UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 86th CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 106—PART 14

AUGUST 29, 1960, TO SEPTEMBER 1, 1960
(PAGES 18071 TO 19568)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1960

J
11
.R
V.106
pt. 14

DEPOSITED BY THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 86th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

SENATE

MONDAY, AUGUST 29, 1960

(Legislative day of Wednesday, August 24, 1960)

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Vice President.

Dr. Lawrence D. Folkemer, minister, Lutheran Church of the Reformation, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Breathe on us, Breath of God, that we may love what Thou dost love and do what Thou wouldst do. Grant us the power, O God, to will one will in order that whatever we will may be pleasing in Thy sight.

Open our eyes to see the wrongs and the woes of our land that cry out to be put right. Give to us a vision of our land as Thou wouldst have it be and as Thou alone canst fashion it. Touch our hearts to make them sensitive to the burdens people carry in more difficult places of the world; then teach us how to bear one another's burdens and so fulfill Thy law of love.

Safeguard us, O Lord, from pride and self-righteousness. Nourish in us a true humility that does not measure the distance between ourselves and others, but only the distance between ourselves and Thee.

Among us, let there ever be harmony in essentials, liberty in nonessentials, and charity in all things. Make us all, this day and always, Thy servants, giving us no rest or discharge until Thou hast wrought in us Thy work of righteousness and compassion. In the Spirit of Christ, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, August 27, 1960, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 1806. An act to revise title 18, chapter 39, of the United States Code, entitled "Explosives and Combustibles";

S. 2306. An act to exempt from taxation certain property of the National Woman's Party, Inc., in the District of Columbia;

S. 3415. An act to exempt from taxation certain property of the American Association of University Women, Educational Foundation, Inc., in the District of Columbia;

S. 3727. An act to authorize the bonding of persons engaging in the home improvement business, and for other purposes;

S. 3834. An act to increase the maximum amount which may be borrowed by the District of Columbia for use in the construction and improvement of its sanitary and combined sewer systems, and for other purposes;

H.R. 900. An act to validate certain overpayments inadvertently made by the United States to several of the States and to relieve certifying and disbursing officers from liability therefrom;

H.R. 2069. An act for the relief of James H. Presley;

H.R. 2178. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to make certain changes in the road at White Branch, Grapevine Reservoir, Tex.;

H.R. 4059. An act to amend title 28 of the United States Code relating to actions for infringements of copyrights by the United States;

H.R. 6084. An act for the relief of J. Butler Hyde;

H.R. 6767. An act for the relief of Raymond Baurkot;

H.R. 7124. An act to require the payment of tuition on account of certain persons who attend the public schools of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7792. An act for the relief of Martin A. Mastandrea;

H.R. 8054. An act for the relief of William Edgar Weaver;

H.R. 8989. An act for the relief of Ralph W. Anderson;

H.R. 9377. An act to provide for the protection of forest cover for reservoir areas under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Army and Chief of Engineers;

H.R. 9406. An act for the relief of William J. Huntsman;

H.R. 9417. An act for the relief of Henry Kaloian;

H.R. 9432. An act for the relief of Major Edmund T. Coppinger;

H.R. 9958. An act for the relief of Brooklyn Steel Warehouse Co.;

H.R. 10431. An act for the relief of Isami Nozuka (also known as Isami Notsuka);

H.R. 10598. An act to clarify certain provisions of the Criminal Code relating to the importation or shipment of injurious mammals, birds, amphibians, fish, and reptiles (18 U.S.C. 42(a), 42(b)); and relating to the transportation or receipt of wild mammals or birds taken in violation of State, National, or foreign laws (18 U.S.C. 43), and for other purposes;

H.R. 11165. An act for the relief of Robert J. Reeves;

H.R. 11188. An act for the relief of Edward S. Anderson;

H.R. 11327. An act for the relief of Chauncey A. Ahalt;

H.R. 11390. An act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11420. An act for the relief of Ferdinand Hofacker;

H.R. 11460. An act for the relief of Edouard E. Perret;

H.R. 11486. An act for the relief of Richard J. Power;

H.R. 11813. An act to amend the Menominee Termination Act;

H.R. 12350. An act for the relief of Marion John Nagurski;

H.R. 12471. An act for the relief of Capt. Lucien B. Clark, O2051623, MSC, U.S. Army;

H.R. 12475. An act for the relief of Claude L. Wimberly;

H.R. 12476. An act for the relief of John H. Esterline;

H.R. 12530. An act to authorize adjustment, in the public interest, of rentals under leases entered into for the provision of commercial recreational facilities at the John H. Kerr Reservoir, Va.-N.C.;

H.R. 12533. An act to amend the Migratory Bird Treaty Act to increase penalties for violations of that act, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12563. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved August 17, 1937, as amended; and

H.J. Res. 658. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation in connection with the centennial of the birth of Jane Addams, founder and leader of Chicago's Hull House.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1961

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and ask unanimous consent that the time required for it be charged equally to both sides.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we proceed to the consideration of the second supplemental appropriation bill for 1961; that we enter into a unanimous-consent agreement, in accordance with the usual form at the desk, that the time on each amendment be limited to 30 minutes, to be equally divided, and the time on the bill be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided; that after we conclude that time, if we have the third reading before 2 o'clock p.m. and any yea-and-nay votes are ordered, that they

be not taken before 2 o'clock. Of course, this is without prejudice to the unanimous-consent agreement previously entered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the agreement is entered.

The clerk will state the bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 13161) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, if there is no Senator to discuss the bill on either side, I fear some Senators interested in the bill do not know the measure is before the Senate. I would suggest we have a quorum call for a few minutes and alert Senators that we have the bill up for consideration.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. We have just gone through a quorum call.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I fear Senators thought we were going to discuss the medical aid bill. I think Senators should be alerted.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I ask the attachés of the Senate, Mr. McDonnell and Mr. Trice, to notify Members of the Senate that we have before us the second supplemental appropriation bill; that it is going to be discussed; that, while we have just had a quorum call we are going to have another call, and at the conclusion of the quorum call we should like to have their presence if they care to offer any discussion. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARLSON in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the bill as it was passed by the House of Representatives provided $91,085,481.

The increase by the Senate committee was $213,957,250.

Under the bill as reported to the Senate the amount provided is $305,042,731.

The estimates considered by the Senate amounted to $81,932,731.

The bill provides an amount over the budget estimates of $223,110,000.

I say the amount in the committee bill is over the budget estimates because some budget estimates for these items in the bill were considered in other appropriation bills. These items were denied in the other bills and were shown as reductions in the budget at that time. So in this bill these items, which aggregate well in excess of $200 million, must be shown as increases over the budget.

The largest increases in the bill are for the President's special international program, which is increased to $986,000.

Special foreign currency programs: Administrative expenses, oversea surplus agricultural commodity donations—$1 million.

The President's special international program, $1,300,000.

Then under the mutual security program, for defense support there is a proposed increase of $65 million; for technical cooperation an increase of $22 million; for special assistance an increase of $26 million; for general administrative expenses $2 million; and Development Loan Fund, an increase of $75 million.

The total for mutual security is $190 million.

I ask that the committee amendments to the bill be agreed to en bloc, and that the bill as thus amended be regarded for the purpose of amendment as original text; provided, that no point of order shall be considered to have been waived by reason of agreement to this order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the committee amendments to the bill will be agreed to en bloc.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. May we have the amendments agreed to with the exception of the amendments involving mutual aid, and have an agreement to have a yea-and-nay vote on those amendments?

Mr. HAYDEN. That procedure could be followed. I suggested a provision that no point of order should be considered to have been waived by reason of agreement to the order. If a Senator insists upon a yea-and-nay vote upon any amendment, he can have it.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, though I am not sure I shall object, I understand that there is no real controversy about this conference report.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. This is not a conference report; this is a bill.

We wish to have a yea-and-nay vote on the mutual aid amendments that were put in the supplemental bill, and I was not sure when we asked for a unanimous-consent agreement whether that would foreclose our voting on those amendments. Now the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] is restating the question.

The unanimous-consent agreement would not foreclose the request of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], who is desirous that we have a yea-and-nay vote on the mutual aid amendments en bloc.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Am I to understand that there is no real controversy about these amendments and no Senator cares to discuss the supplemental appropriation bill? So far only the committee chairman has discussed it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. He has only started.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I would not like to see Senators prejudiced by reason of their not knowing the bill is being considered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. We have called the Senators. We have had a quorum call for the Senators. We have tried to notify the office of each Senator. The committee chairman has started the discussion in the normal, routine way.

Mr. HAYDEN. I shall be glad to answer any questions.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I do not object. I only have in mind that some Senators might wish to speak and they might be prejudiced.

At 1:30 a. m. Sunday morning we had ourselves a bank night and passed a number of bills with amendments which some Senator subsequently may find objectionable. While those of us who are here tried to protect any Senator who was not here in case such Senator wished to make an objection, I would not want to be in a position of passing this bill without a Senator who wished to object not being here and being able to do so.

Mr. HAYDEN. We have a very unusual procedure. The House of Representatives and the Senate passed a bill and sent it to conference. The conferees met and there was an agreement. The President has strongly objected to the action of the conference committee. Representations were made that he would like to have the subject reconsidered. So the committee met and listened to the President's representatives present the request, and the committee has decided to report out practically what the President wishes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. As I understand, the State Department raised some questions about four instances of language that were considered undesirable. As I understand, the committee went along with the State Department and agreed to strike all of the undesirable language features. Is that correct?

Mr. HAYDEN. Some of them. They made some modifications, I think, which I believe the House agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thought we had changed that modification.

Mr. HAYDEN. For example, with respect to technical cooperation, the committee report states—

TECHNICAL COOPERATION

For the bilateral technical cooperation program, the committee recommends an appropriation of $22 million in this bill. In the mutual security appropriation bill for fiscal year 1961, the Senate approved an appropriation of $172 million, an increase of $22 million over the House-approved amount of $150 million. The deletion of $22 million approved by the conference committee is restored in this bill.

The House bill for the mutual security program for fiscal year 1961 contained the following language provision: *"Provided,* That no part of this appropriation shall be used to initiate any project or activity which has not been justified to the House of Representatives and the Senate."

The provision was deleted from the bill by the Senate but it was restored by the committee of conference. The committee, in this bill, has adopted the following provision which has the effect of repealing the provision previously stricken by the Senate from the mutual security appropriation bill. This new provision provides for a reporting to the committees of the Senate and House whenever a project is financed from fiscal year 1961 funds where an estimate has not

been submitted: The proviso in the paragraph headed "Technical cooperation, general authorization" in title I of the Mutual Security and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1961, is amended to read as follows: ": *Provided*, That every project or activity financed from funds made available for the fiscal year 1961 for such assistance and for which an estimate has not been submitted, shall be reported to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator. With respect to the amount of funds appropriated for defense support, I understand that the Senate bill as originally passed provided $675 million, and that the conference report reduced that amount to $610 million.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Department asked for the restoration of $65 million and the committee agreed to that restoration of $65 million, thus giving a total for the next fiscal year of $675 million. Is that correct?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. On the subject of technical cooperation, it is my understanding that the conference report provided $150 million; that the Senate bill as originally passed provided $172 million; that the Department asked that $22 million be added for technical cooperation, and the committee agreed to add $22 million for technical cooperation. Is that correct?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; with a new proviso and with this modification of requiring that any project undertaken shall be reported to the committees, I believe part of the objection is removed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. What I have specific reference to is that the Department asked for $22 million, and they received $22 million.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. With respect to special assistance, the Department asked for $256 million; the conference report provided $230 million; so they asked for an additional $26 million for special assistance, and they received an additional $26 million. Is that correct?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. With respect to administrative expenses, the Department asked for $2 million and they received $2 million?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. With respect to the Development Loan Fund, the Department representatives testified that they could get by without any of the additional $150 million requested, but they felt it would be desirable to add the $150 million. However, the committee, after considering the request, decided they would split the amount, and they added $75 million. Is that correct?

Mr. HAYDEN. Upon the theory that they actually would not need more than $75 million between now and when Congress meets next year.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Dillon testified that they could get by until next year without any of the $150 million, did he not?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. As I understand the testimony was that the Department would receive $150 million by this bill, but that since it was not programed for the full 12 months, the Department could come back as late as next April, and if anything had to be reduced, the representative of the Department would prefer that this item be reduced to any other item, and in the light of that statement, the committee agreed to recommend $75 million of that $150 million. Is that correct?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I commend the majority leader and the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee for the action they took on Saturday, which I believe to be clearly in the public interest. I commend the leader for the commitment he made on the floor of the Senate on Saturday. My only regret is that the entire $150 million for the Development Loan Fund was not restored. We are going to be very busy, indeed, in January, February, and March with a great many important matters, in order to put the Democratic platform into effect and bring about effective legislation based on it. I would have been much happier to have had the entire sum restored, instead of only a part of it.

Mr. HAYDEN. Nevertheless, there is always, in March, and sometimes in February, a supplemental appropriation bill presented to cover contingencies or changes in a situation. We will have an opportunity to take care of any such matters. In the meantime, in the opinion of the committee, the administration has enough money on hand to run this fund.

Mr. CLARK. I understand the Senator's explanation. Press reports indicate that the House committee will be very difficult to deal with in conference on this matter. Therefore, I wonder if it would not have been desirable to have a little more bargaining power by having restored the full $150 million, because we know that when we go to conference it is always a matter of give and take between the Senate conferees and the managers on the part of the House. If we had the assurance that our conferees, the conferees on the part of the Senate, will stand firm on this point, then I believe we would be in good shape. Otherwise, I would like to have seen the full $150 million restored.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I had hoped so, too. However, when five items are in dispute, and we get 4½ of them, and win on those, we have made a very good record. With reference to the Development Loan Fund, I had hoped that the testimony would be much stronger than it was. Each member of the committee, when I asked that the full amount be restored, replied that the Secretary himself had said that this was a matter which could be handled at another time. It was difficult enough to get half of it. We had a divided vote on it, as a matter of fact.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from Texas. He and the Senator from Arizona should be commended for the fine work they did with regard to this whole matter. I just wish that we had been able to restore the full amount.

Mr. HAYDEN. Would the Senator like to hear the testimony on this point?

Mr. CLARK. Yes; if the Senator would be kind enough to read it.

Mr. HAYDEN. I read from the testimony of Mr. Dillon on page 617 of the printed hearings:

> The Development Loan Fund is of every bit as high priority as the other items. We need these funds and we have to use them, obligate them, during the year. However, it is a fact that the Development Loan Fund funds are obligated only as different projects are approved by the Loan Committee, by the Board of the Development Loan Fund. Therefore, if we have the assurance that we can come back to the Congress if we need extra funds, and our request will be looked at and listened to, there always is a possibility of coming back in January, asking for a supplemental and getting it, say, in due course, in April, without really hurting the Development Loan Fund operation.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator for his explanation. It is very clear. I wonder if he does not think that too often the administration has followed the old adage that he who runs away will live to fight another day.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. Did I understand the Senator's statement on Friday to the effect that the provision in the bill for technical cooperation provided that every project or activity financed during fiscal 1961 is to be justified to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. GRUENING. Do I understand that that provision was deleted from the appropriation bill now before the Senate?

Mr. HAYDEN. No; that is in the bill. We want that in the bill.

Mr. GRUENING. The Senator wants that in the bill?

Mr. HAYDEN. We are insistent that that remain in the bill. The charge was made that we would be granting a blank check to the administration in that respect. That would be looked into, just as is the case on military expenditures where a report is given to the Armed Services Committee. This would be reported to the committees. That is done over and over again.

Mr. GRUENING. Do I understand that there is nothing in the present proposal which will diminish or slacken controls which Congress now has over mutual security appropriations? There was some language in the original bill, which I was fearful would be deleted in this appropriation bill. Am I wrong about that?

Mr. HAYDEN. There has been no deletion.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I opposed the language in the conference report, on the ground that it gave committees a veto power before any projects could be initiated. The language now has been

changed to read that projects shall be reported to the committees, but that the committees shall have no veto power over projects being initiated. If it were not so, the hands of the administration would be tied, notably in the case of the independent nations which are coming into being in Africa.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator knows that with reference to military projects, the committees are notified, and if they are disapproved prompt notice can be given and an effective stop can be put to whatever is going on.

Mr. GRUENING. We hope that objection, when made, will be effective. I have particularly in mind the chaos in Africa as these new nations are being spawned, and it is certainly desirable that we exercise greater caution in respect to these projects than we have in the past. As I say, with some 20 new nations being spawned, and some of these dividing, amoeba-like, great confusion is bound to exist, and it is desirable for Congress to have greater control than it has now.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, may we have action on the request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARLSON in the chair). The question is on the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

The amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

At the top of page 2, to insert:

"FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

"President's special international program

"For an additional amount for the 'President's special international program', including not to exceed $6,600 for representation, $986,800, to remain available until expended."

On page 2, after line 5, to insert:

"SPECIAL FOREIGN CURRENCY PROGRAM

"For purchase of Indian rupees which accrue under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1704), for the purposes authorized by section 104(m)(A) of that Act, to remain available until expended, $1,300,000, of which not to exceed $2,500 may be expended for representation."

On page 2, after line 12, to insert:

"SPECIAL FOREIGN CURRENCY PROGRAM

"Administrative expenses, oversea surplus agricultural commodity donations

"For purchase of foreign currencies which accrue under section 104(f) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, for the purpose of administering section 302 of the Act as it relates to donations of surplus agricultural commodities to nonprofit voluntary agencies and intergovernmental organizations for use in assistance to needy persons outside the United States, $1,000,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be used to purchase only currencies which the Treasury Department shall determine to be excess to the normal requirements of the United States."

On page 5, after line 3, to insert:

"FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL SERVICE

"For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses,' $275,000; and in addition, $170,000 of the funds appropriated by section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935, as amended (7 U.S.C. 612c), shall be merged with this appropriation and shall be available for all expenses of the Foreign Agricultural Service in carrying out the purposes of said section 32."

On page 5, after line 12, to insert:

"FOREST PROTECTION AND UTILIZATION"

On page 5, line 15, after the word "management", to strike out "$700,000" and insert "$800,000".

On page 5, after line 17, to insert:

"GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

"Office of Field Services

"Salaries and Expenses

"For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses', $207,500.

On page 6, line 6, after "(74 Stat. 204)", to strike out "$5,000" and insert "$15,000".

On page 6, after line 8, to insert:

"SALARIES AND EXPENSES

"For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses,' $150,000."

On page 6, after line 15, to insert:

"COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

"Salaries and expenses

"For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses', $284,000."

On page 6, after line 19, to insert:

"CONSTRUCTION AND EQUIPMENT

"For the purpose of obtaining a suitable site for construction of a Coast and Geodetic Survey Seismological Laboratory, the Secretary of Commerce is authorized, on behalf of the United States, to lease from the Isleta Indian Tribe, and the Isleta Indian Tribe, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, is authorized to lease to the Secretary of Commerce, for a minimum term of 25 years with provisions for renewal, approximately seven hundred and fifty acres, more or less, of tribal land on the Isleta Indian Reservation; such land being situated in sections 5, 6, 7, and 8, township 8 north, range 5 east, New Mexico principal meridian, county of Bernalillo, State of New Mexico. Any lease entered into hereunder shall provide for an annual rental not in excess of $1,200, and shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which the tribe may jointly use that portion of the leased area not specifically needed for the Laboratory. The construction of the Laboratory, on the land leased hereunder, shall be undertaken by the Secretary of Commerce, on behalf of the United States, and the Secretary shall provide, in connection therewith, such structures, appurtenances and facilities as may be necessary or desirable in furtherance of the purposes and requirements of such Laboratory, and shall provide for the repair, maintenance, alteration, or improvements thereof."

On page 7, after line 19, to insert:

"BUSINESS AND DEFENSE SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

"Salaries and expenses

"For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses', $291,500."

At the top of page 8, to insert:

"BUREAU OF FOREIGN COMMERCE

"Salaries and expenses

"For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses', $1,000,000, of which not to exceed $83,000 may be transferred to the appropriation for 'Salaries and expenses', General administration."

On page 8, line 20, after the word "in", to strike out "carry" and insert "carrying".

On page 9, after line 19, to insert:

"WEATHER BUREAU

"Salaries and expenses

"For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses', $50,000."

On page 9, after line 19, to insert:

"EXECUTIVE OFFICE

"For an additional amount for 'Executive Office', $47,700."

On page 10, after line 7, to insert:

"CAPITAL OUTLAY

"Public building construction

"For an additional amount for 'Capital outlay, public building construction' for construction projects as authorized by the Act of June 6, 1958 (72 Stat. 183), including acquisition of sites; preliminary survey at the Receiving Home; preparation of plans and specifications for the following buildings: Eliot Junior High School addition, new elementary school in the vicinity of Eleventh and Clifton Streets Northwest, and Bancroft Elementary School addition; erection of the following structures, including building improvement and alteration and the treatment of grounds: Kenilworth Elementary School addition, new junior high school in the vicinity of South Dakota Avenue and Hamilton Street Northeast, Deal Junior High School addition, additional dormitory at the Youth Correctional Center, cowbarn and dairy facility at the Workhouse, laundry addition at the District of Columbia Village, children's cottages at the Junior Village, and a chapel at the Cedar Knoll School; equipment for new buildings; advanced planning for various recreation units; $25,000 for purchase of equipment for new school buildings; and permanent improvements of buildings and grounds (including purchase and installation of furnishings and equipment) of correctional and welfare institutions, and other District of Columbia buildings; to remain available until expended, $6,170,800 of which $900,000 shall not become available for expenditure until July 1, 1961, and $330,100 shall be available for construction services by the Director of Buildings and Grounds or by contract for architectural engineering services, as may be determined by the Commissioners, and the funds for the use of the Director of Buildings and Grounds shall be advanced to the appropriation account, 'Construction services, Department of Buildings and Grounds'."

On page 11, after line 17, to insert:

"DEPARTMENT OF SANITARY ENGINEERING

"For an additional amount for 'Capital outlay, Department of Sanitary Engineering", for construction projects as authorized by the Act of April 22, 1904 (33 Stat. 244), the Act of May 18, 1954 (68 Stat. 105), and the Act of June 6, 1958 (72 Stat. 183), to remain available until expended, $3,838,000, of which $1,100,000 shall not become available for expenditure until July 1, 1961."

On page 12, at the beginning of line 12, to strike out "$1,000,000" and insert "$1,528,000."

On page 13, line 4, after "July 12, 1960", to strike out "$2,225,000" and insert "$6,000,000."

On page 13, after line 4, to insert:

"PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

"Assistance to States, general

"For an additional amount for 'Assistance to States, general', $3,070,000, including funds to provide project grants for public health training pursuant to section 309 of the Public Health Service Act, as amended."

On page 13, after line 10, to insert:

"SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

"Grants to States for public assistance

"The amounts made available for 'Grants to States for public assistance', in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1961, shall be available for grants for medical assistance for the aged, as authorized by the 'Social Security Amendments of 1960'."

On page 14, line 25, to strike out "$28,500" and insert "$57,000".

On page 15, at the beginning of line 8, to strike out "$145,000" and insert "including allowances and benefits similar to those

provided by title IX of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, as determined by the Commission; expenses of packing, shipping, and storing personal effects of personnel assigned abroad; rental or lease, for such periods as may be necessary, of office space and living quarters for personnel assigned abroad; maintenance, improvement, and repair of properties rented or leased abroad, and furnishing fuel, water, and utilities for such properties; hire of passenger motor vehicles abroad; insurance on official motor vehicles abroad; and advances of funds abroad; $290,000: *Provided*, That the limitation under this head in the General Government Matters Appropriation Act, 1961, on the amount available for expenses of travel, is increased from '$10,000' to '$30,000'."

On page 16, after line 1, to insert:

"REPAIR AND IMPROVEMENT OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS

"For an additional amount for 'Repair and improvement of public buildings', for construction of fallout shelters, $2,000,000, to remain available until expended."

On page 16, after line 5, to insert:

"CONSTRUCTION, PUBLIC BUILDINGS PROJECTS

"For an additional amount for 'Construction, public buildings projects', for construction of fallout shelters in public buildings to be constructed or altered pursuant to the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 479), $5,289,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the maximum construction improvement costs (excluding funds for sites and expenses) approved for individual projects in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1961, are hereby amended to read as follows subject to increases of not to exceed 10 per centum per project, as authorized in said Act:".

On page 16, after line 17, to insert:

"Post office and Federal office building, Camden, Arkansas, $655,050;".

On page 16, after line 19, to insert:

"Courthouse and Federal office building, San Francisco, California, $38,296,900;".

On page 16, after line 21, to insert:

"Courthouse and Federal office building, Hartford, Connecticut, $7,816,400;".

On page 16, after line 23, to insert:

"Post office and courthouse, Thomasville, Georgia, $1,119,600;".

At the top of page 17, to insert:

"Border station, Van Buren, Maine, $297,550;".

On page 17, after line 1, to insert:

"Border station, Vanceboro, Maine, $261,150;".

On page 17, after line 2, to insert:

"Immigration and Naturalization Service center (construction and alteration), Detroit, Michigan, $895,050;".

On page 17, after line 4, to insert:

"Border station, Sweetgrass, Montana, $615,600;".

On page 17, after line 5, to insert:

"Post office and courthouse, Bismarck, North Dakota, $3,283,050;".

On page 17, after line 7, to insert:

"Federal office building, Toledo, Ohio, $3,980,700;".

On page 17, after line 8, to insert:

"Courthouse and Federal office building, Memphis, Tennessee, $10,167,150;".

On page 17, after line 10, to insert:

"Post office and Federal office building, Dayton, Washington, $288,700;".

On page 17, after line 12, to insert:

"Federal Office Building Numbered 8, District of Columbia, exclusive of laboratory and other equipment, $15,735,000;".

On page 17, after line 15, to insert:

"Federal Office Building Numbered 10, District of Columbia, $40,803,500; and".

On page 17, after line 17, to insert:

"United States Court of Claims and Court of Customs and Patent Appeals building, $6,491,000.".

On page 18, after line 6, to insert:

"Section 303 of the Independent Offices Appropriations Act, 1961, is repealed."

On page 18, line 15, after the word "Commission", to strike out "$125,000" and insert "$25,000".

On page 18, line 22, after the word "Commission", to strike out "$5,000" and insert "$10,000".

At the top of page 19, to insert:

"UNITED STATES TERRITORIAL EXPANSION MEMORIAL COMMISSION

"Funds previously appropriated under this head shall remain available until expended."

On page 19, line 13, after "(5 U.S.C. 2131)", to strike out "$250,000" and insert "$500,000".

On page 19, at the beginning of line 18, to strike out "$593,750" and insert "$950,700", and after the amendment just above stated, to insert a colon and "*Provided*, That $325,700 of this amount shall become available only upon enactment into law during this calendar year of legislation providing pay increases for policemen, firemen, and teachers of the District of Columbia."

On page 20, line 2, after the word "outlay", to strike out "$121,000" and insert "134,200", and in line 3, after the word "expended", to strike out the colon and "*Provided*, That no part of the foregoing amount shall be available for any expenses related to the construction of any quarters at a cost in excess of $9,000 per unit", and, in lieu thereof, to insert ": *Provided*, That no part of the foregoing amount shall be available for any expenses related to the construction of any quarters, exclusive of provision of utility connections and costs of the Canal Zone Government, at an average cost in excess of $9,000 per unit."

On page 20, line 18, after the word "to", to strike out "$9,375,600" and insert "$9,412,200".

On page 21, line 12, to strike out "$400,000" and insert "$500,000".

On page 21, line 22, after the word "until", to strike out "expended," and insert "expended", and, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "of which not to exceed $200,000 shall be available for administration and supervision".

On page 22, line 4, after the word "resources", to strike out "$1,350,000" and insert "$1,500".

On page 22, line 12, after the word "Construction", to strike out "$1,800,000" and insert "$2,450,000", and in line 13, after the word "expended", to insert a comma and "of which $250,000 shall be available for payment to the Parshall, North Dakota Special School District Numbered 3 for the construction of school facilities which shall be available to Indian children."

On page 22, line 21, after the figures "$300,000", to insert a colon and "*Provided*, That the limitation under this head in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1955, on the amount available toward the emergency rehabilitation of the Crescent Lake Dam project, Oregon, is increased from $297,000 to $305,000."

On page 23, line 6, after the word "for", to strike out "Construction and Rehabilitation" and insert "Upper Colorado River Basin Fund".

On page 23, line 13, after the word "appropriation", to strike out "Construction and Rehabilitation" and insert "Upper Colorado River Basin Fund".

On page 23, after line 14, to insert:

"ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

"After August 31, 1960, the position of Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation shall have the same annual rate of compensation as that provided for positions listed in 5 U.S.C. 2205(b), so long as held by the present incumbent."

On page 23, after line 19, to insert:

"GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

"Surveys, investigations, and research

"For an additional amount for 'Surveys, investigations, and research', $300,000."

At the top of page 24, to insert:

"NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

"Construction

"For an additional amount for 'Construction', $500,000."

On page 24, line 12, after the word "resources", to strike out "$100,000" and insert "$300,000".

On page 24, line 16, after the word "vessels", to strike out "$500,000" and insert "$1,000,000".

On page 24, after line 16, to insert:

"ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

"Not to exceed twenty of the passenger motor vehicles authorized to be purchased by the Fish and Wildlife Service, during the fiscal year 1961, shall be for police-type use, and may exceed by $300 each the general purchase price limitation for such fiscal year."

On page 25, line 4, after the word "effect", to strike out "the United States" and insert "either party", and in line 12, after the word "of", to strike out "the United States" and insert "either party".

On page 26, after line 2, to strike out:

"ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

"Office of the Architect of the Capitol

"Salaries

"For an additional amount for "Salaries", $8,200: *Provided*, That from and after July 1, 1960, the salary rates of the Architect of the Capitol, the Assistant Architect of the Capitol, and the Second Assistant Architect of the Capitol, shall be $22,000, $20,200, and $18,500 per annum, respectively."

On page 26, after line 15, to insert:

"DEPARTMENT OF STATE

"Administration of Foreign Affairs

"Salaries and Expenses

"For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", $250,000."

On page 26, after line 20, to insert:

"UNITED STATES CITIZENS COMMISSION ON NATO

"For necessary expenses of the United States Citizens Commission on NATO, including personal services as authorized by section 3(4) of S. J. Res. 170 without regard to civil service and classification laws; travel, subsistence, and other expenses of the Commission and its staff; hire of passenger motor vehicles; printing and binding without regard to section 11 of the Act of March 1, 1919 (44 U.S.C. 111); $300,000, of which not to exceed $3,000 may be expended for entertainment: *Provided*, That not to exceed $100,000 may be expended for meetings and conferences pursuant to section 3(5), S.J. Res. 170; to remain available until January 31, 1962."

And, on page 27, after line 8, to insert:

"TREASURY DEPARTMENT

"Bureau of the Public Debt

"Administering the Public Debt

"Not to exceed $375,000 of the unobligated balance of the appropriation for 'Administering the public debt,' fiscal year 1960, shall remain available during the current fiscal year for expenses of advance refunding of the public debt."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I note that the committee did increase the amount of the appropriation for the Inspector General and Comptroller from $1,200,000 to

$1,762,000, with the proviso that reports be furnished to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives. In that way great savings in the administration of the mutual security program will be accomplished; also, duplication and waste in the administration of the funds will be avoided. I am wondering, however, if there is not some way, without doing a disservice to the bill, an amendment could be offered to provide that reports by the Inspector General and Comptroller would also be furnished to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and to the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If we make a legislative record now that it is the intent of the Senate that these reports should be submitted to the Committee on Foreign Relations and to the Committee on Foreign Affairs—and I think it is proper that that be done—it would require nothing more; it would not require an amendment to the bill and no proviso otherwise. I believe the legislative history on the matter would be sufficient.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Then do I understand that that is the unanimous intent of the Senate at this time?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is in the report.

Mr. HAYDEN. It is clearly indicated that they would be glad to furnish information to the committees of Congress. It is the intention that copies would come to us.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is my understanding that it is the sense of the Senate that reports furnished to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees be also furnished to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and to the House Foreign Affairs Committee. Is that correct?

Mr. HAYDEN. There is no reason why that cannot be done.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, while we have a good number of Senators on the floor, I wonder if this unanimous-consent agreement could be acted on; that we order the yeas and nays on the mutual aid amendments en bloc.

Mr. President, I ask that the yeas and nays be ordered and that the vote be postponed until later in the day. We can then go ahead and discuss generally the provisions of the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, under ordinary circumstances, I would have no objection. However, there was an understanding that there would be no yea-and-nay vote before 2 o'clock this afternoon.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am not suggesting that a vote be taken now; I am only asking that the yeas and nays be ordered now, while a large number of Senators are on the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. We can have the yeas and nays ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I do not expect to have the vote now. Mr. President, I ask that the yeas and nays be ordered on the committee amendments en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays are ordered.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I should like to ask the majority leader a question. What is the reason for not wanting to discuss the amendments separately? They are quite different in their intent.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. They can be discussed separately. However, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] wanted a vote on the mutual aid amendments en bloc. We have provided for that, so that we will not have 10 yea-and-nay votes, but 1 yea-and-nay vote.

Mr. GRUENING. Some amendments might be more desirable than others.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, there is one particular amendment on which a yea-and-nay vote should be taken in its own right. I objected before the gavel fell. If the Senator from Texas will separate that amendment from the rest, I shall have no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have no objection to doing that.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That particular amendment provides that the President will have to inform the Senate as to who will receive the money.

Mr. GRUENING. I think that is a reasonable request.

Mr. LONG. So long as I am protected on that amendment, I will have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York will state it.

Mr. KEATING. What is the question before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, do any other Senators desire to discuss any of the amendments which are being added as mutual security amendments? If not, the yea-and-nay vote will be postponed until later in the day.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, was the request agreed to?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the question be stated again. I thought it had been agreed to once.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous consent request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask for the third reading of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read the third time.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the yea-and-nay vote be delayed until later in the day, and that the Senate now return to the time limitation on the medical aid conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas withhold his request?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I withhold my request and yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I direct my question to the distinguished Senator from Arizona. On page 5 of the report, reference is made to the inclusion of $100,000 over the House allowance. The report reads:

> In recommending the full amount of the allowance, which is an increase of $100,000 over the House allowance, the committee has taken into consideration that since this estimate was submitted, a substantial number of acres have burned in national forests in Idaho and South Dakota.

Mr. HAYDEN. A mistake was made. The language should have included Nevada and California. The report can be read in that context.

Mr. BIBLE. Yes. A disastrous fire occurred along the border of the two States.

Mr. President, I thank the chairman of the committee and the distinguished majority leader for their courtesy.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware has the floor.

Mr. FREAR. I am waiting until the majority leader and the minority leader have completed their discussion.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, while we are waiting, I should like to make it clear that I expect to object to postponing the vote on the mutual aid amendments. I think it would be most desirable to have a vote on something, so that more Senators will be in attendance. I disagree to a postponement of the vote.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. FREAR. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I should like to have the yeas and nays ordered on the passage of the second supplemental appropriation bill, so that all Senators may know that a yea-and-nay vote will be taken.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been requested on the passage of the second supplemental appropriation bill. Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I do not agree to the setting aside of the vote on the mutual security amendments. I think it would be good to have a yea-and-nay vote on some matter, so as to bring more Senators to the Chamber.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, it had been agreed that there would be no yea-and-nay votes before 2 o'clock. This was to accommodate certain Senators who could not be present until that time. It was understood that we would have all the yea-and-nay votes at one time. The Senator from Louisiana can speak on the medical aid conference report.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I did not agree to set aside the vote on the mutual security amendments. So far as I am concerned, it was not my intention to

postpone the vote on them. I thought the debate on the supplemental bill would continue from now until 2 o'clock. I do not feel disposed to set the mutual security amendments aside.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. We simply agreed to have the vote on the medical aid conference report at 2 o'clock. We cannot have a yea-and-nay vote on the supplemental appropriation bill before 2 o'clock, because of an agreement not to have yea-and-nay votes before that time. I do not want to catch Senators off base. I am sure the Senator from Louisiana is sympathetic to that understanding. He would not want Senators who had understood there would be no votes until 2 o'clock to be surprised.

We shall have three yea-and-nay votes this afternoon: one on the medical aid conference report; then, in accordance with the understanding with the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], on the mutual security amendments; and then on the passage of the supplemental appropriation bill.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. My understanding was that we had agreed to set aside the consideration of the conference report on the medical-aid bill long enough to take up the second supplemental appropriation bill, without prejudice to the time limitation on the conference report. I have discussed this question with the Parliamentarian and, according to his interpretation and mine, the vote on the conference report would come after the time when the vote is taken on the mutual security amendments.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I shall be glad to arrange for that.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. But it was my understanding that when we took up the second supplemental appropriation bill and, after everyone who wanted to discuss it had discussed it, we would then be ready to vote.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. No. The understanding was that there would be no votes until 2 o'clock. Several Senators will not be ready to vote until 2 o'clock.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If the Senators' agreement is not to vote on the second supplemental appropriation bill until 2 o'clock, I should like to have it understood that the time for debate on the medical-aid conference report will be extended beyond 2 o'clock.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I shall do my best to accommodate the Senator. Will the Senator state how much time he desires?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. My understanding was that when it was agreed to set aside the medical-aid conference report, without prejudice to the report, the time which still remained to discuss the report, which was 3 hours and 45 minutes, would be continued, to be equally divided, to which I would have no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is all right.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The time we have taken thus far on the supplemental bill—45 minutes—postpones the time for debate on the medical-aid conference report by 45 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is agreeable.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Plus whatever additional time is taken for the vote on the second supplemental appropriation bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. There is no additional time. I understand the Senator's desire.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an additional 45 minutes may be allotted for debate on the medical-aid conference report, and that no vote be taken on the medical-aid report until 2:45 this afternoon.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Plus such time as will be required for the yea-and-nay vote on the supplemental appropriation bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. All right. How much time would the Senator suggest altogether? One hour?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Why not clarify the proposal by saying 45 minutes plus such additional time as is required for the vote on the mutual security amendments?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. All right. I modify my request accordingly, Mr. President, that we extend the time by 45 minutes plus such time as is necessary for the yea-and-nay vote.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I trust that request will not be made. We were here until 1:30 Sunday morning.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. But does the Senator from Illinois understand——

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, Mr. President, I understand it perfectly. We allowed 4 hours. We convened this morning at 10 a.m. The Senator from Louisiana has occupied most of the time. I do not believe all of the time available to the proponents of the conference report will be taken. So I see no need to go beyond 2 o'clock.

This matter has been here, and it has been discussed until the small hours of the morning. So I trust it will not be continued any longer. I do not believe it fair to Members who stayed here religiously all day and into the wee hours of Sunday morning.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Let me see if this will satisfy the Senator: The Senator from Louisiana has control of the time for the opponents——

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I do.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. And he has 2 hours, exclusive of the time taken for the rollcall. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Louisiana have not to exceed 2 hours to discuss the conference report on the medical aid bill.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, what change will that make?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. None.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Some of us were here until 1 o'clock Sunday morning, waiting for the vote. I do not care whether the Senator from Louisiana gets 2 hours either next week or next year, but I think we should adhere to the unanimous-consent agreement which was entered into at 1 a.m. on Sunday morning.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. We are doing so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARLSON in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS subsequently said: Mr. President, I am grateful to my minority leader for yielding to me at this time. I had my say on the pending social security conference report on Saturday, with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. I hope Senators will refer to it as a real pledge to do all we can to bring about adequate legislation on medical care for our older citizens next year.

I wish to say a word about the mutual security appropriations contained in the supplemental appropriation bill. I say only that it is a fact that it pays to protest. I should also like to compliment and congratulate those Senators who like myself are among the most devoted advocates of mutual security yet who voted "nay" on the conference report on the mutual security appropriations bill. It indicates that when we protest and when we have a case, something does happen. I am very glad for the restoration of funds for mutual security and the removal of onerous conditions which have been made. I am only sorry that the minuscule figure of $2 million has not been provided for the private investment incentive program, and I hope very much that it may be repaired in the same fashion.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

During Mr. FREAR's remarks on the second supplemental appropriation bill:

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I want to make a unanimous-consent request, and I ask that it come at the end of the discourse by the Senator from Delaware, so it will not interfere with it.

Mr. FREAR. I yield for that purpose, without losing the floor.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, what is the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I am about to make it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be allowed to meet while the Senate is in session.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President——

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I must object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

ATROCITIES TO AMERICAN SOLDIERS AND OTHERS IN THE CONGO

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, if I may obtain the attention of the majority leader and the minority leader—although I expect that will be more difficult than obtaining a unanimous-consent agreement; nevertheless I will try. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, something of unusual interest, which certainly affects the junior Senator from Delaware, has occurred. I know that the majority leader and the minority leader are well acquainted with it.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Chair restore order in the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. The Senator from Delaware will not proceed until the Senate is in order.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I shall object to having the Senate proceed until every Senator except the one who has been recognized is in his chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee will state it.

Mr. GORE. Senators are standing, and the Senate is not in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

The Senator from Delaware may proceed.

Mr. FREAR. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, over the weekend the newspapers carried headlines about certain matters in the Congo. For instance, in the Washington Post the headline is: "U.S. Airmen Beaten in Congo."

That was the second incident of that type. Canadian soldiers were beaten only a few days before. I am especially interested in this matter because those airmen come from the Dover Air Force Base, at Dover, Del. I know many of them.

Mr. President, it is with great regret that we have learned of these incidents, through dispatches by the Associated Press. From the dispatches, we learn that eight airmen stationed at Dover were attacked and beaten—in some cases, savagely—by a mob of Congolese, over the weekend. The incident occurred at Stanleyville, when a U.S. Globemaster carrying those airmen landed with a cargo of signal equipment for United Nations forces. I understand that one or two of the injured men may have suffered skull fractures. Some are stretcher cases. All were cruelly beaten in the assault.

The Associated Press dispatch which I have read quotes one of our Dover Air Force Base airmen as saying that the mob, when it attacked them, was made up of soldiers and civilians armed with clubs, submachine guns, and rifles. And, Mr. President, let us bear in mind that our men were unprotected.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. FREAR. I yield.

Mr. TALMADGE. I commend my able and distinguished friend, the Senator from Delaware, for his observations about those incidents and the situation which prevails in the Congo.

I say to the Senator from Delaware that yesterday I received a long-distance call from a veteran of World War II, who lives in my State. He had read in the press of the incident to which the Senator from Delaware has referred. He was so angry and upset that he was crying at the thought that servicemen wearing the uniform of the United States of America could be treated in such fashion in any part of the world.

Does the Senator from Delaware think, after what he has read and heard, that the Congress should have voted $100 million in aid for the Congo?

Mr. FREAR. I shall answer the distinguished Senator from Georgia by saying that I voted against it, and I think that expresses my sentiments. I cannot conceive that a request would be made to grant $100 million to a country that is maiming our soldiers in uniform—our unarmed soldiers, without protection—and also Canadian soldiers.

Before I finish, I shall say something that I expect will probably cause the Senator from Georgia to say, "It cannot be proved. Is it true? How could it be true?" But I am going to say it, and I will say it in terms that I hope will be justified.

Mr. TALMADGE. I shall be listening with interest to what the Senator from Delaware has to say in further reference to this situation. I am sure the able Senator has often heard the statement "Crime does not pay." Would the Senator think that observation would be correct with reference to the Congo?

Mr. FREAR. Quite to the contrary. Instead, it seems that $100 million is granted by our country, following those instances of assault and battery. I do not know the exact terms which should be used, but I am sure the Senator from Georgia has the correct ones in mind; and I must agree that terms of that sort are properly used in connection with that situation—much to my sorrow, let me say.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield to me?

Mr. FREAR. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. Does the able Senator from Delaware agree with what is apparently the policy of the administration in this situation?

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, may we have order? I cannot hear the distinguished Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. GRUENING. Does the Senator from Delaware agree with the apparent policy of the administration—namely, that the worse the situation becomes and the more shabbily we are treated, the more money we will pour into that situation?

Mr. FREAR. Let me answer the Senator from Alaska by saying that I think I would have to go back to my voting record, rather than answer the Senator directly, because I do not wish to get into a debate regarding the administration.

Mr. GRUENING. I congratulate the Senator from Delaware on his voting record on this subject.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I make a vast understatement when I say that the situation in the Congo is a deplorable one. That small group of American flyers might well have been murdered by that uncontrolled mob. I am told that the American Ambassador expects to lodge a protest with the Congolese Government as soon as he can contact the proper officials.

Mr. President, in line with that matter, I should like to ask distinguished Senators on this floor who are in authority whether they have heard about or whether they know anything about another matter—namely, that a planeload of children was taken out of the Congo, back to Belgium, and the children had mutilated hands. I recognize that that may be a serious charge, and I should like to have it either confirmed or denied.

But if our representatives cannot find the proper officials in the Congo, how can our Ambassador make these protests? I do not know, unless it is done to the State Department or to the President of the United States here in Washington.

But regardless of how it may be done, I think it imperative that we get an answer in regard to that matter and that report. Is it true or is it not true? If it is true, what are we doing about it? If it is not true, then I do not think any more should be said about it.

I can hardly believe that we would permit American soldiers, in uniform, to be assigned the job of taking mutilated children from that country. Of course I know we want to get them out of there; but just the sight of those poor children with mutilated hands, when our airmen were directed to take them back to Belgium.

I do not know how the mutilations were done, but apparently they were done in the Congo. Certainly those children were not born that way.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. FREAR. I yield.

Mr. TALMADGE. Last week I received a letter from a constituent, the tenor of which was similar to this: "DEAR SENATOR: I notice the Congress has appropriated $600 million for Latin America and $100 million for the Congo. If this is the best you can do, I would suggest that you adjourn, come home, and let the inmates of our mental institutions run the country."

I wrote the constituent and said I was inclined to agree with him.

I commend the Senator from Delaware for pointing up this matter before the Senate. It is wholly unthinkable to me how this country could spend money it does not have in a nation which is incapable of governing itself—a nation where murder, rape, assaults, and riots are commonplace at the present time. I commend the Senator for bringing this matter to the attention of his colleagues.

Mr. FREAR. We send our American airmen in there unprotected and unarmed.

Mr. TALMADGE. We are not even giving them the protection of the uniform they wear.

Mr. FREAR. Yes.

In conclusion, I extend publicly my sympathies to the wives and families of these airmen from Delaware, and express to them the hope that a way can be found to prevent further incidents cf this or any other type.

I think perhaps we should express sympathy to many of the families now being carried back to Belgium with children who have mutilated hands.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. FREAR. I yield.

Mr. TALMADGE. Does not the Senator believe that if we are incapable of defending the rights and persons of military personnel sent to other countries, we ought to bring them home?

Mr. FREAR. I do.

Mr. TALMADGE. I share the Senator's viewpoint.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of these men, all of whom live in the Dover area, be included in the RECORD at this portion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The names and squadrons of the men involved, as released by the Dover base, are:

Capt. Elbert L. Mott, 20th ATS (Air Transport Squadron); Lt. Kennett E. Stickevers, 31st ATS; Lt. Armand A. Kelzenberg, 1st ATS; Lt. William M. Shaw, 15th ATS; Lt. Gerald T. Henery, 20th ATS; T. Sgt. Kenneth E. Bennett, 20th ATS; T. Sgt. Frederick N. Kiser, 20th ATS, from Smyrna, Del.; S. Sgt. Barice E. Bossa, 20th ATS.

All these men live in the general Dover area, including Kiser, who lives in Smyrna. Stickevers is the only bachelor in the group.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FREAR. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. I asked the Senator to yield for the purpose of commending him for his remarks in bringing this matter to the attention of the Senate and of the country. It has relation to the broad question of relief and the amount of $100 million that was voted in a recent bill. As the Senator will recall, part of that money is to be used not in a relief program, as was pointed out when the bill was on the floor, but for the purpose of paying the expenses and costs of United Nations troops. The United Nations is trying to get into that area where the trouble is and operate to restore some semblance of order.

I commend the Senator from Delaware wholeheartedly for raising the point about these men having been attacked. They are members of the Armed Forces of the United States, on an official mission, not only for ourselves but for the whole world, through the United Nations.

Mr. President, time was when we were a much smaller nation and a much weaker nation, but perhaps more respected than we are now, when in a situation such as has been mentioned, when one of our men, wearing the uniform of the country, representing this country on a mission, was attacked, we would demand a retraction or an apology, or regard it as an act of war. I cannot escape the idea that we are degrading ourselves by putting up with insults of this kind. It has happened many times in the last few years, not in Africa, but in other areas of the world. I think we are making great progress in reverse—I repeat, in reverse—in trying to restore world order, or trying to bring about order.

We are making progress in reverse in such matters, and we are degrading our position with the Western World.

In the old days, when incidents of this kind happened, we backed our men up, and either had something done about it or they were interpreted as an act of war.

I am hoping—and I am willing to do my part—that our Government will step in and reverse this trend, which is worldwide, with reference to our men being attacked, abused, and treated inhumanely, as would a country in the most obscure place. Certainly, our attitude does not indicate world leadership. This is not Western leadership. And we continue to put up with these practices.

Mr. FREAR. I am grateful to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FREAR. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. First, I commend the Senator from Delaware for what he is developing here today. I think this Nation of ours has been traveling down the wrong road for a long time. It looks as if we stir up strife and discontent. I notice we are going down into the Dominican Republic. They are going to pull the carpet from under us there. The same thing will happen in that country that happened in Cuba. I do not know why they do it, but they do it. Then, if someone wants money, all they have to do is start strife and then run to the United States and say, "Give me $100 million," and we give it to them. It looks as if that is the only thing they have to do in order to get money from the United States.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. GRUENING and Mr. KEATING addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senator that the Senate is operating under controlled time.

Mr. GRUENING. May I have 1 minute?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield the Senator from Alaska 1 minute.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I am willing to yield to the Senator such time as he may require, but I understand the proponents of the conference report on the social security bill do not wish to use their time. If they are going to fritter their time away, I suggest that they use some of it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I associate myself with the remarks of the able junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] and point out my complete agreement, not merely with his statement that we have lost respect which was formerly accorded to us throughout the world, but that we have engaged in a new policy in recent years of pouring money into those very places where the least respect is shown.

Does the Senator think this will increase respect for us, and that it is any remedy for the tragic situations we are confronting all over the world?

Mr. STENNIS. If the Senator will yield, this is not a matter of relief or aid primarily, but there is a connection, as the Senator from Alaska says. We are making progress in reverse, and becoming objects of contempt rather than respect.

THE NOMINATION OF ROBERT A. BICKS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the "head yielder" yield me 5 minutes?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, this morning's New York Times contains an editorial summarizing the tremendous support from many sources and from both sides of the aisle which the nomination of Robert A. Bicks has received.

The editorial puts responsibility squarely on the leadership of the Senate to get the nomination out of committee and under consideration by the Senate before the Senate adjourns.

Mr. President, I believe this nomination would be overwhelmingly approved if it were presented to the Senate. I hope we shall not let this matter wither in committee because of any rush to leave Washington. I had hoped that we would have had a meeting of the Committee on the Judiciary today, but unfortunately, none has been scheduled thus far, and none appears to be scheduled.

This nomination is as important as some of the legislation which has been before us. It is certainly more important than a resolution proposing to tell the President how to make his appointments to the Supreme Court, which is the unfinished business. It is apparent that only some bold action by the leadership can bring the matter to a head at this stage of the session. If such action is forthcoming, the public interest will be the chief beneficiary.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD, following my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN OVERDUE CONFIRMATION

During the past week Robert A. Bicks, President Eisenhower's nominee to head the Antitrust Division of the Justice Department, has received an extraordinary series of tributes. Senators of both parties have risen on the floor to praise him. Telegrams of endorsement have come from many State attorneys general. One of the country's most distinguished lawyers, Whitney North Seymour—president-elect of the American Bar Association and an antitrust practitioner himself—said that Mr. Bicks' "conduct of the office compares favorably with that of any of his predecessors" over the last 30 years.

Yet Mr. Bicks' nomination remains lodged in the Senate Judiciary Committee. As Richard E. Mooney pointed out in a Washington dispatch to this newspaper yesterday, he is the only Eisenhower nominee to a position in the executive branch who remains unconfirmed. Why? No one knows, or at least no one says. There is talk of big business opposition to a tough trustbuster, but none has appeared in public.

The nomination has been before the Judiciary Committee since May, time enough to hear and decide any nomination. The

fact is that Mr. Bicks has been in good measure responsible for the excellent antitrust record of the last 7 years. Even if he should stay on as a recess appointee, a failure to confirm him now would be an unjustified slap at his record. At the least the Senate should have a chance to vote on Mr. Bicks. The reputation of Senate majority leader JOHNSON for honorable dealing on Presidential nominations will be injured if he does not move to get the Bicks nomination out of committee and on to the floor before the Senate adjourns.

NATIONAL CATHOLIC CONFERENCE FOR INTERRACIAL JUSTICE URGES CREATION OF DEPARTMENT OF URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the recently concluded first National Catholic Conference for Interracial Justice adopted a number of reports and resolutions on various vital subjects. I noted with great interest the strong stand taken by the conference on the need for equality of opportunity in such fields as public schools, housing, and other phases of civil rights activities.

Endorsement was also given to peaceful sit-in demonstrations against segregation.

In addition, the conference went on record as favoring the establishment of a Federal department to deal with problems of urban dwellers. As in the field of civil rights, this is a subject in which I have taken a deep interest.

In my view, the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs—or Department of Urbiculture as I have described it in my bill, S. 2397—would be a master stroke in achieving better coordination and more effective results in carrying out various programs of importance to city dwellers. Leading experts in the field of urban problems have backed this proposal vigorously, and it is my hope some action will be forthcoming on it before too long.

The support of the National Catholic Conference for Interracial Justice will be a great assistance in this endeavor, so I am delighted with the action recently taken by this distinguished group.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a portion of an article from the New York Times of August 29 dealing with this subject be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. HOUSING POST IN CABINET URGED—CATHOLIC INTERRACIAL GROUP CALLS FOR A DEPARTMENT OF URBAN AFFAIRS

(By Leonard Buder)

ST. LOUIS, August 28.—Creation of a Federal Department of Urban Affairs was urged here today at the closing session of the first National Catholic Conference for Interracial Justice.

The conference recommended that the proposed department be headed by a Cabinet officer who would be responsible for coordinating the Government's activities in the housing field.

A particular concern of this department, the participants said, should be the effects of Federal housing programs on minority groups.

The conference held that there was little synchronization between the Federal agencies, administrations, and authorities in the field. As a result, it was asserted, urban renewal projects go one way and housing programs go another.

TWO HUNDRED AND FIFTY ATTENDED SESSION

Because of this situation, one speaker said, members of minority groups who must leave a slum area because of a federally supported redevelopment project often find that they have no place to move except to another slum neighborhood.

About 250 persons, most of them representatives of Roman Catholic interracial councils throughout the Nation, attended the 4-day meeting here at St. Louis University.

MISSILES AND PEANUTS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I should like, if I may, to pursue a little further the discussion on our missile program which I had on Friday and which was continued on Saturday, with the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON]. The Senator questioned a table which I had printed in the RECORD on Friday and the conclusion which I drew from that table. The figures in the table deal with expenditures both on intermediate and intercontinental range ballistic missiles and on other missiles in the fiscal years 1946 through 1960.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the table may again be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[In millions of dollars]

Fiscal year	IR ICBM programs	All missile programs
1946	1.9	70
1947	0	58
1948	.3	81
1949	.1	98
1950	0	134
1951	.5	784
1952	.8	1,058
1953	3.0	1,116
1954	14.0	1,067
1955	159.0	1,470
1956	526.0	2,270
1957	1,401.0	4,470
1958	2,150.0	5,107
1959	2,945.0	6,913
1960	3,303.0	6,634

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, these figures came directly from the Department of Defense. They reveal beyond the shadow of doubt or cavil that during the years 1946 through 1952 the Government spent $3.6 million on the long-range ballistic missile program. As I pointed out last week, Mr. President, during that same period, the Government spent $117 million to support the price of peanuts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I ask if I may have 3 additional minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I will take 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. KEATING. Moreover, Mr. President, the Senator from Missouri, who is well known as an expert on factual matters of defense, has gone even further than I in this line. On February 19 of this year, he pointed out that in 1949 and 1950 private funds were needed to keep alive this vital Government program. At that same time, peanuts continued to receive public, Government support.

The Senator from Missouri has questioned my statement. On Saturday, he suggested that my figures were inconsistent. He said that I had omitted the funds spent for the Snark and the Navajo missiles from my calculation. Mr. President, that was not my intent. The table, as introduced today and as I introduced it previously, makes it very clear that I was speaking only of expenditures on ballistic missiles. Neither the Snark nor the Navajo is a ballistic missile, as my good friend must realize. They are air breathing, subsonic missiles, as much out of date now as manned bombers. Neither is completely out of date, but they are not what is included in this program.

Few people are better acquainted with the history of American missile development than the distinguished Senator from Missouri. But in the past when he has spoken about our missile gap, he has spoken almost exclusively about the gap in ICBM's, in ballistic missiles. This was, in fact, the salient point in his remarks on the so-called missile gap January 27 and February 19 of this year.

Therefore, Mr. President, having looked into the matter very thoroughly, I find that my original figures were entirely accurate and my meaning clear: Between 1946 and 1952 we spent 30 times as much on peanuts as we did on IR and ICBM's.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEATING. Will the Senator obtain some time of his own?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. How much time does the Senator from Missouri require?

Mr. SYMINGTON. May I have 3 minutes?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Missouri. If he requires more, I shall yield him additional time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I have always admired the many fields in which the distinguished junior Senator from New York is an expert. I wish I could be as conversant with the figures and facts about so many departments and so many issues as he is, when he constantly presents his positions to the Senate. I do, with all sincerity, admire the Senator for his extensive knowledge.

The Senator gave a series of figures in a table the other day. The use of the table itself was in some respects inaccurate. For example, the designation on the lefthand column is "IR ICBM," for the years 1946 to 1952, inclusive.

None of the money during those years was spent for IRBM's. All of that money was spent for ICBM's.

When one of the Senator's colleagues talked about this matter on Friday, he talked about intercontinental missiles. The word "ballistic" was not in the debate.

I say to my friend from New York that we have no argument in this field except to that extent he wishes to make an argument out of it, because until the development of the hydrogen bomb in late 1952 there was no demand in this Government for any long-range missile except the long-range subsonic and supersonic guided air-breathing missile. To attempt to set a record to be carried to the country later on, that the previous administration was responsible for holding up developments in the long-range missile field, is misleading and inaccurate from the standpoint of the facts.

I say to my friend from New York that until 1952, and until some developments I understand were made by a great physicist, Dr. Teller, there was no real interest in the ICBM from the standpoint of a long-range ballistics missile as against the long-range supersonic guided missile.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I should like to continue my statement and then I shall be glad to yield. If there is to be debate regarding responsibility for the cancellation of the ICBM, I point out that the ICBM program was canceled on July 8, 1947. There was no Air Force at that time. The Chief of Staff at that time was Dwight D. Eisenhower. The ICBM research item, the MX–774 was continued in its development by the manufacturer, and I had something to do with the continuance.

When the Air Force was established later, the contract was reinstated. Actually, all the money apparently lost as a result of the cancellation of the intercontinental supersonic guided missile Navajo, which cancellation was done by this administration, and which I believe was a mistake, was not lost entirely, because the rocketdyne engine, the propulsion design in the Navajo, is now used in the Atlas long-range ballistic missile.

Whereas an apparent effort has been made here on this floor to show that for long-range intercontinental missiles only a few million dollars had been spent by the previous administration, the truth is that many hundreds of millions of dollars were spent in long-range intercontinental missiles by the previous administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Will the Senator from Louisiana yield 2 more minutes?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The figures which the Senator from New York put in the RECORD verify that fact.

Another aspect of this problem is the question of what has happened since this administration took office. I well remember when the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] asked the then Secretary of Defense, Mr. Charles E. Wilson, what he meant when he deprecated basic research. Mr. Wilson said, as I remember, that it was like trying to find out why grass turned green or potatoes turned brown when fried. The senior Senator from Alabama then asked the Secretary of Defense, in the spring of 1953, what he meant by that comment, and asked him to give an illustration.

The Secretary of Defense illustrated the point by referring to a nuclear propulsion airplane as a typical illustration of trying to find out why grass turns green.

The Senator from New York and some of his colleagues have been attempting consistently to state that only those in the previous administration were responsible for the production program of missiles. If such be true, his own figures prove that if blame is to be placed anywhere, everyone shares it.

If any blame is to be placed on the activities of the executive branch, I share it. If the ballistic missile was canceled when the President of the United States was Chief of Staff, he shares the blame.

Everyone who was in this Chamber in 1953 remembers when the Secretary of Defense announced that he was going to cut $5 billion from the expenditures of the Air Force and give us a better Air Force.

The distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], who is chairman of the Armed Services Committee observed "Why not cut out $10 billion and give us a much better Air Force?"

Incidentally, at that time the Secretary of Defense also cut hundreds of millions of dollars from the proposed expenditures of the Navy.

Congress in the spring of 1953, when the present administration was in power, reacted against the missile program, and the proof is, on the basis of the figures which the Senator from New York inserted in the RECORD.

During the first year of this administration tens of millions of dollars less were spent for missiles than in the last year of the previous administration.

Therefore I say it would be better for all of us, instead of some people trying to build up something to be carried to the people on the basis that any missile lag is the responsibility and the fault of the previous administration, we should now join together to decide what is the right thing to do for the future..

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Any implication that no money was spent on long range missiles is not correct. During the previous administration hundreds of millions of dollars were spent on long range intercontinental missiles, one of which is now in operation today.

I might remind the Senator that the Assistant Secretary of Research and Development for the Air Force in this administration resigned in protest at the lack of priority given the entire missile picture. He resigned early in 1956, saying that insufficient time, attention, and money were being given to this important program. So I do not see why we should continue to belabor the question.

I hope that in accordance with the recommendations of the great Governor of the State of New York we go ahead with programs and policies in the defense field beyond what this administration believes proper, because I believe present programs are seriously inadequate.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from New York, with the approval of the Senator from Louisiana, who has the floor.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, if we are to have a debate on defense, I should like to have the yielding done on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from New York. However, I think we should resume our debate on the conference report as soon as possible.

Mr. KEATING. The entire matter was brought up by the effort of the distinguished Senator from Missouri in saying that there is a missile gap, and that it is the fault of the present administration that we have such a missile gap. All that we need to do is to read the words of a great American, whom everyone has learned to respect.

Dr. Wernher von Braun, rocket expert whose Army team developed the Jupiter IRBM, stated on November 10, 1957:

> The United States had no ballistic missile program worth mentioning between 1945 and 1951. These 6 years, during which the Russians obviously laid the groundwork for their large rocket program, are irretrievably lost.
>
> Thus, our present dilemma is not due to the fact that we are not working hard enough now, but that we did not work hard enough during the first 6 to 10 years after the war.

I agree with the distinguished Senator from Missouri that what we need to do is to look to the future, but the RECORD should be clear.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator from New York quotes Dr. Wernher von Braun. We can take various quotations and make a case either way. I say the fact that the Assistant Secretary of Research and Development in 1955 resigned from the missile administration in protest of its slow activity in missiles is more important on this subject than any statement made by Dr. von Braun. The Senator quoted Dr. von Braun. I remember a television program which included the President of the United States, the Secretary of Defense, and Dr. von Braun handled by the Washington Post. On that program Dr. von Braun took a position exactly opposite, before the American people, from the position taken in the quotation the Senator just read.

I was so surprised at his optimistic position expressed at that time that I went to the Secretary of the Army and protested. The Senator from New York will find that the actual figures speak better

than any statement from the various individuals, and tend to support the case with respect to the missile gap. I hope that the Senator will read the testimony of Trevor Gardner before the subcommittees of the Armed Services Committee. I would rather accept his opinion than that of others I know of as to who is responsible for the missile gap. I am sure the Senator believes what he says. Therefore I would hope he will support the position of Governor Rockefeller rather than the present defense policy of the present administration.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 1 minute to me?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator from New York has failed to answer three important questions. First, why did not Dwight Eisenhower do something about the missile gap when he was Army Chief of Staff? Second, why did not Charles Wilson do something when he became Secretary of Defense? Third, why does the distinguished Senator from New York disagree so vigorously with the Governor of his own State?

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1960—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill H.R. 12580 the Social Security Amendments of 1960.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. How much time remains on the conference report?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana has 1 hour and 48 minutes remaining; the opponents have 33 minutes remaining.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 10 minutes to me, or would he prefer to do so later?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I shall be glad to yield in a few minutes. The junior Senator from Louisiana is often struck by the discrepancy between that for which we pray in the morning, when the Chaplain guides us in prayer, and that which we vote for during the day; just as he has been impressed by the discrepancy by what we put into our platform and in public pronouncements to the press and the public, as compared with what we actually vote for when we have an opportunity to carry out some of the pronouncements on the floor of the Senate.

The other day I was presiding over the Senate as the Acting President pro tempore when the Chaplain of the Senate, the Reverend Frederick Brown Harris, offered the prayer:

> Stay our hands when we attempt to postpone into the future the justice waiting to be done today.

Only a few Senators were in the Chamber at that time, but I am sure many of them would like to subscribe to the sentiments of that prayer:

> Stay our hands when we attempt to postpone into the future the justice waiting to be done today.

I would urge, as we vote on the conference report, that we follow the sentiments of that prayer, because the conference report before us surrenders back 80 percent of what the Senate voted for when it voted that justice be done to the least of them, all our people. Justice for these people can be obtained if we have the courage to reject the conference report and ask for a further conference.

Earlier today, when the Senate convened, a visiting chaplain offered the prayer. He is Dr. Lawrence D. Folkemer, minister of the Lutheran Church of the Reformation in Washington. He prayed:

> Open our eyes to see the wrongs and the woes of our land that cry out to be put right. Give to us a vision of our land as Thou wouldst have it be and as Thou alone canst fashion it.

It would be a sad response to that entreaty to vote today to accept a conference report which surrenders most of the justice, righteousness and charity that the Senate voted for only a few days ago.

In doing so, the Senate would place itself in line with the previous action of the Senate at least three times when it voted to agree to certain welfare amendments, which would have done something for the needy, the poor, the depressed, and later voted to accept a report from the House-Senate conference which dropped out these amendments.

The conference committee has brought back a report which surrenders and strikes out the kind of justice for which the Senate voted. Unfortunately, many of the same Senators who voted to do this justice will proceed to vote to accept the conference report.

It comes with ill grace from some of our Democratic Senators to talk about a Republican-Dixiecrat coalition, because if they vote for the conference report they will be voting for the attitude of some of our more conservative friends plus the view of some of our Republican friends, the most conservative ones of all, when they vote to accept the report, which strikes out about 80 percent of what the majority voted for on the Senate floor.

A Senator this morning quoted a familiar and apt passage from Shakespeare:

> The fault, dear Brutus, is not in our stars, But in ourselves, that we are underlings.

The fault is in ourselves that we do not make progress, because too many of us are faint of heart when we fight for what we believe in, and when we send our conferees to conference knowing that we have no strong reason to believe that the conferees will make an all-out fight for it.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. What percentage of the benefits given by the House bill were cut out in the conference report?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The House bill did not give many benefits, to begin with. So they are not much reduced. The best provision in the House bill, that was a subject in conference, was over the provision that would have reduced the required number of quarters for coverage. It would have made it possible for persons who had worked only one quarter out of every four quarters between 1950 and the present time, or a total of 2½ years, to have been covered under social security. That provision was stricken by the Senate committee and the conference agreed that we include a provision calling for one quarter in every three quarters. By doing so we eliminated from coverage 200,000 people out of 600,000 to whom the coverage would have been extended. In doing this, we eliminated the neediest of the 600,000 people to be included.

In my judgment, the conference report moves entirely in the direction whereby we economize at the expense of the neediest and the most pitiful of all. The House-Senate conference did some fancy economizing here. The bill has been described by Representative FORAND as a sham and a delusion. I will quote from the author of the amendment, describing the bill in the House debate, when he said:

> Personally, I think it is a sham; I think it is a mirage that we are holding up to the old folks to look at and think they are going to get something. I say that because they have to depend upon 50 State governments to enact legislation to authorize them to handle the program that is listed there.

That is the kind of description we have of it. We can with better grace criticize the final product here in the Senate than on the House side, because at least most of what was in the House bill was retained, while most of what was in the Senate bill was taken out.

We heard much talk in the Senate about how we would make it possible for a man to retain what little earnings he made under social security. It sounded good. The bill went to conference, providing that a person could earn $150 a month, whereas previously he could earn only $100 a month, and still retain his social security benefits.

We brought back from conference a measure which would cost 10 percent of what it would have cost to let the person keep some additional earnings. In other words, from a cost point of view, 90 percent of the benefits were extracted by the conference. The report we brought back provided that a person could make an extra $300 per year, provided his social security benefits were reduced by half that amount; and that thereafter every dollar he made would result in a $1 reduction of his social security benefits. So, in effect, he would be working, 100 percent, for the Federal Government. It would amount to the same as a Federal tax of 100 percent on a poor man, for every dollar a person earned over $1,500.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. TALMADGE. I commend the Senator from Louisiana for bringing out that point. Is it not true that the Committee on Finance voted unanimously to permit persons who are retired and are drawing social security to earn up to $1,800 annually rather than the $1,200 which is permitted at present?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Committee on Finance so voted unanimously,

and the Senator from Georgia was one of the Senators who voted that way.

Mr. TALMADGE. Every Democrat and Republican on the Committee on Finance so voted; did he not?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator is correct, and there was not a vote against that plan on the Senate floor, unless it might be construed that the two Senators who voted against the passage of the bill were against that provision.

Mr. TALMADGE. As I understand, the conference brought back a compromise which permits a person to earn between $1,200 and $1,500 annually, but will force him to relinquish $1 of every $2 he earns.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Out of the first $25 a month he makes he will be required to relinquish $1 out of every $2. Thereafter, he relinquishes it all.

Mr. TALMADGE. Under the terms of the conference report, what will be the maximum a person will be permited to earn now and still draw social security?

Mr. LONG. If we eliminate some of the complicated technicalities under which a person might be able to obtain a little more, the figure would be $1,500. He could earn the first $1,200, as under existing law, and keep that; and he could earn $300 more and keep $150 of that.

Mr. TALMADGE. In other words, a man could earn $1,500 and still receive social security?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. No. If he earned $1,500, he would be permitted to keep $1,350.

Mr. TALMADGE. Actually, then, the amount limit on earnings of those receiving social security benefits is raised from $1,200 a year to $1,350?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes.

Mr. TALMADGE. I am glad that the conference did not entirely eliminate the increase. However, I would have much preferred the $1,800 for which the Committee on Finance unanimously voted and which the Senate approved.

I commend the Senator for bringing this point to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It is a matter of opinion. Some Senators, including a Senator for whom I know the Senator from Georgia has high regard, said that if this was all we could give the poor old people, then we might just as well have forgotten the whole thing.

If we are simply changing the law to a degree where the employees of the social security program have to stand behind people with a pencil and pad to take its cut every time a person earns 50 cents, we might as well forget the whole thing anyway.

Mr. TALMADGE. I know that many people in my State, in the Senator's State of Louisiana, and in all other States of the Union, who are retired and are drawing modest social security retirement checks, find those amounts are insufficient to live upon. They want to work and perform duties in honest toil so as to increase their income. I cannot understand why Congress will not permit them to do so.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator's statement is entirely correct. I thank him for it.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. Is it not true that when these provisions were originally written into the Social Security Act, the cost of living was very much lower; and that the increase in the cost of living in the last 7 years was one reason for including an amendment of the very kind which was written into the Senate bill, but which the conferees have taken out?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I agree. Just as a matter of reducing the cost to the Federal Government, a great injustice is done, because if a person receives income from stocks and bonds, if he receives income from annuities; or assume that he is one who holds a private retirement policy, or has any sort of "retirement" income, he can keep it. In other words, if he is receiving a Government retirement check of $200 or $400 a month, or if he is a Senator and is receiving Government retirement pay of $900 a month, he can keep all of that and still draw his social security benefits. In fact, there is no limit to the amount of retirement income a person can draw and still draw social security. But suppose he is a poor fellow who draws a social security check of only $30 a month. Suppose he has a wife, which makes it possible for him to draw an extra $15 a month. There are two people who are living on $45 a month. If he goes out and works for himself and his wife makes an extra $100 a month, from that point forward the Government starts to cut him $1 for every $2 he earns; and after he earns an extra $1,350 net, with the Government taking $150 from a gross of $1,500, then, from that point forward the Government reduces his social security by 100 percent of whatever he earns.

Imagine a man and wife living on an income of $142.50 a month and paying what amounts to a tax of 100 percent. If the same person had a retirement income from a corporation, after he had worked as a corporation executive; or if he had retired and had income from stocks, bonds, or other investments; if he had retirement income from life insurance policies he had taken out, he could receive all the income for which he was not then working, and still draw his full maximum benefit of social security. But that would not be true of the poor devil who has to continue to work for a living. If he continues to work, Uncle Sam gets 100 percent after the first $25, over the amount presently permitted by law.

Mr. TALMADGE. As a matter of fact, such a proposal puts a premium on idleness, instead of providing an incentive to one who wants to continue to work.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It continues to carry out the old concept, which is to be only slightly modified, of prompting a man to quit work, to enable a younger person to take his place.

Mr. TALMADGE. No matter how productive he might be.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That is fine if that concept is applied to someone who is well able to retire, and has plenty of retirement income. But how about the poor fellow who is expected to retire on $30 a month? Some persons seem to think he can live on $30 a month.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator said the Committee on Finance unanimously voted to raise the limit to $1,800, and that the Senate voted for it. What reasons were ascribed in conference for striking or modifying that particular provision?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Fundamental to the whole backdown, the whole march down the hill, the whole 80 or 90 percent surrender, was the House concept that it did not want a situation to arise in which it might be necessary, at any time during the next 2 years, to raise the social security tax.

Mr. COOPER. But was it argued or shown that the change would affect the social security fund from an actuarial standpoint? Would the change have had any effect upon the fund actuarially?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Let us consider what this proposal really means. The provision would not have cost anything in this calendar year, because the statute we were amending works on a calendar-year basis. This proposal was the big one, costwise. It was the biggest item of them all. It would have cost 0.19 of the payrolls; in other words, almost two-tenths of 1 percent of the payroll; about $500 million per annum.

If the provision for which the Senate had voted had been adopted, sometime next year it would have been necessary for Congress to vote a small increase in the social security tax. If the conference had agreed to every benefit for which the Senate voted and everything for which the House voted, it would have meant that sometime next year, because very little of the benefits would have become effective before the first of the year, it would have been necessary to provide an increase of one-eighth of 1 percent in the social security tax. That was the basis for the bill the conference committee reported. That is the foundation of the conference report: that any benefits which are provided now must be benefits that can be achieved without providing any increase in the long-range cost of the program, to the extent that an increase in the tax would be required.

Mr. COOPER. Let me say that I believe I have received more letters regarding the social security problem from people who would like to work than I have from any other group. Not only would they like to earn additional money, but they wish to work because they are happier when they are working, and they feel that in that way they are more productive.

I believe this amendment is one of the most important that was adopted by the Senate. I am sorry it has been modified.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Some Senators make the point that in terms of the overall economy, this amendment probably would pay for itself, because when these people are at work, they have to

pay excise taxes and hidden taxes on their earnings, and the result is that the income of the Government is increased to that extent.

Mr. President, so far as I know, this amendment was adopted without any protest at all. But 42 Democratic Senators voted to do a lot more than that; and they voted for the tax to pay for it. They voted to increase the present tax by one-half of 1 percent. They wanted to make a start on medical aid; and they would have voted for whatever tax was necessary to cover the cost. In my judgment, if the House were permitted to vote on this proposal, the House would accept it in a moment. But it was surrendered by the conferees just because conservative members of the House group seemed to feel that the conference report should not contain any provision which would mean an increase in the long-range cost of this program.

Then we had a provision which would have permitted persons to retire at age 62. That provision was designed primarily for the benefit of persons who have lost their jobs at or after age 62 and have not been able to find jobs, even though they are still able to do some kinds of light work, and who now are not likely to find employment. Under this provision, they would be allowed to retire at age 62, although with reduced benefits. Theoretically, this provision would not have entailed any additional cost to the program. But, actually, it would seem that there would be some cost to the program as a result of reducing the number of years such persons would be working and earning and contributing to the program. That cost would perhaps be about one-fourth of the cost of the $1,800 limitation.

We know what persons that provision was intended to cover.

The Senator from West Virginia was the principal sponsor of the amendment on this subject. In States where there is much unemployment, many people have used up their unemployment benefits. They have no indication that they can find employment. There is a tendency for them to retire at an earlier age and to accept benefits from 10 to 20 percent lower, provided they can then begin to draw their social security payments. In other words, it will do a man little good to know that he can retire and can draw these benefits at age 65, if he is likely to starve to death before he reaches that age.

So the Senate agreed to the amendment. But in the conference report there is not even so much as a shadow to indicate that the Senate ever acted at all on that matter. That provision was dropped from the conference report on the basis of the concept—which the Senate conferees did not protest—that nothing included in the final bill should increase the cost of social security to such an extent that there would be a requirement to increase the social security tax in the future. So, proceeding on the basis that we were to have a few little bones and scraps here and there, provided they did not increase the social security tax, our conferees yielded on this major provision.

Mr. President, let me refer again to another provision that was thrown back in. It had to do with a House provision that would help low income people achieve at least some assistance. Many persons have not been covered by social security, even though they have paid some social security taxes. The House bill took the position that if a man worked one quarter in every four quarters which expired between 1950 and the present time, and if during that period he was under social security coverage, he could draw some benefits. Of course, in most instances he would be able to draw only the minimum benefit of $30 a month for a single man or $45 a month for a man and wife.

In order to try to squeeze in some of what the House had provided, and still come within the cost limitation, the Senate agreed, to the extent of providing that only one of every three such persons would be included. Generally speaking it can be said that the two-thirds thus included do not need that assistance as much as do the one-third who were dropped out.

PLANNING, DEVELOPMENT, MAINTENANCE, AND COORDINATION OF WILDLIFE, FISH, AND GAME CONSERVATION IN MILITARY RESERVATIONS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield, to permit the appointment of conferees in connection with two other measures?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives in regard to House bill 2565.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2565) to promote effectual planning, development, maintenance, and coordination of wildlife, fish, and game conservation and rehabilitation in military reservations, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. ENGLE, Mr. BARTLETT, and Mr. COTTON conferees on the part of the Senate.

AMENDMENT OF SHIPPING ACT OF 1916 TO PROVIDE LICENSING OF INDEPENDENT FOREIGN FREIGHT FORWARDERS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives in regard to House bill 5068.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5068) to amend the Shipping Act, 1916, to provide for licensing independent foreign freight forwarders, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. PASTORE, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. ENGLE, Mr. BUTLER, and Mr. SCOTT conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator from Louisiana.

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1960—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill H.R. 12580, the Social Security Amendments of 1960.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, it will take me about 5 more minutes to explain the conference report, and then I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

So, Mr. President, as I pointed out a moment ago, there, again, is a major provision on which the Senate conferees yielded, although it could easily have been included in the report unless we had accepted the House idea that we should not take any action that would require an increase in the social security tax sometime next year. In other words, the theory of the conference report is that benefits are all right, provided they do not require more taxes.

Of course, the fourth provision which was surrendered had to do with the effort to make some provision about the disgraceful conditions which exist in the State mental institutions.

I wish to place in the RECORD a chart which shows what the States are doing in that connection. The States cannot be criticized in that regard. Although the conditions which exist in the State mental hospitals are absolutely disgraceful and deplorable, yet without any Federal aid at all, the States are making a real effort in this field.

Mr. CLARK. Some of the States are making a real effort.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. However, it is hard to be critical. For instance, consider a State such as Alabama. Alabama spends $16 million a year in attempting to provide for the mentally sick who are in these institutions. Yet the cost per patient in Alabama is only $3.05.

Of course, as the Senator from Pennsylvania knows, we have available to us statistics and information which show how horrible are the conditions when the cost per patient is $4.65, or even when the cost per patient approaches $5.

A number of States really make an effort to do something about this situation. Pennsylvania would be a good example. Pennsylvania, which is so ably

represented by the Senator from that State who has been engaging in this colloquy with me, spends $124 million to care for all the mentally sick in that State. Yet the latest figures show that the daily expenditure amounts to a per capita expenditure of only $4.50—just within the range that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has described as disgraceful.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator from Louisiana is quite correct in regard to the figures about my Commonwealth. But we would not be doing nearly as well as we are now doing if we had not had two successive Democratic Governors who were able to persuade the legislature to increase to an amount substantially greater than it used to be the amount that is spent on those in our State who need medical care. But, even so, I do not think our State is doing all that it should; it should be doing much more.

I recognize the requirement of rule XIX, to the effect that in the course of debate, no Senator shall refer offensively to any State of the Union; and I shall conform to that requirement. But I believe I should point out that unquestionably there are States which should do far more in this respect than they are doing.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania. In fact, what is happening in these States is typical of the situation prevalent all over the Nation. The provision of greater aid to the mentally sick is of such major importance that certainly it should take precedence over many other programs.

As a matter of fact, in the conference I pleaded that, if need be, it would be proper to decrease to some extent the provisions proposed for hospitalization elsewhere—for instance, perhaps even make a decrease in the area subject to 80 percent matching, or reduce some of the benefits elsewhere, if necessary, in order to make some provision in this field. Certainly in this field there is a crying need; and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare himself has said he has under way a crusade for the provision of greater aid in this field. Yet he fights to the bitter end our attempts to make some provision for the terrific need for additional care in this field, and he suggests that the bill might be subject to a veto if Congress were to do anything about providing aid in this field.

Why? Because this is the field of greatest need. It is a field where States are making a great effort, but are still doing a miserable job for many patients, and a field where, if the Federal Government gets into it, will cost it a lot of money. That being the case, the tendency is to do nothing, because the Federal Government has done nothing. It is said we should leave it to a study next year. I have oftentimes heard the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare described as one who wants to go even beyond what the Democrats do—but not now, not now, not now.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. I wish to commend the Senator from Louisiana, who has presented a potent series of arguments why the Senate should vote against the conference report and send it back for further conference in the hope that we will get a better bill. The conferees have so weakened an already weak bill so as to make it a sham, as one Member of the other body has described it.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. We should stop saying we are fighting for the underprivileged, the needy, the least of them all, according to Christian concepts, if we first vote to do something about it and then vote to back down. This is the third time in the experience of the Senator from Louisiana that we have voted in the Senate to do something for the needy, and then have had the conferees drop it. In my judgment, these proposals could have been obtained. Yet, after the conferees came back here, many Senators who voted for the amendment agreed to drop it after the Senate conferees yielded as they had done before.

To talk about what we stand for leaves us open to the criticism by the Republicans who say the Democrats are not sincere, that they will talk big, but not to make it stick; they will vote in the Senate to put something in a bill, but will not fight to keep it in.

I do not criticize our conferees. They are reflecting the point of view of their States. But three of our conferees come from two States that do the least in terms of public welfare.

I have in front of me the chart I put into the RECORD the other night. The States are listed in the order of the effort they make in the field of public welfare.

Ordinarily, if a Senator is a Democrat he cannot go on a committee if a Senator from his own State is on that committee. A lot of Senators would like to be on the Appropriations Committee. I would like to be on it. But a colleague from my State is on that committee. Some Members of the Senate would like to be on the Finance Committee, but they cannot be on it because colleagues from their States are on that committee. On the other hand, if a Republican comes from the same State as a Democrat, both of them can be on the same committee. That condition exists in the Committee on Finance. We have two Senators on that committee from the great State of Delaware. In my judgment, if the junior Senator from Delaware represented the State of Louisiana, he would be one of the greatest public welfare advocates in the Senate. Now and then he has voted for public welfare even to the extent of being criticized for it, because such measures would not benefit his State as much as they would other States. Yet as a Senator from Delaware he cannot be expected to take as much interest as Senators from other States. On the conference committee were two Senators from the State of Delaware and one from the State of Virginia. The State of Virginia spends 74 cents per capita in its efforts in the public welfare field. Delaware spends $1.56 per capita.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, what does the highest State spend?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The State of Colorado spends $21.80. If one tries to arrive at an average, I would say the figure would be about $4.80; and that is just about what the State of Pennsylvania pays.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield me 10 minutes?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the Senator from Louisiana, with unassailable logic, has made it very clear, to me at least, why this conference report should be rejected; and I shall vote with him to reject the report.

I should like to summarize briefly my reasons for doing so. I believe the Senator from Louisiana is correct when he says the Senate conferees surrendered in conference. I say that with no invidious connotation to any Member of this body. I am sure our conferees thought what they did was right. But the fact of the matter is that, as a result of this conference, 80 percent of the benefits which were in the bill when the bill left the Senate have been abandoned.

Let me say, in my judgment, this conference report does not meet the standards of the Democratic platform which was adopted in Los Angeles on July 12, 1960. I read from page 32 of that platform:

> For those relatively few of our older people who have never been eligible for social security coverage, we shall provide corresponding benefits by appropriations from the general revenue.

It is true this bill does make some gesture in support of our old people who are not on social security; but, in my judgment, that gesture is entirely inadequate. It might have been close to being adequate if the bill as it left the Senate had been accepted in conference, but it was not. So I find, in my judgment, that pledge in our platform is not met in this conference report.

With respect to the problem of the mentally ill, I think this bill as it comes back from conference also does not meet the Democratic platform; and I read the plank in our platform dealing with mental health:

> Mental patients fill more than half the hospital beds in the country today. We will provide greatly increased Federal support for psychiatric research and training, and community mental health programs, to help bring back thousands of our hospitalized mentally ill to full and useful lives in the community.

Had the Long amendment remained in the bill, I believe we would have gone a long step along the road to meet that plank in the platform.

Does the Senator from Louisiana agree?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It would have provided $120 million, which would have been a long step.

Mr. CLARK. And the $120 million is not in the conference report?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. No; it is left out; not one nickel is provided.

Mr. CLARK. I read from page 33 of the Democratic platform, under the heading, "Special Services":

We shall take Federal action in support of State efforts to bring standards of care in nursing homes and other institutions for the aged up to desirable minimums.

Are not the mental hospitals and the tubercular hospitals, which the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana would have affected, the "other type of institution" where the aged are being taken care of and where the desirable minimums are not in effect?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. As the Senator knows, in many of the institutions for the mentally ill there have been constructed the so-called geriatric buildings for aged persons whose mental condition is really associated more with old age than it is with any other type of mental illness. I speak of feeblemindedness, for example, or hardening of the arteries in the brain.

Many persons of this sort are today being treated in mental institutions. It might be possible for States to distort the use of the money to build a separate institution, to move the people out and put them somewhere else, in order to get the matching funds to which we refer, but it does seem ridiculous even in such an instance to require the States to change the entire way of doing business. Some States will and some will not. The simple way to do this would be to make the funds available.

Mr. CLARK. In my judgment, most of the States will not. As a member of the Special Committee Dealing With the Problems of the Aged and Aging, under the chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], I had an opportunity to observe the medical needs of that part of the aging population to which my friend has referred. I assure the Senator from personal knowledge, from my service on the committee, as well as from my former capacity of mayor of Philadelphia, I have seen many helpless older people who, if provided only a little medical care, could be brought back to the situation where they could leave the mental institution and go back to live with their families. These people were being treated entirely on a custodial basis, with no effort at rehabilitation.

If the Senator's amendment had been agreed to in the conference we would have made a real step toward taking care of those unfortunate people.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, the Senator is correct.

I can understand why the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare would be reluctant to go along on a program to provide adequate medical care for the mentally ill. It could become a big program. Of course, in many respects some of the expenditures would result in subsequent savings, as the Senator well knows, because in many cases these people can be cured. I have seen estimates that anywhere from 20 to 50 percent of these people, if they could be treated, could be returned to society as useful citizens, or at least as happy persons in the homes from which they came.

Mr. CLARK. That has been the experience in Pennsylvania.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That is what could be done. Those who operate these institutions feel that much could be done even without further research. There is a possibility, of course, that with further research we could do a lot more.

I have some figures in this regard, Mr. President, and I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD at this point, in order to show what the States are presently doing in terms of expenditures for medical and hospital care for patients suffering from mental illness. I shall supply that for the RECORD, since this is the only copy I have.

There being no objection, the information is ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Latest figures available on expenditures for State mental hospitals and costs per patient

State	Total expenditures	Cost per patient per diem
1. Alabama	$16,383,025	$3.05
2. Alaska	1,100,000	8.00
3. Arizona	2,914,709	4.52
4. California	73,542,922	5.79
5. Colorado	10,189,917	4.39
6. Connecticut	43,416,440	6.86
7. Delaware	2,288,000	4.32
8. Florida	28,527,787	3.96
9. Georgia	10,700,000	2.41
10. Hawaii	2,463,377	5.63
11. Idaho	4,193,500	8.03
12. Illinois	122,491,400	4.93
13. Indiana	44,416,566	5.07
14. Iowa	16,594,200	
15. Kansas	9,996,733	6.83
16. Kentucky	17,930,608	3.59
17. Louisiana	11,917,459	3.74
18. Maine	9,732,103	4.55
19. Maryland	20,097,249	4.66
20. Massachusetts	42,717,853	5.16
21. Minnesota	34,982,399	4.35
22. Michigan	40,225,963	
23. Mississippi	8,171,361	2.33
24. Missouri	35,704,426	4.24
25. Nebraska	16,571,049	5.71
26. Nevada	1,058,848	4.25
27. New Hampshire	4,614,593	4.86
28. New Jersey	34,616,602	6.36
29. New Mexico	4,033,768	5.48
30. New York	191,569,916	5.65
31. North Carolina	26,376,608	4.24
32. North Dakota	5,109,493	4.30–4.60
33. Ohio	99,758,695	4.60
34. Oregon	17,110,633	4.45
35. Pennsylvania	124,532,547	4.50
36. Puerto Rico	1,925,420	3.25
37. Rhode Island	4,999,560	4.83
38. South Carolina	5,018,494	2.50
39. South Dakota	4,100,000	3.50
40. Tennessee	15,654,192	2.64
41. Texas	41,880,000	3.54
42. Vermont	4,611,000	5.40
43. Virginia	25,976,198	3.31
44. Washington	31,544,500	5.16
45. Wisconsin	15,744,381	8.36
46. Wyoming	2,286,700	4.50

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If I were to judge the entire Nation by the figures for Louisiana, my impression would be that about 20 percent of the persons in the mental institutions are over the age of 65. Therefore, only about 20 percent of the amount will be subject to matching. If the amendment which I offered had been agreed to, every State would have been in a position to at least double its standard of care, and it would be difficult to say that any State, with the possible exceptions of Wisconsin and Alaska, might be in a position of spending more than is necessary.

I say that because the hospitals of the State of Louisiana are provided about $15.60 for general hospitalization of such persons. We spend about $3.74 for those who are mentally ill.

I made the point that the State of Alaska and the State of Wisconsin have made a real effort to provide adequate care. The standard of care is about $8 per patient in Alaska, while the standard of care for mental illness is only about $4.07 on the average in most States. Of course, Alaska has a high cost of living, as the Senator from Alaska knows. That would somewhat discount the relatively high per capita expenditure which the State makes.

Mr. GRUENING. I thank the Senator for his comment.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. When we compare this to a hospital cost of $26 per day nationwide, Senators can see that is very low.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I turn to the third reason why I believe the conference report should be rejected. As I understand it, no really serious effort was made to hold to the Senate's position that the earnings criterion for older people should be raised from $1,200 a year to $1,800 a year. I myself have had a bill which would raise the criterion to $2,400 before the Committee on Finance for 2 years. I think this ought to be the absolute minimum. The committee adopted a compromise of $1,800, and then gave most of that away. As the Senator said awhile ago, we end up—oversimplifying the case, perhaps, but realistically—with $1,350.

Mr. President, my friend from Louisiana is correct when he says that was a surrender by the Senate conferees to our friends in the House, who, as I understand it, were quite unwilling to have any bill come from the conference which would increase the social security tax by as much as one-tenth of 1 percent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me an additional 5 minutes?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I believe the House was wrong in that regard. I believe, with my friend from Louisiana, that if we appointed conferees to go back to conference who really represented the prevailing view in the Senate, we could persuade our friends in the other body to yield on this and on several other points I have raised.

I turn now to the fourth reason why I think the conference report should be rejected. As the Senator from Louisiana has so well said, this bill, when it left the Senate, blanketed under social security coverage 600,000 additional individuals who have been working on a part-time coverage of social security. When the bill came back from the conference the 600,000 had been reduced to 400,000.

In addition, the 200,000 eliminated were the most needy of the entire lot. This seems to me to be the wrong way to approach the problem. It is sort of a "wrong-way Corrigan" approach. If one is going to cut down in conference, for goodness sake, one should cut down those who are the least needy. We should keep the most needy under the terms of the bill, and not cut them out.

That action seems to me to evidence a quite unfortunate lack of compassion.

For these reasons, I shall support the position of the Senator from Louisiana, and I shall vote against the conference report.

Mr. President, I wish to turn to another subject with respect to which I suspect my good friend from Louisiana and I are not in complete accord. I wonder if my friend will permit me 5 minutes from now to complete my comments.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield to the Senator.

NEED FOR CHANGE IN SENATE RULES

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I turn now to the lessons which we should perhaps learn from this debate with respect to the rules of the Senate. Those lessons, I think, are four in number.

In the first place, we should have learned again from this debate what we have learned to our sorrow many times in the 4 years I have served in the Senate: that when we send Senate conferees to conference, regardless of their force, of their vigor, or of their integrity, if they do not believe in the position of the Senate in opposition to the position of the House, we must expect we are going to get a conference report back which is not the kind of compromise which Senators who believe in the position of the Senate would have been able to negotiate had they been the conferees.

Mr. President, I yield to no man in my respect and admiration for the Senate conferees in this case. I point out, however, that the only Senate conferee who refused to sign the conference report was the Senator from Louisiana, and he was the only Senate conferee who supported the position of the Senate.

I suggest, Mr. President, that is not a very sensible way of doing business either in the Senate of the United States or elsewhere. Who would hire a lawyer who did not believe in his client's case to represent him? Who would send somebody who though his side was wrong to negotiate for him in a labor dispute? What sense is there, Mr. President, in sending Senate conferees to deal with House conferees to represent a position of the Senate with which they do not agree?

This argument has been made on the floor many times. Senate precedents are 100 percent in support of the position I have just indicated. If a Senator wishes to make a fuss, or a row, or to make himself unpopular with many of his senior colleagues in positions of great importance in the Senate, colleagues who are serving on committees with whom he would like to work and request to do things for him in the future as they have done in the past, he has to be a pretty brave Senator to do so. Perhaps he would not actually be properly representing the interests of his State if he stood up on the floor of the Senate and demanded that the conferees who are proposed by the chairman of a committee should be rejected and other conferees who support the position of the Senate should be appointed in their place—because in the long run it might hurt his State's interests in the future.

There have been brave Senators of that sort on this floor. I recall reading about an occasion before I came to the Senate when the Senator from Louisiana did just that. But I wish to say to all who may read my remarks that that is not the way to win friends and influence people.

I have had pending in the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration for over a year a proposed rule which would automatically require that a majority of the Senators going to conference must represent the prevailing view of the Senate with respect to matters on which the Senate and House are in disagreement.

That proposed rule has never received a hearing; that proposed rule has never had a discussion. That proposed rule was buried 10 fathoms deep because of what seems to me to be an entirely erroneous position with respect to seniority and an erroneous position with respect to the thought that it might be construed to be an adverse criticism of some of our most dearly beloved and respected Senators.

I say that next year we had better change that rule, if we wish to enact the program of the Democratic Party, which I confidently expect to win the election.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. As the Senator from Pennsylvania knows, there is no Senate rule that stands between this body and the appointment of conferees who represent the majority position of the Senate.

Mr. CLARK. I have already so stated.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Our failure to get such conferees is because of our timidity, not because of the absence of a Senate rule. There is no rule standing in our way. Many times the Senate has insisted that the seniority habit be discarded in favor of a guarantee that the majority of the conferees would be those who could be depended upon to fight to the bitter end for the position of the Senate. I have been here longer than has the Senator from Pennsylvania and I have seen that happen.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is far younger than I. He has been here many more years than have I. I know that. Let me say that if those who supported the Anderson-Kennedy amendment, which to my deep regret was defeated by a vote of 51 to 44, a fight would have been made for the appointment of conferees who favored the Anderson-Kennedy amendment, there would have been a real row in the Senate. We would have won that fight because the precedents of the Senate support us. There would have been bruised feelings, naturally, but we would have to do it.

I regret very much that the Senator from Louisiana did not choose to make a fight with respect to the conferees when his own amendment was adopted, because he knew very well what would happen to it in conference. Had he done so I would have stood shoulder to shoulder with him in getting proper conferees appointed.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. When the Senator makes that point, he knows as well as I do that Senators who have senior positions on the Finance Committee have taken the attitude that they would be offended if it were even suggested that they would not fight to the bitter end for an amendment for which they had not voted, once the Senate had instructed them to do so. Advice was asked of Senators, when the conferees proceeded to move to recede and agree to that which was reported to the Senate, and the attitude was that other provisions of the bill that we wished to retain would be jeopardized if we fought to keep that particular provision.

Of course, those Senators had voted for a number of provisions in the bill. The Senator knows what the problem is in that regard.

I say that it is time the Senate started to stand up, when the facts demonstrated by those who offered the amendment are that there is a chance to get it agreed to if a more determined fight were made. I do not know how one can tell a Senator how much effort he should make for something, or how determined he should be in a conference. When I was asked before the final vote on this matter what I thought should be done, I said I thought we should go back and request that the Senate report the difference with the House, and that the House conferees do the same thing and give the House itself the first opportunity it has ever had to vote and express how the House feels about these matters, because the social security bill, as the Senator knows, was brought out under a cloture rule in the House, and they could not vote on the kind of amendment that the Senator had in mind on the House side, could they?

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct.

I turn to the second lesson I think we should learn from this debate with respect to the need for changes in the rules of the Senate, and with this I am sure my friend from Louisiana will be in complete disagreement, as will many other Senators.

Last week I proposed a rule which would limit the time which any Senator could hold the floor to 3 hours. I believe that is a sound and wise amendment. I do not believe there is any subject, no matter how important, that comes before the Senate which cannot adequately be discussed by one Senator in 3 hours, and if there are any Senators who agree with him, and if he is unable to make a complete case in 3 hours, his colleagues can make what is left of the case in the 3 hours each which are available to them.

I point out that in ordinary cases which come before the Supreme Court of the United States, cases of infinite complexity, else they would not have reached oral argument in that tribunal, arguments are normally limited to 1 hour on each side. I say that if a great constitutional case can be argued in the Supreme Court of the United States with 1 hour allowed to each side, Members of the U.S. Senate should be able to make their points in a maximum of 3 hours. I point out that if that had been the case in this debate, we would have had a vote on this amendment early Saturday afternoon. We would have had germane debate throughout the entire discussion. In my judgment, not

one vote would have been changed from the way we shall vote at 2 o'clock this afternoon.

In the modern world, with crises breaking overseas almost daily, from Cuba to the Congo, with domestic problems piling up like a logjam in the winter before the ice breaks in the spring, we cannot afford next year to have the Senate held up for indefinite periods of time while speeches made solely for the purpose of delay prevent the Senate from taking action.

So I say that the second lesson we should learn from this debate is the desirability of a rule which would limit the amount of time that any one Senator can hold the floor on any one subject.

The third lesson which I think we can learn from this debate with respect to the rules of the Senate is the desirability of a rule of germaneness. Nothing could have indicated that more aptly than what has happened this morning. Senators are anxious to vote on the conference report. One Senator—one sincere, one honorable, one able Senator, the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]—can keep the Senate from voting on this conference report as long as breath remains in his body and he can stand on his feet, and those of us who honor the Senator from Louisiana, love him, and respect him, know that the Senator has a plentiful supply of breath, and that he can stand on his feet for a very long time. I think I am right in saying that at one point in the history of the Senate he held the record for having held the floor longer than any other Senator in this body, and I suspect that unless we change the rules, he will try to beat that record and again take first place in the senatorial league with respect to how long he can hold the floor.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I remind the Senator that I have never been within 12 hours of the record.

Mr. CLARK. Then the Senator having been within only 12 hours of the record, has still spoken on a great many occasions for more than 3 hours, which is the limitation which I would like to see in effect.

Under the present rules the Senator from Louisiana—and he has many friends in that respect—could have indefinitely prevented this matter from coming to a vote if he had wanted to prevent it. So the only way we can get a vote is through his generosity and graciousness—when he finally agreed to cease and desist from preventing a vote coming at 2 o'clock; but it took a unanimous-consent agreement to do it. If we had not agreed to vote at 2 o'clock, a great many Senators would have wanted to talk about something else. As it is, we have already had a little nongermane debate on defense, between the Senator from New York and the Senator from Missouri. I was happy to participate in that debate. As long as the Senate rules are as they are, we might as well live up to them. As long as we have the present Senate rules, I intend to take full advantage of them.

The third lesson we can learn from this debate is the desirability of a rule of germaneness, this is one illustration and good evidence of how nongermane debate can delay action in the Senate. I state again my firm belief that we should have in the Senate a rule of germaneness, as well as a rule limiting debate. If we had these rules, we could cut down the time wasted on the floor by at least 50 percent, and in that way we could do in 3 months what takes 6 months to do now. I hope we will be able to save that much time next year.

Now the fourth lesson which we can learn from this debate is the desirability of having a rule permitting the previous question to be moved after there has been adequate debate on any bill or amendment. Generally speaking, in that regard, 15 hours of debate is sufficient before we should come to the point where a majority of the Senate can determine whether a bill shall be passed or rejected.

I point out that we are getting very close to the 15 hours' time in connection with the pending conference report. It may be that we have exceeded that time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. CLARK. I ask for 3 more minutes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield 3 additional minutes to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. If my proposed rule were in effect, and if a majority of Senators should agree with me and should vote to move the previous question, then under my proposed amendment there would still be 4 hours of debate, to be divided equally between the two sides, before a vote could be had on the pending conference report.

I say that this is the only legislative body in the world which is not able to act when a majority of it is ready for action. I must make one qualification in that respect. This body can act in 10 minutes if it wishes to defeat a measure. Any Senator can move to table an amendment. Every Senator and many of the guests in the galleries know the many occasions during this session alone when a motion to table has been used to defeat a measure. At the same time there is no way in the world under the present rules of the Senate by which a majority can get a bill passed for the benefit of the country and for the benefit of the free world. There is no way we can do it under the present rules of the Senate if one Senator objects and is willing to talk indefinitely.

So I point out that the fourth lesson we should learn from the debate is the need to have a rule permitting the previous question to be moved and to have it moved without further debate after a reasonable debate on any amendment, motion, or pending matter has been had. Then if the moving of the previous question results in an affirmative vote, we can still have an hour of debate on each amendment or other matter, and 4 hours on the final passage.

What would the result of moving the previous question have been if it had been invoked in connection with this debate? We would have had the same result as we have obtained by the unanimous consent agreement. But we would have achieved the same result by the vote of the majority of the Senate, not because of the acquiescence of one Member who is either fatigued or thinks he has made the point and is willing to desist.

I shall vote against the conference report. I shall support the Senator from Louisiana if he asks to send the matter back to conference and to appoint other conferees, in the hope that they can have some impact on our friends in the House.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Before the Senator leaves the Chamber I hope that he will listen to my reaction to his suggestion. I know he would like to go to lunch.

Mr. CLARK. I will stay if the Senator will make his reply within a reasonable time.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I will try to reply in the same amount of time that it took the Senator to make his suggestion.

I do not quarrel with anything the Senator has said except his advocacy of the motion with respect to the previous question.

The Senator from Pennsylvania has made a very fine speech. Unfortunately, he did not have more than five Senators to listen to him. I doubt that of the five there is more than one who has an open mind. I believe that four of the five have already decided how they will vote. The junior Senator from Louisiana is appealing for some help in behalf of the neediest and most desirable cases of them all. I see before me nothing but a sea of empty seats on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. If there were five Senators here, I would say that four of them were not listening.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It seems to me that one of the good things that can be said for the Senate rules is this: Senators can criticize the junior Senator from Louisiana, as he has been criticized by the press and by the Republican Party, for what he believes in in connection with the conference report. The trouble is that we are too timorous. That includes me, too. We do not fight to do something for the needy, the disabled. We do not vote for what is in our platform. We have surrendered. As far as a man making his fight is concerned, I tried to do my best on Saturday night. Most Senators did not like it. It takes the hide of a rhinoceros to do what I have tried to do. I have been criticized in the press and by Senators. Some Senators have told me—and I do not say this only of Senators who are now serving, but also former Senators, like Burton Wheeler—that if a Senator wishes other Senators to understand what he is trying to say, it is necessary for him to make the speech twice.

It is necessary to make it twice, because only a few are on the floor at a time to hear the Senator, and others do not know that the Senator has even made a speech.

I know I made some headway by making my long speech. I did not expect the support of the Senator from Pennsylvania. I think my speech, or the fire of my speech, perhaps, struck some tinder. I did not know that I would have his vote when I started out.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. In my judgment the Senator from Louisiana has made his speech not twice, but four times, each time to an empty Chamber. The first time he made it he convinced the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I had a much better representation on the Republican side during the early morning hours of Sunday. Apparently they were trying to keep enough Members here to try to force a vote at that time.

Mr. CLARK. I believe they were all here because they were cooking up a funny telegram to send to the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I do not know what the purpose was. I must say that I heard a great deal of laughter coming from the Republican cloakroom while I was standing here making my speech. My guess is that on some occasions the wit and good nature of what they were doing produced more noise in the Chamber than the junior Senator from Louisiana produced on the floor while he was speaking.

Mr. CLARK. It got on the Western Union wires.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. It is good that the Senator from Louisiana has made his speech, even to an empty Chamber, because I feel quite sure, just as he has converted the Senator from Pennsylvania, he has also converted other Senators. I hope the Senator from Pennsylvania will add to his proposed amendment changing the rules of the Senate, an amendment which will make it possible to have Senators listen to so excellent a presentation as that of the junior Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. CLARK. In that regard I invoke the help of the distinguished Senator from Alaska. My thought is that while one can lead a horse to water, it is impossible to make it drink.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I ask Senators to consider what they would be doing if they voted against the inclusion of mental cases. I stood on the floor on Saturday night telling about the pitiful condition of these mental cases. We treat a dog better than we treat some of these cases.

When I try to fight for these people, I look across the aisle, and not a single Senator is seated at his desk on the Republican side. Fortunately, there is one good Republican, whose mind is closed against me already, who is occupying the seat of the Presiding Officer, the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON]. What chance have I to get a Republican vote?

On the other hand, I see at least one prospect, on the Democratic side of the aisle, so perhaps there is one whom I might persuade to vote with me.

I am not here to ridicule. I shall not take much more time. I simply point out that this is what we are up against when we try to point out the realities of the situation.

Why have all the fine prayers:

> Stay our hands when we attempt to postpone into the future the justice waiting to be done today.

Nevertheless, we will not vote that way.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I would not want the able Senator to refer to me as a prospect. I voted for his amendment. I was one of the conferees who sought to retain it in the bill. I recognize that a good many people thought it might relate to distressed action; but, as I said about another provision, I would not worry about the prospects of this provision at all. I am glad the Senator from Louisiana has brought this situation to the attention of the Senate. I hope that early in the next session of Congress, the Senator's amendment might find its way into a bill and receive consideration in the other House.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I am not worrying about that situation. I am talking about the bill as a whole. I think the Senator from New Mexico knows, if he did not know before, that what we have brought back from conference is only about one-quarter of what we voted for in the Senate bill.

Mr. ANDERSON. I think one of the most desirable parts of the entire bill was the part raising to $1,800 the amount a person beyond 65 might earn without great damage to himself or without loss of income. I thought that was a provision which would come back intact from the House. As I recall—and the Senator from Louisiana will correct me if I am wrong—every member of the Senate committee favored the $1,800 amendment. It was presented by the present Presiding Officer, the able Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON]. It was unanimously supported on our side.

In order to show that we were not partisan or narrowminded about this question, we all joined in the effort made to have the amendment of the able Senator from Kansas considered, because he was trying to have adopted something in which we all joined, but as to which we came back from the House almost empty. I think that is unfortunate. I do not know how much the amendment offered by the Senator from Kansas would have cost; but whatever the cost, it was not too much for that particular amendment. I am sorry, indeed, that it did not come back from the conference.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. I associate myself with the comments of the Senator from New Mexico. I think the omission of that one provision would justify the Senate in not approving the conference report and sending it back, either with a different set of conferees or with the same conferees, and asking if it would not be possible to restore that provision, which, I agree, is the most important single item in the bill. It is most unfortunate to have omitted the provision which will enable social security recipients to increase their income by working.

Mr. ANDERSON. I can only say that I might differ with the Senator on how I would vote on that particular proposition. After all, some of us believe that even a small concession, when we want a bill might be worth while.

The Senator from Louisiana has brought out so forcefully the situation with respect to tuberculosis hospitals and mental patients that I am certain the Committee on Finance will take a much different view of that situation in the future from what it has taken in the past.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. This Senator has been around long enough to know that we make great speeches and suggestions to the people of the Nation and tell them about the kinds of things for which we will vote. I have seen great charges made against the breastworks, and have then seen great retreats; great crusades have been followed by great retreats.

The junior Senator from Louisiana would like to point out that it is about time that those who favored the great crusade, which has achieved nothing, proceed to tell the public that they are the ones who led the great retreat.

It is fine to tell a sick man we have voted for him. It is fine to tell someone who cannot get a job that we have voted to assist him.

However, when we lead the retreat from what we have said we would vote for, then I think we ought to say, "My friend, I voted for you when the bill was before the Senate, but in the conference I led the great retreat."

I can say this, however, no Democrat can claim as much credit for the great retreat as can an outstanding Republican I have in mind, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mr. Flemming.

The headline of an article published in the New York Times of April 21, 1959, reads: "Flemming Pleads for Mentally Ill. Says Care Is 'Disgracefully Deficient,' Many Hospitals Only 'Custodial Bases'."

The article continues:

> The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare declared today that the mentally ill of the country were receiving "disgracefully inadequate" care and treatment.
>
> Arthur S. Flemming added that the Federal Government had a responsibility to crusade in the field and that it was starting such a crusade.
>
> Many of the country's 277 State and county mental hospitals, he asserted, are "little more than custodial institutions" and "inadequate for even the simplest methods of treatment." The average cost per patient per day, he said, is only $4.07 for care and treatment, that comparing with $26 a day per patient in general hospitals, exclusive of physicians' fees.

That is a statement by the man who led the great retreat, and who recommended against anything of this sort being done, after he had made his great plea and placed himself, across the Nation, in the New York Times and other

large newspapers, as a man who was leading a crusade against disgraceful conditions which existed in State mental hospitals. That is the leader of our retreat.

Now I should like to help to alert Senators to our actions when we say we are for something. I have reference to a book published by the noted Washington cartoonist, Mr. Herblock. He says:

Every once in a while when a Congressman or an entire session of Congress is on the pan, somebody is sure to say, "But they work so hard" or "You don't know how hard they work."

Then he goes on to say:

It's a busy schedule for all of them, even when they're not campaigning for reelection, and I respect their efforts as exhibitions of sheer physical stamina, if nothing else. But that's not what people mean when they rise to the defense of a Congressman by saying he works hard. They mean his work on legislation. And the answer to that is that there's no special virtue in working hard if they're not doing the right kind of work. Better that some of them should stay in bed. You and I work hard, too, and so do those people who engrave the Lord's Prayer on the heads of pins, a mysterious occupation that I've never quite understood, but which at least does nobody any harm.

Unfortunately, some of the Congressmen do harm, and some of the worst ones probably work harder than many of the better legislators. You have to get up pretty early in the morning to fool 150 million people, and stay late at committee meetings, too, if you want to make sure that a good bill is stopped or a bad one is slipped through. And if you're serving some special interests, it probably can be quite a task to get them what they want and still make it look all right to the folks back home. But to the man who's been waiting for a housing bill, let's say, and who finds it still stuck in a committee room when the congressional quitting whistle blows, it's no consolation to know that somebody—or several somebodies—had to work hard to keep it there. And when he comes home to his one-room apartment, he does not tell the little woman and the kiddies, "My, but those poor fellows must have had to work hard to do us out of a better deal than this."

Mr. President, though I may be criticized for keeping the Senate in session all day Saturday and well into Sunday morning, and although I may be criticized for speaking too much in trying to make people understand what is being done concerning the conference report, I have at least accomplished one thing. I have made the conferees work hard to surrender back at least 80 percent of what the Senate proposed. That is some satisfaction. They worked hard to bring back what we see here, when some thought it was going to be extremely easy to do away with what we fought to achieve.

The people get a particularly unfavorable impression of us when they cannot understand why we do not do more to help the workingman.

I do not care to reflect on other Senators. They feel that the Federal Government should not intrude into these fields. Some States are much more interested in economy than they are in social security or public welfare benefits.

The public is most uncharitable and most unkind to us when it sees us advocate that something be done, but then sees that we do so little about it.

For instance, let me refer now to an article from the Washington Post. It refers to my good friend, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

DOUGLAS SCORES "HILL" COALITION

Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, said yesterday that Democratic presidential candidate JOHN F. KENNEDY should go to the people and denounce the unholy coalition of Republicans and southern Democrats in Congress.

DOUGLAS said KENNEDY should publicly lay the blame on the two groups for the failure of Congress to accomplish much during its current short session.

He also advised KENNEDY to openly call for the coalition to be broken.

DOUGLAS voiced his views in a radio interview, "Radio News Conference," taped for independent stations.

The Illinois Senator said the bobtail congressional session has been a political loss because of obstructionism and negative votes by Republicans and Dixie Democrats.

"But the Democrats of the North and the West will get the blame," he predicted.

DOUGLAS said he was surprised that Senate Democratic leader LYNDON B. JOHNSON, the party's vice presidential candidate, and Speaker SAM RAYBURN did not foresee this would happen. "It's their baby," DOUGLAS added acidly.

Mr. President, one can criticize Republicans and southern Democrats for voting parallel on certain issues. But see what happens when the vote on this conference report comes. See how many so-called liberal Democrats will vote to surrender what they previously voted for. A Senator who does that should not criticize southern Democrats. Here is one southern Democrat who is trying to have the Congress do something about the situation; but I do not have much doubt as to what the result will be. A vote for this conference report will be a vote for a big surrender and a big relinquishment of the things for which the Senate has stood. The Senate voted to do a few things worth doing. The House said that in view of the amount already charged for disability insurance to benefit those above age 50 was sufficient to cover all groups, it would not cause an increase in the charge if all groups were covered. So the House included that provision.

In fact, the bill which came to the Senate from the House would, in the main, not have resulted in any increase in the social security tax. The bill as passed by the House actually provided for little bits and smidgets which could be provided without increasing the social security tax.

Then the Senate proceeded to add some major amendments; and the Senate added more than $1 billion of social security benefits, in addition to what the House has voted. Some Senators then argued that even that was not enough; and, first, our Republican friends offered amendments to do a great deal more in terms of medical care than the Senate actually voted to do.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a tabulation of the additional cost of the Javits amendment, which was voted for by 26 Republican Senators.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ESTIMATED ANNUAL COSTS OF JAVITS AMENDMENT

Estimated annual costs under Javits amendment to H.R. 12580 providing for medical services for the aged

	Number of participants [1]	"Minimum" package			"Maximum" package		
		Total Government cost	Federal cost	State cost	Total Government cost	Federal cost	State cost
	Thousands	*Millions*	*Millions*	*Millions*	*Millions*	*Millions*	*Millions*
United States	8,250	$671.8	$320.4	$351.4	$950.4	$462.8	$487.6
Alabama	105	7.6	5.1	2.5	12.1	8.1	4.0
Alaska	2	.2	.1	.1	.2	.1	.1
Arizona	38	3.0	1.7	1.3	4.4	2.5	1.9
Arkansas	85	5.7	3.8	1.9	9.8	6.5	3.3
California	611	60.8	22.8	38.0	70.4	26.4	44.0
Colorado	65	5.0	2.6	2.4	7.5	3.9	3.6
Connecticut	137	14.3	4.8	9.5	15.8	5.3	10.5
Delaware	20	1.8	.6	1.2	2.3	.8	1.5
District of Columbia	28	2.6	1.0	1.6	3.2	1.2	2.0
Florida	257	20.5	11.3	9.2	29.6	16.3	13.3
Georgia	113	8.2	5.3	2.9	13.0	8.3	4.7
Hawaii	17	1.4	.8	.6	2.0	1.1	.9
Idaho	32	2.7	1.6	1.1	3.7	2.2	1.5
Illinois	510	44.1	17.4	26.7	58.3	23.2	35.6
Indiana	253	19.3	9.8	10.0	29.2	14.5	14.7
Iowa	164	$11.0	$6.3	$4.7	$18.9	$10.8	$8.1
Kansas	116	7.7	4.3	3.4	13.4	7.5	5.9
Kentucky	141	10.9	7.2	3.7	16.2	10.7	5.5
Louisiana	61	4.2	2.6	1.6	7.0	4.4	2.6
Maine	62	4.7	2.7	2.0	7.2	4.2	3.0
Maryland	109	8.9	4.2	4.7	12.6	5.9	6.7
Massachusetts	301	29.7	17.8	16.9	34.7	15.0	19.7
Michigan	358	33.8	15.2	18.6	41.3	18.6	22.7
Minnesota	172	14.0	7.6	6.4	19.8	10.8	9.0
Mississippi	65	4.2	2.8	1.4	7.5	5.0	2.5
Missouri	228	16.2	8.4	7.8	26.3	13.6	12.7
Montana	34	2.5	1.3	1.2	3.9	2.0	1.9
Nebraska	80	5.4	3.1	2.3	9.2	5.3	3.9
Nevada	8	.7	.3	.4	.9	.3	.6
New Hampshire	38	3.0	1.6	1.4	4.4	2.4	2.0
New Jersey	320	26.0	10.0	16.0	36.9	14.1	22.8
New Mexico	20	1.6	1.0	.6	2.3	1.4	.9
New York	924	79.8	29.8	50.0	106.4	39.7	66.7

[1] Assumes 75 percent participation by the 11,000,000 persons eligible to participate in the program.

ESTIMATED ANNUAL COSTS OF JAVITS AMENDMENT—Continued

Estimated annual costs under Javits amendment to H.R. 12580 providing for medical services for the aged—Continued

	Number of participants	"Minimum" package			"Maximum" package		
		Total Government cost	Federal cost	State cost	Total Government cost	Federal cost	State cost
	Thousands	*Millions*	*Millions*	*Millions*	*Millions*	*Millions*	*Millions*
North Carolina	152	$9.7	$6.4	$3.3	$17.5	$11.6	$5.9
North Dakota	29	1.9	1.2	.7	3.3	2.1	1.2
Ohio	473	40.1	17.8	22.3	54.5	24.2	30.3
Oklahoma	94	6.4	3.8	2.6	10.8	6.5	4.3
Oregon	104	9.5	4.9	4.6	12.0	6.2	5.8
Pennsylvania	629	44.1	21.4	22.7	72.5	35.1	37.4
Rhode Island	53	5.3	2.6	2.7	6.1	3.0	3.1
South Carolina	68	3.8	2.5	1.3	7.8	5.2	2.6
South Dakota	35	2.2	1.4	.8	4.0	2.6	1.4
Tennessee	137	9.7	6.4	3.3	15.8	10.4	5.4
Texas	287	$23.2	$13.0	$10.2	$33.1	$18.5	$14.5
Utah	30	2.3	1.3	1.0	3.5	2.0	1.5
Vermont	23	1.9	1.1	.8	2.7	1.6	1.1
Virginia	140	9.3	5.4	3.9	16.1	9.4	6.7
Washington	143	14.2	6.7	7.5	16.5	7.8	8.7
West Virginia	94	6.3	4.0	2.3	10.8	6.8	4.0
Wisconsin	224	16.6	8.7	7.8	25.8	13.5	12.3
Wyoming	13	1.0	.5	.5	1.5	.8	.7
Puerto Rico	47	2.1	1.4	.7	5.4	3.6	1.8
Virgin Islands	1	[2]	[2]	[2]	.1	[2]	[2]

[2] Less than $50,000.

NOTE.—In addition to the above costs, for the Kerr-Frear plan, to which the Javits plan would be attached, 1st year estimated costs were $202,000,000.

Therefore, the overall cost of the Javits amendment would be $522,400,000 for the "minimum" package, and $664,800,000 for the "maximum" package.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The minimum expectation of the cost of the Javits amendment was $320 million, and the maximum was $462 million. So let us say the average would be $420 million—as the additional cost which would have been entailed by the Javits amendment.

Then the Anderson amendment was offered. Its first-year additional cost was estimated at $720 million supported by 42 Democrats. So 26 Republican Senators and 42 Democratic Senators—or a total of 68 Senators out of the 100—voted for far more than what was called for by the bill as reported by our committee. In other words, those Senators wanted to go much further than that—anywhere from $700 million to $400 million beyond anything called for by the bill as reported by our committee. Apparently that was the position of a great majority of the Members of the Senate.

After they failed to get that much agreed to, the same Senators voted for a bill which provided for benefits totaling $1 billion over and above the cost of the benefits voted for by the House.

Now we see that those who voted for so much, today are willing to settle for about 10 percent of that for which they previously voted. I presume they will try to explain why they voted for the much greater benefits in the first instance, but will not vote for them in the second instance.

Mr. President, how much time remains available to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Moss in the chair). Twenty-four minutes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. How much time remains available to the opposition?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Thirty minutes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I observe four other Senators in the Chamber, and I do not see any particular point in my using more of the time available to me when the Chamber is virtually empty. So I suggest that the opposition now use some of their time, if they care to do so.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Does that mean that the Senator from Louisiana has used all the time he desires to use?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. No; but I have used more time than the opposition has. So I suggest that the opposition now proceed to use some of their time; or, if not, I suggest that we have a quorum call, and charge equally to both sides the time required for the quorum call.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I object, because we have an agreement to vote at 2 o'clock, and a quorum call could mean that the vote would be taken later than 2 o'clock, could it not?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It could.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the report.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, if it is agreed that the time required for it shall not be charged to either side.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, if the Senator from Vermont will, instead, request that the time required for the quorum call be charged equally to each side——

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If it is understood that after calling the roll for 10 minutes, the order for the quorum call will be rescinded, then I shall have no objection.

Mr. AIKEN. My purpose is to alert the absent Senators to the fact that there is now no activity here. If the quorum call is begun, after a reasonable time it can be called off.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, is it proposed that the time required for the quorum call be charged equally to both sides?

Mr. AIKEN. No. The purpose is to have the absent Senators notified.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me point out that we have an agreement to vote not later than 2 o'clock. Therefore, if the current debate were to continue beyond 2 p.m., it would be subject to objection.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I have no objection to having the time required for a quorum call charged equally to both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request that there now be a quorum call, and that the time required therefor be charged equally to both sides? The Chair hears none; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call may be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, several years ago the New Jersey Teachers Pension Fund and the New Jersey Public Employees Pension Fund were integrated with the Federal social security system.

A cardinal feature of the plan by which this integration was accomplished was the so-called "offset" provision. Under this provision, the amount of any social security benefits a member of either of the New Jersey funds became entitled to as a result of his employment as a teacher or public employee in New Jersey would be deducted from the pension such person would otherwise receive from the State Teachers or New Jersey Public Employees Pension Fund.

The integration of our State funds with the Federal social security system required, of course, an affirmative vote of approval by the members of the two New Jersey pension funds. Such approval was given after a period of spirited discussion and thorough explanation of the provisions and implications of the integration plan.

In the course of such discussion, it was explicitly and specifically stated to the teachers and other public employees that, if the integration plan was approved, any of them who considered it in his own interests to do so could avoid the operation of the "offset" provision and receive both the benefits under the social security system and the State pension by retiring from public service before his social security benefits matured as a result of such public service.

The ability to do this was an affirmative inducement to a large number of New Jersey teachers and other public employees to vote for the integration plan.

In addition, many teachers and other public employees of New Jersey have subsequently rendered years of service in the justified expectation that they would be able, in the manner stated, to avoid the effect of the offset provision. So, in a very real sense, the ability to avoid the offset was a part of the consideration for the service rendered by these individuals in their public employment in New Jersey.

In the bill before the Senate, when it originally went before the House, there was a provision shortening the time under which individuals would qualify for social security benefits. The effect of this would be to fully qualify, retroactively, many teachers and other public employees in New Jersey as a result of their public service and thus make it impossible for them to avoid the offset provision to which I have referred.

The Senate Finance Committee took a somewhat different approach but, insofar as male teachers and public employees were concerned, the results would have been the same. So when the bill came before the Senate, the committee very generously agreed to take to conference an amendment offered jointly by my colleague, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] and by me, under which the members of the New Jersey Teachers and Public Employees Pension Funds would be exempted from the provisions of the pending bill.

In conference, Mr. President, the Senate conferees receded and accepted, with modification, the House approach, but the conferees dropped the provisions of the Williams-Case amendment. The result is that under the bill agreed to by the conferees, many teachers and other public employees of New Jersey will lose their right to avoid the effect of the offset provision which they had counted on when they voted for the integration of the Teachers and Public Employees Pension Funds with the social security system.

This question was raised in the House, when the conference report came before the House for action, by Representative CANFIELD, of New Jersey, in a colloquy with Representative MILLS, Chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee. Mr. CANFIELD referred to a letter which Mr. MILLS had written him, explaining the reasons why the House conferees felt that the Williams-Case amendment was undesirable.

I ask unanimous consent to have Representative MILLS' letter appear in full at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., August 26, 1960.

HON. GORDON CANFIELD,
House of Representatives.

DEAR GORDON: This letter is to inform you, as I promised I would, of the conference action on the social security bill on the Senate amendment relating to teachers and other public employees in the State of New Jersey. This is the provision which you had discussed with me and other House conferees on behalf of yourself and the rest of the New Jersey delegation urging that the House conferees accept the Senate amendment. This amendment was deleted from the bill in conference. You were also interested in an exception in the case of New Jersey if any change was made liberalizing the quarters of coverage requirements.

I am sure you are aware of the fact that on August 23, when the Senate amendment was being discussed in the Senate, Senator KERR, who at that time was handling the bill on the Senate floor, stated at page 17228 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD: "I have not had time to digest the amendment; neither have the other members of the committee. However, in view of the fact that they have stated it relates only to New Jersey, I hope it will be accepted and taken to conference. If it is found there to be objectionable, it can be taken out of the bill."

During our discussion of the liberalizations in eligibility requirement in conference the main objection which was raised to adding the changes the New Jersey House delegation were urging was that it was designed to exclude public employees in the State of New Jersey from the liberalizations. Since the social security insurance system is a nationwide system, the eligibility requirements must be the same for all workers throughout the country. The conclusion was reached that this is a matter entirely within the control of the State of New Jersey, and that if the State desires to do so it can change its provisions relating to public employees who are also covered by social security. I hope that you will agree that this is the logical and reasonable way to handle this situation. The Congress in any legislation which it enacts affecting the whole of the United States cannot make exceptions which take into account individual provisions of either public or private pension plans.

I am advised that in 1956 when the provision relating to the age for women to become eligible for benefits was reduced from age 65 to age 62, and certain general liberalizations were made in eligibility requirements, the State of New Jersey did amend provisions of its law relating to public employees in such a way that such employees, both women and men, who had already retired, would not be affected by the liberalizations in these requirements in the Federal law.

The conferees agreed that the above considerations were basic and fundamental and for this reason it was decided that no exception should be made in the case of New Jersey.

I regret that the House conferees were not able to accede to your request, but under the circumstances both in the matter of policy and precedent it appeared that the Senate amendment was undesirable particularly in light of the fact that this is a State matter which can be handled at the State level.

Sincerely yours,

WILBUR D. MILLS.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, Mr. CANFIELD then asked Mr. MILLS to summarize the reasons for the action of the conference in rejecting the Williams-Case amendment. I read now what Mr. MILLS replied.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I ask for 3 minutes.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I yield the Senator only 1 more minute. We are under limited time.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. MILLS said:

As I tried to point out in the letter to my friends from New Jersey, this is a matter that I think really involves State law rather than Federal law. We cannot, and at least I do not want us, to get into the habit of making exceptions at the request of individual States to some broad improvement in the Social Security Act. I think the States can more easily adjust their own laws to conform to this program since this is a Federal program.

It is my understanding this is not only the view of Chairman MILLS, but also the vi v of the experts in the social security system whose offices are located downtown.

I should like to ask the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] who is a member of the Finance Committee and was one of the conferees on the pending bill, whether that is also his understanding, and whether it represents as well the view of at least a majority of the members of the Senate Finance Committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I was told that represents the sentiment of the majority of the conferees of the Senate, who felt this was a State matter. I think Chairman MILLS has accurately stated the case.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. So, in the judgment of the Senator from Delaware, who I know speaks for the majority of the members of the Senate Finance Committee, this should be handled at the State level rather than at the Federal level.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator from New Jersey is correct. I cannot imagine the Senate Finance Committee or the House Ways and Means Committee ever acceding to the suggestion that the Federal Government should handle this New Jersey problem which the State of New Jersey can easily, and I believe should, take care of itself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, during this debate there has been much discussion of the problems of our mental health programs in Kansas, in other States, and throughout the Nation. Before we agree to the conference report, I wish specifically to mention at least the great progress which has been made in our own State and in the Nation in regard to this problem.

Before I do, I wish to compliment the Senator from Louisiana. I think the Senator has rendered a service in a field about which every Member of the Senate is greatly concerned. I sincerely believe if the distinguished Senator from Louisiana will make a further study, he will find it is not so much a question of money which make these programs work as it is a question of trained people. No matter how much money we provide, we cannot now hire a sufficient number of psychiatrists to do the work,

and we would have great difficulty getting the needed nurses. I am sure every Senator who has been a State Governor knows of that problem. I have had some experience myself in that field. It is not simply a question of dollars, when it comes to working on a program such as this.

Mr. President, I wish to discuss the State of Kansas first. The State of Kansas has gone from the very lowest position among the States of the Nation in the care of the mentally ill to the top. It is only in recent years that we have actually come to grips with this problem. We are now treating patients for mental illness, instead of incarcerating them in hospitals, which in reality, became prisons for the rest of their lives.

I will admit that our State, as well as other States, had that as its only program for many years. We have progressed from that stage to the stage of treatment. In reality, those hospitals became prisons, where such people were committed for the rest of their lives, as the Senator from Louisiana has mentioned on several occasions during the debate.

I think I should mention that we in Kansas are fortunate, in that the Menninger Foundation is located at Topeka and has for many years conducted a program of research and carried on clinical demonstrations which prove that mental illness responds to treatment exactly like physical ailments.

There was a feeling at one time in the Nation that mental illness would not respond to treatment. It does respond to treatment, and that has been proved.

As we observed the effectiveness of the work of the Menninger Foundation, we in Kansas became convinced that their program was good not only for Kansas, but also for the Nation.

In 1947, Kansas decided to do something about its mental health problem, and while I am going to discuss the mental health program from a national standpoint, I also wish to discuss some of the changes that have taken place in Kansas since 1947.

As Governor of the State, I not only took a personal part in the campaign which our citizens and the Kansas Legislature approved, but also took steps necessary to get the program underway.

One of my first official acts was to appoint a commission composed of outstanding doctors and private citizens and to charge them with the responsibility of making recommendations to the Governor and the legislature for changes in our mental health program.

It was fortunate for the State that Dr. Franklin Murphy, former chancellor of Kansas University and at that time director of the Kansas University Medical Center, and Dr. Karl Menninger of the Menninger Foundation, agreed to serve on the committee. They spent much time on this study and report. I think the results speak for themselves.

Kansas has experienced a tremendous change in its State mental institutions. We have advanced from 45th place among the States, in 1948, in per capita expenditures for maintenance, to 10th in 1951—6th in 1952—and 3d in 1955. Our standing has progressively risen since.

Under our present mental health program approximately 80 percent—as a matter of fact, over 80 percent—of those who are admitted to our hospitals are released within 1 year.

In other words, we are treating these people. We are not incarcerating them in the hospitals. We provide mental treatment for mental illness, which gets these people back into society, where they become productive again. This is not only the humane thing, but also the economic thing, to do.

Our State program not only provides outstanding psychiatric and medical care, but also provides for outpatient and at-home treatment.

I believe that Kansas has the only system of State hospitals in the country where there is not a long waiting list—and where people do not have to sit in jail for a week or a month before they can even enter a hospital, where a doctor might see them a month later.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on my own time?

Mr. CARLSON. I am happy to yield to the Senator on my time. I believe I have sufficient.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The kind of thing about which the Senator is speaking, in regard to Kansas, is what I should like to see done all over, that and perhaps a little bit more. The State of Kansas recently increased expenditures for this purpose by 600 percent.

Mr. CARLSON. I appreciate that.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator is not speaking for the average State, but is speaking for a State which is one of the leaders in this field.

Mr. CARLSON. I appreciate the kind remarks of the Senator from Louisiana, because this is a field with which I am somewhat familiar. As I said, I think the Senator has rendered a service by bringing this to the attention of the country at the present time.

This work can be done by the States. It is not necessarily a question of money. We have to provide psychiatrists, nurses, and trained personnel.

We have been fortunate to have the Menninger Foundation located at Topeka, Kans. We have more people in training than are training in any other place in the Nation. We use them. This has been a great advantage for Kansas.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, we are spending our State funds for the treatment of those who become mentally ill rather than for the construction of new buildings in which to confine them permanently. Ours is a program of treatment and cure rather than of incarceration.

That situation prevailed in our State at one time, and I have no doubt it prevails in some States in this country today. We in Kansas are spending our funds for the treatment of those who are mentally ill, rather than for the construction of new buildings into which to confine them permanently.

One of the mistakes we make when we talk about the treatment of the mentally ill is to talk about the building of elaborate hospitals and the spending of large sums of money to provide new and elaborate hospitals. These people can be treated in very nice, modern buildings. We do not need elaborate hospitals for treatment of these people, as is true for treatment of some other illnesses. We have proved that. Ours is a program, in Kansas, of treatment rather than incarceration.

Mr. President, I now wish to talk about the work of the Federal Government.

The Federal Government has a long history of concern with the problems of mental illness, including those of providing appropriate care on both a short term and long term basis for those who develop mental disorders. The formal recognition of these problems within the Public Health Service dates at least from 1928 with the establishment of the Mental Hygiene Division and the program developed by this group which resulted, among other things, in the establishment of two Public Health Service hospitals devoted to narcotic addiction, the causes for which are broadly based in psychological and psychiatric difficulties of the victims.

Work in this field received a tremendous impetus with the passage of the National Mental Health Act—Public Law 487, 79th Congress—which authorized a more intensive program with respect to the problems of prevention, treatment, and rehabilitation of the mentally ill. Since that date and continuing into the present, the National Institute of Mental Health has developed a broad program designed to promote the proper care of mentally ill persons, responsibility for which has traditionally been vested with the States.

Several approaches to this problem can be identified. First, the Institute provides consultation to State mental health authorities through personnel assigned to regional offices of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Through this device, consultation and assistance with respect to State programs concerned not only with prevention but with outpatient and inpatient care is provided. Where regional office personnel encounter problems they are unable to solve, they may call upon other Institute personnel or outside consultants provided through Institute resources and authorities.

Also of great importance is the activity of the Biometrics Branch of the National Institute of Mental Health, which has the responsibility for collecting information concerning patients in mental hospitals in the United States and for conducting related research and investigations concerning them. This group has not only developed excellent reporting of the size and nature of the problem of hospitalized patients through a series of annual comprehensive reports concerning the number and kinds of patients hospitalized in this country, as well as intermediate reports issued currently on a monthly basis, but it has also done intensive analyses of factors associated with length of patient stay, factors related to release from mental hospitals,

and other considerations involving the efficiency and effectiveness of mental hospital operation and management. With the voluntary collaboration of States highly concerned with this problem, a model reporting area has been developed which has led to information and statistics repeatedly shown to have value to those responsible for mental hospitals in understanding the factors associated with successful and unsuccessful treatment of patients. These data have led to many specific studies in individual hospitals, to reformulation of policies with respect to admission and release of patients, and to extensive exploratory studies of new approaches to treatment and management of patients.

The National Institute of Mental Health, utilizing new authority granted by the Congress several years ago, also has developed mental health project grants, which are dedicated to studies of the problem of the treatment and care of patients. Under these grants, awards may be made to test and evaluate new and improved methods of treatment, staffing patterns, and other aspects of hospital operation considered likely to increase efficiency and results and to return people to the community in as short a time as possible.

The mission of mental treatment is to return people to society. As I stated earlier, it is the human thing to do; it is the economic thing to do. These grants may support not only research activities as such, but some of the associated necessary costs of clinical care for the purpose of demonstrating improved methods and techniques leading to the more effective and economical operation of these hospitals.

The hospital survey and construction program—Hill-Burton—also is available for the purpose of financing the construction of mental health inpatient and outpatient facilities, thereby allowing States and communities to secure in terms of their need help in providing adequate facilities for the care of the mentally ill. The initiative for the utilization of these funds rests with the State and community groups, but these funds have been used for this purpose in numerous cases.

The intramural research program of the National Institute of Mental Health is also devoted to studies of the improvement of patient care and includes a large research program conducted under arrangements with St. Elizabeths Hospital devoted to problems in the area of psychopharmacology.

Finally, it should be pointed out that that the grant program and other services supplied through the Psychopharmacology Service Center of the Institute have done much in testing and evaluating the value and effectiveness of the psychiatrically significant drugs—tranquilizers, and so forth—developed during the last several years. These services include not only comprehensive reporting of the status of research work in this field but also grants for the testing and evaluation of drugs on a research basis and services designed to assure adequate analysis of data secured by investigators.

It is felt that this combination of consultation; grants for research, pilot studies, and treatment; construction of facilities; and the provision of data analyzing services, together with the basic information coming out of the general research grant programs and intramural research of the Institute, provide a meaningful and appropriate pattern of activity and concern of the Federal Government with the problems of the hospitalized mentally ill and others requiring treatment. It should finally be added that the training program of the National Institute of Mental Health has, since 1948, made significant contribution to the production of increased numbers of increasingly well trained psychiatric and other mental health personnel.

Before the vote is taken on the conference report, I urge Senators to keep in mind that it is a step in our program for caring for the aged who are physically ill. I have no doubt that it is the beginning of a great program, and in the future the program will be expanded by Congress. It may be expanded into a program such as that suggested by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana in regard to taking care of the mentally ill and those afflicted with tuberculosis. But these are problems that we have left to the States. The States are working in the field now.

I visited informally with the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] the other day, and I firmly believe that the adoption of his amendment would not be of assistance to the mentally ill or to those in tuberculosis hospitals at the present time. I can see that if the program were applied only to those over the age of 65, it could upset some programs in the States that are well on the way. I sincerely hope that the Senate this afternoon will vote to approve the conference report.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, how does the time record stand?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seven minutes remain to the Senator from Illinois; 20 minutes remain to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I have listened to the comments of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and I wish to commend him on the sincerity of his presentation. I do not mean by that that I contemplate voting for his proposal, but I know that there are substantial aspects of this problem which he discussed with which I am in agreement. I will not attempt to identify them at this time, except to say what I have already said.

I should like to point out that from my study of the Senate version of the bill and the conference recommendation and with the aid of Mr. Myers, who is here representing the Social Security Board, it appears that the Senate version of the bill, if it had been adopted, would have cost $1,720 million. Of that $1,720 million, $1,400 million would have been absorbed through currently sustained finances in the social security service. The balance of $320 million would include old-age assistance care in the amount of $140 million, medical assistance for the aged under the new program in the amount of $60 million, and care to patients in mental and tubercular hospitals in the sum of $120 million.

Thus under the Senate version of the House bill there would have been those three items amounting to $320 million that would have had to have been financed out of the general fund.

Under the conference report, the social security expenditure will be $450 million; the expenditures out of the general fund will be $200 million, or a total of $650 million, as compared to $1,720 million, the difference being $970 million. That is the difference between the cost of the two plans.

I should like to point out certain factors which I believe the citizens of Ohio should know concerning what its position will be in respect to the benefits that it will receive and the cost that it will incur. Ohio will have to expend $1,330,000, to receive $8 million. There are other States that will have to spend much less to receive much more. The Senator from Louisiana and I discussed this matter late Saturday night. For instance, his State, on the basis of the huge expenditures which it has already made, will have to expend $48,000 to receive $13 million.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on my time on that point?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. In my judgment it is a very misleading and inaccurate chart, for the reason that the chart does not show what the States are now spending. The bill, insofar as the Kerr amendment is concerned, causes the Federal Government to match the States on the expenditures they are already making. The table does not show the amounts the States are now spending and which are matched.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The more a State spends, the more it gets. There is some question on the correctness of that philosophy, because the bill contemplates the principle of "The more you spend the more we will give you." That fundamental question runs into trouble, and I do not believe it is a sound principle, but is a principle which underlies the allocation made by the Federal Government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield 1 more minute to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. In summary under the conference bill the State of Ohio will receive $7,766,000, providing it spends $1,336,000. This amount of $7,766,000, which it will receive, is a little more than 3½ percent of the $200 million that the Federal Government will expend on a national basis for the 50 States.

However, statistics show that while Ohio will receive 3½ percent, it will have to pay by way of taxes 6 percent of the $200 million, or in other words, $12 million. Thus to receive $7,766,000 it will have to expend $12 million by way of Federal tax, plus $1,336,000 as its

share of the program amounting in all to $13,336,000. Now let us take a look at what the situation would be if the Federal Government would undertake to finance the cost of caring for the mentally sick and the tuberculosis.

The cost for the 50 States would be $120 million. The share of Ohio for financing this program would be $7,200,000, being 6 percent of the total cost.

In return for its $7,200,000 it would receive $1,200,000 being 3½ percent of the total program. Thus it is apparent that Ohio would be far better off if it took care of its own problem even on at greatly liberalized bases.

It would cost Ohio $8,696,000 more than it would receive. I voted for the social security plan. It was not accepted. I shall vote for the conference report, because I believe if the conference report is not approved, we will have no bill at all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, how much time do we have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CANNON in the chair). Eleven minutes remain to the Senator from Louisiana, and 6 minutes on the other side.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we may have a quorum call, with 2 minutes being charged to each side. Then we will have the closing arguments of each side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I have been fighting the conference report for 3 days. I have said that a vote to accept the conference report is a vote for the big backdown. We came back to this session in the belief that we would do something effective to provide medical care for the people. We said we would pass a minimum wage bill. We said we would enact legislation in other fields where legislation is urgently needed. But particularly we said we would do something to provide two major pieces of legislation which would help people.

The Republicans, at their national convention, made the point that the people could not expect anything by listening to the Democrats, who were talking about what they would do for the public. The Republicans said that they would demonstrate at this session that the Democrats talk big but act little. When Democrats vote for the conference report, our Republican friends will demonstrate what they said at their national convention: That we talk big but act little.

Mr. President, we took a House bill, which was passed on the promise that a few benefits could be voted if it was not necessary to increase the tax; a few little bones and scraps could be voted into the program, providing no increase in tax would be necessary now or in the future.

We took the House bill and we put more than a billion dollars of highly desirable and justified benefits into it. We provided many deserved benefits for working people, persons without jobs, persons without hope.

We included a provision to assist States to provide matching payments for the mentally ill.

We included a provision to assist States to make matching payments for general hospitals for the aged.

Those provisions we took to conference.

We entrusted that bill to conferees, three of whom come from States which make the least effort in terms of public welfare expenditures. In other words, one State, represented by the chairman of the conference, is a State which makes the least contribution to public welfare expenditures; two other conferees come from a State which makes the second least contribution to public welfare expenditures. As a result of this, half the Senate conferees came from States which have shown the least interest in the program.

As one of the conferees, it is my judgment that we should have returned to the Senate and reported disagreement or have insisted on our amendments. All we brought back was a provision which retains the Kerr amendment. That is about all we brought back. The conference report waters down the provision that a man may earn more under retirement than previously, a provision which would have cost 0.19 of the payroll, but which now costs 0.02 of the payroll. The conferees have knocked out about 90 percent of that provision.

The provision that a man can get work and earn some money is knocked out 90 percent.

The provision for the group whom the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare said the need was the greatest, and for which he led the great crusade, has been knocked out on recommendation of the same gentleman, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The House said they would permit a few additional persons to come under coverage of social security by reducing the number of quarters in which persons could achieve coverage.

We have come back with about two-thirds of the House provision, and about one-third of the people knocked out. One-third, or the most needy of them, have been removed.

I think it is time Senators who reported to the public that they have voted to help retired and sick persons now report to the people that they have voted to knock out those provisions. I am afraid that many of them knew that such provisions would never come back from conference when they voted to send them to conference.

What can we do? We can reject the conference report. We can ask for a further conference, and get it. We can ask the House to vote as we will vote on the conference report, or, if necessary, to report disagreement and give the House the first chance it has had in 2 years to vote in favor of indicating to its committee, one of the most conservative of them all, that the House would like to do something along the lines we have proposed.

If we are so timorous that we will not fight for the things we have said we would fight for; if we back down—and here we are backing down on 80 percent of what we sent to conference—the public cannot expect from us what they expected from us when their votes sent us here to provide for the needy, the disabled, and those who are in need of medical care.

I have placed in the RECORD statements to the effect—and there is no doubt about them—that in many States caged animals are treated better than the average patient in a State mental hospital is treated. I believe I have placed enough corroboration in the RECORD to establish that point.

The provision about the earnings test has been knocked out of the report. Eighty percent of all for which the Senate voted has been left out. We have only a few scraps left.

If Senators want to make a real effort to provide these benefits, I hope they will vote to reject the conference report.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the conferees of the Senate have been very diligent in their work. We can now have a bill which can be effective on the first day of October of this year if we will now accept the conference report already approved by the House and send it to the President for his signature.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, there is a beautiful rendition of the Dickens Christmas Carol known as "The Stingiest Man in Town." One or two sentences in that poem particularly appeal to me. It is in the scene where Scrooge is dreaming that he is in a very hot place, where everyone drags a chain. Scrooge is quoted as saying:

> I see another fellow,
> He had a great career.
> He used to be so lucky.
> What is he doing here?

Then the voice of the spirit comes to him and says:

> In government he used to be a crooked politician.
> He never did a thing to help the workingman's condition.
> The stand he took on crime and vice was in the wrong direction.
> So when he ran for Paradise he lost the big election.

Our Chaplain has offered prayers, day in and day out, like the following:

> Lord, help us to extend charity to those in need.
> Lord, stay our hands when we attempt to postpone into the future the justice waiting to be done today.

Mr. President, I say the Senate should vote to insist on the inclusion of these provisions, even though they call for a few extra dollars, for they would make it possible to do the great amount of good the Senate has voted to do.

I plead with Senators not to vote for less.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock has arrived; and, under the agreement, all time available for debate on the conference report has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to House bill 12580.

On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], who is temporarily away from the Senate Chamber.

If the Senator from Oklahoma were present and voting, he would vote "yea," in support of the conference report. If I were at liberty to vote I would vote "nay," as I am opposed to the conference report. So I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I have a pair with the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is necessarily absent to attend a funeral in the State, and, if present and voting, would vote "yea."

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 74, nays 11, as follows:

[No. 314]

YEAS—74

Aiken	Case, S. Dak.	Hart
Allott	Chavez	Hayden
Anderson	Church	Hickenlooper
Beall	Cooper	Hill
Bennett	Cotton	Holland
Bible	Curtis	Hruska
Burdick	Dirksen	Jackson
Bush	Dworshak	Javits
Butler	Eastland	Johnson, Tex.
Byrd, Va.	Ellender	Johnston, S.C.
Byrd, W. Va.	Engle	Jordan
Cannon	Ervin	Keating
Capehart	Fong	Kefauver
Carlson	Frear	Kennedy
Carroll	Gore	Kuchel
Case, N.J.	Green	Lausche
Lusk	Mundt	Scott
McCarthy	Murray	Smith
McClellan	Muskie	Stennis
McGee	O'Mahoney	Symington
Magnuson	Prouty	Talmadge
Mansfield	Proxmire	Wiley
Monroney	Randolph	Williams, Del.
Morse	Saltonstall	Young, N. Dak.
Morton	Schoeppel	

NAYS—11

Bartlett	Long, Hawaii	Thurmond
Clark	Long, La.	Williams, N.J.
Goldwater	Moss	Yarborough
Gruening	Russell	

NOT VOTING—15

Bridges	Hennings	Pastore
Dodd	Humphrey	Robertson
Douglas	Kerr	Smathers
Fulbright	Martin	Sparkman
Hartke	McNamara	Young, Ohio

So the conference report was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the conference report was agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Texas to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 13161) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous agreement, the pending question is on agreeing to the mutual security amendments to the second supplemental appropriation bill, en bloc, on which question the yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. GRUENING. This morning, when I was discussing the bill with the distinguished majority leader, he said he would permit us to have a separate vote on the change which was made in the original report, with regard to the powers of the Congress in checking on the mutual security appropriations. I think the majority leader should be willing at this time to allow a separate vote on this particular amendment, which would diminish the power of Congress to scrutinize these actions of the Executive in the field of foreign aid.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska has a point of order. Will the Senator state it?

Mr. GRUENING. On page 2 of the report on the second supplemental appropriation bill, the following language is set forth:

Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to initiate any project or activity which has not been justified to the House of Representatives and the Senate.

That was changed in the committee, so that the language now reads:

: Provided, That every project or activity financed from funds made available for the fiscal year 1961 for such assistance and for which an estimate has not been submitted, shall be reported to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

That represents a great diminution in the power which was originally conferred upon the Congress. In the first instance, it was necessary for a project or activity to be justified. In the second instance, it is only necessary for the project to be reported. That is almost total nullification of the power of Congress to oppose projects of which it does not approve.

When I spoke to the distinguished majority leader this morning, he said he had no objection to a separate vote on this proposal. I hope he will agree that we should vote on this very important diminution of the power of the Congress.

I believe it is appropriate that we have the vote on such an issue, involving authorizations and appropriations made in such great haste, with blank checks authority given the Executive in the foreign aid field. These projects should be justified, not merely reported. I think it was a great mistake for the committee to weaken that provision and to provide that they need only be reported. I think the word "justified" is a proper word, and the course of action which it directs highly desirable, and I hope the majority leader will allow a vote on this issue.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the Senator did not state the entire case. Did I not correctly understand that the Senator from Louisiana reserved the right to object to the unanimous consent request, after consultation with the Senator from Alaska, and after reading the language withdrew the objection? Is that true?

Mr. GRUENING. Not quite. It is true in substance, but I understood from the able majority leader's statement at that time that something had been put into the bill by the conferees which in effect would strengthen or at least preserve the Congress' control.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I pointed to the language, and the Senator read it. I shall not insist. If the Senator wishes to take the time of the Senate on this, he can do so. The language will be in conference anyway. There is the House version. This is the Senate version. The two versions will be in conference as it is.

Mr. GRUENING. I have no desire to delay the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I had the impression that the Senator from Louisiana, with the knowledge and consent of the Senator from Alaska, withdrew the objection.

Mr. GRUENING. I think that was probably due to a misunderstanding on my part.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The provision will be in conference.

Mr. GRUENING. I have no desire to delay the Senate, but the issue is important. Perhaps many Senators wish to vote for the appropriation amendments in the bill. I shall not be among them. Other Senators, of whom I am

one, may not wish to see the power of the Congress diminished. If we could have a separate vote on the amendments there might be a different result.

If the Senator assures me that this will come up in the conference——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. It will be in conference. The House has one version and the Senate has another version.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President——

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I make a point of order. The rollcall had begun.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A point of order was raised, and therefore considered by the Chair. The point of order is not well taken.

There is a unanimous consent agreement that the Senate proceed to vote.

Mr. GRUENING. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senators will take their seats.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, if I have the floor, I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska does not have the floor at this time. The point of order has been stated and has been determined by the Chair not to be well taken.

The Senate will proceed, under the unanimous-consent agreement with the yea-and-nay vote.

Mr. GRUENING. Discussion of the point of order has scarcely been exhausted. Perhaps the Senator from Louisiana wishes to make another point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is not debatable. The regular order has been called for.

The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Will the Chair state to the Senate the question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. This is a vote on the mutual security amendments to the second supplemental appropriation bill. The vote is on the amendments en bloc, in accordance with the unanimous-consent agreement previously made.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. RUSSELL. When was the unanimous-consent agreement entered into?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It was agreed to earlier in the day.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] is absent because of illness.

On this vote, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] is paired with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Illinois would vote "yea," and the Senator from Alabama would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Arkansas would vote "yea," and the Senator from Florida would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is paired with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR]. If present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota would vote "yea," and the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] is paired with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Rhode Island would vote "yea," and the Senator from Virginia would vote "nay."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 56, nays 31, as follows:

[No. 315]

YEAS—56

Aiken	Dirksen	McCarthy
Allott	Dodd	McGee
Anderson	Engle	Magnuson
Bartlett	Fong	Monroney
Beall	Green	Morse
Bennett	Hart	Morton
Bridges	Hayden	Mundt
Burdick	Hickenlooper	Muskie
Bush	Holland	Prouty
Butler	Jackson	Randolph
Cannon	Javits	Saltonstall
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Scott
Carroll	Keating	Smith
Case, N.J.	Kefauver	Symington
Case, S. Dak.	Kennedy	Wiley
Church	Kuchel	Williams, N.J.
Clark	Lausche	Yarborough
Cooper	Long, Hawaii	Young, Ohio
Cotton	Lusk	

NAYS—31

Bible	Goldwater	O'Mahoney
Byrd, Va.	Gruening	Proxmire
Byrd, W. Va.	Hill	Russell
Capehart	Hruska	Schoeppel
Chavez	Johnston, S.C.	Stennis
Curtis	Jordan	Talmadge
Dworshak	Long, La.	Thurmond
Eastland	McClellan	Williams, Del.
Ellender	Mansfield	Young, N. Dak.
Ervin	Moss	
Frear	Murray	

NOT VOTING—13

Douglas	Humphrey	Robertson
Fulbright	Kerr	Smathers
Gore	Martin	Sparkman
Hartke	McNamara	
Hennings	Pastore	

So the mutual security amendments were agreed to en bloc.

The amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 3, after line 2, to insert:

"MUTUAL SECURITY

"Defense support

"For an additional amount for defense support, as authorized by section 131(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, $65,000,000."

On page 3, after line 7, to insert:

"TECHNICAL COOPERATION

"For an additional amount for technical cooperation, as authorized by section 304 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, $22,000,000."

On page 3, after line 11, to insert:

"SPECIAL ASSISTANCE

"For an additional amount for special assistance, as authorized by section 400(a) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, $26,000,000."

On page 3, after line 15, to insert:

"GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

"For an additional amount for general administrative expenses, as authorized by section 411(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, $2,000,000."

On page 3, after line 19, to insert:

"DEVELOPMENT LOAN FUND

"For an additional amount for advances to the Development Loan Fund as authorized by section 203, $75,000,000, to remain available until expended.

"The limitation on the amount available for administrative expenses of the Development Loan Fund covering the categories set forth in the fiscal year 1961 budget estimates for such expenses is $2,150,000.

"Funds appropriated under each paragraph of title I of the Mutual Security and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1961 (other than appropriations under the head of military assistance), including unobligated balances continued available, the respective funds appropriated by this Act, and amounts certified pursuant to section 1311 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1955, as having been obligated against appropriations heretofore made for the same general purpose as such paragraph, which amounts are hereby continued available for the same general purpose, may be consolidated in one account for each paragraph.

"The proviso in the paragraph headed 'Technical Cooperation, General Authorization' in title I of the Mutual Security and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1961, is amended to read as follows: *'Provided*, That every project or activity financed from funds made available for the fiscal year 1961 for such assistance and for which an estimate has not been submitted, shall be reported to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives.'

"The limitation on the amount available for expenses of the Office of the Inspector General and Comptroller, as established by section 533A of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, is $1,762,000."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendments were agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider was agreed to.

Mr. GORE subsequently said: Mr. President, while talking with some constituents in the room adjoining the Senate Chamber, I inadvertently missed the vote on the amendments affecting mutual security a moment ago. Had I been present and voting, I would have

voted "yea." I am sorry I inadvertently missed the vote.

Mr. MORSE subsequently said: Mr. President, at this time I would like to make a few comments upon the amounts provided in the pending bill for the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management for the reseeding and reforestation of burned-over acreages.

Mr. President, I was very pleased that the committee, as shown on pages 4 and 13, of Senate Report 1915 on the second supplemental appropriation bill recommended that the full amounts requested by the administration be restored to the bill.

It should be pointed out, however, that the estimates submitted by the administration are for substantially less than what is actually needed in comparison with the acreage which has been destroyed. I am informed that on Forest Service land alone there are now in excess of 320,000 acres which need to be rehabilitated. At a cost of approximately $10 per acre this would indicate a need of $3,200,000 for rehabilitative work on the forest lands. If this estimate of the cost per acre is correct, an amount in the neighborhood of $2,400,000 more than the administration requested could be profitably used by the Forest Service.

I have great sympathy for the difficulty in which the committee finds itself when it is proposed that budget estimates be exceeded. I know that the revered and distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], who deserves the title of Mr. Conservation, is most sympathetic to the problems faced as the result of these devastating fires. I recall with pleasure that during my testimony before him, which may be found on page 108 of the Senate hearings on H.R. 13161, he corroborated my recommendation that reseeding operations be started as soon as possible in order that fullest advantage may be taken of the ash as a growing medium for the seed to be planted under the reforestation program.

I would hope that he would also be able to agree with me that the ultimate future costs of rehabilitation work will be greater because we are not providing the money now.

Mr. President, as I said, I can appreciate the difficult position that the committee finds itself in as the result of the minimal request of the administration. It therefore becomes even more important, in my judgment, for the committee to stand firmy behind the amounts submitted in the pending bill during the conference with the House. The amounts are not large but the importance of providing the full estimates to both the Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management is urgent and justifiable.

Mr. President, I wish to compliment the distinguished and able Senator from Arizona, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, who with his colleague, has performed a public service in providing funds for needed capital outlay items in the District of Columbia.

I am particularly pleased that the committee supplied funds for construction of the District schools. It is my understanding that construction funds were made available to the full extent of the budget estimates.

It is also my understanding that construction funds were made available to relieve the serious housing shortage at Junior Village. As I recall it, the average daily population at Junior Village in the month of June 1960 was 448, although the capacity of the cottages was only 241.

Again, I wish to express my appreciation to the chairman of the committee and to his colleagues for the splendid work they have done on the supplemental appropriations bill as it pertains to the District of Columbia items. I have every confidence that the chairman and has associates, in conference, will be able to make their views, which are the views of the Senate, prevail. There is a great need in the District for these schools and Junior Village structures to serve the children of the District.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time on the supplemental appropriations bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I understand that the vote now comes on the passage of the supplemental appropriation bill. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct. The question on the passage of the bill. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] is absent because of illness.

On this vote, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] is paired with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Illinois would vote "yea," and the Senator from Alabama would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Arkansas would vote "yea," and the Senator from Florida would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is paired with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR]. If present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota would vote "yea," and the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] is paired with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Rhode Island would vote "yea," and the Senator from Virginia would vote "nay."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announced that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 67, nays 21, as follows:

[No. 316]

YEAS—67

Aiken	Dodd	Magnuson
Allott	Dworshak	Mansfield
Anderson	Engle	Monroney
Bartlett	Fong	Morse
Beall	Gore	Morton
Bennett	Green	Moss
Bible	Hart	Mundt
Bridges	Hayden	Murray
Burdick	Hickenlooper	Muskie
Bush	Holland	O'Mahoney
Butler	Hruska	Prouty
Byrd, W. Va.	Jackson	Randolph
Cannon	Javits	Saltonstall
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Scott
Carroll	Keating	Smith
Case, N.J.	Kefauver	Symington
Case, S. Dak.	Kennedy	Wiley
Church	Kuchel	Williams, N.J.
Clark	Lausche	Yarborough
Cooper	Long, Hawaii	Young, N. Dak.
Cotton	Lusk	Young, Ohio
Curtis	McCarthy	
Dirksen	McGee	

NAYS—21

Byrd, Va.	Goldwater	Proxmire
Capehart	Gruening	Russell
Chavez	Hill	Schoeppel
Eastland	Johnston, S.C.	Stennis
Ellender	Jordan	Talmadge
Ervin	Long, La.	Thurmond
Frear	McClellan	Williams, Del.

NOT VOTING—12

Douglas	Humphrey	Pastore
Fulbright	Kerr	Robertson
Hartke	McNamara	Smathers
Hennings	Martin	Sparkman

So the bill (H.R. 13161) was passed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to table was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference thereon with the House of Representatives, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Chair appointed Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HILL, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, and Mr. MUNDT conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I respectfully ask to be excused from service on the conference committee on the bill. I was a member of the conference on the mutual security bill, and after a full and free conference, the Senate conferees unanimously agreed to the original figures in the conference bill. I do not feel that I could now represent the Senate's new viewpoint and support this effort to restore items already handled through the ordinary legislative process. As a matter of fact, I could not face the Members of the House after signing the original conference report and seriously

insist that they reverse their position only a day or two after the original conference. Therefore, I ask to be excused.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator is excused.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] has declined to serve as a conferee on the supplemental appropriations bill, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] be named to serve in his place.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCGEE subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, immediately following the vote on the second supplemental appropriation bill, a statement I have prepared relative to moneys appropriated to rehabilitate recently burned forest areas; a letter from me to Dr. Richard E. McArdle, Chief of the U.S. Forest Service, dated August 29, 1960; and a table taken from page 20 of the record of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee hearing on Senate Joint Resolution 95.

There being no objection, the statement, letter, and table were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MCGEE

The administration's request for $1,300,000 to be added to the funds expendable by the Forest Service during this fiscal year is a matter of great interest to those of us who have large national forests in our States.

Of this sum, $800,000 is to be expended to rehabilitate and restore forest and range lands in 11 Western States. We on the Appropriations Committee have been aware for some time that it was necessary to take steps to develop better methods for fire prevention and control and more systematic and thorough reforestation of recently burned-over lands.

The administration has been invited by Senator HAYDEN for the last 2 fiscal years to request funds which would be adequate to carry out its own program for the national forests. The refusal of the administration to request these funds despite the committee's invitation seems to be part of a pattern which has held true for the last 7 fiscal years.

I should like to ask that a table taken from page 20 of the record of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee hearing on Senate Joint Resolution 95 be printed at this point in my remarks, together with the totals for the columns in the table. This table shows the difference between the Forest Service request to the Agriculture Department for reforestation funds, the Department's request to the Bureau of the Budget, the President's request to Congress, and the amounts appropriated by Congress. Over these fiscal years the Forest Service has requested $21,281,000 for reforestation. This request has been chopped to just over $15 million with the Department, further limited to about $14.5 million by the Bureau, and raised to just over $18 million by Congress.

These figures are cited to show that the record of the administration has been one of consistent diminution of the efforts on the part of the Forest Service to provide adequate funds for reforestation and rehabilitation of our precious forest lands. The record also shows the consistent efforts of Congress to increase expenditures and get the job done.

It is gratifying that the administration has finally in this summer of tragic forest fires realized that we need more money for this purpose. Their request, however, is too little and too late to do any good and is, therefore, no more than a pitiful admission of what we have long known—that the administration is not really interested in the conservation of our vital natural resources.

Yesterday I wrote to Dr. McArdle, head of the Forest Service, and to Mr. Woozley, Director of the Bureau of Land Management, to request the facts and figures with regard to the ravaging fires which have destroyed so many thousands of acres of our national forests this summer. I should like to ask that my letter to Dr. McArdle be printed at this point in the RECORD in order that the concern of Congress may be made perfectly clear.

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
August 29, 1960.

DR. RICHARD E. MCARDLE,
Chief, U.S. Forest Service,
U.S. Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. MCARDLE: The reports that this year there have been far more serious fires affecting the land your agency administers than in any recent period have given me a great deal of concern. During a recent visit to my home State, I had the opportunity to learn of the very serious inroads on our timber and land resources which have been and are being made by fire. Such losses are acute in any State, but in Wyoming not only our present economy, but our future capacity to provide the jobs and the standard of living which we require are very seriously jeopardized by this situation.

As you know, I have expressed my views on the need for a more thorough program of fire prevention and land rehabilitation on many occasions. Just a few months ago, working with a number of my colleagues, I attempted to have funds added to the Forest Service's appropriation so that we could develop better methods for fire prevention and control and more systematic and thorough reforestation of recently burned-over lands. The Forest Service itself, in requesting a supplemental appropriation to rehabilitate recently burned-over land from the fires which have lately occurred, has given recognition to the severity of the situation which confronts us.

It is my belief that although the expenditure of these funds is justified, such stopgap appropriations do not really meet the Nation's need. It is becoming more obvious with each passing day that the program for the national forests, with its contemplated expenditures, must be carried out and that only when we appropriate funds adequate to perfom the long-range tasks of more efficient fire prevention and more thorough rehabilitation of recently burned-over lands will we be fulfilling our obligation to the more numerous generations which will follow ours.

As an aid to my understanding of the problem, I should like to request the following information for fires either causing damage in excess of $10,000 or costing more than $10,000 to extinguish. I should like to have this information furnished not only for Wyoming, but for each of the other States which have been afflicted, and also to have national totals.

It would also be desirable to have one report which covers the period from January 1, 1960, to June 30, 1960, and a second report commencing with July 1, 1960, and covering the period through August 30, 1960. It would be a very real convenience if these reports could be prepared by September 15 and a complete report for the second half of 1960 finished by January 15, 1961.

1. The date and location of the fire.
2. The cause.
3. The reasons for the fire becoming so large.
4. The cost to extinguish the fire.
5. The resulting losses:
   (a) Watershed damage and value.
   (b) Timber volume including young or unmerchantable timber and value.
   (c) Grazing use and value.
   (d) Recreation use and value.
   (e) Other uses and value.
   (f) Total losses.
6. The cost of rehabilitating the land to full productivity (not merely to return the land to its previous condition if this was unsatisfactory).
7. The ability of your agency to rehabilitate the lands based upon funds requested for the pertinent fiscal year.
8. The additional rehabilitation which is possible with the funds provided by Congress beyond the January 1960 budget request.
9. The future annual losses in land use and revenues if rehabilitation is not undertaken.
10. Specific suggestions of steps needed to:
   (a) Reduce the incidence of and damage from fires.
   (b) Insure prompt restoration of the soil and its resources to full productivity.

Sincerely yours,

GALE W. MCGEE,
U.S. Senator.

Year	Forest Service request to Agriculture Department	Department's request to Budget Bureau	President's request to Congress	Appropriated by Congress
1955	$1,492,000	$637,000	$637,000	$1,049,612
1956	1,577,000	1,046,000	1,046,000	1,389,700
1957	1,512,000	1,406,000	1,406,000	2,058,000
1958	3,371,000	2,414,600	2,414,000	2,414,000
1959	2,914,000	2,941,000	2,412,000	3,162,000
1960	4,650,000	3,297,000	3,255,000	3,455,000
1961	5,765,000	3,465,000	3,465,000	4,730,000
Total	21,281,000	15,206,600	14,635,000	18,258,312

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 3416. An act to provide for the restoration to the United States of amounts expended in the District of Columbia in carrying out the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act of 1958;

S. 3835. An act to authorize the District of Columbia Civil War Centennial Commission to plan and carry out in the District of Columbia civic programs in commemoration of the one-hundredth anniversary of the Civil War; to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of Defense to make certain property of the District and of the United States available for the use of such Commission; to authorize the said Commissioners to make certain regulations and permit certain uses to be made of public space, and for other purposes; and

S. 3867. An act to exempt from taxation certain property of the National Guard Association of the United States in the District of Columbia.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2575) to provide a health benefits program for certain retired employees of the Government.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the

amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2633) to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6871) to amend title III of the Public Health Service Act, to authorize project grants for graduate training in public health, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 270) to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the rate of special pension payable to certain persons awarded the Medal of Honor, and for other purposes, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY OF SENATOR DWORSHAK, OF IDAHO

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in the remaining time, I must call attention to the fact that when I was in the House of Representatives, there came to the 76th Congress a very vigorous and distinguished editor and publisher from the State of Idaho, for whom, since that time, I have had an enduring affection, deep devotion, and high esteem. We served together on the House Committee on Appropriations. We have served together on the Senate Committee on Appropriations. Few people have addressed themselves with so much conviction, so much zeal, so much earnestness, and so much devotion to the public business as has HENRY DWORSHAK, the distinguished senior Senator from Idaho.

He distinguished himself in the service of his country, in the American Expeditionary Force in World War I. We were soldiers together. He became commander of the American Legion in the State of Idaho. For 20 years he was an editor and publisher, and has long pursued those things of community, State, and national interest with an unselfishness and a devotion unequaled by anyone.

So today, and since he is old enough not to be vain about it, I salute, on his 66th birthday, a great Member of the U.S. Senate.

Mr. President, under the unanimous-consent request, I believe all time has expired. However, if there is a minute remaining, I should like to suggest——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana has 2 minutes remaining.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR MURRAY

Mr. STENNIS. It was with a deep sense of personal loss that I learned of JIM MURRAY's decision to retire from the Senate at the end of this session.

We will miss him, but we will long remember our association with him, our common experiences, and the solid leadership he always exhibits in advocating programs close to his heart. The programs he has supported, and in most instances they have been adopted, were ones worthy of devotion and support. His efforts for conservation, for agriculture and industry have been magnanimous and fruitful—for the things he advocates concern the welfare of our people, even unborn generations—and he has been a towering example of consistency and solidity in the Senate.

For a quarter of a century here, he has been a leader in worthwhile, patriotic, and humanitarian causes. His long period of unselfish service is an inspiration—his personal friendship a treasured experience.

Humane, solid, consistent, and devoted are words that come to mind when we think of JIM MURRAY's career of Senate service.

His dedicated service to the people of America made his service to the people of Montana stronger. We know of his deep affection to his fellow Montanans, and by electing him to the Senate for five consecutive terms, the people of Montana have demonstrated their affection for him.

I want to join with others here in wishing him Godspeed and many, many more years of happiness and satisfaction with a job well done.

ADDRESS BY DR. T. KEITH GLENNAN, ADMINISTRATOR, NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the exploration of space—a relatively new experience in the life of man—has become one of the most significant events to mark world history in recent times.

As a new venture, it has inordinate importance to our national prestige and progress.

By concentration of human and natural resources, the Soviet Union, also has made some admirable accomplishments in space.

Despite a later start by the United States, however, I am convinced—based upon the best information available—that the United States is moving ahead in this field.

As a new endeavor, it is necessary, of course, to expand public understanding of our program and its objectives—if we are to elicit the necessary foundation of support.

Recently, Dr. T. Keith Glennan, Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, speaking before the Fifth AFBMD–STL Aerospace Symposium on "Ballistic Missile and Space Technology," reviewed what I believe is sound philosophy for achievement in space.

Reflecting a realistic approach to advancement in this field, I ask unanimous consent to have Dr. Glennan's informative address printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY T. KEITH GLENNAN, ADMINISTRATOR, NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

Gentlemen, in Mr. Le Galley's letter giving me information on the program for this symposium, he included a sentence which ran thusly—"We would like to have you select your own topic but would like to suggest that it be in the general field of the accomplishments of NASA to date and the role of NASA in the future." With that wide-open charter, I decided to avail myself of the freedom of choice offered me. Accordingly, I am going to make a valiant effort to avoid one of the pitfalls that so frequently swallow up a speaker like myself when he faces an audience composed of experts in the chosen topic. This noon, I propose not to speak about the space business in the sense of what NASA has done and plans to do—these are matters that have been recounted many times and widely reported. Rather, I intend to do some "thinking out loud" with you, about some matters that are, I really believe, of fundamental importance to all America as we press forward in our program of space exploration and utilization.

Preparation of this paper began a couple of weeks ago. As a matter of fact, it was the evening of the 14th that I began the task of putting my thoughts on paper. But it wasn't until I was well along with the first draft that I realized what a coincidence there was in the timing: August 14, 1960 was the second anniversary of the day when I appeared before members of the Special Committee on Space and Astronautics of the U.S. Senate to expose myself to their consideration of my fitness as the President's nominee to head up the legislatively assured but as-yet-unborn National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

On that occasion, Senator JOHNSON observed, "If you are confirmed, I am not certain whether congratulations or commiserations will be in order." And then he went on to predict, "This position is in no sense a sinecure." In the 2 years since, I've never had reason to quarrel with the Senator's assessment of what was needed.

One more bit of reminiscing about that Senate hearing. I had very recently returned from a brief visit to the Soviet Union where, in company with six other college presidents, I had seen something of their system of higher education. It was natural, then, that we should get into a discussion of the importance that the Soviets have placed on education generally and on higher education and research and development particularly. At that time I said—I've refreshed my memory by referring back to the published hearings—"the Soviet educational system is not one which I think we should admire. It is a pragmatic system. It is set up to serve their purposes, the kind of program which the Government establishes. They are not making education available to everyone in the higher educational field at all. They are educating the people that they need. They are not concerned with the individual one little bit.

"They are concerned only with fulfilling the aims set up by the Council of Ministers."

And I went on to say that the most vivid impressions I had carried away from my short visit to Russia and middle Asia were—first, their ability to control the application of the energy and thoughts of the Soviet people and, second, the high degree of motivation and dedication evident in the attitude of every person and in every activity with which we had experience. As I told the Senate committee, "We need more of that kind of dedication in this country."

We continue to need a kind of individual and informed dedication throughout the fiber and muscle of our national being. In this space business, I say proudly and I believe with complete accuracy, we do have people—hundreds upon hundreds of them—who possess an impressive kind of dedication to the performance of their tasks. Certainly, these dedicated workers include men in uniform as well as civilians. They are to be found in every segment of our national space effort. But there is and will continue to be need for many more such people who are willing to participate effectively, unselfishly, and, at times, at some real cost to themselves.

Out of my experience over the past 2 years, I have come to feel very strongly about the importance, the essentiality, of prosecuting our space activity as a genuinely national effort. In January of this year I summed up my conviction as follows:

"The Nation's space exploration program is not and should not be the subject of partisan politics. The rockets that launch our satellites do not bear the insignia of the Republican Party or that of the Democratic Party. They do not carry the name of one of the military services or the name of my Agency—the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. They carry only these words—United States.

"They represent the genius, the labor and the devoted efforts of the citizens of this Nation, regardless of religion, color or political affiliation. They represent the tax dollars of all the people—your dollars and mine.

"I assert then, that the Nation's program of space exploration is, and by its very nature should be, the responsible concern of all of our people." And I could have added, that such responsible military men as Gen. Thomas D. White, Air Force Chief of Staff, have shown by word and deed, that they share in this conviction.

Thomas E. Murray, with whom I served nearly a decade ago on the Atomic Energy Commission, has written, "I have seen the two faces of the atom—one fierce, the other benevolent." Respecting activities in space, there are also two kinds of activity, one to serve military needs for a variety of operational support systems and the other essentially nonmilitary. There is a distinction, but there is also a similarity of purpose; both, by the very nature of our way of life, are designed to strengthen our national role as a world leader in the search for lasting peace. Together, they mutually support our national purpose—the preservation of a society of free men acting in a responsible way to improve the conditions of life for all of our fellow human beings.

Ironically, the U.S.S.R. has seemingly done a quite good job of convincing much of the world, especially among the so-called neutralist or uncommitted nations, that most of what we in America have so far accomplished in space has been military and thus intrinsically evil. I say, ironically, because the Soviets themselves have proved masters at the space-bunkum game, "now you see it, now you don't—now it's military, now it's not."

William Sargent, of London, internationally known for his studies in psychological medicine, suggests that the Russian efforts to be on both sides of the fence simultaneously are entirely deliberate. "The fact remains that," and now I quote Dr. Sargent, "Russian propaganda has for some time now been showing a quite fascinating and consistent pattern, very reminiscent of Pavlov's method of breaking down his conditioned dogs by the scientific application of positive and negative conditioning signals.

"For instance, when the first sputnik was launched by Russia, and a state of world excitement and tension had been created by this great scientific feat, we were first of all told by Russia that it had no military significance, and then almost immediately afterward that this achievement meant most parts of America could now be destroyed at will.

"Then we were again reassured," Dr. Sargent says, "that this experiment and the research leading up to it were part of a peace-loving Russia's contribution to the International Geophysical Year; but later we were again reminded that it also meant a total revolution in all modern ideas of global warfare."

Dr. Sargent notes further that as a consequence of this "long bombardment of conflicting signals * * * some sections of the British and American public and press alike showed temporarily much the same sort of bewildered confusion, increase in generalized anxiety and suggestibility, and even the tendency to hysteria that was also seen in Pavlov's animal experiments."

To all of which I say, "amen." Every time the Russians have launched a space experiment, there has been a frightful clamor about how "far behind" we are in the United States. And every time we have had space success in America—and recently, we have had a number of really significant successes—there has been a flurry of self-congratulation about how handsomely we have already "caught up."

You who are here today know better than anyone else that what we're engaged in isn't any Saturday afternoon ball game with the outcome to be measured in runs, hits, and errors. But, unfortunately, the public—and included here are many well-meaning people who certainly should be better informed—continue to equate Russian and American accomplishments in space technology as a contest wherein the relative position of the opposing rivals can be charted, inning by inning, just by keeping a score card.

Earlier this month, one of our hosts—Dr. Reuben F. Mettler, executive vice president of Space Technology Laboratories—performed a chore similar to mine today. His rostrum was in Washington, and one comment he made bears upon this vital matter:

"No doubt that the Russians have selected space development as an area to display technological development and to impress other nations, and they have acted cleverly. The United States has not done sufficiently well in this respect. It has been frequently stated that the United States should not engage in space stunts—I agree with that—but that does not mean that we should fail to recognize that space experiments properly publicized and properly explained abroad are important to us.

"We shouldn't be ashamed to be first.

"If we fail to appear as the technological leader to other nations, there is the danger that the Soviets may succeed in convincing the world that their system of government has intrinsic advantages which all nations should copy."

So far as I am concerned—and I would expect total agreement from this audience—there is no question whatsoever but that space technology and space exploration make up the internationally most visible, internationally most vital, area where the United States must excel. And I believe, most sincerely, that excelling will be achieved only by deeds accomplished—not by "hairy" statements of things to come that border on the irresponsible—statements made usually to stake out a claim to a particular area or in response to pressures within an organization, either civilian or military, for representation in a particular field of effort.

What was first necessary to determine, even before we could make the attempt to excel, is what we wanted to accomplish and how we proposed to do it. Perhaps it would be well to state again for the record the convictions which have guided me as we have developed a program of space exploration for the Nation. Resisting, for the most part, the strong and at times widely expressed clamor for so-called "spectacular firsts—space stunts," as Dr. Mettler termed them—we have held to the belief that a broadly based program of investigations would bring us the real leadership position in this field even though some years might, and probably would, elapse before we realized that goal. It has been my contention that really significant accomplishments—"spectacular firsts," if you will—must occur from time to time if we pursued such a program with vigor and determination. And in the meantime, we would be building solidly that body of information that would permit achievement of our ultimate long-range goals—the development of operating systems of benefit to mankind and manned flight through space to other parts of our solar system.

While I would have to admit that had we had available to us, in the past 2 years, a launch vehicle of very high thrust we would have found it more difficult to adhere to this philosophy, I contend that only by pursuing such a program will we gain—within a reasonable time and on a basis of sustained effort, funded on an adequately generous basis over many years—will we gain and retain that position of leadership we all so much desire. No one could wish more than I that we had photographed the other side of the moon first, but I contend that the very real promise of successful accomplishment of our objectives in meteorology and improved long-range weather forecasting, of global telephone and television communications, and of reliable navigational systems will bring to this Nation the long-range and sustaining satisfactions of responsible leadership and citizenship in this world of conflicting ideologies.

One remembers the old adage that runs—a man is not without honor save in his own community. Tiros I, Pioneer V, Echo I, Transit I and II, and the satisfying and important results of the Discoverer XIII exercise have been acclaimed by the rest of the world as evidence of the strength and solid purposes of the United States in this competition. Indeed, the editorial comment abroad now suggests a consensus that we do, in fact, lead the world in these activities. Even in our own country, there seems to be some inclination to stop downgrading our efforts as confused, too little and too late. I happen to hold strongly the opinion that in the things that count and will count in the struggle between communism and freedom—in the things that count and will count as solid contributions to the betterment of man's material well-being the world over—we have achieved the leadership position. But we will continue to have that position only so long as we keep our eyes on these long term and, at times, seemingly diffuse goals of achieving across-the-board competence in the space field.

And the stakes in this competition are high. Our excelling in space technology will surely provide great benefits in what one of the wisest men of our time has called "the decisiveness of the present moment in history." That man was Dr. Charles Malik, Lebanese diplomat and former President of the United Nations Assembly.

Mr. Malik spoke in June at colonial Williamsburg in Virginia during the annual celebration of the 50 days of 1776 which have become known as the prelude to independence. What he said was deeply sobering, strangely moving, and wonderfully inspiring.

As I said, Dr. Malik is from the Middle East, and so it may be pertinent to identify his own position respecting the United States vis-a-vis the U.S.S.R.: "I view the decisiveness of the present moment in history as consisting in a life-and-death struggle between international communism, not only or even primarily as an economic system, but as a total outlook on life, and the rest of the world, especially the Western World, and in the Western World especially the United States of America; and because of my knowledge of its ultimate positive values * * * I range myself wholly on the side of the West, despite its many imperfections, mistakes, failures, and sins."

It is Dr. Malik's passionate conviction, one in which I share, that, and I quote, "Putting aside the question of vision, softness of living, and unity of effort among the diverse factors involved, there is no doubt whatsoever that, by any standard of measurement,

the material and human resources of North and South America, of Western Europe, of Japan, of Australasia, and of as much of Africa (and there is no reason why all of Africa should not be included) and Asia as may be persuaded to cooperate, can be so marshaled and coordinated as to outdo the Communist domain, in any field of human endeavor, by a ratio of at least five to one. It is all therefore a question of vision, overcoming the softness of life, and inducing the necessary unified effort. The free world has nobody and nothing to blame but itself if it cannot so order its house as to beat communism in every realm."

Lester B. Pearson of Canada, also a former president of the United Nations Assembly, assesses the situation as follows: "We are living in an era of towering material and scientific achievement, along with a stubborn refusal to accept, in political action, the implications of that achievement. It is a desolate thought that, in the field of cooperation for world peace, we are not far beyond the tribal in our hopes and fears, in our policies and practices. Man can now receive a message from a gadget 8 million miles away in outer space (I digress, to update Mr. Pearson's statement which he made before all the returns were in. The final message was from 22.5 million miles out)—a gadget whose course around the sun he has determined. But a message across a curtain is blocked or misinterpreted or misunderstood.

"Humanity can—as we are so often told—be lost in the chasm created by this imbalance. This is no holiday from history. It is the time when man's destiny is to be decided. It is a time of challenge to our resolve—and our right—to survive."

Gentlemen, we have our work to do. Let us be courageous, responsible, and at the same time, daring in what we have to do. And let us, no less, be thankful for our opportunity to serve * * * all mankind.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

INCREASED TARIFFS ON LEAD AND ZINC

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State, transmitting a telegram from the Acting Minister of Foreign Relations of Peru, to the Secretary of State, relating to prospective legislation to increase U.S. tariffs on lead and zinc (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT OF NATIONAL COMMISSION FOR UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC, AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

A letter from the Executive Secretary, the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report for fiscal year 1960 of gifts and bequests received and accepted by the U.S. National Commission for the United National Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

CERTIFICATION OF ADEQUATE SOIL SURVEY AND LAND RECLASSIFICATION, LA FERIA DIVISION, LOWER RIO GRANDE REHABILITATION PROJECT, TEXAS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, that an adequate soil survey and land reclassification has been made of the lands in the La Feria division, lower Rio Grande rehabilitation project, Texas, and that the lands to be irrigated are susceptible to the production of agricultural crops by means of irrigation (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON OROVILLE-TONASKET UNIT, CHIEF JOSEPH DAM PROJECT, WASHINGTON

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Oroville-Tonasket unit, Okanogan-Similkameen division, Chief Joseph Dam project, Washington (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

APPRECIATION OF OKINAWA FOR U.S. ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

A letter from the Chief of Legislative Liaison, Office of the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a resolution of the chairman of Central District Shi-cho-son Assembly Chairmen's Association of Okinawa, for U.S. economic assistance (with accompanying papers); ordered to lie on the table.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

H.R. 8156. An act for the relief of Jack Kent Cooke (Rept. No. 1933).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

H.J. Res. 721. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens (Rept. No. 1926).

By Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendments:

S. 3846. A bill to establish a National Armed Forces Museum Advisory Board of the Smithsonian Institution, to authorize expansion of the Smithsonian Institution's facilities for portraying the contributions of the Armed Forces of the United States, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1932);

S. 3901. A bill to authorize the erection of a memorial in the District of Columbia to Gen. John J. Pershing (Rept. No. 1931);

H.J. Res. 311. Joint resolution authorizing the erection of a statue of Taras Shevchenko on public grounds in the District of Columbia (Rept. No. 1930);

S. Res. 354. Resolution amending S. Res. 243 authorizing the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate certain matters within its jurisdiction (Rept. No. 1927);

S. Res. 355. Resolution amending Senate Resolution 244 authorizing the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to undertake a study of transportation policies in the United States (Rept. No. 1927);

S. Res. 360. Resolution authorizing the printing of the "Legislative History of the Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, 86th Congress," as a Senate document;

S. Res. 362. Resolution to print "Strengthening Free World Security," as a Senate document;

S. Res. 363. Resolution to print additional copies of certain hearings on "U.S. Foreign Policy";

S. Res. 368. Resolution providing additional funds for the investigation of antitrust and monopoly laws and their administration (Rept. No. 1929);

S. Res. 374. Resolution amending Senate Resolution 305, authorizing the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to undertake a study of the uses of Government-licensed media for the dissemination of political opinions, news, and so forth (Rept. No. 1928);

S. Res. 379. Resolution to authorize the printing for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary 2,000 additional copies of Senate Report No. 1834, 86th Congress, 2d session, entitled "The Insurance Industry—Aviation, Ocean Marine, and State Regulations"; and

S. Con. Res. 115. Concurrent resolution to print additional hearings on Senate Resolution 94, relating to the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice.

AMENDMENT OF WAR CLAIMS ACT OF 1948, TO PROVIDE COMPENSATION FOR CERTAIN WORLD WAR II LOSSES—SUPPLEMENTAL AND INDIVIDUAL VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 1934)

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report favorably, with amendments, the bill (H.R. 2485) to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, to provide compensation for certain World War II losses, and I submit a report thereon, together with the supplemental views of the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], and the individual views of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART]. I ask unanimous consent that the report, together with the supplemental and individual views, be printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Moss in the chair). The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the report will be printed, as requested by the Senator from South Carolina.

COMMITTEE SERVICE

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 380) electing a member on the part of the Senate to the Joint Committee on Printing and the Joint Committee on the Library, which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That Mr. MARTIN be, and he is hereby, elected a member on the part of the Senate of the Joint Committee on Printing and the Joint Committee on the Library.

MARY E. PASCO

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 381) to pay a gratuity to Mary E. Pasco, which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Mary E. Pasco, widow of John Pasco, an employee of the Architect of the Capitol assigned to duty in the Senate Office Buildings at the time of his death, a sum equal to six months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Administrator of General Services that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon, pursuant to law.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Arthur L. Wardwell, and sundry other persons, for permanent appointment in the Coast and Geodetic Survey; and

John A. Packard, and sundry other persons, to be chief warrant officers in the U.S. Coast Guard.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota:

S. 3905. A bill for the relief of Dr. Fang Luke Chiu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS (for himself and Mr. HAYDEN):

S. 3906. A bill for the relief of Howard B. Schmutz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY (for himself, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. BIBLE, and Mr. MORSE):

S. 3907. A bill providing for the regulation of rates for all forms of casualty insurance including fidelity, surety and guaranty bonds and for all forms of fire, marine and inland marine insurance, except as herein provided, and to rating and advisory organizations within the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(See the remarks of Mr. O'MAHONEY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

S. 3908. A bill to provide means for the Federal Government to combat interstate crime and to assist the States in enforcement of their criminal laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. CASE of New Jersey when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. O'MAHONEY (for himself, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. ALLOTT, and Mr. CARROLL):

S. 3909. A bill to provide for the construction, operation and maintenance of the Savery-Pot Hook Federal reclamation project, Colorado-Wyoming; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BENNETT:

S. 3910. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Takimi Yamada; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG of Hawaii:

S.J. Res. 222. Joint resolution providing a government for American Samoa; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. LONG of Hawaii when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTIONS

COMMITTEE SERVICE

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 380) electing a member on the part of the Senate to the Joint Committee on Printing and the Joint Committee on the Library, which was placed on the calendar.

(See the above resolution printed in full, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

MARY E. PASCO

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 381) to pay a gratuity to Mary E. Pasco, which was placed on the calendar.

(See the above resolution printed in full, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

COPYING AND PRESENTATION OF CERTAIN EVIDENCE IN THE CASE OF UNITED STATES AGAINST SALLY T. HUCKS ET AL.

Mr. MCCLELLAN submitted a resolution (S. Res. 382) authorizing the copying of certain evidence for presentation in the case of the United States against Sally T. Hucks and others, and authorizing the appearance of Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN and certain staff members of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. MCCLELLAN, which appears under a separate heading.)

EXTENSION OF BIRTHDAY GREETINGS TO PRESIDENT EISENHOWER AND FORMER VICE PRESIDENT JOHN NANCE GARNER

Mr. YARBOROUGH submitted a resolution (S. Res. 383) extending greetings to President Eisenhower and former Vice President John Nance Garner on the occasion of their coming birthdays, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. YARBOROUGH, which appears under a separate heading.)

REVISION OF INSURANCE RATE REGULATORY LAWS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Sentor from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and myself, I introduce a bill relating to the revision of the insurance laws of the District of Columbia.

The studies of insurance which have been made in the United States, not only by the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee since 1958, but also 15 years ago by the Senate Judiciary Committee following the decision of the Supreme Court in the South-Eastern Underwriters case of June 5, 1944, have indicated the necessity for immediate action in the revision of the insurance rate regulatory laws in the District of Columbia. This is true because the present District of Columbia fire insurance rate law was enacted before the Congress, as a result of the above-mentioned Supreme Court decision, passed the well-known McCarran-Ferguson Act on March 9, 1945, now generally known to the industry as Public Law 15 of the 79th Congress.

This law, while maintaining State regulation, also made it clear that it was the desire of Congress and the Chief Executive which approved the Act, to protect the insurance-buying public from combinations designed to raise insurance rates by members of the insurance industry, in violation of certain of the antitrust laws.

The bill I offer today on behalf of myself, Mr. KEFAUVER, as chairman of the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, Mr. BIBLE, and Mr. MORSE, is intended to preserve competition in the insurance industry in the District of Columbia. It does not in any respect atttempt to reverse the policy of State regulation, but deals only with the fire and casualty insurance rate laws of the District of Columbia. This is accomplished in this proposed bill by taking full advantage of all the revelations of the last 15 years in the insurance industry, to protect the public.

It is, of course, not my intention to seek action upon this measure at this session of Congress. It is being presented largely as a result of the rate studies which have been concluded by the Antitrust Subcommittee. The interest in the matter is so great that I felt it necessary to have the bill introduced now, so that Members of Congress and the public may know the conclusions reached, at the completion of our rating studies.

COMPETITION SHOULD BE CHIEF ARBITER OF RATES

In the McCarran-Ferguson Act, nothing was said with respect to the establishment of rating bureaus by the industry. But our studies have shown that rating bureaus have been established in such a manner throughout the United States as to provide the means by which some companies may use the rate bureaus to prevent competitive rivals from reducing rates to a more satisfactory level. The ability of such insurance companies to be free to provide less costly insurance for the public is the very heart of competition. Accordingly, it is the purpose of this measure to make the free play of competition the chief arbiter over the rate level at which fire and casualty insurance will be sold in the District of Columbia. It is necessary to do this, because the present District of Columbia Fire Insurance Act, which requires all insurers to be members of the rating bureau, is frequently used as an argument to avoid the intent and purpose of Congress in enacting the McCarran Act.

The bill which I am introducing today would repeal the District of Columbia laws of June 1, 1944, regulating fire insurance rates, and of May 20, 1948, regulating casualty rates, and would substitute therefor a single consolidated law. While the measure places chief reliance upon competition in the determination of rates, it nevertheless recognizes the vital importance of the Insurance Superintendent's office, and fortifies his authority in the areas where it should properly be exercised.

The present District of Columbia fire rate law was enacted just 4 days before the Supreme Court decided the South-Eastern Underwriters case. In that decision the Supreme Court declared for the first time that insurance is interstate

commerce, and thus is subject to the regulatory power of Congress. The Court held that the practices of the South-Eastern Underwriters Association and 198 member companies were subject to the Sherman Antitrust Act. The case was aimed at the coercive practices of the rating bureau in seeking to compel uniformity of rates and to boycott and engage in other acts of intimidation and coercion in order to compel other insurers to do business on its terms.

When the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee began its study, in 1958, of the effectiveness of State insurance regulations following the enactment of Public Law 15, the subcommittee emphasized that its paramount concern was to determine whether competition has been permitted to flourish in the manner contemplated by the framers of that act. It was natural, therefore, that the subcommittee would devote considerable attention to the manner in which insurance rates were regulated by the various State laws.

RATE HEARINGS OF ANTITRUST SUBCOMMITTEE

An extensive series of hearings was conducted by the subcommittee in 1959, at which time the subcommittee heard testimony from spokesmen representing all the major points of view in both industry and Government. These rate hearings were a major part of the broad study of insurance conducted by the subcommittee over which I have served as chairman, at the designation of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. Contemporaneously with these hearings, the staff of the subcommittee was assembling, by means of questionnaire and otherwise, a vast body of empirical data which would aid the subcommittee in determining the nature and extent of competition throughout the various States. The hearings and the study have not produced any substantial support for an overall revision of our national policy for the regulation of insurance by substituting Federal power for State power. Nevertheless, in the course of the study it became evident that there were basic defects in the kind of rate regulation which has evolved in the States. Some of the basic defects noted in these State laws were found to exist in the regulatory system in the District of Columbia.

During the subcommittee's hearings, the principal criticism of the various State laws regulating rates was directed at the provisions which made membership in rating bureaus mandatory and limited competition to cumbersome deviation procedures. It is important to note that the rating bureaus were organized by the industry, not by the States. The testimony clearly showed that in the enforcement of such laws, the position of the bureau on rates received preferred treatment. Bureau rates occupied a paramount position, and deviators seeking to sell insurance at a lower rate had a special burden in justifying their positions. The District of Columbia fire rate law provides for the organization of a single rating bureau, and declares that—

> All such companies now or hereafter authorized to transact such business in the District shall be members of such bureau (35 D.C. Code 1404).

It is interesting to note that the casualty-rate law enacted after the McCarran Act did not contain a similar provision requiring all companies to join a rating bureau.

I feel it is vital that the Congress indicate its unequivocal opposition to laws which are diametrically opposed to the principle of free competition by making membership in rating bureaus compulsory. Under such laws, rate competition becomes a sham, for they become a price-fixing device, and the means provided for independence of action offers only a token gesture to the traditional American concept of free enterprise.

COMPULSORY MEMBERSHIP IN RATE BUREAUS ELIMINATED

In proposing a change in the District of Columbia laws, I was primarily motivated by a desire to remove this restrictive, noncompetitive feature of the District fire-rate law. However, in introducing this bill I felt that it was advisable that we now propose to correct not only these basically objectionable features, but also to propose the kind of rate-regulatory law which generally offer the greatest opportunity for the full expression of competition in the determination of rates. Therefore, the bill which I am now introducing represents, in my view and in that of our expert staff, the most enlightened approach to fire and casualty rate regulation. It embodies the conclusions which have been arrived at after laborious exploration of all facets of this rate-regulation problem.

Over the past 15 years there has been considerable controversy concerning the kind of rating laws which conform with the spirit of the McCarran Act. Proponents of these restrictive mandatory rating-bureau laws have argued with considerable effect that Congress had given its sanction to such laws by enacting the District fire-rate law. While it is true this law was passed a few days before the South-Eastern Underwriters case, the fact that Congress has not changed the law in the intervening years has furnished opponents of free competition a formidable argument. I am confident that in enacting the McCarran Act, Congress did not intend to give its sanction to such laws, for I was a participating Member of that Congress. In any event, I deem it essential that Congress now repeal this objectionable provision in the District law, and set the issue forever at rest.

The National Association of Insurance Commissioners—NAIC—has formally presented its views to the subcommittee. In addition, a number of State insurance commissioners from States representing divergent approaches to rate regulation testified during the hearings. As a result of these hearings, a special subcommittee of the NAIC undertook to review fire and casualty rating laws by conducting a series of hearings in different parts of the country. The work of this subcommittee is still in progress, and it is expected that a report will be made at the next semiannual meeting of the NAIC. At the meeting of the NAIC subcommittee on May 30, 1960, in San Francisco, Calif., the National Association of Independent Insurers submitted a draft of a proposed fire and casualty rating law. This draft bill embodies the approach to rate regulation which I have always considered sound. The essential principles upon which this bill is founded are, in my opinion, in the public interest. However, I have found it necessary to make substantial changes in this bill in accordance with the results of our subcommittee's study. These changes are designed to provide a greater measure of freedom of action than that provided in the NAII bill. Moreover, this bill clothes the superintendent of insurance with greater authority over the activities of advisory organizations and other insurance groups which have utilized their power to dominate the rating processes and to restrict competition.

ADHERENCE RULES ELIMINATED

The bill authorizes the formation of rating bureaus by the industry, and provides for licensing and other careful regulation by the Insurance Superintendent of their operations. However, membership in such rating organizations is wholly optional; and neither directly nor indirectly would the bill attempt to compel membership in such rating organizations. Furthermore, unlike the draft bill of the NAII, this bill would prevent rating organizations from adopting any rules or engaging in any practices requiring either members or subscribers to agree to adhere to the rates filed. While an insurer may satisfy its obligations to make rate filings by becoming a member or subscriber of a rating organization, any such member or subscriber may make its own independent rate filings for any kind of insurance or subdivision or class of risk or a part or combination of such kind, subdivision, or class of risk. Section 5 (d) specifically provides that a rating organization shall have authority to make a filing on behalf of any member or subscriber only where specifically authorized in writing by such member or subscriber. Therefore, if a member or subscriber does not so authorize a bureau to make a rate filing, said insurer, whether a member or a subscriber to such rating organization, may then make its own independent rate filing.

DEVIATION SECTION NOT NEEDED

The 12-year experience with the all-industry rate bill in both the fire and casualty fields has clearly demonstrated that the provisions for deviations, particularly since they necessitate annual renewals, have unnecessarily delayed, and in some cases prevented, the public from enjoying rate reductions. As this bill is drawn, there is no need for any deviation section. The bill resolves the thorny question of deviation by eliminating provisions in the rating bill which made deviation necessary. Members or subscribers have full authority to withhold authorization from the rating bureau to make rate filings and to file their own independent rates. Furthermore, under such an approach, there is no need for a minority appeals section. While under the all-industry rate bills, the minority appeals section was intended to provide another avenue for com-

petition, it has in effect become obsolete, and has seldom been utilized.

While I find the compulsory membership and deviation provisions in the District fire rate law fundamentally objectionable, I should point out that under the present Superintendent of insurance in the District of Columbia we have had an enlightened administration of the act, which has tended to minimize the harmful effect of these provisions. The Superintendent of insurance in the District of Columbia has not fallen under the control of the rating bureau. While fire-rate filings independent of the bureau are not possible under the statute, he has adopted a liberal policy in approving deviations. Nevertheless, it is a fact that during the 5-year period from 1953 to 1957, the bureau opposition to deviations in the District of Columbia was far higher than in any State of the Union. The bureau opposition to deviations in the District of Columbia was approximately 12 percent of the total filed. Throughout the United States, bureau opposition to deviations was less than 1 percent of the total. Of course, it should be noted that in only nine cases during this period did the District Superintendent uphold the bureau and disapprove the deviation. The minutes of the rating bureau are replete with references to the consideration by the bureau of deviations, and to the opposition filed by the bureau with the Superintendent to many of these deviations. For example, the report of the executive committee for April 25, 1957, states that:

> Your committee processed 94 requests from member companies for new and renewal deviations of bureau rules, rates, or forms. Your committee authorized management to protest to the insurance department the granting of 20 of these requests for deviations. Of the 20 deviations opposed, 12 were approved by the insurance department over the bureau's objections, 4 were denied, with 4 pending. There were 12 withdrawals of deviations due to the adoption of new rules, rates or forms by the bureau.

It is perfectly clear from these minutes that the bureau considers it to be its responsibility under the law to note its opposition whenever it is deemed appropriate. Since the law permits fire deviations to remain in effect for only 1 year, with the requirement that affirmative justification be made at the end of such period, the rating bureau possesses great potential power in thwarting or slowing up such deviations, thus restricting competition. It is apparent that under a statute which gives the rating bureau so much authority over competitive rate filings there is great danger for abuse. Subsequent Superintendents of insurance may not be as independent as as the present incumbent. Under such a statute, a weak Superintendent might be a pliable tool in the hands of the rating bureau.

NO REASON FOR SEPARATE RATE LAWS

Recent developments in the insurance field indicate that there is no longer any logical reason for separate laws for fire and for casualty insurance. Especially has this become true since the development of multiple-line underwriting. The wide public acceptance of the homeowners policy and other package policies including fire and casualty coverage has outmoded separate fire and casualty rate laws. For this reason, it seemed that the most sensible solution was to repeal the fire and casualty laws in the District, and to substitute a consolidated law incorporating what history and experience have indicated are the best features of the various rate regulatory laws.

RATE FILINGS BUT NO PRIOR APPROVAL REQUIRED

In its broad outline, this bill approaches most closely the California-type regulatory law. However, unlike the California law, the bill requires every insurer to make with the Superintendent a rate filing, together with all necessary supporting data. The rate becomes effective immediately upon filing with the Insurance Superintendent. While the bill reposes sole responsibility in each insurer for the making of rates, the Insurance Superintendent retains comprehensive powers to review these filings and to disapprove them in accordance with the procedures set forth, whenever he finds them to be excessive, inadequate, or unfairly discriminatory. Fundamental to this bill is the requirement that rates become effective automatically upon filing, without the necessity of any affirmative action by the Superintendent. Since insurance is not a public utility, it should not be treated as one. The proper level of rates which best serves the public interest should, to the extent possible, be determined in the marketplace.

The role of the Superintendent in the rating field should be only to review rates which are, in effect, to determine whether the standards of "excessive, inadequate, or unfairly discriminatory" have been complied with. In limiting the Superintendent's authority to review and disapprove rates which do not meet the standards of the act, the bill, as the NAII so aptly stated, preserves the status of the insurance commissioner "as a regulator who can set aside the insignificant and unimportant to concentrate on those matters which deeply affect the citizens of his State." Since this bill emphasizes the proper regulatory functions of the Insurance Superintendent's office, it was deemed essential that every insurer be required to file his rates and supporting data, so that the Superintendent would have available the needed regulatory tools. The essential dignity of the office and the functions to be performed demand that rates be at his disposal for inspection at all times, without the necessity of going to company officials to request the data when deemed necessary.

The all-industry fire and casualty bills were not designed to operate as prior approval statutes—that is to say, laws which make ineffective the mere filing of rates until the Superintendent approves; but because of the unfortunate language in which they were cast, they have in fact degenerated into prior approval statutes. However, the present District fire-rate law in no uncertain terms requires that rates must first be approved by the Superintendent before they become effective. The casualty rate law is more ambiguous, and provides that "rates may become effective immediately upon filing or at such future time as the company or rating organizations making them may specify." If the provisions of the fire-rate law were enforced in their literal sense, the administrative burdens upon the insurance Superintendent would be enormous. It would require that the Superintendent devote a great percentage of resources of staff and time to reviewing and examining and testing a vast volume of rate filings, including manuals, classifications, rules, and supporting statistical data. It is apparent that the Superintendent in fact is not employing his resources of staff and time in this fashion. The bill which I am introducing would thus bring the law into conformity with what is now realistically possible under the existing practice. It is expected that by thus relieving the Superintendent's office of any responsibility over the multiplicity of duties involved in prior approval, the bill will free supervisory personnel to work on major regulatory problems.

BRITISH ATTITUDE TOWARD RATE REGULATION

When the chairman of the committee of Lloyd's of London testified before this subcommittee on June 16 of this year, the subcommittee was privileged to receive a lucid statement of the British philosophy toward rate regulation. British experience has sought to keep supervisory officials out of the techniques and mechanics of ratemaking. This is based on the British concept that competition among insurers will protect the public on rate levels. British regulatory laws, on the other hand, emphasize the need of careful safeguards for solvency. The bill which I am introducing today adopts a similar philosophy in reliance upon competition in the ratemaking field. It presupposes that the office of the superintendent will be utilized to a much greater extent in making careful examinations of insurers and organizations, in order to be alert to unsound operations which threaten insolvency, and otherwise to protect the public.

RATING BUREAUS SHOULD NOT BE AGGRIEVED PERSONS

The subcommittee's rate hearings strongly indicated that State rating laws have been perverted to thwart free competition, through the "aggrieved persons" provision. Under such provision, competitors, and in particular rating bureaus, have won recognition as aggrieved parties in hearings and appeals on rate filings. The result has been considerable harassment of insurers seeking to reduce rates by companies which did not welcome such competition. Insurance commissioners have been needlessly burdened by such proceedings, and the courts have been busy litigating such issues. The evil is compounded where competitors through rating bureaus are permitted to pool their resources in opposing their more venturesome competitors. Such mischievous provisions in rating laws have served no purpose other than to frustrate or delay the healthy processes of competition. A decision by

the U.S. Court for the District of Columbia in January 1957, in a proceeding involving opposition to a 10-percent fire rate cut by the insurance companies of North America, has been construed by many as recognizing the right of a rating bureau to be an aggrieved party to a lawsuit contesting a reduction in rates. One of the purposes of the bill I am introducing is to strip from the rating bureau and from any competitor company the right to have status as an aggrieved party in any hearing or suit involving a competitor's rate filing.

The bill permits only the filer or a policyholder to be an aggrieved person and thus become a party in interest in a hearing or appeal from the Superintendent's ruling. Of course, any person, including rating bureaus, should be permitted in good faith to bring to the Superintendent's attention facts providing reasonable grounds for him to believe that such filing does not comply with the standards of the act. This bill permits any person in good faith to file with the Superintendent a written request stating reasonable grounds for the holding of a hearing on any rate filing. The bill makes it optional with the Superintendent whether to call a hearing after receiving such a complaint, but makes it mandatory for a hearing to be held before the Superintendent can issue an order that a rate does not conform with the requirements of the act.

STANDARDS FOR RATEMAKING

The bill adopts the same standards for making rates as those contained in the present fire and casualty rate laws. These are the same standards generally adopted by the States throughout the country. However, the bill I am introducing does contain definitions of "excessive" and "inadequate" which are not now found in the existing District law. The bill adopts the California-Missouri definition of the term "excessive." In thus defining "excessive," these States took the lead in recognizing the role of competition as a regulator against excessive rates.

In defining inadequate rates the bill declares:

> No rate shall be held to be inadequate which upon reasonable assumptions of prospective loss and expense experience will not produce an underwriting loss.

This definition establishes a reasonably clear standard by which the Superintendent may test the adequacy of any rate.

TIGHTER SUPERVISION OF ADVISORY ORGANIZATIONS

This subcommittee gave considerable attention, during its rate hearings, to consideration of the importance and influence of advisory organizations. It was found that a number of such advisory organizations exercised a profound influence over rate levels. Furthermore, it was noted that these advisory organizations, operating on both a regional basis and a national basis, had concentrated power and responsibility in the hands of a relatively small group who largely operated out of the insurance district of New York City. Very clear evidence was obtained by the staff of the subcommittee that the offices of these advisory organizations have, in fact, been employed in an effort to restrict and otherwise delay competitive rate filings. It was also manifest that the State insurance departments were not sufficiently aware of all the activities engaged in by these advisory organizations, which so vitally affect the ratemaking processes. While the rating bureaus themselves were subject to regular, periodic investigations, these advisory organizations had not been subjected to the same careful examinations.

The proposed consolidated law would require all such advisory organizations to file considerable data with the Superintendent of Insurance, including all recommendations submitted by such advisory organizations to insurers or other organizations. In addition, the bill would require advisory organizations to maintain full and complete minutes of all board, committee, and subcommittee meetings, as well as the membership meetings. By requiring the maintenance of such records, and by requiring the Superintendent to conduct periodic examinations of such advisory organizations, the bill seeks to bring all of the activities of these organizations under strict supervision of the Superintendent of Insurance. The bill expressly prohibits such organizations from engaging in certain activities, including prohibitions against rules or programs having the effect of requiring insurers to adhere to rates or of preventing insurers from acting independently. The Superintendent of Insurance is then clothed with adequate authority to proceed against advisory organizations for acts or practices which are unfair or unreasonable. The definition of advisory organizations is deliberately made broad in order to include any trade association or other insurance organization which may seek to exercise influence or control over the making of rates.

I firmly believe that the bill I am offering today represents a constructive effort to remedy basic defects which have developed over the past 16 years in the ratemaking processes in the District of Columbia. Of course, I am not wedded to the language of every provision of this bill. Careful hearings will be required to obtain the views of all interested parties. I regret that I shall not be a Member of the Senate next year when this work will be done. In the crucible of public hearings, many defects of language and form in proposed legislation are exposed. I offer this bill as a working model on which such hearings may be conducted, and in the hope that the basic philosophy underlying this approach to rate regulation will be ultimately written into the law. In conclusion, I should point out that this bill deals only with the rate regulation sections of the District of Columbia Insurance Code, and does not affect in any way the other broad body of the insurance law.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the bill may be printed in the RECORD after my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3907) providing for the regulation of rates for all forms of casualty insurance including fidelity, surety, and guaranty bonds and for all forms of fire, marine, and inland marine insurance, except as herein provided, and to rating and advisory organizations within the District of Columbia, introduced by Mr. O'MAHONEY (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. LAWS REPEALED.—Chapter 224, sections 1–9 inclusive, 58 Stat. 267–269, Public Law 78–327, June 1, 1944, "An Act to provide for regulation of certain insurance rates in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes", (35–1401 through 1409 inclusive, District of Columbia Code); and chapter 324, sections 1–10 inclusive, 62 Stat. 242–247, Public Law 80–541, May 20, 1948, "An Act to provide for regulation of certain insurance rates in the District of Columbia and for other purposes", (35–1501 through 1510 inclusive, District of Columbia Code), are hereby repealed.

SEC. 2. PURPOSE OF ACT.—The purpose of this Act is to promote the public welfare by regulating insurance rates to the end that they shall not be excessive, inadequate or unfairly discriminatory and to encourage reasonable competition among insurers and to permit and regulate but not require cooperative action among insurers, as to rates, rating systems, rating plans and practices and other matters within the scope of this Act. This Act shall be liberally interpreted to carry into effect the provisions of this section.

SEC. 3. SCOPE OF ACT.—This Act applies to all forms of casualty insurance including fidelity, surety, and guaranty bonds, to all forms of fire, marine, and inland marine insurance, and to any combinations of any of the foregoing, on risks or operations in the District of Columbia except:

(a) Reinsurance, other than joint reinsurance to the extent stated in section 14;

(b) Accident and health insurance;

(c) Insurance against loss of or damage to aircraft, including accessories and equipment, or against liability, other than workmen's compensation and employers' liability, arising out of the ownership, maintenance, or use of aircraft;

(d) Insurance of vessels or craft, their cargoes, marine builders' risks, marine protection and indemnity, or other risks commonly insured under marine, as distinguished from inland marine insurance policies;

(e) Inland marine risks which are not made by a rating organization and which by general custom of the business are not written according to manual rates or rating plans;

(f) Insurance issued to self-insurers and insuring against loss in excess of at least $10,000 resulting from any one accident or event, except when rates therefor are made by a rating organization.

SEC. 4. MAKING OF RATES.—Rates shall be made only by insurers or rating organizations and in accordance with the following provisions:

(a) Rates shall not be excessive, inadequate, or unfairly discriminatory.

No rate shall be held to be excessive unless (1) such rate is unreasonably high for the insurance provided, and (2) a reasonable degree of competition does not exist in the area with respect to the classification to which such rate is applicable.

No rate shall be held to be inadequate which upon reasonable assumptions of

prospective loss and expense experience will not produce an underwriting loss.

(b) To the extent applicable, consideration shall be given to the following factors:

(1) As a guide to reasonable assumptions as to prospective experience:

a. Past loss experience, if any, of the filer or other insurers or advisory or rating organizations, within or without this state;

b. Past countryside expense experience, if any, and those expenses, if any, especially applicable to this jurisdiction, of the filer or other insurers or advisory or rating organizations;

c. Any combination of any of the foregoing factors;

d. Catastrophe and conflagration hazards, if any;

(2) The judgment of the filer and its interpretation of any data relied upon;

(3) A reasonable margin for underwriting profit and contingencies;

(4) Dividends, savings or unabsorbed premium deposits allowed or returned by insurers to their policyholders, members or subscribers;

(5) All other factors, including trend factors, deemed by the filer to be relevant.

(c) The expense provisions included in the rates for use by any insurer or group of insurers may differ from those of other insurers or groups of insurers with respect to any kind of insurance or subdivision or class of risk, or a part or combination of any of the foregoing for which separate expense provisions are applicable

(d) Manual, minimum, class rates, rating schedules or rating plans may be made and adopted. Risks may be grouped by classifications for the establishment of rates and minimum premiums. Classification rates may be modified under rating plans to produce rates for individual risks. Classification of risks, and rating plans used in modification of classification rates may be based upon any differences among risks deemed by the filer to have a probable effect upon losses or expenses.

(e) Uniformity among insurers in any matters within the scope of this section is not required or prohibited.

SEC. 5. RATE FILINGS.—(a) Each insurer shall file with the Superintendent of Insurance, hereinafter referred to as Superintendent, every manual of classifications, rules and rates, and every minimum rate, class rate, rating plan, rating schedule and rating system and any modification of the foregoing it intends to use within the District of Columbia, and shall indicate the character and extent of the coverage involved. The filing shall automatically become effective upon the date of filing.

Such filing shall be accompanied by the information upon which the filer supports such filing. The filer may incorporate by reference into its filing by specific designation all or part of any existing filing and supporting information and any other relevant information upon which the filer supports such filing. The filer may incorporate by reference into its filing by specific designation all or part of any existing filing and supporting information and any other relevant information or material in the Superintendent's possession which is open to public inspection.

A filing and any supporting information shall be open to public inspection the date it becomes effective.

(b) Any insurer may satisfy its obligation to make any such filings by becoming a member of, or a subscriber to, a licensed rating organization which makes such filings, and by authorizing the Superintendent to accept such filings on its behalf; provided that nothing contained in this Act shall be construed as requiring any insurer to become a member of or a subscriber to any rating organization, or as preventing any insurer, while a member or subscriber to a rating organization, from making its own rate filing for any kind of insurance or subdivision or class of risk, or a part or combination of any of the foregoing, for which it does not elect to authorize the rating organization to make filings on its behalf.

(c) Any insurer which is a member of or subscriber to a rating or advisory organization may use the rates, rating systems, underwriting rules or policy or bond forms of such organization, either consistently or intermittently, but, except as provided in Sections 13, 14 and 15, shall not agree with any other such member or subscriber or rating or advisory organization or others to adhere thereto.

(d) Any insurer which is a member of or subscriber to a rating organization may make its own rate filings for any kind of insurance, or subdivision, or class of risk, or a part or combination of any of the foregoing. No rating organization shall have authority to make any filing on behalf of any insurer which is a member of or subscriber to such rating organization except as authorized in writing by such member or subscriber, which authority may be supplemented, modified or revoked, in whole or in part, at any time by such member or subscriber at its option.

(e) Under such rules and regulations as he shall adopt the Superintendent may, by written order, suspend or modify the requirement of filing as to any kind of insurance, subdivision or combination thereof, or as to classes of risks, the rates for which cannot practicably be filed before they are used. Such orders, rules and regulations shall be made known to insurers and rating organizations affected thereby. Such rates shall be subject to the provisions of Section 4.

(f) Upon the written application of the insured, stating his reasons therefor, filed with the Superintendent, a rate in excess of that provided by a filing otherwise applicable may be used on any specific risk.

(g) Upon the effective date of this Act it shall be mandatory for every insurer to make or issue a policy or contract only in accordance with filings which are effective for said insurer or in accordance with subsections (e) and (f) of this section.

SEC. 6. RIGHT OF INSURED TO REVIEW OF MANNER IN WHICH A FILING HAS BEEN APPLIED TO HIM.—Any insured may in writing request his insurer to review the manner in which its filing has been applied with respect to insurance afforded him. Any such insured aggrieved by the failure or refusal of an insurer to make such review and to grant appropriate relief within thirty days after such request is received may file a written complaint and request for hearing with the Superintendent, specifying the grounds relied upon. If the complaint charges a violation of this Act and the Superintendent finds that the complaint was made in good faith and that the complainant would be aggrieved if the violation is proven, he shall hold a hearing upon not less than ten days' written notice to the complainant and to the insurer stating the grounds of the complaint. If after such hearing he finds the complaint justified he shall order the matter complained of to be corrected within a reasonable time and not less than twenty days after a copy of his written order has been mailed to or served upon the insurer complained against.

SEC. 7. DISAPPROVAL OF FILINGS.—(a) Upon his own motion, or upon written complaint of a policyholder to whose policy a filing is applicable, if such complaint is made in good faith and on his own behalf, and states reasonable grounds, or upon written request by any person, if such request is made in good faith and on his own behalf and states reasonable grounds, the Superintendent, if he shall have reason to believe that any filing is not in compliance with the applicable provisions of section 4(a) of this Act, may, in his discretion, hold a hearing upon not less than ten days' written notice to the rating organization or insurer which made the filing in issue specifying the items and matters to be considered and stating in what manner and to what extent noncompliance is alleged to exist. No other matter or subject shall be considered at such hearing. Only the rating organization or insurer which made such filing and such complaining policyholder, if any, may be parties to any such hearing or to any judicial appeal resulting therefrom.

(b) If after such hearing the Superintendent finds that any filing is not in compliance with the applicable provisions of section 4(a) of this Act, he may issue an order which shall be in writing to the insurer or rating organization which has been subject to hearing specifying in what respects such noncompliance exists and stating when, within a reasonable period and not less than ninety days after such order, the further application of such filing by such insurer or rating organization to contracts of insurance made thereafter shall be prohibited.

(c) No manual of classifications or rules, and no minimum rate, class rate, rating plan, rating schedule or rating system, or any modification of any of the foregoing, which has been filed pursuant to section 5 of this Act shall be disapproved if the rates thereby produced meet the requirements of section 4 of this Act.

SEC. 8. RATING ORGANIZATIONS.—(a) A "rating organization" is an individual, partnership, corporation, or unincorporated association, other than an insurer, located within or without the District of Columbia, who or which has as its primary object and purpose, the making of rates, rating plans, rating systems, or rules relating thereto. The government of a rating organization shall be vested in its members and it shall not be subject to the direction or control of any other rating organization, bureau, association, corporation, company, individual, or group of individuals.

(b) No rating organization shall conduct its operations in the District of Columbia without first securing a license. Any rating organization may make application for and obtain a license if it shall meet the requirements set forth in this Act. Every such rating organization shall file with its application (1) a copy of its constitution, its articles of agreement or association, or certificate of incorporation, and of its by-laws, rules and regulations governing the conduct of its business which shall include a provision requiring the maintenance of full and complete minutes of all board, committee, and subcommittee meetings as well as the meeting of its members, and all rules and regulations that include the basis of assessments of members and subscribers and charges for services to insurers and organizations; (2) a list of its members and subscribers; (3) the name and address of a resident of this jurisdiction upon whom notice or orders of the Superintendent or process affecting such rating organization may be served; and (4) a statement of qualifications as a rating organization. It shall thereafter notify the Superintendent promptly of any changes in any of the foregoing.

(c) If the Superintendent finds that the applicant is competent, trustworthy, and otherwise qualified to act as a rating orgzanization and that its constitution, articles of agreement or association, or certificate of incorporation, and its bylaws, rules and regulations governing the conduct of its business conforms to the requirements of law, he shall issue a license specifying the kind of insurance or subdivision or class of risk, or a part or combination of any of the foregoing, for which the applicant is authorized to act as a rating organization. Every such application shall be granted or denied in whole or in part by the Superintendent within sixty days of the date of its filing with him. If

the application is denied in whole or in part the Superintendent shall notify the applicant of the reasons for such denial. Licenses so issued shall remain in effect for three years unless sooner revoked or suspended by the Superintendent. The fee for such license shall be $250. Licenses issued pursuant to this section may be suspended or revoked by the Superintendent, after hearing upon at least ten days' notice, in the event the rating organization ceases to meet the requirements of this Act.

(d) "Member" of a rating organization means an insurer, entitled to participate in its management. Subject to the approval of the Superintendent, rating organizations may make reasonable rules governing eligibility for membership.

(e) Subject to rules and regulations which have been approved by the Superintendent as reasonable, each rating organization shall permit any insurer, not a member, to be a subscriber to its rating services for any kind of insurance or subdivision or class of risk, or a part of combination of any of the foregoing, for which it is authorized to act as a rating organization. Each rating organization shall furnish its rating services without discrimination to its members and subscribers for providing such services, but any rate or rates of assessment shall be applied uniformly to all members and subscribers and no subscriber shall be required to pay any assessment for classes of business for which it does not subscribe to the rating bureau. The reasonableness of any rule or regulation in its application to subscribers, or the refusal of any rating organization to admit an insurer as a subscriber, shall, at the request of any subscriber or any such insurer, be reviewed by the Superintendent at a hearing held upon at least ten days' written notice to such rating organization and to such subscriber or insurer. If the Superintendent finds that such rule or regulation is unreasonable in its application to subscribers, he shall order that such rule or regulation shall not be applicable to subscribers. If the rating organization fails to grant or reject an insurer's application for subscribership within thirty days after it was made, the insurer may request a review by the Superintendent as if the application had been rejected. If the Superintendent finds that the insurer has been refused admittance to the rating organization as a subscriber without justification, he shall order the rating organization to admit the insurer as a subscriber. If he finds that the action of the rating organization was justified, he shall make an order affirming its action.

(f) Every rating organization shall notify its members and subscribers in writing of every proposed change in its constitution, its articles of agreement or association or certificate of incorporation, or its by-laws, rules or regulations, which affects or may affect them. The Superintendent shall upon written request in good faith by any such member or subscriber review any such proposed change. If the Superintendent finds after hearing, on at least ten days' notice to the rating organization and each such complaining member or subscriber, that such proposed change is unreasonable or is not in compliance with the requirements of this Act, he may disapprove it in whole or in part.

(g) No rating organization shall adopt any rule or exact any agreement the effect of which would be to prohibit or regulate the payment of dividends, savings or unabsorbed premium deposits allowed or returned by insurers to their policyholders, members or subscribers.

(h) No rating organization shall have or adopt any rule or exact any agreement, or formulate or engage in any program the effect of which would be to require any member or subscriber or other insurer to utilize some or all of its filing services, or to adhere to its rates, rating plans, rating systems, underwriting rules, or policy or bond forms, or to prevent any insurer from acting independently.

(i) Cooperation among rating organizations or among rating organizations and insurers in ratemaking or in other matters within the scope of this act is hereby authorized, provided the filings resulting from such cooperation are subject to all the provisions of this act which are applicable to filings generally. The superintendent may review such cooperative activities and practices and if, after a hearing on at least ten days' written notice to the parties involved, he finds that any such activity or practice is unfair or unreasonable or otherwise inconsistent with the provisions of this act, he may issue a written order specifying in what respects such activity or practice is unfair or unreasonable or otherwise inconsistent with the provisions of this act, and requiring the discontinuance of such activity or practice.

(j) Any rating organization may subscribe for or purchase actuarial, technical, or other services, and such services shall be available to all members and subscribers without discrimination.

SEC. 9. ADVISORY ORGANIZATIONS.—(a) Every group, association or other organization of insurers, or of their officers or employees, whether located within or outside the District of Columbia, which is neither a rating organization as defined in this act nor subject to regulation under sections 13, 14, or 15 of this act, and which engages in any activity affecting in the District of Columbia any matter or practice regulated, permitted or prohibited by this act, shall be known as an advisory organization.

(b) Every advisory organization shall file with the Superintendent (1) a copy of its constitution, its articles of agreement or association or its certificate of incorporation and of its bylaws, rules and regulations governing its activities, which shall include a provision requiring the maintenance of full and complete minutes of all board, committee and subcommittee meetings, as well as the meetings of its members, (2) all recommendations submitted to any rating organization or insurer, trade organization, other advisory organization, (3) a list of its members, (4) the name and address of a resident of the District of Columbia upon whom notices or orders of the Superintendent or process issued at his direction may be served, and (5) an agreement that the Superintendent may examine such advisory organization in accordance with the provisions of section 10 of this Act.

(c) No advisory organization shall (1) make any actual determination of rates or otherwise perform the functions of a rating organization as defined in section (8) of this Act, or (2) direct or control the policies or activities of any rating organization.

(d) No advisory organization shall have or adopt any rule or enact any agreement or formulate or engage in any program, the effect of which would be to require any member or subscriber or other insurer to adhere to any rates, rating plans, rating systems, underwriting rules, or policy or bond forms, or to prevent any insurer from acting independently.

(e) If, after a hearing, the Superintendent finds that any advisory organization has engaged in any act or practice which is unfair or unreasonable or which may have the effect of substantially lessening competition, or is otherwise inconsistent with the provisions of this Act, he may issue a written order specifying in what respects such act or practice is unfair or unreasonable or may have the effect of substantially lessening competition or is otherwise inconsistent with the provisions of this Act, and requiring the discontinuance of such act or practice.

(f) No insurer which makes its own filing nor any rating organization shall support its filings by statistics or adopt ratemaking recommendations, furnished to it by an advisory organization which has not complied with this section or with an order of the Superintendent involving such statistics or recommendations issued under subsection (e) of this section.

SEC. 10. EXAMINATIONS.—(a) The Superintendent shall, at least once every five years, make or cause to be made an examination of each licensed rating organization and advisory organization, and may, as often as he may deem it expedient, make or cause to be made an examination of each group, association or other organization of insurers which engages in joint underwriting or joint reinsurance pursuant to Section 14 of this Act, to ascertain whether the applicable provisions of this Act have been complied with. In lieu of any such examination the Superintendent may accept the report of an examination made by the insurance supervisory official of any State.

(b) The officers, managers, agents and employees of any such organization, group or association may be examined at any time under oath and shall exhibit all books, records, accounts, documents or agreements governing its method of operation, together with all data, statistics and information of every kind and character collected or considered by such organization, group or association in the conduct of the operations to which such examination relates.

(c) No fee or assessment covering any part of the cost of any examination authorized by this Act shall be levied against or charged to the organization, group or association examined.

SEC. 11. RATE ADMINISTRATION.—(a) The Superintendent shall promulgate or approve reasonable rules and statistical plans, reasonably adapted to each of the rating systems on file with him, which may be modified from time to time and which shall be used thereafter by each insurer in the recording and reporting of its loss and countrywide expense experience, in order that the experience of all insurers may be made available at least annually. Such rules and plans may also provide for the recording and reporting of expense experience items which are specially applicable to this jurisdiction and are not susceptible of determination by a prorating of countrywide expense experience. In promulgating or approving such rules and plans, the Superintendent shall give due consideration to the rating systems on file with him and, in order that such rules and plans may be as uniform as is practicable among the several States, to the rules and to the form of the plans used for such rating systems in other jurisdictions. No insurer shall be required to record or report its loss experience on a classification basis that is inconsistent with the rating system filed by it. The Superintendent may designate one or more rating organizations or other agencies, or both, to assist him in gathering such experience and making compilations thereof, and such compilations shall be made available, subject to reasonable rules approved by the Superintendent, to insurers and advisory and rating organizations.

(b) In order to further efficient administration of rate regulatory laws, the Superintendent and every insurer, rating organization, advisory organization, or statistical agency may exchange information and experience data with insurance supervisory officials, insurers, rating organizations, advisory organizations, or statistical agencies in this jurisdiction and other States, and may consult with them with respect to ratemaking and the application of rating systems.

(c) The Superintendent may make reasonable rules and regulations necessary to effect the purposes of this Act.

SEC. 12. FALSE AND MISLEADING INFORMATION.—No person or organization shall will-

fully withhold information required to be submitted by this Act, from or knowingly give false or misleading information to, the Superintendent, or to anyone designated by the Superintendent pursuant to this Act. A violation of this section shall subject the one guilty of such violation to the penalties provided in section 16 of this Act.

SEC. 13. INSURERS WITH COMMON OWNERSHIP OR MANAGEMENT: MATTERS RELATING TO CO-SURETY BONDS.—With respect to any matters pertaining to the making of rates, rating plans or rating systems, the preparation or making of insurance policy or bond forms, underwriting rules, surveys, inspections and investigations, the furnishing of loss or expense statistics or other information and data, or carrying on of research, two or more admitted insurers having a common ownership or operating in this jurisdiction under common management or control, are hereby authorized to act in concert between or among themselves the same as if they constituted a single insurer, and to the extent that such matters relate to co-surety bonds, two or more admitted insurers executing such bonds are hereby authorized to act in concert between or among themselves the same as if they constituted a single insurer.

SEC. 14. JOINT UNDERWRITING AND JOINT REINSURANCE.—(a) Every group, association, or other organization of insurers which engages in joint underwriting shall be subject to all the provisions of this Act and, every group, association, or other organization of insurers which engages in joint reinsurance shall be subject to sections 10, 14, and 16 to 19 of this Act.

(b) If, after a hearing, the Superintendent finds that any activity or practice of any such group, association, or other organization is unfair or unreasonable or may have the effect of substantially lessening competition, or is otherwise inconsistent with the provisions of this Act, he may issue a written order specifying in what respects such activity or practice is unfair or unreasonable or may have the effect of substantially lessening competition, or is otherwise inconsistent with the provisions of this Act, and requiring the discontinuance of such activity or practice.

SEC. 15. ASSIGNED RISKS.—Agreements may be made among insurers with respect to the equitable apportionment among them of insurance which may be afforded applicants who are in good faith entitled to but who are unable to procure such insurance through ordinary methods and such insurers may agree among themselves on the use of reasonable rates or rate modifications for such insurance, such agreements to be subject to the approval of the Superintendent.

SEC. 16. PENALTIES FOR NONCOMPLIANCE WITH FINAL ORDERS OF THE SUPERINTENDENT.—(a) The Superintendent may, if he finds that any person or organization has violated any provision of this Act, impose a penalty of not more than fifty dollars ($50) for each such violation, but if he finds such violation to be willful he may impose a penalty of not more than five hundred dollars ($500) for each such violation. Such penalties may be in addition to any other penalty provided by law. A series of acts constituting the same offense shall be treated as a single violation.

(b) The Superintendent may suspend the license of any rating organization or insurer which fails to comply with an order of the Superintendent within the time limited by such order, or any extension thereof which the Superintendent may grant. The Superintendent shall not suspend the license of any rating organization or insurer for failure to comply with an order until the time prescribed for an appeal therefrom has expired or if an appeal has been taken, until such order has been affirmed. The Superintendent may determine when a suspension of license shall become effective and it shall remain in effect for the period fixed by him, unless he modifies or rescinds such suspension, or until the order upon which such suspension is based is modified, rescinded or reversed.

(c) No penalty shall be imposed and no license shall be suspended or revoked except upon a written order of the Superintendent, stating his findings, made after a hearing held upon not less than ten days' written notice to such person or organization or insurer specifying the alleged violation.

SEC. 17. HEARINGS AND JUDICIAL REVIEW.—(a) Any person, firm or corporation aggrieved by any order, ruling, proceeding or action of the Superintendent may contest the validity of such order, ruling, proceeding, or action in any court of competent jurisdiction by appeal or through any other appropriate proceedings, as provided under section 35–1348 and 1349, provided however that the provisions of Section 7(a) of this Act shall be applicable to any hearing or judicial appeal or proceeding in connection with an order issued under this section.

(b) No order, ruling or decision of the Superintendent of Insurance that a rate is excessive or inadequate in violation of Section 4(a) of this Act, nor of any court rendered upon judicial review of any such order, ruling or decision of the Superintendent of Insurance shall affect any insurance contract or policy which was in force prior to the effective date of such order, ruling or decision.

SEC. 18. CONSTITUTIONALITY.—If any section, subsection, subdivision, paragraph, sentence or clause of this Act is held invalid or unconstitutional, such decision shall not affect the remaining portions of this Act.

SEC. 19. EFFECTIVE DATE.—This Act shall take effect 120 days after its enactment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall always be proud that my name appears as a cosponsor on the insurance rate bill which the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] has introduced this afternoon. I want to say for the record that the Senate has just seen a man who, I think, will go down in American Senate history as probably the most effective and the most able advocate of protecting the free enterprise system in this country of any man who has served in the Senate.

We often hear reference to the phrase "trust buster," but in my judgment the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] personifies the meaning of the phrase "trust buster."

When I think of the great record the Senator from Wyoming has made through the years of noble service in the Senate on this issue, I am particularly proud to have my name associated with the bill he is introducing this afternoon.

I want to assure the Senator we intend to carry on. In my judgment, this bill opens the door to another investigation long overdue in this country, and that is an investigation of the many problems caused by the American insurance combine in this country at the present time. In my judgment, the American insurance industry has been getting by with practices that are not in the public interest and are deserving of an early investigation.

The senior Senator from Oregon intends, in the next session of Congress, to do what he can to open the doors for such an investigation, because the senior Senator from Oregon is a strong defender of the institution of insurance; but here again we find that certain practices, when constant viligance is not being maintained, have crept into the insurance fraternity in this country that need to be looked into by the Congress of the United States. As far as I am concerned, this is the beginning of an investigation in this field.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McGEE. I want to join in the comments made this afternoon on the proposal of my senior colleague from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. I think it is significant that in the closing moments of the 86th Congress he is still pressing for legislation which is more than antitrust; it is that which epitomizes his whole public career—it is propeople.

In that connection, I ask unanimous consent that a compilation of the legislative product of the senior Senator from Wyoming's [Mr. O'MAHONEY] long public career, prepared by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, be included in the RECORD at this point, along with comments of my own that bear upon that same matter.

There being no objection, the statement and compilation were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEGISLATIVE RECORD OF THE HONORABLE JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, SENATOR FROM WYOMING

The Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress has prepared a list of the public laws originating in bills introduced or cosponsored by Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY during his service in the Senate, which began on January 3, 1934.

As lengthy as it is, it does not include the almost countless amendments which he has sponsored and which have been enacted into law. I call attention to several so, taken with the list of bills, the range of his endeavors as well as his legislative skill may be more properly assessed.

Without attempting any particular order, I mention first the O'Mahoney amendment to the McCarran Insurance Act of 1945. The McCarran Act provides generally for the State regulation of insurance but Senator O'MAHONEY, to assure that regulation by the States could not be used as a device to escape the Federal antitrust laws with respect to boycott, coercion or intimidation, secured the adoption of an important amendment. It provided expressly that insurance activities involving boycott, coercion, and intimidation would continue to fall within the scope of the Sherman Act. This amendment has been used by the courts to strike down a boycott in the insurance business. Judge J. Skelly Wright, of the Federal District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana, dismissed the argument of the boycotters in these terse words: "The legislative history of [the O'Mahoney amendment] affirms what its language so plainly says." The Supreme Court has confirmed Judge Wright's decision (*U.S. v. New Orleans Insurance Exchange*, 148 Fed. Supp. 915 and 355 U.S. 22) and boycotts in the insurance field are now clearly subject to the antitrust laws.

In another area of our national life affairs would be far different if the Department of Defense would bestir itself to implement fully the O'Mahoney amendment to the Defense Appropriation Act of 1952 which authorizes a unified supply system for items of common use among the armed services. Hundreds of millions of dollars, various studies have shown, could be saved for the public if the armed services could be required to set aside their rivalry in this field. While some progress has been made there is still ample ground for the Department of Defense to cover before the intent of the O'Mahoney amendment is fully realized.

With respect to the development of water power and irrigation I call attention to the O'Mahoney-Hayden amendment to the Department of the Interior appropriation bill for 1939. This important amendment provides that the revenues from the public power projects shall be available, after the costs of the powerplants, including interest, have been recovered, for the retirement of part of the costs of developing irrigated land.

Another mark which Senator O'MAHONEY has inscribed on the statutes is the O'Mahoney-Milliken amendment to the Flood Control Act of 1944. That amendment is highly important for the semiarid States of the Far West for it preserves for them their priority on the beneficial uses of water for "domestic, municipal, stock water, irrigation, mining, or industrial purposes."

I should report that under slightly different circumstances the list prepared by the Legislative Reference Service would include the revision of the Mineral Leasing Act sent to the President on August 24, 1960. The impetus for this legislation came from the introduction of S. 2181 by Senator O'MAHONEY on June 15, 1959. An emergency feature of this bill was enacted into law on September 21, 1959 (Public Law 86–294). In this session Senator O'MAHONEY returned to the task of revising the Mineral Leasing Act by introduction of S. 2983. Before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs could act, the House had passed H.R. 10455 and Senator O'MAHONEY insisted that the Senate Committee use the House bill for the text of its proposals.

The list prepared by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress is appended to this statement.

LIST OF PUBLIC LAWS SPONSORED OR COSPONSORED BY THE HONORABLE JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY DURING HIS CAREER IN THE SENATE (73D CONG.–86TH CONG.)

I. SENATOR O'MAHONEY SOLE SPONSOR

Seventy-third Congress

Public Law 241, approved May 21, 1934 (S. 2568): Grants a leave of absence to settlers of homestead lands during the years 1932, 1933, and 1934.

Public Law 373, approved June 16, 1934 (S. 3723): Amends the Mineral Lands Leasing Act of 1920 with reference to oil- or gas-prospecting permits and leases.

Seventy-fourth Congress

Public Law 12, approved February 21, 1935 (S. 932): Postpones the effective date of certain restrictions respecting airmail contracts.

Public Law 64, approved May 22, 1935 (S. 1776): Grants a leave of absence to settlers of homestead lands during the year 1935.

Public Law 297½, approved August 21, 1935 (S. 3311): Amends an act entitled "An act to promote the mining of coal, phosphate, oil, oil shale, gas, and sodium on the public domain," approved February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437; U.S.C. title 30, secs. 185, 221, 223, 226), as amended.

Public Law 488, approved April 10, 1936 (S. 3761): Authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to patent certain land to the town of Wamsutter, Wyo.

Public Law 817, approved June 26, 1936 (S. 2712): Promotes the efficiency of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing.

Public Res. No. 109, approved June 19, 1936 (S.J. Res. 276): Modified and extends the act entitled "An act to include sugar beets and sugarcane as basic agricultural commodities under the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes," approved May 9, 1934, as amended.

Seventy-fifth Congress

Public Law 346, approved August 24, 1937 (S. 2682): Authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents to States under the provisions of section 8 of the Act of June 28, 1934 (48 Stat. 1269), as amended by the act of June 26, 1936 (49 Stat. 1976), subject to prior leases issued under section 15 of the said act.

Public Law 471, approved April 7, 1938 (S. 3105): Amends the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended, to extend its provisions to wool and other agricultural commodities traded in for future delivery.

Public Law 615, approved June 15, 1938 (S. 3416): Provides for the addition of certain lands to the Black Hills National Forest in the State of Wyoming.

Public Law 674, approved June 20, 1938 (S. 3415): Purchases certain private lands within the Shoshone (Wind River) Indian Reservation.

Public Resolution 113, approved June 16, 1938 (S.J. Res. 300): Creates a temporary national economic committee.

Seventy-sixth Congress

Public Law 187, approved July 17, 1939 (S. 2336): Authorizes an exchange of lands at the Fort Francis E. Warren Military Reservation, Wyo.

Public Law 397, approved August 11, 1939 (S. 878): Amends the act of August 29, 1937 relating to prospecting permits.

Public Law 431, approved March 14, 1940 (S. 2843): Grants easements of Indian lands of the Wind River or Shoshone Indian Reservation, Wyo., for dam site and reservoir purposes in connection with the Riverton reclamation project.

Public Law 726, approved July 8, 1940 (S. 2915): Relates to rentals in certain oil and gas leases issued under authority of the act of February 25, 1920, as amended.

Public Resolution 12, approved April 26, 1939 (S.J. Res. 90): Amends the joint resolution approved June 16, 1938, entitled "Joint resolution to create a Temporary National Economic Committee."

Public Resolution 109, approved December 16, 1940 (S.J. Res. 306): Extends the time for submitting the final report of the Temporary National Economic Committee.

S. 1898 (H.R. 5076 passed in lieu of Mr. O'Mahoney's bill which became Public Law 97, approved May 31, 1939): Authorizes further relief to water users on U.S. reclamation projects and on Indian reclamation projects.

Seventy-seventh Congress

Public Law 131, approved June 25, 1941 (S. 879): Relates to certain Carey Act lands in Wyoming.

Public Law 151, approved July 3, 1941 (S. 178): Authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to issue oil and gas leases on certain lands.

Public Law 679, approved July 27, 1942 (S. 2362): Relates to the jurisdiction over certain lands in the Isle Royale National Park.

Public Law 832, approved December 24, 1942 (S. 2239): Encourages the discovery of oil and gas on the public domain during the continuance of the present war.

S. 2915 (H.R. 7841 passed in lieu which became Public Law 817, December 18, 1942): Relates to the administration of grazing districts.

Seventy-eighth Congress

Public Law 192, approved November 28, 1943 (S. 364): Authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to settle certain claims.

Public Law 290, approved April 5, 1944 (S. 1243): Authorizes the construction and operation of demonstration plants to produce synthetic liquid fuels from coal and other substances, in order to aid the prosecution of the war, to conserve and increase the oil resources of the Nation.

Public Law 336, approved June 13, 1944 (S. 1335): Amends the act entitled "An act to promote the mining of coal, phosphate, oil, oil shale, gas, and sodium on the public domain, as amended.

Public Law 442, approved September 27, 1944 (S. 2111): Provides for the extension of certain oil and gas leases.

Seventy-ninth Congress

Public Law 39, approved April 24, 1945 (S. 37): Amends sections 4, 7, and 17 of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187) for the purpose of extending the time in which amendatory contracts may be made, and for other related purposes.

Public Law 150, approved July 14, 1945 (S. 911): Authorizes the conveyance of certain lands to the city of Cheyenne, Wyo.

Public Law 502, approved July 11, 1946 (S.J. Res. 160): Amends the act of March 22, 1946, for the purpose of correcting the description of the small parcel of land authorized to be conveyed to the State of Wyoming by such act.

Public Law 506, approved July 13, 1946 (S. 680): Encourages and protects small oil refineries by extending preference to such refineries in disposing of royalty oil under the Mineral Lands Leasing Act.

Public Law 602, approved August 2, 1946 (S. 1235): Authorizes the use of the funds of any tribe of Indians for insurance premiums.

Eightieth Congress

S. 134 (H.R. 2161 passed in lieu which became Public Law 443, approved March 15, 1948): Amends the act entitled "An act authorizing the construction and operation of demonstration plants to produce synthetic liquid fuels from coal, oil shales, agricultural and forestry products, and other substances, in order to aid the prosecution of the war, to conserve and increase the oil resources of the Nation, and for other purposes," approved April 5, 1944 (58 Stat. 190).

Eighty-first Congress

Public Law 120, approved June 23, 1949 (S.J. Res. 55): Prints the monthly publication entitled "Economic Indicators."

Public Law 462, approved March 18, 1950 (S. 493): Extends the benefits of the Vocational Education Act of 1946 to the Virgin Islands.

Public Law 548, approved June 15, 1950 (S. 1719): Amends section 3 of the act of Congress approved June 28, 1906, relating to the Osage Indians of Oklahoma.

Eighty-second Congress

S. 5 (H.R. 6578 passed in lieu which became Public Law 448, approved July 3, 1952): Provides for research into and demonstration of practical means for the economical production, from sea or other saline waters, or from the atmosphere (including cloud formations), of water suitable for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and other beneficial consumptive uses.

Senate Joint Resolution 151 (H.J. Res. 430 passed in lieu which became Public Law 447, approved July 3, 1952): Approved the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico which was adopted by the people of Puerto Rico on March 3, 1952.

Eighty-fourth Congress

Public Law 887, approved August 1, 1956 (S. 3970): Provides for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of the Wyandotte Tribe of Oklahoma and the individual members thereof.

Public Law 921, approved August 2, 1956 (S. 3968): Provides for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of the Peoria Tribe of Indians in the State of Oklahoma and the individual members thereof.

Public Law 943, approved August 3, 1956 (S. 3969): Provides for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of the Ottawa Tribe of Indians in the State of Oklahoma and the individual members thereof.

Public Law 980, approved August 6, 1956 (S. 3386): Amends the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to establish a commission for the celebration of the 100th

anniversary of the birth of Theodore Roosevelt," approved July 28, 1955.

Eighty-sixth Congress through July 2, 1960

Public Law 86–47, approved June 17, 1959 (S. 949): Incorporates the Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic.

Public Law 86–294, approved September 21, 1959 (S. 2181): amends the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920.

II. SENATOR O'MAHONEY'S NAME FIRST IN LIST OF SPONSORS

Seventy-fifth Congress

Public Law 616, approved June 15, 1938 (S. 3417): For the relief of the State of Wyoming.

Seventy-sixth Congress

Public Law 238, approved July 27, 1939 (S. 1878): Provides for the distribution of the judgment fund of the Shoshone Tribe of the Wind River Reservation in Wyoming.

Seventy-eighth Congress

Public Law 212, approved December 22, 1943 (S. 1576): Provides for the extension of certain oil and gas leases.

S. 1933 (H.R. 4833 passed in lieu which became Public Law 345, approved June 20, 1944): Extends, for 2 additional years, the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1937, as amended, and the taxes with respect to sugar.

Eightieth Congress

Public Law 85, approved May 31, 1947 (S. 854): Amends section 502(a) of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes."

Public Law 164, approved July 31, 1945 (S. 1270): Relates to the payment of subsidies by the Commodity Credit Corporation and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Public Law 696, approved August 8, 1946 (S. 1236): Promotes the development of oil and gas on the public domain and on lands acquired for the Appalachian National Forest.

S. 1821 (H.R. 4462 passed in lieu which became Public Law 887, approved July 2, 1948): Authorizes the conveyance of certain lands in Park County, Wyo., to the State of Wyoming.

Eighty-first Congress

Public Law 37, approved April 6, 1949 (S. 790): Grants the consent of the United States to the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact.

Public Law 132, approved June 28, 1949 (S. 55): Authorizes completion of construction and development of the Eden project, Wyoming.

Public Law 330, approved October 6, 1949 (S. 2085): Amends the Employment Act of 1946 with respect to the Joint Committee on the Economic Report.

Public Law 474, approved April 19, 1950 (S. 2734): Promotes the rehabilitation of the Navajo and Hopi Tribes of Indians and a better utilization of the resources of the Navajo and Hopi Indian Reservations.

Public Law 787, approved September 14, 1950 (S. 3409): Establishes a new Grand Teton National Park in the State of Wyoming.

Public Law 832, approved September 25, 1950 (S. 3136): Authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to transfer to the town of Mills, Wyo., a sewage system located in such town.

Public Law 600, approved July 3, 1950 (S. 3336): Provides for the organization of a constitutional government by the people of Puerto Rico.

Eighty-second Congress

Public Law 231, approved October 30, 1951 (S. 1311): Grants the consent of Congress to a compact entered into by the States of Montana, North Dakota, and Wyoming relating to the waters of the Yellowstone River.

S. 2658 (H.R. 5698 passed in lieu which became Public Law 331, approved May 8, 1952): Amends the act of September 25, 1950, so as to provide that the liability of the town of Mills, Wyo., to furnish sewerage service under such act shall not extend to future construction by the United States.

Eighty-fourth Congress

Public Law 278, approved August 9, 1955 (S. 2087): Amends the act of May 19, 1947 (ch. 80, 61 Stat. 102), as amended, so as to permit per capita payments to the individual members of the Shoshone Tribe and the Arapahoe Tribe of the Wind River Reservation in Wyoming, to be made quarterly.

Public Law 283, approved August 9, 1955 (S. 2339): Authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to include capacity to serve the town of Glendo, Wyo., in a sewerage system to be installed in connection with the construction of Glendo Dam and Reservoir.

Public Law 794, approved July 25, 1956 (S. 3397): Amends section 3 of the act of May 19, 1947 (ch. 80, 61 Stat. 102), as amended, for the purpose of extending the time in which payments are to be made to members of the Shoshone Tribe and the Arapahoe Tribe of the Wind River Reservation in Wyoming.

Public Law 960, approved August 3, 1956 (S. 3467): Authorizes the conveyance of tribal lands from the Shoshone Indian Tribe and the Arapahoe Indian Tribe of the Wind River Reservation in Wyoming to the United States.

Public Law 1026, approved August 8, 1956 (S. 3879): Supplements the antitrust laws of the United States, in order to balance the power now heavily weighted in favor of automobile manufacturers, by enabling franchise automobile dealers to bring suit in the district courts of the United States to recover compensatory damages sustained by reason of the failure of automobile manufacturers to act in good faith in complying with the terms of franchises or in terminating or not renewing franchises with their dealers.

Eighty-fifth Congress

Public Law 85–269, approved September 2, 1957 (S. 2377): Amends chapter 223, title 18, United States Code, to provide for the production of statements and reports of witnesses.

Public Law 85–297, approved September 4, 1957 (S.J. Res. 18): Authorizes and requests the President to issue a proclamation in connection with the centennial of the birth of Theodore Roosevelt.

Public Law 85–498, approved July 3, 1958 (S.J. Res. 159): Authorizes and requests the President to proclaim July 4, 1958, a day of rededication to the responsibilities of free citizenship.

Public Law 85–698, approved August 21, 1958 (S. 2069): Amends section 27 of the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, as amended, in order to promote the development of coal on the public domain.

Public Law 85–933, approved September 6, 1958 (S. 1864): Authorizes an increase in the membership of the Board of Appeals of the Patent Office; provides increased salaries for certain officers and employees of the Patent Office.

Eighty-sixth Congress through July 2, 1960

Public Law 86–450, approved May 6, 1960 (S. 1751): Places in trust status certain lands on the Wind River Indian Reservation in Wyoming.

III. SENATOR O'MAHONEY A COSPONSOR BUT NAME NOT FIRST

Seventy-fourth Congress

Public Law 298, approved August 22, 1935 (S. 2361): Fixes the compensation of registers of district land offices.

Seventy-eighth Congress

Public Law 155, approved September 29, 1943 (S. 1223): Fixes the compensation of the Recorder of Deeds of the District of Columbia and the Superintendent of the National Training School for Girls.

Public Law 346, approved June 22, 1944 (S. 1767): Provides Federal Government aid for the readjustment in civilian life of returning World War II veterans.

Seventy-ninth Congress

Public Law 231, approved November 30, 1945 (S. 1459). Provides for the extension of certain oil and gas leases.

Public Law 375, approved May 3, 1946 (S. 1757): Broadens the scope and raises the rank of the veterans' preference provided for in the Surplus Property Act of 1944.

Public Law 304, approved February 20, 1946 (S. 380): Establishes a national policy and program for assuring continuing full employment in a free competitive economy, through the concerted efforts of industry, agriculture, labor, State and local governments, and the Federal Government.

Eightieth Congress

S. 1028 (H.R. 2956 passed in lieu which became Public Law 245, approved July 25, 1947): Amends the Natural Gas Act approved June 21, 1938, as amended.

Eighty-first Congress

Public Law 265, approved August 24, 1949 (S.J. Res. 3): Provides that any future payments by the Republic of Finland on the principal or interest of its debt of the First World War to the United States shall be used to provide educational and technical instruction and training in the United States for citizens of Finland and America books and technical equipment for institutions of higher education in Finland.

Public Law 464, approved March 21, 1950 (S. 3159): Grants the consent and approval of Congress to a compact entered into by the States of Idaho and Wyoming relating to the waters of the Snake River.

Eighty-second Congress

Public Law 48, approved June 15, 1951 (S. 872): Furnishes emergency food aid to India.

Public Law 133, approved August 30, 1951 (S. 950): Amends the act authorizing the segregation and expenditure of trust funds held in joint ownership by the Shoshone and Arapaho Tribes of the Wind River Reservation for the purpose of extending the time in which payments are to be made to members of such tribes under such act.

Public Law 591, approved July 18, 1952 (S. 3333): Vests title in the United States to certain lands and interests in lands of the Shoshone and Arapaho Indian Tribes of the Wind River Reservation and to provide compensation therefor.

Eighty-fourth Congress

Public Law 76, approved June 16, 1955 (S. 265): Amends the acts authorizing agricultural entries under the nonmineral land laws of certain mineral lands in order to increase the limitation with respect to desert entries made under such acts to 320 acres.

Public Law 77, approved June 16, 1955 (S. 266): Authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to transfer certain property of the U.S. Government (in the Wyoming National Guard Camp Guernsey target and maneuver area, Platte County, Wyo.), to the State of Wyoming.

Public Law 94, approved June 28, 1955 (S. 67): Adjusts the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government.

Public Law 275, approved August 9, 1955 (S. 1917): Authorizes the construction within Grand Teton National Park of an alternate route to U.S. Highway 89, also numbered U.S. 187 and U.S. 26, and the conveyance thereof to the State of Wyoming.

Public Law 287, approved August 9, 1955 (S. 2049): Provides recognition of the 50th anniversary of the Devils Tower National Monument, Wyo., the first national

monument established by the President of the United States pursuant to the Antiquities Act of 1906; authorizes the addition of certain land to the monument; and permits land exchanges.

Public Law 485, approved April 11, 1956 (S. 500): Authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects.

Public Law 664, approved July 9, 1956 (S. 2913): Extends for 2 years the Advisory Committee on Weather Control.

Eighty-fifth Congress

Public Law 85–76, approved July 1, 1957 (S. 768): Designates the east 14th Street highway bridge over the Potomac River at 14th Street in the District of Columbia as the Rochambeau Memorial Bridge.

Public Law 85–97, approved July 11, 1957 (S. 1396): Amends section 6 of the act approved July 10, 1890 (26 Stat. 222) relating to the admission into the Union of the State of Wyoming by providing for the use of public lands granted to said State for the purpose of construction, reconstruction, repair, renovation, furnishing, equipment, or other permanent improvement of public buildings at the capital of said State.

Public Law 85–184, approved August 28, 1957 (S. 1556): Grants the consent of Congress to the States of Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact relating to their interest in, and the apportionment of, the waters of the Little Missouri and its tributaries as they affect such States.

Public Law 85–283, approved September 4, 1957 (S. 1996): Approves the contract negotiated with the Casper-Alcove Irrigation District, to authorize its execution, provide that the excess-land provisions of the Federal reclamation laws shall not apply to the lands of the Kendrick project, Wyoming.

Public Law 85–348, approved March 17, 1958 (S. 1086): Grants the consent and approval of Congress to a Bear River Compact, and for related purposes.

Public Law 85–427, approved May 29, 1958 (S. 2557): Amends the act granting the consent of Congress to the negotiation of certain compacts by the States of Nebraska, Wyoming, and South Dakota in order to extend the time for such negotiation.

Public Law 85–523, approved July 15, 1958 (S. J. Res. 12): Provides for transfer of right-of-way for Yellowtail Dam and Reservoir, Hardin unit, Missouri River Basin project and payment to Crow Indian Tribe in connection therewith.

Public Law 85–651, approved August 14, 1958 (S. 1748): Adds certain lands located in Idaho and Wyoming to the Caribou and Targhee National Forests.

Public Law 85–699, approved August 21, 1958 (S. 3651): Makes equity capital and long-term credit more readily available for small-business concerns.

Public Law 85–726, approved August 23, 1958 (S. 3880): Creates a Civil Aeronautics Board and a Federal Aviation Agency, to provide for the regulation and promotion of civil aviation in such manner as to best foster its development and safety, and provides for the safe and efficient use of the airspace by both civil and military aircraft.

Public Law 85–780, approved August 27, 1958 (S. 3203): Amends the act of August 15, 1953 (ch. 509, 67 Stat. 592; Public Law 284, 83d Cong., 1st sess.), to revest title to the minerals in the Indian tribes, to require that oil and gas and other mineral leases of lands in the Riverton reclamation project within the Wind River Indian Reservation shall be issued on the basis of competitive bidding only.

Public Law 85–826, approved August 28, 1958 (S.J. Res. 201): Authorizes the chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy to confer a medal on Rear Adm. Hyman George Rickover, U.S. Navy.

Public Law 85–889, approved September 2, 1958 (S. 4088): Approves a repayment contract negotiated with the Heart Mountain Irrigation District, Wyoming, and authorizes its execution.

S. 3406 (H.R. 11086 passed in lieu which became Public Law 85–366, approved April 4, 1958): Amends the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to wheat acreage history.

Senate Joint Resolution 79 (H.J. Res. 287 passed in lieu which became Public Law 85–33, approved May 16, 1957): Permits the Secretary of the Interior to continue to deliver water to lands in the Heart Mountain division, Shoshone Federal reclamation project, Wyoming.

Eighty-sixth Congress through July 2, 1960

Public Law 86–3, approved March 18, 1959 (S. 50): Provides for the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union.

Public Law 86–107, approved May 23, 1959 (S. 726): Amends section 11 of the Clayton Act to provide for the more expeditious enforcement of cease-and-desist orders issued thereunder.

Public Law 86–444, approved April 29, 1960 (S. 2434): Revises the boundaries and changes the name of the Fort Laramie National Monument, Wyo., to Fort Laramie National Historic Site.

Public Law 86–448, approved May 5, 1960 (S.J. Res. 150): Permits the Secretary of the Interior to deliver water to lands in the third division, Riverton Federal reclamation project, Wyoming.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, in the Washington Post this morning Mr. Drew Pearson devoted his entire "Washington Merry-Go-Round" column to a moving tribute to my senior colleague, JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, who will be retiring at the end of this term after many years of outstanding and distinguished service in this body.

As Mr. Pearson points out, there has been no one more devoted to the welfare of the little man, the average citizen, the John Doe of America. JOE O'MAHONEY's vigorous career in the U.S. Senate has been one marked by extraordinary physical effort and mental drive, and it is characteristic of this outstanding legislator that even a serious stroke which he suffered nearly a year ago was incapable of restricting his dedication to actively respresenting his constituents, his ideals, and the interests of our Nation. I ask unanimous consent that the column be included in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

O'MAHONEY ENDING LONG CAREER

(By Drew Pearson)

An old man will roll his wheelchair out on the Senate floor today to introduce his last piece of legislation. He is JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, senior Senator from Wyoming, 76 years old, frail, feeble, but still fighting after 43 years of helping to grind out the laws of the Nation.

The bill O'MAHONEY will introduce will be in keeping with his long career as a public servant. It will call for the abolition of the insurance ratemaking body of the District of Columbia on the ground that it has become a means of guaranteeing high rates to insurance companies rather than giving fair rates to the public.

Shortly after that bill is introduced and his last speech is made, JOE O'MAHONEY will begin packing up his files and correspondence from room 232 in the Senate Office Building, a room which he has occupied almost ever since he came to Washington in 1917 to work for Senator John Kendrick, Democrat, of Wyoming.

On the bookcase of that office is a peculiar piece of wood which illustrates the greatest contribution JOE O'MAHONEY has made to his country—battling against big business monopoly.

FIRST MONOPOLY CASE

The wood is a cross section of a water main, the first ever laid in Manhattan. Behind it lies the story of the first monopoly case in the United States and later the duel in which Aaron Burr killed Alexander Hamilton.

"Back in the early days of the Republic," O'MAHONEY told me when I dropped in to see him, "Vice President Aaron Burr was trying to set up a bank in New York—then the capital of the United States. But Alexander Hamilton, the first Secretary of the Treasury and founder of the Republican Party, had arranged the law so that no rival bank could be established in New York.

"Finally," explained the Senator, "the yellow fever epidemic hit New York and there was no water. People died by the thousands. So Aaron Burr established a company to build a water main and provided in its charter: 'This company may engage in any other business not contrary to the laws of New York.'

"When the charter came up before John Jay, then Governor of New York, Alexander Hamilton opposed it on the ground that it could start competition for his bank. But John Jay pointed out, 'There's a yellow fever epidemic in New York and we've got to have water.' He signed the charter.

"That," said O'MAHONEY, "was the way Aaron Burr was able to establish free banking competition in New York. He established the Bank of Manhattan."

And one of the prize possessions which O'MAHONEY will soon pack up is the 12-inch cross section of tree trunk in the very center of which is a hole two inches wide, through which water was first brought to the people of New York.

BEETLE-BROW PROBER

O'MAHONEY's own battle against monopoly has been confined to more recent American history. During the heydey of the Roosevelt New Deal he served as chairman of the Temporary National Economic Committee which hauled the big insurance companies, the big food chains, and the big industrial combines on the carpet.

In 1948 when Harry Truman was running for reelection, O'MAHONEY was seriously considered as his running mate, but was vetoed by Truman's friends Ed Flynn and Howard McGrath, both Catholics, because O'MAHONEY was a Catholic. They were afraid religion would hurt the ticket.

And in the next election—1952—JOE lost his Senate seat in the Eisenhower landslide. Whereupon he did what few defeated Senators have the heart or nerve or energy to do. At the age of 70 he ran again in 1954 and won.

He won despite the fact that he had defended Owen Lattimore, the Johns Hopkins professor pilloried by McCarthy; and despite the fact that he was called a pro-Red for so doing. Having won, JOE came back to the Senate where he had previously acquired great seniority, and began all over.

He began, however, with the same old fire in his blue eyes, the same old determination blazing out from under his bushy eyebrows. Among other things, he focused attention on the Dixon-Yates contract, wanted to know why New York Life and Metropolitan Life, two insurance companies which he had once investigated, were putting up $99 million of their policyholders' money for the highly speculative Dixon-Yates venture. Thanks in part to O'MAHONEY, Dixon-Yates was canceled.

And today, JOE O'MAHONEY, now in a wheelchair, but with fire still in his blue eyes, will wheel himself out on the Senate floor to introduce his last legislation—the curtailment of insurance rate bodies because they protect the insurance companies, not the public.

COMBATING OF INTERSTATE CRIME

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide means for the Federal Government to combat interstate crime, and to assist the States in the enforcement of their criminal laws. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD at at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3908) to provide means for the Federal Government to combat interstate crime and to assist the States in enforcement of their criminal laws, introduced by Mr. CASE of New Jersey, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

TO PROHIBIT TRAVEL IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE TO AID RACKETEERING ENTERPRISES, INTERSTATE TRANSPORTATION OF WAGERING PARAPHERNALIA AND THE TRANSMISSION OF CERTAIN GAMBLING INFORMATION IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE

SEC. 101. Chapter 95 of title 18, United States Code, is amended (a) by adding the following new sections at the end thereof:

"SEC. 1952. Interstate travel and the use of communication facilities in interstate or foreign commerce to aid racketeering enterprises.

"(a) Whoever travels in interstate or foreign commerce or uses communication facilities in interstate or foreign commerce to—

"(1) promote, manage, establish, carry on, or facilitate the promotion, management, establishment or carrying on of a racketeering enterprise; or

"(2) distribute the proceeds of any racketeering enterprise; or

"(3) commit any crime of violence to further the activities of any racketeering enterprise;

shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned for not more than five years or both.

"(b) As used in this section the term 'racketeering enterprise' means any person, group or organization engaged in unlawful gambling, liquor, narcotics or prostitution activities, or in extortion or bribery.

"(c) Investigations of liquor and narcotics racketeering enterprises shall be conducted in accordance with chapter 80 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended.

"SEC. 1953. Interstate transportation of wagering paraphernalia.

"Whoever except a common carrier in the usual course of its business carries or sends in interstate or foreign commerce any records or paraphernalia used or intended or designed for use in (a) bookmaking; or (b) wagering polls with respect to a sporting event; or (c) in a numbers, policy, bolita or similar game shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned for not more than five years or both."; and

(b) by adding the following items to the analysis of the chapter:

"Sec. 1952. Interstate travel to aid racketeering enterprises."

"Sec. 1953. Interstate transportation of wagering paraphernalia."

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, in recent years citizens throughout the land have been shocked and outraged by revelations of the growth of organized criminal activities stretching across State lines and threatening the well-being of communities in every corner of the Nation. Like some giant octopus, feeding primarily on gambling, liquor, narcotics or prostitution activities, organized crime reaches out its ugly tentacles seeking new prey.

There can be no question, to my mind, of either the need or the responsibility of the Federal Government to take direct action against organized interstate crime. Unfortunately, at the present time the means available to the Federal Government are very limited. What is urgently needed is legislation to provide Federal jurisdiction for both investigation and prosecution in this field.

This is essentially what my bill would do. It would utilize the power conferred on Congress to regulate interstate and foreign commerce to make certain illegal activities a Federal crime and thus make available the investigative and legal resources of the Federal Government in the fight against this evil.

Specifically, my bill would make it a crime for any person to travel interstate or to use communication facilities in interstate or foreign commerce to aid racketeering enterprises. Such aid would include travel to promote, manage, establish or carry on a racketeering enterprise, to distribute the proceeds of a racketeering enterprise or to commit a crime of violence to further a racketeering enterprise. Also prohibited would be interstate transportation of wagering paraphernalia, including records or equipment used in bookmaking, wagering polls, numbers policy, bolita or a similar game.

It has long been obvious that the day of the individual professional gambler or organized gang, locally controlled and operating in a relatively confined area, is gone. Today careerists in crime are highly professionalized, highly organized, and far more difficult to halt. Time and again local law enforcement efforts are frustrated by inability to do more than hack away at an isolated tentacle, leaving untouched the central body and brains of the criminal conspiracy. Indeed, in too many instances no real enforcement effort is made. Sometimes this is because local law enforcement agencies have themselves been corrupted. Sometimes it occurs because local officials feel powerless to act effectively against the evil they know exists.

Whatever the explanation, the effect is always corrosive. Whether it is willingly or unwillingly done, to condone the flouting of law inevitably has a corruptive effect on those charged with responsibility for maintenance of law and order. Public respect for law, vital to our whole society, diminishes, and lawlessness and violence are invited in every aspect of our lives.

Rightly, those who confront the possibility of such a situation in their own communities are deeply disturbed. In my own State, charges have been made of widespread illegal activities in Camden, a part of the Philadelphia metropolitan area. The results of one grand jury investigation deepened the concern of citizens there. For while the grand jury returned several indictments, they were confined to a few individuals in the police force of the city of Camden. No indictment was returned against a member of the underworld.

At the present time the ability of the Federal Government to proceed effectively against persons engaged in illegal gambling, liquor, narcotics or prostitution activities, is limited. The Wagering Tax Act does provide some help to States in enforcing local gambling statutes. But tax collection is fundamentally different from law enforcement and court experience has domonstrated the limited usefulness of the act as a weapon against crime. Far greater assistance should and can be provided. In any case, existing Federal law does not meet the direct responsibility of the Federal Government in this field. For in many regards, only the Federal Government can combat effectively the criminal conspiracies, covering at least several States, known to exist.

This Congress is, of course, near adjournment. But the introduction of my bill will, I hope, help to focus public attention on the need for legislation and thus pave the way for early action next year to provide the weapon needed to enable both the State and the Federal Governments to attack more effectively illegal activities that strike at the heart of a law-abiding society.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will my distinguished colleague yield?

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I am happy to yield.

Mr. KEATING. I commend my distinguished colleague from New Jersey for his proposed legislation. It is in line with his long-standing effort to combat the criminal elements in our country. The Senator has a long record of interest in this type of legislation.

As my colleague knows, I have introduced proposed legislation to make it a Federal crime to use the facilities of interstate commerce to commit specified local crimes. In many cases local law-enforcement officials simply are not able to cope with interstate criminals organized on a national basis. This bill would permit the effective arm of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and of other Federal investigative agencies to go to work at the outset against such crimes and this would be very helpful.

I shall be glad to work with my distinguished colleague. Probably it will not be possible in the present session of Congress to have such legislation enacted, but I shall certainly work with my colleague in the next Congress to try to bring about some hearings and some definite and positive action in this field.

History demonstrates that when the Federal Government has been able to step into criminal activities, to a large extent they have been curbed. We have seen that with respect to motor vehicle thefts; to lotteries, as a result of the lottery act; to the white slave traffic; and to kidnaping; as well as other activities.

I am very happy my colleague from New Jersey has focused attention on this very pressing problem again.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I thank the Senator from New York. I am aware of the interest the Senator has taken in this particular problem, and of the bill he has introduced. I commend him for doing so.

I appreciate deeply the Senator's assurance of support to the common effort we intend to make. I am sure my colleague will agree that the average citizen of America has no idea whatever how limited is the Federal power in this area. The average citizen would be shocked to realize that the Federal Government in most cases has no power at all, so far as investigation is concerned, and particularly so far as prosecution is concerned.

The average citizen thinks that anything which is a crime locally is a crime if conducted over State borders. This is not so, Mr. President. There are limitations on the Federal Government in most areas, except for the specific ones for which legislation has been provided, as mentioned by my colleague from New York. That is an aid to law enforcement under the wage and tax laws. In both cases the Federal Government has to use the tax officials and not the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

The Federal Government has no power of prosecution except with respect to the rather limited penalties under the two laws.

My colleague from New York and I seek to make it clear that the Federal Government has a right to go into these areas, because we would specifically make Federal crimes of these activities involving travel, communication, or transportation across State lines.

CONSTITUTION OF AMERICAN SAMOA

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. Mr. President, on April 27, 1960, a constitutional convention chosen by the people of American Samoa formally approved a constitution which it had drafted after several months of earnest consideration. On that same day the document was approved by the Secretary of the Interior of the United States, pursuant to an executive order directing him to act, in harmony with applicable law, for the administration of civil government in American Samoa.

I now introduce a joint resolution which would adopt and approve this constitution on behalf of the Congress. It is late in the session to take action on the joint resolution, but during the legislative interim period consideration can be given to it and to the new constitution by the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. That committee has been authorized to study the political, economic, and social needs of American Somoa. I should think that the committee would want to give careful consideration to the governmental structure established by this constitution and to see how it serves the needs of the Samoan community. Thought should be given as to the desirability of drafting a more detailed organic act for American Samoa and the reactions of the people of Samoa to this idea should be ascertained.

I introduce the resolution for appropriate reference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 222) providing a government for American Samoa, introduced by Mr. LONG of Hawaii, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

EXTENSION OF BIRTHDAY GREETINGS TO PRESIDENT EISENHOWER AND FORMER VICE PRESIDENT JOHN NANCE GARNER

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, a resolution by which the Senate would extend its greetings and best wishes to two distinguished Americans who have birthday anniversaries after this session of Congress will adjourn and before next January.

Those two Americans are two persons born in the State of Texas who have attained the highest distinction in the Government of the United States. Both are still living. One is the President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower, who will be 70 years of age on the 14th of October 1960.

The other is the former Vice President John Nance Garner, the only man in the history of this country to serve successively, without a breach, as the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Vice President of the country, and the President of the Senate. John Nance Garner will be 92 years of age November 22, 1960.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in full in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 383) extending greetings to President Eisenhower and former Vice President John N. Garner on the occasion of their coming birthdays, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Whereas, the two Texas-born Americans who have reached the highest governmental offices since Texas entered the Union are both still living, the Honorable John Nance Garner, age 91, and the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, age 69; and

Whereas both will celebrate their birthdays after the adjourning of the second session of the Eighty-sixth Congress; and

Whereas Dwight David Eisenhower, the thirty-fourth President of the United States, born in Denison, Texas, will celebrate his seventieth birthday this year;

Whereas Mr. Eisenhower, having graduated from the United States Military Academy in 1911, followed his chosen career in the United States Army and soon after the entry of the United States in World War II was appointed commanding general of the European theater of operations; and

Whereas in December 1943, Dwight D. Eisenhower was given the title of Supreme Commander, Allied Expeditionary Force, and as such directed the successful invasion of Europe leading to the surrender of Germany in May 1945; and

Whereas, having been named Army Chief of Staff, Mr. Eisenhower's promotion to the rank of permanent General of the Army came in April 1946; and

Whereas, although retired from active duty in the Army to accept an appointment as president of Columbia University in 1948, Mr. Eisenhower took a leave of absence from Columbia from December 1950 to February 1951, when President Truman appointed him commander of Allied Powers in Europe, with the task of organizing the armed forces of NATO; and

Whereas, in 1952, this distinguished American was elected to the country's highest office, President of the United States; and

Whereas another distinguished American, also a native son of Texas, John Nance Garner, the thirty-second Vice President of the United States, born in Red River County, Texas, will celebrate his ninety-second birthday this year; and

Whereas John Nance Garner, was a self-taught lawyer and held his first public office from 1893 to 1898 as county judge of Uvalde County, Texas; and

Whereas John Nance Garner was elected to the Texas House of Representatives in 1898, serving through 1902, and, beginning in 1903, served thirty years in the United States House of Representatives from the Fifteenth Congressional District of Texas, and was Speaker of the House of the Seventy-second Congress; and

Whereas in 1932 the people of the United States, on the basis of his achievements in national affairs, elected Mr. Garner to the Office of Vice President, in which office he ably served from 1933 to 1941; and

Whereas John Nance Garner is the only man in history to preside in uninterrupted succession over both Houses of the Congress, first as Speaker of the House of Representatives and then as Vice President of the United States; and

Whereas, in addition to his other public duties, John Nance Garner has made great contributions to the preservation of the Texas heritage, having assisted in founding the University of Texas Memorial Museum; and

Whereas the Nation owes these two distinguished men, so large a part of whose lives have been spent in public service, a grateful salute and best wishes on the approach of their respective birthdays: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate hereby extends its warm greetings and best wishes to these two distinguished Americans on their birthdays anniversaries which, in the case of President Eisenhower, will occur on October 14, 1960, and, in the case of John Nance Garner, will occur on November 22, 1960.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Senate is directed to transmit properly certified copies of this resolution to President Eisenhower and to Mr. Garner.

CONSTRUCTION OF MEMORIAL TO THEODORE ROOSEVELT—AMENDMENT

Mr. CASE of South Dakota (for himself, Mr. JAVITS, and Mr. KEATING) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 2561) to amend the act entitled "An Act to establish a memorial to Theodore Roosevelt in the National Capital" to provide for the construction of such memorial by the Secretary of the Interior, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ERECTION OF MEMORIAL IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TO GENERAL JOHN J. PERSHING—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of my colleague, the senior Senator from

Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and myself may be added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 3901) to authorize the erection of a memorial in the District of Columbia to Gen. John J. Pershing, introduced by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] on August 26, 1960.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, as one of the cosponsors of the bill in question, I join in the request of the Senator from Nebraska.

AMENDMENT OF SMALL BUSINESS ACT—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] be added as a cosponsor to S. 3903, a bill I have introduced to enable the Small Business Administration to work effectively to secure for small business a fair share of the Government's huge, multimillion procurement program.

Mr. President, I am proud that the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] is a cosponsor of this bill. As chairman of the Small Business Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee, I have been deeply impressed by the Senator's hard working, conscientious championship of small business. He has repeatedly fought and worked for legislation to help small business solve the heavy problems it has. He has been a mighty effective member of the Senate Select Committee on Small Business.

I also ask that the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], another stalwart champion of small business, be added as a cosponsor to this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF TARIFF ACT OF 1930—AMENDMENT

Mr. CLARK submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 4384) to amend paragraph 1774 of the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to the importation of certain articles for religious purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954, RELATING TO POSSESSIONS OF THE UNITED STATES—AMENDMENT

Mr. CLARK submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 5547) to amend certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to possessions of the United States, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

TECHNICAL REVISIONS OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954, RELATING TO ESTATES, TRUSTS, PARTNERS, AND PARTNERSHIPS—AMENDMENT

Mr. CLARK submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 9662) to make technical revisions in the income tax provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to estates, trusts, partners, and partnerships, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF TARIFF ACT OF 1930 RELATING TO BAMBOO PIPESTEMS—AMENDMENT

Mr. CLARK submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 10841) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to place bamboo pipestems on the free list, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

PRINTING OF DOCUMENT ENTITLED "NATIONAL FORESTS IN WYOMING—BASIC FACTS" AS A SENATE DOCUMENT

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, at my request the National Forest Service is preparing a document entitled "National Forests in Wyoming—Basic Facts." I believe that this document will be an invaluable aid to the understanding of the Appropriations Committee, of which I am a member, of the forest program needs of Wyoming and that it will help us constructively to determine the levels of expenditure which are justified in future years. My staff informs me that this document will not exceed 50 pages in length, and that it will be completed soon. Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed, with an illustration, as a Senate document during the coming recess.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wyoming? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

CONVEYANCE OF PART OF LOCK AND DAM NO. 10, KENTUCKY RIVER, MADISON COUNTY, KY.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, Calendar No. 1977, H.R. 11561, to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Army to convey part of lock and dam No. 10, Kentucky River, Madison County, Ky., to the Pioneer National Monument Association for use as a part of a historic site, was objected to on the call of the calendar by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], who is interested in the bill, has agreed to accept an amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon. It will not require any discussion.

Notwithstanding the unanimous-consent agreement already entered into, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1977, H.R. 11561, with the understanding that the Morse amendment will be accepted, and with the further understanding that action will then be taken on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H.R. 11561) to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Army to convey part of lock and dam No. 10, Kentucky River, Madison County, Ky., to the Pioneer National Monument Association for use as a part of a historic site.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 5, it is proposed to strike out "without monetary payment therefor but" and insert in lieu thereof "in return for the payment of an amount equal to 50 per centum of the fair market value of the land conveyed, as determined by the Secretary of the Army after appraisal, and".

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, S. 3324 would authorize the conveyance, without consideration, of a 4.1-acre track of Federal land to the Pioneer National Monument Association, an instrumentality of the State of Kentucky.

The 4.1-acre tract is a portion of lock and dam No. 10, Kentucky River. It would be used as part of a national historical fort-museum, and the bill provides that the conveyance would be conditioned on the tract's being used in conjunction with the adjacent tract as part of a historic monument.

The General Services Administration is opposed to the bill. I ask unanimous consent that the letter dated June 23, 1960, addressed to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Public Works by General Services Administrator Floete, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., June 23, 1960.

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Chairman, Committee on Public Works,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Your letter of April 6, 1960, requested the views of General Services Administration on S. 3324, 86th Congress, a bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Army to convey part of lock and dam No. 10, Kentucky River, Madison County, Ky., to the Pioneer National Monument Association for use as part of a historic site.

The purpose of the bill is to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Army to convey to the association, without monetary consideration therefor, 4.1 acres of land at the lock and dam project determined by him to be available for use in connection with development of a fort-museum on adjacent property.

By quitclaim deed dated December 3, 1956, GSA conveyed to the Pioneer National Monument Association, a nonprofit corporation organized under the laws of the Commonwealth of Kentucky, 7.6 acres of surplus land at Kentucky River lock and dam No. 10, in accordance with Private Law 576, 84th Congress. The conveyance was made without monetary consideration and subject to a right of reentry on the part of the United States in the event that the property should not be continuously used as part of a historic site or monument for a period of 25 years. The remainder of the property at the lock and dam, including the 4.1 acres rereferred to in this bill, has not been reported to GSA as excess property pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended.

In the event that the 4.1-acre tract is determined by the Secretary of the Army to be available for purposes other than the

fulfillment of the needs and the discharge of the responsibilities of the Department of the Army, section 202 of the 1949 act provides that the property shall be made available for possible use by other Federal agencies. GSA is opposed in principle to the enactment of legislation which would preclude the opportunity for further Federal utilization of excess property. S. 3324 would authorize the use of the Government-owned property at lock and dam No. 10, Kentucky River, for a historic site by a private organization, and its enactment would effectively preclude the possibility of further use of the property for the needs of Federal agencies.

If the property is determined to be surplus to the needs and the discharge of the responsibilities of all Federal agencies, it would be disposed of pursuant to the provisions of the 1949 act and other applicable law. GSA is opposed to the enactment of legislation which has for its purpose the disposition of specific property under terms and conditions less favorable to the Government than those provided for in laws of general application.

Section 602(a) of the 1949 act continues in effect the provisions of section 13(h) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended (50 U.S.C. App. 1622(h)), which authorizes any disposal agency with the approval of the Administrator of General Services to convey without monetary consideration to any State, political subdivision or instrumentality thereof, or municipality, surplus land including improvements and equipment thereon, which, in the determination of the Secretary of the Interior, is suitable and desirable for use as a historic monument site, provided that property may not be determined to be suitable for such use if its area exceeds that necessary for the preservation and proper observation of the monument situated thereon, or if it was acquired by the United States at any time after January 1, 1900.

Inasmuch as the Pioneer National Monument Association is not a governmental agency or instrumentality, and as we are informed that the 4.1-acre tract was acquired by the United States after January 1, 1900, the association would not be entitled to either a priority or price preference in the disposition of the land pursuant to the aforementioned provisions of law of general application. We believe, under these circumstances, that the association should bid for purchase of the property if and when it is offered for public sale in accordance with the 1949 act.

For the reasons stated above, General Services Administration is opposed to the enactment of this measure.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that while there is no objection to the submission of this report to your committee the Bureau would have no objection to the enactment of S. 3324.

Sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN FLOETE,
Administrator.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, committee report No. 1823 relative to the bill contains a reference to a 1956 conveyance of similar land to the Pioneer National Museum Association pursuant to Private Law 576 of the 84th Congress.

I was not present in the Senate when the bill S. 1992, now Private Law 576, was brought up on the call of the calendar. I was in New York on official foreign relations business. Had I been present, I would have objected to its passage so long as it did not contain an amendment conforming to the Morse formula.

I object to the passage of S. 3324 today because it violates the Morse formula. I have reference particularly to that portion of the GSA Administrator's letter to the effect that "the remainder of the property at the lock and dam, including the 4.1 acres referred to in this bill, has not been reported to GSA as excess property pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended."

Mr. President, I object to the passage of the bill today without my amendment which provides for the adoption of the Morse formula. The Senator from Kentucky has taken up the question with the people in Kentucky who are interested in the matter. He has informed me that they have agreed to accept the Morse amendment.

I have previously made the statement that I shall not agree to the passage of House bills without the inclusion of the Morse formula, when it is applicable. The Senator from Kentucky has assured me that he will see to it that this amendment is adopted in conference. If it is not adopted in conference, I shall have a long speech to make on the subject.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I have discussed this matter with the Senator from Oregon, and am prepared to accept the amendment.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at a point before the vote on the bill, a statement I have prepared on the situation.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATORS THRUSTON B. MORTON AND JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, OF KENTUCKY

We introduced in the Senate S. 3324, a bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Army to convey part of lock and dam No. 10, Kentucky River, Madison County, Ky., to the Pioneer National Monument Association for use as part of a historic site.

The purpose of the bill was to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Army to convey to the association, without monetary consideration, 4.1 acres of land at lock and dam No. 10, determined by him to be available for use in connection with the development of a fort-museum on adjacent property.

The bill was approved by the Senate Committee on Public Works and reported favorably to the Senate. A similar bill, H.R. 11561, was introduced in the House of Representatives by Congressman JOHN WATTS, of Kentucky. H.R. 11561 was passed by the House and is now before the Senate for its consideration. H.R. 11561 was objected to in the Senate on the call of the calendar, by Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, on the ground that an amendment should be added requiring the association to pay to the Treasurer of the United States one-half of its appraised fair market value. He has offered such an amendment to the pending bill, which we include at this point.

"On page 2, line 5, strike out 'without monetary payment therefor but' and insert in lieu thereof 'in return for the payment of an amount equal to 50 per centum of the fair market value of the land conveyed, as determined by the Secretary of the Army after appraisal, and'."

We have inquired of the Corps of Engineers regarding their judgment of the appraised value of the 4.1 acres which would be conveyed. We include at this point copies of letters from the Corps of Engineers.

JULY 22, 1960.

Hon. THRUSTON B. MORTON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORTON: Information concerning the 4.1 acres of Government land at lock and dam No. 10, Kentucky River, requested in your letter of July 19, 1960, is as follows: 4.1 acres, appraised value $800; two each garages, frame, 10 by 19 feet, appraised value $250 each. The garages are to be relocated within the retained area at no expense to the Government.

If you desire any additional information regarding this matter, it will be furnished upon request.

Very truly yours,

C. C. NOBLE,
Colonel, CE,
District Engineer.

JULY 6, 1960.

Hon. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR COOPER: This is in reply to the verbal request of a member of your staff concerning the value of the 4.1 acres of land in Madison County, Ky., involved in S. 3324, 86th Congress.

I am pleased to inform you that the district engineer, U.S. Army Engineer district, Louisville, Ky., has estimated that the present value of the 4.1 acres is $800.

Sincerely yours,

O. J. PICKARD,
Colonel, Corps of Engineers,
Director of Real Estate.

In doing this we cannot say that the amounts stated in these letters will be the actual amount determined to be the fair market value when an appraisal is made pursuant to the terms of the amendment.

In view of the fact that this special session will close within a few days, and if the Congress should adjourn without passing H.R. 11561 in the Senate it will be necessary for a similar bill to be passed again by the House at the next session of the Congress, as well as by the Senate, we think it better that the bill be passed with the amendment offered by Senator MORSE, rather than go over until the next session of the Congress.

Senator COOPER talked by telephone with Dr. J. T. Dorris, president of the Pioneer National Monument Association, and after being advised of the situation, Dr. Dorris stated to Senator COOPER that rather than have the bill passed over to the next session of the Congress it would be agreeable to him, as the president of the association, to accept the amendment, and that it was his judgment the association would be agreeable to paying to the Treasurer of the United States one-half of such sum as might be determined as the fair market value of the 4.1 acres, provided that it was in the general range of the statement made by the Corps of Engineers to Senators MORTON and COOPER. Upon this basis we consent to the amendment.

We further include at this point a statement entitled "Historic Boonesboro," an excerpt from the Senate report:

"HISTORIC BOONESBORO

"Daniel Boone made his first exploration of Kentucky in 1767, when he spent the winter hunting in what is now Floyd County. This was followed by several visits, prior to 1775.

"In March of 1775 Boone set out through the Cumberland Gap with a party of frontiersmen, and by the following June had brought the wilderness road to the south bank of the Kentucky river. There, in what is now Madison County, Boone constructed the fort and settlement named in his honor. The following September, Boone led his wife and daughter, the first white women in Ken-

tucky, down the wilderness road to Boonesboro.

"The settlement survived an Indian attack in December of 1775. And later when Boone's daughter Jemima and two of her friends were captured by Shawnee Indians, Boone's knowledge of the area and familiarity with Shawnee customs enabled him to rescue the girls. This incident was used as the basis of an episode in James Fenimore Cooper's 'The Last of the Mohicans.'

"Throughout the period of the Revolutionary War, Boone served as an officer in the frontier militia which checked Indian unrest in eastern Kentucky. In February of 1778, Boone was captured by the Shawnees and taken to Detroit, then turned over to Chief Blackfish and inducted into the tribe. He escaped and returned to Boonesboro in time to warn the settlement of attack, which proved the longest Indian siege in history.

"For his courage, Boone was promoted to the rank of lieutenant colonel. He was elected county lieutenant of Fayette County, Ky., when Virginia organized the territory in 1780. Until late in 1782, Boone fought both the British army and restless Indians on the frontier.

"The flood of settlers into Kentucky along the wilderness road opened the west. It is a fitting tribute to one of her greatest sons that the historic site of Boonesborough be preserved."

"PURPOSE OF THE BILL

"The purpose of S. 3324 is to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Army to convey to the Pioneer National Monument Association quitclaim deed without monetary consideration, 4.1 acres of land at lock and dam No. 10, Madison County, Ky., determined by him to be available for use in connection with development of a fort-museum on adjacent property previously conveyed to the association.

"GENERAL STATEMENT

"The Pioneer National Monument Association is an instrumentality of the State of Kentucky. Under authority of the act of April 2, 1956 (70 Stat. A31), 7.6 acres of surplus land at lock and dam No. 10 on the Kentucky River was conveyed to the association. S. 3324 would authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey an additional 4.1 acres of land at the lock and dam determined by him to be available, without monetary consideration, to the association.

"The Pioneer National Monument Association was organized as a corporation by the Daniel Boone Bicentennial Commission. The Commission was created by the Kentucky General Assembly in 1934. The association was formed to develop the Pioneer National Museum project which was authorized by the act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 982). The property previously conveyed by the act of 1956 and the additional property proposed to be conveyed under the provisions of S. 3324 will provide the site for a national historical fort-museum in the area which is part of the historic community of Boonesboro as it existed in 1809."

"COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

"The committee believes that the property to be conveyed has a special interest for the general public, and that its development and preservation as a historic site is desirable. Its development, along with the area previously conveyed to the association, appears to be justified, and enactment of S. 3324 is recommended by the committee."

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the bill was reported by the Committee on Public Works with the understanding that the two Senators from Kentucky would accept the amendment of the Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H.R. 11561) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill S. 3324 is indefinitely postponed.

OPPOSITION TO RECESS APPOINTMENTS TO THE SUPREME COURT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 334) opposing the making of recess appointments to the Supreme Court.

FILENE CENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague [Mr. KENNEDY] and myself, I make the following statement.

Mr. President, we would like to call attention to the Filene Centennial Anniversary being celebrated by credit union members and other citizens throughout the world during the month of September.

Edward A. Filene was truly a great American and I am proud to join Senator KENNEDY in pointing out his numerous accomplishments on behalf of all mankind and an everlasting, worldwide peace.

This native of Massachusetts, born of shopkeeper parents in the small city of Salem on September 3, 1860, was destined to become one of the world's leading merchants, but more than that, he was to achieve international fame for his many activities in quest of social and economic betterment and worldwide peace for all men. For these activities, he was decorated by many foreign countries including France, Austria, and Italy. He frequently admitted, however, that it was his work in connection with the development of the credit union movement that he found most satisfying.

In honor of the man who founded the credit union movement in this country, the Credit Union National Association recently prepared an article illustrating Mr. Filene's many-faceted life and recalling his devotion to the credit union idea.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD following my remarks this article summarizing the life of Edward A. Filene and the resolution of the Credit Union National Association.

There being no objection, the article and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEPTEMBER 3 MARKS 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTHDAY OF EDWARD A. FILENE

There were no credit unions in the United States; Raiffeisen hadn't started his first real credit union, and DesJardins was just 6 years old, but September 3, 1860, was still a very important date in the history of credit unions.

For on that date, the man who was to do so much for credit unions was born in the small town of Salem, Mass.

He was Edward A. Filene, the founder of the credit union movement in the United States, who spent close to a million dollars of his personal fortune and much of his time and energy for the credit union idea. In gratitude, credit union members all over the world are observing 1960 as Filene Centennial Year.

The founder of the U.S. credit union movement was a man of contrasts. He developed his father's shop into a famous department store, but preferred to be known as a "simple shopkeeper." He made a fortune and gained worldwide fame for his business ingenuity, but he referred to himself as an "unsuccessful millionaire." He disliked charity intensely, but he gave away most of his own fortune.

His first contact with the credit union idea occurred accidentally during a trip to India in 1907. He liked what he saw and thought it would be good for America. He decided to find out more about it and to do something about it.

In 1909 Filene helped get the first U.S. credit union law written and enacted in Massachusetts. Thirteen years later, in 1921, Filene again gave a major impetus to the infant credit union movement. He set up the Credit Union National Extension Bureau (forerunner of CUNA) and hired the Boston attorney, Roy F. Bergengren, to promote and develop credit unions throughout the United States.

During the next 13 years, the Filene-financed Credit Union National Extension Bureau succeeded in getting credit union laws passed in the majority of States and organized 2,000 credit unions. Its campaign was climaxed in 1934 with the enactment of a Federal Credit Union Act that enables credit unions to operate anywhere within the United States and its territories.

In that same year, another Filene goal was realized when the Credit Union National Association (CUNA) was born. The credit union movement began to stand on its own two feet and pay its own way. At the historic Estes Park conference in Colorado, Filene was the first to sign CUNA's organization charter, and he was immediately chosen as CUNA's first president.

CUNA's two affiliates, CUNA Supply Cooperative and CUNA Mutual Insurance Society, also owe their existence to Filene, because CUNA Supply was originally started as a department of the Filene-financed Credit Union National Extension Bureau, and CUNA Mutual was started in 1935 with a $25,000 loan from Filene.

To tell Filene's story without mentioning his many other interests, however, would be like saying that Benjamin Franklin's only contribution to mankind was his discovery of electricity.

Filene's store became internationally famous for its many innovations, including machine-made dresses and the world's first "bargain basement." He gave his employees many fringe benefits that are just becoming usual in the business world today. He suggested to shipping companies that they offer tourist-class ocean travel. The simultaneous translator used at the League of Nations, and at the United Nations today, was his

idea. He was largely responsible for the organization of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. He even tried to interest Americans in water skiing almost 50 years ago.

However, Filene's greatest satisfaction is said to have come from his sponsorship of the credit union idea. He once summed up his belief in credit unions this way:

"The credit unions of America * * * have shown the way of self-help to thousands. Not self-help, in the sense of each person attempting to go it alone—for people do not and never could help themselves by any such negation of the social facts of life—but the credit unions have shown how assistance may be a mutual matter, instead of being condescending on the one hand, and hopelessly receptive on the other. The credit unionists have revived the spirit of early Americanism, and made it apply to present-day America. There is kindness, there is neighborliness, in their cooperative transactions; but they have been business transactions based upon an understanding that it pays to help others; and they not only help others to help themselves, but to help one another, too."

These words are as apt today as they were when Filene wrote them more than 25 years ago.

Whereas the 3d day of September of 1960 marks the 100th birthday of Edward A. Filene; and

Whereas Edward A. Filene is revered throughout the credit union movement as the founder and leading champion of the credit union movement in the United States during the critical years of its infancy; and

Whereas in the unswerving pursuit of his ambition to make credit union services available to his fellow citizens throughout the United States, Edward A. Filene contributed greatly from his personal fortune; and

Whereas in the fall of 1908 and the spring of 1909 Edward A. Filene appeared before a committee of the legislature of the State of Massachusetts where his testimony on credit unions was instrumental in persuading that body to pass the first credit union enabling legislation in the United States; and

Whereas in the year 1921 Edward A. Filene established the Credit Union National Extension Bureau to propagate the credit union idea, and thereafter gave it his help and guidance for 13 years until the credit unions of the United States were prepared to form their own national association; and

Whereas Edward A. Filene was a signer of the charter of the Credit Union National Association at Estes Park in 1934, and was elected the first president of the association; and

Whereas Edward A. Filene was also instrumental in establishing the CUNA Mutual Insurance Society, making available a loan of $25,000 from his personal funds for that purpose; and

Whereas Edward A. Filene was one of the most foresighted liberal thinkers of his time, contributing much to our modern way of life in addition to the credit union, including development of the bargain basement, tourist-class ocean travel, and the chamber of commerce, establishment of an international peace prize and other social and economic advances: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the month of September be designated Filene Centennial Month to be so celebrated with appropriate solemnities throughout the credit union movement.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT NOT TO CHARGE TIME

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the colloquies which have taken place since we started consideration of the court resolution, which have not been relevant to the court resolution, not be charged against the time of the proponents of the court resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the distinguished Senator from Kansas for a short statement, and that the time not be charged to the time of the opponents of the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New York? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

WHEAT AND THE NATIONAL ECONOMY

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, shortly before the last session of Congress adjourned I wrote the Honorable Ezra T. Benson, Secretary of Agriculture, and requested that the Department of Agriculture make a study with reference to the contribution of the wheat enterprise to national employment.

Wheat is one of our basic crops and is produced in practically every State in the Union. The Secretary, realizing the importance of this crop, immediately complied with my request and the study was initiated and the report has now been completed.

The Secretary and the Department are entitled to commendation for their prompt action on this request.

This study is important as we deal with this commodity. It is interesting to note in the study that in 1959 wheat through all of its phases from production through processing, transportation, storage, and distribution, involved some 876,000 man-years of employment, or 1.3 percent of total civilian employment in the United States.

The estimates cover employment directly concerned with wheat and its products. The data are for the Nation as a whole. It should be noted that in some States, such as North Dakota, Kansas, and Montana, where wheat accounts for one-third or more of total cash farm receipts, the impact of wheat on the local economies is much greater than the data for the United States as a whole indicate.

The importance of wheat to our economy can be realized when we note that in 1959 wheat farmers marketed an estimated 1,131 million bushels of wheat valued at close to $2 billion. About 44 percent of the wheat marketed was processed for food; 40 percent was exported and most of the remainder moved into storage. Receipts from wheat constituted 6 percent of total cash receipts by farmers from the sale of all farm products. Wheat ranked sixth among all farm products in receipts from marketings, being exceeded by beef cattle, 23.8 percent; dairy products, 14 percent; and hogs, 8.4 percent; chickens and eggs, 7.6 percent; and cotton, 7.8 percent.

Consumers in the United States spent over $4 billion in 1959 on wheat products, some 7 percent of total consumer expenditures for food. In our normal diet, wheat flour and cereal products, as now enriched, contribute 17 percent of the calories, 17 percent of the protein, 21 percent of iron and niacin, and 28 percent of the thiamine.

In addition to our home consumption, we exported last year 444 million bushels of wheat. While large quantities of this wheat was exported through regular consumer export channels, much of it was exported under Public Law 480. There is no farm crop which plays a more important part in our international program for peace than the wheat that we export. It is truly a large part of the program of "Food for Peace." In view of the importance of this study, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD as a part of these remarks.

There being no objection, the study was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHEAT AND THE NATIONAL ECONOMY

(This study develops in broad fashion the contribution of the wheat enterprise to our national employment in 1959. It was prepared in response to a request by Senator FRANK CARLSON to Secretary Benson for information on the jobs generated in our national economy by wheat and the products and services associated with wheat.)

SUMMARY

In 1959, wheat through all of its phases from production through processing, transportation, storage, and distribution involved some 876,000 man-years of employment, or 1.3 percent of total civilian employment in the United States.

Wheat production accounted for 164,000 man-years—approximately 109,000 on the farm and 55,000 in the supplying industries, such as fertilizer and machinery.

Wheat processing involved about 360,000 man-years of employment, primarily in the baking industry. Storage, transportation, and distribution accounted for some 344,000 man-years, a large part of which is concerned in retailing products to the consumer.

Federal Government programs represent the equivalent of about 8,000 man-years of employment, primarily in connection with the operations of the price support and soil bank programs.

LIMITATIONS OF THE ESTIMATES

1. The employment data derived are very rough approximations. It is virtually impossible to dissect the influence of an individual commodity in our complex economy with confidence in the results. The basic statistical materials at hand cover entire industries in which wheat is only one of many commodities involved. Considerable judgment is involved in allocating that part of employment attributable to wheat and its products. Notes are attached describing the procedure used.

2. The figures represent full-time equivalent man-years of employment. This understates very substantially the actual number of workers involved part time in the various stages of wheat production, processing, etc. For example, the latest estimates indicate about 1,300,000 farms produce wheat, compared with the 109,000 man-years of full-time employment on the farm allocated to wheat production. Similarly, in other stages, such as transportation and retailing, wheat and its products represent only a small fraction of the wide range of commodities handled.

3. The estimates cover employment directly concerned with wheat and its products. It should be noted that employment and purchasing power generated by activities related to wheat provides employment and purchasing power in still other industries, such as

the automobile industry. We have not been able to measure such indirect effects, but substantial additional employment would be involved.

4. The data are for the Nation as a whole. It should be noted that in some States, such as North Dakota, Kansas, and Montana, where wheat accounts for one-third or more of total cash farm receipts, the impact of wheat on the local economies is much greater than the data for the United States as a whole indicate.

5. It should also be noted that wheat is in a surplus situation. Stocks at the end of 1959 were 181 million bushels larger than at the beginning of the year. The increase in stocks amounted to 16 percent of all wheat marketed by farmers during the year. Thus, some of the employment, particularly employment on the farm and employment in storage activities, resulted from production and stocks of wheat in excess of requirements.

BACKGROUND MATERIALS

In 1959 wheat farmers marketed an estimated 1,131 million bushels of wheat, valued at close to $2 billion. About 44 percent of the wheat marketed was processed for food, 40 percent was exported, and most of the remainder moved into storage. Receipts from wheat constituted 6 percent of total cash receipts by farmers from the sale of all farm products. Wheat ranked sixth among all farm products in receipts from marketings, being exceeded by beef cattle, 23.8 percent; dairy products, 14 percent; hogs, 8.4 percent; chickens and eggs, 7.6 percent; and cotton, 7.8 percent. In the principal wheat-producing States receipts from the sale of wheat are substantially larger relative to total receipts from farm products, accounting for 37 percent of all cash receipts in North Dakota, 34 percent in Kansas, 33 percent in Montana, and 25 percent and 23 percent, respectively, in Oklahoma and Washington (table 1).

TABLE 1.—*Cash receipts from marketings of wheat, by States, 1959*

State	Cash receipts from sale of wheat [1]	Percent of total cash receipts from farm marketings
	Million	
Kansas	$398.3	33.7
North Dakota	200.3	36.6
Oklahoma	157.1	24.7
Montana	134.9	33.4
Nebraska	126.7	10.5
Washington	124.3	22.8
Texas	106.2	4.7
Colorado	85.4	14.4
Illinois	71.5	3.7
Idaho	67.1	16.2
Missouri	63.4	5.6
Michigan	60.0	8.5
Indiana	53.9	5.2
Ohio	53.1	5.6
Oregon	52.4	12.4
Minnesota	49.0	3.5
South Dakota	45.1	7.5
Pennsylvania	17.2	2.2
California	14.4	.5
North Carolina	12.0	1.2
New York	11.8	1.4
Wyoming	8.4	5.2
Virginia	8.2	1.9
New Mexico	6.6	2.6
Kentucky	6.6	1.2
Utah	6.4	4.0
Maryland	5.7	2.2
Arkansas	5.6	.8
South Carolina	5.3	1.5
Arizona	5.3	1.3
Iowa	4.8	.2
Tennessee	4.2	.8
Georgia	3.0	.4
New Jersey	2.3	.8
Wisconsin	2.2	.2
Alabama	1.8	.4
Louisiana	1.7	.4
Mississippi	1.3	.2
Delaware	1.2	1.1
Nevada	.9	1.8
West Virginia	.6	.6

[1] Includes loans under price-support activities.

Consumers in the United States spent over $4 billion in 1959 on wheat products, some 7 percent of total consumer expenditures for food. In our normal diet, wheat flour and cereal products, as now enriched, contribute 17 percent of the calories, 17 percent of the protein, 21 percent of iron and niacin, and 28 percent of the thiamine.

During calendar 1959, some 444 million bushels of wheat were exported, 40 percent of the total marketed by farmers. The value of wheat and wheat products moving into final use either domestically or abroad totaled over $5 billion, a little more than 1 percent of the gross national product. Thus, the share of wheat and wheat products in our national economy measured on a value or dollar basis is approximately the same as on an employment basis.

EMPLOYMENT ASSOCIATED WITH WHEAT PRODUCTION

Employment associated with the production of wheat, that is, before it moves into the various channels of distribution, consists of the direct labor of farm operators, family workers, and hired workers who perform the various operations on the farm, and the labor used to produce and distribute supplies and services used in the production of wheat. In 1959, an estimated 109,000 man-years of labor were employed directly in the production of wheat (table 2). Another 55,000 man-years of employment were estimated to be required in industries producing fertilizer, insecticides, tractors and other farm machinery and parts, fuel, and other goods and services used in the production of wheat.

TABLE 2.—*Employment provided by wheat production, 1959*

Industry	Estimated employment (man-years)
Farming (direct labor)	109,000
Supply and service industries:	
1. Chemicals, fertilizers, pesticides	3,700
2. Machinery parts, fuel, and electric energy	4,900
3. Miscellaneous repair services and maintenance construction	7,600
4. Wholesale retail trade, railroad and truck transportation	24,200
5. New machinery (tractor, trucks, other)	8,200
6. New construction	6,700
Total number of employees dependent on wheat directly on farms and in the supplying industries	164,300

EMPLOYMENT ASSOCIATED WITH PROCESSING

From the farm, wheat moves into the various broad marketing channels shown in chart I. The activities of storing, processing, and distribution require substantial labor inputs to place the wheat or products made from wheat through the channels of trade and into the hands of final users.

Employment associated with the processing of wheat or wheat products in 1959 is estimated at about 360,000 man-years. The bulk of such employment, 319,000, was in the manufacture of bread and related products, biscuits and crackers, and flour and meal (table 3).

TABLE 3.—*Employment associated with processing of wheat and wheat products, 1959*

Industry	Estimated employment (man-years)
Biscuits and crackers	42,100
Bread and related products	251,800
Macaroni and spaghetti	6,700
Cereal breakfast foods	3,600
Flour and meal	25,600
Flour mixes	4,600
Meat animals	9,800
Poultry and eggs	13,000
Prepared mill feed	2,800
Total	360,000

EMPLOYMENT ASSOCIATED WITH STORAGE, TRANSPORTATION, AND DISTRIBUTION

The functions of storing, transporting, exporting, and distributing wheat and wheat products required an estimated 344,000 man-years of employment in the United States in 1959. Employment in retail trade—retail bakeries, grocery stores, and eating places accounted for about 226,000, or almost two-thirds of the total (table 4).

TABLE 4.—*Employment associated with storing, transporting, and distributing wheat and wheat products, 1959*

Function	Estimated employment (man-years)
Country elevators	8,500
Terminal elevators and wholesale trade (grain)	4,600
Transportation (including exports in American ships)	54,900
Wholesaling (wheat products)	33,800
Retailing (grocery, restaurant, and retail bakery)	225,600
Other (building)	16,300
Total	343,700

EMPLOYMENT ASSOCIATED WITH FEDERAL GOVERNMENT ACTIVITIES

Activities of the Federal Government relating to wheat, such as research, pest control, crop insurance, loans, marketing, and inspection, involve the equivalent of about 8,000 man-years. More than two-thirds of the employment relates to the commodity stabilization programs, such as the price support loan and storage activities and the soil bank program.

No estimates are available as to employment related to wheat at the State and county levels.

NOTES ON SOURCES OF DATA AND METHODS USED

1. Employment associated with wheat production

The estimated man-hours of farm labor used in the production of wheat are from unpublished estimates of the Cost, Income, and Efficiency Research Branch, ARS. Estimated employment in supply industries is based on data obtained from the 1954 Census of Manufacturers and unpublished reports of the Agricultural Industrial Relations Study, 1955, AMS.

Direct labor requirements for the production of wheat were obtained by applying estimated average man-hour requirements for preharvest and harvest operations to estimated acres of wheat planted and harvested, as reported by the Agricultural Estimates Division, AMS. Estimated man-hour requirements per acre were obtained from studies made by various Federal and State agencies.

The producers' value of inputs from the major supplying industries into wheat farms in 1955 as obtained from the Agricultural-Industrial Relations Study were converted to total inputs in terms of man-hours of employment on the basis of the ratio of total employment to the value of output in these industries as reported in the 1954 Census of Manufacturers. These were then adjusted for productivity changes in the wheat sector and the supplying sectors and extrapolated to 1959 on the basis of wheat production in that year.

2. Employment associated with processing

Estimated employment in 1959 in the major industries processing wheat was obtained from the 1958 Census of Manufacturers and extrapolated to 1959 on the basic of changes in employment reported for the bakery products and grain mill products industries in Employment and Earnings, Annual Supplement, BLS, May 1960. For biscuits and crackers, bread and bakery products, macaroni and spaghetti, and flour

mixes, 100 percent of reported employment was assumed to be dependent on wheat. Employment in other industries allocable to wheat was based on the estimated ratio of value of wheat inputs to total grain inputs into those industries in 1955.

EMPLOYMENT ASSOCIATED WITH STORAGE, TRANSPORTATION, AND DISTRIBUTION

(a) Country elevators and terminals: Total employment in these facilities was derived by multiplying the estimated quantities handled by estimated labor cost per unit and dividing by an estimated average annual wage paid to employees engaged at these facilities. Data on the volume of wheat handled were obtained from unpublished reports of AMS; those on unit labor costs from a survey of storage and handling costs conducted by the CSS.

Also included in the total employment figures for these facilities were employees engaged in new construction. These were estimated on the basis of unpublished AMS data relating to labor costs and CSS reports of new facilities approved under the Uniform Grain Storage Agreement.

(b) Transportation: Estimates of employees engaged in transportation of wheat were based on data from Wage Statistics of Class I Railroads, 1958, ICC; Maritime Manpower Report, 1958, U.S. Maritime Commission, and a study of tonnage of wheat and wheat products moved by truck in the north central region. In general, total employment attributable to domestic transportation of wheat by rail and water was derived by applying an estimate of the ratio of wheat tonnage to total tonnage of all shipments, to the estimated total number of employees engaged in rail and water transportation. Employment in trucking was based on an estimate of the ratio of truck movement of wheat to rail movements as indicated by the study of truck movement of wheat in the north-central region.

Transportation abroad: Employment associated with the transportation of wheat to foreign ports in U.S.-flag vessels was estimated on the basis of shipments under Public Law 480, section 402 of the mutual security program and cash sales. Ocean transportation cost and volume data were obtained from fiscal records of CSS. Employment estimates were derived by converting volume of wheat shipped to number of ships required to move such volume and multiplying by an estimated average number of seaman and loading and service workers per ship.

Wholesale trade: Estimated employment in wholesale trade in industries associated with wheat is based on the estimated number of employees and employers reported for merchant wholesalers, manufacturers, sales branches and offices, and agents and brokers reported in the 1954 Census of Wholesalers. Benchmark totals for 1954 were extrapolated to 1959 on the basis of the change in output in such industries from 1954 to 1959.

Retail trade: Total employment in retail establishments dependent on wheat and related products was based on employment data reported in the 1958 Census of Retail Trade. The total number of employees reported for retail bakeries was assumed to be completely dependent on wheat. For grocery stores, an estimated 9 percent of all employees was allocated to wheat and wheat products, based on the assumption that wheat-related employment was proportional to sales of wheat and wheat products in retail grocery stores. Wheat-related employment in eating and drinking places and, hay, feed, and grain stores was derived on the basis of the ratio of the value of wheat and wheat products purchased to total materials purchased by such establishments, as shown by the 1947 BLS Interindustry Relations Study.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to my distinguished colleague from Ohio, and ask unanimous consent that it not be taken out of the time on the resolution.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, several times during this so-called bobtail session of the Congress I have suggested that a serious mistake would be committed unless Congress passed legislation giving the Secretary of State discretionary powers within the mandate declared by the Supreme Court of the United States regarding the issuance of passports.

In 1958 the Supreme Court rendered a decision which completely removed from the Secretary of State any control over the right to deny passports regardless of the character of the individual who applies for one. It has been pointed out that Communists can apply for passports and obtain them. They can go to the Soviet and deliver to Moscow whatever information they desire. The Secretary of State can do nothing about such practices.

We have been in session since August 8. Several times this subject has been discussed on the floor of the Senate, and yet nothing has been done toward presenting a bill for discussion, and thus affording Senators an opportunity to pass upon it.

I am a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, before which bills are pending. A representative of the Communist League of the United States appeared before that committee and protested against the passage of the bill. The representatives of other agencies which are not strictly within the same category appeared to testify.

The bill has not yet been reported out of committee. There is one bill on the calendar which deals with the same subject that has not been called up for consideration.

I should like to make this query of my associates in the Senate. A bill subsidizing the mining of zinc and lead was called up for discussion, debate, and was finally passed. Compared with the proposed bill on passports, of what significance to the safety of the Nation has a bill to subsidize the lead and the zinc mining industries?

With due respect to my colleague from the State of Michigan [Mr. HART], he has had brought before the Senate for consideration a resolution on which there will be 3 hours of debate, and which contemplates a request that the President of the United States not make appointments to the Supreme Court during the recess.

I shall not argue about the propriety of the proposal of the Senator from Michigan, but I do ask this question. For more than 150 years there has been no such resolution or proposal made. What is the emergency nature of such a proposal? What has happened that the question should now be considered so seriously, and requiring treatment in this special session, while the bill to which I referred dealing with Communists remains at sleep, with nothing being done about it?

Some explanation will have to be made to the question of why we gave the utmost of consideration to matters that could have waited until next January, and yet we declined to listen to the plea of the Secretary of State, who repeatedly has said, "I need this legislation. Please pass it."

What tremendous power is operating upon the Senate? Who is it that possesses the influence to see to it that such bill is not brought up for consideration?

I wish to commend the Senator from Nebraska for his effort to get the bill before the Senate. I observe he has not succeeded up to this time.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me, and I shall yield him a couple of additional minutes if necessary?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. The distinguished Senator from Nebraska brought this subject to our attention very forcibly.

On Friday, August 26, I placed in the RECORD a letter from the Acting Secretary of State, Douglas Dillon, which emphatically asked for passport legislation at this session, and said this was a matter of the utmost concern. Under Secretary of State Dillon indicated that there is a clear and present danger to this country unless we enact this proposed legislation to give him some authority in this field.

There is on the calendar a bill which is Calendar No. 1881, Senate bill 2652. This bill was introduced by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] and myself jointly and has been reported out of the Committee on the Judiciary. Long hearings dealing with this problem were held and, as I said on the floor, if the bill needs amendment, if it does not give enough rights to the individuals affected, we can take whatever action is necessary on the floor of the Senate to improve it.

The bill deals not only with the problem stated by the Senator from Ohio, but several others to meet the Communist menace in this country in, I believe, an effective but fair, realistic, objective, and judicial manner.

I am very happy that the distinguished Senator from Ohio has called attention to the necessity for this proposed legislation today, and it is my earnest hope that we shall be able to consider it before the session ends.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I am sorry that I was not present last Friday when the Senator from New York made his presentation on this subject. What he has stated reemphasizes the proposal that I have submitted to the Senate. How can the Senate consider as important many of the subjects that have come before us, while at the same time, in effect, declare as unimportant a bill about which the Secretary of State has said the failure of adoption would constitute a danger and a menace to our country?

We have been waiting 3 years. No action has been taken. I wish to repeat again that the headman of the Communist association of the United States testified. I was present. He testified that the bill should not be passed, because the right to travel is just as sacred as the right to worship God, the right to enjoy free speech, a jury trial, freedom

of assembly, and all the other rights declared in the Constitution. To him we listen. To the Secretary of State we turn a deaf ear. That is about the sum and substance of the whole matter. [Applause in the galleries.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The occupants of the galleries will refrain from any manifestations.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, am I correct in understanding that we are now proceeding under a limitation of time for debate on the unfinished business, the resolution opposing the making of recess appointments to the Supreme Court?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; but another unanimous-consent request has been entered into, eliminating the present portion of the debate from the operation of that limitation.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 3313) to amend section 200 of the Soldiers and Sailors Civil Relief Act of 1940 to permit the establishment of certain facts by a declaration under penalty of perjury in lieu of an affidavit.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10960) to amend section 5701 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the excise tax upon cigars; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MILLS, Mr. FORAND, Mr. KING of California, Mr. MASON, and Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12536) relating to the treatment of charges for local advertising for purposes of determining the manufacturers sale price; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MILLS, Mr. FORAND, Mr. KING of California, Mr. MASON, and Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12659) to suspend for a temporary period the import duty on heptanoic acid; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MILLS, Mr. FORAND, Mr. KING of California, Mr. MASON, and Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954, RELATING TO EXCISE TAX ON CIGARS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10960) to amend section 5701 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the excise tax upon cigars, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. TALMADGE. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. KERR, Mr. FREAR, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, and Mr. CARLSON conferees on the part of the Senate.

TREATMENT OF CHARGES FOR LOCAL ADVERTISING FOR PURPOSES OF DETERMINING THE MANUFACTURERS SALE PRICE

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12536) relating to the treatment of charges for local advertising for purposes of determining the manufacturers sale price, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. TALMADGE. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. KERR, Mr. FREAR, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, and Mr. CARLSON conferees on the part of the Senate.

TEMPORARY SUSPENSION OF IMPORT DUTY ON HEPTANOIC ACID

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12659) to suspend for a temporary period the import duty on heptanoic acid, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. TALMADGE. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to, and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. KERR, Mr. FREAR, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, and Mr. CARLSON managers on the part of the Senate.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, may we have a brief explanation of the matters involved?

Mr. TALMADGE. In the three cases just acted on amendments were added in the Senate on Saturday night. The House has asked for a conference. I have moved that the Senate insist on its amendments, agree to the conference requested by the House, and that the Chair appoint conferees.

FOREIGN SERVICE ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1960—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2633) to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report. (For conference report, see House proceedings of August 29, 1960, pp. 18164–18170, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a brief explanation of the conference report on S. 2633. I hope the conference report will be agreed to.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPLANATION OF CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 2633

I should like to speak briefly in explanation of the conference report on S. 2633, the Foreign Service Act Amendments of 1960.

The Senate passed S. 2633 a year ago on September 9, 1959. The Senate bill made numerous changes in the administration of the Foreign Service and the Department of State. A new class structure for Foreign Service staff personnel was provided. The Foreign Service retirement and disability system was liberalized in conformity with the civil service retirement system. Improvements were made in the recruitment and training of Foreign Service officers. Functional and geographic area specification by Foreign Service officers was encouraged. An increase in the authorization of appropriations for the Foreign Service buildings fund was approved.

On August 22, 1960, the House passed S. 2633 with amendments. Most of these amendments were of a technical perfecting nature and for the most part were readily acceptable to the Senate conferees.

There were six matters of greater substance which were in disagreement.

1. REVISION OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE STAFF CLASS STRUCTURE

The Senate bill would have decreased the number of classes for staff personnel from 22 to 10. Classes 15 through 22 under the present structure have not been used for a number of years. The smaller number of classes would rationalize administration of the staff corps.

The House bill eliminated this revision of the staff class structure. The conferees agreed that owing to the recent 7½-percent pay increase the proposed salary levels in the revised class structure ought to be reexamined and the conferees expect that the Department will submit legislation next year for consideration.

2. AUTHORIZATION OF 15-PERCENT EXTRA PAY FOR COURIERS

The Senate version of S. 2633 would have permitted the Secretary to establish rates of extra pay for couriers not to exceed 15 percent of their basic salary. This was justified on an analogy to the various kinds of hazardous duty in the armed services which is compensated for by extra pay. The House bill eliminated the provision. The conferees agreed to its deletion pending further study.

3. AUTHORIZATION OF A WASHINGTON HOUSING ALLOWANCE FOR FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS

The Senate bill authorized a modest differential to be applied to the basic salary of Foreign Service officers assigned to duty in the United States, according to the number of their dependents. This provision was designed to give the same kind of financial help to Foreign Service officers assigned to Washington as has long been given to military officers in the same circumstances. The housing allowance is necessary because Foreign Service officers spend the greater part of their careers overseas and when they come to Washington for relatively short periods they have many additional expenses largely related to housing. The House bill eliminated this housing allowance.

The House conferees agreed on the desirability of a Washington housing allowance for Foreign Service officers, but the conference gave careful consideration to the opposition to such an allowance which has been expressed by the members of the House Appropriations Committee and by the Bureau of the Budget. While discussing this opposition a message was received by the conferees from the Department of State indicating that the President might veto S. 2633 if the housing allowance stayed in the bill. The conferees greatly resented this unwarranted interference in the legislative process. In view, however, of the apparent lack of understanding of the need for a Washington housing allowance, the conferees reluctantly decided to eliminate the provision rather than jeopardize other important advances which would be secured by the bill.

4. AUTHORIZATION OF INCENTIVE PAY FOR LEARNING ESOTERIC FOREIGN LANGUAGES

The Senate bill authorized the Secretary of State to provide special monetary incentives to encourage the acquisition or retention of proficiency in esoteric foreign languages or other special abilities needed in the Foreign Service. The House bill eliminated this provision. The Senate conferees persuaded the House conferees that the extra push which this provision would give to the Department's accelerated programs of language training would be helpful. The inclusion of this incentive provision complements another provision of the bill according to which the Secretary of State is required to designate every Foreign Service officer position in a foreign country, the incumbent of which should have a useful knowledge of the language of the country. After a 5-year period to allow for increased training in a foreign language, such designated position can be filled only by a qualified linguist. The conferees believe that the achievement of such a high standard of competence is already overdue.

5. ELIMINATION OF FREE OFFICIAL SERVICES TO AMERICAN VESSELS AND SEAMEN

The Senate bill would amend existing laws which now prohibit charging of fees by consular officers for official services to American vessels and seamen. The conferees were of the opinion that the establishing of a reasonable schedule of fees for such services is appropriate, but also felt that it would be more appropriate to have this subject handled in separate legislation.

6. INCREASE IN AUTHORIZATION FOR FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICE SPACE

The Senate version of S. 2633 would have increased by $100 million (of which $50 million was in foreign currencies) the appropriations authorized for the purpose of erecting office buildings and other buildings needed by U.S. missions overseas. The House bill eliminated this increased authorization. The conferees decided that further study ought to be given to the Department's proposed 5-year buildings program before the full program is authorized. They agreed upon an increase in the authorization of $10 million, an amount which it was felt would enable the current program to continue without interruption.

I believe that this product of the conference which I have described is an excellent one. I believe that the changes in the Foreign Service contained in the bill will, if they are administered wisely by the Department of State, help to achieve a better quality of representation of the U.S. interests abroad.

I hope that the conference report on S. 2633 will be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

THE CONGO AND POLICY TOWARD THE NEW AFRICA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, hopes rise and fall with respect to developments in the Congo. A road to an orderly and progressive future for that region opens one day only to be blocked the next by seemingly insurmountable obstacles. The problems of the Congolese transition are dumped suddenly on the United Nations to the tune of universal acclamation. Just as suddenly discordant notes are injected into the tune.

It is late in the day of this Congress to raise a question of this kind. I do so, however, because almost imperceptibly but deeply and rapidly, this Government is moving into involvement in the affairs of the Congo and Africa. Acts of the Senate are a factor in this trend in policy and, hence, the Senate shares responsibility for the form which the trend assumes. I would note in this connection that we have recently approved an increase in the President's contingency fund of $100 million and that this amount was sought by him in anticipation of needs in the Congo and elsewhere in Africa. Since we do have a responsibility, it behooves us to see as clearly as we are able the essentials of the situation which exists on the African Continent and to consider the course which we are pursuing.

Let me say at the outset that the conduct of African policy for the past few years by the President, the Secretary of State, and Mr. Lodge at the United Nations, in my opinion, deserves the support of the Senate. They have acted with insight and dispatch in dealing with a most uncertain situation.

It is no criticism of them to note that, of late, the waters of African affairs and particularly those in the Congo have become more turbulent.

What is taking place in the Congo may spread to other parts of the African Continent. Indeed, in the last few days the short-lived unity of Senegal and the Soudan Republic in the Mali Federation has threatened to come apart in factional dispute.

In short, we are likely to be in for a protracted period of difficulties in Africa. It is not easy to define the sources of these difficulties even though it is essential for the Senate to make the effort. Africa, from the point of view of our comprehension, is a new continent. It has burst upon our awareness suddenly, after having been shut off almost entirely by barriers of nature and the closed doors of colonial enclaves. What we need to know now for effective policies is not to be derived from the old travel books on Africa and the attitudes which they induced. It is the emergent Africa, the Africa of today and, even more important, the Africa of tomorrow which we must seek to fathom. For it is to this new Africa that we must address our policies.

It will be some time before the channels of objective information and skilled interpretation become fully adequate to this need. What pours out of Africa today is a confusing mixture of fact and fancy, of the sober and the sensational, of what is past and what is yet to be. However, there is a constant improvement in the flow of information as American reporters, writers and scholars converge on the African Continent and a network of American Embassies develops in the new Republics.

COLONIALISM

Some of the significant realities have already come into sharper focus. The first and most important of these is that European colonialism as a system of government is fast disappearing. At the end of World War II, there were four independent nations in Africa. Now, there are 24. By the end of the year, two more former colonies will become independent. Four African nations, including South Africa, signed the U.N. Charter in 1945. Ten African States are now members; 14 are likely to become members in the very near future.

It is clear that colonialism is rapidly disappearing as a political system in Africa. What is not so clear but what may be of even greater significance is that colonialism as a political propellant has not yet left the scene. The word still has the capacity to evoke a militant nationalism, and even racism, in Africans. Its capacity in this respect may increase before it begins to decrease. That is likely to be the case so long as any part of the African Continent remains under alien jurisdiction. It is likely to be the case so long as any independent nation of Africa, now dominated by European settlers, has still to evolve a workable system of government under which the peoples of varying races can live together in a reasonable acceptance of one another. It is likely to be the case until a free Africa persuades itself that it is a full and equal participant in the general affairs of the world.

The persistence of this political propellant may or may not be valid in logic. What matters from the point of view of

policy, however, is that it exists in fact and it is likely to continue to exist for some time. A policy which, in concept or administration, ignores its existence rests upon a most fragile foundation.

POLITICAL INSTABILITY

Beyond the persistence of the factor of colonialism, there are other political realities in the African situation with which our policies must reckon. It is now apparent that the stability of the colonial system was imposed from without at the price of a large measure of social atrophy within Africa. The basic mode of existence for great numbers of Africans today differs little from the pattern of an earlier time with its multiple tribes; multiple languages; multiple customs, values, and superstitions. Furthermore, the political boundaries which colonialism drew in Africa were more a consequence of power adjustments among the European nations rather than expressions of natural divisions and of human forces within Africa itself. Yet it is within these boundaries that African nations, today, are emerging into independence.

I do not make these observations in criticism. What is past is past and cannot be undone. I point to these factors because they are significant in the unstable situation with which our policies must deal during this period of transition in Africa. There will be strong pressures to pull apart the outwardly imposed political unities and to revert to the schismatic earlier pattern. The sophisticated nationalism of a handful of African leaders will not easily be transferred to the many. These leaders themselves will have to search for ways to reorder boundaries into new political units, knowing as they do the requirements for a durable statehood in the modern world. To a considerable extent this search can be fruitful and beneficial. Other consequences, however, may also be anticipated if the search becomes aggressive or if African leaders pursue concepts of pan-Africanism on the basis of a militant racism.

AFRICAN LEADERSHIP AND MODERN SKILLS

That brings me, Mr. President, to still another significant factor in the African situation with which we must deal in policy. To a degree perhaps unparalleled since the revolutions of independence in the Americas, the great political transition in Africa depends upon a handful of trained and experienced leaders. And unlike the simple world of the Americas at an earlier time, Africa is being propelled, in independence, into the modern world of instant communications, missiles, nuclear power and complex bureaucratic organization.

Few Africans have been introduced as apprentices and, even fewer as managerial participants in the affairs of the modern state, the modern economy, and the modern world. Yet many must learn rapidly if, to the bare bones of independence, there is to be added the sinews of economic and political organization which will give that independence beneficial meaning and durability for the people of Africa. The problem is not simply one of replacing the European colonial bureaucracies, with U.N. or other bureaucracies and, then, with an African bureaucracy in the same form. However much replacements of this kind may be unavoidable for the present, the deeper problem is the development of responsible African government and responsible African management to guide the African peoples into a way of life suited to their needs and, at the same time, capable of peaceful, free and constructive cooperation in the general progress of mankind.

The task which confronts an emerging Africa is monumental. Much will depend on an understanding and patient hand from the rest of the world. But even more will depend upon the dedication, the wisdom and the realistic restraint of those few Africans who are now assuming the reins of political power. They, more than anyone else, will make the decisions which set the patterns, for better or for worse, for the new way of life in Africa.

OUTSIDE INFLUENCES

I turn now, Mr. President, to the last significant factor in the African situation with which I wish to deal at this time. I have already noted that Africa's future is partially dependent on an understanding and patient assist from the rest of the world. There appears to be a great, a universal eagerness to lend a hand in Africa. We see it clearly in the Soviet Union and China. We see it clearly in Cairo. We see it clearly in Europe. We see it clearly in this country and in the United Nations.

What we do not yet see clearly is the nature of this hand. Certainly there is a human and sincere desire—and I am sure it exists among the people of all countries—to help those who for too long have been cut off from equal participation in the mainstream of human civilization. But is that all there is in the extended hands? Is there not also a certain eagerness to project into Africa the many ramifications of the cold war and other power rivalries which now plague the rest of the world?

The field is wide open for that game at the moment. Africa is in transition and its leadership has only limited experience. But transitions are not forever and those who have learned the way to national independence are equipped to learn other matters. Most important, I believe the emerging African peoples have had enough of the role of pawns moved on the chessboards of others. They will not meekly assume that role again and they will react against those who seek to return them to it.

It may be too much to expect but it is not too much to attempt to insulate an emergent Africa from the international, political, and ideological storms which now sweep the rest of the world. In any event, I believe that policies, in concept or administration, which deliberately seek to project these storms into Africa will redound neither to the benefit of the African nations nor even to the long-range interests of those nations which pursue them.

THE SITUATION IN THE CONGO

The factors which I have been discussing and with which our policies respecting Africa must contend are to be found to a greater or lesser degree throughout that continent. And they are of intense significance in the immediate crisis in the Congo. The propellant of colonialism still drives people in that region to militant action despite the fact that independence has been achieved, despite the fact that the Belgians are in rapid withdrawal as U.N. forces enter the situation. Furthermore, as the colonial system has been progressively dismantled, the outward political unity which this system created faces rising centrifugal pressures, not only in Katanga and Kasai but elsewhere in that huge land. Also in evidence in the Congo is the countergroping of pan-Africanism to which I have already alluded; unfortunately, I may add, it has already taken on some dangerous racial overtones in the expression of differing attitudes toward U.N. forces supplied by African nations and those from elsewhere. In the Congo, too, is to be found an enormous gap between the immediate need for skilled Africans in government and management and the extremely limited supply. In the Congo, finally, we see the helping hand from the rest of the world extended in sincere understanding of the difficulties confronting this new nation but also with the muscles of the external power-rivalries flexing here and there in an eagerness to plunge into the inviting situation.

U.S. INTERESTS

If we are to deal effectively in policy not only with the situation in the Congo but, in truth, with developments throughout Africa, we must not only see our interests clearly but we must pursue those interests in the light of significant factors of the kind I have been discussing today. Our interests are not hard to define. They arise, first and foremost from the universal implications of the historic American doctrines of freedom. And men and women in Africa, today, are striving for freedom and its meaning for them. They may struggle awkwardly and ineptly, perhaps, and sometimes even blindly but, nevertheless, the struggle is authentic.

Furthermore, American citizens have modest, cultural, and commercial ties with Africa and the prospects for the improvement of the ties are good as Africa develops in freedom. These, too, constitute American interests.

Finally, we have an interest in human progress in peace in Africa. We have that interest in part because we cannot, and no people worthy of the name human can, close eyes to the desperate travails of a vast segment of the human family. We have it, too, because the peaceful progress of Africa is interrelated with the peace of the people of this Nation in this second half of the 20th century. We have this interest because if Africa can progress in freedom and peace, it will spare us the extension of the costly trappings of the cold war to still another continent.

FRAMEWORK FOR U.S. POLICY

What, then, do these interests suggest as a proper course of policy for this Nation? I do not believe that they suggest that we plunge headlong into the turbulent troubles of Africa with eager dollars, with unsolicited advice, with an indiscriminate outpouring of new military and economic aid programs wherever takers may be found. It should be obvious, now, on the basis of experience elsewhere that this approach can guarantee neither to dispel Africa's troubles nor to exorcise communism from that continent. Equally, Mr. President, we must resist the easy temptation to pass off the difficulties in Africa as of little import to this Nation. In short, our important but limited interests suggests that we do not assume the role of either first or last among equals in our approach to Africa but that we take our place as true equals among outsiders while Africa develops within, under its own leadership and in accord with its own genius. This view presupposes a major effort of assistance by the United Nations, as Africans need it, seek it, and can use it. But I hasten to add that that supposition is not the same as the glib slogan: "Let the United Nations do it."

With all due respect to Mr. Hammarskjold, a brilliant and dedicated man, the fact is that what needs to be done in Africa will not be done unless the policies of this Government and others and, most of all, the leadership of the new Africa permit it to be done.

PRINCIPLES OF A U.S. POLICY ON AFRICA

We cannot answer for others in this connection, but we can look to our own policies on Africa and their administration. In the light of the analysis which I have attempted today, I would suggest that our policies must flow from the following principles:

First. This Nation should give its support, diplomatically and otherwise, to the end that independence and human equality will eventually be achieved throughout Africa. Our support must go, as it has begun to go under this administration, to those who work soberly in Africa for these ends. May I say, in all candor, that this principle grows easier to maintain with consistency and dynamism as the nations of Europe with whom we are associated in other matters increasingly espouse it in their own African policies. The difficulties, however, are great and will remain great in those areas in Africa of heavy European settlement, and I do not wish to make light of the task of those who must conduct our policies affecting those areas.

It seems to me particularly important that this principle find expression in the character and conduct of our expanding network of embassies in the new African Republics. I hope that these establishments will be kept modest in size and character. I hope, further, that our official representatives will seek a fresh and full understanding of the situations which they encounter, based upon direct and broad contact with the peoples of these new nations. I hope, finally, that these embassies will be conducted in a manner which reflects the simple good will of this Nation toward the new Republics of Africa and our sympathetic appreciation of their struggles. In sum, it seems to me of the utmost importance that now, at the beginnings of contact with the new Africa, our official representation be kept free of those characteristics which would invite a deflection of the political propellant of colonialism to this Nation.

Second. In the absence of overriding considerations to the contrary, this Nation should use whatever influence it can against a centrifugal fragmentation of existing political units in Africa. However powerful the divisive forces of an ancient tribalism may still be, they are the forces of the dying Africa; they are not the strengths of the Africa that is struggling to come into being. May I say that to hold to this principle is not to stand against adjustments in present political boundaries. Such adjustments are to be anticipated and are to be encouraged if they lead to more practical political and economic units. We should resist these tendencies, however if they derive either from a narrow tribalism or a sweeping racist pan-Africanism.

I realize that these particular problems must be dealt with primarily by the African peoples themselves. There is every indication, however, that the United Nations may be drawn increasingly into them. Since that is the probability, we must be prepared to exert our influence affirmatively in that organization and, in other ways, on the side of modern political progress in Africa.

Third. We should recognize that the hopes for freedom and progress in Africa during this period of transition depend, perhaps, more on the caliber of men than on the forms of governments and we should lend a most understanding ear to those African leaders who, with sincerity, personal dedication and realism seek to move their nations forward.

We must learn, quickly, as much as we can about the emergent African leadership and, if we are to learn accurately, we will eschew such inapplicable frames of reference as pro-Communist or pro-Western. The leadership that matters for the future of Africa will be neither one nor the other. It will be pro-African in the finest sense of the term in that it will be dedicated to the welfare of its own peoples and will drive soberly but relentlessly to increase their capacity for survival and expression in the modern world.

Fourth. We should join with all nations so inclined in an effort to lend a genuinely helpful hand to the vast needs of Africa for training in modern skills and for prompt economic and social development.

If Africa is to make the most of this help, and if the rest of the world is to gain from it in terms of peace, then it seems to me that this help must go to Africa free of any extension—expressed or implied—of the power conflicts and rivalries which divide the world. The challenge of Africa is not a call to greater propoganda battles between us and the Soviet Union. The challenge of Africa is to the world. It is a challenge to help open in peace the doors of modern life for the peoples of Africa, for their benefit and for the still unfathomed benefits which may flow to mankind from that opening.

SPECIFICS OF A U.S. POLICY

If we accept this as the deeper challenge of Africa then it seems to me that we must begin to seek agreement through our policies, in the U.N. and elsewhere, on the following points:

First. That all requests for military training missions and military aid from the African nations henceforth be referred to the United Nations and that such missions, as approved by the Security Council, be supplied solely under the aegis of the U.N.; further, that existing military aid missions in Africa be converted into U.N. missions at the request of any independent African nation and, as rapidly as possible.

Second. That the United States seek agreement with the Soviet Union to the end that both nations shall refrain from seeking military bases in Africa and from sending military forces to any part of Africa except as the Security Council may direct; further, that existing bases of either nation in Africa be closed out in due course and any military forces of either nation on the African Continent be withdrawn as the Security Council may direct.

Third. That the United Nations effort in the Congo, and similar efforts which may be required and sought elsewhere in Africa, henceforth be financed by a four-quarter fund: One-quarter supplied by the United States; one-quarter by the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe acting, as willing, in concert; one-quarter by Western Europe acting, as willing, in concert; and one-quarter by the other members of the United Nations.

Fourth. That the four-quarter fund be used, further, as the principal instrument for financing a substantial program of technical aid to Africa, to be pursued predominantly through an expansion of educational and training facilities in that continent, with technicians and teachers supplied on a similar four-quarter division, under the general direction of the U.N. Secretary General; and further, as this effort comes into operation, that bilateral assistance by all nations in Africa be progressively curtailed.

Mr. President, my principal interest today has been to explore the limits of our proper concern in the unfolding situation in Africa. The difficulty which confronts our policy is not only that we may do too little but that we may be impelled to do too much and in ill-adapted ways and, hence, contribute to the creation on the African Continent of still another front in the cold war. We shall not be thanked by the Africans if that is the effect of our contribution regard-

less of its size and our good intentions. Nor will we serve the interests of this Nation by enlarging the already costly trappings of the cold war—notably, military and political aid, propaganda dissemination and increased defense expenditures—if it can be avoided.

I do not know if it will be possible to bring into being the beginnings of a constructive and cooperative approach to Africa along the lines of the suggestions which I have advanced. There is little ground for sanguine expectations. Nevertheless, I believe we should make, in policy, an effort of this kind. We should make it with all diligence and in all sincerity. We should make it in our own interests, in the interests of the emergent African peoples, and in the interests of the peace of the world.

If I may add a few words by way of summary of the needs of U.S. policy on Africa at this time, I would like to stress that the emphasis of our approach should be based on the following: First, we should encourage the African leaders to assume responsibilities for themselves and seek to minimize the involvement of ourselves and the rest of the world in the African situation; second, to the extent that aid from the outside is brought to bear on the African situation, it should be supplied on a multilateral basis; third, aid from the outside should take the form, largely, of educational assistance designed to create in Africa as rapidly as possible a full system of primary and secondary schools and institutions of higher learning; and I would suggest that the aid be given on the spot, as far as possible, with the device of student and leadership exchanges used most sparingly. This device is relatively slow and costly and, despite its great virtues in other situations, it is not necessarily well suited to the African situation where the first need is for a rapid and massive expansion in educational facilities.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a geographical and historical table relative to the present situation in Africa, and also a speech entitled "Africa—the Beginnings of Policy," which I delivered on the floor of the Senate on June 8, 1956.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Nation or territory	Population	Present Political Status	Year of independence	Prior jurisdiction	Planned changes of status	U.N. status
Algeria	10,000,000	Administered as part of France.				
Angola and Cabinda	4,200,000	Portuguese Overseas Province.				
Basutoland	642,000	British High Commission territory in southern Africa. Controlled by Commonwealth Relations Office, not the Colonial Office.		Claimed by South Africa		
Bechuanaland	300,000	British protectorate which is also one of the High Commission Territories in southern Africa.				
British Cameroons	1,500,000	U.N. trust territory			Plebiscites early in 1961 to future.	
Cameroon	3,300,000	Independent republic	1960	U.N. trust territory (France).		Membership anticipated.
Central African Federation		Self-governing territory of Southern Rhodesia protectorates of Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland.			1961, constitutional review	
Southern Rhodesia	2,600,000					
Northern Rhodesia	2,300,000					
Nyasaland	2,700,000					
Central African Republic (Ubangi-Shari).	2,600,000	Independent republic within French community.	1960			Do.
Chad	2,600,000	Independent republic within French community.	1960			Do.
Congo Republic	750,000	do	1960			Do.
Dahomey	1,700,000	do	1960			Do.
Eritrea	1,000,000	Federated with Ethiopia under Ethiopian Crown since 1952.		Italy		
Ethiopia	18,000,000	Independent				Member.
French Somaliland	68,000	French territory			Early independence unlikely	
Gabon	400,000	Independent republic within French community.	1960			Membership anticipated.
Gambia	275,000	British colony and protectorate			Self-government	
Ghana	4,500,000	Independent republic within the British Commonwealth.	1957	United Kingdom		Member.
Guinea	2,500,000	Independent	1958	France		Do.
Ifni	40,000	Spanish province administered from Madrid			Its future has been a subject of discussion with Morocco.	
Ivory Coast	3,300,000	Independent republic within French community.	1960			Membership anticipated.
Kenya	6,800,000	British colony and protectorate			Africans to secure a majority in legislative council within foreseeable future.	
Liberia	1,000,000	Independent	1847			Member.
Libya	1,000,000	do	1962	Italy		Do.
Malagasy Republic	5,000,000	Independent republic within French community.	1960			Membership anticipated.
Mali Federation (Senegal and Soudan).	6,000,000	do	1960			Do.
Mauritania	650,000	Autonomous republic within the French community.			Expected to become fully independent within French community, November 1960. (Claimed by Morocco as part of its kingdom.)	
Morocco	10,000,000	Independent	1956	Spain and France		Member.
Mozambique	5,700,000	Portuguese oversea province				
Niger	2,500,000	Independent republic within French community.	1960			Membership anticipated.
Nigeria	35,000,000	Self-governing colony within the British Commonwealth.		United Kingdom	Fully independent member of the Commonwealth Oct. 1, 1960.	Do.
Portuguese Guinea	511,000	Portuguese oversea territory				
Republic of the Congo	13,300,000	Independent	1960			Do.
Ruanda-Urindi	4,500,000	Belgian-administered territory			Eventual independence, but now complicated by Congo situation.	
Sao Tome and Principe (island)	60,000	Portuguese oversea territories				
Sierra Leone	2,500,000	Self-governing colony within the British Commonwealth.			Becomes fully independent within Commonwealth on Apr. 27, 1961.	
Somali Republic	2,000,000	Independent	1960	Italy and United Kingdom.		Do.
Southwest Africa	415,000	Territory administered under a League of Nations mandate by Union of South Africa, which has refused to accept U.N. trusteeship.				
Spanish Guinea	200,000	Spanish colony				
Spanish Sahara (Rio de Oro)	37,000	Administered from Madrid				
Sudan	10,000,000	Independent republic	1956	United Kingdom		Member.

Nation or territory	Population	Present Political Status	Year of independence	Prior jurisdiction	Planned changes of status	U.N. status
Swaziland	237,000	British High Commission territory in southern Africa.			Claimed by South Africa	
Tanganyika	8,600,000	U.N. trust territory			Internal self-government, Oct. 1, 1960.	
Togo	1,000,000	Independent republic	1960	U.N. trust (France).		Membership anticipated.
Tunisia	3,800,000	Independent	1956	France		Member.
Uganda	5,000,000	British protectorate			Implementation of proposals for an elected African majority is under way.	
Union of South Africa	14,500,000	Independent	1909	United Kingdom		Do.
United Arab Republic (Egypt)	25,000,000	do	1922	do		Do.
Voltaic Republic	3,300,000	Independent republic within French community.	1960			Membership anticipated.
Zanzibar	300,000	British protectorate governed by a sultan, in collaboration with a British resident.			Proposals for an elected majority on the legislative council are to be implemented in 1961.	

REVIEW OF FOREIGN POLICY—VI

AFRICA—THE BEGINNINGS OF POLICY

This is the sixth in a series of discussions which I began last January under the general description "Review of Foreign Policy." In these discussions, I have sought to call attention to situations in various regions of the world and the policies which we are pursuing with respect to them.

My purpose in undertaking this review is threefold. I hope that my observations in concert with those of other Members will enlarge our common understanding of the international issues which face the Nation. I hope that they will contribute in a similar fashion to the understanding of these issues by the American people. I hope, finally, that they will serve some constructive purpose in improving the foreign policies on which the Nation heavily depends for our peace and well-being.

In previous statements I discussed in succession our relations with southeast Asia, north Africa, the Middle East, and most recently with Latin America. In all of those statements, it was possible to describe a pattern of American policy. It was not always an effective or consistent policy. Nevertheless, there was at least an understandable base to build on, frequently a faltering, uncertain base, but at least a recognizable base.

That is less the case with respect to the area which I propose to consider today. For Africa and sub-Sahara Africa in particular, we have barely the beginnings of a policy.

I say that, not so much in criticism, but merely to underscore a fact that is of great pertinence in our relations with that region. Much of Africa has long been beyond the horizon of our direct interest and, in consequence, we have given it little direct consideration in our policy. For the most part we have approached that continent through the European nations which exercise sovereignty over a great part of it.

That this is the case is clearly reflected in the organization of the Department of State. The African Division has been tacked on, like an afterthought, to the Bureau of Near Eastern, South Asian, and Africa Affairs. I might also note that despite his wide and farflung travels, the Secretary of State has somehow managed virtually to overlook the second largest continent in the world. On second thought, I believe his plane did set down briefly in Cairo at one time, on the way to somewhere else or coming from somewhere else.

What might be termed this official unawareness of Africa is not confined to the executive branch; it is shared by the Congress. Africa has been the subject of almost no discussion in the Senate in the last decade. That is, to say the least, a most unusual phenomenon for this body. As the Members know, our range of interest has otherwise been broad enough to cover in great detail a range of such diverse subjects as daylight saving time in the District of Columbia, the awe-inspiring power of atomic energy, and presidential critiques of music critics.

Very few Senators in their travels abroad have found occasion to retrace the paths of Stanley and Livington, through Africa, and I hasten to add that I am as guilty as others of this negligence. It has remained for the intrepid gentlewoman from Ohio, in the other House, to blaze a congressional trail through the dangerous recesses of that vast continent.

In all seriousness, this neglect of Africa seems to me to create a gap both in our understanding of the total international situation and in our foreign policies. In the past, the gap might have had few significant consequences. Today, however, it seems to me that it is one which we can ill afford.

Circumstances change rapidly in the world whether or not the executive branch and the Congress choose to ignore the changes. Then, sooner or later, we are face to face with their accumulated impact. What usually follows is a new round of crisis diplomacy.

Current reports in the press and elsewhere suggest that something of this sort may be building up in Africa. Not entirely unlike Asia of the past decade, the continent of Africa is now in major transition. The circumstances in the two situations are not precisely the same and therefore the outcome is not likely to be precisely the same. But the transition in Africa, like that of Asia, arises from the same powerful source. Concepts of national and human equality have entered in force into the awareness of Africa. So, too, have concepts of modern material progress. Many in Africa now know that life elsewhere offers more than a presdestined and unchangeable status of servitude whether it be servitude to alien political power or servitude to sickness, superstition, and starvation.

They have learned that men have human rights lodged in them by God. They have learned, too, that modern technology points the way out of the long night of fearful struggle for mere animal existence. Those Africans who know these truths—and they are still comparatively few in number—are passing them on to their kinsmen. The ideas are spreading irresistibly through the continent.

These concepts—the concepts of national and human equality and of modern progress—are just beginning to take root in Africa. But experience elsewhere in the world teaches us that once planted, they are concepts which are not likely to be eradicated from the minds of men. They may be twisted, turned and trampled on, but they will not die.

What will issue from these concepts in Africa is uncertain, for every people give to them a unique imprint. What is certain, however, is that the Africa of tomorrow will be vastly different from the Africa of today, just as Africa today bears little resemblance to the Africa of 50 years ago.

I believe it essential that, now, at the beginnings of policy with Africa, we recognize the origin of the concepts which are stimulating these changes. They are not the product of an unseen or conspiratorial hand. They arise out of the total experience of civilized man. They are the lifeblood of freedom, the same concepts which have underlain the development of America and in a larger sense of all Western culture. They are the same concepts which time and again all over the world have rallied whole peoples to resist or to overthrow tyrannies.

I stress the universal and especially the Western source of these concepts. I do so because I believe we are about to witness the beginning of an attempt to twist and turn the transition of Africa into channels of totalitarianism. Press reports indicate that the Soviet drive into the Middle East is moving beyond that area, deeply into Africa, above and below the Sahara. It is being pursued on cultural, diplomatic, and economic fronts and, as has happened elsewhere, the concepts of freedom itself have been usurped and are being used by the Communists to spearhead this drive.

The free nations may deplore this development. If we are honest with ourselves, however, we shall acknowledge the fact that it has been the inadequacies of Western policies in interpreting our own political, social, and economic ideals in Africa which have afforded in large part the opening wedge.

The Soviet drive is not going to be stopped by a wringing of hands. It is not going to be stopped by military measures so long as it remains nonmilitary in nature. Least of all, will it be stopped by a further retreat from our own finest beliefs. If we and other free nations fail to uphold those beliefs in our relations with Africa, in deed as well as word, then we will have no one to blame but ourselves if the emergent continent turns not toward the West but toward totalitarianism, Communist or otherwise.

That is the principal reason why this country must remain alert to the present African transition. Until now, Africa has been largely what might be termed a "political neutron," inert and acted upon by others. It is now beginning to move as an independent force in international life. What takes place there in the years immediately ahead will, in effect, determine whether the area of human freedom in the world shall be enlarged or contracted by the addition or subtraction of much, if not all, of that continent.

At this moment we can foresee only dimly the consequences to our own direct national interests which will stem from one or the other development. Some immediate effects of the transition, however, are already visible in their impact on our international relations elsewhere. The transition has involved our relations with the principal

European democracies. And as the Bandung Conference of Asian-African nations so clearly demonstrated, it has involved our relations with the numerous peoples in Asia and elsewhere who have recently achieved national freedom or who are moving in that direction.

Later in my remarks I shall deal in greater detail with the transition in Africa and what I believe to be its meaning for American policy. First, however, I wish to sketch briefly the background against which this transition is taking place.

The continent consists roughly of three zones of change. Across the north, along the shores of the Mediterranean, are peoples in such areas as Egypt, Libya, Algeria, and Morocco who are tied closely by history to trends in the Middle East and Europe. I have already dealt at considerable length with that region in previous remarks on north Africa on March 20, and the Middle East on April 18. I shall not cover the same ground in detail again today.

At the extreme south of the continent is another distinct zone in the form of the Union of South Africa. This independent Commonwealth marks the area of most intense European penetration. Of its 12 or 13 million inhabitants, some 3 million derive from Europe, largely from the United Kingdom and the Netherlands. Members of the Senate are well aware of what is transpiring in that region at the present time. There, in acute form, is presented the problem of adjustment, each to the other, of three groups, Asian, African, and European. So far the attempt, based upon intensifying their separation, has produced a tragedy compounded of fear, arrogance, injustice, and alienation. Our own great difficulty with the problem of segregation, however, constrains us to a great humility in discussing this matter when it involves others.

Between the northern zone of Moslem peoples and the southern zone of European penetration lies the heart of Africa and the core of the African transition. A map of this region, of sub-Sahara Africa, reveals a patchwork of independent nations, United Nations trusteeships, and colonies in various stages of dependency on European powers. It shows, for example, an independent Ethiopia, restored at the end of World War II, a Sudan recently set free by the United Kingdom, and a Liberia occupied by descendants of former American slaves, set free, and returned to Africa many decades ago.

Mapmaking, like other honorable professions, has its own unique traditions. Certain colors, for example, have been assigned consistently over the years to certain countries. In keeping with this tradition, current maps of Africa, as did their predecessors, show a number of red patches. These patches, I hasten to add, refer not to Communist-sponsored states but to ancient and honorable British possessions. In addition to Britain, France, Portugal, Belgium, and Spain, all have dependencies in the region. Certain of these countries also administer trusteeships over which the United Nations exercises a considerable degree of supervision.

Each of the European nations has reacted to the recent pressures for change within Africa in its own unique fashion. The United Kingdom, for example, has met the growing demand for national equality by adjusting promptly in some instances to bona fide nationalist movements which promise to lead to stable self-government or independence. Under this policy the Sudan has already achieved political freedom in peace and the Gold Coast and Nigeria have moved close to that goal in the same fashion. By contrast, in the East African dependency of Kenya, the stirrings of African discontent have led to the brutal and violent conflict of the Mau Mau uprisings.

France has sought to meet the pressures for change by a policy of assimilation, an attempt to absorb the colonies, and their inhabitants into the French Union. The effort has not been conspicuously successful in north Africa and has now been altered in Morocco and Tunisia so that it conforms more closely to the British example. Elsewhere in the French possessions, however, the policy of assimilation remains. Belgium has reacted by what might be termed a policy of reserve equality; it has denied to Belgian nationals in the Congo all political participation just as it denies such participation to the indigenous inhabitants. The Portuguese dispute the reality of the pressure for change, and their colonial policies are little different now than they were centuries ago.

Regardless of these differences in approach, I believe it is correct to state that all the European nations have at one time or another recognized one or more of the principal factors which are involved in the present transition in Africa. There is no question, for example, that the process of political adjustment is well advanced in many British possessions. On the other hand, in the Belgian Congo where no political expression is permitted and the young are not encouraged to expose themselves to the political beliefs of the West, there has nevertheless been a great advance in indigenous education in health and other social services. And in the French, Spanish, and Portuguese colonies, racial bars to human equality have been largely eliminated.

I do not know how effective these adjustments are likely to be in the face of mounting pressure for change, whether they will suffice or not. I do know, however, that we ought to avoid superficial judgments of them. It is easy enough from the vantage point of distance and noninvolvement to be critical of the European colonial nations. Their past record in dealing with the primitive peoples of Africa is not, in many respects, an admirable one. But then neither is ours in North America, nor the British in Australia, nor the Spaniards in Latin America, nor the Chinese in southeast Asia, nor the Russians in central Asia, nor the Mongols in Europe, and so on into history.

The point I am trying to make is that past injustices cannot be undone. The most we can hope to do is to put them in reasonable perspective and go on from there. It seems to me fruitless to engage in debate over whether the balance of African colonialism lies on the side of benefit or harm to the indigenous peoples. Certainly the Europeans have made contributions to Africa and certainly they have exacted in return contributions from that continent. Or perhaps it is more correct to put it the other way around.

What matters most, however, is not the past. What matters most is whether the policies of the colonial powers, and the policies of other free nations, including our own, are effectively adjusted now and in the future to the transition which has been set in motion by the awakening of the inhabitants of Africa to the modern world.

We ought not to underestimate the complexity and the magnitude of this task of adjustment, particularly for the European colonial powers. I mentioned earlier that the situation in Africa was somewhat analagous to that in Asia a decade ago. It is, in the sense that nationalism versus colonialism was the decisive issue in many Asian countries at the end of World War II. In a similar fashion, it is or is becoming the decisive issue in many parts of Africa.

In drawing the comparison between Asia and Africa, however, we ought not to overlook the differences in the two situations. European colonialism in Asia was superimposed for the most part on sophisticated civilizations with long histories of cultural development. The ideas and the techniques of the West influenced the existing way of Asian life but they did not obliterate or suffocate it. In Africa, however, the Europeans opened a continent inhabited largely by peoples who, like the North American Indians, existed apart from the mainstreams of history.

To cite another significant difference: in Asia, colonialism was not accompanied by massive European settlement. There was never—as there are in South Africa, in Kenya or in Algeria—anywhere near the same large bodies of settled Europeans. These settlers see their future and their children's future in Africa, not in Europe. Many are uncertain of that future. Their fears not infrequently lead them to resist being cut away from sources of military and political power which lie largely in Europe or the sharing of any significant political power with the indigenous peoples of the continent.

I am not condoning this fear; I am merely recognizing its existence, for it poses a major problem for the European colonial nations. In a previous statement I dealt at some length with this problem as it confronts France in North Africa. But any responsible European government which attempts to adjust its policies to meet the demands of the African transition, faces tremendous pressures over the same question.

If we contrast the peaceful political progress in the Gold Coast and Nigeria on the one hand with the strife in Kenya and the regression in South Africa, the point should be clear. The contrast, I believe, is due in large measure to the fact that in the Gold Coast and Nigeria, there are few permanent European settlers. In Kenya and in South Africa, however, Europeans and descendants of Europeans are settled in great numbers.

If the European nations face a formidable task in adjusting to the transition, so too, do the leaders of African nationalism. To them falls much of the responsibility for shaping the changes which are bound to occur in Africa.

They, too, face tremendous pressures. In some cases, their responsibility involves literally moving whole populations from the Stone Age into the 20th century with great rapidity.

Modern African leaders are themselves awake to the meaning of national and human equality and modern progress. Their own enlightenment, however, can have lasting significance only if it is shared with their own peoples. They will need great compassion and patience for that. They will also need wisdom if they are to choose with discrimination from among the welter of ideas and ideologies which bear down on Africa from all sides, those which will benefit their peoples. As the Soviet drive into the continent gains momentum, the pressures on these leaders will increase and the confusion of alternatives will be further compounded.

I believe it will be well to recognize that while the ideological choices which are made will be those of the African leaders and their peoples, the policies of the free nations will profoundly influence them. To the extent that these policies reflect a firm devotion to the concepts of free men—to the concepts of national and human equality, to the extent that they reflect a willingness to assist in the progress of the African people—they can make a great contribution to the growth of human freedom. By the same token, irreparable harm can be done if these policies are shortsighted, fearful, and repressive.

It seems to me that a foreign policy which serves the total interests of this country must welcome the present transition in Africa and the inevitability of change which it brings. We have already had an expression of congressional sentiment to that effect with regard to all dependent people throughout the world. In the 84th Congress, a resolution was adopted unanimously

by both Houses calling for the administering of foreign policies and the exercising of our influence in support of other peoples "in their efforts to achieve self-government or independence" (H. Con. Res. 149, 84th Cong., 1st sess.).

I can conceive of no long-range interest worthy of this country which would be at variance with this fundamental expression. How could it be otherwise? Can we reject the desire for national equality on the part of any people? Similarly, can we frown upon their desire for human equality? Or can we deprecate their efforts to improve their social and economic existence? To those who can answer these questions in the affirmative, I respectfully suggest a rereading of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States.

National and human equality, and progress—these are the basic concepts of this Nation. In signing the Charter of the United Nations we gave endorsement to these same goals as legitimate for all people. That endorsement must remain the guiding principle, the anchor of our policies with respect to Africa. It imposes on us—indeed it imposes on all nations which have signed the Charter—an obligation with respect to Africa which, in the light of our own history if for no other reason, we ought willingly to sustain. It is an obligation to strive in our policies with respect to that continent to contribute to, rather than detract from, the achievement of these goals by the African peoples themselves.

At the same time, we ought to have clearly in mind our limitations in this connection. The achievement of rights is primarily the responsibility of peoples directly involved, both African and European. We can assist, but we cannot impose.

I fully realize the difficulties of interpreting the principles of the Charter, as they apply to Africa, in the countless decisions which must be made by the executive branch of the Government. It seems to me, however, that we have compounded these difficulties by our own neglect, by clinging to what seems to me to be an outmoded approach to that continent.

I would suggest, therefore, that the first step toward a more effective policy on Africa involves an increase in the flow of direct information on that continent into the formulation of policy. Would such a flow not be facilitated if the African branch of the Department of State were separated from Near Eastern and south Asian affairs and constituted as a Bureau under an Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs? And would this body not be better equipped to advise with the President on African matters if more Members found occasion to include Africa in their travels abroad?

Even with the limited and inadequate knowledge we now possess, it is possible to see the beginnings of a sound policy for Africa.

As I have already noted, the growing aspirations of the African people for national and human equality must have the consistent sympathy of this country. This sympathy must be reflected more clearly than is presently the case in the general course which we pursue in the United Nations and elsewhere.

I hope that few occasions will arise in which we will be at variance with the Western Europeans on this matter. When they do, however, our position ought to be forthright. If we disagree with them, let us disagree honestly. And if overriding circumstances compel us to accept temporary compromises, let us be equally prepared to acknowledge them frankly. Accommodation has a place in the foreign policy of this Nation, no less than in that of others, but hypocrisy does not.

I believe this country should also be prepared to enlarge the technical assistance program in Africa if it is clear that such assistance can be effective and that it is sought by the indigenous peoples: If other practicable ways can be developed which will hasten the economic and social progress of the African peoples, we should be prepared to give them sympathetic consideration. Again, the test of any such measures must be their contribution to the development of national and human equality in Africa and to the well-being of the African people.

I noted earlier in these remarks that we were at the beginnings of policy on Africa. Because we are, we have an unusual opportunity to set a firm foundation for our future relations with that continent. If we do so, we shall serve the interests of this country far beyond the present generation.

The key to an effective policy on Africa, I believe, will be found in the perception with which we treat the developing transition on that continent. If we understand and appreciate its vast implications and assist in the adjustments it requires, we will facilitate the emergence of a new Africa. It will be an Africa which will do willingly what it cannot be coerced into doing. It will be an Africa which will pour its original and as yet incalculable contributions into the general progress of freemen and into the maintenance of world peace.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I express commendation to the Senator from Montana for the very enlightening and constructive presentation which he has made, and his statement of the course we ought to follow with respect to Africa. It seems to me that he has concluded that through joint efforts we ought to keep Africa out of involvement. I subscribe to that view fully and heartily. I express my gratitude to him for the fine speech he has just made.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator from Ohio.

FREEDOM FIGHTERS OF CUBA WORK TO OVERTHROW CASTRO

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, this week's issue of Our Sunday Visitor carries a highly informative article entitled "Freedom Fighters of Cuba Work To Overthrow Castro."

This article was written by Dale Francis and was brought to my attention by my friend, the Reverend Father Joseph F. Thorning, associate editor of World Affairs and a highly respected specialist on inter-American history. Father Thorning was one of the very first to assess Castro for what he is and to expose the Communist nature of his regime.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Our Sunday Visitor, Aug. 28, 1960]

FREEDOM FIGHTERS OF CUBA WORK TO OVERTHROW CASTRO

(By Dale Francis)

The Red regime of Fidel Castro is starting to topple. Within Cuba, thousands of men who were armed by the revolutionary regime are waiting for the word to use the arms against the men who betrayed them by selling out to the Communists. Guajiros who placed their hopes in Fidel and saw their hopes destroyed by Castro's Red lieutenants now stand ready to fight against the Communists who want to be their masters.

Outside Cuba, dynamic leaders are preparing for the drive that will mean the end of Castro's Red government. They are men who battled Batista, who are unsullied by any contact with the tyrannical and corrupt Batista regime. They are men who were willing to trust Fidel Castro but who saw him betray Cuba.

I have come from meetings with these men. Some are still in Cuba, preparing for the downfall of Castro from within. Obviously I not only cannot give their names, I cannot even give general information about them for fear of identifying them. If they were known they would be imprisoned—just as thousands of others have been imprisoned.

Castro knows they are there; he does not know who they are. My telling you of their existence offers nothing to Fidel, except perhaps to add more worry to that which has already frayed his nerves almost to the point of insanity. He will learn who they are when the day arrives. Right now he can only worry sleeplessly with the knowledge they are all about him, that when he turns over arms to the people he may well be arming the men who will destroy his dictatorship.

In his frenzy, Castro will make mistakes just as he made the mistake of pushing the betrayal too far, too fast, and so made inevitable the opposition of the Catholic Church. When at last the Catholic Church took a strong stand against the Communist infiltration into the life of Cuba, Fidel faced the force that has marked the beginning of his destruction. His plan to avoid out-and-out conflict with the church as long as possible, his careful plan to counterbalance the inevitable struggle by currying favor with Protestant groups in the hope they would support him, all was lost because the struggle came too soon.

But if I do not dare to give the identities of those men who are supporting the forces of freedom within Cuba, I can tell you of the men who are preparing to join the struggle from outside. They say that with the help of forces already in Cuba, they will be able to overthrow the Castro regime.

They say, too, that the help of the United States or of the Organization of American States will not be needed. They say they have sufficient strength to overthrow Castro alone—but they add one important reservation. They can overthrow Castro if Castro is alone. If Russia and Red China join the battle against them—and there are already more than 2,000 foreign Communists in Cuba—then they will need help. If they battle Castro's Red regime, it will have to be accompanied by a firm warning to Russia, Red China, and the other Communist States to stay out of the battle. This warning must be accompanied by immediate action if the leaders of world communism interfere.

This poses danger for the United States, of course, but nothing like the danger that would exist were Russia and her Red allies permitted to destroy freedom fighters in Cuba as they destroyed freedom fighters in Hungary.

Who are the leaders of Cuba's freedom fighters? What do they believe? What are their political backgrounds? What do they propose in the future for Cuba? These are the questions I sought to answer as I talked with the men who will regain freedom for Cuba. The answer to these questions when it concerns those still in Cuba will have to wait for the day when the battle begins. Their identities I must keep secret now except to say they include some names that will be recognized by all Cubans and by Americans who have been acquainted with the leaders who overthrew Batista. Those outside of Cuba, I can talk about openly.

Among those I can discuss there are seven or eight men who are of greatest importance. All are men without any connection with the Batista regime. They range in po-

litical viewpoint from the non-Communist far left to a conservative position, considerably short of the far right. Some have long been active in Cuban politics, others are new on the political scene.

Jose Ignacio Rasco is typical of the new political leaders. Thirty-four years old, Rasco was a classmate of Fidel Castro at the University of Havana. There they were rivals and friends—although never close friends. Rasco, who is a cultured man with considerable poise, has been envied by Castro since their school days. This probably accounts for the fact that when Fidel made his triumphant entry into Havana after the fall of Batista, he sent word ahead that he wanted Rasco to be in the party that greeted him. As one man said, it was Fidel's way of showing his old rival that Fidel had reached the peak of fame.

Rasco is a lawyer and was a columnist for Informacion, which today is the only newspaper in Cuba not under the thumb of Castro's government. A good Catholic, he was named president of the Christian Democratic Party when it was formed a few months ago.

Rasco knows Castro well and he insists today that it is possible that Fidel might finally betray even the Communists. He simply believes Castro incapable of any loyalty except to himself. Today he is agreed, as once he was not, that Fidel is operating under Communist orders, but he thinks it possible that Castro might under pressure betray them just as he has betrayed the Cuban people.

Politically, Jose Ignacio Rasco would probably be listed as close to the center. He believes social reforms are necessary in Cuba, thinks that agrarian reform is necessary, but opposes most strongly the form it has taken under the Castro regime. He has already promised that elections would be held within 18 months after the establishment of a new regime—a promise that would be accompanied by immediate permission for the formation of political parties. When Castro made similar promises when he came into power, the tipoff he didn't mean to keep his promise was in the road blocks he placed in the path of legitimate political parties.

Another of those in the political center, probably a little left of center, is the group headed by Manuel Artime, a 28-year-old medical doctor who worked actively with the Castro regime until last December.

Probably none of the potential political leaders of Cuba has more personal dynamic force than this square-shouldered, dark-browed, granite-chinned young man. Cubans, used to the colorful personality of Fidel Castro, might find some of the serious-minded, intellectual leaders a quick change of pace, but Artime is a man whose eyes flash fire much like those of Castro.

He is, however, a soft-spoken man with ideas that are the very antithesis of those of the Castro regime. The head of a group that has strong connections with underground forces already in Cuba, he has at his command the most powerful forces of all the leaders.

But when he speaks of the fight for freedom in Cuba he speaks of a hope he has. "It must be a war of love," he says with obvious sincerity. "We must despise communism and love Communists, we must remove communism but not harm the people who have been the victims of it. I pray it will be a short conflict and that few people will be killed. I think it is possible, too, for I know already the strength of our forces within Cuba."

Artime is a member of the University Catholic Action group. As a young doctor, he went into the Sierra Maestra during the last days of Batista, remained with Castro's government for 12 months.

He told me he had read my articles beginning in March 1959, and when he became convinced it was true that Fidel was turning the government over to the Communists, he decided to remain within the government to see if he couldn't retrieve the revolution from within.

I talked with him briefly months ago in Cuba, while he was still in the Castro government. He was then already convinced the Castro regime had gone Communist, but it was not until last December that he decided that he could best operate outside Cuba.

His political ideas are center but perhaps a little left of center. He would hold that a certain social revolution was necessary, that agrarian reform is needed although not in the form now in operation. A strong Catholic, he would expect to make the social doctrines of this government conform to those of the social encyclicals of the popes.

It is probably not accurate to refer to any of the leaders as belonging to the right—certainly not if this would create a picture of a position close to that of Latin American dictators of the right. All of the Cuban freedom leaders are strong advocates of democratic freedoms, all would establish strongly democratic governments.

But the leader of the conservative forces is Juan Antonio Rubio Padilla, a longtime political leader in Cuba, a man with a penetrating mind, a strong antipathy for anything Communist or socialistic and a strong believer in modern day capitalism.

Like Artime, Dr. Rubio is a medical doctor. Now 51 years old, his life has been given almost entirely to a struggle against Cuban tyrants. He was one of the leaders of the struggle against the dictatorship of Machado and he was imprisoned under that tyrant. During the democratic regime of Carlos Prio, Dr. Rubio was a member of the Cabinet. Later when Batista seized power, Dr. Rubio finally had to flee the country to escape imprisonment again.

When Castro came to power, Dr. Rubio was almost alone among the real political leaders of Cuba to protest against him. Dr. Rubio had reason for his position, his own personal contacts with Castro years before had convinced him Castro was a Communist. His close of knowledge of the workings of communism—few men in Cuba or anywhere else know its methods better—convinced him from the beginning that what would happen in Cuba was what has happened.

Today he wants a new Cuba that will place its trust in enlightened capitalism. He says that many of the other leaders are falling into the Communist trap of believing that capitalism is dying and that only a society that moves toward partial socialism can survive. Dr. Rubio insists this is not true. He believes that a stable Cuban Government could draw capital that would make Cuba into a replica of Western Germany. He says that he has strong faith both in Cuba and the capitalistic system.

Dr. Rubio, an intellectual with a sensitive face and a solemn manner, is like Dr. Artimes, a member of the University of Havana Catholic Action group. He was, as a matter of fact, one of the founders of this important group and few Catholic laymen anywhere can match his knowledge of theology.

A third medical doctor, Dr. Orlando Bosch Avila, is another leader of the freedom forces. The 33-year-old doctor is a member of a socially prominent family from Santa Clara in central Cuba. Friends say that he was most noted for his service to the poor, spending long hours treating the sick who could not pay him. Because he was financially independent, his friends say, he gave even the money he earned from his practice to charity. This background is important when you remember that Castro has always tried to pose as a friend of the poor.

Dr. Bosch's group is one of the few willing to reveal the identity of its military leader in Cuba. His forces are headed by a handsome young captain in the Castro Army who has gone into the Escambray Mountains with a force of 30 officers and more than 300 men. The young captain, Quino Membribe, is already drawing support from dissatisfied elements in the rebel army.

The program of the group headed in this country by Dr. Bosch calls for the return of all intervened property, free elections within 18 months, the right of political parties to resume activities immediately. The group also calls for a just agrarian reform program, revision of revolutionary laws, eventual nationalization of foreign industries, abolishment of the death penalty, and general political amnesty.

The political veteran of all the forces opposing Castro is 54-year-old Tony Varona, nominal head of the Authentic Party, a lawyer and onetime Prime Minister of Cuba. Varona's long service with the Authentic Party, his center of the road position, his political experience, make him a man of considerable importance in the formation of a new Cuban government, but his assets may also be his liability since it may be the Cuban people will not want to look back to one of the names of its political past in the formation of its future.

Varona tried to get along with the Castro regime—his onetime boss, Carlos Prio, still plays it cosy with Castro—but he found it necessary to express his opposition and move into exile when Castro moved closer to Russia.

Friends of Cuba in the United States are likely to feel a bit uneasy about two of the opponents of Castro who are tagged with far left positions.

Less anxiety is to be felt about Justo Carillo, 48-year-old lawyer who was director of Castro's bank for agrarian reform until last January. Carillo is anti-Communist but his own political position is so far to the left that it amounts to a position close to that of Castro, minus the Communists. He is, however, a man of considerable importance in the opposition to Castro. He once served in a Batista government but in the first years of the Batista era, before Batista's seizure of power in 1952. The Cuban people differentiate between those who served with Batista after his unlawful seizure of power and those who served with him while he was President through legitimate election.

But if some anxiety is to be felt about Carillo, far more is to be felt about Aureliano Sanchez Arango. The 54-year-old professor has a long background of Communist and Socialist affiliation. He was the cofounder of the Communist Party in Cuba, was an international Communist who worked in the United States for the Reds during the troubled years of 1928–34.

Sometime after this he presumably broke with the Communist Party and he later served in the cabinet of Carlos Prio. But while he was in Prio's cabinet, Jacob Arbenz took power in Guatemala and it was Sanchez Arango who arranged for Cubans to join the Arbenz fighting forces.

Today he is presumably anti-Communist but power for this man would hardly make anti-Communists happy. His political positions may be changed but it would be difficult to tag him as anything less than the far left.

Pedro Diaz Lanz, once chief of the Castro air force, is a man who has been widely publicized in the United States. While Cubans believe he is sincere, are grateful for his campaign against the Communists in Cuba, none of the political leaders seem to take him seriously as a potential leader. He has had too little experience on such a level, has too few qualifications for leadership.

Jose Miro Cardona might have been an important man in the new government had he acted sooner. The first prime minister of the Castro regime, later Spanish Ambassador and U.S. Ambassador-elect, he has certainly been aware of what was happening in Cuba for a long time. Had he defected early,

he would have become an important leader of the opposition forces. He is of importance even now but others call him a "parachutist," one who rode the Castro government until he saw it was falling and then parachuted to safety.

Still another potential Cuban leader who waited too long to make his stand against Castro was Raul Chibas. The name of Chibas is revered by the people in Cuba because of Raul's brother, Eduardo. Eddie Chibas was a dramatic speaker of the Castro type and his radio broadcasts were listened to by millions. He was the leader of the Orthodox Party and the popular hero of the people. At the peak of his fame, discouraged by the tyranny and corruption in the country under Batista, Eddie Chibas climaxed a broadcast by killing himself. Raul Chibas, his brother, was in exile under Batista, returned to take an important position in the Castro government. Although he recognized the trend of the Castro government months ago, he waited until August to defect. Today he is considered another of the parachutists and this, plus the active role he played in the executions, seems likely to lessen his importance in the new Cuba.

There are other Cuban leaders who are not likely to play important roles in the new government because of their positions in the Batista government. Many were good and honest men, not everyone in the Batista government was evil, but the very fact of their connection with Batista makes it impossible for them now to play a role in the new government.

Another man who is not interested in politics but who may by force of circumstances be drawn into it is Jose Ignacio Rivero, 39-year-old editor of Diario de la Marina. Tall, ruggedly handsome, Pepin Rivero was the son of an editor so famous that the son stood in the shadow of his more famous father even after the father's death.

But circumstances sometimes show the greatness of men and Jose Ignacio Rivero has become an important man in his own right by the courage of his stand against communism and Castro.

Diario de la Marina has always been a good newspaper, conservative both politically and in format, but so clearly one of the Western Hemisphere's outstanding newspapers that U.S. journalism schools pointed to it as a model.

When Castro came to power, Jose Ignacio Rivero, like all other newspapermen, was willing to grant him the chance to lead the nation to freedom. But when it became clear that Castro was linked with communism and when the freedoms of the Cuban people were endangered, Jose Ignacio Rivero took a strong stand.

His stand won him the hatred of Castro and he and his paper became prime targets for the Red propagandists. Through it all, Jose Ignacio Rivero grew in stature. His clearly worded and courageous editorials probably did more to draw the lines of battle between Western freedom and communism than anything in Castro's Cuba.

When finally Castro's goons took over the paper and Jose Ignacio Rivero had to go into exile, he went as one of the most important men in Cuba. Today he wants only to return to Cuba to again edit Diario de la Marina in Havana. He is uninterested in politics except that he wants communism to be rooted out of Cuba and freedom restored.

His own political position is conservative, probably closest to that of Dr. Rubio, although perhaps a bit less conservative. He has absolutely no personal political ambitions, however. This may be the very reason why he may be drawn into politics.

Each of the men I've listed here—and a dozen more that I will tell you about later—has a legitimate reason to suppose he could handle the Presidency of Cuba. Obviously not all can be President. Yet a struggle for power now might destroy any unified action against Castro and hinder hopes of overthrowing him.

It seems obvious that all will have to get together, agree on certain objectives to be gained in the first 18 months before elections and agree, too, on the one to head the country in the transition period.

It seems unlikely that any would be happy seeing a rival named to the top position because it would give the rival an advantage in the first election. So perhaps the compromise solution would be to name as President a man with no political ambitions, a man who by his acceptance of the temporary position would agree he could not be a candidate for the Presidency.

For such a position, it would be difficult to find a man better qualified and more generally acceptable than Jose Ignacio Rivero. He would not want it, might even refuse it. Probably some of the groups would not be too happy about him as the head of the government, particularly those on the far left, but it would be hard to find a man better qualified.

The government of Fidel Castro is going to fall. It may come within 3 months, it may come within 6 months, it will come not later than 1 year. The new leadership of Cuba will be drawn from the men now opposing Castro, both those in exile and those still in Cuba. The United States has a stake in this new leadership for all citizens of this country want friendly relations with the people of Cuba.

And the United States has a role to play in the struggle to overthrow Castro. It will not be an active role. The Cubans don't want it that way, they say they can do it themselves. But while they are doing it the United States must pledge—and see the pledge is honored—that this time world Communists will not be allowed to murder the freedom fighters of Cuba as once they murdered the freedom fighters of Hungary.

OPPOSITION TO RECESS APPOINTMENTS TO THE SUPREME COURT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 334) opposing the making of recess appointments to the Supreme Court.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The controlled time for debate begins now.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the Senate resolution which is now before the Senate is a relatively brief one. It has been on our desks in printed form for several days, having been the unfinished or pending business before the Senate. Also on our desks for several days are the report of the Committee on the Judiciary and the minority views.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this point in the RECORD, the text of the resolution itself be printed, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas one of the solemn constitutional tasks enjoined upon the Senate is to give or withhold its advice and consent with respect to nominations made to the Supreme Court of the United States, doing so, if possible, in an atmosphere free from pressures inimical to due deliberations; and

Whereas the nomination of a person to the office of Justice of the Supreme Court should be considered only in the light of the qualifications the person brings to threshold of the office; and

Whereas Presidents of the United States have from time to time made recess appointments to the Supreme Court, which actions were unquestionably taken in good faith and with a desire to promote the public interest, but without a full appreciation of the difficulties thereby caused the Members of this body; and

Whereas there is inevitably public speculation on the independence of a Justice serving by recess appointment who sits in judgment upon cases prior to his confirmation by this body, which speculation, however ill founded, is distressing to the Court, to the Justice, to the litigants, and to the Senate of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the making of recess appointments to the Supreme Court of the United States may not be wholly consistent with the best interests of the Supreme Court, the nominee who may be involved, the litigants before the Court, nor indeed the people of the United States, and that such appointments, therefore, should not be made except under unusual circumstances and for the purpose of preventing or ending a demonstrable breakdown in the administration of the Court's business.

Mr. HART. What does the resolution suggest to be the attitude of the Senate with respect to the appointment of Justices, including the Chief Justice, to the Supreme Court during a period when the Senate is in recess? As I intended the resolution, and as I think it states, the Senate will indicate by the adoption of the resolution that, except under unusual circumstances, and for the purpose of ending a breakdown in the administration of the Court's business, it is our belief that such appointments may not be wholly consistent with the best interests of the Court, the Senate, the people of the United States and, indeed, the litigants who may appear before the Supreme Court.

I think it wise to note at the very outset of the debate—a debate which I will do my very best to maintain on a level worthy of the issue—that no interpretation should be drawn from the resolution suggesting a criticism of the Supreme Court, of any member of the Court, or, indeed, of the President of the United States.

Congress has never made clear our attitude with respect to this matter, and today I am suggesting that we should do so. Fairness requires that we acknowledge that there is no criticism aimed at anyone.

Let me describe in very brief fashion the history of recess appointments to the Supreme Court.

If there ever was ground for the argument that the more specific language of article III of the Constitution should be construed as excluding judicial appointments from the general authorization given the President in article II, time has answered it. The President does have such power and this resolution does not argue otherwise.

The first occasion of an appointment to the Supreme Court during the recess of Congress, when that appointee took his place on the Court before the Senate acted upon the nomination, was in the year 1795. Mr. Justice Rutledge was appointed during a period when the Senate was in recess. He entered upon the duties of the Court. On the return of the Senate into session Mr. Justice Rutledge's nomination was not advised and consented to.

The next time a Justice was appointed to the Supreme Court during the recess of the Senate, and entered upon the duties of the Court before his confirmation by the Senate, was about 1850.

In that case, Mr. Justice Curtis took his place on the Court and participated in its business before the Senate confirmed his nomination.

For about 100 years, although a dozen-odd Supreme Court appointments were made during recesses of the Senate, no one under such an appointment assumed his place on the bench and participated in the business of the Court, except after the confirmation of his nomination.

Beginning in 1953, three vacancies occurred during a period when the Senate was in recess. Very able men were nominated. In all three cases, they assumed their places and participated in the business of the Court prior to the action of the Senate upon their nominations.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HART. I am glad to yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. Does the able Senator from Michigan object or quarrel with the fact that those three Justices assumed their responsibilities after their presidential appointments?

Mr. HART. No. I appreciate the Senator's question, and I am attempting to make it very plain that I do not quarrel with the action taken by any one in any branch of the Government in the absence of an expression by the Senate to the other branches, which I suggest the resolution does, of the difficulty under which the Senate must operate if we are asked to pass upon the nomination of a man who has taken his seat as a Justice of the Supreme Court. Indeed, the Senator from California is honored to represent, in part, a State which contributed one of the great Chief Justices who happened to be an interim appointee and who took his seat on the Court.

Mr. KUCHEL. The Senator from Michigan neither finds any impinging on the Constitution in the fact that Justices from time to time have taken their oath of office and entered upon their duties prior to the Senate advising and confirming their nominations, nor quarrels with that in practice?

Mr. HART. In practice, I suggest, in the resolution, that we now state that it operates to a very great disadvantage upon the Members of the Senate, and I suggest that if this should develop as a traditional practice, as what should be done always, rather than under unusual circumstances, it would adversely affect the Court.

Mr. KUCHEL. I do not wish to interrupt the able Senator's presentation, although from time to time, if he will permit it, there may be questions which would be relevant to what he is saying. However, at this point, I repeat, I understand that as to what has happened in the filling of Supreme Court vacancies from the beginning, in those circumstances where the appointees have immediately entered upon the duties of their office, the Senator from Michigan finds no unconstitutionality in that history.

Mr. HART. I appreciate the Senator's question. In response, I do not question that what occurred is constitutional. As I have said, if ever there was a question for debate, I think time long since has resolved it. This is a perfectly constitutional action. The attention of the junior Senator from Michigan was brought to this problem very early after I was permitted to enter this body. It will be recalled that in the fall of 1958 a vacancy occurred on the Supreme Court. The President appointed a distinguished circuit judge from the Federal circuit of which Michigan is a part—Mr. Justice Potter Stewart. I discovered that the assignment of the duty of reviewing this appointment, the appointment of one who has served as a Justice and was serving on the days he appeared before the committee, to the Committee on the Judiciary brought with it many disagreeable aspects.

As I stated very shortly after that action, when I rose on the floor in support of the nomination of Potter Stewart, I felt that the Senate and the Court as an institution would be infinitely better off if the Senate were not dealing with a man who, in fact, was a participating Justice of that Court, when we undertook to review his nomination. Having expressed myself at that time, I went no further.

Then I reviewed the proceedings of the committee on a prior occasion, involving an interim appointee who had taken his seat on the bench. I refer to the nomination of Mr. Justice Brennan, who had received an interim appointment to a vacancy in 1956.

When the committee, during its hearing, had Mr. Justice Brennan on the stand, I find a typical exchange. A Member of the Senate, who incidentally was not a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, asked certain questions of Mr. Justice Brennan. As the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], who has sat on the committee for a long time, will, I believe, confirm, the practice of the committee in considering nominations to the Supreme Court is to invite any Member of the Senate to participate with the committee in the examination of the appointee. In the case of Mr. Justice Brennan, a Senator asked a question of the Justice, and the Justice replied:

Mr. BRENNAN. Will you forgive me an embarrassment, Senator? You appreciate that I am a sitting Justice of the Court. There are presently pending before the Court some cases, and so on.

The Justice continued:

"I know, too, that you appreciate that having taken an oath of office it is my obligation not to discuss any of those pending matters.

The Senator later said:

I do not want to press you unnecessarily, but the question was simple. You have not been confirmed yet as a member of the Supreme Court.

Justice Brennan replied:

Of course, my nomination is now before the Senate for consideration. Nevertheless since October 16 I have in fact been sitting as a member of the Court. The oath I took, I took as unreservedly as I know you took your own, and as I know every Senator took his. And I know, too, that your oath imposes upon you the obligation to ask just such questions as these.

But I am in the position of having an oath of my own by which I have to guide my conduct and that oath obligates me not to discuss any matter presently pending before the Court, because I have actually sat in consideration on such matters and the only way that the mouth of a member of the Court may be opened in expression of an opinion in respect of any one of them is a formal written opinion when that is finally written and filed.

I do hope you will not feel that in saying what I do, I am doing any more than taking what I am sure is your own position that each of us has to be faithful to his own oath.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. HART. I gladly yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. If that occurrence in the Committee on the Judiciary hearings on that occasion, when Justice Brennan was interrogated in the fashion just described by the Senator from Michigan, is to be used as an argument in favor of the resolution, let me ask this of the Senator from Michigan:

During the hearings on the confirmation of another Justice, a similar line of questions was asked of a nominee who had not yet qualified for the Supreme Court. He was not sitting. He had not taken the oath. When a line of questions on the same subject matter was asked of him, he said, that, obviously, he could not answer those questions, because he would be prejudging cases in that field which would come before him as a member of the Supreme Court, if the Senate confirmed his nomination, and he were sworn in as a member of the Supreme Court.

My question is, What difference is there between the asking of a question like that and the refusal on the part of the nominee to answer it, whether he is a member of the Court or is a potential member of the Court?

Mr. HART. If I may reply, I think the answer is included in the last clause of the Senator's question. There is an infinite difference between the situation when the committee sits with one who is not a justice of the Supreme Court and the situation when the committee sits with one who is a Justice of the Supreme Court. I do not argue that in either case he should be required to comment on a matter which is pending before him while he is sitting or on a matter which will come before him if his nomination is confirmed. My point is this: Who of us would want to do that to a sitting member of the Supreme Court of the United States, if it were possible to avoid it?

Mr. HRUSKA. If the Senator from Michigan will yield, I will answer that

question by asking the Senator from Michigan another question—which perhaps is not very good manners, but I believe it will serve our purpose here: Who of us would ask such a question of a potential Justice, or would insist upon an answer from him?

I wish to say that I have presided over or attended many hearings when the Judiciary Committee has been considering the question of confirmation of a judicial nomination; and on each occasion there has always been uppermost in the minds of the witnesses who came there, "I should be careful; this nomination may be confirmed, and the nominee may be sitting as a Justice at a time when I bring cases before the Court."

I say there is no difference between asking questions of that kind of one who has already assumed his duties and of one who is about to assume them, because the record shows that in an overwhelming proportion of the cases, nominations to the Supreme Court of the United States have been confirmed. In fact, I cannot remember any instance in which such a nomination has been rejected.

Mr. HART. Does the Senator refer to interim appointments?

Mr. HRUSKA. I refer to any kind of appointments to the Supreme Court.

Mr. HART. I think the record will show that the Senate has rejected some nominations to the Supreme Court.

But I shall respond by saying that apparently the Senator from Nebraska and I disagree on the basic question of the propriety, wisdom, desirability, and consequences of doing business with one who wears the robe, as compared to the situation when doing business with one who is an applicant for that role. I feel very deeply about this matter. Perhaps it was my innocence as a new Member that caused me to suffer thus, but I hope I shall never be here so long that I will not sense the indelicacy involved when the legislative branch does business with one who wears the robe of the highest court in the land.

Incidentally, this is the view of those who have given some study to the question, not as legislators, not as appointing authorities, not as judges. Admittedly, the literature on this point is skimpy; but the conclusion, in the cases in which a conclusion has been reached, is uniformly against the practice.

I believe that in the committee report, citation is made of the article published in the Stanford Law Review, to Stanford Law Review 129. I would cite the attitude expressed by John R. Thompson, a former Yale Law School professor in an article published in the February 5, 1959, issue of The Reporter magazine.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD correspondence received, and including letters from the dean of the University of Pennsylvania Law School, the dean of the University of Michigan Law School, the dean of the Catholic University of America Law School, and Professor Kurland, of the University of Chicago Law School, who, conducts in that distinguished law school, of a seminar on the Supreme Court, and is the editor of the Supreme Court Review.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA,
Washington, D.C., August 2, 1960.

Hon. PHILIP A. HART,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HART: I think your resolution is in order. There were practical reasons why the President made the recess appointments. The load of the Court is heavy, and there is reason to suppose that the Court cannot work effectively unless it can operate at full strength. I am sure that was the reason for the Attorney General's interest in the quick appointments. After your experiences with the Stewart confirmation, the special factors you have described outweigh any justification for recess appointments.

There are times when Justices are sick and when the other men must spread the load. It has never been proposed that the Court should be maintained at full strength through the appointment of Circuit Judges to sit with the Justices. That is done in the States, but it has not been done on the Supreme Court of the United States. There is no other institution anywhere like the Court. There should not be any status but full membership for every person who serves on the Court.

I hope the new administration and all subsequent administrations will be advised by your resolution.

Sincerely yours,
VERNON X. MILLER, *Dean.*

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA,
Philadelphia, Pa., August 17, 1960.

Hon. PHILIP A. HART,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HART: This will supplement my letter of July 28, 1960.

I think there is merit in the position you have taken with respect to recess appointments to the Supreme Court. As you have pointed out, it creates an awkward situation both for the Senate and the appointee when the latter takes his seat prior to Senate advice and consent. On the one hand, the Senate is dealing, to some extent, with an accomplished fact and does not have full freedom in considering the nomination. On the other hand, the recess appointee is serving under the overhang of Senate consideration of the nomination, which is not in harmony with the constitutional policy of judicial independence.

I see no reason why the President should not be free to make a nomination when Congress is not in session so long as the nominee does not take a seat on the bench. Pertinent here is the fact that Senate committees are empowered to function ad interim.

Your resolution is, of course, hortatory; it does not bind the President nor the Senate, for that matter.

Sincerely,
JEFFERSON B. FORDHAM.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LAW SCHOOL,
Ann Arbor, August 12, 1960.

Hon. PHILIP A. HART,
U.S. Senate, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR PHIL: On July 22 you wrote to me to ask for my comments with respect to your resolution to the effect that recess appointees to the Supreme Court of the United States should not assume the bench until the appointments are confirmed. This letter reached my desk during my absence abroad, but now that I am back in Ann Arbor, I hasten to reply.

I quite agree with you that the subject is a touchy one, but the reasons in support of your resolution set forth in your statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for June 16 are very persuasive indeed. I am inclined to agree that both the Court, the appointees, and the Senate are handicapped by an appointee assuming duties prior to confirmation. I believe that compliance with the resolution would be in the best interests of all concerned.

Sincerely yours,
E. BLYTHE STASON,
Dean.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO,
Chicago, Ill., July 28, 1960.

Senator PHILIP A. HART,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HART: Your letter of July 22 to Dean Levi has been referred to me for reply in his absence.

Of course, I can only express my personal views and not those of Dean Levi or the school. But I want you to know that I am in wholehearted agreement, not only with your resolution, but with the comments you made in the course of introducing it.

I agree that article II makes it impossible for you to do more than to express the sentiments of the Senate on this subject. But it should be recalled that at the time the article was written the need for giving the Executive the power to fill vacancies during Senate recesses was far greater than it is today, for it was not contemplated then that the Congress would be in almost continuous session, as modern times demand.

I think, however, that I should add one point to the resolution, if I had a say in the matter. It seems to me that the Senate should recognize that if a Justice is not to take his seat under an interim appointment, it is critical that the Senate act with the greatest dispatch on the question of confirmation when it reconvenes after the appointment is made. The interim appointment could give a subcommittee the opportunity to make such investigation and hold such hearings as may be necessary even during the recess. In this way expedition would be guaranteed and the difficulties which you state would nonetheless be substantially obviated.

Sincerely,
PHILIP B. KURLAND,
Professor of Law.

INDIANA UNIVERSITY,
July 29, 1960.

Hon. PHILIP A. HART,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HART: I appreciated your thoughtfulness in writing me and advising of the Senate resolution concerning appointments to the Supreme Court. I believe that your resolution has much merit.

Sincerely yours,
LEON H. WALLACE.

Mr. HART. Perhaps it would be helpful for me to excerpt, very briefly, the points made by those students of the law.

The dean of the University of Pennsylvania Law School stated, among other things, when referring to a situation in which an interim appointee participated in the business of the Court, prior to confirmation by the Senate:

It creates an awkward situation both for the Senate and the appointee when the latter takes his seat prior to Senate advice and consent. On the one hand, the Senate is dealing, to some extent, with an accom-

plished fact and does not have full freedom in considering the nomination. On the other hand, the recess appointee is serving under the overhang of Senate consideration of the nomination, which is not in harmony with the constitutional policy of judicial independence.

I see no reason why the President should not be free to make a nomination when Congress is not in session so long as the nominee does not take a seat on the bench.

The dean of the Law School of the University of Michigan wrote:

The subject is a touchy one, but the reasons in support of your resolution are very persuasive indeed. I am inclined to agree that both the Court, the appointees, and the Senate are handicapped by an appointee assuming duties prior to confirmation. I believe that compliance with the resolution would be in the best interests of all concerned.

Professor Kurland, of the University of Chicago, in expressing a personal view, wrote:

I am in wholehearted agreement.

I agree that article II makes it impossible for you to do more than to express the sentiments of the Senate on this subject. But it should be recalled that at the time the article was written—

Referring to that article of the Constitution—

the need for giving the Executive the power to fill vacancies during Senate recesses was far greater than it is today, for it was not contemplated then that the Congress would be in almost continuous session, as modern times demand.

And the dean of the Catholic University Law School has written that he thinks the "resolution is in order."

I believe that by way of fairness, and as a comment on the last three appointments, his additional observation should be placed in the RECORD, as follows:

There were practical reasons why the President made the recess appointments. The load of the Court is heavy, and there is reason to suppose that the Court cannot work effectively unless it can operate at full strength. I am sure that was the reason for the Attorney General's interest in the quick appointments.

Parenthetically let me say that, so far as I am concerned, I, too, believe that was the reason, and I have no quarrel with it.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. HART. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. Does the Senator from Michigan feel that was a valid reason?

Mr. HART. I prefer to respond by saying that as between taking the position "Yes, the Court load is heavy, and therefore the Court must always be filled" and the position that we should, as a practice, have a rule requiring the immediate filling of every vacancy on the Court, I would prefer to reject such a rule. Instead of developing a tradition under which, whenever there is vacancy, someone automatically puts on the robe and goes to work, I would prefer to see the robe put on before the appointment only if there were a demonstrable necessity, apart from application of a general rule that in all cases such appointments should be made because in all cases there is a great deal of work to be done there.

Mr. KUCHEL. I wish to say that I respect my friend, and I think he knows that.

Mr. HART. Yes and I feel similarly toward the gentleman from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. The Senator from Michigan is a friend of mine. But I happen to believe that he is woefully and completely wrong in this instance.

I should like to ask him this question: Does he believe that the ends of justice were served or were not served by the President's three interim appointments which the Senator has described?

Mr. HART. I think I have already indicated that, so far as I am concerned, I have no quarrel with the conduct of the three appointees or with the performance of the Court in connection with the business which came before it during the period of their service.

My concern goes to the basic problem—a problem which, if we express ourselves by means of this resolution, I think will not develop. But I fear very much that it will develop if we do not indicate our attitude. The point is this: The Senate is assigned a heavy duty with respect to nominations to membership on the Supreme Court of the United States; and the Senate is dreadfully handicapped in the discharge of that duty if it has a fait accompli on its hands.

Additionally, I believe the day would never come when any President would put his hand on me and suggest that I should go on that bench; but this I know and feel deeply: If that day ever came, this lawyer would much prefer that he not serve as a Justice of the Supreme Court until he was in full a Justice. He would prefer that, from his own personal standpoint. He would prefer it in deference to the Judiciary Committee. He would prefer it in deference to the Senate, and, indeed, to the institution on which that President might suggest he would serve.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HART. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. My colleague uses the expression "fait accompli." Yet in the record he has compiled he demonstrated in one instance there was no fait accompli, and that the U.S. Senate, regardless of the fact that the President had made the appointment and that the appointee had received it, nevertheless rejected that appointment. I want to be sure what my friend's answer to my first question was.

Mr. HART. May I respond to that point first? The incident cited occurred in 1795. I had not forgotten it, but we were not here at the time.

Mr. KUCHEL. Very well. I want to be sure I understand these answers. Does the Senator believe that the ends of justice were served by the President's three interim appointments to the bench?

Mr. HART. For the purposes of the resolution I am suggesting here, my answer can be "yes," and I believe it to be "yes."

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HART. Continuing with the letter of the dean of Catholic University Law School:

There are times when Justices are sick and when the other men must spread the load. It has never been proposed that the Court should be maintained at full strength through the appointment of circuit judges to sit with the Justices. That is done in the States, but it has not been done on the Supreme Court of the United States.

There is no other institution any where like the Court. There should not be any status but full membership for every person who sits on the Court.

This is the point which I feel so deeply—there should be no such status except in the case of a demonstrable emergency; there should be no one on that Court who is not in all respects a full member of that Court.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HART. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. May I inquire what the idea of a "demonstrable emergency" might be in the mind of the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. HART. Let us assume that several members of the bench are sick and not able to perform, and a death occurs in recess. That might be an unusual circumstance which would make necessary the appointment of a man and his ascension to the bench before there was any action in the Senate. The death of the Chief Justice might well be such an emergency. I am sure there are others.

Mr. HRUSKA. Would a heavy caseload be such an emergency?

Mr. HART. In and of itself, I would suggest "No."

Mr. HRUSKA. If there has been an increase in the caseload from 1,300-some cases to 2,100-some cases, and those cases are pending on the docket which work is burdening the other members of the Supreme Court, is that not an emergency situation of unusual circumstance?

Mr. HART. I prefer to think that we should think of the Court as an instrument in pursuit of justice—not efficiency, not speed. I would prefer to see the decisions of the Supreme Court, whether they are with respect to 1,300 or 13,000 cases, made by men whose occupancy on the seats of that Court is never to be questioned except by impeachment.

Mr. HRUSKA. And, of course, the old adage that justice delayed is justice denied would not be a factor in the mind of the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. HART. I think the Senator from Nebraska understands my position. I would love to see prompt justice. All of us would. But justice includes something besides speed.

Mr. HRUSKA. May I inquire, with reference to the Court's requiring, in the judgment of the professor who was quoted by the Senator from Michigan, full-fledged members at all times, was about the concept of having a full-fledged court? In case of one vacancy, we have eight members of the Court who will exercise the power of nine. We have a situation where for additional months four members will have the power of five, when it comes to the point

of rejecting any plea for relief. Normally, it takes five members of the Court to deny such pleas. Where there are eight members on the Court, four members will be able to block the granting of a prayer to an appellant. What would the Senator from Michigan say as to the idea, not so much of having a full-fledged member, but a full-fledged court of complete and competent jurisdiction?

Mr. HART. I would like to see a full-fledged court of full-fledged members.

Mr. HRUSKA. So would I; but when it comes to a choice between a full-fledged member—who, as experience has shown ripens into a confirmed member, in due time, when a recess appointment is made—and a court which has eight members and one who will be shortly confirmed, the choice is not difficult to make.

Mr. HART. It could ripen into a little problem that is also suggested by this resolution.

In my deepest conscience, I doubt if any President would ever designate to that Court a man who was other than wholly honorable; but there is the problem not alone of doing justice, but, to the extent that we can eliminate it, of eliminating any circumstance that might argue something less than justice was done.

Here we come to another basic problem. The litigant disappointed by a decision of the Court, on which one of the members of that Court was not a full-fledged member, may for the rest of his life wonder whether that non-full-fledged member was unconsciously influenced. How? Who knows? It may be in one of several ways: Either to take a position during his period of probation which would please the President who had appointed him and who could withdraw his name; or to please the Senate, which, sooner or later, would either approve or disapprove; or, at the other extreme, conscious of the fact that there would be public scrutiny and interpretation of his action in light of whether he was bending to the Senate or to the President, he would rear back and bend the other way in order to prove that he was subservient to neither branch.

Mr. President, this is not good, and this is not necessary.

May I conclude, and I do so because I know there is an hour and a half available to those who have been questioning me.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one brief question?

Mr. HART. Yes.

Mr. KUCHEL. The Senator, I am sure, was not implying in any fashion whatsoever that such a hazard as he has just outlined took place with respect to the last three appointees?

Mr. HART. The Senator may rise and ask that question as often as he feels necessary. I would want him to, because I would want this RECORD to be perfectly clear. In my book, this Court, in the case of the three men who happen to have arrived there through that device, is graced by their membership.

Mr. President, I wish to include in the RECORD, having obtained permission to do so, a letter addressed to me by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. The Senator from Wyoming had hoped to remain on the floor to participate in this discussion. Because there was business following the introduction of his insurance bill, he felt could not remain longer.

He said in his letter, in part:

Recess appointments for the operating heads of executive agencies are, of course, very much in order to assure the continued disposition of public business. The Supreme Court is not, however, an operating agency and it can transact its business effectively even with a vacancy. You are quite correct in believing that Senators called upon to confirm a sitting Justice are under pressures which they ought not be under; conversely, a Justice sitting without his appointment confirmed is also subject to subtle pressures which should not be permitted to exist.

I suggest the necessity of agreeing to the resolution, for the reason, in part, assigned by the Senator from Wyoming in his letter, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in its entirety.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., August 23, 1960.

Hon. PHILIP A. HART,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR PHIL: I regret very much that I was unable to attend the judiciary meeting on Monday, August 22, when your Resolution 334 with respect to recess appointments of Supreme Court Justices was ordered reported favorably. I commend you for your efforts in this direction. I do not know what assistance I can lend you on the floor, but I shall wish to do anything within my power to assist its passage.

Recess appointments for the operating heads of executive agencies are, of course, very much in order to assure the continued disposition of public business. The Supreme Court is not, however, an operating agency and it can transact its business effectively even with a vacancy. You are quite correct in believing that Senators called upon to confirm a sitting Justice are under pressures which they ought not be under; conversely, a Justice sitting without his appointment confirmed is also subject to subtle pressures which should not be permitted to exist.

With kind regards.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I compliment the Senator from Michigan for a worthwhile and valid discussion of an exceedingly pertinent subject. I assure the Senator I fully support his views.

Mr. HART. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, how much time remains to the proponents of the resolution?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The proponents have 23 minutes remaining; the opponents have 90 minutes.

Mr. HART. I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have been privileged this afternoon to hear two very able speeches, one on the subject which is now before the Senate; the other delivered by the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]. Had I the time, I should like to comment in relation to the speech by the Senator from Montana, because I think it was a fine review of the world situation. I did not hear the Senator from Montana relate his remarks particularly to Russia or to Red China, two world forces which are, of course, in Africa, decidedly so, and having much to do there.

However, I wish to discuss today the issue brought up by the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART]. I am reminded of an incident in which the Supreme Court of Wisconsin said to a young man who was addressing the court, "We have heard a brilliant exposition of the facts. Now would you mind telling us what the law is?"

The young man replied, "No, Your Honors, I would not; but the law is against me."

What is the law on the subject before us? What is the fundamental law? It is the Constitution of the United States. I shall read the pertinent provision:

The President shall have power to fill up all vacancies that may happen during the recess of the Senate, by granting commissions which shall expire at the end of their next session.

That is the law. That is the constitutional law. All the resolutions we pass will have no effect. In fact, they will tend to make us a laughingstock. The filling of vacancies on the Supreme Court during recess is a definite power lodged in the President under the Constitution; we, as legislators, do not like to have our powers meddled with. Similarly, the Executive does not like to have his powers meddled with; in fact, we cannot do anything about his powers. They are set out in the Constitution. There may be plenty of argument about what we think they ought to be, or what others think they ought to be. But the Founding Fathers decided what those powers are.

I have already stated that the Constitution specifically grants to the President the power "to fill up all vacancies that may happen during the recess of the Senate," and the Senate lacks the authority to interfere with the exercise of this power.

I return to the first provision. I read:

The President shall have power to fill up all vacancies that may happen during the recess of the Senate, by granting commissions which shall expire at the end of their session.

Where is the provision for advice and consent? It is not there. I repeat. The wisdom of the Founding Fathers determined this particular form; of section 2 of article II in relation to the powers of the President.

When the Committee on the Judiciary considered Senate Resolution 334, expressing the sense of the Senate that recess appointments to the Supreme Court not be made except under unusual circumstances, I objected to it on the ground that it constituted an improper interference with Executive powers and privileges. I still continue in my objection to this resolution. My objections can be summarized as follows:

First, as I have already said, the Constitution specifically grants the Presi-

dent the power to "fill up all vacancies that may happen during the recess of the Senate," and the Senate lacks the authority to interfere with the exercise of this power. I sincerely trust that we shall not begin to meddle and muddle, in an attempt to erode the Constitution.

Second, the Constitution grants the President the power to nominate Supreme Court Justices and then to appoint them "by and with the advice and consent of the Senate—when the Senate is in session." The power of the Senate is thus limited to the time after a Justice is nominated, not prior to it.

Third, the resolution is a mere expression of congressional opinion. Of course, we recognize it has no compelling force.

Fourth, lacking any compelling power, the passage of the resolution may seem to imply that Congress is of the view that the Chief Executive cannot be entrusted with the power given to him by the Founding Fathers. Let us consider that.

Fifth, the adoption of the resolution may be construed as a critical reflection of those judges who commence or may commence to serve under recess appointments, and also upon the President for making such appointments. Is that our position? Is that what we are here for? As was suggested so ably today by the distinguished Senator from Ohio, we have other functions to perform which really concern the very vitality of the country.

The language of the resolution is phrased in such ambiguous fashion as to make its meaning totally uncertain. The resolution expresses the sense of the Senate that recess appointments "should not be made except under unusual circumstances." It fails, however, to identify such "circumstances" and consequently confuses the issue rather than clarifies it.

Furthermore, the resolution still leaves to the Chief Executive the final decision as to the existence of such unusual circumstances. Thus, while it imposes a new standard on the exercise of Executive power, it fails to give the President any guidance as to its meaning.

Article II, section 2, clause 2, of the Constitution provides that the President shall have "power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur; and he shall nominate, and, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint Ambassadors, other public Ministers and consuls, judges of the Supreme Court, and all other officers of the United States." This applies, as previously stated, when the Senate is in session.

Students of constitutional history have clearly emphasized the difference between the President's power to make treaties and his power to make appointments. The language of clause 2 clearly establishes the fact that the President requires the consent of the Senate to make any treaties. But clause 2 clearly states, also, that in the appointment of U.S. officers the President must have the advice and consent of the Senate only after he has already made a nomination.

This constitutional provision specifically distinguishes between the nomination of a person to a public office—which is done by the President alone—and the appointment of such person to the office—which is accomplished only after the Senate has given its consent. It is clear, therefore, that the power of the Senate to give its advice and consent is limited—and I emphasize this—to a time subsequent to a nomination, rather than prior to it. For the Senate now to endeavor to prescribe new rules for the making of nominations to the Supreme Court appears to be an interference with the constitutional provisions.

Mr. President, we find that at this time some Senators wish to require that when the President is about to appoint during a recess of the Senate, he should consult with the Senate—but how? How could he then consult with the Senate, inasmuch as it would not be in session? Is it meant that he should consult with individual Senators? Just what is the meaning?

It has been well established historically that the power of nomination belongs to the President alone, and that this prevents the Senate from attaching conditions to its approval of an appointment—such as it may do to its approval of a treaty. This division of power between the President and the Senate with regard to public appointments was clearly established early in our constitutional history. An 1837 opinion of the Attorney General clearly states, with regard to advice and consent:

> The Senate cannot originate an appointment. Its constitutional action is confined to the simple affirmation or rejection of the President's nomination [Op. Atty. Gen. 188 (1837)].

Furthermore, article II, section 2, clause 3 of the Constitution provides that "The President shall have power to fill up all vacancies that may happen during the recess of the Senate by granting commissions which shall expire at the end of their next session." The reason for the enactment of this clause is the fact that the very nature of the Executive power requires that it shall always be "in capacity for action." The constitutional provision dealing with recess appointments was obviously intended by the Founding Fathers to give the President the power to assure continuity in the functions of Government during the recess of Congress. In enacting this constitutional provision, it was the view of the Founding Fathers that continuity in Government is more important than the certainty that no person should hold any office prior to his Senate confirmation.

Senate Resolution 334 now endeavors to do away with the original constitutional intent—by stating, in fact, that the power of the Senate to advise and consent should take priority over the need for continuity in government. It is my belief that if it is the desire of Congress to bring a new principle into the management of government affairs in connection with the making of recess appointments, it should do so directly rather than indirectly. If it is our desire to prevent recess appointments, we should go about it by means of an amendment to the Constitution, rather than by a Senate resolution.

Over the years, the President has exercised with restraint and in a manner that has fulfilled the intent of the Constitution the power to make recess appointments. I believe that we must assume that the person whom we elect to be our Chief Executive is—and will continue to be—aware of the problems which may be raised by making recess appointments. To deprive the President of this power would be unfair and unreasonable interference with his executive authority—and will violate the principle of the separation of powers.

As a body vested with the power to legislate, the Senate is under a duty to utilize its prerogatives effectively; that is, in a manner which will enhance the welfare of this Nation. In my opinion, passage of Senate Resolution 334 will not foster this objective; and, accordingly, consideration thereof, as well as its passage, may be condemned as a waste of time.

Mr. President, I am very seriously concerned, because, if my recollection is correct, in all of my 21 years of service in the U.S. Senate, this is the first time the Senate has had before it any measure—whether a resolution or some other type of legislative proposal—proposed in an attempt to interfere with the basic law of the land, by trying to change it or modify it. We know that cannot be done by such means.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded to the Senator from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. I thank the Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the result of such an attempt would be to put us in the position of being considered a laughingstock by the people, both now and in the future. Let us not try to erode away the most precious inheritance we have.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, does the Senator from Wisconsin yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. WILEY. I do.

Mr. KEATING. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, earlier I said that I do not question in any fashion the sincerity or the good faith of my friend, the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the author of the pending resolution. Likewise, I am sure he does not question mine.

Mr. President, the pending resolution is pregnant with mischief. It is wrong. It would unconstitutionally attempt, in so many words, to amend the Constitution of the United States and that we ought not, in this illegal manner, attempt. As my able friend, the Senator

from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], has stated, the Constitution provides, in part:

> The President * * * shall nominate, and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint * * * judges of the Supreme Court.

Among others.

And in the next paragraph, the Constitution provides:

> The President shall have power to fill up all vacancies that may happen during the recess of the Senate, by granting commissions which shall expire at the end of their next session.

Those are the constitutional provisions; they are crystal clear; and it ill becomes the Senate now, by the consideration and the possible adoption of this resolution, to try to say, by way of an addendum, "However, we do not want the President of the United States to operate under this part of the Constitution unless he finds that there are 'unusual circumstances' during a recess of the Senate, when a vacancy on the Supreme Court occurs." What does that phrase, indeed, mean?

Mr. President, what would be your thought if the President of the United States wrote to the Senate a letter in which he stated, "In the future, when I send to you any nomination for an appointment to the Supreme Court, I suggest that the Senate Committee on the Judiciary take not more than 15 days to make its decision as to whether to report the nomination favorably to the Senate."

Mr. President, of course, no President of the United States would do that.

And after the Constitution provides, in irresistibly American fashion, that the Senate shall advise and consent to the appointments the Chief Executive makes, it ill becomes, I repeat, the Senate to attempt to tell the President as to the fashion in which he shall discharge his constitutional responsibility, and as to the fashion in which he shall not follow that responsibility.

Simply stated, that is the issue which confronts us. Stripped of the verbiage in which it has now twice been written, the pending resolution is simply an unfair, unhappy, unconstitutional attempt to sheer away some of the constitutional powers of the Chief Executive in making appointments to the highest tribunal in this land.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. ENGLE. What does my colleague think the Constitution means when it refers to "advice"? We cannot tell the President that we advise him not to send to us any interim appointments because it is embarrassing to Senators to interrogate those who wear the robes of the Supreme Court of our land. It seems to me this resolution is advisory, for, as I understand it, in no way does it inhibit or limit or curtail in a legal sense the power of the President to make such appointments.

If the word "advice," as used in the Constitution, means anything, it means that the Senate has a right to give an advisory opinion that it is the sense of the majority of the Senate that that way is not the way the President should do it. That is the point, it seems to me. Otherwise, the Senate either consents or refuses to consent, but gives no advice.

Therefore, I ask my colleague whether he thinks it improper for the Senate to give an advisory opinion, and thereby express the sense of the Senate, when, in doing so, no inhibitions at all would be put on the President.

Mr. KUCHEL. I regret very much that my colleague and I apparently are at variance on this occasion.

Mr. ENGLE. We may not be at variance; I am merely asking for clarification.

Mr. KUCHEL. Let me say, as clearly as I can, that, in my judgment, the phrase "advice and consent of the Senate" is inherent in the constitutional responsibility the Senate discharges each time the President sends to the Senate a nomination which, under the Constitution, requires the advice and consent of the Senate. That phrase describes our function when a nomination is received.

But I say to my colleague that what is sought to be accomplished by the pending resolution, which I regard as unwise and unconstitutional, is to sheer off part of the President's responsibility under the Constitution of the United States, under the provision:

> The President shall have power to fill up all vacancies that may happen during the recess of the Senate, by granting commissions which shall expire at the end of their next session.

I say to my colleague that what is sought to be done here is to say to this President, to the next President, and to any President, Democratic or Republican, "We do not want you to discharge your constitutional 'power to fill up all vacancies that may happen during the recess of the Senate' unless you find there are unusual circumstances with respect to a Supreme Court vacancy." That is a ridiculous thing.

Unusual circumstances? The Constitution is silent in that respect.

The other phrase that is used——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded to the Senator from California has expired.

Mr. KUCHEL. May I have 2 more minutes?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I yield 3 more minutes to my friend, the Senator from California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized for 3 additional minutes.

Mr. KEATING. At this time I wish to respond directly to the question asked by the junior Senator from California, if I may do so.

Mr. KUCHEL. Certainly.

Mr. KEATING. The Constitution provides:

> The President * * * shall nominate,—

And I call attention to the fact that a comma appears after the word "nominate"—

> and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint ambassadors.

And others.

The President nominates, not with any advice or consent, for in the Constitution, following the words, "he shall nominate," a comma appears, and then come the words, "and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint."

I have made rather exhaustive research, but it has not led me to any precedent which would justify adoption by the Senate of a resolution which might well be construed as an effort to tell the Chief Executive, in advance, how he is to make his appointments to the Supreme Court. There is no precedent for the Senate adopting a resolution in advance which might well be construed as an effort to tell the Chief Executive how he is to make his appointments to the Supreme Court.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an observation?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. ENGLE. If I thought this resolution was a reflection upon our Chief Justices or any of the Justices of the Supreme Court, I would not be for it. I would not support any resolution which reflected on a separate and equal branch of the Government.

Nominations come before our committees on the theory that the Senate is to advise and consent; but never do we give any advice. If any advice has been given, I have never been aware of it. It seems to me it would be sound, when the Senate has power to advise and consent, for the Senate to give expression to its advice to the President.

This resolution would not inhibit the constitutional power, but would express the sense of the Senate with reference to how these appointments, which are subject to the advice and consent of the Senate, should be exercised.

I admit that there is a very fine line of distinction, and my colleague from California makes a good point when he quotes the language of the Constitution. I would not inhibit that power; but in my brief service I have failed to see any advice given on these appointments. As a result, we get appointments which perhaps, if we had given advice on them, we would not get.

With regard to judicial appointments, I have the same reluctance as has the junior Senator from Michigan. It seems to me, as a lawyer who has great respect for the courts, it is a little difficult, with our attitude and with our background in the law, to have a man walk into committee who is wearing the judicial robes, and, after writing seven or eight decisions, be questioned with reference to his competency. It is something I would rather not see occur. If we have to do it, I suppose we will do it; but I would prefer not to do it, because it is embarrassing to those of us who are lawyers to interrogate a man wearing the robes, who has already written decisions, and who will probably be questioned on the decisions he has already made. That is the thing which disturbs me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. KEATING. I yield 3 more minutes to the distinguished Senator from California.

Mr. ENGLE. I appreciate my friend's yielding to me.

Mr. KEATING. I wish to make a brief statement, and then I shall be glad to yield to my colleague. I have found my colleague from California [Mr. ENGLE] to be a reasonable man—at times. I want to try to convince him, if I can, that this resolution departs from the spirit of what the Senate has done in the past and what it should do here tonight. I feel very deeply that we would make a serious mistake in agreeing to this resolution, and one which we would at some future time regret.

The "advice and consent" language of the Constitution has been referred to. I concede there have been many times when advice has not been sought by Chief Executives as much as it might have been. However, as I read the language, the advice and consent apply to the particular appointment. It seems to me very clear: "he shall nominate"—there is no advice and consent about his nominations, "and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint" various individuals.

It seems to me implicit in that language that the wording "advice and consent" relates to a particular nominee, and not any general advice such as envisioned in the resolution, which is a general advice as to how the President shall operate under all conditions. That is the point I wanted to make.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question? Will either the Senator from California or the Senator from New York yield for a question?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I yield 2 more minutes to the Senator from California.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is there any question about which of the paragraphs is applicable when the President makes an appointment during recess? Is it the last paragraph of section 2, or the one that was just read by the Senator from New York?

Mr. KUCHEL. The last paragraph. There can be no question about that, I will say to my friend.

Mr. LAUSCHE. There is no question that the last paragraph of section 2 is applicable to appointments made during recess?

Mr. KEATING. There is no question that it is applicable to recess appointments; but I feel it must be read with the preceding paragraph in connection with the method of making nominations and appointments.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, self-government is indeed on trial today. Self-government by peoples through representatives is a difficult chore. I do not think the Senate ought to try to make it more difficult by passing this resolution.

A part of the American system, as Senators know, is an independent judiciary. From 1851 until 1954 no interim appointments were made by the President of the United States of individuals to become members of the Supreme Court, who then assumed their responsibilities and took their oath of office. In 1953 the incumbent Chief Executive made the first three such appointments during his term. They were excellent appointments. I think it is to his credit, Mr. President, that he acted with dispatch. The author of the resolution, to his credit, has said that in each instance the three appointees to the U.S. Supreme Court, under those circumstances, was a man of great capacity and integrity, and he approves of their gracing the Supreme Court bench.

I can only say that, in my judgment, it would be a sad and tragic mistake for the Senate, in this extra-constitutional attempt, to tell the President what he should do and how he should do it under the clear wording of the Constitution. It would be a frightful wrong. It would do a wrong to the theory of American government, and, in the last analysis, it would be a completely meaningless and idle act.

I hope that, on a bipartisan basis, the resolution will go down to the defeat which it deserves.

I thank my friend from New York, and I yield back whatever time I have left.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA].

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, this body is frequently referred to as a deliberative body. I wonder if we are not doing violence to the term this afternoon if we go through with the approval of the instant resolution.

I should like to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the resolution was submitted on June 16 of this year, only a little more than 2 months ago.

There was no reference of the resolution to any subcommittee. There was no meeting of any subcommittee. There was no reference of the resolution to any of the departments.

We all know what is the usual procedure. The first thing which is usually done with any resolution is that it is referred to the department or departments concerned with the subject matter. That was not done. There was no reference of the resolution to the Department of Justice. There was no reference of the resolution to the Judicial Conference, which speaks for a coequal and independent branch of the Government, consisting of the judiciary.

There were no hearings on the resolution. There was a brief discussion immediately prior to the time the resolution was reported by the committee of the Senate, at which time the only material before the members of the committee, consisted of the text of the resolution.

It is sought to construe the Constitution and to apply it. This is sought to be done on the basis of ill-considered and inadequately considered history.

Another reason why we ought to hold our tongues in cheek when we refer to ourselves as a deliberative body this afternoon, is that we are taking the equivalent of a half day for the purpose of considering and voting upon a measure which has had no consideration worthy of the word and are refusing consistently to consider such an important piece of proposed legislation as that to which the Senator from Ohio referred about an hour or an hour and a half ago. On the contrary, that proposed legislation has a long history of committee action, not only in this body but also in the other body. It has been considered not only by one committee but also by two committees in this body and by the Judiciary Committee in the other body. It has been acted upon twice in the other body. It has been passed. It was actually approved. It is pending before this body now. It is a full-fledged, well-considered, and well-rounded bill which was approved by the other body. It involves a situation which is important. It involves a situation in which the Supreme Court struck down the regulations by which passports were issued by the Secretary of State. Now there are no limitations and no regulations whatsoever governing that situation.

In the first 5 months following the decision over 2 years ago, in June of 1958, about 500 well-known persons who are active in and sympathetic to the international Communist movement applied for passports, received them, and traveled to their ideological homeland, the U.S.S.R. Those passports not only got them there, but insured the protection of the majesty of this Government on the other side of the water, wherever they went, and guaranteed their reentry into this country after they had "put in a few good licks" on behalf of betraying this country and turning it over to the international Communist movement. That is what would happen if they had their way.

Mr. President, the Members of this body had better hold their tongues in cheek when they consider this a deliberative body, in the light of these two facts.

What is sought to be done today? It is suggested that we take a step which is in derogation of the constitutional powers and duties of the President. The clause involved has been read several times. I shall read it again, so that it will appear in the proper context with my remarks. It is the last clause of section 2, article II, of our Constitution:

> The President shall have power to fill up all vacancies that may happen during the recess of the Senate, by granting commissions which shall expire at the end of their next session.

Mr. President, I invite attention to the words "fill up." It is said:

> The President shall have power to fill up all vacancies.

That language does not say there shall be nominations made which shall be held in abeyance. The Founding Fathers who drew the document undoubtedly had in mind that the positions would be filled up, not on an abeyance basis, but on an actual basis.

It is sought to place into this language a limitation which is far beyond any necessity in the situation. Certain objections are heard. The Senator sponsoring the resolution, in one of the earlier appearances he made, before any of the hearings on confirmation of nominations in the Committee on the Judiciary, was impressed with certain arguments and reasons, which he set forth in the report. He cites them as reasons why we should change at this time and should express the sense of the Senate in the fashion which I have described.

Mr. President, these objections and any others which might be registered should be weighed in the light of what the resolution would do. The resolution, among other things, would involve a delay in regard to the taking office by any nominee named during a recess. What would be one of the first consequences of that? One of the first consequences would be the absence of a single member of the Supreme Court, which magnifies the power of the remaining Justices.

All of us know that normally when an appellant comes to the Supreme Court and places before the Court his prayer for relief, in a nine-man Court a vote of five members is required to grant the prayer of the appellant. It takes five out of nine to get that job done.

Throughout the months when there would be only eight Justices serving on the Court, a vote of 4 to 4 would mean that no relief would be granted. No action would be taken. The appellant would remain in the very place in which he was put by the court from which he appealed.

This could have been the situation in a number of cases during the 7 interim months of Justice Potter, for example. He was nominated in October. His nomination was not confirmed until May. There were 7 full months of Court proceedings in which four members would have been able to effect the result I cite.

When we show concern or seek to show concern about litigants who might theoretically be affected by what a recess appointee might do, we should remember that we are faced with the situation which happens quite regularly in connection with a 5-to-4 decision. That is something not out of the ordinary, as a brief reference to the decisions of the Supreme Court will indicate. We are urged to put aside the practical effect because of a mere theoretical possibility which may or may not happen.

We are asked, "Why should the situation be different now? In the past 7 years, three Supreme Court Justices, the Chief Justice and two Associate Justices, assumed the duties of their offices and qualified for their offices and started the discharge of their duties immediately upon appointment, but did not await confirmation of their nominations by the Senate."

We did not have the opportunity to get the reasons why this was done. We have no report from the Judicial Conference. Undoubtedly there were reasons why those three men immediately assumed their duties. Undoubtedly those in charge of the administration of the courts and of the executive department were aware that previously it had not been done that way. We should assume there were good reasons why there was a departure from the precedents.

I should like to suggest some reasons. One is that there is a constantly rising volume of litigation. I shall give only one statistic. I did not come to the Chamber prepared with others, but it would be easy to compile them. In 1950 there were 1,335 cases on the Supreme Court docket, and in the fall of 1959, when the October term started, there were 2,178. That is an increase of 843 cases.

It is said, "There should be full fledged Justices only, and not those who are provisionally created."

Mr. President, these Judges are not provisionally created. They are constitutionally created. Moreover, it seems to me that the argument that the Court should be at its full strength is a more persuasive one, inasmuch as otherwise litigants would be denied the functioning of a full Court.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I yield the Senator 5 more minutes.

Mr. HRUSKA. They are denied the functioning of a full Court, to their practical and irreparable detriment, unless the full nine Justices are actually functioning.

Another reason could be that, after all, there must always be a Chief Justice. In the past 15 or 20 years in this country we have adopted policies and statutes which have thrust upon the Chief Justice many key and necessary activities, some of which are administrative in character. For example, the Administrative Office has been established. Judicial Conferences are held. There are circuit conferences. There are circuit councils, and so on.

There must always be a Chief Justice, if we expect the duties assigned to the Chief Justice to be performed. It will not do to have an acting Chief Justice. There should be a Chief Justice who, upon appointment, will commence the performance of his duties. The procedure of confirmation can be gone into afterward. After all, we are dealing with the head of a coordinate, coequal and independent branch of the Government, and there should be no inhibition upon him, nor should there be any desire to raise an obstruction to a prompt and immediate designation and qualification of the nominee pursuant to the language of the Constitution which has been followed all these years.

The President has the power to fill vacancies, and no question whatsoever of advice and consent is encountered at that point.

Finally, I wonder if the purpose of the sponsor of this resolution has not been served by this discussion we have had here. This problem is being reviewed. It has been extensively, thoroughly and competently researched by my colleague from New York, and he will shortly enlighten the Senate with the benefit of the study which he has accorded the subject. It will serve the purpose of calling attention to this problem.

If there are situations in which the volume of the litigation or other circumstance does not prevail which make it necessary for the appointee to qualify immediately, I have an idea that the appointment would be held in abeyance until we are called back into session, at least for either announcement of the appointment or for qualification of the justice himself.

But I suggest that this discussion does tend to serve the purpose, and in the judgment of the Senator from Nebraska, it serves it fairly well, so that it will not be necessary to engage in a formal declaration of the kind which we are considering, and which would be in derogation of a plainly stated Presidential right and duty provided in the Constitution itself.

I say again that it would be a reflection upon the respect which this Senate has always placed on the Constitution for us to proceed to a step of this kind, virtually upon the basis of testimony of one of our Members, reference to two or three law journal articles, and without the benefit of either the Judicial Conference, the Department of Justice or even a serious and ample discussion among members of the Judiciary Committee itself. I urge my colleagues at least to consider a motion for recommitting the resolution to the Judiciary Committee so that we may come back in due time with a more considered judgment.

I know the argument will be raised that if we do not take action now, we will not do so at all, because this is the end of one administration and we would hesitate to take action in another administration which is just starting, for fear that it would be a reflection upon the new President.

When we get to that argument I say that however sincere and however express are the attempts on the part of the sponsor of the resolution or anyone else to divorce any impact of the approval of this resolution from the three nominations which were made by the present administration they would be futile. Built into the resolution and the consideration thereof, is a rebuff of those nominations, in spite of the disavowals.

I say that with all due respect to my colleague, because I know he is sincere when he indicates his intention not to reflect in any way upon the three nominations which we have discussed this afternoon, but a consideration by anyone of this situation in gross will certainly lead to the impression that that was the reason for the proposed resolution.

Frankly had the action not taken place, this resolution would not have been introduced.

Again I say on the basis of the inadequate record and inadequate consideration, the least we should do this afternoon or evening is to approve a motion to recommit the resolution to the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may need.

I know of the great interest of our distinguished colleague from Michigan in this subject. He is completely sincere. He and I have discussed it. We find ourselves in disagreement. I do not want anything I might say in any way to be considered as a reflection upon his sincerity, his ability, or his judgment. I hope that as a result of what I and others may say he will see fit to ask that the resolution be withdrawn at this time.

I very much fear a straight partisan vote on the issue. To my mind that would be regrettable. We are not deal-

ing with a partisan matter, but I do share the views expressed by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska that what we do today is very likely to be construed as an effort to criticize either the present Chief Executive, the Court, or both.

A word about the history of the resolution. It was first submitted on June 16, 1960, only a little more than 2 months ago. The resolution has never had the consideration of any subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary. No hearings whatsoever have been held. No reports and no comments were ever requested from any of the interested Government departments or agencies. It received less than a half hour of study or discussion—I would be inclined to say less than 20 minutes—in the full Committee of the Judiciary before being reported to the Senate. There was a voice vote. Though two or three of us voted no, the resolution was reported, and now it is before us.

The history of this resolution does not seem an appropriate basis for legislating on a subject of such delicacy as appointments to the Supreme Court of the United States. At the very minimum, a report should have been requested from the Judicial Conference of the United States in a matter with such a potentially heavy impact as this resolution would have on the entire judiciary.

The only reason I can think of for not asking for such a report is that the Conference would wish to take the time necessary to fully deliberate and study the issues raised by the resolution. But that is not a reason for bypassing the Conference. The resolution needs to be studied. The Judicial Conference is the body to which such matters are usually referred. Such study and deliberation should be welcomed, not shortcutted or bypassed or rejected. The Judicial Conference has never refused its full cooperation with Congress on any matter on which its assistance was requested. Nothing more logically warrants consideration of the Conference than a resolution such as this. Yet we look in vain for so much as one word from the Conference, or one phrase or sentence or any kind of advice or guidance or counsel from the Conference on this subject.

The same could be said about the Department of Justice. At least the Department of Justice should be given an opportunity to comment on the resolution. It might decline to do so, or it might agree to do so.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Will the Senator identify the function and composition of the Judicial Conference?

Mr. KEATING. The Judicial Conference is made up of the chief judges of the various courts of appeal, and certain district court judges and is presided over by the Chief Justice of the United States.

I think it is fair to ask why we must act with this haste. Why must we consider such a far-reaching resolution with so little preparation? What great crisis calls for this precipitate action? Bills have been pending on the calendar not for 2 months, but for many months. There is other proposed legislation which has been on the calendar for years. It is still unacted on. It is important legislation. Why should we decide to displace all this important proposed legislation in order to plunge headlong into unnecessary debate dealing with recess appointments to the Supreme Court, particularly debate which could easily be misconstrued?

If for no other reason, the resolution should be rejected because of the failure to submit it to the scrutiny of the Judicial Conference, and at least to give some of the executive departments an opportunity to comment on it if they care to do so.

Where does the American Bar Association stand on the resolution? Frequently we ask the views of the American Bar Association on such matters. Many distinguished lawyers are visiting in Washington attending their convention. It seems that this is a peculiarly appropriate question to submit to the American Bar Association. I should like to know where the New York State Bar Association stands on this issue, or the Bar Association of the City of New York. Other Members would like to know where their State bar associations stand. It would be extremely helpful for us to have them analyze the measure. Why must we proceed to act now without giving these organizations an opportunity to be heard?

Has the issue of recess appointments to the Supreme Court suddenly become a part of the majority leader's sacrosanct list of must bills, or a part of his select program? If so, I wonder under what possible standard of what constitutes the people's business this matter is given priority over all the vital matters which should be considered, including, indeed, the one so eloquently advanced today on the floor of the Senate by the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], which is the problem of dealing with the Communist conspiracy in our own country.

If we are sincerely interested in doing something about the courts, if we are sincerely interested in advancing the public interest in regard to the function of the judiciary, why do we not take the time we devote to the consideration of the pending resolution and consider instead the omnibus judgeship bill, which has been on the Senate Calendar, not since the time the pending resolution was placed on the calendar, which was a month or so ago, but since September 1959, almost a year ago. Action on that bill is needed and is truly critical. Judgeship legislation deserves priority, not proposed advice to the Chief Executive. We should pass laws which will adequately staff the courts of the United States with the judge power that is needed to expeditiously and properly deal with the business of the courts.

The omnibus judgeship bill has been studied and restudied for years. It has been the subject of extensive hearings. Volumes of testimony have been taken on it. No one who is at all familiar with the problem doubts the necessity for the expansion of our judge power. The President included legislation in this area in his list of necessary legislation to be passed at this session of Congress. He has time and time again pleaded for legislation in this field. How can we possibly justify placing the pending resolution, which has had no study and no hearings, no agency reports, and no review by the bar associations or by the Judicial Conference, and not one scintilla of urgency connected with it, ahead of the omnibus judgeship bill?

How can we place this issue ahead of passport legislation? How can we place it ahead of the need to improve immigration legislation? How, indeed, can we place it ahead of the necessity to act in the field of civil rights, minimum pay, housing, school construction, medicare, situs picketing, or the five subjects mentioned by the majority leader to be dealt with at this session? They are all important. I hope that we will stay in session until we have dealt with those five problems.

Certainly, this problem is not on the necessary list of anyone. It does not share importance in any way with these five measures, or immigration legislation, or civil rights legislation, or passport legislation, or many other pieces of proposed legislation on the long list of items on which the Senate ought to be acting at this time.

We are faced with a rather extensive debate on the resolution. I do not know of any circumstances which justify approving a resolution which interferes with the explicit power granted to the President under article II, section 2, clause 3, of the Constitution pertaining to the making of recess appointments to the Supreme Court.

That section of our fundamental law, interestingly enough, is not even mentioned in the committee report on the resolution. Could it be that in the haste to report the measure and to rush it through, and in the failure to consult experts on the subject, the committee actually overlooked the clear and explicit language of the Constitution dealing with the President's authority to make recess appointments?

It has been quoted before, but it cannot be quoted too often, and it is necessary for me to read this sentence again, for a continuity of my presentation.

It provides:

> The President shall have power to fill up all vacancies that may happen during the recess of the Senate, by granting commissions which shall expire at the end of their next session.

Since when have we started to amend provisions of the Constitution by the sense of a Senate resolution? Such a course as this is wholly without precedent. I have exhaustively endeavored to obtain knowledge of any precedent for this kind of action. I should be delighted to be referred to one. I have not been referred to any precedent. Such action on the part of the Senate would certainly not be a constructive influence on the implementation of our fundamental law.

The report of the committee contains the remarks of the distinguished Senator

from Michigan, in which he expressed the hope that the adoption by the Senate of this resolution "would clearly advise the President, whoever he is, that this is the sense of the Senate," and the hope that in all but the most exceptional circumstances the next President "will refrain from making such recess appointments."

I do not question the good faith or the purpose of the Senator from Michigan. I have already said so. I say it again. I say it lest in the heat of my argument something might be said which could possibly reflect upon him. He is sincere in his objective. He is well motivated. He is learned in the work of the Senate. What he says, however, in my judgment, is in direct contradiction of the plain words of the Constitution and at variance with the power and authority of the President under the explicit mandate of the Constitution.

The resolution proposes an unprecedented extension of the power of the Senate to advise and consent. It is unparalleled. In my judgment, it is mischievous. It should not be tolerated. This is not an affirmation of the power to advise and consent. It is an intrusion upon a power wholly foreign to the function of the Senate, namely, the power of the President to make recess appointments in accordance with his constitutional authority.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEATING. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I have just read the resolution. It seems to me that it amounts to an advisory expression by the Senate. I do not believe it would preclude the President from making recess appointments. Is my understanding correct?

Mr. KEATING. I agree with the Senator in that regard.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It is advisory only. It is the function of the Senate to advise with respect to appointments under the Constitution.

Mr. KEATING. It is; and this has been the subject of a colloquy in which I am happy to have the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, who is a fine lawyer, engage. I do not believe that this is the type of advice which is contemplated under the terms of the Constitution.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The authority and the duty to advise is initiated only when an appointment is made.

Mr. KEATING. That is my opinion. The language in which reference to advice and consent is made is as follows:

> The President shall nominate, and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint.

In other words, the effort to advise him how he shall make nominations in advance is not the advice and consent which was contemplated by the terms of the Constitution.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The Senator may be correct. However, I do not know of anything to prohibit the Senate from expressing a view or an opinion that it would be well for such an appointment not to be made during the period of a recess. Is there anything in the Constitution which prohibits or inhibits the Senate, in its wisdom, from making such a suggestion by way of a resolution?

Mr. KEATING. No, there is nothing in the Constitution which prohibits it. In my judgment, however, it would be extremely bad policy. It would be looked upon by any Chief Executive as an interference with his prerogatives. The resolution would not be binding; I concede that. It is merely advisory.

However, in my judgment, the Senate would not enjoy it or appreciate it if the President were to give us advice as to how we are to operate in our committees. He sends us a program of proposed legislation. He advises that it be enacted. He asks Congress to enact it. However, if it came to advising us about our operations—about how our committees should be operated, or something of that kind—we would not like it.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The Senator believes, then, that the resolution would trespass upon the constitutional prerogatives of the President of the United States?

Mr. KEATING. I certainly do. Not legally. There is nothing unconstitutional about it. Still, I sincerely feel that it would not be the finest hour of the Senate of the United States if we passed a resolution of this type.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Would the Senator also regard it equally an intrusion or a trespass upon the prerogatives of the Senate if the President should recommend a change in the rules of the Senate?

Mr. KEATING. If the President should recommend a change in the rules of the Senate?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes.

Mr. KEATING. I had never given thought to that question.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I think it might be analogous to a situation—and we ought to give some thought to it—in which the President might suggest that the Senate change its rules, so as to enable the Senate, in the President's judgment, to function more expeditiously. What would the Senator think of that?

Mr. KEATING. I think it would be proper for the President, if he had a legislative program which he was intent upon having enacted, to point out what was preventing Congress from acting on such a program. That would not be out of order.

Mr. McCLELLAN. He might do it informally in the public press. However, I am thinking about his sending a message to this body, in the form of a recommendation to the Senate. I was simply thinking out loud, for a moment, about what we would do.

Mr. KEATING. I did not know that the President had done that.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I did not say he had; however, I understand there has been agitation for him to do it.

Mr. KEATING. I know the Senator from Arkansas and I are in rather violent, but always respectful, disagreement on one important rule of the Senate. I was not familiar with the action of any Chief Executive with regard to that rule in any degree.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I think the Senator is aware, possibly, that some have sought fortification or reinforcement in the view to which the Senator subscribes, with respect to the change in the rules of the Senate, and have considered enlisting the aid and support or endorsement of the Chief Executive of the Nation. The Senator is aware of such hopes and expectations, is he not?

Mr. KEATING. The Senator is aware of the position taken by the nominee of his party for the next President of the United States, a position taken as a Member of Congress, and of his views now on the desirability of a change in one of the rules of the Senate. But the Senator is not aware that any Chief Executive in the past, some of whom may have felt the same way, voiced such a view in a message to Congress.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not think such a view has been voiced up to now; and neither has such a resolution ever been adopted by the Senate prior to now. I am thinking in terms of the propriety of the Senate taking such action as this. It might very well take the action in the sense of letting it be known to the President that the Senate prefers or would look more favorably upon appointments made while the Senate was in session, rather than as recess appointments.

I think the Senate could, if it determined to do so, take the position that we would not confirm any recess appointments, and the President could do nothing about it if we took that position. If the Senate entertains such ideas or feels that it would have to take that rigid position in order to prevent recess appointments being made, I think it would be well and proper for the Senate, in some manner, to advise the President of its position, and state that recess appointments would militate against such nominations, if they were made.

I think that would be about the only way the Senate could formally advise the Chief Executive of its sentiments.

Mr. KEATING. But I think the Senate could do it informally, without taking any formal action. I take it that if the leadership of the Senate—whoever they might be—were to indicate to the Chief Executive—whoever he might be—that the Senate would not be likely to confirm an interim appointment, then, I feel sure, that would have as much effect on the Chief Executive as would a formal resolution.

I do not like to see a formal resolution of this kind put on the statute books. And from the statements made by my distinguished friend, the Senator from Arkansas, I rather sense that he would not like to see the Chief Executive send to us a message in which he told us that we should change one of the Senate rules.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The Senator says we have a legal right to do it. Everyone admits we have a legal right to adopt the resolution. But the question in my mind is whether there would be any propriety in our adopting it. If it is the sense of the Senate that recess appointments to these positions should not be

made, how are we going to make that opinion known, other than by means of a resolution? I am in a bit of a quandary in that respect. But I should not like to have the Senate establish a precedent for invading the province of the Chief Executive, but then have the Senate unwilling to defer to an attempt by the President to invade the rights of the Senate by suggesting a change in the Senate rules.

Of course, we can say individually, as Senators, that in our opinion the President should not make recess appointments, but should wait until the Congress reconvenes.

But the pending resolution raises a number of questions in my mind, and at the moment, I am not at all sure about the matter.

Mr. KEATING. I agree with the Senator from Arkansas. This resolution would be a formal method. I prefer to see us proceed informally. I believe that all that is sought to be accomplished in this instance could be accomplished informally.

Similarly, if the President thinks one of the Senate rules should be changed, he is entitled to tell Senators so, in conversation; and I would rather have him tell them that in informal conversation, rather than by means of a formal communication to the Senate.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Of course, the formal method for the President to use would be to send a formal communication, in writing, to the Senate. The informal way would be for him to hold such a conversation with Members of the Senate.

I believe that the President should not make recess appointments; I think no one should serve on the bench until his nomination is confirmed.

Mr. KEATING. I am quite sympathetic with the view the Senator from Arkansas has expressed. I think the Chief Executive should think hard and long and weigh many factors before he makes any interim appointment. I do not say he should never make them.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I agree; I, too, do not say that he should never make them. But I refer to what I believe to be the sounder procedure.

Mr. KEATING. I agree, and I am not out of sympathy with some of the reservations expressed in the resolution. My plea is not to put it on the statute books, not to formalize a particular point of view on such a delicate subject, and not to interfere with the President's power to make recess appointments, even by indirection.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I simply want the RECORD to show clearly my view on the matter, regardless of how I vote on the resolution. If I were to vote in opposition to adoption of the resolution, my vote would not indicate my view with respect to whether it is advisable for the President to make interim appointments. Therefore I wish to have the RECORD show that I much prefer that he make interim appointments only under the most extraordinary circumstances, for I do not like to have an interim appointment made of one who sits on the highest court in the land. There is no appeal from its decisions, and I call particular attention to the fact that the vote of one member of that Court might result in the establishment of a precedent which thereafter would be regarded as the law of the land. Therefore I do not think that power should be lodged by means of an interim appointment. I think the power should be vested only in one who has met the full requirements of the Constitution by having the approbation and the approval of this body.

I wanted to raise these questions, and I thank the distinguished Senator from New York for yielding to me. After reading the resolution, these questions arose in my mind, and I wished to see whether I could obtain a little clarification.

Mr. KEATING. I appreciate the Senator's comment.

Mr. President, inasmuch as the time is limited, I shall be brief in the additional statement I shall make, and then I shall be glad to yield to other Senators. I know that my colleague from New York has requested time.

Mr. President, another important reason for objecting to this unnecessary, unstudied, hastily processed resolution, for which I have not found any precedent, is that there is not a scintilla of urgency about it. On the other hand, adoption of the resolution would be bound to be considered by the public as a criticism of either the Chief Executive or the particular Justices who have been named by interim appointments, or both.

In my opinion, the President has appointed outstanding men to our highest court, and, in fact, to all the Federal courts. The President has been very prompt, moreover, in filling vacancies on the Court. At no time has more than 1 month elapsed between the death or retirement of one Justice and the appointment of his successor. The President should be commended for the selections he has made and for the speed with which he has acted, rather than be subjected to the criticism implicit in this resolution. I am sure such criticism is not intentional.

The three recess appointments made to the Court in the past 8 years demonstrate fully the wisdom of the practice the administration has been following in attempting to keep the Court at full strength whenever possible. Without these appointments, the Court would have had to operate understaffed for considerable periods of time.

Mr. President, we are familiar with the large number of close decisions; and the maintenance of the full strength of the Court is very important, particularly in view of the great increase in the business of the Court, which has been referred to by the Senator from Nebraska.

Chief Justice Warren took office under a recess appointment on October 5, 1953. His confirmation did not occur until March 1, 1954. Justice Brennan took office on October 16, 1956; and the Senate did not confirm his appointment until March 19, 1957. Justice Stewart took his seat on October 14, 1958; and his nomination was not confirmed until May 5, 1959.

It is thus clear that the work of the Supreme Court would have been severely hampered if the recess appointments had not been made.

The long delays between nomination and confirmation which have occurred show the difficulties which would confront the Chief Executive if he bowed to this effort to modify the explicit provisions of article II section 2, clause 3, of the Constitution.

Mr. President, there is no indication that the President is unaware of the problems which may be raised by making recess appointments. It is apparent however that he is also aware of the importance of other factors in determining whether to make recess appointments, chief among these other factors being the importance of keeping the Court at full strength and preventing even splits among its members. This course has enabled the Court to cope more effectively with its tremendous backlog of cases and has prevented deadlocks on many important cases which have come before the High Tribunal in recent years.

This resolution could upset the delicate balancing of factors involved in a decision by the President as to whether a recess appointment to the Supreme Court is necessary when a vacancy occurs during the recess of Congress. I know of no overriding considerations which should lead to its adoption despite the dangers I have outlined and despite the lack of study the resolution has received.

Mr. President, I believe the most appropriate disposition of the pending resolution would be to recommit it to the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. This would permit the committee to request agency reports and to give the subject the study it deserves. Frankly, I believe that after such study, the resolution would not be favored.

However, I certainly would cooperate, and I know all members of the Judiciary Committee would cooperate, to make certain that the resolution, in which the distinguished Senator from Michigan has evidenced such a great interest, would be given full consideration in the committee. And I am certain that all would approach the matter in that spirit.

Mr. President, this discussion has been constructive; it has been helpful. As I said before, there is very little, if anything, in the language of the resolution to which I would take any exception. Anyone who is the Chief Executive would think a long time before sending an interim appointment to the Supreme Court. But I hope that my friend from Michigan may feel it desirable, after further discussion and after giving an opportunity to those who may still wish to be heard on it, to ask that the resolution may be withdrawn.

Mr. President, I move to recommit the resolution to the Committee on the Judiciary, and, at the appropriate time, when we have a larger number of brethren on the floor, I shall ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so I may ask a question of the Senator?

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have not heard all the debate, and I am sure the Senator has made some very wise remarks. Is not this problem, under the Constitution, one that is left to the discretion and good sense of the President of the United States?

Mr. KEATING. I think the answer definitely is "Yes."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Over the years, ever since the Constitution was adopted, while there have been some appointments, there has never been an appointment that has been rejected which was made between sessions, or there has never been an appointment made between sessions that affected a decision of the Court. Is that correct?

Mr. KEATING. On the first question, as to whether one was ever rejected, I think there was, about 100 years ago. As to whether it has affected the decisions of the Court on a 5-to-4 decision, I am not able to say. The Senator from Michigan has researched this matter. Perhaps there were one or two decisions where that occurred. There have been three recess appointments made by President Eisenhower—Chief Justice Warren, Justice Brennan, and Justice Potter Stewart. Whether during the period of time between their appointments and confirmation they participated in a 5-to-4 decision or not, I am not able to say. That is, of course, a possibility, and I assume is one of the reasons why the Senator from Michigan feels as strongly as he does on this matter.

The expedition of the business of the Court is also important. My thesis has been, first, as brought out in the first question of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, that this is a matter which should be left to the Chief Executive to determine, and that is an unwarranted intrusion upon his nominations; and, second, if we want to transmit this language to the President, it is better to do it in some other way than by this formal resolution.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, in response to the question which I understood to be addressed to the Senator from New York by the Senator from Massachusetts; namely, whether there had been 5-to-4 decisions in which interim appointees participated, I do not know how many, but I do know that in the instance of Mr. Justice Stewart he did participate in such a decision. What has been said on both sides of this discussion today can be used as an argument as to why vacancies should always be filled or why it should not be done except in rare cases. In my opinion, whether there is a 4-to-4 decision because vacancies have not been filled because the Senate has not consented to an appointment, or a 5-to-4 decision, in which one of the Justices who participated was in the twilight area, and not yet confirmed, I would prefer that the law be established by a court about whose members there is not a shadow of a doubt.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Will the Senator from New York permit the Senator from Michigan to answer whether there has been any indication, by a 5-to-4 decision later, or anything else, which would indicate that a litigant had been prejudiced?

Mr. HART. This question, I think, touches one of the sensitive, basic nerves in this whole problem. So far as I know, it has never been raised. There may have been litigants who may have wondered whether it was because an appointee had been so appointed that he lost a 5-to-4 decision; but this is the kind of wonderment, the kind of concern, the kind of outside guessing that the Supreme Court of the United States ought not to be exposed to, unless there is an overriding necessity for it. I think it far more desirable that the Senate announce it finds this, too, is a disgraceful aspect of an interim appointment.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield for several questions?

Mr. HART. I am glad to yield.

Mr. ERVIN. I should like to ask the Senator from Michigan if, under the law, so far as Federal district judges are concerned, it is not a fact that Federal district judges can be sent from one district to another, and therefore there is never any necessity for making recess appointments for Federal district judges?

Mr. HART. The law does provide for such transfer.

Mr. ERVIN. The law also provides, with respect to the U.S. court of appeals, that the chief judge may order any district judge within the circuit to sit with the other members of the court of appeals with equal authority to make decisions on cases; is that not true?

Mr. HART. That is the law, and it is a practice indulged in rather frequently.

Mr. ERVIN. Since that is a practice authorized by law and is frequently followed, there is really no necessity for making a recess appointment to the U.S. court of appeals, is there?

Mr. HART. It would be my feeling there is none, for that reason.

Mr. ERVIN. The only remaining Federal constitutional court with which we are dealing is the Supreme Court of the United States, is it not?

Mr. HART. That is correct.

Mr. ERVIN. The Supreme Court of the United States never convenes before October does it? Normally the Court convenes its terms on or after the first of October.

Mr. HART. Normally, yes.

Mr. ERVIN. The Senate meets in January, as part of the Congress. During recent years it has been customary for the Senate to remain in session approximately 8 months out of each year, has it not?

Mr. HART. I regret that developing tendency to stay longer and longer.

Mr. ERVIN. Consequently, when we deduct the time the Senators have available to pass on appointments to the Supreme Court of the United Sates from the year, there are 4 months remaining in which a recess appointment could be made, but one of those months is during the period the Court ordinarily is not sitting.

Mr. HART. That is true.

Mr. ERVIN. One of the other months is December, which is taken up in large measure, or substantial measure, by the Christmas vacations.

Mr. HART. I assume that the Justices of the Court enjoy that holiday season, as do other humans.

Mr. ERVIN. So we really are discussing 2½ months of the year when the Court is sitting when the Senate is not also normally sitting.

Mr. HART. That is correct.

Mr. ERVIN. Furthermore, the Supreme Court of the United States rarely hands down a decision in less than 3 months, does it?

Mr. HART. I would be hesitant to respond with an absolute yes, but I am sure that is true.

Mr. ERVIN. If there were a vacancy on the Court and the Court for any reason felt there was danger of having a split decision, the Court could postpone the decision until the Senate met, which would not postpone action for more than 3 months normally.

Mr. HART. That is certainly true.

Mr. ERVIN. For that reason, there is really no crying need for the President to make a recess appointment or for having the recess appointee take office.

Mr. HART. I would respond in this way to the distinguished Senator from North Carolina, whose background includes very distinguished service on the courts of his State of North Carolina: If it were simply a question of a couple of months I would say, "Perhaps even for a couple of months it would be all right to make an appointment and to have the appointee serve." If it were only a couple of weeks I would say that, except for the overriding dilemma, which is the inevitable result of the man putting on the robe of the judge and participating in the business of the Court, while remaining subject to the scrutiny of the Senate. Except for that reason I would have no concern. For that reason, I would have concern even if there were a 6-month interval.

Mr. ERVIN. Under the second article of the Constitution the President has power to make recess appointment which will last until the end of the next session of Congress.

Mr. HART. That is correct.

Mr. ERVIN. Most of the important offices—for example, Cabinet members, U.S. district attorneys for a particular district, and the like—are filled by one man, are they not?

Mr. HART. In large part, yes.

Mr. ERVIN. When a vacancy occurs in such an office during a recess of the Senate it is highly important, for that reason, to permit the President to have power to make a recess appointment; otherwise, the office would be entirely vacant.

Mr. HART. That is true.

Mr. ERVIN. That is quite different from the situation in regard to the Supreme Court of the United States or the U.S. court of appeals, in that those two courts have more than one judge. A majority of the judges constitute a quorum and have the power to act, do they not?

Mr. HART. They do.

Mr. ERVIN. Furthermore, the third section of the Constitution, which deals with the judicial power of the United

States, clearly contemplates that the Federal courts shall be presided over by judges who hold office for life; is that not so?

Mr. HART. That is the explicit provision.

Mr. ERVIN. When one gives a recess appointment as a Federal judge, the man really does not have absolute title to the office of judge until his nomination is confirmed by the Senate; is that correct?

Mr. HART. That is correct.

Mr. ERVIN. Therefore, when a man receives a recess appointment to be a judge and takes office before his nomination is confirmed by the Senate, he is actually taking office before he has absolute title to the office, and his right to sit is subject to a condition subsequent; is that not true?

Mr. HART. The full title to the office can be granted only by the Senate.

Mr. ERVIN. Does not the Senator from Michigan agree with me in the thought that the third article of the Constitution certainly contemplates that members of the Court who make the decisions shall be men who occupy their offices for life; and, therefore, it is somewhat inconsistent with the spirit of the third article of the Constitution for a judge to make decisions when he does not occupy his office for life but only until the end of the next session of the Senate?

Mr. HART. There was a distinguished faculty member at Harvard, whose name I bear—Professor Hart—who made that point. He did not assert that there was any absence of constitutional power to do what the President has done, but he said that in his judgment the spirit of the Constitution was violated by so doing.

Mr. ERVIN. On several occasions history has shown that there was very violent opposition to appointees to the bench, who, fortunately in those cases, had not assumed their seats under recess appointments. Does not the Senator think if a recess appointee should take his seat and it should turn out that there is serious objection to his nomination being confirmed, the revelations made by an investigation would have a tendency to cast a cloud on the Court as well as on the appointee?

Mr. HART. In my judgment, that would be the inevitable result.

Mr. ERVIN. I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. HART. I thank the distinguished Senator from North Carolina very much for his indication of support for the resolution. I mean this with the greatest of sincerity. All of us, I think, have the very highest regard for the Senator's background as a jurist, in addition to our regard for him as a Senator.

Mr. ERVIN. I thank the Senator. I favor the resolution, because I think the resolution would carry out the spirit of the third article of the Constitution. I think passage of the resolution in advance would be a wise thing for the Senate to do, because it certainly cannot be questioned, in my judgment, that it is inadvisable for recess appointees to take the bench before the confirmation of their nominations.

Mr. HART. Indeed, I feel that some of the discussion which has developed—explicitly from the junior Senator from New York—indicates that there is a growing attitude on the part of those on both sides of the aisle to admit that recess appointees sitting upon the bench create a situation which all of us would be happy to see avoided. I feel this strongly. Otherwise, I certainly would not have raised the point in the formality of a resolution.

Mr. President, I understood the Senator from New York desired to have a further discussion, on his time.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, may I inquire regarding the remaining time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York has 3 minutes.

Mr. KEATING. Three minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Twelve minutes remain for the proponents; and the Senator from New York has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. KEATING. I wonder if the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] has received requests for time? I am placed in a very embarrassing position. I was told about 5 minutes ago by someone that I had 16 minutes remaining, and now I find I have only 3 minutes. If the Senator from Michigan does not need all his time, since my colleague from New York does need time, I would appreciate it if he would yield some.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, may I inquire as to the time remaining for the proponents?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The proponents have 12 minutes remaining and the opponents have 3 minutes.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, our dilemma is a mutual one. I yield 6 minutes to the opponents, and we will see if the time balances out.

Mr. KEATING. I yield 5 minutes to my colleague.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I shall not use the 5 minutes, which I am grateful to my colleague for yielding. Perhaps he should not yield to me because I feel so strongly about the resolution.

I am very fond of the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART]. He is a great ally in many liberal causes. I do not understand why he sponsored the resolution. I do not think it is worthy of him. I say that for this reason.

When we begin to tamper with constitutional authority, we upset many things we do not realize we are upsetting.

I should like to make my point briefly here. We talk about judges who are in the shadow. If we are going to start a procedure such as proposed, I do not see how we can do anything but amend the Constitution. Certainly we cannot accomplish the objective by a resolution of the Senate.

That is what we did with respect to lameduck Representatives and Senators. We thought they were in the shadow. So we amended the Constitution in order that so-called lameducks would be eliminated.

We cannot shortcut the process. If we try, we shall get into trouble. As an example of the trouble we might get into, we would leave it within the power of the Senate to prevent a judge from being confirmed, not for a month or 2 months, but for a year or two, or as long as it would take us to get a civil rights bill passed in the Senate. That is what we would do, and that is what is so dangerous about the resolution.

So long as rule XXII remains upon the books of the Senate in its present form, we would be transferring the power to control the Supreme Court, if any President would pay any attention to the resolution—I hope and pray he would not, and that he does not have to. We would be doing a perfectly vain act, which I will prove in just a moment. We would be transferring to the Senate a power which the Constitution gave to the Presidency. The framers of the Constitution gave the power of appointment to the President when they had their eyes wide open, knowing the inhibition of the power of filibuster in the Senate, which has thwarted us time and again in respect to activities which a certain group does not like.

Second, we would be taking this action at the tail end of a Senate session, when we have about 3 days to go, and when we will soon have a Senate, one-third of whose Members will be newly elected or new Members. It seems to me that the resolution is sheer presumption to give the President these instructions between now and the next Congress, when the next Senate may not agree with us at all.

I think it is absolutely a certitude in respect of the announcements of this proposal. So when we begin to fuss with the fundamental balances, the delicacy of the balances in respect of the Constitution, we open it up to all kinds of problems. The President could tell us, for example, that he would approve no supplementary requests for funds. He could do that. We could tell the President that we are going to sit on our hands, and we are not going to give him any money for anything unless he does X, or Y, or Z.

There is no provision of the Constitution which would prevent such action, any more than there is anything in the Constitution which would prevent us from passing the resolution. We would be unwise to do so. We have more self-discipline in this body.

If the resolution were submitted to the American Bar Association, which is meeting here in Washington today, I am confident that it would be unbelievably and overwhelmingly defeated. No lawyer would countenance anything like this for a minute. We are all too well acquainted with the reasons why these powers were divided.

We gave the President appointive power in order to enable him to appoint judges of the U.S. Supreme Court for a very specific reason. We gave him that power because we wanted, so far as we could, to keep the judiciary independent. I say this advisedly as a lawyer, I am not arguing this point as a Senator or as a Republican. I am arguing it as a lawyer. If any President paid

any attention to the proposed resolution—which I warn that if the Democrats elect their candidate as President or we elect ours, he would not, and he dare not—I say advisedly, there is no single step that we could have taken in order to break down the independence of the judiciary more than we would by passing a resolution of the character of the one before the Senate, if it had effect.

I am extremely sorry to see the Senate considering the resolution without the very extended discussion it deserves. I blame myself. I should not have been one of those on this side of the aisle who consented to 3 hours of debate on anything as serious as this resolution. I am as much in fault, if the resolution passes, as any Member here who has made the same comment.

I hope very much that the self-discipline of the Senate at the tail end of this session, with a new Congress coming in—particularly for that reason if for no other—will prevent so improvident a step as intruding in this field in a way which would disturb, and disturb to our disadvantage, and to our historical disadvantage, the balance of power between the President, the judiciary, and the Congress.

I cannot tell my friend from Michigan—I think he knows it—how much it hurts me to make this argument, because he is a wonderful man, a fine Senator, and a great friend of everything liberal. I just do not think that this is calculated to advance any of the things in which he believes any more than it is calculated to advance the things that I believe in. I thank my colleague.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, how much time have we remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 4 minutes remaining. He yielded 6 minutes.

Mr. KEATING. I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. What is the pending motion?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending motion is a motion to recommit the resolution.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on the motion to recommit, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, at first blush the resolution seems laudible, but one needs only to examine the "whereas" clauses to find that it admits real doubt. I noted, for instance, in the third clause of the preamble these words:

> Whereas Presidents of the United States have from time to time made recess appointments to the Supreme Court, which actions were unquestionably taken in good faith and with a desire to promote the public interest, but without a full appreciation of the difficulties thereby caused the Members of this body—

What difficulties? I never had any difficulties on that score. But, I think, this resolution would convey to the public that we, the Senators, have had difficulties when a name has been submitted during an interim period when the Senate was not in session. Then the next whereas clause states:

> Whereas there is inevitably public speculation on the independence of a Justice serving by recess appointment—

What speculations? And what reflections upon those who may have been appointed in an interim period and subsequently confirmed? I believe if I were an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court and read "whereas clause No. 4" of this resolution, I would wonder a little bit about the faith and the confidence of the confirming body under the Constitution, namely, the Senate of the United States.

This is a sort of blunderbuss approach. The Constitution states very simply that in the interim period the President shall have the power to grant individual commissions. That is individual power. It is the power to grant an individual commission. It does not deal with an institution. It deals with all the regulatory agencies with respect to which that power comes into being.

To me it looks like an effort to place an inhibition upon a power which is crystal clear. The proposal may represent the sense of the Senate as of this day in August 1960. It may not be the sense of the Senate a week later or a month later. It may not be the sense of the Senate in January, February, March, or at any other time in 1961.

I notice a growing tendency for so-called sense-of-the-Senate resolutions. I am becoming more and more dubious about this approach. It looks to me like tinkering. I hope the motion to recommit will be sustained.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The opponents have no time remaining. Six minutes remain on the side of the proponents.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, of course I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit. I wish to make clear again on the record, although it has been amply documented—and it should be stated again in fairness to the Supreme Court—that the resolution is not directed in criticism of any member of the bench, or of the Court as an institution. I do not direct it in criticism of any President.

However, I say that now, if ever, is the time when the Senate should express its sense that it is unfair to the Senate to be asked to consider action on a Supreme Court appointee when that man wears the robes of his office and has written opinions. If that is our belief, let us act now, when we do not know who the next President will be, when to our knowledge there is no vacancy to be anticipated on the Supreme Court, and when our action will not be tied with any individual.

The resolution merely provides that in the discharge of our constitutional duties we are terribly handicapped if we must face a man wearing his robes of office. It is much better for us, and much better for the Supreme Court itself that we not face this extraordinarily difficult dilemma, in the discharge of our responsibility and duty, of being faced with a man who has participated in the conduct and operation and activity of the highest court of the land. If we really believe it, let us not estop ourselves by our silence.

For that reason I hope that the motion to recommit will be defeated and that we will adopt the resolution. I yield back the remainder of my time. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired. The absence of a quorum has been suggested, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The yeas and nays have been ordered——

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, what is the question before the Senate, on which the yeas and nays have been ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] to recommit the resolution. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

MR. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. LUSK], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 33, nays 52, as follows:

[No. 317]

YEAS—33

Aiken	Cooper	Kuchel
Allott	Cotton	Morton
Beall	Curtis	Mundt
Bennett	Dirksen	Prouty
Bridges	Dworshak	Saltonstall
Bush	Fong	Schoeppel
Butler	Goldwater	Scott
Capehart	Hickenlooper	Smith
Carlson	Hruska	Wiley
Case, N.J.	Javits	Williams, Del.
Case, S. Dak.	Keating	Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—52

Anderson	Hart	Morse
Bartlett	Hill	Moss
Bible	Holland	Muskie
Burdick	Jackson	Pastore
Byrd, W. Va.	Johnson, Tex.	Proxmire
Cannon	Johnston, S.C.	Randolph
Carroll	Jordan	Robertson
Church	Kennedy	Russell
Clark	Lausche	Sparkman
Dodd	Long, Hawaii	Stennis
Eastland	Long, La.	Symington
Ellender	McCarthy	Talmadge
Engle	McClellan	Thurmond
Ervin	McGee	Williams, N.J.
Frear	McNamara	Yarborough
Gore	Magnuson	Young, Ohio
Green	Mansfield	
Gruening	Monroney	

NOT VOTING—15

Byrd, Va.	Hayden	Lusk
Chavez	Hennings	Martin
Douglas	Humphrey	Murray
Fulbright	Kefauver	O'Mahoney
Hartke	Kerr	Smathers

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the motion to recommit was rejected be reconsidered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. On the question of agreeing to the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the request for the yeas and nays on the question of agreeing to the committee amendment or on the question of agreeing to the resolution?

Mr. HRUSKA. On the question of agreeing to the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, is there still time in which to speak on the committee amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is not; all time has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. LUSK], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] is absent, by leave of the Senate, on official business.

The results was announced—yeas 48, nays 37, as follows:

[No. 318]

YEAS—48

Anderson	Gruening	Mansfield
Bartlett	Hart	Monroney
Bible	Hill	Morse
Burdick	Holland	Moss
Byrd, W. Va.	Jackson	Proxmire
Cannon	Johnson, Tex.	Randolph
Carroll	Johnston, S.C.	Robertson
Church	Jordan	Russell
Clark	Kennedy	Sparkman
Dodd	Long, Hawaii	Stennis
Eastland	Long, La.	Symington
Ellender	McCarthy	Talmadge
Engle	McClellan	Thurmond
Ervin	McGee	Williams, N.J.
Frear	McNamara	Yarborough
Green	Magnuson	Young, Ohio

NAYS—37

Aiken	Curtis	Mundt
Allott	Dirksen	Muskie
Beall	Dworshak	Pastore
Bennett	Fong	Prouty
Bridges	Goldwater	Saltonstall
Bush	Gore	Schoeppel
Butler	Hickenlooper	Scott
Capehart	Hruska	Smith
Carlson	Javits	Wiley
Case, N.J.	Keating	Williams, Del.
Case, S. Dak.	Kuchel	Young, N. Dak.
Cooper	Lausche	
Cotton	Morton	

NOT VOTING—15

Byrd, Va.	Hayden	Lusk
Chavez	Hennings	Martin
Douglas	Humphrey	Murray
Fulbright	Kefauver	O'Mahoney
Hartke	Kerr	Smathers

So the resolution (S. Res. 334) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the making of recess appointments to the Supreme Court of the United States may not be wholly consistent with the best interests of the Supreme Court, the nominee who may be involved, the litigants before the Court, nor indeed the people of the United States, and that such appointments, therefore, should not be made except under unusual circumstances and for the purpose of preventing or ending a demonstrable breakdown in the administration of the Court's business.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment to the preamble.

The amendment was agreed to.

The preamble, as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Whereas one of the solemn constitutional tasks enjoined upon the Senate is to give or withhold its advice and consent with respect to nominations made to the Supreme Court of the United States, doing so, if possible, in an atmosphere free from pressures inimical to due deliberations; and

Whereas the nomination of a person to the office of Justice of the Supreme Court should be considered only in the light of the qualifications the person brings to threshold of the office; and

Whereas Presidents of the United States have from time to time made recess appointments to the Supreme Court, which actions were unquestionably taken in good faith and with a desire to promote the public interest, but without a full appreciation of the difficulties thereby caused the Members of this body; and

Whereas there is inevitably public speculation on the independence of a Justice serving by recess appointment who sits in judgment upon cases prior to his confirmation by this body, which speculation, however ill founded, is distressing to the Court, to the Justice, to the litigants, and to the Senate of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the acting majority leader whether any other legislation is scheduled for action tonight. It was my earlier impression that at the conclusion of action on the resolution which came from the Judiciary Committee, that would terminate the business for today; but I am informed there are some bills presently pending on the calendar which the acting majority leader intends to call up. Some of them are controversial; others probably not controversial. But it would be an excellent thing now if a statement were made to the Members of the Senate, while they are present, about what the remaining business is for tonight, and how long it is proposed to remain in session this evening.

CREATION OF THE FREEDOM COMMISSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that Calendar No. 1882, Senate bill 1689, establishing the Freedom Commission, be laid before the Senate as the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1689) to create the Freedom Commission for the development of the science of

counteraction to the world Communist conspiracy for the training and development of leaders in a total political war.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM—ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is the intention of the leadership, after consultation with the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], to announce that the following measures may be called up for consideration in the days to come, depending on the amount of time taken in debate:

Calendar No. 1884, House bill 10548, to amend the Helium Act.

Calendar No. 1897, House bill 12483, to amend section 801 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia."

Calendar No. 1916, Senate bill 3713, providing a salary increase for District of Columbia policemen and firemen.

Calendar No. 1939, House bill 2074, for the relief of Eric and Ida Mae Hjeipe.

Calendar No. 1965, House bill 4428, for the relief of John David Aleida.

Calendar No. 1607, House bill 4601, amending the Hiss Act.

Calendar No. 1671, Senate bill 3421, amending the Federal Employees Group Life Insurance Act.

Calendar No. 1678, House bill 10, dealing with self-employed pension plans.

Calendar No. 1706, Senate bill 3258, amending the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act.

Calendar No. 1753, Senate bill 3739, amending the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act.

Calendar No. 1943, House bill 7618, for the relief of H. P. Lambert Co. and Southeastern Drilling Corp.

Calendar No. 1971, House bill 12759, extending the Alien Farm Labor Act.

Calendar No. 1987, House Joint Resolution 784, extending the time within which the U.S. Constitution 175th Anniversary Commission shall report to Congress.

These measures may or may not be brought up, depending on the length of the session. It is not anticipated that the Senate will be in session too long or too late tonight. We hope to get the approval of the Senate on the noncontroversial items, and perhaps, if some bills entail some debate, they will be carried over until tomorrow or later.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I inquire of the acting majority leader whether, when he says it is not anticipated that the Senate will be in session too late, he means probably 8 o'clock, or 8:30, or 9 o'clock, or some earlier time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I will say to the distinguished minority leader that the Senate ought to be out of here somewhere between 8 and 9 tonight.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. There was some conversation going on, and I am not sure I heard what the Senator said. Did the Senator list the District of Columbia sales tax bill?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is not on the list, but if it is brought up, I assure the Senator from Oregon that he, particularly, will receive prompt and prior notice.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator mentioned calendar No. 1691. I do not even find it on the calendar.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is calendar No. 1671, Senate bill 3421, to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act.

Mr. ANDERSON. Will the Senator agree that in case calendar No. 1884, H.R. 10548, to amend the Helium Act, should be called up, the two Colorado Senators will be notified, both Senator CARROLL and Senator ALLOTT?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes, as well as the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE].

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Will there be any more yea-and-nay votes tonight?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, some of us who remain in our seats, as the rules provide, would like to hear what is being said. I for one do not propose to get into the huddle in the front part of the Chamber. I would like to hear what is being said.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have heard about the morning hour in the Senate, but what we are having now is the informal hour.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Twilight hour, I think it is.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I would like to renew the question which has been asked, as to whether or not there will be any yea-and-nay votes tonight.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I hope there will be no further yea-and-nay votes this evening, but neither the minority leader nor I can give an ironclad guarantee.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am wondering whether we could contrive an understanding that if there is a demand for a yea-and-nay vote, the vote can go over until tomorrow.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I shall be delighted to attempt to arrive at an agreement to that effect with the minority leader.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield before he does that?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. JAVITS. May I ask the intention of the leadership about recessing or adjourning the Senate?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I wish I knew.

Mr. JAVITS. What is the intention of the leadership tonight?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That the Senate will adjourn between 8 and 9 o'clock.

Mr. JAVITS. Does the Senator intend to adjourn tonight?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senate will probably recess.

Mr. JAVITS. Suppose there should be a contest about that. It might involve a yea-and-nay vote.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am glad the Senator from New York is putting Members of the Senate on notice in answer to the question raised by the Senator from Illinois, and I hope all Senators will be on notice to that effect.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Is Calendar No. 1708, House bill 4306, the war orphans education bill, one of those that will be called?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Not for this evening, no.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Could we obtain early consideration of that measure?

Mr. MANSFIELD. We shall do our best on that, either tomorrow or the next day.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to inquire further as to the hour when the Senate will convene tomorrow. It was my understanding that we would come in at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If that was the understanding of the minority leader, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate recesses tonight it recess to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I object. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JAVITS. I wish to preserve my rights. The request is that the Senate recess and not adjourn. I should like to move that the Senate adjourn and not recess. My parliamentary inquiry is, Will I be yielding my rights if I consent to the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I believe I can answer the question of the Senator from New York.

I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business tonight it meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

Mr. JAVITS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President, if that unanimous-consent request is agreed to may I nonetheless move to adjourn the session tonight rather than to recess it, which I understand has priority?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A motion to adjourn would take precedence.

Mr. JAVITS. Would that motion be made impossible if I consented to the unanimous-consent request as now phrased?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No.

Mr. JAVITS. I am asking the Presiding Officer, if the Senator will allow me to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request in the modified form, in the opinion of the Chair, would not preclude the Senator from making the motion.

Mr. JAVITS. I have no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I renew my request.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I have a resolution before the Senate. Is it necessary for the Senate to adjourn before the resolution can be taken up? The resolution is lying on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised by the Parliamentarian——

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Presiding Officer talk a little louder, please.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised by the Parliamentarian that the resolution is in its day of introduction and it must wait another legislative day, so if a recess is had the resolution will not be eligible for consideration except by unanimous consent.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I believe the Presiding Officer answered the question I was about to ask. I can have the resolution considered by unanimous consent; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President——

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to propound two parliamentary inquiries.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to serve notice on the Senate, in view of the statements which have been made by the Senator from New York, that every Member of the Senate should be on notice. Senators have no assurance that there will be no votes tonight. I would suggest all Senators stay on the job, looking after the people's business.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I shall not object to the unanimous-consent request as so phrased, but I should like to tell my colleagues what this is all about, in a word.

A Senator cannot have a bill read for the second time unless the Senate adjourns. He cannot submit and have seasoned for 1 day a petition to discharge a committee unless the Senate adjourns.

Since I am very serious about the fact that we ought to do something about the proposed civil rights legislation which is elementary, I think now is the time to begin to do something about it. I think the only way we can effectively do it is by finding out whether at the end of the session, as at the beginning, the Senate is or is not interested. Any other procedure would be missing the main point. I am of the mind that we had better get to the main point, to find out how the Senate feels. Then we will all know, instead of going through a lot of curlicue procedural maneuvers which will tell us no more and no less.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

COPYING OF CERTAIN EVIDENCE FOR PRESENTATION IN THE CASE OF THE UNITED STATES v. SALLY T. HUCKS ET AL.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I submit a resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President——

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may we have the title read?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I shall be glad to explain the resolution.

Mr. President, the purpose of the resolution is to grant authority to me, as the former chairman of the Senate Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field, to release certain records and also to appear in court, along with members of the staff, to testify in criminal proceedings growing out of the hearings, now pending in the Federal courts in Washington, D.C.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I withdraw my reservation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arkansas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 382).

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Just a moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. MORSE. I am sorry. I thought the resolution had been agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 382) was agreed to, as follows:

Whereas the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations has in its possession, by virtue of Senate Resolution 255, section 5, Eighty-sixth Congress, certain evidence pertaining to an investigation dealing with Sally T. Hucks, Joseph M. Williamson, and Moss Herman, which investigation was conducted by the Senate Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field under Senate Resolution 44, Eighty-sixth Congress; and

Whereas criminal action is pending in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia against said Sally T. Hucks et al., charging conspiracy to obstruct justice and perjury; and

Whereas the United States Department of Justice has advised that a criminal trial in the aforementioned matter is scheduled to commence October 18, 1960, in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia; and

Whereas the United States Department of Justice has advised that at said criminal trial there will be required the introduction of certain evidence in the possession of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, as well as the testimony of the former chairman of the Senate Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field, Senator John L. McClellan, and former staff members of said select committee, namely, Robert F. Kennedy, Carmine S. Bellino, Walter R. May, John Constandy, Sherman Willse, Arthur G. Kaplan, Walter J. Sheridan, and Michael McInerney; and

Whereas by the privileges of the Senate no Member or Senate employee is authorized to produce Senate documents but by order of the Senate: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Senate Committee on Government Operations is granted leave to permit the copying and presentation of certain evidence for examination in connection with the aforementioned court case, the evidence thereupon to be returned to the possession of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations; and be it further

Resolved, That the former chairman of the said select committee, Senator John L. McClellan, and former staff members of said select committee, Robert F. Kennedy, Carmine S. Bellino, Walter R. May, John Constandy, Sherman Willse, Arthur G. Kaplan, Walter J. Sheridan, and Michael McInerney, are authorized to appear and testify in the above-mentioned proceedings.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Montana for a moment. I have been asked by the District of Columbia Committee, and one of the members of the committee, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], to get action on two District of Columbia bills which have already been cleared with the leadership on both sides of the aisle. The first is S. 1870, to which there are House amendments which are acceptable. I should like to have those amendments agreed to. The second is S. 3648, another District of Columbia bill which has been cleared on both sides of the aisle, to which there is a House amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Will the Senator read the titles of those bills?

EXAMINATION, LICENSING, REGISTRATION, AND REGULATION OF PROFESSIONAL AND PRACTICAL NURSES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask the Presiding Officer to lay before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to S. 1870, which is the nursing bill. The amendments of the House are acceptable. After the amendments have been laid before the Senate, I shall move that the Senate agree to the House amendments.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the pending business be temporarily laid aside and that the request of the Senator from Oregon be granted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that this is a privileged matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1870) to provide for examination, licensing, registration, and for regulation of professional and practical nurses, and for nursing education in the District of Columbia, and for other

purposes, which were, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That this Act shall be known and may be cited as the "District of Columbia Practical Nurses' Licensing Act".

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. As used in this Act—

(a) The term "Commissioners" means the Commissioners of the District of Columbia sitting as a board or their authorized agent or agents.

(b) The word "person" includes corporations, companies, associations, firms, partnerships, societies, and schools of practical nursing, as well as natural persons.

(c) The word "she" and the derivatives thereof shall be construed to include the word "he" and the derivatives thereof.

(d) The term "school of practical nursing" means a school or institution for the training of practical nurses.

SEC. 3. This Act shall not apply to any person employed in the District of Columbia by the Federal Government or any agency thereof, while such person is acting in the discharge of her official duties.

SEC. 4. Nothing in this Act shall be construed to prevent any person from nursing any other person in the District of Columbia, either gratuitously or for hire: *Provided*, That such person so nursing shall not represent herself as being a licensed practical nurse.

SEC. 5. (a) From and after the effective date of this Act, no person shall, in the District of Columbia, in any manner whatsoever, represent herself to be a licensed practical nurse or allow herself to be so represented unless she is licensed in accordance with the provisions of this Act.

(b) Any person licensed to practice as a licensed practical nurse in the District of Columbia shall have the right to use the title "Licensed Practical Nurse" and the abbreviation "L.P.N.". No other person shall assume such title or use such abbreviation.

SEC. 6. The Commissioners are hereby vested with full power and authority to delegate, from time to time, to their designated agent or agents, any of the functions vested in them by this Act.

SEC. 7. The Commissioners may establish a Practical Nurses' Examining Board to perform any of the functions vested in the Commissioners by this Act, and, if so established, such Board shall be composed of such number of graduate nurses and practical nurses and possessing such qualifications as the Commissioners shall determine: *Provided*, That the graduate nurse members of such Board shall be in the majority; shall be registered under the Act of February 9, 1907, as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 2-401 et seq.); and shall have had at least five years of experience since graduation in the nursing service: *Provided further*, That all practical nurse members of such Board shall, from and after the expiration of ninety days from the effective date of this Act, be licensed under this Act: *And provided further*, That at least two practical nurse members of such Board shall be present at each meeting of the Board. The members of such Board shall serve for such terms and for such compensation as the Commissioners shall determine.

SEC. 8. (a) The Commissioners are authorized to adopt from time to time and prescribe such rules and regulations as may be necessary to enable them to carry into effect the provisions of this Act. The Commissioners shall prescribe minimum curricula and standards for schools and for programs preparing persons for licensure under this Act. They may provide for surveys of such schools and programs at such times as they may deem necessary. They shall accredit such schools and programs as meet the Commissioners' requirements and the requirements of this Act. They shall evaluate and approve programs for affiliation. They shall examine, license, and renew the license of any duly qualified applicant.

(b) The Commissioners may make such studies and investigations, and obtain or require the furnishing of such information under oath or affirmation or otherwise, as they deem necessary or proper to assist them in prescribing any regulation or order under this Act, or in the administration and enforcement of this Act, and regulations and orders thereunder. For such purposes, the Commissioners may administer oaths and affirmations, may require by subpena or otherwise the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of documents at any designated place. In the event of contumacy or refusal to obey any such subpena or requirement under this section, the Commissioners may make application to the municipal court for the District of Columbia for an order requiring obedience thereto. Thereupon the court, with or without notice and hearing, as it, in its discretion, may decide, shall make such order as is proper and may punish as a contempt any failure to comply with such order in accordance with the provisions of subsection (c), section 5, of the Act of April 1, 1942 (56 Stat. 193, ch. 207; sec. 11-756(c), D.C. Code, 1951 edition).

SEC. 9. (a) Except as provided in section 10, an applicant for a license to practice as a licensed practical nurse shall submit to the Commissioners written evidence, verified by her oath, that the applicant (1) is at least 18 years of age; (2) is of good moral character; (3) is in good physical and mental health, as certified by a physician licensed to practice in the District of Columbia; (4) has completed at least two years of high school or the equivalent thereof as determined by the Commissioners; and (5) has successfully completed an accredited program for the training of licensed practical nurses approved by the Commissioners, or the equivalent thereof as determined by them. The applicant shall meet such other qualification requirements as the Commissioners may prescribe. Except as otherwise provided in this Act, the applicant shall be required to pass a written examination in such subjects as the Commissioners may determine. Each written examination may be supplemented by an oral or practical examination. If the applicant passes such examinations, the Commissioners shall issue to the applicant a license to practice as a licensed practical nurse if they are satisfied that she possesses the required qualifications.

(b) The Commissioners may issue a license to practice as a licensed practical nurse without examination to any applicant who has been duly licensed or registered as a licensed vocational or practical nurse or a person entitled to perform similar service under a different title, by examination, under the laws of a State, territory, or possession of the United States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, or a foreign country, if they are satisfied that the applicant meets the qualifications required of licensed practical nurses in the District of Columbia.

(c) An applicant for a license to practice as a licensed practical nurse shall at the time such application is made pay the required fee for an original license. An application shall be closed and filed as closed and incomplete at the end of a year from the time that the application was received if the applicant has failed to take all steps required of her to obtain a license. In order to reopen an application which has been closed or withdrawn, the applicant shall pay the same fee as is required for an original license.

SEC. 10. Upon receipt of an application, accompanied by the required fee for an original license, the Commissioners shall issue a license to practice as a licensed practical nurse, without written examination, to any person who shall make application therefor prior to the expiration of one year immediately following the effective date of this Act: *Provided*, That (A) the Commissioners find that such person (1) is at least twenty-one years of age; (2) is of good moral character; (3) is in good physical and mental health as certified by a physician licensed to practice in the District of Columbia; (4) has been actively engaged in caring for the sick in the District of Columbia for the year immediately preceding the effective date of this Act; (5) has had three or more years of experience in the case of the sick prior to the effective date of this Act; and (6) has submitted evidence satisfactory to the Commissioners that she is competent to practice as a licensed practical nurse, and (B) either the application is endorsed by two physicians licensed to practice in the District of Columbia who have personal knowledge of the applicant's nursing qualifications and by two persons who have employed the applicant in the capacity of practical nurse, or the applicant is listed on a nurses' registry licensed in the District of Columbia.

SEC. 11. (a) The license of every person licensed under the provisions of this Act shall expire on June 30 of each year and be annually renewed. On or before May 31 of each year, the Commissioners shall mail an application for renewal of license to every person who at the time of such mailing holds a valid license under this Act. The applicant shall, before the following July 1, complete and execute such application and return the same to the Commissioners with the required renewal fee. Upon receipt of such application and fee, the Commissioners shall verify the accuracy of the application and issue to the applicant a certificate of renewal for the year beginning on such July 1 and expire the following June 30. Any licensee who allows her license to lapse by failing to renew the license as provided above, may be reinstated by the Commissioners by showing cause satisfactory to the Commissioners for such failure and on payment of the required fee.

(b) Any person licensed under the provisions of this Act but not so practicing in the District of Columbia shall give written notice of such fact to the Commissioners. Upon receipt of such notice, the Commissioners shall place the name of such person upon the nonpracticing list. While remaining on such list, the person shall not be subject to the payment of any renewal fee and shall not hold herself out as a licensed practical nurse in the District of Columbia. Application for renewal of license and payment of renewal fee for the current year shall be made to the Commissioners by any such person desiring to resume practice as a licensed practical nurse.

SEC. 12. (a) Any person conducting or desiring to conduct a school of practical nursing may apply to the Commissioners and submit evidence that such person is prepared to give a course of study of not less than twelve months, including clinical experience, and is prepared to meet the standards prescribed by the Commissioners. Each such person shall pay the required fees at the time such application is made. A survey of such school shall be made by the Commissioners. If, in the opinion of the Commissioners, the requirements for an accredited school of practical nursing are met, they shall approve such school as an accredited school for the training of practical nurses.

(b) The Commissioners may, whenever they deem it necessary, survey any accredited school of practical nursing in this District of Columbia. If the Commissioners determine that any accredited school of practical nursing does not meet the standards required by this Act and by the Commissioners, notice thereof in writing specifying the defect or defects shall be given to such school. If the defects are not corrected within a reasonable

time, such school shall, after hearing, be removed from the list of accredited schools of practical nursing.

SEC. 13. (a) The Commissioners are authorized and empowered after public hearing, to determine and from time to time to increase or decrease fees for all services rendered under authority of any provision of this Act, including fees for the following services: (1) For licenses and renewals thereof; (2) for repeat examinations; (3) for the evaluation of each school record of a candidate for admission to a school of practical nursing; (4) for verification of records; (5) for a duplicate license to practice as a licensed practical nurse upon proof acceptable to the Commissioners that the original license has been lost or destroyed; (6) for duplicate certificates of renewal of licenses; (7) for mailing a certificate a second time if no timely notification of change of address has been made; (8) for the proctoring of out-of-State applicants when the examination is held at a time other than the regular examination of the District of Columbia. The Commissioners shall fix such fees in such amounts, as will, in the judgment of the Commissioners, approximate the cost to the District of Columbia of such services.

(b) All moneys collected for fees and charges under this Act shall be paid into the Treasury to the credit of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 14. The Commissioners are authorized and empowered to deny, revoke, or suspend any license, or certificate of renewal of license, issued by the Commissioners or applied for in accordance with the provisions of this Act if the applicant or holder thereof—

(1) has been guilty of fraud or deceit in procuring or attempting to procure any license, or renewal thereof provided for in this Act;

(2) has been convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude;

(3) is an intemperate consumer of intoxicating liquors or is addicted to the use of habit-forming drugs;

(4) has been guilty of unprofessional conduct;

(5) has willfully or repeatedly violated any of the provisions of this Act or rules or regulations promulgated by the Commissioners pursuant to authority contained in this Act; or

(6) is mentally incompetent:

Provided, That said denial, revocation, or suspension shall be made only upon specific charges in writing. A certified copy of any such charge and at least five days' notice of the hearing of the same shall be served upon the holder of or applicant for such license. The Commissioners are hereby authorized to furnish a list of names and addresses of persons to whom licenses, or renewal of licenses, have been denied, revoked, or suspended under this section to the board of examiners of a State, territory, or possession of the United States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, or a foreign country, upon written request of such board.

SEC. 15. Any person aggrieved by any final decision or final order of the Commissioners denying, suspending, or revoking any license, or renewal of license, issued or applied for under this Act may obtain a review thereof in the municipal court of appeals for the District of Columbia, and may seek a review by the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit of any judgment of the Municipal Court of Appeals entered pursuant to its review of any such decision or order, all in accordance with subsection (f) of section 7 of the Act approved April 1, 1942, as added by the Act approved August 31, 1954 (68 Stat. 1048).

SEC. 16. It shall be unlawful for any person in the District of Columbia to (a) sell or fraudulently obtain or furnish any diploma, license, or record required by this Act, or required by the Commissioners under authority of this Act, or aid or abet in the selling, fraudulently obtaining or furnishing thereof; (b) practice nursing as a licensed practical nurse under cover of any diploma, license, or record required by this Act or required by the Commissioners under authority of this Act, illegally or fraudulently obtained or signed or issued unlawfully or under fradulent representation; (c) use in connection with his or her name any designation tending to imply that he or she is a licensed practical nurse unless licensed so to practice under the provisions of this Act; or (d) practice nursing as a licensed practical nurse during the time his or her license issued under the provisions of this Act shall be suspended or revoked.

SEC. 17. Any person who shall violate any of the provisions of section 5 or 16 of this Act shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be punished by a fine not exceeding $300 or by imprisonment for not more than ninety days.

SEC. 18. (a) Prosecution for violations of any provision of section 5 or 16 of this Act shall be conducted in the name of the District of Columbia in the municipal court for the District of Columbia by the Corporation Counsel or any of his assistants.

(b) It shall be necessary to prove in any prosecution or hearing under this Act only a single act prohibited by law or a single holding out or an attempt without proving a general course of conduct in order to constitute a violation.

SEC. 19. If any provision of this Act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of the Act, and the application of such provision to other persons and circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 20. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated out of the revenues of the District of Columbia such sums as may be necessary to pay the expenses of administering and carrying out the purposes of this Act.

SEC. 21. This Act shall take effect one hundred and twenty days after funds are appropriated for the purpose of administering the provisions of this Act.

And to amend the title so as to read: "An act to provide for examination, licensing, and for regulation of practical nurses, and for practical nursing education in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, do I correctly understand the amendments have been cleared with the minority?

Mr. MORSE. I assure the Senator from Illinois they have been cleared with the leadership on both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Oregon.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a letter from the Engineer Commissioner, District of Columbia, explaining the bill.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUGUST 25, 1960.

HON. ALAN BIBLE,
Chairman, Commtitee on the District of Columbia, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BIBLE: I have just been advised of the action taken by the House District Committee on S. 1870, a bill providing for the examination and licensing of practical nurses and schools of practical nursing in the District of Columbia. The action of the House District Committee amends S. 1870 so as to eliminate all provisions relating to registered nurses and schools of registered nursing, and confines the bill to the licensing of practical nurses and schools of practical nursing in the District of Columbia. It is my understanding that the existing statuate regulating the examination and registration of graduate nurses in the District of Columbia is not in any wise affected by S. 1870, as amended by the House District Committee.

I wish to advise you that I have no objection to the amendments of S. 1870 made by the House District Committee, and recommend that this amended version be reported out favorably by your committee and be passed by the Senate.

Yours very sincerely,

F. J. CLARKE,
Colonel, Corps of Engineers, U.S. Army, Engineering Commissioner, District of Columia.

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask the Presiding Officer to lay before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to S. 3648. I ask that the pending business be temporarily laid aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill, S. 3648, to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia on behalf of the United States to transfer from the United States, to the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency title to certain real property in said District, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That subject to the provisions of this Act the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized on behalf of the United States to transfer to the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency established by section 4 of the Act approved August 4, 1946 (60 Stat. 793), as amended (sec. 5–703, D.C. Code, 1951 edition), all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to part or all of certain property in the said District, as follows: The area bounded by the east line of Fourteenth Street Southwest, the existing southerly (or westerly) building line of Maine Avenue Southwest, the northerly line of Fort Lesley J. McNair at P Street Southwest, and the bulkhead line established pursuant to the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 (30 Stat. 1151), as amended, together with any land area extending channelward from said bulkhead line.

SEC. 2. The said Commissioners shall, prior to transferring to the Agency right, title, and interest in and to any of the said property described in the preceding section, determining whether such property is necessary to the redevelopment of the southwest section of the District of Columbia in accordance with an urban renewal plan approved by them, and, if they so find, they shall, acting on behalf of the United States, transfer and donate to the Agency all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to so much of said property as they determine is necessary to carry out such urban renewal plan.

SEC. 3. Subject to the provisions of section 5 of this Act, the Commissioners shall, at

the time of transferring to the Agency right, title, and interest in and to any of the property described in the first section hereof, also transfer to the Agency their jurisdiction as provided by the first section of the Act approved March 3, 1899 (30 Stat. 1377, chapter 458; sec. 9–101, D.C. Code, 1951 edition), over so much of the said property as may be so transferred.

SEC. 4. (a) The Agency is hereby authorized, in accordance with the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945, to lease to a redevelopment company or other lessee such real property as may be transferred to the Agency under the authority of this Act but may not otherwise dispose of such property except to the United States or any department or agency thereof, or to the District of Columbia, in accordance with section 5 of this Act. In the event that real property acquired by the Agency from the United States pursuant to this Act is transferred to the District of Columbia or to any department or agency of the United States pursuant to this section, such transfer shall be without reimbursement or transfer of funds.

(b) In connection with the leasing of the real property transferred to the Agency under the authority of this Act, together with the leasing of any real property lying between such real property so transferred and the southerly or westerly line of Maine Avenue as the same may be relocated in connection with carrying out an urban renewal plan, the Agency is authorized and directed to provide to the owner or owners of any business concern displaced by reason of the enactment of the joint resolution approved August 28, 1958 (72 Stat. 983; Public Law 85–821), from the area described in the first section of this Act, a priority of opportunity to lease, either individually or as a redevelopment company solely owned by the owner or owners of one or more such business concerns, so much of such real property lying channelward of the southerly or westerly line of Maine Avenue as so relocated, at a rental based on the use-value of the real property so leased determined in accordance with the provisions of section 10 of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945, as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 5–709), and section 110(c)(4) of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended (70 Stat. 1098; 42 U.S.C. 1460(c)(4)), as may be required for the construction of commercial facilities at least substantially equal to the facilities from which such business concern was so displaced. When the real property affected by the provisions of this subsection becomes available for leasing by the Agency, the Agency shall notify, in writing, the owners of the business concerns displaced by reason of the operation of such joint resolution approved August 28, 1958, as to the availability of such real property for leasing to such owners in accordance with the provisions of this subsection. The Agency shall give such owners so notified a period of one hundred and eighty days to notify the Agency, in writing, of their intention to proceed in accordance with the general development plan of the Agency for the area lying channelward of Maine Avenue, as so relocated, and to demonstrate to the Agency their ability to carry out so much of such plan as may be embraced within the area which they desire to lease. If at the end of such period of one hundred and eighty days, such owners have failed to make a demonstration to that effect which is satisfactory to the Agency, the priority of opportunity provided by this subsection shall no longer continue to be available to such owners.

SEC. 5. Notwithstanding the preceding provisions of this Act, if any of the real property transferred to the Agency under the authority of this Act is not leased by the Agency in accordance with an urban renewal plan approved by the Commissioners, or otherwise disposed of, on or before the date the Housing and Home Finance Administrator makes the final Federal capital grant payment to the Agency for the project pursuant to title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, then the right, title, and interest in and to so much of the said real property as is not so leased or otherwise disposed of by such date shall revert to the United States, subject to the exclusive control and jurisdiction of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and subject to the provisions of the Act approved May 20, 1932 (47 Stat. 161; secs. 8–115 and 8–116, D.C. Code, 1951 edition).

SEC. 6. Nothing herein contained shall be construed as requiring the said Commissioners to transfer the right, title, and interest in and to so much of the property described in the first section of this Act as the Commissioners may determine, in their discretion, is required for municipal purposes or is to continue to be owned by the United States under the jurisdiction of the Commissioners, for the benefit of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 7. No transfer or donation of any interest in real property under the authority of this Act shall constitute a local grant-in-aid in connection with any urban renewal project being undertaken with Federal assistance under title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended.

SEC. 8. As used in this Act, the terms "Agency", "lessee", "real property", "redevelopment", and "redevelopment company" shall have the respective meanings provided for such terms by section 3 of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945, as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 5–702).

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. Has the Senate temporarily laid aside the pending business to take up this House amendment?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Oregon.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Montana very much.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON].

THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, the Richmond News Leader of Friday, August 26, 1960, contained one of the clearest cut editorials regarding the ridiculous policy of our State Department concerning the Dominican Republic which I have ever read.

The editorial sums up the action of the United States in breaking off relations with the Dominican Republic Government as being a stab in the back by our Government to a friend. The editorial points out that while Rafael Trujillo had been called the Caesar of the Caribbean, it would be a fair epithet to say that this Carribean Caesar now has a Brutus of his own.

I agree with this editorial further when it asks the question: "By what combination of blindness, stupidity, subversion, or misplaced idealism" do we turn our backs upon the anti-Communists and support forces intent upon ousting formerly friendly governments such as that in the Dominican Republic?

The policy of our country in joining forces to condemn the Dominican Republic Government, and then cutting off our diplomatic relations with this country—while we cannot even get a strong chastisement against the government of Fidel Castro, which has seized nearly every piece of American property in that country and embraced Communist Russia and its ideals—borders on one of traitorous nature.

If the efforts of our State Department had been directed originally to prevent Cuba's falling into the hands of Communists instead of needling and picking on the Dominican Republic, we would not be in the shape we now find ourselves.

I commend the Richmond News Leader for this excellent editorial entitled "So We Knife Another Friend," and I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the body of the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was order to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Richmond News Leader, Aug. 26, 1960]

SO WE KNIFE ANOTHER FRIEND

Let it be conceded: Generalissimo Rafael Leonidas Trujillo Molina, commander in chief of the Dominican Republic, is not cast exactly in the mold of Thomas Jefferson. General Trujillo has suppressed political opposition, throttled free speech, jailed his enemies without fair trials and engaged in various intrigues of high and low degree. He is no beauty.

But when that has been said, it remains beyond comprehension why the State Department, the Congress, and the President suddenly have joined in an effort to topple one of the staunchest friends the United States Government has in the Caribbean. How is it possible, with the ominous example of Cuba before our eyes, that our government can duplicate the very blunders that led us to Castro?

Even his severest critics have admitted that General Trujillo has taken great strides in recent years toward the relief of living conditions in the Dominican Republic. Edwin Lieuwen, in his "Arms and Politics in Latin America," credits Trujillo with "a period of political stability and economic progress unparalleled in the history of the republic." In the past few years, "new highways have been built, harbors modernized, powerplants constructed, agriculture diversified, industrialization promoted, schools built, illiteracy reduced, hospitals erected, and disease attacked."

Yet Trujillo today is the target of an organized campaign to overthrow his administration and to cast his country into chaos. In the hills a few miles from the capital city that bears his name, armed rebels, supplied by Communist Cuba, await with itching fingers.

Do we never learn? Do we learn nothing by the overthrow of a Batista in Cuba and the entrance of a Castro? By what combination of blindness, stupidity, subversion or misplaced idealism do we fawn upon Patrice Lumumba of the Congo, and turn our backs upon the anti-Communist Tshombe of Katanga? Who are the forces that would oust Trujillo? Why, they are the leftist dictators of neighboring Latin American countries, as repressive in their own ways as Trujillo is in his.

It is now proposed to take away from the Dominican Republic, so long as Trujillo is in power, a sugar quota of vital importance to this tiny country. Other diplomatic and economic sanctions are to follow. The State Department already has meddled in the Dominican Republic's internal affairs with denunciations of its policies on free press. Yet this same State Department encourages a wide variety of trade with Russia, Poland, and Yugoslavia, and invites Nikita Khrushchev to come sleep at Camp David. What price consistency?

As far back as 1938, a magazine writer described Trujillo as the "Caesar of the Caribbean." It is a fair epithet. Caesar had his Brutus. And Rafael Trujillo has a Brutus of his own in the U.S. Government today.

CIVIL RIGHTS AND THE REPUBLICAN ADMINISTRATION

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the question of civil rights is one which is being much discussed and debated throughout the country.

In some quarters it has been charged that the Republican Party has not made the efforts in this field that should have been made.

I believe, Mr. President, that the record of the Republican Party in this field has been one of action—of deeds, not words.

Because of its importance, a compilation of this record is not amiss. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted into the RECORD at this point an article entitled "Civil Rights and the Republican Administration," by my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from New Jersey.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CIVIL RIGHTS AND THE REPUBLICAN ADMINISTRATION

(By U.S. Senator CLIFFORD P. CASE, of New Jersey)

This Republican administration has been successful in its progressive sponsorship of the Civil Rights Acts of 1957 and 1960, the first major civil rights legislation in 82 years. These, and the following items, are a matter of record, not just hopeful promises, and they represent accomplishments in all fields of civil rights: education, employment, housing, and the local administration of justice as well as the most important area of voting rights.

SUMMARY OF RECORD IN AREAS OTHER THAN VOTING RIGHTS

1. Created first U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.

2. Created new Assistant Attorney General and Civil Rights Division of Department of Justice.

3. Made "hate" bombings and bomb scares a Federal crime.

4. Provided free public schooling for Armed Forces children when local schools closed due to segregation.

5. Created President's Committee on Government Contracts headed by Vice President NIXON to obtain compliance of Federal contractors to administration policy of free job opportunity.

6. Successfully advocated abolition of segregation in the District of Columbia;

7. Vigorously completed desegregation of Armed Forces and abolition of segregation in schools on military reservations in 1954;

8. Commenced litigation by Attorney General to eliminate segregation on public beaches in Biloxi, Miss., where Federal contract exisited; participated in school desegregation cases; prosecuted local police abuses of the administration of justice.

9. Implemented administration's desegregation policy in federally assisted housing.

10. Desegregated interstate transportation.

11. Implemented desegregation and free job opportunity policies in assisting airport develoment and improvement.

The civil rights record of the Eisenhower administration represents a more progressive series of accomplishments, as opposed to promises, than in any previous Democratic administration, and certainly is not limited only to the important field of voting rights. In the past 3 years alone, the first two Civil Rights Acts in more than 80 years have become law under the sponsorship of the Republican administration. Aside from securing the important right to vote for all qualified citizens regardless of race or color, the Civil Rights Acts of 1957 and 1960 have:

1. Created in 1958 the first U.S. Commission on Civil Rights for the investigation of complaints of discrimination at elections and the study of the denial of equal protection of the law in areas of discrimination. The Commission's report in 1959 and its recommendations was one of the primary causes for the enactment of the Civil Rights Act of 1960.

2. Created a new Assistant Attorney General to head a new Division of the Department of Justice for Civil Rights. The number of Federal attorneys carrying the administration's progressive civil rights policies into the courts has trebled over those earmarked for this purpose under Democratic administrations.

3. Made it a Federal crime to threaten "hate" bombings or execute them or even possess explosives with knowledge or intent that they may be used for such a purpose.

4. Provided for free public schooling for children of members of the Armed Forces, regardless of race or color, where local schools are closed to them.

In addition to these provisions of the 1957 and 1960 Civil Rights Acts which go beyond securing the right to vote, the following achievements of this Republican administration further demonstrate that the Republican Party is the party of progressive action instead of belated progressive talk in the field of civil rights:

5. On August 13, 1953, President Eisenhower established by Executive Order 10479, the President's Committee on Government Contracts, with Vice President NIXON as Chairman. This order established a standard antidiscrimination clause for all Government contracts and authorized the Committee to follow all Federal funds going to private employers under Government contracts in order to obtain compliance with the administration policy of free job opportunity. This committee has investigated almost 1,000 complaints of job discrimination by Government contractors and, on its own initiative, has surveyed several primary employment areas and through its action many employers have increased job opportunities for minorities. The effectiveness of this President's Committee would be far greater if it were not for a Democratic-sponsored amendment to permanent legislation which forces the committee to work through Government agencies rather than directly in its own name.[1] The Republican Party platform for 1960 would remedy this, however, by giving the Committee a statutory basis for its program of nondiscrimination in private employment under Federal contracts.

6. On January 18, 1955, President Eisenhower ordered (Executive Order 10590) the creation of the President's Committee on Employment Policy, which is the first committee created for the enforcement of nondiscrimination in Federal employment which reports directly to the President. The administration's policy of free job opportunity is stated clearly in this Executive order. Surveys conducted in 1956 indicated that approximately one-fourth of our Federal employees were Negroes and preliminary figures in a resurvey being concluded now indicate improvements in the upgrading of Negro Federal employees as well.

7. When the administration took office on January 20, 1953, in the Capital of the world's greatest democracy, a Negro could not be served in white restaurants; he could not sleep in white hotels; and he could not sit with whites in many motion picture theaters. Action by the administration helped bring this disgrace to an end.

8. Vigorous executive action brought to completion the elimination of segregation in the Armed Forces and abolished segregation which remained untouched among civilian employees of Navy yards and in veterans' hospitals.

9. The Republican administration has provided the Justice Department with a progressive Attorney General in the field of civil rights. Confirmation of the appointment of the Assistant Attorney General for the Civil Rights Division has been held up for approximately 6 months by the Democratically controlled Constitutional Rights Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee to which all civil rights matters go, which is headed by Senator EASTLAND, Democrat of Mississippi, the most outspoken segregationist in the Senate. Nevertheless, the Attorney General has been vigorous in his support of all litigation to safeguard individual equal protection of the laws as well as voting rights. Federal court action, for instance, has been instituted to stop segregation of the public beaches in Biloxi, Miss., on the basis of a Federal contract under which the beach was constructed, and the Attorney General participated in many school desegregation cases as a friend of the court. Since 1957, 23 State police officers have been prosecuted by the Justice Department for violations of the constitutional rights of prisoners, and 14 are presently on trial for such abuses in a Federal court in Florida.

10. The Housing and Home Finance Agency, which is responsible for the principal housing programs and functions of the administration, such as urban renewal, slum clearance, public housing and home mortgage loan insurance, has refused since 1957 to approve or insure projects of builders who have been found to have violated local housing antidiscrimination laws. On August 14, 1959, HHFA Administrator Norman Mason announced that certification of future insurance of mortgages on low-cost homes for families from urban renewal areas would disregard the racial quota system used in the past. This enables all eligible displaced families to purchase or rent section 221 housing, irrespective of their race, and without allocation or quotas by color. The HHFA has also established a new requirement for an intergroup relations officer for urban renewal in each regional office of HHFA and in February 1960 announced that, before any locality can qualify for urban renewal benefits, it must establish a Citizens Advisory Committee to deal fairly with racial minority problems.

11. The Interstate Commerce Commission, in accordance with the progressive civil rights policy of the Republican administration, outlawed segregated passenger coaches and terminal facilties for Negro interstate passengers on November 7, 1955, in a historic ruling ending the "separate but equal" principle in interstate transportation subject to the Commission's jurisdiction. They also have received and investigated about 100 complaints of discrimination in interstate commerce in the last 8 years, 60 of which were handled in the last 2½ years.

[1] Russell amendment to sec. 213 of 58 Stat. 337.

12. The Federal Aviation Agency has issued a regulation, under its grant-in-aid program for airport development and improvement, that no Federal funds shall be available for participation in the development of terminals if such facilities are designated for use now, or in the future, on a segregated basis. The FAA has most recently begun to require localities contracting for airport development with Federal grant money to insert a nondiscrimination clause covering all jobs created by such contracts.

SALARY INCREASES FOR MEMBERS OF POLICE, FIRE DEPARTMENT, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, THE PARK POLICE, AND THE WHITE HOUSE POLICE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1916, Senate bill 3713.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3713) to increase the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police Force, and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the U.S. Park Police, the White House Police, and for other purposes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may I ask if the request is for unanimous consent or on motion?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is asking unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside.

Mr. JAVITS. May I ask the Senator a question under my reservation of objection. I wish to be recognized in order to pursue very briefly, in order to make the RECORD, the matter of adjournment and recessing. A number of Senators are interested in what we shall do. I shall do so some time this evening. I am perfectly happy to do it now, for it will save the time of Senators, who I know are interested in what I am about to do. I submit that to the leader, so at the earliest time that suits his convenience the way be cleared for getting that permission. Of course, I have no objection to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from New York. He, of course, has the right to be recognized under the bill, but I express the hope that he would allow us to consider and act upon three or four relatively noncontroversial bills.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I say that only in the interest of the convenience of Senators. I know there are a number of Senators who are very much interested and who will have to remain here until that time comes. I am willing to submit it to the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of Senate bill 3713?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with amendments on page 1, line 3, after the word "Columbia", to insert "or of the United States"; at the top of page 2, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 2. (a) Retroactive compensation or salary shall be paid by reason of this Act only in the case of an individual in the service of the District of Columbia or of the United States (including service in the Armed Forces of the United States) on the date of enactment of this Act, except that such retroactive compensation or salary shall be paid (1) to any employee covered in this Act who retired during the period beginning on the day following the first day of the first pay period which began on or after July 1, 1960, and ending on the date of enactment of this Act for services rendered during such period and (2) in accordance with the provisions of the Act of August 3, 1950 (Public Law 636, Eighty-first Congress), as amended, for services rendered during the period beginning on the first day of the first pay period which began on or after July 1, 1960, and ending on the date of enactment of this Act by any such employee who dies during such period.

(b) For the purposes of this section, service in the Armed Forces of the United States in the case of an individual relieved from training and service in the Armed Forces of the United States or discharged from hospitalization following such training and service, shall include the period provided by law for the mandatory restoration of such individual to a position in or under the Federal Government or the municipal government of the District of Columbia.

At the top of page 3, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 3. For the purpose of determining the amount of insurance for which an individual is eligible under the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, as amended, all changes in rates of compensation or salary which result from the enactment of this Act shall be held and considered to be effective as of the date of enactment of this Act.

And at the beginning of line 7, to change the section number from "2" to "4", and in line 8, after the word "the", to insert "first day of the"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That each employee of the District of Columbia or of the United States whose salary is fixed and regulated by the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 480) shall receive, in addition to the compensation provided by such Act, compensation at the rate of 7.5 per centum of the basic compensation provided by such Act.

SEC. 2. (a) Retroactive compensation or salary shall be paid by reason of this Act only in the case of an individual in the service of the District of Columbia or of the United States (including service in the Armed Forces of the United States) on the date of enactment of this Act, except that such retroactive compensation or salary shall be paid (1) to any employee covered in this Act who retired during the period beginning on the day following the first day of the first pay period which began on or after July 1, 1960, and ending on the date of enactment of this Act for services rendered during such period and (2) in accordance with the provisions of the Act of August 3, 1950 (Public Law 636, Eighty-first Congress), as amended, for services rendered during the period beginning on the first day of the first pay period which began on or after July 1, 1960, and ending on the date of enactment of this Act by any such employee who dies during such period.

(b) For the purposes of this section, service in the Armed Forces of the United States in the case of an individual relieved from training and service in the Armed Forces of the United States or discharged from hospitalization following such training and service, shall include the period provided by law for the mandatory restoration of such individual to a position in or under the Federal Government or the municipal government of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 3. For the purpose of determining the amount of insurance for which an individual is eligible under the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, as amended, all changes in rates of compensation or salary which result from the enactment of this Act shall be held and considered to be effective as of the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 4. The provisions of this Act shall become effective on the first day of the first pay period beginning after July 1, 1960.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments. Without objection, the amendments are agreed to.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3 after line 9 it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. 5. Any person who shall retire for age after serving at least thirty years as Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall receive an annuity during the remainder of his life equal to the salary payable to him at the time of his retirement.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment is very simple. It is to afford a measure of recognition to FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover for a lifetime dedicated to the welfare of this country. This amendment would permit Director Hoover to retire at full salary at such time as he elects to do so.

There is a precedent for this amendment inasmuch as Congress enacted a similar provision for Mr. Lindsay Warren when he was Comptroller General of the United States. I believe, in consideration of the outstanding contributions of this great American during the more than 30 years he has served as FBI Director, it is fitting that we pay tribute to him in this manner.

Mr. Hoover's noteworthy record as head of the FBI is too well known for me to take the time now for a review of his many accomplishments. I should make it decidedly clear, however, that he does not contemplate retirement at this time. Our country needs his valuable service and I sincerely hope that he will continue as head of the Bureau for many years.

I earnestly feel that we should accord him this token of our appreciation and I recommend that my amendment be adopted.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. There is precedent in that Lindsay Warren was authorized to receive the pay after his

retirement equal to that which he received while he was occupying the position of Comptroller General, but the precedent rests in that fact rather upon 30 years of service. Lindsay Warren had a distinguished career in Government service, but he was not Comptroller General for 30 years.

Mr. BRIDGES. The amendment applies the test of 30 years of service to this one office, and it will be a long time—probably none of us will be around—when the law will have to be applied again. I think it is a good amendment. I think Mr. Hoover's outstanding record warrants its adoption.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I should like to say that the remarks of the Senator from New Hampshire are certainly worthy. I concur in all that he said, and I would like to add whatever emphasis I can to his statement, for certainly J. Edgar Hoover is cherished by all Americans and deserves this consideration. I understand that the House will concur in the amendment if the Senate accepts and passes it.

Mr. BRIDGES. I understand that if the Senate agrees to the amendment, the House will gladly accept and concur in it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I wish to direct some remarks to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire. I hold J. Edgar Hoover in the highest respect. I value deeply the services he has performed. However, I am obliged to say that regardless of his patriotism and the righteousness of what he has done, we would embark upon a program that would likely rise to plague us. The amendment contemplates allowing him in his retirement to draw the same salary that he is drawing while he is working. I have seen States in which liberal retirement pay and pensions have been allowed. They begin innocuously. It is contended that they will not become a precedent. But I cannot bring myself to the conviction that there is anyone who serves the Government who ought to be permitted to retire and to receive the same pay that he did while he was working.

Mr. BRIDGES. I point out to the distinguished Senator that Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, circuit and district judges of the U.S. courts, five-star generals, and admirals all receive the same pay after retirement.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The argument of the Senator from New Hampshire is what may be called begging the question. The fact that others are receiving the same pay does not constitute an argument that the principle is sound.

Mr. BRIDGES. I agree. However, the Senator said we would be establishing a new principle by adopting the amendment, or setting a new precedent. My response answers in part that argument.

Mr. LAUSCHE. My argument was predicated on what was said by the Senator from South Dakota, when he said that there had been a precedent established for the receiving of full pay. Would I dare ask, after 30 years of service in the Senate, that I be paid my full salary? Pensions are contemplated on the principle that they make possible a reasonably comfortable life. They should not be intended to create for the recipient a basis upon which they would be a luxury, rather than the means to the enjoyment of a reasonably comfortable life. I cannot see my way clear, in spite of my high regard for J. Edgar Hoover, to subscribe to this program. Moreover, I do not believe he would. I object to any consent approval of the amendment.

Mr. FREAR. Under the present situation, I assume the Senate will have to vote on accepting the amendment. I move that the amendment be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CANNON in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, have the committee amendments been agreed to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I voted against the original salary increase bill, but nevertheless the bill was passed. We have set the precedent. Now, it is no more than right that we extend to these employees the same principle that we have extended to others. However, if we are going to raise salaries, we should be willing to provide the money to pay for the cost.

We all know there is much more enthusiasm in the granting of salary increases than in voting for the necessary taxes to pay for them. Therefore, I am sending to the desk an amendment which is the text of H.R. 10346, a revenue-producing measure requested by the District of Columbia. I ask that the amendment be read, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. JAVITS. May we first hear the amendment read?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed—

That (a) section 125 of the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act (D.C. Code 47–2602) is amended by striking out "2 per centum" and by inserting in lieu thereof "3 per centum".

(b) Subsection (a) of section 127 of such Act (D.C. Code 47–2604(a)) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) On each sale, other than sales of food for human consumption off the premises where such food is sold, and other than sales or charges for rooms, lodgings, or accommodations furnished to transients, such amounts as may be prescribed by the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to carry out the purposes of this section."

SEC. 2. Section 212 of the District of Columbia Use Tax Act (D.C. Code 47–2702) is amended by striking out "2 per centum" and inserting in lieu thereof "3 per centum".

SEC. 3. The amendments made by the first two sections of this Act shall take effect on the first day of the first month which begins more than sixty days after the date of enactment of this Act. From and after the effective date of such amendments, all references in the District of Columbia Use Tax Act to sections 125 and 127 of the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act shall be deemed to be references to such sections 125 and 127, as amended by the first section of this Act.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. As I said before, I am offering the amendment because I believe the two proposals should be considered together. I will support not only the amendment but also the bill if the amendment is adopted. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield first before he requests the yeas and nays?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I invite the Senator's attention to the fact that there is a separate measure on the calendar seeking to do what the Senator wants to do. I point out that the proposed salary increase, as the Senator has pointed out, is in line with increases which have already been granted to Federal employees, extending from Post Office employees on up. I am afraid that if we consider it on the proposed basis, it may bring about prolonged debate; whereas if it is considered as a sales tax proposal, we can accomplish a great deal more.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. If the leader wants to take up the revenue producing measure first, I will be glad to cooperate. That is the procedure which I think should be followed. I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment. There will be no prolonged debate so far as I am concerned. I am ready to vote.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Is the bill we are considering Calendar No. 1916, S. 3713?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Any amendment to increase the sales tax would be a revenue measure and would be deemed unconstitutional if attached to S. 3713, which is a Senate bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. We need not be bothered about that if this bill is approved it will be substituted for the language of the companion House bill that is also on the calendar. Then it will be constitutional. We have no rule of germaneness in the Senate. The final bill approved here will be a House bill. Again I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Before the Senator does that, I should like to make a request of him. Would he consent to postponing consideration of the pending measure until later in the evening, so that we may get other proposed legislation considered and passed, and then come back to the consideration of the pending measure?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It is entirely up to the majority leader whether we act now or later. Any procedure you wish is agreeable to me. I will certainly cooperate with him. First, I ask for the yeas and nays, so that we will be on notice when we come back that there will be a vote.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I withdraw my request.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. Would the ordering of the yeas and nays affect in any way a motion to lay the amendment on the table?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No; a motion can be offered even though the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. MORSE. A motion to lay on the table would be in order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I request the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection——

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, what was the request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Reserving the right to object, we stayed here Saturday night——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator cannot reserve the right to object.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The legislative clerk resumed the call of the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, on my amendment, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move that the amendment of the Senator from Delaware be laid on the table.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, on that motion I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Oregon to lay on the table the amendment of the Senator from Delaware. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennesee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. LUSK], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], and the Senators from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS and Mr. SYMINGTON] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MARTIN], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 21, as follows:

[No. 319]

YEAS—50

Allott	Engle	McGee
Anderson	Ervin	McNamara
Bartlett	Frear	Magnuson
Beall	Green	Mansfield
Bible	Hart	Morse
Burdick	Holland	Moss
Butler	Jackson	Muskie
Byrd, W. Va.	Javits	Pastore
Cannon	Johnson, Tex.	Prouty
Capehart	Johnston, S.C.	Proxmire
Carroll	Jordan	Randolph
Case, N. J.	Keating	Robertson
Church	Kennedy	Sparkman
Clark	Kuchel	Williams, N.J.
Cooper	Lausche	Yarborough
Dodd	Long, La.	Young, Ohio
Ellender	McClellan	

NAYS—21

Aiken	Dirksen	Scott
Bennett	Dworshak	Smith
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Talmadge
Carlson	Hruska	Thurmond
Case, S. Dak.	Mundt	Wiley
Cotton	Russell	Williams, Del.
Curtis	Schoeppel	Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—29

Bush	Hartke	Martin
Byrd, Va.	Hayden	Monroney
Chavez	Hennings	Morton
Douglas	Hill	Murray
Eastland	Humphrey	O'Mahoney
Fong	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Fulbright	Kerr	Smathers
Goldwater	Long, Hawaii	Stennis
Gore	Lusk	Symington
Gruening	McCarthy	

So the motion to lay the amendment of Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the motion to lay the amendment on the table was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

RESOLUTION TO DISCHARGE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE FROM FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF S. 958, TO ASSIST IN MEETING COSTS OF SPECIAL PROFESSIONAL SERVICES NEEDED IN CARRYING OUT PUBLIC SCHOOL DESEGREGATION PROGRAMS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution for which I request immediate consideration. As part of my unanimous-consent request——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York has the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thought the Senator from Delaware was recognized.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on the Judiciary be, and hereby is, discharged from further consideration of the bill (S. 958) to assist in meeting the costs of special professional services needed in carrying out public school desegregation programs, and for other purposes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I withdraw that request for a moment, and would just like to be recognized for a minute.

This bill has been pending before the Judiciary Committee since April 10, 1959. It was submitted by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], on behalf of himself, the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], myself, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER]. It is one of the two measures which the President has urged upon us as having been fully debated and as being the very minimal earnest in respect of civil rights upon which we should do something before we go home. It relates to the giving of some financial assistance and technical assistance to school districts wanting to desegregate. They seek to do that

themselves, and ask for the assistance of the United States.

I also point out that we are just at the beginning of the school season; and if we go home without doing anything about this, that horse will be out of the barn by the time we return.

Now I ask unanimous consent that the discharge resolution which I have just sent to the desk may be immediately considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, of course there is objection. This is very palpably just a political move on the eve of the adjournment of Congress; and I object.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have another request: I ask unanimous consent that the resolution for the discharge of the committee, which I have presented, may go on the calendar.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I likewise object to that unanimous-consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will go over 1 day, under the rule.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank my colleague.

SALARY INCREASES FOR MEMBERS OF POLICE, FIRE DEPARTMENT, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, THE PARK POLICE, AND THE WHITE HOUSE POLICE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3713) to increase the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the U.S. Park Police, the White House Police, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I shall not delay the Senate on this bill.

This bill provides for salary increases for the firemen and policemen of the District of Columbia and its cost is estimated at $2,381,450. The bill to raise salaries for teachers in the District which immediately follows this bill will cost $2,600,000 or a total additional cost of about $5 million. If we are going to vote these salary increases, the Senate has the responsibility to provide the necessary revenue.

If we are not going to provide the revenue, let us stop spending the money. This bill, if enacted, would cost $2,381,000 to the District of Columbia. The next bill, which will come up immediately following, is one which would increase salaries for teachers in the District of Columbia, and will cost $2,600,000. Together, we are increasing the cost of running the District of Columbia by approximately $5 million.

The proposal which the Senate has just rejected, and which I offered as an amendment, would have provided additional revenues for the District of Columbia in the amount of $5½ million, and would have financed the salary increases which the Senate seems so enthusiastic to vote for.

I think the Senate will be negligent in its responsibilities if it enacts the salary increases without providing the necessary revenue. Let us not kid ourselves; every Senator knows the ultimate fate of the proposal to raise the revenue. We all know there is a threatened filibuster against the revenue producing measure and a considerable lack of enthusiasm to vote for the bill.

I think this is another illustration of fiscal irresponsibility, in not providing the money at a time when we vote to spend it. Either these bills should have been brought up together, or the bill providing for revenue should have been brought up for consideration first.

Apparently we are willing to spend $5 million on the eve of a political election to raise salaries, but do not have the nerve to provide the revenues until after the election. It is being argued that the unpopular part of this proposal can be postponed until next year.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I want to say I have no desire to curry any favor with the policemen or firemen of the District of Columbia. None of them can vote for me. But they have a pretty tough job in the District of Columbia, because of the multiple problems involved. I think if Government employees, from postal employees on up, are entitled to a 7½-percent increase in their pay, then the policemen and firemen are entitled to it just as much. It is not a question of currying favor; it is a question of doing justice where justice is due. So I hope the bill will be passed.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President——

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. There are two of us. Which one has been recognized?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from Delaware has the floor.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. When has the senior Senator from Delaware been taken off the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has recognized the junior Senator from Delaware.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. The senior Senator from Delaware did not relinquish the floor. He was still on the floor. How can the Chair take him off the floor when he has not yielded?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I had yielded to the Senator from Montana. It is all right. I can yield to the Senator from Ohio a little while later.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. FREAR. Who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from Delaware has the floor.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I respect the opinion of my senior colleague and fully recognize what revenues it is anticipated would come in under the bill. I concur in his opinion, and also recognize that the salaries for the policemen and firemen are an expense of the people of the country and of the District of Columbia. I think we ought to protect both of them. If they walk in the streets of Washington at night and are unprotected, who is going to be responsible? We have had case after case in the District of Columbia of crimes because we have lacked policemen.

The chief of police now says that even with what he has today he cannot get policemen to do the job. If we are not going to give them the increase when we recognize they need it, then I do not know how we can expect to control crime in the District of Columbia. I believe we ought to pay for the salary increases, and I think the sales tax is the way to do it. It may be that we should couple both bills together. Perhaps that is the way to do it. Unfortunately, thus far, the committee has not seen fit to do it that way.

I respect my senior colleague very much and I want to have the sales tax, and I will vote for the sales tax; but I do not think we should deny a salary increase to the policemen and firemen of the District of Columbia if we do not get the sales tax.

I cannot get any policemen in the District of Columbia to vote for me. If there was anything to that, I would surely try, but I recognize this measure is for the protection of the citizens of the District of Columbia, as well as visitors to the District of Columbia.

In conclusion, I wish to say that I presented a bill to increase the sales tax, and I surely hope it can be passed. I recognize what the senior Senator from Delaware has said.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FREAR. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is the Senator from Delaware able to state when the last pay increase was granted?

Mr. FREAR. In 1958.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What was the percentage of increase granted in 1958?

Mr. FREAR. It was 13.2 percent.

Mr. LAUSCHE. When the 13.2 percent was granted in 1958, was it for the purpose of bringing salaries in the District up to a level corresponding to those in other areas?

Mr. FREAR. In some categories the salaries in the District of Columbia may be higher than what they are in other cities; but also, salaries are higher for some police and firemen in some other cities than they are in the District. The District of Columbia does not have the highest paid constabulary in the country.

Mr. LAUSCHE. So that since 1958 there will be an increase of 22 percent—13½ percent in 1958 and 7½ percent this year. Is that correct?

Mr. FREAR. I am sure the Senator's arithmetic is accurate.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What is the starting salary of a patrolman now?

Mr. FREAR. It is $4,800 per annum.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What is the progression of increase that they have? Is a regular increment added each year or every second year?

Mr. FREAR. Does the Senator have a report on this bill?

Mr. LAUSCHE. No; I do not.

Mr. FREAR. There is one available, and the scale is set forth in the report.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If it is set forth in the report, very well.

May I ask when prior to 1958 the last increase was granted?

Mr. FREAR. If my memory is correct, I think it was in 1955.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Does the report show it?

Mr. FREAR. The report does not show it. I think it was in 1955.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from Delaware has said this information is all contained in the report. I am sure he understands that in the haste in which we are acting it is absolutely impossible to make studies of reports.

Mr. FREAR. I recognize that, but the report has been available for several days.

Mr. LAUSCHE. There has been a lot of other pressing work.

Mr. FREAR. Absolutely. I will say to the Senator from Ohio that he is one who stays on the floor and takes an interest in the work of the Senate and reads all the reports he can; and I give him credit for it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator from Delaware very much, and I return the compliment to him.

This pay increase contemplates taking care of the police, the firemen, and the schoolteachers?

Mr. FREAR. No; the police and firemen. We added an amendment to take care of the Director of the FBI.

Mr. LAUSCHE. In the contemplation of the granting of the pay increase, was it not considered that we would concomitantly provide the revenues which would be required to meet the new obligation?

Mr. FREAR. The junior Senator from Delware reported a bill, which passed the committee and is on the Senate Calendar, to increase the sales tax in certain sales made in the District of Columbia, which bill would provide revenues.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It was the purpose to provide the revenues with which to meet the added cost; is that correct?

Mr. FREAR. The bills were not joined. The cost as determined by the Commissioners with respect to this bill is approximately $2.2 million, with an additional cost of $180,000 to the U.S. Government. The anticipated income from the sales tax would be in excess of $5.5 million.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I know the Senator from Delaware does not subscribe to this principle which I shall now declare——

Mr. FREAR. The Senator from Ohio does not know.

Mr. LAUSCHE. In passing the bill without providing the revenues, we are following the well-established precedent, "Spend, but do not tax."

Mr. FREAR. We have a taxing program, I advise the Senator from Ohio. I will further state that there is a sufficient amount of revenue in the District of Columbia to carry this program without the addition of the sales tax until the first of the year.

I certainly concur in what the Senator from Ohio has said. I believe in the sales tax. I think it ought to be passed. I think the revenue ought to go into the District of Columbia treasury. I also think the police, firemen, and teachers should get an increase in salary.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If I had any doubts about the way I ought to vote, knowing the type of "pennypincher" the Senator from Delaware is, I must subscribe to what he said.

Mr. FREAR. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 3713) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of——

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be substituted the language of the bill just passed for H.R. 13053, Calendar No. 1994, and that action on the Senate bill be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry, reserving the right to object.

Is that in order, in view of the fact that the bill has been passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is unable to hear the Senator.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Should not the substitution have been made prior to the passage of the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Parliamentarian advises the Chair that it would be in order to take up the House bill on that same subject.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The language could be substituted, even though the bill has been passed, the motion to reconsider made, and the motion laid on the table. Could the language be substituted after that?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Parliamentarian advises the Chair that any language may be substituted for the language of the House bill, if the House bill is considered.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry——

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. First, it is necessary to make a motion to consider the House bill. That is the point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It is necessary first to make a motion that the House bill be considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. A further parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. After the bill has been taken up by motion, the bill will be subject to amendment?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Surely. All after the enacting clause could be striken, and the Senate language could be substituted in lieu thereof.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes; but the bill would also be open to amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Is there objection to the present consideration of Calendar No. 1994, H.R. 13053?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I object.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1994.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H.R. 13053) to increase the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the U.S. Park Police, the White House Police, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 13053) to increase the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the U.S. Park Police, the White House Police, and for other purposes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that all language after the enacting clause in H.R. 13053 be stricken and that the language of the Senate bill, S. 3713, as amended, be substituted in lieu thereof.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (H.R. 13053) was passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TEACHERS SALARY ACT OF 1955, AS AMENDED

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1993, H.R. 12993.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H.R. 12993) to amend the District of Columbia Teachers Salary Act of 1955, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I moved that the Senate proceed to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. CASE of South Dakota and Mr. JOHNSON of Texas addressed the Chair.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I wish to be recognized on the bill. I get a little tired of being yielded to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I simply intended to make the bill, H.R. 12993, the unfinished business tonight.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, once in a while other Members of the Senate would like to be recognized in their own right, and not be recognized under the sufferance of the majority leader. The Senator from South Dakota rarely asks for recognition.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The Senator is going to be recognized in his own right and not under the sufferance of the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the majority leader does not intend to yield the floor. The majority leader is prepared to make a motion to recess, in accordance with his understanding with the minority leader some time ago. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator if he wishes to make a statement.

This bill is to be the unfinished business for tomorrow. We do not expect to pass other bills this evening. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator if he desires to speak at this time, or I shall make the motion to recess.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If the Senator from South Dakota cannot be recognized in his own right tonight, he will wait until he can be recognized, when he can talk.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Delaware without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

FIGHTING FOR FREEDOM—AT HOME AND ABROAD—ADDRESS BY SENATOR BRIDGES

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, a recent address by the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] documents the importance of fiscal responsibility. While this speech by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is not political in the ordinary sense, its message is especially timely as a reminder that "there is no magic formula that will solve the domestic problems confronting our Nation. They cannot be solved by political drumbeating or the reckless spending of the people's money."

The address makes many other telling points, which I also commend to the Senate's attention.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the address entitled "Fighting for Freedom at Home and Abroad," by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIGHTING FOR FREEDOM AT HOME AND ABROAD

(By U.S. Senator STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire)

With the 2d session of the 86th Congress drawing to a close, there are many questions in our minds about the future. Some fateful decisions that will affect the lives of all of us will be made very soon.

There are many things going on in the world that will affect all our lives for all time to come.

SUMMIT COLLAPSE NOT A NATIONAL TRAGEDY

Foremost in our minds is the international situation. The collapse of the summit conference startled many of us. It was as though we were strolling along a quiet country road, and suddenly a dog, snapping and snarling, runs at us from a farmyard. We don't know whether to kick at him, or throw a stone, or to keep on our way, ignoring him. So it was when Khrushchev began snapping and snarling at Paris.

But, let me assure you of this: the collapse of the summit conference was no national tragedy. A great many Americans have opposed such conferences all along. We remembered earlier summits, when Western heads of state were outmaneuvered and cheated by Khrushchev's predecessor—the cunning Stalin.

Khrushchev's 180° turn from so-called peaceful coexistence at Paris was just a reminder of how fully he remains a dedicated Communist. When he saw that he wasn't going to get away with anything, he flip-flopped around and tried to embarass the President for his own political advantage.

Khrushchev is a pure Communist agitator, from the top of his head to the soles of his feet, but especially in the area of the larynx.

Any time he can talk the world into a crisis, you can be sure he will do so. His failure at Paris was that he did not panic the world. Our President, to his everlasting credit, withstood his inflammatory onslaught with dignity and forbearance. In my opinion, that saved the day for the free world.

RED-INSPIRED RIOTS WILL NOT BREAK JAPANESE-AMERICAN TIES

But crisis follows crisis in these troubled times; the Communist agitators never rest. They stirred up student Socialist riots in Japan in a vain effort to scuttle the Japanese-American peace treaty. Then, when President Eisenhower's planned visit was postponed, they tried to make something of that, too. They said the United States lost face, but let's look at it another way. When you want to invite a friend to your home, but your children are so bad that you are ashamed to go through with it, who is embarrassed? Or, if you refuse to break bread with a friend because his household is too rowdy, who should be ashamed, you or your friend?

The fact is, we acted the part of the mature friend and gave Japan the opportunity to postpone the visit, thus saving face. In my opinion, our action was generous, just, and proper. Our friendship with the Japanese people and their Government, carefully nurtured during all the years since the tragedy of World War II, will continue and flourish. The Communists won't drive a wedge between us, because we won't let them.

OUR FOREIGN POLICY HAS KEPT THE PEACE

The fundamental purpose of our foreign policy is to keep the peace. That is the test. During the past 7½ years—since the end of the Korean war—our foreign policy has been eminently successful. No American armies are fighting in foreign lands. No American blood is wetting alien soil. No American boys are dying on faraway battlefields.

That is the acid test of our foreign policy. Let us pray that our efforts to wage peace will be equally successful in the years ahead.

Whether we call it cold war or what-have-you, resistance to the international Communist conspiracy is a condition of survival for the foreseeable future. We've got to maintain the moral strength and courage to sustain future diplomatic blowups, and we've got to back it up with military power. Certainly we could not have come through the past 7 years in peace, unless we had had the military strength to back up our foreign policies.

GROWTH OF U.S. MILITARY POWER SINCE KOREAN WAR

In 1953, no ship afloat was powered by atomic energy. Today we have 9 nuclear submarines in commission and 23 under construction or being converted.

In 1953 the polaris missile system was just a dream.

This year it is a reality, as two of these submarines, each capable of firing 16 warheaded missile while submerged, join our active defense forces.

At the close of the Korean war, just 7 years ago, an airplane expected to operate at speeds greater than the speed of sound was in its early design stage. Today, mach 2 aircraft are part of our regular forces, and a mach 3 plane is on the way.

In 1953, the Atlas intercontinental ballistic missile was a hazy concept. It was surrounded by doubters. They said it would be operational by 1965. But today—1960—we have Atlases on the launching pads, with an incredible record of successful test firings, and a proved accuracy far exceeding the most optimistic hopes of a few years ago.

In 1953, the intermediate range ballistic missiles, Jupiter and Thor, were not even contemplated. Today the Thor is in the

hands of our allies in the United Kingdom, and the Jupiter booster launched our first earth satellite in 1958.

Since that first launching, the United States has put 24 satellites into orbit, compared with a total of 6 space vehicles for the Soviets. Today we have 13 satellites circling in space, including the remarkable Transit–II–A, launched June 15. This two-package scientific achievement is designed to benefit all of humanity. The American people, who provided the knowledge and skill that went into Transit–II–A, deserve the congratulations and thanks of the entire world.

Two, perhaps three, Soviet space devices are in orbit today, transmitting no information. Beyond any question, we have far surpassed them in overall scientific achievement in the exploration of outer space.

Two years ago, the launching of a satellite made headlines in every newspaper. Today, it does well to make page 1 at all. Antiaircraft and tactical missiles, air defense and offense systems come off of the drawing boards and into ships, planes, and land installations—and are taken for granted. Our ground forces have been constantly modernized during the past few years, and just a few weeks ago, more funds were voted for these purposes.

All these changes I have mentioned have taken place in just 7 years—since the close of the Korean war—and during a Republican administration. It's amazing to me that so much could have been accomplished, and there is absolutely no doubt in my mind that this progress in the military field, backing up our foreign policy, has been the main factor in keeping the peace during these trying years.

PEACE LETS US GIVE ATTENTION TO DOMESTIC PROBLEMS

Following the great economic crisis of the 1930's, World War II in the 1940's, and the Korean war in the early 1950's, we took full advantage of the years of peace and gave attention to domestic problems.

As I recall a TV commercial—it goes, I think—"Better things for better living, through chemistry."

I'd like to paraphrase that and say, "Better living, for more Americans, through sound Government and the free enterprise system." And I'd like to add a personal opinion—that's a pretty good commercial for the progress that we have made since the close of the Korean war.

During this period the American free enterprise system has served our people magnificently.

I would also like to mention that, in 1952, the average weekly earnings of factory workers was $67.97. Last month, it was over $90. Is this not indicative of our tremendous economic growth?

During this same period, home ownership has risen at a steady and healthy rate—and I mention that because I know of no more reliable and significant indicator of economic health. Today, more than 60 percent of us own or are buying our own homes.

THE PROBLEM OF INFLATION

During the quarter century of crisis to which I referred, when economic catastrophe was followed by war, more economic troubles, and yet another war, the problem of inflation reared its ugly head, and the cost of living soared.

The 100-cent dollar slipped downward to 90 cents, to 80 cents, to 70 cents, and so on, until, during the Korean war, it skidded to 52 cents. We put the brakes on the inflationary roller coaster in 1953, and since then have held the depreciation of the dollar to just a few cents. It is now worth approximately 48 cents, in comparison with the 1939 dollar.

To express inflation another way—the Consumer Price Index rose 89.4 percent between 1940 and 1952. It rose 9.8 percent between 1952 and 1959.

But, no matter how you express it or illustrate it, it is a terrible thing.

In my opinion, although we have effectively slowed down inflation in the past 7 years, it is still the major domestic problem facing the Nation.

A study in 1957 by the Social Security Administration showed that the average monthly benefit for retired workers had risen only 13.6 percent in terms of real dollars between 1940 and 1957. This means that the typical social security retiree is scarcely better off today than he was nearly 20 years ago. Thus, all the economic progress we're so proud of has not been shared by retired persons.

Now, maybe I'm old fashioned, but I think a person who works 30 or 40 years and, one way or another, prepares for retirement through savings, participation in a pension plan, and/or the social security program, is entitled to live out his remaining years in comfort. When a person saves on the basis of a 100-cent dollar, but upon retirement finds he must pay for food, shelter, and clothing on the basis of a 50-cent dollar—it's like changing the rules on him in the middle of the game. And I don't think it's right to change the rules on him when he reaches retirement age. When the rules are changed inadvertently, as in inflation, I think we should try to do something to compensate the retiree for the damage.

THE BRIDGES SOCIAL SECURITY PROPOSAL

There are various proposals before Congress having to do with helping our senior citizens. One, which I introduced, would permit a man or woman to earn up to $1,800 a year without sacrificing any of his social security benefit. This, it seems to me, is logical and justifiable. This Nation needs the wisdom and skills of our elder statesman citizens. And they need the freedom to work and earn, to the limit of their own judgment. The present law puts a penalty on those who are able and happy to work and earn.

THE ADMINISTRATION'S MEDICARE PLAN

Another proposal before Congress of interest to our retirees is the plan for hospitalization insurance for citizens over 65 years old.

Actually, there are two proposals. One is the Forand bill—a compulsory, socialized-medicine approach that would be operated by the Federal Government. The other is the administration's medicare plan—a voluntary plan that would be operated jointly by the Federal Government and the States.

The Forand bill benefits many people who do not need the benefits, but leaves out 4 million aged not covered by social security, more than half of whom have incomes of less than $1,000 a year. And the Forand bill is compulsory for those it does cover.

I hate compulsion.

I believe in personal freedom.

I support the medicare plan because I think it is the best plan for the most people. And it is a voluntary plan.

FIGHTING INFLATION IS FIGHTING FOR RETIREES

I hope that the medicare plan and my proposal for the modernization of our social security laws will become law. Both will help. But, there is another fight which, in the long run, is even more important to our senior citizens. That is the battle against inflation.

There are three principal causes of inflation. One is profiteering by business. Another is excessive wage demands by labor. The third, and this is the one I am most directly interested in, is Government spending and monetary matters.

Government deficit spending is simply printing paper money and feeding it into the main stream of our economy without a compensating supply of goods and services. The result, as someone has expressed it, is: "Too much money chasing too few goods." The result is a soaring cost-of-living index, and the depreciating dollar.

RECKLESS GOVERNMENT SPENDING WON'T SOLVE PROBLEMS

There is no magic formula that will solve the domestic problems confronting our Nation. They cannot be solved by political drumbeating or the reckless spending of the people's money.

While every thoughtful citizen wants a full measure of goods and services for every dollar he spends, our senior citizens are the first to detect signs of inflation, and the first to feel its effects.

BALANCED BUDGET KEY TO PROGRESS

The mistaken idea has been planted that the drive for a balanced Federal budget stifles progress. On the contrary, by balancing the budget, the Federal Government can contribute to solid progress by stabilizing our dollars. The alternative is creeping or leaping inflation—depending on the amount of deficit spending.

Inflation is not progress—it is only the illusion of progress. During inflation we receive higher wages, but they buy less than before, so how can we say we are making progress?

The greatest service our Government could do for the people right now is to put its fiscal house in order. The greatest service the people could do for their Government is to demand fiscal responsibility of their elected representatives.

DOLLARS AND PEOPLE

One political accusation that I am sick and tired of hearing is the one that goes something like this: "My opponent is interested in dollars; I am interested in people."

That is the cry of the demagog. What hogwash.

This absurd charge is usually leveled at any conscientious public servant who questions a costly Government spending program designed to benefit a special-interest group.

Well, let me ask this: Whose dollars are we talking about? Aren't they the people's dollars? Or have we forgotten our own screams of anguish and our rages against Government spending the last time income taxes were due?

I think two questions should be asked of every Government spending proposal: (1) Can we afford it? (2) Is it the best use of the public's money in the public's interest?

I view with suspicion any politician who lacks the courage, honesty, or wisdom to face up to the hard decision of how best to spend public money.

We should think twice before entrusting such a man with our welfare and our tax money.

WELL-INFORMED CITIZENS—OUR HOPE FOR THE FUTURE

The hope for the future is a well-informed public. If the problems I have mentioned are solved—and I am confident they will be—it will come about mainly through the interest and efforts of the people.

By now the cold war has demonstrated that to survive and prosper in a free society America must rely on its human resources, including its most mature minds.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, August 29, 1960, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 1806. An act to revise title 18, chapter 39, of the United States Code, entitled "Explosives and Combustibles";

S. 2306. An act to exempt from taxation certain property of the National Woman's Party, Inc., in the District of Columbia;

S. 3415. An act to exempt from taxation certain property of the American Association of University Women, Educational Foundation, Inc., in the District of Columbia;

S. 3727. An act to authorize the bonding of persons engaging in the home improvement business, and for other purposes; and

S. 3834. An act to increase the maximum amount which may be borrowed by the District of Columbia for use in the construction and improvement of its sanitary and combined sewer systems, and for other purposes.

RECESS TO 12 O'CLOCK NOON TOMORROW

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have made the motion that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock tomorrow.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Did the Presiding Officer recognize the Senator from South Dakota?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A motion to recess is in order, and it is not debatable.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. And I have not yielded for anything else. I ask the Presiding Officer to put the question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 8 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, August 30, 1960, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, AUGUST 29, 1960

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Joshua 1: 5: *I will be with thee; I will not fail thee, nor forsake thee.*

O Thou who art man's companion and counselor, we beseech Thee to guide and sustain with Thy infinite and infallible wisdom the Members of this legislative body as they face difficult decisions.

Grant that they may serve Thee and our beloved country without reproach and continue to carry on with patience and perseverance those deliberations and councils which will bring about a better understanding among all the various classes in our human society.

May the citizens of our Republic be aroused to the necessity of safeguarding their liberties and give themselves in loyal and patriotic devotion to the principles and virtues which make for peace.

Hear us in the name of the Captain of our salvation. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, August 26, 1960, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 10960. An act to amend section 5701 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the excise tax upon cigars;

H.R. 11573. An act to provide for the free entry of an electron microscope for the use of William Marsh Rice University of Houston, Tex., and an electron microscope for the use of the University of Colorado Medical Center, Denver, Colo.;

H.R. 12536. An act relating to the treatment of charges for local advertising for purposes of determining the manufacturers' sale price; and

H.R. 12659. An act to suspend for a temporary period the import duty on heptanoic acid.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 3299. An act to provide for the conveyance to the State of Maine of certain lands located in such State;

S. 3880. An act to provide for the establishment of the Roger Williams National Monument; and

S. Con. Res. 116. Concurrent resolution favoring further exploration for the establishment of an international food program for relief purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1066. An act to revise the boundaries and change the name of Fort Donelson National Military Park, and for other purposes;

S. 1214. An act to amend the act of March 11, 1948 (62 Stat. 78), relating to the establishment of the De Soto National Memorial, in the State of Florida; and

S. 1806. An act to revise title 18, chapter 39, of the United States Code, entitled "Explosives and Combustibles."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the House amendment to the bill (S. 2575) entitled "An act to provide a health benefits program for certain retired employees of the Government", with an amendment as follows:

Page 11, of the House engrossed amendment, strike out all of section 10, including the heading, and renumber following sections accordingly.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6871) entitled "An act to amend title III of the Public Health Service Act, to authorize project grants for graduate training in public health, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11390) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to Senate amendments Nos. 9 and 21 to the foregoing bill.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12619) entitled "An act making appropriations for Mutual Security and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 22, 31, 33, and 35 to the foregoing bill.

FOREIGN TAX CREDIT

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the part of the House have until midnight tonight to file a conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 10087) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit taxpayers to elect an overall limitation on the foreign tax credit.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

FOREIGN-AID PROGRAM

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, after this brief political session has ended, some of us will have clear consciences; doubtless, others, guilty ones.

Last Thursday, the House and Senate conferees reached an agreement on funds for the foreign-aid program. The House conferees bought some pretty bad stuff in compromising our differences.

Now, the bureaucrats downtown are so determined that their will and not the will of the Congress shall prevail that they are attempting to satisfy their greedy appetites for more of the taxpayers' money to give away by bypassing the regular committee that conducted the hearings, the full committee that approved the actions of the subcommittee, the House that approved the actions of both, and void the agreement of the conferees and the approval of the conference by the House. They are now attempting to get funds by misrepresentation, half-truths, and innuendoes. God forbid that such a betrayal of the will of this body should succeed.

WATERSHED AND FLOOD PREVENTION PROJECTS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed:

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., August 26, 1960.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
The Speaker,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the provisions of section 2 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended, the Committee on Public Works has approved the work plans transmitted to you which were referred to this committee. The work plans involved are:

State	Watershed	Ex. Com. No.	Committee approval
Oklahoma	Fourche Maline Creek.	2395	Aug. 25, 1960
Do	Leader-Middle Clear Boggy Creek.	2395	Do.
Do	Upper Black Bear Creek.	2183	Do.
Michigan	Misteguay Creek	2239	Do.

Sincerely yours,
CHARLES A. BUCKLEY,
Member of Congress,
Chairman, Committee on Public Works.

FILING OF REPORTS

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs may have until midnight tonight to file reports on S. 1105, S. 1889, H.R. 8712, S. 2757, S. 2914, S. 3267, S. 3399, S. 1670, and S. 1663.

The reason for this request is to give the House notice of bills that may be brought up at any time during the last days of the session.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

STATE DEPARMENT ACTION CALLED FOR ON CUBA

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, the American people are sick and tired of Castro. Whether he is sane, insane, or simply egotistical is beside the point. Whether he is a Communist, a Socialist, or simply a political neuter is entirely academic. That flaming firebrand, if left unquenched, is going to ignite a third world war.

I call upon the State Department for definitive action. If we are to sever diplomatic relations with Dictator Trujillo, then let us sever diplomatic relations with Dictator Castro. If we are to impose economic sanctions on the Dominican Republic, then let us impose economic sanctions on Cuba. If we are to ostracize one, let us ostracize both.

Never fear the propaganda impact in other Latin-American countries. They cannot respect an America which does not respect herself enough to defend herself. We can no longer tolerate these unprovoked insults. We can no longer afford confiscation. We can no longer compromise with this evil. Appeasement is folly. Vacillation is dangerous. Timidity may be suicidal.

OPERATION VERACITY

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, today begins Operation Veracity.

Throughout the week, Republican Congressmen will expose certain untruths in the Democrat platform.

I charge as the first untruth this Democrat platform statement:

> Over the past 7½-year period, the Republicans have failed to balance the budget.

This transparent inaccuracy should be corrected to read:

> Over the past 7½ years, the Republicans balanced the budget in fiscal years 1956, 1957, 1960, and 1961.

A key issue of this campaign is experience versus inexperience.

The youngsters who play at "New Frontiersmanship" should have included in their platform a bit of grownup veracity.

THE LATE HONORABLE WILLIAM RICHARD THOM

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I was saddened this morning to learn of the passing of William Richard Thom, a former Member of the House of Representatives from the 16th Ohio Congressional District.

Mr. Thom served in the 73d, the 74th, and the 75th Congresses and also in the 77th and 79th.

He came to Washington originally as a secretary to former Congressman John J. Whitacre. Thereafter he was a member of the House of Representatives press gallery in 1915 and 1916, and during the time he was a member of the press gallery he studied law at Georgetown University here in Washington.

Although Mr. Thom and I were of opposing political parties, we were lifelong friends.

Mr. Thom was active in civic affairs in his home city of Canton, Ohio, but undoubtedly closest to his heart was his activity on behalf of the Democratic Party. There never was a campaign or issue that Mr. Thom did not take an active part in leadership.

Mr. Speaker, William Richard Thom was 75 years of age. He lived a full and productive life. He had worked in his law office several hours on Saturday and shortly before noon he was stricken with a heart attack. He died shortly thereafter.

Mr. Thom will long be remembered for his service in the House, his contributions to his home city of Canton and, most of all, for the friendships that he had among the Republicans as well as Democrats, people in high places, and the man who labors. They all knew and respected William Richard Thom. Mrs. Bow and I extend to his family our deep sympathy—we shall both miss Bill Thom.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am very sorry to hear of the death of my former colleague and friend Bill Thom. He was not only a dedicated legislator and a great American, but he had one of the kindest and sweetest dispositions of any person I have ever met. His friends who served with him in this body will always remember Bill Thom's service in this body and our associations with him. He certainly was a constructive legislator and one who contributed, and a man whose friendship, as the gentleman has said, transcended the middle aisle.

In their bereavement, I extend my deep sympathy to his loved ones.

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the life and accomplishments of William Thom.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of William R. Thom his community, his State, and the country have lost a valuable and patriotic citizen in public service. It was my pleasure to serve with Bill Thom during his 5 terms in Congress. He was always on the side with the right as in his heart he wanted to serve his day and generation. He was a fine Representative, a fine man, and a great American patriot.

OPERATION VERACITY

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I commend the efforts of the Republican Congressmen participating in Operation Veracity. In special orders today and tomorrow, some of the glar-

ing misstatements of fact in the Democrat platform will be exposed to public view.

I wish to call attention to this inaccurate statement in the Democrat platform:

> Their [the Republican] years of power have consisted of two recessions, in 1953–54 and 1957–60, separated by the most severe peacetime inflation in history.

This statement is an absolute falsehood.

In the single year, March 1946 to March 1947, the consumer price index, which is our basic indicator of inflation, rose over 20 percent. In 1 year during a Democrat administration a 20-percent rise. During the entire Eisenhower administration—January 1953 to this date, prices have risen less than 11 percent.

What confidence can people have in a platform that is so flagrantly in error?

THE HONORABLE LEO E. ALLEN

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, there is every indication that the 86th Congress will adjourn sine die sometime this week, and with that sine die adjournment, unless Congress should be called back into special session, one of our leading Members, a man whom I feel is a truly great American, my colleague in the House and on the Rules Committee, the Honorable LEO E. ALLEN, of Illinois, will conclude his services in this body after 28 years of membership.

We have all known LEO ALLEN long, favorably and, of course, very well. It has been my privilege and my honor to serve with him on the House Rules Committee for a great many years. I have never known, in my long service in the House, a more dedicated public servant, a man who has been more honest and frank in his convictions and the expression thereof, or in his ability to meet every situation fairly and squarely, and to use exceptionally good judgment in its solution, than our colleague LEO ALLEN.

I am sure every Member of the House who has been here any length of time not only appreciates the many sterling qualities LEO ALLEN has shown here in this legislative Hall, but also join in wishing for him many happy, healthful, and successful years to come.

LEO ALLEN of Illinois has indeed proven himself to be a truly great American by the services he has rendered his country, both on the battlefields and in the Congress.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I am sure every member of the Rules Committee has the desire to call to the attention of the House of Representatives the fact that LEO ALLEN, much to our regret, is leaving the Congress of the United States. It was my good privilege and pleasure to serve on the Rules Committee with LEO ALLEN and my responsibility to be majority leader of our side when Mr. ALLEN was chairman of the committee. I certainly want to add my words to those of the gentleman from Ohio.

LEO ALLEN is a great American and an outstanding Member of this body who has always put the welfare of his country above personal motivations, doing what he thought was best for the nation, thereby upholding the truest traditions of the House of Representatives.

All of us can profit by the example of the deep sense of loyalty that LEO ALLEN has shown to the cause for which he has fought tirelessly through the years.

He has been a man of convictions who has held to those convictions when the chips were down and the going was rough.

For me, he has been a warm and generous friend, and I shall miss him around here more than I can say.

While LEO ALLEN may be laying down the burdens of his office here in the Congress, I am sure that his talents and his vigor will not go unused in the future. And as one who has known, first hand, of his capabilities, I can safely predict for my great friend continued success in whatever endeavors he may undertake.

As we here in this Chamber will not forget him, it is my fond hope that he will not forget us, but will find the time and the inclination to renew, on many occasions, the friendship that has meant so much to me, as it has to all of us.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I am sure you are all fully aware that Mr. ALLEN is leaving Congress voluntarily, despite the fact that many of us who knew he was considering such action urged him to remain with us.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. The gentleman from Ohio just beat me by a couple of days. I had anticipated sometime this week saying something about Mr. ALLEN's long service in this body.

LEO ALLEN was here 2 years when I first came to Congress in January 1935. From him I learned much about the way Congress operated and he gave me great help on many occasions, which I appreciated. He gave me good advice and over the years I have followed much of which he recommended.

Along with my other colleagues on both sides of the aisle, I am sorry to see LEO ALLEN leave Congress. He has been a devoted public servant. He has rendered outstanding service. The representation he has given his district has been splendid. It has been the kind of representation that is not only good for all America but especially for the part of the country from which he comes.

I have on occasion been privileged to tell his fine constituency of LEO's determined and forthright efforts to not only represent the people of his district but to serve his country as a true American. LEO has been an outstanding public servant. I am truly sorry he is leaving this body. I wish him and his family the very best in health and happiness in the years that lie ahead.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] and I have been very close personal friends throughout the years of our association in this body. While the gentleman and I have not agreed on some occasions, if not many occasions, I have always had profound respect for the integrity, the honorableness, the trustworthiness, and the intellectual honesty of my friend LEO ALLEN. He has been honest in his convictions, as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] has so well stated.

Mr. Speaker, I can disagree with persons, but if they honestly entertain the views that they express I have profound respect for them in disagreement. I have great respect for LEO ALLEN as a legislator. I have profound respect for him as a gentleman, and particularly I value the friendship that has so closely existed between us for many years.

I also join with my friend from Ohio and his other friends in wishing LEO ALLEN every happiness and success in the years that lie ahead.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join the majority leader in his expressions on behalf of a very good friend of mine, one of the real pillars of strength on the other side of the aisle, who is leaving us at the end of this session. I do not know of a keener political mind, I do not know of a more forthright, outspoken and strong-minded character than the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

I certainly will miss him, as will all of us on this side of the aisle.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the public service of LEO ALLEN.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, 10 years ago when Illinois had its last congressional reapportionment, LEO ALLEN was given Winnebago County as a part of his district. This county happened to be one of my best Republican counties and I was sorry to lose it. However, at a farewell banquet in Rockford for me, combined with a welcome for their new Congressman, I said:

> My loss is ALLEN's gain, and Winnebago County is getting a more seasoned Congressman, a Congressman with greater seniority, and a Congressman that will represent the people of Winnebago County more ably and more effectively than I can.

That has been true. LEO has ably and effectively represented the people of Winnebago and of the other counties of his district. His decision not to run for another term must have been a great

disappointment to his people. It will be very difficult for LEO's successor to fill his shoes. We who have known LEO will miss him. His retirement will leave a great gap in our Republican ranks in Congress.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret that my good friend LEO ALLEN is leaving the House of Representatives after the expiration of his present term. He is ending a long period of congressional service wholly devoted to the best interests of his constituents, the State of Illinois and the Nation. LEO ALLEN is one of the stalwarts in the House of Representatives. His record in behalf of constitutional government, sound government and good government is a matter of public record. It is a good record of accomplishment and achievement which has endeared him to his constituents as evidenced by the fact that he has been reelected to the Congress time and time again. My heartiest best wishes go with LEO as he retires from a job well done.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that the Honorable LEO ALLEN, the brilliant Congressman representing the 16th District of Illinois, determined to retire at this session of the Congress. The people of our country are being deprived of the specialized legislative talents of one of the great statesmen of our time.

I recall my first meeting with LEO at the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor—in attendance at the opening of the law school September term 1922—we were seatmates and became close friends. He was a skillful boxer and became an active member of the University of Michigan Boxing Club. We both became members of the university boxing team. As lawyer, statesman, soldier, teacher, coach, and clerk of the circuit court he fulfilled every requisite for leadership in the performance of his duties.

It is with little wonder that in his assignment to the powerful Rules Committee, both in his capacity of chairman and as a member for 24 years he was outstanding.

He enjoyed his duties and in official performance was an astute leader of his party. His advice and solidarity for party regularity never weakened in the face of popular movements or changes. It can truly be said that he was a solid anchor for adherence to party principles.

It was his wish to retire and enjoy the fruits of his success with his fine family. He said that he yearned for that intimacy with old friends and associates that most men are forced to relinquish in public service away from home.

His retirement is a sad loss but well deserved for a job well done. We will miss our good friend—we wish him well and God's blessing in his new role—as Private Citizen LEO ALLEN—a great American and a valued statesman. We have suffered a great loss both in the Congress and the Nation, but especially our delegation of the State of Illinois.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in the spring of 1898, when war with Spain was declared, I left high school in Benton Harbor, Mich., to enlist in the Army of my country. Six months later LEO ALLEN was born, and when our country again went to war, this time with Germany, LEO ALLEN left high school in Illinois to enlist in the Army of his country. For 27 months he served in uniform, a sergeant in the Field Artillery of the famous Thirty-third Division, much of the time in the front lines in France.

I am very fond of LEO ALLEN. It could not be otherwise because when I came to the Congress in 1949, and LEO ALLEN was even then a high ranking member in seniority, and a part of the leadership of the Republican Party, he received me as though it were the reunion of two high school lads who had left their books to fight for their country. We were of different generations, as schoolboys had been soldiers in different wars, and moreover we were members of opposite political parties, and yet the warmth of LEO ALLEN's welcome to me, a Democratic freshman, I shall never forget.

I have never known LEO ALLEN in his personal associations that his smile did not spread good cheer. He will be missed greatly by all his colleagues. The friendships he has made in his 27 years of service in this Chamber are imperishable.

As a member of the Illinois delegation it is natural that I should take pride in the outstanding contributions that my State of Illinois has made to this historic body. It seldom happens that one State of the Union has two numbered among the leadership in this body of one of the major political parties. In all the Congresses of which I have been a Member LEO ALLEN and LES ARENDS have been vital parts of the Republican leadership. In the retirement of LEO ALLEN the Republicans in the House are suffering a loss, the weight of which cannot be minimized. Those of us on the other side of the aisle, those of us who have not seen eye-to-eye with LEO ALLEN on partisan matters and political philosophy, are suffering the loss of a personal association in friendship that we feel deeply. My best wishes always will go to LEO ALLEN in all his undertakings and in all his doings in private life. He has served well and faithfully his State and his country, according to his convictions, and is leaving a record of achievement of which his party, his friends, and his family well may be proud.

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, LEO ALLEN has been a great and dedicated public servant. He has brought honor to our State through his services in this great legislative body. He served as chairman of perhaps the most important committee in this Congress. I, too, differed with LEO on some of my votes but I am thoroughly convinced that he ably, efficiently, and accurately represented the views of the majority of his constituents. He has served his country well and while his services will be missed he richly deserves his well earned retirement.

Since coming to Washington nearly 12 years ago I have admired and respected LEO ALLEN. I consider him a warm personal friend and wish to join with my other colleagues in extending best wishes for him and his family in the future.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, LEO ALLEN and I came to Washington after the election of November of 1932 to begin our congressional service as members of the 73d Congress. LEO came as a Republican at a time when Republican Members of the Congress were dropping like frost-bitten leaves, and everyone knows that I am and always have been a Democrat. LEO went through the elections when things were bad for the Republicans and when things were looking up. I want to say that the Republicans were fortunate in having LEO ALLEN on their ticket. I have been fortunate in having LEO ALLEN as a colleague and as a personal friend. However, much we may have differed on partisan matters and on philosophical approaches, when it came to things of concern to Illinois, LEO ALLEN was always on the firing line, just as he was in France as a sergeant of the famed 33d Division in World War I. I shall not forget the help he gave Chicago on the Rules Committee with the Lake Michigan Water Diversion bill. LEO ALLEN has served his district, and the State of Illinois with tireless industry and with great distinction. Illinois is proud that it has contributed to the House of Representatives Speaker Cannon, a Republican, and Speaker Rainey, a Democrat. It is proud that in LEO ALLEN, now voluntarily retiring from public life after years of service it has made a contribution to the Republican leadership of the House, both when his was the majority party and when it was the minority party. There are few Members of Congress who have been privileged to enjoy such distinction. LEO and I, of opposite political faiths, have worked together as warm personal friends for near a quarter of a century, and my warmest good wishes go with him in the years ahead.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, may I add to the comments of my colleagues by expressing my appreciation to LEO ALLEN for the sound counsel and warm friendship that he has extended me in the 9 years that it has been my privilege to serve in the House of Representatives.

LEO ALLEN has rendered distinguished service to both his State and his Nation. We shall miss his stalwart defense of sound principles of government.

I extend my very best wishes to LEO and Mrs. Allen, and I express the sincere wish that their years ahead will harbor a bounty of good health and a great harvest of happiness.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, LEO ALLEN has served in the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States for 28 years. He came here young and vigorous, and he still is young and vigorous in mind and heart. Although on the other side of the aisle, he has been one of my closest personal friends for many, many years. He is a man of character, a man of ability, and one who has served with great ability and has done the things, without fear or fame, that were in the interest of the American people. It may surprise some people, but friendships do not stop at the center of the aisle, because some of the closest friendships I have known

have been between Democratic and Republican Members. This is true in the case of LEO ALLEN and me.

I trust that in the years that are allotted to him that he will be happy, contented, healthy, and prosperous.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, when I first came to Congress in 1939 LEO ALLEN was quite well seasoned as he had already served three terms. As a freshmen Member myself he was most helpful to me in his guidance.

Now after 28 years of service to his people and the country our colleague is retiring from the heavy burdens he has carried.

LEO ALLEN is an outstanding Member of this House who has always put his duty ahead of political expediency. He has always held firmly to his convictions and fought for his high principles. In my 22 years of service I have never known a more dedicated Member or a man who has been more honest and frank in his convictions and faced every issue fairly and squarely.

I am sure every Member of the House of Representatives joins me in wishing for LEO ALLEN good health and happiness in the years to come.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, before leaving Congress I would like to pay a word of tribute to LEO E. ALLEN, who is retiring from service in the House of Representatives this year.

LEO ALLEN has established a great record. He has, for a number of years, held the responsible assignment of membership on the Rules Committee. He has discharged his duty with credit to himself and to the House, as well as to his country. We trust that his dreams for the future may be fully realized. We wish for LEO ALLEN the best that life can hold.

THE LATE JOHN CARDINAL O'HARA

Mrs. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I call to the attention of the House the death on Sunday of John Cardinal O'Hara, one of America's greatest churchmen and one of her greatest contemporary citizens. He was beloved by people of all faiths and he was an educator for so many years and so closely identified with Notre Dame University that his name was synonomous with Notre Dame. He came to Philadelphia in 1951 as the archbishop of Philadelphia, and was made a cardinal in 1958. Mr. Speaker, I shall ask unanimous consent that an outstanding article on Cardinal O'Hara appearing in today's Philadelphia Inquirer and an editorial from the same newspaper today be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GRANAHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the distinguished gentlewoman from Pennsylvania [Mrs. GRANAHAN] for bringing to the attention of the House the loss to our city and to our country of Cardinal O'Hara, who was one of the greatest educators and greatest humanitarians that ever came to our city and State.

H.R. 8093

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, we are told that a rule on the bill H.R. 8093, will be filed and that it will be called up for House consideration. I regret this because the entire California, Oregon, and Washington delegations urged that no rule be granted, but instead that the General Accounting Office be allowed to check the figures and the differences in the testimony in order that in the next Congress it can be properly considered. I also regret it because I feel that there have been no hearings on the Senate side and that it could not properly be enacted into law. If there is no political motivation in calling up H.R. 8093, at least there is a minimum absence of any lack of political consideration about this situation, and I want to just say with regret that I hereby serve notice to the House that some of us who object to calling up this bill will be forced to exercise our individual rights and to object to the consideration of other maybe worthwhile bills and other measures that will come before the House following the filing of the rule on H.R. 8093.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture may sit this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, on Friday last, late in the afternoon, when the rollcall vote was had on rollcall No. 197 (H.R. 12580), if I had been personally present I would have voted "aye." I firmly believe it is essential that in the best interests of our Nation that our elder citizens have the protection against bills as a result of illness and the otherwise unobtainable hospital and medical care for them. While this bill, in my humble judgment, is not as adequate as I would hope, I vote for it as it apparently is the only opportunity we will have in this present short session to make any definite progress along this line.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate you and the others of this great legislative body unanimously having granted me leave of absence to hurriedly fly to southern California on account of the very critical illness of my eldest daughter whom I hope and pray to be with timely as in compliance with Mrs. Doyle's long-distance phone message advising me to come as soon as possible.

Mr. Speaker, when I reported to you the very critical condition of my lovely daughter in California, questioning, nevertheless, whether I should depart previous to the full completion of the voting on two or three important bills imminent before this session closes, I thank you for being so kind and considerate to me, as you always are, in "ordering" me to go "right now." All the members of our immediate family and my daughter's many close friends will everlastingly thank you, Mr. Speaker.

OPERATION UNTRUTH

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker I ask unianimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, we have read in the newspapers about the so-called political Operation Truth of the Republican Members of the House that some of them intend to engage in, and we have seen a very weak exhibition this morning. From the exhibition this morning and the subjects referred to by the two gentlemen, it might well be referred to as Republican Political Operation Untruth. The first Member talked about a balanced budget. The fact is that the national debt is at least $20 billion to $25 billion more today than it was when former President Truman left office. The second Member talked about inflation. The fact is that we have the highest cost of living today in the entire history of our country. Despite the promise of the Republican Party to reduce the national debt, the national debt today is $20 billion to $25 billion more, and despite the promise to reduce the cost of living and reduce inflation, we have a greater cost of living today than ever in the history of our country.

FOREIGN SERVICE ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1960

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 2633) to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I assume the gentleman will take time, before the vote on this conference report, to explain what was arrived at in conference.

Mr. HAYS. I expect to do so, and I also expect to yield time to the ranking minority member.

Mr. GROSS. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2173)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2633) to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That this Act may be cited as the 'Foreign Service Act Amendments of 1960'.

"SEC. 2. Section 416 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 416. (a) A person appointed as a staff officer or employee shall receive basic salary at one of the rates of the class to which he is appointed which the Secretary shall, taking into account his qualifications and experience and the needs of the Service, determine to be appropriate for him to receive.

"'(b) Whenever the Secretary determines that the needs of the Service warrant the appointment of staff officers or employees in a particular occupational group uniformly at a rate above the minimum rate of the applicable class, he may adjust the basic salary of any staff officer or employee in the same class and occupational group who is receiving less than such established rate.'

"SEC. 3. Section 417 of such Act is amended by striking out '(b)' in the first sentence.

"SEC. 4. Section 431 of such Act is amended by striking out in the first sentence of paragraph (a) the phrase 'the termination of time spent on authorized leave, whichever shall be later,' and inserting in lieu thereof the phrase 'upon termination of his service in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (b) of this section,'; and by amending paragraph (b) of this section to read as follows:

"'(b) The official services of a chief of mission shall not be deemed terminated by the appointment of a successor but shall continue until he has relinquished charge of the mission and for such additional period as may be determined by the Secretary, but in no case shall such additional period exceed fifty days, including time spent in transit. During such period the Secretary may require him to render such services as he may deem necessary in the interests of the Government.'

"SEC. 5. Section 441 of such Act and the heading to such section are amended to read as follows:

"'CLASSIFICATION OF POSITIONS IN THE FOREIGN SERVICE AND IN THE DEPARTMENT

"'SEC. 441. (a) Under such regulations as he may prescribe, and in order to facilitate effective management, the Secretary shall classify all positions in the Service at posts abroad, excluding positions to be occupied by chiefs of mission, and in the case of those occupied by Foreign Service officers, Reserve officers, and staff officers and employees, he shall establish such positions in relation to the classes established by sections 412, 414, and 415, respectively. Positions occupied by alien employees and consular agents, respectively, shall be allocated to such classes as the Secretary may establish by regulation.

"'(b) Under such regulations as he may prescribe, the Secretary may, notwithstanding the provisions of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (5 U.S.C. 1071 and the following), classify positions in or under the Department which he designates as Foreign Service Officer positions to be occupied by officers and employees of the Service, and establish such positions in relation to the classes established by sections 412, 414, and 415.'

"SEC. 6. Section 444 of such Act and the heading to such section are amended to read as follows:

"'COMPENSATION PLANS FOR ALIEN EMPLOYEES

"'SEC. 444. (a) The Secretary shall, in accordance with such regulations as he may prescribe, establish compensation plans for alien employees of the Service: *Provided*, That such compensation plans shall be based upon prevailing wage rates and compensation practices for corresponding types of positions in the locality, to the extent consistent with the public interest.

"'(b) For the purpose of performing functions abroad, other Government agencies are authorized to administer alien employee programs in accordance with the applicable provisions of this Act.'

"SEC. 7. Title V of such Act is amended by adding at the beginning thereof the following new section:

"'POLICY

"'SEC. 500. It is the policy of the Congress that chiefs of mission and Foreign Service officers appointed or assigned to serve the United States in foreign countries shall have, to the maximum practicable extent, among their qualifications, a useful knowledge of the principal language or dialect of the country in which they are to serve, and knowledge and understanding of the history, the culture, the economic and political institutions, and the interests of such country and its people.'

"SEC. 8. (a) The heading to section 516 of such Act is amended to read as follows: 'ADMISSION TO CLASS 7 OR 8'.

"(b) Section 516 of such Act is amended by striking out 'SEC. 516.' and inserting in lieu thereof 'SEC. 516. (a)' and by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph (b) which shall read as follows:

"'(b) The Secretary may furnish the President with the names of those persons who have passed such examinations and are eligible for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 8, whom he recommends for appointment directly to class 7 when in his opinion, their age, experience, or other qualifications make such an appointment appropriate.'

"SEC. 9. (a) Section 517 of such Act is amended by striking out the words 'A person who has not served in class 8' which appear at the beginning of the first sentence, and inserting in place thereof the following: 'A person who has not been appointed as a Foreign Service officer in accordance with section 516 of this Act'.

"(b) Section 517 of such Act is further amended by striking out the second and third sentences of such section.

"SEC. 10. (a) The heading to section 520 of such Act is amended by striking out the phrase 'REINSTATEMENT AND RECALL' and substituting in lieu thereof the phrase 'REAPPOINTMENT, RECALL OR REEMPLOYMENT'.

"(b) The first sentence of paragraph (a) of section 520 of such Act is amended by inserting a period after the word 'Service' where it appears for the third time, and by striking out the remainder of that sentence.

"(c) Paragraph (b) of section 520 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"'(b) The Secretary may recall any retired Foreign Service officer temporarily to duty in the Service whenever he shall determine such recall is in the public interest.'

"(d) Section 520 of such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph (c) which shall read as follows:

"'(c) Notwithstanding the provisions of title 5, United States Code, section 62 and title 5, United States Code, section 715a, a Foreign Service officer heretofore or hereafter retired under the provisions of section 631 or 632 or a Foreign Service staff officer or employee hereafter retired under the provisions of section 803 shall not, by reason of his retired status, be barred from employment in Federal Government service in any appointive position for which he is qualified. An annuitant so reemployed shall serve at the will of the appointing officer.'

"SEC. 11. Section 528 of such Act is amended by striking out in the second sentence of such section the phrase 'subsection (d), section 7, of the Classification Act of 1923' and substituting in lieu thereof the phrase 'the Classification Act of 1949'.

"SEC. 12. Section 531 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 531. The Secretary may, under such regulations as he may prescribe, appoint staff officers and employees on the basis of qualifications and experience. The Secretary may make provisions for temporary, limited, and such other types of appointment as he may deem necessary. He is authorized to establish appropriate probationary periods during which newly appointed staff officers or employees, other than those appointed for temporary or limited services, shall be required to serve. The Secretary may terminate at any time, without regard to the provisions of section 637, or the provisions of any other law, the services of staff officers or employees appointed for temporary or limited service and staff officers or employees who have not completed probationary periods, except that if such separation is by reason of misconduct the provisions of section 637 shall be applicable.'

"SEC. 13. Section 532 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 532. Under such regulations as he may prescribe, the Secretary may assign a staff officer or employee to any post or he may assign him to serve in any position in which he is eligible to serve under the terms of this or any other Act. A staff officer or employee may be transferred from one post to another by order of the Secretary as the interests of the Service may require.'

"SEC. 14. (a) Section 571 of such Act is amended by striking out paragraphs (a), (b), (c), and (d), and the heading to such section, and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"'ASSIGNMENTS TO ANY GOVERNMENT AGENCY OR INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION

"'SEC. 571. (a) Any officer or employee of the Service may, in the discretion of the Secretary, be assigned or detailed for duty in any Government agency, or in any international organization, international commission, or international body, such an assignment or combination of assignments to be for a period of not more than four years, except that under special circumstances the Secretary may extend this four-year period for not more than four additional years.

"'(b) If a Foreign Service officer shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, or by the President alone, to a position in any Government agency, any United States delegation or mission to any international organization, in any international commission, or in any international body, the period of his

service in such capacity shall be construed as constituting an assignment within the meaning of paragraph (a) of this section and such person shall not, by virtue of the acceptance of such an assignment, lose his status as a Foreign Service officer. Service in such a position shall not, however, be subject to the limitations concerning the duration of an assignment contained in that paragraph.

"'(c) If the basic minimum salary of the position to which an officer or employee of the Service is assigned pursuant to the terms of this section is higher than the salary such officer or employee is entitled to receive as an officer or employee of the Service, such officer or employee shall, during the period such difference in salary exists, receive the salary and allowances of the position in which he is serving in lieu of his salary and allowances as an officer or employee of the Service. Any salary paid under the provisions of this section shall be the salary on the basis of which computations and payments shall be made in accordance with the provisions of title VIII. No officer or employee of the Service who, subsequent to the date of enactment of the Foreign Service Act Amendments of 1960, is assigned to, or who, after June 30, 1961, occupies a position in the Department that is designated as a Foreign Service officer position, shall be entitled to receive a salary differential under the provisions of this paragraph.'

"(b) Parapraph (e) of section 571 of such Act is amended by striking the phrase 'with heads of Government agencies' where it appears in the second sentence and by redesignating the paragraph as '(d)'.

"SEC. 15. Section 575 of such Act is amended by striking out all after the word 'accordance' and inserting in lieu thereof the phrase 'with the appropriate provisions of titles III and IX of Public Law 402, Eightieth Congress (62 Stat. 7 and 13; 22 U.S.C. 1451–1453, 1478 and 1479).'

"SEC. 16. Title V of such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"'FOREIGN LANGUAGE KNOWLEDGE PREREQUISITE TO ASSIGNMENT

"'SEC. 578. The Secretary shall designate every Foreign Service officer position in a foreign country whose incumbent should have a useful knowledge of a language or dialect common to such country. After December 31, 1963, each position so designated shall be filled only by an incumbent having such knowledge: *Provided,* That the Secretary or Deputy Under Secretary for Administration may make exceptions to this requirement for individuals or when special or emergency conditions exist. The Secretary shall establish foreign language standards for assignment abroad of officers and employees of the Service, and shall arrange for appropriate language training of such officers and employees at the Foreign Service Institute or elsewhere.'

"SEC. 17. Section 625 of such Act and the heading of such section are amended to read as follows:

"'WITHIN-CLASS SALARY INCREASES OF FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS AND RESERVE OFFICERS

"'SEC. 625. Any Foreign Service officer or any Reserve officer, whose services meet the standards required for the efficient conduct of the work of the Service and who shall have been in a given class for a continuous period of nine months or more, shall, on the first day of each fiscal year, receive an increase in salary to the next higher rate for the class in which he is serving. Without regard to any other law, the Secretary is authorized to grant to any such officer additional increases in salary, within the salary range established for the class in which he is serving, based upon especially meritorious service.'

"SEC. 18. Title VI of such Act is amended by inserting after section 625 the following new section and the heading thereto:

"'RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PROMOTIONS AND FUNCTIONAL AND GEOGRAPHIC AREA SPECIALIZATION

"'SEC. 626. The achievement of the objectives of this Act requires increasing numbers of Foreign Service officers to acquire functional and geographic area specializations and to pursue such specializations for a substantial part of their careers. Such specialization shall not in any way inhibit or prejudice the orderly advancement through class 1 of any such officer in the Foreign Service.'

"SEC. 19. The heading 'PART D—SEPARATION OF FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS FROM THE SERVICE' under title VI of such Act is amended to read as follows: 'PART D—SEPARATION OF OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES FROM THE SERVICE'.

"SEC. 20. Section 631 of such Act and the heading to such section are amended to read as follows:

"'FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS WHO ARE CAREER AMBASSADORS OR CAREER MINISTERS

"'SEC. 631. Any Foreign Service officer who is a career ambassador or a career minister, other than one occupying a position as chief of mission or any other position to which he has been appointed by the President, by and with the advice and the consent of the Senate, shall upon reaching the age of sixty-five, be retired from the Service and receive retirement benefits in accordance with the provisions of section 821, but whenever the Secretary shall determine it to be in the public interest, he may extend such an officer's service for a period not to exceed five years.'

"SEC. 21. Section 632 of such Act and the heading to such section are amended to read as follows:

"'PARTICIPANTS IN THE FOREIGN SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY SYSTEM WHO ARE NOT CAREER AMBASSADORS OR CAREER MINISTERS

"'SEC. 632. Any participant in the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability System, other than one occupying a position as chief of mission or any other position to which he has been appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, who is not a career ambassador or a career minister shall, upon reaching the age of sixty, be retired from the Service and receive retirement benefits in accordance with the provisions of section 821, but whenever the Secretary shall determine it to be in the public interest, he may extend such participant's service for a period not to exceed five years.'

"SEC. 22. Subparagraphs (1) and (2) of paragraph (b) of section 634 of such Act are amended to read as follows:

"'(1) one-twelfth of a year's salary at his then current salary rate for each year of service and proportionately for a fraction of a year, but not exceeding a total of one year's salary at his then current salary rate, payable without interest, from the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund, in three equal installments on the 1st day of January following the officers' retirement and on the two anniversaries of this date immediately following: *Provided,* That in special cases, the Secretary may in his discretion accelerate or combine the installments; and

"'(2) a refund of the contributions made to the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund, with interest as provided in section 841(a), except that in lieu of such refund such officer, if he has at least five years of service credit toward retirement under the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability System, excluding military or naval service that is credited in accordance with the provisions of section 851 or 852(a), may elect to receive retirement benefits on reaching the age of sixty in accordance with the provisions of section 821. In the event that an officer who was separated from class 4 or 5 and who has elected to receive retirement benefits dies before reaching the age of sixty, his death shall be considered a death in service within the meaning of section 832. In the event that an officer who was separated from class 6 or 7 and who has elected to receive retirement benefits dies before reaching the age of sixty, the total amount of his contributions made to the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund, with interest as provided in section 841(a), shall be paid in accordance with the provisions of section 841(b).'

"SEC. 23. Section 635 of such Act and the heading to such section are amended to read as follows:

"'FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS RETIRED FROM CLASS 7 OR 8

"'SEC. 635. Any Foreign Service officer in class 7 who is appointed under the provisions of section 516(b) and any Foreign Service officer in class 8 shall occupy probationary status. The Secretary may terminate his service at any time.'

"SEC. 24. Section 636 of such Act is amended by striking out the phrase 'Any Foreign Service officer' and inserting in lieu thereof the phrase 'Any participant in the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability System'.

"SEC. 25. (a) Paragraphs (a), (b), (c), and (d) of section 637 of such Act and the heading to such section are amended to read as follows:

"'SEPARATION FOR CAUSE

"'SEC. 637. (a) The Secretary may, under such regulations as he may prescribe, separate from the Service any Foreign Service officer, Reserve officer, or staff officer or employee, on account of the unsatisfactory performance of his duties, or for such other cause as will promote the efficiency of the Service, with reasons given in writing, but no such officer or employee shall be so separated until he shall have been granted a hearing by the Board of the Foreign Service and the unsatisfactory performance of his duties, or other cause for separation, shall have been established at such hearing, unless he shall have waived in writing his right to a hearing. The provisions of this section shall not apply to Foreign Service officers of class 8 or any other officer or employee of the Service who is in a probationary status or whose appointment is limited or temporary, except when separation is by reason of misconduct.

"'(b) Any participant in the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability System separated under the provisions of paragraph (a) of this section shall receive a refund of the contributions made to the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund, with interest, as provided in section 841(a) except that in lieu of such refund such officer may (except in cases where the Secretary determines that separation was based in whole or in part on the ground of disloyalty to the United States) if he has at least five years of service credit toward retirement under this System, excluding military or naval service that is credited in accordance with the provisions of section 851 or 852(a), elect to leave his contributions in the Fund and receive an annuity, computed as prescribed in section 821 commencing at the age of sixty years. In the event that an officer who has elected under the provisions of this section to receive a deferred annuity dies before reaching the age of sixty, his contributions to the Fund, with interest, shall be paid in accordance with the provisions of sections 841 and 881.

"'(c) Any officer or employee of the Service separated under the provisions of paragraph (a) of this section who is not a participant in the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability System shall be entitled only

to such benefits as shall accrue to him under the retirement system in which he is a participant.

"'(d) Any payments made in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (b) of this section shall be made out of the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund.'

"SEC. 26. Section 638 of such Act and the heading to such section are amended to read as follows:

"'TERMINATION OF LIMITED APPOINTMENTS OF FOREIGN SERVICE RESERVE OFFICERS AND STAFF OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

"'SEC. 638. Notwithstanding the provisions of this or any other law, the Secretary may, under such regulations as he may prescribe, terminate at any time the services of any Reserve officer or staff officer or employee serving under limited appointment, except that, if the termination is because of misconduct, the provisions of section 637 shall be applicable.'

"SEC. 27. Section 641 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 641. All promotions of staff officers and employees to a higher class shall be made at a higher salary on the basis of performance and merit in accordance with such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe.'

"SEC. 28. Section 642 of such Act and the heading thereto are amended to read as follows:

"'WITHIN CLASS AND LONGEVITY SALARY INCREASES

"'SEC. 642. (a) Under such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, any staff officer or employee whose services meet the standards required for the efficient conduct of the work of the Service shall receive an increase in salary at periodic intervals to the next higher salary rate for the class in which he is serving. Without regard to any other law the Secretary is authorized to grant any such officer or employee additional increases in salary within the salary range established for the class in which he is serving, based upon specially meritorious service.

"'(b) Under such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, any staff officer or employee who has attained the maximum salary rate prescribed by section 415 for the class in which he is serving may be granted from time to time an additional salary increase beyond the maximum salary rate for his class in recognition of longevity or proficiency in the Service. Each such salary increase shall be equal to the maximum salary rate increase of the applicable class and no person shall receive more than four such salary increases while serving in the same class.'

"SEC. 29. Section 701 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: 'The Secretary may also provide to the extent that space is available therefor appropriate orientation and language training to spouses of officers and employees of the Government in anticipation of the assignment abroad of such officers and employees. Other agencies of the Government shall wherever practicable avoid duplicating the facilities of the Institute and the training provided by the Secretary at the Institute or elsewhere.'

"SEC. 30. (a) Paragraph (a) of section 704 of such Act is amended by striking out '1923' in the two places where it appears and inserting in lieu thereof '1949'.

"(b) Section 704 of such Act is amended by adding at the end of such section new paragraphs (e) and (f) which shall read as follows:

"'(e) The Secretary may, under such regulations as he may prescribe, in the absence of suitably qualified United States citizens, employ persons who are not citizens of the United States by appointment to the staff of the Institute either on a full- or part-time basis or by contract for services in the United States or abroad at rates not in excess of those provided by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (5 U.S.C. 1071).

"'(f) The Secretary may, under such regulations as he may prescribe, provide special monetary or other incentives not inconsistent with this Act to encourage Foreign Service personnel to acquire or retain proficiency in esoteric foreign languages or special abilities needed in the Service.'

"SEC. 31. (a) Section 803(b)(2) of such Act is amended to read as follows—

"'(2) have paid into the Fund a special contribution for each year of such service in accordance with the provisions of section 852(b).'

"(b) Section 803 is further amended by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph (c) which shall read as follows:

"'(c)(1) In accordance with such regulations as the President may prescribe, any Foreign Service staff officer or employee appointed by the Secretary of State who has completed at least ten years of continuous service in the Department's Foreign Service, exclusive of military service, shall become a participant in the System and shall make a special contribution to the Fund in accordance with the provisions of section 852.

"'(2) Any such officer or employee who, under the provisions of paragraph (c)(1) of this section, becomes a participant in the System, shall be mandatorily retired for age during the first year after the effective date of this paragraph if he attains age sixty-four or if he is over age sixty-four; during the second year at age sixty-three; during the third year at age sixty-two; during the fourth year at age sixty-one, and thereafter at age sixty.

"'(3) Any officer or employee who becomes a participant in the System under the provisions of paragraph (c)(1) of this section who is age 57 or over on the effective date of this paragraph, may retire voluntarily at any time before mandatory retirement under paragraph (c)(2) of this section and receive retirement benefits under section 821.'

"SEC. 32. Section 804 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 804. (a) Annuitants shall be persons who are receiving annuities from the Fund and all persons, including surviving wives and husbands, widows, dependent widowers, children and beneficiaries of participants or annuitants who shall become entitled to receive annuities in accordance with the provisions of this Act, as amended, or in accordance with the provisions of section 5 of the Act of May 1, 1956 (70 Stat. 125).

"'(b) When used in this title the term—

"'(1) "Widow" means the surviving wife of a participant who was married to such participant for at least two years immediately preceding his death or is the mother of issue by such marriage.

"'(2) "Dependent widower" means the surviving husband of a participant who was married to such participant for at least two years immediately preceding her death or is the father of issue by such marriage, and who is incapable of self-support by reason of mental or physical disability, and who received more than one-half of his support from such participant.

"'(3) "Child" means an unmarried child, under the age of eighteen years, or such unmarried child regardless of age who because of physical or mental disability incurred before age eighteen is incapable of self-support. In addition to the offspring of the participant and his or her spouse the term includes (a) an adopted child, and (b) a step-child or recognized natural child who received more than one-half of his support from the participant.'

"SEC. 33. Section 811 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 811. (a) Six and one-half per centum of the basic salary received by each participant shall be contributed to the Fund for the payment of annuities, cash benefits, refunds, and allowances. An equal sum shall also be contributed from the respective appropriation or fund which is used for payment of his salary. The amounts deducted and withheld from basic salary together with the amounts so contributed from the appropriation or fund, shall be deposited by the Department of State in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Fund.

"'(b) Each participant shall be deemed to consent and agree to such deductions from basic salary, and payment less such deductions shall be a full and complete discharge and acquittance of all claims and demands whatsoever for all regular services during the period covered by such payment, except the right to the benefits to which he shall be entitled under this Act, notwithstanding any law, rule, or regulation affecting the individual's salary.'

"SEC. 34. (a) Paragraphs (a), (b), and (c) of section 821 of such Act are amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 821. (a) The annuity of a participant shall be equal to 2 per centum of his average basic salary for the highest five consecutive years of service, for which full contributions have been made to the Fund, multiplied by the number of years, not exceeding thirty-five, of service credit obtained in accordance with the provisions of sections 851, 852, and 853. However, the highest five years of service for which full contributions have been made to the Fund shall be used in computing the annuity of any participant who serves as chief of mission and whose continuity of service as such is interrupted prior to retirement by appointment or assignment to any other position determined by the Secretary to be of comparable importance. In determining the aggregate period of service upon which the annuity is to be based, the fractional part of a month, if any, shall not be counted.

"'(b) At the time of retirement, any married participant may elect to receive a reduced annuity and to provide for an annuity payable to his wife or her husband, commencing on the date following such participant's death and terminating upon the death of such surviving wife or husband. The annuity payable to the surviving wife or husband after such participant's death shall be 50 per centum of the amount of the participant's annuity computed as prescribed in paragraph (a) of this section, up to the full amount of such annuity specified by him as the base for the survivor benefits. The annuity of the participant making such election shall be reduced by 2½ per centum of any amount up to $2,400 he specifies as the base for the survivor benefit plus 10 per centum of any amount over $2,400 so specified.

"'(c)(1) If an annuitant dies and is survived by a wife or husband and by a child or children, in addition to the annuity payable to the surviving wife or husband, there shall be paid to or on behalf of each child an annuity equal to the smallest of: (i) 40 per centum of the annuitant's average basic salary, as determined under paragraph (a) of this section, divided by the number of children; (ii) $600; or (iii) $1,800 divided by the number of children.

"'(2) If an annuitant dies and is not survived by a wife or husband but by a child or children, each surviving child shall be paid an annuity equal to the smallest of: (i) 50 per centum of the annuitant's average basic salary, as determined under paragraph (a) of this section, divided by the number of children; (ii) $720; or (iii) $2,160 divided by the number of children.'

"(b) Section 821 of such Act is further amended by adding new paragraphs (d), (e), and (f) which shall read as follows:

"'(d) If a surviving wife or husband dies or the annuity of a child is terminated, the annuities of any remaining children shall

be recomputed and paid as though such wife, husband, or child had not survived the participant.

"'(e) The annuity payable to a child under paragraph (c) or (d) of this section shall begin on the first day of the next month after the participant dies and such annuity or any right thereto shall be terminated upon death, marriage, or attainment of the age of eighteen years, except that, if a child is incapable of self-support by reasons of mental or physical disability, the annuity shall be terminated only when such child dies, marries, or recovers from such disability.

"'(f) At the time of retirement an unmarried participant may elect to receive a reduced annuity and to provide for an annuity equal to 50 per centum of the reduced annuity payable after his or her death to a beneficiary whose name shall be designated in writing to the Secretary. The annuity payable to a participant making such election shall be reduced by 10 per centum of an annuity computed as provided in paragraph (a) of this section and by 5 per centum of an annuity so computed for each full five years the person designated is younger than the retiring participant, but such total reduction shall not exceed 40 per centum. No such election of a reduced annuity payable to a beneficiary shall be valid until the participant shall have satisfactorily passed a physical examination as prescribed by the Secretary. The annuity payable to a beneficiary under the provisions of this paragraph shall begin on the first day of the next month after the participant dies. Upon the death of the surviving beneficiary all payments shall cease and no further annuity payments authorized under this paragraph shall be due or payable.'

"SEC. 35. (a) Paragraphs (a), (b), and (c) of section 831 of such Act are amended to read as follows:

"'(a) Any participant who has five years of service credit toward retirement under the System, excluding military or naval service that is credited in accordance with provisions of section 851 or 852(a)(2), and who becomes totally disabled or incapacitated for useful and efficient service by reason of disease, illness, or injury not due to vicious habits, intemperance, or willful misconduct on his part, shall, upon his own application or upon order of the Secretary, be retired on an annuity computed as prescribed in section 821. If the disabled or incapacitated participant has less than twenty years of service credit toward his retirement under the System at the time he is retired, his annuity shall be computed on the assumption that he has had twenty years of service, but the additional service credit that may accrue to a participant under this provision shall in no case exceed the difference between his age at the time of retirement and the mandatory retirement age applicable to his class in the Service.

"'(b) In each case, the participant shall be given a physical examination by one or more duly qualified physicians or surgeons designated by the Secretary to conduct examinations, and disability shall be determined by the Secretary on the basis of the advice of such physicians or surgeons. Unless the disability is permanent, like examinations shall be made annually until the annuitant has reached the statutory mandatory retirement age for his class in the Service. If the Secretary determines, on the basis of the advice of one or more duly qualified physicians or surgeons conducting such examinations that an annuitant has recovered to the extent that he can return to duty, the annuitant may apply for reinstatement or reappointment in the Service within one year from the date his recovery is determined. Upon application the Secretary shall reinstate any such recovered disability annuitant in the class in which he was serving at time of retirement, or the Secretary may, taking into consideration the age, qualifications, and experience of such annuitant, and the present class of his contemporaries in the Service, appoint him or, in the case of an annuitant who is a former Foreign Service officer, recommend that the President appoint him, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to a class higher than the one in which he was serving prior to retirement. Payment of the annuity shall continue until a date six months after the date of the examination showing recovery or until the date of reinstatement or reappointment in the Service, whichever is earlier. Fees for examinations under this provision, together with reasonable traveling and other expenses incurred in order to submit to examination, shall be paid out of the Fund. If the annuitant fails to submit to examination as required under this section, payment of the annuity shall be suspended until continuance of the disability is satisfactorily established.

"'(c) If a recovered disability annuitant whose annuity is discontinued is for any reason not reinstated or reappointed in the Service, he shall be considered to have been separated within the meaning of section 834 as of the date he was retired for disability and he shall, after the discontinuance of the disability annuity, be entitled to the benefits of that section or of section 841(a) except that he may elect voluntary retirement in accordance with the provisions of section 636 if he can qualify under its provisions.'

"(b) Section 831 of such Act is further amended by adding new paragraphs (d) and (e) which shall read as follows:

"'(d) No participant shall be entitled to receive an annuity under this Act and compensation for injury or disability to himself under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act of September 7, 1916, as amended, covering the same period of time. This provision shall not bar the right of any claimant to the greater benefit conferred by either Act for any part of the same period of time. Neither this provision nor any provision of the Act of September 7, 1916, as amended, shall be so construed as to deny the right of any person to receive an annuity under this Act by reason of his own services and to receive concurrently any payment under such Act of September 7, 1916, as amended, by reason of the death of any other person.

"'(e) Notwithstanding any provision of law to the contrary, the right of any person entitled to an annuity under this Act shall not be affected because such person has received an award of compensation in a lump sum under section 14 of the Act of September 7, 1916, as amended, except that where such annuity is payable on account of the same disability for which compensation under such section has been paid, so much of such compensation as has been paid for any period extended beyond the date such annuity becomes effective, as determined by the Secretary of Labor, shall be refunded to the Department of Labor, to be paid into the Federal Employees' Compensation Fund. Before such person shall receive such annuity he shall (1) refund to the Department of Labor the amount representing such computed payments for such extended period, or (2) authorize the deduction of such amount from the annuity payable to him under this Act, which amount shall be transmitted to such Department for reimbursement to such Fund. Deductions from such annuity may be made from accrued and accruing payments, or may be prorated against and paid from accruing payments in such manner as the Secretary of Labor shall determine, whenever he finds that the financial circumstances of the annuitant are such as to warrant such deferred refunding.'

"SEC. 36. Section 832 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 832. (a) In case a participant dies and no claim for annuity is payable under the provisions of this Act, his contributions to the Fund, with interest at the rates prescribed in sections 841(a) and 881(a), shall be paid in the order of precedence shown in section 841(b).

"'(b) If a participant who has at least five years of service credit toward retirement under the System, excluding military or naval service that is credited in accordance with the provisions of section 851 or 852(a)(2), dies before separation or retirement from the Service and is survived by a widow or a dependent widower, as defined in section 804, such widow or dependent widower shall be entitled to an annuity equal to 50 per centum of the annuity computed in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (c) of this section and of section 821(a). The annuity of such widow or dependent widower shall commence on the date following death of the participant and shall terminate upon death of the widow or dependent widower, or upon the dependent widower's becoming capable of self-support.

"'(c) If a participant who has at least five years of service credit toward retirement under the System, excluding military or naval service that is credited in accordance with the provisions of section 851 or 852(a)(2), dies before separation or retirement from the Service and is survived by a wife or a husband and a child or children, each surviving child shall be entitled to an annuity computed in accordance with the provisions of section 821(c)(1). The child's annuity shall begin and be terminated in accordance with the provisions of section 821(e). Upon the death of the surviving wife or husband or termination of the annuity of a child, the annuities of any remaining children shall be recomputed and paid as though such wife or husband or child had not survived the participant.

"'(d) If a participant who has at least five years of service credit toward retirement under the System, excluding military or naval service that is credited in accordance with the provisions of section 851 or 852(a)(2), dies before separation or retirement from the Service and is not survived by a wife or husband, but by a child or children, each surviving child shall be entitled to an annuity computed in accordance with the provisions of section 821(c)(2). The child's annuity shall begin and terminate in accordance with the provisions of section 821(e). Upon termination of the annuity of a child, the annuities of any remaining children shall be recomputed and paid as though that child had never been entitled to the benefit.

"'(e) If, at the time of his or her death, the participant had less than twenty years of service credit toward retirement under the System, the annuities payable in accordance with paragraph (b) of this section shall be computed in accordance with the provisions of section 821 on the assumption he or she has had twenty years of service, but the additional service credit that may accrue to a deceased participant under this provision shall in no case exceed the difference between his or her age on the date of death and the mandatory retirement age applicable to his or her class in the Service. In all cases arising under paragraphs (b), (c), (d), or (e) of this section, it shall be assumed that the deceased participant was qualified for retirement on the date of his death.'

"SEC. 37. A new section 834 is hereby added to such Act as follows:

"'DISCONTINUED SERVICE RETIREMENT

"'SEC. 834. (a) Any participant who voluntarily separates from the Service after obtaining at least five years of service credit toward retirement under the System, excluding military or naval service that is credited

in accordance with the provisions of section 851 or 852(a)(2), may, upon separation from the Service or at any time prior to becoming eligible for an annuity, elect to have his contributions to the Fund returned to him in accordance with the provisions of section 841, or to leave his contributions in the Fund and receive an annuity, computed as prescribed in section 821, commencing at the age of sixty years.

"'(b) If a participant who has qualified in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (a) of this section to receive a deferred annuity commencing at the age of sixty dies before reaching the age of sixty his contributions to the Fund, with interest, shall be paid in accordance with the provisions of sections 841 and 881.'

"SEC. 38. Section 841 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 841. (a) Whenever a participant becomes separated from the Service without becoming eligible for an annuity or a deferred annuity in accordance with the provisions of this Act, the total amount of contributions from his salary with interest thereon at 4 per centum per annum, compounded annually at the end of each fiscal year through June 30, 1960; semiannually as of December 31, 1960; annually thereafter as of December 31, and proportionately for the period served during the year of separation including all contributions made during or for such period, except as provided in section 881, shall be returned to him.

"'(b) In the event that the total contributions of a retired participant, other than voluntary contributions made in accordance with the provisions of section 881, with interest at 4 per centum per annum compounded annually as is provided in paragraph (a) of this section added thereto, exceed the total amount returned to such participant or to an annuitant claiming through him, in the form of annuities, accumulated at the same rate of interest up to the date the annuity payments cease under the terms of the annuity, the excess of the accumulated contributions over the accumulated annuity payments shall be paid inthe following order of precedence, upon the establishment of a valid claim therefor, and such payment shall be a bar to recovery by any other person:

"'(1) To the beneficiary or beneficiaries designated by the retired participant in writing to the Secretary;

"'(2) If there be no such beneficiary, to the surviving wife or husband of such participant;

"'(3) If none of the above, to the child or children of such participant and descendants of deceased children by representation;

"'(4) If none of the above, to the parents of such participant or the survivor of them;

"'(5) If none of the above, to the duly appointed executor or administrator of the estate of such participant;

"'(6) If none of the above, to other next of kin of such participant as may be determined by the Secretary in his judgment to be legally entitled thereto.

"'(c) No payment shall be made pursuant to paragraph (b)(6) of this section until after the expiration of thirty days from the death of the retired participant or his surviving annuitant.'

"SEC. 39. Section 851 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 851. For the purposes of this title, the period of service of a participant shall be computed from the effective date of appointment as a Foreign Service officer, or, if appointed prior to July 1, 1924, as an officer or employee of the Diplomatic or Consular Service of the United States, or from the date he becomes a participant under the provisions of this Act, as amended, but all periods of separation from the Service and so much of any leaves of absence without pay as may exceed six months in the aggregate in any calendar year shall be excluded, except leaves of absence while receiving benefits under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act of September 7, 1916, as amended, and leaves of absence granted participants while performing active and honorable military or naval service in the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard of the United States.'

"SEC. 40. (a) Paragraphs (a), (b), and (c) of section 852 of such Act are amended to read as follows:

"'(a) A participant may, subject to the provisions of this section, include in his period of service—

"'(1) civilian service in the executive, judicial, and legislative branches of the Federal Government and in the District of Columbia government, prior to becoming a participant; and

"'(2) active and honorable military or naval service in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Air Force, or Coast Guard of the United States.

"'(b) A person may obtain prior civilian service credit in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (a)(1) of this section by making a special contribution to the Fund equal to 5 per centum of his basic annual salary for each year of service for which credit is sought subsequent to July 1, 1924, and prior to the effective date of the Foreign Service Act Amendments of 1960, and at 6½ per centum thereafter with interest compounded annually at 4 per centum per annum to the date of payment. Any such person may, under such conditions as may be determined in each instance by the Secretary, pay such special contributions in installments.

"'(c)(1) If an officer or employee under some other Government retirement system, becomes a participant in the System by direct transfer, such officer or employee's total contributions and deposits, including interest accrued thereon, except voluntary contributions, shall be transferred to the Fund effective as of the date such officer or employee becomes a participant in the System. Each such officer or employee shall be deemed to consent to the transfer of such funds and such transfer shall be a complete discharge and acquittance of all claims and demands against the other Government retirement fund on account of service rendered prior to becoming a participant in the System.

"'(2) No officer or employee, whose contributions are transferred to the Fund in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (c)(1) of this section, shall be required to make contributions in addition to those transferred, for periods of service for which full contributions were made to the other Government retirement fund, nor shall any refund be made to any such officer or employee on account of contributions made during any period to the other Government retirement fund, at a higher rate than that fixed by section 811 of this Act for contributions to the Fund.

"'(3) No officer or employee, whose contributions are transferred to the Fund in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (c)(1) of this section, shall receive credit for periods of service subsequent to July 1, 1924, for which a refund of contributions has been made, or for which no contributions were made to the other Government retirement fund. A participant may, however, obtain credit for such prior service by making a special contribution to the Fund in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (b) of this section.'

"(b) Section 852 of such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof new paragraphs (d) and (e) which shall read as follows:

"'(d) No participant may obtain prior civilian service credit toward retirement under the System for any period of civilian service on the basis of which he is receiving or will in the future be entitled to receive any annuity under another retirement system covering civilian personnel of the Government.

"'(e) A participant may obtain prior military or naval service credit in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (a)(2) of this section by applying for it to the Secretary prior to retirement or separation from the Service. However, in the case of a participant who is eligible for and receives retired pay on account of military or naval service, the period of service upon which such retired pay is based shall not be included, except that in the case of a participant who is eligible for and receives retired pay on account of a service-connected disability incurred in combat with an enemy of the United States or caused by an instrumentality of war and incurred in line of duty during a period of war (as that term is used in chapter 11 of title 38, United States Code), or is awarded under chapter 67 of title 10 of the United States Code, the period of such military or naval service shall be included. No contributions to the Fund shall be required in connection with military or naval service credited to a participant in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (a)(2) of this section.'

"SEC. 41. Such Act is amended by adding after section 854 a new section as follows:

"'RECOMPUTATION OF ANNUITIES OF CERTAIN FORMER PARTICIPANTS

"'SEC. 855. The annuity of each former participant under the System, who retired prior to July 28, 1956, and who at the time of his retirement had creditable service in excess of thirty years, shall be recomputed on the basis of actual years of creditable service not in excess of thirty-five years. Service which was not creditable under the System on the date a former participant retired, shall not be included as creditable service for the purpose of this recomputation. The annuities payable to such persons shall, when recomputed, be paid at the rates so determined, but no such recomputation or any other action taken pursuant to this section shall operate to reduce the rate of the annuity any such person is entitled to receive under the System.'

"SEC. 42. The heading 'PART H—OFFICERS REINSTATED IN THE SERVICE' under title VIII of such Act is amended to read as follows:

'PART H—ANNUITANTS RECALLED, REINSTATED OR REAPPOINTED IN THE SERVICE OR REEMPLOYED IN THE GOVERNMENT'.

"SEC. 43. Section 871 of such Act is amended and a heading is added thereto as follows:

"'RECALL

"'SEC. 871. Any annuitant recalled to duty in the Service in accordance with the provisions of section 520(b) or reinstated or reappointed in accordance with the provisions of section 831(b) shall, while so serving, be entitled in lieu of his annuity to the full salary of the class in which he is serving. During such service, he shall make contributions to the Fund in accordance with the provisions of section 811. When he reverts to his retired status, his annuity shall be determined anew in accordance with the provisions of section 821.'

"SEC. 44. A new section 872 is hereby added to such Act as follows:

"'REEMPLOYMENT

"'SEC. 872. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any officer or employee of the Service, who has retired under this Act, as amended, and is receiving an annuity pursuant thereto, and who is reemployed in the Federal Government service in any appointive position either on a part-time or full-time basis, shall be entitled to receive the salary of the position in which he is serving plus so much of his annuity payable under this Act, as amended, which when combined with such salary does not exceed

during any calendar year the basic salary such officer or employee was entitled to receive under section 412 or 415 of the Act, as amended, on the date of his retirement from the Service. Any such reemployed officer or employee who receives salary during any calendar year in excess of the maximum amount which he may be entitled to receive under this paragraph shall be entitled to such salary in lieu of benefits hereunder.

"'(b) When any such retired officer or employee of the Service is reemployed, the employer shall send a notice to the Department of State of such reemployment together with all pertinent information relating thereto and shall cause to be paid, by transfer or otherwise, to the Department of State funds necessary to cover gross salary, employer contributions, and gross lump-sum leave payment relating to the employment of the reemployed officer or employee. The Department of State shall make to and on behalf of the reemployed officer or employee payments to which he is entitled under the provisions of paragraph (a) of this section, and shall make those withholdings and deductions authorized and required by law.

"'(c) In the event of any overpayment under this section the Secretary of State is authorized to withhold the amount of such overpayment from the salary payable to such reemployed officer or employee or from his annuity.'

"SEC. 45. (a) So much of paragraph (a) of section 881 of such Act as precedes subparagraph (1) thereof is amended to read as follows:

"'(a) Any participant may, at his option and under such regulations as may be prescribed by the President, deposit additional sums in multiples of 1 per centum of his basic salary, but not in excess of 10 per centum of such salary, which amounts together with interest at 3 per centum per annum, compounded annually at the end of each fiscal year through June 30, 1960; semiannually as of December 31, 1960; annually thereafter as of December 31, and proportionately for the period served during the year of his retirement, including all contributions made during or for such period, shall, at the date of his retirement and at his election, be—'.

"(b) Paragraph (c) of section 881 of such Act is amended by deleting the word 'annually' and inserting in lieu thereof the phrase 'as is provided in paragraph (a) of this section', and by changing the words 'withdrawal from active service' at the end of such paragraph to 'separation from the Service'.

"SEC. 46. Section 912 of such Act is amended by changing the heading thereto to read 'LOAN OF HOUSEHOLD FURNISHINGS AND EQUIPMENT' and by inserting between the words 'with household' the word 'basic' and by inserting between the words 'household equipment' the phrase 'furnishings and'.

"SEC. 47. Section 913 of such Act and the heading thereto is amended to read as follows:

"'TRANSPORTATION OF MOTOR VEHICLES

"'SEC. 913. The Secretary may, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, transport for or on behalf of an officer or employee of the Service, a privately owned motor vehicle in any case in which he shall determine that water, rail, or air transportation of the motor vehicle is necessary or expedient for all or any part of the distance between points of origin and destination. Not more than one motor vehicle of any such officer or employee may be transported under authority of this section during any four-year period, except that, as a replacement for such motor vehicle, one additional motor vehicle of any such officer or employee may be so transported during such period upon approval, in advance, by the Secretary and upon a determination, in advance, by the Secretary that such replacement is necessary for reasons beyond the control of the officer or employee and is in the interest of the Government. After the expiration of a period of four years following the date of transportation under authority of this section of a privately owned motor vehicle of any officer or employee who has remained in continuous service outside the continental United States (excluding Alaska and Hawaii) during such period, the transportation of a replacement for such motor vehicle for such officer or employee may be authorized by the Secretary in accordance with this section.'

"SEC. 48. (a) Section 1021 of such Act is amended by inserting the phrase 'the Department including' immediately prior to the phrase 'the Service' wherever it appears in this section.

"(b) Section 1021(a) is further amended by striking out the phrase 'if recommended by the Director General' and inserting in lieu thereof the phrase 'at the discretion of the Secretary'.

"SEC. 49. Section 4 of the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, as amended (22 U.S.C. 295), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(c) For the purpose of carrying into effect the provisions of this Act there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, in addition to amounts previously authorized, an amount not to exceed $10,000,000, which shall remain available until expended.'

"SEC. 50. Section 11 of the Act of August 1, 1956 (70 Stat. 890), is hereby amended by inserting after the phrase 'Government-owned vehicles' the phrase 'or taxicabs', and by inserting after the phrase 'public transportation facilities' the phrase 'other than taxicabs'.

"SEC. 51. Paragraph (4) of section 104(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (26 U.S.C. 104(a)(4)) (relating to the exclusion from gross income of compensation for injuries and sickness) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(4) amounts received as a pension, annuity, or similar allowance for personal injuries or sickness resulting from active service in the armed forces of any country or in the Coast and Geodetic Survey or the Public Health Service, or as a disability annuity payable under the provisions of section 831 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U.S.C. 1081; 60 Stat. 1021).'

"SEC. 52. The following headings and sections in the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, are hereby repealed:

"(1) Section 442 of such Act and the heading thereto.

"(2) Section 525 of such Act and the heading thereto.

"(3) Section 576 of such Act and the heading thereto.

"(4) Section 577 of such Act and the heading thereto.

"SEC. 53. Any person who occupies a position in the Department of State to which he was appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, at the time that he was an active Foreign Service officer, and who while holding this position has retired for age as a Foreign Service officer, and who on the effective date of this section, continues to hold such position is hereby reinstated, effective as of the date of such retirement, to active status as a Foreign Service officer and shall be entitled to all the provisions of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, as though he had never retired.

"SEC. 54. Notwithstanding the provisions of this Act, existing rules and regulations of or applicable to the Foreign Service of the United States shall remain in effect until revoked or rescinded or until modified or superseded by regulations made in accordance with the provisions of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended by this Act, unless clearly inconsistent with the provisions of this Act or the provisions so amended.

"SEC. 55. Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, any Foreign Service staff officer who accepted an appointment as a Foreign Service Reserve officer in the Department of State during the period beginning September 1, 1958, and ending December 31, 1958, both dates inclusive, shall not be separated from the Foreign Service before the expiration of his original appointment as a Foreign Service Reserve officer, except as authorized by section 637 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended.

"SEC. 56. (a) The provisions of this Act shall become effective as of the first day of the first pay period which begins more than thirty days after the date of enactment of this Act, except as provided in paragraphs (b), (c), (d), and (e) of this section, and except as otherwise provided in the text of this Act.

"(b)(1) The provisions of paragraph (c)(1) of section 803 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended by section 31(b) of this Act, shall become effective on the first day of the first month which begins more than one year after the date of enactment of this Act, except that any Foreign Service staff officer or employee, who at the time this Act becomes effective meets the requirements for participation in the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability System, may elect to become a participant in the System before the mandatory provisions become effective. Such Foreign Service staff officers and employees shall become participants effective on the first day of the second month following the date of their application for earlier participation.

"(2) The provisions of paragraph (c)(2) of section 803 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended by section 31(b) of this Act, shall become effective on the first day of the first month which begins more than three years after the date of enactment of this Act.

"(c) The amendment made by section 33 of this Act, with respect to a contribution to the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund to be made by the Department, shall become effective July 1, 1961.

"(d) The amendment made by section 41 of this Act shall take effect on the first day of the first month which begins more than thirty days after the date of enactment of this Act.

"(e) The amendment made by section 51 of this Act shall be effective with respect to taxable years ending after the date of enactment of this Act."

And the House agree to the same.

WAYNE L. HAYS,
EDNA F. KELLY,
LEONARD FARBSTEIN,
ALVIN M. BENTLEY,
FRANCES P. BOLTON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

J. W. FULBRIGHT,
JOHN SPARKMAN,
MIKE MANSFIELD,
BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER,
HOMER E. CAPEHART,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2633) to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

LIMITED AND PROBATIONARY APPOINTMENTS

Section 12 of the House amendment to the Senate bill amends section 531 of the Foreign Service Act which deals with limited and

temporary appointments, including probationary periods of service, of Foreign Service Staff officers and employees. The Senate bill contains a similar provision. Under both versions the Secretary may terminate at any time and without regard to the provisions of any other law the services of Staff officers and employees appointed for temporary or limited service or who occupy probationary status. The Senate version contains a provision that should a Staff officer or employee in one of these categories be separated because of misconduct, he shall be given a hearing in accordance with the provisions of section 637 of the act. The managers on the part of the House accepted the Senate language.

TERMINATION OF SERVICES OF RESERVES AND LIMITED APPOINTEES

The managers on the part of the House accepted section 28 of the Senate bill with an amendment. This section permits the Secretary to terminate at any time the services of any Foreign Service Reserve officer or staff officer or employee who is serving under a limited appointment except that if such termination is because of misconduct the provisions of the language contained in section 27 of the Senate bill dealing with separation for cause will be applicable. The managers on the part of the House accepted this part of section 28 of the Senate bill.

Section 28 also provides that the conditions of employment of a small group of former staff officers who accepted Reserve officer appointments in the latter part of 1958 would not be affected by the provisions for termination of Reserve officer appointments contained in the first sentence of this section. The conferees deleted this portion of the Senate bill, as covered by section 52 of the House amendment, which was accepted by the Senate conferees. Section 52 of the House amendment (renumbered as section 55 of the conference substitute) provides that the services of this small group of Reserve officers would not be terminated before the expiration date of their appointments except where termination is for cause. The Senate accepted the language of the House amendment, with a perfecting amendment.

SEPARATION FOR CAUSE

Section 27 of the Senate bill brings into one section procedures for the separation of Foreign Service officers, Reserve officers or staff personnel for unsatisfactory performance of duty or for such other cause as will promote the efficiency of the Foreign Service. These procedures do not apply to Foreign Service officers of class 8 or any other officer or employee of the Service who is in a probationary status or whose appointment is limited or temporary except when the separation of such individuals is by reason of misconduct. It also provides that a participant in the Foreign Service retirement system separated under this section, if he has 5 years of service, may elect to receive a deferred annuity at age 60 except in cases where the Secretary determines that separation was based in whole or in part on grounds of disloyalty.

The managers on the part of the House accepted the Senate provision. The provisions for separation in this section will be used in those cases involving misconduct as provided in sections 14 and 28 of the Senate bill which the managers on the part of the House agreed to.

EXTENSION OF SERVICES

Section 20 of the Senate bill permits the Secretary of State whenever he shall determine it to be in the public interest to extend for a period of not more than 5 years the services of a career ambassador or a career minister who has reached the mandatory retirement age. The House amendment contains no limitation on the number of years of postretirement service that such an individual could serve. The managers on the part of the House accepted the limitation contained in the Senate bill.

HOUSING DIFFERENTIAL DURING SERVICE IN THE UNITED STATES

The Senate bill (sec. 18) contains a section providing for a housing differential for Foreign Service personnel assigned to duty in the continental United States and Foreign Service officers of class 7 and 8 assigned to duty in the continental United States prior to assignment abroad. The House amendment does not contain this provision. In receding from the Senate version the conferees of both Houses were in agreement that the Senate provision was desirable and reasonable. Unlike other Government employees the Foreign Service is a mobile service in which a tour of duty in Washington constitutes only a small part of their total service. They acquire little or no equity in housing. Because of the strong opposition of the executive branch the conferees agreed to omit this section from the bill.

ESOTERIC FOREIGN LANGUAGES

Section 32(b) of the Senate bill adds a provision to the Foreign Service Act which authorizes the Secretary of State to provide special monetary incentives to encourage Foreign Service personnel to acquire or to retain proficiency in esoteric foreign languages or other special abilities needed in the Service. The House amendment has no comparable provision. The acquisition and maintenance of proficiency in the esoteric languages is a time-consuming and frequently extracurricular requirement which imposes heavily upon an officer's or employee's time. Further, an officer who becomes such a language and area specialist will in most instances be called upon to spend a disproportionate part of his career in the Service at posts where living conditions are difficult. The need for officers trained in these difficult languages is becoming increasingly important in the conduct of foreign affairs activities. The managers on the part of the House accepted the Senate language in the belief that the Secretary should have authority to offer incentives that will stimulate the mastery of these languages.

FOREIGN LANGUAGE KNOWLEDGE PREREQUISITE TO ASSIGNMENT

The Senate bill requires that the Secretary designate every Foreign Service officer position in a foreign country whose incumbent should have a useful knowledge of a language or dialect common to such country. The House amendment requires that the Secretary determine annually the number of such positions.

The Senate bill also provides that each such position so designated shall be filled after December 31, 1963, only by an incumbent having such knowledge. The House amendment provides that after that date the prescribed quota of language officers be maintained for each country.

The Senate bill permits either the Secretary or the Deputy Under Secretary for Administration to make exceptions to this requirement for individuals or when special or emergency conditions exist. The House amendment permits exceptions only by the Secretary when special or emergency conditions exist.

The managers on the part of the House accepted the Senate language.

FOREIGN SERVICE BUILDINGS PROGRAM

Section 55 of the Senate bill carries an authorization for the Foreign Service buildings program of $100 million of which half is to be used for the purchase of local currencies to finance the program. The House amendment contains no language on this matter.

The Subcommittee on State Department Organization and Foreign Operations of the Committee on Foreign Affairs held extensive hearings during 1959 and 1960 on the buildings program. Testimony before the subcommittee showed inconsistencies in justification of new buildings and an arbitrary handling of the program by the Office of Foreign Buildings. Under these conditions neither the subcommittee nor the Committee on Foreign Affairs was willing to authorize additional sums. Apart from new construction and acquisition of property, money is needed for maintenance, rehabilitation, and planning. The managers on the part of the House agreed to an authorization of $10 million for the program. It is the intention of the conferees that to the maximum extent practicable local currencies owed to or owned by the United States will be used.

WAYNE L. HAYS,
EDNA F. KELLY,
LEONARD FARBSTEIN,
ALVIN M. BENTLEY,
FRANCES P. BOLTON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to discuss briefly the conference report on the Foreign Service Act amendments of 1960. There were 23 items in disagreement between the Senate bill, S. 2633, and the House amendment to that bill.

The managers on the part of the House were successful in upholding the House position. The Senate conferees receded on 15 items, the House conferees on 6, and in 2 cases an adjustment was reached between the 2 versions before the conferees.

There were four items in the Senate bill that the Committee on Foreign Affairs had taken out of its version before bringing the bill to the floor. These were first, the reorganization of the Foreign Service staff structure from 22 classes to 10 classes; second, hazardous duty pay for couriers; third, a housing differential for Foreign Service officers assigned to a tour of duty in the United States; and, fourth, special incentive payments for personnel acquiring proficiency in esoteric languages.

I am pleased to report to the House that on three of these items in disagreement the Senate accepted the House position and receded. There is no provision in the agreed bill for the reorganization of the Foreign Service staff, no extra pay for couriers, and no provision for a housing differential for personnel assigned to the United States. On the latter point the conferees of both bodies were in agreement that such a differential was desirable. During the conference we were advised that the Bureau of the Budget and the White House were strongly opposed to this provision. In order to get through the rest of the bill which we all thought desirable, the Senate receded and accepted the House position that no differential be provided. The only one of the four points on which the House had to recede in the face of strenuous arguments from the Senate was that provision for special incentive payments for individuals becoming proficient in esoteric foreign languages. This may add about $150,000 to the annual operations of the Department, but if it can supply our country with some of the linguistic skills so badly needed in these days it will be a sum well spent.

The conference report carries an authorization for $10 million for the continuation of the oversea building program. Let me make clear that this has nothing to do with the so-called housing differential. The authorization contained in section 49 of the conference text is for the maintenance, rehabilitation, and planning of office buildings and residences outside the United States.

The Senate bill contained an authorization of $100 million for this purpose. The House amendment had no language on this matter. The reason was simple. My Subcommittee on State Department Organization and Foreign Operations had exhaustive hearings on the Department's request for $100 million that was designed to carry the buildings program for the next 5 years. All of us on the subcommittee recognize the need for an orderly building program. Frankly, the evidence presented to the subcommittee was marked by inconsistencies. The head of the buildings operation in the Department was arbitrary and arrogant. It was, and is, our opinion that so long as the operation is headed by the present incumbent we would have no confidence in the buildings program. We considered in subcommittee an authorization sufficient to carry the program for a 2-year period, but even gave up on that and reported out no bill.

The $10 million authorization which the House conferees accepted in lieu of the $100 million in the Senate bill will be sufficient to provide for the maintenance, rehabilitation, and planning of buildings. It will not permit much construction for the next year. When the new Congress convenes next year, we can take a fresh look at the Department's needs and justifications.

The other points which the House accepted concern the administration of the Foreign Service. They are important for the effective operation of the Service and represent no major or radical departure; rather they are in the nature of clarification of the Secretary's responsibilities and authority over the Service.

In summary, I think the managers on the part of the House did a splendid job in upholding the views of the House. I urge the adoption of the conference report.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY], the ranking minority member of the subcommittee and of the conferees.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, as the able and distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS], the chairman of our subcommittee and chairman of the House conferees, has pointed out, the House was successful in imposing its viewpoint upon the conferees from the other body in 15 out of the 21 points of difference which were actually brought to the conference, 2 having been settled earlier by mutual agreement. The House conferees felt it necessary to recede in only 6 out of the 21 instances, which I maintain is a very fine record. I think the Members of the House should recognize the fact that the Senate, as I say, did recede on more than two-thirds of all of the points of difference at issue.

When this bill was last before the House, Mr. Speaker, there had been deleted, as I recall, four items which had been strenuously objected to by certain Members of the House. On three of those four items the Senate receded. The only one of these items which is now contained in the conference report before you, as has been pointed out by the gentleman from Ohio, can be found at the top of page 9 of the conference report, section 30(f), which reads:

> The Secretary may, under such regulations as he may prescribe, provide special monetary or other incentives not inconsistent with this act to encourage Foreign Service personnel to acquire or retain proficiency in esoteric foreign languages or special abilities needed in the Service.

The Department of State has estimated the annual cost of the implementation of this portion of the bill will come to approximately $156,000, which I am sure all Members will agree is a small enough cost if it will really accomplish the purpose for which it is intended, which is to provide incentive and initiative for officers and members of the Service to acquire and maintain proficiency in foreign languages, particularly those languages not usually taught in our educational system.

The only other new item where considerable cost is involved is this $10 million authorization for office buildings and residences. The original Senate bill contained $100 million for this purpose. The members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs originally intended to treat this in separate legislation, but for many reasons no such legislation came forth this year. The Senate conferees felt very strongly that because of the necessity for additional authorization to provide for maintenance in certain limited areas and new construction in others that some money should be forthcoming, owing to the fact that this year many new countries have been established in various parts of the world where we will have to have diplomatic or consular missions or both. Therefore, the House agreed to put in $10 million, which will be primarily for the upkeep and maintenance of existing buildings, and for planning for new buildings, but which will permit very little for actual new construction starts.

In summation, it is my opinion as ranking minority member of this subcommittee that the conferees have done a very outstanding job. I want to commend all of them, particularly the gentleman from Ohio. I strongly urge the House to adopt the conference report before us.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Under section 642, appearing on page 8 of the conference report, does the gentleman feel there are any built-in pay increases in that language?

Mr. BENTLEY. I may say to the gentleman from Iowa that of course the members of the Foreign Service are beneficiaries of the 7.5-percent pay increase for Federal employees adopted by the Congress a short time ago. On the other hand, so far as I know, there are no substantial built-in increases in this legislation. I believe the estimated cost of this interclass payment to which the gentleman refers is estimated by the Department of State to be not more than $20,500 for the first year. It was not the intention of the members of the committee or the conferees of either body, I believe, to provide for the Department any substantial pay increase in this connection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman mentioned the 7½-percent increase. That leads to this question, which, perhaps, the gentleman cannot answer. But, is it the gentleman's thinking that in the future the Committtee on Foreign Affairs will handle pay legislation and legislation of this type or will there continue to be the split authority as between the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. BENTLEY. I recall the gentleman raised that question the last time this bill was before the House. I think the answer given to the gentleman at that time was that that question should be directed to the parliamentarian whose responsibility is to refer bills of this type. I would say that there are problems, and, speaking as a veteran of the Foreign Service, there are problems having to do with the Foreign Service that from a personnel standpoint I think should be handled by the Committee on Foreign Affairs. With respect to legislation confined to salaries and annuities, I am not so certain that the gentleman's own Committee on Post Office and Civil Service might not properly be the best committee to handle this type of bills, if confined to those subjects alone. Again, basically, it is up to the parliamentarian who, as the gentleman is aware, has the responsibility for deciding to which committee bill are referred.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I understand you are merely talking about what the House committee might do and not what the Senate committee might do when you are over there.

Mr. BENTLEY. Oh, no; as far as the House is concerned, we have the responsibility, basically, for Foreign Service legislation, but I have no idea what ideas the other body might have on such bills.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Probably you can advise us after the first of the year.

Mr. BENTLEY. I hope to have the privilege, I will say to the gentleman, and I can be grateful for his confident prediction that such a privilege will be mine.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALTER). The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HEALTH BENEFITS FOR CERTAIN RETIRED GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 2575) to provide a health benefits program for certain retired employees of the Government, with a Senate amendment to the House amendment thereto and agree to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the amendment as follows:

Page 11, of the House engrossed amendment, strike out all of section 10, including the heading, and renumber the following sections accordingly.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman whether this is a matter on which you have had an agreement with the minority leader?

Mr. MORRISON. Yes.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING MERCHANT MARINE ACT OF 1936

Mr. COLMER, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 633, Rept. No. 2183) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8093) to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to eliminate the 6 per centum differential applying to certain bids of Pacific coast shipbuilders. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

PROJECT GRANTS FOR GRADUATE TRAINING IN PUBLIC HEALTH

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 6871) to amend title III of the Public Health Service Act, to authorize project grants for graduate training in public health, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2062)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6871) to amend title III of the Public Health Service Act, to authorize project grants for graduate training in public health, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"'SEC. 309. (a) In order to enable the Surgeon General to make project grants to schools of public health, and to those schools of nursing or engineering which provide graduate or specialized training in public health for nurses or engineers, for the purpose of strengthening or expanding graduate public health training in such schools, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $2,000,000 for each fiscal year in the period beginning July 1, 1960, and ending June 30, 1965.

"'(b) Grants to schools under subsection (a) of this section may be made only for those projects which are recommended by the advisory committee appointed pursuant to section 306(d). Any grant for a project made from an appropriation under this section for any fiscal year may include such amounts for carrying out such project during succeeding years. Payment pursuant to such grants may be made in advance or by way of reimbursement, and in such installments as the Surgeon General shall prescribe by regulations after consultation with representatives of such schools.'

"(b) The first sentence of subsection (d) of section 306 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 242d) is amended by inserting 'and section 309' after 'this section' and by adding before the period at the end thereof 'and including, in the case of section 309, certification to the Surgeon General of projects which it has reviewed and approved'."

And the Senate agree to the same.

OREN HARRIS,
KENNETH A. ROBERTS,
GEORGE M. RHODES,
PAUL F. SCHENCK,
Managers on the Part of the House.

LISTER HILL,
RALPH YARBOROUGH,
HARRISON WILLIAMS,
CLIFFORD P. CASE,
JACOB JAVITS,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6871) to amend title III of the Public Health Service Act, to authorize project grants for graduate training in public health, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate amendment substituted for a substantial part of the first section of H.R. 6871, as passed by the House, new language which was intended to clarify the language of the House bill. The amendment agreed to by the conferees is substantially the same as the language of the bill as passed by the House. Under the language of section 309(b) of the Public Health Service Act as it would be written by the conference amendment, the Surgeon General would have discretion not to make grants recommended by the advisory committee or to make such grants in a lesser amount than recommended by such advisory committee.

OREN HARRIS,
KENNETH A. ROBERTS,
GEORGE M. RHODES,
PAUL F. SCHENCK,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, to explain the matter briefly, the bill passed by the House was amended by the other body. The conferees on the part of the House were able to get the original House passed bill adopted by the conference. It was unanimous and there was no disagreement on the part of the conferees. It has been cleared on both sides of the aisle. I hope the conference report will be approved by the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is the day for District of Columbia business.

RETIREMENT COMPENSATION OF CERTAIN FORMER MEMBERS OF METROPOLITAN POLICE FORCE, FIRE DEPARTMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, U.S. PARK POLICE FORCE AND WHITE HOUSE POLICE FORCE, AND THE U.S. SECRET SERVICE AND OF THEIR WIDOWS, WIDOWERS, AND CHILDREN

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up H.R. 12775, to increase the relief or retirement compensation of certain former members of the Metropolitan Police force, the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the U.S. Park Police force, the White House Police force, and the U.S. Secret Service; and of their widows, widowers, and children, and ask unanimous consent that the same be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a)

the amount of relief or retirement compensation payable to each person who, immediately before the effective date of the Policemen and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act Amendments of 1957, was receiving, or was entitled to receive, relief or retirement compensation from the District of Columbia by reason of his service as an officer or member of the Metropolitan Police force, the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the United States Park Police force, the White House Police force, or the United States Secret Service is hereby increased by 10 per centum.

(b) In the case of each widow, widower, and child who, immediately before the effective date of the Policemen and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act Amendments of 1957, was receiving or was entitled to receive relief or retirement compensation from the District of Columbia by reason of the service on the Metropolitan Police force, the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the United States Park Police force, the White House Police force, or the United States Secret Service, of a deceased officer or member or a deceased former officer or member, the date of death of such officer or member, or former officer or member, shall, for the purposes of such amendments of 1957, be held and considered to be such effective date.

(c) No retroactive relief or retirement compensation shall be payable by reason of the enactment of this Act to any person subject to subsection (a) of this section for any period before the first day of the month following the date of enactment of this Act.

(d) No increase in relief or annuity shall be payable by reason of the enactment of this Act for any period before the effective date of the Policemen and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act Amendments of 1957, and this Act shall not be applicable in the case of any widow or any child otherwise entitled to benefits under this Act who died on or after October 1, 1956, but prior to the date of enactment of this Act.

(e) Nothing in this Act shall be deemed to reduce the relief or retirement compensation any person receives, or is entitled to receive, from the District of Columbia on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 2. Section 4 of the Policemen and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act Amendments of 1957 is hereby repealed.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 2, line 21, insert a period following the word "person" and strike the following on lines 21, 22, and 23: "subject to subsection (a) of this section for any period before the first day of the month following the date of enactment of this Act."

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to equalize benefits to those former policemen, firemen, park police, White House Police, and Secret Service personnel, who retired before the effective date of the Policemen and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act Amendments of 1957, and to equalize benefits to widows and children of such persons.

Prior to that act, the benefits of all those on the rolls were automatically equalized each time the base was changed for the computation of future retirement benefits. In other words, all retired policemen, firemen, Secret Service personnel and their widows and children received the same level of benefits, regardless of the date on which the retirement—or in the case of survivors, the death—occurred.

The policemen and firemen's relief fund was established by act of Congress in 1916 (39 Stat. 718). This act established a schedule of benefits for retirees, their widows, and children and required a contribution of 1½ percent from the salaries of employees. The rate of contribution was increased to 2½ percent in July 1924, 3½ percent in 1930, 5 percent in 1949, and to the present 6½ percent rate in August 1957.

EQUALIZATION

By the act of February 17, 1923 (42 Stat. 1263) a policy of equalization was adopted which provided eligibility for equal benefits for equal service credits to all retired members regardless of the date of retirement or the contribution percentage retained from salaries. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia in their recommendations to the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia, concerning the bill (S. 3169) which became the act of February 17, 1923, stated:

The purpose of this bill is to equalize the situation so that all pensioners of the police and fire departments, irrespective of the date on which they may have been retired, shall be eligible to equal benefits (S. Rept. 589, 67th Cong., 2d sess.).

The House Committee on the District of Columbia, in recommending that bill favorably to the House—House Report No. 1400, 67th Congress, 4th session—stated:

Your committee is of the opinion that all pensioners who are subjected to the same living cost and who have rendered exceptional service to the District and who have been injured or have been retired because of age should receive the same pension and that there should be no discrimination in the treatment of those aged and disabled public servants.

The equalization formula was related to a recent pay increase which had resulted in differences in retirement benefits between those who had retired before and those retired after the pay increase. The equalization policy has been applied to all pay increases since.

NINETEEN HUNDRED AND FIFTY-SEVEN AMENDMENTS

The Policemen and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act amendments of 1957, among other changes, increased benefits from a maximum of 50 percent of the base salary to, first, not to exceed 66⅔ percent of the base salary in case of disability retirement; and second, not to exceed 70 percent of the base salary in case of retirements for years of service. That act did not equalize benefits for those already retired. For the first time in 33 years a retiree with the same salary and service credits received less in benefits than his fellow retiree who left the service following the effective date of a change in the computation of benefits. This bill will continue the policy of Congress of providing equal benefits for equal service, irrespective of the date of eligibility for benefits.

Widows and children of former members, until the effective date of the 1957 amendments, all were eligible for like benefits, regardless of the date of death of the husband or father, in amounts not exceeding $125 per month for widows and not exceeding $25 per month for children. Widows or dependent widowers whose entitlement arose following the 1957 amendments, as a minimum benefit, may receive annually the larger of $1,800, or 30 percent of the deceased member's basic salary, compared to $1,500 for those widows previously on the rolls. Children whose entitlement to benefits arose following the 1957 amendments may receive annually the lesser of $600, or $1,800 divided by the number of children, as compared to $300 for each child previously on the rolls. Thus, a widow with three children on the rolls before the 1957 amendments may receive a maximum benefit of $2,400, while another widow with three children having entitlement arising following the effective date of the 1957 amendments may receive a minimum of $3,600 per year. This bill would again equalize benefits for widows and children regardless of the date entitlement arose.

NUMBER OF ANNUITANTS

The total number of annuitant member policemen and firemen who would have benefited under the terms of this bill as of January 1, 1960, was 1,178. Of this number, 90 percent were retired for disability and must now pay their own medical and hospitalization expense. The average length of service for all retired members is 22.4 years. Policemen retired for disability averaged 20.5 years' service and firemen averaged 22.6 years. Those in both groups retired for age and service averaged 32.9 years of service. Under this bill, these former members would have their benefits reestablished on the equalized basis which existed prior to October 1, 1956. This bill prohibits any retroactive payment of benefits to this group.

Approximately 525 widows and their children, under the terms of this bill, would receive retroactive payments from October 1, 1956, and their benefits would be equalized with those of other widows and children.

COST

The cost of the bill can only be estimated on the basis of careful actuarial tables. These tables show that there will be 1,159 retired members remaining on the rolls on January 1, 1961. The number of deaths during the preceding 3 years, plus the estimated deaths for 1960, exceeds 200.

The first year estimated cost in 1961, as shown on the actuarial tables, is $1,265,000. By 1970, the cost for this group will have dropped by 37 percent to $792,000. The 1980 cost estimate is $344,000, or about 27 percent of the 1961 estimate.

In the case of widows' benefits, the estimated cost for 1961 is $189,000 and for children the estimate is $19,000. By 1970, the cost for widows is estimated at $158,000 and for children at $2,000.

The provisions of this legislation apply retroactively to widows and children only, making the increased benefits effective as to them from October 1, 1956. The retroactive costs for widows and children, as of January 1, 1961, would have been $700,000.

Contributions from salaries going into the retirement fund were increased from 5 to 6½ percent in August 1957. The

gross annual dollar increase in contributions to the retirement fund is $517,000, the increase being from $991,000 for the last full year at the 5-percent rate to $1,508,312 estimated for the first full year at the new 6½-percent rate.

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 12775 is a bill designed to correct, in some measure, an injustice which has existed for the past 4 years in regard to certain retired members of the District of Columbia Police and Fire Departments, and the widows and children of some of these members.

From 1916, when the policemen's and firemen's relief fund was established by act of Congress, until 1957, all retired members of the Police and Fire Departments, and their widows and children were treated alike with respect to their pensions. By the act of February 17, 1923, a policy of equalization provided equal benefits for equal service credits to all retired members, regardless of date of retirement or of the contribution percentage retained from their salaries toward the retirement fund. The prevailing attitude of Congress was eloquently expressed in House Report No. 1400 of the 67th Congress, which said in part:

> Your committee is of the opinion that all pensioners who are subjected to the same living cost and who have rendered exceptional service to the District and who have been injured or have been retired because of age should receive the same pension and that there should be no discrimination in the treatment of those aged and disabled public servants.

I wholeheartedly subscribe to this philosophy.

In 1957, however, the Congress for the first time saw fit to create a discriminatory situation, by amendments to the Policemen's and Firemen's Disability Act which substantially increased the benefits for those policemen and firemen who retired subsequent to the date of October 1, 1956, and their widows and children, whereas no increases whatever were provided for those who were retired prior to that date. Briefly, this act of 1957 entitles a member with 30 years' service who retired after October 1, 1956, to receive 70 percent of his terminal salary as an annual pension, whereas a man with the same service who retired prior to that date received only 50 percent. Thus, despite the fact that the Equalization Act of 1923 provided that both of these annuities are computed on the same base salary, there is a glaring discrepancy here of 20 percent in favor of the later retiree which I consider indefensible.

This bill would elevate the annuity rate for the member who retired before October 1, 1956, to 55 percent of the base salary. Thus, there still would remain a difference of 15 percent in favor of the later retiree, which I still consider to be a rank injustice. As a practical matter, however, in view of the opposition to this measure, I am glad to support this increase as a step in the right direction.

The principal argument leveled against this bill is that the older retirees did not contribute as much money toward the retirement fund during their active service as did those who retired later—because of lower salary scales and also somewhat lower contribution rates—and therefore they are not entitled to as much annuity. This reasoning is utterly fallacious, however, in view of the fact that the contributions of the older members were in dollars of much greater value and buying power than those of later times. Thus, a contribution of $10 some years ago certainly was as large, in the true sense, as one of perhaps $15 or $20 today.

In the case of the widows and children of deceased members, the discrimination is perhaps even more pronounced. The widow of a member who died prior to October 1, 1956, receives a pension of $125 per month, and a child of such a member receives $25 per month. The widow of a member who died after that date, on the other hand, receives at least $150 per month, and a child can receive $50 to $60 per month. This proposed legislation would establish the same annuities for widows and children, regardless of the date of the death of the member.

It is my sincere conviction that these injustices should be corrected, at least to the extent of the terms of this bill, without delay. Members of the police and fire departments, who performed the same services, faced the same perils and in many cases suffered the same injuries and disabilities, and who now face the problem of the same costs of living in retirement—as well as widows and children in many instances—are entitled in my opinion to the same amount of pension with which to pass their declining years.

The cost of this bill, based upon the most reliable actuarial estimates, will be some $9 to $10 million, in reducing annual amounts over a period of 25 years or more. In this case, I contend that this is simply the price of justice.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to offer a supplemental report on the bill H.R. 12775.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESTORATION TO THE UNITED STATES OF AMOUNTS EXPENDED IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FOR TEMPORARY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION ACT OF 1958

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (S. 3416) to provide for the restoration to the United States of amounts expended in the District of Columbia in carrying out the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act of 1958, and I ask unanimous consent that the same be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to transfer from the account of the District of Columbia in the Unemployment Trust Fund in the Treasury of the United States to the United States, an amount equal to the amount of temporary unemployment compensation paid in the District of Columbia under the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act of 1958 (except amounts paid to individuals who exhausted their unemployment compensation under title XV of the Social Security Act and title IV of the Veterans Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, prior to their making their first claim under the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act of 1958), whenever such amount has been determined with respect to the District of Columbia, but prior to December 1, 1963.

SEC. 2. There is hereby appropriated, pursuant to section 14 of the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act (48 Stat. 946, 954), as amended (sec. 46–314, D.C. Code, 1951 edition, supp. VII) from the moneys credited pursuant to section 903 of the Social Security Act (49 Stat. 640), as amended (68 Stat. 670; 42 U.S.C. 1958 ed., sec. 1103), to the account of the District of Columbia in the Unemployment Trust Fund in the Treasury of the United States, $150,000 or so much thereof as may be necessary to pay over to the United States an amount equal to the amount of cost incurred by the District Unemployment Compensation Board in the administration of the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act of 1958. This amount shall be paid whenever such amount is determined but not later than two years from the date of the enactment of this appropriation. In any event this payment shall be made prior to December 1, 1963. The amount obligated pursuant to this section during any fiscal year shall not exceed the amount by which (a) the aggregate of the amounts credited to the account of the District of Columbia pursuant to section 903 of the Social Security Act during such fiscal year and the four preceding fiscal years exceeds (b) the aggregate of the amounts obligated for administration and paid out for benefits and charged against the amounts credited to the account of the District of Columbia during such five fiscal years.

SEC. 3. (a) There is hereby created a special fund in the Treasury of the United States, separate and apart from the District Unemployment Fund, to be known as a Special Administration Fund. Notwithstanding any contrary provisions of the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act—(1) Interest and penalties collected from employers after the end of the month in which this Act is enacted shall be deposited into the clearing account in the District Unemployment Fund in the Treasury of the United States for clearance only and shall not, except as provided in subsection (c), be deemed a part of the District Unemployment Fund; (2) thereafter, during each calendar quarter there shall be transferred from the clearing account to such Special Administration Fund all interest and penalties collected from employers during the preceding calendar quarter; and (3) refunds of interest and penalties paid

into the Special Administration Fund shall be made from such fund or, after such fund is discontinued as hereinafter provided, from the balance transferred from such fund to the clearing account in the District Unemployment Fund.

(b) The District Unemployment Compensation Board is authorized and directed to requisition from such Special Administration Fund an amount equal to the District's proportionate share of other costs incurred in the administration of the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act of 1958 as prescribed in section 104(a) thereof, whenever such amount has been determined with respect to the District of Columbia and sufficient funds are available in such Special Administration Fund, and prior to December 1, 1963, to pay such amount to the United States.

(c) Thereafter, and as soon as the amount in the Special Administration Fund exceeds $5,000, such amount shall be transferred to the clearing account in the District Unemployment Fund, such Special Administration Fund shall be discontinued, and all interest and penalties subsequently collected from employers shall be paid into the District Unemployment Fund as provided by the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to provide necessary authorization for appropriations and of procedures which will enable the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Board to reimburse the Treasury of the United States for certain expenditures made pursuant to the provisions of the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act of 1958, and to avoid the necessity of increasing the Federal Unemployment Compensation taxes upon employers of four or more employees in the District of Columbia.

Relevant portions of a letter from the Acting President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, dated April 5, 1960, addressed to the President of the Senate, which transmitted the draft legislation, are made herewith a part of this report:

The Commissioners of the District of Columbia have the honor to submit herewith a draft of a bill to provide for the restoration to the United States of amounts expended in the District of Columbia in carrying out the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act of 1958.

The act approved June 4, 1958 (72 Stat. 171; 42 U.S.C.A. 1400–1400k), cited as the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act of 1958, among other things provides that the Federal unemployment compensation taxes of all employers in the District of Columbia who employ four or more individuals shall be increased 50 percent for the calendar year 1963 unless the amounts expended in the District of Columbia under the authority of the said act are restored to the Treasury prior to December 1, 1963. Should such amounts not be restored to the Treasury prior to December 1, 1964, the act provides that the Federal unemployment compensation taxes of the District employers subject to such taxes shall be increased 100 percent over the present taxes.

The costs incurred by the District of Columbia under the authority of the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act of 1958 fall into three categories. The first category includes the benefits paid to individuals under the said act based upon the exhaustion of a claim under the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act. The second category includes the actual administrative expenses incurred by the District Unemployment Compensation Board in administering the program. The third category includes all other costs chargeable to the District of Columbia, other than those contained in the above categories. This last-mentioned category is principally the District's share of the Federal Government's costs of administering the act.

The first section of the bill provides that the Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer from the account of the District of Columbia in the unemployment trust fund to the United States a sum equal to the amount of benefits paid in the District of Columbia based upon claims exhausted under the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act. There would appear to be no objection to such a transfer as the moneys in the unemployment trust fund are primarily collected for the payment of benefits and the District's account in such fund is more than adequate for the foreseeable future.

The second section of the bill appropriates $150,000 or so much of such sum as may be necessary to pay over to the United States an amount equal to the amount of costs incurred by the District Unemployment Compensation Board in connection with its administration of the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act of 1958. This sum would be appropriated from the moneys credited pursuant to section 903 of the Social Security Act, as amended, to the account of the District of Columbia in the unemployment trust fund in the Treasury of the United States. The bill provides that the amount so appropriated shall be paid within 2 years from the date of enactment of the bill, and in no event later than December 1, 1963.

It is against established policy to pay Federal administrative expenses out of moneys collected for the payment of benefits or from funds distributed to the States—including the District of Columbia—under the authority of the act approved August 5, 1954 (68 Stat. 668), familiarly known as the Reed bill. However, many States have interest and penalty funds which are used for any purpose that a State legislature might see fit to approve. Section 3 of the bill establishes a temporary interest and penalty fund for the purpose of paying the District's share of the Federal Government's administrative expenses.

The Commissioners have been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection on the part of that office to submission of this draft bill to the Congress.

It has been brought to the attention of the committee that as of December 31, 1959, the District of Columbia had reserves of $60,076,000, or a ratio of 11.76 times the amounts paid out in benefits in 1959.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CIVIC PROGRAMS IN COMMEMORATION OF THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CIVIL WAR

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (S. 3835) to authorize the District of Columbia Civil War Centennial Commission to plan and carry out in the District of Columbia civic programs in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the Civil War; to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of Defense to make certain property of the District and of the United States available for the use of such Commission; to authorize the said Commissioners to make certain regulations and permit certain uses to be made of public space, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the same be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the District of Columbia Civil War Centennial Commission is authorized and empowered to prepare, arrange, supervise and carry out in the District of Columbia appropriate civic programs to commemorate the one hundredth anniversary of the Civil War. In carrying out its functions the Commission shall collaborate with the Civil War Centennial Commission established by the joint resolution of September 7, 1959 (71 Stat. 626).

SEC. 2. (a) As used in this Act the terms "District of Columbia Civil War Centennial Commission" and "Commission" mean the District of Columbia Civil War Centennial Commission created by the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia on April 28, 1959, and the terms "Commissioners of the District of Columbia" and "District Commissioners" mean the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia or their designated agent.

(b) The Commission shall consist of such members, and shall continue in existence until such time, as the District Commissioners shall determine.

(c) The members of the Commission shall serve without compensation, but shall be paid for all necessary expenses incurred by them in carrying out their duties, including traveling expenses.

(d) The Commission shall, in carrying out its functions and duties, be subject to the supervision and control of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

(e) The Commission is authorized to utilize such personnel, facilities, and property, real or personal, of the District of Columbia or of the United States as may be made available for the use of said Commission, and under such conditions and at such times as may be prescribed, by the District Commissioners or by the head of the concerned department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States, or by his designated agent.

SEC. 3. (a) The members of the District of Columbia Civil War Centennial Commission shall not be personally liable in damages for any official action of the said Commission in which the said members participate, nor shall any member of said Commission be liable for any costs that may be taxed against them or the Commission on account of any such official action by them as members of the said Commission, but such costs shall be charged to the District of Columbia and paid as other costs are paid in suits brought against the municipality; nor shall the said Commission or any of its members be required to give any bond or security for costs or damages on any appeal whatever.

(b) Service of an individual as a member of the said Commission or in connection with carrying out any activity authorized by this Act shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such individual within the provisions of sections 216, 281, 283, 284, 434, or 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code, or section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U.S.C. 99) nor shall any member of the said Commission by reason of his status as such

be deemed to be an "officer of the Government" within the meaning of the Act of April 27, 1916 (5 U.S.C. 101).

SEC. 4. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Commissioners may accept the voluntary services of persons appointed as members of the said Commission or in connection with carrying out any activity authorized by this Act.

SEC. 5. (a) In connection with the various activities scheduled to take place during the observance of the centennial of the Civil War, the District Commissioners are authorized and directed to make all reasonable regulations necessary to secure the preservation of public order and protection of life, health, and property; to make special regulations respecting the standing, movement, and operation of vehicles of whatever character or kind during said period; and to grant, under such conditions as they may impose, special licenses to peddlers and vendors for the privilege of selling goods, wares, and merchandise in such places in the District of Columbia, and to fix such fees for such privilege, as they may deem proper: *Provided*, That the granting of licenses to sell in places under the jurisdiction of the head of a department of the United States shall require his approval.

(b) The Commission is authorized to establish such fees and charges as it deems appropriate in connection with any activity officially connected with the observance of the centennial anniversary of the Civil War, and the District of Columbia Civil War Centennial Commission shall be responsible for the collection of such fees and charges, with the exception of those fees and charges provided in subsection (a) of this section.

(c)(1) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the use of the District of Columbia Civil War Centennial Commission such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act, and such sums shall be deposited in the Civil War Centennial Fund, District of Columbia, authorized by paragraph (2) of subsection (c) of this section.

(c)(2) All moneys collected pursuant to fees and charges made under authority of subsections (a) and (b) of this section shall be paid to the District Commissioners and deposited in a revolving fund in the Treasury which is hereby authorized to be established, to be known as the Civil War Centennial Fund, District of Columbia. Such fund shall be used to carry out the purposes of this Act, and may be expended without regard to the laws and procedures applicable to District of Columbia or Federal agencies for the procurement of supplies, services, and property. Contracts may be entered into for the purposes of this Act without regard to applicable District of Columbia or Federal laws or regulations.

(d) The District Commissioners may use any property acquired by the District of Columbia Civil War Centennial Commission remaining upon its termination, or they may dispose of the said property as surplus property. The net revenues, after payment of Commission expenses, derived from Commission activities shall be deposited in the Treasury to the credit of the District of Columbia.

(e) The Commission is authorized to carry public liability insurance protecting the Commission, members, officials, and employees thereof; the United States and the District of Columbia and their officers and employees performing services under this Act, and persons performing voluntary services under provisions of this Act.

SEC. 6. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary, payable in like manner as other appropriations for the expenses of the District of Columbia, to enable the District Commissioners to provide additional municipal services in said District in connection with any program, function, or activity prepared, arranged, supervised, or carried out by the Commission or by the Civil War Centennial Commission established by the joint resolution of September 7, 1959 (71 Stat. 626), including employment of personal services without regard to the civil service and classification laws; travel expenses of law enforcement personnel from other jurisdictions; hire of means of transportation; meals for policemen and firemen, cost of removing and relocating streetcar loading platforms, construction, rent, maintenance, and expenses incident to the operation of temporary public comfort stations, first-aid stations, and information booths, and other incidental expenses in the discretion of the Commissioners.

SEC. 7. The District Commissioners may authorize the Commission to install suitable overhead conductors and install suitable lighting or other electrical facilities, with adequate supports, for illumination or other purposes. If it should be necessary to place wires for illuminating or other purposes over any park or reservation in the District of Columbia, such placing of wires and their removal shall be under the supervision of the official in charge of said park or reservation. Such conductors with their supports shall be removed by the date specified by the said Commissioners or by said official, as the case may be. The said Commissioners, or such other officials as may have jurisdiction in the premises, shall enforce the provisions of this Act, take needful precautions for the protection of the public, and insure that the pavement of any street, sidewalk, avenue, or alley which is disturbed or damaged is restored to its previous condition.

SEC. 8. The regulations and licenses authorized by this Act shall be in full force and effect for such period of time as may be specified by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia. Such regulations shall be published in one or more of the daily newspapers published in the District of Columbia and no penalty prescribed for the violation of any such regulation shall be enforced until three days after such publication. Any person violating any regulation promulgated by the said Commissioners under the authority of this Act shall be fined not more than $100 or imprisoned for not more than thirty days. Each and every day a violation of any such regulation exists shall constitute a separate offense, and the penalty prescribed shall be applicable to each such separate offense.

SEC. 9. Nothing contained in this Act shall be applicable to the United States Capitol buildings or grounds or other properties under the jurisdiction of the Congress or any committee, commission, or officer thereof: *Provided, however*, That any of the services or facilities authorized by or under this Act shall be made available with respect to any such properties upon request or approval of the Senate and House of Representatives.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING THAT CLASS C AND D LICENSES SHALL NOT BE PROHIBITED FROM SERVING ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES ON NEW YEAR'S DAY WHEN NEW YEAR'S DAY FALLS ON SUNDAY

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H.R. 11535) to amend the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act to provide that class C and D licensees shall not be prohibited from serving alcoholic beverages in their establishments on New Year's Day when New Year's falls on Sunday, and I ask unanimous consent that the same be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the second paragraph of section 7 of the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act (D.C. Code 25–107) is hereby amended to read as follows: "The Commissioners shall have specific authority to make rules and regulations for the issuance, transfer, and revocation of licenses; to facilitate and insure the collection of taxes; to govern the operation of the business of licensees, with full power and authority to prescribe the terms and conditions under which alcoholic beverages may be sold by each class of licensees; to forbid the issuance of licenses for manufacture, sale, or storage of alcoholic beverages in such localities in, and such sections and portions of, the District of Columbia as they may deem proper in the public interest; to limit the number of licenses of each class to be issued in the District of Columbia and to limit the number of licenses of each class in any locality in, or sections or portions of, the District of Columbia as they may deem proper in the public interest; to forbid the issuance of licenses for businesses conducted on such premises as they, in the public interest, may deem inappropriate; to forbid the issuance of any class or classes of licenses for businesses established subsequent to the date of enactment of this Act near or around schools, colleges, universities, churches, or public institutions, to prescribe the hours during which beverages may be sold and to forbid the sale on Sundays; but the Commissioners shall not authorize the sale by any licensee, other than the holder of a retailer's license, class E, of any beverages on Sunday except when January 1 falls on a Sunday, other than light wines and beer, and any such sale is hereby prohibited. The powers and authorities expressly enumerated are to be construed as in addition to, and not by way of limitation of, the general powers herein granted. Different regulations may be prescribed for the different classes of licenses, for the different classes of beverages, and for different localities in or sections or portions of the District of Columbia."

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, under existing law section 7 of the Alcoholic Beverage Control Act (D.C. Code 25–107) authorizes the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to make regulations governing the sale of beverages and governing the hours when beverages may be sold but it expressly prohibits the Commissioners from such authorization: "but the Commissioners shall not authorize the sale by any licensee, other than the holder of a retailer's license, class E, of any beverages on Sundays other than light wines and beer, and any such sale is hereby prohibited."

The purpose of this legislation is to overcome the effect of the above noted prohibition and to permit the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to make regulations which would permit the sale of alcoholic beverages other than

light wines and beer, or including light wines and beer, on Sunday when Sunday falls on January 1, New Year's Day.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO EXEMPT FROM TAXATION CERTAIN PROPERTY OF THE NATIONAL GUARD ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (S. 3867) to exempt from taxation certain property of the National Guard Association of the United States in the District of Columbia, and I ask unanimous consent that the same be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the property situated in square 625 in the city of Washington, District of Columbia, described as lot 60, together with the improvements thereon, owned by the President, Vice President, Secretary, and Treasurer of the National Guard Association of the United States, as trustees and in trust for the use and benefit of the National Guard Association of the United States, a voluntary unincorporated association with principal headquarters in the District of Columbia, is hereby exempt from all taxation from and after July 1, 1961, so long as the same is owned by the President, Vice President, Secretary, and Treasurer of the National Guard Association of the United States, as trustees and in trust for the use and benefit of the National Guard Association of the United States and occupied by the National Guard Association of the United States, is used solely for the purposes of said Association, and is not used for commercial purposes, subject to the provisions of sections 2, 3, and 5 of the Act entitled "An Act to define the real property exempt from taxation in the District of Columbia," approved December 24, 1942 (56 Stat. 1091; D.C. Code, secs. 47–801b, 47–801c, and 47–801e).

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include at this point a statement that will explain the actions and conduct of the Committee on the District of Columbia during the 2d session of the 86th Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The statement is as follows:

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I take great pride and pleasure in presenting to the House the record of the House District Committee during the 2d session of the 86th Congress.

The 25 members of the House District Committee, in my opinion, deserve the thanks of the entire Nation and certainly the Members of the House of Representatives for the hours, days, and weeks they have spent attending hearings and meetings on problems vitally affecting the Nation's Capital during the past 8 months.

The Members of the House of Representatives have been very helpful at all times by assisting us in having numerous pieces of legislation enacted that would assist in properly carrying out the commission form of government now in existence in the District of Columbia. We have had numerous subcommittee hearings and a great number of full committee meeting hearings and on only one occasion have we failed to have a quorum present. I think this is an excellent record for any committee as I have been a member of several committees since I have been a Member of the House of Representatives and on numerous occasions we failed to have a quorum.

I am certain that if every person, including the newspapers in the District of Columbia, would exert his influence and energy in trying to make the commission form of government we have in the District of Columbia at the present time function properly, we would have a government here in the Nation's Capital that would certainly compare favorably with that of any other city in the Nation. In fact, I presume, it is about the only large city in the United States that does not have a heavy debt and is bonded up to the hilt.

I do hope that as long as we have a commission form of government here in the District of Columbia the Presidents who occupy the White House in the future will be certain to appoint Commissioners who believe in the commission form of government so that our official duties as members of the District Committees on Capitol Hill will be much easier and the entire District government can function with a greater degree of efficiency.

The House District Committee has passed a resolution praising Gen. A. C. Welling, the former Engineer Commissioner of the District of Columbia, who has just received another assignment with the U.S. engineers for his outstanding and courageous work during his 3-year term of service as Engineer Commissioner in the District of Columbia. We have at the present time 3 bridges under construction across the Potomac River and several of the leading avenues and streets in the city have been completely modernized and reconstructed during General Welling's tour of duty. In the 30 years I have been on Capitol Hill, there has never been a Commissioner, either engineer or otherwise, who has, in my opinion, rendered the outstanding service to the Nation's Capital that has been rendered by General Welling.

The entire Congress and the Nation owe him a debt of gratitude for his outstanding work.

You will note from the following that there are 75 District bills, acts, and resolutions in connection with which the House District Committee has taken action during the 2d session of the 86th Congress and 38 of these have passed the House during this session:

DISTRICT BILLS, ACTS, AND RESOLUTIONS IN CONNECTION WITH WHICH THE HOUSE DISTRICT COMMITTEE HAS TAKEN ACTION DURING THE 2D SESSION OF THE 86TH CONGRESS

H.R. 1844, insurance, life, amend District of Columbia Act.

H.R. 3298, charitable contributions, deductible even though activities not carried on in District.

H.R. 3855, licensing of public adjusters, provide for.

H.R. 4192, ministers, communications made to them shall be considered privileged.

H.R. 4383, Income and Franchise Tax Act, 1949, exempt certain employees from District of Columbia income tax.

H.R. 5889, indigents in judicial proceedings in District of Columbia, provide for representation.

H.R. 6738, fire prevention and safety laws, applicable to schools in District of Columbia, strengthen.

H.R.7124, tuition, payment of by certain persons who attend public schools in District of Columbia.

H.R. 7714, television service contractors, dealers, technicians, provide for regulation and licensing of.

H.R. 8391, junior college division with D.C. Teachers College, authorize.

H.R. 8697, Redevelopment Act of 1945, amend with respect to the requirements for adoption of a redevelopment plan for a project area.

H.R. 9110, National Woman's Party, Inc., exempt certain property from taxation.

H.R. 9223, Roman Catholic Archbishop of Washington, exempt certain property from taxation.

H.R. 9293, teachers, given service for retirement purposes for authorized leave without pay taken for educational purposes.

H.R. 9451, Veterans of Foreign Wars, tax exemption granted effective with respect to taxable years beginning on or after July 1, 1959.

H.R. 9579, National Guard Association of the United States, exempt certain property from taxation.

H.R. 9737, corporations, District of Columbia, eliminate requirement that majority of trustees be citizens of the District of Columbia.

H.R. 9876, financial charges for retail installment sales of motor vehicles, provide for regulation of.

H.R. 10000, inheritance taxes erroneously collected, to extend time for overpayment and refund of.

H.R. 10021, securities, transfer of to and by fiduciaries in District of Columbia, provide uniform law.

H.R. 10183, insurance, fire, marine, and casualty, amend act regulating business of.

H.R. 10346, sales tax, increase to 3 percent.

H.R. 10597, practice of pharmacy, amend act providing for.

H.R. 10619, A.B.C. Act, amend, relative to tax stamps.

H.R. 10683, automobile installment financing in District of Columbia, provide for regulation of.

H.R. 10684, premiums, adjusted, amend life insurance act relative thereto.

H.R. 10761, indigents in judicial proceedings in District of Columbia, provide for representation.

H.R. 10921, insurance, life, amend act of 1934 concerning investments which an insurance company may make.

H.R. 10952, National Society Daughters of the American Colonists use certain real property in District of Columbia as national headquarters.

H.R. 10964, insurance, life, amend act to provide variable annuities.

H.R. 11135, Interstate Transportation Agency, authorize negotiations to create.

H.R. 11220, Business Corporation Act, amend, to provide that foreign loaning institutions engaged in investing in loans secured by real estate shall not be considered to be transacting or engaged in business in the District of Columbia under certain conditions.

H.R. 11263, capital punishment, mandatory, abolish in the District of Columbia.

H.R. 11370, Alcoholic Beverage Control Act, amend relative to tax stamps.

H.R. 11415, Plaza of the Americas, provide for designation of a portion of the District of Columbia.

H.R. 11535, A.B.C. Act, amend, permit the sale of alcoholic beverages by class C and D licenses when New Year's Day falls on Sunday.

H.R. 11931, wills, filing of caveat to, amend act with respect to the time within which it must be filed.

H.R. 12004, nurses, professional, practical, provide for examination, licensing, and registration of.

H.R. 12055, Metropolitan Police Relief Association, provide for incorporation of.

H.R. 12063, Dulles International Airport, authorize Commissioners of District of Columbia to plan, construct, operate, and maintain a sanitary sewer connecting airport with District of Columbia system.

H.R. 12073, Dulles International Airport, authorize Commissioners of District of Columbia to plan, construct, operate, and maintain a sanitary sewer connecting airport with District of Columbia system.

H.R. 12205, mandatory death sentence, abolish in District of Columbia.

H.R. 12246, National Woman's Party, Inc., exempt certain property from taxation.

H.R. 12422, credit life insurance, and credit accident and health insurance, provide for regulation of.

H.R. 12483, mandatory death sentence, abolish in District of Columbia.

H.R. 12497, Income and Franchise Tax Act of 1947, amend relative to certain foreign corporations.

H.R. 12520, Group Hospitalization, Inc., enter into contracts with certain dental hospitals for care and treatment of individuals.

H.R. 12563, Revenue Act of 1937, amend, provide for registration of vehicles using nontaxed fuels.

H.R. 12584, Narcotic Drug Act, District of Columbia, amend relative to certain cough medicines containing dihydrocodeinone.

H.R. 12597, Motor Vehicle Parking Facility Act of 1942, amend relative to parking meter attendants.

H.R. 12748, Redevelopment Land Agency, provide for transfer of title to certain real property by Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

H.R. 12761, home improvement business, provide for bonding of persons engaged in.

H.R. 12775, Policemen and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act, applicable to retired former members of police and fire departments, their widows, widowers, and children.

H.R. 12993, salary increase for teachers, provide for.

H.R. 13053, salary increase for Metropolitan, Park and White House Police and Firemen, provide for.

Senate Joint Resolution 42, Metropolitan Region Development Act, provide for.

S. 715, indecent publications, amend law relating thereto.

S. 1159, real property, to facilitate the acquisition of, amendment to District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Act.

S. 1315, Blue Star Mothers of America, Inc., provide for incorporation of.

S. 1456, juvenile court judges, to provide for appointment of two additional.

S. 1870, nurses, professional, practical, provide for examination, licensing, and registration of.

S. 1966, licensing of public insurance adjusters, provide for.

S. 2131, Motor Vehicle Safety Responsibility Act, to amend.

S. 2306, National Woman's Party, Inc., exempt certain property from.

S. 2327, births, amend act providing for registration of.

S. 2439, teachers, given service for retirement purposes for authorized leave without pay taken for educational purposes.

S. 2446, civil defense office, amend act authorizing establishment of.

S. 2671, American War Mothers, Inc., exempt certain property from taxation.

S. 2954, alien employees, to exempt from District of Columbia income tax compensation paid by certain international organizations to.

S. 3415, exempt from taxation certain property of the American Association of University Women.

S. 3416, Unemployment Compensation Act of 1958, temporary, to provide for the restoration to the United States of amounts expended in the District of Columbia in carrying out.

S. 3648, Redevelopment Land Agency, to transfer title to certain waterfront property in Southwest Washington to.

S. 3688, Redevelopment Land Agency, to authorize to eliminate or restore all slum or blighted areas, whether residential or nonresidential.

S. 3727, bonding of persons engaged in the home-improvement business.

S. 3835, Civil War Centennial Commission, authorize to carry out civic programs in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the Civil War.

BILLS, ACTS, AND RESOLUTIONS WHICH PASSED HOUSE DURING 2D SESSION OF 86TH CONGRESS

H.R. 7124, tuition, payment of by certain persons who attend public schools in District of Columbia.

H.R. 8697, Redevelopment Act of 1945, amend with respect to the requirements for adoption of a redevelopment plan for a project area.

H.R. 9451, Veterans of Foreign Wars, tax exemption granted effective with respect to taxable years beginning on or after July 1, 1959.

H.R. 9737, corporations, District of Columbia, eliminate requirement that majority of trustees be citizens of the District of Columbia.

H.R. 10000, inheritance taxes erroneously collected, to extend time for overpayment and refund of.

H.R. 10021, securities, transfer of, to, and by fiduciaries in District of Columbia, provide uniform law.

H.R. 10183, insurance, fire, marine, and casualty, amend act regulating business of.

H.R. 10346, sales tax, increase to 3 percent.

H.R. 10683, automobile installment financing in District of Columbia, provide for regulation of.

H.R. 10684, premiums, adjusted, amend life insurance act relative thereto.

H.R. 10761, indigents in judicial proceedings in District of Columbia, provide for representation.

H.R. 10921, insurance, life, amend act of 1934 concerning investments which an insurance company may make.

H.R. 10952, National Society Daughters of the American Colonists use certain real property in District of Columbia as national headquarters.

H.R. 10964, insurance, life, amend act to provide variable annuities.

H.R. 11135, Interstate Transportation Agency, authorize negotiations to create.

H.R. 11415, Plaza of the Americas, provide for designation of a portion of the District of Columbia.

H.R. 11931, wills, filing of caveat to, amend act with respect to the time within which it must be filed.

H.R. 12055, Metropolitan Police Relief Association, provide for incorporation of.

H.R. 12063, Dulles International Airport, authorize Commissioners of District of Columbia to plan, construct, operate, and maintain a sanitary sewer connecting airport with District of Columbia system.

H.R. 12483, mandatory death sentence, abolish in District of Columbia.

H.R. 12497, Income and Franchise Tax Act of 1947, amend relative to certain foreign corporations.

H.R. 12520, Group Hospitalization, Inc., enter into contracts with certain dental hospitals for care and treatment of individuals.

H.R. 12563, Revenue Act of 1937, amend, provide for registration of vehicles using nontaxed fuels.

H.R. 12584, Narcotic Drug Act, District of Columbia, amend relative to certain cough medicines containing dihydrocodeinone.

H.R. 12597, Motor Vehicle Parking Facility Act of 1942, amend relative to parking meter attendants.

H.R. 12775, Policemen and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act, applicable to retired former members of po-

lice and fire departments, their widows, widowers, and children.

Senate Joint Resolution 42, Metropolitan Region Development Act, provide for.

S. 715, indecent publications, amend law relating thereto.

S. 1315, Blue Star Mothers of America, Inc., provide for incorporation of.

S. 1159, real property, to facilitate the acquisition of, amendment to District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Act.

S. 2327, births, amend act providing for registration of.

S. 2439, teachers, given service for retirement purposes for authorized leave without pay taken for educational purposes.

S. 2954, alien employees, to exempt from District of Columbia income tax compensation paid by certain international organizations.

S. 3416, Unemployment Compensation Act of 1958, temporary, to provide for the restoration to the United States of amounts expended in the District of Columbia in carrying out.

S. 3616, vehicles, operation of by District employees in the scope of their employment, to provide for the defense of suits involving.

S. 3648, Redevelopment Land Agency, to transfer title to certain waterfront property in Southwest Washington to.

S. 3688, Redevelopment Land Agency, to authorize to eliminate or restore all slums or blighted areas, whether residential or nonresidential.

S. 3835, Civil War Centennial Commission, authorize to carry out civic programs in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the Civil War.

CHARGE FOR LOCAL ADVERTISING TO DETERMINE MANUFACTURERS SALE PRICE

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 12536) relating to the treatment of charges for local advertising for purposes of determining the manufacturers sale price, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments and request a conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman if this has been cleared with the minority members of his committee?

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] and I have discussed this matter.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

The Chair hears none, and without objection, appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MILLS, FORAND, KING of California, MASON, and BYRNES of Wisconsin.

EXCISE TAX UPON CIGARS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 10960) to amend section 5701 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the excise tax upon cigars, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments and request a conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

The Chair hears none and, without objection, appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MILLS, FORAND, KING of California, MASON, and BYRNES of Wisconsin.

SUGAR ACT OF 1948

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill (H.R. 13062) to extend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE HONORABLE PAUL BROWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALTER). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, there come times when we face a task with mixed emotions. This is such an occasion for me. I take the floor today to speak in all sincerity regarding the decision of a beloved, esteemed, distinguished, and able member of the Georgia delegation not to offer again for membership in this body in the coming election. I refer to a Member who is beloved by all of the membership of the House of Representatives, Members of the other body, and countless people in this Nation's Capital with whom he has come in contact during the last 27 years.

Congressman PAUL BROWN was first elected to membership in the House of Representatives at a special election held on July 5, 1933. In the time which has elapsed since he first took the oath of office on the floor of this House, PAUL BROWN has established a reputation for loyalty, faithfulness, and dedication to duty, a reputation which has been exceeded by no Member in this House.

During the time he has served here he has been, I believe, the only Member who has throughout that period answered every rollcall, and every yea-and-nay vote, except for one time. That was an occasion when he was stricken with a serious illness. He stayed at his post of duty here in the House of Representatives until the doctor ordered him removed from the floor and carried to the hospital in an ambulance. Seldom does a Member establish a reputation of that kind. I know of no other Member of whom this could be said.

When I think of PAUL BROWN, his activities are divided into three categories: First a statesman of national stature. In that capacity PAUL BROWN has accomplished many difficult tasks, tasks which at times have seemed impossible. I think of the construction of the great Clark Hill Dam on the Savannah River, the river which is the dividing line between the States of Georgia and South Carolina. That is a monument to the efforts of PAUL BROWN which many generations in the future will enjoy. Following that, when the construction of the Clark Hill Dam was assured, PAUL BROWN began efforts for the construction of another great dam on the same river, the Hartwell Dam, near Hartwell, Ga. That dam now is proceeding rapidly toward completion. It also will be a monument to the continuing, constant, indefatigable efforts of this great statesman from the 10th District of Georgia. He is the author of many bills benefiting the farmers of the Nation. He has sponsored many measures strengthening the economy of the country.

I think of him also as a faithful and devoted husband and father, a man who has loved his family, and has devoted his efforts to creating and sustaining a family which has measured up to the greatest American traditions.

He also is a man who has bound himself with ties of steel to the numerous friends he has made and kept during his lifetime.

When I came to Congress in 1947 as a Member entirely unfamiliar with the procedures here, almost at a loss how to take the first step to become a Member of the House of Representatives, one of the first Members to whom I went for advice and counsel was PAUL BROWN. Throughout the 14 years I have served here I have called upon him many times. He has always responded gladly, willingly, and cheerfully, and my task in the House of Representatives has been made much easier because of the assistance which PAUL BROWN has given me from time to time with the problems which I have had and about which I have called upon him for assistance. However long I may live I shall never forget the kindness and the consideration which I have received at his hands.

It was with a great deal of disappointment that I learned he had made the decision this year not to offer for reelection. People throughout the entire State of Georgia have had that same feeling of disappointment and regret that when the 87th Congress begins next January it will begin without having in its membership here that revered statesman, that person whom we have all learned to love, and without whose presence here on the floor, this House of Representatives will certainly not seem the same.

As PAUL leaves to begin the retirement which he has so justly earned and deserves, I want to say that with him will go my best wishes and a heart full of love and appreciation, together with the hope that he will be spared by Almighty God to live among his native people whom he loved so well and to render service there, as I know he will, even though he has ceased to serve here in an active capacity.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, as the 2d session of the 86th Congress comes to

its inevitable final adjournment, those of us who have been privileged to be Members of this Congress will look back with a pride of association in its accomplishments, but also with regret for the decision of those of our colleagues who have chosen not to return to the legislative tasks of government that lie ahead for the 87th Congress.

Among those who have earned the privilege of retiring from the insistent demands of representative government, is the very distinguished, the very able, the very affable, and the very outstanding gentleman from Georgia's 10th Congressional District, PAUL BROWN.

First elected to the 73d Congress on July 5, 1933, he is now completing his 27th year as a Member of the House of Representatives.

All Members of the House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate will miss this distinguished Georgia gentleman when the 87th Congress convenes in January.

But I claim, with sincerity and conviction, that I shall miss him most.

I shall miss his constant dependability; I shall miss his wise advice and expert counsel, particularly in the area of banking and economics; I shall miss the good common sense that is inherent in his intellectual attainments; I shall miss the experience that is irreplaceable in this man who has served so long and so faithfully in the Congress, and who previously served his State in the Georgia Legislature.

PAUL BROWN has many attributes which distinguish him from others, but among those that he will pass on as a challenge to whoever succeeds him, is the fact that no Member of Congress has ever been more faithful in his attendance, has ever answered more rollcalls, or has ever placed himself on record, pro and con, more times than PAUL BROWN for the many years he has served in the Congress.

His is a unique record and one in which he, his State, and his district can take great pride.

Much to our regret, PAUL BROWN did not seek to be reelected to the next Congress, but I am confident that the people of his district would have sent him back here as long as he sought reelection.

The Congress will miss PAUL BROWN.

But above all, the Nation will miss the invaluable contributions this able legislator, brilliant lawyer, and devoted American has made in the vital fields of Federal housing and the Federal banking laws.

We can count our blessings and be grateful that we have had the benefit of his skill, his integrity, and his wisdom for the 27 years he has been a Member of the House.

In some ways those words of James Thomson now seem most appropriate when I think of PAUL BROWN:

An elegant, sufficiency, content,
Retirement, rural quiet, friendship, books.

These may be his ambitions in retirement, but if I know PAUL BROWN, he will not be fully content to live in quiet retirement.

He will continue to serve his people and his State, if called upon again, with his counsel and advice. He has always been endowed with the ability to do that which is best for Georgia and that which is best for America.

PAUL BROWN is now, has been, and always will be a true and faithful servant to the people of the United States of America.

He has now richly earned the privilege of enjoying the prestige and dignity that will follow his honorable retirement in the State of his birth.

I know that I speak for every Member of the Congress of the United States when I say:

"PAUL BROWN, we wish you well and a long life. We thank you for your many contributions to the greatness of America."

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues here today in everything they have said or will say about the loss of our retiring friend from Georgia, and I hope and pray that when he goes back to those good old red hills that he will have many years to enjoy a well-earned and a deserved rest. I think that PAUL BROWN has made himself an outstanding statesman here. I know as a Member of the Congress coming here for the first time I went to him for counsel and advice which he was willing to give, as I am sure he has given every new Member who has come here the benefit of the wisdom he has accumulated over these many years of distinguished service in the House of Representatives and to his native State of Georgia.

I, too, wish him well as he retires and goes back home to the friendly people who have indicated for these many years the affection in which they hold this fine and outstanding public servant.

I think that Georgia is losing one of her great sons in this body. I hope he continues in some manner in which he might give his service to his native State and country because we need in these days the benefit of his calm and sound judgment more than ever before in our history. I shall miss him. I know this Congress has been a better Congress because of the services of PAUL BROWN here in the House of Representatives.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I should like to associate myself with the splendid and deserved compliments that are being paid to our friend, the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. PAUL BROWN, who is serving his last term here in this House. I think I am peculiarly qualified to speak about PAUL BROWN, because I am sure that I have served with him here longer, possibly, than anybody else with the exception, of course, of the dean of the Georgia delegation. PAUL BROWN came to the Congress in a special election just a few months after I did, and he has served his State and his Nation well.

Mr. Speaker, I approach PAUL'S departure from these halls with mixed emotions. I hate to see him go, and yet I recognize that he is entitled to a well-earned retirement from his arduous duties here. To me PAUL BROWN is one of the sweetest characters I have ever known. I like to think of him in the terms of the poet who wrote of the man who lived by the side of the road and was a friend of man. He was easily one of the most popular Members of this House. Everybody who knows him loves him.

I join with the rest of my colleagues here, and I am sure that all of us feel the same way, in wishing for him a well-earned and a long rest from his duties to his country he has served so well here in the Congress of the United States. I hope that he will have the pleasure of enjoying the benefit and association of his family and his friends back home that he has been so long denied.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PILCHER].

Mr. PILCHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay sincere respects to my good friend and colleague, Congressman PAUL BROWN, of Georgia. While I was not surprised to learn of his intention to retire from the Congress at the end of the present term, I must admit that the shock of realization that he would not return has left a lasting imprint upon my consciousness in that he will no longer be among us to offer his wise counsel.

The reason I was not surprised at his announcement is that I am fully aware that after serving his country so well for 28 years, and having reached the age of four score, he is justly entitled to the fruits of his decision. Yes; he is more than entitled to the pleasure of returning home to live out the balance of his allotted years among those whom he loves so much, his family, his friends, and his neighbors.

Congressman BROWN is a quiet, unassuming man who spends a great deal of his time seeking ways that he could be helpful. He loves people, and he has innumerable friends. To him friendship is something to be cherished, and there is not anything he would would not do to aid a friend. He is a personal friend of mine whom I shall never forget. He has been unusually kind to me, and I do not hesitate saying that I have considered him my leader. He has been an inspiration to me, and I am sure to many of you, as well. He is indeed a man for whom we all have great affection and respect.

PAUL BROWN is indeed a man of unsurpassed humility. Humility for his fellow man, humility for the many hours which have been heaped upon him for courageous and untiring service to his Nation, his State, and to the world. He is endowed with a courageous boldness as strong as democracy itself. It is a boldness of everlasting quality borne only by a chosen few—chosen by destiny to provide those qualities of leadership for mankind in a free nation's hour of trouble and despair for survival.

Our colleague, PAUL BROWN, honored as he already has been by his congressional colleagues, his party, his constituents, and by many other groups, stands as a symbol of excellence. In

the comments of all those who have praised him, there is singular agreement concerning the high quality of his service to Nation, State, and constituents. In his long career in public life he has come to personify the ideal public servant. His record of achievement based on principle, the vigor with which he has fought for all things in which he believes, the courtesy and grace with which he has listened to all who have sought his ear—these have lifted him, stanch partisan though he has been, so far above the level of partisan politics that he has been hailed widely as a true servant of their needs.

It is therefore most fitting that this body should honor our esteemed colleague, PAUL BROWN, here today. I, for one, am delighted and proud to have the opportunity to join with his many other friends for that purpose.

His high principles, his dedication to the ideal of service, his sound judgment, his interest in people—these and other fine qualities to be found in his record, his character, and his personality—make him a perfect model for all who seek the type leadership which will see America safely through the turbulence in the future history of our beloved Nation.

I know that all of his friends at home will be glad to have him back. I know that they can say with pride and conviction—"Welcome home, PAUL, you have indeed well kept your appointment with destiny."

As our friend PAUL BROWN moves forward to continue his rendezvous with destiny, I know that each and every Member of this body joins with me in wishing for him a safe journey and Godspeed.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague from Georgia [Mr. FLYNT].

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in the House of Representatives to pay my tribute and respects to one of the greatest men, one of the finest men, one of the greatest Americans, one of the ablest Members with whom I have had the privilege of serving in the House of Representatives, my beloved friend, PAUL BROWN, of Elberton, Ga., who for so many years has with distinction and ability represented the 10th District of his native State, our State of Georgia.

PAUL BROWN is genuinely loved, admired, and respected by all of us who have been privileged to know him and to call him friend, especially those of us who have also been privileged to call him our colleague, as a Member of this body.

I, too, was disappointed beyond expression when I learned of Mr. PAUL'S decision to retire at the end of this session to private life, to a retirement which he has earned. If any man ever deserved the right to go home among his neighbors and his friends and live out his life in well-earned retirement, among his home people who know him and love him, it is PAUL BROWN.

Mr. BROWN has been here during practically all of the Roosevelt, Truman, and Eisenhower administration. He today serves as the ranking majority member on the important Committee on Banking and Currency. He has played an important part throughout his service in this body in writing and rewriting the legislation which has had such a dynamic impact on the economy and the economic life of the United States of America. He has ably fulfilled this role. He has played one of the dominant parts of Members of the Congress of the United States in writing legislation designed to vitalize and strengthen the American economy.

When PAUL BROWN first came to the Congress of the United States he left one of the most widespread and one of the best general law practices in the northeastern area of our State. PAUL BROWN maintained for many years an office for the general practice of law in Elbert County. Prior to that time he had maintained an office in the adjoining county of Oglethorpe. Even though those were the two places his offices were located, he played an important part in the practice of law and jurisprudence in every county of the northern judicial circuit of our State. He also played an important role in the science of law and jurisprudence throughout the entire northeastern area of our State, and, indeed, of our State as a whole.

He was a lawyer respected and admired by the judges before whom he practiced and by the lawyers with whom he practiced. His word was good in a court of law as it was wherever PAUL BROWN went. It was indeed a bond taken at full faith and credit without any reservation of any kind by the presiding judge of the court in which he was participating, by his fellow attorneys, by juries trying cases in which he was on one side or the other, and, indeed, by all those he encountered anywhere.

As a family man PAUL BROWN has been a devoted husband and a devoted father. He married the sister of two close friends of mine, one of whom is my neighbor in my hometown. Mrs. Brown is the former Frances Lewis Arnold, a member of a distinguished family of our State. This union was blessed by two children, Robert Thomas Brown and Mrs. Charles Nathan DuVal. Robert Thomas Brown, as an officer in the United States Navy in World War II, made the supreme sacrifice in behalf of his country and of those principles in which we all believe.

PAUL BROWN as a citizen has truly made his community, his country, the United States, and the State of which he is a part, a better place in which to live. The impact of his life is today and shall remain throughout the lifetime and memory of any person now alive as having been good in every place he has ever been and has ever served. I honestly and sincerely believe that this body of which we are Members is a better place because of the service of PAUL BROWN, of Georgia.

When I first came to this House in November of 1954 my first official contact as a Member of this body was with this beloved friend of mine. He is a man whose friendship is something that I inherited from my own father. PAUL BROWN and my father served together in the general assembly of Georgia many years ago. I remember when PAUL BROWN was the successful candidate for Congress in 1933, at which time I was a student at the University of Georgia, which is located now as it was then in the 10th district he has represented so ably and so well. I remember as distinctly as if it were yesterday hearing my father make the statement that he wished he lived in the 10th Congressional District so that he could vote for this fine Georgian, this fine American, this fine man.

When I came to the Congress PAUL BROWN gave me the advice and counsel that I wish every new Member of this House could have. It is my hope that I may sometime be able to inspire and to help and to advise and counsel incoming Members as PAUL BROWN did those things for me and, indeed, with every other Member of the Georgia delegation who has come to Congress since PAUL BROWN has been here. We regret that after this session he will not continue to be our colleague in this body.

I am sure he knows, without any of us saying it, that not a day shall go by but what we shall think of him and wish that he were back here in our midst as our colleague and our friend. There have been few sessions of this body that PAUL BROWN has not attended. I expect he has been here more continuously and has been more diligent and prompt in his attendance than any Member with whom he has ever served. During his service in Congress not a single rollcall has ever taken place in the House of Representatives but that PAUL BROWN answered. He has been here. He has given of his time and his energies, his talents and his presence to lend to this House the dignity which it deserves. I wish that that, too, could be an inspiration to all of us to serve as he has served, with diligence, with ability, and with promptness and regularity.

I expect that one thing in which he has had, perhaps, as great and as intense interest as anything connected with his congressional service has been the development of the Savannah River which divides his district and his State from the States and districts of the State of South Carolina. He played a dominant role in obtaining the first authorization and appropriations, and later saw through to completion, the great Clark Hill Dam and Reservoir which means so much to our entire southeastern region. The Hartwell Dam which today impounds a reservoir which, I hope, some day will bear his name, is rapidly nearing completion.

The work that PAUL BROWN has done in developing the natural resources of this Nation as well as the natural resources of our State and our region stands as an everlasting monument to those things in which he believes. He has contributed in every phase of his life, in his public life and in his private life, to the progress of that work. In his public service as a Member of this body, he has contributed that which he thought best for the welfare, security, and development and preservation of our American way of life. He is a man whose place will be difficult to fill. He has made a place in the hearts and minds

of all of us who have come to know him, a place which never can be filled, but which shall be forever reserved for him in the hearts and minds of all of us who know him and love him.

So we say to you, Mr. PAUL, as you voluntarily retire from your service in the House of Representatives to go back to your beloved home in Elberton, in Elbert County, Ga., please know that you carry with you our admiration and respect and our love. May God bless you and your family.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Georgia yielding to me permitting me to join with our colleagues in the Congress and the Georgia delegation in paying a tribute to my good and close friend, PAUL BROWN.

The tribute that is so well deserved comes because of the great service PAUL BROWN has rendered to his country. It has been my privilege to have known PAUL BROWN for the past 22 years, and to work with him in the Halls of Congress. While we have not been of the same party affiliation politically, we have quite often voted together. We have thought alike on many of the great issues of the day. For many years we lived in the same apartment building. I had the privilege, as did my good wife, of knowing PAUL BROWN and all of his family. I know he has made many sacrifices for the benefit of his country. He gave to this Nation his only son, a lad who was designated by nature and ability to become a great man in his own light, but he gave up his life in behalf of his country in World War II out in the Pacific. I sat with PAUL BROWN during those tragic hours. I know something of the suffering, and sacrifice that he made, yet he carried on despite the heart that was broken. He served his country well here after that sad event occurred.

I know his daughter. I know many of the distant members of his family well. I am rather proud of the fact that I bear the same name as the gentleman from Georgia, because he has given luster to our family name.

I join with all of you in wishing for him and his family many happy and healthful years ahead.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, for more than 25 years I have cherished the friendship of our beloved colleague, PAUL BROWN, of Georgia. Through the years I have known him and his lovely wife and children. My family and I lived in the same hotel with Paul Brown and the members of his family and we knew each other intimately and well.

PAUL BROWN is a magnificent man. He has by his life and labor and great devotion to duty endeared himself to his colleagues and to his countrymen. He is a devoted public servant and his life has been a benediction and a blessing to the people of the district he has so well and so faithfully served for so long. During the long time that I have served in this House I have not known any Member who has applied himself more diligently to the performance of the duties of the high office he has held than our dear friend, PAUL BROWN. He is a great and a good man and wherever he has gone he has made a broad thoroughfare for friendship. He has at all times been interested in the welfare and the happiness of the people of his great congressional district. His achievements here in Congress are too many to enumerate. His great work here will be remembered through the years to come. He has proven himself worthy of the confidence and love of the people of his district, State, and Nation. His record here will remain as a monument to his greatness and because of his manifold achievements, his gracious and kindly manner, he shall be long remembered. He has a right to enjoy his achievements and to be proud of his grand record as a public servant.

Mr. Speaker, I am prompted by the impulse of sincere friendship and love and admiration for PAUL BROWN, when I say that I am glad that I have known him and have been associated with him. He is a statesman in the true sense of that word. By the nobility of his soul and the simplicity of his life, I shall always remember him. While I regret that he is retiring from Congress, I am happy in the glad thought that he is taking kindly the counsel of the years and is graciously surrendering the great burdens he has borne so well. He has nurtured the strength of spirit and shall never be fatigued by fears that are born of loneliness. He has gone placidly amid the noise and the haste of the modern world in which he has lived, but he has at all times remembered that there is peace in silence. He has never been loud and aggressive nor in any way offensive, but at all times has been one of God's noblemen and a gentleman.

I extend to my colleague my cordial good wishes for his personal welfare and happiness, and I hope that when he returns home to his loved ones and friends he will take a new lease on life and live abundantly for many long years to come.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I think that Congressman PAUL BROWN, of Georgia, was perhaps the first Member of Congress, outside of my own delegation whom I met when I came to the House of Representatives many years ago. Naturally I was distressed to learn that in the course of his active career he had reached the time when he wanted to retire.

I can well understand, as I pass through the State of Georgia on my way home at the end of each and every session of Congress, the lure and attraction that naturally is his in wanting to return to his native environments in Georgia and to share some of the pleasures that naturally attend living in that great State.

Since I met PAUL BROWN I have seen him on every occasion here as he sat on this floor, and I have had an opportunity to talk to him at length about various problems that have come before the Congress from time to time. I was here on the floor, Mr. Speaker, when, as the gentleman who just preceded me, has well said, he received the news of the loss of his son in submarine service in World War II. I remember the uncertainty that was ours for many days as to the fate of that boy who had served his Nation in a time of great crisis. I know PAUL has given unstintingly of his time and talent and years, and his son in the service of this Nation.

PAUL is realistic. He is a perfect gentleman at the same time. In my opinion he represents better than anyone I know the old South that you and I love. He has been faithful in attendance on the floor. He is capable. At the same time he has always been modest. He is quiet, but at the same time he has always been determined. He is relaxed in his composure but is brilliant in his thinking. He is a man capable of vision, but at the same time is coolly practical. He has his feet on the ground. He knows the needs of the Nation as well as the needs of his own State. He has given so well of his own life and his own ability. We are going to lose here in the House of Representatives a most capable, a most loyal, and a most patriotic leader, but as he goes back to Georgia, Georgia will regain what we have lost.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join in the general tribute to PAUL BROWN.

Mr. Speaker, Congressman PAUL BROWN deserves the praise of every American for his outstanding service here in Congress. His career has been characterized by vision, courage, and perseverance. He is typical of all of the best of our beloved Old South, while at the same time embodying a forward-looking progressive attitude for the strengthening and betterment of our Nation. The Congressional Quarterly recently pointed out that he has the best voting record among all the Members of Congress, having been in constant attendance for many years. In a body of fine American statesmen, such as the House of Representatives, it is rare that any man can achieve superlative attainment. He has achieved this not only in his perfect attendance record, but also in measures of importance to our country, not only in this day, but in generations to come. His legislative attainments are indeed outstanding. We all regret to see him go from among us and we all wish him every happiness in his retirement. This unanimous feeling of good will toward him has been earned by him. In my own case as well as that of many others, I owe him a deep sense of gratitude because of his kindly counsel on many occasions. Certainly my life has

been greatly enriched by the friendship between us, a blessing to me for which I will always be deeply grateful.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER].

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay respect to one of the retiring Members of the Congress, the Honorable PAUL BROWN, of Georgia.

I will always consider it a great privilege to have served with Congressman BROWN. His many years of work in Congress have been outstanding and his dedication to his country, his State and his district is unexcelled.

The many friends of PAUL BROWN will miss his quiet and unassuming, but firm manner in which he participates in the conduct of the House so efficiently and effectively. He has shown to have a keen knowledge of legislation, and he has demonstrated great influence on the floor of the House in handling legislation that has been assigned to him by the committees on which he has served. His important work on the Banking and Currency Committee has profoundly affected the monetary system of the country, and his retirement from this committee and the Congress will be a tremendous loss to the entire Nation.

I hope this great servant of the people will have many pleasurable years of retirement. My thoughts and best wishes will be with him always.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. HIESTAND].

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, I am very, very happy to join in this testimonial to a real statesman, the Honorable PAUL BROWN, of Georgia. Serving with him on the Banking and Currency Committee ever since coming to Congress, I have come to respect him and to respect his judgment, which I have requested many times on many complicated subjects in that committee. Invariably I have had fine, unprejudiced, nonpartisan advice, advice calculated for the best interests of our country rather than any partisan advantage. I, being the ranking Republican member of the subcommittee of which he was chairman, had occasion to discuss these matters many times. Always I got sound advice, based upon real knowledge of the complicated problems. I am quite positive I speak for the entire Republican delegation on the Banking and Currency Committee in respect and affection for the Honorable PAUL BROWN. We hate to lose him. He is a gentleman and a real statesman.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, unhappy as I am to note the prospective retirement of the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN], I am happy that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS] has yielded this time to me so I can express my "Amen" to all that has been said about PAUL BROWN.

He was among the first new friends I made when I came to Congress in 1947, and I am happy to say that that friendship has not only endured through these years, but has been strengthened. I have heard him referred to as a southern gentleman; he is all of that, a southern gentleman beloved, admired, and respected by all of us, no matter what part of the country we may come from. He is a very able lawyer and a most distinguished public servant. He has not only served his city, and his district, and his State, but the entire Nation.

We have had many difficult problems presented in our committee. PAUL BROWN always looked upon each problem not from the viewpoint of what was best for his district or his State, but from the viewpoint of what he conscientiously believed the country required. Always he considered what was in the best interest of the country.

Oh, yes, we have occasionally had disagreements on some things; that is only natural. The important thing about those disagreements is that he was always agreeable, he always respected the opinion that differed with his own, and it is because of that trait in his character that he will be so sorely missed. I am honored to be able to call him my friend and my mentor. I learned much from him, not only about how to legislate but about how to get along with my fellow man.

On behalf of those of our members of our committee who cannot be present at the moment, I want to express their wishes as well as my own that the Lord may spare him for many a day so he may enjoy with his family the fruits of his well-earned retirement. His absence from here will be felt by all in this body, for he is, indeed, beloved by all who have had the privilege to know him. PAUL BROWN, good luck and God bless you.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, it has been my pleasure to have my office in the same corridor with our good friend PAUL BROWN for the past 20 years. I have learned to know the heartbeats of that great American. I visit with him many times on important matters and his counsel has always been good.

There is one attribute of PAUL BROWN that has not been mentioned here today, as I recall. Until PAUL had a siege of sickness a couple of years ago he had not missed one single quorum call nor vote up until that time. That is without doubt the best attendance record that any Member of the Congress has ever had for so long a time.

PAUL BROWN has been diligent in his work. He has been on the job, the job to which he was elected 14 times, 28 years by his good people, so we say well done good and faithful servant. PAUL is honest in all his dealings, he is upright, he is a great patriotic American gentleman of the highest order, and one of God's noblemen. While I rejoice in his retirement because I am sure that he will enjoy many, many happy years of retirement, I regret to see a man of his stature leave the Halls of Congress. His kind are needed badly during these trying times. But, nonetheless, PAUL has served his country well and he leaves here with the blessing of every Member that has ever served with him. I join in all the wonderful things which have been said about PAUL BROWN today and, PAUL, come back and see us whenever you have time. We will welcome you with open arms.

Mr. MUMMA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MUMMA. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to pay my respects to PAUL BROWN and to say that I am very, very sorry to hear that he is leaving the Congress.

It was my privilege to serve with him on the Committee on Banking and Currency for several terms, and even though I did not ask his advice on each and every proposition that came before that committee, I was always interested to find out how PAUL BROWN stood and I would govern my vote accordingly, because he was a solid American.

I am certainly sorry that PAUL is leaving us.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, it is a high privilege to participate in the tribute to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN]. When one has served several years in this great body with a constant and abiding friend, the bonds of love and affection, respect and appreciation are deep, strong and sacred.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN], was a veteran member when I came here in January 1951. He ranked with the great when I was first privileged to know him. I was an apprentice. For him, I could do nothing. For me, it was my rare fortune to have his friendship, confidence, counsel, and assistance. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN], knows what real friendship is and how it should be exercised. To have had his friendship, as I have, was and is one of the finest experiences I have had in life.

When I came here I recognized him almost immediately as one of the most influential and outstanding members. His ability and devotion to his work was appreciated by his colleagues, but the confidence every Member placed in his word was perhaps the crowning attribute of this man.

Nature is a respecter of persons. It boldly and flagrantly discriminates in the kind and quality of men and women it produces. In form, features, bearing, thought and deportment, PAUL BROWN is and was born a gentleman. He is eminently practical and he always means business. I have observed him for 10 years and I have never known him to fall below the standard of great. His common sense is so dominant that he could not shake it off or take leave of it if he tried. However, there is not the least probability that he ever tried or wanted to do so.

He has steadfastly regarded life as a scene for doing good and a period for constructive work. He steadfastly regards work as an agency for serving his fellow man. With him there can be no regret for wasted power of misspent time.

The only time during his 28 years of service that he missed a rollcall was when he was almost forcibly taken from his post of duty on the floor to the hospital for treatment of pneumonia. He felt that if he missed a vote, he would disfranchise about 350,000 constituents on that issue, so, he did not miss.

It can probably be said that Congressman PAUL BROWN paired more absent Congressmen than any single Member in history. Every Congressman intending to be absent knew that Congressman PAUL BROWN would be present and would see that he was paired, if requested. The great majority of Congressmen requesting him to pair them usually added that he pair them on the side he voted.

His private and professional career was long and without wrinkle or blemish. For some years he was a ripe and learned lawyer, always laborious and thorough in the preparation and presentation of his cases. The counties in his own and adjoining circuits in which he practiced boasted of many and brilliant lawyers who left their mark upon their own and future times. It was no small achievement to win an honored name at such an illustrious bar. But he did this and more, for he is to this day recognized as one of the best lawyers that ever appeared in those courts.

In 1933 he came to Congress, and during these 28 years of outstanding service he has earned a place among the foremost statesmen of his time. On this exalted stage, Mr. Speaker, sit those colossal giants of the yesterdays furnished by the remarkable district he has been privileged to serve. Reading the rolls of the past—Alexander Stephens, Robert Toombs, Howell Cobb—eloquently illustrates the statesmanship of that section. It is great to know that the name of our friend and colleague ranks equally with those patriots of old in the affections of the 10th District of Georgia.

After 28 years fraught with honor and service, he has decided that he wants to go home. No one made this decision for him, for he makes his decisions himself. The little city of Elberton, Ga., has missed him, his fine wife, his splendid daughter, and they are eagerly awaiting the privilege of welcoming them home as good and faithful servants.

Mr. Speaker, he leaves to this membership, to his native State, the district, county, and city he calls home, to the family he so genuinely reveres, and to posterity, a record of faithful service that cannot be surpassed, simply because you cannot surpass perfection.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN].

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, it has been a privilege and a pleasure to serve in this body with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN]. Certainly, this body is a better place in which to serve for PAUL BROWN's having served in it, and this country is a better place to live for PAUL BROWN's having lived in it. He has been an inspiration to many of us here, and certainly we are going to miss him.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to join my colleagues in wishing for our distinguished friend and colleague, PAUL BROWN, many happy years in retirement.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON].

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in paying tribute to our colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN]. This House can ill afford to lose such a fine man as this great American statesman is.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. TUCK].

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Georgia yielding to me on this occasion. I did not know in advance of the program he had arranged; I just happened to walk into the Chamber, and heard what was going on. I cannot allow this occasion to pass without joining my colleagues in expressing my high admiration for our esteemed colleague, the gentleman from Georgia, the Honorable PAUL BROWN.

When I came to the Congress nearly 8 years ago he was one of the first here who met me, who greeted me, and who welcomed me to this Chamber. I have formed a very strong and abiding friendship for him which will last throughout the remaining years of my life.

I watched him with a great deal of interest and admiration as he went about the discharge of the duties devolving upon him as a Member of the House of Representatives. I can say that in my judgment his services have been of such a character and the manner in which he approached them, as to gain the plaudits of all right-thinking Americans. His service has been of such a character as to enhance the already high standing of this honorable body.

As he lays down the burdens of the duties of a Member of Congress and goes back to his home in Georgia, amid the picturesque scenery, the quietude and the serenity of that great State and that section from which he comes, I want him and the members of his family and others who appreciate him and who think of him as I do, to know that he goes back there with my unbounded admiration and my warm personal affection.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues from the State of Georgia in expressing my regrets over the fact that my good friend, Congressman PAUL BROWN of the great State of Georgia, has decided to retire.

I have leaned heavily on Congressman Brown for advice and leadership since the first day I came to serve in the 76th Congress. I do not know of any man that is more unanimously respected by every Member of Congress than PAUL BROWN. We shall all greatly miss his friendship and his sound judgment on all legislation that is reported to the House of Representatives for consideration. I believe that he has the best voting record of any man that has ever served in the House of Representatives as I understand that he has not missed more than one or two votes in the 28 years that he has served as a Member of this body.

I shall always consider it one of the outstanding privileges that I have had since I have been a Member of Congress to have the opportunity of serving in the House of Representatives with PAUL BROWN. His record in this body will go down in history as one of our greatest statesmen.

Again I want to thank the Speaker for giving me an opportunity to say a few words concerning my personal and political friend, PAUL BROWN, and wish for him and his wonderful family all the happiness possible during his years of retirement.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the voluntary retirement of PAUL BROWN has saddened all in the Illinois delegation. The dean of our delegation, TOM O'BRIEN, is in the Chamber listening to the tributes to a beloved friend, and so deep is the emotion attending the approaching end of the intimate associations of a long and precious friendship that has lasted for more than a quarter of a century that he has requested me to ask unanimous consent that his remarks be extended at that point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, when I came here as a freshman, TOM O'BRIEN introduced me to PAUL BROWN. Through TOM O'BRIEN I had been assigned to the Banking and Currency Committee because of the interest and concern of my constituents in housing. PAUL BROWN gave me every help that one with towering ability and long experience could give in the guidance of a novice. I can never forget the friendly counsel, the understanding help PAUL BROWN gave me at every turn, every moment, and every hour of my freshman term here. I have never known a finer character. My feeling for PAUL BROWN is one of deep affection, a feeling shared by all the members of our Illinois delegation. He has been a human bridge of understanding between the representatives of two sections of our great country, all sincerely seeking, according to their respective outlooks, what would prove best for our country. Intensely loyal and devoted to his own Georgia, he was understanding of our problems in the urban North and accorded us the same respect for sincerity that we accorded to him. He helped whenever he could.

PAUL BROWN, as a Member of this body, has set a pattern for diligence in attention to public duty that never has been surpassed. I doubt if ever, in the long history of Congress, has there been a record of unbroken response to all rollcalls, including quorum calls, and unbroken attendance at committee meetings to compare with that of PAUL BROWN. He is a great American by any measure of quality in character and quality in ability and in dedication. The Congress is the better for PAUL BROWN's being here and we are vastly richer because of our

associations with him. Illinois is joined with Georgia in a deep feeling of loss.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, 27 years ago this summer the friendship of PAUL BROWN and TOM O'BRIEN began when we clasped hands as newcomers to the House. I had been elected in 1932 to the 73d Congress, PAUL, to fill a vacancy at a special election in July of 1933. My friendship with PAUL BROWN is one of the richest rewards that have come to me in my associations in this body. He never broke his word. There was never a time when he did not give a helping hand when that was possible. I will say to PAUL BROWN that in TOM O'BRIEN'S book his marking is 100 percent. He was loyal and devoted to his native State of Georgia, true to its traditions and its causes, yet understanding of the problems of the urban North. The Illinois delegation held him in the same respect and affection as did the delegation of his own State of Georgia. It is with deep emotion that I shall say goodbye, and with the prayer that God's choicest blessings every hour in his retirement will be with my beloved friend, PAUL BROWN.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I was not aware that this program was scheduled for this afternoon. Had I been, the best I might have done would be to put in perhaps more apt words my opinions of PAUL BROWN, but I certainly could not have improved upon the depth or the sincerity of the expressions that I make now, nor upon those that have been made by his colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, it has been said that those who retire from Congress, those who quit voluntarily, are those we can ill afford to give up.

That is my belief here today.

PAUL BROWN was a Member of Congress when I was first elected. At that time he was an experienced lawyer and experienced banker, and able Congressman. But even then he took time to confer with and counsel younger Members who came here. He has been a source of strength to all of us with whom he has served. Respected, by all, he is intelligent, industrious, with a sense of balance that has made everyone who knows him appreciate him not only for what he is in his own right but for his service to others.

I recall the very practical work we did here during the war years when it was extremely difficult to keep a sense of balance on legislation. Hardly a bill came before this Congress of any importance that there was not a Brown amendment. We know that on some occasions Members have just simply wanted to get into matters as they came before them. I assure the membership that that was not the case with PAUL BROWN.

I mean by that that the major legislation we passed through this body usually was improved, and if his amendments were adopted they were improved, by the so-called Brown amendments.

PAUL, we hate to see you go. We wish for you and your fine family the very best of everything. But as you go, you may be sure that you will have left your imprint on every man in this Congress who has known you, and on this country of which we are all so proud. We hate to give you up, but we can all say that we have profited by having known you here. We hope we will have the pleasure of your visits for many years to come.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RILEY].

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Georgia's yielding to me to express my appreciation of PAUL BROWN and to pay tribute to him for the outstanding services he has rendered to his State and his Nation in this great body.

When I first entered Congress in January 1945 I had the privilege of serving on the great Banking and Currency Committee of the House, on which committee Congressman BROWN was the second ranking member.

PAUL BROWN was more than kind to me. He advised me on many of the matters which came before our committee and oriented me in the background of the legislation which was being considered.

He was thoroughly conversant with the matters which came before that great committee. At that time they were handling almost two-thirds of all the legislation which was being considered. He looked at matters coming before the committee from a very broad viewpoint, considering first whether or not it would benefit our great Nation. I felt as though I were sitting at the feet of a great teacher, and because of his kindness to me and the practical manner in which he approached all problems, he and I have become fast friends.

No one regrets more than I, PAUL BROWN'S decision to retire voluntarily from the Congress. He could have remained in this body as long as he wished, because the people of his district realized what a tremendous asset they had in him as their Representative.

Some years ago Mrs. Riley and I drove from our home in central South Carolina to Elberton, Ga., to join with other friends of PAUL BROWN, including the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to pay tribute to PAUL BROWN at his own home.

Thousands of his friends and neighbors throughout a number of States joined in expressing to PAUL BROWN the high esteem in which he was held both as an individual and as a Representative of the people of Georgia.

PAUL BROWN has been the moving spirit in the development of the Savannah River at Clark's Hill which was completed some years ago and at Hartwell which is under construction at this time; also, in the development of navigation from the Atlantic Ocean up the Savannah River to Augusta and points in South Carolina opposite Augusta.

I have been privileged to work with him on these projects, but he was the initiator and the leader.

PAUL was devoted to his work and has an outstanding record both as to quorum calls and voting which, to my knowledge, has not been surpassed. His votes have been for constructive legislation. I have not known of a single vote that he has cast which was not in the best interest of the United States.

The House of Representatives is losing an outstanding Member in the retirement of PAUL BROWN. He has served for 28 years in the House and his influence has been one of the factors during all of this time in bringing about constructive legislation.

I regret along with the majority of the other Members to see him leave Congress. However, since he wishes to enjoy some years with his family in the beautiful rolling country of Georgia where he lives I accede to his wishes and bespeak for him and his lovely family, peace, contentment, and happiness which he so richly deserves.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS].

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, one of the first men I met when I came to Congress in 1944 was PAUL BROWN. I liked him from the start, and through the years he has been a wonderful friend and a great adviser. It is refreshing to see a man reach the age he has and retire voluntarily from public service, knowing that he is leaving a wonderful record such as has been made by PAUL BROWN.

He possesses what I consider to be the essential qualifications for a good public servant: First and foremost, he is ruggedly honest; second, he is able; and third, he is courageous. PAUL BROWN has made a great record in this Congress.

Those of us who have had the pleasure of knowing him intimately wish for him many years of happiness. Above all, Mr. Speaker, PAUL BROWN is a sincere man. That makes it doubly fortunate for me to have had the privilege of enjoying his friendship. He has been a sincere and devoted friend, and a wonderful public official.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE].

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that irrespective of political affiliations the Congress has learned with profound regret of the retirement of PAUL BROWN, of Georgia.

His retirement will be a great loss to the Banking and Currency Committee on which he has served so long and so conscientiously. PAUL BROWN and I have been members of that committee for almost 28 years. We have differed on many legislative matters, but I have always had the profoundest respect for him. The respect and the confidence of his colleagues has grown as time has gone on.

He is a man of courage, honesty, and character. His faithful service to his people, his genial disposition, the sincerity of his friendship, and his kindness endeared him to all who knew him. His district, his State, and the Nation have sustained a great loss through his retirement. I am confident that he could have been reelected if he desired and I am sure his constituents regret his decision not to offer again. Pleasant associations with him, his sound judgment,

and honest decisions will be greatly missed by his colleagues.

The people of his district will not be unmindful of his long and faithful service and will affectionately welcome him to his home. We all hope he and his family may have many years of peace and happiness among his friends who have honored him so long.

PAUL BROWN was true to every duty, to every obligation. He was true to himself.

To thine own self be true,
And it must follow, as the night the day,
Thou canst not then be false to any man.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALTER). The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia may be permitted to continue for another 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to PAUL BROWN. I shall not speak of his distinguished official service in this body. I have a very deep personal affection for PAUL BROWN. For years we lived in the same apartment house. During World War II, when gasoline was rationed to civilians, we had a riding arrangement back and forth from our apartment house to the Capitol.

PAUL BROWN has borne all his responsibilities with dignity and honor. Included in those things which he has borne was the loss of his son, a noble young man in the submarine service in World War II. Yes, PAUL BROWN has been of service to our Nation in many, many ways. He deserves the tributes which are being paid him today. There are many here and elsewhere who love him for his humble spirit and great heart.

So it is with a very deep feeling of affection that I rise to salute him and wish him and family good health and happiness.

Another thing that comes to mind is this: PAUL BROWN is always in attendance at the sessions of the House of Representatives. He listens to the speeches that are made. He makes it easier for the Members to express their views because he lends a sympathetic ear; not only does he lend a sympathetic ear, he gives a word of encouragement. I rejoice in the feeling that PAUL BROWN considers me his devoted friend. He will not be back in the House next year, but he will be remembered here by all those who served with him.

PAUL, may God bless you and your family.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ROBERTS].

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the distinguished gentleman from Georgia for yielding to me at this point.

I certainly would not try to compete with the many sincere expressions of friendship or tributes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] for his qualities of leadership and statesmanship, but I would feel that I had passed an opportunity to pay a debt if I did not say how much I personally owe him.

When I first came to Congress I was fortunate enough to become his friend, and I have leaned on him heavily many, many times in trying to make a decision about some of the issues that came before this great deliberative body. I have always found that when I voted along the same lines as PAUL BROWN I had no reason to doubt the wisdom of the choice.

There have been many times, indeed, when I have looked to this wise and astute Member of this body for leadership on a host of matters. The deep admiration I hold for PAUL BROWN transcends the normal sectional kindredship which of course we share, and it goes beyond even the bonds of fraternal brotherhood which PAUL BROWN and I happen to share in the Alpha Tau Omega fraternity. I feel a real kindredship of spirit and philosophy with the outstanding gentleman from Georgia. His departure from this body will give me a personal sense of loss.

I have always found that he had a sense of balance and stability about him that he imparts to this body, which will be missed when he goes back to the fine people of Georgia.

I wish for him and his family all the happiness and all the pleasures that a well-earned retirement can bring to them.

I hate to see you go, Brother PAUL BROWN.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN].

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to tell my friend PAUL BROWN goodby because we will be seeing much of each other in the years to come. We are going to dedicate the completion of the great Hartwell Dam, of which he is the father. Some day it will be named Paul Brown Dam. Mr. BROWN'S district and mine have a common boundary for more than 100 miles. Mr. Speaker, as a young man I have benefited greatly from the wisdom, counsel, experience, and patriotism of this great American. Of course, the Nation will miss his services here in the Congress. We will miss being associated with him in our deliberations here on the floor and in committee, but the example he set, his devotion to duty, personality and punctuality, his spirit and enthusiasm, will continue in the lives and endeavors of the rest of us. PAUL BROWN is not only the closest Congressman to me geographically, but he has been one of the very closest of friends and the wisest of counselors. I have been and will be a better Representative having known and associated with this great Georgian. PAUL BROWN has exemplified and upheld the ideals and principles of the Founding Fathers. He has held high the traditions and heritages of the great State of Georgia.

The people of South Carolina and my family join me in wishing for PAUL BROWN, Mrs. Brown, and his lovely daughter many, many more happy years together in his lovely home city of Elberton.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. MCDONOUGH].

Mr. MCDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I join with other Members of this House, especially the members of the Committee on Banking and Currency, of which I am a member, in expressing regret at the retirement of PAUL BROWN, and to inform the general public through these proceedings of the type of gentleman that PAUL BROWN is. In my opinion, he stands high above the average Member of this House in his devotion to Americanism, patriotism, dedication to the kind of public service that has made this country great. He has a unique record, I am informed, of never having missed a quorum call or a rollcall in a period of 15 years.

He will be missed here. In my association with him on the Banking and Currency Committee I will miss him because of his sound advice and counsel. I trust he will enjoy years of retirement in happiness.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BETTS].

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to PAUL BROWN at this time. I am proud that he was one of my close personal friends. When I first became a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I found him to be most helpful and friendly to myself as a newcomer. I will always be grateful to him for the friendly and happy assistance he gave me at this time. I consider him one of the great men of this day. I want to extend my best wishes to him as he leaves us, and hope he will return to find the friendship he has always had throughout his service in the House.

Best wishes to you, PAUL.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to insert their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the public service of PAUL BROWN.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, PAUL BROWN, a Member of the House since the 73d Congress, is retiring after 27 years of service. One of his greatest attributes has been his dedication to the duties as a Congressman. Indeed, his unusual fidelity to duty is widely admired. In 1942, one of his colleagues commented before this House that since his first election, some 10 years earlier, he had never missed a rollcall or a committee meeting. He has continued to show this sort of dedication throughout his long career.

A second attribute of PAUL BROWN is that he not only has worked for the best interests of the people of his own district of Georgia, but also has served as a patriot in the best interests of his country. As chairman of the Joint Committee on Defense Production, for several years, he has made a fine record, doing much to help make the defenses of our country strong.

Like many of his colleagues, he sent his only son into service for his country during World War II. Some of us, no doubt, recall that his son, Robert Thomas Brown, a brilliant graduate of the University of Georgia, lost his life while on hazardous submarine duty with the Navy.

A farmer and lawyer most of his life until he became a Congressman, PAUL BROWN was born in Hart County, Ga. After graduation from the Lumpkin Law School, University of Georgia, he practiced law in Georgia and served as a State legislator and county attorney before becoming a Member of this House in 1933.

He is my dear friend and I shall miss him.

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to add to what has been said here today about our distinguished colleague, PAUL BROWN. It has been my privilege to know Mr. BROWN since 1944 when I was in the Army and was on official business in Washington relative to some matters at Fort Oglethorpe, Ga. I first met PAUL BROWN then and it has certainly been a pleasure to have worked with him in many instances.

Later on I came to Washington as administrative assistant to Senator Stewart and at all times then he was always most kind and considerate to me.

On February 1, 1958, when I was elected as a Member of this body he was among the first to congratulate me. He has been most helpful to me as a freshman Member of this body.

I certainly hate to see him relinquish his post of duty here in the House of Representatives.

We all wish him the best of everything in the many years to come.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS] has taken this time to call to the attention of the House the life and works of our good friend, Congressman PAUL BROWN, who has announced his retirement from this body. Those who have preceded me have expressed in an excellent fashion their sentiments of love and affection for our retiring friend, as well as their appreciation for his good works.

I could not let this opportunity pass without expressing to our dear friend and colleague my appreciation for the many evidences of friendship which he has manifested toward me. He has always been available to me when I sought his counsel and advice. On each occasion that I have followed his lead I have found that the course being followed was a wise one. So I will miss his guidance and leadership if I am privileged to return to this body during the ensuing years.

Prior to coming to the House of Representatives some of my very close relatives, who are constituents of Congressman BROWN, had told me of their sentiments of warm friendship for the man and their appreciation of the public service of their Congressman. It was only natural, therefore, that upon arriving in Washington in the 85th Congress that I should immediately seek out this man about whom I had heard so many words of commendation. I can say with complete candor that the evaluation which had been related to me has proven to be correct in every respect and that Mr. BROWN is all that he was pictured to me to be.

So, Mr. Speaker, on this occasion I join with our other colleagues in expressing the hope that as the years roll on that Divine Providence shall continue to look with favor upon the life and works of our splendid colleague, PAUL BROWN, whose retirement constitutes a great loss to me personally and to the Nation which he has served so excellently.

REPRESENTATIVE PAUL BROWN'S RETIREMENT WILL BE A GREAT LOSS TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, we shall all miss PAUL BROWN, and very deeply. Yet, despite our loss, I believe he is to be congratulated on his decision to retire while he is still a relatively young man. He has earned the years of fun and pleasure and the ease from the stress of hard work which I know are ahead of him.

All the Members join me in hoping, I know, that these years will be many and all be happy years.

It has been my good fortune to know PAUL BROWN since he first came to Congress, as a very young man, back in 1933. I have had the privilege of working intimately with him on the Banking Committee and on legislation from other committees in which we were mutually interested. We have not always agreed, of course. They say that the number of disagreements two people have is an index of how closely they live and work together in pursuit of the same objectives.

On such an occasion as this it strikes me as a matter of deep regret that the House of Representatives does not have some more impressive and memorable way of honoring one of its Members for such long years of public service as PAUL BROWN has given. The best we can do is say "Thanks" and wish him good luck, good health, and many years of happiness. This I do from the bottom of my heart.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to say goodbye to our distinguished colleague, the Honorable PAUL BROWN, of Georgia. He personifies the true dignity of man as a gentle, kind southern gentlemen.

I cannot think of any Member of the House whose friendship and personality are more appreciated. He is a person devoid of rancor and bitterness—no one has ever heard him belittle or castigate anyone. His public life has been given to the service of everyone. He has advised and consoled—especially the new Members—whenever the occasion presented itself.

He is truly a great legislator and has done much to placate the troubled situations that result from political disagreements. There is greater love for no man in this Chamber. His deep sagacity and noble manners have quieted the most pugnacious antagonists. A true statesman who lives in the hearts of his colleagues with the fond love and sincere regret for his determination to leave the Congress. This great man with soft spoken words has made his colleagues sad in his departure. We have lost a great leader and a patriotic American—may God reward him and his family with the recovery of his health and the blessings for a distinctive service to his State and his Nation.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with those who are paying tribute to one of the grandest men I have ever known either in public or private life—the Honorable PAUL BROWN, of Georgia. He has been a neighbor on the same corridor since I have been in the House.

His integrity is golden. We will miss him much as Members of the House, and the country will miss his services even more.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, it is with a mixed feeling that we learn of the voluntary retirement of our dear friend and colleague PAUL BROWN, of the great State of Georgia. Mixed in that we are sad and loth to lose his wise counsel, ready smile, warm handshake, and excellent leadership—but happy to know in our hearts that he has so richly deserved a rest from the cares of the office of a Member of the House of Representatives.

PAUL BROWN is a "gentleman's gentleman"—A Chesterfield, if you please. Before illness struck at him he had served his people in this House without missing a single rollcall or a quorum call. When he finally missed one it was because he had a high fever and was forced by the doctors to the hospital. Such loyalty and devotion to duty by him have set a magnificient example to us all. May God bless and preserve him and his family always.

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with my colleagues from Georgia in paying tribute to a great American, who is voluntarily retiring from the House of Representatives at the close of the 86th Congress, the Honorable PAUL BROWN of the 10th District of the great State of Georgia.

My service in the Congress with PAUL BROWN has been one of the happy experiences of my life.

He has been an inspiration to me during the last 4 years. Ever ready to assist new members of the House of Representatives, he has done it in a fashion that impressed his protege with his dedication to the welfare of people of the Nation.

I have sought his counsel and advice on a number of occasions on measures under debate and he has given of his time and intellect in the most gracious fashion. PAUL BROWN is a true Southern gentleman. Never harsh, always courteous.

Mr. Speaker, one of our capable and official reporters of debates in the House, told me of an act of kindness extended him many years ago by PAUL BROWN. Frank E. Battaglia of New York City,

stated that Mr. BROWN, many years ago, recommended him for the position he now holds as one of the official reporters of debates of the House.

The membership of the House will miss this great man. His counsel and advice to the new members have been of inestimable benefit. But after all these years of service to his people, PAUL BROWN is entitled to spend the remainder of his years where he is loved and respected by a great people.

I join with Georgians in wishing for him many more years of happiness, joy, and comfort.

And when his life has come to a close, many, many years hence, may it be his portion to hear from Him who sitteth as the Judge Supreme the welcome words "Well done my good and faithful servant; enter thou into the joys of thy Lord."

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, today, more than ever during my congressional service, I appreciate the fine tradition by which it is the custom of this House to pay tribute in farewell to Members who voluntarily relinquish their seats in this great deliberative body.

My special appreciation lies in the opportunity to express, if I can in mere words, a small part of the deep admiration and respect and affection for my close and dear friend of many years, the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, PAUL BROWN, during these last days of service in the House.

I believe the Members will agree that seldom in a lifetime are we so fortunate to have our paths cross that of a man, such as PAUL BROWN, who exerts such a strong and lasting influence for good on our own lives and principles. No one could help but profit from association with this great and able statesman and legislator. No one could help but find a better life by sharing his friendship, counsel, and guidance.

And so it is with a mingled sense of sadness at his leaving and pride in his illustrious record of service that I speak today of this tried and true friend of so many years. His diligence in the public interest, his unquestioned integrity, and—above all—his gentle, thoughtful, and helpful consideration may be matched but will never be exceeded.

PAUL BROWN has well and ably served the Nation and the people of his district through the most difficult and trying era in the history of America. Chosen by his friends and neighbors in the 10th District of Georgia as their Representative in Congress during the depth of the great depression in 1933, his tireless diligence, great knowledge, and deep insight have contributed immeasurably to bring this country to its position of strength, prosperity, and honor in the free world.

With other Members, I will feel the absence of PAUL BROWN from the Halls of Congress more deeply than I can say. I will always treasure his friendship and the knowledge that I have been privileged to serve with him through the years. His fine example will continue, as always, an inspiration to me in my personal and official life. I wish for him good health and every happiness during his richly deserved retirement with honor from public life.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, our colleague from Georgia, the Honorable PAUL BROWN, has served his constituency and his country long and well. After 14 terms in the House of Representatives, he is retiring from political life and on this occasion I would like to pay tribute to my colleague.

Through the years that I have served with him on the House Banking and Currency Committee, PAUL BROWN has diligently worked in behalf of legislation which he believed to be in the best interests of our country. His faithful attendance and his deep-seated interest in the issues which have been before us have inspired many of us.

Our colleague has a long record of support for those measures which have done so much for farmers and for rural areas of the Nation. I doubt there is one among us who has followed more closely or been more concerned with the activities of the Commodity Credit Corporation or the Soil Conservation Service than the gentleman from Georgia. Likewise he has always been identified with the rural electrification service and with the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, both of which have been of immense value to our citizens. This kind of legislation cannot be identified with any special interests but rather with the general welfare and progress of the American people and that is what PAUL BROWN'S record in Congress has stood for.

Of course the people of Georgia and the Southeast are indebted to him for his tireless efforts in behalf of the Savannah River development. Indeed he will be long remembered for his dedication to the completion of this great project which is of such vital importance to the entire Southeast.

Mr. Speaker, when we come back in January PAUL BROWN will not be with us. We shall miss him in many ways and I join with his many friends in the sincere hope that he and his family will enjoy happiness and contentment back home in Georgia.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. PAUL BROWN, on his retirement from Congress.

PAUL BROWN has served his country well in the performance of his congressional duties and I know of no one who has been as dedicated as he in this regard.

He has been a man of great judgment in his actions on all subjects before the Congress.

While I have not been on his Banking and Currency Committee he always gave me a fair hearing on any subject that I was interested in.

Aside from his congressional duties I will miss him as a personal friend.

Our families enjoyed a friendship brought about by the fact that Rosalyn, his daughter, and my youngest daughter, Peggy, were companions in Western High School in Washington, D.C.

Their companionship led to a friendship that still continues—as a matter of fact we enjoyed having Rosalyn visit us at our home in Pennsylvania on one occasion.

This House can ill afford to lose from its membership such a fine man and American as PAUL BROWN.

My family join me in wishing Mr. BROWN, his wife and daughter many more happy years in his well-earned retirement.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, the loss of our great colleague, Hon. PAUL BROWN, of Georgia, by retirement, from the House of Representatives, is a loss to this Nation, a loss to every part of this Nation. While he carried lofty the banner of Southern belief and tradition, he was forever thinking of his Nation as a whole. He was a statesman, an inspiring patriot of unsurpassed judgment and dedicated.

To know PAUL BROWN is to love him and I have been inspired by his example. He not only never missed a rollcall but he never missed an opportunity to do something for his Nation or for his fellow Congressmen. I have talked to him on many occasions about legislation because I treasured his advice and he not only never led me astray, but was always quick to advise and give an opinion in the light of my interest in my constitutents.

I am going to miss PAUL BROWN. He was not only my friend but my neighbor up the hall and a man whom I admire very much. Many may follow in his footsteps, but none will fill his shoes.

I wish for him not only the good health he desires in retirement, but the pleasant reflection of happy years spent in the highest public service and the finest statesmanship.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues in expressing deep regret that our friend the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] has decided to retire.

Mr. PAUL BROWN was one of the first Members with whom I became acquainted when I came to Congress. He was kind and helpful. We became fast friends.

PAUL BROWN is able, sincere and dependable. He has always been loyal to his people, to the U.S. House of Representatives, and to his political party.

As he leaves the Congress, the gentleman from Georgia can be proud of his accomplishments here. He can be proud of the affectionate regard in which he is held generally. I shall miss his advice and counsel and my association with him very much.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, it is hard to find words which adequately express the stature of a man such as PAUL BROWN, or which convey the full meaning of the appreciation which we, his colleagues, feel for his services in the Congress of the United States. I came here 20 years ago. PAUL BROWN was then already a veteran Member of this body; more importantly he was already a recognized leader in the world's most important legislative forum.

Twenty-eight years is a long time. But for 28 years, PAUL BROWN has been one of the stalwarts of this body. He has been a sound and conscientious student of government. He has been a careful exponent of justice and right for all the people. He has been a leader where leadership counted.

To me one of the really important facets of the great character of this outstanding Georgian is his uniform kindness and courtesy. In this he knows no politics, he is not partisan, he is a friend whose friendship is as enduring as time. Yet he is a man of strong principle and sound belief. He is a man undaunted by pressures, untouched by devious trends, and unafraid to stand by his convictions.

These traits provide a rare combination indeed, one of the finest and best loved men of our time, the Honorable PAUL BROWN, Member of Congress. I am saddened by his departure. I shall miss his wise counsel and warm friendship. Yet I know he has earned many times over the rest which he is now to enjoy. To PAUL and to his ever constant helpmate, Mrs. Brown, and to all his family, I extend my very best wishes for many pleasant and happy years, enriched by the knowledge that his work lives on and his footsteps are followed with pride.

Mrs. BLITCH. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply grateful to have had the privilege of serving with a man who had all the characteristics that PAUL BROWN exemplified here during his 28 years in the Congress. He epitomizes what I believe to be truly a man who loves freedom, who loves liberty, and who carries out in his actions on this floor and in his daily life those things that really make great Americans.

Mr. PAUL has been an inspiration to me from the day I entered Congress, and I am sure he has been an inspiration to everyone who has had the privilege of knowing him. He is a tower of strength and integrity. He is so courageous. He has never deviated from his convictions no matter what the pressures of the times may have dictated. His sincerity and honesty in all he has ever done is an example which will be emulated for years to come.

I particularly have a feeling of personal loss in the retirement of this beloved man. His counsel and advice will be sorely missed by me, as well as by all of the Members of Congress who have come in contact with him.

I hope that Mr. PAUL's retirement does not mean that he will not return on frequent occasions to honor us with his presence and counsel. To know that we could look forward to such intervals would ease the deep hurt in our hearts when he goes into retirement, which retirement, incidentally, he has more than earned and deeply deserves. I wish for him many years with his family and his neighbors back home who have shown their love and respect by keeping him in Congress for so long.

His district, his State, and his country have been enchanced by his presence in the Congress. It is impossible to measure the services this great American has rendered for his fellow countrymen. His Christian character and nobility of spirit I shall cherish for the rest of my life.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, it was with keen disappointment and regret that I learned of the intention of our beloved and esteemed colleague, the Honorable PAUL BROWN, to retire after the close of this session of Congress.

It is needless for me to say that his warm friendship, his advice and counsel and his wisdom and judgment after his 27 years of dedicated service to his Nation, his State, and district will be sorely missed by all of us. His legislative accomplishments are many; his friends here and throughout the Nation are legion; his loyalty, his integrity and his high statesmanship are matters of public record.

I was especially fortunate when I first came to the Congress on January 3, 1939, in being assigned to the Banking and Currency Committee of the House on which PAUL BROWN was then a high-ranking Democratic member. Thus, as a new Member I became the recipient of his wise advice and counsel and the kindness and consideration which he extended to all new Members of this great body. It was my good fortune to serve with him in the Banking and Currency Committee until nearly the end of 1942 when I became a member of the Committee on Ways and Means. I am thus aware of the great contributions which he made to Federal housing and Federal banking laws and to the many other projects within the particular jurisdiction of the committee on which he served for such a long time.

I join with other Members of the House who have paid tribute to the diligent, conscientious, and forthright manner in which PAUL BROWN always tended to his duties here on the floor and placed himself on record on the many issues which came before the Congress during his 27 years of service here. Probably no Member of the House of Representatives has a higher record of attendance and of recorded yea-and-nay votes on legislative issues which have transpired.

May I extend to you, PAUL, and to your family, my very best and most sincere wishes for a well-earned and highly deserved period of relaxation from the incessant and heavy legislative duties which you have handled for so long and in such a faithful manner.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, one of the sad occasions of this session of the Congress is the realization that PAUL BROWN of Georgia, will not be with us in the coming year. He is going on to a well-earned retirement, but we in the Congress who have benefited from his leadership and advice will sorely miss him.

PAUL BROWN's career is in the best tradition of a southern statesman. He has stoutly defended the way of life of his people, and at the same time has lent his full contribution to progress for all the people of our country. PAUL BROWN is always a gentleman, fully understanding of the viewpoints of others, while stanch in his own convictions. I know that the people of Georgia, whom he has served so well, share the love and affection for him felt by all the Members of the House of Representatives.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, it has been a privilege to know and serve with my colleague, the Honorable PAUL BROWN, and as a result of this association I have a profound feeling of respect, admiration, and friendship for this truly great American.

PAUL BROWN has represented the people of the 10th District of Georgia well and conscientiously for over a quarter of a century, and I daresay there are few men in this body today who have a finer attendance record than has our beloved colleague. He has dedicated his life to the principles of sound constitutional government and the problems and welfare of his people have received his constant attention. He has made an outstanding contribution to the strength of our Nation and he is highly regarded by Members on both sides of the aisle.

It was with regret that I learned of his decision to retire and return to Georgia, but as he leaves the Congress I salute him for a job well done and sincerely trust that he and his fine wife will enjoy many years of good health and happiness.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include therewith my tribute to Hon. PAUL BROWN, distinguished Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the departure of PAUL BROWN from the Congress of the United States leaves a void that will be difficult to fill. PAUL BROWN has established a record of constant attendance never before equaled in the history of the Congress. For over two decades he answered every rollcall and every quorum call of the House of Representatives. He was equally vigilant and attentive to his official duties. His dedication to his people was reflected in the fact that he seldom experienced opposition in either a primary or general election. His devotion to his people was as constant as his love for his country.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the great Committee on Banking and Currency PAUL BROWN contributed to the economic growth and stability of this Nation. His wise counsel and sound judgment brought forth much constructive legislation in the field of banking, housing, and other lines of endeavor indispensable to the free economy of this country.

The Congress will miss this lofty son of Georgia. The Congress will long remember this amiable and wise man from the most democratic State in the Union. His close friends will long remember his eagerness to give advice when it was sought and his generosity in sharing his knowledge with those of us who were less fortunate.

Mr. Speaker, America wishes for PAUL BROWN a happy and healthful retirement of tranquillity and contentment on his native soil from which have come other distinguished statesmen and patriots to the service of their country.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, the retirement of PAUL BROWN from the House of Representatives is regretted universally by all of his colleagues in the House of Representatives regardless of party. If I were selecting what I call a good man, I would select PAUL BROWN. His services in the Congress have been outstanding. He has been conscientious, he has been wise—in words, he has been a great Congressman. He has been my close, personal friend for many, many years, and I, from a personal standpoint, deeply regret his retirement from the House of Representatives. I wish for him that his path may lie through green

pastures and beside still waters because by his life and his work he deserves the best.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, it is with mixed feelings that I bid Godspeed to PAUL BROWN, who is retiring from the House of Representatives. After serving with distinction, dedication, and vigor since 1933, he has earned a rest and it is my earnest wish that he may enjoy in good health for many years his well deserved retirement.

But his retirement from the daily routine of the House of Representatives leaves me with a deep sense of loss. In a very real way, PAUL BROWN was to me, as he was to scores of others, a fatherly figure, who was an unfailing source of counsel and advice. It will never be known how much PAUL BROWN's innate kindness has meant to many a new, untried Member of Congress.

To a multitude of young men, he was a tower of strength and comfort and a wise, patient guide to those who aspired to high accomplishments in the public service. It is gratifying to know that so many who achieved their objectives are abundant in their gratitude to him. My own debt to an old and dear friend is unbounded.

He was very well equipped to give good counsel, for he had years of distinction in the public service in his own State of Georgia before coming to the House of Representatives. A lawyer, county attorney, and mayor, he had a practical knowledge of government and above all, a deep knowledge and sympathy with the day-to-day problems of the average man and woman. His service in Washington was only an extension and enlargement of his work and for years he was acknowledged as one of the outstanding Members of Congress in his devotion to good government.

PAUL BROWN may retire in person from the House, but he leaves a legacy of spirit and memory that will endure.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with his many other friends in expressing regret that the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. PAUL BROWN, is retiring from Congress at the end of this year. I have known PAUL quite well personally since I came here many years ago. He has always been recognized and respected because of his sincerity and outstanding ability. He has been an inspiration and a comfort to me as I know he has been to scores of others.

I join in wishing PAUL BROWN and his family the very best of everything in the years ahead.

AMENDMENTS OF SOLDIERS AND SAILORS CIVIL RELIEF ACT OF 1940

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 3313) to amend section 200 of the Soldiers and Sailors Civil Relief Act of 1940 to permit the establishment of certain facts by a declaration under penalty of perjury in lieu of an affidavit, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, after line 9, insert:

"SEC. 3. Section 1502(c) of title 38 of the United States Code is amended by—

"(1) striking the word 'vocational' in paragraph (1) and inserting in lieu thereof 'Except as provided in paragraph (2), vocational'; and

"(2) redesignating paragraphs (2) and (3) as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively, and inserting after paragraph (1) the following new paragraph:

"'(2) Vocational rehabilitation may be afforded on account of World War II service beyond the termination date otherwise applicable, but not beyond July 25, 1965, if—

"'(A) the veteran was unable to enter or complete a suitable course of training within the period otherwise applicable because of one of the reasons set forth in subparagraphs (A) through (C) of paragraph (1); or

"'(B) the veteran was in the pursuit of a course of training under this chapter on June 1, 1960.'"

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to amend section 200 of the Soldiers and Sailors Civil Relief Act of 1940 to permit the establishment of certain facts by a declaration under penalty of perjury in lieu of an affidavit, and for other purposes."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object and, of course, I shall not object, I should like to briefly, but nonetheless sincerely, join in the commendatory remarks of the previous speakers with regard to my dear friend PAUL BROWN, of Georgia, who is retiring at the end of this session after 14 consecutive terms of service in this House. This House is not going to be the same without PAUL BROWN. He has been one of its most faithful Members. On behalf of the people of Brooklyn and of the city of New York, I pay tribute to an able, distinguished, kindly gentleman from Georgia who has helped my people on many occasions over the years when issues such as low-cost public housing and many others before the Committee on Banking and Currency were of important advantage to the metropolitan areas of our country. PAUL BROWN never approached these issues on a narrow sectional basis but voted for the best interest of the country as a whole. I wish him many years of good health and happiness in his retirement.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from West Virginia state whether this has been cleared with the minority leadership?

Mr. SLACK. I understand it has been cleared with the minority leadership.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia.

There was no objection.

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, this bill as it passed the House would have amended the Soldiers and Sailors Civil Relief Act of 1940 to provide that facts may be established by written unsworn statements, declarations, verifications, or certificates which are certified to be true under penalty of perjury.

This bill would have general application only in those States which permit unsworn statements but is highlighted by the State law of California which generally permits such form of proof where an affidavit is otherwise required.

The Veterans' Administration, the Department of Justice, and the Department of Defense have filed reports indicating they have no objection to the bill. No cost is involved.

The amendment of the Senate is entirely different subject matter and extends the Vocational Rehabilitation Act for service-connected, disabled veterans, World War II, the right to take training through July 25, 1965. This applies generally to those service-connected veterans who have not attained full training due to their illness or disease. The cost of this amendment would be small.

The authority expired July 25, 1960.

ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION TO HOLDERS OF THE CONGRESSIONAL MEDAL OF HONOR

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 270) to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the rate of special pension payable to certain persons awarded the Medal of Honor, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That (a) subsection (b) of section 560 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out 'sixty-five' and inserting 'sixty-two'.

"(b) Any person who, by reason of the amendment made by subsection (a), first becomes eligible to apply for special pension under section 562 of title 38, United States Code, shall, if he files application for such special pension within such one-year period, be paid such pension beginning September 1, 1960, or the date he attains age sixty-two, whichever is later; but no person shall become entitled to payment of special pension by reason of the enactment of subsection (a) for any month prior to September 1960.

"SEC. 2. Section 562 of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"'(a) The Administrator shall pay monthly to each person whose name has been entered on the Army, Navy, and Air Force Medal of Honor roll a special pension at the rate of $10, beginning as of the date of application therefor under section 560 of this title.

"'(b) Any person entitled to special pension under subsection (a) may, upon written application to the Administrator, or to the Secretary concerned in the case of an initial application, elect to receive in lieu thereof special pension at the rate of $100 per month, reduced (but not below the rate of $10 per month) by any pension payable

to such person under subchapter II of this chapter. If such application is filed with the Administrator within one year after September 1, 1960, payment of special pension at such rate shall begin on such date, or on the date the person filing such application first became entitled to special pension under subsection (a), whichever is later; otherwise payment of special pension at such rate shall begin with the month in which application therefor is filed with the Administrator, or the Secretary concerned, as the case may be.

"'(c) The receipt of special pension shall not deprive any person of any other pension or other benefit, right or privilege to which he is or may hereafter be entitled under any existing or subsequent law. Except as provided in subsection (b), special pension shall be paid in addition to all other payments under laws of the United States.

"'(d) Special pension shall not be subject to any attachment, execution, levy, tax lien, or detention under any process whatever.

"'(e) If any person has been awarded more than one Medal of Honor he shall not receive more than one special pension.'

"SEC. 3. The amendments made by this Act shall become effective on September 1, 1960."

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, can the gentleman from West Virginia tell me whether this has been cleared with the minority leadership?

Mr. SLACK. This matter has been cleared with the minority leader.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SLACK as an amendment to the Senate amendment:

"AMENDMENT TO SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 270

"In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment, insert the following:

"'That (a) subsection (b) of section 560 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out "sixty-five" and inserting "fifty".

"'(b) Any person who, by reason of the amendment made by subsection (a), first becomes eligible to apply for special pension under section 562 of title 38, United States Code, shall, if he files application for such special pension before September 1, 1961, be paid such pension beginning September 1, 1960, or the date he attains age fifty, whichever is later; but no person shall become entitled to payment of special pension by reason of the enactment of subsection (a) for any month prior to September 1960.'

"SEC. 2. Section 562 of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"'§ 562. Special provisions relating to pension.

"'(a) The Administrator shall pay monthly to each person whose name has been entered on the Army, Navy, and Air Force Medal of Honor roll a special pension at the rate of $100, beginning as of the date of application therefor under section 560 of this title.

"'(b) Except where the person being paid special pension under this subchapter is in receipt of pension based upon his need of regular aid and attendance, special pension shall be reduced (but not below the rate of $10 per month) by any pension payable to such person under subchapter II of this chapter.

"'(c) The receipt of special pension shall not deprive any person of any other pension or other benefit, right, or privilege to which he is or may hereafter be entitled under any existing or subsequent law. Except as provided in subsection (b), special pension shall be paid in addition to all other payments under laws of the United States.

"'(d) Special pension shall not be subject to any attachment, execution, levy, tax lien, or detention under any process whatever.

"'(e) If any person has been awarded more than one Medal of Honor he shall not receive more than one special pension.'

"SEC. 3. The amendments made by this Act shall become effective on September 1, 1960."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The Senate amendment as amended was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include statistics.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, the bill H.R. 270, which seeks to provide a higher rate of pension for holders of the Congressional Medal of Honor, has passed the House for the past three Congresses and prior to this time has never been reported in the other body. Under present law, a holder of the Congressional Medal of Honor is entitled to a monthly pension of $10 a month in addition to compensation or non-service-connected pension, if he is at least age 65 and has been honorably discharged from the service. This latter requirement bars such payment to retired personnel or to active duty personnel.

As passed by the House, the age requirement was eliminated altogether. The rate was set at $100, and this was payable to all who had ever earned the medal. The belief of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs was that this honor was so unusual and so limited that it should be adequately rewarded and that no individual who ever received this highest award of our Government should be on relief or otherwise in dire need. Unfortunately, several recipients of this honor are today in that category.

There are 308 holders of the Congressional Medal of Honor, divided between 158 officers, 146 enlisted men, and 4 warrant officers.

The Senate, in reporting the bill, reduced the age limit to 62, provided for a $10 or $100 a month additional payment, excluded retired personnel and active duty personnel, permitted the payment to go to those receiving service-connected compensation and to those receiving non-service-connected pension, but as a practical matter the pensioner would have to choose between the regular pension and the $100 a month rate. This, in effect, would exclude all veterans of the Spanish-American War who are getting a pension from receiving any additional payment other than the small payment of $10.

The proposed substitute which I am offering at the request of the chairman sets the age limit at 50, provides for one rate of $100 a month, excludes retired personnel and active duty personnel, but would be payable to those receiving service-connected compensation. So far as non-service-connected pension is involved, it would provide for retention of the Senate provision, with the exception of the aid and attendance cases. These cases are individuals who are so helpless or blind or nearly so as to need the aid and attendance of another person. Most individuals in this category are receiving $135.45. Under the new pension law, Public Law 86-211, some veterans may be receiving as much as $170 who are in this pitiful condition. The amendment which I am offering would pay to these individuals $100 in addition.

It seems to me that this compromise meets the Senate more than half way and I am hopeful that it will be concurred in in the other body.

I think it is important to bear in mind that in awarding a Congressional Medal of Honor, the following action is necessary:

First. There must be an eye witness to swear that the action was performed by the individual;

Second. The company commander must approve of the citation;

Third. The battalion commander must approve;

Fourth. The regimental commander must give his approval;

Fifth. The division commander must approve; and

Sixth. The military department, Army, Navy, or Air Force, must approve.

I think that these steps indicate that the awards are made in a most careful manner and are not the result of friendship or happenstance.

Mr. Speaker, under consent already granted, I insert certain pertinent statistics on the Medal of Honor law and the recipients thereof, as well as a comparison of the law and the various proposals for changing it.

Medal of Honor recipients

	Officers	Enlisted men	Warrant officers	Total
Army	68	112	1	181
Navy	42	19		61
Air Force	13	2		15
Marine Corps	35	13	3	51
Total	158	146	4	308

Age

	Youngest	Oldest	Average
Army	27	88	44.1
Navy	28	85	61.0
Air Force	30	70	49.8
Marine Corps	29	85	47.8
Overall average			51.3

Age distribution

30 or below	10
31 to 40	91
41 to 50	86
51 to 60	25
61 to 70	42
71 to 80	35
Above 80	19
Total	308
Receiving:	
Retirement pay	71
Non-service-connected pension	24
Service-connected compensation	77
$10 Medal of Honor award	26

Components	Law	H.R. 270 as passed House	H.R. 270 as passed Senate	House substitute amendment
Age	65	Any age	62	50.
Rate	$10	$100	$10 or $100	$100.
Retired personnel	Not covered	In addition to retired pay.	Not covered	Not covered.
Compensation payees.	In addition to compensation.	In addition to compensation.	In addition to compensation.	In addition to compensation.
Non-service-connected pensioners.	In addition to pension.	In addition to pension.	Generally not more than $100 regular pension and Medal of Honor pension combined.	Same as Senate provision, except does not apply to aid and attendance cases.
Active-duty personnel.	Not covered	Covered	Not covered	Not covered.

TEMPORARY SUSPENSION OF IMPORT DUTY ON HEPTANOIC ACID

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 12659) to suspend for a temporary period the import duty on heptanoic acid, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the amendments of the Senate and request a conference with the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas? (After a pause). The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MILLS, FORAND, KING of California, MASON, and BYRNES of Wisconsin.

WHERE THE BLAME REALLY BELONGS

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, it was with much interest that I noted an editorial dealing with the farm problem in the August 17, 1960, issue of the Williamston Enterprise, Williamston, Mich. The editorial is entitled, "Where the Blame Really Belongs," and under leave to extend my remarks, I am asking that it be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

The editorial follows:

WHERE THE BLAME REALLY BELONGS

The Democratic-inspired outcry against one man and against one administration for everything that is wrong with the farm picture continues as those who are really responsible seek to shift the blame to others.

It's long since past the time when another look should be taken at the evidence. The accused is entitled to a day in court—and could well earn a deserved and just acquittal.

It can be freely admitted that a costly outpouring of the taxpayers dollars has long resulted from outmoded programs too long maintained. The issue is: Who is responsible?

Part of the answer shows up as far back as 1952. Over 90 percent of the expenditures by the Department of Agriculture between that year and 1959 has resulted from continuance of programs inherited by this administration, plus new programs that had to be initiated by this administration to offset inherited problems.

Let's examine them.

The increase in expenditures in the 7 years between 1952 and 1959 was roughly $5.9 billion. Of this amount, $3 billion was the increased outlay for price supports which the Secretary of Agriculture fought to adjust.

Of this $5.9 billion increase, about $2.4 billion has been for programs to help dispose of mountainous surpluses piled up by the unrealistic support program. Included in this figure is $1.5 billion for Public Law 480 and $848 million for the soil bank.

Most of this surplus pile-up and surplus reduction is in wheat. The administration has implored the Democratic Congress to take constructive action on wheat.

This, then, is the real need: Positive action to correct the problem instead of negative nagging and shifting the blame. Sounds simple. But did you ever try it with a Democratic-controlled Congress hugging a potent campaign issue?

That's where the blame really belongs.

AID TO EDUCATION WITHOUT FEDERAL CONTROLS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, again Congress is adjourning without passing a bill to aid in the construction of schools or in the payment of schoolteachers. Few issues before Congress in the last dozen years have brought forth more differences of opinion than has Federal aid to education. The House and the Senate passed bills which were so far different that there was no reconciling them.

RELIEF NEEDED FROM TAX BURDEN

America is united in wanting the best education for our youth. We are also aware that the costs of education are a great and increasing burden. The taxes to support this educational system are falling heavily on property owners, especially on the owners of homes, farms, and small businesses. The property taxes for the building and maintenance of schools in some school districts have pushed the local property tax levy to $7, $8, and even as much as $9 and $10 per hundred dollars of taxable property. This is becoming an unbearable burden to homeowners, farmers, and small businessmen. Some tax relief must be found and at the same time our educational system must not be handicapped.

PROBLEMS IN ALLOCATING FEDERAL FUNDS TO STATES FOR SCHOOLS

In order to alleviate this burden, taxpayers and legislators are considering many alternatives. For years it has been suggested that the Federal Government contribute heavily to the support of our schools; but that, too, entails several problems. One is that the Federal Government in the end gets its money from the taxpayer. If Federal money is to be used, a problem arises about the formula for allocating the money among the various States and school districts. If the allotment were based on proposals for improvements and use, then there would result a scramble of "featherbedding" to get as much as possible. If the allotment were based on the degree of need, the States would be encouraged to neglect their responsibilities in education. There are an increasing number of States which, in order to get industries to move from other States into their own to help the employment situation, have promised those industries exemption from taxes. Thus tax money for schools is cut, and they seek to supplement school funds by showing great need for Federal aid for education.

There was a factory in Indiana employing approximately 2,000 persons. Another State, in order to get that factory to move there, granted the company freedom from taxation for 10 years. The State which made the offer is one of those showing a great need for Federal money for schools and is today taking a lead in Congress in promoting Federal aid in education to the States on the basis of need.

In addition to these problems arising from proposals for Federal assistance in education, we also have a national fear, and I think a just one, that the Government might dominate our schools and would not exert the same care in spending our tax dollars as the individual State or school unit does.

FEDERAL EXCISE TAX ON CIGARETTES RETURNED TO STATE FOR EDUCATIONAL USE

The Federal Government has, throughout the years, exploited new taxes in an aggressive manner and now dominates the excise, corporation, and personal income tax fields. What I propose is that the Federal Government earmark a certain part of the taxes it collects on cigarettes from the citizens of each State to be returned to that State for educational purposes. The Federal Government would have no claim on that money; there would be no need for congressional wrangles about the distribution of such funds, for each State would receive back the established percent of that which had been paid in; there would be no part of it remaining in Washington; and its administration would cost Indiana and the Federal Government practically nothing.

I introduced H.R. 12252 on May 17, 1960, and addressed the House on this legislation. This bill provides that the Federal Government shall return to each State one-half of the Federal excise tax it collects on cigarettes sold in that State. The State would be obligated to use this money for teachers' salaries or the construction of school buildings. The Federal Government, in collecting and returning money to the States, would act in the same capacity as the county

treasurer does in Indiana. The county treasurer collects the taxes due all tax units, including school districts, and turns that percent of the tax money allocated to schools over to the school authorities. Aside from the requirement that the money be used for school purposes, there are no strings attached. So it would be with Federal funds collected from the sale of cigarettes and turned over directly to the State—there would be no Federal strings attached and there would be no opportunity for Federal bureaucracy to absorb part of this money. I want to point out that today there are those people who plainly show that they are more interested in the operation of a large Federal bureau than they are in providing the proper school facilities and staff. No bureau could thrive on my proposal. The Federal collecting agency is already operating and the allocation would be merely a statistical accounting problem.

If such legislation were enacted, the following figures give some idea of how Indiana would fare:

Amount that would have been received by Indiana under H.R. 10128 which passed the House but which could only have been used for school construction	$8,600,000
Amount that would have been received from one-half of Federal gross cigarette tax paid by Indiana and which could have been used for buildings or for salaries without any Federal control	22,324,000

While these figures are approximate and round figures, they do give an idea of the relief such legislation would give to the taxpayers of Indiana.

The legislation which I presented did not get out of committee. A 4-year, $1.3 billion program of Federal grants to the States for school construction was approved by the House of Representatives, and efforts were made to reconcile it with a measure approved by the Senate which would provide $1.8 billion for 2 years for school construction and teachers' salaries. The House tentatively approved but later rejected an amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio, Representative FRANK BOW, to return to each State one-fourth of the Federal cigarette tax collected from its residents. I spoke in behalf of the Bow amendment.

The several alternatives for Federal aid which have been before the Congress this year are all temporary "stopgap" measures, or so we are told. A rebate of excise tax collections could provide a steady and permanent source of additional revenue for school purposes.

SEVENTH DISTRICT FAVORS CIGARETTE TAX REFUND

While we did not succeed in enacting legislation to return a portion of the Federal excise tax on cigarettes to each State in this session of Congress, I feel that it is something toward which we must continue to work. In the information poll which I sent out this spring, one of the questions was, "Do you favor returning to each State one-half of the cigarette tax collected from its residents for educational uses without Federal direction?" It was a mandate to me to continue along this line, for 85 percent indicated that they favored such legislation.

For more than a decade we have heard many voices raised to provide Federal financial assistance to our schools to relieve the burden on State and local revenue sources. These proposals have varied widely but have inevitably become mired down, owing to the problems stemming from the Federal association with the program. If we really want to provide additional money for school purposes, here is a way to do it and leave the authority with the States and communities. It will offset much of the criticism of the other proposals and avoid some of the problems which have prevented enactment of other suggestions.

OPERATION VERACITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, this is the beginning of "Operation Veracity." It is the intention of the Republican Members of the House of Representatives in this operation to study some of the statements made in the platform of the opposition party with the idea of showing that there are certain statements contained therein which are misstatements, to say the very least. We suspect that some of them are the result of overzealous draftsmanship, we suspect that some of them are the result of overzealous writing. We do not accuse our colleagues on the other side of the aisle of being deceitful, but we do feel that the record is such that it is up to the Republican Members to dispel the effect of some rather amazing statements which appear in the platform of the Democratic Party adopted in Los Angeles.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that this is a rather historic occasion in that I do not know of many times in the last few years that the House and Senate have been in session after the two parties have held their conventions and after the platforms have been adopted. Therefore, we have an opportunity to explore with our colleagues the various statements contained in these platforms which occurs very rarely.

It is not our purpose at this time to go into the philosophy behind these platforms. The mere fact we do not go into that philosophy is certainly not indicative that we agree with the philosophy of the platform of the opposition. The opposite would certainly be true.

Time being what it is and the House being pushed for adjournment some time this week, possibly we will have time to go into the philosophy and possibly not. It will be my privilege to yield to certain members of the Republican Party for the purpose of correcting certain misstatements, made in the platform of the opposition, and showing the truth as the truth exists. We will certainly not be able to cover all of what we believe to be misstatements.

We will cover only those that we believe are patently wrong. There are others with which we could take issue if time would permit. However, this is an operation by which we hope to show for the benefit of the country as well as the members of the opposition party that a platform really is something which must be lived up to. It is something which must not be forgotten as time goes on. No longer should the platform of a political party be allowed to gather dust on a shelf. That platform should, in the campaign, be a very vital and important part of the campaign. We feel that the platforms of both parties should be a vital portion of this campaign, and we intend in every way we can to make sure that those two documents do not gather any dust on anybody's shelf. If the platform of the opposition party turns out to be an albatross, they should wear it around their necks.

So, with that, Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES].

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that a Member of the Congress was the chairman of the platform drafting committee at the Democrat Convention, I am wondering if the gentleman has notified the chairman of that committee that this matter would be taken up at this time.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I thank the gentleman. The question is whether or not I advised the Honorable CHESTER BOWLES, the gentleman from Connecticut, the chairman of the Democratic platform committee of 1960, that the Republicans intended to question some of the material in the platform. The answer is, "Yes, I did." The letter was written on Friday last, directed to the gentleman from Connecticut, in his office here in Washington. I hope that the gentleman will be on the floor before this operation is over. I do not now see him on the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES].

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of "Operation Veracity."

Whenever a political party incorporates in its platform misstatements of fact, this must be called to the public attention.

This is the mission of "Operation Veracity." Republican Congressmen are exposing 14 misstatements of fact, misstatements in the Democratic platform which I believe very few Members of this body would defend as true, regardless of party.

Take for example this statement of the Democratic platform:

> The quality of medical care furnished to disabled veterans has deteriorated under the Republican administration.

Indeed, this is an outrageous charge. Since 1953 the Joint Commission on the Accreditation of Hospitals representing the American Medical Association, the American College of Surgeons, the American College of Physicians, the American Hospital Association has surveyed and accredited for the first time all Veterans' Administration hospitals.

Does this represent a deterioration of medical service?

Under the leadership of the Veterans' Administration, a new specific treatment

for tuberculosis by chemotherapy was developed in 1954 which has dramatically reduced the length of treatment required for tuberculosis, not only in VA hospitals, but throughout the world.

Does this represent a deterioration of medical service?

VA first developed scientific methods for evaluating the new chemicals for treatment of the mentally ill and was one of the first to make extensive application of these drugs.

Does this represent a deterioration of medical service?

In 1959 the first nuclear reactor of its type to be used both for treatment and research was installed in a VA hospital in Omaha.

Does this represent a deterioration of medical service?

Expenditures for the care of hospital patients and domiciliary members have increased from less than $600 million in fiscal year 1952 to an estimated $817 million in fiscal year 1961, a record high.

Does this represent a deterioration of medical service?

In 1959 President Eisenhower approved a VA plan for a 12-year $900 million hospital modernization and placement program.

Does this represent a deterioration of medical service?

A statement by one of the foremost authorities in the care of seriously disabled patients, Dr. Donald Munro, published in an article in the October 22, 1959, issue of the New England Journal of Medicine, is particularly relevant. He states:

> By and large, no such patient receives better treatment, or approaches closer to the total rehabilitation than is possible in his individual case, than those who have been and are being cared for in the Veterans' Administration paraplegic centers.

Does this indicate that the services of the Veterans' Administration are deteriorating?

Gentlemen, if the new frontiersmanship of certain candidates in the other party is to be hewed from the low road of such unfounded charges as this charge about the Veterans' Administration, I believe the American public will not long tolerate this brand of new frontiersmanship.

The American public in these serious times looks for a sense of mature responsibility in party platforms and in party leaders.

And I want to say that I am confident that no member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs would have approved this unfounded statement which is in that platform, that—

> The quality of medical care furnished to disabled veterans has deteriorated under the Republican administration.

Those members of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs who have worked closely with this program and are dedicated to its welfare know that this statement is not true.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, it is now my privilege to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD], who was vice chairman of the Republican platform committee for 1960.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, the Republican platform committee worked long and diligently to come up with a platform and document that contains no misstatements of fact. As a matter of fact, each subject it reported which was adopted by subcommittees and reported to the full committee was gone over very carefully by a special drafting committee. Every fact which was included in the platform in its final approved version is factually correct and was gone over in great, great detail. Certain subcommittee reports may have wandered from certain basic facts, but these facts before approval were checked out very carefully in the convention-approved document. The document approved by our convention does not contain any misstatements of fact.

Mr. Speaker, Operation Veracity has been effectively performing its mission this week. And that mission is an exposé of 14 incorrect statements of fact which make up the fabric of the Democratic platform.

As one who served as vice chairman of the Republican platform committee, I wish to make this comment:

The delegates and staff which wrote the Republican platform worked long and assiduous hours to insure, first, that we did not make promises on which we could not deliver, and secondly, that the statements of fact in our platform were accurate.

In the presidential campaign, Americans everywhere are looking for the party and the candidates who possess in greatest measure the qualities of responsibility and experience. Therefore, the public has a right to be concerned when the platform of a party and of its candidates is not characterized by a scrupulous veracity.

Now I would like to examine this statement in the Democratic platform:

> Unimaginative, outmoded Republican policies which fail to use these productive capacities of our farms have been immensely costly to our Nation.

In order to show the inaccuracy of this flagrant statement, let us see which party is responsible for existing legislation—legislation which fails "to use these productive capacities of our farms."

The basic farm price support legislation was enacted in 1933 by the Democrats.

In 1938, the Democrats gave continuing status to their 1933 emergency legislation. These were the days when the New Deal was trying to gear our economy to a permanent depression climate.

In 1941 and 1942, the Steagall amendment and other legislation was passed. Price supports were raised to a high level during the war emergency. As I recall, the Democrats controlled the White House and the Congress during the war years.

Now, in 1948, Congress provided for an adjustment from the wartime price supports.

But the next Congress, a Democratic Congress, rewrote the law, so the law of the Republican Congress was not permitted to go into effect.

In 1952, the Democratic Congress further extended the wartime level of price supports.

A Republican Congress in 1954 let this 1952 extension expire, thereby permiting the functioning of legislation previously enacted.

Since the 1954 elections, this Congress has been controlled by one party—the Democratic Party.

With the exception of 4 years, the Congress, since the inception of the New Deal farm legislation in 1933 has been controlled by the Democratic Party.

The failure of agricultural adjustment which hurts the farmer is a legislative failure. The Democrats have been the legislators. They put this legislation on the books. Today, by their 2-to-1 majority they keep it there. They condone it. They tolerate it. They have the power to change it.

Thus, the statement of the Democratic platform I read earlier should be corrected to read:

> Unimaginative, outmoded Democratic policies which fail to use these productive capacities of our farms have been immensely costly to our Nation. Furthermore, high rigid price supports on the basic commodities (corn, cotton, rice, peanuts, tobacco, and wheat) would produce a continued rise in costs and a continuing buildup in surpluses, which in turn would exert increasing price depressing influences.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to note the position on price supports in the Republican platform:

> Use of price supports at levels best fitted to specific commodities, in order to widen markets, ease production controls, and help achieve increased farm family income.

This is the program the Republicans will follow when they gain control of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I now return to the original Democratic platform statement, as it stood before I corrected it. Preceding the statement are paragraphs entitled, "Using Our Abundance."

While in one paragraph they charge Republican policies as being unimaginative, in these paragraphs they endorse certain programs which are Republican programs. Food for peace is the notable example. This is an imaginative program to cope effectively with the farm surpluses inherited from the Democratic rigid supports.

In his January 29, 1959, message to Congress, President Eisenhower said:

> I am setting steps in motion to explore anew with other surplus-producing nations all practical means of utilizing the various agricultural surpluses of each in the interest of reinforcing peace and the well-being of friendly peoples throughout the world—in short, using food for peace.

So the Democrats seem to endorse this concept in one paragraph, and then call it unimaginative in the next. They prove their own error by their transparent flip-flops.

Mr. Speaker, I now request unanimous consent to include at this point in the RECORD, 19 quite remarkable efforts and accomplishments of President Eisenhower to cope effectively with the farm problem inherited from the Democrat rigid-support formulas.

1. Accumulation of surpluses held down by an amount estimated at $14 billion through adjustment in price supports, Public Law 480, and the soil bank.

2. About 60 million people in 82 foreign countries given food and fiber donated by the United States. Over 4 million Americans receiving donations of surplus foods.

3. New records set:

Total agricultural assets at alltime high of $208.2 billion (compared to $162.9 billion in 1953).

Farm foreclosures and tax sales from 1953 to 1960 averaged only 2.3 farms per 1,000 per year, compared with nearly 11 farms per 1,000 per year from 1932 to 1952.

4. Standard of living on farms highest in history, measured in terms of electrical appliances, automobiles, and other conveniences owned by farm families.

5. Per capita income of farm people rose from $838 in 1950 to $960 in 1959, with further upturn seen in 1960.

6. Six hundred million dollars a year extended in disaster and drought aid since 1953.

7. Social security coverage extended to farmers in 1954, ending 19 years of discrimination.

8. Payment-in-kind export program for grain and cotton established resulting in higher prices to producers and increased exports.

9. More than 28 million acres of farmland taken out of production by the conservation reserve program of the soil bank and put to soil-conserving uses.

10. The agricultural credit system was more responsive to farmers' needs with broadening and liberalization of credit programs. Farm Credit Administration was made an independent agency.

11. Food-for-peace program set in motion and is being rapidly expanded.

12. Exports of farm commodities up from $2.8 billion in 1953 to alltime high of $4.7 billion in fiscal 1957; for past 3 years averaged $4 billion per year. Exports in fiscal 1960 estimated at $4.5 billion in value, highest ever in volume.

13. Special milk program, inaugurated in 1954, operating in 83,000 schools and child care institutions, where nearly 2.4 billion half pints of milk helped improve diets of our children.

14. School-lunch program doubled since 1951—13 million participating children and 2 billion complete meals served in 1959–60 school year.

15. Producers of dairy products will receive estimated cash receipts of $4.7 billion in 1960, an alltime high.

16. Agricultural research appropriations increased by 117 percent since 1953—much to find new uses for farm abundance and to develop new crops for current needs.

17. Great Plains conservation program, established in 1956 to minimize erosion, operating in 351 countries, 12 million acres covered by cost-sharing contracts as of May 1, 1960.

18. Two hundred and thirty-six local watershed projects in forty-five States receiving assistance. Authorization for planning assistance extended to 549 projects in 48 States.

19. Operation Outdoor set up to expand family recreation facilities in the national forests. In 1953, 35.4 million people visited the national forests; in 1959 the number was 81,521,000.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, let me point out one more false statement in the platform:

The Democratic Congress has successfully fought the efforts of the Republican administration to cut off REA loans.

Now, REA has has been in existence 25 years. The Eisenhower administration has been in office a little over 7½ years—in other words, about 30 percent of the time of REA existence. Yet, 45 percent of all the loans approved in REA history were approved during the Eisenhower-Nixon administration.

The authors of the Democratic platform, indeed, are in bad need of facts.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], ranking minority member of the great Subcommittee on Armed Services of the House Appropriations Committee.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I feel that it is disturbing and demoralizing to the American public for a political party to write a platform containing inaccurate statements. We find 14 such inaccurate statements incorporated into the Democratic platform as adopted recently at Los Angeles.

Is this an example of the "new frontiersmanship" to which Democrats hope to attract forward-looking Americans? Perhaps it might be better described as an example of a "new gamesmanship" to hoodwink Americans.

Republican Congressmen have united in Operation Veracity in order to purge the record of the Democratic platform of 14 inaccurate statements. We heard the gentleman from Arizona expose the first inaccuracy today by pointing out balanced budgets in fiscal years 1956, 1957, and 1960, thus exposing the inaccuracy of the Democratic claim that over the past 7½ years the Republicans had failed to balance the budget. This claim just does not hold up in light of factual analysis.

I would like to call your attention to another Democratic platform statement which even more lacks authenticity, accuracy, and even plausibility:

They [the Republicans] have also admitted that our conventional military forces, on which we depend for defense in any nonnuclear war, have been dangerously slashed for reasons of "economy"—and that they have no plans to reverse this trend.

Mr. Speaker, I challenge the authors of the Democratic platform to produce the administration statements which admit that our conventional military forces have been slashed for reasons of economy. If no such statements are available, then why place this distorted claim in their platform?

Because, obviously, they did not want to insert in their partisan document a correct statement, which might have read instead:

They [the Republicans] have ended the peaks and valleys characteristic of the preparedness program of previous administrations and have developed both our conventional and nuclear capabilities as well as aided in development of over 200 allied divisions and 250 global bases. Our military posture, in conjunction with our alliance system, has deterred both nuclear and conventional war, a deterrence of which our military posture and alliance system was not capable in 1950.

Mr. Speaker, now I will address myself to the question of whether our conventional military forces, on which we depend for defense in any nonnuclear war, have been dangerously slashed.

First, let us take airpower.

Our bombers have the capability of conventional bombing as well as nuclear bombing. Since 1953 our heavy bomber force has almost doubled, while in effectiveness their capabilities have increased manyfold. For in 1953 our mainstay was the old B–36 and the still older B–29's. Perhaps the Democrat platform means to complain that we slashed production of B–36's in order to produce B–47's, B–52's, and B–58's, as well as nearly doubling our bomber force. If so, they criticize progress leading to greater airpower for our dollars.

Next, let us consider naval power.

When President Eisenhower took office, not one single modern firstline ship had joined the fleet since the end of the World War II construction program, with the exception of a few destroyer-type vessels. Since 1953, however, this administration has provided for approximately 50 new guided-missile ships and approximately the same number of nuclear-powered vessels. The aircraft carrier, one of the mainstays of both our conventional and nuclear war capabilities, is a complete void in the Soviet arsenal of naval power. In contrast, we presently have 14 carriers, with more on the way.

How can the Democratic platform framers complain that this naval buildup represents a slash of conventional war forces?

Finally, let us examine land power.

Our forward strategy aimed at repelling any Soviet or Red Chinese aggression directed at any part of our free-world alliance system is in refreshing contrast with a fortress America approach, which would result in disengagement from both our alliance obligations and our determination to resist Soviet aggression—in Korea, in Formosa, in Berlin or in any other portion of the free world.

Certainly our Republican administration has not been satisfied with merely maintaining our 870,000-man Army, our 175,000-man Marine Corps, our 300,000-man Army Reserve, our 45,000-man Marine Reserves, our 400,000-man Army National Guard and our other ever-improving Reserve forces, the Air Force and Naval Reserves. Since our reaction must be quick and since groundpower must be generated at the spots of potential aggression, we have augmented our forces with the worldwide collective defense of over 5 million men, 25,000 planes and 2,200 combat ships.

Mr. Speaker, all of these forces become a part of our conventional war deterrent. They have been built up since 1953, at which time we lacked SEATO alliance in the Far East, and when we not only lacked a consistent long-range defense policy but also were pinned down in the wrong war, at the wrong place and at the wrong time.

I submit that anyone who feels that our 900 ships, 35,000 planes and over 2 million men are mere byproducts of nuclear deterrence and that they make no great contribution to conventional forces simply does not understand the strategy of a flexible deterrent policy. As Gen. Maxwell Taylor stated, "If one regards the force structure of our three services, one finds that nearly all the Army and Marine Corps, much of the Tactical Air Force, some of the Navy's carriers, and large parts of our strategic air and sea lift must be associated with limited war forces and are available in any emergency."

In further consideration of the Democratic charge that our conventional military forces have been dangerously slashed for reasons of economy, I would like to insert in the RECORD at this point a statement from a recent publication of the Instiute for Strategic Studies in London, entitled "The Soviet Union and the NATO powers: The Military Balance." The statement points out the weakness of NATO 10 years ago, and its great comparative strength today:

Ten years ago, when the North Atlantic Treaty was signed in Washington, the military position of the Western Powers was very weak. Most of the ground forces available were badly equipped and were deployed not for defense but for occupation duties. Less than 1,000 operational aircraft were available in Europe, and only about 20 airfields. Now, as the facts below indicate, the defensive position of the NATO powers in Europe, although in certain respects it leaves much to be desired, has changed out of all recognition. The ground forces in the central area have been built up to about two-thirds of the planned goal of 30 divisions, and equipped with nuclear ground-to-ground and ground-to-air missiles. The air forces in Europe of the NATO powers can now muster about 5,000 tactical aircraft (strategic bombers remain under national control) which operate from some 220 operational bases. Joint production in NATO countries of modern weapons such as the Hawk and Sidewinder is about to begin, while a project for a NATO tank is under discussion.

Next, Mr. Speaker, I would point out that the Democratic-controlled Congresses for 6 fiscal years have slashed the attempts of the Republican President to increase further our defense posture. I request unanimous consent to include in the RECORD at this point a table reflecting the slashes of $3.4 billion made by the Congress in the defense requests of the President from fiscal year 1955 through 1960.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask unanimous consent at this point that I may be heard for 5 minutes at the conclusion of other special orders heretofore entered for today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Department of Defense: President's budget requests and congressional appropriations, fiscal year 1955–60

[From chart supplied by Assistant Secretary of Defense Lincoln, DOD hearings, House, fiscal year 1961, III 115–117]

[In millions of dollars]

Fiscal year	Request	Appropriation	Net change
1955	30,942	29,583	−1,359
1956	33,700	33,082	−618
1957	35,197	36,134	+937
1958	39,257	36,648	−2,609
1959	40,830	41,232	+402
1960	40,811	40,592	−219
Overall, 1955–60	220,738	217,271	−3,467

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, this chart should, of course, be brought up to date by the addition of figures for fiscal year 1961, in which the 2d session of the 86th Congress added $661 million to the President's defense budget requests. If this figure were included, it would mean that the net reduction of the President's military budgets from fiscal year 1956 through 1961, inclusive, totals $1.447 billion, still a substantial reduction when the Democratic opposition calls for increases in spending for our national security at every turn.

Mr. Speaker, to sum up, the Democratic platform has made an inaccurate statement that Republicans have admitted "that our conventional military forces have been dangerously slashed for reasons of 'economy.'" I ask the Democrats this—to what source in this administration can they attribute such a statement? As a matter of record, a 15-member task force of the House Republican policy committee stated on June 20, 1960, that "we can afford all the defense that is needed, if we will soundly finance the full cost." Furthermore, in the Republican platform ratified by delegates at Chicago, our official statement of policy for the future, we affirmed that "there is no price ceiling on America's security."

I would also assert that this administration has vastly increased the total capability of the free world to resist Communist aggression, conventional or nuclear. In 1953, we and our allies were weak in conventional war capabilities. In Europe and in Asia, our conventional war capabilities were being sucked into the Korean war in a manner that left freedom of action to the Communists. In contrast, I now note that even Senator KENNEDY told the VFW last Friday in Detroit that we were first in military power in the world.

Air Force magazine recently gave an example of how this administration changed vascillation to victory in the field of intercontinental ballistic missiles. Dr. Vannevar Bush, wartime Director of the Office of Scientific Research and Development, said in 1945 that a 3,000-mile rocket was impossible and would be for years to come. He stated:

People have been talking about a 3,000-mile high-angle rocket, shot from one continent to another. * * * I say, technically, I don't think anybody in the world knows how to do a thing. * * * I wish the American people would leave it out of their thinking.

The Eisenhower administration ended this negative policy. By 1954, Dr. von Neumann told the Air Force they could achieve an operational ICBM in from 6 to 9 years, provided an all-out development effort was initiated immediately. We not only achieved operational status of the Atlas in 5 years instead of 6 to 9, but also have vastly improved the 5,500-mile range set by the Von Neumann committee as well as more than halving their 5-mile accuracy goal.

Mr. Speaker, we have not slashed, we have surpassed. We have not faltered, we have achieved. American strategy and strength is secure today despite the sorry state of our defenses in 1953, despite the budget cuts of a Democratic-controlled Congress, and despite the inaccuracies of the 1960 Democratic platform.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER], a distinguished member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, Operation Veracity is performing a valuable service to the Nation by exposing inaccurate statements in the Democrat platform. I join in support of my colleagues.

I wish to call attention to this statement:

It [the Republican administration] has stalled atomic energy development.

So charge the writers of the Democrat platform. In doing so, these platform writers are making a game out of their platform. Indeed, their philosophy should be called "new gamesmanship," instead of "new frontiersmanship."

True, there has been some stalling on atomic research and development, and the stalling has been by the Democratic Congress. I speak now of high-energy nuclear-physics research. For the second year the President has requested full authorization for the construction of the linear electron accelerator—the next logical step in our high-energy physics program. His request was based upon unimpeachable scientific advice and endorsed by practically the entire scientific community. But the Democratic-controlled Congress stalled on granting the full authorization which would insure that the United States continues its decisive lead in this field.

Mr. Speaker, the platform writers chose to ignore the inaction of their own Democratic controlled Congress, and they chose to ignore the great leadership of this administration. Here are 12 examples of accomplishments of this administration:

First. Research in controlled thermonuclear power expanded several hundredfold, from $1 million during 1951–53 to $30.8 million for fiscal 1960.

Second. Eight nuclear powerplants built; 21 more authorized.

Third. Nuclear submarines cruised around the world under water and crossed and recrossed the North Pole ice cap.

Fourth. Nuclear navy begun with the launching of first nuclear submarine in 1954.

Fifth. First and second atoms-for-peace conferences.

Sixth. Expenditures on civilian power reactor development and construction increased 11 times over 1952 level.

Seventh. First nuclear-powered merchant ship in the world, the NS *Savannah*, and first surface nuclear naval ship, the U.S.S. *Long Beach*, launched.

Eighth. Use of radioisotopes in research and in practical application increased threefold since 1953—a million patients treated each year.

Ninth. Agreements made by the United States with 42 other countries on atomic power and research.

Tenth. Collective action for atomic development promoted as a result of President Eisenhower's 1953 atoms-for-peace proposal. International Atomic Energy Agency established, composed of 70 nations, which has advanced the peaceful uses of atomic energy by giving technical assistance, sponsoring training and exchange of scientists and establishing norms and standards in health and safety.

Eleventh. More atomic data declassified and released to private industry.

Twelfth. Atomic Energy Act revised to change a Government monopoly to a regulated free enterprise industry.

Certainly these achievements prove the Democratic platform to be inaccurate, and hence, throw a shadow on the sincerity of their so-called new frontiers.

The portion of the Democratic Party's platform charging atomic stalling looks to the so-called McKinney report, shortly to be issued by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, as documentation for its charge. It is interesting to note that Nucleonics magazine polled top atomic industry leaders on this report's recommendations and conclusions and had this to say in its August, 1960, issue:

> Top atomic industry leaders found them generally idealistic, naive, and too strongly Government-oriented. Particularly criticized were: Confusion of the aims of atoms for peace [to help underdeveloped countries raise their standards of living] with nuclear disarmament; naivete of the report's contention that it was a mistake to set competitive rather than "truly low-cost, as low as waterpower" nuclear power as the goal ["this is semantic nonsense—obviously you push your technology to give you the lowest-cost power you can get"]; and the emphasis on a stronger role for Government at the expense of industry. The proposed new international bodies were scouted as top-heavy and unnecessary additional organs. A few felt it was healthy to have had the report, but most agreed with the view, "Frankly, I just don't think there's anything that's very constructive."

The last quotation from Nucleonics quite well describes the Democratic plank on atomic energy.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the distinguished member of the Subcommittee on Public Works of the House Committee on Appropriations, the Honorable KEITH THOMSON, of Wyoming.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in support of Operation Veracity. This operation is a conscientious attempt to focus the light of truth on 14 dark misstatements in the Democratic Party platform.

All of us are amazed at one of our great political parties allowing its platform to fall into such a state of affairs. And I sympathize with my many colleagues of the other party who find such deep embarrassment in the condition of their platform.

Let us examine the following statement of the platform:

> We will support and intensify the research effort to find an economical way to convert salt and brackish water. The Republicans discouraged this research, which holds untold possibilities for the whole world.

Now, for the facts:

First, in 4 out of the last 7 years the Democratic-controlled Congress has cut the President's budget requests for further saline water research and development.

Plainly, this indicates that the untruths which Operation Veracity has been examining are often not even subtle untruths, but absurd untruths. This all places the platform in an absurd position, indeed.

Actually, the cost of converting sea water to fresh water has come down further and faster during the Eisenhower-Nixon administration than during all previous human history. This is a remarkable achievement—a seven-fold reduction in cost—for the Democratic platform framers to be attacking.

The Democrat platform further states:

> We will resume research and development work on use of low-grade mineral reserves, especially oil shale, lignites, iron ore taconite, and radioactive minerals. These efforts have been halted or cut back by the Republican administration.

Nothing could be further from the fact. Let me use as an example oil shale research, since this is conducted at the Bureau of Mines experimental laboratory at Laramie, Wyo., in the State which it is my privilege to represent.

In 1956, the administration requested funds for a full program. The Democrat Congress cut this appropriation so severely that lack of funds made it necessary to lay off about one-third of the experiment station's personnel. In 1957, the administration again requested funds for a full program, and with its support such were provided. Since that time, adequate funds for a continuing program have been requested by the administration.

In spite of setbacks, imposed by Democrat-controlled Congresses, the administration has continued efforts to find new mineral resources uses. The Bureau of Mines continued its emphasis on research involving high-temperature and special structural metals, and is attempting to develop new uses for materials having unusual properties and find new uses for minerals in distress such as coal.

More recently, deposition of high purity tungsten into simple controlled shapes by a novel process developed by the Bureau has generated untold interest among the designers of missiles. Its possible application in helping to solve the problems incident to high-temperature alloys is significant.

Additional emphasis has been placed by the Department of the Interior's geological survey on the development of new geologic concepts, techniques, and tools to aid in the search for mineral deposits and to determine the water supplies of the Nation.

As a member of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Interior and related agencies for the past 2 years, I can state unequivocally that the Republican administration and Republicans in Congress have supported other basic mineral research.

Furthermore, the Democrat platform, with this as in other things, assumes that everything must be done by the Federal Government. May I say that private industry as in other things makes a tremendous contribution to research and development work on new minerals and new uses for minerals, if given the proper encouragement. Using the State of Wyoming, which I represent and with which I am most familiar, again as an example, at Kemmerer, Wyo., private industry is erecting a pilot plant experimenting with development of coking coal from our subbituminous coals. At South Pass City out of Lander, Wyo., private industry is opening up an iron ore taconite deposit. The Democrat platform, again in this area, demonstrates a complete lack of faith in the free enterprise system and understanding of the mineral industry, or else is indulging in plain demogogery, and you can be the judge of that.

Depletion allowances are fair taxation which encourage research, exploration, and development by private industry. Criticism comes with ill grace from a party that would discourage such. The Democrat platform states:

> We shall close the loopholes in the tax laws by which certain privileged groups legally escape their fair share of taxation.
>
> Among the more conspicuous loopholes are depletion allowances which are inequitable.

People who are in the business of developing our mineral resources and people who rely upon this for their jobs and livelihood and know the score will do well to contrast that with the Republican platform, which states:

> Republicans therefore pledge * * * continued support for Federal financial assistance and incentives under our tax laws to encourage exploration for domestic sources of minerals and metals, with reasonable depletion allowances.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, a new Republican administration can be elected with confidence that government and private industry will go forward hand in hand, with the necessary research, exploration, and development to provide adequate water and mineral resources for this Nation, in the finest tradition of our free enterprise system.

During the 8 years of the Republican administration, the total annual value of

our domestic mineral production has risen from $13.4 billion to $17.1 billion.

This concludes my comments on these two false statements in the Democrat platform, but, Mr. Speaker, it does not conclude my amazement at the document.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS], a distinguished member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, to the remarks that have already been made by the gentlemen who have preceded me, I wish to add my deep concern about the untruths incorporated into the Democratic platform. "Operation Veracity," whereby these untruths are exposed in the RECORD of the Congress for the benefit of the people is certainly called for.

Appropriately, it was said earlier that a key issue, yes, perhaps the key issue, of the fall presidential campaign is experience versus inexperience. I might enlarge on this. The issue is between mature statesmanship versus immature politics.

Mr. Speaker, it is immature politics to slur over the truth, to boondoggle the truth, to downgrade the true successes which help the well-being of every American citizen and which make the United States of America the strongest nation on earth.

Now, take this immature political and false statement in the Democratic platform:

> The Republican failure in the economic field has been virtually complete.

What economic indicator of all the indicators we have now built up to test our economic well-being are the Democratic platform framers looking to in order to justify this false statement? The answer is "None." Every indicator of economic well-being of a society reveals that just the reverse is true. Never in the history of mankind has the economic condition of a society been as good and on such a sound and broad base as that of the United States in the year 1960.

During the Eisenhower-Nixon administration:

The gross national product—total output of the economy—has been pushed beyond half a trillion dollars in 1960—44 percent above the $347 billion level of 1952. A new American record, a new world record.

So this is a failure according to new frontiersmanship.

Per capita gross national product is now $2,805 compared to $2,547 in 1952, a new American record, a new world record and with 23 million more persons sharing the wealth.

Job opportunities have expanded—almost 69 million now at work in civilian jobs, 7 million more than in 1952. A new American record, a new world record.

So the new frontiersmen do not want expanded opportunities.

Federal Government's share of the output of the economy has been reduced from 20 percent in 1952 to 16 percent today. Ninety percent of the increase in personal income over 1952 level kept by individuals and private business instead of being taken by the tax collector.

So the framers of the Democratic platform think it a failure when the tax collector does not cut into the private sector more.

Average family income—$6,520 last year—is 27 percent above 1952. A new American record, a new world record.

That constitutes a failure according to the Democratic platform.

Financial assets of individuals increased more than 2½ times—from $373 billion at the end of 1952 to $956 billion at the end of 1959.

A new American record, a new world record but another failure, according to the platform.

Per capita consumer spending is up from $1,400 in 1952 to $1,760 today. Even in constant dollars this is a jump of 14 percent per person. Another American and world record but according to the Democratic platform another failure.

Labor income up almost 50 percent—from $190 billion in 1952 to over $280 billion in 1959. Average factory wages up 36 percent—from $1.67 an hour in 1952 to $2.28 this year. Another American and world record.

Do the platform framers think it is a Republican failure for labor income to increase? Or perhaps the failure lies in the eyes of the Democrats that the income was boosted through private endeavor rather than by transfer payments from some of the Federal spending programs the Democrats have been advocating.

In 1959 as compared with 1952 there were 10,039,000 more U.S. families with incomes of more than $4,000 for a grand total of 36,500,000 families.

In 1959 as compared with 1952 there were 4,649,000 fewer U.S. families limited to annual income of $4,000 or less. Both of these are new American records and new world records for societies.

The economic indicators that reveal the base for future economic growth give us assurance that we will break even these high records in the near future.

Investment by industry has increased—$247 billion invested in new plant and equipment in 7 years, 1953 to 1959, more than the total invested over the preceding 20 years.

The new frontiersmen must list this a failure, too.

Ownership of corporate business expanded; almost twice as many Americans now own shares as did in 1952. A new American and world record.

The Democrat platform framers call that a failure, I suppose, because it will be harder for them to undermine private economic growth because more and more voters are getting a stake in our American enterprise.

Value of dollar has been stabilized; consumer price level, which more than doubled under 20 years before 1953, held to 1 percent annual increase since 1953. Nineteen hundred and thirty-nine dollar, which lost 48 cents in purchasing power under Democrats, dropped 5 cents in value since 1952.

The platform framers must prefer the dollar to lose 48 cents in purchasing power. Certainly, they have been urging that we go back to the days when they corrupted our money by having the Federal Reserve System provide an artificial market for our Treasury bonds in the guise of being for low interest rates.

Labor-management relations improved; in 1952 there were 5117 strikes involving 3.5 million workers; in 1959, 3,900 strikes involving 1.9 million workers, despite the steel strike.

This is not progress, according to the "new frontiersmen."

And just a note of caution lest anyone think that these overall economic statistics of social and personal economic well being are at the sacrifice of education, personal freedom, and other intangibles which mean so much to us both in the present and in the future, let me give one statistic on expenditure in just one area of education.

In 1952 we spent $313 per pupil in average daily attendance in public and elementary and secondary schools; in 1958 $446 per pupil. The figures for 1959 and 1960 not available are even greater. This means that in 1952 about $8,138 billion was spent for education here compared to about $15,510 billion, based upon an interpolated figure in 1959—number of pupils in 1952 was 26 million, in 1959 the number was 33 million.

This, too, is a new American record and a new world record.

I observe that one of two things is true about this Democratic platform statement that the Republican failure in the economic field has been virtually complete.

Either the statement was an intentional falsehood, or the framers of the Democratic platform picture a "New Frontier" in which there is no prosperity, no individual incentive, no pursuit of personal happiness, but only a superstate all-powerful over miserable individuals and one which is probably at war.

In 1934 Henry A. Wallace wrote a book, "New Frontiers."

Apparently, the "new frontiers" at which the 1960 Democratic platform framers gaze are the depression frontiers of 1934.

The failures of the 1934 Democratic leadership when facing the economic problems of 1934 were great.

I quote from a February 26, 1959, speech of the gentleman from Connecticut, the chairman of the Democratic platform committee:

> But, Mr. Speaker, let us face the fact that the New Deal failed in its second major objective, which was to restore full employment and prosperity to our country. In 1940, more than 8 million Americans were still unemployed: 14½ percent of the working force.

He might have added that only upon the advent of World War II was the depression of the thirties eliminated.

Let us never forget that all of the new American and world records that we have set in the field of economic well-being for our society in the year 1960 have been accomplished upon the base of a peacetime, not a wartime economy. The Democratic Party has yet to prove that it can achieve prosperity based upon peace. They might have proved it in 1950 as we were emerging from the

recession of 1949–50, but the advent of the Korean war robbed them of this proof.

Certainly the leaders of the Democratic Party have given rise to a question, which every citizen should ponder carefully. Can they distinguish between an economy based upon war and one based upon peace? This question can be properly asked in light of the Democrats' use of juggled economic statistics, particularly those which measure economic growth, in which they deliberately ignore the Korean war, even after this gross oversight is called to their attention. To try to prove that under Truman's administration our economic growth was good they ignore the immediate aftermath of World War II, the year 1946, start with 1947 and go to 1953 the height of the Korean war. They then take the Eisenhower administration at the height of the Korean war 1953 to 1959, the year of the emergence from a recession. Just jiggle the figures the other way and use 1945 the year Truman went in office and go to 1952 the year he left office and we have a reverse effect. Or start with the year 1954 the immediate aftermath of the Korean war and go to estimated 1960 and we have excellent figures of economic growth.

The Democratic platform proposes to resurrect the depression approach to meet the challenges of the 1960's. This reactionary platform wishes to look at the economy through a rear-view mirror.

I do not believe the American public this fall will follow a 1934 version of so-called new frontiersmanship which has no place for initiative, opportunity, and prosperity.

I do not believe the American public will subscribe to a platform or support a party which shows such political immaturity and disregard for the intelligence of the voter by including these many glaring and serious misstatements of fact.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I do not like to comment on a news clipping. However, I think I have no better answer to my letter to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. BOWLES], and therefore I read a statement from a news ticker into the RECORD, with reference to my invitation to Mr. BOWLES.

BOWLES, foreign policy adviser to Senator KENNEDY, Democratic presidential nominee, was not immediately available for comment.

However, an aid to BOWLES dismissed the GOP attacks as "just another political stunt." If the truth can be called "just another political stunt," we plead guilty. Further quoting from the news ticker, this unnamed aid said:

We are not viewing it as a very major threat.

And he added that BOWLES stands by the truthfulness of the Democratic platform.

All I can say is that if this is correct, and the gentleman from Connecticut really stands behind the truthfulness of his platform after the facts presented by Operation Veracity, I am disappointed.

I am sorry time will not permit me to yield to the gentlemen from the other side. If they desire to take more time today, and answer the statements we are making, we will be glad to stay on the floor to accommodate them.

I now yield to the gentleman from New York, [Mr. DEROUNIAN], a distinguished member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I support Operation Veracity, to purge the Democratic platform of certain untrue statements imbedded in it.

In effect, by exposing these untruths, "Operation Veracity" is upholding the great achievements of many of our Government agencies in the face of an attempt by some to downgrade and belittle their achievements.

Let us place this following statement of the Democratic platform in analytical examination with the facts:

The Republican administration has allowed the Food and Drug Administration to be weakened.

As to what has transpired in the last 7 years, here are some facts:

Food and Drug Administration inspection force has been tripled since 1954 in order more effectively to guard the Nation's food and drug supply and remove unsafe products from the marketplace.

Basic scientific research programs have been intensified, scientific staffs have been increased, laboratory equipment has been modernized, two new field headquarters have been established, and construction of a new headquarters building with modern laboratories has been authorized.

Far-reaching legislation has been sought and obtained to improve the protection of the public against harmful, unclean, or misrepresented foods, drugs, or cosmetics. A landmark in this effort was the Food Additives Amendment of 1958 which required that food additives be shown safe for human consumption before use. This legislation established the principle that the burden of proof must rest squarely on the manufacturer to assume the safety of products prior to their sale to consumers.

Administration-sponsored legislation was enacted in July 1960 to provide a scientifically sound basis for approving colors that may be safely used in foods, drugs, and cosmetics, and to establish other safeguards including, where necessary, appropriate tolerance limitations on the amount of the color that may be used.

In addition, the Eisenhower-Nixon team has proposed further amendments to the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to strengthen factory inspection authority, require manufacturers to make reports on clinical experience with new drugs, and assure adequate controls over the purity and quality of drugs.

Mr. Speaker, I could continue to cite such examples. These are adequate, however, to prove the fabrication of the Democratic platform statement I quoted.

A TRIBUTE TO ED REES

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. WALTER]. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AVERY] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AVERY. I yield.

Mr. LAIRD. I just had an opportunity to read a United Press story which is carried on the ticker in the Speaker's lobby, and I would like to comment on it:

Representative FRANK THOMPSON (New Jersey) is engaging in deliberate deception when he charges there are two versions of the 1960 Republican Platform, one for the South and another for the North.

There is only one authorized text of the platform and only one printed version of it being circulated. This booklet is being circulated nationally, North, South, East, and West.

The phrase mentioned by Representative THOMPSON that one-quarter of all Federal employees are Negroes was contained in a draft of the report of the Committee on Resolutions.

It does not appear in the final authorized version of the platform. In comparing a draft with the final version of the platform and charging that differences between the two add up to "doctoring", Representative THOMPSON is himself guilty of gross deception.

That particular statement appeared in this report of the Resolutions Committee. Upon checking the statement it was found to be questionable and was not included in the platform which was adopted by the Republican Party convention. It does not appear in the final authorized version of the platform. In comparing this draft with the final version of the platform and charging that a difference between the two adds up to doctoring, the gentleman from New Jersey, Representative THOMPSON, is himself guilty of gross deception.

As vice chairman of the Republican Platform Committee I can say that every statement in the Republican platform that was presented to the Republican Convention was closely and thoroughly scrutinized for accuracy, and no statement such as is attributed by the gentleman from New Jersey is contained in the Republican Party platform. I assure the gentleman and assure all Americans that the 1960 platform as adopted by the Republican Party Convention is being distributed in one form, the convention adopted form, in the South, and the North, and the East, and the West. The charge of the gentleman from New Jersey is pure and deliberate deception at its worst.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, ordinarily one might expect the author of his own work to be thoroughly familiar with it and in this particular case one might have expected the Republican Party, as represented so fastidiously by my distinguished colleagues, to be familiar with its party platform in general and, here specifically, with its plank on the urgent problem of civil rights.

Since it was the professed objective of my Republican friends to illuminate this particular plank of their party's platform for the benefit of all Americans, perhaps it would not be too presumptuous of us to ask them to go one step further and tell us which civil rights plank they do support. While we realize that an issue is seldom all black and white and that there is often a large gray area to explore, we have found in the Republican civil rights plank an area of blue as well which we feel must also be explored.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, it would appear that there is both a blue and a gray edition of the platform. I have in my hand two copies of the 1960 Republican platform, "Building a Better America," a report of the committee on resolutions to the Republican National Convention, July 27, 1960, Chicago, Ill. One copy I received some 4 weeks ago. It contains this sentence in the eighth paragraph of the civil rights section on page 27:

> Today nearly one-fourth of all Federal employees are Negro.

This is obviously the blue edition. The other copy, obtained by my office last Saturday, is identical to the blue edition in every way except that the above-quoted sentence has been conspicuously omitted. It is clearly not a typographical mistake, since the omission of the sentence required a change in the spacing of the entire page 27. This is clearly the gray edition.

I have checked the copies of the civil rights plank appearing in the daily press during the Republican convention and have found that the omitted sentence did, in fact, appear in the original text.

Mr. Speaker, I demand, and, yes, every responsible citizen demands to know why this sentence, this reference to our Negro Government employees, was omitted in later reprints of the Republican platform. Was this omission sanctioned by the Republican presidential candidate to cautiously coincide with his recent trip through the Southern States? Perhaps the notorious "truth squad" which Republicans hold so dear to their sectional hearts will find a moment—of truth as it were—to investigate this outrageous disparity in their own party's position on the critical problem of civil rights—and discover just who was responsible for "doctoring" the Republican platform.

Anticipating, as we must from such inquiries, that the truth squad will be on furlough when this memo reaches its underworked staff, perhaps we should initiate the inquiry ourselves. We must ask first of all what agency of the Federal Government compiles statistics on racial characteristics of Government employees. I have a copy of the standard Form 57 Federal employment application form and I see no question soliciting information as to the applicant's race or color. How was it then that the Republican National Committee gathered information to the effect that "nearly one-fourth of all Federal employees are Negro" as is stated in the northern, blue cover, version of the Republican platform? It would also be most enlightening to know how many southern, gray cover, copies of the Republican platform have been distributed and in which Southern States.

Mr. Speaker, this disgraceful exhibition of duplicity and political expediency on this vital issue of civil rights points up the fact that the Republican Party is not a national party and must "doctor" certain planks of its platform to appeal to the voters on a sectional basis.

I am proud that the Democratic Party is a national party and its platform planks apply equally in the North, South, East, and West. We do not try to deceive the voters of any section of the country. Our platform says the same thing to the people of Birmingham, Ala., or Atlanta, Ga., as it says in Chicago, Ill., or in my own hometown of Trenton, N.J.

We await their veracious reply.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I want the record to show that I am extremely prejudiced in this political debate that seems to be going on here today. I concede that. Notwithstanding my prejudice, the reason for my requesting this time for discussion is strictly nonpolitical. In keeping with the nonpolitical nature of the speech and also in a sense of fairness I am going to yield to one gentleman on my right, and one only; then I am going to proceed with the matter I prepared.

The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] has requested that I yield to him, and I am going to yield to him 30 seconds and then proceed with the special order I have prepared.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I thank the gentleman from Kansas for his courtesy.

Mr. Speaker, I merely want the record to show that during the past hour on several occasions Members on this side of the aisle did seek recognition asking Members to yield in order that the truth which we were here seeking to ascertain might have been seen from more than one perspective. No yielding took place and, therefore, it has been impossible this afternoon to answer the questions that have been asked.

I simply want the record to show that efforts were made to secure recognition. These efforts were denied. I thank the gentleman from Kansas for his courtesy and trust that upon another occasion Members of the Democratic Party on this side of the aisle will provide answers to the questions that were raised. I certainly will not take any more of the gentleman's time, and again express my appreciation for his yielding.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield me 30 seconds?

Mr. AVERY. I have just announced that I would yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Colorado and then would decline to yield until after I had finished my special order. In keeping with my statement I must respectfully decline to yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I might say to the gentleman from Kansas that I simply wanted to point out to the gentleman from Colorado that he and his colleagues can get ample time today. I will remain and I am sure others will remain in order to discuss the points that were advanced on the floor.

Mr. AVERY. Now, Mr. Speaker, if I may be permitted to proceed I will present the matter I had prepared.

In 1936, when Kansas was enduring one of the most severe droughts and grasshopper infestations in our history, a man knocked at our farm home door during the noon hour. I answered the door and was met by a friendly, bright-eyed man who introduced himself as follows: "I am ED REES. I am a Republican candidate for Congress from this district."

I still live on that same farm, and of course it is no longer in the Fourth Congressional District, I have since that day been a most ardent admirer of my colleague from Kansas, the Honorable ED REES. I have taken this time today to pay tribute to him in these closing days of a long and successful career of his service as a Member of the House of Representatives. You are all aware I am sure, my colleagues, that ED REES announced his retirement from this body some months ago. And not only will his presence be missed by those of us who expect to remain as Members of this body, but many thousands of Kansans, both within and without his congressional district, will be very much aware of his absence from this body.

As is frequently the case when we attempt to summarize our many thoughts about a longstanding friend, we find it difficult to express into words our innermost feelings and impressions of those we seek to honor. The fine qualities that we see most in a group of individuals to me all seem to be present and have many times been exemplified in the character and the record of Mr. REES. Not only have these outstanding qualities been identified with his service in the Congress of the United States, but they were also quite evident in his service as a public servant in our native State of Kansas before his election to this body.

A lawyer by profession, he was elected to the House of Representatives of the Kansas Legislature in 1927 and in 1931 was elected majority leader of the house of representatives. Although the House Journal does not tell the whole story, he missed being elected speaker of that body by one vote. As an aside, it was a joke in Kansas for many years that the winning candidate for speaker of the house received 46 votes. He said that all 46 house members afterward told him that they had at the last minute switched their vote to the successful candidate in order to assure his election.

At the conclusion of his three terms of service in the House of Representatives of the Kansas Legislature, Mr. REES was elected to the Kansas Senate in 1932 and served as a distinguished member of that body until his election to the Congress 4 years later.

His service in the House of Representatives, of course, is known personally to most of you. He was ranking minority member of the Civil Service Committee, and after the Reorganization Act of 1945 became the first chairman of the com-

bined Post Office and Civil Service Committee in the 80th Congress. He has been ranking minority member of that same committee since that time, except for the several periods of time that he has been chairman.

I will not even attempt to recite the many legislative accomplishments of the Federal employees under Mr. REES' term of office. He has always had the courage to take the position in respect to all legislation that he believed to be right and for the best interest of the United States of America. Many times this has been the prevailing and popular position to take, but there have been other times when it was not the prevailing position and certainly not the most popular one either. But the comparative popularity of a position never seemed to concern Mr. REES. He was only concerned to find a position which he believed to be right. I think this is one of the qualities that we admire the most about him, if one such quality can be identified among the many others.

In addition to the sterling quality of conviction to his ideals must also be mentioned his loyalty to his party and to his leadership. In this respect his support has always been dependable.

Nor have all of Mr. REES' legislative interests been confined to the field of civil service legislation. He has had a continuing and a very profound interest in all problems related to agriculture, and also has been an ardent supporter of soil and water conservation programs. Further, he has also been a dependable supporter for legislation improving the status of the veterans of the United States. A veteran of World War I himself, his influence is apparent in many statutes that have been enacted by the Congress for those who served in the Armed Forces. Particularly, I would like to mention the designating of November 11 as Veterans Day was accomplished by legislation introduced and sponsored by Mr. REES. The United Dry Forces of Kansas always looked to Mr. REES as one of their friends in Congress.

Even though the Fourth Congressional District of Kansas traditionally has been dominated by agriculture during the years he has represented it, industry has expanded and grown to where it is nearly in balance with agriculture. Particularly should be noted Wichita, Kans., whose growth and expansion has been phenomenal since 1940 and has since become known throughout the United States as the air capital of the world.

In reciting the many accomplishments of Mr. REES, I think some mention should also be made of his good wife, Agnes, who has been his constant companion for almost 50 years. She has been his companion as a homemaker, as a churchworker, as a community servant, and as a most effective campaign partner. They are the proud parents of a son, John Edward, who has commenced a most sucsessful career as a young lawyer in Wichita, Kans., after serving with honor and distinction in the Armed Forces.

As I said in the beginning, I find it extremely difficult to compress into a few words my true feeling of honor and respect to Mr. REES. Although I have not been in agreement with him in every instance, I have always admired him and always felt the reassurance of his leadership during my comparatively brief term in Congress.

I shall be very much aware of his absence in the 87th Congress, but shall always remember the fine example of courageous leadership he displayed as a Member of this body and will set it for a goal for the discharge of my own responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, the following is an excerpt from an editorial which appeared in the Topeka Daily Capital of Wednesday, March 9, 1960, regarding the announced retirement of my colleague, the Honorable EDWARD H. REES:

ED REES RETIRES

The retirement of ED REES as Representative from the Fourth District closes another chapter in a long career of public service.

REES was born on a farm in Lyon County, and was graduated from Kansas State Teachers College of Emporia in 1913. He taught school from 1909 to 1911; was clerk of the court in Lyon County from 1912 to 1918, during which time he was admitted to the practice of law; was a member of the Kansas House of Representatives from 1927 to 1933; a member of the Kansas Senate from 1933 to 1935, and has served 12 consecutive terms in the U.S. House of Representatives to become the senior Member of the Kansas congressional delegation. He has been on the Post Office Committee for many years, and is considered to be expert on postal matters.

A whole generation of voters has grown up in the Fourth District who have never thought of voting for anybody but ED REES for Congress. But with his retirement it seems probable there will be a scramble for his seat in the House.

* * * * *

But whoever is elected in the Fourth District will have an example set for him in the long and devoted service of ED REES.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, it has been my rare privilege to serve with EDWARD H. REES on the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee for nearly 14 years, during which we have alternated as chairman and ranking minority member of the committee since its creation under the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

I can say without qualification that never in my experience has there been a more dedicated, diligent, and effective worker than ED REES in the interest of efficient Government and the welfare of Federal personnel.

Throughout the years Mr. REES has sponsored and supported measures to strengthen the Federal civil service and to advance the welfare of Federal employees too numerous by far to permit repetition now. As the first chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee in the 80th Congress he guided to completion one of the most productive employee programs in the entire history of our Government. He has always been the champion of the little fellow and insisted on protecting individual rights to prevent any inequity or injustice.

Mr. REES' advice and counsel have proved invaluable to me personally, and to the entire committee, in finding solutions to the very complex—and sometimes controversial—problems concerned in our tremendously expanded Government personnel activities. His great knowledge and wealth of experience in postal matters also have contributed immeasurably to the great public service rendered by our farflung and ever-growing postal service.

It is with deep regret and a sense of personal loss that I contemplate the retirement of this fine public servant and dear friend. I wish him every happiness and success in the years to come.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AVERY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I know that I express the sentiment of all those in the House when I say that we are sorry to see Mr. REES retire. In the 10 years that I have been here, he and Mrs. Rees have been a real inspiration to me as an individual. They come from an area where my mother was born and raised as a girl. Some of the times we have had a chance to chat together and reminisce about things that happened in Kansas before I was in the Congress.

The thing that impressed me most about the REES family is the fact that they have been such a guiding light to all of those who have known them. I know of no one in my experience who has come up the hard way, as ED REES did, has had considerable success, and then find him and his wife still the sincere, God-fearing, and humble people they always were and are. We shall miss them.

I might also say that in my opinion wherever you find a good man, you find close to him right at hand, a good woman. And I think that is true in ED's case.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio. I now yield to our distinguished present minority leader, and quite possibly the next Speaker of the House of Representatives, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, to say that I am making these observations with mixed emotions is an understatement.

I am happy for my beloved friend and colleague, ED REES, that he is going to leave the heavy burdens he has carried so long for a richly deserved retirement from the Congress.

But as one who has enjoyed his companionship here in the House of Representatives through the years I shall miss him keenly.

I shall miss him for the wisdom of his counsel.

I shall miss him for the gentleness of his nature.

I shall miss him for the courage and the integrity he has shown, time and again, on decisions that have involved the very fate of our Nation.

I have no hesitation in saying to this House that ED REES has served in this body with true distinction.

He has been an anchorman of strength on his committee, serving in two Congresses as chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and at other times as ranking Republican.

His influence for sound legislation has been felt, not only by his fellow members on that committee, not only by the Members who have heard him in debate, but also by those in the executive branch who have benefited from the logic and experience of his advice. I am sure it is not my place to tell the good citizens of the Fourth District of Kansas that they are losing a devoted, faithful servant in the retirement of ED REES. But I do want to assure them that, beyond that, the country is losing the services of an able, dedicated statesman, a Member of the U.S. Congress for whom every colleague, on both sides of the aisle, holds the highest esteem as a man who has, in his time, made a major contribution to good government on the national scene. His shoes will be mighty hard to fill around here, but he has earned, and he deserves, some leisure for himself. My wish for ED REES is that the years ahead will be filled with happiness and good health, and a rich satisfaction that comes from the knowledge of having used his full talents to make our Nation a better place in which to live.

Mr. AVERY. I thank the gentleman from Indiana for his contribution. And I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HEMPHILL], a former member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I want to associate myself with all the remarks which have been made about ED REES. I think so often, on the American scene today, the American people fail to appreciate the kind of service and the kind of dedication a man gives and has when he serves his nation as has our beloved gentleman from Kansas. Those of us who came to the committee early in our career called him affectionately "Mr. Chairman." I see in him a great lawyer, a great statesman and a great legislator; and I think of the old adage, "We are part of all that we have met." So that, as we go through life, with whatever burdens we bear, we will be better men, better citizens, and better legislators for having known this distinguished gentleman.

I wish for him and Mrs. Rees every happiness deserved by a great citizen and his noble helpmate, conscious of the fact that this country is the better for his service, these generations inspired by their exemplary lives.

Mr. AVERY. I thank the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, along with my other colleagues I do want to add mine to the words of praise to ED REES for the splendid service he has rendered not only to the people of his district, his State, but the Congress of the United States, which represents the whole country.

I would not know exactly what the definition of "gentleman" would be unless I looked it up in the dictionary, but the word itself is just a word until you know ED REES. He gives meaning to the word. Nowhere can be found anyone who exemplifies the true meaning of the word gentleman—and a gentleman always.

As I have often said, one of the greatest pleasures of serving in this illustrious body is that we come to know real Americans, real patriotic, sincere individuals, ED REES is one of them. Our association with him has made us, as individuals, truly enriched in mind, in heart, and in purpose.

His service to his country has been outstanding. His ability and sincerity is beyond question. He is a man who has stood on his convictions with firmness. All that he has done in Congress is a monument to him. It will stand forever.

May I say to ED REES that it is my hope that he may enjoy good health and all the rewards of life of service to his people and his country. We shall miss him even more than we now realize.

Mr. AVERY. I thank the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN].

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to associate my views with those of the Members who today pay tribute to our beloved colleague, ED REES. It has been a privilege and a pleasure to serve here with him. It has been helpful, it has been an inspiration to observe this great legislator handling bills, seeing in what a calm manner he has accomplished so much. I have said it before in this body and I would like to say again that I think we are in complete accord that this world is a better place in which to live for his having lived in it. Certainly we of this Congress, those of us who, we hope, will return next year, will be better prepared to do our jobs well for having had the wise counsel of ED REES. I wish the Honorable EDWARD REES and his family many years of retirement and happiness.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman who is the next ranking member to Mr. REES on the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service [Mr. CORBETT].

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, since the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service was first comprised as it has been since the passage of the Reorganization Act, I have had the pleasure of serving on that committee with Mr. REES. We have over the years at some times disagreed on policy, and to many people it undoubtedly appeared that he more often than not was right and I was wrong. However, his sincerity of purpose in all of his arguments has always been respected by all the members of the committee and I am sure by the House as well.

At this time two things might well be pointed out, that service on this particular committee, while it has never been regarded as a blue-ribbon committee of the House, is possibly as arduous service as can be engaged in. With the 2¼ million Federal employees; with all of their organization pressure at all times for the establishment of certain points of view; with all of the labor-management relationships that come before that committee dealing not only with salary rates but with fringe benefits, it is a committee where one could be eternally busy. I am sure that Mr. REES devoted as much attention to this work as any individual who ever served on the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

I think the second thing that ought to be emphasized is that this particular branch of the Government, the House of Representatives, is the only body in all of the farflung Federal Government, in which the only way you can possibly sit on this floor as a voting Member is to be elected by your neighbors and fellow residents in your own congressional district. It is not a common thing to be returned to this body 12 times. I think this is the greatest compliment that can be paid to Mr. REES, that his friends and neighbors are so pleased with him as an individual and so pleased with him as a Representative that they returned him here as their Representative for 24 years. Now that he has seen fit to retire, all of us wish him and his family all good fortune and good health, and we hope he returns from time to time to renew acquaintances and to give us the benefit of his wisdom and advice.

Mr. AVERY. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

I now would like to yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, during the many years I have served with the gentleman from Kansas, and they have been many years—a quarter of a century—I have always found him to be gentle and kind and ever attentive to his duties. He has always been skillful and effective in his work not only on his committees but on the floor of the House. He has been a sincere and truly dedicated public servant. You know character is what you are when nobody is looking, and judging by that test, ED REES has an exceptionally good character. I think he leaves upon the tablets of this House a good name. You know, a good name is like an acrostic, you read it from left to right and from right to left and up or down—it spells goodness, and ED REES is the very embodiment of goodness.

Mr. AVERY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES].

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity to join in this most deserving tribute to our colleague, ED REES. I had the very distinct privilege when I came here as a freshman Member of the House of Representatives to have the opportunity to serve on what was then the Committee on Civil Service and at that time Mr. REES was the ranking member of that committee. I do not know of any Member who in that capacity gave more attention, time and consideration to helping the younger Members get their feet on the ground or who served as a finer model of a splendid legislator than did ED REES. We are all going to miss him. His counsel, his advice, his tolerance and his consideration are all things that we will always remember about him. I would like to join with the gentleman who has the floor and identify myself

with his very fine statement with respect to ED REES. I am sure all Members of the House feel deeply that the Congress will sustain a great loss in not having him here as part of the House of Representatives when the Congress reconvenes next year. We wish him every bit of long life, pleasure and happiness possible in his well earned retirement.

Mr. AVERY. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a comment. I think the gentleman from Wisconsin mentioned a characteristic of Mr. REES, which I am sure I had in my prepared remarks, but which I did not happen to mention. That is the characteristic of tolerance. I think if you will reflect for just a moment on your contacts with Mr. REES, you will know that you have never known a more tolerant man.

Nothwithstanding his characteristic of tolerance, he still stood firm in the position he took because he felt it to be right. Nevertheless, that is just another characteristic of the great man.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AVERY. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. The diligent and energetic gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] has announced his retirement. He was very helpful to me as a freshman Member of this body. He is courteous and loyal to his people, a man of the greatest integrity. He has been a source of encouragement to a great many Members not only from Kansas but from other States. Although politically we often differ, as I do with the gentleman who has the floor on fundamental issues, we find ourselves in agreement many, many times.

It is my hope, even though the days of this Congress are numbered, that the Cheney project at Wichita, Kans., can still be approved, not only in the interest of the economic welfare of the people of the Fourth District and of the State of Kansas but its passage would be a great and deserving tribute to my friend, Mr. REES.

Never have I, during my 2 years as a Member of this House, ever heard the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] engage in any slanted, partisan tirade as just took place a few moments ago. He has, in addition, always permitted someone to interrupt to give the other side of any question he was discussing.

Every Member of this body wishes for Mr. ED and Mrs. Rees many years of happiness.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. AVERY. I thank the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GEORGE].

I have noticed the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] seeking recognition. I assume he would like to pay tribute to Mr. REES. I am sure that all of my colleagues would join with us in hoping that Mr. GROSS would pay his tribute to the gentleman from Kansas. I take it that Mr. GROSS would join with his colleagues in this special order today.

I now yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. I join with a great many other Members in expressing regret that our good friend Mr. ED REES is voluntarily retiring from the House of Representatives. He has given years of faithful service to the people of his district and to the citizens of this country.

As a former chairman of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, he has written his name indelibly upon the statutes in behalf of laws of benefit to Federal employees and the Nation's citizens who benefit from the farflung postal service.

As a new Member of Congress and upon assignment to the Post Office and Civil Service Committee I was given invaluable help by the gentleman from Kansas, and I shall ever be grateful to him.

May good health and contentment attend Mr. and Mrs. Rees in their retirement, a retirement well earned and richly deserved.

Mr. AVERY. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS].

Mr. STAGGERS. I thank my colleague for yielding to me to join with my colleagues in paying their respect to a distinguished American, a man whom I have deeply respected in every way. I have found him to be a true gentleman. He is an American; one who has given of his life, of his time, and of his talent toward his fellow man. I have always felt that when the end of our days come and we face our Maker, that He will ask us not whether we are Democrats or Republicans or what church we belonged to, but whether we have been of service, and about our conduct in life. I am sure that the gentleman from Kansas, Congressman REES, fits the bill, a kindly gentleman at all times. I wish for him and his family in their future path through life that it may be through green pastures and beside still waters.

Mr. AVERY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

I could not let this occasion pass without joining with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in paying this deserved tribute to ED REES, which he richly deserves, a tribute that transcends politics and a tribute based upon deep and profound respect, and also upon the higher and nobler things in politics, friendship. I have profound respect for ED REES and a strong feeling of friendship. He is a person of understanding mind with true love of his fellow men. I find as a result of my years of association with ED REES that I had no difficulty because in ED REES I have met a man of deep, profound, understanding mind, a gentleman in every respect of the word, one who could disagree without being disagreeable, a man whose sweetness in his outlook on life has made a profound impression upon all of us. He little realizes how much of an impression he has made upon his fellow colleagues as a result of that nice, sweet character and disposition; but, ED, you have more than you realize. I am glad of the opportunity to be on the floor while this tribute is being paid to let ED REES know of the profound impression he has made upon JOHN MCCORMACK and others, and the inspiration he has been to us in connection not with the superficial things of life, but the real, deep, fundamental things of life that constitute the spirit, the outlook of life, outlook in our relationship to our fellow men. All I can say is that meeting ED REES I have met one of the most noble-minded persons I have ever met in the journey of life. He leaves here with the profound respect of all of us without regard to party, and we all wish for him a long life in retirement and every happiness.

We know that ED REES even in retirement from active legislative life will lead an active life making his contribution to the furtherance of things such as charitable drives and activities of that kind that mean so much in the life of a community and the life of a nation and in the life of a state. While he retires from this body I cannot figure ED REES being inactive. My good friend, ED REES, I am not going to say goodby, but good day.

Mr. AVERY. I thank the distinguished majority leader. I would like to make some observations, if I might, at this time rather briefly. This order I requested on last Thursday, but made no particular decision about its progression until this morning. I think one of the finest tributes to our colleague that could possibly be made rests in the number of Members who are present to participate in this tribute to our colleague who is no longer going to be a Member of this body.

You have heard a lot about Kansas quite a number of times. We have so many capable persons in Kansas there are not enough congressional districts to accommodate all of them so some of them had to leave. I would now like to yield to one such person, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES], who is Kansas-trained.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I thank my good friend from Kansas.

Mr. Speaker, it is a real privilege for me to be on the floor today and to join with the other Members in paying tribute to one of my oldest and best friends. I venture to say I have known ED REES longer than any other Member of this body; and the two of us, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AVERY] and myself, I believe, are the only two Members of the House to be privileged to have once been constituents of ED REES.

Mr. REES comes from Emporia, Kans. My mother was born and raised in Emporia. The Reeses and the Thomases have been fast friends for many years. Mrs. Rees' mother and my grandmother were practically like sisters. So I have known ED REES ever since I can remember. I have known of him as a fine lawyer, a fine gentleman, and as a great friend of my family.

My father was county chairman of the Republican Party of Morris County, Kans. When ED REES first decided to run for the House of Representatives, ED will well remember that he had two quite capable primary opponents at that time. It was my father's definite pleasure, although he had great respect for the other two, to give his backing to ED REES because of his ability and because of the fact he had known him for so long. I can say that having grown up

in the Fourth District of Kansas there was never one who represented a district in the Congress of the United States who is more revered and better respected than is ED REES, not only because of the big things he did but because of the many little things he did.

I know one of my first contacts with a Member of Congress consisted of receiving a birthday card from Congressman ED REES. Whether that had any effect on my deciding to try to be in a position to write birthday cards at some time I do not know, but I know the thrill that came from that first gesture of his filled a teenager's heart with a great amount of admiration and certainly with a great amount of gratitude.

Mr. REES will be missed by everybody, not only here but all over the country, and particularly by the people of the State of Kansas. I am very pleased that ED and Mrs. Rees, his wonderful wife and partner for life, will be able to enjoy these years and to relax a bit because these have been arduous years. Mr. REES is a man who has borne more than the average share of the trials and tribulations of his time. He was a Member of Congress during World War II, during the depression, and during the Korean war. Certainly his span of service has encompassed many of the great crises which face this Nation today.

In closing, I want to pay my tribute and that of my wife, and my mother's family to ED REES and Mrs. Rees, for their fine service to their country, and for the wonderful people they are. Especially, I thank ED REES for the great influence he has had, not only on me but on many others who grew up in his district, as I did. We wish him and Mrs. Rees the best of everything in the future.

Mr. AVERY. I thank the gentleman from Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS], also a ranking member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Kansas for yielding to me. It is a great pleasure and a genuine privilege to join with other Members in expressing my appreciation and admiration for the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES], who is soon to leave this body. I am serving now in my 14th year as a member of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Mr. REES was chairman of that committee when I first came to Congress. I soon learned that he possessed the basic qualities of truth, honesty, and integrity. I was not long in learning also that it was his effort and his keen desire to do all that he could to see that our Government is operated on the basis of efficiency and economy.

As I served on that committee, I noticed that although at times he may be on the losing side in connection with legislation which goes through the committee, he never ceased his efforts to work for the principles in which he believes. While he has always been a loyal member of the Republican Party, at the same time he has never been partisan in his conduct. Mrs. Davis has been a great friend of Mrs. Rees. It is with deep regret that I see them leave, and I join with the many Members who have expressed themselves here today in extending best wishes to Mr. and Mrs. Rees as they return home and in wishing for them many years of pleasure and contentment. I know that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] will continue, although he is leaving here in an active capacity, to serve the people of his home district and his State in other capacities. My best wishes go with him.

Mr. AVERY. I thank the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. Speaker, there might be some disagreement as to which Member might be placed in the category of being the greatest statesman here today, but I next want to yield to a Member who, I am sure, we will all agree is the most charming Member and perhaps the greatest statesman, to participate in this tribute, the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE].

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I think there may be grave doubts on both of those counts, but I am certainly very happy to be here at this time with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to pay tribute to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

When I first came to the Congress 13 years ago, in the 80th Congress, the gentleman from Kansas was the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. It has been said here this afternoon that that is not a blue-ribbon committee, and I think that is probably true, because since I have become a member of the committee on committees, I find that all new Members want to belong to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and some of them eventually become members of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. But, I would also like to say that it is the best political committee in the House, and for that reason it is one of the greatest challenges in the House.

Mr. Speaker, I consider that I have been very, very fortunate in having the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] as my first chairman, because we probably learn more from our first chairman, as we do from our first teachers, than we do from anybody else while we serve in the Congress of the United States. And, to me the gentleman from Kansas was an example, and he was an example because of his character, not because of his politics, not because of the way in which he got things done, but because of the patience, because of his great kindness. And, at times it is very hard to be kind unless it is in your own nature and in your own heart. And, I can assure the membership, and I know that they already know it, because I have heard it in their tributes, that the gentleman from Kansas is always kind and that he is always patient; that in his conduct as chairman and ranking member of that great committee he has never let politics embitter or sour him. Whether he won or lost, he was always fair and he was always just, and he always received the full support and the deep affection of all those who worked with him. Sometimes they did not always agree. In my case this is not true. I think that over all I have agreed with the gentleman from Kansas, with his feelings, with his beliefs, and above all, with his example, more than with anyone else in the House of Representatives.

It is indeed with great regret that I see him leave this House, but I know that he has earned this rest, and I hope that he and Mrs. Rees will have many long and very happy years together with their family and a happy retirement, and may all those good things and all those pleasures that maybe they have had to forgo, owing to all the calls upon them here in Washington, be theirs from here on out.

Mr. Speaker, may I end by saying that the State of Kansas will gain by their return and that we in the House of Representatives will be much the poorer by their departure.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON].

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, it is almost impossible to add anything to the tribute that has been paid this great public servant or to add anything to the words that have been said about him today or, for that matter, to increase in any way the dimensions of the tribute which the people of his district have paid him in 12 successive elections. I do want the House to know that I have been a personal beneficiary of the kindness, the good nature, the generosity, and the neighborly spirit of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES], on many occasions; and I want to join with my colleagues in this House in expressing regret that this body is losing the services of such a distinguished American.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma. Now I should like to yield to another one of Mr. REES' students, so to speak, a member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service whose first committee assignment, if I remember correctly, was on that committee under Mr. REES as his ranking minority member, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JOHANSEN].

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, of course, I count it a high privilege and it is a great personal pleasure to join in this tribute to our friend, ED REES. I share the mixed feelings that have been expressed by various of our colleagues, one of gratification for the gentleman from Kansas and one of regret for those who may be privileged to remain in the House after he leaves.

I would not make reference to one personal matter were I not very positive that I could document it, since everyone seems to be claiming kinship to the State of Kansas today, and I quite understand and applaud that desire. It does happen, however, that my mother was a native of the State of Kansas, a fact which I was not too long in acquainting Mr. REES with when we first met.

I have a further personal tie which possibly he had forgotten, so far as it relates to me, and that is that my distinguished predecessor whom I was privileged to serve as an assistant for 4 years prior to his death, the late Congressman Paul Shafer, was one I believe of three or four new Republican Members elected to the House along with Mr. REES in 1936.

Of course, I pay tribute as all of my colleagues who have spoken here do to the gentlemanly qualities, the kindness and courtesy of our friend. As the other gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AVERY] has mentioned, it has been my pleasure to serve with Mr. REES throughout my nearly 6 years as a member of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. And apropos, and I hope this is not inappropriate, of the remark made by the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE], whatever the ribbon status given to this committee, if I am privileged to remain here, I hope to continue on that committee. I regard it as one of great and significant importance to this House and the Nation.

I should like to have the record clear on one point. It is very true that the gentleman from Kansas wears the velvet glove of courtesy, of kindness, and considerateness; but I know, as I am sure all of his colleagues on the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service have had reason to know, and as many of his other colleagues in the House have had cause to know, and as some of those outside Congress who had had occasion to deal with him in his legislative capacity have learned, that there has always been under that velvet glove of courtesy the steel of integrity, of firm adherence to convictions, of dignified and quiet firmness, for ED REES is a man of character, of which kindness is one attribute and a very high sense of devotion to what he believes right is an equally important attribute.

I join with all my colleagues who have spoken in wishing for Mr. and Mrs. REES many years of health, of contentment, and of companionship together—a wish in which Mrs. Johansen joins me.

Mr. AVERY. I thank the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to our neighbor from the State of Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH].

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, it is a sad day for this Congress and for this country when men like ED REES retire from public life. I wish to join my colleagues in paying this well-deserved tribute to a great American and one of the most beloved Members of this House, ED REES.

When I first came to Congress in 1941 ED REES had his office just across the hall from me. I had never had the pleasure of meeting him before. It did not take me long to recognize his sterling qualities. He was most gracious and affable, and soon made me very much at home. We found we had many things in common, including an interest in baseball, and I have enjoyed many games with ED. Our friendship has been very close and words are utterly inadequate to express my feelings.

One of the richest experiences of my service in this House has been my friendship with ED REES. His retirement is a great personal loss to me. ED REES has been a constant source of strength and inspiration to me during the years we have served in the House.

No good cause ever lacked a champion when ED REES was around. Everyone knew where he stood on every issue. He was for everything that was good and decent. It is obvious by the many expressions of affection here today that the Members of this House have confidence in ED REES, regardless of party affiliation. I do not recall when I have seen so many sincere and eloquent tributes paid a retiring Member. It makes me very happy to see ED REES receive this high praise, which he so richly deserves.

It has been a real privilege for me to serve in Congress with ED REES. I shall always treasure happy memories of our close association over the years. My life is richer for having known ED REES. Truly ED REES is one of God's noblemen. He shall be greatly missed by all of us. We shall not see his like again.

Mrs. Chenoweth and every member of my family join in wishing ED and Mrs. Rees much happiness and good health for many years to come. I know that ED REES is not going to retire, but he will always be found doing good and extending a helping hand where needed.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, may I join my colleagues in pointing out that ED REES is a man of humility. He worked quietly but very effectively as he represented his people and stood up for the highest traditions and ideals of this great Republic. ED REES served with honor and distinction in this great deliberative body and will be long remembered by all of us who associated with him. ED REES was loyal, patriotic, forthright, and capable. I join his colleagues here and his thousands of friends in wishing for him a pleasant retirement he has so well earned.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, like our distinguished colleague, ED REES, I am retiring from the House this year, and I am prepared to say that during my 37 years of service on Capitol Hill this characterful Kansan is one of the most unforgettable men I have ever known.

ED was always a standup man in committee and in debate. He has been the sponsor of many constructive statutes and whenever he addressed his fellow members his presentations commanded attention. I have never seen him lose his temper or utter a word which he would recall. He exalted the friendly and the constructive approach.

I am certain that while ED REES is retiring from the Congress he is not retiring from the cause of good government and other worthwhile endeavors in behalf of his fellow men. He has a congenital liking for people and I cannot help but feel that more will be heard about his good works in the years to come.

Prayerfully I hope in these new years it will be so Mrs. Canfield and I can see ED and the lovely Mrs. Rees occasionally. I know it will mean much to us.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee of the 86th Congress and a Republican, it is a double pleasure to rise to honor ED REES.

This great Congressman has served 24 years in the House. He was the first chairman of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee when it was organized in 1946. He has been probably its most influential member, fighting tirelessly for legislation to benefit the employees of our Federal Government. Through his ceaseless efforts to strengthen and improve the Federal Civil Service and the Post Office, he has benefited the whole Nation, for the well-being of its employees is essential to an efficient Federal Government.

To ED REES is owed the undying gratitude of millions of Federal employees and of the whole country.

But ED REES means more to me than his greatness as a man. As a freshman Congressman on his committee he, the senior Republican member, never made me feel a freshman. He always extended me great courtesy and appeared as interested in having me participate as I was to participate. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee will not be the same without ED REES. His friendship has been one of the greatest privileges of my first term in the Congress and I count myself lucky to have had the opportunity of knowing him.

To ED REES, one of our ablest leaders, you leave us with the appreciation of your colleagues and your countrymen—may you enjoy the long and useful years that lie ahead.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, it is a real privilege for me to join in this tribute to ED REES who has announced his retirement at the end of the present session.

All of the complimentary remarks could not have been made to many men on this earth with the note of sincerity and honesty that is so evident here today.

This is a very complex life that we live, but it is made so much more simple if, as we pass through, we meet one who, by his friendship and friendliness, helps us pass along the way.

Such a person is ED REES, whose knowledge, integrity, and willingness to help have been of such great assistance to me in our most pleasant association.

I appreciate, beyond my ability to say in words, the privilege of knowing him and I wish for him and his family good health and an abundance of happiness in the future.

Mr. AVERY. I thank the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. Speaker, I yield now to a longtime legislative and personal friend of Mr. REES, the former Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, one of the great satisfactions that come to us from service in this great legislative body is the friendships we make with our colleagues who have served with us over a long period of years. For the past 24 years, it has been my privilege to have enjoyed the association and friendship of ED REES, who I regret has decided to retire at the end of his present term.

I know of no man who has served our country, the Congress and his district with more dedication or more conscientiousness than ED REES. He brought to the Congress a background of legislative experience in the Kansas Legislature and in the practice of law. Being the operator of a farm and coming from an agricultural district, he has always been interested in the problems of agriculture

and has always sought sound solutions of these problems. No one has fought harder for Kansas and the progress of the great western country than he.

ED REES is a man of courage, rare judgment and dedicated to making his country a better place to live in. His warm, affable personality won for him the love and affection of his colleagues in both political parties. In these days when we sorely need men of courage, men who will vote their convictions, the Nation can ill afford to lose the services of ED REES. These critical years ahead sorely need men like ED REES and his loss to the Congress is a distinct one to Kansas and the Nation.

As he approaches his well-earned retirement, I wish him and his good wife long life, good health, happiness and prosperity in the years ahead.

Mr. AVERY. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that following my own remarks at the outset of the special order there may be inserted in the RECORD the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY]; and I further ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD in regard to our colleague, ED REES.

The Speaker pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, ED REES and I entered Congress the same year, 1937, and we have been close friends since that time. When the reorganization of the committees of the House took place about 15 years ago, we were friendly rivals for the chairmanship of the new Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. ED REES had been ranking member of the Civil Service Committee, and I had been ranking member of the Post Office and Post Roads Committee.

The better man—ED REES—was the lucky one to be named the chairman of the new committee, and I became a member of the Ways and Means Committee. However, being rivals for the same position did not interfere with the respect nor the friendship between us.

ED REES has decided to leave Congress at the close of this his 24th year. He will be missed by those of us who have looked to him for advice and help in all matters coming from his committee. We hate to see him go, but we wish him many years of not only quiet enjoyment but also years in which he will act as adviser and counselor for the coming Republicans of his district.

May God bless thee and keep thee
May His face shine upon thee and give thee peace.

This is the wish of your colleagues.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in expressing regrets that Congressman EDWARD H. REES, of Kansas, has seen fit to announce his retirement from Congress. Having served with him as a member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I have had an opportunity to become closely associated with him and have come to greatly admire and respect him as a fine gentleman in every sense of the term, and as a most able legislator. He has made many valuable contributions and has distinguished himself throughout the many years of his service as a hard-working, conscientious Member of the Congress.

I join my colleagues in expressing the hope that he will enjoy to the fullest the rest and happiness in retirement that he has earned and so well deserves.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join the many friends of Hon. EDWARD H. REES, of Kansas, in expressing my regret that he is not seeking reelection to Congress. Elected to the 75th Congress, he has served with distinction continuously for 12 terms.

I have known ED during all those years. To know him is to respect and admire him. He is of the civic bone and sinew of the district in which he resides—American in every instinct.

He possesses tact and imagination. He is absolutely reliable; has a keen sense of honor and responsibility. His record of right living and honesty is unimpeachable.

The House of Representatives will seem different without him.

It is the hope of all of us that the future will bring him contentment and happiness.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, the retirement of the Honorable EDWARD REES, of Kansas, removes from the Congress one of its illustrious leaders especially in the field of the Post Office and Civil Service fields of regulatory law and legal systems.

Although I have only known Mr. REES for a short period of his long service—24 years—it has been my privilege to converse with him on various subjects related to the legislation assigned to his committee. As a senior statesman his loss will be felt in not only an advisory capacity at the national level, but also the great qualities of leadership that establish his authoritative knowledge in his chosen field of activity.

It takes many years of experience and study in legislative affairs to develop the values of accomplishment in the services rendered by a Congressman. Mr. REES, personified the true value of congressional service. His experience over the years beginning in the House of Representatives of the Kansas Legislature, 1927–33; serving as majority leader, 1931–33; as State senator 1935–37—chairman of senate judiciary committee, 1935–37—are testimony to his extensive training over the early years—and now at the height of a great career of legislative service in these National Halls, this great lawyer, soldier, and statesman is retiring to enjoy the days of leisure that are so well earned. May God bless you on your way and we who respect and are fond of you pray for your greatest happiness and perfect health to be enjoyed with your dear family in days to come. The Nation and the State of Kansas have lost the services of a great patriot and statesman.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that I have learned of the impending retirement of my distinguished colleague and friend, EDWARD H. REES.

I had the honor of serving with the gentleman from Kansas, Congressman REES, as a member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. EDWARD REES made a lasting impression on me as a man completely devoted to the trust the good people of Kansas placed in him, a man of integrity and the highest character. He shall be greatly missed as my colleague and friend. I want to take this opportunity to wish him the greatest of good fortune and good health in the years to come.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, it has been for me a prime personal pleasure and privilege to have had the acquaintanceship of the Honorable EDWARD REES of Kansas.

During the 9 years I have been in Congress, I have known ED REES to be generous and expert in his counsel on legislative matters, and with it all he was extremely kind and thoughtful.

He has been a truly devoted servant to his district, State, and Nation, just as he has been a key figure in the House of Representatives.

ED has been a distinguished member of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and his record in this area is replete with efforts directed toward sound legislation designed to create efficient Government service and provide just rewards for Government employees.

By all standards ED REES has well earned the comforts of a less strenuous life, but his personal gain will prove a loss to the House of Representatives.

Mrs. McIntire joins with me in extending to ED and Mrs. Rees our warmest and best wishes for health and happiness in their many years that lie ahead.

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, I cannot allow this occasion to pass without associating myself with those who have made remarks in respect to the high type of public service rendered by our distinguished colleague from Kansas, the Honorable EDWARD H. REES. I served during the 83d Congress as a member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee during the time that Mr. REES was chairman of that committee. He presided with dexterity and skill, and with fairness and impartiality. He enjoys the respect and confidence not only of the members of that committee, but of the Members of the House of Representatives in general. I soon came to recognize his true manly worth and his nobility of character. He certainly deserves to rank as he does among the great men who have served in the House of Representatives. He is a solid and substantial man. He possesses sterling qualities of character and he will be greatly missed when he leaves this body.

I wish him every happiness and contentment in his retirement and hope that he may be spared many more years of his useful and happy life. His friendship means much to me and I shall always remember our associations in the House of Representatives.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the impending retirement from Congress of my good friend and colleague, EDWARD H. REES, recalls the bond of friendship that has existed between us since my three-term administration of the office of commander in chief of the Veterans

of Foreign Wars of the United States. I was highly pleased when ED REES was elected to the 75th Congress and 2 years later I began my congressional career as a Member of the 76th Congress. From the day when I took my seat in Congress in 1939, ED REES has always proved to be a dependable source of encouragement and counsel on many legislative matters and has always been willing and able to help me with his sage advice born of a legal mind. Born on a farm, he has been greatly interested in farm legislation. His ability as an attorney and as a State and National legislator enabled him to develop a reputation for thorough analysis of all issues while his unquestioned integrity clothed his views with authority and respect. This is especially true with respect to ED REES' membership on the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service where his views are highly valued as the ranking Republican member of that committee.

When the 86th Congress adjourns and our genial colleague ED REES enters voluntary retirement from the congressional scene, he will have completed a legislative career that began in 1927 with his election to the Kansas State Legislature and which embraced 24 years as a Member of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, there is no Member of Congress for whom I have greater affection or respect than our colleague ED REES. Serving with him in Congress for over a score of years has given me added opportunity to supplement the knowledge I had of his many fine qualities and which, as stated previously, I first discovered in the early 1930's before either of us were elected to Congress. Therefore, ED's retirement is tinged with sorrow because it means that Congress is losing one of its most valued Members. I join in extending best wishes to ED on the eve of his retirement and it is my fervent hope that continued good health and a full measure of happiness will continue to attend him, for he has justly earned the right to happiness and peace of mind for his years of dedicated service as a Member of Congress.

Mrs. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to join in extending by best wishes to the ranking minority member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the Honorable EDWARD H. REES, of Kansas, as he retires from Congress after 24 years of service.

Mr. REES has been a strong defender of his party's viewpoint in committee and has fought hard for principles in which he believes, but always has managed to make his arguments and pursue his legislative objectives without turning controversy into bitterness. He has always had a ready smile for his colleagues and it has been a pleasure to work with him even when we disagree on details of legislation.

I am sure I express the wishes of every Member that his retirement from Congress will be followed by many years of happiness.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, one of my very closest friends in Congress is ED REES, of Kansas. I suppose our close friendship is because we have so many interests in common. Among them is our nationality. Now the Welsh people are quite clannish. They love to associate together, to sing together, to worship together, and to work together.

Nearly 6 years ago when I found that ED could speak the most difficult language of his ancestry, I prevailed upon him to teach me a few expressions which he did. Soon thereafter he prevailed upon me to attend a huge Welsh banquet at the Statler Hotel and I enjoyed being with him and with my mother's countrymen so much that we have attended similar gatherings together since that time.

I know his heart. I admire his dedication to his God and country. I respect his great wisdom and I praise this man "within the gates." May Heaven reward him for his long years of unselfish service to our people and may every blessing follow him today and forever.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I cannot think of a more honorable and distinguished man who has served in this Congress during the time I have been here than the Honorable ED REES, of Kansas. He is the one man who has always commanded universal respect. He is one man who, when he speaks, is listened to because everyone knows it comes from a well-informed source that speaks from sincerity.

I wish to join with his other friends in expressing regret that ED REES is leaving Congress and to wish for him the blessing of good health and happiness in the years ahead.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable EDWARD H. REES has served 24 years in this historic Chamber and his voluntary retirement at the close of his present term brings a pang of sorrow to his colleagues on this side of the aisle as well as on the side of the aisle that so long he has graced. It can truly be said that ED REES leaves with the friendship and good wishes of all his colleagues. I shall miss him very much. When the 87th Congress convenes and, if I am reelected, I shall miss the occasional meetings with him, the occasional little chats, and the warming of the heart and the cheering of the soul that always he gave to others. I do not think that ED REES ever thought ill of another human being. He served in the House quietly, unobtrusively, but with great ability and a steadfastness to his convictions.

I am sure I speak, not only for myself, but for all my colleagues from Illinois in wishing him in the years of his retirement the choicest of God's blessings.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate announced that the Senate has passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 13161. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists on its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HILL, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, and Mr. MUNDT to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 2565) entitled "An act to promote the effectual planning, development, maintenance, and coordination of wildlife, fish, and game conservation and rehabilitation in military reservations", disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. ENGLE, Mr. BARTLETT, and Mr. COTTON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 5068) entitled "An act to amend the Shipping Act, 1916, to provide for licensing independent foreign freight forwarders, and for other purposes", disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. PASTORE, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. ENGLE, Mr. BUTLER, and Mr. SCOTT to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 10960) entitled "An act to amend section 5701 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the excise tax upon cigars", disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. KERR, Mr. FREAR, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, and Mr. CARLSON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 12536) entitled "An act relating to the treatment of charges for local advertising for purposes of determining the manufacturers sale price", disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. KERR, Mr. FREAR, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, and Mr. CARLSON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 12659) entitled "An act to suspend for a temporary period the import duty on heptanoic acid," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. KERR, Mr. FREAR, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, and Mr. CARLSON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R.

12580) entitled "An act to extend and improve coverage under the Federal Old-Age, Survivors, and Disability Insurance System and to remove hardships and inequities, improve the financing of the trust funds, and provide disability benefits to additional individuals under such system; to provide grants to States for medical care for aged individuals of low income; to amend the public assistance and maternal and child welfare provisions of the Social Security Act; to improve the unemployment compensation provisions of such act; and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2633) entitled "An act to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, and for other purposes."

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Government Operations be permitted to file one or more reports along with any minority or individual views after the House adjourns the current session.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is it my understanding the gentleman is asking consent to file reports?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. To file certain reports.

Mr. GROSS. From what committee?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. From the Committee on Government Operations.

Mr. GROSS. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALTER). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HEMPHILL] for 30 minutes.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEMPHILL. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD and to revise and extend them in a second instance in the time allotted to me for a special order today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I know Members of the House who are gathered in this Hall this afternoon listened with keen interest and a sense of frustration at points to what was described by our colleagues on the other side of the aisle as Operation Veracity. I know a number of us who were seated at the table on the Democratic side prepared rather extensive notes on remarks made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] regarding military strength, on the remarks made by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] on agriculture, and on the remarks of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] on our economic strength, with the hope that at the conclusion of their remarks or at some time during their remarks there would be opportunity to answer some of the representations and misrepresentations which had been made to this House. Unfortunately, in this instance, veracity was not strong enough to stand up under interruption because there was a refusal uniformly to yield by the task force on veracity, and this marks the first opportunity anyone on the Democratic side has had to say something on the subject of Operation Veracity.

Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to impose on my good friend, the gentleman from South Carolina, beyond another minute. I will not go into the points which I have mentioned here at this moment this afternoon, but I would like to cite just one instance of how much fidelity we have had to veracity in Operation Veracity this afternoon.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] who, I regret, has left the floor and who is not here, made very strong references to the fact that the Democrats possessed a 2-to-1 majority in both Houses of the Congress. He spoke very forcefully on the fact that this put Democrats in the position to do something about any legislative problem that confronted us. Now I think this represents a departure from veracity not just with reference to one House and its membership but as to the two Houses of the Congress. I hold in my hand, Mr. Speaker, an official list of the Members of the Congress of the United States compiled by Ralph R. Roberts, Clerk of the House on August 18, 1960. When I look at the membership of the Senate of the United States, I find listed Democrats 66, Republicans 34. In order to have a 2-to-1 majority in the Senate, Democrats would have to have 68 Members in the Senate, if my arithmetic is correct. Now you might say that that is a quibble and that they are pretty close to being accurate on that point. Let us look at the membership in the House. The same official list of Members gives as the membership of the House of Representatives, Republicans 152 and Democrats 280. To have a 2-to-1 majority on the House side, we would have to have 304 Democrats rather than the 280 who presently serve on the Democratic side.

If this is a sample of the standards of veracity that will be followed by the so-called "Truth Squad" on the opposite side, I would say we might just as well back up and rename it. Let us call it "Operation Inaccuracy" and let it be known throughout the country by the name it deserves.

I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I want to reiterate that those of us on this side who participated in Operation Veracity stated that we would remain on the floor, and the gentleman has full opportunity to take whatever time he wants. We will remain here and examine him on his statements. Furthermore, this operation will continue tomorrow, and if the gentleman wants to be on the floor and get time, he may do so then.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of my taking this time today was to discuss a piece of legislation which has been needed in this country for many years. Unfortunately, at the very time Congress is hard at work on legislation introduced for the purposes of benefiting this country, selfish interests, which are too often present, misinform the public of this country in order to delay the legislation, defeat it, or serve their own selfish purposes.

The legislation I refer to is H.R. 7201, known as the upstream benefits bill. Many people have asked me about the legislation. I realize it is technical legislation because it deals with the question of firm power, firm energy, hydroelectric physics. It also deals with problems about which both public and private power are concerned. Public and private power, each and both, are today in great need of the hydropower, the river coordination, the reservoir utilization and control, this legislation will produce.

I have been impressed at the opposition to the legislation by those who claim they are trying to do something for their country, because the initial impact of the legislation would have been to provide that insofar as the storage facilities of this country are concerned, the maximum benefits on release of that storage capacity would be required in order that we have the maximum electric power from the available storage and waterpower.

There were some who said: "Well, this is legislation to benefit the private power people." Some people wanted to believe that rather than to look into the facts. Then there were others who said: "Well, you are going to raise the rates of the REA's and other public power people"; and some people wanted to believe that because they were told so. It will not cause a raise in REA rates. The fact of the matter, however, was, is today, and will be tomorrow, whether or not this legislation is passed next year, that this legislation is needed. It is needed by REA's, PUD's, and private power. The report of our committee, which I suppose very few people have read, shows public and private power alike crying for the legislation.

The public utility districts out on the Columbia River are crying for the legislation because under the present law there is no way to make any private power company upstream release the storage in such way that the public utility districts could be guaranteed the firm hydropower it needs to meet consumer demands or attract new industry.

In Oklahoma, in the great district of my friend who sits at the debate table, we have a great public power authority desperately needing this legislation.

There were some who said this looks like a windfall to the private power people. When we put the testimony into

the record and the statistics into the record they showed that on the Columbia River system alone the United States would benefit $1 million per year. Then the opposition tried to find some other excuse.

Then, I went to my friends from Tennessee realizing some others might go to them and say this would hurt the Tennessee Valley Authority which it will not. I found that in the Tennessee Valley the public and private power interests do just what this bill wants them to do all over the Nation, and I found that there is a great aluminum plant on the Tennessee River system solely because of the fact—solely because of the fact—that public and private power people cooperate and coordinate.

Then I went to some other people who are trying to fight this legislation to try to reason with them because certainly I do not believe I have sponsored anything unreasonable here, and I said: "How about backing this legislation?" One gentleman from Alabama said: "I am just afraid you are going to upset my cost-benefit ratio." So I went to the Department of Engineers of the U.S. Army who are the people who determine the cost-benefit ratio, and asked them about it. They gave me a letter which I gave to interested Alabama people which said that it would not disturb the cost-benefit ratio.

Then, lo and behold, I find that the opposition began to come from headquarters of the National Rural Electric Cooperatives Association. It just so happens I know something about the REA. It is a great authority. REA has meant a lot to this country; it is going to mean a lot in the future. But the people I know who direct the REA's are the farmers and businessmen of my area, people who are not inclined toward any socialism. They are people who recognize that the REA is pretty much indispensable to them. REA did what private power would not do.

It has been very definitely proven that public and private power both need competition. The private power people need the public power competition, and vice versa, because it keeps them both on their toes. The REA directors over the country are farmers and businessmen who still believe in the private enterprise system. They correctly think of REA as organizations of private citizens to do a public job and they do a magnificent job of providing rural power. But the directors did not object to the legislation. They are neither selfish nor blind. The directors I know are God fearing, honest, independent and patriotic. The opposition did not come from them.

On June 27, 1960, expecting this legislation to come up and hoping it would come up before the end of the session, I put in the RECORD some remarks on H.R. 7201. Included in those remarks were statements and documents to point out to the country at large the fact that certain opposition had come from the general manager, I believe is the way the gentleman signs himself, of the National Rural Electrical Cooperative Association. This man had not even testified in connection with the legislation. I felt at that time, and I feel today, that if the people in the REA's were told the truth about this legislation they would be for it. The reason I put that statement in the record was because of the fact that on a bill called H.R. 3, which was a bill called the States Rights bill, rights which in the Constitution even though it is not in the hearts of as many men as I would like, this man had taken a certain part. I documented it. In fairness to the gentleman, may I say he wrote me back a letter and said I had not represented him correctly and asked if I would put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a certain letter. I am going to put it in today because, above everything, I want to be fair. He said that my remarks were personal because I had documented a certain situation. Of course, my remarks were not personal. I have never seen any Member of the House feel that way. We just documented what we thought was the truth.

Now, I do not control the REA magazine, and I have no access to it, but I challenge that gentleman right now to put my remarks of June 27 and these remarks in their magazine, if he wants to be fair, because I am putting them both in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I could go on and say something not only about the fact that the farmers of my district and the farmers in my State believe in States Rights—they do not want the NRECA dabbling in States rights, and when he does dabble he is not representing their views or their wishes.

A number of my homefolk directors were in my office, a number of them, and I said "Is this what you want?" They said, "Heavens, no, deliver us from that sort of thing." Even the manager of the South Carolina co-op came up and said "No, I am a States Righter." I said "I am glad that exists in the hearts of men somewhere."

I could talk about a bill that we voted on the other day involving farmers, a bill in which there was involved the migratory farm proposition. It had to do with the migratory labor. Somebody asked, "Are you going to vote for it?" I said "Of course I am." I saw some of my friends from Arkansas and other places here, and that their farmers are in trouble. Let us go out and vote for them. But I am not going to comment on the fact that once again the manager of the NRECA took a stand against the farmers. He was against that.

The reason I am documenting that today is I am going to tell lots of people about this. If the NRECA is for the rural people of this country, let them begin to speak for the rural people and get their nose out of other people's business and quit trying to block farm legislation to help farmers in other parts of the country, quit trying to block States rights legislation. All of us are for the REA. I have voted for it every chance I had. Now, to have this sort of thing happen is almost beyond my comprehension.

In this particular letter, which I am including out of a sense of fairness, they said they thought I had no personal interest. And, I have none. I have never yet owned one share of power stock in my life. I have never represented a power company as a lawyer, and I do not believe I have ever been in the office of a power company except to pay my light bill. They say that the South Carolina Gas & Electric Co. had an interest in it. I think they did. But, the officers are not in my district. I think they had one dam in my district, but that is not affected by this legislation. Not a soul in my district would be adversely affected. Yet the inference here is that because somebody from South Carolina had asked me to come in and examine the merits that I was protecting their interests. I want you to read it. It is on page 3. This letter I am going to put in to be fair, and I challenge the REA magazine to place this letter of June 27 in their magazine, because they have put me in an unfavorable light.

Here are people who are supposed to be specialists in the power business. I do not claim such erudition. They say that under the present law you can accomplish all that H.R. 7201 seeks to accomplish. If it could be accomplished, read my remarks of June 27, if you do not believe it, and I document in there the letters from the people out West who are suffering.

Here is the situation. Section 10(f) of the Federal Power Act as it presently exists provides that a downstream owner, whether public or private, can require the public upstream owner to release the water in a beneficial way, but if the upstream facility is a private power company, the Government facility cannot make them do it. Now, it is a two-way street, and all we are doing is saying if the private power company operates upstream and they have the capacity to help the downstream public facility by release of water—if the upstream can hold his storage and then release it beneficially, the downstream fellow can demand it if he pays for it. But, it will be distorted. I know as I speak today that this speech will be distorted when it is reported, and I expect it, and I make the speech knowing it.

Then he quotes from certain testimony of a Mr. Williams, which they took out of context or, at least, reported it in a manner to reflect something that I do not actually think it reflected.

Then we went on and talked about the payments under the Federal Power Act. Under this particular legislation we have a provision—and it may sound silly to you—it says that if I furnish you some power that I have not been furnishing you, hydropower, I want you to pay for it; you cannot make me furnish it now, but if I furnish it to you and you can profit by it you have to pay for it. But, this legislation also says that if I have the water and I let you have it, I cannot charge you for it unless you can benefit by it and make a profit or it.

Now, that is a simple premise. It has aroused much propaganda among the REA people. They say they are going to raise your rates. Well, I went into that question very fully with the Federal Power Commission and with the Department of the Interior, which was interested in it, and I got a letter from them dated February 29, 1960, in which it says that costs would be increased by only in accordance with benefits. However,

these charges would be a very minimum and only of the magnitude of those now being charged non-Federal interests under section 10(f) of the Federal Power Act. And, looking over here, I find that the United States this year will lose $1 million, and these public utility districts will not get the power or the water they need. They are going to lose and the country at large is going to lose.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in my remarks a letter from the Federal Power Commission dated February 29, 1960.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The letter is as follows:

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., February 29, 1960.

Hon. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HEMPHILL: Your inquiry concerning the effect of the headwater-benefit-charge provisions of H.R. 7201, H.R. 7494, and related bills, amending section 10(f) of the Federal Power Act, has come to me. A question naturally arises as to whether under this amendment customers served by Federal powerplants would find their rates increased by reason of the payment by the United States of annual charges for power benefits received corresponding to the annual charges paid by non-Federal power developers.

If the United States is required to pay annual charges for power benefits which it now receives without charge, it is obvious that the operating costs would be correspondingly increased by the amounts so paid. However, these new charges would be very minimal and only of the magnitude of those now being charged non-Federal interests under section 10(f) of the Federal Power Act because there is presently no provision for a guarantee of firm capacity such as would be authorized in the bill. Correlatively, the payments to the United States under section 10(f) at the present time are equally minor in the Pacific Northwest and will continue to be so as long as there is no agreement for storage releases which will add firm capacity at the downstream powerplants. You understand, I am sure, that the bill would not impose any retroactive obligation upon the United States since as to constructed powerplants of the United States the bill would impose a liability only from the date of its enactment.

One of the major purposes of the new provisions is to assure downstream powerplants of new firm capacity which would be made available by upstream facilities by reason of the water control exercised. This new firm capacity would be obtained at the downstream powerplants without any additional capital investment or additional labor costs.

Also, during some years, the stream flow is so high that practically no storage at these upstream reservoirs is used for downstream power production and the payments to the United States under the present law become relatively insignificant. Under the bill, however, if an agreement is made for payments for firm capacity, as anticipated, the United States would receive payments even during a high-flow year, similar to the high flows in 1958 in the Columbia River system. These firm power payments must, by the very economics of the situation, be greater than would be the costs to the United States for the benefits now being received from non-Federal storage releases.

The only section of the country where the charges paid by the United States would be substantial is in the Columbia River basin where large storage reservoirs are the rule. In the other river basins where there are Federal powerplants, it happens that the power benefits from the storage and release of water at non-Federal reservoirs are not substantial, and, therefore, the payments could not be material.

Specific testimony on these points was given when Mr. Farley (Chief, Division of Licensed Projects, of our Bureau of Power) testified before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on S. 3434 in the 83d Congress, 2d Session, June 9, 1954. He said (hearings, p. 38 et seq.) that the Commission's engineering staff had studied the Columbia River basin with conditions as they would be about 5 years from that time when all of the projects under construction would be completed except The Dalles, which would be practically completed. Under those conditions they estimated that the United States under the terms of the bill then proposed would pay about $300,000 a year to non-Federal owners of reservoirs who would be providing benefits, and that in that area the United States would receive $435,000 a year in payments from non-Federal agencies. None of the $300,000 is presently being paid, of course, but he said that amount is about four-tenths of 1 percent of the revenues of the Bonneville system, or in terms of the cost of kilowatt-hours it would be about one one-hundredth of a mill. In his opinion, this would be far too small to enter into the rate picture. At the McNary power project, for example, he said that with full operation the payments by the United States would amount to half of 1 percent of the annual cost of the project, which is beyond the realm of accurate estimate.

It is my opinion, therefore, that the United States has far more to gain from the passage of this legislation than it has to receive under the present law. This legislation would not only be of direct financial benefit to the United States, but in providing impetus for more practical cooperation between Federal and non-Federal power interests, the legislation would be of genuine benefit to the economy of the country, especially in the Pacific Northwest where so many of the municipalities and public utility districts are urging its enactment.

Sincerely yours,
WILLARD W. GATCHELL,
General Counsel.

Mr. Speaker, on page 9 of this letter which I am going to include in the RECORD in a spirit of fairness, he says that H.R. 721 is itself a club with which the investor-owned company seeks to subjugate the United States. There was not any testimony like that. There was objection to the legislation, and that is proper. But if that were true, where was the REA when we had the hearings? Where was the gentleman who wrote the letter?

I could go on, but my time has been taken in many instances by gentlemen who needed the time for other purposes.

All we want here is reservoir coordination. The Tennessee Valley boys will tell you that they have it. If it is wrong, tell me why it is wrong. The REA's are not going to suffer. They are going to benefit, because if you take the question or the answer and turn it around, if an REA facility gets some water it has not been able to get, and if it can market that water they can make money for REA. Do you not know that hydropower as compared to steampower can be manufactured at much less cost? And that means that the domestic facility has a generator and a generator is moved by waterpower instead of by steampower and the cost is less. And, of course, the power is marketed at the same price.

I do not know what is wrong with the efficient use of water in this country. I am a little bit appalled at the trend of affairs. We find that the steel companies now are producing only 50 percent of their production and that should be a matter of concern to every American. We find that many firms, businesses, are closing their doors in many areas of the country. And my friend from West Virginia would point out that their people are destitute. Americans either were betrayed by the policies of this Government or were just plain let down. And here we find a situation in which what we are trying to do is to increase the productive capacity of this country.

I know what we are coming to. I know what we are coming to, and it is later than you think. You can talk about socialism all you want to. We are going to come face-to-face with this proposition in this Nation in the not too distant future. Either you want a completely welfare state with every national industry nationalized, or you do not. Either you will return to the private enterprise system which has brought us to greatness or you will let down future generations by saying that we want the Government to do everything for us.

What we have done with this legislation is withdraw it because it did not have any hearings in the Senate. It is going to be presented next year to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House. We are going to make sure at that time that everybody who wants to be heard will be given a chance to be heard and those who did not come before will get a chance to be heard. We are going to make sure, and we are going to take apart this propaganda about rates, REA rates, and about windfalls. We are going to take that apart. We have had to do it here on the floor.

We are going to ask these people to build up a record. We are going to ask the people of the House to read it, as well as the people of the Senate, and I am satisfied if that be done that this Nation will demand the legislation.

I want to include here my response to a certain premise made to Members of Congress June 1, 1960.

First. The ultimate effects of this bill on the various river basins of the Nation, and the ultimate cost to the Federal Government has never been fully evaluated.

Neither are the ultimate or even the current effects of present section 10(f) of the Federal Power Act known after 40 years of operation under this act.

Second. In the Columbia and certain other river basins, H.R. 7201 would make the Federal Power Commission the "water master" of the river, and would assign to the Commission considerable jurisdiction over operation of river projects—an operating function not suited to the FPC's regulatory responsibilities.

Under the provisions of H.R. 7201 the Federal Power Commission would have the normal authority of the Commission in approving coordination commitments and agreements to determine if they meet the requirements of this bill with

respect to coordination, determination of charges and other factors and also act in a reviewing capacity if hearings are involved. These functions of the Commission are not those of a "water master." The determinations as to how coordination is implemented on a day-to-day, month-to-month and year-to-year basis will be up to the utilities involved as is now done under power pooling arrangements in the Northwest and other areas.

Third. This proposed legislation would provide windfall benefits to the Idaho Power Co., the Montana Power Co., and other organizations owning upstream dams built under Federal licenses which, in some cases, already require coordinated operation.

Benefit payments to licensed dams and reservoirs of the Idaho Power Co. and the Montana Power Co. by downstream Federal and non-Federal project owners would be on a cost basis as if the downstream owner also owned the portion of the upstream dam and reservoir contributing the benefit and not on a market value basis. Such payment would, in effect, be for service performed in storing and releasing water, which service is made possible by the upstream dam and reservoir owners investment. It is true that the licenses for headwater projects in some cases have provisions requiring coordination, but such provisions do not state that coordination must be performed in a particular manner or that it is required at the detriment or financial disadvantage of the headwater project owner. The bill does not in any way disturb existing license provisions. Thus, the payments for benefits would be for services performed and actually at less than the non-Federal headwater project owners costs. Under such conditions and the actual intent of coordination provisions in existing headwater project licenses it seems misleading to call the payments for benefits windfall benefits. The provisions of section 28 of the Federal Power Act—which remain in full force—are as follows:

> That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved; but no such alteration, amendment, or repeal shall affect any license theretofore issued under the provisions of this act, or the rights of any licensee thereunder (41 Stat. 1077; 16 U.S.C. 821).

Fourth. H.R. 7201 would require the Federal Government to make upstream benefit payments on the basis of private investment and operating costs, while the non-Federal project owner would make payments on the basis of lower cost Federal financing, giving the non-Federal owner a 3-to-1 advantage over the Federal Government in payments for comparable benefits.

This statement ignores the fact that payments for coordination benefits under the bill as proposed for amendment would be on the basis that the Federal Government would pay for such benefits received by it at the Government's costs and the non-Federal project owner would pay the Federal Government on the basis of the non-Federal project owner's higher costs. Thus, the Government would pay for such benefits received by it at a lower rate than the non-Federal project owner would pay for such benefits as they would receive from the Government.

Fifth. H.R. 7201 could place downstream project owners, Federal and non-Federal, at a disadvantage to upstream project owners, since subsection (c) on page 4 permits the upstream owner to file a plan of coordinated operation, on his own terms, with the FPC such plan to go into effect unless disapproved by FPC within 6 months. It is highly unlikely that FPC would make a full and equitable study of such a complicated river basin operating plan within 6 months, especially since the Commission has spent years studying similar problems under the present section 10(f) of the Federal Power Act and still has not resolved all questions.

The factual situation would be that a coordination plan of a headwater project owner must assure benefits to the downstream project owners and under such conditions the downstream owner should pay for these assured benefits. With the requirement in the bill that a coordination plan provide for production of optimum firm and secondary power at the downstream plants and with the headwater reservoir owner having right of ownership and operation of his project it is unrealistic to consider an arrangement for a downstream owner to initiate a coordinated operation with a headwater owner. The headwater owner owns and controls his storage and his right of ownership is not compatable with having another project owner require him to conform to a particular method of operation. In addition, it is at least questionable whether a downstream owner or anyone else can legally force a reservoir owner to operate in any particular way.

With reference to the question raised over the 6-month provision for approval of a coordination commitment by the FPC, it is very important that prolonged delays not be permitted in bringing about actual coordinated operation after a commitment is filed with the Commission. Any increase in the 6-month period for approval could possibly result in correspondingly longer delays in bringing coordination plans into operation. Also the determinations that must be made by the Commission within the 6-month period are only those relating to the proper form of the commitment and plan and do not relate to the more complex and time consuming determinations of annual charges and so forth.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 7201 is good legislation. It is good for the present of this country and it is going to be good for the future.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in my remarks a letter directed to me from the Federal Power Commission dated June 30, 1960; a letter directed to me by Howard C. Elmore, assistant manager of Public Utility District No. 1 of Chelan County, Wenatchee, Wash., dated August 18, 1960, including a copy of a letter, written by Mr. Kirby Billingsley, manager of Public Utility District No. 1 of Chelan County to Mr. Gus Norwood, executive secretary, Northwest Public Power Association, Vancouver, Wash., and another letter by the same gentleman dated August 18, 1960, addressed to our distinguished colleague from California [Mr. Moss]; also a letter dated July 25, 1960, sent to me by Clyde T. Ellis, general manager of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The letters referred to follow:

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION,
Washington, June 30, 1960.

Hon. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HEMPHILL: This will confirm your telephonic conversation with Mr. Stewart P. Crum on June 30, 1960, relative to H.R. 7201—a bill to provide for the comprehensive operation of hydroelectric power resources of the United States, and for other purposes.

I understand that you have informed Mr. Crum the authorized Federal Millers Ferry and Jones Bluff projects on the Alabama-Coosa River are marginal from an economic point of view, and that objections have been raised to H.R. 7201 because these two projects would be rendered economically infeasible if they are assessed for benefits provided by privately-owned headwater improvements.

At present the Alabama Power Co. owns and operates three hydroelectric developments, namely its Lay, Mitchell, and Jordan developments, under Federal Power Commission license on the Alabama-Coosa River upstream from the aforementioned Federal projects. These three privately-owned plants provide pondage only, and it is believed that they would provide little, if any, benefits to the two downstream Federal projects. Consequently, the three existing privately-owned plants would have practically no beneficial effect on the two downstream Federal projects.

The Alabama Power Co. now has under construction its Weiss hydroelectric development with 135,000 acre-feet of usable storage capacity on the Alabama-Coosa River upstream from the Federal Millers Ferry and Jones Bluff. Construction of the Alabama Power Co.'s Kelly Creek development with 56,000 acre-feet of usable storage capacity, also on the Alabama-Coosa River upstream from the two Federal projects, is scheduled to be commenced this year. The Weiss and Kelly Creek projects are licensed by the Federal Power Commission. Owing to the regulatory storage capacity to be provided by the two projects, it is believed that they will provide benefits to the two downstream Federal projects. If this is the case, under H.R. 7201 the Federal projects would be required to make payments for headwater benefits. However, such payments would not be more in any case than the value of the benefits received. In other words, the margin of benefits over costs would not in any case be reduced. Hence, construction of the Weiss and Kelly Creek storage projects could not adversely affect the economic feasibility of the downstream Federal projects, and would probably improve their feasibility.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY J. TRAINOR,
Executive Director.

PUBLIC UTILITY DISTRICT NO. 1
OF CHELAN COUNTY,
Wenatchee, Wash., August 18, 1960.

Hon. ROBERT HEMPHILL,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: For your information in support of H.R. 7201, forwarded herewith are copies of two letters which I believe are

self-explanatory and which might be of some value to you. One letter is dated August 1, 1960, and was directed by us to Mr. Gus Norwood, executive secretary of the Northwest Public Power Association. The other letter, dated August 18, 1960, is directed to Congressman JOHN MOSS. Both of these letters attempt to answer unjustified and erroneous statements concerning H.R. 7201.

Reports reach us here that the bill will be debated in Congress on August 23. As you know, we are vitally interested in this legislation, however, if there is a possibility that the bill might be defeated in Congress we believe it would be better strategy to not consider the bill during the remaining period of this session. It appears to us that the possibility of getting favorable action on this legislation during the next session of Congress would be greatly improved if we did not have a record of a defeated bill in the House. We know, of course, that you will exercise your best judgment in this regard.

Your interest and cooperation is most appreciated.

Very truly yours,

HOWARD C. ELMORE,
Assistant Manager.

PUBLIC UTILITY DISTRICT NO. 1
OF CHELAN COUNTY,
Wenatchee, Wash., August 1, 1960.

Mr. GUS NORWOOD,
Executive Secretary, Northwest Public Power Association, Vancouver, Wash.

DEAR GUS: You have forwarded me a copy of your letter to WALT HORAN, dated July 26, 1960, in which you quote a statement by WALT as published in a recent issue of the Wenatchee Daily World with reference to H.R. 7201. WALT should, of course, defend his own statements; however, since you have sent a copy of your letter to me, I am taking the opportunity to comment.

You disagree with WALT's statement that "We're wasting on the Columbia River a great many dollars for failure to properly regulate the flow of the river." You state that "This surprised me so much that I double checked with BPA. They cannot point out any basis for the report. They do not know where or how any dollars are being wasted; neither do I." You further state that we may know where this report got started.

We believe you should know well where the report got started.

In our work on this legislation, among the first questions raised during and following the congressional hearings last year by you and others was for specific information on what this legislation could be expected to bring about in the way of payments to the Federal Government and payments to the non-Federal reservoir owners for benefits created downstream as a result of the form of coordinated operation visualized by the proponents of the legislation. To answer this question, you are aware that Jack Stevens prepared a study, the results of which were given wide distribution and made a part of the Senate committee hearings on S. 1782.

In spite of the fact that you and others have questioned the study, no one, to my knowledge, including Bonneville, has come up with any analysis that could be used to factually or conclusively disprove its assumptions or conclusions. One of the conclusions of the study, as you know, was that if coordinated operations worked as envisaged in the legislation the Federal Government would receive in payments something over $900,000 annually over and above any payments that the Government would be required to make. This would be revenue to the Government which is not now received.

Perhaps someone can come up with an analysis that shows a different answer, but until a different answer is produced with some basis in fact, it seems to me that from the evidence at hand it is entirely correct to say that something is going to waste on the Columbia River.

It does not seem right that you should claim ignorance on this point since the Stevens study as well as considerations in the legislation, have been worked out to answer critical questions and accusations as to the possible bad results that might be expected from the legislation and you have considerable familiarity with all this.

We have never made any "pie in the sky" claims for this legislation. Many things have been said for and against it that are entirely misleading. We are only concerned with the fundamentals involved and these, we think, are properly being taken care of.

One is that we now have to operate our plants on the Columbia River without assurance in advance as to how headwater storage is to be released for use in our plants. Our resulting benefits from headwater storage on such a basis are, in effect, uncoordinated as far as we are concerned and do not have firm power value. We want coordination on a firm basis to produce firm power and we see no reason why the Federal Government should not desire and be willing to commit itself to operate on such a basis for its own benefit and for the benefit of others, including ourselves. Existing section 10(f) of the Federal Power Act is entirely inconsistent with this principle, since it recognizes only payment for benefits received on an after-the-fact basis without assurance in advance that they will be received downstream, and, of course, there is the further barrier to full coordination in the exclusion of payment by the Federal Government for benefits received from non-Federal reservoirs.

Secondly, we do not know what our costs are or what they will be for these indefinite after-the-fact benefits. We need to know what we can expect to pay for firm benefits.

Thirdly, we believe that there is real urgency in doing something legislatively on this matter because of the impending Canadian Treaty settlement which could, we think, adversely affect the type of legislation that might be passed if such legislation does not precede the treaty settlement. The Canadian Treaty will make it imperative that powerplants in the U.S. Columbia River Basin be coordinated in dealing with Canada and that we have legislation making it possible to carry out this on an overall basis, and also to establish a principle for payment for benefits created by U.S. Federal and non-Federal reservoirs.

We have discussed these various points with you and in your presence many times, and it seems somewhat redundant and repetitious to restate them here. However, repetition seems to be necessary to answer questions being raised against H.R. 7201 that have the appearance of being deliberate, misleading attempts to give the legislation some sinister purpose and associate those of us working on it with some sort of a plot to increase the cost of Bonneville power or take the Federal Government out of the power business or some other such ridiculous ideas.

Sincerely,

KIRBY BILLINGSLEY,
Manager.

PUBLIC UTILITY DISTRICT NO. 1
OF CHELAN COUNTY,
Wenatchee, Wash., August 18, 1960.

Hon. JOHN E. MOSS,
Member of Congress,
Old House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MOSS: Your letter of July 20, 1960, to Mr. Alex Radin, executive director of the American Public Power Association has been forwarded by Mr. Radin to members of the association, including ourselves. We believe it our obligation to answer the erroneous and unjust statements and claims made therein discrediting needed legislation that is definitely in the public interest. The bill, H.R. 7201, now before Congress provides for needed amendment to the Federal Power Act. To make certain that the intent of the bill is clearly expressed Congressman HEMPHILL is proposing two amendments to the bill. One of these amendments would add the optimum production of secondary energy as well as firm energy to the requirements for coordinated operation of hydroplants and the other would provide more specific language on the determination of how payments for storage and coordination benefits shall be determined. It is with these proposed amendments in mind that we wish to comment on your letter, however, even without consideration of these amendments our comments in most instances are valid.

Your letter states that H.R. 7201 would amend the Federal Power Act and would "drastically impair some of the best and most firmly established principles of this Nation's water resources." We believe that amendment of the Federal Power Act with reference to section 10(f) is essential. Also, contrary to your contention the bill is intended to operate and would operate in accordance with the best principles of water resource development. The people of the Nation are certainly entitled to the greatest possible use of the Nation's water resources. They are so entitled whether the manmade improvements on our waterways are constructed by the Federal Government, by local governmental agencies, or by privately financed corporations. When the Federal Water Power Act was enacted in 1920, the value and necessity of operating facilities in concert, with such facilities under multiple ownership, were not clearly recognized. The Congress did provide certain standards for the construction of such facilities by licensees, but it did not take the additional necessary step of providing the machinery and proper inducement to procure the now essential coordinated operation of such facilities. H.R. 7201 will provide the additional step of bringing about the sensible and proper operation of existing projects so that all of the people may realize the full benefit that a river allows regardless of who owns the projects. It does not in any way violate principles of water resource development or conservation; it implements those principles by providing for sensible operating procedures and a fair distribution of the benefits of such operation to all consumers.

An accusation is also made that the bill would provide a subsidy to private utilities and a drain on the Federal treasury. This is completely erroneous. Perhaps the best explanation of the true facts relating to the effect the bill would have on the Federal Government and on private utilities is to be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 27, 1960, at page 14620. On the Columbia River system alone the Federal Government will receive a net payment of some $927,000 per year. There is no possibility of the United States realizing such an income under the present law and practices on the Columbia River. On the other hand, the private utilities on the Columbia River, as a group, would receive a net payment of less than $50,000 per year for the benefits they provide. Additionally, the general counsel for the Federal Power Commission testified that the Federal Government has far more to gain than it has to lose under H.R. 7201. Further still, the Federal Government is not responsible for any sum of money under this bill because every cost involved is an obligation of the rate payers. Therefore, the tendency of the bill is either to reduce Federal power rates or bring money into the Treasury of the United States. It cannot by any stretch of the imagination result in a subsidy; it is a revenue measure.

You claim that the bill would impair multiple purpose functions of Federal projects and that it would require the Federal Government to pay more than others for the same or lesser benefits. Neither of these claims has any foundation in truth.

The Department of the Interior at one time considered that the bill did not contain sufficient specific language to insure that Federal project functions other than power production would remain unimpaired. The Department, together with the Federal Power Commission, drafted language to provide such assurance. Such language was accepted by the House Committee and is now in the bill. Also, the sponsors and proponents of the legislation have at all times in the development of language in the bill intended that the Federal Government would in no case be required to pay more than it receives for equal benefits. You must certainly be aware that the proponents, rather than those who claim the Government would pay more than others, have prepared an amendment to the bill to make it specific and clear that no such situation shall result. It is important to note that the opponents of this bill, who have apparently advised you in this matter, have studiously avoided admitting the obvious—that the Government will in fact receive a higher payment per unit of benefit conferred than it will be required to pay for benefits conferred on the Government.

You criticize the procedure for bringing about coordinated operation in the event that contractual negotiations fail. The bill does not allow an upstream owner to bind a downstream owner to do anything at all merely by the act of filing a plan. The commitment filed by the upstream owner (such as the Bonneville Power Administration which is by far the most important upstream owner in the Columbia River system) merely (a) obligates such upstream owner to operate his facility for the overall good of the region, and (b) activates the legal machinery by which the Federal Government, acting through the Federal Power Commission, decides what amount, if any, of the appropriate reservoir costs must be contributed by each downstream owner for the benefits conferred upon him. Thus the upstream owner can only impose an obligation on himself. The Federal Government imposes the obligation on downstream owners in accordance with standards set forth in the bill.

Under present law, the Federal Government, acting through the Federal Power Commission, is charged with the responsibility of establishing charges which must be paid by downstream owners. However, under present law, a reservoir owner may be entitled to a federally enforced contribution even though he does nothing whatsoever except operate his facility to meet his own needs. Under H.R. 7201, a reservoir owner is not entitled to receive any contribution from downstream owners and consumers unless and until he obligates himself to operate for the best benefit of the unit composed of himself and everyone who will be expected to contribute to his costs. In either event, the Federal Government establishes the amount, if any, of the payments to be made. It is true that, under present law, the Federal Government is not required to make any contribution to the costs of a reservoir owner even though the Government receives benefits made possible through the expenditure of such costs. Under H.R. 7201 the Federal Government would be required to make its fair contribution to such costs. The reasons and necessity for including the Federal Government within the purview of this obligation is conclusively shown by the testimony in the hearings on this bill, and the official position of affected Federal agency is in support of this basic principle.

Your letter also alleges that neither the Commission nor the downstream owners have any meaningful opportunity to challenge the coordination terms. We are sure that the Congress will realize that the interested parties have the right to challenge the proceedings at each stage. The Federal Power Commission has the power to throw out the whole plan and the additional power and responsibility to establish the amount and allocation of all required payments.

You state that the bill is anti-conservation in its impact. This position, like most of the other matters contained in your letter, is a repetition of statements made in the minority report of the House Committee. You apparently base this position on the same reasoning contained in the minority report, i.e., the erroneous assumption that the Federal Government will be required to pay more than it receives per unit of benefit. The error in this assumption has been discussed above. Suffice it to say that the whole intent and effect of the bill is to secure the maximum in perpetual benefits for every affected consumer and prevent the existing waste of hydroelectric power resources. It is a conservation measure in every sense. We agree that it is essential that the full meaning of this bill be brought to the attention of the American people. For that reason we are writing you in answer to your July 20, 1960 letter, with the hope that the erroneous conceptions about H.R. 7201 that are being formed might be viewed in the light of the facts and the true conditions.

We are writing you in behalf of the public utility districts of Grant County, Pend Oreille County, Douglas County and our own district. All of these districts have generating plants on the Columbia River or its tributaries either in operation, under construction or being engineered. We are speaking from the standpoint of our particular interest which is not in any way contrary to the broad public interest even though some individuals and organizations have attempted to make our position appear as a selfish one.

We sincerely hope this will be of value to you in taking a constructive look at the problem.

Very truly yours,

KIRBY BILLINGSLEY,
Manager.

NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C., July 25, 1960.

Hon. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HEMPHILL: This is in further reference to your statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 27, 1960, concerning the position of this association on H.R. 7201. As you know, I sent you a telegram on June 28, 1960, regarding the personal references you had made about me in your statement. However, 30 days later, I have had no response from you. The text of the telegram was as follows:

"I have just read your speech entitled, 'Upstream Benefit Bill,' in June 27 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and shall write you next week on issues involved.

"Meantime, however, I hope you will reconsider, in light of all the facts, your references to my 'individual honesty and integrity.' I cannot bring myself to believe any Member of Congress would make such unwarranted accusation against a citizen, no matter how divergent the views held on the issues, if all the facts had been clear to you.

"You charged me with falsification and what amounts to perjury, and you did this on basis of an obvious misreading of the record. You have done me a great and grave injustice and I hope your honesty and fairness will impel you to correct it and place a statement to that effect in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

"Apparently you confuse the sequence of the communications you quote on page 14613 of the RECORD. Actually you omit one date altogether. Here is what I did and when:

"June 16: I signed a letter to five Congressmen in regard to what I feared would be effect of H.R. 3 on rural electrification program.

"June 25: I sent a wire to Mr. Shiflet, stating in part: 'I did write five Members of the House in the hope of getting an amendment to exclude matters affecting the rural electrification program from H.R. 3 and such an amendment was offered on the floor.'

"July 9: (note this is the next month) I wrote Congressman PILCHER, stating in part: 'Prior to the day on which the letter was written, I personally had no knowledge of the contents or purpose of H.R. 3.' The letter here referred to was the June 16 letter.

"It is apparent from this sequence there are no inconsistencies. My statement to Mr. Shiflet was true and my statement to Mr. PILCHER was true. There is no inconsistency.

"Nor is there basis for your statement: 'There is no question but what Mr. Ellis has impeached himself because these two statements from his own mouth are inconsistent. One of these statements must be false. For in one he contends he did send the letter in the hope of getting an amendment. Now he says he had no personal knowledge of that bill. If he had no personal knowledge, how could he have been hoping for an amendment?'

"To leave no doubt, I did not say that I: 'Had no personal knowledge of that bill.' But that: 'Prior to the day on which the letter (June 16) was written I personally had no knowledge of the contents or purpose of H.R. 3.' On that day, June 16, the matter first came to my attention and on the same day I signed the letter to the five Congressmen.

"This is a very serious charge to make without any basis. You say: 'Had these inconsistent statements been made under oath in a court of justice, the consequences would be serious indeed.' I shall be glad to make the same statements under oath, for they are true.

"You are aware, I know, that in a court of law the accused is always given equal opportunity to present his case with equal force and effect. For such simple justice I am forced to depend upon your honesty and fairness. I value my character as much as I am sure you do yours and I appeal to you for the justice of which you speak by correcting the RECORD.

"Regards."

I still appeal to you to correct your incorrect and unfair statements in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Now, as to the issues involved in H.R. 7201. I would like to discuss various points that seem significant to us.

As you know, the membership of this association passed resolution No. E-14 at our 1960 annual meeting in St. Louis opposing H.R. 7201. The NRECA staff is bound by this resolution to employ all ethical means to persuade Congress that it would be in the national interest to defeat H.R. 7201.

You may recall that during the morning of February 25, 1960, at the very time our membership was considering the 1960 annual meeting resolutions, I took a call from you at the stage telephone in Kiel Auditorium, St. Louis. You asked us to contact you immediately upon our return to Washington concerning H.R. 7201.

On Tuesday morning March 1, 1960, Mr. Dick Dell, Mr. Charles A. Robinson, Jr., and I called at your office. You expressly informed us that you had no personal interest in this bill, and were supporting its passage to help those members of the House committee who were directly interested in it. We explained our opposition to you. But

not until we read the printed hearings later did we learn of the interest of the South Carolina Electric & Gas Co. And not until we read your House floor speech did we learn of your strong feeling toward the national organization of the rural electric cooperatives.

H.R. 7201 provides, among other things, that the owner of a headwater storage dam may go to the Federal Power Commission, and, upon agreeing to coordinate its project with downstream projects for a 5-year period, require the Commission to assess against all downstream projects annual charges payable to the headwater project owner for such benefits as its coordination may confer upon downstream projects. The bill, however, does not confer parallel procedural rights on the downstream owner resulting from its coordination with the upstream project. However, the downstream owner cannot require that FPC order a headwater licensee to operate his project on a coordinated basis. We suggested to you during our March 1 meeting that our opposition to the bill might be lessened, though not eliminated, were it amended to allow downstream Federal projects to require coordinated operation of the privately owned headwater projects. We talked particularly of the Columbia Basin.

You then said that you had no desire to impose any inequity on Federal projects. You asked us to prepare a suitable amendment in this regard.

Within 3 days we wrote to you and enclosed the requested amendment. To this day we have received no reply, nor have we any indication that our amendment was ever considered by you or by anyone else.

Benefits to South Carolina Electric & Gas Co. You accuse us of misrepresenting the facts in stating that Mr. Arthur Williams, Jr., vice president and general counsel of the South Carolina Electric & Gas Co., indicated in his testimony that H.R. 7201 would benefit his company by some $1 million per year.

In support of our assertion in this particular, I submit the following information:

On July 27, 1959, Mr. Williams appeared before the House subcommittee and testified in part as follows:

"South Carolina Electric & Gas Co. has maintained on this river, for approximately 50 years, a hydroelectric facility known as the Stevens Creek plant. Shortly after World War II, the United States, acting through the Army Engineers, completed a dam and hydroelectric generating station a few miles upstream at Clark Hill.

"Acting in accordance with authority embodied in the act, and permit from the Secretary of War issued pursuant thereto, under which Stevens Creek Dam was constructed, the Federal Power Commission moved in 1952 to assess the annual charge to be paid by our company to the United States for alleged benefits derived by Stevens Creek plant from the Clark Hill facility.

"We were then informed by representatives of the Federal Power Commission that their studies over the period 1950–56 inclusive, had resulted in these significant figures: (a) The benefit to Stevens Creek from Clark Hill amounted to $247,498; (b) the benefit from Stevens Creek to Clark Hill amounted to $318,000; and (c) the damage to Stevens Creek from Clark Hill amounted to $896,900.

"Thus, it can be seen that if either the damages resulting to our facility from the operation of the Federal facility, or the benefits from our facility to the Federal facility could have been used in computing the annual charge, we would have been relieved of paying anything" (p. 80, House hearings).

I submit that the following three conclusions can be reasonably drawn from the above statement: (1) That the Stevens Creek project is 50 years old, that probably a major portion of it has already been amortized by the company's customers and that any payments large or small, annual or otherwise, made by the Federal Government to Stevens Creek would, therefore, constitute windfall profits. (2) That in claiming payments under H.R. 7201, South Carolina Electric & Gas Co. intends to rely upon the $896,900 damages which it asserts have been imposed on Stevens Creek as a result of Clark Hill operation.

And, concerning damages, it appears to us that the bill is entirely susceptible to just such interpretation as evidenced by the language of the Minority Report appearing at page 60 of House Report 1414, 86th Congress, 2d session, which reads as follows:

"(e) Furthermore the language of subsection (d) authorizing the Commission to allow the owner of a hydroelectric facility suffering a detriment 'such offset charges assessed under subsection (b) of this section as the Commission shall deem to be equitable,' is quite unclear. There is no provision in subsection (b) for the assessment of offset charges."

(3) That the benefits and detriments mentioned by Mr. Williams which amount to over $1 million will be claimed on an annual basis. And I call your attention to the words "annual charge" used by Mr. Williams himself as mentioned above.

It is quite true that subsequent to his direct testimony before the House subcommittee, the following exchange took place between Congressman AVERY of Kansas and Mr. Williams at page 85 of the House hearings:

"Mr. AVERY. I think I understand the general premise you are working on. It is a little hard for me; I am trying to understand with no larger reservoir than that how you could account for that large damage. That is an annual damage?

"Mr. WILLIAMS. No, sir. That is over a 6-year period, from 1950 to 1956.

"Mr. AVERY. That would make a little difference then.

"Mr. WILLIAMS. The other two I had put annual. Those are the figures I corrected orally. I should have made it even stronger by saying that all three of those figures represent the time during the Federal Power Commission study which covered 1950–56." (There is no record of any oral correction.)

"Mr. AVERY. In other words that is a 6-year loss.

"Mr. WILLIAMS. That is correct, sir.

"Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman I have one more question. I do not seem to find it right now.

"Mr. WILLIAMS. Let me say this: That a 6-year period, during the first couple of years they were still filling the reservoir up at Clark Hill. I think they started in 1950.

"Mr. AVERY. So actually it would amount to a 4-year period.

"Mr. WILLIAMS. I think that is correct."

Therefore, during the House hearings Mr. Williams stated under questioning that the period involved might be 6 years or 4 years despite his direct testimony to the effect that it was 1 year.

But, the very next day, on July 28, 1959, Mr. Williams appeared before the Senate subcommittee. We must presume that he is a competent lawyer and had well in mind his cross-examination on the preceding day. Nonetheless, during his presentation to the Senate subcommittee, he made exactly the same direct presentation, talked of "computing the annual charge," and never mentioned a 4- or 6-year period.

When he completed his Senate testimony on "annual charges," Senator THURMOND of South Carolina asked:

"Senator THURMOND. Do you have anything else you would like to say in addition?

"Mr. WILLIAMS. Nothing, except to thank you for your courtesy and time, Senator."

This presentation I think is significant in view of the fact that at the present time, South Carolina Electric & Gas Co. and the Department of the Interior are engaged in an FPC proceeding to determine the benefits and detriments which flow between Clark Hill and Stevens Creek by way of reservoir storage and reregulation.

It is our opinion that Mr. Williams wants to play both sides of the street so that his company will not be precluded from claiming the largest possible payments.

And, any person who happened to read the Senate hearings, and not the House hearings, would draw only one conclusion; that the company intends to claim $1 million per year under the bill.

Will H.R. 7201 increase hydro capacity? You state at page 14615 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on June 27, 1960, that:

"The net effect of the proposal is to assure 1,268,000 kilowatts of firm energy from coordinated use of the different owners' storage on the Columbia River system, alone, as an example, a large part of which could not otherwise be guaranteed firm."

This figure seems to have increased substantially during the past year. During the House hearings held on July 16, 1959, Congressman LEE METCALF, of Montana, who introduced the bill, stated:

"When Senator MURRAY introduced S. 1782, which is an identical bill, he said that the mere passage of this legislation would create from 500,000 to a million extra kilowatts of firm power without building another dam on the Columbia."

Your figure of 1,268,000 kilowatts is apparently taken from a letter submitted to the Senate committee by Mr. Jack Stevens, a consulting engineer of Seattle, Wash., who testified in support of the legislation. This letter, which appears in the printed record of the Senate hearings at page 36, is dated March 18, 1960; 8 months after conclusion of the hearings. There was, therefore, no opportunity to cross examine Mr. Stevens nor was any Federal agency asked to comment on his estimate. No comparable figure was presented orally by Mr. Stevens during his personal appearance before either the Senate or House subcommittee.

And, immediately after Congressman METCALF's assertion before the House subcommittee to the effect that H.R. 7201 would create 500,000 kilowatts in the Columbia Basin, we wrote a letter to him asking that he apprise us of the assumption upon which his assertion was based. To this day we have not been favored with a reply. A copy of our letter to Congressman METCALF is attached.

As a matter of fact a major portion of any possible increase that would be made available by this legislation in the Columbia Basin is already realized by the existing Northwest Power Pool. Assistant Secretary Aandahl testified on H.R. 7201 before the House subcommittee in part as follows:

"And I might say that the pooled operation on the Columbia River which is not reduced to contract but is voluntary day-to-day operation carries sizable elements of coordinated operation. In fact, that is the secret to the fact that by voluntary coordinated operation without a contract, the usable kilowatts in the Pacific Northwest, I believe, are now close to a million above what they would be if there were independent operation of each of the facilities by their respective owners" (p. 152, House hearings).

Therefore, it appears to me that the benefits which you ascribe to the affect of H.R. 7201 on the Columbia River system are very much too large and are based upon biased testimony submitted after the hearings were concluded.

Costs to the Government under the proposed legislation. At page 13568 of the RECORD of June 27, 1960, you refer to a table thereon contained, which purports to indicate that under H.R. 7201 the United States would realize a net income of $927,700 from headwater benefit payments in the Columbia

Basin. This figure, and the chart upon which it is based, were submitted to the Senate committee on October 9, 1959, more than 8 months after the conclusion of that committee's hearings by Mr. Jack Stevens to whom I have previously referred. Mr. Stevens' estimates, in our opinion, simply do not agree with the facts.

Under the Federal Power Act as it now stands, the Commission is empowered to assess against downstream non-Federal projects annual charges related to the benefits conferred upon such projects by Federal dams. The record shows that for the Columbia River Basin the Federal Government was paid a total of $21,100 in 1957, $15,900 in 1958, and $53,400 in 1959. This is indeed a far cry from the $927,700 net income which Mr. Stevens claims will be available under H.R. 7201, although that legislation must, it seems to me, reduce rather than increase the income to the Federal Government in view of the fact that the Federal Government is not chargeable with any downstream benefit liability at the present time.

H.R. 7201, as it now stands, would require the Federal Government, in making headwater benefit payments to non-Federal projects, to pay three times what a non-Federal project would pay a Federal project under the same circumstances. This is true simply because investor-owned fixed charges are about three times Federal fixed charges. In this regard you commented in a letter of June 25, 1960, which you sent to Members of Congress:

"Clarifying amendments will be offered to H.R. 7201 on the floor which will assure that the Federal Government will pay no more than the cost of furnishing such storage had it owned all of the storage in the river basin. These amendments will satisfy the major objection of the American Public Power Association in its resolution of May 5, 1960."

This declaration is, you must concede, an admission that H.R. 7201 is deficient in its present form. Whether the proposed amendments, which you say will be offered on the floor, would resolve this problem, we do not know. I have not seen copies of the proposed amendments, and I suggest, that in view of our extensive interest in the legislation, we might have been given a chance to help formulate and/or review them.

Can H.R. 7201 actually achieve its purpose? You say at page 13562 of the aforementioned RECORD that:

"The essence of the solution is that Federal, private, and non-Federal public reservoirs be operated in concert to assure the most efficient utilization of water for power generation. As things now stand, each dam owner is free to operate his reservoir without regard to the needs of the other owners' downstream dams, and there is now no real inducement to operate in any other way."

The Federal power marketing agencies already possess full authority to enter into voluntary coordination contracts with other hydroelectric project owners. In fact, this has been done to a great extent in the Northwest. In those cases where no coordination agreement has been executed, it is, in large measure, I think, due to the fact that the investor-owned utility companies demand a lion's share of the benefits, leaving only the dregs to the Federal Government.

Under such circumstances, the Federal agency involved understandably refuses to enter into a voluntary contract. This bill purports to confer authority on the headwater owner to have the Federal Power Commission require that the downstream Federal projects coordinate facilities and pay for such headwater benefits as may be bestowed upon them by the upstream owner. To secure this domination of the Federal Government, the upstream owner need only agree to provide such benefits for 5 years. H.R. 7201 is, therefore, a club with which the investor-owned companies seek to subjugate the United States.

If I may be very presumptuous, let me say that there is, however, in my mind, very serious doubt as to whether this bill could actually achieve this purpose at all as a matter of law. The Federal Power Commission has authority to require its licensees to operate their projects in coordination with all other hydroelectric projects in their river basins. This requirement has been placed in some licenses. But it has been omitted from many.

Article 6 of the Federal Power Act provides that licenses may be altered only on mutual agreement of the licensee and the Commission. And article 28 of the act, which reserves to Congress the right to amend the act, expressly states that no amendment of the act shall affect any license theretofore issued or the rights of any licensee thereunder. Moreover, section 2 of H.R. 7201 provides that—

"Nothing contained in this act shall in any matter affect any right * * * which vested or accrued prior to the effective date of this act."

To now require a licensed project to operate on a coordinated basis against the owner's consent would certainly "affect" its vested right, except where the license already requires such operation. So also would an order to a licensed project to pay for benefits from upstream projects on a basis different than that prescribed in the present law.

Accordingly, I submit that by its very terms H.R. 7201 could not apply to many existing licensees without their consent. It follows very logically that the bill could not achieve full coordination.

If the bill could not achieve full coordination, and yet would impose on the Federal Government headwater benefit liability, it would be nothing more than a subsidy for non-Federal headwater project owners.

In closing we want again to emphasize our strong conviction that enactment of this bill will saddle the rural electric systems and their consumer members with extra costs in tribute to the power companies, costs that will go on and on for decades. Furthermore, we are convinced that passage of this bill will destroy or impair the feasibility of Federal hydro projects.

Congressman, we value very highly your support of the rural electrification program in Congress, and your record of generally supporting the Federal wholesale power program. We wish you could agree with the rural electric systems on H.R. 7201. We hope that our disagreement on this issue can be maintained on a professional level because neither NRECA nor you can possibly gain by either attacking the motivation or personal character of the other.

I, of course, have no access to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and cannot, therefore publish my arguments against H.R. 7201 in the same way that you published your support of it. In fairness, therefore, I request you to place this letter in the RECORD.

Again, may I say we appreciate your record of support in the past and we hope we can be privileged to work with you in the future. We stand ready to talk with you further on H.R. 7201 at your convenience.

Since Congress is in recess, I am sending a carbon copy of this letter to your office in South Carolina.

Sincerely,

CLYDE T. ELLIS,
General Manager.

NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C., July 30, 1959.

Hon. LEE METCALF,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN METCALF: I was very much interested in your recent testimony in support of H.R. 7201 before the Subcommittee on Communications and Power of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

As you probably know, we have not taken a position on this legislation this year. We are, however, attempting to work up a study of the effects to be anticipated should H.R. 7201 or similar legislation be enacted. As I recall, you stated that one such effect would be the development of an additional 500,000 kilowatts of power on the Columbia River system without the necessity of building additional dams. I feel certain that our study of this matter would be substantially expedited if you would be willing to make available to us the basic data which you used in the preparation of your testimony.

Sincerely,

RICHARD A. DELL,
Director, Legislation and Research Department.

FACTS ABOUT FARMERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RANDALL] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I am taking the floor today on behalf of the forgotten man—the farmer. I represent a district in western Missouri. About half of my constituents earn their living by tilling the soil. Farming is an essential and an honorable profession but it is a profession which has fared badly in recent years.

I know of no better way to dramatize the plight of the farmer today than to review his recent losses in purchasing power. At the close of 1952 farmers in Missouri could buy a standard tractor with 55 market hogs, 1,325 bushels of corn, or 10 head of beef cattle.

At the close of 1959, Missouri farmers had to sell 100 hogs, 2,583 bushels of corn or 12 head of beef cattle to purchase a similar tractor. Note that it took almost twice as many hogs or bushels of corn in 1959 as in 1952 to buy a tractor, and it took about one-fifth more beef cattle.

A similar situation prevails with respect to the loss in farm buying power for other industrial products. In late 1952 it took 46 market hogs to buy a combine. At the close of last year it required 85 hogs to buy a similar combine. In terms of corn, the cost had jumped from 1,007 in 1952 to 1,958 bushels last month.

All farm prices stood at 77 percent of parity on January 1 of this year, the lowest parity ratio since 1933. However, the national average parity ratio does not fully reflect the desperate economic situation of Midwest farmers.

The major farm products of the Midwest are corn, hogs, milk for manufacturing, eggs and beef cattle. Prices received by farmers for these products last month—as a percentage of parity—were as follows:

Corn	56
Hogs	52
Milk for manufacturing	87
Eggs	61
Beef cattle	84

Mr. Speaker, the farmers in my district want to know why their prices are allowed to drift lower and lower while high administration officials help large industrial corporations experiencing record profits, to increase still further their wages and prices.

The distinguished chairman of our Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], analyzed the situation correctly at the close of the last session of Congress when he said:

In this session of Congress, as in past sessions, Mr. Ezra Taft Benson, the chief agricultural officer of our country, has placed roadblocks and obstacles in the pathway of progress.

The Secretary of Agriculture has not provided leadership commensurate with the responsibilities of his high office. On the contrary, he has continued his efforts to divide the agricultural forces of our country and to array consumers against producers and to bring the farm program into disrepute.

Freedom and bankruptcy for the farmers of America is Mr. Benson's program.

Unfortunately he does not understand the plight of our farmers nor does he understand their problems.

Mr. Speaker, the farm income problem as it has developed in the last 7 years is the result of production-increasing technical advances being adopted at a rate which causes total farm production to increase faster than markets can be expanded.

With fewer workers and a smaller crop acreage, farmers produced 23 percent more products in 1958 than in 1950 and would have increased production even further except for the soil bank program and acreage restrictions on basic crops. Yet population increases amounted to only 15 percent during these years.

The availability of the new technologies for adoption which resulted in this sharp increase in production are largely the result of our scientific research and educational programs, supported to a large extent by public funds. A recent report of the National Planning Association, a nonprofit, nonpolitical organization established in 1934, concludes that, given the present backlog of new farm production techniques now available or in the testing stage, farm production will likely continue to expand faster than available markets even though farm production techniques now available or in the testing stage, farm production will likely continue to expand faster than available markets even though farm product prices decline further. Yet the program of the Secretary of Agriculture and the administration continues to be the further lowering of price supports, removal of production controls and additional public funds for research and education. How mistaken can an administration be?

Farm economists at Iowa State University recently completed a study which shows that there would be further drastic declines in farm prices if the administration's program was adopted. This study, although assuming that surpluses now on hand are held off the market concludes that if prices were allowed to find their own level in a free market, within a year or two wheat would drop from an average price this marketing year of about $1.71 a bushel to 74 cents. Corn would drop from $1.06 to $.66 a bushel. Beef cattle prices would drop from $21.60 per 100 pounds to $11.50. Hog prices, which are establishing a postwar yearly average low of $13.50 per 100 pounds this year, would slide on down to $10.80 in another 2 years. Other livestock prices would fall more or less in proportion.

Mr. Speaker, I cosponsored a bill entitled "The Family Farm Income Act." I do not pose as a farmer or as a specialist on farm problems. But I am enough of a businessman to know that farmers must find some means of balancing their production with available markets. Industry developed the large corporation, labor developed large labor union and out of these large aggregations of market power came a system of price leadership and price stability. In industry it is an accepted practice to gear production to the amount that can be sold at stable and profitable prices. Workers in the automobile industry were laid off in 1957 and 1958 and plants were utilized at less than full capacity. What would have happened to the automobile industry if full production had been maintained and the additional cars sold in auction markets or put in Government warehouses? This is what farmers will be forced to do under the administration's program. It just doesn't make sense. We must develop a farm program which permits farmers to gear their production to available markets and reduces Government costs.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I should like to compliment my good friend from Missouri on the fine statement he has made and for the very profound way in which he has answered part of the so-called Operation Veracity which occurred earlier this afternoon.

A few moments ago I had the opportunity to comment on the fact that Operation Veracity could not even be accurate in its presentation to the House of the cold figures with regard to membership in the House and the Senate. One spokesman for the other side had said that the Democrats had a 2-to-1 majority in both Houses, when as a matter of fact we do not have a 2-to-1 majority in either House of Congress. We fall far short of a 2-to-1 majority in the House. I do not think it is particularly remarkable that this misstatement should be made by the gentleman on the other side because it has been made on a number of occasions by their party leader, the President of the United States, in White House press conferences. He persists in commenting upon the 2-to-1 majority in both Houses which the Democrats are supposed to have.

As we demonstrated a few moments ago, the membership ratio is 280 Democrats to 152 Republicans in the House, and 66 Democrats to 34 Republicans in the Senate. But, the gentleman has touched upon a field in which I think, certainly, the standards of veracity were outraged a few moments ago by one of the spokesmen participating in the Republican operation on the floor. I see that the gentleman is here on the floor, my good friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD], and he took great exception to some language appearing in the Democratic platform which said that "unimaginative, outmoded Republican policies which failed to use these productive facilities of our farms have been immensely costly to our Nation." And the argument made in answer to this by the gentleman from Wisconsin was that, in fact, this administration has been forced to operate under Democratic policies and not under Republican policies. Would not the gentleman agree with me that in an operation called Operation Veracity, there is some obligation on the other side to make part of the record the fact that five different pieces of major legislation in the farm field, which the Democratic Congresses have enacted since the Eisenhower-Nixon administration took over, have been vetoed by the President of the United States? In other words, the efforts of the Democratic Congresses to update and to bring in line with present conditions the farm policies of this country have uniformly been thwarted by the Republican administration.

Any Operation Veracity that failed to make part of the record the five major vetoes by the President in the field of farm legislation, certainly falls far short of spreading the complete record for the public to examine in determining who is responsible.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] also had some statements to make and a challenge to issue in the course of his remarks. I had hoped that the gentleman from Michigan would be back on the floor of the House. He took exception to some language occurring in the Democratic platform in which it stated that the Republican administration has "lost that position of preeminence" and that "over the past 7½ years, our military power has steadily declined relative to that of the Russians and the Chinese." Further, that this "is not a partisan election charge. It has been persistently made by high officials of the Republican administration itself." The gentleman from Michigan said he challenged us to name a single administration official who has in any way made that kind of representation to the people. Well, I think to get the record straight, we can name one at least who is well known to the public, a gentleman who held the position of Assistant Secretary of the Air Force named Trevor Gardner who protested bitterly against administration policies of putting the budget first on military matters and who finally resigned as an official of this administration in protest against the policies which were being followed by this administration with regard to the military budget. I think if you want to look around a little bit to find some other prominent Republican who shared Mr. Gardner's viewpoint, you can go just a few miles north and find one of the most prominent names in the Republican party, the Governor of the State of New York, Nelson Rockefeller, who had quite an extensive study made of the budgetary policies of this administration in the military field. He, unless I am mistaken, came out with some pretty

positive criticisms of those policies and some pretty strong recommendations for action in the Republican National Convention.

Unless I am mistaken the Republican National Convention radically changed its platform position on the question of military strength after this protest had been registered by its spokesman for the Republican Party in the State of New York, the Governor of that State.

There is one other statement I would like to comment upon in reference to Operation Veracity.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] took exception to the language appearing in the Democratic platform in which the Democratic platform pointed out the problems of economic growth and stated that "the Republican failure in the economic field has been virtually complete." As I recall the gentleman's statement, he said that no indicator of economic strength to support that charge is cited in the Democratic platform. If the gentleman has copy of the platform before him, he will find directly following the language to which he takes exception is some pretty strong language about the fact of two recessions, 1953–54 and 1957, which occurred during this administration. He also will find mention that $9 billion of additional interest charges have been added to the national debt. He will find reference to unemployment ranging from 5 to 7½ percent of our labor force. The gentleman may not regard unemployment as an economic indicator. He may not regard additional interest as an economic indicator, but certainly I think the gentleman would agree that a recession is an economic indicator.

Reference is made very definitely to the recessions which took place during the Republican administrations.

So I would say that on several accounts Operation Veracity has been something of a disappointment to the House today.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. GEORGE. I do not know what they mean by Operation Veracity. I wish the gentleman from Ohio was here on the floor. I am sure he realizes the provisions of the Democratic platform do not go to the Veterans' Affairs Committee.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDALL. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I have already characterized in two 1-minute speeches that is actually Republican political operation untruth.

Mr. GEORGE. I agree with that. Two thousand and seven hundred beds for veterans in every area of the country today are needed, and we have a waiting list of veterans who do not have beds to enter in the hospitals. That is one of the things the Democratic platform referred to.

Another remark the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] made was that our economic status was higher than ever. Never have the farmers been faced with such high prices. The income is lower than at any time in history when consideration is given to the things they have to buy. That is one of the reasons Operation Veracity must fail.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. It is interesting to try to discover which Madison Avenue agency dreamed up this latest slogan "Operation Veracity." Two years ago we heard about truth bonds. We have been getting these slogans all along, but I wonder how the Republican Party is going to explain to the American people the answer to the question which I had in my district 2 or 3 weeks ago.

I asked my constituents if they had any reason to believe on the basis of their employment and business that we were headed for another economic slump. Thirty-one percent of the people said "Yes." Now we have heard a number of statistics about economic growth; we have heard a lot of things here this afternoon about the Democratic platform, but the fact of the matter is that apparently—and this is a statement that has been made not only to us on this side of the floor, but it is testimony that was presented to the other body by the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, that we are headed for another economic slump either during the third or fourth quarter of this year or the first quarter of 1961. I suspect we are going to hear a great deal of discussion on the other side about international matters only because of the abominable domestic record that the Republican Party has written in this Congress and previous Congresses.

The fact of the matter is today you have 5½ million people unemployed, and another very distressing factor is that we have a shorter workweek. We in Chicago for instance have the electronics industry and we are working a 3- and 4-day week.

These are the things our friends on the other side are going to very conveniently sweep under the rug and with the very fancy title "Operation Veracity" they will run with the ball.

Mr. RANDALL. I compliment the gentlemen from Oklahoma, Kansas, and Illinois.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

BEEF AND PORK IMPORTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. WOLF] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I have had many letters from farmers in my State who are concerned that the price of their production is being reduced in the marketplace, and yet day after day they read in the papers of shipload after shipload of meat of all kinds arriving at American ports from other countries and finding its way into the domestic market.

The farmers of my district know that they are not only competing with domestic production of their neighbors and friends but they are also competing with beef and pork raisers in many other countries of the world.

If the American farmer's profits and the return on his investment were adequate, I am sure that we would hear no complaint from him, but in light of the fact that each day the statistics tell a more grim story about the tragedy of the average family farmer in America, there must be some way that we can deal with this problem.

In 1959 we imported more red meat—beef and pork—products than the total production of these products in 26 average counties in Iowa. In other words, our importation of red meat is equal to more than one-fourth the production of red meat in Iowa, the largest hog and cattle producing State in the Nation.

Coupled with this knowledge is the fact that in many of the countries from which this meat is coming there are many people living on very inadequate diets—many on the verge of starvation. This is the greater tragedy. In other words, what we are doing, Mr. Speaker, is literally taking the food out of the mouths of the hungry people in these countries.

Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity to visit various meat-processing plants in Europe in 1957, and I can say that the standard of quality of processing permitted in these countries is considerably below that standard which would be tolerated in this country. It is significant that wages which are paid to workers in the nations from which we are importing red meats are, of course, far below the wages paid to American farm employees and workers. Mr. Speaker, it seems that increased imports help more the richest elements in these nations rather than the poor worker and his family.

Thus, the tragedy of this situation, Mr. Speaker, as I see it, is that while the purpose of importing this meat is to aid the economy in the country involved it is unfortunate, but true, that in many cases the great corporations involved are not sharing the benefits with the unfortunate low-paid farmers and workers in the particular country.

It has been my feeling for many years that it was important to America to support the reciprocal trade agreements and to expand trade with other nations of the world. For this reason I have always been a strong supporter of the reciprocal trade agreements. But the intent of the framers of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act was to guarantee good markets for American producers, not just for foreign producers. The intent of the act was not to penalize any section of the American economy but rather to strengthen it. This is the general directive under which the Tariff Commission carries out its duty.

Mr. Speaker, today it appears that the intent of the framers of this law is being violated because of what I believe to be a misunderstanding of the purpose of the act. I hope the administration will promptly review this situation.

I also hope that in the beginning of the next session of Congress we will be able to look more closely into this matter. And, I hope other Members of this body will give considerable attention to this grave economic problem.

Mr. Speaker, concerning the effects of meat imports on the domestic economy, I would like to point out that under our present law it is impossible for livestock producers and feeders to secure any relief from the Tariff Commission, even if they can show serious injury to their industry.

This fact was pointed up in a 4-to-2 decision on June 1, 1960, of the members of the Tariff Commission in the case of a petition made by the producers and feeders of sheep. In this instance, the Commission held, in effect, that any objection and showing of injury by imports of carcass or frozen meat products would have to come, not from producers and feeders, but from the packers themselves. The impact of this decision that producers still would not be entitled to relief even if, in the future, they made a satisfactory showing of injury from imports is devastating. This situation is unrealistic and must not be allowed to stand.

For this reason, I am introducing a bill which, if enacted, will overturn the above-mentioned interpretation in the future and provide that the producers and feeders of the live animals shall be considered interested parties under any escape-clause investigation and are included within the definition of "domestic industry producing like or directly competitive products."

I realize that this bill has no chance for consideration by committee in this session of the Congress. I feel it important, however, to point up the need for prompt action in the next Congress to correct this grievous situation so that the producers and feeders—the people who can be really hurt the most—can be heard. My bill, therefore, is merely an expression of what I believe is the direction in which the Congress should go next year on this subject.

The text of my bill follows:

A BILL TO AMEND SECTION 7 OF THE TRADE AGREEMENTS EXTENSION ACT OF 1951, AS AMENDED

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first sentence of subsection (e) of section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1364(e)), is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a comma and the following: "or any group of producers of the raw or processed agricultural or horticultural products from which any such products or articles are obtained."

SOIL BANK ILLUSIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a letter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. As soon as I have made my statement I will yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Will not the gentleman yield for half a minute?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I will yield later.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I suggest to my friend that he show the true democratic spirit and yield to the gentleman?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I have a statement to make. I will have plenty of time to yield later.

Mr. Speaker, there have been so many misleading and inaccurate statements concerning the soil bank and other aspects of farm programs that I feel certain facts should be stated on the floor of the House. Since I have been working many months trying to get some of these facts and have been close to the problem, several of my colleagues asked that I present them before all of you, and, in response to letters from my neighbors in Iowa the past few days, I am going to have it reprinted and sent to farmers in my area immediately.

Lack of information is bad, but misinformation is worse. We must have the facts straight to act properly. There is a saying in the farm community where I was raised, "Salt down the facts, the law will keep." To apply it to the farm problem, "one must have the true facts to know what law we need."

I have been engaged in farming and lived on a farm all my life except for time spent in service and in school. In fact, I farmed part of the time I was in college. Farming is more than a way of making a livelihood for many people, it is a way of life, a wonderful, clean place to raise children. With the operator of a grocery store, the law of supply and demand rules; but, with the farmer, the laws of nature are also at work.

All acres do not have the same fertility; the rainfall, hail, wind, and sun are not the same each year, nor do they come on a prescheduled date; insects and weeds are at work trying to balance nature, and animal diseases come and go. Thus, renting 10 percent of the farmland in the United States does not mean a 10 percent reduction in production of each commodity—it depends on which acres are rented and the other forces at work. The Secretary of Agriculture and others have stated, and I am not doubting their statement, that 40 percent of our land produces 90 percent of our products. This means that withdrawal of the 60 percent least productive farms would only reduce production by 10 percent. That would be over 200 million acres.

At my request, the Agricultural Adjustment Center at Iowa State University worked on some estimates of the number of acres which would have to be taken out of production nationally by extending the present conservation reserve program—soil bank—to make corn bring $1.30 and other grains a comparable price. This is very important because the cost must be within reason or we must turn to some alternate approach as the main goal. A figure of 60 million acres within 3 years has been used by the Department of Agriculture, and others, without any real estimate as to what is required to produce reasonable results. We should not be experimenting with such an important and costly thing without at least some hope that it will succeed. In the effort to balance production with demand we cannot afford any more failures such as the 1959 corn program—or the farm programs will be so discredited that no more farm legislation can be passed.

I personally think 3-year conservation contracts result in at least two-thirds slippage. I can change my rotation, go from a 4-year to a 6-year rotation, and move my capital to other acres and produce just about as much. In New Mexico over one-third of the land is in the program and production of every major crop moved to new heights. I believe 1 acre under a 10-year easement is as effective as 2 acres under a 3-year contract. I am trying to get an independent estimate on this at the present time.

Only 15 percent of input into production comes from land, 30 percent from labor, and 55 percent from capital. Reducing land alone does not reduce the same percentage of labor and capital. Much of a farmer's labor and capital moves to his other land. To reduce input of land 60 million acres would be sure to reduce total input only 2 percent (12 percent by 15 percent). I doubt if the total input of labor and capital on a farm would be reduced more than a fraction under 3-year contracts that are not conditioned on cross-compliance and a reduction of a base allotment.

An additional problem arises in that the rental price will rise as prices become higher. If it works, it will cost more. It seems that we may discredit what should not be discredited by not having the right kind of contract or a realistic goal.

Most everyone agrees that considerably less than average productive land has gone into the present soil bank contracts. In commenting upon the estimated acreage that must be retired to make corn bring $1.30 and wheat $1.50 per bushel, Arnold Paulsen of the Adjustment Center at Iowa State University states as follows:

> There is some variation in the present yields of land assigned the same rate per acre within a State. One might assume that the land attracted to the conservation reserve yields less than the average of all land assigned a given rate. If the land presently attracted to the conservation reserve yields only 75 percent as much as the average of all land receiving the same rate, the present production control would be 9.6 million tons and 133 million acres would be required of an expanded conservation reserve.

The figure of 60 or 70 million acres in contracts under the present program to bring corn to $1.30 has been thrown around so much that even responsible people are in good faith quoting it with the thought that it is backed by responsible analysis. This estimate was for a vastly different kind of program—more nearly like the acreage reserve program which was abandoned by the Administration with the approval of Congress in 1959 when the new corn program without allotments was adopted. Vastly differ-

ent acreage payments would be required and every acre must be an acre that reduces grain production. It is very misleading and grossly inaccurate to use the 60-million-acre estimate as the amount required under the present conservation reserve program to balance supply and demand sufficiently to make corn bring $1.30 and wheat bring $1.50 per bushel. The 133 million figure is much more accurate and many think it is too low a figure. Although it is doubtful that this many acres could be secured on a voluntary basis at the average $20.80 estimated necessary to secure 60 million acres, it would cost $2.75 billion per year at this rate. I watched all but 9 of the 150 Republicans and also 90 of the 250 Democrats vote against a bill that would have cost less than one-third of this amount and reduced storage costs tremendously. Is there anyone who thinks those Representatives who voted to sustain the Presidential vetoes of farm bills, either Republican or Democratic, are going to vote $2.75 billion per year for 1 year—let alone 10 or 20 years?

It is interesting to note that some of the strongest advocates of extending the conservation reserve program enough to balance supply and demand at the level mentioned also advocate a 25-percent maximum per farm or per county. Even if every farm in the United States complied with the maximum of 25 percent, there would not be the required 133 million acres in the program.

Let us correct those who are throwing irresponsible illusions around and face the facts. The present 28 million acres under the current program is just a teaser and 60 million acres will not do the job either. Both will help slightly but neither will do the job without being connected with a control program such as has been contained in the vetoed bills, and a vastly different rate paid per acre so better acres can be secured. There has been considerable argument whether whole farms or only portions of farms should be retired; however, the fact is that many farmers farm what is considered more than one farm unit or separate tracts of land that do not belong to the same person. In this event, one "farm" can be put in the soil bank and then fertilize and crop the other land heavily. Thus there is also slippage in whole farm retirement under the present program.

I want to do whatever will help, even if it is not a complete cure, and will support any responsible legislation as I have in the past, and I will not take the attitude that some have that it must be exactly what I prefer or I vote "no"; but, we cannot afford to have anyone under the illusion that a program adopted will solve the problem and then after adoption find that it will not work. If this were to happen, I predict that would sour most Congressmen against all future farm legislation. Misleading people as to the effects of a 60-million-acre extension of the present program is a great disservice to farmers for years to come and if such extension were adopted with the illusion that it would balance supply and demand at the level of $1.30 for corn and $1.50 for wheat, it would in the end disgust Congressmen from nonfarm areas so much it would prove disastrous to future legislation.

A subcommittee of which I was a member, the Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee of the Government Operations Committee, after long hearings and study into such matters and the problem of economy and efficiency in the administration of the programs, has just pointed out that a large share of the vast resources of the Department of Agriculture for analyzing programs and making estimates are being wasted by only projecting the views that coincide with conclusions of the Secretary and the President. We recommended that minority as well as majority views be released in analyzing these programs. For example, we found that the cost per bushel of reducing corn production under the acreage reserve was 57 cents in 1953 compared with a much higher cost under the conservation reserve program, but these facts were not given to the Congress when it approved substituting the conservation reserve for the acreage reserve program. Not only the Secretary, but also most others debating farm issues, reach their conclusion and then look only for the facts that support the previously conceived conclusion. I think this is a most important recommendation and refers to a waste of cost analysis that has cost us billions of dollars by hiding facts necessary to objectively draft new legislation with a minimum of loopholes. Throttling the views of responsible Government-paid technicians to the effect that 60 million acres would have little effect in adjusting total supplies is really unconscionable. If the thousands of technicians and economic analysts added to the Department of Agriculture are to have their work distorted by using only those politically acceptable to the Secretary, we would be better off to loan all of the technicians to the agricultural colleges that do not curb academic freedom or to the Adjustment Center at Iowa State University, and thereby secure the benefits of their skill and work.

I sincerely hope that the next administration, whether Republican or Democratic, will adopt the recommendation.

The full text of the statement of the Adjustment Center is as follows:

AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT CENTER,
IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY,
Ames, Iowa, August 26, 1960.

Congressman NEAL SMITH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: You inquired in your letter as to how large the present conservation reserve program would have to be to bring about a price of $1.30 for corn. Estimates of this kind can only be made with the aid of assumptions and are difficult to make with a satisfactory degree of accuracy.

In a study made at Iowa, it was estimated that a reduction in grain production of 40 million tons would be required to support prices at $1.30 per bushel for corn and $1.50 for wheat and simultaneously reduce stocks to normal carryover levels in 10 years. With the present 28.6 million acres in the conservation reserve, the soil bank division estimates that total grain production is reduced 12.8 million tons. Thus, assuming that the Department of Agriculture estimate of the effectiveness of the conservation reserve program is accurate and if additional land were retired in the present geographical pattern, the same mix of crops, and of the same productive quality, a conservation reserve of 100 million acres would be required to reduce grain production 40 million tons. One hundred million acres may be near the low end of the range of possible estimates. I propose the following hypothesis as a basis for higher estimate.

There is some variation in the present yields of land assigned the same rate per acre within a State. One might assume that the land attracted to the conservation reserve yields less than the average land of all land assigned a given rate. If the land presently attracted to the conservation reserve yields only 75 percent as much as the average of all land receiving the same rate, the present production control would be 9.6 million tons and 133 million acres would be required of an expanded conservation reserve. Any change in the conservation reserve program as it were expanded would change the estimate of acres required to reduce certain grain production by a given amount.

The important principle involved is that a rather significant proportion of agriculture's capacity to produce grain must be prevented from doing so if the goals of $1.30 corn and $1.50 wheat and orderly reduction of stocks are to be obtained.

Sincerely,

ARNOLD PAULSEN,
Agricultural Policy Analyst.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I will ask the gentleman to yield to somebody on the Republican side to show the real democratic spirit of understanding and generosity. Furthermore, they are on the defensive already. We are not afraid of anything they may offer.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. First, I would like to say to the majority leader that had he been here he would have heard these observations made.

Mr. McCORMACK. I did not hear the gentleman.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Had the majority leader been on the floor throughout the entire time, he would have heard these observations made. We took longer in our hour than we had anticipated and many of us had actually to cut short what we were going to say. The Republicans were asking us to yield as well. I pointed out twice on the floor we would remain here in order to answer any remarks or comments that the Democrats might make later today.

Mr. McCORMACK. But you would not yield. You could not use it as campaign literature then, is that right?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. No, that is not right.

Mr. McCORMACK. It was a planned proposition. I would like to know who wrote the speeches?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I will tell the gentleman who wrote mine. I wrote my own, and the gentleman knows I did, and I think probably each one of the members wrote his own. The members

were picked on the basis of which particular field they were familiar with because of their work in the House and on the committees.

Mr. McCORMACK. I see.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. They had their own material.

Mr. McCORMACK. Your own material. What about writing the speeches?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. We had our own material.

Mr. McCORMACK. Your own material and writing speeches are two different things.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. And writing the speeches. I said both.

Mr. McCORMACK. I will accept the gentleman's word, but the gentleman will admit there is a justifiable suspicion?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. No, we would not make the mistake again. If this operation is going to continue tomorrow we will be sure we have ample time so we can yield, because it is the purpose to lay out our charges, to have whatever answers you gentlemen might have to these charges, then we in turn can rebut those answers if we can. Although the gentleman from Missouri was going to yield, we never had time enough to yield, and I can understand that because there is a limitation on time.

I would like to direct my charges in reference to the charges I made about the untruth, as I see it, in the Democratic platform which stated—I have it here—that the Republican failure in the economic field has been virtually complete. Then I made the remark about the economic indicators, and they will reveal that the reverse is true. Then I proceeded to read off these basic indicators. I think they are true. They show that we have broken American records and world records in all these instances.

The question of two recessions having occurred during this administration is proper argument, proper comment, in light of the recession that was in the previous administration. The main thing I will say about the 1954 recession is it was the mildest we ever had, and I might say in regard to the gentleman from Illinois who is now predicting a depression, the Democratic leaders, including your Senator from Illinois, predicted these previous recessions were going to amount to depressions. We have been listening to 7 instances, we have been listening to the gloom and doom of some of the Democratic leaders, and if we had taken them seriously we would have had 7 depressions and about 10 wars in the last 7 years.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman of course again makes a statement that is not consistent with truth or with what the Democrats have said.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Those are the words of Senator DOUGLAS.

Mr. McCORACK. We never said there would be a depression. We said there would not be a depression due to the cushions in the law, like social security, unemployment insurance, and the other beneficial and progressive legislation that all became law under the Democrats. Your own administration as well said it was due to the cushions in the law. What are the cushions?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. We are not objecting to that.

Mr. McCORMACK. It was all the result of Democratic Congresses of the past.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. We are not going to accept that statement. It is true our recessions cannot become depressions because of these built-in controls, but they were all assisted in by the ranking member of our Subcommittee on Unemployment Insurance and Social Security and, may I say that during the Republican administration we have improved the unemployment insurance system, we have extended it to more people during this administration than any previous Congress possibly. I am only pointing out that no political party has a claim to legislation involving unemployment compensation. It first began in the State of Wisconsin under a Republican administration.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman was not here when we put the first bill through.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. No political party, neither this nor any previous administration, has the sole claim.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman was not here when the Mutual Security Act and the unemployment compensation bills were put through, and a great majority of your party tried to defeat them.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. That is not true.

Mr. McCORMACK. Oh, my friend, you were not here then.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I know, but I can read the RECORD, and I have gone back to read the RECORD.

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not have to read the RECORD. I lived the record.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. The gentleman's memory and all of our memories sometimes are faulty, but I suggest he go back and read the RECORD and refresh his memory on just what occurred, because that, I regret to say, is not an accurate statement.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. The gentleman made a remark about a statement I made, and I think I should have a chance to reply. The fact of the matter is I never said there was going to be a recession or a depression.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. What did the gentleman say?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I am relying on a statement made by the Harris Trust & Savings Bank of Chicago in their business summary for this week in which they point out that all of those stable business indicators which the gentleman quoted in his earlier statement do not indicate that the much expected upturn in business activity in the third and fourth quarters of 1960 is going to materialize. The fact of the matter is that we had two recessions under the Republican Party. And, the fact that they did not develop into depressions is simply because of the foresight of the Democratic Party in building up these economic cushions, and yet we see in every instance, in this last session of the Congress, the Republican Party standing firmly as one phalanx against every effort to improve that legislation. I know that in a free economy, such as we have in our country, there are going to be hills and valleys, but I say that the job of this Congress and the job of this Government is to make sure that those valleys do not become depressions. This is what we have been doing in this entire Congress, and yet your party has refused to recognize that fact.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I disagree with the gentleman.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Since the original minimum wage bill was passed in 1938 we had 56 percent of the American labor force employed in production and 44 percent in services. Now, in the ensuing 20 years the picture has changed. Today only 45 percent of the Nation's labor force is in production and 55 percent in services, and yet the gentleman knows under the minimum wage law passed in 1938 those engaged in services do not have any protection of fair labor standards. And, the other side ran through this House a minimum wage bill a few weeks ago that does nothing to improve the standards of the people or improve the standard of living. This is obstructionism that we had to fight in this Congress all the way, not only this Congress but in the history of your party.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I will say, first of all, I sure am pleased to see so many Republicans reading the Democratic platform. And, they are doing it in Iowa and all over the country. I think it is a real good thing. The other thing I want to mention to the gentleman from Missouri is—and I wish he would straighten me out—that any good laws that are passed when a Republican administration is in and the Democrats are in control, why, then the administration gets credit, but anything they do not think does good, then it is the Democrats' loss.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. No, I do not believe this way. The point I would like to make to the gentleman from Illinois is the statement I was taking exception to in the Democratic platform that the Republican failure in the economic field has been virtually complete. I think the gentleman's remarks equally indicate that he himself recognizes that is an inaccurate statement. The fact that we are not going into quite the prosperous fourth quarter that we expected certainly is no indication that we are going into a recession or depression.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, in response to the last statement, the Democratic platform covers the ground quite prop-

erly, because we are now locked in a gigantic world struggle, and the fact of the matter is that this Nation's economic growth has not been what it needs to be to cope with these tremendous advancements made by the Soviet Union or even countries friendly to us.

Germany, for instance, has been increasing its economic growth by a vastly larger percentage than we have; so has Japan. The question is, how does the gentleman under his program, under the platform, propose to provide some 70 million jobs in this country? If he has an answer, I would like to listen to it, because it certainly has not been reflected in the legislative program of the minority party in this Congress.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I yield.

Mr. EDMONDSON. The point at which we clash in the statement of the gentleman from Missouri is when he says that the Democratic platform contained no indicators of economic strength to back up the statement in the platform. I call his attention to the fact that not only did we mention the recessions, not only did we mention the added interest charges on the national debt, but we also mentioned and set forth the unemployment statistics in this country which certainly bear on economic strength. So the gentleman has missed the point completely in his rebuttal to the charges made.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. If the gentleman were listening to me he would have heard me say that every indicator of economic well-being of a society reveals that just the reverse is true. In other words, never in the history of mankind has the economic condition of a society been as good or on such a sound, broad basis as the United States in the year 1960.

The previous recessions do not bear on that statement.

I will say this; there is no way to tell in the indicator on unemployment. The indicator on unemployment is an indication of well-being, and I, myself, have said in our minority views on the Economic Report this year, that unemployment is an area on which we need to do a great deal of thinking and studying. On the other hand, I certainly would say this, that the incidence of unemployment in light of the rapid technological growth in this country is something that we have to deal with almost as an indication of our achieving these high goals which I pointed out in the other economic indicators.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Missouri would agree that even the unemployment figures are not always a sound indicator, because they do not always reflect the facts. Let us take a man who is working only 2 or 3 days a week. Let us say that he gets $80 a week net, brings home $80 a week. He has three youngsters. If he is reduced to a 2- or 3-day workweek, this man is suffering as great a depression as anybody on relief. Yet his reduced earning capacity is not being reflected in the figures on unemployment.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. But the number of hours worked per week, which is another one of the statistics, does not bear out the gentleman's statement.

Mr. PUCINSKI. It has been going down, and the gentleman knows it. The average workweek has been going down.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FORD. I appreciate the gentleman's yielding. Earlier this afternoon I made this statement. I said this was an inaccurate statement in the Democratic platform for 1960, that the Republicans have also admitted that our conventional military forces on which we depend for defense in any nonnuclear war have been dangerously slashed for reasons of economy and that they have no plans to reverse this trend.

It is my understanding that the gentleman from Oklahoma subsequent to my statement on the floor of the House indicated that former Assistant Secretary of the Air Force Trevor Gardner did have views that coincided with this statement in the Democratic platform. It is my recollection that former Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Research and Development, Mr. Gardner, resigned because of his disagreement with the President over the adequacy of funds for our missile programs primarily and research and development particularly. I have no recollection whatsoever that Mr. Gardner ever had this view as expressed in the Democratic platform for 1960.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me to comment on that point?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I yield.

Mr. EDMONDSON. If I have in any way misrepresented Mr. Gardner's position I regret it. I based my statement on the short newspaper account which I have shown to the gentleman from Michigan, and in good faith made the statement regarding Mr. Gardner's resignation over the budget-first position which the administration had taken.

I wonder if the gentleman would comment on the books which have been written on the subject of a budget-first defense policy by General Ridgway, who was associated in a very responsible way with this administration's military program, and by General Gavin, who has also associated with the military program of this administration. Both of them have written volumes, I believe, on the conventional forces in this country and the way in which they have been hurt by a budget-first philosophy.

Mr. FORD. Let me ask my friend from Oklahoma whether he has read the books by the two gentlemen he mentions, Generals Ridgway and Gavin, or the latest book by General Taylor. I do not think he will find in any of those three books a statement which coincides with this paragraph in the Democratic platform. That was the only inaccuracy which I indicated.

Mr. McCORMACK. If the gentleman will yield, as a matter of fact, they go much further than that. Their attack was that our defense was inadequate. As a matter of fact, President Eisenhower himself admitted it only a few days ago. In his recent message to Congress he admitted that because of Communist efforts greater national defense is necessary. That is what we Democrats have been mentioning.

At the Republican Convention President Eisenhower, Vice President NIXON, and others criticized the Democrats for urging and advocating greater national defense, yet within a few weeks the President sent a message up here advising us he was going to use some of the money Congress appropriated over his budget.

My friend and I do not disagree on the necessity for strong national defense, so I do not have to go to the fact that we appropriated for a 900,000-man Army, and it was frozen. I do not have to refer to the fact that the Marine Corp was 200,000 and it is now down to about 180,000—frozen. I do not have to refresh my friend's mind that last year he made us increase the assignments for the future Army and to start it only $400 million was used for that purpose. I do not have to refresh my friend's mind that the Polaris was started by men in this Congress on both sides. It did not originate in the executive branch. Nine out of the 14 Polaris submarines authorized to be constructed were from funds appropriated by Congress over and above the budget estimate. I do not have to refresh my friend's memory that the Soviets are 4 to 5 years ahead of us in outer space in the propulsion part and my friend knows that is the heart of it.

Those are some of the things that cause concern to the American people, that have caused concern to the gentlemen my friend referred to, and have caused concern to Robert Lovett, to Robert Sprague, to Thomas Watson, Thomas Lanphier, and some of the others who have expressed themselves in connection with the adequacy of our national defense. Of course we are powerful but are we powerful in relation to the Soviet Union? That is the question. Men might honestly disagree about that. But those who do not think we are powerful enough should not be attacked and accused that we are weakening the position of our country throughout the world by urging a greater national defense, because my friend did not do that, and I join with him and he joins with me.

I expect within a few days I will join with others if necessary, and I shall if necessary. I hope that the conference committee on deficiency appropriations will bring in $115 million, at least, voted in by the other body. The other $90 or $95 million might well go over to next year on the development loan, and so forth but I hope they will agree to the $115 million, to show how I feel on the matter.

So that "Operation Veracity," as you call it, in fact, as I call it, has become

"Republican Political Operation Untruth;" and quote or unquote it, it is so.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. In the first place, the Democratic candidate for President in Detroit, Mich., my home State, last week said the United States was first in military power at the present time. I agree with him and I believe the military program recommended by President Eisenhower and passed by the Congress will maintain that superiority.

Second, my only statement today was as to a paragraph in the Democratic platform. As of now, I still have not found a single person in this administration, past or present, who agrees with that.

One other point, in looking over the statistics for the last six sessions of the Congress, starting in 1955, which following the election of 1954, and in 1955, 1956, 1957, 1958, 1959, and in 1960 the Democrats have controlled the Congress. Peculiarly enough, in 1955, in 1957, and in 1959, the Democratic controlled Congresses cut the President's military budget. Those are nonelection years.

In 1956, 1958, and 1960, in other words, in election years, the Democratic controlled Congresses have increased the President's budgets. I do not know whether this is by happenstance or by direction that in political years they increase the military budget and in nonelection years the military budget is cut. I do not know what causes that to happen, but it is a fact.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. But whose responsibility is it to balance the budget? Is it the responsibility of the President or of the Congress? I wish you would take a consistent position on that.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, the gentleman realizes it does not necessarily mean that just because those statements were made that my friend's recollection as to what happened is correct. My recollection is that last year we put in $400 million that the President did not recommend to start the modernization of our Army. The President froze that money with the exception of 40-and-some-odd million dollars. He did use 160-some-odd million dollars for some other purpose by use of the transferability clause. But he froze about $40 million.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, if my colleague will go back to the record, I am sure he will find the record will show this—in the fiscal year 1960, the military appropriation bill which we approved in the last session, in the regular military operations bill, the Congress cut $19 million and some-odd thousand below the President's budget and in the military construction appropriation bill, the cut was about $190 million for a total of $219 million less than the President recommended. That was a nonelection year.

In this session of the Congress, in other words, in an election year the President's budget for military operating expenses was increased $661 million. I cannot recall what the figures were on military construction, but I believe the Congress gave less than what the President recommended.

Mr. McCORMACK. There was a reduction of over $600 million in other directions, and then we increased the appropriations to the extent of about $1,300 million in other directions where we felt increased appropriations were necessary; is that not correct?

Mr. FORD. No; when the bill went through the House of Representatives, actually, the House cut the President's military budget by $3,200,000 approximately. When the bill went to the other body, the President's military budget was increased $1,200 million in the compromise between the Senate and the House versions, and we came up with a figure of $661 million over the President's request for the fiscal year 1961. I am told, however, that the military construction appropriation bill for fiscal 1961 was cut by approximately $200 million; so there is a net increase of $400 million for fiscal 1961. I happen to think those changes were desirable because circumstances have changed between January 1960, and June, July, and August 1960. I think the Congress was right in making those changes. However, the increases were made but in prior years there were greater decreases.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman does admit that in the last fiscal year ending June 30 last we appropriated over $400 million for modernization purposes in the Army.

Mr. FORD. Not over the President's budget.

Mr. McCORMACK. Oh, but we did; but the President did not ask for that, did he?

Mr. FORD. The authorizations went over the President's budget.

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not recall the exact detail but he did not ask for it.

Mr. FORD. There was about $1,100 million in total Army procurement items and about $400 million for modernization, about half of which was for military hardware.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman will remember that the year before we fixed the Army at 900,000 officers and men and we appropriated funds for that purpose. The President said he was going to reduce it to 870,000. Is that right?

Mr. FORD. I will have to refresh my memory, but I think the gentleman is in error. I think he is talking about the Army National Guard and the Army Reserve.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is another matter.

Mr. FORD. That is correct, but I do not think those figures are accurate.

BANKRUPTCIES AND BUSINESS FAILURES—TRENDS BY TYPE OF INDUSTRY, BY SIZE OF BUSINESS, BY STATE, AND FOR A LIST OF LARGE CITIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALTER). Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, there has been some discussion of the increasing number of bankruptcies taking place in the country and some attention directed to the mounting toll of small business failures. All of us know in a general way about these most disturbing trends, but most of us have not seen the facts on the subject assembled in one place.

Just what has the record of business failures been over the past 40 years? In which States are the bankruptcies and failures taking place? What are the trends in the principal cities of the country? How long have the firms that are now failing been in business? How large are the firms that are failing? And what is the amount of their liabilities?

I have had prepared several statistical tables in answer to all of these questions. I will give a brief description of each of these tables and then insert them in the RECORD for the Members' attention.

WHAT ARE THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN BANKRUPTCIES AND BUSINESS FAILURES?

First, however, let me call attention to the sources of this information and give a brief description of the definitions used in assembling this information.

The information on business failures all comes from reports of Dun & Bradstreet, Inc. The information on bankruptcies all comes from the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts. Unlike the Dun & Bradstreet reports, the data on bankruptcies refer to all types of bankruptcies, including business firms, farmers, and individuals.

It is particularly important to know what the Dun & Bradstreet data on business failures actually refer to. These data by no means include all types of business firms, nor do they by any means include all of the firms which close their doors and cease operations even among the types of business which the reports cover. Let me be more specific.

As I understand the matter, Dun & Bradstreet reports failures only when the failing firm appears on the Dun & Bradstreet list of what it calls listed concerns. To illustrate, for the year 1959, Dun & Bradstreet listed 2,746,000 business concerns in the United States, whereas the Department of Commerce reported that there were 4,710,000 firms actually in operation. In other words, Dun & Bradstreet lists slightly more than one-half the business firms which are actually in operation, and its report of business failures refers to failures among firms on this list.

Dun & Bradstreet does not list among its listed concerns businesses of a number

of types. For example, it does not list business firms which are classified as amusements, such as movie houses, bowling alleys, sports facilities, and so on. It does not list insurance and real estate companies, mortgage, loan, or investment companies, or other financial enterprises, including banks. Furthermore, it does not list what it calls "many small one-man services." None of the professional offices, such as those of doctors, lawyers, dentists, accountants, and so on, are listed; nor are farmers included either in the listed concerns or in the business failures. Speaking of what it does list, Dun & Bradstreet states in its report:

Total listed concerns represents the total number of business enterprises listed in the Dun & Bradstreet reference book. This book includes manufacturers, wholesalers, retailers, building contractors, and certain types of commercial service including public utilities, water carriers, motor carriers, and airlines. This count by no means covers all the business enterprises of the country. Specific types of business not listed are: financial enterprises including banks, and mortgage, loan, and investment companies; insurance and real estate companies; railroads; terminals; amusements; and many small one-man services. Neither the professions nor farmers are included.

WHAT IS A BUSINESS FAILURE?

Now what do we mean by "failure"? The number of failures reported by no means include all of the business firms that are forced out of business or go out of business voluntarily. They include only those firms who go bankrupt or otherwise close under circumstances which involve a substantial loss to their creditors. Those business operators who close their doors when they run out of money or those who can raise enough money to pay off their creditors, such as by selling their homes or borrowing on their life insurance, are not counted as business failures, although from the point of view of our interest in what is happening in the economy, and our interest in knowing the extent to which small business is disappearing, such small business disappearances are as much failures as any other small business failures.

In view of these limitations in the Dun & Bradstreet reports on business failures, we must keep these points in mind: First, the number of failures reported by no means includes all of the business failures—certain types of businesses are omitted entirely. Furthermore, the failures reported are generally instances of failures among the more substantial firms. Certainly all of the larger firms that fail, among the types of businesses covered, are reported, and the important omissions tend to be for the smaller firms. Increases or decreases in the number of failures reported surely provide a good indication of the trends taking place, even though these reports do not tell us the total number of firms that have actually failed.

With this background, let me describe each of the tables I will insert in the RECORD.

WHAT HAS BEEN THE TREND IN BUSINESS FAILURES SINCE 1920?

Year before last, which, as we know, was a recession year, Dun & Bradstreet reported 14,964 failures. This was the greatest number of failures in any year since 1933.

Last year, which I believe is ranked as a year of high prosperity, there were still 14,053 failures, a number just slightly under the 1958 total.

Coming now to the rate of failures, considering that there are more firms in business today than in years gone by, Dun & Bradstreet reports that the failures last year were at the rate of 52 firms per each 10,000 concerns listed. We may note from table 1, to follow, that the failure rate has increased sharply since a low point in 1945. The rate of 52 for last year compares, for example, with a failure rate of 34 in 1949, and a rate of 29 in 1952. The failure rate of the last 3 years is now in the neighborhood of the rate reached during the years of the great depression of the 1930's, though it is only about half of the rate of failures reached in the years of the Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover administrations.

TABLE 1.—*Number of business failures, 1920–59*

Year	Number of listed concerns	Number of failures	Failure rate per 10,000 listed concerns
1920	[1]	8,881	48
1921	[1]	19,652	102
1922	[1]	23,676	120
1923	[1]	18,718	93
1924	[1]	20,615	100
1925	[1]	21,214	100
1926	[1]	21,773	101
1927	[1]	23,146	106
1928	[1]	23,842	109
1929	[1]	22,909	104
1930	2,183,000	26,355	122
1931	2,125,000	28,285	133
1932	2,077,000	31,822	154
1933	1,961,000	19,859	100
1934	1,974,000	12,091	61
1935	1,983,000	12,244	62
1936	2,010,000	9,607	48
1937	2,057,000	9,490	46
1938	2,102,000	12,836	61
1939	2,116,000	14,768	70
1940	2,156,000	13,619	63
1941	2,171,000	11,848	55
1942	2,152,000	9,405	45
1943	2,023,000	3,221	16
1944	1,855,000	1,222	7
1945	1,909,000	809	4
1946	2,142,000	1,129	5
1947	2,405,000	3,474	14
1948	2,550,000	5,250	20
1949	2,679,000	9,246	34
1950	2,687,000	9,162	34
1951	2,608,000	8,058	31
1952	2,637,000	7,611	29
1953	2,667,000	8,862	33
1954	2,632,000	11,086	42
1955	2,633,000	10,969	42
1956	2,750,000	12,686	48
1957	2,080,000	13,739	52
1958	2,704,000	14,964	56
1959	2,746,000	14,053	52

[1] Not available.

Source: Dun & Bradstreet, Inc.

Table 1, which I will insert at this point, shows the number of concerns on the Dun & Bradstreet list for each year since 1920, the number of failures, and the failure rate per 10,000 concerns. The number of listed concerns is omitted from the table for the years 1920–29, as this information is not available to me. However, since both the failures and the failure rates are shown, the number of listed concerns for these years can be computed with reasonably close approximation.

WHAT HAS BEEN THE FAILURE LIABILITIES SINCE 1920?

Last year the total liabilities of the failures reported by Dun & Bradstreet amounted to approximately $693 million. The average liability per failing firm was $49,300. The average liability has been increasing in recent years. No doubt several factors account for this. As I will point out later, more of the older and better established firms are appearing among the failures. Furthermore, some account must be taken of the fact that more money is required to do a given volume of business today than was true in previous years. Table 2 is as follows:

TABLE 2.—*Failure liabilities and average liability per failure, 1920–59*

Year	Number of failures	Total failure liabilities	Average liability per failure
1920	8,881	$295,121,000	$33,230
1921	19,652	627,401,000	31,926
1922	23,676	623,895,000	26,351
1923	18,718	539,387,000	28,817
1924	20,615	543,226,000	26,351
1925	21,214	443,744,000	20,918
1926	21,773	409,233,000	18,795
1927	23,146	520,105,000	22,471
1928	23,842	489,559,000	20,534
1929	22,909	483,252,000	21,094
1930	26,355	668,282,000	25,357
1931	28,285	736,310,000	26,032
1932	31,822	928,313,000	29,172
1933	19,859	457,520,000	23,038
1934	12,091	333,959,000	27,621
1935	12,244	310,580,000	25,366
1936	9,607	203,173,000	21,148
1937	9,490	183,253,000	19,310
1938	12,836	246,505,000	19,204
1939	14,768	182,520,000	12,359
1940	13,619	166,684,000	12,239
1941	11,848	136,104,000	11,488
1942	9,405	100,763,000	10,713
1943	3,221	45,339,000	14,076
1944	1,222	31,660,000	25,908
1945	809	30,225,000	37,361
1946	1,129	67,349,000	59,654
1947	3,474	204,612,000	58,898
1948	5,250	234,620,000	44,690
1949	9,246	308,109,000	33,323
1950	9,162	248,283,000	27,099
1951	8,058	259,547,000	32,210
1952	7,611	283,314,000	37,224
1953	8,862	394,153,000	44,477
1954	11,086	462,628,000	41,731
1955	10,969	449,380,000	40,968
1956	12,686	562,607,000	44,356
1957	13,739	615,293,000	44,784
1958	14,964	728,258,000	48,667
1959	14,053	692,808,000	49,300

Source: Dun & Bradstreet, Inc.

WHAT HAS BEEN THE FAILURE TREND OF THE FIRST 7 MONTHS OF 1960?

During the first 7 months of this year, failures have been running substantially ahead of the first 7 months of 1959. It is too early to say whether total failures in the year 1960 will exceed those of the depression year 1958, but the record to date indicates a good possibility that they will do so.

Table 3 shows the number of failures reported in each month during the first 7 months of the year. In addition, for purposes of comparison, the monthly totals over the previous 10 years are shown, as are monthly averages for these 10 years.

TABLE 3.—*Number of business failures, by month, 1950–60, and 10-year monthly average*

	1960	Average for 10-year period, 1950–59	1959	1958	1957	1956	1955	1954	1953	1952	1951	1950
January	1,181	951	1,273	1,279	1,148	1,048	939	867	647	671	775	864
February	1,214	909	1,161	1,238	1,146	1,024	877	926	691	619	599	811
March	1,335	1,048	1,263	1,495	1,336	1,170	1,038	1,102	739	716	732	884
April	1,370	976	1,292	1,458	1,175	985	903	975	693	780	693	806
May	1,273	970	1,135	1,341	1,200	1,164	955	943	697	638	755	874
June	1,334	948	1,244	1,260	1,084	1,105	914	965	817	671	699	725
July	1,146	878	1,071	1,253	1,059	1,018	861	856	724	580	665	694
August		907	1,135	1,127	1,145	1,101	888	912	700	594	678	787
September		832	1,144	1,039	1,071	932	822	819	686	539	620	648
October		929	1,125	1,271	1,122	1,158	919	871	840	631	643	707
November		898	1,130	1,121	1,173	999	945	933	815	590	587	683
December		874	1,080	1,082	1,080	982	908	917	813	583	612	679
Total	8,853	11,119	14,053	14,964	13,739	12,686	10,969	11,086	8,862	7,611	8,058	9,162

Source: Dun & Bradstreet, Inc.

WHAT SIZE BUSINESS FIRM FAILS?

Dun & Bradstreet has reported, since 1934, the number of failures according to the amount of the liability of the failing firm. More precisely, it has reported this information for five size classes.

Less than one-half of 1 percent of the firms that failed had liabilities in excess of $1 million. I believe then we can safely say that all of the firms that have failed are small firms. Certainly we have heard of no failures among the really large corporations, such as those having $10 million of liabilities, or $100 million of liabilities, or the corporate giants having several billion dollars of liabilities:

TABLE 4.—*Distribution of business failures, by size of liability, 1934–59*

	Under $5,000		$5,000 to $25,000		$25,000 to $100,000		$100,000 to $1,000,000		Over $1,000,000			Under $5,000		$5,000 to $25,000		$25,000 to $100,000		$100,000 to $1,000,000		Over $1,000,000	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1934	4,610	38.1	5,340	44.2	1,471	12.2	615	5.1	55	0.4	1947	600	17.3	1,661	47.8	842	24.2	350	10.1	21	0.6
1935	4,992	40.8	5,278	43.1	1,421	11.6	496	4.0	57	.5	1948	846	16.1	2,799	53.3	1,208	23.0	374	7.1	23	.5
1936	3,988	41.5	4,255	44.3	1,042	10.9	290	3.0	32	.3	1949	1,915	20.7	4,646	50.3	2,147	23.2	520	5.6	18	.2
1937	3,866	40.8	4,349	45.8	988	10.4	266	2.8	21	.2	1950	2,065	22.5	4,706	51.4	1,975	21.6	407	4.4	9	.1
1938	5,131	40.0	6,026	46.9	1,396	10.9	263	2.0	20	.2	1951	1,832	22.7	4,160	51.6	1,634	20.3	412	5.1	20	.3
1939	6,522	44.2	6,873	46.5	1,146	7.8	213	1.4	14	.1	1952	1,428	18.8	3,884	51.0	1,769	23.3	512	6.7	18	.2
1940	6,891	50.6	5,442	40.0	1,067	7.8	209	1.5	10	.1	1953	1,383	15.6	4,317	48.7	2,375	26.8	748	8.5	39	.4
1941	6,754	57.0	4,116	34.7	815	6.9	153	1.3	10	.1	1954	1,640	14.8	5,640	50.9	2,946	26.5	829	7.5	31	.3
1942	5,097	54.2	3,525	37.5	660	7.0	122	1.3	1	.0	1955	1,785	16.3	5,412	49.3	2,916	26.6	820	7.5	36	.3
1943	1,614	50.1	1,272	39.5	269	8.3	61	1.9	5	.2	1956	2,032	16.0	6,152	48.4	3,431	27.1	1,022	8.1	49	.4
1944	452	37.0	549	44.9	175	14.3	42	3.5	4	.3	1957	2,001	14.6	6,699	48.8	3,847	28.0	1,147	8.3	45	.3
1945	270	33.4	343	42.4	146	18.0	45	5.6	5	.6	1958	2,028	13.5	7,015	46.9	4,456	29.8	1,408	9.4	57	.4
1946	263	23.3	488	43.2	252	22.3	119	10.6	7	.6	1959	1,841	13.1	6,664	47.4	4,202	29.9	1,284	9.1	62	.5

Source: Dun & Bradstreet, Inc.

HOW OLD ARE THE BUSINESS FIRMS THAT ARE FAILING?

In recent years more and more of the older, established small business firms have been falling in the ranks among the failures. In 1949, 10.9 percent of all the firms that failed had been in business more than 10 years. This percentage has increased almost steadily until last year 20.6 percent of the firms that failed had been in business for more than 10 years. The percentages for the intervening years are shown in the following table 5.

TABLE 5.—*Trend in age of business failures, 1949–59*

[Percent in business over 10 years]

1949	10.9
1950	12.8
1951	13.3
1952	14.3
1953	14.8
1954	15.5
1955	17.4
1956	18.3
1957	19.3
1958	21.4
1959	20.6

Source: Dun & Bradstreet, Inc.

Last year 37 percent of the firms that failed had been in business for 3 years or less, and 57 percent had been in business for less than 5 years. In all major lines of business—manufacturing, wholesale, retail, construction, and service industries—about 40 percent to 50 percent of all the failing firms had been in business 5 years or more. Further details on the age of the business firms failing in each of the major industry classes are shown in table 6, below:

TABLE 6.—*Age of business failures, by functions, in 1959*

Age in years	Manufacturing	Wholesale	Retail	Construction	Commercialservice	Total, all concerns	Age in years	Manufacturing	Wholesale	Retail	Construction	Commercialservice	Total, all concerns
	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent		Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent
1 year or less	3.1	3.3	4.3	2.0	3.6	3.6	6	6.7	6.8	6.3	8.8	6.7	6.9
2	16.8	12.8	21.4	12.1	18.7	18.1	7	4.8	5.7	5.1	6.3	4.1	5.2
3	14.2	11.8	17.1	13.0	15.6	15.3	8	3.9	5.1	3.8	5.4	4.0	4.2
							9	3.0	3.0	2.7	4.0	3.2	3.0
Total, 3 years or less	34.1	27.9	42.8	27.1	37.9	37.0	10	3.3	3.8	2.6	3.4	3.6	3.0
							Total, 6–10 years	21.7	24.4	20.5	27.9	21.6	22.3
4	10.5	10.7	11.5	13.4	11.5	11.5							
5	7.4	8.7	7.9	11.4	9.6	8.6	Over 10 years	26.3	28.3	17.3	20.2	19.4	20.6
Total, 5 years or less	52.0	47.3	62.2	51.9	59.0	57.1	Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
							Number of failures	2,465	1,387	6,873	2,064	1,264	14,053

Source: Dun & Bradstreet, Inc.

WHAT TYPES OF BUSINESS FIRMS ARE FAILING?

The Members will be especially interested, no doubt, in some industries more than others, particularly when some particular industry looms large in the economy of a Member's district. Last year 6,873 of the roughly 14,000 business failures occurred in one retail line or another. Failures were, however, high among almost all kinds of manufacturing firms, among the wholesale firms, the building contractors, and the service industries.

Table 7, below, shows both the number of failures and the total liabilities of the firms failing in each of some 44 divisions of industry. This information is provided, furthermore, for each of the years 1953 through 1959:

TABLE 7.—*Commercial and industrial failures by 44 divisions of industry, 1953–59*

[Liabilities in thousands of dollars]

Line of industry	1953		1954		1955		1956		1957		1958		1959	
	Number	Liabilities	Number	Liabilities	Number	Liabilities	Number	Liabilities	Number	Liabilities	Number	Liabilities	Number	Liabilities
Mining and manufacturing:														
Mining—Coal, oil, miscellaneous	41	$3,034	42	$8,007	55	$5,156	42	$8,193	75	$11,588	86	$17,619	91	$88,363
Food and kindred products	165	22,370	179	16,089	165	14,198	188	10,366	183	11,407	189	17,431	176	14,288
Textile mill products and apparel	472	30,381	543	28,682	506	25,334	537	34,536	500	30,447	493	33,082	420	24,125
Lumber and lumber products	287	14,092	336	18,584	336	13,658	401	22,898	504	25,087	530	30,453	503	24,599
Paper, printing, and publishing	107	10,687	129	12,274	114	6,760	123	7,542	136	9,609	181	8,411	164	8,881
Chemicals and allied products	60	7,292	75	5,634	49	3,454	61	12,607	56	5,460	66	4,477	62	4,568
Leather and leather products	98	7,109	103	6,868	80	4,358	84	5,519	77	7,460	100	12,668	72	6,724
Stone, clay, and glass products	39	2,082	60	2,232	49	1,821	33	4,720	56	3,015	62	10,631	48	4,143
Iron and steel, and products	66	11,977	115	10,437	120	14,219	139	12,056	113	27,803	177	16,797	136	15,098
Machinery	171	29,753	301	37,874	291	37,278	259	30,172	254	27,477	294	38,487	254	43,049
Transportation equipment	60	6,249	51	5,938	47	5,327	64	5,209	76	8,869	80	16,838	108	9,457
Miscellaneous	291	13,828	348	18,665	390	25,382	354	37,412	381	28,619	422	38,704	431	44,441
Total mining and manufacturing	1,857	158,854	2,282	171,284	2,202	156,945	2,285	191,230	2,411	196,841	2,680	245,598	2,465	207,736
Wholesale trade:														
Food and farm products	265	16,672	298	14,038	274	12,635	300	12,787	283	18,724	330	20,903	290	22,602
Apparel	38	1,217	46	1,595	62	2,176	49	2,241	43	2,531	62	2,726	42	1,722
Dry goods	44	2,338	60	2,377	54	4,107	47	1,808	34	1,375	46	1,463	42	1,954
Lumber, building materials, hardware	103	9,304	113	5,019	135	7,014	147	18,121	154	9,136	175	12,840	153	10,171
Chemicals and drugs	35	1,598	47	1,334	36	1,187	45	1,460	45	1,883	50	1,297	60	1,672
Motor vehicles and auto equipment	36	1,240	56	1,833	68	2,020	66	3,576	72	3,202	67	2,274	74	3,340
Miscellaneous	412	19,830	512	30,142	535	28,543	553	34,717	605	41,086	701	40,481	726	40,713
Total wholesale trade	933	52,199	1,132	56,338	1,164	57,682	1,207	74,710	1,236	77,937	1,431	81,984	1,387	82,174
Retail trade:														
Food and liquor	888	15,586	1,004	14,805	1,053	19,556	1,102	18,773	1,096	24,104	1,127	25,717	1,113	29,973
General merchandise	149	4,239	192	7,052	193	5,193	274	9,626	265	11,620	291	11,438	281	16,202
Apparel and accessories	597	15,204	808	15,153	865	17,774	1,161	28,762	1,122	24,490	1,140	29,459	1,011	38,841
Furniture, home furnishings	711	26,654	906	43,419	719	21,072	793	26,696	1,004	37,334	1,041	45,098	816	35,859
Lumber, building materials, hardware	221	7,181	311	9,844	324	10,367	380	11,256	469	13,705	504	15,980	453	15,146
Automotive group	520	17,172	616	20,604	544	12,915	727	22,191	885	24,279	1,101	39,300	1,015	26,922
Eating and drinking places	793	17,473	985	18,683	956	20,330	1,149	23,914	1,279	28,543	1,436	37,333	1,334	35,528
Drug stores	123	4,199	161	4,839	128	2,574	165	3,486	162	3,986	165	3,975	122	3,111
Miscellaneous	379	9,591	508	11,074	557	11,838	590	11,344	613	18,786	709	16,977	728	25,250
Total retail trade	4,381	117,299	5,491	145,473	5,339	121,619	6,341	156,048	6,895	186,847	7,514	225,277	6,873	226,832
Construction:														
General building contractors	382	21,537	456	29,757	443	39,827	708	54,115	805	64,425	872	62,758	749	66,075
Building subcontractors	582	16,082	793	23,707	880	34,485	1,030	41,400	1,175	36,466	1,169	41,006	1,159	42,492
Other contractors	60	5,708	56	3,365	81	8,867	96	5,288	125	9,421	121	11,351	156	13,316
Total construction	1,024	43,327	1,305	56,829	1,404	83,179	1,834	100,803	2,105	110,312	2,162	115,115	2,064	121,883
Commercial service:														
Passenger and freight transportation	212	8,197	282	14,461	255	11,870	295	13,693	367	13,614	398	21,943	437	22,714
Miscellaneous public services	27	2,513	40	1,746	30	4,028	34	3,613	48	2,723	43	2,424	43	2,523
Hotels	25	4,088	37	2,614	41	5,901	65	11,127	59	8,955	76	17,988	68	9,380
Cleaning, dyeing, repairing	74	1,315	105	1,838	95	1,229	99	2,097	112	2,117	121	2,746	138	2,461
Laundries	40	1,189	41	1,174	50	1,344	53	1,203	39	1,771	41	1,178	53	1,612
Undertakers	5	133	5	32	8	401	8	60	7	179	6	98	11	282
Other personal services	41	648	61	2,124	61	536	82	1,385	64	1,026	71	3,240	83	3,949
Business and repair services	243	4,391	305	8,715	320	4,646	383	6,728	396	12,971	421	10,667	431	11,262
Total commercial service	667	22,474	876	32,704	860	29,955	1,019	39,906	1,092	43,356	1,177	60,284	1,264	54,183
Total United States	8,862	394,153	1,086	462,628	10,969	449,380	12,686	562,697	13,739	615,293	14,964	728,258	14,053	692,808

Source: Dun & Bradstreet, Inc.

WHAT LINES OF BUSINESS ARE SHOWING A HIGH RATE OF FAILURE?

When we consider not just the number of failures in an industry, but also the number of firms in the industry, we find, of course, the failure rate in some industries is much higher than in others. Among the lines of business for which Dun & Bradstreet has given failure rates, furniture manufacturing stands out as the highest. Failures in this industry last year were at the rate of 244 failing firms for each 10,000 firms in the industry.

Failures among manufacturing firms making transportation equipment, electrical machinery, leather, shoes, and apparel all amounted to more than 100 firms per each 10,000 in the industry.

Among the retail lines, failures in infants' and children's wear firms, sporting goods stores, women's ready-to-wear stores, and men's wear stores were all at a rate above 100 failures per 10,000 firms. In no line, however, can we really say that the failure rate was low. Table 8 presents these rates for several selected lines of manufacturing and retail, as follows.

TABLE 8.—*Failure rates in specific manufacturing and retail lines, 1959*

MANUFACTURING

[Failure rate per 10,000 operating concerns]

Furniture	244
Transportation equipment	208
Electrical machinery	143
Leather and shoes	136
Apparel	112
Metals, primary and fabricated	91
Textiles	76
Machinery	71
Lumber	60
Chemicals and drugs	53
Food	48
Printing and publishing	45
Paper	42
Stone, clay, and glass	41

TABLE 8.—*Failure rates in specific manufacturing and retail lines, 1959*—Continued

RETAIL

[Failure rate per 10,000 operating concerns]

Infants' and children's wear	176
Sporting goods	157
Women's ready-to-wear	132
Men's wear	110
Furniture and furnishings	92
Cameras and photographic supplies	90
Appliances, radio, and television	87
Lumber and building materials	78
Gifts	66
Women's accessories	65
Shoes	61
Bakeries	61
Dry goods and general merchandise	57
Jewelry	57
Books and stationery	51
Automotive parts and accessories	43
Eating and drinking places	42
Automobiles	34
Hardware	33
Groceries, meats, and produce	26
Drugs	22
Farm implements	15

Source: Dun & Bradstreet, Inc.

IN WHICH REGIONS AND STATES ARE THE BUSINESS FAILURES OCCURRING?

Last year, as well as the year before, the largest number of firms failed in New York of any one State. Total failures in New York in 1959 were 3,190, and more than $173 million of liabilities was involved.

California had the second largest number of failures last year with 2,296 in that State. The losses amounted to more than $105 million.

Table 9, below, shows the number and the amounts of liabilities for each State, as well as the totals for the various regions:

TABLE 9.—*Number and liabilities of business failures, by region and State, 1959*

Regions and States	Number		Liabilities (in thousands)	
	1959	1958	1959	1958
New England	809	908	$40,341	$49,114
Maine	38	33	824	2,220
New Hampshire	23	27	2,403	1,904
Vermont	13	15	529	1,970
Massachusetts	377	390	17,501	22,170
Connecticut	208	308	12,824	15,804
Rhode Island	150	135	6,260	5,046
Middle Atlantic	4,566	4,969	238,749	232,006
New York	3,190	3,365	173,178	139,503
New Jersey	639	778	27,619	43,475
Pennsylvania	737	826	37,952	49,028
East North Central	2,401	2,374	124,258	127,416
Ohio	740	664	29,431	36,084
Indiana	143	168	10,391	11,560
Illinois	663	622	39,508	35,022
Michigan	496	547	30,600	32,767
Wisconsin	359	373	14,328	11,983
West North Central	448	529	23,754	35,151
Minnesota	118	133	4,098	7,499
Iowa	74	62	4,369	2,499
Missouri	158	182	7,948	7,764
North Dakota	4	13	195	1,101
South Dakota	6	10	115	187
Nebraska	13	30	384	2,998
Kansas	75	99	6,645	13,103
South Atlantic	1,262	1,417	68,806	66,802
Maryland	142	197	4,425	8,856
Delaware	12	9	3,097	629
District of Columbia	27	28	4,931	2,680
Virginia	129	129	7,385	7,781
West Virginia	69	67	5,123	2,581
North Carolina	131	157	4,467	4,913
South Carolina	133	122	3,207	1,969
Georgia	177	191	11,904	10,476
Florida	422	517	24,267	26,917

TABLE 9.—*Number and liabilities of business failures, by region and State, 1959*—Con.

Regions and States	Number		Liabilities (in thousands)	
	1959	1958	1959	1958
East South Central	328	397	$12,763	$20,968
Kentucky	59	80	2,027	6,870
Tennessee	133	157	5,746	6,225
Alabama	80	72	3,202	4,390
Mississippi	56	88	1,788	3,483
West South Central	752	819	42,325	46,832
Arkansas	65	55	2,506	1,970
Oklahoma	60	92	2,977	6,431
Louisiana	192	222	6,676	8,628
Texas	435	450	30,166	29,803
Mountain	364	330	17,890	15,301
Montana	21	30	744	1,269
Idaho	20	32	555	911
Wyoming	17	5	1,017	128
Colorado	103	62	5,108	4,032
New Mexico	7	11	1,374	403
Arizona	123	111	5,921	4,288
Utah	46	49	1,543	2,816
Nevada	27	30	1,628	1,454
Pacific	3,123	3,221	123,922	134,668
Alaska	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
Washington	356	355	8,715	8,144
Oregon	471	532	9,785	11,308
California	2,296	2,334	105,422	115,216
Total, United States	14,053	14,964	692,808	728,258

[1] Not available.

Source: Dun & Bradstreet, Inc.

WHICH STATES HAVE THE HIGHEST RATE OF BUSINESS FAILURES?

Last year Oregon, New York, and California, respectively, suffered the highest rate of business failures. In Oregon, 175.3 firms failed for each 10,000 firms in operation. In New York and California the rates were 127.8 and 112.5, respectively. However, only North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, and New Mexico suffered what seemed to be a reasonable rate of business failures. In these States the failure rate ranged between 4 firms and 6 firms for each 10,000 firms in operation.

Table 10, below, gives the failure rate for each State for the years 1957 to 1959, except that at the time of publication the data for Alaska and Hawaii were not available:

TABLE 10.—*Rate of failures, by States,*[1] *1957–59*

[Failure rate per 10,000 listed concerns]

Region and State	1957	1958	1959
NEW ENGLAND			
Maine	19.0	21.3	25.2
New Hampshire	27.6	27.2	23.6
Vermont	19.0	23.0	20.1
Massachusetts	34.9	42.9	41.5
Connecticut	54.6	79.6	55.1
Rhode Island	97.5	83.4	98.1
Total, New England	42.6	51.1	46.2
MIDDLE ATLANTIC			
New York	111.4	129.3	127.8
New Jersey	59.9	81.9	67.5
Pennsylvania	43.5	48.1	43.4
Total Middle Atlantic	80.3	94.3	88.8
SOUTH ATLANTIC			
Maryland	44.6	56.7	41.0
Delaware	23.3	14.9	20.4
District of Columbia	41.8	32.6	30.2
Virginia	26.0	28.3	28.1
West Virginia	26.5	26.3	35.7
North Carolina	19.8	26.3	21.5
South Carolina	40.0	44.3	47.4
Georgia	42.2	39.9	35.3
Florida	57.8	69.8	52.2
Total, South Atlantic	37.9	43.0	37.1
EAST NORTH CENTRAL			
Ohio	44.5	52.1	58.5
Indiana	20.0	27.0	22.6
Illinois	37.3	42.6	45.6
Michigan	51.4	54.5	49.6
Wisconsin	37.3	55.0	51.9
Total, East North Central	39.7	47.1	47.6
WEST NORTH CENTRAL			
Minnesota	30.7	25.3	22.4
Iowa	14.1	12.8	15.3
Missouri	18.6	26.9	23.6
North Dakota	12.8	12.9	4.0
South Dakota	172.0	8.8	5.2
Nebraska	15.2	11.5	4.9
Kansas	28.2	26.8	20.6
Total, West North Central	21.0	20.9	17.8
EAST SOUTH CENTRAL			
Kentucky	13.4	19.9	14.8
Tennessee	47.2	36.6	31.6
Alabama	26.2	21.2	23.6
Mississippi	34.7	36.6	22.7
Total, East South Central	31.9	28.1	23.3
WEST SOUTH CENTRAL			
Arkansas	25.9	21.2	24.9
Oklahoma	17.8	24.2	15.7
Louisiana	47.3	53.1	44.2
Texas	32.2	29.8	28.5
Total, West South Central	31.8	31.9	28.9
MOUNTAIN			
Montana	16.3	24.8	16.9
Idaho	23.3	32.7	20.3
Wyoming	17.2	8.5	27.5
Colorado	45.6	20.7	32.8
New Mexico	14.6	8.4	5.1
Arizona	93.6	77.8	76.1
Utah	50.5	41.5	38.9
Nevada	110.5	75.4	63.1
Total, Mountain	44.0	32.7	34.4
PACIFIC			
Washington	101.9	91.2	90.2
Oregon	198.0	201.5	175.3
California	123.9	118.9	112.5
Total, Pacific	128.4	123.1	115.5

[1] Data for Alaska and Hawaii not yet available.

Source: Dun & Bradstreet, Inc.

IN WHICH CITIES ARE THE BUSINESS FAILURES OCCURRING?

Last year almost 4,700 of the 14,000 small business failures reported by Dun & Bradstreet occurred in 25 of the principal cities of the country. In New York City alone there were almost 2,100 failures, and these involved liabilities of more than $122 million.

Dun & Bradstreet has reported the failures and the amount of liabilities for each of these 25 cities as shown in table 11, below:

TABLE 11.—*Number and liabilities of business failures in 25 large cities, 1958 and 1959*

	Number		Liabilities (in thousands)	
	1959	1958	1959	1958
New York, N.Y.	2,096	2,261	$122,164	$93,567
Chicago, Ill.	303	332	19,017	23,515
Philadelphia, Pa.	256	355	10,419	24,026

TABLE 11.—*Number and liabilities of business failures in 25 large cities, 1958 and 1959*—Continued

	Number		Liabilities (in thousands)	
	1959	1958	1959	1958
Detroit, Mich	200	254	$16,604	$17,495
Los Angeles, Calif	294	350	18,944	17,305
Cleveland, Ohio	187	176	6,386	7,561
Baltimore, Md	97	134	2,813	5,132
St. Louis, Mo	60	73	2,981	3,532
Boston, Mass	81	78	4,626	4,759
Pittsburgh, Pa	76	74	3,676	5,977
Washington, D.C	27	28	4,931	2,680
San Francisco, Calif	130	114	4,440	4,618
Milwaukee, Wis	173	190	4,285	4,902
Buffalo, N.Y	72	72	6,514	2,750
New Orleans, La	34	55	939	2,267
Minneapolis, Minn	37	62	1,203	4,990
Cincinnati, Ohio	58	57	2,676	3,117
Newark, N.J	77	101	5,391	5,700
Kansas City, Mo	42	43	2,688	3,008
Indianapolis, Ind	47	49	1,717	4,287
Houston, Tex	68	84	7,474	9,052
Seattle, Wash	113	127	3,116	2,877
Rochester, N.Y	86	64	2,499	2,486
Louisville, Ky	16	35	439	1,428
Denver, Colo	43	37	1,807	3,148
Total, 25 cities	4,673	5,205	257,749	260,279
Balance of country	9,380	9,759	435,059	467,979
Total, United States	14,053	14,964	692,808	728,250

Source: Dun & Bradstreet, Inc.

WHAT IS THE TREND OF BANKRUPTCIES?

We come now to the statistics on bankruptcies. These include bankruptcies of business firms of all types and of all sizes, and they also include bankruptcies of individuals and partners running professional offices; they include farmer bankruptcies and bankruptcies of individuals.

In the fiscal year ended June 30, 1960, 110,034 bankruptcy petitions were filed in the U.S. courts. This was by far the largest number in the history of the country. In fact, almost twice as many firms and individuals went bankrupt last year as in the peak depression year, 1932, when there were some 70,000 bankruptcies.

It is extremely disturbing to note, furthermore, that the number of business firms and individuals who went bankrupt last year were almost 10,000 more than in the previous fiscal year—a year which embraced a long period of business recession. There were almost four times as many bankruptcies in this past fiscal year as occurred in 1952.

The year-by-year totals from 1900 through fiscal year 1960 are presented in table 12, as follows:

Bankruptcy petitions filed in the United States, fiscal years 1900–60

Fiscal year ending June 30:	
1900	21,938
1901	19,007
1902	18,482
1903	16,875
1904	17,082
1905	16,946
1906	12,972
1907	14,160
1908	17,818
1909	18,018
1910	18,053
1911	19,338
1912	19,745
1913	20,930
1914	22,959
1915	27,632
1916	27,368
1917	24,838
1918	20,385
1919	14,048
1920	13,558
1921	22,812
1922	38,165
1923	41,304
1924	43,519
1925	45,641
1926	46,374
1927	48,758
1928	53,064
1929	57,280
1930	62,845
1931	65,335
1932	70,049
1933	62,256
1934	58,888
1935	69,153
1936	60,624
1937	57,485
1938	57,306
1939	50,997
1940	52,577
1941	56,332
1942	52,109
1943	34,711
1944	19,533
1945	12,862
1946	10,196
1947	13,170
1948	18,510
1949	26,021
1950	33,392
1951	35,193
1952	34,873
1953	40,087
1954	53,136
1955	59,404
1956	62,086
1957	73,761
1958	91,668
1959	100,672
1960	110,034

Source: Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts.

IN WHICH STATES ARE THE BANKRUPTCIES OCCURRING?

Increasing numbers of bankruptcies have occurred in all States over the past 10 years. Table 13, below, shows the number of bankruptcy cases started in each State, and in the territories in the fiscal years 1950 through 1959. Information is not yet available for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1960, on the basis of individual States.

This information has been compiled on the basis of the jurisdictions covered by the Federal district courts. In several States there are, of course, more than one judicial district. In these instances the number of bankruptcy petitions filed are shown for each district within the State, as is the total for the State.

Table 13 is as follows:

TABLE 13.—*Number of bankruptcy petitions filed, by State, fiscal years 1950–59*

	1950	1951	1952	1953	1954	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959
Alabama	6,513	7,107	7,452	8,046	8,616	8,734	7,598	8,525	8,559	7,767
Northern	5,851	6,430	6,827	7,097	7,241	7,285	6,496	7,322	7,056	6,271
Middle	533	508	441	495	593	568	436	473	606	606
Southern	129	169	184	454	782	881	666	730	897	890
Alaska	9	10	28	12	12	16	28	12	30	27
1st	3		15	6	2	4	4	3	5	
2d				1		1				
3d	5	8	10	4	8	10	18	9	21	24
4th	1	2	3	1	2	1	6	1	4	3
Arizona	116	88	113	120	193	287	397	488	665	806
Arkansas	66	78	62	85	96	143	192	216	357	331
Eastern	43	54	51	61	73	107	176	193	328	304
Western	23	24	11	24	23	36	16	23	29	27
California	4,124	4,238	4,004	4,748	7,510	8,933	9,294	11,629	15,219	17,477
Northern	1,420	1,372	1,323	1,507	2,153	2,674	2,799	3,344	4,232	5,004
Southern	2,704	2,866	2,681	3,241	5,357	6,259	6,495	8,285	10,087	12,473
Colorado	453	528	494	536	1,070	1,137	1,276	1,546	1,871	2,039
Connecticut	553	553	506	542	687	734	726	761	981	1,100
Delaware	21	17	11	19	20	22	18	32	33	27
Florida	232	181	197	211	306	313	308	318	432	467
Northern	25	9	10	12	6	14	11	12	15	18
Southern	207	172	187	199	300	299	297	306	417	449
Georgia	987	872	918	1,116	1,727	1,904	2,135	2,398	3,164	3,334
Northern	663	603	677	777	1,193	1,164	1,181	1,296	1,640	1,688
Middle	222	177	177	260	423	434	458	545	866	875
Southern	102	92	64	79	111	306	496	557	658	771

TABLE 13.—*Number of bankruptcy petitions filed, by State, fiscal years 1950–59*—Continued

	1950	1951	1952	1953	1954	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959
Hawaii	70	61	74	64	76	83	75	119	119	110
Idaho	88	87	75	96	145	189	252	281	364	451
Illinois	1,658	1,693	2,020	2,741	4,200	5,138	6,537	8,108	11,013	12,583
Northern	1,045	1,019	1,263	1,892	2,868	3,785	5,081	6,385	8,942	10,264
Eastern	161	174	201	222	415	440	462	484	575	610
Southern	452	500	556	627	917	913	994	1,239	1,496	1,709
Indiana	268	266	272	303	431	579	641	781	1,177	1,534
Northern	157	169	139	171	247	291	336	481	640	889
Southern	111	97	133	132	184	288	305	300	537	645
Iowa	130	105	120	160	192	209	248	431	821	809
Northern	42	38	45	62	73	84	87	98	159	202
Southern	88	67	75	98	119	125	161	333	662	607
Kansas	361	426	425	589	1,094	855	905	1,332	2,209	2,174
Kentucky	472	521	541	639	809	1,038	1,148	1,513	2,238	2,356
Eastern	169	189	215	244	237	305	347	427	575	720
Western	303	332	326	395	572	733	801	1,086	1,663	1,636
Louisiana	279	339	305	388	504	537	500	632	798	997
Eastern	194	232	192	265	300	362	327	383	491	596
Western	85	107	113	123	204	175	173	249	307	401
Maine	356	435	396	458	536	593	622	733	913	872
Maryland	109	79	56	58	89	83	96	113	121	179
Massachusetts	811	788	667	672	888	888	850	935	1,153	1,112
Michigan	1,309	1,331	1,307	1,585	1,940	2,415	2,396	2,981	3,235	4,057
Eastern	1,020	959	935	1,166	1,285	1,570	1,488	1,930	2,223	3,001
Western	289	372	372	419	655	845	908	1,051	1,012	1,056
Minnesota	715	767	858	1,022	1,419	1,434	1,398	1,533	1,695	1,785
Mississippi	86	89	85	79	143	117	123	159	206	221
Northern	18	16	19	14	45	35	30	38	39	43
Southern	68	73	66	65	98	82	93	121	167	178
Missouri	532	499	410	641	941	976	1,033	1,332	1,410	1,555
Eastern	160	123	129	160	241	280	337	420	628	772
Western	372	376	281	481	700	696	696	912	782	783
Montana	95	75	65	64	86	126	106	159	197	243
Nebraska	170	177	141	162	239	305	325	431	572	510
Nevada	15	28	25	23	37	49	88	97	140	153
New Hampshire	60	88	80	91	83	121	141	135	269	278
New Jersey	653	677	568	591	645	717	769	821	796	854
New Mexico	49	60	54	57	90	97	118	136	141	161
New York	2,549	2,451	2,450	2,471	3,058	3,219	3,298	3,315	3,698	4,064
Northern	525	512	512	546	693	862	943	964	1,036	1,152
Eastern	681	646	731	698	819	805	825	822	886	832
Southern	827	751	781	735	894	787	811	720	736	831
Western	516	542	426	492	652	765	719	809	1,040	1,249
North Carolina	70	68	60	72	97	105	82	99	106	113
Eastern	33	29	21	24	29	42	32	40	37	49
Middle	14	19	17	17	36	36	33	42	46	44
Western	23	20	22	31	32	27	17	17	23	20
North Dakota	24	29	16	20	22	41	22	48	57	55
Ohio	2,420	2,581	2,474	2,816	3,813	4,629	4,641	5,824	7,869	10,118
Northern	1,426	1,560	1,388	1,579	2,000	2,579	2,499	3,113	4,164	5,815
Southern	994	1,021	1,086	1,237	1,813	2,050	2,142	2,711	3,705	4,303
Oklahoma	314	351	346	375	604	666	748	967	1,138	1,120
Northern	153	207	187	204	317	354	411	460	520	512
Eastern	21	29	37	26	19	33	27	40	48	46
Western	140	115	122	145	268	279	310	467	570	562
Oregon	776	881	910	1,065	1,501	1,730	1,827	2,170	2,682	2,860
Pennsylvania	382	345	318	353	466	516	549	595	694	728
Eastern	214	181	183	201	262	308	335	343	414	402
Middle	61	60	62	53	74	73	72	82	98	116
Western	107	104	73	99	130	135	142	170	182	210
Rhode Island	95	122	109	97	160	159	202	233	262	301
South Carolina	20	22	21	26	30	33	23	27	30	28
Eastern	12	14	12	19	16	25	17	17	17	19
Western	8	8	9	7	14	8	6	10	13	9
South Dakota	17	22	27	15	24	26	30	67	58	61
Tennessee	1,513	1,914	1,960	2,585	2,742	2,976	3,250	3,699	4,460	4,482
Eastern	699	830	879	1,115	1,055	1,134	1,193	1,272	1,424	1,502
Middle	341	410	383	415	546	561	649	712	903	884
Western	473	674	698	1,055	1,141	1,281	1,408	1,715	2,133	2,096
Texas	240	210	175	222	287	285	283	305	341	340
Northern	91	87	61	98	122	103	117	136	154	164
Eastern	44	34	24	22	28	34	25	29	48	30
Southern	57	50	50	52	76	88	71	81	67	83
Western	48	39	40	50	61	60	70	59	72	63

TABLE 13.—*Number of bankruptcy petitions filed, by State, fiscal years 1950–59*—Continued

	1950	1951	1952	1953	1954	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959
Utah	168	170	174	224	357	361	393	482	570	475
Vermont	90	76	70	86	101	120	124	118	127	147
Virginia	1,010	1,149	923	1,067	1,554	1,730	1,845	2,204	2,862	2,830
Eastern	632	668	499	627	903	1,093	1,203	1,415	1,809	1,759
Western	378	481	424	440	651	637	642	789	1,053	1,071
Washington	901	947	1,037	1,035	1,487	1,609	1,930	2,277	2,533	2,731
Eastern	211	262	250	276	398	438	559	654	741	785
Western	690	685	787	759	1,089	1,171	1,371	1,623	1,792	1,946
West Virginia	443	570	532	561	711	745	784	764	977	1,186
Northern	118	145	129	165	212	232	200	208	259	315
Southern	325	425	403	396	499	513	584	556	718	871
Wisconsin	796	841	788	942	1,103	1,451	1,453	1,602	2,029	2,355
Eastern	578	620	548	658	775	1,043	1,085	1,185	1,546	1,791
Western	218	221	240	284	328	408	368	417	483	564
Wyoming	55	55	47	27	61	63	82	113	114	140
District of Columbia	99	83	67	65	90	123	113	110	97	104
Guam	(1)	2			1	1	2	1		2
Puerto Rico	50	41	40	45	43	44	62	53	64	60
Virgin Islands									2	3
Total	33,392	35,193	34,873	40,087	53,136	59,404	62,086	73,760	91,668	100,672

[1] Not available.

Source: Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts.

LITTLE LEAGUE WORLD CHAMPIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CURTIN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CURTIN. Mr. Speaker, I spent last evening in Levittown, Pa., and it is a night I shall always remember. More than 30,000 residents of this Bucks County community turned out to welcome home the "Champs of the World." The Levittown Little League baseball team had just won the world championship at Williamsport, Pa., the day before.

In this day of space travel, missiles, rockets, and even worry about juvenile delinquency, it was heartwarming and encouraging to watch the people of this new community, just 8 years old, come out and show their admiration and affection for this wonderful group of boys. And, mind you, these boys who conducted themselves like big leaguers are 11 and 12 years old. I think our concerns and worries fall back into the shadows when our children can teach us good habits of competitiveness and good sportsmanship. This team, an all-star team, was formed just 6 weeks ago. They had little time to practice—and then went on to win 13 consecutive games, and then the title. After winning the Pennsylvania State championship, they defeated the State champs from New York, Massachusetts, Hawaii, California, and Texas. It was a team effort all the way through that won this contest. Fourteen young men welded together with a common purpose, directed by a group of dedicated coaches who gave all their free hours for this accomplishment. The miraculous nature of the winning by Levittown, Pa., can be gaged when I tell you that this tournament started with 5,568 all-star Little League teams across the Nation, and ended Saturday in Williamsport with Levittown defeating Fort Worth, Tex., for the championship.

Here are some of the pertinent facts concerning Little Leagues. There are over 2 million boys between the ages of 9 and 12 participating in over 10,000 leagues throughout the 50 States. The regular season schedule called for the playing of 20 games, not more than 2 a week. So that an especially fine pitcher may not be able to overwhelm the league, there is a ruling requiring 72 hours between pitching assignments. As important as anything which happened in this competition, was the attitude of Levittown's defeated opponents. In each case, and this applies right down to the final in Williamsport, the teams defeated by Levittown came out to root for them at the following game. Officials and managers marveled at the fine sportsmanship and conduct of these Levittowners, who could make friends with their opponents. I think we adults can take a good lesson from this performance.

In speaking of this wonderful group of boys, no one member of the team can be singled out, because of the tremendous teamwork shown by all of them. Every one of them is a champ in his own right. However, I would like to call the attention to Joe Mormello, the pitcher in the final game, who set a new strikeout record for the world series, in addition to pitching a no-hit, no-run game for the championship.

It is also interesting to note that this is the second Little League Baseball World Championship for lower Bucks County. Morrisville won the championship in 1955, and now Levittown wins the same title in 1960. This is a remarkable record for this section of the congressional district which I have the honor and privilege to represent.

OPERATION VERACITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALTER). Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I will take just a minute or 2 of the 5.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Might I suggest that if the Members on the other side would use as much time on members of the Rules Committee as they did trying to push us around, perhaps they might get out a couple of bills that we could work on and use our time to some useful purpose.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Or we might get a farm bill out.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. That would be a good idea.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I just want to make an interesting observation. In a speech recently made by Vice President NIXON as the candidate of the Republican Party for the Presidency, he promised a solution of the farm situation during the next 4 years. The White House has been controlled by the Republicans for the last 8 years, and we have yet to see any effective solution to the farm program. The Democrats during that time have passed five farm bills, but the President has vetoed them. Is that correct?

Mr. EDMONDSON. That is my understanding.

Mr. McCORMACK. In addition to that, in the 83d Congress the Republicans had control of both the Presidency and the Congress, complete control of the Congress, yet they failed to put through a farm bill. Now all the Vice

President promises is 4 more years of the same thing they had when the Republicans were in control of the White House for 8 years.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, in our rebuttal of Operation Veracity I think it can be stated in all fairness that we have detected some pretty considerable loopholes in the armor of righteousness worn by our friends on Operation Veracity here this afternoon. I hope that in the future when the Operation Veracity squad takes the floor of the House there will be more of the spirit of yielding to give us a chance to show the loopholes so that the RECORD as it will be printed and sent out to the people of the country will contain all the facts.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a consent request?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes after the disposition of the special orders heretofore entered for today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

RULES COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, above partisan politics is the interest of the American people in the functioning of their representative Government in accordance with the dictates of our democratic system. The processes of substantive committee consideration and study, and floor deliberation and debate are integral aspects of that system.

The orderly flow of business also requires that rules for proceeding with the consideration of bills by the House be promulgated by a committee established for that purpose. This assumes, however, that the bills reported from the substantive committees will be presented to the Members so that they might have the opportunity to pass on them. Such is the essence of the democratic system.

But, where bills are not permitted to come before the House because a rule will not be granted to them, it becomes difficult to jibe such a procedure with our democratic beliefs. I have the deepest respect for the members of the Rules Committee but I do not believe that it or any committee should possess a power to thwart consideration by the whole House of measures reported out by their committees.

A reasonable procedure to insure the adequate working of the system can be created by the readoption, for instance, of the 21-day rule which provides that after any bill has been referred to the Rules Committee for a total of 21 days, it may be brought to the floor of the House without the adoption of a rule by the Rules Committee. Such a system would neither create chaos in the handling of bills by the House nor would it unduly delay the opportunity of Members to vote on legislation. It would be in accord with our cherished democratic tradition.

Mr. Speaker, I fervently urge that it be adopted as the first order of business when Congress convenes in January.

SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order I have for tomorrow be extended for 2 hours so that there may be ample time for Operation Veracity to go on, so that gentlemen on the other side who desire to be here and to contest the various points which will be made will have the time to do so. I assure them I will be just as zealous in yielding to them as was the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] today. I would have done so had I had the time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

OPERATION VERACITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. THOMSON] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], earlier took exception to the statement in one of the speeches that the Democratic Party had a 2-to-1 majority in this Congress. We figured it out, and in the House the Democratic Party has a majority of 1.83 to 1, or a majority of 127 seats. If we were inaccurate in making the statement there was a 2-to-1 majority, I certainly wish to apologize, and I hope the gentleman on that side will be as eager to apologize for the misstatements which we will prove which appear in their own platform. I still submit to the gentleman from Oklahoma that a 1.83 to 1 is a pretty good majority and that 127 seats majority should allow you to do most anything you want to do.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I may reinforce that by saying that in the other body there is a 66 to 34 majority; 2 to 1 about as close as you can get with a simple ratio.

Mr. EDMONDSON. It just so happens that the rules under which we operate require us in overriding a veto to do so by a two-thirds majority. When you do not have that in either House, you have a very significant change in the situation from what you would if you had a 2-to-1 majority, and I hope in the future that you gentlemen conducting Operation Veracity will note that distinction between 1.83 to 1 and 2 to 1.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. May I say to the gentleman that we certainly appreciate the cooperation of his party since we came back to this postconvention session. Apparently you cannot agree on anything in your platform to send down to the White House. I wish you could. I would like to have some of these things vetoed and set up as an issue. I would like to take the issue squarely to the country.

Mr. EDMONDSON. We sent the other day a bill affecting small producers of lead and zinc, in which the gentleman is interested, to the White House, and I have been waiting with rather a great deal of interest to see what the White House is going to do with that particular bill. I hope the gentleman will use his good offices with the White House on that bill.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Before the gentleman goes too much further, I voted against that bill because I think we ought to have tariffs instead of subsidies at this time. So, I do not know that I can help the gentleman a lot.

Before I yield further, I would just like to say that no matter how much smokescreen is thrown up around here, certain statements have been quoted from the platform, and I say if you have got anything to prove them, let us have it. There has not been any proof. There has not been any proof by quotes from General Taylor or General Gavin or Mr. Gardner. They were military men. There have been no statements made to prove that the statements in the Democratic platform are true. But, the majority leader throws up many smokescreens, and among those—I cannot follow them all—is the statement that we would have to agree that we were behind in propulsion power of the Soviets, as far as missiles and space is concerned.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does the gentleman disagree with my statement?

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. I do not agree that we are 3 or 4 years behind; that they are 3 or 4 years ahead of us. We are not second best to anyone.

Mr. McCORMACK. I said 4 or 5 years.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. All right. Four or five. But, for the purpose of argument if I were to accept your statement, I would point out to the gentleman and refer him to the table put in in this year's military appropriation hearings in response to a question of mine which shows the facts. Among these facts is simply this: During the time Tom Lanphier was Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, and so forth, the total amount requested for missile research, development, and procurement—the whole works—from 1946 to 1952, was $6.6 million. That was during the Democratic Truman administration. We did not have a program until the Eisenhower administration came in and got it off the ground.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman ought to know, if he does not know, that the nuclear breakthrough did not come until the latter part of 1952. That is when the nuclear breakthrough came out.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. The gentleman is talking about a Democratic excuse now. The Democratic administration said that we had to have a breakthrough to get a lighter bomb, but the Russians did not accept that defeatism. The Russians went to work on propulsion and therefore they have bigger motors. The fact is that today we have all the propulsion we need and all the warheads

we need to deliver all the destruction we want to deliver any place in the world.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does the gentleman deny the fact that the Russians, in connection with propulsion in outer space, are 4 or 5 years ahead of us?

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. I do not agree with that statement.

Mr. McCORMACK. You do not? That is what the officials of NASA testified to. They testified we are 5 years behind. And Dr. von Braun said it had been reduced, in his opinion, to 4 years.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. For the purpose of argument, I will accept the gentleman's opinion, but I still have to call attention to the fact that we can never buy back 8 years of research that we lost between 1946 and 1952 when we had a Democratic administration.

Mr. McCORMACK. Oh, that is no argument to blame the Democrats for the misdeeds of the Republican Party. Who was in control?

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. I refuse to yield further.

Mr. McCORMACK. Who has been in control for 8 years?

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. In the last years I take pride neither as a Democrat or a Republican, but I take pride as an American in the free American enterprise system, scientific knowledge and know-how and the fact that we have been able to develop in such a short period of time a completely operational and workable intercontinental ballistic missile, and we are going ahead and soon, if not now, will exceed their record in space. But this, I repeat, is a smokescreen. You have not proved a single one of these challenged statements to be true.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Will the gentleman stand or fall on whether or not General Taylor and Trev Gardner have made the statements that we have stated they have made?

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. No. If I may explain to the gentleman, I sat through long hearings day after day on the Defense Appropriation Subcommittee and I heard General Taylor and others testify. I cross-examined them and I heard their testimony, but neither he nor others speak for the Republican Party. And, that is what this statement says.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Will the gentleman stand or fall on whether Trev Gardner made such statements?

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. My proposition is simply this, if you want to quote Trev Gardner, I will certainly be glad to examine it to hear out this statement, but the fact is—I will just leave it that way—no statement of his has been quoted to substantiate the allegation of the Democrat platform.

Now let us jump over to one other statement that the gentleman from Kansas seemed to take issue with it in his colloquy with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES]:

> The quality of medical care furnished disabled veterans has deteriorated under the Republican administration. We shall work for increased availability of facilities for all veterans.

Now, may I just say that I served on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs in my first 2 years in Congress, from 1955 to 1957.

I served with the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON]. We tried to work for improved facilities jointly and with the administration. We got a program going satisfactorily. The administration cannot take all the credit for it. The chairman of the Veterans' Committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], cooperated as did other Members, and we moved forward. At the Cheyenne, Wyo., hospital which serves not only Wyoming but part of Nebraska and Colorado, we just dedicated a beautiful new addition to the veterans' hospital, with many new beds and women's facilities. We have gone forward. Although I left the committee, I think the committee has continued in that direction. I feel quite certain of that. May I say to the gentleman from Kansas, who I think is on that committee, that what is said in the Democrat platform of 1960 would not only be an indictment of any Republican, but would be an indictment of every Democrat member of that Committee on Veterans' Affairs if they were to let such a situation as that develop and not stand up on the floor of the House and do something about it. And not one of them has.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr THOMSON] has expired.

COPYRIGHT RESTRICTIONS AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to announce to the House, having stated the other day that I would do so, in connection with any resolutions coming out of the Committee on House Administration tomorrow, that the only eligible bill that can be brought up tomorrow is House Joint Resolution 704, having to do with a pledge of allegiance to the flag in connection with copyright restrictions.

FPC AND MIDWESTERN GAS TRANSMISSION CO.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the consumers of Michigan and other areas of the Midwest will save millions of dollars in the price of natural gas through the diligence of a Washington newspaper reporter and an investigation by the House Legislative Oversight Subcommittee.

The Federal Power Commission has just rejected a tariff submitted by Midwestern Gas Transmission Co. of Houston, Tex., fixing rates for gas to be imported from Canada to the midwestern United States. The rates as proposed by the company were designed to give a 7 percent rate of return to Midwestern. The Commisson, however, decided:

> It is the Commission's opinion that the proper rate of return for the Northern system is 6.5 percent per year.

Economists state that the difference between 6.5 percent and 7 percent is more than $10 million over a 20-year period for gas consumers. This, then, is the outcome of a dramatic instance of ex parte influence brought to the attention of the Congress and the Nation.

As recently as last spring, the company said in a Securities and Exchange Commission filing that it "presently expects" the rate of return to be "approximately 7 percent in the third year of operation."

The Midwestern case was brought to light in a series of news stories by Joseph B. Huttlinger of Washington, D.C., writing in Oildom, a daily trade paper of the petroleum industry and in his column to newspapers throughout the southwestern United States as far back as October, 1959.

Mr. Huttlinger disclosed that officials of Midwestern had contacted four members of the FPC on the eve of the Commission's decision which awarded a certificate to Midwestern. These news stories reported that at the time of the visits, the Commission had prepared a tentative decision allowing a return of 6.25 percent and that after the visits, the Commission gave an open end rate of return, with the exact amount to be set later.

The back door visits and the change that followed them were brought to the attention of President Eisenhower at a press conference in December and the President indicated he would look into it. If he did, we have no knowledge of it.

Later, however, I brought the matter to the attention of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. After that, the House Legislative Oversight Subcommittee conducted full scale hearings over a period of weeks.

Those hearings turned up evidence that backed up Mr. Huttlinger's stories in each and every particular. By throwing the spotlight on this matter, Mr. Huttlinger and the Legislative Oversight Subcommittee performed a vital service in the interests of good government and of the gas consumers of the Nation.

Mr. Huttlinger's reporting is as striking an example as I know of a reporter digging up facts the public should know about. This was a case of original reporting, for he obtained the facts all by himself. It was a case of reporting in depth on an issue of major importance. It was a case of getting results in the form of national attention to an evil, a revision of gas rates to consumers, and a mighty push to the effort to clean up practices in Government agencies. It was a case of years of experience in reporting being put to good use in the public interest.

The Congress cannot rest at this juncture. It must take steps to reform

practices in Government agencies, as shown in this instance, and to close the back door to ex parte contacts tightly now and in the future.

I insert here the release of the Federal Power Commission dated August 19, 1960, on this subject:

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION RELEASE

FPC REJECTS TARIFF FILED BY MIDWESTERN GAS TRANSMISSION CO.

WASHINGTON, D.C., August 19, 1960.—The Federal Power Commission rejected today a tariff submitted by Midwestern Gas Transmission Co., of Houston, Tex., containing rates for the service it proposes to commence this fall in the North Central United States with natural gas to be imported from Canada.

In a letter to the company, the FPC said that the proposed rates reflect a 7-percent rate of return for the northern system. The letter said that "It is the Commission's opinion that the proper rate of return for the northern system is 6½ percent per year."

The 6½-percent rate and the 6¼ percent previously allowed on Midwestern's southern system will permit an average rate of return of about 6.38 percent on the undepreciated cost of plant for both systems as estimated in the respective certificate proceedings, the FPC said.

The Commission also objected to Midwestern's inclusion of four rate schedules for the southern system covering services not yet authorized, and the reservation of tariff sheets for future use. The FPC said that both of these proposals are contrary to its regulations.

The letter said that the rejection of the tariff "is without prejudice" to its being refiled containing rates for the northern system reflecting a rate of return no greater than 6½ percent; containing only rate schedules for services authorized by the FPC; and eliminating the tariff sheets reserved for future use.

The Commission last October 31 authorized Midwestern to construct its northern system, extending from the United States-Canadian border near Emerson, Manitoba, to Marshfield, Wis. The Canadian gas will be purchased from Trans-Canada Pipe Lines, Ltd. The Commission previously in May of 1959, authorized Midwestern to construct its separate southern system, extending from Portland, Tenn., to Joliet, Ill., for service to the Chicago-Gary metropolitan area. That system already is in operation.

The FPC's October 31 order contained several conditions, including a requirement that Midwestern had to file rates satisfactory to the Commission at least 60 days prior to commencing service. Midwestern's tariff, which has now been rejected was submitted July 1. The Commission's October 31 order did not set a rate of return for Midwestern's northern system, because the company did not plan to commence construction for about 6 months. The FPC said it did "not think it wise" to look that far into the future and undertake to fix a rate of return. Midwestern at that time proposed a 7-percent rate of return.

RECAPITULATION OF FEDERAL REVENUES TO DATE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a very interesting and informative letter dated June 14, 1960, that was sent by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] to myself and a number of other colleagues, showing the total tax receipts for 157 years from George Washington to Harry Truman, for the years of the Truman administration and the years of the Eisenhower administration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The letter referred to follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., June 14, 1960.

To Whom It May Concern:

The following verified recapitulation of Federal revenues, from the beginning of our Government as we know it, is submitted in the belief that it will be of interest to you:

Total tax receipts

157 YEARS (WASHINGTON TO TRUMAN)	
Apr. 30, 1789–Jan. 1, 1946, total	$233, 124, 696, 392
7-PLUS YEARS (TRUMAN)	
Jan. 1, 1946–Jan. 20, 1953:	
1946	42, 867, 772, 454
1947	42, 911, 827, 900
1948	43, 098, 474, 025
1949	39, 833, 226, 896
1950	40, 510, 854, 464
1951	56, 842, 879, 512
1952	69, 336, 974, 951
1953 (to Jan. 20)	2, 259, 855, 220
Total	337, 661, 865, 422
Total revenues received, George Washington-Harry Truman (inclusive), 164 years	570, 786, 561, 814
7 YEARS, 4 MONTHS, AND 11 DAYS (EISENHOWER)	
Jan. 20, 1953–June 1, 1960:	
1953 (from Jan. 20)	65, 811, 590, 850
1954	66, 894, 388, 427
1955	69, 613, 680, 692
1956	78, 233, 911, 713
1957	82, 091, 696, 351
1958	79, 285, 472, 618
1959	84, 515, 760, 844
1960 (to June 1)	45, 811, 318, 170
Total revenues received, Eisenhower (7 years, 4 months, 11 days)	572, 258, 819, 664
Eisenhower revenues over all other Presidents	1, 472, 257, 850

Sincerely yours,

OTTO E. PASSMAN,
Member of Congress.

THE DIVIDEND CREDIT ENCOURAGES EQUITY INVESTMENT

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include certain tables.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, one of America's most pressing needs is to secure added equity capital, particularly for small- and medium-sized businesses and to continue to increase the number of Americans who have a stake in our private enterprises. Expansion cannot be financed permanently through the assumption of additional debt. Our system of free competitive enterprise is based on competition and venture capital in a profit-and-loss economy. Unless incentives for investors are preserved, the entire system will collapse.

For this reason I have opposed any amendments to the Revenue Code that would reduce or eliminate the dividend credit. Experience shows that this provision has successfully furthered equity investment and thereby assisted our economy in attaining a more balanced financial structure, encouraged more people to participate in the free enterprise process, and gained more revenue for the Federal Government. Indeed, we need to extend the principle of the dividend credit as we originally planned so that equity investment displaces even more debt financing and retained earning financing than it presently has.

It is too often forgotten that a portion of the public debt is represented by loans made by the Federal Government to private business enterprises. While such expenditures may be amply justified under today's tax structure, it would be far better if, instead of burdening new corporate enterprises with debt obligation, there were even greater incentives for the formation of equity capital to finance their growth. Basically this was the purpose of the dividend credit when it was first proposed during the 83d Congress, and it is the only justification for its continuance.

The Committee for Economic Development made a study some years ago entitled "Production, Jobs, and Taxes." The author of this document was Harold M. Groves, professor of economics at the University of Wisconsin. He was assisted by Henry C. Simons, who prepared a memorandum on bond versus stock financing. This study stresses the need for equity investment as well as the dangers to our economic stability of an unwieldy debt structure. Mr. Simons' statement contained the following pertinent observations, which are applicable today as they were in 1944:

Heavy fixed (or floating) debt is obviously undesirable for the single enterprise in an unstable economy or industry. Any temporary adversity is likely to produce insolvency, with grave losses, not only for the stockholders but also for senior securities and the enterprise as a whole, through the great costs of reorganization and the inevitable disturbances of operations and business relations which insolvency involves. Moreover, even if technical insolvency and reorganization are avoided, the enterprise and the whole economy may gravely be damaged by the practices necessary in avoiding it. Thus, physical properties may be abused merely to prolong technical, legal solvency, to avoid definitive squeezing out of shareholders, management, or control in bankruptcy or reorganization, and thus to gamble (with nothing to lose) on remotely favorable contingencies. The physical plant may thus be "bled white" to meet current obligations, especially interest payment and bond maturities, in the pursuit of mere liquidity.

These things are doubtless widely understood. What is less clearly apprehended is the aggravated instability of the whole economy, and the obstacle to deliberate monetary stablization, which corporate debt structures produce in their aggregate. It should be obvious what desperate and frantic struggles for corporate liquidity mean in total where the economy has slipped into general recession which, debt structures apart, might prove innocuous and short-lived. They may well mean the difference

between a mild recession and a precipitous, catastrophic deflation.

At the end of 1957, based on Treasury statistics, the invested capital of all corporations was $328 billion. Debt obligations, both long and short term, were $143 billion. Incentives which will direct more equity investment into new and growing enterprises can best be met by continuing and enlarging the present dividend credit. It serves to direct funds toward venture-capital channels rather than to encourage investors to purchase debt obligations because of the special Federal tax benefits corporations and their stockholders derive from debt financing.

Mr. Speaker, as I have already indicated, a disproportionate amount of debt in our corporate capital structure tends to unstabilize our economy. Because of the fact that interest is an expense to a corporation it can be deducted as an expense and so escape the Federal corporate income tax. This tax benefit has undoubtedly produced an increasing tendency to finance additional corporate plant or other corporate growths in this manner.

In order to illustrate the magnitude of the problem, I have had prepared two tables. They contrast in dollars as well as in percentages of the total new financing in corporate securities offered for cash, the sources of funds as between common stocks, and preferred stocks and bonds. Mr. Speaker, I insert these tables in my remarks at this point:

TABLE I–A.—*Corporate securities offered for cash sale*

[Millions of dollars]

	Gross proceeds total	Common stock	Preferred stocks	Bonds and notes
1946	6,900	891	1,127	4,882
1947	6,577	779	762	5,036
1948	7,078	614	492	5,973
1949	6,052	736	425	4,890
1950	6,361	811	631	4,920
1951	7,741	1,212	838	5,691
1952	9,534	1,369	564	7,601
1953	8,898	1,326	489	7,083
1954	9,516	1,213	816	7,488
1955	10,240	2,185	635	7,420
1956	10,939	2,301	636	8,002
1957	12,884	2,516	411	9,957
1958	11,558	1,334	571	9,653
1959 [1]	9,579	2,003	510	7,066

[1] Preliminary estimates.

Source: "Economic Report of the President, January 1960," table D–62, p. 226.

TABLE I–B.—*Corporate securities offered for cash sale*

	Gross proceeds total	Common stock as percent of total	Preferred stock as percent of total	Bonds as percent of total
1946	100.0	12.9	16.3	70.8
1947	100.0	11.8	11.6	76.6
1948	100.0	8.7	6.9	84.4
1949	100.0	12.2	7.0	80.8
1950	100.0	12.7	9.9	77.4
1951	100.0	15.7	10.8	73.5
1952	100.0	14.4	5.9	79.7
1953	100.0	14.9	5.5	79.6
1954	100.0	12.7	8.6	78.7
1955	100.0	21.3	6.2	72.5
1956	100.0	21.0	5.8	73.2
1957	100.0	19.5	3.2	77.3
1958	100.0	11.6	4.9	83.5
1959	100.0	20.9	5.3	73.8

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that my colleagues carefully examine the percentage distribution of new funds which clearly shows that the sale of debt obligations have exceeded new common stock issues by a ratio of almost 4 to 1 over most of this period and even with the noticeable increase of common stock percentage after the 1954 stock dividend credit reform became effective—from 13 percent average from 1946 to 1954 to 19 percent average after 1954—the ratio is still an unhealthy one. If this course is to continue indefinitely, it will badly damage our free enterprise economy. It is quite apparent that the combination of both corporate and personal taxes, the double taxation of equity investment, have discouraged individuals of moderate means from becoming stockholders and discouraged corporations from trying to sell new common stock to the public to finance their growth.

Most of today's larger corporate enterprises which have played a vital role in providing jobs, desirable goods and services, and the weapons for our defense were created in an era when it was possible for an individual to accumulate substantial savings. In such a climate an enterprising person could secure financial assistance from his friends who would buy stock in an untried enterprise. Under the present tax laws, this is a difficult task for those with similar abilities.

Mr. Speaker, the Under Secretary of the Treasury, the Honorable Fred C. Scribner, Jr., in a letter to a member of the Senate Finance Committee with reference to the dividend credit, said:

> A dividend credit is desirable not only for reasons of fairness and equity but also because it encourages more widespread stock ownership. Further, it tends to encourage equity financing in lieu of borrowing.
>
> It is encouraging to note that in the last 5 years the number of individuals owning shares of stock has increased by more than 4 million. Most of these own very few shares of stock and are truly small taxpayers. We believe that enactment of the 4-percent dividend credit was a step in the right direction. We know of no developments which have occurred since the adoption of the 1954 code which lead us to believe that a change in our position on this particular credit is desirable.

There is another reason why it is wrong to discourage equity investment. Such a step will reduce Federal revenues rather than increase them. I say this advisedly. If corporations issue bonds or borrow money from the banking system to finance their growth, the interest costs are a business expense and are not subject to the 52-percent corporate income tax. On the other hand, the Federal Government receives more than half of the earnings of the corporation in excess of $25,000 from any equity investment, whether it is paid out as dividends or not. Certainly the Congress should take every possible step to encourage equity financing as preferable to debt financing, as it did in instituting the stock dividend credit. The application of the Federal personal income tax to dividends paid out even after deducting the 4-percent dividend credit makes the Federal Government the principal beneficiary from every equity investment because the Federal Government gets the 52-percent corporate tax on the earnings plus the individual's personal income tax on that portion of the same earnings that are declared as dividends which may run as high as 87 percent even with the 4-percent dividend credit.

Mr. Speaker, I have prepared a table which compares the returns to the Government and the equity investor, the one who assumes all the financial risks of an enterprise under existing laws. I insert this table in my remarks at this point:

TABLE II.—*Comparison of return to Federal Government and to a stockholder from investments by an unmarried individual*

Taxable income derived entirely from common-stock dividends; no allowance for deductions or personal exemptions [1]	Corporate earnings before taxes necessary to pay dividend shown in 1st column with no retained earnings	Corporate income tax [2]	Personal income tax without regard to dividend credit	4-percent dividend credit	Total personal income tax adjusted for dividend credit	Total Federal revenue from stockholder's investment	Earnings retained by individual on his investment
$2,000	$4,167	$2,167	$400	$80	$320	$2,487	$1,680
$4,000	8,333	4,333	840	160	680	5,013	3,320
$6,000	12,500	6,500	1,360	240	1,120	7,620	4,880
$8,000	16,666	8,666	1,960	320	1,640	10,306	6,360
$10,000	20,833	10,833	2,640	400	2,240	13,073	7,760
$12,000	25,000	13,000	3,400	480	2,920	15,920	9,080
$14,000	29,166	15,166	4,260	560	3,700	18,866	10,300
$16,000	33,333	17,333	5,200	640	4,560	21,893	11,440
$18,000	37,500	19,500	6,200	720	5,480	24,980	12,520
$20,000	41,666	21,666	7,260	800	6,460	28,126	13,540
$22,000	45,833	23,833	8,380	880	7,500	31,333	14,500
$26,000	54,166	28,166	10,740	1,040	9,700	37,866	16,300
$32,000	66,666	34,666	14,460	1,280	13,180	47,846	18,820
$38,000	79,165	41,166	18,360	1,520	16,840	58,006	21,160
$44,000	91,665	47,666	22,500	1,760	20,740	68,406	23,260
$50,000	104,165	54,166	26,820	2,000	24,820	78,986	25,180
$60,000	124,998	64,999	34,320	2,400	31,920	96,919	28,080
$70,000	145,831	75,832	42,120	2,800	39,320	115,152	30,680
$30,000	166,664	86,665	50,220	3,200	47,020	133,685	32,980
$90,000	187,497	97,498	58,620	3,600	55,020	152,518	34,980
$100,000	208,330	108,332	67,320	4,000	63,320	171,652	36,680
$150,000	312,495	162,497	111,820	6,000	105,820	268,317	44,180
$200,000	416,660	216,663	156,820	8,000	148,820	365,483	51,180

[1] It is assumed that such deductions and exemptions equal the amount of income other than dividends.
[2] Corporate marginal rate of 52 percent in these computations.

Mr. Speaker, the arithmetic behind this table provides an adequate answer to those who feel that this provision of the Revenue Code is designed to or does favor a few individuals. It will be noted that before an unmarried individual may receive dividends of $2,000, the corporation must earn $4,167 before taxes.

Assuming that this individual has no other taxable income, from the $4,167 which the corporation earned the Government receives $2,487, and the investor who made these earnings possible retains $1,680. However, if the same investor were a bondholder the corporation would have to earn only $2,000 to pay him, and the Federal Government would receive only the $320 which the bondholder paid in personal income tax.

At the other end of the scale, if an unmarried individual is to receive $200,000 of taxable income through dividends, a corporation must first earn $416,660. Again, assuming that the $200,000 received in dividends represents his entire taxable income, the Government receipts from the investment which made these earnings possible totals $365,483, and the individual retains only $51,180. If the same investor were a bondholder the Federal Government would receive $216,663 less in taxes and the bondholder would still receive his $51,180 from $200,000 paid to him in interest. At this level of income, the 4-percent dividend credit, which is the subject of so much consternation, represents $8,000. Mr. Speaker, this seems a very low price for the Government to pay in order to secure the $216,663 additional revenue which it receives from this equity type investment.

This leads us to consider another way the investor-taxpayer gets around or minimizes the impact of the double Federal tax on equity investment which leads to corporations not broadening their common stock investors group to include more of the public and the more moderate investors.

Because of our steeply graduated personal income taxes, there are strong incentives for investors in the high-income tax brackets to purchase securities without any regard for immediate income and to encourage corporations to retain earnings rather than to declare dividends. Instead they are motivated by the fact that if growth occurs through reinvestment or earnings by the corporation itself, they can ultimately dispose of their holdings at a maximum tax of 25 percent as a capital gains instead of the maximum they might be subjected to of 91-percent tax. This fact discriminates grossly between wealthier stockholders and those with more modest means who look to their stock dividends to supplement their personal budget. The smaller stockholders who should be the bulwark of a free enterprise economy obviously are anxious to see dividends declared. Therefore, the modest dividend credit is one of the more substantial means to promote a greater participation by individual citizens in our capitalist economy. It removes some of the incentive for corporations to finance their growth through retained earnings.

I am not merely discussing a theoretical situation. An examination of the sources of corporate funds from 1948 through 1959 clearly shows that internal sources are assuming a major proportion of the total while external sources, particularly the sale of new common stock issues, are becoming a minor factor, although the average dollar figure of new stock issues per year has gone from the $6 billion figure preceding the 1954 dividend credit to $8.6 billion per year since 1954 still the percentage of financing from retained earnings is dangerously high.

Mr. Speaker, I insert at this point in my remarks two tables derived from the President's 1960 economic report. One shows the sources of corporate funds in dollars, and the other the percentage of new capital obtained from internal and external sources:

TABLE III–A.—*Sources of corporate funds*

[Billions of dollars]

	Total sources	Internal sources	External sources	Net new issues
1948	27.8	18.8	9.0	5.9
1949	15.8	14.9	.9	4.9
1950	35.4	20.8	14.6	3.7
1951	36.9	19.0	17.9	6.3
1952	28.1	17.8	10.3	7.9
1953	30.0	19.7	10.3	7.1
1954	22.4	19.8	2.6	5.9
1955	44.8	26.6	18.2	6.9
1956	42.4	27.8	14.6	7.9
1957	40.2	27.7	12.5	10.5
1958	31.6	25.6	6.0	9.5
1959 [1]	47.0	30.5	16.5	8.0

[1] Preliminary estimates.

Source: "Economic Report of the President, January 1960," table D–60, p. 224.

TABLE III–B.—*Sources of corporate funds*

	Total sources	Internal sources as percent of total	External sources as percent of total	Net new issues as percent of total
1948	100.0	67.6	32.4	21.2
1949	100.0	94.3	5.7	31.0
1950	100.0	58.8	41.2	10.5
1951	100.0	51.5	48.5	17.1
1952	100.0	63.3	36.7	28.1
1953	100.0	65.7	34.3	23.7
1954	100.0	88.4	11.6	26.3
1955	100.0	59.4	40.6	15.4
1956	100.0	65.6	34.4	18.6
1957	100.0	68.9	31.1	26.1
1958	100.0	81.0	19.0	30.1
1959	100.0	64.9	35.1	17.0

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include two additional tables which show both dividends and reinvested earnings as a percent of total corporate profits from the period 1946 through 1959 as well as their dollar amounts. These were also taken from basic data published in the President's economic report. These tables show a reversal of dividend payments as a percentage of corporate profits from 45 percent for the years preceding the 1954 dividend tax credit to 54 percent for the years following this reform:

TABLE IV–A.—*Corporate profits and finance*

[Billions of dollars]

	Corporate profits after taxes	Dividend payments	Undistributed profits
1946	13.4	5.8	7.7
1947	18.2	6.5	11.7
1948	20.5	7.2	13.3
1949	16.0	7.5	8.5
1950	22.8	9.2	13.6
1951	19.7	9.0	10.7
1952	17.2	9.0	8.3
1953	18.1	9.2	8.9
1954	16.8	9.8	7.0
1955	23.0	11.2	11.8
1956	23.5	12.1	11.3

TABLE IV–A.—*Corporate profits and finance*—Continued

[Billions of dollars]

	Corporate profits after taxes	Dividend payments	Undistributed profits
1957	22.2	12.5	9.7
1958	18.9	12.4	6.5
1959	[1] 24.6	[1] 13.2	[1] 11.4

[1] Preliminary estimates.

Source: "Economic Report of the President, January 1960," table D–57, p. 220.

TABLE IV–B.—*Corporate profits and finance*

	Dividend payments as percent of corporate profits	Undistributed profits as percent of corporate profits
1946	43.3	56.7
1947	35.7	64.3
1948	35.1	64.9
1949	46.9	53.1
1950	40.4	59.6
1951	45.7	54.3
1952	52.3	47.7
1953	50.8	49.2
1954	58.3	41.7
1955	48.7	51.3
1956	51.5	48.5
1957	56.3	43.7
1958	65.6	34.4
1959	53.7	46.3
14-year average	48.9	51.1

Mr. Speaker, if an individual stockholder had the corporation retain his $200,000 for financing future growth instead of paying him dividends the Federal Government would lose $148,820 which it would realize through his personal income tax. The $8,000 the Federal Government loses through the stock dividend credit is a small price to pay for removing this incentive on the part of the corporations and its richer stockholders not to pay its earnings out in dividends. Added to this is the incentive which the corporation receives through the stock dividend credit to increase the number of its stockholders through floating new issues of common stock to finance its growth instead of through retained earnings. Furthermore, once the corporation has broadened its stockholding group to include the smaller investor the pressure of the needs of the smaller investor for dividends is a healthy restraint on the corporation relying too heavily on retained earnings for future financing.

Nor can it be argued that the wealthy stockholder gives up his position of getting cash out of the retained earnings of $200,000. Theoretically, and actually, the stock he owns increases in value to the extent of these retained earnings. He can sell $200,000 of his stock and pay only a 25-percent personal income tax on the capital gain and so gain $160,000 in cash and retain the same amount of dollar investment in the corporation. Under this operation the Federal Government still loses $108,820 in revenue it would have had if the $200,000 had been paid in dividends.

Mr. Speaker, I have prepared an additional table which dramatically shows the respective interest of the Federal Government and the investor who has assumed the risk in the earnings of America's corporations. I insert this table in my remarks at this point.

TABLE V.—*Percent of earnings paid in corporate and personal income taxes by an unmarried individual*

Taxable income derived entirely from common dividends; no allowance for deductions or personal exemptions [1]	Corporate earnings before taxes necessary to pay dividend with no retained earnings	Amount of earnings retained by investor	Percent of earnings retained by investor	Percent of earnings paid in corporate and personal income taxes to the Federal Government	Taxable income derived entirely from common dividends; no allowance for deductions or personal exemptions [1]	Corporate earnings before taxes necessary to pay dividend with no retained earnings	Amount of earnings retained by investor	Percent of earnings retained by investor	Percent of earnings paid in corporate and personal income taxes to the Federal Government
$2,000	$4,167	$1,680	40.3	59.7	$32,000	$66,666	$18,820	28.2	71.8
$4,000	8,333	3,320	39.8	60.2	$38,000	79,165	21,160	26.7	73.3
$6,000	12,500	4,880	39.0	61.0	$44,000	91,665	23,260	25.4	74.6
$8,000	16,666	6,360	38.2	61.8	$50,000	104,165	25,180	24.2	75.8
$10,000	20,833	7,760	37.2	62.8	$60,000	124,998	28,080	22.5	77.5
$12,000	25,000	9,080	36.3	63.7	$70,000	145,831	30,680	21.0	79.0
$14,000	29,166	10,300	35.3	64.7	$80,000	166,664	32,980	19.8	80.2
$16,000	33,333	11,440	34.3	65.7	$90,000	187,497	34,980	18.7	81.3
$18,000	37,500	12,520	33.4	66.6	$100,000	208,330	36,680	17.6	82.4
$20,000	41,666	13,540	32.5	67.5	$150,000	312,495	44,180	14.1	85.9
$22,000	45,833	14,500	31.6	68.4	$200,000	416,660	51,180	12.3	87.7
$26,000	54,166	16,300	30.1	69.9					

[1] It is assumed that such deductions and exemptions equal the amount of income other than dividends.

Mr. Speaker, there are many who regard these figures as an academic matter since they assume that individuals will buy corporate stocks regardless of the tax consequences. Again, it is important to set the record straight and note that in developing our tax laws the Congress has actually placed a premium not only on financing private investment through debt financing and retained earnings it has also placed a premium on Government-operated enterprises and penalizes those who are willing to invest their funds in our free enterprise system.

During the forthcoming campaign, I am sure that no candidate of either major political party will espouse socialism. Every individual seeking office will give lip service to the free enterprise system. Yet the tax structure the Congress has created encourages individuals with substantial means to place their funds in tax-exempt securities and thereby avoid the entire burden of the progressive income tax.

Mr. Speaker, I have prepared a further table which shows the required earnings before taxes from an equity investment to be equivalent to the returns that are readily available by the purchase of tax-exempt bonds in today's bond market where AAA municipal bonds will yield 3.30 percent. I insert this table in my remarks at this point:

TABLE VI.—*Required earnings from a private investment before corporate and personal taxes to yield 3.30 percent to an unmarried individual after taxes* [1]

Taxable income derived entirely from common stock dividends, no allowance for deductions or personal exemptions: [2]

[Percent of return on investment]	
$2,000	8.6
$4,000	8.8
$6,000	9.3
$8,000	9.8
$10,000	10.4
$12,000	11.1
$14,000	12.1
$16,000	13.0
$18,000	13.8
$20,000	14.6
$22,000	15.6
$26,000	16.8
$32,000	18.1
$38,000	19.6
$44,000	22.2
$50,000	24.6
$60,000	27.5
$70,000	31.3
$80,000	36.2
$90,000	43.0
$100,000	52.9
$150,000	62.5
$200,000	68.8
$200,000 and over	76.4

[1] 3.30 percent is the prevailing yield on AAA municipal bonds and is free from personal income taxes.

[2] It is assumed that such deductions and exemptions equal the amount of income other than dividends.

Mr. Speaker, because of the combined effect of the corporate and personal income tax, a return on investment of at least 8.6 percent must be earned by a corporation if an individual in the lowest bracket is to have an equivalent return on his investment. If an individual is in the $200,000 bracket or above, a corporate investment must produce a return of 76.4 percent if it is to be equivalent to a tax-exempt bond. Such a rate of return exceeds any that can be found in a competitive market.

Before the era of highly progressive taxes, it was the expected practice in America for individuals with modest incomes to invest in Government bonds or place their funds in a savings bank. Individuals with substantial means were looked to by inventors and small businessmen to provide equity financing. If a risky venture turned out well, the investor could look forward to a return that would compensate him for some of the expected failures in backing new, untried enterprises.

Apparently, however, we are attempting to reverse this normal method of financing our private enterprise system inasmuch as the expected yield on a new investment has to rise to astronomical levels to be attractive to those in the higher tax brackets. They can secure the same net income without risk through the purchase of tax-exempt securities. The individual in the lower brackets has more incentive if there is a prospect of a reasonable return, but even in this instance it is necessary for an investment to be more than 2½ times as attractive in its prospective earnings over a riskless investment backed with the taxing powers of governmental bodies.

We can take still another approach, namely to compare the yield required in terms of market price in purchasing a common stock to be equivalent to a tax-exempt bond of the category I have already described. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert this table in my remarks at this point:

TABLE VII.—*Dividend yield required in purchasing equity securities to give net return of 3.30 percent to an unmarried individual after taxes*

Taxable income derived entirely from common stock dividends, no allowance for deductions or personal exemptions: [1]

[Percent of yield]	
$2,000	4.1
$4,000	4.2
$6,000	4.5
$8,000	4.7
$10,000	5.0
$12,000	5.3
$14,000	5.8
$16,000	6.2
$18,000	6.6
$20,000	7.0
$22,000	7.5
$26,000	8.1
$32,000	8.7
$38,000	9.4
$44,000	10.6
$50,000	11.8
$60,000	13.2
$70,000	15.0
$80,000	17.4
$90,000	20.6
$100,000	25.4
$150,000	30.0
$200,000	33.0
$200,000 and over	36.7

[1] It is assumed that such deductions and exemptions equal the amount of income other than dividends.

Mr. Speaker, any fairminded citizen who wishes to see free enterprise preserved in America will oppose the demagogic efforts which have been made to eliminate this small incentive for equity investment embodied in the dividend credit.

Free enterprise means different things to different people, but once again it is worth defining this concept. To me it signifies a system of production and distribution which is responsive to the wishes of consumers in a competitive market rather than to the dictates of an all-powerful state. It is a system which uses the marketplace as the laboratory to test economic ideas instead of a system of scholasticism where appointed

bureaucrats make economic decisions without the benefit of knowledge which can only be gained if there are laboratories at hand from which to gain the knowledge. It also means a system in which every individual is free to select the occupation which will best use his talents. No permission from any authority is required to leave a job or to accept a more promising one. It is also a system in which investors have a true opportunity to decide which ventures are worthy of their support and which are likely to fail.

Our task as responsible members of a legislative body is to maintain a climate in which prudent investors and prudent consumers will be able to exercise their individual and collective judgment of what is valuable, and what is good, what is happiness, and what is necessary to insure this freedom for their posterity.

NEW WHEAT LEGISLATION IS NEEDED NOW

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, on June 3, 1959, I introduced H.R. 7530, which would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to remove marketing quotas and controls from the production of any class of wheat whenever, prior to June 1 of any year, he determines that the production of such class will not exceed the estimated normal supply by less than a given percentage fixed by Congress. It is now evident that this bill will not be enacted into law during this session. However, had this 86th Congress enacted this bill into law during this holdover session, it could have taken credit for the passage of at least one piece of farm legislation designed not only to help a great number of the wheat producers of the Nation but the taxpayers as well.

At the time the existing legislation was enacted there were undoubtedly two basic considerations in the minds of the Members for voting for its passage. First, they believed the law would assist the farmer in securing his fair share of our national income, and secondly, that wheat surpluses would be avoided. Certainly everyone will agree that the farmer has not been securing his fair share of our national income. It is also agreed by everyone that our overall wheat surpluses have not been controlled or avoided. Even though the present program has completely failed to meet the basic reasons for its original enactment, it remains on the books. Why? Certainly Congress should amend or repeal laws it has enacted whenever it appears they are doing the very opposite of what was intended. A partial answer to this question may lie in the fact that this program has been beneficial to a few of the larger producers in the Nation and they want to see it continue without regard to its costs, the tremendous surpluses, or its effect on the great majority of smaller wheat producers living in other farming regions of America. To continue this program under these circumstances seems incredible and unthinkable. However, if such a program must be continued, and I hope it will not be, it seems to me that the principles embodied in H.R. 7530 should be adopted.

May I ask, Mr. Speaker, does it make sense to impose marketing quotas and controls on the producers of Soft Red Winter wheat, for example, when we have actually had shortages of this class of wheat and it is not adding to our surpluses? The February 1960 issue of the Department of Agriculture bulletin, entitled "The Wheat Situation," reveals the following quotation by the Department:

> Production of Soft Red Winter wheat was not large enough to maintain our level of exports and still maintain a normal carryover.

The carryover of Soft Red Winter wheat on July 1, 1960, was only 11 million bushels—8 million bushels less than the normal supply and 10 million bushels less than the 1959 carryover. With the supply of Soft Red Winter wheat less than the normal and necessary carryover, I ask why should practically all of the wheat producers east of the Mississippi-Missouri Rivers, to say nothing of the taxpayers, have to pay the price for being a part of the present costly and disastrous overall wheat program?

I take this opportunity to insert in the RECORD the carryovers of all classes of wheat in order that all members may have a clear wheat surplus picture. By comparison with the subnormal carryover of Soft Red Winter wheat, the July 1, 1960, carryover of Hard Red Winter wheat was 1,001 million bushels for an increase of 60 million bushels over just 1 year ago. In passing, it is well to note the fact that this one particular class of wheat is accounting for 75 percent of our total wheat surpluses. The carryover on July 1, 1960, of Hard Red Spring wheat was 225 million bushels as compared with 251 million bushels on July 1, 1959. The carryover of Durum wheat this year was 13 million bushels as compared with 18 million bushels 1 year earlier. The carryover of White wheat on July 1, 1960, was 63 million bushels as compared with 64 million bushels on July 1, 1959. In other words, Mr. Speaker, the carryover of every class of wheat grown in the United States was down on July 1, 1960, with the exception of the one which is causing three-fourths of our wheat surpluses. How much longer, Mr. Speaker, will the vast majority of the wheat producers of the Nation permit the Congress to ignore the real source of our trouble and fail to do anything about it? How much longer can we expect the taxpayers of the Nation to pay in excess of $1 million per day for storage charges on these wheat surpluses? Yes; and how much longer can we expect to sweep these facts under Mr. Benson's rug before the consumer and producer find out that he inherited this calamitous wheat program when he took office and that his own program never has been enacted into law?

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. SMITH of Iowa, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. PORTER, for 60 minutes, tomorrow.

Mr. PASSMAN, for 80 minutes, tomorrow.

Mr. PATMAN, for 30 minutes, today and tomorrow, and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter and tables.

Mr. BAILEY, for 20 minutes, on Tuesday.

Mr. CURTIN, for 5 minutes, today.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. SCHERER):

Mr. GRAY, for 15 minutes, on August 31.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 1 hour, on August 30.

Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. SCHERER), for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CONTE (at the request of Mr. SCHERER), for 30 minutes, on August 31.

Mr. SANTANGELO (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK), for 20 minutes, on tomorrow.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. MORRIS of Oklahoma and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JENSEN.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. SCHERER), and to include extraneous matter:

Mr. KEARNS.

Mr. ALGER.

Mr. DAGUE.

Mr. AYRES.

Mr. VAN ZANDT.

At the request of Mr. SCHERER, the following Members were granted permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD:

Mr. UTT in one instance.

Mr. LINDSAY in two instances.

Mr. FORD, the remarks he made in the House today.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri, the remarks he made in the House today, and all other Members who participated in the colloquy.

Mrs. BOLTON (at the request of Mr. SCHERER) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WEAVER (at the request of Mr. SCHERER) and to include extraneous matter.

(At the request of Mr. MCCORMACK, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. SHELLEY.

Mr. GILBERT.

Mr. DONOHUE in two instances.

Mr. PUCINSKI and to include an article.

SENATE BILLS AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 3299. An act to provide for the conveyance to the State of Maine of certain lands located in such State; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 3830. An act to provide for the establishment of the Roger Williams National Monument; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. Con. Res. 116. Concurrent resolution favoring further exploration for the establishment of an international food program for relief purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 900. An act to validate certain overpayments inadvertently made by the United States to several of the States and to relieve certifying and disbursing officers from liability therefrom;

H.R. 2069. An act for the relief of James H. Presley;

H.R. 2178. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to make certain changes in the road at White Branch, Grapevine Reservoir, Tex.;

H.R. 4059. An act to amend title 28 of the United States Code relating to actions for infringements of copyrights by the United States;

H.R. 6084. An act for the relief of J. Butler Hyde;

H.R. 6767. An act for the relief of Raymond Baurkot;

H.R. 7124. An act to require the payment of tuition on account of certain persons who attend the public schools of the District of Columbia; and for other purposes;

H.R. 7792. An act for the relief of Martin A. Mastandrea;

H.R. 8054. An act for the relief of William Edgar Weaver;

H.R. 8989. An act for the relief of Ralph W. Anderson;

H.R. 9377. An act to provide for the protection of forest cover for reservoir areas under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Army and Chief of Engineers;

H.R. 9406. An act for the relief of William J. Huntsman;

H.R. 9417. An act for the relief of Henry Kaloian;

H.R. 9432. An act for the relief of Major Edmund T. Coppinger;

H.R. 9958. An act for the relief of Brooklyn Steel Warehouse Co.;

H.R. 10431. An act for the relief of Isami Nozuka (also known as Isami Notsuka);

H.R. 10598. An act to clarify certain provisions of the Criminal Code relating to the importation or shipment of injurious mammals, birds, amphibians, fish, and reptiles (18 U.S.C. 42(a), 42(b)); and relating to the transportation or receipt of wild mammals or birds taken in violation of State, national, or foreign laws (18 U.S.C. 43), and for other purposes;

H.R. 11165. An act for the relief of Robert J. Reeves;

H.R. 11813. An act to amend the Menominee Termination Act;

H.R. 11188. An act for the relief of Edward S. Anderson;

H.R. 11327. An act for the relief of Chauncey A. Ahalt;

H.R. 11390. An act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11420. An act for the relief of Ferdinand Hofacker;

H.R. 11460. An act for the relief of Edouard E. Perret;

H.R. 11486. An act for the relief of Richard J. Power;

H.R. 12350. An act for the relief of Marion John Nagurski;

H.R. 12471. An act for the relief of Capt. Lucien B. Clark O2051623, MSC, U.S. Army;

H.R. 12475. An act for the relief of Claude L. Wimberly;

H.R. 12476. An act for the relief of John H. Esterline;

H.R. 12530. An act to authorize adjustment, in the public interest, of rentals under leases entered into for the provision of commercial recreational facilities at the John H. Kerr Reservoir, Va.-N.C.;

H.R. 12533. An act to amend the Migratory Bird Treaty Act to increase penalties for violations of that act, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12563. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved August 17, 1937, as amended; and

H.J. Res. 658. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation in connection with the centennial of the birth of Jane Addams, founder and leader of Chicago's Hull House.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1806. An act to revise title 18, chapter 39, of the United States Code, entitled "Explosives and Combustibles";

S. 2306. An act to exempt from taxation certain property of the National Woman's Party, Inc., in the District of Columbia;

S. 3415. An act to exempt from taxation certain property of the American Association of University Women, Educational Foundation, Inc., in the District of Columbia;

S. 3727. An act to authorize the bonding of persons engaging in the home improvement business, and for other purposes; and

S. 3834. An act to increase the maximum amount which may be borrowed by the District of Columbia for use in the construction and improvement of its sanitary and combined sewer systems, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 5747. An act to amend section 152, title 18, United States Code, with respect to the concealment of assets in contemplation of bankruptcy;

H.R. 7242. An act to amend sections 1, 57j, 64a(5), 67b, 67c, and 70c of the Bankruptcy Act, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8289. An act to accelerate the commencing date of civil service retirement annuities, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 10455. An act to amend the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, August 30, 1960, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2428. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Navy, transmitting an annual report relating to all tort claims paid by the Department of the Navy during the fiscal year 1960, pursuant to section 2672 of title 28, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2429. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "a bill to repeal the limitation on the number of postal employees who can be placed in salary levels PFS–17 through PFS–20, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. Supplemental report. H.R. 12775. A bill to increase the relief or retirement compensation of certain former members of the Metropolitan Police force, the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the U.S. Park Police force, the White House Police force, and the U.S. Secret Service; and of their widows, widowers, and children; without amendment (Rept. No. 2151, pt. 2). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. S. 2917. An act to establish a price support level for milk and butterfat; without amendment (Rept. No. 2182). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 633. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 8093, a bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to eliminate the 6-percent differential applying to certain bids of Pacific coast shipbuilders; without amendment (Rept. 2183). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 3835. An act to authorize the District of Columbia Civil War Centennial Commission to plan and carry out in the District of Columbia civic programs in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the Civil War; to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of Defense to make certain property of the District and of the United States available for the use of such Commission; to authorize the said Commissioners to make certain regulations and permit certain uses to be made of public space, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2184). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BARDEN: Committee on Education and Labor. S. 743. An act to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act in order to remove the exemption with respect to certain mines employing no more than 14 individuals; without amendment (Rept. No. 2186). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BARDEN: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 12574. A bill to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, so as to provide that an injured employee shall have the right to select his own physician, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2187). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 2188. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BARDEN: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 12777. A bill to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, as amended, to provide increased benefits in case of disabling injuries, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2189). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 1105. An act to improve the land tenure patterns on the Fort Belknap Reservation; without amendment (Rept. No. 2190). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. PFOST: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 1663. An act directing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain property in the State of North Dakota to the city of Bismarck, N. Dak.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2191). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ASPINALL: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 1670. An act to provide for the granting of mineral rights in certain homestead lands in the State of Alaska; with amendment (Rept. No. 2192). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 1889. An act to authorize the transfer of three units of the Fort Belknap Indian irrigation project to the landowners within the project; without amendment (Rept. No. 2193). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. PFOST: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 2757. An act to supplement the act of June 14, 1926, as amended, to permit any State to acquire certain public lands for recreational use; with amendment (Rept. No. 2194). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. PFOST: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 2914. An act to authorize the purchase and exchange of land and interests therein on the Blue Ridge and Natchez Trace Parkways; without amendment (Rept. No. 2195). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. PFOST: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 3267. An act to amend the act of October 17, 1940, relating to the disposition of certain public lands in Alaska; with amendment (Rept. No. 2196). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. PFOST: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 3399. An act to authorize the exchange of certain property within Shenandoah National Park, in the State of Virginia, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2197). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 8712. A bill to amend the act of August 9, 1955, to authorize longer term leases of Indian lands on the Agua Caliente (Palm Springs) Reservation and the Seminole Reservations in Florida; with amendment (Rept. No. 2198). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee of conference. H.R. 10087. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit taxpayers to elect an overall limitation on the foreign tax credit (Rept. No. 2199). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 13062. A bill to extend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 2200). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 3867. An act to exempt from taxation certain property of the National Guard Association of the United States in the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 2185). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.R. 13198. A bill to establish a Federal Recreation Service in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana:

H.R. 13199. A bill to amend the Submerged Lands Act to establish and confirm the seaward boundaries of the coastal States, as a line three marine leagues distant from the coastline; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LOSER:

H.R. 13200. A bill to amend chapter 35 of title 38, United States Code, relating to war orphans' educational assistance, in order to permit eligible persons thereunder to attend foreign educational institutions under certain circumstances; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 13201. A bill to strengthen and make clear the authority of the States relating to the control, appropriation, use, or distribution of water within their boundaries, to promote harmony between the United States and the States with the administration of water, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H.R. 13202. A bill to provide that amounts equal to amounts paid by a veteran for expenses of the last illness and burial of a wife or child shall not be included in the computation of his annual income for pension purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 13203. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide that in determining eligibility of a veteran to disability pension the income of a spouse shall not be counted in computing the veteran's annual income; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 13204. A bill to provide a basis for payment of death pension by the Veterans' Administration to a widow or child of a person who served in World War I, World War II, or the Korean conflict, and who died while on active duty under circumstances which are held not to be a basis for an award of death compensation or dependency and indemnity compensation; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 13205. A bill to provide that where the entitlement of a veteran, widow, or child to a pension from the Veterans' Administration is based upon the veteran's having served in World War I, the beneficiary shall if otherwise eligible have the right to elect payment of pension under either the provisions of title 38 as in effect on June 30, 1960, or as amended by the Veterans' Pension Act of 1959, whichever provides the greater benefit; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PORTER:

H.R. 13206. A bill to modernize the laws relating to contracts for the transportation of mail, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DORN of New York:

H.R. 13207. A bill to amend title III of the act of March 3, 1933, commonly referred to as the Buy American Act, so as to provide that, in the case of certain articles, materials, and supplies required for public use, the procurement of such articles, materials, and supplies by the Federal Government shall be limited to the holders of patents issued by the United States; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.R. 13208. A bill to amend paragraph 702 of the Tariff Act of 1930 to establish quotas for live sheep and lambs and for fresh, chilled, or frozen lamb and mutton, and to provide for additional duties on imports in excess of such quotas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H.R. 13209. A bill to provide that members of the Philippine Scouts who served during World War II shall be paid the difference between the pay they received for their service during World War II and the pay which they would have received if their rates of pay had been the same as other members of the Army of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SAUND:

H.R. 13210. A bill to provide for preference to existing applicants in the leasing of oil and gas resources of public lands on San Nicolas Island, in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WOLF:

H. Con. Res. 729. Concurrent resolution favoring further exploration for the establishment of an international food program for relief purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. Con. Res. 730. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress in favor of granting relief to the domestic carpet industry, to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H. Con. Res. 731. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress in favor of granting relief to the domestic carpet industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 13211. A bill for the relief of Yick T. Jew; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENTLEY:

H.R. 13212. A bill for the relief of Polyxeni K. Mina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 13213. A bill for the relief of Margarita Jericevic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHANSEN:

H.R. 13214. A bill for the relief of Kwong Ja Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY:

H.R. 13215. A bill for the relief of Cesare Nannizzi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RABAUT:

H.R. 13216. A bill for the relief of Eva Nowik; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WAINWRIGHT:

H.R. 13217. A bill for the relief of Loukas A. Saravanos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Help From Hoffa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 29, 1960

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report that in the current issue of Jimmy Hoffa's new political publication, the Drive Reporter, I have been signally honored with a long and emotional denunciation as a horrible example of what a Congressman should be.

This being an election year and campaign expenses being what they are, I consider myself fortunate indeed to have been given such attention.

I say this, Mr. Speaker, because most of us know what is a horrible congressional example to Mr. Hoffa more often than not is considered the epitome of legislative virtue elsewhere. Modesty prevents my placing this exact interpretation upon the Hoffa remarks and their effect, but I believe most of my colleagues will agree that being inscribed on Jimmy Hoffa's personal political purge list considerably enhances a political candidate's chances.

Without going into detail concerning the Hoffa analysis of my voting record and character, I can say that Mr. Hoffa expresses grave fears as to what would happen in the event the Republican Party were to take control of this body in November.

If the Republicans elect a congressional majority—

The article states—

KEARNS will chairman the Committee on Education and Labor. This they should not inflict on the rest of the Nation.

I can understand that this would worry Mr. Hoffa, for he knows that in the past I consistently have voted to protect the rights of the rank-and-file workingman against abuses by union bosses.

The working men and women of my district—many of them members of the Teamsters Union—are aware of this and are familiar with my work in their behalf. I do not think that they who so recently have been freed of the coercive burdens of labor bossism, will forget.

They will remember that I pushed through for them the first school lunch bill in the history of Pennsylvania. They will remember, too, that I was instrumental in this body, in obtaining the first $1 minimum wage bill.

A responsible union leadership—that of the International Association of Machinists—said at the time that the minimum was raised to a dollar in a miracle of the 84th Congress.

The official publication of the Machinists' Union stated that Representative CARROLL KEARNS, Republican of Pennsylvania, was one of the principal miracle makers.

Mr. Speaker, I believe Jimmy Hoffa is peeved with those of us who have attempted to guarantee the workingman his God-given rights, because among these rights are freedom of speech and action.

These, of course, are two things Hoffa would rather not have in his organization.

I believe he is unhappy, too, because most of the Members of this body banded together in the past year to free the workingman from labor totalitarianism and give him, instead, representative unionism.

He is particularly angry at me, I feel, because I was active in this legislative battle and because I am, as he has noted, the senior Republican member of the committee which drafted the labor reform bill.

He is unhappy because that bill gives equal rights to all union members in the conduct of their union affairs.

He is displeased because that bill allows rank-and-file members to speak up at union meetings without fear of reprisals from union bosses such as himself.

He is irked because union members are protected against arbitrary dues increases under terms of that bill.

He is disconsolate because the labor reform law I helped write protects the union member's right to sue union bosses for abuses.

He is plagued with the reality that because of this legislation he cannot arbitrarily impose fines and penalties on his membership.

His ambitions have been thwarted noticeably by the provision making free and fair union elections mandatory.

He perhaps is spending many sleepless nights because the bill makes it possible for a union membership to purge itself of crooked officials.

He is irate because union funds now are protected and trusteeships are regulated.

He is indignant because I gladly helped in the outlawing of blackmail picketing.

And, most significant, he perhaps is downright enraged because the bill bans hot-cargo agreements in labor contracts, one of Jimmy's favorite weapons of destruction.

He is displeased with my voting record because I have voted in the public interest and against the selfish interest of a labor boss whose operations led to the expulsion of his union from the AFL–CIO.

He is wrathful because Civic Affairs Associates, a nonpartisan organization which analyzes voting records of Members of Congress, has given me a rather high performance rating, as noted in the Pittsburgh Press. On August 13, Douglas Smith, distinguished Washington correspondent for that newspaper, wrote of the Civic Affairs Associates' poll:

The western Pennsylvanian most pleasing to the scoring group was Representative CARROLL D. KEARNS, Farrell Republican, who scored 0.786.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is obvious that what is a horrible example to Jimmy Hoffa fortunately is not that to more responsible persons.

In conclusion, I should advise my colleagues that boss Hoffa is very likely to single out others in the House for attacks of the type made against me. Nevertheless, I am sure that in a spirit of charity all Members of this body join me in wishing Mr. Hoffa a recovery—sometime after November 8—from the condition which produces such outbursts as his intemperate attack upon me.

Prior to that date, however, these outbursts can be a great asset to the cause of good government. They will show the American people that any vote is a vote in the public interest—provided it is a vote directly contrary to the interest of one James R. Hoffa.

Small Business Assistance Act of 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 29, 1960

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, it has been always an unquestioned American tradition that this Government shall aid, counsel, assist, and protect the interests of small business in order to preserve our democratic system of free competitive enterprise.

That is why I advocated and voted for the passage of the original legislation establishing a permanent, independent Small Business Administration agency. Recognizing the importance of our small businesses in defense production efforts and the national economy I have consistently urged every reasonable Federal assistance and guidance to them throughout my congressional service.

Over these past 2 years I regret to say the fate and the fare of American small business has discouragingly declined, while the Congress concentrated attention largely upon international issues and domestic security. In partial recognition of this neglect this body passed, last June, approved H.R. 11207, designed to increase the Small Business Administration's revolving fund for its regular loan program, to provide for a wider participation by small business concerns in the subcontracting phase of Government procurement and to authorize the agency to set up a small business subcontracting program.

While this bill does not offer the complete assistance a good many of us have advocated it does contain elements of material encouragement and aid desperately needed by small business to survive.

Mr. Speaker, the House-passed measure, together with a Senate-passed version is now in conference. I most earnestly hope the leadership on both sides, in both Chambers, will use their combined influence in having the conferees reach sensible agreement and report the bill back for congressional action before adjournment.

I consider it my conscientious duty to speak here today for the small business people of my own district and the Nation. The only voice they have in Federal legislation is ours and we will be neglecting our obligation if we fail to grant this limited assistance to this patriotic segment of our economy.

Medical Care for the Needy Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB H. GILBERT
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 29, 1960

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, until the Congress has the benefit of strong leadership, which would be shown by a Democratic President, there will be no comprehensive, adequate plan to meet the medical needs of our senior citizens. Medical and hospital care for the elderly must eventually be devised as part of the time-tested social security insurance system. I am grievously disappointed in the bill we have just passed.

The measure which first passed the House was meager and miserly; the compromise measure which finally passed has been termed a shabby joke. It would cover some 2.4 million persons over 65 now receiving old-age medical assistance under State assistance programs, plus an estimated million more persons a year classed as medically indigent. Federal assistance grants would be stepped up under the bill to encourage States to develop comprehensive medical care programs. Participation of the States would be completely optional however, with each State determining the extent and character of its own program.

This is a paupers oath type of medical care. We have to wait until 50 different States, with varying abilities to finance such medical care decide what help they will give the elderly. It is believed that many States will adopt the programs and, equally many will not. There is no guarantee that our elderly citizens will get any help at all in many instances. It means that those desperately in need of medical care might get some help if the States did their part and if the recipients proved themselves too poor to pay their own doctor bills. They will be subjected to investigation through the local departments of public assistance; they will be forced to answer embarrassing questions regarding income of members of the family; all dignity will be stripped from them at a time when they should have medical help free from harassment and worry.

Responsibility is placed on the States and this means that the entire program will be unwieldy and totally inadequate. A wise and efficient plan should have been made a part of our orderly, nationwide system of social security, to insure the medical aid which is sorely needed.

Several excellent plans were proposed, but defeated, and it is discouraging to have to accept a plan which, while it will do no harm, will not do much good, and falls far short of my expectations. The Forand bill would have provided insurance against the costs of hospital, nursing home, and surgical service for persons eligible for old-age and survivors insurance benefits. Such protection is vitally needed, and should be given our senior citizens who now cannot afford such care and cannot obtain or afford private insurance. Inasmuch as they would have helped pay the costs during their working years, under the social security insurance system, they would have been entitled to medical assistance during the years when they need it most, and they would have had such help as a matter of right, rather than to have to beg for it. I introduced a bill identical with the Forand bill, in the House, to indicate my strong support. The Anderson amendment, backed by KENNEDY would have met the medical needs of our senior citizens and would have been administered under a workable, adequate, nationwide system.

As matters now stand, our elderly citizens will continue to be without adequate medical care and will suffer illness and pain without the assistance they should have, and which has been promised them.

I shall continue to give of my best efforts to the end that the situation will be corrected and our senior citizens will be given adequate help, just as soon as it is possible to secure passage of a good, effective medical aid bill.

What's Happened? They Don't Hate Us—They Love Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL B. DAGUE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 29, 1960

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the exclamation with which I have captioned these remarks was reportedly made by a woman spectator at the opening of the Olympic games in Rome this week.

At the opening ceremonies each delegation marched on the field behind their national colors and when the U.S. group moved out with Old Glory borne aloft by Rafer L. Johnson—the first Negro ever to carry the American flag in an Olympic parade—the crowd literally went wild. Cheers followed cheers and, as our reporter implied in his article, the collapse of the summit conference, the Powers trial, the cataract of Communist abuse all seemed to fade into insignificance. Literally, the people—the ordinary folks like you and me—are not mad at Uncle Sam and as DICK NIXON learned in Warsaw there is a wealth of good feeling for the United States. And this fact was further emphasized at the Olympic spectacle when the Russian athletes marched on the field and were given polite but a very minimum of applause.

It seems that the time is here when political candidates and partisan politicians should stop trying to downgrade the United States and refrain from trying to make it appear that we are hated everywhere overseas. That idea is exactly what Communists are trying to promote both here and abroad and it certainly does us no credit when in seeking political advantage some of our people brand our Nation as a second-rate power and minimize the influence that both President Eisenhower and Vice President NIXON have had in promoting good will around the world.

Hugh Bennett Has Passed to His Reward

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 29, 1960

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to pay tribute to the memory of one of our greatest Americans, Hugh Hammond Bennett, man of the soil.

Dr. Bennett, the first Chief of the Soil Conservation Service, died July 7 at the age of 79 and was buried in Arlington National Cemetery.

Our country, and the people of the world as well, owe him a great debt for his lifetime crusade against soil erosion and on behalf of an action program to conserve our soil resources.

More than any man, Dr. Bennett was responsible for our national soil and water conservation and small watershed protection and flood prevention programs that extend into nearly every corner of the Nation, and for the development of similar programs in some 48 other countries.

Dr. Bennett's great crusade began some 55 years ago when, as a young soil surveyor just 2 years out of college, he identified the process of sheet erosion. This is the gradual removal, with every heavy rain, of a thin sheet of topsoil. Gullies were common and accepted as a "natural" event, but Bennett's theory of sheet erosion—the forerunner of gullies—was a new concept.

The young scientist's concept did not impress anybody, least of all his superiors in the Department of Agriculture.

But young Hugh Bennett was undismayed. He kept at it. He gathered additional data as he continued his regular work—studying the soils of America across the length and breadth of the land. He talked about soil erosion. He wrote about it. He argued. But his road was a lonely one for more than two decades.

In 1928 he finally got his full story into a Department of Agriculture pamphlet, "Soil Erosion a National Menace." That

was the beginning. People began to listen. People who counted, such as a congressional committee that called on him to testify and then appropriated a small sum to start investigations into soil erosion.

Hugh Bennett, who almost single-handedly aroused the Nation to the dangers of soil wastage, was the man chosen to develop and direct a program of research and action in soil conservation.

He directed the early research starting in 1929. He headed the Soil Erosion Service, an emergency depression agency. He headed its successor, the Soil Conservation Service when it was established in 1935 by the Congress without a single dissenting vote. He established the principles and concepts that today guide our national programs. He retired from active service in 1952 after 18 years as Chief of the Soil Conservation Service, and after nearly a half century of magnificent service to his country and to the world.

But Hugh Bennett continued to be a messiah of the soil in the 8 years of his life after formal retirement. He accepted assignments to other nations, as health permitted. He continued to speak and to write.

His last public appearance, where he spoke briefly but with his usual eloquence and humor, was on May 5 at a banquet here in Washington sponsored by the National Association of Soil Conservation Districts in observance of the 25th anniversary of the Soil Conservation Service.

It was my privilege, along with others, to share the platform with him on that occasion.

I knew this man well, and there was no man I respected or admired more. He was simple and direct. He had no time for pompous or scientific posture, yet he was a scientist and a great one. Essentially, this man was an evangelist, who, by the force of his personality, his ability to speak and write simply but eloquently, and his ability to adapt himself to any group or occasion, gained widespread support for a noble ideal—to safeguard our land for present and future generations. He was of that rare breed of men who can translate knowledge into action and achieve results.

It was my sad privilege but I deemed it a great honor to represent the Congress as an honorary pallbearer at his burial rites in Arlington National Cemetery.

As I traveled slowly with the horse-drawn caisson bearing his body to its last resting place, I reflected on the greatness of this man who fought so long and so alone, but who lived, as few men do, to see his dream come true.

And it came to me then that the good works of this man to whom we owe so much should be perpetuated by a memorial for the benefit of generations unborn—the generations that will profit most from his lifetime of service to all mankind.

I understand many of the national agricultural and conservation organizations, soil conservation districts, and conservation farmers and ranchers everywhere want to erect a suitable memorial to the memory of this great and good man.

I hope that their efforts will come together and emerge as a single suitable memorial to the man of whom Louis Bromfield said, "Hugh Bennett deserves the greatest honor from the American people as one of the greatest benefactors since the beginning of their history." Our hearts go out to his wonderful wife and family.

God rest his soul and may the same God who took him to his heavenly home give Mrs. Bennett and family strength to bear the great loss they have suffered in the passing of their dearly loved one.

Our National Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHIL WEAVER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 29, 1960

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, much has been said and much more will be said—some of it in a partisan political vein—about the status of our Nation's defense posture. This is a subject of such vital importance to every American that I feel I must speak out on it. I also feel that my position as a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense requires my making this statement.

When all of the uproar dies down and the cold facts are brought into the light, I think the American people will find that they are by no means a second-rate power, and that our Nation is now and will remain the strongest on earth.

This massive strength which we have built up at tremendous cost and effort has been and is being used as an arm of our foreign policy. It permits us to deal with any potential aggressor with a strong hand and a winning suit. It has permitted us to stabilize the situation in many parts of the world and will enable us to force the issue and clear up the situation which is festering now in Cuba.

Were it not for this strength and the knowledge that the Kremlin has that we are as strong as we say we are, the world would today be in utter chaos or perhaps under the domination of the Soviet Union. Believe me, if the Soviet bosses for one moment thought they could launch an aggressive war without themselves being destroyed, they would do so. In fact, the Soviets would have acted long ago were it not for the fear that retaliation would mean destruction of their homeland.

President Eisenhower has steered a course which has kept this Nation out of war for the past 8 years and has ended the war which was raging when he took office. This has been a difficult task, an almost superhuman one because when he took office the world situation was such that communism was feeling its oats and was making overt moves in every possible direction. There was open warfare in Southeast Asia. There was the threat of invasion of Taiwan. In the Middle East the previous administration had allowed the situation to deteriorate to the point that Communists were moving ahead in Iran, Iraq, Syria, and Egypt. The explosion at the Suez was even then in the making and was inevitable. That we managed to steer clear of open warfare at that time and in that area is one of the real feats of statesmanship by the President.

The President was committed by the previous administration to the foreign-aid policy. It could not be ended, once begun, without the danger of chaos. However, Mr. Eisenhower has been able to shift the emphasis in this field and has made the money work better for the advantage of the United States as it never did before.

I personally feel that much of our foreign aid is a mistake and its continuance is a mistake. Therefore, I have voted consistently against it. I do recognize, though, that there is need in some areas of the world and I think it is our responsibility as Americans to help in these areas with bushels, not bucks. The best way I know of to accomplish this is by use of our vast stores of surplus grain, butter, and grain oils for shipment to these have-not countries. This would not only be another step toward an enduring peace but would be of great assistance in cutting down the costs of storing our surplus commodities.

Mr. Speaker, during the past 2 years we of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense have worked consistently under the able leadership of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] to develop a flexible, balanced, attack force.

This force is a mixture of manpower, bombers, ships, and missiles. It is a potent fighting force and one which can go into action at a moment's notice. We have provided funds to start work on an airborne alert for the Strategic Air Command in the event of crisis.

In the past 2 years we have seen Atlas come into operation. Testing of Titan is proceeding and this powerful weapon is moving toward the operational stage. We have had a remarkable breakthrough on Minuteman and that program is well ahead of schedule. Minuteman is so mobile that it will make it extremely difficult for an enemy attack to knock it out.

Polaris, the submarine-launched missile, will within a short time become the backbone of our sea attack force. The submarine will be able to hide offshore and hit many of the major targets in the Communist empire. It will be very nearly immune to enemy action.

During the past 2 years we have speeded up our antisubmarine warfare work and are making some progress in this area. However, it is my feeling that we must find a new Rickover to coordinate this effort and to give it the kind of drive essential to getting the job done.

Altogether, Mr. Speaker, this presents a mighty array of weapons in the arsenal of democracy. With this kind of strength the United States is capable of striking so hard that no enemy would dare launch a military venture.

This strength we have built for the United States carries with it also a grave responsibility. We cannot afford to make an unwise move. We must have men in command who have the wisdom and restraint that only experience can provide.

In closing, I would like to emphasize once again that the United States has been thrust into the position of leadership in the free world—and that we have the strength, both military and diplomatic, to handle the assignment and keep the peace.

Radio Free Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 29, 1960

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, a Chicago newspaper recently asked how much longer the United States can afford to let a tinpot dictator in Cuba get away with wholesale robbery crowned with insults.

The action of the Foreign Ministers of the Organization of American States yesterday in condemning Moscow interference in the Western Hemisphere clearly indicates that people throughout the Americas indeed agree with the question asked by the Chicago newspaper. But the action taken yesterday by the OAS in condemning the Communists will have little meaning unless this information is given to the people of Cuba.

I am proposing today that the American people help organize a privately financed agency to be known as Free Cuba, Inc., and whose principal function will be to immediately set up powerful radio transmitters to be known as Radio Free Cuba and beam the truth about Castro and his Communist advisers to the people of this island Republic.

There is no question in my mind that the Cubans are now being brainwashed with the most bitter hate-America campaign ever staged anywhere in the world by Castro and his Communist conspirators through his tightly controlled press and radio in Cuba.

We must immediately provide a counterforce which will tell our traditional allies and friends in Cuba the truth about Castro.

My suggestion is not without precedent, even though we still maintain flimsy diplomatic relations with the Cuban dictator. The United States maintains diplomatic relations with the Communist regime in Poland and other nations behind the Iron Curtain, but we also maintain our anti-Communist broadcasts into these countries through Radio Free Europe and the Voice of America. I feel that this proposal in no way violates the sovereignty of Cuba or any other nation.

I believe there is a sense of urgency in my proposal. I have been informed by leaders of the anti-Communist underground movement in Cuba that Castro and his Communist advisers are plotting now to carry out the final blow of his anti-America drive, and that is, the seizure of our naval base in Guantanamo. I have it on what I believe reasonable authority that Castro very shortly is going to organize a large group of Cubans to stage a march on the American naval base in Cuba. These will not be Castro's soldiers, but innocent Cuban citizens, while ire will be fanned by Communist agitators. The plot is to make sure that several of these Cuban citizens will be killed during the melee not by Americans, but by the Communists themselves. This incident is designed to give Castro the springboard from which he will brand America as an aggressor in an attempt to drive Americans out of the base.

It is extremely important for us to set up a facility now which will forewarn the Cubans of Castro's plot and will tell them of his true intentions. It is also essential now to tell the Cuban people that some of the outstanding Cubans who helped Castro in his July 26 movement have now turned into counter-revolutionaries who are fighting him because he has sold out lock, stock, and barrel to Kremlin rule.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure the American people will support this program as a voluntary citizens movement. I do not believe it should become an official Government function because then Castro would single out our State Department as his target for intensifying anti-America hate propaganda. Instead, this should be a wireless people-to-people program starting at the American grassroots level in our effort to tell our friends in Cuba the truth about their leader. I am confident American industry, the American labor movement, and the American people will help make this a successful venture.

The powerful radio transmitters could be built on one of the offshore islands between Cuba and Miami. I have been assured by the Cuban anti-Communist underground that the people of Cuba not only can but will listen intensely to these broadcasts. One of the things that puzzles the Cuban people more than anything else today is the complete lack of a possible counteroffensive by the American people. We can cure this lack with the Radio Free Cuba project, which I am proposing today.

Mr. Speaker, I am enclosing an editorial from the Chicago Daily News, which I think quite accurately reflects the temper of the American people regarding Castro and his Communist legions in Cuba:

CUBA CROWNS THEFT WITH INSULTS—PATIENCE MAY BE DANGEROUS, TOO

How much longer can the United States afford to let a tinpot dictator in Cuba get away with wholesale robbery crowned with insults?

Up to now, patience has been the watchword in U.S. dealings with Cuba. With one exception—the cut in the sugar quota—our Government has limited itself to ineffectual protests while Fidel Castro and his Communist cohorts have systematically destroyed the fruits of more than 50 years of economic collaboration.

A weekend decree read by the ailing dictator completes the seizure of American-owned property in Cuba valued at nearly $1 billion. There is almost no hope that any of it will be paid for; it is robbery pure and simple.

The fact that the Castro gang believes it can do its dirty work with impunity may in the long run be more damaging than the financial loss. If the Cubans can get away with it, who is next in line to try? The United States has a good many billions invested around the world, and the lineup of greedy politicians willing to grab the loot could get pretty long.

Castro is confident that the United States will do nothing. He derides us as a "second-rate military power." His pal, Nikita Khrushchev, whose hands are still bloody from the butchery in Hungary, has the gall to threaten a rain of rockets on America if we dare to lay a hand on the Cuban hijackers.

It is not fear of Russia, and much less of Cuba, that has restrained the United States from administering a spanking to the Cuban upstart. The one thing we want to avoid is to give substance to the false charge of Yankee imperialism.

But in this case it seems the facts don't matter anyway. Not only the Cubans, but millions elsewhere in the world, are willing to believe the worst of the United States on any crackpot's say-so. At the same time, they disregard the flagrant imperialist aggression practiced by the Soviet Union and swallow the line about peace-loving Communist states.

In leaning over backward to be fair, we run the risk of becoming a pushover. While we seek to gain respect by forbearance, we lose respect by failing to stand up for our rights.

We would gain no points for good behavior if we adopted a tougher line toward Cuba, but if the reward for good behavior is a punch in the nose for Uncle Sam, maybe it is time Uncle Sam took a different tack.

There was a time when an American symbol was a rattler with the words "Don't tread on me." The world has changed some since then, but it surely cannot have changed so much that we have to offer ourselves as a doormat.

American Athletes at the Olympics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 29, 1960

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I think we should stop for a moment to reflect on the marvelous achievements of our American athletes at the Olympic games in Rome. Daily reports of the excellent performances of these young men and women pay tribute to them for the years of arduous training and effort they have put in to achieve the very highest level in athletic prowess.

But amidst these marvelous feats of athletic accomplishments the greatest tribute we can pay to these youngsters is to focus attention on them as representatives of American youth. It was with a great sense of warmth and pride that I read the accounts of the tremendous welcome that was given to our standard bearers when the team entered the Olympic Stadium. The accounts clearly dispel some of the reports we sometimes hear about the regard in which Americans are held abroad. The tumult of 100,000 unrestrained cheers of

persons from all nations when the bearers of the Stars and Stripes entered the stadium justifies our confidence and support of these outstanding young Americans. They represent the finest in American traditions and more so they are among our best missionaries for good will. I salute them and I ask my colleague to join with me in wishing them well.

Philipsburg, Pa., Hails Dr. Walter Roy Heaton, Prominent Centre County Physician, as "The Country Doctor of Today" on the 80th Anniversary of His Birth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 29, 1960

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, a large throng of residents of Philipsburg, Centre County, Pa., aided by many persons from the surrounding area and from adjoining Clearfield County, gathered at Memorial Stadium in Philipsburg on Sunday afternoon, August 28, to pay a well-deserved tribute to Dr. Walter R. Heaton on the occasion of the celebration of his 80th birthday.

Various clubs and civic organizations were represented at the testimonial to one of Pennsylvania's best-loved physicians who during his active medical career has found time to serve as coroner of Centre County for 20 years. The chairman of the program committee, Rev. Harrison Price, pastor of the Woodland (Pa.) Evangelical Church, is among the 4,000 babies delivered by Dr. Heaton during his dedicated service to humanity. The fine program had a dual purpose in honoring Dr. Heaton and the medical profession in general.

During the interesting and enjoyable program, greetings to the popular Centre County physician were voiced by Mr. S. Z. Miller, burgess of Philipsburg, and by over a dozen representatives of business, civic, and service clubs present for the happy occasion. The medical profession was represented by Dr. Lester Luxenberg, of Philipsburg, while music was performed by the Centre County Hymn-Sing Association and the Sandy Ridge Methodist Bible Class.

It was my privilege and honor to deliver the principal address in tribute to Dr. and Mrs. Heaton and the medical profession which he has so nobly represented during his many years of service to Centre County residents.

The address follows:

ADDRESS BY JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, 20TH DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT THE 80TH BIRTHDAY CELEBRATION FOR WALTER ROY HEATON, M.D., AT THE PHILIPSBURG STADIUM, PHILIPSBURG, PA., AUGUST 28

It gives me the greatest pleasure to be among my friends in Philipsburg today and to join with you in the celebration of the 80th birthday of one of the most exceptional members of this community—Dr. Walter Roy Heaton.

I want to give my thanks to those who took part in arranging this event—for I can think of no more fitting way to show Dr. Heaton our gratitude and esteem.

He has served this community as few men have served it.

For nearly 50 years he has been "on call" in Philipsburg and you have all had the opportunity to observe his devotion to the task of relieving pain and suffering.

He has brought a unique spirit of confidenec into your homes.

I am certain that everyone here today shares my feeling of deep humility before the productive way in which Dr. Heaton has spent these 80 years.

How many of us approach our chosen professions with so rich a background of experience as did Walter Roy Heaton the practice of medicine?

How many of us continue to take an active interest in civic affairs not having a direct bearing on our more narrow circle of interests?

Dr. Heaton's growing years were undoubtedly instrumental in giving him the broad and vital approach to life which delights us all.

He helped his father dig a farm and dwelling out of timber and brush.

He taught school at an early age and was led to seek out still more knowledge and education.

He studied law, graduated from law school, was admitted to the bar and practiced before the supreme court of the State of Indiana and the circuit court of the United States.

But the call of the medical profession had for Dr. Heaton an appeal which could not be postponed indefinitely—and he left the practice of law to attend Valparaiso Medical School from which he graduated in 1911.

He has practiced medicine in Philipsburg for more than 45 years.

These years have been marked by changes in medicine which are no less dramatic than the other scientific advances which have revolutionized our whole view of the world.

Dr. Heaton has had the opportunity not only to witness the product of these changes but to see their evolution.

I think this gives us all great confidence in the kind of medicine he practices.

Perhaps today we can all consider the transformation of medical science over the period in which Dr. Heaton has practiced in Philipsburg and ponder the advances likely to occur within the next few years.

I think even a hurried glimpse of the developments in medicine can help us to appreciate the enormity of the challenge facing Dr. Heaton and other physicians throughout the country in keeping up with the rapidly changing methods of diagnosis and treatment.

That he has performed his task so admirably is a tribute to his greatness as a human being and as a physician.

I would like to read to you what I consider to be an excellent description of these advances and of others we are likely to experience.

The following is a statement by the chairman of the section on pediatrics of the American Medical Association, Dr. Wyman C. Cole.

He states:

"Any doctor starting in practice 40 years ago might have found it hard to believe there would come a day when such diseases as rickets and scurvy would be textbook ones rarely if ever to be seen in practice, when he would treat pneumonia right in his office and essentially cure it in 24 hours, when he wouldn't see a case of diphtheria or tetanus in 25 years, when suitable formulas for 99 out of 100 babies would be available at any drugstore or supermarket.

"Looking ahead, well within the next 40 years cancer may have become relegated to medical history and the common cold forgotten, a single injection or tablet may immunize against all communicable diseases, many congenital defects will be avoided, and arthritis and other metabolic diseases will be easily controlled.

"I am sure this is only a small fragment of what will actually transpire."

Since the turn of the century and Dr. Heaton's years of early practice—we have seen the lifespan of a child at birth extended by a full 20 years.

We have seen near mastery of medicine over the dangers of communicable diseases.

Sulfa drugs and antibiotics—greater understanding of the importance of nutrition—improved sanitation—immunizations—these weapons have helped conquer diphtheria, scarlet fever, whooping cough, typhoid, infectious diarrhea, tetanus, gonorrhea, and syphilis.

Probably no advance is more dramatic than the change in the methods of controlling and caring for tuberculosis.

We have so increased our diagnostic tools and so improved the treatment through various drugs that tuberculosis is no longer termed the "great white plague."

But if we have made great strides against infectious diseases since the turn of the century—the threat from chronic and degenerative diseases seems to increase each year.

Recently we have shown a growing awareness that this problem must be met with the same courage and strength as were the disease threats of the past.

We have constantly expanded our medical research programs; we have attempted to spread widely existing information on preventive measures which can be taken by the public; and we have tried to adapt our health services to changing needs.

I would like to single out some of the major disease threats which Dr. Heaton and his colleagues face today and consider with you both the remarkable progress of recent years and the great areas of hope for future progress.

Of course our vigilance against diseases of the past must be constant and we must not ignore or lessen our use of all methods of prevention and control now at our disposal, but I think that medical advances have freed us to spend more of our Nation's time and resources on the major hazards to our health today.

As you know, various forms of heart disease still account for more than half of all deaths each year.

At the same time we can be encouraged to note that many heart attack victims of a few years ago can be saved today.

Some of the advances against heart damage are familiar to you.

We have been warned of the necessity of preventing rheumatic fever through careful control of strep throats.

Penicillin has been invaluable not only in the treatment of strep infections but also in the prevention of recurrent attacks for those people with rheumatic hearts.

Dr. Heaton has watched quantities of new information pour out each year on ways to prevent hardening of the arteries.

Heredity, stress, high-fat diets, smoking, and lack of exercise have all been singled out as important factors in causing coronary attacks.

To the physicians' weapons in this field have been added drugs which have the effect to thinning the blood and prevenling the formation of clots.

These anticoaguiants have already been effective in preventing heart disease in many who might otherwise have been attacked.

Other drugs have been instrumental in controlling high blood pressure.

The development of heart surgery has been characterized by the Director of the National Heart Institute, Dr. James Watt, as the "one field that you can specifically say is resulting in the saving of life today."

Most of us are scarcely able to imagine the heart operations being performed today.

Who can consider the possibility of the heart's being deliberately stopped so that the surgeon can work on it while the rest of the body is being run by a machine?

Add to this the fact that spare parts such as heart valves and arteries are now available and it seems that medicine has broken nearly every barrier.

We still have a lot to learn.

I understand that the hardening of arteries is a process still not completely understood although it is subject to a limited amount of control.

We can still make advances in isolating the factors which cause various heard ailments and in this way hope to forestall more effectively the toll of heart disease in our population.

Unfortunately, our progress against cancer has not brought us to a determination of cause in this disease enemy either.

But we are all glad to know that instead of only one in seven persons with cancer who could be saved 20 years ago, today we believe that only one in three persons who contact cancer must die.

Surgery and radiation are no longer a physician's only hope.

Drugs have delayed the course of leukemia; seem to have checked Hodgkin's disease; and occasionally have suppressed a rare type of uterine tumor.

The National Cancer Institute in combination with other governmental and private groups has been carrying on one of the most massive research projects ever attempted in order to screen thousands of compounds with the hope of finding a possible cure for cancer.

Air pollution, radiation, tobacco tars, and other substances are being carefully studied as suspected irritants which may cause cancer.

Some research workers are confident that viruses cause cancer and this leads us to hope that anticancer vaccine is not an idle dream.

In addition to encouraging signs in the search for a cancer cure—progress in the development of diagnostic techniques for the early detection of cancer has meant that control of this enemy through existing weapons has improved greatly.

The remarks of a member of the Committee of Consultants on Medical Research chosen to advise the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare on the level of Government research spending are particularly encouraging with respect to our progress against cancer.

Dr. DeBakey stated at hearings before the Senate committee:

"I think there are two very important areas of progress in this field. One lies in providing a more concentrated attack of the many problems of cancer which will lead to an increase in our fundamental understanding of its causation.

"The other is that in the practical approach to treatment, we have combined several kinds of therapy to be used more effectively in the individual cancer cases."

Dr. Heaton has had opportunity to view developments in still another area, that of mental illness.

The occupancy of more than half of the hospital beds in this country by those afflicted with mental disorders in testimony to the importance of this disease problem.

But in recent years the number of persons discharged from mental institutions to resume normal lives has continued to rise.

This has been made possible in part by the various forms of tranquilizing drugs.

Experimentation with various hospital procedures especially suited to the treatment of mental disorders has also helped return the mental patient to his family with great speed.

We now have "open" mental hospitals with unlocked doors and no bars on the windows.

Night and day hospitals—so-called halfway houses and—in general a more understanding public have helped to bring about these changes.

The more than 10 million sufferers from some sort of rheumatic complaint in this country have watched the medical advances of past years with great interest.

There has been a rapid output of synthetic hormones and steroid drugs and these have provided some relief from the discomforts of arthritis.

We know, however, that these drugs do sometimes have unpleasant side effects, and sure relief for the arthritic is still not in sight.

Diabetics, too, have had good reason to be encouraged by medical advances.

Today one out of five diabetics is able to take a pill instead of an insulin injection.

The oral diabetic drugs are unfortunately not useful for all diabetics, and here again future discoveries may further improve methods of controlling this disorder.

Dr. Heaton's years of medical practice have been marked by other breakthroughs.

Today 80 percent of all epileptics can be kept free of seizures with drugs, and surgical treatment has proven valuable for others.

Drugs and surgery are providing relief for Parkinson's disease; cortisonelike hormones are making the treatment of kidney ailments more effective; radioactive isotopes can be used to scan the brain for tumors before surgery; new relievers of pain and itching; scrutiny of possible vaccines for colds and viruses. I think I could go on endlessly simply naming encouraging advances in the field of medicine.

The drama of these medical gains is similar to the drama of other changes in Dr. Heaton's own life.

The frontier village of Philipsburg has given way to the modern community of today.

The railroads, lumber and coal industry, and countless other forces have altered this community.

I feel certain that as I have discussed these dramatic changes in medical practice there comes to the mind of Dr. Heaton and others in the audience another area of change no less pronounced and no less vital.

This is the change which has taken place in the practice of medicine.

Whereas in 1928, 75 percent of practicing doctors were general practitioners, today only about 40 percent are in general practice.

The increase in the demands of the public for specialized medical care, the increasingly technical nature of medical treatment—these and other factors have changed the character of medical practice throughout the country.

Many have raised their voices to plead for a return to emphasis on the art as well as the science of medicine.

This is a subject Dr. Heaton knows well for I am certain that he has never for a moment lost this art.

The importance of this factor was recently given recognition by the past president of the American Medical Association, Dr. Louis M. Orr, who stated:

"The G.P. (or general practitioner) is still the backbone of American medicine and is best able to preserve personal relationships in healing—85 percent of all illnesses are within the skills of the well-trained G.P.

"Consultants are available for the rest."

The personal relationship which Dr. Heaton has established with this community is a unique one.

We can never for a moment forget the lives he has saved, the babies he has delivered, or the suffering he has relieved.

He organized the local Lions Club; served as coroner of Centre County for 20 years; and has for 28 years been a director and vice president of the State Sabbath School Association.

Philipsburg area children have attended his Sunday school classes for well over 50 years.

We can never show our gratitude adequately, but I trust that as his friends gather about him today to celebrate his 80th birthday, Dr. Heaton senses a part of the deep respect and thankfulness they feel for his dedicated service.

I think that another past president of the American Medical Association, Dr. Gunner Gundersen, summed up the unique contribution of Dr. Heaton and others like him in a speech he made 2 years ago.

Dr. Gundersen said:

"In recent years the individual physician has had an increasingly difficult time in trying to keep up with the accelerated scientific advances in medicine.

"Now with man probing into outer space, it appears that our scientific future will be further complicated by the development of still another specialty—space medicine.

"Nevertheless, right here on terra firma it is more than ever true that medicine is a lifelong study, one which actually is just beginning when the doctor receives his doctor of medicine degree or completes his graduate training.

"Meanwhile, we are also reemphasizing the emotional, personal, and spiritual factors in medical care.

"The age-old art of medicine—that intangible element made up of compassion and warmth—is regaining its proper place.

"In medicine, as in all other phases of life, we are rediscovering that philosophy is just as important as technology, that the human personality cannot be subordinated to crisp efficiency."

As I conclude my tribute to Dr. Heaton I wish to join the thousands of his fellow citizens and admirers in not only saluting him as a great American and a credit to the medical profession but a humanitarian who by his consideration of his fellow man has enshrined himself in the hearts of those fortunate to have known him.

Happy birthday, Dr. Heaton, and many more of them.

Committee on Un-American Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 29, 1960

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, a patriotic group in San Diego, Calif., has just concluded a 4-day seminar on the dangers of internal subversion by the international Communist conspiracy. The final speaker was Adm. Richard Arens, former counsel to the House Un-American Activities Committee. I have received many wires from those in attendance saying his address was received by a standing ovation of the 1,200 people in attendance.

This is further indication that the general public is in full support of the House Un-American Activities Committee and the Senate Internal Security Committee, as opposed to the numerous Communist fronts which are constantly trying to destroy the efficacy of these committees.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 29, 1960

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of August 27, 1960:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

In Congress, the Democrat leadership is caught in a snare of its own making; namely, the reconvening of Congress after the political conventions. It is a fact that Congress could indeed have finished the year's work earlier. Congress' program of work is solely under the jurisdiction of the Democrat leaders and their preponderant majorities in both Houses. Little that is constructive can be accomplished now in an atmosphere so politically supercharged that objectivity of judgment and statesmanship is much less possible. The House virtually marks time while the other body, the Senate, engages in a showy political power struggle before hordes of sightseers. The consensus of feeling here is that the sooner Congress adjourns, the better off the political parties and the country will be.

The suspension of section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934 by amendment passed overwhelmingly and clears the way for political debates by the presidential nominees. Originally, Congress required that political opponents be granted equal time on television. Now the presidential and vice presidential nominees are to be granted time voluntarily by television stations and networks for the 1960 campaign only. Thus the original danger (which the law sought to correct) of favoritism to a particular candidate or party is reinstated, although the intent of the amendment is to entitle each candidate to 1 hour per week for the 8-week period beginning September 1.

Amending the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 (passed 395 to 3) brought to our attention the fact that millions of pieces of Communist propaganda are being mailed into our country and circulated through U.S. mails to individuals, schools, legislators, and organizations to influence and warp individuals' minds. The amendment therefore was to close the loopholes in the original act to require the registration of agents disseminating such political propaganda and the labeling of it as such on entrance into this country.

The extension of the Library Services Act for another 5 years (beyond the original 4 years) presented another typical congressional action of making permanent in effect the originally alleged temporary subsidy of rural library facilities. Here's the reasoning: Rural communities need libraries; Congress recognizes this need; the Federal Government extends funds (and Federal terms), available if matched by the States. Then it follows that any acceptance by States of this money and program demonstrates the recognition of need and the States endorsement of the program. This, of course, precludes any argument that States endorse a Federal program in order to get money back. Sometimes I wonder if Federal legislators give the States and localities credit for any self-motivation. And so the Federal bureaucracy grows. Debate forcefully demonstrated that the need is already being met, the States can handle the situation alone, the program can be tapered off, and that men must seek the books, not books the men.

House Joint Resolution 615 requiring the consent of Congress for future amendments to the Port of New York Authority Compact brought a sharp conflict between Federal versus States rights in a unique way. A majority of the Judiciary Committee, headed by Chairman CELLER, brought contempt of Congress citations against three members of the port authority for refusal to submit all data concerning port operation at the committee's request. So the constitutional question was raised whether Congress had the authority to demand the records. New York and New Jersey had made a bi-State compact. The Constitution clearly permits Congress to grant or repeal a compact between States, but Congress does not have the power to supervise or regulate activities between the States. Yet the House voted to cite the port members of contempt and to force the two States to submit to Federal regulation. The 270 to 124 recorded vote shows how easily the Constitution can be reinterpreted by a majority. It is noteworthy that in the 2-hour debate only 20 minutes was allocated to those holding the States rights position. Strongly worded communications were received during debate from Governors Harriman, Rockefeller, Meyner, Lehman, and Dewey against this instance of the violation of States rights and centralization of government at the Federal level. As one Congressman put it, thinking of the past liberal activities of these men, "It is so gratifying to see the chickens come home to roost."

Senate Joint Resolution 170 passed 349 to 39 (ALGER against) and becomes more alarming as I think of it. This resolution, apparently innocuous, is to authorize the designation of a Commission of 20 U.S. citizens to meet with other citizens of the NATO countries "for the purpose of developing paths toward greater political and economic cooperation within the alliance" for "nonmilitary collaboration in the political and economic areas." This sounds great but there are no guidelines or goals set out. If it means economic aid, we have already empowered 72 other countries to think up ways to give away U.S. money. If it's political, then we remember that "One-World do-goodism" ends up with loss of U.S. sovereignty. As one Member said, "I can't be for organizations which end up in the United States alone paying the lion's share of the cost, getting only one vote, and giving up sovereignty." True, my suspicions may be groundless, but the Hoover Commission, to which this was compared, had ground rules and goals. It seems to me that this is too dangerous an area for us to take lightly or without proper direction and specific goals.

Construction Contractors' Difficulty in Obtaining Loans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 29, 1960

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, the recent article appearing in the magazine Construction Equipment, a Conover-Mast publication, is a most interesting article regarding the construction industry outlining the difficulty contractors themselves often have in borrowing money.

Having worked very closely with the GI housing program I can appreciate how reluctant some bankers are to loan money at current interest rates.

One quote from the Conover-Mast publication says:

If the bankers would take the trouble to learn more about this dynamic industry, they would find that contractors are good risks.

Our GI's have proved to be good risks also. I hope the entire construction industry can be helped.

I direct your attention to the May issue of Construction Equipment magazine and the article on "How To Get Money." A copy of this can be obtained from Conover-Mast.

A Report to the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 29, 1960

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, as has been my custom, throughout my public life, I desire to include at this time a summary account of my activities and speeches during this 86th Congress.

NEW REGULATIONS

In accord with your direction on speech limitation, and the current regulations of the Joint Committee on Printing on "retrenchment in extensions," I shall necessarily be restricted in my objective. I will observe the rules of the House, which I always have, while doing my best to comply with the duty I have.

A MORAL OBLIGATION

In my conscientious conviction, the Biblical mandate "to render an account of thy stewardship" imposes upon every responsible public officeholder a moral obligation. It is an obligation that I have always and consistently attempted to fulfill.

Realizing the thousands of bills that were introduced in this Congress, and the several hundred public laws enacted, it is obviously impossible to completely cover the whole record, especially in view of the new space and time regulations. However, I shall, herein, try to present and reveal my personal pronouncements and actions upon some of the more important and more widely publicized legislative issues of this 86th Congress.

AN EXPLANATORY WORD

Mr. Speaker, in the past "stewardship accounts" which I have given here, it was my custom to accompany the inclusion of my remarks upon particular measures and issues with an outline of what I felt to be the background and significance of each bill. Today I am confronted with a restriction on that custom and the task I am attempting here is a little more difficult on that account; however, I shall probably have opportunities to enlarge upon my report here after the adjournment of the Congress.

Meanwhile, I think I can best carry out my duty, under the circumstances,

through revealing my stand on some of the prominent legislative issues by reviewing the speeches and remarks I made on the particular occasions. The listing will be made not so much in any chronological order, since the report summarizes a 2-year period, but more in an effort to present problems in accord with the importance the general public appears to attach to them. Any necessary accompanying remarks will be kept as brief as possible. Of course, the great majority of our people are aware that most of our important legislative actions these days are for the continuation and amendment of laws that are already in effect and which are expanded or modified, by our determinations here, through the succeeding years.

Military Security and Communist Containment

Guaranteed Defense Appropriations, Yes; Extravagance and Waste, No

(Thursday, June 9, 1960)

Mr. Donohue. Mr. Speaker, in the wake of the unhappy collapse of the Paris summit meeting, and the apparent cancellation of the U–2 intelligence information flights, there is much talk about the necessity for increasing the proposed military budget of $39.3 billion.

Indeed, there is no question about the imperative necessity, in the light of the belligerent attitude of the Kremlin, of our military forces being fully prepared to protect the security of the United States against any surprise move by the Soviets. It would seem logical in the consideration of our recent experiences with Russia that the proposal to maintain an airborne alert at all times be reexamined, and that our research and development activities in the space field be accelerated.

If these, and other proposed military security provisions, require additional appropriations, over and above what the House has appropriated, then, of course, such additions must be seriously entertained. It is evident from the recent actions of the Senate Defense Appropriations Subcommittee that the Members of that body feel that the Nation's military power should be increased.

When the House returns to the consideration of this grave subject, in the near future, I most earnestly hope we will not be of a spirit to disregard the necessity for including every reasonable safeguard against and restriction upon wasteful and extravagant military spending that we can. Thirty-nine and a third billion dollars is an awful lot of money and its very enormity provides an avenue for careless and negligent expenditures.

As you all realize, this House levied a 3-percent cut in the $13 billion military procurement fund in the bill in an attempt to force the Defense Department to adopt more economical and frugal procurement practices.

On this score the Comptroller General, in his recent report, pointed out the existence of waste and inefficiency, by the Defense Department, in its management of electronic supplies of the military services.

He revealed that a recent review disclosed that electronic equipment valued at $2.5 million was being unnecessarily repaired at a cost of $680,000 when usable items were available in large quantities in the other services.

He indicated that unnecessary administrative costs were being incurred because there are six independent organizations performing the same or similar stock management functions.

In past reports multitudinous examples of extravagance and waste by the Defense Department have been disclosed through the use of negotiated contracts instead of competitive bidding and confused and antiquated bookkeeping methods.

Mr. Speaker, it is the duty of the Congress, and of the administration itself, to insure that the purse strings operated by the various departments of the Defense Department are kept sensibly and economically tight. Closer supervision of negotiated contracts to prevent exorbitant profits and a wider use of competitive bidding practices would do much to save the taxpayers' money.

A more strict adherence to the provisions of the Budget and Accounting Procedures Act of 1950, and a better organized central procurement unit would go far toward preventing duplication and waste.

Adequate national defense is indeed vital but the people of this country are seriously disturbed by the continuing revelations of wasteful and extravagant spending by the military without regard to the fact that each and every penny spent comes out of the hard earned, and highly taxed, pay of the average American workingman and business. The duty of the Defense Department to guarantee our security does not carry with it any license to indulge in loose and careless financial practices.

With past experience in mind, and with due respect to whatever action the Senate may take, I hope that this House will continue to impress upon the Defense Department that economic frugality and wise spending can be a mark of efficiency in the military field as well as it is of an enterprising business.

If and when an emergency hour should come immediate authorization can always and readily be given to place the military on an actual war spending scale.

Mutual Security

(Tuesday, July 28, 1959)

Mr. Donohue. Mr. Chairman, as I see it, this debate on the reduced and reasonable continuation of our mutual security aid program should begin with a concrete demonstration of our deepest concern for our overburdened American taxpayers.

That legislative concern should be even more concentrated and emphasized because of the factual evidence in the record, by the Draper Committee, the Comptroller General, himself, and our congressional committees, "of waste and extravagance—a pattern of loose, lax administration through the entire complex of foreign aid—and refusal of the ICA to provide information."

I earnestly hope that in the phases of the program where this extravagance and waste has been displayed the recommended reductions will be approved.

The divisions of this program which appear to have been operated and projected in the best interests of ourselves and the advancement of our foreign allies are the technical assistance and Development Loan Fund extensions. I hope that these features will be adequately supported as their worth has been substantially proven.

Let us strive today to conscientiously enact a measure that will provide reasonable assistance to our allies, in the fields where such help is most needed, while we insure elimination of those parts of the program which have been proved wasteful and worthless.

(Friday, August 26, 1960)

Mr. Donohue. Mr. Speaker, over the past few years, when we have been debating this mutual security appropriations bill, I have emphasized my belief that the parts of the program which have proved of substantial worth by experience, such as technical assistance to underdeveloped countries and Development Loan Fund operations, should be adequately supported, and the most careful examination, in the interests of the American taxpayers, should be concentrated upon those phases of the program in which impressive evidence has been demonstrated in revelation of great waste and extravagance.

I very greatly fear that, particularly these days, we too often overlook the fact that without the existence of a high morale among our own citizens neither this program, nor any other, will ever accomplish their full objectives. The only legislative way in which we can encourage the morale of our own people is by proving to them that we intend to fulfill our responsibility of protecting this foreign investment for them, and by showing them that we are not neglecting their domestic needs because of loose and extravagant spending abroad.

The Communist Captive Nations Must Never Be Abandoned

(Monday, May 2, 1960)

Mr. Donohue. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of this resolution, designed to influence the restoration of the fundamental freedoms and God-given rights of the subjugated peoples now existing in Communist captive nations, I most earnestly hope this House will promptly and unanimously approve it.

As we all know, in numerous and repetitive documents and agreements, the great powers of the world, including Soviet Russia, have pledged and promised the persecuted peoples of these nations the return of their national freedom and personal liberties. The United States has consistently attempted to have these promises carried out but Russia still denies these countries the right of free elections and independent sovereignty.

To my mind the adoption of this resolution will add substantial strength to the position of the President when he meets with the Soviet leaders at the approaching summit conference. The Communist rulers, by our action, will be emphatically reminded that it is the sense of this Congress that no firm and lasting agreements for peace can be made while the world remains practically half free and half slave. By our action the rest of the free world can be concretely convinced this Nation will not abandon her traditional principles of free government for all peoples and the captive nations themselves will be further inspired to remain adamant in their determination to reject any Communist entreaties for cooperative existence under the Soviet system.

The fact and the truth is that the Russian Kremlin is solely responsible for the inhuman slavery being imposed upon the brave peoples of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Lithuania, Estonia, Latvia, Bulgaria, Hungary, Rumania, and all the other captive countries. It is also unfortunately true that we have suffered many disastrous propaganda defeats at the hands of the Russians.

Not the least of the purposes of this resolution is an attempt to meet the Russians in their own most effective field. Unlike their multitudinous and skillful distortions for propaganda purposes, we are telling the truth. If the Kremlin leaders want to prove their sincerity in seeking peace in the world then let them simply declare freedom for the captive nations. That is the first and fundamental step that must be taken before there can be any reasonable hope for the achievement of a peaceful world.

Let us then promptly approve this resolution to encourage the Soviet rulers to take this first just action and then proceed, at the summit, to the adoption of agreements for all of us to live, in good will and good faith, in a world at peace.

DOMESTIC PROGRESS AND AMERICAN MORALE

Mr. Speaker, it has been my growing fear over the last several years, and I have repeatedly expressed it here, that in our concentration upon foreign affairs and Communist containment measures, we are tempted to entirely neglect or unwisely retrench domestic programs primarily designed to keep American progress on the march and retain the morale of the American people at a high level.

Many times I have here emphasized my deep conviction that it would be ironical, indeed, to overexert ourselves in retaining the friendship of foreign allies, while at the same time we encourage the decline of morale among our own people by neglecting their essential needs.

I have felt it my duty to continuously point out to this body that at a time when we are telling the world of our better way of life, as opposed to Communist regimentation, it could be dangerously impractical to eliminate or cripple any of those public services and programs whose contribution to the progress of the country have been nationally recognized and which sustain the vitally important high morale of our people to determinedly endure the sacrifices required to win the cold war.

This is the basic thought contained in my remarks upon such recognized legislative programs of domestic progress as social security expansion, medical aid for the elderly, appropriations for health, education, and welfare, aid to economically distressed areas, adequate American housing, fair labor standards amendments, and a host of other measures fundamentally intended for the good of all Americans.

Extracts from my speeches in the House on these various subjects follow:

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS

(Wednesday, June 22, 1960)

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, unfortunately it is quite evident there is much fear and distressing doubt in the minds of a goodly number of Members here that this proposal, H.R. 12580, the Social Security Amendments of 1960, is as reasonable and realistically responsive as it could and should be to the needs and the desires of the great majority of American citizens. Under such circumstances we are, unhappily, because of the closed rule under which we are operating, permitted to vote only for or against the whole bill, without modifications.

Being restricted, then, to these two choices, I intend to support the bill because it does provide an extension and expansion of a limited number of benefits to those people whose needs are most urgent.

For instance, the bill removes the age 50 eligibility requirement for disability benefits; it liberalizes the eligibility requirements of old age, survivors, and disability benefits; it makes certain improvements in the social security benefit protection for children and extends benefit eligibility to more widows; it effectuates certain improvements in the administrative financing and solvency provisions of the unemployment compensation system, as well as extending its coverage; it extends coverage to groups that were not before included. All these improvements are good and they have already been carefully and thoroughly explained by the distinguished chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee.

Unfortunately, the committee has not seen fit to recommend other advances and improvements which a great many of us have been advocating with the earnest hope that they would be included in this measure. Chief among these would be provisions to reduce the retirement age, especially for women, and particularly for widows; to increase the minimum benefits in accord with rising living costs; and realistically raise the outmoded and outdated basic income limitations.

TITLE XVI

Of course, the major fears and doubts about the substantial worth of this measure are concentrated on the most controversial new title XVI, which would initiate a new Federal-State grants-in-aid program to help the States assist low-income aged individuals who need help to meet their medical expenses. In my own opinion this title, and its provisions, fall far short of adequately and equitably assisting our older citizens in the desperate financial distress they tragically encounter from the ills and the sicknesses so common in the later stages of life.

It is my earnest hope that after this measure is considered, and probably changed, in the Senate, we may yet have the opportunity to repair and strengthen this title so that a far more equitable and effective program of medical service and hospitalization treatment assistance may be granted to the millions of aged Americans so desperately and despairingly in need of it.

MEDICAL AID FOR THE AGED

(Thursday, June 9, 1960)

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, despite our vaunted boast of high living standards and Christian concern for the well-being of all our people it remains a fact that the United States is the only major industrial country in the world without some form of national medical insurance for its elderly and retired citizens.

From the overwhelming evidence in the record, contained in economic statistics and the testimony of experts, it is painfully obvious that our aged people are in imperative need of some type of Federal medical aid.

According to Dr. Porterfield, Deputy Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service, out of the 10 million persons in the Nation who have heart disease, 4 million are 65 or older. At any given time, some 750,000 persons have cancer and most of these are persons over 65. Almost 3 million individuals have diabetes and the aged account for the majority. This is also true of the 5 million suffering from arthritis and the 6 million who are affected by related rheumatic disorders. Each of these diseases brings with it the high costs of medical and hospitalization treatment as well as the need for expensive drugs. In considering these dramatic and disturbing figures let us not forget that medical costs have increased 46 percent in the last 10 years.

The economic distress caused by these advanced medical costs is even more impressive when we realize that 74 percent of the aged have income of nothing to $1,000; 11 percent have incomes from $1,000 to $2,000; and only 15 percent have incomes of $2,000 and more. These statistics make us consciously appreciate that illness among the elderly is truly a staggering and discouraging financial burden.

There is no common sense in any attempt to deny or gloss over this obvious national problem, and the urgent necessity of promptly dealing with it. The administration itself has openly admitted its existence. There remains only the legislative task and duty of designing a measure acceptable to the Congress and the President, which will extend the fullest and most equitable Federal insurance possible to the desperate aged in their gallant fight against the economic distress and discouragement of costly sickness in their declining years.

Mr. Speaker, I earnestly hope this session of the Congress will not conclude until those of us, in the Congress and the administration who have the responsibility, have fully discharged our duty and obligation to the elderly citizens of this blessed and bountiful country.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL

(Tuesday, March 29, 1960)

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, it was the unanimous judgment of our Original Thirteen States, as expressed in their Independence Declaration, that all men are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

In my opinion there is no measure coming before this body more fully designed to promote the enjoyment of these rights to American citizens than the appropriations bill, now under consideration, for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961. The basic units and activities of these executive departments are more closely connected with the lives of our citizens than any other agency of our Government "for the people."

That is why I would feel remiss in my duty if I did not urge you all to approve and accept the appropriation here unanimously reported and recommended to us by the distinguished Subcommittee on Appropriations directed by our esteemed colleague, the Honorable JOHN E. FOGARTY, of Rhode Island. The recommendations of the subcommittee are unanimous and represent the best compromise decision of reasonable and capable men.

Mr. Chairman, to attempt to either regulate or improve the health and happiness of human beings in terms of dollars and cents is a most difficult, if not impossible, task. We are all, I am certain, agreed on the necessity for practicing economy in Government expenditures and to preserve our financial stability and world position. However, I think we are further agreed that gestures of doubtful economy at the expense of lowering national standards of working conditions, health protection, and educational advancement is most unwise and impractical, more especially in these days of communistic competition.

For that fundamental reason, I most earnestly hope that no crippling reductions will be attempted during our action on this bill; indeed, it is my deepest hope that the moderate increases recommended by the subcommittee and the chairman, principally in the fields of hospital construction, vocational education, assistance to the schools in federally impacted areas, grants to States to build waste-treatment plants, and research at the National Institutes of Health will be unanimously accepted.

I would like to emphasize that the subcommittee has not advocated general increases in all the areas covered by this bill. The subcommittee adopted the very sensible approach that there are certain selective and essential areas of public need that can and must be met in the national interest. It would be most difficult to justify any wide disagreement on these specific activities the subcommittee has chosen for their special attention.

The fundamental objective of the subcommittee, so obviously and patriotically revealed in their report, was to keep all of the many and varied activities of these two major public service departments of Government in operation at their highest economically efficient level while encouraging a selected few activities to moderately advance their scope of service in response to particular and proven expanding public needs.

Mr. Chairman, the appropriations we grant under this measure are designed to continuously improve the Christian, civilized working conditions of our people and to protect and advance the health of all our citizens, particularly children, women, and the aged. It is obvious, therefore, that this

appropriations bill is of the greatest importance to the progress of our national welfare and that is why each of us have the highest obligation to devote the most conscientious attention to it.

At a time when we are generously granting billions of dollars to aid our foreign allies, let us not be neglectful of our own citizens. At a time when we are telling the world of our better way of life, as opposed to Communist barbarism, let us not dangerously reduce any of these public services whose contributions to national progress have been universally acknowledged. At a time when we are engaged in a life-and-death struggle with the curse of communism, let us take no unwise chances of disrupting the high morale of our own good people. In conscience, let us vote in support of the continuing and full functioning of these units and agencies whose services are, indeed, in the national interest and emphatically good for all Americans.

FEDERAL AID TO DISTRESSED AREAS IS URGENT

(Thursday, June 9, 1960)

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, as you are well aware, the whole matter of depressed areas was thoroughly explored and debated during our recent House approval of the aid-to-depressed-areas bill, and I am not going to, at this hour, unnecessarily belabor the subject.

The Department of Labor officially testified to the existence of multitudinous pockets of economic distress and decline throughout the country, and we have our unhappy share of them in the New England region and within my own home State of Massachusetts. It has been demonstrated that the economic distress in these areas cannot be alleviated by the resources of area industries and municipal authority alone.

Unfortunately, the President saw fit to veto the bill to extend these areas Federal aid and the Congress did not override the veto. However, the President did express his hope "that suitable legislation would be enacted at this session of the Congress."

Mr. Speaker, on that hope, and in that spirit, I most earnestly urge that the leadership, together with administration representatives, will work out compromise legislation that can be presented and acted upon by the Congress before adjournment.

ADEQUATE HOUSING FOR THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

(Thursday, August 27, 1959)

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, this is, we might say, the "second time around" on housing legislation, so there is no need to inflict any repetitive recital of statistical information upon you.

In my own opinion the evidence and information provided to us in proof of housing deficiencies in this great country and the essentiality of an adequate continuing program has been overwhelming. The distinguished chairman of the committee, and his diligent associates, have worked tirelessly to bring a sound measure before us, and both he and they deserve our deepest thanks and congratulations. They have made a substantial effort, in good faith, and in accord with high principles, to present a revised bill to reasonably meet Presidential objections.

As you are all aware, the measure still contains, and I earnestly hope they will be retained, provisions for loans and grants for slum elimination, college dormitories and classrooms, housing for the elderly, nursing homes, and an additional $8 billion of authority for FHA to continue its mortgage loan insurance program. If these features, yet more limited than many of us think wise, are not in the best national interest, then I confess I do not know what is.

As you all further realize, this new measure represents a reduction in Federal housing grants of 27 percent below the amount in the previously vetoed bill and a cut of 17 percent in loans.

Mr. Chairman, I want to remind my colleagues that we have been urged in the past and we will be called upon again in the future, ironically by many of the same people who desire to cripple this housing bill, to approve the granting and the loaning of billions of the American taxpayer's money for the rehabilitation of foreign nations and assistance to underdeveloped countries. If we can afford to continue and expand that gigantic program, then certainly we can afford to carry on a moderate housing program to alleviate the desperate needs of our own citizens for decent housing, slum clearance, and college facilities.

I hope you will all give your most conscientious consideration to the compromise merits of this bill and pass it without stifling amendments.

FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT

(Thursday, June 30, 1960)

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to urge unanimous approval of this bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act by increasing the minimum wage and otherwise providing progressive changes in the present act.

Primarily I urge approval of this bill because it is clearly another advance toward fulfillment of the declared policy of the original Fair Labor Standards Act, "to correct, and as rapidly as practicable, to eliminate labor conditions detrimental to the maintenance of the minimum standard of living necessary for health, efficiency, and general well-being of workers."

According to a study made by the Bureau of Labor Statistics among 34 cities in the country, the basic budget required for a minimum standard of living, for a family of 4, varied from $3,812 to $4,454. Even with these admittedly low budget figures and estimates it would require a minimum wage of $1.91 per hour to earn enough to meet the barest needs for a decent standard of living as defined by this study.

In dwelling upon this problem let us not forget the most impressive lesson of the unfortunate depression of the early 1930's, that lack of purchasing power in the hands of our lowest income families, who necessarily spend the most, brings about widespread unemployment, hardships, and economic stagnation. It profits us nothing to possess the greatest industrial production potential in the world if low wages and low consumer income prevent millions of Americans from buying these products.

Mr. Chairman, we are here obligated to enact laws designed to assist, not hinder, all those who are patriotically and conscientiously trying to be fair, honest, and decent in their employment obligations and industrial operations. We are here obligated to enact laws primarily designed to advance the general welfare. In compliance with and in the spirit of that high duty I urge you all to approve this minimum wage raise legislation now, while we, at the same time, pledge ourselves to be continuously and conscientiously concerned with the further advancement of American living standards and national economic progress.

LEGISLATION FOR THE GOOD OF ALL AMERICANS

Mr. Speaker, over the past 4 years, as international tensions mounted, our country and the Congress have increasingly recognize that we cannot hope to retain our boasted leadership in advocating freedom and liberty for all peoples everywhere if we continue to deny certain rights and privileges to some of our own citizens, including the right to vote in our State and National elections without harassment.

It became clearly apparent that we were losing much prestige among many peoples, particularly in Asia and Africa, because of this obvious contradiction and being subjected to embarrassing criticism and ridicule by the skillful propaganda organs of Communist Russia.

It was my privilege on May 21, 1956, to favorably report, on behalf of the House Judiciary Committee, of which I am a member, H.R. 627, of the 84th Congress, a bill which was known as the Civil Rights Act of 1956. With some amendments, this measure passed the House in 1956, but was not reached by the Senate before that Congress concluded.

At the beginning of the 85th Congress in 1957, this measure, under a new number, H.R. 6127, passed both the House and Senate and was signed by the President. It is identified as Public Law 315, of the 85th Congress, and was called the Civil Rights Act of 1957.

I am modestly proud of the cooperative part I played in providing the background that resulted in the passage of this law, which was characterized by authorities as the first real step forward in the field of civil rights in almost a century. This law, I am pleased to say, was improved and expanded in this 86th Congress.

Extracts from my remarks on this important legislation when it was presented to the House, and on other measures affecting the progress and welfare of all Americans follow:

CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1960

(Monday, March 14, 1960)

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, as we are about to begin the day of decisive action on civil rights, reflecting that the Senate is entering its fifth week of deliberation on this subject, it may be pertinent to remind ourselves that the fundamental business of the Congress is to legislate.

Let us emphasize, further, to ourselves that our primary obligation is fulfilling this business is to protect and expand the basic rights and freedoms guaranteed to our American citizens under the Constitution; paramount among such is the right to vote.

Our primary purpose here today is, then, to enact the best legislative measure that reasonable men can devise to insure every qualified individual in this Nation can exercise the right to vote in the fullest freedom.

We all realize that the legislative action along these lines that occurred in 1957 was the first real step forward in this field in almost a century.

In my own opinion, our exhaustive efforts should be exercised to have included in the final bill we approve provisions to effectively protect the right to vote through a system of either Federal registrars or referees; to eliminate the vicious and un-American hate bombings; to erect requirements for the preservation of voting records; to provide Federal education for children of service personnel in areas where public schools are closed; and to effectively prevent unwarranted and illegal obstruction, in any form, of duly issued Federal court orders in school-desegregation cases.

The encouraging eyes of all American citizens are directed upon the Congress today; the questioning eyes of allied and hesitating peoples abroad are centered upon us during this debate; the cynical eyes of the Kremlin leaders are fastened on the legislative capital of the world, waiting, with propaganda fangs exposed, to see if we can and

will grant to each of our own citizens the rights and privileges we claim to espouse for all peoples everywhere. This is a fateful hour in the destiny of our blessed country, and the Congress is faced with one of the greatest legislative challenges of our history.

There is vital need for us to exercise restrained emotion, subdued prejudice, heightened conscience, and supreme patriotism for the welfare and preservation of America and the free world.

Let us be patient with each other, let us be tolerant of one another's deepest convictions, and let us resolutely unite in devotion to duty.

Above all, let us legislate. Let us decide that when our work is done we shall have enacted another milestone, for all the world to see, in advancement of the traditions upon which this great Nation was founded and upon which, the Creator willing, it will endure as the free world's leader against every provocation and every challenge of the Communist government of atheistic Russia.

SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION ASSISTANCE ACT

(Thursday, May 26, 1960)

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, because of the overwhelming evidence on record showing the urgent need of improving school facilities throughout the Nation, I rise in support of this bill granting reasonable Federal assistance to the States for such purpose.

There is no need for me to reiterate the testimony of the multitudinous officials of States and municipalities demonstrating that their various States are wholly unable to provide, from their own drained resources, the urgently required improvements in school facilities.

The two basic factors involved are the need for school improvements and the inability of the States to construct them. Since these two factors have been proved beyond question, it appears to me that there should be no reasonable doubt that this measure should be approved.

With full realization of the consequences that may follow from the collapse of the Paris summit meeting, there ought to be no uncertainty about the imperative necessity of accelerating our preparations to meet the Russian Communists on every front, including the educational front. Realistically admitting our past mistakes and factually facing the import of a long, continuing cold war atmosphere, let us wisely now take the steps to guarantee that our youth will be adequately trained to meet and beat the Communist challenges in the future.

There can be no better or wiser economic planning for the future security of America than a reasonable investment for the superior schooling of the country's children. Let us endorse and approve that practical investment today.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT REPORTING AND DISCLOSURE ACT

(Wednesday, August 12, 1959)

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, for the better part of 2 days we have been dutifully listening to the sponsors and proponents of these several labor-management reform proposals explain the substance of their different intents and designs, down to their last technical meaning and application. I think they should all be commended for their earnestness, sincerity, and painstaking efforts, even though we may not fully agree with each of them.

The fundamental that we should scrupulously recall is the basic axiom that punitive, extreme legislation, emanating from emotion, prejudice and misguided fervor is the worst sin that any legislative body can commit. All the pages of legislative history disclose that axiom and on it all legislative authorities agree.

Let us forcefully remind ourselves that the original intent and patriotic objective in dealing with this problem was to enact legislation that would rid labor-management operations of "crooks and gangsters," eliminate certain corrupt practices, while at the same time insuring that the rank and file American workingman and women is not deprived of the rights and benefits developed for themselves and their families through the legitimate activities of labor and management within our economic society. There are no irreconcilable provisions within the Senate passed measure and the proposals before us that cannot be sensibly fused and compromised by reasonable men.

Let us then look into our hearts, our minds, and our consciences in patriotic devotion to our duty of enacting a Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act that will effectively cure the evils that we all decry while it preserves and strengthens the stability of our economic household, which, divided against itself, in adamant controversy, will surely fall an easy prey to the Communist enslavement design, almost on the eve of the visit of the chief Communist dictator to this Nation which proudly proclaims itself the cradle of justice.

SMALL BUSINESS ASSISTANCE ACT

(Monday, August 29, 1960)

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, it has been always an unquestioned American tradition that this Government shall aid, counsel, assist, and protect the interests of small business in order to preserve our democratic system of free competitive enterprise.

That is why I advocated and voted for the passage of the original legislation establishing a permanent, independent Small Business Administration agency. Recognizing the importance of our small businesses in defense production efforts and the national economy I have consistently urged every reasonable Federal assistance and guidance to them throughout my congressional service.

Last June this body approved H.R. 11207, designed to increase the Small Business Administration's revolving fund for its regular loan program, to provide for a wider participation by small business concerns in the subcontracting phase of Government procurement and to authorize the agency to set up a small business subcontracting program.

While this bill does not offer the complete assistance a good many of us have advocated it does contain elements of material encouragement and aid desperately needed by small business to survive.

Mr. Speaker, the House-passed measure, together with a Senate-passed version is now in conference. I most earnestly hope the leadership on both sides, in both Chambers, will use their combined influence in having the conferees reach sensible agreement and report the bill back for congressional action before adjournment.

VETERANS LEGISLATIVE MEASURES

(Monday, August 29, 1960)

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, as you and the Members are aware, it was my privilege, upon entering this House, to serve for 4 years on the Veterans' Affairs Committee. My activities, here and on that committee, on behalf of our veterans, their families, and dependents, are well-known and have been publicly recognized. Personal commendations, for these efforts, have been conferred upon me by the Disabled American Veterans, the Order of the Purple Heart, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the American Legion, as well as several other veterans organizations.

This Congress devoted considerable time to measures affecting our veterans and the record shows that more than 30 such measures were enacted into law. Prominent among them, which I supported, were measures to extend for 2 years the VA direct loan and loan guarantee program; to increase the presumptive period to 3 years for service connection for the disease of multiple sclerosis; to expand the program of assistance for severely disabled veterans in acquiring suitable homes; to reimburse State veterans facilities to a maximum of $912.50 a year per veteran for care of veterans who would be eligible for treatment in VA hospital or domiciliary centers; to modify the educational training regulations to permit veterans to change their program under certain conditions to attain high educational degrees; and to authorize payment of service-connected death compensation to certain eligible widows of veterans.

WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT

(Tuesday, February 9, 1960)

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I earnestly hope that this House will accept and approve this conference report without undue delay and extended debate.

The very title of the bill, the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, is indicative of its whole purpose to protect the lives and safety of American citizens and assist our various American communities in constructing the necessary sewage treatment projects. Certainly any program that has to do with the prevention of wholesale dangers to the lives of our citizens is of substantial economic worth.

The amount of money this bill would annually provide for the objectives that are outlined is within reason, and the objectives are of vital importance to the communities concerned.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EMPLOYMENT FOR OLDER WORKERS

(Thursday, June 9, 1960)

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, there is still time and I most earnestly hope we will be granted the opportunity to act before adjournment on one of the many bills, including my own, H.R. 12106, which have been introduced and are designed to eliminate discriminatory employment practices on account of age by contractors and subcontractors in the performance of contracts with the United States and the District of Columbia.

The reluctance or refusal of employers to engage older workers is a national handicap. The report by the U.S. Department of Labor, conducted in 1956, disclosed that 58 percent of job openings had some upper age restriction; 52 percent barred workers 55 and over; 41 percent barred those 45 and over; and 20 percent barred those 35 and over.

There is then, Mr. Speaker, the obvious need for the establishment, now, of this public policy, and approval of this legislation ought not to be further delayed.

All of the measures proposed are in full accord with our basic American tradition; they are all economically feasible, and they are all in the best national interest. The impact of this proposed legislation is entirely reasonable and includes provision for formal hearings, judicial appeal, and the exercise of Presidential discretion.

In patriotic consideration of the national welfare and in Christian concern for our older workers, I sincerely hope that this proposed legislation will soon be placed before the Congress for action.

EXCISE TAX REDUCTIONS

(Wednesday, June 8, 1960)

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make it plain that I have no objection against title I of this bill, providing for a

temporary increase in the statutory debt limit, as requested by the administration. If that was the sole title and provision of this measure I would vote in favor of it as I have done in the past.

However, and unfortunately, title II of the bill, providing for the continuation of certain existing excise taxes presents a conscientious challenge to me and many other members of this body. It involves a matter of keeping faith with ourselves and the general public, as well as affording some little relief to persons and industries suffering severe economic distress. As you all know, when this subject was being acted upon just about a year ago the promise was made that certain excise taxes, particularly in the field of telephone service and passenger transportation, would be reduced and repealed.

These taxes, and others, were imposed during the World War II period, as emergency measures, and it was even then intimated they would endure only through the war duration; that time has long since passed. Today most of these taxed articles and services cannot be considered luxuries; they are closer to the nature of necessities. In many areas they create unusual and severe economic hardships upon persons and industries and there is real doubt about their overall economic soundness and wisdom.

Under these circumstances, together with the word that was made and the promise that is on the record, I am constrained to vote against this bill with the hope title I may be hereafter presented for separate consideration.

WORCESTER FLOOD DIVERSIONARY TUNNEL

(Monday, August 29, 1960)

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, it was a matter of very great, but humble, personal satisfaction to me, to attend recently, on July 8, last, the dedication exercises marking the operational opening and completion of the Worcester flood diversionary tunnel.

This flood diversionary project, primarily designed for the preservation of the lives and property of my fellow area citizens, is one of the most important things accomplished during my service in the Congress and I can assure you there was nothing upon which more concentrated work was expended.

In the pursuit of approval for the enabling and continuing appropriations legislative action necessary, covering nearly 5 years, I appeared three times before the House Public Works Committee, four times before the House Appropriations Public Works Subcommittee, and spoke several times in the House Chamber in support of this tunnel.

Its completion may well be considered a monument to those who lost their lives and family fortunes in the frightening flood waters and an inspiration to continue our united and persevering efforts to prevent the recurrence of such natural disaster tragedy from ever being visited again upon American citizens in this area, this State, or this blessed Nation.

I am pleased to include a statistical account of the yearly appropriations that were approved for the tunnel completion.

Yearly appropriations for Worcester flood diversion tunnel

Fiscal year	Amount	Purpose
1956	$60,000	Surveying and planning.
1957	840,000	Begin construction.
1958	1,766,000	Continue construction.
1959	2,534,000	Complete construction.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Mr. Speaker, limited as this summary necessarily is, it would be even more inadequate if a partial list of some of the measures I introduced in this Congress were not included; they follow:

House Resolution 109, a resolution calling upon Congress to take effective action against the spread of inflation and the high cost of living.

House Concurrent Resolution 36, a concurrent resolution favoring universal disarmament.

House Concurrent Resolution 677, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States should not grant further tariff reductions in the forthcoming tariff negotiations under the provisions of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958, and for other purposes.

House Concurrent Resolution 731, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress in favor of granting relief to the domestic carpet industry.

House Joint Resolution 429, a joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a gold medal in honor of the late Prof. Robert H. Goddard.

H.R. 2395, a bill to provide for the establishment of a U.S. Foreign Service Academy.

H.R. 2471, a bill to establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped, to define its duties, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2472, a bill to protect the right of the blind to self-expression through organizations of the blind.

H.R. 2473, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a 30-percent credit against the individual income tax for amounts paid as tuition or fees to certain public and private institutions of higher education.

H.R. 2474, a bill to provide for unemployment reinsurance grants to States to revise, extend, and improve the unemployment insurance program, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2475, a bill to provide assistance to communities, industries, business enterprises, and individuals to facilitate adjustments made necessary by the trade policy of the United States.

H.R. 2527, a bill to provide for programs of public facilities construction which will stimulate employment in areas having a substantial surplus of labor, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2529, a bill to amend section 201 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, so as to provide that all quota numbers not used in any year shall be made available to immigrants in oversubscribed areas in the following year, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2868, a bill to reaffirm the national public policy and the purposes of Congress in enacting the Robinson-Patman Antiprice Discrimination Act entitled "An act to amend section 2 of the act entitled 'An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes,' approved October 15, 1914, as amended (U.S.C., title 15, sec. 13), and for other purposes," and to clarify the intent and meaning of the aforesaid law by providing for the mandatory nature of functional discounts under certain circumstances.

H.R. 3161, a bill to incorporate the Paralyzed Veterans of America.

H.R. 8905, a bill to provide a health benefits program for certain retired employees of the Government.

H.R. 11113, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I.

H.R. 12038, a bill to provide for adjusting conditions of competition between certain domestic industries and foreign industries with respect to the level of wages and the working conditions in the production of articles imported into the United States.

H.R. 12106, a bill to eliminate discriminatory employment practices on account of age by contractors and subcontractors in the performance of contracts with the United States and the District of Columbia.

H.R. 12872, a bill to create and prescribe the functions of a National Peace Agency.

CONCLUSION—TIMELY COUNSEL FROM A GREAT AMERICAN

Mr. Speaker, the words of wise authority remain forever as comforting beacons of guidance in troubled, distressing hours. A counseling message to all Americans is contained in the following extract from a speech given at Harvard University graduation exercises on June 30, 1910, by the late great Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes:

"The most important agencies of democracy are, after all, not the organs of government, but the influences that shape public opinion. * * * Democracy must prize its public life. It has stripped it almost altogether of ceremonial and of meaningless and absurd forms. It has placed the public officer in a position of power, to be used for service. * * * Having surrounded him with none of the pomp which makes appeal to the thoughtless and ignorant, it must invest him with the higher honor which should be the reward of fidelity. Those who cultivate the true democratic spirit will be as earnest in their support of faithful officers as they are unsparing in their condemnation of the faithless."

Colloquy Between Former Congressman Murdock of Arizona and Congressman Toby Morris

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOBY MORRIS

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 29, 1960

Mr. MORRIS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert a recent colloquy between former Congressman Murdock of Arizona and me.

Mr. John R. Murdock is truly a gentleman and a scholar. He holds an AB and a master's degree, and the Arizona State University recently in 1960 conferred upon him the honorary degree of doctor of law. He is eminently worthy of these honors.

Mr. Murdock served 16 years as an outstanding member of the U.S. House of Representatives and was chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee in the 82d Congress, during the years 1951 and 1952. He was a great chairman, respected and beloved by all his colleagues.

He has studied, worked, and effectively pushed forward many important bills and programs for the benefit of his beloved State of Arizona and for our entire Nation. For over 40 years he has given intense study and consideration to many matters of public interest and importance, and particularly to Colorado River water problems. He has become and remains one of the greatest authorities in regard to water problems, in the West, and is an outstanding specialist on the great Colorado River and its tributaries.

I am honored and my life has been enlightened and enriched in associating

with and in having served on that great committee with him. I herewith set out our colloquy relative to some of the matters with which we dealt:

Congressman MORRIS. In the closing session of the 86th Congress I'd like to get a few statements from you, Mr. Murdock, of mutual interest for the record. What do you think, would you answer some questions?

Chairman MURDOCK. Yes, Judge; gladly if I may ask you some. I agree with you that we should briefly summarize some high points of our long cooperation in Congress, our many joint activities. What comes to your mind as most significant?

Congressman MORRIS. Well, that was my question. I notice you call me Judge. I am proud of that title as a former district judge.

Chairman MURDOCK. Yes, Judge; our many activities together in Congress have been varied. Sometimes they have been regarded as of minor importance, little noticed by the public press. Sometimes they have been strenuously hectic and were spread all over the country by a section of the press, as, for instance, Arizona's struggle with California over water from the Colorado River.

Congressman MORRIS. I well remember parts of that struggle and am proud of the part we played in it, but that is a long story and I fear we could not brief it. What are those apparently "minor" things you mentioned? Perhaps they were not so "minor"?

Chairman MURDOCK. By that I was thinking of the "seed" we placed in the fertile soil of American social and industrial life from which we hoped for great future growth. I like to think of those bills we introduced and hearings we held as "little acorns from which mighty oaks may grow," perhaps long after we are gone. To name a few bills and hearings and only a few: (1) Your bill for rehabilitation of the Navajo and Hopi Indians; (2) my bill and hearings on Dr. Percy Thomas' power proposal; (3) my hearings on several so-called salt-water bills.

Congressman MORRIS. During the 81st and 82d Congresses you and I worked together on several matters of legislation pertaining to the great West. Since then I have gone to other House committees and have not kept full track of the results of our former united efforts. Will you bring me up to date on the most important results of our legislative measures?

Chairman MURDOCK. Yes, Judge, you and I did work as a team, and I believe effectively—during the 4 years 1949, 1950, 1951, and 1952—I as chairman of the House Public Lands Committee and later of the House Interior Committee, and you as a member of that committee and as chairman of the Indian Affairs Subcommittee on numerous bills and proposals. I shall never cease to be grateful for your energetic leadership, especially on Indian bills. So far as action in the House is concerned I am giving you full credit for the enactment of the Navajo-Hopi rehabilitation bill which authorized a $90 million project for those two tribes of Indians in northern Arizona over a 10-year period. Of course there were other measures, too, on which we cooperated. Naturally I was greatly concerned about Indian water problems—on which you helped very much. Water for the vast Navajo Reservation was one of a dozen pressing problems for those Indians which you handled admirably. That $90 million authorization for a 10-year period has come nearer being fully implemented by later appropriations than an optimistic prophet might have prophesied—probably thanks to Senator CARL HAYDEN—and it is a delight to see what improvement has resulted on that big reservation for present and unborn generations.

Congressman MORRIS. It is pleasant to hear you say that, even if exaggerated. I do remember the subcommittee trips to the West and hearings held at Window Rock and farther West, and especially our hearing at Phoenix and our trip to the Papago and the Pima Reservations. I shall never forget Phoenix and its fine Indian school.

THE NAVAJO SHOULD HAVE A FUTURE

Chairman MURDOCK. Before leaving the Navajo, you will remember that we crossed the reservations from Window Rock to Tuba City, and then turned south to cross the Little Colorado River at Cameron. We stopped to get our evening meal at that trading post and I told you then that the suspension bridge at that place was not the only unique thing about that typical western stream—that the canyon river itself, especially the stream's physical possibilities from Cameron 50-odd miles toward the west to the main Colorado River could be an important theme for a whole book of facts, and also another whole book of plausible prophesies. I have given many years of close study to that unique stream—the Little Colorado River in northern Arizona—and you have helped me.

Congressman MORRIS. I remember the suspension bridge way out on the Navajo Desert, but cannot recall much mention of the Little Colorado in our hearings. Oh yes, you wanted a silt control dam, called the Coconino Dam, on the Little Colorado River, which was about the only thing the Californians didn't object to. Is that significant?

Chairman MURDOCK. Yes, as I see it that is very significant, but the Coconino Dam on the Little Colorado is only a starter on that tributary. Turning from the larger question of water in a thirsty land, with all its intricate and agonizing phases of infighting of States and communities to divide a limited supply, as you have suggested, I want to tell you how you helped me without knowing it on an important development that hasn't happened yet, but must happen in some form in the future. Do you remember in 1952 two hearings—one a small subcommittee hearing at which you were present, and the other a full-fledged hearing September 19, 1951—recorded and printed—at which Dr. Percy Thomas and three other high authorities from the Interior Department and the Federal Power Commission stated the proposal of Dr. Percy Thomas to make a highly modern use of windpower? This was especially for conserving water for hydroelectric power production throughout the West.

Congressman MORRIS. Yes, I remember Dr. Percy Thomas and his model powerplants. I was enlightened and amazed at what those men said about possible power that can be obtained from variable and changing winds, as they contrasted their proposals with our well-known small windmills on the farms. How did that help you? Has anything been done with it?

Chairman MURDOCK. No. Not yet. Dr. Thomas at that time was an elderly man, retired after many fruitful years in a department in Government service. He is now deceased. You helped me—in spite of your first doubts about the usefulness of fluctuating and changing winds—by giving me sympathetic support at that first hearing so that I called a full hearing September 19, 1951, in spite of the ridicule which I expected from some committee members. But even the three California members of the committee, who always strained themselves to take a dim view of any proposals of mine touching water, sat up and took notice. The one member most connected with power said: "Sounds good if it works." Well, I am more and more convinced that on the Little Colorado watershed it would work. That is a great prospect for the future, requiring a book to picture it.

Congressman MORRIS. John, I once heard you say that if you could have your way you would lift the face of northern Arizona. What did you mean by that? From what I've seen nature has already done that.

Chairman MURDOCK. It was a brief way of my saying that I thought man could work with nature in changing the topography of Eastern Coconino County, Ariz., containing the lower 50 miles of the Little Colorado River. It has taken millions of years of running water to carve the canyons of that tributary. I would stop that running water and let nature reverse the process of cutting those deep wrinkles on the face of the land and smooth them out instead. That would be the effect if that part of the Little Colorado Basin could be made into what the geologists call a "closed basin."

Congressman MORRIS. Just what do you mean by "closed basin"? I should think that only nature could do that.

Chairman MURDOCK. Yes, we have numerous "closed basins" in the West which have no drainage or outlets of their waters to the sea. If those great volcanoes north of Flagstaff thousands of years ago had spit out a few more millions of tons of molten lava into the mouth of the Little Colorado it would have accomplished in short order what, I think, man should accomplish through many future years. That would mean sealing off the Little Colorado tributary from the main Colorado River, and that would make its lower basin in effect a "closed basin."

Congressman MORRIS. Would not that destroy the scenic canyons in that part of Coconino County?

Chairman MURDOCK. Well, yes, eventually, but Coconino County has canyons to spare with several hundred miles of such within the Grand Canyon National Park of mile-deep canyons, which are greater by far than the canyons that I would let nature fill up during the next 1,000 years. This stopping of erosion and filling up the canyons on that tributary stream would make feasible one phase of Dr. Percy Thomas' power proposal and, in my judgment, is basic to the water conservation work needed on that watershed.

BEGINNINGS OF SALT-WATER BILLS

Congressman MORRIS. John, when you mentioned salt-water bills you were getting close to one of my greatest interests. What can you remind us that is both pertinent and interesting?

Chairman MURDOCK. One interesting fact to me is that California Congressmen took an early lead in introducing the so-called salt-water bills. Three Members from San Diego, alone, while I was in Congress, introduced such bills, and those Members were from both major political parties. It doesn't take much reasoning to figure out why that was so. On the other hand, some California Members shied away from such bills—and thereby hangs a tale which is too long to tell here.

Congressman MORRIS. Didn't you hold the first hearing on such a salt-water bill in the House about 10 years ago relative to "sweetening," taking the salinity out of salt water?

Congressman MURDOCK. To the best of my knowledge that is correct. It was on August 29, 1950, and you were present and participating. At that time I was chairman of the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation, but the next year I was chairman of the full Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and I as such, backed the legislation which was passed in 1952. I was officially responsible.

In fact, the very first of my efforts in Congress was to work for the meager appropriation to implement the salt-water bill we had just passed. After midnight of the last full day of the 82d Congress I remember saying to Congressman GEORGE MAHON and Congressman ALBERT THOMAS of Texas—what they already knew and had probably said to

me—"The man or set of men who can treat sea water, or saline waters, effectively, and cheaply, will have performed a greater service for mankind than the man or set of men who split the atom." On the following Tuesday, July 8, 1952 I was thanked by Secretary Oscar Chapman for my help on his pet salt-water bill.

Pardon me, Judge, for monopolizing the time on this topic, but I know your interest in it and activities on it and commend them. What a sturdy "oak" this "acorn" has become in 10 years under the fostering care of several western Senators—not now a meager $100,000 appropriation and no pilot plant, as 10 years ago, but now four big pilot plants—located on Atlantic coast, gulf coast, Pacific coast and one in the interior, with millions to finance them, as should be. While this "acorn" through 10 years has become a "sturdy oak," it is still only a sapling. What is it destined to become in the future of our Nation?

Congressman MORRIS. How well satisfied are you with our work together in the 81st and 82d Congresses on the matters we have here briefly discussed?

Chairman MURDOCK. On these three items I am more than satisfied. To change the figure of speech from the acorn and the oak, I truly feel that you and I have presided at the laying of legislative "corner stones" of three magnificent superstructures, the building of which will require years and generations to finish. The designs, though dim, are subject to change, and improvement with greater knowledge and wisdom than we posssessed. These superstructures are certain to be useful to the fast growing State of Arizona and the Nation through a long future.

Ukrainian Congress Committee of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 29, 1960

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, in the fall, the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America will mark the 20th anniversary of its founding. I ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join with me in extending greetings to the committee and to its chairman, Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky.

Many members of this organization reside in my district and I have had opportunity to observe their efforts. These Americans, knowledgeable in Soviet matters, have served our Nation by advancing the cause of the captive nations, by informing our fellow citizens about the struggles for independence of the dozen captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. by exposing the myths about Soviet unity and by proposing courses of action to counteract Soviet propaganda.

The people of the Ukraine have long suffered political and religious persecution. They have been deprived of the freedom for which they long fought.

The Ukrainian Congress Committee of America and the 2½ million Americans of Ukrainian ancestry, will not rest until freedom has been restored.

That spirit must be continually rekindled. Enlightened concern for human dignity is paramount with all of us.

I salute the committee for its 20 years of dedication and service.

San Francisco Baseball Giants To Make Centennial Good-Will Tour of Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 29, 1960

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, may I invite the attention of my colleagues in the House and the Senate to the good-will baseball tour of Japan to be made this fall by the San Francisco Giants as the sports feature of the centennial celebration commemorating the signing of the first Treaty of Commerce and Friendship with Japan.

After stopping off in our newest and 50th State of Hawaii for a few exhibitions, the Giants will play 16 games in Tokyo, Sapporo, Sendai, Toyama, Osaka, Fukuoka, Shimonoseki, Hiroshima, Nagoya, and Shizuoka.

Most of us are aware of the tremendous interest that the Japanese have in our national pastime. But few of us, I am sure, have any idea of the influence that baseball has had on Japanese-American relations.

BASEBALL IN JAPAN 86 YEARS OLD

Japan is said to be the oldest nation outside of the United States to be playing baseball. Only 30 years after Abner Doubleday is supposed to have originated the game at historic Cooperstown, baseball was introduced to Japan. This was in 1874, so Japanese baseball is 86 years old this year.

Count Nobuaki Makino, one of Japan's most illustrious statesmen and father-in-law of former Prime Minister Shigeru Yoshida, who, probably more than any single individual, gave new Japan its pro-United States orientation, is generally remembered as Japan's first baseball player. Premier Yoshida, as most Americans recall, was the last Prime Minister during the period of the occupation and the first Prime Minister when Japan regained her sovereignty in 1952. He headed a special delegation to Washington this past May to participate in the centennial celebration here. He also headed the Japanese delegation that signed the peace treaty in San Francisco in 1951. Count Makino learned to play baseball when he visited Philadelphia in 1871 as a member of the Prince Iwakura mission. On his return he introduced baseball, with its special terminology, to a Japan just emerging from its feudalism.

Within 20 years it had become a popular and well-accepted game, largely because of the promotional writings of Shiki Masaoka, who, though known as the foremost "haiku" poet of the Meiji era, is better remembered as the father of Japanese baseball.

In 1878, Ki Hiraoka, who was bitten by the baseball bug while studying in New York City, organized the first team, representing the Shimbasi Athletic Club, built the first baseball diamond in what is now the famous Ginza district in Tokyo, introduced the wearing of team uniforms, and threw the first curve ball seen outside this country.

In its early developmental period, baseball teams represented various athletic clubs or industrial plants. In a few years, however, the schools and universities took up the game and made it the spectacular spectator sport that it is today, when crowds of 80,000 are not unusual for a college championship.

In 1905, Waseda University came to this country to play a number of our colleges and universities. This was the first oversea trip ever taken by any Japanese sports team and was the forerunner of the many exchange good-will tours by various athletic stars and teams in the past half century.

SAN FRANCISCO IDENTIFIED WITH JAPANESE GAME

Two San Franciscans, Herb Hunter and Lefty O'Doul are the legendary baseball idols of Japan. The former helped develop college baseball, while the latter helped to organize professional baseball there.

The first all-star team to visit Japan was in November 1931, which included such baseball immortals as Lefty O'Doul, Lefty Grove, Larry French, Mickey Cochrane, Muddy Ruel, Lou Gehrig, George Kelly, Frank Frisch, Willie Kamm, Rabbit Maranville, Al Simmons, and others. In 1934 Babe Ruth led one of the greatest aggregations ever assembled, every member of which has been enshrined in baseball's Hall of Fame in Cooperstown, N.Y., to Japan, where they played to crowds of over 100,000. Connie Mack, incidentally, was the manager of that dream team, and his assistant was Lefty O'Doul.

Herb Hunter of San Francisco is known as America's baseball ambassador because he remained to coach the game at Waseda and Keio universities after visiting Japan as a member of a group of Pacific coast players in 1920. When he returned to the United States, he persuaded then Baseball Commissioner Landis to authorize major leaguers to visit Japan to conduct clinics to instruct the Japanese in the finer points of the game. Casey Stengel, currently the revered manager of the New York Yankees, was a member of the first contingent, which also included Waite Hoyt, Herb Pennock, Guy Bush, and George Kelly.

Lefty O'Doul, a native San Franciscan, is synonymous with the spirit of American baseball in Japan. While visiting Japan in 1934 with the all-star team, he advised Matsutaro Shoriki, president of the Yomiuri Shimbun, one of the "Big Three" national newspapers of the country with a circulation over 3 millions, in organizing what has come to be known as the Yomiuri Giants, named in honor of the then New York National League entry who are the San

Francisco Giants of today. The Yomiuri Giants are known as the Yankees of Japan, however, for their perennial championships. The Yomiuri Giants were the first professional baseball club there, but others quickly followed and their version of a major league was established. Today, there are two major leagues, with the champions of each playing off for the Japanese title every autumn, much as is done in the United States.

As beloved as Lefty O'Doul is in his native city, where he managed the San Francisco Seals entry in the old Pacific Coast League for many years, he is probably better known in Japan, where his humanitarianism in helping orphan children is almost as legendary as his baseball contributions. The two-time batting champion of the National League enjoyed his greatest years in our national game as the star outfielder for the Brooklyn Dodgers and the New York Giants of the late twenties and early thirties.

During World War II, the militarists tried to "wipe out" baseball because of its American origin and its popularity among all segments of the population. After the surrender, baseball was among the first sports to regain its place in the minds and hearts of the people. Gen. Douglas MacArthur, as the Supreme Commander of the Allied Powers, recognized its potential as an invaluable instrument in building new Japan into a democratic, freedom-loving nation and issued a directive to assist in its revival.

BASEBALL'S FINEST HOUR

Probably baseball's finest hour, and its greatest contribution to international understanding and friendship, was in the fall of 1949, when Lefty O'Doul took his then San Francisco Seals over for a series of 13 games. That tour is credited with bringing the Japanese and the American people together in a spirit of mutual fellowship, for it was the first time since the end of the war that the defeated Japanese left their self-imposed shell to cheer Americans.

Just before Mrs. MacArthur threw out the first ball at Korakuen Park in Tokyo, for the first time after the war the Japanese Rising Sun flag was raised, and the band played their national anthem. Thereafter, the American flag was raised, and the Star-Spangled Banner was played. Also, for the first time, hot dogs and cokes were sold to the Japanese on that day.

Near the conclusion of their tour, Lefty O'Doul was invited to the Imperial Palace to meet the Emperor, who told him:

It is by means of sports that our countries can be brought together. I am glad that I can personally thank you for it.

At a reception for the team at the American Embassy where General MacArthur had his residence at that time, prior to its departure for the States, the Supreme Commander told O'Doul:

This trip is the greatest piece of diplomacy ever. All the diplomats put together would not have been able to do this.

Later, referring to the love and admiration in which he is held by the Japanese public at large, General MacArthur told him:

You've finally arrived home, Lefty.

Two years later, in 1951, Lefty O'Doul returned to Japan with the first postwar major league all-stars, who included Joe DiMaggio, then of the New York Yankees. Since that time, several all-star aggregations and several major league teams, such as the New York Giants, the Brooklyn Dodgers, the New York Yankees, and the St. Louis Cardinals, have played in Japan.

APPROPRIATE TEAM, APPROPRIATE YEAR

In this Centennial Year of Japanese-American relations, it is appropriate that the San Francisco Giants, heirs of the immortal New York Giants' heritage, are visiting Japan.

The American baseball team will be led by Baseball Commissioner Ford Frick, who long ago appreciated the significant role that baseball could play in international good will. It was he, by the way, who in a statesmanlike decree several years ago ruled that major league teams could visit Japan only on alternate years in order that there would not be too much of a drain on Japan's hard earned dollar exchange.

Horace C. Stoneham, longtime owner and president of the Giants, will accompany his team, which is among the most colorful and representative in sports. His Willie Mays is considered by many to be the best player in our national pastime today.

And, of course, Lefty O'Doul will again be with the team, for the Japanese identify baseball with this distinguished native son of California.

Appropriately enough too, the invitation to visit Japan was extended by the Yomiuri Giants, whose president is still Matsutaro Shoriki, recently described by his U.S. biographers Edward Uhlan, Dana L. Thomas, and Bob Considine as the "Miracle Man of Japan." Among his accomplishments are that he is a ranking member of the Japanese Parliament, former cabinet minister, Japan's first atomic energy commissioner, and the individual responsible for making television available to the rank and file Japanese.

Tsuneo P. "Cappy" Harada, an American-born Californian of Japanese ancestry who as a lieutenant during the occupation period contributed much to the revival of baseball after the surrender, served as the liaison in arranging this goodwill tour as the sports feature of this 100th anniversary year of diplomatic relations between the United States and Japan.

As our Nation and Japan begin the second century of diplomatic relations, all of us are aware of the increasingly important role that Japan must play as our partner and ally in the Far East. There are forces in the world today which would destroy the good will that exists between the American and Japanese peoples. And so, in these critical times, I know that I speak the sentiments of the American people in paying tribute to the constructive character of baseball's contributions to Japanese-American friendship and understanding.

May the forthcoming visit of the San Francisco Giants, and their fellow citizens of the city by the Golden Gate who plan to accompany them as special individual good will ambassadors, be as successful in promoting good will as those in the past, for on the field of friendly competition, with friendly spectators, are sown the seeds of international comity and cooperation that are so essential to the peace and prosperity of the Pacific.

We Must Develop a Strategy for Victory—To Save Freedom—Freedom Everywhere

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 29, 1960

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, it was my very great privilege to introduce the keynote speaker of the Republican Convention held in Chicago the last week in July, our colleague, the distinguished Member from Minnesota, Dr. WALTER JUDD.

Tireless, effective, and fearless, a champion of independence and freedom, he is one of the very rare men in this House of Representatives. For 10 years a medical missionary in China, his penetrating vision recognized the menace of the Japanese aggression in China and the sinister quality of communism a decade before they exploded in our face. Upon his return home, he did his utmost to bring the realization to America.

I do not need to tell anyone here what his rare talents are nor with what consecration he works. His contribution is greatest in foreign affairs, for that is his major responsibility, but he has been the author of important and intelligent legislation aimed at full employment for America's working millions. Active in the field of medical aid for the aging and in measures dealing with vocational rehabilitation and education, he has been a leader in the successful battle of the administration of President Eisenhower to check inflation.

Beyond all else, WALTER JUDD is a man of deep religious faith, a man whose life is based upon the certainty that understanding and wisdom are given to those who ask for it.

I, therefore, under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, include with my remarks, the keynote address given in Chicago by our colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota, WALTER H. JUDD:

WE MUST DEVELOP A STRATEGY FOR VICTORY—TO SAVE FREEDOM—FREEDOM EVERYWHERE

(Keynote address to the 1960 Republican National Convention by Representative WALTER H. JUDD, of Minnesota, July 25, 1960, Chicago, Ill.)

Mr. Chairman, fellow Republicans, fellow Americans, as we meet tonight in this Republican National Convention of 1960 I do not believe you want me to indulge in the traditional keynote speech, blaming the

other party for everything that is bad, taking credit to ourselves for everything that is good, and promising that if you voters will just elect us to office this fall, we will solve every problem, increase every benefit, expand every existing program, start a whole flock of new ones, give everyone everything he wants—and reduce the national debt at the same time.

The times in which we meet are too serious for that.

The problems we face are too disturbing.

Our country's safety—your safety and mine—are too gravely endangered.

What the American people want to know as they watch us here tonight is: Which party has the greatest capacity to keep this country safe and sound?

Which party is the most alert to and best understands the powerful forces against us, abroad and at home?

Which party best understands the forces for us, abroad and at home?

Which party has the ablest, the most experienced, the best qualified, and the finest men to lead our country through the perilous months and years ahead?

We do not pretend that our party is always right and the Democratic Party is always wrong.

We know, as do you who are listening, that both Democrats and Republicans want a strong, free, and prosperous America in a peaceful and secure world. The difference between the two parties is not over those good objectives, but over the best way to achieve those good objectives—and keep them.

Some Democrats have regularly tried to make it appear that Republicans are opposed to various good ends—such as security for old age, adequate medical care, better education, better housing, protection of the rights of labor, aid to agriculture—just because we do not agree with the solutions they advocate, believing they are not the right way to get what we all want. But it is not because we are against the good ends; it is precisely because we are for them that we oppose measures we believe are unsound.

It is the obligation of the Republican Party and its members to show that loose fiscal policies, while temporarily gratifying, in the end inhibit growth rather than expand it.

Sometimes we are told that to win elections, we Republicans should make more grandiose promises, like those the opposition party made at its convention. Maybe that is a way to win elections; but we repudiate it, first because it would not be shooting square with you, the voters; and second, it would not succeed. For there is no chance of our outpromising the Democrats.

Overshadowing everything else as we meet is the hard fact that a powerful enemy threatens us on every front. It is the most dangerous assault upon us in our history, in part because it is so different from any previous threat.

And without victory in this struggle, there will be no survival of freedom for any of us—Democrats or Republicans.

I

The Republican Party was born in a time of crisis. It was brought into being by the strong free spirits of a century ago, to deal with the gravest issue of the 19th century—human slavery.

In 1860 in this city the Republican Party nominated as its candidate for the Presidency of the United States a man who had risen from the humblest beginnings to become a leader in the effort to end human slavery without destroying the Union.

He led the party to victory, the Nation to salvation, and the people to a rededication to the sound principles on which the country had been founded and had grown great.

We want, tonight, both to honor Abraham Lincoln and to learn from him.

Please God, we may do as well with our divided world as he did with his divided Nation.

For the gravest issue of our century also is human slavery—this time not men enslaved by other men; but, far more complex and dangerous, masses of men enslaved by governments.

More human beings are in bondage tonight than ever before in human history.

Nine hundred million abroad are denied by their government the right to worship, to speak, to assemble, to join, to own; the right of a man to choose or to change his work and to live his own life with his family and friends—in freedom.

In this total situation, the Republican Party stands today as it has from the beginning—for freedom and against slavery.

You will judge both parties not by promises but by performance. And it is on the basis of our record of solid performance that we proudly present to you in this convention, an honest accounting of our stewardship during these 8 years—and a look at the future.

How well we have done what we said we would do when you elected us?

How do we propose to deal with the challenges we face now, at home and abroad?

Why do we believe our principles and proposals offer greatest hope for accomplishing the greatest good and the greatest growth for America in the next 4 years?

II

Let us deal first with our international relations.

We said in 1952 we believed we could get and maintain peace with honor. We have done it.

We brought to an end the fighting in the Korean war which the Truman administration would not win and could not stop.

It did not make sense to continue to enlist American youth and exhort them to fight well in the noblest tradition of America's greatest heroes—but not to fight too well because then they might win, and that might provoke the enemy. They should give all they had, their lives—and over 33,000 did—but they must not win. It was the first war ever fought—so far as I am aware—in terms of trying to please the enemy. To continue that war was madness.

Then President Eisenhower took charge. It took time and patience and skill, but within 9 months, the fighting was brought to a close—without dishonor, without sacrificing the interests of an ally, or weakening our security position in the Pacific. We Republicans are proud of that accomplishment.

In addition, this administration has prevented a half dozen other threats from developing into war—Trieste, the Mossadegh uprising in Iran, Guatemala, Formosa, Suez, Lebanon, Quemoy, West Berlin.

How was it done? Not by sacrificing our principles in secret deals under the table; but by steady, patient firmness and strength in support of principles.

What principles? First, our own historic principles: human freedom; keeping our word; steadfast support of friends and allies. And, second, wholehearted support of the United Nations.

In short, our efforts everywhere have been to help build free nations up; the efforts of the Communists everywhere are to pull free governments down.

III

It does not avail, however, to be firm in support of principles unless we have the strength to back the firmness up. This administration has built up gigantic strength in our own Armed Forces and given vital assistance in building up the strength of other nations standing with us against the common threat.

Ours is a balanced power, not all our eggs in one basket, whether it be a bomber basket, a missile, a submarine, or any other basket.

President Eisenhower will perhaps have something to say on this subject tomorrow night. I hope those who have thought they know more about our armed strength than he and our Joint Chiefs of Staff, will listen in too.

But I am compelled to take notice here of certain charges made by the opposition party.

It is claimed that this administration allowed a missile gap to develop. No, it found a missile gap and has managed to get it almost closed.

When President Eisenhower took office in 1953, the preceding administration had actually retarded work in this field, even though it knew that the Soviet Union was making tremendous efforts.

The Truman administration in 8 years had spent 17 times more for price supports for peanuts than for long-range missiles.

The Eisenhower administration is today putting 40 times as much into such missiles each month as the previous administration did in 8 years.

It took the Soviet Union 12 years to develop its long-range missiles. It took this administration 6 years to get ours operational. Anything wrong with that?

Senator KENNEDY was reported by the press to have said on February 21 of this year, "We have the greatest deterrent force in history and thank God for that." He was right.

IV

But it is not enough to have such vast overall power. Our primary desire in building such striking force is not to fight a war, but to deter one.

It is not just the strength that we have, it is the strength that our enemies, our allies and our own people know that we have, which is our hope of deterring war.

What kind of reckless and irresponsible action is it for anyone to misrepresent the United States as a second-class power, as was done in the Democratic convention, and thereby encourage the very attacks which all Americans profoundly hope and pray can be prevented?

Did you see the movie shown at their convention 2 weeks ago, dredging up scenes of hunger, squalor, and misery in the United States as if they were typical of America? What kind of salesmanship for their country is that?

Can our Nation's prestige be raised by tearing it down?

It is devoutly to be hoped—because it offers our best chance of avoiding war—that Mr. Khrushchev, in making up his mind about our actual military, economic and moral strength, will depend a lot more on the reports of his own agents than on the shameful misstatements made in the heat of the Los Angeles convention.

It is claimed that this administration has not taken the initiative in the cold war, that we have allowed things to drift. Yet the orators condemn the Republican administration for brilliant examples of successful initiative. For example, the U–2 flights. If we had not developed U–2 and had not been using it to keep up to date on military preparations within the Soviet Union, we could properly have been charged with inviting another Pearl Harbor. The fact that our U–2 operations were so outstandingly successful for 4 years should be a source of intense pride to all Americans. The U–2's were not provoking war, they were helping to prevent war.

Again, it has been suggested that the President should have done something different or better about Mr. Khrushchev's breakup of the Paris conference. Will they please tell you what they think the American people wanted their President to do? Apologize, and hand over West Berlin? Blow up and start a war? Of course not.

The facts are that it has been the President himself and Secretaries of State Dulles and Herter who on innumerable occasions have warned the American people against optimism regarding any conference with Communists at the summit in the absence of any evidence of change in their objectives and methods.

Just as Prime Minister Macmillan said a year ago that he thought he ought to go to Moscow to find out if possible just what the Soviets had in mind, so the President invited Mr. Khrushchev to this country, and agreed to go to the Soviet Union; and the Big Three agreed to meet with Khrushchev in Paris—all in the hope of finding ways to get a settlement that might end the cold war without betrayal of our principles, our commitments, or our allies.

At the Paris conference, everybody hoped that the miracle might take place and Mr. Khrushchev would abandon his avowed purpose to bury us—one way or another. Tragically, there was no miracle. Mr. Khrushchev killed the hope.

But his ruthless torpedoing of the Paris meeting was evidence of the failure of his foreign policy, not ours. His strategy for at least 2 years had been the old one of trying to conquer the West by dividing it. He tried his best to set our allies against each other and against us. He came to our country and talked about peace and friendship, trying to whittle down our resolution and soothe us into relaxed slumber. He did not succeed.

When Mr. Khrushchev knew before the Paris conference convened that he had failed to divide, deceive or soften up the free powers, he had no choice but to break up the conference. Otherwise, he would either have had to back down on West Berlin, or actually start a war. Either would have been fatal to him. His scuttling of the Paris conference and his grotesque efforts to pin the blame on us were proof positive, not of our weakness, but of our strength.

With the bald deception of Khrushchev's fake peace posture exposed at Paris by himself, he had to change his tactics and make a different effort to divide and conquer. He is now moving heaven and earth to achieve by subversion among the newer or more vulnerable nations of the free world coalition what he could not achieve by division of the Western Powers. He is trying to upset free governments, one by one, by ordering into action the apparatus the Communists have been systematically building and training in other countries for decades, for the very purposes now revealed so plainly in Japan and Cuba.

Why did the Communists have to cancel President Eisenhower's visit to Russia and resort to such violent measures in Japan to prevent his visit there? Not because of the ineffectiveness of the President's visits abroad, but because of their demonstrated effectiveness. The Red leaders saw the vast difference between Eisenhower's reception in India, for example, and the receptions given Khrushchev and Chou En-lai. They didn't dare let Ike chalk up still another tremendous triumph with millions of people in Mother Russia itself, and in a key country like Japan.

V

It has been charged that no previous Presidents or Vice Presidents ever suffered such insults abroad—as if somehow that is their fault. There are two inescapable answers. One is that as long as two previous American Presidents were willing to give in to Soviet leaders, they got along famously with them. Why should the Communists insult them as long as they were getting what they wanted?

Naturally Khrushchev would prefer not to negotiate with a Republican President who he has learned will not be taken in or intimidated or tricked into any concessions, no matter how innocent looking, that would weaken the free world.

The second answer is that no previous President has faced a Communist conspiracy that was strong and arrogant enough to take such action as Mr. Khrushchev took.

And how did the Communist conspiracy get so strong and arrogant? That cannot be laid at the door of Republicans. Look again at the record.

I would rather not go over the mistakes of the past; there's more than enough to talk about regarding the future. But if Republicans are to be charged with inability to deal with the forces of aggression which those who make the charges helped to build up, then we owe it to the truth to set the record straight.

The trouble we are in with the Communists is exactly the trouble that Republicans warned for years before 1952 would develop if we followed the courses that were followed.

Was it Republicans who recognized the Soviet Union in 1933 and gave it acceptance into our country and world society as if it were a respectable and dependable member thereof?

Was it Republicans who, at Teheran, against the urgent advice of Mr. Churchill, agreed to give the Russians a free hand in the Balkans?

Was it Republicans who secretly divided Poland and gave half of it to the Soviet Union?

Was it Republicans who agreed to the Communist takeover of a hundred million people in Eastern Europe who are not Russian?

Was it a Republican administration which at Potsdam gave the Soviet Union East Germany and left West Berlin cut off from the rest of the free world?

Was it a Republican administration that publicly promised that Manchuria would go back to its rightful owners, the Chinese, and then secretly at Yalta gave control of Manchuria to the Russians?

Was it a Republican administration that divided Korea and gave control of North Korea to the Communists?

Was it a Republican administration that gave to the Soviet Union the Kurile Islands which had never been anybody's except Japan's, thereby endangering both Japan's and our security in the North Pacific?

Was it a Republican administration that rightly put its hand to the plow in Korea, and then when victory was in sight turned back, allowing the Reds to recover so they can make still more trouble for us in the future?

Was it a Republican administration that fell for the Communist offer of a truce in Korea without requiring that the North Korean aggressors lay down their arms and the Chinese Communists get out of Korea where they had no business to be? You know it wasn't.

In summary, it wasn't under Republicans that 600 million human beings disappeared behind the Iron Curtain in the first 5 years after World War II.

In fact, the record will show that Republicans opposed these steps every time they were taken.

VI

What our Republican administration has done in these 8 years is, with initiative and imagination, to stop the process of retreat before the Frankenstein monster that its predecessors did so much to build up.

We have resolutely opposed anything anywhere that would make Communist regimes stronger—and we shall continue to do so.

That is why, for example, we have opposed and must oppose official recognition of Communist China or its admission into the United Nations, unless or until it will give up in a dependable way its aggressive acts and threats against other countries; that is, give up communism. Recognition and admission would needlessly present it with smashing victories. Does it make sense to build up an avowed enemy?

But our refusal to give Red China the tremendous boost of official recognition does not mean—as has been asserted by people who ought to know better—that this administration has been hiding its head in the sand, or pretending Red China does not exist, or trying to ignore 600 million Chinese. The exact reverse is the truth. This administration is acutely aware of Red China's existence and the threat it constitutes to freedom, not only in Asia, but everywhere. It was not this administration which indulged in the illusion that Communists in China are democratic agrarian reformers.

We are not ignoring Red China. We have been negotiating with its official representatives for 5 years. The 99th such negotiation, unfortunately still fruitless, took place just last week.

VII

Surely it is now plain to all that since the Communist world conspiracy remains the same, and since America does not intend to surrender, and since nobody wants a hot war, there is only one alternative left. We must win this cold war.

To do this we must have leaders who understand this enemy and its tactics, and will mobilize all our resources for the struggle.

We must use more effectively our strongest weapons, the values and virtues of a system of government which has given freedom and dignity and better living standards to human beings than any other system ever has.

How many of us understand our own system well enough to sell it to others with contagious enthusiasm, as the Communists are so well trained to sell theirs?

We must let loose in the world the dynamic forces of freedom in our day as our forefathers did in theirs, causing people everywhere to look toward the American dream.

Men have always found ways to bring down tyrants in the past; men will find ways to bring down today's tyrants, if only we don't build up the tyrants.

In short, we have a good strategy for holding. But we cannot hope to win in the end just by holding. We must develop a strategy for victory.

A new chapter has now been opened by Khrushchev. The Soviet Union stands naked before the world today, self-exposed, its objectives and its unchanging methods of deception and trickery revealed by its own acts.

It is going to require stronger approaches, different strategies, new tactics by someone who has proved he understands communism.

America has the brains, she has the wealth, she has the weapons. Who can best harden into rocklife firmness her will?

I am confident that the nearer our people come to election day next November, the more they will become convinced that the course of wisdom and sureness for America is to continue to entrust the destiny of our Nation to steady, competent, experienced, principled Republican hands.

The man who will be nominated in this convention as our candidate will be incomparably the best qualified to deal with the relentless cold war which we have tried our best to avoid, but which we now have no choice except to win.

It has been said by Mr. KENNEDY that the most important issue in this campaign is foreign policy. We agree and welcome the test.

VIII

Now let us take a look at our record on the domestic front. Undeniably this has been overall the best 7-year period in the history of the United States.

What did we say in 1952 that we would do? First, we said we would be a middle-of-the-road government. We believe that middle-of-the-road government is, in the long run, the best kind of government for everyone. For when anybody or any group, whether at one extreme of the other, gets all it wants, it is at the expense of the people as a whole.

We promised we would clean out the corruption that was a scandal under the previous administration and led to more than 20 convictions of high officials. I am proud of the fact that there has not been a single conviction for malfeasance in office of any high official of this administration. That does not mean everything has been perfect. It does mean that whenever and wherever there was any slightest suspicion of impropriety, this Republican administration has not tried to cover up; it has cleaned up. That is what you wanted it to do.

We said we were convinced we could bring prosperity without war—something our predecessors had never been able to do in this century. We succeeded.

The first requirement was to stabilize our economy and slow down the inflation. It was stealing the people's substance—and was especially cruel in its eating away of the value of the pensions and social security benefits which millions of older persons were counting on for the security and serenity they so richly deserve in their years of retirement.

How could inflation best be checked?

The Democrats clamored for more controls.

President Eisenhower announced he would take off the controls.

You will recall how some screamed that the Republicans were yielding to the profiteers, big business, money interests; prices for common people would now go sky high, and so on.

But did they? No. The prices which had been rising alarmingly—48 percent in the 7 Truman years—promptly leveled off and stayed practically stable for 4 years. The total rise in prices in these 8 Republican years is less than 10 percent.

We achieved this stability not by changing our free system, but by using it. It works better than those of little faith in the American people give it credit for.

We said in 1952 that if the Federal Government would stick to its proper function of running the business of the Nation, and get out of trying to manage the affairs of our people, the creative energies of the American people and their millions of individual enterprises would create a vaster expansion of production and trade, with correspondingly greater expansion of jobs, than the Government itself could do. Were we right or wrong? Well, there were 61 million jobs when we took over in 1953. There are 68 million jobs tonight.

And jobs at higher wages. Wages up 39 percent in these 7 years. Do you recall the seven consecutive cost-of-living increases that labor had to fight for, just to keep up with inflation under Truman? In contrast, real wages, actual purchasing power, has gone up 20 percent under this administration.

To buy a standard market basket of groceries in 1945 under the Roosevelt administration, it cost the average worker 13 hours of labor. To buy the same market basket in 1952 under the Truman administration took 13.7 hours of labor. To buy it in 1959 under the Eisenhower administration cost 10 hours.

This is the measure of how much better off rank and file people are today. Does this sound like a party of big business?

Our workers have better food and clothing for themselves and their families, more homes, more automobiles, more refrigerators, more TV's, more free time for study, for recreation, for sports, for travel, for whatever. The record is clear that labor has done better under this Republican administration than in all its previous history.

Personal income, the money that goes into your pockets, has gone up a whopping 33 percent—from $301 billion in 1952 to $420 billion in 1960—and in constant dollars.

Furthermore, a larger share of that higher income, more than 4 percent larger, goes now into the pay envelopes of workers. Anything wrong with workers getting a bigger share of the national income under the Republicans than they ever got under the Democrats?

Isn't it plain horse sense to trust for the next 4 years the leadership which has enabled you to do so well for yourself in the last 8 years?

IX

While the Republican 83d Congress was in power to cooperate with the Eisenhower administration during its first 2 years, we gave the American people the biggest single tax cut in their history—and at the same time expanded the benefits to people; more social security benefits, more for highways, hospitals, health, housing.

And you still have that tax cut. If I may borrow a phrase that you perhaps remember: "Don't let them take it away."

The Republican record in the area of meeting human needs has been one of remarkable action and progress in all fronts, contrary to the image promoted by the opposition that they alone are the party of the people.

Under social security 7½ million more persons are now covered than before. The number receiving benefits has increased from 5 to more than 14 million persons.

Under the vocational rehabilitation program as strengthened by Republicans in 1954, some 400,000 disabled men and women have been returned to active, self-respecting employment and have earned almost $2 billion. This is the true American system of enabling people to do things for themselves.

Deeply concerned with the increasing complexity of the problems of senior citizens, this administration has established a staff for research into their problems and how to use their valuable experience and talents. It has called the first White House Conference on the Aging in our Nation's history for next January.

Bold and dramatic steps have been taken to expand medical research in cancer, heart disease, mental illnesses, and other crippling and killing maladies.

In the 7 years prior to 1953, the value of surplus agricultural products distributed in the school lunch program and to needy persons, institutions, schools, and Indian reservations totaled $263 million. In the 7 years since 1953 the total distributed was $960 million worth—3½ times as much. Anything wrong with that record?

In short, we have moved vigorously whenever and wherever action by the Federal Government is the proper and best way to deal with any problem affecting public safety and the people's welfare.

When before did any government ever take less from the people in taxes and give them more in return?

How was it done? Not by Government orders, edicts, or controls, and not by Government handouts.

It was done, not by changing our principles of freedom of enterprise, but by sticking to them.

It was done by good Republican management of the Government, not management of the people.

Obviously, I cannot try here to outline our detailed proposals for the years ahead. I have not even mentioned vitally important areas like education, health, agriculture, conservation, taxation, and a dozen other issues which would require almost a separate speech each. They will be covered, however, before this convention is over.

X

May I turn, finally, to some basic principles, tested principles of freedom, which we believe it is necessary for us to understand and follow if we are to meet successfully the challenges of the future.

Many Americans have come to think that our two major parties are, after all, just about the same. But it is not so. The main difference between them, as I said in the beginning, is not over good ends. The difference—and it is a profound one—is over means. Which are the right ways to get the good ends?

We Republicans deeply believe that the first function of a good government is to protect the liberty of the individual citizen, not to take it away.

There have never been but two basic philosophies of government—government from the bottom up and government from the top down. Our fathers believed, and so do we Republicans, that most problems can best be solved by the people themselves.

One philosophy puts its primary faith in government officials. The other puts its primary faith in the good sense and the capabilities of our people.

One group begins with the assumption that the more complex and complicated a society becomes the more its control and management must be centralized in an increasingly powerful government.

We Republicans begin with the same premises and come to exactly the opposite conclusion; namely, that the more complex and complicated a society, the more impossible it is for any centrally located group of men—no matter how able or devoted or sincere—even to grasp all the details of the complicated problems, to say nothing of handling those details from Washington.

We are not against adequate Federal Government. There must be such Government to prevent abuses of power. We merely want to keep it limited to its proper fields, so that the liberty of individuals will be protected. The Republican Party stands for liberty.

In the Democratic Convention you heard a lot about Woodrow Wilson. What did he, a real student of government, think on this issue? In a speech in New York in 1912 he said, "Liberty has never come from the Government. Liberty has always come from the subject of the Government. The history of liberty is a history of resistance. The history of liberty is a history of the limitation of governmental power, not the increase of it."

Nobody has said it better than that. Yet we now see those who claim to be the followers of Wilson insisting that the way to expand liberty is to increase the powers of Government.

XI

How did our forefathers seek to limit Government to its essential functions? By putting the Government under a Constitution. Many regard that Constitution as the means by which the Government regulates the people. No, it is the magnificent means our fathers devised by which the people can regulate their Government.

Why did they insist on having a Bill of Rights in that Constitution? In order to be sure that their Government would take care of them? No, in order to be sure that their Government could not interfere in their taking care of themselves.

Rights are not what our Government must do for us; rights are what our Government cannot do to us. Rights are not guarantees by the Government; rights are guarantees against the Government, even against our own Government, in order to keep it a good government.

We believe also that all men are created equal. In support of this fundamental faith, Republicans work for government that

will provide equality under the law for all citizens, and equality of opportunity for all citizens. We believe this is the best way to get the fullest possible rewards for all citizens.

It is because of this Republican emphasis on equal opportunity that the Republican Party is the party to which youth will naturally gravitate, if we make our principles clear to them. For what does youth want most of all? Youth wants to get ahead. The Republican Party stands always for maximum freedom and opportunity—for every man to improve his condition.

This is why it is possible in America for the son of a rich man, like JACK KENNEDY, to become President.

This is why it is possible in America for the son of a poor man, like DICK NIXON, to become President.

Republicans believe that that government is best, not which does most for its citizens directly, but which makes it possible for most citizens to do most for themselves—and then assists with those who, for whatever reason, cannot provide the basic necessities for themselves.

I do not say these things because I am a Republican; I am a Republican because these are the things I believe with all my heart and soul.

I think we can state it as a law that whenever a government does for its citizens that which they have the capacity to do for themselves, individually and in groups, it begins to destroy both their capacity and their incentive to do for themselves. It begins to weaken rather than to strengthen the foundations of freedom and the means of progress.

I can work my girl's arithmetic problems better for her than she can work them for herself. I can get the right answers almost every time. And she would like to have me do them for her. She'd even vote for me if I would. But I don't. Not because I don't love her or want her to succeed—but because I do.

XII

Abraham Lincoln at Gettysburg said, "Now we are engaged in a great civil war testing"—testing, among other things, whether Government of the people, by the people, for the people can long endure.

Lincoln and the Republican Party led our country through that crisis of 100 years ago. Now we are engaged in a greater conflict—the whole planet is in the throes of the mightiest conflict in all history. It is a world civil war. What is it about? It is about exactly the same thing as then: Is government of the people, by the people, and, therefore, for the people to perish, literally, from the earth?

During the fiery trial of Lincoln's day he warned solemnly that this Nation could not exist half slave, half free. He and his party succeeded in restoring unity and freedom to the Nation.

Can this whole wide world of our day go on indefinitely half slave, half free? Deep down in our hearts, we know the answer is "No."

The reason why it has not proved possible to get any real agreement with the Communist world all these years is because the Communists are not pursuing the same objectives as we are pursuing. And why are they not pursuing the same objectives? Because they do not believe the same things we believe—about man, about the universe, about God.

If we in America, of whatever political opinion at the moment, are to prove worthy of this most terrible testing in our Nation's life, we too must resolve with Lincoln, "that, under God, this Nation shall have a new birth of freedom."

It was under God that our freedom was born. Only under God can there be a rebirth.

What then is our role to be? Listen again to Lincoln in his message to the Congress in 1862, "The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present. The occasion is piled high with difficulty, and we must rise with the occasion. As our case is new, so we must think anew, and act anew. We must disenthrall ourselves, and then we shall save our country."

There it is:

Under God, a new birth of freedom;
A new and deeper understanding of it;
A new and deeper dedication to it.

With such a rebirth within you and me, and within our beloved party, we shall deserve to be entrusted by the people with the awful responsibilities of governing this great land. And they will turn to us and our country will be saved.

And now let us get to work.

SENATE

TUESDAY, AUGUST 30, 1960

(Legislative day of Wednesday, August 24, 1960)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who desirest truth in the inward parts, even as we lift to Thy everlasting mercy our world with its crying needs, we would bring the inwardness of our individual lives to the searchlight of Thy scrutiny.

Give us confidence in ourselves, that we may be saved by the hope that Thou canst redeem our imperfections and link what Thou canst make of us, and do through us, to the working out of Thy beneficent designs for mankind.

Give us a creative faith, that we can be a part of what moves forward and belong to the company pushing back evil and establishing the good.

Save our inner lives, we pray, from the blight of cynicism which, if we allow it to master our outlook, poisons our very eyes and tinges all we see with signs of evil.

Renew in us a sense of the essential goodness of life and the vision of its constant pageant of beauty, that even as we struggle against the discords which spoil life's music, we may find joy and gladness as we journey on our way.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, August 29, 1960, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

REPORT OF NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 454)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the third semiannual report of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, covering the period October 1, 1959, to April 1, 1960.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 30, 1960.*

WITHDRAWALS OF NOMINATIONS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore, as in executive session, laid before the Senate a message in writing from the President of the United States, withdrawing the nominations of Cecile M. Hill, to be postmaster at Tok, Alaska, Florabelle Rominger, to be postmaster at Bangor, Calif., and Donald E. Trees, to be postmaster at Armstrong, Iowa.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 13161) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. THOMAS, Mr. KIRWAN, Mr. CANNON, Mr. JENSEN, and Mr. TABER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 11535. An act to amend the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act to provide that class C and D licensees shall not be prohibited from serving alcoholic beverages in their establishments on New Year's Day when New Year's falls on Sunday; and

H.R. 12775. An act to increase the relief or retirement compensation of certain former members of the Metropolitan Police force, the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the U.S. Park Police force, the White House Police force, and the U.S. Secret Service; and of their widows, widowers, and children.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature

to the enrolled bill (H.R. 12619) making appropriations for mutual security and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

H.R. 11535. An act to amend the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act to provide that class C and D licensees shall not be prohibited from serving alcoholic beverages in their establishments on New Year's Day when New Year's falls on Sunday; and

H.R. 12775. An act to increase the relief or retirement compensation of certain former members of the Metropolitan Police force, the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the U.S. Park Police force, the White House Police force, and the U.S. Secret Service; and of their widows, widowers, and children.

PROCEDURE IN CONNECTION WITH RESOLUTION TO DISCHARGE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE FROM FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF BILL TO ASSIST IN PUBLIC SCHOOL DESEGREGATION PROGRAMS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we have the usual morning hour, with statements limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I feel constrained to object until we can clarify a matter with respect to the RECORD of yesterday. At this stage of the proceedings, I feel that I must object.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Would the Senator from Georgia care to state what needs to be clarified?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. The matter to which I have reference appears on page 18154 of the RECORD of the proceedings of yesterday, if Senators are interested. A resolution apparently was accepted for introduction, although the putative author of the resolution did not ask that it be introduced. Apparently it was accepted for introduction, although the Senator who presented the resolution did not even request that the resolution be introduced and objection was entered to the requests that were made.

I desire to clarify that matter before we have any morning hour.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I attempted to clarify that matter last evening, with both the Presiding Officer and the Parliamentarian. My hearing was good, I think. I heard the Chair recognize the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]. The Senator from Delaware, in turn, turned to his right and motioned to the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS]; and the Senator from New York addressed the Chair.

The Senator from New York, as I recall—and I think the RECORD will so show—made this request:

> Now I ask unanimous consent that the discharge resolution which I have just sent to the desk may be immediately considered.

He did not ask permission to introduce it; he did not ask unanimous consent to introduce it. He could introduce it only in the morning hour, unless he obtained unanimous consent. He asked for its immediate consideration, whereupon objection was entered.

He then asked that it go to the calendar, and objection was made there.

But at no time did he ask that he introduce it out of order, since we were not in the morning hour.

The Chair stated that, under the rule, it would go over, so I inquired of the Chair, immediately, why he would make such a statement. He said the Parliamentarian told him to say that.

I asked the Parliamentarian; and he said, "Well, by implication or by inference, you could assume that perhaps you might be getting consent to introduce it."

I said, "Well, such a request was never made, and such a request was never granted."

I think that is the position in which we find ourselves, and I believe that is the position the Senate would take.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Yes, I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I am glad to be able to respond to the Senator from Texas, and first to say that I yield to no one in this Chamber in my respect not only for the Senator from Texas as a Senator and as a man, but also in my respect for his leadership position.

The Senator from Texas will notice that I made no effort last night to move to adjourn the Senate—which would have been wrong on my part. I have read the RECORD, and it indicates that I had such a thing in mind. But I state now to the Senator from Texas that I did not, although in the excitement of laying the matter before the Senate, I used words of imminence. But I did not have in mind in any respect attempting to take over the leadership function.

Furthermore, I believe the Senator from Texas is just as much interested as I am in preserving the right of every Member of the Senate to offer resolutions and bills, for even a Member who might not have liked what I was doing might, on another occasion, on another issue, be in another position.

I was trying to picture as graphically as I could what happens when there is not a morning hour, and, as a result, Senators are cut off in certain respects—in the expectation, which I hoped would not be bashed, that the majority leader, in the exercise of his great responsibilities, would make that opportunity available.

So much for the background of my own attitude and position, which have not changed since I have been here, and I hope will never change in my respect for the leadership function, notwithstanding my efforts to win the points which I think need to be won and to fight as I think I should and I have in that respect.

With respect to the particular resolution, it was my understanding, too, that there was implied in my request a request that I might at least file the resolution.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Well, Mr. President——

Mr. JAVITS. If I may continue, please: That is what I took the Chair to mean when the Chair said what the Chair did say.

However, it is a fact, and it has been quite properly stated by the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Texas, that the unanimous-consent request I made did not include a unanimous-consent request to file the resolution.

But, Mr. President, I have no desire to allow anything to go by implication, if other Members challenge it as not having been properly implied.

So, Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that I may introduce the resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. RUSSELL. I object.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I do not care to labor this point any further.

The minority leader informed me, last evening, of the statements made by the Senator from New York, which appear on page 18146. I did not have a chance to read those statements, but I gathered that the Senator from New York was indicating that he might move to adjourn the session of the Senate last night. And that is all I said to him. I told him that if he desired to adjourn the Senate or to recess the Senate, if he would tell me, I would see if I could not comply with his wishes, because an hour earlier I had said to the minority leader that we would go out at any time that was desirable to him. And while I was away from the Chamber, I got word that the Senator from New York was indicating that, "nonetheless" he might "move to adjourn the session tonight rather than to recess it."

That would indicate, to me, that he had some such thing in mind. If he did not, all is forgiven; and let us proceed.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to point out that later in the RECORD I explained my whole position, in detail, for the information of Senators.

It seems to me that if the two parts of the RECORD are taken together, one does not receive the impression that I was swashbuckling here, in the expectation of taking over the leadership of the distinguished majority leader—which I cannot do, anyhow, and which I had no intention to imply.

However, I will say—and I think the Senator will agree—that where it is necessary for a Member, having given very adequate notice, to make a procedural move in order to protect elementary rights, such as the right to offer a resolution, I hope in those instances the Senator from Texas will not consider that anyone is treading on his leadership prerogatives.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator is within his rights to make any motion or request. In light of his statement as it appears on page 18147, in

which he said, "now is the time to do something about it," I think any reasonable man would conclude he had in mind what I said he had in mind last night.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator from New York has explained the situation. I agree that we should start all over again, and I will start again. I now request from the Senator from Texas the opportunity to introduce my resolution, to have a procedural framework, in view of the objections to doing it under unanimous consent.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I desire to make a brief statement. I have no desire to prevent the Senator from New York from submitting the resolution when it is done in normal circumstances and in the normal manner. Last evening I objected to any proceeding under the resolution, and I wish to make it perfectly clear now that there can be no implied matter of agreement to suspend the rules of the Senate without the Chair at least stating that proposition to the Senate. And in this instance, as will be found on page 18154, the Senator from New York did start to make what was apparently a double-barrelled unanimous-consent request, as appears under the verbiage, "a resolution to discharge the Judiciary Committee from further consideration of the bill, S. 958," when a controversy arose as to who had the floor; and when that was settled—and it was before the Presiding Officer ever submitted any request, and I was sitting here, ready, willing, and able to object to any unanimous-consent request—the Senator from New York stated he withdrew that request for the moment. Then he proceeded to discuss his resolution.

Later, without waiting to submit the resolution, he said, "Now I ask unanimous consent that the discharge resolution which I have just sent to the desk may be immediately considered."

I was sitting here, Mr. President. I did not immediately jump to my feet and say, "I object." I was prepared to object, but I waited until we went through the ordinary parliamentary process. The RECORD will show that the first time the Presiding Officer submitted any of this question to the Senate occurred after the Senator's request. The Presiding Officer said:

Is there objection?

I said:

Mr. President, of course there is objection—

And I did object, and that, of course, absolutely vitiated any proceedings whatever under the resolution.

I did not hear the Chair when he stated that "The resolution will go over one day." Had I understood the Chair to make that statement, I would have immediately submitted a point of order against the statement, because it could only have been done by unanimous consent, and the unanimous-consent request had not been granted.

Mr. President, this is a matter under rather peculiar conditions. I should like to submit a parliamentary inquiry. What is the present status of this resolution?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Since objection was made to it, it was not submitted.

Mr. RUSSELL. So the statement that "the resolution will go over one day" does not imply that the resolution was submitted?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have no further comment.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. JAVITS. If the unanimous-consent request I made a moment ago had been granted, that I be permitted to submit the resolution, it would then be submitted and go over for 1 day, would it not?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. On objection to present consideration, it would go over 1 day.

Mr. JAVITS. So the objection of the Senator from Georgia has prevented me from submitting it by unanimous consent. Is that correct?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, may I say that was certainly the intention of the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. JAVITS. It was well performed.

Mr. RUSSELL. That was the intention of the Senator from Georgia. That was the intention of the objection, and I so recorded it last evening.

Mr. President, I am not a great stickler for form in our procedures here, but I do not think a Senator should, day on day, be expected to object, unless the Chair has stated to the Senate a unanimous consent request.

The Senate can do almost anything by unanimous consent, and therefore we should be very careful in handling unanimous consent requests; and no unanimous consents can be granted until the Chair has officially, as Presiding Officer, asked the Senate if there is objection, and has permitted at least a couple of seconds to go by to give an objector an opportunity to get on his feet. An objection merely in the words "I object" is sufficient to kill a unanimous consent request of 12 or 15 parts. A Senator does not have to get up and say, "I object to the Senator's proposal. I object to the Senator's having the floor. I object to Fidel Castro. I object to Lumumba." All he has to do is say, "I object," and that kills the entire unanimous consent request even if it is composed of several parts. I shall be glad to see it later, if the Senator does not have any opportunity at this time, but for the time being I object.

Mr. JAVITS. I think, in all fairness to the Chair, it should be said the point is, the Senator did not hear the statement.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am certainly not reflecting on the Chair.

Mr. JAVITS. That is the important point. If the Senator had heard the Chair, the Senator would have objected.

Mr. RUSSELL. I would not have objected. I would have submitted a point of order on the ground that the resolution could not go over for 1 day when it had not been introduced.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I should like to say a word about this matter to clear it up for the RECORD. I know all Senators on the floor are aware of the situation, but I am not so sure that those who read the RECORD will be aware of it. The point is that the Senator cannot submit his resolution at any time except during a morning hour. I would particularly like to have the attention of the distinguished majority leader. Personally, I was on the floor and heard all of the discussion. I have no quarrel with the RECORD. I have no quarrel with the rulings of the Chair. I think the Senator from Georgia was within his rights. But I do say to the majority leader that the recessing of the Senate from day to day, and from day to day indefinitely, is an assumption of more than his leadership, and that when it reaches the point that it deprives Members of the Senate of having the Senate adjourn and have a morning hour when resolutions can be introduced, then I think Senators are being deprived of their fundamental rights under the rules.

I understand perfectly that sometimes we go along for several days as we have; but it seems to me it is more than the majority leader's leadership. I want to say, frankly, I read nothing and can see nothing in the remarks of the Senator from New York which would imply that he was in any degree trying to assume to himself any of the cloak of leadership; but it reaches a place, in the scheme of things, where the only way one can protect his fundamental rights under the rules is to make a motion to adjourn.

I do not know what the Senator from New York proposes to do. He has not discussed it with me. It seems to me in this instance a motion to adjourn does not indicate a desire to take away the leadership, but simply a desire to secure for a Senator the right to submit a resolution and to protect the people whom he feels he represents. It is not an attempt to take away leadership, but an attempt to secure for a Senator the rights which are his under the rules.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am very grateful to my colleague from Colorado. The discussion this morning is very helpful to me, certainly, and I hope to the Senate, in making this whole situation clear.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield before the Senator from Colorado leaves the floor, I wish to thank him for his contribution and for the remarks he has made about the leadership.

Any Senator, of course, is within his rights to move that the Senate adjourn at any time he wishes to do so. I informed the Senator from New York last night I would be very glad to yield and to let him make that motion.

So long as the leadership has it within his discretion as to when to adjourn or to recess he will exercise that discretion in accordance with his best judgment. He

is glad to have everyone's recommendations, and particularly the recommendations of the learned Senator from Colorado.

We do adjourn from day to day. We have adjourned several times in the last few days. We have also recessed. We shall adjourn before the session comes to an end.

The Senator from Colorado can place such construction as he cares to on the remarks of the Senator from New York. I understood that the Senator desired an adjournment and indicated that he was prepared to move that the Senate adjourn. That was the message which was brought to me by a very distinguished Member of this body. I replied by saying, "He is perfectly within his rights. Simply ask for a rollcall, and we shall come in and vote on the question."

When I came to the Chamber I learned that the Senator from New York felt his position had been misinterpreted. I do not criticize him for that position. I do not quarrel with him about it. I assume that he will permit me and the other Members to reserve to myself and to themselves the same rights any Senator claims for himself.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. My reply to the distinguished majority leader is that there is much more than is in the RECORD, which simply shows the cold words in black and white. Much can also be interpreted from the manner and from the demeanor of the man who says the words, and the tone in which they are said.

All I wished to say was that since I was present on the floor at the time, judging both from the words which were said and the manner and the demeanor of the Senator from New York, I know he had no idea of trying to usurp any of the functions of the leadership. It was this point I wished to clear up.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, we can all judge each Senator's motives and demeanor. We do. I have no objection to being judged likewise.

The Senator has a right to move that the Senate adjourn at any time he wishes. Every Senator has that right. I have not tried to instruct them. I assume they will exercise any rights they have. I have no objection to their doing so.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank my colleague from Texas, and I thank my colleague from Colorado for his remarks.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

PUBLICATION OF NOTICE OF PROPOSED DISPOSITION OF CERTAIN SILK NOILS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of a notice to be published in the Federal Register of a proposed disposition of approximately 1,450,000 pounds of silk noils now held in the national stockpile, which with the accompanying paper was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

PETITIONS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution adopted by the Young Democratic Clubs of Oregon, Eugene, Oreg., relating to medical care for the aged; ordered to lie on the table.

RESOLUTION OF AMERICAN VETERINARY MEDICAL ASSOCIATION

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the American Veterinary Medical Association at its 97th annual meeing in Denver, Colo., August 14 through 18, adopted a resolution urging the U.S. Civil Service Commission and both the House and Senate Committees on Post Office and Civil Service to study and survey positions in the U.S. Department of Agriculture with regard to classification and retention of doctors of veterinary medicine.

In view of the outstanding service rendered by the doctors of veterinary medicine, I sincerely hope Congress will have an opportunity to act on this at an early date.

I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be printed in the RECORD, and referred to the appropriate committee.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY 97TH ANNUAL MEETING AMERICAN VETERINARY MEDICAL ASSOCIATION

Whereas the recruitment, classification, and retention of doctors of veterinary medicine in the Department of Agriculture presents a serious problem; and

Whereas this problem has received the attention and study of the American Veterinary Medical Association for a number of years; and

Whereas recommendations made to the Department of Agriculture have not solved the problem; and

Whereas this association is quite concerned about the effect the shortage of veterinarians has on programs in the Agricultural Research Service particularly in connection with disease prevention and control, inspection and quarantine, and research; and

Whereas this association believes a review and reclassification of veterinary positions in the Department is indicated: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the American Veterinary Association, in convention assembled, requests the U.S. Civil Service Commission to conduct a complete occupational study and survey of veterinary positions in the U.S. Department of Agriculture and other agencies in the Federal Government; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, the chairman of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the chairman of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and to other appropriate officials as deemed desirable.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 3911. A bill to provide for a First Secretary of the Government and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. JAVITS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 3912. A bill for the relief of Dr. Eugenio De Lacruz and his wife, Josefa Ancheta Lacruz; and

S. 3913. A bill for the relief of Dr. Rodolfo De Oca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HRUSKA:

S. 3914. A bill to amend chapter 235 of title 18, United States Code, to provide for the appellate review of sentences imposed in criminal cases arising in the district courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOPER:

S. 3915. A bill for the relief of Jasper Y. Willoughby; and

S. 3916. A bill for the relief of Rosario Barrena Villachoia, Maria Dolores Villar Salinas, Angela Casanova Cabello and Carmen Guenaga Anchustegui; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESOLUTIONS

AMENDMENT OF RULE XIX TO LIMIT DEBATE ON PART OF A SENATOR

Mr. CLARK submitted a resolution (S. Res. 384) to amend rule XIX so as to limit debate on the part of a Senator, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted to Mr. CLARK, which appears under a separate heading.)

PROCEEDINGS IN STANDING COMMITTEES OF SENATE

Mr. CLARK submitted a resolution (S. Res. 385) relating to proceedings in standing committees of the Senate, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. CLARK, which appears under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF TARIFF ACT OF 1930—AMENDMENT

Mr. McCARTHY submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 4384) to amend paragraph 1774 of the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to the importation of certain articles for religious purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954, RELATING TO POSSESSIONS OF THE UNITED STATES—AMENDMENT

Mr. McCARTHY submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him,

to the bill (H.R. 5547) to amend certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to possessions of the United States, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

INCOME TAX TREATMENT OF NONREFUNDABLE CAPITAL CONTRIBUTIONS TO FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION—AMENDMENT

Mr. McCARTHY submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 7885) relating to the income tax treatment of nonrefundable capital contributions to Federal National Mortgage Association, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

TECHNICAL REVISIONS OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954, RELATING TO ESTATES, TRUSTS, PARTNERS, AND PARTNERSHIPS—AMENDMENT

Mr. McCARTHY submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 9662) to make technical revisions in the income tax provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to estates, trusts, partners, and partnerships, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF TARIFF ACT OF 1930 RELATING TO BAMBOO PIPESTEMS—AMENDMENT

Mr. McCARTHY submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 10841) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to place bamboo pipestems on the free list, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENTS TO LAW PROHIBITING PAYMENT OF ANNUITIES AND RETIRED PAY TO CERTAIN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, it is generally agreed that the so-called Hiss Act, Public Law 769, passed in 1954, which prohibits the payment of annuities and retired pay to officers and employees of the United States, is too broad in its application. There have been differences of opinion between Senators who wish to leave that act exactly as it is and Senators who may wish to go too far in changing it. There have been cited numerous cases of hardship in which individuals who have been convicted of relatively minor crimes have been forced to pay, in the loss of annuities, penalties far exceeding what the nature of their crimes demands.

House bill 4601, which is on the calendar, and which the majority leader has announced will be called up for action, justifiably seeks to narrow the application of the Hiss Act. It was contended, when this measure was debated on May 12, that the bill, as originally reported by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, went too far. H.R. 4601 limits the application of the Hiss Act prohibition on the payment of annuities only to cases involving loyalty or the national security. In doing so, it may make it possible for certain persons who have committed major crimes to receive retirement benefits. That point was brought out very forcefully on the floor by the distinguished Senator from Delaware.

On May 12 the distinguished Senator from Delaware successfully moved to recommit H.R. 4601, in order that it might be narrowed, so as not to restore "crooks and scoundrels" to the public retirement rolls. I joined the Senator from Delaware on his motion to recommit.

The Post Office and Civil Service Committee has not reported this bill to the Senate without amendment. Since the members of the committee failed to narrow this bill to a more acceptable and justifiable form, it will be up to us, here on the floor, if the bill is programed before us, to do that job ourselves.

For this reason, I send to the desk, for printing under the rule, amendments which would limit the withholding of annuities to cases involving a crime for which an individual has been committed to serve more than a year in confinement. By so restricting the restoration of annuities, I believe we would eliminate hardship cases in which those who have not received a significant penalty are nevertheless forced to sacrifice annuities, sometimes worth $25,000 or $30,000. At the same time, persons who have embezzled large sums of money from the Government or have committed equally serious crimes would not be permitted to receive benefits from the Government which they served so poorly.

Since a crime must be punishable by a sentence of a year or more in order to be a felony, as defined in the United States Code, this would seem to me to be a valid way of distinguishing between major and minor crimes for purposes of the Hiss Act.

Mr. President, I do not contend that this is a final answer, but I suggest that these amendments be printed, under the rule, in order that they may receive attention when the bill comes before us.

Mr. President, I hope it is clear that the 1-year provision is not arbitrary, but is based upon longstanding practice, as set out in the United States Code.

The need to narrow the scope of House bill 4601 seems to be reasonably clear, because there were cited instances in which real hardships resulted from the strict application of the law. But in narrowing its application or scope we must, in my judgment, still deny annuities to those who have committed crimes involving the national security or who have committed serious crimes against the Government. It is for that reason that I am submitting these amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). The amendments will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE V OF AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1949—AMENDMENT

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I submit an amendment, intended to be proposed by me, to the bill (H.R. 12759) to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes, which is on the Senate Calendar. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be printed, and be printed in the RECORD, with a brief explanatory statement, at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and will lie on the table; and, without objection, the amendment and explanatory statement will be printed in the RECORD, as requested by the Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, section 503 of Public Law 78 states that no Mexican worker recruited under this title shall be available for employment in any area unless the Secretary of Labor has determined and certified that first, sufficient domestic workers are not available, second, the employment of Mexican workers will not adversely affect the wages and conditions of domestic workers and third—and I quote—"reasonable efforts have been made to attract domestic workers for such employment at wages and standard hours of work comparable to those offered to foreign workers."

Mr. President, my amendment strikes the word "wages and standard hours of work comparable to those offered to foreign workers" which appears in the third provision that I just read. It inserts in lieu thereof the words "terms and conditions of employment at least equal to those offered to foreign workers." The net effect of my amendment would be to strengthen the tone of this statute with respect to these provisions intended to avoid having the employment of Mexican farmworkers undermine employment conditions for domestic farmworkers. Mr. President, the Secretary already has such power. My amendment would simply say that rather than conditions being comparable, the Secretary shall see to it that conditions of domestic workers in areas where they compete with Mexican workers are "at least equal" to those of Mexicans. It seems to me that this is only fair. American farmworkers should receive the same protection under the law as do those coming in from outside of the United States.

The amendment and explanatory statement are as follows:

At the end of the bill add the following new section:

SEC. 2. Clause (3) of section 503 of such Act is amended to read as follows: "(3) reasonable efforts have been made to attract domestic workers for such employment at terms and on conditions at least equal to those offered to foreign workers".

EXPLANATION OF KEATING AMENDMENT TO H.R. 12759

Although employers are required to provide their Mexican workers with free housing, workmen's compensation, transportation from the Mexican border, guarantee of

employment for three-fourths of the working days within the contract period, free food when work is not available, similar benefits are not ordinarily required for U.S. farmworkers. In addition to its manifest inequity, failure of growers requesting Mexicans to offer such benefits to U.S. workers helps to create the labor shortages that justify use of Mexicans.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. THURMOND:

Address delivered by Senator BYRD of Virginia on accepting a distinguished service award of the American Bar Association Section on Insurance, Negligence and Compensation Law, at Washington, D.C., on August 29, 1960.

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia:

Address delivered by him at his annual orchard picnic, at Berryville, Va., on August 27, 1960.

FIRST SECRETARY ACT OF 1960

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would establish a First Secretary of the Government, a post first proposed by Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller, of New York.

The primary functions of the First Secretary, who would be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, would include the coordination of national security and international affairs required by the cold war. The First Secretary would receive a salary of $35,000 annually—equivalent to the amount received by the Vice President and Justices of the Supreme Court—and would stand after the President pro tempore of the Senate in line of succession to the Presidency.

The bill I am introducing today is a direct implementation of that part of the Republican platform plank on Government administration. The Republican convention unanimously endorsed the proposal that "two top positions should be established to assist the President in, first, the entire field of national security and international affairs, and, second, governmental planning and management, particularly in domestic affairs." The post of First Secretary would carry out the first of those two suggestions. In addition, my bill would implement the proposal included in the Nixon-Rockefeller agreement of July 23, 1960, for the "creation of a post to assist the President in the whole area of national security and international affairs."

The First Secretary of the Government would be the No. 1 aid to the President and be responsible to him for the effective coordination of U.S. activities in the cold war. Introducing the First Secretary of the Government Act of 1960 in the closing days of this congressional session will make it possible for this proposal to undergo careful study by those outside of and in the Federal Government and receive detailed consideration by those executive departments asked to submit reports on the bill, which can be available to the Congress when we return early in January 1961.

Prompt consideration of this plan should receive top priority by the next Congress and the new administration.

The months of intensive hearings by the Subcommittee on National Policy Machinery, of which I am a member, included much testimony by men of both parties who served in the highest policymaking appointive posts and under different Presidents. Many stressed in the most persuasive terms the urgent need for a super-Cabinet official who can help direct and coordinate concerning national security and international affairs policy once it has been set by the President.

Under the terms of my bill, the First Secretary would be a member of the National Security Council and could preside at these meetings should the President so direct. His staff could include four employees, each eligible to receive a maximum of $19,000 per annum, and two additional officers appointed by the President to assist the First Secretary. On a protocol basis, a First Secretary also could relieve the President of at least some of his appearances, ranking as he would with other prime ministers.

Although we may be aware of the enormous dangers and the tremendous challenges which confront us on almost every front, foreign and domestic, few of us can conceive of the extreme pressures or the awesome complexity of the problems which daily come to the desk of the President. As Governor Rockefeller pointed out in his testimony before the Subcommittee on National Policy Machinery, the President must play many roles. He is Chief of State, Chief Executive, Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces, constitutionally responsible for conducting foreign policy, and head of his political party. More than 50 departments and agencies of Government report directly to the President and those involved in the national security field have a total annual budget of almost $50 billion. This, in turn, has led to the creation of scores of interdepartmental and interagency committees—160 exist in the field of international affairs alone. In addition, there are 18 independent agencies, many more boards and commissions—4 Government agencies and 6 international financial organizations are concerned with foreign economic aid.

My bill provides that the First Secretary may serve as Chairman of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems. In a sense, this chairmanship is a high command post in U.S. foreign economic policy for the council is responsible for U.S. activities in the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the International Development Association, the International Finance Corporation, and the International Monetary Fund.

Decision making, as President Eisenhower has properly emphasized, is properly a function of the Presidency. However, the outstanding contributions which are made regularly by Cabinet officers, the Vice President, and other top level advisers in the efficient and imaginative conduct of Government cannot be discounted. The creation of the post of First Secretary is meant to contribute to this process by vesting the coordinating responsibility for activities related to our very survival in an official able to carry multidepartmental authority without encroaching on what must be recognized as the final authority and the constitutional powers of the President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New York to introduce the bill? The Chair hears none; and the bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3911) to provide for a First Secretary of the Government and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. JAVITS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

Mr. JAVITS subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, in connection with my introduction of a bill to provide for a First Secretary of the Government, that the text of the bill may be included in my remarks.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "First Secretary Act of 1960."

SEC. 2. The President, in his discretion, may appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, an officer who shall:

(a) have the title of First Secretary of the Government or such other title as the President may from time to time designate;

(b) be in the Executive Office of the President;

(c) be compensated at the rate of $35,000 per annum;

(d) be an additional member of the National Security Council and preside at meetings of the Council if and as the President may from time to time direct; and

(e) perform such other functions concerned principally with national security and international affairs as the President shall from time to time direct.

SEC. 3. Subsection (d)(1) of section 19 of title 3 of the United States Code is hereby amended by inserting therein, after the words "shall act as President:", the following: "First Secretary of the Government,".

SEC. 4. The President may appoint two additional officers who shall be in the Executive Office of the President, shall have such titles as the President shall from time to time designate, and who shall assist the First Secretary in connection with the performance of his functions as he may from time to time specify. When, by reason of absence, disability, or vacancy in office, the First Secretary cannot perform the functions assigned to him, the officers provided for in this section, in such sequence as the President may from time to time specify, shall act as First Secretary.

SEC. 5. The First Secretary of the Government is authorized:

(a) to appoint, in accordance with the civil service and classification laws, such officers and other employees as may be necessary to assist in connection with the performance of his functions, except that not more than four employees may be appointed without regard to such laws at rates of not more than $19,000 per annum; and

(b) to obtain services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5

U.S.C. 55a), at such per diem rates for individuals as may be approved by the President.

SEC. 6. Section 104a of the Federal Executive Pay Act of 1956 (70 Stat. 736; 5 U.S.C. 2201 et. seq.) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(21) the two officers provided for in section 4 of the First Secretary Act of 1960."

SEC. 7. Subsection (a) of section 4 of the Bretton Woods Agreement Act, c. 339, 59 Stat. 512, as amended (22 U.S.C. 286(b)), is hereby further amended to read as follows:

"(a) In order to coordinate the policies and operations of the representatives of the United States on the Fund and the Bank and of all agencies of the Government which make or participate in making foreign loans or which engage in foreign financial, exchange or monetary transactions, there is established a National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems (hereinafter referred to as the "Council"), consisting of such person as the President may designate as Chairman, and of the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Commerce, the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and the President of the Export-Import Bank of Washington."

SEC. 8. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

THE NOMINATION OF ROBERT A. BICKS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the struggle continues over the confirmation of Robert A. Bicks, the President's nominee to head the Antitrust Division of the Justice Department.

I ask unanimous consent that there may be included in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a magnificent lead editorial published in the New York Times of August 29, 1960, entitled "An Overdue Confirmation."

Also a fine endorsement of Mr. Robert A. Bicks from Arthur H. Dean, an outstanding leader in the bar and a senior partner of Sullivan & Cromwell, of New York, who states in his telegram:

In my judgment Mr. Bicks is capable and experienced and a hard-hitting litigator and I have always found him to be fair and responsible.

Also a letter addressed to Mr. Bicks by the Junior Bar Conference of the American Bar Association, signed by the chairman of the junior bar conference, in which the chairman states:

Your leadership in the administration of the antitrust laws, while extremely vigorous, has exhibited wisdom and judicious restraint.

Finally, an address delivered by Mr. Bicks before the Antitrust Section of the American Bar Association, at Washington on August 29, 1960, on the consent decree policy of the Government in respect of antitrust cases, showing the tremendous capability of Mr. Bicks in this field.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Aug. 29, 1960]

AN OVERDUE CONFIRMATION

During the past week Robert A. Bicks, President Eisenhower's nominee to head the Antitrust Division of the Justice Department, has received an extraordinary series of tributes. Senators of both parties have risen on the floor to praise him. Telegrams of endorsement have come from many State attorneys general. One of the country's most distinguished lawyers, Whitney North Seymour—president-elect of the American Bar Association and an antitrust practitioner himself—said that Mr. Bicks' conduct of the office compares favorably with that of any of his predecessors over the last 30 years.

Yet Mr. Bicks' nomination remains lodged in the Senate Judiciary Committee. As Richard E. Mooney pointed out in a Washington dispatch to this newspaper yesterday, he is the only Eisenhower nominee to a position in the executive branch who remains unconfirmed. Why? No one knows, or at least no one says. There is talk of big business opposition to a tough trustbuster, but none has appeared in public.

The nomination has been before the Judiciary Committee since May, time enough to hear and decide any nomination. The fact is that Mr. Bicks has been in good measure responsible for the excellent antitrust record of the last 7 years. Even if he should stay on as a recess appointee, a failure to confirm him now would be an unjustified slap at his record. At least the Senate should have a chance to vote on Mr. Bicks. The reputation of Senate Majority Leader JOHNSON for honorable dealing on Presidential nominations will be injured if he does not move to get the Bicks nomination out of committee and on to the floor before the Senate adjourns.

AUGUST 26, 1960.

Hon. JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman, Senate Judiciary Committee,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I have been engaged in various matters involving interpretation of and litigation arising out of the antitrust laws of the United States and have had occasion to deal with the Attorneys General and the Assistant Attorneys General in charge of antitrust matters under many administrations. Over the past few years I have had occasion in connection with the work of my clients to come into contact with Robert Bicks who has been nominated by President Eisenhower to be Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Antitrust Division.

In my judgment Mr. Bicks is capable and experienced and a hard-hitting litigator and I have always found him to be fair and responsible. This post, as I know you are aware, is a very difficult one because whoever occupies it must be a hard, capable, and diligent fighter and at the same time he must exercise careful and reasoned judgment in both the types of suits and the particular suits he brings. He may be criticized by some if he brings many and by others equally sincere if he brings few.

I myself have always felt that criminal sanctions should play no part in the determination of the exceptionally difficult economic questions which have confronted our society and our problems of growth and indeed a reexamination of these laws is essential if we are to compete with the U.S.S.R. in the growing economic war but nevertheless the Congress has seen fit to include criminal provisions in the antitrust laws and when criminal antitrust suits are brought they frequently result in harsh and unusual treatment for men who all their lives have deservedly been highly respected members of the community but who have perhaps made mistakes in respect of our indefinite antitrust laws about the interpretation of which experts differ widely.

Since I have been counsel for defendants in a number of antitrust cases over the years and have been fighting the Department's interpretation of these laws, I have not thought the committee would be particularly interested in my views as to Mr. Bicks' qualifications.

It has come to my attention, however, that the committee considers the lack of endorsements by lawyers with such experience to be a mark against Mr. Bicks. In my capacity as a citizen and as a member of the bars of the State of New York and the Federal courts, including the U.S. Supreme Court, I would therefore like to endorse Mr. Bicks' nomination, and to add that in my judgment it is better to have a hard and a capable fighter in this post than it is to have someone who is timid and declines to make decisions.

Respectfully yours,

ARTHUR H. DEAN.

AUGUST 29, 1960.

Hon. ROBERT A. BICKS,
Assistant Attorney General,
Antitrust Division,
Department of Justice,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BICKS: By the unanimous vote of the conference assembly of the Junior Bar Conference of the American Bar Association, I have been directed to commend you on the outstanding manner in which you have conducted your high office. Your leadership in the administration of the antitrust laws, while extremely vigorous, has exhibited wisdom and judicious restraint.

You have given a splendid example of how a lawyer, though young in years, may nevertheless possess the ability and maturity necessary to qualify him for the most important positions in the field of law.

Your work has been noted and admired by lawyers of all ages and levels of experience and you stand as an inspiration to all young lawyers in all fields of legal endeavor.

We wish you continued success in your career and hope that you will continue to be accorded those honors commensurate with the dignity of your office and the level of your achievements.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM REECE SMITH, JR.,
Chairman, Junior Bar Conference.

ADDRESS BY ROBERT A. BICKS, ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL, ANTITRUST DIVISION, U.S. JUSTICE DEPARTMENT, BEFORE THE ANTITRUST SECTION OF THE AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION, WASHINGTON, D.C., AUGUST 29, 1960

I am indeed honored to join with you in the antitrust section's annual bar convention program. Treating my assigned topic of recent policy developments, my plan this morning is to touch on one aspect of the antitrust division's program for working closely with interested State attorneys general.

At the outset, what is the States' interest in collecting damages when a State or its subdivisions have felt the pinch of an antitrust violation? Second, what is the appropriate role of a Federal antitrust enforcement agency in aiding the State attorneys general to protect their States' interests? And, finally, just how does the Federal Government's obligation to aid State enforcement agencies accord, not only with the congressional design for antitrust, but with basic considerations of comity between State and Federal law enforcement?

I. THE INTERESTS OF THE STATES

First, the interests of the States. In some antitrust cases, brought by the Federal Government, the primary parties injured may be States or cities throughout the country. When States or cities have been hurt by an antitrust violation, the law provides that a State or city may sue and recover treble damages. As the Supreme Court has put it, holding that Congress intended to grant the States a right to sue to recover treble damages on behalf of their citizens (*Georgia* v. *Evans*, 316 U.S. 159, 162):

"We can perceive no reason for believing that Congress wanted to deprive a State, as purchaser of commodities shipped in interstate commerce, of the civil remedy of treble damages. * * * We have already held that such a remedy is afforded to a subdivision of the State, a municipality, which purchases pipes for use in constructing a waterworks system (*Chattanooga Foundry* v. *Atlanta*, 203 U.S. 390). Reason balks against implying denial of such a remedy to a State which purchases materials for use in public highways. * * * Such a construction would deny all redress to a State, when mulcted by a violator of the Sherman law."

Though Congress intended that States or cities be able to sue to recover damages on behalf of the people, oftimes this remedy may be less than fully effective. A State or city may know its citizens have been hurt. And badly hurt. But a State or city may not have the resources to investigate and prove that antitrust conspiracy from which its damaged stemmed.

As the attorney general of California recently put it, referring to a particular case he had brought: [1]

"The defendants are all located in the Mississippi Valley or on the Atlantic seaboard. For the State of California to have undertaken the investigation of this matter would have been prohibitively expensive as well as impracticable for other reasons."

In much the same vein, the attorney general of Maine has flatly stated: "The State of Maine is not equipped to uncover and evaluate information essential to the prosecution of * * * multistate conspiracies." [2] Like views have been expressed by the attorneys general of Massachusetts and Wisconsin.

II. THE FEDERAL ANTITRUST ENFORCEMENT OFFICIAL'S RESPONSIBILITY

In light of this difficulty States face, this Division has been considering means for handling its antitrust litigation with an eye toward aiding State attorneys general to protect the interests of injured States or cities.

Assume the Federal Government proceeds, proceeds both civilly and criminally, against an antitrust offense that has damaged a State or its subdivisions. On the one hand, if defendants plead guilty, or are adjudged to have violated the law after a criminal or civil trial, then States or cities may be able effectively to protect their interests. For, as the Supreme Court has made clear, States or cities then have "available to them all matters previously established by the Government in antitrust actions. [They enjoy] as large an advantage as the estoppel doctrine would afford had the [Federal] Government brought suit." [3]

On the other hand, as often happens, if defendants plead nolo contendere, as distinct from guilty, and enter a consent decree, rather than go to trial, then States or cities hurt by the antitrust offense may be left out in the cold. Then injured States or cities have to investigate and prove in court the existence of the antitrust conspiracy, a conspiracy that violated Federal—not State—law, before they can recover. And this States or cities are ofttimes in no position to do.

It is this problem that the Antitrust Division, together with interested State attorneys general, has been seeking to overcome. Thus, in antitrust cases where States or cities have been hurt, and where courts have, over the Antitrust Division's objection, accepted nolo pleas, the Division is now appraising the wisdom of considering, as one element of the public interest test which guides acceptance or rejection of a civil consent decree, the interest of a State or its subdivisions primarily injured by the violations alleged. This means that, in appropriate civil cases, the Division has offered defendants the alternative of proceeding to trial or accepting a consent decree that protects the State's interests.

One means thus far discussed has been the inclusion in the Federal consent decree of an injunction against contesting antitrust liability in any subsequent suit by a State or city to collect damages. If defendants choose to litigate the issue of antitrust liability, then they must do so in the context of the Federal proceeding—where the Antitrust Division has evidence of violation close at hand and is presumably well schooled in presenting same.

An antitrust defendant, on the other hand, may choose to waive its right to contest antitrust liability in any subsequent State damage suit. In that event, left at issue in any State damage proceeding would simply be the question of whether or not the State was hurt and, if so, how much?

However, such issues—the fact and extent of damage—seem peculiarly within the States' competence to ascertain and prove. For it is the State that will likely know where and how much its operations have been hurt. And it is the State that should have most ready access to data and witnesses needed to prove its damage.

In short, firmly assured is any antitrust defendant's right to a day in court on any and all issues. He is free to contest via trial the issue of antitrust liability. He is free, if he chooses, to try out the fact and extent of damage to States or cities. But if a defendant chooses to litigate his antitrust liability, he must do so in the context of the Federal proceeding—where evidence is already garnered and legal issues are familiar to enforcement officials. Thus we seek to make effective the right granted by Congress to the States to secure appropriate recompense.

So much for a brief, very brief, sketch of the policy we are now evolving together with interested State attorneys general. Now, let me emphasize some limiting factors.

Initially this policy would apply only where one or more States have borne the primary brunt of violations alleged. And any injunction against contesting antitrust liability would be carefully limited to subsequent State or city—as distinct from private—damage proceedings.

Beyond that, even where States or cities may have beeen primary parties injured, insistence on a decree waiving any contest of liability may not always be appropriate. Still to be considered is the value of relief offered but postponed by the delay of trial and, perhaps, should proof fail at trial, forever forgone. In each case, then, the decision whether or not to accept a consent decree without an injunction against contesting liability must turn on a balance between the value of antitrust relief postponed and perhaps forgone as against the extent of provable injury to the State involved.

Finally, this policy should come into play only where an injured State already filed its damage proceeeding or indicated its intent to promptly do so. Then any antitrust trial stemming from a defendant's refusal to waive contest of liability would spell no unintended added burden to any court. In short, with the State damage proceeding filed or in the immediate offing, the Court is thus faced with trying out the issue of liability in either the State or the Federal case. Indeed, the Court's resources would seem best spared by contest of the liability issue in the Federal case—where evidence is already together and experienced antitrust litigators more likely.

Against this background, the division is currently appraising the wisdom of this policy, aimed at aiding State officials to protect their States' interests, by attempting its application on a case by case basis. There is not sufficient data rooted in experience now available to warrant any broad conclusion.

However, the hopes of some State attorneys general are high. And many feel that such cooperative endeavor may well aid in making real those damage remedies which the Congress has provided the States.

III. CONCLUSION

This effort accords, not only with the congressional design for antitrust, but with basic considerations of comity at the heart of our federalism.

Initially the Congress long ago evidenced its special concern for minimizing burdens to recompensate for parties injured by antitrust violations. As the Supreme Court put it, almost a decade ago in Emich Motors: [4]

"Congressional reports and debates on the proposal which ultimately became [Clayton Act] section 5 reflect a purpose to minimize the burdens of litigation for injured * * * suitors by making available to them all matters previously established by the Government in antitrust actions. * * *

The "very purpose" of this provision, one district court recently concluded,[5] was that the Federal Government assist or encourage injured parties, "by reducing the almost prohibitive costs and staggering burdens of * * * antitrust litigation * * *."

True, to aid the Attorney General in securing consent decrees otherwise in the public interest, Congress did not secure section 5's benefits for injured parties where the Federal Government's case was terminated by "consent judgments or decrees entered before any testimony has been taken * * *" (15 U.S.C. 16). The proviso's "clear purpose" as one court noted, "is to induce defendants in [antitrust] actions * * * to submit to prompt capitulation * * *." [6]

Equally true, however, thus aiding the Attorney General to secure consent decrees that serve the public interest, Congress by no stretch obliged him to consent to those that do not. Beyond doubt, deciding to which "judgments" the "consent" of the United States shall be given, law enforcement officials must be governed by the public interest. One ingredient of the public interest must be the legitimate interests of the several States. And the means chosen to protect those interests—acceptance of a consent decree that protects the States' concern or "the simple process of the Attorney General going forward in the trial of the civil suit"—are

---

[1] Letter of Hon. Stanley Mosk, attorney general of the State of California, to Robert A. Bicks, dated Aug. 20, 1960.

[2] Telegram from Hon. Frank S. Hancock, attorney general of the State of Maine, to Robert A. Bicks, dated Aug. 22, 1960.

[3] *Emich Motors* v. *General Motors* (340 U.S. 558, 568).

[4] *Emich Motors* v. *General Motors* (340 U.S. 558, 567–568).

[5] *United States* v. *Standard Ultramarine & Color Co.* (137 F. Supp. 167 (S. D. N. Y.)). As that Court put it, at p. 172:

"The defendants urge that there is no obligation upon the Government to assist or encourage litigants. But a fair reading of the debates and the committee reports indicate that such was the very purpose of the clause. It was fashioned as a powerful weapon to aid private litigants in their suits against antitrust violators by reducing the almost prohibitive costs and staggering burdens of such litigation in making available to him the results of the Government's successful action * * *. And the hoped for by-product of the benefit to a plaintiff was increased law enforcement."

[6] *Deluxe Theater Corp.* v. *Balaban and Katz Corp.* (95 F. Supp. 983, 986).

precisely those, one Court has indicated,[7] that the Congress envisioned.

For as the Supreme Court put it many decades ago: [8]

"We live in the jurisdiction of two sovereigns, each having its own system of courts to decree and enforce its laws in a given territory * * *. The situation requires, therefore, * * * a spirit of reciprocal comity and mutual assistance to promote due and orderly procedure.

And just this year the Court once more [9] underscored these principles "of reciprocal comity and mutual assistance" in the law enforcement area: "free and open cooperation between State and Federal law enforcement officers" the Court stated, "is to be commended and encouraged" and "forthright cooperation" "will be promoted and fostered."

It is entirely fitting, I suggest, that such Federal-State "cooperation" be manifest in the antitrust enforcement area. For, as Prof. Kingman Brewster recently put it so well:

"The virtue of leaving considerable economic power" in numerous "private hands is not too dissimilar from the virtue of leaving considerable political power in the several States of a federation. In the negative sense both reject centralism * * *. More important, both exponents of States' rights and those who would leave economic power in private hands are affirming that more socially constructive energies will be released in the long run if problems can be attacked by and left to the final decision of those living closest to them. * * * [Both seek] maximum play for diverse solutions to comparable problems." [10]

CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT—REMARKS BY SENATOR ROBERTSON

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, our colleague from Virginia, [Mr. ROBERTSON], has often made some of the most profound arguments ever heard in the Senate Chamber involving major constitutional questions. His knowledge of the U.S. Constitution is thorough. His love for it is unbounded.

The Senator's recent speech, entitled "Constitutional Government," delivered on August 29, 1960, to the Annual Local Government Officials' Conference at the University of Virginia, Charlottesville, reflects the knowledge and wisdom of its author, as well as his love for and devotion to the Constitution and the American ideals it represents. It is particularly fitting that he delivered this address to the local officials of his State, which is also the State of George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, and James Madison, who laid the foundation stones of our constitutional government.

Since the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD has reflected so many of the speeches of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] on the Constitution over the years, when he has also put into practice its lofty principles in his splendid services to his beloved State of Virginia and our Nation, I ask unanimous consent that this timely address be printed in the body of the RECORD following my remarks. I commend it to our colleagues and the American public.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT

(Address by Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON)

The invitation to address this large and distinguished group of State and local officials on the subject of constitutional government was doubly appreciated—first, because I am privileged to speak at the school of the founder of a great political party dedicated to States rights and constitutional government, and, secondly, because the dean of the university's law school, who so ably expounds the Jeffersonian view of States rights, has few peers and no superior, as a teacher of constitutional law.

The immortal George Washington, to whom more than any other one man we are indebted for constitutional liberty, expressed in his Farewell Address the fervent hope "that the free Constitution, which is the work of your hands, may be sacredly maintained—that its administration in every department may be stamped with wisdom and virtue—that, in fine, the happiness of the people of these States, under the auspices of liberty, may be made complete, by so careful a preservation and so prudent a use of this blessing as will acquire to them the glory of recommending it to the applause, the affection and adoption of every nation which is yet a stranger to it." [1]

George Washington had great respect and warm affection for his brilliant staff officer, Col. Alexander Hamilton, but stoutly resisted Hamilton's effort at the Constitutional Convention of 1787 to draft the constitution of a limited monarchy of which George Washington was to be the first king. Washington, with great understanding of human nature, and foresight of what would best promote the happiness and prosperity of the 13 struggling Colonies, insisted that the new Government be a republic with a written constitution; a government of laws and not of men. Washington, a deeply religious man, wanted that government to be based upon the teachings of the Bible which recognizes the dignity of the individual; a government that would be the servant and not the master of the people.

The first governmental document of our Nation, the Declaration of Independence, proclaimed the principle of individual importance and inalienable rights. It is presented again by Thomas Jefferson in his first inaugural address. This address looks not only to the rights of man but to the means of attainment. The will of the people, said Jefferson, "is the only legitimate foundation of any government." [2]

In the Ten Commandments the right to own and enjoy private property is clearly taught. All will recall the prophesied destruction of King Ahab for his illegal taking of Naboth's vineyard. From the Bible we get our free enterprise system which is embedded in our Constitution and is the foundation of our unparalleled material progress.

These three things, constitutional government, the Biblical traditions, and the free enterprise system, have in common this principle, that the state is made for man and not man for the state. It is the individual who is important.

Constitutional government is not solely a matter of draftsmanship. England has had constitutional government for centuries, without a written constitution. The fine phrases concerning freedom in the Russian constitution did not save the millions who were liquidated to insure the continuation of dictatorial power. Other countries have drawn up and adopted what would appear on the surface to be very satisfactory written constitutions, but they have not been able to make them live as working instruments reflecting the realities of the nation for which they were drawn, to make them live in the hearts of the people.

Constitutional government is based upon the recognition that the governors of a nation are not themselves supreme and cannot act arbitrarily; they are trustees for the people and they are bound by the general rules laid down by the people. And this must be recognized both by the governors and by the governed. Constitutional government must be so devised as to enable the people to give effect to their needs and desires, and it must provide for doing this in an orderly fashion, without permitting passing fancies to upset the foundations of the government, and without unduly restricting changing demands arising from changing circumstances.

The Constitution of the United States exemplifies the principles of constitutionalism which I have mentioned. In the Constitution, the people of the United States, acting through their State representatives in the Constitutional Convention and the ratifying conventions, created a unique system of government embodying two basic constitutional principles designed to insure that the government created would be in fact a government of laws and not of men and would in fact be the servant and not the master of the individual.

The first of these great principles is the principle of federalism. The States which sent representatives to the Constitutional Convention and which ratified the Constitution, continued as sovereign States of the United States and became integral and essential parts of the new United States, as such.

The second of these great principles embodied in the Constitution of the United States is the separation of powers between the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of the Government, each coordinate with and equal to each of the others but not entirely independent of the others.

James Madison in No. 51 of "The Federalist," speaking particularly of the division of the Central Government into three departments, used language applicable to the separation of powers between the States and the Central Government, as well as to the separation of powers within the Central Government.

"The great security against a gradual concentration of the several powers in the same department," he said, "consists in giving to those who administer each department the necessary constitutional means and personal motives to resist encroachments of the others. The provision for defence must be this, as in all other cases, be made commensurate to the danger of attack. Ambition must be made to counteract ambition. The interest of the man must be connected with the constitutional rights of the place. It may be a reflection on human nature that

---

[7] *United States* v. *Cigarette Merchandisers Ass'n* (136 F. Supp. 212, 213). See also *United States* v. *Safeway Stores* (20 F. R. D. 451, 456) where the Court similarly pointed the appropriate path for the Government to help injured parties to help themselves: "In the case at bar there is a civil suit * * * which may be brought to trial by the Government."

[8] *Ponzi* v. *Fessenden* (258 U.S. 254, at 259).

[9] *Elkins* v. *United States*, ——— U.S. ———, 80 Sup. Ct. 1437, 1446.

[10] "Ch. IV: The Corporation and Economic Federalism," by Kingman Brewster, Jr., pp. 75–76.

[1] "Washington's Farewell Address," V. H. Poltsits, 1935, pp. 108–109.

[2] Letter to Benjamin Waring, Mar. 23, 1801. "The Writings of Thomas Jefferson," ed. H. A. Washington, 1854, vol. 4, p. 379.

such devices should be necessary to control the abuses of government. But what is government itself, but the greatest of all reflections on human nature? If men were angels, no government would be necessary. If angels were to govern men, neither external nor internal controls on government would be necessary. In framing a government which is to be administered by men over men, the great difficulty lies in this: you must first enable the government to control the governed; and in the next place oblige it to control itself. A dependence on the people is, no doubt, the primary control on the government; but experience has taught mankind the necessity of auxiliary precautions." [3]

Mr. Justice Brandeis, in 1926, also expressed this principle when he said:

"The doctrine of the separation of powers was adopted * * * not to promote efficiency but to preclude the exercise of arbitrary power. The purpose was, not to avoid friction, but, by means of the inevitable friction incident to the distribution of the governmental powers among three departments, to save the people from autocracy." [4]

The separation of powers between the Federal Government and the sovereign States, in order to provide an automatic check upon oppression and arbitrary government, did not come into being in its constitutional form until after it had been considered again and again at the Constitutional Convention.

Before the Convention, James Madison considered giving the Federal Government "a negative in all cases whatsoever on the legislative acts of the States, as heretofore exercised by the Kingly prerogative." [5]

The Committee of Detail, at one point in the Convention's deliberations, recommended that the Constitution should authorize the Congress to provide for the management and security of the general interests and welfare of the United States, with only the general limitation that such power should not interfere with "the Government of individual States, in matters which respect only their internal police, or for which their individual authority may be competent." [6]

These proposals do not appear in the Constitution. Instead of such broad and general powers, the Constitutional Convention decided to give the Federal Government only the limited powers specifically enumerated in the Constitution.

The 9th and 10th amendments were added to the Constitution, as parts of the Bill of Rights, in order to make it abundantly clear that the Constitution was a limited document, delegating to the Federal Government only those powers enumerated in the Constitution and reserving to the States or to the people all remaining powers.

In 1819, in the famous case of *McCulloch* v. *Maryland*, Chief Justice Marshall declared that, while the 10th amendment did not take away from the Federal Government those powers which the Constitution delegated to it, it was an express and explicit reiteration of the principle that the Constitution was a grant of enumerated powers, not an unlimited delegation.[7]

There are, of course, a number of powers granted to the Federal Government in fairly explicit terms. Much of the expansion of these powers since 1789 has been incident to the changes in our civilization. Jefferson once wrote of a trip from Charlottesville to Washington, during which his fastest speed was 3 miles per hour. He would be fascinated by an airplane trip today in 40 minutes. I am sure he would agree that the power in the Constitution to regulate commerce among the several States and with foreign nations extends to railroads, automobiles, airplanes, radio and television, even though these were unknown to the framers of the Constitution.

Much of the expansion of the power of the Federal Government has resulted from enlargement in the construction of certain clauses of the Constitution, some of which were originally intended only as limitations upon the power of the Federal Government.

The Bill of Rights, adopted at the beginning of our national history, contains the guarantee that no person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property without "due process of law."

In his great treatise on the Constitution, Justice Story considered this phrase as a requirement of orderly procedure, in other words a procedural limitation rather than a grant of substantive power to the Federal Government.[8] The phrase was given no real substantive content until after its adoption in the 14th amendment providing that no State shall deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law.[9] The opportunities for interpretation of these four words, "due process of law," are tremendous. Under judicial interpretation the words have developed from a requirement of fair procedure to the status of a broad veto power over both State and Federal action. Perhaps as good a statement as any of the power assumed by the Supreme Court under the due-process clause of the 14th amendment is that the Court can set aside any State action which it considers too bad. As Mr. Justice Douglas said in a recent dissent, "Due process under the prevailing doctrine is what the judges say it is; and it differs from judge to judge, from court to court." [10]

One clause of the Constitution which has been expanded greatly is the power of Congress to spend money in aid of the general welfare. The Supreme Court has adopted Hamilton's view of the meaning of the power "to lay and collect taxes * * * to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States" and has stated, in effect, that it would impose virtually no restriction on expenditures which might be made by the Federal Government.

Mr. Justice Cardozo expressed this view in 1937 when he said, "The conception of the spending power advocated by Hamilton and strongly reinforced by Story has prevailed over that of Madison, which has not been lacking in adherents. * * * The discretion belongs to Congress, unless the choice is clearly wrong, a display of arbitrary power, not an exercise of judgment. This is now familiar law." [11]

The power of the Federal Government has also been increased by what Justice Story called the doctrine of "resulting powers." This is that vague but inclusive power which is said to result from the very fact of the creation of the Federal Government.[12]

Thus, both in the extension of national power by interpretation of express grants such as the extension of the commerce clause to include intrastate business and in converting limitations on Federal powers into grants of Federal judicial power over State action, there has been a manifest shift in our constitutional structure not foreseen by the framers.

The tremendous expansion and development of our Nation in the past 170 years emphasizes the necessity for a division of powers between the Federal Government and the States. The United States today includes a tremendous area and a very wide variety of soils, climates and physical resources. This diversity was increased greatly by the admission of Alaska and Hawaii to statehood. The United States contains people of widely differing interests and abilities. Some of these variations have been diminished by improvements in transportation, communications and education, but there are still wide differences in the characteristics of our geography, economy and our people, not least by reason of their differing abilities and interests. In No. 10 of "The Federalist," Madison gave particular emphasis to this as the source of differing interests and parties or "factions" as he called them. He said:

"As long as the reason of man continues fallible, and he is at liberty to exercise it, different opinions will be formed. As long as the connection subsists between his reason and his self-love, his opinions and his passions will have a reciprocal influence on each other; and the former will be objects to which the latter will attach themselves. The diversity in the faculties of men, from which the rights of property originate, is not less an insuperable obstacle to a uniformity of interests. The protection of these faculties is the first object of government. From the protection of different and unequal faculties of acquiring property, the possession of different degrees and kinds of property immediately results; and from the influence of these on the sentiments and views of the respective proprietors, ensues a division of the society into different interests and parties." [13]

Even though the population of the United States in 1787, at the time of the Constitutional Convention, was no greater than that of Virginia today, both being approximately 3,800,000, the framers of the Constitution thought it wise to preserve a division of the Nation into 13 States of varying area and population. Nearly 4 million people could best be governed under a decentralized Federal system, instead of a single centralized authority.

A single unified government for the entire United States would not have given proper scope to the wide differences among the people and their State governments and would have been all too likely to have been resulted in oppressive dictatorship. Madison in No. 10 of the Federalist, from which I have quoted, pointed to two elements of the Federal Government which would minimize the undesirable effects of "factions." These two elements were first, the Federal nature of the government, with a limited Federal Government and many powers reserved to the States and the people, and second, the representative nature of the Federal Government itself.

The representative nature of the Federal Government finally agreed upon gave additional protection to the variety of interests within the Nation.

In the Congress, Senators, being chosen by States, were to be primarily responsive to their States. Until the adoption of the 17th amendment in 1913, they were actually

---

[3] "The Federalist," Modern Library ed., 1937, p. 337.

[4] *Myers* v. *U.S.* (1926) 272 U.S. 52, 293.

[5] Letter to George Washington, April 16, 1787. "The Writings of James Madison," ed. G. Hunt, 1901, vol. 2, p. 346.

[6] Aug. 22, 1787, "Debates on the Federal Constitution," J. Elliot, 1861 ed., vol. 5, p. 462.

[7] Wheat. 316, 406.

[8] "Commentaries on the Constitution of the United States," Joseph Story. Secs. 1788–1789 (5th ed., M. M. Bigelow, 1891, vol. 2, pp. 565–566).

[9] "The Constitution of the United States," ed. E. S. Corwin, 1953 (Sen. Doc. No. 170, 82d Cong.), pp. xxii–xxvi.

[10] *Hannah* v. *Larche* (1960) 363 U.S. 420, 505.

[11] *Helvering* v. *Davis* (1937) 301 U.S. 619, 640.

[12] "Commentaries on the Constitution of the United States," Joseph Story, sec. 1256 (5th ed., vol. 2, p. 148); "The Constitution of the United States," ed. E. S. Corwin, pp. 71–72.

[13] "The Federalist," Modern Library ed., 1937, p. 55.

chosen by the legislatures of the States, and, therefore, represented the people of those States only indirectly. Representatives were to be chosen from the districts within States and to speak for the interests of their particular districts.

The President was to be elected by the electoral college under a system, which, as it has developed, gives particular importance to the large States. A candidate who carries New York by one vote receives a huge block of electoral votes which outweigh overwhelming losses in a number of smaller States. This system, and the developments which have occurred in party machinery in the national political conventions, have given the large States a particularly strong voice in the selection of the President.

Thus, we see that representative government in the United States is the product of forces and influences which, while they do not necessarily always conflict, do arise from basically different systems of representation.

Of course, all these representatives should cooperate and work together, and under our two-party system, they do so in the vast majority of matters. But not in all matters. When the interests of a particular State represented by a Senator, or the interests of a particular district represented by a Member of the House, do not coincide with the views of the President or the majority of the Senators or the Representative's party, then the Senator or the Representative must carry out his responsibility to represent the interests of his State or district, in contrast to the other views presented. It is to his own system of representation that he owes his allegiance when these conflicts occur.

In this way the manifold interests of the country, or "factions," are reasonably assured of an opportunity for a hearing for their point of view, an opportunity to make their views known, before legislation is enacted.

To summarize, constitutional government in the United States was framed so as to provide an effective government and at the same time to prevent this effective government from becoming so overwhelming, so oppressive, that the liberty of the individual, and his initiative and enterprise, would be obliterated. These devices include the separation of the powers of the Federal Government into the three great departments, the division of governmental powers between the Federal Government and the several State governments, and the reservation of powers to the States and to the people. These devices, which are basic to our constitutional government, pose many problems, problems which may appear to be completely insoluble in theory. But the framers of the Constitution, as my quotation from James Madison shows, rose above the theories of political science and organization charts. Instead, they concerned themselves with human nature, with all its potentialities of good and evil. And the successful result of their efforts is a tribute to their wisdom and foresight.

The problems caused by the division of powers—the division between Federal and State governments and the division between the three departments of the Federal Government—obviously raise questions which are difficult and even irreconcilable in theory. How can both the Federal Government and the State governments be sovereign? How can the executive branch, the legislative branch, and the judicial branch each be supreme and yet each be subject to the control of the others? The answers to these questions do not lie in neat and precise organization charts. The answers to these questions lie rather in the good judgment, discretion, and restraint of the officials who make the government work and who have made the government work.

Mr. Justice Holmes, in 1908, expressed the basic problem posed by these divisions of power, when he said:

"All rights tend to declare themselves absolute to their logical extreme. Yet all in fact are limited by the neighborhood of principles of policy which are other than those on which the particular right is founded, and which become strong enough to hold their own when a certain point is reached. The limits set to property by other public interests present themselves as a branch of what is called the police power of the State. The boundary at which the conflicting interests balance cannot be determined by any formula in advance, but points in the line, or helping to establish it, are fixed by decisions that this or that concrete case falls on the nearer or farther side." [14]

These kinds of distinctions, these kinds of practical adjustments, cannot be drawn arbitrarily. They must be drawn on the basis of specific cases, and at times on the basis of trial and error. For this reason the Founding Fathers were wise to limit the authority of the Federal judiciary to cases and controversies. We can understand principles better when they are applied to the specific facts of a specific case.

Legislators, just as much as courts and the executive branch, must bear in mind the need for mutual toleration and discretion and self-restraint. The Federal Government must also bear this need in mind with respect to State powers, and the State governments with respect to Federal powers.

Let me illustrate this need for toleration, discretion, and self-restraint by reference to two broad powers of the Federal Government. These are the money power and the war power. I have already referred to Mr. Justice Cardozo's statement regarding the virtually unlimited power to spend money in aid of the general welfare. Also involved in the money power is that which was expressly granted to the Congress in the Constitution, to coin money and regulate the value thereof. In the gold clause cases decided by the Supreme Court in 1935,[15] and in subsequent cases in 1937 [16] and 1939,[17] the Supreme Court has made it entirely clear that the money powers are for all practical purposes limitless.

The war power, that virtually endless power under which all materials and facilities may be allocated in the interests of national defense, prices may be fixed, rents may be controlled, and men, materials, and land may be drafted, requisitioned, or condemned, is subject to little or no judicial review.[18] Even in the case of President Truman's seizure of the steel mills in 1952, the action of the President was invalidated by the Supreme Court, not on the grounds that Congress could not have granted this power, but on the basis that the President was acting contrary to the decision of Congress.[19]

Mr. Justice Jackson has expressed vividly the dangers to the Nation which arise from these great powers:

"Two of the greatest powers possessed by the political branches, which seem to me the disaster potentials in our system, are utterly beyond judicial reach," he said. "These are the war power and the money, taxing, and spending power, which is the power of inflation. The improvident use of these powers can destroy the conditions for the existence of liberty, because either can set up great currents of strife within the population which might carry constitutional forms and limitations before them.

"No protection against these catastrophic courses can be expected from the judiciary. The people must guard against these dangers at the polls." [20]

I deplore recent trends in the Congress to promote what is claimed to be liberalism at the expense of constitutional government. Conservatives share the aims and ambitions of liberals to promote the welfare of the individual but differ as to methods. The liberals of the 18th century have become the conservatives of the 20th century, endorsing the principle of constitutional government expressed by Thomas Jefferson when he said: "I consider the foundation of the Constitution as laid on this ground: That 'all powers not delegated to the United States, by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States or to the people,'" referring to the 10th amendment then pending before the States. Jefferson went on: "To take a single step beyond the boundaries thus specially drawn around the powers of Congress, is to take possession of a boundless field of power, no longer susceptible of any definition." [21] It seems that Jefferson felt that any broader interpretation would reduce the instrument to a single phase, that of instituting a Congress with a power to do whatever would be good for the United States; but as the Congress would be the sole judges of the good or evil, it would be a power to do whatever evil they please.

By the same token, 20th century conservatives still believe that Daniel Webster was right when, pleading for the preservation of constitutional government, he said: "Other misfortunes may be borne, or their effects overcome. If disastrous war should sweep our commerce from the ocean, another generation may renew it; if it exhaust our treasury, future industry may replenish it; if it desolate and lay waste our fields, still, under a new cultivation, they will grow green again, and ripen to future harvests. It were but a trifle even if the walls of yonder Capitol were to crumble, if its lofty pillars should fall, and its gorgeous decorations be all covered by the dust of the valley. All these might be rebuilt. But who shall reconstruct the fabric of demolished government? Who shall rear again the well-proportioned columns of constitutional liberty? Who shall frame together the skillful architecture which unites national sovereignty with State rights, individual security, and public prosperity? No, if these columns fall, they will be raised not again. Like the Coliseum and the Parthenon, they will be destined to a mournful, a melancholy immortality. Bitterer tears, however, will flow over them, than were ever shed over the monuments of Roman or Grecian art; for they will be the remnants of a more glorious edifice than Greece or Rome ever saw, the edifice of constitutional American liberty." [22]

Let us, therefore, constantly keep in mind the principles on which our constitutional government has been based—the division of powers between State and Federal governments, with final power reserved to the people and to the States, the division of powers

---

[14] *Hudson County Water Company* v. *McCarter* (1908), 209 U.S. 349, 355.

[15] *Norman* v. *B. & O. Railroad Co.* (294 U.S. 240); *Nortz* v. *U.S.* (294 U.S. 317); *Perry* v. *U.S.* (294 U.S. 330).

[16] *Holyoke Water Power Co.* v. *American Writing Paper Co.* (300 U.S. 324).

[17] *Guaranty Trust Co.* v. *Henwood* (307 U.S. 247).

[18] See *Lichter* v. *U.S.* ((1948) 334 U.S. 742); *Yakus* v. *U.S.* ((1944) 321 U.S. 414); *Hirabayashi* v. *U.S.* ((1943) 320 U.S. 81).

[19] *Youngstown Sheet and Tube Co.* v. *Sawyer* ((1952) 343 U.S. 579).

[20] "The Supreme Court in the American System of Government," Robert H. Jackson, 1955, pp. 59–61.

[21] Opinion against the constitutionality of a national bank, Feb. 15, 1791. "The Writings of Thomas Jefferson," ed. H. A. Washington, 1854, vol. 7, p. 556.

[22] "The Character of Washington"; "The Works of Daniel Webster," 6th ed., 1853, vol. 1, p. 231.

between the three great departments of the Federal Government, and the basic principle underlying these constitutional arrangements—the conviction that the State is created by the people in order to serve the people's needs and in order to enable the people to achieve their maximum potential. If we keep these principles clearly in mind and judge all proposed policies and legislation in the light of them, acting with discretion and restraint, our constitutional government will continue to make possible in the future, as it has in the past, the greatest freedom and the greatest possibility for development, of the individual for whose benefit constitutional government is created.

We are disturbed by the threat to our freedom of the military power of the Soviet Union. We should be no less concerned by the threat to our cherished institutions by the growing number at home who believe progress will be promoted by the substitution of the welfare state for constitutional government. May our Nation never forget that in the same Bible, from which our Founding Fathers drew inspiration for the drafting of "the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man," it is written: "Remove not the ancient landmark, which thy fathers have set."

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR LUSK

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, we have been privileged to have with us for the last several months, in the person of our colleague from Oregon, Senator HALL S. LUSK, a gentleman of rare attainments in the law. His concepts of Government are anchored to the Constitution, and he possesses a fine knowledge of and a constructive outlook on national and international problems.

In making the appointment of Senator LUSK, I recall that Governor Hatfield of Oregon said that he was sending to the Senate "one of the wisest men in Oregon," or words to this effect. Those of us who have learned to know HALL LUSK have found this tribute true and well deserved. Also, we have found in him the essential qualities that go to make sound character and sound judgment, and fine spiritual qualities permeating his thinking and strengthening both his character and his conclusions. In his quiet way, Senator LUSK has made a deep and lasting impression on all of his colleagues, and he has influenced the course of legislation as few men ever have in such a relatively short time. He personifies the U.S. Senate and constitutional processes at their very best. We appreciate his friendship and his scholarly and gentlemanly qualities; his influence will continue to be felt in the Senate in the years to come. The Nation is better and stronger because of his service here.

We extend to him our fond good wishes for many enduring satisfactions and happiness in the years ahead, all of which he so richly deserves.

THE NOMINATIONS OF ROBERT A. BICKS AND EARL W. KINTNER

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, several weeks ago I pleaded on the floor of the Senate for the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Robert A. Bicks to be Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Antitrust Division and confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Earl W. Kintner to be the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission.

Mr. President, since that time many Senators have joined in the plea that these nominations be confirmed. This morning I should like to add two documents to the evidence on the competence of these gentlemen.

Yesterday the Junior Bar Conference of the American Bar Association, meeting in Washington, as I understand it, took a very unusual step. I believe this is unique, and if not unique certainly very rare. The conference warmly praised the ability and the competence—as they put it, the wisdom and judicious restraint of the Honorable Robert Bicks, Assistant Attorney General. The conference highly praised Mr. Bicks and commented on his remarkable accomplishments in his position.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUGUST 29, 1960.

HON. ROBERT A. BICKS,
Assistant Attorney General,
Antitrust Division, Department of Justice,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BICKS: By the unanimous vote of the Conference Assembly of the Junior Bar Conference of the American Bar Association, I have been directed to commend you on the outstanding manner in which you have conducted your high office. Your leadership in the administration of the antitrust laws, while extremely vigorous, has exhibited wisdom and judicious restraint.

You have given a splendid example of how a lawyer though young in years, may nevertheless possess the ability and maturity necessary to qualify him for the most important positions in the field of law.

Your work has been noted and admired by lawyers of all ages and levels of experience and you stand as an inspiration to all young lawyers in all fields of legal endeavor.

We wish you continued success in your career and hope that you will continue to be accorded those honors commensurate with the dignity of your office and the level of your achievements.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM REECE SMITH, JR.,
Chairman, Junior Bar Conference.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, there also came to my attention a column from Drug Trade News, written by Stephens Rippey, commenting on the remarkable job Mr. Earl Kintner has done as Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission. It is more than a good, solid, honest administrative job, Mr. President. Mr. Kintner has taken over an agency which had done very little for a long time and has put new life, drive, and zest in the agency.

I think this, too, adds to the very large amount of evidence put in the RECORD in the last few days as to why these two champions of competitive economic enterprise should have their nominations confirmed at a time when competition in our economic system urgently needs champions of this kind in the public service. What a travesty on this bastion of economic freedom, Mr. President, that this Senate which has confirmed many a mediocre appointment should refuse to confirm two of the finest appointments made by this administration, certainly the two men who have done the most to fight monopoly and keep free competitive enterprise both free and competitive.

I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Old Timer Looks at a New FTC" be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OLDTIMER LOOKS AT A NEW FTC

"Things sure ain't what they used to be," said the oldtimer, shaking his head in wonderment as he trudged through the corridors of the Apex Building, home of the Federal Trade Commission.

"When I retired only a little more than a year ago this was a nice, easy place to work. We didn't have to hurry and we didn't need to have ideas. A lawyer could take a single case and make a career of it. He didn't care if it wasn't settled for a decade; in fact, he'd just as soon it wouldn't be.

"Now, young lawyers vie with one another to get things done fast. They are dreaming up new ways to stop delays and to enforce FTC's laws. Yes, and they are actually thinking—unbelievable. When I talk with these young fellows I just can't believe my ears."

It isn't surprising that the retiree visiting his old haunts couldn't believe what he heard. The plain truth is that what has happened at FTC during the brief period (since June 1959) that Earl W. Kintner has been Chairman can be described only by such words as incredible, fantastic, revolutionary. Some businessmen who have been hit with the newly created FTC lightning would add unconstitutional and un-American.

There is a new spirit abroad among the FTC staff, though a few oldtimers haven't succumbed to it. They probably never will. Nor have all of Mr. Kintner's fellow commissioners gone all the way with his thinking. A majority has given him support in the important things, however.

For the first time in memory, ideas are welcomed in the Chairman's office. There is a vast drive to get things done quickly. There is a desire to enforce the laws firmly, promptly, and equitably. New techniques are being tried out and refined through trial and error instead of being discarded because "this never has been done."

The man who approaches the Chairman with an idea is apt to have it thrown back at him with a command to put it into effect immediately. Promotions are going to the young in spirit who are showing ability to think and do.

One of the fruits of the Kintner revolution is the fantastic success in the food field of FTC's newly discovered (though 46 years old) weapon to obtain information in investigations of possible law violations. By using section 6 of the FTC Act, the Commission can tackle abuses in an entire industry with relatively low cost by mailing out questionnaires from Washington seeking key information. This information, which must be furnished under penalty for refusal, shows on its face whether the firm has violated the law. Although there has been some protest, the scheme is working.

OTHER TECHNIQUES DUE

So far the weapon hasn't been turned on the drug and cosmetic industries, but the chances are it will be. Other new techniques are due for trial in these fields, especially with respect to advertising. FTC expects to use the affirmative disclosure weapon to force advertisers to tell the bad with the good when this is indicated.

Under the incredible heading also could come FTC's recent request to producers of veterinary drug products. FTC asked them to include in their ads for antibiotics used for mastitis in cows a suitable and conspicuous notice of the period of time the milk

must be withheld to eliminate residues. Such a requirement has been in effect with respect to labeling for some time, but advertising statements were beyond the jurisdiction of the Food and Drug Administration. Actually, FTC has no power to compel an advertiser to say anything in his advertising, except in an order resulting from a complaint. But it was done, and FTC reports the response to its request for voluntary action was gratifying.

Mr. Kintner has set up a special task force in FTC's Bureau of Investigation to give immediate attention to important cases and push them through to completion. Headed by Winfield Wagner, this group will take to the field when necessary to expedite investigations. Their operations will encompass all types of cases handled by FTC—mergers, antimonopoly, Robinson-Patman, and deceptive practices.

John R. Heim, new director of FTC's Bureau of Consultation, has joined the idea squad in trying to breathe life into a moribund bureau. Among other things, Mr. Heim is holding a series of meetings throughout the country with retailers to explain to them the intricacies of R–P and other laws administered by FTC. This helps to carry out Mr. Kintner's belief that FTC has an obligation to tell businessmen as clearly as possible what it believes the law is. If they don't heed these explanations, they should be prosecuted, Mr. Kintner believes. But they first should have a chance to learn what the law is and conform voluntarily.

One of FTC's handicaps is lack of money. This is a chronic condition among Federal bureaus and Mr. Kintner is well aware of the pitfalls involved in asking for more. First, he wants FTC to get on its toes and show Congress and the public what it can do when it really tries. This being done, then he wants to point out what it could do if it had adequate help.

REMOVAL OF CERTAIN LIMITATIONS ON DEFENSE EXPENDITURES

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senate Resolution 376, "a resolution for removal of certain limitations on defense expenditures," now be made the pending business.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, may we have order? Will the Presiding Officer state the request, so that the Senator from Delaware can hear it?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. What is the request?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Missouri is making a unanimous-consent request. I was afraid the Senator from Delaware could not hear it.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, apparently the majority leader would like to have me repeat my request. I ask unanimous consent that Senate Resolution 376, a resolution for "removal of certain limitations on defense expenditures," be made the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I am not sure whether the resolution has been cleared with Senators on this side who might be interested. I have no personal interests, but I shall have to object temporarily. I wonder if the Senator from Missouri will renew the request a little later after we can consult with Senators on this side of the aisle who may be interested?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, my resolution has been before the Senate for several days. I have discussed it with the distinguished junior Senator from South Dakota, who has some suggestions satisfactory to me. In view of the fact the Senate has been recessing daily instead of adjourning, it is not possible for me to bring up this resolution for consideration without unanimous consent.

The resolution provides that it is the sense of the Senate to remove expenditure ceilings and other such administrative devices and procedures which limit or retard high priority programs and projects in the Department of Defense. It is hard for me to understand why there would be objection to the Senate voting on the resolution.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I myself have no objection to a vote; nevertheless, I am serving at the moment in the chair of the minority leader, and on behalf of Senators who might be interested, I would have to object until they are present on the floor.

Mr. SYMINGTON. May I ask the Senator whether he has any suggestion as to how to handle this?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes; I should like the Senator from Missouri to wait until we find out if there is objection on this side of the aisle.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator does not know whether there would be an objection?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I do not, but at the moment there is an objection.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, there have been various views expressed as to whether more funds should have been appropriated for defense and, if so, how much more.

My recommendations in this regard are a matter of record.

However, I doubt that there are divergent views as to whether the money the Congress has appropriated should be used, and particularly whether such money should be used for the highest priority programs and projects.

Consequently, I have submitted a resolution to express the sense of the Senate that certain administrative barriers to the acceleration of high priority defense programs and projects should be removed.

The specific barriers to which the resolution directs its attention are expenditure ceilings and other such devices and procedures, to the extent that they affect high priority programs and projects.

The Department of Defense follows the practice of establishing specific dollar amounts, above which expenditures cannot be made in the period for which the limitation is established.

This is a useful device when extended periods of relaxed international tensions are anticipated, but it operates contrary to the public interest under conditions such as exist at the present time.

Expenditure ceilings, and similar devices and procedures, tend to have the following effects:

First. Prevent or delay the use of funds appropriated by the Congress.

Second. Encourage the stretchout of programs so that other needed programs do not have to be dropped entirely to keep under the expenditure ceiling.

Third. Raise the unit cost in procurement by causing the purchase of items in smaller numbers, even though a program for larger numbers has been approved.

Fourth. Delay exploitation of "scientific breakthroughs" and slow down or decrease the test programs decided upon for new equipment.

Fifth. Curtail training and alert exercises.

Sixth. Cause the closing of bases, the reduction of personnel, and the cutback of programs on fiscal grounds rather than on military grounds.

Following are a few illustrations of specific programs adversely affected by expenditure ceilings, and similar devices and procedures:

B–58 procurement.

Construction of missile bases and maintenance of training bases.

Number of military personnel.

Atlas procurement program.

B–70 development.

Navy ship construction.

Army modernization program.

It is my hope the Senate will make it clear that it does not want to have defense projects and programs, which have been carefully worked out and assigned high priorities, to be hampered and delayed by administrative devices which, in effect, place a higher priority on the amount of money spent than on the projects themselves.

For these reasons, I urge the Senate to approve this resolution when it can be taken up under the rules.

That was the reason I submitted the resolution. As I understand, the acting minority leader does not wish to have the resolution considered by the Senate at this time. I will try to bring up the resolution tomorrow, as soon as I can obtain the floor, in an effort to have it adopted by the Senate.

AMENDMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TEACHERS SALARY ACT OF 1955, AS AMENDED

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12993) to amend the District of Columbia Teachers Salary Act of 1955, as amended.

HAMMARSKJOLD AND THE CONGO

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] made a speech yesterday on the situation in the Congo, which I hope will receive wide reading. He has made several suggestions in his speech that are of importance at this particularly crucial time.

Apropos of the situation in the Congo, I ask unanimous consent that at this point in my remarks I may have printed

in the RECORD an article entitled "How Dag Does It—Right Man at Right Moment," by Roscoe Drummond, which was published in the Washington Post on August 22, 1960.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW DAG DOES IT—RIGHT MAN AT RIGHT MOMENT

(By Roscoe Drummond)

If the Congo is saved from self-destruction and from dragging the world to the brink of conflict, the credit will mostly go to one man. The credit will go rightly to the world's most valuable and influential international servant, that man of quiet, patient, and determined diplomacy, Secretary General of the United Nations Dag Hammarskjold.

The Secretary Generalship of the United Nations is a pretty empty office unless it is filled by a man who can give it stature and force. That is what Dag Hammarskjold is doing today.

Literally Hammarskjold can only do what he is told. But at critical moments—and the Congo is only the latest—he finds a way to tell his superiors what to tell him.

He has become far more than the administrative officer of the U.N. He has become an active participant in some of the most delicate diplomacy—so delicate that in the present state of the cold war the great powers have recognized that only he could handle it.

His careful but decisive role in attempting to save the fragile Government of the Congo from hopeless deterioration is Hammarskjold at his best.

Obviously he can only go as far as the U.N. Security Council is willing and able to let him go. But at times, as over the Congo, he has helped to restrain the Soviet Union and the Western powers from falling into helpless misunderstanding which could lead to unintended conflict.

It seems to me that Hammarskjold is winning something of an independent status for the U.N. Secretary General which goes beyond the technical job-description of the Charter. He is doing so by an unusual combination of prudence and wisdom and courage, and by carefully choosing the occasions to intervene.

Here are some of the things he has done:

In 1955, after the General Assembly passed a resolution vaguely hopeful that something could be done to get Red China to release the 15 U.S. Air Force flyers it was holding, he quickly saw that more would be needed than long-distance communiques. He took this resolution as authority for him to go to Peiping to press the negotiations. This step later led to the freeing of the prisoners.

He contributed immeasurably to bringing about the cease-fire ending the Franco-British-Israeli action following Nasser's nationalization of the Suez Canal. He helped to persuade Britain and France not to veto U.N. action and he was thus able to put U.N. observers between the opposing forces.

You will remember the dust-up which Premier Khrushchev sought to create when the United States responded to the appeal of Lebanon for the temporary assistance of American troops. Moscow sought to pillory the United States at the U.N. and Hammarskjold prevented the meeting from turning into a cold war thunderstorm by taking the initiative to offer proposals to the Arab Nations and to the big powers for a nonaggression and a noninterference pact, a program for economic aid, and a strengthening of U.N. observer forces in the Middle East.

In the field of arms control he has done a good deal to keep the discussions going. He welcomed Russia's plan for ending nuclear testing when the Western powers were holding back. When Moscow complained about American bomber flights over the Arctic, he endorsed the U.S. proposal for aerial Arctic inspection.

Though he was unanimously reelected Secretary General in 1955, the Soviet Union occasionally argues that he is overly pro-Western. The fact is that he has been able to do as much as he has because he has proved so often that his motive is not to serve the interests of either side but the larger interests of the U.N.

In the Congo he is the indispensable man, the right man at the right moment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Drummond stated:

If the Congo is saved from self-destruction and from dragging the world to the brink of conflict, the credit will mostly go to one man.

Meaning to Dag Hammarskjold, Secretary General of the United Nations.

Mr. Drummond's commendation of the Secretary General's work is well merited, in my opinion, and I earnestly hope that his efforts may meet with success.

It is evident, however, that problems will attend the emergence of the new states in Africa and the statesmen who handle international matters in every country will be dealing with these problems for years to come.

Mr. President the suggestion of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] that we should withdraw from our bases in Africa is one that merits very careful consideration. We already have plans to withdraw from our bases in Morocco. The additional suggestion with regard to all bases in Africa, of course, entails additional considerations. In 1953 the subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee on Military Construction drew attention to the uncertain tenure that went with placing bases in Africa. At that time our committee learned that a field in Egypt on which some $5 million had been spent would not be available for us to visit, much less ever to use.

Originally the plan was to have seven bases in Morocco. Two of such bases were never built, following a recommendation of the Subcommittee on Military Construction, because we came to the conclusion that they had been poorly sited.

Another installation which was planned for headquarters at Rabat was, under the recommendation of our committee, moved to Nouaseur, where we had an installation, where headquarters facilities were available, where housekeeping facilities were available, and where there was some housing that was being vacated by a contractor. We have always believed that the recommendations of our committee at that time saved $7 million in the consolidation of headquarters at Nousseur and upwards of $100 million, by not building the two bases that had been sited but had not been constructed.

At that time our judgment was not supported in some quarters but it seems amply justified by developments since that time. The U.S. Treasury is at least $100 million better off than it would have been had the other bases been built.

Perhaps we did not need the bases that were built. One can never be categorically certain about such things, because times change and stresses change. It is probable that the bases we have had in Morocco served a useful purpose during a certain period of time. But today the suggestion that they be abandoned is worthy of consideration, and I hope Members of the Senate will read the speech of the Senator from Montana with thoughtful consideration.

PROPOSED APPOINTMENT OF HENRY CABOT LODGE TO FIND A SOLUTION TO THE NEAR EAST PROBLEMS

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, on a somewhat related but slightly different note, I wish to commend the Vice President for the constructive suggestion he made that Ambassador Lodge be assigned the responsibility of trying to work out a solution to the problems in the Middle East.

The importance of doing something in the Middle East was highlighted yesterday by the assassination of officials in Jordan. One cannot visit the Palestinian countries in these times without realizing that there exists one of the festering sores which could produce a war of considerable magnitude, the repercussions of which probably would reach every continent.

Another development in yesterday's news was the announcement of the agreement on a plan for the use of the waters of the Indus River, to develop them for the benefit of both Pakistan and India. I mention this in connection with my remarks on the situation in Jordan, because water is a key to the solution of the problems in both areas.

The account of the agreement between India and Pakistan was well treated in an article written by Warren Unna, published in the Washington Post of yesterday, in which he observed that a solution or an agreement had been reached which some time ago would have been thought impossible.

Today a solution of a division of the waters of the Jordan River between Israel and Jordan would seem to be similarly difficult of solution. However, if Mr. Lodge's talents were brought to that task, and there was achieved a solution of the kind that has been worked out between India and Pakistan on the Indus River, it would be a landmark in the easing of tensions that afflict the world today.

When the junior Senator from South Dakota visited Jordan and Israel last December, he was impressed by the fact that hard labor by the people there and contributions of cash from people throughout the world have succeeded in converting a desolate country into a land of orange groves and productive fields. It seemed almost impossible that the barren land and rocky hillsides, which were the heritage of the people who returned to Israel, could have been converted into productive fields and orchard lands, such as has been accomplished.

When one goes from Israel, through the Mandelbaum Gate, down and down into the Valley of the Jordan River and to Jericho, he is impressed by the fact

that a similar transformation could be accomplished there, if adequate supplies of water were available for irrigation.

One other idea occurred to me while I was there, and I mentioned it to some of the Jordanians. It is that the great difference between sea level and the below sea level location of the city of Jericho is such that an unusual program might be worked out; namely, to take sea water from the Gulf of Aqaba, put it through a desalination plant, and then, due to the fact that the valley near Jericho is approximately 1,500 feet below sea level, use the drop to run the water down there and utilize the head to produce hydroelectric power, and thus have both the power and the water for the development of the countryside.

I found some encouraging reaction to the idea. However, one Jordanian disposed of the suggestion with the observation that if Israel would permit the Arabs to have the waters of the Jordan, which they feel they are entitled to in Jordan, they would not need to convert any salt water from the ocean.

However that may be, the problem of water is one of the most pressing problems that must be solved, along with the political and economic problems in that area.

So I commend the Vice President for his statement that, if he is elected President, Mr. Lodge will be commissioned to study the problems in the Middle East and bring to their solution his great talents in diplomacy, as well as his knowledge of the background of many of the problems that afflict that area.

And it is clear, Mr. President, that in the Middle East, as well as in south Asia, arrangements to make more water available for domestic, industrial, and agricultural use will contribute greatly to reducing political tensions and to increasing the well-being of millions of people.

DESALINATION OF WATER—THE RECORD SHOWS REPUBLICAN AS WELL AS DEMOCRATIC LEADERSHIP AND SUPPORT

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I wish to turn now to another aspect of the subject, and that is the legislative history on the desalination of water. I was somewhat surprised by the statement read on the floor of the Senate the other day by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at page 17577, under the heading: "The Democratic Saline Water Program."

I was surprised because the statement would give the average reader or hearer the impression that the saline water program was exclusively a product of the Democratic Members of Congress in a Democratic administration, when that is very, very far from the record.

The Senator may have been prompted to make a statement by noting the lines in the 1960 Republican platform, which he read:

> The Republican 1960 platform—page 15—mistakenly claims the saline and brackish water conversion program as "Republican initiative."

But the Senator was mistaken when he went on to say:

> Democrats initiated, extended, and supplied continuing support for the saline and brackish water conversion program, in the face of Republican indifference or resistance.

Such a conclusion or claim is refuted by the record. I propose to review it in some detail at this time.

Mr. President, the junior Senator from South Dakota would be the last person to claim that the desalination program has been exclusively a Republican effort; but I would stoutly affirm that the program has developed through a course of years on a nonpartisan basis with the active initiative and the active support by Members of both parties, in both the House and Senate.

I also would be the last one to detract in any way from the brilliant, constructive legislative record made by the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. I am one who has long been an admirer of his outstanding public career. However, the statement by the distinguished senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], that the saline and brackish water program was first proposed by a Democratic Senator, JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, on March 18, 1949, is not wholly accurate. He may have been the first Senator to introduce a bill on the subject but there appear to have been earlier bills introduced in the House of Representatives.

My legislative assistant, Miss Van Horn, has gone back through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to get the numbers and the dates of the several bills which have been introduced on this subject as far back as the 80th Congress, of 1948. The first bill which she found dealing with the subject was H.R. 5777, in the 80th Congress, introduced in the House of Representatives by Representative Charles K. Fletcher, a Republican of California, on March 9, 1948.

Another Republican, Representative Leo McDonough, of California, introduced H.R. 6031 on March 29, 1948.

Those bills proposed a Water Research Act which would authorize the use of $30 million by the Secretary of the Navy over a period of not more than 5 years "to construct and operate demonstration plants to produce potable water from sea water or other liquids, elements, or substances and to conserve and increase the national water resources."

So far as she could determine, those were the only bills on the subject introduced in the 80th Congress.

I digress to remark that the 80th Congress was the Congress which the then Democratic President, Mr. Truman, characterized as a "do-nothing" Congress. It is evident, at least, that the Democratic national administration in 1948 put no effort behind the wheel to get any action upon the bills introduced by Republicans proposing a water research program for the desalination of sea water. In that respect, it was a "do-nothing" Congress but there is no evidence that Mr. Truman encouraged it to do anything or that he supported in any way the efforts of the two Republicans from California, who introduced the bills mentioned.

Again, on January 5, 1949, at the opening of the 81st Congress, Representative GORDON L. MCDONOUGH, Republican, of California, introduced H.R. 859, dealing with the desalination subject, and proposing a research and demonstration program.

On March 1, 1949, approximately 2 months later, Representative Clinton D. McKinnon, Democrat, of California, introduced H.R. 3123. I should note, in passing, that that is the first evidence my assistant was able to find that a Democratic Member of either the House or Senate introduced a bill on the subject. That was substantially a year later than the two bills which were introduced in March 1948, by the California Republicans, Representative FLETCHER and Representative MCDONOUGH.

On March 18, 1949, the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] introduced S. 1300. That is the bill to which the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] alluded, I assume, in his remarks the other day as having been the first bill to be introduced on the subject. It was one of the early bills, but it was something more than a year after the earlier bills had been introduced in the House.

On March 21, 1949, Representative GORDON L. MCDONOUGH, Republican, of California, introduced a revised bill, H.R. 3650. However, in neither the 80th nor the 81st Congress was action taken on any of those bills. The bills, however, served an educational purpose to help to develop sentiment along this line.

In the 82d Congress, of 1951 and 1952, action was taken. The first bill introduced on the subject in the 82d Congress was H.R. 6, by Representative John Phillips, Republican, of California, on January 3, 1951.

On the same day, and with the next number, H.R. 7, Representative Clinton D. McKinnon, Democrat, of California, introduced his bill.

The first bill to be introduced in the Senate on that subject in the 82d Congress was S. 5, by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], a Democrat, on January 8, 1951.

On February 14, 1952, in the 82d Congress, Representative CLAIR ENGLE Democrat, of California, introduced H.R. 6578. I do not hesitate to say that the work of former Representative ENGLE, now the present junior Senator from California, has been outstanding and was most effective in regard to the initiation of the actual legislation on this subject. I commend his active and consistent efforts in this field.

On February 19, 1952, Representative John Phillips, Republican, of California, introduced H.R. 6704, on the same subject.

Representative Clinton D. McKinnon, Democrat, of California, introduced H.R. 7185 on March 21, 1952.

In the 82d Congress, as I have said, the first legislative action was taken. The bill introduced by Representative ENGLE was passed by the House and came over to the Senate. While a Member of

the House I had been interested in various measures to increase our water supplies. In the Senate I continued that interest with bills to explore cloud modification and otherwise to capture and conserve water. Hearings were held, as I recall on three bills, one of which was introduced by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], one by Mr. O'MAHONEY and one by myself. They were in a related field. On desalination, S. 5, the bill introduced by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], was reported. It was similar to, if not identical with, H.R. 6578, the Engle bill. On the floor, I offered an amendment in the nature of a substitute which proposed two changes. One was to double the amount which might be authorized for expenditure under the program; the other was that instead of a demonstration plant to be built by the Government at that time, the Secretary of the Interior would be authorized to enter into contracts with research institutions, universities, and other groups which were interested in the problem of converting salt water into fresh. My thought was that initially the Government would be saved the expenditure of capital funds if we could get the benefit of research which was being undertaken by various institutions who already had the equipment and personnel to carry on the basic research that should precede experimental and demonstration programs. That point of view was endorsed by other Senators, notably by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. The amendment was adopted as the text of the bill which became the first law on the subject. The act properly reflects the House number although the text was actually that of the amendment which I had the honor to offer at that time. It was substantially the Engle bill but modified in the two particulars I have mentioned.

My assistant has also researched the legislation in the 83d, 84th, 85th, and 86th Congresses.

During the 83d Congress, the principal effort of all those who were interested in this field was to secure appropriations to carry out the authorization provided in the bill passed in the 82d Congress, in 1952.

Came the 84th Congress, and it was necessary to get an extension of the research program if it was to be carried forward.

On January 13, 1955, Representative FRANK T. BOW, Republican, of Ohio, introduced H.R. 2104, which proposed an extension of the program.

On the same day, January 13, 1955, the then Representative CLAIR ENGLE, a Democrat, of California, introduced House bill 2126.

On January 18, 1955, I introduced Senate bill 516, which embraced the suggestions of others in the Senate who were interested in the idea. That bill was reported to the Senate floor and became the public law on the subject that year.

On March 5, 1956, Representative BOB WILSON, a Republican, of California, introduced House Joint Resolution 574.

And on March 19, 1956, Representative JAMES B. UTT, a Republican, of California, introduced House Joint Resolution 587, which also dealt with the subject.

This extension of the program resulted in additional research contracts; and considerable progress was made. A little later I shall deal with that.

Now I wish to complete this review of the various bills and other measures which have been introduced.

In the 85th Congress, Members of the Congress came to the conclusion that the time had arrived for the construction of actual demonstration plants.

The Honorable CLINTON D. ANDERSON, a Democrat, the junior Senator from New Mexico, introduced Senate Joint Resolution 135 on January 9, 1958, proposing construction of demonstration plants to treat sea water.

On February 27, 1958, I introduced Senate bill 3370, proposing additional plants to treat brackish inland waters.

Those were the two bills upon which hearings were held at some length by a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs that year. The Senator from New Mexico generously invited me to sit with him and jointly to conduct the hearings on the two bills. I shall speak more about them later on.

A number of bills were introduced in the House of Representatives during the 85th Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the list of the several bills from the 80th through the 85th Congress printed at this point in the RECORD, so that I shall not have to take the time of the Senate to read the list. In each instance I have indicated whether the measure was introduced by a Republican or by a Democrat.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BILLS TO DESALINATE WATER

EIGHTIETH CONGRESS (1948)

H.R. 5777 by Representative Charles K. Fletcher, Republican, of California, March 9, 1948.

H.R. 6031 by Representative Leo McDonough, Republican, of California, March 29, 1948.

(The bills were identical. Water Research Act—authorizes $30 million to be used by the Secretary of the Navy over a period of not more than 5 years to construct and operate demonstration plants to produce potable water from sea water, or other liquids, elements, or substances and to conserve and increase the national water resources.)

EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS (1949)

H.R. 859 by Representative GORDON L. MCDONOUGH, Republican, of California, January 5, 1949.

H.R. 3123 by Representative Clinton D. McKinnon, Democrat, of California, March 1, 1949.

S. 1300 by Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, Democrat, of Wyoming, March 18, 1949.

H.R. 3650 by Representative GORDON L. MCDONOUGH, Republican, of California, March 21, 1949.

EIGHTY-SECOND CONGRESS (1951) (1952)

H.R. 6 by Representative John Phillips, Republican, of California, January 3, 1951.

H.R. 7 by Representative Clinton D. McKinnon, Democrat, of California, January 3, 1951.

S. 5 by Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, Democrat, of Wyoming, January 8, 1951.

H.R. 6578 by Representative CLAIR ENGLE, Democrat, of California, February 14, 1952.

H.R. 6704 by Representative John Phillips, Republican, of California, February 19, 1952.

H.R. 7185 by Representative Clinton D. McKinnon, Democrat, of California, March 21, 1952.

EIGHTY-FOURTH CONGRESS (1955) (1956)

H.R. 2104 by Representative FRANK T. BOW, Republican, of Ohio, January 13, 1955.

H.R. 2126 by Representative CLAIR ENGLE, Democrat, of California, January 13, 1955.

S. 516 by Senator FRANCIS CASE, Republican, of South Dakota, January 18, 1955.

H.J. Res. 574 by Representative BOB WILSON, Republican, of California, March 5, 1956.

H.J. Res. 587 by Representative JAMES B. UTT, Republican, of California, March 19, 1956.

EIGHTY-FIFTH CONGRESS (1958)

S.J. Res. 135 by Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, Democrat, of New Mexico, January 9, 1958.

H.J. Res. 521 by Representative CHET HOLIFIELD, Democrat, of California, January 30, 1958.

H.J. Res. 541 by Representative BOB WILSON, Republican, of California, February 10, 1958.

H.R. 10606 by Representative CLAIR ENGLE, Democrat, of California, February 10, 1958.

H.J. Res. 545 by Representative JAMES ROOSEVELT, Democrat, of California, February 19, 1958.

S. 3370 by Senator FRANCIS CASE, Republican, of South Dakota, February 27, 1958.

H.R. 11405 by Representative CECIL R. KING, Democrat, of California, March 13, 1958.

H.R. 11838 by Representative CHARLES M. TEAGUE, Republican, of California, April 2, 1958.

H.J. Res. 596 by Representative JAMES ROOSEVELT, Democrat, of California, February 19, 1958.

H.J. Res. 617 by Representative JOHN J. RHODES, Republican, of Arizona, May 29, 1958.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, as I have related, the bill the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] introduced in the 85th Congress proposed that we authorize the construction of three demonstration plants to convert sea water into fresh water—in other words, to use the water of the ocean.

The bill I introduced proposed an authorization for the construction of plants to treat brackish water—that is, plants to remove the minerals from brackish waters, which are found in many inland States. It was my belief that the problem of water in the inland States could be solved in many instances if we found a practical, feasible, and economical method to desalt or demineralize brackish waters, some of which are in shallow wells, but many of which are in artesian wells or wells of considerable depth with great volume.

Extensive hearings were held in the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. The printed hearings are an encyclopedia on methods and processes developed by industry and various research institutions.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from California, provided I may do so without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from South Dakota.

I observe that my friend, who has taken an active interest in the saline water program, is speaking now of the contributions by the Republican Members of the House of Representatives and the Republican Members of the Senate to the development of the desalting program, and that he is speaking in answer to the statement made on August 25 by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Not exactly in answer to it, Mr. President. I said I thought the RECORD deserved some amplification, because I thought it was wholly incorrect to say that it was a Democratic saline water program and that it was initiated, extended, and supplied exclusively, apparently, by the Democrats. I was trying to give an impartial, objective, nonpartisan review and to point out that both Democrats and Republicans have contributed to the program.

I hope the Senator from California was present when I referred to the contribution he has made to this program, particularly to the enactment of legislation on this subject when he was a Member of the House of Representatives.

Mr. ENGLE. Yes. I am well aware of the contributions to which the Senator from South Dakota has referred. Of course I have been in this program a long time.

I understand that the Senator from South Dakota is trying to balance out the record, so as to show that Republican Senators, as well as Democratic Senators, introduced proposed legislation on this subject. The Senator submitted a list of the bills introduced by Representative McKinnon, of the House of Representatives—for a number of years he represented San Diego—and Representative John Phillips, of Banning, Calif., who introduced one of the first bills.

Later on, I introduced proposed legislation which passed the Congress. But in passing the Congress, it embodied the language in the nature of an amendment which was drafted by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

His recitation of the RECORD is correct, so far as I can tell—that is, that proposed legislation coming from both sides of the aisle contributed significantly to this great program.

On the other hand, I think I should say to my good friend that the Democratic Congress and the Democratic leadership are responsible for what occurs in this Congress. We expect to take that responsibility; we expect to take the blame with the praise.

The fact of the matter is that to the extent that this program has moved forward, it has moved forward under Democratic authorship and it has moved forward under Democratic urging.

I recall that we urged the Department of the Interior to be much more aggressive about this program than it has been. That was the reason—as an illustration—for the bill introduced the last time and the last amendment to the Saline Water Act, which was offered by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

I was the author of the other two—which tried to put the saline water program into high gear. We have felt for a long, long time—if the Senator from South Dakota will permit, I should like to add this—that by means of this program, which would revolutionize significant areas throughout the world that have been neglected for lack of funds, if we could desalt the sea and if we could desalt saline waters, we could make major changes on the face of the earth.

We could not understand why we could crack the atom and could develop the hydrogen bomb, and yet, somehow or other, we had not found a way to get salt out of seawater, when we have oceans all around us.

So we wanted more energy, in the form of hard cash and vigor, put into the administration of this program; and as my good friend, the Senator from South Dakota, knows, the former ranking member and the former chairman of the House Committee on the Interior, Dr. A. L. Miller, of Nebraska, after he retired from the House of Representatives, went to the Department of the Interior and undertook to administer the saline water program. I think it is now going forward more aggressively.

But in my humble judgment it is deserving of more attention than we have given it, for the capability of revolutionizing the economy of major areas of the world is so apparent, to me, that it seems ridiculous not to put more money and more aggressive action and more vigor than we have into this program.

Let me say, in conclusion, to my friend, the Senator from South Dakota, that if everyone on his side of the aisle had been as vigorous and as interested in this program as he has been and as constructive as he has been in formulating and supporting legislation for this purpose, I think we would have moved much faster, because we did want to move faster.

I compliment the Senator on the fine contribution he has made, his continuing interest in this program, and especially his constructive addition to the legislation. When the program was initiated with the first bill, when the bill went to the White House it was a bill with the number on it that I had introduced, but it embodied the Senator's language.

In view of the interest the Senator has shown in the problem of saline water, I hope his concern will continue. I appreciate his interest. But I want to make it plain that the responsibility is ours, and we accept the responsibility, and if there is credit to be gained for the initiation and execution of the program, and the revolutionary results in certain areas of the world, it belongs to the Democratic Party.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The Senator from South Dakota welcomes the comments and observations of the Senator from California, and particularly the references which he was generous enough to make in regard to my own part in the program.

Mr. President, I will pursue my observations on this subject, and when the record is wholly complete, I think it will be evident it has not been any more a Democratic program than a Republican program. Republican Members have participated in the matter in both the House and the Senate.

I expect to place in the RECORD later the budget estimates which have been submitted by the Eisenhower administration, and the appropriations which have been provided by the Democratic Congress. The record shows that at least in three different years the estimates submitted by the Eisenhower administration for the carrying on of this program called for more funds than what were appropriated by the Democratic Congresses in response to those requests.

While that fact appears on the record, I will say, in justification of the action taken, that perhaps Congress decided the amount it was appropriating, even though less than what the Eisenhower administration had requested, might be all that could be well and efficiently spent in a given year. I am not critical on that score; I merely wish the RECORD to show whatever the facts may show as to responsibility for and interest in the program.

Mr. President, I had two purposes in seeking recognition to make this review. One was to make it clear that the record was not wholly or accurately told if it is presented as a one-sided statement, mentioning only the names of a few Democrats who had been active in the program, and claiming it as a Democratic program. The record would not be clear if it was left at that point, because as many Republicans, practically, as Democrats have introduced bills on the subject, and all the legislation has had bipartisan support.

I think the RECORD will show it has developed that way and that the administration of the program has been in the hands of the Republicans. The legislation enacted has actually been almost altogether under Republican administration.

The first act, passed in 1952, was implemented to a certain extent, but it could have been only started in the last 6 months of the Truman administration. The appropriations were only $175,000, the first year. The work was hardly organized when President Eisenhower took office, so the major development of the program has come during his administration, under Interior Secretary Seaton and Assistant Secretary Aandahl. The individual who first had the responsibility for setting up the saline work under the first act passed was a gentleman by the name of David Jenkins. I want, in passing, to pay tribute to the work Jenkins did, because it was a pioneering job. He had to develop the content for research contracts. He had to find worthy candidates for those contracts. He had to educate the public and the Congress on what was being done under the limited authorization of the first bill, and then to develop the

sentiment, by the record established, for an extension of the act in 1952, and upon the record of the Saline Water Division in the Interior Department under those first two acts, we could move to the third act, that of 1958, which was enacted under the number of the bill introduced by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] for himself and the Senator from South Dakota, now speaking.

And possibly the Senator from South Dakota will be pardoned for pointing out that the provision for brackish waters in the bill which the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] referred to as the Anderson Act, was definitely the suggestion of the Senator from South Dakota. I have no desire to minimize the credit due the Senator from New Mexico for his imaginative, aggressive, and resourceful work in this field. I merely wish the RECORD to show that some of us who are affiliated with the Republican Party have been active in the field as well, and as I say that, I think of the very great help we got in the Appropriations Committee in 1953 and 1954 by former Senator Guy Cordon, a Republican from Oregon, and in later years by Senators Knowland and KUCHEL of California, both Republicans. And if I have made any special contribution to this matter, it may have been in directing attention to the problem of the brackish waters.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. ENGLE. That is an important matter. The matter of desalting brackish water is one that is more important than most people think, because desalting the sea is one thing; the sea contains about 3 percent salt by volume, whereas the salt in brackish water may be much less. Throughout major areas of the world, including the southwestern part of the United States, there is brackish water which is not fit for human consumption or agricultural use; but it has much less salt by volume than the sea itself. We find the problems of desalting brackish water are much simpler than the problems of desalting the sea. If we could desalt brackish water, we could make large bodies of water available for human consumption and for industrial and agricultural uses at a much lower cost than would be required to desalt the sea.

The program to which the distinguished Senator from South Dakota has addressed himself, and in which he has long been interested, has been broadened to go into the field of handling brackish waters, because we know if we can arrive at an economical solution of those problems first, in doing so we can make available large bodies of water which otherwise would not be available. That is the essence of the case—the more salt in water, the more the cost to get it out. The salt solution in the sea is more than in other waters. What I have said about brackish waters is especially true of the southwestern part of the United States, some parts of Africa, and the Middle East. To go beyond the direct challenge of desalting the sea, and to include desalting brackish waters, has been one of the most advanced developments in that area.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The Senator from South Dakota appreciates that statement by the able Senator from California. This conquest of demineralizing inland waters is an important element of the whole problem, and a contribution to many areas of the world will be made by the developments which are being made as a result of this program in the field of brackish water. The demonstration plants being established at Roswell, N. Mex., and at Webster, S. Dak., will be visited by engineers from all over the world.

Now, Mr. President, at this point in the RECORD, I ask unanimous consent to have printed a list of the bills introduced in this Congress, in 1959 and 1960, dealing with the problem of water desalination. At the end of each line dealing with the bill introduced, the letter "(D)" or "(R)" indicates whether it was a Democrat or a Republican who introduced the bill. Some of the bills have several cosponsors, but I have given the political affiliation only of the person who introduced the bill. In summary, it appears that 23 Democrats and 22 Republicans have introduced bills on this subject, a more nearly even distribution of honors and interest than the relative membership in either body of the Congress.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIST OF BILLS INTRODUCED IN THIS CONGRESS ON WATER DESALINATION

S. 1576 by Senators MAGNUSON and JOHNSON of Texas, March 26, 1959 (D).

S. 2816 by Senator ALLOTT and others, January 14, 1960 (R).

S. 3446 by Senator CASE of South Dakota, and others, April 29, 1960 (R).

S. 3557 by Senator JOHNSON of Texas and others, May 16, 1960 (D).

H.R. 9641 by Representative ASPINALL, January 14, 1960 (D).

H.R. 9642 by Representative RHODES of Arizona, January 14, 1960 (R).

H.R. 9643 by Representative SAYLOR, January 14, 1960 (R).

H.R. 9644 by Representative UDALL, January 14, 1960 (D).

H.R. 9645 by Representative WAINWRIGHT, January 14, 1960 (R).

H.R. 9646 by Representative WILSON, January 14, 1960 (R).

H.R. 10973 by Representative DIXON, March 8, 1960 (R).

H.R. 12438 by Representative MONTOYA, May 27, 1960 (D).

H.R. 12452 by Representative MORRIS of New Mexico, May 31, 1960 (D).

H.R. 12462 by Representative HOLIFIELD, June 1, 1960 (D).

H.R. 12555 by Representative FASCELL, June 8, 1960 (D).

H.R. 12569 by Representative ROGERS of Texas, June 8, 1960 (D).

H.R. 12780 by Representative FASCELL, June 22, 1960 (D).

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have appear at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks an excerpt from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 18, 1949, under the heading "Conversion of Sea Water for Industrial and Irrigation Uses," being the words of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] at the time he introduced the bill, S. 1300.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONVERSION OF SEA WATER FOR INDUSTRIAL AND IRRIGATION USES

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to authorize the Department of the Interior to develop methods for conversion of sea water on a large scale for public, industrial, and irrigation uses, and I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement by me be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1300) to conserve and increase the Nation's water resources, for promotion of irrigation in arid areas, by research and demonstration of practical means of producing, from sea or other saline waters, water suitable for beneficial consumptive use, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. O'MAHONEY, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"CONVERSION OF SEA WATER FOR INDUSTRIAL AND IRRIGATION USES

"The arid West, where reclamation is essential to the cultivation of agricultural land, is not the only area of the country in need of new sources of water supply. Water shortages already exist or are threatened in a large number of industrial and urban areas throughout the Nation, Senator O'MAHONEY explained in commenting on his bill which calls for construction and operation of demonstration plants to discover the most feasible means to convert sea water for industrial, domestic, and agricultural use.

"The situation is acute not only for arid regions of the West, such as those through which the Colorado River flows, but also for large metropolitan areas throughout the country. So great has been the drain on underground water supplies in the East that industrial use of ground water in Brooklyn and in Queens County has been limited by law ever since 1934. The consumption of water in that area has been so great that the water table has been rapidly falling, and sea water has been flowing into the source of supply for domestic use.

"The long struggle which has been waged over the distribution and use of the water of the Colorado River system is an illustration of the need for legislation of this character. There is not enough water in the river for all present and contemplated uses by the people of the States in the Colorado River Basin. Not only is this true with respect to irrigation and power, but it's true with respect to industrial and municipal use.

"More than that, the Los Angeles-San Diego-San Francisco-Oakland areas, which are among the fastest-growing industrial and metropolitan regions of the Nation, are experiencing serious water shortages. This is a condition which will seriously limit the expansion of industrial development unless a solution is found.

"Similar conditions exist in the Virgin Islands and in other insular possessions of the United States. If a feasible method for converting sea water is developed, it will be an untold blessing to all parts of the country.

"Our oceans, with their limitless quantities of water at our doorsteps, are a national resource. The legislation I am introducing would permit American scientific and industrial genius to develop this great resource to meet existing and expanding needs for national security, public health, and economic development."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I shall read into the RECORD an excerpt from the RECORD of June 20, 1952, since it is only a short paragraph.

RESEARCH INTO MEANS OF CONVERTING SALINE WATERS FOR AGRICULTURAL AND INDUSTRIAL USES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. CASE of South Dakota submitted amendments in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 5) to provide for research into and demonstration of practical means for the economical production, from sea or other saline waters, or from the atmosphere (including cloud formations), of water suitable for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and other beneficial consumptive uses, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Those are the amendments to which the Senator from California alluded as having been offered by me as a substitute for the text of the bill introduced by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], which was identical to the bill introduced by the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], then a Member of the House of Representatives, which was passed by the House.

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an excerpt from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 98, part 6, beginning on page 7780, under the heading "Conversion of Saline Waters for Beneficial Consumptive Uses." This is from the proceedings of the Senate on June 21, 1952, when the bill, H.R. 6578, originally authored by the Senator from California, was considered, for which my amendments to S. 5 were substituted. They provided the text of the first bill which was enacted by the Congress on the subject of saline water.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONVERSION OF SALINE WATERS FOR BENEFICIAL CONSUMPTIVE USES

The bill (H.R. 6578) to provide for correlation and coordination of research into practical means for the economical production, from sea or other saline waters, of water suitable for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and other beneficial consumptive uses, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation of this bill and some indication of what the cost will be?

Mr. CASE. Mr. President——

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I should like to have the Senator from South Dakota submit the amendment which he has.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 6578) to provide for correlation and coordination of research into practical means for the economical production, from sea or other saline waters, of water suitable for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and other beneficial consumptive uses, and for other purposes.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I offer my amendment, which is designated as an amendment to S. 5, a similar bill, which was originally introduced by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

" 'That, in view of the acute shortage of water in the arid areas of the Nation and elsewhere and the excessive use of underground waters throughout the Nation, it is the policy of the Congress to provide for the development of practicable low-cost means of producing from sea water, or from other saline waters, water of a quality suitable for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and other beneficial consumptive uses on a scale sufficient to determine the feasibility of the development of such production and distribution on a large-scale basis, for the purpose of conserving and increasing the water resources of the Nation.

" 'SEC. 2. In order to carry out the purposes of this act, the Secretary of the Interior, acting through such agencies of the Department of the Interior as he may deem appropriate, is authorized—

" '(a) by means of research grants and contracts as set forth in subsection (d) of this section to conduct research and technical development work, to make careful engineering studies to ascertain the lowest investment and operating costs, and to determine the best plant designs and conditions of operation;

" '(b) to study methods for the recovery and marketing of byproducts resulting from and incident to the production of water as herein provided for the purpose of ascertaining the possibilities of offsetting the costs of water production in any area by the commercial utilization of such products;

" '(c) to acquire, by purchase, license, lease, or donation, secret processes, technical data, inventions, patent applications, patents, licenses, land and any interest in land (including water rights, easements, and leasehold interests), plants and facilities, and other property or rights: *Provided*, That the land or other property acquired hereunder shall not exceed that necessary to carry on the experiments and demonstrations for the purposes herein provided;

" '(d) to engage, by noncompetitive contract or otherwise, chemists, physicists, engineers, and such other personnel as may be deemed necessary, and any educational institution, scientific organization, or industrial or engineering firm deemed suitable to do any part of the research or other work, and to the extent appropriate to correlate and coordinate the research and development work of such educational institutions, scientific organizations and industrial and engineering firms; and

" '(e) to cooperate with any other Federal, State, or municipal department, agency, or instrumentality, and with any private person, firm, educational institution, or other organization in effectuating the purpose of this act.

" 'SEC. 3. Research undertaken by the Secretary of the Interior under the authority contained in this act shall be coordinated or conducted jointly with the Department of Defense to the greatest practicable extent compatible with military and security limitations, to the end that research and developments under this act which are primarily of a civil nature will contribute to the defense of the Nation and that research and developments in the same field which are primarily of a military nature and are conducted by the Department of Defense will be made available to advance the purposes of this act and to strengthen the civil economy of the Nation.

" 'SEC. 4. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized, for the sole purpose of this act, to dispose of all water and other products produced as a result of his operations under this act pursuant to regulations to be prescribed by him: *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall be construed to alter existing law with respect to the ownership and control of water.

" 'SEC. 5. All moneys received for products of the plants under this act shall be paid into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

" 'SEC. 6. The Secretary of the Interior shall make reports to the President and the Congress at the beginning of each regular session of the action taken or instituted by him under the provisions of this act. The report shall include suitable recommendations for further legislation.

" 'SEC. 7. The Secretary of the Interior may issue rules and regulations to effectuate the purposes of this act.

" 'SEC. 8. There are authorized to be appropriated, from any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums, not to exceed $2,000,000, for a 5-year period, to carry out the provisions of this act: *Provided*, That departmental expenses for the correlation and coordination of information over such 5-year period shall not exceed the sum of $500,000: *Provided further*, That such departmental expenses shall be scheduled in equal amounts for each year of such period insofar as practicable.' "

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the amendment?

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, House bill 6578 proposed a program of research and demonstration of making sea and other saline waters available for industrial, agricultural, municipal, and domestic uses. The subject was developed in extensive hearings held last year by a joint committee for three committees of the Senate, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The original hearings was conducted for 4 days. This was supplemented by later hearings and visits of Senators and staff members to various plants and laboratories. The hearings were presided over by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, former Secretary of Agriculture [Mr. ANDERSON]. These studies developed that a great deal may be done to make available for use water which had been previously considered impossible to be used but that more research is needed.

The House has already passed a bill which proposes a program of research and the building of a pilot or demonstration plant to be operated by the Department of the Interior. There has been some objection, however, to having the Department build a plant, in view of the fact that there are some able nonprofit research organizations working in this field. The amendment which I have proposed eliminates the building and operation of a plant by the Department of the Interior and authorizes in lieu thereof the making of contracts with research foundations and industry. That is the principal difference between the bill and the amendment. We believe this approach will get more results for the money expended.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Is it not true that some companies have asked for an opportunity to proceed under Government sponsorship, and that at least one research organization has offered to take over some of the cost?

Mr. CASE. That is correct. A research institution near Boston with which our colleague the very able Senator from Vermont [Mr. Flanders] is familiar has been pointing to some possibilities in water modification which would be of the greatest importance to the Department of Defense, the Department of Agriculture, and the Department of Commerce, and our entire economy. Some who are working in this field say that we are on the eve of making sea water usable for

great coastal cities and for irrigation. Inland cities and towns may find it practicable to desalt alkaline and brackish waters. This, conceivably, will save huge sums to both the areas concerned and to the National Government.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Will the Senator give the Senate some indication of the cost of the operation under the bill?

Mr. CASE. The authorization in the amendment which I have proposed makes a limitation on departmental expenditures of $500,000 over a period of 5 years. An amount up to $2 million may be expended for the program over a period of 5 years, this covering research contracts as well as departmental expenses. The House bill proposed $1 million, but on a 5-year basis that is considered inadequate.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Does the Senator feel that such an expenditure is justified?

Mr. CASE. I do. The use of water in modern industry, such as in oil refineries, is greatly depleting the good water resources in many parts of the country. For example, I was surprised to learn that a single refinery in New York uses more water than the city of Buffalo. There are, however, a great many cities and towns in the United States that have access to water which is relatively brackish and not usable for domestic or industrial purposes. This research, which is in its infancy, indicates that we can unlock for cities, industries, or agriculture great supplies of water in the country by relatively cheap methods. But considerable research and demonstration are necessary to demonstrate just what can be done. The field is national in importance and beyond the resources of any single foundation working in the field as far as known.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask that the Senator be yielded 2 additional minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The purpose seems a very worthy one but it involves the operation of a private plant by the Government. I am wondering if the Senator from South Dakota does not regard this as a dangerous experiment in socialism. Would it not be much better to have private industry operate the plant rather than to have the Government go into the water business?

Mr. CASE. The Senator is making a case for the amendment I have offered. The House bill provided for a pilot plant to be built and operated by the Government. My amendment denies such a pilot plant and authorizes research contracts with private institutions and foundations.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am happy to say that that is why I am very strongly in favor of the amendment suggested by the Senator from South Dakota. I think it removes all possible objections to the bill, and gives the country a chance to take advantage of processes being developed throughout the world. I associate myself with the Senator from South Dakota in his effort to have adopted the approach he is now providing by his amendment.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I should like to observe that I know the Senator from South Dakota is always on the side of sound economy, so I accept his judgment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide for research into and development of practical means for the economical production, from sea or other saline waters, of water suitable for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and other beneficial consumptive uses, and for other purposes."

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared under the title of the Senate bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"STATEMENT BY SENATOR CASE ON H.R. 6578 AND AMENDMENT THERETO

"I am today offering an amendment to the bill H.R. 6578 (S. 5), providing for research into and demonstration of practical means for the economical production, from sea or other saline waters, or from the atmosphere (including cloud formations), of water suitable for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and other beneficial consumptive uses.

"I was privileged to attend hearings on this bill held by three subcommittees of the Senate simultaneously with hearings on various weather-control bills, one of which I had introduced. As these hearings progressed, I realized that the desalting or demineralizing of water was a subject important to all persons and all areas of the Nation, and not just to those involved in sea commerce and those living on our coasts.

"We are all conscious of the fact that water supply is a serious and often critical problem all over the United States.

"As our population gets larger, as industrial production expands, and as agricultural production increases, we will certainly meet up with a tremendously enlarged demand for water, making the problem still more serious.

"It is obvious, therefore, that we must now and in the immediate future develop new sources of water and make better use of the sources of water supply presently available to us.

"If we do not use foresight in handling this problem, we will most certainly find ourselves in a predicament affecting the health and well-being of everyone.

"Many persons do not realize the immensity of our present and future water needs. The Senators who heard testimony on this subject last year, however, were given many eye-opening examples of water use, some of which were quoted in the committee report on S. 5. I would, in turn, like to quote an excerpt from that report:

" 'The magnitude of modern need for and use of water is illustrated by a fact reported at the hearings, that the Baton Rouge oil refinery in Louisiana uses more water than the entire city of Cleveland, Ohio, although it is only one plant. The Bay Refinery in New York uses more water than the city of Buffalo, N.Y. The committee was told that in such plants water is pumped through the cooling towers at the rate of approximately 260 million gallons per day.

" 'Not less than 30,000 gallons of water are required to make a ton of newsprint, some 60,000 to 120,000 gallons to make steam from a ton of coal. For every thousand pounds of cotton used to produce mercerized cotton 30,000 gallons of water are consumed. Even the basic operation of sizing cotton requires 820 gallons for a thousand pounds. It takes 70,000 gallons to finish a thousand pounds of woolen fabrics, and 77,000 gallons of water to refine 100,000 barrels of oil. It takes 500 gallons of water to manufacture a ton of soap, and one-half gallon to make a pound of sugar.

" 'As the canning industry grows the use of water apparently grows; 7,000 gallons are required to process 100 cases of No. 2 cans of tomatoes, 12,500 gallons for the same amount of succotash, and 25,000 gallons for the same amount of lima beans.

" 'In every field of industry—production of electrical energy, the testing of airplane engines, the manufacture of aviation gasoline, the manufacture of aluminum, the processing of iron ore, the manufacture of explosives, the operation of slaughterhouses—more and more water is required.

" 'OTHER PRESSING SHORTAGES

" 'Many States are finding it necessary to pass legislation to limit the drilling of water wells. The need of additional water to solve the problems of the arid West has long been known. Indeed, acute water shortages have developed in many areas of the West and there is every reason to believe that if fresh water can be economically made from salt water both agriculture and industry will benefit to the great economic advantage of the whole country.

" 'Domestic and municipal uses are also increasing. An average office building uses from 27 to 45 gallons per day per person. Hospital uses, as might be expected, are very much greater. The daily rate runs from 135 to 350 gallons per day per patient. Hotels, growing in number throughout the country, like hospitals, use huge quantities, running at the rate of 300 to 525 gallons per day per guest room.

" 'It was represented to the committee that while a few decades ago a per capita supply of 100 gallons of water per day was considered sufficient for all human needs, that amount of water would not begin to meet requirements at the present time.

" 'In the case of many municipalities the per capita use now is more than 200 gallons per day, thus illustrating the widespread basic need for research of the character provided in this bill.'

"We can reasonably expect that the seas and our brackish inland waters might provide two new sources of potable water. Research in developing means for desalting or demineralizing these waters has progressed over a period of several years. But this research must be further promoted and accelerated so that we can meet, in time, the pressing demands for potable water in the near future.

"Sea water as a source of sweetwater appeals, of course, principally to the communities and areas reasonably close to the sea. What we commonly speak of as brackish water, however, is common to many inland areas where it is found in streams and wells, particularly in arid and semiarid parts of the country.

"Economical means of demineralizing this latter type of water will mean that farmers and ranchers can support more livestock on their grazing lands and can store more water for irrigation purposes.

"An economical demineralizing process could not only provide additional stock water and extend irrigation, especially where irrigation projects have failed of feasibility because of alkaline water, but could also vastly improve water supplies for thousands of communities and homes, rural and urban, all over the Nation.

"Conceivably a demineralizing process could eventually be substituted for present-day softening processes and could also solve problems arising from mineral deposits in boilers and in water-distributing systems.

"A demineralizing process could also be used to produce and purify various industrial fluids, and the possibilities here are so great that research in purifying water might be deferred by private research companies and institutions if the Government does not provide encouragement for the latter.

"Providing water for community and agricultural uses has been generally recognized as a public responsibility, and our Federal Government and our local governments have therefore made huge investments in projects to concentrate and distribute water. For this reason, it is clearly appropriate for the Federal Government to show a concern

for future water supplies to the extent of encouraging and supporting research leading to the development of processes which will make more water generally available.

"This the Federal Government can do, with a comparatively small expenditure, by passing the bill with the amendment."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, Senate bill 5 will be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Next, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the record of proceedings of the Senate, to be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 101, part 6, page 7104, during the consideration of S. 516, relating to research in the development and utilization of saline waters. This was the bill which I introduced, which was presented to the Senate by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSEN], who pointed out that the Senate would consider S. 516 and that at a proper time the Senate would consider H.R. 2126, the corresponding House bill. That was the bill which became the act of 1955, providing for an extension of the program.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESEARCH IN THE DEVELOPMENT AND UTILIZATION OF SALINE WATERS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 374, Senate bill 516, to amend the act relating to research in the development and utilization of saline waters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 516) to amend the act of July 3, 1952, relating to research in the development and utilization of saline waters, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with amendments.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I call the bill to the attention of the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I hope that at the proper time we may take up H.R. 2126, the corresponding House bill.

However, first, let me refer to the Senate bill. Senate bill 516 was introduced by the Senator from South Dakota, Mr. CASE. The bill is designed to further the program involving the study of saline water which was begun several years ago. This time the committee voted to increase substantially the amount of money which would be authorized, because we seem to be coming somewhat closer to actually making it possible to develop potable water from sea water. If this can be done, it will solve some of the great problems we now confront in connection with the rights to irrigation water on streams, for example. It would be extremely helpful to the State of the able junior Senator from California, Mr. KUCHEL, where growing communities need constantly increasing supplies of water.

Only a few minutes ago the Senate passed a bill under which certain communities in Oklahoma will pay about 30 cents for 1,000 gallons of water. As the result of the work which is being done, the cost of producing potable water from saline water has been brought down to a somewhat comparable figure. I do not say that it has reached that point yet, but it is somewhat comparable. Therefore, we felt that a great deal of good could be accomplished if this bill, providing larger sums, could be passed.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President——

Mr. ANDERSON. Let me add one further statement.

We also made provision for the expansion of the amount of money that can be used in Federal research, because, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I felt obligated to call to the attention of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs the fact that there was a similarity between certain research work now going on in connection with atomic energy and the work involved in this program. I thought the atomic research had a bearing on the bill of the able Senator from South Dakota. We, therefore, have suggested an increased amount, because I think it can be advantageously spent.

I am very happy now to yield to the author of the bill, who has done fine work in this field.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from New Mexico has been most helpful. I should say that he was the author of one of the three bills which were considered by the Congress in initiating the original legislation on this subject. He has had a keen appreciation of the purposes of this type of legislation throughout its history. He made a distinct contribution in the committee hearings a few days ago when he brought to the attention of the committee the fact that similar problems concerning the recovery of water were involved in research being conducted by the Atomic Energy Commission, or under its auspices.

The original measure was passed a couple of years ago, and during the time the program has been in operation significant results have been obtained. It was my privilege to go to Boston, Mass., last summer immediately following adjournment of the Congress to see some of the experiments which were being carried on. Several Members of the House were there at the same time. We were all greatly encouraged. I believe that the progress which has been made in reducing the costs of the various processes which are under investigation is of great significance.

I may add that I have been surprised at the number of projects or approaches to this problem which have been uncovered. The imagination of the scientist and that of the manufacturer have been stimulated by the program. Research workers in various institutions and in private industry are going forward with various proposals. It is not necessary at this time to take the time of the Senate to recount them. Some reference to them will be found in the report of the committee. Members who are interested in the problem of the recovery of potable and usable water from brackish or saline waters are urged to read the testimony which was presented at the time of the hearings.

The House has passed a similar bill. At the proper stage I hope the Senator from New Mexico will make the motion—or I shall be happy to make it—to discharge the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs from the further consideration of House bill 2126, so that it may be considered by the Senate and we may move to strike out all after the enacting clause and substitute the text of Senate bill 516, as reported from the committee, so that the bill may go to conference with the text of both bills before the conferees.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I am happy to follow the suggestion made by the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Have the committee amendments been agreed to?

Mr. ANDERSON. I am told that I should proceed in this fashion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will be discharged from further consideration of House bill 2126.

The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 2126) to amend the act of July 3, 1952, relating to research in the development and utilization of saline waters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the House bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I move to strike out all after the enacting clause, and to insert in lieu thereof the language of Senate bill 516, as reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Mexico.

The motion was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H.R. 2126) was read the third time and passed, as follows:

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act of July 3, 1952 (66 Stat. 328; 42 U.S.C., secs. 1951 ff.), is hereby amended as follows:

"(1) By modifying subsection (a) of section 2 of said Act so as to read: 'by means of research grants and contracts as set forth in subsection (d) of this section and by use of the facilities of existing Federal scientific laboratories within the monetary limits set forth in section 8 of this Act, to conduct research and technical development work, to make careful engineering studies to ascertain the lowest investment and operating costs, and to determine the best plant designs and conditions of operation.'

"(2) by modifying section 3 of said Act to add the following: 'Similarly, the fullest cooperation by and with the Atomic Energy Commission and the Civil Defense Administration in research and in determining the future needs of the Nation with respect to potable water and ways and means to provide same shall be carried out in the interest of achieving the objectives of the program.'

"(3) By modifying section 8 of said Act so as to read: 'There are authorized to be appropriated such sums, but not more than $10,000,000 in all, as may be required (a) to carry out the provisions of this Act during the fiscal years 1953 to 1963, inclusive, (b) to finance for not more than two years beyond the end of said period such grants, contracts, cooperative agreements, and studies as may theretofore have been undertaken pursuant to this Act, and (c) during the same additional period plus one more year, to correlate, coordinate, and round out the results of studies and research undertaken pursuant to this Act. Departmental expenses for direction of the program authorized by this Act and for the correlation and coordination of information as provided in subsection (d) of its section 2 shall not exceed $1,500,000, and not less than $2,500,000 shall be expended for research and development in Federal or educational institution (State or private) laboratories. Both of said sums shall be scheduled for expenditure in equal annual amounts insofar as its practicable: *Provided,* That not to exceed 10 per centum of the funds available in any one year for research and development may be expended in cooperation with public or private agencies in foreign countries in the development of processes useful to the program in the United States: *And provided further,* That contracts or agreements made in pursuance of this proviso shall provide that the results or information developed in connection therewith shall be available without cost to the program in the United States herein authorized.' "

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senate bill 516 be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 516 is indefinitely postponed.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the proceedings of the Senate for June 10, 1958, under the heading "Construction of Demonstration Plant." This relates to Senate Joint Resolution 135, which was the consolidated resolution submitted by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], for himself, for the junior Senator from South Dakota, myself, for the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and for other Senators. It consolidated the proposals of the bill which the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] had introduced to provide for the construction of three plants for the conversion of sea water, and the bill which I had introduced to provide for the construction of two plants for the treatment of brackish water.

That resolution became the act of 1958, and under the authority of that act, Mr. President, the Saline Water Division in the Department of the Interior today has four plants under bid, two for sea water and two for brackish water.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONSTRUCTION OF DEMONSTRATION PLANT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1623, Senate Joint Resolution 135.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 135) providing for the construction by the Department of the Interior of a full-scale demonstration plant for the production, from sea or other saline waters, of water suitable for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and other beneficial consumptive uses.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with amendments to strike out all after the resolving clause and insert:

"That (a) the Secretary of the Interior shall, pursuant to the provisions of the Act of July 3, 1952, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1951–1958), and in accordance with this joint resolution, provide for the construction, operation, and maintenance of not less than five demonstration plants for the production, from sea water or brackish water, of water suitable for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and other beneficial consumptive uses. Such plants shall be designed to demonstrate the reliability, engineering, operating, and economic potentials of the sea or brackish water conversion processes which the Secretary shall select from among the most promising of the presently known processes. A decision with respect to the processes to be utilized in such plants shall be made by the Secretary within six months after the date of approval of this joint resolution, and the construction of such plants shall proceed as rapidly thereafter as is practicable.

"(b) The construction of the demonstration plants referred to above shall be subject to the following conditions:

"(1) Not less than three plants shall be designed for the conversion of sea water, and each of two plants so designed shall have a capacity of not less than one million gallons per day:

"(2) Not less than two plants shall be designed for the treatment of brackish water, and at least one of the plants so designed shall have a capacity of not less than two hundred and fifty thousand gallons per day; and

"(3) Such plants shall be located in the following geographical areas with a view to demonstrating optimum utility from the standpoint of reliable operation, maintenance, and economic potential—

"(A) at least one plant which is designed for the conversion of sea water shall be located on the west coast of the United States, and at least one plant so designed shall be located on the east coast or gulf coast of the United States:

"(B) at least one plant which is designed for the treatment of brackish water shall be located in the area generally described as the Northern Great Plains, and at least one plant so designed shall be located in the arid areas of the Southwest; and

"(C) one plant which is designed for the conversion of sea water shall be located in the Virgin Islands or some other territorial possession of the United States, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior, with a view to providing potable water and/or additional electric power.

"(c) As used in this joint resolution, the term "demonstration plant" means a plant of sufficient size and capacity to establish on a day-to-day operating basis the optimum attainable reliability, engineering, operating, and economic potential of the particular sea water conversion process or the brackish water treatment process selected by the Secretary of the Interior for utilization in such plant.

"SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior shall enter into a contract or contracts for the construction of the demonstration plants referred to in the preceding section, and the Secretary shall enter into a separate contract or contracts for the operation and maintenance of such plants. Any such operation and maintenance contract shall provide for the compilation by the contractor of complete records with respect to the operation, maintenance, and engineering of the plant or plants specified in the contract. The records so compiled shall be made available to the public by the Secretary at periodic and reasonable intervals with a view to demonstrating the most feasible existing processes for desalting sea water and treating brackish water. Access by the public to the demonstration plants herein provided for shall be assured during all phases of construction and operation subject to such reasonable restrictions as to time and place as the Secretary of the Interior may require or approve.

"SEC. 3. The authority of the Secretary of the Interior under this joint resolution to construct, operate, and maintain demonstration plants shall terminate upon the expiration of 5 years after the date on which this joint resolution is approved. Upon the expiration of such 5-year period the Secretary shall proceed as promptly as practicable to dispose of any plants so constructed by sale to the highest bidder, or as may otherwise be directed by act of Congress.

"SEC. 4. The powers conferred on the Secretary of the Interior by this joint resolution shall be in addition to and not in derogation of the authority conferred on the Secretary by the act of July 3, 1952, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1951–58). The provisions of such act, except as otherwise provided in this joint resolution, shall be applicable in the administration of this joint resolution.

"SEC. 5. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums, not in excess of $10 million, as may be necessary to provide for the construction of the demonstration plants referred to in this joint resolution, together with such additional sums as may be necessary for the operation and maintenance of such plants, and the administration of the program authorized by this resolution."

And to insert a preamble, as follows:

"Whereas official Government reports show unmistakably that the U.S. population is multiplying at a rate which by 1980 will triple the demand for supplies of fresh water, which if not available will adversely affect the national defense by jeopardizing the economic welfare and general well-being of vast segments of the population of the United States, as well as the population of some of our territorial possessions; and

"Whereas many cities, towns, and rural areas are already confronted by shortages of potable water that imperil health; and

"Whereas the expanding population, industry, and agriculture of the United States are becoming increasingly dependent upon an assured augmented supply of fresh water while the future welfare and national defense of the United States rest upon increased sources of fresh water; and

"Whereas research by governmental agencies, educational institutions, and private industry, has brought about the evolution, on a limited scale, of methods of desalting sea water and the treatment of brackish water which give promise of ultimate economical results; and

"Whereas the United States Government has the responsibility, along with safeguarding the national defense, and protecting the health, welfare, and economic stability of the country, to transform these experiments into production tests on a scale not possible of achievement otherwise; and

"Whereas the Congress recognized its responsibility in this field by the enactment in 1952 of the Saline Water Act (66 Stat. 328), reaffirmed its position by the amendments to such act in 1955 (69 Stat. 198); and the legislative history of such acts reveals that the Congress recognized even then that the time had arrived for tackling the problem more realistically and effectively, but unfortunately the program was limited to such an extent that concrete results are not possible of attainment under the provisions of existing legislation; and

"Whereas the Congress now finds it is in the national interest to demonstrate, with the least possible delay, in actual production tests the several optimum aspects of the construction, operation, and maintenance of sea water conversion and brackish water treatment plants: Now, therefore, be it."

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the majority leader, be added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 135, to provide for the construction by the Department of the Interior of a full-scale demonstration plant for the production, from sea or other saline waters, of water suitable for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and other beneficial consumptive uses.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, Senate Joint Resolution 135, providing for saline and brackish water demonstration plants, comes to the Senate with the unanimous recommendation of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs that it do pass.

The Senate will recall that three distinguished Senators from widely separate areas of the country, who are not members of the committee, have joined as cosponsors of the

measure. Their action illustrates the broad interest and concern of the country at large in reaching for a solution of the water problem with which the Nation will be confronted within a few short years.

I refer to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from California, [Mr. KUCHEL], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

In fact, Government experts forecast that by 1980 the demand and use of water in the United States will treble. Not only rapidly expanding coastal cities will face shortages, but inland centers of population, large and small, will be confronted with shortages. Already many areas are already faced by the problem.

Our position, as reflected in Senate Joint Resolution 135, is that the Federal Government must take the leadership in solving the problem of converting sea water to potable uses in the coastal areas and for the treatment of brackish waters in the interior. While there is something of the spectacular about the desalting of ocean water, we must bear in mind that interior areas will require additional supplies of fresh or sweet water for domestic, industrial, and agricultural uses.

The United States of America can ill afford to wait until other nations outstrip us in reaching a solution of the fresh-water problem or until we are confronted with water shortages that threaten the health, welfare, and safety, as well as the industrial and agricultural stability of the Nation. Therefore, we urge the Senate to act favorably on this resolution and express the hope the House of Representatives will concur.

As is well known, there is no trick about desalting sea water or making brackish water potable. The problem is to find processes by which the ends can be achieved at economical cost. We have confidence that American ingenuity, backed wholeheartedly by the Government, can achieve the desired results within a reasonable time.

What scientists and industry need is encouragement, assistance, and leadership.

Senate Joint Resolution 135 places responsibility for execution of the program on the Secretary of the Interior, who already has responsibility for major conservation programs. The Department of the Interior, by the Saline Water Act of 1952, was charged with research and development in the saline water field.

While limited research progress has been made, the feeling generally is that the Department has failed to come to grips with the urgency of demonstrating economic processes. The Appropriations Committees have withheld authorized funds, doubtless due to a feeling that the program should be accelerated by action, rather than confining it to research or limited pilot plant operation.

As I have stated previously on the floor of the Senate, we have every confidence that the present Secretary of the Interior has the imagination, administrative and leadership qualities to direct an action program, as is contemplated by the resolution. We propose to give him the funds and authority to do the job. In brief, the authorization in Senate Joint Resolution 135, as reported, sets forth these objectives with an appropriation of $10 million, with additional funds for operation and maintenance.

First. Construction and operation of:

One. Not less than 3 plants which shall be designed for the conversion of sea water, and each of 2 plants so designed to have a capacity of not less than 1 million gallons per day;

Two. Not less than 2 plants, designed for the treatment of brackish water, and at least 1 of the plants so designed to have a capacity of not less than 250,000 gallons per day; and

Three. Such plants shall be located in the following geographical areas with a view to demonstrating optimum utility from the standpoint of reliable operation, maintenance, and economic potential—

(A) At least 1 plant which is designed for the conversion of sea water shall be located on the west coast of the United States, and at least 1 plant so designed shall be located on the east coast or gulf coast of the United States;

(B) At least 1 plant which is designed for the treatment of brackish water shall be located in the area generally described as the Northern Great Plains, and at least 1 plant so designed shall be located in the arid areas of the Southwest; and

(C) One plant which is designed for the conversion of sea water shall be located in the Virgin Islands or some other Territorial possession of the United States, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior, with a view to providing potable water and/or additional electric power.

The committee has avoided any indication as to the precise locations of any of the plants in the general geographical areas indicated. The decisions on the precise locations are the responsibility of the Secretary.

Presumably, the Secretary will take into consideration the critical water problems of local areas and the market for the potable water produced at the plants. Cooperation of States and local communities will undoubtedly be a factor in the Secretary's consideration of the locations.

I hope the Senate will pass the joint resolution, because I think it provides for something which the country urgently needs.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am wondering what is proposed by the joint resolution which will differ from what the Government has been doing for the past 7 or 8 years. We have been spending from $450,000 to $500,000 a year, trying to find ways and means of extracting salt from water. Is this to be an additional plan?

Mr. ANDERSON. This is the result of work which has been in progress. The committee heard extensive testimony that there were several plans whose feasibility had been demonstrated by the small pilot plants which had been constructed and operated by the Government.

We feel—and I myself feel—that there are probably five processes, each of which is capable of producing 1 million gallons a day. Later, if the plants are to be completely economical, they will have to operate at a production rate of as much as from 17 to 20 million gallons a day.

Mr. ELLENDER. Have the experiments so far demonstrated that salt can be extracted by an economical method?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; I think so. We cannot tell for certain, of course, until a large plant has been built. But the reaction to the work which has been done thus far indicates that with a plant having a capacity of 1 million gallons a day, it will be possible to prove the feasibility of the work. Rather than to begin to build a plant with a capacity of 20 million gallons a day, it is thought desirable to try three different types of plants having a capacity of about 1 million gallons each.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will those plants be so constructed that they will use the same process?

Mr. ANDERSON. Each of the plants will use a different process for testing. I am certain that much money will be saved by proceeding in this manner rather than to build a large plant at an extremely high cost.

The proposal includes two plants for the purifying of brackish water. Each of those plants would cost about $200,000, which is a relatively cheap way to operate. A plant having almost that capacity was constructed and operated for a while at Miller, S. Dak. It was then moved to Wyoming, and then to Denver, Colo. The process which was tested in those three areas certainly ought to work in a large-scale plant.

Mr. ELLENDER. I notice that the authorization is for $10 million. If the two plants which are proposed for purifying brackish water will cost $500,000——

Mr. ANDERSON. The two brackish-water plants cost about half a million dollars apiece. The two large plants for the conversion of sea water will cost in the neighborhood of $3 million apiece. The third plant, which probably would be built in the Virgin Islands, to solve a problem which exists there, would cost, I judge, from $1,500,000 to $1,750,000.

That totals approximately the $10 million that is provided for in this measure.

Mr. ELLENDER. It is the purpose of the Senator from New Mexico to have the joint resolution placed on the calendar?

Mr. ANDERSON. It has been on the calendar for some time.

Mr. ELLENDER. Has the committee held hearings on the joint resolution?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Perhaps I misunderstood. I thought the Senator was introducing another joint resolution.

Mr. ANDERSON. No; I stated that the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] had joined in sponsoring the joint resolution.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREAR in the chair). Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I wish to compliment the distinguished Senator from New Mexico. In this age of exploration, he is demonstrating, as an explorer, his Viking ancestry.

Today our explorers, not only extend our knowledge of the skies and not only go to the North Pole and to the South Pole, but they also discover ways and means to make life more pleasant.

In the case of the particular subject the Senator from New Mexico has pursued so diligently and so enlighteningly, he is certainly an explorer; and I am very happy to join in sponsoring the joint resolution.

Mr. President, I am glad to reiterate my support of Senate Joint Resolution 135, which provides for the construction, under contract with the Department of the Interior, of full-scale demonstration plants for the production, from sea or saline water, of water suitable for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and other beneficial uses.

I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

Water abundance may not last forever

It is my belief that the future of America and of the rest of the world depends, more than most persons realize, on adequate supplies of water. As the committee report on Senate Joint Resolution 135 states:

"The day is not far off—some persons say it will arrive in 1980—when the United States must have available an adequate, economic, and proven new source of fresh water, or face an unrelenting and crippling shortage."

We have assumed that water would always be as abundant as ever. However, increasing water uses in homes, in industries and in agriculture, and the cutting down of many of our forests, are going to make water a scarce commodity unless we take steps to prevent it. The findings of the Senate committee include the following very important conclusions:

"That there is a rapidly developing acute shortage of water in the United States, in addition to many current localized deficiencies.

"* * * * *

"That there is a desperate need for potable water in many areas of the world where

U.S. prestige would be materially enhanced by supplying new technology and equipment for conversion of brackish or sea water.

"* * * * * *

"That the demonstration phase envisaged by Senate Joint Resolution 135, as amended, must be executed with boldness, imagination, and urgency—attributes not normally associated with the methodical, painstaking, careful approach required for fundamental research and development."

Will push back frontiers of knowledge

Mr. President, if we can quickly pass this measure, it will, I hope, stimulate immediate hearings on this subject in the House, where there are many supporters of such legislation. And if the joint resolution is enacted into law, a real step forward will have been taken toward extending the frontier of science in another direction—that of making sure that future generations will be free from fear of lack of water. Plenty of water in arid areas would release the tensions which, in the international controversy raging in the Middle East, makes so difficult agreement on practical steps to improve the living conditions of the inhabitants.

Effect on a peaceful world

It is my great hope that this and other measures will go far first, toward making more plentiful supplies of water available wherever they are needed; second, toward improving the lives of many peoples; and, third, toward the resulting relaxation of tensions. Consequently, a vote for this joint resolution will, in a real sense, be for a more peaceful world, as well as for the benefit of the western farmer and others in arid areas of the United States who suffer from lack of fresh water.

Wisconsin company helps

Mr. President, since cosponsoring this measure, I have learned of the very worthwhile activity in this field of a Wisconsin concern, the Cleaver-Brooks Co. As a matter of general interest, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks, an article entitled "Milwaukee Firm Boosts Supplies of Fresh Water."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"MILWAUKEE FIRM BOOSTS SUPPLIES OF FRESH WATER—NEW CLEAVER-BROOKS UNITS DISTILL SEA WATER FOR SHIPS, OTHERS AROUND WORLD

"(By Harry Watson)

"The plight of the ancient mariner is as old as the world, but a comparatively young Milwaukee firm has gained a worldwide reputation in the growing field of producing fresh water from the sea.

"Cleaver-Brooks Co., through its special products division, is building fresh-water manufacturing plants for water-short areas of South America, Asia, and Africa, for offshore oil rigs, and for nuclear-powered U.S. ships.

"The importance of its work was highlighted last week with announcement of the keel laying of the first nuclear-powered passenger-cargo vessel, the *Savannah*, for which Cleaver-Brooks has the contract for fresh-water evaporators.

"And in Washington, Senator WILEY, Republican, of Wisconsin, announced that he was joining in sponsoring legislation for demonstration plants to produce fresh water from salty and brackish water.

"Still not cheap

"Federally sponsored demonstration plants were urged by Fred A. Loebel, vice president for engineering of Cleaver-Brooks and father of its evaporator business, in testimony before a House subcommittee last month.

"Costs, he explained, are one of the principal stumbling blocks. Cleaver-Brooks' new flash-type evaporator units can produce fresh, potable water from the sea or deep wells for about $1 a thousand gallons.

"This cost isn't cheap compared with Milwaukee water rates, for instance, but Loebel pointed out that it wasn't unreasonable for domestic and industrial use where there simply isn't any fresh water.

"(City water department officials give figures ranging from about 9 cents to about 21 cents a thousand gallons for Milwaukee water, depending on volume of usage.)

"Further research and development might bring the cost of producing fresh water from the sea down to a minimum of 50 cents a thousand gallons, Loebel said.

"Whip scale problem

"Another big problem is scaling. When you make fresh water by boiling sea water and collecting the steam, you also make scale—a deposit of unwanted solids which forces continual shutdowns for scale removal. If scale isn't removed regularly, it soon builds up so that there's no room for distillation—and hence no way to make fresh water.

"Flash evaporators have largely eliminated this vexing problem. Such Cleaver-Brooks units have logged the equivalent of 6 months of continuous operation without a servicing shutdown.

" 'For all practical purposes, our flash units are scale free,' said Gordon Leitner, manager of the special products division.

"Before the company started work on the flash-type evaporators, however, the water distillation business almost died, John C. Cleaver, president, said.

"Founded in 1931 by Cleaver and R. E. Brooks, now board chairman, the company was largely a sales engineering organization. Starting with a tank car heater, the firm added steam generating plants, oil burners, and during the war, portable distillation rigs, shower bath units, and food dehydrators for troops overseas.

"Division at Waukesha

"In 1951, Cleaver-Brooks purchased a bottling plant in Waukesha and moved its water evaporator work there as the special products division. Today some 150 are employed in the division.

"The distillation units were vapor compression types, a heat pump operation, in which a compressor raises both the steam pressure and temperature. It is efficient and compact, but requires its own independent power source and must be shut down regularly for scale removal. It is particularly useful when soft water must be treated, or where the supply of raw material is limited, since it produces 1 gallon of fresh water for every 2 gallons of untreated water.

"Cleaver-Brooks still produces these units for the Army, Navy, and industrial use, in capacities from 1,000 to 50,000 gallons a day.

"Several years ago, Cleaver-Brooks turned to the flash-type evaporator. The idea dates back to the early 1900's, but its application to purifying sea water has come within the last 5 years, according to Leitner.

"Goes through stages

"In this process, sea water is heated to 170° and flows into the first stage of the evaporator under vacuum, where some of it flashes into vapor.

"The remaining sea water passes into the second stage under a greater vacuum and still more water flashes into vapor and is condensed as fresh water.

"Salts remain in solution and the excess brine is pumped back into the ocean.

"Where vapor compression units require electrical or internal combustion powerplants, the flash evaporators can use waste steam, hot water, or exhaust gases from ship boilers, drilling rigs, or electrical generating plants.

"As a result, fresh water can be made available for the price of the evaporating units, plus a relatively small additional cost for enlarging the steam boilers or power units.

"Because of its design and operation, the scaling problem is far less than with vapor compression units, and the flash evaporator has fewer moving parts. It does require large amounts of sea water, however, since about 20 gallons go through the unit for each gallon of fresh water produced.

"Used at Gibraltar

"Since 1951, Cleaver-Brooks has supplied evaporators for Gibraltar City, and just recently received a contract for a flash-type unit for the NATO base there. Two of the units are on radar platforms in the Atlantic; 20 are in use on offshore oil rigs in the gulf coast (fresh water is needed for drilling mud as well as human use), and others have gone into Navy guided missile destroyers, missile frigates, and other warships.

"Since Cleaver-Brooks started the work 12 years ago, it has turned out some 4,000 units of all sizes and types with a total fresh water capacity of 16 million gallons a day.

"The special products division, for 1957, had $2 million in sales and is expecting $3,100,000 this year. The backlog currently stands at $4 million. Cleaver-Brooks' boiler and burner sales last year were about $10 million and the 1958 volume should be slightly more than this figure, Cleaver said."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, let me inquire whether the Senator from New Mexico has concluded his remarks.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; I have.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wish to express to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico my appreciation for the very fine work he has done in this field, and for bringing before the Senate, for action, Senate Joint Resolution 135, which provides for the construction and maintenance of demonstration plants to produce usable water from sea water or brackish water.

Representing in part, as I do, a State that often in the past has suffered from water shortages, and that may be expected to suffer from water shortages in the future, I have a very intimate knowledge of the great need for pressing forward with the saline-water-conversion program.

Until rains came to Texas last year, to relieve a long-continued drought, some of the cities in my State were alarmingly short of water. In the large and flourishing city of Dallas, for example, people were going to stores to buy water to drink, and the municipal government sought desperately for any new source of water to keep up pressure in the water mains for fire protection.

This problem is not confined to my own State of Texas. We are at a point in the United States where water demand is beginning to equal water supply. And the consumption of water continues to grow at a rapid rate.

The tremendous supplies of sea and brackish waters have scarcely been tapped. Our problem is to convert the water of the seas to beneficial use at a price we can afford to pay, and to find economically feasible ways of treating brackish water in the interior areas.

Fortunately, as the committee notes in its report on this measure, the time when we can begin to take these necessary steps appears to be at hand.

The joint resolution before us offers an opportunity to make a real beginning. I hope, Mr. President, that we shall take advantage of this opportunity.

The pending joint resolution provides for the construction of 3 plants for the conversion of sea water and 2 plants for the treatment of brackish water, at a total cost of not more than $10 million.

This seems to me little enough to do at this time about a matter that literally has to do with our survival. Civilization has

changed in many ways, but there has been no change in the fact that man is utterly dependent upon water for his survival.

We must go forward with a well-defined and integrated program to get the water we must all from all sources available to us.

Mr. President, I congratulate the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] for the pioneering work they have done in this very important field. I am pleased that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has favorably reported the joint resolution; and I hope the Senate will pass it by unanimous vote.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, next to the air we breathe, the water we drink and the water which makes it possible for plants to grow is the most important thing to human life on this planet.

Senate Joint Resolution 135 would authorize the Department of the Interior to go to the demonstration phase of treating saline waters. It is one of the more important measures considered by Congress at this session. Probably few measures of such far-reaching importance come to the Senate with as little advance publicity as accompanied this particular measure.

I well recall that in 1952, a simple bill to authorize a small research program in the desalination of water attracted very little attention. The distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], and the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] have given it their important help from the outset. Their interest and help must be credited to a great extent for the progress which has been made.

Two other persons should be mentioned in this connection. One is no longer a Member of this body. I refer to the distinguished former Senator from Oregon, Guy Cordon, who, with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], chairman of the Appropriations Committee, President pro tempore of the Senate, and senior Member of the Senate, gave the necessary help when we went before the Appropriations Committee for appropriations after getting the initial legislation to authorize the desalination research program.

I recall one hearing before the Appropriations Committee, conducted by former Senator Cordon, in which the question was asked the witness, "What are you going to do with this research money?"

The man who was testifying was a professor from Boston. He said, "Mr. Chairman, if we knew what we were going to find out, we would not need to have the research."

The result was that the committee recommended the funds which were desired, and the research which followed made it possible for the Department of the Interior to develop processes which now offer the promise which this program offers.

I should also mention the interest of the Secretary of the Interior, Fred Seaton, a former Member of this body, the interest of Fred Aandahl, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, who was formerly a Member of Congress, and who has given his active interest to the program, and the good work of Mr. David Jenkins, who has been the head of the particular division to which the work was assigned. His official title is Director, Office of Saline Water, within the Department of the Interior. From time to time all of us have been encouraged by reports of progress. But even those of us who have been active in the program since its inception had our eyes opened, when the hearings were held in March this year on the resolutions which Senator ANDERSON and I had introduced to authorize demonstration plants to get from laboratories into actual field operations.

Although I was relatively conversant with the work which was being done in the Office of Saline Water, I was surprised at the testimony, developed by men representing industry, by men representing research organizations, and by scientists who appeared before the subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs when they testified on the progress which was being made.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], who is chairman of the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, would say the same thing, I believe; namely, that the testimony adduced at the hearings exceeded our expectations. It was my privilege, although not a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, to attend all the hearings and to participate actively in them through the courtesy of the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. President, no history of this proposed legislation would be complete without a statement saying that the consistent and persistent interest of the Senator from New Mexico had much to do with the progress which has made. Our interests have proceeded from perhaps somewhat different motivations, although they have been partly the same. The Senator from New Mexico was born in the State of South Dakota and is personally familiar with some of the problems which I have seen in the northern Great Plains during my lifetime.

However, the original resolution of the Senator from New Mexico, proposing a plant for the treatment of sea water, was prompted, I believe, by his knowledge of the great importance of water to the cities on the Pacific coast, and also by the fact that he knows what might happen in an atomic war if water supplies should become contaminated.

Because my interest was motivated by wishing to do something for the areas where there is heavy mineralization in some prairie streams and in many wells, the bill which I introduced, S. 3770, sought not merely to utilize the sea water, but also to authorize a plant for the treatment of brackish water.

As a result of the hearings and the testimony there adduced, the Senator from New Mexico proposed that we authorize not merely one plant to treat sea water and one plant to deal with brackish water, but that the bill be extended to authorize five plants, three plants to deal with sea water, and two plants to deal with brackish water. In that form, the joint resolution was reported favorably by the subcommittee to the full committee, and in that form it came to the Senate.

Mr. President, it is not my desire at this time to speak at length upon the subject. It has been pretty well discussed; and the remarks by the Senator from New Mexico and other remarks by the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] and the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] have and will portray many of the benefits to be derived.

However, I should like to mention briefly the particular types of processes which are suitable for different purposes. The osmotic process is a new method which has been developed under the sponsorship of the saline water program. It is somewhat similar to electrodialysis, except that it requires no outside electrical current and no electrodes. The driving force is obtained from the differences in concentration between a brine and the water to be demineralized. This feature makes the process very attractive in areas where electrical power is not available, but where supplies of concentrated brine can be obtained easily, possibly by open-pond evaporation and concentration of sea water. Costs have not been determined, but appear to be competitive with other processes under development.

The reverse osmotic process involves the passage of water through a membrane from a dilute solution to a more concentrated one, or from the fresh-water side into the salt water. If enough pressure is applied to the salt solution, the osmotic flow can be reversed and pure water from the salt solution will be forced through the membranes into the more dilute solution. Hence the term reverse osmosis.

At the University of Florida, a laboratory unit capable of producing 8 gallons of fresh water per day has been constructed. This, of course, is a laboratory process at the present time, and the testimony before the subcommittee indicated that it was a process which might have commercial application.

At the Texas Agricultural and Mechanical Research Foundation a process was developed which would absorb large quantities of water. However, at the same time the compound must be practically insoluble in water. A solvent is used which extracts the fresh water from the salt water and then releases the fresh water when the system undergoes a slight change in temperature.

There are two processes now in commercial use which seem to me to have the most immediate promise. One of them is the multiple effect distillation, and the other is electrodialysis.

The Westinghouse Co. has recently constructed a distillation plant in Arabia, which consists of four units, each handling about 600,000 gallons a day. Others are in use for special purposes. The cost of water is about $2 or more a thousand gallons. The fact that in Arabia this process is being used for practical production suggests the potential in this method. A number of competent American industrial firms are capable of designing and producing these various distillation plants.

Electrodialysis is adaptable for water where the hard parts per million do not run above 2,000. It is that type of water which is found in a great many of the communities on the northern Great Plains. Many towns have water supplies in which the hard parts per million run from 1,400 or 1,500 to 2,200 or 2,400 parts per million.

With the average of these brackish inland waters, the electrodialysis process seems to be particularly effective. It is not necessary to take out of the water all the salt in it, as distillation does. Distillation takes all the salts out of the water, with the result that there is left a rather flat and tasteless water. Most water carries a certain amount of minerals. Water which has in the vicinity of 1,500 or 1,600 parts per million of solids and salts is not only not good tasting, but it also creates problems in laundering and plumbing. The minerals, depending upon the kind of salts and the quality of the salts, may damage pipes and plumbing fixtures. Such water may even have a bad effect on ceramic and porcelain plumbing fixtures. Sometimes it results only in a stain, but many times it can have a corrosive effect also.

Therefore, the electrodialysis process, which has the quality of reducing a portion of the mineral content, may be the one most useful for some of these communities.

There have been some pilot plant test runs of equipment provided by one American manufacturer, where the cost has been $1.10 per 1,000 gallons for a plant of 25,000 gallons daily capacity, and an indicated cost as low as 60 cents per 1,000 gallons for a plant which can handle 1½ million gallons a day.

It is that type of plant which I believe would be particularly useful in meeting the problems in the Great Plains area. Recently a process has been developed in Europe which offers some promise. I understand that the Office of Saline Water is proposing to purchase a pilot plant from those people.

However, whatever the particular process used, I anticipate that if this program is authorized and implemented with appropriations, one of the plants for the treatment of brackish waters would be in the Southwest and one of them would be in the northern

Great Plains area. I believe that no program is of greater importance to the well-being and progress of our people.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement which has been prepared by a member of my staff who has been interested in following this program.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"STATEMENT BY SENATOR CASE OF SOUTH DAKOTA

"In all of America there is hardly a city, town, or farm that does not have a water problem. Continued expansion of our industries, our growing population, and expanded agricultural needs have greatly increased the demand for fresh water. Our per capita consumption of 1,500 gallons per day for industrial and domestic use is double what it was 50 years ago. When to that is added our increasing population, our water needs have quadrupled.

"Research into this development, as provided for under the Saline Water Act of July 3, 1952, has produced encouraging results in the desalination of water.

"Now we have reached the point where it is time to replace laboratory and pilot plant operations with full scale plants using the most promising process.

"When the first desalination bill came over from the House of Representatives, it attracted my interest because in South Dakota we have much hard water. I offered an amendment to expand the scope of the bill. The amendment was accepted by the Senate and concurred in by the House and became Public Law 448—the enabling legislation for the saline water program. It was the concept of Congressman ENGLE, of California, that the Government be authorized to contract for research with private companies and research institutions to study the process of converting hard to soft water. That approach appealed to me. It has proved to be a sound approach. After getting the authorizing legislation, we were successful in obtaining a supplemental appropriation for $125,000 to get the program started in 1952. In 1955 I introduced S. 516, the Senate bill to extend the program beyond the original 3 years because of the good results obtained.

"The people of South Dakota have taken a great deal of interest in the saline water research. Henry J. Schmitt, publisher of the Aberdeen American News, was named to the nine-member advisory group to the saline water program.

"Several small research contracts were sought in my State. The School of Mines in Rapid City, S. Dak., made a study of brackish waters in South Dakota in 1953. In Miller, S. Dak., a field test of an electrical membrane water demineralizing apparatus was successfully made. This unit was able to treat about 1,500 gallons of water per hour, reducing the salt content from 2,500 to 350 parts per million.

"I saw this plant in operation at Miller and tasted some of the water which went through the plant. Two-thirds of the water put into it came out salt-free water. One-third of it carried away the sludge. The water that came out was palatable and easy and safe to drink.

"The reason for this interest is the hope given to the rancher and farmer living in an area where water is often alkaline and brackish, and is poor water for his stock to drink or for his wife to use in her laundry. This program offers advantages for the small towns that have iron, magnesium, or sulfur in their water supplies; it offers a way for them to get good water, so that the use of water softeners will be unnecessary, and so that better living will be possible.

"This program offers the small city a chance to develop industrially, but that does not have an adequate water supply. Large seacoast cities that are wondering how to supply the water needs of their expanding industrialization would have to look no farther than the sea for their water supplies.

"Hearings this spring demonstrated we have now reached the point where it is time to replace exploratory research in the laboratory with pilot plants and active field operations in the more promising processes."

Mr. KUCHEL subsequently said:

Mr. President, a little earlier today, I was called from the Chamber at the time when the Senate had before it the joint resolution dealing with saline water.

I am a coauthor of that joint resolution. I ask unanimous consent that the few remarks which I propose to make at this time be printed in the RECORD at the point where the saline water joint resolution was under consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection it is so ordered.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I come from a magnificent State, California. I was born there. My father was born there. My grandfather was an immigrant to California, back in the gold-rush days, over 100 years ago. Often I listened to my late father talk about the artesian wells which were in evidence over the countryside, in his day, particularly in the southern part of California. They are all gone now. In the early days of this rapidly expanding semiarid area, water was no problem. But today it is a problem. It is a deadly serious problem for the 14 million people who now make California their home. Beyond that, it is a serious problem for the people of the entire country, indeed, for all the globe.

During the testimony of the proposed saline water legislation, sponsored by the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], and myself, it was most interesting to me to hear testimony of the type of saline water research and development which has taken place and is taking place, in far-flung areas of the world. Some of the smaller European countries which have interests in Africa are today, for example, underwriting the cost for demonstration plants in this whole field of making sea water potable, because of the problem of water shortage which plague the people of such areas.

I may also observe, in passing, that the people of my State are eternally grateful for that which the Congress of the country has done in years gone by in authorizing the construction of great reclamation and multipurpose projects in California, which have meant literally the difference between economic life and economic death to citizens and property in various parts of our 1,100-mile-long State.

For all those reasons, I think what the Senate does today in adopting proposed legislation to authorize the construction of a half dozen demonstration plants in the field of conversion of water, both sea water and brackish water, represents a great milestone in coping with a continuing and an enlarging problem.

The proposed legislation, Mr. President, authorizes the appropriation of a relatively small amount of money, so far as American Government costs are concerned. If it will be possible, for the few million dollars that are authorized under the proposed legislation to be expended by the Department of the Interior in various parts of the country, to bring the cost of sea water and brackish water conversion down to an economical base, then we shall have done a magnificent thing, not only for the people of my State or my Nation, but, beyond that, and in a very real sense, for all humanity.

I know of one city in California which is required to import its water in tank cars, because the water in the ground beneath that community is not fit for human consumption. I say to Senators, what a wonderful thing to think that, on an economical basis, that small community, as an example, can look forward to the time when it can have its own conversion plant and utilize the techniques authorized and developed by Federal legislation which the Senate passed today.

I wish to say, in addition, although such legislation will not appear on the front pages of American newspapers, the passage of the proposed legislation is one of the great acts that the Senate is accomplishing.

I look forward to speedy approval of the bill in the House of Representatives, and then approval by the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I want to commend the distinguished Senator from California for the great work, the great interest, and the behind-the-scenes activities performed by him in getting through the Senate this most meritorious proposed legislation.

I think that he, with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Texas, the majority leader [Mr. JOHNSON], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] have been responsible for the milestone in this particular field. While the Senator from California has rightly noted this proposed legislation will not make the headlines, nevertheless, in the semiarid parts of our country, including my own State, and especially in California, such legislation may well be the answer to the future of a State. This is a way in which the Government, representing all the people, is undertaking, through such authorization, to bring about a more economical way of condensing or transforming sea water to fresh water, so the welfare of the people can be further advanced.

I wish to commend the Senator from California for the very great interest and the real efforts he has put forth in behalf of this particular type of legislation, which means so much to his own State.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank my able friend the Senator from Montana, the assistant majority leader; and I wish to state that on a number of occasions he and I have discussed, in our own offices, the veritable romance of what this type of legislation could eventually bring to our people. Montana is one of the great States of the American Union. Montana has a problem with respect to the shortage of water, exactly as does the State of the present Presiding Officer [Mr. MCNAMARA], the great State of Michigan, and exactly as my State of California has.

Surely such legislation represents a constructive type of legislation about which all of us, no matter from what part of the country we come, can take real pride in knowing that we are facing up to the necessity of an early and expeditious means of providing sufficient water to care for the future growth of our country.

I appreciate very much the generous comment which my friend the able Senator from Montana has made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution (S.J. Res. 135) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The committee amendment setting forth a preamble was agreed to.

The title was amended so as to read: "Joint resolution providing for the construction by the Department of the Interior of demonstration plants for the production, from saline or brackish waters, of water suitable for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and other beneficial consumptive uses."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the joint resolution was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Mexico to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, recently the Department has announced a call for bids for the construction of a third saline water conversion demonstration plant which is to be constructed at San Diego, Calif. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the release from the office of the Secretary of the Interior dated August 15, 1960, in which the Interior Department asks for bids for the construction of the San Diego plant and gives the statement of notice to bidders by Dr. A. L. Miller, the Director of the Office of Saline Water.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERIOR ASKS FOR BIDS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF SAN DIEGO, CALIF., SALINE WATER CONVERSION DEMONSTRATION PLANT

Construction specifications for the one-million gallons per day saline water conversion demonstration plant to be erected on Point Loma at San Diego, Calif., will be available on September 1, the Department of the Interior today announced.

In the notice to bidders, Dr. A. L. Miller, Director of the Office of Saline Water, stated that the specifications call for the work to be performed under a single contractor responsible for complete construction and start-up operation of the conversion plant which will utilize a multistage flash distillation process.

Architect-engineering services for the plant were performed by the Fluor Corp., Ltd., Los Angeles, Calif. Bids will be opened on October 18. The Department expects to be able to evaluate the bids and award a contract in November. Construction is scheduled to be completed in 365 calendar days from the date of notice to proceed.

Under a cooperative agreement with the Atomic Energy Commission the Department and the AEC had planned a joint project: the Department to construct and operate a one-million gallons per day sea water conversion plant and the Commission to construct and operate an experimental low-temperature process heat reactor to provide steam for the conversion plant. The Safeguards Committee of the AEC has ruled against the site as a location for the reactor. Other proposed sites were investigated as a location for the joint project, but none of the alternate sites met the Department's site criteria as well as Point Loma. The plant has been designed therefore to utilize a conventional steam boiler with heat supplied by fuel oil.

The city of San Diego has signed an agreement to assist in the development of the site by grading the site, providing an access road, and constructing a connecting pipeline to the city's water system. In addition, the city will also purchase the product water of the plant.

The California Department of Water Resources is assisting in this project. The State has appropriated $1.5 million for saline water conversion and will participate in the construction of this plant by providing up to 50 percent, or not to exceed $1.25 million, of the design and construction costs.

Describing the operation of the process Dr. Miller said, "In flash distillation, sea water is progressively heated and then introduced into a large chamber where a pressure just below the boiling point of the hot brine is maintained. When the brine enters this chamber the reduced pressure causes part of the liquid to immediately boil—or flash—into steam. The remaining brine passes through a series of additional chambers (multistages) each at successively higher vacuum where the flash process is repeated at progressively lower boiling temperatures."

"The progressive heating," Dr. Miller explained, "is accomplished by piping the incoming sea water through the flash chambers, starting at the low temperature end. In each of the chambers the flashed vapor condenses as it gives up its heat to the sea water. The condensed vapor is the product water of the plant."

The notice to bidders is available with this release.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, in accepting the nomination of the Republican Party for the Presidency of the United States, RICHARD NIXON told the national convention that "Americans are always at their best when the challenge is greatest." He clearly pointed out to the delegates of that great convention his confidence in the ability of the United States to cope with the grave and perilous problems facing the world in the dangerous 1960's. He called for a vigorous strategy to win the battle of freedom and peace against communism.

Many plans and programs are being formulated to accomplish the great goals laid down by the Vice President. Not the least of these is the effort of the Republican administration to develop low-cost processes to convert sea and brackish water to fresh in order to assure adequate supplies of potable water, not only for the future needs of the United States, but for all the free nations of the world who look to the United States for leadership.

Man's epic struggle to survive on this planet could be written in terms of this constant concern and need for water.

Through the ages, natural supplies of water, fluctuating in an unpredictable and erratic manner, have governed the rise and fall of civilizations. Some of the most creative and cooperative ventures in the annals of human advancement were applied to the development of water resources.

As a part of his quest for water, man has been trying for a long time to brew a drink of fresh water from the sea—probably a lot longer than most people realize. For centuries people generally have known how to turn the trick; just distill it. The basic concept of the science is probably as old as the teakettle, but what the world is still searching for is the answer to the question: "How do you do this on a large scale at a cost cheap enough to substitute or augment water from conventional sources?"

I am pleased to report to Senators that the cost of conversion has come down further and faster during the Eisenhower administration than during all previous recorded history.

When the Office of Saline Water was organized as a part of the Department of the Interior in 1952, the cost of conversion ranged upward from $5 per thousand gallons. Through an aggressive program of research and development, although three times slowed down when Congress failed to appropriate the full amount requested by the administration, the cost of conversion has nonetheless been reduced far below the early predictions of even the most optimistic scientists.

In the little gulf coast town of Freeport, Tex., the Department of the Interior now has under construction a 1-million-gallon-per-day sea water conversion demonstration plant that is scheduled to be in operation early next year. This plant is expected to produce fresh water from the sea for the first time at a cost of less than $1 per thousand gallons. Using a new process developed wholly under Office of Saline Water sponsorship, engineering cost estimates of this process indicate when it is incorporated in plants of 15 to 20 million gallons per day capacity, the cost of conversion will be less than 50 cents per thousand gallons.

Another 1-million-gallon-per-day conversion plant of advanced design will soon be under construction at San Diego, Calif., utilizing a process that lends itself to multimillion-gallons-per-day production. It is not expected to reach its maximum of economic efficiency until it is incorporated in plants of at least 50 million gallons per day capacity.

The present state of development of this process indicates that it will be capable of providing fresh water from the sea for 42 cents per thousand gallons. A third sea water conversion plant using an entirely new approach to the problem, that is to produce fresh water by freezing, will be constructed next year on the east coast of the United States.

Processes are also being developed to convert inland brackish water to fresh. To demonstrate the progress that has been achieved in this area of endeavor, a plant will soon be under construction at Webster, S. Dak. The specifications are out and bids have been called for September 20, 1960.

This plant at Webster is designed to convert daily 250,000 gallons of brackish inland water common to the northern Great Plains into good municipal supplies at an anticipated cost of somewhat less than 80 cents per thousand gallons.

A second brackish water conversion plant designed to produce at least 250,000 gallons of fresh water per day will be located at Roswell, N. Mex.

Many formidable problems have been solved to make possible these remarkable achievements which have provided us with the technology to assure ample water supplies to many areas of the world now severely crippled by dwindling sources of supply. One of the basic reasons why many countries of the world remain underdeveloped is because they lack this basic commodity. Certainly the accomplishments of this research endeavor have provided us with an attractive lure to induce water-short countries to look to the West for invaluable assistance.

New concepts now being developed in the laboratory give promise of producing fresh water for much less than is presently possible.

Based on the rate of progress that has been achieved in 8 short years, and with a view to the research work now under way, we can safely predict that in the coming decade we will be able to produce fresh water from the sea at a price that will be economically competitive with many natural sources of supply, thereby removing forever from the face of the earth the specter of water shortages.

The saline water conversion program may well be an important part of our strategy to win the battle of freedom. The economic and political implications provided by the development of low-cost conversion processes will bring blessings to mankind of a magnitude that stagger the imagination to forecast.

EACH DAY SEES PROGRESS

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an article by the Associated Press published August 23, 1960, regarding a new plan developed by scientists at the University of California; and, following that, an article published in the Baltimore Sun of August 18, 1960, entitled "Salt Water Into Fresh," written by Janetta S. Ridgely.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DESALTING FILTER PROVIDES DRINKABLE WATER IN HURRY

LOS ANGELES.—Two university engineers have developed a new desalting filter which they say can produce drinkable water 100 times faster than previous methods.

Sidney Loeb and Dr. Srinivasa Sourirajan of the University of California at Los Angeles said Monday that their synthetic film yields consumable water at the rate of 8 gallons a day for each square foot of membrane area.

Membranes have been used before to desalt water, but the engineers say that so far such filters are too slow for commercial purposes.

Their membrane is produced by mixing cellulose acetate with a water solution of magnesium perchlorate and acetone. This sticky mixture is spread on a glass plate and, when dry, is stripped away in a film four one-thousandths of an inch thick.

It is cheap, durable, and can be used 24 hours a day without maintenance or power, the engineers said. They say they have made potable water from brine containing 5.25 percent salt concentration, which is much saltier than ordinary ocean water.

[From the Baltimore Sun, Aug. 18, 1960]

SALT WATER INTO FRESH—THE NEED FOR A PRACTICAL CONVERSION PROCESS

(By Janetta S. Ridgely)

On an average day, subscribers to Baltimore's water system use about 200 million gallons, or 141 gallons for each person reached by the city's water. Individuals actually use less than this for perhaps 40 percent of the city's water is used by industry and business.

Baltimore is lucky. It has water, thanks both to municipal foresight and to its geographical situation in an area of temperate climate, fairly heavy rainfall, and great rivers. There are cities in the United States where fresh water must be brought in by railroad, where a leaky faucet rates a fine, where industry cannot settle for want of water. It has been estimated that dry-year demand leaves one city in five with less water than it needs.

What is more, water use is rising all the time with rising population and rising standards of living. Meanwhile, natural watersheds are being deforested and built over, rivers are being polluted, and natural sources of underground water are drying up with overuse. Industry increases its demands for water. The Wall Street Journal estimates that it may take 60,000 gallons of water to turn out a ton of steel, and 240,000 gallons of water to manufacture a ton of rayon or newsprint.

With daily use of water in this country expected to rise from the present 312 billion gallons to nearly 600 billion gallons in 1980, a search has begun for alternative water supplies for long-term needs. Meanwhile, the plight of the many communities in the West which already suffer water shortage has speeded research. Whereas Congress and the Government once grudgingly dished out a few millions a year for water conversion research, it now is estimated that Government and other sources are spending about $50 million a year on finding ways to make salt water into fresh.

Two sources of water remain almost untouched. They are salt water in the sea and in lakes, and brackish water with a heavy saline content which can be found under the surface, especially through artesian wells. There is much brackish water available in the West, and it is easier to clear of salt and other minerals than sea water. Salt water from the sea may have 35,000 parts of minerals per 1 million parts of water, whereas brackish water will run as low as 3,000 parts per million.

Saline water conversion is being practiced in many parts of the world already. Two small California towns depend on it, as do the oil towns of the Persian Gulf and Aruba, and parts of Israel and South Africa. In none of these places is fresh water produced at prices comparable with those of, say, Baltimore city water. So far this has not mattered: If you have no water at all you are not going to quarrel about price. But if desalted water is to be used to supplement existing supplies in U.S. cities, a way must be found of producing it economically.

There are three main methods so far under consideration. The first and second are those familiar to every schoolboy: Boiling and freezing. The fresh water may be separated from the salt as steam and condensed, or it may be frozen and later melted when the salt has been left behind. In either case, a great deal of energy is needed and there is the problem of disposing of the salty waste, which also corrodes metal pipes and tanks.

In the Middle East, where labor is relatively cheap, the accumulation of salt and other minerals can be chipped from the plants by hand. New alloys are reducing the damage done by corrosion and the efficiency of the "teakettles" is increasing all the time. All the same, desalted water still costs about $1.75 to $2 per 1,000 gallons by the cheapest proven method, and runs higher by the third method now under investigation, electrolysis. This involves picking the salt ions out of the water by means of membranes, generally of some plastic material, which have been electrically charged. While this method is very promising, especially when dealing with brackish, low-saline-content water, it needs more research.

What must be found, for general use, is a way of desalting water which will make it competitive with the general average of 40 cents per 1,000 gallons paid by industrial cities. For the future of desalted water does not only lie in the desert areas of this country and of the world where it is urgently being tested now. The fact that an experimental desalting plant is to be built by the Federal Government in an eastern State—possibly Maryland—tells its own story.

Within 20 years many densely populated parts of the United States, even in the temperate region, may have to run out of new water sources. They may have enough for domestic use, but will need more for industry. They will have to turn to the sea and brackish lakes and springs for water, just as the desert areas are now turning that way. What is now a matter for a few scattered communities will be a way of life. And as the United States goes, so will other countries. Research now being carried out in this country on desalting water one day will bear fruit in Asia, Africa, and Australia. It has been said that fresh water is the most precious mineral on earth; certainly, almost no part of the world has enough of it now, and need is growing all the time.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, this Congress has also taken significant action to expand and extend the saline water conversion program.

A bill was introduced by me early in this session to extend the present program further and to authorize more demonstration plants. Following that the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], introduced a bill, S. 3557, calling for an even more extensive program. A number of Senators joined with the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] in the sponsorship of that bill, including the Senator from South Dakota. The bill was passed by the Senate on the 24th of June 1960, and is presently in the House of Representatives. I for one wish to express the hope that the bill will be passed by the House of Representatives before the session adjourns.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the text of the bill as it passed the Senate.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 3557) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas a serious problem exists in many areas of the country today because natural fresh water supplies have remained relatively constant while population and the consumption of fresh water have increased tremendously;

Whereas the areas in which water shortages exist may be expected to increase at an alarming rate if reliance is placed solely upon natural fresh water supplies;

Whereas, as the limit of the natural fresh water supplies is approached, this country will become increasingly dependent upon the conversion of salt and brackish waters for its supplies of water suitable for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and other beneficial consumptive uses;

Whereas the Federal Government has been conducting a limited program to develop lower cost means of converting saline waters into water suitable for beneficial consumptive purposes;

Whereas, although some significant progress has been made under that program, the answers to low-cost conversion of saline waters have not been found as yet;

Whereas a considerable expansion of a cooperative Federal program of research, development, and demonstration, and of aid to public bodies in practical application, could yield enormous dividends to the Nation in terms of lowered saline water conversion costs and new supplies of beneficial water to a growing number of needy areas; and

Whereas the future well-being and development of this country, its civil and military defense, its world prestige, and the well-being of its friends and allies in the free world, require a sharp acceleration of the national effort to develop lower cost methods of converting sea or other saline waters into water suitable for beneficial consumptive uses: Now, therefore,

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act of July 3, 1952, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1951–1958), is amended to read as follows:

"TITLE I—SALINE WATER RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

"POLICY AND PURPOSE

"SEC. 101. In view of the acute shortage of water in many areas of the Nation, and in recognition of the increasing importance of finding new sources of supply to meet the present and future water needs of this country, the Congress reaffirms and declares its policy to assist in the development of practicable low-cost means of producing, from sea or other saline waters, water of a quality suitable for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and other beneficial consumptive uses on a scale sufficient to determine the feasibility of the development of such production and distribution on a large scale.

"ADMINISTRATION

"SEC. 102. The provisions of this Act shall be administered by the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to in this title as the 'Secretary') acting through such agencies of the Department of the Interior as he deems appropriate.

"FUNCTIONS

"SEC. 103. (a) STUDIES AND RESEARCH.—The Secretary shall conduct research and make careful engineering studies to ascertain the lowest investment and operating costs and the best designs and conditions of operation to accomplish the purposes of this Act. Such research shall include, but not be limited to (1) the use of small conversion units, (2) methods of extraction and use of byproducts, (3) an evaluation of various materials for use in construction, and of types of components and equipment, (4) methods of overcoming or lessening corrosion, (5) the use of atomic energy in conversion systems, (6) methods of preventing scale, (7) the development of improved membranes, and (8) the advancement of scientific data on thermodynamics, polarization, properties of solutions, ion exchange, absorption, and brine disposal. In connection with studies to ascertain the lowest investment and operating costs, the Secretary shall consider and evaluate methods for the recovery and marketing of byproducts resulting from and incident to the production of water by the conversion of sea and other saline waters for the purpose of ascertaining the possibilities of offsetting the costs of water production in any area by the commercial utilization of such byproducts.

"(b) PROCESS DEVELOPMENT.—The Secretary shall conduct technical development work to determine the results of research by laboratory and pilot plant testing with a view to developing processes to the point where they can be demonstrated on a large and practical scale. Such development work shall include the laboratory or pilot plant testing of saline water conversion processes, including (1) distillation processes, (2) freezing processes, (3) membrane and ion-exchange processes, (4) solar distillation processes, and (5) other promising processes, such as gas hydrates and solvent extraction. The Secretary shall also, subject to the provisions of section 105, undertake the laboratory or pilot plant testing of saline water conversion systems suitable for civil defense purposes.

"(c) INVESTIGATION, COORDINATION, AND CORRELATION OF SCIENTIFIC DATA.—The Secretary shall, with a view to obtaining and making available the most advanced information concerning saline water conversion developments—

"(1) assemble and maintain pertinent and current scientific literature, both domestic and foreign, and issue periodically bibliographical data with respect to such literature;

"(2) cause on-site inspections to be made of promising projects, domestic and foreign, and cooperate and participate insofar as practicable, in their development;

"(3) provide for the calling of, and sending representatives to, national and international conferences relating to saline water conversion;

"(4) stimulate, by grant or otherwise, pioneering research in matters relating to saline water conversion by educational institutions, scientific organizations, and industrial and engineering firms; and

"(5) coordinate, correlate, and publish information obtained with a view to advancing the development of low-cost saline water conversion projects.

"(d) ECONOMIC STUDIES.—With a view to clarifying the economics of saline water conversion and thereby stimulate development, the Secretary shall undertake economic studies and market surveys to determine (1) present and prospective comparative costs of natural fresh water, and potable water by the leading saline water conversion processes in various, representative areas, and (2) present and prospective markets for saline water conversion equipment.

"POWERS

"SEC. 104. (a) In carrying out his functions under section 103, the Secretary may—

"(1) acquire, by purchase, license, lease, or donation, secret processes, technical data, inventions, patent applications, patents, licenses, land and any interest in land (including water rights, easements, and leasehold interests), plants and facilities, and other property or rights: *Provided,* That the land or other property acquired hereunder shall not exceed that necessary to carry out experiments and demonstrations authorized by this title;

"(2) make research grants to and enter into noncompetitive contracts with any educational institution, scientific organization, or industrial or engineering firm deemed suitable to do any part of the research or other work to be carried out under this title;

"(3) acquire the services of chemists, physicists, engineers, and such other personnel as may be deemed necessary;

"(4) utilize the facilities of existing Federal scientific laboratories;

"(5) establish and operate a central laboratory and test site, serving both sea and brackish water, for the purpose of conducting the continuous research, testing, development, and programing necessary to effectuate the purposes of this title;

"(6) negotiate contracts with any States, territories, possessions, political subdivisions or agencies thereof, or publicly owned utilities organizations, hereinafter called organization, for use of organization's saline water conversion plant facilities to further the sea and brackish water conversion research and demonstration program; and

"(7) evaluate loan applications made by any State or political subdivision or agency thereof, or publicly owned public utility organization to the Housing and Home Finance Agency for the construction of saline water conversion plants for the purpose of certifying to said Agency the reliability and economic potential of the proposed process, and to make such recommendations as may be necessary as to engineering, design, and capacity of said plant.

"(b) All research within the United States which has been contracted for, sponsored, cosponsored or authorized under authority of this Act, shall be provided for in such a manner that all information, uses, products, processes, patents, and other developments resulting from such research developed by Government expenditure will (with such exceptions and limitations, if any, as the Secretary may find to be necessary in the interest of national defense) be available to the general public.

"This subsection shall not be construed as to deprive the owner of any background patent relating hereto of such rights as he may have thereunder.

"COOPERATION WITH OTHER AGENCIES

"SEC. 105. The Secretary shall, in carrying out the purposes of this title, cooperate with other Federal, State, or municipal departments, agencies, or instrumentalities, and with interested persons, firms, institutions, and organizations. Research activities undertaken by the Secretary shall be coordinated or conducted jointly with the Department of Defense to the greatest practicable extent compatible with military and security limitations to the end that research and developments under this title which are primarily of a civil nature will contribute to the defense of the Nation, and that research and developments in the same field which are primarily of a military nature and are conducted by the Department of Defense will be made available to advance the purposes of this title and to strengthen the civil economy of the Nation. Similarly the fullest cooperation by and with the Atomic Energy Commission and the Civil Defense Administration in research shall be carried out in the interest of achieving the objectives of this title.

"DISPOSAL OF WATER AND BYPRODUCTS

"SEC. 106. The Secretary is authorized, for the sole purpose of this title, to dispose of all water and other products produced as a result of his operations under this title pursuant to regulations prescribed by him. Nothing in this title shall be construed to alter existing law with respect to the ownership and control of water.

"DISPOSITION OF MONEY

"SEC. 107. All moneys received for products of the plants under this title shall be paid into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

"REPORTS

"SEC. 108. The Secretary shall make reports to the President and the Congress at the beginning of each regular session of the action taken or instituted by him under the provisions of this title. Any such report may include suitable recommendations for further legislation.

"RULES AND REGULATIONS

"SEC. 109. The Secretary may issue rules and regulations to effectuate the purposes of this title.

"AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 110. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated any unappropriated funds authorized by the Act of July 3, 1952 (66 Stat. 328), as amended (42 U.S.C. 1951), and such additional sums not exceeding $20,000,000, as may be required to carry out the provisions of this Act during the fiscal years 1961–1965, inclusive, with such funds to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That not to exceed 10 per centum of the funds available in any one year for research and development may be expended in cooperation with public or private agencies in foreign countries in the development of processes useful to the program in the United States: *And provided further,* That contracts or agreements made with public or private agencies in foreign countries shall provide that the results or information developed in connection therewith shall be available without cost to the United States for the use of the United States throughout the world and for the use of the general public within the United States.

"TITLE II—FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF CONVERSION PLANTS

"DECLARATION OF POLICY

"SEC. 201. It is the purpose of this title to stimulate the construction of plants for the production, from sea water or brackish water,

of water that is suitable for municipal or other beneficial consumptive uses, and thereby make maximum use of the research for the development and utilization of saline waters that is authorized by title I of this Act, and maximum use of the demonstration plant program authorized by the Act of September 2, 1958 (72 Stat. 1706).

"APPLICATIONS FOR FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 202. (a) Any State, or political subdivision or agency thereof, or publicly owned public utility organization (any such entity being hereinafter referred to as 'organization') may submit to the Secretary of the Interior, in such form as the Secretary may prescribe, an application for a loan, or an offer to sell to the United States securities of the organization, to finance the design and construction of a plant to produce, from sea water or brackish water, water that is suitable for municipal, industrial, domestic, or other beneficial consumptive use.

"(b) Any application for a loan or offer to sell securities hereunder shall include a showing that the organization (1) holds or can acquire, pursuant to State law, all lands and interests in land, and rights to the use of water, which are necessary for the successful construction, operation, and maintenance of the plant, and (2) is ready, able, and willing to finance by other means the portion of the cost of design and construction that is not covered by the loan application or offer to sell securities.

"(c) No application for a loan or offer to sell securities under this section shall be made in an amount which exceeds 90 per centum of the estimated cost of design and construction (exclusive of land and water costs), or $1,000,000, whichever is smaller.

"(d) As used in this section, the term 'State' includes any of the several States of the United States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and any of the territorial possessions of the United States.

"SUBMITTAL TO CONGRESS

"SEC. 203. (a) If the Secretary of the Interior approves an application or offer submitted under section 202, after finding that the proposed construction is feasible and that the loan or purchase of securities would be a reasonable risk, he shall transmit to the Congress the application or offer, his approval, and his findings.

"(b) No appropriation shall be made for a loan to, or a purchase of securities from, the organization prior to sixty calendar days (which sixty days shall not include days on which either the House of Representatives or the Senate is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three calendar days to a day certain) from the date on which the Secretary's findings and approval are submitted to the Congress and then only if, within said sixty days, the Congress does not disapprove the application or offer by concurrent resolution.

"TERMS APPLICABLE TO LOANS OR PURCHASES

"SEC. 204. Either concurrently with the submission to Congress of an application or offer, or after the time for congressional disapproval has expired without the adoption of a resolution of disapproval, the Secretary of the Interior may negotiate and execute an agreement with the organization which shall set out, among other things:

"(1) the maximum amount of the loan or the securities to be purchased;

"(2) the time and method for making the money available to the organization;

"(3) a plan for the repayment of the loan in not more than forty years in periodic installments that need not necessarily be in equal amounts, and for the payment of interest on unamortized balances, beginning three months after the plant first commences operation, at a rate determined by the Secretary which shall not exceed the average rate of interest computed as of the end of the calendar month next preceding the date on which such loan is made, borne by all outstanding interest-bearing marketable public debt obligations of the United States having a maturity date of fifteen or more years, adjusted to the nearest one-eighth of 1 percentum; or, in the case of an offer to sell securities, a plan of redemption that is consistent with the foregoing requirements with respect to a loan;

"(4) provisions for assuring and securing the prompt repayment of the loan and interest or for the redemption of the securities; and

"(5) provisions making the liability of the United States under the agreement contingent upon the availability of appropriations for the purpose.

"USE OF PLANTS FOR WHICH ASSISTANCE IS EXTENDED

"SEC. 205. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to contract with a borrower under this title for the use of the borrower's plant facilities to further the research and demonstration programs authorized by title I of this Act, and the Act of September 2, 1958 (72 Stat. 1706), and to provide in the contract for a credit on the organization's loan, or for a cancellation of its securities, in an amount up to 25 per centum of the original amount thereof as compensation to the borrower for the use made of its facilities in connection with such programs.

"UNAVAILABILITY OF OTHER FINANCING

"SEC. 206. No loan or purchase of securities shall be made pursuant to this title if the Secretary determines that in his judgment the organization can obtain funds on reasonable terms from other sources.

"AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 207. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums, not to exceed $20,000,000 in the aggregate, as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title, and any such appropriation shall remain available until expended."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Finally, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a foreword by Dr. A. L. Miller, Director of the Office of Saline Water, as it appears in the Saline Water Conversion Report for 1959.

The foreword by Dr. Miller is somewhat modest, because Dr. Miller has brought to the program a deep personal interest and a background of legislative knowledge that has been most important in carrying the program forward. As the Senator from California has said, he has been aggressive, and I wish personally to pay tribute to the excellent record that is being written by the Department of the Interior through the interest taken by the Department of Interior Secretary Fred A. Seaton, the Assistant Secretary, Fred G. Aandahl, and by Dr. Miller in the Office of Saline Water.

I call attention to the fact that Dr. Miller's foreword states the funds that have been appropriated by the Congress from the year 1953 to the present, and I have inserted by that list the requests of the Bureau of the Budget for the corresponding year. These figures reflect the disparity betweeen the budget requests of the administration and the appropriations by Congress to which I earlier alluded.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREWORD BY A. L. MILLER, M.D. DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF SALINE WATER

This report of the activities of the Office of Saline Water contains information on developments during 1959. Additional technical information may be obtained from research and development reports—see appendix D [not printed in RECORD] or by writing this office.

Recognizing the growing shortage of water in the arid areas of the Nation and elsewhere, Congress in 1952 authorized the Secretary of the Interior, by means of research grants and contracts, to conduct research and technical development work to provide for the development of practicable low-cost means of producing from sea water, water of a quality suitable for agriculture, industrial, municipal, and other beneficial consumptive uses.

The 1952 Saline Water Act authorized an appropriation of $2 million for a 5-year period. The act was amended in 1955 by increasing the authorization to $10 million for an 11-year period, fiscal years 1953 to 1963 inclusive.

In 1958, Congress reaffirmed its interest in this field by a second $10 million authorization, which provided for the construction and operation of five saline water conversion plants for actual production tests to demonstrate the reliability, engineering, operating, and economic potentials of the most promising sea or brackish water conversion processes.

Under these two authorizations, the Office of Saline Water has received the following appropriations:

Congressional appropriations since 1953

Fiscal year	Research and development		Demonstration plants
	Request	Appropriation	
1953	$400,000	$175,000	----------
1954	400,000	400,000	----------
1955	400,000	400,000	----------
1956	600,000	600,000	----------
1957	600,000	550,000	----------
1958	1,159,000	725,000	----------
1959	1,355,000	1,170,000	[1] $33,000
1960	1,355,000	1,755,000	1,850,000
1961	{ 1,355,000 [2] 500,000 }	1,355,000	2,040,000

[1] Transferred from research and development appropriations.
[2] Supplemental budget request.

As a part of the continuing effort to develop a policy that will expedite the development of low-cost conversion processes, the Secretary of the Interior has appointed a board of scientific and industrial leaders to serve as advisers to the Secretary on Saline Water Conversion. The advisory group is comprised of the following:

Mr. T. B. Ford, vice president, Dorr-Oliver, Inc., Stamford, Conn.

Dr. Thorndike Saville, director, Science and Engineering Center Study, University of Florida, Gainesville, Fla.

Mr. L. W. Grayson, president, American Water Works Association, Inc., Glendale, Calif.

Dr. Robert G. Sproul, president emeritus, University of California, Berkeley, Calif.

Dr. Louis Koenig, Louis Koenig Research, San Antonio, Tex.

Mr. Sheppard T. Powell, consulting engineer, Baltimore, Md.

Mr. Robert Lusk, editor-publisher, Huronite & Daily Plainsman, Huron, S. Dak.

Dr. C. F. Prutton, executive vice president, Food Machinery & Chemical Corp., New York, N.Y.

Mr. Ellwood H. Aldrich, vice president and chief engineer, American Water Works Service Co., Inc., Philadelphia, Pa.

Dr. Alex G. Oblad, vice president, research and development, the M. W. Kellogg Co., New York 17, N.Y.

Dr. Lee A. DuBridge, president, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, Calif.

Dr. George D. Humphrey, president, University of Wyoming, Laramie, Wyo.

Dr. Frederick L. Hovde, president, Purdue University, Lafayette, Ind.

Mr. N. T. Veatch, consulting engineer, Black & Veatch, Kansas City, Mo.

Mr. J. J. Cronin, vice president, General Motors Corp., Detroit, Mich.

The advisers met on December 4, 1959, in Washington, and as a result of the meeting made a number of recommendations to the Secretary. Secretary Seaton listed these recommendations in his report to the President, which is included in another section of this report.

Contractors, consultants, and proposers were asked to participate in four conferences; the agenda of each of these conferences covered one of the major saline water conversion processes divisions—distillation, membranes, freezing, and solar distillation. We were impressed by the high degree of interest evidenced by the large number of those invited who took the time from busy schedules to attend the various meetings (see appendix B for list of attendees). The meetings proved to be an excellent method of exchanging information and served to stimulate interest in solving saline water conversion problems. The time and effort dedicated to these meetings by the participants are deeply appreciated by this Office.

We also express our appreciation to other Government agencies, and private industrial and research organizations who have rendered assistance and cooperation. We urge all industrial and research organizations to give consideration and attention to the problems and potential of saline water conversion.

During 1959, cooperative agreements for the exchange of information and cooperation in saline water conversion were entered into between the Office of Saline Water and the States of New Mexico, Arizona, Florida, and Texas. Negotiations are under way for cooperative agreements with the States of South Dakota and North Carolina. A similar agreement with the State of California was signed in 1958.

The Department of the Interior and the Atomic Energy Commission signed an agreement for a cooperative project for the development of a nuclear-powered saline water conversion plant. Under the agreement, the Commission will design, construct, and operate a 40,000-thermal kilowatt experimental low-temperature process heat reactor, and the Department of the Interior will design, construct, and operate a saline water conversion plant which will use steam from the reactor to produce at least 1 million gallons of fresh water per day.

A solar research station was established at Daytona Beach, Fla., for sea water conversion research. Three types of solar stills are presently being tested at the site and additional stills will be constructed in the coming year.

The Office takes special note of the outstanding work accomplished by two special boards appointed by the Assistant Secretary for Water and Power, Fred G. Aandahl, to assist in the selection of sites and processes for the demonstration plant program. This work is more completely discussed in the section "Division of Demonstration Plants."

During 1959, the Office of Saline Water was completely reorganized—see appendix E, organization chart [not printed in RECORD]. Staff engineers have completed a personal inspection of all contract work being conducted by other Government agencies and the various universities and industrial firms and research organizations. The increased field activity also included the presentation of papers at various symposia and technical meetings as well as addresses to interested groups and organizations. Interesting developments and activities of the Office of Saline Water are described in press releases issued throughout the year. Persons interested in receiving these releases will be placed on the mailing list upon receipt of a written request to this Office.

Contractors and consultants of the Office of Saline Water generally agree that low-cost conversion is a goal that can be achieved. In the demonstration plant program we hope, for the first time, to produce fresh water from the sea for about $1 per thousand gallons. Laboratory investigations now under way give promise of lowering the cost of conversion in large plants to less than 50 cents per thousand gallons. This price, if attained, will be sufficiently low to make conversion an important source of supplemental water for many areas of the world.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I thank the Senate for its indulgence and for the time that I have been accorded to present this review.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am sorry that I was not present to hear all of the address of the Senator from South Dakota. I wish to express my gratification that he was able to acquire the floor in his own right at an early hour today. I also wish to express my apologies to him for the inconvenience caused him last night, due to the fact that an agreement had been entered into. I am only sorry that the situation arose whereby the promise made by the Senator from Montana to the junior Senator from South Dakota could not be kept, and I hope he will understand.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, the Senator from South Dakota does understand, and he appreciates this generous and characteristic statement by the Senator from Montana. I did understand the situation that arose, but in view of the fact that the Senator from South Dakota had talked with the distinguished minority leader and the Senator from Montana, who was then the acting majority leader, I thought we had an understanding that I would be recognized last night. I deferred on two or three occasions when some other matters were pending, so that they could be cleared up, expecting to be recognized subsequently.

Mr. MANSFIELD. And, may I say, at my request, the Senator deferred.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is correct. The Senator from South Dakota deferred to the request of the Senator from Montana. Therefore he felt that he was entitled to be recognized in his own right, and has appreciated the way things have worked out today so that he has had ample time to review the legislative history on the saline water program in some detail. I thank the Senator for his thoughtful and considerate observations.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, before I start to discuss the subject which I wish to discuss, I, too, wish to commend the Senator from South Dakota for his speech on saline water. While we in Massachusetts do not have so much need for such development as those people in his section of the country, we are working on research in that field. Personally I have always supported such research as one of the most important subjects for the conservation of our country's resources.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, the Senator from Massachusetts speaks with justifiable interest in this program. One of the field trips that it was my privilege to take was to Boston to observe a research program that was being carried out there by a research organization affiliated with MIT, I believe it was, in which the ionics process was being developed. The ionics process, provided the first portable demonstration plant that was sent to Arizona and South Dakota some years ago, and furnished the basic theories and design for the plant which is now to be constructed at Webster, S. Dak., dealing with brackish water. The people of Massachusetts and the research organizations have been in the forefront in this field, and the Senator from Massachusetts speaks with justifiable interest and pride.

AMENDMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE CONTROL ACT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield for just a moment?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield, provided I do not lose my right to the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, after consultation with the distinguished minority leader, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 1706, Senate bill 3258.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3258) to amend the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with an amendment, on page 4, at the beginning of line 4, it is proposed to strike out "(1)" and insert "(i)", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 23(c) of the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act, as amended (48 Stat. 332; sec. 25–124(c), D.C. Code), is hereby repealed.

SEC. 2. Section 23(d) of the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act, as amended (48 Stat. 332; sec. 25–124(d), D.C. Code), is renumbered as section "23(c)" and as so renumbered is amended to read as follows:

"(c) Said taxes shall be collected and paid in the following manner:

"(1) Each holder of a manufacturer's or wholesaler's license shall, on or before the tenth day of each month, furnish to the Commissioners or their designated agent on a form to be prescribed by the Commissioners, a statement under oath showing the

quantity of beverage subject to taxation hereunder sold by him during the preceding calendar month and shall, on or before the fifteenth day of each month, pay to the Commissioners or their designated agent the tax hereby imposed upon the quantity of beverages subject to taxation hereunder sold by him during the preceding calendar month.

"(2) No licensee holding a retailer's license shall transport or cause to be transported into the District of Columbia any beverages subject to taxation hereunder other than the regular stock on hand in a passenger carrying marine vessel operating in and beyond the District of Columbia, or a club car or a dining car on a railroad operating in and beyond the District of Columbia, for which a retailer's license, class C or D, has been issued under this Act, unless such licensee has first obtained a permit so to do from the Alcoholic Beverage Control Board. No such permit shall issue until the tax imposed by this section shall have been paid for the beverages for which the permit is requested. Such permit shall specifically set forth the quantity, character, and brand or trade name of the beverage to be transported and the names and addresses of the seller and of the purchaser. Such permit shall accompany such beverage during transportation in the District of Columbia to the licensed premises of such retail licensee and shall be exhibited upon the demand of any police officer or duly authorized inspector of the Board. Such permit shall, immediately (upon receipt of the beverage by the retail) licensee, be marked 'Canceled' and retained by him.

"(3) The Commissioners are authorized and empowered to prescribe by regulation such other methods or devices or both for the assessment, evidencing of payment, and collection of the taxes imposed by this section in addition to or in lieu of the method hereinbefore set forth whenever in their judgment such action is necessary to prevent frauds or evasions."

SEC. 3. Sections 23(e), 23(f), 23(i), and 23(j) of the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act, as amended (48 Stat. 332; secs. 25–124(e), 25–124(f), 25–124(i), and 23(j), D.C. Code), are repealed, and sections 23(g) and 23(h) of said Act are renumbered as "23(d)" and "23(e)", respectively.

SEC. 4. Section 23(k) of the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act, as amended (48 Stat. 332; sec. 25–124(k), D.C. Code) is renumbered as "23(f)" and as so renumbered is amended as follows:

By striking the words "of subsection (a), (c), (e) and (i)," from the first sentence, and by amending the last sentence to read as follows: "Each holder of such a license shall, on or before the tenth day of each month, forward to the Board on a form to be prescribed by the Commissioners, a statement under oath, showing the quantity of each kind of beverage, except beer and nontaxable light wines, sold under such license in the District of Columbia during the preceding calendar month and such statement shall be accompanied by payment of any tax imposed under this Act upon any such beverages set forth in said report."

SEC. 5. Nothing in this Act shall be construed as requiring the payment of any further tax on beverages to which stamps have been lawfully affixed under provisions of prior law.

SEC. 6. The Commissioners or their designated agent are authorized to redeem any unused stamps issued under the provisions of prior law or to accept same in payment of tax shown due on a monthly return.

SEC. 7. Nothing in this Act shall be construed so as to affect the authority vested in the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia by Reorganization Plan Numbered 5 of 1952 (66 Stat. 824). The performance of any function vested by this Act in the Board of Commissioners or in any office or agency under the jurisdiction and control of said Board of Commissioners may be delegated by said Board of Commissioners in accordance with section 3 of such plan.

SEC. 8. This Act shall take effect on the first day of the calendar month beginning not less than sixty days after the date of approval of this Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to the distinguished chairman of the District Committee, the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], and others be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOVERNMENT OF THE
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
EXECUTIVE OFFICE.
Washington, D.C., Aug. 27, 1960.

HON. ALAN BIBLE,
Chairman, Committee on the District of Columbia, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR BIBLE: The Commissioners are advised that it has been suggested that existing authority reposed in the Commissioners under the Alcoholic Beverage Control Act to adopt regulations implementing the act is sufficient to authorize promulgation of a regulation requiring that alcoholic beverage dealers shall continue to place an identifying mark upon the containers of alcoholic beverages sold by them even though, as proposed by S. 3258, the stamp method of collecting alcoholic beverage taxes is eliminated. It is the understanding of the Commissioners that the committee desires to be advised as to whether, if identification of the place of sale of an alcoholic beverage is retained, the Commissioners would be disposed to the view that the elimination of alcoholic beverage tax stamps would not be inimical to the processes of crime detection in the District.

The Commissioners, by report dated April 28, 1960, addressed to the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia of the U.S. Senate, observed that the tax stamp method now in force for the collection of alcoholic beverage taxes has proved of valuable assistance in the enforcement of the laws, including enforcement of those provisions of the Alcoholic Beverage Control Act relating to the sale of alcoholic beverages to minors and sales of such beverages during restricted periods.

The Commissioners are of the view that, irrespective of whether the collection of alcoholic beverage taxes is accomplished by tax stamps or by a reporting method, the continuation of the requirements for the identification of the dealer from whom the alcoholic beverage is obtained is essential to proper law enforcement in the District. But the Commissioners are not concerned that such an identification appear upon a District tax stamp as such so long as the identification may be obtained by other adequate means. Thus the Commissioners, although favoring retention of the tax stamp method now in force in the District for the collection of taxes on alcoholic beverages, would not, so far as crime detection in the District alone is concerned, object to the elimination of tax stamps if the Commissioners are assured that the identification of dealers will not be eliminated.

The Commissioners, in their report of April 28, 1960, apprised the committee of the additional expenses to the District which, in their view, will result from the enactment of S. 3258. The Commissioners expressed concern that the reporting method for the collection of District alcoholic beverage taxes presents a considerable potential for evasion and fraud. The Commissioners, for the reasons they expressed in their April report, are opposed to modification of the present method of alcoholic beverage tax collection in the District.

The Commissioners desire to comment upon one further matter. The Commissioners are advised that on May 6, 1960, counsel for the committee submitted certain questions to Assistant Corporation Counsel Henry E. Wixon, relating to S. 3258 and upon which the committee desired information. By letter dated June 3, 1960, addressed to William P. Gulledge, Esq., Mr. Wixon submitted responses to the aforementioned questions as prepared by the Director of General Administration, chief of police, and the chairman of the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Board. In the course of responding to the May 6, 1960 letter, Mr. Wixon suggested to counsel for the committee that the use of the word "sold" in S. 3258 presented problems in respect of the collection of District taxes. Mr. Wixon observed that under current District taxing provisions, the alcoholic beverage tax is imposed upon the importation of alcoholic beverages into the District rather than upon the fact of sale. Under these circumstances, and if this rationale is to be continued, the District tax should be payable upon all alcoholic beverages imported or brought into the District whether or not they are sold in the sense of a completed commercial transaction. The Commissioners would be deeply concerned if the liability of dealers in alcoholic beverages for District taxes on such beverages were to be modified so as to permit these beverages to be held in the District tax-free, with the responsibility for payment of such taxes to occur only upon the disposition thereof by sale. Certainly, if the word "sold" were to imply a completed transaction between a seller and a purchaser (and the Commissioners do not understand this to be the intention of the Congress), dealers in alcoholic beverages would not be responsible for the payment of any taxes on any alcoholic beverages which they themselves consume or which were consumed in the District through the medium of gift.

Without further comment upon this matter, the Commissioners are in full accord with the expressions contained in the letter of June 3, 1960, from Mr. Wixon to counsel for the committee. In this regard, however, the committee should be advised that regulations promulgated by the Commissioners in connection with taxation of wine and beer under the reporting method are now under attack in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit in a case entitled *American Sales Company* v. *The District of Columbia* (Ct. of Apps., No. 153940) on the ground, inter alia, that the Commissioners may not tax any wine and beer in the District held or possessed by a dealer which has not been "sold" by him, that is, sold in the sense of a completed commercial transaction between the buyer and a seller for a consideration. The Commissioners' regulations which are under attack base taxation upon possession rather than upon a sale, a premise which the Commissioners feel is justified not only in light of the purport of the Alcoholic Beverage Control Act but, in view of the requirement upon the Commissioners that, so far as possible, opportunity for evasion of District taxes shall be minimized even though it may not be entirely prevented. The American Sales Co. case, of itself, provides sufficient reason for the concern of the Commissioners over the use of the word "sold" not only as it relates to the taxation of spirits but as well to the taxation of wine and beer.

In summary, the Commissioners do not object, from the standpoint of crime enforcement in the District, to the elimination of tax stamps provided that the elimination of tax stamps does not include elimination of the means for identifying the dealer from whom an alcoholic beverage is purchased. In this regard, it is immaterial whether identification is secured upon a tax stamp or in some other manner such as the stamping of a dealer's identifying number upon the label of the container of the beverage. The Commissioners are opposed, however, from the standpoint of the revenues of the District of Columbia, to the elimination of tax stamps as the means of collecting alcoholic beverage taxes. The Commissioners deem it essential that District alcoholic beverage taxes be imposed upon alcoholic beverages imported or brought into the District and not merely upon their sale. To the extent, therefore, that S. 3258 may be deemed or potentially suggest that dealers are not liable to tax upon beverages in their possession, but only upon beverages which they have sold in the sense of a consummated commercial transaction, the Commissioners urge that, in the event of the adoption of a reporting method for the collection of alcoholic beverage taxes, legislation to this end specifically provide that the liability for tax shall not depend upon a sale, but rather upon importation and possession.

Sincerely yours,

F. J. CLARKE,
Colonel, Corps of Engineers, U.S. Army,
Engineer Commissioner.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD subsequently said: Mr. President, early this afternoon the Senate passed Calendar 1706, Senate bill 3258, to amend the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act. I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

OUR DEFENSE POSITION—PRESENT AND FUTURE

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, before we return once again to our homes, it may be helpful to submit to you, to the Congress, and to the people, a review of the state of the Nation's defenses, as I see them.

Since Congress completed action on the fiscal year 1961 appropriations bill there has been continued discussion at home about our defense adequacy and continued tensions abroad as the cold war has entered a new phase of Communist arrogance.

Congress adjourned for a brief 4 weeks, dominated by the national conventions of both parties. Trouble in the Belgian Congo quickly reached serious dimensions, and Premier Castro's government heightened its animosity toward the United States and its identification with the Communist bloc. The Soviet Union blatantly charged our Government with aggressive invasion of its air space, and now fans the world's fears and suspicions with its dramatization of the trial of American pilot Francis Gary Powers.

We returned to Washington with the hope of taking earnest and constructive action on needed legislation. Shortly we shall finally adjourn the 86th Congress and return home for the rigors of a nationwide election campaign.

I believe that it would be particularly appropriate and helpful, at this time, to review briefly our defense position, present and future. A concise, balanced analysis of our defense preparedness is called for not only by the nature of the current international situation, but also by the inevitable commentary of the political campaign ahead of us.

With respect to our present defense position, I think it is generally agreed among informed observers that this country's military strength is clearly superior to that of any potential aggressor. We believe our forces to be capable of deterring thermonuclear general war and of coping successfully with so-called limited conflicts, emphasizing the use of conventional forces, should they break out. In fact, it was with some interest that I noticed that Mr. Robert Sprague and Dr. James Baxter, when they appeared before Senator JACKSON's Subcommittee on National Policy Machinery, testified that they felt our present military strength was not only awesomely great in an absolute sense, but that it probably represented an all-time high relative to the military strength of the Soviet Union.

This conclusion is inescapable to anyone who considers objectively the size and high state of readiness of our forces, the effectiveness and diversity of the weapons systems with which they are equipped, and the experience and dedication of our soldiers, sailors, and airmen.

Our strategic retaliatory forces now consist of 12 wings of B–52 intercontinental attack bombers and 25 wings of B–47 jet bombers, widely dispersed and well supported by a large fleet of refueling tankers. The planes and men of the Strategic Air Command represent a force unmatched in world history in experience, training, and combat power. SAC's already great effectiveness is being considerably enhanced at this very moment as the first units of the B–52 force are equipped with the Hound Dog air-to-surface missile. Supplementing the almost unimaginable destructive power carried by these bombers of the Strategic Air Command are operationally ready Atlas intercontinental ballistic missiles.

Also, within the next few months, the first two Polaris-firing nuclear-powered submarines will be combat-ready—at sea with missiles aboard. This schedule was assured by the recent dramatic and highly successful underwater test firings of the U.S.S. *George Washington*. The Polaris system, of course, has brought a wholly new dimension to our strategic retaliatory power in terms of mobility, concealment, and near invulnerability to enemy missile attack.

Basic to the projection of our military power overseas in situations of limited conflict, as well as important to our general war strength, are the Navy's four great fleets built around modern attack carriers and the tactical fighters and missiles of the Air Force deployed in forward areas. These, together with the 870,000 men in the Army and 175,000 men in the Marine Corps, either deployed overseas or in reserve in this country, constitute a balanced and highly effective force capable of rapidly containing or of defeating local aggression in distant parts of the world.

Our present military strength is not only well known to the members of the free world it is dedicated to defend, but also appreciated by those nations whose aggressive impulsiveness it is intended to deter. But, present strength is not enough; the real question we must address ourselves to is not present but future proficiency—"will we be strong enough in the years ahead?"

By way of providing some needed perspective, let me cite a brief historical case study. A few years ago it was charged our defense programs were not adequate to provide the military strength we would need in 1958–60. But the predicted "bomber gap" never materialized. The same dire predictions were made over the superior development of Russian nuclear-powered submarines. But, on the contrary, our own B–52 fleet has increased from less than 1 fully equipped wing then to 12 at the present time. They now represent a force several times larger than the estimated Soviet long-range heavy-bomber force and possess capabilities far superior to those of the B–36 bomber force upon which our strategic air strength depended in those days.

Similarly, our present continental air defense system against manned bomber attack is the best in the world. We have many more true all-weather fighters than the Soviet Union, contrary to the popular predictions of 4 years ago, and a highly sophisticated electronic control and warning system. Our present surface-to-air missile defenses are constantly improving. It is doubtful that the Soviet Union has any nuclear-powered submarines. We have 10 nuclear-powered submarines in the active fleet and well over 30 other nuclear-powered warships are now authorized or under construction.

The fears expressed in 1956 that America would not be prepared in 1960 were unfounded. Now there is general agreement that our Defense Establishment is the best in the world today.

But today persistent viewers-with-alarm tell us that we will not be prepared 3 or 4 years from now. The fact is that we are moving ahead on many programs—land, sea, and air, atomic and conventional power, nuclear weapons and conventional weapons, missiles and aircraft, ships and land vehicles. We are strengthening simultaneously our Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force. The totality of power must impress any fairminded and responsible citizen.

Naturally, in improving these defenses, we have had to recognize a system of

priorities of programs. First things have had to come first. And top priority ratings have produced such miracles as the nuclear submarines and their Polaris armament.

The Soviet Union, too, has been forced to allocate limited resources among many competing demands. All nations have to live with the program of allocating limited material and manpower resources.

Some voices have been raised in our land for a feast-or-famine approach to the Nation's defenses. The President has chosen to ignore that siren song in favor of a policy of building strength for the long haul of maintaining a steady level of effort while continually adjusting its programs to the rapid changes which are taking place constantly in military technology.

We have worked continually to modernize our forces and at the same time have pressed vigorously for the development of the weapons of the future. The President has steered wisely between complacency and weakness on the one hand, and wasteful crash programs on the other.

We can never be complacent about past experience in successfully evolving one's programs to provide a continuing military superiority, when the question before us is still the future. The situation in the summer of 1960 obviously is not the same as it was in 1956. There are great new dangers as well as new opportunities in our position relative to that of the Soviet Union. It is only natural, in view of the collapse of the summit conference in May, more recently the abandonment by the Soviet Union of its participation in the general disarmament conference, and the "increased truculence" of the Communist bloc generally which the President has mentioned, that the question should be raised whether our present programs and funds are adequate to insure our safety in the coming years. In order to serve the national security, it is not only natural, it is necesary to examine these questions.

There has been in recent weeks much discussion as to (1) whether Congress appropriated sufficient funds to maintain our security and to make it clear to the world that we were so strong that no nation would dare to attack us for fear of our ability to retaliate devastatingly, (2) whether the funds appropriated by Congress are being wisely obligated and expended; and (3) whether there is more money needed to be appropriated to make certain that our defenses are adequate and that the research and development of new weapons is sufficiently provided for. These are important questions.

In general, I believe that the defense policies which have served us so well in the immediate past are equally applicable to the coming years. We still need a relatively stable level of effort on a high enough plateau to maintain adequate protection until some less precarious and more permanent understanding is reached with the Soviet Union.

More specifically, we will have continually to adjust our forces and programs to the rapid progress in military technology and to take the steps necessary to maintain a mixed force of retaliatory weapons systems safe from surprise attack, as well as versatile and mobile forces capable of dealing rapidly with situations of limited conflict. The 1961 budget provides funds dedicated to meet these objectives.

What kind of armed forces does this fiscal year 1961 defense appropriations legislation provide: For our strategic retaliatory forces, additional B–52H heavy jet bombers will be purchased to permit equipping of the 14th Wing. Enough B–58 supersonic medium bombers will be procured to complete the equipping of three wings. More KC–135 jet tankers are also provided to modernize further our airborne refueling capability. Additional Hound Dog air-to-surface missiles are being ordered for our B–52 force, as well as Quail decoy missiles.

In active development is the Sky Bolt air-launched ballistic missile. This will have about double the range and many times the speed of the present Hound Dog missile. Its successful development would strengthen greatly the capabilities of the heavy bomber force and would considerably extend its useful life. In fact, the B–52 carrying Sky Bolt missiles represents a powerful combination of the advantages of the manned bomber—flexibility and weight of attack, with the advantages of the ballistic missile—speed and inflight invulnerability.

The 1961 Defense Appropriation Act also contains about $260 million to continue the development of the B–70 intercontinental heavy bomber, designed to fly at three times the speed of sound.

With respect to our strategic missile strength, this year's budget provides for an increase of more than one-third in the number of Atlas and Titan ICBM squadrons and, in addition, for the substantial augmentation of the last six of the Atlas squadrons.

Development effort on Minuteman will also be increased. This missile, because of its reduced cost, short reaction time, and mobility, is expected to become an important part of our nuclear retaliatory forces by the mid-1960's. Deployed in large numbers in hardened, well-dispersed underground sites and on moving railway cars, Minuteman will be a nuclear strike force of tremendous power and speed.

Funds are also provided this year toward the procurement of 12 more Polaris submarines. These submarines, because of their ability to utilize the ocean depths of the world for mobility and concealment, represent a near-invulnerable weapon system, and one which presents any aggressor with the virtual certainty of a deadly counterblow. I would like to point out, contrary to the impression in some quarters, that the Polaris program has not been held back. In fact, this program is now about 3 years ahead of its original schedule.

But the significant increase in our offensive aircraft and missile strength is only part of the story. As Secretary Gates stated to the Senate Committee on Appropriations when he came before us this past February:

> Our first concern is how best to assure our continued capability to retaliate effectively to surprise attack, at a time when the U.S.S.R. could have in its possession a large number of intercontinental ballistic missiles, in addition to a significant number of manned bombers.
>
> The solution lies in a whole complex of related measures, each of which in various degrees contributes to the establishment and maintenance of an assured retaliatory capability. These are: improved warning against both missile and aircraft attack, reduction of reaction time, dispersal, protective hardening, concealment, and mobility for our weapon systems; and, as soon as practicable, an effective active defense against ballistic missiles as well as aircraft.

A number of these objectives are met by the 1961 aircraft and missile programs which I have just described. The 1961 defense budget also makes provisions for the other necessary measures.

As General Power, head of the Strategic Air Command, testified, it is not now necessary actually to fly a continuous airborne alert. Funds are provided, however, for the Strategic Air Command to acquire the capability for such an alert, if and when needed. This precaution will serve to reduce significantly the vulnerability of SAC during periods of heightened international tension.

The first ballistic missile early warning station is expected to be in operation within just a few months. Funds are provided this year to accelerate the completion of the two other stations in the system. When this system is operational, that portion of the Strategic Air Command on ground alert will have 15 minutes of warning which will give them time to get into the air and to avoid destruction on the ground from a surprise enemy missile attack.

Development of our military satellite systems is also being accelerated with funds provided this year. The Midas infrared warning satellite will provide even earlier warning of an enemy missile attack than BMEWS, and Samos will do much to supply needed military reconnaissance information and to detect signs of an impending attack.

Research and development on the Nike-Zeus antimissile missile will also go forward at a higher level than ever before in an effort to perfect an active defense against ballistic missile attack.

The Navy will construct another new, large, modern attack aircraft carrier with 1961 funds. This will provide a highly valuable addition to our ability to cope with limited aggression in the distant areas of the world.

A large number of vessels for antisubmarine warfare have been funded in this year's Navy shipbuilding program and funds for research in this field have also been increased.

The Army's ability to meet its responsibilities likewise will be considerably enhanced by the funds made available in the 1961 budget. The procurement of F–105 tactical fighters by the Air

Force for close support of Army ground forces in the field, of airlift aircraft to enhance their long-range mobility, and Army procurement of modern rifles, machineguns, tanks, trucks, missiles, and self-propelled artillery, all received sharply increased funding this year.

For military functions of the Department of Defense, Congress, on June 30, approved a total of $39,996,608,000. This was $661,608,000 in excess of the amount submitted in January by President Eisenhower. For military construction in the Department of Defense, Congress, on July 1, approved a total of $994,855,000. This was $193,145,000 less than the President requested in his January budget.

As President Eisenhower pointed out in a press conference Wednesday, August 10, 1960, funds requested in the budget amounting to approximately $1,100 million for certain purposes were not appropriated, and on the other hand approximately $1,750 million were appropriated for purposes that the Defense Department had not originally planned.

As Secretary Gates has assured Congress in recent letters to the Senate majority leader, Senator JOHNSON, and the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense, Senator CHAVEZ, the Department of Defense plans to utilize the great part of the funds provided by Congress immediately.

Adequate time is required for making new plans in order to see that additional funds provided by Congress above the budget request are properly and effectively obligated for spending. Therefore, certain funds are reserved until these programs can be worked out and put to use for urgent future requirements as they develop. As the President has emphasized, this does not mean that the money has been impounded. It does mean that careful plans must be made before the millions involved can be expended thoughtfully.

Among the programs to which additional funding will be applied are: strengthening of the SAC airborne alert capacity, Army modernization, the B–70 supersonic bomber, the Samos reconnaissance satellite, the Polaris program, and modernization of the airlift fleet. Some of these actions had been indicated in funds appropriated by Congress and others had not.

As Secretary Gates explained in his letter to Senator JOHNSON dated August 9, 1960:

> With respect to the funds not yet apportioned and the items "apportioned but undergoing review," I am sure you appreciate that not all service programs are ready to go forward at the time the bill is enacted into law. For many reasons—technical difficulties, changes in concepts, lack of definitive plans—additional time is frequently required in order to assure the development of valid programs. As a matter of good business practice, we must assure that the requirement is still valid in the light of present circumstances, and that all significant aspects of the program have been properly worked out before the funds are released.

In addition, as President Eisenhower announced in his special message to Congress of August 8, numerous practical actions had already been ordered toward improving the readiness and posture of our military commands. These included the deployment of additional aircraft carriers to the 6th and 7th Fleets, the retention of a number of B–47 medium bombers and tankers, and an increase in the number and scope of ground forces' strategic and airborne exercises.

In considering the question of whether additional preparedness funds are needed at the present time, it is important to look at the defense appropriations bill to see what opportunities it provides the Secretary of Defense to enable him—as the chief administrator directly in charge of our ultracomplex Defense Establishment—to continuously assure maximum security according to the changing priorities of our political-military environment. I think this is a most important item.

In order to assure that no weapons program could suffer from lack of funds while Congress was not in session, an emergency fund of $150 million is provided in the legislation for application to any research and development or procurement account of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Defense Department whenever the Secretary of Defense deems it necessary to speed up that particular program. Congress also provided transfer authority of $150 million through the emergency fund which can be used to accelerate any needy program. Furthermore, the Congress made available in section 535 an additional $150 million transfer authority for the acceleration of missile or satellite programs that the Secretary of Defense deems advantageous to the national defense.

In addition, each year the Department carries forward to the next budget some billions of dollars of unobligated balances. These balances are earmarked for specific projects, but, for various reasons, may not be obligated. In the current budget, it is expected there will be approximately 6.3 billion of balances unobligated during fiscal year 1961. Within certain procurement limitations, these funds can, if it is wise and necessary, be reprogramed with the consent of the Appropriations Committees of the Congress. For instance, if more money is needed for a Polaris submarine and there is an unobligated balance in Navy ship construction accounts, these funds could be transferred for this purpose. Or, if it was considered wise to proceed with more procurement of the Minuteman missile, funds could be reprogramed from other Air Force missile programs. The use of these unobligated balances thus provides a certain amount of additional flexibility to our Defense Establishment for procurement purposes.

Through these allowances permitting transfer of funds for research, for procurement, and for acceleration of programs, Congress has given the Defense Secretary broad authority. Furthermore, Congress has approved section 512A, a provision authorizing the President to permit the Defense Department to obligate appropriated funds at a faster rate than now planned whenever he deems such action to be necessary in the interest of national defense. Section 512B permits the President to provide for all the costs of an airborne alert on an actual deficiency basis if necessary. Although section B is little known and has not yet been used, it is highly important for it is another step that Congress has taken to assure that our defenses will not suffer for lack of funds in those areas where high priorities exist and emergencies can develop.

Aside from programs specifically provided for by congressional appropriations and the further authority of the President and the Secretary of Defense to administer their activities with freedom and flexibility, our Defense Establishment cannot meet the revolutionary challenges of the future unless it can and will move quickly for new funds with which to implement new policies at the time they are needed. I believe the record is clear that the present administration will come to Congress for more funds if and when they are necessary.

As President Eisenhower said in his August 8 message:

> Total resources are adequate, although a modest increase * * * may prove to be necessary to carry out the readiness measures. If such an increase should be required, I shall promptly request the necessary funds.
>
> Once again I assure the Congress that this Nation's military power is second to none and will be kept that way.

Secretary Gates wrote to Majority Leader JOHNSON on August 9:

> All of our programs, force levels and deployments are kept under constant review. Where technological breakthroughs occur, emphasis will be added; where programs are overtaken by events, terminations will be effected. This is in accord with the long-established policy of the executive branch; no change has been made in this policy.

And in his letter of August 12:

> But, this I can assure you—should we conclude that additional programs are required for the Nation's defense, the necessary funds will be requested regardless of the amounts involved.

In conclusion, I believe that Congress has provided sufficient funds in the fiscal year 1961 appropriations bill to provide the proficiency mix of defenses which will keep us secure. The foregoing review of military items which these funds make available impressively documents this conviction, in my opinion.

I feel that the Defense Department has demonstrated its competence to utilize these funds in the most effective manner according to changing conditions and priorities. There will always be minor differences of opinion on financial administration, but the strong, continuing cooperation of the executive branch with the legislative branch to the end of highest security seems clear. Moreover, Congress provides the money with such flexibility that the President, the Secretary of Defense, and their deputies are able to make use of it wisely, prudently, and efficiently.

For all these reasons, Congress can have confidence in the multidimensional character of the U.S. defense posture, its emphasis on the long haul, and the long-range validity of these basic concepts—and can be satisfied that adequate funds have now been appropriated to guard the Nation's security.

Our prime responsibility, however, is to be vigilant for needed additions and revisions and quick to bring them about with necessary action. We must avoid any aspect of complacency or lethargy, but sustain a critical, imaginative, and vigorous attitude which alone can produce that unmistakable margin of military supremacy upon which our national security rests.

FOREIGN TAX CREDIT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10087) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit taxpayers to elect an overall limitation on the foreign tax credit. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today, pp. 18410–18413, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia state whether this is a unanimous report?

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. It is a unanimous report.

Mr. President, the bill deals with the limitations on the foreign tax credit with respect to taxes paid to foreign countries. There were 20 Senate amendments.

The main dispute with the House conferees was in connection with Senate amendment No. 10. Under this Senate amendment, where an affiliated group of corporations filed a consolidated return, income credits attributable to the income of a Western Hemisphere trade corporation which is taxed at 38 percent could not be used to offset the tax at 52 percent on the income from other corporations operating abroad, whether within or without the Western Hemisphere. The House conferees objected to this amendment. The conferees finally reached a compromise whereby the Senate rule would be applied in all cases except in the case of regulated public utility corporations. I believe this compromise was justified because of the fact that a regulated public utility corporation operating in the Western Hemisphere is not competing with other business corporations operating in this country. Accordingly, the Senate conferees agreed to this change in order to reach a conference settlement.

The other Senate amendments with slight modifications were agreed to by the House conferees.

Amendment No. 17, which was offered in the committee by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], was adopted with certain modifications suggested by the Treasury and accepted by Senator ANDERSON.

Amendment No. 18, which was offered by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], which provides for the reporting of information by corporations with respect to foreign subsidiaries and new foreign corporations was rewritten at the suggestion of the Treasury to spell out in greater detail the type of information to be supplied and the penalty was modified so that it would not result in the entire loss of the foreign tax credit but one-tenth of such credit.

Mr. President, I move the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is this the bill to which the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] interposed objections on the floor of the Senate?

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. No. He suggested some amendments.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What is the position of the Treasury?

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. The Treasury approves the bill.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. There was unanimous agreement on the report. The bill was rewritten in conference to the satisfaction of the Treasury, I am certain, and of the chairman of the conferees. I trust the report will be unanimously approved by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

SALARY INCREASES FOR MEMBERS OF POLICE, FIRE DEPARTMENT, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, THE PARK POLICE AND THE WHITE HOUSE POLICE—BILL INDEFINITELY POSTPONED

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, on last evening the Senate passed with amendments the bill (S. 3713) to increase the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the U.S. Park Police, the White House Police, and for other purposes, and laid on the table a motion to reconsider the vote on its passage. Subsequently, the Senate, on motion, proceeded to consider the bill H.R. 13053 of an identical title, and passed it with a substitute amendment embracing the language of Senate bill S. 3713 as passed by the Senate.

In view of the action on the passage of the House bill, and notwithstanding the action of the Senate in laying on the table a motion to reconsider the passage of the Senate bill, I ask unanimous consent that the vote on its passage be reconsidered and the bill be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY TROUBADOURS

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, it is a point of very special and personal pride with me to call attention to the activities of a group of young Washingtonians who now are representing a great university and this city in a most pleasing and entertaining manner. I speak, of course, of the George Washington University Troubadours, who began an extended engagement in New York's famed Radio City Music Hall on Thursday, August 11.

Perhaps the term "personal pride" is more understandable when I acknowledge the fact that I am a graduate of the university's law school and for many years have been an enthusiastic supporter of this great university, so uniquely located at the seat of government. The term "special pride" has still a different meaning to one who looks back over the nearly 10 years of unselfish service on the part of the unusual group of talented young men and women called the Troubadours. Since 1950, the Troubadours have traveled more than 175,000 miles to entertain American servicemen in remote bases and citizens in many foreign lands. They have distinguished themselves as good-will ambassadors everywhere they have visited, from the Aleutians to Tripoli.

While most Americans are enjoying the holiday season in the comfort of their homes, the Troubadours and their director, Dr. Robert H. Harmon, have voluntarily taken to the airways, to reach the out-of-way places on America's defense perimeter. Women members of the troup were the first white women to visit as far north as Thule, Greenland. They were the first entertainment group to venture into Narsarssuak, a narrow fiord in Greenland. In Iceland, they were greeted with enthusiasm by soldiers and citizens—so much so that their picture now hangs in the National Institute of Music in Reykjavik.

For the last 10 years they have made trips out of the country—14 trips in all—during Christmas, Easter, and summer vacations. In December 1960, they will journey to Newfoundland, Labrador, Baffin Island, Greenland, and Iceland, to sing at the special invitation of the Armed Services Entertainment Department and the State Department.

A special word should be said here about Dr. Harmon, whose talent and imagination created the singing tradition at the George Washington University. As a student at the university in 1921, Dr. Harmon was a member of the glee club. In 1924, he was named direc-

tor, and he has been so since that time. A practicing obstetrician in this city for all those years, he prides himself on never having missed "a delivery or a concert." Mrs. Harmon is associate director of the glee club, and has been the accompanist for many years. Their unselfish devotion and love of music have been an inspiring guide to many generations of university students.

This tribute to the Troubadours and the university is particularly fitting at this time, because the university has only recently announced the appointment of its 13th president, Dr. Thomas H. Carroll, a vice president of the Ford Foundation, and an outstanding educator, will take up his duties as president of the George Washington University in February 1961.

When asked about his appointment, Dr. Carroll commented, "The challenge of the George Washington University comes from its unique location in the very heart of the Nation's Capital.

"The role of government is obviously changing," he continued, "and the opportunities for greater mutual understanding among business, the professions, and government should be developed through education, particularly at an outstanding university located in the Nation's Capital."

For almost a century and a half this great university, founded in the spirit of the first President, has served this community and Nation. Through the years, thousands have come and gone from its campus; and, through its graduates, the university's name has become known around the world.

CIVIL DEFENSE AN UTTERLY USELESS BOONDOGGLE

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, civil defense as now conducted in the United States is an utterly useless boondoggle.

Since 1951 over $1 billion of taxpayers' money has been thrown down the drain on what is theoretically known as our civil defense program. Over half a billion dollars of this was Federal money. The rest was wasted by State and local governments. At the same time they declare that revenue for vitally needed projects, such as housing, sewage treatment, streets, and many others, cannot be found.

In addition, well over $82 million worth of surplus Federal property has been turned over to State and local civil defense officials. On previous occasions I have reported in detail on the misuse of this property in my State of Ohio. The distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] has done likewise regarding waste of taxpayers' money in his State and in the Nation, notably in the case involving the community of Carpenterville, Ill.

Mr. President, I am sure that Ohio and Illinois are not unique in respect to this inexcusable waste and misuse of Government property by civil defense officials.

Other Federal agencies also spend money and devote staff time to civil defense projects. The appropriation for next year includes over $6 million for this purpose.

Federal money is being squandered on this outmoded agency at the rate of over $5,000 an hour around the clock. State and local tax funds are being spent at approximately the same rate. If we would allow the appropriation requested by administration officials, Federal spending would be hiked to $10,000 an hour, with higher boosts for years to come.

To date, this agency has requested appropriations totaling over $2 billion. Wisely, the Congress has refused to grant this exorbitant sum. Only this year, we appropriated $16 million less than requested, and I personally feel that the meat ax should have cut thicker and deeper.

Each year, millions of dollars are appropriated for the use of the civil defense bureaucrats. In doing so, we fool ourselves and the American people into believing that something is being accomplished. It is true that in comparison to the total annual budget, this appropriation is not very significant. However, in terms of taxpayer's dollars spent in the long run, the waste will be fantastic. How many better ways there are to spend these billions of hard earned tax dollars

Mr. President, Americans are entitled to know what they are receiving for this billion-dollar throwaway.

Last week, the distinguished senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] placed in the RECORD a review of the accomplishments of the Republican administration regarding civil defense activities. To read it, one would think that nothing whatever is wrong with this program. If ever there were an instance for the old truism, "All that glitters is not gold," this is it.

Mr. President, the truth is that we have less civil defense today than when we started almost 10 years ago. At that time there was no such thing as the intercontinental ballistic missile armed with a hydrogen warhead. It was possible in those years to plan for a war in which 75 to 95 percent of the population would be alive at the end. As the capabilities of modern warfare have increased, this concept is as outmoded as tallow dips, mustache cups, and flintlock muskets.

Mr. President, I was going to say that this conception of civil defense is as outmoded as women's bustles, but perhaps it is much more outmoded than that, as women's bustles may again come into fashion, one of these days.

In spite of this, boondoggling Civil Defense officials still advocate a policy of evacuation and of primitive, useless basement shelters. Citizens generally, in the event of a nuclear attack, would not know whether to run or to hide. Civil Defense boondogglers advocate both.

In my home city of Cleveland, Ohio, on every Monday, at 12:15 p.m., the Civil Defense sirens have screeched for years. The citizens of Cleveland do not know what to do about it—whether to run or to pray or to hide, or whether to go to the nearest cocktail bar.

Despite this, the boondoggling practice continues, and of course this feeding at the public trough by high-salaried Civil Defense officials who direct these activities continues.

The truth is that we have spent over a billion dollars for millions of contradictory pamphlets that have only confused Americans, who would not know what to do in the face of enemy attack. We have paid out money for stockpiles of strategic materials which have been handled with unbelievable mismanagement and waste, such as occurred in my own State of Ohio, where thousands of dollars were spent for penicillin which Civil Defense officials later had to destroy as utterly useless.

This huge sum of money has gone largely to provide jobs for political hacks in county courthouses and city halls across the land, for shrieking sirens, for silly schemes such as useless synchronized traffic lights, in the city of Columbus, Ohio. Mr. President, there should have been indictments by the grand jury for the expenditure of nearly $700,000 of the taxpayers' money to synchronize the traffic lights, so that in the event of nuclear attack on the city of Columbus, all the lights would turn green one way—east-west or north-south—so that the citizens could flee. Those of us who sometimes drive home at 4:30 or 5 o'clock at night can imagine the traffic jam which would result. Just think of the additional loss of life that would occur, as a result of this scheme, if the Soviet Union were to drop a nuclear bomb on the city of Columbus, Ohio.

I do not know why they would drop it there. They might want to drop it while the General Assembly of Ohio was in session. If they did, and if, unfortunately, the legislators of my State assembled in Columbus, Ohio, were to be killed by the effects of a nuclear bomb, I have faith and confidence that a divine providence would come to the rescue of my beloved State and fill the vacant chairs at Columbus.

I seriously doubt that today there is one American in 10,000 who has any idea of what he or she has to do in the event of an enemy attack. The ridiculous shelter program advocated by these boondogglers in civil defense is plain nonsense in this nuclear age. Evidently the American people agree with that assertion, because during the months of April and May of this year a total of 18 people in the United States—a total of 18 in the entire Nation—sought home improvement loans for bomb shelters from the Federal Housing Administration.

Incidentally, one person, who may have wanted to waste a few thousand dollars of his own money, attempted to build one in Washington, D.C. He immediately found himself in trouble with the authorities, because he discovered that local building regulations required that he put windows in his shelter.

Mr. President, the volunteer civil defense workers are the only ones who have made any sacrifice whatsoever. Some of the money now spent for salaries of subaverage civil defense planners would be put to better use to finance a national disaster corps whose base would be formed by these dedicated volunteer workers.

They have rendered needful services, while the paid civil defense officials sit smugly behind their desks, direct matters, and do not make any sacrifices. I do not think they even make a sacrifice when they draw their pay each month. I imagine their checks are delivered to them.

These volunteer workers could accomplish just as much were they to be deputized as auxiliary policemen or special duty sheriffs.

In the history of our Nation, whenever there have been floods, fires, catastrophes, and calamities, people have come forward and have helped their neighbors. They will always do so whether they wear civil defense armbands or not.

Mr. President, you, and others in this Chamber, have served in the Armed Forces of our country in time of war. Can you, Mr. President, imagine what a hard-boiled Army sergeant would say to some civilian with an armband who tried to interfere with the movement of troops or civilians at a moment of nuclear attack, at a time when the President of the United States had declared an emergency and has placed the military in charge?

We should be hopeful, however, that next January there will be a new administration and a new President, a President who has had congressional and senatorial experience, a President who will review this entire program realistically, a President who knows the utter folly of civil defense as now conducted.

Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY and Vice President RICHARD NIXON are both well aware of the ridiculous and foolhardy situation that now exists with respect to our civil defense preparedness. It is my fervent hope that one of the first acts of the new President, following January 20, will be to abolish the superannuated Civil Defense Agency and to turn this vital function over to the leaders of our Armed Forces, where it rightfully belongs.

Mr. President, every American has reason to be proud of the Armed Forces of this country. What more important factor is there in the defense of this Nation than to defend the lives of our civilians? Of course, that duty should be entrusted, and it will be, I am confident, by the new administration, to the hands of those in whom it rightfully belongs—the Armed Forces of our country.

The Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization has been operated under Director Leo A. Hoegh, ex-Governor of Iowa. By the way, Mr. President, second terms are quite customary for Governors. In my State of Ohio, my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Ohio, was elected for five terms. It is customary, when a man has performed a good job as Governor of his State, that he is given a second term. However, Leo A. Hoegh, Director of the Civil Defense Agency and an ex-Governor of Iowa, was denied a second term by the citizens of his State, who knew him best. But we do not need to be concerned about him, because when he lost his $12,000 per year job as Governor of the sovereign State of Iowa, he was appointed to a $22,500 a year job as head of this huge boondoggle, the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization—and it has been a boondoggle, and nothing more, throughout the last 10 years.

Because the defense and safety of our citizens is a major part of the defense of the United States of America, were this Nation to be attacked by the Soviet Union, every Senator here knows that before the time the first enemy missile struck, the President of the United States, as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of our country, would declare a state of emergency, and the military would take over.

Mr. President, you, as a student of the history of the United States, recall that the War Between the States, the war we northerners call the Civil War, was a brutal war in those days, and a prolonged war. Yet today it would be considered a limited or brush-fire war when one considers what would occur were the Soviet Union or Red China to attack this country without warning.

In the Civil War, or the War Between the States, President Abraham Lincoln at the outset, shortly after the first shot was fired at Fort Sumter, declared martial law. The President suspended the writ of habeas corpus. The military forces of the Union took charge in the North, as the armed forces of the South did likewise there. That was done in what now would be called a limited war.

In an all-out war, when this Nation is threatened with annihilation, civilians in armbands will not be of any help. Some of them are pompous paid civil defense officials such as those sitting around in my State of Ohio, some of whom draw more than $1,000 a month in salaries, doing nothing but waiting for the bomb to fall.

Mr. President, instant retaliation is our only defense against nuclear attack. Civil defense as it has been conducted throughout the last 10 years has served only to give patronage jobs to some "has been" politicians—usually to defeated politicians or hangers-on who have lost their jobs. These people seek out and secure the civil defense jobs, exactly as the defeated ex-Governor of Iowa was appointed to be head of this huge boondoggling, expensive agency, while the taxpayers sweat on and sweat on.

Mr. President, these political appointees are rendering no needful public service. They announce evacuation plans at one time and a shelter program at another time. They plan alerts and inconvenience citizens generally with their screaming sirens, the distribution of pamphlets, and so on. They have schools purchase identification bracelets, so that teenage boys and girls can exchange them with each other.

Mr. President, while a person may speak lightly on this subject, it is a serious matter. We must put a stop to this boondoggle which has in the last 10 years used up $1 billion of the taxpayers' money. Let us look forward with hope that the next President of the United States, an experienced legislator, whether it be the Republican nominee or the Democratic nominee, will direct that an end be put to this boondoggling outfit. It does nothing whatever for the defense of our country. In fact, it is weakening the Nation by causing a huge expenditure of money, and showing no results whatsoever.

I yield the floor.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12326) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and certain study commissions, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 4 and 10 to the bill, and concurred therein, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20 to the bill, and concurred therein with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12326) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and certain study commissions, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of August 30, 1960, p. 18367, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the conference report was signed by all the conferees. It was a unanimous report.

I believe that the Senate conferees did good work in maintaining or sustaining most of the projects which the Senate provided for during the consideration of the bill.

All legislation must be the result of adjusting the differences in a bill as passed by the two Houses of Congress. The conference bill does not provide all that I personally feel we should be providing to develop the water resources of this country. I would have liked to see the House agree to the Senate amendments; on the other hand, the House felt that it sent us a good bill and that we should have accepted the bill. I must agree that the House did send us a pretty good bill. Last year and this year the House did provide for some new starts. The new starts were good projects, and I believe the Senate committee would have recommended most of them if the House committee had not included them.

The Senate added 34 new starts under "Construction, general." The conferees agreed on 26 of the 34 new starts recommended by the Senate.

The conference report provides for direct appropriations of $3,938,819,305, which is $34,158,695 below the budget and $25,869,425 below the amount approved by the Senate. Of that reduction, $12,590,000 is a reduction in the item for savings and slippages. The conference report is $55,183,500 above the amount approved by the House.

I have a summary of the bill showing how the money is to be distributed among titles I, II, and III. Title I covers "Civil functions, Department of the Army." Title II covers certain agencies of the Department of the Interior. Title III covers the Atomic Energy Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and certain river basin study commissions.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the summary table be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Summary table

	Estimates, 1961	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference allowance
TITLE I				
CIVIL FUNCTIONS, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY				
Quartermaster Corps cemeterial expenses	$9,400,000	$9,400,000	$9,400,000	$9,400,000
Corps of Engineers:				
General investigations	9,700,000	10,895,800	13,062,800	12,023,000
Construction	710,819,000	662,622,300	737,884,600	706,491,600
Operation and maintenance	126,325,000	126,420,000	126,420,000	126,420,000
General expenses	12,120,000	12,120,000	12,120,000	12,120,000
Mississippi River and tributaries	69,500,000	69,560,000	74,896,000	71,896,000
St. Lawrence Joint Board of Engineers	30,000	30,000	30,000	30,000
International Navigation Congresses	180,000	150,000	180,000	150,000
Total, Corps of Engineers	928,674,000	881,798,100	964,563,400	929,130,600
Total, title I	938,074,000	891,198,100	973,963,400	938,530,600
TITLE II				
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR				
Bureau of Reclamation:				
General investigations	4,650,000	4,575,000	5,376,000	4,893,000
General investigations (special foreign currency program)	4,957,000		4,522,000	
Construction and rehabilitation	173,950,000	166,444,880	173,855,200	166,444,880
Operation and maintenance	31,900,000	31,000,000	31,443,000	31,443,000
Loan program	18,437,000	9,742,825	11,642,825	11,642,825
General administrative expenses	4,320,000	4,200,000	4,320,000	4,290,000
Boulder City municipal fund	(150,000)	(150,000)	(150,000)	(150,000)
Disposal of Coulee Dam community	(15,000)	(15,000)	(15,000)	(15,000)
Upper Colorado River Basin fund	64,900,000	61,400,000	61,400,000	61,400,000
Total, Bureau of Reclamation	303,114,000	277,362,705	292,559,025	280,113,705
Office of the Secretary, Southeastern Power Administration, operation and maintenance	800,000	800,000	800,000	800,000
Southwestern Power Administration:				
Construction	1,325,000	1,325,000	1,325,000	1,325,000
Operation and maintenance	1,250,000	1,200,000	1,250,000	1,250,000
Continuing fund	(5,000,000)	(5,000,000)	(5,000,000)	(5,000,000)
Total, Southwestern Power Administration	2,575,000	2,525,000	2,575,000	2,575,000
Bonneville Power Administration:				
Construction	18,720,000	18,720,000	18,720,000	18,720,000
Operation and maintenance	10,975,000	10,750,000	10,850,000	10,800,000
Total, Bonneville Power Administration	29,695,000	29,470,000	29,570,000	29,520,000
Total, title II	336,184,000	310,157,705	325,504,025	313,008,705
TITLE III				
INDEPENDENT OFFICES				
Atomic Energy Commission:				
Operating expenses	2,459,800,000	2,450,360,000	2,452,960,000	2,451,210,000
Plant acquisition and construction	215,500,000	208,500,000	223,000,000	212,750,000
Total, Atomic Energy Commission	2,675,300,000	2,659,060,000	2,675,960,000	2,663,960,000
River Basin Study Commission for South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Florida, salaries and expenses	1,600,000	1,500,000	1,600,000	1,550,000
River Basin Study Commission for Texas, salaries and expenses	1,300,000	1,200,000	1,300,000	1,250,000
Tennessee Valley Authority	20,520,000	20,520,000	20,520,000	20,520,000
Total, title III	2,698,720,000	2,682,280,000	2,699,380,000	2,687,280,000
Grand total, definite appropriations	3,972,978,000	3,883,635,805	3,998,847,425	3,938,819,305

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the conferees had to take a substantial cut on "General investigations." It will be recalled that the Senate provided $13,062,800 for that purpose. The House had provided $10,895,800. The conferees agreed on $12,023,000. I ask unanimous consent that the table on "General investigations" be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

Amendment No. 1—General investigations

Item	Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1961	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference allowance
(1)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS				
1. Examinations and surveys:				
(a) Navigation studies	$880,000	$1,084,200	$1,556,700	$1,320,000
(b) Flood control studies	2,720,000	3,561,600	4,496,100	4,000,000
(c) Beach erosion cooperative studies	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
(d) Special studies:				
(1) San Francisco Bay survey	400,000	400,000	600,000	500,000
(2) Ohio River Basin review	400,000	400,000	400,000	400,000
(3) Great Lakes Harbor survey	107,000	107,000	264,000	264,000
(4) Coordination studies with other agencies	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
(5) Delaware River comprehensive survey				
(6) Rampart Canyon, Alaska	100,000	100,000	350,000	225,000
(7) Hurricane studies	850,000	850,000	850,000	850,000
(8) Hudson River (siltation) studies	90,000	90,000	90,000	90,000
(9) Potomac River review	400,000	400,000	400,000	400,000
(10) Colorado River, Tex	118,000	118,000	200,000	118,000
(11) Trinity River	250,000	250,000	321,000	321,000
Subtotal, examinations and surveys	6,615,000	7,660,800	9,827,800	8,788,000
2. Collection and study of basic data:				
(a) Stream gaging (U.S. Geological Survey)	235,000	235,000	235,000	235,000
(b) Precipitation studies (U.S. Weather Bureau)	340,000	340,000	340,000	340,000
(c) Fish and wildlife studies (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service)	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
(d) International water studies	60,000	60,000	60,000	60,000
Subtotal, collection and study of basic data	685,000	685,000	685,000	685,000
3. Research and development:				
(a) Beach erosion development studies	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
(b) Hydrologic studies	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
(c) Civil works investigations	1,200,000	1,200,000	1,200,000	1,200,000
(d) Mississippi Basin model:				
(1) Construction	700,000	700,000	700,000	700,000
(2) Mississippi River comprehensive study	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
Subtotal, research and development	2,400,000	2,400,000	2,400,000	2,400,000
4. Arkansas-Red River pollution survey		150,000	150,000	150,000
Total, general investigations	9,700,000	10,895,800	13,062,800	12,023,000

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, on "Construction, general," the conferees provided for 26 of the 34 new starts recommended by the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that the table showing the details of the conference agreement be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Construction, general, fiscal year 1961

	Construction, general, State and project	Budget estimate for fiscal year 1961		House allowance		Senate allowance		Conference allowance	
		Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
	Alabama:								
	Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)								
(N)	Columbia lock and dam, Alabama and Georgia	$3,325,000		$3,325,000		$3,325,000		$3,325,000	
(N)	Holt lock and dam		$378,000		$549,000	149,000	$400,000		$549,000
(N)	Jackson lock and dam	4,409,000		4,238,000		4,238,000		4,238,000	
(P)	Millers Ferry lock and dam				200,000		200,000		200,000
(P)	Walter F. George (Fort Gaines) lock and dam, Alabama and Georgia	20,178,000		20,178,000		20,178,000		20,178,000	
	Alaska:								
(N)	Douglas Harbor					[1] (364,000)		[1] (364,000)	
(FC)	Fairbanks		100,000		100,000		100,000		100,000
(N)	Homer Harbor, small-boat harbor	542,000				542,000		542,000	
(N)	Juneau Harbor					1,958,000			
(N)	Ninilchik Harbor	[1] (229,000)		[1] (229,000)		[1] (229,000)		[1] (229,000)	
(N)	Seldovia Harbor, small-boat harbor	548,000		548,000		548,000		548,000	
	Arizona:								
(FC)	Alamo Reservoir		175,000		175,000		175,000		175,000
(FC)	Gila River-Camelsback Reservoir					150,000		150,000	
(FC)	Tucson		90,000		90,000		90,000		90,000
	Arkansas:								
(N)	Arkansas River and tributaries, Arkansas and Oklahoma:								
	(a) Emergency bank stabilization	5,000,000		5,000,000		5,000,000		5,000,000	
	(b) Other bank stabilization					4,000,000		2,000,000	
(N)	Arkansas River and tributaries, Arkansas and Oklahoma (general studies)		381,000		381,000		381,000		381,000
(N)	Arkansas River and tributaries, navigation locks and dams, Arkansas and Oklahoma						200,000		
(P)	Beaver Reservoir	2,800,000		2,800,000		2,800,000		2,800,000	
(P)	Bull Shoals Reservoir (units 5 and 6), Ark. and Mo	3,200,000		3,200,000		3,200,000		3,200,000	
(P)	Bull Shoals Reservoir (units 7 and 8), Ark. and Mo	100,000		100,000		100,000		100,000	
(P)	Dardanelle lock and dam	6,100,000		6,100,000		6,100,000		6,100,000	
(P)	DeGray Reservoir		300,000		300,000		300,000		300,000
(FC)	Gillham Reservoir		100,000		100,000		100,000		100,000
(P)	Greers Ferry Reservoir	14,143,000		14,143,000		14,143,000		14,143,000	
(FC)	McKinney Bayou and Barkman Creek, Ark. and Tex	668,000		668,000		668,000		668,000	
(FC)	Millwood Reservoir					500,000		500,000	
(N)	Ouachita River, 9-foot project, Arkansas and Louisiana						150,000		
(FC)	Red River at Garland City [2]					200,000		200,000	
(FC)	Red River levees and bank stabilization below Denison Dam, Ark., La., and Tex	700,000		700,000		700,000		700,000	
	Table Rock Reservoir, Ark. and Mo. (See Missouri.)								

See footnotes at end of table.

Construction, general, fiscal year 1961—Continued

	Construction, general, State and project	Budget estimate for fiscal year 1961		House allowance		Senate allowance		Conference allowance	
		Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
	California:								
(FC)	Bear Creek		$70,000		$70,000		$70,000		$70,000
(FC)	Black Butte Reservoir	$5,900,000		$5,900,000		$5,900,000		$5,900,000	
(R)	Bodega Bay					405,000		405,000	
(FC)	Carbon Canyon Dam and channels	1,207,000		1,207,000		1,207,000		1,207,000	
(FC)	Devil, East Twin, Warm, and Lytle Creeks	1,300,000		1,300,000		1,300,000		1,300,000	
(N)	Halfmoon Bay Harbor (Pillar Point)	1,800,000		1,800,000		1,800,000		1,800,000	
(FC)	Los Angeles County drainage area	13,100,000		13,100,000		13,100,000		13,100,000	
(FC)	Lower San Joaquin River and tributaries	1,260,000		1,260,000		1,260,000		1,260,000	
(FC)	Middle Creek	403,000		403,000		403,000		403,000	
(FC)	Mill Creek levees	503,000		503,000		503,000		503,000	
(FC)	Mojave River Reservoir						50,000		
(FC)	New Hogan Reservoir	1,800,000		1,800,000		1,800,000		1,800,000	
(N)	Noyo River and Harbor (breakwater)						56,000		56,000
(FC)	Oroville Reservoir		50,000		50,000		50,000		50,000
(FC)	Pine Flat Reservoir	500,000		500,000		500,000		500,000	
(N)	Playa Del Rey Inlet and Harbor	154,000		154,000		154,000		154,000	
(N)	Port Hueneme Harbor	2,422,000		2,422,000		2,422,000		2,422,000	
(FC)	Russian River Reservoir	400,000		400,000		400,000		400,000	
(FC)	Sacramento River	2,200,000		2,200,000		2,200,000		2,200,000	
(FC)	Sacramento River and major and minor tributaries	1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	
(FC)	Sacramento River, Chico Landing to Red Bluff		50,000		50,000		50,000		50,000
(N)	Sacramento River deep-water ship channel	8,000,000		5,000,000		8,000,000		7,000,000	
(FC)	San Antonio and Chino Creeks	1,336,000		1,336,000		1,336,000		1,336,000	
(FC)	San Jacinto River and Bautista Creek	1,300,000		1,300,000		1,300,000		1,300,000	
(FC)	San Lorenzo Creek	1,608,000		1,608,000		1,608,000		1,608,000	
(FC)	Santa Clara River	305,000		305,000		305,000		305,000	
(N)	Santa Cruz Harbor	300,000				300,000			
(FC)	Santa Maria Valley levees	1,850,000		1,850,000		1,850,000		1,850,000	
(FC)	Success Reservoir	2,588,000		2,588,000		2,588,000		2,588,000	
(FC)	Terminus Reservoir	6,300,000		6,300,000		6,300,000		6,300,000	
	Truckee River and tributaries, California and Nevada. (See Nevada.)								
(FC)	Tuolumne River Reservoir (new Don Pedro)		25,000		25,000		25,000		25,000
	Colorado:								
(FC)	Trinidad Reservoir		185,000		185,000		185,000		185,000
	Connecticut:								
(FC)	Black Rock Reservoir, Branch Brook						75,000		
(N)	Bridgeport Harbor 1958 Act (351 main harbor)	750,000		750,000		750,000		750,000	
(FC)	East Branch Reservoir		150,000		150,000		150,000		150,000
(FC)	Hall Meadow Brook Reservoir	1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	
(FC)	Hancock Brook Reservoir						75,000		75,000
(FC)	Mad River Reservoir	870,000		870,000		870,000		870,000	
(FC)	Northfield Brook Reservoir						60,000		60,000
(FC)	Pawcatuck						38,000		38,000
(FC)	Thomaston Reservoir	1,547,000		1,547,000		1,547,000		1,547,000	
	Delaware:								
(N)	Inland Waterway, Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay, Del. and Md.: Canal improvement (pt. II)		103,000		103,000		103,000		103,000
(BE)	Rehoboth Beach to Indian River Inlet (reimbursement)	75,000		75,000		75,000		75,000	
	Florida:								
	Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)								
(FC)	Central and southern Florida	10,000,000		10,000,000		11,500,000		11,500,000	
(N)	Cross Florida barge canal						160,000		
(N)	Intracoastal Waterway, Caloosahatchee River to Anclote River	2,000,000		2,000,000		2,000,000		2,000,000	
(N)	Intracoastal Waterway, Jacksonville to Miami					400,000		400,000	
(BE)	Lake Worth Inlet to South Lake Worth Inlet, Palm Beach County (reimbursement)	118,200		118,200		118,200		118,200	
(N)	Little Manatee River (deferred for restudy)		12,000		12,000		12,000		12,000
(N)	Port Everglades Harbor, 1958 act	750,000		750,000		750,000		750,000	
(N)	Tampa Harbor, 30-, 34-, and 36-foot channels	117,000		117,000		117,000		117,000	
	Georgia:								
	Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)								
(P)	Carters Dam						150,000		75,000
	Columbia lock and dam, Alabama and Georgia. (See Alabama.)								
(P)	Hartwell Reservoir, Ga. and S.C	21,375,000		21,375,000		21,375,000		21,375,000	
(N)	Savannah River below Augusta	900,000		900,000		900,000		900,000	
	Walter F. George lock and dam, Alabama and Georgia. (See Alabama.)								
	Hawaii:								
(N)	Hilo Harbor						100,000		100,000
(N)	Honolulu Harbor	1,216,000		1,216,000		1,216,000		1,216,000	
(N)	Kahului Harbor					808,000		808,000	
(FC)	Kawainui Swamp	500,000		500,000		500,000		500,000	
	Idaho:								
(P)	Bruces Eddy Reservoir (construction not yet authorized)						600,000		600,000
(FC)	Columbia River local protection: Blackfoot River					(1)		(1)	
	Illinois:								
(FC)	Beardstown	700,000		700,000		700,000		700,000	
(N)	Calumet Harbor, Ill. and Ind						70,000		70,000
(R)	Calumet Harbor and River, Ill. and Ind. (breakwater)		31,000		31,000		31,000		31,000
(N)	Calumet Harbor and River, Ill. and Ind. (Cargill docks only)					225,000		225,000	
(FC)	Campbells Island	175,000				175,000			
(FC)	Carlyle Reservoir	3,500,000		3,500,000		3,500,000		3,500,000	
(BA)	Chicago, Burlington & Quincy RR. bridge, including channel change	752,000		752,000		752,000		752,000	
(FC)	Clear Creek Drainage and Levee District	270,000		270,000		270,000		270,000	
(FC)	East St. Louis and vicinity	2,476,000		2,476,000		2,476,000		2,476,000	
(FC)	Freeport (deferred for restudy)		10,000		10,000		10,000		10,000
(FC)	Henderson County Drainage District No. 2						50,000		
(FC)	Hunt Drainage District and Lima Lake Drainage District	900,000		900,000		900,000		900,000	
(N)	Illinois Waterway Calumet-Sag Channel (pt. I)	9,500,000		7,500,000		9,500,000		7,500,000	
(BE)	Kenilworth (reimbursement)	5,200		5,200		5,200		5,200	
(N)	Mississippi River between St. Louis, Mo., and lock and dam 26, dam 27, Illinois and Missouri	1,500,000		1,500,000		1,500,000		1,500,000	

See footnotes at end of table.

Construction, general, fiscal year 1961—Continued

Construction, general, State and project	Budget estimate for fiscal year 1961		House allowance		Senate allowance		Conference allowance	
	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
Illinois—Continued								
(N) Mississippi River between the Ohio and Missouri Rivers, Ill. and Mo.: Regulating works	$1,500,000		$1,500,000		$1,500,000		$1,500,000	
(R) Mississippi River between the Ohio and Missouri Rivers (repair dikes and revetments)		$20,000		$20,000		$20,000		$20,000
(N) Mississippi River between Missouri River and Minneapolis, Minn.: Rectification of damages	2,660,000		2,660,000		2,660,000		2,660,000	
(FC) Shelbyville Reservoir		250,000		250,000		250,000		250,000
(FC) Sny Island Levee District						100,000		
(FC) Subdistrict No. 1 of Drainage Union No. 1 and Bay Island Drainage and Levee District		111,000		111,000		111,000		111,000
(FC) The Sny Basin	1,800,000		1,800,000		1,800,000		1,800,000	
(FC) Wood River Drainage and Levee District	1,180,000		1,180,000		1,180,000		1,180,000	
Indiana: Calumet Harbor, Ill. and Ind. (See Illinois.)								
(N) Cannelton locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky				150,000		150,000		150,000
(FC) Evansville	450,000		100,000		100,000		100,000	
(FC) Huntington Reservoir		125,000		125,000		125,000		125,000
(N) Indiana Harbor						25,000		25,000
(FC) Levee unit No. 5, Wabash River						25,000		25,000
Louisville lock and dam Indiana, and Kentucky. (See Kentucky.)								
Maryland locks and dam, Indiana, Kentucky, and Ohio. (See Kentucky.)								
(FC) Mason J. Niblack levee					100,000			
(FC) Mississinewa Reservoir		156,000		156,000		156,000		156,000
(FC) Monroe Reservoir	275,000		275,000		275,000		275,000	
(FC) Salamonie Reservoir		56,000		56,000	400,000	56,000		56,000
(FC) Sugar Creek levee		15,000		15,000		15,000		15,000
(FC) West Terre Haute					100,000		100,000	
Iowa: Decatur Bend Cutoff [2]			155,000		155,000		155,000	
(N) Dubuque					[1]		[1]	
(FC) Floyd River and tributaries	791,900		791,900		791,900		791,900	
(FC) Green Bay Levee and Drainage District No. 2		45,000		45,000		45,000		45,000
(FC) Little Sioux River	2,300,000		2,300,000		2,300,000		2,300,000	
(FC) Missouri River agricultural levees, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska (active portion only) [2]				175,000		175,000		175,000
(N) Missouri River channel stabilization, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska:								
(a) Sioux City, Iowa, to Omaha, Nebr	5,600,000		5,600,000		5,600,000		5,600,000	
(b) Omaha, Nebr., to Kansas City	2,800,000		2,800,000		2,800,000		2,800,000	
(c) Kansas City to the mouth	3,475,000		3,475,000		3,475,000		3,475,000	
Missouri River, Kenslers Bend, Nebr., to Sioux City, Iowa, Nebr. and S. Dak. (See Nebraska.)								
(FC) Muscatine Island Levee District and Muscatine-Louisa County Drainage District No. 13	1,400,000		1,400,000		1,400,000		1,400,000	
(FC) Rathbun Reservoir				130,000		130,000		130,000
(FC) Red Rock Reservoir	3,600,000		3,600,000		3,600,000		3,600,000	
(FC) Saylorville Reservoir		165,000		165,000		165,000		165,000
Kansas:								
(FC) Council Grove Reservoir	2,000,000		2,000,000		2,000,000		2,000,000	
(FC) Frankfort		20,000		20,000		20,000		20,000
(FC) John Redmond (Strawn) Reservoir	3,800,000		3,800,000		3,800,000		3,800,000	
(FC) Kansas City, Kans. and Mo					500,000		500,000	
(FC) Lawrence						50,000		
(FC) Manhattan	800,000		800,000		800,000		800,000	
(FC) Marion Reservoir		150,000		150,000		150,000		150,000
(FC) Milford Reservoir	1,000,000			250,000	500,000		500,000	
Missouri River agricultural levees, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)								
Missouri River channel stabilization, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)								
(FC) Ottawa	940,000		940,000		940,000		940,000	
(FC) Perry Reservoir		175,000		175,000		175,000		175,000
(FC) Pomona Reservoir	3,500,000		3,500,000		3,500,000		3,500,000	
(FC) Topeka	1,700,000		1,700,000		1,700,000		1,700,000	
(FC) Tuttle Creek Reservoir	16,500,000		16,500,000		16,500,000		16,500,000	
(FC) Wilson Reservoir	2,000,000		2,000,000		2,000,000		2,000,000	
Kentucky:								
(P) Barkley Dam, Ky. and Tenn	17,100,000		3,300,000		17,100,000		17,100,000	
Cannelton locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky. (See Indiana.)								
(N) Captain Anthony Meldahl locks and dam (New Richmond), Kentucky and Ohio	15,000,000		15,000,000		15,000,000		15,000,000	
(FC) Fishtrap Reservoir		349,000		349,000	300,000	349,000		349,000
(N) Greenup locks and dam, Kentucky and Ohio	9,959,000		9,959,000		9,959,000		9,959,000	
(N) Louisville locks and dam (lock and dam No. 41), Indiana and Kentucky	9,215,000		9,215,000		9,215,000		9,215,000	
(N) Markland locks and dam, Indiana, Kentucky, and Ohio	12,600,000		12,600,000		12,600,000		12,600,000	
(FC) Nolin Reservoir	2,600,000		2,600,000		2,600,000		2,600,000	
(FC) No. 2 Barren Reservoir	2,175,000		2,175,000		2,175,000		2,175,000	
(FC) No. 2 Green Reservoir		100,000		100,000		100,000		100,000
Louisiana:								
(N) Aquatic plant control, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Texas, and Louisiana	700,000		700,000		700,000		700,000	
(N) Barataria Bay Waterway	1,116,000		1,116,000		1,116,000		1,116,000	
(FC) Bayou Chevreuil	502,000		502,000		502,000		502,000	
(N) Bayou Lafourche						90,000		90,000
(N) Calcasieu River and Pass						100,000		100,000
(N) Gulf Intracoastal Waterway:								
(a) Freshwater Bayou						90,000		90,000
(b) Plaquemine-Morgan City alternate route	4,166,000		4,166,000		4,166,000		4,166,000	
(SN) Lake Providence Channel					[1]			
(N) Mississippi River, Baton Rouge to the Gulf of Mexico	2,000,000		2,000,000		2,000,000		2,000,000	
(N) Mississippi River, gulf outlet	8,750,000		8,750,000		8,750,000		8,750,000	
(N) Petit Anse, Tigre and Carlin Bayous					[1]		[1]	
Red River levees and bank stabilization below Denison Dam, Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas. (See Arkansas.)								

See footnotes at end of table.

Construction, general, fiscal year 1961—Continued

	Construction, general, State and project	Budget estimate for fiscal year 1961		House allowance		Senate allowance		Conference allowance	
		Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
	Maine:								
(N)	Eastport Harbor					$300,000		$300,000	
(N)	Scarboro River					117,000		117,000	
(N)	Southwest Harbor					(1)		(1)	
(N)	Stonington Harbor					(1)		(1)	
(N)	York Harbor					391,000		391,000	
	Maryland:								
(N)	Baltimore Harbor and Channel, 42 feet, 1958 act	$1,500,000		$1,500,000		2,500,000		2,000,000	
	Inland waterway, Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay, Delaware, and Maryland, canal improvement. (See Delaware.)								
	Massachusetts:								
(BA)	Chelsea Bridge	242,000		242,000		242,000		242,000	
(FC)	Littleville Reservoir		$154,000		$154,000		$154,000		$154,000
(BE)	Quincy shore (reimbursement)	645,000		645,000		645,000		645,000	
(FC)	West Hill Reservoir	733,000		733,000		733,000		733,000	
(FC)	Westville Reservoir	2,660,000		2,660,000		2,660,000		2,660,000	
	Michigan:								
(FC)	Battle Creek	250,000		250,000		250,000		250,000	
(R)	Grand Haven Harbor (revetment)		27,000		27,000		27,000		27,000
(N)	Grand Marais Harbor	732,000		732,000		732,000		732,000	
(N)	Great Lakes connecting channels	30,000,000		30,000,000		30,000,000		30,000,000	
(N)	Hammond Bay Harbor					200,000		200,000	
(N)	Manistee Harbor						75,000		75,000
(R)	Menominee Harbor, Mich. and Wis. (south pier and north pier)		31,500		31,500		31,500		31,500
(N)	Presque Isle Harbor						10,000		10,000
(N)	St. Marys River: New Poe Lock	1,350,000		1,350,000		1,350,000		1,350,000	
(R)	St. Joseph Harbor				84,000		84,000		84,000
(R)	South Haven Harbor				63,000		63,000		63,000
(N)	Trenton Channel Harbor				90,000		90,000		90,000
	Minnesota:								
(N)	Duluth-Superior Harbor, outer harbor, Minnesota and Wisconsin						60,000		60,000
(N)	Duluth-Superior Harbor, inner harbor, Minnesota and Wisconsin						50,000		
(N)	Minnesota River, 9-foot channel	500,000		500,000		500,000		500,000	
	Mississippi River between Missouri River and Minneapolis, Minn., rectification of damages. (See Illinois.)								
(FC)	Red River of the North, Minn. and N. Dak	368,000		368,000		368,000		368,000	
	Redwood River at Marshall				60,000		60,000		60,000
(FC)	Rushford		75,000		75,000		75,000		75,000
(N)	St. Anthony Falls	4,900,000		4,900,000		4,900,000		4,900,000	
(FC)	St. Paul and South St. Paul			500,000		500,000		500,000	
(N)	Two Harbors						6,000		6,000
(FC)	Winona		80,000		80,000		80,000		80,000
	Mississippi:								
	Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)								
	Pascagoula Harbor (33-foot main channel) [2]					850,000			100,000
	Missouri:								
	Bull Shoals Reservoir (units 5, 6, 7, and 8), Ark. and Mo. (See Arkansas.)								
(FC)	Fabius River Drainage District	350,000		350,000		350,000		350,000	
(FC)	Joanna Reservoir [2]				100,000		100,000		100,000
	Kansas Citys, Kans. and Mo. (See Kansas.)								
(FC)	Kaysinger Bluff Reservoir		400,000		400,000		400,000		400,000
	Mississippi River between St. Louis, Mo. and lock and dam 26, Illinois and Missouri, dam 27. (See Illinois.)								
	Mississippi River between the Ohio and Missouri Rivers, Ill. and Mo.: Regulating works. (See Illinois.)								
	Missouri River agricultural levees, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)								
	Missouri River Channel stabilization, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)								
(FC)	Perry County Drainage and Levee Districts 1, 2, and 3			75,000		75,000		75,000	
(FC)	Pomme de Terre Reservoir	3,600,000		3,600,000		3,600,000		3,600,000	
(FC)	South River Drainage District				60,000		60,000		60,000
(FC)	St. Louis	6,250,000		6,250,000		6,250,000		6,250,000	
(P)	Stockton Reservoir		250,000		250,000		250,000		250,000
(P)	Table Rock Reservoir, Ark. and Mo	600,000		600,000		600,000		600,000	
	Montana:								
(P)	Fort Peck Dam (2d powerplant)	4,500,000		4,500,000		4,500,000		4,500,000	
	Nebraska:								
(FC)	Gering Valley [2]	530,000				530,000		530,000	
	Missouri River agricultural levees, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)								
	Missouri River channel stabilization, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)								
(FC)	Missouri River (Kenslers Bend, Nebr., to Sioux City, Iowa, including Miners Bend), Iowa, Nebr., and S. Dak	770,000		770,000		770,000		770,000	
(FC)	Salt Creek and tributaries		162,000		162,000	500,000	162,000	412,000	
(FC)	Shell Creek and tributaries		75,000		75,000		75,000		75,000
	Nevada:								
	Gleason Creek (Keystone Reservoir)						40,000		20,000
	Las Vegas Wash						100,000		50,000
(FC)	Truckee River and tributaries, California and Nevada	154,000		154,000		154,000		154,000	
	New Hampshire:								
(FC)	Hopkinton-Everett Reservoirs	8,370,000		8,370,000		8,370,000		8,370,000	
	New Jersey:								
(N)	Delaware River, Philadelphia Naval Base to Trenton, Pennsylvania and New Jersey	11,700,000		11,700,000		11,700,000		11,700,000	
	New York Harbor—New Jersey pierhead line, New York and New Jersey. (See New York.)								
(BE)	Ocean City (reimbursement)	50,000		50,000		50,000		50,000	
	New Mexico:								
(FC)	Abiquiu Reservoir	4,600,000		4,600,000		4,600,000		4,600,000	
(FC)	Cochita Reservoir						100,000		50,000
(FC)	Galisteo Reservoir						50,000		50,000
(FC)	Rio Grande Floodway—Conchita to Rio Puerco	1,000,000		1,000,000		1,200,000		1,000,000	
(FC)	Socorro		157,000		157,000		157,000		157,000
(FC)	Two Rivers Reservoir	400,000		400,000		400,000		400,000	

See footnotes at end of table.

Construction, general, fiscal year 1961—Continued

	Construction, general, State and project	Budget estimate for fiscal year 1961		House allowance		Senate allowance		Conference allowance	
		Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
	New York:								
	Allegheny River Reservoir, Pennsylvania and New York. (See Pennsylvania.)								
(N)	Buffalo Harbor, south entrance				$16,000		$16,000		$16,000
(N)	Buffalo Harbor, north entrance	$1,900,000		$1,900,000		$1,900,000		$1,900,000	
(FC)	Endicott, Johnson City, and Vestal	335,000		335,000		335,000		335,000	
(N)	Great Lakes to Hudson River Waterway	400,000		400,000		400,000		400,000	
(R)	Great Sodus Bay Harbor (east and west piers)		$32,000		32,000		32,000		32,000
(N)	Hudson River, New York City to Albany, 32-foot channel	1,880,000		1,880,000		1,880,000		1,880,000	
(N)	Jamaica Bay					700,000		700,000	
(N)	New York Harbor—New Jersey pierhead line, New York and New Jersey	886,000		886,000		886,000		886,000	
(N)	New York Harbor, ocean to Bayside Channel					500,000			
(FC)	Nichols		51,000		51,000		51,000		51,000
(BA)	Ohio Street Bridge, Buffalo River	800,000		800,000		800,000		800,000	
(N)	Rochester Harbor						25,000		25,000
(BE)	Selkirk Shores State Park (reimbursement)	18,700		18,700		18,700		18,700	
(FC)	South Amsterdam		70,000		70,000		70,000		70,000
	North Carolina:								
	Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)								
(N)	Morehead City Harbor	942,000		942,000		942,000		942,000	
(N)	Ocracoke Inlet					185,000		185,000	
(FC)	Pantego and Cucklers Creek	473,000		473,000		473,000		473,000	
(FC)	Wilkesboro Reservoir	3,300,000		3,300,000		3,300,000		3,300,000	
	North Dakota:								
(P)	Garrison Reservoir	4,000,000		4,000,000		4,000,000		4,000,000	
(FC)	Lower Heart River	836,000		836,000		836,000		836,000	
	Red River of the North, Minnesota and North Dakota. (See Minnesota.)								
	Ohio:								
(N)	Ashtabula Harbor						40,000		40,000
(N)	Belleville locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia		250,000		250,000	500,000	250,000		250,000
	Captain Anthony Meldall locks and dam, Kentucky and Ohio. (See Kentucky.)								
(N)	Cleveland Harbor						20,000		20,000
(N)	Cleveland Harbor (1958 modification)		200,000		200,000		200,000		200,000
(R)	Cleveland Harbor (east and west breakwater)		20,000		20,000		20,000		20,000
(FC)	Dillon Reservoir	4,223,000		4,223,000		4,223,000		4,223,000	
	Greenup locks and dam, Kentucky and Ohio. (See Kentucky.)								
(N)	Lorain Harbor				300,000		300,000		300,000
	Markland lock and dam, Indiana, Kentucky, and Ohio. (See Kentucky.)								
(N)	New Cumberland locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia	6,180,000		6,180,000		6,180,000		6,180,000	
(N)	Pike Island locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia	9,000,000		9,000,000		9,000,000		9,000,000	
(N)	Sandusky Harbor				53,000		53,000		53,000
	Shenango River Reservoir, Pennsylvania and Ohio. (See Pennsylvania.)								
(N)	Toledo Harbor						60,000		60,000
(FC)	West Branch Mahoning River Reservoir	2,200,000		2,200,000		2,200,000		2,200,000	
	Oklahoma:								
	Arkansas River and Tributaries, Emergency Bank Stabilization, Arkansas and Oklahoma. (See Arkansas.)								
	Arkansas River and tributaries, general studies, Arkansas and Oklahoma. (See Arkansas.)								
(FC)	Broken Bow Reservoir					500,000		500,000	
(R)	Canton Reservoir		7,500		7,500		7,500		7,500
(P)	Eufaula Reservoir	20,700,000		20,700,000		20,700,000		20,700,000	
(FC)	Keystone Reservoir	17,400,000		14,630,000		17,400,000		17,400,000	
(FC)	Oologah Reservoir	3,700,000		3,700,000		3,700,000		3,700,000	
	Ouachita River 9-foot project, Arkansas and Oklahoma. (See Arkansas.)								
(FC)	Pine Creek Reservoir		150,000		150,000		150,000		150,000
	Oregon:								
(FC)	Blue River Reservoir		136,000		136,000		136,000		136,000
(R)	Columbia River at the mouth, south jetty		50,000		50,000		50,000		50,000
(FC)	Columbia River local protection: Malheur River-Vale unit	112,000		112,000		112,000		112,000	
(N)	Coos and Millicoma Rivers		23,000				23,000		
(R)	Coos Bay, south jetty		50,000		50,000		50,000		50,000
(P)	Cougar Reservoir	12,300,000		12,300,000		12,300,000		12,300,000	
(P)	Green Peter Reservoir	1,400,000		1,400,000		2,000,000		1,400,000	
(P)	Hills Creek Reservoir	10,500,000		10,500,000		10,500,000		10,500,000	
(P)	John Day lock and dam, Oregon and Washington	37,000,000		33,344,300		33,344,300		33,344,300	
(FC)	Lower Columbia River bank protection, Oregon and Washington	400,000		400,000		400,000		400,000	
(FC)	Lower Columbia River improvement to existing works:								
	(a) Multnomah County Drainage District	590,000		590,000		590,000		590,000	
	(b) Rainier Drainage District					200,000		200,000	
	(c) Sauvie Island Drainage District					150,000		150,000	
(N)	Rogue River Harbor at Gold Beach	2,018,000		2,018,000		2,018,000		2,018,000	
(R)	Siuslaw River, south jetty		30,000		30,000	150,000	30,000		30,000
(P)	The Dalles lock and dam, Oregon and Washington	1,900,000		1,900,000		1,900,000		1,900,000	
(R)	Umpqua River					150,000	30,000		30,000
(FC)	Willamette River Basin bank protection	500,000		500,000		500,000		500,000	
(FC)	Willamette River Basin channel improvement and major drainage:								
	(a) Area east of Albany						10,000		
	(b) West Muddy and Marys River						35,000		
(N)	Yaquina Bay and Harbor		300,000		300,000		300,000		300,000
	Pennsylvania:								
(FC)	Allegheny River Reservoir, Pa. and N.Y.	4,530,000		4,530,000		4,530,000		4,530,000	
(FC)	Bear Creek Reservoir	1,067,000		1,067,000		1,067,000		1,067,000	
(FC)	Bethlehem	1,300,000		1,300,000		1,300,000		1,300,000	
(FC)	Bradford	1,377,000		1,377,000		1,377,000		1,377,000	
(FC)	Brookville	500,000		500,000		500,000		500,000	
(FC)	Butler, Connoquenessing Creek						25,000		25,000
(FC)	Curwensville Reservoir		280,000		280,000		280,000		280,000
(N)	Dam 4, Monongahela River		130,000		130,000		130,000		130,000

See footnotes at end of table.

Construction, general, fiscal year 1961—Continued

	Construction, general, State and project	Budget estimate for fiscal year 1961		House allowance		Senate allowance		Conference allowance	
		Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
	Pennsylvania—Continued								
(FC)	Elkland		$75,000		$75,000		$75,000		$75,000
(N)	Erie Harbor				27,000		27,000		27,000
(FC)	Kettle Creek Reservoir	$2,200,000		$2,200,000		$2,200,000		$2,200,000	
(N)	Maxwell locks and dam, Monongahela River	1,400,000		1,400,000		1,400,000		1,400,000	
(FC)	Ridgway			200,000		200,000		200,000	
(FC)	Shenango River Reservoir, Pa. and Ohio	2,200,000		2,200,000		2,200,000		2,200,000	
(FC)	Stillwater Reservoir	455,000		455,000		455,000		455,000	
(FC)	Turtle Creek		150,000		150,000		150,000		150,000
(FC)	Tyrone		111,000		111,000		111,000		111,000
(FC)	Washington	400,000		400,000		400,000		400,000	
	Puerto Rico:								
(N)	San Juan Harbor—1958 act		70,000		70,000		70,000		70,000
	Rhode Island:								
(FC)	Fox Point Barrier	800,000		800,000		800,000		800,000	
(R)	Point Judith Harbor of Refuge (breakwaters)		13,000		13,000		13,000		13,000
	South Carolina:								
	Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)								
	Hartwell Reservoir, Ga. and S.C. (See Georgia.)								
	South Dakota:								
(P)	Big Bend Reservoir	10,000,000		10,000,000		10,000,000		10,000,000	
(P)	Fort Randall Reservoir	400,000		400,000		400,000		400,000	
	Missouri River, Kenslers Bend, Nebr. to Sioux City, Iowa, Nebraska, and South Dakota; (see Nebraska.)								
(P)	Oahe Reservoir [2]	53,500,000		53,500,000		53,500,000		53,500,000	
(FC)	Sioux Falls [2]						50,000		50,000
(FC)	Vermillion River						75,000		50,000
	Tennessee:								
	Barkley Dam, Ky. and Tenn. (See Kentucky.)								
(P)	Cordell Hull Dam				50,000		50,000		50,000
(P)	J. Percy Priest Reservoir (deferred for restudy)				10,000				
	Texas:								
	Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)								
(FC)	Bardwell Reservoir				125,000		125,000		125,000
(N)	Brazos Island Harbor	100,000		100,000		100,000		100,000	
(FC)	Buffalo Bayou and tributaries	2,500,000		2,500,000		2,500,000		2,500,000	
(FC)	Canyon Reservoir	2,900,000		2,900,000		3,100,000		2,900,000	
(FC)	Cooper Reservoir and channels	1,000,000		250,000		250,000		250,000	
(BA)	Corpus Christi Bridge	512,000		512,000		512,000		512,000	
(P)	Denison Dam and Reservoir (Lake Texoma)			200,000		200,000		200,000	
(N)	Freeport Harbor 36-and 38-ft. channels and realinement of outer bar channel	899,000				899,000		899,000	
(R)	Galveston Harbor (jetties)		85,000		85,000		85,000		85,000
(N)	Galveston Harbor and channel: Seawall	2,700,000		2,700,000		2,700,000		2,700,000	
(N)	Gulf Intracoastal Waterway:								
	(a) Channel to Port Mansfield	1,600,000		1,600,000		1,600,000		1,600,000	
	(b) Colorado River Channel	956,000		956,000		956,000		956,000	
	(c) Guadalupe River Channel to Victoria	1,400,000		1,400,000		1,400,000		1,400,000	
(N)	Houston ship channel: 40-foot project (bend easing and widening to 36 foot only)	1,240,000		1,240,000		1,240,000		1,240,000	
(N)	Madagorda ship channel: 36- and 38-foot channel—1958 act		266,000		266,000		266,000		266,000
(P)	McGee Bend Dam	6,000,000		6,000,000		6,500,000		6,000,000	
	McKinney Bayou and Barkman Creek, Ark. and Tex. (See Arkansas.)								
(FC)	Navarro Mills Reservoir	3,100,000		3,100,000		3,500,000		3,100,000	
(FC)	Pecos		51,000		51,000		51,000		51,000
(N)	Port Aransas-Corpus Christi Waterway: 36-foot channel	1,500,000		1,500,000		1,500,000		1,500,000	
(FC)	Proctor Reservoir	1,600,000		1,600,000		1,600,000		1,600,000	
	Red River levees and bank stabilization below Denison Dam, Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas. (See Arkansas.)								
(N)	Sabine-Neches Waterway	1,800,000		1,800,000		1,800,000		1,800,000	
(FC)	San Antonio Channel	1,100,000		1,100,000		1,100,000		1,100,000	
(FC)	Somerville Reservoir		100,000		100,000		100,000		100,000
(FC)	Stillhouse Hollow Dam					500,000			
(FC)	Texas City, Galveston Bay		169,000		169,000		169,000		169,000
(FC)	Waco Reservoir	11,000,000		11,000,000		11,000,000		11,000,000	
	Utah:								
(FC)	Little Dell Reservoir						50,000		
(FC)	Weber River and tributaries		35,000		35,000		35,000		35,000
	Vermont:								
(FC)	Ball Mountain Reservoir	2,223,000		2,223,000		2,223,000		2,223,000	
(R)	Burlington Harbor						50,000		50,000
(FC)	North Hartland Reservoir	735,000		735,000		735,000		735,000	
(FC)	North Springfield Reservoir	531,000		531,000		531,000		531,000	
(FC)	Townshend Reservoir	1,554,000		1,554,000		1,554,000		1,554,000	
	Virginia:								
(FC)	John W. Flannagan (Pound) Reservoir	3,100,000		3,100,000		3,100,000		3,100,000	
(FC)	North Fork Reservoir						25,000		25,000
	Washington:								
(P)	Chief Joseph Dam	300,000		300,000		300,000		300,000	
(FC)	Colfax	425,000		425,000		425,000		425,000	
(FC)	Dayton						26,300		26,300
(FC)	Howard A. Hanson (Eagle Gorge) Reservoir	4,400,000		4,400,000		4,400,000		4,400,000	
(P)	Ice Harbor lock and dam	30,000,000		30,000,000		30,000,000		30,000,000	
	John Day lock and dam, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.)								
(P)	Little Goose lock and dam		550,000		550,000		550,000		550,000
	Lower Columbia River bank protection, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.)								
(P)	Lower Monumental lock and dam					3,500,000		1,000,000	
(FC)	Sammamish River		50,000		50,000		50,000		50,000
(N)	Snohomish River						35,000		
	The Dalles Dam, Oreg. and Wash. (See Oregon.)								
	West Virginia:								
	Belleville locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.)								
(FC)	East Rainelle	404,000		404,000		404,000		404,000	
	New Cumberland locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.)								

See footnotes at end of table.

Construction, general, fiscal year 1961—Continued

Construction, general, State and project	Budget estimate for fiscal		House allowance		Senate allowance		Conference allowance	
	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
West Virginia—Continued								
(N) Opekiska lock and dam					$500,000		$500,000	
Pike Island locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.)								
(FC) Princeton	$350,000		$350,000		350,000		350,000	
(FC) Summersville Reservoir	4,400,000		4,400,000		4,400,000		4,400,000	
(FC) Williamson	300,000		300,000		300,000		300,000	
Wisconsin:								
(N) Ashland Harbor						$34,000		$34,000
Duluth-Superior Harbor, Minnesota and Wisconsin. (See Minnesota.)								
(FC) Eau Galle River		$250,000		$250,000		250,000		250,000
(N) Kewaunee Harbor					[1]		[1]	
Menominee Harbor, Michigan and Wisconsin. (See Michigan.)								
(R) Milwaukee Harbor (north breakwater and north pier)		71,000		71,000		71,000		71,000
(N) Milwaukee Harbor—outer harbor (reimbursement)	7,000		7,000		7,000		7,000	
(R) Sheboygan Harbor (north stub pier and south pier)		32,000		32,000		32,000		32,000
Wyoming:								
(FC) Jackson Hole	150,000		150,000		150,000		150,000	
(FC) Sheridan	340,000							
(FC) Emergency bank protection	300,000		300,000		300,000		300,000	
(FC) Local protection projects not requiring specific legislation	2,000,000		1,500,000		2,000,000		1,500,000	
(FC) Snagging and clearing	300,000		300,000		300,000		300,000	
Recreation facilities, completed projects	2,500,000		2,365,000		2,500,000		2,365,000	
Small navigation projects not requiring specific legislation					250,000			
Small authorized projects	2,000,000		2,000,000		3,750,000		3,047,000	
Fish and wildlife studies (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service)	500,000		500,000		500,000		500,000	
Rehabilitation of existing projects:								
(a) Advance engineering and design						114,000		114,000
(b) Construction small rehabilitation projects under $400,000	2,500,000		2,000,000		2,500,000		2,500,000	
Reduction for anticipated savings and slippages	−40,000,000		−60,000,000		−40,000,000		−52,500,000	
Total	700,203,000	9,216,000	649,915,300	11,307,000	722,054,300	14,430,300		
Lower Columbia River Fish Sanctuary program (Fish and Wildlife Service)	1,400,000		1,400,000		1,400,000		1,400,000	
Grand total, construction, general	701,603,000 (710,819,000)	9,216,000	651,315,300 (662,622,300)	11,307,000	723,454,300 (737,884,600)	14,430,300		

[1] Not included in totals—eligible for selection under appropriate lump-sum appropriation at end of table.

[2] Construction not to be started until all requirements of authorization have been met.

TABLE 5—*Bureau of Reclamation—Construction and rehabilitation*

State and project	Budget, fiscal year 1961		House allowance		Senate allowance		Conference allowance	
	Construction	Advance planning	Construction	Advance planning	Construction	Advance planning	Construction	Advance planning
Arizona:								
Boulder Canyon project	$2,857,000		$2,857,000		$2,857,000		$2,857,000	
Colorado River front work and levee system	769,500		769,500		869,500		869,500	
Gila project	4,219,000		4,219,000		4,219,000		4,219,000	
California:								
Central Valley project	61,306,100		61,138,100		61,635,300		61,278,100	
Colorado River front work and levee system. (See Arizona.)								
Klamath project. (See Oregon.)								
Washoe project. (See Nevada.)								
Colorado:								
Collbran project	5,140,000		5,140,000		5,140,000		5,140,000	
Trinidad project		$5,000		$5,000		$5,000		$5,000
Idaho:								
Minidoka project, north side pumping division	429,000		429,000		429,000		429,000	
Palisades project, Burns Creek Dam and powerplant			[1]		[1]		[1]	
Spokane Valley project. (See Washington.)								
Nevada:								
Boulder Canyon project. (See Arizona.)								
Washoe project, Prosser Creek Dam and Reservoir	3,137,000		3,137,000		3,137,000		3,137,000	
Washoe project, initial phase		149,000		149,000		149,000		149,000
New Mexico:								
McMillan Delta project	100,000		100,000		100,000		100,000	
Middle Rio Grande project	1,729,000		1,729,000		1,729,000		1,729,000	
Oklahoma:								
Washita project	6,960,000		6,960,000		6,960,000		6,960,000	
Norman project						150,000		150,000
Oregon:								
Crooked River project	2,235,000		2,235,000		2,235,000		2,235,000	
Klamath project	868,000		868,000		868,000		868,000	
Rogue River Basin project, Talent division	2,450,000		2,450,000		2,450,000		2,450,000	
Vale project, Bully Creek extension	173,000			121,000	173,000			121,000
Texas:								
Lower Rio Grande rehabilitation project, La Feria division	500,000		500,000		500,000		500,000	
Lower Rio Grande rehabilitation project, Mercedes division	2,500,000		2,500,000		2,500,000		2,500,000	
San Angelo project	11,000,000		11,000,000		11,000,000		11,000,000	
Utah:								
Provo River project	825,000		825,000		825,000		825,000	
Weber Basin project	8,283,000		8,183,000		8,283,000		8,183,000	
Washington:								
Chief Joseph Dam project, Greater Wenatchee division	2,000,000		2,000,000		2,000,000		2,000,000	
Columbia Basin project	6,100,000		4,606,000		6,100,000		4,606,000	
Spokane Valley project		100,000		100,000		100,000		100,000
Drainage and minor construction	921,120		800,000		946,120		946,120	
Rehabilitation and betterment	3,609,000		3,609,000		3,609,000		3,609,000	
Subtotal, construction and rehabilitation (exclusive of Missouri River Basin)	128,110,720	254,000	126,054,600	375,000	128,564,920	404,000	126,440,720	525,000

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 5—*Bureau of Reclamation—Construction and rehabilitation*—Continued

State and project	Budget, fiscal year 1961		House allowance		Senate allowance		Conference allowance	
	Construction	Advance planning	Construction	Advance planning	Construction	Advance planning	Construction	Advance planning
MISSOURI RIVER BASIN PROJECT								
Colorado:								
Narrows unit		$48,800		$48,800		$48,800		$48,800
Kansas:								
Almena unit	$1,000,000		$1,000,000		$1,000,000		$1,000,000	
Bostwick division. (See Nebraska.)								
Cedar Bluff unit	1,400,000		1,400,000		1,400,000		1,400,000	
Glen Elder unit		133,000		133,000		133,000		133,000
Kanopolis unit		1,000		1,000		1,000		1,000
Webster unit	617,000		617,000		617,000		617,000	
Montana:								
East Bench unit	2,800,000		2,800,000		2,800,000		2,800,000	
Helena Valley unit	565,000		565,000		565,000		565,000	
Jefferson unit		336,000		336,000		336,000		336,000
West Beach unit						80,000		
Yellowtail unit	2,500,000		2,500,000		2,500,000		2,500,000	
Nebraska:								
Ainsworth unit	1,500,000		1,500,000		1,500,000		1,500,000	
Bostwick division	821,000		821,000		821,000		821,000	
Cedar Rapids division		252,800		252,800		252,800		252,800
Farwell unit	7,700,000		7,700,000		7,700,000		7,700,000	
Frenchman-Cambridge division	5,439,000		5,439,000		5,439,000		5,439,000	
North Dakota:								
Garrison diversion unit		445,000		225,000		445,000		335,000
South Dakota:								
Crazy Horse, Tower, Greenwood, and Yankton units		109,400		109,400		109,400		109,400
Garrison diversion unit. (See North Dakota.)								
Oahe unit		18,000		18,000		113,000		113,000
Wyoming:								
Glendo unit	775,280		775,280		775,280		775,280	
Owl Creek unit	455,000		455,000		455,000		455,000	
Yellowtail unit. (See Montana.)								
Adjustment advance as to planning for stores on hand, prior year funds, etc.								
Transmission division	24,415,000		24,415,000		24,415,000		24,415,000	
Drainage and minor construction	598,000		598,000		598,000		598,000	
Subtotal, construction and advance planning (Missouri River Basin)	50,585,280	1,344,000	50,585,280	1,124,000	50,585,280	1,519,000	50,585,280	1,329,000
Investigations		656,000		656,000		782,000		782,000
Other department agencies		3,000,000		2,650,000		3,000,000		2,650,000
Total, Missouri River Basin project	50,585,280	5,000,000	50,585,280	4,430,000	50,585,280	5,301,000	50,585,280	4,761,000
Subtotal, construction and rehabilitation	183,950,000		181,444,880		184,855,200		182,312,000	
Undistributed reduction based on anticipated delays	−10,000,000		−15,000,000		−11,000,000		−15,867,120	
Total, construction and rehabilitation	173,950,000		166,444,880		173,855,200		166,444,880	

[1] $487,500 of previously appropriated funds available.

Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries, fiscal year 1961

Projects	Budget estimate for fiscal year 1961		House allowance		Senate allowance		Conference allowance	
	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
1. General investigations:								
(a) Examinations and surveys	$60,000		$60,000		$60,000		$60,000	
(b) Collection and study of basic data	55,000		55,000		55,000		55,000	
Subtotal, general investigations	115,000		115,000		115,000		115,000	
2. Construction and planning:								
Mississippi River levees	2,760,000		2,760,000		3,686,000		3,386,000	
Channel improvement	22,000,000		22,000,000		25,000,000		23,000,000	
Memphis Harbor	640,000		640,000		640,000		640,000	
Greenville Harbor	0		150,000		150,000		150,000	
Vicksburg Harbor	1,370,000		1,370,000		1,370,000		1,370,000	
Old River control	8,400,000		8,400,000		8,400,000		8,400,000	
St. Francis Basin	4,600,000		4,600,000		4,600,000		4,600,000	
Lower White River	150,000		150,000		150,000		150,000	
West Tennessee tributaries	400,000		400,000		400,000		400,000	
Wolf River and tributaries	500,000		500,000		500,000		500,000	
Lower Arkansas	530,000		530,000		600,000		600,000	
Tensas Basin:								
Boeuf and Tensas Rivers, etc	1,090,000		1,090,000		1,150,000		1,140,000	
Red River backwater	25,000		25,000		25,000		25,000	
Yazoo Basin:								
Sardis Reservoir	50,000		50,000		50,000		50,000	
Enid Reservoir	50,000		50,000		50,000		50,000	
Arkabutla Reservoir	70,000		70,000		70,000		70,000	
Grenada Reservoir	30,000		30,000		30,000		30,000	
Lower auxiliary channels	1,555,000		1,555,000		1,955,000		1,805,000	
Main stem	1,040,000		1,040,000		1,040,000		1,040,000	
Tributaries	450,000		450,000		450,000		450,000	
Big Sunflower River, etc	820,000		820,000		820,000		820,000	
Yazoo backwater	325,000		325,000		325,000		325,000	
Atchafalaya Basin	6,000,000		6,000,000		6,500,000		6,300,000	
Lake Pontchartrain	660,000		660,000		700,000		700,000	
Other work	0							
Subtotal, construction and planning	53,515,000		53,665,000		58,661,000		56,001,000	
3. Reduction for anticipated savings and slippages	−1,380,000		−1,470,000		−1,380,000		−1,470,000	
Total, construction and planning	52,135,000		52,195,000		57,281,000		54,531,000	
4. Maintenance	17,250,000		17,250,000		17,500,000		17,250,000	
5. Flood control emergencies								
Grand total	69,500,000		69,560,000		74,896,000		71,896,000	

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, with respect to title II, the conference bill provides $313,008,705, which is $12,495,320 below the amount allowed by the Senate and $2,851,000 above the amount allowed by the House.

With respect to title III, the conferees allowed $2,687,280,000, which is $5 million more than the amount allowed by the House and $12,100,000 below the amount approved by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to make inquiry about the report. The Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] was one of the conferees. I should like to ascertain whether he has any comment to make.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, all the Republican members of the conference committee signed the conference report. So far as I know, there was no controversy.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The conference report is agreeable to all of our conferees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 12326, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U.S.,
August 30, 1960.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 4 and 10 to the bill (H.R. 12326) entitled "An act making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and certain study commissions, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes," and concur therein;

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert: *Provided further,* That not to exceed $3,500,000 of this appropriation shall be transferred to the appropriation "Other Procurement, Navy," solely for construction of power reactor plants for the Antarctic.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Louisiana.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. BARTLETT. I rise to express my appreciation to the Senator from Louisiana and the members of his subcommittee for what they accomplished in respect to the essential projects in Alaska in their consideration of the report. I do not know how many years it has been since I started to give my thanks to the Senator in this field. It has been a good many, because consistently he has added money for needed projects which have benefited the economy of Alaska.

I am especially grateful to him and to the members of his subcommittee for having made it possible to start work on small-boat harbors at Homer and at Douglas, Alaska, and for having increased funds for studies looking forward to the construction of the greatest hydroelectric project in the United States at Rampart, Alaska. I know that the Senator persisted, insofar as he was able, in seeking to preserve the funds for the Juneau small-boat harbor, and it was not his fault or the fault of his colleagues that those funds were deleted.

Mr. ELLENDER. I was delighted to be of assistance to Alaska. Of course, as the Senator knows, it is almost impossible to retain all the projects that were placed in the bill. I believe Alaska received the majority of those that were included in the bill. I appreciate the kind remarks of my friend from Alaska.

THE NATION'S ECONOMIC WELFARE UNDER THE REPUBLICAN ADMINISTRATION, 1953–60

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, at the Republican Convention in Chicago, President Eisenhower commented on the fact that there are more Americans employed at higher wages and with more take-home pay than at any time in the Nation's history.

Statistics compiled by my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from New Hampshire, bears out the President's assertion.

Mr. President, because of the importance of these statistics in revealing the economic progress made during the last 7½ years, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point this report from the senior Senator from New Hampshire entitled "The Nation's Economic Welfare Under the Republican Administration, 1953–60."

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NATION'S ECONOMIC WELFARE UNDER THE REPUBLICAN ADMINISTRATION, 1953–60

(A report by U.S. Senator STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire)

The Republican administration has brought the Nation to the highest prosperity in history. More people are earning more and saving more and spending more; they are living better, eating better, getting a better education and receiving better health protection, enjoying more leisure and more culture—enjoying, in short, a higher and happier standard of living than ever before.

Cold statistics tell the tale.

National wealth is up:

	1952	1960
Gross national product	$347,000,000,000	$505,000,000,000
Personal income	301,000,000,000	406,000,000,000
Average personal income (all families and unattached individuals)	5,630	6,000
Financial assets of individuals	373,000,000,000	956,000,000,000
Total investment in plant and equipment (nonfarm residential structures, mining (underground) structures, producers' durable equipment, private nonfarm inventories)	$345,000,000,000	$562,000,000,000

Ten million more families have moved into income brackets of more than $4,000.

Labor is better off

	1952	1960
Total employment	61,000,000	68,700,000
Compensation of employees	$195,000,000,000	$295,000,000,000
Man-days idle through strikes	59,100,000	2,750,000
Average weekly wage	$67.97	$91.20

People are better prepared for a rainy day:

	1952	1960
Savings deposits in banks, credit unions, postal savings, building and loan associations (yearend)	$85,000,000,000	[1] $157,600,000,000
Life insurance, average per family (yearend)	$5,300	[1] $9,500
Number of persons with hospital insurance	92,000,000	128,000,000

[1] 1959.

Number of persons covered under social security has gone up nearly 12 million.

People are living better:

	1952	1960
Per capita consumer spending	$1,400	$1,760
	Percent	*Percent*
Percent owner-occupied homes	56.8	64.0
Percent of homes that are substandard (either dilapidated or lacking inside hot and cold running water, flush toilet and bath for unit's exclusive use)	32.5	14.9

People have more leisure and travel more:

	1952	1960
Average weekly hours of work in manufacturing industries.	41 hours	40 hours.
Average length of vacation in private, nonagricultural sector.	2 weeks	2.5 weeks.
Number of vacations away from home.	145,000,000	185,000,000.
Attendance at national parks.	42,300,000	71,045,000.
Motor-vehicle registration.	53,000,000	73,000,000.
New mileage of highways (in dollars) at all levels of government.	$4,871,000,000	$9,977,000,000.
Dollars spent in travel abroad.	$1,188,000,000	$2,550,000,000.

Education has moved forward:

	1952	1960
Number of elementary and secondary schoolrooms constructed	48,000	69,600
(Total: 1949–53	178,000	
1955–59	272,300)	
Expenditure for equipment, per pupil enrolled	$6.04	$9.15
Expenditures for public elementary and secondary schools in 48 States and the District of Columbia as percent of GNP	*Percent* 2.23	*Percent* 3.28

	1952	1960
Percent of population 15 years and up who completed high school.	35 percent....	41.7 percent.
Percent of population 20 years and up who completed college.	6 percent.....	7.3 percent.
Enrollment in adult education.	2,564,870.....	3,428,000 (1959).

Expenditures on church construction in the last 7 years have averaged close to $800 million a year; average in 6 previous years was $330 million. Even in constant dollars, up 60–70 percent.

All this has been achieved at the same time that inflation has been slowed down—from 48 percent in the Truman years to 11 percent in the last 7½. As the President said in Chicago, "There are more Americans employed at higher wages and with more take-home pay than ever before in our history. And today they have more confidence in the stability of their money than they have enjoyed in three decades."

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY VISCOUNT KILMUIR, LORD HIGH CHANCELLOR OF GREAT BRITAIN

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, it is a great privilege and pleasure for me at this time to introduce from our sister nation the British Commonwealth the Lord High Chancellor of Great Britain, Viscount Kilmuir.

I respectfully present to the Senate Viscount Kilmuir.

[Applause, Senators rising.]

AMENDMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TEACHERS SALARY ACT OF 1955, AS AMENDED

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12993) to amend the District of Columbia Teachers Salary Act of 1955, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, what is the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The District of Columbia teachers' pay bill.

Mr. MORSE. Without amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. What is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending bill is the District of Columbia teachers pay bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. What is its present status? Are there any amendments at the desk?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are no amendments.

ERIC AND IDA MAE HJERPE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1939, H.R. 2074.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 2074) for the relief of Eric and Ida Mae Hjerpe.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The purpose of the bill is to pay to Eric Hjerpe and Ida Mae Hjerpe, of Sunnyvale, Calif., the sum of $1,096.48 in full settlement of their claims against the United States based on erroneous payment they made in connection with their income tax liability for 1952.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the committee accompanying the proposal be incorporated in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Department of the Treasury in reporting to the Congress on the bill has commented as follows:

"The records of the Internal Revenue Service disclose that on January 28, 1957, the taxpayers filed a claim for refund of 1952 income tax in the amount of $1,096.48. This claim was supported by a declaration by the taxpayers that Eric Hjerpe was sick and absent from work through 1952 and that the amount of '$5,200 received from wages (52 weeks, $100 per week under the wage continuation plan of the First National Bank of Chicago, Ill.,' should have been excluded from income. This claim for refund was rejected because the claim was not filed within the 3-year period of limitations prescribed by law.

"The taxpayers' claim is based upon section 22(b)(5) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 which provided an exclusion from gross income of amounts received 'through accident or health insurance.' The issue whether section 22(b)(5) of the 1939 code applied to amounts received as sick pay from uninsured wage continuation plans was not settled until 1957. In 1952 the court of appeals, in the case of *Epmeier* v. *United States* (199 F. 2d 508 (7th Cir. 1952)) held that such payments were excludable from gross income as amounts received through 'health insurance.'

"For some period of time, the Internal Revenue Service did not believe that the Epmeier case correctly interpreted the law and rejected claims for refund filed on the basis of the Epmeier case. However, in December 1954 the field offices of the Internal Revenue Service were advised by the national office that there would be no objection to having claims for refund with respect to disability payments, similar to those involved in the Epmeier case, held in suspense rather than disallowing such claims as had been the prior practice. This 'suspense' procedure was established in order that taxpayers who filed such claims would not have their claims automatically disallowed and thereby be compelled to litigate the issue within the 2-year period prescribed by law for appealing from the disallowance of refund claims. At the time this suspense procedure was adopted, the taxpayers had more than 1 year in which to file a timely claim for refund. However, their claim for refund was not filed until January 28, 1957, which date was almost 1 year after the expiration of the 3-year period of limitations prescribed by law.

"In 1957 the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of *Gordon P. Haynes, et ux.* v. *United States* (353 U.S. 81) followed the decision in the Epmeier case and held that amounts received through an uninsured employees sickness benefit plan were excludable from income as 'health insurance.'

"Because of the large number of taxpayers whose timely claims for refund filed on the basis of the Epmeier case had been rejected by the Internal Revenue Service prior to the decision of the U.S. Supreme Court in the Haynes case, Congress enacted a provision granting general relief on a nondiscriminatory basis to such taxpayers. This relief provision is contained in section 98 of the Technical Amendments Act of 1958 (Public Law 85–866) which was approved by the President on September 2, 1958. However, this provision grants relief only to those taxpayers who initially filed timely claims for refund but who failed to protect their rights by filing a suit in court within 2 years after disallowance of the claims. This provision does not grant relief to taxpayers such as Eric and Ida Mae Hjerpe who did not file timely claims for refund.

"The instant bill is similar to H.R. 6335 (86th Cong., 1st sess.) for the relief of Mrs. Lourene O. Estes, from which the President withheld his approval on September 22, 1959. In his memorandum of disapproval, the President stated:

" 'During the last Congress, I approved legislation designed to grant general relief, on a nondiscriminatory basis, to taxpayers who had received disability pay which was excludable from gross income under the Supreme Court decision. This general legislation does not provide relief for taxpayers, such as Mrs. Estes, who did not attempt to protect their rights by filing timely claims for refund.

" 'The statutory period of limitations, which the Congress has included in the revenue system as a matter of sound policy, is essential in order to achieve finality in tax administration. A substantial number of taxpayers paid income tax on disability payments received by them and failed to file timely claims for refund. Accordingly, to grant special relief in this case, where a refund was not claimed in the time and manner prescribed by law, would be to discriminate against such other similarly situated taxpayers and to create an undesirable precedent.'

"In view of the foregoing, the Department is opposed to the enactment of H.R. 2074."

In favorably reporting the bill the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives commented in House Report No. 1985 as follows:

"The claimant, Eric Hjerpe, was sick and absent from work through 1952 and the amount he received from his employer, the First National Bank of Chicago, Ill., was $5,200 computed at the rate of $100 per week for 52 weeks. Said amount was paid to him under a wage continuation plan and should have been excluded from income. However, the claimant declared such receipt as income and paid the aforesaid amount as a tax.

"A subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee received evidence on the merits of this bill and was informed by affidavit submitted to it that Mr. Hjerpe underwent a sympathectomy in 1947, a rare nerve-cutting operation to relieve very high blood pressure. In December 1951 he developed hypertensive cardiovascular disease with left ventricular failure and tachycardia which prevented him

from returning to work. On January 1, 1953, medical authorities for the employer, the aforesaid First National Bank of Chicago, Ill., and the Equitable Life Assurance Society found him to be totally and permanently disabled. He was only 45 years of age when he had to retire and for years he "was just too sick to care about anything" (quotation is taken from claimant's personal sworn statement submitted to the subcommittee), and his illness caused him to file his claim 10½ months late.

"The committee is of the opinion that the claimant has a meritorious claim. The Secretary of the Treasury opposes the enactment of this legislation and cites the veto message of the President under date of September 22, 1959, relative to the bill H.R. 6335 (86th Cong., 1st sess.) for the relief of Mrs. Lourene O. Estes, which particularly stated, among other things, the running of the statute of limitations and the failure of the claimant to timely file her claim for refund.

"The committee wishes to indicate that opposition was also raised by the Treasury Department on the basis of failure to make a timely claim for refund and the running of the statute of limitations relative to the bill H.R. 7745 (86th Cong., 1st sess.) for the relief of Mrs. Willie Soher, which also concerned an overpayment in her income tax. This bill was approved by the President on September 22, 1959 (Private Law 86–234).

"There appears to be no question that the payment made by the claimants to the Government as a purported tax was in essence and in fact not due to the Government. The money does not constitute tax money; it was paid in error and received without right. The committee is of the opinion and concludes that the claimants are entitled to the relief sought and accordingly recommends that the bill be considered favorably."

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What is the position of the Treasury Department on this bill?

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is my understanding that the Treasury Department is opposed to this particular proposal because the statute of limitatons has run, but I understand that the committee unanimously is of the opinion that the claimants have a meritorious claim. The Secretary of the Treasury opposes the enactment of the legislation and cites the veto message of the President under date of September 22, 1959, relative to H.R. 6335, for the relief of Mrs. Lourene O. Estes, and so forth.

The committee indicates also that opposition was raised by the Treasury Department on the basis of failure to make a timely claim for refund and the running of the statute of limitations relative to H.R. 7745, 86th Congress, 1st session, for the relief of Mrs. Willie Soher, and so forth.

There appears to be no question that the payment made by the claimants to the Government as a purported tax was in essence and in fact not due the Government. The money did not constitute tax money; it was paid in error and received without right. The committee was of the opinion and concludes that the claimants were entitled to the relief sought, and accordingly recommended that the bill be considered favorably.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The statute of limitations for the presentation of the claims bars that presentation. Is that correct?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is the position of the Treasury Department.

Mr. LAUSCHE. How will the committee or the Senate be able to deny other pleas which are made asking that the bar contained in the statute be removed?

Mr. DIRKSEN. If I may respond to the distinguished Senator from Ohio, first of all, every one of these claims is carefully surveyed by responsible professional staff members of the committee. Ofttimes we discover extraordinary and unusual circumstances, where, through no fault particularly of the claimant, the statute of limitations has run. It is indeed difficult to draw a line and say that all is black or all is white. Some of these borderline cases have been vetoed and others have been approved.

Always we must take all the facts into account. While I do not have all the facts in mind with respect to the pending claim, I do know that all of the claims are carefully presented and all the detailed facts are carefully evaluated by the committee before determination is made on them.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is the Senator from Illinois a member of the committee?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am on the committee.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Are other bills of this nature pending now?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Of this particular nature?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Are they on the calendar?

Mr. DIRKSEN. It would not be surprising if that were the case, although offhand, since so many claims come to the Judiciary Committee, I could not give the Senator a responsive answer.

Mr. MANSFIELD. To the best of my knowledge there are no like bills pending at this time, based on the statute of limitations.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I have a distaste for removing the operation of the statute of limitations in this manner, because I believe the statute ought to operate unless there are extraordinary circumstances justifying our ignoring the statute of limitations.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I can concur with the sentiment expressed by the Senator from Ohio. However, we must take into account all equitable considerations. As a general rule, when the Department passes judgment, and either objects or approves of a claim, it is normally done on a wholly legal basis, and equitable considerations are ignored.

It is the responsibility of the committee to take that into account, examine into all the facts, and see whether or not justice can be done by some action of Congress; and we did take it into account.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What is the uniform principle which is applied; or does the committee decide each case on the basis of the committee's disposition? Does the committee have a uniform rule which is applicable to each case, those which fall within the rule to receive the benefits, and those which do not to be excluded? What is the measure of justice?

Mr. DIRKSEN. There is no uniform rule. We take every case which is presented. Once the staff has explored the facts and secured the opinions of the various agencies of the government involved, an explanation is made to the committee. The whole matter is discussed. Every factor is evaluated. Then the full committee makes a judgment on the claim.

Sometimes—many times—claims are cast aside. In other cases, notwithstanding the disapproval of the department, the committee itself believes an inequity is involved which can be righted only by Congress itself.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I direct the attention of the Senator from Ohio to the historic purpose of the statute of limitations. The Senator from Ohio has not said anything in the colloquy with which I find myself in disagreement, because I interpret his remarks to mean that in extraordinary circumstances, and when clear justice dictates that there should be an exception to the rule, then there is residual legislative power in Congress to do justice.

The statute of limitations, historically, was developed in order to protect private citizens in litigation brought by other private citizens because the lapse of time itself causes evidence to be lost and witnesses to die, disappear, or move away. It is true that it is a general statute and is applicable for use by the Government, too.

However, I should like to have the Senator from Ohio know that in cases such as the one with which we are dealing all the evidence is in the possession of the Government. There can be no loss of evidence in tax cases. The Internal Revenue Service today has the same evidence it had in 1952, when this case first arose. There is not the slightest chance of the Government being placed at a disadvantage because of the lapse of time. It is a matter of mathematics, and the mathematics are all on file. The returns are in the possession of the Government. It is very easy to determine—and it has been determined—whether this particular citizen paid the Federal Government money in 1952 by mistake.

Therefore, it seems to me that it would be most unfair for us simply to say that because the statute of limitations is on the books, it will be automatically applied, when all the evidence we have shows that to apply the statute will mean that Uncle Sam will be getting money which was mistakenly paid by an American citizen to Uncle Sam under a misapprehension.

It seems to me that we ought to recognize that in a situation such as that, Congress, under its legislative power, should say to the Federal Government, "We do not care now what caused the mistake to be made. Perhaps it was made through ignorance. Nevertheless,

a mistake was made. Uncle Sam is the beneficiary of money which does not belong to him, and never should have been taken by him in the first place. So we will return it to its true owner."

That is justice. If we make it perfectly clear, as the Senator from Illinois has, I believe, made it clear, that we will do justice in this way only in those exceptional cases where the facts are perfectly clear, where the evidence shows that the citizen ought to be relieved of a mistake which he has made, then we shall be living up to our responsibilities, and not falling behind the statute of limitations as an estoppel in such a case.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I am very grateful for the learned exposition of the doctrine of laches or the statute of limitations which the Senator from Oregon has given. The Senator from Ohio, likewise, is familiar with those doctrines. However, I point out to the Senator from Oregon that if his position is correct, that since the Government has all the evidence in its possession in that instance there is no need of the statute of limitations, then it follows, as a matter of logic, that we ought to abolish the statute of limitations so far as it applies to the making of claims which have been barred by the running of time.

The Senator from Oregon states that this issue must be decided on the basis of the conclusions reached by the members of the committee. I asked the Senator from Illinois, "Does the committee have a rule?" He said there is no rule. I know of the strict adherence to the rules of law which the Senator from Oregon has always advocated. Ours is a government of laws; it is not a government of men. I am not disposed to depend upon the changing judgments and whims of men in determining, one day, one way how a claim shall be decided, and on another day, another way.

It may be that justice in this case is in favor of the applicant. However, I respectfully submit that ours is a government of laws; it is not a government of men; and that if claims are to be decided on the basis of the friendliness of the members of the committee—which can happen—then law does not operate in our country.

This claim is unconsequential. Probably it does not warrant the discussion which we have had about it. However, I wish to see the justice done which the Senator from Oregon has always expounded concerning the Morse formula about what shall be paid to the government for property which people want as a gift.

I have not raised objection to the bill. However, I shall constantly want to know what these claims are, with the view of learning whether there is merit or no merit to the claims made.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to comment concerning the observation made by the distinguished Senator from Ohio. I do not suggest that we adopt rule by men rather than rule by law. Quite to the contrary. The Senator from Ohio is concerned about the principle which is followed in these cases. I think it is a very clear, uniform principle, namely, that when allegations such as these are made that the Federal Government is the beneficiary of unjust enrichment as the result of a mistake which was made in the payment of taxes; when the Government has all the facts; when there is no doubt in the Treasury Department about the facts, and what the Treasury Department is seeking to do is hide behind the statute of limitations or to use the statute of limitations as a sort of estoppel, then Congress has a uniform principle to follow. We must decide whether we shall pass a law which will correct the gross injustice which the facts show has arisen in regard to a specific case. I do not know of a clearer example of the following of the rule of law than that.

I point out that it is the clear duty of Congress, when such injustices occur, and the facts show there is injustice and show that the Government is the beneficiary of unjust enrichment, the money should be returned, irrespective of the fact that there has been a lapse of years to comply with the statute of limitations.

I certainly join with the Senator from Ohio in insisting on government by law. That is exactly what we are doing in this case. We are proposing to pass a law which will do justice to a citizen who mistakenly overpaid the Federal Government his taxes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill, H.R. 2074, was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

H. P. LAMBERT CO., INC., AND SOUTHEASTERN DRILLING CORP.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate turn to the consideration of Calendar No. 1943, H.R. 7618.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 7618) for the relief of H. P. Lambert Co., Inc., and Southeastern Drilling Corp.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana wish to move or ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the bill?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to provide that the claimants, notwithstanding final liquidation of entry or the limitations of time, may file within 90 days from the date of the enactment of the legislation, such claim or protest with the collector of customs of New Orleans, or do such other acts as will enable them to submit evidence of entitlement to refund of duties collected from them upon certain articles covered by consumption entry No. 2892, dated November 10, 1955, at New Orleans, La.

I will say to the Senator from Ohio that the Treasury Department is opposed to the bill as introduced. The House Committee on the Judiciary amended the bill so as to enable the claimants to submit evidence to establish their claim. So the purpose of the bill really is to allow the claimants to submit evidence. I understand that the bill was unanimously reported by the committee.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement in explanation of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report (No. 1872) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The bill as introduced in the House provided for the payment of $3,690.46 as the sum collected by the Government from the claimants as duty on articles not subject to duty.

The Treasury Department opposed the bill as introduced.

The Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives amended the bill to enable the claimants to submit evidence to establish the claim.

The Treasury Department in its report to the Congress on the bill as introduced commented as follows:

"The goods were entered as duty free under Tariff Act paragraph 1615(a), and a bond was filed for the production of necessary documents. 'Customs Form 4467: Certificate of Exportation' was not produced despite extensions of the bonded period and the entry was liquidated dutiable on February 11, 1958.

"Although the importer did finally produce proof satisfactory to the collector that the goods were American goods returned, such proof was not produced until after the liquidation became final under the provisions of section 514, Tariff Act of 1930. Furthermore, the situation did not permit the granting of administrative relief under the provisions of section 520(c)(1), Tariff Act of 1930, as amended.

"The enactment of this legislation for the benefit of these corporations, authorizing a refund of duties legally assessed, would establish an undesirable precedent and create dissatisfaction among other importers who were obliged to pay duty on similar goods imported under like circumstances. Therefore, the Department cannot recommend the enactment of the proposed legislation."

A subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives considered the matter at a hearing.

In its favorable report on the bill, as amended, the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives commented as follows:

"The evidence presented at a hearing before a subcommittee disclosed that on November 10, 1955, 118 pieces of oil well equipment were entered duty free through the port of New Orleans and a bond was filed by H. P. Lambert Co., Inc., customhouse brokers for Southeastern Drilling Corp., to guarantee the payment of duties in the event of failure to produce the necessary documents to establish that the articles were goods of American origin being returned from British West Indies to the United States.

"The evidence that the goods were of American origin was not produced until after liquidation became final and on or about April 10, 1958, the sum of $3,690.46 duty was collected by the Government on the bond.

"The Southeastern Drilling Corp. was finally able to produce the necessary documents to prove the American origin and manufacture of the articles. Appeal was then made to the Commissioner of Customs for relief on the ground that there had been a technical error in the service of the notice of duty due on February 11, 1958, which would allow reliquidation of the entry. The appeal was denied on the basis that there was no technical error and not on the basis that the goods were dutiable.

"The administrative remedies had been exhausted and under applicable law there are no grounds for reconsideration of the

assessment of duties. Inasmuch as the Commissioner ruled against the claimants on the question raised by them as to the technical error in the service of the notice and did not favorably rule that the goods were in fact not dutiable, the committee recommends favorable consideration of this legislation as amended so that a ruling can be formally made and entered as to the question of duty and if found not dutiable to allow refund of the amount of duty collected. The failure of the claimants to timely produce the necessary documents was due to a forgivable misunderstanding by the parties as to whom the notice of duty due should have been directed for action."

Mr. LAUSCHE. Does the report show how much is involved?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The sum mentioned is $3,690.46 as the sum collected by the Government from the claimants as duty on articles not subject to duty. The House Committee on the Judiciary amended the bill so as to enable the claimants to submit evidence to establish their claim. The bill does not provide for any payment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Otherwise, the statute has run; and this bill gives the claimants the right to file?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Very well; I have no amendment to submit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 7618) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

OPPOSITION TO HOUSE BILL TO PERMIT SERVING OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ON NEW YEAR'S DAY, WHEN IT FALLS ON SUNDAY

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to the fact that yesterday the House passed H.R. 11535, the purpose of which is to provide that licensees shall not be prohibited from serving alcoholic beverages in their establishments on New Year's Day in the District of Columbia when New Year's Day falls on Sunday.

The bill has come to the Senate.

I wish to serve notice that if the bill is reported by the committee and is brought before the Senate, the bill will be opposed.

I hope the leadership will make note of this, and will see that we are properly notified.

I think we have reached a sad state if we are to suspend the proper observance of the Sabbath in the Nation's Capital and I, for one, will certainly oppose the bill.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I certainly join the Senator from Delaware in objecting to the passage of that bill, which in my judgment would do violence to the proper observance of the Sabbath in the Capital City.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish the Senator from Delaware were as correct in his position on other measures as he is in his position on this one. But I wish to state that I shall completely support his position on this bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to state that the Senator from Delaware, the Senator from Oregon, and the Senator from Kansas will be notified in plenty of time when the bill is called up.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks made by the Senator from Delaware and other Senators in regard to this particular measure. I think the Senator from Delaware is to be complimented for calling the attention of the Senate to this matter.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Certainly it would be a reflection on all of us if we were to allow any such measure to be passed. I am confident we can defeat the bill should it be called up for consideration.

VLADISLAV FOTICH

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 1945, House bill 7877, for the relief of Vladislav Fotich.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the purpose of the proposed legislation is to waive section 33 of the Trading With the Enemy Act so as to permit Vladislav Fotich, a Yugoslavian citizen, who was precluded by illness and absence from the United States from making timely assertions of claim or institute suit for the return, under section 32 of that act, of his 12 shares of securities of the International Nickel Co. of Canada, Ltd., which were vested in the Alien Property Custodian in 1951, or the proceeds thereof, and any revenue received from the securities.

I ask unanimous consent that an excerpt from the report on the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report (No. 1874) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Department of Justice in its report states that it is unable to recommend enactment of the bill.

The Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, although opposing enactment of the bill, states that it is informed that the subject bill involves only a relatively small amount of money and that its enactment would have little effect on the total amounts potentially available to compensate American citizens for certain war losses.

The facts and conclusions in connection with this matter are contained in House Report 1705 on H.R. 7877, and are as follows:

"In 1939, just before the outbreak of World War II, Mr. Vladislav Fotich was in Rotterdam with the former Yugoslav General Consulate. At that time Mr. Fotich, with his savings, purchased 12 shares of International Nickel Co. of Canada. This stock was purchased through the Dutch bank Nederlandtsche Handel-Maatschappij, in Rotterdam, with whom he left the securities for safekeeping.

"Mr. Fotich was in Rotterdam when it was occupied by the Germans. He was taken by force to Belgrade whence he escaped to southern France in 1942 where he hid from the Germans. He was taken seriously ill and was discovered and arrested in 1944. He was taken to the Drancy camp, but later in 1944 when he was released from that camp for return to Yugoslavia he escaped and lived in hiding in Paris until that city was liberated. After the war he returned to Yugoslavia where he was pensioned in 1949 due to serious illness.

When Mr. Fotich returned to Yugoslavia in 1946, he contacted the Dutch bank concerning his securities and was advised that they were blocked in the United States, and that it was not necessary for him to do anything under the circumstances unless he wanted to sell them.

"In 1955, Mr. Fotich was in need of funds and contacted the Dutch bank, at which time he learned that his securities had been vested in 1951 under vesting order No. 17940. It was at that time that he was advised that he was barred by the provisions of section 33 of the Trading With the Enemy Act from filing a claim for the return of his property.

"The committee has concluded on the basis of the unusual circumstances of this case, Mr. Fotich should be extended the opportunity of filing his claim and having it considered under the applicable provisions of the Trading With the Enemy Act. Therefore, it is recommended thta the bill be considered favorably."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 7877) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LEGAL GUARDIAN OF JOHN DAVID ALMEIDA, A MINOR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 1965, House bill 4428, for the relief of the legal guardian of John David Almeida, a minor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to pay to the legal guardian of John David Almeida, a minor, the sum of $15,000 in full settlement of the claims of the child against the United States for the loss of his left eye as the result of its being struck by a splinter of glass when a window in the Government quarters in which the child lived was shattered on May 13, 1957.

I ask unanimous consent that an excerpt from the report be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report (No. 1895) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The facts in the case as summarized by the Department of the Air Force in a letter, dated March 26, 1959, to the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, are as follows:

"The events upon which this claim is based occurred on May 13, 1957 at Sergeant Almeida's assigned Government quarters at Otis Air Force Base. At the time of the accident, Sergeant Almeida and a neighbor, Staff Sgt. Robert E. Richards, were off duty and in the backyard of the Almeida quarters. The Almeida child was in the house, looking out of a window. Sergeant Richards tapped on the window either in response to the child or to engage the child's attention, and the window broke. Sergeant Richards avers, however, that the actual breakage of the

window was caused by the child's striking the window with a toy held in his hand. A splinter of glass entered the child's left eye necessitating eventual removal of the eye.

"Inspection of the window revealed that the windowpane had been properly installed and maintained in all respects, and further revealed no connection between any act of the United States and the child's injury.

"Sergeant Almeida was then advised that there was no apparent legal liability on the part of the United States, but that he was free to file any kind of a claim that he might choose. However, no claim has been filed as of March 6, 1959.

"Sergeant Almeida subsequently filed a civil suit in the courts of Massachusetts against Sergeant Richards in the amount of $250,000. The court awarded him a $500 judgment.

"On August 4, 1958, the Almeidas brought suit against the United States in the U.S. District Court for Massachusetts, civil case No. 58-803-W, for $210,000. This suit was brought under the Federal Tort Claims Act (28 U.S.C. 1346(b)). In January 1959, the court directed a verdict for the United States on the grounds that the relationship between the United States and Almeida was that of landlord and tenant, and that under Massachusetts law (which, for the purposes of this case, is controlling under the Tort Claims Act), no basis for liability existed.

"Accordingly, the Department of the Air Force recommends against enactment of H.R. 4428. The legislation would create an undesirable precedent and would be discriminatory against other claimants who have suffered similarly."

The sponsor of the legislation in the House of Representatives appeared before the Committee on the Judiciary of the House and that committee went into the circumstances of the case in some detail. The facts and conclusions in the case as set forth in the report on the bill by the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives are as follows:

On May 13, 1957, John David Almeida, then 17 months of age, was sitting in a high chair in the kitchen of family quarters assigned to his father, Air Force S. Sgt. John E. Almeida, when another serviceman, S. Sgt. Robert Richards, appeared outside of the window near the child and tapped on the window. The window broke and a splinter of glass lodged in the child's eye. As is noted in the Air Force report, there is some conflict as to whether the child also struck the window with a toy; however, the child's parents state that the baby could not have hit the window with a toy train since they didn't own one. This committee feels that the basic point involved in this matter is the condition of the window itself. The Air Force report merely states that "Inspection of the window revealed that the windowpane had been properly installed and maintained in all respects" and further avers that the inspection revealed no connection between any act of the United States and the child's injury. This committee feels that the facts presented in support of the claim present a different picture, and establish a definite basis for legislative relief in this instance. The child's mother, Mrs. Caroline Almeida, stated concerning the condition of the window prior to the accident:

"I reported to the Air Installations Office at Otis on many occasions that the windows were in bad condition and that they were dangerous. Furthermore the windows had no putty on them. The Air Force representatives who were notified agreed that the matter needed repairing and agreed to repair it, but never got around to it."

Pictures of the windows in question were submitted to the committee in connection with this matter. These pictures tend to bear out the statement of the child's mother in her affidavit filed with the committee. The pictures disclose the general rundown condition of the windows. The information supplied to the committee shows that the windows were loose due to missing putty, and that in addition they were cracked in places. The committee has, therefore, concluded that the unsafe condition of the window was the principal factor in this unfortunate train of events. It is obvious from the facts of this case that the quarters were intended for the use of the families of servicemen, and it must have been anticipated that children would be in the area. Regardless of the minor question referred to in the Air Force report concerning just how the window was struck, it is clear that it was tapped or at the most hit an insubstantial blow of a sort which should not have caused the result described above. However, a loose and poorly maintained window would be expected to break under such conditions. To allow such conditions to exist is to almost invite occurrences such as this one. Accordingly, this committee has concluded that it is only just to recognize a responsibility on the part of the Government to this child.

After the window shattered, the child was given emergency treatment and was eventually taken to the Chelsea Naval Hospital. Efforts were made to save the eye, but it ultimately was necessary to remove the eye.

The Air Force report notes that the parents were unsuccessful in their attempt to recover under the Federal Tort Claims Act. The court in that action ruled that under Massachusetts law they were required, as tenants, to accept the premises as they found them. The committee has carefully considered this circumstance along with the small amount recovered against the other serviceman, and has concluded that there is a moral responsibility on the part of the United States to compensate this small child for his lifelong disability. The committee felt that the bill should be amended so as to provide for a $15,000 payment to the legal guardian of the child in lieu of the original provision of a payment of $100,000 to the parents. The committee, therefore, recommends that the bill be amended to provide for such a $15,000 payment to the legal guardian of the child, and that the amended bill be considered favorably.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 4428) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LAUSCHE ON RESOLUTION IN OPPOSITION TO RECESS APPOINTMENTS TO THE SUPREME COURT

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, yesterday when the Hart resolution was voted on, I cast my vote against the resolution. At that time I did not have an opportunity to speak on the measure, because the available time had expired.

Today I should like to state my reasons for voting against the resolution. I voted against it because I was convinced that the Senate would thus be exercising a right which did not legitimately belong to it. It was my opinion that the Senate was thus guilty of usurpation of a right which was not its, and that the Senate had no justification for attempting to state what the President should do in regard to a matter which the Constitution clearly and unequivocally states is one of the powers of the President.

I now read paragraph 3 of section 2 of article II of the Constitution.

> The President shall have power to fill up all vacancies that may happen during the recess of the Senate, by granting commissions which shall expire at the end of their next session.

That language is clear, and does not require any interpretation. It specifically declares that the President shall have the unconditional power to fill vacancies during a Senate recess. What I have read is contained within the Constitution of the United States.

On September 17, Members of the Senate will be speaking throughout the Nation, urging the people to adhere to the provisions of the Constitution of the United States. When our Constitution was adopted its writers contemplated giving limited and clearly defined powers to the Chief Executive, the Congress, and the courts. Based upon experience prior to 1787, the men who sat in the Constitutional Convention knew that it was dangerous to give unlimited power to government. The writers of the Constitution contemplated that the supreme powers shall remain with the people.

The sovereignty shall be with the people. The Congress and the courts and the Chief Executive shall have only those powers which are specifically granted to them.

There were men of great learning who spoke in that convention; and subsequently to the assembly of those men, statements were made about the Constitution. Those statements are worthy of being considered again, and I should like to read for the moment what was said by various men with respect to the Constitution. Here is what Jefferson said:

> It would be a dangerous delusion were a confidence in the men of our choice to silence our fears for the safety of our rights: that confidence in men is everywhere the parent of depotism—free government is founded in jealousy, and not in confidence; it is jealousy and not confidence which prescribes limited constitutions, to bind down those whom we are obliged to trust with power: that our Constitution has accordingly fixed the limits to which, and no further, our confidence may go.

Jefferson finally concludes with this sentence:

> In questions of power, then, let no more be heard of confidence in man, but bind him down from mischief by the chains of the Constitution.

That is what they intended to do, and that is what they did.

Now returning again to the resolution of yesterday, as I pointed out, the Constitution gives the President the clear power to fill all vacancies. There is nothing said to the effect that the Congress shall advise him. But what did the Senate do yesterday? It adopted a resolution in which it said that:

> It is the sense of the Senate that the making of recess appointments to the Supreme Court of the United States may not be wholly consistent with the best interests of the Supreme Court, the nominee who may be involved, the litigants before the Court, nor indeed the people of the United States.

I ask my colleagues: By what justification do we proceed to say that the clear and unequivocal declarations in the Constitution are to be interpreted in the manner set forth in that resolution?

Mr. President, the Constitution gives to the President power which was given to him by the people. The language is clear. But the Senate, contrary to what the Constitution provides, went on to declare that if the President acted in accordance with the authority granted him in the basic law of the land, he, in effect, would be taking action that was inimical to the best operation of the Supreme Court, action that would become disadvantageous to litigants, action that would impair the rights of the citizens of the United States.

I simply cannot understand it. The Constitution is clear in its provisions. The President has the right to make appointments during recess. I assume that when the Constitution was written, consideration was given to the fact that the Senate would not be in session when certain recess appointments were made. But in spite of that fact, the Senate on yesterday, in effect, as I have said a moment ago, declared that the making of appointments to the Supreme Court in time of recess may not be wholly consistent with the best interests of the Supreme Court, and may not be wholly consistent with the rights of the nominee and the litigants before the court.

Where did we get the authority to exercise that right on yesterday? We took it upon ourselves without any justification in the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. As the able Senator knows, he and I voted together against the adoption of that resolution on yesterday. I do not question the right of the Senate to adopt such a resolution. I respectfully question the advisability and good judgment of doing so.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I think there is great substance in what the Senator has stated. We have the power to adopt the resolution. I question our right to adopt it. There is a difference between the two. Right means that such action is in conformity with the letter of the Constitution.

We urge people to obey the Constitution. We proclaim its glory throughout the world. We condemn the Supreme Court when we believe it has exercised rights not granted to it by the Constitution.

Despite this, this great deliberative body repudiates the clear implication of the Constitution that the President is within his right, when the Congress is in recess, to make appointments. What do we say. We say, "Mr. President, if you wish to make an appointment during the recess, even though the Constitution grants you the right, you will be guilty of conduct inconsistent with the best interests of the Supreme Court; you will be guilty of conduct which is not helpful to the nominee who has been appointed; you will create a condition inimical to the rights of litigants who appear before the court."

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I did not speak on the resolution yesterday, although I voted for it. I respect the strong and well-presented views of my friend from Ohio and my friend from Tennessee. I disagree completely with them.

I think the Senate was well within its rights. I think we did a very wise thing in passing the resolution we passed. I hope that future Executives will stick to the point which the sense-of-the-Senate resolution indicates. I make this comment not to engage my friends in argument, but merely to make my own record clear. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from Pennsylvania is of the opinion that the President should not make appointments during recesses?

Mr. CLARK. I am of the opinion that the President of the United States might perhaps make an appointment during the recess, but that the appointee should not take his seat and participate in the business of the Court until after his nomination has been confirmed by the Senate.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Let us assume that the Senator from Pennsylvania is correct. Would not the proper course be to propose an amendment to the Constitution, rather than to take a step which to me, at least, is clearly inconsistent with the spirit of the Constitution?

Mr. CLARK. The Senator asked me a question. I can only reply in the negative. The sense-of-the-Senate resolution is not binding on anybody. It is a matter of guidance for the President. The President can ignore it, if he sees fit. The President has a constitutional right to ignore it, exactly as we have a constitutional right to pass it. I think we did the proper thing.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The weakness, in my opinion, in the position taken by the Senator from Pennsylvania is that, in effect, we say to the President, "Disregard the provisions of the Constitution. Unless you do, if your nominee comes before the Senate, we will not approve his nomination."

Mr. CLARK. In my view, the interpretation of my friend from Ohio is a strained one. I know we disagree on this. I do not mean to continue the argument.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, yesterday I did not get the opportunity to discuss the resolution. I feel that this matter is of such significance that I should make my views clear on the RECORD. I do not wish to be a party, especially in the exalted Senate, to declarations which are, in my opinion, clearly in conflict with the letter and with the spirit of the Constitution.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Does not the able Senator find it possible to draw a clear line of distinction between the exercise of a Presidential prerogative on the one hand, and the qualification and assumption of duties by an appointee on the other?

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from Tennessee is repeating what the Senator from Pennsylvania said. The Constitution says nothing about the appointee delaying filling the office. The Constitution says the President shall have the power to fill vacancies. If the writers of the Constitution had intended that the appointee should not begin his services, they would have so stated in the Constitution. If we think they should have said it in that way and that it should be said now, then let some Senator introduce a joint resolution to amend the Constitution.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO SENATE RULES TO LIMIT SPEECHES TO 3 HOURS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I submit a resolution to amend the Senate rules to permit any Senator to object when another Senator holds the floor for more than 3 hours during Senate debates, and I ask that the resolution be appropriately referred. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution lie on the desk until the close of business tomorrow for additional cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield.

Mr. BUSH. Would the resolution provide that if a Senator wishes to proceed after 3 hours of speaking, he would have to have unanimous consent?

Mr. CLARK. Yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, what is the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. CLARK. I am submitting a resolution to change the rules of the Senate. I asked unanimous consent that it lie on the desk until the close of business tomorrow for additional cosponsors, of whom I hope the Senator from Ohio will be one.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is merely requesting that the resolution be referred, in the usual way, to a committee. Is that correct?

Mr. CLARK. That is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the resolution will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The resolution (S. Res. 384) to amend rule XIX so as to limit debate on the part of a Senator, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That paragraph numbered 1 of rule XIX of the Standing Rules of the Senate (relating to debate) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Whenever any Senator has held the floor for more than 3 consecutive hours, an objection to his continued recognition shall be in order at any time, and, if such an

objection is made, the Senator shall yield the floor."

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, in the 18th century when the Senate had 26 Members and the Legislative Calendar was brief and did not contain matters of urgent importance to many millions of people, there was time to permit individuals to engage in filibusters. There is no time for such tactics in the 1960's. Marathon speeches by any one Senator in a body which now numbers 100 Members should not be tolerated.

I submit that no Senator needs more than 3 hours to expound his views on any specific matter coming before the Senate for action. Senators will judge for themselves whether they can recall a single occasion on which any Member took more than 3 consecutive hours to state his views on any subject when his purpose was not purely one of delay. I recall no such occasion.

When a Senator is interrupted repeatedly by a colloquy the Senate can be relied upon to grant unanimous consent for the Senator to continue beyond the 3-hour period, unless the colloquy is obviously engaged in for the purpose of delay. If he cannot get such consent, he would still have the right under rule XIX to speak once more on the same subject during the same legislative day, if he can obtain recognition.

I am reminded of Oliver Wendell Holmes' apology when he delivered a particularly long opinion one day as a member of the Massachusetts Supreme Court:

I did not have time to write a short one.

A 3-hour speech is hardly a short one, but the Senate should take the time next January, when we determine the rules we will operate under during the 87th Congress, to make sure that no future speech is longer than that.

PROPOSED BILL OF RIGHTS FOR SENATE STANDING COMMITTEES

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, another resolution to change the Senate rules so as to establish a bill of rights for Senate standing committees. This is the last of my nine proposals for changes in Senate procedures, which I hope will be given careful consideration by my colleagues next January.

This proposal would permit a majority of members of any standing committee of the Senate, first, to convene meetings of the committee; second, to consider any matter within the jurisdiction of the committee; and, third, to end committee debate on a given measure by moving the previous question.

The 16 Senate standing committees vary enormously in their recognition of democratic procedures. No one could ask for fairer treatment or more expeditious handling of committee business than occurs in some committees. In other committees, however, it is well known that the will of the majority can be, and often is, thwarted with impunity.

We should have more confidence in democratic procedures than to permit such practices to continue. The enormous backlog of public legislative business piled up because of the indifference of the Eisenhower administration should compel us to expedite committee action on important measures when a majority of the committee are ready to act.

My proposal would permit a majority of the members of any standing committee to convene committee meetings, to call up any matter within the jurisdiction of the committee for consideration at any meeting, and to move the previous question when any matter has been under consideration for a total of 5 hours of debate. If the motion were adopted, each member of the committee desiring to be heard on any of the issues on which the previous question had been ordered would be allowed to speak for a total of 30 minutes before the amendment or bill was brought to a final vote.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution may be permitted to lie on the desk until the Senate concludes its business tomorrow, to permit other Senators to cosponsor it.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator's request is that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, but that it lie on the table for the purpose of permitting other Senators, who may wish to sign with the Senator from Pennsylvania, to do so; is that correct?

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the resolution will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The resolution (S. Res. 385) relating to proceedings in standing committees of the Senate, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 190(b)), enacted by the Congress in the exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, is amended with respect to the Senate by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(d) Each standing committee of the Senate shall meet at such time as it may prescribe by rule, upon the call of the chairman thereof, and at such other time as may be fixed by written request made to the chairman by a majority of the members thereof.

"(e) The business to be considered at any meeting of a standing committee of the Senate shall be determined in accordance with its rules, and any other measure, motion, or matter within the jurisdiction of the committee shall be considered at such meeting that a majority of the members of the committee indicate their desire to consider by votes or by presentation of written request to the chairman.

"(f) Whenever any measure, motion, or other matter pending before a standing committee of the Senate has received consideration in executive session or sessions of the committee for a total of not less than five hours, any Senator may move the previous question with respect thereto. When such a motion is made and seconded, or a petition signed by a majority of the committee is presented to the chairman, and a quorum is present, it shall be submitted immediately to the committee by the chairman, and shall be determined without debate by yea-and-nay vote. A previous question may be asked and ordered with respect to one or more pending measures, motions, or matters, and may embrace one or more pending amendments to any pending measure, motion, or matter described therein and final action by the committee on the pending bill or resolution. If the previous question is so ordered as to any measure, motion, or matter, that measure, motion, or matter shall be presented immediately to the committee for determination. Each member of the committee desiring to be heard on one or more of the measures, motions, or other matters on which the previous question has been ordered shall be allowed to speak thereon for a total of thirty minutes."

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills and joint resolutions of the Senate:

S. 882. An act for the relief of the heirs of J. B. White;

S. 2353. An act for the relief of Col. John A. Ryan, Jr.;

S. 2761. An act to validate payments made for certain emergency conservation measures under the program authorized by the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1957;

S. 2770. An act for the relief of Borinquen Home Corp.;

S. 2959. An act to clarify the right of States to select certain public lands subject to any outstanding mineral lease or permit;

S. 3146. An act to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to donate dairy products and other agricultural commodities for use in home economics courses;

S. 3439. An act authorizing the President of the United States of America to present a gold medal to Robert Frost, a New England poet;

S. 3619. An act to make permanent law the provisions of section 408 of the National Housing Act regulating savings and loan holding companies;

S. 3665. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to grant an easement over certain lands to the trustees of the Cincinnati Southern Railway, their successors and assigns;

S. 3681. An act authorizing the Rhode Island Turnpike and Bridge Authority to combine for financing purposes the bridge across the West Passage of Narragansett Bay with the Newport Bridge and any other project acquired or constructed by said authority;

S. 3759. An act authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands to Auburn University, Auburn, Ala.;

S. 3771. An act to amend certain provisions of the Trust Indenture Act of 1939, as amended;

S. 3773. An act to amend certain provisions of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940, as amended;

S.J. Res. 9. Joint resolution to provide for the removal of a reservation of timber rights from a patent issued to Ivan H. McCormack; and

S.J. Res. 209. Joint resolution providing for the establishment of an annual National Forest Products Week.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1898) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 with respect to the procedure in obtaining a license and for rehearings under such act.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H.R. 5396. An act to amend title 28 of the United States Code to provide for transfer of cases between the district courts and the Court of Claims; and

H.R. 11573. An act to provide for the free entry of an electron microscope for the use of William Marsh Rice University of Houston, Tex., and an electron microscope for the use of the University of Colorado Medical Center, Denver, Colo.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11561) to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Army to convey part of lock and dam No. 10, Kentucky River, Madison County, Ky., to the Pioneer National Monument Association for use as part of a historic site.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10087) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit taxpayers to elect an overall limitation on the foreign tax credit.

TO BE FOREWARNED

Mr. KEFAUVER. In every national election the claim is made that the Nation is at a crossroads. This claim is not altogether untrue, because, when examined carefully, each of our national elections has taken place in the shadow of one or more important issues.

It is not the purpose of my remarks today to enumerate the many important issues facing the American people when they go to the polls in November 1960.

Nor is it my purpose to dwell on the fact that the rest of the world—both Communist and free—always watches our elections with much interest. It will watch more carefully than usual this time, because the hope for freedom on every continent hangs on the survival of a strong American democracy. We can no longer afford the luxury of indifference to the people who watch us. Our lives may well depend on their reactions.

If we allow this present contest to descend to the low level of some past elections, we cannot help but lower ourselves in the eyes of those upon whose help and friendship we depend and also give aid and comfort to those who boast that they will "bury" us.

But, more important in my view is the harm which a hatemongering election will do to us as a nation.

Hate begets hate; passion begets passion. Not only will a smear campaign damage the image of our country, it will also damage the soul and the conscience of our Nation.

Therefore, I would like to join those who have raised their voices to warn against the professional hatemongers and poison-pen pamphleteers who will come into this election as they have in others.

It is not enough to dissociate oneself from scurrilous propaganda put out on one's behalf, but a candidate has the responsibility to take active measures against it.

The purpose of a political campaign is to make clear the parties' stands on major problems and to demonstrate the candidates' abilities to deal on critical questions. The American people can make an intelligent decision this year only if the issues are presented to them honestly.

If the American people succeed, it will be despite the efforts of some strong forces to deflect them. There will be organizations and publications—like the Ku Klux Klan, the falsely named committee for constitutional government, and a magazine called Human Events, to mention just three—that will peddle messages of suspicion and falsehood, that will attempt to rally prejudice in place of reason.

The hatemongers are already using every smear technique in the book to invoke hatred in an effort to win elections by hiding the issues. They deal in guilt by association, innuendoes, distortions, half-truths, and wild fabrications. They use leaflets, crude and obscene cartoons, composite photographs, whispering campaigns, and a hundred other devices. Sometimes they peddle signed literature; more often, anonymous trash.

We cannot stop the circulation of all of this hate literature, but we can cut it down. We can also publicly disown it. And, more important, we can immunize ourselves against it—"to be forewarned is to be forearmed."

And, as the denial rarely ever catches up with the charge, we can do some denying in advance.

Before discussing methods we can use to inoculate ourselves against the hate injections, let me make clear that, although I am highly partisan—and shall do everything I can to help Senators KENNEDY and JOHNSON—I do not consider this problem of clean campaign tactics as even vaguely partisan. It is important for all Americans that, whichever slate of candidates we select, we select them for valid reasons.

Certainly there can be no doubt that the political conscience of America is nonpartisan. The National Committee on Fair Campaign Practices is led by a courageous Republican, Charles P. Taft, of Cincinnati, who has worked hard and effectively to secure the observance of fair campaign practices codes. My Democratic colleague from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] has labored long and hard in this field. A Republican and a Democrat, the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] and the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], made the presentations before the Internal Revenue Commission which led to a denial of tax exemptions for the political propaganda for Edward Rumely's committee for constitutional government.

I feel a particular responsibility for speaking out on this subject at this time because I recently witnessed a classical example of a campaign where appeals to false issues were rife.

I was the target of a number of these issues, such as "soft on communism." To support this charge, it was stated that I voted for the Kennedy bill to abolish student loyalty oaths. New charges were made when I pointed out that first, the bill did not abolish the loyalty oath for students getting Federal loans, but simply eliminated from it a fuzzy and unfair part about no disloyal acts; and second, the bill was agreed to in the Senate on June 15, 1960, without even a request for a rollcall and, virtually, without dissent.

As this loyalty oath bill is now being used against Senator KENNEDY to support the allegation that he is "soft on communism," I shall read the student oath as it now stands:

I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the United States of America and will support and defend the Constitution and laws of the United States against all its enemies, foreign and domestic.

We cannot stop anybody from saying that all of us who voted for this oath are "soft on communism" but we can forewarn those who might hear the charge and do not know the facts.

Many of the doctors and druggists in Tennessee participated in a massive letterwriting campaign, charging me with being "socialistic" because of our drug investigations and my support of an adequate plan for medical care for the aged.

I was cursed for my support of the United Nations.

All in all, it was pretty rough. Yet, we did manage to keep the real issues before the people of Tennessee, and we did penetrate the fog so that they could see the role played by the special economic interests and by the professional hatemongers.

We were successful in Tennessee and I am hopeful that we will be successful in the Nation. Now with our national life challenged by attacks on both sides of the oceans, America faces a crucial test of its maturity. Can we choose a government rationally and intelligently? Or will we make our decision on the basis of blind, unreasoning passions and irrelevant "issues"?

We have faced this test before.

In 1860, Abraham Lincoln was subjected to the worst sort of vilification imaginable. Yet, he won. I believe his victory was partially due to the fact that he refused the support of hate groups.

In more recent times, in 1928, we went through an equally dirty campaign, and one in which the vilified candidate lost. There is certainly grave doubt that Al Smith would have won in 1928 even if there had been no scurrilous attack upon him because of his religion—it was probably not a Democratic year in any event. But this detracts not one whit from the fact that part of his defeat was directly due to a campaign calculated to stir up religious hatreds.

And this campaign was a blatant repudiation of both the spirit and letter of our Constitution that religion is not a test for political office. Article VI of that sacred document states specifically that "no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States."

When America faced the test in 1928, she flunked.

The question now is whether the ghost of 1928 has been laid to rest.

All indications are that it has not—that it is riding high, at least in some places.

The country is being flooded once again with false and libelous anti-Catholic materials. Some of it is obscene. Most of it is unsigned.

There is every likelihood that this hate campaign will get worse before it gets better. There is no telling what type of disgusting trash may be shoved under the doors or put in the mailboxes of millions of decent Americans.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am happy to yield to my distinguished colleague from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. Does not the Senator believe that, regrettable though this type of activity is, it may be better for the electorate that it has started so soon? Starting so soon, the American people will have ample opportunity to measure it and reject it.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes; I agree with my colleague that it is regrettable that there must be distortion and smear literature and misrepresentations. I commend the many outstanding statesmen and public servants, both Democrats and Republicans, for denouncing it. I thank my colleague. He is right that, with the smear campaign having started early, and with the American people analyzing and weighing it over a period of time, its effect will certainly be diminished and, in many cases, completely demolished.

However, there is every present indication that we can expect an increasing flow of different types of smear literature and unsigned political documents. I believe that immediately before the election we may anticipate new types. Therefore, I think it is well that the American people be forewarned as to what to expect and what might happen, so that they can be on the lookout for it.

As a matter of fact, in some cases, when there is time and when the explanation catches up with the charge, the charge backfires against the people upon whose behalf it is intended to be circulated.

I thank my colleague. As chairman of the subcommittee investigating elections several years ago, he has had a great deal of experience with this kind of thing.

We may see the scurrilous "Awful Disclosures of Maria Monk," which purports to be the autobiography of a nun, but which, in fact, was written by a demented woman of ill repute in 1832. The people of Wisconsin saw a revival of this fraud in the primary election of 1960.

Or we may see the false charge that Abraham Lincoln was assassinated by Catholics after he had voiced a warning against Catholicism. The people of Wisconsin did.

Or we may see the bogus document which pretends to be a secret oath of the Knights of Columbus, a Catholic fraternal and patriotic group. According to this fraudulent document, members of the organization pledge that, when ordered, they will commit against heretics almost every horrible crime imaginable, including murder, torture, and arson.

Unfortunately, this false oath was an issue in the West Virginia primary this year. It is still being widely circulated in the country.

I have a copy of this false document here, and I shall not ask that it be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This was done once before—in 1913—in an attempt by a congressional committee to demonstrate its absolutely false nature. Ever since then, hatemongers have cited its appearance in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as proof of its authenticity. The technique is typical of the hatemongers.

The Library of Congress prepared a short "Statement Concerning the Fraudulent Character of the Alleged Knights of Columbus Oath," and I desire that it be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT CONCERNING THE FRAUDULENT CHARACTER OF THE ALLEGED KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS OATH

The so-called oath of the Knights of Columbus formed the basis of one of the charges in the contested election of Eugene C. Bonniwell against Thomas S. Butler of the 7th Congressional District of Pennsylvania, in the 62d Congress, and was printed as an exhibit, not as being the oath of the order, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, February 15, 1913 (p. 3216). The committee report on the case (H. Rept. 1523 of the House Committee on Elections No. 1, 62d Cong.) was also printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 15, 1913 (pp. 3215–3221).

Mr. Bonniwell's fourth charge (p. 3216) referred to the circulation of "a blasphemous and infamous libel, a copy of which is hereto attached, pretended to be an oath of the Knights of Columbus, of which body the contestant is a member." He added: "So revolting are the terms of this document and so nauseating its pledges that the injury it did not merely to the contestant but also to the Knights of Columbus and to Catholics in general can hardly be measured in terms."

Mr. Butler, the contestee, said (p. 3219): "I believe the circulation of this paper known as the Knights of Columbus oath, notwithstanding my sincere efforts to suppress it, and spurious as I believed it to be, was of disadvantage to me and lost rather than gained votes for me."

The committee, while seating Mr. Butler, concluded: "This committee cannot condemn too strongly the publication of the false and libelous article referred to in the paper of Mr. Bonniwell, and which was the spurious Knights of Columbus oath, a copy of which is appended to the paper."

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 29, 1915, contains (p. 2721) the findings submitted by Representative Kettner, of California, of a committee of Free Masons in California, who examined the ceremonials and pledges of the Order of Knights of Columbus. The committee said: "We find that neither the alleged oath nor any oath or pledge bearing the remotest resemblance thereto in matter, manner, spirit, or purpose is used or forms a part of the ceremonies of any degree of the Knights of Columbus. The alleged oath is scurrilous, wicked, and libelous, and must be the invention of an impious and venomous mind."

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 4, 1915 (pp. 3017–3020) in connection with remarks by Representative Gallivan, of Massachusetts, contains a report, presented by him, of the commission on religious prejudice of the Knights of Columbus, in which there is a review of the various prosecutions for criminal libel "in printing or publishing or defaming by means of the alleged oath." The same number of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD (p. 3021) contains also the abovementioned report of the committee of Free Masons.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, for those who might wonder what the true oath is, I shall read that actually taken by members of the Knights of Columbus:

I swear to support the Constitution of the United States. I pledge myself, as a Catholic citizen and a Knight of Columbus, fully to enlighten myself upon my duties as a citizen and conscientiously perform them entirely in the interest of my country, regardless of personal consequences. I pledge myself to do all in my power to preserve the integrity and purity of the ballot and to promote respect for law and order. I promise to practice my religion consistently and faithfully, and to so conduct myself in public affairs and in the exercise of public virtue as to reflect nothing but credit upon our holy church, to the end that she may flourish and our country prosper to the greater honor and glory of God.

During the present campaign we may also suddenly discover that a candidate chooses to run against a labor leader rather than against his opponent.

For example, in the 1958 electioneering, Walter Reuther, whose total commitments to democracy and whose integrity in the American labor movement have been used to good effect in our struggle overseas against communism by our own State Department, was not a candidate. Yet, in 35 States of the Union, candidates for office chose to run against him and straw issues rather than against their actual opponent and on the real issues.

Let me suggest that a proper regard for the rights of people who are not candidates in the election campaign be observed.

Vilification and character assassination of innocent bystanders certainly should not be tolerated. Candidates themselves, of course, must expect to bear up under the blasts of campaign heat. But even at the climax of the campaign battle, candidates, too, are entitled to criticism that stops on the decent side of the line that separates libel and accusations of treason from a fair charge, strongly made.

In the present campaign, both the Republican and Democratic National Committees, as well as both candidates, have pledged their best efforts to see that prejudice and intolerance are kept out of the campaign.

This is certainly highly commendable. But, if past experience is any guide, these declarations will be only partially successful in spite of the statements of good intentions.

The American people themselves must be informed on the activities of hate peddlers.

They must be on the alert against plausible poisons.

They must be skeptical.

They must be inoculated against becoming infected with the germ of unreason.

They must become suspicious of all unsigned political literature, especially leaflets and pamphlets containing stories that are too pat or too inflammatory.

They must be able to recognize self-contradictions, such as accusations that a candidate is "ruled from Rome" and at the same time he is "soft on communism."

They should make no appeal and hear no appeal which cannot properly be made to every American.

They should be informed that there are both Federal and State laws against corrupt campaign practices and unsigned literature.

They should know that there is a national committee on fair campaign practices which is ready, willing, and able to help cut down on the evil effects of hate peddling.

They should demand that all candidates for political office agree to the committee's code of fair campaign practices, and I ask that this brief code be printed at this point in my remarks. And they should report violations of the code to the committee.

There being no objection, the code was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CODE OF FAIR CAMPAIGN PRACTICES

There are basic principles of decency, honesty, and fairplay which every candidate for public office in the United States has a moral obligation to observe and uphold, in order that, after vigorously contested but fairly conducted campaigns, our citizens may exercise their constitutional right to a free and untrammeled choice and the will of the people may be fully and clearly expressed on the issues before the country.

Therefore:

I shall conduct my campaign in the best American tradition, discussing the issues as I see them, presenting my record and policies with sincerity and frankness, and criticizing without fear or favor the record and policies of my opponent and his party which merit such criticism.

I shall defend and uphold the right of every qualified American voter to full and equal participation in the electoral process.

I shall condemn the use of personal vilification, character defamation, whispering campaigns, libel, slander, or scurrilous attacks on any candidate or his personal or family life.

I shall condemn the use of campaign material of any sort which misrepresents, distorts, or otherwise falsifies the facts regarding any candidate, as well as the use of malicious or unfounded accusations against any candidate which aim at creating or exploiting doubts, without justification, as to his loyalty and patriotism.

I shall condemn any appeal to prejudice based on race, creed, or national origin.

I shall condemn any dishonest or unethical practice which tends to corrupt or undermine our American system of free elections or which hampers or prevents the full and free expression of the will of the voters.

I shall immediately and publicly repudiate support deriving from any individual or group which resorts, on behalf of my candidacy or in opposition to that of my opponent, to the methods and tactics which I condemn.

I, the undersigned, candidate for election to public office in the United States of America, hereby endorse, subscribe to, and solemnly pledge myself to conduct my campaign in accordance with the above principles and practices, so help me God.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, we Members of the Senate, of both parties, have a responsibility in this regard. We are leaders in our communities. We have the duty to raise our voices against prejudice when it raises its head.

Provided the people get the facts, I am confident that their good sense and the national conscience will not tolerate the substitution of poison peddling and scandal mongering for a presentation of the reality which must be faced in the election booth.

No party has a monopoly on patriotism. Both parties have an identical commitment to the welfare of our country and our people. The differences which exist between parties are based on different American views of how this welfare might best be furthered.

We do differ, and properly, on vital issues whose resolution will decide how we meet our national destiny—foreign policy, a national growth policy, the farm calamity, monopoly controls, how to insure justice for every American, national education policy, resources policy, medical assistance for the aged. On these issues, the debate should be hot and articulate, and every fact that has a bearing should be put before the people.

This is the responsibility of the candidates and the parties, but the American people have a responsibility too: They must search their conscience and vote accordingly.

In conclusion, I should like to quote a few short paragraphs from a booklet entitled, "Prejudice and Politics," by Charles P. Taft and Bruce L. Felknor.

The citizen can learn that the average voter can, in fact, exert absolute control over politics in his community, and over the use of prejudice in politics.

For prejudice and politics have one thing in common: Each can work only so far as people are willing to accept it. Prejudice operates where people are willing to let it hold sway over their minds and beliefs and actions. Politics can operate only so far as people accept it as the means by which governments are constituted and conducted. The citizen who calls politics beneath his consideration is depriving himself of his only opportunity to share in governing himself and his neighbors.

In the final analysis, the voter who is fooled and the citizen who is misgoverned have only themselves to blame for their plight. And the realization of that fact is our brightest hope for the future of the United States of America.

I, for one, have great faith in the American voter. Let us give him a fighting chance by keeping the campaign on the tracks, by discouraging false charges, and by ruling out blind intolerances.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. BIBLE. I have followed with great interest the very fine talk which the distinguished Senator from Tennessee has just made. I commend him for it. I think he strikes the right tone. I had occasion to appear on a television program day before yesterday. I hope I spoke in the same vein, although I am certain I did not speak half so well. I think we ought to look with great alarm upon any campaign that moves in the direction against which the Senator from Tennessee has warned.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am certain the Senator from Nevada spoke more forcefully and eloquently than I have.

Mr. BIBLE. I commend the Senator. His remarks are in good taste and are properly spoken. Certainly the people of the United States should take great strength from reading such an able talk as the one he has just delivered.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thank the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I, too, wish to to commend the senior Senator from Tennessee for what he has just said. In his speech, he talked about the responsibilities of the people, using the term in its generic sense. He has exercised his responsibility as a U.S. Senator in a very statesmanlike and responsible way.

I hope that the remarks he made this afternoon will be read by all Americans, regardless of their political affiliation.

The Constitution of the United States makes no mention of race, religion, or region. I express the hope that when the people of the country go to the polls, they will judge the candidate of their choice on the basis of his record, his integrity, his ability, and his determination.

I compliment the Senator from Tennessee. Once again, as on so many public occasions, he has rendered a distinct public service. I commend him.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I deeply appreciate the compliment paid me by the distinguished Senator from Montana.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. The distinguished Senator from Tennessee, in characteristic fashion, has made a forceful, vigorous plea for religious tolerance. Certainly we who know him and know his record are aware of the fact that the Senator from Tennessee has always stood for human tolerance and mutual understanding among peoples. The words which he has spoken cannot be too often stated. In the forthcoming presidential campaign—and in every election campaign—candidates should be judged on the record. The place where they attend church is a matter of their own choice. The place where they were born is irrelevant. Their economic status is irrelevant. The things that are relevant are their record, their qualifications, their character, and their ability to lead our great country.

All Americans can join in the hope expressed by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee that religion must in no way enter into the forthcoming campaign.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thank the Senator from New York. I know his words represent the philosophy which he has demonstrated over many years. I thank him for his addition to this discussion this afternoon.

CONDEMNATION BY ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES OF INTERFERENCE BY SINO-SOVIET BLOC IN THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the action of the foreign ministers of the Organization of American States in condemning interference by the Sino-Soviet bloc of nations in this hemisphere and in condemning any attempt to "make use of the political, economic, or social situation of any American state for their purposes" marks an important step in the development of effective Pan-American cooperation.

It was not easy for the Latin American States to come out with what amounted to a bold denunciation of Cuba's policies. But with this step comes a growing realization throughout the continent that the revolutionary propaganda and incitement from Cuba are aimed not only at the United States, but also at the rest of the Western Hemisphere.

We must not expect the Latin American States to move as rapidly against one of their own number as we might like to. And we must not expect them to be as fully aware of the dangerous threat of communism as we have come to be. But it is clear that in this matter, time is on our side.

The excesses and Communist infiltration of the Cuban regime and Castro's overweening ambition to spread this brutal "revolution" beyond the borders of Cuba can only strengthen the general suspicion of that country.

The OAS condemnation of outside intervention, as worded in the Declaration of San José, is a very good start, indeed. I hope that the six-nation committee that was set up to mediate the existing Caribbean problems will be active in seeking either a change of heart in Cuban leadership or an effective policy of quarantining the Cuban menace on the Island of Cuba until the Cubans see for themselves how they have been duped by their own leaders.

As Secretary of State Herter pointed out at the conclusion of the meetings:

> The U.S. delegation firmly associates itself with the feeling of so many of its colleagues in hoping that the people of the Dominican Republic and Cuba will have the opportunity quickly to return their governments to the principles of freedom and to democracy within the inter-American system.

Mr. President, I request unanimous consent that a penetrating editorial from the New York Times be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Aug. 30, 1960]

VICTORY AT SAN JOSÉ

The United States won a notable victory at the second Foreign Ministers meeting in San José, Costa Rica. The Ministers completed a historic pair of sessions yesterday. In the first the Trujillo regime of the Dominican Republic was condemned and sanctions were voted against it. In the second of the consultative meetings there were no sanctions and Cuba was not even mentioned in the final resolution, but Cuba was the loser in an extraordinary diplomatic battle with the United States.

By any standards of the historic and traditionally acceptable principles of the inter-American system, Cuba deserved to lose. She had welcomed a threat by Russia to intervene with nuclear missiles in a Western Hemispheric quarrel. Inter-American disputes should be handled by the Organization of American States. Premier Castro had indulged in a bitter attack on the OAS while the Foreign Ministers were in San José. Moreover, the Cubans were in the process of a fierce assault on the United States. When a flyweight takes on a heavyweight he must expect to be flattened out.

The Americans won a genuine moral victory. It was important to get the OAS on record against intervention by the Sino-Soviet powers and against their attempt to make use of the political, economic, or social situation of any American state for their purposes. This represents a real threat to hemispheric stability and unity. The outcome at San José preserved hemispheric solidarity to the maximum extent possible.

It is necessary, however, to go beyond the numerical victory for the United States and beyond the wording of the resolution which was so satisfactory to the North Americans. The length of time it took to win this victory—a whole week—was extraordinary. This was a tribute to the skill and tenacity with which Cuban Foreign Minister Raul Roa fought, but it was also due to the peculiar and delicate position of the United States in the inter-American system.

Any exercise of U.S. power against a Latin American nation is instinctively resented by all the other Latin American countries. The Latins, moreover, do not really feel and see and understand the issue of communism as we do, even when they go along with the wording of resolutions like the Declaration of San José and the Caracas Resolution of 1954. Another factor to keep in mind is that the Latin delegates would have a degree of sympathy and understanding for the Cuban social revolution that is largely missing in the United States. Besides, anti-Yankeeism is a Latin American, not just a Cuban, phenomenon and the Latin members would be far more willing than we to accept the fact that the Cubans are really frightened of us and of possible intervention.

For these and other reasons one must wait to make a final, historic judgment on the San José meeting. A battle was won by the United States, but the campaign goes on. Neither the conflict with Cuba nor the problem of Communist intervention in the Western Hemisphere has been settled.

AMENDMENT TO BILL FOR CONSTRUCTION OF MEMORIAL TO PRESIDENT THEODORE ROOSEVELT

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, yesterday the distinguished junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] presented an amendment to Senate bill 2561, to construct a Memorial to President Theodore Roosevelt in the Nation's Capital. The amendment was to the effect that the living children of the former President should be consulted in connection with the approval of a design. I am a cosponsor of that amendment, as is my distinguished senior colleague.

I wish to take this opportunity to commend and thank the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] for his interest in this problem. I am impressed by his wide knowledge of the life and the accomplishments of Theodore Roosevelt, who spent so much time in South Dakota. In fact, we have learned that our colleague, the Senator from South Dakota, is sometimes somewhat of a rough rider himself.

Mr. President, today I wish to call attention to the fact that Mr. Conrad Wirth, Director of the National Parks Service, has contacted me and has indicated his complete approval of our amendment and has expressed the hope that the Theodore Roosevelt Memorial bill, as amended, will be passed by the Congress before we adjourn.

Mr. President, I share these sentiments 100 percent. I appeal with the utmost fervor to our distinguished majority leader that he program this bill. I share fully the sentiments of Mr. Wirth that it should be done at this session.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEATING. I am very happy to yield to my colleague.

Mr. JAVITS. I merely want to join my colleague in commending the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, who I think gave us a formula to break the logjam which is very embarrassing to us, and I think is embarrassing to the majority. There is no reason why the Theodore Roosevelt memorial should not be approved, so long as we can find a way to satisfy the artistic merits of the proposal and the views of the Roosevelt family. I am very glad a resolution on the matter is in sight, and join with my colleague in the hope that the measure will be programed at the earliest possible time before we adjourn, the problems in connection with the matter having been settled.

Mr. KEATING. I thank my colleague. I feel, as we get along with legislation, and get enacted some of the legislation for which this session, it is said, was called, we may be able to take up some of these other measures.

ADMINISTRATION FAILS TO PROVIDE A REALLY HELPFUL PROGRAM OF AID FOR DEPRESSED AREAS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, on August 19 our delightful and diligent colleague from New York [Mr. KEATING] made reference to the so-called 21 legislative points which the President of the United States had called to the attention of those of us who serve in this body and the other body as being important matters for attention during the short session in which we are now engaged.

I believe it is important for me, as one of the Senators from a State which has been suffering from chronic unemployment, to call attention to the reference made by my colleague, the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], to the sixth proposal, which was one of the important items the President believed could be acted upon during the few days that we would be in session.

The junior Senator from New York said this:

The fact of the matter is that Congress has repeatedly ignored the President's recommendations.

The Senator was speaking of the President's recommendations on the subject of area redevelopment legislation.

I would want the RECORD to show that the junior Senator from New York was one of the Members of this body who voted in the affirmative on the legislation for area redevelopment. He opposed, in 1959, the Senate bill calling for $389,500,000; but on May 6 of this year the junior Senator from New York voted in the Senate for the $251 million measure, the bill which had been passed in the House of Representatives. On that occasion, the vote was on a motion of the majority leader, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], to concur in the House amendments to Senate bill 722.

Then on May 24, the junior Senator from New York voted to override the veto of the President of the United States on the matter of area redevelopment.

Mr. President, I think it is important to repeat what the junior Senator from New York said on August 19:

The fact of the matter is that Congress has repeatedly ignored the President's recommendations.

PRESIDENT THWARTS MAJORITY ACTIONS

I would add that the President also has ignored the majority actions of the Congress of the United States When the junior Senator from New York speaks about a Presidential viewpoint in this matter., it should be pointed out that he disagreed with the President of the United States by voting, on May 6, for concurrence with the House, and then, on May 24, by voting to override the veto of the legislation by the President, who sent a message to Capitol Hill indicating his displeasure with the action of the Congress.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I am happy to yield.

Mr. KEATING. I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from West Virginia. Very frankly, I did disagree with the President in his action on that legislation. I regretted that the more modest bill which has been referred to by my distinguished friend from West Virginia was vetoed. I did share the President's view that the first bill which we had before us did not deal with the problem adequately; but the second bill, involving 200-odd million dollars, I did support, and I did vote to override the veto, because it dealt reasonably with a great national problem, which still exists. I refer to the distressed areas problem. I know how serious it is in the State represented by my distinguished colleague. It is also a problem in areas of New York, and the second bill would have benefited some 20 communities in New York, many of which seriously need at this time Federal assistance. Strong representations were made to me by the mayors and other leaders of these communities, both in business life and in the field of labor. There was virtual unanimity that the Federal Government should do something in this area.

The President did not agree. He favored a more modest proposal.

LEGISLATIVE PROCESS ACCOMMODATIVE

Mr. President, what I was seeking to say, in the remarks to which my friend has referred, was that the legislative process is, and must be, to some degree an accommodative process. It is more important to have needed legislation enacted than it is to have political issues. My plea was that the Congress should take up the problem again and approve a bill which had a reasonable prospect of being signed into law by the President. I believe the recommendation which I made—or, very likely, that recommendation somewhat "beefed up"—would meet with the President's approval, would be enacted into law, and would benefit many communities, including communities in the State of the Senator from West Virginia, and, to a lesser degree, those in my own State. That was the purpose of including this in the 21 points which the President sent to us as being desirable and urgent for action at this session.

I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I am very grateful for the candor with which my colleague from New York speaks on this important matter. I feel he is a realistic legislator. I am sure he feels, as I do, that in the relatively few days we have been here it would have been nearly impossible to pass the legislation in which the Senator from New York and the Senator from West Virginia have a very intense interest.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. On that question I must take issue with my friend from West Virginia. We spent 3 hours yesterday debating whether we should pass a resolution declaring it to be the sense of the Senate that the President should not make interim appointments to the Supreme Court. We might better have spent those 3 hours and the hours we have spent on other subjects trying to pass distressed areas legislation. I think we could have done so. I believe the committee could act in this area, could recommend legislation which we could pass. This, in my opinion, is more important than some of the other proposals we are now considering.

Up to now my friend and I have been in agreement, but now I must part company with him.

NEW HEARINGS ARE HELD

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, that allows me to develop this subject in a way I had intended to develop it, namely, to show that the Subcommittee on Stabilization of the Committee on Banking and Currency held a hearing on August 18 of this month. The principal witness was the Honorable Frederick H. Mueller, the Secretary of Commerce. He came before the subcommittee with a very adamant position, speaking, very frankly, for the administration with reference to a bill which was said to be a comprehensive measure to help solve this problem.

I must repeat that when the Senate originally passed a bill in 1959, in the amount of $389.5 million, the House this year passed a different version estimated to cost $251 million. The Senate, in an effort to accommodate itself to the thinking of the House and to pass a so-called moderate bill, agreed with the House. Upon the Johnson motion, the Senate agreed to the $251 million, rather than insist upon the $389.5 million as provided in the bill which passed the Senate. That measure was sent to the White House and received the veto.

We in the Senate were attempting to legislate and to be realistic. Very frankly, when we dropped from $389.5 million to $251 million it certainly meant we were in a mood to accommodate the thinking of both bodies and to send to the President—which we did—a bill which was modest in its approach to this very pressing problem.

Mr. President, I wish to refer to the testimony on August 18, 1960, of Secretary of Commerce Frederick H. Mueller before the Subcommittee on Stabilization of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency. It was my privilege to testify during the afternoon session, after Secretary Mueller had presented the administration's position and his own views earlier in the day.

The Secretary had attempted to demonstrate by dollar comparisons that the administration bill, S. 3569, introduced by the minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN], would be better for depressed area States like West Virginia and New York than S. 722, the bill vetoed by the President of the United States earlier this year. The Secretary admitted that he used a yardstick which was purely hypothetical.

COMMERCE SECRETARY'S HYPOTHETICAL YARDSTICK

Mr. President, in addition to using the hypothetical yardstick, the Secretary of Commerce, as I noted in my statement before the subcommittee, resorted to the device of picking out only one phase of the administration's proposal and comparing it with the measure which the President had vetoed. The Secretary compared only the hypothetical figures for the two bills under the provisions for loan funds for industrial areas. By so doing he was able to show that certain communities in West Virginia, Pennsylvania, and Illinois, which he specified, would have more industrial loan funds available to them under the administration version than under the bill which the President vetoed.

I said to the subcommittee then, and I repeat this afternoon, that perhaps the Secretary's method in this instance was valid, but it fell far short of proving that the Dirksen bill en toto would be as good for all the depressed areas of this country as the vetoed measure. I refer to the parts of our country which have chronic unemployment, and I allude also to the depressed rural areas. The Dirksen bill, with regard to those areas, would not provide the help afforded by the bill which the President of the United States vetoed.

The Secretary of Commerce conveniently failed to point out, in connection with the figures which were the product of the yardstick about which I have spoken, that the administration bill would require the communities or enterprises to furnish 65 percent financing before qualifying for industrial loans, whereas the bill the President vetoed would have required them to supply only 35 percent.

Mr. President, if a community or enterprise cannot furnish 65 percent of the cost of the project—as most communities in depressed areas cannot do—I ask my friend from New York of what value is a large Federal fund available for industrial loans? And that is the question I asked both the subcommittee and the Secretary of Commerce while the latter was still present in the hearing room.

Then I stated what I believe to be the position of the West Virginia delegation in the Congress—or most of us, at least:

We are far less interested in the short-term question of funds available in the first year of operation of a program of area redevelopment than we are in seeing that the basic principles of the program are inclusive of the elements needed to make that program comprehensive and adequate.

NO RURAL AID OR COMMUNITY GRANTS

A measure which provides nothing excepting technical assistance for rural areas is inadequate. The administration bill, therefore, is inadequate in this particular.

Legislation on this subject without grant provisions for community facility projects, in addition to loans for such activities, likewise is deficient, insofar as concerns depressed areas. The administration measure makes no provision for community facility grants and thus falls short in this particular, too.

And a bill which totally neglects provision for subsistence payments for those persons undergoing vocational retraining fails to face realities. An unemployed person cannot commute between home and training center and assume other expenses while undergoing training unless he has some subsistence moneys available to him. The administration version thus is unrealistic in this instance, as well as the others mentioned.

Notwithstanding these major deficiencies, Secretary Mueller claimed in his testimony before the subcommittee, while I was present in the hearing room, that the administration bill is more comprehensive than was the measure which the President vetoed. I respectfully disagree with the Secretary of Commerce, and I will point out—as I did in my testimony to the subcommittee—that in four important particulars both the original Senate-passed version of the Douglas-Cooper bill, which I cosponsored, and the measure as it ultimately passed Congress were superior to the legislation proposed by the administration following the Presidential veto.

I declare that the administration bill would fail to meet the real problems of the depressed areas most in need of redevelopment assistance.

First, and of vital importance for such a State as West Virginia, which is still predominantly rural in its population, is the provision in the last vetoed bill—S. 722—for a $100 million revolving loan fund to carry out a rural redevelopment program. This aspect of depressed area aid has been shunted aside in the administration version which calls for "technical assistance" only to rural areas. The President defended this position in his veto message when he stated:

> The rural development program and the Small Business Administration are already contributing greatly to the economic improvement of low-income rural areas.

This information will come, however, as a novel surprise to the hundreds of thousands of citizens who are literally scratching out their existence in the rural areas of our State—as in most of the Appalachian region—and in other parts of the country, too.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the learned Senator from Minnesota.

INTENTIONS BUT NO ACHIEVEMENTS

Mr. McCARTHY. I commend the Senator from West Virginia for this report to his own people and to the country on the failure of the administration to respond to the needs which are so very clear in his own State, and certainly are very pressing in other parts of the country. The reaction and the attitude of the administration which he has described with regard to this program is one which has been manifest in many areas. We Democrats propose something in the way of a practical program; those in the Republican Party respond with another program which they say is more comprehensive, but the comprehensive character of their program is always one which relates to intention and not to practical achievement. The Senator, I am sure, agrees that in all the months during which we held hearings on the problems of the unemployed and the distressed areas we could never propose a program which would be acceptable. It is like offering someone crackers. If one should give a cracker to a representative of the present administration, the receiver would say, "There is not quite enough salt on it. If the salt ratio were changed a little bit, it would be all right."

But we could never get the adjustment quite right; and likewise the administration has never come up with its own program. It is like a swimmer in distress 20 feet offshore who is thrown a 15-foot line. The administration says, "We have thrown out a 15-foot line. We have gone more than halfway." But they are always 5 feet short.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The Senator from Minnesota speaks with characteristic pointedness on this subject, and he is correct. I should like to refer to the Senator's able leadership as chairman of the Special Committee on Unemployment Problems. I think the Senator from Minnesota will remember that the committee was unanimous in the belief it is absolutely essential that assistance be provided for rural areas. Many of the coal mining communities are in that category. The three Republican members of the committee joined in making that statement.

I am amazed that the minority of the Banking and Currency Committee and the President leave the rural people and rural areas out of their considerations while, on the other hand, the three minority members of the Senate's Special Committee on Unemployment Problems unanimously stated on page 134 of that committee's report:

> It is absolutely essential that assistance be provided for rural areas. Many of the coal-mining areas are in this category.

In the State of West Virginia there are 37 counties listed among the 500 from throughout the United States with the highest percentage of commercial farms having sales of less than $2,500 per year. Furthermore, there are 17 counties of our State listed among the 500 in the country with the lowest level of farm income; and there are 17 of our counties which appear on both lists. Therefore, by either set of criteria, or by a combination of both, West Virginia is shown to be in serious need of the rural redevelopment provisions of the legislation (S. 722) which the President vetoed.

Without these rural assistance benefits, any bill would be but a cruel hoax to the thousands of citizens of the State which I am privileged to represent.

FEDERAL PARTICIPATION PERCENTAGES

The second major distinction between the vetoed S. 722 and the administration's proposal is that the so-called Dirksen administration bill proposes to limit Federal participation to a maximum of 35 percent, while the measure passed by Congress and vetoed by the President would have allowed a much higher maximum Federal participation, namely, 65 percent. So, what are we doing? We go to the communities which literally are flat upon their backs and say that whereas the bill passed by Congress and vetoed by the President would have given 65 percent participation by the Federal Government, the administration's "comprehensive" bill, as the Secretary of Commerce termed it, has cut the Federal participation down to 35 percent, and these communities cannot participate under such a formula.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. In other words this is another example of that rope which is just 5 feet too short. Is that not correct?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes; it certainly is. It is also a frayed rope, because we are constantly hearing of the threat of a veto, or the implication of a veto. It is difficult for Congress, expressive of the viewpoint of the people of this country, which is constantly under the bludgeon—and I used the word advisedly—to act affirmatively. If we act contrary to the administration's viewpoint we can expect no approval from the White House. So, when we talk about the 65 percent share, we recall the President's statement in the veto message that

essential local, State, and private initiative would be materially inhibited by the degree of Federal participation under Senate bill 722. Where the administration finds any support for this doctrinaire assumption, I do not know, because, in fact, the entire experience of the Federal Government with matching fund programs would tend to controvert that statement in the President's veto message.

Furthermore, it is worth noting that despite the oratory concerning private enterprise, the administration bill would not require any participation by private capital, whereas S. 722, which was passed by Congress but which the President vetoed, would have required a minimum private participation of 5 percent.

I emphasize again that the administration proposal to hold Federal participation to a maximum of 35 percent, thus requiring local share assumption of 65 percent, would inhibit the ability of the most needy depressed areas to undertake a program of redevelopment.

This would be especially true in West Virginia under the difficult constitutional provisions and constitutional tax limitations which prevail.

ADMINISTRATION BILL TERMED DEFICIENT

On the vital question of Federal participation maximum, the administration bill is so deficient it would defeat the prime purpose of aiding chronic areas of unemployment in our Nation.

As a third consideration, the measure approved by Congress, but vetoed by the President, would have authorized appropriations of $35 million for grants to communities for public facilities, but the administration version provides only for loans, and absolutely nothing by way of grants.

As was pointed out in the discussion of Federal participation maximum, many of the communities which have suffered most severely from unemployment and related economic problems cannot gain any material help from the administration bill—in this instance because they cannot borrow needed redevelopment funds at the interest rates prescribed.

Then, as the fourth major difference, both the vetoed measure (S. 722) and the proposed Scott bill (S. 3658) acknowledge the realities of the problem of vocational retraining by authorizing subsistence payments for those citizens undergoing vocational retraining who are not eligible for unemployment compensation. This vital aspect of the problem—like the rural aspect—has been practically ignored by the administration version (S. 3569).

Mr. President, it seems to me that there must be some provision to alleviate the tragic human waste of workers whose skills have been declared surplus because of technological advances, and who have not acquired new skills. In this instance I speak, of course, of the thousands of coal miners who wait vainly for the mines to reopen or for the operating mines to again call for their skills or their brawn.

In West Virginia there are about 10,700 non-agricultural workers who are not employed now but who were employed 1 year ago. The figures in June showed a decrease in nonagricultural employment in our State of 6,800. In July it was increased to 10,700.

We think of thousands of men, for the most part mature men with families. Many of them had been on only a partial workweek for 1, 2, or even 3 years before becoming totally unemployed. Their material resources long since have been exhausted, and their psychological resources are being eroded by neglect. Many of them must have retraining and the subsistance fund necessary to enable them to participate in training courses.

APPELLATE REVIEW OF CRIMINAL SENTENCES

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, ordinarily this late in a session it would be impractical to introduce legislation which proposes to extend our procedural law in Federal criminal matters. For a reason which will be made clear later in my remarks I send to the desk a bill on that subject and ask unanimous consent that its full text be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, briefly, this bill calls for an appellate review of criminal sentences on the ground of excessiveness. It may come as a surprise to many of my colleagues that the United States appears to be the only country in the free world in which there is no review of the punishment imposed by the trial court in its discretion. Nevertheless, this is the case.

Although our circuit courts of appeal may correct a sentence which is outside the bounds set by statute—in other words, an illegal sentence—such courts are powerless to review and modify a sentence which imposes punishment within the limits allowed by statute but is in their own judgment more severe than warranted by the circumstances of the case.

Parenthetically, although the State jurisdictions of Arkansas, Arizona, Hawaii, Idaho, Iowa, Nebraska, Ohio, Oklahoma and Pennsylvania will allow appellate modification of criminal sentences for abuse of discretion by the trial court, only in Connecticut, Massachusetts and New York will the reviewing authority replace the discretion of the trial court with its own discretion in the absence of a showing of abuse. This as far as the United States has progressed in this direction.

By such legislation as I introduce today we make further progress regarding a problem that has concerned Congress, bar associations and legal societies, students, and workers in the field of penology and, indeed, the executive branch of our Government and the courts for many years. This is the problem of disparity of sentences. Putting aside what may be the ultimate or most desirable goals of a rational and humane sentence, we have in modern times been receding from the practice of enacting statutes calling for a mandatory fixed sentence. A greater number of our criminal laws now call for wide-range, indeterminate sentences. The practical effect of this is obvious. As the final determining factor in the sentence to be imposed, the judge's discretionary power becomes increasingly important.

By and large the wisdom of this policy of delegating the function to the trial judge has been clearly demonstrated. Our district judges are exceedingly conscientious, knowledgeable, and experienced. They are best able, informed, and qualified to deal fairly with the convicted defendant.

However, they are the first to recognize the inadequacies in the present system. The exercise of judgment in this delicate area is not easy. The responsibility for determining the proper sentence is so great as to justify and warrant the means of review. There is little wonder that judges have openly commented on the incongruity of the situation that the power to impose a sentence is the only discretionary power vested in the Federal trial judge which is not subject to appeal, for the purposes set out in the proposed measure.

Yet a study of the Federal statutes and the interpretation given them by the courts establishes that no authority exists for an appellate review of the sentence imposed by the judge in a criminal case so as to determine whether the sentence is excessive. A sentence will be modified only when it is unauthorized by law as not being within the limits fixed by a valid statute.

How serious is this failing was the subject of comment in the case of *Shepard* v. *United States* (257 F. 2d 293, 294):

> It is an anomaly that a judicial system which has developed so scrupulous a concern for the protection of a criminal defendant throughout every other stage of the proceedings against him should have neglected this most important dimension of fundamental justice.

In the 85th Congress the concern about the problem of sentence disparities brought about pioneering legislation. With the enactment of Public Law 85-752, 28 U.S.C. 334, institutes and joint councils on sentencing were provided. Their value cannot be overestimated. Assistant Attorney General Doub recently described the institutes as giving "the Federal judges themselves an opportunity to assume the initiative in eliminating sentences which may appear biased, capricious, or the result of defective judgment."

However, in the 85th Congress this and related legislation did not entirely round out the relief which ought to be provided by Congress. A gap exists. Our courts of appeal should be empowered to modify a criminal sentence imposed in the discretion of the trial judge on the ground as well that it is excessive.

The legislation which has been prepared endeavors to accomplish that purpose. It permits the taking of an appeal of the sentence imposed upon conviction. As a control factor, the allowance of the appeal is made discretionary with the appellate court. Whenever leave to appeal is granted, however, the reviewing court may reduce the sentence if, to use the technical language of the bill,

"it determines that the conviction was proper but that the sentence imposed was more severe than warranted by the circumstances of the case."

The mechanics of the bill I leave for future discussion. My purpose here is mainly to outline the need for such a measure. No doubt as the bill is analyzed and evaluated, it will be necessary to go into the technical aspect of its operation as that relates to criminal procedural law generally. It is sufficient only to say here that the bill calls for a limitation of time in which such an appeal can be taken after sentence is imposed; that with an allowance of an appeal, the appellate court may have access to whatever reports or additional information is deemed necessary and not included in the record; and that determination of such an appeal may be had with or without a hearing.

The Senator from Nebraska recognizes that no bill of this nature could receive adequate consideration in the time remaining in this session. The purpose of introducing it now is mainly to allow interested groups and the various departments of Government affected to offer their comments during the intervening months prior to the opening of the 87th Congress, when I intend to reintroduce the measure with the hope that it will receive early consideration.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following material and articles on the subject be printed after the text of the bill: "The Sentence of the Court: Should There Be Appellate Review?" by Simon E. Sobeloff, from the January 1955, issue of the American Bar Association Journal; and excerpts from "Recent Trends in the Criminal Law," by George C. Doub, from the February 1960 issue of the ABA Journal.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the ABA Journal, January 1960]

THE SENTENCE OF THE COURT—SHOULD THERE BE APPELLATE REVIEW?

(By Simon E. Sobeloff, Solicitor General of the United States)

(Addressing the section of criminal law during the 1954 annual meeting in Chicago, Solicitor General Sobeloff called attention to the fact that, while we have elaborate safeguards to protect an accused during trial, in most jurisdictions the problem of sentencing a convicted defendant is left almost entirely to the discretion of one man—the trial judge, although the problem of what to do with the convict is often greater than that of determining his guilt. He proposes that appellate courts be given the power to review sentences imposed.)

It is commonplace to say that often the real problem is not to establish the guilt or innocence of the accused but to decide on a proper sentence. An English jurist, Mr. Justice McCardle, is quoted as having revealed a not too obscure professional secret: "Anyone," he said, "can try a case. That is as easy as falling off a log. The difficulty comes in knowing what to do with a man once he has been found guilty."

It has been very impressive to me that the law is so solicitous of the defendant in safeguarding his rights at every stage of the trial before verdict, and yet leaves him almost completely without protection when he stands before the judge to be sentenced.

We go to great lengths to insure a fair trial. Courts are gravely concerned if the prosecutor or the police publicize their version of the facts in advance of trial, because it is feared that this may prejudice the cause of the accused. We recognize as fundamental his right to be represented by counsel and this right has been given added vitality in recent decisions of the Supreme Court. Further emphasis has been put on this constitutional right in the recommendation of Attorney General Herbert Brownell, Jr., that public defenders or special counsel be provided for indigent accused at government expense to assure a competent and vigorous defense in every case where the defendant stands trial.

We insist upon strict requirements as to the form of the indictment, so as to inform the accused of the nature of the accusation. Carefully we exclude hearsay and demand that the defendant be confronted with the witnesses against him. Every act or circumstance which is liable to embarrass the defendant in court is discountenanced. He may not be brought into the courtroom manacled or otherwise restrained and he may not be photographed there against his will. The person charged may not be called by the prosecution to testify, but he is allowed to take the stand on his own behalf if he elects to do so. If he prefers to remain mute, the prosecutor may not comment on the fact that the defendant has refrained from giving his version of transactions peculiarly within his knowledge.

Many are the convictions that have been reversed because the judge erred on some technical ruling on evidence or refused to instruct the jury sufficiently as to the rights of the accused, particularly in respect to the presumption of innocence and the State's burden of proof. Extreme precautions are taken to exclude from the jury room all extraneous influences. A verdict of guilty cannot be returned in a Federal court, and in most States, unless all 12 jurors are convinced of guilt beyond a reasonable doubt.

Contrast this strict insistence on the rights of the accused during trial, when the issue is often not too doubtful, with the total absence of safeguards when the ultimate problem is reached, namely, what final disposition to make of the case. The really difficult question usually is what to do with the defendant after conviction. Here the trial judge is given in most jurisdictions, including the Federal, the widest latitude of discretion. He may suspend the sentence; he may put the defendant on probation; he may impose a nominal fine or a jail sentence for a short period; or he may "throw the book" at the defendant.

Under our practice, which permits multiple counts for the same or related acts, with cumulative sentences, the aggregated penalties can be oppressive indeed without transcending legal limits. In some jurisdictions the effect of mounting one sentence upon another consecutively is to deny the prisoner opportunity for parole until he has served a minimum part of the last of the series of sentences.

There is, it is true, a constitutional guarantee against "cruel and unusual punishments" but this has been interpreted in my State of Maryland, and I think generally, to mean only that the judge may not impose a sentence greater than the maximum allowed by statute. This is mighty little protection to the convicted man. The range between a suspended sentence and one of 300 years, such as was imposed recently by one judge, permits considerable leeway for differences of opinion, to put it mildly. There are no definite guides for the judge. He follows his sense of justice which, like the proverbial chancellor's foot, varies from judge to judge. The sentence in the particular case lies practically uncontrolled in the understanding and the conscience of the judge, and the criteria are vague and almost nonexistent.

Writers have listed some of the factors which are customarily considered in imposing sentence. It is often said that the prime objective in administering the criminal law is to protect society, and that the idea of meting out punishment as retribution has generally been discarded. But if the prevention of crime is the goal, how is this to be achieved?

THE TENDENCY TO OVERWORK PET SIMPLIFICATIONS

A regrettable feature of much of the discussion in this field is the tendency to overwork pet simplifications. Some sweepingly insist that the nature of the crime is controlling, and they disregard the personality of the criminal. Others stress the character of the offender with almost no attention to the character of the offense.

There are those who would limit the inquiry to questions such as these: Is the defendant subject to rehabilitation? Would he be a menace if set at large? What period of imprisonment and what type of treatment are needed to make it safe to restore him to society? They say with truth that you cannot equate crimes or even all crimes within a single category. The endless variety of fact and circumstance which distinguishes cases must enter into judgment.

But these factors may be unduly weighted at the expense of another consideration. No one will argue that the community sense of justice is not a contributing, even sometimes a decisive ingredient in arriving at the proper sentence. The public expectations—not to be confused with public passion and hysteria—are also entitled to consideration.

Furthermore, shall we stress the deterring effect of the public example in sentencing the convicted person? Some have argued that the deterring effect of a severe sentence is considerable, while others deny that a person contemplating a crime is often influenced by this. Yet we can be sure without demonstration that in the absence of sanctions in our criminal law, violations would be so general as to destroy public order.

Obviously each of these competing factors plays its part. Some validity is to be found in each, and all truth is to be found in no one of them. An alert and open-minded willingness to examine them all is necessary, and wisdom lies in knowing what weight to ascribe to each in the particular case. There are no pat answers anywhere, and certainly the search for a clue must not be restricted to the buckram-bound books. The world, as Alice in Wonderland was reminded, is full of a number of things. The necessary insights and experience for the delicate task of fixing criminal penalties must be sought in other fields as well as in the law.

As in other areas of public business, attitudes swing widely between extremes. People sway, sometimes with dramatic swiftness, from complete lethargy toward lax prosecution and sentimental softness in handling offenders, to shrill demands for extreme and excessive penalties. The same good people who express sincere abhorrence when they read sympathetic accounts of a disproportionately long or cruel sentence callously inflicted, are likely to shout for tough justice when a particularly revolting crime is not punished as promptly or as severely as they think it deserves. They favor the mitigations of our probation and parole systems, but when their indignation is aroused by some spectacular crime they abandon faith in these processes. They then demand Draconian laws, hard and inflexible, setting mandatory minimum sentences without the possibility of suspension or reduction by parole or pardon.

One of the most deplorable and self-defeating arrangements that then is likely to follow is the writing into law of a rigid formula under the illusion that it will automatically insure a good result in all cases. The desired ends cannot be achieved in that way. We indeed exalt a government of laws and not of men; but what is meant thereby is that men shall be limited by law and shall not be free to act arrogantly and arbitrarily. It does not mean that laws are or can be self-executing. It is quite beyond legislative ingenuity to invent a slot machine that will dispense automatic justice and make unnecessary the adjudicative function.

The very principle of the separation of powers—so basic in our form of government—is predicated on the concept that to declare a rule is one function and to apply it to specific cases is a distinct function; and that any attempt to combine the two is likely to prove unwise and dangerous. It is a tragic mistake to rule out thinking and feeling from the administration of justice. I do not go so far as to argue that a law which sets a fixed penalty for every violation is unconstitutional, but not everything that is constitutional is necessarily wise. There will always be a need for the application of discriminating judgment, the exercise of compassion, and the use of that lubricating common sense without which it is not possible to attain the satisfactory operation of any government machinery.

A depressing result of laws commanding the imposition of minimum penalties in disregard of the particular circumstances of the case is that they leave no scope to soften harshness and mitigate injustice. What Federal judge has not been torn in his heart by the inflexible minimum penalties prescribed in certain statutes? Recently I attended the judicial conference of the fifth circuit. Half of an entire session was devoted to the recital of instances of unconscionable penalties made mandatory by the Anti-Narcotic Act. One judge told of a case where a highly regarded pharmacist, with no prior criminal record, violated the law by giving someone a small quantity of a narcotic drug to relieve acute suffering. This he did for no personal gain, but for humanitarian reasons, expecting that a doctor's prescription would follow. The evidence of the violation, however, was entirely clear and the jury was about to bring in a verdict of guilty. The judge related how he sent the jurors back after explaining that if they convicted, he would have no choice but to impose a minimum 2-year penitentiary sentence. The jury further considered the matter and brought in a verdict of not guilty, to the immense relief of the judge.

JUDGES ARE IN DIFFICULT POSITION

No one can fail to sympathize with a judge put in such a difficult position by a rigid law passed by men of good motives who fail to foresee and understand the consequences of their legislation. For all their training and discipline, judges are not unlike other men in their reluctance to serve as instruments of unnecessary inclemency and injustice. The tendency then is for the trial judge or the appellate tribunal to deflect the force of the law in the instant case by strained and unnatural constructions that may work havoc to the legal system in future cases. It is a truism that hard cases make bad law, and many of the technical absurdities found in the law had their origin in the humane effort of judges to escape from the imposition of excessive sentences.

If there is anything that the long experience with our system of criminal law and punishment should teach, it is that mere severity in sentencing fails to prevent crime. In my law school days I recall reading in Stephen's "History of the English Criminal Law," about sentences imposed in former times by British courts. They seemed inordinately cruel—tearing out of the tongue; branding; transportation for a period of many years. Several hundred offenses were punishable by death. Larceny was one of them and hangings were conducted in public the better to impress the populace and in the hope, by the gruesome example to deter similar crimes. Nevertheless we are told that pickpockets were not deterred from plying their trade in the very crowd that stood witnessing the spectacle.

Until 1826, in fact, every felony in England was punishable by death. Now the English have reduced the number of crimes which are capital and they have standardized the method of punishment to terms in prison instead of the mayhems and physical tortures of ancient days. I daresay that Englishmen of our day are far more rational in their sentences than we are.

It is a striking fact that although the British and we have a common legal heritage there is a wide difference between them and us in the amount of crime and in the character of the penalties. We have two and a half times the number of prisoners they have per 100,000 population, and our sentences are longer. In all England in a recent year not more than 588 men received terms of 5 years or more and in the United States in the same year 18,000 offenders were committed for maximum terms of 5 years or more. The disparity is out of proportion to the size of the respective populations of the two countries; the difference is partly in the crime rate and partly in the unequal values the two countries ascribe to long sentences.

Likewise, to the north of us in the province of Alberta, Canada, is a population of a million with less than 500 in prison. In contrast the District of Columbia, with a population of slightly more than 800,000, has some 4,000 prisoners—more than 8 times as many.

There may be a lesson, too, in comparing the figures from different States in the Union. After making allowance for differences in statistical methods, it is still notable that many of the States that release their prisoners after shorter terms are the ones in which the crime rate is lower. Generally capital punishment is less in vogue than in the past, and there is nothing to warrant the belief that the crime rate is affected thereby. This was recently shown in a series of articles appearing in the New York Herald Tribune. The conclusion is strongly suggested that merely imposing heavy penalties does not diminish the incidence of crime.

THE OTHER SIDE OF THE COIN: INADEQUATE SENTENCES

There is another side to the coin. Misuse of the sentencing power is not always directed against the defendant. Sometimes judges impose grossly inadequate sentences, due to misunderstanding, defective judgment, caprice, or bias. In one case the cashier of a small national bank stole enough money to wipe out the bank's capital and surplus. By clever manipulation of a certain large inactive deposit account, the defalcations were concealed for many years, but at long last the crime was discovered. When the banker was indicted the judge was very critical of the form of the indictment and sustained a motion to quash, but on direct appeal to the U.S. Supreme Court he was reversed and the indictment upheld. The judge was chagrined but remained unconvinced. When the defendant, finding himself with no defense on the merits, pleaded guilty, the judge expressed his resentment by suspending sentence.

Yet in the same court a 16-year-old newsboy was given an 18-month term for selling song-sheets printed without permission of the copyright owners of the songs. One may be permitted to doubt that either of these sentences would have been passed if the judge had known that his action might have to meet scrutiny on appeal.

Such fantastic vagaries tear down the mightiest sanction of the law—respect for the courts. We have good and wise men on the bench, but not all are wise and good; and even the best and most prudent, being human are like Homer, sometimes likely to nod. The truth is that passing sentence is too delicate and too powerful a function to lodge in any man's hands entirely unsupervised.

We have in the Federal courts a system of definite sentences, except for the Federal Youth Correction Act, which allows commitment of young offenders to a special board without specifying a minimum period of confinement. Such offenders, after they have been studied, may be released at any time. In other jurisdictions, as in California, there are several kinds of indeterminate sentences where the courts merely set the maximum and leave it to some administrative board to determine the minimum. Some form of indefinite sentence is used in 9 States, and in 22 they are the predominant pattern. Actually definite sentences are being imposed now in upward of 40 percent of all felony convictions.

It is not unusual to expect the writer on a topic such as this to come up with some solutions, but I think it better not to be dogmatic. The wiser approach is not to offer solutions forthwith but to encourage inquiry. There is hope in the American Law Institute's formulation of a criminal code and its other undertakings, and in such projects as are now being planned by the Committee on the Administration of Criminal Justice, under the auspices of this association. The participation of the able head of our Criminal Division, Assistant Attorney General Warren Olney III, bespeaks the cooperation of the Department of Justice.

Whether more objective criteria for sentencing can ever be developed than we have today or if it is possible to harmonize the various elements that demand consideration in the disposition of a criminal case, I do not know. I should, however, like to propose something for the attention of the researchers and students. There is need for a more effective protection of the rights of the individual not inconsistent with the needs of the community; there is need, too, to protect society's interest where that has been lost sight of in meting out sentences. I suggest a study of the desirability of providing for appellate review of sentences. I do not claim for the idea that it would accomplish a miracle but its merits deserve investigation.

It is not a radical idea and is not altogether untried. In England, legislation authorizing appellate courts to review sentences was enacted in 1907. In order to discourage frivolous and unfounded appeals, the law empowers the higher courts not only to quash or reduce sentences they deem excessive but they may substitute such sentences as they think proper, whether they be more or less severe. The result is that sentencing judges exercise their power with moderation and restraint, and without going to unwarranted extremes of severity or leniency, for they know that the higher court will not tolerate abuses on their part. At the same time defendents do not lightheartedly seek review for they know that in appropriate cases the penalty may be increased.

For years the American Law Institute has recommended appellate examination of criminal sentences. New York and approximately a half dozen other States permit reduction of sentences on appeal in certain types of cases, and in the military system sentences as well as judgments of guilt are reviewable as a matter of course.

In a certain case an appellate court had before it the appeal of a man in his early

twenties who had raped his young sister-in-law. There was no real doubt that he had committed the crime, yet there was a long meticulous inquiry in the trial about a question that was hardly in dispute, namely, the man's guilt. However, when the verdict was pronounced the man was subject to the will of the one judge in the trial court. The defendant was sentenced to be hanged and the case was then appealed. The appellate tribunal came inevitably to the conclusion that the man had been proved guilty in accordance with all the rules and in accordance, as the judges thought, with the justice of the case. Some members of the court, however, felt grave misgivings about the appropriateness and justice of the death penalty under the circumstances. Nevertheless they were powerless to interfere.

In that case the Governor commuted the sentence to life imprisonment, thereby drawing upon himself considerable criticism for his so-called interfering with the courts. These unthinking critics did not realize that no court above the trial judge had ever examined the sentence. "The courts," spoken of with such unctuous veneration, was in this, as in other cases, only one man. Few people understand that on appeal the court is not permitted to pay any attention to the fitness of the penalty. Although in the case I have in mind the Governor courageously intervened, it must be recognized that the duty of reviewing sentences should not ordinarily rest on the Governor. The judicial process should have the internal means of overcoming its own mistakes.

It is no disrespect to trial judges to suggest that the provision of an appeal from the sentence, at least in the more serious cases, would have a sobering and moderating effect. Realization by the sentencing judge that extreme behavior on his part is subject to modification would prevent such an incident as the sentence of 140 years, imposed upon a 17-year-old boy—seven consecutive 20-year sentences for a series of robberies committed in 1 night. The possibility of review would make itself felt even in cases not actually appealed. The existence of the power would make its exercise unnecessary in all but a few cases.

If there is not to be a separation of the sentencing from the guilt-finding function, and if the bench is to retain the power to sentence with the vast discretion that the criminal law necessarily lodges in the trial judge, then it seems desirable to provide an appeal broad enough to prevent abuses and to lessen gross disparities. A proper measure of uniformity in sentences is to be achieved not by inexorable statutory commands of minimum penalties regardless of circumstances, but rather by the occasional review in an appellate court of sentences passed by the trial judges in its jurisdiction. Equally to be avoided are two extremes: On the one hand the undeviating rigidity of statutes and on the other unappealable and sometimes capricious and inflamed sentencing by a single man on the bench.

It is often said that the appellate court lacks advantages possessed by the trial judge who has seen the witnesses and the defendant. This is true. On the other hand the appellate court has some advantages that are denied the trial judge. On appeal there is less likelihood of emotional overtones from which even a conscientious trial judge may find it difficult to escape when he imposes sentence shortly after hearing of the defendant's outrageous conduct. The appellate court also has the advantage of a wider perspective of cases.

Of course the appellate court would have access to probation reports and similar data precisely to the same extent as the trial judge. I do not find it necessary to enter the controversy as to whether counsel should be shown "confidential reports." That is a separate question. Whatever is the prevailing practice in the sentencing court, the same practice may be followed on appeal.

It may not be amiss to suggest further that judges at all levels should be required to be more familiar than some judges are with relevant developments in the medical and social sciences and with procedures in the penal institutions to which they commit convicted persons.

The fact that sentences must be determined without the benefit of definite and reliable formulas is no reason for denying opportunity to test the judgment of the court on appeal. On the contrary, precisely because the trial judge is forced to operate with so little guidance in the legal rules a second glance at the product is all the more indicated.

If it is not unfair to the trial judge in an equity case or a law case on the civil side to test not only his conclusions of law but his findings of fact, I do not see why in a criminal case it should be considered an invasion of the trial judge's province for the higher court to review the sentence. Naturally, great weight should be given to the trial court's action, but it should not be considered sacrosanct.

To the sentencing judge in serious cases it should be a source of comfort to know that any error he may have committed in this most crucial step of the whole trial is subject to correction on appeal as rulings of less gravity may be tested and, if need be, corrected. Moreover, when affirmed on appeal, the trial judge would have the satisfying assurance that not only some technical rulings of his have been approved but that his judgment on the most momentous question in the case has been upheld. In exercising the pardoning power the chief executive too would be able to act with greater confidence if he knew that not only the judge at nisi prius thought the sentence proper, but that on appeal the higher courts had sustained that judgment.

If you hesitate at this extension of appellate authority, I remind you that the right to any kind of appeal in criminal cases is only a century old; yet no one today would dream of withdrawing this established feature of our law.

I conclude with the confident hope that this, like any proposal aimed to prevent the miscarriage of justice, may command at least the interest of lawyers, serious about their role as ministers of justice and devoted to the study and orderly reform of our system of criminal law.

[From the ABA Journal, February 1960]

EXCERPTS FROM "RECENT TRENDS IN THE CRIMINAL LAW"

(Mr. Doub devotes his attention to two aspects of criminal law: the problem of setting up standards to guide judges in imposing sentences and the need for some revisions in the work of the U.S. Commissioners. The article is taken from an address delivered before the section of criminal law at the association's 1959 annual meeting in Bal Harbour/Miami Beach last August.)

(By George Cochran Doub, Assistant Attorney General of the United States)

The most conspicuous trend in criminal law in recent years has been the new look at some of our established concepts accompanied by an eagerness to overhaul well-defined notions and principles. During the past 5 years, there has been more inquiry, study, and questioning of the method of our system of criminal justice than in any prior period in our history. Reevaluation has included the causes of crime, the criminal court process, sentence, probation, parole, and custodial care. It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that this ferment indicates an underlying dissatisfaction with our simplified treatment of crime and punishment in the modern society.

Commissions for the study and revision of criminal codes have been appointed in a number of States, and the State of Wisconsin has recently proceeded further and adopted a new, more direct and less ambiguous code. The painstaking work of the American Law Institute in the development of its Model Penal Code is attracting increasing attention and even proposed sections contained in its tentative drafts have achieved sufficient recognition to be cited in Supreme Court opinions. I have no doubt that the Model Penal Code proposals will make notable contributions to the complex problem of reconciling criminal justice with desirable theories of social justice to the advantage of both the individual and society.

* * * * *

CAPRICIOUS SENTENCES—A CAUSE OF DISSATISFACTION

Particular dissatisfaction has been manifested lately with respect to the vagaries involved in our present methods of sentencing. The sometimes grossly excessive or grossly inadequate punishment and the conflicting standards applied by the same, as well as different, trial judges have suggested to some that the power of sentence is too delicate and too powerful a function to be lodged in one man without supervision. After giving a number of examples of seemingly capricious sentences, Chief Judge Simon Sobeloff of the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals has concluded:

"Such fantastic vagaries tear down the mightiest sanction of the law—respect for the courts. We have good and wise men on the bench, but not all are wise and good; and even the best and most prudent, being human are, like Homer, liable sometimes to nod. The truth is that passing sentence is too delicate and too powerful a function to lodge in any man's hands entirely unsupervised."

Under the civil law of Western Europe, sentences are imposed by multiple-judge trial courts. In no criminal court under the civil law system of Western Europe is one judge permitted to fix a punishment involving the loss of life or liberty of a citizen. In addition, statutes attempt to formulate and define the aggravating and mitigating circumstances which the trial judges are directed to consider.

The United States is the only country in the free world where a sentencing court need give no reasons for the imposition of a sentence. In every other country the decision of the court on matters of punishment must be supported by detailed explanation. As Professor George has said, with respect to foreign courts, "The decision of the court on matters of sentence, in contrast to the stark declaration of the sentence practiced in this country, must be supported by reasons at least as detailed as those which support the finding of guilt itself."

The United States appears to be the only country in the free world in which there is no appellate review of the punishment imposed by the trial court. Under the civil law, courts of appeal are authorized to make independent findings of fact with respect to sentences. Appeal may be brought by either the government, the accused or the injured party. In most civil law jurisdictions the appellate court is only permitted to reduce, not increase, the sentence, although in Italy the sentence may be either increased or reduced.

Under the civil law a sentence upon appeal is evaluated upon the basis of the degree of consistency between the sentence imposed and sentences imposed in other courts for similar offenses. Accordingly, the appellate courts tend to bring the sentences reviewed toward a common denominator or common standard. If a particular sentence

deviates conspicuously from the usual measure of punishment for similar crimes, it is modified.

The English system has completely departed from the common law tradition of limited appellate review in criminal cases.

Under the Criminal Appeals Act of 1907 a convicted person may, by leave of the Court of Criminal Appeals, appeal a sentence following conviction unless the sentence is one determined by law. If the court is of the opinion that a different sentence should have been imposed, it may pass any sentence warranted under the circumstances, whether more or less than that originally ordered. The possibility of an increased sentence upon appeal discourages frivolous appeals from the sanctions imposed. In the Commonwealth countries, the accused, the government or the injured party may appeal matters of sentence, and in these jurisdictions sentences have on occasion been substantially increased despite objections by the nonappealing defendant.

Under the British system appellate judges consistently refuse to interfere merely because they, sitting as a trial judge, might have fixed some other punishment. They only interfere when matters of principle are involved. The requirement that no one may appeal the sentence imposed except with permission of the appellate court and the comparatively few permissions granted have held the number of sentences reviewed to a minimum. In the period from June 1948 to August 1949 only 10 appeals against sentence were heard by the English Court of Criminal Appeals. In five the sentence was affirmed, in four the sentence was reduced, and in one the sentence was increased. In 1956 leave to appeal against a sentence was permitted in six cases, in two the sentence was affirmed, in three the sentence was reduced, and in one the sentence was increased. In the Commonwealth countries appeals from sentences have likewise not been numerous.

The value of this appeal right from sentence may not be determined by either the number of appeals or the percentage of affirmances or modifications. The existence of the appeal privilege inevitably results in lower courts conforming to a considerable degree in their sentencing standards to those defined in appellate decisions. The tendency is against extreme harshness of punishment or extreme leniency.

In the Federal system we insist upon strict and highly technical requirements for the protection of the rights of the accused during trial, although the issue of guilt may not even be doubtful. Yet we provide a total absence of safeguards when the ultimate and most difficult problem is reached as to the disposition to be made of the convicted person. Here the trial judge is given in the Federal system, and in most State jurisdictions, the widest latitude of discretion. He may impose the maximum prison sentence, he may suspend the sentence, he may prescribe probation, he may impose a nominal fine. There are no guides for the judge and he follows his sense of justice which, like the Chancellor's foot, varies from judge to judge. Justice Cardozo once wrote that "the present system, in the view of many is as irrational in its mercies as in its rigors, and in its rigors as in its mercies." So in a particular case the sentence lies practically uncontrolled in the understanding and the conscience of the judge, the criteria applied being vague, if not non-existent.

NO RECORD OF THE REASONS FOR THE SENTENCE

Although the character of the sanction to be imposed may be the most difficult problem in a criminal case, it is not the practice in the Federal system for the appellate record to contain any information as to the reasons why the district judge imposed the particular sentence. Indeed, there is no requirement in the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure that the district court state its reasons for the imposition of the sentence made and, if the district court does state its reasons, the appellate record omits this significant information.

I believe that the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure should be amended to require the district court to make a statement of record as to the reasons for his sentence and to require the appellate record to include that statement. Sentences which, without explanation, may seem whimsical or oppressive to an appellate court may have had in fact a reasonable basis. The requirement I suggest should result in fewer fallacious assumptions by the appellate court and should cause the district courts, in defining their reasons for the particular sentence on the record, to develop an even more careful and objective approach to their difficult problem.

* * * * *

The judges who have served on the appellate division are enthusiastic about its success and believe that this procedure has brought about much better sentencing. They also report that there has been no criticism of the system by prosecutors, the courts, the press, or the public. The principal objections of substance to appeals from a criminal court sentence appear to be avoided by the Massachusetts system of providing for informal appellate review by trial judges.

A reflex of the current dissatisfaction with existing sentencing methods has been the repeated efforts of the Congress and State legislatures to restrict the discretion of trial judges by making mandatory fixed prison sentences for particular crimes. Such statutes generally are adopted as an angry reaction to some publicized offenses, are designed to destroy any discretion of the trial court and implicitly manifest a lack of confidence in them. By statute the armed robbery of a post office carries a mandatory sentence of 25 years. The penalties provided for in the Narcotics Control Act make it impossible for a judge to distinguish between the drug racketeer on the one hand and a hapless victim of the racketeer on the other.

I believe that these Draconian laws, hard and inflexible, are basically unsound because they preclude discriminating judgment, the exercise of compassion and the use of any lubricating common sense. The artificial rigidity of such statutes, denying any consideration of mitigating circumstances, has resulted in trial judges, juries, and appellate courts deflecting the impact of the laws by strained and unnatural constructions.

Another constructive development during the past few months has been the decision of the Judicial Conference of the United States to make a comprehensive study of the U.S. commissioner system. You will recall that the commissioners, who act as committing magistrates, issue warrants for arrest and search, conduct preliminary examinations, commit prisoners for trial and set bail. When authorized by the district courts, commissioners try petty offenses originating in the Federal enclaves. In spite of their important work, the commissioners have been the "lost brethren" of the Federal judicial system. Few members of the bar have been acquainted with their functions and the lack of interest in their work is best indicated by the fact that, as far as I know, the law review article of Mr. Kestenbaum and myself, in the University of Pennsylvania Law Review for March 1959, is the only published article attempting to analyze their functions.

I am convinced that the important but little-known work of the U.S. commissioners needs a major overhaul. It is my hope that the study directed by the Judicial Conference will result in the abolition of the archaic fee system of compensation for U.S. commissioners, which requires them to look to their fees, fines, and bail forfeitures for their compensation, and the substitution of fixed salaries. It is a return to medievalism for the Federal system to compel magistrates to have a personal pecuniary stake in their judicial or quasi-judicial acts. I am also hopeful that, although the power of appointment of commissioners continue to remain in the chief judge of each district, who is particularly familiar with the qualifications of members of the bar, the Judicial Conference of the United States will establish minimum standards and qualifications which must be applied in the appointment of the commissioners.

And finally, the commissioners should be vested with authority to try all Federal petty offenses, not because such offenses are burdensome upon the district courts, but because it is oppressive and onerous for persons to be charged and tried upon minor offenses in the Federal district courts. Federal justices of the peace should handle such cases for the same good reasons that comparable offenses have been handled for more than a century by State justices of the peace throughout the United States.

In conclusion, may I suggest that the notable current interest in the reexamination and reevaluation of our system of criminal justice is a wholesome development. Any civilization must be judged to a considerable extent by its treatment of the historic problems of crime and punishment. In this area we deal with great problems and they require the very best thinking on the part of the bar, the bench, and the public.

EXHIBIT 1

S. 3914

A bill to amend chapter 235 of title 18, United States Code, to provide for the appellate review of sentences imposed in criminal cases arising in the district courts of the United States

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) chapter 235 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting, immediately after section 3741 thereof, the following new section:

"§ 3742. APPEAL FROM SENTENCE.

"(a) In every case arising in a district court of the United States in which a defendant has been convicted of a criminal offense for which no mandatory sentence is fixed by law, the defendant may, with leave granted by the circuit court of the United States for the appropriate circuit upon application therefor made by the defendant within ten days after the date of entry of the judgment imposing sentence upon him, appeal from the sentence so imposed upon the ground that the sentence, although within lawful limits, is excessive. Upon the allowance of any such appeal by a circuit court, the clerk of the district court and the appropriate United States attorney shall certify to the court of appeals such transcripts of proceedings, records, and other information relating to the offense of the defendant and the sentence imposed upon him as the circuit court by rule or order may require.

"(b) Any such appeal may be determined by the circuit court with or without hearing thereon. On any such an appeal, the appellate court may reduce the sentence imposed by the district court to any lawful sentence which it deems appropriate, if it determines that the conviction was proper, but that the sentence imposed was more severe than warranted by the circumstances of the case. By taking an appeal from the sentence under this section, the defendant shall waive any right to plead that as a result of any revision of the sentence by the appellate court he has been twice put in jeopardy for the same offense."

(b) The analysis of chapter 235 of title 18, United State Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"3742. Appeal from sentence."

WIRETAPPING

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, pending on the Senate Calendar is S. 3340, a bill introduced by the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] to permit court-authorized wiretapping by State law-enforcement officers. It was reported by the Committee on the Judiciary on June 24, 1960.

Considering the great amount of space which has already been devoted to this topic in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in the past months, I ordinarily would be hesitant to offer another article. However, it is surprising that with all the efforts which have been taken to explain the purpose of the bill and the conditions which give rise to legislative action, considerable apprehension and outright fear is found whenever wiretapping controls are proposed.

For this reason, the well-written article by Mr. Anthony Lewis, published in the August 21, 1960, issue of the New York Times magazine deserves the widest circulation among those troubled and concerned about this and related legislation. Entitled "Tangled Issue of Wiretapping," it reviews the unsteady progress which has been made in coping with the problem thus far by the courts.

Mr. President, I recommend this balanced, though brief, essay on the issues for the thoughtful consideration of my colleagues, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TANGLED ISSUE OF WIRETAPPING

(By Anthony Lewis)

For three decades, since the Supreme Court first dealt with the problem, wiretapping has been the subject of recurrent controversy in this country. Waves of public outrage at notorious uses of the dismal art have alternated with campaigns by law-enforcement officials to eliminate restraints on tapping.

At the moment the cycle seems to be in its second phase. Police and prosecutors, who consider wiretapping an essential weapon against crime, are concerned about what they believe is a movement in the courts to clamp down on tapping. "You can't hunt lions with a beanshooter," Brooklyn's District Attorney Edward S. Silver explained to a group of Congressmen in urging them to support permissive wiretap legislation, Mr. Silver is president of the National District Attorneys Association, which shares his view.

Scientific developments have made wiretapping easy—and its detection extremely difficult. A cheap induction coil placed next to a telephone line will pick up a conversation without causing any telltale hum or interference. A device known as a pen register or dial recorder picks up the number dialed by the unsuspecting party and prints it in dots or dashes on ticker tape.

The legality of wiretapping is an intricate question that can be considered most simply if broken down into three parts—tapping by Federal agents, by State and local officers, and by private persons.

The Federal constitutionality of wiretapping was upheld by the Supreme Court in 1928. Over the dissent of Justices Brandeis, Butler, and Stone—and Holmes on nonconstitutional grounds—the Court ruled that tapping was not an "unreasonable search and seizure" of the kind prohibited by the fourth amendment, and that use of wiretap evidence at a trial did not violate the fifth amendment's guarantee against compulsory self-incrimination.

Then, in section 605 of the Communications Act of 1934, Congress provided: "No person not being authorized by the sender shall intercept any communication and divulge * * * the contents." This cryptic language was given content by the Supreme Court in 1937. It held that the statute applied to Federal agents as well as private persons and prohibited the use of wiretap evidence in Federal courts.

Despite section 605, the Federal Bureau of Investigation and other Federal agents continue to wiretap. The FBI asserts that its tapping is legal because section 605 makes it a crime only to "intercept and divulge"—both acts, not just the first—and because only public disclosure, not merely reporting to an official superior, counts as divulging under the statute. These somewhat fragile legal theories have never been passed upon by the Supreme Court, but successive Attorneys General have supported them.

At one time the director of the FBI, J. Edgar Hoover, opposed wiretapping on the ground that its benefits would be outweighted by the "discredit and suspicion" it would bring on law enforcement. But his views changed in the 1930's, and in 1940 President Roosevelt officially authorized wiretapping by the FBI provided the approval for each tap be obtained in advance from the Attorney General. That procedure is still followed. According to Mr. Hoover, the Bureau uses taps only in internal security cases and where life is at stake, as in kidnaping and extortion. He testified last February 8 that the FBI then had 78 wiretaps.

As for the States, only a few have restricted tapping. Illinois and Pennsylvania in 1957 enacted statutes flatly prohibiting all wiretapping, police taps included, and barring wiretap evidence. The courts of California and Florida have ruled out the use of wiretap evidence. In five States—New York, Massachusetts, Maryland, Oregon and Nevada—the police are permitted to tap if they first obtain a court order from a judge.

State and local officials are concerned now at the possible effects of the Federal law, section 605, on their use of wiretap evidence. For in 1957 the Supreme Court said section 605 applied to State officials and overrode any State laws purporting to authorize tapping. Since then a few judges in New York have refused to issue wiretap orders or have barred evidence obtained by tapping under other judges' orders. The Supreme Court said in 1952 that nothing in section 605 compelled State courts to exclude wiretap evidence, but this principle is being challenged in a case which the Supreme Court will review next term.

Private wiretapping—by marital investigators, private eyes of all kinds, and criminals—is illegal under section 605 and under some State laws. Until recently there had been virtually no prosecutions, a fact sometimes said to result from government's embarrassment in punishing others for what its own agents do. But in the last half dozen years there has been significant action against private tappers. A tapping case in New York led to a legislative investigation and a general crackdown on tapping by private detectives. Other State prosecutions have been reported; and the Federal Government, which had obtained only one conviction in the first 20 years of section 605, has chalked up six since 1954. (It lost the best-known case, against Teamster Chief James Hoffa.)

In this legal wilderness, how much telephone tapping actually goes on? There are no reliable estimates, but undoubtedly there is a great deal. In 1955 a New York private detective, John Broady, was found in a room with access to 100,000 telephone lines, some of which he was busily tapping. The New York City police, probably the most active official tappers, obtain perhaps 1,000 court orders a year authorizing taps. A recent study by the Pennsylvania Bar Association estimated that the police in New York actually tap as many as 20,000 lines a year without bothering to obtain court orders in advance, but officials ridicule this figure.

The foremost legal analyst of the problem, Alan F. Westin of Columbia University, wrote in 1952: "Despite the statutes and judicial decisions which purport to regulate wiretapping, today this practice flourishes as a wide-open operation at the Federal, State, municipal, and private levels." This year Professor Westin has expressed the belief that the amount of tapping is down somewhat since "the high tide of the early 1950's."

Since no one has a good word to say for private wiretappers, the question of what to do about wiretapping centers on official tapping by law enforcement agencies. What then, are the arguments pro and con?

The basic argument for police wiretapping is that it works. Taps are said to be an essential weapon against crime—especially against a criminal element that is becoming better and better organized. As distinguished a liberal as the late Robert P. Patterson, judge and Secretary of War, endorsed official wiretapping as a necessary device to fight ever more resourceful and sophisticated criminals who do not hesitate to use any contrivance against the law-abiding.

A second argument of those who favor official wiretapping is that, under modern conditions, respect for privacy is an insufficient basis for policy. Society and the individual himself have interests aside from privacy, and one of them is protection against crime. If wiretapping is "dirty business," as Justice Holmes said, so is crime. When the Supreme Court in 1937 construed section 605 to bar wiretap evidence, Justice Sutherland wrote in dissent:

"My abhorrence of the odious practices of the town gossip, the Peeping Tom and the private eavesdropper is quite as strong as that of any of my brethren. But to put the sworn officers of the law, engaged in the detection and apprehension of organized gangs of criminals, in the same category is to lose all sense of proportion. * * * The necessity of public protection against crime is being submerged by an overflow of sentimentality."

Wiretapping proponents argue that under the control of court orders tapping is no more reprehensible than many traditional police practices—the use of informants, for example, or searches under warrant. They argue that regulated wiretapping will not touch the law-abiding.

Some who oppose wiretapping doubt that it is really necessary to law enforcement. Senator THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., whose Constitutional Rights Subcommittee has made an exhaustive study of the subject, says the verdict as to need is "not proven." Others concede that wiretapping helps the police, but say the price is not worth paying. Thomas McBride, former attorney general of Pennsylvania, told the Hennings subcommittee that tapping does not catch enough criminals to outweigh the loss of "the feeling of freedom that people have that they are not being listened to."

This threatened loss of privacy is, of course, the basic objection to wiretapping. The fear is that to put this weapon into the hands of Government agencies is to move toward totalitarian spying on individuals. The classic statement of the values at stake was that of Justice Brandeis, in his dissent

from the 1928 decision upholding official wiretapping:

"The makers of our Constitution * * * recognized the significance of man's spiritual nature, of his feelings and his intellect. They knew that only a part of the pain, pleasure and satisfactions of life are to be found in material things. They sought to protect Americans in their beliefs, their thoughts, their emotions, and their sensations. They conferred, as against the Government, the right to be let alone—the most comprehensive of rights and the right most valued by civilized men."

The right to be let alone—a phrase first used by Brandeis in an 1890 law-review article—sums up what lies behind the instinctive aversion to wiretapping. Opponents dispute the claim that tapping affects only the guilty or can be effectively regulated. A judicial order for a tap is not like a search warrant, limited to a particular time and place and object; it may go on indefinitely, without the notice that a search warrant gives the suspect. Conversations with innocent persons as well as conspirators are overheard.

Moreover, say the opponents, authorities may misuse supposedly limited wiretapping authority. A Brooklyn grand jury charged in 1950 that police were using taps to blackmail gamblers after attaching the taps without court approval, and that they were obtaining court orders wholesale on the basis of inadequate or false affidavits of need. The FBI was said to have listened in on conversations between Judith Coplon, the alleged Soviet spy, and her lawyer.

In the present situation, one may conclude, there are elements that dissatisfy all sides. The police and others concerned with law enforcement see what they consider their necessary power to wiretap clouded by section 605 of the Federal law. Opponents of official tapping think too much of it is going on. The citizen has no confidence that private tapping is effectively controlled. Worst of all is the impression that law enforcement officers themselves are violating the law. That was the situation in the 1928 Supreme Court case: Prohibition agents had wiretapped in violation of a District of Columbia statute. Justice Brandeis, in the greatest passage of his great dissent, foresaw the consequences:

"In a government of laws, existence of the Government will be imperiled if it fails to observe the law scrupulously. Our Government is the potent, the omnipresent teacher. For good or for ill, it teaches the whole people by its example. Crime is contagious. If the Government becomes a lawbreaker, it breeds contempt for law; it invites every man to become a law unto himself; it invites anarchy. To declare that in the administration of the criminal law the end justifies the means—to declare that the Government may commit crimes in order to secure the conviction of a private criminal—would bring terrible retribution."

The observer seeking a solution to the wiretapping dilemma may find the British example instructive. A country hardly insensitive to the claims of freedom and privacy, Great Britain nevertheless permits police wiretapping—under the strictest of controls. Each tap must be approved in advance by a high official of the Home Office. A 1957 report by a committee of Privy Councilors, approving the continuation of controlled wiretapping, said it was "an effective weapon" against crime and concluded:

"The interference with the privacy of the ordinary law-abiding citizen or with his individual liberty is infinitesimal, and only arises as an inevitable incident of intercepting the communications of some wrongdoer. It has produced no harmful consequences."

That conclusion of the Privy Councilors can be understood only against the background of the facts on wiretapping in Britain. Official taps in the entire United Kingdom have averaged fewer than 150 a year. The police invariably destroy all records of wiretaps, the Privy Councilors found; it was unthinkable that officials would use taps for private ends. Most astonishing to an American, the councilors found no evidence of the existence of any private wiretapping whatsoever.

The secret behind the generally accepted and satisfactory wiretapping situation in Britain, then, is public confidence—confidence that power given officials will not be misused, confidence that the privacy of the honest citizen's conversation is unlikely to be invaded by either private eavesdroppers or overzealous police.

The problem in this country is to create conditions giving rise to the same degree of confidence. Some argue that in a nation without Britain's tradition of official self-restraint, the only answer is absolute prohibition of all wiretapping. Others believe that there should be regulated wiretapping. Perhaps in part because complete prohibition is likely to be an unrealistic idea so long as crime remains as severe a problem as it is, the alternative of regulation seems to be gaining support among those concerned about wiretapping.

Professor Westin, who favors such limited tapping, notes that the vital element in any legislative plan to that end is control to insure against police excesses. The legislation must at the same time be sufficiently workable so that it will be obeyed and not avoided by law-enforcement officials. Because this is now overridingly a problem of Federal law, any meaningful resolution of the wiretapping conflict must come from Congress.

The legislation envisaged by Professor Westin and others would allow the States to wiretap—if they wished to at all—only under a court-order system rigorously defined by Congress. The State courts would be allowed to issue orders only upon a genuine, particularized showing of need. Orders would be good for a limited time, say a month. The wiretap authority might be limited to serious crimes and placed in the hands of district attorneys rather than the police.

On the Federal level—where the need for legislation is certainly less urgent—the ideal statute would provide a clear legal basis for the kind of wiretapping now done by the FBI. Tapping authority might be limited to certain crimes, such as espionage and kidnaping, and certain Federal agencies, perhaps only the FBI. Some think a Federal court order should be required for each tap, while others think the Attorney General's personal approval, as at present, suffices.

Along with these permissive provisions, the legislation would include a flat and total prohibition on all other wiretapping—that is, on the tapping itself, without regard to fine points about "divulgence." There would be an assumption of strict enforcement by the Justice Department, including prosecution of officers who violate the law.

It would be foolhardy, in light of the record, to forecast early congressional action. Dozens of bills have been introduced and dozens of hearings held in the last 20 years, and Congress has done nothing. But the pressures are rising now, and they come from several directions—from law-enforcement officials worried about their legal position, from libertarians concerned about wiretapping in general, from those who see a gradual breakdown of legal controls in this area. Perhaps the time is approaching when Congress will have to settle this particular conflict between liberty and order.

INTERNATIONAL COMMUNISM—AGGRESSION WITHOUT WAR

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, one of the major problems confronting the Nation is to keep the people informed and aware of the character of the kind of aggression without war which is consistently on the march under the banner of international communism.

Aggression without war is that strategy in which the aggressor comes not as a conqueror but as a champion of people and freedom by offering progress, plenty, and hope to the unfortunates, of the earth—and, it might be added, a new kind of life which has been regarded as attractive by some people within our own Nation.

Communism as such is reprehensible to America. However, this knowledge is not sufficient without an ability to recognize its presence and to be articulate about it.

It is encouraging to know that there are efforts within America to bring about a knowledge and understanding in regard to the philosophy of communism and also a basic understanding of the principles and operation of our American Government.

One such event opened its sessions yesterday in a program entitled "Education for American Security."

It is a 4-day school held at the Naval Air Station in Glenview, Ill., under the sponsorship of the Glenview Chamber of Commerce and presented by the U.S. Naval Air Station at that point.

The purpose of this school is announced as being to motivate an active force against moral decay, political apathy, and spiritual bankruptcy; to bring an awareness of the ominous hammer and sickle that threatens the very life of our Nation.

It is announced further that:

An important phase of the school includes a workshop training program on the various techniques of organizing and participating in discussion group meetings and seminars. As the material to be covered will be unclassified, the program has been opened to all interested citizens, including educators and students, clergy, business and industry leaders, and above all, to mothers and fathers.

Mr. President, a copy of the program has been sent to me by my friend, Capt. Isaiah M. Hampton, U.S. Navy, commanding officer of the Naval Air Station in Glenview, Ill.

Commendations are due in heaping measure to the leadership which makes this school possible. Each and every one of those appearing on the program are performing a great service.

It is quite evident that they are governed by the rule that the most effective proponents of freedom are not governments, but free people.

Truly it can be said that they also are making a vast step in the current battle for the minds and hearts of men.

It is to be hoped that similar programs are undertaken elsewhere along the same line.

AMENDMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TEACHERS' SALARY ACT OF 1955, AS AMENDED

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12993) to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955, as amended.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is the District of Columbia teachers' salary bill. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGEE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada will state it.

Mr. BIBLE. What is the pending bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending bill is the one to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955, as amended.

Mr. BIBLE. That is House bill 12993, is it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I should like to make a short opening statement about the purpose of the bill.

First, let me state, so there will be no misunderstanding, that we have notified both the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] and the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], both of whom are interested in this measure, so they can be here as the debate on the bill progresses.

Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is, first, to increase the entrance salary step of District teachers from the present $4,500 per annum to $4,800 per annum, and, second, to provide an average 7.5 percent salary increase to teachers and officials of the District school system, excluding from this increase the positions of Superintendent and Deputy Superintendent of Schools.

I may say in connection with this exclusion that I had hoped that due recognition would be given to the present Superintendent of Schools for the District of Columbia. I think there should have been a salary increase for this particular salaried position.

But the thinking of the committee was that the teachers and those in the lower level administrative positions should first be taken care of, and that the other positions should be taken care of—as has been done in the past—by a separate bill. I hope that when we return in January, such legislation will move forward expeditiously. I think the present Superintendent of Schools in the District of Columbia has done an outstanding job, and that his salary should be increased. I expect to introduce a bill along that line at the beginning of the next session, and would hope for favorable action by the committee.

In considering these school bills, the committee has before it a number of bills for its consideration. There were many complex differences in the approaches suggested by means of the various bills. An attempt was made to change the classifications of the teachers, and to change the service steps built into the basic act.

The Senate committee felt that due to the short time remaining in this session, to attempt to enact all these proposed classification changes would encumber the bill and possibly make its enactment impossible.

Therefore, the committee arrived at what it regards as a simpler and more direct approach, as represented by the pending bill, and one which we believe to be more feasible.

The committee, in increasing the base salary of step 1, class 18, from the present $4,500 per annum to $4,800 per annum, adopted the view of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia that a $4,800 per annum base salary for teachers entering the school system would be most helpful in recruiting new teachers of high professional caliber and would be of material assistance in retaining them in the system.

The committee decided on a 7½-percent increase in the salaries of employees of the Board of Education, other than those in classes 1 and 2, which, as I explained a moment ago, are the classes which were excluded—namely, those of the Superintendent and the Deputy Superintendent of Schools.

The first year cost of the bill is estimated to be approximately $2,600,000; that is based on an estimate submitted by the Board of Commissioners, at the request of the committee.

The committee arrived at the figure of 7½ percent rather obviously, I think, from the other pay raises which have been voted by the Congress for those in the classified pay category. This percentage follows the same pattern that the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] was following so closely last evening in connection with the pay increase for the policemen and firemen of the District of Columbia.

The committee felt that this class of public officials and public servants—namely, the schoolteachers—is entitled to the same percentage increase in salary.

I see that the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio is on his feet. If he wishes to ask some questions, I am happy to yield to him at this time.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator from Nevada for yielding to me.

In the face of the fact that salary increases have been granted generally to the employees of the Federal Government, and the further fact that last night salary increases were granted to the District of Columbia policemen and firemen, obviously it is imperative that the teachers in the District of Columbia not be dealt with differently.

However, I should like to have the RECORD show that with regard to the policemen, the firemen, the teachers, and the school officials, the pending bill, if enacted, will mean that there will have been five pay increases since 1951.

In 1951, a 10-percent pay raise was granted to the policemen and firemen; in 1953, 13.7 percent; in 1955, 7.5 percent; in 1958, 13.8 percent; and now, in 1960, there will be a pay raise of 7½ percent. The total comes to pay increases of 52½ percent since 1951, to the policemen and firemen. The record also shows that every 2 years those increases are granted.

With respect to the teachers and the school officials who are specifically covered by the bill we are debating, the statistics show that in 1951 a 10-percent pay raise was granted; in 1953, 10 percent on the first $3,000 of salary, 8 percent on the portion between $3,000 and $5,000, and 6 percent on the portion in excess of $5,000.

Mr. BIBLE. That was done in 1953, and I believe the figures the Senator from Ohio has submitted are correct. They are in accordance with the table which was furnished to me.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes. Let me ask whether any one of the staff members is able to explain what that pay increase amounted to, on the average. It is based on a graduated scale. I have just now been informed, Mr. President, that it averages approximately 8 percent.

In 1955, a 14.9-percent pay raise was granted to the schoolteachers; in 1958, 14 percent; and it is my understanding that the pending bill would grant them an additional 7½ percent.

Mr. BIBLE. That is correct; if the pending bill is enacted into law, it will provide a pay increase of 7½ percent.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I wish to repeat that inasmuch as general pay raises have been granted to all Federal employees, it is simply inescapable—regardless of what the presently proposed pay raise may be—that it, likewise, must be granted to the schoolteachers.

Mr. BIBLE. And I commend the attitude of the distinguished Senator from Ohio in that connection. I know he has some feelings in regard to this area of pay increases. But I think the conclusion inescapable that if pay raises are granted to the other employees of the Government, this one should be granted to the schoolteachers.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I voted against the general pay raise for all Federal employees because I felt that those in the $12,000, $15,000, and $17,000 categories were not the ones we contemplated taking care of on the same basis as that on which we would take care of the employees in the lower categories.

However, I should like to say that when the pay increase now proposed for the teachers in the District of Columbia is granted, the District of Columbia will be second in the Nation, in terms of the salaries paid to schoolteachers—second in the Nation among cities with a population of 500,000 or more.

Mr. BIBLE. That is correct—second among the 17 larger cities, as regards teachers who hold B.A. degrees, if my information is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes.

Mr. BIBLE. I think that is commendable, and I believe that the Senator from Ohio will agree that we are required to pay the teachers in the District of Columbia higher salaries, in order to obtain schoolteachers of the proper caliber.

Mr. LAUSCHE. My answer is that when the pay of schoolteachers in the District of Columbia is increased to the extent that the District of Columbia stands second among the larger cities of the Nation, in terms of the salaries paid to schoolteachers, undoubtedly we shall create difficulties for the school operations in the adjoining area, with whom the District of Columbia competes in substantial degree in connection with the hiring of teachers.

Only Chicago, of the 17 large cities in the country, will excel the pay given to teachers in the District of Columbia. The pay in Boston, Pittsburgh, Buffalo, Baltimore, St. Louis, Philadelphia, and Houston will be $800 lower for the initial pay. The pay in New Orleans is $3,490, as compared to $4,800 in the District of Columbia. The median pay in these 17 large cities is $4,300, while the Washington pay will be $4,800 at the beginning.

Mr. BIBLE. That will be the starting pay under the new schedule. I think that is a step in the right direction in urging people to go into teaching as a career.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I do not want to enter into a debate on that question, but I point out that when the pay in Washington, D.C., goes up—and I am not denying that a pay increase should be granted, after what we did in the two previous bills—it will undoubtedly present a problem for Prince Georges, Arlington, Fairfax, and Montgomery Counties, and Falls Church. The pay in Prince Georges is $4,200; in Alexandria, $4,200; in Arlington, $4,300; in Fairfax, $4,200; in Falls Church, $4,300; and in Montgomery, $4,500. By our action we would drive those salaries up to $4,800, if it can possibly be done.

Mr. BIBLE. The various counties are now proposing to raise starting salaries, for example, to $4,500 in Prince Georges and $4,600 in Arlington, and so forth. They are stepping up the salaries in accordance with the metropolitan area pay.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I merely point out that there is a race going on to see who can pirate teachers from one place to the other. In any event, I think I have presented figures for the RECORD so they will be available 2 years from now, and it will be interesting to see if, in the next election, we shall go through the same process of either a 13-percent or a 7½-percent salary increase.

Will the Senator yield so I may offer an amendment?

Mr. BIBLE. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] and myself, I offer an amendment to the bill, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio, for himself and the Senator from Delaware, will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the appropriate place, it is proposed to insert:

That (a) section 125 of the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act (D.C. Code 47–2602) is amended by striking out "2 per centum" and by inserting in lieu thereof "3 per centum".

(b) Subsection (a) of section 127 of such Act (D.C. Code 47–2604(a)) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) On each sale, other than sales of food for human consumption off the premises where such food is sold, and other than sales or charges for room, lodgings, or accommodations furnished to transients, such amounts as may be prescribed by the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to carry out the purposes of this section."

SEC. 2. Section 212 of the District of Columbia Use Tax Act (D.C. Code 47–2702) is amended by striking out "2 per centum" and inserting in lieu thereof "3 per centum".

SEC. 3. The amendments made by the first two sections of this Act shall take effect on the first day of the first month which begins more than sixty days after the date of enactment of this Act. From and after the effective date of such amendments, all references in the District of Columbia Use Tax Act to sections 125 and 127 of the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act shall be deemed to be references to such sections 125 and 127, as amended by the first section of this Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, with respect to the amendment, will the Senator from Nevada yield for a few questions?

Mr. BIBLE. Yes; I am happy to yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What is the cost of the bill the Senate passed last night with respect to the salaries for policemen and firemen?

Mr. BIBLE. The cost of the bill that was passed last night is $2.2 million, and the cost of this bill, as we earlier stated, is $2.6 million.

Mr. LAUSCHE. So the cost of the two bills is $4,800,000?

Mr. BIBLE. Yes; I believe about $4,800,000 or closer to $4,900,000.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I have not calculated the revenues that will be produced by the amendment, but I understand they will be about $5,200,000.

Mr. BIBLE. The figure which was used in the report that accompanied the bill from the District of Columbia Committee is an estimate of the revenues to be expected from the proposed sales tax bill as passed by the House, and as reported by the Senate District of Columbia Committee. The estimate is approximately $5.5 million in fiscal year 1961. About $5½ million is a correct figure.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That statement places in the RECORD what I feel ought to be contained therein.

My amendment is offered to provide revenues that will defray the cost of these two bills, which will entail an expenditure of $4,800,000. The amendment which I offer will produce between $5,500,000 and $5,800,000.

Mr. President, the amendment that I offer has been passed by the House. It is the identical provision that is contained in the House bill. My theory is that we ought to provide the finances with which to meet our obligations. That is all I have to say on it.

Last night I voted against the Williams amendment because I thought it was improperly attached to that bill. It is my understanding the Parliamentarian has ruled this amendment is a proper amendment and comes within the rules.

That is all I have to say.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, after adequate debate is had on the amendment, I propose to move to lay it on the table, as I did last night with reference to the policemen's and firemen's bill.

Mr. President, during the course of debate upon the salary increase for police and firemen, the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], who is also one of the two members of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia who serve with the Appropriations Committee on matters pertaining to the District, stated:

We have a taxing program, I advise the Senator from Ohio. I will further state that there is a sufficient amount of revenue in the District of Columbia to carry this program without the addition of the sales tax until the first of the year.

I was pleased to have my worthy colleague state this fact, frankly, because I believe it to be a key point in this debate. My own information, based upon inquiries made of District officials, is to the effect that revenue in conjunction with the approval of the use of borrowing authority is sufficient, beyond the first of the year date supplied by the Senator from Delaware, to finance pay legislation through February, and perhaps even longer than that.

In this connection, I note also that the Appropriations Committee report upon the supplemental bill we considered yesterday, in speaking of District items, stated at page 7, Senate Report No. 1925, H.R. 13161:

The committee has approved additional appropriations of $10,261,500 for essential operating and capital outlay expenses in fiscal year 1961. Testimony presented to the committee showed the sufficiency of revenues in the general fund account that would be required to meet the expenditures anticipated through approval of the items listed as follows:

Operating expenses:	
Executive Office	$47,000
Department of Occupations and Professions	50,000
Courts	155,000
Capital outlay:	
Public building construction	6,170,800
Department of Sanitary Engineering	3,838,000

The request of $3 million as additional Federal payment to the general fund is disapproved. The committee expects to fully explore the financial status of the general fund early in the next session, in consideration of the legislation passed by the 86th Congress respecting pay increase costs and additional revenues expected from new tax measures.

Press reports upon the action of the committee are also of interest.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Washington Post and Times-Herald of August 28, 1960, which states, in part, about the junior Senator from Rhode Island:

PASTORE, whose appropriations subcommittee regularly processes the District budget, reported the committee made no assumptions about the pending sales tax increase.

The House has passed a bill raising the levy from 2 to 3 percent.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PUBLIC WORKS PROJECT CLEARS SENATE GROUP; EXTRA $3 MILLION LOST—ADDED SUM WOULD HAVE HELPED TO PAY DISTRICT SALARY INCREASES

(By James R. Carberry)

The Senate Appropriations Committee in effect decided last night to let Congress straighten out the District's finances when it returns in January.

The committee:

Gave the District clearance for its $8.3 million special public works program this fiscal year.

Refused the $3 million added Federal payment the Commissioners asked to help finance $9 million worth of employee pay raises in fiscal 1961.

The District can pay for its public works program, chiefly school construction, with the $8.8 million surplus it expects this year. But the denial of the extra payment, coupled with Senator WAYNE MORSE's threat to talk to death a proposed sales tax increase from 2 to 3 percent, leaves the Commissioners with virtually no ready cash for the salary increases.

MAY BE ADDED IN '61

When asked about this, committee member JOHN O. PASTORE, Democrat, of Rhode Island, replied that since Congress voted the pay raises, the District ought to ask Congress to help pay for them—presumably as an addition to next year's Federal payment.

PASTORE declined to say how much the addition should be.

In less complex actions last night, the committee put back in the supplemental appropriation bill two loan items the House rejected.

First, the committee recommended approval of the full $500,000 appropriation sought to get the National Capital Transportation Agency started. The Agency is to build and possibly operate the area's first mass transit system.

The House cut the request in half Friday, and limited the Agency to 25 instead of the requested 54 staffers. Planners said the move would cripple the Agency before it got started. The Senate committee junked the personnel ceiling.

MASTERS' FUND BACK

Second, the committee endorsed an $80,000 request to hire four special masters to hear the backlog of cases in juvenile court. The House evidently rejected the plan as being legislation on an appropriation bill.

But the Senate committee appeared to agree with an opinion by the District's corporation counsel that Juvenile Court Judge Orman W. Ketcham has the authority to appoint masters; all he needs is the money.

PASTORE, whose Appropriations Subcommittee regularly processes the District budget, reported the committee made no assumptions about the pending sales tax increase. The House has passed a bill raising the levy from 2 to 3 percent, but MORSE has blocked it in the Senate. The Oregon Democrat feels sales taxes are undemocratic.

CONGRESS MAY STEP IN

If the 3-percent sales tax passes, PASTORE said, the Commissioners will have about $5.5 million more this year to apply to the pay raises. If the bill dies, PASTORE said, the District may be able to balance its budget anyway. PASTORE did not specifically say how this could be accomplished, but he implied the next Congress will have to put a thumb on the scales.

On the other hand, PASTORE said he assumes the two bills on the Senate calendar granting policemen, firemen, and teachers $4.8 million in pay raises will be enacted. (A $4.2 million raise for District classified workers has already been passed.)

The reason the $3 million added Federal payment was scuttled, the Senator reported, was that committee members felt it had no chance of winning concurrence by the House.

The committee added to the bill approving the public works program $5.2 million cut out by the House to install fallout shelters in new Federal buildings, including the new Court of Claims Building on Lafayette Square.

The bill is scheduled for Senate debate Monday.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the quotation from the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] to which I earlier alluded appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at page 18156.

We have a taxing program, I advise the Senator from Ohio. I will further state that there is a sufficient amount of revenue in the District of Columbia to carry this program without the addition of the sales tax until the first of the year.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a news story from the Washington Sunday Star of August 28, bearing on this same general problem.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PLEA DIES IN SENATE—GROUP RESTORES CUT FOR TRANSIT

(By James G. Deane)

The Senate Appropriations Committee yesterday turned down a District plea for an added $3 million Federal payment to bolster city finances.

But the unit approved $10 million in public works projects, as well as restoring several cuts made Friday by the House in other local spending items. The latter included:

Restoring to $500,000 the allotment for the new National Capital Transportation Agency, cut in half Friday by the House.

JUVENILE COURT FUND

Backing $80,000 for four special masters to help relieve the caseload at juvenile court, which the House deleted.

Recommending an extra $47,700 for the District's executive office expenses.

Senator PASTORE, Democrat of Rhode Island, committee member in charge of District matters, conceded after the committee session that the turndown on the Federal payment was, in effect, postponing the day of reckoning to January.

NEW PLEA SEEN

The District then presumably will be forced to return to Congress for funds to meet urgent city costs, he said.

But he said the committee was forced to be realistic in accepting the refusal of House leaders to do anything more now.

The Rhode Island Senator strongly endorsed the city's claim for further help. The fiscal difficulties are being created primarily, he pointed out, by pay raises enacted without consultation with the District.

"We've got to take cognizance of this and do equity to the city," he told reporters.

The Senator did not commit himself as to what additional Federal payment figure he would support in January, but he indicated it would be whatever proves to be essential at that time.

The Federal allotment for the current fiscal year now stands at $25 million. The Commissioners originally asked for an additional $7 million, but this was scaled down after tax collections improved.

MORSE'S OPPOSITION

The serious fiscal prospect was underscored last night by renewed opposition of Senator MORSE, Democrat of Oregon, to a proposed increase from 2 percent to 3 percent in the city's sales tax. Senator MORSE announced on the Senate floor that he is prepared to offer 22 amendments to a House-passed sales tax measure, along with detailed explanations of all 22.

With adjournment impending, this clearly amounted to a threat to filibuster against favorable Senate action on the bill.

The sales tax rise is being looked to by city officials to produce some $5.5 million this fiscal year. This would be one of the principal means of meeting the pay raises, which are expected to cost some $9 million.

Classified city workers already have received a 7.5 percent raise, and Congress is expected to clear a similar increase for teachers, police, and firemen before adjournment.

FUND PINCH SEEN

Enough cash is available to meet the increased payroll costs through January, but without a sales-tax rise the city's coffers will be in precarious shape soon thereafter, officials said.

The public works projects cleared by the Senate committee include $3.4 million in school facilities, additional sums for library, recreation, correctional, welfare and other construction, and nearly $4 million for sewers to combat Potomac River pollution.

The school projects include the new Bertie Backus Junior High School at South Dakota Avenue and Hamilton Street NE.

Other school projects include additions to Kenilworth Elementary and Deal Junior High, plans for a new elementary school at the site of Garfield Hospital and additions to Eliot Junior High and Bancroft Elementary and sites for new elementary schools at North Dakota and Kansas Avenues NW. and Wheeler Road and Mississippi Avenue SE.

BRANCH LIBRARY SITE

Library items are a branch site near 24th Street and Pennsylvania Avenue NW. and another near 53d Place and East Capitol Street.

Recreation items are for plans for a Benning-Stoddard recreation center and a Randall recreation center.

The principal correctional projects are a $500,000 dormitory at the Lorton (Va.) Youth Center and a dairy barn at the Occoquan work house.

Welfare projects include two children's cottages at Junior Village, a D.C. Village laundry addition and a chapel at the Cedar Knoll School.

Miscellaneous building items include new elevators at 499 Pennsylvania Avenue NW. and the Recorder of Deeds office and some air conditioning in the District Building.

WARNING ON TRANSIT

The restoration of funds for the new transportation agency followed a warning yesterday from Federal officials that the House budget cut would cripple plans for fast development of subways and other new rapid transit facilities to serve the congested metropolitan area.

The House, besides halving the $500,000 asked by President Eisenhower set a 25-employee ceiling on the new agency. The President asked for 54 employees.

Appointments of top agency officials are awaiting clearance of the budget item.

The special masters wanted for Juvenile Court could aid Judge Orman W. Ketcham in reducing a case backlog. The judge and other community leaders have been seeking

extra judges but Congress has not acted to provide them.

The Senate committee restored to the appropriation bill $7.3 million deleted by the House for fallout shelters in Government buildings.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio and I are very good personal friends. We disagree very much on this legislative process in which the Senator is engaged at the present time. He is really suggesting a rider to a teachers' salary bill.

I do not think a teachers pay bill is the proper vehicle for the consideration of a sales tax. I intend to discuss, at great length, a sales tax bill, if my motion to lay on the table should fail, because I have made a very detailed analysis of the budget problems of the District of Columbia and the fiscal situation in the District of Columbia and I am convinced there is no need for such an increase in the sales tax. In my judgment no sales tax bill should be passed in this short session of Congress as a rider to a teachers' salary bill.

I therefore move to lay on the table the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE].

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 12993) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate indefinitely postpone action on the companion bill to the House bill which has been passed, Calendar No. 1753, S. 3739.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nevada.

The motion was agreed to.

PROPOSED FREEDOM COMMISSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of calendar No. 1882, S. 1689, the bill providing for the creation of the Freedom Commission, which I desire to have made the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1689) to create the Freedom Commission for the development of the science of counteraction to the world Communist conspiracy for the training and development of leaders in a total political war.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1689) to create the Freedom Commission for the development of the science of counteraction to the world Communist conspiracy for the training and development of leaders in a total political war, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, on page 2, line 3, after the word "the", to strike out "free world" and insert "Free World"; in line 4, after the word "the", where it appears the first time, to strike out "free world" and insert "Free World"; in line 8, after the word "tests", to strike out "the"; in line 14, after the word "the", to strike out "free world" and insert "Free World"; in line 16, after the word "intensive", to strike out "continuous"; on page 3, line 3, after the word "the", to strike out "free world" and insert "Free World"; in line 5, after the word "the", where it appears the second time, to strike out "free world" and insert "Free World"; in line 11, after the word "the", where it appears the second time, to strike out "free world" and insert "Free World"; in line 13, after the word "the", where it appears the second time, to strike out "free world" and insert "Free World"; at the beginning of line 15, to insert "and of the dimensions and nature of the global struggle between freedom and Communism"; at the beginning of line 19, to strike out "true nature of the international Communist conspiracy" and insert "dimensions and nature of the threat"; on page 4, line 3, after the word "conspiracy", to insert "and of the dimensions and nature of the global struggle between freedom and Communism"; in line 20, after the word "Freedom", to strike out "Academy; and" and insert "Academy"; after line 21, to strike out:

(3) The term "joint committee" means the Joint Congressional Freedom Committee.

On page 5, line 8, after the word "United", strike out "States" and insert "States, one of whom shall be selected from the higher echelon of the State Department"; on page 7, line 11, after the word "Commission", to strike out "is authorized and empowered to" and insert "shall"; in line 16, after the word "the", where it appears the second time, to insert "Commission and"; after line 17, to strike out:

(1) the development of systematic knowledge about the international Communist conspiracy;

(2) the development of counteraction to the international Communist conspiracy into an operational science that befits and bespeaks the methods and values of freemen, and to achieve this purpose the entire area of counteraction is to be thoroughly explored and studied with emphasis on the methods and means that may best be employed by private citizens and nongovernmental organizations and the methods and means available to Government agencies other than the methods and means already being used;

(3) the education and training of private citizens concerning all aspects of the international Communist conspiracy and in the science of counteraction to that conspiracy;

(4) the education and training of persons in Government service concerning all aspects of the international Communist conspiracy and in the science of counteraction to that conspiracy to the end that they can be more useful to their Government in defeating the international Communist conspiracy.

On page 8, after line 14, to insert:

(1) to carry on a research program designed to develop an integrated operational science that befits and bespeaks the methods and values of freemen and through which the Free World will be able to meet and defeat the carefully patterned total aggression—political, ideological, psychological, economic, paramilitary, and organizational—of the Soviet Bloc, and through which we, as a Nation, may work toward our national objectives in a systematic manner. To achieve this purpose the full range of methods and means is to be thoroughly explored and studied including the methods and means that may best be employed by private citizens and nongovernmental organizations and the methods and means available to the Government other than the methods and means already being used. This research program shall include the study of our national objectives and purpose and the development of proposals for intermeshing and integrating the full spectrum of methods and means into a coordinated, short and long range strategy for victory, seeking the utilization of our full potential in the public and private sectors,

(2) to educate and train Governmental personnel, private citizens, and foreign students concerning all aspects of the international Communist conspiracy, the nature of the global struggle between freedom and communism, and the science of counteraction to the Communist conspiracy.

On page 9, line 19, after "(a)", to strike out "Academy students shall be selected, insofar as is practicable and in the public interest, from a cross section of the diverse groups, within and without the United States, in which the total political war is being fought. Before accepting any student for training who is an officer or employee of a Government agency, the Commission shall first obtain the concurrence of that agency." and insert "Academy students, other than Government personnel, shall be selected, insofar as is practicable and in the public interest, from the diverse groups within and without the United States where trained leadership and informed public opinion are most needed."; on page 10, line 9, after the word "All", to strike out "other"; in line 10, after the word "to", to strike out "aid and assist the Commission in the selection of students" and insert "assign officers and employees to the Academy for designated training"; in line 20, after the word "Act", to strike out "Foreign students selected for training"; at the beginning of line 22 to insert "(c) Foreign students selected for training"; on page 11, after line 15, to strike out:

NON-ACADEMY TRAINING OF ACADEMY STUDENTS

SEC. 8. The Commission is authorized to provide students selected for training at the Academy (either before, after, or during Academy training) with such additional education and training at colleges, universities, or technical schools other than the Academy, or with such on-the-job training in industry and business as the Commission shall determine to be in the public interest.

On page 12, at the beginning of line 2, to change the section number from "2" to "8"; in line 5, after the word "to", to strike out "disseminate" and insert "disseminate,"; in line 6, after the word "without", to strike out "charge" and insert "charge,"; in line 7, after the word "assist", to strike out "persons" and insert "people"; in line 9, after the word "and", to strike out "the ways and means of defeating that conspiracy" and insert "of the dimensions and nature of the global struggle between freedom and communism, and of ways they can participate effectively toward winning that struggle"; in line 16, after the word "level", to strike out "instruction" and insert "instruction, and also to publish such research materials as may be in the public interest"; at the beginning of line 23, to change the section number from "10" to "9"; on page 13, at the beginning of line 4, to change the section number from "11" to "10"; at the beginning of line 19, to change the section number from "12" to "11"; on page 16, at the beginning of line 16, to change the section number from "13" to "12"; at the top of page 17, to strike out:

ESTABLISHMENT OF JOINT CONGRESSIONAL FREEDOM COMMITTEE; MEMBERSHIP

SEC. 14. There is established the Joint Congressional Freedom Committee hereinafter referred to as the "joint committee" to be composed of seven Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and seven Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. In each instance not more than four Members shall be the members of the same political party.

After line 10, to strike out:

AUTHORITY AND DUTY OF JOINT COMMITTEE

SEC. 15. The joint committee shall make continued studies of the activities of the Commission and of problems relating to the development of counteraction to the international Communist conspiracy. During the first sixty days of each session of the Congress the joint committee shall conduct hearings in either open or executive session for the purposes of receiving information concerning the development and state of counteraction. The Commission shall keep the joint committee fully and currently informed with respect to all of the Commission's activities. All bills, resolutions, and other matters in the Senate or House of Representatives relating primarily to the Commission shall be referred to the joint committee. The members of the joint committee who are Members of the Senate shall from time to time report to the Senate and the members of the joint committee who are Members of the House of Representatives shall from time to time report to the House, by bill or otherwise, their recommendations with respect to matters within the jurisdiction of their respective Houses which are referred to the joint committee, or otherwise within the jurisdiction of the joint committee.

On page 18, after line 8, to strike out:

CHAIRMAN AND VICE CHAIRMAN OF JOINT COMMITTEE; VACANCIES IN MEMBERSHIP

SEC. 16. Vacancies in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection. The joint committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members at the beginning of each Congress. The vice chairman shall act in the place and stead of the chairman in the absence of the chairman. The chairmanship shall alternate between the Senate and the House of Representatives with each Congress, and the chairman shall be selected by the members from that House entitled to the chairmanship. The vice chairman shall be chosen from the House other than that of the chairman by the members from that House.

At the top of page 19, to strike out:

POWERS OF JOINT COMMITTEE

SEC. 17. In carrying out its duties under this chapter, the joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings or investigations, to sit and act at such places and times, to require by subpena or otherwise, the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The joint committee may make such rules respecting its organization and procedures as it deems necessary: *Provided, however,* That no measure or recommenadtion shall be reported from the joint committee or by any member designated by him or by the joint committee, and may be served by such person or persons as may be designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the joint committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses. The joint committee may use a committee seal. The provisions of sections 192–194 of title 2, United States Code, shall apply in case of any failure of any witness to comply with a subpena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section. The expenses of the joint committee shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate from funds appropriated for the joint committee upon vouchers approved by the chairman. The cost of stenographic services to report public hearings shall not be in excess of the amounts prescribed by law for reporting the hearings of standing committees of the Senate. The cost of stenographic services to report executive hearings shall be fixed at an equitable rate by the joint committee. Members of the joint committee, and its employees and consultants, while traveling on official business for the joint committee, may receive either the per diem allowance authorized to be paid to Members of Congress or its employees, or their actual and necessary expenses provided an itemized statement of such expenses is attached to the voucher.

On page 20, after line 12, to strike out:

STAFF AND ASSISTANCE; UTILIZATION OF FEDERAL DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES; ARMED PROTECTION

SEC. 18. The joint committee is empowered to appoint and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, and staff employees as it deems necessary and advisable. The joint committee is authorized to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and establishments of the Government.

After line 20, to strike out:

CLASSIFICATION OF INFORMATION BY JOINT COMMITTEE

SEC. 19. The joint committee may classify information originating within the committee in accordance with standards used generally by the executive branch for classifying restricted data or defense information.

At the top of page 21, to strike out:

RECORDS OF JOINT COMMITTEE

SEC. 20. The joint committee shall keep a complete record of all committee actions, including a record of the votes on any question on which a record vote is demanded. All committee records, data, charts and files shall be the property of the joint committee and shall be kept in the offices of the joint committee or other places as the joint committee may direct under such security safeguards as the joint committee shall determine in the interest of the common defense and security.

And at the beginning of line 12, to change the section number from "21" to "13", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Freedom Commission Act".

CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF POLICY

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress of the United States makes the following findings:

(1) The Soviet Union and Communist China are waging a total political war against the United States and against the peoples and governments of all other nations of the Free World.

(2) Unlike the Free World, the Soviet Union has systematically prepared for this total political war over several decades. Drawing on the experience of previous conquerors and upon their own elaborate studies and extensive pragmatic tests, Soviet leaders have developed their conspiratorial version of political warfare into a highly effective operational science. Recognizing that political warfare is a difficult science making unusual demands on its practitioners, the Soviet Union and Communist China have established an elaborate network of training schools, within and without the Free World, in which have been trained large numbers of highly skilled activists. These activists continue to receive intensive training throughout their party careers.

(3) In this total political war the Soviets permit no neutrals. Every citizen, every economic, cultural, religious, or ethnic group is a target and is under some form of direct or indirect Communist attack. The battleground is everywhere, and every citizen, knowingly or unknowingly, through action or inaction, is involved in this continuous struggle.

(4) Since the end of World War II, the Soviets, taking full advantage of their better preparation and often superior organizational and operational know-how, have inflicted a series of political warfare defeats on the Free World. The total sum of these defeats is nothing less than a disaster for the United States and the Free World and the continuation of this political war by the Soviets confronts the United States with a grave, present, and continuing danger to its national survival.

(5) In order to defeat the Soviet political warfare offensive and to preserve the integrity and independence of the nations of the Free World, it is imperative—

(A) that the knowledge and understanding of all the peoples of the Free World concerning the true nature of the international Communist conspiracy and of the dimensions and nature of the global struggle between freedom and Communism be increased as rapidly as is practicable;

(B) that private citizens not only understand the dimensions and nature of the threat, but that they also know how they can participate, and do participate, in this continuous struggle in an effective, sustained, and systematic manner;

(C) that Government personnel engaged in the cold war increase their knowledge of the international Communist conspiracy and of the dimensions and nature of the global struggle between freedom and Communism, develop a high esprit de corps and sense of

mission and a high degree of operational know-how in counteracting the international Communist conspiracy.

(b) It is the intent and purpose of the Congress that the authority and powers granted in this Act be fully utilized by the hereinafter created Commission to achieve the objectives set forth in the preceding subsection (a)(5) of this section. It is the further intent and purpose of the Congress that the authority, powers, and functions of the Commission and the Academy as hereinafter set forth are to be broadly construed.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. When used in this chapter—

(1) The term "Commission" means the Freedom Commission;

(2) The term "Academy" means the Freedom Academy.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE FREEDOM COMMISSION; COMPOSITION; CHAIRMAN AND ACTING CHAIRMAN; QUORUM; OFFICIAL SPOKESMAN; SEAL

SEC. 4. There is established in the executive branch of the Government an independent agency to be known as the Freedom Commission which shall be composed of six members and a Chairman, each of whom shall be a citizen of the United States, one of whom shall be selected from the higher echelon of the State Department. The Chairman may from time to time designate any other member of the Commission as Acting Chairman to act in the place and stead of the Chairman during his absence. The Chairman (or the Acting Chairman in the absence of the Chairman) shall preside at all meetings of the Commission and a quorum for the transaction of business shall consist of at least four members present. Each member of the Commission, including the Chairman, shall have equal responsibility and authority in all decisions and actions of the Commission, shall have full access to all information relating to the performance of his duties or responsibilities, and shall have one vote. Action of the Commission shall be determined by a majority vote of the members present. The Chairman (or Acting Chairman in the absence of the Chairman) shall be the official spokesman of the Commission in its relations with the Congress, Government agencies, persons, or the public, and, on behalf of the Commission, shall see to the faithful execution of the policies and decisions of the Commission, and shall report thereon to the Commission from time to time or as the Commission may direct. The Commission shall have an official seal which shall be judicially noticed.

MEMBERS: APPOINTMENTS; TERMS; COMPENSATION; EXTRANEOUS BUSINESS

SEC. 5. (a) Members of the Commission and Chairman shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Not more than four members, including the Chairman, may be members of any one political party. In submitting any nomination to the Senate, the President shall set forth the experience and qualifications of the nominee. The term of each member of the Commission, other than the Chairman, shall be six years, except that (1) the terms of office of the members first taking office shall expire as designated by the President at the time of the appointment, two at the end of two years, two at the end of four years, and two at the end of six years; and (2) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term. The Chairman shall serve during the pleasure of the President. Any member of the Commission may be removed by the President for inefficiency, neglect of duty, or malfeasance in office. Each member, except the Chairman, shall receive compensation at the rate of $20,000 per annum; and the Chairman shall receive compensation at the rate of $20,500 per annum.

(b) No member of the Commission shall engage in any business, vocation, or employment other than that of serving as a member of the Commission.

AUTHORIZATION TO ESTABLISH THE FREEDOM ACADEMY; FUNCTIONS OF COMMISSION AND ACADEMY

SEC. 6. The Commission shall establish under its supervision and control an advanced training and development center to be known as the Freedom Academy. The Academy shall be located at such place or places within the United States as the Commission shall determine. The principal functions of the Commission and Academy shall be—

(1) to carry on a research program designed to develop an integrated operational science that befits and bespeaks the methods and values of freemen and through which the Free World will be able to meet and defeat the carefully patterned total aggression—political, ideological, psychological, economic, paramilitary, and organizational—of the Soviet Bloc, and through which we, as a Nation, may work toward our national objectives in a systematic manner. To achieve this purpose the full range of methods and means is to be thoroughly explored and studied including the methods and means that may best be employed by private citizens and nongovernmental organizations and the methods and means available to the Government other than the methods and means already being used. This research program shall include the study of our national objectives and purpose and the development of proposals for intermeshing and integrating the full spectrum of methods and means into a coordinated, short and long range strategy for victory, seeking the utilization of our full potential in the public and private sectors,

(2) to educate and train Governmental personnel, private citizens, and foreign students concerning all aspects of the international Communist conspiracy, the nature of the global struggle between freedom and Communism, and the science of counteraction to the Communist conspiracy.

ACADEMY STUDENTS; SELECTION; GRANTS AND EXPENSES; ADMISSION AS NONIMMIGRANT VISITORS; DEPORTATION

SEC. 7. (a) Academy students, other than Government personnel, shall be selected, insofar as is practicable and in the public interest, from the diverse groups within and without the United States where trained leadership and informed public opinion are most needed. Persons in Government service coming within the provisions of the Government Employees Training Act may be trained at the Academy pursuant to the provisions of said Act. All agencies and departments of Government are authorized to assign officers and employees to the Academy for designated training.

(b) The Commission is authorized to make grants to students and to pay expenses incident to training and study under this chapter. This authorization shall include authority to pay travel expenses to and from the Academy or other authorized place of training under the chapter, and authority to give financial assistance to the dependents of students during the time they are undergoing training authorized under this Act.

(c) Foreign students selected for training under this Act shall be admitted as nonimmigrants under section 1101 (a) (15) of title 8, United States Code, for such time and under such conditions as may be prescribed by regulations promulgated by the Commission, the Secretary of State, and the Attorney General. A person admitted under this section who fails to maintain the status under which he was admitted, or who fails to depart from the United States at the expiration of the time for which he was admitted, or who engages in activities of a political nature detrimental to the interest of the United States, or in activities in conflict with the security of the United States, shall, upon the warrant of the Attorney General, be taken into custody and promptly deported pursuant to sections 1251–1253 of title 8, United States Code. Deportation proceedings under this section shall be summary and findings of the Attorney General as to matters of fact shall be conclusive. Such persons shall not be eligible for suspension of deportation under section 1254 of such title 8.

AUTHORIZATION TO ESTABLISH AN INFORMATION CENTER

SEC. 8. The Commission is authorized to establish an information center at such place or places within the United States as the Commission may determine. The principal function of the information center shall be to disseminate, with or without charge, information and materials which will assist people and organizations to increase their understanding of the true nature of the international Communist conspiracy and of the dimensions and nature of the global struggle between freedom and Communism, and of ways they can participate effectively toward winning that struggle. In carrying out this function, the Commission is authorized to prepare, make, and publish textbooks and other materials, including training films, suitable for high school, college, and community level instruction, and also to publish such research materials as may be in the public interest. The Commission is authorized to disseminate such information and materials to such persons and organizations as may be in the public interest on such terms and conditions as the Commission shall determine.

RESTRICTIONS ON DISCLOSURE OF INFORMATION

SEC. 9. Nothing in this chapter shall authorize the disclosure of any information or knowledge in any case in which such disclosure (1) is prohibited by any other law of the United States, or (2) is inconsistent with the security of the United States.

SECURITY CHECK OF PERSONNEL

SEC. 10. (a) Except as authorized by the Commission upon a determination by the Commission that such action is clearly consistent with the national interest, no individual shall be employed by the Commission until such individual has been investigated by the Civil Service Commission to determine whether the said individual is a good security risk and a report thereof has been made to the Freedom Commission.

(b) In addition to the foregoing provisions, the Commission may request that any individual employed by the Commission, or under consideration for employment by the Commission, be investigated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation to determine whether the said individual is a good security risk.

GENERAL AUTHORITY OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 11. In addition to the authority already granted, the Commission is authorized and empowered—

(1) to establish such temporary or permanent boards and committees as the Commission may from time to time deem necessary for the purposes of this Act;

(2) to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as may be necessary to carry out the functions of the Commission. Such personnel shall be appointed in accordance with the civil service laws and their compensation fixed in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, except that, to the extent the Commission deems such action necessary to the dis-

charge of its responsibilities, personnel may be employed and their compensation fixed without regard to such laws: *Provided, however,* That no personnel (except such personnel whose compensation is fixed by law, and specially qualified professional personnel up to a limit of $19,000) whose position would be subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, if such Act were applicable to such position, shall be paid a salary at a rate in excess of the rate payable under such Act for positions of equivalent difficulty or responsibility. The Commission shall make adequate provision for administrative review of any determination to dismiss any employee;

(3) to conduct such research, studies and surveys as necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act;

(4) to make, promulgate, issue, rescind, and amend such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act;

(5) to make expenditures as may be necessary for administering and carrying out the provisions of this Act;

(6) to utilize, with the approval of the President, the services, facilities, and personnel of other Government agencies. Whenever the Commission shall use the services, facilities, or personnel of any Government agency for activities under the authority of this Act, the Commission shall pay for such performance out of funds available to the Commission under this Act, either in advance, by reimbursement, or by direct transfer;

(7) to utilize or employ on a full- or part-time basis, with the consent of the organization or governmental body concerned, the services of personnel of any State or local government or private organization to perform such functions on its behalf as may appear desirable to carry out the purposes of this Act, without said personnel severing their connection with the furnishing organization or governmental body; and further to utilize personnel of a foreign government in the same manner and under the same circumstances with the approval of the Secretary of State;

(8) to acquire by purchase, lease, loan, or gift, and to hold and dispose of by sale, lease, or loan, real and personal property of all kinds necessary for, or resulting from, the exercise of authority granted by this Act;

(9) to receive and use funds donated by others, if such funds are donated without restrictions other than that they be used in furtherance of one or more of the purposes of this Act;

(10) to accept and utilize the services of voluntary and uncompensated personnel and to provide transportation and subsistence as authorized by section 73b–2 of title 5, United States Code, for persons serving without compensation;

(11) to utilize the services of persons on a temporary basis and to pay their actual and necessary travel expenses and subsistence and in addition compensation at a rate not to exceed $50 per day for each day spent in the work of the Commission.

GENERAL MANAGER; APPOINTMENT; COMPENSATION

SEC. 12. The Commission is authorized to establish within the Commission a General Manager, who shall discharge such of the administrative and executive functions of the Commission as the Commission may direct. The General Manager shall be appointed by the Commission, shall serve at the pleasure of the Commission, shall be removable by the Commission, and shall receive compensation at a rate determined by the Commission, but not in excess of $18,000 per annum.

APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 13. There is authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, so much as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

PURCHASE OF SPRINGFIELD, MASS., NEWSPAPERS BY SAMUEL I. NEWHOUSE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, several times this year I have spoken before the Senate about what I consider to be a growing and serious problem in our country—the practices of newspapers and publishers of our country in the field of labor relations.

I would expand this discussion, Mr. President, to include a very serious problem which should be raised in regard to the business practices of such newspapers, and in regard to monopolistic trends which we observe in the newspaper industry, not only with regard to monopolistic control of an increasing percentage of the presses of the country, but also the taking over of more and more radio and television stations.

It was Jefferson who said that the strength of a democracy can be no greater than the enlightenment of its people. If the people in this country start to be brainwashed by a monopolistically controlled press, radio, and television business in this country, democracy will be greatly weakened.

It is a rather shocking thing to see the growing octopus control of the Newhouse interests in connection with the press, television, and radio sources of information in this country.

I have studied in some detail the practices of the growing Newhouse monopoly. I am satisfied it is a threat to sound public policy in this country. I serve notice today that in the next session of Congress I shall do all within my power to seek a congressional investigation of the type of monopolistic practices the Newhouse so-called newspaper, radio-television chain is developing in this country. The American people need to be warned before it is too late about the threat which is arising as a result of the monopolistic practices of the Newhouse interests.

Mr. President, I have here an article which was published in the Springfield Republican newspaper of Springfield, Mass., on August 14, 1960. It is an article written by Reverend Ibraham, pastor of the College Highway Methodist Church in Southwick, Mass. In the article he points out that a community suffers when its newspapers lose their independence. He proceeds to set out a point-by-point analysis of the threat to an independent press in that section of Massachusetts as the result of the monopolistic tentacles of the octopus of the Newhouse dynasty stretching into Massachusetts. I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Springfield, Mass., newspaper be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMUNITY SUFFERS WHEN ITS NEWSPAPERS LOSE THEIR INDEPENDENCE, SAYS PASTOR

The recent grab for control of the Springfield newspapers by outside interests is certainly a most just cause for alarm among the citizens of Greater Springfield. It could usher in an era of impersonal journalism dedicated solely to the profit motive. The disadvantages to the citizens of the Greater Springfield area will be many. In order to fully appreciate the dangers inherent in this situation, let us see what an independent paper means to the people:

1. It means "person-centered" journalism. By this, I mean a journalism which is interested in persons it serves because they are persons and not because they could be manipulated for ends other than serving them. An independent newspaper views its task as a servant of the people, aware of their needs, problems, fears, and frustrations. Sensing their needs, it attempts to minister to them to the extent that journalism is capable to do so. Springfield newspapers have helped in pioneering this person-centered journalism. Indeed, the heart and soul of the papers has always revolved around the service to the local citizens. Thus, the Springfield newspapers have always had a "heart" for the "least" person which outside ownership can never possibly have.

2. The fortunes of an independent, locally controlled newspaper are tied to the local region which nourishes it. Therefore, it is by the very nature of its circumstances, sensitive to the highest economic, social, and spiritual aspirations of the locality it serves. It seeks to promote these aspirations with integrity and honestly formulated policies. It feels part and parcel of the ongoing local social stream. This aspect gives the citizens also, the satisfying feeling that the local papers are "their" papers. A loyalty develops to the paper which is healthy and constructive. This bond of affection and mutual dependency and loyalty between paper and people serves to further and unify the social and political pride which is necessary to maintain, improve, and better the local town or community.

3. An independent newspaper, while desiring to make the profit necessary to keep it going, does not make profit the sole criterion of its usefulness and service. Outside controlling interests aim solely to make money via the successfully run local papers, else what other interest would they have by attempting to seize control of the local paper and incorporate it into a "chain"?

4. An independent newspaper, locally controlled, is easily accessible to the citizens it serves. You can drop in on the editors, reporters; chat with them, talk with them, suggest views and ideas and feel you are at home with the paper.

AN OMINOUS CHALLENGE

Most of us in the Springfield area have grown accustomed to depend on our locally controlled paper to hear us and sympathize with our aspirations to improve our localities and towns. Outside interests cannot possibly have the knowledge of and sympathy for these aspirations of ours or the desire to help us attain them. One cannot now visualize the loss to us all which may come from the taking over of our papers by a "chain." It is well that it be pointed out now before it is too late.

5. An independent newspaper has a local personality of its own spun from the warp and woof of the color and excitement of local history. This becomes a necessary mirror by which a locality needs to see itself. A chain-run paper will import an alien personality and attempt to force that on the citizens of our area. I view with alarm such developments. Common sense observation leads us to conclude that the newspapers, if the Newhouse calamity befalls them, will go for organization men. Rugged Yankee individualism which has characterized the Springfield newspapers will receive a severe blow. It will be a sad day for us and for New England

when that mortal blow falls and rugged individualism disappears from the local journalistic scene.

6. A chain-run paper will have the kind of power, by its very economics, that Lord Acton spoke about when he said that "power corrupts and absolute power corrupts absolutely." It will present an ominous challenge to the many forces striving to give Springfield the go-ahead impetus.

As a reader of your newspapers I may not always agree with your point of view or even with some of the features of your distinguished papers. This, however, is my right as a citizen of a democracy. However, I will feel the loss a personal one if you allow the control to slip into the hands of a money-grabbing clique. I am certain the overwhelming majority of the citizens feel like I do. It will be a sad day for us all when the Springfield newspapers become impersonal, power structures, dedicated to the profit and money-grabbing motive. Please do all you possibly can on our behalf to fight for the local independence of the papers. Rest assured that, in the final analysis, this is also a people's fight for what they deem is right and good for their city, town, and community.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I invite attention to an editorial announcement made in the Springfield, Mass., Republican newspaper for June 19, 1960, announcing that the Newhouse chain had purchased some 40 percent stock of the Springfield newspaper. The article reads in part as follows:

The announcement on Friday, Bunker Hill Day, of the sale by the descendants of the founder of the Republican, Samuel Bowles, of their stock interest in the Springfield newspapers came as a shock. The work and pride of four generations is at an inglorious end.

Inroads by outsiders into New England business are attaining galloping proportions.

The article goes on to point out the undesirable effects, in the opinion of the editors of these newspapers of which the purchase, 40 percent of the stock by the Newhouse chain will have on an independent press in Springfield, Mass.

These editors are under an ownership arrangement by which the employees have the controlling interest in these papers for the next 7 years. They have served notice on the Newhouse dynasty that there will be a fight to the finish. They have probably the best employee pension plan and retirement plan existing in any group of newspapers in the country, but they are fearful as to what the Newhouse group will do, and they have good reason to be fearful. As the editor of one of these newspapers told me this noon at luncheon in the Senate restaurant, when I met with him and his lawyer, the Newhouses have already brought legal action seeking to upset the pension plan of the employees.

Mr. President, the last paragraph of the article to which I refer states:

We assure the readers, advertisers, and employees of the Springfield Sunday Republican, the Springfield Union, and the Springfield Daily News that irrespective of Mr. Newhouse the present employee management will continue to control these newspapers, at least for the next 7 years, perhaps longer. Employees are assured that the substantial assets of the newspapers' pension funds are carefully safeguarded for their exclusive benefit. The funds are controlled by employee trustees who appoint their own successors, and will continue so to be controlled.

The Newhouse interests are determined to use every economic force, pressure, and legal tactic they can in order to upset this employee control of the newspapers in which the Newhouses already have bought a 40-percent interest, and in which they hope to buy another 45-percent interest from some of the heirs of the Bowles estate. What is going on in this part of New Hampshire is but a repetition of what the Newhouse interests are doing in other parts of the country.

In my own State for the past many months we have had the shocking labor practices of the Newhouse interests in the case of the Oregonian and the Journal. I have pleaded several times in the Senate for a Senate investigation of the antilabor policies not only of the Newhouse interests, but also of other newspaper interests in this country, because there are a group of newspaper publishers in this country who are out to break the backs of the unions in the newspaper industry of this Nation.

We find the Newhouse chain engaged in this nefarious economic and antilabor practice in other parts of the country besides Massachusetts and Oregon. We find them in Missouri. We find them seeking to invade Colorado. We find them in New York and New Jersey. Therefore I think it is of the utmost importance that there be a congressional investigation of this Newhouse newspaper dynasty and empire in the early part of the next session of Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks another article appearing in the Springfield Union, issue of June 18, 1960, entitled "Samuel Newhouse Buys Stock in Republican Co."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAMUEL NEWHOUSE BUYS STOCK IN REPUBLICAN CO.

Sidney R. Cook, treasurer of the Republican Co., today issued the following statement concerning sale of stock in the company: "I wish to announce that Samuel I. Newhouse has acquired from the relatives of the late Samuel Bowles a 40-percent interest in the stock of the Republican Co., a company holding controlling stock interest in companies which publish the Springfield Union, the Springfield Daily News, and the Springfield Sunday Republican.

"Mr. Newhouse has also acquired from the widow and children of the late Sherman H. Bowles, the rights to an additional 45-percent interest in the Republican Co. at a future date.

"Control of the Republican Co. presently remains in a trust, of which the trustees of the two pension funds established by the newspaper companies are a majority."

Mr. MORSE. I happen to know that there is a research study being conducted by some of the foundations of our country in regard to the status of pension funds and retirement funds of employees. I am speaking of private funds. I point out that private pension and welfare funds in many instances are not as secure as employees have been led to believe. We see here an attempt, on the part of the Newhouse empire, to weaken the pension fund in connection with certain Massachusetts newspapers.

This practice should be looked into. I happen to be one who believes that it is inexcusable for Congress to stand by while many millions of workers contribute to private pension and welfare funds in this country on the assumption that when workers reach retirement age they will be able to collect those funds. The pension fund problem is part and parcel of the investigation that I seek. I think the investigation for which I plead should lead also into an investigation as to the extent to which pension funds are administered, so that when the workers are ready for their retirement, they in fact will receive the benefit of the funds.

I mention this subject only because at a luncheon this noon with the editor of one of these newspapers and its very able and distinguished lawyer I was given an insight into the legal tactics of the Newhouse group in trying to undercut and destroy the morale of the employees of these newspapers.

I insert these remarks in the RECORD in the closing days of this session as my notice to the Newhouses: I have only begun to fight.

THE 1960 NATIONAL EASTER SEAL CHILD JOHNNY KEMP

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, earlier in the year I had the pleasure of visiting with and presenting to the Senate Johnny Kemp, the 1960 National Easter Seal Child. His grandparents, Mr. and Mrs. John B. Kemp of Wolf Point, Mont., are very dear friends of mine.

Johnny and his family are constituents of my good friends, the Senators from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG and Mr. BURDICK] from my neighboring State, but I have been in close contact with the family for many years. I am now advised that Johnny's father has just recently been promoted to the position of Division Engineer for the Bureau of Public Roads in Bismarck, N. Dak. He will be in charge of the Federal-aid highway activities in the State. It is a difficult position, one with many headaches, but I know he will do an outstanding job because of his previous record of service with the Bureau. Mr. Kemp was a student of mine when I was on the faculty of Montana State University. I also want to point out that he has been doing another fine job of raising a family of three children since the untimely death of his wife nearly 10 years ago.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have two newspaper articles printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks; one from the August 11 issue of the Wolf Point Herald News of Wolf Point, Mont., and the other from the August 18 issue of the Daniels County Leader, of Scobey, Mont.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wolf Point (Mont.) Herald-News, Aug. 11, 1960]

FORMER WOLF POINT RESIDENT PROMOTED BY ROAD BUREAU

John Bernard Kemp, son of Mr. and Mrs. John B. Kemp of Wolf Point, who has been with the Bureau of Public Roads at Bismarck, N. Dak., for the past 8½ years was advanced to the position of division engineer on August 1. As division engineer for the Federal Road agency he will be in immediate charge of the Bureau's Federal-aid highway activities in North Dakota. He will be assisted in that capacity by a staff of about 20 which includes engineers, an auditor, a right-of-way appraiser, and administrative personnel.

Kemp was born at Scobey, August 14, 1918. He attended high school at Scobey and Wolf Point, graduating from Wolf Point High School in May 1935. He then attended Northern Montana College at Havre and Montana State University at Missoula, graduating from the latter with a degree in economics and sociology in March of 1940. Kemp attended the U.S.N.R. Midshipmen's School at Northwestern University of Chicago in 1942. He graduated 13th in a class of 900 men in the spring of 1943 and was retained as an instructor in navigation. He later served on Guam at the Naval Operating Base. While in the Navy he was advanced in rank to lieutenant, senior grade. Upon release from the Navy early in 1946 Kemp entered Iowa State University at Ames, Iowa, where he received a bachelor of science degree in engineering in 1947 and a master of science degree in engineering and economics in 1949. While at Iowa State University he was elected to membership in Tau Beta Pi, national engineering honorary fraternity and to Phi Kappa Phi, national scholastic honorary fraternity.

While attending college he worked during vacation periods for the Montana Highway Department on construction and surveys. After graduating from Montana State University in 1940 he was again employed by the Montana Highway Department for over a year before joining the U.S. Corps of Engineers at Fort Peck where he was empolyed on airport construction work at several airports and bases in Montana before enlisting in the Navy in 1942. In September of 1949 he joined the Bureau of Public Roads staff at the St. Paul office, and on March 1, 1952, he was transferred to Bismarck, N. Dak. From 1952 to 1957 he served as division planning and programing engineer and since 1957 he has been a district engineer in charge of Federal-aid activities in the western half of North Dakota. In 1957 and again in July of 1960 Mr. Kemp was awarded the Bureau of Public Roads citation and a cash award for sustained superior performance of official duties.

While teaching at Northwestern University in Chicago Mr. Kemp met Miss Kathryn Lally, of Dysart, Iowa, whom he married in 1944. Three children were born to this marriage: Kathy now 14, Johnny 10, and Marq 9. Mrs. Kemp died in December of 1950 while the family was living at St. Paul, and since the death of his wife Mr. Kemp has raised the family with the assistance of housekeepers. The son Johnny, who was born a quadruple amputee, is the 1960 National Easter Seal Child and in that capacity he visited the White House in March 1960 to present the first sheet of Easter Seals to Mrs. Eisenhower. While in Washington, Johnny, his father, and two sisters, and his grandparents of Wolf Point, were breakfast guests of Senator MIKE MANSFIELD. The breakfast was also attended by Senator MURRAY and Senator YOUNG of North Dakota.

Mr. Kemp has two sisters living in Montana and one at Calgary, Alta. Mrs. William Wagner lives at Missoula; Mrs. Walt Moreno lives at Miles City; and Mrs. Harold Degnan lives at Calgary. A brother, Robert, is a senior at the Creighton University School of Dentistry, at Omaha, Nebr. Mr. Kemp's parents have been residents of northeastern Montana for 45 years.

In addition to his duties as both father and mother to three healthy children, and those involved in his professional capacity with the Bureau of Public Roads Mr. Kemp has found time for public service. He is currently president of the North Dakota Society for Crippled Children and Adults, and is president of the Capital City Lions Club of Bismarck. He is a member of the Elks, the American Legion, the Knights of Columbus, the American Society of Civil Engineers, and the National Society of Professional Engineers. He is a registered professional highway engineer.

[From the Daniels County Leader, Scobey, Mont.]

WITH PEOPLE MAKING NEWS

J. Bernard Kemp, native of the Scobey community, son of Mr. and Mrs. John B. Kemp, former residents of the Carbert community and Scobey, is the new North Dakota head of the Federal Bureau of Public Roads, and as division engineer he is in charge of that Bureau's activities in that State.

Raised on his parents' farm northwest of Scobey, Bernard received his early schooling and part of high school in rural schools and at Scobey. His folks still have farming interests here.

Since leaving high school (1935) his career has been one of high scholarship and diligence. He received his degree in economics and sociology from Montana State University in 1940, and in 1942 entered the Navy and was assigned to midshipman's school at Northwestern University from which he graduated and became an instructor in navigation, later serving in the Pacific area.

Upon his discharge from the Navy in 1946 he attended Iowa State University where he received his B.S. degree in engineering in 1947 and his master's degree in engineering and economics in 1949.

That year he joined the Bureau of Public Roads staff in St. Paul and in 1952 was transferred to Bismarck where he has been since. In 1957 and again in 1960, Mr. Kemp received the Bureau of Public Roads citation and a cash award for sustained superior performance of official duties.

While Bernard was teaching at Northwestern University, following his graduation from midshipman's school, he met and married Miss Kathryn Lally in 1944. Three children were born to this marriage. His wife passed away in 1950.

One of the children, Johnny, who is 10, was born without feet or hands and was selected as the 1960 National Easter Seal Child and as such visited the White House last March and was introduced to other dignitaries of the Nation. The boy is a marvel of resourcefulness and stout spirits, to the amazement of all who meet him. His father has raised the three children by himself since the passing of the mother. Adversity has not interferred with accomplishment in the Kemp family.

In addition to his work, Bernard heads the North Dakota Society for Crippled Children and Adults, is president of the Lions Club in Bismarck, belongs to a number of other civic and fraternal organizations and is a member of several national scholastic honorary societies.

PENNSYLVANIA RAILROAD STRIKE

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, a strike will end service on the Pennsylvania Railroad system at 12:01 Thursday unless negotiators, now in continuous session, can reach an agreement before that deadline. According to newspaper accounts, 20,000 maintenance workers would be affected; 52,000 employees in all would be laid off if the strike is not averted; approximately 722 passenger and about 870 freight trains, now operating daily, would be put out of service.

I understand that the railroad, faced with a threat of strike, has discontinued any further through trains from the south to the north. They have discontinued any further shipments of perishables from the west to the east.

As one of the representatives of a State which depends to a great extent upon the passenger and freight operaions of the Pennsylvania I am hopeful that the discussions will lead to a constructive conclusion before the strike deadline, and I believe, too, that we here have a duty to inspect the current situation thoroughly.

The Railway Labor Act, as I understand it, is intended to prevent major disruptions of service. It is also intended to diminish or remove the necessity of resort to a strike in order for labor to win a dispute. If, indeed, a strike is the only answer, then we should determine what is lacking in our legislation.

This impending shutdown of the Pennsylvania Railroad is going to be especially hard on the people, factories, farms, and businesses of New Jersey. This particular railroad carries many thousands of New Jersey commuters a day to and from their jobs. It carries a good many people on business trips to and from our many plants and offices to plants and offices in many parts of the country. A considerable portion of its millions of tons of freight—I believe the figure is 118 million ton-miles a day—move to or from the New Jersey economy; our farms, plants, and stores.

Aside from the immediate damage to New Jersey's people and economy, this strike would inevitably set back the efforts of our State to make possible the survival of commuter services like those of the Pennsylvania. I believe the railroad is already in the red by almost $3 million; this strike would put the railroad even further behind, and seriously jeopardize our State's efforts to keep commuter services alive.

I strongly urge both management and labor that during the time the present emergency negotiations are in progress, that the trains be kept operating for the convenience of the shippers, receivers, and traveling public within our great State of New Jersey and throughout the country.

REPEAL OF WASHINGTON STATE'S ANTIALIEN LAND LAW

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I wish to invite the attention of my colleagues to a significant and heartwarming movement now under way in my State of Washington. The movement is headed by a volunteer organization

called the Washington State Committee for the Repeal of the Anti-Alien Land Law. Its members are mostly Japanese Americans, an ethnic minority who are excellent citizens and of whom our State is justifiably proud. No organization which has been fully apprised of this committee's efforts has failed to see the justice of its objectives. The committee is small in numbers and has only limited resources, but it has gained widespread support for the goal it seeks.

Briefly, the committee seeks the repeal, by popular referendum, of a law that is archaic, obsolete, unjust, and legally meaningless. At the same time the law is psychologically repugnant and incompatible with democratic principles. It is a law that should be stricken from the lawbooks.

I am referring to article II, section 33 of the original constitution of the State of Washington, adopted in 1889. Section 33 has been amended several times but the essence of the original law remains unchanged. It prohibits ownership of land by aliens other than those who in good faith have declared their intention to become citizens of the United States.

At first glance, the purpose of the law may appear to be a good one. It is necessary to understand the intent of the law, the history of its application, and its present status, to see clearly why it is an unworthy law.

As originally conceived, section 33 was aimed against immigrants from Asia who, under the U.S. Constitution, were "ineligible to U.S. citizenship." In other words, under Federal law they were forced to remain aliens and consequently never could own land in Washington. Since the Japanese in our midst were the largest group of aliens of Asian ancestry, the law had the effect of discriminating primarily against them.

DISCRIMINATORY EFFECT

Let me digress here just a moment to point out the law's effect. While the law was aimed at the aliens, its greater discrimination was against native-born Americans of Japanese ancestry. The U.S. Supreme Court found in the Oyama case in 1948 that antialien land laws discriminated against American citizens of Japanese extraction when compared to the citizen children of other ancestries. Thus, antialien land laws, which existed for many years in California and Oregon as well as Washington, had the very real effect of reducing Japanese Americans into second class citizenship, circumscribing and restricting the lives of citizens and aliens alike. I am convinced that these antialien land laws helped substantially to create the prejudices which were fanned by hysteria in 1942 into the incident that has been described as "our worst wartime mistake." I have reference to the mass military evacuation of 110,000 persons of Japanese ancestry, regardless of citizenship, age, or sex, from their homes into interior internment camps.

I am proud to say that the Japanese Americans who call Washington home distinguished themselves in many ways during World War II, both as civilians and servicemen. More Japanese Americans per capita volunteered for military service from Washington than any other State, and the list of their awards for valor is a proud and lengthy one.

In 1952, the Congress of the United States saw fit to wipe racism from our naturalization laws and extend the privilege of citizenship to all persons regardless of race, color, creed, or national origin. This made aliens of Japanese ancestry, the last remaining national group of consequence, eligible to naturalization.

Simultaneously, this action by the Congress nullified the substance and intent of antialien laws such as section 33 of the Washington State constitution.

Grateful for the privilege, thousands of Japanese aliens, many of whom had lived in the United States for 40, 50, and 60 years, applied for and were granted American citizenship. Today they are entitled to all the rights and privileges of Americans, including the right to own land.

OTHER WESTERN STATES REPEAL SIMILAR LAWS

One by one, States with the now meaningless antialien statutes on their books repealed them. Oregon, Utah, Arkansas, and Idaho quickly wiped out antialien land laws. The California State Legislature in 1955 approved a referendum repealing such laws and the following year the people passed the measure by a substantial majority.

In the State of Washington a legislative committee after exhaustive study recommended repeal of the offending section 33. Senate Joint Resolution 4, providing for repeal, was passed unanimously in the State Senate and with only two dissident votes in the House.

The proposal is now on the ballot to be presented to the people of the State of Washington in the general election this coming November.

REASONS FOR REPEAL

Perhaps it should be explained here why there is so much concern about repealing a law that is without effect. There are several reasons.

First. Section 33 is a grim and unpleasant reminder of the days when antiorientalism was fashionable in the West. We want to wipe the slate clean.

Second. We are aware of the warning by the late Justice Robert H. Jackson that discriminatory laws are "like a loaded weapon ready for the hand of any authority that can bring forward a plausible claim of an urgent need." In other words, so long as there is legal sanction of the kind provided in section 33, in another time of hysteria and hate it may be used as the pattern for discrimination against an American minority. No American can be secure in his civil rights so long as legal justification for bigotry remains in the statutes.

Third. We are cognizant of the importance of winning friends for democracy in Asia. I can think of no better way to demonstrate our friendship than to repeal a law with its foundations mired in the dark mud of racism.

Fourth. Repeal of section 33 would be recognition by Washingtonians of the great and substantial role played by Japanese Americans in the development, progress and well-being of the Pacific Northwest. Our history, of relatively recent origins, is rich with the contributions Japanese immigrants made in the farming, lumbering, railroad, fishing, and other industries. Today their descendants are an integral and valued part of our commerce, culture and civic life.

Fifth and not least, we realize simple justice cries for repeal of section 33 and the State will be better for the action.

CITIZENS COMMITTEE ORGANIZED

To aid in this vital and necessary effort, an advisory committee to the citizens' Washington State Committee for the Repeal of the Anti-Alien Land Law has been organized. I am proud to be a cochairman of this advisory committee, along with my colleague, Senator Henry M. Jackson, Gov. Albert D. Rosellini, Mayor Gordon S. Clinton of Seattle, Mayor Neal R. Fosseen of Spokane, and the Honorable Henry Schmitz, president emeritus of the University of Washington. The members of this advisory committee are outstanding citizens of my State, representing every aspect of our life, including businessmen, educators, attorneys, realtors, ministers of every faith, veterans, farmers, civic leaders, and so forth.

To demonstrate the bipartisan support for the repeal of this antialien land law, I note that both the Democratic and Republican State conventions unanimously adopted platform pledges to this end.

Representing the organized concern of our citizens are organizations too numerous to mention. Suffice it to list only a few whose endorsement are particularly meaningful, such as the Washington Association of Realtors, the Washington State Board Against Discrimination, the American Legion, the Seattle Civic Unity Committee, and the Japanese American Citizens League.

I have no doubt that the people of the great State of Washington will go to the polls in November and, while making known their choice for President and Members of Congress, vote overwhelmingly in support of Senate Joint Resolution 4. With the indulgence of my colleagues, I take this opportunity to express the hope that Washingtonians will make their renunciation of bigotry an emphatic and vigorous one.

All members of both political parties, of the State of Washington congressional delegation have highly recommended the repeal of this law, and have signed a so-called bipartisan statement of opinions in regard to that matter.

I have held several meetings with my colleague, the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], on this subject; and to supplement the statement I have made, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a further statement detailing our position on this matter, which in November will come before the people of the State of Washington.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RELEASE FROM THE OFFICE OF SENATOR WARREN G. MAGNUSON

In the interest of fair play, equality, and justice, Washington voters should, Novem-

ber 8, approve Senate Joint Resolution 4 repealing the so-called antialien land law, the State's congressional delegation urged today in a bipartisan, joint statement.

All legally admitted immigrants are entitled to be free to purchase land, Senators WARREN G. MAGNUSON and HENRY M. JACKSON, Congresswoman CATHERINE MAY, and Congressmen DON MAGNUSON, THOMAS PELLY, THOR C. TOLLEFSON, JACK WESTLAND, and WALT HORAN declared.

They pointed out that the 1959 Washington Legislature had unanimously voted to place the constitutional amendment before the people.

In their joint statement, lawmakers said: "We feel that the resident Japanese aliens who contributed so much to the development of our State and of our country, and whose native-born American citizen sons fought so courageously in both the European and the Pacific theaters of World War II in spite of bigotry and persecution, were not only treated unfairly by this law which will be repealed by an affirmative vote, but they also earned the right to dignity and decency."

Washington's representatives in the Senate and the House said they "urge the repeal of this antiquated statute that can no longer be used against those against whom it was directed because of corrective national legislation on the subject."

Their statement concluded: "For fair play, for equality, for justice, as Americans and citizens of the State of Washington, join us in voting 'yes' on Senate Joint Resolution 4 on November 8."

AUTHORIZATIONS FOR SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS TO SUBMIT REPORTS SUBSEQUENT TO ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], chairman of the Subcommittee on Retailing, Distribution, and Fair Trade Practices, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Small Business be authorized, during the adjournment of the 2d session of the 86th Congress, to file with the Secretary of the Senate a report entitled "Dual Distribution in the Automotive Tire Industry," and that the report be printed along with any individual, supplemental or minority views.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], chairman of the Subcommittee on Government Procurement, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Small Business be authorized, during the adjournment of the 2d session of the 86th Congress, to file with the Secretary of the Senate a report entitled "Government Procurement, 1960," and that the report be printed along with any individual, supplemental, or minority views.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NATIONAL EMPLOY THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED WEEK—PAUL STRACHAN

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, yesterday the Post Office Department issued a stamp commemorating the National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week. I am delighted to see the Post Office Department take this action giving recognition to the program of employment of the physically handicapped, and the dedication of a week each year to that program. I take special pride in it because I was the author of the resolution that established the National Employ the Handicapped Week, and it has been continued in good fashion since.

At the time the resolution was agreed to, a man in Washington, who was himself physically handicapped, headed an organization that worked very hard for the physically handicapped. He was on the brink of death at one time, and it was believed that he would never be able to survive. However, he pulled through. Many Senators and Representatives will recall the man to whom I refer. He is Paul Strachan.

Paul has left Washington and is now living in Florida. I believe no one had more to do with initiating, working for, pushing through, and bringing to final fruition the movement to show some interest in the employment of physically handicapped persons than did Paul Strachan. I believe it is only fitting that on the occasion that this commemorative stamp is issued we should remember the very fine, efficient and effective work that was done by Paul Strachan. He deserves a great deal of credit for what has been accomplished over the years.

A great deal has been accomplished. Physically handicapped people who in former days would not have been thought of in connection with gainful employment have been employed by the thousands throughout the country. We owe a great deal to Paul Strachan. I wish to take this opportunity to pay tribute to him.

I thank the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DODD. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, with the proviso that the Senator from Connecticut will not lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ENFORCEMENT OF THE BILATERAL AIR AGREEMENTS—STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAGNUSON

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement I sent today to the State Department and to the Civil Aeronautics Board.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAGNUSON

I want to commend the Department of State and the CAB for taking what I understand to be a step recommended by the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in its report on International Air Agreements in 1956. Our committee called on the executive branch to enforce the bilateral air agreements. It has taken a long time and the action is long overdue but we are glad to see that some action is finally being taken.

I have reference to the report in the Aviation Daily for August 29, 1960, which indicates that the United States has initiated capacity consultations with the Scandinavian governments. The purpose of these talks will be to review the operations of the Scandinavian airlines to and from the United States to see whether they conform to what is justified in the international air agreements.

Unless prompt, vigorous, and effective action is taken by our Government, our airlines will be driven from the skies.

We do not threaten the legitimate operations of foreign airlines. There is enough traffic for all—if each operates in conformity with its solemn international air agreements. But when a few operate in excess of what is authorized—they threaten the livelihood of our airmen and the continued efficiency of our national flag lines.

Since the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee urged that the State Department and the CAB enforce the agreements more than 4 years ago, we wish them success on this precedent-making occasion, when for the first time in our aviation history, our Government has initiated capacity negotiations.

[From Aviation Daily, Aug. 29, 1960]

LIMITS URGED ON SAS TRAFFIC TO UNITED STATES

American-flag carriers are urging that the U.S. delegation to the upcoming Scandinavian bilateral talks adopt specific limitations on traffic which SAS will be allowed to carry out of New York and Los Angeles. ATA President S. G. Tipton has told the CAB that U.S. negotiators should realize that "there is no possibility of getting the Scandinavians to agree to anything."

Tipton, who told the CAB that he spoke for all U.S. carriers except Ponagra, said, "No matter how politely and carefully, in the last analysis the Scandinavians are probably going to have to be told what changes they must make in their scheduling policy. Unless the U.S. team goes to Copenhagen in this frame of mind, the whole consultation will not only be futile but it will be seriously damaging to the posture of the United States in other capacity consultations which must inevitably follow in the near future."

This is the first indication that the SAS negotiations are the first of a series to be held with foreign governments on capacity restriction. Some clue as to who the other airlines are is contained in an ATA table of "Fifth freedom operators." "Bermuda-type" operators says ATA, are those that carry mostly their own nationals or U.S. citizens traveling to or from the foreign-flag carrier's own country.

ATA lists the transatlantic airlines, together with the percentage of legitimate Bermuda-type traffic carriers, as "TWA, 95 percent; PAA, 93 percent; Lufthansa, 76 percent; Irish, 73 percent; BOAC, 72 percent; Air France, 62 percent; Swissair, 50 percent; Alitalia, 47 percent; SAS, 47 percent; Sabena, 33 percent; KLM,, 31 percent." Commenting on these figures, ATA says "the SAS capacity is not primarily tailored to fit the traffic flow between the United States and the three Scandinavian countries."

The United States should require SAS to cut its on-season schedules in half and its off-season schedules by two-thirds, Tipton says. The recommended U.S. position assumes that SAS will retain 50 percent of the total air traffic between the United States and Scandinavia. "This is generous because it means that the U.S.-flag carrier will carry

substantially less than 50 percent—the balance going partially or wholly by other carriers," Tipton says.

In addition, the United States should give SAS credit for "bona fide stopovers as being equal to 10 percent of their third and fourth freedom traffic. This generous allowance results in a figure 24 percent greater than the number of SAS 72-hour stopovers." SAS should also be allowed 30 percent of its total traffic for intermediate and transiting fifth freedom passengers, says the ATA, "even though such traffic of the U.S.-flag airlines on comparable transatlantic sectors probably comprises less than 5 percent of their total."

This proposed SAS limitation, says Tipton, "is not intended to suggest that either 70 or 90 percent is the correct figure for worldwide application. There is no such magic figure. We only say that these figures are reasonable for the sectors under discussion here." Tipton also points out that "it is extremely important to recognize the marked seasonal peaks and valleys of the trans-Atlantic market, i.e., to have one set of figures and conclusions for the on season and another for the off season."

The importance of the United States-Scandinavian talks is emphasized by Tipton. "From the airline standpoint, this is the first capacity consultation undertaken by our Government; the degree to which it is successful is certain to influence the attitude of our Government officials toward the similar consultations which must be held in the near future with the other countries which are also major violators of the Bermuda capacity principles," he told CAB Chairman Whitney Gilliland last week.

"It must be recognized that the Scandinavians will use every instrument of propaganda and political resistance at their command. As in the case of Dutch propaganda, the Scandinavians are trying to strengthen their position by claiming publicly that the U.S.-flag airlines are seeking to drive them off the Atlantic. We trust that the officials of our Government at all levels are convinced that the opposite is true. Our carriers are not opposing the right of the Scandinavians to compete on equal terms for the traffic between the United States and Scandinavia.

"It it the Scandinavians and other fifth freedom operators with low wage costs who would be pleased to drive the high-wage cost U.S.-flag operators off the international air routes—or at least to bring about such a heavy burden of subsidy on the American taxpayers as to weaken U.S.-flag efforts. Still worse, their continued assertion of their demand to operate untrammeled by the Bermuda capacity provisions simply puts the U.S. Government in the position of knowingly violating its obligations to its other bilateral partners who have a primary entitlement, with the United States, to the traffic between the United States and these other countries."

FREEDOM COMMISSION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1689) to create the Freedom Commission for the development of the science of counteraction to the world Communist conspiracy for the training and development of leaders in a total political war.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, on last Friday I called the attention of the Senate to the Freedom Commission bill which we are now considering, S. 1689. I expressed the hope then that, despite the brief time which remains to us, it would be possible to bring the measure to the floor for consideration.

I said I was confident that if the bill could be brought to a vote it would receive a great deal of support in the Senate. I joined my colleague the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] in the belief that once the Senate had acted on the measure the House would promptly take parallel action.

It is encouraging that the majority leader, who is confronted with so many competing demands from so many sides, has nevertheless decided to bring the Freedom Commission bill before the Senate today. His action in doing so is a tribute to his vision and to the bipartisan spirit which he has always manifested on basic issues of foreign policy.

The Freedom Commission bill seeks to rectify what many of us consider to be the gravest deficiency in our national defense.

There are some who say that if we wish to be secure we must be prepared to spend more for defense purposes—and I agree with this view.

There are others who say that if we are to react intelligently to the Communist menace we must improve our policy-planning machinery—and I agree with that view.

And there are still others who say that if we wish to compete with our Communist opponents for the minds of men we must improve our society and grant the full measure of liberty to all Americans—and I agree. I am in most hearty agreement with all these views.

However, Mr. President, we could do all of these things and still lose the cold war—if we fail to recognize the total nature of the cold war, if we continue to fight it as amateurs against professionals, if we fail to give the representatives of the free world the same kind of intensive, broad spectrum training which the Kremlin provides for its adherents in every part of the world where it is still seeking to obtain power.

When I addressed the Senate last Friday I referred to the successes the Communists have had in such countries as Cuba, Iraq, Japan, and Guinea, and I pointed out that in every case these successes could be traced back principally to two things.

First of all, the Communists have learned the art of total warfare. They have learned how to combine the political, the economic, the psychological, the organizational, and the cultural into a single, integrated strategy of conflict.

Second, the Communists maintain scores of specialized training establishments, where they teach the art of total political warfare to revolutionary recruits from all parts of the world.

So long as the Communists have this advantage in strategic understanding, in training, and in organization, the free world will be helpless against them.

We could make no more fatal mistake than to underestimate the power of a single Communist professional, schooled in the tactics and strategy of subversion.

Among the several thousand men whom Castro had with him in the mountains, no more than several score, probably less than a score, were Moscow-trained Communists. But that handful of trained men were able to subvert a popular revolution and to give the Kremlin effective control in Cuba today.

American missionaries returning from the Congo were agreed that the violence which broke out throughout that country immediately independence was declared was too well organized and too well synchronized to have been accidental or spontaneous. No precise arithmetical estimate may ever be available to us. However, I am convinced that in a country like the Congo, 50 trained agitators, distributed at key posts, would be quite capable of turning over the entire country to rape, mayhem, and chaos.

In his remarks before the Veterans of Foreign Wars in Detroit last February 22, Mr. Allen W. Dulles, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, made some profound observations. I shall quote a few paragraphs:

> Maybe many people in this country will be taught a new lesson in communism because Khrushchev, right at our doorstep, is applying his methods and techniques. He is perverting a revolutionary movement which initially had the support of some estimable people but which now is in the throes of a Communist takeover. Cuba is not the only country, though it is the one nearest to us, where such a process is underway.
>
> Are we alerted fully to this kind of danger, and are we prepared to do all that we can to see that this development does not occur in a dozen or more countries elsewhere in the world?
>
> This, today, is the major element of the Soviet scheme for world domination. We must understand it. We must analyze it, and through a well coordinated program of education and of action, protect ourselves against it.

Mr. President, in my judgment, the free world does not lack dedication. Of this I am utterly convinced. Nevertheless, so long as we have not developed the science of counteraction to the Communist conspiracy, so long as we do not have cold war professionals who have received intensive training in this science, just so long shall we remain helpless to cope with situations like those which exist in Cuba and the Congo.

The purpose of the Freedom Academy, under the Freedom Commission, is to fill, or attempt to fill, this gap in our defenses. By bringing together under one roof the best brains we have in our country for this purpose we shall be creating the kind of research facilities which have made possible our nuclear development program and our space exploration. In those fields we brought together the best talent available and put them to work, we provided them with facilities and equipment with which to work, and they have been and are producing results that could never have been achieved without a concentration of brains and effort.

At the same time as they engaged in the basic task of research, the Freedom Academy people would impart their knowledge and understanding to Americans and to the nationals of other free countries who come to the Academy for special training.

Mr. President, think how important that can be.

We must never permit ourselves to become fatalists about Communist progress. If we ever become fatalists about Communist progress, we shall be lost. The Communists can be defeated. As I said on Friday, it is not enough to out-

gun them or outspend them. We must outthink them and outmaneuver them, and this can be done with brains. It can only be done on the intellectual level, and at no other level. In my judgment, only in that way will the struggle against communism ever be brought to a successful conclusion.

Day after day, in this body and in the House, men and women of high intention have been saying that this is a struggle for the hearts and minds of men. Indeed, it is. But while we have talked in these terms, what have we actually done to win the hearts and minds of men?

I do not suggest that the Freedom Academy would be a cure-all. I offer it as one suggestion, made by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] and the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. They have proposed a plan which is positive, something which should be tried. If this is a battle for the hearts and minds of men, let us get into the battle on that level.

Let us start thinking, and let us get our best minds thinking. Let us place them in touch with each other. Let us provide them with a repository of the thinking of free people all over the world. Let them exchange ideas and expose themselves to the thinking of others. Let them analyze this knowledge, put the bits and pieces together, and come up with a carefully thought-out plan of counteraction to the Communist conspiracy.

Already many battles have been won against the Communists. I think we are inclined to overlook that fact. Let us remember the experience of the people in the labor unions of the Nation. The great trade unions and great labor unions have met the threat of communism head on in their own organizations. In instance after instance, labor has overcome communism. I cite that as a first-class example of the position that the battle against communism can be won. It has been done. It has been done by means of brains, organization, and dedication.

The leaders of the American labor movement did not outspend the Communists. Certainly they did not outgun them. But they out thought them and out fought them. Today, the influence of communism in the labor unions is so small as to amount to very little.

Mr. President, that is the kind of effort we are talking about. That is the kind of task in which we suggest a Freedom Institute can help so much.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DODD. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, who is a coauthor of the bill, and who has done so much to bring this matter before the Senate.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the Senator from Connecticut. I asked him to yield so that I might substantiate what he has said in his words of commendation concerning what has been done in the American labor union movement to rid its ranks of any tinge of communism.

I point out that one of the early advocates of the Freedom Academy, about which we are now speaking, and one of the great crusaders for such legislation, is Mr. Arthur G. McDowell, a prominent labor union official in the United States, who, in addition to holding a responsible position in the trade union movement, has been made secretary of the Council Against Communist Aggression.

Arthur McDowell has been a real tower of strength in pushing the proposed legislation to the point where it is today, and where it appears we shall have an opportunity to vote upon it.

Even though there remain only a few days—or perhaps only 1 day—in which the House can take action, I am confident that as a result of the type of support that has been generated from all over the Nation, in insisting that this Congress do something effective in this area, it will be possible for the Congress to act expeditiously, so this measure can be enacted into law at this session of Congress.

Mr. DODD. I thank the Senator from South Dakota. I know of none who have done more or who are more intelligent in their attitude to the menace of communism than are our labor organizations. In my opinion, they have been far ahead of any other segment of our society on this score. The Senator from South Dakota is quite correct in what he says about Mr. McDowell; and I think we could easily name 100 or 200 other labor leaders who have been outstanding in this regard.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. DODD. I am glad to yield.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Connecticut, who is my personal friend, that I am puzzled about two aspects of the bill.

Upon reading the report, I note that the bill proposes the creation of a Freedom Commission which would establish a Freedom Academy, which would have the responsibility for training Americans, and selecting foreign students and training them, also, to better understand the nature of the international Communist conspiracy and to develop effective methods of combating it.

And the bill includes various provisions in regard to how the Commission and the Academy would function.

In the report it is stated that the Department of Justice is wholly in accord with the view that it is most desirable to develop throughout the world greater awareness of the operations of Communism and the methods of combating it.

But there are two aspects of this proposal that are puzzling to me. First I shall state them, and then I shall ask the Senator from Connecticut to comment on them.

First of all, I wonder how it is that this proposal was not handled by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, instead of by the Judiciary Committee.

In addition, I note that the report states that the Department of Justice is unable to recommend enactment of this bill. In short, to be blunt about the matter, it would seem that the Department of Justice is opposed to the bill.

So I should like to have the Senator state his views on both of those points.

Mr. DODD. Let me take them up one at a time, if I may.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Certainly.

Mr. DODD. As to the jurisdictional question, I do not know the complete answer. I understand that the Parliamentarian—or someone other than Senators, at any rate—handles the reference of measures to the Senate committees. The Freedom Commission bill was referred to the Judiciary Committee in April 1959.

We held hearings for 3 days, and heard approximately 20 or 30 witnesses—rather distinguished witnesses, I think it fair to say. All of them favored the proposal. No one appeared in opposition to it.

So with respect to the jurisdictional question, I can only say that the bill was referred to the Judiciary Committee—and properly so, I suppose, because this subject concerns the Judiciary Committee. As a matter of fact, I think it will concern many other Senate committees. Certainly, it will concern the Foreign Relations Committee. I suppose it will concern the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and also the Appropriations Committee, and perhaps others. Any undertaking of this kind will inevitably involve several of our committees, and I think it is good that this is so.

Originally, it was proposed that a joint committee be established, and that it, in turn, supervise the establishment and functioning of the proposed Academy.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. DODD. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Just now I was discussing the bill with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. Let me ask whether printed copies of the hearings are available.

Mr. DODD. Yes. I believe they have been distributed.

Mr. MAGNUSON. There is none on our desks.

Mr. DODD. I am afraid I do not know what the machinery for their distribution is.

Mr. President, in my answer to the question asked by the distinguished Senator from Ohio in regard to the matter of jurisdiction, I mentioned the Foreign Relations Committee and also the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Obviously, I should also mention the Committee on Government Operations. My understanding is that the Foreign Relations Committee probably would also have a great deal to say about the operations of the Commission and the Academy, once they became operational. I assume, also, that the Foreign Relations Committee would wish to make recommendations; and I assume that after the operations got underway, it would make suggestions for their improvement.

That is about all I can say in regard to the question of jurisdiction.

I am not an expert on the subject of committee jurisdiction, and I do not

know the precise answer. But I do know that this proposal seems to be a good one. I have no personal pride in the measure, for, unfortunately, I am not either the author or a coauthor of this proposal. It was authored by others. It was brought to my attention only because of my membership of the committee. I believe the Senate rules were not violated when the measure was referred for consideration to the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. As I read the bill and the report, I judged that the proposal deals completely and extensively with the foreign relations of our country. So I wondered why the measure was not handled by the Foreign Relations Committee. I thank the Senator for answering me on that point. Evidently we are all somewhat puzzled that it should be handled by other committees.

Mr. DODD. I do not agree it deals exclusively with matters within the jurisdiction of that committee. I think we have much to do to educate our people on this issue, and in a sense, I suppose, all these matters are foreign relations matters. So much of what we do is so. We do not live by ourselves at all.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If the Senator will yield, I would like to say for the RECORD that I believe the bill should have gone to the Foreign Relations Committee. It is primarily, I believe, intended to affect our foreign relations. I think the Department of State should be permitted to testify upon it.

Would the Senator from Connecticut tell me whether or not the Department of State appeared in connection with this bill and expressed its support of it?

Mr. DODD. I do not see any record of the Department of State as such. I do recall the names that appear in the list of the contents in the hearings are those of men who are well informed on the subject. But I do not see anyone sppecifically representing the State Department listed.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It seems to me, under the Standing Rules of the Senate, which provide, among other things, that relations of the United States with foreign nations generally are within the jurisdiction of the Foreign Relations Committee, that this bill is primarily in that field.

I grant there are many bills which affect various establishments of our activities and are not exclusively in one or another field; but I think, on the general principles which apply to this question, that the one which predominates has jurisdiction, and I believe this bill should go to the Foreign Relations Committee, where I certainly would propose that the Department of State and the Department of Justice would both be called as the experts in the executive department to testify upon the merits of this measure.

My own attention was brought to this bill only in the last day or two. It may be a very good bill, but I think my duty as chairman of that committee impels me to suggest to the Senate that the bill be sent to that committee for its consideration.

Mr. DODD. I am sorry the Senator feels that way. I understand his concern. I wish this question had been raised a year ago. It would have saved us a great deal of time. We heard 20 or 30 witnesses. I do not think it was a secret matter on which the Judiciary Committee was conducting the hearings. I do not know of anyone on the committee who wanted to have it that way. I do not think there is any proprietary attitude in the committee itself on the subject.

Because the bill was referred to our committee, we did the best we could. I do not say we did all we could. It seems to me the public notice of the fact that the subject was up for consideration gave ample opportunity, insofar as any committee can give it, for others to appear and to raise the question of jurisdiction, if they felt it should be raised.

I am not one who is a stickler for technicalities, either here or in other places. If this is a good bill, if this is something this country needs, if it ought to be done, if it is a wise proposal, or seems to be such to the Members of the Senate, if it can contribute to a better understanding of the struggle we are in, of what great moment is it that the bill was sent to the Judiciary Committee instead of to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, or the Committee on Government Operations, or the Committee on Foreign Relations?

Is not the really important thing that we should get on with the business and get it started and get it underway? Then several other great committees of the Senate can bring all their interest to bear upon the program. They can keep an eye on it and they can have much to say about what is done. That seems to me to be the most important point. I hope at this time we shall not be faced with a delay, which will necessarily result from referring this bill to another great committee of the Senate.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DODD. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I hope my distinguished colleague and friend does not think I am resorting to a technicality.

Mr. DODD. Oh, no.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. But the fact is that I have been trying to obtain a copy of the hearings. I have a copy of the bill. I have a copy of the report. However, I have not as yet, after efforts late this afternoon and early evening, secured a copy of the hearings.

If the Senator from Connecticut has a copy of the hearings, may I ask whether a representative from the Department of Justice testified before the committee as I observe from the report? This statement carries great weight with me, I may say to the Senator from Connecticut. It states:

> Accordingly, the Department of Justice is unable to recommend enactment of this bill.

I construe that statement to mean that, in reality, the Department of Justice is opposed to the enactment of the bill. May I ask the Senator's views on that subject?

Mr. DODD. Yes; I shall be happy to reply. The committee wrote the Department of Justice, asking if it would like to present its views. The reply we got was in the form of a letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Mr. Walsh, and that letter is contained in the hearings.

I am very distressed that the Senator does not have a copy of the hearings. I do not want to plead ignorance all the time, but I am not familiar enough with the machinery here to understand why he does not have a copy of the hearings. I assumed a copy of the bill, report, and hearings would be on every Senator's desk. I should be glad to give the Senator the copy of the hearings which I have with me for his attention and study right now.

The Department of Justice wrote a letter, over the signature of the Deputy Attorney General, making the point, as I understand the letter, that the services to be provided by the Freedom Commission and Freedom Academy were already available. That seems to be the principal strongpoint of the letter to the committee—namely, we already have it, and therefore we do not need a duplicate facility.

The best answer I can give to that is to quote very briefly from the testimony of Mr. C. D. Jackson, whose name is certainly known to all of us. He was a White House adviser on intelligence matters. He is thoroughly experienced in the whole business of psychological warfare and our efforts to overcome and to successfully resist the menace of communism. I quote from his testimony before the committee.

> Now, Mr. Chairman, if I may repeat and paraphrase, I am sure that there is a general impression that adequate instruction places exist where this art or this profession can be studied.

I will say to my friend from Ohio that, of course, he was referring to the bill under consideration. Mr. C. D. Jackson went on:

> Actually, sir, there is no existing place where the whole problem is pulled together and taught in concentrated form and not in bits and in pieces. That is why I think this is a good idea.

He added another sentence:

> It is only by uniting the study and teaching of these elements in one place and one time that the challenge can be fully comprehended and adequate responses generated.

That is the best answer, I think, to those who contend that the facilities are already available. I think there are several places where one can learn some phase of the matter, but I do not know of a place where it can be learned whole. Mr. Jackson is an expert, and he ought to know better than I.

As the Senator from Ohio knows, the committee in its report made a statement, after hearing all of the witnesses and reviewing the matter not summarily or hastily:

> No concentrated, systematic effort is being made to develop an integrated, operational science for our side which will meet the entire Soviet attack.

The report goes on to explain at greater length.

I think it is sensible to say that we do not have a place where all this information is gathered together and where this kind of service, this kind of facility, can be made available, not only to our own people in Government and in private life, but also to nationals of free countries who wish to learn how to resist communism more effectively.

That is my answer to the question raised by the Deputy Attorney General.

I wish to conclude very briefly. I think the bill is eminently sensible. That is the first point I wish to make.

For many years all of us have heard that people have been saying: "We will never beat the Russians by scolding them, by arguing with them, and by calling them names"—which is all true—"we have to beat them on the intellectual plane."

As they generally put it, "We have to win this fight for the minds of men and for the hearts of men."

We have been saying all this—but this is the first time I have seen any concrete suggestion for implementing it. That is all this is. It is an effort to start using our intellects.

The second point I wish to make is that this program is urgent. Last week I tried to spell out why I thought it was urgent. I pointed out that our opponents in this struggle have been working at it for 40 years. They have all kinds of institutes throughout their empire. We have not one of this kind.

The third point is somewhat related to the second point. In my judgment, the time is desperately short. We have very little time.

For these three reasons it seems to me the bill merits favorable consideration by the Senate.

I can think of no more edifying way in which the Senate might conclude its affairs this year than by unanimous bipartisan action to establish the Freedom Academy, with both sides saying, "Let us try this, anyway. Let us get at the business of developing a scientific strategy to win this fight."

This is not a Republican measure. It is not a Democratic measure. It is a bipartisan measure. Those who urge it upon the Senate have never said—and I certainly have never said—it is the best or only plan which can be suggested. It is a plan—and one which ought to be tried if we are ever to win this fight.

I hope the bill will receive the favorable consideration of the Senate. If it does, I think there is still time to take it to our colleagues in the other body. If they will take the time to study it and to look at it, they, too, will agree that this ought to be done.

This plan should be tried. What can be lost by trying? What great setback will this Nation suffer if it sets up the Commission, and if the Commissioners try to set up, and do set up, an institute or academy in which communism and the counteraction to communism can be studied?

The dollars would be minuscule compared to what we are spending to outbuy and outgun the Communists. Certainly there should not be any great feeling of regret about it.

All I plead for is a chance, for once, to do something positive, something direct, something affirmative, something to win the minds of men that we talk about so much, something to win the hearts of men that we talk about so much.

I hope the bill will be favorably considered.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. DODD. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, in regard to the Senator's statement that the bill will be sent to the House if it passes the Senate, two thoughts occur to me, about which I wish to ask my distinguished friend questions.

The statement is made, "Accordingly, the Department of Justice is unable to recommend enactment of this bill." That, to me, implies the Department of Justice of this administration is in reality opposed to the passage of the bill.

We are now in the closing moments of this session, which was supposed to be a "clean-up and get-out" session of Congress. We are, in a way, hoping that this is the night before the final night of this session. We are marking time, waiting, and hoping that a conference report will come in on the supplemental appropriation bill.

What basis is there for a belief, even if the bill were to pass the Senate and were to be passed in the House, that the President would sign it? The President has, in fact, vetoed so many bills that sometimes one thinks he takes a fountain pen with him on the golf course and vetoes bills between rounds of golf. What assurance is there to believe that the President would not veto this bill, particularly in view of the fact that the bill provides for the appointment of six members of a commission?

I was somewhat surprised to note, the provisions of the bill. I must say in all frankness to the Senator from Connecticut that I had not read the bill until late today. I thought this might be an honorary commission, with patriotic Americans contributing a large part of their time. Lo and behold, in reading the bill I learned the members of the Commission will be appointed for 6 years, for 4 years, and for 2 years, respectively, and after that for 6-year terms. Each member of the Commission is to receive $20,000 per annum.

To a fellow like me, that seems like a great deal of money. In addition, the bill provides for expenditures by the Commission.

I notice the chairman is to receive $20,500 per annum, and the other members are to receive $20,000 per annum.

There is an academy to be constructed and located.

Some other people would be employed; students, of course, would be employed and paid; and some other personnel are provided. I shall not take the time to cover compensation fully, but I noticed that $50 a day is set forth as compensation. Those points lead me to believe that probably the bill, particularly in view of the opposition of the Department of Justice and the expenditures involved, would face a veto by the President, even if we should pass it tonight and if the House of Representatives should also pass it in the closing hours of the session without amendment.

What basis is there for a contrary belief?

Mr. DODD. I am happy to try to respond. First, I do not know how anyone can ever say with certainty that the House will do this or do that. When I said that I thought the House would pass the measure, I made that statement because I believe in the measure. I think it would be good for the country. Because I believe that it would be good for the country, I must therefore believe that the House would pass it, if it has an opportunity to do so, and if it understands the measure.

With respect to a possible Presidential veto, I assure my friend from Ohio that I am the least knowing of men in this body about such matters. I do not know what the President's mind is in respect to this measure; but if I were to make a guess, my guess would be that he would probably sign the measure.

The Senator may wish to know why I would make such a guess. Largely because of Mr. C. D. Jackson, who has been the President's close adviser. For 2 years he was special assistant to the President, and advised him on a subject very close to this proposal. He was a special assistant on cold war planning.

I do not know what the President would do. Anyway, I might add, we ought not to be concerned about vetoes.

I think this is a proper matter for consideration when we have legislation under discussion. However, when we are considering something that we believe to be right and good for the country, it seems to me it is our duty to pass the bill. We do not know the President's attitude, since he has not expressed it, nor has he expressed opposition. If the President sees fit to veto it, such action is within his power and proper jurisdiction. But I think it is as reasonable to assume that he will sign the bill as it is to assume that he will veto the measure.

With respect to the subject of salaries and expenses, let me say to my good friend, whom I respect and like so much, that I do not care if the Senator wishes to change the salary to $10,000 or to $15,000, or to raise it to $30,000. In the battle in which we are engaged, in which many billions of dollars are being spent every year, it seems to me to be a small question whether members of the Commission should be paid $20,000 or $25,000. I do not believe that that is an important point.

If the men chosen to serve on the Commission are qualified and can do the work, I should like to see them adequately reimbursed. If the Senator believes that $20,000 is too much compensation for a member of this important Commission, then I certainly shall not rise and say that it is outrageous. Twenty thousand dollars is a great deal of money to me, too.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the Senator from Connecticut knows that I have on a number of occasions voted to override President Eisenhower's vetoes of needed legislation which we

had passed. I would not hesitate to do so again. But I raise that question because of the expense involved, and principally because of the expressed opposition of the Department of Justice in this administration.

Mr. DODD. I understand my friend's attitude. I do not want him to think I am being harsh, because I do not intend to be. I have too much respect for him for that. But I wonder if, on reflection, the Senator from Ohio would not agree with me that $20,000 is not a great deal of money today, when we ask a man to devote full time to such an important job as this would be.

I think we would be accomplishing the job at very low cost if we could get good people. I do not think we would ever be able adequately to pay qualified people for service on such a commission under our system. We should obtain people who have a sense of dedication and devotion and who would be willing to work for $20,000 a year. I state my judgment. Even if we should pay the salaries set forth in the bill I do not think we would be paying them anywhere near what they would be worth.

Therefore I do not believe the money point is a serious block to favorable consideration of this proposal.

I would put the question of expenses in the same category. These questions seem to be small when compared with what we are attempting to do in so many areas in which the likelihood of success is not nearly so great as it is in this area.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I would like to congratulate the distinguished Senator from Connecticut on a very profound and persuasive address and argument on a vitally important bill. I think every Senator recognizes that what he has been discussing, and what the proposed Freedom Commission would attack, is the crux of the problem in the free world today. What are we as free men going to be able to do effectively, short of war, to preserve peace and to preserve freedom?

So we are dealing tonight with a subject of great significance. We have an opportunity, at long last—late in the session to be sure, but not too late—for this Congress to distinguish itself by taking a great forward step in the successful waging of the cold war.

I am happy that the majority leader has vindicated the confidence which the distinguished Senator from Connecticut and I expressed to him last Friday when we said that we were certain that he would bring the bill up for a vote in this session of the Congress. He has done so. Tonight we shall vote. Tonight the Senate will have an opportunity to express itself, as it should, on this vitally important subject.

The great Senate Committee on the Judiciary, in making its report on the subject, said on page 13 of the report:

> The committee considers this bill to be one of the most important ever introduced in the Congress.

Mr. President, that is a pretty superlative phrase, a very strong phrase. Congress has been meeting for a long, long while in the history of this country. But Congress has never met under the threat of a more urgent and virulent danger than it meets tonight on the verge of its adjournment, in an era when communism is running rampant in so many areas of the world. I do not really believe that the argument is whether the members of the Commission should receive $20,000 or $25,000 or $35,000, or whether the bill should be considered by this committee or that committee or some other committee.

One of the criticisms the Communists wage against free men is that democracy does not seem to be able to operate fast enough to meet a challenge on time. I hope the Senate tonight will not do anything to verify that kind of scurrilous attack upon the machinery of democracy.

I serve as the ranking Republican member of a committee headed by the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], which is studying the machinery of the cold war. A great many witnesses have appeared before us. We have a very talented staff. We have been trying to determine what recommendation should be made and what changes should be made so that the administrative agencies of the Government in this cold war, can act more expeditiously, efficiently, and effectively to meet the challenges.

It is a proper exercise for Congress to undertake. However, if we bog down at this late hour by demonstrating that we lack, as a legislative body, the cold war machinery to act promptly to meet the challenge, if we thwart ourselves by having the bill shunted aside to another committee, to die a still death, while Congress adjourns, we will be guilty of the kind of inactivity in the legislature that we have created a committee to study and to criticize and to correct in the executive branch of the Government. We would in fact be exercising the errors that we established a committee to correct, if they exist, in the executive department.

I was greatly impressed by the closing comments of the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], when he made three irrefutable points.

First is this legislation sensible? Certainly it is sensible to try to establish, through this form of commission, the machinery for properly training in the arts and skills and sciences of the cold war the people who represent America abroad. Certainly it is sensible to spend this pittance, when $40 billion, half of the national budget, is being devoted to trying to do something effective to protect ourselves against communism.

Certainly it is sensible to try a new idea. I hope that people are not afraid of new ideas. I believe that on occasion we must try something different, and I think we have reached that time. We have been spending money. We have been building armaments. We have been working in the area of mutual security, national defense, and missilery, and we are continuing to do all that. However, we have not been getting our quota of manpower and training and knowledge and know-how in order to fight the cold war effectively, short of a shooting war.

It comes as no surprise to me that the bill has attracted support from every section of our American citizens. The Senator from Connecticut has correctly said that it is neither a Republican nor a Democratic bill; it is an American bill.

Its sponsors are from both parties. It is a bill which is not the creature of any segment of our economy. I have been interested by the list of witnesses who appeared before the committee. There is a long list of witnesses. The witnesses represent labor, industry, business, and the professions. They represent a great cross section of support for legislation of this type.

David Sarnoff, who has done as much as any other American to help activate machinery in the cold war, is one of the eloquent witnesses in support of the proposed legislation, and his testimony appears at page 39 of the hearings.

Andrew J. Biemiller, former Member of Congress from Wisconsin, with whom I served in the House of Representatives, speaks in favor of the bill at page 56. He speaks as an acknowledged, authorized representative of the AFL–CIO, whose endorsement he is authorized to present as a part of his testimony, at page 56.

Then there is the testimony of Mr. Jackson. He has already been alluded to, as has the testimony of Arthur G. McDowell, another prominent leader of organized labor.

So it goes, in and out of Congress.

I have in my hand an article written by David Sarnoff entitled "Turn the Cold War Tide in America's Favor." We all want to do that. We want to do it whether we have a commission which pays $20,000 to its members, or $25,000, or any other sum. We want to turn the tide of the cold war in America's favor, to avert a hot war.

It was printed as a feature article in Life magazine, which supported such a proposal long before this bill was introduced, and which has been advocating the establishment of a West Point of the Cold War, as it refers to a commission or academy of this type.

For the information of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TURN THE COLD WAR TIDE IN AMERICA'S FAVOR

(By David Sarnoff)

The unfolding American debate on national purpose carries the disquieting implication that our traditional purposes, though they served the Nation well in the past, have somehow been outmoded if not wholly invalidated. This I do not believe to be true. I am convinced, on the contrary, that these time-tested purposes, rooted in the Nation's whole history, are more compelling than ever before. More, they are indispensable in enabling the United States to meet the paramount challenge of this epoch: the struggle between communism and freedom. If revitalized, redefined for our times and translated into great decisions, they could turn the tide of conflict in our favor.

The need now, as I see it, is not for tailor-made new purposes but for a renewed understanding and dedication to old purposes—raised to a dimension adequate for this fateful period. The need is for firm and inspiring positions commensurate with the immense perils facing our country and the human race.

The Communists, whatever their tactics in a given period, have never deviated from their purpose. It has been openly proclaimed from Lenin's day down to Khrushchev's and Mao Tse-tung's. It is, in the words of the official Moscow magazine Kommunist, "implacable struggle" looking to "the inevitable end of capitalism and the total triumph of communism." Such a challenge can be met and frustrated only with a purpose of equal scope.

MOUNT A POLITICAL COUNTERSTRATEGY AS MASSIVE AS THE ENEMY'S

Five years ago I submitted a memorandum to the White House sketching a program for a political offensive against world communism. "For Moscow," it said, "the real alternative to a nuclear showdown is not peace but political-psychological warfare of a magnitude to weaken, demoralize, chip away and ultimately take over what remains of the free world." The memorandum therefore urged that we renounce all delusions of easy solutions and compromises; that instead we mount a political counterstrategy as massive, as intensive, and as clear about its ultimate goals as the strategy of the enemy himself.

Events in the intervening years and intensified Communist pressures today have, if anything, fortified this point of view. The essence of my proposed program, for which I claim no originality, was—and still is—an unequivocal decision to fight the so-called cold war with a will and on a scale for complete victory.

The decision would have to be communicated to the entire world as boldly and energetically as the Communists communicate their intentions. Our message to humankind must be that America has decided, irrevocably, to win the cold war and thereby to cancel out the destructive power of Soviet-based communism. A national commitment of this scope, I submit, would be consistent with American instincts and experience, a restatement of historic purposes in contemporary terms.

The nature of those purposes has been sufficiently defined by the editors in the introductory article to this series. It is explicit in basic American documents, beginning with the Declaration of Independence, of which Thomas Jefferson could say, "We are acting for all mankind."

It is implicit in the widespread assertion—presented by some as an accusation—that our foreign policies have been "idealistic." Through the generations Americans have always thought of themselves as being in the vanguard of freedom. They cherished the image of their country as the citadel of democracy and morality and a living defiance to depotism anywhere.

The Rockefeller Bros. Fund report on U.S. foreign policy—prepared by a panel of which I was a member and published last year—put it this way: "The United States at its best has always seen its national life as an experiment in liberty * * * [Americans] have known that the hopes of the world were, in some measure, bound up with their success. * * * Whenever [the United States] has wielded effective power in the world, its ideals and its moral convictions have played a vital part in its decisions. Whenever, on the contrary, the United States has tried to act without moral conviction, or in ways that went counter to its basic beliefs it has found itself inhibited and has ultimately had to rechart its course. * * * Ideas and ideals are thus to the United States an essential element of reality."

WHY THE SHRINKING FROM LOFTY GOALS IN FAVOR OF THE SAFE, THE COMPROMISING?

This is why expediency and appeasement, solutions that condemn other peoples to enslavement, failure to react to international crimes, violate the deepest instincts of the American people. Why is there such a pervasive skepticism about our historic purposes and such a widespread search for substitutes? Why the shrinking from lofty goals for all mankind in favor of the safe, the compromising, or mere survival?

The easy answer—that it is all due to the advent of terrible new weapons—will hardly do. The calendar refutes it: The retreat began before those weapons were forged and grew more panicky during the time when America had a monopoly on the atom bomb. It was precisely in the years before Soviet Russia produced the bomb that communism scored its greatest gains, and it did so almost always by the default of the free world. The Soviet advantages were not military and technological but political and psychological.

The true answer, as I see it, is related to the ever-rising costs of idealism in terms of the sacrifices and the hazards involved. The trouble is not that the older purposes have become irrelevant but that they have become too relevant. I mean that the time when America could serve passively as an example or inspiration to other nations has run out. Today, professions of principle have serious consequences: they must be implemented in policy and action. To say it in slang, the time has come to put up or shut up.

As far as the contest with communism is concerned we had "shut up," quite literally. We had curbed our tongues for fear of offending the delicate sensibilities of those who daily offend us. Few democratic leaders dare to speak as uninhibitedly about the coming doom of the Communist empire as Khrushchev and Mao Tse-tung regularly speak about our impending doom. Our opponents defy, denounce and challenge, while we plead and propitiate. We have left the vocabularly of confidence and victory to the other side, contenting ourselves with such solacing and temporizing words as accommodations, modus vivendi, relaxed tensions and coexistence.

This semantic timidity, of course, is merely a symptom and a minor one. The all-encompassing malady is a loss of nerve, marked by depleted self-esteem and purpose. It has impelled us, whenever we have been faced with a choice of interpretations on some aspect of the Communist affliction, to choose the more agreeable one, the one more conducive to complacency and less likely to tax our courage. With rare exceptions the choice has turned out to be the wrong and often the disastrous one, regardless of the political parties in power in this country and in the free world.

Thus in the 1930's we eagerly found assurance in Stalin's talk about "socialism in one country." Later we relaxed in the cozy conviction that the Chinese Communists were simply "agrarian reformers." We prefer to believe in the "evolution" of communism, though there has not been the slightest revision of ultimate Communist goals. We seek a comforting answer to our prayers in tensions between Moscow and Peking, though these are strictly within the framework of their unshakable alliance against the West, no more significant than Anglo-American tension within our alliance.

A familiar gambit is to list communism as just one item in a long inventory of problems. But if the Sino-Soviet bloc wins world dominion, the other problems will cease to matter: they will have been solved for the free world in about the way that death solves all bodily ills.

In the debate on National Purpose we find at least one area of virtually unanimous agreement. It is that sheer survival, in the elementary physical sense, is not enough. A nation which thinks and acts exclusively for self-preservation cannot, in the present-day world preserve itself. The posture, even if it were desired and desirable, has been turned into an anachronism by the surge of science and technology. The world has become too small for physical, economic or political isolationism. The polarization of forces dueling for supremacy has gone too far to permit the survival of an island of humanism in a sea of dehumanized totalitarianism. No single nation can survive unless the civilization of which it is part survives.

Our civilization, too, cannot remain isolated, confined to a delimited segment of the earth and indifferent to the humanity beyond those limits. The world cannot be frozen in its present patterns. In this period of great flux and of intermeshed revolutions, static, and passive arrangements are doomed to disruption. If the area of freedom is not expanded, then assuredly it will continue to contract.

Despite this, "survival of the free world"—side by side with an unfree world—has been and remains the maximum goal of Western diplomacy. Not the weakening and eventual defeat of communism but a lasting accommodation seems to mark the farthest reach of hope. It is scarcely a vision to inspire confidence or zeal, and in any case it is utterly utopian, because two parties are needed to make an accommodation.

The best analysis of Communist strategy that I know is in a recent book called "Protracted Conflict," by Dr. Robert Strausz-Hupé of the University of Pennsylvania and three associates. The book's title is a phrase used by Mao Tse-tung. The Communist plan, say the authors, is protracted in time and space and in the limitless variety of its techniques and weapons, and the weapons can even include "the final and total knockout punch." Short of surrender, the authors see for our world no alternative but a many-sided, continuous, long-range counteroffensive.

Such a policy would reject all illusions of an enduring truce, let alone a negotiated division of the globe. The historic contest will be with us for a long, long time. We may delay, maneuver, bargain and compromise, but it will be so much flailing of water unless all such moves become for us—as they have always been for the enemy—calculated holding actions geared to long-range objectives, means not ends, tactics not strategy.

RISKS AND SACRIFICES CANNOT BE EVADED BY PIECEMEAL SURRENDERS

Whatever we do or fail to do in the years and decades ahead, we shall be forced to take great risks and make great sacrifices. These cannot be evaded even by piecemeal surrenders. In fact, if Americans and other free peoples are to understand and accept these costs and exertions, there must be some rational relation between the magnitude of the goal and the magnitude of the burdens it imposes.

This means that in the conflict with communism we must become the dynamic challenger rather than remain the inert target of challenge. Only then can freedom regain the initiative. Only then will we have a global goal to match that of communism, and the incentive to apply the full weight of our brains, energies and resources to its achievement. The great decision, once made and communicated to all concerned, will dictate its appropriate program of policy and action. The strategy will shape the necessary tactics.

Even the things we are now doing and must continue to do will become more relevant and more effective when geared to a conscious ultimate goal. Military and economic aid to our allies, to underdeveloped areas and to neutral nations will cease to be hit-or-miss improvisations.

They will be integral elements of an affirmative program. Propaganda, cultural exchanges, diplomatic moves, summit meetings will all acquire for us—as they always have for the Communists—dimensions of purpose beyond their limited immediate effects.

Before the Soviet Union attained its present technological stature, America's paramount problem appeared to be the struggle for men's minds. Today it is dangerous to concentrate on any one facet of the conflict. I think of the image in terms of a table with four legs, military, political, economic, and psychological. The significance of the last three is self-evident, since they relate to activities short of all-out war. But the military leg must not be underrated.

The present approximate balance of terror presents a false appearance of stability. But it may be upset. And if we relax in this area it will be upset. The enemy is constantly probing out vitality and resolution. Any one of these probes may lead to the brink of war and possibly to war itself. No matter how often we repeat that war is unthinkable it remains possible. War may be touched off by accident, or it may come because the Communist high command considers itself ready to deliver the "final and total knockout punch." The maintenance of adequate military power, both offensive and defensive, is therefore of paramount importance. Whether it is ever used or not, moreover, it is the indispensable shield for all other types of action in the protracted conflict.

USE AGAINST THE ENEMY SOME OF THE WEAPONS USED AGAINST US

A strategy for victory in the cold war would, however, begin with a complete reappraisal of present efforts. It would aim to seize the initiative in every possible arena of competition. Not merely the expansion of present projects and the addition of new ones would be considered but how to give each of them a clear role within the framework of the overall objective.

It would not reject courses of action simply because they are unconventional. We would no longer disdain to use against the enemy some of the weapons used against us. Having finally acknowledged that the struggle is decisive and therefore as real as a "real" war, we would not hesitate to fight fire with fire.

American ingenuity would be called upon to evolve devices and techniques to exploit weaknesses and vulnerabilities in the Communist world, to keep the enemy constantly off balance, to impose upon him problems and crises instead of always waiting to counteract crises of his making. By all the instruments of communication and through the loudspeakers of events, we would aim to saturate the Communist world with reminders that we intend to keep alive the memory of human dignity, the hatred of injustice, the hope of liberation and the courage needed for resistance.

Debates in the United Nations and at diplomatic conferences would be made sounding boards for our views as well as for theirs. No allusion to "colonialism" would be permitted to pass without our throwing the limelight on Red imperialism and on the principles of self-determination.

Thus the Communist world, rather than ours, would tend increasingly to become the principal battlefield of ideological and political conflict. The immunity their world has so long enjoyed would be shattered.

A bill to establish a Freedom Academy for training cold-war specialists—what a Life editorial called a political West Point—is before Congress. Whatever the merits or demerits of this particular bill, it is in line with a commitment to victory. Various proposals have been made for setting up a liberation force, a volunteer formation drawn largely from among refugees from captive nations and ready to serve in emergencies. That, too, is in line with a strategy for victory. Official and private agencies of other kinds would be generated by focused strategic thinking in offensive rather than defensive terms. And a new department of Cabinet rank could and should be established to plan and coordinate all cold-war activities.

WE WOULD HAVE TO EMBRACE THE GRIM BUT INSPIRING REALITIES OF OUR EPOCH

Certainly this new approach would call for substantial sacrifices in material terms. But the notion that it would require a deep cut in American living standards underestimates the wealth and productive genius of our country. The more demanding sacrifices, indeed, would be in the psychological and moral domains. Our people, in short, would have to renounce complacency, euphoria, and illusion; they would have to embrace the grim but inspiring realities of our epoch.

The ultimate rise of a world order under law is dictated by the logic of devastating weaponry, the conquest of space, and modern communications. What remains to be settled is whether it will be an order rooted in freedom or in universal tyranny.

I do not doubt that we have what it takes to assure that it will be an order that we may cherish. The Western concepts of open societies, of liberty under law, of government by the consent of the governed, of the supremacy of the individual rather than the State—these are far closer to the natural aspirations of man than the anthill concepts of communism. In any equal propaganda contest, what these Western concepts have brought in human well-being will become obvious and irresistible to the majority of mankind.

In my 1955 memorandum to the White House I wrote: "Once that decision is made, some of the means for implementing it will become self-evident; others will be explored and developed under the impetus of a clear-cut goal. Agreement on the problem must come before agreement on the solution." But Abraham Lincoln said it better a century ago: "Determine that the thing can and shall be done, and then we shall find the way."

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the proposed legislation would fill the most glaring gap in our whole cold war technique, and would provide a basis and the machinery and the manpower to train those who represent America abroad in the business that they are sent to do, effectively to promote America's interest in the cold war.

We would not send a soldier to fight a battle ill prepared and untrained, without any concept of what his job was. Still, we send all over the world to represent us people from the bureaus and agencies of various institutions of the Government who are skilled in their particular pursuits, but who have never had an opportunity to be trained in the machinations of communism, and what it actually means, and what they can expect as they find Communist operatives all over these areas of the world.

We wonder why, in spite of our expenditures and our sacrifices, victories come all too infrequently for our side in the cold war.

The proposed legislation has excited the imagination and attracted the support of many writers and editorialists and commentators. I hold in my hand a very recent endorsement published in the San Diego Union of Sunday, August 21, 1960. It is entitled "The Anatomy of Cold War." The subhead reads: "Only by knowing communism, its goals and tactics, can Americans avert conquest by infiltration."

Does anyone dispute that? Does anyone believe that we can win these wars by not understanding communism, by not being trained in how communism operates and what it proposes to do? Can anyone here tonight point to any place in America where one can go to get that education, that training, and that background?

Where can the young career officer go—for example, the agricultural attaché who is heading for Pakistan? Where will he go to learn? Not about agriculture; he knows that. He has attended the State college. He has been an extension agent. He knows about agriculture. He goes to Pakistan as an agricultural attaché because he is a soldier in the cold war. Where will he learn the major lesson? Where will he learn about communism? Where will he learn about what the Communists plan in that particular area of the world? Where will he learn to fortify himself, equip himself, and train himself, so that he can be an effective leader in the cold war? It is not enough that he goes to Pakistan to teach something about agriculture. We squander pretty much the cost of sending people overseas until and unless they are fully trained to do the job. The bill provides that opportunity. That is why the proposed legislation has attracted bipartisan support and national acclaim from every walk of life.

Americans feel that time is late already to train people in government to do the job in the cold war that they are supposed to do.

Someone will say, "Let us send it to another committee. Let it die. We will be back in another 4 months. Then hearings can be held."

That will be 6 months. Then it can find a place on the calendar, and that will be 9 months. How do we know Khrushchev will wait? What will the Communists be doing in the meantime? How much longer can we delay becoming equipped to fight a war which is raging white hot now? Every day we delay increases the danger. Every week we delay increases the cost. Every month we delay increases the probability of a hot war, unless we successfully conclude victories in the cold war.

"The Anatomy of Cold War," published by objective writers in the San Diego Union, is a most persuasive argument for the legislation which I hope the Senate will adopt with unanimity tonight. It lists specifically the weaknesses in our present approach. It bills persuasively the arguments for doing something effective to remove those weaknesses now.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire article be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ANATOMY OF COLD WAR

(Only by knowing communism, its goals and tactics, can Americans avert conquest by infiltration.)

The cold war is more than a political phrase. It's a reality, and potentially decisive skirmishes are being fought right now, today, this moment. It's as close as a short jet run, measured in geographic terms. Cuba is only 90 miles from the United States. Since the admission of Alaska, the Soviet Union itself is less than 50 miles from our own borders. Over the pole by subsonic jet, Moscow is 7 hours to New York or Detroit. San Francisco is 30 minutes' missile time from Kamchatka Peninsula. San Diego is 20 minutes from a missile-bearing submarine 500 miles at sea.

But the important characteristic of the cold war is not the physical threat, great as that may be.

What is important is that this war could be won without a single shot. It could be won by encirclement—to the point where the United States is helpless. It could be won by nibbling at our own strength and that of our allies—to the point where we and they are exhausted. It could be won by the invisible softening attack—to the point where an entire nation is brainwashed into believing surrender is proper and regimentation is good.

The maps on the first page [not printed in RECORD], and this have been prepared to emphasize the scope and significance of Communist victories and inroads around the world in relation to our own land. A cabinet shakeup in Africa, a general riot in any country along the Mediterranean, an upswing in Communist activity in Rio or Buenos Aires is an alarm signal that Americans cannot ignore.

But, again, the Communist threat, like disease, knows no international boundaries. It can—and is intended to—take its toll from within. "Within" means "within the United States as well as within our alliances."

Three facts are vital to understanding Communist strategy. If you don't recognize them, much that happens in today's world will appear all but inexplicable.

Fact No. 1 is the nature of the Communist's prime target. It is not any geographical area. It is the human mind. Communist dogma acknowledges that the only lasting conquest is the conquest of the human spirit. If you conquer a man's spirit, you don't have to fight with him physically.

Fact No. 2 is the nature of the Communists' political tactics. Perhaps of all the things about the cold war, this is the most difficult for the average American to realize, for most of us have been reared in a climate of Anglo-Saxon and Roman law, melded with American frontier and British Victorian concepts of fairness, "playing the game." The Communist does not achieve his objectives by normal partisan politics. No Marxist believes in nor accepts open debate and free elections.

When the Communist pays lipservice to democracy and "people's republics," he is indulging in an ironic twist of words. Communist dogma has no abiding faith in the people. It states repeatedly that a "proletarian" elite must make decisions for the people. What Americans and western allies understand as constitutional and democratic processes are regarded by the Communist as unrealistic.

Realism is permitting a display purporting to be a popular choice only after the election, the cabinet change, the court ruling has been rigged. The Communist only bets on a sure thing, and his tactics are designed to bring that sure thing about. Method doesn't matter.

Fact No. 3 is the nature of Communist timing. The Communists are playing for keeps, and they are willing to take as much time as necessary, fluctuating with the immediate times whenever it is expedient. They have alternated between talk of peace and war since the end of World War II, depending upon what best suited the long-range Communist objective—complete domination of the earth. In fact, the only area in the world today that is not a war zone, from a Communist viewpoint, is Soviet Russia and her satellites. This area covering one-sixth of the earth's land mass is already under Communist control.

Related to this fact of a "protracted struggle" is the very nature of democratic processes. Free choice through free institutions after free discussion can function properly only in a climate of order. The Communists recognize this and go to practically any lengths to maintain a worldwide climate of disorder, violence, and unrest.

This helps explain their jamming of allied broadcasts, their demonstrations in Caracas, Tokyo, and Léopoldville, their barrage of publications into unsettled areas like Latin America, southeast Asia, and Africa.

Mao Tse-tung, ruler of Communist China, is fond of quoting an ancient Chinese militarist, Sun Tzu, who lived in 500 B.C. Sun wrote: "To fight and conquer in all your battles is not supreme excellence; supreme excellence consists in breaking the enemy's resistance without fighting." Mao, in his own "Strategic Problems of China's Revolutionary War," quotes Sun again: "Avoid the enemy when he is full of dash, and strike him when he withdraws exhausted." But perhaps the most pointed is this one, quoted by Mao: "Make a noise in the East, but strike in the West."

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, one of the great things about our country is that ideas have a habit of popping up all over and finally finding their way to Washington and getting people to embrace them, understand them, endorse them, and advocate them. One of the men who originated this concept of a Freedom Commission and a Freedom Academy is Allen Grant, of Orlando, Fla. He made a most persuasive witness before the committee. He has worked long with Representative HERLONG, of Florida, Representative JUDD, of Minnesota, and other Members of the House who have done Trojan work in this connection; men who, I know, tomorrow will pick up the cudgels and try to induce the House to suspend the rules, as it can tomorrow, to pass the bill, as I hope it will, and send the bill to the President's desk, where I am confident he will sign it, because all Americans want the cold war to be won.

In giving his reasons for favoring the proposed legislation, Mr. Grant testified for the bill more than a year ago, on July 17, 18, and 19, 1959.

This is not a new proposal. It is not something which has suddenly been dropped on the Senate. This is a bill which was introduced in April 1959. Voluminous hearings have been held, and much discussion has taken place. It has been on the Senate Calendar for a long while. We were hopeful that it would be enacted before the recess of Congress for the political conventions. We were hopeful it would be one of the first items of business to occupy our time during this resumed session. However, we are grateful that it is before the Senate today. However, it is not new; it is not unexpected. If there was any question, such as the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] raised, about jurisdiction, that question comes 18 months too late. Certainly we need to move more rapidly than that if we expect to win the cold war, than to wait for 18 months and many days; and then, when it is too late for Senate consideration by any committee, suggest that it be killed by cubbyholing it in another committee a day or two before the adjournment of Congress sine die.

I was about to mention Mr. Grant and his small group of Orlando public-minded, public-spirited citizens, most of them, I suppose—probably all of them—Democrats, who met and decided that it was time, at least in that little community, to try to develop a program which would enable the people of Orlando, as they put it, to know their enemy. So they organized a committee of "know your enemy" speakers.

Mr. Grant said:

This committee believed that as an absolute minimum our high school seniors should be given a broad survey course on world communism (in addition to courses in American history and civic courses to show the advantages of an open society) so they could understand something of the frightful challenge—political, scientific, economic, and military—facing their Nation, and as a result would better understand the unique obligations of American citizenship. Our committee soon learned our high school teachers were not prepared to give such a course, and it was up to us if anything was to be done.

Mr. President, that is not the fault of the high school teacher. Except in a few highly to be congratulated institutions of upper learning in this country, there is no place to which teachers can go to learn the facts about communism which they are expected to teach to the children in the classrooms. Except for a few institutions of higher learning, there is no place to which anyone can go to get this kind of information first hand, authoritatively packaged and prepared, ready for people to understand, ready for them to absorb, ready for them to take out and put into practice as willing soldiers of the cold war. I mention that because, it seems to me, that out of that experience comes a situation of great significance.

Last week in Detroit, addressing the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Allen W. Dulles, Director of the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency, spoke most eloquently about the need for the type of program of which the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] has spoken so effectively tonight, and which would be made available by the bill now before the Senate.

I quote a few paragraphs from the remarkable address delivered by Mr. Dulles on that occasion. He said:

We need far and wide in this country more education on the whole history of the Communist movement.

In our schools and colleges we can find many courses in ancient history, in philosophy, courses on the great movements of the past, the conquests of ancient times from Alexander the Great to Napoleon. Courses on Communist theory and practices are few and far between.

The bill before the Senate moves in the direction of preparing people to teach courses of that type. Mr. Dulles states that in a few higher institutions such courses are available, but he continues:

By and large, however, in our educational institutions, except in the graduate field or in specialized schools and seminars, these subjects are not generally taught.

I have reviewed the curriculums of many of our universities and colleges and, despite a considerable advance in recent years, our students are not yet afforded a broad opportunity to gain the essential background knowledge of Communist history and policy. And we should start this education in our secondary schools.

That is another authoritative voice, the voice of the head of the Central Intelligence Agency, echoing the lament of the people of Orlando, that there is no place where teachers can go to learn the facts that Allen Dulles wants to make available to the children in the high schools. Indeed, we are late in starting such an operation.

Mr. President, I commend to all a reading of the entire speech by Mr. Allen Dulles.

In concluding what I have to say about this matter at this time, let me point out the tremendous disadvantage which we Americans undergo because of our failure to have available to us now the mechanisms provided by this measure, which I have been privileged to sponsor, along with the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE].

In this exchange-of-persons program—the exchange of Russians with Americans, and back and forth, again—we find that when visitors from the Communist countries come to our country, they come here as agents, many of them as agents provocateur. Some of them are spies, but all of them are agents. All of them are trained in communism, understand communism, and believe in communism; and they are also trained in our way of life, after having studied it for many years, and they know the strengths and the weaknesses of our way of life, and come here prepared to try to make its weaknesses look larger and its strengths look smaller, and they endeavor to do what mischief they can. And when they return home, they are ready to make propaganda attacks of the kind which their experience here would lead them to believe would be the most effective.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield to me?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Anyone who has attended an international conference at which representatives of the Communist countries are present understands the point which the Senator from South Dakota is making. All of the representatives of the Communist countries are extraordinarily well prepared to back up the policies enunciated by the Communist bloc. They are all exceptionally dedicated and of one mind.

The distinguished Senator from South Dakota rightly stresses the need for thorough training and indoctrination on the part of those teachers who will instruct our young people as to the meaning of communism. In my judgment it is very important that this be taught to our young people in addition to American history and other key subjects relevant to the history and meaning of democracy. I do not think enough American history is presently being taught in our schools. I believe that in addition the meaning of communism should be taught in our schools. This should be done by those who know the subject well and have been properly instructed in it, rather than by persons who have taken it up as a sideline.

I believe that by presenting this bill to us, the Senator from South Dakota has performed an important service.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the Senator from New York for his very profound, interesting, and effective comments. Certainly what he has said is borne out by everyone who has attended an international conference at which Communists have been present. The Communists send their best trained people there; and every one of them who attends such conferences, whether he be a smiling Mikoyan or a scowling Gromyko, goes there knowing full well what he seeks to do. When the Russian farmers came to this country, I suspect that some of them had had experience on farms, but I feel sure that all of them had had thorough instruction in a training school in the Lenin Institute, so that they knew the Communist line, the Communist propaganda approach, the Communist attack on Christianity, and the Communist attack upon capitalism. They came here prepared, equipped, and ready to try to pick flaws in our system and to try to advance arguments in behalf of the system they represent.

On the other hand, when Americans are sent to Russia, whom do we send? We send good Americans, but not one of them in a hundred is as well informed about communism as the most stupid emissary from Russia is informed about our way of life before he ever leaves his homeland.

Mr. President, if one is unprepared, how can he win in such a fight? Without thorough preparation it is impossible to win a tennis match or a baseball game or a fisticuffs match, or the contests at the Olympics which now are being held in Rome. One can do well only when he is well equipped, understanding, and knowledgeable; and the Communist countries take great pains to send such well-trained representatives to our country to represent them.

The pending measure provides for machinery of that kind—by calling for the establishment of a Freedom Commission, which, in turn, will establish a Freedom Academy, where those who are presently in the service of our Government will be trained to represent us in the future. They will receive training in regard to the things they need to know in order to be able to fight effectively in the cold war and to represent us well.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, after consultation with the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], I send to the desk a proposed unanimous-consent agreement, and ask particularly that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] listen to its reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The proposed agreement will be read.

The proposed agreement was read, as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That, effective on Wednesday, August 31, 1960, at the conclusion of routine morning business, during the further consideration of the bill (S. 1689) to create the Freedom Commission for the development of the science of counteraction to the world Communist conspiracy and for the training and development of leaders in a total political war, debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to one-half hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the majority leader: *Provided,* That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided further,* That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said bill shall be received.

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the said bill debate shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders: *Provided,* That the said leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the said bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the proposed agreement?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and let me say that I desire to ask some questions, for purposes of clarification—I wish to state, speaking as one Senator who is vitally interested in this proposed legislation, that it is my purpose to cooperate in every possible way to expedite the prompt taking of action on the bill, and I am very hopeful that we can shorten the time allowed for its further consideration to such an extent—if that will be agreeable to the Senate—that we may be able to act on this measure tonight, so that if it is passed tonight by the Senate—as I hope and as I believe it will be—the House will have that much additional time in which to act on the bill. That is important, because the House already is confronted with a crowded agenda.

Mr. MANSFIELD. We could shorten the time limitation proposed, if that is desired. But in view of the fact that the American Bar Association is holding its annual meeting in this city, quite a number of Senators are not in the Chamber at the moment. So we thought the proposed agreement, as read at the desk, would be one way to speed up the further consideration of the bill and the taking of action on it.

Mr. MUNDT. At what time is it proposed that the Senate convene tomorrow?

Mr. MANSFIELD. At 10 a.m.; and tonight the Senate will adjourn, for the benefit of the Senator from New York.

On tomorrow, the House will not convene until 12.

Mr. MUNDT. Will it be agreeable to have an understanding that this measure will be the first order of business tomorrow, following the morning hour?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes, indeed.

Mr. MUNDT. What is the likelihood of its being set aside, for the consideration of other matters, until later tomorrow afternoon, perhaps?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Aside from a conference report during the morning—and I believe that the chances for that are very slim—I believe the further consideration of this bill is likely to be concluded at noon, at the latest.

If agreeable, I shall propose that the time available for debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal be 15 minutes, to be equally divided, and that the time available for debate on the bill itself be one-half an hour, also to be equally divided.

Mr. MUNDT. That is agreeable to me. That would be agreeable to me, so far as time is concerned.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, am I to understand the time would be 15 minutes to a side on motions to recommit or amendments, and then 1 hour a side on the bill?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Twenty minutes on a motion to recommit or amendments, and a half hour on the bill itself.

Mr. DODD. I do not know how many Senators want to be heard.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I, of course, defer to the Senator from South Dakota, but it occurs to me that it would be the feeling of the Senator from South Dakota that this is a very brief time on the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The shortening of the time was in consideration of the suggestion of the Senator from South Dakota, and the idea was to be cooperative.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, my suggestions were based on the premise that perhaps we could complete action on the bill tonight. The acting majority leader seems to be faced with a situation that a good many Members of the Senate are away at the American Bar Association. Therefore, I do not suppose it would make any difference whether the time might be a little longer or a little shorter. I thought if we could consider it tonight and act, by having a shorter time on it, Senators could get away earlier. But if the Senator prefers another time limitation, it is all right with me.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I prefer the latter suggestion, with the proviso that a motion to recommit would be confined to 20 minutes, with one-half hour on the bill itself. In view of the discussions which have taken place, I think that time would be sufficient.

I make that request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I have no desire to be heard on this bill, so far as I know, but if a bill which is so important is going over until tomorrow, it seems to be unseemly to have only 10 minutes on a side. I certainly hope the majority leader will keep to his original request.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is perfectly all right. I was doing what the Senator from South Dakota desired.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator from South Dakota said if it were going over until tomorrow there would be no point in limiting the time to that extent. Ten minutes more or less should not make any difference.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I suggest that the acting majority leader make his request.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I renew the original request.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Chair restate the request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request was 30 minutes on amendments and motions, and so forth, and 1 hour on the bill itself.

Is there objection?

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, is this bill so important that we must take action tonight?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I was hopeful that we could take action tonight, but I understand the leadership has problems. I know the American Bar Association is in town.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Idaho is always cooperative.

Mr. MUNDT. Yes, and we hope he is going to be that way tonight.

I ask the acting majority leader, who was also at one time a Member of the House—my memory of the rules of the House is rusty—if in the closing days of the session, even though the Senate acted tomorrow, the House could still suspend the rules and could act on the bill on the day it passed the Senate. Is that correct?

Mr. MANSFIELD. It certainly would be within the rules of the House to suspend the rules if it saw fit.

Mr. MUNDT. Then we have nothing to lose by waiting until tomorrow, so I hope the Senator from Idaho will concur.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, to keep the record straight, the House can suspend the rules in the last 6 days after a sine die resolution.

Mr. KEATING. There has not been any yet.

Mr. MANSFIELD. But it is my understanding that the House can consider a bill under suspension of the rules.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and the agreement is entered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns tonight, it adjourn to meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. GORE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. After consultation with the minority leader, I announce for the information of Senators that there will be no more votes tonight.

THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the past 8 years have been characterized by extreme tensions in the Middle East. Armed conflict involving two of our major allies erupted over the operation of the Suez Canal. We ourselves dispatched troops to Lebanon in order to maintain order.

The recent assassination of the Premier of Jordan is an outgrowth of the seething turmoil which pervades the entire area and which continues to constitute a serious threat to peace.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on the Middle East of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I have watched these developments with growing concern. Last fall, together with the able junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE], I visited the Middle East. We had an opportunity to talk privately with many political leaders in the area, including Prime Minister Ben-Gurion of Israel and President Nasser of the United Arab Republic. These conversations served to emphasize the seriousness of the basic problems which trouble the area. But also, Mr. President, from these conversations I concluded that progress, perhaps very significant, is possible if we but follow the correct approach. I am constrained to believe that the junior Senator from Wyoming reached a similar conclusion.

I was encouraged that, after lengthy discussion, both Mr. Ben-Gurion and Mr. Nasser separately indicated a willingness to negotiate through an intermediary for the solution of the thorny Palestinian refugee problem. Mr. Ben-Gurion preferred the United States, while Mr. Nasser felt that use of the United Nations for this purpose would be more appropriate, but neither seemed adamant on the identity of the intermediary. I regarded as highly significant the fact that both appeared receptive to the idea of negotiations on this one problem without making such negotiations conditional upon an overall settlement of all the problems of the Middle East.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield to my distinguished friend from Wyoming.

Mr. McGEE. I compliment my colleague on the statement he is submitting here tonight on the very difficult question of the refugee problem in the Middle East; but in particular I think it is well to underscore for the Senate that the refugee question is deteriorating, has been deteriorating now for 10 years, and in this state of deterioration it has created an explosive situation in the Near East that goes far beyond the matter of a quarrel between the Israelis and the Arabs in that part of the world.

It is so explosive, and the power balance is so delicate, that an explosion of the kind we read of yesterday in Jordan may infect the rest of the world with its consequences. It could even trigger the much larger explosion we all fear. For that reason it is no longer simply a refugee question in an isolated portion of the globe, but it is one which affects all the peoples of the world and concerns all governments.

The question must now be approached as one of world-shaking proportions rather than one of dealing with unfortunate human beings in a narrow part of the world.

Mr. GORE. I agree with the Senator. Does the Senator share with me the feeling that this is a dangerous world tinderbox?

Mr. McGEE. It is dangerous beyond the control of the leaders of any one government in that area. Whereas it was viewed as a personal quarrel, it in fact became much like the dropping of a pebble in the lake—the ripples kept spreading out further and further. As a result, with the concern of the Soviet Union in one part of that portion of the world and the concern of the non-Communist countries in the other part, there was a delicate balance which could be easily disturbed and fearfully disrupted, to the point of open warfare of much greater magnitude than we have been witnessing between Israel and the Arabs.

Mr. GORE. I thank my friend.

The Palestinian refugee question is, of course, but one of the many problems which plague the Middle East. It is a question upon which the position of both sides is strongly influenced by emotions. To many, it operates as a psychological block to progress on all other issues. In my opinion, it represents the key with which the door to other solutions may be unlocked. I am convinced that unless and until this, one of the great human tragedies of our time, is satisfactorily resolved, little progress can be made in bringing about political stability and improving economic conditions in the Middle East.

Unless at least a beginning can be made at resolving the refugee problem, we can but anticipate a succession of incidents such as the recent occurrence in Jordan, increased unrest, the hurling of charge and countercharge, and the constant danger of the outbreak of armed hostilities.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, will my colleague again yield?

Mr. GORE. I gladly yield.

Mr. McGEE. Speaking for myself, I think I share the view with the Senator that the single most important impression, next to the explosive capability of that situation, was how much a settlement in that part of the world depended upon the resolution of the refugee question.

Mr. GORE. Even an approach to a settlement.

Mr. McGEE. One could not get the opposing factions to sit down to talk about water, about the Suez, or about many other difficult questions affecting boundary lines which concern them, because there was a psychological block which stemmed from the bitterness, the hatred, and the deterioration resulting from the entire refugee question.

As the Senator has said so well, it was our opinion that unless and until the refugee issue could be removed, we could not approach rationally a useful discussion of the other questions.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator. As the Senator will recall, it was only after long negotiation and persuasion that we obtained the assent of the two leaders to whom I have referred to negotiate with an intermediary on the refugee problem as separate and apart from the economic, the political, the geographic, and the many other questions which permeate this troubled area.

Mr. McGEE. I think it was impressive that in these discussions to which the Senator referred, the political sensitivity on both sides on the question of the refugees was such that most of the leaders in those regions dared not appear to be discussing the problem. It was very delicate, because it had been brought home to them in the minds of the people on both sides. The bias, the prejudice, the emotions were so deeply rooted that this problem has become what we might call a political hot potato. Unless the blindness which passions evoke can be eased, a useful negotiation on the other matters cannot be had, because, in my judgment, it will not focus upon the problem which, if solved, has the greatest chance to do the most good. I refer, of course, to relieving the refugee pressure.

Mr. GORE. We have discussed this problem with many people, and we have seen it with our own eyes.

I reached the conclusion, which I am sure the distinguished junior Senator from Wyoming shares, that if the human tragedy could be separated from the other problems and dealt with apart, if we could obtain an agreement to begin treating this as an identifiable separate problem, great progress could be made.

When, separately, Premier Ben-Gurion and President Nasser acceded to our earnest entreaty in this regard, I felt greatly encouraged, and I know my colleague felt greatly encouraged.

I do not know with what vigor these discussions were pursued by the State Department. As the able Senator knows, our discussions were reported to the State Department in detail.

As the 86th Congress draws to a close, and particularly in view of the outbreak of violence in Jordan, I feel it incumbent upon me publicly to express my regret that the administration has not successfully prosecuted a program of action designed to break the stalemate and to bring about a peaceful solution of political and economic controversy in this area which lies at the crossroads of the world.

Mr. President, the stakes in the Middle East are high. Nowhere is the challenge to freedom and democracy more acute. Nowhere are the demands on free world leadership more exacting.

If the United States is to discharge its responsibilities for leadership, it must act in a manner commensurate with the task before it. Here is a task which demands to the fullest the prestige, the power, and the influence of the office of the President of the United States. The settlement of the controversy in the Middle East has not been, and cannot be, successfully accomplished by relegating it to the category of problems for the attention of officials at secondary levels of government. A downgrading of the problem can but make its solution unattainable.

On August 27, in a message to the Zionist Organization of America, meeting in New York City, Vice President NIXON stated:

> The time has come when we should try to bring about an overall settlement of the Palestine question in all its aspects.

I do not argue the question that "the time has come." In fact, the need for leadership and action has been with us throughout the years of the Eisenhower administration.

I am genuinely concerned, Mr. President, with the manner in which Vice President NIXON proposes, if elected, to bring about the solution, the need for which he now recognizes as being acute. I quote from his message, as follows:

> For that reason, I intend if elected President to give this problem the highest priority by assigning primary responsibility for directing negotiations in this field to a man who has so magnificently demonstrated at the United Nations that he is one of the skilled diplomats of our times—my running mate, Henry Cabot Lodge.

Now, it is not my purpose today, Mr. President, to belittle or otherwise characterize the abilities of Mr. Lodge in the field of diplomacy. It is to be noted that he has been an active participant in the formulation and implementation of Middle East policies which have proven singularly ineffective. He is identified with policies which led us to the incongruous position of siding with the Soviet Union and against Great Britain, France, and Israel in the United Nations. He is a part of a record characterized by reaction rather than action, by unsuccessful rather than successful policies.

Now, Mr. Lodge's relative qualifications for the office he seeks are an appropriate subject for discussion. I shall, however, reserve that subject for some other occasion.

Of far greater importance than any question of Mr. Lodge's individual ability as a diplomat is the announcement of Mr. NIXON, if elected, as to how he proposes to discharge the constitutional responsibilities of the Presidency in the conduct of U.S. foreign policy, especially, I should say, in the Middle East.

Under the Constitution, there can be but one person upon whom rests the "primary responsibility" for U.S. foreign policy. That person is not the Vice President, but the President. All the world so understands it.

Mr. NIXON proposes, if elected, to turn over to his Vice President the "primary responsibility" for bringing about a solution to the Palestinian problem. Whether or not other problems such as that of Berlin and Germany would also be turned over to Mr. Lodge, or to someone else, is unclear.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. McGEE. It is my recollection that as we were visiting with the various heads of state over there, there was present a rather keen sensitivity on the question of the level at which they would be able to discuss or deal with this problem. They had the feeling, which they expressed on occasion, that we sometimes dumped them off onto the second,

third, or fourth team. They have a certain innate pride—national pride, I suppose we would call it—with which they regard their problem; and their problem, which has now become very heavily our problem, merits the topmost consideration.

In view of these attitudes, would it not be a disruptive and discomforting move to let it be known that we were going to turn these problems over to a Vice President, regardless of who he might be?

Mr. GORE. A Vice President who has neither constitutional responsibility nor authority.

Mr. McGEE. However, we may view that office, it is very true, from afar, and from a foreign government, that our responsibility, as the Senator has said so well, rests with the President of the United States, and the proposed action would be regarded as something of a downgrading of negotiations if we deliberately announced in advance that we were going to delegate the problem to some secondary or tertiary official of the Government.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. It seems to me what the Senator from Tennessee has said, with all due apology to him, is not very realistic, because the Vice President of the United States is the second highest official of our Government. President Roosevelt did not hesitate to make someone a special ambassador. He selected Harry Hopkins, who was not even a Vice President, and gave him vast power and influence, and quite properly, because he had confidence in him and he was the President's representative.

I think what is more important, frankly, with respect to what the Senator is saying is how he thinks this very trying situation in the Near East can be dealt with. I do not think any briefs need to be drawn for Henry Cabot Lodge. I think, for example, in developing the formula by which the relations between Israel and the Argentine were dealt with in the United Nations on the Eichmann case he avoided one of the most sticky and thorny diplomatic difficulties which could have faced us in that area of the world.

There is no magic about that area, as Senators who have been there know. This is one of the toughest and most difficult bits of hostility which we have on earth. It is very deeply built in, and it has resisted the power of the entire United Nations, let alone an individual, even the President of the United States.

Finally, let us be a little concerned about how much time and how much heart and how much effort any President has, whether he be NIXON or KENNEDY. This is an unbelievably difficult and complex job, and I do not think it is a bit demeaning to this area. On the contrary, I think it would put our actions on a higher level than ever if the problem were entrusted to a man who has the high office of Vice President and it was made a very major cause of his concern, which it could hardly be with the President of the United States without his neglecting a great many other vital duties.

I hope, whether the next President is Mr. KENNEDY, or Mr. NIXON, that he will adopt some technique of that character which will give that responsibility to one very high level person who will rank, incidentally, above the Secretary of State.

I might point out the great responsibility of trying to deal with this very trying problem. I do not wish to engage in any long debate with a Senator tonight. I gather the Senate wants to go home. But I will read what the Senator has to say with the greatest attention. I have enormous and genuine affection for him.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. JAVITS. It is a subject which I think the Senator from New York knows a little about. I have lived with it for many years, and perhaps if we get a little time tomorrow or the next day, if we are here, I should like to give my version of the problem, and perhaps the Senator could react to that.

Mr. GORE. I would welcome the reactions of the able senior Senator from New York. I only regret that he does not feel disposed to explore the subject further tonight. But I shall be available for discussion at any time that it serves the wish or the desire or the purpose of the senior Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. If the Senator will yield again, I may have given the Senator the wrong impression. It is not that I am not happy to engage in debate, but it is the first I knew that the Senator was going to make this statement. I really have not gotten the full import or detail of it. I respect the Senator from Tennessee so much that I would really like to see and study what he has said, and then, if I may, react to it.

Mr. GORE. The Senator compliments me highly and I appreciate his statement.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on this point, while the Senator from New York is still present?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. McGEE. I trust that none of this debate will be construed in any partisan way. I think a really important point is being contributed, that is not only the psychological but the protocol national point of view, that if this question is submitted to the Vice President, whether he be a Republican or a Democrat, and however able he may be, that we would automatically throw a block in the path of a possible settlement or a disposition to agree on both sides. Those countries would feel that their problem had been downgraded to a secondary level. I think the Senator points out very well the wisdom of our trying to avoid that situation from the very outset. This has become much more than a bilateral quarrel between Arabs and Jews. This subject has become so explosive, in the judgment of the Senator from Tennessee, and certainly in my own, that it merits the deepest concern on a high priority basis of our Government, because of the explosive qualities now attendant upon that question.

For that reason the Senator from Tennessee petitions that we consider placing this question, at long last, without attempting to attribute any blame in the past, but only trying to resolve it in the future, at the top as a priority No. 1 item. So much else hinges upon its wise solution in what the Senator from New York rightly describes as one of the most tortuous and difficult situations anywhere around the world.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Of course, if Vice President NIXON would entrust the actual conduct of this problem, in a dynamic sense, to the Vice President, that would not mean that the Presidency would not be committed to the resolution, that the Presidency would not participate in its resolution, or even that the Vice President would meet with the other heads of state. All Mr. NIXON or Mr. KENNEDY would say would be that this problem merits the concentration of a high-level, fine mind, and the Vice President, the man who had run with him, is the kind of man who could give it that kind of attention.

I do not think such statement would mean that the Vice President would be the man who would sit in the meetings with the heads of other states or in any way encounter a situation where protocol would cause difficulty with other heads of state.

I think in all fairness we should recognize that, whether it applies to either a Vice President who may be the President of the United States or not.

Mr. GORE. My point of view, whether correct or incorrect, is, nevertheless, firmly held that here is one of the real potentially dangerous, explosive areas of the world.

At this time in history, when we are going through a passage of hazards, the few most dangerous problems of the world which threaten world war require now, have required, and, in my opinion, during the next 8 years will require the full prestige and power and influence of the Presidency of the United States. I claim no vast store of knowledge in this area or any vast knowledge of the problems of the area. I have studied them. I have been hesitant to speak out upon them. Nevertheless, I have some firmly held opinions. I am constrained to believe that if President Eisenhower had secured from these two leaders in that area a commitment which the junior Senator from Wyoming and the junior Senator from Tennessee obtained, it might well have led to significant negotiations and perhaps a beginning of a settlement of the vexatious problems in this area.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. McGEE. Again trying to view this subject as a very serious national question, rather than as a partisan question—for we must never let it become a partisan factor—I would hope that we would have been able to learn from some of the admitted mistakes that we have made in our kind of government, in the new experience we have been going through. As a leader in a difficult world,

we were bound to make some mistakes. We are entitled to make mistakes. However, we are not entitled to repeat the same mistakes.

One of the mistakes that we made in the past was that of misjudging or downgrading the sensitivity of important peoples, in the way that we have treated them in our deliberations of their problems, in that we have favored them with the second team. We realize that the President of the United States can do all these things. He has to do them on a selective basis. What is being said here tonight is on a priority basis, selectively speaking. What was once relatively regional in a bilateral quarrel between two peoples has now been permitted, through one circumstance or another, to become a major explosive problem. This must be put at the top of the list and must command the prime concern and attention of the President of the United States, rather than the Vice President.

We have encountered this situation in South America. Those countries will not settle for the assistant President, the Vice President. They will not settle for any kind of emissary who speaks for the President, when they see the President in direct negotiations considering problems important enough for his personal attention. That is the only point at stake here.

The situation has gotten out of hand, and it therefore requires courageous attention from the Chief Executive, not from his constitutional successor in the event he dies, and the President himself must take command, to try to bring about the kind of settlement the Senator from New York, the Senator from Tennessee, and the Senator from Wyoming now seek.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. With all due respect, the idea that the President's personally laying on his hand will magically solve everything is not the answer. We know that there are places in the world where one can do things only once; and if the conditions are not propitious for success, the effort will have the reverse effect, rather than an affirmative effect.

The promises which some Senators may have obtained privately is another point I should like to touch on. We know the methods of the rulers of states. When we talk to them privately in their chambers, we get a certain impression. Then later we wonder how they could be the same people who the next day in public statements or in deals with the Russians for armaments and other support could have done the things they did. They hold their power because they can charm a bird out of a tree. They charm Senators, too. It does not mean that they will not do things that make negotiations fruitful or possible.

I submit that all this does not hit the main point, that the Vice President should not be charged with responsibility for developing ideas and undertaking negotiations which the President could and would carry through, because I am confident that that will not make the difference; for example, that Nasser or Ben-Gurion will not like the idea that the Vice President, rather than the President, is dealing with them. I cannot believe that that is going to make the difference as to whether some negotiations will succeed or not succeed.

Besides that, it makes a great difference who the President is. Perhaps Eisenhower might have been able to do or not do something that his successor may or may not be able to do. That is the only point I make.

Mr. GORE. I respectfully suggest that Mr. NIXON said he would assign primary responsibility in this field to the Vice President. I suggest that the history of our country does not reflect very favorably upon the diplomatic endeavors of Vice Presidents, including the present Vice President. I could mention the trip to South America or the quarrel in the kitchen. There are few instances which can be cited in history when a Vice President has successfully conducted foreign policy for the United States. In this particular area, so sensitive and dangerous as it is, it is distressing to me that the Republican candidate for the Presidency of the United States should say he would assign primary responsibility to the Vice President in this area. The primary responsibility belongs to the President of the United States. In my humble opinion, it is only with the power and prestige and influence of the Presidency, fully used, that a solution to this dangerous problem can be wrought.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. McGEE. I should like to address myself to the point the distinguished Senator from New York has raised about the possibility of a common basis for understanding being reached because of what the leader of another government might tell some touring Senator. No one is more mindful of the limitations of such conversations than the junior Senator from Tennessee and the junior Senator from Wyoming. It would seem to me that in the face-to-face question of the refugee question in that part of the world, the explosion of which could light fires that could spread to other parts of the world, we have the kind of difficult situation in which we must go one step further, and that is what happens before the bar of history as we look backward, and we perhaps discover that there was a moment, that there was a time, when there was a chance, and we did not have the courage or vision to treat that chance or put it to the test. This may not be the time. But no one has tried it yet. It has not been pressed on the level that, in the judgment of the Senator from Tennessee, it ought to be pressed. That is why it seems imperative that, given the experience we have just gone through over there, in the explosion which occurred only yesterday, it is time that, at least, we listen to the kind of experience which the junior Senator from Tennessee has tried to pass along, and to share with our colleagues; namely, that one of the difficulties of finding a common ground is that we turn to the negotiations in the past, and there is a sensitivity over the question of the level on which we are willing to talk.

The second difficulty has to do with the kind of diplomatic approach—a package deal or an individual problem of refugees, which is really controversial. That splits the diplomats. It splits our State Department. But it needs consideration now. It needs, at least, a careful weighing to determine the chances of combining the approach to the question of urgency with the highest level of executive consideration, but within the field of the sentiments we had reason to believe came rather sincerely from those leaders. Nobody has called their hands. Nobody has given them a chance to put up or shut up. It seems to me the time is imperative for somebody to look into that problem without introducing new obstacles.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. If time permits in the next few days, I shall recount the number of times the Arab States and Colonel Nasser have been called from their most eminent podiums. What has happened? I am afraid the Senator is discussing this subject in somewhat of a vacuum, with all due respect to his conviction and feeling that if only the President would lay hands on this subject, all would be well.

I wanted to read the Senator's remarks. There is a great history; there are many precedents. That does not mean that results can be achieved tomorrow. However, I do not think it is fair to say that the proposal of a man who is running for the Presidency, simply because he has said he will give the prime responsibility for the handling of certain duties to one who has really worked at that business, a man with such prestige as Henry Cabot Lodge, will be ill-starred and inauspicious, and will not succeed. I do not agree with the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. The fact is that no one can have the prime responsibility except the President of the United States. He can delegate, but the advisability of delegating, the advisability of thus downgrading this very acute problem, is a question which I raise tonight.

Mr. JAVITS. I cannot conceivably agree with the use of the word "downgrading." I think it is most unfair to the office, to the proposal as it was made, and even to the man in question, who is our Ambassador to the United Nations. I sincerely hope that the Senator from Tennessee does not feel that way. If he does, then it is just too bad. I could not possibly agree with him.

Mr. GORE. I do not know why the Senator from New York expresses the hope that I will not feel that way, when I have expressed, as emphatically as I have, that I do feel that way.

Mr. JAVITS. Then I disagree with the Senator, when he speaks of downgrading so distinguished a citizen as Henry Cabot Lodge.

Mr. GORE. I said I was not presuming to discuss the diplomatic qualifications, or lack thereof, of the Ambassador. That is not the subject tonight.

Mr. Lodge is a distinguished American. But I must, so long as the Senator from New York has ventured his remarks, suggest that something less than great success has attended the efforts of Ambassador Lodge.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. McGEE. I think we should not lose sight of one fact, if the Senator from New York will be considerate enough to listen for an additional moment. Considering the watershed, internationally, across which we are passing right now, all sides are talking about it, all countries are concerned about it. In the Middle East, with all of its explosiveness, we come to one of those points in history where there is a new set of ingredients, a new cast of characters, which might make possible a new approach. If it fails, then it fails, like distinguished efforts in the past. The only urgency is that there must be an element of maximum effort, to see if it cannot be made to work.

There is a new government, which has not been in office for many months up until now, in Israel. There is a new set of changing circumstances in the Arab world. A new administration will be taking office in this country, regardless of which party it may be. Younger leadership will be assuming the Presidency, of whichever party it may be. There will be an approach thus recreated with old facts, with old circumstances, but confronted by new, younger, and different personalities, having a chance to make a fresh approach, without listening to all of the old, warped biases and expressions of a very personal sort. There is that chance. We are simply asking that the chance be exploited to the full. If failure occurs, it will be necessary to try again. We cannot continue to follow the reasoning of the distinguished senior Senator from New York that because such an approach was tried in 1948, 1950, 1957, and 1958, there is no point in trying again, or that it ought not be tried at any other level. The point again remains that we still have not broken through on this question, and we must break through. That breakthrough will have to come with the maximum effort from the highest level of government, and that is the office of President.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I am sorry the Senator apparently has construed my views as quite contrary to what they are. I welcome new initiative. I think it is simply great that we shall have in the Presidency a young man who will make a totally new start on this and many other problems. I simply say, in all respect and affection for the Senator from Tennessee, that I think to pick out the point that NIXON said he would give primary responsibility to Lodge, who has really worked on such problems is carping a little in the situation.

Mr. GORE. I hope the Senator from New York intends to be fair. I certainly have not intended to be carping. I have quoted the Vice President's words, not out of context. I think I have quoted them fairly, and I have found them to be distressing. I found them distressing as an indication of his conception of the role of the Presidency of the United States in the conduct of our country's foreign affairs. I submit that it cannot be the prime responsibility, under our Constitution, of anyone else, whether he be the Vice President, the Secretary of State, the majority leader, the minority leader, or any other official. The world looks to the President of the United States, and the Constitution places that responsibility inexorably and inescapably upon the President of the United States.

I hope the Senator from New York will not insist upon characterizing my remarks as carping. I assure him that they have not been so intended, nor do I think they can so be characterized fairly.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, again I repeat my enormous respect and affection for the Senator from Tennessee. I still cannot bring myself to believe that the use of the words "prime responsibility" in that context means any more than an efficient utilization of a really top level man who would be available for a very difficult job, without any derogation of the final responsibility for the conduct of the foreign affairs of the country, which is inherent in the office of the Presidency.

With all due respect, a President who would try to spread himself to solve all these problems himself—disarmament, the Near East, the Russians, Africa, South America, Taiwan, and the multitude of other problems in the world—would be a pretty bad administrator.

I think Vice President NIXON has made quite the right decision, rather than the wrong one.

I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from New York that the burdens and responsibilities of the Presidency are enormous. One who holds that high office needs and must have qualified advisors of the highest order. But it is to the President himself that the Free World must look for the leadership upon which the cause of peace depends.

Those who yearn for more effective United States leadership will not be reassured by this announcement by Mr. NIXON. For the President of the United States to turn over "primary responsibility" in the dangerous, vexatious problems of the Middle East to anyone, however capable he may be, is to downgrade it. Peaceful solution of the complex controversy will be difficult at best. It can only be attained, in my opinion, with full power and prestige of the President of the United States. Anything less than the active attention of the President himself will cast doubt upon the depth of our conviction and upon our resolution to lead effectively the forces of freedom to an enduring peace.

THE THREATENED STRIKE ON THE PENNSYLVANIA RAILROAD

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the indications are that the Pennsylvania Railroad is to be shut down by strike at midnight tomorrow night.

This is a national emergency, and should not be permitted.

It is a national emergency because it will, in many States, hamper and, in a large part of the country, come close to paralyzing altogether the rail transportation that people need in order to get to and from their jobs and the rail transportation that is needed to keep the economy going. The Pennsylvania Railroad is the largest railroad in the country, serving a part of the East that contains almost half the Nation's population and much of its industry; it ties that area in with the rest of the country by taking passengers and freight to and from the railroads of the South, the West, and New England.

The emergency is made even worse by its timing. It comes at the time of peak Labor Day vacation travel, and of the return of students to schools and colleges far from their homes. And it disrupts the movement of farm and factory freight right on the brink of the pickup in the national economy that all of us are hoping for.

Our interest here is not in the merits of the dispute that is causing the strike and shutting down the railroad. Our interest here, I suggest, is in the general public—to protect their interest by keeping the trains moving until negotiations are concluded.

In that connection, I think we should note that the dispute has already gone twice to factfinding boards. The first time was before a neutral referee agreed on by both sides. Unsatisfactory as the railroad found some of that referee's decisions, it agreed to accept them.

The leaders of two unions involved in the dispute refused, and served notice that they would strike. The President was notified, and recognized the situation as a national emergency. As authorized by the Railway Labor Act, he named a three-man emergency factfinding board to hear the case as an impartial tribunal and to make recommendations. It did, and again the railroad accepted the recommendations.

The leaders of the two unions again refused, and under the present terms of the Railway Labor Act the unions were free to strike after 30 days. This is the strike scheduled for midnight Wednesday. By midnight tomorrow, service will have stopped for some 136,000 daily passengers, 73,000 of whom are commuters; for some 118 million ton-miles a day of freight important to the national economy; and for several hundred cars a day of mail, express, newspapers, and magazines.

As I indicated, the resources of the Railway Labor Act, as it now stands, are exhausted. If the leaders of these 2 of the railroad's 24 unions choose to shut down the road by their strike and picket lines, there is nothing in the present law to stop them.

This threatened damage is not confined to the people and businesses of the District of Columbia and the 13 States directly served by this railroad. Other localities will be hurt in differing degrees. Here are some specific ways in

which Delaware can expect to suffer unless we act:

First. A good part of our State is devoted to farming; and some of our farmers rely heavily, or even exclusively, on this railroad to get their crops to market. This is especially true on the Delmarva Peninsula, which is largely agricultural, and which we share with our neighboring States of Maryland and Virginia. In fact, the Pennsylvania Railroad is the only railroad which serves that large area. One of our big crops there is soybeans; these are a bulky commodity for which railroad transportation is essential.

Delaware and the Eastern Shore are also the heart of the broiler industry, which is dependent on the railroads to bring in daily hundreds of tons of feed grains from other areas. To cut off this source of supply, which is essential to maintain the flocks, would mean economic ruin to many Eastern Shore farmers and poultrymen.

The food supply in many of our cities and other heavily populated areas would be seriously disrupted, and acute shortages would develop, under even a short suspension of operations.

Second. Although the railroad is being compelled to shut down by the leaders of only 2 of its 24 unions, the action idles the railroad's entire work force—both union and nonunion. Many hundreds of these men and women live in Delaware. There is nothing that they or the railroad can do about this loss of wages which is being forced on them at a time when few people, even those without families, can comfortably lose wages. This loss, by the way, is going to affect even more families in some of the larger States.

Third. A good many hundreds of Delaware men and women use the railroad to get to and from their daily work within the State or in Maryland and Pennsylvania. Also a good many men and women live in Maryland and Pennsylvania and work in Delaware, and use the railroad to go back and forth. The shutdown of the railroad will be a serious and costly inconvenience to all these people.

Fourth. Delaware has, as Senators know, a number of large manufacturing companies that are important to the national economy and to the national defense. Aside from helping to get people to and from their daily work in the plants and offices of these companies, the Pennsylvania Railroad is the one passenger railroad link for travel between these companies and the rest of the country.

Fifth. This railroad has a large responsibility for moving freight to and from these plants, which provide many thousands of jobs for our people. Dislocation of this freight service could mean serious unemployment for thousands of our men and women.

Sixth. Some of our light and power companies have to rely exclusively on this railroad for their coal supplies. The halting of the movement of these supplies could seriously disrupt the home life and the business life of considerable areas.

The Delmarva Peninsula will, of course, experience its share of inconvenience at interruption of important mail service.

This is a very serious public emergency. The intent of the Railway Labor Act was that the procedures set up therein would prevent any cessation of services and resulting inconveniences and hardships to the traveling and the shipping public. If this strike should come to pass, as is indicated, there would seem to be only one remedy for the protection of the public interest, and that would be compulsory arbitration.

I would regret very much the necessity of having to take such action. But if labor and management fail to carry on negotiations which will make it possible to avoid such serious resultant effects on the public, there will be no alternative. The public interest deserves and requires no less.

In making this statement, it is not my intention to take the side of either management or labor. Instead my purpose is to call attention to the economic loss that will be suffered by the public over a large section of the heaviest populated area of the Nation, should this strike be allowed to go into effect.

I call upon both management and labor to recognize that the interest of the general public is paramount in this question, and that arrangements should be made to keep these trains in operation pending a settlement.

If such an arrangement cannot be agreed upon, then the Federal Government should take the appropriate steps to protect the welfare of the general public.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, the threatened strike against the Pennsylvania Railroad is an issue of great and immediate concern to all of us.

The technicalities of the situation have been studied and assessed by experts, including a neutral referee and an Emergency Factfinding Board appointed by the President.

I do not propose to discuss them here, since my senior colleague has already given the findings. But it is a matter of public record that this board and another neutral tribunal made these findings.

It is likewise well established that management chose to accept the recommendations of these impartial factfinders, but the union persists in its demands and has announced there is "absolutely no hope" of settlement.

At this time the all-important issue of the public interest, as it is affected by the impending tie-up, is our main concern.

Mr. President, it would seem to me that this is the type of situation that should lend itself to reasonable discussion and traditional negotiation.

Let us remember that the present dispute does not involve wages, but rather work rules.

The public may well ask if it is to be inconvenienced by questions of this kind that should be settled within the house of labor and management jointly.

Is the interpretation of work rules sufficient reason to tie up a major carrier and inflict economic loss and hardship on the public, on private business, and on other railroad employees who are not involved? This is a situation that calls for responsibility.

It recommends statesmanship of an order and degree that will recognize the larger question of public interest and national welfare.

It does not make good sense to stop all trains on a major railroad, whose services are like a blood supply to large and vital sectors of the national economy, because one party to a dispute cannot agree—and this in the face of the findings of impartial boards.

Where would the world be today, Mr. President, in what kind of shape would it be, if every time a nation felt it could not have its own way it would take punitive action? The result would be chaos and worldwide destruction.

This is the reason why we have the United Nations—a place and a forum and an authority wherein differences can be roconciled by negotiation.

I earnestly hope and trust, Mr. President, that even at this late hour this threatened strike—so costly, so harmful to all parties involved—can be avoided.

FAILURE OF CONFERENCE ON MINIMUM WAGE BILL

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, on the eve of the failure of the committee of conference to reach agreement on a minimum wage bill, I want to extend my sympathies to the thousands of working men and women and their families whose standards of living would have been raised under such a bill, but who now must wait and wait and wait with no certainty of future action by Congress.

Why, indeed, Mr. President, did this conference fail? I wish I had all the answers to that question. I can only say that never at any time during the course of the conference was there anything resembling a common meeting ground. Is it possible, Mr. President, that there are those in high positions of congressional leadership who publicly profess to want a bill but who privately admit to preferring an issue?

Under the rules of the House, the Speaker has absolute authority in the appointment of conferees. The points of view, and the exact degree of intensity of those views, of each of the conferees appointed by the Speaker, were well known to Congress generally and to the Speaker in particular.

Was there no liaison between the junior Senator from Massachusetts, his running mate, the distinguished majority leader of the Senate, and the close friend of the Senate majority leader, Speaker RAYBURN?

Mr. President, compromise is the essence of democratic lawmaking, and it is for the purpose of reconciling honest differences among equally reasonable and equally patriotic men, and to provide them with a common meeting place, that Congress developed and maintains the institution of the conference committee.

During the course of the conference, I offered a number of compromise pro-

posals which were varied in scope and nature. It became clear at the first meeting that the House conferees were concerned about the term in the Senate bill "activity affecting commerce." It was apparent also that a majority of the Senate conferees felt that the coverage test in the House bill was unacceptable. The House text would bring under the Fair Labor Standards Act only those firms which have five or more establishments in two or more States. The House bill would exempt any chain operating solely within one State.

In short, Mr. President, very little discussion took place in conference as to what wage and hour levels we should have in the new bill or with respect to the number to be covered. Almost all discussion centered on this question of what method would be used to obtain coverage.

In an effort to bring the differing forces together, I offered a compromise which would apply the five establishment, in two or more States, test in combination with another test which would bring under the Fair Labor Standards Act any enterprise that purchased a million dollars worth of goods that moved directly across State lines to its place or places of business. Since it was the House view that two or more States had to be definitely involved in any test for coverage, and since it was the Senate view that some chains operating in just one State should be covered, I felt that my amendment provided a reasonable compromise.

Under this amendment presently covered workers would have received $1.15 and newly covered workers would have received $1.15 at the end of a 3-year period. The new workers would receive initially under this proposal $1.05.

The overtime provision in my first compromise was also designed to bring together the extremes of the House and Senate bills. It called for overtime after 44 hours.

The number of workers who would have been brought under the Fair Labor Standards Act by my first compromise was estimated to be 3.1 million. The major portion of this number, 2.7 million, would be from the retail trade.

I would point out, Mr. President, that this first compromise proposal specifically stated that all exemptions in the Senate-passed bill would be retained.

Mr. President, I regret to say that my first attempt to bring together the conferees failed. It was objected to by a majority of the Senate conferees on the ground that it covered only those intrastate firms that receive goods directly across State lines, and did not cover those firms that purchased from a wholesaler who, in turn, purchases goods that move across State lines.

Although the House conferees never had an opportunity to vote on it under the conference rules, there was an objection raised because the amendment contained the term "enterprise" which was used in the Senate bill in contrast to the term "employer" which was used in the House bill.

I ask unanimous consent that an outline of my first compromise proposal be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the outline was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIRST COMPROMISE PROPOSAL SUGGESTED BY SENATOR PROUTY

COVERAGE TEST

I. (a) Eliminate "Activity affecting commerce" concept in Senate-passed bill.

(b) Substitute for the "Activity affecting commerce" concept the term "Enterprise doing business in commerce to a substantial extent."

(c) "Enterprise doing business in commerce to a substantial extent" shall mean (1) any enterprise which has five or more establishments and who operates such establishments in two or more States; or (2) any enterprise that purchases merchandise, materials, or supplies that move directly across State lines to its place or places of business which amount in total annual dollar value to $1 million or more as measured by the preceding calendar or fiscal year.

(d) The substitution of the new coverage test would result in the elimination of 3(t) (1), (2), (3), (4), and (5) in the Senate-passed bill. All exemptions in the Senate-passed bill would be retained.

Wage rates

II. Minimum wage rate for presently covered workers: $1.15.

III. Minimum wage rate for newly covered workers: $1.05, 1961; $1.10, 1962; $1.15, 1963.

IV. Overtime for newly covered workers: Overtime after 44 hours.

Number of workers

V. Number of workers who would be brought under FLSA by compromise proposal: (a) 3.1 million (the major portion of this number—2.7 million—would be from the retail trade).

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, my second compromise proposal closely resembled the first except that it used the term "employer engaged in commerce" because of objections raised about problems that might be caused if we inserted the word "enterprise" in the Fair Labor Standards Act. This amendment was squarely rejected by a majority of the Senate conferees and, therefore, never voted upon by House Members. I ask unanimous consent that its text be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECOND COVERAGE TEST PROPOSAL

I. (a) Substitute for the "Activity affecting commerce" concept the term "Employer engaged in commerce."

(b) "Employer engaged in commerce" means (1) any employer who has five or more establishments and who operates such establishments in two or more States; or (2) any employer who purchases for use in his business operations (exclusive of purchases for general maintenance, repairs or capital improvements) merchandise, materials or supplies that move directly across State lines to his place or places of business which amount in annual dollar value to $1 million or more as measured by the preceding calendar or fiscal year.

(c) The substitution of the new coverage test would result in the elimination of 3(t) (1), (2), (3), (4), and (5) in the Senate-passed bill. All exemptions in the Senate-passed bill would be retained.

WAGE RATES

II. Minimum wage rate for presently covered workers: $1.15.

III. Minimum wage rate for newly covered workers: $1, 1961; $1.05, 1962; and $1.10, 1963.

IV. Overtime for newly covered workers: Overtime after 44 hours.

NUMBER OF WORKERS

V. Number of workers who would be brought under FLSA by compromise proposal: (a) 3.1 million (the major portion of this number—2.7 million—would be from the retail trade).

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, in an effort to satisfy the objections which were raised to my first and second compromise proposal, I offered a third coverage test which substituted for the Senate-approved concept "activity affecting commerce" the term "employer engaged in commerce." "Employer engaged in commerce" was defined as meaning any employer who has five or more establishments in two or more States or any employer who purchases for use in his business $1 million worth of goods which have moved across State lines. Note the two significant changes this amendment brings forth which the first did not contain. It substitutes the term "employer" for "enterprise." It also would include in the coverage test purchases of material even though such purchases did not move directly across State lines to the retail firm to which the test is to be applied.

What happened to the amendment? I accepted two slight modifications of it which hiked the $1 million inflow figure to $1½ million and made more clear the fact that the test involved both direct and indirect inflow.

Mr. President, the amendment as modified was accepted by a majority of the Senate conferees, but rejected by a majority of the House conferees.

I ask unanimous consent that an outline of my third compromise amendment be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the outline was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIRD COVERAGE TEST PROPOSAL

I. (a) Substitute for the "Activity affecting commerce" concept the term "Employer engaged in commerce."

(b) "Employer engaged in commerce" means (1) any employer who has five or more establishments and who operates such establishments in two or more States; or (2) any employer who purchases for use in his business operations (exclusive of purchases for general maintenance, repairs or capital improvements) merchandise, materials or supplies which have moved across State lines and which amount in annual dollar value to $1 million or more as measured by the preceding calendar or fiscal year.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, since the conferees rejected a coverage test which involved direct purchases across State lines, and since the conferees also rejected a coverage test involving both direct and indirect purchases across State lines, I decided that any compromise reached would have to be based on some other concept.

It was with this thought in mind that I drafted a fourth compromise proposal which contained the following coverage test: First, it would have brought under the Fair Labor Standards Act certain employers with five or more establishments in two or more States. It would have also brought under the wage and

hour law certain employers who derive $2 million or more in annual gross sales from activities which depend on or further movement in commerce of goods. In other words, Mr. President, it was a $2 million sales test.

The fourth compromise proposal would also have maintained all of the exemptions in the Senate-passed bill and would have provided a minimum wage rate of $1.15 for presently covered workers and $1 for newly covered workers.

In the course of discussion, Mr. President, I accepted amendments to this fourth compromise proposal so that the proposal would have extended to firms with two or more establishments in two or more States rather than five such establishments. I also accepted amendments which would have hiked the minimum wage rate for newly covered workers from $1.00 to $1.15 over a 3-year period.

As amended my proposal would have provided overtime for newly covered workers according to the following schedule: First year, overtime after 46 hours; second year, overtime after 44 hours; third year, overtime after 42 hours; fourth year, overtime after 40 hours.

Mr. President, this fourth compromise of mine was approved by the Senate conferees by a vote of 4 to 3, but was rejected by a House conferee vote of 2 to 5.

Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD my fourth coverage test proposal as introduced, to be immediately followed by the text of the fourth proposal as amended.

There being no objection, the proposals were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOURTH COVERAGE TEST PROPOSAL AS INTRODUCED

I. (a) Eliminate activity affecting commerce concept in Senate-passed bill.

(b) Substitute for the "Activity affecting commerce" concept the term "employer engaged in commerce."

(c) "Employer engaged in commerce" means (1) any employer who has five or more establishments and who operates such establishments in two or more States; or (2) any employer who derives $2 million or more in annual gross sales from activities depending on, or furthering, movement or travel in commerce of persons, or goods, or of communications or otherwise requiring or enabling persons to engage in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce.

(d) The substitution of the new coverage test would result in the elimination of 3(t) (1), (2), (3), (4), and (5) in the Senate-passed bill. All exemptions in the Senate-passed bill would be retained, including the $250,000 establishment exemption.

WAGE RATES

II. Minimum wage rate for presently covered workers: $1.15.

III. Minimum wage rate for newly covered workers: $1.

IV. Overtime for newly covered workers:

FOURTH COVERAGE TEST PROPOSAL AS AMENDED

I. (a) Eliminate activity affecting commerce concept in Senate-passed bill.

(b) Substitute for the "Activity affecting commerce" concept the term "employer engaged in commerce."

(c) "Employer engaged in commerce" means (1) any employer who has two or more establishments and who operates such establishments in two or more States; or (2) any employer who derives $2 million or more in annual gross sales from activities depending on, or furthering, movement or travel in commerce of persons, or goods, or of communications or otherwise requiring or enabling persons to engage in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce.

(d) The substitution of the new coverage test would result in the elimination of 3(t) (1), (2), (3), (4), and (5) in the Senate-passed bill. All exemptions in the Senate-passed bill would be retained, including the $250,000 establishment exemption.

WAGE RATES

II. Minimum wage rate for presently covered workers: $1.15.

III. Minimum wage rate for newly covered workers: $1 first year, $1.05 second year, $1.15 third year.

IV. Overtime for newly covered workers: First year, overtime after 46 hours; second year, overtime after 44 hours; third year, overtime after 42 hours; fourth year, overtime after 40 hours.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, after I found myself in the position of having four compromise proposals turned down because the Senate and House conferees could not agree on the method to be used in bringing about new coverage, I worked out a fifth compromise proposal which no one could deny would apply strictly to employers in interstate commerce. Yet at the same time, Mr. President, it was sufficiently broad in scope so that it would have brought under the Fair Labor Standards Act 2,840,000 workers, a compromise figure midway between the coverage contained in the House and Senate bills.

This fifth and last compromise proposal was made up of two tests to give protection to newly covered workers. The first test would have given wage and hour safeguards to people who work for an employer who has two or more establishments in two or more States. The second test, Mr. President, would have brought under the wage-and-hour law the employees of any employer who gets $100,000 or more in receipts from interstate sales. Note carefully how this proposal attempts to bridge the gap between the extreme positions of various conferees. A majority of the Senate conferees wanted to cover some chains whose establishments were located in only one State. My fifth compromise proposal would have reached many of these chains, because a number of them do at least $100,000 worth of business with customers who live in another State.

Consider any large department store in Washington, D.C., for example. It would have customers in Virginia and Maryland who ordered articles from it. Under my proposal, if such a store in Washington, D.C., had sales totaling $100,000 to these customers from Maryland and Virginia, it would be covered.

Note also, Mr. President, how my fifth compromise proposal was an attempt to meet the view of the House conferees that a firm should only be covered if it does business in two or more States. Certainly a Maryland department store that ships merchandise to a customer in Virginia is in interstate commerce.

The amendment also contained suggested wage rates and overtime rates for presently covered and newly covered workers. They were not rates to which I was wedded. I would have much preferred a more generous schedule, but, again, I was attempting to subordinate my own desires to my overall wish to get an acceptable bill.

I would point out also, Mr. President, that my fifth and last compromise proposal would have given some measure of protection to 2,840,000 new workers.

What happened to this fifth and last compromise proposal? It never even got to a vote among the House conferees because it was flatly rejected by a majority of the Senate conferees.

Why was it rejected? It was not rejected, Mr. President, because of the wage rate schedule. I made it very clear that I was willing to accept amendments to this schedule. Nor, Mr. President, was it rejected because it covered 2,840,000 workers.

It was turned down because a majority of the Senate conferees were not so much concerned with the question of how many workers were involved, but what method was used to bring them under the Fair Labor Standards Act. A majority of the Senate conferees were absolutely and irrevocably wedded to the idea that we must have some method of coverage which will get all—and I repeat—all intrastate—and I repeat—intrastate firms which do approximately the same volume of business no matter how little or how great their connection with commerce might be.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have my fifth proposal printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the proposal was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIFTH COVERAGE TEST PROPOSAL

I. (a) Eliminate activity affecting commerce concept in Senate-passed bill.

(b) Substitute for the "Activity affecting commerce" concept the term "employer engaged in commerce."

(c) "Employer engaged in commerce" means (1) any employer who has two or more establishments and who operates such establishments in two or more States; or (2) any employer who derives $100,000 or more in annual receipts from interstate sales.

(d) The substitution of the new coverage test would result in the elimination of 3(t) (1), (2), (3), (4), and (5) in the Senate-passed bill. All exemptions in the Senate-passed bill would be retained, including the $250,000 establishment exemption.

WAGE RATES

II. Minimum wage rate for presently covered workers: $1.15.

III. Minimum wage rate for newly covered workers: $1.

IV. Overtime for newly covered workers:

V. Number covered: 2,840,000.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I do not know what would have been the fate of this fifth and last compromise proposal if under the conference rules the House conferees had had an opportunity to vote on it, but I do know, Mr. President, that the American public has a right to express its genuine disappointment about the inflexibility and im-

mutability of a majority of both conference groups.

Such obstinacy, Mr. President, calls to my mind the behavior of a poor little rich boy whose parents always bought him everything he wanted, including all kinds of sports equipment. The poorer kids needed his equipment to play baseball, but he insisted that they play according to his rule, and if they did not, he would pick up his equipment and run home to "daddy."

In that case, I always felt sorry for the poor little rich boy who thought he had to have his own way. I feel sorry, too, Mr. President, that the conference committee has run home to "daddy," and has run away from the poor children and poor families who need their help.

For 7 years the President has recommended an extension of wage and hour coverage to new workers. For 7 lean years, 5 of which the Democratic Party has held control of Congress, there has been no bill sent to the White House.

Those who have waited help for 7 years might indeed echo the cry: "How long, oh Lord, how long!"

The answer to that question may well lie within the bosom of the majority leader and the majority leader's leader.

Are we going to have a law or an issue which will be exploited until November 7, and forgotten thereafter?

AUTHORIZATION FOR SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS TO SUBMIT REPORT SUBSEQUENT TO ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Small Business be authorized, during the adjournment of the second session of the 86th Congress, to file with the Secretary of the Senate a report entitled "Case Study in Subcontracting by Weapon-System Contractor," and that the report be printed along with any individual, supplemental, or minority views.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MIGRATORY AGRICULTURAL LABOR

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Migratory Labor during the past year, I have had to learn a great deal about the problems facing the American migratory agricultural worker and his employers. These problems call for solutions founded on sound legislative judgment and this requires careful study and analysis of the facts.

Migratory agricultural workers move with and work in three northbound main streams: one along the east coast, another through the Midwest, and the third up the west coast.

The northeastern area of migratory agricultural labor has been excellently described by Mr. Kennett Love in the Monday, August 29, New York Times. In discussing, among other aspects, the social environment in this section, he notes that—

Good and bad, nearly all the camps are situated away from the main roads, isolated from the farmsteads and rural communities. Neither the camps nor the migrants come often into the awarness of the society within which they exist.

Because of the many variables in the agricultural scene, as well as the transient habits of the migratory agricultural worker, the task of writing an accurate and informative article about any part of this area is indeed imposing. The need for such writing is crucial both for the public and for the legislators. Mr. Love's fine article evidences thorough research and will be most helpful to us in achieving a more complete understanding of the northeastern part of this complex problem.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the following article from the Monday, August 29, New York Times be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INFLUX OF MIGRANT WORKERS AT PEAK ON FARMS IN EAST

(By Kennett Love)

The annual tide of tattered humanity that follows the harvest up the Atlantic seaboard has reached its high mark in New York and adjacent States. About 60,000 migrant farm workers—men, women, and teenagers, and uncounted myriads of children—have settled for the duration of the "pickin' season" in hundreds of camps scattered among the bean patches and orchards of upstate New York, the vast potato fields of Long Island, the truck gardens of New Jersey, and the shrouded stands of tobacco in the Connecticut Valley.

"Tell me, Mister, how is the potato crop down in Jersey?" asked the spokesman for a hundred migrants newly arrived at a camp near the shore of Lake Ontario. "Potatoes coming in so slow around here that we don't get much work even when the sun shines."

ONE HUNDRED IN FIVE TRUCKS

Eighty grownups and twenty children, the group had come in two stages all the way from Lake Okeechobee, Fla., in five battered, stake-sided, tarpaulin-covered trucks. The trip had been broken by a few weeks of potato picking in North Carolina.

On the road they jolted northward day and night, pausing only to eat and stretch, because neither in the segregated South nor in the North could they find or afford a night's lodging, except in the work camps.

Some of the camps are squalid clusters of tar paper shacks or cooplike barracks of weathered wood and tin on plots of dust or mire, depending on the weather.

Large families are crowded into a single cubicle to sleep, cook, and eat. They lack electricity, screens, or garbage can lids, and have, in place of plumbing, a hand pump out front and a couple of privies out back. State regulations are on the way toward eliminating or improving the worst camps.

SOME CAMPS IMPROVED

Many camps, some of them not much better to look at, are equipped with showers and other plumbing and screened in accordance with health codes. The buildings are sturdier and more comfortable, sometimes of cinder block construction, and the rooms may be provided with bottled-gas stoves instead of kerosene burners.

One large men's camp maintained by the Connecticut shade-grown tobacco planters in a landscaped grove near Poquonock is said to have cost nearly a million dollars, and it looks it.

Good or bad, nearly all the camps are situated away from the main roads, isolated from the farmsteads and rural communities. Neither the camps nor the migrants come often into the awareness of the society within which they exist. Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Democrat, of New Jersey, and chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor, has called them the forgotten people.

MILLION ON ROAD

The Atlantic migration stream is part of a pattern in which a million people, from coast to coast, move northward "on the season" every year.

The larger and better known part of the pattern is the migration up through the Midwest, the Great Plains, and the Pacific States that has attracted both legal and illegal immigrants from Mexico, the latter known as "wetbacks." Nearly half a million Mexicans and a similar number of Americans, chiefly of Mexican origin or Negroes, make the yearly harvest trek west of the Appalachian mountain chain.

The sources of the Atlantic seaboard stream are mainly in the colored quarters that sprawl out into the pines and palmetto on the poor side of southern towns.

The stream is fed also from the sugarcane and tobacco fincas of Puerto Rico by Spanish-speaking men who flock to San Juan to take the $45 airplane trip north. A smaller current joins the stream from the West Indies. And a few white "knights of the road" come into the migration from the skid rows of the Central Atlantic and New England cities.

Much of the movement is prompted by dire economic need. Lois Garrison, a young woman from Palmetto, Fla., explained it in simple terms one rainy, workless day this month in a camp near Cranbury, N.J.

"If you don't get no work in the summer," she said, "the rent man's going to shut you right out the door."

LEFT CREW IN VIRGINIA

She had come up "freewheeling" in search of work after leaving a crew that had completed a harvesting contract in Virginia.

Other migrants, including some substantial, provident citizens, come north as much for the opportunity to travel as for economic reasons.

Mrs. Willie Brown, in a beanpickers' camp in the Genesee Valley, complacently broke snap beans into canning lengths on a recent evening as she told how she took leave every summer from a permanent job as a cook in Sanford, Fla., to work in the northern New York climate. She has entered her eldest daughter in Tallahassee University and plans to send her other three children to college.

In "Tobacco Valley" along the Connecticut River, 2,250 Negro youths and girls from southern high schools and colleges are nearing the end of a 10-week season harvesting the delicate leaves of tobacco grown in the shade of vast canopies of cotton netting.

Alphonzo R. Liggins, a grammar-school teacher of Goldsboro, N.C., who brought 168 students to a dormitory camp at Broadbrook, Conn., said the students would take home up to $400 each. It is the 24th Connecticut season for students from his school.

Students, smaller and slimmer than adults, are preferred for the early part of the harvest, when the lower leaves of the 8- to 10-foot stalks are picked, because they can move among the close-set rows without damaging the plants.

Although most migrants' lives are disorganized, precarious, and impoverished to a degree unknown in other sectors of society, they bear their lot with a resignation that is more often cheerful than gloomy.

"They make very few complaints," said Samuel P. Singletary, employment practice representative of the State labor department. "Mostly, they're just interested in getting work and aren't much concerned about living conditions. And some are

mainly interested in seeing New York and will lay off every couple of days."

EARNINGS AVERAGE $859

As agricultural workers, migrants are excluded from Federal minimum wage and unemployment compensation laws. Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell has estimated that the average migrant in 1957 worked 131 days and earned $859—about $6.55 a day.

Frank Pixley, a large employer of migrants on his Genesee County, N.Y., string bean harvest, asserts that growers do not want to pay low wages but that low produce prices force them to. He concedes that he has paid harvesters 70 cents for each 35-pound hamper of beans since 1946, but he observes that in the same period his own return on each ton of beans had dropped from $125 to $113.40. A good worker can pick up to 20 hampers in a day.

Hourly wage rates vary from 80 cents in New Jersey's truck gardens to 95 cents in the tobacco fields of Connecticut.

In the last decade progress has been made toward regulating the agricultural migration by the annual worker plan administered by State farm placement service agents and financed by Federal funds.

Planning begins in February and March when local State employment officials obtain estimated labor requirements and job orders from farmers in participating States from South Carolina to Massachusetts and Vermont.

Then the farm placement service agents go to Florida to lay out a comprehensive schedule of the migratory labor demands for harvests phased progressively northward. The trekking begins as early as April as Florida harvesting tapers toward a close.

A typical schedule was that worked out last year for Alvin Braboy of Lakeland, Fla., whose crew at first consisted of 11 families—23 adults and 6 children.

The crew picked oranges, tangerines, and grapefruit in Florida until June 20. Then it moved up to Painter, Va., to dig potatoes until July 20. From July 25 to September 7 it picked tomatoes in Trappe, Md., and arrived in Linlithgo, N.Y., September 9 to harvest apples and grapes.

On November 10, Alvin Braboy and his crew took to the road again in a truck, a bus, and two cars, Florida bound, to start again on the oranges, tangerines, and grapefruit.

The employment record shows that the Braboy crew stuck remarkably close to a schedule subject to variations imposed by the weather, produce market conditions, sickness and often-recurring breakdowns of its dilapidated vehicles.

The record also shows that when the crew started south its composition had changed to 3 families with 7 children, 11 unattached men and 1 unattached woman.

Similar fluctuations are disclosed by the records of many of the 371 crews brought into New York State last year by registered leaders.

Statistically, the migrant problem is a nightmare. There is no certainty that workers who have stopped in more than one State have not been counted more than once. A similar uncertainty exists regarding migrants joining and leaving crews during the season.

It has been estimated that up to 40 percent of the whole migration are free wheelers, crews and families who travel without work agreements with farmers. And many crews contract with farmers outside the annual worker plan.

New York is the largest user of migrant labor among the Eastern States, having employed last year some 31,500 southern Negroes and nearly 5,000 Puerto Ricans. Of the Puerto Ricans 1,144 were under contract and the rest were walk-ins who came without work assurances.

CONNECTICUT PLAN

New Jersey reported an August peak of 25,600 seasonal farmworkers last year but nearly half were day hauls, workers recruited at dawn shape-ups from the Negro and Puerto Rican neighborhoods of Philadelphia and other Pennsylvania and New Jersey cities and returned home at night. The New Jersey migrant workers last year included 3,000 southern Negroes and more than 8,000 Puerto Ricans, three-quarters of whom came on contract.

Connecticut differs from other Eastern States in that no families accompany workers going there under formal agreements, although some walk-in families arrive. Connecticut this season has 1,200 West Indians and 1,350 Puerto Ricans in addition to the 2,250 southern students.

The present pattern of agricultural migration is a post-World War II development, although it has been influenced by wartime and prewar economic and technological developments.

A major factor has been the disappearance of local seasonal labor as the immigrant groups that formerly did it moved up the economic ladder into industrial and white-collar jobs.

Nelson Hopper, director of the State Farm Placement Bureau in Rochester, said:

"Fifteen years ago the farmer, his family and local workers did 90 percent of the harvest. Now they handle maybe as little as 25 percent and they need migrants for the rest."

TRANSACTION OF ADDITIONAL ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following additional routine business was transacted:

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

By unanimous consent, the following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. RUSSELL, from the Committee on Armed Services, with amendments:

H.R. 5132. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, with respect to active duty agreements for reserve officers, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1935).

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. DODD, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

J. Joseph Smith, of Connecticut, to be U.S. circuit judge for the second circuit.

AMENDMENT OF WAR CLAIMS ACT OF 1948 TO PROVIDE COMPENSATION FOR CERTAIN WORLD WAR II LOSSES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I send to the desk, and ask to have printed and lie on the table, for the information of Senators, certain amendments to the war claims bill, H.R. 2485, reported yesterday from the Committee on the Judiciary. This is an extremely important bill, Mr. President. It deals with American war damage claims which have been passed over for more than 14 years in the enactment of legislation by the Congress for the recognition and payment of other types of American war losses. My amendments are designed to improve the bill in the following particulars:

First, the category of eligible claimants would be broadened, so as to include individuals who are American citizens on the date of the bill's enactment into law.

Second, provisions for the payment of the claims from the net proceeds of former enemy vested assets, as provided for in the bill as passed by the House, would be restored.

Third, among the types of claims authorized are claims for the removal of American-owned capital and other industrial equipment in Germany for reparation purposes.

Finally, there would be added provisions authorizing the Attorney General to dispose of any vested properties that may be affected by pending litigation, with full safeguards for just compensation to any successful litigant in any suit brought for the return of such properties.

The background of these amendments and the problems involved in them are quite fully explained in the supplemental views attached to the committee's report (S. Rept. 1934). I feel very strongly that they are needed in order to make the bill a fully rounded war claims measure. The absence from the bill of the provisions found in the changes I am recommending is extremely regrettable. Although H.R. 2485, as reported from the committee, is a long overdue recognition of the importance of the war claims problem, it is, in my judgment, seriously defective in the areas I have indicated.

We can no longer blind ourselves to the need for immediate action in the matter of these claims, but neither can we turn our backs upon the proper handling of the matter by making a half-hearted gesture, as proposed in the bill as it comes to us from the committee.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of my amendments be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be received, printed, and will lie on the table; and, without objection, the amendments will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendments are as follows:

On page 8, line 8, following the comma, insert the following: "or on the date of enactment of this title are".

On page 12, line 17, amend that portion of subsection (a) of proposed section 213 preceding paragraph (1) to read as follows:

"SEC. 213. (a) The Secretary of the Treasury shall pay out of the War Claims Fund on account of awards certified by the Commission pursuant to this title as follows and in the following order of priority:"

SEC. 2. On page 17, line 5, amend section 5 of the bill to read as follows:

"SEC. 5. Section 39 of the Trading With the Enemy Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) The Attorney General is authorized and directed to cover into the Treasury from time to time for deposit in the War Claims Funds such sums from property vested in him or transferred to him under this Act as he shall determine in his discretion not to be required to fulfill obligations imposed under this Act or any other provision of law, and

not to be the subject matter of any judicial action or proceeding. There shall be deducted from each such deposit 5 per centum thereof for expenses incurred by the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission and by the Treasury Department in the administration of title II of the War Claims Act of 1948. Such deductions shall be made before any payment is made pursuant to such title. All amounts so deducted shall be covered into the Treasury to the credit of miscellaneous receipts."

On page 7, following line 17, insert the following:

"(f) losses resulting from the removal of industrial or other capital equipment in Germany owned, directly or indirectly, by a national of the United States on the date of removal and removed for the purpose of reparations including losses from any destruction of property incident to such destruction."

On page 18, following line 10, add a new section 6 to read as follows:

"SEC. 6. Section 9(a) of the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a colon and the following: *'Provided further,* That upon a determination made by the President, in time of war or during any national emergency declared by the President, that the interest and welfare of the United States require the sale of any property or interest or any part thereof claimed in any suit filed under this subsection and pending on or after the date of enactment of this proviso the Alien Property Custodian or any successor officer or agency may sell such property or interest or part thereof, in conformity with law applicable to sales of property by him, at any time prior to the entry of final judgment in such suit. No such sale shall be made until thirty days have passed after the publication of notice in the Federal Register of the intention to sell. The net proceeds of any such sale shall be deposited in a special account established in the Treasury, and shall be held in trust by the Secretary of the Treasury pending the entry of final judgment in such suit. Any recovery of any claimant in such suit in respect of the property or interest or part thereof so sold shall be satisfied from the net proceeds of such sale unless such claimant, within sixty days after receipt of the notice of the amount of net proceeds of sale serves upon the Alien Property Custodian, or any successor officer or agency, and files with the court an election to waive all claims to the net proceeds, or any part thereof, and to claim just compensation instead. If the court finds that the claimant has established an interest, right, or title in any property in respect of which such an election has been served and filed, it shall proceed to determine the amount which will constitute just compensation for such interest, right, or title, and shall order payment to the claimant of the amount so determined. An order for the payment of just compensation hereunder shall be a judgment against the United States and shall be payable first from the net proceeds of the sale in an amount not to exceed the amount the claimant would have received had he elected to accept his proportionate part of the net proceeds of the sale and the balance, if any, shall be payable in the same manner as are judgments in cases arising under section 1346 of title 28, United States Code. The Alien Property Custodian or any successor officer or agency, shall, immediately upon the entry of final judgment, notify the Secretary of the Treasury of the determination by final judgment of the claimant's interest and right to the proportionate part of the net proceeds from the sale, and the final determination by judgment of the amount of just compensation in the event the claimant has elected to recover just compensation for the interest in the property he claimed.' "

On page 18, line 11, renumber section 6, as section 7.

On page 18, following line 15, strike out the text of the amended title and insert: "An act to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, to provide compensation for certain World War II losses, and to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended."

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, under the order previously entered, I move that the Senate adjourn until 10 o'clock a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 8 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow Wednesday, August 31, 1960, at 10 o'clock a.m.

WITHDRAWALS

Executive nominations withdrawn from the Senate August 30 (legislative day of August 24), 1960:

POSTMASTERS

Mrs. Cecile M. Hill to be postmaster at Tok, in the State of Alaska.

Mrs. Florabelle Rominger to be postmaster at Bangor, in the State of California.

Donald E. Trees to be postmaster at Armstrong, in the State of Iowa.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, AUGUST 30, 1960

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Psalm 55: 22: *Cast thy burden upon the Lord, and He shall sustain thee.*

O Thou Lord God omnipotent, may we daily unburden ourselves humbly and reverently to Thy listening ear and understanding heart for Thou alone canst supply all our temporal needs and satisfy our eternal longings.

We penitently confess that we so frequently fail to see life in its true perspective and are tempted to enter upon the duties and responsibilities of a new day with fear and foreboding.

Grant that we may appropriate Thy overtures of friendship more courageously and avail ourselves more eagerly of those moral and spiritual resources which Thou hast placed at our disposal to sustain us.

Hear us in the name of our Master. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 11561. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Army to convey part of lock and dam No. 10, Kentucky River, Madison County, Ky., to the Pioneer National Monument Association for use as part of a historic site; and

H.R. 13053. An act to increase the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the U.S. Park Police, the White House Police, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 3258. An act to amend the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1870. An act to provide for examination, licensing, registration, and for regulation of professional and practical nurses, and for nursing education in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; and

S. 3648. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia on behalf of the United States, to transfer from the United States to the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency title to certain real property in said District.

WATERSHED PROTECTION AND FLOOD PREVENTION PROJECTS

The SPEAKER. The Chair laid before the House the following communication which was read by the Clerk, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed:

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., August 29, 1960.

Hon SAM RAYBURN,
The Speaker,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the provisions of section 2 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended, the Committee on Agriculture has today considered the work plans transmitted to you by Executive Communications 2394 and 2306 and referred to this committee and unanimously approved each of such plans. The work plans involved are:

State	Watershed	Exec. Comm.
Texas	Kickapoo Creek	2394
Oklahoma	Timber Creek	2394
Maryland	Long Marsh	2394
Virginia	Beaver Creek	2306
New Mexico	Upper Gila Valley	2306
Mississippi	Bentonia	2306
Hawaii	Waianae Nui	2306
Georgia	Sandy Creek	2306
Colorado	Franktown-Parker tributaries of Cherry Creek.	2306

Sincerely yours,
HAROLD D. COOLEY,
Chairman.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS, COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Elections of the Committee on House Administration may sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1961

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 13161) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes, with amendments of the Senate thereto, disagree to the amendments of the Senate and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. GROSS. Reserving the right to object, I understand this is a request to send to conference the supplemental appropriation bill.

Mr. THOMAS. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Then, I think a little review of this situation is in order.

Mr. THOMAS. I think the question is timely, and I am glad the gentleman asked the question.

Mr. GROSS. If I remember correctly, on last Friday the House had before it and adopted the conference report on the foreign aid bill.

Mr. THOMAS. Let me review it briefly for the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Just a moment. The House had before it the conference report on the foreign aid bill, and that report was the product of a free and untrammeled conference between the House and Senate. Is that correct?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. Then about an hour and a half later the gentleman from Texas called up the deficiency appropriation bill. Is that correct?

Mr. THOMAS. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. That was sent to the other body only last Friday and yesterday afternoon it was messaged back with some $190 or $200 million added to it.

Mr. THOMAS. $215 million, in round figures, was added by the other body.

Mr. GROSS. Practically all of which should have been in the foreign aid bill if it was to be appropriated at all.

Mr. THOMAS. $190 million of it was in the foreign aid bill.

Mr. GROSS. I ask the gentleman this question: Why was not this money put in the bill when the conference was held on the mutual security bill?

Mr. THOMAS. The gentleman is asking me a question I cannot answer. Let me explain what the facts are and what we are up against. I might say I am in sympathy with the position of the gentleman from Iowa. We had a budget estimate—I am referring to the deficiency bill, covering some 40 items, $118 million. The House reduced that amount to about $90 million. Then the other body meets and they add about $215 million over and above the $90 million as it left the House, some 35 or 40 additional amendments. Of that $215 million $190 million was for the mutual security program. What we are seeking to do here is to go to conference, and we will inquire why it is the other body will march up the hill one day and down the hill the next day to the tune of $190 million.

Mr. GROSS. Your subcommittee which is in charge of the deficiency appropriation bill never held a single day's hearings on the appropriation for mutual security, did you?

Mr. THOMAS. Technically you are right. We discussed the items yesterday with the Under Secretary of the State Department, Mr. Dillon, but that covered the sum and substance of it.

Mr. GROSS. This is the strangest proceeding I have heard of in my time in the House. We have before us today a deficiency appropriation bill and it is in such shape that one of the most distinguished and veteran Members of the other body declined to serve as a conferee, saying in effect that he would be ashamed to face the Members of the House in defense of what had transpired in the Chamber in which he serves.

Mr. THOMAS. May I say to the distinguished gentleman that he is 100 percent correct in everything he has said. Of course the House has not passed on the actions of the other body. The purpose of the conference is to give the House an opportunity to be heard. I hope the distinguished gentleman will uphold the hands of the House.

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN].

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, it has been my great privilege to serve as chairman of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee for 6 years. I think perhaps I can contribute something to the matter under consideration.

The subcommittee, and at a subsequent date, the full committee, and at another date, the House approved the action of the subcommittee and the full committee. It was my privilege to take the bill to conference last Thursday. We made substantial concessions, brought the bill back $131,850,000 above the original House bill. The total called for was $490 million more than we appropriated last year. There was complete agreement with two or three reservations. Inasmuch as I have spent 6 years on this matter, took 10,000 pages of transcript this year, having had the support of the full committee and the House on two occasions, and inasmuch as not a single member of the Deficiency Appropriations Subcommittee has asked me one single question about one single item in this bill, I do not believe that the subcommittee intends to allow one additional dime or intends for any of the language to be amended. I could not imagine the members of this subcommittee going to conference on this bill to put back what we agreed to take out last Thursday without at least consulting some member of the subcommittee that has been holding hearings for years.

I am just as confused as the gentleman from Iowa. I do not believe that the House would ever reverse its decision, but on that we will just have to wait see.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia, a ranking member of Appropriations Subcommittee which spent many long weeks in hearings on the foreign aid bill.

Mr. GARY. May I say to the gentleman that there is far more involved in these proceedings than mere dollars. Using the slang of the day, $190 million "ain't hay"; it is a considerable sum of money, But the integrity of the committee system in the House of Representatives and in the Congress of the United States is at stake in these proceedings.

Our subcommittee has sat day after day, week after week, month after month hearing numerous witnesses form various parts of the world on foreign aid. Our members have traveled extensively gathering information. We brought in what we believed was a fair bill. The House adopted that bill. It went over to the other body. It was increased. Then according to regular parliamentary procedure and the rules of both bodies, we went into conference with the other body and we reached a fair and impartial compromise in the conference committee, agreed to in writing by both the Senate and the House conferees. The conference report was adopted by this body and also by the Senate. Subsequently the Senate put back every dollar that had been deleted in the conference, put it back in this bill.

The gentleman is correctly informed, according to my information, that one of the conferees of the Senate felt that this was such an improper action that he absolutely refused to sit on another conference on this bill. I feel that the integrity of the entire system is involved. If the House yields 1 inch in this matter I think it will be disastrous to our entire congressional system of procedure.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. I wish to clear up a possible misunderstanding. I did mention to each of the five conferees who will represent the House, the principle involved, but not the details of the bill. I have not discussed it with the leadership on either side or the leadership in the other body. I did discuss the principle involved with the five members who I assume will be the conferees on the part of the House, but not the details of the bill in any respect.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, may I assure the House that your House conferees will demand a very complete and a very adequate answer from the other body as to why they marched up the hill one day and marched down the hill the next day. I assure you we will do that.

Mr. PASSMAN. I want to assure the Members of the House that if I am given the same amount of time that was awarded Mr. Dillon yesterday morning, and if I cannot refute what Secretary Dillon has said and what Mr. Murphy has said and what the Members on the other side have said, if I cannot refute

that successfully I will withdraw my objection and support their position. If I cannot do that I should no longer serve as chairman of the subcommittee, but I do ask an opportunity to explain to the House something about this matter and how we are being run out on in connection with a sound agreement we obtained last Thursday and approved by this House last Friday.

Mr. GROSS. This is a thoroughly unwarranted and in many respects a shameful proceeding. Mr. Speaker, I must object.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman from Iowa to let this bill go to conference. There is a good deal involved in this matter, a good deal involved besides dollars and cents. I do hope that our distinguished friend will let this bill go to conference so that we can work out the entire 86 items in disagreement to the satisfaction of the membership of the House. I sincerely hope my friend will not object. Let us get this thing to conference and get out of here.

Mr. GROSS. That is the point I have been trying to make. The sum of $190 million is important but of equal importance is the integrity of the House and its committees.

Mr. THOMAS. Yes; it is.

Mr. GROSS. The situation with which we are faced clearly violates the orderly procedures of the House.

Mr. THOMAS. I hope our friend will trust our judgment. I agree with the gentleman, and there is a lot to what he said.

Mr. GROSS. I understand the gentleman cannot commit the conferees on the part of the House, but with the assurance of the gentleman that the sentiment he has expressed will be brought into full play in conference, I withdraw my objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection, and the Chair appointed the following conferees: Messrs. THOMAS, KIRWAN, CANNON, JENSEN, and TABER.

OPERATION VERACITY

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, this is the second day in Operation Veracity.

Yesterday, in a special order, we exposed numerous misstatements in the Democrat platform. In a special order later today, we shall expose still more.

But here is a quick one. The Democrat platform states that the Republicans have reduced "outlays for essential public services which directly benefit our people."

What do the platform writers mean by outlays for essential public services?

Outlays for natural resources? Such outlays have been increased 27 percent under this administration.

Do they mean outlays for veterans? These have been increased 28 percent.

In matters of health, the Eisenhower-Nixon administration has 13 concrete accomplishments to point to, which I have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. They surely do not mean health.

Mr. Speaker, with the lack of further qualification, it is only natural to question the accuracy of this Democrat platform statement.

AMENDING COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934 WITH RESPECT TO THE PROCEDURE IN OBTAINING A LICENSE AND FOR REHEARINGS UNDER SUCH ACT

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I call up from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 1898) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 with respect to the procedure in obtaining a license and for rehearings under such act, with Senate amendments thereto to the House amendments, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 14, line 4, strike out "SUSPENSION, REVOCATION," and insert "REVOCATION".

Page 14, line 6, strike out "(a) Section" and insert "Subsections (a) and (b) of section".

Page 14, line 7, strike out "is" and insert "are".

Page 14, line 23, after "any" insert "final".

Page 15, line 10, strike out "action." and insert "action.'"

Page 15, strike out all after line 10 over to and including page 17.

Page 18, strike out lines 8 to 24, inclusive, and insert:

"'(b)(1) Any licensee or permittee of a broadcast station who—

"'(A) willfully or repeatedly fails to operate such station substantially as set forth in his license or permit,

"'(B) willfully or repeatedly fails to observe any of the provisions of this Act or of any rule or regulation of the Commission prescribed under authority of this Act or under authority of any treaty ratified by the United States,

"'(C) fails to observe any final cease and desist order issued by the Commission,

"'(D) violates section 317(c) or section 509(a)(4) of this Act, or

"'(E) violates section 1304, 1343, or 1464 of title 18 of the United States Code, shall forfeit to the United States a sum not to exceed $1,000. Each day during which such violation occurs shall constitute a separate offense. Such forfeiture shall be in addition to any other penalty provided by this Act.

"'(2) No forfeiture liability under paragraph (1) of this subsection (b) shall attach unless a written notice of apparent liability shall have been issued by the Commission and such notice has been received by the licensee or permittee or the Commission shall have sent such notice by registered or certified mail to the last known address of the licensee or permittee. A licensee or permittee so notified shall be granted an opportunity to show in writing, within such reasonable period as the Commission shall by regulations prescribe, why he should not be held liable. A notice issued under this paragraph shall not be valid unless it sets forth the date, facts, and nature of the act or omission with which the licensee or permittee is charged and specifically identifies the particular provision or provisions of the law, rule, or regulation or the license, permit, or cease and desist order involved.

"'(3) No forfeiture liability under paragraph (1) of this subsection (b) shall attach for any violation occurring more than one year prior to the date of issuance of the notice of apparent liability and in no event shall the forfeiture imposed for the acts or omissions set forth in any notice of apparent liability exceed $10,000.'

"(b) Section 504(a) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 504) is amended by inserting after *'Provided,'* in the first sentence thereof the following: 'That any suit for the recovery of a forfeiture imposed pursuant to the provisions of this Act shall be a trial de novo: *Provided further,'*.

"(c) Section 504(b) of such Act is amended by striking out 'section 507' and inserting in lieu thereof 'sections 503(b) and 507'.

"(d) Section 504 of such Act is further amended by adding a new subsection to read as follows:

"'(c) In any case where the Commission issues a notice of apparent liability looking toward the imposition of a forfeiture under this Act, that fact shall not be used, in any other proceeding before the Commission, to the prejudice of the person to whom such notice was issued, unless (1) the forfeiture has been paid, or (ii) a court of competent jurisdiction has ordered payment of such forfeiture, and such order has become final.'"

Page 22, line 12, strike out all after "317." down to and including "section." in line 14 and insert:

"(e) The inclusion in the program of the announcement required by section 317 shall constitute the disclosure required by this section."

Page 22, line 15, strike out "(e)" and insert: "(f)".

Page 22, line 25, strike out "(f)" and insert "(g)".

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to promote the public interest by amending the Communications Act of 1934, to provide a pre-grant procedure in case of certain applications; to impose limitations on payoffs between applicants; to require disclosure of payments made for the broadcasting of certain matter; to grant authority to impose forfeitures in the broadcast service; and to prohibit deceptive practices in contests of intellectual knowledge, skill, or chance; and for other purposes."

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I send a motion to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HARRIS moves that the House concur in the Senate amendments to the House amendments.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I propound a parliamentary inquiry as to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas. I had no information this request was going to be made and I do not know what the request is.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arkansas can explain what it is.

Mr. HARRIS. I shall be glad to explain the parliamentary inquiry. As I understand, Mr. Speaker, I have an hour now.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman desires to take that much time, yes.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HALLECK. I would like to know what the request of the gentleman was, whether it was for the immediate consideration of the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman called up from the Speaker's table a Senate bill

with Senate amendments to the House amendments.

Mr. HARRIS. If the gentleman will permit, I will explain the amendments, and I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the bill which I have just called up is one that we have had before the House. It is a Senate bill which was amended by the House to include such matters as pregrant procedure with reference to the Federal Communications Act, the so-called payola requirement, amendment to section 317, deceptive practices problems, and so forth. I would like to describe what this is.

After the bill went back to the other body it was amended in two instances and has come back to us with those amendments thereto. I have asked to take from the Speaker's desk the bill with Senate amendments and moved that the House concur in the Senate amendments, which will finalize and complete the bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, what did the amendments do? That is what we want to know.

Mr. HARRIS. Well, I am just about to explain to the gentleman that I thought the procedure that the gentleman from Indiana would like to have was important.

I might say that the members of the committee have been advised that this motion was going to be made as of yesterday, and everyone on the committee has been notified that this action would be taken today.

Mr. HALLECK. I might say to the gentleman, as I understand under the parliamentary situation, it is now a matter before the House to be acted upon one way or the other and that no objection could be made. I have learned since the gentleman called it up that the members on my side on the committee were consulted with reference to this procedure, and as I understand have no objection to it now.

Mr. HARRIS. That is true, with the exception of the ranking minority member whom I advised personally that it would be called up today, and he wanted some time. I hope he was notified so that he will come in right away.

Mr. Speaker, this motion today is in further consideration of S. 1898, which has to do with amending the Federal Communications Act to close some of the loopholes and bring about some correction badly needed, which resulted from the investigation by our Special Committee on Legislative Oversight.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the body of the RECORD immediately preceding the portion of the RECORD when this bill was brought up.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, the Members are familiar with the legislation as it passed the House because I took considerable time explaining what the committee had done. As you will recall, this bill as passed by the Senate dealt exclusively with the pregrant procedure in connection with the licensing of broadcasting facilities. Our committee amended the bill in several ways. As a matter of fact, there were five major amendments dealing with the problems which I explained very carefully at that time.

The bill went back to the other body. As you recall, during the debate, there were two provisions of the bill about which many Members raised questions. One had to do with the suspension provision authorizing the Federal Communications Commission under certain conditions to suspend a broadcasting license for not to exceed 10 days. In other words, it provided a lesser penalty than revocation—the so-called death penalty—which has been a part of the Communications Act from the beginning.

Another provision about which great concern was expressed was the forfeiture provision, which gives the Federal Communications Commission authority to levy a fine on broadcasters for violations of the Communications Act and the Commission's rules.

Those were the only two provisions of the bill as it passed the House concerning which any questions have been raised. The Senate, when it received the bill, amended only those two provisions. So we come back now and ask the House to concur in the action of the Senate.

The principal amendments proposed in the Senate were to eliminate completely the power to suspend licenses for a brief period of time, to wit, 10 days.

The changes made by the Senate in the forfeiture section—section 7 of the bill—are as follows:

In the first place, the Senate amendment provides that in no event shall the forfeiture imposed for any act or omission exceed $10,000. The House-passed bill contains no such limitation.

Second, the Senate amendment provides that the Notice of Apparent Liability which the Commission is required to send to the licensee shall set forth the date, facts, and nature of the act or omission with which the licensee is charged and shall specifically identify the particular provision of the law, rule, or regulation, or the particular provision of the license or cease-and-desist order involved so that the licensee is properly advised with respect to the violation with which he is charged.

Furthermore, under the Senate amendment the licensee so notified is granted an opportunity to show in writing, within such reasonable period as the Commission shall by regulation prescribe, why he should not be held liable.

The Senate amendment substitutes the words "willfully or repeatedly" for the words "negligently or intentionally," contained in the bill as passed by the House. Because of this change it became necessary to refer specifically to violations of section 317(c) or section 509(a)(4) which impose an obligation to exercise reasonable diligence on licensees with respect to payola and deceptive practices. A requirement that violations of these two sections must have been either willful or repeated would be tantamount to making unavailable the forfeiture sanction in the case of violations of these two sections which are being added to the Communications Act by this legislation.

The Senate amendment provides specifically that any suit for recovery of a forfeiture shall be a trial de novo. It was the understanding of our committee that such suits traditionally are trials de novo and, therefore, I am glad to see that this has been specifically spelled out in the Senate amendment. The committee inquired of the FCC and the FAA with respect to such suits under present law and received the following information from them:

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., July 13, 1960.

Hon. OREN HARRIS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HARRIS: This is in reply to your letter of July 1, 1960, requesting a memorandum setting forth the procedures followed by the Commission together with the rights of persons upon whom forfeitures are imposed to obtain judicial review of the Commission's decision imposing the forfeiture.

Section 6 of S. 1898 would amend the Communications Act to provide for forfeitures similar to those now applying to vessels involved in violations of the Communications Act, title III, parts II and III and section 507. (See, especially, 47 United States Code secs. 364, 386, and 507, appended hereto.)

The procedure followed by the Commission when it receives information of an apparent violation of the Communications Act by a vessel is set out in section 1.581 of the Commission's rules (title 47 Code of Federal Regulations sec. 1.581) which provides as follows:

"§ 1.581 Forfeitures against ships and ship masters.

"(a) Whenever information is received indicating that reasonable grounds exist to support a suit for collection of forfeitures provided by sections 364, 386, and 507 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, the owner of the ship and the master will be notified of apparent liability for forfeitures. The notification will specify dates, places, and the nature of the alleged violations or irregularities, and will advise the parties of the Commission's authority under section 504(b) of the act to remit or mitigate such forfeitures upon application therefor. Applications for mitigation or remission may be filed within 30 days from the date of receipt of the notification letter, or within such extended time as may for good cause be granted. The application must be in duplicate but need not follow any special form. After a review of the case in the light of all the information available, including the information and arguments presented in the application, the applicant will be notified of the determination, which may be either remission of the entire amount, an offer of mitigation of the forfeiture to the extent which appears warranted under the circumstances, or denial of any relief.

"(b) Acceptance of an offer of mitigation may be accomplished through payment, within 30 days from the date of receipt of the notification, of the amount specified therein by check or similar means drawn to the order of the Treasurer of the United States and mailed to the Commission.

"(c) In lieu of acceptance of an offer of mitigation, or in the event of denial of relief, application may be made within 30 days from the date of receipt of the notification for review by the Commission as provided in section 5(d)(2) of the act. The application should set forth the reasons for applicant's belief that the original action on his application should be modified. It may include

a statement of any material facts that may have been omitted from the original application for relief. On review the Commission may affirm, modify, or set aside the previous action, or direct any further proceedings that appear necessary and in the public interest.

"(d) If the applicant fails to take any action in respect to a notification of apparent liability for forfeiture or an offer of mitigation or a notification of denial of relief, the case may be referred by the Commission to the Attorney General of the United States for appropriate civil action to recover the forfeiture in accordance with the provisions of section 504(a) of the act."

As section 1.581 states, if the person incurring the forfeiture persists in his refusal to pay the forfeiture the matter is referred to the Department of Justice for recovery of the forfeiture under section 504 of the act. If a civil or libel action should be commenced the persons incurring the forfeitures are entitled to a trial de novo in a court of law before being finally required to pay.

Since the forfeiture provisions of section 6 of S. 1898 are to be incorporated in sections 503 and 504 of the Communications Act which already apply to established Commission forfeiture proceedings, we are of the view that any forfeitures levied under S. 1898 would follow the same general procedural pattern as have been already established by the Commission in marine forfeiture cases. After the passage of S. 1898 a study will be made the Commission to determine the specific rules which should be adopted to implement congressional intent as expressed in the final version of the bill.

We hope that this information is sufficeint for your purposes. If it is not, please do not hesitate to request any further information which you would deem helpful.

Sincerely,

FREDERICK W. FORD,
Chairman.

APPENDIX

Communications Act of 1934, as amended (47 U.S.C. 151 et seq.):

"SEC. 364. The following forfeitures shall apply to this part, in addition to the penalties and forfeitures provided by title V of this Act:

"(a) Any ship that leaves or attempts to leave any harbor or port of the United States in violation of the provisions of this part, or the rules and regulations of the Commission made in pursuance thereof, or any ship of the United States that is navigated outside of any harbor or port in violation of any of the provisions of this part, or the rules and regulations of the Commission made in pursuance thereof, shall forfeit to the United States the sum of $500, recoverable by way of suit or libel. Each such departure or attempted departure, and in the case of a ship of the United States each day during which such navigation occurs shall constitute a separate offense.

"(b) Every willful failure on the part of the master of a ship of the United States to enforce or to comply with the provisions of this Act or the rules and regulations of the Commission as to equipment, operators, watches, or radio service shall cause him to forfeit to the United States the sum of $100.

"SEC. 386. The following forfeitures shall apply to this part in addition to penalties and forfeitures provided by title V of this Act:

"(a) Any vessel of the United States that is navigated in violation of the provisions of this part or of the rules and regulations of the Commission made in pursuance thereof shall forfeit to the United States the sum of $500 recoverable by way of suit or libel. Each day during which such navigation occurs shall constitute a separate offense.

"(b) Every willful failure on the part of the master of a vessel of the United States to enforce or to comply with the provisions of this part or the rules and regulations of the Commission made in pursuance thereof shall cause him to forfeit to the United States the sum of $100.

"SEC. 507. (a) Any vessel of the United States that is navigated in violation of the provisions of the Great Lakes Agreement or the rules and regulations of the Commission made in pursuance thereof and any vessel of a foreign country that is so navigated on waters under the jurisdiction of the United States shall forfeit to the United States the sum of $500 recoverable by way of suit or libel. Each day during which such navigation occurs shall constitute a separate offense.

"(b) Every willful failure on the part of the master of a vessel of the United States to enforce or to comply with the provisions of the Great Lakes Agreement or the rules and regulations of the Commission made in pursuance thereof shall cause him to forfeit to the United States the sum of $100."

FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY,
OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR,
Washington, D.C., July 15, 1960.

Hon. OREN HARRIS,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Reference is made to your letter dated July 1, 1960, in which you inquired as to the authority of the Federal Aviation Agency to impose forfeitures for violations of laws and regulations applicable to the Agency's operations. You also requested information as to the procedures used for imposing any such forfeitures, as well as the rights of persons to appeal forfeiture actions to the courts.

Under section 901 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (49 USC 1471), persons who violate specified titles of the act, or any rule, regulation, or order issued thereunder are subject to a civil penalty not to exceed $1,000 for each violation, and the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency is authorized to compromise any such civil penalty. The section further provides that:

"(b) In case an aircraft is involved in such violation and the violation is by the owner or person in command of the aircraft, such aircraft shall be subject to lien for the penalty."

The procedure for collection of civil penalties which are not voluntarily compromised by the violator and the Administrator is contained in section 903(b), which provides:

"(b)(1) Any civil penalty imposed under this act may be collected by proceedings in personam against the person subject to the penalty and, in case the penalty is a lien, by proceedings in rem against the aircraft, or by either method alone. Such proceedings shall conform as nearly as may be to civil suits in admiralty, except that either party may demand trial by jury of any issue of fact, if the value in controversy exceeds $20, and the facts so tried shall not be reexamined other than in accordance with the rules of the common law. * * *

"(2) Any aircraft subject to such lien may be summarily seized by and placed in the custody of such persons as the Board or Administrator may by regulation prescribe, and a report of the cause shall thereupon be transmitted to the U.S. attorney for the judicial district in which the seizure is made. The U.S. attorney shall promptly institute proceedings for the enforcement of the lien or notify the Board or Administrator of his failure to so act.

"(3) The aircraft shall be released from such custody upon payment of the penalty or the amount agreed upon in compromise; or seizure in pursuance of process of any court in proceedings in rem for enforcement of the lien, or notification of the U.S. attorney of failure to institute such proceedings; or deposit of a bond in such amount and with such sureties as the Board or Administrator may prescribe, conditioned upon the payment of the penalty or the amount agreed upon in compromise.

"(4) The Supreme Court of the United States, and under its direction other courts of the United States, may prescribe rules regulating such proceedings in any particular not provided by law."

You will observe that these provisions do not authorize the Administrator to initiate seizure and forfeiture actions in the nature of those provided for in the customs and immigration laws. He is empowered only to compromise liability for a civil penalty or, if the violator declines to pay, to refer the matter to a U.S. attorney for collection through civil suit.

You also inquire as to the procedure followed by this Agency. Violations of the Federal Aviation Act or of the regulations thereunder are investigated by FAA inspectors. If, in a particular case, the inspector's report and supporting statements and other evidence show that a violation, in fact, occurred and that a civil penalty should be imposed, the Agency sends a certified letter to the alleged violator, advising him of the circumstances of the incident, the sections of the act or the regulations allegedly violated, and the amount we would be willing to accept as a compromise settlement of the penalty.

The alleged violator is advised of his right to (1) furnish additional information in defense or mitigation of the charges, (2) request an informal hearing at the Federal Aviation Agency, at which time he, or his counsel, will have an opportunity to discuss the charges and the amount of any acceptable compromise offer, (3) submit the suggested offer in compromise, or (4) refuse to make a compromise settlement.

If an alleged violator fails to submit satisfactory evidence in answer to the charges, or if he does not prefer to effect a compromise settlement, the matter is then referred to the appropriate U.S. attorney where a suit is instituted in U.S. district court to collect a civil penalty. The court will determine, after trial, whether a violation has occurred, as well as the amount of the civil penalty, if any, to be imposed.

Although the Administrator is authorized to summarily seize an aircraft subject to a lien for violations under the act, the lien is possessory only, and such action is initiated only in a situation where it would be difficult or impossible to collect the penalty in any other way. Then, as provided in section 903(b) of the act, the U.S. attorney must institute proceedings for enforcement of the lien, and the aircraft must be released from custody upon payment of the civil penalty, or the amount agreed upon in compromise, or for one of the other reasons specified in section 903(b)(3).

Please advise if I may be of any further assistance to you in this matter.

Sincerely,

E. R. QUESADA,
Administrator.

Finally, the Senate amendment provides that the fact of the issuance of a notice of apparent liability shall not be used in any other proceeding before the Commission to the prejudice of the person to whom such notice was issued, unless the forfeiture has been paid or a court of competent jurisdiction has ordered payment of such forfeiture and such order has become final.

In summary, the changes made by the Senate in the forfeiture section are entirely satisfactory and in most respects merely spell out in greater detail what the House language sought to express in more general language.

Those are the particulars in which the Senate modified these two sections of the bill.

Actually it boils down to this: First, the Senate knocked out completely the suspension provision and secondly, the Senate amended the forfeiture provisions in a number of respects.

The amendments relating to the forfeiture provision do not change that provision in any basic respect. Consequently, the only important change which we have here deals with the suspension provision, about which great concern was expressed by several Members on the floor of the House. I may say that adoption of the Senate amendments would bring this bill in line with what some Members wanted at the time when it was originally before the House.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. The gentleman will recall I participated in the debate in support of the amendments to liberalize this rather restrictive authority given to the Communications Commission.

Mr. HARRIS. Yes; I recall the gentleman's great interest in that change.

Mr. BAILEY. May I ask the gentleman from Arkansas if he considers this more liberal treatment than was in the House bill? The Senate has gone even further than we went in that direction. Is that true?

Mr. HARRIS. The Senate has imposed a ceiling on forfeitures which may be imposed and there would be no suspension now at all under the Senate amendments with which we are trying to concur here.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HARRIS. The Senate amended the forfeiture provision so that the Commission can deal with those who violate provisions included in the bill relating to deceptive practices or who violate section 317 (c) of the act. Even though the penalty of forfeiture is not nearly as severe as the penalty of suspension, I think it would reach the problem, and the licensees are put on notice that they must observe those provisions of the law and discharge the responsibilities that are imposed on them by these provisions, or else be subject to a civil penalty which may be imposed by the Commission.

Mr. BAILEY. In the event this penalty still imposed resulted in a court trial, we will say in the U.S. court, what is the status of the broadcasting station or radio station? Is it permitted to operate?

Mr. HARRIS. There would be no interference with the station at all. It could go on operating without interruption. The licensee on whom a forfeiture is imposed could come in and say, "We are not guilty." Then the Federal Communications Commission would have to go to court to collect the forfeiture and it would have to prove that there was a violation.

Mr. BAILEY. In other words, it is a fine and not a forfeiture?

Mr. HARRIS. It is referred to as a forfeiture, a civil penalty, and that is the usual way in which the FCC and the FAA enforce compliance with their laws and regulations.

Mr. BAILEY. But the station does not have to be closed down?

Mr. HARRIS. No; not at all.

If I may continue with my statement on the Senate amendments, when the Senate committee proposed to amend the forfeiture provision and before they reported the bill, we discovered that there would be what I referred to as a windfall for the licensees with reference to two of the provisions of the bill that we passed. I called this to the attention of the Members of the other body and explained what would happen if their proposal would be accepted. They understood the problem, and they agreed that the broadcasters should not escape certain responsibilities imposed on them by this bill, so that they could close their eyes or turn their backs on a deceptive programing and payola practices that were going on. When we called this to their attention, they agreed to include a specific provision to that effect in the forfeiture section. That in turn caused me to agree to ask the House to accept the action of the Senate.

This provision is referred to on pages 9 and 10 of the Senate report which was issued August 19, 1960.

I would like to quote these two brief sentences from that report:

> Your committee specifically authorizes the imposition of a forfeiture where there is a violation of the amendment herein provided as section 317(c) which concerns the responsibility of a licensee to make an announcement with reference to certain matters that are broadcast, as well as the amendment added as section 509(a)4 which concerns the responsibility of a licensee to prohibit deceptive practices in cases of contests of intellectual knowledge, intellectual skill or chance.

In other words, the forfeiture provision will reach those provisions of the bill which resulted from our investigation over the last 3 years namely the provisions relating to payola and deceptive programs.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HIESTAND. Without any intention, Mr. Speaker, of objecting to the bill, I would like to ask the chairman a couple of questions having to do with making the record clear so far as the intent of the committee and the Congress is concerned. The first question is:

Theatrical motion pictures and television motion picture producers have arrangements with manufacturers with respect to the use of their product for motion picture production purposes. Some contracts have been in existence for many years; others are of more recent origin. Would the following type of arrangement be in violation of the proposed legislation and thus require the prescribed notice at the risk of incurring the $10,000 and/or 1-year imprisonment penalty?

For example, an automobile manufacturer has a written agreement with a motion picture producer whereby the automobile manufacturer will make available to the producer 10 motor vehicles of various kinds for its general use. The producer makes no payment for these automobiles which are returned annually and replaced with new automobiles, but does agree that when automobiles are needed for photographic purposes in conection with any theatrical or television motion picture, it will photograph automobiles manufactured by this automobile manufacturer, but without any attempt to emphasize or even necessarily show the brand name in connection with such usage.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman from California has been kind enough to submit these questions to me, and I have had an opportunity to examine and analyze them.

The question raised by the gentleman from California [Mr. HIESTAND] can be answered rather specifically, I think, by referring to the report of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee—Report No. 1800, which accompanied the bill S. 1898.

In this report we set forth a number of specific examples in order to clarify the meaning of the general language contained in section 317 of this bill. Let me refer the gentleman to example No. 17 on page 22 of the report which reads as follows:

> An automobile manufacturer furnishes his identifiable current model car for use in a mystery program, and it is used by a detective to chase a villian. No anouncement is required. If it is understood, however, that the producer may keep the car for his personal use, an announcement would be required. Similarly, an announcement would be required if the car is loaned in exchange for a mention on the program beyond that reasonably related to its use, such as the villian saying: "If you hadn't had that speedy Chrysler, you never would have caught me."

It appears from the gentleman's question that the motor vehicles were made available to the producer for general use and not solely for use on the set in connection with the production of a motion picture. Under these circumstances an announcement would be required pursuant to section 317 and therefore the film producer would be required to furnish the necessary information to the network or broadcast licensee for whom the film is being produced.

Mr. HIESTAND. The second question is:

In addition to the arrangements of the nature illustrated by the foregoing example, there are other situations which permit a producer to put more value into its programs at no additional cost to the sponsor.

For example, a producer of motion pictures for theater and television may have a contract with a network providing that the producer will supply a series of television programs for a stated dollar cost. Among other terms of the agreement, the producer has the right to include a 30-second trailer—a preview of coming attractions—relating to a current theatrical release of the producer, and an announcement that such theatrical motion picture may soon be seen at the viewer's neighborhood theater.

Would such a provision in the contract have to be acknowledged at the close of each broadcast?

Mr. HARRIS. It is my considered opinion, with reference to that question,

that no special announcement will be required, since the content of the trailer itself would indicate that this is in the nature of a paid commercial.

In other words, it seems to me that section 317 does not require a special announcement to be made in those cases where it is clear from the matter broadcast itself that payment is ordinarily made for the broadcasting of such matter.

If Goodrich or Firestone, for example, buy a spot commercial for their tires, no announcement need to be made to the effect that Goodrich or Firestone have paid for these commercials. That is inherent in the commercial itself and it is the same with regard to an announcement that a certain film can be seen in the neighborhood theaters. The fact that it has been produced by the same producer who produced the film shown on television makes no difference, in my opinion.

I hope that these explanations will help to clear up the questions propounded by the gentleman from California.

Let me say, in addition, that Senator PASTORE, chairman of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, has addressed a letter to the Federal Communications Commission and has been assured by the Commission that it would, in the near future, arrange informal conferences with interested parties to discuss what is a reasonable approach to the implementation of this bill. I have every confidence that the FCC is going to proceed with these conferences prior to issuing rules and regulations under this bill and many, if not most, of these problems will be worked out.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Referring to section 312, is the language in parts 3 and 4 identical with the language which the House acted on when the bill was before the House originally?

Mr. HARRIS. What does that deal with?

Mr. JENSEN. That deals with willful and repeated violations.

Mr. HARRIS. As I have explained, we would amend it if the House concurs in the Senate amendments.

Mr. JENSEN. You feel that is an improvement over what the House agreed to?

Mr. HARRIS. I think it is more acceptable to the broadcasters.

Mr. JENSEN. It will protect the small broadcasters?

Mr. HARRIS. I think it will amply do so.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has again expired.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I opposed this bill when it was last before this body because I considered it woefully inadequate to remedy the abuses which were uncovered during the course of our hearings. Moreover, and perhaps more important, the bill places responsibility upon, and imposes sanctions against, the one who needs it the least, the individual station licensee. For practical purposes the networks of the country originate, produce and control the major part of all radio and television programing. The individual station licensee for the most part passes on to the viewing and listening public what is handed to him by the networks. Thus, while the networks virtually control the radio and television business and are broadcasters in every sense of the word, there is no provision in this bill or in present law which places any responsibility on them to operate in the public interest. The individual station owner is licensed and regulated. The big networks who hand the station licensee his programs remain free of any regulation or any legal obligation to operate in the public interest.

Mr. Speaker, we could have produced an effective, meaningful piece of legislation. The record of our committee contains more testimony and more evidence on the subject of network regulation than on any of the other matters covered in this bill. Regulation or licensing of the networks has been recommended by the Attorney General of the United States, the Federal Communications Commission and by our own Legislative Oversight Subcommittee. On the basis of the record before us it is a real sham and delusion to be legislating additional penalties against innocent individual station licensees while letting the real violators—the networks—go scot free. I am sure the American public will recognize this bill for what it is—a smoke screen to penalize the little fellow and let the big fellow get away.

Mr. Speaker, so that all the Members of the House might know what our committee record reveals, last month I requested the chief counsel of the Oversight Committee to prepare a memorandum setting forth in detail the evidence from the record and the reasoning which prompted our committee membership to make this unanimous recommendation. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the aforementioned memorandum be inserted in the RECORD immediately following my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The memorandum follows:

JULY 28, 1960.

To: Chairman HARRIS.
From: Robert W. Lishman.
Subject: Reasons for interim report recommendation that television networks should be licensed by the FCC.

In response to the July 8, 1960, written request of Hon. JOHN BENNETT, Member of Congress, this memorandum summarizes some of the reasons for the recommendation in our interim report[1] that networks be licensed by the FCC.

As you know, the original draft of the report did not contain the recommendation. You will recall that, after discussing it with me, you directed several changes in and additions to the draft. One of the additions was the network licensing recommendation. That recommendation, appearing on pages 38–39 of the report, is as follows:

"3. A new section should be added to the act requiring that radio and television networks be licensed and be subject to the regulations of the Federal Communications Commission for a term of not to exceed 3 years, with provisions for renewals thereof. The license and renewal should be conditioned upon a determination by the FCC after a hearing of record that the issuance or renewal is in the public interest. The section should also provide guidelines as to what constitutes the public interest as used in this section. Included in such guidelines should be a requirement prohibiting the network (a) from furnishing deceptive material to any radio or television station; (b) surrendering control of material to be broadcast to an advertiser, advertising agency, producer, or any person other than a licensee; (c) using any broadcasting facility, directly or indirectly, in promoting the sale or distribution of the product or service of any company or person in which it has any direct or indirect financial or beneficial interest; and (d) entering into any contract which would limit the ability of any station licensee to fulfill its responsibility to operate in the public interest."

As was disclosed in the subcommittee's hearings on television quiz programs and as has been pointed out in several Congressional studies and reports, there is no way whereby a licensee (i.e., under existing law, a TV station) can determine whether deception has gone into the production of a network program at its source. Most network programs, whether produced by a network itself, or by outsiders, originate in New York, Chicago or Hollywood. Under existing network affiliation contracts providing for "option time," especially in prime (evening) viewing hours, the licensee broadcasts pretty much what the network sends him. While legally he may not abdicate his responsibility to broadcast in the public interest by pleading the existence of an oppressive network affiliation agreement, the fact is that he broadcasts what is transmitted to him and the FCC knows it.[2]

It is common knowledge that the network, through its superior bargaining power and the threat it holds over every licensee of withdrawing affiliation, can effectively insist that an affiliate broadcast a heavy diet of network-originated programs. And despite their bargaining disadvantage, most affiliates are quite content with this arrangement which relieves them of the effort and expense of originating their own programs and carries several additional benefits (e.g., with respect to selling time to national advertisers) of network affiliation. These circumstances may not be ideal from the standpoint of a lofty interpretation of the public interest requirements of the Communications Act, but the licensees are also businessmen with obligations to their shareholders. So long as commercial broadcasting is financed by advertising dollars and under primary control of private businessmen, it is only realistic to recognize the concern of the licensee for his stockholders. Proposals to change the present system of financing television (e.g., subscription television and a competing Federal or federally-subsidized network) have not yet found wide favor.

Except for a few independent stations in large urban markets, TV licensees have viewed network affiliation as practically essential for economic survival. This is primarily for two reasons; the enormous costs of TV (as opposed to radio) programing and transmission and the relative (to radio) scarcity of frequencies available for commercial broadcasting. Since there are some 447 commercial VHF stations now licensed and in operation and only 3 important TV networks, the fact that affiliation is economically necessary to most licensees gives the networks tremendous bargaining leverage vis-a-vis stations. Indeed, former Senator John W. Bricker has referred to the "unprecedented economic stranglehold" of

[1] H. Rept. No. 1258, 86th Cong., 2d sess., Feb. 9, 1960.

[2] Cf. testimony of W. Theodore Pierson, Esquire in App. A, attached hereto.

the two major networks (NBC and CBS) over their affiliates.[3] Licensees are understandably reluctant to reject network programs or to take any other action that might tempt the network to look elsewhere for a local outlet. And while a few licensees chafe under such dominance, as suggested above most of them are apparently satisfied.[4]

When television quiz programs were most popular, and networks, licensees, advertisers, producers, etc., were waxing rich at the expense of a deluded viewing public, there was little disposition to question whether all was what it seemed to be.[5] Indeed, if licensees, the only group accountable under existing law, had desired to question the propriety of quiz show production, they would have had little or no opportunity to prove their suspicions. The hearing record contains testimony that even the networks, which had supervisory personnel present at the quiz shows, did not believe the charges of "fixing" when told.[6] Its representatives accepted at face value the false assurances of the producers that rigging charges made against the producers of "21" were untrue. There is also evidence that in other instances the CBS network made little or no investigation to ascertain the validity of "rigging" charges.[7]

The staff drew from the quiz hearings the general conclusion that the existing law, placing sole responsibility on licensees and none on networks qua networks, places responsibility where power to discharge it is lacking. This conclusion is reinforced by the fact that some 80 percent of programs broadcast during the prime viewing hours originate with network organizations, over whom the licensee's theoretical legal control is illusory.[8]

The staff was influenced by the following statement of then Chairman Doerfer, of the FCC, in answer to a question by Representative ROGERS of Texas:

"MR. DOERFER. I wouldn't hesitate to give very serious consideration to a reversal of my opinion some time ago that network licensing would be a vain effort on the part of Congress because we could reach it through the licensee. With the developments, as you have indicated, I am inclined very much to consider very carefully the licensing of networks, indeed. * * * I think that where we cannot reach network practices through our power over the licensee, certainly it calls for the licensing of the network." [9]

We were similarly impressed with the suggestion of the Attorney General of the United States in his December 30, 1959, report to the President [10] contained in the following paragraph:

"First, as earlier explained, the networks, as such, are not regulated by the Federal Communications Commission. This is so even though the individual broadcasters rely upon the networks so heavily for matter broadcast, and the networks are ordinarily in a far better position than the individual licensee to select and control the presentation of that matter. Legislation could be enacted which would place direct regulatory authority over the networks in the FCC."

The FCC under existing law indirectly regulates networks in two ways. First, the major networks, NBC, CBS, and ABC, all own TV stations subject to FCC licenses. Secondly, the chain broadcasting rules promulgated in 1941, before the spread of commercial TV and still ill adapted to the newer medium, are used by the Commission to regulate certain aspects of the relations between networks and the licensees contractually affiliated with them.

The networks have contended repeatedly that these means are adequate to prevent network-originated competitive and programing evils. The question arises, then, what is to be gained by subjecting network organizations to direct regulation through licensing?

If offending program material (i.e., offending material not falling under the protection of section 326 of the Communications Act or under the first amendment to the Constitution) is transmitted from a network source and broadcast by network owned and affiliated stations, existing law logically requires that the same sanction be applied to every licensee broadcasting the material. As a practical matter, and as the history of FCC regulation indicates, such a logical approach would be unduly harsh. If the Commission decided instead to proceed against one or more network-owned stations, the network could plausibly argue that neither the statute nor regulations authorize such discriminatory enforcement action. The statute does not distinguish between licensees based on their ownership. Since it would be unduly Draconian to punish all licensees carrying an offending program, where they might have no effective means of detecting or preventing the offending matter, the practical result is that no one is subjected to FCC sanctions. To punish licensees for the dereliction of networks would be comparable to punishing a ventriloquist's dummy when his master puts bad words into his mouth. This anomalous situation is clearly a threat to the regulation of broadcasting in the public interest. That regulation cannot be effective until it extends to the source of supply rather than merely to conduits was implicit in H.R. 5042, introduced by Congressman BENNETT on February 26, 1959 (86th Cong., 1st sess.).

One of the most persuasive arguments for direct network regulation is contained in the 1957 report of the network study staff of the FCC Network Study Committee (hereinafter Barrow report).[11] The foundation of the argument is the practical difficulty in enforcing the Commission's chain broadcasting rules, by which sanctions can be imposed on licensees only and not on networks qua networks. The existing chain broadcasting rules (some slight changes have been made since the Barrow report) prescribe certain restrictions on the terms of agreement between networks and their affiliates. These relate, among other things, to territorial exclusivity, term of affiliation, option time, the right to reject network programs, network ownership of stations, and control by networks of station advertising rates. Following an exhaustive review of the reasons for and against direct regulation,[12] the report concludes that "the Commission's rules and regulations relating to network-station relations should be applied both to stations and networks; those applying only to network conduct should be applied exclusively to networks." [13]

The following quotation from pages 619–620 of the Barrow report summarizes succinctly most of the Barrow staff's reasons for its recommendation of direct regulation:

"Rigid application of the sanctions under such rules to stations would result in the stations raising sufficiently strong objections to the network conduct to prevent its continuance. However, when the rule and sanction are applied to the injured party, the atmosphere is not conducive to the most effective enforcement. Some evidence of this is found in the Don Lee case. In that case the Commission disclaimed supervisory control over network organizations, yet recognized explicitly that the proven violations of the chain broadcasting rules which had occurred were primarily the result of network practices.

" 'The chain broadcasting regulations, * * * are designed to govern the conduct of the individual stations rather than the networks. Thus they provide that no license shall be issued to a station which violates any of the regulations. Where, however, a station has been induced to violate one or more of the regulations because of pressure or coercion from a network, it is the network which is primarily responsible for the violations of the regulations. For an individual station does not deal with a network as an equal, particularly when it is a small station.' (5 R. R. 1197–1198 (1950).

"It is unlikely that stations will have their licenses revoked, or have other substantial sanctions imposed, for submitting, in the interest of retaining a necessary network affiliation, to the domination of the networks in matters proscribed by the rules. In the Don Lee case, while it was found that almost every chain broadcasting rule relative to network-station relations had been violated, the licenses of the affiliates were not revoked because it was realized that the proscribed conduct by the station had been induced by the network. Since the rules did not apply to the network, there was no action which could be taken against the network unless the network were found unqualified to be a broadcast licensee. Such a determination logically would have required that the network surrender licenses to all its stations and this the Commission considered too harsh a penalty for the violation of the rules. The conduct in violation of the rules was discontinued following the investigation and Commission action in that case. Hence, it cannot be said that rules addressed to stations are necessarily ineffective in controlling network conduct. Nevertheless, enforcement would be more readily effected and sanctions more rigidly applied were the rules directed to the parties responsible for the proscribed conduct.

"The Commission's regulatory design has been to license broadcasting stations and to hold the licensee to the responsibility of

---

[3] The Network Monopoly, a report prepared by Senator Bricker for the use of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Apr. 30, 1956, p. 1 and passim.

[4] Cf. the testimony of the president of KTTV, Inc., with that of most licensee witnesses heard by the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in hearings, "Television Inquiry, Part IV—Network Practices," p. 1475 et seq. and passim.

[5] See the excerpts from testimony before the subcommittee quoted in H. Rept. 1258, sec. (V)(F), at pp. 32–35.

[6] See, e.g., testimony of Thomas E. Ervin, vice president and general attorney of NBC, tr., Oct. 7, 1959, p. 363 et seq. and passim.

[7] See testimony of Merton Koplin in app. C, attached hereto.

[8] See Barrow, "Network Broadcasting: The Report of the Network Study Staff," 22 L. Cont. Prob. 611 (1957) at 615. NBC and CBS basic affiliates' programing in these hours is over 90 percent network originated.

[9] Tr., Oct. 10, 1959, p. 84.

[10] Report to the President by the Attorney General on "Deceptive Practices in Broadcasting Media," Dec. 30, 1959, at p. 53.

[11] Printed as "Network Broadcasting," report of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Jan. 27, 1958.

[12] Barrow report, pp. 614–632, 653–654, 660–661. One objection to direct regulation discussed in the report was the possibility that FCC supervision of restrictive network affiliation practices would interfere with Justice Department antitrust enforcement. Cited as an instance of such possible friction was the NBC-Westinghouse station exchange approved by the FCC with respect to which the Justice Department brought a civil antitrust action in 1956. Barrow report, pp. 622–624. This objection, which the Barrow staff found wanting, has been rendered even weaker by the subsequent decision of the U.S. Supreme Court that FCC approval of a station transfer was no bar to Justice Department antitrust action. *U.S.* v. *RCA* (358 U.S. 334 (1959)).

[13] Barrow report, p. 631.

broadcasting in the public interest. As the industry developed, however, the decision-making power in providing programing for television has passed, to a great degree, from the hands of the station to those of the network, and to a lesser extent to the advertiser. An advertiser-supported national network system of broadcasting has been accepted as an integral part of the industry structure. The advertiser desires programing which is designed to attract an audience of buyers for the product. The network must produce or select programs which fulfill the need of the advertiser. Of course, the advertiser and network must take into account the viewing tastes of the desired national audience. However, in programing to a national audience for the purpose of advertising a product, the decisions are made not from the individual station viewpoint but from a national viewpoint. Thus, of necessity, the selection of programs offered over the network is made by the network, and the station licensee's function has been limited accordingly.

"Power and responsibility go hand in hand, not weakness and responsibility. Decisions are more responsible when those who make them are answerable to those affected by the decisions. The important service of television is programing. The group most directly affected by programing service is the viewing public. To establish appropriate responsibility of the networks to the people, the Commission's rules and regulations which are concerned with network activities in areas of importance to the public interest should be applied to the networks."

Of great interest in this connection is the following colloquy occurring during the testimony of a leading network spokesman, Dr. Frank Stanton of CBS, before the Antitrust Subcommittee of the House Committee on the Judiciary,[14] a part of which is quoted on pp. 626–627 of the Barrow report:

"The CHAIRMAN. The FCC adopted rules back in 1941 concerning radio chain broadcasting and those rules were approved by the Supreme Court, which said the FCC had the right to issue those rules. Presently the FCC regulates stations, is that correct?

"Mr. STANTON. Yes; that is correct.

"The CHAIRMAN. And the FCC does not regulate the networks?

"Mr. STANTON. Not directly, sir.

"The CHAIRMAN. They only do it by virtue of their regulation of the stations?

"Mr. STANTON. That is correct.

"The CHAIRMAN. In other words there is indirect regulation by virtue of Commission jurisdiction over stations, but there is no direct regulatory jurisdiction over networks?

"Mr. STANTON. As I understand it, that is a correct statement of the situation.

"The CHAIRMAN. Now, I would like to ask you this, and you do not have to answer if you do not wish: Would you be averse to having the Federal Communications Commission regulate directly in the way that they now regulate indirectly; that is, have direct regulatory jurisdiction over the networks?

"Mr. STANTON. I think, Mr. Chairman, that it would make sense if that were what the regulation was intended to accomplish. So as not to look as if I am on both sides of the issue, I have opposed network regulation when it was nonspecified, because I feared program control and certain other features that might be introduced into such regulation, but if you are asking me, as I understood your question, would I prefer to have what I have now got, directly as against indirectly, my answer is in the affirmative.

"The CHAIRMAN. In other words, you would rather see direct regulation concerning what you have not got rather than indirect regulation?

"Mr. STANTON. Yes; I think it is a less complicated way to live, because we get our regulation now only as it affects our affiliates and our company-owned stations, whereas if the same regulations were applied directly to us, I think it would be a more businesslike and systematic way to handle the situation. But it is the blank check kind of regulation that troubles me, and that is the reason I opposed it.

"The CHAIRMAN. Now, just one more question: If it is found by the Federal Communications Commission that they just cannot change their regulations to conform to what you desire, you would not be averse to changing the statute to give them the power?

"Mr. STANTON. No.

"Mr. KEATING. You had better talk that over with the lawyers first.

"Mr. STANTON. I wanted to say just that, Mr. KEATING, but if you look through to the end of what the net result is, I think it is better to have the regulations direct than to have them indirect, and I stand by that.

"The CHAIRMAN. Well, I think it is a natural inference to state that if the Federal Communications cannot do that, but needs changes in the statute, it would seem advisable to make the changes to give them the power."

The staff was at the time of preparation of the recommendations contained in the subcommittee's interim report [15] also engaged in preparation for the hearings into "Payola and Related Deceptive Methods in the Broadcast Field," which were held in February, April, and May 1960, after issuance of the report. Information in the files indicated that broadcasters, and conspicuously the major network organizations, made frequent use of their broadcast facilities to promote commercially the sale of articles in which they, or persons or corporations affiliated with them, had a financial interest.[16] It has long been well known that each of the major network organizations is affiliated with phonograph record manufacturing and music publishing enterprises.[17] In addition, RCA, parent corporation of NBC network, and CBS, of which CBS radio and television networks are divisions, manufacture broadcast receiving sets and other equipment. ABC network, a division of American Broadcasting-Paramount Theatres, Inc., is associated with the Paramount motion picture theater chain. There is evidence in the subcommittee files and in executive session testimony that ABC employees have been pressured to book some of their outside activities in Paramount theaters.[18]

There is need for a thorough study into the effects on competition of broadcasters who use their publicly licensed facilities to promote the sale of goods and services in which they are directly or indirectly interested. Are nonbroadcaster equipment and appliance manufacturers afforded access to broadcast advertising time on the same terms as those affiliated with broadcasters? To what extent are independent songwriters, music publishers, record manufacturers, etc., at a competitive disadvantage unless they meet terms imposed by broadcasters? What are the competitive and overall implications for the public interest of the widespread ownership of broadcast facilities by the increasingly concentrated newspaper and magazine publishing industries?[19] And would the public policy against restrictive practices through patent control be more readily effected in the broadcasting equipment industry through direct FCC control over networks affiliated with such patentholders? [20]

APPENDIX A

On November 16, 1959, the FCC issued a general invitation to organizations and persons to appear and present views at public hearings on various matters relating to the field of radio and television network broadcasting. Thereafter, extended hearings were held, commencing December 7, 1959, and terminating February 1, 1960. In the course of these hearings, several witnesses testified to the need for network licensing. For example, at the hearing on December 11, 1959, Theodore Peterson, dean of the College of Journalism and Communications at the University of Illinois, stated:

"In any medium, responsibility for content must be clearly fixed somewhere. In the broadcast media, the legal responsibility for programing seems to me fixed at the weakest possible place for maintaining high standards—the local station. The average network affiliate produces fewer than 10 percent of the programs it carries, I understand; local stations depend greatly on the networks not only for their programs, but also for their economic survival. As the Barrow report on the network broadcasting put it: '* * * network practices have, to some extent, restricted the programing responsibility of the station licensee and limited the licensee's opportunities to program according to the specific needs of his local community. They have also curtailed the availability of alternative program sources to the station and thus to the public which it serves.'

"True, the networks are to some degree accountable to the Commission through the stations for which they hold licenses. But this to me seems a devious and unsatisfactory way for the Commission to exert its influence. Indeed, even Frank Stanton of CBS in testimony in 1956 said that he thought the direct application of existing regulations * * * to networks rather than their indirect application through company-owned stations would represent 'a less complicated way to live.'

"I am quite aware, of course, of some of the problems, legal and otherwise, involved in extending the Commission's authority over networks. I am quite aware, too, of the special nature of networks: that they exist essentially as dealers in services, that they technically do no broadcasting of their own, except through their company-owned stations.

"Yet I think that network regulation is important enough to demand serious study and consideration by the Commission and by Congress. One possible approach might be to give legal recognition to the important and unique part which the networks play in broadcasting operations and to license them under standards of performance similar to those asked of individual stations." ("Study of Radio and Television Network Broadcasting," FCC Docket No. 12782, vol. 4, pp. 841–3.)

Peterson viewed network licensing as a means of more readily holding the networks

[14] "Monopoly Problems in Regulated Industries," pt. 2, vol. 3, Television, hearings before the Antitrust Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, 84th Cong., 2d sess. (1956), pp. 5029–5030 (hereinafter cited as "Celler hearings").

[15] Note 1, supra.

[16] See appendix B below.

[17] See, e.g., "Songplugging and the Airwaves: A Functional Outline of the Popular Music Business," staff study for the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House of Representatives, 86th Cong., 2d sess., May 1960, pp. 10–13; "Amendment to Communications Act of 1934," hearings before the Subcommittee on Communications of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, U.S. Senate, 85th Cong., 2d sess., on S. 2834 (1958), passim; and two Celler hearings, n. 13 supra, pp. 4141–4491, passim.

[18] See appendix B below.

[19] For a discussion of this latter question and particularly of the vacillating application of diversification criteria in licensing by the FCC, see comment, "Diversification and the Public Interest: Administrative Responsibility of the FCC," 66 Yale Law Journal 365 (1957).

[20] See app. D, attached hereto.

"to standards of broadcasting in the public interest," particularly as to the enforcement of a requirement that the networks devote a portion of prime time to "public service broadcasting" (pp. 853–4). Such a requirement, in his opinion, would not constitute censorship (p. 854).

If networks were licensed, they would be compelled to assume direct responsibility for the content of programs originating with them. Certain witnesses appearing before the FCC in the course of its public hearings recommended the exercise of greater control by the networks. For example, one witness stated:

"Implicit in the license * * * is the assumption * * * that the licensee will operate responsibly and in the public interest and welfare, with honesty, integrity, and acceptable moral purpose.

* * * * *

"It is the licensee who promises to retain control over programs when he accepts the license, and it is the licensee who ultimately must assume responsibility for what is done all the way down the line. * * *

"Now this is the theory. In practice, however, the sponsor and his advertising counsel may—and I assume sometimes does—exercise a high degree of responsibility and authority for program content.

"This results in a dispersal of responsibility from network or station * * * to producer, to advertising agency, to sponsor. This division of responsibility may well be responsible for some of the current problems in broadcasting." (Steiner, vol. 1, p. 51–52.)

W. Theodore Pierson, a member of the law firm of Pierson, Ball & Doud, Washington, whose well-considered testimony was stated to represent in substance the views of 10 station licensees whom he represents, urged that "the fiction of licensee responsibility for choice and selection of network programs * * * be eliminated by permitting stations to transfer that responsibility to any network that is licensed as such by the Commission" (vol. 14, p. 2706).

His lengthy opening statement surveyed the problem of program content, highlighting the difficulties, both legal and practical, which would be encountered if the Commission itself were to exercise greater control over programing. It concludes with the following observations:

"We believe that no legislation should be sought by the Commission to give it authority to dictate broadcast programing in any degree, because of its doubtful constitutionality and because it would impose a new system of broadcasting which could not possibly be as effective as the present system in meeting the demands of the public.

* * * * * *

"With respect to quiz rigging and payola, we are unaware that any licensee has been found to have been responsible for such conduct, but in any event, program regulation is not necessary to eliminate such evils. If any licensee did commit fraud and deceit similar to that involved in some of the quiz shows, it would raise a serious question as to his licensee qualifications. * * * Likewise a licensee who knowingly indulged the payola schemes. * * * Legislation making the receipt of payola by a station employee a crime might be helpful in the station's attempt to regulate its own shop. * * *

"There is a failure under the present system to merge the legal and practicable responsibility for the programs that are broadcast. While under the law the licensee has the nondelegable duty to choose and select his programs, he cannot as a practical matter, with respect to network programs, perform any real and substantial function in this connection. If we are to have network sales and programing, this responsibility of the licensee to choose and select programs must primarily remain a legal fiction and a virtual practical impossibility. * * * The indulgence of any fiction cannot help but spread its mockery to other areas of the law, with the result that responsibility tends to break down all along the line. We believe it essential, in order that broadcasting can expand its facilities to meet the ever-increasing public demand for service, that it have the practical means of competing in the national market for national advertising and of distributing program material countrywide to a large group of markets. To function effectively in competition with other media * * * there must be efficient means of clearing time for advertisers and programs by a central source.

"Under the present rules of the Commission a station may not grant rights of clearance to a network but can only give the network what has loosely been called option time, but which is not in reality an option. Clumsy procedures are required under the rules before the network can determine whether a package of markets that an advertiser wants to buy can be supplied. These procedures were imposed by the Commission on the grounds that the act placed the responsibility for choosing and selecting programs upon the licensee and this duty and responsibility was not delegable by contract to any other person, including a network. This interpretation of the act was upheld by the Supreme Court.

"We believe the Commission should recommend legislation that would permit a licensee to grant absolute rights of clearance for a portion of his time to any network organization that itself was licensed as a network by the Commission and that the Commission should be given the same licensing and regulatory authority and powers over the network that it now has over individual licensees. It would then be possible for a station, if it so desired, to transfer to the network the responsibility for programing a certain portion of its broadcast day under such conditions as the station might wish to impose. This would enable stations and the networks to establish a far more efficient system of time and program clearance. It would remove once and for all the fiction that a licensee can in reality choose and select the programs that he receives from the network. It would fix legal responsibility for network and nonnetwork programs in the hands of the ones who could practically and realistically control them" (Pierson, vol. 14, pp. 2732–2735).

In the course of interrogation by the Commissioners, the witness supplemented the foregoing statement as follows:

"Commissioner FORD. * * * I am afraid that what this proposal you have here might do, or might lead to, ultimately, would be an abdication to three men in the United States of the program fare throughout the country.

"Mr. PIERSON. Well, to no greater extent does it need to than it does now. Because as a practical matter, this is true now. The Commission, however, has limited the time, in its rules, that can be delegated to a network, and it has done this on the basis of avoiding concentration of controls, and it has been upheld by the Supreme Court as not involving any violation of censorship." (Pierson, vol. 14, p. 2790.)

APPENDIX B

The subcommittee's interim report, dated February 9, 1960, recommends that the proposed legislation providing for network licensing set forth particular factors to be considered by the Commission in determining whether the issuance or renewal of the license to the applicant-network meets the standard of public interest. These four factors or guidelines included a requirement prohibiting the network from "using any broadcasting facility, directly or indirectly, in promoting the sale or distribution of the product or service of any company or person in which it has any direct or indirect financial or beneficial interest."

At the time the subcommittee's interim report was written, its files contained material indicating that certain networks had used their facilities in promoting the sale of products of companies in which the networks had financial interests. In the course of the subcommittee's payola hearings following the publication of the report, testimony was developed which supported these allegations.

For example, the network facilities of American Broadcasting-Paramount Theaters Inc., were used to promote sales of a record-carrying case which was specifically endorsed by Dick Clark and plugged in various ways on the "Dick Clark Show," and "American Bandstand." Although there is doubt as to the actual amount, if any, received by the network, the financial arrangement between the company which manufactured the product (in which company Dick Clark has a financial interest) and the network contemplated apparently the distribution to the network of one-third of any royalties paid on sales of the record cases. ("Payola" and Related Deceptive Methods in the Broadcast Field, 1960, Tr. 2070.)

Although Mr. Leonard Goldenson, president of ABC-Paramount, denied that the network ever condoned the free plugs of the product over the air, he pointed out that royalty agreements between networks and manufacturers of products (such products being identified in some way with a television personality) are common throughout the television industry:

"This was a merchandising thing under which the Dick Clark name and face, as a subsidiary right, had been made by WFIL with whatever the company is that had this carrying case. And this is common in the business, to have licensing of subsidiary rights of a personality, which helps to merchandise that personality and get him known in different areas." (Tr. p. 2069.)

ABC-Paramount has similar royalty contracts with other manufacturers. Mr. Goldenson cited one specific example:

"Well, there would be a contract, let us say, Rifleman, a program. It may be the sponsors have as a result of the show, they have plastic guns made up in the form of a rifle. Now those are given out in, say, stores as premiums throughout the United States.

"We, together with the talent and the producer of the show may get a royalty for licensing that gun that was created out of that show." (Tr. p. 2085.)

Although the witness contended that the revenue derived by the network in the form of royalties from the sale of the carrying cases, plastic rifles, etc., are nominal, he frankly stated that such "merchandising tieups" were obtained in order to "better get the American public acquainted with the show." (Tr. p. 2087.) The ultimate pecuniary benefit to the network resulting therefrom is obvious.

There are also products in which the network has a direct financial interest, by way of a stock interest in the company which manufactures the product. ABC-Paramount owns 35 percent of Disneyland, a unique type of amusement park located near Los Angeles. A television program produced by Walt Disney originates from Disneyland and is carried over the ABC network. Although the primary purpose of the show is not to "merchandise" Disneyland as such (but rather some sponsor's product), that is surely one of the incidental effects:

"Mr. BENNETT. Are you trying to sell Disneyland?

"Mr. GOLDENSON. It is not being done. The program is emanating from it but actually Disneyland is in a sense being sold when the program is emanating from there." (Tr. p. 2074.)

The temptation to use the broadcast facility improperly by the network for the purpose of promoting the product, whatever its

nature, is obvious. Were a more searching investigation made in this area, frequent and widespread abuses, resulting from the application of subtle but nevertheless coercive means, would undoubtedly be revealed. For instance, Mr. Alan Freed, formerly an employee of ABC-Paramount, testified in executive session before this subcommittee regarding his activities as a network diskjockey. This testimony has not been publicly released. However, Mr. Goldenson, who apparently had learned of a certain charge made by Mr. Freed in the course of his testimony, undertook to refute Mr. Freed's testimony on that point, and in doing so revealed its substance:

"If I may disgress for a minute * * * it has come to my attention that Mr. Freed advised this committee in executive session that Mr. Mortimer Weinbach, vice president and general counsel of the American Broadcasting Division, stated to Mr. Freed at the time—Mr. Freed was about to sign his contract with ABC dated May 20, 1958—that 'I trust you will be sure to play heavily on ABC-Paramount records now that you are in the family; and I also trust that you would play nothing but Paramount theaters with your station show.' * * * Mr. Weinbach has assured me that Mr. Freed's statement is completely untrue." (Tr. pp. 2021–2022.)

The injury to the public interest inherent in ownership by diskjockeys of recording companies and the like also exists with respect to ownership by networks of such and other facilities. Network licensing and regulation will provide a statutory means of curbing network broadcasting which enhances profits from their outside commercial ventures without public disclosure of the existence of their interest in such ventures. The principle that diskjockeys should not be allowed to exploit the airwaves for their own hidden profit applies with equal directness to the same type of exploitation by the networks.

APPENDIX C

In the course of the subcommittee's quiz show hearings, considerable testimony was developed which clearly indicates the lethargic attitude of the networks toward the exercise of control and assumption of any direct responsibility for the material broadcast over their facilities.

Mr. Merton Koplin, producer of the quiz shows, "$64,000 Challenge" (CBS), "$64,000 Question" (CBS), and associate producer, for a time, of "The Big Surprise" (NBC), gave some illuminating testimony regarding the methods by which the outcome of such contests was arranged by the producers of these shows. The inertia displayed by network officials, even in the face of news accounts clearly indicating the use of deceptive practices, can reasonably be interpreted as an acceptance on their part that the networks' role be reduced to that of a cipher, a mere conduit through which program matter moves on its way to the viewer. For example:

"Mr. GOODWIN. Prior to these incidents which were the first ones which received public attention where a contestant made a complaint, in the years of production of the Question and the Challenge, did any representative of the Columbia Broadcasting System ever ask you in any fashion whether the shows * * * were controlled?

"Mr. KOPLIN. No, sir.

"Mr. GOODWIN. Did any representative of the National Broadcasting Company ever, throughout the life of the show, 'The Big Surprise,' ask you whether or not that show was a controlled show?

"Mr. KOPLIN. No, sir.

* * * * *

"Mr. GOODWIN. * * * in April, 1957, * * * an article entitled 'The $60 Million Question', in Time magazine * * * charged that people appearing on shows had been guaranteed money * * * that producers of shows were using techniques in order to make contestants continue in order to raise ratings, that a contestant on 'The Big Surprise' admitted publicly in Time magazine that on some of the questions he answered during his screening interviews they turned up on the show itself, that the article concluded, a 4-page article, by saying that the producers seem to be able to control everything except their own fears of losing an audience.

* * * * *

"To your knowledge, during 1957, was any member of your organization approached and asked if the shows were controlled?

"Mr. KOPLIN. Not to my knowledge.

"Mr. GOODWIN. Have you discussed this matter with Mr. Carlin, who was the head and executive producer of Entertainment Productions, Incorporated? * * * Has he stated if anyone ever approached him and asked if the shows were controlled?

"Mr. KOPLIN. He stated that no one has.

* * * * *

"Mr. GOODWIN. In light of the fact of * * * these national publications, of charges which show control, and in light of the fact that at least within your experience and the experience of your organization, one of the largest producers of quiz shows, no inquiries were ever made, would you consider it a fair statement to say that at least the eyes of the television industry were closed to this mass deception of the American public?

* * * * *

"Mr. KOPLIN. No one seemed to care.

* * * * *

"Mr. GOODWIN. * * * Would it be fair to say that the most charitable thing that can be said is that the television industry closed its eyes to this deception? * * *

"Mr. KOPLIN. I think they accepted it as a natural part of show business." ("Television Quiz Show Programs," 1959, Tr. 241–246).

APPENDIX D

During the subcommittee's 1958 hearings, a great volume of testimony and other evidence was presented relating to the technical standards of the FCC which pertain to the manufacture and sale of transmitters and receivers for FM and TV broadcast stations. The issue which principally concerned the subcommittee was whether these standards are conducive, because of their lack of flexibility, to the establishment and continuation of patent monopolies. "The problem of formulating technical standards so as to avoid tying the standards to patents owned or controlled by a single manufacturer has long been recognized." ("Investigation of Regulatory Commissions and Agencies," 1958, pt. 7, p. 2426.)

A distinct but closely related issue before the subcommittee was whether, and in what circumstances, the Commission ought to revoke or refuse to license anyone whose conduct, in respect to patents, is considered by the Commission to have violated the antitrust laws.

Section 313 of the Communications Act, as amended, provides that the antitrust laws apply to the "manufacture and sale of and to trade in radio apparatus and devices entering into or affecting" interstate and foreign communications. The section also provides that a court may, in cases where "any licensee" is "found guilty of the violation of the provisions of such laws," not only impose appropriate penalties under the antitrust laws, but also revoke the license of such licensee. Section 311, a companion provision, expressly directs the Commission to refuse a station license or construction permit to any person (or to persons directly or indirectly controlled by such persons) whose license has been revoked by a court pursuant to section 313. (Pt. 7, p. 2832.) However, the Supreme Court has held that the FCC's authority is not limited merely to instances where there has been a prior judicial determination of the existence of an antitrust violation. In the Chain rules case, *National Broadcasting Co., et al. v. United States*, 319 U.S. 190 (1943), the Supreme Court declared that the Commission is under a duty to challenge the qualifications of an existing licensee, or any applicant for a license, to operate the station in the public interest when the licensee or applicant can exercise monopolistic patent control as to broadcasting equipment, even though such licensee or applicant has not been adjudged guilty by a Federal court of violating the Sherman or Clayton Act. (Id., pt. 7, p. 2796.) The Court said, 319 U.S. at pp. 222–223:

"That the Commission may refuse to grant to persons adjudged guilty in a court of law of conduct in violation of the antitrust laws certainly does not render irrelevant consideration by the Commission of the effect of such conduct upon the public interest, convenience, or necessity. A licensee charged with practices in contravention of this standard cannot continue to hold his license merely because his conduct is also in violation of the antitrust laws and he has not been proceeded against and convicted. By clarifying in S. 311 the scope of the Commission's authority in dealing with persons convicted of violating the antitrust laws, Congress can hardly be deemed to have limited the concept of public interest so as to exclude all considerations relating to monopoly and unreasonable restraints upon commerce. Nothing in the provisions or history of the acts lends support to the inference that the Commission was denied the power to refuse a license to a station not operating in the public interest merely because its misconduct happened to be an unconvicted violation of the antitrust laws." (Id., pt. 7, p. 2796.)

Hence, the Commission need not wait until a violation of law is found to exist by some other forum prior to taking action looking toward the challenging of the licensee's qualifications to use his license in the public interest. But, as noted by the Supreme Court in the NBC case, it is not the Commission's function to apply the antitrust laws, as such. (Id., pt. 7, pp. 2832–2833.)

A memorandum prepared by William H. Bauer in the course of his duties as patent adviser to the FCC contains the following summary of Commission policy regarding information which indicates antitrust violations by a broadcast licensee:

"The Commission will refer to the Department of Justice facts evidenced by its records which it believes show a violation of one or more antitrust laws for appropriate action, and if the 'person' or 'persons' involved are licensees or applicants for licenses the Commission will consider the facts in a separate proceeding, to determine whether said 'person' or 'persons' are qualified to operate a broadcast station in the public interest or do both." (Id., pt. 7, p. 2538.)[1]

Notwithstanding the powers of the Commission outlined above, it has in practice, apparently, followed in this connection what

---

[1] The "Commission Report on Uniform Policy as to Violation by Applicants of Laws of United States" (1950) contains the following statement:

"As hereinabove pointed out, the Commission has the authority to examine pertinent aspects of the past history of an applicant and this history, of course, includes any violation of Federal law. Even though no suit alleging illegal conduct has been filed, or if one has been filed but has not been adjudicated, the Commission may consider and evaluate the conduct of an applicant insofar as it may relate to matters intrusted to the Commission." (Id., pt. 7, p. 2832.)

might be described as a hands-off policy. In 1951 the Commission, upon the advice of its patent adviser, recommended to the Department of Justice that antitrust proceedings be instituted against RCA and NBC, but reserved to itself consideration of the issue whether revocation of NBC's licenses should be sought. In 1954 the Department of Justice filed its antitrust action against RCA and NBC, naming the Bell System, General Electric, and Westinghouse as coconspirators, but its complaint, in accordance with the Commission's reservation, did not seek revocation of NBC licenses (id., pt. 7, p. 2639). However, in 1952 the Commission voted against challenging several NBC license renewals on the ground of patent misuse, despite memorandums of the patent staff calling attention to the Commission's policy (set forth in a 1949 letter report to the chairman of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee) which was based on the 1943 opinion of the Supreme Court in the *NBC* (chain rules) case (id., pt. 7, pp. 2614, 2722).

The opposing position of the Commission (or at least its General Counsel) and the patent adviser is illustrated by 1956 memorandums of the latter in which he took the position that (under the principle of the chain rules case) the Commission was charged with a nondiscretionary duty to challenge the qualifications of a licensee in the public interest, whereas the former took the position that this duty was discretionary, pending a court determination of the existence of a patent misuse (id., pt. 7, p. 2642).

Ex-Commissioner Doerfer testified that he was not aware of any instance where the FCC had challenged a license's renewal because of the licensee's participation in a patent misuse (id., pt. 7, p. 2819).

POWER OF FCC TO REVOKE LICENSE OF SUBSIDIARY COMPANY

Where a radio and television network organization operates the manufacturing and broadcasting phases of its business as merely separate divisions of one large company, the construction permits and licenses for stations which it has been granted by the Commission, together with its patents, are all held by the same entity. The company is the licensee. As licensee, in the event it engages in any monopolistic patent practice, it is subject to challenge by the FCC that it is not fit to operate its broadcasting activity in the public interest, in accordance with the views expressed by the Supreme Court in the NBC chain rules case.

On the other hand, where the broadcasting and manufacturing phases of the business are carried on by separate corporate entities, the various station licenses and construction permits are issued to the broadcasting company, i.e., the network; the manufacturing company is not the licensee as such. The broadcasting company is a wholly owned subsidiary of the manufacturing company (as in the case of NBC and RCA). In this situation, can the licensee (the network subsidiary) be challenged because of alleged improper patent practices of the manufacturing parent?

Some consideration of this question was given in the course of the subcommittee's 1958 hearings. The FCC's former patent adviser, William H. Bauer, stated in a memorandum dated October 24, 1952, that there "seems to be no question respecting the Commission's legal right to initiate a proceeding on the question of NBC's qualifications as a license of TV broadcast stations because of RCA's acquisitions and practices for obtaining and maintaining its monopoly." (Id., pt. 7, p. 2623.)

In his testimony, ex-Commissioner Doerfer, after noting that any patent misuse or patent monopoly on the part of broadcast licensees who are also engaged in manufacturing "would be of concern to the Commission" because such misconduct "if brought to the attention of the Commission and finally established * * * is a character blemish which may disqualify a licensee," went on to say that the Commission, "of course, has no direct jurisdiction over manufacturers who are not licensees of the * * * Commission, nor does the * * * Commission have direct jurisdiction over the parent company of one of its licensees." (Id., pt. 7, p. 2800.)

Commissioner Doerfer's views concerning this question were further developed in the course of interrogation by Chairman HARRIS and Representative FLYNT:

"The CHAIRMAN. * * * you testified that the Commission did not have direct jurisdiction over a parent company of one of its licensees. Is that true?

"Mr. DOERFER. That is correct.

* * * * *

"The CHAIRMAN. Are you in a position to state an opinion * * * whether or not the Commission should grant or renew a license to a subsidiary of what would be considered an unfit parent company?

"Mr. DOERFER. * * * I would hestitate to lay down sanctions or urge sanctions for the refusal to renew a license outside of the conduct of the licensee. If in fact the licensee is not independent in carrying out the purpose for which he got the license, that would be a matter of consideration, but as long as that licensee exercises complete independence of judgment and is not the tool for carrying out some unlawful purpose, or purposes, contrary to the public policy, I am very doubtful that any action of the FCC would be other than arbitrary and capricious.

"The CHAIRMAN. You see what I am getting at, as to whether or not you would think there is need for legislation in this field regarding the authority of the Commission. If there is any lack of authority to look into the character of the parent campany, and if the Commission does not have that power, then perhaps legislation might be considered. * * *

"Mr. DOERFER. * * * I hesitate to try to defend the proposition, for illustration, whereby a licensee should be refused a license because his brother or his relatives are not good citizens, or somebody's son is a reprobate. * * * I think that we have to take a look at the licensee, and if he is not the tool or the instrument or whatever you call him, just a front, I don't wish to go that far.

* * * * *

"Mr. FLYNT. * * * Do you feel that you as a Commissioner have, under existing law, full power and authority to deny or withdraw a license from a subsidiary in a case where the parent company is disqualified for the license which the subsidiary seeks to get or to have renewed?

"Mr. DOERFER. Yes; but there is this qualification: let's take an illustration. Let's assume that a company is convicted of an antitrust violation, but the court, having the power to revoke the license, does not revoke the license.

"It is my understanding that Congress in 1952 indicated that it did not want the FCC to revoke that license on the theory of the injustice of double jeopardy.

"With respect to a parent company, certainly the Commission may have the authority, but again if in the divestiture proceeding the court did not see fit to divest the subsidiary and correct an abuse, I cannot say that the Commission would be warranted in inflicting the extreme sanctions of revocation. After all, there is a relationship between a sanction which the FCC administers and which a court does. * * *

"Mr. FLYNT. * * * If John Doe is the sole stockholder of A company which is a licensee, and if he is convicted, you would certainly then go behind the corporate identity and associate the sole individual with the corporation that owns it?

"Mr. DOERFER. * * * Yes.

"Mr. FLYNT. * * * Then would you permit a licensee subsidiary company to hide behind the cloak of corporate separation and treat that company differently than you would treat A company, which was owned by an individual other than by a parent company?

"Mr. DOERFER. Absolutely not; but I wanted to add that whether or not there would be an absolute revocation depends upon the facts of the condition and the circumstances.

* * * * *

"The CHAIRMAN. In other words, the act requires the Commission to refuse such station license when the court has revoked such license, but if the court convicts someone in an antitrust proceeding, as an example, and does not revoke the license, then you are not required to take such action, but you may if you feel it necessary. Is that true?

"Mr. DOERFER. Yes; we may if we found it necessary. * * * my reaction is, if it were within the power of the court to revoke the license and if it had it under consideration and did not do so, I think it would be rather presumptuous on the part of the FCC to inflict a further penalty." (Id., pt. 7, pp. 2854–2858.)

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I will just take a minute to respond to the gentleman, because I do not want the record to be left with inaccuracies.

This bill was thoroughly explained to this House at length some time ago. The gentleman, and every member of the committee, is well aware of the fact that there is no one who has to do with the preparation of programs who is freed from responsibility. The provisions of this bill which get at the problems of payola and deceptive programing apply to the networks, the producers, the advertisers, and everybody, and would subject them to penalties if they do not discharge their responsibilities. In connection with deceptive practices, section 509(a)(4) of this bill, which I explained before, is applicable to networks, to advertisers, and to producers. Consequently the gentleman's remark that it is ineffective by leaving a windfall for certain groups is contrary to the fact. I refer you to those sections of the bill and to the application of the forfeiture provision to those sections.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Is there anything in this bill which places any legal responsibility upon the networks to operate in the public interest as the individual licensees is required to operate?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes; two provisions—sections 508 and 509 to which I have referred, are applicable to everybody connected with programing.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. These sections provide for criminal penalties against anyone who knowingly violates the law. They do not bring the networks under FCC regulation in the sense that the individual station owner is regulated. They do not require the networks to operate in the public interest. The networks remain completely free as such from FCC regulation.

Mr. HARRIS. The responsibility is placed on them: No. 1, with respect to payola and matters associated therewith; and, No. 2, with respect to deceptive programs that are put on the air

through a broadcasting facility. In other words, the producers and the networks cannot turn their backs and close their eyes any more on these practices without being subject to the penalty of the law.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield.

Mr. AVERY. They certainly are not excluded from the responsibilities set out in the bill.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman knows they are not. They are included.

Mr. AVERY. Of course they are.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The motion was agreed to.

ESTABLISHMENT OF ANNUAL NATIONAL FOREST PRODUCTS WEEK

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FORRESTER].

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution (S.J. Res. 209) providing for the establishment of an annual National Forest Products Week.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas our country and its people have always found constant strength, individual peace and personal pride in the bounty of our forest and timber lands; and

Whereas from the beginning of our Nation's founding, the forest and its products have provided a core of living and freedom touching and inspiring each citizen with majestic beauty and practical use; and

Whereas as our only renewable resource, wood offers the availability and abundance to satisfy the Nation's ever growing demands and through modern forestry we can be assured of a continuous supply of timber for the future; and

Whereas the first settlers gained foothold in the new world and carved for themselves and their descendants a free nation and built homes, schools, and churches using the forests as an ever plentiful source of material; and

Whereas this early building is now multiplied a thousandfold in these great United States and the importance of our forest lands has developed with equal vigor through wise management, constant replanting and growth of his vital resource, and today our forests provide thousands of products—lumber, paper, building materials, chemicals, furniture, and cloth—all dedicated to improving the lives of our people; and

Whereas in order to reemphasize to each citizen in the United States the importance and heritage of our vast forest resources which are inseparably tied to our present and our future: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the seven-day period beginning on the third Sunday of October in each year is hereby designated as National Forest Products Week, and the President is requested to issue annually a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 12326) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority and certain study commissions, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement follow:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2181)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12326) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority and certain study commissions, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 3, 8, 9, and 14.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 11, 12, 16, and 18, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$12,023,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$706,491,600"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$71,896,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,893,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,943,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,290,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$10,800,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,451,210,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$212,750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,550,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 4, 10, and 20.

CLARENCE CANNON,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
BEN F. JENSEN,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
CARL HAYDEN,
RICHARD R. RUSSELL,
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
LISTER HILL,
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
ROBT. S. KERR,
CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
HENRY DWORSHAK,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
KARL MUNDT,
MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12326) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority and certain study commissions, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TITLE I—CIVIL FUNCTIONS, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Rivers and harbors and flood control

General Investigations

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates $12,023,000 instead of $10,895,800 as proposed by the House and $13,062,800 as proposed by the Senate. The funds provided are to be distributed as follows.

Item	Budget estimate for fiscal year 1961	Conference allowance
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS		
Examinations and surveys:		
Navigation studies	$880,000	$1,320,000
Flood control studies	2,720,000	4,000,000
Beach erosion cooperative studies	150,000	150,000
Special studies:		
San Francisco Bay survey	400,000	500,000
Ohio River Basin review	400,000	400,000
Great Lakes Harbor survey	107,000	264,000
Coordination studies with other agencies	150,000	150,000
Rampart Canyon, Alaska	100,000	225,000
Hurricane studies	850,000	850,000
Hudson River (siltation) studies	90,000	90,000
Potomac River review	400,000	400,000
Colorado River, Tex	118,000	118,000
Trinity River	250,000	321,000
Subtotal, examinations and surveys	6,615,000	8,788,000
Collection and study of basic data:		
Stream gaging (U.S. Geological Survey)	$235,000	$235,000
Precipitation studies (U.S. Weather Bureau)	340,000	340,000
Fish and wildlife studies (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service)	50,000	50,000
International water studies	60,000	60,000
Subtotal, collection and study of basic data	685,000	685,000
Research and development:		
Beach erosion development studies	200,000	200,000
Hydrologic studies	150,000	150,000
Civil works investigations	1,200,000	1,200,000
Mississippi Basin model:		
Construction	700,000	700,000
Mississippi River comprehensive study	150,000	150,000
Subtotal, research and development	2,400,000	2,400,000
Arkansas-Red River pollution survey		150,000
Total, general investigations	9,700,000	12,023,000

Budgeted funds for the Missouri River slack-water navigation study and the Garfield, Utah, small-boat harbor have been disallowed.

Within the amount provided for the flood control studies, $10,000 is to be used on the J. Percy Priest Reservoir study.

Construction, General

Amendment No. 2: Appropriates $706,491,600, instead of $662,622,300 as proposed by the House and $737,884,600, as proposed by the Senate. The conferees are in agreement that funds appropriated under this item should be allocated as set forth in the following tabulation:

Construction, general, State and project	Budget estimate for fiscal year 1961		Conference allowance	
	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
Alabama:				
Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)				
Columbia lock and dam, Alabama and Georgia	$3,325,000		$3,325,000	
Holt lock and dam		$378,000		$549,000
Jackson lock and dam	4,409,000		4,238,000	
Millers Ferry lock and dam				200,000
Walter F. George (Fort Gaines) lock and dam, Alabama and Georgia	20,178,000		20,178,000	
Alaska:				
Douglas Harbor			[1] (364,000)	
Fairbanks		100,000		100,000
Homer Harbor, small-boat harbor	542,000		542,000	
Ninilchik Harbor	[1] (229,000)		[1] (229,000)	
Seldovia Harbor, small-boat harbor	548,000		548,000	
Arizona:				
Alamo Reservoir		175,000		175,000
Gila River-Camelsback Reservoir			150,000	
Tucson		90,000		90,000
Arkansas:				
Arkansas River and tributaries, Arkansas and Oklahoma:				
(a) Emergency bank stabilization	5,000,000		5,000,000	
(b) Other bank stabilization			2,000,000	
Arkansas River and tributaries, Arkansas and Oklahoma (general studies)		381,000		381,000
Beaver Reservoir	2,800,000		2,800,000	
Bull Shoals Reservoir (units 5 and 6), Ark. and Mo.	3,200,000		3,200,000	
Bull Shoals Reservoir (units 7 and 8), Ark. and Mo.	100,000		100,000	
Dardanelle lock and dam	6,100,000		6,100,000	
DeGray Reservoir		300,000		300,000
Gillham Reservoir		100,000		100,000
Greers Ferry Reservoir	14,143,000		14,143,000	
McKinney Bayou and Barkman Creek, Ark. and Tex.	668,000		668,000	
Millwood Reservoir			500,000	
Red River at Garland City			200,000	
Red River levees and bank stabilization below Denison Dam, Ark., La., and Tex.	700,000		700,000	
Table Rock Reservoir, Ark. and Mo. (See Missouri.)				
California:				
Bear Creek		70,000		70,000
Black Butte Reservoir	5,900,000		5,900,000	
Bodega Bay			405,000	
Carbon Canyon Dam and channels	1,207,000		1,207,000	
Devil, East Twin, Warm, and Lytle Creeks	1,300,000		1,300,000	
Halfmoon Bay Harbor (Pillar Point)	1,800,000		1,800,000	
Los Angeles County drainage area	13,100,000		13,100,000	
Lower San Joaquin River and tributaries	1,260,000		1,260,000	
Middle Creek	403,000		403,000	
Mill Creek levees	503,000		503,000	
New Hogan Reservoir	1,800,000		1,800,000	
Noyo River and Harbor (breakwater)				56,000
Oroville Reservoir		50,000		50,000
Pine Flat Reservoir	500,000		500,000	
Playa Del Rey Inlet and Harbor	154,000		154,000	
Port Hueneme Harbor	2,422,000		2,422,000	
Russian River Reservoir	400,000		400,000	
Sacramento River	2,200,000		2,200,000	
Sacramento River and major and minor tributaries	1,000,000		1,000,000	
Sacramento River, Chico Landing to Red Bluff		50,000		50,000
Sacramento River deep-water ship channel	8,000,000		7,000,000	
San Antonio and Chino Creeks	1,336,000		1,336,000	
San Jacinto River and Bautista Creek	1,300,000		1,300,000	
San Lorenzo Creek	1,608,000		1,608,000	
Santa Clara River	305,000		305,000	
Santa Cruz Harbor	300,000			
Santa Maria Valley levees	1,850,000		1,850,000	
Success Reservoir	2,588,000		2,588,000	
Terminus Reservoir	6,300,000		6,300,000	
Truckee River and tributaries, California and Nevada. (See Nevada.)				
Tuolumne River Reservoir (new Don Pedro)		25,000		25,000

See footnote at end of table.

Construction, general, State and project	Budget estimate for fiscal year 1961		Conference allowance	
	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
Colorado: Trinidad Reservoir		$185,000		$185,000
Connecticut:				
Bridgeport Harbor 1958 Act (35' main harbor)	$750,000		$750,000	
East Branch Reservoir		150,000		150,000
Hall Meadow Brook Reservoir	1,000,000		1,000,000	
Hancock Brook Reservoir				75,000
Mad River Reservoir	870,000		870,000	
Northfield Brook Reservoir				60,000
Pawcatuck				38,000
Thomaston Reservoir	1,547,000		1,547,000	
Delaware:				
Inland Waterway, Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay, Del. and Md.: Canal improvement (pt. II)		103,000		103,000
Rehoboth Beach to Indian River Inlet (reimbursement)	75,000		75,000	
Florida:				
Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)				
Central and southern Florida	10,000,000		11,500,000	
Intracoastal Waterway, Caloosahatchee River to Anclote River	2,000,000		2,000,000	
Intracoastal Waterway, Jacksonville to Miami (10' by 125' channel)			400,000	
Lake Worth Inlet to South Lake Worth Inlet, Palm Beach County (reimbursement)	118,200		118,200	
Little Manatee River (deferred for restudy)		12,000		12,000
Port Everglades Harbor, 1958 act	750,000		750,000	
Tampa Harbor, 30-, 34-, and 36-foot channels	117,000		117,000	
Georgia:				
Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)				
Carters Dam				75,000
Columbia lock and dam, Alabama and Georgia. (See Alabama.)				
Hartwell Reservoir, Ga. and S.C	21,375,000		21,375,000	
Savannah River below Augusta	900,000		900,000	
Walter F. George lock and dam, Alabama and Georgia. (See Alabama.)				
Hawaii:				
Hilo Harbor				100,000
Honolulu Harbor	1,216,000		1,216,000	
Kahului Harbor			808,000	
Kawainui Swamp	500,000		500,000	
Idaho:				
Bruces Eddy Reservoir (construction not yet authorized)				600,000
Columbia River local protection: Blackfoot River			(1)	
Illinois:				
Beardstown	700,000		700,000	
Calumet Harbor, Ill. and Ind				70,000
Calumet Harbor and River, Ill. and Ind. (breakwater)		31,000		31,000
Calumet Harbor and River, Ill. and Ind. (Cargill docks only)			225,000	
Campbells Island	175,000			
Carlyle Reservoir	3,500,000		3,500,000	
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy RR. bridge, including channel change	752,000		752,000	
Clear Creek drainage and levee district	270,000		270,000	
East St. Louis and vicinity	2,476,000		2,476,000	
Freeport (deferred for restudy)		10,000		10,000
Hunt Drainage District and Lima Lake Drainage District	900,000		900,000	
Illinois Waterway Calumet-Sag Channel (part I)	9,500,000		7,500,000	
Kenilworth (reimbursement)	5,200		5,200	
Mississippi River between St. Louis, Mo., and lock and dam 26, dam 27, Illinois and Missouri	1,500,000		1,500,000	
Mississippi River between the Ohio and Missouri Rivers, Ill. and Mo.: Regulating works	1,500,000		1,500,000	
Mississippi River between the Ohio and Missouri Rivers (repair dikes and revetments)		20,000		20,000
Mississippi River between Missouri River and Minneapolis, Minn.: Rectification of damages	2,660,000		2,660,000	
Shelbyville Reservoir		250,000		250,000
Subdistrict No. 1 of Drainage Union No. 1 and Bay Island Drainage and Levee District		111,000		111,000
The Sny Basin	1,800,000		1,800,000	
Wood River drainage and levee district	1,180,000		1,180,000	
Indiana:				
Calumet Harbor, Ill. and Ind. (See Illinois.)				
Cannelton locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky				150,000
Evansville	450,000		100,000	
Huntington Reservoir		125,000		125,000
Indiana Harbor				25,000
Levee unit No. 5, Wabash River				25,000
Louisville lock and dam, Indiana and Kentucky. (See Kentucky.)				
Markland locks and dam, Indiana, Kentucky, and Ohio. (See Kentucky.)				
Mississinewa Reservoir		156,000		156,000
Monroe Reservoir	275,000		275,000	
Salamonie Reservoir		56,000		56,000
Sugar Creek levee		15,000		15,000
West Terre Haute			100,000	
Iowa:				
Decatur Bend Cutoff			155,000	
Dubuque			(1)	
Floyd River and tributaries	791,900		791,900	
Green Bay levee and drainage district No. 2		45,000		45,000
Little Sioux River	2,300,000		2,300,000	
Missouri River agricultural levees, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska (active portion only)				175,000
Missouri River channel stabilization, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska:				
(a) Sioux City, Iowa, to Omaha, Nebr	5,600,000		5,600,000	
(b) Omaha, Nebr., to Kansas City	2,800,000		2,800,000	
(c) Kansas City to the mouth	3,475,000		3,475,000	
Missouri River, Kensiers Bend, Nebr., to Sioux City, Iowa, Nebr. and S. Dak. (See Nebraska.)				
Muscatine Island Levee District and Muscatine-Louisa County Drainage District No. 13	1,400,000		1,400,000	
Rathbun Reservoir				130,000
Red Rock Reservoir	3,600,000		3,600,000	
Saylorville Reservoir		165,000		165,000
Kansas:				
Council Grove Reservoir	2,000,000		2,000,000	
Frankfort		20,000		20,000
John Redmond (Strawn) Reservoir	3,800,000		3,800,000	
Kansas City, Kans. and Mo			500,000	
Manhattan	800,000		800,000	
Marion Reservoir		150,000		150,000
Milford Reservoir	1,000,000		500,000	
Missouri River agricultural levees, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)				
Missouri River channel stabilization, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)				
Ottawa	940,000		940,000	
Perry Reservoir		175,000		175,000
Pomona Reservoir	3,500,000		3,500,000	
Topeka	1,700,000		1,700,000	
Tuttle Creek Reservoir	16,500,000		16,500,000	
Wilson Reservoir	2,000,000		2,000,000	

See footnote at end of table.

Construction, general, State and project	Budget estimate for fiscal year 1961		Conference allowance	
	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
Kentucky:				
Barkley Dam, Ky. and Tenn	$17,100,000		$17,100,000	
Cannelton locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky. (See Indiana.)				
Captain Anthony Meldahl locks and dam (New Richmond), Kentucky and Ohio	15,000,000		15,000,000	
Fishtrap Reservoir		$349,000		$349,000
Greenup locks and dam, Kentucky and Ohio	9,959,000		9,959,000	
Louisville locks and dam (lock and dam No. 41), Indiana and Kentucky	9,215,000		9,215,000	
Markland locks and dam, Indiana, Kentucky, and Ohio	12,600,000		12,600,000	
Nolin Reservoir	2,600,000		2,600,000	
No. 2 Barren Reservoir	2,175,000		2,175,000	
No. 2 Green Reservoir		100,000		100,000
Louisiana:				
Aquatic plant control, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Texas, and Louisiana	700,000		700,000	
Barataria Bay Waterway	1,116,000		1,116,000	
Bayou Chevreuil	502,000		502,000	
Bayou Lafourche				90,000
Calcasieu River and Pass				100,000
Gulf Intracoastal Waterway:				
(a) Freshwater Bayou				90,000
(b) Plaquemine-Morgan City alternate route	4,166,000		4,166,000	
Mississippi River, Baton Rouge to the Gulf of Mexico	2,000,000		2,000,000	
Mississippi River, gulf outlet	8,750,000		8,750,000	
Petit Anse, Tigre and Carlin Bayous			(1)	
Red River levees and bank stabilization below Denison Dam, Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas. (See Arkansas.)				
Maine:				
Eastport Harbor			300,000	
Scarboro River			117,000	
Southwest Harbor			(1)	
Stonington Harbor			(1)	
York Harbor			391,000	
Maryland:				
Baltimore Harbor and Channel, 42 feet, 1958 act	1,500,000		2,000,000	
Inland waterway, Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay, Delaware, and Maryland, canal improvement. (See Delaware.)				
Massachusetts:				
Chelsea Bridge	242,000		242,000	
Littleville Reservoir		154,000		154,000
Quincy shore (reimbursement)	645,000		645,000	
West Hill Reservoir	733,000		733,000	
Westville Reservoir	2,660,000		2,660,000	
Michigan:				
Battle Creek	250,000		250,000	
Grand Haven Harbor (revetment)		27,000		27,000
Grand Marais Harbor	732,000		732,000	
Great Lakes connecting channels	30,000,000		30,000,000	
Hammond Bay Harbor			200,000	
Manistee Harbor				75,000
Menominee Harbor, Mich. and Wis. (south pier and north pier)		31,500		31,500
Presque Isle Harbor				10,000
Saint Marys River: New Poe Lock	1,350,000		1,350,000	
St. Joseph Harbor				84,000
South Haven Harbor				63,000
Trenton Channel Harbor				90,000
Minnesota:				
Duluth-Superior Harbor, outer harbor, Minnesota and Wisconsin				60,000
Minnesota River, 9-foot channel	500,000		500,000	
Mississippi River between Missouri River and Minneapolis, Minn., Rectification of damages. (See Illinois.)				
Red River of the North, Minn. and N. Dak	368,000		368,000	
Redwood River at Marshall				60,000
Rushford		75,000		75,000
St. Anthony Falls	4,900,000		4,900,000	
St. Paul and South St. Paul			500,000	
Two harbors				6,000
Winona		80,000		80,000
Mississippi:				
Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)				
Pascagoula Harbor (33-foot main channel)				100,000
Missouri:				
Bull Shoals Reservoir (units 5, 6, 7, and 8), Ark. and Mo. (See Arkansas.)				
Fabius River Drainage District	350,000		350,000	
Joanna Reservoir				100,000
Kansas Citys, Kans. and Mo. (See Kansas.)				
Kaysinger Bluff Reservoir		400,000		400,000
Mississippi River between St. Louis, Mo., and lock and dam 26, Illinois and Missouri, dam 27. (See Illinois.)				
Mississippi River between the Ohio and Missouri Rivers, Ill. and Mo.: Regulating works. (See Illinois.)				
Missouri River agricultural levees, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)				
Missouri River channel stabilization, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)				
Perry County Drainage and Levee Districts, 1, 2, and 3			75,000	
Pomme de Terre Reservoir	3,600,000		3,600,000	
South River Drainage District				60,000
St. Louis	6,250,000		6,250,000	
Stockton Reservoir		250,000		250,000
Table Rock Reservoir, Ark. and Mo	600,000		600,000	
Montana: Fort Peck Dam (2d powerplant)	4,500,000		4,500,000	
Nebraska:				
Gering Valley	530,000		530,000	
Missouri River agricultural levees, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)				
Missouri River channel stabilization, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)				
Missouri River (Kensers Bend, Nebr., to Sioux City, Iowa, including Miners Bend), Iowa, Nebr., and S. Dak	770,000		770,000	
Salt Creek and tributaries		162,000	412,000	
Shell Creek and tributaries		75,000		75,000
Nevada:				
Gleason Creek (Keystone Reservoir)				20,000
Las Vegas Wash				50,000
Truckee River and tributaries, California and Nevada	154,000		154,000	
New Hampshire: Hopkinton-Everett Reservoirs	8,370,000		8,370,000	
New Jersey:				
Delaware River, Philadelphia Naval Base to Trenton, Pennsylvania and New Jersey	11,700,000		11,700,000	
New York Harbor-New Jersey Pierhead Line, New York and New Jersey. (See New York.)				
Ocean City (reimbursement)	50,000		50,000	
New Mexico:				
Abiquiu Reservoir	4,600,000		4,600,000	
Cochiti Reservoir				50,000
Galisteo Reservoir				50,000
Rio Grande Floodway—Conchiti to Rio Puerco	1,000,000		1,000,000	
Socorro		157,000		157,000
Two Rivers Reservoir	400,000		400,000	

See footnote at end of table.

Construction, general, State and project	Budget estimate for fiscal year 1961		Conference allowance	
	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
New York:				
Allegheny River Reservoir, Pa. and N.Y. (See Pennsylvania.)				
Buffalo Harbor, south entrance				$16,000
Buffalo Harbor, north entrance	$1,900,000		$1,900,000	
Endicott, Johnson City, and Vestal	335,000		335,000	
Great Lakes to Hudson River Waterway	400,000		400,000	
Great Sodus Bay Harbor (east and west piers)		$32,000		32,000
Hudson River, New York City to Albany, 32-foot channel	1,880,000		1,880,000	
Jamaica Bay			700,000	
New York Harbor—New Jersey Pierhead Line, New York and New Jersey	886,000		886,000	
Nichols		51,000		51,000
Ohio Street Bridge, Buffalo River	800,000		800,000	
Rochester Harbor				25,000
Selkirk Shores State Park (reimbursement)	18,700		18,700	
South Amsterdam		70,000		70,000
North Carolina:				
Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)				
Morehead City Harbor	942,000		942,000	
Ocracoke Inlet			185,000	
Pantego and Cucklers Creek	473,000		473,000	
Wilkesboro Reservoir	3,300,000		3,300,000	
North Dakota:				
Garrison Reservoir	4,000,000		4,000,000	
Lower Heart River	836,000		836,000	
Red River of the North, Minn. and N. Dak. (See Minnesota.)				
Ohio:				
Ashtabula Harbor				40,000
Belleville locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia		250,000		250,000
Captain Anthony Meldahl locks and dam, Kentucky and Ohio. (See Kentucky.)				
Cleveland Harbor				20,000
Cleveland Harbor (1958 modification)		200,000		200,000
Cleveland Harbor (east and west breakwater)		20,000		20,000
Dillon Reservoir	4,223,000		4,223,000	
Greenup locks and dam, Kentucky and Ohio. (See Kentucky.)				
Lorain Harbor				300,000
Markland lock and dam, Indiana, Kentucky and Ohio. (See Kentucky.)				
New Cumberland locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia	6,180,000		6,180,000	
Pike Island locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia	9,000,000		9,000,000	
Sandusky Harbor				53,000
Shenango River Reservoir, Pennsylvania and Ohio. (See Pennsylvania.)				
Toledo Harbor				60,000
West Branch Mahoning River Reservoir	2,200,000		2,200,000	
Oklahoma:				
Arkansas River and Tributaries, Emergency Bank Stabilization, Arkansas and Oklahoma. (See Arkansas.)				
Arkansas River and tributaries, general studies, Arkansas and Oklahoma. (See Arkansas.)				
Broken Bow Reservoir			500,000	
Canton Reservoir		7,500		7,500
Eufaula Reservoir	20,700,000		20,700,000	
Keystone Reservoir	17,400,000		17,400,000	
Oologah Reservoir	3,700,000		3,700,000	
Pine Creek Reservoir		150,000		150,000
Oregon:				
Blue River Reservoir		136,000		136,000
Columbia River at the mouth, south jetty		50,000		50,000
Columbia River local protection: Malheur River-Vale Unit	112,000		112,000	
Coos and Millicoma Rivers		23,000		
Coos Bay, south jetty		50,000		50,000
Cougar Reservoir	12,300,000		12,300,000	
Green Peter Reservoir	1,400,000		1,400,000	
Hills Creek Reservoir	10,500,000		10,500,000	
John Day lock and dam, Oregon and Washington	37,000,000		33,344,300	
Lower Columbia River bank protection, Oregon and Washington	400,000		400,000	
Lower Columbia River improvement to existing works:				
(a) Multnomah County Drainage District	590,000		590,000	
(b) Rainier Drainage District			200,000	
(c) Sauvie Island Drainage District			150,000	
Rogue River Harbor at Gold Beach	2,018,000		2,018,000	
Siuslaw River, south jetty		30,000		30,000
The Dalles lock and dam, Oregon and Washington	1,900,000		1,900,000	
Umpqua River				30,000
Willamette River Basin bank protection	500,000		500,000	
Yaquina Bay and Harbor		300,000		300,000
Pennsylvania:				
Allegheny River Reservoir, Pa. and N. Y.	4,530,000		4,530,000	
Bear Creek Reservoir	1,067,000		1,067,000	
Bethlehem	1,300,000		1,300,000	
Bradford	1,377,000		1,377,000	
Brookville	500,000		500,000	
Butler, Connoquenessing Creek				25,000
Curwensville Reservoir		280,000		280,000
Dam 4, Monongahela River		130,000		130,000
Elkland		75,000		75,000
Erie Harbor				27,000
Kettle Creek Reservoir	2,200,000		2,200,000	
Maxwell locks and dam, Monongahela River	1,400,000		1,400,000	
Ridgeway			200,000	
Shenango River Reservoir, Pa. and Ohio	2,200,000		2,200,000	
Stillwater Reservoir	455,000		455,000	
Turtle Creek		150,000		150,000
Tyrone		111,000		111,000
Washington	400,000		400,000	
Puerto Rico: San Juan Harbor—1958 act		70,000		70,000
Rhode Island:				
Fox Point Barrier	800,000		800,000	
Point Judith Harbor of Refuge (breakwaters)		13,000		13,000
South Carolina:				
Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)				
Hartwell Reservoir, Ga. and S.C. (See Georgia.)				

See footnote at end of table.

Construction, general, State and project	Budget estimate for fiscal year 1961		Conference allowance	
	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
South Dakota:				
Big Bend Reservoir	$10,000,000		$10,000,000	
Fort Randall Reservoir	400,000		400,000	
Missouri River, Kenslers Bend, Nebr., to Sioux City, Iowa, Nebr. and S. Dak. (See Nebraska.)				
Oahe Reservoir	53,500,000		53,500,000	
Sioux Falls				$50,000
Vermillion River				50,000
Tennessee:				
Barkley Dam, Ky. and Tenn. (See Kentucky.)				
Cordell Hull Dam				50,000
Texas:				
Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)				
Bardwell Reservoir				125,000
Brazos Island Harbor	100,000		160,000	
Buffalo Bayou and tributaries	2,500,000		2,500,000	
Canyon Reservoir	2,900,000		2,900,000	
Cooper Reservoir and channels	1,000,000		250,000	
Corpus Christi Bridge	512,000		512,000	
Denison Dam and Reservoir (Lake Texoma)			200,000	
Freeport Harbor 36- and 38-foot channels and realinement of outer bar channel	899,000		899,000	
Galveston Harbor (jetties)		$85,000		85,000
Galveston Harbor and channel: Seawall	2,700,000		2,700,000	
Gulf Intracoastal waterway:				
(a) Channel to Port Mansfield	1,600,000		1,600,000	
(b) Colorado River Channel	956,000		956,000	
(c) Guadalupe River channel to Victoria	1,400,000		1,400,000	
Houston ship channel: 40-foot project (bend easing and widening to 36 foot only)	1,240,000		1,240,000	
Matagorda ship channel: 36- and 38-foot channel—1958 act		266,000		266,000
McGee Bend Dam	6,000,000		6,000,000	
McKinney Bayou and Barkman Creek, Ark. and Tex. (See Arkansas.)				
Navarro Mills Reservoir	3,100,000		3,100,000	
Pecos		51,000		51,000
Port Aransas-Corpus Christi Waterway: 36-foot channel	1,500,000		1,500,000	
Proctor Reservoir	1,600,000		1,600,000	
Red River levees and bank stabilization below Denison Dam, Ark., La., and Tex. (See Arkansas).				
Sabine-Neches Waterway	1,800,000		1,800,000	
San Antonio Channel	1,100,000		1,100,000	
Somerville Reservoir		100,000		100,000
Texas City, Galveston Bay		169,000		169,000
Waco Reservoir	11,000,000		11,000,000	
Utah: Weber River and tributaries		35,000		35,000
Vermont:				
Ball Mountain Reservoir	2,223,000		2,223,000	
Burlington Harbor				50,000
North Hartland Reservoir	735,000		735,000	
North Springfield Reservoir	531,000		531,000	
Townshend Reservoir	1,554,000		1,554,000	
Virginia:				
John W. Flannagan (Pound) Reservoir	3,100,000		3,100,000	
North Fork Reservoir				25,000
Washington:				
Chief Joseph Dam	300,000		300,000	
Colfax	425,000		425,000	
Dayton				26,300
Howard A. Hanson (Eagle Gorge) Reservoir	4,400,000		4,400,000	
Ice Harbor lock and dam	30,000,000		30,000,000	
John Day lock and dam, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.)				
Little Goose lock and dam		550,000		550,000
Lower Columbia River bank protection, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.)				
Lower Monumental lock and dam			1,000,000	
Sammamish River		50,000		50,000
The Dalles Dam, Oreg. and Wash. (See Oregon.)				
West Virginia:				
Belleville locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.)				
East Rainelle	404,000		404,000	
New Cumberland locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.)				
Opekiska lock and dam			500,000	
Pike Island locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.)				
Princeton	350,000		350,000	
Summersville Reservoir	4,400,000		4,400,000	
Williamson	300,000		300,000	
Wisconsin:				
Ashland Harbor				34,000
Duluth-Superior Harbor, Minn. and Wis. (See Minnesota.)				
Eau Galle River		250,000		250,000
Kewaunee Harbor			[1]	
Menominee Harbor, Mich. and Wis. (See Michigan.)				
Milwaukee Harbor (north breakwater and north pier)		71,000		71,000
Milwaukee Harbor—outer harbor (reimbursement)	7,000		7,000	
Sheboygan Harbor (north stub pier and south pier)		32,000		32,000
Wyoming:				
Jackson Hole	150,000		150,000	
Sheridan	340,000			
Emergency bank protection	300,000		300,000	
Local protection projects not requiring specific legislation	2,000,000		1,500,000	
Snagging and clearing	300,000		300,000	
Recreation facilities, completed projects	2,500,000		2,365,000	
Small authorized projects	2,000,000		3,047,000	
Fish and wildlife studies (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service)	500,000		500,000	
Rehabilitation of existing projects: Construction small rehabilitation projects under $400,000	2,500,000		2,500,000	
Reduction for anticipated savings and slippages	−40,000,000		−52,500,000	
Total	700,203,000	9,216,000	691,946,300	13,145,300
Lower Columbia River fish sanctuary program (Fish and Wildlife Service)	1,400,000		1,400,000	
Grand total, construction, general	701,603,000 (710,819,000)	9,216,000	693,346,300 (706,491,600)	13,145,300

[1] Not included in totals—eligible for selection under appropriate lump-sum appropriation at end of table.

Amendment No. 3: Strikes language proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 4: Reported in disagreement.

Operation and Maintenance, General

Missouri River, Kansas City to the mouth

The conferees of both Houses are in agreement that the Senate report statement concerning the use of maintenance funds to remove shoals in this section of the Missouri River is to be disregarded and that the prohibition carried in the language of the bill concerning the use of such funds is to be followed without deviation or modification in any manner.

Flood control, Mississippi River and Tributaries

Amendment No. 5: Appropriates $71,896,000 instead of $69,560,000 as proposed by the House and $74,896,000 as proposed by the Senate. The funds appropriated under this heading are to be distributed as follows:

Projects	Budget estimate for fiscal year 1961		Conference allowance	
	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
1. General investigations:				
(a) Examinations and surveys		$60,000		$60,000
(b) Collection and study of basic data		55,000		55,000
Subtotal, general investigations		115,000		115,000
2. Construction and planning:				
Mississippi River levees	2,760,000		3,386,000	
Channel improvement	22,000,000		23,000,000	
Memphis Harbor	640,000		640,000	
Greenville Harbor			150,000	
Vicksburg Harbor	1,370,000		1,370,000	
Old River control	8,400,000		8,400,000	
St. Francis Basin	4,600,000		4,600,000	
Lower White River	150,000		150,000	
West Tennessee tributaries	400,000		400,000	
Wolf River and tributaries	500,000		500,000	
Lower Arkansas	530,000		600,000	
Tensas Basin:				
Boeuf and Tensas Rivers, etc	1,090,000		1,140,000	
Red River backwater	25,000		25,000	
Yazoo Basin:				
Sardis Reservoir	80,000		80,000	
Enid Reservoir	50,000		50,000	
Arkabutla Reservoir	70,000		70,000	
Grenada Reservoir	30,000		30,000	
Lower auxiliary channels	1,555,000		1,805,000	
Main stem	1,040,000		1,040,000	
Tributaries	450,000		450,000	
Big Sunflower River, etc	820,000		820,000	
Yazoo backwater	325,000		325,000	
Atchafalaya Basin	6,000,000		6,300,000	
Lake Pontchartrain	660,000		700,000	
Subtotal, construction and planning	53,515,000		56,001,000	
3. Reduction for anticipated savings and slippages	−1,380,000		−1,470,000	
Total, construction and planning	52,135,000		54,531,000	
4. Maintenance	17,250,000		17,250,000	
Grand total	69,500,000		71,896,000	

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Reclamation

General Investigations

Amendment No. 6: Appropriates $4,893,000 instead of $4,575,000 as proposed by the House and $5,376,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase above the House figure is distributed as follows:

Evaporation reduction materials and methods	$100,000
Middle Gila River project, Arizona	10,000
W. C. Austin project, Oklahoma	25,000
Opal project, Wyoming	156,000
Lahontan Basin, California-Nevada	2,000
For general distribution	25,000

Amendment No. 7: Provides that $3,943,000 of the funds provided for General Investigations shall be derived from the reclamation fund instead of $3,375,000 as proposed by the House and $4,426,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 8: Strikes language inserted by the Senate providing funds for the General Investigations (Special Currency Program).

Construction and Rehabilitation

Amendment No. 9: Appropriates $166,444,880 as proposed by the House instead of $173,855,200 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees are in agreement that the funds provided in this item are to be allocated to projects and activities as shown in the following tabulation:

Projects	Budget for fiscal year 1961		Conference allowance	
	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
Arizona:				
Boulder Canyon project	$2,857,000		$2,857,000	
Colorado River front work and levee system	769,500		869,500	
Gila project	4,219,000		4,219,000	
California:				
Central Valley project	61,306,100		61,278,100	
Colorado River front work and levee system. (See Arizona.)				
Klamath project. (See Oregon.)				
Washoe project. (See Nevada.)				
Colorado:				
Collbran project	5,140,000		5,140,000	
Trinidad project		$5,000		$5,000
Idaho:				
Minidoka project, north side pumping division	429,000		429,000	
Palisades project, Burns Creek Dam and powerplant			(1)	
Spokane Valley project. (See Washington.)				
Nevada:				
Boulder Canyon project. (See Arizona.)				
Washoe project, Prosser Creek Dam and Reservoir	3,137,000		3,137,000	
Washoe project, initial phase		149,000		149,000
New Mexico:				
McMillan Delta project	100,000		100,000	
Middle Rio Grande project	1,729,000		1,729,000	
Oklahoma:				
Washita project	6,960,000		6,960,000	
Norman project				150,000

[1] $457,500 of previously appropriated funds available.

Projects	Budget for fiscal year 1961		Conference allowance	
	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
Oregon:				
Crooked River project	$2,235,000		$2,235,000	
Klamath project	868,000		868,000	
Rogue River Basin project, Talent division	2,450,000		2,450,000	
Vale project, Bully Creek extension	173,000			$121,000
Texas:				
Lower Rio Grande rehabilitation project, La Feria division	500,000		500,000	
Lower Rio Grande rehabilitation project, Mercedes division	2,500,000		2,500,000	
San Angelo project	11,000,000		11,000,000	
Utah:				
Provo River project	825,000		825,000	
Weber Basin project	8,283,000		8,183,000	
Washington:				
Chief Joseph Dam project, Greater Wenatchee division	2,000,000		2,000,000	
Columbia Basin project	6,100,000		4,606,000	
Spokane Valley project		$100,000		100,000
Drainage and minor construction	921,120		946,120	
Rehabilitation and betterment	3,609,000		3,609,000	
Subtotal, construction and rehabilitation (exclusive of Missouri River Basin)	128,110,720	254,000	126,440,720	525,000
MISSOURI RIVER BASIN PROJECT				
Colorado: Narrows unit		48,800		48,800
Kansas:				
Almena unit	1,000,000		1,000,000	
Bostwick division. (See Nebraska.)				
Cedar Bluff unit	1,400,000		1,400,000	
Glen Elder unit		133,000		133,000
Kanopolis unit		1,000		1,000
Webster unit	617,000		617,000	
Montana:				
East Bench unit	2,800,000		2,800,000	
Helena Valley unit	565,000		565,000	
Jefferson unit		336,000		336,000
Yellowtail unit	2,500,000		2,500,000	
Nebraska:				
Ainsworth unit	1,500,000		1,500,000	
Bostwick division	821,000		821,000	
Cedar Rapids division		252,800		252,800
Farwell unit	7,700,000		7,700,000	
Frenchman-Cambridge division	5,439,000		5,439,000	
North Dakota: Garrison diversion unit		445,000		335,000
South Dakota:				
Crazy Horse, Tower, Greenwood, and Yankton units		109,400		109,400
Garrison diversion unit. (See North Dakota.)				
Oahe unit		18,000		113,000
Wyoming:				
Glendo unit	775,280		775,280	
Owl Creek unit	455,000		455,000	
Yellowtail unit. (See Montana.)				
Transmission division	24,415,000		24,415,000	
Drainage and minor construction	598,000		598,000	
Subtotal, construction and advance planning (Missouri River Basin)	50,585,280	1,344,000	50,585,280	1,329,000
Investigations		656,000		782,000
Other Department agencies		3,000,000		2,650,000
Total, Missouri River Basin project	50,585,280	5,000,000	50,585,280	4,761,000
Subtotal, construction and rehabilitation	183,950,000		182,312,000	
Undistributed reduction based on anticipated delays	−10,000,000		−15,867,120	
Total, construction and rehabilitation	173,950,000		166,444,880	

The increase of $140,000 above the House figure provided for the Central Valley project is to be used on the Cow Creek Unit (Trinity Division, California).

The conferees of both Houses are in agreement that up to 15% of the $4,606,000 provided for the Columbia Basin project may be transferred to this project for unforeseen contingencies if necessary.

Amendment No. 10: Reported in disagreement.

Operation and Maintenance

Amendment No. 11: Appropriates $31,443,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $31,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Loan Program

Amendment No. 12: Appropriates $11,642,825, as proposed by the Senate instead of $9,742,825 as proposed by the House.

General administrative expenses

Amendment No. 13: Appropriates $4,290,000 instead of $4,200,000 as proposed by the House and $4,320,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Administrative Provisions

Amendment No. 14: Strikes language inserted by the Senate.

The Senate language providing a salary increase for the Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation has been deleted without prejudice. The conferees recognize the outstanding manner in which the present incumbent has discharged his duties. The purpose of the provision was to correct the inequity resulting from the failure to make the recent classified pay raise applicable to officials covered by the Executive Pay Act. As over 200 employees are involved in this category, it was believed that, in lieu of individual corrective action, the matter should await appropriate consideration by the legislative committee.

Bonneville Power Administration

Operation and Maintenance

Amendment No. 15: Appropriates $10,800,000 instead of $10,750,000 as proposed by the House and $10,850,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Southwestern Power Administration

Operation and Maintenance

Amendment No. 16: Appropriates $1,250,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,200,000 as proposed by the House.

TITLE III—INDEPENDENT OFFICES

Atomic Energy Commission

Operating Expenses

Amendment No. 17: Appropriates $2,451,210,000 instead of $2,450,560,000 as proposed by the House and $2,452,960,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The increase above the House figure is for the following:

Reactor development nuclear technology and general support, direct conversion research	$400,000
Isotopes development program	250,000

Amendment No. 18: Strikes House language limiting the amount for the airplane propulsion reactor program to $58,000,000.

Plant Acquisition and Construction

Amendment No. 19: Appropriates $212,750,000 instead of $208,500,000 as proposed by the House and $223,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Of the increase above the House figure, $3,500,000 is for a nuclear power reactor at McMurdo Sound in the Antarctic. These funds, plus the $1,500,000 already made available for this purpose by the Department of the Navy, are to be used for full funding of the reactor.

The remaining portion of the increase above the House figure provides $750,000 for a radiation laboratory at the University of Notre Dame.

The Senate proposed also to provide for planning and engineering of a materials research laboratory at the University of Illinois. The program which would be carried on in this laboratory is the same as that being sponsored by the Advance Research Projects Agency of the Department of De-

fense. Under this program, contracts are made with universities which provide for amortization of laboratories to be constructed by the universities. It is considered equitable that the laboratory at the University of Illinois be constructed on the same basis. The conferees of both Houses are in agreement that a laboratory financed in this manner should be considered as either an AEC or an ARPA project.

Amendment No. 20: Reported in disagreement.

U.S. Study Commission—Southeast River Basins

Salaries and Expenses

Amendment No. 21: Appropriates $1,550,000 instead of $1,500,000 as proposed by the House and $1,600,000 as proposed by the Senate.

U.S. Study Commission—Texas

Salaries and Expenses

Amendment No. 22: Appropriates $1,250,000 instead of $1,200,000 as proposed by the House and $1,300,000 as proposed by the Senate.

CLARENCE CANNON,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
BEN F. JENSEN,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, all appropriation bills for the session, with one exception, have cleared conference. In the 18 bills cleared, the President's budget requests for appropriations have been cut $301,544,748, even after congressional adjustments upward on the defense budget bill and the customary excessive increases in the Labor-HEW budget.

The one remaining bill—the closing supplemental—messaged back from the Senate yesterday, is $232,762,000 over the pertinent budget requests, largely because of the $190 million foreign aid addition inserted by the Senate. Thus the total of this final bill now stands as a substantial mortgage against the net reduction already made on the other 18 bills:

Public works appropriation bill, 1961

Budget estimate	$4,013,793,180
House bill	3,914,798,985
Senate bill	4,030,010,605
Conference report	3,969,982,485
Conference report compared with:	
Budget	−43,810,695
House bill	+55,183,500
Senate bill	−60,028,120

Flood control and navigation study additions made by the House and Senate to the General Investigations Program of the Corps of Engineers

ALABAMA	
Bon Secour River	$6,000
ALASKA	
Knuk River	10,000
Kodiak	10,000
Valdez Harbor	10,000
ARKANSAS	
Lee Creek (c)	3,500
Red River, Oklahoma, Texas, Arkansas, and Louisiana	25,000
CALIFORNIA	
Anaheim Bay Beach erosion	5,000
Bodega Bay	25,000
Cache Creek	10,000
Caliente Creek stream group	15,000

Flood control and navigation study additions made by the House and Senate to the General Investigations Program of the Corps of Engineers—Continued

CALIFORNIA—continued	
Merced County streams	10,000
San Diego River	15,000
San Luis Obispo Harbor	[1] 9,300
COLORADO	
Arkansas River above John Martin Dam	15,000
DELAWARE	
Chincoteague Bay—Delaware Bay, Virginia and Delaware	6,000
FLORIDA	
Big Sarasota Pass	10,000
East Pass Channel	10,000
Frenchmen's Creek	7,000
Martin County	25,000
Panacea-Apalachee Bay	15,000
Ponce de Leon Inlet	14,000
Southwest Dade County	25,000
Sunshine Skyway	4,700
GEORGIA	
Satilla-St. Mary's — Suwanne River, Georgia and Florida	25,000
Savannah River	20,000
HAWAII	
Coast of the Hawaiian Islands	[1] 8,200
Honolulu Harbor and Barbers Point	5,000
IDAHO	
Lower Snake River, Idaho, and Oregon	10,000
ILLINOIS	
Fox River, Illinois and Wisconsin	10,000
Mississippi River — Agriculture levees, Illinois and Missouri	[1] 33,000
Wabash River, Indiana and Illinois	[1] 15,000
Wabash River, Mount Carmel	[1] 15,000
INDIANA	
Little Calumet River, Illinois and Indiana	[1] 5,000
Maumee River, Indiana and Ohio	20,000
Whitewater River	10,000
IOWA	
Mississippi River—Urban areas, Iowa, Illinois, and Missouri	[1] 47,900
KANSAS	
Arkansas River, Great Bend to Colorado-Kansas line	10,000
Walnut River	15,000
KENTUCKY	
Green River locks and dams 3 and 4	$15,000
Rockcastle River	10,000
LOUISIANA	
Mississippi River, Baton Rouge to the gulf	5,100
MAINE	
Androscoggin River	60,000
New Harbor	10,000
Penobscot River	4,000
MASSACHUSETTS	
Edgartown Harbor	11,000
MICHIGAN	
Cedar River Harbor	5,000
Cheboygan inland route	5,000
Cross Village—Good Hart	8,000
Detroit Metropolitan area	[1] 5,000
Gladstone Harbor	7,000
Grand River	[1] 5,000
MISSOURI	
Chariton River	9,000
Meramec Basin	50,000

[1] Increase above the budget figure.

Flood control and navigation study additions made by the House and Senate to the General Investigations Program of the Corps of Engineers—Continued

MONTANA	
Missouri River above Fort Peck Dam	20,000
NEW YORK	
Cazanovia and Cayuga Creeks	[1] 32,500
Cattaraugus Creek Harbor	20,000
Chenango River study	25,000
Lake Erie—Ontario Waterway	[1] 15,000
Wappinger Creek	25,000
NORTH CAROLINA	
Cape Fear	[1] 5,000
Carolina Beach	7,000
Drum Inlet	8,000
Neuse River	[1] 10,000
Pamlico Sound	10,000
Shallotte and Lockwood's Folly Inlets	[1] 15,000
Waccamaw River, North Carolina and South Carolina	10,000
NORTH DAKOTA	
Green River	10,000
Souris-Mouse River	[1] 20,000
Red River, Devil's Lake	10,000
OHIO	
Chagrin River	[1] 32,200
Clear and Rock Forks, Mohican River (c)	5,900
Hacking River (c)	5,000
Licking River	15,000
OKLAHOMA	
Red River pollution abatement study	150,000
OREGON	
Coquille River	10,000
Port Orford	9,000
Tillamook Bay	10,000
PENNSYLVANIA	
French Creek	15,500
Miscellaneous streams, Maryland and Pennsylvania (Wyoming Valley, Pa.—Wilkes-Barre vicinity)	495,000
RHODE ISLAND	
Bristol Harbor	6,000
Dutch Island Harbor	2,000
Providence Harbor	28,000
SOUTH CAROLINA	
Gill's Creek	16,000
TENNESSEE	
J. Percy Priest Reservoir	10,000
TEXAS	
Brazos River (above Whitney Dam)	$10,000
Edwards Underground Reservoir	15,000
Gulf Pentacoastal Waterway:	
(a) Palacios	4,000
(b) Port Mansfield	10,000
Port Aransas-Corpus Christi Waterway	5,000
VIRGINIA	
Beach Creek	6,500
Inland Waterway, Chincoteague Bay to Chesapeake Bay	14,800
WASHINGTON	
Point Roberts	15,000
Seattle Harbor, Duwamish Waterway	25,000
Total	1,901,100

[1] Increase above the budget figure.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include certain tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. CANNON] has given some figures relating to this bill but I think those figures should be supplemented by the following figures:

The public works appropriation bill for 1961 budget estimate was $4,013,793,180. The House bill as it passed the House provided for $3,914,798,985. The Senate raised that figure by $116,211,620, making a total of the Senate bill $4,030,010,605. The conference report comes back to the House in the amount of $3,969,982,485, or $60,028,120 below the Senate figure and $43,810,695 below the budget.

Mr. Speaker, as everyone knows, this is a bill which includes the Atomic Energy Commission's request for funds, and for all flood control, reclamation, irrigation, river and harbor improvement, hydropower projects, and so forth, nationwide. We have done the best we could to eliminate unnecessary projects and reduce amounts in the bill which we thought were exorbitant. In many items I feel we have done as good a job as possible, and I hope this conference report will be accepted.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, this bill is brought back with less new starts than it was expected we would be able to do, but the 22 new projects that are included will ultimately cost $365 million, which will have to be added year by year to the items that have heretofore been considered by the committee.

Mr. Speaker, I include as part of my remarks the following table:

1961 public works appropriation bill

	Number	Total estimated Federal cost
New construction starts added	[1] 23	[1] $350,567,000
Budgeted new construction starts deleted	−5	−7,928,000
New cost of new commitments	18	342,639,000
Resumptions of old projects	[2] +4	[2] +12,827,000
Total (net change)	22	355,466,000

[1] 19 added by Senate, total cost of $339,348,000; 4 added by House, total cost of $11,219,000.

[2] 3 added by Senate, total cost of $11,082,000; 1 added by House, total cost of $1,745,000.

(In addition, a total of 50 new unbudgeted planning starts included in bill of which 16 were added by House; 34 by the Senate.)

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include a table.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, the Public Works Appropriations conference report is a great disappointment to the people of Illinois because it deletes from the public works appropriations bill the $900,000 appropriation inserted by the Senate for the removal of the Western Avenue highway bridge. This is an appropriation which in all justice and fairness should have been approved by the House conferees. Compounding the injury is the fact that the manner in which the conference reached agreement precludes bringing the matter before the House for a separate vote. Had the Senate not receded and had the item been reported in disagreement, a separate vote could have been had upon the amendment. This cannot be done now. Under the parliamentary situation now, the only way to upset the conferees' action is to reject the entire bill, an obviously impossible goal.

Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress from Illinois have made their position known time and again to the members of the Public Works Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee. We have been unable to move them from their opposition to this appropriation, even though reason and equity are on our side. Their argument was presented in a letter written by one of the members to the dean of the Illinois delegation, Hon. THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, and it stated the justification for the subcommittee's action, as follows:

ILLINOIS WATERWAY—CALUMET-SAG

The critical consideration underlying the committee's action on this item is that this particular project was singled out for special consideration with respect to local contributions. When the Truman-Hobbs Act was amended in the 82d Congress to provide that the cost of relocating highway bridges would be shared between the Federal Government and the owners, there was no intention that it should be applied retroactively to either already authorized projects or those in the construction stage.

In the public works authorization bill of 1958, this particular project was singled out for preferential treatment and language was included to make the provisions of the amended Truman-Hobbs Act retroactive in order to relieve the local interests of a cost of $10 million in the relocation of highway bridges which they had committed themselves to in order to get the project authorized in the first place.

There are, of course, many instances in which liberalizing legislation alters the more stringent requirements of earlier acts and authorizations. However, it can certainly be considered unusual when there is a following action in a specific instance to go back of the liberalizing legislation and apply its provisions to already accomplished projects and contracts. The committee considers this a dangerous precedent. There is enough inequity in water resources legislation without adding to it in as obvious a manner as has been done in this particular case. The view that the committee insists is a correct one is that this action has the practical effect of penalizing the contributors on all prior projects for having met the commitments on which their projects were originally authorized.

The point has been made that the specific instruments received by the corps on local assurances indicate that the local interests expected to pay all costs of relocations of highway bridges under laws existing at the time of their construction and that this means that the amended Truman-Hobbs Act should apply in figuring their contribution on highway bridges. If these assurances were valid there would have been no reason for the special legislation in the public works bill of 1958.

When the project was originally authorized in 1946, it was on the basis that the full cost of highway relocations would be carried by the local interests and a search of the hearings and the reports on this authorization fail to show that there was any such conditioning on the local contribution commitments before the legislative committee when the project was authorized. The fact that assurances were later finalized in these terms has no bearing on the issue since they could not be accepted in this form by the corps under the strict terms of the original authorization on the project.

Pertinent report statements in connection with this question are, as follows:

1. From the report of the Committee on Public Works on the river and harbor, beach control, and flood control project authorization bill for 1958, page 69:

"Local interests were required to bear the cost of alterations to highway bridges in accordance with policy at that time."

2. From the report of the Secretary of the Army, House Document No. 45, dated January 3, 1957 on the Illinois Waterway and Grand Calument River, Ill. and Ind. (Calumet-Sag navigation project), page 2:

"The district engineer states that for the existing project, the cost of alterations to highway bridges was assigned to local interests in accordance with the then-established policy of Congress under the General Bridge Act, approved March 23, 1906. This assignment was generally acceptable to local interests at the time the project was authorized."

Page 15: "The present authorization for the Calumet-Sag project requires as a condition of local cooperation that the cost of all highway-bridge alterations will be borne by local interests."

Page 22: "Legislation contained in Public Law 564 of the 82d Congress, in amending the Bridge Act of 1940 to include publicly owned highway bridges, contains no retroactive provision, and application of the amended act retroactively to highway bridges included in previously authorized navigation projects is not considered proper or justified."

There are three parts to this project. The special provision in the 1958 authorization, designed to relieve the local sponsors of a $10 million commitment which was a condition precedent to authorization, involves only part I. If this provision is implemented with appropriations, it would logically follow that the local contribution of $38 million more on parts II and III, also a condition precedent to authorization, would be excused.

It is, of course, speculative as to whether or not there would have been favorable action on the original authorization if this total of $48 million had been planned as an additional Federal cost. Under such circumstances, the Federal cost is $183 million and the local cost is only $17 million, instead of $135 million Federal and $65 million local, which the original authorization anticipated.

Mr. Speaker, an analysis of the subcommittee's position shows that the subcommittee's conclusions are not well founded for the following reasons:

First. There is no basis in fact or legislative history for the assertion in the first paragraph that at the time of the enactment of the amendment to the Truman-Hobbs Act it was intended that it would not be applied retroactively to either already authorized projects or those in the construction stage. If there had been a declaration of any such legis-

lative intention, certainly it would have quoted it from either the bill, the reports, or the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Page 17 of the report of the subcommittee for 1961 itself points out:

The Truman-Hobbs Act was silent on the question of applying its provisions to already authorized projects and projects in the construction stage.

There is no merit to the contention that such an interpretation will require payment by the Federal Government for all highway bridges constucted prior to passage of the Truman-Hobbs amendment. I believe, however, that projects upon which construction was not begun until after passage of the amendment in 1952 should certainly be examined to determine whether they are so important to the national interest as to warrant the assumption of payment by the Federal Government for removal of any highway bridges involved in the project. The Engineers so described this project.

Second. This paragraph is entirely conjectural. The facts are that the Public Works Committee in 1958 considered whether the Cal-Sag project was of sufficient importance to warrant assumption of the cost by the Federal Government of removing the highway bridges. The matter was submitted to the Corps of Engineers for its recommendation. The Corps could have taken the same viewpoint as the subcommittee. It could have declared that the amendment to the Truman-Hobbs Act was not meant to apply to projects authorized prior to the 1952 amendment. However, the Corps came to the opposite conclusion. It declared that because of the importance of the development, the cost of removing highway bridges should be assumed by the Federal Government in the same manner as railroad bridges—House Document No. 45, 85th Congress, 1st session. The Public Works Committee approved the recommendation of the Corps of Engineers. The Bureau of the Budget, which cannot be accused of approving projects which are not authorized or which are given preferential treatment, approved a budget item for the appropriation to remove the highway bridges.

The subcommittee's adamance is shown by its position in which it refused even to grant funds for the removal of railroad bridges. There can be no possible question but that the appropriation for removing such bridges should be granted. Yet, it is said on page 17 of its report that it would not approve the appropriation of any additional funds for the project, because "it is the committee's intention that no new work be undertaken on this project until the question of financing the highway bridges has been settled in favor of the Federal Government." If this intractable attitude prevails, the investment by local governments and the Federal Government in excess of $100 million is likely to go down the drain.

Paragraph 3 states that "the committee insists that this action has the practical effect of penalizing the contributors on all prior projects for having met the commitments on which their projects were originally authorized." This is again a conclusion which is not based on fact or upon recognition of the effect of legislation. The same argument might be made against approving funds for removals authorized and constructed following passage of the Truman-Hobbs amendment. If some local governments have paid for removal of projects prior to 1952, why should those whose projects happened to follow the critical date be relieved of payment? The reason, of course, is the fact that passage of a law establishes a separation and may grant benefits where they did not previously exist. There are always fringe cases, such as the present one, which require special interpretation to determine whether the benefits should be conferred or not.

However, that question was passed on by three relevant and authoritative agencies, the Corps of Engineers, the Public Works Committee, and the Bureau of the Budget. All decided that the present case was one in which the costs should be assumed by the Federal Government. This subcommittee said no.

Fourth. The next paragraph indicates that local interests have given assurances of their expectation to pay the cost of relocating the highway bridges. Assuming for the purpose of argument that this is true, and I do not know whether it is because I have not seen the instruments, must payments still be required of such local interests if it is legal and equitable for assumption of such costs by the Federal Government? Suppose such assurances had been given in 1946 and the amendment to the Truman-Hobbs Act had been passed in 1946 prior to the authorizing legislation: Would the subcommittee then have insisted, too, that because agreement to pay such costs had been given by the local government that passage of the amendment would not have relieved them of their obligations? Of course not.

Fifth. The next paragraph is only a half statement of the pertinent facts. Of the assertions in the paragraph, it is stated that a search of the hearings and reports in 1946 failed to show that there was any conditioning of local contribution commitments before the legislative committee. Even if that be true, that exact question was presented to the Public Works Committee of the House during the 85th Congress, 2d session. In its report on H.R. 12955, House Report 1894, at page 69, the committee said:

The review made by the Corps of Engineers of the existing project was directed at determining if the conditions of local cooperation with respect to highway bridges should be modified in any way at this time.

After considering this question, which is the heart of the controversy, the committee said:

It [the committee] considers that modification of part 1 to accomplish that portion of the waterway for which funds have been appropriated should be made, and recommends that the highway bridge cost of $9,884,000 in part 1 of the improvement be borne by the Federal Government.

Sixth. The next paragraph dealing with "pertinent report statements" distorts the action of the Committee on Public Works. It is like citing the dissenting opinion of a law case to justify a position, for if one reads the balance of section 109 from which the statement is taken, one finds the recommendation of the committee as follows, and I quote it again:

It considers that modification of part I to accomplish that portion of the waterway for which funds have been appropriated should be made, and recommends that the highway bridge cost of $9,884,000 in part I of the improvement be borne by the Federal Government.

The subcommittee's next argument uses the same approach. Again, they are half statements which result in improper conclusions from the documents. One needs only to quote the statement and the balance of the paragraph on page 22 of the document alluded to, namely, House Document No. 45 of the 85th Congress, 1st session, as follows:

The legislation contained in Public Law 564, 82d Congress, in amending the Bridge Act of 1940 to include publicly owned highway bridges contains no retroactive provision, and application of the amended act retroactively to highway bridges included in previously authorized navigation projects is not considered proper or justified. It is proper, however, to consider further the extent of local participation with regard to the cost of alteration of highway bridges in the light of present conditions, including the policy of Congress as contained in the 1942 amendment to the Bridge Act. Alteration of the highway bridges involved in the Calumet-Sag project is not necessary to remove any unreasonable obstruction to navigation under existing channel conditions but is required to permit the extensive widening of the channels beyond the present tops of banks in order to undertake the presently authorized projects to provide for a waterway to accommodate prospective navigation. Consequently, the alteration of bridges is an essential and integral part of the improvement. The only special local benefits accruing from the project are those resulting to bridge owners from the bridge construction program.

50. In view of the predominantly general nature of the benefits accruing from the project and of the major local contributions toward the development of the project, and in consideration of the special benefits to highway bridge owners, it is considered equitable that the allocation of cost of highway bridge alterations be made in accordance with the provisions of section 6 of Public Law 647, 76th Congress, as amended, in a similar manner to that authorized for railroad bridges.

If one reads the rest of the report by the Corps of Engineers it will be noted the recommendation by the corps that the cost should be assumed by the Federal Government in the same manner in which the Government assumes the cost for removal of railroad bridges.

Mr. Speaker, finally, in conversations with members of the subcommittee it was suggested that the present attitude of the Corps of Engineers be ascertained. Accordingly, General Itschner was contacted, and again asked for the corps' recommendation. On May 17, the corps reaffirmed its earlier recommendation that the Federal Government should pay the costs of removing the highway bridges.

Mr. Speaker, proponents of the appropriation have done everything possible to sustain their position. In spite of the

fact that the Corps of Army Engineers, the Public Works Committee of the House and the Bureau of the Budget have all approved the appropriation, the members of the Appropriations Subcommittee refuse to change their position.

It is unfortunate that the matter cannot be brought before the House today for a vote. I believe that if the matter were presented to the House for its consideration, the subcommittee's viewpoint might be overruled.

Whether the question can be raised again next year is problematic. Obviously the bridges must be removed if the work on this vital waterway is to continue, and the work must be completed as promptly as possible. Whether it can be delayed sufficiently to permit another attempt to obtain a redetermination of this controversy is not known at this time and I shall reserve that question until I have had an opportunity to check the matter further.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire if it is not the basic purpose of this supplemental appropriation to cover deficits in the previous year's spending. Here, if I understand the situation right, you are proposing to inject expenditures or make money available for expenditures in this year, which has nothing to do with a deficiency appropriation at all.

Mr. CANNON. This is not a deficiency bill. This is a public works bill. The matter the gentleman refers to was covered in the bill which just went to conference.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PORTER].

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I very much regret the misunderstanding in the Appropriations Committee of the House which has resulted in the deletion from this bill of the amount of $23,000 which was budgeted for preconstruction planning on the Coos and Millicoma Rivers project in my district.

Apparently some members of the committee felt that this project would be in the nature of a subsidy for private industry—a sort of an unnecessary water substitute for a timber access road to serve private timber stands. I hope that next year we will be able to have full hearings on this point. I know that it can be shown that this project would serve vast stands of public timber, much of it Federal timber, as well as creating some benefits for industry in the area. To construct access roads in lieu of the project would be immensely expensive. The cost per mile of even minimum standard logging roads in that area is not less than $20,000 and often as high as $60,000.

The Corps of Engineers had carefully studied this project and brought in a favorable report. It has been ready for a planning start for 3 years and the administration included it finally in this year's budget. It should have been approved by both committees and made a part of this bill. However, the House committee knocked it out, it was restored by the Senate committee and deleted again by the conferees.

I certainly intend to do everything possible, if I am returned to Congress, to have this project appropriation reconsidered and acted upon favorably at the next session.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSEN].

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I will take just a moment to congratulate and commend the subcommittee conferees upon the splendid job which they have done with a very difficult task.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to say, as a matter of record, that the full amount of $6,100,000 recommended by the President for construction work on the Columbia Basin reclamation project in the State of Washington was not allowed by the conference committee. The agreement reached, instead, provides for $5,296,900, including funds which can be transferred to the project for unforeseen contingencies.

What this means, of course, is that some construction work will have to be deferred until 1962, instead of being programed at this time. It is too early to be able to determine exactly where the necessary cutbacks in construction will occur, but I have been assured by the Bureau of Reclamation that most urgent priority work can be carried out with the funds allowed by the conference committee.

I feel it is regrettable that the full amount of $6,100,000 in the President's budget could not have been retained because all of the work which had been programed could be accomplished within the limits of the existing farmers' 1945 repayment contract. I believe it is now clear, moreover, that progressive steps are being taken by both the irrigation districts and the Bureau of Reclamation toward putting a new and more satisfactory contract into operation at the earliest practicable date.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 12326, as reported out to us by the conference committee, does not contain the funds required to start design work on the materials research laboratory at the University of Illinois. I think this was a serious oversight. I am happy to report, however, that I have been assured by the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission that design work will be provided for this facility from AEC operating appropriations so that time will not be lost.

I think a brief summary of the consideration of the University of Illinois Materials Research Laboratory during the year will be of value for the record. The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy added project 61-f-8, authorizing $5,600,000 for the construction of the laboratory, to the Atomic Energy Commission's fiscal year 1961 authorization bill. This was done by the Joint Committee because the importance of research work in the field of materials to the atomic energy program was recognized and the special talents of the University of Illinois to perform this work was also recognized.

The Congress agreed in the need for the materials research laboratory for the University of Illinois and approved the inclusion of the item in the AEC authorization bill.

During subsequent consideration of the appropriation bill for the Atomic Energy Commission on May 26, 1960, before the Senate Appropriations Committee, Mr. McCone, Chairman of the AEC, testified in support of the project. In his testimony Mr. McCone explained why the project was not included in the original bill submitted to the Congress by the Commission and why, now that a policy question concerning the financing of laboratories has been settled, it could be included.

Quoting from the testimony, Mr. McCone explained it this way:

Mr. MCCONE. Something over a year ago, 18 months ago now, a study was made of the facilities throughout the country for materials research. It was recognized by those who made the study—this study was done under the direction of the scientific adviser to the President—that the country was lagging in its facilities for basic material research and, therefore, a recommendation was made that several laboratories be constructed at universities and the interested agencies of Government undertake to finance these laboratories. The total of the six was in the order of capital costs of $30 million to $35 million, and it was indicated the operating costs would be about $20 million per year.

The Atomic Energy Commission considered this matter very seriously, as did the Department of Defense. Of the six, one of the ones most attractive to us, because of the quality of the men, was the one at Illinois.

We, however, deferred action because no policy was developed at the Government level on construction of facilities at university sites at private universities or State universities using Federal funds, although there have been at various times very extensive amounts of Federal funds used at universities for this purpose by the Atomic Energy Commission and others.

It was for that reason, the absence of national policy, that we deferred action on the University of Illinois project at the time that our authorization bill was formulated and our appropriation bills submitted to the Bureau of the Budget.

Subsequently the Federal Council, Science Council, has more or less agreed, certainly informally, and perhaps formally.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think they have adopted the resolution formally.

Mr. MCCONE. They have adopted the resolution formally, thereby indicating that this was a thing we should support. Therefore, although this item was not included in our authorization bill, when it was included by the committee, we considered it and felt that in the ensuing months the project could be advanced by the expenditure of design money and negotiations with the university so that we could submit the whole amount in an orderly fashion next year and that is what we intended to do.

I think we will have funds that would be available for design although we do not have any particular item in our budget. A million dollars is in the order of magnitude of the funds we might be able to use.

The University of Illinois facilities would be in our opinion desirable.

As indicated in the above-quoted testimony, the AEC considers the University of Illinois one of the most attractive materials research facility proposals because of the abilities of the scientists at the university. The testimony also indicates the intent of the Commission to proceed with the design of the University of Illinois facility.

In summary, although the authorization for the University of Illinois Research Laboratory was deleted from the AEC appropriations bill, the necessary design work on this important facility will be able to proceed and consideration for full authorization of construction can be handled in the next appropriations bill.

RADIATION RESEARCH LABORATORY FOR THE UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME

I was also happy to see that the planning and engineering work for the Radiation Research Laboratory at the University of Illinois was included in the AEC appropriation bill for next year. The Notre Dame facility was also recognized by the Joint Committee and the Congress as a necessary item in our atomic energy program and, accordingly, also added to the Atomic Energy Commission's authorization bill this year.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut.

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I support this public works conference report.

It contains provision for two new important flood control works in my district. I refer to the funds provided for planning projects at Hancock Brook and Northfield Brook. Although these projects were not included in the President's Budget, nevertheless, it has been possible to get authorization and appropriation at the same time and this represents a very unusual procedure but one which means that we do not have to wait until 1961 to obtain the money for these projects.

Also included in the bill are funds for the continuance of construction at the Thomaston Dam, at Mad River, at East Branch Brook and Hall Meadow Brook. Thus again, this year, we take a great step forward. Our program is not complete but with the inclusion of these new works we have moved well toward the initiation of the major works required in the engineers plan for this area.

We must, of course, continue to press for the completion of this program and for appropriations for the final projects at the earliest possible opportunity.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 4: Page 4, line 22, after "bridge" insert ": *Provided further* That not to exceed $200,000 of the funds herein or hereafter provided for 'Construction, general,' shall be available for the construction of necessary bank stabilization and other protective measures on Red River in the vicinity of the St. Louis Southwestern Railroad and the Arkansas State highway bridges at Garland City, Arkansas: *Provided further,*".

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 10: Page 10, line 18, after "customer" insert ": *Provided further,* That not to exceed $25,000 shall be available toward investigation and the emergency rehabilitation of the Dalton Gardens, Avondale, and Hayden Lake Unit, Rathdrum Prairie Irrigation Projects, Idaho, to be repaid in full under conditions satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 20: Page 23, line 22, after "gram" insert ": *Provided further,* That not to exceed $13,000,000 of this appropriation may be transferred to the appropriation 'Other procurement, Navy', solely for construction of power reactor plants for the Antarctic".

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert ": *Provided further,* That not to exceed $3,500,000 of this appropriation shall be transferred to the appropriation 'Other procurement, Navy', solely for construction of power reactor plants for the Antarctic".

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the conference report just agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the action of the Congress in refusing to approve $2.9 million for necessary relocation of railroad and highway bridges over the Cal-Sag Channel constitutes a major detriment to the completion of this vital project. I wish to point out to you that this Cal-Sag navigation project easily ranks as one of the most vital in the Nation, since it represents the necessary link between the commerce now generating through the St. Lawrence Seaway and the commercial traffic on the inland waterway system which serves all of mid-America.

Work on the Cal-Sag Channel has continued at a rapid pace, a tribute to the citizen communities that have provided the inspiration, and the recognition by the Corps of Engineers of the importance of this program.

Behind the Cal-Sag project stands a record of intense local participation; a record of accomplishments and spending amounting to millions of dollars. Three years ago, the Illinois General Assembly passed a bill which granted the metropolitan sanitary district the authority to issue bonds to provide purchase of land necessary for the channel-widening project. I must point out to you that local cooperation has been received from the city of Chicago and numerous suburban communities, county of Cook, through which the channel runs, State of Illinois, and, as indicated, the Sanitary District of Chicago—all of which have contributed direct funds as well as tremendous amount of time and energy on the part of their officials to the furtherance of this project.

Mr. Speaker, an important phase of the Cal-Sag project is the replacement, alteration, or removal of railroad and highway bridges in conformity with the horizontal and vertical clearance requirements of the vastly improved channel. It must be pointed out that in the omnibus rivers and harbors bill of 1958, the House Public Works Committee, after a separate survey report had been ordered and processed through channels, authorized the inclusion of the Western Avenue Highway Bridge under the Truman-Hobbs Act. Their reason for so doing, that they felt this to be sufficiently justified, may I call your attention to House Report 1894, 85th Congress, 2d session, section 109, on page 69, which gives a detailed explanation of the reason for the inclusion of this project in the 1958 act:

The committee recognizes the importance of the Cal-Sag Navigation Project as a vital link, through commerce, between the Great Lakes and Mississippi-Ohio Inland Waterway system.

Mr. Speaker, I regret the failure of the committee to properly assess this matter.

My purpose in calling this matter to your attention at this time is in the hope that the Members of the House, especially those members of the Appropriations Committee, will carefully study this matter and in the early days of the 87th Congress move to rectify what I consider to be a serious error in judgment.

"PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG"

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 704) to remove copyright restrictions upon the musical composition "Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag," and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the musical composition "Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag", covered by copyright EU399400, granted to Irving Caesar on June 3, 1955, assigned by Irving Caesar to Congressman Louis C. Rabaut by an instrument recorded in the Office of the Register of Copyrights in assignment record book 942 at page 57, and assigned by Congressman Louis C. Rabaut to the Congress of the United States by an instrument recorded in the Office of the Register of Copyrights in assignment record book 943 at page 451, is hereby declared to be in the public domain.

SEC. 2. The Joint Committee on Printing is authorized and directed to cause to be prepared three arrangements of the musical composition "Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag" suitable for use in nonprofessional performances. One arrangement shall be for vocal, one for band, and one for orchestral performance. The Joint Committee on Printing shall cause to be printed and distributed one hundred copies of each such arrangement to each Member of Congress and to the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico.

SEC. 3. The Joint Committee on Printing shall cause copies of the arrangements authorized by section 2 to be printed for sale to the public through the Superintendent of Documents, and shall cause additional copies to be printed from time to time for such purpose in such quantities as may be necessary to meet public demand. Such sales shall be made at such prices as the Committee may from time to time determine as adequate to cover the cost of printing.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 17, strike out "Such sales shall be made at such prices as the committee may from time to time determine as adequate to cover the cost of printing."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, House Joint Resolution 704, which just passed the House, represents the culmination of several years of work concerning the "Pledge of Allegiance" to our flag. As you will recall the President, on Flag Day—June 14—in 1954, signed into law the legislation which I introduced to insert the words "Under God" in the "Pledge of Allegiance." On Flag Day of the following year, 1955, as you will also recall, the Pledge was played and sung on the floor of the House in an unprecedented ceremony. Subsequent to that the copyright to the song, which was held by the composer, Irving Caesar, was turned over to me and I, in turn, assigned the copyright to the Congress. That is where the matter stands at the present time. However, with the Congress holding the copyright, it develops that the many groups, organizations, schools and so forth that would like and would have occasion to use the song cannot freely do so. As a consequence, I introduced the resolution just passed for the purpose of making this song, "Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag," public domain. This will enable anyone who so desires to use, print, reproduce and distribute this musical composition without restrictions or inhibitions.

Further than this, House Joint Resolution 704 authorizes and directs the Joint Committee on Printing to cause to be prepared three arrangements of the song. One of these arrangements will be for vocal, one for band, and one for orchestra. Mr. Donald Hunsberger, of the Crane Department of Music, New York State Teachers College, has graciously donated his services for the preparations of these arrangements. This resolution further directs the Joint Committee on Printing to print and distribute to each Member of Congress 100 copies of each arrangement. These would be for the specific purpose of allowing each Member to present these arrangements to schools and various groups in his home area In addition the committee is also directed to print copies of the arrangements for sale to the public through the Superintendent of Documents in sufficient numbers to meet public demand.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very worthwhile undertaking. It is primarily aimed for the children of the country. The arrangements will be purposely simple in form with the foremost objective being their use by school chorus, classroom singing periods, school bands, and the like. As we all know, the children of today are the lifeblood of America's future. We know also that music and song constitute one of the highest forms of praise and devotion. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that there is no better place to concentrate on teaching and instilling love of country and devotion to the national flag in the children of this Nation than through the schools. This is the primary intent of the resolution. However, not only the children will benefit. In a time when all of us are so concerned with vast international problems and the many major domestic issues, it is well indeed that we reflect and lay new emphasis upon the basic principles for which this Nation stands. Those principles are all embodied in the shining symbol of this country—our flag. When we pledge our allegiance to our flag, we are pledging our devotion to the fundamental precepts for which it stands—freedom, democracy, justice, and equality. The more emphasis we can lay on this pledge, this allegiance, the stronger our Nation will be. This resolution will further that purpose.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is the day for the call of the Consent Calendar. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

AGRICULTURAL ATTACHÉ ROTATION

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8074) to amend section 602 of the Agricultural Act of 1954.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

CLAIMS OF CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF ALASKA RAILROAD

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4084) to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to determine the amounts due and owing and render judgment upon the claims of certain employees of the Alaska Railroad for overtime work performed.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

MARKER TO COMMEMORATE ACHIEVEMENTS OF JOHN C. PAGE

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 416) to provide for the erection in the city of Page, Ariz., of an appropriate marker to commemorate the achievements of former Commissioner of Reclamation, John C. Page.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, at the request of another Member who could not be present, I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

USE OF PESTICIDES OR OTHER CHEMICALS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 12419) to provide for advance consultation with the Fish and Wildlife Service and with State wildlife agencies before the beginning of any Federal program involving the use of pesticides or other chemicals designed for mass biological controls.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WEAVER, Mr. MARSHALL and Mr. NATCHER objected.

OPERATION ROUTE OF POSTAL POWERBOAT SERVICE IN ALASKA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1849) to amend the act of August 10, 1939, authorizing the Postmaster General to contract for certain powerboat service in Alaska.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL GUARD CLAIMS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5435) to extend the Federal Tort Claims Act to members of the National Guard when engaged in training duty under Federal law, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 2671 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 2671. Definitions

"As used in this chapter and sections 1346(b) and 2401(b) of this title, the term—

"'Federal agency' includes the executive departments and independent establishments of the United States and corporations primarily acting as instrumentalities or agencies of the United States, but does not include any contractor with the United States.

"'Employee of the Government' includes officers or employees of any Federal agency; members of the military or naval forces of the United States and, while engaged in training or duty under section 316, 502, 503, 504, or 505 of title 32 of the United States Code or other provision of law under which they are entitled to Federal pay or for which such pay has been waived; members of the National Guard, as defined in section 101(2) of title 32 of the United States Code; civilian employees of the National Guard of a State, Territory, or Commonwealth, employed under the authority contained in section 709 of title 32 of the United States Code, and paid from Federal funds; and persons acting on behalf of a Federal agency in an official capacity, temporarily or permanently in the service of the United States, whether with or without compensation.

"'Acting within the scope of his office or employment' in the case of a member of the military or naval forces of the United States or, while engaged in training or duty under section 316, 502, 503, 504, or 505 of the United States Code, or other provision of law under which he is entitled to Federal pay or for which such pay has been waived, a member of the National Guard, as defined in section 101(2) of title 32 of the United States Code, means acting in line of duty."

SEC. 2. Section 2733(f) of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(f) For the purposes of this section

"(1) a member of the Coast and Geodetic Survey or of the Public Health Service who is serving with the Navy or the Marine Corps,

"(2) a member of the National Guard who is engaged in training or duty under section 316, 502, 503, 504, or 505 of title 32 of the United States Code, or other provision of law under which he is entitled to Federal pay or for which such pay has been waived, and

"(3) a civilian employee of the National Guard of a State, Territory, or Commonwealth, employed under the authority contained in section 709 of title 32 of the United States Code and paid from Federal funds, shall be treated as if he were a member of the armed force concerned."

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to amend title 32, United States Code, to authorize the payment of certain claims against the National Guard."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That chapter 7 of title 32, United States Code, is amended—

"(1) by adding the following new section at the end thereof:

"'§ 715. Property loss; personal injury or death: activities under certain section of this title

"'(2) Under such regulations as the Secretary of the Army or Secretary of the Air Force may prescribe, he or, subject to appeal to him, the Judge Advocate General of the armed force under his jurisdiction, if designated by him, may settle, and pay in an amount not more than $5,000, a claim against the United States for—

"'(1) damage to, or loss of, real property, including damage or loss incident to use and occupancy;

"'(2) damage to, or loss of, personal property, including property bailed to the United States or the National Guard and including registered or insured mail damaged, lost, or destroyed by a criminal act while in the possession of the National Guard; or

"'(3) personal injury or death;

either caused by a member of the Army National Guard or the Air National Guard, as the case may be, while engaged in training or duty under section 316, 502, 503, 504, or 505 of this title or any other provision of law for which he is entitled to pay under section 301 of title 37, or for which he has waived that pay, and acting within the scope of his employment; caused by a person employed under section 709 of this title acting within the scope of his employment; or otherwise incident to noncombat activities of the Army National Guard or the Air National Guard, as the case may be, under one of those sections.

"'(b) A claim may be allowed under subsection (a) only if—

"'(1) it is presented in writing two years after it accrues, except that if the claim accrues in time of war or armed conflict or if such a war or armed conflict intervenes within two years after it accrues, and if good cause is shown, the claim may be presented not later than two years after the war or armed conflict is terminated;

"'(2) it is not covered by section 2734 of title 10 or section 2672 of title 28;

"'(3) it is not for personal injury or death of such a member or a person employed under section 709 of this title, whose injury or death is incident to his service;

"'(4) the damage to, or loss of, property, or the personal injury or death, was not caused wholly or partly by a negligent or wrongful act of the claimant, his agent, or his employee; and

"'(5) it is substantiated as prescribed in regulations of the Secretary concerned.

For the purposes of clause (1), the dates of the beginning and end of an armed conflict are the dates established by concurrent resolution of Congress or by a determination of the President.

"'(c) Payment may not be made under this section for reimbursement for medical, hospital, or burial services furnished at the expense of the United States or of any State or the District of Columbia or Puerto Rico.

"'(d) If the Secretary of the military department concerned considers that a claim in excess of $5,000 is meritorious and would otherwise be covered by this section, he may pay the claimant $5,000 and report the excess to Congress for its consideration.

"'(e) Except as provided in subsection (d), no claim may be paid under this section unless the amount tendered is accepted by the claimant in full satisfaction.

"'(f) In any case where the amount to be paid is not more than $1,000, the authority contained in subsection (a) may be delegated to any officer of the Army or the Air Force, as the case may be, who has been delegated authority under section 2733(g) of title 10 to settle similar claims.

"'(g) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the settlement of a claim under this section is final and conclusive.

"'(h) In this section, "settle" means consider, ascertain, adjust, determine, and dispose of a claim, whether by full or partial allowance or disallowance.'; and

"(2) by adding the following new item at the end of the analysis:

"'715. Property loss; personal injury or death: activities under certain sections of this title.'"

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANE. I yield.

Mr. FORD. Is this an amendment which was agreed to by the committee or is it some other proposal outside of the recommendations by the committee?

Mr. LANE. This is an amendment agreed to by the committee to the committee amendment. It is a matter of phraseology and not substance.

Mr. FORD. It does not go to the substance of the bill?

Mr. LANE. That is right.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The Clerk read as follows:

Clause (1) of subsection (b) of new section 715 of title 32 added by the bill is amended to read, as follows:

"(1) it is presented in writing within 2 years after it accrues, except that if the claim accrues in time of war or armed conflict or (if such a war or armed conflict) intervenes within 2 years after it accrues, and if good cause is shown, the claim may be presented not later than 2 years after the war or armed conflict is terminated;"

The last sentence of subsection (b) is amended to read as follows:

"For the purposes of clause (1), the dates of the beginning and end of an armed conflict are the dates established by concurrent resolution of Congress or by a determination of the President."

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to. The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend title 32, United States Code, to authorize the payment of certain claims against the National Guard."

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1764) to amend title 32, United States Code, to authorize the payment of certain claims against the National Guard.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. FORD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, it was my understanding that there was some printing flaw or some other similar problem connected with the bill which went through the other body.

Mr. LANE. That is the amendment to the committee amendment which I just offered. In two places words were left out by the Senate. The amendment I intend to offer will strike out all after the enacting clause of the Senate bill and insert the provisions of the bill we have just passed, H.R. 5435.

Mr. FORD. While I have the floor, Mr. Speaker, may I say that I had some reservations concerning this legislation. I have consulted with responsible authorities in the Department of Defense. They have made certain representations to me. I have been supplied with a letter by Mr. George S. Leonard, First Assistant to the Assistant Attorney General, Civil Division, dated August 25, 1960, which resolves my reservations concerning this legislation. I ask unanimous consent that this letter from Mr. Leonard may be included in my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The letter referred to follows:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, D.C., August 25, 1960.

Re H.R. 5435.

Hon. GERALD R. FORD, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FORD: I am informed by Colonel Blatt of the National Guard Bureau of your interest in this matter. He has advised me of your request for a restatement of the position of this Department with respect to the above numbered bill, as now amended to limit the legislation to administrative payment of claims arising from National Guard activities under the terms of chapter 7 of title 32, United States Code, the Military Claims Act.

In writing to Senator EASTLAND on May 23, 1960, we noted that the administrative disposition of claims for property damage and personal injuries under the Military Claims Act was "not a matter of direct concern to the Department of Justice." The same position was taken in my statement before Subcommittee No. 2 of the House Committee on the Judiciary on May 11, 1960, in which I added that "this Department would defer to other agencies on this point."

Both in the letter and statement referred to, this Department suggested the alternate possibility of indemnification of State liability for these activities. This proposal was intended solely as a constructive suggestion and was not intended as a limitation upon our stated policy that the administrative disposition of tort claims is within the primary jurisdiction of the agency from whose activities the liability arises.

Accordingly, in reaffirmation of the position previously taken, we defer to the recommendation of the Department of Defense and do not object to enactment of this legislation.

Sincerely,

GEO. S. LEONARD,
First Assistant.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, this legislation, looking to the assumption by the Federal Government of pecuniary responsibility for the acts of members of the National Guard and the civilian employees authorized by section 709 of title 32, United States Code while of tremendous importance, and a landmark in National Guard legislation is not entirely without precedent.

Since 1937, with the exception of the war years, the Congress in its annual appropriation acts for the military departments has provided for the payment from Federal funds of claims for damage to private property incident to the operation of National Guard camps of instruction. Initially limited to $500 per claim, the maximum amount authorized to be paid during recent years has been $1,000. These enactments have resulted from the conviction that the Federal Government had a moral obligation to such private persons as might be damaged by actions of National Guardsmen performing training duties authorized by Federal law, even though the National Guard while performing training duty under title 32, United States Code was not as a matter of law in the Federal service. All of this prior legislation provided for administrative settlement by the service Secretaries. None has provided for judicial review or relief.

The essential fact that members of the National Guard performing training duty authorized by the National Defense Act, now codified as title 32, United States Code, were nevertheless not in Federal service has been repeatedly recognized by the Federal courts in construing the Federal Tort Claims Act. The recent case of *Storer Broadcasting Co.* v. *U.S.* C.C.A. (1958), 251 F. 2d 268, certiorari denied 356 U.S. 951, is illustrative of the established doctrine. The only exception has been the unusual case of *O'Toole* v. *U.S.* (C.A. Del. (1953) 206 F. 2d 912) which involved the District of Columbia National Guard. In this case, because of the unique status of the District of Columbia National Guard, a contrary result was reached, and the United States was held liable.

The Federal courts, however, have repeatedly held the United States liable for tortious acts of these civilian employees of the National Guard whose hire is authorized under section 709 of title 32, United States Code. The United States Circuit Courts of Appeal in four circuits have so held. None of these cases have been decided in the United States Supreme Court.

In the light of previous legislation and the cited court decisions, the Department of Defense has recommended enactment of that portion of H.R. 5435 which would authorize the Secretaries of the Army and of the Air Force to pay claims arising out of federally authorized National Guard activities to the same extent and in the same manner as they now pay claims under section 2733 of title 10, United States Code—familiarly known as the Military Claims Act—for death, personal injury, or property damage caused by members or civilian employees of the Army and Air Force. The Federal Government would not, of course, undertake to pay any claims arising out of activities of the National Guard at other times, such as when they might be ordered to duty by the Governor or other State authorities, in their capacity of State troops and divorced from their federally authorized training.

This legislation recognizes the gradual change in emphasis on the mission and training of the National Guard. Over the years, what were once primarily State forces have become principal elements of the Ready Reserve of the Army and Air Force. The training of the guard is now directed almost entirely to readying it for instantaneous mobilization in augmentation of the active Federal establishment in the event of war or national emergency. The National Guard is armed and equipped, for Federal use, with such armament as jet aircraft, heavy tracked vehicles, and missiles. Inherent in the training with such weapons is the possibility of accidental personal injury to members of the civilian community, or to their property. The crash in Worcester, Mass., of a New Hampshire Air National Guard aircraft, resulted in damage by fire to several homes, and Public Law 85–760 was enacted as a result; the midair collision in Maryland with a commercial airline cost many lives and resulted in several pending lawsuits; the potential damage and litigation that might arise out of an explosion on an Army National Guard Nike site might be imagined.

In this connection, the present attitude of the States deserves consideration. State legislatures do not feel that their States should shoulder the financial burden of paying claims incident to National Guard activities which are primarily intended to prepare these forces for their Federal mission. The situation becomes even more complex when the damage is done not in the guardsman's home State but while training in another State.

The individual guardsman is also placed in an untenable legal position. If he refuses to drive his assigned vehicle he is subject to trial under a State court-martial; if he drives that vehicle he may find himself party defendant in a civil suit, and possibly in a foreign State. He will receive no Federal assistance, and only in rare instances will his home State be able to furnish him counsel or protect him against a personal money judgment.

Thus, from the standpoint of the Federal Government, the State, the individual National Guard member, and the public, the present state of the law is unsatisfactory.

Legislation authorizing payment of National Guard claims on a year round basis, rather than a limited class of claims, restricted in nature, amount, and point of time, as now authorized for payment in annual appropriation acts is appropriate and essential.

Administrative relief comparable to that provided by section 2733 of title 10, United States Code, would be provided under this bill. This legislation should be couched as an amendment of title 32, United States Code, which title relates to the National Guard not in Federal service rather than as an amendment to title 10, United States Code, which relates to the Armed Forces in Federal service. H.R. 5435 in the form recommended by the Judiciary Committee is calculated to restate the substance of 10 U.S.C. 2733.

If this legislation is enacted, the Departments of the Army and of the Air Force will amend their regulations which now implement section 2733 of title 10, United States Code, to implement as well this new section. New joint Army-Air

National Guard regulations supplementing the regulations of the Army and Air Force will provide for the transmission of claims to the agencies of those Armed Forces designated by the service Secretaries to settle them.

The fiscal impact of this legislation is so speculative as to preclude any reasonably accurate forecast. Past experience indicates an annual cost upward of $25,000. This $25,000 figure is however manifestly low, since it is based solely on the cost of claims incident to the operations of the National Guard during annual field training, exclusive of claims for damage to property of public agencies, personal injury, death, or in excess of $1,000, all of which have heretofore been beyond the statutory authority. These claims have, in the main, resulted from automobile accidents. The potential claims which might arise out of catastrophes such as midair collisions, with attendant loss of life, aircraft crashes in metropolitan areas, or missile explosions, make it impossible to estimate annual costs with any degree of precision.

This inherent uncertainty and unpredicability as to the nature and magnitude in loss of life and damage to property is perhaps the most cogent and persuasive argument for enactment of this legislation, which will furnish a reasonable degree of protection to members of the National Guard and the several States, and provide appropriate compensation to private citizens who may sustain injury or damage by reason of accidents arising out of the training of the National Guard with these modern weapons of war, issued by the Federal Government to equip these troops for Federal service. I endorse and strongly urge the passage of this bill in its amended form.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the bill, in the form recommended by the committee, contains the language suggested by the Department of the Army which is intended to provide a means for settlement of claims arising from activities of the National Guard while engaged in training which involves a distinct Federal relationship. The sections referred to in the language of the committee amendment, sections 502 to 505 of title 32, the National Guard title of the United States Code, concern inactive duty training, annual field training, field exercises, National Guard schools and small arms competitions, Army and Air Force schools. The claims which could be settled under the provisions of the amended bill would be those arising from activities provided for under those sections. It is further provided that settlement authority would extend to claims caused by a National Guard member engaged in training or duty for which he would be entitled to pay under section 301 of title 37, the pay and allowances title of the United States Code, which section concerns training duty of Reserve and National Guard personnel. Similarly, that authority would also extend to claims based on actions of caretakers and clerks employed under the authority of section 709 of title 32. The claims would have to be caused by persons acting within the scope of their employment "or otherwise incident to noncombat activities of the Army, National Guard, or the Air National Guard, as the case may be, under one of those sections."

The training activities covered by sections 502 and 505, referred to above, are "primarily intended" to make the members of the National Guard ready for active Federal service in the event of an emergency. It is further observed that equipment such as jet aircraft, tanks, and heavy artillery would seldom, if ever, be useful in accomplishing a State mission. These modern military weapons are of such a character that provision should be made for the payment of claims incident to their use for National Guard training.

This is borne out by the Army report to the Committee on the Judiciary which referred to the fact that the potential financial magnitude of the damage which may be caused by National Guard aircraft crashes, ammunition explosions, and other activities is a matter of great concern to the States. The crash of a New Hampshire Air National Guard plane in Worcester, Mass., resulted in Federal legislation—the act of August 26, 1958, Public Law 85–760, 72 Stat. 853—authorizing the payment of the unsubrogated portion of property damage claims. The subrogee has since instituted suit against the adjutant general of New Hampshire.

The enactment of the claims settlement authority provided in the amended bill would provide a means of extending administrative relief where damage is suffered to National Guard activities of the sort covered by the bill. The need is demonstrated by the fact that incidents involving such activities have occurred and no authority existed for the United States to pay compensation. For example, National Guard aircraft have caused damage by dropping tow target cables in Arizona and Illinois. Claims arising out of the activities of the National Guard in these and almost every other State in the Union, when not incident to the operation of a camp of instruction—as for instance, during a routine training flight, or weekend drill—have necessarily been rejected by the Federal Government.

Present day realities require that the U.S. Government be empowered to settle claims administratively when they arise from activities included within the scope of the sections referred to in the committee amendment. This language would be added to title 32, and the claims arising out of the activities, in the scope of the employment, of members of the National Guard employed under authority of section 709 of that title; or incident to noncombat activities under that title would be administered and settled by the same personnel, in the same manner, and to the same extent as claims cognizable under section 2733, title 10, United States Code, are now settled by the Secretaries of the Departments of the Army and of the Air Force under regulations implementing that section.

Claims arising out of the ordinary traffic accident and other tort-type claims will, however, be made payable only when the proximate cause of the accident was the negligent act or omission of the National Guard man or civilian employee acting in the scope of his employment. Claims for damage to or destruction of property caused by acts of depredation, willful misconduct, or such reckless disregard of property rights as to carry an implication of guilty intent will not be payable. On the other hand, claims incident to noncombat activities, though not caused by any ascertainable negligence, such as those proximately caused by maneuvers, special field exercises, operating aircraft and missiles, using explosives, firing guns, or other weapons, including vibration or concussion, using equipment or devices having latent mechanical defects, moving combat or other vehicles designed especially for military use, and using and occupying real property, will be made payable.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, this legislation recognizes the gradual change in emphasis on the mission and training of the National Guard. In fact where the National Guard was previously regarded as being composed primarily of State forces, it is now the source of important elements of the Ready Reserve of the Army and Air Force. The training of the National Guard is now directed almost entirely to making it ready for rapid mobilization to augment the active Federal Military Establishment in the event of war or national emergency. It, therefore, must be recognized that the National Guard is trained and equipped with modern equipment for Federal purposes. The possibility of accidental injury to persons and property incident to National Guard training, particularly that involving such modern weapons as jet aircraft, heavy tracked vehicles, and missiles, provide a realistic basis for this legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the Senate bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That chapter 7 of title 32, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by adding the following new section at the end thereof:

"§ 715. Property loss; personal injury or death: activities under certain sections of this title

"(a) Under such regulations as the Secretary of the Army or Secretary of the Air Force may prescribe, he or, subject to appeal to him, the Judge Advocate General of the armed force under his jurisdiction, if designated by him, may settle, and pay in an amount not more than $5,000 a claim against the United States for—

"(1) damage to, or loss of, real property, including damage or loss incident to use and occupancy;

"(2) damage to, or loss of, personal property, including property bailed to the United States or the National Guard and including registered or insured mail damaged, lost, or

destroyed by a criminal act while in the possession of the National Guard; or

"(3) personal injury or death;

either caused by a member of the Army National Guard or the Air National Guard, as the case may be, while engaged in training or duty under section 316, 502, 503, 504, or 505 of this title or any other provision of law for which he is entitled to pay under section 301 of title 37, or for which he has waived that pay, and acting within the scope of his employment; caused by a person employed under section 709 of this title acting within the scope of his employment; or otherwise incident to noncombat activities of the Army National Guard or the Air National Guard, as the case may be, under one of those sections.

"(b) A claim may be allowed under subsection (a) only if—

"(1) it is presented in writing two years after it accrues, except that if the claim accrues in time of war or armed conflict intervenes within two years after it accrues, and if good cause is shown, the claim may be presented not later than two years after the war or armed conflict is terminated;

"(2) it is not covered by section 2734 of title 10 or section 2672 of title 28;

"(3) it is not for personal injury or death of such a member or a person employed under section 709 of this title, whose injury or death is incident to his service;

"(4) the damage to, or loss of, property, or the personal injury or death, was not caused wholly or partly by a negligent or wrongful act of the claimant, his agent, or his employee; and

"(5) it is substantiated as prescribed in regulations of the Secretary concerned.

For the purpose of clause (1), the dates of the beginning and end of an armed conflict are the dates established by concurrent resolution of Congress or by a determination of the President.

"(c) Payment may not be made under this section for reimbursement for medical, hospital, or burial services furnished at the expense of the United States or of any State or the District of Columbia or Puerto Rico.

"(d) If the Secretary of the military department concerned considers that a claim in excess of $5,000 is meritorious and would otherwise be covered by this section, he may pay the claimant $5,000 and report the excess to Congress for its consideration.

"(e) Except as provided in subsection (d), no claim may be paid under this section unless the amount tendered is accepted by the claimant in full satisfaction.

"(f) In any case where the amount to be paid is not more than $1,000, the authority contained in subsection (a) may be delegated to any officer of the Army or the Air Force, as the case be, who has been delegated authority under section 2733(g) of title 10 to settle similar claims.

"(g) Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the settlement of a claim under this section is final and conclusive.

"(h) In this section, 'settle' means consider, ascertain, adjust, determine, and dispose of a claim, whether by full or partial allowance or disallowance."; and

(2) by adding the following new item at the end of the analysis:

"715. Property loss; personal injury or death: activities under certain sections of this title."

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LANE: Strike out all after the enacting clause of the bill S. 1764 and insert the provisions of H.R. 5435, as passed, as follows: "That chapter 7 of title 32, United States Code, is amended—

"(1) by adding the following new section at the end thereof:

"'§ 715. Property loss; personal injury or death: activities under certain sections of this title

"'(a) Under such regulations as the Secretary of the Army or Secretary of the Air Force may prescribe, he or, subject to appeal to him, the Judge Advocate General of the armed force under his jurisdiction, if designated by him, may settle, and pay in an amount not more than $5,000 a claim against the United States for—

"'(1) damage to, or loss of, real property, including damage or loss incident to use and occupancy;

"'(2) damage to, or loss of, personal property, including property bailed to the United States or the National Guard and including registered or insured mail damaged, lost, or destroyed by a criminal act while in the possession of the National Guard; or

"'(3) personal injury or death;

either caused by a member of the Army National Guard or the Air National Guard, as the case may be, while engaged in training or duty under section 316, 502, 503, 504, or 505 of this title or any other provision of law for which he is entitled to pay under section 301 of title 37, or for which he has waived that pay, and acting within the scope of his employment; caused by a person employed under section 709 of this title acting within the scope of his employment; or otherwise incident to noncombat activities of the Army National Guard or the Air National Guard, as the case may be, under one of those sections.

"'(b) A claim may be allowed under subsection (a) only if—

"'(1) it is presented in writing within two years after it accrues, except that if the claim accrues in time of war or armed conflict or if such a war or armed conflict intervenes within two years after it accrues, and if good cause is shown, the claim may be presented not later than two years after the war or armed conflict is terminated;

"'(2) it is not covered by section 2734 of title 10 or section 2672 of title 28;

"'(3) it is not for personal injury or death of such a member or a person employed under section 709 of this title, whose injury or death is incident to his service;

"'(4) the damage to, or loss of, property, or the personal injury or death, was not caused wholly or partly by a negligent or wrongful act of the claimant, his agent, or his employee; and

"'(5) it is substantiated as prescribed in regulations of the Secretary concerned.

For the purposes of clause (1), the dates of the beginning and end of an armed conflict are the dates established by concurrent resolution of Congress or by a determination of the President.

"'(c) Payment may not be made under this section for reimbursement for medical, hospital, or burial services furnished at the expense of the United States or of any State or the District of Columbia or Puerto Rico.

"'(d) If the Secretary of the military department concerned considers that a claim in excess of $5,000 is meritorious and would otherwise be covered by this section, he may pay the claimant $5,000 and report the excess to Congress for its consideration.

"'(e) Except as provided in subsection (d), no claim may be paid under this section unless the amount tendered is accepted by the claimant in full satisfaction.

"'(f) In any case where the amount to be paid is not more than $1,000, the authority contained in subsection (a) may be delegated to any officer of the Army or the Air Force, as the case may be, who has been delegated authority under section 2733(g) of title 10 to settle similar claims.

"'(g) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the settlement of a claim under this section is final and conclusive.

"'(h) In this section, 'settle' means consider, ascertain, adjust, determine, and dispose of a claim, whether by full or partial allowance or disallowance.'; and

"(2) by adding the following new item at the end of the analysis:

"'715. Property loss; personal injury or death: activities under certain sections of this title.'"

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to amend title 32, United States Code, to authorize the payment of certain claims against the National Guard."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read the third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The proceedings whereby a similar House bill (H.R. 5435) was passed were vacated and the House bill was laid on the table.

SURVIVORS' ANNUITIES UNDER CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT

The Clerk called the next bill (H.R. 6743) to provide for certain survivors' annuities in additional cases under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

FORT BOWIE NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE, ARIZ.

The Clerk called the next bill (H.R. 11876) to authorize the establishment of the Fort Bowie National Historic Site in the State of Arizona, and for other purposes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

JUDICIAL REVIEW OF VETERANS' CLAIMS

The Clerk called the next bill (H.R. 12653) to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish a Court of Veterans' Appeals and to prescribe its jurisdiction and functions.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL BOTANICAL GARDEN IN HAWAII

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2919) providing for a study and investigation of the desirability and feasibility of establishing and maintaining a national tropical botanic garden.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

LAND TRANSFER TO CITY OF SUSANVILLE, CALIF.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 11917) to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands in Lassen County, Calif., to the city of Susanville, Calif.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed, without consideration, to the city of Susanville, California, all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the following lands which were previously donated to the United States by C. D. Mathews and Ethel M. Mathews, his wife, by deed dated December 6, 1939, and recorded in book 38 of deeds, at page 218, in the records of Lassen County, California:

All those certain lots, pieces, ad parcels of land situate, lying and being in the county of Lassen, State of California, and particularly described as follows, to wit:

Parcel 1. Commencing at the corner common to sections 29, 30, 31, and 32, in township 30 north, range 12 east, of the Mount Diablo Base and Meridian; thence north 89 degrees 22 minutes east along the section line 497.37 feet; thence south 16 degrees 50 minutes west 1,908.58 feet to the point of intersection of the center line of Roop Street with the center line of Main Street of the city of Susanville; thence south 73 degrees 10 minutes east along said center line of Main Street 1,525.6 feet to the center line of Weatherlow Street of said city; thence continuing along said center line of Main Street of said city south 73 degrees 08 minutes 15 seconds east 1,264.25 feet; thence continuing along said center line of Main Street south 73 degrees 37 minutes 15 seconds east 445.12 feet; thence north 19 degrees 52 minutes 45 seconds east 40.07 feet to the notherly line of the California State Highway and the true point of beginning; running thence north 19 degrees 52 minutes 45 seconds east 229.20 feet; thence south 73 degrees 07 minutes 15 seconds east 115.0 feet; thence south 15 degrees 22 minutes 45 seconds west 227.80 feet to the northerly right-of-way line of the California State Highway, and thence north 73 degrees 37 minutes 15 seconds west along the said northerly right-of-way line to the California State Highway, a distance of 136 feet to the true point of beginning.

Parcel 2. Lots numbered 1, 2, and 3 of block numbered 18 of the east addition to the city of Susanville, as shown on the map entitled "Map of East Addition to Susanville, Lassen County, California" filed in the office of the county recorder of Lassen County, California, January 6, 1911.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 3, line 1, strike out "to" and insert "of".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMANENT REGULATIONS OF SAVINGS AND LOAN HOLDING COMPANIES

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3319) to make permanent law the provisions of section 408 of the National Housing Act regulating savings and loan holding companies.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, the information at my disposal indicates that the report of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board in reference to this legislation, although it supports the legislation, is not included in the committee report. I also understand that the Bureau of the Budget, although it has no objection to the legislation, does not have its views set forth in the committee report.

I raise this point at this moment because those of us who are objectors on the Consent Calendar cannot be expected to make an evaluation and a sound analysis of the pieces of legislation that come before us unless the committee reports are full, complete, and comprehensive. I have made an effort in this case to look into the matter. I think the situation deserves and warrants affirmative action. But there is no excuse for this situation to prevail in the future. I give warning here and now that the rule will be observed as far as I am concerned unless we have this information in the committee report.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I want to say for the information of the House that if the expiration date is stricken from the Holding Company Act, then the act will be exactly as it was reported out unanimously by the Banking and Currency Committee and passed unanimously by the House. This is a bill which was recommended by the savings and loan associations. The Federal Home Loan Bank Board favors the bill, although they did propose some amendments to it. I do not think there can be any valid objection to the bill.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I am not raising any objection as to the merits of the legislation. In fact, the legislation is extremely meritorious and I am wholeheartedly in favor of it. The only question I raise is that the committee report does not contain information which would be helpful and beneficial to the members of the Consent Calendar objectors committee. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge that the staff of this committee in the future as well as the staffs of other committees make a conscientious effort to provide reports from the executive branch so that we can do a better job for the benefit of all the Members of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is there anyone who can tell us anything about this bill? We do not seem to have much information on this. We do not seem to have the slightest idea at this time what this is about.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill to regulate and control the savings and loan holding companies. Many of the holding companies were organized for the purpose of persuading mutual associations to convert to stock companies so that the holding companies could gain control of them by purchasing their stock, for which they often paid more than a fair price. Then, by reorganization, an increase in stock was effected again, which was sold to the public. I am told that many of the organizers were greatly enriched by this process. It was to remedy this condition that the Savings and Loan Holding Company Act was enacted. This does not imply that there are not many good and lawful holding companies that are rendering good service. Also, one of the principal purposes of the Holding Company Act is to preserve the local character of the savings and loan associations, which have endeared themselves to the people by reason of the interest local management has shown in the welfare of the community. I think the holding companies are entitled to maintain what they have and nothing will be taken away from them, but we just cannot permit resumption of certain promoters' practices which are neither good for the public nor for the industry.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (g) of section 408 of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1730a.(g)) is hereby repealed.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BILL TO QUIET TITLE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 12491) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands in the State of Wyoming to the county of Fremont, Wyo.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed, without consideration, to the county of Fremont, Wyoming, all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to lot 5, block 14, of the original townsite of Lander, Fremont County, Wyoming.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

USE OF SURPLUS FOODS IN HOME ECONOMICS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3146) to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to donate dairy products and other agricultural commodities for use in home economics courses.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That schools receiving surplus foods pursuant to clause (3) of section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U.S.C. 1431) or section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935, as amended (7 U.S.C. 612c) are authorized to use such foods in training students in home economics.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, writing to your Congressman can bring results. Proof of this is found in the action just taken by the House of Representatives in passing S. 3146. This measure provides for the use of surplus foods in home economics classes and was in effect written by a constituent of mine, Mrs. Emerson Towers of Spring Grove, Pa.

Mrs. Towers did not set out to write legislation but merely, as people will, wrote her Congressman to ask if he knew why it was that she could not use surplus foods in the home economics classes she teaches in the Spring Grove Junior High School.

Upon investigation, I discovered that the law did not provide for the use of surplus foods in this manner and promptly introduced the bill we have just passed. At the same time, Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK introduced a similar bill in the other body. The Senate approved the measure just before the July recess.

I trust the President will act favorably and promptly on this bill so that it may become law in time to become effective with the new school year. Under its provisions, any school participating in the school lunch program would be eligible to receive additional food from the Commodity Credit Corporation for use in its home economics classes.

This bill is not likely to make a big dent in this country's vast farm surpluses, but it will help consume some of our overabundance of food immediately, and, who knows, if our future homemakers become adept in the preparation of these foods in a variety of ways, it may help us eat our way out of the surplus.

Since no additional personnel or money is required to operate this addition to the school lunch program it will not add to the Federal taxpayers' burden, and it should be a real help to Mrs. Towers and home economics teachers like her throughout the country who must operate on a very tight budget. Mrs. Towers, for example, operated last year on a budget of $45 a month for 235 students. To do this requires some real penny watching. So you can see what surplus rice, flour, dried eggs, butter, and other foods will mean to her.

For the information of my colleagues I would like to say that Mrs. Towers is a 49-year-old housewife who has only recently returned to teaching. She is a graduate of Hood College in Frederick, Md.; she has been absent from the teaching profession for 22 years. Two years ago the shortage of teachers prompted her to return to her profession, and she has been serving since as an instructor in home economics in Spring Grove Junior High School.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to include as part of my remarks, the letter which gave birth to the law we have just enacted. On February 17, 1960, Mrs. Towers wrote to me, as follows:

As a housewife and a teacher of home economics, I have decided to bring to your attention a situation I think is very unfortunate in this land of plenty—the United States of America. This concerns a Federal law that governs the distribution of excess foods to schools for use in cafeterias. I am sorry that I cannot give you the number of the law.

We who teach home economics in public schools wonder why we cannot use some of these surplus foods in the classrooms in our foods work. The foods prepared in class are eaten in class by the same children who eat in the cafeterias. They learn how to prepare foods and the food is not wasted. Surely this is a contribution to the future American housewife:

1. Proper preparation of food;
2. Economical foods prepared so that they are tasty;
3. Proper serving of these foods so that they are appetizing;
4. Use of surplus foods on which the Government is paying storage;
5. Teaching how to use these foods in a balanced diet.

Most home economics teachers are on limited budgets. These surplus foods would really fill a great need in the U.S. educational system.

Is there a misinterpretation of the law? I certainly would appreciate some action that would change this sorry situation, and I am sure that I am not alone in this line of thinking. Will you help all of us who teach home economics?

CLARIFYING THE RIGHT OF STATES TO SELECT CERTAIN PUBLIC LANDS SUBJECT TO ANY OUTSTANDING MINERAL LEASE OR PERMIT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10102) to clarify the right of States to select certain public lands subject to any outstanding mineral lease or permit.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 2276(a)(3) of the Revised Statutes of the United States (43 U.S.C. 852(a)(3)) is amended to read as follows:

"(3) Lands subject to a mineral lease or permit may be selected if none of the lands subject to that lease or permit are in a producing or producible status, but if a State shall select part but not all of the unappropriated, surveyed public lands subject to any mineral lease or permit, there shall be reserved from such part to the United States, for so long as that lease or permit shall remain in effect, the mineral for which that lease or permit issued, together with a right to enter upon the same to prospect for, recover, and remove the said mineral without unreasonably interfering with other rights therein; where lands subject to a mineral lease or permit are selected and acquired without reservation of the leased mineral as provided for herein, the State shall succeed to the position of the United States thereunder."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 3, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That subsection (a) of section 2276 of the Revised Statutes (43 U.S.C. 852(a)) is amended by the deletion of the existing paragraph (3) and the substitution therefor of the following paragraphs:

"'(3) Land subject to a mineral lease or permit may be selected if none of the land subject to that lease or permit is in a producing or producible status, subject, however, to the restrictions and conditions of the preceding and following paragraphs of this subsection.

"'(4) If a selection is consummated as to a portion but not all of the lands subject to any mineral lease or permit, then, as to such portion and for so long only as such lease or permit or any lease issued pursuant to such permit shall remain in effect, there shall be automatically reserved to the United States the mineral or minerals for which the lease or permit was issued, together with such further rights as may be necessary for the full and complete enjoyment of all rights, privileges and benefits under or with respect to the lease or permit: *Provided, however,* That after approval of the selection the Secretary of the Interior shall determine what portion of any rents and royalties accruing thereafter which may be paid under the lease or permit is properly applicable to that portion of the land subject to the lease or permit selected by the State, the portion applicable being determined by applying to the sum of the rents and royalties the same ratio as that existing between the acreage selected by the State and the total acreage subject to the lease or permit; of the portion applicable to the selected land 90 per centum shall be paid to the State by the United States annually and 10 per centum shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

"'(5) If a selection is consummated as to all of the lands subject to any mineral lease or permit or if, where the selecting State has previously acquired title to a portion of the lands subject to a mineral lease or permit, a selection is consummated as to all of the remaining lands subject to that lease or permit, then and upon condition that the United States shall retain all rents and royalties theretofore paid and that the lessee or permittee shall have and may enjoy under and with respect to that lease or permit all the rights, privileges, and benefits which he would have had or might have enjoyed had the selection not been made and approved, the State shall succeed to all the rights of the United States under the lease or permit as to the mineral or minerals covered thereby, subject, however, to all obligations of the United States under and with respect to that lease or permit.'

"SEC. 2. Paragraph (1) of subsection (d) of section 2276 of the Revised Statutes (43 U.S.C., sec. 852(d)(1)) is amended to read as follows:

"'(d)(1) The term "unappropriated public lands" as used in this section shall include, without otherwise affecting the meaning thereof, lands withdrawn for coal, phosphate, nitrate, potash, oil, gas, asphaltic minerals, oil shale, sodium, and sulfur, but otherwise subject to appropriation, location, selection, entry, or purchase under the nonmineral laws of the United States; lands withdrawn by Executive Order Numbered 5327, of April 15, 1930, if otherwise available for selection; and the retained or reserved interest of the United States in lands which have been disposed of with a reservation to the United States of all minerals or any specified mineral or minerals.'"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That concludes the bills on the calendar eligible for consideration.

WORLD SPORT PARACHUTING CHAMPIONSHIPS AT ORANGE, MASS.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution, House Joint Resolution 723, extending an invitation to the Federation Aeronautique Internationale to hold the 1962 world sport parachuting championships at Orange, Mass., which is No. 562 on the Consent Calendar but which was not reached on the calendar today as it has not been on the calendar 3 days. The chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs has sent word to me that it has been cleared by both sides of the aisle.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, some of us were opposed to the congressional recess for the political party conventions at a date as early as it took place. Also we wanted to come back earlier and finish the business of the House. Our objection is that under those circumstances much legislation would have been eligible at this time. Actually, I think this is a good bill and I shall not object to it, but with bills that are not eligible for consideration on the Consent Calendar in the future I am not going to let go by without objection, because as I said we did not get back to work in this bobtailed session as soon as we should have, and we should not have recessed as early as we did.

I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I note in the committee report, on this resolution, page 3, the last line, "No expense to the United States Government is involved." May we take that as gospel in connection with this resolution?

Mr. McCORMACK. I cannot conceive of any committee report carrying that unless it were so.

Mr. GROSS. With the statement of the distinguished majority leader that this will not cost the U.S. Government any money, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the House joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, whereas the National Aeronautic Association has invited the Federation Aeronautique Internationale to hold the biennial world sport parachuting championship in the United States at Orange, Massachusetts, in 1962, the Government of the United States joins in the invitation of the National Aeronautic Association to the Federation Aeronautique Internationale to hold the 1962 world sport parachuting championship in the United States at Orange, Massachusetts.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of State is directed to transmit a copy of this joint resolution to the Federation Aeronautique Internationale.

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL—1961

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill H.R. 13161, the second supplemental appropriation bill for 1961.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PRICE SUPPORT AND PRODUCTION ADJUSTMENT ACTIVITIES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Government Operations may have permission to file reports on price support and production adjustment activities and on grain activities until midnight Wednesday night, August 31, 1960.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

CLARIFYING THE RIGHTS OF STATES TO SELECT CERTAIN PUBLIC LANDS SUBJECT TO ANY OUTSTANDING LEASE OR PERMIT

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10102) to clarify the right of States to select certain public lands subject to any outstanding mineral lease or permit. Consent Calendar No. 599.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. H.R. 10102 passed the House just a few moments ago on the Consent Calendar.

Mr. ASPINALL. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that we take up consideration of S. 2959 and that it be substituted in lieu of the bill which was passed.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the Senate bill?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain what he intends to do?

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, S. 2959, which passed the other body on June 28 is a combination of the provisions of two House bills. One of these bills is H.R. 11957, which has passed the House, and the other is H.R. 10102, pending consent calendar business.

Sections 1 and 2 of S. 2959 are identical to H.R. 10102 as reported by the committee. Sections 3 and 4 of S. 2959 are identical to H.R. 11957 as it passed the House.

Passage of S. 2959 would render unnecessary further action by the other body on H.R. 11957.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the Senate bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (a) of section 2276 of the Revised Statutes (43 U.S.C. 852(a)) is amended by the deletion of the existing paragraph (3) and the substitution therefor of the following paragraphs:

"(3) Land subject to a mineral lease or permit may be selected if none of the land subject to that lease or permit is in a producing or producible status, subject, however, to the restrictions and conditions of the preceding and following paragraphs of this subsection.

"(4) If a selection is consummated as to a portion but not all of the lands subject to any mineral lease or permit, then, as to such portion and for so long only as such lease or permit or any lease issued pursuant to such permit shall remain in effect, there shall be automatically reserved to the United States the mineral or minerals for which the lease or permit was issued, together with such further rights as may be necessary for the full and complete enjoyment of all rights, privileges and benefits under or with respect to the lease or permit: *Provided, however,* That after approval of the selection the Secretary of the Interior shall determine what portion of any rents and royalties accruing thereafter which may be paid under the lease or permit is properly applicable to that portion of the land subject to the lease or permit selected by the State, the portion applicable being determined by applying to the sum of the rents and royalties the same ratio as that existing between the acreage selected by the State and the total acreage subject to the lease or permit; of the portion applicable to the selected land 90 per centum shall be paid to the State by the United States annually and 10 per centum shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

"(5) If a selection is consummated as to all of the lands subject to any mineral lease or permit or if, where the selecting State has previously acquired title to a portion of the lands subject to a mineral lease or permit, a selection is consummated as to all of the

remaining lands subject to that lease or permit, then and upon condition that the United States shall retain all rents and royalties theretofore paid and that the lessee or permittee shall have and may enjoy under and with respect to that lease or permit all the rights, privileges, and benefits which he would have had or might have enjoyed had the selection not been made and approved, the State shall succeed to all the rights of the United States under the lease or permit as to the mineral or minerals covered thereby, subject, however, to all obligations of the United States under and with respect to that lease or permit."

SEC. 2. Paragraph (1) of subsection (d) of section 2276 of the Revised Statutes (43 U.S.C. 852(d)(1)) is amended to read as follows:

"(d)(1) The term 'unappropriated public lands' as used in this section shall include, without otherwise affecting the meaning thereof, lands withdrawn for coal, phosphate, nitrate, potash, oil, gas, asphaltic minerals, oil shale sodium, and sulphur, but otherwise subject to appropriation, location, selection, entry, or purchase under the nonmineral laws of the United States; lands withdrawn by Executive Order Numbered 5327, of April 15, 1930, if otherwise available for selection; and the retained or reserved interest of the United Staets in lands which have been disposed of with a reservation to the United States of all minerals or any specified mineral or minerals."

SEC. 3. The second and third sentences of subsection (h) of section 6 of the Act of July 7, 1958 (72 Stat. 342), are hereby replaced by the following sentences: "Such selections shall be made only from lands that are otherwise open to selection under this Act. When all of the lands subject to a lease, permit, license, or contract are selected, the patent for the lands so selected shall vest in the State of Alaska all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to that lease, permit, license, or contract that remains outstanding on the effective date of the patent, including the right to all the rentals, royalties, and other payments accruing after that date under that lease, permit, license, or contract, and including any authority that may have been retained by the United States to modify the terms and conditions of that lease, permit, license, or contract: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall affect the continued validity of any such lease, permit, license, or contract or any rights arising thereunder. Where only a portion of the lands subject to a lease, permit, license, or contract are selected, there shall be reserved to the United States the mineral or minerals subject to that lease, permit, license, or contract, together with such further rights as may be necessary to the full and complete enjoyment of all rights, privileges, and benefits under or with respect to that lease, permit, license, or contract; upon the termination of the lease, permit, license, or contract, title to the minerals so reserved to the United States shall pass to the State of Alaska."

SEC. 4. Subsection (a) of section 6 of the Act of July 7, 1958 (72 Stat. 340), is hereby amended by the addition of the following: "*Provided further*, That for the purposes of this section the term 'public lands of the United States in Alaska which are vacant, unappropriated, and unreserved' shall include, without limiting the use thereof, the retained or reserved interest of the United States in lands which have been disposed of with a reservation to the United States of all minerals or any specified mineral or minerals."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The proceedings whereby the bill H.R. 10102 was passed were vacated, and that bill was laid on the table.

CONVEYANCE OF PART OF LOCK AND DAM NO. 10, KENTUCKY RIVER, TO PIONEER NATIONAL MONUMENT ASSOCIATION

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 11561) to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Army to convey part of lock and dam numbered 10, Kentucky River, Madison County, Ky., to the Pioneer National Monument Association for use as part of a historic site, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

On page 2, line 5, strike out "without monetary payment therefor but" and insert "in return for the payment of an amount equal to 50 per centum of the fair market value of the land conveyed, as determined by the Secretary of the Army after appraisal, and".

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RHODE ISLAND TURNPIKE AND BRIDGE AUTHORITY

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 3681) authorizing the Rhode Island Turnpike and Bridge Authority to combine for financing purposes the bridge across the West Passage of Narragansett Bay with the Newport Bridge and any other project acquired or constructed by said authority.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may we have a brief explanation of the bill?

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, S. 3681 amends the act of April 4, 1938 (52 Stat. 194), which authorized the State of Rhode Island, acting through the Jamestown Bridge Commission or its successors, to construct a bridge across the West Passage of Narragansett Bay between the towns of Jamestown and North Kingston. The bridge was completed in 1940. Section 3 of the act provides for adjustment of tolls to provide a fund sufficient to amortize the cost of the bridge within a period of not to exceed 40 years and to provide a fund to pay for maintaining and operating the bridge. After establishment of such funds, the bridge would become free of tolls.

This bill would amend the 1938 act so as to provide that, upon title to the bridge becoming vested in the Rhode Island Turnpike and Bridge Authority, the authority would be authorized to combine into one project for financing purposes the existing bridge and any other bridges of the authority and to charge tolls for all such bridges, with adjustment of tolls to provide a fund to pay maintenance and operation costs and a fund to amortize the aggregate construction or acquisition cost of all the structures within a period not exceeding 40 years from the date of completion of the last bridge included in the project. At the end of the 40-year period from the date of completion of the last bridge the bridges in question would become free.

The principle involved is purely an intrastate matter wholly within the State of Rhode Island and is not in conflict with the objectives of the Federal-aid highway program. It is consistent with legislation previously adopted at various locations throughout the country. Federal legislation is needed to permit early planning and remove any impediment to the future operation of the State agency. The need for enactment of this legislation at this time is due to the fact that a referendum concerning a State guarantee authorization will be voted upon by the people of Rhode Island in the November election. If this referendum is favorably acted upon, the turnpike and bridge authority will be in a position to take prompt and immediate action, and failure to obtain this permissive legislation will delay the authority's taking any action.

The Rhode Island Legislature has passed legislation which in effect is a mandate to the turnpike and bridge authority to utilize the tolls on the existing Jamestown Bridge covered by S. 3681 to help finance construction of a new and larger series of bridges.

All interested agencies, including the Department of Commerce and the Department of the Army, have reported favorably on this legislation.

Mr. GROSS. There will be no cost to the Federal Government?

Mr. FALLON. No.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act entitled "An Act authorizing the State of Rhode Island, acting by and through the Jamestown Bridge Commission as an agency of the State, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the West Passage of Narragansett Bay between the towns of Jamestown and North Kingston", approved April 4, 1938 (52 Stat. 194), is hereby amended by striking out section 4, and inserting in lieu thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 4. That upon title to the bridge which was constructed under the authority of this Act becoming vested in the Rhode Island Turnpike and Bridge Authority, created by chapter 3390, Public Laws of Rhode Island, 1954 (chapter 12 of title 24, General Laws of Rhode Island, 1956), said authority shall be authorized to combine said bridge for financing purposes with any other bridge, bridges, or structures financed by said authority under the provisions of said chapter 12, as heretofore amended, and to fix and charge tolls in accordance with State law for the use of said bridge and such other bridges

and approaches so combined into one project, and to pledge the use of such tolls in accordance with the provisions of said chapter 12, as amended."

SEC. 2. That the word "bridge" in the first line of section 5 be stricken and the word "bridges" inserted in lieu thereof.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Government Operations may have until midnight tomorrow to file a report dealing with the sale and transmission of power.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Government Operations may have until midnight tonight to file a report regarding foreign operations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the Private Calendar will be called at this time. The Clerk will call the first bill on the calendar.

COL. JOHN A. RYAN, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2353) for the relief of Col. John A. Ryan, Jr.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to John A. Ryan, Junior, colonel, United States Air Force, the sum of $100,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full satisfaction of all claims of the said Colonel John A. Ryan, Junior, against the United States, or any foreign country, resulting from the development by him outside of official working hours of a new bombing system known as the low altitude bombing system and apparatus, the said Colonel John A. Ryan, Junior, having been unable to protect or retain the domestic or foreign commercial rights to such system because of the security laws of the United States: *Provided,* That such payment shall be upon condition that Colonel John A. Ryan, Junior, assign to the United States the entire right, title, and interest to such invention: *And provided further,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BORINQUEN HOME CORP.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2770) for the relief of Borinquen Home Corp.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Borinquen Home Corporation of San Juan, Puerto Rico, the sum of $19,204.14. The payment of such sum shall be in full satisfaction of all claims of such Corporation against the United States for compensation or work performed by such Corporation pursuant to an agreement entered into between the Corporation and the Tenth Naval District, Department of the Navy, for the construction of two storm sewers for the use of the San Patricio Naval Project: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GRANT OF EASEMENT TO CINCINNATI SOUTHERN RAILWAY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3665) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to grant an easement over certain lands to the trustees of the Cincinnati Southern Railway, their successors and assigns.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized, upon such terms as he may deem advisable, to grant and convey by proper instrument a perpetual easement to the trustees of the Cincinnati Southern Railway, their successors and assigns, in, upon, across, and over national forest lands and other lands under the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture for the construction, maintenance, and operation of the line of railway incident to the relocation of its main line between Tateville, Kentucky, and Flat Rock, Kentucky, and for any related purpose deemed appropriate by the Secretary: *Provided,* That such easement (a) shall be granted only upon a finding by the Secretary that it will not be incompatible with the public interest, (b) shall not include any more land than is reasonably necessary for the purpose for which granted, (c) shall include provisions for payment of adequate compensation, and (d) may include a right to use from the subject lands materials and products for the construction and maintenance of authorized improvements thereon upon the payment of adequate compensation therefor.

SEC. 2. All or any part of such easement may be annulled or forfeited by declaration of the Secretary for failure to comply with the terms of the grant or for nonuse for a period of two consecutive years or abandonment of rights granted under authority hereof.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROBERT FROST MEDAL

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3439) authorizing the President of the United States of America to present a gold medal to Robert Frost, a New England poet.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is authorized to present, in the name of Congress, an appropriate gold medal to Robert Frost in recognition of his poetry, which has enriched the culture of the United States and the philosophy of the world. For such purpose, the Secretary of the Treasury shall cause to be struck a gold medal with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions to be determined by the Secretary.

SEC. 2. There is authorized to be appropriated the sum of $2,500 to carry out the provisions of this Act.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLS). The gentleman cannot be recognized for that.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. A Member cannot be recognized to offer an amendment?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. An amendment to strike out or reduce an amount would be in order, but not a pro forma amendment.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. This is to authorize the President to present a gold medal. That is the one I want to offer an amendment to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill to authorize the President to present a gold medal to this New England poet. I am in favor of that, but I would like to add to it the presentation of a gold medal to the chairman of any committee of the House who will give consideration to a bill I have pending. We all recall that the politicians in both parties have been "het up" and bothered about the civil rights of certain persons; that is to say, it is claimed certain individuals, because of their race, color, or state of origin have been discriminated against. Permit me to say something about civil rights protection for some—not all.

Certainly every citizen, regardless of race, creed, color, or state of origin, should have the right to vote.

Certainly he should have equal rights to participate in every activity where the expenditure of Federal funds is involved.

Equally important is the right to earn a livelihood.

Certainly no one should be deprived of that right by being forced to work where conditions are detrimental to his health or the wage is insufficient to buy not only necessities but the enjoyable customary advantages offered by our economic system.

Most assuredly no one who has created a job, an opportunity for work, the earning of a wage, should be required to pay an amount or accept conditions which will not permit him to continue his activities.

It is necessary that the public be protected from exorbitant charges where there is a monopolistic control of the necessities of life. Hence the proposition that Government—State and Federal—shall impose the restrictions upon services and products which are necessary for the continued existence of our people.

But strange as it may seem the politicians who are so active in behalf of what they call the people's civil rights are blind in this, a political year, to the obvious fact that it is not only un-American, unconstitutional, but obviously unfair and oppressive to permit any group to exercise the power of levying a tax upon the right to earn a living, upon the right to a job, upon the right to work. But such is the fact.

In Boston, on August 22, 1960, a busdriver's refusal to work overtime—either 2 minutes or 3 hours—caused a strike which tied up Boston's Metropolitan Transit Authority System just as the evening rush hour began—the New York Times, August 23, 1960. The strike ended 24 hours later.

An editorial of August 24, 1960, from the Washington Evening Star, referring to the busdriver, carried this caption, "He Wanted To Go Home," and called attention to the fact that thousands who wanted to use the buses also wanted to go home—the Washington Evening Star, August 24, 1960.

An Associated Press news story of August 29, 1960, called attention to the fact that negotiations were pending in an effort to prevent on September 1 a sitdown and strike of the entire Pennsylvania Railroad, the issue being whether the company should have the privilege, in managing its business, of "farming out" repair work to other companies, that is to say, whether the company or the union should determine how much of its business should be carried on in the home plant—the Washington Evening Star, August 29, 1960.

It has long been my contention that, where a public utility was involved, where the Government—State or Federal—fixed the conditions and the amount of the rate under which an organization should operate, when it was furnishing services or products upon the existence of which our daily activities depended, no one, no organization, should be permitted to halt the supply of those necessities.

Many can remember the statement of Governor Coolidge who unhesitatingly announced that strikes against the public would not be tolerated in Massachusetts. His subsequent election as Vice President, his assumption of the office of President on the death of President Harding, is proof that the people overwhelmingly subscribed to that statement.

As recently as March 10, 1959, when Mr. Meany, president of the AFL–CIO, appeared before a House committee, in answer to my question as to what he would say about legislation which would prohibit employees of public utilities, where the Government has something to do with fixing rates, from striking, replied:

> Well, I'll tell you, the idea of that legislation, Mr. HOFFMAN, would be that because of a tremendous public interest in a public utility, because the operation of a public utility touches the lives of practically all the people in the community, that the employee, should not have the right to strike because that would sort of have an adverse effect on all the people.

When hundreds of thousands of Federal employees, engaged in transacting the business of the Government here in Washington, were prevented from going to their jobs by a strike against the Capital Transit Co., a bill, H.R. 4612, was introduced by me on November 7, 1945, "to expedite the business of the Federal Government."

Again, on July 7, 1955, a similar bill was introduced. Again, on February 9, 1959, another effort was made by introducing a bill which, among other things, provided:

> 1. It shall be unlawful for any individual employed in any public utility affecting commerce whose rates are fixed by some governmental agency to participate in any strike.

Since then, after the Congress had authorized the appropriation of billions upon billions of dollars for national defense, including expenditures for the production of missiles, strikes in Florida and California halted the production of needed implements of war.

Day after day, time and time again, we are advised by those in authority, those who should have accurate information, that our country is in danger because we have lacked production and so endangered our national security.

One of the paramount issues of this campaign is whether we have adequate defense—defense equal or superior to the war power of Russia.

Time and again in the past, and many times I have put the facts in the record, our ability to defend ourselves has been impaired by strikes.

Yet the politicians and the statesmen seeking office have refused, both on the Committee on Education and Labor, of which I am a member, and in the House, to give any consideration whatsoever to the issue as to whether an American citizen shall or shall not be permitted to work for his own advantage, for national security, permitted to participate in the preparation for national defense, without paying tribute to some organization.

Will some of the officeseekers, some of the statesmen, in either or both political parties, give the public the reason for their failure to act?

It cannot be because of a lack of information, a lack of knowledge—ignorance of the right involved. Why is it? Is it because we lack the courage to deny the commands of union officials?

Is any small group to be permitted to fix the cost of national defense or determine whether our defense shall be adequate?

It has been my privilege to serve on the House Committee on Education and Labor since 1940. Repeatedly, consideration of legislation similar to that to which reference has been made has been requested, not only of early chairmen of that committee, but the request was made to a Republican chairman—Chairman McConnell of Pennsylvania—to the present Democratic chairman, GRAHAM BARDEN of North Carolina.

No consideration whatever has been given to this measure.

The House itself, when the Landrum-Griffin bill was under consideration, at the dictation of those in charge of the bill, limited my discussion of this and another equally important amendment to 54 seconds on each proposition.

Is it not the desire for political advantage which is denying at least a hearing of this vital proposition that no longer shall a minority be permitted to interfere with the welfare of our citizens—the future national security of the Nation?

The editorials referred to follow:

[From the New York Times, Aug. 23, 1960]

TRANSIT IN BOSTON HALTED BY STRIKE—METROPOLITAN EMPLOYEES ACT AFTER DRIVER IS SUSPENDED—690,000 USE SYSTEM

BOSTON, August 22.—A general strike, caused by a driver's refusal to work overtime, tied up Boston's Metropolitan Transit Authority System today, just as the evening rush hour began.

The management suspended the driver and said that the overtime work involved about 2 minutes at the end of the run. Union officials denied this and said the overtime involved a total of 3 hours.

More than 690,000 commuters were stranded when 4,600 members of MTA Local 589 of the Street, Electric Railway, and Motor Coach Employees Union called the strike.

The transit authority said the strike was caused by a public-be-damned attitude on the part of the drivers.

Thomas J. McLernon, MTA general manager, who came to the job in July from a post with the New York Transit Authority, and Joseph Fahey, a member of the international executive board of the carmen's union, met with Gov. Foster Furcolo and Atty. Gen. Edward J. McCormack, Jr., to confer on a proposal to end the walkout.

COMPROMISE SOUGHT

Officials said a compromise was sought. It repeatedly involved the return to work of Edward Burns of Westford, the driver who refused the overtime, and simultaneous return to work of the strikers.

The issue was complicated by the fact that, since last December 31, the MTA workers have been without a formal contract. The union's demand for a wage increase is before two arbitrators, but the aribtrators have been unable to agree on a third, or neutral, member of the arbitration board.

The last strike on what is now the MTA system was a 12-hour walkout against the Boston Elevated Railway Co. in 1945. There were also brief strikes against the Boston El in 1912 and 1919. The deficit-ridden Boston El was purchased by the State in 1957 for $22 million.

MAIN ROADS JAMMED

The Boston police reported that many main roads into the city were jammed with cars. They said the city's Common, a grassy park in the heart of the downtown area, was

ringed with double and triple lines of automobiles as suburban housewives sought their husbands, stranded in the city by the transit tieup.

At Revere Beach, about 10 miles north of Boston, the MTA reported nearly 2,000 persons, many clad in bathing suits and carrying beach umbrellas and picnic baskets, were milling about the transit system's beach station seeking transportation home.

The vast transit authority system extends like the spokes of a wheel over 114 square miles and serves more than a dozen cities and towns on Boston's periphery. It is a combination of rapid transit subway tunnels and above-ground trolleys and buses, serving a Greater Boston population of nearly 2 million persons.

[From the New York Times, Aug. 24, 1960]

TRANSIT STRIKE IS ENDED IN BOSTON

BOSTON, August 23.—A strike that tied up Greater Boston's rapid transit system for 24 hours ended late today.

Gov. Foster Furcolo announced the settlement after an all-day conference with representatives of the Metropolitan Transit Authority and the Street Railway and Motor Coach Employees Union. The authority runs the transit system.

Commuters had resorted to walking, hitchhiking, car pools, and taxicabs during the brief strike.

The authority said the strike was called over a driver's refusal to work 2 minutes overtime. The union denied this.

The bus driver involved was Edward L. Burns of Westford. He said the run he was asked to take would have caused 30 minutes of overtime. "I wanted to go home," he said.

The strike involved 4,500 operators and affected 1,500 other employees who were thrown out of work.

Under the agreement Mr. Burns will be reinstated.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Aug. 24, 1960]

HE WANTED TO GO HOME

Hundreds of thousands of hapless commuters in Greater Boston have just been subjected for 24 hours to the enormous indignities, inconveniences and discomforts of a sudden, unexpected and altogether crippling transit strike. Why?

Well, it seems that a bus driver up there—a 42-year-old man named Edward Burns, with "a very good record"—refused to take on an overtime task that would have required him to work, according to his boss, only an extra 2 minutes. He disputes this. He says it would have been nearer a half hour. Anyhow, he walked away from the job. As he has put it, "I just wanted to go home."

In response, Mr. Burns' boss temporarily suspended him, and then his union reacted by going on strike without warning—at the height of the evening rush hour for buses, streetcars, and subway trains. There then followed chaos in the transportation system run by Boston's Metropolitan Transit Authority whose general manager bravely declared: "I don't intend to retreat one bit * * *. The basic point at issue is whether management is going to run the MTA or whether the union is going to run it.

This is good talk and sound principle. Yet the fact remains that the people of Boston's metropolitan area—people who like to travel normally to work in the morning and who want to go home in the evening quite as much as anybody else, including Mr. Burns—have been caught in the middle. On one hand, the transit authorities have sought to be properly firm; on the other, acting with what might be called ironfisted whimsicality, the union has created a paralysis of transportation in protest against the mild disciplining of a driver who had refused to work a few minutes overtime at overtime pay.

Perhaps we should hail this event as another example of how wonderfully free is our free way of life, and how gloriously armed are our unions to safeguard their members from laboring a few extra minutes at bonus rates of pay. Boston's commuters, however, probably take a less cheery view of the matter. Some people, of course, can be pretty narrowminded.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Aug. 29, 1960]

PENNSY DISPUTE TALKS SLATED

PHILADELPHIA, August 29.—Last-minute negotiations to prevent a September 1 strike and shutdown of the entire Pennsylvania Railroad begin today on an unpleasant note.

Francis A. O'Neill, chairman of the National (Railway) Mediation Board, meets separately with the Transport Workers Union and the railroad and then, if possible, with both sides jointly.

Over the weekend, Michael J. Quill, international president of the TWU, said he wanted the joint session to be open to the public because the railroad has said the public will suffer greatly from a strike.

Railroad spokesmen countered that Mr. Quill's proposal was a publicity gag. In any event, they said, public sessions were a matter for the mediation board to decide.

LITTLE HOPE OF ACCORD

Mr. O'Neill has not commented on the proposal.

Mr. Quill also said that Allen J. Greenough, president of the railroad, must be present at the negotiations. The railroad said Mr. Greenough had not changed earlier plans to attend.

"There is absolutely no hope of a settlement," Mr. Quill added.

His union represents 20,000 nonoperating employees who are scheduled to strike at 1 minute past midnight Thursday morning. Five thousand more nonoperating employees, represented by the system federation, also are to strike.

ISSUES OUTLINED

The railroad has said that all but 2,000 of its remaining 50,000 employees will be furloughed and the entire line from New York to St. Louis will be shut down.

The major issue is the farming out of repair work to other companies. The two unions claim this practice endangers the jobs of the employees they represent. The railroad says some repair work can be done more efficiently by outside companies.

Another big issue is job classification, or spelling out in the contract the exact duties of each employee.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, our most distinguished living poet, Robert Frost, was born in San Francisco, Calif. He was named for the Confederate general, Robert E. Lee. And he was raised in Massachusetts.

The biographical summary of Mr. Frost, prepared by the Library of Congress, observes that "Robert disliked study and refused to read any book by himself until he was 12." Then came the first turning point in his life:

At Lawrence High School, however—

In Lawrence, Mass.—

he developed an enthusiasm for learning, and was graduated in 1892 as valedictorian and class poet.

We pause, in tribute to the unsung teachers of his formative years. In discovering and encouraging his genius, they fulfilled the inspiring traditions of their profession.

After a brief stay at Dartmouth College, Robert Frost returned to Lawrence. For the next few years he worked in the textile mills, tried newspaper reporting, and helped his mother in the management of a small private school. It was during this period that his first poem was accepted for publication by the New York Independent.

He married his high school sweetheart, and enrolled as a special student at Harvard, but later abandoned the academic career. In 1900 he moved to Derry, N.H., where he struggled to support his family as a poultry farmer, with ill success, until 1909. From 1906 until 1911 he taught English at Pinkerton Academy in Derry, and for the academic year 1911 and 1912 was teacher of psychology at the State normal school, Plymouth, N.H. In 1912, he decided to give up farming and teaching. Taking his wife and four children to England, he concentrated on developing the style and the insights that eventually "brought pleasure, comfort, inspiration, thoughtfulness, keener awareness of nature, and greater understanding of fellow human beings to thousands of people in all parts of the civilized world."

His first book of poems, "A Boy's Will," won the acclaim of critics and poets. It was followed by "North of Boston," which delighted and impressed many readers. In the New York Times book review of June 19, 1960, Winfield Townley Scott wrote:

Finally there has been his emergence as the most widely read poet of our time, read by highbrow and low; his establishment in the public consciousness as an ancient sage endowed almost with sainthood * * * an American institution right along with motherhood and the flag.

The lengthy list of honorary degrees and prizes awarded to Frost testify to his talent and his prestige. In 1959, he accepted an appointment as honorary consultant in the humanities of the Library of Congress, for a 3-year term.

Mr. Speaker, a civilization becomes immortal through the creations of its mind and spirit. The proud and brazen symbols of its material power crumbles in the dust of centuries, while the expression of its highest aspirations, become timeless.

So it was with Greece and Rome, and others before and since. Plato, Leonardo da Vinci, Shakespeare, Lincoln, Einstein, and many more; saints and poets, philosophers and scientists, they have opened up new frontiers for the human race in its restless search for truth.

In the United States today, thoughtful citizens are seeking to define our national purposes and objectives as if to rediscover something we once knew and have forgotten.

The age of affluence is not enough. We need modern prophets, with insight

imagination, wisdom, and courage, to illuminate the way for us. Men like Robert Frost "whom age cannot wither nor custom stale his infinite variety."

Today in the Congress, we take a minute's recess from ponderous matters to consider a small and simple bill. By the numbers, it is identified as S. 3439. It calls for a modest appropriation of $2,500. This small sum will enable the Bureau of the Mint to design and strike a gold medal which the President of the United States will then present to Robert Frost.

It will be a small token of gratitude that will pass unnoticed among the billions of dollars appropriated for defense and for other compelling material requirements. And yet, future generations in passing judgment on our times, may well conclude that this act coincided with the beginning of greatness for American civilization.

Robert Frost will cherish this honor in his own right. But he will derive much more satisfaction from the fact that he opened the way for others.

Robert Frost had the vision to see and to say that the United States would come of age when it granted national recognition to those who make outstanding contributions to the cultural development of our society.

For only the Nation that values and honors creative excellence is worthy of honor, itself.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

J. B. WHITE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 882) for the relief of heirs of J. B. White.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed, without consideration, to the heirs of J. B. White (living at the time of the death of the said J. B. White) all oil, gas, and other mineral rights which are held by the United States in lands conveyed by such heirs to the United States and described in the records of the office of the county court clerk of Powell County, Stanton, Kentucky, in deed book 31, pages 362–367, inclusive, such rights having been erroneously conveyed to the United States.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUBURN UNIVERSITY, AUBURN, ALA.

The clerk called the bill (S. 3759) authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands to Auburn University, Auburn, Ala.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, subject to the provisions of section 2 of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to convey by quitclaim deed to Auburn University, a land-grant college located at Auburn, Alabama, all right, title, and interest in and to the following described tract of land which constitutes a portion of a forty-acre tract of land donated in 1939 to the United States by the Alabama Polytechnic Institute (now Auburn University), and which is essential to the planned immediate expansion of such university: Beginning at a point 336.1 feet north 0 degrees 57 minutes west of the southeast corner of section 25, township 19 north, range 25 east, Saint Stephens meridian in the city of Auburn, county of Lee, State of Alabama; thence continuing north 0 degrees 57 minutes west along the east boundary line of said section 25, 1,144.2 feet; thence south 89 degrees 40 minutes west 1,164.0 feet to the southeasterly margin of the Wire Road; thence south 36 degrees 15 minutes west along said margin of the Wire Road 126.8 feet; thence south 24 degrees 26 minutes east 780.0 feet; thence south 10 degrees 06 minutes west 328.0 feet; thence south 89 degrees 50 minutes east 938.9 feet to the point of beginning, containing 27 acres more or less.

SEC. 2. In consideration of the conveyance authorized by the first section of this Act, Auburn University shall lease to the Department of Agriculture forty-two acres of land, more or less, in the vicinity of such university suitable (as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture) for carrying on the same or similar type research now engaged in by the Department of Agriculture on lands to be conveyed pursuant to the first section of this Act. Any lease entered into pursuant to the provisions of this section shall run for a period of one year from the date of its execution by Auburn University, and shall contain an option in favor of the Department of Agriculture for its renewal for one or more periods, the total leasing period not to exceed 99 years.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LAND CONVEYANCE, BIBB COUNTY, GA.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 12503) to provide for the conveyance to Carolina Freight Carriers Corp., a corporation of the State of North Carolina, of certain lands and any improvements thereon located in Bibb County, Ga.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of Commerce is directed to convey to Carolina Freight Carriers Corporation, a corporation of the State of North Carolina, at the fair market value, all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a certain rectangular parcel of land, situate in Bibb County, Georgia, measuring 15.1 feet by 21.4 feet, and hereinafter more particularly described together with any and all improvements thereon: *Provided,* That the consideration of and for said conveyance shall be limited to the fair market value of the land alone, the improvements having been inadvertently erected thereon by and at the sole expense of said Carolina Freight Carriers Corporation.

Said parcel of land to be conveyed is more particularly described as follows:

That portion of the right-of-way on project FAGS 252–A(1) Bibb County, Georgia, beginning on the northerly right-of-way line at station 28+00 and running thence in a southerly direction perpendicular to the right-of-way a distance of 15.1 feet to a point 84.9 feet from the center line of said project, which point is at the southerly end of the building located thereon; thence angle right running east a distance of 21.4 feet to a point at station 27+78.6, which is the easterly edge of the building located thereon; thence angle right running northerly a distance of 15.1 feet to the northerly right-of-way line of said project; thence angle right, running 21.4 feet to the point of beginning.

A plat delineating the property to be conveyed, bearing date of June 29, 1959, was prepared by and is of record in the Department of the Navy.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3, strike out "Commerce" and insert "the Navy".

Page 1, line 7, strike out "situate" and insert "situated".

Page 2, line 14, strike out "east" and insert "west".

Page 2, line 16, strike out "easterly" and insert "westerly".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELATING TO TIMBER RIGHTS OF IVAN H. McCORMACK

The Clerk called the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 9) to provide for the removal of a reservation of timber rights from a patent issued to Ivan H. McCormack.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Whereas the Act of August 23, 1935, authorized the conveyance of certain land in Oregon to Ivan H. McCormack; and

Whereas the patent conveying such land contained a reservation to the United States of the timber on such land; and

Whereas a field inspection by the Department of the Interior has revealed that no merchantable timber remains on such land: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first section of the Act entitled "An Act for the relief of Ivan H. McCormack", approved August 23, 1935 (49 Stat. 2163), is amended by striking out ": *Provided further,* That the patent issued hereunder shall contain a reservation to the United States of the timber on the northeast quarter southwest quarter and the northwest quarter southeast quarter of said section 31, which timber shall remain subject to sale, and the proceeds thereof shall be credited to the 'Oregon and California land-grant fund' in accordance with the provisions of the Act of June 9, 1916 (39 Stat. L. 218)".

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior shall execute and deliver to Clarence A. Sapp and Pearl E. Sapp of Philomath, Oregon, an appropriate written instrument which will effect with respect to the land conveyed under such Act the amendment made by the first section of this Act.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVEY TITLE TO CERTAIN LANDS IN IDAHO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10586) to enable the Oregon Short Line Railroad Co. to convey title to certain lands in

Idaho to the Pocatello First Corp., of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That notwithstanding any provisions of the Act of September 1, 1888 (25 Stat. 452 and the following), relating to the ratification of an agreement between the United States and the Shoshone and Bannock Indians, or any other provision of law, no forfeiture or reversion to the United States or to any tribe or tribes of Indians shall take place by reason of any conveyance, quitclaim, or otherwise, made within one year after the date of enactment of this Act by the Oregon Short Line Railroad Company and/or the Union Pacific Railroad Company (corporations of the State of Utah), to the Pocatello First Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (a corporation solely of the State of Idaho) of any or all right, title, or interests which such companies, or either of them, has or would have in and to the following described real property lying in Bannock County, State of Idaho:

An irregular tract of land situate in the northeast quarter of southwest quarter of section 35, township 6 south, range 34 east of the Boise meridian in the city of Pocatello, Bannock County, Idaho, bounded and described as follows:

Beginning at the northwest corner of said northeast quarter of southwest quarter of section 35; thence east along the east and west centerline of said section 35, a distance of 465.8 feet, more or less, to the southwesterly line of Grant Avenue in the city of Pocatello; thence southeasterly along the southeasterly extension of said southwesterly line of Grant Avenue, a distance of 643.5 feet; thence southwesterly, at right angles, a distance of 228.2 feet; thence west along a straight line parallel with said east and west centerline of section 35, a distance of 563.5 feet, more or less, to a point in the southeasterly extension of the northeasterly line of Lincoln Avenue; thence northwesterly along said extension of northeasterly line of Lincoln Avenue a distance of 229.0 feet, more or less, to a point in the west line of said northeast quarter of southwest quarter of section 35; thence north along the west line of said northeast quarter of southwest quarter a distance of 463.0 feet, more or less, to the point of beginning.

Containing an area of 10.0 acres, more or less.

SEC. 2. That said railroad companies are hereby authorized to quitclaim jointly or separately any or all interest they, or each of them, have in and to the above described property to said church, reserving, however, to themselves, their successors and assigns, an easement for any and all existing pipelines and pipeline right-of-way over, under, and across the premises hereinbefore described, and also reserving to said railroad companies the right to operate and maintain the same, and that the rights of forfeiture or reversion of all lands granted in said Act passed and approved September 1, 1888, be, and the same are in all respects, insofar as they pertain to the lands above described, including the easements and rights reserved, hereby revoked and held for naught.

SEC. 3. That upon said railroad companies, or either of them, conveyed by quitclaim deed, or otherwise, to such Pocatello First Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints pursuant to sections 1 and 2 of this Act, the lands described in section 1, the United States hereby waives, relinquishes, and quitclaims to said railroads, or either of them, all right, title, or interest which the United States may have in or to the easements and rights reserved by said railroad companies, or either of them, and waives, relinquishes, and quitclaims to said church all right, title, or interest which the United States may have in and to such lands, subject to the aforementioned reservations in favor of said railroads.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, lines 9 and 10, strike out the words "made within one year after the date of enactment of this Act".

Page 3, line 7, strike out the words "That said" and insert in lieu thereof "Said".

Page 3, line 15, strike out the word "that".

Page 3, line 17, strike out the words "be, and the same".

Page 3, line 21, strike out the words "That upon" and insert in lieu thereof "Upon".

Page 3, line 22, strike out the word "conveyed" and insert "conveying".

Page 4, after line 8, add a new section to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. The provisions of this Act shall be effective only upon payment to the United States within one year from the date of this Act of the present fair market value of the lands described in section 1 hereof except such part of said value as is attributable to improvements on said lands which were not placed thereon by the United States as determined by the Secretary of the Interior."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Hr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HALEY: On page 3, line 17, after the date "September 1, 1888" strike out the word "be".

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That concludes the call of the Private Calendar.

AMENDING THE ACCIDENTS REPORTS ACT

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1964) to amend the act requiring certain common carriers by railroad to make reports to the Interstate Commerce Commission with respect to certain accidents in order to clarify the requirements of such act.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first section of the Act entitled "An Act requiring common carriers engaged in interstate and foreign commerce to make full reports of all accidents to the Interstate Commerce Commission, and authorizing investigations thereof by said Commission", approved May 6, 1910 (45 U.S.C., sec. 38), is amended to read as follows:

"It shall be the duty of the general manager, superintendent, or other proper officer of every common carrier engaged in interstate or foreign commerce by railroad to make to the Interstate Commerce Commission at its office in Washington, District of Columbia, a monthly report, under oath, of all collisions, derailments, or other accidents resulting in death or injury to any person sufficient to incapacitate such person from performing his regular work for 24 hours or more, or damage to equipment or roadbed arising from the operation of such railroad, which report shall state the nature and causes thereof and the circumstances connected therewith: *Provided,* That hereafter all said carriers shall be relieved from the duty of reporting accidents in their annual financial and operating reports made to the Commission."

SEC. 2. Section 5 of such Act of May 6, 1910 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 5. The Interstate Commerce Commission is authorized to prescribe such rules and regulations and such forms for making the reports hereinbefore provided as are necessary to implement and effectuate the purposes of this Act: *Provided, however,* That this shall not authorize the Commission to limit in any way reports required under this Act of all collisions, derailments, or other accidents resulting in injury to persons, equipment, or roadbed arising from the operation of such railroad as provided in section 1 of this Act."

SEC. 3. Section 7 of such Act of May 6, 1910, is amended (1) by inserting "(a)" after "SEC. 7.", and (2) by inserting at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(b) The phrase 'arising from the operation of such railroad', as used in this Act, shall include all activities of the railroad which are related to the performance of its transportation business."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 9, strike out "It" and insert "That it".

Page 2, in lines 6, 7, and 8, strike out "sufficient to incapacitate such person from performing his regular work for 24 hours or more,"; and in line 8, after "roadbed" insert a comma.

Page 2, line 15, after "1910" and before the comma insert "(45 U.S.C., sec. 42)".

Page 2, line 21, strike out the colon and all that follows through the word "Act" in line 2 on page 3.

Page 3, line 3, after "1910" and before the comma insert "(45 U.S.C., sec. 43)".

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I do this merely to ask a question of the chairman of the committee. Is there any cost involved in this bill?

Mr. HARRIS. None at all.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HARRIS. This bill has to do with reporting requirements by common carriers; that is, the railroads, of accidents. It was approved by the railroads, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Railroad Retirement Board, the Railway Labor Executives Association, and everyone concerned.

Mr. GROSS. And there is no cost to the Federal Government?

Mr. HARRIS. No additional cost to the Federal Government at all by reason of this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GRANTS-IN-AID TO UNIVERSITIES, HOSPITALS, LABORATORIES, AND OTHER PUBLIC OR NONPROFIT INSTITUTIONS

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 10341) to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants-in-aid to universities, hospitals, laboratories, and other public or nonprofit institutions to strengthen their programs of research and research training in sciences related to health.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what, if any, will be the cost of this bill to the Federal Government?

Mr. HARRIS. Not any additional cost at all. This has to do with institutions which receive research grants under the present program. This authority would permit up to 15 percent of the allocations to be made to the institutions for allocation by the institutions instead of Federal Government making it directly to the individual.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 301(d) of the Public Health Service Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 241(d)), is amended by adding after the semicolon at the end thereof "and make, upon recommendation of the National Advisory Health Council, grants-in-aid to public or nonprofit universities, hospitals, laboratories, and other institutions for the general support of their research and research training programs: *Provided*, That such uniform percentage, not to exceed 15 per centum, as the Surgeon General may determine, of the amounts provided for grants for research projects for any fiscal year through the appropriations for the National Institutes of Health may be transferred from such appropriations to a separate account to be available for such research and research training program grants-in-aid for such fiscal year;".

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SECTION 4(a) OF THE SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934, AS AMENDED

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 13066) to amend section 4(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the fourth sentence of subsection (a) of section 4 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended (15 U.S.C. 78(d)), is amended by adding ", except that the chairman shall receive additional salary at the rate of $500 a year" after "$20,000 a year".

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks immediately prior to the passage of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, cannot the gentleman, without my having to get up each time, make a brief statement and say what his proposal is going to cost, if anything. I do not like to get up on all these bills, but I would like to know.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's situation and I hope he appreciates mine. But I would have some hesitancy in reserving the right to object to my own request in order to make a statement.

Mr. GROSS. Very well, then, I will do it for the gentleman.

Mr. HARRIS. This will cost no more money than is now the case. We passed a bill a few days ago affecting the terms of office of the Chairman and other members of the Securities and Exchange Commission, but there was a little item overlooked. Under established procedure, under the Federal Executives Pay Act it is provided that the chairmen of these regulatory commissions would be paid $500 in salary more than the other commissioners. When we amended the bill, affecting their terms of office, in the last few days, we overlooked that and in fact reduced the chairman's salary by $500. This corrects the error.

Mr. GROSS. So there is some money involved in this bill. Why should the Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission have $500 more than the chairman of any other commission? Is not that the statement the gentleman just made?

Mr. HARRIS. The procedure was established many years ago, because of the extra duties required of the Chairman, and has been so recognized throughout the years, to do as I have stated.

Mr. GROSS. Let us get this straight. Does the gentleman say that he gets $500 more than the chairman of any other commission? That is, $500 more than the chairman of any other commission in Government?

Mr. HARRIS. No; $500 more than the members of that particular commission. The chairmen of other commissions receive $500 more than the members of their commission.

Mr. GROSS. I can understand that, but I thought the gentleman was saying the chairman of the Federal Securities and Exchange Commission got $500 more than the chairman of any other commission.

Mr. HARRIS. I did not intend to leave that impression.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has been here a long, long time and is quite familiar with the procedure. Does the gentleman recall any instances over the years where we have had any of these equalization bills up where anyone's compensation has been reduced in order to equalize the compensation? Now, think hard. After due deliberation the gentleman cannot recall a single one.

Mr. HARRIS. After due deliberation, I cannot think of a single one.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. It seems to me that some time when we are on this equalization process we should reduce the whole outfit, to reduce this tendency toward inflation all the time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman's request to extend his remarks is agreed to.

There was no objection.

TERMS OF OFFICE OF CERTAIN REGULATORY AGENCIES

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 13067) to amend Public Law 86–619, an act to make uniform provisions of law with respect to the terms of office of the members of certain regulatory agencies, approved July 12, 1960.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. YOUNGER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I should like to have our distinguished chairman explain this bill.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, this is another bill to correct an error that was made when the House passed a bill extending the terms of office of members of the Federal Power Commission. We accepted an explanation of the provision. They sent it up here. The language was used at that time that the second sentence of the first section of the act was amended, and so forth, when in fact it should have been the second sentence of the second paragraph of the first section of the act. That is all this does, amend what we did before to correct an error.

Mr. YOUNGER. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first section of Public Law 86–619 (74 Stat. 407), approved July 12, 1960, is amended by inserting "of the second paragraph" immediately following the word "sentence". As so amended, section 1 reads as follows:

"That the second sentence of the second paragraph of the first section of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 792) is amended to read as follows: 'Their successors shall be appointed each for a term of five years from the date of the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed and until his successor is appointed and has qualified, except that he shall not so continue to serve beyond the expiration of the next session of Congress subsequent to the expiration of said fixed term of office, and

except that any person appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed only for the unexpired term.'"

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF SUGAR ACT

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 13062) to extend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 412 of the Sugar Act of 1948 (relating to termination of the powers of the Secretary under the Act) is amended to read: "The powers vested in the Secretary under this Act shall terminate on December 31, 1961, except that the Secretary shall have power to make payments under title III under programs applicable to the crop year 1961 and previous crop years".

SEC. 2. Sections 4501(c) and 6412(d) (relating to the termination and refund of taxes on sugar) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 are amended by striking out "September 31, 1961" in each place it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1962".

SEC. 3. Section 408 of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended (relating to suspension of quotas), is amended by striking out of subsection (b) "for the period ending March 31, 1961" and inserting "for the period ending December 31, 1961" and by striking out of subsection (b)(1) "for the balance of calendar year 1960 and for the three-month period ending March 31, 1961" and inserting "for the period ending December 31, 1961".

SEC. 4. Section 302(b) of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended (relating to the establishment of proportionate shares for farms), is amended by striking out the period at the end of the first sentence and inserting a colon and the following: *"Provided,* That 75 per centum of any increase in proportionate shares in any area where restrictions are in effect for the 1961 crop year over the total of restricted proportionate shares established for such area in the preceding year, less any shares arising from the 1960 growth factor, shall be reserved for new producers.".

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 2, strike out "31" and insert "30".

Page 2, following line 21, add following new section:

"SEC. 5. Subparagraph (iii) of subsection (b)(2) of section 408 of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, is amended—

"(a) by inserting after the word 'shall' the word 'next'; and

"(b) by striking out the proviso therein and inserting: *'Provided,* That if at any time after this Act goes into effect, collective economic sanctions against one or more of the countries from which purchases are to be made under the provisions of this subsection are agreed upon by and between the United States and other countries, pursuant to treaty, and effective specific actions to implement such sanctions are undertaken by a majority provided in the treaty of such other treaty signatories, the President may discontinue, in whole or in part, and for such periods of time as he may deem necessary, further purchases from such country or countries under this subsection to the extent that such further purchases are in excess of an amount equivalent to the amount established under section 202(c), except that for the calendar year 1960 unless such sanctions are agreed upon and implemented prior to October 15, 1960, no purchases under this subsection for 1960 may be discontinued or deferred and authorization for such purchases shall be made in time to permit shipment of the entire amount to be received in the United States prior to December 31, 1960: *And provided further,* That if amounts of sugar in addition to those purchased hereunder are required, the President may authorize the purchase of such amounts from any foreign countries, without regard to allocation, but with preference to those countries agreeing to purchase United States agricultural commodities;'."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT OF TRUST INDENTURE ACT OF 1939

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 3771) to amend certain provisions of the Trust Indenture Act of 1939, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (c) of section 304 of the Trust Indenture Act of 1939, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(c) The Commission shall, on application by the issuer and after opportunity for hearing thereon, by order exempt from any one or more provisions of this title any security issued or proposed to be issued under any indenture under which, at the time such application is filed, securities referred to in paragraph (3) of subsection (a) of this section are outstanding or on January 1, 1959, such securities were outstanding, if and to the extent that the Commission finds that compliance with such provision or provisions, through the execution of a supplemental indenture or otherwise—

"(1) would require, by reason of the provisions of such indenture, or the provisions of any other indenture or agreement made prior to the enactment of this title, or the provisions of any applicable law, the consent of the holders of securities outstanding under any such indenture or agreement; or

"(2) would impose an undue burden on this issuer, having due regard to the public interest and the interests of investors."

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I direct the attention of the Members of the House to the purpose of the bill S. 3771, as set forth in the report:

The amendment to the Trust Indenture Act of 1939 embodied in the bill (S. 3771) here being reported would extend the time within which certain applications for exemption from the act might be filed.

The Trust Indenture Act of 1939 requires that bonds, notes, debentures, and similar securities publicly offered for sale, except as specifically exempted by the act, be issued under an indenture which meets the requirements of the act and has been duly qualified with the Securities and Exchange Commission. The act requires the indenture to be qualified to designate standards of eligibility and qualification of the corporate trustee, to outlaw exculpatory provisions with respect to the liability of the indenture trustee, and to provide provisions by which the securities issued thereunder may be protected and enforced.

Section 304(c) of the Trust Indenture Act of 1939 presently permits the filing of an application for exemption from provisions of the act where the change in an indenture would require the consent of holders of securities outstanding under the indenture or would impose an undue burden on the issuer having due regard to the public interest and the protection of investors. However, this application may be filed only if there are outstanding at the time of filing securities which were outstanding prior to or within 6 months after August 3, 1939.

In anticipation of the fact that the opportunity to file application for exemption would some day expire, most companies have inserted such provisions of the act in their indenture to become effective when such old indenture securities are no longer outstanding. However, in some cases there was a delay in inserting such provisions so that there may be a period of time when such a company would be unable to do mortgage financing because of its inability to comply with certain provisions of the act under the standards of this provision.

In order to afford such companies an opportunity to bring their indentures fully into compliance with the act without undue hardship, the Commission proposes to amend such provision so as to extend the time of filing applications for exemption thereunder if securities were outstanding when the application is filed which were outstanding on January 1, 1959.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING SECTION 202(b), COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 1740) to amend section 202(b) of the Communications Act of 1934 in order to expand

the Federal Communications Commission's regulatory authority under such section, with an amendment, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (b) of section 202 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 202(b)) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Charges or services, whenever referred to in this Act, include charges for, or services in connection with, the use of communication facilities of common carriers in chain broadcasting or incidental to radio communication of any kind."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 1, strike out lines 6 to 10, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(b) Charges or services, whenever referred to in this Act, include charges for, or services in connection with, the use of common carrier lines of communication, whether derived from wire or radio facilities, in chain broadcasting or incidental to radio communication of any kind."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of S. 1740 is clearly stated in the short and concise report—Report No. 2148—which accompanies this bill. It simply is an amendment to the scope of authority provision of the Federal Communications Act in the area of radio and wireless communications by common carrier facilities.

It is a provision which has been made necessary by recent technical electronic developments in the transmission of communications.

For example, until recent years, most communications were by means of wire facilities, and the regulations of charges, rates, and services were in some instances written in the light of technical developments as they were in 1930, 1940, or even 1950.

Today a substantial part of common carrier communications is accomplished by means of microwave facilities—a form of radio communications.

It is abundantly clear that such services and facilities are clearly within the purview of the Federal Communications Act, and the act should be amended accordingly.

Since the Communications Act of 1934 was enacted, increasing use has been made of point-to-point transmission as a substitute for wires in certain types of broadcasting—especially in network broadcasting.

Some common carriers are presently filing tariffs for the services of the type contemplated in this amending legislation.

In substance, S. 1740 takes a realistic look at technical developments and advances which have occurred since the enactment of the original language of this provision.

This legislation will make it very clear that the regulatory authority of the Commission extends to charges for the use of lines of communications which include use of radio facilities.

The language of the House amendment is clarifying language only. It does not change in any respect the purpose of the Senate bill. We believe that the House language clarifies the bill so as to more clearly reflect legislative intent.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING FEDERAL AVIATION ACT OF 1958

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 1545) to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so as to authorize elimination of a hearing in certain cases under section 408, with an amendment, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the chairman for an explanation of the bill?

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] who will give a brief explanation of the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this legislation is to eliminate certain nonessential hearings presently required by the Federal Aviation Act of 1958. It is part of the legislative program of the Civil Aeronautics Board. The Committee knows of no opposition to the proposal.

Enactment of this legislation would permit the Civil Aeronautics Board to eliminate the mandatory requirement of a hearing under section 408(b) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 in cases involving relatively simple transactions which cannot affect the control of a direct air carrier or create a monopoly, or tend to restrain competition. The bill requires that in such cases the Board would first have to determine that the public interest does not require a hearing and that no person disclosing a substantial interest has requested a hearing. Furthermore, notice of its intention to act without a hearing would have to be given by the Board through publication in the Federal Register with a copy of such notice sent to the Attorney General.

The need for the legislation arises from the fact that under section 408(b) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, the Board may not grant its approval of certain acts without first conducting a hearing. The acts referred to in section 408(a) may be generally classified as those tending to bring about a consolidation or merger of properties or acquisition of control of any air carrier, by another air carrier, common carrier, or person engaged in any phase of aeronautics. Among other things, they relate to the purchase, lease, or contract to operate the properties, or any substantial part thereof, of any air carrier as well as other conduct to bring about a merger or consolidation of air-carrier properties. Since the chief purpose of this section of the act is to prohibit the acquisition of control of one air carrier by another carrier, without specific Board approval, which requires both an application and a formal hearing, the majority of cases coming within its purview involve transactions which substantially affect the public interest and the mandatory hearing requirement should be and is retained with respect to them.

However, experience has shown that in many other cases a hearing required under section 408(b) serves no useful purpose. These are cases involving relatively simple transactions which by reason of their limited nature, first, cannot conceivably affect the control of a direct air carrier or result in creating a monopoly, restrain competition, or jeopardize another air carrier not a party to the transactions; second, do not involve an objection by any party having a substantial interest in the transactions involved; and, third, where a hearing would provide no further significant information concerning the transactions.

One example of such a transaction is the purchase or lease of a limited number of aircraft—often only one aircraft and seldom more than three—where it appears that the transaction will prove beneficial to both parties and the public and where no person not a party to the transaction is concerned with it. Another example is a transaction directly affecting only a small airfreight forwarder, where the public interest in the case is insignificant.

In cases such as these where a hearing serves no useful purpose and no interested person requests a hearing, the committee feels the Board should have authority to act on the matter without a hearing. Congress has granted authority similar to that being here requested to the Interstate Commerce Commission—section 5 of the Interstate Commerce Act—and to the Federal Communications Commission—section 221 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended by the act of August 2, 1956.

The Board's action would be subject to court review, so that interested parties would be protected against arbitrary action.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 408(b) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 be amended by striking the period at the end thereof, inserting a colon in lieu thereof, and adding the following proviso: *"Provided*

further, That in cases involving relatively simple transactions which do not affect the control of a direct air carrier, or result in creating a monopoly, or tend to restrain competition and where no person disclosing a substantial interest requests a hearing, the Board, after notice published in the Federal Register, copy of which shall be forwarded to the Attorney General, may determine that a hearing is not required in the public interest and may by order approve or disapprove the transaction which is the subject of the application."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That section 408(b) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (49 U.S.C., sec. 1378(b)) is amended by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof a colon and the following: '*Provided further,* That in any case in which the Board determines that the transaction which is the subject of the application does not affect the control of an air carrier directly engaged in the operation of aircraft in air transportation, does not result in creating a monopoly, and does not tend to restrain competition, and determines that no person disclosing a substantial interest then currently is requesting a hearing, the Board, after publication in the Federal Register of notice of the Board's intention to dispose of such application without a hearing (a copy of which notice shall be furnished by the Board to the Attorney General not later than the day following the date of such publication), may determine that the public interest does not require a hearing and by order approve or disapprove such transaction.'

"SEC. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this Act shall apply only with respect to applications submitted to the Civil Aeronautics Board on or after the date of enactment of this Act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF INVESTMENT COMPANY ACT OF 1940

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 2481) to amend certain provisions of the Investment Company Act of 1940, as amended, with amendments thereto, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I ask the chairman to give us an explanation of this bill.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois, the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. MACK].

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, these are amendments to the Investment Company Act which have been recommended by the Securities and Exchange Commission. This is part of the legislative program of the Securities and Exchange Commission. It is the first amendment since 1940. Briefly, the proposed amendment would require a statement of policy of a registered investment company, which cannot be changed without the consent or approval of the holders of a majority of the voting securities, to include its fundamental investment objectives and investment characteristics. It would also strengthened the statutory provisions requiring that at least 40 percent of the members of the board of directors be persons who have no pecuniary interest in the operations and management of the investment company and who are not part of its operating staff. It would require that if an investment company chooses to keep its securities and investments in the custody of a bank such custodianship shall include the cash assets of the investment company; impose limitations upon the proportion of common or preferred stock that may be acquired by face amount certificate companies issuing fixed obligations—face amount certificates—to prevent such obligations from becoming unduly speculative; clarify certain exceptions to the definition of an investment company; required to register under the act; and clarify the terms "depositor" and "share of stock" used in the statute by adding specific definitions of these terms.

Mr. YOUNGER. Is it not true that the main function of this piece of legislation is to strengthen the hands of the SEC in administering the act? It is a stronger act than it was before?

Mr. MACK. The gentleman is entirely correct. There was some opposition from the Investment Company Association to the provisions which strengthen the act to give more control over the operation of the investment company. As the gentleman knows, this has become a tremendous business in the last 4 or 5 years, and there are tremendous sums being invested by the public each year.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MACK. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Is it my understanding that all of these bills from your committee were unanimously approved by the committee?

Mr. MACK. I would like to say that they were all reported unanimously by my subcommittee, and the full committee.

Mr. HARRIS. This bill and other bills were reported by the full committee unanimously.

Mr. GROSS. I do not know whether I am an exception in the House or not, but I had no previous notice or I saw no previous notice that any of these bills were coming up. We are taking this list of bills on faith. I hope we have not made any mistakes along the way. I saw no previous notice that the gentleman was going to bring up a series of bills such as this. Perhaps it is all right.

Mr. HARRIS. I might say to the gentleman that these bills are all bills that have been before us a long time. They are needed and are necessary. There has been some difficulty in working them out satisfactorily to everybody, with full protection of the public interest. We had five bills that the SEC requested. We are bringing up three of them. We are not bringing up the other two because there are differences of opinion, but these will strengthen the hands of the Commission in the administration of these acts and in doing their duty and carrying out their responsibilities.

Mr. GROSS. I would hope that next year some prior notice be given to Members of the House that you are going to call up a series of bills such as you have, so that we might have some opportunity to look them over.

Mr. HARRIS. I might say to the gentleman I worked this out yesterday; we finally worked it out and both sides agreed yesterday afternoon. I did not have any further opportunity. The gentleman knows what the situation is around here with reference to adjournment. That is the reason for this action today. I appreciate the confidence the gentleman from Iowa has in our committee and I will try never to do anything to destroy the confidence the gentleman has reposed in us.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of section 2 of the Investment Company Act of 1940, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

."(1) 'Advisory board' means a board, committee, or group, whether elected or appointed, which is distinct from the board of directors or board of trustees, of an investment company, whether or not the functions of such board are such as to render its members 'directors' within the definition of that term, which board has advisory functions as to investments but has no power to determine that any security or other investment shall be purchased or sold by such company, but shall not include a board, committee, or group composed solely of directors, officers, and employees of such company and investment advisers and officers, directors, partners, or employees of any investment adviser of such company, or any of them."

SEC. 2. Paragraph (11) of subsection (a) of section 2 of the Investment Company Act of 1940, as amended, is amended by adding the following new paragraph:

"(11A) 'Depositor' means any person who has promoted or is promoting an investment company not having a board of directors, or his successor, or who has administrative functions relating to such company, including the power to eliminate or substitute portfolio securities under the instrument of organization of such company but does not include a person whose functions as a depositor have been assumed by a successor, or a trustee or custodian of such company designated in accordance with the provisions of Section 26 of this title."

SEC. 3. Paragraph (35) of subsection of section 2 of the Investment Company Act of 1940, as amended, is amended by adding the following new paragraph:

"(35A) 'Share of stock' means any security similar in nature to an equity security."

SEC. 4. Paragraph (37) of subsection (a) of section 2 of the Investment Company Act of 1940, as amended, is amended by striking out "Alaska," and "the Philippine Islands,".

SEC. 5. Paragraph (7) of subsection (c) of section 3 of the Investment Company Act of 1940, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(7) Any company substantially all of whose business, directly or through majority-owned subsidiaries, consists of one or

more of the businesses described in paragraphs (3), (5), and (6), or one or more of such businesses (from which not less than 25 per centum of such company's gross income during its last fiscal year was derived) together with an additional business or businesses other than investing, reinvesting, owning, holding, or trading in securities: *Provided,* That if such company or any majority-owned subsidiary is engaged in one or more of the businesses described in paragraph (6), such company or subsidiary is not engaged in the business of issuing face-amount certificates of the installment type or periodic payment plan certificates."

SEC. 6. Paragraph (8) of subsection (c) of section 3 of the Investment Company Act of 1940, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(8) Any company 90 per centum or more of the value of whose investment securities are represented by securities of a single issuer included within a class of persons enumerated in paragraphs (3), (5), (6), or (7), which issuer is controlled by such company within the meaning of section 2(a)(9)."

SEC. 7. Subsection (c)(9) of section 3 of the Investment Company Act of 1940, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(9) Any company (A) which is subject to regulation under the Interstate Commerce Act: *Provided,* That this exception shall not apply to a company which the Commission finds and by order declares to be primarily engaged, directly or indirectly, in the business of investing, reinvesting, owning, holding, or trading in securities; or (B) whose entire outstanding stock is owned or controlled by a company excepted under clause (A) hereof: *Provided,* That the assets of the controlled company consist substantially of securities issued by companies which are subject to regulation under the Interstate Commerce Act

SEC. 8. Paragraph (10) of subsection (c) of section 3 of the Investment Company Act of 1940, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(10) Any company with a registration in effect as a holding company under the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935: *Provided,* That such registered company has not been exempted pursuant to section 3 of that Act."

SEC. 9. Paragraph (13) of subsection (c) of section 3 of the Investment Company Act of 1940, as amended, is amended by striking out "conditions of section 165 of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended" and inserting in lieu thereof "requirements of section 401 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended."

SEC. 10. Paragraph (1) of subsection (b) of section 5 of the Investment Company Act of 1940, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(1) 'Diversified company' means a management company which meets the following requirements: At least 75 per centum of the value of its total assets is represented by cash and cash items (including receivables), Government securities, securities of other diversified investment companies, and other securities for the purposes of this calculation limited in respect of any one issuer to an amount not greater in value than 5 per centum of the value of the total assets of such management company and to not more than 10 per centum of the outstanding voting securities of such issuer."

SEC. 11. Paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of section 6 of the Investment Company Act of 1940, as amended, is amended by striking out "Alaska," and "the Philippine Islands,".

SEC. 12. Paragraph (2) of subsection (b) of section 8 of the Investment Company Act of 1940, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(2) a recital of the investment policy of the registrant, which may, if it desires, make appropriate reservations of freedom of action for the protection of investors, in respect of (A) the extent to which it intends generally to invest in bonds or other obligations, preferred stocks, common stocks, or any one or more of any class or type of securities; (B) objectives as to income, preservation of capital or capital appreciation, if registrant represents that it will place emphasis on any one or more of such objectives; (C) the extent of investments to be made in issuers operating in particular geographical areas, if registrant represents that its investments will be so limited; (D) investment in companies for the purpose of exercising control or management; and (E) matters, not enumerated above or in paragraph (1), which the registrant deems matters of fundamental policy and elects to treat as such;".

SEC. 13. Subsection (a) of section 10 of the Investment Company Act of 1940, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 10. (a) After one year from the effective date of this title, no registered investment company shall have a board of directors more than 60 per centum of the members of which are persons who are investment advisers of, affiliated persons or stockholders of any investment adviser of, or officers of employees of, such registered company or who are principal underwriters of, or persons controlling such registered company, investment adviser or underwriter, or affiliated persons of such underwriters or affiliated persons (other than solely as directors) of controlling or controlled persons of such registered company, investment adviser or underwriter, or shall have a board of directors more than 80 per centum of the members of which are the persons mentioned above and regular brokers of the company or affiliated persons of such brokers."

SEC. 14. Subsection (f) of section 10 of the Investment Company Act of 1940, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(f) No registered investment company shall knowingly purchase or otherwise acquire, during the existence of any underwriting or selling syndicate, any security (except a security of which such company is the issuer) a principal underwriter of which is an officer, director, member of an advisory board, investment adviser, or employee of such registered company, or is a person (other than a company of the character described in section 12(d)(3) (A) and (B), voting securities of which are owned by such registered company) of which any such officer, director, member of an advisory board, investment adviser, or employee is an affiliated person, unless in acquiring such security such registered company is itself acting as a principal underwriter for the issuer. The Commission, by rules and regulations upon its own motion or by order upon application may conditionally or unconditionally exempt any transaction or classes of transactions from any of the provisions of this subsection, if and to the extent that such exemption is consistent with the protection of investors."

SEC. 15. Subsection (h) of section 10 of the Investment Company Act of 1940, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(h) In the case of a registered management company which is an unincorporated company not having a board of directors, the provisions of this section shall apply as follows:

"(1) the provisions of subsection (a), as modified by subsection (e), shall apply to the board of directors of the depositor of such company: *Provided,* That where the depositor acts as investment adviser to such company, a person who is an affiliated person of the depositor only by reason of being a director thereof shall not thereby be considered to be an affiliated person of an investment adviser of such company for the purposes of this subsection;

"(2) the provisions of subsections (b) and (c), as modified by subsection (e), shall apply to the board of directors of the depositor and of every investment adviser of such company: *Provided,* That where the depositor acts as a principal underwriter of securities issued by such company, a person who is an affiliated person of the depositor only by reason of being a director thereof shall not thereby be considered to be an affiliated person of a principal underwriter of such company for the purposes of this subsection; and

"(3) the provisions of subsection (f) shall apply to purchases and other acquisitions for the account of such company of securities a principal underwriter of which is the depositor or an investment adviser of such company, or an affiliated person of such depositor or investment adviser."

SEC. 16. Paragraph (3) of subsection (a) of section 13 of the Investment Company Act of 1940, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(3) Deviate from its policy in respect of concentration of investments in any particular industry or group of industries as recited in its registration statement, or deviate from any investment policy or any other fundamental policy recited in its registration statement pursuant to section 8(b)(2); or"

SEC. 17. Subsection (a) of section 17 of the Investment Company Act of 1940, as amended, is amended by striking out the clause: "(other than a company of the character described in section 12(d)(3) (A) and (B))."

SEC. 18. Subsection (c) of section 17 of the Investment Company Act of 1940, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(c) Notwithstanding subsection (a)—

"(1) a person may, in the ordinary course of business sell to or purchase from any company merchandise or may enter into a lessor-lease relationship with any person and furnish the services incident thereto;

"(2) a company described in section 12(d)(3) (A) and (B) may purchase from and sell securities or other property to the registered investment company or companies which own its voting securities or may borrow money or other property from such registered company or companies."

SEC. 19. Subsection (d) of section 17 of the Investment Company Act of 1940, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(d) It shall be unlawful for any affiliated person of or principal underwriter for a registered investment company, or any affiliated person of such a person or principal underwriter, acting as principal to effect any transaction in which such registered company, or a company controlled by such registered company, is a joint or a joint and several participant with such person, principal underwriter, or affiliated person, in contravention of such rules and regulations as the Commission may prescribe for the purpose of limiting or preventing participation by such registered or controlled company on a basis different from or less advantageous than that of such other participant. Nothing contained in this subsection shall be deemed to preclude any affiliated person from acting as manager of any underwriting syndicate or other group in which such registered or controlled company is a participant and receiving compensation therefor; nor shall it preclude a company described in section 12(d)(3) (A) and (B) from effecting any transaction because of the joint or joint and several participation of the registered investment company or companies which own its voting securities."

SEC. 20. Subsection (f) of section 17 of the Investment Company Act of 1940, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(f) Every registered management company shall place and maintain its securities and similar investment in the custody of (1) a bank or banks having the qualifications prescribed in paragraph (1) of section 26(a) for the trustees of unit investment trusts; or (2) a company which is a member of a national securities exchange as defined

in the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, subject to such rules and regulations as the Commission may from time to time prescribe for the protection of investors; or (3) such registered company, but only in accordance with such rules and regulations or orders as the Commission may from time to time prescribe for the protection of investors. Rules, regulations, and orders of the Commission under this subsection, among other things, may make appropriate provision with respect to such matters as the earmarking, segregation, and hypothecation of such securities and investments, and may provide for or require periodic or other inspections by any or all of the following: Independent public accountants, employees, and agents of the Commission, and such other persons as the Commission may designate. No such member which trades in securities for its own account may act as custodian except in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the Commission for the protection of investors. If a registered company maintains its securities and similar investments in the custody of a qualified bank or banks, the cash proceeds from the sale of such securities and similar investments and other cash assets of the company shall likewise be kept in the custody of such a bank or banks: *Provided*, That such a registered company may maintain an operating account in a qualified bank or banks which the balance of such account or the aggregate balances of such accounts at no time in excess of the amount of the fidelity bond, pursuant to section 17(g) of the Act, covering the officers or employees authorized to draw on such account or accounts."

SEC. 21. Paragraph (2) of subsection (f) of section 18 of the Investment Company Act of 1940, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(2) 'Senior security' shall not, in the case of a registered open-end company, include a class or classes or a number of series of preferred or special stock each of which is preferred over all other classes or series in respect of assets specifically allocated to that class or series: *Provided*, (A) that such company has outstanding no class or series of stock which is not so preferred over all other classes or series; or (B) that the only other outstanding class of the issuer's stock consists of a common stock upon which no dividend (other than a liquidating dividend) is permitted to be paid and which in the aggregate represents not more than one-half of 1 per centum of the issuer's outstanding voting securities; and (C) that such company files a recital of policy in respect of each class or series in accordance with the provisions of section 8(b) (1) and (2) of this title. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 13(a), a change or deviation in policy in respect of any class or series of preferred or special stock shall be authorized solely by the vote of the holders of a majority of the stock of each such class or series."

SEC. 22. Subsection (d) of section 20 of the Investment Company Act of 1940, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(d) If on the effective date of this title cross-ownership or circular ownership exists between a registered investment company and any other company or companies, it shall be the duty of such registered company, within five years after such effective date, to eliminate such cross-ownership or circular ownership. If at any time after the effective date of this title cross-ownership or circular ownership between a registered investment company and any other company or companies comes into existence upon the purchase by a registered investment company of the securities of another company or upon the purchase by a company controlled by the registered investment company of the securities of such registered company or another company, it shall be the duty of such registered company, within one year after it first knows of the existence of such cross-ownership or circular ownership, to eliminate the same."

SEC. 23. Subsection (b) of section 23 of the Investment Company Act of 1940, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(b) No registered closed-end company shall sell any common stock of which it is the issuer at a price below the current net asset value of such stock, exclusive of any distributing commission or discount (which net asset value shall be determined as of a time within forty-eight hours, excluding Sundays and holidays, next preceding the time of such determination), except (1) in connection with an offering to the holders of one or more classes of its capital stock; (2) with the consent of the holders of a majority of its common stock; (3) upon conversion of a convertible security in accordance with its terms; (4) upon the exercise of any warrant outstanding on the date of enactment of this Act or issued in accordance with the provisions of section 18(d); or (5) under such other circumstances as the Commission may permit by rules and regulations or orders for the protection of investors."

SEC. 24. Subsection (b) of section 28 of the Investment Company Act of 1940, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(b) (1) It shall be unlawful for any registered face-amount certificate company to issue or sell any face-amount certificate, or to collect or accept any payment on any such certificate issued by such company on or after the effective date of this title, unless such company has, in cash or qualified investments, assets having a value not less than the aggregate amount of the capital stock requirement and certificate reserves as computed under the provisions of subsection (a) hereof. As used in this subsection, 'qualified investments' means investments of a kind which life insurance companies are permitted to invest in or hold under the provisions of the Code of the District of Columbia as heretofore or hereafter amended, and such other investments as the Commission shall by rule, regulation, or order authorize as qualified investments. Such investments shall be valued in accordance with the provisions of said code where such provisions are applicable. Investments to which such provisions do not apply shall be valued in accordance with such rules, regulations, or orders as the Commission shall prescribe for the protection of investors.

"(2) The assets which such company is required to have under paragraph (1) of this subsection in an amount equal to the certificate reserves required under subsection (a) hereof shall not include at any time:

"(A) preferred stocks, or similar senior securities which are stocks, in an amount more than 25 per centum of the certificate reserves; and

"(B) common stocks, or similar equity securities, in an amount more than the aggregate of

"(i) 10 per centum of the certificate reserves; plus

"(ii) an amount equal to 100 per centum of that portion of the stockholders' equity in the company which is represented by assets consisting of cash or qualified investments; plus

"(iii) an amount equal to 100 per centum of that portion of the stockholders' equity in the company which is represented by assets consisting of cash, or qualified investments other than common stocks or similar equity securities;

Provided, however, That where the company has outstanding separate series of certificates and the assets applicable to the reserve requirements of one or more of such series are maintained separately, then the limitations in (A) and (B) (i) above shall be computed separately on the basis of the required certificate reserves for the outstanding certificates in each series or group of series for which assets are maintained separately; and the permissible amounts computed pursuant to the limitations stated in (B) (ii) and (B) (iii) above shall be allocated in accordance with the company's discretion but in no event shall the aggregate amount of common stocks, or similar equity securities, exceed 30 per centum of the required assets for each series or group of series for which assets are maintained separately. There shall be no limitation as to the type of securities in which assets in an amount equal to the minimum capital stock requirement are invested, other than the requirement of paragraph (1) of this subsection as to qualified investments. As used in this subsection 'stockholders' equity' means the amount of the company's assets less the amount of the indebtedness of the company and its certificate and other reserves."

SEC. 25. Subsection (a) of section 43 of the Investment Company Act of 1940, as amended, is amended by striking out "sections 239 and 240 of the Judicial Code, as amended" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 1254 of title 28, United States Code."

SEC. 26. Section 44 of the Investment Company Act of 1940, as amended, is amended by striking out "sections 128 and 240 of the Judicial Code, as amended, and section 7, as amended, of the Act entitled 'An Act to establish a court of appeals for the District of Columbia', approved February 9, 1893", and inserting in lieu thereof "sections 1254, 1291, 1292, and 1293 of title 28, United States Code."

SEC. 27. This Act shall become effective upon its enactment: *Provided, however*, That, as to companies which were registered prior to that time, the effective date of the amendments to sections 5, 8(b) (2), and 18(f) (2) shall be six months thereafter. The provisions of section 28(b) (2) shall not apply to any series or group of series of face-amount certificates which were registered under the Securities Act of 1933 prior to the enactment of section 28(b) (2) in any case where the registered face-amount certificate company has outstanding separate series of face-amount certificates and the assets applicable to the reserve requirements of such series are maintained separately.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendments: Page 1, strike out line 3 and all that follows down through line 7 on page 2.

Page 2, line 8, strike out "SEC. 2. Paragraph (11) of" and insert "That".

Page 2, line 10, strike out "adding" and insert: "inserting immediately after paragraph (11) thereof".

Page 2, line 21, strike out "3" and insert "2".

Page 2, line 21, strike out "Paragraph (35) of subsection" and insert "Subsection (a)".

Page 2, line 23, strike out "adding" and insert "inserting immediately after paragraph (35) thereof".

Page 3, line 1, strike out "4" and insert "3".

Page 3, line 5, strike out "5" and insert "4".

Page 3, line 21, strike out "6" and insert "5".

Page 4, strike out lines 5 to 18, inclusive.

Page 4, line 19, strike out "8" and insert "6".

Page 5, line 1, strike out "9" and insert "7".

Page 5, line 7, strike out "10" and insert "8".

Page 5, line 21, strike out "11" and insert "9".

Page 5, line 23, strike out "'Alaska,' and".

Page 5, line 25, strike out "12" and insert "10".

Page 6, line 20, strike out "13" and insert "11".

Page 7, line 13, strike out "14" and insert "12".

Page 8, line 19, strike out "15" and insert "13".

Page 9, line 19, strike out "16" and insert "14".

Page 9, strike out line 22 and all that follows down through line 5 on page 10, and insert the following:

"(3) deviate from its policy in respect of concentration of investments in any particular industry or group of industries as recited in its registration statement, or deviate from any investment policy or any other fundamental policy recited in its registration statement pursuant to section 8(b)(2); or".

Page 10, line 6, strike out "17" and insert "15".

Page 10, line 9, strike out "(B))." and insert "(B)),".

Page 10, line 10, strike out "18" and insert "16".

Page 10, line 17, after "thereto;" insert "and".

Page 10, line 24, strike out "19" and insert "17".

Page 11, line 24, strike out "20" and insert "18".

Page 13, line 12, strike out "21" and insert "19".

Page 14, line 9, insert quotation marks after "series."

Page 14, line 10, strike out "22" and insert "20".

Page 15, line 4, strike out "23" and insert "21".

Page 15, line 23, strike out "24" and insert "22".

Page 18, line 12, strike out "25" and insert "23".

Page 18, line 16, strike out "Code." " and insert "Code'."

Page 18, line 17, strike out "26" and insert "24".

Page 18, line 23, strike out "Code." " and insert "Code'."

Page 18, line 24, strike out "27" and insert "25".

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALTER:

After line 20 insert the following new section and renumber sections 23, 24, and 25 as sections 24, 25, and 26, respectively:

"SEC. 23. Section 36 of the Investment Company Act of 1940, as amended, is amended to renumber section 36 as section 36(a) and to add the following new subsections as sections 36 (b), (c), and (d):

" 'SEC. 36. (b) Whenever the board of directors of a registered investment company, or the investment adviser or principal underwriter for a registered investment company, so requests, any person who is or has been a director, officer, agent, or employee of said registered investment company or investment adviser shall file within 30 days after service of said request a written statement with the secretary for the board of directors making the request in which shall be set forth—

" '(1) the names, amounts, prices, and dates of acquisition, purchase, and sale of all securities and other investments directly and indirectly acquired or purchased by said director, officer, agent, and employee, including members of said person's family, and by any person controlled by said director, officer, agent, and employee, during the period of time said person was or has been a director, officer, agent, or employee;

" '(2) the dates of, and proceeds and consideration received from, the sale or other disposition of said securities and investments and, if not sold on a national securities exchange, the name and address of the person acquiring or purchasing the said securities and investments;

" '(3) a list of all loans and any other transaction and business deal by said director, officer, employee, and person with—

" '(a) each bank and broker that during said period has acted as a custodian, depository, bank, agent, or broker for said registered investment company; and

" '(b) any company in which said registered investment company owns or owned during said period any security.

Said statement and any supplement thereto filed within thirty days after said supplement has been requested shall include a statement of any material facts and a copy of any document, paper, and other writing respecting said loan, transaction, and deal that may be requested.

" 'Said statement shall also have attached thereto an affidavit stating that it is a true and complete answer to the best of affiant's knowledge, information, and belief to the request in question.

" '(c) Whenever any director, officer, agent, or employee of a registered investment company has filed a statement pursuant to the above subsection, the board of directors of any registered investment company, or investment adviser, or principal underwriter for a registered invest-

possession relevant to the acts in question. Said bank, broker, agent, or other person shall comply with said request no later than thirty days after service upon it of said request in writing.

" '(d) Any court of competent jurisdiction in which is filed a complaint alleging a violation of any provision of this section or of sections 17, 21, 34, 37 or 48 of this title, or of sections 9, 10 or 16 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, or sections 10, 12 or 17 of the Securities Act of 1933, shall, if the facts alleged therein are shown to be supported by substantial evidence, preliminarily and permanently enjoin any director or officer or other person found to have violated any of the aforesaid provisions from serving as a director or officer or controlling person in his own right or in association with others of any registered investment company, investment adviser, or principal underwriter for a registered investment company, or of any company or other person controlling any registered investment company or any investment adviser or principal underwriter for a registered investment company and from performing any act, including voting for or electing any director or officer of such a company, in furtherance of the acquisition, exercise or maintenance of such control by any other person. Such court shall also, if requested, require said director or officer and any associated person to account to the registered investment company for all profits made by said director or officer, and for all losses incurred by said company resulting from any of the aforesaid acts.' "

Mr. WALTER (interrupting the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with and that it be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, this amendment is intended to give to the management of investment companies the power to put their own house in order. The amendment does this: It permits the directors of an investment company, after board action, to request any of the officers, directors, agents, or employees of the investment company to furnish the board of directors with a detailed account of their dealings.

There is provision for 30-day notice, and if there is failure to comply with this request, after the 30-day period, then the corporation is authorized to go into the appropriate court and seek an injunction restraining the member of the board or the officer of the corporation from continuing to function as a member of the board of directors or as an officer.

It certainly seems to me that the Securities and Exchange Commission ought not to oppose an amendment of this sort. Its sole purpose is to enable the board, which today is absolutely powerless to do anything about it, to compel people, if they believe those people are dealing improperly in securities, to make a full disclosure of what their financial transactions are; that is, any transactions which might be against the best interests of the company by which they are being employed.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman has been very kind to discuss his amendments with me. As the gentleman knows, I have expressed a great deal of sympathy; certainly I am solicitous with what he is trying to do.

The thing that causes me to hesitate at this particular time in agreeing to an amendment of this kind is that I, as chairman of the committee, happen to know that had the gentleman's amendment been debated in the committee we would not have been able to get this bill up by unanimous consent, because there was some opposition within the committee. To now agree to the gentleman's amendment at this point, knowing that kind of situation, seems to me to be not the way to handle the situation. I recognize that from the gentleman's standpoint it is important that he get what he would like to have adopted, but I feel that as chairman I owe an obligation to the members of the committee in bringing up legislation under unanimous consent not to agree to amendments such as the gentleman offers when I know there would have been objection to it by some members of the committee. Therefore, reluctant as I am, I have to oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. I cannot understand why anybody would object to this amendment, particularly in view of the fact that the Securities and Exchange Commission has hinted that there are serious abuses of trust by investment company managers in the administration of these huge funds.

As the gentleman knows, members of the board of directors may be more aware of improper conduct of other members or officers than the Securities and Exchange Commission could be. These abuses of trust are not brought to the attention of the Securities and Exchange Commission. Under existing law the members of the board of directors are powerless to require a person whom they have any reason to believe is not conducting himself properly, to make a full disclosure of his financial transactions.

Mr. HARRIS. I well understand what the gentleman is saying is an actual fact. As I say, I have great sympathy for the amendment and very likely under normal conditions I would be in support of it. But the gentleman introduced this bill about a week ago?

Mr. WALTER. I introduced it at about the time the gentleman indicated he was going to take up bills of this sort.

Mr. HARRIS. That is the first time we have had it called to our attention. We have been unable to hold hearings and develop a record on it. If the House wants to adopt it today, of course, that is the prerogative of the House, but, under the circumstances, I am going to have to oppose the amendment. The gentleman understands the reason for it. If it is not adopted, I assure the gentleman if I have anything to do with it early in the next session it will be taken up, hearings will be given the gentleman immediately and consideration had.

Mr. WALTER. May I ask whether or not hearings have been held on the bills we have been passing here by unanimous consent?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes; substantial hearings, and over a period of 3 years in some cases.

Mr. WALTER. Certainly this subject matter has been discussed by the committee at great length. As a matter of fact, the very bill that we seek to amend has as its objective the elimination of the abuses which my amendment deals with adequately and which the gentleman's bill does not deal with adequately. With my amendment abuses can and will be uncovered and an honest management enabled to regulate their own affairs.

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MACK. May I say that I have viewed the gentleman's amendment with some favor. I would like to have had the bill introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania before my subcommittee when I was holding hearings on this subject. I think that is the proper way to consider the gentleman's proposal. The bill was not introduced until after my subcommittee had completed all of the public hearings, consideration had in executive session, and the bill reported to the full committee. It was not until the executive sessions that it was possible to have the benefit of the gentleman's views in the consideration of this proposal. Because of certain opposition that was raised at the time, we decided not to include it in the bill this year. I do think it is a matter that needs to be dealt with and I am hoping that the next Congress will give considerable study to this proposition.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, do I understand there is objection?

Mr. WALTER. I have not heard any objection; no. It has been indicated perhaps the amendment was offered at the wrong time, but I have heard no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I have heard no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. I tried to explain a moment ago the reason I felt compelled to oppose the amendment as it is presented here today. Had the amendment been offered and adopted——

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I understand all that.

Mr. HARRIS. We would not have gotten it up for consideration.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Is the gentleman objecting on his own account or on behalf of somebody else?

Mr. HARRIS. I am objecting because of the procedure involved.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman cannot object on the part of somebody who is not here. If he wants to object on his own responsibility, all right.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WALTER) there were—ayes 51, noes 8.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 3772) to amend certain provisions of the Investment Company Act of 1940, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the provisions of H.R. 2481 as passed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The proceedings whereby a similar House bill (H.R. 2481) was passed were vacated and the House bill was laid on the table.

INVESTMENT ADVISERS ACT OF 1940, AS AMENDED

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 2482) to amend certain provisions of the Investment Advisers Act of 1950, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That paragraph (18) of section 202(a) of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940, as amended, is amended by striking out "Alaska," and "the Philippine Islands,".

SEC. 2. Clause (F) of paragraph (1) of section 203(c) of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(F) whether such investment adviser, any partner, officer, director, or person performing similar functions, or any person directly or indirectly controlling or controlled by such investment adviser, is subject to any disqualification which would be a basis for denial, suspension, or revocation of registration of such investment adviser under the provisions of subsection (d), and"

SEC. 3. Subsection (d) of section 203 of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(d) The Commission shall, after appropriate notice and opportunity for hearing, by order deny registration or suspend for a period not exceeding twelve months or revoke the registration of an investment adviser, if it finds that such denial, suspension, or revocation is in the public interest and that (1) such investment adviser, whether prior or subsequent to becoming such, or (2) any partner, officer, or director (or any person performing similar functions), or any person directly or indirectly controlling or controlled by such investment adviser, whether prior or subsequent to becoming such (A) has willfully made or caused to be made in any application for registration or report filed with the Commission under this title, or in any proceeding before the Commission with respect to registration, any statement which was at the time and in the light of the circumstances under which it was made false or misleading with respect to any material fact, or who has omitted to state in any such application or report any material fact which is required to be stated therein; or (B) has been convicted within ten years preceding the filing of the application or at any time thereafter of any felony or misdemeanor which the Commission finds (i) involves the purchase or sale of any security, (ii) arises out of the conduct of the business of a broker, dealer, or investment adviser, (iii) involves embezzlement, fraudulent conversion, or misappropriation of funds or securities, or (iv) involves the violation of section 1341, 1342, or 1343 of title 18, United States Code, as heretofore or hereafter amended; or (C) is permanently or temporarily enjoined by order, judgment, or decree of any court of competent jurisdiction from acting as an investment adviser, underwriter, broker, or dealer, or as an affiliated person or employee of any investment company, bank, or insurance company, or from engaging in or continuing any conduct or practice in connection with any such activity, or in connection with the purchase or sale of any security; or (D) has willfully violated any provision of the Securities Act of 1933, or of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, or of this title, as any of such statutes heretofore have been or hereafter may be amended, or of any rule or regulation under any of such statutes."

SEC. 4. Subsection (e) of section 203 of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(e) The commencement of a proceeding to deny registration under this section shall operate to postpone the effective date of registration for a period of ninety days, or until final determination whether such registration shall be denied if that determination is made within such ninety-day period; but if, after appropriate notice and opportunity for hearing, it shall appear to the Commission to be necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors to postpone the effective date of such registration beyond such ninety-day period and until final determination of whether such registration shall be denied, the Commission shall so order."

SEC. 5. Subsection (g) of section 203 of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(g) Any person registered under this section may, upon such terms and conditions as the Commission finds necessary in the public interest or for the protection of investors, withdraw from registration by filing

a written notice of withdrawal with the Commission. An application for registration under this section may be withdrawn only with the consent of the Commission if the request to withdraw such application is received by the Commission after it has commenced a proceeding to deny registration. If the Commission finds that any person registered under this section, or who has pending an application for registration filed under this section, is no longer in existence or is not engaged in business as an investment adviser, the Commission shall by order cancel the registration of such person."

SEC. 6. Section 204 of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 204. Every investment adviser who makes use of the mails or of any means or instrumentality of interstate commerce in connection with his or its business as an investment adviser (other than one specifically exempted from registration pursuant to section 203(h)), shall make, keep, and preserve for such periods, such accounts, correspondence, memorandums, papers, books, and other records, and make such reports, as the Commission by its rules and regulations may prescribe as necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors. Such accounts, correspondence, memorandums, papers, books, and other records shall be subject at any time or from time to time to such reasonable periodic, special, or other examinations by examiners or other representatives of the Commission as the Commission may deem necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors."

SEC. 7. The introductory paragraph of section 205 of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 205. No investment adviser, unless exempt from registration pursuant to section 203(b), shall make use of the mails or any means or instrumentality of interstate commerce, directly or indirectly, to enter into, extend, or renew any investment advisory contract, or in any way to perform any investment advisory contract entered into, extended, or renewed on or after the effective date of this title if such contract—".

SEC. 8. The introductory paragraph of section 206 of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940, as amended, is amended by striking out "registered under section 203".

SEC. 9. Section 206 of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940, as amended, is amended by adding the following new clause:

"(4) to engage in any act, practice, or course of business which is fraudulent, deceptive, or manipulative. The Commission shall, for the purposes of this paragraph (4) by rules and regulations define, and prescribe means reasonably designed to prevent, such acts, practices, and courses of business as are fraudulent, deceptive, or manipulative."

SEC. 10. The caption of section 208 of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940, as amended, is amended by striking out "UNLAWFUL REPRESENTATIONS" and inserting in lieu thereof "GENERAL PROHIBITIONS".

SEC. 11. Section 208 of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940, as amended, is amended by adding the following new subsection:

"(d) It shall be unlawful for any person indirectly, or through or by any other person, to do any act or thing which it would be unlawful for such person to do directly under the provisions of this title or any rule or regulation thereunder. It shall be unlawful for any person to aid, abet, counsel, command, induce, or procure the violation of any provision of this title or any rule or regulation thereunder by any other person. These provisions shall not constitute a limitation with respect to the applicability to this title of section 2 of title 18, United States Code."

SEC. 12. Subsection (e) of section 209 of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940, as amended, is amended by striking out "has engaged or is about to engage" in the first and in the second sentences and inserting in lieu thereof "has engaged, is engaged or is about to engage".

SEC. 13. Subsection (b) of section 210 of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Subject to the provisions of subsections (c) and (e), of section 209, the Commission, or any member, officer, or employee thereof, shall not make public the fact that any examination or investigation under this title is being conducted, or the results of or any facts ascertained during any such examination or investigation; and no member, officer, or employee of the Commission shall disclose to any person other than a member, officer, or employee of the Commission any information obtained as a result of any such examination or investigation except with the approval of the Commission. The provisions of this subsection shall not apply—

"(1) in the case of any hearing which is public under the provisions of section 212; or

"(2) in the case of a resolution or request from either House of Congress."

SEC. 14. Subsection (a) of section 211 of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The Commission shall have authority from time to time to make, issue, amend, and rescind such rules and regulations and such orders as are necessary or appropriate to the exercise of the functions and powers conferred upon the Commission elsewhere in this title. For the purpose of its rules or regulations the Commission may classify persons and matters within its jurisdiction and prescribe different requirements for different classes of persons or matters."

SEC. 15. Section 217 of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 217. Any person who willfully violates any provision of this title, or any rule, regulation, or order promulgated by the Commission under authority thereof, shall, upon conviction, be fined not more than $10,000, or imprisoned for not more than two years, or both."

SEC. 16. The Investment Advisers Act of 1940, as amended, is amended by adding the following new section:

"STATE CONTROL OF INVESTMENT ADVISERS

"SEC. 222. Nothing in this title shall affect the jurisdiction of the securities commissioner (or any agency or officer performing like functions) of any State over any security or any person insofar as it does not conflict with the provisions of this title or the rules and regulations thereunder."

With the following committee amendments:

First page, line 3, strike out "Alaska,' ".

First page, strike out line 9 and all that follows down through line 5 on page 2, and insert the following:

"'(F) whether such investment adviser, any partner, officer, director, or person performing similar functions, or any person directly or indirectly controlling or controlled by such investment adviser, is subject to any disqualification which would be a basis for denial, suspension, or revocation of registration of such investment adviser under the provisions of subsection (d), and'.

"SEC. 3. Paragraph (2) of subsection (c) of section 203 of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'(2) a statement as to whether the principal business of such investment adviser consists or is to consist of acting as investment adviser and a statement as to whether a substantial part of the business of such investment adviser consists or is to consist of rendering investment supervisory services.'"

Page 2, line 6, strike out "3" and insert "4".

Page 4, line 1, strike out "4" and insert "5".

Page 4, line 16, strike out "5" and insert "6".

Page 5, line 9, strike out "6" and insert "7".

Page 5, line 15, strike out "(h)" and insert "(b)".

Page 6, line 4, strike out "7" and insert "8".

Page 6, line 15, strike out "8" and insert "9".

Page 6, line 18, strike out "9" and insert "10".

Page 6, line 19, after "is amended" insert "(1) by striking out the semicolons at the end of clauses (1) and (2) and inserting periods in lieu thereof, and (2)".

Page 6, strike out line 21 and all that follows down through line 2 on page 7, and insert the following:

"(4) to engage in any act, practice, or course of business which is fraudulent, deceptive, or manipulative. The Commission shall, for the purposes of this paragraph (4) by rules and regulations define, and prescribe means reasonably designed to prevent, such acts, practices, and courses of business as are fraudulent, deceptive, or manipulative."

Page 7, line 3, strike out "10" and insert "11".

Page 7, after line 6, insert the following:

"SEC. 12. (a) Subsection (c) of section 208 of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'(c) It shall be unlawful for any person registered under section 203 of this title to represent that he is an investment counsel or to use the name investment counsel as descriptive of his business unless (1) his or its principal business consists of acting as investment adviser, and (2) a substantial part of his or its business consists of rendering investment supervisory services.'"

Page 7, line 7, strike out "11" and insert "13".

Page 7, line 20, strike out "12" and insert "14".

Page 7, line 24, strike out "engaged or" and insert "engaged, or".

Page 8, line 1, strike out "13" and insert "15".

Page 8, line 5, strike out "(e), of" and insert "(e) of".

Page 8, line 18, insert ", or any committee thereof" after "Congress".

Page 8, line 19, strike out "14" and insert "16".

Page 9, line 5, strike out "15" and insert "17".

Page 9, lines 9 and 10, strike out ", upon conviction,".

Page 9, line 10, strike out the comma after "$10,000" and insert "or".

Page 9, line 12, strike out "16" and insert "18".

Mr. HARRIS. I direct the attention of the Members of the House to the purpose of the bill, H.R. 2482, as set forth in the report:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The bill, H.R. 2482, here being reported amends the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 for the purpose of making the enforcement activities of the Securities and Exchange Commission more effective, by giving the Commission additional authority, and by providing additional remedies and eliminating or minimizing various problems which have come to light in the course of the Commission's enforcement of the act. The more significant of these proposals would, in brief: (1) expand the basis for disqualification of an applicant for

registration or a registrant because of misconduct; (2) revise the provisions relating to the postponement of effectiveness and the withdrawal of applications for registration; (3) authorize the Commission by rule to require the keeping of books and records and the filing of reports; (4) permit periodic examinations of a registrant's books and records; (5) empower the Commission by rule to define and prescribe means reasonably designed to prevent fraudulent practices; and (6) extend criminal liability to include a willful violation of a rule or order of the Commission.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks just prior to the adoption of the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

INVESTMENT ADVISERS ACT OF 1940, AS AMENDED

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 3773) to amend certain provisions of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940, as amended, and substitute it for the bill just passed, H.R. 2482.

The clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

The was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) paragraph 12 of subsection (a) of section 202 of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(12) 'Investment company', affiliated person, and 'insurance company' have the same meanings as in the Investment Company Act of 1940. 'Control' means the power to exercise a controlling influence over the management or policies of a company, unless such power is solely the result of an official position with such company."

(b) Paragraph (18) of section 202(a) of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940, as amended, is amended by striking out "the Philippine Islands,".

SEC. 2. Clause (F) of paragraph (1) of section 203(c) of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(F) whether such investment adviser, or any partner, officer, director thereof, or any person performing similar functions, or any person directly or indirectly controlling or controlled by such investment adviser, is subject to any disqualification which would be a basis for denial, suspension, or revocation of registration of such investment adviser under the provisions of subsection (d), and".

SEC. 3. (a) Paragraph (2) of subsection (c) of section 203 of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(2) a statement as to whether the principal business of such investment adviser consists or is to consist of acting as investment adviser and a statement as to whether a substantial part of the business of such investment adviser consists or is to consist of rendering investment supervisory services."

(b) Subsection (d) of section 203 of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(d) The Commission shall, after appropriate notice and opportunity for hearing, by order deny registration to, or suspend for a period not exceeding twelve months or revoke the registration of, an investment adviser, if it finds that such denial, suspension, or revocation is in the public interest and that (1) such investment adviser, whether prior or subsequent to becoming such, or (2) any partner, officer, or director thereof, or any person performing similar functions, or (3) any person directly or indirectly controlling or controlled by such investment adviser, whether prior or subsequent to becoming such, (A) has willfully made or caused to be made in any application for registration or report filed with the Commission under this title, or in any proceeding before the Commission with respect to registration, any statement which was at the time and in the light of the circumstances under which it was made false or misleading with respect to any material fact, or who has omitted to state in any such application or report any material fact which is required to be stated therein; or (B) has been convicted within ten years preceding the filing of the application or at any time thereafter of any felony or misdemeanor which the Commission finds (i) involves the purchase or sale of any security, (ii) arises out of the conduct of the business of a broker, dealer, or investment adviser, (iii) involves embezzlement, fraudulent conversion, or misappropriation of funds or securities, or (iv) involves the violation of section 1341, 1342, or 1343 of title 18, United States Code, as heretofore or hereafter amended; or (C) is permanently or temporarily enjoined by order, judgment, or decree of any court of competent jurisdiction from acting as an investment adviser, underwriter, broker, or dealer, or as an affiliated person or employee of any investment company, bank, or insurance company, or from engaging in or continuing any conduct or practice in connection with any such activity, or in connection with the purchase or sale of any security; or (D) has willfully violated any provision of the Securities Act of 1933, or of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, or of this title, as any of such statutes heretofore have been or hereafter may be amended, or of any rule or regulation under and of such statutes; or (E) has aided, abetted, counseled, commanded, induced, or procured the violation by any other person of the Securities Act of 1933, or the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, or of this title, as any of such statutes heretofore have been or hereafter may be amended, or of any rule or regulation under any of such statutes."

SEC. 4. Subsection (e) of section 203 of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(e) The commencement of a proceeding to deny registration under this section shall operate to postpone the effective date of registration for a period of ninety days, or until final determination whether such registration shall be denied if that determination is made within such ninety-day period; but if, after appropriate notice and opportunity for hearing, it shall appear to the Commission to be necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors to postpone the effective date of such registration beyond such ninety-day period and until final determination of whether such registration shall be denied, the Commission shall so order. Upon request of any interested party, made more than ninety days after the effective date of such order, the Commission shall consider whether such postponement should continue, and shall take such action, if any, with respect thereto as in its discretion is necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors."

SEC. 5. Subsection (g) of section 203 of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(g) Any person registered under this section may, upon such terms and conditions as the Commission finds necessary in the public interest or for the protection of investors, withdraw from registration by filing a written notice of withdrawal with the Commission. If the Commission finds that any person registered under this section, or who has pending an application for registration filed under this section, is no longer in existence or is not engaged in business as an investment adviser, the Commission shall by order cancel the registration of such person."

SEC. 6. Section 204 of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 204. Every investment adviser who makes use of the mails or of any means or instrumentality of interstate commerce in connection with his or its business as an investment adviser (other than one specifically exempted from registration pursuant to section 203(b)), shall make, keep, and preserve for such periods, such accounts, correspondence, memorandums, papers, books, and other records, and make such reports, as the Commission by its rules and regulations may prescribe as necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors. Such accounts, correspondence, memorandums, papers, books, and other records shall be subject at any time or from time to time to such reasonable periodic, special, or other examinations by examiners or other representatives of the Commission as the Commission may deem necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors."

SEC. 7. The introductory paragraph of section 205 of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 205. No investment adviser, unless exempt from registration pursuant to section 203(b), shall make use of the mails or any means or instrumentality of interstate commerce, directly or indirectly, to enter into, extend, or renew any investment advisory contract, or in any way to perform any investment advisory contract entered into, extended, or renewed on or after the effective date of this title, if such contract—".

SEC. 8. The introductory paragraph of section 206 of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940, as amended, is amended by striking out "registered under section 203".

SEC. 9. Section 206 of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940, as amended, is amended by changing the period at the end thereof to a semicolon and by adding the following new paragraph:

"(4) to engage in any act, practice, or course of business which is fraudulent, deceptive, or manipulative. The Commission shall, for the purposes of this paragraph (4) by rules and regulations define, and prescribe means reasonably designed to prevent, such acts, practices, and courses of business as are fraudulent, deceptive, or manipulative."

SEC. 10. The caption of section 208 of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940, as amended, is amended by striking out "UNLAWFUL REPRESENTATIONS" and inserting in lieu thereof "GENERAL PROHIBITIONS".

SEC. 11. (a) Subsection (c) of section 208 of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(c) It shall be unlawful for any person registered under section 203 of this title to represent that he is an investment counsel or to use the name 'investment counsel' as descriptive of his business unless (1) his or its principal business consists of acting as

investment adviser, and (2) a substantial part of his or its business consists of rendering investment supervisory services."

(b) Section 208 of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940, as amended, is amended by adding the following new subsection:

"(d) It shall be unlawful for any person indirectly, or through or by any other person, to do any act or thing which it would be unlawful for such person to do directly under the provisions of this title or any rule or regulation thereunder."

SEC. 12. Subsection (e) of section 209 of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940, as amended, is amended by striking out "has engaged or is about to engage" in the first and in the second sentences and inserting in lieu thereof "has engaged, is engaged, or is about to engage"; by inserting in the first sentence after "any rule, regulation, or order hereunder," the first time that phrase appears, the following: "or that any person has aided, abetted, counseled, commanded, induced, or procured, is aiding, abetting, counseling, commanding, inducing, or procuring, or is about to aid, abet, counsel, command, induce, or procure such a violation,"; and by inserting in the second sentence, after "such act or practice,", the following: "or in aiding, abetting, counseling, commanding, inducing, or procuring any such act or practice,".

SEC. 13. Subsection (b) of section 210 of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Subject to the provisions of subsections (c) and (e) of section 209, the Commission, or any member, officer, or employee thereof, shall not make public the fact that any examination or investigation under this title is being conducted, or the results of or any facts ascertained during any such examination or investigation; and no member, officer, or employee of the Commission shall disclose to any person other than a member, officer, or employee of the Commission any information obtained as a result of any such examination or investigation except with the approval of the Commission. The provisions of this subsection shall not apply—

"(1) in the case of any hearing which is public under the provisions of section 212; or

"(2) in the case of a resolution or request from either House of Congress."

SEC. 14. Subsection (a) of section 211 of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The Commission shall have authority from time to time to make, issue, amend, and rescind such rules and regulations and such orders as are necessary or appropriate to the exercise of the functions and powers conferred upon the Commission elsewhere in this title. For the purposes of its rules or regulations the Commission may classify persons and matters within its jurisdiction and prescribe different requirements for different classes of persons or matters."

SEC. 15. Section 217 of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 217. Any person who willfully violates any provision of this title, or any rule, regulation, or order promulgated by the Commission under authority thereof, shall, upon conviction, be fined not more than $10,000, imprisoned for not more than two years, or both."

SEC. 16. The Investment Advisers Act of 1940, as amended, is amended by adding the following new section:

"STATE CONTROL OF INVESTMENT ADVISERS

"SEC. 222. Nothing in this title shall affect the jurisdiction of the securities commissioner (or any agency or officer performing like functions) of any State over any security or any person insofar as it does not conflict with the provisions of this title or the rules and regulations thereunder."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The proceedings whereby a similar House bill (H.R. 2482) was passed were vacated and the House bill was laid on the table.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10087) entitled "An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit taxpayers to elect an overall limitation on the foreign tax credit."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 2074. An act for the relief of Eric and Ida Mae Hjerpe;

H.R. 4428. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of John David Almeida, a minor;

H.R. 7618. An act for the relief of H. P. Lambert Co., Inc., and Southeastern Drilling Corp.; and

H.R. 7877. An act for the relief of Vladislav Fotich.

ELECTRON MICROSCOPE

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 11573) to provide for the free entry of an electron microscope for the use of William Marsh Rice University, of Houston, Tex., and an electron microscope for the use of the University of Colorado Medical Center, Denver, Colo., with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

After line 7, insert:

"SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to admit free of duty grain milling equipment and appurtenances imported for the use of Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kansas, in the building now under construction for the department of flour and feed milling industries at such university.

"SEC. 3. Section 809(g) of the National Housing Act is amended to read as follows:

"'(g)(1) A mortgage secured by property which is intended to provide housing for a person (i) employed or assigned to duty at a research or development installation of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and which is located at or near such installation, where such installation was a research or development installation of one of the military departments of the United States (on or after June 13, 1956) before its transfer to the jurisdiction of such Administration, or (ii) employed at the research and development installation of the Atomic Energy Commission in Los Alamos County, New Mexico, and which is located at or near such installation, may (if the mortgage otherwise meets the requirements of this section) be insured by the Commissioner under the provisions of this section. The Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (or his designee), in the case of any mortgage secured by property intended to provide housing for any person employed or assigned to duty at any such installation of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, or the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission (or his designee), in the case of any mortgage secured by property intended to provide housing for any person employed at such installation of the Atomic Energy Commission, is authorized to guarantee and indemnify the Armed Services Housing Mortgage Insurance Fund against loss to the extent required by the Commissioner, in accordance with the provisions of subsection (b) of this section.

"'(2) For purposes of this subsection—

"'(i) The terms "Armed Forces", "one of the military departments of the United States," "military department", "Secretary or his designee", and "Secretary", when used in subsections (a) and (b) of this section, shall be deemed to refer to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (or the Administrator thereof), or the Atomic Energy Commission (or the Chairman thereof), as may be appropriate;

"'(ii) The term "Secretary of the Army, Navy, or Air Force", when used in section 805, shall be deemed to refer to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration or the Administrator thereof, as may be appropriate;

"'(iii) The terms "civilian employee", "civilians", and "civilian personnel", as used in this section, shall be deemed to refer to (A) employees of such Administration or a contractor thereof or to military personnel assigned to duty at an installation of such Administration, or (B) persons employed in connection with the Atomic Energy Commission's installation at Los Alamos, New Mexico, as the case may be; and

"'(iv) The term "military installation" when used in section 805 shall be deemed to refer to an installation of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.'"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, of course, I make this reservation in order that I might inquire of the gentleman from Arkansas if the Senate amendment is what we might refer to as the Carlson amendment that extends a comparable privilege to Kansas State University as provided in the bill for institutions of higher learning in Texas.

Mr. MILLS. That is correct, with respect to one of the Senate amendments. There were two Senate amendments, and if the gentleman will reserve his right to object and if he wants me to, I will explain briefly the two amendments.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I further reserve the right to object, in order that the gentleman from Arkansas, Mr. MILLS, may explain both these amendments. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman is correct in his observation with respect to the first amendment. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AVERY] had introduced a bill, H.R. 12103, which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, on which the committee received favorable reports from the Department of Commerce, the Department of Labor, the Department of State, as well as an informative report from the Tariff Commission, having to do with the free importation of

certain equipment desired by Kansas State University in connection with the construction of a mill, of a type not produced in the United States, to replace one that had been burned some years ago. That is the amendment the gentleman introduced.

There is a second amendment having to do with housing for a research and development installation of the Atomic Energy Commission, to accommodate some people who have been transferred to that facility from the Huntsville, Ala., facility. I have taken occasion to discuss this amendment with members of the Committee on Banking and Currency and those with whom I have discussed it all agreed to it, including the gentleman from California [Mr. McDONOUGH]; the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE]; and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS].

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, in view of the explanation of the gentleman from Arkansas, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BAILEY. Does this proposed legislation involve the setting aside of import duties?

Mr. MILLS. Only with respect to certain articles that are being brought into the United States by Kansas State University in connection with the construction of a type of milling operation that they have, and which is not commercially produced domestically. It consists of the importation of articles, according to the report of the Senate Finance Committee, that are not competitive here in the United States.

Mr. BAILEY. Does the gentleman mean that the article is not produced in the United States?

Mr. MILLS. Not commercially produced; that is the information given us.

Mr. BAILEY. Over the past week I have patiently waited and have seen these standing committees clear all of their legislation that has accumulated throughout the year, including the gentleman's own committee, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and the Committee on Agriculture. Yet most of the major legislation that I am interested in is resting quietly in the Committee on Rules. For some reason or other I have not been able to get consideration of them, without someone wanting to object. I have no intention of objecting to this particular piece of legislation but I hope the gentleman does not have any more to offer that has to do with bringing articles in on the free list.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, as Members of the House will recall in the form in which H.R. 11573 passed the House of Representatives, its purpose was to permit the duty-free entry of an electron microscope for the use of William Marsh Rice University of Houston, Tex., and an electron microscope for the use of the University of Colorado Medical Center, Denver, Colo. It may be recalled that these universities had procured from abroad these highly specialized microscopes for use in connection with their highly technical research and educational activities.

The Senate added two amendments to the House bill, as follows:

First, a Senate Finance Committee amendment would authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to admit free of duty grain milling equipment and appurtenances imported for the use of Kansas State University in the building being constructed for the department of flour and feed milling industries at that university. As was the case with respect to the highly specialized electron microscopes covered under the House bill, it was felt that the burden of duty should not be added to the cost of the equipment in this instance. According to the report of the Senate Finance Committee, several foreign countries are supplying the various technical parts for the grain mill and a considerable portion is being donated free of charge thus making it possible for the university to embark on a research and educational program for the improvement of the milling industry.

I should point out that there was pending before the Committee on Ways and Means a bill on this subject by our colleague, the Honorable WILLIAM AVERY. The Committee on Ways and Means has received favorable reports on this House bill, H.R. 12103, from the Department of Commerce, the Department of Labor, and the Department of State, as well as an informative report from the U.S. Tariff Commission. It is pointed out in the report of the Department of Labor that the experimental flour mill at the Kansas State University was destroyed by fire several years ago and that the replacement contemplated by the university would be a mill of a type not produced commercially in the United States.

The second amendment added by the Senate was a floor amendment sponsored by Senator ANDERSON, which amends section 809(g) of the National Housing Act. As explained by the sponsor, the amendment is designed to afford housing at the research and development installation of the Atomic Energy Commission in Los Alamos County, N. Mex. It was stated that when the Huntsville, Ala., station was transferred to Los Alamos it was found that employees could not provide their own housing and that a survey and report indicated that additional housing should be provided in the same fashion that housing was provided in Huntsville, Ala.

Mr. Speaker, I recognize that it is unusual for an amendment to the National Housing Act to be added as an amendment to a tariff bill, since the tariff bill is of course within the jurisdiction of the Ways and Means Committee and the National Housing Act, of course, is within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Banking and Currency. I therefore took occasion to confer with the chairman and certain members of the Banking and Currency Committee of the House to insure that they would have no objection to handling this amendment in this manner.

Senator ANDERSON stated on the floor of the Senate that he had cleared the matter with the Senate Banking and Currency Committee before he offered the amendment.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I have concurred in the request of the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means that the House accept the Senate amendments to H.R. 11573.

It will be recalled that this legislation as it passed the House provided for the importation of highly specialized electron microscope equipment by two U.S. universities.

The Senate in approving this legislation added two amendments. The first of these amendments provides for the duty-free importation of certain equipment by Kansas State University for a pilot-plant grain and flour milling installation. The second Senate amendment is to the National Housing Act and affects the development for housing for certain employees at Los Alamos.

Mr. Speaker, both of these amendments are meritorious and it is appropriate that they should be approved by the House.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JURISDICTION OF U.S. DISTRICT COURTS IN CERTAIN ACTIONS

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 12622) to amend chapter 85 of title 28 of the United States Code relating to the jurisdiction of the U.S. district courts, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That chapter 85 of title 28 of the United States Code is amended—

(a) By adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 1361. ACTION TO COMPEL AN OFFICER OF THE UNITED STATES TO PERFORM HIS DUTY.

"The district courts shall have original jurisdiction of any action to compel an officer or employee of the United States or any agency thereof to perform his duty."

(b) By adding at the end of the table of sections for chapter 85 of title 28 of the United States Code the following:

"1361. Action to compel an officer of the United States to perform his duty."

SEC. 2. Section 1391 of title 28 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(e) A civil action in which each defendant is an officer or employee of the United States or any agency thereof acting in his official capacity or under color of legal authority, or an agency of the United States, may be brought in any judicial district where a plaintiff in the action resides, or in which the cause of the action arose, or in which any property involved in the action is situated.

"The summons and complaint in such an action shall be served as provided by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure except that the delivery of the summons and complaint to the officer or agency as required by the rules may be made by certified mail beyond the territorial limits of the district in which the action is brought."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

House Resolution 584 was laid on the table.

PROTECT FARM AND RANCH OPERATORS MAKING CERTAIN LAND USE CHANGES

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 3533) to protect farm and ranch operators making certain land use changes under the Great Plains conservation program against loss of acreage allotments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. POAGE: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the provisions of H.R. 12849, as follows: "That section 16 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended as follows:

"(1) Paragraph (3) of subsection (b) is amended to read as follows:

"'(3) insofar as the acreage of cropland on any farm enters into the determination of acreage allotments and marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, the cropland acreage on the farm shall not be decreased during the period of any contract heretofore or hereafter entered into under this subsection by reason of any action taken for the purpose of carrying out such contract and, under regulations of the Secretary, shall not be decreased, for such period after the expiration of the contract as is equal to the period of the contract, by reason of the maintenance of any change in land use from cultivated cropland to permanent vegetation carried out under the contract;'.

"(2) Paragraph (4) of subsection (b) is amended to read as follows:

"'(4) the acreage on any farm which is determined under regulations of the Secretary to have been diverted from the production of any commodity subject to acreage allotments or marketing quotas in order to carry out any contract heretofore or hereafter entered into under the program or in order to maintain, for such period after the expiration of the contract as is equal to the period of the contract, any change in land use from cultivated cropland to permanent vegetation carried out under the contract shall be considered acreage devoted to the commodity for the purposes of establishing future State, county, and farm acreage allotments under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.'

"SEC. 2. Section 112 of the Soil Bank Act, as amended, is amended as follows:

"(1) Paragraph (1) is amended to read as follows:

"'(1) insofar as the acreage of cropland on any farm enters into the determination of acreage allotments and marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, the cropland acreage on the farm shall not be decreased during the period of any contract heretofore or hereafter entered into under this subtitle by reason of any action taken for the purpose of carrying out such contract and, under regulations of the Secretary, shall not be decreased, for such period after the expiration of the contract as is equal to the period of the contract, by reason of the maintenance of any change in land use from cultivated cropland to permanent vegetation carried out under the contract;'.

"(2) Paragraph (2) is amended to read as follows:

"'(2) the acreage on any farm which is determined under regulations of the Secretary to have been diverted from the production of any commodity subject to acreage allotments or marketing quotas in order to carry out any contract heretofore or hereafter entered into under this subtitle or in order to maintain, for such period after the expiration of the contract as is equal to the period of the contract, any change in land use from cultivated cropland to permanent vegetation carried out under the contract shall be considered acreage devoted to the commodity for the purposes of establishing future State, county, and farm acreage allotments under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.'"

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EMERGENCY CONSERVATION MEASURES

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2761) to validate payments made for certain emergency conservation measures under the program authorized by the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1957.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

Mr. McINTIRE. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I say that this is a bill passed by the other body, and reported out unanimously by the House Committee on Agriculture.

I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That payments which have heretofore been made under the program authorized by the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1957, under the item entitled "Emergency Conservation Measures, Agricultural Conservation Program Service", for emergency conservation measures carried out between January 1, 1956, and June 21, 1957, shall, if otherwise proper, not be considered invalid by reason of the fact that they were made for measures carried out prior to the enactment of said Act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 3, HOUSE COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and include a progress report made by Subcommittee No. 3 of the House Committee on the District of Columbia on the bill (S. 1456) to provide for the appointment of two additional judges for the juvenile court of the District of Columbia, and also to include the letter of transmittal accompanying it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., August 30, 1960.

Hon. JOHN L. MCMILLAN,
Chairman, Committee on the District of Columbia, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I submit to you herewith a progress report of Subcommittee No. 3 on Senate bill, S. 1456.

The subcommittee is planning to meet during the congressional recess for further consideration of this legislation and the information we have gathered.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES C. DAVIS,
Chairman.

PROGRESS REPORT OF SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 3 OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ON S. 1456—A BILL TO PROVIDE THE APPOINTMENT OF TWO ADDITIONAL JUDGES FOR THE JUVENILE COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—AUGUST 28, 1960

During the 85th Congress H.R. 7785 was introduced providing for the appointment of one additional judge to the juvenile court of the District of Columbia. This bill was approved by the House Committee on the District of Columbia, passed by the House of Representatives, and was amended and passed by the Senate. The bill did not emerge from conference committee in time for final passage before adjournment of the 85th Congress.

Following the opening of the 86th Congress, S. 465, calling for the appointment of an additional judge to the juvenile court was introduced in the Senate. The Senate Committee on the District of Columbia held hearings on the bill in February 1959. Later, the committee favorably reported S. 1456 calling for the appointment of two additional judges of the juvenile court of the District of Columbia. The bill was thereafter passed by the Senate.

In July 1959, this subcommittee of the House Committee on the District of Columbia held hearings on S. 1456. Hearings for 2 additional days were held in December

1959. Evidence was received showing that the one-judge court had disposed of cases more rapidly than the rate of new cases filed and had reduced the court backlog by about 10 percent during fiscal year 1959. This fact, along with other information developed during the hearings, dictated the need for further study before any decision was reached on the two-judge bill. Committee staff was directed to develop more fully information on the past history of operation of the court, its caseload and organization, coupled with statistical data on at least part of the court's operation for fiscal year 1960.

Preliminary figures for fiscal year 1960 indicated a reversal in the trends shown by the court in 1959. With the very recent availability of final statistical information for fiscal year 1960, the subcommittee now has before it sufficient data, testimony, and evidence of record on which to reasonably gage the problems of the juvenile court, its needs, and what legislation may be necessary to assure an adequate, efficient, and effective juvenile court in the District of Columbia.

PART I—TESTIMONY AND STATISTICAL RECORDS

Extensive testimony on the operation and needs of the juvenile court of the District of Columbia is a matter of record, in hearings before the House Committee on the District of Columbia, the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia, the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations, and the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency, in addition to statistical reports. Many prominent persons from District of Columbia courts, law enforcement agencies, and community organizations testified regarding S. 1456. Most witnesses expressed their sincere belief that the enactment of S. 1456 was the principal need of the juvenile court. Some witnesses urged other amendments to the Juvenile Court Act of the District of Columbia.

Testimony of record before this subcommittee and the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia indicates that the support for the appointment of two additional judges was premised mostly on the following: (1) The great volume of hearings in the juvenile court; (2) the heavy backlog of cases pending in the court; and (3) population comparison studies with other cities relating the number of sitting juvenile court judges in those cities to the population.

1. Volume of juvenile court hearings: Witnesses testifying before the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia in February 1959 on S. 465 expressed the view that the volume of court hearings alone was persuasive that two additional judges were needed and that "the single statistic of some 13,000 hearings" was sufficient to prove the point.[1]

In July 1959, following the passage of S. 1456 by the Senate, this subcommittee of the House Committee on the District of Columbia held public hearings on the two-judge proposal. Again principal witnesses referred to the number of hearings as being a most significant factor in support of the bill. However, the number of hearings was then placed at 10,000 for the previous year.[2]

In December 1959, for the 2 days of committee hearings, there was available to the subcommittee the first annual statistical report of the juvenile court which had been issued in October for the fiscal year 1959. Table 21 of this document reported that the total of all court hearings on juvenile and adult cases for the year was 5,192. Included in this figure were 149 court trials and 32 jury trials.

Thus within a period of about 10 months the reported hearing load of the court, as represented to congressional committees dropped successively from 13,000 to 10,000 to less than 5,200. This indicated the need for further study of the operation of the court.

2. Backlog of cases: Prior to the change in the judgeship in the juvenile court of the District of Columbia in May 1957, there had been no backlog of cases for several years, either as to juvenile or adult matters. During those years, when the court kept its docket free of any backlog, there was an average of 450 more cases filed with the court per year than during the fiscal years beginning in 1958. The court kept its caseload current.

No tabulation of the juvenile court backlog, which began accumulating in fiscal year 1958, is available prior to September 1, 1958, shortly after the end of the fiscal year. At that date, the backlog was 270 juvenile cases and 552 adult cases for a total of 822 cases.[3]

During fiscal year 1959, the juvenile court reduced its backlog by about 10 percent and ended the year with a backlog of 235 juvenile and 510 adult cases for a total of 745 cases.[4] During fiscal year 1960 the number of juvenile and adult cases filed with the court increased by 337 but the backlog rose to a total of 1,667.[5] The increase in the court's backlog exceeded the increase in cases filed by 585.

The relation between the backlog of cases in the juvenile court and the need for additional judges must be weighed in the light of the following: (1) That for fiscal years prior to and including 1957, with a substantially greater number of cases, the court had no backlog accumulation; (2) that during fiscal year 1958, with 500 fewer cases filed than for the average of the preceding fiscal years, the court suddenly accumulated a backlog of 822 cases; (3) that with 3 percent fewer cases filed in fiscal year 1959 than in 1958, the court reduced its backlog by about 10 percent; (4) that during fiscal year 1960 with an increase of approximately 350 in the number of cases filed, the backlog increased by more than 900 cases for a total of 1667.

3. Comparison of the District of Columbia with other juvenile court jurisdictions: Determining the need of judges in the juvenile court of the District of Columbia by comparing juvenile courts in other cities, brings into consideration many factors which cannot be accurately weighed for such purposes. The jurisdiction of courts in other cities may be broader or narrower; the age limit may be lower; in some cities juvenile problems are handled by family courts with similar or broader jurisdiction than that of the juvenile court in the District; in some cities, all juvenile complaints are transmitted directly to the juvenile court while in others, of which Washington is one, juvenile complaints are screened by a juvenile division of the police department and only those cases involving other than minor offenses or second time offenders are transmitted to the juvenile court; also, the number of offenders per thousand population may vary considerably in different cities.

In hearings before various committees of Congress, testimony is on record comparing the population of the District of Columbia with that of other cities and relating the population comparison factor to the number of judges in the particular cities to establish the basis for additional judges in the juvenile court of the District of Columbia.[6] Studies made by the subcommittee staff indicated that if a three-judge court proposed by S. 1456 were established in the District of Columbia, and the same formula applied to the other cities, it would be necessary to appoint additional judges in the cities used for comparison if they were to conform to the population-judge ratio proposed for the District in S. 1456. To illustrate, the juvenile court in Cleveland, Ohio, serves the metropolitan area within Cuyahoga County.[7] Placing the population of the District at 800,000 (the 1960 census shows substantially less) and applying the three-judge formula of S. 1456, the Cleveland court should have six judges since it has twice the population to serve. Cleveland has three judges, the third being appointed just about 2 years ago.

PART II—AUTONOMY AND MANAGEMENT OF THE COURT

Under the Juvenile Court Act of the District of Columbia, the juvenile court is autonomous. It operates solely under the authority of the sitting judge and there is no supervision of its functions or management by any other judicial official or administrative official in the District of Columbia.

Under these circumstances, the effective and efficient operation of the juvenile court calls for the application of multiple skills. In addition to an understanding of the responsibilities and duties placed upon the court by the Juvenile Court Act, an understanding of juvenile court law and procedures, and the exercise of judicial capability, the judge of this court must likewise have the capacity to cooperate closely with agencies whose functions may be related to the court, and the capacity for supervising and managing a considerable staff of employees.

The closest relationship the juvenile court has with any other body in the District of Columbia is with the municipal court of the District by reason of provisions of law calling for the assignment of judges from the municipal court bench to the juvenile court in the absence of the judge or the event a vacancy exists in the juvenile court.

Early in fiscal year 1958, management studies were started looking forward to the reorganization of the juvenile court.[8] The management office of the District of Columbia assisted the court in this work. Visits were made to juvenile courts in other cities to study their operations and discover methods which might be advantageously used. As a result of these management studies, the court procedures were streamlined. Duplicate operations eliminated where possible, recordkeeping mechanized and simplified, and other changes made to relieve the judge of burdens and to facilitate the smooth functioning of the court at staff levels. The court was given an administrative division, not found in the organizational structures of other courts in the District.

Appropriations were increased in excess of $250,000 between fiscal year 1957 and the

[1] Hearings—Senate Committee on District of Columbia Feb. 11, 1959, transcript pp. 58, 61 (statement), 65 (statement), 167, 176.

[2] Hearings—House Committee on the District of Columbia, July 23, 1959, p. 15; p. 6.

[3] Hearings—House Committee on District of Columbia, Dec. 11, 1959, p. 121; hearings, Senate Committee on the District of Columbia, Feb. 4, 1959, p. 121.

[4] Hearings—House Committee on the District of Columbia, Dec. 11, 1959, p. 120; Statistical Report of Juvenile Court, 1st quarter fiscal year 1960, table 9.

[5] Statistical Report of Juvenile Court, 4th quarter 1960, table 9.

[6] Hearings—House Committee on the District of Columbia, July 23, 1959, p. 18; hearings—House Committee on Appropriations, 1961, p. 416 (District of Columbia Appropriations—1961); hearing—Senate Committee on the District of Columbia, Feb. 4, 1959, pp. 44, 46, 65 (statement).

[7] Population comparisons in this instance used as a population figure of about 900,000 correct for metropolitan Cleveland. However, the Cleveland court serves the entire population of Cuyahoga County which is approximately 1,600,000. Hearings—House Committee on the District of Columbia, July 23, 1959, p. 19.

[8] Hearings—House Committee on Appropriations, District of Columbia Appropriations, 1961, pp. 408–419.

current fiscal year and 22 new positions were authorized. Despite these facts, and with a decrease in the average number of cases filed, the court backlog rose from zero at the beginning of fiscal year 1958 to 1,667 at the end of fiscal year 1960.

The Juvenile Court Act of the District of Columbia gives to the juvenile court the exclusive jurisdiction in determining the paternity of illegitimate children and concurrent jurisdiction with the U.S. district court in criminal nonsupport cases.[9] The handling of these adult cases, is not only directly related to the well-being of those for whom support is ordered by the court but also to the financial burdens of the Department of Public Welfare. The statutory function of the court is to determine legal obligation and necessity of the support and to enforce its judgments.

In connection with criminal nonsupport cases, the court at one time discontinued scheduling such cases for court action. The court has indicated that such cases are given lowest priority rating of all matters within its jurisdiction.[10]

Collections in adult cases involving support matters increased steadily through the end of fiscal year 1957, when court collections totaled $945,677. Beginning in fiscal 1958, and even with the reorganization of the court, collections declined each year to a point approaching $450,000 less than the amount collected in fiscal year 1957.

In connection with the justification of requests for appropriations for the court for fiscal year 1959 to provide additional positions, it was stated that certain additional employees might increase the court's collections by about $200,000 per year.[11] The new positions were authorized and within a few months thereafter the intake section handling support cases was abolished, the employees transferred, and the workload shifted to the Office of the Corporation Counsel who was compelled to request additional employees to assume the additional work. Collections thereafter continued to decline.

At Appropriations Committee hearings the following year, explanation of this action was requested.[12] Discussion was had concerning the transfer of adult cases from the juvenile court, and testimony was taken concerning the effect of court's action on the operations of the Office of the Corporation Counsel and the Department of Public Welfare. The court there and elsewhere expressed its "chafing" under the adult problem imposed by the Juvenile Court Act.[13]

The following tables present in summary form, the essence of statistical figures concerning the operation of the juvenile court in the years preceding and including fiscal year 1957, and the 3 succeeding fiscal years to the present. Table 1 deals with appropriations, personnel, caseload, backlog, and court collections. Table 2 relates the appropriations or cost of operation of the court to the amount of the court collections on a per case filed basis. The figures used are extracted from hearings before Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate, hearings before the House Committee on the District of Columbia, and from the statistical reports of the juvenile court for fiscal 1959 and the quarterly reports for fiscal 1960, by quarter or cumulatively for the year.

CHART I

Statistics relating to cost of operation, cases filed, case backlog, and collections, District of Columbia juvenile court

Fiscal year	Appropriation	Number of authorized positions	Number of cases filed			Backlog of cases			Collections
			Juvenile	Adult	Total	Juvenile	Adult	Total	
1954	$327,000	72	2,057	1,407	3,464				
1955	347,000	74	1,757	1,516	3,273				
1956	407,000	80	1,877	1,797	3,674				$785,000
1957	428,000	81	1,846	1,578	3,424				945,677
(Present judge took office at this point)									
1958	$490,900	86	1,870	1,027	2,897	270	552	822	$636,415
1959	573,000	95	[1] 1,840	993	2,833	235	510	745	511,931
1960	620,000	97	1,685	1,485	3,170	502	1,165	1,667	506,040
1961	689,700	103							

[1] Comparison of the statistical reports of the court for fiscal years 1959 and 1960 indicates that the method of reporting was changed in 1960. There was no table in the 1959 statistical report showing new petitions filed with the court. The 1959 figure of 1,840 for juvenile petitions used in chart 1 may be slightly in excess of the total number of new juvenile petitions filed in the court. The figure of 1,685 new juvenile petitions filed for fiscal 1960 is a cumulative total taken from table 9 of the quarterly reports. However, the cumulative total of table 1 shows an intake of 3,243 individual juveniles. Table 7 shows disposition of 2,030 new juvenile petitions. As to new adult petitions, the cumulative total of the quarterly statistical reports of the court shows in table 9, 1,485 new adult petitions. Table 8 shows a total of 1,720 new adult petitions. The Assistant Corporation Counsel's Office indicates a total of 1,390 new adult petitions filed.

CHART II

Fiscal year	Net difference between court collections and court operating costs	Net difference per case filed	Backlog of cases
1956	+$378,000	+$102.88	None
1957	+517,677	+151.19	None
(Present judge took office at this point)			
1958	+$135,515	+$46.77	822
1959	−61,069	−21.55	745
1960	−113,960	−35.00	1,667

The essence of these charts is that through fiscal year 1957 the juvenile court, with a significantly great number of cases filed, operated on less money, had fewer employees, greatly increased collections, and had no backlog. From fiscal year 1957 to date this court has been reorganized, received increased appropriations, given additional personnel, had fewer filed cases, but collections have dropped precipitately and a large backlog has developed. All steps which might be expected to improve the operation of the court seem to have had the opposite result.

Related directly or indirectly to the autonomy and management of the court are the conflicts and confusions which have developed between the court and other District agencies. Mild to severe conflicts have been noted in the press and have been the subject of attention by House and Senate Appropriations Committees. Involved have been the Office of the Corporation Counsel, the Youth Aid Division of the Police Department, and the Department of Public Welfare. Conflicts related to the handling of adults charged with contributing to delinquency, handling of support cases, control over juveniles committed for rehabilitation, referral of juvenile first offenders involved in very minor infractions, and other problems. To minimize such incidents, clarifying amendments may be necessary.

PART III—AMENDMENTS TO THE JUVENILE COURT ACT

The subcommittees feels that the foregoing parts of this report indicate a court that is in genuine difficulty. In no other facet of the judicial system do delays have more far-reaching consequences to the community than in a juvenile court. The decision of the Congress must be such as to bring the caseload in the juvenile court to current status and insure that it be kept current. The loss of more than $400,000 per year in court collections must be corrected.

First considerations leading to legislative action to assure an efficient and effective court are: (1) Will additional judicial personnel alone provide efficient handling of the court load? (2) Should the juvenile court continue as an autonomous body? (3) If supervision is needed, should the juvenile court become a branch of the municipal court or a unit within the domestic relations branch of the municipal court of the District of Columbia?

Subordinate to the above major issues, but meriting attention, are other amendments suggested to the subcommittee or which have appeared as closely related to juvenile matters.

1. Referees: Referees are used in many juvenile courts. The referee usually handles less serious offenses and places his findings and recommendations before the judge for final action. Under procedure instituted by the court about 2 years ago, the Director of Social Work conducts hearings. This procedure closely parallels that used in courts served by referees. These director's hearings have reduced the caseload handled by the court since a substantial portion of juvenile cases have been disposed of at that level.

2. Waiver by the court: Under terms of the Juvenile Court Act, the judge may waive to the U.S. district court the case of any juvenile 16 years of age or older who has committed an offense which would constitute a felony. Pending court action or after disposition, the same juvenile may be brought before the juvenile court for another offense. If the offense is a misdemeanor, the case cannot be waived and the same juvenile has cases pending before both the juvenile and adult courts. Waiver of the child rather than the offense would prevent such a contradiction wherein the same person is a juvenile offender in one court and an adult criminal in the other court.

3. Determining sufficiency of complaints at intake: Complaints against juveniles referred to the juvenile court are not evaluated for their legal sufficiency at the time of referral. After a complaint has been investigated and a full social study made, a determination is reached as to whether the case shall be petitioned to the court. If it is to

[9] As a matter of practice, the juvenile court is exercising exclusive jurisdiction on criminal nonsupport cases since the U.S. district court has exercised no jurisdiction in such cases for several years. Municipal court for the District of Columbia enforces reciprocal nonsupport laws in the District and reports a growing volume of collections within the District. Funds so collected, however, accrue to the support of persons located outside the District of Columbia.

[10] Hearings—Senate District of Columbia Committee, Feb. 4, 1959, p. 12; Hearings—House Committee on Appropriations, District of Columbia Appropriations 1960, p. 515.

[11] Hearings—House Committee on Appropriations, District of Columbia Appropriations 1959, p. 395.

[12] Hearings—House Committee on Appropriations, District of Columbia Appropriations 1960, pp. 509–517.

[13] Hearings—House Committee on District of Columbia, July 23, 1959, p. 20.

be petitioned, the legal sufficiency of the complaint is determined by the Assistant Corporation Counsel. If there is inadequate legal basis for action, the case is dropped. Power in the hands of the Corporation Counsel to determine whether a complaint shall be petitioned to court before other disposition and determine the legal sufficiency of complaints at intake may better protect the interests of the public, the juvenile, and save staff time and effort.

4. Jury trials for juveniles: The juvenile court of the District of Columbia must grant a jury trial to a juvenile when request is made under terms of the Juvenile Court Act. This may be the only jurisdiction where such right is provided in law. The Judicial Conference of the District of Columbia recommends that the jury-trial provision for juveniles be repealed.

5. Waiver of incorrigible habitual offenders: The repeat offender, demonstrably not yielding to rehabilitative efforts, and whose offenses remain misdemeanors, is beyond the benefit of services offered by the juvenile court. Power to the juvenile court to waive such offenders for commission of misdemeanors to the municipal court would remove them from contact and association with other juveniles who might be influenced to their detriment.

6. Lowering of age limits: The present age limit for juveniles is 18. The great majority of repeat offenders and hardened young criminals are found between the ages of 16 and 18. Lowering the age limit below 18 for all offenders or only repeat offenders, for felonies or felonies and misdemeanors, would remove those beyond probable help by the juvenile court rehabilitation resources and minimize their potential of detrimental influence on other juveniles.

7. Opening court records: Present law closes the records on juvenile cases to the public and the press. In consequence the press refrains from printing names of juveniles involved in crime regardless of the source of information. Strong authority is found on both sides of the issue of secrecy of juvenile files. Whether secrecy has helped to promote increased delinquency or whether it has been a brake on an increase which would otherwise have been more rapid cannot be demonstrated by any proof. Opening records of juveniles 16 and over may merit examination in the light of present trends and beliefs of juvenile experts.

8. Juvenile traffic cases: The juvenile 16 years of age enjoys the status and privileges of an adult as to driving a car with the exception that he must go to the juvenile court for any violation of traffic regulations, including those minor violations for which an adult may post collateral. It is questioned if such minor violations constitute delinquency. Removal of such minor violations from the court's jurisdiction will lighten the court's load without increasing delinquency rates in the District of Columbia.

SPECIAL ORDER VACATED

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to vacate the special order granted me for today that I requested on yesterday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I have asked this time today in order to call the attention of my colleagues to misleading information contained in an Associated Press dispatch of yesterday commenting on a campaign booklet issued by the Republican National Committee boasting about our great national prosperity.

I want to refer to the "Operations Voracity" group of Republican Members of Congress the following article, under a Charleston, W. Va., dateline, in which the Federal Department of Employment Security releases information to the effect that 6,800 jobs in West Virginia were lost between June 15 and July 15. These jobs were nonagricultural employment. This same report shows there are 10,700 less people employed in industry in my State than there were 1 year ago.

All of this talk about national prosperity is so much hooey to the better than 80,000 unemployed people in the State of West Virginia. I challenge the members of the "Operations Voracity" group individually and collectively to explain why this great general prosperity they boast about does not apply to West Virginia.

[From the Clarksburg Exponent, Aug. 27, 1960]

SIX THOUSAND EIGHT HUNDRED LOSE THEIR JOBS

CHARLESTON.—About 6,800 workers in West Virginia lost their jobs in the latest month reported on by the Department of Employment Security.

This was from mid-June to mid-July. The loss reduced nonagricultural employment in the State to 450,000 or 10,700 less than a year earlier.

Here are some of the details as presented in the Department's report, released Friday:

"Manufacturing, with a July work force of 127,900, was 2,100 below June's 130,000 and lagged July 1959 by 2,600. Nonmanufacturing industries reported over-the-month losses totaling 4,800 as employment dropped to an estimated 322,000. This indicated a cutback of 8,100 during the past year.

"The sharp drop in demand for steel, coupled with heavy imports of glass and vacation taking without pay, all combined to reduce mid-July employment in the durable goods industries. The 76,900 at work during the reporting period represented a drop of 2,200 over the month and 3,700 over the year."

TRANSFER OF CASES BETWEEN DISTRICT COURTS AND COURT OF CLAIMS

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 5396) to amend title 28 of the United States Code to provide for transfer of cases between the district courts and the Court of Claims, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 8, strike out "unless the parties consent to dismissal" and insert "if it be in the interest of justice".

Page 1, line 9, after "Claims" insert ", where the case shall proceed as if it had been filed in the Court of Claims on the date it was filed in the district court".

Page 2, line 6, strike out "unless the parties consent to dismissal" and insert "if it be in the interest of justice".

Page 2, line 8, after "filed" insert ", where the case shall proceed as if it had been filed in the district court on the date it was filed in the Court of Claims".

Page 2, preceding line 12, insert:

"SEC. 3. The first sentence of section 2 of the Act of March 9, 1920 (title 46, U.S.C. 742), is amended to read as follows:

"'In cases where if such vessel were privately owned or operated, or if such cargo were privately owned or possessed, or if a private person or property were involved, a proceeding in admiralty could be maintained, any appropriate nonjury proceeding in personam may be brought against the United States or against any corporation mentioned in section 1 of this Act.'"

Page 2, line 12, strike out "3" and insert "4".

Page 2, line 12, after "by" insert "sections 1 and 2 of".

Page 2, line 15, after "Claims." insert "The amendment made by section 3 shall apply to any case or proceeding brought after the date of enactment of this Act."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to amend title 28 of the United States Code to provide for transfer of cases between the district courts and the Court of Claims and for other purposes."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from a committee:

AUGUST 29, 1960.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the House Committee on Ways and Means, effective immediately.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN A. LAFORE, JR.,
Thirteenth District, Pennsylvania.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution, House Resolution 634, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That WALTER M. MUMMA, Pennsylvania, be and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Ways and Means.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OVERALL LIMITATION ON FOREIGN TAX CREDIT

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R.

10087) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit taxpayers to elect an overall limitation on the foreign tax credit, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2199)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10087) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit taxpayers to elect an overall limitation on the foreign tax credit, having met after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, and 16, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 2. Section 1503 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to computation and payment of tax in case of consolidated returns) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(d) SPECIAL RULE FOR APPLICATION OF FOREIGN TAX CREDIT WHEN OVERALL LIMITATION APPLIES.—

"'(1) IN GENERAL.—If the affiliated group includes one or more Western Hemisphere trade corporations (as defined in section 921), and if for the taxable year an election under section 904(b)(1) (relating to election of overall limitation on foreign tax credit) is in effect, then the amount of taxes paid or accrued to foreign countries and possessions of the United States by such Western Hemisphere trade corporations which may be taken into account for purposes of section 901 shall be reduced by the amount (if any) by which—

"'(A) the amount of such taxes (or, if smaller, the amount of the tax which would be computed under subsection (a), if such corporations were not Western Hemisphere trade corporations, with respect to the portion of the consolidated taxable income attributable to such corporations), exceeds

"'(B) the amount of the tax computed under subsection (a) with respect to the portion of the consolidated taxable income attributable to such corporations.

"'(2) ADJUSTMENT IN CASE OF CERTAIN PUBLIC UTILITIES.—So much of any reduction under paragraph (1) as is attributable to taxes paid or accrued to foreign countries and possessions of the United States by one or more corporations which are both Western Hemisphere trade corporations and regulated public utilities shall be decreased by the excess of—

"'(A) the amount of tax computed under subsection (a) with respect to the portion of the consolidated taxable income attributable to income derived, by the corporations in the affiliated group which are not Western Hemisphere trade corporations, from sources within the foreign countries referred to in paragraph (3)(B), over

"'(B) the amount of taxes paid or accrued to such foreign countries by the corporations referred to in subparagraph (A).

This paragraph shall apply only if the corporations described in subparagraph (A) derive 80 percent or more, of the gross income (computed without regard to capital gains and losses) which they derive from sources within the foreign countries described in paragraph (3)(B), from regulated public utilities and from operations as regulated public utilities.

"'(3) SPECIAL RULES.—

"'(A) For purposes of paragraph (2), a corporation is a regulated public utility only if it is a regulated public utility within the meaning of subparagraph (A) (other than clauses (ii) and (iii) thereof) or (D) of subsection (c)(1). For purposes of the preceding sentence, subsection (c)(2) shall be applied as if subsection (c)(1) were limited to subparagraphs (A)(i) and (D) thereof.

"'(B) For purposes of paragraph (2), the foreign countries referred to in this subparagraph include only any country from which any public utility referred to in the first sentence of paragraph (2) derives the principal part of its income.

"'(C) For purposes of paragraph (1)(A), the amount of tax which would be computed with respect to the portion of the consolidated taxable income attributable to any corporation or corporations shall be determined without regard to the increase of 2 percent provided in subsection (a).'"

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with the following amendments:

On page 4 of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out line 5 and "any" on line 6, and insert "SEC. 5. Any".

On page 4 of the Senate engrossed amendments, line 7, strike out "the date of the enactment of this Act" and insert the following: "October 1, 1955,".

On page 4 of the Senate engrossed amendments, line 22, strike out "unless" and insert "if".

On page 5 of the Senate engrossed amendments, line 1, strike out "would be" and insert "would not be"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 6. (a) Subpart A of part III of subchapter A of chapter 61 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to information concerning persons subject to special provisions) is amended by renumbering section 6038 as 6039, and by inserting after section 6037 the following new section:

"'SEC. 6038. INFORMATION WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN FOREIGN CORPORATIONS.

"'(a) REQUIREMENT.—

"'(1) IN GENERAL.—A domestic corporation shall furnish, with respect to any foreign corporation which it controls (within the meaning of subsection (c)(1)) and with respect to any foreign subsidiary of any such foreign corporation (within the meaning of subsection (c)(2)), such information as the Secretary or his delegate may prescribe by regulations relating to—

"'(A) the name, the principal place of business, and the nature of business of such foreign corporation or foreign subsidiary, and the country under whose laws incorporated;

"'(B) the accumulated profits (as defined in section 902(c)) of such foreign corporation or foreign subsidiary, including the items of income (whether or not included in gross income under chapter 1), deductions (whether or not allowed in computing taxable income under chapter 1), and any other items taken into account in computing such accumulated profits;

"'(C) a balance sheet for such foreign corporation or foreign subsidiary, listing assets, liabilities, and capital;

"'(D) transactions between such foreign corporation or foreign subsidiary and—

"'(i) any foreign corporation controlled by the domestic corporation,

"'(ii) any foreign subsidiary of a foreign corporation controlled by the domestic corporation, and

"'(iii) the domestic corporation or any shareholder of the domestic corporation owning at the time of the transaction takes place 10 percent or more of the value of any class of stock outstanding of the domestic corporation; and

"'(E) a description of the various classes of stock outstanding, and a list showing the name and address of, and number of shares held by, each citizen or resident of the United States and each domestic corporation who is a shareholder of record owning at any time during the annual accounting period 5 percent or more in value of any class of stock outstanding of such foreign corporation or foreign subsidiary.

"'(2) PERIOD FOR WHICH INFORMATION IS TO BE FURNISHED, ETC.—The information required under paragraph (1) shall be furnished—

"'(A) in the case of a foreign corporation, for its annual accounting period ending with or within the domestic corporation's taxable year, and

"'(B) in the case of any foreign subsidiary of such foreign corporation, for such subsidiary's annual accounting period ending with or within such foreign corporation's annual accounting period described in subparagraph (A).

The information required under this subsection shall be furnished at such time and in such manner as the Secretary or his delegate shall by regulations prescribe.

"'(3) LIMITATION.—No information shall be required to be furnished under this subsection with respect to any foreign corporation or foreign subsidiary for any annual accounting period unles such information was required to be furnished under regulations in effect on the first day of such annual accounting period.

"'(b) EFFECT OF FAILURE TO FURNISH INFORMATION.—If a domestic corporation fails to furnish, within the time prescribed under paragraph (2) of subsection (a), any information with respect to any foreign corporation or foreign subsidiary required under paragraph (1) of subsection (a), then, in applying section 902 (relating to foreign tax credit for corporate stockholder in foreign corporation) to such domestic corporation (or to any person who acquires from any person any portion of the interest of such domestic corporation in any such foreign corporation or foreign subsidiary, but only to the extent of such portion) for any taxable year, the amount of taxes paid or deemed paid by each foreign corporation and foreign subsidiary with respect to which the domestic corporation is required to furnish information during the annual accounting period or periods with respect to which such information is required under such paragraph (2) of subsection (a) shall be reduced by 10 percent. If such failure continues 90 days or more after notice by the Secretary or his delegate to the domestic corporation, then the amount of the reduction under this subsection shall be 10 percent plus an additional 5 percent for each 3-month period, or fraction thereof, during which such failure to furnish information continues after the expiration of such 90-day period. No taxes shall be reduced under this subsection more than once for the same failure. For purposes of this subsection, the time prescribed under paragraph (2) of subsection (a) to furnish information (and the beginning of

the 90-day period after notice by the Secretary) shall be treated as being not earlier than the last day on which (as shown to the satisfaction of the Secretary or his delegate) reasonable cause existed for failure to furnish such information.

"'(c) CONTROL, ETC.—For purposes of this section—

"'(1) If at any time during its taxable year a domestic corporation owns more than 50 percent of the voting stock of a foreign corporation, it shall be deemed to be in control of such foreign corporation.

"'(2) If at any time during its annual accounting period a foreign corporation owns more than 50 percent of the voting stock of another foreign corporation, such other corporation shall be considered a foreign subsidiary of the corporation owning such stock.

"'(d) ANNUAL ACCOUNTING PERIOD.—For purposes of this section, the annual accounting period of a foreign corporation or of a foreign subsidiary is the annual period on the basis of which such foreign corporation or such foreign subsidiary regularly computes its income in keeping its books.

"'(e) CROSS REFERENCE.—

"'For provisions relating to penalties for violations of this section, see section 7203.'

"(b)(1) The table of sections for such subpart is amended by striking out the last item and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"'SEC. 6038. Information with respect to certain foreign corporations.

"'SEC. 6039. Cross references.'

"(2) Section 902 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to credit for corporate stockholder in foreign corporation) is amended by adding at the end thereof of the following new subsection:

"'(e) CROSS REFERENCE.—

"'For reduction of credit with respect to dividends paid out of accumulated profits for years for which certain information is not furnished, see section 6038.'

"(c) The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) shall apply to taxable years of domestic corporations beginning after December 31, 1960, with respect to information relating to a foreign corporation or a foreign subsidiary described in section 6038(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (as added by subsection (a)) for its annual accounting periods beginning after December 31, 1960."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with the following amendments:

On page 8 of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out lines 5 and 6 and in lieu thereof insert the following:

"SEC. 7. (a) Section 6046 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to information returns as to formation or reorganization of foreign corporations) is amended to read as follows:"

On page 10 of the Senate engrossed amendments, line 2, strike out the closing quotation marks, and after line 2 insert the following:

"(d) CROSS REFERENCE.—

"For provisions relating to penalties for violations of this section, see section 7203."

"(b) The table of sections for subpart B of part III of chapter 61 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by striking out the last item and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"'Sec. 6046. Returns as to creation or organization, or reorganization, of foreign corporations."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

On page 10 of the Senate engrossed amendments, line 4, strike out "amendment" and insert "amendments"; and the Senate agree to the same.

W. D. MILLS,
AIME J. FORAND,
CECIL R. KING,
N. M. MASON,
JOHN W. BYRNES,
Managers on the Part of the House.

H. F. BYRD,
ROBERT KERR,
(by H. F. BYRD),
CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
JOHN WILLIAMS,
FRANK CARLSON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10087) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit taxpayers to elect an overall limitation on the foreign tax credit, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendments Nos. 1, 2, 3, and 4: Under present law (subpart A of part III of subchapter N of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954) income taxes paid to a foreign country or a possession of the United States may be taken as a credit against income taxes otherwise due the United States. However, under section 904 of such Code, the taxes of each foreign country which may be taken as a credit are limited to the same proportion of the United States income tax (before the credit) which the taxable income from that foreign country is of the taxpayer's total taxable income. This is known as the "per-country" limitation.

The bill as passed by both the House and the Senate provides an alternative limitation, to be applied at the election of the taxpayer. This alternative limitation, known as the "overall limitation", applies to the amount of taxes paid to all foreign countries taken together, and allows as a credit against the United States income tax the same proportion of the United States tax (before the credit) which the taxable income from sources without the United States is of the total taxable income.

Under the bill as passed by the House, taxpayers could make their initial shift from the per-country limitation to the overall limitation at any time. Once under the overall limitation they could of their own volition shift back to the per-country limitation after an interval of 5 years (or after a shorter period if they had the permission of the Treasury Department). After having shifted back to the per-country limitation they could of their own volition again return to the overall limitation after a 5-year interval (or lesser time with the consent of the Treasury Department). Senate amendments Nos. 1, 2, 3, and 4 provide that taxpayers may at their own volition elect to make an initial shift from the per-country to the overall limitation at any time, but thereafter they can change from the overall limitation to the per-country limitation, or vice versa, only with the consent of the Treasury Department.

The House recedes.

Amendments Nos. 5 and 6: These are clerical amendments. The House recedes.

Amendments Nos. 7 and 8: Under the bill as it passed the House, the amount of income taxes paid to foreign countries which was in excess of the amount which could be credited against the United States income tax for the current year could be carried back or forward from a year in which the per-country limitation was used to a year in which either the per-country limitation or the overall limitation was used, but could not be carried from an overall limitation year to a per-country limitation year. Under Senate amendments Nos. 7 and 8, such excess cannot be carried either from a per-country limitation year to an overall limitation year, or from an overall limitation year to a per-country limitation year (but may, as under the bill as passed by the House, be carried from one per-country limitation year to another per-country limitation year, or from one overall limitation year to another overall limitation year).

The House recedes.

Amendment No. 9: This is a technical amendment. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 10: Senate amendment No. 10 adds a new subsection (d) to section 1503 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, relating to computation and payment of tax in case of consolidated returns. This new subsection provides that in the case of a consolidated return by an affiliated group of corporations which includes one or more Western Hemisphere trade corporations in a year in which the new overall limitation applies, the amount of taxes paid to foreign countries or United States possessions with respect to the income of Western Hemisphere trade corporations (which are taxed at a 38 percent rate instead of the regular corporate 52 percent rate) in excess of a 38 percent rate, but not in excess of a 52 percent rate, should not be taken into account in computing the foreign tax credit of the affiliated group. The bill as passed the House contained no comparable provision.

The House recedes with an amendment. The conference agreement retains the substance of the Senate amendment as a general rule which appears in paragraph (1) of the new subsection (d). As under the Senate amendment, the rule provided in this paragraph denies, where the overall limitation is used, the right to credit certain foreign taxes[1] paid by the Western Hemisphere trade corporations against the United States taxes on income attributable to corporations in the same affiliated group which are not Western Hemisphere trade corporations. The taxes which may not be credited are those in excess of what the United States taxes are for these Western Hemisphere trade corporations (generally resulting in an effective tax rate slightly under 38 percent), but only to the extent these foreign taxes do not exceed the United States taxes which would be imposed on these corporations if they were not Western Hemisphere trade corporations (generally resulting in an effective tax rate slightly under 52 percent).[2] Thus if all the Western Hemisphere trade corporations in a consolidated group in the aggregate pay foreign taxes which, in terms of United States methods of computing income, result in a tax at the effective rate of, say, 32 percent then paragraph (1) would not come into operation. However, if the effective rate of the tax exceeds 38 percent,[3] then paragraph (1) denies the use of such excess foreign taxes as credits against the United States taxes on other foreign income in the consolidated group. However, once this effective rate reaches 52 percent,[4] to the extent of any taxes over this effective rate the taxes

[1] All references to foreign taxes are intended to also include taxes of United States possessions.

[2] This is determined without regard to the additional 2 percent tax on consolidated returns

[3] This is an approximation since it does not take into account the surtax exemption.

[4] This is an approximation since it does not take into account the surtax exemption.

are eligible for crediting. The omission in this paragraph of any reference to the computation of the United States taxes involved as being before allowance of the foreign tax credit does not have any substantive effect but merely conforms with the general references in the Code to income taxes as those before the allowance of credits.

Under the conference agreement, the reduction in the taxes of Western Hemisphere trade corporations which may be credited in the case of taxes on other incomes, i.e., the general rule provided by paragraph (1), may itself be reduced where the Western Hemisphere trade corporations are also regulated public utilities. An adjustment is provided for in a new paragraph (2) of the subsection (d). This paragraph (2) makes the reduction provided by paragraph (1) inapplicable in the case of excess foreign taxes of Western Hemisphere trade corporations which are also public utilities (the excess referred to is the taxes which, under paragraph (1) of the new subsection (d), may not be credited against U.S. taxes on the income of corporations other than Western Hemisphere trade corporations) but only to the extent of the excess of U.S. taxes over the foreign taxes paid by corporations in the same affiliated group which are other than Western Hemisphere trade corporations, with respect to income derived from these same foreign countries.

The adjustment provided by paragraph (2) is to be available only when the corporations involved, which are not Western Hemisphere trade corporations, receive 80 percent or more of the gross income (from the foreign countries specified in the conference agreement) from regulated public utilities and from their own operations (where they are regulated public utilities). Income from regulated public utilities for this purpose is intended to include dividend and interest income received from regulated public utilities as well as commissions, fees, etc., received from such utilities as payments for the rendition of technical and management services. Capital gains and losses are not taken into account for the purposes of this computation. Moreover, it is not intended, in the computation of gross income for this purpose, that any amount be taken into account more than once.

A new paragraph (3) in subsection (d) specifies in subparagraph (A) that the regulated public utility referred to is one which is described in section 1503(c)(1)(A) (other than clauses (ii) and (iii) thereof) or (D). Thus, it must be a corporation engaged in the furnishing or sale of electric energy, gas, water or sewerage disposal services or telephone or telegraph services and 80 percent or more of its income must be derived from some combination of these sources. The rates must be established or approved by the agencies specified in the law or the requirements of the last sentence of section 1503(c)(2) (relating to treatment of unregulated rates) must be satisfied.

Subparagraph (B) of paragraph (3) provides that the foreign countries referred to in paragraph (2) are those from which the public utility referred to in the first sentence of paragraph (2) derives the principal part of its income. Where more than two countries are involved this means the country from which the utility derives more income than it derives from any other country.

Subparagraph (C) of paragraph (3) provides that, for purposes of the computation of United States tax required by paragraph (1)(A), the 2 percent additional tax provided by section 1503(a) is to be omitted.

The adjustment provided in paragraph (2) can be illustrated by the following example: Assume that four Western Hemisphere trade corporations, which are regulated public utilities, operate in four different Latin American countries and have an aggregate consolidated taxable income of $100,000 on which they paid foreign taxes of $45,000. The United States tax in such a case (ignoring the surtax exemption) would be $38,000. Assuming the overall limitation is used, only $38,000 of the $45,000 could be claimed as a foreign tax credit as the result of the application of subsection (d)(1). However, assume also that the other two corporations in the same consolidated group (which are not Western Hemisphere trade corporations and which meet the 80 percent gross income test of the new section 1503(d)(2)) receive $50,000 of consolidated taxable income from the same four countries on which they pay taxes to those countries of $22,000. The United States tax in this case (again ignoring the surtax exemption but including the additional 2 percent tax on certain consolidated income) would be $27,000. Paragraph (2) provides in such a case that $7,000 of excess foreign taxes paid by the four Western Hemisphere trade corporations ($45,000 less $38,000) is available to be claimed as a credit to the extent the United States taxes on the other income in the consolidated group from the same foreign countries ($27,000) exceeds the taxes paid these foreign countries with respect to this income ($22,000). Thus $5,000 of $7,000 in this case could be claimed as a credit.

Amendments Nos. 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, and 16: These are clerical amendments. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 17: Senate amendment No. 17 added a new section to the bill as it passed the House. Under this new section, any amount received after 1949 and before the enactment of the bill from a corporation (1) formed exclusively for the purpose of, and engaged exclusively in, operating without profit a scientific laboratory for the Atomic Energy Commission, and (2) operated solely on funds appropriated to the Commission, by an individual as reimbursement for moving himself and his immediate family, his household goods, and his personal effects to a new place of residence in order to accept employment with such corporation, is to be treated (for Federal income tax purposes) as an amount not includible in gross income to the extent such amount did not exceed the expenses actually paid or incurred for such purposes. This provision was to apply unless the individual was advised at the time of his employment by an authorized officer, employee, or agent of the corporation that the amount of reimbursement would be includible in gross income. In any case in which a refund or credit of an overpayment resulting from the application of this provision is prevented by the operation of any law or rule of law (other than ch. 74 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, relating to closing agreements and compromises, and the corresponding provisions of prior law), such refund or credit may be made or allowed if claim is filed within six months from the enactment of the bill, but no interest is payable or allowable on any refund or credit payable by reason of the application of this waiver.

The House recedes with amendments. Under the conference agreement, the new section added by the Senate amendment No. 17 is retained but applies only to amounts received before October 1, 1955 (rather than before the date of the enactment of the bill). In addition, this provision applies only to cases where the individual involved was advised (either expressly or by clear implication) at the time of his employment by an authorized official of the corporation that the amount of the reimbursement would not be includible in gross income.

It is the understanding of the conferees that prior to about September 1, 1955, the officials of a corporation engaged exclusively in operating without profit a scientific laboratory for the Atomic Energy Commission had assumed that such expense reimbursement was not taxable income. It is further understood that professional and skilled employees who were hired by the corporation before that date were either expressly told or given the clear impression that their reimbursed traveling or moving expenses were not taxable income to them. For example, the conferees have been advised that in many cases new employees were told all of their expenses of moving would be paid by the corporation, with no mention made as to the taxable nature of such reimbursed expenses. Under such circumstances it is the view of the conferees that prior to September 1955, corporate officials of the corporation were, in effect, advising newly hired employees that they would not be taxable with respect to such expense reimbursement.

Amendment No. 18: Senate amendment No. 18 adds a new section to the bill as it passed the House redesignating section 6038 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 as section 6039 and inserting a new section 6038. Under the Senate amendment, the new section 6038 provides that, if a domestic corporation controls any foreign corporation, it must furnish such information with respect to such foreign corporation (and with respect to any foreign subsidiary of such foreign corporation) as the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate prescribes by forms and regulation as necessary to carry out the provisions of the income tax laws. If such information is not furnished at the time required by the Secretary or his delegate, no credit is allowable to any person under section 902 (relating to foreign tax credit for corporate stockholder in foreign corporation) for taxes paid by such foreign corporation or its subsidiaries for their taxable years for which the domestic corporation failed to furnish information.

The House recedes with an amendment substantially revising the new section 6038. Under the conference agreement section 6038 specifies the information required to be furnished by the domestic corporation, concerning any foreign corporation it controls and any of such foreign corporation's subsidiaries, as such information as the Secretary or his delegate prescribes by regulations relating to specific listed items. In general, these include corporation name; country of incorporation; nature and place of business; profits, deductions, foreign taxes, and any other items taken into account to determine accumulated profits; a balance sheet showing assets, liabilities, and capital; transactions with certain related persons; and certain shareholders who are citizens or residents of the United States or who are domestic corporations.

Such information must be furnished as to the foreign corporation for its annual accounting period ending with or without the domestic corporation's taxable year and as to the subsidiary for its annual accounting period ending with or within the foreign corporation's annual accounting period. The information must be furnished at such time and in such manner as the Secretary or his delegate prescribes by regulations, but only such information shall be required for any annual accounting period as is required to be furnished under regulations in effect on the first day of the period.

Subsection (b) provides that, if the domestic corporation fails, by the time prescribed by regulations for a taxable year, to furnish any information concerning any one or more of the foreign corporations or subsidiaries, then in applying section 902 (relating to foreign tax credit for corporate shareholder in foreign corporation) to such domestic corporation (or to any person who acquires from any person any portion of the interest of such domestic corporation in any such foreign corporation or subsidiary, but only to the extent of such portion) for any taxable year, the amount of taxes paid

or deemed paid by each foreign corporation and subsidiary during the accounting period or periods for which the domestic corporation was required to furnish information for the taxable year of the failure shall be reduced by 10 percent. If the failure continues 90 days or more after notice by the Secretary or his delegate, the reduction is 10 percent plus 5 percent for each 3 month period or part thereof during which the failure continues after the 90-day period. No taxes, however, shall be reduced more than once for the same failure. For purposes of the new section 6038(b), the time to furnish information, and the beginning of the 90-day period is treated as delayed, however, until the last day (as shown to the satisfaction of the Secretary or his delegate) that reasonable cause exists for the failure.

Under subsection (c) the domestic corporation is deemed to control a foreign corporation 50 percent of whose voting stock it owns, and the foreign corporation is deemed to have as a subsidiary another foreign corporation 50 percent of whose voting stock it owns.

Subsection (d), adapting the definition contained in section 441 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, defines "annual accounting period" of a foreign corporation or its foreign subsidiary as the annual period on the basis of which such corporation keeps its books. The term may refer to an accounting period of less than 1 years, however, where for example the foreign income, war profits, and excess profits taxes are determined on the basis of an accounting period of less than 1 year as described in section 902(c)(2).

The new section 6038 applies to taxable years of a domestic corporation beginning after December 31, 1960, with respect to information as to a foreign corporation or foreign subsidiary for annual accounting periods beginning after December 31, 1960.

Amendment Nos. 19 and 20: Senate amendment No. 19 adds a new section to the bill as it passed the House. The amendment would modify section 6046 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. Present section 6046 requires every attorney, accountant, fiduciary, bank, trust company, financial institution, or other person, who advises as to the formation or reorganization of a foreign corporation, to file a return in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate. The regulations under this section provide that an attorney need not furnish any information which he has obtained by virtue of the attorney-client relationship. As a result, existing section 6046 has had little practical effect. Attorneys are not free to furnish information which is the subject of privileged communications, and in most cases those not entitled to invoke the privilege contend that they have merely given general advice or performed clerical services and therefore possess no substantive information.

In order to obtain more comprehensive information concerning a greater number of foreign corporate organizations and reorganizations than is available under the present section 6046, the section is amended to require returns relating to the creation, organization, or reorganization of foreign corporations to be made by every citizen or resident of the United States who was an officer or director of the corporation at any time within 60 days after its creation, organization, or reorganization, and by every U.S. shareholder of the corporation owning at least 5 percent of its outstanding stock at any time within such 60 days. This amendment eliminates from the section the problem resulting from privileged communications and places the responsibility for making returns on those persons who are most likely to have within their possession the information desired.

Senate amendment No. 20 adds a new section to the bill providing that the amendment to section 6046 is to apply only with respect to foreign corporations created or organized, or reorganized, after the date of the enactment of the bill.

Under the conference agreement, the House recedes on Senate amendments Nos. 19 and 20 with technical amendments.

W. D. MILLS,
AIME J. FORAND,
CECIL R. KING,
N. M. MASON,
JOHN W. BYRNES,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. MILLS (during the reading of the statement). Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the statement of the managers on the part of the House is rather lengthy and since it is the result of unanimous agreement among the managers on the part of the House, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the statement be dispensed with since it is printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, your House conferees have reached agreement with the conferees of the other body on the bill, H.R. 10087, which, you will recall, deals with the limitation on the credit allowable against U.S. income taxes for taxes paid to foreign countries and U.S. possessions.

As passed by the House, H.R. 10087 gave taxpayers the privilege of electing to compute the foreign tax credit to which they were entitled under an overall limitation rather than under the per-country limitation provided under present law. The bill provided that once such an election had been made it could be changed only with the consent of the Treasury, except that after 5 years taxpayers were permitted to shift their election without Treasury consent. In addition, the House bill provided that any unused foreign tax credits arising in a per-country limitation year could be carried over and used in either another per-country limitation year or in an overall limitation year, but that any such credits arising in an overall limitation year could only be carried over to another year in which the overall limitation applied.

The other body made three substantive amendments that related to the bill in the form in which it was passed by the House and which operated to restrict its application.

The first of these amendments provided that with the exception of an initial election to use the overall limitation, any shift from one limitation to the other could only be made with the approval of the Treasury Department. This amendment was designated to preclude the changing of the applicable limitation after 5-year intervals for tax reasons alone. It is expected, however, that the Treasury will permit changes where business conditions change.

The second restrictive amendment made by the other body provided that unused foreign tax credits from a per-country limitation year or from an overall limitation year may be carried over and used only in another year in which the same limitation was applicable. Your House conferees were advised that this amendment precluded an initial nonrecurring revenue loss of some $30 million which would result from a windfall gain to taxpayers who have large accumulated but unused tax credits under the present per-country limitation.

Under the conference agreement, both of these restrictive amendments were retained.

The third restrictive amendment made by the other body to the provisions of H.R. 10087 as passed by the House related to the application of the overall limitation on the foreign tax credit where a consolidated tax return is filed by an affiliated group of corporations which includes one or more Western Hemisphere trade corporations. Under the House bill any unused tax credits of a Western Hemisphere trade corporation which was a member of an affiliated group which elected the overall limitation could be applied to offset the U.S. tax on the foreign source income of other members of the group which were not Western Hemisphere corporations.

The other body, however, amended the House bill to provide that where the unused tax credits of the Western Hemisphere trade corporations in the group were attributable solely to the fact that such corporations are taxed at only a rate of about 38 percent rather than the generally applicable U.S. corporate rate of about 52 percent, such credits could not be used to offset any U.S. tax on the foreign source income of other non-Western Hemisphere trade corporation members of the group.

Under the conference agreement the substance of the amendment made by the other body is retained as a general rule. However, your conferees were of the opinion that the offsetting of the unused tax credits of the Western Hemisphere trade corporation members of an affiliated group was warranted where they were applied against U.S. tax on income realized by the non-Western Hemisphere trade corporation members of the group from sources within the same countries in which the Western Hemisphere corporations realized the principal part of their income. This seemed to be particularly true where the Western Hemisphere trade corporations producing the income were regulated public utilities and therefore not competitive with domestic enterprises.

Accordingly, under the conference agreement, any unused tax credits of the Western Hemisphere trade corporation members of the group, if they are regulated public utilities, are permitted to offset the U.S. tax on the income of other group members who are not Western Hemisphere trade corporations provided the income realized by the non-Western Hemisphere trade corporation group members is derived from sources within the countries in which the Western Hemisphere trade corporation members of the group, which are public utilities, realize the principal part of their income. However, to further restrict the application of this provision to public utility-type income, 80 percent or more of the

gross income of the non-Western Hemisphere trade corporation members, against which the excess taxes are credited, must be derived from or by regulated public utilities.

The other body also made three substantive amendments to H.R. 10087 which were not related to the general effect of that bill as it was passed by the House.

The first of these amendments added a new provision under which the gross income of certain employees of nonprofit corporations formed by the Atomic Energy Commission to operate scientific laboratories would not include any reimbursed moving expenses incurred after 1949 and before enactment of this bill unless such employees were advised that such reimbursed expenses would be includible on their gross incomes. This amendment also provided that a refund or credit of an overpayment resulting from the application of this provision would not be barred by any rule of law—with certain exceptions as to closing agreements and compromises—if an appropriate claim therefor was filed within 6 months after enactment. However, no interest would be allowable with respect to any such credit or refund.

Under the conference agreement, the provision added by amendment made by the other body is generally retained but only applies to amounts received before October 1, 1955—rather than before the date of enactment. Furthermore, it only applies where the employees were advised—either expressly or by direct implication—at the time of employment by an authorized official that such reimbursed moving expenses would not be includible in the gross income.

The second amendment made by the other body which was not related to the bill in the form in which it was passed by the House added a new section 6038 to the Internal Revenue Code which required domestic corporations that have 50-percent control of a foreign corporation to file certain information required by forms and regulations of the Treasury. This also applies to a subsidiary of such a foreign corporation where the foreign corporation has a 50-percent interest in the subsidiary. The failure to file this information within the prescribed time would preclude any person from obtaining a tax credit for foreign taxes paid by such foreign corporation—or foreign subsidiary—for years for which the domestic corporation failed to furnish the required information.

Under the conference agreement, the new section 6038 was substantially revised. As revised, this section specifies in more detail the information which the Treasury may by regulation require to be furnished by the domestic corporation, concerning any foreign corporation it controls—or any of such foreign corporation's subsidiaries. The information required with respect to the annual accounting period of the foreign corporation or its foreign subsidiaries must be furnished in the time and manner prescribed by Treasury regulations but only if such regulations were in effect on the first day of such annual accounting period.

If the domestic corporation in control of the foreign corporation—or its subsidiary—fails to timely file the required information without reasonable cause, then in applying the foreign tax credit provisions to such corporations—or its successors in interest to the particular stock involved—the amount of the taxes paid or deemed paid by each foreign corporation—and subsidiary—during the accounting period or periods for which the domestic corporation was required to furnish information for the taxable year of the failure is to be reduced by 10 percent. If the failure continues 90 days or more after notice by the Secretary or his delegate, the reduction is 10 percent plus 5 percent for each 3-month period or part thereof during which this failure continues after the 90-day period. However, no taxes shall be reduced more than once for the same failure. This reduction of the foreign tax credit by 10 percent—with subsequent reductions of 5 percent—is in lieu of the other body's penalty which would have denied the credit altogether in such cases. Moreover, the conference agreement applies the penalty only to those who failed to file the return, and not to minority stockholders not required to supply the new information.

The new section 6038 applies with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1960, with respect to information for the annual accounting period of a foreign corporation—or foreign subsidiary—beginning after that date.

The third amendment made by the other body which was not related to the provisions of the House bill, would modify section 6046 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, which at present requires the filing of certain information returns by attorneys, accountants, and other persons who render assistance or advice in the formation or reorganization of foreign corporations. This section has had little practical effect today in obtaining the information required on these returns. In part this is because the attorneys, accountants, and other professional aids consider this information to be privileged communications with clients which could not be disclosed without violating a confidential professional relationship. Also, the section now has little practical effect because the persons required to file the returns disclaim any knowledge of the substantive information required.

As amended by the other body, section 6046 is designed to achieve greater success in obtaining the information sought as to foreign corporate organizations or reorganizations by requiring returns by citizens and residents of the United States who are officers or directors of the organizations within 60 days after their creation or organization. Reporting is also required by every U.S. shareholder who owns at least 5 percent of the stock within such period. These persons are the ones who are most likely to have the required information at hand and they have no professional reasons for not disclosing it. This amendment was retained and is to be effective with respect to foreign corporations created, organized, or reorganized after enactment.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I join my distinguished committee chairman and esteemed friend from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] in urging the House adoption of the conference report on H.R. 10087. This legislation pertains to the taxation of income derived from abroad.

Under existing law income taxes paid to a foreign country may be taken as a credit against income taxes otherwise due the United States. This credit for income taxes paid abroad dates from 1918 in our Federal tax structure and was designed to eliminate double taxation of income. Prior to 1918 a deduction from gross income had been allowed for foreign income taxes. Under the existing law provisions a so-called per country limitation is applicable so that the taxes paid in each foreign country which may be taken as a credit against U.S. tax are limited to the same proportion of the U.S. tax before the credit which the income from that foreign country is of the taxpayer's total taxable income.

The first limitation on the foreign tax credit which was adopted in 1921, was an overall limitation in effect permitting the aggregation of foreign income and the aggregation of foreign tax credits in making the computation. Under the overall limitation the foreign taxes were put in one combined tax-basket and the domestic taxes were put in another tax-basket and the one was offset against the other. The 1932 Revenue Act added the per-country limitation whereunder a separate tax-basket is provided with respect to foreign income from each foreign country. It is the purpose of the overall limitation and the per-country limitation to prevent U.S. tax on domestic income from being reduced by foreign tax rates which are higher than U.S. tax rates. The 1954 code eliminated the overall limitation so that since the enactment of the 1954 law only the per-country limitation has been available.

By making the overall limitation available as provided in H.R. 10087 we will be allowing a U.S. taxpayer to treat his domestic business as one operation and his foreign business as another operation and to average together the high and low taxes of the various countries in which he may be operating by using the overall limitation. To an extent we will through the adoption of the overall limitation be equalizing the tax on foreign operations generally with the tax treatment which is already available in the case of the so-called foreign-base corporation or foreign subsidiary serving as a holding company.

H.R. 10087 in its House-passed form allowed a taxpayer to shift initially from the per-country limitation to the overall limitation at any time. After the initial shift a new election would be available after a 5-year interval or at an earlier date if the taxpayer had permission from the Treasury Department. The Senate modified this election privilege to provide that the taxpayer has discretion to make the initial shift from

one basis to the other basis but a change, once the initial election is made, can be made only with the consent of the Treasury Department. The House conferees accepted this Senate amendment.

The House and Senate versions also differed with respect to the carryover provisions affecting the treatment of excess credits. The House and Senate versions differed in the way in which such excess credits could be carried back or forward from a year in which the per-country limitation was used to a year in which the overall limitation was used. The House conferees agreed to the Senate version.

The House conferees as a general rule accepted a Senate amendment having to do with the allowance of foreign tax credits in the case of consolidated returns. This rule would deny, where the overall limitation is used, the right to credit foreign taxes paid by a Western Hemisphere trade corporation against U.S. taxes on income attributable to corporations in the same affiliated group which are not Western Hemisphere trade corporations. This restriction applies only with respect to the special 14-point tax differential available to these Western Hemisphere trade corporations. The House conferees provided an exception to this general rule where income is earned by members of the consolidated group which are not Western Hemisphere trade corporations in the same countries from which the Western Hemisphere trade corporations derive their principal income. However, this is provided only if the Western Hemisphere trade corporations are also regulated public utilities. Moreover, the income of the other companies against which the excess Western Hemisphere trade corporation taxes are applied must be derived to the extent of 80 percent from public utility sources. It is intended that all income derived from a non-utility company in an affiliated group from scientific, technical, engineering, management, and other similar services rendered to regulated public utilities shall qualify as income derived from the regulated public utilities for purposes of the 80-percent rule.

The effect of this amendment to H.R. 10087, as agreed to by the conferees, is to permit the separate aggregation of all income and all tax credits in countries, taken together in one group, in which affiliated companies have Western Hemisphere trade corporations included in a consolidated tax return, provided such Western Hemisphere trade corporations are public utilities in accordance with certain parts of section 1503 of the code.

Thus this amendment allows affiliated companies filing a consolidated tax return to aggregate the income and tax credits earned in the countries wherein Western Hemisphere trade corporations, which are also regulated public utilities, derive the principal part of their income. This grouping would include all income from sources in countries in which there are Western Hemisphere trade corporations if the tests of this bill are met. However, none of these excess credits within the range of 38 percent to 52 percent could offset the U.S. tax on income from other countries either inside or outside the Western Hemisphere. Thus the income and tax credits from countries in which the affiliated companies do not have Western Hemisphere trade corporations would be aggregated separately. The total of the tax credits allowable under the two groupings would not exceed the amount of credits allowable under the overall limitation under section 904(a)(2).

Another Senate amendment which was accepted by the House conferees with modification concerned new information returns to be required of foreign corporations and the subsidiaries which are controlled by domestic corporations.

The Senate also provided that where individuals are reimbursed for moving expenses in certain cases involving scientific laboratories established on a nonprofit basis to work with the Atomic Energy Commission, the reimbursement need not be included in income for tax purposes. Your conferees accepted this amendment with modification.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the conference agreement.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRIBUTE TO HON. WINT SMITH

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to one of our Members who will not, because of his decision to retire, be with the Members of Congress who meet in the 87th Congress—our colleague and good friend, WINT SMITH of the Sixth District of Kansas.

Farewells always harbor a certain sense of sadness, but there is also a brightness associated with reflections, and so I am quickly led to think of my associations with WINT in the House of Representatives and on the House Committee on Agriculture on which we both serve.

The first impression that one gets of WINT is that he is a big man, big of physical being. The second impression is even more profound—and this is gained only after one gets to know him through daily association—and it is that he is big not only physically but mentally and spiritually as well.

WINT, I think we will all agree, epitomizes the true conservative legislator, adhering, as he does, to those time-tested principles which have withstood the acid of the ages.

One quickly finds that there is something of the Kansas plains in WINT SMITH, for he has a ruggedness of character about him that permits him to stand unflinching and unyielding. A man of firm conviction, he is not easily swayed from his course of thought nor ever led to surrender up principle on the altar of expediency. Consistency is WINT SMITH's trademark, and one can always be certain just where he will stand on any particular issue.

Coming from a great wheat-producing section, WINT has an intimate familiarity with the problems of the wheat farmer. Equipped with such an understanding, he is never hesitant to champion the cause of the wheat farmer either in the House Committee on Agriculture or on the floor of the House of Representatives.

WINT SMITH preceded me in the Congress, having been elected to the 80th Congress on November 5, 1946. Subsequently, he was reelected to the 81st, 82d, 83d, 84th, 85th, and 86th Congresses.

During my association with him I have grown to know him and to respect him, holding high the value of his counsel and advice. I quickly found him to be the strong, silent type of individual, but discovered that he is not without words when something need be said. And as one gets to know him, he finds this out swiftly, so when he speaks one listens, and when one listens he learns.

As WINT SMITH leaves these Legislative Chambers, the Sixth District of Kansas loses an able, a sound, and a vigorous Representative in the Congress. But, as a consoling feature the district also gains an eminently solid citizen.

As WINT leaves the House of Representatives, he will be missed by his colleagues, for both Republicans and Democrats alike will freely admit that he has made a real contribution to our legislative body, a contribution that will become all the more apparent in his absence.

As the curtain fast falls on the 86th Congress and on WINT SMITH's career in the House of Representatives, WINT must be touched with at least a tinge of regret, for it is not easy to break a cord so well and strongly tied.

But as he leaves he takes with him a rich store of memories from which he can generously draw in the future. So fortified, he can look to tomorrow with hope and into yesterday with pure pleasure.

This wish I extend WINT as he leaves us: May the harvest of your future years be filled with the rich fruits that always spring from the productive seed of honest and earnest effort.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McINTIRE. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I want to commend the gentleman for taking this time this afternoon to pay tribute to WINT SMITH. I want to join in this expression of our affection for our colleague from Kansas, and of our sincere regret over his retirement from the House. I was very disappointed when I learned that WINT SMITH had decided to leave Congress. His retirement is a distinct loss, not alone to his district and to the State of Kansas,

but to the entire Nation. Men of the type of WINT SMITH are needed in public life today as never before.

Mr. Speaker, I greatly enjoyed and appreciated the friendship of WINT SMITH. I admired his sterling qualities and his rugged individualism. I found him to be a true and a loyal friend, and I shall always be grateful to him for his many acts of kindness.

WINT SMITH was independent in thought and action. He voted his convictions and followed the course that he thought was for the best interests of our Nation. I always enjoyed a visit with him, whether in his office, on the floor, or at a baseball game. He was a fine companion and we spent many happy hours together.

I take this opportunity to wish WINT SMITH much happiness in the years ahead, and success in all of his plans for the future. I hope that our paths cross frequently. Mrs. Chenoweth joins me in extending our very best wishes to both Mrs. Smith and WINT.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McINTIRE. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. AVERY. I certainly want to be associated with the tributes that are being paid to my colleague from Kansas, who is retiring from the Sixth District, Mr. WINT SMITH.

I have been faced with a rather serious problem in the last few days, since I am the remaining Member from Kansas on the Republican side who will be a candidate for reelection, and I wanted to have proper time to pay tribute to my retiring collegues from Kansas, Mr. REES, from the Fourth District, and Mr. WINT SMITH. I had hoped that Mr. SMITH could have been present in order to hear the remarks that are to be made this afternoon in his behalf. I do not know of anyone who has been a Member of this body since I have been a Member who has stood more solidly for the principles in which he believes than has the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SMITH].

Although I was not always in agreement with him—very frankly, of course, I was frequently in disagreement with him—nevertheless, I always respected WINT for the position he took. I knew it was taken only after full consideration of all the points and arguments that had been presented. Certainly anybody who knew WINT at all would know that he was not swayed by any influence of any special interest group in the conclusions he came to. They were developed entirely within his own mind upon the facts that had been presented to him or knowledge he may have had of the subject.

So. Mr. Speaker, he will certainly be missed from this body in the succeeding Congresses. I know his district well. I feel that his successor will reflect the same philosophic view, although probably not in complete agreement with him.

While WINT served recently on the Committee on Agriculture, yet during the first part of his congressional service he worked in the field of labor and education. Any Member who has served on that committee with WINT certainly knows to be true what I have said, that when he took a position it was based strictly upon facts as he knew them; and after his position was taken he remained immovable, oblivious of any pressure that might be applied.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased now to yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have the opportunity to express my appreciation of and respect for our colleague, the gentleman from Kansas, [Mr. WINT SMITH.] I have had the privilege of serving with him on the Committee on the District of Columbia. I have found him to be one of the foundation stones of good legislation in this body. He is a tower of strength. He is a man who not only has served his country honorably, well, and with great distinction in time of war, but his contribution in this legislative body has been one of the greatest that has come within my acquaintance during the time I have been here. I regard him as a great man and a great American. I deeply regret to see him leave this body, and my best wishes go with him.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to be able to join with the gentleman from Maine and others in paying tribute to one of the stoutest Americans I have ever known in the Congress of the United States, WINT SMITH. He is a man of character; he is a man of courage; he is a man of conviction. He has served his country well in many fields. He will be missed in the years ahead, I am sure.

I also want to take this opportunity, if I may, Mr. Speaker, to join with those who yesterday paid tribute to another great Kansan, who is leaving this body, the Honorable ED REES. I have never known a finer Christian gentleman or finer legislator in all the years I have been here, than ED REES. He, too, will be missed. With these two great individuals, these two great Americans from Kansas leaving this body, there will be indeed created here a great vacancy that will be hard and difficult to fill.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to join with the rest of the Members in paying tribute to WINT SMITH and ED REES. It has been my pleasure to know both these gentleman since I came to Congress, and I know the outstanding service WINT SMITH has rendered to the Nation in both World War I and World War II. Not only that, but he also has an outstanding record in the State of Kansas.

While I did not serve on a committee with WINT SMITH I recognize that he studied each problem and arrived at the conclusion he felt best and that he had the nerve and the courage to stand up and cast his vote as he analyzed each particular piece of legislation submitted to him. I know we shall miss him in the future.

I hope both he and Mr. REES enjoy their retirement to the great State of Kansas and continue their great interests in that State.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to recognize the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KEARNS].

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with my colleagues in recognition of the work of this great statesman, WINT SMITH of Kansas. I had the privilege of serving with him on the Labor Committee during those trying days when we were writing the Taft-Hartley law. He was one of the mainstays of good sound labor legislation all during his stay here.

We regretted it when he left our committee to go to the Committee on Agriculture. We were the losers, the other committee gained a great statesman.

At this time I would like to pay great tribute to ED REES, who has been a neighbor of mine on the same floor during all of the years I have been here. He has served his country well and deserves the fine retirement he will enjoy in the years to come.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McINTIRE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, as this session of Congress draws to a close, I find it increasingly difficult to become reconciled to the fact that my good friend, WINT SMITH, is voluntarily leaving the House of Representatives.

I know of no man in public life more endowed with those great virtues of personal integrity and courage. Once convinced of the proper course to pursue he never wavered, even though that course was sometimes unpopular in the view of certain people.

WINT SMITH has a long and enviable record of military service and I am sure that from this service to his country has stemmed, in part, his resolute determination that this constitutional government be preserved at all cost.

WINT SMITH is a great American, a true patriot, and a splendid public servant. Even though I deeply regret his decision to retire, I am confident he will continue to give of his talents to his State and Nation.

May both Mr. and Mrs. Smith find a full measure of health and happiness in the days to come.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McINTIRE. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, I have received much inspiration from the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SMITH]. He is a great statesman, he exemplifies everything that is fine. Every action of his has been in the interest of his State and country. No wonder we are going to miss him. I wish for him and his family the very best always.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McINTIRE. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman and also

thank him for taking this time so that we may pay tribute to our fine colleague, WINT SMITH, of Kansas.

I have known WINT SMITH since my young manhood. This is the second day in a row that I have had the privilege of paying tribute to two Members of Congress who have been friends of my father. WINT SMITH, when I first knew him, was head of the Kansas Highway Patrol. My father was in politics in Kansas at the time. My father and WINT were friends and associates.

Since coming to the Congress I have had many occasions to be grateful to WINT for the help he has given to me so freely. As a matter of fact, the reason I became a member of the Committee on Education and Labor of the House was because WINT SMITH one day asked me if I would be willing to do so. I said I would, and have never regretted that.

This is a man who has integrity that is almost beyond depth. I do not know any way that you could express in words the type of integrity which is possessed by WINT. Suffice it to say, whenever he said he would be in a certain position you always knew that he would be there. You never had to look for him.

To me it will be a great loss to the House of Representatives and the country to have WINT SMITH retire to private life. But I do wish for WINT and Mrs. Smith on behalf of my family and myself the best of everything in the years to come in the full knowledge that they have contributed tremendously to the welfare of their country, their State, and their district.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McINTIRE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to say a few words on behalf of WINT SMITH, who is voluntarily leaving the House of Representatives. It has been a real pleasure not only to know him but to work with him. I would interpret WINT SMITH as being one of those individuals we might refer to as a rugged individual. For that he has had my wholesome respect at all times. He is a man of great ability, a man of character, a man of determination and conviction. He is the type of individual we do not like to see leave the public service which he so ably rendered in this House.

Not only was he a credit to the people of his own State but certainly to the Nation. He will be sorely missed here. But, those of us who have known him for so many years hope that he will have a most wonderful life in retirement and do the things he would like to do and enjoy both health and prosperity as the days go by. His district will always remember him as a man who served his country ably and well.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCULLOCH].

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I, too, am sorry that WINT SMITH has decided to voluntarily retire from the Congress. Both his State and his Nation will miss him. In my opinion, WINT SMITH was a great conservative in accordance with the best traditions of America. And, I am sure that every vote that WINT SMITH cast on the floor of the House or in the committees on which he served was in defense of the spirit and substance of American liberty. I repeat, he will be missed by his State and by his Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to join, too, in paying tribute to ED REES, who was, when I came here, chairman of that great Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. In those intricate subjects he was a master; he was my expert. All the time that I have been here I turned to him for advice in those fields. He was a good legislator, as well as an effective legislator. His State and the Nation will miss him, too.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to join the gentleman from Maine [Mr. McINTIRE], and other colleagues, particularly those on the Committee on Agriculture, in this tribute to a great American and a distinguished and fine member of our committee and of this House and a personal friend of mine. Congressman WINT SMITH is, as many have already said, a rugged, real American in every sense of the term. He is a man whose word is as good as his bond. He has contributed much to this House. He is a person who pays tremendous attention to duty. I had the pleasure of going to Bogotá, Colombia, last year with WINT to a hearing conducted by our agricultural attachés from Latin America. It was a long and tiresome meeting, lasting several days, all day long every day I recall that WINT spent every minute and every hour of every day on the job on what some might term a junket. He put his heart into everything he did.

Mr. Speaker, I was not on the floor yesterday, and if the gentleman will indulge me just a moment, I would like also to say in wishing WINT well that I wish the distinguished gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES], a long and useful life in retirement. It was my honor and privilege to serve on his committee in the 80th Congress when he was chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. He was an able, distinguished, and fair chairman. He has been of great service to this House and to this country.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. DIXON].

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, for 2 years I have had the honor of sitting immediately next to General SMITH on the Committee on Agriculture. He has taught me much about American principles. He has taught me more of unswerving allegiance to those principles. He has one question, Is that an American principle? And, if it is, he stands for it regardless of consequences. I have a great affection for this wonderful gentleman, soldier, and Representative, WINT SMITH, and shall always retain my affection and respect for him.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McINTIRE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, courage is at least of two kinds. There is that courage which inspires one to meet physical combat. WINT's war record is ample proof that he possessed that in immeasurable degree.

Then there is the moral courage which enables a man to stand up when criticized, when it comes thick and fast, untrue and without reason. And WINT had that. Though grievously hurt, he never faltered.

It was my privilege to serve with him as a member of the Committee on Education and Labor at the same time when it was my privilege to be chairman of the Committee on Government Operations. At that time the question of the need of an investigation of the activities of labor union leaders and racketeers came up. Extortionists were raising "heck" with our constitutional liberties. There was the question at that time as to which committee of the Congress had jurisdiction to make investigations, hold hearings. The Committee on Government Operations has jurisdiction over everything. Its jurisdiction runs across that of every other House committee, something which perhaps should not be permitted to continue.

Our committee appointed a three-man committee to investigate the question of whether the racketeers were in control of labor organizations. It was my privilege to be chairman of the committee. We induced the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. McConnell, to appoint a like committee of three members, which gave us five members, because it happened that it was my privilege to be a member of both committees. In that way we avoided the question of jurisdiction which had caused so much trouble in the other body and which finally ended there by the creation of the McClelland committee which has done a remarkable job.

At my request, WINT was named chairman of the joint committee and he began investigations in Detroit and elsewhere which, had they been permitted to continue, would have given us a much earlier light on the necessity for legislation disassociating the racketeers from the labor movement.

However, the author of "The Enemy Within," Bob Kennedy, took occasion in the very first pages of that publication to charge that WINT SMITH ended those hearings. There was absolutely no foundation for that statement. I know what I am talking about. This is not hearsay. There was no foundation whatever for that statement which was a vicious and a wicked one. The reason I know is because the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor limited and gave WINT his orders. WINT was forced to obey his chairman. The statement that was carried in that book that WINT came back from a telephone conversation at Detroit and then closed those hearings on his own is absolutely false. He did not do it on his own volition. He did it because he was told that the authority of the committee would be taken

from him if he did not limit those hearings at that particular point. Other witnesses had been subpenaed but were not permitted to testify. I say that that was a vicious and unjust charge made against WINT. It could not help but hurt. WINT did not complain. Like the soldier that he was, he took it.

As to its effect, it had none among those who knew WINT, as we all did. He was a man of unequaled courage, dignity, and patriotism.

Mr. Speaker, I was not here yesterday when tribute was paid to our colleague, ED REES, of the Fourth District of Kansas.

When it was my privilege to come here 25 years ago, our colleague was a distinguished Member of this body. His office was on the east side of the New House Office Building, and the striking thing I soon observed was that, late at night, there was a light in his window, and our colleague, long after he should have been resting, was at work.

My hope, never attained, was to equal—I knew I could not excel—his record for able, continuous patriotic service to his people and the country. His friendship and encouragement were invaluable. He was an encyclopedia of information, and he never lacked courage to express his views.

I join, too, in the tribute paid to him a few days ago.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I join with those who have spoken of the stature of WINT SMITH, of Kansas.

A great soldier, legislator, statesman, and most of all a wonderful friend. My service in the House has been made more enjoyable by WINT SMITH.

Most of all, Mr. Speaker, WINT SMITH has been a fine American; his country is better today because of him.

I wish him well and trust he shall visit with us often so that we may be able to have his sound judgment and sage advice.

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, I regret that our distinguished colleague from Kansas, the Honorable WINT SMITH, has seen fit to retire and thus terminate his service in the House of Representatives, but I am glad to join with my other colleagues in paying tribute to him in testimony of the high type of public service which he has rendered to the people of his State and Nation. I have known Congressman SMITH ever since I became a Member of this body and knew him beforehand by reputation. He is a patriotic American citizen, whose heart is attuned to the highest public good. He has the capacity to know the right from the wrong and, what is more, he has the courage to do the right even though at the time it may seem unpopular. WINT SMITH enjoys and is thoroughly established in the confidence and the esteem of his colleagues because of his sturdiness of character, his dependability, and his firm determination to keep our Government and our country on a sound basis. Too many of our public men of the present generation are more concerned with their own political preferment rather than the best interest of the country. We need more men of the type of WINT SMITH and I am saddened that he is leaving the Congress. I do hope that the judgment and the wisdom of the people of the great district which he represents will be such as to cause them to send a worthy successor as Representative of that district.

I have served for the past several years as Vice Chairman of the Civil War Centennial Commission and during that time WINT SMITH has served as chairman of the executive committee. I have watched him as he goes about the performance of his public duties with great interest and admiration. He is high minded and fearless, but gentle in his approach so that he never needlessly offends or wounds the feelings of others.

The ties of friendship existing between the gentleman from Kansas and myself are closing and binding. I shall ever cherish the memory of my associations with him, and the patriotic manner in which he has discharged his duties as a Representative in the Congress is of such a nature as to be of an inspiration to me. I wish him and his family all happiness in his retirement.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MCINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the life and services of Congressman WINT SMITH.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I join my colleagues in honoring the Honorable WINT SMITH, of Kansas, my good friend and neighbor, who is leaving Washington but not his life of service to his fellow men.

I have known and admired WINT SMITH ever since coming to Washington. I have admired his devotion to duty and his devotion to principles. But, Mr. Speaker, our association has not always been solely in the realm of legislative and political friendship. WINT SMITH and I have shared a love of sports and particularly baseball. In fact, on occasions he and I have joined at lunch with the star outfielder for the Washington Senators, Bob Allison. Those were indeed memorable events.

WINT SMITH is a man highly regarded by his colleagues. Those who were of the opposite political faith admired him for his devotion to principle. Those of us who felt as he did on many issues admire him as a dogged and determined fighter for those principles. He could not be and would not be swayed from the course if he felt he was steering a proper course based on principle.

Those principles were simple and fundamental to America or to any democracy.

One was freedom.

He feels that all Americans should be free to choose their own way of life. He does not feel that the Government should step in to guide them in the long course from cradle to grave, to counsel them at every turn and to dictate their every move.

He believes, too, that a bankrupt nation can do nothing for its people. A bankrupt nation, he feels, could neither protect itself nor stand as a bulwark against the aggression of world communism.

For that reason, WINT SMITH has always voted for the sound dollar. He has always voted against wasteful programs which fritter away the national resources.

He does not believe that as a nation we can spend ourselves rich. He does not feel that as a nation we can get something for nothing. He does not feel that the Government can give anything to anybody which it first has not taken from somebody.

For these reasons he scrutinized carefully every spending bill that came before the Congress. He looked painstakingly and with a skeptical eye at every new program which was offered to give somebody something. Somebody, he knew, had to pay for it. And all too often the somebody who was supposed to be getting something was the very same person who wound up paying for what he got—only a little more that somehow managed to wind up in the Washington bureaucracy.

In another area WINT SMITH has fought hard.

And that is for the American farmers.

WINT has told me many times that too many of the farm ideas generated here in Washington were conceived by people who did not know anything about farming. And WINT SMITH is a man who knows. He is a farmer and rancher. He is a good one, too. He has made farming pay and feels that, given a proper break, all farmers can make a good, honest and prideful living from the soil.

Mr. Speaker, WINT SMITH has decided not to seek reelection to the House of Representatives. This was his own decision and one which we, his friends tried to persuade him not to make. However, the decision has been made and he will not be here next year.

WINT SMITH will be sorely missed in the House. His words of caution will be missed by all of those serving here. And I, for one, will very much miss his wise counsel and advice and his helping hand. I also will miss the presence of a good and valued friend.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, WINT SMITH is one of the truly outstanding soldier-statesmen of our time. WINT SMITH as a soldier served his Nation and the free world with honor and distinction. The climax of his military contribution was reached when, with a handful of men, he stopped the German Ardennes drive cold in his sector in December 1944. WINT SMITH by superior ability, determination, and courage rose to the high rank of brigadier general. As a military man, WINT SMITH was a great admirer and believer in the strategy and policies of Douglas MacArthur, Al Wedemeyer, and the late Gen. George Patton. I remember visiting Gen. Douglas MacArthur in New York City with WINT SMITH. I remember well the affection, respect, and admiration General MacArthur held for WINT SMITH not only as a Congressman but as a soldier.

As a Congressman, WINT SMITH is a statesman always putting the welfare of the United States ahead of party and personal consideration. He is an Ameri-

can whose courage and foresight are reminiscent of the Founding Fathers of the Republic. WINT SMITH has always been absolutely fearless. He would not compromise principle. He fought here in the Congress untiringly and unceasingly for the Constitution, for the free enterprise system, for States rights, for his farm people, and to preserve the individual liberties of all of our people. He expressed confidence in the people's ability to govern at the local level. In his deliberations here he emphasized frugality, thrift, and independence for the individual as well as for the Federal Government. WINT SMITH was not afraid to stand alone. He would not hesitate to oppose his party when he thought the party wrong. He was not sectional but fought endlessly for the whole Nation. As a Congressman, he ranks with the very best in history; and in my 12 years in this body, I have never known or associated with a more patriotic, forthright, and able individual.

WINT SMITH has always fought communism above and beyond the call of duty. He could be found in his office Saturday afternoons and holidays thinking and working against this growing menace to our civilization. WINT SMITH realized early that appeasement and coexistence is the road to destruction. Many years ago he foresaw that this evil would even surpass the menace of fascism and nazism. He realized its worldwide revolutionary intent and its utter ruthlessness. WINT SMITH was never duped and hoodwinked by the liberals and pinks who so often advanced the cause of communism.

WINT SMITH's efforts have been and are an inspiration to me. WINT SMITH will never retire from the arena. He will always fight for oldtime Americanism. He will fight communism, atheism, and centralization of our Government. I rank him in a very special category with Douglas MacArthur and the late Bob Taft as one of the very greatest men I have ever known. While I am going to miss him here in Congress, I know he will be standing up for freedom, liberty, and justice in his beloved Kansas.

Mrs. Dorn and my family join me in wishing for WINT SMITH and Mrs. Smith every future success and much happiness.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret that my dear friend and colleague, WINT SMITH, is retiring from the Congress at the end of this session. I have enjoyed my close association with him as a member of the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives. He was most faithful in attendance at committee meetings and he contributed much to committee discussion and in the enactment of farm legislation.

WINT SMITH is a rugged individualist who thoroughly believes in the Constitution and the free enterprise system. Honest, sincere, and firm in his convictions, he is the kind of a Congressman whom we hate to lose. Now that he voluntarily seeks retirement, he has my best wishes for good health, happiness, and success in the days that lie ahead.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, a number of years ago the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SMITH] was my football coach and I have known him for many years.

At one time, Congressman SMITH resided in my home city of Kansas City, where he practiced law with the Honorable C. Clyde Myers, now a city judge.

When I first came to Congress, the gentleman from Kansas did not hesitate to advise and counsel with me, for which I was very grateful.

Although of the opposite political faith, frequently we agree on fundamental issues and I have never known of one instance where the gentleman from Kansas failed to take a stand, regardless of the consequences.

To this soldier-statesman goes my admiration and esteem and I join with his colleagues on both sides of the aisle in wishing he and Mrs. Smith a grand and glorious future.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I share the deep regard of my colleagues who have spoken in tribute to WINT SMITH over his decision voluntarily to retire from this House.

Both as a military officer and as a Member of this House, WINT SMITH had occasion many times to take the oath of office in which he swore to "defend the Constitution against all enemies, foreign and domestic."

No man ever took that oath with greater sincerity and integrity of purpose, and no man was ever more diligent and dedicated in his devotion to that solemn commitment.

Defense of the Constitution of the United States was and is a very real and compelling obligation in the mind and heart of WINT SMITH.

I recall, as I am sure many of my colleagues do, occasions on which a discussion of some constitutional point arose in personal conversation with WINT SMITH. Invariably he would reach into his pocket and pull therefrom a small vest pocket edition of the Constitution which gave evidence of being often and well used.

In his brilliant service as an army officer, in his steadfast dedication to basic constitutional principles in this House, and most particularly in his persistent and unrelenting hostility to the vicious forces of international and domestic communism, WINT SMITH demonstrated over and over again his unqualified devotion to the Constitution and its defense.

For the privilege of his friendship and of service with him in this House, I shall always be deeply grateful.

Mrs. Johansen joins me in every good wish to Congressman and Mrs. Smith in the years ahead.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. McCORMACK. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain reports.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill S. 3018.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

COMMUTER SERVICE ON THE LONG ISLAND RAIL ROAD

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the Long Island commuter has not yet recovered from the 25-day strike by the employees of the Long Island Rail Road and he is threatened again, this time by a strike which not only will tie up the Long Island Rail Road but the entire Pennsylvania system.

The American people are sick and tired of the arrogance and public-be-damned attitude portrayed by Michael J. Quill, of the Transport Workers Union.

The excessive and unjustified financial burden, tremendous loss of time, expenditure of effort, harassment, and untold personal losses threaten again to be the lot of the hapless, helpless commuter. In the strike threatened for September 1, once again the commuter is in no way involved in the conflict between the carrier and Mike Quill, but he, the commuter, will be the one who will suffer most and profit nothing. And in the end, he will be the one who is going to pay out of his own pocket, whatever the cost of a strike may be. Whether he can afford it or not, he will foot the bill.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. BECKER] and I have introduced legislation offering help to the commuter. It proposes a sound, sensible solution. If the Congress will act on it, strikes such as that Long Island has just suffered, and that now threatened, will no longer be necessary and the railroad worker will be helped immeasurably—labor negotiations will have taken a long step forward.

With our proposal enacted into law, the commuter will be served, the railroad worker will be on his job, enjoying the full benefits of effective negotiation as well as his full salary.

Our proposal encourages voluntary arbitration and adjustment of dispute between carrier and employee. If such effort should prove unsuccessful, it provides for the creation of an impartial presidential board to investigate and decide the factors of the dispute. This decision will be binding.

In addition, protection is given both carrier and employee if it is indicated that the report does not conform to the requirements laid down by the Railway Labor Act, or if it does not conform to

the issues of the controversy, or if any member of the board is guilty of corruption or fraud.

Assistance to the people has been long delayed. The time to act is now.

CONGRESSMAN BECKER SPEAKS ON COMPULSORY ARBITRATION

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in two instances at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I have been reading the newspapers and am shocked to learn of a possibility of a strike of employees of the Pennsylvania Railroad. While the Pennsylvania Railroad does not operate within my Congressional District of Long Island, it is connected very vitally with the Long Island Rail Road, particularly in that the Long Island Rail Road trains must use the Pennsylvania terminal in New York City. On checking this matter, I am informed that the Pennsylvania Station would be closed to Long Island trains and, therefore, a strike of the Pennsylvania Railroad would cause the shutting down of the Long Island Rail Road.

Mr. Speaker, only a short while ago, we had a most devastating Long Island Rail Road strike that was in effect for 25 days. This forced some 200,000 commuters to reach their places of business in New York City and elsewhere by overcrowded buses and subways and driving their own cars each day. This method of transportation took tens of thousands of people sometimes 2 and 3 hours to reach their destination, either to business or coming home. The physical and mental torture suffered by Long Islanders, caused by the strike, can never be fully evaluated.

Therefore, a possible strike that would shut down the Long Island Rail Road again, indirectly through a strike of the Pennsylvania Railroad, is almost unthinkable. For this reason, my colleague from Nassau County, Congressman STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN from the Second District, and I introduced H.R. 13063 and H.R. 13061, respectively, on August 22, 1960, providing legislation calling for compulsory arbitration of railway disputes.

The bills would remedy present faults of the existing Railway Labor Act: First, they would set up machinery to get a decision on a dispute relative to wages and conditions; second, provide for a special Presidential Board to be appointed if dispute is not settled in 15 days and its report to be enforcible against both the railroad and the employees; third, the report may be impeached in the district courts in 30 days if found to be faulty; fourth, the proposals outlaw all strikes and lockouts under the Railway Labor Act with penalties for persons guilty of such activity; fifth, they authorize the district courts to issue injunctions against violations and threatened violations.

When a railroad strike occurs, it is not just between labor and management, the people are the ones most seriously injured. No employer or employee has the right to bring essential transportation to a halt. The bills will not interfere with the agreements between labor and management on wages or working conditions. Rather, they would set up an orderly method for arbitration and mediation, and promote speedy and just settlements.

Under this legislation, there would be no hindrance to labor or management in the exercise of their rights. No one can contend that there is any attempt in this legislation to restrict the rights of labor or management. It is designed only to preserve the rights of the public who find it necessary to use the railroads and thereby support the people who run them.

Mr. Speaker, I realize it is late in the session, but I urge that emergency action be taken to prevent another railway strike such as that of the recent Long Island Rail Road 25-day strike.

APPOINTMENTS TO MILITARY ACADEMIES

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, as have other Members of Congress, I had the privilege of selecting the highest caliber of young men for appointment to our various military academies. All of them have made good and are not only a credit to their country but to themselves and their families.

One of the finest young men I appointed to the Air Force Academy, in 1956, unfortunately, was honorably discharged due to physical condition that arose in his first year, something entirely out of his control. Having met with him after he returned home, I know how badly he felt, as if the world had dropped out from under him. Then I lost contact for awhile.

A few weeks ago I received a letter from him, datelined Israel, July 17, 1960, and I thought it was one of the finest things I had ever read. Not only does he deal with his appointment to the Air Force Academy, with his illness and eventual honorable discharge, but with the years that have transpired since that date. As he talks of trying to "find himself," he unfolds the story of how eventually he went to Israel. He paints a realistic picture of Israel, what he has found there in the past year, and expresses feelings that have generated in him for his own country, the United States. What it has taught him and how it has prepared him to meet the future.

I thought this was such a remarkable letter that I wrote and asked his permission to insert this in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that people all over this Nation, young and old alike, could read the expressions of this very wonderful young man. I have made it a practice with all the young men I have appointed to the Academies to correspond with them during their years of cadetship. They have in turn corresponded with me and let me know how they are getting along. I have felt it part of my responsibility to keep in contact with them, and so on their holidays when they are home, they always visit me at my office.

I think anyone can see from reading this letter that he would have made a great officer and one of the future leaders of our U.S. Air Force. I regret that we have lost him in this capacity, but I know that he will make his mark in some field and a great citizen of this wonderful country of ours.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKER: The coming and going of the 9th of July 1960, carried little significance in itself, but it was enough to exhume the memory of a July 9 of another year. July 9, 1956, saw my arrival in Denver, Colo., for the beginning of what I thought was to be a promising career with an exceptionally bright future. On that day, as one of your nominees, I entered the U.S. Air Force Academy.

That career died in its infancy, aborted by a perhaps unavoidable medical difficulty. The once bright future clouded over, and the sudden blow with its attendant shock set me adrift on a sea of aimlessness. Once, I had intensely wanted to serve my country in its skies and in the vanguard of its future space frontiers. Now I have been relegated to the realm of those who must walk the earth.

Yet, despite what has transpired, I nevertheless feel I owe you a debt of gratitude; a debt of gratitude for the priceless opportunity of service with the elite, that you once placed within my reach by nomination to the Air Force Academy; and a debt of gratitude for enabling me to receive the intensive, mind-building, body-building training—truncated though it may have been—afforded by this springboard of the space age. Because of this debt of gratitude, I feel that I owe it to you to let you know what became of one of your erstwhile "Academy Boys."

Permit me to backtrack a bit into the past. Officially, you knew what had happened. First, "Cadet Sternberg was granted 1 year's leave of absence," and then, last, "Cadet Sternberg, Alan L., has been honorably discharged from the U.S. Air Force Academy." But what did these staid official communiques mean in terms of personal feeling?

A series of unexplained, somewhat mysterious medical disorders dictated that the flight surgeon recommend a year's leave of absence, during which time further medical examination could be conducted by a specialist. I came home in September 1957. From September to May, my future as a cadet and as an air officer hung in the balance. Nine months of not knowing whether one's aspirations will be brought to a halt or will be allowed to continue causes no little below-the-surface strain, believe me.

On May 22, 1958, I received an honorable discharge from the Air Force Academy, for medical reasons. Although half-expected and vaguely prepared for, the blow was swift, sure, and sudden. It rocked me to my roots. It was as if a flash flood had washed out the road ahead of me and had carried with it half the soil from beneath my feet. I returned to my civilian studies, not knowing in which direction my path to the future lay. A year later, still a bit dazed and with motivation at low ebb, I suspended my studies. I needed time to regroup my wandering ambitions and energies.

I went to work as a U.S. postal employee. One day, I sorted from the incoming mail a brochure describing a work-study program, in Israel, for American students. This program, of a year's duration, located in a communal settlement on the border, would involve working half a day and studying the other half. The educational program ran

4 hours a day, 6 days a week, and devoted itself to intensive studies of the Hebrew language, and studies of Israeli history, culture, and geography. This program was to be supplemented with lectures by prominent people from economic, political, sociological, educational, governmental, and journalistic circles, as well as with extensive tours of the country, its cultural centers, its landmarks and historical sites, its agricultural and technical achievements. I became interested in the program, world travel, a brief vacation from the American scene, and a short stay in a historical land which has achieved and is achieving the near impossible, could be what was needed to revive and recharge motivation and drive. I applied to the appropriate agency, underwent the requisite examination, and was accepted. In mid-September of 1959, with a group of 20 American youths, I sailed for Israel.

I have been in Israel for 10 months now, and if I may, I shall digress to give a quick picture of what I have found.

In 10 months, I have traveled from the Negev in the South to the Galilee in the North, from the Judean Mountains in the East to the Plain of Sharon in the West. I have hiked over desert, mountain, and plain, into canyon, cave, and wadi; have stood at the borders of Jordan, Syria, Egypt, Lebanon, and Gaza; and have swum in the Mediterranean, the Dead, and the Red Seas. I have suffered the sticky heat of metropolitan Haifa and Tel Aviv; stumbled along the narrow streets of Holy Jerusalem and Nazareth; and looked across the border towns of Eilat and Metula. I have poked through ruins of ancient Jewish, Arabic, Roman, and Byzantine cultures; have listened to lectures on Jewish history; and have talked to people instrumental in making some of that history. These, then, are my impressions of Israel.

Israel is a tiny, rock-strewn plot of land that has the nerve to call itself a nation and the determination to back up the claim. The country is comparable in size to New Jersey, with a good half of it comparable to some of our coastal beaches. The population numbers little better than 2 million. There are probably more people on the street, on a Sunday, on New York City's East Side. But the experiences of the Israeli people are unlike that of any other similar group their size.

The Israelis have taken a harsh, barren, eroded land, neglected for centuries, and have forced it to support them and their aspirations. Land has been cleared, soil reclaimed, and swamps drained. Bare, rocky mountains have been covered with trees, crops for export raised in impossible places, and substantial villages, towns, and cities built where once existed wasteland (the thriving city of Tel Aviv was once a series of sand dunes). Miles of road and track have been forged through impossible desert and mountain; harbors have been built where none existed; and airfields have been put down where wild camels roam. The Israeli has had to pull his belt tight to accomplish these semimiracles.

Little Israel, the size of New Jersey, with some 2 million people, stocks her tables with an abundance of bread, many vegetables, plenty of eggs, and little meat. She stocks her stores with high-priced luxury items, high-priced clothing, high-priced household goods, and little that is low priced. Chocolate is a treat, french fries a delicacy, and ice cream a watered-down version of an American commodity. Hot water is sometimes, toilet paper scarce, and television nonexistent. In-city telephone communications is fair, between-city is worse, and oversea calls are impossible. Private cars are hard to come by, trains drag along, and buses double as freight trucks. (A bus will pick up anything from the passenger to his household goods and/or his flocks. Live chickens are common, and once someone managed to take on two sheep).

Surrounded by the hostile Arab League bent on her destruction, Israel is run by and lives on nerve. Her spirit is tough, unyielding, and seemingly boundless. Her citizens are a standing militia, and her 18–21-year-old boys and girls are her standing army. Her borders are fenced with barbed wire, mined with high explosives, and staked out with army and border police patrols. Her skies are crisscrossed by her air force of French-, British-, Canadian-, and American-make fighters, while the ground below rumbles to the practice maneuvers of her armored force of American, British, French, and captured Russian and Egyptian tanks and vehicles. Her communal settlements have their own armories, bomb shelters, and field fortifications. Yet, despite the necessity—as the saying goes—for every Israeli citizen to be a soldier on 11 months leave, these people go about their daily routine unworried by the threat poised at their borders.

Israel's population is a conglomeration of immigrants from some 75 countries, topped by a sprinkling of the native born. Her language is Hebrew, spoken with 20 to 30 different foreign accents. Her people work hard, live simply, read much, and think more.

A one sentence summary? Israel is a tough nation run by tough Jews—a new breed who refuse to retreat.

On September 26, I sail from Israel. I do not regret having decided to come, for it has been a year well spent. I have traveled, I have seen, I have questioned, I have listened, and I have learned. Perhaps for the first time, I have fully awakened to what you and your congressional colleagues have known of and have warned us about for years. From my forward observation post in Israel has come the awareness of some of the very real dangers confronting us of the West, the real dangers threatening our very security and freedom—the security and freedom we take so much for granted. Israel is a hotspot in the seething Mideast, the power plays of West versus East cause crises to erupt with volcanic force at a moment's notice. Middle East tensions are like tangible lines of force—pulling, pushing, twisting, tearing, warping, with never more than a moment of uneasy peace granted to relax the pressure.

Removed from the womblike security of vast America, with its great resources and superior, far-reaching technological achievements and advancements, the full threat to what we of America believe and stand for has been brought home to me with stunning force. Somehow this threat must be counteracted. Whatever it is within my limited power as an individual to do to help counteract that threat, I will do. My interest has always been in science—perhaps my path lies in that direction.

I shall arrive home with considerably more motivation than when I left. A tangible road lies before me, a direction in which to throw my energies. In the beginning, it will be a difficult road to walk. With two brothers in college, it will mean working a bit more than studying. But this is no more than what many of my contemporaries have had to face. I am sure that I shall succeed. I must succeed if I am to be ready with the rest of my generation to inherit the reins of leadership.

Sir, I have taken up enough of your valuable time. I hope I have been able to adequately sketch what has transpired with one of "your boys." The Academy and the Air Force as a doorway to service has been closed to me. But possibly this happened for the best, for now another perhaps more important door has been opened.

If just possibly there might be something I can do for you before I leave this part of the world, please do not hesitate to call on me.

With best wishes to your family, I am,

Sincerely yours,

ALAN L. STERNBERG.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12326) entitled "An act making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and certain study commissions, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to Senate amendment No. 20 to the above-entitled bill.

OPERATION VERACITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] is recognized for 2 hours.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, this is the second day of Operation Veracity. I have had people ask me if we are attacking the Democratic Party. The answer is, We are not attacking the Democratic Party. I have had people ask me if we are attacking the veracity of the delegates to the Democratic convention. The answer is no, we are not attacking the veracity of the delegates to the Democratic convention. We are saying there are certain statements contained in the Democratic platform which are misstatements and which, whether intended to deceive or not, do in fact deceive the American people as to certain alleged facts.

As far as the delegates to the Democratic convention are concerned, those people had every right to believe that the platform committee had gone through the platform and pulled out any misstatements. Therefore, the delegates were not at fault if misstatements have occurred.

The Republican committee had a 6-man panel which, before the platform was taken before the convention, had gone through the platform and taken out any statements which could not absolutely be proved. If the Democratic platform committee had had such a panel, then this particular exercise would not be necessary. We regret that it is necessary, but in order to keep the record straight it is necessary.

For the information of the gentlemen of the House, I intend to yield to certain Members to cover certain statements which appear in the Democratic platform. I have 2 hours. I estimate

that the prepared statements will take 45 or 50 minutes to deliver. It will be my purpose to yield only to those persons who have prepared statements to give, but after that I will be most happy to yield to all Members of the House on both sides of the aisle, and there will be ample time to discuss all of the matters we intend to bring up today.

It is now my pleasure, Mr. Speaker, to yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN], a former Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration.

Mr. NELSEN. Two statements made in the Democratic platform directly attack the last 7½ years of Republican administration of the rural electrification and rural telephone programs. Those two statements are:

The Democratic Congress has successfully fought the efforts of the Republican administration to cut off REA loans.

It [the Republican administration] has sought to cripple rural electrification.

Regarding such statements, I suggest we look at the record of Republican administration of REA for the last 7½ years, compare that record with prior Democratic years and let the people draw their own conclusions. For 3½ years of the Republican administration it was my privilege to serve as Administrator of this REA program. The record is as follows:

MORE PEOPLE SERVED

About a million new consumers have been added to REA lines—an increase of 23 percent. Total consumers served are 4,653,502, compared with 3,769,426 on June 30, 1952.

REA now serves 97 percent of all the farmers in America, compared with about 90 percent when this administration took office.

The rural telephone program which is under the Rural Electrification Administration has boomed—more than a million telephone users have been added during this administration, whereas only 7,500 subscribers had been connected from the time the Rural Telephone Act went into effect in 1949 until the Republicans took over in 1953.

Does this sound like the Republicans are crippling the operations of the Rural Electrification Administration?

FARMERS PAY LESS FOR REA

By fostering a climate of cooperation in the power industry, this administration has reduced the average cost of REA power to 2.68 cents per kilowatt-hour, compared with 3.43 cents in 1952—a 21-percent slash in cost.

Federal power supplied to REA consumers has increased by nearly 5 times—going from 2.7 billion kilowatt-hours in 1952 to 9.1 billion kilowatt-hours last year.

Per farm consumption of REA electricity has almost doubled during this administration. By June 1959, consumption had risen to 317 kilowatt-hours, compared with 184 kilowatt-hours per month in 1952.

MORE "GENERATION AND TRANSMISSION" LOANS

In the last 7½ years, REA generation and transmission loans have more than matched the capacity authorized in the previous 17½ years of Democratic administration of REA. Of the total of 2,419,530 kilowatts of generated capacity approved under REA, 1,274,530 kilowatts of capacity have been approved under this administration.

REA CO-OPS IN BETTER SHAPE

Under the Republican administration, REA borrowers have achieved the soundest financial position in their history. The backlog of over $200 million loan applications pending when I became Administrator in 1953, was speedily cut to practically nothing. Today, more than $500 million in unadvanced funds are available for the asking. The delinquency rate among borrowers is lowest in the history of the REA program, and advanced payments on REA loans—payments ahead of schedule—are the highest ever.

CONCLUSION

More people served at a cheaper cost, lower cost of administering the program, and at the same time better service to the REA borrowers who are in the soundest financial position in their history, this is the record of the Republican administration of REA. This is the record not only to be presented now at election time, Mr. Speaker, but it is the record of solid administrative accomplishment brought about by continuous hard work in REA these last 7½ years.

As former Administrator of that great program, I feel confident that America's REA consumers are not now deceived by such misleading and false statements as those found in the Democratic platform.

Mr. McCORMACK. While I understand that our colleague, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] has stated that he would prefer not to yield until the conclusion of all remarks, perhaps the gentleman might yield at that point following a particular subject since I would like to ask one or two questions with reference to the REA, which the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN] has been discussing.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman will admit, will he not, that the REA legislation was passed by Congresses controlled by the Democrats; is that not a fact?

Mr. NELSEN. The act was passed under President Roosevelt in 1936, but I will also suggest to the gentleman that the greatest and highest appropriation ever given to the REA was under the Republican 80th Congress which followed.

Mr. McCORMACK. But, the fact is that the REA was created by legislation sponsored by the Democratic Party and it is Democrat-sponsored legislation; is that not a fact?

Mr. NELSEN. I think it must be said, if one wishes to be accurate, that the REA program has bipartisan support in the Congress of the United States, and I do not think anyone can truthfully deny that.

Mr. McCORMACK. What does the gentleman from Minnesota have to say about the action of Secretary Benson in issuing orders that his subordinate shall pass upon all applications for loans, as I remember, over $500,000? What is the gentleman's answer to that situation?

Mr. NELSEN. I served as administrator of this program and I can say that no one ever interfered with the making of loans and no one has ever interfered with the administration of the making of loans under the succeeding administrator in this program, and the administrator so stated before committees on Capitol Hill. If it were true, as the gentleman from Massachusetts wishes to imply, that the administrator of this program has been curtailed in this connection, certainly, the record of accomplishment that I have set forth in my previous remarks would not exist today.

Mr. McCORMACK. Then why did the Secretary do that?

Mr. NELSEN. Under the act the Secretary is responsible for the program. Certainly anyone in an administrative position would never wish to fail to discuss the problems that the Secretary is responsible for.

There has never been any curtailment of loan applications of any kind, and there is no proof to that effect.

Mr. McCORMACK. We had proof before the committee that there was withheld for a long time applications, in order to impose conditions.

Mr. NELSEN. I do not think the interpretation that the gentleman advances is correct. I think the gentleman is misstating the facts as they appeared in committee.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman happens to have been a member of the committee at the time, so the gentleman is relying on his memory. I think I have enough confidence in my memory of what took place before the subcommittee of which I was a member in the Government Operations Committee. The gentleman is aware that all REA organizations were much disturbed by the action of Secretary Benson.

Mr. NELSEN. That is not correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman says that none of them were disturbed?

Mr. NELSEN. Some were led to be disturbed by some propaganda that came out of Washington, but the REA cooperatives throughout the country have been well served, and the record so indicates.

Mr. McCORMACK. The record before the committee was such as to justify a bill that was reported out which passed both branches of the Congress and which President Eisenhower vetoed. The gentleman is aware of that bill, is he not?

Mr. NELSEN. Very much so.

Mr. McCORMACK. So the committee found evidence that through administrative action Secretary Benson was attempting to hamstring applications of that kind; and, as I remember, over

$500,000 in applications, and through administrative action was attempting to circumscribe the intent of Congress as provided in the law. For that reason we reported out a bill and the President vetoed it.

Mr. NELSEN. The gentleman is making assumptions as to the evidence that was submitted before the committee. The performance of the REA does not substantiate the charge that the gentleman wishes to make.

Mr. McCORMACK. What the gentleman says after the hearing, after the bill was reported out and after the President vetoed it, administratively there was a relaxation, but as a request of Secretary Benson's action there was a limitation on the number of REA applications over a certain amount, over $500,000, as I remember. We had hearings in order to subscribe what Secretary Benson had done and in order to carry out the intent of Congress.

Mr. NELSEN. I do not agree there has been some relaxation since that act; there has never been a curtailment, but the Secretary has been carrying out the intent of Congress.

Mr. McCORMACK. As originally intended, but if it had not been for committee action that would not have happened; but prior to that there was.

Mr. NELSEN. The majority leader says there has been relaxation of that rule. That is not true, as the loans that have been approved by REA have increased. The charge that is presently being made is one that has been politically developed. The performance does not coincide with the charge.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NELSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PRICE. As the sponsor of the bill to which the majority leader referred and which was passed by both the House and Senate and then vetoed, and which failed by 4 votes to be passed over the veto, the idea for that legislation resulted from a desire to correct the situation in the REA caused by the Secretary of Agriculture. It had the result of direct interference with application for a loan in Indiana.

Mr. NELSEN. The gentleman wishes to imply that there has been interference regarding a loan in Indiana. There have been many loans that have been considered in REA that have been carefully examined. That is no pertinent point as far as I can see in the discussion.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I shall have to return again to my former announcement of my plan for yielding. I relaxed it in order to accommodate the majority leader. I will yield to other gentleman after I have proceeded as I had planned.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. This is on that point.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I will be compelled to yield to the gentleman from Iowa who himself was so gracious in the matter of yielding yesterday. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I am sure the gentleman will admit that in speaking of appropriations they were made in circumstances which put them over and above what the administration requested and were in fact even resisted by the administration at times including a veto last year.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield.

Mr. LAIRD. That is incorrect. There has been no veto of any REA appropriation. There has been an increase in contingency funds carried in this year's bill. There was no increase carried by the Congress in the regular appropriations for REA.

The point we want to keep in mind here is that there has been a charge made in the Democratic platform as to the cutoff of REA loans. The record itself will show that in 7½ years, although REA has been in existence 25 years, 45 percent of all the loans have been made in the last 7½ years.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. The record however shows that appropriations made last year for public works carried several millions for REA and that the bill was vetoed and passed over the President's veto.

Mr. LAIRD. The gentleman and I are speaking of different things.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I am sorry I cannot yield. When I have concluded my speech there will be ample time and I will gladly yield then.

Mr. SANTANGELO. That would be too late, for my question deals with this very matter that is being touched on now.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SANTANGELO. The charge at times is made that the Republicans have sought to cripple the REA. Is it not a fact that Mr. Benson, Secretary of Agriculture, proposed that interest rates for cooperatives be increased from 2 percent to a higher figure?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. The facts are that the Secretary of Agriculture wanted to impose an interest rate paid by certain REA's more nearly in line with the interest rate which the Government itself has to pay on borrowed money.

Mr. SANTANGELO. I have no REA's in my district, but I do know that the Secretary appearing before a Subcommittee on Agriculture proposed to increase the rate of interest to 5 percent. Do you deny that the Republican Party through Mr. Benson proposed to increase the rate of interest to 5 percent on REA cooperatives?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I do deny that. It is not the situation.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DEROUNIAN].

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join with my colleagues on this side of the aisle in condemning some of the many inaccuracies which appear in the 1960 Democrat platform.

We have already dealt with several of these fallacies. Now, I should like to quote another incredible misstatement of fact which blindly distorts the labor policies of the Republican administration:

> Under Democratic leadership a sound national policy was developed, expressed particularly by the Wagner National Labor Relations Act, which guaranteed the rights of workers to organize and to bargain collectively. But the Republican administration has replaced this sound policy with a national antilabor policy.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot believe that any sizable number of my Democratic colleagues in this body subscribes to this falsehood.

Certainly they realize that the record of the Republican administration in this field has exhibited the greatest respect for the rights of the American worker.

Last year, Vice President NIXON and Secretary of Labor Mitchell brought about a settlement of the disastrous steel strike. Was this a manifestation of the administration's antilabor policy? If it was, that was lost on the president of the United Steel Workers who publicly stated his extreme satisfaction with the terms of the settlement.

Mr. Speaker, I challenge those who were responsible for this plank in the Democratic platform to cite one single antilabor act by this administration.

I challenge them to call the Landrum-Griffin bill an antilabor measure. This bipartisan legislation was framed for a single purpose—to protect the American worker and the American people from the greedy excesses of power-hungry labor bosses whose activities in the past few years have become an unbearable burden to all workers—to all Americans.

The 1960 Democratic platform recognizes this fact, for it states:

> Organized criminals have even infiltrated into legitimate business enterprises and labor unions.

It then launches into another fantastic charge by claiming that the administration has failed lamentably to deal with this problem.

Mr. Speaker, may I point out to the authors of the Democratic platform that they just cannot have it both ways. The administration acts against these evils and is called antilabor, or it does not and is accused of failing lamentably to deal with the problem.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to read into the RECORD achievements under the Eisenhower-Nixon administration—achievements which have brought a better life to the working men and women of America through high levels of employment, the highest standard of living with highest real wages, protection of rights of working men and women, strong enforcement of fair labor standards, wider unemployment insurance coverage, increased benefits in social security, and promotion of free collective bargaining.

First. Minimum wage raised; extension of coverage to several million additional workers repeatedly recommended.

In 1960, administration recommended increase in minimum wage.

Second. Average weekly wages in manufacturing up from $67.97 in 1952 to $91.60—an increase of 35 percent.

Third. Labor income raised 43 percent; as national income rose by $106.1 billion, compensation of employees rose by $82.4 billion.

Fourth. Unemployment insurance permanent coverage extended to 2.6 million ex-servicemen, 2.4 million Federal employees, and 1.2 million employees of small businesses.

Fifth. Temporary additional benefits granted to those whose payments had been exhausted during periods of higher unemployment.

Sixth. States stimulated to improve unemployment compensation benefits; since 1953 all States have made improvements in their laws.

Seventh. Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act strengthened by increasing benefits and extending periods of coverage.

Eighth. Improvement in industrial peace with 27.5 percent fewer strikes in 1959 than in 1952 involving 46.9 percent fewer workers (despite prolonged steel strike). The percentage of man-days lost from work stoppages cut in half compared to 7 years of last Democratic administration—1946–52, 8 percent; 1953–59, 4 percent.

Ninth. Safety standards for longshoremen and ship repair workers made by Labor Department.

Tenth. Comparisons of existing State safety services to assist States in improving their safety regulations and promote greater uniformity established by Labor Department.

Eleventh. Employment of older workers encouraged to meet crucial deficit in our human resources during the coming decade: 1.2 million older workers placed last year by public employment service.

Twelfth. Migratory farm workers' conditions improved by Federal stimulus to housing, transportation, child labor and crew leader legislation.

Thirteenth. Labor pension and welfare funds safeguarded through financial reporting to Secretary of Labor; legislation essential to make act effective and enforcible urged by Labor Department.

Fourteenth. Fair Labor Standards Act vigorously enforced—in 1959 had largest number of cases litigated in history—some 1,360.

Fifteenth. Employers violating minimum wage standards required to pay $60 million in back wages—20 percent more than comparable period under the previous Democratic administration.

Sixteenth. 300 firms and individuals ruled ineligible to bid on Government contracts for violating the Davis-Bacon Act and related legislation, contrasted to only 4 in the 17-year history of this law from 1935 through 1952.

Seventeenth. Landrum-Griffin Act enacted which guaranteed union members: (a) greater participation in determining their own affairs; (b) freedom of speech in union meeting; (c) protection against arbitrary dues increases; (d) free and fair union elections; (e) elimination of racketeers from labor-management relations; (f) protection of union funds.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEROUNIAN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. The conferees are meeting now on a minimum wage bill. The Republicans have three members on that committee. They could very well bring this conference report back here and let the Congress act on a minimum wage extension, an extension that your own President asked for. Are these men in opposing this compromise measure working for the best interests of the workingmen of America?

Mr. DEROUNIAN. I will say to the gentleman that Mr. KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, loudly proclaimed when he got back to this special session he was going to do all he could to bring the bill out. The House has already expressed its will on this legislation. The gentleman's party has a majority of the conferees. Does the gentleman want to tell me that before his party can control a majority of his party he must have a total Democratic membership in the House of Representatives? It would seem to me that with a majority of 127 Members, if you cannot control your own party it is a sorry spectacle for leadership.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. THOMSON].

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, Operation Veracity seems to discover more and more misstatements of fact in the Democrat platform as our examination continues. Apparently the limit is that of time.

Let us consider this statement of the Democrat platform:

> We will erase the Republican slogan of "no new starts" and will begin again to build multiple-purpose dams, hydroelectric facilities, flood control works, navigation facilities, and reclamation projects to meet mounting and urgent needs.

It is flagrantly untrue to say that there is a Republican program or slogan of "No New Starts."

By the Bureau of Reclamation alone, there have been at least 24 new starts launched which were requested in the President's budget since 1953.

The Colorado River storage project passed in 1956 was the largest reclamation project approved in a single piece of legislation. The Republican administration requested it and gave it all-out support. The present Democrat candidate for President voted against it. I guess the Democrat platform writers, in their enthusiasm about the new frontier, forgot that fact, too.

Examples of "new starts" requested by and commenced under the Eisenhower Republican administration include the Little Wood River project, Idaho; Crooked River project, Oregon; Wapinitia project, Oregon; Yellowtail unit, Montana and Wyoming; Curecanti unit of the Colorado River storage project; Florida participating project in Colorado; Glendo unit in Wyoming; Hanover Bluff in Wyoming; Helena Valley project in Montana; Sargent unit, Nebraska; Ventura River in California; Collbran project, Colorado; Washita project in Oklahoma; Glen Canyon unit of the Upper Colorado River storage project; Flaming Gorge unit of Upper Colorado in Utah and Wyoming; Navaho unit, New Mexico; and Trinity division of the Central Valley project in California.

Now that we have shown the error in the first part of this platform statement, let us consider the second part, which says they would "begin again to build multiple-purpose dams, hydroelectric facilities" and so forth.

Virtually all of the projects authorized today are multiple purpose in nature. But there was not, Mr. Speaker, a single basinwide multiple-purpose project in the United States undertaken in the 8 years previous to the Eisenhower-Nixon administration.

Now, just how do the Democrat platform writers explain such errors of their pens? It does indeed seem that their "New Frontiersmanship" is merely a juvenile attempt at "Boyish Gamesmanship" of fact juggling.

Now the Democrat platform says they will begin to build again hydroelectric facilities.

With just a minimum of checking, they would have known that since 1953 this administration has placed in service 75 dams, providing 60 million acre-feet of storage capacity, and 18 powerplants having over 950,000 kilowatts of power capacity.

This is a fine record, but just as important, if not even more important to the taxpayers and to the users of electricity, private industry has been permitted to move forward with confidence, to furnish its full share of the new requirements for electricity.

The "brown-outs" of the previous Democrat administrations have been ended by the Eisenhower-Nixon administration.

Here is another fact that the Democrat platform fiction writers of course ignored:

Total acreage that can be supplied with irrigation water by reclamation projects increased from 6.9 million acres in 1952 to 8 million acres in 1959. The 53 projects authorized during this administration's tenure in office will provide an irrigation water supply for 1,330,000 acres of land in the 17 Western States.

Another milestone of the Eisenhower administration progress which the Democrat platform writers nicely ignored in regard to reclamation was the passage of Public Law 85–47, known as "The Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956."

Mr. Speaker, I have principally dwelt on reclamation, because that is the area with which I am most familiar. A similar story might be told as to flood control projects. In the area of navigation facilities, I need only mention the St. Lawrence Seaway, which was, under the Eisenhower administration, made a reality instead of a political promise.

Mr. Speaker, I am indeed proud to be a member of a political party whose political philosophy, whose platform, and whose candidates take pride and pleasure in the great achievements of America and Americans everywhere. I am sure—indeed, I hope—that it is only a small minority in the other party who really subscribe to the desperation approach of the Democrat platform. Obviously, the Democrat platform writers are still searching desperately for an issue to cause American citizens to vote against their better judgment. Even that cannot be an excuse for such statements, that are so obviously without basis in fact, being found in a platform of one of our major political parties.

The American public will not be misled by such tactics.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. BASS].

Mr. BASS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, a group of my Republican colleagues in this body are taking part in Operation Veracity—the project to explore some outright untruths in the 1960 Democratic platform.

Several of these untruths have already been discussed, and I must say, Mr. Speaker, that they constitute a serious indictment of those who took part in the preparation of the Democratic platform.

The untruth which I plan to explore as my part in Operation Veracity is, in my opinion, the worst falsehood of all—that which claims:

> They [the Republicans] have admitted that the Soviet Union leads in the space race—and that they have no plans to catch up.

This is not only a falsehood, Mr. Speaker, it is a shameful reflection on those dedicated Americans who have achieved so much in space exploration in so short a time.

In my opening remarks, Mr. Speaker, I referred to this sentence as an untruth. Actually, the framers of the Democratic platform managed to accomplish a somewhat difficult feat—two falsehoods in one brief sentence.

Let my Democratic friends cite one single statement by an administration spokesman in which it is claimed that the Soviet Union leads in the space race.

Dr. T. Keith Glennan and others concerned with space exploration have repeatedly stated that the United States leads in all fields of space exploration and concede to the Soviet's superiority in only one limited field—rocket thrust.

As Vice President NIXON stated on January 16, 1960:

> The reason we are behind in developing the very large size rockets * * * is that we did little to begin our ballistic missile program until after President Eisenhower assumed the Presidency, whereas the Russians began in 1946.

In one day, Mr. Speaker, the United States accomplished the following feats in the space and missile field:

First. Sent into orbit the largest man-made object ever put into space;

Second. Achieved, at 25 miles up, the highest altitude ever reached by a piloted craft;

Third. Recovered, for the first time anywhere, an instrumented capsule sent into space;

Fourth. Shot a missile 5,000 miles dead to target;

Fifth. Launched a Polaris missile, designed for underwater firing, on a successful 1,100-mile test run.

In the light of these accomplishments, can anyone honestly say that the Soviet Union leads the United States in space exploration? Of course, they cannot.

Here is what a few foreign newspapers have to say about the subject:

> London Daily Telegraph: "The Americans may have found the way to control with precision the return of a weapon launched into space whereas the Russians have not."
>
> De Telegraaf (Amsterdam): "As far as the total of successfully-launched space objects goes, America has finally taken over the lead. * * * America's space successes mean Russia has been overtaken in the technical race."
>
> Die Welt (Hamburg): "This marks a decisive step toward manned flight in space."

Mr. Speaker, American accomplishments in space exploration have produced hard data that have proven invaluable in both the military and scientific fields. In contrast to this realistic effort, most of the Soviet accomplishments lacked scientific depth, providing mainly propoganda.

Here are some of the hard and impressive accomplishments of this administration, which have kept us ahead of Russia.

First. Twenty-six earth and solar satellites successfully launched by the United States compared to eight by the Soviet Union—as of August 1960.

Second. Fourteen U.S. satellites still in orbit—12 around the earth, 2 around the sun—Russia has just one each.

Third. Spectacular U.S. space firsts include:

First to land and measure the Van Allen radiation belts—the most important scientific discovery of the IGY.

First to photograph the earth from 300 miles out in space;

First to discover the pear shape of the earth;

First to recover an object intact from outer space;

First to orbit a communications satellite;

First to orbit two instrumented satellites at the same time;

First vehicle to start, shut down, and restart in space.

Fourth. Thousands of pictures of cloud formation have been photographed successfully by meteorological satellite Tiros I—a major step in observations of major storms and frontal systems.

Fifth. Pioneer V—one of the great scientific and engineering successes in history—set record for radio communications, 22.5 million miles.

The second part of this untruthful sentence, Mr. Speaker, in which the administration is charged with having "no plans to catch up" with the Soviets is also a false and irresponsible statement. Obviously it cannot stand up if the first part is false, which we have shown. But let me also point out that NASA has developed a well planned, well balanced, ambitious 10-year program calling for 260 shots—designed to insure that we remain ahead in the field of space exploration. This 10-year plan has been well publicized, and of course the Democratic authors of this untruthful statement must have been aware of it.

Time does not permit, but here are a few of the steps already taken under this 10-year plan:

First. National Aeronautics and Space Administration established to centralize space exploration administration.

Second. Project Mercury, the first step in manned space flight, moving at accelerated goal of successful completion in 1961.

Third. A new family of space launch vehicles, including the Thor, Atlas, Centaur, and the Saturn system, inaugurated—design, development, and testing under way.

Fourth. Worldwide tracking and data acquisition network developed to facilitate and coordinate space exploration efforts.

Fifth. New launching facilities constructed—more being built to enable United States to utilize at the earliest possible date heavier thrust vehicles and spacecraft planned.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that more is required, in the case of these specific untruths, than my exposé. I believe that the authors of this sentence owe an apology to those Americans whose dedication and perseverance have put us first in space.

I do not think I am asking too much in demanding an apology, Mr. Speaker. Those who wrote these sentences should be only too aware of the need to apologize when proven wrong.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at this time?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I have yielded to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. BASS].

Mr. BASS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, I believe that more is required in the case of these specific untruths than my exposé today. I believe the authors of this sentence owe an apology to those Americans whose dedication and perseverance have put us first in space. I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that I am asking too much in demanding an apology. Those who wrote these sentences should be only too aware of the need to apologize when proven wrong.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Mississippi was not on the floor when I explained a few minutes ago that it is not my purpose to yield until all the Members have made their prepared talks. There are two more Members, and after about 10 minutes, we will have plenty of time to yield to all Members.

Mr. PRICE. The gentleman from New Hampshire asked a direct question. Two of the members of the space committee were present at the time, but could not remain on the floor. They have asked me to reply to the direct question asked by the gentleman.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I presume then that the gentleman from Illinois

will remain for about 10 more minutes so that that can be done.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman for a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BASS of Tennessee). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, in my years of service in this House I have never heard so much political hokum in one sitting. The fiction writers at the Republican National Committee must indeed be working overtime these days. The Republican Operation Veracity is distinguished by the its lack of veracity.

But let me address myself to the challenge of the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. BASS] and furnish him with the names of two outstanding leaders of the present administration who had something to say about the way our defense and space programs were and are being run. There have been others who have made similar statements before congressional committees, but since these two men, Trevor Gardner, Assistant Secretary of the Air Force under this Republican administration, and Lt. Gen. James M. Gavin, a member of the weapons systems, Department of the Army, were so disturbed by budgetary interference in research and development that they left their high positions to fight on the outside for recognition of the fact our Government should work to remove serious roadblocks to our scientific advancement.

The plain truth is there is no veracity in the Republican National Committee's Operation Veracity. In the prepared speeches of the few speakers who have so far appeared, untruth after untruth have been parroted, and have been successfully challenged by Members on the floor.

I quote from Trevor Gardner—until February 8, 1956, Assistant Secretary of the Air Force—in Life magazine for November 4, 1957:

> We have been running second best in the race with Russia for ballistic missiles because (1) we have refused to admit that national security is more important than balancing the budget, and (2) former Secretary of Defense Charles Wilson and Deputy Secretary Donald Quarles permitted the continuance of a hopeless administrative jungle. * * * This has strangled scientific thinking and performance. We have suffered a temporary defeat not because of the inadequacy of our scientists but because of the incredible ineptness with which we have managed our scientific resources.
>
> By the use of large injections of sedation, the American public was lulled into the happy dream that all was well with our American scientific and military effort and that there was no reason to fear that Russia could really ever overtake us. For those who prefer dreaming, the sedatives are again ready and available. We can all count upon an avalanche of science fiction stories, photos, releases, speeches, press conferences, diagrams, news releases and predictions—all designed to create the comforting illusion of American scientific and military supremacy. The formerly tight lid of censorship on ballistic missile firings has already been removed and series on series of quickly generated progress announcements by newly minted "missiles experts" are being rushed to the press.
>
> But what we really need is flying hardware doing our bidding in outer space. Sooner, not later. In the final analysis a beleaguered administration cannot change unhappy facts with happy words. Clear and concise action, taken with a minimum of delay, is the only answer.
>
> For those who prefer staying awake to dreaming it will be useful to know how our country was trapped into the present situation and how we can get out of it.
>
> Mr. Wilson and Mr. Quarles unquestionably served their private employers in American industry well and faithfully. But when they arrived in Washington, they were lacking in the imagination, the skill and the daring to lead American science and scientists to victory over the Russians. If, when in private business, they had allowed Russian telephones and automobiles to invade their markets, they would have been fired. It is hard to believe that President Eisenhower was ignorant of missile progress within the U.S.S.R. and of the stupendous and daring nature of the Soviet programs. It is equally inconceivable for him to have been unaware that our own ballistic missile program was being "managed" into intolerable delays by a dinosaur of an administrative system.

A quote from Lt. Gen. James M. Gavin, who for 10 years was closely associated with the development of national defense policy, as a member of the Weapons Systems Evaluation Group, Department of the Army staff, and in the search for tactical innovations in field commands.

The quote is taken from his book "War and Peace in the Space Age," copyrighted 1958 by Harper & Bros., New York, N.Y.:

> Immediately following Hiroshima and for a number of years thereafter our nuclear weapons program was well ahead of that of the Soviets. But this advantage is now disappearing, both in weapons and in their associated delivery systems. The New York Times on April 13, 1958, in reporting a talk given by H. Rowan Gaither [1] at the California Institute of Technology, reported him as saying: "The relative strength of the United States in comparison with the Soviet Union and Red China is ebbing." And while our strength is ebbing our obligations are increasing. Since Korea we have made numerous treaty arrangements, NATO and SEATO for example, that imply a responsibility to come to the aid of our allies in case of trouble. The skimpy forces that we do have are scattered worldwide—in the frontlines. We have no geographically placed reserves of the type that could deal with limited conflagrations to back up Korea, southeast Asia, the Middle East, or Europe. So far the talk about a fire brigade is just that—talk.
>
> Until our position improves, limited wars, if we were to be favored with them, would result in limited defeats—limited defeats that we would rationalize at the time but that would ultimately lead to general defeat, or to general war. Thus, by failing to provide adequately for something less than general war, by failing to provide for limited wars, we invite general wars, and such a war is one that no one will win. This is the great danger of the missile lag.

[1] H. Rowan Gaither is Chairman of the Security Resources Panel of President Eisenhower's Science Advisory Committee.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AVERY].

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to associate myself today with my colleagues in support of what we describe as Operation Veracity. I might add parenthetically that I am pleased to note the presence on the floor today of many of our Democratic friends, more than we had yesterday, so at least we may be inspiring some interest on the Democratic side of the aisle. Also I want to say we appreciate our colleagues from our own side of the aisle remaining today to participate in this scrutiny that we are directing toward the platform written by the Democratic Party in Los Angeles.

Mr. Speaker, I feel further constrained to comment upon the fact that the chairman of the Democratic platform committee was advised nearly a week ago of the fact that this analysis of the Democratic platform was going to be made and made on a factual basis. We recognize that each party will disagree in respect to philosophy and ideals and we welcome this exchange of views to sharpen the views for the electorate.

By the chairman of the platform committee, Mr. BOWLES' absence yesterday, and again by his absence today, we can only conclude that he will not attempt to defend the platform written by the Democratic Party.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, that is obviously an unfair statement. Many of us have been here and are here wishing to defend the platform, but we have not been permitted to have an opportunity to defend it since the gentleman has refused to yield at any point.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I decline to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I do not yield.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, responsibility, veracity, and maturity will indeed be key words in the forthcoming presidential campaign. It is only natural that the American public will scrutinize both the party candidates and platforms to find an abundance or a dearth of these qualities. I think that is probably more so because of the colloquy we have had on the floor today and the one we had yesterday. We invite such scrutiny of the Republican platform. More particularly the facts that may be recited in it. Meanwhile, Operation Veracity will continue, not only on the floor of this House but throughout the fall months of the campaign. As its initial mission, our operation will continue to expose some of the untruths that, as we see it, are in the Democratic platform.

I would like to direct my remarks to this particular statement:

> Over the past 7 years we have watched the steady weakening of the Nation's transportation system.

This statement makes me wonder where the authors of the Democratic platform, the so-called "new frontiersmen" have been looking in the last 7 years.

I further note that there is present on the floor of the House today on my right, the chairman of the Transportation Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I have served on that committee for 4 years under the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], as chairman of the Subcommittee on Transportation, and frankly I thought our committee had done a pretty good job in a continued examination of our Nation's transportation system and had recommended to the Congress such laws as had been necessary and were deemed expedient not only to sustain but to guarantee additional expansion commensurate with our growth and our national needs. I think it is somewhat of a reflection on our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to say that the Congress or the administration has stood idly by to witness and preside over a weakening of our Nation's transportation.

To be completely honest, and I want to be honest, because we are expecting our friends to be honest with us, there is I think perhaps one particular area in which our transportation has deteriorated. There are fewer horses and mules in the country today than there were 10 years ago. In that area there has been some deterioration in our transportation. It may have been to that area that the Democratic platform was directing the Nation's attention.

I think there is some reason to come to that conclusion, because as I watched our friends' convention in Los Angeles they were still running on the so-called depression that existed under the Hoover administration, as though that were going to be one of the issues in the 1960 campaign. So if we are still going to use that particular issue in the 1960 campaign, perhaps it is reasonable to assume that the deterioration in the number of horses and buggies might also be another issue this fall, although I think there are probably other directions, where we should more profitably direct our attention this afternoon.

In every other area except the one just mentioned there has been a phenomenal growth in transportation since 1952. Following me, I understand will be by colleague from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI], who will discuss the development of the St. Lawrence Seaway, which I would classify as a very definite step in the growth of our transportation system.

I would like to remind my colleagues also that upon the Eisenhower administration's recommendation and under a Democratic-controlled Congress we authorized 41,000 miles of an interstate highway system, which very definitely augments our rail transportation system.

In the way of rail transportation I want to suggest that there has been spent since 1953 over $7 billion to improve the railroads of America. This sum was spent to modernize equipment and for further improvements of roadways and structures in addition to installing new signaling systems to improve the safety measures of the various systems. The same railroads added 360,000 new freight cars during this 7-year period as well as 2,000 passenger train cars and over 8,000 new locomotive units.

Railroad labor has also shared in the general improvement of the railroad industry. Admittedly due to automation and some readjustment in the rail systems the number of employees is somewhat lower. However, the wage scale for employees now working has advanced from an average wage of $1.76 per hour in 1953 to $2.59 in 1960. In addition to the present employees of the railroad system, the annuities of former employees have also been advanced in keeping with the increased standard of living. Whereas in 1959 the maximum monthly annuity for a retired railroad employee was $165 today it is $206.

There are many other areas I could recite for you but I do not want to impose at length on the time of the House. But just let me make a few brief statements showing the progress tnat has been made.

Let us take aircraft operations. Aircraft operations at the Nation's airports set a new record in 1959 for the sixth consecutive year. 1959 was the eighth consecutive year that the Nation's airlines maintained a safety rate of less than one fatality per 100,000,000 passenger miles.

There has been a 75-percent growth in overall revenue ton-miles in scheduled air service and an increase in total revenue passenger-miles from 15.06 billion in 1952 to 36.4 billion in 1959.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the RECORD these other accomplishments in the field of transportation since 1953.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. AVERY. The largest U.S.-flag tanker, SS *National Defender*, launched.

Panama Canal enlargement is under way with deepening and widening of the canal.

Seagoing vessels are being replaced at a cost of $4½ billion.

Changes in the Interstate Commerce Act concerning ratemaking, filing of offers of rates, authorization of ICC to review the discontinuance of passenger train service, and elimination of procedural detail given impetus by 1955 Report of the President's Committee on Transport Policy and Organization.

Aviation weather research has been put on a substantial scale through cooperative of composite Federal agencies.

Computer program instituted to provide automation in air traffic control under way.

A program for forecasting air passenger and cargo traffic and capacity has been developed.

Low-fare, transatlantic "economy" air passenger service, was introduced on the North Atlantic in April, 1958, which by the end of 1959 had virtually replaced coach service.

There has been a 75 percent growth in overall revenue ton-miles in scheduled air service and an increase in total revenue passenger miles from 15.6 billion in 1952 to 36.4 billion in 1959 occurred.

Neutrality in policy between competing modes of transportation promoted to help maintain conditions and provide regulations for competitive equality for railroads and common carriers industries.

Federal Aviation Agency, established 1958, has made great contributions to air service—medical investigations now made in all significant accidents, training and proficiency requirements in flight instruments introduced for private pilots, new improved medical standards for airmen established.

Airport expansion and improvement has been pursued under the Federal-aid airport program—$380 million spent, obligated, or programed between fiscal 1953 and fiscal 1961.

Aircraft operations at the Nation's airports set a new record in 1959 for the sixth consecutive year, or that 1959 was the eighth consecutive year that the Nation's airlines maintained a safety rate of less than one fatality per 100 million passenger-miles.

The statement of the Democratic platform, then, reflects either that the new frontiersmen are blind to air, sea, and land transportation progress, and apparently think in terms of horse travel only. Or else, the platform writers do know these things and were intentionally being inaccurate. Either way, I think that most of the American public has had enough of the immaturity of these new frontiersmen.

I want to make one other observation: The Democratic platform in regard to transportation makes this one final conclusion:

> We will establish a national transportation policy designed to coordinate and modernize our facilities for transportation by road, rail, water, and air.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the Democratic platform writers belatedly subscribe to the measures that the Republican President of the United States undertook long ago. A year ago, in his budget message, President Eisenhower requested the Secretary of Commerce to make a comprehensive study of transportation to identify emerging problems, redefine the appropriate Federal role, and make such recommendations as are necessary to insure the balanced development of our transportation system.

This report was submitted to this Congress and it was too bad that the writers of the Democratic platform were unfamiliar with it.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I thank the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the very able Member from the State of Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI].

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, before I direct by remarks to the subject assigned to me I will say that the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] should be heartily applauded by our good friends in the Democratic Party, for even though he was not invited to attend their convention in Los Angeles he has done them a great service by pointing out serious discrepancies in their platform through this Operation Veracity.

Mr. Speaker, I also join with my colleagues in support of Operation Veracity and in stern disapproval over the inclusion of numerous untruths in the Democrat platform.

The hearty, courageous Americans of the frontier days possessed above all, faith and hope in America. They were proud, not ashamed or ignorant, of the great achievements of their country.

At the Democrat Convention where their platform was written, there was much talk of a new frontier. But it was all mixed up with calling America second rate, with downgrading truly great progress.

This was not just true of their downgrading our great progress in space, where today we are far ahead of Russia, for example, in the number of earth satellites successfully launched, or in the military field, where Russia has no weapon which can compare with the capabilities of the Polaris. They did not stop here. They downgraded our economic progress in the very year we achieved a gross national product of over $500 billion.

No, they did not stop here.

They even had to downgrade the efforts of a truly great American, the President of the United States, in the field of inland waterways.

Here is one of the inaccurate, untrue statements of fact written into the Democrat platform:

> Development of our inland waterways, our harbors, and Great Lakes commerce has been held back by the Republican President.

They had the gall to make this statement a little over a year after our President, with the Queen of England, had formally opened the St. Lawrence Seaway.

They had the gall to make this statement after their presidential candidate had lined up against the St. Lawrence Seaway in his 1952 campaign.

All our Presidents since World War I had urged development of the St. Lawrence Seaway project, but may I emphasize that it was President Eisenhower's personal interest and the imagination of the Republican administration that finally brought about U.S. participation in this vital development.

To further refute their platform misstatement:

There has been an 80-percent increase in water commerce from 1952 to 1958;

The Eisenhower-Nixon team is having a study conducted to provide for 50 new harbors on the Great Lakes;

The total inland waterways commerce was four times as much in 1957 as, for example, in 1946;

Typical progress in Duluth, Minn., opening a $40 million public cargo terminal to world commerce;

Typical of progress was the intergovernmental shipping conference on U.S. shipping policies held in 1959.

Mr. Speaker, of special interest to me, representing as I do a midwestern district, may I point out that the Cal-Sag Channel project authorized in 1930, had its construction start in 1955. Just another example of the farsightedness of the Eisenhower administration's program.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Did I understand the gentleman from Illinois to say that the Democratic Party presidential candidate had voted against the St. Lawrence Seaway?

Mr. DERWINSKI. My statement reads "had lined up against the St. Lawrence Seaway in his 1952 campaign."

Mr. McCORMACK. May I suggest to my friend that he look over the rollcall vote again? He stated on two occasions. I do not know about that. I am talking about the time the bill passed, which was only a few years ago. My recollection is that the gentleman might be mistaken in that respect.

Mr. DERWINSKI. May I advise the majority leader that I will be glad to check the accuracy of my statement. In addition, so there will not be any misunderstanding, I think we should both recollect that the St. Lawrence Seaway project was the subject of congressional controversy for many years.

Mr. McCORMACK. I voted against it myself, but I think my friend ought to check in connection with his statement that the Democratic candidate voted against that bill.

Mr. DERWINSKI. For the benefit of the majority leader and for the sake of the record I will check it, and if my statement is incorrect I will correct it.

Mr. PRICE. May I ask the gentleman where he received his information?

Mr. DERWINSKI. From statements on the subject involved.

Mr. PRICE. It has been guaranteed by the Republican National Committee that they would furnish you with an accurate statement?

Mr. DERWINSKI. The gentleman's implication is incorrect.

I think it is reassuring to see so many indications that the Democrat platform, filled with promises which cannot be kept, and filled with these grossly degrading, inaccurate statements of fact, was not well received by the American public.

I sympathize with my many fine colleagues in the other party in their disgust over this sort of performance. We all endorse the goals of peace with justice, prosperity, and progress. And I am sure that almost all of us really believe the means to achieve the goals is not to be found in degrading American achievements, or utilizing untrue statements of facts in hopes of a bit of political benefit.

Mr. Speaker, the plain truth is that due to the excellent record of the Eisenhower administration in the development of our inland waterways, and the tremendous impact that the St. Lawrence Seaway has on the Great Lakes region, Americans in the Middle West, and for that matter in the entire country, will benefit over the years by greater employment opportunities, with the corresponding increase in living standards that come with great commercial development.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER].

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter and tables.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, in an effort to set the record straight, in the light of certain false charges in the Democratic platform that deal with a subject with which I have specific knowledge as a member of the Committee on Public Works, it involves the question of the interstate highway program. And, I quote from the platform:

> The Republican administration has slowed down, stretched out, and greatly increased the costs of the interstate highway program.
>
> The Democratic Party supports the highway program embodied in the acts of 1956 and 1958 and the principle of Federal-State partnership in highway construction.
>
> We commend the Democratic Congress for establishing a special committee which has launched an extensive investigation of this highway program. Continued scrutiny of this multi-billion dollar highway program can prevent waste, inefficiency, and graft and maintain the public's confidence.

Briefly, I want to touch on the latter first. I happen to be the second ranking minority member on the Special Subcommittee of the Federal Aid Highway Program. There are only 6 minority members as compared to 13 on the majority side—an almost unheard of majority on any special investigating committee, having also been denied as a minority member the right to have counsel from the period of 1959 when this committee was established until early in March of 1960—any right at all to minority committee counsel or staff; and further, after this special subcommittee was established with this 13 to 6 lopsided majority membership the majority leadership in effect deposed the rightful chairman of the subcommittee, the chairman on roads, who knew the highway program and knew all about it and had been involved in litigation concerning highways for years and years, the gentleman from Maryland, the great Congressman, GEORGE FALLON.

Instead of appointing him, they appointed the gentleman from Minnesota as chairman of the subcommittee. Then we got into the so-called investigation which the platform had said itself indicates was intended to "prevent waste, inefficiency, and graft and maintain the public's confidence."

What actually happened? What great crusade was there to try to ferret out—and I for one readily admit there exist and I am apprehensive about these wrongdoings and loose practices in this $25 billion program. There are bound to be some, and it is our job to find out where they are, to uncover them and where necessary, see that the parties involved are prosecuted and otherwise to make certain that laws are amended to tighten up the loose practices in the highway program in order to maintain the public's confidence in it.

But, what has this subcommittee done? What is this great crusade for which this subcommittee was set up? Shortly after the passage of the Interstate Defense Highway Act, I was one of the first, along with the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHERER], and along with the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL], in requesting that a surveillance committee be set up to keep track of what was going on in this program. What has happened with this great crusading subcommittee which was not set up until 1959 and which the Democratic platform says should be used for the purpose of maintaining the public's confidence in the highway program? They have had two investigations. And, I see the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] on the floor, and I am delighted to see him here, and I would like to ask him to correct any remarks I make if they are incorrect. There have been two investigations. One of them was directed at the Bureau of Public Roads. It was an effort to try to show that a decision was made in regard to bridge clearance, that instead of a 17-foot bridge clearance, as the Department of Defense had recommended—and some of the majority apparently were in favor of it—they established a 16-foot bridge clearance.

Hearings were held. The committee never made recommendations to the contrary. That was one of the big exposes that had been previously announced that this committee was going into.

The second great expose dealt with the State of Oklahoma. And apparently some internal, largely political, problems were involved there. I must admit that there was considerable uncovered in Oklahoma that made me quite concerned. The Bureau of Public Roads took immediate action to do something about it, including withdrawing funds from Oklahoma, interstate funds, until employees who had not only been retained on the payroll after they had admitted to the local prosecutor that they were guilty of falsifying records, but as a matter of fact were given salary increases and were blanketed in under the merit system. This was subsequently brought to the attention of the local administration by the Bureau of Public Roads and the funds were withheld until those persons were fired, as they should have been in the first place. Those are the two exposes that have taken place.

I, for one, have been quite concerned about the fact that this committee has not been more active and has not been more effective in this field, and have so stated on a number of occasions.

We recently had an executive session, which I am not at liberty to discuss at this time, as it was an executive session. But I will say this, that despite the fact that our subcommittee at that time took action and voted that the staff should go ahead with investigations in some 6 States throughout the country where they had "substantial reason to believe" that there were wrongdoings—and I see the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT] standing and I believe he will corroborate that this was the tenor of our action, asking that those investigations continue and that our committee be advised with regard to them and that hearings would be called as those investigations were completed. But let me say this at this time. We were advised by the chairman of the subcommittee—and I can only interpret this as resulting in the handcuffing of our committee and throwing a coldwater blanket on the investigating staff from now until election time—we were advised that the chairman was going to be busy campaigning and he did not feel he would be available for these investigations during this period. And my only interpretation of that is that apparently the committee and its staff will be handcuffed between now and November although, in my opinion, there are some things that deserve committee hearings.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. If the gentleman will permit, I would like to have this statement finished first and then yield to the gentleman on the floor. This is the policy that has been followed.

Mr. CRAMER. Now with regard to the question of the Interstate Defense Highway System, with regard to the administration's attitude toward the highway program, it is a matter of public record, no one has to guess about it and there is no reason for anyone to misrepresent that record, because it is a matter of record.

I insert for the RECORD the official documents of the Bureau of Public Roads stating progress under the 1956 National System of Interstate and Defense Highways Act which disproves conclusively in and of itself the fallacious statement contained in that platform.

The quarterly report on the Federal aid highway program issued August 9, together with the remarks of Ellis Armstrong, Commissioner of Public Roads, of April 29, state factually the very gratifying and substantial progress being made on this greatest of public works programs in the history of the world. These documents show, for instance—this is a matter of record and I wish the gentleman from Texas would address himself to these points so far as the administration and its attitude concerning this program is concerned, when he gets the floor—these documents show, for instance, that in the 4-year period following the 1956 act, construction is underway or advertised on 5,394 miles on the Interstate System; that is, of the 41,000-mile system; 25,509 miles on the A–B–C system; and 172 miles under the D program, as provided for in the 1958 Accelerated Highway Program Act. This is a total of 31,075 miles under construction since 1956.

In addition, the record of construction completed throughout the country is substantial, realizing that there is approximately a 2½-year lead time required for actual construction and the records show that on the Interstate System 6,615 miles have been completed; from the A–B–C system, 89,686 miles; 11,938 on the D system; for a total of 108,239 miles.

A full summary of the progress of the Federal-aid highway program follows in table A.

It is further to be noted that the Eisenhower Republican administration has given the leadership an impetus to the accelerated program starting with the 1954 McGregor Act, which provided for approximately $1 billion a year for Federal-aid funds, the largest total ever authorized, and commenced the basic approach of pay-as-you-go highway users taxes, which became the foundation of the $25 billion 14-year program in the 1956 act. The appointment by the President, on the suggestion of Republican Congressional leaders, of the Clay committee, formed a basis for analyzing highway needs throughout the Nation and evolved the 41,000 mile Interstate System approach, while accepting the McGregor pay-as-you-go road user taxes concept. The McGregor bill was passed during a Republican Congress on the request of the Republican President. The President followed with recommendations resulting from the Clay committee report to the 84th Congress, and gave strong leadership and backing which resulted in the 1956 act. It was largely because of the President's strong leadership and the support he had among Republicans in Congress that the program enacted was a responsible one, providing adequate funds for construction, and the establishment of a trust fund, to be replenished with earmarked road user taxes, although there was tremendous Democrat pressure to finance the program out of the general fund.

If the gentleman from Texas has any remarks on that, I would be glad to hear them, because we discussed this in committee.

Mr. WRIGHT. May I inquire of the gentleman who has the floor at approximately what hour he anticipates he might yield to me? Otherwise I might want to make a point of order.

Mr. CRAMER. I would suggest to the gentleman that he just walked into the Chamber. I will be glad to yield in about a minute, if the gentleman from Arizona is agreeable to that. There are plenty of Members on my right who have been here much longer than the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WRIGHT. The gentleman from Florida has been asking all these questions of me, and he gives me no opportunity to answer. I am afraid I am going to forget some of them before I get time to answer.

Mr. CRAMER. I notice the gentleman has been marking them down.

Mr. WRIGHT. I might have trouble reading my writing.

Mr. CRAMER. Again, in the 1959 and 1960 sessions of the 86th Congress, the President requested additional road user taxes to supplement the trust fund which had been depleted with the 1958 act increasing the authorizations as a special antirecession measure. With an additional $400 million on the A–B–C program, on a two-thirds Federal one-third State matching basis—this became the Democrat program—and a similar amount for the Interstate System without providing any funds for financing this accelerated program, the obvious result was the depletion of the trust fund and Congress has never, despite the President's repeated requests, accepted its responsibility and provided funds to replenish the depleted trust funds. Likewise, Congress added the Byrd amendment in the 1956 act which prevents the Bureau from apportioning funds that are not foreseeably available in the trust fund, which, together with the trust fund depletion, resulted in reimbursement planning and contract control.

Thus, as the following documents provide on the record, the Republican administration has been successfully pressing for the passage of the most successful and largest public works highway building program in the history of the world and, through the Bureau of Public Roads management, it is actually ahead of schedule, with the limited funds that Congress has made available and certainly if there is any program of which the Republicans can be proud from a standpoint of substantial accomplishment it is the national highway program, under the McGregor Act of 1954, and the Interstate and Defense Highway Act of 1956.

THE PROGRESS OF THE NATIONAL HIGHWAY PROGRAM

(Remarks of Ellis L. Armstrong, Commissioner of Public Roads, U.S. Department of Commerce, at chamber of commerce central highway committee luncheon meeting, Adolphus Hotel, Dallas, Tex., April 29, 1960)

This is my third visit to Dallas and my wonder as your amazing, dynamic, growing city continues to increase. Your accomplishments in Dallas are continuing to show the way to all of America. You have shown what can be done in our cities with wise, enthusiastic, energetic, farsighted leadership. I congratulate you.

We outsiders never cease to wonder at the vast scale of things in all of Texas. As Commissioner of Public Roads, I am particularly impressed. When the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways is completed, for example, you will have within your borders more than 3,000 of its 41,000 miles. You already have more mileage completed to full or acceptable Interstate standards, more open to traffic, and more under construction than any other State.

Since our greatly expanded highway program was inauguarted in 1956, construction contracts totaling about $185 million have been completed on the Texas segments of the Interstate System. In what we call the ABC program which started in a small way in 1916 and concerns improvement of the primary and secondary (or farm-to-market) roads, and their extensions into urban areas, $350 million in construction has been completed since 1956.

As you know, the Federal share of Interstate costs is 90 percent, and 50 percent in the case of the ABC program. It may be useful, in considering where our highway programs stand today, to review the evolution of American roadbuilding policies, and especially the terms of the partnership between the Federal Government and the States.

In the early days of the Republic, many roads were operated by turnpike companies chartered to relieve the States and localities of the burden of building and maintaining highways. The operators collected tolls from travelers. Although the roads are publicly owned, tolls are still a source of revenue over many stretches of modern highway, some of them on the Interstate System.

Since the Federal Government took a hand with highways, its policies have made almost a complete cycle. In the early years the National Government participated directly in the work. A provision of the 1802 act admitting Ohio to statehood set apart 5 percent of the net proceeds from the sale of public lands in the State for the construction of public roads leading from the navigable waters emptying into the Atlantic to and through Ohio. Of this, 3 percent was for roadmaking within the State and 2 percent for highways outside. The chief result was the famous Cumberland Road, which was constructed largely under the direction of Army engineers, and for which by 1838 a total of $7 million had been appropriated. A number of other highways were built by the Federal Government, many of them also financed through the sale of public lands.

Even before the final appropriation for the Cumberland Road was made in 1838, the Federal Government had begun to surrender sections of the road to States through which it passed. Gradually, Washington retired from roadbuilding, handing the job over to the States. They in turn left it increasingly to the counties or other local authorities, in whose charge it remained for years. One factor in the trend away from broad-scale highway planning was the rise of the railroads, which were relied on for long-distance transportation.

In 1891, another turn of policy was made when New Jersey enacted a State aid law under which the State, if prescribed conditions were met, aided the county and the property owners along the road by paying part of the cost. The policy found favor elsewhere, and many other States adopted similar systems.

In the days when counties, towns, and townships built and maintained public highways, they were used almost entirely for local traffic. The road supervisors were amateurs and the road crews were manned with statute labor, that is, men working out the road tax by contributing their own labor for 1 day or more during the year.

As a youngster in Utah, I remember riding on a road drag with my father as he worked out his yearly road tax. Actually the roads involved were used primarily by the farmers of the valley. Occasionally a brave soul from distant parts ventured through on the dusty, washboard, main highway, if you could call it that, but most of the traffic was local—and was financed by the local users, mainly by work supplied.

In 1916 the Federal Government again took an active part in highway building by helping the States. What is now the Bureau of Public Roads in the Department of Commerce had begun as the Office of Road Inquiry, a small unit established in the Department of Agriculture in 1893. For a score of years its activities were educational, and its only construction jobs comprised short object-lesson roads in various parts of the country. In 1912, Congress also authorized an experimental program of rural post-road construction.

By the time the Federal Aid Road Act of 1916 became effective, Federal highway policy had in a sense come full circle. Nationally, we were again building roads. In the 44 years that have passed since that time, the Federal Government's roadbuilding activities have increasingly centered in the Federal aid systems where we are the working partners with the State highway departments. Of course, we still do direct highway design and construction work in national forests, national parks, and other Federal lands.

The 1916 act authorized cooperation with the States, through their highway departments, in the construction of rural post roads, which it defined as "any public road over which the U.S. mails now are or may hereafter be transported, excluding every street and road in a place having a population, as shown by the latest available Federal census, of 2,500 or more, except that portion of any such street or road along which the houses average more than 200 feet apart." Although the kinds of highways built with Federal aid have greatly changed over the years, the 50–50 cost-sharing arrangement fixed in 1916 still obtains for the ABC program.

It was not until 1944 that the Interstate System was authorized. Congress then decreed, "There shall be designated within the continental United States a National System of Interstate Highways not exceeding 40,000 miles in extent so located as to connect by routes, as direct as practicable, the principal metropolitan areas, cities, and industrial centers, to serve the national defense, and to connect at suitable border points with routes of continental importance in the Dominion of Canada and the Republic of Mexico." The interstate routes were added to the Federal-aid system, but no special financing was provided.

The Department of Defense cooperated in the designation of the Interstate System, which includes the strategic routes of greatest importance to defense needs of the United States. In the 1954 act, Congress recognized that it was in the Federal interest to build the system to a high standard, and authorized the matching of funds on a 60 percent Federal, 10 percent State basis, with an additional allowance for States including large areas of Federal land from which they derived no taxes.

Congress and the executive branch and all of us all across America, increasingly recognized that highways were of national concern.

"There are two basic facts which are recognized and agreed upon by all concerned," said a House committee report on the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956. "First, the whole economy of the United States is directly dependent upon motor vehicle transportation. Secondly, we are failing to keep our highway systems adequate to meet our needs and the backlog of deficiencies required to be overcome has been and is constantly piling up at an alarming degree. Unless drastic steps are taken immediately we will fall farther and farther behind and traffic jams will soon stagnate our growing economy."

It was also realized that good highways were a necessity for defense. In 1955 President Eisenhower said in his message on the highway program, "In case of an atomic attack on our key cities, the road net must permit quick evacuation of target areas, mobilization of defense forces, and maintenance of every essential economic function. But the present system in critical areas would be the breeder of a deadly congestion within hours of an attack."

Accordingly, the 1956 act not only amended the name of the Interstate System to include "Defense" but increased the Federal share to 90 percent. As a practical matter, it

was recognized that projects on the Interstate System were, by their very nature, costly, and that it was of vital concern to all of us clear across America that they be completed as soon as possible.

There have been other evolutionary changes in the Federal-State partnership since the early joint building of rural post roads. We now grant aid to the States for construction on a system of principal secondary and feeder roads. We carry Federal-aid highways into and through the urban areas.

In the early days, State highway departments were prohibited from building or maintaining highways within incorporated cities, as was also the case with Federal-aid highway construction. The cities had for many years financed their street improvements out of benefit assessments and ad valorem property taxes. As motor-vehicle use increased, the State income from license fees and fuel taxes also increased, and a high proportion of the total tax income came from urban residents. There naturally arose a demand in the cities for a share in road-user taxes.

The States moved slowly in this direction. Maryland, in allocating 20 percent of the license fee revenue to Baltimore, was one of the first States to grant substantial urban aid. New York State made a similar grant to New York City as a part of the distribution of license fee receipts to counties. Several other States made concessions in the 1920's and 1930's.

The building of urban extensions of State highways in larger places also developed slowly. Major changes came in the National Industrial Recovery Act of 1933, which provided emergency funds for use on extensions of Federal-aid highways into and through cities, and in the Hayden-Cartwright Act of 1934, which permanently removed the restriction on urban projects.

The changes in State and Federal law and practice have brought a very great increase in the amount of money spent on urban connections of Federal-aid and other State highways. The policy of Federal and State responsibility for urban connections of primary highways has become firmly established. It has also been firmly fixed in law and practice for Federal-aid funds to be used on projects carrying Federal-aid secondary highways through cities.

This shift in emphasis toward the urban is quite in accord with the changes in our national life. Our cities contain about 100 million people, and the percentage is steadily increasing. About half of the total travel is within urban areas, and thus about half our highway user funds come from those sections.

As you know, most Federal funds are not expended directly, but are paid to States as Federal aid in reimbursement for work performed. The States also transfer to local governments about one-fourth of all State road-user tax revenues as State aid for local roads and streets. Taking into account these intergovernmental transfers, the States in 1960 will administer $7.2 billion of highway funds, or about two-thirds of the total.

Capital outlay (expenditures for right-of-way and construction) is estimated to reach $6.7 billion in 1960, slightly less than in 1959.

Highway construction expenditures (excluding right-of-way and preliminary engineering cost), are estimated to exceed $5.6 billion in 1960, a decline of about $140 million from 1959. Construction expenditures on the Interstate System will account for one-third of the total in 1960, and nearly three-fourths of the total will be expended on the various Federal-aid systems.

Before 1956, Federal appropriations for highway purposes were made from the general funds of the Treasury. The Federal-Aid Highway Act passed that year established the Highway Trust Fund from which highway payments are made. The law increased most automotive taxes and earmarked for the Trust Fund all those on gasoline, diesel and special fuels, tires and tubes, and motor vehicle use, and half the tax on new trucks, buses, and trailers.

A pay-as-you-go clause in the 1956 act limited apportionments that the Federal Government could make to the States to amounts that the Trust Fund could support. In 1958 Congress suspended this limit, increased the authorizations for Interstate and ABC, and as a special antirecession measure provided $400 million on a two-thirds Federal, one-third State matching basis for immediate road improvements.

The result was that we were forced to live beyond our income. When the pay-as-you-go clause came back into effect last year, the Interstate program was threatened with a halt as far as any new work was concerned unless additional funds were provided. President Eisenhower recommended a 1½-cent increase in the Federal motor-fuel tax for 5 years. In a compromise, Congress voted a 1-cent increase through the fiscal year 1961, to be succeeded by the earmarking of additional sums from motor-vehicle excise taxes through the fiscal year 1964. This legislation made it possible to keep up the Federal-aid programs without too serious a slowdown, but demanded some careful planning on reimbursements to the States. In effect, the situation limited the amount each State could obligate from its available apportionment and still be sure of payment of the vouchers when they came due.

Public Roads was able to apportion $1.8 billion to the States for the Interstate program in the fiscal year 1961, and expects to be able to apportion $2 billion for 1962 on the basis of present revenues.

In his budget message this year, President Eisenhower renewed his recommendation of the full 1½-cent fuel tax increase through 1964. He said this would permit the Interstate construction program to proceed at a higher and more desirable level. No action has been taken on this recommendation.

In the first 3½ years of the new program we have completed over 102,000 miles of construction work on our Federal-aid systems, including nearly 21,000 bridges, at a construction cost of over $8 billion. This road-building record includes almost 6,000 miles of construction on the Interstate System. We have construction underway on 25,000 additional miles of which 4,600 miles are on the Interstate System. During this 3½-year period contracts were let for approximately $14 billion on Federal-aid highways.

These improvements already have made a significant contribution to highway safety and efficiency in America. More than 7,570 miles of the 41,000-mile Interstate System are now open to traffic, including toll and free roads incorporated into the System.

We now have over 10,000 Federal-aid construction contracts underway involving nearly $6 billion.

It is natural that among all the people involved in one way or another there are a few who try to chisel, to make a fast highway buck. But it does not seem to me that the very few real instances of shenanigans justify the broad allegations that have been published about the Interstate System being in "trouble" or "a mess." It is most unfortunate that relatively trivial incidents have been magnified from molehills to mountains and that some wild reports have been interpreted as facts, while the great accomplishments have been overlooked.

In the Federal-State road partnership the State carries the responsibility for initiating the projects, programing the work, doing the detail design, and supervising the construction, subject to approval of each step by the Bureau of Public Roads. The States pay the contractors and then submit vouchers to the Bureau of Public Roads for reimbursement of the Federal share. The relationship is a partnership to assure construction to high standards and protection of public moneys. Actually, the large number of checks and counterchecks that are built into the program assure a good measure of protection.

Each State, of course, has regular inspection and auditing machinery of its own to keep tight rein on the expenditures of the various State departments. Then the regular inspection and auditing machinery of the Bureau of Public Roads has served as additional safeguard for many years.

Nearly every project receives engineering inspections during construction and all projects undergo a final engineering inspection and a final audit which are completed before the States get full reimbursement for the Federal share. The Bureau engineers' progress reports of interim inspections guide the auditors in approving progress payments.

The audits are prepared in the division offices that the Bureau of Public Roads maintains in all the States. They are forwarded to the regional offices (each region comprising four or more States) for review before amounts due the States are certified to the U.S. Treasury disbursing officers for payment.

In view of the magnitude of the Interstate program and the 90-percent Federal share, an additional safeguard was set up by the Federal Highway Administrator, Bertram D. Tallamy, shortly after he took office in 1957. This is the Project Examination Division of the Bureau of Public Roads. Since 1957 the Bureau has referred to the Department of Justice a dozen or more cases of irregularity investigated by the Project Examination Division.

The division is headed by a staff man of long experience, who is an accountant and a member of the bar. It has conducted general reviews of the Bureau's own field offices and the State highway departments in 44 States, and expects by July 1 to have examined all 50.

In a general review of State operations, a team of about six persons samples financial records that bear on the use of Federal funds, spot checking contracts and arrangements with consulting engineers. Three of the men who head these teams are former special agents of the FBI. In addition to the director, a team may include an engineer, two accountants or investigators, and a real property specialist.

If there is any indication of fraud, the team director has his men investigate the matter on the spot or he may bring in other specialists.

The Bureau of Public Roads often receives tips from independent sources on alleged wrongdoing. It makes a special review in such a case, sending one or more engineers or other specialists, their selection depending on the nature of the suspected irregularity.

Believe me, the Bureau of Public Roads is not indifferent to the loss of any tax dollar, whether it is State or Federal. But we must not forget that this is a cooperative Federal-State program. Complete domination of every aspect of the program by the Federal Government would amount to duplication of effort, would endanger the historic partnership and would be wasteful of public funds—both Federal and State.

A special subcommittee of the House Committee on Public Works, headed by Representative JOHN A. BLATNIK, of Minnesota, was appointed last November to investigate the Federal-aid highway program. The announcement of its appointment mentioned "information received by the committee alleging deficiencies, wasteful extravagance," and other matters. The Blatnik group can perform a valuable service to the highway program if, through its power of subpena and independent review, it points out areas where State and Federal controls should be strengthened.

We fully expect that instances of human error and attempted profiteering will be turned up by the committee, as well as by the Bureau's own forces. It would be naive to expect a multibillion-dollar program involving probably 1½ million people in various capacities—to proceed without such instances.

It is a credit to the Bureau and the States that the program has been so free of wrongdoing. Both the Bureau of Public Roads and the State highway departments are staffed by hard-working, dedicated people whose careers are bound up with the success of their joint undertaking. Their record of advancement in a very difficult and trying job is one of which all Americans can well be proud. It would be a sad commentary indeed in our America if they should become victims of irresponsible gossip and misleading headlines.

Besides the allegations of dishonesty, there has been some talk about carelessness, laxity, and waste. When charges of extravagance are specific, I have yet to see any that have stood up under examination.

It must be remembered that Congress has ordered the Interstate System to be built to carry the kinds and volumes of traffic expected for 1975. And it is good economy and good sense to build for the days ahead. Real waste and extravagance would be to build something that became obsolescent the day the opening ribbon was cut. Surely we are thinking enough and farsighted enough to plan and build adequately for our dynamic, growing America.

The interstate network, which is to carry 20 percent of the country's traffic on its 41,000 miles, is bound to be costly. It averages nearly $1 million a mile.

The real cost of highways is measured by the cost of highways per vehicle mile of travel. On our urban interstate routes, which cost the most per mile of construction, the returns are the greatest. Here actual travel is the most economical as the vehicle mile cost of the highway will be about a half cent. This compares with about three-fourths of a cent on the Federal-aid primary system, other than interstate, an overall average of all roads of nearly 1 cent and a cost of 1½ cents per vehicle-mile on the farm-to-market roads.

A dirt road would be cheaper than a four-lane surfaced highway, but in an area of high traffic volume it would be a waste of anybody's taxes. What may seem extravagant from one point of view is true economy from another. Perhaps a heavy car is wasteful for one purpose, but not for others. Perhaps taking a toll road and also paying gasoline taxes is wasteful for a traveler on a leisurely vacation trip, but not to a businessman who wants to get to an appointment quickly and without fatigue.

The Interstate System is to be a permanent national asset, and must be built for the future, to the high standards Congress prescribed. While watching quality, the Bureau of Public Roads at the same time looks for chances to stretch the highway dollar. The Bureau's annual report for 1959, which was published recently, recounts estimated savings of nearly $55 million achieved in that year through modifying conventional highway design in the interest of economy at no expense to the safety, comfort, and convenience of the traveling public. Bureau engineers worked out the modifications with State engineers during the design stages of Federal-aid projects.

In all the criticism of the vast highway undertaking, I have heard no serious demand that it be stopped. There is agreement on all sides that the Interstate System must be completed. The sea of trucks and passenger cars bears down on our inadequate highway channels in ever greater waves.

We have the engineers, the contractors, the machines, and the materials. The chief need is a permanent solution of the question of finance, on a basis that is fair to those who use the highways directly and those who do not. The present revenues of the highway trust fund have caused a moderate slowdown in construction. Next year, Congress plans to review the whole picture.

There will then be available a wealth of basic background information on which the Bureau of Public Roads and the State highway departments are working. An up-to-date estimate of the cost of completing the Interstate System will have been just completed. Other extensive studies will present benefits that highways bring to the various classes of users, as well as nonusers, so that Congress can consider the best and most equitable distribution of the cost of the long-range program. Extensive data will show the incremental costs due to different users of the highway system.

This I believe: The development of the Federal highway policy in the long partnership with the States is sound and is the best way possible to obtain our objectives of an integrated, high-standard, optimum, highway system to meet our evermounting traffic demands. The present program is geared to meeting the needs of a dynamic, growing America and is making great strides. I have great faith in the integrity and ability of the thousands of dedicated men and women who are carrying out the program. There are great days ahead.

QUARTERLY REPORT ON THE FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY PROGRAM, JUNE 30, 1960

More than 9,100 miles of the 41,000-mile National System of Interstate and Defense Highways are now open to traffic and construction is underway on another 4,700 miles, Federal Highway Administrator Bertram D. Tallamy announced today.

Information as of June 30, 1960, compiled by the Bureau of Public Roads, U.S. Department of Commerce, showed that 250 miles of the system were completed to final standards during the last 3 months.

"The actual mileage in use by passenger and commercial vehicles rose from 8,855 as of March 31, the date of the last survey, to 9,107 as of June 30," Mr. Tallamy said. "Thus, well over one-fifth of the Interstate System is now open to traffic and new mileage is being completed rapidly as the construction season nears its peak."

The Interstate System will be the Nation's key highway network, serving both civilian and defense requirements, and carrying about 20 percent of the total traffic. The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 required the system to be designed to accommodate the traffic needs of 1975 and assumed completion of the system by 1972.

Of the 9,107 miles of the Interstate System now in use by motorists, 3,693 miles were completed to standards adequate for 1975 traffic, and 3,140 miles were improved to adequacy for present traffic but will need additional improvement to bring them up to the standards for 1975. Toll roads, bridges, and tunnels incorporated in the system, as permitted by law, totaled 2,274 miles.

Almost half of the mileage open to traffic, 4,386 miles, has been built or improved under the Federal-aid interstate program, most of it on the 90-percent Federal, 10-percent State sharing program launched in 1956. Work on the remaining 2,447 miles (other than toll facilities) was financed by the States and localities, mostly before 1956, under other programs—in many cases with Federal aid.

In addition to the sections open to traffic, 4,690 miles were under construction with interstate funds as of June 30, and engineering or right-of-way acquisition was in progress on another 10,093 miles. Thus some form of work was underway or completed on 23,890 miles of the 41,000-mile system—over half of the total.

Under the controlling Federal legislation, each State receives a yearly apportionment of Federal Interstate funds for work on approved Interstate System routes. The apportionment of $2.2 billion for fiscal year 1962 was announced on July 26. The scheduling of preliminary steps and actual construction on the interstate routes is the responsibility of the States, subject to approval by the Bureau of Public Roads.

The status of the Interstate System as of June 30 is shown on the accompanying map, and in detail by States in table I. In summary, the status is as follows:

Mileage improved and open to traffic:	
Completed to full or acceptable standards:	
With interstate funds	3,141
With other public funds	552
Total	3,693
Improved to standards adequate for present traffic but additional improvement needed to meet full standards:	
With interstate funds	1,245
With other public funds	1,895
Total	3,140
Toll facilities	2,274
Total mileage improved and open to traffic	9,107
Mileage under construction with interstate funds	4,690
Preliminary engineering or right-of-way acquisition under way	10,093
Total mileage improved or work underway	23,890

Nearly $9 billion has been put to work on the Federal-aid interstate program since the accelerated program began, 4 years ago. Work completed since July 1, 1956, has cost $3.61 billion, of which $2.76 billion was for construction and $853 million for engineering and right-of-way acquisition. As of June 30, 1960, work estimated to cost $5.09 billion was underway or authorized, including $3.33 billion of construction and $1.76 billion of engineering and right-of-way acquisition. Interstate financing data, by States, are reported in table II.

The continuing program of Federal assistance for the improvement of the Federal-aid primary and secondary highway systems and their urban extensions (the ABC program) has also shown remarkable accomplishment, with more than $9½ billion worth of work involving over 126,000 miles of construction contracts completed or underway.

Construction contracts involving 100,100 miles in the ABC program have been completed since July 1, 1956, at a cost of $6.14 billion; and contracts involving 25,912 miles at a cost of $2.70 billion were underway on June 30, 1960. In addition, $427 million of engineering and right-of-way acquisition work had been completed and $275 million worth of such work was underway. The ABC program is financed by the Federal Government and the States on an equal-share basis. Data are reported by States in table III.

The highway trust fund, source of Federal funds for the Federal-aid highway program, received over $683 million of tax revenue income during the 3 months ended June 30, 1960, about four-fifths of it from the taxes on motor fuel. Disbursements for highways during the period amounted to nearly $552 million. For the entire fiscal year 1960, the total trust fund excise tax revenue was more than $2.5 billion, and disbursements for highways were over $2.9 billion. The status of the trust fund is shown in table IV.

TABLE I.—*National System of Interstate and Defense Highways—Status of improvement as of June 30, 1960*

State	Open to traffic								Work in progress with interstate funds			Remaining mileage	Total designated system mileage
	Completed to full or acceptable standards			Improved to standards adequate for present traffic			Toll facilities	Total open to traffic	Under construction	Engineering or right-of-way	Total underway		
	With interstate funds	With other public funds	Total	With interstate funds	With other public funds	Total							
Alabama	8.0		8.0	19.4	32.1	51.5		59.5	237.5	123.1	360.6	453.8	873.9
Alaska													
Arizona	166.5	0.2	166.7	68.7	278.3	347.0		513.7	41.1	130.1	171.2	476.3	1,161.2
Arkansas	38.4		38.4		2.8	2.8		41.2	76.3	384.1	460.4	16.1	517.7
California	123.0	22.1	145.1	167.8	177.2	345.0	18.9	509.0	111.3	1,063.6	1,174.9	498.9	2,182.8
Colorado	94.1	4.3	98.4	63.3	39.3	102.6		201.0	98.0	113.1	211.1	537.8	949.9
Connecticut	16.8	71.1	87.9	5.6	18.1	23.7	19.5	131.1	28.8	110.7	139.5	27.2	297.8
Delaware	.6		.6	.6		.6	2.3	3.5	.7	27.2	27.9	9.1	40.5
Florida	40.6		40.6				42.4	83.0	141.0	65.5	206.5	852.7	1,142.2
Georgia	26.0	17.5	43.5		89.0	89.0		132.5	147.4	135.4	282.8	696.1	1,111.4
Hawaii													
Idaho	15.1		15.1	23.8	37.4	61.2		76.3	90.4	197.9	288.3	246.2	610.8
Illinois	76.4	20.3	96.7	23.3	133.2	156.5	151.5	404.7	169.4	527.9	697.3	484.3	1,586.3
Indiana	12.0		12.0	3.9	2.8	6.7	156.9	175.6	125.1	304.2	429.3	513.9	1,118.8
Iowa	103.4		103.4	21.5		21.5	3.8	128.7	121.9	218.7	340.6	239.4	708.7
Kansas	95.8		95.8	16.0	46.5	62.5	187.1	345.4	86.0	62.8	148.8	306.9	801.1
Kentucky	19.4		19.4		8.5	8.5	40.0	67.9	101.7	154.7	256.4	373.1	697.4
Louisiana	14.4	2.9	17.3		.8	.8		18.1	101.0	245.4	346.4	315.8	680.3
Maine	11.3	.9	12.2		3.0	3.0	59.8	75.0	42.7	27.7	70.4	166.6	312.0
Maryland	27.0	32.5	59.5	15.8	29.1	44.9	10.5	114.9	17.4	189.4	206.8	32.2	353.9
Massachusetts	22.5	5.4	27.9		27.3	27.3	126.5	181.7	65.7	67.1	132.8	147.4	461.9
Michigan	133.0	127.1	260.1		5.0	5.0	4.9	270.0	178.9	289.3	469.1	335.4	1,074.5
Minnesota	16.2		16.2	56.3	6.3	62.6		78.8	73.8	240.6	314.4	499.6	892.8
Mississippi				15.3	13.8	29.1		29.1	216.2	102.5	318.7	324.1	671.9
Missouri	46.7	1.9	48.6	88.4	168.1	256.5	3.0	308.1	100.6	648.1	748.7	43.5	1,100.3
Montana	60.7		60.7					60.7	71.7	336.8	408.5	710.4	1,179.6
Nebraska	13.2		13.2		12.9	12.9	.3	26.4	42.7	91.5	134.2	328.0	488.6
Nevada	50.7		50.7	5.5		5.5		56.2	12.7	145.9	158.6	319.2	534.0
New Hampshire	23.7		23.7		.3	.3	25.7	49.7	36.1	7.4	43.5	120.0	213.2
New Jersey	7.1	7.8	14.9	7.0	15.0	22.0	52.4	89.3	22.2	72.8	95.0	187.2	371.5
New Mexico	197.3		197.3	94.0		94.0		291.3	40.5	32.2	72.7	638.9	1,002.9
New York	68.8	51.9	120.7	6.2	12.5	18.7	500.3	639.7	126.7	217.5	344.2	243.3	1,227.2
North Carolina	92.0		92.0	68.5	85.2	153.7		245.7	182.2	21.2	203.4	324.1	773.2
North Dakota	114.8		114.8	26.1	33.2	59.3		174.1	43.2	30.5	73.7	320.1	567.9
Ohio	258.4	25.3	283.7		38.0	38.0	173.5	495.2	112.0	329.1	441.1	553.0	1,489.3
Oklahoma	57.3		57.3	27.6	22.6	50.2	175.8	283.3	135.7	143.6	279.3	233.0	795.6
Oregon	143.8	26.4	170.2	27.7	199.7	227.4	.7	398.3	105.4	25.6	131.0	202.1	731.4
Pennsylvania	136.2	58.6	194.8	6.2	12.2	18.4	362.8	576.0	117.6	203.0	320.6	634.4	1,531.0
Rhode Island	10.0	9.7	19.7	.2	.1	.3		20.0	1.4	3.3	4.7	46.4	71.1
South Carolina	43.5		43.5	2.2	7.9	10.1		53.6	241.5	72.0	313.5	311.9	679.0
South Dakota	7.2		7.2	56.5		56.5		63.7	92.1	239.4	331.5	282.4	677.6
Tennessee	5.5	1.7	7.2					7.2	159.4	230.6	390.0	653.4	1,050.6
Texas	465.2	54.2	519.4	117.6	145.0	262.6	30.0	812.0	272.6	1,208.3	1,480.9	738.1	3,031.0
Utah	31.5		31.5	19.9	2.1	22.0		53.5	68.3	129.8	198.1	670.1	921.7
Vermont	7.8		7.8					7.8	33.8	110.8	144.6	169.8	321.2
Virginia	22.4	4.4	26.8	48.0	37.3	85.3	39.2	151.3	107.1	337.0	444.1	471.3	1,066.7
Washington	53.6	2.8	56.4	121.8	111.0	232.8	.6	289.8	36.3	282.0	318.3	118.8	726.9
West Virginia	.2		.2				85.8	86.0	52.5	47.1	99.6	208.8	394.4
Wisconsin	99.3		99.3		39.5	39.5		138.8	57.7	256.0	313.7		452.5
Wyoming	63.7		63.7	20.5		20.5		84.2	140.7	82.4	223.1	608.1	915.4
District of Columbia		2.6	2.6		1.3	1.3		3.9	4.5	7.6	12.1	16.9	32.8
Puerto Rico													
Total	3,141.1	551.6	3,692.7	1,245.2	1,894.4	3,139.6	2,274.2	9,106.5	4,690.4	10,092.5	14,782.9	16,705.0	[1] 40,594.4

[1] The system is limited to 41,000 miles by law. The small balance is held in reserve for adjustments as final locations are selected and projects built.

TABLE II.—*National System of Interstate and Defense Highways—Active and completed projects financed with Federal-aid Interstate funds as of June 30, 1960*

[Millions of dollars]

State	Projects under way or authorized						Projects completed July 1, 1956, to date					
	Construction		Engineering and right-of-way		Total		Construction		Engineering and right-of-way		Total	
	Total cost	Federal funds	Total cost	Federal funds	Total cost	Federal funds	Total cost	Federal funds	Total cost	Federal funds	Total cost	Federal funds
Alabama	78.7	70.8	24.8	21.6	103.5	92.4	28.4	24.2	5.4	4.8	33.8	29.0
Alaska												
Arizona	29.5	27.9	18.4	17.4	47.9	45.3	36.3	33.3	1.7	1.6	38.0	34.9
Arkansas	48.6	43.7	30.9	27.1	79.5	70.8	16.4	12.9	2.1	1.6	18.5	14.5
California	250.9	208.7	226.9	95.7	477.8	304.4	242.4	205.9	254.7	144.5	497.1	350.4
Colorado	19.7	17.8	3.4	3.1	23.1	20.9	55.9	47.9	13.8	12.0	69.7	59.9
Connecticut	41.3	36.7	35.7	31.5	77.0	68.2	27.4	22.7	4.1	3.6	31.5	26.3
Delaware	8.2	7.3	16.8	14.0	25.0	21.3	2.5	2.2	.9	.6	3.4	2.8
Florida	76.8	68.2	27.5	24.7	104.3	92.9	58.4	49.1	45.6	40.7	104.0	89.8
Georgia	71.2	62.9	43.6	35.5	114.8	98.4	24.8	19.8	12.5	11.0	37.3	30.8
Hawaii												
Idaho	22.4	20.9	6.0	5.5	28.4	26.4	16.6	14.4	2.9	2.6	19.5	17.0
Illinois	220.3	192.4	93.1	81.8	313.4	274.2	131.6	103.5	21.7	18.8	153.3	122.3
Indiana	107.6	94.0	33.0	29.7	140.6	123.7	22.4	18.5	9.5	8.5	31.9	27.0
Iowa	49.4	44.7	9.0	8.1	58.4	52.8	76.1	66.1	18.1	15.6	94.2	81.7
Kansas	26.0	23.1	13.3	8.6	39.3	31.7	65.4	56.5	11.0	9.8	76.4	66.3
Kentucky	69.0	61.9	34.3	30.0	103.3	91.9	33.2	28.7	14.2	11.7	47.4	40.4
Louisiana	72.6	65.3	66.8	56.1	139.4	121.4	43.2	37.9	4.2	3.7	47.4	41.6
Maine	29.8	26.7	2.0	1.8	31.8	28.5	18.2	15.0	5.0	4.5	23.2	19.5
Maryland	40.8	36.3	19.8	17.4	60.6	53.7	45.3	38.9	2.3	2.0	47.6	40.9
Massachusetts	123.7	109.3	39.8	35.8	163.5	145.1	35.7	32.0	12.5	11.1	48.2	43.1
Michigan	118.1	106.1	98.9	89.0	217.0	195.1	134.9	112.4	10.0	8.2	144.9	120.6
Minnesota	68.0	61.8	118.7	63.9	186.7	125.7	20.1	16.6	4.8	4.2	24.9	20.8
Mississippi	62.0	55.3	16.3	13.9	78.3	69.2	26.3	22.5	3.0	2.2	29.3	24.7
Missouri	77.4	69.8	17.7	15.9	95.1	85.7	100.1	86.4	50.2	42.3	150.3	128.7
Montana	40.4	37.0	14.8	13.5	55.2	50.5	6.1	5.1	10.4	9.3	16.5	14.4
Nebraska	28.6	25.7	23.2	20.9	51.8	46.6	11.0	9.0	4.5	3.8	15.5	12.8
Nevada	4.5	4.3	30.0	28.5	34.5	32.8	15.2	14.1	1.5	1.3	16.7	15.4

TABLE II.—*National System of Interstate and Defense Highways—Active and completed projects financed with Federal-aid Interstate funds as of June 30, 1960*—Continued

[Millions of dollars]

State	Projects underway or authorized						Projects completed July 1, 1956, to date					
	Construction		Engineering and right-of-way		Total		Construction		Engineering and right-of-way		Total	
	Total cost	Federal funds	Total cost	Federal funds	Total cost	Federal funds	Total cost	Federal funds	Total cost	Federal funds	Total cost	Federal funds
New Hampshire	28.0	24.4	6.2	5.6	34.2	30.0	21.3	17.8	1.7	1.4	23.0	19.2
New Jersey	60.0	53.4	82.8	71.2	142.8	124.6	34.4	30.3	3.1	2.6	37.5	32.9
New Mexico	17.5	16.3	9.8	9.1	27.3	25.4	63.0	58.1	5.8	5.3	68.8	63.4
New York	264.0	225.7	142.4	126.2	406.4	351.9	200.8	153.1	15.2	13.5	216.0	166.6
North Carolina	48.0	43.2	4.4	4.0	52.4	47.2	60.2	50.4	18.4	16.1	78.6	66.5
North Dakota	19.1	17.3	3.4	3.1	22.5	20.4	40.6	36.2	2.6	2.2	43.2	38.4
Ohio	137.7	121.4	35.0	31.5	172.7	152.9	260.8	226.3	113.3	101.4	374.1	327.7
Oklahoma	28.6	25.7	14.9	13.4	43.5	39.1	72.3	61.3	7.5	6.7	79.8	68.0
Oregon	54.0	49.7	31.4	28.8	84.5	78.5	57.0	46.7	2.2	1.9	59.2	48.6
Pennsylvania	135.2	121.6	41.0	36.9	176.2	158.5	164.3	137.4	37.8	33.9	202.1	171.3
Rhode Island	5.3	4.7	19.5	17.3	24.8	22.0	20.3	17.1	3.2	2.8	23.5	19.9
South Carolina	70.8	63.1	3.7	3.3	74.5	66.4	19.6	16.2	10.2	8.9	29.8	25.1
South Dakota	31.8	28.9	6.0	5.4	37.8	34.3	13.3	10.4	2.3	2.1	15.6	12.5
Tennessee	102.7	92.4	69.6	59.6	172.3	152.0	20.5	18.1	7.5	6.4	28.0	24.5
Texas	147.7	132.8	77.3	69.6	225.0	202.4	214.4	184.8	15.2	13.6	229.6	198.4
Utah	27.5	25.5	20.1	19.1	47.6	44.6	16.2	14.4	14.3	13.2	30.5	27.6
Vermont	41.6	37.5	8.4	7.5	50.0	45.0	5.6	4.2	2.2	1.8	7.8	6.0
Virginia	112.9	100.9	42.9	38.6	155.8	139.5	16.2	12.5	13.8	11.9	30.0	24.4
Washington	40.0	36.3	19.4	17.5	59.4	53.8	65.0	52.1	27.8	24.9	92.8	77.0
West Virginia	61.5	54.6	17.8	15.1	79.3	69.7	3.1	2.6	6.0	5.2	9.1	7.8
Wisconsin	41.8	36.7	20.6	18.6	62.4	55.3	54.6	47.0	12.7	10.5	67.3	57.5
Wyoming	40.1	37.2	7.0	6.5	47.1	43.7	35.8	32.0	1.4	1.3	37.2	33.3
District of Columbia	31.6	27.7	12.3	11.0	43.9	38.7	2.5	2.2	2.6	2.3	5.1	4.5
Puerto Rico												
Total	3,332.9	2,955.6	1,760.6	1,409.9	5,093.5	4,365.5	2,755.7	2,326.8	853.4	669.9	3,609.1	2,996.7

TABLE III.—*Federal-aid primary and secondary highway systems, active and completed projects financed with primary, secondary, and urban funds, as of June 30, 1960*

[Millions of dollars]

State	Projects under way or authorized							Projects completed July 1, 1956, to date						
	Construction			Engineering and right-of-way		Total		Construction			Engineering and right-of-way		Total	
	Total cost	Federal funds	Miles	Total cost	Federal funds	Total cost	Federal funds	Total cost	Federal funds	Miles	Total cost	Federal funds	Total cost	Federal funds
Alabama	60.5	29.1	02.3	7.7	3.8	68.2	32.9	125.5	66.6	3,283.2	10.8	5.4	136.3	72.0
Alaska	29.4	25.5	197.9	10.1	8.8	39.5	34.3	20.5	17.4	638.1	1.6	1.6	22.1	19.0
Arizona	17.6	13.4	166.9	3.0	2.2	20.6	15.6	55.5	41.0	657.8	1.3	.9	56.8	41.9
Arkansas	35.2	17.9	561.2	1.9	1.0	37.1	18.9	74.8	38.6	2,062.7	6.3	3.1	81.1	41.7
California	146.4	78.6	310.0	2.6	1.5	149.0	80.1	344.2	175.3	1,389.2	2.6	1.3	346.8	176.6
Colorado	24.4	13.1	290.0	5.3	3.0	29.7	16.1	94.9	50.7	1,271.5	9.2	4.7	104.1	55.4
Connecticut	57.3	27.3	67.6	2.9	1.4	60.2	28.7	47.4	25.2	95.5	1.7	.9	49.1	26.1
Delaware	9.0	4.5	74.6	.3	.2	9.3	4.7	29.4	14.1	219.1	.3	.2	29.7	14.3
Florida	47.8	24.2	219.5	1.0	.5	48.8	24.7	116.7	57.2	1,475.8	1.0	.4	117.7	57.6
Georgia	80.8	40.6	831.0	13.1	6.6	93.9	47.2	128.4	64.9	2,370.6	7.4	3.6	135.8	68.5
Hawaii	9.7	4.6	14.0	.6	.3	10.3	4.9	17.5	9.0	46.8	3.2	1.6	20.7	10.6
Idaho	16.5	10.6	219.3	3.0	1.8	19.5	12.4	49.0	30.4	1,069.1	3.9	2.1	52.9	32.5
Illinois	145.1	77.6	912.7	7.9	3.9	153.0	81.5	280.8	147.8	3,306.9	6.4	3.4	287.2	151.2
Indiana	78.7	40.4	557.8	15.3	7.7	94.0	48.1	141.9	76.0	1,438.7	20.9	10.5	162.8	86.5
Iowa	39.1	20.0	803.5	1.9	.9	41.0	20.9	154.5	82.7	4,910.6	5.3	2.7	159.8	85.4
Kansas	35.6	17.8	1,307.7	1.5	.7	37.1	18.5	135.3	69.0	5,405.1	13.2	6.7	148.5	75.7
Kentucky	51.1	26.7	291.5	6.3	3.2	57.4	29.9	96.7	50.9	1,355.0	20.5	10.2	117.2	61.1
Louisiana	73.1	34.4	529.7	4.7	2.3	77.8	36.7	109.2	55.0	1,329.5	6.1	3.1	115.3	58.1
Maine	8.9	4.5	75.0	1.7	.9	10.6	5.4	50.4	25.7	459.6	4.5	2.1	54.9	27.8
Maryland	34.0	17.5	208.6	1.1	.5	35.1	18.0	81.5	42.4	652.6	.8	.4	82.3	42.8
Massachusetts	98.1	49.1	93.7	11.9	6.0	110.0	55.1	96.4	47.9	154.7	21.1	10.3	117.5	58.2
Michigan	87.3	43.6	924.4	11.0	5.5	98.3	49.1	231.2	113.4	3,408.0	4.3	1.8	235.5	115.2
Minnesota	84.2	44.6	1,713.6	1.0	.5	85.2	45.1	149.5	78.1	6,262.8	4.8	2.5	154.3	80.6
Mississippi	40.9	19.6	865.8	3.3	1.6	44.2	21.2	92.2	46.6	3,080.1	11.2	5.6	103.4	52.2
Missouri	67.2	33.9	1,071.5	14.0	7.0	81.2	40.9	167.5	87.7	5,208.4	29.1	14.5	196.6	102.2
Montana	33.1	20.7	587.9	4.2	2.4	37.3	23.1	86.9	54.8	1,881.5	6.7	3.9	93.6	58.7
Nebraska	41.4	21.9	886.4	1.7	.9	43.1	22.8	113.2	60.4	3,163.8	11.8	6.0	125.0	66.4
Nevada	8.8	7.4	149.8	1.7	1.4	10.5	8.8	42.4	34.7	893.5	2.2	1.6	44.6	36.3
New Hampshire	11.2	5.5	45.7	.4	.2	11.6	5.7	35.4	18.2	195.4	1.5	.7	36.9	18.9
New Jersey	44.9	22.3	83.7	16.2	8.2	61.1	30.5	92.8	46.3	208.3	1.9	.9	94.7	47.2
New Mexico	15.7	10.2	196.4	2.5	1.6	18.2	11.8	73.1	47.1	1,108.8	6.4	4.0	79.5	51.1
New York	271.8	129.3	654.3	5.9	3.2	277.7	132.5	476.8	228.8	1,347.4			476.8	228.8
North Carolina	37.1	18.3	483.3	4.3	2.1	41.4	20.4	138.0	70.4	2,541.4	24.2	11.9	162.2	82.3
North Dakota	29.2	14.8	1,192.5	.4	.2	29.6	15.0	80.1	41.6	5,633.9	3.6	1.9	83.7	43.5
Ohio	149.7	81.6	333.5	4.2	2.1	153.9	83.7	205.6	107.1	1,341.3	72.7	36.5	278.3	143.6
Oklahoma	42.4	21.2	773.6	4.3	2.2	46.7	23.4	139.9	71.1	2,238.8	6.0	3.0	145.9	74.1
Oregon	28.8	17.8	298.3	7.9	4.8	36.7	22.6	83.8	50.0	1,070.1	1.9	1.1	85.7	51.1
Pennsylvania	130.1	63.7	285.1	8.1	4.1	138.2	67.8	315.3	161.1	1,022.7	7.3	3.6	322.6	164.7
Rhode Island	12.3	6.0	25.4	5.2	2.6	17.5	8.6	27.6	14.2	108.3	5.7	2.8	33.3	17.0
South Carolina	37.9	19.3	1,195.1	1.4	.7	39.3	20.0	71.3	37.5	2,126.0	6.5	3.3	77.8	40.8
South Dakota	23.6	13.3	716.1	.7	.4	24.3	13.7	81.3	46.5	3,922.6	.9	.6	82.2	47.1
Tennessee	40.4	20.2	783.4	12.6	6.2	53.0	26.4	139.6	71.1	2,822.7	6.7	2.5	146.3	73.6
Texas	133.3	69.5	1,560.4	.6	.3	133.9	69.8	423.4	218.4	8,122.1	2.7	1.5	426.1	219.9
Utah	14.4	10.6	180.9	2.5	1.9	16.9	12.5	45.3	31.4	721.3	4.7	3.5	50.0	34.9
Vermont	12.0	6.0	62.5	.4	.2	12.4	6.2	27.9	14.4	238.8	3.5	1.7	31.4	16.1
Virginia	38.0	20.3	438.2	12.9	6.5	50.9	26.8	122.3	63.2	1,908.3	17.9	8.9	140.2	72.1
Washington	33.9	18.6	427.3	8.5	4.6	42.4	23.2	107.4	56.2	1,652.2	1.7	.9	109.1	57.1
West Virginia	29.9	15.4	477.2	8.5	4.1	38.4	19.5	53.9	27.8	392.8	12.7	6.3	66.6	34.1
Wisconsin	36.6	18.5	644.7	12.6	5.7	49.2	24.2	157.0	79.8	2,743.5	9.6	4.8	166.6	84.6
Wyoming	19.4	12.7	239.5	2.9	1.9	22.3	14.6	50.0	32.7	1,005.5	1.2	.8	51.2	33.5
District of Columbia	18.1	8.8	9.6	9.0	4.5	27.1	13.3	21.1	10.8	24.5	1.4	.6	22.5	11.4
Puerto Rico	25.6	12.3	71.1	2.2	1.1	27.8	13.4	34.7	16.6	112.7	7.7	3.3	42.4	19.9
Total	2,697.5	1,405.3	25,911.7	274.9	145.9	2,972.4	1,551.2	6,137.0	3,225.8	100,099.6	426.6	216.2	6,563.6	3,442.0

Status of highway trust fund

[Thousands of dollars]

	3 months ended June 30, 1960	Fiscal year 1960
Balance at beginning of period	[1] 184,905	523,657
Income:		
Tax revenue (net, after refunds):		
Motor-fuel taxes	549,689	2,043,764
Trucks, buses and trailers	46,810	141,944
Tires, tubes and tread rubber	82,896	315,607
Vehicle use	3,945	37,712
Total excise revenue	683,340	2,539,027
Advances from general fund		359,000
Interest earned	857	1,855
Total income	684,197	2,899,882
Disbursements:		
For highways	551,715	2,940,583
Interest on advances from general fund	3,498	5,067
Repayments to general fund	195,000	359,000
Total disbursements	750,213	3,304,650
Balance at end of period	118,889	118,889

[1] This balance would be $10,095,000, if adjusted for the $195,000,000 net advance from the general fund to the trust fund.

TABLE A.—*Progress of Federal-aid highway program to Aug. 1, 1960*

[Dollars in millions]

1. TOTAL CONTRACTS ADVERTISED AND FUNDS OBLIGATED, JULY 1, 1956, TO DATE

	Program			Total
	Interstate	ABC	D	
Miles	10,983	91,377	12,110	114,470
Total cost	$8,583	$6,926	$621	$16,130
Federal funds:				
Construction	5,235	3,281	399.4	8,915
Right-of-way	1,624	225	.5	1,850
Preliminary engineering	481	88	.1	569
Subtotal	7,340	3,594	400.0	11,334
Administration	44	52	0	96
Total	7,384	3,646	400.0	11,430
Percent of funds obligated:				
Fiscal year	1960	1961	1959	
Percent obligated	93	22	100	

2. CONSTRUCTION UNDER WAY OR ADVERTISED, AS OF AUG. 1, 1960

Total cost	$3,373	$2,676	$22	$6,071
Federal funds	$2,992	$1,389	$13	$4,394
Miles	5,394	25,509	172	31,075

3. CONSTRUCTION COMPLETED, JULY 1, 1956, TO DATE (INCLUDES COMPLETED CONTRACTS ADVERTISED PRIOR TO JULY 1, 1956)

Total cost	$2,835	$5,651	$598	$9,084
Federal funds	$2,398	$2,900	$386	$5,684
Miles	6,615	89,686	11,938	108,239

4. STATUS OF HIGHWAY TRUST FUNDS AS OF JULY 1, 1960

	Receipts	Expenditures	Balance
Fiscal year 1957	$1,482	$966	$516
Fiscal year 1958	2,044	1,511	1,049
Fiscal year 1959	2,088	2,613	524
Fiscal year 1960	2,541	2,946	119
Total to July 1, 1960	8,155	8,036	119

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. With all due respect to the gentleman from Texas, the gentleman from Illinois deserves to be the first to be yielded to. I yield to him, and I congratulate him on his attendance here on the floor. As always, the gentleman from Illinois is a fine Member of the House, and I am sure we will enjoy his remarks.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arizona. It is sometimes amusing in this type of performance to hear these well delivered speeches where many questions are asked, and you would think the Member asking the question was going to faint if someone looked like he was going to attempt to answer the questions. But, I appreciate the courtesy of the gentleman in giving me at least a moment to reply and, particularly, to reply to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. BASS] because he asked a direct question which most certainly can be answered. Some names could be given now in reply to the question and there are many others whose names could be given, if I had a chance to check the congressional hearings because frequently I have sat through congressional hearings in which our top scientists and top leaders in the administration have conceded certain edges to the Soviet Union—and I do not consider this to be such a terrible thing because we are all in the same fight. We want to overcome our shortcomings. I think if we learn something from these debates, maybe we will overcome our shortcomings and vote for sufficient appropriations to overcome our shortcomings and be more interested in overcoming these shortcomings than we are in balancing the budget and making a good record on economy. But to my mind, there come the names of two distinguished leaders of this administration who would refute the statement made by the gentleman from New Hampshire. One is the name of Trevor Gardner, Asssistant Secretary of the Air Force, in the Eisenhower administration. Another is Lieutenant General Gavin, a member of the Weapons System Evaluation Committee of the Department of the Army. These men have spoken out forcefully on this subject. They have even resigned their positions in the Government so that they could carry their battle directly to the people and so that they could speak more frankly. I do not think there is any secret about that. I think many names could be supplied to the gentleman from New Hampshire in answer to the question contained in the early part of his statement.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. If the gentleman will permit me to make one statement, I hope the gentleman from Illinois is not confusing the space program with the accomplishments of the military.

Mr. PRICE. I am thinking both of space and the accomplishments of the military. I am very fortunate to serve on two committees, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy which had original jurisdiction at the inception of the space program. We hear the same witnesses that the Space Committee hears. We also hear the same witnesses that the Committee on Armed Services hears. I also have the good fortune to serve on the Committee on Armed Services so I know whereof I speak and I am not speaking on the basis of secondhand information or from hearsay.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. In order to put this in the proper context, may I repeat the statement in the platform to which we objected. The quote is:

> They had admitted that the Soviet Union leads in the space race and they have no plan to catch up.

Now I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. PRICE. If the gentleman will permit me, I have heard that statement made before congressional committees. They made almost the same statement. I would not even say it is taken out of context. But, I have heard that statement made by responsible leaders in our defense picture and the space picture before congressional committees.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. May I say to the gentleman, just let us know who that high official in the Republican administration is and quote him.

Mr. BASS of New Hampshire. May I answer the gentleman's statement?

Mr. PRICE. Let us take one question at a time. Let us answer the gentleman. I will now quote from the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force. Assistant Secretary of the Air Force Trevor Gardner said:

> We have been running second best in the race with Russia for ballistic missiles because (1) we have refused to admit that national security is more important than balancing the budget, and (2) former Secretary of Defense Charles Wilson and Deputy Secretary Donald Quarles permitted the continuance of a hopeless administrative jungle. This has strangled scientific thinking and performance. We have suffered a temporary defeat not because of the inadequacy of our scientists but because of the incredible ineptness with which we have managed our scientific resources.

Mr. BASS of New Hampshire. I would like to remind the gentleman that he is quoting from a statement made in 1956. I am a member of the Space Committee, and I have had the privilege of hearing most of the witnesses that my distinguished friend has heard, and I did not hear a single administration spokesman say what the Democrats have said in this platform—that the Republicans have admitted that the Soviets lead in the space race—not one.

I would like to ask the gentleman, Does he think the Republicans have no program in this exploration of outer space?

Mr. PRICE. No; I do not think that at all. I think, however, that there have been delays in the space program and in our defense program because of the restricted budget procedure and methods.

Mr. BASS of New Hampshire. I am glad the gentleman agrees with me that part of this is wrong; namely, that the Republicans do have a plan, the administration does have a plan for the exploration of outer space.

Mr. PRICE. I would like to refer to the gentleman's statement about the Polaris. Does the gentleman know that on the eve of the sputnik there were officials testifying before the committee that they could not push forward the

Polaris program; that no amount of additional funds would speed up the program and increase the day when we would have a missile? Yet 2 months after the sputnik funds were available. Because they were available, they did accomplish a great deal in expediting the Polaris program. Those are things that the platform refers to.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BASS of New Hampshire. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. The Polaris program has never been lacking for funds. As a member of the House Appropriations Committee for Defense, we have never been in a position where the Polaris program has lacked for funds at any time during this administration.

I would like to make one further comment in regard to the gentleman's statement and the authority he used. I would like to comment that the statement we take exception to is the statement of fact quoting certain Republican administration officials as to certain conditions that exist with regard to the space program. The authority you used is not the authority the Democrats were using in Los Angeles. If he is not a Republican spokesman he could not be considered one in July 1960. If you will look at the picture in the outer lobby you will find that this particular gentleman today in Los Angeles opened Democratic headquarters for JOHN KENNEDY for President of the United States.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. WINSTEAD. I cannot make much contribution to this argument, but the late Secretary of War, just before he died, testified before the Armed Services Committee and said, "We are not short of money. We are not short of time. We are not short of anything. We are just short of decisions to do something." I just do not want to let all these statements go by unchallenged. That is all I want to say.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. And now may I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming?

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] again speaks of the missile and space programs in almost the same vein as did the Democrat majority leader on yesterday during Operation Veracity. Yesterday when the same subject came up and I pointed out to the majority leader that between 1946 and 1952 the Truman administration had spent only $6.6 million on research and development of ballistic missiles including both intermediate range and intercontinental.

This represented 8 long years of research and development lost under their stewardship. I have the tables prepared by the Department of Defense with me today.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert these tables at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to follows:)

BALLISTIC MISSILE FUNDING

Mr. THOMSON. Then with regard to missiles, Mr. Secretary, I wish that you would state for the record, because I do not believe it is in the record, separately for both the IRBM's and the ICBM's for the fiscal years 1945 through 1960 the amount that was requested, the amount appropriated, and the amount that was released for expenditure and the amount expended.

Mr. LINCOLN. We will be happy to do that.

(The information requested follows:)

History of IRBM and ICBM funding, fiscal years 1946–61

[Millions of dollars]

Fiscal year	IRBM			ICBM			Total		
	Budget request	Appropriated	Current program	Budget request	Appropriated	Current program	Budget request	Appropriated	Current program
1946				1.9	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.9
1947									
1948				.3	.3	.3	.3	.3	.3
1949				.1	.1	.1	.1	.1	.1
1950									
1951				.5	.5	.5	.5	.5	.5
1952				.8	.8	.8	.8	.8	.8
1953				3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
1954				13.9	13.9	13.9	13.9	13.9	13.9
1955				40.9	40.9	158.9	40.9	40.9	158.9
1956 [1]	4.4	4.4	107.5	154.9	154.9	418.8	159.3	159.3	526.3
1957 [1]	276.0	276.0	501.9	582.9	582.9	899.0	858.9	858.9	1,400.9
1958 [1]	892.5	892.5	1,151.2	1,044.8	1,044.8	998.6	1,937.3	1,937.3	2,149.8
1959 [2]	1,322.0	1,931.0	1,617.1	1,069.0	1,209.0	1,328.5	2,391.0	3,140.0	2,945.6
1960 [2]	839.8	839.8	1,189.5	1,683.0	1,855.0	2,113.8	2,522.8	2,694.8	[3] 3,303.3
1961	952.2			2,471.8			3,424.0		

[1] No funds appropriated to Army P. & P.; unobligated balances utilized.
[2] $300,300,000 fiscal year 1959 funds utilized in fiscal year 1960 for Polaris submarines.
[3] Fiscal year 1960 estimates refined from those used in tentative table dated Jan. 7, 1960.

NOTE.—Estimates are subject to minor revision due to program adjustments.

Program data reflected in this table cover the development and capital costs involved in missile programs; i.e., the cost of bringing missile systems to operational status plus the costs of procuring missiles and related equipment for operational purposes. These data include all procurement, construction, and research and development programs directly associated with missile programs. These figures do not include military pay, operation and maintenance costs for operational missile units and sites and include only those shipbuilding and aircraft costs directly associated with providing missile capability.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, let the record speak for itself. This table, and my question, are taken from part 3 of the hearings of the Department of Defense appropriations for 1961, released February 23, 1960, and appears at page 133 thereof.

May I further point out that this table would not reflect the additional effort made in space programs during the last years, as that is the subject of a separate appropriation. Separate budget requests submitted this year for space exploration and flight technology exceed $600 million.

It is perfectly obvious from looking at this table that we did not seriously commence on a missile research and development program until fiscal year 1954, commencing on July 1, 1953. This has allowed us only 7 years of real effort. There is no doubt in my mind that we could have been farther ahead in all phases of missilry, both military and space, had we not virtually wasted the 8 years of the Democrat Truman regime.

That time lost in research and development can never be purchased.

The remarkable thing, to me, is that after giving up this time in research and development, we are, militarily speaking, equal to or ahead of the Soviet. In this short period of time, we have successfully developed intermediate range ballistic missiles and placed them in operation. Both the Jupiter and the Thor are deployed or are being deployed in oversea bases where, with their limited range, they can be effective.

Even more significant is the fact that we have performed the research and development to have operationally effective and completely successful the Atlas intercontinental ballistic missile. From bases in this country, it will deliver, any place in the world, an adequate warhead to effectively destroy any known possible military target, whether now or in the future.

Sure, we are not quitting. It will be further improved. There will be follow-on missiles, the Minuteman and others which, in certain respects, will constitute a technological advance.

Let us not be misled by confusing space capability and military capability. As a military weapon, by any standards, it is as good or better than anything the Russians have. It will carry all the load we want to carry or have any military reason to carry, any place we want to carry it. There is every reason to believe that it is superior in reliability and accuracy to what the Soviet has now. With us having achieved that in such a short period of time, it is obvious to anyone that continuing with a responsible effort, we will stay out in front and go farther out in front.

Even in the space field, there is no reason to hang our heads or to take a back seat. These weapons were never intended for space vehicles, but when that became important, with makeshift modifications we have demonstrated our ability and scientific know-how. Their principal space limitation is that of thrust. They were developed as military weapons, and their thrust is completely adequate for that purpose. To be available soon, and progressing on schedule, will be vehicles intended for space which will have the thrust and other capabilities to far exceed anything that the Rus-

sians have done yet or will, I predict, do in that time, as concerns the size of payload or anything else.

This is truly a remarkable achievement to have been gained in such a short period of time. It is a great tribute to our scientists, both in and out of the Government, to our military, to those responsible for our production facilities, to the free enterprise system, and to our American way. It simply says that once we set out to do it, we can accomplish more than the Soviet in less than half the time. We should all join, not in bragging about this, but in forcefully pointing out the facts to the whole world. It should not be the subject of misrepresentation in a political platform.

Our sole objective is to preserve the security of this country and our way of life, while maintaining the peace. We now fully appreciate that to preserve our own security, we must join in preserving the security of other free nations of the world. For the moment, we accomplish this through military strength. Simultaneously, we sincerely and steadfastly pursue other means. Concurrently, we must exercise judgment, which will adequately provide for the security and the peace, but thwart the plans of those who would lead us into spending our way into a foreign ideology by destroying our system economically. America is not second rate and will not be if we follow the guidelines of this Republican—Eisenhower-Nixon—administration.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT].

Mr. WRIGHT. I thank the gentleman from Arizona for his graciousness in yielding to me. I want to allude to the remarks made a moment ago by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER]. The gentleman from Florida left the distinct impression on me that he was attacking the special subcommittee investigating the interstate highway program, and he left the distinct implication that the committee was conducting a political investigation. He accused the chairman of that committee of handcuffing and throwing a cold blanket upon an investigation between now and November, with the further implication that the distinguished chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK] had something to hide.

Let me make one point abundantly clear as a member of that subcommittee: We are proceeding in the most nonpartisan way possible. Let me remind the gentleman from Florida that had we wanted to make a partisan investigation there were plenty of States involving allegations—I do not say truths, but allegations—that could have been investigated in open hearings regarding Republican administrations of those States. Had we wished to make a political investigation of it that is precisely what we would have done by holding investigations between now and November in such States as Illinois, in such States as Indiana, in such States as West Virginia, out of each of which reports have come to our investigative staff of irregularities.

It was precisely because we did not wish to make a political investigation that we have not scheduled any hearings between now and November. We thought we were doing the decent thing, we thought we were doing the objective thing, we thought we were doing the bipartisan or nonpartisan thing.

If we had wished to make a political investigation out of this, or to direct the investigative force of the subcommittee on a political path, we certainly would not have made our first investigation in a Democratic State; and that is exactly what we did. The very first investigation involved the State of Oklahoma, a Democratic State, where the Governor of the State happened to be a brother of one of the members of the subcommittee.

When the subject was broached to that member of the subcommittee he said, "Let the chips fall where they may."

That has been the theme of the investigation, not that it would be a whitewash, not that it would be a witch hunt, but it would be an objective and clear appraisal and would let the chips fall where they may.

Let me say further, the gentleman has cast some innuendo over the Oklahoma investigation by referring to it as an investigation into "internal political problems." Let me ask the gentleman if he regards the falsifying of samples to be sent to the State laboratory and the admission of those deliberate falsifications as internal political problems? Let me ask if he regards the testimony of improper weighing without inspection as an internal political problem. Let me ask if he regards the secret partnership of a member of the highway commission in a contracting firm as an internal political problem. Let me ask if he regards it as an internal political problem when the independent appraisers say the contractors were overpaid by some $500,000, and when most of this was Federal money? Was it an internal political problem that the Bureau of Public Roads inspectors failed utterly to detect any of these irregularities?

I get carried away, I expect, but it pains me very deeply for somebody to get up on the floor of the House and say this investigating committee has not done its work. It pains me particularly for that to come from a member of the minority with the inference that we have been conducting a political investigation, when the truth is that we have not been conducting a political investigation.

The gentleman indicated that our initial investigation into the matter of bridge clearances was aimed at the Bureau of Public Roads. Let me clarify that point by saying most emphatically that that investigation was aimed at getting the facts, and I think we did get the facts.

Let me ask the gentleman or any Member of the House if this is privileged information that should not be exposed when it can be proven that for 3 long years the members of the administration team in the Bureau of Public Roads and in the Defense Department could not get together and decide just how high the minimum bridge clearances should be, and that during that time some 2,200 new bridges were approved at lower levels than they now believe should be required at a total cost of some $374 million, and that we produce military hardware which must be moved from one end of the country to the other at rapid notice which cannot clear those bridges that were built during these 3 long years in which these administrative people were trying to make up their minds? I do not say that bureaucratic indecision is an exclusive domain of the Republican Party, but neither is it an exclusive domain of the Democratic Party.

If there need be any further proof of the value of these investigations, it can be found in the very fact that those charged with making this determination of minimum vertical clearances floundered on indecision for 3 long years, and shortly after we began our investigation, they got busy for the first time and finally made a decision.

I want to say simply that any criticisms of this subcommittee which are designed to imply that this subcommittee has conducted itself in any way other than as an objective subcommittee aimed at getting the facts, regardless of whom they may hurt, is not a valid criticism.

I want to say that those who level this criticism have not been conspicuous among those who supported the initial creation of the committee, they have not been conspicuous among those who asked for and supported requests for funds with which to conduct the committee hearings. They have tried in every way they could to discredit the committee and to obstruct its work, but they have not succeeded in either.

I want to say that this committee under the able leadership of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK] has bent over backward to be fair. This committee is dedicated to getting the truth out on the table, not to blame anybody, not to punish anybody, not to criticize anybody or any party but simply to see how this program can be improved to the end that the American public will be getting its full dollar's worth of road for every dollar of taxes it pays.

The gentleman may rest assured that these investigations by the committee staff are proceeding. They are proceeding, not helter-skelter, but in an orderly way. They are preparing their cases carefully. Hearings on each of the substantive cases will be held. Of that you may be sure. They will be public hearings. They will be held when the facts have been adequately developed. They will be objective hearings, and they will be designed to serve the specific interests of no particular political party, but those of the taxpaying public.

Anything that attempts to bring this committee and its work into a political arena is an unworthy allegation. This is a committee designed to get the facts, to let the chips fall where they may. It will not be a witch hunt but, by the same token, it will not be a coverup.

Mr. CRAMER. I will just take a minute in reply, and I will just reiterate the statements I made at the outset, none of which have been disproved by the gentleman from Texas. Of course, what he

says here today is a repetition of statements he has been issuing to the press, and it is a statement of his position on the subcommittee. So far as I am concerned, I just happen to disagree with him in regard to some of the facts of what happened and in regard to the road this subcommittee should take in pursuing for full, fair, and effective hearings on all matters. I particularly disagree with the Democratic platform and its statement in regard to this committee when it says that the committee has launched an extensive investigation of this highway program. The gentleman, in my opinion, proved the point I was trying to make when he stated that they had uncovered all of these things in these States, and I repeat that all of these things have been uncovered in all of these States, which all of us are concerned about and feel something must be done about it, and what this subcommittee was set up to do something about. Despite this admission, there has been only one investigation in one State which I said at the time I mentioned it uncovered things that made me very unhappy, and action was taken immediately to do something about them. And, I am sure the gentleman will agree with that statement of fact.

Let me say further that so far as I am concerned the gentleman knows full well, that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL], who was one of the first to request the establishment of such a committee, along with myself and along with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHERER], who has been constantly criticized—and with the gentleman from Texas, too—we have been constantly criticized because we made such demands. When the subcommittee was finally set up, we were not even permitted to have a staff member and we were given a worse than 2 to 1 minority position. The chairman came in one day when the session started and said, without justifications and plans for committee action, "I want $300,000 to run this committee this year." I think that was the greatest amount any special committee has received, including the House Committee on Un-American Activities, with a staff of 40 people, and at that time we had a proposal for a staff of 6 people. Regardless, the minority asked for adequate funds, not funds that could not be justified, not funds to be squandered. We were not consulted on the makeup of the staff. These are legitimate complaints, and they still are legitimate complaints. We now have one minority counsel. Our counsel asked for information on these investigations, and that information was denied on the instructions of the chairman. I ask the gentleman from Texas if he does not feel that this is just a little bit unfair treatment of the minority, even though we are a 2 to 1 minority, and if we are not entitled to some of this information, some of these facts? And, my position in this matter, and in full support of the objectives of the committee is a matter of record. The gentleman has stated, that despite all the allegations of wrongdoing there has been only one investigation, which proves the point I made conclusively.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. A gentleman who has been on the floor all afternoon and who has asked to make a statement certainly is entitled to be heard. I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI].

Mr. PUCINSKI. I want to congratulate the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] for taking this additional time today for this discussion. I was on the floor yesterday when the gentleman asked unanimous consent for this additional time. I did not object simply because I felt that a give-and-take of this type was healthy. There will be those, of course, who will charge that this is a political discussion. After all, this House of Representatives is the greatest forum in the world today. If, perhaps, in the last few years there had been more of this give-and-take on major legislation we would perhaps have gotten better legislation out of the Congress.

I also want to thank the gentleman for taking this time, and I particularly want to thank the Republican congressional committee for doing an excellent job on research on all this great progress that has been made in this administration, because it is no question, no mystery or secret that the Democrats control the majority of this Congress, and we know that not one of these things that have been explained today in such glowing terms and attributed to the Republican Party could have been accomplished without some support from the Democrats.

We know that in every instance the Democrats have supported those things we thought were good. And I am happy to note that today a great deal of time has been saved for me and many other Members, time that normally we would have had to use for research to find out what the effects have been of the legislation that we have been supporting. Let us not make any mistake. Any way you want to chop this up, the fact remains that this administration would have been in a hopeless box if they had not received the cooperation and support of the Democrats who conducted themselves as statesmen in this House. The fact of the matter is that right now, at this moment, the gentleman recited many things that the administration had accomplished, but just a few moments ago the conferees broke up on the minimum wage bill. The President had told us that he was ready to recall Congress if we did not come up with a minimum wage bill. But just a moment ago the conferees broke up and three members of the Republican Party refused to go along with a compromise that would have given us a minimum wage bill in this session. Certainly the situation now looks rather hopeless.

I have been here through this great debate. I was very much surprised to hear that the speakers were perfectly willing to claim credit for all the good things but very conveniently were sweeping under the rug the shortcomings. I would have been much more impressed with this presentation if it had been in fact a factual presentation. But just a moment ago the statement was made on this floor that the Democratic candidate for President had voted against the St. Lawrence Seaway. The fact of the matter is that in 1953 on final passage the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] did vote for this project. Now, if you were as wrong in all your other presentations as you were on this, we cannot take it with a great deal of confidence.

I would have preferred if we had discussed fully the failures in foreign policy. But here again we Democrats are immediately accused, whenever we want to discuss foreign policy, that this is the untouchable thing; you cannot touch this because it might jeopardize the world situation, that foreign policy must be nonpartisan. We are supposed to sit by while 90 miles from the Miami beaches we have today a Communist satellite.

Of course, on the matter of defense, despite the fact that the Rockefeller report, the Gaither report, and the Hopkins report have all stated conclusively and clearly that while we are strong today—and there is no question about it, we are strong today—if we do not make the changes that have been recommended, in 3 years the Soviet Union may well issue an ultimatum to this country to surrender or face a nuclear war that we could very well lose. These are things which, when we want to discuss them, we are accused of undermining the confidence of our allies in America's ability to defend itself.

These are the inequities in this one-sided debate conducted by the Republicans who do not want to stand up and accept the challenge from those of us who want to challenge their statements.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I am sure the gentleman knows exactly how to obtain a special order for himself on the floor of the House. You just make the request of the Speaker for permission to speak. And if the gentleman wants to conduct a debate on foreign affairs, there is nobody who can keep him from doing it. Whether he feels the Republicans have done this, or the Republicans have not done that, is beside the point. He knows that he can get whatever time he wants to make his statements, and if he will let me know, I will be very happy to join him, as will many others.

Mr. PUCINSKI. The only way is to do as I did last night, by not objecting to the gentleman's unanimous request for an extension of time, because I thought we would be doing much better if both sides were here.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I am very grateful to the gentleman for that, I assure him.

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a word or two about space in answer to the remarks of the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. BASS]. I, too, am a member of the Committee on Science and Astronautics. My attendance has been good, I believe; I think I have done my homework and can speak with some authority.

A few months ago the chairman of the Republican congressional campaign committee was in my home city of Salt Lake making a keynote address at a Republican gathering. In referring to me indirectly he tried to think of the most opprobrious thing he could say. Finally he came up with this remark, that the Congressman from the Second Congressional District of Utah is a member of the Space Committee, flipping around in outer space instead of attending to his business here in Utah.

That is exactly the trouble. The Republican Party has not taken this matter of space seriously, as is evident from the statement I have just made. For that reason, I feel, and the evidence that has come before our committee has conclusively demonstrated, that we have fallen perilously behind the Russians and that there has been manifested a gap that we have no assurance can be closed up during the years to come.

I cannot remember any witness coming before our committee and stating categorically that we were ahead of the Russians in any field. I have heard several of them suggest that our progress in telemetering and in miniaturization was satisfactory and that there was a likelihood that we were ahead of the Russians in that field, but none of them have been able to state categorically that that is true. All of them have agreed the Russians are way ahead of us in the matter of the booster, the large rocket or missile that carries the machinery, the equipment, into space. They are up into 800,000 and 900,000 pounds of thrust while we are still in the 350,000-pound thrust area.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Before the gentleman leaves that point, may I say I am a member of the House Appropriations Committee and the Independent Offices Subcommittee. We appropriate money for the National Aeronautics and Space Agency. Certainly my recollection is that Dr. Glennan when he has come before us has said that we are behind the Russians in rocketry but we are not behind them in anything else. If the gentleman has any other quotes from Dr. Glennan I would certainly like to have him put them in the RECORD.

Mr. KING of Utah. Allow me to pursue this thought for a minute.

In 1954, as was testified before our committee, the Russians made a great decision. That was the year in which they decided to put most of their defense eggs in the missile basket, if I may use the phrase. That was the year in which they decided to give their space program the green light, to go all out to develop a superbooster. By a strange coincidence, that was the same year we made just the reverse decision. We decided we would specialize in a smaller rocket instead of a larger rocket, that we would specialize in miniaturization. By 1957 our own error had caught up with us. Sputnik I was launched. We realized that the decision of 1954 was a grave error. Then we reversed ourselves and tried to catch up. Now in 1960 we have still not caught up with where the Russians were in 1957.

This is the appalling fact of the matter. We have no evidence—and this comes back to the Democratic platform—we have no evidence that we are catching up with the Russians in the matter of the thrust of our missiles. We are doing our best now, of course, and we have an ambitious program, but we have every reason to believe that the Russians are also doing their best, that they have a program that is just as ambitious as ours, and every indication is that they will remain that much ahead of us.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. If the gentleman has no evidence, then he probably has not read most of the testimony that has come from the National Aeronautics and Space Agency. I have evidence from having heard the testimony in my own subcommittee that we are catching up and that we will catch up. I am sorry the gentleman does not feel that way.

Mr. KING of Utah. To round out my point, let me make two other points. Then I will not trespass further on the time of the gentleman.

Edward Teller, the father of the hydrogen bomb, has stated repeatedly that we have fallen so far behind in the education of our potential scientists and in coming along to replenish the reservoir of scientists, we have fallen so far behind in the tempo of our education, remembering that the Russians are turning out three engineers to our one and two general scientists to our one, that there is nothing we can do, even if we try now, no matter what we do, to keep the Russians from overtaking us. Admittedly, we are still ahead of them. I do not think anyone questions that. The point is that their tempo, their acceleration is so rapid and they are taking this thing so seriously and are putting such a tremendous amount of their natural resources into educating scientists to take their place in the Russian space program that there is nothing we can do now to stop them. Those are the things that worry me and those are the things that I believe are at the base of the statement made in the Democratic platform. We have no assurance now that we are catching up with the Russians—and on that statement I will stand.

Mr. BASS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, I want to say first of all that I had the privilege of serving on the Space Committee with my very good friend, the gentleman from Utah. I would corroborate what you say. You have done your homework well and you have served conscientiously. But you have made many statements with which I disagree. We do not have the time to go into that now, but I know my friend even if he is a Democrat is fairminded and I would just like to ask him this question. Going back to the original point that I am making and which I will repeat again, the Democratic statement in the platform and I am going to repeat it again to you and ask you if you think that that corresponds with the facts—the statement in the Democratic platform that—

> They [the Republicans] have admitted that the Soviet Union leads in the space race and they have no plan to catch up.

I would ask my friend if he believes that is a fact?

Mr. KING of Utah. If the gentleman from Arizona will yield so that I may answer. Naturally, the statement is not to be construed as meaning that all Republicans admit that the Russians are ahead of us. The statement is to be construed as meaning simply that there are responsible Republicans on record who have so stated. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] has given their names for the record. As to the second part of the statement, neither you nor I nor any other living American can state categorically whether we are or are not catching up with the Russians. If there is a gap—and I realize you challenge that—we do not know what the Russians are doing. We do not know the pace of their progress. That was testified to again and again and all we can do is to surmise. But, I would say, based upon the testimony that has come before our committee, I have every reason to believe that the Russians are travelling as fast as we are and since in 1957 they produced a rocket that we are not able to duplicate 3 years later in 1960, and if they are travelling as fast as we are, then it stands to reason that we are not catching up with them.

Mr. BASS of New Hampshire. The point I am trying to make to my good friend is, and I refer to the statement, "That the Republicans have no plans to catch up." That is not true; is it?

Mr. KING of Utah. My point is that there is nothing to show we have a concrete plan designed to develop a thrust equal to what the Russians will, presumably, have by the time we come out with what we are developing. We are now working on Project Saturn and other projects as well. We know that. I commend Dr. Glennan for what he is doing. But we have no evidence to show that when Project Saturn finally materializes that that will be equal to what the Russians have accomplished by the time we come out with Project Saturn. In fact, all of the testimony seems to be that they will have paced us and since they are at least 3 years ahead of us and very likely more, when we come out with Project Saturn, they will still be 3 years ahead of us.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. The gentleman knows, of course, that Saturn is not the last word so far as our plans are concerned.

Mr. KING of Utah. That is correct. There is the project Nova and what I said about project Saturn would apply to project Nova or any other project as long as it is assumed that the Russians are traveling as fast as we are and we have every reason to believe that they are.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Of course, I have to disagree with the gentleman. I think we have every reason to believe that they are not, but the gentleman cannot prove his statement any better than I can prove my statement so we will have to leave it as a disagreement between friends.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. If I understand the gentleman correctly, it does not quite jibe with the testimony I have heard as a member of the Defense Appropriation Subcommittee. We spent about 5 hours a day for about 5 months

listening to this type of thing. If I understand the gentleman correctly, he stated the Russians did not start on any research program for large propulsion rocket meteors until 1954. This differs from my understanding and I think I must have misunderstood the gentleman from Utah. The testimony I heard was that the Russians, using the German experts that were captured, started right after World War II. The other thing I heard was that we did not have any program because we—that was during the Truman administration—said, "No, we cannot develop this big propulsion system." Then with a defeatist attitude, we decided to do nothing, and the table that I included in the RECORD today will show that we did nothing. The Truman administration decided to wait until they got a breakthrough on a smaller warhead or as we might say "bomb load."

Mr. KING of Utah. Nothing I have said is to be construed as meaning that we were not in the missile field in 1954. My point was that at that time we had a decision to make. The decision was whether we concentrate on a smaller missile or go all out with a super missile. My point is that we made a fatal error by choosing the smaller instead of the larger.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. But actually in fiscal 1946 the first money was appropriated in this country for a ballistic missile program. That was $1.9 million. Then World War II was over, and not a dime was requested or appropriated in fiscal year 1947. Then in 1948 only $300,000 was requested by the Truman administration because they thought they could not develop this big propulsion. In fiscal 1949 only $100,000 was requested in the budget, and in the next year, 1950, nothing. In 1951, $500,000; in fiscal 1952, $800,000. In other words, you had no program because they accepted this defeatist attitude. Then this breakthrough was made to the smaller weapons, and we went ahead with the smaller payload. We went ahead with the smaller thrust system, which was all we needed, but the Russians started right away on greater propulsion and now they have got a bigger motor. Militarily speaking, ours is just as good as theirs. We will soon have the bigger motors, greater propulsion for space because this administration also has gone to work on that.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield briefly.

Mr. PRICE. The figures the gentleman has been referring to was money actually expended on rockets. However, at that time there were under order the Snark project and the Regulus project.

I see the gentleman shaking his head. I happened to be on the committee that handled this in 1947. I would remind the gentleman that it was during those years that they originated and developed the inertial guidance system and most of the gadgetry in the rockets of today. This research and development was not charged to the Space Administration or charged to the rocketry program but was charged to the Air Force and the Navy. If it were not for the discoveries made in that research and development as far back as 1947 and 1948 you would not have the guts of the present missiles.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I decline to yield.

The Snark, as the gentleman knows, is an air breather, so is Regulus. Those are not true rockets.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot yield further. I want to button this up, if I may.

Operation Veracity has charged that there have been certain misstatements in the Democratic platform. We have had a debate. Members from both sides have participated, and I think it has been a very beneficial sort of thing. I would like to remark that at least—I say, at least—three-quarters of the statements which we stated were false have been unchallenged as false statements.

The gentleman from Ohio's statement that the statement of the Democratic platform—"The quality of medical care furnished to the disabled veterans has deteriorated under the Republican administration"—was untrue went unchallenged; no one challenged that fact.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield right at that point?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I am sorry; I cannot yield.

The gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. THOMSON] stated that the Democratic platform statement that "the Republicans discouraged this research"—referring to salt and brackish water conversion—was an untrue statement. His challenge stands alone. There has been no attempt to justify the statement in the platform.

THOMAS CURTIS from Missouri charged that the Democratic statement—"the Republican failure in the economic field has been virtually complete"—was untrue. His charge remains unchallenged except for some very fine cliches and renovation of old campaign speeches.

The statement by the Democratic administration—"the Republican administration has allowed the Food and Drug Administration to be weakened"—was challenged by the gentleman from New York [Mr. DEROUNIAN], and I do not remember any Member on either side stating that Mr. DEROUNIAN's challenge was incorrect.

The gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER], challenged the statement in the Democratic platform—"it has stalled the atomic energy development." His challenge was not accepted by any Member of the other side.

The Democratic platform stated "but the Republican administration has replaced this sound policy with a national antilabor policy."

The gentleman from New York [Mr. DEROUNIAN] challenged this statement and no Member on the other side has disputed his challenge.

Neither has any Member on the other side disputed the challenges of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] concerning the development of inland waterways; of the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. THOMSON] concerning the allegation that the Republicans had had "no new starts," nor the challenge of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AVERY] to the statement concerning the weakening of the Nation's transportation system.

Certainly there was no successful contradiction of the challenge by Congressman NELSEN, of Minnesota, of the statement that the Republicans had "sought to cripple rural electrification."

In the items of defense, the farm policy, and space, there has been much debate. However, I submit to any fair-minded person that the statements made in the Democratic platform on these points which were challenged by the Republican Members have been proved to be misstatements.

I must also comment on the fact that at no time during Operation Veracity did the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. BOWLES], the chairman of the 1960 Democratic platform committee, make an appearance on the floor of the House, even though he was specifically invited to be present.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Arizona has expired.

HON. HENRY ALDOUS DIXON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the debate on the House floor in which we have attempted to set the record straight. It has engendered some debate. The subject I am going to talk about I am sure will not engender debate; it is on the life and public work of HENRY DIXON, a colleague of ours who is planning to retire this year.

The gentleman from Utah, Congressman DIXON, as might be expected from his own unique, interesting, and genial personality, comes from a colorful family background. For example, his father was elected to be Utah's State treasurer on the Republican ticket and became concerned about the lack of revenue in this sparsely populated State. The senior Dixon heard of a new idea that had been tried by three States of taxing inheritances. Consequently he took a trip to the States which had enacted the law to find out how it worked and how much revenue was raised from it. He brought back his information and by diligent efforts lobbied an inheritance tax law through a reluctant Utah Legislature. The legislature even refused to reimburse his travel expenses yet within a few months after the law was enacted Averell Harriman's father died, and since Union Pacific was incorporated in Utah he left a small fortune to the new State. Almost simultaneously David Eccles, the father of Marriner Eccles who became Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, died and left another small fortune to the State. With this money Utah built its attractive State capitol which it had long wanted to construct.

While his father was State treasurer, HENRY DIXON was a young boy growing up in Salt Lake City. He was adventuresome as were many of the other boys

in the area, and one day was caught by local police officers on a very minor juvenile offense. Although the offense was minor, that of climbing under a fence to see a ball game, ALDOUS DIXON'S father was horrified, particularly since the newspapers wrote up the story and listed his son's name, this being before the time that newspapers refused to print the names of juveniles who got into trouble.

Consequently, John Dixon went down and bought a large plot of land north of Provo, Utah, sent his son, HENRY, down there to convert this raw earth into a thriving orchard, thinking that keeping his son busy in this kind of endeavor would keep him out of mischief. Young HENRY succeeded and developed one of the most beautiful orchards in Utah County. This experience gave ALDOUS DIXON a life-long love of farm youth, since they particularly learn the value of work. The city hall in Orem today stands on ALDOUS DIXON'S former orchard.

Seeing the disadvantage that the farmers had marketing their produce, he subsequently organized and became the first president of the Timpanogos Fruit Marketing Cooperative.

He married gracious and attractive Lucile Knowlden whose father had been an honest-to-goodness western sheriff's deputy and had helped capture a number of real desperados from "Robber's Roost," but who retired into safer business activities.

HENRY DIXON later became the managing vice president of the Farmers and Merchants Bank in Provo, but after a certain length of time in this position, he decided that the real opportunity for service was in the field of education. He accepted a position as superintendent of schools in Provo—a position for which the board of education told him he would not need any further education himself. However, in his typical conscientious manner he decided that if he were going to be involved in educational administration, he should learn everything that could be learned about it. So he began the very arduous task of moving his family away to school every summer in order to gradually work to fulfill the requirements for a doctor's degree in educational administration.

Frequently when we see people who have made outstanding achievements we can look back to an earlier period of their lives and see the sacrifice that they made which laid the basis for the building of character and knowledge which contributed to their later achievements.

In writing his doctor's dissertation HENRY DIXON decided to write on the investment of permanent school funds in Utah. The people who managed the permanent school funds in the State were extremely uncooperative with his efforts to make the study. However, through assiduous perseverance he finally initiated and got well into the study. He uncovered so much corruption in the use of the permanent school funds that the legislature gave him a team of six persons full time to help him complete the study. Thus those who know Dr. DIXON'S remarkable combination of educational idealism and practicality will not be surprised to know that he is probably the only man in history who wrote a doctor's dissertation which was so practical that it put two men in jail.

In this combination of practicality and idealism HENRY DIXON is an outstanding exemplification of the Mormon people from which he was produced.

It is also typical of his perseverance that once he undertook to get his doctor's degree he did not give up even though the slow summer-by-summer process took him until he was 47 years old and had six children before he received that doctor's degree.

Incidently, Dr. DIXON'S doctoral dissertation was published by the University of Southern California Press where he received his degree, and I have been advised that to this day the school of education recommends that doctoral candidates study the Dixon book as a masterpiece of organization and clarity.

Another interesting characteristic about Dr. DIXON'S employment was that he had such a friendly personality that he was able to reconcile intense conflicts and bring order out of troubled situations. This had been the case when he took over as superintendent of the Provo schools and it was also the case in his next move. He was called to become president of Weber College in Ogden where they had been having some difficulty. He took the position and soon unified the faculty and the community toward the goal of building an outstanding junior college.

One of his first accomplishments at Weber College was also typical of his practical nature. He realized that so much college work had been traditionally theoretical and difficult for many individuals to profit from. Consequently, one of his first efforts was to secure funds from the State legislature to build a vocational education building to help upgrade peoples' skills during the depression and train them for jobs—particularly those who normally would find little of value in a college education. His foresight turned out to be prophetic in that World War II began not long after the vocational education program had been fully launched. As president of the college he cooperated closely with the Armed Forces which established major depots in the Ogden area, which is even today the biggest railroad freight reloading point west of Chicago. DIXON kept the vocational education building going in three 8-hour shifts daily so that the lights and machines and building were operating at full capacity day and night to produce airplane mechanics, welders, and various other semiskilled and skilled employees. He also honored these laboring men with the highest dignity. For example, he brought union leaders from each of the crafts in to serve as advisory committees for the various technical educational programs. He also set up what were the only known graduation ceremonies for participants in the vocational education programs.

Weber College has been ranked as having one of the best vocational education programs in the Nation. The program expanded and included training for policemen and an amazing number of other types of positions.

With the terrific community support that he generated for the college he made an agreement with the State legislature that the community would raise $50,000 if the State legislature would match the amount to buy land for a new campus at the base of the beautiful Wasatch Mountains in the southeast part of Ogden. Those were hard days to collect volunteer contributions amounting to $50,000, but Dr. DIXON succeeded. Incidentally one of his biggest contributions came from a former student body president of Dr. DIXON'S at Weber College, Willard Marriott, a name that we have all come to know here in Washington as an outstanding civic leader and president of the Hot Shoppes, Inc.

Dr. DIXON once more became a troubleshooter when after Utah State University, then called Utah State Agricultural College, called on him to come and be president of Utah's Land-Grant College. There had been a rapid turnover of presidents and here once more Dr. DIXON soothed the troubled waters and brought harmony between the faculty and board members, the Governor, the alumni, and the community.

After being at the helm at Utah State University for a year and a half, Dr. DIXON, a lifelong Republican, was brought to his current post in Congress by one of the most amazing routes that any Member of Congress has taken to get here.

Scarcely 2 weeks before the final election Utah was embarrassed at the revelation that one of its Representatives had greatly exaggerated his war record. A Republican Convention for the First Congressional District was called, accepted the incumbent's resignation of candidacy for reelection, and literally drafted Dr. DIXON to run for the spot. Some political scientists have written that there has never been a genuine political draft—that every apparent draft is manipulated by the candidate. Perhaps that rule is proved by the Dixon exception. This may be the only genuine draft in political history.

Dr. DIXON had every reason to want to stay at Utah State University. He had a higher salary than Congressmen received at that time, and he was truly interested in dedicating his efforts to continuing to build up the agricultural college. But the party convention literally drafted him with the apparent belief that there was no other man in the State who was so loved by all that had a chance of defeating an ex-Congressman with only about 10 days to campaign.

Dr. DIXON accepted the challenge and fulfilled every expectation of this supporters even though many of his good friends voted against him because they wanted to keep him in the State. In fact the night that the returns came in his family divided up into two rooms—those who were cheering for DIXON because they wanted him to win and those who were cheering for his opponent because they wanted him to remain in Utah.

Of course his victory was so spectacular that many House Members were intrigued to get to know him, which gave

him a very good start in his 6-year congressional career.

In his second election he won by 61 percent of the vote which tied for the highest percentage of the vote ever won by a Republican congressional candidate in the State of Utah.

Although he is now retiring from Congress, he never plans to retire from his constant life of service. He will teach two classes at Brigham Young University. Although he has worked with education much of the past 46 years it has been to a great extent heavy administrative work, and he wants now to return to his first love—teaching students directly in the classroom. In closing may I observe that our loss is your State and communities gain. Good luck and God bless you as you continue to serve humankind.

Mr. Speaker, today as we take this opportunity to pay tribute to a great American with whom all of us have had the pleasure to serve during the past six years, we are again reminded how important it is to have men and women who are able, knowledgeable, and dedicated to the great ideals left us by our forebears.

The story of this man's life is a part of the great American story of success through unselfish service to his fellow men, to his community, his State, and his Nation.

HENRY DIXON whom we honor today has served with us for 6 years now and he has chosen to retire and to turn the responsibilities of this office over to his successor and to return to his native State and former professional interest. To those of us who came here with him and came to know him so well, we hasten to point out that these past 6 years have been rewarding and pleasant years for all who have worked and served with him. These have been worthwhile years, too, for his district, his State, and his Nation. He gave to them generously and unselfishly the best from his own vast and varied storehouse of experience and knowledge.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN].

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, let me say that I think it has been an inspiration to all of us who have served in Congress during the 6 years that HENRY DIXON has been here just simply to serve with him in the House of Representatives. It was my privilege to become a Member of the House in the 84th Congress, the same year that HENRY DIXON came in as House Member, and one of the greatest inspirations to me during the 6-year period has been the service of HENRY DIXON. He was elected as president of the 84th Republican Club because all of us who served with him respected him so highly. He has the most laudable and admirable personality, I think, of anyone that I have ever met. In short, he has the ability to speak his convictions, and I think in the two fields of agriculture and education all of us recognize today that he is one of the most thoroughly grounded and most familiar with the subjects of anyone in the House. I think that all of us feel that we have been given something that will lift us further than we would otherwise be lifted just because we were associated with HENRY DIXON during the past few years. It has been my privilege to meet his wife and the members of his family on a number of occasions, and they were truly an inspiration to me. In his retirement I know he will be busy, because it is in the nature of HENRY DIXON to be so. I wish for HENRY DIXON all of the happiness and success that all of us could wish him in the days to come.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. KING].

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I rise willingly and agreeably to add my tribute to those already given to my distinguished colleague, HENRY ALDOUS DIXON. The broad aisle separating the east half from the west half of this historic Chamber has a tendency to block the free interchange of friendship and personal confidence among its Members. But, in the case of Dr. DIXON and myself this has not been so, and I give full credit for that fact to Dr. DIXON. I am not suggesting that he has not played his part aggressively and courageously as a member of his party, and I am certain that his fellow party members are proud of his record. What I am saying is that Dr. DIXON is a Christian gentleman, a loyal American, a true friend, and that he does not allow partisanship to destroy fellowship.

When I first came to the Congress Dr. DIXON opened up his office and his heart to me. He gave me sound counsel on a number of points; suggested ways in which I could avoid some of the aches and heartaches and pitfalls that always accompany a freshman in this great body. I was glad to follow his counsel. He was as an elder brother to me.

I became very close, and I am now; and with all my heart I hope that that closeness of fellowship may continue through the years to come.

Dr. DIXON, I might add, is a member of the General Board of the Deseret Sunday School Union of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, known generally as the Mormon Church. He has served in this capacity along with his many other responsibilities for many years.

His conduct has been exemplary. Always he has lived up to the high standards and ideals which he professes.

I think Dr. DIXON has an earthy quality; and I use the term "earthy" in its highest and most exalted sense. He has his feet firmly planted in reality.

He is approachable, in spite of the many honors which have been heaped upon him, politically, academically, religiously. Always he is approachable, always friendly, always filled with good humor, sage advice, sound philosophy.

I have enjoyed so much knowing his wonderful wife who has backed him up in so many ways and helped to create an exemplary family in every way. I deem Dr. DIXON to be one of the finest, closest friends I have. I wish him Godspeed in his new assignments.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to pay tribute to one of the distinguished Members of the House who on his own volition is retiring from our midst. I cannot help but note as I look around, particularly on our side of the aisle, all Members present in the immediate area of the Speaker at least, came to Congress, as did the gentleman in the well addressing the House, in the same year as did our good friend from Utah, Dr. DIXON. Several of the Members at least who are here today, were here yesterday, possibly, when I had a special order to pay tribute to a retiring Member of the House from my native State of Kansas, Mr. REES. As I sat here listening to the tributes that are being paid to Dr. DIXON today, the thought occurred to me how much alike is my colleague from Kansas, characterwise at at least, and personalitywise, if you please, and the Member to whom we are paying tribute here this afternoon, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. DIXON].

Their legislative and professional careers, of course, are at variance. However, when you stop to think of the many things they do have in common—they are both very kindly persons; they are both extremely tolerant; they both have a very fine and delicate sense of humor; they have both raised very fine families; they are both living examples of the very principles which they espouse, that of honor, integrity, loyalty and devotion to duty and also, a might add, fear of God. I know that HENRY DIXON has had a very definite impact on my life, Mr. Speaker, not only as a Member of Congress, but also as an individual and as the titular head of my family. I shall certainly miss not only his wise counsel on the floor of the House of Representatives and in committees, as a committee member and as a witness, but I shall also miss my association with him as a tried and true friend and also, I think, as an inspiration.

So in summary I want to associate myself with everything that has been said in tribute to HENRY DIXON and to his fine wife and family.

I think if we could at this point inject a little different note, had I heard the recitation of the event about the offense committed by the gentleman from Utah [Mr. DIXON] in his youth from any other source than from the gentleman addressing the House from the well, I would have discounted it, because as I have known Mr. DIXON I can hardly conceive that he would have done anything in the slightest degree irregular. But I must accept it as being true in fact, coming from no less a source than the gentleman from Iowa. Nevertheless, I think that only makes him more human. It does not in any way detract from the high respect and dignity with which I regard him.

I thank the gentleman from Iowa for yielding to me that I might pay my personal tribute to Dr. DIXON.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I recited this only to point out a lesson from which we could all learn, that it was a part of his life and it ended in fine fashion. It had a salutary effect on his whole experience, on his life. It made him the personality that he is and made it pos-

sible for us in a way to share some of his experiences.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I yield.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I know of no man, not only in this Congress but in this life of mine, that I have had the opportunity to meet and come to know for whom I have a more profound respect, high regard, and deep affection than to the gentleman from our neighboring State of Utah, who will be leaving the Halls of Congress by his own choice at the expiration of this term—Congressman DIXON, affectionately known to all of us as Dr. DIXON.

Dr. DIXON and I came to Congress in January 1955 at the same time. Because of our community of interests, coming from the same area, we have worked closely together. I have come to know him in ways that few Members of Congress can, because whenever I am traveling in the western part of Wyoming along the Utah border, particularly when I am campaigning and shaking hands, and I run into somebody from Utah I say, "How is my good friend Dr. DIXON over there?" I can pay no greater tribute to him than to say that whether it be Republican or Democrat, whether it be a workingman, a salesman, or a banker, and we have many people from Utah coming into Wyoming at that time of year for recreation, never have I had anyone respond with anything but high words of tribute to this really fine man. I know that they spoke from their hearts, and in spontaneous terms.

That is the way we, too, feel about him who are familiar with the services he has rendered to his community, his State, and his Nation. The people in Utah are grateful, we here are grateful, and the people of the Nation are grateful and fortunate that he has performed that service. I think about his dedicated support of the upper Colorado River storage project. I know that throughout his life he has dedicated himself to the service of youth. I think his service in Congress could be characterized as the carrying forward of that dedication. With respect to the upper Colorado and reclamation, I know his great concern was to make Utah and that part of the United States a better place for youth to grow up in and find a better way of life. I think of his dedication to a sound agricultural program and the guidance that he as a member of the Committee on Agriculture has given to us through his service here in Congress. I also am quite familiar with his stand on other issues of our time. I think all of this is a living memorial to his unselfishness and his dedication to the youth of our country. Throughout his life his service has been characterized by an effort to make this country a better place for young people to live and to provide for them an ever higher standard of living and more opportunities.

I do not believe in the city of Washington, Dr. DIXON has three greater admirers or three stancher friends than my three boys. If they could speak here in this Hall of the House of Representatives, even though they are but 8, 14, and 17 years old, they would speak from their hearts, and they could say this better than I, because he has touched them as he has touched every Member of the Congress. He is dedicated to the work of the Lord whether it be in his church or in the Halls of the Congress. In everything he has ever done, as I have observed him, he has been dedicated to the proposition to search for that which was right and then to champion that cause with everything he has.

My wife Thyra and I have come to know and to love his lovely wife, Lucille. I know they are planning to return to their State of Utah, to their home not far from the borders of Wyoming.

Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in this one thought at this time of the departure of Dr. DIXON from the Congress of the United States and that is I hope and trust we will have occasion to be associated together back in our home States over a long period of time. I wish for him and his family many, many years of real happiness with a little more leisure to go hunting and fishing, which I know he enjoys so much. Mr. Speaker, I hope we will see him often.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES].

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Iowa not only for yielding to me but for making it possible for me as well as other Members of the Congress to pay tribute to our very good friend and respected colleague, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. DIXON]. The Congress will be a poorer place because of his decision to retire voluntarily. The people with whom he will come in contact in his future life will be the richer because of that decision which he now makes. Dr. DIXON is the type of person who is best characterized by the words "sterling integrity." Not only because he is a man who believes deeply in his religion and in his God, but because he also believes in his fellow man and in the inherent goodness of his fellow man. I am sure that no Member of the House of Representatives, in fact, no person who has ever known Dr. DIXON can say that he has ever been guilty of a mean thing or of anything that is unworthy of the highest standards of manhood and of the profession which he has chosen, that of teaching young people. Although his contributions in the Congress have been great, probably his greatest contributions have been and will in the future be in the field of education. His church is establishing a new university in my district. I mentioned this to Dr. DIXON once and suggested that, perhaps, he could tear himself away from his native State of Utah and come on down and let those of us who live in Arizona have the benefit of his wisdom and the benefit of the fine company he affords to all of his friends.

I repeat that invitation and do so with all my heart. I am sure that he would make a fine citizen of any State, and I am more than sure that he would find he has more friends in the State of Arizona than even he can realize. I have come to know Dr. DIXON not only personally, but by reputation because he has many friends living in my hometown of Mesa and in the city of Phoenix—not only friends but relatives. I know of no person who has not the highest regard for him as a person, as an educator and as a legislator. It is my great privilege to wish Dr. DIXON and his wife the best of everything in the days to come and to assure him that he has made friends in the Congress, friends that he will never be without. I hope our paths will cross frequently in the days to come and that I may be privileged in some way to be of service to him in any manner that he may choose as time goes on.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. WEAVER].

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to join with my colleagues on the floor in paying my respects to the distinguished gentleman from Utah, my friend and colleague, Dr. DIXON.

Along with most of my colleagues who are now on the floor it was my privilege to have first met and become acquainted with Dr. DIXON at the beginning of the 84th Congress. Since that time I have found no finer friend in the Halls of Congress than Dr. DIXON.

Dr. DIXON is a very kindly man, a man of great talent, a man of great ability, and a man who has been completely devoted to the task of doing his job properly for the people of Utah as well as our country as a whole.

My service in Congress, I feel, has been the better because of my friendship with Dr. DIXON. I certainly join with my colleagues and wish him and his splendid family well in the days ahead, and I hope that in those days ahead he will take time to come back and say "hello" to all of us.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the public service of HENRY DIXON.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, it was with deepest regret that his colleagues in the House learned of Dr. DIXON's decision to retire from the Congress upon the completion of his present term. Those of us who have been privileged to be closely associated with him have appreciated and admired his quiet efficiency, his deep understanding, and his gentle firmness. To his tasks he has brought a truly dedicated spirit and in the performance of his duties he has displayed sound judgment and keen perception. He has gained our complete respect and won our enduring affection.

Dr. DIXON has achieved a record of service seldom equaled. The problems of his constituents have received his careful and skillful attention. He has been proud to represent them and has evidenced this pride by loyalty to their needs and proper interests. Absorbed as he has been with these countless personal services, he has encompassed

with his study and advocacy all the great problems and issues, domestic and foreign, which have highlighted his years of service. He has sought to guide this country along paths of progress and real service to mankind.

With dignity and skill he has represented faithfully the people of his district and the welfare of his Nation. He has earned retirement status but we understand he will return to the halls of learning which have claimed a major portion of his life. In leaving this Congress, he takes with him the very best wishes of the Members of this House and the gratitude of the people he has served so well. He will be blessed with all the happy memories loyal and unselfish service to his country inspire.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, Dr. DIXON is one of the most beloved and one of the most highly respected Members of the House of Representatives. He is a unique person, having all of the qualities of a kind, gentle, and considerate individual. In short, he is an outstanding Christian gentleman.

Dr. DIXON by reason of his training and experience has been closely associated with the problems of American agriculture. He has been intensely interested in agricultural research and in that particular field he has contributed much to the writing and presentation of research legislation. His fine services will be solely missed by the Committee on Agriculture.

Dr. DIXON has been a conscientious Representatives and his retirement gives us a keen sense of loss. My best wishes go out to Dr. DIXON for good health, happiness, and success in all of his future undertakings.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, ever since I heard of the coming retirement of the Honorable HENRY A. DIXON, I have had a constant feeling of regret that the Congress must lose the services of this able and genial Member. From the first time I met him, HENRY and I have always "clicked." We have worked side by side in the Committee on Agriculture and I cannot recall a single instance when we differed on fundamentals. On minor political matters, maybe yes. But on fundamentals, definitely no.

HENRY combines an unusually fine and analytical mind, with a lovable and warm personality. I can easily understand why he was such an outstanding success in his former profession of teaching prior to his coming to Congress. We shall all miss him.

I, for one, take comfort in the fact that he is not retiring from all activity and that his home country out in Utah will again claim him, after the close of the present Congress.

HENRY is and has always been one of our very best. May his successor be half as good.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to say that it is with a certain sense of sadness that I avail myself the privilege of paying tribute to a Member who will not—because of a decision to retire—be with those Members who meet at the inception of the 87th Congress: the distinguished Member from Utah, Mr. ALDOUS DIXON.

Mr. DIXON has given outstanding service to his constituency, displayed dedication, devotion, and love for his country, and exhibited great compassion and understanding for his fellow man. He is a man possessed of the highest of ideals, applying these in his everyday living, and these are supported by a deep religious conviction. In him do we truly find a personification of real character, and through him do we really see the operation of those principles upon which America was built.

"DOC" DIXON came to the Congress after distinguishing himself in Utah as a leading educator, and he was, in fact, the president of the land-grant college in his State. His intelligence and broad experience combined to make a very valuable contribution to the function of the Congress, and in serving with him on the House Committee on Agriculture I have had the opportunity of availing myself of his sound counsel.

I have had an additional pleasure, for it has been Mrs. McIntire's and my privilege to have a personal acquaintanceship with Dr. and Mrs. Dixon, as well as members of their family. We have found all of them to be truly wonderful persons.

These fine folks will certainly be very much missed in the environs of Washington, but the harsh aspect of their absence can in some respects be tempered by the realization that these vigorous persons have earned their just due of a less strenuous life. I would, however, venture to say that the luster of activity will never depart from their future lives, for their love of and interest in their fellow man will continue to lead them into the dynamic current of social service.

Mrs. McIntire joins with me in extending to "Doc" and Mrs. Dixon our very best wishes for the years that lie ahead, and it is our fervent hope that these will be replete with good health and great happiness. We would also like to say that our lives—having touched theirs—have become fuller, richer, and deeper.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, before leaving the House of Representatives, I want to join with my other colleagues in paying respects to a distinguished American who is retiring from Congress this year.

The Honorable HENRY A. DIXON is one of the finest characters I have known. He is an educator. He is a scholar. He ranks high as a legislator. Dr. DIXON has contributed much to legislation during the time he has been in Congress. His views and his influence have meant much to other Members. The Congress and the country are better because of the services of Dr. HENRY A. DIXON.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, it is with sincere regret that I join other Members of the House in bidding farewell to Dr. HENRY ALDOUS DIXON. Dr. DIXON, in addition to being a neighbor of mine in political districts, is a close personal friend and one for whom I have the highest regard. Since he represents Idaho's neighboring State of Utah, we have had many things in common, due to the similarity in natural resources and the interests of our constituents. We have found ourselves on the same side of most, if not all, political questions and particularly those involving the basic rights of the individual and the development of our natural resources. It has been a pleasure to join with him in championing the supremacy of States rights in the matter of control and use of perhaps the greatest resources within our States, that of water, and of sponsoring legislation to authorize projects which provide for the growth and development of our area.

As I recall, Dr. DIXON was drafted by the citizens of the Second Congressional District of Utah late in the campaign of the year 1954, and with reluctance on his part, since he had never before sought public office. He was at that time president of the fine Utah State Agricultural College at Logan, Utah, which is now known as the Utah State University. Prior to that time he had served for many years as president of Weber Junior College in Ogden and had served in numerous other assignments in the educational field.

I know from personal discussion with my colleague of his great love for these United States and for the Constitution of this great Nation. We share similar basic beliefs that this Constitution was divinely inspired. I am sure it was because of this strong conviction that he agreed to become the Republican candidate which resulted in his election to the 84th Congress. This was his first attempt at either a State or National political office, and I am sure he is a member of a rather select group who can claim the distinction of being elected on the very first try, of having served in successive Congresses without defeat, and of retiring through his choice.

His devoted service in the House is known to all of us, and more particularly to the members of the Agricultural Committee on which he has been an active member. Dr. DIXON is a man with high ideals and yet he has the common, sympathetic approach to all problems of society. As I have indicated, he left the rather quiet atmosphere of the college campus and the classroom to respond to the call of his party and enter the hectic activities of a political campaign. He has continued as a campaigner here and proven himself to be not only an unusually well qualified legislator, but a most courageous one as well.

It is with deepest respect that I pay tribute to his service as a distinguished Member of the Congress, a great defender of Republican ideals and a man with great religious faith. As he leaves the Washington scene to join the faculty at Brigham Young University, I know we will miss him, but I also know that he will be an inspiration to the many students who come under his striking personality. I can only hope they measure up to him.

RUIN FOR THE DAIRY FARMER

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, the other day the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CURTIN] took the floor of the House to discuss at some length a situation that has developed in his district in northeastern Pennsylvania along the border of New Jersey which affects certain dairy farmers in his area who ship and have traditionally shipped some of their bottled or packaged fluid milk across the Delaware River for sale in New Jersey.

Under the present Federal Milk Marketing Order No. 27, which applies to New Jersey as well as to a substantial portion of New York State, including, I might add, a sizable portion of the 32d Congressional District of New York, which I have the honor to represent, anyone who sells the fluid milk within the limits of the order area is required to pay into a common pool a certain portion of his receipts for this milk for the purpose of establishing a certain fixed and fair price both for fluid milk and for manufactured milk applicable to all producers selling within the designated area.

I am sure it is not necessary to dwell at length with the Members of this House on the details of this milk order procedure, which are already familiar to most of you, especially those who represent dairy areas. Similarly, it is not necessary to dwell at length either on the reasons behind these milk orders, even though they are somewhat different from procedures usually followed by manufacturer or businessman.

Briefly, the State and Federal orders to which the gentleman from Pennsylvania referred were originally set up in New York State back in 1938 under President Roosevelt and Governor Lehman and a companion order was subsequently established for the State of New Jersey in 1957. The purpose of the orders, of course, was to prevent the economic disaster that had hit the dairy farmer in the past as a result of drastic shifts in the supply and demand for fluid milk and which had upon occasion led not only, as you will recall, to milk strikes with fluid milk running away into the ditch, but even to outright violence. These orders have succeeded remarkably well in eliminating that kind of disaster and they have brought a high degree of stability to the milk marketing areas they affect.

They do this by creating what are known as market pools under which all producers of fluid milk selling in a given area share in the benefits of the high prices that are paid for milk used for fluid consumption and by the same token also share in the burdens of the lower prices that are paid for milk which falls into the extra reserve or cushion part of total production used for lower-priced manufacturing purposes. Without this kind of pooling or sharing arrangement all milk producers would be scrambling for the higher price outlets and the result, of course, as has occurred so often in the past, would be a break in the price structure and disaster for all the milk producers involved. The bigger the market area the more the producers who are damaged.

The New York and New Jersey milk marketing orders for example, which have been supplemented by a Federal order which was expanded in 1957 to take in an even larger zone, now cover some 50,000 producers and one and a third million dollars worth of milk a day is being distributed and sold in the area of these orders.

To make a pool arrangement like this work there must, of course, be a careful definition of the milk which is to be included in the pool. And such rules must be spelled out by regulation and designed so carefully as to be enforceable against violation. Without drawing a careful line as to the area affected, each pool could easily cover the whole country and then, of course, the effectiveness of the order would be lost.

Naturally, any definition of such an area involves the exclusion of areas as well as the inclusion of other areas. Fringe, periphery, and borderline situations are bound to develop and these, of course, have to be dealt with, too.

Now while this order No. 27 has not been perfect in all respects, as nothing produced by mere mortals can ever be perfect, it has indeed introduced an element of much-needed stability into a situation which was not only unstable but fraught with economic and even political disaster. As a result, even though the farmers and cooperative groups which represent them may disagree from time to time with regard to some of the provisions or price levels that are established by the milk marketing administrator under the order, I think it is fair to say that all of them are united in believing that the existence of the order is essential to their own economic stability and they would naturally view with great alarm any attempt to destroy this piece of governmental action which has over the years brought so much to them in the way of economic benefit.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I understand the situation, the case to which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CURTIN] referred had to do with producers of milk whose plant was physically located, as I have said, outside the specific area delineated by the New York-New Jersey Federal Milk Marketing Order No. 27, specifically the Lehigh and Suncrest concerns. Over the years these producers had, however, sold a portion of their milk across the river in the State of New Jersey, within the boundaries of the order. In an effort to deal with the various fringe situations to which I referred a moment ago, the order provided that those who sell all or a portion of their milk within the order's area, like the gentleman's constituents, must be prepared to play according to the rules. They are permitted to pool either a portion of their milk returns based on the percentage of milk which they sell in the marketing order area, or to pool all of their returns, whichever they prefer.

Frankly, the arrangement strikes me as being eminently fair. No one has to play the game, but if he does play the game certainly he should expect to play it according to the rules. No one has to sell milk within the area of a marketing order, but if he desires to take advantage of the area affected by the order, then he should be expected to abide by the rules which set it up. Yet the gentleman from Pennsylvania has objected to the requirement that his constituents should be required to pay even a portion of their funds into an arrangement designed to be of benefit to all of the farmers of the area.

Because his constituents live outside the geographical boundaries he believes that they should therefore be exempt from the provisions of the law, even though in fact they are one of the group of producers selling within the zone covered by the law. And so vigorously do his constituents feel about this matter, Mr. Speaker, that they have taken the matter to court, as the gentleman explained in his remarks the other day, and are seeking a judicial determination that the order, which has these provisions with which they disagree, should be thrown out and wiped from the books.

Now let us make no mistake about this, Mr. Speaker. This would certainly be the result of the suit by the gentleman's clients, Lehigh and Suncrest, if they were successful—to destroy the whole order. Because if one producer can move into the order area and can ignore the provisions of the order with impunity, then, of course, any other producer can do the same thing and thus provisions and controls which have been built up carefully over the years in an effort to avoid the economic chaos and violence that occurred to the dairy farmer in the thirties would be eliminated.

This problem of the more remotely distant occasional bulk shipper not regularly associated with a particular milk market who might like to unload unmanageable surpluses upon the market, Mr. Speaker, was met way back in 1945 by providing that they pay into the pool on the amount they shipped at a rate sufficient to represent their effect on the pool in displacing regular pool milk. This provision was put in in 1945 after several amendment hearings.

The problem, which the gentleman's constituents face, of a fringe distributor selling principally outside the market but with some sales coming into the area in his own packages and vehicles, did not arise, I am informed, until 1957 when the order was extended to include milk produced for northern New Jersey and the southeast portion of upstate New York. There were no such periphery operators previously, because the original marketing area—New York City and Nassau, Suffolk, and Westchester Counties—did not have adjacent land areas except sparsely settled northern Westchester. However, when the area was extended, some actual and much potential distribution on both sides of the market bounds had to be considered.

Therefore, the rule now being attacked was provided. The remote bulk non-pool shipper had been allowed to pool, that is to pay in, only on the amount he shipped; but when the area was extended, the fringe distributor

with a small percentage of his business inside the area was given the privilege of total pooling, in case he did not like to pay in on only the amount sold inside the area. The two concerns in eastern Pennsylvania who reside in the gentleman's district do not want either to pool fully or make this partial payment.

Regular pool handlers with whom these two compete in distribution all have to make payments to the pool for the benefit of all pool producers on this high priced fluid utilization, but these two concerns desire to keep such moneys solely for the benefit of their own producers. Many regular pool producers who have all fluid sales could get much apparent benefit by the same treatment, but they realize that to do so would break down the whole principle of marketwide pool equalization, force a fight for fluid markets at cut prices, and break the entire price structure to ruinous levels.

I might say that all the producer organizations of New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania, except Lehigh, are in this case on the side of the Government as friends of the court. These number 130 all of which, except 2 operate on a much smaller scale than Lehigh. It is the third largest in the area.

Of the 29 country milk plants that receive milk from about 3,000 producers in my district, 5 are owned and run by 1 single plant operating cooperatives, 6 by a multiplant operating cooperative, and the other 18 by dealers at each of which the producers are members of one or another of 4 cooperatives which represent them in bargaining for the sale of their milk. All of these cooperatives have entered this case as friends of the court on the side of the Government.

These cooperative groups frequently disagree with determination of the USDA on provisions or price levels in the regulatory orders. They are firm, however, on their insistence on the provision being attacked by these two Pennsylvania concerns because they know that the orders cannot exist without it and the orders have proven to be their only method of price stabilization needed to keep their farms financially sound.

The States of New York and New Jersey have also come into this case, along with the largest cooperative in New England, as friends of the court on the side of the Federal Government.

In fact, if the New York and New Jersey order is stricken down, then 50 other similar orders across the Nation would also be stricken down, with ruinously low prices to the milk producers affected as the result.

In addition, the gentleman from Pennsylvania has also introduced a resolution, House Resolution 625, calling for a congressional investigation of the operation of this order in the light of the gentleman's contention that the order is not in the public interest.

Now I have no desire, Mr. Speaker, to take issue with the gentleman from Pennsylvania in his very proper desire to represent his constituents. All of us here are trying as best we can, of course, to do precisely that. But I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, that in representing his constituents in Pennsylvania the gentleman is proposing to destroy an economic arrangement under which thousands of dairy farmers in my district of New York have been living and doing business for years and which all of them regard as being absolutely vital to their own economic health and well-being.

I think it would be most unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman's remarks about the operation of the order were to go unchallenged on this floor or if the impression were to be gained, particularly now that this case is currently pending in the courts, that this House by tacit consent supports the gentleman's contention or his desire to upset those arrangements of law which have brought peace and stability into so much of the dairy industry. I think it is important, Mr. Speaker, that since this matter is pending in the courts, we take no action here that would appear to be forcing the hand of the judiciary.

I, for one, believe that it would be disastrous if this order were to be upset. The result would be ruin for the dairy farmer and we would be back again in the dark days of milk strikes and dairy truck violence. I hope and pray that day will never come again. So let us stand firm behind the dairy farmers of our Nation. Let us support them in their efforts to live their lives and conduct their business with security and stability and dignity. Let us continue to adhere to the American principle that he who desires to play the game must play it under the same rules as are followed by everyone else. And let us not even unwittingly act to stir up controversy and dissension within the dairy industry but rather work to promote and extend the kind of economic stability which has been such an important byproduct of the milk orders set up so many years ago.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to agree most earnestly with the remarks of the gentleman from the 32d New York District, Mr. SAMUEL S. STRATTON.

The gentleman from New York has said everything that needs statement at this time in this matter, that is, that the Congress should not interfere with the orderly procedure of the court cases testing the legality of the compensatory payment provisions of the New York and New Jersey State and Federal milk producer price orders.

I have three such order plants in my district with approximately 600 producers delivering to these plants. These producers, through their cooperative organizations, have come into this case as friends of the court on the side of the Government.

The principal point I want to make is that this is not a partisan matter between States or political parties. It is true that the Lehigh Cooperative is a Pennsylvania concern, but it is the only one of the 130 cooperatives affected by the price orders in question, which is not in this case on the side of maintaining the provision of the orders attacked by Lehigh.

Pennsylvania dairy farmers have a most important stake in the maintenance of the New York-New Jersey Federal milk order as it now stands. Some 12,000 of our dairymen are producing milk for this New York-New Jersey market. This is more than the combined totals of our Pennsylvania dairymen serving the two largest markets within the State—Philadelphia and Pittsburgh.

A majority of these 12,000 dairymen are members of some 36 cooperatives operating in Pennsylvania who are on the side of the Government in support of the milk order and the contested provision.

Let the interests of all these dairy farmers, including those of the Lehigh Cooperative, be adjudicated by the orderly processes of the courts which presently have jurisdiction.

FARM POLICY AND FARM PROBLEMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KING of Utah). Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RANDALL] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, before this short session adjourns, I feel it is appropriate to attempt to round up a not too elongated résumé of some of the thoughts or thinking of several different groups or viewpoints which seek to analyze our farm problem.

I wish to make it very clear and plain that I do not profess any claim to authorship to these ideas, nor do I suggest they are new or original, or exclusive to all other approaches. Instead my objective is to simply restate some of these thoughts as a sort of recapitulation, or as an outline of suggestions dropped into the hopper, with some possible value as a stimulant to further thought on this most complex problem.

If I may be permitted to do so, I would like to present these thoughts in outline form:

I. IMPACT OF THE FARM PROBLEM ON THE REST OF THE ECONOMY

I read where steel production is operating only at a little over 50 percent of its capacity. Certainly steel is one of the keys to our industrial well-being. We must hasten then to note that farms are still steel's largest civilian customer. Steel followed the same pattern in the 1955–56 farm recession, and if we have any hope of stabilizing our entire national economy, and in particular in the steel industry, then one of the first and most important steps must be the stabilization of prices in agriculture, which is our largest basic industry.

The low per capita income of agriculture States has even resulted in shifts of population to industrial areas. What happens? There are no new jobs in these latter areas and yet an effort must be made to make room for this new labor supply. One suggested solution is the shortening of the work week. But

in the event of a depression, large urban population represents a real threat to our economy. Certainly it is preferable that the population be not so falsely and suddenly concentrated, but remain distributed in a balanced pattern throughout our vast agricultural areas.

Another facet to this problem is that the reverse of such a trend can sometimes be observed. An area low in agricultural income will be forced to offer tax-free industrial sites, and enact such legislation as right-to-work laws—in a desperate last-ditch effort to attract industry from other States. A careful observance of this sort of thing will lead to the conclusion that the farm problem—if it remains unsolved as to one State—represents a direct threat to neighboring States.

II. THE PROBLEM ITSELF

At the base of the pyramid, as one of the major elements in this problem, is overproduction. Technological strides in agriculture have been almost beyond imagination. One of the great changes is from horse and mule power to tractors. This power source in years past consumed a lot of the grains produced. The iron horse consumes only gas and oil. In years gone by, the horse and mule consumed the product of about 80 million acres of land. But those remaining today consume the product of only 10 million acres of land. In the last 25 years, we have seen the switch from old varieties to hybrid corn, improved strains of wheat and other grains, plus the widespread use of commercial fertilizer. It appears unlikely that in the future, progress in technical improvement will continue at the same rate of pace that it has in the past. This fact taken alone should be helpful to the surplus problem and cause the production curve to flatten. But one thing we must all remember is that as the production curve rounds out, there is another curve to reckon with. Apparently there is but one way for the population curve to be plotted on the graph and that is upward. These two trends going in diverse directions should accomplish a permanent solution to the surplus problem within the years ahead. But our problem is now—this year and the next few years, which leads us to an analysis of another phase of the problem itself, and this is our marketing system.

True, great strides have been made in production, but then we must ask ourselves if we can equally well apply our intelligence and wisdom in an equally efficient manner to the marketing of this production. Here again is one of the basic blocks at the foot of the pyramid and one of the most important factors to be included in building a solid foundation for a solution to the problem. It starts with the recognition that most of the world is hungry, that actually there is no food surplus—in terms of supplies over total human needs. Rather there is only a surplus which our present marketing system cannot dispose of with a reasonable return to the producer. Stripped bare, our marketing system is not much more than an auction, but with one advantage and that is its ability to move an almost unlimited amount at some price. But let's underscore the words, "Some price," which certainly holds no hope for the producer, the American farmer. Any incentives in this present marketing system are ordinarily set up by the processor, and one must remember that the incentives are usually set up for the benefit of only the processor. As to these incentives, no consideration is given to such things that might aid producers in leveling out livestock cycles.

Our domestic marketing system is not geared to the opening up of secondary markets at home or abroad and is not well coordinated with Public Law 480. In the marketing system itself, there are no mechanics at all to adjust supply to effective demand, other than Government legislation—which enforces this adjustment part way.

III. ABSENCE OF BARGAINING POSITION

A good part of the trouble comes from the farmers' inability to bargain. He walks into the marketplace with hat in hand and says "What will you give me?" Then, later when he goes to make his own purchases he is told what the price will be, on a take-it-or-leave-it basis.

On the one hand, there are millions of producers who are dealing with the processing industry, which is dominated by a few giants who set prices and market policies. These processors are the ones who have been most critical of price supports, but it is these selfsame price supports that have given the millions of producers the only bargaining ability that they today possess.

IV. FUTURE FARM PROBLEMS

It might be unwise and even impractical to detail with great particularity the specifics in a new farm problem, but certainly it is possible to set down broad guidelines for such a program.

First. Any solution should recognize the necessity of maintaining agricultural price structure in balance with the industrial price structure. It is suggested this can be done in the following two ways: Price supports and deficiency payments.

Certainly the first has the advantage because it need not involve large Government appropriations.

Second. There should be a recognition of two paramount problems: The present low price-surplus emergency; and long-range market developments.

In my opinion, any current land withdrawal program should, because of present huge surpluses, be financed by payment-in-kind. This would accomplish a good result in that less feed grain would be fed back into the livestock economy than would be normally produced. Further, such a proposition would serve a dual purpose. It would cut storage costs and at the same time reduce the otherwise large appropriation necessary for land withdrawal. Such a land withdrawal program should be approved only after the necessary food reserves have been carefully determined, allowing for hostilities, disaster, and drought, and only after being carefully keyed to the plan for "food for peace," when these plans have been fully explored.

An alternative to land withdrawal plan, financed by a payment-in-kind, would be the mandatory allotment program, very similar to the old allotment program but with much tighter controls and cross-compliance. For my part, I would favor such mandatory or forced allotments only after a referendum vote by farmers, bearing in mind this mandatory allotment and the land withdrawal supported by payment-in-kind are all the time to be classified as emergency measures.

After the emergency period is past, it is time to pursue a marketing expansion program with the ultimate and eventual goal to be full production for American agriculture, limited only by sound soil conservation practices.

It is my opinion that in this entire effort, farmers should have not simply the right which should certainly exist in a democracy, to have a referendum to vote for the particular program, but should be given substantial responsibility in setting up, administering and financing these programs. Bargaining position can be improved through Federal marketing orders. This bargaining should be aided and improved by granting authority to certain commodity crops, to limit production, after national needs are satisfied. Not only farmer responsibility must be encouraged, but also there must be farmer realization that he must share in the cost of surplus disposal. Producers—farmers—should be given the tools to maintain price levels that will return the cost of production, plus a reasonable profit, but it must also be brought home to these producers that surplus production beyond market needs is his own responsibility and the farmer must either not produce an excess, or if he does, be willing to share in the cost of disposal of the excess.

I think most farmers as individuals realize the problems and are willing to cooperate to solve them. It is the place of the Government to provide the legal means necessary to implement corrective group action.

In a final word, the program which provides the most lasting benefit and solution will be that program which gives farmers the tools to help himself and to be financed by these farmer producers.

WE NEED A MORAL AND SENSIBLE FOREIGN POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House the Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PORTER] for 60 minutes.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, we need a moral and sensible foreign policy. We do not have one today. A Johnson-Kennedy victory on November 8 will give us such a policy. A Nixon-Lodge victory will not.

Our foreign policy has not been moral. The Republican administration has treated tyrants as though they were respectable and worthy of our friendship. Our foreign policy has not been sensible in other respects. The Republican administration endorses disarmament but refuses to invite China to the conferences where the agreements must be negotiated and to which China must

be a party. The Republican administration repeatedly stresses the pressing necessity for disarmament and a world under law, yet its actual efforts in these directions are puny and without conviction.

It is not surprising that our prestige has declined alarmingly among the freedom-loving peoples of the world. We appear, with some reason, to be both hypocritical and ignorant. Actually, as a nation, we are neither. We truly hate tyranny. We deplore governments based on cruelty and corruption. We truly want a world where disputes among nations will be settled by law, not force. We truly wish to share our resources, our know-how and compassion with the hungry, the miserable, and the oppressed of the world.

DISCARD REPUBLICAN POLICIES

For a moral and sensible foreign policy we must discard the Republican administration's immoral and senseless policies which have led us to chaos and discord. Persisting on the present course can only lead to disaster—complete, irrevocable disaster for all mankind.

Last month in Chicago our colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD], took a somewhat different view in his keynote speech at the Republican Convention. I shall refer to his remarks as I discuss three recommendations for a moral and sensible foreign policy. I notified him yesterday of my intention. At the conclusion of these remarks I shall be glad to hear his comments as well as those of other Members.

There is a wide area of agreement as to foreign policies. We all agree that our Nation, born as it was out of a revolution against tyranny, opposes slavery and endorses freedom. We all agree that we must remain strong and that any disarmament must be accompanied by appropriate safeguards.

We all agree that our terrible weapons, atomic, biological, and chemical, not only burden our people with tremendous taxes but offer an increasing threat to the survival of mankind. We know that the possibility of war by accident increases daily and will be as universally lethal as intentional war.

It is right and sensible that we promote freedom. It is sensible that we seek a strengthened United Nations, an end to the deadly and expensive arms race, and a beginning of a massive and far better use of our ingenuity and resources in the conquest of poverty, of the ocean depths, of outer space, of the many other frontiers where men can collaborate constructively instead of fighting each other in fear, hatred, and despair.

FREEDOM VERSUS SLAVERY

The Republican keynoter said in Chicago that, "The gravest issue of our century" is human slavery—"masses of men enslaved by governments." He asserted that the Republican Party stands for freedom and against slavery. No doubt he is correct but the fact is that the Republican administration has not demonstrated its adherence to that stand. This brings me to my first recommendation.

ACTS, NOT JUST WORDS

First. Honor by acts, not just words, our belief in freedom. The late Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles, a sincere and able man, set up our standards of friendship with other nations; namely, are you with us against the Soviet Union? It didn't matter that a nation's government was a tyranny. All that mattered was its anticommunism or purported anticommunism.

I found this out joltingly when I first came to Washington as a Member of Congress nearly 4 years ago. Gerry Murphy, a constituent of mine from my hometown, Eugene, Oreg., disappeared in the Dominican Republic under circumstances that strongly suggested murder at the order of Dictator Trujillo.

When I demanded appropriate action, the State Department tried to persuade me to join them in forgetting about the event. Gerry was just an adventurer, they told me, and besides Trujillo votes with us in the United Nations and we have important military installations there.

DISTRESS AMONG OUR FRIENDS

I quickly found out that the democratic leaders in Latin America were deeply hurt and distressed by the way we courted Trujillo, Batista of Cuba, Stroessner of Paraguay, Perez Jimenez of Venezuela, Somoza of Nicaragua, and, earlier before their fall, Peron of Argentina and Rojas Penilla of Colombia, all tyrants, most of whom worked together to persecute democratic leaders in the hemisphere, even when they were in other countries, including the United States.

The bitter fruit of these immoral policies is being harvested today in Cuba and elsewhere in Latin America.

The Republican keynoter called upon the Nation to support our principles and the first principle he named was human freedom. The truth is that the Republican administration, except by glowing words, has not supported human freedom in Latin America or elsewhere in the world. It has supported allies regardless of their crimes against their own peoples.

Adlai Stevenson last January said:

> Our present combination of complacency and apprehension, of little aims and larger fears, has within itself the seed of destruction, first for our own community, and then for the larger hope that freedom, not tyranny, will be the organizing principle of the society of man.

EISENHOWER'S VISIT TO FRANCO AND CHIANG

This Republican administration was not only immoral in its unholy friendship with tyrannies in Latin America. On his trip to Europe the President last December went out of his way to honor Franco, an unrepentant tyrant who was allied ideologically and by his sympathies with Hitler and Mussolini in World War II.

A few months ago the President visited Taiwan and as he departed he referred to Chiang Kai-shek's tight little tyranny as "a thriving democracy." What do you suppose the Japanese students thought of that? I can tell you what they thought of that. They thought that our President was either ignorant about democracy or Chiang's government or that he was a hypocrite.

When Vice President NIXON went to Latin America in 1958 he was often asked why the United States supported dictators. He gave the usual State Department evasive answer:

> We do not interfere in the internal affairs of sister nations.

When he stopped off in Puerto Rico, able and democratic Governor Luis Munoz Marin convinced him that our policy should be to give a formal handshake to dictators and a warm embrace to democratic leaders.

Dr. Milton Eisenhower included this recommendation in the Latin American report which he gave to the President in January 1959. The President endorsed the entire report but no actions followed these words until the Organization of American States began to take united action against Trujillo and the administration began to worry about Soviet influence in Cuba.

Now the Secretary of State publicly calls Trujillo a "dictator." Under Secretary of State Dillon goes further. He told a Senate committee the other day that Trujillo was a murderer, a torturer, and a tyrant.

The news here is who is saying these things, not what is being said. Trujillo has been all these things and more for a long time on a large and notorious scale. This is not news in the Western Hemisphere nor indeed in the Eastern Hemisphere. The Republican administration began to move against him only as it seemed we had to do so in order to persuade our fellow Americans to side with us against Castro, as Castro's policies appeared to bring the cold war to our very shores.

TRUJILLO TURNS TO THE COMMUNISTS

The administration was very reluctant to call Trujillo the criminal enemy of freedom which he is and has been for many years. Hailed by his erstwhile defenders as a great anti-Communist and a devout Catholic, Trujillo now actively courts Soviet support. The Catholic bishops in the Dominican Republic are now firmly and publicly opposed to him and his policies. Ramfis, his oldest son, even now is in Moscow as Papa's emissary and Trujillo is permitting Communists once again to operate within the Dominican Republic.

Along with others who rejoiced when Batista fell I once had high hopes that Fidel Castro would keep his promise to hold free elections and to maintain individual freedoms. Instead, and in spite of the efforts of many of his former friends, Castro established a dictatorship in Cuba, a policy of extreme abuse of the United States, and a close relationship to the Soviet Union and the Communist Party.

If the Republican administration had shown by its actions, not just by empty words, our preference for freedom when Batista ruled by murder, torture and corruption, instead of giving Batista arms and friendly Ambassadors, we would be better able to help the cause

of freedom today in Cuba. As it is, we must admit our errors and not make them worse. I am confident that freedom can win over Soviet communism in Cuba as elsewhere in the world, but first we must ourselves pledge anew our belief in the principles on which our Nation was founded and then conduct ourselves accordingly.

How can we lead the free world against communism if we fail to speak out against all tyranny, of both the left and the right, and for freedom through honest elections everywhere? We have a duty to argue the case for democracy versus communism, for freedom versus tyranny, in our relations with other nations.

Is it too simple, too naive, to believe that our foreign policy should be moral? That it should reflect our deepest feelings about right and wrong? That our actions should correspond with our words supporting freedom? Lip service to freedom is not enough. The warm embrace of friendship for democratic leaders must be accompanied by the helping hand. Actions speak louder than words.

SENATOR KENNEDY CALLS FOR NEW ATTITUDES

In June Senator KENNEDY in a Senate speech said:

> A return to the good neighbor policy is not enough. Dollar diplomacy is not enough. A patronizing attitude, taking for granted their dedication to an anti-Communist crusade is not enough. We will need a whole new set of attitudes and emphasis to make the nations of Latin America full partners in the rapid development of the Western Hemisphere.

The Democratic nominee for President is right. It is plain that we need a whole new set of attitudes and emphasis to achieve this partnership.

The junior Senator from Massachusetts in that speech also pointed out with reference to Africa, although the application is worldwide, that if our policies are to be effective we must give our aid in terms of America's desire to bring freedom and prosperity to Africa—not in terms of a narrow self-interest which seeks only to use African nations as pawns in the cold war.

It is right to help democratic leaders and embrace them warmly. It is wrong to help enemies of freedom and to warmly embrace tyrants. These are elementary but neglected truisms. My friend from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] declared in his keynote speech that—

> Men will find ways to bring down today's tyrants, if only we don't build up tyrants.

I agree, but I do not agree that increased communication with China would build China up. My second recommendation for a chance in our foreign policy is:

INCREASED COMMUNICATION WITH CHINA

Second. Bring China into international negotiations for disarmament and peace. This means first, exchange of newsmen and other citizens; second, trade in nonstrategic items; and third, eventual, not immediate, admission to the United Nations and recognition by the United States along the lines recommended last November in the Conlon Report to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee at its request.

"Recognition and admission," according to the Republican keynoter, "would needlessly present it with smashing victories." This is a remarkable defense of the long obsolete containment by isolation policy. The Republicans insist that the Democrats, Mr. Acheson in particular, "lost" China to the Communists. Mr. NIXON used this false charge again in the 1952 campaign. The truth is that Chiang's corruption and lack of constructive social and economic policies lost China. General Wedemeyer testified that the battles were lost to the Communists because of the poor morale of Chiang's troops, not lack of arms.

No one suggests that Taiwan be surrendered, but it is in order to suggest that we stop propping up a tyrant like Chiang Kai-shek and allowing the 8 million Taiwanese—as compared to the 2 million mainland Chinese now on the island—a proper voice in their government. We believe in self-determination so why not make our conduct conform accordingly? It would appear sensible and moral to do so.

By identifying ourselves so closely with Chiang we provide exactly the fearsome foreign devil that the Chinese Communist leaders require in order to keep their people apprehensive and thus amenable to harsh measures and hard work.

Senator KENNEDY has recommended withdrawal of troops from the Matsu and Quemoy Islands. This accords with the congressional resolution on this subject but not with the Republican administration's foreign and military policies.

CHINA AT THE CONFERENCE TABLE

Senator KENNEDY has also suggested that China be invited to participate in the Geneva negotiations for stopping the testing of nuclear weapons. Here is the imperative reasons why we must generally increase our lines of communication with China.

Secretary Herter last spring publicly conceded that China would have to agree or nuclear tests could not be stopped. This is obvious. The other nations will not stop testing if China can go ahead. We will not stop unless we can be assured that all other nations will stop. This means that there must be inspection stations in China as well as in the Soviet Union, a matter on which both nations must agree.

Mr. Herter's publicly expressed thought was that China be asked after the agreement was drafted. I hope that his private opinion favored the more practical suggestion which Senator KENNEDY made, namely to invite China to participate in the negotiations.

"Jaw, jaw, jaw," said Winston Churchill, "is better than war, war, war."

I have no illusions about such negotiations. They are frustrating, infuriating, exhausting—but is there a better alternative? These negotiations are a challenge to our statesmen, our diplomats, our lawyers, our political scientists, to all men who want to see their children grow up and who want a world unharassed by the dread of catastrophic war.

This brings me to my final recommendation for a moral and sensible foreign policy.

MOBILIZE FOR PEACE THROUGH LAW

Third. Mobilize powerfully to preserve peace with freedom. This administration is on record, repeatedly and emphatically, in favor of disarmament and a world under law. Just yesterday the President told the American Bar Association here in Washington that there was the "mighty force" of "world opinion" behind the rule of law among nations and that "world opinion is not lightly to be discarded."

Is it sensible to spend $46 billion this year for arms and only a few dollars mobilizing for safely escaping this burden? Our present leadership says that world rule of law and disarmament offer the only alternatives to disaster. But do these leaders believe it? It does not seem that they do if you judge by what they do, not what they say.

In the State Department there is a Special Assistant for Disarmament and Atomic Energy. He also handles outer space. He has 12 assistants. The Congress just authorized five more assistants and $400,000 for research. Over in the Defense Department an Assistant Secretary has another half-dozen men in an office for disarmament. The Atomic Energy Commission has two disarmament specialists and the Science Advisory Committee two or three.

A total of less than 30 men are working on disarmament in the whole executive branch. This is an incredibly puny response to the challenge of figuring out how to turn back from the arms race without endangering our security and the security of the free world. I agree with Prof. Louis Sohn of Harvard Law School. He recommends a Manhattan Project for disarmament, a mobilization of our best spiritual and intellectual resources on a scale more in proportion to the challenge. Senator KENNEDY and the Democratic Party have proposed a Peace Agency to accomplish this. The Republican administration again has generally employed the right words but has initiated practically no action to put them into effect.

A U.S. DELEGATE WITH NO EXPERIENCE

Frederick Eaton, appointed by the President to represent the United States in Geneva, is an outstanding corporation lawyer but a man with no experience in disarmament, none at all. Furthermore, he told some of us here on Capitol Hill shortly before he left for Geneva that he did not intend to study disarmament. He said that the President would give him his instructions.

With due respect for Mr. Eaton's efforts at Geneva, I say that we cannot hope to progress affirmatively if we send such men as delegates to disarmament conferences.

Grenville Clark, in the introduction to the second edition of "World Peace Through World Law," by Clark and Sohn, Harvard University Press, 1960, states both the challenge and the alternatives in these well-chosen words:

> The proposition no peace without law also embodies the conception that peace

cannot be insured by a continued arms race, nor by an indefinite balance of terror, nor by diplomatic maneuver, but only by universal and complete national disarmament together with the establishment of institutions corresponding in the world field to those which maintain law and order within local communities and nations.

On the cover of the booklet reprinting the Republican keynote speech is this quotation from Dr. JUDD's address:

> We must develop a strategy for victory * * * save freedom. Freedom everywhere.

With this we all agree. Our strategy can be no gimmick. It cannot be based on hate and fear. It must be based on our love for freedom and our hatred of tyranny.

DISAPPROVE ALL TYRANTS

It means that we must show our disapproval for all tyrants, Communist and non-Communist alike. It means that we must not back away from communication, with formal handshakes, not warm embraces with nations like China. It means we must mobilize our resources for peace and turn the concentrated and united power of our minds and spirits to the problem of surviving our terrible weapons.

If we do these simple, obvious but much neglected things we will have a foreign policy that is both moral and sensible. It does not, however, seem likely that RICHARD NIXON as President would make the necessary changes. Nothing in his conduct to date, and he has had ample opportunity, supports any hope that he as our Chief Executive would express in word and action our opposition to all tyrants; that he would attempt to increase communication with China; and that he would mobilize appropriately for disarmament and the rule of law in the world.

Instead we see him in speech after speech demogogically misrepresenting Senator KENNEDY'S proposal that the United States express regret to the Soviet Union for the effect of the U–2 flight on the summit conference. NIXON wants the voters to believe that KENNEDY wanted to apologize to Khrushchev for sending such flights. This is a well-recognized, typical NIXON twisting of the facts in order to reflect on the motives or good sense of his adversary.

Senator KENNEDY believes we have to deal with the Soviet Union and with China if we are to turn back from nuclear disaster. He believes that the small nations should not be regarded as pawns in the cold war. Senator KENNEDY'S election will assure this Nation a new, vitally necessary, and far more effective foreign policy, a policy that is both moral and sensible.

FIDEL CASTRO FROM LIBERATOR TO INFIDEL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KING of Utah). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SANTANGELO] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, Fidel Castro, the liberator of Cuba, has become an infidel and the tool of Communists. Recent tirades demonstrate that he is a pawn in the Russian game of power politics and that he is a psychotic without religion and without scruples.

On July 26, 1958, the words "Batista has fled" electrified the world. On that day a bearded giant in army fatigues marched down with his loyal freedom fighters from the hills of Oriente Province into Santiago de Cuba. Tyranny fell and democracy under the banner of an inspirational leader marched on toward victory and liberty.

For years the Cuban nation has been stirred—stirred by a solemn passion, of ideals lost, of a government debauched and too often made the instrument of evil. A tyrant had fallen and hopes of liberty soared. With the flight of the tyrant had come liberation and an opportunity for a new life. As the bearded soldier marched on to victory among waving flags and cheering throngs, the people of the pan-American world felt as did the people of the Near East 1,960 years ago, when another bearded man walked on the face of the earth bringing salvation and peace. To some Cubans, he was the new messiah. The people of this wartorn Carribean island rejoiced; dictators to the south trembled; the world awaited expectantly for oncoming events and bloodless revolutions. Within a fortnight the world recoiled and shrank back in horror. Instead of peace, Cuba had blood baths; instead of justice, circus trials; instead of guillotines, the firing squad; instead of binding the nation's wounds, Castro ordered reprisals, retaliation, and revenge. This new government conceived in liberty was weaned on blood and nurtured in hate.

As the Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse ran wild in Cuba, trampling upon hundreds of so-called traitors, the friends of Castro sheepishly apologized, paused, and declared that the end justified the means, and that traitors must be exterminated for the sake of the new order. The press was divided in its condemnation and in its praise. Certain writers saw some justification, others expressed their disgust and dismay. Some Members of our own Congress asked forbearance, understanding, and pointed out the significant silence of the critics in the face of 18 years of barbarous treatment of the Cuban people by the predecessor regime. I, too, advised that continuous and senseless killings would alienate friends of liberty and of the cause of Castro.

This man, Castro, who had been pardoned by the ruthless Batista, found no compassion in his heart for his enemies. This liberator, who lived in the wilds immune to the wind and rain, was sensitive to society's barbs of criticism. He remonstrated. He raved. He ranted. Even the words "The gringos will die," sputtered from his lips above the din of oral condemnation.

After the fall of Batista, Fidel Castro acted fast. He took over the reins of government and solemnly declared that within a year free elections would be held. That solemn promise, he broke. Two years and more have slipped by without elections, and none are foreseeable in the near future. It appears that he does not intend to keep his promise. Men in government throughout the world waited and the people asked themselves: "What manner of man is this Fidel Castro? A hero or an infidel? Is he another modern George Washington or is he an impetuous George Jacques Danton, of French Revolutionary days, who lived and died in violence." Events have answered part of the inquiry, and in the meantime, have given certain characters to compare.

George Washington stabilized his government, renounced power, and recommended no entangling alliances with foreign powers. George Washington attracted to himself men of wisdom, experience, and financial knowledge who could revive the corpse of national credit and who could administer an economic program. Castro is the son of a rich landowner. Like George Washington at Valley Forge, Castro has the capacity to withstand the rigors of winter in the mountains of Oriente Province. Like George Washington, Castro can inspire his men to withstand cold, privation, and hunger. Like George Washington, Castro had an abiding faith in himself and his cause. Both were fierce fighters, one fiery, the other calm. Both were symbols and legends, and each inspired foreign troops to fight side by side with him for liberty. But there the similarity ends. Whereas George Washington sought peace and rehabilitation, Castro sought vengeance and more worlds to conquer. Castro encourages foreign revolution in Latin America, and particularly in the Dominican Republic and in Panama. Washington, in his newly formed government, guaranteed the freedom of the press and freedom of speech. After the government was organized there was quickly enacted a Bill of Rights, whereas Castro suppressed the press and took over the media of communication, the radio and the television. General Washington guaranteed freedom of religion, where Castro, who was ostensibly religious, raved at the criticisms by the Catholic Church and ranted at the so-called interference by the men of God. Washington guaranteed the owners, yea, even the Tories, the right to own their property, whereas Castro confiscated properties, expropriated businesses running into the millions, and vowed further acquisitions with no compensation or with illusory compensation. Under the shibboleth of agrarian reform, Castro took from the landed gentry and the businessmen the fruits of their labor and turned them over to his followers and the rabble. Castro sought entangling alliances and called upon communistic nations, namely, Russia and Red China, to support Castro's fight for economic stability and oppose "Yanqui imperialism." Cut off by an aroused United States of the opportunity to unload his sugar products, Castro made agreements with Soviet Russia and its satellites. He called upon Soviet Russia and Red China for military and economic aid. He violated the sphere of the Western Hemisphere as enunciated by the Monroe Doctrine which guaranteed American solidarity against foreign interference. He subordinated his country to the

saber-rattling communistic nations who spoke of retaliation with rockets and missiles.

Castro, instead of turning over the government to the civilian authority, placed the hands of government with the military. He attracted to himself nondescript warriors. He designated Ernesto Che Guevara, a 31-year-old man with strong communistic leanings, as the czar of industry. He appointed Antonio Nunez Jimenez as economic dictator. He appointed Raul Castro, a younger brother, age 28, commander of the armed forces. To him, a man with strong communistic ideas, he entrusted the youth of Cuba and the system of education.

While Castro orally and vehemently disavowed communism, he gave comfort to the Communist surge and then embraced its principles wholeheartedly. He has an urge for personal power which Washington abjured. In self-appraisal, he hoarsely shouts "History will absolve me."

The people of the American Revolutionary days considered George Washington a father who could do no wrong. The people of Cuba view Castro as the small child of the family who does wrong, but must be defended under any circumstances.

More than 2 years have passed since the great liberation and history has written indelibly its words of condemnation of Castro. Castro in the eyes of the free world is no longer a liberator, but a psychotic thirsting for power. He is no longer an inspiration for good, but a force for evil and a potential threat to world disturbance. Some of his former admirers have fled from him and have turned their backs to him. Even nations which joined with him in his fight for liberty have recoiled. Puerto Rico, which gave so many sons to Castro and Cuba for liberty in the spirit of Jose Marti, has recognized that Castro has betrayed their confidence, hopes, and principles. Castro has lost their sympathy and admiration, which at one time, accompanied him among all the democratic peoples of the Western Hemisphere.

This week in the Organization of American States, Cuba fought a losing battle against the resolution to censure Cuba's acceptance of Soviet military protection. The resolution, passed by the Organization of American States, known as the Declaration of San José, indirectly censured Cuba by condemning the threats of intervention by foreign powers in American affairs and disapproved and rejected the acceptance of such intervention. Communism must not take root in America. History has demonstrated that Castro, despite his education and military success, is no George Washington.

Infidel Castro is more like the French revolutionist, George Jacques Danton, who stormed the Bastille to destroy tyranny and reveled at the beheading of French emigrés. Like Danton, the so-called liberator of Cuba must destroy his enemies and his friends suspected to be consorting with the enemy. To survive, he, like Faustus, must pledge his soul to Mephistopheles. He shall receive his sugar quotas from the almighty demon and enjoy his free additional hours of glory and false power. However, the day of reckoning is not too distant.

Those in America who helped Cuba gain freedom, who helped Cuba develop its economic resources, who purchased her sugar products at bonus prices, and who nurtured the new government, regret the aberrations of a leader who might have been great, but who lost his stability. We can only ask Cuban peoples and the Latin Americans to communicate with their Latin brethren on this island 100 miles off our Florida coast to point out Castro's misdeeds, mistakes, and misdirections. We urge the Puerto Rican and Latin American media of communication to convey the message that in America, we seek not domination, but peace, and those who listen to the siren call of missiles and rockets will be lured to destruction on the rocks between Scylla and Charybdis. Violence begets violence, and he who gave so much promise for the free world will perish as an infidel without friends, without glory, and without faith.

DICK ARENS—AN UNCOMPROMISING AMERICAN PATRIOT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHERER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of mourning the departure of a dedicated servant of the Congress of the United States. I mourn not his death, but the fact that he is today leaving a position in which he has rendered such valuable and unselfish service.

As I rise to mourn his departure, those individuals and organizations who are dedicated to the ultimate destruction of this Republic are breaking out with brass bands in celebration of the same event. The brass bands will be loud and their notes will be held long, thereby giving the impression that the music celebrates an event in which all should rejoice.

However, these brass bands deceive, just as the Communists and their dupes deceive. It is the exposure of this deceit which has made the man about whom I speak valuable, not only to the Congress, but to all who are dedicated to the cause of freedom from Communist slavery.

I rise, Mr. Speaker, to praise the contribution which Richard Arens has made to the security of the United States during the last 12½ years as a staff member of the Judiciary Committee of the Senate, and our own Committee on Un-American Activities.

Dick Arens was born in Kansas City, Mo. He worked his way through college and law school, graduating at the head of his class from Baker University. He was awarded a scholarship from the Washington University School of Law. While in college his leadership ability was recognized and he was elected president of the student YMCA and later president of Delta Theta Phi, a law fraternity.

After several years of private practice, he was called upon by the Governor of Missouri to take up a career of public service. Dick served as legal secretary to the Governor of Missouri from 1941 to 1945. The Governor appointed him to membership on the Missouri Public Service Commission, which position he vacated to serve the Missouri Legislature as director for the reorganization of the executive department of that great State.

In 1947, Dick Arens came to Washington as a member of the staff of the Judiciary Committee of the Senate. Until 1956, he served that committee in various capacities. He directed the work on war decontrol legislation. He directed a 4-year study by that committee of the immigration and naturalization system, which study resulted in the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952. It was his study of the immigration and naturalization system that first brought Dick Arens to grips with communism, and the knowledge that it was an international conspiracy designed to enslave the world. Through his studies in the field of immigration and naturalization, he learned that international Communist agents were being filtered into the United States and other countries of the free world under the disguise of legitimate immigrants. He learned that agents of Moscow, such as Arthur Adams, the man who directed Soviet atomic espionage in the United States during World War II, came into this country as an immigrant from Canada, using fraudulent Canadian citizenship papers. He likewise learned the facts relating to other outstanding Soviet agents, Gerhart Eisler, Bill Giebert, and others.

Thus armed with the knowledge of how communism conspired against the United States and all free countries, Dick Arens dedicated himself to its destruction. He was sought after to head studies of various phases of Communist activities in the United States. He was made staff director of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, which dealt largely with the Communist threat to the security of the United States.

His devotion to duty was quickly recognized. The certificate of merit awarded him in 1953 by the National Camp, Patriotic Order, Sons of America, reads,, "For great and inspiring public service."

In 1954 he was one of six persons in the history of the American Legion to receive its citation of merit and commendation.

Confronted with the need of a person to direct the staff functions of the Committee on Un-American Activities, our great chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, FRANCIS WALTER, in 1956 asked Dick Arens to become the committee's staff director.

Within a month Arens was questioning witnesses who had been using U.S. passports for the purpose of working with the Communist Party of Russia and Red China in condemnation of the United States. During the interrogation of these witnesses, Arens disclosed how these Communists had falsely accused the United States of acts of germ warfare and of slaughtering innocent women and children during the Korean conflict.

Mr. Speaker, during the next 4 years, the staff of the committee under Arens'

direction conducted an investigation into many areas where Communists had infiltrated. Through hearings, the committee attempted to learn the extent of each infiltration effort from the persons whom the investigation disclosed possessed the knowledge. These efforts to obtain the facts by which to guide the Congress in its legislative deliberations were not met with truthful revelations, but by slanderous attacks, not only on the committee, but on Arens as the committee's staff director. As each committee hearing touched upon an activity in which the Communists were seeking a privileged sanctuary, the Communist attack on the committee and Arens increased.

Not only did the Communists distort Arens' conduct of interrogation during committee hearings, but they distorted what he had to say during speeches made at the invitation of those seeking the truth about communism. The latest of these distortions occurred only last month during a speech Arens made at the time he accepted an award from the National Conference of Police Associations meeting in Des Moines, Iowa. It is not bad enough to be attacked by the Communists, but the spirit of even a Goliath can be broken through distortion of remarks by such organs as an alleged truthful press, the Des Moines Register.

Consider the insult to a staff member of this House when one of its elected Members inserts the distorted press account in the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Consider how this insult is added to when the Member of Congress making the insertion possesses no information about the speech under attack, and makes no effort to obtain the truth.

Mr. Speaker, compare the distortion by the Communists of the conduct of Mr. Arens during the committee's hearings in San Francisco last May, with the statement issued by more than a dozen ministers who were in attendance at the hearings. Said these ministers in a released statement:

> We came away from this hearing absolutely convinced of the overwhelming necessity of continuing the House Committee on Un-American Activities. No free agent could view the hearings without being impressed with the fairness, justice, and dedication to a thankless but positively necessary task. Chairman EDWIN WILLIS was unusually temperate and patient. We have nothing but unbounded admiration for Richard Arens, committee counsel, whose skill and understanding of this perilous conspiracy was a blessing to behold.

Little wonder Dick Arens is leaving the committee to accept a position with the U.S. Court of Claims. Little wonder that the Communists and the apologists have broken out their brass bands to celebrate Arens' departure as staff director of this committee.

While the Communists have reason to celebrate, I wish to advise them that their celebration will be short lived.

Dick Arens' departure is a great loss to the committee and to the House of Representatives. His departure will be a great personal loss to me. His departure will be a great loss to the American people. It will not be a complete loss, however, because Dick Arens has agreed to continue the fight against communism by making his knowledge available to all and by continuing as a nonpaid consultant to the committee.

ANALYSIS OF WHAT CAN BE DONE CONCERNING THE FARM PROBLEM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. WOLF] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, many lines have been written about the farm problem, but none have come to grips with the reasons why we have a farm problem, how our farmers are affected, and what we can do about it, as does the following analysis recently made by Marianne Means and Everett Swingle. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues in the hope that it will stimulate interest and ideas which can be applied toward the solution of this very serious national problem:

It is tragic that in the richest nation on earth, where 1 farmer easily feeds 24 city dwellers, there could be a farm problem.

How can this be?

We have come such a long way from the days when one out of every four Americans had to till the soil to keep the Nation alive.

Our modern farm production and the vast marketing, storing, transporting, processing, wholesaling, and retailing system which moves the food into our kitchens is one reason we are healthier than ever before. Our children are taller, and have a longer life expectancy, than we did at the same age.

We have the highest level of living the world has ever seen. The food we eat is tastier, more varied, and better for us—and it comes to us tidily prepared for a minimum of effort, as ready mixes, concentrated and dehydrated products, or "heat and serve" meals.

And although most people of the world spend half their incomes for food, we in America spend only 21 percent.

If our farmers were no more efficient than those in the Soviet Union, 22½ million Americans who now work in manufacturing, mining, construction, or other nonfarm businesses would have to produce food, clothing, and forest products. For in Russia, one agricultural worker feeds only four or five people, and more than 40 percent of the total labor force works in agriculture or forestry.

Obviously, the American farmer is doing a good job of making life better for the rest of us. But he is not doing so well for himself.

And "aye, there's the rub," as Hamlet said.

For despite rising costs of food in our grocery stores, the average farm income has steadily dropped. Last year 56 percent of American farm families made less than $2,500 a year.

Grain surpluses pile up in warehouses, costing taxpayers about $1,500,000 a day. Government programs aiding farmers cost millions.

People who cannot make a decent living on their small farms are moving into the cities by droves, unprepared for city ways and untrained to handle city jobs.

What went wrong?

As the amount of food processing continues, the farmer's share of our food dollar generally declines. In 1959, the farmer only got 38 cents of every $1 worth of food you put into your grocery bag. The rest went to the men who transported it, stored it, processed it, wrapped it in a fancy package, inspected it, and put it on the grocery shelves.

For example, the wheat used in baking a 20-cent loaf of bread costs only 3 cents. The remaining cost is for the trimmings.

The shopper, cringing at the high price rung up by the grocery clerk, often forgets this when he wonders why farmers are complaining. He sometimes forgets, too, that his grocery bill is increased by the large number of nonfood items—such as drugs, cosmetics, records, cutlery—he can purchase in today's supermarket.

The farmer's unique problem is that his costs are rising, as they are for every businessman—but he cannot pass on these increased costs to the consumer, as other businessmen can. The prices of fertilizer, seed, tractors, machinery repair, fencing, etc., keep going up. But the farmer can rarely increase the prices he gets for his own products.

He cannot control his prices, because he cannot control his supply. When his crop is ripe, he must sell it; he cannot hold it back until some other time when the going market rate may be higher.

He is selling his harvest of wheat, or strawberries, or tomatoes, the same time all his neighbors are selling their harvests, too. The market is glutted, prices go down, but the farmer must sell anyway.

The more abundant the harvest, the bigger the supply, the lesser the demand, and the lower the prices.

Thanks to the technology and research which has replaced the horse with the tractor and the hoe with the combine, and taught the farmer to control drought through irrigation and insects through spray, crop production has increased steadily for the past years. Production is 56 percent higher per acre now than it was in 1919–21.

Output per breeding animal is 81 percent greater than in 1919–21.

Productivity of the American farmer is growing more than twice as fast as the productivity of workers in industry.

Yet the net income for 1 hour of farmwork, including income from capital assets, was $1.29 in 1959. One hour's work in a factory, however, averaged $2.22.

And the hourly wages of food marketing employees, who handle the farmers' products, averaged $2.10.

Thus the farmers' very efficiency has created its own problems. Seeking his own solution, the farmer has steadily increased the size of his farm during the past 20 years, as he found he could handle larger acreages. Machinery and fertilizer and the new hybrids are expensive, and the farmer whose land is too small to keep his costly machinery busy or to use up wholesale purchases cannot meet his production costs.

Thus, small farmers have steadily been forced to leave their homes, sell out to more prosperous neighbors, and make the sad trek to the city. Since 1950, about 5 million persons left their farms, leaving a present farm population of around 20 million.

Ten years ago, there were 4,700,000 farms; now there are only about 4,100,000.

True, some people, young folks usually, want to leave the old ways and share the opportunities of city life. But what about the small farmer who wants to stay on his land, into which he has poured his sweat and tears and toil for many years?

The farm problem, then, boils down to four questions which the Nation has been trying, unsuccessfully, to solve for 30 years:

1. How can we assure all farmers of a decent income, comparable to their city brothers'?

2. What should we do with our huge surpluses, costing taxpayers billions every year? How can we best distribute them to the needy?

3. How can we help the small farmer, but at the same time slash drastically the cost of our whole farm aid program, now at an all-time high?

4. How can we do these three things without complete Government control over the farmer?

Those bumper crops down on the farm and the steady drop in farm income have produced a bushel basket full of trouble which the Government has been trying to solve—with little luck—for the past 30 years.

The Nation is storing a record $9 billion worth of surpluses under the price support program. And it costs the taxpayers about $1.5 million a day to store these surpluses, of which we already have enough to last 2½ years if all production were suspended.

Politicians, aware that the big block of votes from Farm Belt States could turn an election tide, have been scratching their heads and wondering what to do about the farm problem for years.

In the past 5 years, the problem has become acute. During World War II and the Korean conflict, farmers were prosperous and surpluses reasonable because soldiers and warring allies abroad ate up the stepped-up production made possible by technological advances. In peacetime, however, this market disappeared, although production continued to increase.

The Department of Agriculture has been paying some farmers various combinations of price supports since the depression of the 1930's. This means the Government guarantees the farmer a fair profit, based on a formula. If the going market price doesn't reach that level, the Government buys his crop for the guaranteed price and stores the surplus. Law provides, however, for price supports on only 21 crops—the big ones, like corn and wheat—out of 250 commonly grown commodities.

Right now the Government is paying private warehouse and elevator owners to store 5 million bales of cotton, a billion bushels of corn, 800 million bushels of rice, 188 million pounds of peanuts, and over 1 billion bushels of wheat.

The size of these price supports, how flexible they should be, and which crops they should cover is cause for a yearly political storm, out of which both Democrats and Republicans try to make hay.

The battle over price support systems is by no means the only controversial point in the Government's efforts to help the farmer. The conservation reserve program, or soil bank, is also a victim of political crossfire. The Department of Agriculture is now paying farmers about $342 million a year to take a certain percent of their land out of production. This system of Government land rental is reducing production by about 6 percent.

This year, neither the Democrats nor the Republicans have come up with a dramatic new program to aid the farmer. Basically, their major difference on farm policy is that Democrats favor higher price supports and more Government controls than do the Republicans.

Both Senator KENNEDY and Vice President NIXON have vowed to expand versions of three aspects of farm help already urged by Secretary of Agriculture Benson. These are rural development (expanding vocational training and employment services and creating new job opportunities in rural areas); "food for peace" (stepping up shipments of surpluses to underdeveloped countries); and research to find new uses and new markets for farm products.

Fifty-six percent of our farmers are still classified as "small" despite the increasing trend toward bigger and bigger farms. These are the families who live on $2,500 a year, and who are the biggest "farm problem."

The Government does not subsidize their crops, which are usually small-volume specialties, such as strawberries, tomatoes, or truck gardens. But just as the small neighborhood grocery has nearly disappeared because it cannot compete with the huge, efficient supermarket, these small farms are disappearing because they are no longer economically feasible.

In cold logic, the answer to their problem seems to be simply sell out and move off the land.

But we are talking about human beings, used to one way of life. They are not trained for city jobs and often they do not like the crowded conditions and the rush of a city.

This is where rural development could help. The Department of Agriculture 5 years ago launched a program of encouraging industry to locate plants in rural areas, where farmers can drive to work and also till their own land. As yet, efforts along these lines have been limited, however.

The per capita income of farmers from all sources averaged $1,043 in 1958, as compared with a per capita income of $2,073 for off-farm workers. An industry job close to home could preserve our Nation's small farms and supplement the farmer's income.

The farmer wants help to bring his income nearer the rest of the Nation; but he does not want Government handouts. Nor does the Government want to spend any more money than it has to.

So what is to be done? No one seems to know.

Even the farmers themselves cannot agree. The three major organizations—the Farmers Union, the Farm Bureau, and the National Grange—have three different solutions. And the wide diversity of crops, and their often conflicting needs, sometimes leads the farm States to work against each other.

For example, Delaware's major commodity is chickens. Naturally, the chicken farmers of Delaware want cheap feed.

Out in Iowa, however, the major crop is feed corn. So Iowa farmers are all for anything which will raise the price of feed.

The Government, through the years, has tried various combinations of price supports and land retirement and other devices. None has been a complete success.

But should a Federal price-support program that costs billions of dollars a year be dumped if it isn't doing the job?

That's the problem our Nation faces. And it is not just a farmers' problem—it is everybody's problem.

In the presidential campaign, there will be much talk about it, as there has been already.

Meanwhile, the farmers wait.

MORE LIGHT ON THE REPUBLICAN CIVIL RIGHTS PLANK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I charged that the Republican Party was guilty of circulating two different versions of its civil rights plank—one obviously intended for use in the North and one for use in the South. My remarks and those of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] denying my charges appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 29, page 18199. Of course, the gentleman served as vice chairman of the Republican platform committee and I was pleased to have his explanation of how the two versions came into being.

However much the gentleman, and the publicity director of the Republican National Committee in addition, protests, the fact remains that two civil rights faces are being presented to the Nation by the Republican Party.

Perhaps they protest too much.

I am not prepared to accept unquestioningly the gentleman's explanation of how the deletion of a key sentence of the civil rights plank took place. Before I called attention to the two Republican platforms yesterday, I checked to see which version was authentic.

If the gentleman will refer to the impartial news service, the No. 31 issue of the Congressional Quarterly, July 29, 1960, page 1345, he will note this caption: "Complete Text of 1960 Republican Platform," and then this subcaption: "Following Is the Complete Text of the 1960 Platform, Entitled 'Building a Better America,' Adopted by the Republican National Convention July 27."

I emphasize this subcaption and the phrase: "Adopted by the Republican National Convention."

At page 1352 of the same Congressional Quarterly one will find the text of the Republican civil rights plank as follows:

> By Executive order, a committee for the elimination of discrimination in Government employment has been reestablished with broadened authority. Today, nearly one-fourth of all Federal employees are Negro.

I can find no evidence that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] or the Republican National Committee has protested to Congressional Quarterly its printing of this version of the Republican civil rights plank.

Mr. Speaker, if further evidence is needed of the desperate importance of an impartial truth squad in this situation it can be found in the Senate document entitled "Factual Campaign Information" as revised August 15, 1960, and published under the supervision of Felton M. Johnston, Secretary of the Senate to serve Senators in the upcoming campaign.

Mr. Speaker, please note that the complete text of the 1960 Republican Party platform, as adopted, begins at page 115 of this document, and that the sentence "Today nearly one-fourth of all Federal employees are Negro," appears in this official version of the Republican platform.

In view of the remarks of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] yesterday, are we being given a House and Senate version of the Republican civil rights plank, in addition to a northern version, and a southern version of this elusive plank?

Mr. Speaker, I reiterate the questions which I raised yesterday, because I think they are basic to the entire character of the Republican campaign.

Our Republican friends make much of their "truth squads," implying that they are above reproach and never stoop to those despicable devices which they impute to others. However, their past performances bear out the fact that they have had little experience in the "truth" field.

It is particularly important to have all of the facts in this matter of the Republican civil rights plank so that we can get at the truth, in view of campaign tactics employed by the Republican Presidential candidate, campaign tactics which are well known to us all, and which need no elaboration by me.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] stated that the sentence, "Today nearly one-fourth of all Federal employees are Negro," had been omitted because it was "questionable," and based only on a survey of "six large metropolitan areas."

It would be interesting to know which agencies of government participated in this survey, which cities were involved, and who was responsible for categorizing Federal employees by race, particularly in view of the fact that this type of information is not collected in the Form 57 Federal employment application of the Federal Government. If the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] cannot supply this information then, perhaps, the Republican platform chairman, Mr. Percy, or Postmaster General Summerfield can.

Of course, my Democratic colleagues and I are not the only people who are disappointed by the contents of the civil rights plank of the Republican platform. The Republican failure to endorse the moral persuasiveness of the sit-in demonstrations drew the fire of New York's Gov. Nelson Rockefeller, while the Republican delegations from the South also threatened to bolt over even the mild provisions it contains.

Mr. Speaker, the American people in this campaign are not going to judge the two parties on the sentence construction or even the contents of their platforms. They are going to judge the two parties on their performance record.

While I am glad to note the gentleman's admission of the circulation of two separate Republican civil rights planks—which for purposes of identification I have called the blue version and the gray version—this is not the main bone of contention.

The voters of this land will decide on which party has the best record of supporting the goals proclaimed in their platforms, as well as their performance record. Had our Republican friends been more generous in yielding time during their so-called Operation Veracity yesterday, I would have commented on this comparative record.

Mr. Speaker, I include with my remarks an interesting table which analyzes the voting record of Republican and Democratic members in the House and Senate from 1947 to 1952, and from 1953 to 1960 on the platform goals claimed by both parties in the 1960 platforms. This analysis clearly reveals the hypocrisy of the Republican Party in proclaiming support in 1960 for programs and goals which they have consistently opposed in the past when the votes were taken.

This record speaks for itself.

The analysis follows.

The box score of the 2 parties in Congress in supporting progressive platform goals

The following table shows the average percentage of Republicans and Democrats supporting goals now proclaimed by both 1960 party platforms in actual Senate and House votes over the past 13 years.

1960 platform goals	1947–52						1953–60					
	Senate			House			Senate			House		
	Number of votes	Percent for		Number of votes	Percent for		Number of votes	Percent for		Number of votes	Percent for	
		Democrats	Republicans		Democrats	Republicans		Democrats	Republicans		Democrats	Republicans
To expand foreign economic, military and technical assistance	83	91	51	44	87	45	40	68	62	36	72	63
To liberalize and extend reciprocal trade agreements	19	87	28	7	92	25	8	84	57	14	76	53
To increase national defense spending	13	82	49	12	86	81	23	94	69	11	91	91
To increase and stabilize farm income and develop soil conservation programs	30	81	30	11	89	38	71	77	34	21	78	27
To encourage rural electrification co-ops	3	76	20	6	96	21	6	86	24	5	93	30
To develop new water resource projects	44	84	43	10	75	22	19	82	67	22	72	43
To expand coverage and increase minimum wage and unemployment compensation	6	64	47	7	69	28	20	72	30	10	78	53
To extend social security benefits	3	93	68	7	93	49	8	89	53	3	98	95
To aid depressed areas							9	83	24	4	76	24
To foster small business	9	75	44	3	84	36	7	75	12	3	92	66
To use governmental powers to curb inflation	40	83	34	27	81	39	4	81	26			
Aid to education	7	89	40	2	97	85	11	77	36	13	65	57
To promote slum clearance and home financing	19	85	42	25	80	37	34	80	29	23	86	34
Aid to health services and research	17	73	19	5	88	39	5	89	31	4	63	69
Aid for highway and airport construction	8	70	29	2	99	82	11	93	37	9	85	58
To strengthen the civil service	12	80	54	6	90	70	21	96	44	21	95	66
To increase veterans benefits	5	85	43	13	87	73	2	92	75	13	95	52

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

THIRD SEMIANNUAL REPORT OF THE NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 454)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Clerk:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the third semiannual report of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, covering the period October 1, 1959, to April 1, 1960.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 30, 1960.*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection the message and accompanying papers are referred to the Committee on Science and Astronautics and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. PIRNIE] may be permitted to extend his remarks in the body of the RECORD and to include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

NEW YORK-NEW JERSEY MILK MARKETING ORDER

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, recently the attention of this body was called to the decision of the Federal Court, Eastern District of Pennsylvania, ruling against the U.S. Department of Agriculture on the validity of the compensatory payment provision in the New York-New Jersey milk marketing order. It was stated that in view of this decision that Congress should pass a resolution directing a study of this marketing problem.

This approach does not appear to be timely nor appropriate since the Department of Agriculture has appealed from this decision and the case is now pending before the U.S. Third Circuit Court of Appeals. It is not at all certain that any of the provisions of the marketing act will be invalidated. It is quite possible that the court will adopt the line of reasoning set forth in the decision file of August 18, 1960, in the U.S. District

Court, Eastern Division in the Northern District of Ohio, in which the compensatory provisions were upheld. In any event, the matter is clearly for the courts to decide.

Believing that this latter decision is of interest to those concerned with this problem, I am inserting the full text in the extension of my remarks:

IN THE U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO, EASTERN DIVISION—CIVIL ACTION NO. 34708

(The Lawson Milk Co., a corporation, plaintiff, *v.* Ezra Taft Benson, Secretary of Agriculture, defendant—filed August 18, 1960)

McNames, C. J.:

The plaintiff the Lawson Milk Co., is a corporation with its principal place of business in Cuyahoga Falls, Summit County, Ohio, within this district. Plaintiff brings this action pursuant to section 8c(15)B of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, and amendments (hereinafter the act), to review a ruling of the judicial officer of the U.S. Department of Agriculture dismissing on the merits a petition filed by plaintiff under section 8c(15)A of the act. In the proceeding before the judicial officer plaintiff sought a refund of $92,405.62, representing payments made by it, allegedly under protest, to the producers settlement fund, covering the period of December 1, 1947 through May 1952. These payments were exacted under section 975.72A of Order No. 75, which regulates the handling of milk in Cleveland, Cuyahoga County, Ohio and adjacent communities. Both parties have filed motions for summary judgment.

The jurisdiction of this court is limited to a determination whether the decision of the judicial officer, adopted by the Secretary, is in accordance with law. Thus, only questions of law are presented in this review.

Plaintiff's plant in Cuyahoga Falls, Ohio, is located about 31 miles from the center of Cleveland, Ohio. Prior to December 1, 1947, all of plaintiff's milk was distributed outside the Cleveland Marketing Area, most of it being distributed in Summit County, Ohio. In December 1947 plaintiff established a retail outlet in Bedford, Ohio, which is within the Cleveland market. During the period in question, plaintiff's sales of milk in the Cleveland market represented less than 10 percent of its total sales. After May 1952 plaintiff's sales in the Cleveland market exceeded 10 percent of its total sales and, pursuant to the terms of order No. 75, plaintiff became a fully regulated handler. The primary object of order No. 75, like that of similar orders in effect throughout various sections of the country, is to provide a stable market for milk and to secure to the producers, i.e., dairy farmers, an adequate price for their milk. The farmers do not sell milk direct to the consumers but deliver it to various bottling plants known as handlers. The economic value of milk is determined by its use. A handler usually receives raw milk from a number of producers. He may sell it either as fluid milk, as cream, or as milk products such as butter and cheese. A handler realizes his greatest profit on the sale of fluid milk, a lesser profit on the sale of cream and a still lesser profit on the sale of milk products. Producers therefore expect a higher price from handlers for raw milk sold by the latter as fluid milk and correspondingly lower prices for milk utilized in the production and sale of cream or milk products. The pricing of milk strictly in accordance with its utilization presents many difficulties and is conducive to an unstable market. To avoid these undesirable consequences the Government has adopted a scheme of regulation under which each producer is paid a uniform minimum price for all raw milk delivered to a handler irrespective of the use to which it is put.

The plan thus devised operates fairly to place the greater burden of the uniform blend price upon those handlers who sell the greater part of their milk as fluid milk. This is accomplished in the following manner: The market administrator determines a class price which pool handlers must pay for class I milk used as fluid milk, a class price for class II milk sold as cream and a class price for class III milk sold as milk products. He ascertains the marketwide use for each class, multiplies the results by the class prices and then divides the resultant sum of all class prices by the volume of milk used in the whole market. By this method a uniform or blend price for all raw milk is determined. A similar formula is applied to determine the use value of milk sold by individual handlers. Where the greater part of a handler's sales for a specified period is fluid milk, his total use value will be greater than the uniform price paid to his producers. Such a handler must pay the difference into the producers settlement fund. A handler who sells the greater part of his milk as milk products will have a use value less than the uniform blend price and is entitled to withdraw the difference from the producers settlement fund. By this method producers receive a uniform price commensurate with the weighted average use value of milk sold in the regulated market, and through the operation of the producers settlement fund in the manner above described the cost of milk to handlers is equalized. The plan also provides for payments by handlers of administrative assessments.

The foregoing is an altogether inadequate outline of the complicated scheme of regulation but will serve to indicate the essential elements of the plan. For a more comprehensive and detailed description of similar plans see: *United States* v. *Rock Royal Cooperative Inc., et al.*, 307 U.S. 533; *Grant* v. *Benson*, 229 F. 2d 765, 767 (cert. den. 350 U.S. 1015); *United States* v. *Lehigh Valley Cooperative Farmers*, 183 F. Supp. 80.

The handlers above referred to are pool handlers who regularly distribute more than 10 percent of their milk supply to consumers in the Cleveland marketing area. Producers are dairy farmers whose milk is delivered directly from their farms to pool handlers. Pool handlers and producers are subject to full regulation under the terms of order No. 75. During the period of December 1947 through May 1952 plaintiff, as a nonpool handler, distributed less than 10 percent of its fluid milk supply in the Cleveland marketing area and purchased its milk from farmers who were not producers, as that term is defined in order No. 75. Section 975.72(a) of order No. 75 provided that nonpool handlers distributing less than 10 percent of their fluid milk supply in the Cleveland marketing area were required to pay to the producers settlement fund an amount equal to the difference between the class I price (fluid milk) and the class III price (manufacturing) on all milk sold as fluid milk in such area. At the outset plaintiff refused to make the specified payments and the Secretary instituted an action in this court to enforce the terms of section 975.72(a). Early in 1949 plaintiff agreed to make all accumulated and future payments, and the action was dismissed. Thereafter, in June 1952 plaintiff became a fully regulated handler. A year later, in June 1953, plaintiff filed its petition under 608c(15)A of the act to recover the payments made by it during the period of December 1947 through May 1952. In April 1958 the judicial officer of the Department of Agriculture dismissed the petition on the merits. In July of 1958 the judicial officer denied plaintiff's motion for reconsideration.

In the hearing before the judicial officer there was evidence tending to show that during the period in question the average price paid by plaintiff to its farmers for milk was in excess of the uniform minimum blend price and the uniform class I price paid to producers under the Cleveland order. Plaintiff submitted proposed findings of fact to the judicial officer which incorporated the foregoing in detail. In addition plaintiff submitted, inter alia, a further proposed finding showing the average amount per hundredweight of milk paid by plaintiff as compensatory payments under section 975.72(a). The judicial officer refused to make such findings presumably because in his opinion they were immaterial. Additional facts essential to an understanding of the decision reached herein will be stated in the discussion of the issues.

Plaintiff attacks the validity of section 975.72(a) primarily on the ground that it is contrary to the law as announced in *Kass* v. *Brannan*, 196 F. 2d 791 (2d Cir.) Plaintiff also relies upon *Lehigh Valley Cooperative Farmers, Inc., et al.* v. *Ezra Taft Benson*, 183 F Supp. 80 (3d Cir.), which was decided on the authority of Kass. Plaintiff contends further that there is no substantial evidence in the record supporting the rate of payments exacted under section 975.72(a) of the order. The Secretary asserts that the ruling and order of the judicial officer upholding the validity of section 975.72(a) are in accordance with law and advances many other grounds in support of his decision including the contentions that—*Kass* v. *Brannan* is not controlling; the evidence in the promulgation hearing record amply supports section 975.72(a); plaintiff is estopped to claim the refund it seeks; and that order No. 75 provides a cutoff date as to refund payments. By far, the most important issue is whether *Kass* v. *Brannan* is controlling here. Kass was a handler as defined by the New York Marketing Order No. 27. He purchased cream and condensed milk from a handler in Orville, Ohio. Pursuant to section 927.9(h) of order 27 the market administrator exacted payments from Kass in the case of cream in an amount representing the difference between class II–A (New York cream) price and class IV–A (New York butter price); in the case of condensed milk, the exacted payments represented the difference between class II–B (New York condensed milk) price and class IV–A. No consideration was given to the price Kass paid to the Ohio nonpool plant. Kass sought administrative relief by way of a refund of the payments. He was denied relief by the judicial officer of the Department of Agriculture whose decision was affirmed on review by the district court. The Second Circuit Court of Appeals, however, with Judge Learned Hand dissenting, reversed. The appellate court held that the exacted payments were part of the minimum price as that term is used in section 8c(5)A of the act; that the price of nonpool cream or condensed milk to a New York handler was (1) the amount paid to the seller; (2) the "amount of the penalty required to be paid under the order." The court then added:

"Section 927.9(h)(2)(ii) assumes that the initial cost of the nonpool cream and condensed milk will be the class IV–A (butter) price under the New York order. If this assumption were true, the minimum prices of pool and nonpool cream and condensed milk would be the same and would satisfy the requirement imposed by section 8c(5)(a) that 'Such prices shall be uniform as to all handlers.'"

The court found that the initial cost of the milk products was more than the New York class IV–A price and that the exaction of an additional payment computed on the class IV price rather than on the actual cost

to the handler was "* * * a price discrimination between a handler who purchases nonpool milk products and one who purchases pool milk products, although each makes the same use of such products in the New York marketing area. This in our opinion is contrary to the requirement laid down in section 8c(5)(A) that the minimum prices for each use classification shall be uniform as to all handlers."

It is in no spirit of disrespect to the Second Circuit Court of Appeals that I profess my inability to accept the conclusion of that court that the contested provisions of order No. 27 are inconsistent with section 608c(5)(A) of the act. That section of the act is quoted in full in the margin, and in pertinent part reads:

"SEC. 8c. Orders regulating handling of commodity. * * *

"(5) Milk and its products; terms and conditions of orders.

"In the case of milk and its products, orders issued pursuant to this section shall contain one or more of the following terms and conditions, and (except as provided in subsection (7) of this section) no others:

"(A) Classifying milk in accordance with the form in which or the purpose for which it is used, and fixing, or providing a method for fixing, minimum prices for each such use classification which all handlers shall pay, and the time when payments shall be made, for milk purchased from producers or associations of producers. Such prices shall be uniform as to all handlers, subject only to adjustments for (1) volume, market, and production differentials customarily applied by the handlers subject to such order, (2) the grade or quality of the milk purchased, and (3) the locations at which delivery of such milk, or any use classification thereof, is made to such handler."

Section 8c(5)(A) makes no reference to the fixing of minimum prices which handlers shall pay to handlers. In clear and unambiguous language the uniformity of minimum class prices required by section 8c(5)(A) applies to the prices all handlers are required to pay for milk purchased from producers. The payments exacted from Kass were authorized by section 927.9(h) of order No. 27, which is entitled "Payments for Milk or Milk Products Other Than Producers' Sources." The pertinent provisions of section 8c(5)(A) of the act authorize minimum class prices for milk received from producers. The contested provisions of the order deal with the different subject matter of payments for milk and milk products received from others than producers. Moreover, section 927.9(h) of order No. 27 fixes no minimum prices. As Judge Learned Hand said in his dissent:

"Section 8c(5)(A) authorizes the insertion in an order of 'terms and conditions' fixing 'minimum prices' that all handlers shall pay 'for milk purchased from producers.' The provisions in suit do not do that; they fix no prices 'for milk purchased from producers' at all, if by 'price' is meant the money that eventually goes to producers in payment for their milk. The differential exacted from a 'nonpool' handler is not the 'price' of anything; moreover—for whatever that may be worth—it is collected 'to accomplish the purposes' of assuring 'minimum prices' for milk delivered by producers, section 8c(5)(C)" (p. 799).

It seems apparent, therefore, that section 927.9(h) of the New York order is not inconsistent with section 8c(5)(A) of the act. Furthermore, the decision in Kass is premised on the assumption that it is the purpose of 8c(5)(A) to secure equality of costs between pool and nonpool handlers on milk or milk products distributed in a regulated marketing area. However, as I read that section, its purpose is to secure equality of costs among regulated handlers on milk purchased from producers. Even though the Kass decision be considered as sound, it is not controlling here. That case is readily distinguishable from the case under review on its facts, in the nature of the problem presented and in many other respects. *United States* v. *Lehigh Valley Cooperative Farmers, supra,* is more closely analogous. In that case the plaintiffs were distributors of milk in northern New Jersey and by virtue of amendments to order No. 27 were brought within the extended New York marketing area. Only a small percentage of plaintiffs' sales were made in the order 27 area, the remainder being made in Pennsylvania. Under an amendment to order No. 27, plaintiffs were subject to partial regulation. Such regulation required nonpool handlers, including plaintiffs, to make compensatory payments to the producers settlement fund for all fluid milk distributed in the order 27 area. These payments were computed on the basis of the difference between the class I (fluid milk) price and the class III (milk products) price of order 27. An exception was made in those cases where pool milk in the area was in short supply. Upon the authority of *Kass* v. *Brannan,* District Judge Clary held the compensatory payments unlawful. He found that the cost of fluid milk distributed by plaintiffs in the order 27 area was in excess of the cost to fully regulated handlers and observed, "This is exactly what Judge Swan said section 608c(5)(A) of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act prohibited. *Kass* v. *Brannan, supra.*"

In his opinion Judge Clary said:

"Moreover we feel bound by the holding of the second circuit in the Kass case. Although we are not compelled to accept that court's decision under the concept of stare decisis as it applies to Federal courts and although we might have reached a contrary result if initially called upon to interpret section 608c(5), we do not feel justified in now rejecting the interpretation there placed upon section 608c(5)(A) and upon the earlier version of order No. 27. That court's opinion is always entitled to great weight."

It is apparent from the above quoted language and other statements in his opinion that Judge Clary considered that in determining the validity of the challenged compensatory payments of order 27 he was bound to follow the second circuit's decision in Kass, which had struck down an earlier and somewhat similar provision for compensatory payments in the same order. Judge Clary realized that upon appeal, the Third Circuit Court of Appeals might refuse to follow Kass, and that in such event the case would be remanded to the district court for determination of the following questions: (1) Are the compensatory payments supported by the record? (2) Are such payments authorized by the act? To obviate the necessity of a remand in the event of a reversal, Judge Clary passed upon both questions. He held (1) that the compensatory payments were supported by the record; (2) that such payments were authorized under section 7D of the act as being incidental and necessary to effectuate the other provisions of the order, thereby indicating that if not bound by *Kass* v. *Brannan* he would have upheld the contested provisions of order No. 27 as being in accordance with law. The factors that Judge Clary prudently and properly considered are not present here. This court is not bound to follow *Kass* v. *Brannan,* and for the reasons indicated above and hereinafter to be stated, Kass cannot be regarded as a binding precedential authority.

WERE THE TERMS OF SECTION 975.72(a) OF ORDER 75 AUTHORIZED BY THE AGRICULTURAL MARKETING AGREEMENT ACT?

Such authorization must be found in section 608c(7)(D), which reads:

"(7) Terms common to all orders:

"Orders shall contain one or more of the following terms and conditions:

* * * * *

"(D) Incidental to, and not inconsistent with, the terms and conditions specified in subsections (5)–(7) of this section and necessary to effectuate the other provisions of such order."

At the promulgation hearing, it was disclosed that at the fringe of the Cleveland marketing area and at other nearby points there were a number of nonpool handlers who regularly distributed milk outside the area. Located within the Cleveland area also were nonpool handlers whose regular deliveries of milk were made outside the area. It was reasonably anticipated that from time to time some of these nonpool handlers would sell and distribute their surplus milk in the Cleveland area at its highest value as fluid milk.

Fluid milk sold in the regulated area by nonpool handlers displaces fluid milk sales that otherwise would have been made by pool handlers, causing the latter to use more of their milk for manufacturing purposes (class III), thus reducing the uniform blend price to the producers. The prospect of such results constituted a real threat to the integrity of the basic regulatory plan. At the outset of the promulgation hearing it was considered that all handlers who sold any milk in the Cleveland area should be fully regulated. The proposed order that accompanied the notice of the promulgation hearing so provided. Full regulation under similar circumstances has received judicial approval. (*Titusville Dairy Products Co.* v. *Brannan,* 176 F. 2d 332. Cf. *United States* v. *Rock Royal Cooperative, Inc., supra.*)

At the hearings, however, it was shown that full regulation of such nonpool handlers would subject them to an unwarranted burden of payments and assessments and place them at a severe competitive disadvantage with other nonpool handlers in the sale of milk in nonregulated areas. Accordingly, it was determined that the alternative of partial regulation of nonpool handlers who distributed 10 percent or less of their milk in the regulated area would subserve the purpose of protecting the basic plan of regulation and be equitable to such nonpool handlers. Such alternative was incorporated in section 975.72(A) of order No. 75. The provisions of this section of the order are not inconsistent with subsections (5)–(7) of 608c of the act and being designed to preserve the integrity of the basic plan they must be regarded as incidental and necessary "to effectuate the other provisions of the order." It should be noted that in *Kass* v. *Brannan* the alternative of full regulation was not present. Kass purchased milk products from another handler. He made no purchases of milk from farmers who could have been brought within the ambit of full regulation under order No. 27 as producers.

It is held, therefore, that section 975.72(A) is authorized by law.

ARE THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 975.72(A) OF ORDER 75 SUPPORTED BY THE EVIDENCE?

As shown above, the payments required of a nonpool handler selling less than 10 percent of his volume of milk in the Cleveland area are based upon the difference between the class I price of fluid milk and the class III price of milk. When the plan of so-called partial regulation was adopted as an alternative to full regulation of such nonpool handlers, the above formula as to the rate of payments was the only one proposed by witnesses at the promulgation hearing. There was abundant evidence that there were class III uses of milk in the Cleveland milkshed and neighboring areas. It was shown also that a similar formula had been incorporated in the Boston, Mass., order.

Plaintiff assails the formula as being predicated upon the assumption that a nonpool handler's initial cost of fluid milk is no greater than the class III price whereas the evidence demonstrates that the average initial cost to plaintiff was in excess

of both the uniform blend price and the uniform class I price of fluid milk under the order. Plaintiff's argument is premised upon the holding of the court in Kass that the initial cost of nonpool milk is a part of the minimum class prices authorized by section 8c(5)(A) of the act. However, such minimum prices apply only to classified milk, i.e., milk purchased from producers. During the period in question plaintiff made no purchases from producers as that term is defined by order No. 75 and which, as thus defined, means a dairy farmer whose milk "is moved directly from his farm to a pool plant." Section 975.8. To apply the principle of uniformity as announced in Kass would mean that any nonpool partially regulated handler whose initial cost was equal to or greater than the uniform class I price could sell fluid milk in the marketing area without making any compensatory payments. The application of the Kass principle of uniformity in cases where a nonpool handler's initial cost was slightly less than the uniform class I price would enable such handler to sell his surplus milk in the marketing area as fluid milk upon the payment of a small differential bearing no relation to the loss sustained by producers. The uniform minimum prices of classified milk referred to in section 8c(5)(A) of the act take no account of the initial cost of milk. Such prices are based upon use values. A pool handler purchasing milk from a producer may, if he chooses, pay a premium above the minimum blend price to farmers, thus increasing his initial cost. However, if a pool handler pays a premium he is nevertheless required to account to the producers settlement fund in the manner provided by the plan.

The initial cost of milk to a pool handler which may be more than the blend price is not a part of any minimum class price. Nor is the initial cost of milk to a nonpool handler part of a minimum class price. The judicial officer was correct in not regarding the evidence of plaintiff's initial cost as material to the issues. Minimum class prices have no application to milk purchased by a nonpool handler. It is erroneous, therefore, to suppose that the formula by which compensatory payments are computed is based in part upon a hypothetical initial cost to a nonpool handler equal to the class III minimum price of milk.

The rate of payment formula rests upon an entirely different principle. It is designed to compensate producers for the loss of fluid milk sales occasioned by nonpool handlers' sales of fluid milk in the marketing area and thus assure the payment of minimum blend prices to producers. Except for its reliance on the principle of Kass plaintiff submits no argument and no evidence tending to show that the compensatory payments in question are unreasonable. At the hearing in the 8c(15)(A) proceeding defendant called John R. Hanson as an expert witness. Hanson testified at length, and stated that in his expert opinion the rate of payment here in question was reasonable, appropriate and necessary. At the close of his direct testimony, counsel for plaintiff said: "The petitioner does not necessarily agree with the argument advanced in the direct examination of this witness but we have no cross-examination."

I agree with the judicial officer that "rulemaking looks to the future and is experimental in nature, being subject to amendment as experience warrants. (*American Airlines, Inc.* v. *Civil Aeronautics Board*, 192 F. 2d 417.) And, of necessity, rulemaking often calls for forecasts and estimates. In the light of the expertise of the Secretary the evidence in the record could legally form the basis for the judgment of the Secretary reflected in the protested provision. (Cf. *Railway Express Agency* v. *Civil Aeronautics Board*, 243 F. 2d 422.)"

Order No. 75 was promulgated by the Secretary on June 29, 1946. Whether the rate of the compensatory payments is supported by evidence must be determined in the light of the record before the Secretary at the time the order issued. Plaintiff did not enter the Cleveland marketing area until December 1947. Nor does it appear that plaintiff's later entrance into the market area was anticipated at the time the order was promulgated. If, as is now contended by plaintiff, the compensatory payments were unreasonable, that fact was known to plaintiff during the period in question. Yet plaintiff made no attempt, by securing an amendment to the order, to have the amount of the payments reduced although it was fully informed of its right to seek such relief. In oral argument plaintiff's counsel said: "We are not saying that we should have a free ride or that anyone should have a free ride." The above statement is hardly consistent with plaintiff's reliance upon Kass which, if followed, would require a determination that plaintiff ought not be required to make any payments. Plaintiff's case, therefore, comes down to an attack upon the rate of payment which, as indicated above, is supported by evidence and its reasonableness confirmed by expert testimony in the proceeding before the judicial officer. In this state of the case there is no basis for holding the contested provision of order No. 27 invalid. It is not without significance that during the period of partial regulation, particularly in the years 1950 and 1951, plaintiff's sales of fluid milk in the Cleveland marketing area increased substantially.

Furthermore, the Secretary has submitted evidence which is not disputed showing that if plaintiff were subject to full regulation as it lawfully might have been its payments for the period in question, including assessments, would have been more than $240,000 in excess of the amount paid by plaintiff under partial regulation.

Although the defendant raised the defense of estoppel as a bar to the maintenance of this action the judicial officer considered it unnecessary to rule upon that question. He also considered it unnecessary to rule upon the issue raised by defendant's pleading the 2-year limitation of action provision in order No. 75. It is regrettable that these issues were not determined in the proceeding before the judicial officer. Absent such administrative determination this court is without authority to decide the unresolved issues. Nor does section 8c(15)(B) of the act authorize a remand of the case except where the Secretary's decision is reversed.

For the reasons hereinabove stated the decision of the Secretary on the merits is affirmed.

An order may be prepared in accordance with this memorandum.

CHARLES J. MCNAMEE,
U.S. District Judge.

AUGUST 18, 1960.

PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORTS—COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Committee on Ways and Means, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file conference reports on the following bills: H.R. 10960, H.R. 12536, and H.R. 12659.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

DETERMINATION OF RETAIL PRICE FOR PURPOSES OF EXCISE TAX ON CIGARS

Mr. MILLS submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 10960) to amend section 5701 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the excise tax upon cigars.

EXCLUSION OF LOCAL ADVERTISING CHARGES FROM MANUFACTURERS SALE PRICE

Mr. MILLS submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 12536) relating to the treatment of charges for local advertising for purposes of determining the manufacturers sale price.

HEPTANOIC ACID

Mr. MILLS submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 12659) to suspend for a temporary period the import duty on heptanoic acid.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS IN THE BODY OF THE RECORD

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following Members may be permitted to extend their remarks at this point in the body of the RECORD, and to include therein extraneous matter: the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHLEY], and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CONGRESS MUST ACT TO PROTECT JOBS OF AMERICAN RUBBER FOOTWEAR WORKERS

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, full employment has now come to be recognized as one of the major objectives of national policy.

As a Member of Congress from one of the great industrial States of our country, I have been deeply concerned about the problem of serious unemployment in a number of areas of Indiana and of course I have given particular attention to unemployment in the district I have the honor to represent.

Earlier this year I joined with the distinguished junior Senator from Indiana, the Honorable R. VANCE HARTKE, in hearing testimony presented at La Porte, Ind., in my district, to the Senate Special Committee on Unemployment Problems. The first bill I introduced in Congress was the area redevelopment bill designed to encourage new industry and more job opportunities in areas of chronic unemployment, and I have also introduced legislation to modernize our unemployment compensation system.

LEGISLATION TO PROTECT JOBS OF AMERICAN RUBBER FOOTWEAR WORKERS

Today, Mr. Speaker, I am introducing in the House of Representatives a joint resolution that is directed toward solving a problem which affects the employment of many thousands of workers in the United States, some 5,000 of whom are in St. Joseph County, Ind., in the South Bend-Mishawaka area. These workers are employed in the rubber footwear industry.

The American rubber footwear industry is now suffering serious injury from

the vast and rapidly increasing quantity of imports of rubber footwear into the United States, chiefly from Japan. Dramatic evidence of the concern of American working men and women about the threat posed to their employment is the fact that I have received over 4,000 postcards and letters from employees of the U.S. Rubber Co. plant in Mishawaka urging the passage of appropriate legislation to help protect their jobs. This plant, located in my congressional district, employs more than 5,000 men and women and is the largest footwear manufacturing plant in the United States.

U.S. RUBBER PLANT AT MISHAWAKA IMPORTANT FACTOR IN ST. JOSEPH COUNTY ECONOMY

The economic health of the U.S. Rubber Co. plant at Mishawaka is understandably a very important factor in the economy of the St. Joseph County labor market area, which has suffered several periods of serious unemployment in recent years. Mr. Speaker, even our present inadequate statistics on the imports of rubber footwear show that imports have been increasing at a remarkable rate, cutting deeply into the domestic market and thus affecting the jobs of American workers in Mishawaka, Ind., and elsewhere in the Nation.

FROM 1955 TO 1959 PAIRS OF IMPORTED RUBBER FOOTWEAR INCREASED 4,867.5 PERCENT

Here are some significant figures: from 1955 to 1959 pairs of imported rubber footwear increased from 1,085,651 to 52,860,697—an increase of 4,867.5 percent.

Approximate figures indicate that 1959 figures were 175.6 percent greater than those of 1958, and 1960 imports will probably be some 129.8 percent higher than those of 1959.

RUBBER FOOTWEAR IMPORTS TOOK 1.3 PERCENT SHARE OF DOMESTIC MARKET IN 1955 BUT 34.9 PERCENT IN 1959

The imports are coming in principally from Japan, where both labor and materials costs are so low that our efficient but high-wage-paying domestic industry is unable to compete in terms of price. For instance, average wages for the footwear industry in the United States are $2.51 per hour while in Japan the average is 20 cents an hour.

As a result, the foreign rubber footwear has been slashing into the domestic market at an alarming rate: imports in 1955 took a 1.3 percent share of the market, but this rose in 1959 to 34.9 percent, with imports of waterproof footwear taking almost 60 percent of that market in 1959.

The Census Bureau's incomplete figures show that rubber footwear imports were about 700,000 pairs in 1954, went up to 2 million in 1956, 6 million in 1957, 19 million in 1958, and 53 million in 1959, substantially all of these being from Japan.

The domestic industry's employment and profit picture is correspondingly discouraging. I am particularly aware of the problem of the factory in Indiana, but the story of layoffs, shortened workweeks, and financial trouble is generally being repeated in all parts of the country where there are rubber footwear plants. If the American industry were now producing at its 1952 share of the domestic market rate, it would have made some 150 million pairs of shoes in 1959 instead of the 99 million actually shipped. This represents a loss of production of 51 million pairs of shoes in 1959 alone, and a loss of between 9,600 and 13,000 full-time jobs.

DEMOCRATIC PARTY PLATFORM DECLARES INDUSTRIES AFFECTED BY FOREIGN TRADE NEED AND DESERVE HELP

Mr. Speaker, I am a strong believer in expanded world trade, as are both President Eisenhower and Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY, the leaders of the two major political parties in our country. But as assistant to the chairman of the platform committee at the Democratic National Convention at Los Angeles, my distinguished friend and colleague, Congressman CHESTER BOWLES, of Connecticut, I was also glad to have had a firsthand opportunity to see the Democratic Party platform recognize that expanded world trade brings difficulties as well as benefits. I was pleased to see our platform take note of the fact that "the increase in foreign imports involves costly adjustment and damage to some domestic industries and communities."

The Democratic platform concluded that—

> Industries and communities affected by foreign trade need and deserve appropriate help.

I agree.

JAPANESE MAINTAIN RIGOROUS RESTRICTIONS ON IMPORTS

And, Mr. Speaker, I should like parenthetically to point out that reciprocal trade agreements should be reciprocal. For these agreements to be effective and mutually beneficial requires a two-way street of negotiation and compromise. An article entitled "'Made-In-Japan' Dilemma," which appeared in the New York Times of June 12, 1960, made this telling commentary on American-Japanese trade agreements:

> Japan's own attitude presents a formidable block to trade benevolence by others. Ironically this nation that is so successfully invading foreign markets maintains tariffs, quotas, and other import restrictions that are among the world's most rigorous.

CENSUS BUREAU TO COMPILE STATISTICS ON RUBBER FOOTWEAR IMPORTS

Mr. Speaker, the joint resolution I am today introducing is an economically sound and economically responsible proposal. If my bill is passed by Congress and becomes law, it can go a long way toward enabling the American rubber footwear industry to maintain its economic health and workers in that industry to retain their jobs.

The purpose of my bill is simple: It would direct the Census Bureau of the U.S. Department of Commerce to compile statistics on imports of rubber footwear from foreign countries by type of footwear.

Mr. Speaker, let me explain why this legislation is desirable.

Under the Trade Agreements Act, which governs our trade relations with other nations, the only avenue of administrative relief for an American industry which is suffering serious injury from imports from abroad is an escape clause proceeding before the U.S. Tariff Commission.

Under the escape clause procedure, the President may take action to restrict imports if the Tariff Commission finds, after a thorough, factfinding investigation, that imports are causing or threatening serious injury to the domestic industry.

AMERICAN RUBBER INDUSTRY LACKS IMPORT DATA

The U.S. rubber footwear industry has available for presentation to the Tariff Commission all the necessary documentation to make its case for escape clause action with the exception of accurate data on imports of rubber footwear. The statistics compiled by the Bureau of the Census, which is the only reliable source, are inadequate. The purpose of this bill therefore is to obtain accurate statistics on rubber footwear imports in order to enable the domestic industry to prepare a full and adequate application to the Commission. The lack of such statistics has caused the domestic industry great difficulty in ascertaining the extent to which imports of rubber footwear have caused serious injury within the meaning of the escape clause.

ESCAPE CLAUSE PROVISION EXPLAINED

The escape clause provision requires the Tariff Commission to undertake an investigation at the request of any interested party. In the course of the investigation, which usually involves a public hearing, the Tariff Commission studies the domestic industry concerned (i.e., the industry in the United States producing articles "like or directly competitive" with the imported products complained of). In order to find injury to the domestic industry the Commission must conclude that imports of the competitive product have been increasing as a result of a tariff concession and that such increased imports are adversely affecting the domestic industry. Various factors are taken into consideration by the Commission. These are: a downward trend of production, employment, profits, or wages in the domestic industry concerned, or a decline in sales, an increase in imports, either actual or relative to domestic production, a higher or growing inventory, or a decline in the proportion of the domestic market supplied by domestic producers.

Within 6 months from the filing of an application the Commission must complete its investigation and report to the President. If it finds actual or threatened serious injury it is required to recommend an increase in the duty rates or the imposition of a quota or both. The President then must either adopt the recommendation or within 60 days report to the Senate Finance and the House Ways and Means Committees; the statute also provides that if the President rejects the Commission's recommendations, a congressional resolution may overrule the President.

One of the vexing problems which has faced the Commission, and which has been important in preventing it from recommending relief, is the failure of the domestic industry to present full information, thus leaving a gap in the vital statistics concerning domestic production and profits. The domestic rub-

ber footwear industry is able to present full statistics on the domestic field; however, it is seriously handicapped because it is unable to obtain adequate import statistics.

DETAILED IMPORT STATISTICS NEEDED

It is essential that detailed information be submitted to the Tariff Commission if an application is to receive sympathetic consideration. One of the kinds of information necessary is a detailed definition of the various imported products involved in the hearing and statistics by quantity and value for each type of product. This is especially important in the case of rubber footwear. The domestic industry produces distinct and varying types of footwear: Classic tennis and basketball shoes, women's specialty shoes with rubber soles and fabric or synthetic uppers, other types of rubber-soled casual shoes with fabric, synthetic, plastic, or other kinds of uppers, rubber boots for sport or outdoor or dress wear, rubbers, arctics, gaiters, and others. The escape clause now provides specifically that domestic producing organizations may be segmented by type of product and the operations attributable thereto. This enables the Commission to observe the interaction between a particular kind of import and the domestic operations involved in producing a comparable product. For example, if appropriate census figures were available, the domestic rubber footwear industry could present to the Commission an application for tariff relief on certain specified types of rubber footwear. This may be of great importance to the industry. There are indications that the case for import protection against waterproof—weather protective—footwear is one of serious urgency and that if adequate statistics were available this case could be presented convincingly now, on its own merits, independently of the status of other kinds of rubber footwear.

Similarly, without detailed statistics showing the imports of the different types of footwear, the domestic industry is seriously handicapped in proving to the Commission that its products are "like or directly competitive" with the import complained of. The industry must be able to show, for example, that its operations involving rubber boots are being injured by imports of rubber boots; inadequate import statistics which lump rubber boots indiscriminately with rubber beachwear make such a showing difficult or impossible.

Statistics showing the quantity and value of imports of the various products from the various countries must also be available going back to some point before the granting of the concession so that it is clear that imports have increased since the lowering of the rate. Information must also be presented which describes the domestic industry producing articles directly competitive with those being imported.

CENSUS BUREAU DATA NECESSARY

Without the possession of detailed import statistics an adequate presentation cannot, for the reasons given above, be made by the domestic industry involved. The Census Bureau, which collects import data at the various ports of entry, is the only reliable source of such information. Statistics issued by foreign countries are available to varying extents, but are usually unreliable and inadequate. In the case of rubber footwear the Japanese Ministry of Finance has issued statistics showing the exportation of footwear to the United States. The figures are arranged by categories of type of footwear through 1959, but the categories are neither consistent nor meaningful, and their accuracy is not beyond question.

The Census Bureau now keeps statistics on rubber footwear broken down as follows: First, rubber boots; second, rubber shoes and overshoes; and third, rubber soled shoes with fabric uppers. Each of these categories includes different types of shoes, and without a further breakdown it is not possible to make an adequate analysis of the effect of imports on the domestic industry.

INADEQUACY OF STATISTICS ILLUSTRATED

One illustration of the inadequacy of our statistics is the problem of Japanese rubber thong sandals, known as zories. These shoes have recently become enormously popular in the domestic market, but we have not been able to obtain any reliable figures as to the quantity being imported or the quantity being consumed. Journal of Commerce figures indicate approximately 12,763,000 pairs imported in 1959. One of the importers claims that the figure actually is as high as 68 million. Zories imports are of the greatest concern since they have taken from the domestic industry the market for casual beach and lounge footwear which was formerly supplied by the domestically produced stroller. In view of the current enormous size of this market, this is a very substantial loss, but without reliable figures showing the quantity of zories imported the domestic industry cannot demonstrate the extent of the loss. There may well be other types of footwear which have similarly displaced domestic production, which could be shown with adequate import statistics.

CLASSIFICATION DIFFICULTIES

The problem is additionally complicated by the fact that, according to the Census Bureau, many of these rubber shoes have been classified as manufactures of rubber rather than as rubber footwear, so that it is not even possible to obtain an accurate total footwear import figure. The official U.S. import figure for rubber footwear in 1959 is 53 million; the figure reported by the Japanese is somewhere between 61 million and 88 million—it is impossible to tell in some cases whether the Japanese categories are leather or rubber footwear.

Another example of inadequate customs classification in the present reporting system is rubber-soled shoes. Shoes with fabric uppers are separate and distinct from shoes with plastic uppers, and are not necessarily similar among themselves, that is, tennis shoes are different from basketball shoes, women's specialty shoes, and so forth. The statistics should distinguish between such types of shoes.

There is a great deal of other statistical data important to an adequate Tariff Commission presentation. The applicant is requested to present detailed figures on domestic production, profits, employment, costs, and so forth. All such statistical information is available since about 95 percent of the domestic industry is cooperating in the compilation of statistics. The industry is also prepared to present detailed figures concerning the different kinds of shoes it has produced in the past decade and is currently producing in order to correlate such data with any breakdown obtainable on imports. The only gap in the necessary statistical presentation is, therefore, the lack of accurate import figures.

PROFITS AND EMPLOYMENT DOWN

Profits and employment in the domestic rubber footwear industry are fast declining in spite of the fact that consumption is at an all-time high and has been growing far ahead of the population increase. Japanese wage and other cost figures are extremely low and it is almost impossible for the domestic product to compete in terms of price. In at least one case domestic production of a very popular type of shoe has ceased completely because of Japanese competition. The fact that imports are seriously injuring the domestic industry is clear, as is the need for immediate action if permanent damage to the industry is to be avoided.

THE NEED FOR THIS LEGISLATION IS CLEAR

Mr. Speaker, I believe the need for the legislation I am today introducing is clear. I believe my bill, by requiring the Census Bureau to compile statistics on imports of rubber footwear by type of shoe, offers the best hope for the American rubber footwear industry to present its case effectively to the United States Tariff Commission.

Mr. Speaker, I am aware that Congress is not likely to act on my proposal during this session. But I believe that the introduction of this joint resolution now will start the ball rolling for favorable action next year.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the next Congress to act promptly and favorably on this measure. The jobs of several thousand American workers and the economic health of an important industry may well depend upon such action.

The text of the joint resolution follows:

JOINT RESOLUTION TO PROVIDE FOR THE COMPILATION OF RUBBER FOOTWEAR IMPORT STATISTICS BY TYPE OF FOOTWEAR

Whereas it is the policy of Congress, as expressed in subsection (e) of section 484 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C., sec. 1484 (e)), that there be kept a detailed enumeration for statistical purposes of all merchandise imported into the United States, such enumeration established by the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Chairman of the United States Tariff Commission, and reported on the entry statement in conformity with such enumeration, by quantity and value for each kind of article imported;

Whereas it is the policy of Congress, as expressed in sections 6 and 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951 (19 U.S.C., secs. 1363 and 1364) that any domestic industry shall obtain tariff relief which can show to the satisfaction of the Tariff Commission and the President of the United States that it is suffering or threatened with

serious injury by imports of like or directly competitive products which are increasing as a result of a trade concession;

Whereas adequate import statistics must be available to the domestic industry to enable it to establish the need for relief by the criteria set forth in the aforementioned Trade Agreements Extension Act;

Whereas the import statistics on rubber footwear currently compiled by the Bureau of the Census of the Department of Commerce are inadequate for the purpose of showing the quantity and value of types of rubber footwear imported;

Whereas the domestic rubber footwear industry is currently facing serious injury from the greatly increased and increasing imports of rubber footwear: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Chairman of the United States Tariff Commission are authorized and directed to establish an enumeration of articles of rubber footwear imported into the United States, such enumeration shall be made for the year 1959 and for each year thereafter and shall be in the following detail:

(1) Rubber footwear imported under paragraph 1530(e) of the Tariff Act of 1930, to be reported as follows: rubber-soled shoes with fabric uppers, such as tennis shoes, bals, and oxfords; rubber-soled shoes with fabric uppers (other than tennis shoes, bals, and oxfords), such as specialty shoes (including women's casuals); rubber-soled shoes with toya cloth uppers; rubber-soled shoes with plastic uppers (including vinyl film uppers); others; and

(2) Rubber footwear imported under paragraph 1537(b) of the Tariff Act of 1930 to be reported as follows: rubber boots; gaiters and arctics; rubber shoes; zories; waterproof shoes with plastic uppers (including vinyl film uppers); others.

SEC. 2. As a part of the entry into the United States of any rubber footwear there shall be attached thereto an accurate statement specifying in terms of the detailed enumeration as set forth in the first section of this joint resolution the kinds and quantities of all such merchandise imported and the value of the total quantity of each kind of article.

SEC. 3. The recording and compilation of rubber footwear import statistics as described in this joint resolution shall be made at the expense of the United States and no charges therefor shall be made to any other person.

COMMUNISM IN LATIN AMERICA

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the problems posed for the free world by Korea, Vietnam, and the Middle East on yesterday will, I predict, be repeated in Latin America on tomorrow. The picture of events there is far from clear, but its portent is ominous. Castro has virtually delivered Cuba into the grasp of the Communists. Territory once seized by the Communists is rarely relinquished. South Korea was freed from Communist forces by force of arms after United States and U.N. forces went to the rescue. Guatemala threw out a Communist government when the martyred Castillo-Armas sparked a revolution from within. Later the Communists had him killed but the fact remains that only Guatemala in all the world has escaped from Communist domination with its territory intact, after Communist domination had been established. It is clear to see that Cuba can be the beachhead which communism has so long sought in Latin America. Unless positive action is taken—and that means positive action by the United States—Cuba can quickly become the capital of the Communist movement everywhere in Latin America.

Castro's order to the Cuban government to seize all American property in Cuba should have awakened the American people and the Eisenhower administration to the fact that this act is a part of the normal routine of every Communist government that comes to power. That it coincided with the meeting of the Communist-controlled Latin American Youth Congress in Havana adds to its significance. Seizure and promised distribution of private property has a profound effect on the young and impressionable. It has an even more profound effect upon the have-nots, of whom there are many in Latin America. It is most profound in its effect when the seized property belongs to citizens of the rich and powerful United States and this Nation does nothing about it.

There are many things which can be done which are short of armed intervention. American know-how and American dollars, which still are available to Cuba in surprisingly large amounts, are indispensable to Cuba. Castro cannot replace them elsewhere and without them Cuba would quickly collapse economically. Castro cannot survive such a collapse.

In the meantime, Castro's success in twisting Uncle Sam's nose has had quite an effect upon the people of Latin America. Let us face it. Aided and abetted by Russia, others will try it. The world, and particularly Latin America will be watching what the Eisenhower administration does. If there ever was a time when the phrase our Government has so frequently used on others, "deeds, not words," should be invoked, it is now.

It has frequently been said that U.S. policy is quickly to patch together a program to meet the effects of a crisis which has taken place, instead of designed policies and programs to meet crises which may be anticipated. Perhaps this has been the crux of our problems in many parts of the world. Certainly unnecessary damage has been done in Cuba through the policy of inertia and wishful thinking. It has also been said—with good cause—that the Congress of the United States is at least 2 years ahead of the Government in its reaction to world problems. The prodding of the Congress has, I believe, influenced some stiffening of U.S. attitude toward Cuba. Here again the case of Guatemala comes to mind. Here U.S. policy was timely and effective, and to considerable measure this has been because of congressional initiative. The Congress has emphasized over and over again the necessity of demonstrating to the world that the Guatemalan experiment in democracy could succeed.

The objective there as elsewhere, is simply to show that the needs of a people can be met better through democratic processes than through those of a totalitarian system. On the credit side of the ledger is the fact that the people of a small neighboring Latin American state, working now through the forward-looking leadership of President Miguel Ydigoras Fuentes, assisted in time—and I emphasize in time—by a sympathetic and understanding United States, is confronting serious problems with maturity, courage, patience, and faith.

This nation is our friend. People everywhere want to be friends of this nation and of freedom. The people of Cuba are our friends but the current Cuban dictator has alienated some of them. The others are afraid to speak. A firm policy toward Castro and toward Communist stooges elsewhere will give the people an opportunity to demonstrate their friendship for the people of the United States.

It is high time that the United States begins to recognize that she has friends in Latin America who can be counted upon. There are some so-called friends who, when the chips are down, do not stand with us. As reported in the Christian Science Monitor of August 26, 1960, Bolivia, Ecuador, Honduras, Mexico, Panama, and Venezuela were not willing to go along with the strong condemnation of Soviet intervention in the Western Hemisphere through Cuba, which the United States was anxious to be adopted. On the other hand, the report adds that "the United States can count on Brazil, Argentina, Guatemala, and a few others."

I think it is essential that we recognize that these countries which demonstrate their friendship for us, cherish common ideals and principles with us, and we must not permit those ideals to be sacrificed at the altar of complacency. I think it equally essential that the United States adopt a strong policy toward communism in the Western Hemisphere which will make it impossible for communism to gain a lasting foothold here, and around which our friends can rally with complete confidence.

PRINTING OF COMMITTEE ACTIVITY REPORTS

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, with reference to the printing of committee activity reports for the session, as vice chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing, I wish to remind the chairmen of all committees that the Joint Committee on Printing has very properly ruled that the printing of such reports, both as committee prints and in the RECORD, is duplication, the cost of which cannot be justified.

It is requested that committee chairmen decide whether they wish these reports printed as committee prints or in the RECORD, since the Government Printing Office will be directed not to print them both ways.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. PATMAN, for 30 minutes, tomorrow, and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. VANIK, for 30 minutes, tomorrow, and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. STRATTON, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. SCHERER, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. HECHLER, for 30 minutes, on tomorrow.

Mr. FLOOD, for 30 minutes, on tomorrow.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois, for 1 hour, tomorrow.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK), for 20 minutes today, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. WOLF (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK), for 15 minutes, tomorrow.

Mr. DENT, for 15 minutes, tomorrow.

Mr. PUCINSKI asked that his special order for August 31 be extended to 2 hours.

Mr. WRIGHT, for 30 minutes, tomorrow.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. MCCORMACK (at the request of Mr. ASPINALL) and include extraneous matter.

Mr. KILGORE and include a speech by Mr. WALTER.

Mr. SCHERER, in the body of the RECORD in connection with remarks to be made in connection with the retirement of three Members from Ohio.

Mr. MCDONOUGH and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MINSHALL.

Mr. FISHER.

Mr. HECHLER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan, to revise and extend the remarks he made earlier today and include a newspaper article, not extraneous, but related to the remarks.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona.

At the request of Mr. WEAVER, the following Members be permitted to extend their remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and to include extraneous matter:

Mr. VAN ZANDT.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD.

Mr. FINO.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT.

Mr. ROBISON of New York in two instances.

(At the request of Mr. PORTER and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. KEOGH.

Mr. GARMATZ.

Mr. ZELENKO.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS.

Mr. FASCELL.

Mr. ROOSEVELT.

Mr. GIAIMO.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 12619. An act making appropriations for mutual security and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 900. An act to validate certain overpayments inadvertently made by the United States to several of the States and to relieve certifying and disbursing officers from liability therefrom;

H.R. 2069. An act for the relief of James H. Presley;

H.R. 2178. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to make certain changes in the road at White Branch, Grapevine Reservoir, Tex.;

H.R. 4059. An act to amend title 28 of the United States Code relating to actions for infringements of copyrights by the United States;

H.R. 6084. An act for the relief of J. Butler Hyde;

H.R. 6767. An act for the relief of Raymond Baurkot;

H.R. 7124. An act to require the payment of tuition on account of certain persons who attend the public schools of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7792. An act for the relief of Martin A. Mastandrea;

H.R. 8054. An act for the relief of William Edgar Weaver;

H.R. 8989. An act for the relief of Ralph W. Anderson;

H.R. 9377. An act to provide for the protection of forest cover for reservoir areas under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Army and Chief of Engineers;

H.R. 9406. An act for the relief of William J. Huntsman;

H.R. 9417. An act for the relief of Henry Kaloian;

H.R. 9432. An act for the relief of Maj. Edmund T. Coppinger;

H.R. 9958. An act for the relief of Brooklyn Steel Warehouse Co.;

H.R. 10431. An act for the relief of Isami Nozuka (also known as Isami Notsuka);

H.R. 10598. An act to clarify certain provisions of the Criminal Code relating to the importation or shipment of injurious mammals, birds, amphibians, fish, and reptiles (18 U.S.C. 42(a), 42(b)); and relating to the transportation or receipt of wild mammals or birds taken in violation of State, National, or foreign laws (18 U.S.C. 43), and for other purposes;

H.R. 11165. An act for the relief of Robert J. Reeves;

H.R. 11188. An act for the relief of Edward S. Anderson;

H.R. 11327. An act for the relief of Chauncey A. Ahalt;

H.R. 11390. An act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11420. An act for the relief of Ferdinand Hofacker;

H.R. 11460. An act for the relief of Edouard E. Perret;

H.R. 11486. An act for the relief of Richard J. Power;

H.R. 11813. An act to amend the Menominee Termination Act;

H.R. 12350. An act for the relief of Marion John Nagurski;

H.R. 12471. An act for the relief of Capt. Lucien B. Clark O2051623, MSC, U.S. Army;

H.R. 12475. An act for the relief of Claude L. Wimberly;

H.R. 12476. An act for the relief of John H. Esterline;

H.R. 12530. An act to authorize adjustment, in the public interest, of rentals under leases entered into for the provision of commercial recreational facilities at the John H. Kerr Reservoir, Va.-N.C.;

H.R. 12533. An act to amend the Migratory Bird Treaty Act to increase penalties for violations of that act, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12563. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved August 17, 1937, as amended;

H.R. 12619, making appropriations for mutual security and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 658. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation in connection with the centennial of the birth of Jane Addams, founder and leader of Chicago's Hull House.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, August 31, 1960, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

2430. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "a bill to amend section 1037 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize payment of costs for certain United States nationals before foreign tribunals", was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ROGERS of Texas: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 10311. A bill providing that certain provisions of Public Law 335 dated October 7, 1949 (63 Stat. 724), shall apply to the Mercedes division of the lower Rio Grande rehabilitation project, Texas; with amendment (Rept. No. 2201). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 1092. An act to provide for the construction of the Cheney division, Wichita Federal reclamation project, Kansas, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2202). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 2195. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the western division of The Dalles Federal reclamation project, Oregon, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2203). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. S. 2761. An act to validate payments made for certain emergency conservation measures under the program authorized by the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1957; without amendment (Rept. No. 2204). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Report pursuant to section 136 of Legislative Appropriation Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 2205). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. House Resolution 623. Resolution relative to the operation of the Panama Line; with amendment (Rept. No. 2206). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. Twenty-fifth report of the Committee on Government Operations; without amendment (Rept. No. 2207). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 636. Resolution for the consideration of S. 2917. An act to establish a price support level for milk and butterfat; without amendment (Rept. No. 2208). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. O'NEILL: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 637. Resolution for the consideration of H.R. 13021. A bill to provide for assistance in the development of Latin America and in the reconstruction of Chile, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2209). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. S. 3018. An act to authorize the Maritime Administration to make advances on Government-insured ship mortgages; with amendment (Rept. No. 2210). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. THOMAS: Committee of conference. H.R. 13161. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2211). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MILLS: Committee of conference. H.R. 12659. A bill to suspend for a temporary period the import duty on heptanoic acid (Rept. No. 2212). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MILLS: Committee of conference. H.R. 12536. A bill relating to the treatment of charges for local advertising for purposes of determining the manufacturers sale price (Rept. No. 2213). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MILLS: Committee of conference. H.R. 10960. A bill to amend section 5701 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the excise tax on cigars (Rept. No. 2214). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 13218. A bill to provide for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Savery-Pot Hook Federal reclamation project, Colorado-Wyoming; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H.R. 13219. A bill to provide certain payments to assist in providing improved educational opportunities for children of migrant agricultural employees; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 13220. A bill to authorize the Commissioner of Education to enter into contracts for the education of children of migrant agricultural employees, and to provide for fellowships for training teachers of such children; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H.R. 13221. A bill to establish the National Foundation on Aging; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. INOUYE:

H.R. 13222. A bill to provide that the Secretary of State shall investigate and report to the Congress as to the feasibility of establishing a Pacific International House on Sand Island, Hawaii; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MARTIN:

H.R. 13223. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, with respect to the duties on hair of the cashmere goat; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 13224. A bill to implement the Agreement on the Importation of Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Materials, opened for signature at Lake Success on November 22, 1950; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming:

H.R. 13225. A bill to provide for the construction, operation and maintenance of the Savery-Pot Hook Federal reclamation project, Colorado-Wyoming; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TOLL:

H.R. 13226. A bill to amend the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 to provide for counseling and other assistance to foreign students attending colleges or universities in the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H.R. 13227. A bill to create the Freedom Commission for the development of the science of counteraction to the world Communist conspiracy and for the training and development of leaders in a total political war; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H.R. 13228. A bill to further amend the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.J. Res. 803. Joint resolution to provide for the compilation of rubber footwear import statistics by type of footwear; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H.J. Res. 804. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to construct a modern stern ramp trawler to be used for research purposes and authorizing the appropriation of funds; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H. Con. Res. 732. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress in favor of granting relief to the domestic carpet industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. Res. 635. Resolution to provide for an investigation of the Department of Defense directive on transportation of household goods of military and civilian personnel; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of Montana:

H.R. 13229. A bill for the relief of Shi-Kuang Yao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN:

H.R. 13230. A bill for the relief of Sih Chuen Liu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RILEY:

H.R. 13231. A bill for the relief of Jagat Kumar Kaul; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H.R. 13232. A bill for the relief of Necasio Agustin, Artemio Agustin, and Gloria Agustin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13233. A bill for the relief of Leonila Tolentino and Gloria Tolentino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H.R. 13234. A bill to authorize the reconveyance to the former owner thereof of certain property at Cheli Air Force Depot, Los Angeles County, Calif., when such property is declared surplus to the needs of the United States; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. WEIS:

H.R. 13235. A bill for the relief of Antonio Folliero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

539. Mr. STRATTON presented a petition of Mr. Sam Caparossi, Gloversville, N.Y., secretary-treasurer, and 18 other members of local 234 of the International Barbers Union urging adoption of H.R. 11418; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Radio and Television Programing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 30, 1960

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, the concern of our Nation with the uses being made of radio and television has been reflected many times in discussions conducted on this floor. I know that our citizens recognize the fine work of this Congress to insure that the vast resources of the radio and television media would be used constructively.

Last fall, I was among many who spoke out against the indifference to the public interest revealed in certain TV and radio practices. At that time I urged the listening and viewing public in my Connecticut community to insist upon an improvement of radio and television programing.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we should continue our concern with our national educational and entertainment media; I believe citizens should expect that the great power of the airwaves be used in behalf of the public good. I believe that this concern should be expressed not only by criticism of what is bad but also acclaim for what is praiseworthy.

In this regard, Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the House to a unique program being developed by the National Broadcasting Company. Recognizing the urgent need for widespread public participation in defining America's national goals and purposes, the National Broadcasting Co. will begin a

weekly television series this fall that will deal with vital current issues through live discussions and debates. The program, entitled, "The Nation's Future," will premiere on November 12.

As a Representative from the State of Connecticut where the town meeting still flourishes in many communities, I am particularly pleased with the unique approach which this program will make to subjects of pressing concern to each citizen and to the Nation. These discussions will be led by statesmen in public life, including world leaders, Members of Congress, ambassadors, economists, and educators, as well as leaders from management and labor. Recognizing that every citizen has a personal stake in these issues the National Broadcasting Co. will arrange for these programs to be integrated with local activities so as to stimulate discussions in local, civic, fraternal and educational groups. Research and study material will be sent to these groups in advance of each weekly program. The National Broadcasting Co. will also arrange and organize the participation on the air of representatives of these local groups. Through the cooperation of the National Broadcasting Co. affiliates in each area, The Nation's Future will give countrywide scope to our traditional town meeting system.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that the National Broadcasting Co. is to be highly commended for its efforts in originating a program of such vital national importance which will give our people an opportunity to reexamine their ideals and aspirations and utilize the facts for making informed opinions and judgment. I know that The Nation's Future will generate a deeper conscience of the American way of life and the values of democracy and freedom as well as the importance of safeguarding these values not only in our country but the world over.

This is television programing at its best. This is the kind of programing America needs, and I am certain the success of The Nation's Future will prove it is what America wants.

On the Occasion of the 20th Anniversary of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL A. FINO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 30, 1960

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of the 20th anniversary of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America I would like to pay tribute to the Ukrainian patriots who through the centuries have fought the good fight for national independence.

The Ukrainian Congress Committee of America helps us see that the fight is far from over. It serves to remind us of the plight of the dozen captive non-Russian nations. It makes us take a more sober view of the stakes involved in the cold war of today.

The chairman of the committee, Prof. Lev E. Dobriansky, was instrumental in obtaining congressional approval for a Captive Nations Week observance this year. This observance showed Khrushchev that we in the West were aware of the Soviet tyranny which oppresses the captive nations under his sway. It also gave hope to the subject peoples by showing them they were not forgotten. Most importantly, it proved that ideas can pierce through the curtain of terror that encircles the Soviet Union and its satellites.

I would like to offer congratulations to the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America on its anniversary but, in a way, it seems to me as unseemly to congratulate the committee on this occasion as it is to congratulate a man on the anniversary of his mortgage. I would rather save my most joyous congratulations for the day the mortgage is all paid up and burnt, for the day the captive nations have once again taken their rightful place among the family of free nations. In the meantime I wish the committee the very best in its endeavors.

Message to the Ukrainian Congress Committtee of America on Its 20th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 30, 1960

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following message to the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America on the occasion of its 20th anniversary:

MESSAGE TO THE UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE OF AMERICA ON ITS 20TH ANNIVERSARY

Tyranny has never been a stranger to the courageous people of the Ukraine. Long has it been their lot to be the victims of expanding empires, and to suffer at the blood-drenched hands of the invader.

The Ukraine has particularly fared ill at the hands of Russian imperialism. Though claiming to have cast aside the tenets of prior Russian expansionism and though picturing itself as the new savior of the masses, the Soviet Union became the most vicious oppressor in the long and hard fought saga of the Ukraine. Within 5 years after it had taken power the Soviet Union realized that a major stumbling block to her plans for world conquest lay in the nationalist strivings of the Ukraine. Repression of Ukraine culture, massacres of innocents, mass deportations to Siberia—all have been used to consolidate the power of the U.S.S.R. over the Ukraine.

In the past the Ukraine has always emerged triumphant with her enemy destroyed. Years might have passed but victory in each case was ultimately and gloriously hers. Yet in the periods of arduous waiting, years of fearing the every knock on the door, years of starvation and persecution, hope remained alive. It had to if ever the Ukrainian people were to become free again.

It is such an organization as the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America which provides the captive nations with this potent weapon against the Communist aggressor. The committee goes even further for it realizes that hope alone cannot defeat a historic imperialism and a modern totalitarianism. That is why the program of the committee, its splendid publications, and the unflagging efforts of its membership of two and one half million are all fulfilling a highly commendable and active service to America, to the free world and to the enslaved multitudes under the Soviet heel. That is why, on behalf of the millions in the dozen captive nations and on behalf of America I wish to congratulate and to thank the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America on its 20th anniversary.

Public Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 30, 1960

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, to meet the growing health needs of the Nation, the Eisenhower-Nixon administration has pressed forward in the fields of research and training of personnel and of stimulating State, local, and private agencies to expand and improve their facilities and services. Government action which has resulted in major improvements in public health has been of a character which neither discourages nor destroys private effort to combat disease and to lighten the costs of serious illness.

First. Public Health Service appropriation more than tripled in the last 7 years.

Second. National Institutes of Health appropriations increased from approximately $59 million in fiscal year 1953 to $400 million in fiscal 1960.

Third. Health research supported by the National Institutes of Health at outside scientific institutions increased nearly sevenfold—9,166 grants-in-aid amounting to $142,627,000 in fiscal year 1959 compared with 2,054 grants amounting to $20,936,000 in fiscal year 1953.

Fourth. Facilities for health research expanded under new legislation providing $30 million annually to non-Federal public and nonprofit private institutions to help finance construction of health research facilities.

Fifth. Manpower skilled in medical research increased. Seven thousand three hundred regular fellowships and 6,300 in other categories awarded by the National Institutes of Health between 1954 and 1960.

Sixth. Water pollution control program made permanent in 1956. In return for Federal grants amounting to $178 million, 2,100 communities have been stimulated to put up $854 million to build new or to improve existing water pollution control system.

Seventh. Federal program of research and technical activities established to strengthen control of air pollution.

Eighth. National Health Survey initiated providing data for developing more

disease research and control programs for planning health facilities and services.

Ninth. National Library of Medicine founded—will be the Nation's most important source of medical literature.

Tenth. Polio vaccine and inoculation of children carried out by Federal program of assistance to States amounting to $53,600,000.

Eleventh. Grants have been increased for Maternal and Child Health and Crippled Children's Services.

Twelfth. Broadened the program of Federal aid for construction of hospitals and outpatient facilities to include chronic disease hospitals, nursing homes, rehabilitation facilities and diagnostic and treatment centers. Current appropriation for hospital and outpatient facilities is $150 million—double the appropriation of 1953.

Thirteenth. Government action in the health field has been of a nature to stimulate rather than discourage private efforts to provide health services and to protect the American family against the costs of medical care.

As for essential services, note the following increases in public service sectors of the Federal budget between fiscal year 1953 and fiscal year 1961—proposed: Veterans, up 28 percent; labor and welfare, up 91 percent; natural resources, up 27 percent; General Government, up 27 percent.

In addition, State and local governments have expanded spending on services greatly—up well over 50 percent since fiscal year 1953. As for interest charges, these have been an essential cost of carrying the high public debt which the Republican administration inherited. The only way to bring down the cost of the public debt is to resort to the loose-money, low-interest policy of the Democrats which cut the value of the dollar in half during their period in power or to reduce the size of the debt, which Republicans are pledged to do.

Orchard Picnic Address by Senator Byrd of Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 30, 1960

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address which I delivered at my Annual Orchard Picnic, at Berryville, Va., on August 27, 1960.

There being no objection, the adress was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY SENATOR HARRY F. BYRD AT HIS ANNUAL ORCHARD PICNIC, BERRYVILLE, VA., AUGUST 27, 1960

This is the 37th year I have had the great pleasure of greeting my friends at these annual picnics.

Today we pay tribute to Walter Hough, chief entomologist at the Fruit Research Laboratory for this area. I know of no man who has rendered greater service during the 49 years he has served the fruitgrowers so faithfully and well.

It so happens that I planted my first apple orchard 57 years ago, so he and I have grown up together in the apple business.

I had faith in the apple business then and have had through the years. I am still planting on a replacement basis. In the last few years I have pulled out over 25,000 trees, which were not productive or profitable varieties.

We have our problems and they are serious, but we are better prepared to meet them because the apple industry receives no subsidy, bonus or favor from the Federal Government. We stand on our own feet.

When I pass on and my sons and grandsons and maybe great-grandsons continue to operate the apple business, I hope they will do all they can, as I have done, to resist any and all efforts to subsidize and control the apple industry by the Federal Government.

I want to tell you something of my recent trip to Switzerland. It was very educational and at the same time most enjoyable. I went with my friend, Blackburn Moore.

On the day the Democratic candidates were nominated at Los Angeles, we had a summit meeting on the highest mountain in Switzerland—over 14,000 feet. We were enjoying the cool air there and were happy to miss the hot air at Los Angeles.

While in Switzerland we were the guests, for a part of the time, of Mr. and Mrs. Henry J. Taylor. He is our American Ambassador whose home is at Charlottesville.

We saw Switzerland at its best. I was greatly impressed with the cordiality of the Swiss people toward the United States. When we traveled with the Ambassador in his car flying the American flag, the people would clap their hands and smile, indicating their friendliness.

The Swiss have never received a dollar of American aid, and would not take it if we offered it to them. Perhaps that is why they like us so well.

I venture to say that in many areas where our contributions have been sent, instead of applauding our flag, they would hiss and condemn it and shout their disapproval, as has been shown in recent instances.

It is time that America learns that we cannot buy friendship with dollars. So far, we have expended over $80 billion in foreign aid, and much of it has been wasted and squandered in the most shameful fashion.

Incidentally, all of this $80 billion has been added to the public debt for future generations to pay.

The last foreign aid bill was more fantastic than any other because it included $100 million for the Congo, where there has been wholesale rape of the white women of Belgium and the killing and murdering of the Belgians who have accomplished such development as there is in that area.

It is peculiarly difficult to understand this. When the Senate passed this bill, the Congo was in the act of defying the United Nations; but this shows to what extremes fallacious policies can be extended.

I was deeply impressed with the Swiss Government. It is a combination of direct and representative democracy. Emphasis on local and Canton rule makes it close to pure democracy. I had a long conference with the President and his Council.

The executive power of the National Government is placed in a 7-man board known as the Federal Council. The Council is similar to our National Cabinet. The President is chosen from among the members of the Council, and serves 1 year.

Their taxes are reasonable. They have no debt. But, at the same time, they maintain a well trained army of 600,000 men out of a population of 5 million, and have a powerful air force with jet planes.

The Swiss people have lived amid wars on the European Continent for generations, without permitting violation of their territory. The mighty Hitler had this in mind during World War II, but he did not attempt it. The Swiss have a remarkable record of permitting no interference from other nations no matter how powerful.

Swiss law provides that when a member of a family is sick or needs help, the others in the family must take care of their own as far as possible. There is no Federal public assistance such as we have developed in this country.

Swiss bankers are perhaps the ablest in the world. I was deeply interested in my conversations with them. The economy, the business and the Government of Switzerland are based on free enterprise and individual liberty.

We landed at Zurich after a flight of just 6½ hours from New York. We went to Geneva, and on to Bern where we were guests of Ambassador Taylor. From there we went to Lucerne and St. Moritz. We drove back to Zurich through Liechtenstein and Austria.

I wish everyone could visit Switzerland. You would see some of the most superb scenery in the world and the hotels are wonderful. You would become acquainted with fine sturdy people. You would be inspired to fight for individual liberties and States rights.

These liberties and rights are among the fundamental principles which have made our country, in a brief span of time, the greatest democracy in all the world. These principles must be protected and preserved; and there are serious indications that we need to be reminded of this.

I say this with all the sincerity of which I am capable: if we undermine our fundamental principles, and impair our fiscal solvency in the next 25 to 30 years as we have in the past quarter of a century, I cannot believe our democracy will survive.

Perhaps it is the inspiration of Switzerland that leads me to some observations which I believe should be made today. Certainly, there is an element of contrast. This leads me to comment briefly about what has been going on in this country.

The people of Virginia have been extremely generous with their confidence in me. I have held public office almost continuously for more than 40 years. They have allowed me to represent them in the Senate of the United States for nearly 30 years.

I think I know the views of the citizens of our great Commonwealth, and the principles for which they stand, and I have always fought for them. I shall never stop fighting for them. It is a source of deep regret that I have been unable to do more.

I say this as I think over the trends toward centralization in the Federal Government over the past 30 years; and we must keep this trend in mind as we attempt to act intelligently on public matters which will affect the lives of all of us in the future.

Perhaps the two greatest foundation stones of our form of government are individual liberty and State sovereignty. These are the greatest deterrents to centralized government. Centralization of government leads to socialism.

Our great free enterprise system depends on individual freedom and States rights. Free enterprise will diminish as centralization of government and socialistic trends increase. These are vital truths to keep in mind in our efforts to preserve our form of government.

Looking to the future, against the background of trends over the past 30 years, there is reason for concern; and more important there is need for awakening. The trends have been toward centralization of government with the inevitable fiscal and socialistic deterioration.

We have had Federal deficits in 24 of those 30 years. Only 8 of the 24 deficits occurred in war years. There have been 16 peacetime deficits. And during the 22 peacetime years the increase in the Federal debt has averaged more than $2 billion a year.

In these 30 years the Federal debt has been increased by $270 billion. It is now more than $286 billion. And in these 30 years interest on the Federal debt has cost the taxpayers of this country more than $114 billion.

Federal taxes 30 years ago took only about 4 percent of the national income; today they are taking nearly 20 percent. And with these increases in debt and taxes the value of the dollar has been reduced to less than 47 cents.

Along with this fiscal deterioration has come continuous centralization of government. Federal programs are embracing an ever-widening area of our economy and endeavor. Federal subsidies are going out through all kinds of loans, grants, and payments.

There are now Federal subsidies for business, industry, private finance, agriculture, transportation, power, housing, health, education, States, localities, and individuals. Subsidies are under bureaucratic control; to take them means giving up a measure of independence and freedom.

Some 40 million people will receive payments from the Federal Treasury this year totaling some $40 billion, including social security. With their families these 40 million people could easily reach a number equivalent to half of our population.

Federal payments to people on so-called public assistance rolls are now totaling more than $2 billion a year. Thirty years ago such payments were unknown. Over the 30-year period Federal payments through programs of this type have totaled about $25 billion.

The Federal Government is now subsidizing housing in the form of grants, loans, guarantees, insurance, etc., to a total of more than $10 billion a year. The first significant Federal program in housing was the HOLC established in 1933. Since then gross Federal housing subsidies have exceeded $110 billion.

Federal payments through various programs in the field of education are now totaling over $1 billion a year. Thirty years ago the total was less than $10 million. During the 30-year period Federal payments in various forms of educational benefits have totaled about $25 billion.

Federal payments to States, localities, and individuals under numerous health programs now total $500 million a year, exclusive of huge direct Federal expenditures for related programs. Thirty years ago Federal activity in this field was negligible. Over the 30-year period Federal payments to States, localities, and individuals in the field of public health have totaled $2¼ billion.

Thirty years ago there was a mere handful of Federal programs for payments to States, localities, and individuals, costing about $100 million. Now there are at least 90 of these payment programs, and expenditures total $9.6 billion a year.

The programs I have cited are domestic-civilian, with little or no relation to military preparedness or foreign aid. They do not include tremendous subsidy areas in the fields of agriculture, industry, merchant marine, power, transportation, small business, etc.

Think of the increases I have mentioned in terms of percentage, and compare them with an increase of about 45 percent in our population over the period, an increase of about 245 percent in our industrial production, and an increase of about 432 percent in our national income.

When you analyze Federal programs in search of expenditures with subsidy aspects, the results are astonishing. It is disheartening to realize what this means in terms of centralization of government and trends toward socialism.

Thinking of Switzerland's fine example of sound democracy at work, at this 37th picnic I want to emphasize my belief that our great democracy can and should live throughout the ages.

I have confidence in our future if the citizens of the Nation will oppose those things which are destructive of the principles underlying our form of government, our free enterprise system, our individual liberties, and our national solvency.

Tribute to Gustave Fast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 30, 1960

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, as the Representative of a district largely industrial in nature, I deem it highly appropriate to call to the attention of my colleagues that 1960 is the 75th anniversary of the birth year of an inventive genius whose work in the advancement of applied science was one of the most important factors in the development of industry in America, and indeed, the world, as we know it today.

I refer to the late Gustave Fast, a native of Sweden, whose adult life for the most part was spent in the city of Baltimore and in the State of Maryland. Mr. Fast came to America just 50 years ago after thorough training as an engineer. His father before him was a noted engineer and was decorated by the Swedish Government with the Distinguished Service Medal for his engineering work.

It was while living in Baltimore in 1918 that Mr. Fast designed a power-transmission coupling that was to make him world famous and which made it possible for industry—then in the throes of changing from steam to electric power and from belt to direct driven machinery—to make the transition and go on to undreamed of heights of productivity.

Until Fast invented his coupling, industry had been plagued with breakdowns in the vital link between electrical motors and the machinery they were designed to drive. No device then known could long hold up under the stresses and strains of the inevitable misalignment between the driving and driven members. The devices of the time were made of flexible materials and fell victim to metal fatigue.

The late Ernest Von Hartz, writing in the Baltimore Sun, described the situation in this fashion:

> With the birth of the machine age, industry found itself confronted with the problem of misalignment between the directly connected shafts of driven and driving machinery.
>
> The problem was not so serious in the early days with relatively slow speed machinery, but with present-day high-speed machinery this condition became acute. It was found, for instance, to be a physical impossibility to connect two shafts in perfect alignment. The misalignment caused wear on the bearings of the two shafts and other mechanical deficiencies in the machines.
>
> To compensate for errors of alignment, flexible couplings were employed. But the solution itself was subject to limitations. Flexible materials when subjected to constant bending and twisting suffer from fatigue and failure.

Failure, of course, meant shutting down the machinery and replacing the coupling.

Gustave Fast already had made a name for himself with the invention of reducing gears and power drives used on Navy patrol boats in World War I when he concentrated on the design of a power coupling that would be flexible, yet be made of nonflexible materials that would last indefinitely.

As Mr. Von Hartz wrote:

> The coupling invented by Mr. Fast solved this problem in that it does not depend for its flexibility on flexible materials. It is all metal and is based on a simple mathematical principle taking the physical form of completely meshing two spur gears with internal gears of an oil-encasing floating sleeve. Thus the entire power is transmitted through an oil film, which effectively separates the metal surfaces. This is the important discovery by Fast, for it has reduced to a practical minimum the wear on couplings.

Just how well Fast succeeded is history. Nearly 1 million Fast's couplings have been manufactured by the Bartlett Hayward Plant of Koppers Co., Inc., in Baltimore, and placed in use throughout the world, notably in the steel industry. At any given moment of a working day the Fast's couplings in use transmit more than a billion horsepower and from the very first ones manufactured they have outlasted the machinery they connect.

Mr. Fast died nearly 15 years ago but his couplings installed 30 and 35 years ago are still functioning perfectly in their original installations.

Most noteworthy of all, however, is the fact that Fast's couplings manufactured today are basically the same coupling this great Swedish-American engineer designed more than 40 years ago. What a tribute to his genius it is that in all these years no one has been able to improve his invention.

Mr. Speaker, it is my sincere belief that American industry and the world owe much to Gustave Fast. He was honored in 1928 as the recipient of the John Price Wetherill Medal from the Franklin Institute of the State of Pennsylvania in recognition of his mechanical genius, but this adopted son of Maryland should not be forgotten.

The Ukrainian Congress Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 30, 1960

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, 20 years ago this autumn an organization was formed to represent the views of more

than 2 million fine Americans of Ukrainian ancestry. It is a privilege for me today as it reaches that milestone in its history to salute that organization, the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, and its noted chairman, Prof. Lev E. Dobriansky, of Georgetown University and its Institute of Ethnic Studies, who has been the leader of the congress committee during more than half its lifetime.

The Ukrainian Congress Committee, under the direction of such leaders as Dr. Dobriansky, is dedicated to the security interest of the United States which it serves principally through information concerning the struggle for freedom of the captive nations behind the Iron Curtain and through concrete proposals in the propaganda aspects of the cold war. Through information provided by the congress committee we have been able to pierce the myth of Soviet unity which Communist Russia has foisted upon the free world. Dr. Dobriansky has pointed out that the non-Russian nations within the Soviet borders are peoples with enduring histories and that the Ukraine with its 42 million people is the largest of the non-Russian nations within the Soviet Union—which cannot by any stretch of the imagination be called a nation itself.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that the Ukrainian Congress Committee will continue to flourish so that it can proceed with its mission of informing all the American people about the conditions within the Soviet Union. I heartily congratulate it on its 20th aniversary and I commend it for the great work it has done during those years.

Greetings to the Ukrainian Congress Committee on Its 20th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 30, 1960

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker I am pleased on this occasion to salute the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America on its 20th anniversary.

The land and other natural resources of the Ukraine—the tremendously fertile land with acres upon acres of wheat, the rich coal and iron deposits of the Donets River Basin, the power of the Dnieper River which when harnessed helped now to power Soviet industry—all are used to serve the purposes of the Soviet Union. But there remains one invaluable resource of the Ukraine that cannot be harvested, nor extracted, nor harnessed by the brutal conqueror, and that is the people of the Ukraine, a people schooled in adversity, a people rich in national culture, a people of heroic epics. And the Soviet Union now finds, as have all the previous tyrants who have held sway over the Ukrainian people, that nothing can quench the indomitable spirit of independence of the Ukraine.

We can learn much from the history of the Ukrainian people. Their sacrifices perform a valuable service to us. The tribulations they have endured at the hands of Russian imperialism, the horrible massacre at Vinnitsa where the executioners of the hated N.K.V.D. killed 12,000 Ukrainians in cold blood, the violated pledges of the Soviet Union, and the continuing tyranny of Soviet rule over the captive nations—these help us better to see the truth and help us to rid ourselves of delusions about our common enemy.

The Ukrainian Congress Committee of America continually brings these truths to light. It helps keep hope in the hearts of those on both sides of the Iron Curtain that one day Ukrainian freedom, as well as the freedom of all captive nations, will no longer be a phrase and a hope proclaimed by such as I on an anniversary or on some other occasion of sorrowful reminiscence but instead, a living reality.

Address Delivered by Senator Harry F. Byrd, of Virginia, on the Acceptance by Him of a Distinguished Service Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 30, 1960

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on August 29, 1960, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] delivered a magnificent address before the Section on Insurance, Negligence and Compensation Law of the American Bar Association. The address is worthy of the attention not only of the lawyers of the country but also of the people of the United States as a whole.

Senator BYRD is one of the greatest citizens in our Nation today, and I feel that any statement by him is worthy of note by the people of this country.

I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY SENATOR HARRY F. BYRD, DEMOCRAT OF VIRGINIA, ACCEPTING DISTINGUISHED SERVICE AWARD, BEFORE THE AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION SECTION OF INSURANCE, NEGLIGENCE, AND COMPENSATION LAW, SHOREHAM HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., AUGUST 29, 1960

I am honored by this award from the American Bar Association Section of Insurance, Negligence, and Compensation Law. I am not a lawyer, but my father was; and from him I first learned the sources of sovereign power, the principles of our system, and the reasons to respect the law.

I want you to know that, coming from you and coming in these times, this occasion is doubly rewarding. You are an organization of many of the Nation's finest and most responsible citizens. And these are times when friendly public reference to a conservative is rare indeed.

I am a conservative; I have been called unreconstructed. I wear the label with pride if it marks me as one who fights for the fundamentals on which we have developed the finest system of government ever known. I fight for these fundamentals because I believe in them.

I believe sound progress should be the primary purpose in every man's life. Sound progress is the source of strength. But progress is not sound unless it is based on sound financing; this is another application of checks and balances which have been so useful in our Government.

I believe that in the United States we are blessed with all the elements for sound individual progress and, therefore, for national progress. We have the people, resources, climate, and geography; and our system of government was designed for freedom, including freedom to work with incentive.

I believe the character of our governmental system stimulates enterprise and strength. It is a system characterized by local autonomy, State sovereignty, and a central government in three separate, coordinate branches—each limited in power and authority by the Constitution.

I believe that under our system we are the greatest and most productive Nation in history. The principles on which we have thrived must be preserved, and they must be defended wherever they are attacked. They guarantee our freedoms, nourish our free enterprise, and make sound progress possible.

I believe it is the sound productivity and strength developed under this system that have brought us to world power in relatively four generations. Historically, lives of nations are measured in hundreds of years. I want the life of this Nation to be the longest and the best.

I believe continuing centralization of government will destroy our freedoms and our strength. We have already gone too far. Excessive centralization inevitably leads to excessive central edict and regulation, and to excessive Federal competition and taxation. In short, it produces the evils of State socialism.

I believe our people want our system perpetuated and strengthened. Basically, the requirements are: simple honesty and individual initiative; self-reliance and willing work; constructive production and free competition; and progressive development and sound financing.

I believe that with responsible citizenship, good government and fiscal soundness there would be no fear for the future. But without these, there will be neither solid progress nor security with military preparedness. I think we face these alternatives today.

We are in a new era of atomic energy, rockets and space. Our population is increasing. Our resources are great. Our productive know-how and capacity are unsurpassed. In such conditions representative democracy with free enterprise should thrive soundly for the good of all mankind.

But I have a feeling of anxiety, and I suspect most of you know it too. Our Government is being challenged from abroad and undermined at home. This Nation is showing signs of weakness when it should be strongest. The reasons run back over 30 years and they can be documented.

Our strength is being sapped by the paternalism of Federal bureaucracy grown too big, usurpation of power by the Warren court grown too mighty, and force of labor leaders grown too arrogant. These are undermining our system, changing our attitudes, and hobbling our will for freedom.

We have deficits and threats of continuing deficits; we have debt, and inflation; we have foreign trade balance trouble and dwindling gold reserves; there are Communist gains in their race against the free world in the scientific, military, foreign relations, and economic fields. These are serious weaknesses which must be reversed.

I have been a Member of the U.S. Senate since 1933. I have seen the reasons for most of these weaknesses develop. I have tried to prevent them. I wish I could have done more. I am still trying.

It may be of interest to you to look briefly at the 30-year record since 1930 for signs and areas of weakness; and it should be noted that in this period our population has increased about 45 percent; industrial production has increased 240 percent; and national income has increased 432 percent.

But, in the same period the number of Federal agencies has increased 100 percent; Federal employees have increased 300 percent; Federal debt has increased 1,700 percent; Federal tax collections have increased 1,800 percent; and Federal expenditures have increased 2,300 percent.

Thirty years ago Federal programs for grants to States and localities could be counted on the fingers of one hand, including those for highways and land grant colleges. Federal expenditures through these programs at that time totaled about $100 million.

Now there are 60 listed Federal programs for grants to States and localities, and Federal expenditures through them are totaling $6.4 billion. And while Federal grants to States and localities have been increasing 6,300 percent, State and local debt has been increased $40 billion, or nearly 300 percent.

Through programs of grants to States and localities—and payments to individuals—Federal subsidies are now flowing to business, industry, private finance, agriculture, transportation, power, housing, health, education, States, localities, and individuals.

Nearly 40 million people will receive payments from the Federal Treasury this year totaling some $40 billion, including social security. With their families these 40 million people could easily reach a number equivalent to half of our population.

While these conditions have been developing over the past three decades, private debt in the United States has been increased nearly 250 percent; inflation has reduced the purchasing power of the dollar more than 53 cents; the value of the dollar is now 46.9 cents by the 1939 index.

It is a mistake to blame all this fiscal deterioration and socialistic growth on war. The combined duration of World War II and the Korean war was 8 years. In the other 22 years without war there were 16 Federal deficits, and the increase in the Federal debt averaged more than $2 billion a year.

The total annual cost of the Federal Government has gone up nearly $16 billion since the Korean war. This is an increase of nearly 25 percent. It may surprise you to know that the great increases in this period were not for military and foreign aid. They were in domestic-civilian programs.

Federal expenditures for these domestic-civilian programs have increased 86 percent in 7 years; they are now totaling $36 billion. These programs too frequently involve multi-year or permanent commitments for heavy spending in the future, and increases in these programs are continuing.

These are some of the signs of weakness, socialism and centralization to be found all around us—but not all. The Federal Supreme Court has undermined our system of government at all levels. This can be traced back to the Roosevelt administration when the President started packing the Court.

Judicial usurpation of power has reached a peak with the Warren court. Its decisions have invaded homes, handicapped police protection, disregarded State sovereignty, interfered with the authority of the executive branch of the Federal Government and usurped the powers of Congress.

You are familiar with the case documentation. For my purposes today, I rely on the chief justices of State supreme courts throughout the Nation. In their 1958 conference at Pasadena, they found reason to urge the Warren court to restrain itself in the exercise of vast power.

The action was taken in the 38 to 6 adoption of a report by 10 eminent jurists. The report was based on intensive study of recent decisions indicating general trends in the area of Federal-State relationships. I shall quote only two brief excerpts. The report said:

"Second only to the increasing dominance of the National Government has been the development of the immense power of the Supreme Court in both State and national affairs. It is not merely the final arbiter of the law; it is the maker of policy in many social and economic fields."

And then the report said further: "It has long been the American boast that we have a Government of laws and not of men. We believe that any study of recent decisions of the Supreme Court will raise at least considerable doubt as the validity of that boast."

It seems to me that there can be no doubt that the Warren court is undermining our system of government, contributing to centralization of power and authority; and thereby it is sapping our national strength. This makes us more vulnerable to destructive forces at home and abroad.

From experience we have learned that the more government is centralized, the more easily it is influenced—if not yet controlled—by leaders of organized pressure groups. Certainly the political target areas and the ruling officials of the government are more concentrated.

We have learned that the more government is centralized in Federal bureaucracy at Washington, the more it is susceptible to the arrogant influence of labor leaders. Call the roll, Reuther, Hoffa, McDonald, and so on. Make no mistake; these are ruthless men.

Even now there is talk of the Federal Government outlawing State right-to-work statutes. In this connection, think of this fact. In the past 30 years strikes in this country have prevented nearly 3 million man-years of work; that is a loss of nearly 3 million man-years of pay, and nearly 3 million man-years of production.

I have always conceded to good citizens in the rank and file of labor unions the privilege of organizing. I have conceded to legitimate labor unions the privilege of collective bargaining when they represent their members. But, I also concede to men and women the right to work if they choose.

You have seen the parade of some of the labor leaders before the McClellan committee. You have seen them make a mockery of the fifth amendment. Wherever and whenever I could, I have fought against giving such labor leaders power and placing them in position of Federal influence.

Power breeds power, and labor leaders are insatiable in their demands for special privileges and immunities. Federal nullification of all State right-to-work laws is high on their present list of demands.

They want the Federal Government to force membership in a union as a condition of employment. Nearly 50 million, or more than 70 percent of those employed in the United States are not now members of the big national and international unions.

Generally speaking, State right-to-work laws provide that the right of individuals to work shall not be denied on account of either membership or nonmembership in labor organizations.

The Taft-Hartley Act recognizes States rights in this field. Labor leaders want this provision repealed. Without it we could expect the Warren court to strike down every State right-to-work law in the country.

Twenty States to date have enacted right-to-work laws, eight of them with constitutional amendments adopted by referendums. If they are not desired, the people in the States who approved their enactment could bring about their repeal.

But the labor leader pressure is at the Federal level. They want Federal action for wholesale nullification of the States rights these laws represent, and the individual liberty they protect.

I regard the right to work as I do the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. States have the right, the responsibility, and the duty to protect this fundamental freedom. This is my position and I shall fight for it.

I am the only Member now in the Senate who voted against the Wagner Labor Act of 1939, giving special privileges to labor unions and therefore to their leaders. I voted for the Taft-Hartley Act and against the Truman veto. I supported strong labor legislation last year, and I will do it again.

When irresponsible labor leaders have the power virtually to shut down the country, our national security is imperiled. When they have the power to stop production and wages, our economy is impaired. When they have the power to force wage increases without increased production, they create inflation.

You have been good enough to mention my 40 years in public service. I thank you again. I shall try to merit your confidence in the future. In conclusion, let me say that I think our system of government is being menaced by three subverting trends which must be stopped.

These trends are: (1) Increasing Federal paternalism with fiscal deterioration; (2) increasing usurpation of power by the Warren court; and (3) increasing arrogance of labor leaders in their influence over Federal authorities. Reverse these, and I have no doubt about our strength to meet any foreign challenge.

I pledge my unrelenting effort in this direction. But these changes will not come in an attitude of tolerance. There will be no status quo. There will be change.

It is up to all who believe in our system to fight for progress without destroying the fundamental principles of our Government which in a short space of time have made us the greatest Nation in all the world.

Twentieth Anniversiary of the Ukrainian Congress Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 30, 1960

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, this fall 2½ million Americans of Ukrainian descent will be celebrating the 20th anniversary of the founding of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America. I am honored and pleased to extend my wholehearted and sincere congratulations to this nationwide organization with its dedicated principles and ideals.

In the early twenties the political as well as cultural and economic independence of the Ukraine was subject to Red Russian imperialism. As one of the captive nations which was forced into the spurious federation called the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Ukraine's large population of non-Russian people was submerged under the despotic and dictatorial rule of the Bolsheviks. Her

land, rich with coal and manganese, became important captive resources under the Red flag.

By means of a psychopolitical and propagandistic machine during the cold war the Communist leaders have manufactured a myth of unity which they say encompasses their country. Only the reality of truth, with which the Ukrainian Congress Committee attempts to imbue the hearts and minds of these captive people, will smash this legend.

For 20 years the Ukrainian Congress has sought in a purely educational manner to lead their organization in the task of serving these Ukrainian people who do not wish to be a part of the U.S.S.R. It is to this strong and faithful group which reflects the thoughts and sentiments of its followers that I express my appreciation for its heroic objectives toward independence, freedom and justice for the 42 million people that embody the Ukraine as well as for its efforts toward the liberation of all the non-Russian nations of the U.S.S.R.

Congressman Robison's Answers to Questions Concerning Our Chief International and Domestic Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 30, 1960

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, recently, the Binghamton Sun-Bulletin asked me to respond to three questions dealing with our major international and domestic problems and the proper role of the Federal Government in meeting them.

I was pleased to have the opportunity to set forth my views on these questions; and, under unanimous consent, I include the questions and my answers to them at this point in my remarks:

Question No. 1. What should the United States do to promote world peace and to cope with the Soviet Union?

Answer. The goal of world peace is not a partisan one. It is an ambition common to Republican and Democratic Parties alike, and to their respective presidential and vice presidential candidates. Both parties must share in the blame for mistakes of the past, and neither party nor set of candidates has a monopoly on the successful formula we must now adopt in order to cope with the challenges of the Communist conspiracy and promote world peace, meanwhile safeguarding our own independence and preserving our individual freedoms.

The road ahead, regardless of which pathway the electorate decides to take November 8, will be a rough and rocky one. During the forthcoming campaign much will be said about our need for strong and wise leaders to guide us down that road. We will have urgent need of such leadership, but—while I have my own firm belief as to which set of candidates, by virtue of maturity, experience, and demonstrated abilities, is the better qualified—leadership alone is not enough.

I say this because I believe that in a society such as ours, under a government such as we have developed, the key to our survival lies with the individual citizen. Indeed, the individual is the core of our political, religious, and economic thought; and much of the reason for the success of our way of life, historically speaking, has been that America up to now has been blessed with an abundance of rugged individuals.

It has taken the average American citizen of today a long time, too dangerously long in fact, to become aware of the full nature of the Communist challenge. I believe that such an awareness has now, however, broken through what has recently seemed to be a shell of national apathy. We may not like what we see, but at last we are seeing it. We have begun to realize that the time has come, to say it in slang, "to put up or shut up"—to reject the false goal of mere survival, born in an almost unreasoning fear of the horrors of nuclear warfare, in favor of firmly resolving to win the cold war on all its various battlefronts.

It is difficult, in the space permitted me, to be very specific as to what this means we must do. However, I am sure we can all agree that it means we must remain physically strong. We must have a force at arms sufficient to deter our potential enemies—who have the advantage of striking the first blow—from launching an all-out nuclear war against us and, at the same time, sufficient to win such brush-fire wars as they are bound to set, probing for our weaknesses, and seeking to test our resolution. I believe we have such a force at the present time, but it will require constant vigilance to maintain. On this effort we dare not put a price tag of dollars and cents. Nevertheless, facing an enemy that also plots our economic ruin, there is the price tag of self-discipline in deciding how much should be spent and on what.

Next, we must steadfastly stand by our friends, and use every political, economic, and psychological tactic to see that the liberating spirit in the captive people of the nations conquered by communism does not perish. In the long run these people may be our best secret weapon. We must also, regardless of the unpopularity of the sacrifice it entails, continue our programs of military and economic aid to the underdeveloped nations of the world who have helped us hold the line against the spreading Communist stain. In doing so, however, we must abandon once and for all any thought that we can buy friendship, and be as realistic and hardheaded as is our enemy in his counter-effort in these fields.

We have done well to contain communism so far, but we must recognize that a holding policy, under which we are the inert, defensive target for political, economic, and psychological warfare is not enough. To recapture the initiative, as we need to do, we must believe more strongly in ourselves and in our system and sell it throughout the world with the same contagious enthusiasm with which the Communists sell their false philosophy, at the same time making it unmistakably clear that we are intent on preserving our own freedoms.

Here at home, we must also seek to grow spiritually and materially. With all the more obvious moral defects in our society today that others have noted, there may be promise of spiritual growth in the fact that Americans will voluntarily spend an estimated billion dollars this year for new churches. Only countless similar individual decisions can end America's seeming moral decline. Promoting economic growth is an equally complex matter, but here again I do not believe it can be forced by governmental edict nor planned by all wise bureaucrats. Growth will come, as it always has, under a government that holds fast to our historic foundations and provides a climate in which individual enterprises can flourish. The roots of such growth are deep and lasting, unlike those that might ensue from the adoption of economic techniques alien to our system. To those who decry our preoccupation with private comfort, let me remind them that there are dangers in the opposite extreme for it was Hermann Goering who scorned private comfort in the name of national greatness and demanded the production of guns instead of butter. In short, then, we can win this economic horserace with Russia, but not if we try to ride their horse.

Now, to do all of these things is a very large order. It will require the best leadership we can find, and the best that is in each of us. Such leadership must, first of all, believe not in the magic of centralized big government, but in the initiative, vitality, energy, and resourcefulness of our people. Unless the leadership we choose is of that type, it cannot help us cope with Soviet Russia nor help us find the way to world peace.

Question No. 2. What are the major problems on the domestic scene, within the United States, and what should the Federal Government do about them during the next several years

Answer. The list of major domestic problems facing the American citizen is as long as the issues involved are complex. Overshadowing our future decisions as to the Federal Government's proper role in seeking solutions to those problems is our growing awareness that our free society is engaged in a death struggle with communism. Senator KENNEDY, himself, has asked whether a nation organized and governed such as ours can endure in competition with the single-minded advance of the Communist system.

I wholeheartedly believe that it can. America has the brains, the wealth, and the weapons to develop a new strategy for victory. Chief among those weapons is the dynamic force of individual freedom. Using freedom as a tool—prying loose the creative energies of free men and women—America achieved her independence, conquered her wilderness, rounded out her early, natural frontiers, preserved the Union, and successfully completed the transition of her society from an agricultural one to an industrial colossus that is the envy of the world.

Now we seek to prove once again, to ourselves and a watching world, that the forces of free capitalism can continue to build and rebuild a better way of life for its citizens without departing from its historic foundations. That task will be the more difficult because we have, for a generation, been steadily dulling the cutting edge of that tool of freedom. The seeming necessity for doing so was born in a great depression that rocked our faith in ourselves, and was carried forward under the continuing pressures or threat of armed conflict. Under such motivations, we have seen the cash expenditures of the Federal Government, during the same period, rise from a yearly average of $4 billion to the present $80 billion, and our national debt, including future commitments, skyrocket to an unprecedented three-quarters of a trillion dollars.

The congressional justification for such expenditures and the piling of debt upon debt has been that, in the supercharged atmosphere in which we live, only a strong, omipotent, though benevolent, central government can successfully direct the economic affairs of its citizens and care for them in sickness and in health. The proponents of this philosophy, both yesterday and today, have been impatient with the slow processes of individual, community, and State initiative. Where they have thought such traditional areas of concern to be delinquent in action, they have moved in, often oblivious of constitutional limitations and of the ultimate cost of hazardous new areas of Federal interest.

A prime example of how badly this can sometimes work can be found in the so-

called farm problem, an industry now so enmeshed in government planning and control, and dependent upon politically motivated votes, that it seems forever doomed to permanent domination by government. I have sponsored and urged legislation to end this continuing insanity once and for all and to restore agriculture to the free marketplace, with Federal aid restricted to rural redevelopment and protection against radical marketing changes.

Acceptance by Congress of the false notion that Washington can give us something for nothing has also seen our share of world trade diminish as inflation has priced our products out of world markets, our gold reserves drop to a 20-year low, and certain American manufacturers move their plants—lock, stock, and barrel—to foreign lands. Only a continuing firm hand on Federal spending, making us live within our means, can halt the dangerous trends of which these examples serve as handwriting on the wall.

Economic growth is a proper national goal; I think we can and must do better here. Again, Congress has a part to play if it would only recognize the urgent need to ease restrictive taxation that has dulled business and individual initiative, liberalize unrealistic depreciation rates that have eroded needed industrial capital, and equalize the powers of big business and big labor so that they will not be pulling and hauling but pulling together in the national interest. While, like any other piece of machinery, our economy should not be forced to run at artificially high speeds, all parts thereof should function productively. Thus, there are pockets of chronic economic distress throughout our Nation which wise Federal action could help eradicate. I have sponsored or supported legislation, during my 3 congressional years, in all these fields.

Our remaining domestic problems lie mostly in the realm not of providing but of helping our people to provide themselves with the housing, the schools, the health care, and so on, that they need and want. It is vital, I believe, for the Federal Government to approach such needs only in such fashion for, if we remove from the people the responsibility for action we may find that we have, unwittingly, also robbed them of the vigor and faith in themselves that they must have to sustain them in what portends to be a long drawn-out struggle with communism.

The challenges we face, at home and abroad, are monumental in scope. They are unprecedented in our history. They call the American people—as did Abraham Lincoln in a time of peril a century ago—to "think anew and act anew." Yet, with the boundless evidence of the success of our system all about us, it would be utter folly, I think, to so yield either to pressures from abroad or to pressures engendered by our own domestic selfishness as to abandon our institutions and our heritage in a search for the illusory goal of what some are calling national greatness.

The ingredients for true national greatness cannot be found down some blind alley known only to the proponents of big government. They lie locked instead in millions of American hearts. All that is required for total victory is our own realization of that fact, and in the long run the stimulation of such an understanding may be our greatest domestic problem.

Question No. 3. What are the principal problems of this congressional district, with particular reference to problems about which the Federal Government might or should do something, and what should the Federal Government do?

Answer. The principal problems that face the residents of the 37th Congressional District are, in essence, the same as those faced by the other 180 million Americans. All of us—like all of them—are primarily concerned with achieving a better life for ourselves and for our children in a world of peace.

During my 3 years of congressional service I have often been asked by people unfamiliar with our district what sort of a district it is. By this they mean, do we have a predominately agricultural community, an industrial one, a rural or an urban community, or what? It has been my observation, and thus my reply to such questions, that one would have to search far and wide to find another congressional district more typical of America, a better cross-section or composite picture of America and her people in this era, than the 37th district of New York.

Of course, we are more fortunate than some of our southern neighbors in that, to us, racial intolerance is more of a personal than a community problem. We are also more fortunate, even with our spotty areas of economic distress, than the people of the coal fields of Pennsylvania or the textile towns of New England who have not had the diversification of industry and the blend of agriculture and business that have blessed us with an unusually stable economy.

Nevertheless, those of our people who have retired on fixed incomes and our housewives and their breadwinning husbands have become fully aware of the fact that during the last 5 years of the Roosevelt administration their take-home dollars lost 25 cents in purchasing power, and another 28 cents during the Truman years. By way of contrast, I believe they are also aware of the fact that, under President Eisenhower, the bite of inflation—the most insidious and cruel form of taxation ever devised—has been held to only 5 cents. This then is an area where, if it holds to the basic principles of fiscal responsibility, the Federal Government has a vital role to play in helping our individual citizens achieve their goal of economic security. My voting record on this issue speaks for itself.

Similarly, a fiscally responsible government will help our farmers and our small business men and women—the keystone of our national economy—to survive and prosper, and our industries, such as Endicott-Johnson, Remington Rand, and Corning Glass, to meet the growing problems posed by the import of shoes, typewriters, and glassware produced in countries where labor standards are far below our own. I also believe that, regardless of the importance of reciprocal world trade, our Federal Government must reappraise our trade policies without delay and formulate realistic safeguards to protect the jobs of those who work for local industries such as I have named. I have introduced legislation calling for such action in this Congress; if reelected, I will work for its early consideration.

Speaking of local industries, one of the most important—Ansco and its affiliate, Ozalid—has had to compete in this most competitive of worlds under the damper of Federal ownership and control. The history of this matter is as long as the issues involved are complex. But, under my sponsorship, legislation to restore Ansco and Ozalid to the American free enterprise system came closer to congressional approval this year than ever before in 8 years of trying. If reelected, I am pledged to an all-out effort to conclude that fight, the success of which could be of untold benefit to the future economy of our community.

Our people—like all Americans—want and need protection from other things than inflation and cheap imports. For years now, residents of our cities and towns along the Susquehanna have lived under the threat of disastrous floods because the comprehensive Federal plan for their flood protection has been stalled by opposing engineering viewpoints and local opposition. I successfully sponsored one of the largest authorizations ever voted by Congress for a new survey aimed at resolving these differences. Now, funds must be provided to start this work and get our flood-protection effort off dead center; if reelected, I pledge to work to that end.

Finally, of course, our people, like all Americans, have need of such things as new homes, more and better schools, highways, and hospitals. Our cities have slum areas that need rebuilding and they need help, as do our smaller communities, in providing their citizens with an adequate supply of pure water and with modern sanitary facilities. We have a few communities, such as Hornell and, perhaps, Elmira, that have suffered long-term economic distress and need to attract new industries. We also have some people trying to farm land on which they cannot subsist, and who need to be trained for other work.

In meeting all these and comparable needs, our Federal Government has a role, and a very important local role, to play. Space does not permit of specifics, but it is my belief that that role is not to plan and do for people, taking responsibilities from them, but to leave with the people the traditional American responsibility for helping themselves and their neighbors, while at the same time encouraging and stimulating their own creative abilities.

There are clear material limits to what the Federal Government can do. There are less clear philosophical and constitutional limits to what the Federal Government should not do. This means we must seek to establish a table of priorities for our local needs. The pressures of the impatient, combined with the intensifying pressures of the cold war, will make living with those priorities a difficult task. Nevertheless, upon how well we succeed may depend the survival of the American way of life, which has only begun to achieve its promise of abundance, and the blessing of individual freedom without which that way of life has no meaning.

U.S. Senator Spessard Holland, Florida, Wins Great Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 30, 1960

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the city of Long Beach, Calif., recently held a civic testimonial in honor of Florida's Senator, SPESSARD HOLLAND. Does it strike you as unusual that the people of California honor the distinguished U.S. Senator from Florida?

Not at all, they have good cause, as do the people of Florida and all America.

Mr. Speaker, I could not have this Congress close without again calling to the attention of my colleagues a significant and important contribution by Florida's distinguished and able senior Senator, the Honorable SPESSARD HOLLAND. His participation and leadership in a momentous task has culminated in the recent ruling of the Supreme Court of the United States applying the Submerged Lands Act to the State of Florida. This ruling confirms Florida's claim to all property rights to a distance of 3 marine leagues in the Gulf of Mexico, off the mainland of Florida.

Not only has Senator HOLLAND had to carry on his many duties in the U.S. Senate, but since 1951, he has had a primary responsibility in the tidelands dispute, which affects many of our States. His most recent effort was joining in the argument before the U.S. Supreme Court. The case was so brilliantly and convincingly presented that it resulted in a 6-to-1 decision. In this matter, Senator HOLLAND has gone far beyond his duty as a U.S. Senator. He has fought for and supported, in and out of the Senate, a cause born of deep conviction—the cause of States rights. In these days of claims of centralized government, it is especially noteworthy that in a case of this magnitude, the U.S. Supreme Court has recognized the proprietory authority of the State of Florida over these marine lands. The Court's decision not only settled oil and gas rights, but the citizens' rights in construction, extension of lands, conservation, use of sand and gravel, and other still unknown and potential rights in the use of the sea.

The affirmation of these rights are important in themselves. There is, however, greater pride for all of us in recognizing and realizing that this long, persistent effort on the part of Florida's great Senator took courage, determination, ability, and qualities of leadership which can only be claimed by few Americans. U.S. Senator SPESSARD HOLLAND, senior Senator from Florida, has carved a rightful place in American history with this most recent success in a long and distinguished public career.

After this session, Senator HOLLAND will return to Florida for this year's presidential campaign. Nothing less than a hero's welcome should be awaiting him.

Minshall Again Brings Traveling Office to District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 30, 1960

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, for the past 6 years, it has been my privilege and honor to represent the people of the 23d Congressional District of Ohio in the Congress of the United States. As a Representative of this outstanding district, I have considered it my duty not only to be well informed of the opinions of the people through personal contact and use of opinion polls, but also to be of the greatest possible service to persons having problems dealing with Federal agencies and departments. To help accomplish this, I maintain on a year-round basis a congressional office in room 525 of the Federal Building in downtown Cleveland where I can meet with people personally during trips back to the district when my official duties permit. While I am in Washington, a competent staff is in charge of the Cleveland office.

A further service to the people of the 23d District is my Washington Report which, in newsletter form, periodically presents a concise accounting of events and opinions on Capitol Hill.

During my service in the Congress, I have considered it of primary importance to be present at the Capitol whenever Congress is in session in order to participate in committee work and to vote on important legislation. This year with Congress in nearly continuous session, I have not been able with intervening committee work to return to Cleveland as much as I should have liked. Therefore, in accordance with the practice I initiated 6 years ago, I am bringing a traveling office to the various communities in the 23d District. This method of meeting with the public has been tremendously popular and it gives me a wonderful opportunity to discuss and learn at firsthand the opinions and individual needs of the people.

With the understanding that Congress will not be in session during the early part of October, I will again this year from October 3 through October 7 follow the same procedure and have a series of conference meetings so that every resident of this suburban district can conveniently meet with me. These are not group meetings but office conferences for the individual which will enable them to discuss their views and problems personally. No appointments are necessary and I urge individuals to meet with me on the date and at the place most convenient. Every resident of the 23d District is cordially invited to talk over problems of national concern, to discuss personal problems they might have with the Federal Government, or just to chat and get better acquainted. The knowledge thus obtained will better enable me to represent the residents of the 23d District in the Congress of the United States.

I am most appreciative of the fine cooperation of the many officials who have made these meeting places available as an aid in rendering this public service.

Following is the schedule for these office conferences:

Lakewood: Lakewood City Hall, 12650 Detroit Avenue, Monday, October 3, 2 to 4:30.

Westlake, Bay Village: Westlake City Hall, 27216 Hilliard Boulevard, Monday, October 3, 6:30 to 9.

Parma Heights, Brook Park, Middleburg Heights, Linndale, Cuyahoga Heights, Brooklyn Heights: Parma Heights Townhall, 6281 Pearl Road, Tuesday, October 4, 2 to 4:30.

North Royalton, Strongsville, Broadview Heights, Seven Hills, Brecksville, Independence: North Royalton Townhall, 13834 Ridge Road, Tuesday, October 4, 6:30 to 9.

Berea, Olmsted Township, Olmsted Falls, North Olmsted, West View, Riveredge Township: Berea City Hall, 47 East Bridge Street, Wednesday, October 5, 2 to 4:30.

Rocky River, Fairview Park, Parkview: Rocky River City Hall, 21012 Hilliard Boulevard, Wednesday, October 5, 6:30 to 9.

Shaker Heights, University Heights, Pepper Pike, Hunting Valley, Beachwood: Shaker Heights City Hall, 3400 Lee Road, Thursday, October 6, 2 to 4:30.

Maple Heights, Bedford, Bedford Heights, Walton Hills, Valley View: Maple Heights City Hall, 5353 Lee Road, Thursday, October 6, 6:30 to 9.

Solon, Glenwillow, Oakwood, Bentleyville, Chagrin Falls: Solon Village Hall, 6315 SOM Center Road, Friday, October 7, 2 to 4:30.

Warrensville Heights, Orange, North Randall, Moreland Hills, Woodmere, Warrensville Township: Warrensville Heights City Hall, 4700 Warrensville Center Road, Friday, October 7, 6:30 to 9.

The Status of Public and Private Debts, 1952 to 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 30, 1960

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, sometime ago I requested the Library of Congress to prepare for me a statement showing the status of public and private debts by years 1952–59.

I wanted to know the status for the Federal Government, the State governments, and the local governments—county, city, township, school district, special district, and also private debts by corporations, individuals, farm, and nonfarm.

I have recently received a statement from the Library of Congress which, under leave to extend my remarks, I am placing in the RECORD. This statement—all figures in millions—shows that the Federal debt has increased from $259,105 in 1952 to $284,706 in 1959 or about 10 percent. Actually, the public debt as of the present time is about $289,000.

The State governments' debt has increased from $6,874 to $17,102 or about 149 percent.

The local governments' indebtedness rose from $23,226 to $45,235 or about 95 percent.

The total public debt, therefore, has increased from $289,205 to $347,043 or about 20 percent.

In the meantime the total private debt has increased from $337,100 to $601,700 or about 78 percent and is broken down as follows:

Corporation, $201,600 to $335,800 or about 67 percent.

Farm, $15,200 to $23,700 or about 56 percent.

Nonfarm, $120,400 to $242,100 or about 101 percent.

The grand total of public and private indebtedness has increased from $626,

305 to $948,743 or about 51 percent during this 8-year period.

I have noted also from a speech which Budget Director Stans made to the New Jersey State Chamber of Commerce on June 20, 1960, that:

Now the $290 billion of public debt, plus over $350 billion of future obligations for past services, plus nearly $100 billion of c.o.d.'s adds to the almost unbelievable total of nearly $750 billion.

Mr. Stans also states that:

We should realize that when you look only at the budget for one fiscal year at a time, you see merely the visible part of the iceberg; the dangerous part is below the surface.

I am making this information available to the public at this time in order that they may have a more complete look at the fiscal picture than is revealed in a statement that the budget for a particular fiscal year shows a surplus of $1.1 billion or some relatively small amount.

The statement from the Library of Congress follows:

Gross public and private debt, 1952–59

[In millions]

	1952	1953	1954	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959
Public debt:								
Federal Government	$259,105	$266,071	$271,260	$274,374	$272,751	$270,527	$276,343	$284,706
State governments:								
Alabama	51	73	73	69	88	112	134	151
Alaska	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	0	0	3
Arizona	3	3	3	4	6	11	13	13
Arkansas	131	125	123	118	113	109	110	105
California	522	660	795	860	943	1,159	1,455	1,712
Colorado	19	17	21	23	35	49	58	67
Connecticut	238	265	386	361	478	567	797	873
Delaware	93	110	125	128	139	147	184	206
Florida	71	72	78	86	164	212	214	251
Georgia	21	70	193	233	236	264	297	308
Hawaii	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	65	100	124	172
Idaho	1	1	1	2	5	6	6	7
Illinois	381	359	332	306	699	646	687	667
Indiana	18	24	317	321	321	339	355	407
Iowa	33	31	29	29	29	30	31	56
Kansas	6	5	5	173	176	177	197	202
Kentucky	10	10	19	69	70	75	146	148
Louisiana	215	212	216	229	318	321	332	363
Maine	27	64	118	117	119	119	117	123
Maryland	205	234	267	462	493	529	545	559
Massachusetts	402	423	496	824	934	1,024	1,163	1,332
Michigan	351	358	455	518	532	628	624	729
Minnesota	121	114	96	84	84	81	133	178
Mississippi	76	81	76	91	86	89	124	153
Missouri	26	19	15	11	8	30	83	87
Montana	45	46	45	43	46	42	44	46
Nebraska	1	3	3	3	8	9	10	10
Nevada	1	1	1	1	3	3	3	3
New Hampshire	26	31	42	42	56	62	79	86
New Jersey	325	432	678	857	884	896	873	874
New Mexico	30	28	28	28	48	47	51	51
New York	909	964	1,176	1,535	1,939	1,974	2,075	2,434
North Carolina	275	264	299	297	282	281	290	273
North Dakota	35	31	26	22	19	14	20	15
Ohio	165	479	473	497	591	708	852	898
Oklahoma	127	129	124	194	207	205	202	201
Oregon	117	135	184	178	172	182	219	283
Pennsylvania	895	953	1,178	1,203	1,245	1,202	1,214	1,279
Rhode Island	52	55	58	65	66	76	107	102
South Carolina	125	142	170	208	218	231	268	268
South Dakota	21	14	9	(2)	(2)	(2)	5	5
Tennessee	100	111	122	116	110	114	118	119
Texas	81	93	110	139	213	221	286	316
Utah	1	2	3	5	4	4	6	10
Vermont	5	4	5	8	7	16	27	38
Virginia	37	35	33	112	180	180	188	187
Washington	226	245	293	233	232	272	348	394
West Virginia	246	256	289	281	275	268	284	295
Wisconsin	5	5	5	5	6	7	15	39
Wyoming	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Total, State governments	6,874	7,824	9,600	11,198	12,955	13,838	15,518	17,102
Local governments:								
County	2,018	2,454	2,710	3,140	3,528	3,665	4,256	(3)
City	12,659	13,558	14,587	15,973	16,937	18,833	20,355	(3)
Township	619	656	801	860	974	1,089	1,014	(3)
School district	3,806	4,712	5,923	7,259	8,586	9,229	10,085	(3)
Special district	4,125	4,577	5,310	5,837	6,246	6,179	6,946	(3)
Total, local governments	23,226	25,957	29,331	33,069	36,271	38,995	42,656	45,235
Total, public debt	289,205	296,852	310,191	318,641	321,977	323,360	334,517	347,043
Private debt:								
Corporations	201,600	211,500	216,300	251,000	274,900	293,400	305,000	335,800
Individuals and unincorporated enterprises:								
Farm	15,200	16,800	17,600	18,800	19,500	20,300	23,300	23,700
Nonfarm	120,400	133,400	147,800	171,600	188,100	201,200	217,100	242,100
Total, individuals and unincorporated enterprises	135,500	150,100	165,400	190,400	207,700	221,500	240,400	265,800
Total, private debt	337,100	361,600	381,700	441,300	482,600	514,900	545,300	601,700
Total, public and private debt	626,305	658,452	691,891	759,941	804,577	838,260	879,817	$948,743

NOTE.—Debt of the Federal, State, and local governments are for the end of the governmental fiscal year. For the Federal Government, most school districts, and all except 4 of the States the fiscal year ends on June 30. With respect to other governments a considerable proportion end their fiscal years on Dec. 31. Private debt is for the end of each calendar year.

[1] Not reported for these years.
[2] Less than $500,000.
[3] Breakdown is not yet available. Total figure given is for June 30, 1959.

Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, "Compendium of State Government Finances," annual issues for the years 1952 through 1957; "Summary of State Government Finances in 1959," series G–SF–59–No. 1, Apr. 3, 1960, p. 17; "Summary of Governmental Finances," issues for 1954, 1957, and 1958. Office of Business Economics, Survey of Current Business, May issues for 1957, 1959, and 1960. U.S. Treasury Department, Annual Report of the Secretary of the Treasury on the State of the Finances, fiscal year 1959, p. 447.

Maureen McBreen, Legislative Reference Service, Economics Division, June 21, 1960.

Let's Stop Selling America Short

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 30, 1960

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I wonder how many Members of this distinguished body are getting just a little sick and tired of those who are running down our great country.

Just the other day, I heard one of them say his "criticism is not borne out of disloyalty, but out of deep loyalty." To me, that sounds just a bit like the old quote about the licking in the woodshed—"this hurts me more than it does you." But when I was a boy I was always under the impression that I was the one who got hurt.

And today I think the country may be getting hurt worse than those who are trying to make capital by calling us a second-rate power.

Our national wealth is the greatest in the world. We have built more than 9 million new homes since World War II. Only a very few years ago the demand seemed insatiable.

Poverty and unemployment are close to a minimum. Our economy continues steady, neither pushing upward into an inflationary spiral, nor slipping into recession. And above everything else, we are at peace.

We are spending 2½ times more for research and development than we did 7 years ago. Nearly 12 million more persons are covered by social security than when the Democrats lost the White House; and medical care of the aged is at long last getting the attention it deserves.

We are carrying a tremendous burden for defense and foreign aid in addition to the cost of domestic programs. Under President Eisenhower's administration and its leaders in Congress we managed to produce a $1.1 billion surplus last year.

We could probably have had a surplus of $4.2 billion this fiscal year, had the opposition paid any responsible attention to the recommendations of President Eisenhower.

But to become more specific about our relative standing, economically, with our principal competitor, Soviet Russia, I suggest we consider these figures recently compiled by the Library of Congress. They compare prices in terms of hours worked in Moscow and New York. They show how much better off American workers are than Russian workers.

Items	Hours worked, Moscow, Russia	Hours worked, New York, U.S.A.	Russians work times more
Suit clothes	275 hours	23 hours	11 times.
Lady's dress (rayon)	73½ hours	4 hours 36 minutes	16 times.
Cotton shirt	15 hours	56 minutes	16 times.
Shoes (man)	61 hours	7 hours	8½ times.
Nylon hose	8 hours	37 minutes	13 times.
Beef (pound)	1 hour 22 minutes	21 minutes	4 times.
Butter (pound)	3 hours 4 minutes	20½ minutes	9 times.
Milk (quart)	31 minutes	7½ minutes	4 times.
Cigarettes (20)	27 minutes	7 minutes	4 times.

Now it will be said by some that Russia is at least ahead of us in the space race, even though at this moment we have 14 satellites in orbit as against 3 belonging to Russia. It is true that they can send a larger thrust into orbit, but our satellites have a notable advantage in the more subtle areas of instrumentation. We are better able to record, transmit and receive information about the universe.

We were the first to send a navigational satellite aloft; a satellite whose radio signals can provide "fixes" for ships in bad weather.

We were the first with a satellite whose successors will give this country early warning of missile launchings.

We were the first to recover a capsule from orbit in space.

The giant, 100-foot balloon, Echo I, is the largest object in space, and is the first communication satellite. It has already relayed recorded messages, "live" telephone calls and even radioed pictures.

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration expects soon to fire an American astronaut into space in the nose cone of a rocket, and have a man put into orbit and returned to earth. The moon will be the target of an instrument package.

And the most outstanding aspect of these technological breakthroughs is that they came from a nation whose research and development was begun in 1953—less than 8 years ago—in a Republican administration.

We have the word of President Eisenhower that we have become the strongest military power on earth. We have, for example, operational Atlas missiles ready for launching and capable of hitting targets anywhere in the world.

We have 2,000 long-range strategic bombers, deployed at bases around the globe, each of which can deliver more destructive power than has been spent in all the wars in history.

We have 16 wings of tactical aircraft, each with nuclear capability deployed on strategically located advance bases around the world.

We have missiles with large warheads, difficult to detect through defense radar.

We have Matador and Mace operational tactical missiles, each packing more explosive power than was expended against all Axis military targets in Europe during World War II.

We have intermediate range ballistic missiles, such as the Thor, which is stationed in allied forces' hands in the United Kingdom.

We have cruisers and submarines equipped with the Regulus I, a surface-to-surface weapon.

We have aircraft carriers, several of which are deployed around the periphery of the Soviet Union, able to launch more aircraft than the entire Soviet heavy bomber force and capable of nuclear strikes into almost any area of the Communist bloc.

We have naval alert forces which include 9 antisubmarine carriers, 14 cruisers, 269 destroyers, 115 submarines, 81 minecraft, and more than 7,000 operational aircraft.

We have 14 Army divisions, 8 overseas and 6 in this country, all at the highest state of readiness in peacetime history.

We have three divisions of marines, always prepared to move quickly and effectively into trouble spots anywhere in the world.

In addition, we have as part of our defense program another very important factor often overlooked by its critics: The collective military strength of our friends and allies abroad, embracing, in effect, the armed forces of all free nations. Our allies provide the United States with some 250 strategically located bases, contribute to our collective defense more than 5 million men, more than 25,000 planes, half of which are jet powered, and some 2,200 combat vessels which help insure free world control of the seas.

All this adds up to a military force overwhelmingly superior to anything the Russians can put together.

Nowhere in this admittedly brief account do I find anything but justification for pride in our country. I say, let us stop selling America short.

Representative Ken Hechler Answers an Attack on His Record in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KEN HECHLER
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 30, 1960

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on August 24, was printed a letter I received from Clyde B. Pinson, one of my constituents. The following is the text of my response to Mr. Pinson, which was in his hands 24 hours prior to publication; he gave his letter to the press and it was published long before I received the letter in the mail.

AUGUST 25, 1960.

Mr. CLYDE B. PINSON,
Huntington, W. Va.

DEAR MR. PINSON: I was glad to receive your good letter of August 22. I love nothing better than a good, clean campaign on the issues, which will help the voters to make an intelligent choice on November 8.

Your letter furnishes a wonderful springboard for me to discuss some of the basic issues, and I welcome the opportunity.

Reelection really doesn't obsess me, as you say. You know, there are lots of very excit-

ing things I enjoy doing. I love to write, I love to teach, I love to work with young people, and I love any occupation which enables me to help my fellow human beings and bring out their best qualities. I love serving in Congress because it give me an opportunity to help people, to help our State, our Nation, and the whole free world. It is a challenging job, and I love challenges—which is why I accept yours with such relish.

Your letter expresses a concern about my inactivity and failure to "do something." I am glad, however, that my activities are sufficiently important to attract your attention and impel you to write me. As I stated, when your letter appeared in the press, long before I had a chance to receive it, I doubt whether you want a serious answer, or you would not have given it to the press beforehand in the way you did. Nevertheless, I am going to furnish a serious answer in the hope that it will illuminate the issues involved in this campaign.

The Democratic Party has a majority in the House and Senate, which enabled the Congress to pass an area redevelopment bill which would have helped many of our communities with chronic unemployment. West Virginia's one Republican representative, the Honorable ARCH A. MOORE, JR., voted for that bill, yet your Republican President vetoed it and thus helped choke off a program to do something for West Virginia. I voted for that bill, and stood up on the floor of the House of Representatives and invited President Eisenhower to visit West Virginia and see how the area redevelopment bill would have helped our State. The President didn't accept that invitation, although he has had plenty of time to visit India, Turkey, and many other foreign lands. In 1958, President Eisenhower, Vice President NIXON and many members of the Republican Cabinet came to West Virginia to make campaign speeches because our State had two Senators up for election, but despite our pleas they haven't been back to help us or even to inspect West Virginia. I'll be willing to bet you that they'll be back just before the election in 1960 to make some more campaign speeches, but when the chips were down and the President had a good bill in front of him to sign, he vetoed it.

I also fought and voted for a bill which Congress passed to control water pollution of our streams in West Virginia and all over the Nation. Cleaning up our streams and preserving our God-given natural resources was such a worthwhile program—particularly for our Ohio Valley area—that I was astonished when the President opposed this bill and torpedoed it with another veto. This measure would have "done something" for West Virginia, for all American communities and for lovers of the great outdoors everywhere. The spirit of a great Republican President, Theodore Roosevelt, must have wept at this shoddy spectacle.

I must also point out that I voted for bills to create a Coal Research and Development Commission and to preserve the markets for our small tobacco farmers. Yet the President vetoed both these bills in 1959 and stalled action on them for 1 full year, until Congress returned them in revised form to him in 1960.

Your letter said that I had done nothing to "feed our hungry children." President Eisenhower denied in his press conference on April 27, 1960, that there were any hungry children. In response to a question by Mrs. May Craig of the Portland Press-Herald, he answered: "Well, Mrs. Craig, you say they haven't been helped. I thought they had." Nonetheless, I believe that there are needy children in West Virginia, and these are the things I have done to help them:

I introduced a bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to provide a balanced diet for needy persons from funds already at hand. The Department of Agriculture under Ezra Taft Benson fought this bill and deterred its passage.

I wrote, phoned and pleaded with the Department of Agriculture to add a few more staple items to the diet being provided needy persons. I was rebuffed at every turn.

I supported a food stamp plan to reduce our huge crop surpluses by helping to feed the needy. Secretary Benson has refused to use this law a Democratic Congress put on the books to do something for the needy.

I obtained a special order of $10,000 worth of vitamins for needy children in West Virginia from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare after the State health department advised that the poor diet these children were forced to eat had lowered their resistance to flu and other diseases last winter.

Now may I move to your charge that I consistently opposed defense expenditures, while urging better preparedness in the space and missile fields. My position on this is well known, and I am sure you are aware of it. I made it clear at the beginning of this session of Congress that because I believe education is our real first line of defense, I would not vote for any defense expenditures which placed emphasis on muscles and material, without regard for the brainpower and trained hands that could put these things to the best use in our struggle to stay strong and to resist Communist pressures until some form of aid to education had been passed. Although this principle was thoroughly publicized and my position was made crystal clear, I heard no objection from you.

Now as for the request that I "do something" during these last days of the postconvention session of Congress. I am sure that you know—if you keep abreast of national affairs through news media—that this session was called for the sole purpose of handling some "must" legislation, including several appropriations bills. These are major bills affecting the entire Nation. A new bill coming up would require committee hearings and debates for which there simply is not sufficient time prior to the adjournment of this session. I am proud of my record of "doing something" for our district and State. Among the proudest of these accomplishments, I list:

Helped put through two appropriations totaling $19,750 for a survey to determine the feasibility of a dam and reservoir on Twelve Pole Creek in Wayne County. This project had been inactive for 28 years since its inception due to lack of funds.

Called conferences and repeatedly put pressure on Navy and General Services Administration officials to free the idle Sylvania plant for sale to an industrial employer. This plant is now available for sale to private industry.

Helped to get money to complete planning for the vast Belleville lock and dam project on the Ohio River in Wood County.

Assisted area industries with efforts to get defense contracts and spoke out in the House on 18 occasions in favor of more defense contracts and facilities for West Virginia.

Made countless appearances before the Civil Aeronautics Board and its officials in support of better airline service for the State and in appearances before congressional committees urged more funds for the Tri-State Airport.

Worked to convince the Eisenhower administration of the need for mandatory controls on importation of residual fuel oil, which had cut into West Virginia coal markets. These controls were imposed in March 1959, and tightened in 1960.

Urged the U.S. Tariff Commission on several occasions to restrict imports of glass, ceramics, steel and fabrics which were cutting production of West Virginia plants and throwing workers out of their jobs.

Introduced and worked to have enacted a bill to transfer a Federal lock and dam on the Big Sandy River to Fort Gay, W. Va., to improve its water supply and open the way to industrial development.

Repeatedly wrote, called and conferred in person with industrialists interested in locating facilities in West Virginia.

But if I did nothing else in Congress, I am proudest of all of the opportunity and inspiration I have tried to afford young people in West Virginia by enabling them to come to the Capitol to work for periods of a week or longer in my office and learn about our democratic processes. More than 60 high school and college students—45 of them winners in the nonpartisan "Week in Washington" contest which I conduct for high school juniors—have come from West Virginia to work in my office, and the door is always open to these energetic, idealistic young volunteers.

I am enclosing a summary of 101 points which represent my aims and achievements. I also am enclosing a detailed summary of legislation which I have introduced, and a history of what has become of these bills, indicating the number which have become law.

I would be glad to send these two documents to any person you suggest, or to anyone who writes in to ask for them.

In your letter, you state: "I shall be happy to consult with you on the problems we face." That statement particularly interested me, because I am always glad to consult with constituents like yourself who have constructive ideas.

However, in all the time I have represented you in the Congress, you have never communicated with me about issues or problems.

A thorough check of my files reveals that you have never once written me a letter, telephoned me, visited my office in either Huntington or Washington, nor made one single suggestion to consult with me on the problems we face. Our only communication is a response to a telegram I sent you on the occasion of your primary victory.

Since you have been in Washington recently having your picture taken with President Eisenhower, Mr. NIXON and others, I can only assume that you considered none of the problems you mention of sufficient importance to call my office about them, nor to contact me in Huntington, although our offices there are not too far apart.

If you have problems, however, I want to assure you that I shall be happy to consult with you and to attempt to give you the same intensive degree of personal service which I am proud of giving every voter in my district who comes to me for assistance, regardless of political affiliation.

Do you have problems? Why not come by my office and you may be sure my all-West Virginia staff will give you a cordial welcome and we can discuss action in the best interests of our State.

I will be happy to confer with you at any time or place, provided it does not interfere with a rollcall vote in the House of Representatives, for I am very proud of my voting attendance record (95 percent in 1959, 100 percent in 1960) which is the best mark of any West Virginia Congressman and far above the average of all Members of Congress.

As I told 23,000 Huntington citizens in a letter asking them to make my campaign one financed by contributions from the people, "I will conduct a clean and constructive campaign on my record, never either privately or publicly attacking my opponent, but setting forth the details of my performance and platform." I intend to abide by that pledge.

You seem to be disturbed by the fact that frequent stories appear in the newspapers concerning my activities. I believe very deeply that every person in public life must

be an educator, bringing facts to the attention of the people so they can make firm judgments. I also believe that a very important part of a Congressman's job is to keep the people informed on what he is doing. That is why I have worked hard to inform the people about the background of issues confronting the Congress, what goes on behind the scenes of Congress, and what your Congressman is doing or planning to do. In public life, one cannot retire behind a cloak of false modesty, but one must continue to give the people the whole truth about matters which affect their interests. So far as "gimmicks" are concerned, I guess everybody has to get a good, hearty laugh every now and then, and I get just as much of a kick out of this as the next fellow.

I have had your letter printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with an invitation to my colleagues in Congress and constituents to comment on what they feel I have accomplished in my first term. After all, a fellow can't judge this with total objectivity himself, and I'd prefer to have others indicate what they think from their own viewpoint. From time to time, I'll send you copies of these letters.

We are living in very troubled times in the world. From Cuba to the Congo, the world is in ferment. If there is one thing we need in our own country it is a new moral leadership. We also need a rededication to basic ideals and principles, a redefinition of our national purpose, and a determination on the part of the people that we will lift our sights above the petty, backbiting, and selfish jealousies which sap our Nation's moral strength. We must be builders, and not wreckers. We must purify our hearts if we would strengthen our muscles.

Your servant in Congress,

KEN HECHLER.

The American States Must Not Allow Cuba To Become a Soviet Satellite

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 30, 1960

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, anyone so naive as to think the present Cuban Government is not today virtually dominated by communism must, following what took place at San Jose during the past 2 weeks, have any possible doubts removed.

The conduct of Cuban Foreign Minister Raul Roa throughout those proceedings was the conduct of a Communist or of a Communist puppet. His illtempered ravings when his Communist connections were unfolded exposed the depth of his enmeshment in the Communist conspiracy.

It is an old trick of the Communists to hide guilt by violent and unfounded accusations. That technique is a dead giveaway of guilt. It is a pattern that is uniformly followed whenever the Communists take over. It has happened scores of times in different countries in recent years. Look at South Korea, invaded from the north under Russian direction, to avoid invasion by the unarmed, impoverished, peace-loving South Koreans. Look at the "yakking" that has been coming out of Red China for years—about the threat of attack by imperialists. And remember the Soviets that try to keep their own people whipped into a frenzy by the threatened aggression by imperialists. And all this despite the fact that is undeniable, that the only imperialists in the world today are Communists—and they know it.

Now we see the same technique being employed in the Communists' newest satellite, the Caribbean island of Cuba. Is it any wonder, therefore, that at the recent meeting of the Organizaion of American States at San José, Cuban spokesmen there were repeating the old discredited Communist bromide of aggression by the imperialists? The American States are not so dumb as to believe any such tripe. It is a part of a plan handed to the Cuban puppets by their Communist masters, and they know it. Just how dumb do those Communist agents think the people of South, Central and North America are, to expect them to be fooled by such hokum?

The alertness and intelligence of 19 members of the OAS was demonstrated by the adoption at the end of their historic meeting of a resolution condemning the Red Chinese and Russian interference with the freedom, peace and tranquility of the Western Hemisphere. By a vote of 19 to 0, the Cuban involvement in communism was established and recognized by the jury of States that heard the evidence, and then returned their verdict.

OAS FINDING SHOULD BE FOLLOWED BY POSITIVE STEPS

It is to be hoped that the OAS finding will be followed by such positive actions as may be necessary to stamp out this threat to the peace of this hemisphere. If a break in diplomatic relations with the Dominican Republic is a good thing, then surely similar action should be taken at once against Cuba. And the economic boycott should be included, plus whatever other measures as may be needed in effectively dealing with this Communist maneuver. Halfway measures will not suffice.

The Communist beachhead in Cuba got going with the secret arrival there more than a year ago of one Vadim Kotchergin from Soviet Russia, who at first spent about 20 days in Cuba. There he conferred with Raul Castro, the well-known Communist, who is today head of the Cuban military. Kotchergin, a colonel in the Soviet secret service, was in Cuba to give secret instructions in Communist tactics.

Kotchergin called for indoctrination of the Cuban Army and Navy in Marxist-Lenin theories. And that order has been carried out.

He directed that a propaganda campaign be launched at the Cuban people that would depict the Communist image of the United States to them as an enemy, and to be strongly anti-American in character. He required that the line play up the counter revolutionary interests, and to talk and talk and talk about the "Yankee imperialists," intent on aggression.

Colonel Kotchergin instructed Raul to immediately begin preparing the Cuban people for confiscation of all foreign-owned property. And that order was carried out.

The adroit Soviet colonel also called for a preparation of public opinion in Cuba for the taking over of the U.S. naval base at Guantanamo, maintained there by virtue of a treaty. And accordingly the Castro government has been busy lying about aggressive appearances within their territorial waters of American naval craft. Just something to feed the Cuban people in an attempt to poison their minds and deceive them.

He also called for a virtual end to all trade with the United States, and a devaluation of the Cuban peso. That order has been complied with.

Kotchergin expressed particular interest in the Oriente Province. He obtained topographical maps and detailed information of the province. He was particularly interested in the coast of Oriente Province, and this was provided.

Reliable information is available to the effect that Russian agents are making, and have for more than a year been making, frequent trips to what is known as Cienega de Zapata, and that three highways are being constructed to that part of the coast of Cuba. Reinforcing steel and cement in considerable quantity has been reported moving to that area. A Soviet submarine base? A Soviet missile base? They wasted no time. While some in the west were equivocating and trying to imagine the Castros were interested in doing something for the Cuban people, the Soviets and Red Chinese were moving in—and gradually taking over.

RUSSIANS AND CHINESE MOVED IN

When Secretary of State Herter recently informed the Organization of American States that Cuba is marked by Communist conspirators as a base for operations in an all-out attempt to communize other American states, he supported his charge by evidence of a well camouflaged school located in the Oriente Mountains, being used to train students in the art of Communist infiltration, sabotage, and other Communist devices.

Before Kotchergin left Cuba he agreed secretly with Castro to send a Russian military mission, to come secretly to Cuba.

The Russian's visit to Cuba has been followed by many forms of loans, trades, and economic aid. And it has been followed by Red Chinese emissaries who have become very active in the Communists' newest satellite. Large numbers of Chinese have poured in, disguised, many reportedly for military use if and when needed.

The Communists are taking no chances. They want to be prepared to stamp out any outbreak of resistence inside Cuba.

One of the Russian officers who since Kotchergin's departure has spent a lot of time in Cuba is a Colonel Truesoff, a

Soviet Air Force colonel. He has been in close contact with Raul Castro, spending a lot of time in and out of San Antonio (Cuba) Air Base.

Kotchergin's visit to Cuba has been followed by many other forms of aid, much of which has been disclosed in the press.

All freedom of press has been wiped out. Most of the newspapers and other news media have been confiscated, Communist style, their editors either in prison or now refugees. Religion is under heavy attack, and it is only a matter of time until the Soviets decide how to handle that sanctuary for freedom among the Christian people of Cuba.

The University of Havana is today under Communist control, following the taking over by force exerted by leftist students and faculty, undoubtedly acting under Communist direction.

A vast propaganda machine has been at work in Cuba, carrying out orders from Peiping and Moscow. Not confined to Cuba, this propaganda is being spread throughout Latin America.

With total disregard for the freedom and welfare of the Cuban people, the Communist-dominated government is pressing for complete control over the life and activity of every citizen. Who today would dare stand on a street corner in Havana and criticize one of the Castros? Or, for that matter, Red China or Soviet Russia?

MONROE DOCTRINE MUST BE ENFORCED

President Eisenhower, very wisely in my opinion, has said that the Monroe Doctrine must be observed by these foreign imperialists. That doctrine, proclaimed by President James Monroe on December 2, 1823, directed that any attempt by European powers "to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere" would be considered "dangerous to our peace and safety."

The Eisenhower reminder, issued on last July 9, should be implemented by whatever is necessary. I have no doubt that with the understanding our sister republics in this hemisphere must now have of what is taking place in Cuba, the United States will have substantial backing among the American States who are concerned, just as we are, about this Communist grab.

Nikita Khrushchev's missile-rattling threats should be treated as rubbish and condemned for what it is—an imperialist threat and a gratuitous act of attempted intimidation. The "Big Bluffer" wanted to make headlines in the Communist press in Havana, and he succeeded.

WE SHOULD MAKE TRUTH KNOWN TO CUBAN PEOPLE

Mr. Speaker, if this attack on the freedom of the Cuban people by the imperialists of Peiping and Moscow is impressing the people of Cuba, then it is our duty, as I see it, to retaliate by making the truth known to the Cuban people. A lot has been done, but even more needs to be done. The rank and file of Cuban people are good people, and they love freedom. The freedom-loving American States, spearheaded by this country, should saturate the air waves of that Caribbean island with messages of warning and truth. Every time Castro or Guevara tells them a lie—and that is very often—we should send a message of truth three times.

The Cuban people must be made to realize that any legitimate objectives of the revolution is being thwarted by evil-minded men, intent upon using the revolution to disguise their determination to destroy their freedom and their liberty. It is but a snare and a delusion. These warnings can be documented and their truth undeniably established.

The Cuban people must be made to realize that the best friends they can have are the American people. They should be reminded that for more than half a century Cubans and Americans have fought and died together against common enemies, and that for these many decades we have lived in friendship and mutual respect for each other.

They should be reminded that only 60 years ago Americans fought and died with Cubans in the cause of Cuban independence. And they should be reminded that "imperialist" America promptly yielded to Cuba its complete independence following the Spanish-American War.

And, above everything, they should be reminded, day after day, that everything they have fought for in the past is now at stake, with the Communist noose being gradually tightened about their necks. These are simple facts, and they should be brought home, repeatedly, to the Cuban people.

We must fight this menace with every weapon at our command, because a Communist beachhead in Cuba is a threat to the freedom of all the Americas.

The Cubans should be reminded, time and again, of the fate that awaits them. And all of the peoples of the Americas should be reminded.

Let us hope, Mr. Speaker, that the President and the Congress will act boldly and resolutely in this time of peril, when freedom in this hemisphere is under real attack. And I feel certain that the American people will applaud and support every action, drastic though it may be, which will effectively cope with this bold attempt by these Communist warlords to impose tyranny and slavery upon our island neighbors who are being hoodwinked by men whose motives are to use them or destroy them.

The Ukrainians Continue To Fight the Soviets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 30, 1960

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, when Mr. Khrushchev is in the United States attending the United Nations General Assembly session, we should again remind ourselves of the unquenchable thirst for freedom on the part of the people behind the Iron Curtain and particularly many of the nationality groups within the Soviet Union. The torch of freedom is held high by the various nationality organizations in America. One particularly active group is the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., representing some 2½ million Americans of Ukrainian descent.

During Mr. Khrushchev's stay in Manhattain, I know that the Ukrainian Congress and similar groups, while respecting the safety of Mr. Khrushchev's person, will, nevertheless, make it unquestionably clear to him that the Ukrainians and other nationalities within the Soviet Union do not accept dictatorial domination.

Know Your Congressman—Legislative Record, Duties, and Responsibilities of Congressman Gordon L. McDonough

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 30, 1960

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, it is the desire of all Members of Congress to become intimately and personally acquainted with all of the people they represent and likewise for the people they represent to know their Congressman.

This is not always possible as much as the Congressman and the people he represents try to become personally acquainted.

However, through correspondence, the press, radio, TV, and other means of communication, all Congressmen try to inform their people what they are doing; the bills they sponsor, introduce, and promote; the committees they are assigned to; the major issues they have voted for; and their duties and responsibilities.

In order to properly inform the people of the 15th District, I am submitting the following summary of my legislative record, my duties and responsibilities, and some of the important legislation I have promoted:

MAJOR ISSUES CONGRESSMAN M'DONOUGH HAS SUPPORTED AND VOTED FOR

The McDonough record speaks for itself. But the record of achievement in legislation initiated by him is but a small part of the total record of accomplishment built by the consistent and vigorous efforts of the Congressman from the 15th District in behalf of his constituency.

He has supported legislation to establish a strong adequate national and civilian defense to meet any enemy attack.

He has urged legislation to outlaw the Communist Party in the United States and to combat communism both within the United States and abroad.

He stands firmly opposed to the admission of Red China to the United Nations.

He has consistently supported new and improved veterans' hospitals and necessary increases in pensions for service and nonservice-connected veterans and war widows and dependents.

He has supported lower downpayments on new homes and liberal loans for alterations and repairs of existing homes, and for slum clearance under housing legislation.

He has supported increased social security payments that would provide adequate pensions to our senior citizens, and legislation to provide health and medical aid for our needy senior citizens.

He believes in a sound fiscal policy which will hold inflation in check and at the same time promote stable economic growth in the United States and maintain a maximum level of employment.

He has supported civil rights legislation to eliminate discrimination because of race, creed, or color in education, voting rights, and employment.

McDONOUGH believes in economy in Government through elimination of waste, extravagance, and duplication of services. He also believes in providing maximum service to our citizens for every dollar spent by Government.

He believes in tax reduction, if such reduction can be achieved while we at the same time maintain our national defense at the high level necessary and meet the technological challenge of the Soviet Union in the field of scientific achievement.

LEGISLATIVE RECORD OF CONGRESSMAN GORDON L. M'DONOUGH

The record of achievement attained during his term of service to the people of the 15th Congressional District is outstanding. It is a record of action rather than words—of accomplishment rather than promises. It is the result of his consistent efforts to act and work in the best interest of all the people in his district as well as for the Nation.

During the eight complete Congresses in which McDONOUGH has served, he has introduced the following major bills which have resulted in ultimate action and public law.

Now let's have a look at the McDonough record.

California ownership of tidelands: A bill to establish the title of the States to tidelands areas was introduced by McDONOUGH in the 79th Congress. His fight to establish California's ownership of tideland property which is so important to the citizens of our State culminated in enactment of Public Law 31, 83d Congress, which recognizes California's ownership of tideland property.

Los Angeles post office expansion: A bill for the expansion and remodeling of the terminal annex post office was introduced by McDONOUGH in the 80th Congress. The improvement and extension of facilities at terminal annex which included an additional floor on the building was necessary as this post office handles the bulk of ingoing and outgoing mail for the Los Angeles area, and the tremendous population increase in the Los Angeles area since World War II resulted in a corresponding increase in the mail load handled at terminal annex. The expansion and remodeling of terminal annex has been completed as a result of Public Law 238, 81st Congress, and efficient mail service in the Los Angeles area has been maintained.

Federal buildings for Los Angeles: Congressman McDONOUGH introduced a bill in the 80th Congress for the construction of a new customhouse and Federal office building to meet the increased need in the Los Angeles metropolitan area, and to afford greater service and convenience to the public. Congressional action providing approval of this building was completed July 1956, and construction on the new Los Angeles customhouse and Federal office building will soon be under way.

Los Angeles harbor improvements: Los Angeles Harbor is one of the largest harbors in the United States, and with constantly increasing commerce, facilities for the loading and unloading of vessels must be expanded with harbor channels extended and enlarged to provide more space for vessels and to assure adequate channels for larger vessels to make port at Los Angeles.

Congressman McDONOUGH introduced bills to improve the east basin of Los Angeles Harbor by dredging and enlarging, and to improve the west basin including the removal of a drawbridge, and these harbor improvements were authorized in Public Law 641, 84th Congress.

He also obtained reimbursement to the city of Los Angeles for funds which had been expended on the East Basin harbor improvement for necessary immediate work prior to the congressional authorization.

Air pollution control—smog: Recognizing the serious threat of smog to the health and welfare of every citizen of Los Angeles, McDONOUGH introduced a bill in the 84th Congress to provide for research by the Federal Government into the causes of air pollution, its control and prevention.

The Federal program for research on air pollution now in progress under the direction of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare was inaugurated with enactment of Public Law 159, 84th Congress.

Marina Del Rey project: The McDonough bill introduced in the 83d Congress provided for authorization of the Marina Del Rey small craft harbor, a project urgently needed to supply a base for the U.S. Coast Guard Air-Sea Rescue Unit, and which also will provide additional small-craft facilities and a useful recreation area. Authorization for this project was included in Public Law 780, 83d Congress. Congressman McDONOUGH's vigorous efforts also obtained the following appropriations for the Marina Del Rey project: $25,000, Public Law 163, 84th Congress; $355,000, Public Law 641, 84th Congress.

Repeal of taxes: Congressman McDONOUGH introduced legislation in the 80th Congress to repeal the excise tax on theater admissions. Partial repeal of the admission excise tax was enacted under Public Law 324 of the 83d Congress and Public Law 1010, 84th Congress.

Veterans: In the 79th Congress, McDONOUGH introduced a bill to extend national service life insurance for 5 additional years thereby assuring life-insurance benefits for all men in service which otherwise would have terminated. The extension of national service life insurance was established under Public Law 118, 79th Congress.

McDONOUGH introduced a bill in the 83d Congress to extend the 3-year presumption of service connection to veterans in all types of tuberculosis. This bill was designed to bring relief to many veterans with types of tuberculosis other than pulmonary, which were contracted as a result of service. The 3-year presumption of service connection was extended to veterans in all types of tuberculosis under Public Law 241, 83d Congress.

McDONOUGH introduced legislation in the 85th Congress to increase pensions for widows of Spanish-American War veterans. The increase in pension was effective under Public Law 425, 85th Congress.

Armed services: The McDonough bill introduced in the 82d Congress fixed the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps to assure full efficiency of the corps, and also gave the Commandant of the Marine Corps a place on the Joint Chiefs of Staff. This was accomplished with the enactment of Public Law 416, 82d Congress.

Air Force Academy: A bill to establish an Air Force Academy to provide the highly specialized training necessary to provide competent and efficient officers for the United States Air Force necessary for the defense of our Nation was introduced by McDONOUGH in the 81st Congress. The U.S. Air Force Academy, now located in Colorado, was authorized with enactment of Public Law 325, 83d Congress.

Post Graduate Naval Academy in California: The McDonough bill to establish an additional Naval Academy in California and his fight to improve and extend facilities for the technical training of officers for the U.S. Navy resulted in establishment of the Post Graduate Naval School at Monterey, Calif., December 23, 1951.

U.S. flag: McDONOUGH introduced House Joint Resolution 167 in the 80th Congress to assure that the flag of the United States always shall receive proper respect and be placed in its proper position by providing that no foreign or supranational flag shall be displayed in a superior position or in place of the flag of the United States.

This protection of the flag of the United States was established with enactment of Public Law 107, 83d Congress.

Scientific research: In the 85th Congress, McDONOUGH introduced a bill to establish the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration was established with the enactment of Public Law 568, 85th Congress.

In the 80th Congress, McDONOUGH introduced a bill to provide a research program to develop economical methods to convert sea water to fresh. This program is of vital importance to southern California, as a practical economical method which will convert sea water to fresh for industrial, agricultural, and domestic use, will help solve the all important problem of continuous adequate water supply to meet continuing needs of an increasing population and industry. This bill also provided for establishment of demonstration plants, one of which is scheduled for construction in southern California with construction beginning early in 1961.

The research program now in progress by the Federal Government to convert sea water to fresh was initiated under Public Law 448, 82d Congress.

McDONOUGH also introduced a bill in the 80th Congress to provide for Federal research into the causes and treatment of multiple sclerosis. This program was initiated under Public Law 835, 84th Congress.

Statehood for Hawaii: McDONOUGH introduced legislation in the 80th Congress to grant statehood to Hawaii. Hawaii became the 50th State in the Union with the enactment of Public Law 3 of the 86th Congress.

Automobile exhaust control: McDONOUGH introduced a bill in the 86th Congress to provide for the necessary research by the Surgeon General to establish the amounts of exhaust gases discharged by motor vehicles and their effect on human health to provide the basis for necessary Federal control to eliminate harmful exhaust from motor vehicles. Research was authorized under Public Law 493 of the 86th Congress.

Recognition of the American schoolteacher: A bill introduced in the 82d Congress by McDONOUGH provided for the issue of a special postage stamp honoring our American schoolteachers who receive so little recognition for the service they render to our Nation.

The special stamp honoring the American schoolteacher was issued July 1, 1957.

Equal rights: A bill introduced by McDONOUGH in the 82d Congress provided naturalized citizenship rights to all immigrants having the right to permanent residence in the United States, and provided quotas for

Asian and Pacific peoples. The provisions of this bill were included in Public Law 414, 82d Congress.

IMPORTANT DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF CONGRESSMAN GORDON L. M'DONOUGH

Banking and Currency Committee

McDONOUGH is a ranking member of the powerful and important Banking and Currency Committee which has jurisdiction over the Federal Reserve Board, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, the Export-Import Bank, the International Bank for Reconstruction, the International Finance Corporation, and all legislation concerning the financing and rehabilitation of homes, and military housing.

Housing Subcommittee

He is also a ranking member of the House Subcommittee on Housing which has made a specific and detailed study of the need for all types of housing throughout the United States, which includes multiple housing, individual homes, slum clearance, and rehabilitation, and reconstruction of blighted areas in the cities throughout the Nation.

Committee on Science and Astronautics

He is a ranking member of the Committee on Science and Astronautics which has the duty and responsibility to pioneer the study of interplanetary travel and communication, and outer space exploration. The efforts of this committee have resulted in the successful advances in the exploration of outer space and the establishment of its practical uses as typified by Tiros I, Pioneer V, Echo I, and others.

Joint Senate and House Committee on Defense Production

He is also a member of the Joint Senate and House Defense Production Committee, which has the responsibility of making a continuous study of the programs authorized by the Defense Production Act and of reviewing the progress achieved in the execution and administration of these programs for the defense of our Nation.

Voting record and attendance

With the multiple duties and responsibilities required by the foregoing committee assignments and congressional responsibilities, Congressman McDONOUGH has one of the best records for being present and voting on important and vital issues debated and voted upon in the House of Representatives.

He is also a member of the Inter-Parliamentary Union by appointment of the Speaker and approval of the House.

He was a U.S. delegate to the 46th Conference of the Interparliamentary Union, which was held in London in September 1957, and also a U.S. delegate to the 48th Conference of the Interparliamentary Union, which was held in Warsaw, Poland, in September of 1959. Some 700 delegates from 46 countries attended the Conferences.

Jewish Home for Convalescents To Honor Harry D. Cohen, Its President, on the Occasion of Its 45th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT ZELENKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 30, 1960

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, on December 11, 1960, at the Hotel Biltmore, in New York City, the Jewish Home for Convalescents will honor its president, Harry D. Cohen. It is important that the history and efforts of this institution be made a part of this RECORD, for it is indeed a classic example of an American community effort.

In reciting the story of the Jewish Home for Convalescents, located at Grand View on the Hudson, and in bringing it to the attention of a larger public than the community in New York City which it serves, I do so because its story is a reflection of life as we know it in America—where everyday people are concerned about the welfare of a neighbor on a true humanitarian level. It is a story of good will, opportunity, and achievement, and in its dissemination projects a plan which can benefit other communities. To paraphrase an early neighbor, best-seller author, Harry Golden, "Only in America" could this story be told.

It was back in 1915 in New York City that everyday people, struggling to support their families, felt the existing need to succor the needy who had become ill and although discharged from the hospital, had no place to recuperate. This socially creative urge expressed itself in the affiliation of some 15 small fraternal societies of the East Side which began a search for a suitable location for a rest home. They planned that on the basis of an annual $50 membership by enough affiliated organizations they could create the fund with which to initiate the enterprise. Neighborhood doctors Phillip Bereano and Julius Weiss, merchants Samuel Goldstein and Emanuel Bauman, restaurateur Solomon Hechter, and lawyer Morris D. Reiss were of the committee that brought back the report that the opportunity had been found. It presented itself when a roadhouse on the Hudson River, some distance from the city, had been foreclosed.

It would only need a deposit of $500 to sign the contract. The bank was impressed with the project and made the terms easy.

It had to be a labor of love—how else to explain the fact that East Side ladies like Jennie Leibowitz, Rose Markowitz, Betty Zucker, and Rose Cohen would go up to the building on the river to clean rooms, wash floors, and sew linens. How else to explain how Eddie Stein and Max Orenstein would solicit the merchants of the East Side for their overstocked weekend perishable foods and cart them up so that needy sick people could be nourished and restored to health. The efforts of this pioneer group soon became the talk of the organizational life of the community and Rumanian, Hungarian, and Russian organizations joined them. In time there were some 110 affiliations. Labor and industrial groups joined in too, for here was a group of people that was really being helpful to working people. The Masons, Odd Fellows, and Pythians and their ladies' affiliates added their support.

Soon the bank's mortgage was lifted and there was now room for expansion. Solaria were built, modern plumbing introduced, and an elevator installed. The department of social welfare under whose legal supervision the enterprise functioned looked upon the program with great approval—it rated it A–1 for plant and administration. The home had reached a point of development where it was referred to as "Grand View the Gem on the Hudson." What earned it that name was the scenic beauty of the Hudson River at that point. The patients were resting in chaises and lounging chairs on the large veranda overlooking the river, with sun, mountain air, and river breezes blending in a well balanced portion of a health restorative. Plentiful food, adequate rest, and medical supervision assured speedy recovery.

The patients represented a true cross section of the New York community, for this was intended to be a true nonsectarian philanthropic enterprise. They came from the city's municipal and private hospitals, from the social service agencies, and were recommended by the fraternal organizations and private physicians. They included people with backgrounds of 23 different nations, and of all creeds and colors. The project of the city people appealed to the neighbors of the surrounding villages and the nonsectarian character invited the interest of appellate division Justice Arthur Tompkins, Grand View Mayor James Bloor, and the Drs. Kline and Drs. Rooney, fathers and sons.

In its time the home attracted, in New York City, Dr. Julius Weiss, leather merchants Samuel Goldstein and Isaac Lippman, counselor Morris D. Reiss, and construction contractor Maurice Schwartz to become presidents of the organization. Samuel Koenig, the textile executive, made gifts of substantial improvements. Dr. O. L. Friedman, the noted expert on geriatrics, headed the medical board.

Harry D. Cohen, who has been the president during the past 10 years, was an immigrant who had been brought up in a home which had encouraged philanthropic interest. Together with his brothers he found his way into the company of the pioneers in 1915. He prospered as a dress manufacturer and Miami hotel owner. During all this time he has given this philanthropic interest the same devotion he has shown to his own business activities.

Recognition has come to the Jewish Home for Convalescents in its selection as one of the agencies of the Greater New York Fund to receive an allocation from its annual fund raising campaign.

An example of the home's progressive outlook is the seminar which is conducted annually when the social workers of the hospitals are taken for a day's outing to the institution where coupled with a recreation program, a period is devoted to the exchange of ideas of how the service can be put to a more efficient use by the public, and speakers from the department of hospitals and the department of social service are heard.

The home with its 100-bed capacity presently accepts guests for a period of 2 to 4 weeks and under the new program a stay will be of longer duration. It is

most gratifying that during its existence the home has brought important help to over 50,000 families in restoring people to health and enabling them to take again their positions as active members of the community.

During the past several years, with the discovery and use of new drugs and procedures, a new hospital approach to immediate patient ambulation reduced the need of convalescence of hospital patients in the home as the institution had been practicing it for many years.

Always progressive in outlook, the governing board studied the problem and learned how urgent was now the need for care for the aged sick. There was now an overwhelming demand for nursing care. It consulted with the department of social welfare and decided to request charter authority to extend its functions to include nursing care aid to supplement its dwindling convalescent care program.

The State's architects studied the building and plans were formulated to convert one wing of the building from a ward into a series of private rooms. They would experiment with the idea of a concentrated health and care program to serve the community's needs in one center instead of in separate institutions. The idea would encourage an ambulatory existence for all as part of the same health and restoration and maintenance program.

A new day was dawning. The opportunity to serve people would now be greater than ever and it would be measured by the readiness of the organization to adapt itself to the needs of the changing times, changes dictated by science, medical outlook, and community viewpoint. Since the care of the aged was a greater responsibility than the care of the fully ambulatory convalescent patient, the safety measures prescribed by law would be extensive and the home must be prepared to implement them.

And so now in its 45th year of existence, the institution is launching its programs to create these new facilities and is bringing itself to the attention of foundations, labor, industry, fraternal societies, and the legal and accounting professions to grant encouragement and material aid to a project which may serve as a pilot for implementation by other communities throughout the land, illustrating how a people's project, although unendowed, renders superb service.

Address by Hon. Francis E. Walter Before the Texas Department of the American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE M. KILGORE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 30, 1960

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Speaker, recently our colleague, the Honorable FRANCIS E. WALTER, addressed the Texas Department of the American Legion on the occasion of its annual convention in Dallas, Tex.

I obtained a copy of Mr. WALTER'S speech and read it with great interest. It is so timely and so cogent that I know many others will want to read it.

The speech follows:

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN FRANCIS E. WALTER, DEMOCRAT, OF PENNSYLVANIA, CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, TEXAS DEPARTMENT, THE AMERICAN LEGION, DALLAS, TEX., AUGUST 12, 1960

In glancing at the correspondence which I had with Commander Peters in response to the invitation to speak to this convention, I noticed that I addressed him as "Dear Comrade." To those of us in the Legion, this salutation has special significance, because as comrades in arms we have shared common dangers and as Legionnaires we are dedicated to common objectives.

How curious it is that even this salutation "Comrade" has been appropriated and perverted by our Communist enemy who debauches language itself.

Masquerading behind a facade of peace, they have brought to this planet total warfare, in which every weapon—military, psychological, diplomatic, political, and economic—is employed.

In the name of freedom they have imposed slavery on one-third of the people of this globe. Under the banner of humanitarianism they have brought more suffering and human misery than any force since the dawn of time. Under the guise of the more abundant life, they have reaped a harvest of death and destruction—and the end is not in sight.

That in the course of 50 years a devilish conspiracy should evolve and should gain such momentum as to encircle the globe with its tentacles, is sobering indeed. That this conspiracy should pretend to be Messianic in intent and purpose is diabolical, but comprehensible.

What is incomprehensible, however, is that notwithstanding their publicly announced program of world domination and the plain, obvious record which they write in human blood, even now they continue to dupe those whom they would destroy. Even those who have faced them in mortal combat on the field of battle are among the victims of their deceit.

A 5-year study made by a special committee selected by the Secretary of Defense, of the conduct of American prisoners of war during the Korean conflict reveals that one out of every three American prisoners of war collaborated with the Communists. Their collaboration included signing Communist appeals, participation in Communist propaganda broadcasts, and writing articles commending communism and life under communism. Seventy-five American prisoners of war committed themselves to become Communist spies against the United States. Almost two dozen agreed to relinquish all ties with this country and to remain in Communist China. The report of this special committee also reveals unprecedented breakdown in the morale of the American prisoners of war, including fraternization with the enemy.

I brought with me to this convention motion picture films depicting the Communist-led student riots during the recent hearings of the committee in San Francisco. That these riots were the results of Communist infiltration is clearly demonstrated, not only by the films, but by the factual material contained in a report made to our committee by the FBI, which we just published and which confirms beyond a shadow of a doubt that these student riots were inspired and directed by trained Communist agents. In the words of J. Edgar Hoover, "The Communist success in San Francisco in May 1960 proves that it can happen here."

How do we account for the sordid disclosures contained in the report on the conduct of American prisoners of war during the Korean conflict? What interpretation is to be made of the fact that a great many students here on American soil defied lawful authority and openly rioted against a duly constituted committee of the U.S. Congress?

In attempting to assess the reasons for the conduct of the Americans who betrayed their cause during the Korean conflict, the special committee appointed by the Secretary of Defense states:

"When plunged into a Communist indoctrination mill, the average American POW was under a serious handicap. Enemy political officers forced him to read Marxian literature. He was compelled to participate in debates. He had to tell what he knew about American politics and American history. And many times the Chinese or Korean instructors knew more about these subjects than he did. This brainstorming caught many American prisoners off guard. To most of them it came as a complete surprise and they were unprepared. Lectures, study groups, discussion groups, a blizzard of propaganda, and hurricanes of violent oratory were all a part of the enemy technique.

"Ignorance lay behind much of this trouble. A great many servicemen were teenagers. At home they had thought of politics as dry editorials or uninteresting speeches, dull as ditchwater. They were unprepared to give the commissars an argument.

"Some of the POW's—among them men who became defectors—had heard of communism only as a name. Many had never before heard of Karl Marx. And here was communism held up as the salvation of the world and Marx as mankind's benefactor.

"The committee heard evidence which revealed that many of the POW's knew too little about the United States and its ideals and traditions. So the Chinese indoctrinators had the advantage.

"The uninformed POW's were up against it. They couldn't answer arguments in favor of communism with arguments in favor of Americanism, because they knew very little about their America."

And what of the large number of students who engaged in the San Francisco riots? Shortly after the publication of the FBI report in which appears the identification of trained Communist agitators and the techniques which they employed in agitating to action the students who were engaged in the riots, a number of the rioting students joined in the issuance of a public statement denying any cognizance that they had been led by Communists.

The fact is that of those who participated in the riots in San Francisco not more than a dozen were Communists, but they were trained in the techniques of incitement to riot. They spent weeks in laying the groundwork. They knew they had material to work with which had been conditioned by clever propaganda. They were organized for action and at the proper time they pulled the switch and then lurked in the background while the students did their dirty work.

One month before the Communist-led student riots in San Francisco, we read of riots in Korea in which large numbers of students joined mobs led by Communist agitators to force the abdication of a stanch anti-Communist regime. At about the same time, an estimated 100,000 British young people jammed London's Trafalgar Square in a Communist-oriented "ban the bomb" rally.

Within days after the San Francisco student riots, we read of a Communist-led student rally of 20,000 in Bologna, Italy, to protest U.S. bases there, and we read of similar rioting student demonstrations in Indonesia, in Laos and Brazil. A few weeks later, the proposed visit of the President of the United States to Japan was canceled as a result of demonstrations by hundreds of thousands spearheaded by Communist-led students.

I surmise that in each of these riots—as in all Communist enterprises—only a handful of Communist agents who knew their business as agitators were directly responsible for the demonstrations of the multitudes.

This brings us to consideration of one of the dangerous fallacies which many people entertain in attempting to appraise and evaluate the threat of communism. It is often said by people of unquestioned patriotism and of good faith that we in the United States have little to fear from communism or from Communists because they are counted only in the thousands in a population of 180 million.

Time and time again the Committee on Un-American Activities has pointed out that the strength of the Communist movement in any of its ramifications bears little relationship to the number of its members; that instead, its strength and effectiveness are in direct ratio to the intensity of the efforts of the few who are trained and disciplined agents. It was with only a relative few that Lenin seized control of the government of Soviet Russia. Even today only 3 or 4 percent of the captive nations are Communists. It is estimated that of the 33 million Communists in the world today probably not more than 10 percent, some 3 million, are the hard-core trained zealots and yet these 3 million control absolutely 900 million and are masters of the world conspiracy which has tentacles on every continent of the globe. To attempt to appraise the strength of the Communist movement in terms of numbers, then, is like appraising the threat of cancer to the human body by comparing the size of the cancer with the rest of the body which is sound.

Permit me to dwell briefly on one phase of Communist subversion which is illustrated by the student riots which demonstrate the power of a few trained agents; namely, Communist infiltration of youth. At the outset, let me say that the overwhelming majority of the young people of this Nation are of unquestioned patriotism and dedication to all that is good and noble in our society. But this most not beguile us into feeling that the threat from Communist infiltrators among our youth is insignificant. The fact is that today the Communist conspiracy has given a top priority to infiltration and subversion of youth over the world and is right now concentrating on its program of subversion of the youth of the United States.

Here is a resolution passed last year at the national convention of the Communist Party:

"The national committee within a period of no more than 30 days after the adjournment of this convention, shall appoint a full-time director of youth affairs and establish a functioning national commission on youth affairs composed of youth and adult members. This commission, amongst other things, shall issue a regular national party youth bulletin. We urge that in a brief period of time those State committees which have not done so, shall establish political and organizational responsibility for youth affairs."

About a year ago the Committee on Un-American Activities began a series of hearings on Communist activities and propaganda among youth groups. Let me recite to you some of the factual material developed in these hearings.

Officials of the U.S. Bureau of Customs of the U.S. Treasury Department displayed to the committee samples of typical Communist propaganda periodicals published abroad and sent into the United States destined to student groups in schools and colleges. These officials testified that every school and college in the United States is directly or indirectly the recipient of some of these Communist propaganda publications. A spot check of Communist propaganda destined to schools and colleges in this country was made at New Orleans which is one of the lesser ports of entry of approximately 40 ports through which Communist propaganda is entering the country. The result of the spot check made at New Orleans showed that at least 300,000 packages of Communist propaganda destined to schools and colleges in the United States were processed there during a 12-month period and that from 5 to 15 separate publications were contained in each package.

This propaganda emanates from two major international Communist-controlled youth organizations, the World Federation of Democratic Youth, and the International Union of Students. These organizations publish at least 40 different periodicals which are disseminated regularly in schools and colleges over the world, including the United States. None of these publications bears labeling as Communist propaganda, however, in accordance with the requirements of the Foreign Agents Registration Act.

In the United States, tied in with each of these two major international Communist-controlled youth organizations are student groups which, wittingly or unwittingly, are conduits for Communist poison.

Running parallel with this Communist operation there are now infiltrating among youth groups, trained Communist agents under the immediate direction of Hyman Lumer, educational director of the Communist Party. These Communist agents, who are masters of perversion, attempt to turn the legitimate concern of our young people for peace, freedom, civil liberties and the whole area of humanitarianism into an acceptance of the Communist program which is served up under false labels. At the same time, with diabolical cleverness, these Communist agents arouse student groups into an attack against law enforcement agencies of the Government which are portrayed as instruments of oppression.

And let me say, that in this program of Communist subversion, the plain fact is that Communist agents are frequently assisted by the professors in the classrooms. And the American Association of University Professors has a consistent record of censorship against schools and colleges which fire Communist instructors.

"Wait * * * I refuse to accept an award from an organization I cannot respect." So said young Stephen Bayne recently in refusing an American Legion Post citizen award. Those of us who are constantly engaged in surveying the operations of the Communist conspiracy and the impact which this monolithic force has on all segments of our society were not shocked at this statement, because the brainwashing technique of the Communists has not been confined to prisoners of war or to the leading of students in rioting. I dare suggest that the statement by young Bayne is only a symptom of a disease which results from a deliberate infection.

We are today concerned about building more schoolrooms with better equipment for training our youth, but our curriculums are almost void of training regarding the machinations and operations of the world force which threatens freedom everywhere. I have frequently observed that the most appalling fact of our time is our own ignorance respecting the Communist menace and we are beginning to reap the harvest of our ignorance.

The American Legion is to be commended on its back-to-God program which emphasizes basic beliefs in the Divine and in spiritual values. But this is only a start. If the forces of freedom are to survive on this globe, we need desperately to inculcate in our youth the virtues of patriotism and a recognition simply that treason is wrong. We need to reemphasize the sources of strength of our own free society and then we need to present to our youth a critical study of communism, its ideology, philosophy and communism in action. This analytical study of communism which I suggest must not, of course, be confused with advocacy of Communist doctrine. In other words, I am suggesting study of communism in the same manner that the criminologist studies crime—not for the purpose of emulating the criminals, but in order to cope with crime.

The Committee on Un-American Activities and your own Americanism Commission of the Legion, as well as other non-governmental patriotic organizations are constantly publishing authoritative reports and other documentation which are excellent source material.

This program which I have outlined might well be a pilot project to be undertaken by the American Legion of Texas, to urge and assist every school and college in this State to equip its students to cope with the greatest challenge in history—a challenge which we shall either meet or perish.

Report From Washington by Stuyvesant Wainwright

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 30, 1960

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, this is my eighth annual report from Washington to the citizens of Long Island's First District. It is my custom each year to submit this report so that a record of the year's congressional business is available. At this point I ask your permission, Mr. Speaker, to address myself directly to the men and women of Suffolk and Nassau Counties.

The simplest breakdown is to divide this report into two parts: First, a legislative report on this 86th Congress, properly labeled the "Wait and See" Congress; the second part will deal with personal service rendered in the district and to the individual.

I. LEGISLATIVE SECTION

In 1958 at the conclusion of the 85th Congress I wrote in this report that the 85th had been a good session. That also was a Democrat-controlled Congress; but in 1957 and 1958 the Democrats cooperated in the national interest. It was not a major election year. Unfortunately, the same cannot be said for the present 86th Congress. With presidential elections in the offing, the Congress—with a

2-to-1 Democrat majority—turned from statesmanship to gamemanship.

The Democratic leadership—the Johnson-Rayburn team—failed to take action on issues which they were later to incorporate in their party platform. They rejected all major requests made by President Eisenhower in January. A few of these requests were: liberalization of the immigration laws, a farm bill designed to eliminate "giveaway," much needed additional Federal judgeships, new conservation proposals, a sound minimum wage, health insurance for the aged, a housing bill, school construction aid, a depressed area assistance bill, and proper financing of the interstate highway program. With legislation floundering, Congress recessed on July 2 for the hoopla of party conventions. Needed bills gave way to balloon flying, histrionics, and portly cheer leaders reviving the "old college spirit." After 10 days of hearts and flowers, 6 weeks of recess and NIXON and KENNEDY both nominated on the first ballot, Congress reassembled.

The Senate returned on August 8 and proceeded to accuse President Eisenhower of being "silly" to expect 21 measures to be passed in 4 weeks. Yet the President had been urging 18 of these measures for 2 years. The Senate then turned to discussing which presidential nominee had been absent from the Senate on more occasions. A crescendo came when 3 hours of oratory was delivered at the celebration of a Senator's 50th birthday. All this momentous drama played to a sellout audience in the galleries. Occasionally a young spectator would lean on the rail under the approving eye of a parent, displaying a "Vote for ——" banner until an usher would smilingly reprove this offender to senatorial dignity.

The House convened on August 15 and in an entire week worked the grand total of 1 hour and 12 minutes. The Democratic leader did not even bother to show up in Washington. The reason the House loafed through the week of August 15 is the fact that KENNEDY and JOHNSON in the Senate could not unify their party—66 Democrats, 34 Republicans—behind the Democratic Party platform.

The reason the Senate twiddled its thumbs in political quandary lay in ineffectual leadership. During the final 2 weeks of the rump session, Congress could only manage a compromise measure on care for the aged. Of the 21 needed bills advocated by the President, 4 were enacted—2 of these being the ratification of the Antarctica Treaty and the appropriation of funds for Latin American aid. Of the five "must" issues in the Democratic program, none was successful. The Kennedy bills on minimum wage and care for the aged were defeated by his own party.

The lesson here is that "wishful thinking" does not enact legislation. An old Democrat, Columnist Walter Lippmann, summed it up a few days ago as follows:

It is plain enough that the Democrats would be better off if there had been no August session of Congress. Senator JOHNSON and Speaker RAYBURN, who engineered it, made a miscalculation. They supposed that the session would help JOHNSON to win the presidential nomination and then to shine in August as the great legislative operator. In fact, with President Eisenhower in the White House, the odds were overwhelmingly against any Democratic success. For while the Democratic majority can say "No" to the President, and they did, a Republican President can say "No" to a Democratic majority, and he did. In our congressional system positive political achievement in a very short session against the will of the President is impossible.

And the lead article of the New York Times of August 31st:

The end of efforts for a minimum wage bill signaled the failure of the Democratic congressional leadership to pass any of the three major bills it had hoped for when the Senate reconvened August 8—a social security medical-care bill for the aged, a school construction measure, and a broadening of minimum wage legislation.

That the Democratic leaders failed, even with their immense majority, can mean only one thing. The Democratic majority refused to buy the Kennedy legislative proposals. Senator KENNEDY already feels that this congressional rejection of his program may cause his defeat in November.

II. PERSONAL SERVICE RENDERED TO THE DISTRICT AND TO THE INDIVIDUAL

Due to the incredible population growth of the First District—the 1960 census shows a count of approximately 900,000 persons—this personal service phase of congressional work has increased almost beyond the physical ability of my small staff and myself. It is virtually impossible for me to spend as much time on each case as I would like. However, you may be sure that I examine each individual problem to make certain that proper action is taken. I am especially proud of my professional, nonpolitical staff who have worked long, extra hours to serve you.

Of this year's several hundred military cases, over 94 percent have been successfully resolved. A great many people think this type of work is easy for a Congressman. It just is not so. For example, the Congressman can never himself authorize a "compassionate" reassignment or a "transfer." The decision is up to the military service. All the Representative can do is to make sure all the facts are reviewed. Unfortunately, it is often true that the armed services get bogged down in the tremendous volume of peacetime administration. Request forms might lie weeks in a sergeant's "in" box. A Congressman stimulates the machinery, cuts the redtape.

The annual review of our files reveals over 100 veterans cases completed, 267 passports and citizenship cases expedited, and 136 visa cases handled and processed. This is over three times the number received by the average legislator. The visa problems we receive are extremely complicated. One individual case, successful this year, was actually initiated early in 1955. It concerned a young man of Polish descent, born in this country. He was taken to Poland as a child by his parents and thus acquired dual citizenship. Having remained in Poland by necessity during the war, his chance to come to the United States finally arrived in 1955. Naturally, this was within his right as an American citizen. The problem arose when the Polish, Communist-controlled government, ignoring his American birth, claimed him as a national. After 5 years of negotiation with the State Department, our Embassy in Warsaw, the Immigration Service, and relatives in the United States, I am happy to report that the man and his family have arrived safely in this country. Incidentally the file of correspondence in this case is over 4 inches thick. It is also most gratifying to have been of assistance in having several foreign-born orphans admitted for adoption by couples in Suffolk and Nassau—five from Korea, two from Italy, two from Germany, and one each from Greece and Norway. Miss Alison Anderson of my staff has done unselfish service on all these cases.

Another service of this office is to fulfill requests for everything from a 400-foot Navy destroyer, the U.S.S. *Myles S. Fox*, for Port Jefferson's Fourth of July celebration, to simply a copy of a House resolution. Perhaps the bulkiest item in this category was the many flags that were flown at my request over the Capitol this Fourth of July. As a matter of interest, these flags will some day be collectors' items in that they were certified by the Architect of the Capitol as having been flown on the first day our 50-star flag became official. Since it is rather unlikely that there will be any additional States admitted to the Union for many years, or possibly ever, this event is historic. All flags so flown are paid for by the constituent.

As in past years, we have filled our entire quota to each of the service academies, including six at the Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point. Perhaps the most important aspect of the service function is to keep you, the citizen, informed. This report is but one method. Each week while Congress is in session I submit to our weekly newspapers a column for publication. I also broadcast a weekly radio program over a number of local stations. Both of these efforts are designed to give you a better insight into the workings of our Government. This is based on my fundamental belief that a Representative is responsible to the people. What he does or fails to do in Washington is in the last analysis your concern. Perhaps the high point of this year's radio programs was the interview with Captain Edward Beach, a distinguished friend and skipper of the Navy's atomic-powered submarine, *Triton*, immediately after the return from his epic, globe-encircling voyage.

Another important area of service is to provide you with proper postal facilities. In this instance it is necessary to repeat the fact that Suffolk and Nassau Counties are colossal "growth regions." I would estimate that an average of four

letters a day leave my office on some postal matter. This year we have been especially fortunate in acquiring a record of 15 new post offices—Babylon, Center Moriches, East Hampton, East Islip, East Patchogue, East Setauket, Massapequa, Montauk, Shelter Island, Greenport, Shirley, East Quogue, Farmingdale, Farmingville, and Shoreham. In addition, Amityville now has "foot delivery"; Cutchogue, Farmingdale, and Greenport all have new R.F.D. routes; Port Jefferson will have outgoing mail on Sunday; Sag Harbor has delivery service to North Haven; and Westhampton Beach has had city delivery approved. Each one of these items represents many man-hours in Washington, especially on the part of Mr. Ralph A. Patterson of my staff.

As in past years there have been several million dollars in Federal Housing Administration loans and Defense Department contracts awarded to Long Island. This fact in itself is a mark of economic growth and national prosperity. The Army Corps of Engineers reports over $5 million in construction in Suffolk alone. While on the subject of the engineers, I might mention that their work at Fire Island Inlet has not been satisfactory. Guided by the New York Park Commission, they failed to provide the type of inlet channel to give maximum safety. Several tragedies have occurred. All that they did was to put sand on the park commission beach. All my attempts to keep this from happening were to no avail. At the present time I have asked for a complete review of the project. This along with my beach erosion program must be constantly watched or else the State park commission will force deviation.

My personal economic prediction for Long Island, highly accurate over the past 8 years, is extremely optimistic for the next 6 months. Despite every effort of partisan Democratic politics to claim that we are in the midst of a depression, the proof contained in facts and figures continues to provide evidence of a healthy, expanding economy.

Finally, through our efforts the Federal Aviation Agency has agreed to locate a new $41 million air route traffic control center near MacArthur Airport in Islip, as well as to relocate a facility at Montauk.

As you know, I hold regular office hours in Huntington and Wainscott on alternate weekends to hear your problems and suggestions. In Washington I welcome your mail. An effective democracy must involve, by its very nature, the interest and opinions of all its member citizens. It is a pleasure and an honor to serve you in Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for this opportunity to address my annual report to the people of the First District of New York.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 31, 1960

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

Rev. Ronald A. Millian, minister, St. Mark's Methodist Church, Rockville, Md., offered the following prayer:

Holy and great God of all nations and peoples, we bow here in humble reverence before Thee, asking Thy divine blessing for the living of this day. Make us spiritually sensitive, that we may clearly discern Thy divine leading. Open our hearts, that we may accept Thy truth. Bestow upon us moral courage, that we fail not to speak and act for right and righteousness.

May we during this day be worthy of this great Nation founded upon Thy moral and spiritual laws. May there go from these legislative halls such acts and messages of love and understanding that all the world will be brought closer to a oneness of mind and unity of purpose. Help us to be true to the trust placed in us, that together we may build Thy kingdom on earth. This we ask in Thy holy name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, August 30, 1960, was dispensed with.

ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, we shall now have the usual morning hour.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there any morning business?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is in order: Reports of committees, the introduction of bills and joint resolutions, the submission of concurrent and other resolutions.

If there are no concurrent resolutions, morning business is closed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, before morning business closes, I wanted to be sure that the Senator from New York would be here.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I must confess that I could not hear what the Chair said shortly after the prayer. If we did get by the point for the introduction of bills, I would respectfully ask unanimous consent that that be vacated, so that we could go back to that point in the procedure, in case the Senator from New York had something that he wanted to offer.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I certainly will accept at face value the statement of the distinguished minority leader that he did not hear the Chair, because I myself have had a little trouble, on occasion, hearing what has transpired here.

But this is a rather unusual procedure. We have had demand after demand that the Senate adjourn, so that we would have a morning hour. The Senate did adjourn. We had a morning hour. It happened that I did hear the Chair call the order for the introduction of new business. No Senator appeared on the scene to introduce any new legislation or to tender any motions of any kind.

I do not wish to be captious about it. The minority leader, the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], has stated in his place that he did not hear the order for the introduction of new matter, under the rule.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair said the introduction of concurrent and other resolutions was in order at that stage.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New York will state it.

Mr. JAVITS. Is that as of right, or is it by unanimous consent?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. As a matter of right.

Mr. JAVITS. As a matter of right. No unanimous consent is required? Is that correct?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on today, August 31, 1960, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 2830) to amend the Library Services Act in order to extend for 5 years the authorization for appropriations, and for other purposes.

CONVENTION AND RECOMMENDATION CONCERNING WAGES, HOURS OF WORK ON BOARD SHIP, AND MANNING, ADOPTED BY INTERNATIONAL LABOR CONFERENCE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying papers,

was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

To the Senate of the United States:

I transmit herewith an authentic text of a convention (No. 109) concerning wages, hours of work on board ship, and manning, adopted by the International Labor Conference at its 41st (maritime) session, held at Geneva, on May 14, 1958, and request that the Senate give its advice and consent to ratification of the convention, exclusive of the part dealing with wages. In accordance with the obligations of the Government of the United States as a member of the International Labor Organization I transmit also, for such action as may be appropriate, an authentic text of a recommendation (No. 109) concerning wages, hours of work on board ship, and manning, also adopted at the 41st (maritime) session of the International Labor Conference.

In connection with consideration of the convention and recommendation, I am enclosing the report of the Acting Secretary of State with respect thereto, together with a copy of a letter from the Secretary of Labor to the Secretary of State, expressing the coordinated view of the interested departments and agencies of the executive branch of the Government with respect to the convention and recommendation.

Convention No. 109 provides that a member nation of the International Labor Organization may ratify the convention without ratifying that part of it dealing with minimum wage standards (pt. II of the convention). In accordance with the recommendation of the interested departments and agencies, I request that the Senate give its advice and consent to ratification of Convention No. 109, exclusive of part II, subject to the understanding regarding payment of overtime as set forth in the report of the Acting Secretary of State.

No legislation is recommended with regard to Convention No. 109 or recommendation No. 109 inasmuch as U.S. law and practice meet or exceed their terms.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 31, 1960.*

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 1545. An act to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so as to authorize elimination of a hearing in certain cases under section 408;

S. 1740. An act to amend section 202(b) of the Communications Act of 1934, in order to expand the Federal Communications Commission's regulatory authority under such section;

S. 3533. An act to protect farm and ranch operators making certain land use changes under the Great Plains conservation program against loss of acreage allotments; and

S. 3772. An act to amend certain provisions of the Investment Company Act of 1940, as amended.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, each with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 1764. An act to amend title 32, United States Code, to authorize the payment of certain claims against the National Guard; and

S. 1964. An act to amend the act requiring certain common carriers by railroad to make reports to the Interstate Commerce Commission with respect to certain accidents in order to clarify the requirements of such act.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 10341. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants-in-aid to universities, hospitals, laboratories, and other public or nonprofit institutions to strengthen their programs of research and research training in sciences related to health;

H.R. 10586. An act to enable the Oregon Short Line Railroad Co. to convey title to certain lands in Idaho to the Pocatello First Corp. of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints;

H.R. 11917. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands in Lassen County, Calif., to the city of Susanville, Calif.;

H.R. 12491. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands in the State of Wyoming to the county of Fremont, Wyo.;

H.R. 12503. An act to provide for the conveyance to Carolina Freight Carriers Corp., a corporation of the State of North Carolina, of certain lands and any improvements thereon located in Bibb County, Ga.;

H.R. 12622. An act to amend chapter 85 of title 28 of the United States Code relating to the jurisdiction of the U.S. district courts, and for other purposes;

H.R. 13062. An act to amend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended;

H.R. 13066. An act to amend section 4(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended;

H.R. 13067. An act to amend Public Law 86-619, an Act to make uniform provisions of law with respect to the terms of office of the members of certain regulatory agencies, approved July 12, 1960;

H.J. Res. 704. Joint resolution to remove copyright restrictions upon the musical composition "Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag," and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 723. Joint resolution extending an invitation to the Federation Aeronautique Internationale to hold the 1962 world sport parachuting championships at Orange, Mass.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 1066. An act to revise the boundaries and change the name of Fort Donelson National Military Park, and for other purposes;

S. 1214. An act to amend the Act of March 11, 1948 (62 Stat. 78), relating to the establishment of the De Soto National Memorial, in the State of Florida;

S. 1870. An act to provide for examination, licensing, and for regulation of practical nurses, and for practical nursing education in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

S. 2131. An act to amend the Motor Vehicle Safety Responsibility Act of the District of Columbia approved May 25, 1954, as amended;

S. 2575. An act to provide a health benefits program for certain retired employees of the Government;

S. 2633. An act to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, and for other purposes;

S. 3416. An act to provide for the restoration to the United States of amounts expended in the District of Columbia in carrying out the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act of 1958;

S. 3648. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia on behalf of the United States to transfer from the United States to the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency title to certain real property in said District;

S. 3727. An act to authorize the bonding of persons engaging in the home improvement business, and for other purposes;

S. 3834. An act to increase the maximum amount which may be borrowed by the District of Columbia for use in the construction and improvement of its sanitary and combined sewer systems, and for other purposes;

S. 3835. An act to authorize the District of Columbia Civil War Centennial Commission to plan and carry out in the District of Columbia civic programs in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the Civil War; to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of Defense to make certain property of the District and of the United States available for the use of such Commission; to authorize the said Commissioners to make certain regulations and permit certain uses to be made of public space, and for other purposes;

S. 3867. An act to exempt from taxation certain property of the National Guard Association of the United States in the District of Columbia;

H.R. 3313. An act to amend section 200 of the Soldiers and Sailors Civil Relief Act of 1940 to permit the establishment of certain facts by a declaration under penalty of perjury in lieu of an affidavit, and for other purposes;

H.R. 4826. An act for the relief of Arthur E. Collins;

H.R. 6597. An act to revise the boundaries of Dinosaur National Monument and provide an entrance road or roads thereto, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6871. An act to amend title III of the Public Health Service Act, to authorize project grants for graduate training in public health and for other purposes;

H.R. 7758. An act to improve the administration of oversea activities of the Government of the United States, and for other purposes;

H.R. 10921. An act to amend section 35 of chapter III of the Life Insurance Act for the District of Columbia; and

H.R. 12326. An act making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, certain agencies of

the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and certain study commissions, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 10586. An act to enable the Oregon Short Line Railroad Co. to convey title to certain lands in Idaho to the Pocatello First Corp. of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 11917. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands in Lassen County, Calif., to the city of Susanville, Calif.; and

H.R. 12491. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands in the State of Wyoming to the county of Fremont, Wyo.; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

H.R. 12503. An act to provide for the conveyance to Carolina Freight Carriers Corp., a corporation of the State of North Carolina, of certain lands and any improvements thereon located in Bibb County, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 13066. An act to amend section 4(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 13067. An act to amend Public Law 86-619, an act to make uniform provisions of law with respect to the terms of office of the members of certain regulatory agencies, approved July 12, 1960; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.J. Res. 704. Joint resolution to remove copyright restrictions upon the musical composition "Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag," and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13062. An act to amend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on Finance.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Acting Secretary, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, the appointment by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia of Neville Miller as a member of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

SHIPMENTS OF OIL TO CUBA—RESOLUTION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the board of directors of the American Hellenic Congress, relative to the shipments of oil to Cuba.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE AMERICAN HELLENIC CONGRESS—HON. DEAN ALFANGE OF NEW YORK, CHAIRMAN—SHIPMENTS OF OIL TO CUBA—GREEK SHIPOWNERS OF NEW YORK

Resolved, That the American Hellenic Congress commend Manuel E. Kulukundis, president of the Greek Shipowners New York Committee, and the Greek shipowners of the United States for their exemplary patriotism and loyalty to the cause of freedom in placing the great and aggregate interests of the West above personal consideration; and be it further

Resolved, That the American Hellenic Congress call upon all Greek shipowners the world over, irrespective of their citizenship and the flags they fly, to emulate the example of the Greek shipowners of the United States and to refrain from:

1. Shipping oil to Cuba directly on their own tankers, and

2. Generally from chartering their tankers to Russia since such charters would free Russia's own tankers for oil transportation to Cuba; and be it further

Resolved, That the officers of the American Hellenic Congress be authorized to implement this appeal in every feasible way to the end that the attempt by the Soviet Union and Cuba to establish a Communist-controlled base in the Western Hemisphere be defeated in the interest of freedom and democratic survival.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, without amendment:

H.R. 7810. An act to credit periods of internment during World War II to certain Federal employees of Japanese ancestry for purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act and the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 (Rept. No. 1936);

H.R. 8424. An act to amend section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949 with respect to positions in the Library of Congress (Rept. No. 1937); and

H.R. 12043. An act to amend sections 22, 23, and 24, title 13, United States Code, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1938).

By Mr. MURRAY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment:

H.R. 383: An act to authorize the annexation of certain real property of the United States by the city of Wyandotte, Mich. (Rept. No. 1939).

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT AND PAY

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I submit a report on Federal employment and pay for the month of July 1960. In accordance with the practice of several years' standing, I ask unanimous consent to have the report printed in the RECORD, together with a statement by me.

There being no objection, the report and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL PERSONNEL IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH, JULY 1960 AND JUNE 1960, AND PAY, JUNE 1960 AND MAY 1960

PERSONNEL AND PAY SUMMARY

(See table I)

Information in monthly personnel reports for July 1960 submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures is summarized as follow:

Total and major categories	Civilian personnel in executive branch			Payroll (in thousands) in executive branch		
	In July numbered	In June numbered	Increase (+) or decrease (−)	In June was	In May was	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Total [1]	[2] 2,382,551	2,382,674	−123	$1,078,964	$1,082,424	−$3,460
Agencies exclusive of Department of Defense	1,339,719	1,335,454	+4,265	582,513	595,872	−13,359
Department of Defense	1,042,832	1,047,220	−4,388	496,451	486,552	+9,899
Inside the United States	2,224,978	2,224,632	+346			
Outside the United States	157,573	158,042	−469			
Industrial employment	565,406	559,715	+5,691			
Foreign nationals	176,118	177,416	−1,298	23,053	[3] 21,112	+1,941

[1] Exclusive of foreign nationals shown in the last line of this summary.
[2] Includes 3,013 temporary employees (enumerators, clerks, supervisors, crew leaders, etc.) of the Department of Commerce engaged in taking the 18th Decennial Census as compared with 16,174 in June.
[3] Revised on basis of later information.

Table I breaks down the above figures on employment and pay by agencies.

Table II breaks down the above employment figure to show the number inside the United States by agencies.

Table III breaks down the above employment figures to show the number outside the United States by agencies.

Table IV breaks down the above employment figures to show the number in industrial-type activities by agencies inside and outside the United States.

Table V shows foreign nationals by agencies not included in tables I, II, III, and IV.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during July 1960, and comparison with June 1960, and pay for June 1960, and comparison with May 1960*

Department or agency	Personnel				Pay (in thousands)			
	July	June	Increase	Decrease	June	May	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):								
Agriculture	100,263	98,702	1,561		$40,327	$37,397	$2,930	
Commerce [1] [2]	36,177	49,332		13,155	25,046	45,322		$20,276
Health, Education, and Welfare	62,598	61,641	957		28,449	28,217	232	
Interior	56,644	56,113	531		26,470	26,128	342	
Justice	31,334	30,943	391		17,479	17,277	202	
Labor	7,190	[3] 7,106	84		3,675	3,591	84	
Post Office	567,657	562,868	4,789		224,981	222,559	2,422	
State [4]	38,043	37,878	165		15,984	17,014		1,030
Treasury	77,741	76,179	1,562		39,432	39,599		167
Executive Office of the President:								
White House Office	445	446		1	250	249	1	
Bureau of the Budget	437	434	3		327	330		3
Council of Economic Advisers	31	32		1	27	26	1	
Executive Mansion and Grounds	70	70			32	29	3	
National Security Council	65	65			46	46		
Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization	1,884	1,882	2		1,162	1,252		90
President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization	3	3			3	2	1	
President's Committee on Fund Raising Within the Federal Service	4	4			2	2		
Independent agencies:								
Advisory Commission in Intergovernmental Relations	8	8			4	5		1
Alaska International Rail and Highway Commission	3	3			2	2		
American Battle Monuments Commission	454	461		7	86	88		2
Atomic Energy Commission	6,900	6,907		7	4,378	4,308	70	
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	606	598	8		345	343	2	
Boston National Historic Sites Commission [5]		3		3	1	1		
Civil Aeronautics Board	759	755	4		480	441	39	
Civil Service Commission	3,580	3,579	1		1,948	1,926	22	
Civil War Centennial Commission	7	7			5	5		
Commission of Fine Arts	4	4			3	3		
Commission on Civil Rights	83	82	1		44	40	4	
Development Loan Fund	133	117	16		90	81	9	
Export-Import Bank of Washington	239	237	2		153	150	3	
Farm Credit Administration	243	245		2	159	153	6	
Federal Aviation Agency	38,471	38,144	327		21,777	21,180	597	
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	7	7			4	4		
Federal Communications Commission	1,413	1,403	10		811	793	18	
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,250	[3] 1,249	1		705	700	5	
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	1,005	999	6		607	600	7	
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	344	347		3	267	263	4	
Federal Power Commission	861	859	2		526	506	20	
Federal Trade Commission	807	782	25		507	492	15	
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	47	47			34	34		
General Accounting Office	5,082	5,066	16		2,779	2,741	38	
General Services Administration [6]	28,997	28,213	784		12,333	12,125	208	
Government Contract Committee	25	27		2	19	18	1	
Government Printing Office	6,525	6,540		15	3,646	3,411	235	
Housing and Home Finance Agency	11,176	11,105	71		6,057	5,994	63	
Indian Claims Commission	17	17			15	15		
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,371	2,381		10	1,395	1,396		1
Lincoln Sesquicentennial Commission [5]		2		2	1	1		
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	[7] 15,093	10,232	4,861		6,435	6,252	183	
National Capital Housing Authority	329	331		2	139	140		1
National Capital Planning Commission	47	47			29	29		
National Gallery of Art	329	329			125	123	2	
National Labor Relations Board	1,750	1,750			1,034	1,012	22	
National Mediation Board	118	129		11	108	93	15	
National Science Foundation	592	734		142	369	331	38	
Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission	43	42	1		27	26	1	
Panama Canal	14,118	14,061	57		4,175	4,304		129
Railroad Retirement Board	2,262	2,234	28		1,056	1,051	5	
Renegotiation Board	283	284		1	210	205	5	
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	165	159	6		95	92		3
Securities and Exchange Commission	973	980		7	594	594		
Selective Service System	6,198	6,230		32	1,786	1,765	21	
Small Business Administration	2,265	2,244	21		1,268	1,249	19	
Smithsonian Institution	1,231	1,226	5		539	498	41	
Soldiers' Home	1,042	1,041	1		304	316		12
South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Florida Water Study Commission	46	45	1		30	30		
Subversive Activities Control Board	26	25	1		19	20		1
Tariff Commission	276	271	5		165	159	6	
Tax Court of the United States	153	153			112	104	8	
Tennessee Valley Authority	15,260	14,993	267		8,519	8,246	273	
Texas Water Study Commission	50	48	2		31	29	2	
U.S. Information Agency	10,883	10,931		48	3,874	3,802	72	
Veterans' Administration	173,511	172,338	1,173		68,493	68,438	55	
Virgin Islands Corporation	673	705		32	107	102	5	
Total, excluding Department of Defense	1,339,719	1,335,454	17,748	13,483	582,513	595,872	8,357	21,716
Net change, excluding Department of Defense			4,265				13,359	
Department of Defense:								
Office of the Secretary of Defense	1,869	1,949		80	1,290	1,251	39	
Department of the Army	[7] 385,432	[3] 390,057		4,625	183,113	175,751	7,362	
Department of the Navy	347,863	347,761	102		169,813	168,598	1,215	
Department of the Air Force	307,668	307,453	215		142,235	140,952	1,283	
Total, Department of Defense	1,042,832	1,047,220	317	4,705	496,451	486,552	9,899	
Net change, Department of Defense			4,388				9,899	
Grand total, including Department of Defense [8]	2,382,551	2,382,674	18,065	18,188	1,078,964	1,082,424	18,256	21,716
Net decrease, including Department of Defense			123				3,460	

[1] July figure includes 170 seamen on the rolls of the Maritime Administration and their pay.

[2] July figure includes 3,013 temporary employees (enumerators, clerks, supervisors, crew leaders, etc.) of the Department of Commerce engaged in taking the 18th Decennial Census, as compared with 16,174 in June and their pay.

[3] Revised on basis of later information.

[4] July figure includes 14,999 employees of the International Cooperation Administration as compared with 14,443 in June and their pay. These ICA figures include employees who are paid from foreign currencies deposited by foreign governments in a trust fund for this purpose. The July figure includes 3,971 of these trust fund employees and the June figure includes 3,935.

[5] Expired by law June 30, 1960.

[6] Includes 2 employees of the Federal Facilities Corporation.

[7] Pursuant to Public Law 85-568, 4,256 employees of the Army Ballistic Missile Agency were transferred to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration effective July 1, 1960.

[8] Exclusive of personnel and pay of the Central Intelligence Agency and the National Security Agency.

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel inside the United States employed by the executive agencies during July 1960, and comparison with June 1960*

Department or agency	July	June	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	99,251	97,699	1,552	
Commerce [1]	35,574	48,753		13,179
Health, Education, and Welfare	62,151	61,190	961	
Interior	56,205	55,663	542	
Justice	31,017	30,633	384	
Labor	7,087	[2] 7,024	63	
Post Office	566,484	561,656	4,828	
State [3]	9,123	9,111	12	
Treasury	77,187	75,628	1,559	
Executive Office of the President:				
White House Office	445	446		1
Bureau of the Budget	437	434	3	
Council of Economic Advisers	31	32		1
Executive Mansion and Grounds	70	70		
National Security Council	65	65		
Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization	1,884	1,882	2	
President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization	3	3		
President's Committee on Fund Raising Within the Federal Service	4	4		
Independent agencies:				
Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations	8	8		
Alaska International Rail and Highway Commission	3	3		
American Battle Monuments Commission	12	12		
Atomic Energy Commission	6,858	6,864		6
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	606	598	8	
Boston National Historic Sites Commission [4]		3		3
Civil Aeronautics Board	759	755	4	
Civil Service Commission	3,577	3,576	1	
Civil War Centennial Commission	7	7		
Commission of Fine Arts	4	4		
Commission on Civil Rights	83	82	1	
Development Loan Fund	133	117	16	
Export-Import Bank of Washington	239	237	2	
Farm Credit Administration	243	245		2
Federal Aviation Agency	37,615	37,272	343	
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	7	7		
Federal Communications Commission	1,411	1,401	10	
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,248	[2] 1,247	1	
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	1,005	999	6	
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	344	347		3
Federal Power Commission	861	859	2	
Federal Trade Commission	807	782	25	
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	47	47		
General Accounting Office	5,002	4,993	9	
General Services Administration [5]	28,995	28,211	784	
Government Contract Committee	25	27		2
Housing and Home Finance Agency	11,032	10,962	70	
Indian Claims Commission	17	17		
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,371	2,381		10
Lincoln Sesquicentennial Commission [4]		2		2
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	[6] 15,088	10,228	4,860	
National Capital Housing Authority	329	331		2
National Capital Planning Commission	47	47		
National Gallery of Art	329	329		
National Labor Relations Board	1,724	1,724		
National Mediation Board	118	129		11
National Science Foundation	592	734		142
Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission	43	42	1	
Panama Canal	396	393	3	
Railroad Retirement Board	2,262	2,234	28	
Renegotiation Board	283	284		1
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	165	159	6	
Securities and Exchange Commission	973	980		7
Selective Service System	6,046	6,076		30
Small Business Administration	2,240	2,219	21	
Smithsonian Institution	1,221	1,216	5	
Soldiers' Home	1,042	1,041	1	
South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Florida Water Study Commission	46	45	1	
Subversive Activities Control Board	26	25	1	
Tariff Commission	276	271	5	
Tax Court of the United States	153	153		
Tennessee Valley Authority	15,258	14,991	267	
Texas Water Study Commission	50	48	2	
U.S. Information Agency	2,740	2,759		19
Veterans' Administration	172,412	171,243	1,169	
Total, excluding Department of Defense	1,280,721	1,276,599	17,558	13,436
Net increase, excluding Department of Defense			4,122	
Department of Defense:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	1,828	1,909		81
Department of the Army	[6] 336,408	341,195		4,787
Department of the Navy	325,916	325,693	223	
Department of the Air Force	280,105	279,236	869	
Total, Department of Defense	944,257	948,033	1,092	4,868
Net decrease, Department of Defense			3,776	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	2,224,978	2,224,632	18,650	18,304
Net increase, including Department of Defense			346	

[1] July figure includes 170 seamen on the rolls of the Maritime Administration.
[2] Revised on basis of later information.
[3] July figure includes 1,988 employees of the International Cooperation Administration as compared with 1,980 in June.
[4] Expired by law June 30, 1960.
[5] Includes 2 employees of the Federal Facilities Corporation.
[6] Pursuant to Public Law 85-568, 4,256 employees of the Army Ballistic Missile Agency were transferred to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration effective July 1, 1960.

TABLE III.—*Federal personnel outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during July 1960, and comparison with June 1960*

Department or agency	July	June	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	1,012	1,003	9	
Commerce	603	579	24	
Health, Education, and Welfare	447	451		4
Interior	439	450		11
Justice	317	310	7	
Labor	103	82	21	
Post Office	1,173	1,212		39
State [1]	28,920	28,767	153	
Treasury	554	551	3	
Independent agencies:				
American Battle Monuments Commission	442	449		7
Atomic Energy Commission	42	43		1
Civil Service Commission	3	3		
Federal Aviation Agency	856	872		16
Federal Communications Commission	2	2		
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	2	2		
General Accounting Office	80	73	7	
General Services Administration	2	2		
Housing and Home Finance Agency	144	143	1	
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	5	4	1	
National Labor Relations Board	26	26		
Panama Canal	13,722	13,668	54	
Selective Service System	152	154		2
Small Business Administration	25	25		
Smithsonian Institution	10	10		
Tennessee Valley Authority	2	2		
U.S. Information Agency	8,143	8,172		29
Veterans' Administration	1,099	1,095	4	
Virgin Islands Corporation	673	705		32
Total, excluding Department of Defense	58,998	58,855	284	141
Net increase, excluding Department of Defense			143	
Department of Defense:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	41	40	1	
Department of the Army	49,024	[2] 48,862	162	
Department of the Navy	21,947	22,068		121
Department of the Air Force	27,563	28,217		654
Total, Department of Defense	98,575	99,187	163	775
Net decrease, Department of Defense			612	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	157,573	158,042	447	916
Net decrease, including Department of Defense			469	

[1] July figure includes 12,511 employees of the International Cooperation Administration as compared with 12,463 in June. These ICA figures include employees who are paid from foreign currencies deposited by foreign governments in a trust fund for this purpose. The July figure includes 3,971 of these trust fund employees and the June figure includes 3,935.
[2] Revised on basis of later information.

TABLE IV.—*Industrial employees of the Federal Government inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during July 1960, and comparison with June 1960*

Department or agency	July	June	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	3,484	3,449	35	
Commerce	1,983	2,504		521
Interior	8,181	6,946	1,235	
Treasury	5,180	5,191		11
Independent agencies:				
Atomic Energy Commission	248	156	92	
Federal Aviation Agency	1,386	784	602	
Federal Communications Commission		17		17
General Services Administration	1,254	1,244	10	
Government Printing Office	6,525	6,540		15
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	15,093	10,232	4,861	
Panama Canal	7,172	7,133	39	
Tennessee Valley Authority	12,452	12,178	274	
Virgin Islands Corporation	673	705		32
Total, excluding Department of Defense	63,631	57,079	7,148	596
Net increase, excluding Department of Defense			6,552	

Department or agency	July	June	Increase	Decrease
Department of Defense:				
Department of the Army:				
Inside the United States	[1] 135,500	[2] 137,478		1,978
Outside the United States	[1] 7,950	[2] 7,920	30	
Department of the Navy:				
Inside the United States	202,205	201,070	1,135	
Outside the United States	502	503		1
Department of the Air Force:				
Inside the United States	153,812	154,297		485
Outside the United States	1,806	1,368	438	
Total, Department of Defense	501,775	502,636	1,603	2,464
Net decrease, Department of Defense			861	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	565,406	559,715	8,751	3,060
Net increase, including Department of Defense			5,691	

[1] Subject to revision.

[2] Revised on basis of later information.

TABLE V.—*Foreign nationals working under U.S. agencies overseas, excluded from tables I through IV of this report, whose services are provided by contracts and agreements between the United States and foreign governments, or because of the nature of their work or the source of funds from which they are paid, as of July 1960 and comparison with June 1960*

Country	Total		Army		Navy		Air Force		National Aeronautics and Space Administration	
	July	June	July	June	July	June	July	June	July	June
Australia	1								1	
Belgium		3						3		
England	3,214	3,251					3,214	3,251		
France	21,839	22,066	17,735	17,901	4	4	4,100	4,161		
Germany	81,088	80,128	67,849	68,112	56	59	13,183	11,957		
Japan	59,763	62,048	20,655	20,779	15,655	[1] 15,910	23,453	25,359		
Korea	6,177	6,171	6,177	6,171						
Morocco	3,355	3,537			837	853	2,518	2,684		
Netherlands	41	40					41	40		
Norway	24	23					24	23		
Saudi Arabia	1	1					1	1		
Trinidad	615	616			615	[1] 616				
Total	176,118	177,884	112,416	112,963	17,167	17,442	46,534	47,479	1	

[1] Revised on basis of later information.

STATEMENT OF SENATOR BYRD OF VIRGINIA

The cost of civilian employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government reached its all-time high in fiscal year 1960 which ended June 30. The regular Federal payroll exceeded $12.6 billion, averaging more than $1 billion a month for the second consecutive year.

The 12 months' total was $12,637 million plus $268 million in U.S. pay for foreign nationals not on the regular rolls. The Federal Pay Act of 1960 was not effective until July 1, 1960, therefore does not reflect in these figures.

The payroll cost for employment by civilian agencies in fiscal year 1960 was $6,877 million and for civilian employment in military agencies was $5,760 million.

Figures by fiscal years since 1955 follow:

Annual Federal expenditures for civilian payroll, executive branch, fiscal years 1955–60

[In millions of dollars]

Fiscal year	Civilian agencies	Department of Defense [1] (civilian employment)	Total
1955	$4,921	$4,700	$9,621
1956	5,359	5,167	10,526
1957	5,602	5,399	11,000
1958	6,040	5,415	11,455
1959	6,564	5,766	12,330
1960	6,877	5,760	12,637

[1] Excludes U.S. pay for foreign nationals not on regular rolls.

The figures include payroll for temporary employees of the Commerce Department engaged in taking the 18th decennial census, estimated by the Bureau of the Budget at $64 million during fiscal year 1960.

Both employment and payroll increased in fiscal year 1960. Employment by executive branch agencies during fiscal year 1960 (ended June 30) averaged 2,386,345 as compared with an average of 2,352,242 in the previous year. Employment by civilian agencies averaged 1,331,605, an increase of 65,039 as compared with an average of 1,266,566 in the previous year. Civilian employment by military agencies averaged 1,054,740, a decrease of 30,936 as compared with an average of 1,085,676 in the previous year.

Average employment by fiscal years since 1955 follows:

Average civilian employment by Federal agencies, executive branch, fiscal years 1955–60

Fiscal year	Civilian agencies	Department of Defense [1] (civilian employment)	Total
1955	1,182,663	1,184,627	2,367,290
1956	1,189,458	1,174,584	2,364,042
1957	1,219,835	1,174,263	2,394,099
1958	1,242,941	1,104,403	2,347,344
1959	1,266,566	1,085,676	2,352,242
1960	1,331,605	1,054,740	2,386,345

[1] Excludes foreign nationals not on regular rolls (averaging 180,806 during fiscal year 1960).

JULY 1960 EMPLOYMENT

Monthly reports on personnel certified to the committee showed civilian employment by executive agencies of the Federal Government during July totaled 2,382,551 a decrease of 123 from the previous month.

The largest decrease in civilian agency employment was reported by the Department of Commerce with 13,155. Civilian agencies reporting the larger increases were Post Office Department with 4,789, Treasury Department with 1,562, Agriculture Department with 1,561, Veterans' Administration with 1,173, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare with 957, General Services Administration with 784, and Interior Department with 531. The increases in the Departments of Agriculture and Interior were largely seasonal.

(The July figure reflects a decrease of 13,161 in Commerce Department temporary employees engaged in taking the 18th Decennial Census. In July temporary Census employees totaled 3,013, including: 1,333 enumerators, 1,297 crew leaders, and 383 clerks and others.)

Total employment inside the United States in July was 2,224,978 an increase of 346 as compared with June. Total employment outside the United States in July was 158,042, a decrease of 469 as compared with June.

Employment by civilian agencies in July totaled 1,339,719, an increase of 4,265 over June. Civilian employment by military

agencies in July totaled 1,042,832, a decrease of 4,388 as compared with June.

FOREIGN NATIONALS

The total of 2,382,551 civilian employees certified to the committee by executive agencies in their regular monthly personnel reports includes some foreign nationals employed in U.S. Government activities abroad, but in addition to these there were 176,118 foreign nationals working for U.S. agencies overseas during July who were not counted in the usual personnel report. The number in June was 177,416. A breakdown of this employment for July follows:

Country	Total	Army	Navy	Air Force	National Aeronautics and Space Administration
Australia	1				1
England	3,214			3,214	
France	21,839	17,735	4	4,100	
Germany	81,088	67,849	56	13,183	
Japan	59,763	20,655	15,655	23,453	
Korea	6,177	6,177			
Morocco	3,355		837	2,518	
Netherlands	41			41	
Norway	24			24	
Saudi Arabia	1			1	
Trinidad	615		615		
Total	176,118	112,416	17,167	46,534	1

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BIBLE (by request):

S. 3917. A bill to provide for apportioning the expense of maintaining and operating the Woodrow Wilson Memorial Bridge over the Potomac River from Jones Point, Va., to Maryland; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 3918. A bill to assist business enterprises, communities, and individuals to make necessary adjustments required by changed economic conditions resulting from the trade policies of the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. JAVITS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 3919. A bill for the relief of Helen Choi Bratton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CARROLL:

S. 3920. A bill for the relief of Ronald Perrin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARTKE (for himself and Mr. CAPEHART):

S. 3921. A bill to authorize certain property located in the State of Indiana to be made available for use by the Clark County 4-H Club, Inc., Clark County, Ind.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. HARTKE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 3922. A bill for the relief of the State of Texas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 3923. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, with respect to the duties on hair of the Cashmere goat; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. SALTONSTALL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HARTKE:

S.J. Res. 223. Joint resolution to provide for the compilation of rubber footwear import statistics by type of footwear; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. HARTKE when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTIONS

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY FROM FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF S. 958, RELATING TO SCHOOL DESEGREGATION PROGRAMS

Mr. JAVITS submitted a resolution (S. Res. 386) discharging the Committee on the Judiciary from further consideration of S. 958, relative to school desegregation programs; which was ordered to lie over under the rule.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. JAVITS, which appears under a separate heading.)

RESTRICTIONS ON IMPORTATION OF MILITARY SURPLUS FIREARMS

Mr. DODD submitted a resolution (S. Res. 387) favoring restrictions on the importation of military surplus firearms, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. DODD, which appears under a separate hearing.)

SURVEY RELATING TO FEDERAL AID FOR INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER LEARNING

Mr. YARBOROUGH (for himself and Senators HILL, MURRAY, KENNEDY, MCNAMARA, MORSE, CLARK, RANDOLPH, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, BURDICK, CASE of New Jersey, JAVITS, PROUTY, HART, GORE, PROXMIRE, ANDERSON, MANSFIELD, KUCHEL, BYRD of West Virginia, CARROLL, and ENGLE) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 388) favoring a survey looking to Federal aid for institutions of higher learning, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. YARBOROUGH, which appears under a separate heading.)

NATIONAL TRADE POLICY ACT OF 1960

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a comprehensive trade bill which would establish a national export-import policy geared to increased U.S. participation in world trade as an essential element in the maintenance of a sound U.S. economy and healthy international relations with industrial nations and underdeveloped areas.

Mr. President, the National Trade Policy Act of 1960 includes a number of marked innovations not contained in other adjustment assistance measures which set up a national program to provide assistance to businesses, individual workers, and communities, so that they can adjust to the changed economic conditions which may result from the expected increase in world trade. A distinction of prime importance made by this bill is between serious injury from foreign imports to an entire industry or part of it—now dealt with by the Reciprocal Trade Act—and serious injury to a business, community, or worker.

Today, the Tariff Commission may not recommend increased import restrictions unless there is actual or threatened serious economic injury to an entire industry, although there is increasing sentiment that it should be able to do so. However, such action could provide a windfall to the competitive firms in the industry which though not presently affected, would find themselves operating under the cover of additional tariff protection—and it would not help less efficient firms to become more competitive. My bill would make those hurt by increased imports eligible for aid whether or not the Tariff Commission returns a finding of serious injury for the entire industry. Also, it amends the Trade Agreements Act to authorize the President to place a time limit of not more than 7 years on any additional import restrictions which may be adopted upon the recommendation of the Tariff Commission, and to reduce such additional restrictions on a specified gradual basis.

U.S. trade policy is going to be an issue of top priority before the Congress next session. For many months, protectionist pressures have been steadily on the rise at a rate and in a volume which is unparalleled during my 14 years in the Congress, and this despite the fact that U.S. exports are heading toward a record, or near-record high in 1960 of more than $19 billion. The latest figures show that U.S. imports are not expected to exceed $15.5 billion for this year. Nevertheless, the protests of companies and industries that they are being seriously injured by low-priced foreign imports continue to mount and they must be respected.

At my request, the U.S. Tariff Commission has just completed a special study of these intensified pressures. Between 1955 and 1960, written briefs filed with the Committee for Reciprocity Information by companies, trade associations, and unions in opposition to tariff reductions increased 171 percent, and more briefs are still flowing in. Those applicants requesting increases in U.S. import duties have increased by 340 percent in the same 5-year span. A breakdown indicates that a majority of firms in textiles and in metals manufactures have been strongly opposed to any tariff reductions on their products and have been joined in their protests by a substantial number of chemical firms.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a table of briefs received in connection with trade-agreement negotiations, 1960–61, compared to 1955–56.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Briefs received in connection with trade-agreement negotiations, 1960–61 compared to 1955–56

	Firms,[1] total number	Briefs,[2] total number	Firms [1]		Briefs [1]				
			Opposing reduction	Favoring reduction	Opposing reduction	Percent of total	Requesting U.S. duty increase; included in number opposing reduction	Favoring reduction	Percent of total
U.S. imports, imports-exports, general:									
1960–61	537	575	442	105	461	80	(110)	122	21
1955–56	244	276	179	65	170	61	(25)	81	29

[1] Trade and labor organizations, and departments of divisions of individual firms, where indicated, were counted as 1 firm, each.
[2] Some briefs both favored and opposed reductions, in which case they are included in both counts.

NOTE.—In 1960–61, 2,250 schedule A statistical classes of products were included in the published list. In 1955–56, 1,270 schedule A statistical classes of products were included in the original and supplemental published lists.
AUG. 29, 1960.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, in 1962, the Trade Agreements Act, the backbone of our reciprocal trade program, will again come before the Congress for another extension. It has been the principal reason behind the upsurge of U.S. trade, which has grown from $4.8 billion in 1934 when the act first became law, to an estimated $35 billion in total U.S. exports and imports by the end of 1960—a sevenfold increase. The yearlong negotiations among the member nations of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade—GATT—scheduled to start this Thursday in Geneva will swing into high gear by January 1961. Then the United States as the world trade leader must indicate to its trading partners whether or not it is prepared to take the necessary steps including additional tariff reductions which will presage an era of expanded trade in which U.S. exports can soar above the $30 billion figure by 1970.

This goal can only be achieved if U.S. domestic and foreign economic policy incorporates an imaginative dimension in its trade policy which will adequately care for the needs of individuals, businesses, communities, and entire industries which are seriously affected by foreign imports deemed necessary in the overriding national interest of expanding U.S. and free world trade. Therefore, I am introducing for appropriate reference the National Trade Policy Act of 1960. It is being put forward after several months of study in a complex and highly controversial field during which I have personally consulted with some 200 leaders in the fields of business, economics, and labor.

It is my earnest hope that U.S. trade and this extremely sensitive area of what proper remedies should be taken to alleviate the hardships on U.S. firms unavoidably injured by correspondingly expanding imports will undergo the most detailed study by congressional committees in the months ahead.

Under the terms of the National Trade Policy Act of 1960, assistance to alleviate serious injury from imports would be available from the Federal Government in the form of loans, tax incentives, and technical aids to qualified businesses, communities, and industrial development corporations; together with special unemployment compensation, retraining assistance, provisions for early retirement, and relocation allowances for workers.

Large businesses, communities, and industrial development corporations found eligible under the bill's criteria would have recourse to a $100 million revolving loan fund, so they could finance the adjustments necessitated by our policy in support of increased trade. A $50 million fund to supplement the present Small Business Administration's disaster loan fund would be authorized to help smaller companies adjust to the same circumstances. In addition, the bill amends the Internal Revenue Code so that more liberal depreciation allowances and more rapid amortization will be available to seriously affected enterprises.

To workers unemployed as the result of increased foreign imports, the act would set up a program to assure unemployment compensation for at least 6 months at a rate of 70 percent of the average weekly wage in their respective States, with the difference between State unemployment payment levels and the compensation provided under this act to be made up by the Federal Government. Those among these unemployed workers who cannot find new jobs because of their advanced age would become eligible to receive their regular social security retirement benefits at age 60, with such payments to be made out of general revenues and not out of the social security trust fund. In addition, vocational training will be available to workers as well as relocation allowances should they be unable to find new employment in their own labor market areas. In the case of a worker, he must only show that he was dismissed from his last regular employment because of increased imports.

A company or individual applying for tariff relief under this bill would first appear before the Tariff Commission which would then launch an investigation. The Commission might recommend relief in which case the company could apply for assistance at once; but should the Commission find only that the application was made "in good faith and with reasonable cause" without further recommendation, application could still be made. Technical aid would be given a business, community, and industrial development corporation in preparing a program to show how Government aid would be effectively utilized.

The act would also establish an Advisory Committee on Trade Policy to be composed of nine members, appointed by the President, and broadly representative of production, commerce, finance, agriculture, labor, and consumer interests. It would meet at the request of the President to consult on the administration of the provision in this act.

The assistance which is available under this bill is designed to give us a truly flexible trade policy which will not be linked to impossibly high trade barriers that could lock out the exports of nations which currently import increasing amounts of U.S. goods. This act in allowing the President to make a finding of serious injury or the threat of such injury to one or more businesses but not to an entire industry need not lead to the imposition of quotas or higher tariffs. Similarly, the certificates of eligibility for assistance under the act are to be valid for no more than 18 months and are subject to cancellation sooner should the President determine they are no longer necessary.

In the first 6 months of 1960, U.S. trade figures have shown an upsurge over the same period in 1959 and much of this increase is attributable to the very real effort several European nations have made to end many of their discriminatory trade policies. From January through June of this year, our exports to the six Common Market nations shot up 52 percent and to the seven nations of the European Free Trade Association, they rose 57 percent—more than $1 billion and $385 million, respectively. For the first half year of 1960, our total exports to all countries are running $1.7 billion ahead of 1959, January through June, with $1.4 billion of that total represented by gains to the Common Mar-

ket and EFTA countries alone; so that it is very obvious how extremely important the markets of Western Europe continue to be to U.S. traders. However, they may not continue to welcome our goods in such large volume if their traders encounter high tariff walls and quotas which only allow a trickle of their goods into our domestic markets. This is a powerful reason why we must build into our economic structure fair provision for the U.S. industry which must compete with their best selling exports—first, let us help it become competitive if it has fallen behind; but if that proves a futile goal, then let us make provision for such companies and their employees to shift to more profitable pursuits. This is the paramount aim of the National Trade Policy Act, an essential element in an expanding world trade and in a prosperous domestic economy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as part of my remarks, a section-by-section analysis of the National Trade Policy Act of 1960, and also an article from the New York Times and two articles from the New York Herald Tribune.

There being no objection, the analysis and the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF NATIONAL TRADE POLICY ACT OF 1960

Title: A bill to assist business enterprises, communities, and individuals to make necessary adjustments required by changed conditions resulting from the trade policies of the United States.

Section 2 recognizes the need for U.S. participation in world trade in order to maintain a sound domestic economy and healthy international relations, and establish a national trade policy to provide assistance to business enterprises, individuals, and communities so that they may make the adjustments required by changed conditions resulting from U.S. participation in world trade.

Section 3 authorizes the President to delegate the powers he receives under this act. Provides that the several departments and agencies of the Federal Government engaged in carrying out the functions of this act will consult with each other. By precedent, this could call for the setting up of an interdepartmental National Trade Policy Committee with a chairman, possibly the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for International Affairs, or the delegation of these powers to an existing agency of Government.

Section 4 establishes an Advisory Committee on Trade Policy, composed of nine members broadly representative of production, commerce, finance, agriculture, labor, and consumer interests. One of the members shall be a member of the National Export Expansion Committee, which was established as a result of the export promotion program announced by the President on March 17, 1960. This advisory committee, similar to the one established for the Export-Import Bank, would advise in the operation of this act.

Section 5 establishes the criteria for eligibility of business enterprises, communities, industrial development corporations and individuals or organizations representing individuals for assistance under this act. The President is to issue certificates of eligibility, valid for no longer than 18 months, which he may cancel when he feels they are no longer necessary—including in the event of congressional action to change the tariff or quota structure in the United States.

A business enterprise is eligible, if the President finds that it has suffered serious economic injury resulting from increased imports, or is threatened with such injury, after:

(a) The Tariff Commission makes a finding of serious injury, or the threat of serious injury, under section 7 of the Trade Agreements Act (the escape clause) to an industry of which the business enterprise is a member; or

(b) The Tariff Commission makes a recommendation for relief under section 336 of the Tariff Act of 1930, which permits tariff relief in order to eliminate differences in cost of production between foreign and domestic items; or

(c) The Tariff Commission does not make such findings or recommendations for the industry but does find that the application was made "in good faith and with reasonable cause"; or

(d) The Tariff Commission has made an investigation and report under section 332 of the Tariff Act of 1930, which provides for such investigations and reports at the request of the President, either House of Congress, the House Ways and Means Committee, or the Senate Finance Committee, and the business enterprise is a member of an industry which has been the subject of such an investigation.

A community is eligible, when it has substantial and persistent unemployment as the result of reductions in personnel by businesses in industries investigated by the Tariff Commission, if these reductions in personnel are due to increased imports.

An industrial development corporation is eligible, if it is operated to achieve a more balanced and increased level of economic activity in a type of community cited above.

An individual is eligible, if he is unemployed as the result of reductions in personnel by businesses in industries investigated by the Tariff Commission, if his or her last regular employment was in such a business and if the reductions in personnel are due to increased imports.

In addition to the above criteria, the President would have to consider what portion of a business enterprise's production is directly and adversely affected by increased imports. Furthermore, a business enterprise, community or industrial development corporation would have to present plans for effective programs of economic adjustment before being eligible for assistance. A worker, of course, would not have to meet these last two requirements.

This section furthermore amends section 7 of the Trade Agreements Act and section 336 of the Tariff Act of 1930, to authorize the President to place a time limit of not more than 7 years on any additional import restrictions which he adopts upon the recommendation of the Tariff Commission, and to reduce such additional restrictions on a specified, gradual basis.

The distinctive feature of this section is that it permits assistance to a business, community, and worker adversely affected by increased imports, even when the Tariff Commission does not find serious injury to the entire industry. This prevents the establishment of additional import restrictions when only part of an industry is seriously injured, and thus eliminates the accrual of windfall profits for the more efficient members of the industry under the cover of import barriers. Furthermore, the eligibility for assistance of workers and communities seriously injured by additional imports is separated both from the eligibility of industries and of individual business enterprises.

The criteria for eligibility are strict; there must be a thorough investigation by the Tariff Commission upon the findings of which the President can base his decision. The Tariff Commission must also find that the application was made with reasonable cause, and the affected elements of an industry (except the workers) must present effective plans for use of the assistance for which they apply.

Section 6 provides the President with administrative powers under this act, specifically the power to make rules, regulations, and procedures for the carrying out of his functions in determining eligibility for assistance.

Section 7 provides for loans to larger business enterprises, communities, and industrial development corporations which are eligible for assistance. A $100 million revolving fund is established for this purpose.

Section 8 provides for loans to small business enterprises which are eligible for assistance; $50 million is added to the present Small Business Administration disaster loan fund for this purpose.

Section 9 amends the Internal Revenue Code to provide for more liberal depreciation allowances and more rapid amortization of property of business enterprises eligible for assistance.

Section 10 provides for technical and managerial aids to business enterprises, communities, and industrial development corporations in making application for assistance, and, if possible, in making the necessary adjustments without Government assistance. If assistance is required, these aids will also be provided to help those receiving it to make effective use of it. This technical aid will take the form of advice and counsel on good management and related matters.

Sections 7 through 10 are designed to give economic assistance and incentives through loans, tax policies and tecanical aids, so that those elements of our private enterprise system which are seriously injured by increased imports may again become competitive.

Section 11 provides that unemployed workers eligible for assistance will receive unemployment compensation for at least 6 months at a rate of 70 percent of the average weekly earnings in their State. The difference between the payments provided by the regular State unemployment compensation programs and the amounts which are provided to the workers by this act will be paid by the Federal Government. Special provision is made to assure a worker who is eligible for assistance a minimum of unemployment compensation for a period of no more than 3 months, if he works in an on-the-job or in-plant training program approved by the Secretary of Labor and if this work pays no more than the partial earnings allowance permitted by his or her State.

Section 12 provides for the payment of benefits equal to the full social security retirement benefits which workers would receive at the regular age of retirement, if the Secretary of Labor determines that an eligible worker of 60 years of age or older is unable to find employment because of his age. Payments will be out of general revenues; not the social security trust fund.

Section 13 provides for programs of retraining and vocational rehabilitation for eligible workers, under the supervision of the Secretary of Labor.

Section 14 provides for the payment of moving expenses of an eligible worker and his family, when the Secretary of Labor determines that there is no job opportunity in his or her labor market area but that there is such opportunity elsewhere in the United States.

Sections 11 through 14 are designed to give assistance to workers unemployed as the result of increased imports, so that they may be tided over during their period of unemployment and so that they may adjust to the new economic situation.

Section 15 authorizes the appropriation of funds necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

[From the New York Times, Aug. 28, 1960]

U.S. STAND HELD VITAL ON TARIFFS—CONCESSIONS ARE CONSIDERED NECESSARY FOR BIG CUTS AT GATT NEGOTIATIONS

(By Edwin L. Dale, Jr.)

PARIS, August 27.—The world's major trading nations will gather Thursday at Geneva for a set of tariff negotiations that could turn out to be either mountain or molehill. The present odds slightly favor the molehill.

The negotiations among the member nations of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) are expected to take the better part of a year. It is certain that out of them will come some further lowering of world trade barriers, but whether the results will lead to significantly less protection and thus more trade is an open question.

With the industrially developed world rapidly moving away from quantitative controls on imports, at least in nonfarm goods, tariffs now take on more importance than at any time since World War II. In principle, the nations at Geneva will set out to bargain tariff reductions with each other.

The outcome of the bargaining will depend mainly on two factors presently unknown.

One is the attitude of the United States, which will come to Geneva theoretically empowered to reduce tariffs on all products by 20 percent of the present levels. But it is not clear how aggressive U.S. negotiators will feel able to use this power, given the strong protectionist pressure from much of domestic industry and legal provisions hampering concessions in cases where domestic industry might be hurt.

Without significant U.S. concessions—which means tariff reductions on items where increased imports will follow and probably hurt—the other bargainers may save their concessions for another day.

The second unknown, probably even more important, is the attitude of the nations of Western Europe. This will turn not only on the eternal issue of free trade versus protection, but also on intricate questions of European politics.

Europe is now divided into two trading blocs—the six-nation European Economic Community, or Common Market and the Free Trade Association, known as the Outer Seven—each committed to internal free trade with tariffs against outsiders. Each bloc aims at expanding trade internally but the result of the split could be a serious distortion of the traditional flow of goods.

Members of the Common Market are France, West Germany, Italy, Belgium, Luxembourg and the Netherlands. The Outer Seven is composed of Britain, Sweden, Denmark, Portugal, Norway, Switzerland and Austria.

There are two ways of dealing with the problem caused by the split. One is to organize the two groups into some form of Europewide free trade zone, possibly a customs union. This presents many problems, but recent developments in some key countries have revived slightly the hopes of those who want such a solution.

If such a solution is now actively sought, the negotiations will take place outside of GATT and the coming session will take a bad second place in attention and achievement.

The second way of dealing with the European problem is the product-by-product approach, in which the GATT session could be crucial. Each group would negotiate for reductions in the other's outer tariff to give nonmembers a fair try at the market.

Both sides will have until January to decide what approach to take. From now to the end of the year the sessions will be devoted to technical problems raised by the formation of the Common Market and its impact on past tariff bargains with outsiders. The real bargaining will begin in January, and the political and economic attitudes of Western Europe may be considerably clearer by that time.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, July 31, 1960]

WALL STREET, U.S.A.—FOREIGN TRADE AND AID

(By Harvey S. Firestone, Jr., chairman, Firestone Tire & Rubber Co.)

One of the most serious and perplexing problems facing the world today is the question of American assistance to other countries. There is growing concern regarding this problem and increasing sentiment against the continuance of the present large foreign-aid program. Year after year, the Government has requested billions of dollars for this purpose and now, some 15 years after World War II, many Americans are wondering when it is going to end.

This is particularly true of those millions of Americans who have traveled to Europe in recent years and have seen, in some countries, what they regard as a booming industrial economy. In addition, our people have read in their press many reports of waste and inefficiency in the granting and administration of the funds which the United States has sent overseas, and they are aroused by what seems to them an attempt on the part of individuals and nations to gain unreasonable advantages at the expense of American taxpayers.

Therefore, I think it is high time that we take a good, hard look at the subject of foreign aid and that we weigh up the factors for and against its continuance by the United States. In connection with my participation as a member of the International Development Advisory Board, I have followed closely the progress and problems of this program, which is often difficult to understand for people who are not closely associated with it.

WHICH OF TWO ROADS?

Briefly stated, the problem which the United States faces today is simply this: Which of two roads is the better to follow to achieve real security and economic progress for our families and our country today and in the future? If we travel one road, we utilize our industrial might to build an armed fortress, lock the doors, sit tight and let the rest of the world take care of itself, if it can.

If we follow the other road, we carry on the fight for what we believe in, utilizing our ideas, our technical skills and some of our wealth to back our convictions that the free enterprise system can win the cold war by helping to establish strong and free nations which will not fall prey to the economic warfare the Soviet Union is now waging in the strategic areas of the world. There is no middle ground.

It is in our own interest, and the interest of our friends, that we follow the second path. Supporting this position is the fact that foreign trade now provides 4½ million jobs for Americans, more than all the jobs in the automobile, textile, chemical, and steel factories in the United States. In one city alone, New York, 1 job in every 4 is dependent on international trade.

EXPANDS 68 PERCENT

In the last 5 years, our foreign trade has expanded 68 percent, compared with an increase of only 18 percent in our domestic trade.

In the case of agricultural products, foreign markets take the yield of 1 out of every 5 acres in the United States. The production from an estimated 60 million acres of American farm land is sold abroad.

But international trade is a two-way street. About 60 percent of U.S. imports are raw materials. We import three-fourths of the bauxite from which we make aluminum. To manufacture a new television receiver, we use more than 40 imported materials coming from more than a dozen free-world countries. We import substantial quantities of more than 30 materials required in automobile manufacturing.

Surprisingly, the United States is well on its way toward becoming the biggest "have not" nation on the face of the earth. At the moment there are only two metals, magnesium and molybdenum, for which our Nation is not at least partly dependent upon outside supplies.

DEPEND ON IMPORTS

For ten strategic materials we are dependent upon the rest of the world for at least 75 percent of our requirements, and by 1975 we shall need to import between 25 and 100 percent of our consumption of the 26 most important industrial raw materials, ranging from antimony to zinc.

The sale of American-made products to countries which can supply the United States with such raw materials should not result in any excessive balance of trade in favor of the United States. However, since we are basically an industrial, manufacturing nation, it is inevitable that we should make thousands upon thousands of products which are also made by other industrial, manufacturing countries. It is natural that these other nations should want to sell their competing products in the American marketplace.

Just what solution can be worked out between the United States and its friends throughout the world is still a matter of debate. If it is simply a question of dollar balances, it seems to me that much of this difficulty could be resolved if the nations wishing to export their products to the United States would concentrate more upon exporting needed raw materials and other noncompetitive products, rather than trying to put pressure behind the export of goods which compete directly with basic American industries.

WANT FAIR PLAY

Americans are not afraid of competition. On the contrary, they thrive on it. It is the very essence of the free enterprise system which is an integral part of the American way of life. But they believe in fair competition.

They do not believe that it is fair for American industry to have to compete in the world trade race shackled and burdened by heavy taxes, resulting from the cost of foreign aid, which greatly increase its cost of doing business.

Millions of Americans now feel that other nations of the free world should assume a greater part of the responsibility, and a larger proportion of the cost, of keeping the free world free and keeping the uncommitted nations and the less-developed countries of the world out of the Communist orbit.

They believe that other free nations are now in a position to express themselves in ways more material than mere words. They contend it is high time that the nations which insist on full partnership with the United States in the common defense against the military threat of the Communist bloc also accept full partnership with the United States in the common defense against the economic threat of the Communist world.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Aug. 7, 1960]

WALL STREET, U.S.A.—RESEARCH—KEY TO THE FUTURE

(By Donald C. Power, chairman and chief executive officer, General Telephone & Electronics Corp.)

During the last 10 years, America has been going through a full-scale economic revolution. Entirely new industries have emerged, and existing industries have expanded at an unprecedented rate. Countless new products and services have been developed. Manufacturing processes have been steadily improved through the introduction of new equipment and techniques. Major changes have occurred in the country's entire distribution system. All of these devel-

opments have combined to create a half trillion dollar economy, in contrast to some $300 billion a decade ago.

Concurrent with this revolution here in the United States, another revolution has been going on overseas—the rebirth of Western Europe after the war. In place of the "Old Country," we see across the ocean a revitalized, energetic, and progressive European economy, symbolized so well by the Common Market. Here is the new brand of foreign competition—more resourceful, skillful, ingenious, and energetic than ever before.

And there we have the challenge confronting the American businessman in the 1960's—the challenge of maintaining the momentum and strength of our economic revolution of the last decade. This will be the only way we can meet competition from abroad for our markets here at home, and it is the only way we can participate in the growth of markets overseas.

BIGGEST PROBLEM

Management, labor, and Government must keep foremost in mind that foreign competition is here, it is going to grow stronger and we are going to have to adjust to it. Certainly we may find it necessary to adopt protective measures for certain industries—particularly those vital to national security—but any large-scale drive to create tariff barriers across the board will only isolate us from the rest of the world.

There are tremendous opportunities for American industry to participate in the economic growth of the world—by accelerating the development of new and improved products and services, new, and less costly ways of making them and more efficient ways of getting them to present and potential customers. In other words, far greater emphasis must be given to finding new and better ways of doing things, and the key is sharply increased research and development.

Since World War II, there has been a dramatic growth in research and development. Back in 1941, the total spent throughout the country on research was less than a billion annually, and the greater share of it represented advanced engineering, rather than fundamental research.

Today, the total expenditure by industry, Government, and the universities is more than $13 billion annually—and the range of activities reaches across the entire spectrum of science.

RESEARCH NEEDS

Large as this total expenditure is, however, it is not nearly enough. It must at least be doubled over the next 7 or 8 years if we are to maintain our commanding world position in technology.

In many fields today we are seriously challenged; in some, we have already been surpassed, witness the technical achievements of the Soviets. It would be disastrous to lose further ground.

Even more tangibly, however, the National Science Foundation says that research pays off at the rate of 100 to 200 percent a year. This means that $100 spent on research will bring back a total of $2,500 to $5,000 over a 25-year period—depending, of course, on the state of the art prevailing in a given industry or company.

The experience in many companies has been that 7 to 10 years are required on the average to translate the findings of research into a new product. This time interval must be reduced substantially—and this challenge becomes especially significant when you bear in mind that from 50 to 75 percent of the products of many companies today are completely or radically different from their products of 15 years ago.

ELECTRONICS EXAMPLE

The electronics industry is a prime example of the large-scale benefits derived from research. From some $500 million in annual sales and revenues before the war, electronics today is a diversified $15 billion industry. Its dollar volume has increased threefold in 11 years. There is every indication that sales and revenues will be nearly $22 billion by 1965, and upward of $30 billion by 1970.

The greatest potential is in the field of commercial and industrial electronics, where intensive research led to the steadily expanding use of electronic devices and equipment in the broad field of communications, especially data processing and telephone communications.

Ten years ago, commercial and industrial electronics totaled some $700 million. Last year, the total had reached $2.5 billion, and $2.8 billion is our latest estimate for this year. By 1965, annual sales should be approaching $5 billion, and from then on the sky is the limit—the potential applications, being virtually unlimited, particularly because of the rapid advances being made in business communications and space technology.

However, the electronics industry is only one example of the unlimited growth and development that lie ahead for the American economy, provided we devote enough research and development effort to realize the potentials.

This country is confronted with the strongest competition in its history, but our competitors have no magic formulas for success. The advantages they may have in one aspect of the productive process can be effectively neutralized by our advantages in others. Ours has been a history of innovation and invention, of ingeniously coming up with new ideas, year after year. We must increase and accelerate that trend.

Ten years from now we will look back at the rising tide of foreign competition as the incentive which provided us with new concepts and equipped us to play the leading role in the growth of the world's markets. Or we will look back and see where we missed a golden opportunity. The choice is squarely up to us.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3918) to assist business enterprises, communities, and individuals to make necessary adjustments required by changed economic conditions resulting from the trade policies of the United States, introduced by Mr. JAVITS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

HELEN CHOI BRATTON

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriation reference, a bill for the relief of Helen Choi Bratton. It is a private bill which I am introducing today, in the dying hours of the session, because I want to get certain reports on the bill between now and January, when I will reintroduce the bill at that time. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3919) for the relief of Helen Choi Bratton, introduced by Mr. MORSE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Helen Choi Bratton, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Nancy Bratton, a citizen of the United States: *Provided*, That the natural parents of the said Helen Choi Bratton shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

AVAILABILITY OF CERTAIN PROPERTY IN INDIANA FOR USE BY CLARK COUNTY 4–H CLUB

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize certain property located in Indiana to be made available for use by the Clark County 4–H Club.

This land is being declared excess, Mr. President, and the Clark County 4–H Club desires to use it for a permanent fair-and-exhibit ground.

Title in the property would be vested in the Department of Agriculture.

Our 4–H Clubs are training our young men and women to become progressive and helpful members of our communities. We should certainly welcome any opportunity to assist them. Rather than have this land in Clark County, Ind., remain idle, it could serve a useful purpose. I earnestly hope that this bill will receive the favorable consideration of Congress.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3921) to authorize certain property located in the State of Indiana to be made available for use by the Clark County 4–H Club, Inc., Clark County, Ind., introduced by Mr. HARTKE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF TARIFF ACT OF 1930, RELATING TO DUTIES ON HAIR OF THE CASHMERE GOAT

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the trade agreement between the United States and Iran came to an end last Friday. This agreement had been in existence since 1943.

This unfortunate termination has had the effect of increasing by 16 cents per pound the tariff on raw cashmere, and this has had a disastrous effect upon the domestic cashmere industry, most of it centered in Massachusetts.

The continued importation of cashmere at the old rate is necessary for our domestic cashmere industry, and it is in the best interests of consumers in the United States. For those reasons, Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to restore the old tariffs, and request that it be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

I realize that any action on this proposed legislation is impossible at this session, but I introduce it now so that Department reports on it can be requested promptly. Introduction today also serves the useful purpose of reassuring our domestic industry of our awareness of this serious problem.

I ask that the cashmere tariff be restored to the level at which it stood for 17 years for the following reasons:

First. The increased duty will have an adverse effect on the market for cashmere in the United States, and can be expected to injure the entire cashmere industry in this country.

Second. A substantial part of the world's cashmere is produced in areas under Communist domination. These sources of supply are closed off to our domestic industry by the foreign assets control program. It is unfair that our U.S. industry be further penalized by an increase in the tariff on the cashmere that is still available to it.

Third. The American manufacturer, injured now by the increase in the tariff on his raw material, is further injured by having no added tariff protection on the manufactured products containing cashmere against which the U.S. producer has to compete. The new high tariff prevents him from securing his raw material on fair terms; but low tariffs on completed cashmere sweaters, for instance, permit foreign imports to swamp the domestic industry. Our domestic manufacturers ask for no unfair protection; they ask only for a fair chance to compete.

Mr. President, my colleague, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], joins with me in sponsoring this legislation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3923) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, with respect to the duties on hair of the cashmere goat, introduced by Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 1001 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1001) be amended by deleting from paragraph 1102(b) thereof the words "cashmere goat", and inserting after the words "other like animals" the following: "(including animals like the cashmere goat)".

SEC. 2. Section 1001 is further amended by adding the following:

"PAR. 1102(c) Hair of the cashmere goat, in the grease or washed, 18 cents per pound of clean content; scoured, 21 cents per pound of clean content; on the skin, 16 cents per pound of clean content; sorted, or matchings, if not scoured, 19 cents per pound of clean content."

COMPILATION OF RUBBER FOOTWEAR IMPORT STATISTICS BY TYPE OF FOOTWEAR

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to provide for the compilation of rubber footwear import statistics by type of footwear.

This joint resolution is a companion measure to a House joint resolution which was introduced in the House of Representatives yesterday by my distinguished and learned colleague from Indiana's Third District, the Honorable JOHN BRADEMAS.

Mr. President, I have become seriously concerned over the effect which foreign imports are having on our domestic industries. I am particularly concerned over the effect which foreign imports are having on industry in Indiana.

This joint resolution authorizes the Department of Commerce to compile statistics on imports of rubber footwear from foreign countries by type of footwear.

It is necessary to have this breakdown so that the rubber footwear industry may make the strongest possible case when filing an appeal to the Tariff Commission for relief under our trade laws.

I also would like to call attention to the resolution which I submitted in July to set up a special committee of the Senate to consider the effect which imports are having on our domestic economy. Such a study is necessary if we are to proceed intelligently in trying to arrive at a solution to this problem.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 223) to provide for the compilation of rubber footwear import statistics by type of footwear, introduced by Mr. HARTKE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

RESTRICTIONS ON IMPORTATION OF FOREIGN SURPLUS MILITARY RIFLES

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, last week, House conferees twice succeeded in striking from appropriations bills a sense resolution which I submitted advising the State Department to clamp down on the importation of foreign surplus military rifles. These rifles are being dumped on the American market by the hundreds of thousands and are endangering the survival of our domestic arms producing industry.

I know that the Senate conferees on both the State, Justice, and the Judiciary appropriation bill and on the mutual security bill were thoroughly in accord with this amendment and did their best to retain it. In each case, it was deleted because of determined and adamant opposition by the principal conferee in the other body.

I believe this amendment is of supreme importance to the preservation of a great and vital American industry. Day after day and month after month I have heard Senators speaking on this floor of the damage being done to our domestic industries by foreign competition which at least can be described as legitimate commerce. But in this case, we have an American industry, vital to our national defense, being undermined by competition which cannot be called legitimate.

We have an industry being damaged by the importation of goods which were never originally produced for commercial use, which were never intended for civilian use, and which were produced for the use of armed forces of foreign nations. These foreign nations, like our own country, now have millions and millions of surplus military rifles on hand. Our Government will not allow our military rifles to be dumped on the domestic market to go into competition with sporting rifles in our domestic industry because our Government does not want to destroy that industry through unfair competition.

The foreign nations of which I speak, England, Italy, Sweden, and Germany, will not allow these rifles to be sold on their domestic market for fear of destroying their own arms producing industry. And so they send them here and our State Department lets them get away with it. We are even allowing the importation of surplus military rifles from Iron Curtain countries to go on the market in competition with our own sporting rifles made by free American workmen earning decent wages in an industry which is absolutely essential to our national defense.

Having twice succeeded in having the Senate adopt this amendment, only to see it deleted by the House in conference, I shall try a third time.

The resolution which I offer today is in the form of a separate Senate resolution rather than an amendment to an appropriations bill. It does not require concurrence by the other body.

It would advise the State Department that it is the sense of the Senate that the State Department should stop granting licenses to foreign nations permitting the importation of surplus military weapons to be sold in this country at cut rates in competition with our domestic producers.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 387) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas the American firearms industry is important to the national security of the United States; and

Whereas since 1956 hundreds of thousands of used surplus military rifles have been imported into the United States market at prices with which the American arms industry cannot compete, thus threatening to destroy the defense readiness of this essential industry; and

Whereas on June 29, 1956, six of the leading American firearms manufacturers filed a petition with the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, asking for relief against such imports and no decision has been forthcoming from this Agency, and

Whereas the Department of Defense in furtherance of national security has frozen further disposition of the vast quantities of military surplus rifles owned by the United States Government; and

Whereas the Secretary of State has continued to authorize the unrestricted importation of foreign military surplus into the United States market; and

Whereas the United States Government should adopt and pursue a consistent policy with respect to the disposition of all military surplus firearms; and

Whereas the small arms mobilization base of the United States continues to remain in jeopardy unless immediate action is taken by the Secretary of State: Therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that in the administration of section 414 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, the Secretary of State shall take such action

as may be necessary to restrict the importation or reimportation into the United States (other than for use by the Armed Forces of the United States) for resale of surplus rifles originally manufactured for the armed forces of any country, or parts thereof for reassembly, except those which are curios or antiques or weapons of obsolete ignition incapable of using a fixed cartridge or fixed shotgun shell.

ASSISTANCE TO INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER LEARNING, INCLUDING JUNIOR AND COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, a resolution sponsored by more than 20 Senators, including 13 members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. The resolution is on the subject of Federal assistance in the field of higher education. It requests the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to review and survey various forms of potential Federal assistance for encouraging and helping institutions of higher education, including junior and community colleges, to meet their critical needs, and also to help students finance their education.

Mr. President, a number of bills on this subject are pending in the Education Subcommittee. But due to the well-known bogdown of procedure in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, because of the fight over the common situs picketing bills, it has not been possible for the committee to bring up these aid-to-education bills. They include the bill, sponsored by the distinguished majority leader, to provide a guaranteed loan fund to enable students to go to college; Senate bill 3776, introduced by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] and myself, to lend funds and make grants to colleges, to assist them in building additional classrooms; three bills, introduced by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], to lend funds to junior colleges, to assist them in the building of additional classrooms and teaching facilities; and also a bill to help the States survey their college facilities.

In view of the fact that we shall have 1 million more college students by 1964 than the present 3¾ million, due to the fact that the children of the veterans of World War II will be old enough then to go to college, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], who now is on the floor, has successfully sponsored measures to provide Federal funds to assist in the building of college dormitories, although up to this time such funds have not been provided.

But now the American Council on Education, which heretofore has proposed that such Federal aid be restricted to funds and grants for the building of college dormitories, is joining in the requests that Federal funds be made available for the construction of additional classrooms.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter from the American Council on Education and an attached memorandum entitled "Comments on the Proposed Omnibus Bill in the Light of the Most Serious General Needs of Higher Education." The memorandum commences with the following statement of principles and priorities, by the Committee on Relationships of Higher Education to the Federal Government, of the American Council on Education:

STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES AND PRIORITIES

It is the unanimous judgment of the Committee that the priority needs of higher education among items of legislation now being considered by the Congress are as follows:

1. Continuation of the College housing loan program with adequate funds to meet the urgent need for additional dormitories and related facilities.

2. Legislation to make available long-term, low-interest loans or matching grants, at the option of the institution, to facilitate the expansion of academic facilities such as classroom buildings, laboratories, and libraries.

3. Further measures designed to expand educational opportunity through aid to students in financing their higher education.

There being no objection, the letter and the memorandum were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION,
Washington, D.C., August 22, 1960.

Hon. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR YARBOROUGH: It is a pleasure to express to you on behalf of the American Council on Education our gratitude for the excellent presentation concerning the proposed omnibus bill in support of higher education which you made last Thursday to our Committee on Relationships of Higher Education to the Federal Government. Subsequently the committee heard a frank and informative statement from Secretary Flemming on the same subject, and then after full discussion, authorized a statement including comments on the various proposals embodied in the bill. A copy is enclosed for your information. The committee hopes that this statement will assist you and Secretary Flemming in agreeing on the provisions of a bill on which immediate action will be possible with bipartisan support.

Sincerely yours,

RAYMOND F. HOWES,
Acting Chief Executive.

COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSED OMNIBUS BILL IN THE LIGHT OF THE MOST SERIOUS GENERAL NEEDS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

(By the Committee on Relationships of Higher Education)

STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES AND PRIORITIES

It is the unanimous judgment of the committee that the priority needs of higher education among items of legislation now being considered by the Congress are as follows:

1. Continuation of the college housing loan program with adequate funds to meet the urgent need for additional dormitories and related facilities.

2. Legislation to make available long-term, low-interest loans or matching grants, at the option of the institution, to facilitate the expansion of academic facilities such as classroom buildings, laboratories, and libraries.

3. Further measures designed to expand educational opportunity through aid to students in financing their higher education.

COMMENTS ON PROPOSED OMNIBUS BILL

The committee has been invited to present its views on the proposed "Omnibus bill in support of higher education." The six items included in this legislation, as described by the Senate Subcommittee on Education in a news release dated July 1, together with our comments, are as follows:

1. A guarantee loan program for college students similar to a proposal introduced by Senator LYNDON JOHNSON in his bill S. 2710.

Comment: "With the rising cost of higher education, there is expanding need for various types of student assistance. We have been gratified at the success of the fellowships provided by several government agencies, particularly the National Science Foundation under its general authority and the U.S. Office of Education under the National Defense Education Act. We are also pleased with the success of the student loan fund under the National Defense Education Act and strongly recommend that adequate funds to continue this program at a level to meet demonstrable need be appropriated during this session of Congress. A guarantee loan program such as is proposed in S. 2710 would be a useful supplement to the other Federal programs now in effect, although it still would not meet the total needs of students in our colleges and universities."

2. Provision for $2.5 million for statewide inventories of existing college facilities and survey of the need for additional facilities. This is similar to a proposal contained in S. 878, introduced by Senator CASE of New Jersey.

Comment: "A number of States, including most of the larger ones where major planning problems exist, are well advanced in their inventories of present facilities and their studies of projected needs. A national survey of these needs has also been made by the U.S. Office of Education. However, some States have not as yet done all that could be desired in this area, and if the program of assistance here suggested, can be so designed as to apply particularly to their needs, it would certainly strengthen the Nation's total planning program for higher education."

3. A combined loan-guarantee and debt-retirement assistance program, including the earmarking of $50 million for junior colleges.

Comment: "We oppose that part of this legislation (the administration's S. 1017) which would replace the college housing loan program. We believe, however, that this program, as amended by Secretary Arthur S. Flemming in his testimony before the Senate Subcommittee on Education, would provide useful assistance in the construction of academic buildings as one of several optional approaches to the problem."

4. A $100 million grant program for construction of academic and other college and university facilities, with Federal grants to be matched by the institutions, and $15 million earmarked for junior colleges. These two proposals (items 3 and 4) include programs sponsored by the administration in its bill, S. 1017; S. 3776, introduced by Senators JOSEPH S. CLARK and RALPH W. YARBOROUGH; and S. 879, introduced by Senator CASE of New Jersey.

Comment: "Since neither a grant nor a loan program meets the needs of all institutions, we strongly favor legislation which makes both types of assistance available in accordance with institutional option, as is provided in S. 3776. While the suggested amount of $100 million is obviously inadequate to meet the total or even the immediate need, it would be sufficient to launch this dual program on an experimental basis.

"In the event that the Senate Subcommittee on Education believes the inclusion of a program involving matching grants would make the passage of the omnibus bill as a whole impossible during the present session of Congress, we recommend as an absolute minimum that Congress direct the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to prepare a detailed report on a program of this type for submission to the 87th Congress not later than February 15, 1961."

5. A $100 million Federal grant program for construction of medical and dental teaching facilities. This is similar to the administration's proposal contained in S. 3680, introduced by Senators JACOB JAVITS and CASE of New Jersey, and others.

Comment: "In recognition of the long established and critical need for facilities in medical and dental teaching, we endorse legislation of the type represented in S. 3680."

6. Extension of lending authority in the present college housing program to provide $250 million in loan funds for the current backlog of applications. This is similar to the proposal presented by Secretary Flemming before the subcommittee on June 13, 1960.

Comment: "The council stands firmly behind the present college housing loan program, and the previous recommendation of $500 million in additional authorization which is included in the general housing bill passed by the Senate, and in the general housing bill voted out by the House Committee on Banking and Currency and now under consideration by the Rules Committee. In this stand the council has the almost unanimous support of institutions of higher learning and of the organizations representing them. Consequently, the committee would endorse the above proposal only in the event that enactment of a housing bill at this session of Congress should become impossible, and that the reduced amount of authorization in this proposal should not be considered as terminal.

"Specifically, then, the committee strongly recommends that the following two provisos be included in the draft of the proposed omnibus bill:

"(a) That such an additional authorization for housing shall not in any sense be considered a terminal authorization for the college housing loan program, and

"(b) That the provision shall be of no effect if additional authorization of funds is made for the college housing loan program at this session of the Congress through a general housing bill."

Members of the committee extend the appreciation of the colleges and universities of this country to those Members of Congress, of both parties, who by such proposals as the omnibus bill in support of higher education give evidence of their enlightened concern for the future of American education.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter from Arthur S. Flemming, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, addressed to the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], endorsing the principles of this resolution. This is a bipartisan effort to aid higher education in America.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
August 30, 1960.

Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Education, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: It is my understanding that the Education Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is giving consideration to a Senate resolution which would request the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to "review and survey various forms of Federal assistance for encouraging and helping institutions of higher education" and to submit the results of such review and survey to the Congress not later than February 15, 1961, together with such recommendations for legislation as he might deem to be appropriate.

The proposed resolution would put the Senate of the United States on record as initiating and supporting a thorough review and survey by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare of the several forms of Federal assistance which might be utilized to assist institutions of higher education, including junior and community colleges, to meet their critical needs.

I have repeatedly emphasized the need for addressing ourselves to the problems of institutions of higher education. By the fall of 1964 a million more students will seek admission to institutions of higher learning. Every effort must be made to assure that places are available for them and that instruction of undiminished quality is made available to them. Legislative proposals recommended by this administration for various forms of Federal assistance in the field of higher education have indicated our awareness of these problems. The review and survey proposed by the resolution would, in my judgment, give impetus to further consideration of financial assistance for higher institutions.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR S. FLEMMING,
Secretary.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 388) favoring a survey looking to Federal aid for institutions of higher learning, submitted by Mr. YARBOROUGH (for himself and Senators HILL, MURRAY, KENNEDY, MCNAMARA, MORSE, CLARK, RANDOLPH, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, BURDICK, CASE of New Jersey, JAVITS, PROUTY, HART, GORE, PROXMIRE, ANDERSON, MANSFIELD, KUCHEL, BYRD of West Virginia, CARROLL, and ENGLE) was received and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as follows:

Whereas one million additional students are expected to enroll in institutions of higher education by the fall of 1964; and

Whereas the accommodation of these additional students without diminution of the quality of instruction or impairment of educational opportunity will require broad and effective planning and action on the part of the institutions and greatly increased support on the part of all individuals and organizations, public and private, concerned with higher education; and

Whereas strong and effective institutions of higher learning and opportunities for all qualified youths to secure a higher education are essential to the well-being and continued progress of this Nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate requests the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to review and survey various forms of potential Federal assistance for encouraging and helping institutions of higher education, including junior and community colleges, to meet their critical needs, giving particular consideration to the desirability and feasibility of Federal assistance to help States assess their needs in higher education and develop plans for meeting them, of Federal loan and matching grant assistance in the construction of classrooms and related physical facilities, and matching grants to help construct medical, dental, osteopathic, and public health teaching facilities, and of Federal assistance, including student loan insurance, which will broaden the opportunity of qualified students to obtain a higher education.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is requested to consult with persons and groups broadly representative of American higher education in making his review and survey, and to submit the results of such review and survey to the 87th Congress not later than February 15, 1961, together with recommendations for such legislation as he deems to be appropriate.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I wish to commend the junior Senator from Texas on the submission of a resolution in regard to a higher education study which he has presented on behalf of himself and a number of our colleagues, including the senior Senator from New Jersey.

The problem of higher education is one with which we are all concerned, one which has many ramifications, and one that many of us have made many suggestions in regard to handling.

Unfortunately, time ran on so quickly during the session that it was impossible for our Subcommittee on Education to take definitive action on the many proposals that were made before us, but, as the Senator from Texas has said, we have been working not only closely with each other, but also closely with Secretary Flemming. As he also said, the resolution for the study and the report to be made by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is a subject on which the Department is fully agreed, and all Members who have signed the resolution on a bipartisan basis are also agreed.

I hope that much good will come of it. I believe this effort is additional evidence that with respect to this great problem we are not acting in a partisan or narrow way, but Senators on both sides of the aisle who are deeply dedicated to the service of education have joined and will continue to join in seeking the legislation proposed.

I ask unanimous consent that these remarks be placed at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Texas which he made when he submitted his resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE V OF AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1949—AMENDMENT

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I submit an amendment, intended to be proposed by me, to House bill 12759, the so-called Mexican labor bill, and ask that the amendment be printed, under the rule, together with an explanation of the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table; and, without objection, the amendment and explanation will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment and explanation are as follows:

At the end of the bill add a new section as follows:

"SEC. 2. Section 501 of such Act is amended by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (6), and inserting a semicolon in lieu thereof; and by adding at the end of such section a new paragraph as follows:

"'(7) to establish specific criteria for judging whether the employment of Mexi-

can agricultural workers in the United States is adversely affecting or will adversely affect the wages, working conditions, or employment opportunities of domestic workers similarly employed. Such criteria shall include but shall not be limited to (a) failure of wages and earnings in activities and areas using Mexicans to advance with wage increases generally; (b) the relationship between Mexican employment trends and wage trends in areas using Mexican workers; (c) differences in wage and earning levels of workers on farms using Mexican labor compared with nonusers.' "

EXPLANATION OF AMENDMENT

Title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949 prohibits the Secretary of Labor from making Mexican workers available for employment in agricultural activities in the United States unless he determines and certifies that their employment will not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of domestic agricultural workers similarly employed. In its present form, title V contains no standards to guide the Secretary in the development of appropriate measures to carry out his statutory responsibilities. All efforts by the Secretary to establish reasonable standards have been resisted both in and out of the courts.

If this provision, designed to protect domestic workers, is to be meaningful, it would seem necessary and appropriate, in the light of the controversies which surround the Secretary of Labor's effort to apply reasonable tests, for the Congress to provide in the law some criteria against which the Secretary can carry out his statutory responsibility to assure that the use of Mexican workers will not adversely affect the wages, working conditions and employment opportunities of our own workers.

This amendment provides a few minimum statutory guidelines. To this end, clause (a) requires the Secretary of Labor in making a determination as to whether he can certify that the employment of any Mexican agricultural workers in any area would not adversely affect the wages, working conditions and employment opportunities of our own agricultural workers, to examine whether the wages and earnings of workers in the activities and areas that use Mexican workers have risen correspondingly with wage increases generally.

Clause (b) is designed to require the Secretary of Labor to examine and consider in connection with his certification whether the number of Mexican workers in the area involved have increased progressively and whether there has been in the same area a downward trend in wage rates.

The criterion provided for under clause (c) would require a comparison of wages and earning levels of workers on farms using Mexican labor with the wages and earning levels of domestic workers employed on farms that use no Mexican workers.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS TO FILE REPORTS SUBSEQUENT TO ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Government Operations, on its own behalf or on behalf of its subcommittees, be authorized to file reports with the Secretary of the Senate during the adjournment sine die of the 86th Congress, 2d session, and that they be printed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRANSPORTATION BY AIR OF MAIL NOT BEARING AIR MAIL POSTAGE

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, it is evident now that the press of other legislative business very likely will prevent the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service from reporting H.R. 12595, the bill to halt the transportation by air of mail not bearing air mail postage.

In a letter to the Postmaster General on July 20, 1960, Comptroller General Joseph Campbell suggested that there be no expansion of the airlift "during the balance of the 2d session of the 86th Congress in order that the Senate may have an opportunity to consider H.R. 12595."

In my opinion, it is of no practical significance whether or not the Senate actually considers H.R. 12595 in the present session. The House of Representatives on July 2, 1960, passed the bill prohibiting the transportation of first class mail by air unless air mail postage at the 7-cent rate has been paid. The action of the House of Representatives very effectively should eliminate the "implied legislative approval" mentioned in the U.S. court of appeals decision on December 12, 1955, when on the basis of such implied approval, it was found that the airlift operation was legal.

Even though no action may be taken in the Senate because of the time element, it is my considered judgment that the action of the House clearly eliminates any conceivable idea of congressional consent to this operation, and the Postmaster General is hereby put on notice that there is no longer any congressional consent either implied or otherwise. Accordingly, in the future, the Postmaster General should respect the wishes of Congress in this matter.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

Letter written by him, addressed to Prof. Lev E. Dobriansky, chairman of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., relating to the 20th anniversary of the founding of that committee.

By Mr. THURMOND:

Address intended to be delivered by him at the forthcoming dedication of the new headquarters of the National Association of Life Underwriters in Washington, D.C., on September 11, 1960.

DISCHARGE OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY FROM FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF SENATE BILL 958

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I thank the Chair, and I send to the desk a resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read by the clerk.

The resolution (S. Res. 386) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on the Judiciary be, and hereby is, discharged from further consideration of the bill (S. 958) to assist in meeting the costs of special professional services needed in carrying out public school desegregation programs, and for other purposes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President——

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask for its immediate consideration.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to have the reporter read the statement that was made by the Chair in order to ascertain just what stage in the morning hour we had reached. I heard the Chair state that morning business was over. I thought I did, and I would like to have that read back to the Senate to determine whether that is correct. I have no objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois. He was asking me about a matter on the Executive Calendar. I thought the Chair asked if there was any morning business and announced the conclusion of morning business. I have no objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois to return to morning business, but I do not want the RECORD to show it is a matter of right, because it is not a matter of right. The Chair had stated morning business was concluded.

Mr. JAVITS. I think it is very important that we have the RECORD read to see if it is a matter of right. I do not want to avail myself of a unanimous consent if it is a matter of right.

The official reporter (Mr. Herbert N. Budlong) read as follows:

The PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE. Morning business is in order: Reports of committees, the introduction of bills and joint resolutions, the submission of concurrent and other resolutions.

If there are no concurrent resolutions, morning business is closed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I submit that is the statement I heard. It is up to the Senator to make his decision.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I would like to say to my colleague, if I may be recognized, it is very well known why an adjournment was taken.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. An adjournment was taken because the majority leader decided it was appropriate to adjourn, not because anybody put a pistol to his temple.

Mr. JAVITS. It was not because anybody put a pistol to his head. I think I would have a right to be extremely unhappy over that statement in view of the fact that on the floor yesterday I stated I respected the leadership and would not contest that, and said I did not intend to. It seems to me I was very polite to him and very decent about the whole situation. I was not trying to raise a question about that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Texas is not raising a question about somebody being polite. The Senator from Texas raised the question whether morning business had been concluded. It had been concluded. The minority leader asked consent to return to it, and I am willing to give him that

consent. If the Senator from New York does not want to operate under those conditions, it is up to him.

Mr. JAVITS. When I asked the Chair whether it was of right or whether it was by consent, the Chair said it was a matter of right. I would prefer, naturally, to proceed as a matter of right. That was my view, and that was the view I expressed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator heard the RECORD read.

Mr. JAVITS. I did. That is the first time I did hear the RECORD. May I say, too, in all kindness, 10 minutes after 10 was the time I arrived in the Chamber. It would seem to me, even from my own side, a quorum call could have been asked for if this matter was going to be gone through quickly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am sure if the Senator had desired one and had made that suggestion he would have been within his rights. I do not know what steps the Senator took. I was here at 10 o'clock. I am here every morning when we meet.

I have no disposition to preclude the Senator from proceeding, but since he talks about not wanting to do it unless it is a matter of right, I want him to know what his rights are.

Mr. JAVITS. This is the first time I have known about it. I thank the Senator.

I now send the resolution to the desk and ask to have it read——

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I stated a few moments ago I would not object to the request of the minority leader, inasmuch as he had stated in his place he did not hear the Chair state the morning hour had been closed, and that it ought to be reopened, but I must object to any request from the floor for introduction of new matter after that point has passed.

If the minority leader, not having heard the Chair state that morning business was closed, makes the request that we return to the introduction of concurrent and other resolutions, I shall not object, but I shall object to the introduction of this matter from the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is advised by the Parliamentarian that the Senator from Illinois was seeking recognition at the time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I renew my unanimous-consent request that we return to morning business. Let me say in explanation that I was conferring with the majority leader and directing his attention to an item on the Executive Calendar.

I cannot ofttimes well follow all things at once, although the presumption is that every Member of the Senate should know that after the prayer we start on the regular procedure, after adjournment, with the morning business. If I have been in error in that respect, I freely confess my sins.

I renew my request, because I feel duty-bound, because of the adjournment last night, that the distinguished Senator from New York should have an opportunity to submit the resolution he is proposing to offer.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution and ask to have it stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution has been read.

Mr. JAVITS. I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, may I understand what the request was?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New York has asked for present consideration of the resolution.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, there is objection to that request or to any other proceedings that require unanimous consent under this resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In view of the objection, the resolution will go over 1 day, under the rule.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. At what point in the proceeding may I make a brief statement with reference to this resolution?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the present situation, there is a bill under consideration. The Senator will have to get time from somebody in control of the time, because the time on the bill is under control.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators may have not to exceed 3 minutes to make any statements on any matters they may desire to discuss.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, aside from the details of this resolution, everybody knows I could proceed in this matter in many other ways than by submitting a resolution. The important question I am seeking to present to the Senate is what, if anything, the Senate ought to do about the civil rights issue at this session. Instead of presenting that issue in some peripheral way, by a proceeding incident to some bill or by another proceeding that would require a committee to report on a day certain, I have chosen at this moment to present the matter by a discharge resolution, and for this reason: I think we have to pinpoint, both in the Senate and in the country, that whether or not civil rights is considered in this session of Congress is a leadership decision. Under existing circumstances, with a few days to go, it cannot be made by any one Senator, nor can it be made unless there is some reason to expect very extensive and very real bipartisan support.

Mr. President, by presenting a discharge resolution in the way I have, which is now at the desk, the door is open to action by the leadership; and that is my purpose. I think it has to be emphasized time and again to the American people that if civil rights legislation is not acted on in this session of Congress an issue which I think towers above all the others we shall have left unfinished, with those we have tried to secure action on and could not finish, like the minimum wage bill.

Considering the nature of the session, we have no choice in the matter except to understand that this is a leadership decision and that the leadership will unquestionably have made it in a very advised way.

Mr. President, civil rights is the one issue which now towers above all others as the great piece of unfinished business before this Congress. The accomplishment or lack of accomplishment of this bobtail session of Congress will be debated for some time to come—in the immediate future by the political partisans and over the long run by the scholars and analysts. We have apparently approached this session with the view to dealing with the so-called "gut" issues, those issues to protect the persons, the livelihoods and the physical well-being of our citizens. But, despite the results of political conventions which produced lengthy platforms devoted to "building a better America" and "the rights of man," we have failed to deal with the one issue which touches the very soul of our Nation, civil rights.

When we returned after the July conventions, there was an urgent need for action on civil rights. This was due to the critical nature of the issue and to the expectations each party had aroused by its platform pledges. Those of us who attempted even to place this issue on the calendar and bring it on the floor were sidetracked by the cry of "interference" with vital legislation, such as the minimum wage bill, medical care for the aged, school construction, housing, mutual security and even the Antarctic Treaty. All of these issues have now been disposed of, and noticeably without the support of those who cried "interference" most loudly when civil rights was mentioned. Nevertheless, the problem of civil rights is still with us and is still acute—we see the sad spectacle of an elected official in one of our great states openly defying a Federal court; we are plagued with senseless violence resulting from peaceful protests over the failure to secure equal rights.

Both major parties made broad promises on civil rights in their platforms—promises which in some cases were in marked contrast to votes which had been cast on the very same issues earlier in the year. The American people deserve to know whether civil rights is to be a subject for the phrasemakers or the lawmakers.

Should a last-ditch fight now be made to seek the passage of even the most minimal—but still vitally necessary—piece of civil rights legislation before we adjourn sine die? That is the decision with regard to which every sincere supporter of civil rights on this floor must search in his mind and his heart for the answer.

The Democratic majority and its leadership have told us in effect, "No, wait until next year. Next year we'll give you a good civil rights bill." Mr.

President, members of minority groups living in areas of the United States where their constitutional rights are flagrantly violated must find little solace in the Democratic majority's implicit stand that they "wait 'til next year." They know from experience that there is a strong minority within this Chamber—and within the Democratic majority in the Senate—which seems to be determined that they shall wait not "'til next year," but perhaps forever.

Within the next few weeks, millions of schoolchildren will return to their classes throughout the Nation, and once again we can anticipate, with a gripping fear of the national embarrassment which always accompanies it, the difficulties which will arise in many communities where a premium has been placed on failure to honor the law of the land regarding school desegregation; indeed, where the agencies of State and local government are themselves dedicated to evading the law.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New York? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on Monday I submitted a resolution that would have permitted the Senate to consider a very minimal civil rights bill, S. 958. This bill merely provides technical and financial assistance to those communities in our Nation which wish to desegregate their public schools in compliance with the law of the land, a problem which in this season particularly cries out for relief. This legislation deals, therefore, with an immediate problem, one which must be faced now and which cannot be postponed until the Congress returns in January at the beginning of a legislative year. The school year begins in September.

Let us remember that this is not new legislation. Its consideration is not precipitate. It was proposed by the President of the United States, has had many days of hearings and committee consideration in both Houses, and has been debated at great length on the floor of the Senate.

There are several means open to deal with this issue. It can, of course, be dealt with by having a committee report a bill which is pending before it on this issue. There is the route of amendment, which has, in the past, been availed of by the Senate—even during the closing hours of a session—as was the case with the extension of the life of the Federal Civil Rights Commission, which was accomplished as an amendment on the mutual security appropriations bill in 1959; and with the opening Senate consideration of the Civil Rights Act of 1960. It can be done by introducing a new bill and having it placed on the Senate Calendar, as the minority leader attempted to do when this August session began. It can be done by referring a bill to committee with instructions to report back to the Senate on a day certain. It can be done by discharging a bill which has received full consideration in an appropriate committee.

But one clear, penetrating lesson has emerged from this brief session. Notwithstanding the 2-to-1 majority of the Democrats in the Senate—only bipartisan teamwork can get enacted civil rights legislation because of the entrenched opposition of a minority among the majority party. Yet, apparently up to now in this short session a conscious political decision has been made which has led to the sacrifice of civil rights legislation upon the altar of what is seemly considered to be higher political expediency. In effect, the Republican minority, upon which the Democratic majority in the Senate has been inescapably dependent for support for civil rights legislation, has been cut adrift and told to "go it alone" for this short session. But we cannot pass such legislation without the support of Democrats, and the majority leadership knows it. This has sadly occurred, notwithstanding the Democratic Party hoisting high—indeed, it feels higher than the Republican Party—the banner of civil rights in this year's campaign.

But there is even now a last chance for determined action to redeem the promises so brightly made but 6 weeks ago. At this point in the session, successful action on taking up civil rights legislation must have leadership support and it must have bipartisan support—and as we saw in 1959—it can happen in a matter of hours when there is leadership and bipartisan support. The resolution which I intend to place on the Senate Calendar will provide the leadership with an opportunity to indicate whether such action has its support—it will enable friends of civil rights legislation in both parties to join as they did in 1959 and earlier in 1960.

When we pierce the veil of polite parliamentary language used by the opponents of civil rights we see the stark threat of a filibuster against any civil rights measure that is brought to the floor. Therefore, we know in advance that cloture must be invoked if a civil rights bills is to pass in the short time before we go home. The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] told us that over 2 weeks ago. Between the two parties if we will, we have enough votes to invoke cloture even by the unnecessarily restrictive requirements now in the rules—this was illustrated by the fact that two-thirds of the Senators were necessary last year to suspend the rules and extend the life of the Federal Civil Rights Commission and were available to vote such extension.

The discharge resolution which I propose to submit presents to the Senate a full opportunity to select any one of the proper methods under our rules by which we might consider this essential legislation. The discharge petition offers an opportunity for this U.S. Senate, given a determined leadership which has shown in the past that it can act—and which is now calling upon the country to bestow upon it the mantle of national leadership—to take the technical assistance measure and such other proposals as a majority of the Senate choose to add, and enact it into law before we adjourn sine die.

In this eleventh hour, I hope there may yet be Democratic support for taking up civil rights even on this minimal basis, support which I have found but from the four Democratic Senators DOUGLAS, MCNAMARA, HART, and MORSE who voted with the overwhelming majority of Republicans on August 9, 1960. I say to my colleagues on the other side of the asile who have traditionally stood with me in the civil rights fight, I would rather go home with a minimal civil rights bill than with what some may classify as a good campaign issue.

I know we will be together in the fight to revise rule XXII in January again—as we have certainly seen that the change made in January 1959 changed practically nothing at all. But let us go into that fight at least with the unity which will come from redeeming this short session from its signal failure in civil rights legislation which we both join in considering so vital to our country.

Mr. President, I have submitted the resolution in the hope that there may yet be time to arouse the views and feelings of my colleagues on the other side who have been very stanch on this issue before we actually adjourn sine die by again giving an opportunity to the leadership, through the resolution, or a move related to it, to bring up some civil rights legislation, particularly the two items referred to in the President's message.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, were we not in the midst of a presidential campaign, it would be impossible for any person to comprehend the tremendous urgency which is attached to this particular piece of proposed legislation in the last hours of this session.

If there is any bill which has been around for a long time, which has been considered and reconsidered, voted upon in the committee and in the Senate, it is the proposed legislation to which the Senator from New York has referred.

The bill was introduced as early as February 5, 1959, and was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Later, by unanimous consent, on the 10th day of April 1959 the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare was discharged from further consideration and the bill was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

On May 13, 1959, the bill was referred to the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. President, within the 3 minutes at my disposal I cannot discuss the long and checkered career of the bill. I wish to point out, however, that this proposal has been voted upon in the Committee on the Judiciary on four different occasions and has been defeated. It has been voted upon by the Senate on two different occasions in this Congress and has been defeated. It has been laid on the table on two separate occasions. Despite this, in the very last hours of the Congress great urgency is attached to it. We are asked to follow unusual procedures to get resolutions introduced to discharge the committee.

The committee has had the bill in its custody in one form or another ever since February 5, 1959. When the report is generally bruited about the land that the Congress will at last get out of town this week, we are confronted with a motion to discharge a committee from the consideration of a Senate bill dealing with this subject.

There has been no issue, so far as I know, which bears the title, conferred usually by some person seeking public favor, of "civil rights" that has been more thoroughly discussed, more often voted upon, and more consistently defeated in this Congress, than the bill which the Senator from New York is trying to wring from the hands of the Committee on the Judiciary. I can only say it seems that attempt might have been made somewhat earlier.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks a memorandum showing the course of the legislative history of this item, and the fact that it has repeatedly been the subject of votes not only in the committee, but on the floor of the Senate itself.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY OF S. 958, A BILL TO ASSIST IN MEETING THE COST OF SPECIAL PROFESSIONAL SERVICES NEEDED IN CARRYING OUT PUBLIC SCHOOL DESEGREGATION PROGRAMS, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES, 86TH CONGRESS

1. Introduced in the Senate on February 5, 1959. Referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

2. On April 10, 1959, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare discharged, and the bill referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3. On May 13, 1959, referred to the Judiciary Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights.

4. This bill, along with others, was the subject of public hearings conducted by the Constitutional Rights Subcommittee on May 15, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 25, 26, 27 and 28, 1959 (printed hearings are available in four volumes).

5. On July 15, 1959, the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights reported to the full Committee that it had considered S. 958 along with other bills, having held public hearings at length and having considered all the proposals before it, and reported favorably a clean bill (S. 2391) to extend the Commission on Civil Rights and to provide further means of securing and protecting the right to vote. Nothing resembling the text of S. 958 was included in S. 2391.

6. On August 19, 1959, Mr. KEATING proposed an amendment (8-19-59—A) to H.R. 4938, Calendar No. 656, title 8 thereof, incorporating substantially the text of S. 958.

7. On February 15, 1960, Mr. DIRKSEN submitted amendments (2-15-60—B) intended to be proposed to H.R. 8315. Section 204 of these proposed amendments incorporates substantially the text of S. 958.

8. On February 24, 1960, Mr. DIRKSEN proposed an amendment to H.R. 8315 in the nature of a substitute. Section 4 of this amendment incorporates substantially the text of S. 958. The Dirksen substitute was the subject of extended debate on the floor of the Senate and a great portion of the discussion of this amendment in the nature of a substitute was directed to section 4 thereof.

9. On March 24, 1960, the Senate adopted a motion of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas that H.R. 8601, a bill to enforce constitutional rights and for other purposes, be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, with instructions to refer it back to the Senate not later than Tuesday, March 29, 1960.

10. On March 29, 1960, H.R. 8601 was reported to the Senate, with amendments, by the Judiciary Committee under authority of the order of the Senate of March 24, 1960.

11. While H.R. 8601 was being considered by the Senate Judiciary Committee, Senator KEATING, of New York, submitted an amendment thereto proposing to incorporate the text of S. 958 into H.R. 8601. This amendment was defeated in the committee.

12. On April 4, 1960, while H.R. 8601 was being considered by the Senate, Mr. KEATING sent to the desk a proposed amendment which would have incorporated the text of S. 958 into H.R. 8601. This proposed amendment was the subject of a vigorous debate in which the senior Senator from New York, Mr. JAVITS, participated. This proposed amendment, along with others offered thereto, was tabled by a vote of 61 yeas to 30 nays.

13. On August 9, 1960, Mr. DIRKSEN introduced S. 3828, a bill to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1960 in order to establish a Commission on Equal Job Opportunity Under Government Contracts, and to authorize assistance to State and local educational agencies to effectuate desegregation in public schools. The second section of this bill incorporates the substance of S. 958. Mr. DIRKSEN indicated his intention that the bill not be referred to the Judiciary Committee but that it might be placed on the calendar. Mr. CLARK moved to lay on the table the bill introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN. The motion to table carried by a vote of 54 yeas to 28 nays.

UNION WELFARE AND PENSION FUNDS

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, approximately 2 years ago we passed a law concerning the regulation of the union welfare and pension funds. At that time the senior Senator from Colorado was forced to take a very extremely lonesome position about the quality of the legislation which was being submitted to Congress for the control of these funds.

Recently the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] placed in the RECORD a long report by Secretary Mitchell and made a speech upon the subject, showing that the words uttered 2 or 3 years ago were prophetic.

Out of an estimated 400,000 to 500,000 funds in the United States, only 142,000 have ever reported, and those reports are very inadequate. I feel that this is an area in which Congress must take action, but the fact that performance under this law has turned out so unsatisfactorily, it is in my mind conclusive proof that the law that we passed was completely inadequate, that we have wasted hundreds of thousands of dollars in the administration of so-called welfare and pension funds, and, most pathetic and sorrowfully of all, we have not protected the workingman today from raids upon his funds by the unscrupulous people in power.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a statement I have prepared upon this subject.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ALLOTT

There have been references made in this body in the past few weeks as to the need of strengthening the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act of 1958. I was pleased to hear the distinguished Senator from Illinois, Mr. DOUGLAS, only last week add his voice to those of President Eisenhower and Secretary Mitchell in requesting needed amendments to the act. I point out to the Senate that President Eisenhower had grave misgivings as to the effectiveness of the law when he signed the bill in August 1958. At that time he indicated that he was approving the act only "because it establishes a precedent of Federal responsibility in this area. It does little else." He stated: "If the bill is to be at all effective it will require extensive amendment at the next session of the Congress." His views in this regard were shared, I believe, by all of my colleagues who had worked on this problem in the Senate.

Secretary Mitchell's report on the first 18 months of operation of the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act confirms the fact that the act provides only "a shameful illusion" of adequate protection to over $30 billion in which 85 million Americans have a vital interest. That report supports President Eisenhower's misgivings in 1958 and clearly points up the need for action on a bill (S. 2550) which was introduced by my good friend, the junior Senator from Pennsylvania, HUGH SCOTT, in the first session of this Congress to carry out the President's recommendations and provide a measure of protection over these funds.

Unfortunately, that bill has lain dormant, day after day, month after month, and very soon we shall be able to add year after year, in the Senate Labor Subcommittee, chaired by the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts. I hope that Secretary Mitchell's dramatic report indicating the shortcomings of that act will prompt the junior Senator from Massachusetts, who has a responsibility in this area, to join with President Eisenhower, Secretary Mitchell, Senator Douglas, and myself in an effort to correct its ineffectiveness.

I do not intend to cast blame for the original failure of a Democratic controlled Congress to pass meaningful legislation. However, in view of statements recently made on the floor of this great body directed at an administration which was the prime mover in bringing to light the sickening abuses in the handling of welfare and pension funds, I intend to set the record straight.

President Eisenhower in a special message to Congress in January 1954, recommended that the Congress study the operations and administration of welfare and pension plans. The tremendous growth in these plans during World War II and the years that followed, together with possible abuses which may have developed during such expansion, prompted the President's recommendations. In May of that year a special subcommittee was set up under the chairmanship of our esteemed former colleague, Senator Irving Ives, of New York, to investigate the operations and administration of these plans. The investigation was continued during the 84th Congress under the chairmanship of the able Senator from Illinois, Senator DOUGLAS. The final report of the welfare and pension plans investigation filed by Senator DOUGLAS contained the following paragraph:

"The mandate which brought about the subcommittee's investigation of these programs did not arise from a desire on the part of Congress to meddle in the affairs of either labor or management; it became necessary because of unfavorable developments in the welfare and pension programs, as recognized in the President's message of January 11, 1954."

The extensive investigative hearings which had been so ably conducted, first by our well-remembered colleague, Senator Ives, and later by the able senior Senator from Illinois, Senator DOUGLAS, served as a basis for

consideration of legislation by the Subcommittee on Labor of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Unfortunately, Senator DOUGLAS' tenure as chairman of that subcommittee was terminated prior to the consideration of such legislation. I had come to appreciate Senator DOUGLAS' broad insight during the time we served together on the special investigating committee and had confirmed my high regard for his doggedness and determination in debate. His extensive knowledge and wise counsel were sorely missed during the course of our consideration of legislation in this area. I say this even though we did not entirely agree on the proper scope of this legislation.

The administration maintained its position in the forefront of welfare and pension legislation when an administration bill designed to cope with the abuses in the administration and operation of welfare and pension funds was introduced in Congress in January 1956. (Three months before the filing of the final report by Senator DOUGLAS' investigating subcommittee.) A similar bill (S. 1145) was introduced in the Senate. The administration's position was later revised and support given to S. 2888, a bill which passed this body by the overwhelming vote of 88 to 0.

I differed with some of my colleagues as to the broad sweep of S. 2888 which I felt covered unnecessarily certain types of pension and welfare plans where no abuses had been uncovered and which seemed for good reason to be immune to skulduggery—the "level of benefits" plans. But when I was unsuccessful in limiting the legislation to those crucial areas where abuses had been uncovered, I voted to support the bill. My supplemental views filed with the Senate Labor Committee report explained my belief that the broad scope of the bill would "make it difficult for the administering agency to detect the evils which disclosure is intended to reveal." Nevertheless, although I looked upon certain provisions of the bill as questionable (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 104, pt. 6, p. 7515), I voted to support the bill because of the urgent need to "restore some sense of integrity, decency, and honesty to the administration of the fixed-cost funds." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 104, pt. 6, p. 7515.)

I believe that the 88-to-0 vote of this body in support of the Senate bill disproves the charge of administration lipservice to the passage of this legislation.

The fact of the matter is the Democratic-controlled House, led by Chairman BARDEN and Congressman TELLER, conspired to cut the guts out of the Senate-passed bill by stripping the Secretary of Labor of all power under the bill. He was installed by the terms of the House bill as a mere custodian of reports, reports which under the terms of the House bill were meaningless. And, what did this great body do? Why, our conferees led by the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts, in spite of a vote of 88 to 0 in support of our position, accepted the House version of the bill almost verbatim.

It is true that we were successful in obtaining permission from the House conferees to permit the Secretary to prescribe "forms" but even this concession provided that such forms did not have to be used. It was as the junior Senator from Massachusetts has indicated a difficult conference. But I can scarcely agree with his sentiments that "the Senate conferees were negotiating from a point of weakness." I suppose my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who controlled a majority of the Senate conferees and a majority of the House conferees will soon be accusing the Republican administration of making the Senate conferees weak and for having brought forth the more ineffective of the two bills from that completely Democratic dominated conference. The fact of the matter is that an ineffective bill was brought forth and was pawned off to the public as the answer to the abuses discovered in the operation and administration of welfare and pension funds.

I differed with such an approach. When the conference report on this legislation was up for adoption in the Senate, I stated, "I believe the people of the country, particularly the laboring people, should understand that the report will not remedy many of the troubles which afflict the pension and welfare plans. I believe that point should be clearly understood, so that the people of the country who work and who are members of some kind of fund or plan will understand the limitations of the conference report legislation.

"The report will give to each individual member information about how his fund is operated, what it consists of, and what his benefits and his rights under it are. But so far as being a really tough bill to stop the abuses which are found in abundance in many, many of these funds, throughout the country, particularly in the fixed-cost, Taft-Hartley type plans, the conference report does not provide any effective authority to clean up the funds.

"Under the circumstances, I believe the conference report probably is weaker in some respects than Senate bill 2888. The conference report will do what I have just said and no more."

In short we had come full circle from the Committee bill which provided unnecessarily burdensome regulation to one which accomplished virtually nothing.

In spite of the bill's shortcomings I indicated that I believed the wisest thing we could do at that time was agree to the conference report, and go along with it for a year or two; and then, when the next session of Congress convened, proceed to make improvements.

I told the Senate, "* * * that with the information which is given to individual Members, and with the statistical information made available, within a year and a half, or two years at the most, we can have a wealth of information which will permit us to legislate far more adequately than at the present time."

It appeared during our discussion of the conference report that the junior Senator from Massachusetts agreed with my remarks. However, in view of his subsequent statement at the time of the signing of the bill by President Eisenhower that "workers can now rest assured that the funds they depend upon for old-age retirement and for health and welfare benefits will be protected," I have no present knowledge as to whether or not he recognizes the urgent need to amend the legislation to provide adequate safeguards for the over 30 billions of dollars in which 85 million Americans have an interest.

In 1959 and again this year, the administration made specific recommendations to strengthen the law. Bills, which if enacted would make this law effective, have been pending in both Houses of Congress since the first session of this Congress but no legislative action has been taken.

In addition, we now have Secretary Mitchell's report on how the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act has been working out. It is an excellent report, some 43 pages in all, and I urge the Members of the Senate to study it.

In his report, Mr. Mitchell explained that the two major shortcomings of the law were its failure to provide authority to the Secretary to interpret its provisions or to investigate and enforce compliance with it. This lack of authority to administer effectively the law has resulted, Secretary Mitchell stated, in the obvious failure of many thousands of pension and welfare plans to file with the Labor Department as required by the law. In addition, the Secretary explained, thousands of reports filed with the Department contain defects in and omissions of information required by the law.

In his letter of transmittal to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House on August 11 last, Secretary Mitchell called for "prompt amendment of the act" to correct its deficiencies. He asked that the law be changed to require prompt and meaningful reports from pension and welfare funds plan administrators, to permit the Secretary of Labor to issue authoritative interpretations of the law, and to give the Labor Secretary power to investigate violations and enforce provisions of the legislation.

The situation in which the Secretary of Labor finds himself and which so handicaps him is best described by the following examples:

1. The number of plan descriptions (142,500) which have been filed with the Department of Labor to be made available for public disclosure is many thousands short of the number of plans believed to fall within the scope of the act.

2. Based upon information relating to the frequency of changes in employee benefit plans it is obvious that the number of plan amendments submitted to the Department of Labor under the requirements of the act is thousands short of the total number which should have been submitted and thus full and current details of these plans are not available for public disclosure.

3. The law requires that for each description of an employee welfare or pension benefit plan the plan administrator shall file an annual report covering the operations of that plan. By June 30, 1960, only 100,500 annual financial reports had been filed with the Department of Labor. Not only were some 15,000 to 20,000 reports delinquent and in violation of the law after June 30 but thousands of other submissions consolidated the financial data for several plans into a single report contrary to the explicit provisions of the act.

4. Moreover, obvious defects and omissions are clearly evident in thousands of reports which have been filed and thus patently not in compliance with the law. In many instances, after these deficiencies have been called to the attention of plan administrators, they remain uncorrected. Under the present state of the law, the Department can take no further action.

5. Finally, the overall adequacy or accuracy of seemingly complete reports filed with the Department of Labor cannot be effectively determined because of the absence of rulemaking, investigatory or enforcement authority thus leaving the Secretary of Labor for all practical purposes, powerless to uncover abuses.

By failing to act on this legislation, we are failing to keep faith with the people of America. We are continuing to maintain the false impression in the minds of over 85 million working people that their interests in welfare and pension funds amounting to over $30 billion are adequately protected.

We owe a duty to these millions of Americans to amend the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act. By amending the act, we can see to it that the billions of dollars annually received and disbursed by these plans are not being manipulated or embezzled. We should assure the working people of this country that these plans will be honestly managed for the lawful purposes for which they were intended.

I ask the Senate to honor the request of President Eisenhower for amendment to this act. I ask the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts, who has jurisdiction over this area, to give some attention to the ineffectiveness of this law which was pointed out by the President when he signed the bill in August 1958, and confirmed by Secretary Mitchell's report on the

first 18 months of operation of the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act. I ask that the junior Senator from Massachusetts consent to have early hearings on amendment to this act. Continued silence on his part can only mean that the chairman of our Labor Subcommittee really was interested more in getting "a bill" than in protection of the workingman's welfare and retirement funds. They are not now protected and unfortunately those who need the protection believe that the protection exists.

FARM CREDIT

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I am informed, although I have not yet had an opportunity to locate it in the RECORD, that the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] yesterday made a speech upon farm credit and the need for it. I could not agree with him more. The first bill I offered in the Senate of the United States was a bill to completely revise, modernize, and codify the farm credit laws of the United States, which began with the Bankhead-Jones Act, and come up to date with some 30-odd amendments. The regulations alone interpreting these laws consist of about 1,200 pages. Not only are the local committees of the Farm Home Administration confused about the laws and regulations, but also attorneys in the Department of Agriculture many times say that they cannot untangle the web that Congress has woven around them.

There has been lying in the Committee on Agriculture for several months now a codification, a good farm credit bill. I wish to say that it has been held up not by any Members on my side of the aisle but by some Members on the other side of the aisle. I wish to say specifically that the chairman of that subcommittee, the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] deserves our thanks. If he were here on the floor at this moment I would thank him for all the efforts that he has made to try to bring this proposed legislation, which is so necessary to the welfare of our farmers, to fruition. If anyone had seen, as I have seen, good American farmers lined up for a block and a half down the street waiting to file their applications for loans, he would understand why these laws must be simplified and why they should be made meaningful.

THE PLACING OF APPROPRIATE MONUMENT OR MARKER AT SITE OF FORT CLATSOP IN HONOR OF THE LATE SENATOR NEUBERGER

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD the text of a resolution adopted at the last meeting of the Democratic Central Committee of the State of Oregon. The resolution provides for the placing of a marker or plaque at Fort Clatsop in honor of my late colleague, Richard Neuberger, who was the moving spirit behind the creation of Fort Clatsop as a national memorial.

I ask unanimous consent that both the resolution and the letter, which I received from the chairman of the Democratic Party of Oregon, be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF CLATSOP COUNTY DEMOCRATIC CENTRAL COMMITTEE, ASTORIA, OREG.

Whereas it was due to the untiring work and devotion of the late Senator Richard L. Neuberger that Fort Clatsop was declared a national memorial by the Congress of the United States and the necessary funds were provided to carry out the work of making Fort Clatsop a national shrine; and

Whereas the Fort Clatsop National Memorial is of great historical interest and will attract thousands of visitors in coming years: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Clatsop County Democratic Central Committee and the Democratic Party of Oregon, acting jointly do go on record as urging that in recognition of Senator Richard Neuberger's work and devotion a suitable monument or marker be placed at the site of Fort Clatsop in honor of the late Senator; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be presented to the Oregon congressional delegates, Department of Interior Secretary Seaton, Gov. Mark Hatfield, Mrs. Maurine Neuberger, the Oregon Historical Society, Clatsop County Historical Society, and other interested parties.

DEMOCRATIC PARTY OF OREGON,
Portland, Oreg., August 27, 1960.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR WAYNE: The enclosed resolution urging that a suitable monument or marker be placed at the site of Fort Clatsop in honor of Senator Richard Neuberger was proposed at the July 31, 1960, Democratic State Central Committee meeting. That body unanimously endorsed the resolution.

Your favorable attention to this resolution will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

ROBERT W. STRAUB,
State Chairman.

SAN JOSE CONFERENCE OF AMERICAN FOREIGN MINISTERS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, Secretary of State Herter has just returned from San Jose, Costa Rica. I know that the Senate joins with me in welcoming him home. I should also like to take this occasion to extend to him and his associates my congratulations and thanks for their exceptional efforts on behalf of the Nation and the hemisphere at the American Conference of Foreign Ministers.

The word "victory," notwithstanding the use of it in speeches in Havana, has no relevance in relation to the results of this Conference. The Conference did not convene for the purpose of defeating any nation. And it is a measure of the depths of misunderstanding which still remains in this hemisphere that it should be so interpreted by anyone. It convened in an effort to meet two real problems of this hemisphere. In the one, there was a situation of continuing tyranny which, after decades of incubation within the borders of one nation, had evidently reached such lengths as to bring about an attempted assassination of a leader of another nation elsewhere in the hemisphere. The conscience of the Americas could no longer suffer that situation in silence and the first specific steps were taken to neutralize it. The decision, to act in this fashion, adopted by 20 of the 21 American states, was a milestone in the development of a doctrine of hemispheric concern which had been enunciated last year in the Declaration of Santiago.

With respect to the second problem, the Conference drew clearer the line against attempts of those not of this hemisphere to introduce destructive dissension among the American states and break their unity by missile threats. It also strengthened the resolve of the hemisphere to deal in concert with any member nation which facilitates that introduction by an arrogant and immature denial of the common history of the Americas and its own responsibilities to the hemisphere. That is the substance of the new Declaration of San Jose, signed by 19 of the 21 American nations. How it will be elaborated depends upon the strength of the resolve of the preponderant number of nations which signed it and on how those to whom it applies respond, not today or tomorrow but in the weeks and months and years ahead.

Regardless of my personal feelings, there is no comfort in the fact that two states chose not merely to differ with, but to defy the combined judgment of the other American Republics. But there would have been even less comfort in not facing the problems which had to be faced in the interests of the hemisphere in order to put on a misleading mask of unity. I hope that those nations now in defiance will ponder their actions and their interests most carefully. I hope that they will reach the same conclusion which this Nation reached when it inaugurated the good neighbor policy; that it is in the long-range national interests to work in concert with the other American states regardless of what temporary gain may seem to flow from working independently of them or against them.

I do not think it is too much to ask American nations and to continue to ask them to keep family quarrels within the house of the Americas and not, in a blind fury, run to the corner to find a "furioso" to back up their defiance. But if one or two must follow this pattern of immaturity so be it. But let us strengthen the house and keep it strong. The house will be there when the fury is spent. The door will always be open to them, and they can reenter whenever they are prepared to clean the mud from their shoes and to come in not as conquerors or tyrants but as sensible, sober and equal members of the American family.

To keep the house strong, Mr. President, and to build it stronger, we must move forward rapidly in concert with the other American States to deal with the economic and social problems of the hemisphere. This administration already has the full support of the Senate for a new approach to Latin America. I hope that the House will now act on S. 3839, prior to adjournment, so that the administration can go to the Bogotá Economic Conference which opens in a few days certain in the knowledge that the Nation stands solidly behind it in its efforts to rebuild the essential solidarity of the Western Hemisphere.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point in

my remarks the draft text of the Declaration of San Jose, Costa Rica, as published in the New York Times on August 29, 1960.

There being no objection, the draft text was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DRAFT TEXT OF DECLARATION OF SAN JOSE

The Seventh Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs—

1. Condemns emphatically intervention or the threat of intervention, even when conditional, from an extra-continental power in the affairs of the American Republics and declares that the acceptance of a threat of extra-continental intervention by any American state jeopardizes American solidarity and security, wherefore the Organization of American States is under obligation to disapprove it and reject it with equal vigor.

2. Rejects, also, the attempt of the Sino-Soviet powers to make use of the political economic, or social situation of any American state, inasmuch as that attempt is capable of destroying hemispheric unity and jeopardizing the peace and the security of the hemisphere.

3. Reaffirms the principles of nonintervention by any American state in the internal or external affairs of the other American states, and it reiterates that each state has the right to develop its culture, political, and economic life freely and naturally, respecting the rights of the individual and the principles of universal morality, and as a consequence, no American state may intervene for the purpose of imposing upon another American state its ideology or political, economic, or social principles.

OPPOSES TOTALITARIANISM

4. Reaffirms that the Inter-American system is incompatible with any form of totalitarianism and that democracy will achieve the full scope of its objectives in the hemisphere only when all the American Republics conduct themselves in accordance with the principles stated in the Declaration of Santiago, Chile, which was approved at the Fifth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs, the observance of which it recommends as soon as possible.

5. Proclaims that all member states of the regional organization are under obligation to submit to the discipline of the Inter-American system, voluntarily and freely agreed upon, and that the soundest guarantee of their sovereignty and their political independence stems from compliance with the provision of the Charter of the Organization of American States.

6. Declares that all controversies between members states should be resolved by the measures for peaceful solution that are contemplated in the inter-American system.

7. Reaffirms its faith in the regional system and its confidence in the Organization of American States, created to achieve an order of peace and justice that excludes any possible aggression, to promote solidarity among its members, to strengthen their collaboration, and to defend their sovereignty their territorial integrity, and their political independence, since it is in this organization that the members find the best guarantee for their evolution and development.

8. Resolves that this declaration shall be known as the Declaration of San Jose, Costa Rica.

FOREST FIRES AND BUDGET BUREAU POLICY OF NOT ONE CENT FOR DEFENSE BUT MILLIONS FOR TRIBUTE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I rise in the closing hours of this Congress to make some remarks on the terrible forest fires that have swept our national forests again this year. I do not speak in a partisan vein, but I must point out that I believe that the budget policies of this administration have contributed significantly to the terrible situation.

In the years since 1953, 1,585,350 national forest acres have been burned. This year alone over one-third of a million acres will be consumed by these forest fires. The estimated loss in timber, watershed, grazing, recreation, and other values is close to $150 million.

I judge this to be conservative for certainly it does not fully measure the loss in productive capacity, the loss to future generations, or the loss due to delay in rehabilitating these lands.

The cost to extinguish these fires from 1953 to date has been $134 million and before the bill is in for this year it will run in excess of $140 million.

The aggregate of losses and costs to extinguish forest fires has been almost $300 million. This is an expenditure which buys us nothing.

Since fiscal year 1955, and I regret that I do not have immediately available the 2 preceding years, the Forest Service has requested $91.4 million for fire prevention. The Budget Bureau has cut this request to $84.4 million and Congress has granted $86 million. For structural improvements, another program essential to fire prevention, the story is the same. A Forest Service request aggregating $60.4 million was reduced to $46 million by the time the Budget Bureau wielded its ax. Congress granted $50.3 million. I ask unanimous consent that a table showing this history be placed in the RECORD.

These two activities aggregate $136 million. We find the Budget Bureau economizing on fire prevention while not an eyelash is batted as $150 million worth of natural resources are burned up and $140 million is spent to stop the fires.

During the 1930's, under the CCC program, Franklin D. Roosevelt invested substantial funds to develop an adequate forest fire organization. In the 1930's national forest fire losses were reduced 1,600,000 acres below what they were in the 1920's. In the 1940's losses dropped 630,000 acres below those of the 1930's. In the 1950's losses are but 100,000 acres less than in the 1940's.

In the last 8 years, 5 of these have been marked by years when over 200,000 acres of national forest have been consumed by forest fire. In the previous 8 years in only 2 years did losses exceed 200,000 acres.

As the investments of the thirties deteriorated and were not replaced the Forest Service has lost some of its fire prevention capability. The last few years have been bad fire hazard years and there has been increased public use of the forests. The need to start to rebuild our forest fire prevention facilities existed several years ago. The harvest of delay is here today.

Clearly the danger signals have been up, but the Bureau of the Budget can only see the dollar sign in the Federal budget. It is incapable of assessing the national interest.

It is willing, in its myopia, to spend millions to put the fires out—$140 million to be exact—while it cuts budget requests to strengthen fire prevention. It is willing to spend millions in tribute, to close its eyes to the staggering losses in a vital natural resource. It will not allocate money for an adequate defense against these fires. The Budget Bureau has opposed needed investments in roads, reforestation, watershed management research, State and private forestry, and every other phase of national forest activities. This case was clearly presented on June 8 by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE]. On August 29 he again set forth the Bureau of the Budget's historic opposition to adequate funds for reforestation to repair the damage caused by these terrible fires.

I express the hope that the next President will, as his first step, reconstitute the Bureau of the Budget so that he has at his disposal an adequate mechanism for gearing the budget to the national need. Here is a clear example where budget policies have been permitted to wreak havoc with a valuable public resource.

Congress can take pride that it has exceeded the President's budget to strengthen Forest Service fire prevention work. If we had not done this, I shudder to think that the losses would have been even greater.

I want to commend the Chief of the Forest Service and his employees for their accomplishments under difficult circumstances. We can all be proud of the superlative effort of their people against difficult odds.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a table showing Forest Service budget history for the fiscal years 1955–61, and forest fire protection and structural improvements.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

Forest Service budget history, fiscal years 1955–61—Forest fire protection and structural improvements

Fiscal year	Forest fire protection				Structural improvements for fire and general purposes			
	Forest Service request	Department request to Budget Bureau	Budget estimate	Appropriation act	Forest Service request	Department request to Budget Bureau	Budget estimate	Appropriation act
1955	$10,402,000	$9,341,000	$9,341,000	$9,333,707	$3,495,351	$2,896,000	$2,876,000	$3,506,167
1956	12,593,000	10,466,000	10,466,000	10,769,500	3,726,000	3,089,000	3,089,000	3,995,050
1957	11,732,000	11,502,000	11,502,000	11,669,000	5,881,000	4,862,000	4,771,000	5,509,750
1958	13,791,100	12,577,100	12,546,000	12,546,000	13,944,600	8,731,850	8,725,000	7,725,000
1959	12,546,000	12,546,000	12,533,000	12,784,000	8,725,000	8,725,000	8,620,000	10,900,000
1960	15,264,000	14,046,000	13,673,000	13,973,000	13,353,000	11,375,000	8,879,000	8,879,000
1961	15,280,000	14,345,000	14,345,000	14,887,000	11,271,000	9,246,100	9,100,000	9,740,000
Total	91,428,100	84,823,100	84,406,000	85,962,207	60,396,051	48,914,950	46,060,000	50,314,217

MORE TATSEY COLUMNS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, this session of Congress has been a busy one and at times a frustrating one. We have debated and acted on many important issues. And, I am sure we are all most anxious to adjourn and head for home or whatever activities the fall may bring.

A diversion from the heavy and scholarly content of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD would be most appropriate at this time. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have the latest series of John Tatsey's Heart Butte News columns reprinted at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. As my colleagues will recall, John Tatsey is the Indian Service policeman who writes a weekly news column about the Blackfeet Indians which appears regularly in the Glacier Reporter at Browning, Mont., and the Hungry Horse News at Columbia Falls, Mont.

The being no objection, the columns were ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

[From the Hungry Horse News, May 6, 1960]

APRIL STORM STOPS HEART BUTTE NEWS CARS

The storm that came up Saturday sure disappointed a lot of folks because they could not get to church and their weekend stick game. There was all of 3 feet of snow on the level.

Police Tatsey was stalled between Old Agency and Duck Head hill and could not go either way. Luck he had his two-way radio. Porky Sellars came out only to get stuck but all got home OK.

Mose the trapper headed toward Swift dam before the storm to trap. He is trapped in there by the deep snow. There was a letter sent to the reporter asking if Mose would rather give up beaver trapping to go killing porcupine for the hide. Some money in it.

Stoles Head Carrier has been staying close to home, he can not walk in deep snow, he may lose some weight when the snow goes off.

Alfred Bouttier is out to Big Badger helping with cattle and sheep at the Tatsey ranch.

Dr. King was called out to the Richard Heavy Gun Place Tuesday night where Richard got an attack of some sort and was very sick.

Mrs. Frank Comes at Night rushed her little girl to the hospital Saturday afternoon.

Louie Red Head has been staying near the school all winter. Last Friday he went home west of Heart Butte about 4 miles. Sunday morning he saw that he was hemmed in by snow.

The storm was really hard on the loafers. Farmers and stockmen were happy. All worried before the snow came, all safe now.

There will be a music festival at Heart Butte school on May the 5th by the school children.

George Wippert was rather lonely Sunday. No one came but had a few boys who played pool till late at night.

Old time doctors who first came to work among the Indians claimed that they could cure drunkenness by injecting horse blood in their veins. Maybe now it would be better to inject horse sense into their heads. Might help some.

Sam Horn was seen in Browning last Thursday first time all winter. He thought it was summer but found it different Sunday morning.

[From the Glacier Reporter, June 9, 1960]

HEART BUTTE NEWS

(By John Tatsey)

Last Saturday was a fine day. In the afternoon there was a meeting at the Sam New Breast Place on Big Badger. There were some candidates present. There were some speeches by candidates and lunch was served in the evening.

Sunday at the church were a lot of people. Everyone enjoying the nice weather. Fishermen on all the creeks some having luck others had little hard luck. The creeks are a little too high and rilly.

There will be a candidate rally Saturday, June 11, at the gymnasium or the commissary room. All council members and candidates are invited. There will be some lunch served by the candidates. Some have donated to buy lunch with.

One election is over and no one hurt too bad and now the big one coming this fall will be the exciting one.

There has not been anything exciting going on at Heart Butte. Horseracing will be starting this month. Some new race horsemen and new horses on the training track.

Charles Reeves made a talk at Swims Under meeting when he said that the council had made a rut with the wheeler—Howard Act and can't get out of it. So if we elect some new ones they may help old ones get out on the level where they will have good footing.

Heart Butte may have a Mexican rally as one of our candidates has some Mexican blood and he may make a good one. Blackfeet mixture might work out all right.

The Boy Scouts from different parts of the country and Canada were camping out at two medicine lake last Friday and they had a program Saturday evening by a bonfire where the scoutmasters represented a tree. There were five in all. Wayne Higgins represent the sap of the tree and the others represent the rest of the tree so they started running around in a circle as the bark and leaves dropped off on the ground and Wayne was the running sap.

The undersheriff of Pondera County and family were around Heart Butte looking around and looked on at the stick game which they enjoyed very much.

Sorry that we have not heard or seen what Stoles is doing. Everybody watches and listens to hear of Stoles but he is getting wise.

[From the Hungry Horse News, June 24, 1960]

HEART BUTTE PRACTICES FOR RODEO

(By John Tatsey)

Sunday was a busy day visiting tribal council candidates at church and at the rodeo which was held at Francis Bull Shoe ranch. They were a lot of people where riders and ropers were loosing up for the coming big rodeo at Browning. Joe Wild Gun and Francis Bull Shoe were unlucky; when Francis threw his rope his horse stopped quick and Francis kept going and fell off. Joe came next. He caught his calf when he jumped off and ran the opposite direction.

Mr. and Mrs. Allen Milne, of Somers, were over around Heart Butte and at the rodeo—a special trip to see Stoles Head Carrier. They said by reading the news they can picture him so they come over to see if their imagination of Stoles would be true. Stoles showed up after they left.

Stoles came home Sunday and got his car from the police yard and come to town Monday, and Tuesday morning he woke up in a "soop" hole. He went to his house to get help and found his son Thomas still in bed. He jumped on him—the boy swung his right to Stoles' left eye. He came to rally at Morning Gun with a pretty two-row "shiner."

Calf branding has got under way on the south side and sheep shearing also coming up.

Report come Saturday that upper Big Badger was booming with gallo (wine) so the police went to investigate and found only James Spotted Bear and Mike Swims Under in bad shape and were hauled to town to Jim Walters "sober up" shop.

Eugene Rutherford has arrived from Aberdeen, S. Dak., where he attended the boys state which was held on the campus of Northern State Teachers College during the first week of June. Along with him were other high school junior boys from 244 towns in South Dakota. He learned how officials were nominated and elected in South Dakota and what they do when they take office. They studied municipal government, county government and then the State government under South Dakota law. They had legislators and courts—justice courts and supreme court—and were shown how they work.

Mr. and Mrs. Abe Rutherford are proud of their son. They live on Birch Creek near Heart Butte.

The Boy Scouts from different parts of the country and Canada were camping out at 2 Medicine Lake last Friday and they had a program Saturday evening by a bonfire where the Scoutmasters represented a tree. There were five in all. Wayne Higgins represent the sap of the tree and the others represented the rest of the tree so they started running around in a circle as the bark and leaves dropped off on the ground and Wayne was the "running sap."

There has not been anything exciting going on at Heart Butte. Horseracing will be starting this month. Some new racehorsemen and new horses on the training track.

Sunday at the church were a lot of people. Everybody enjoying the nice weather, fishermen on all the creeks—some having luck, others had little hard luck. The creeks are a little to high and rilly.

[From the Hungry Horse News, Aug. 5, 1960]

STOLES SIGNS UP TO FIGHT FIRES

(By John Tatsey)

Stoles Head Carrier got in the Can at Browning last week and paid Jim Walters a short visit and did some work for him digging and covering two graves. He lost a little weight by sweat and not much to eat and now he signed up to fight fires.

The heat has bothered the people to near burning but that could happen anywhere. One Indian is believed to burn up in his house in Moccasin Flat. Some people move right in the devils house when they leave Browning.

There was an old man that took some young girls out for a spin one evening and coming home they landed in the ditch, when the car come to a stop they were setting girls on each side of him and he walked them home.

There were 40 young men signed up to go fight fires so the Police will have some sleep.

Boys and girls that took part in the rodeo at Conrad sure did a fine showing. Bill Brown a Blackfeet only contestant from Browning won first in saddle Bronco riding and 3 places in Calf Roping. One good showing by an Indian.

There were five Teepees and dancers taken to Conrad for the High School Rodeo where the Indians pitched teepees near the grounds. They danced on Sunday and George Montgomery took movies. They started to dance at noon and were out in the heat till about 5 o'clock and pretty hungry. Some got paid others got nothing.

[From the Glacier Reporter, Aug. 18, 1960]

HEART BUTTE NEWS

(By John Tatsey)

Heart Butte news was off for two weeks on account of the reporter being busy haying but will try and have some news each week.

Things have been very quiet all month. Some trying to work and all getting ready for winter.

Some good rains helped out some last week brightens things up some.

Haying has been slow but stock men are really busy trying to get enough hay for their stock for the coming winter.

Rankin Brown was around Heart Butte checking on some hay deals where there was some misunderstanding.

Some of the fire fighters that went over around Wolf Creek told there were 10 Blackfeet and one colored guy so when they put one fire out they new they were on a hog back so they inducted the colored boy into the tribe and giving him the Indian name Chief Hog Back.

The race committee meet and discussed the races they are going to put on this coming labor day.

There will be horse races Sunday Aug 21st at Heart Butte. All match races so bring all your horses and money. There will be coffee and sandwiches which are cheap.

There were some good races last Sunday because Old Bill Show was there made betting lively.

Stoles Head Carrier has quit traveling around. During the day last Sunday the Police was driving around midnight when he saw some thing off the road when the lights were thrown on it was Stoles standing like a post.

George Montgomery was at Heart Butte Monday. Took the trouble of coming just to take a movie of Jerry Comes at Night on a wagon and family showing how the Indians used to move around, so we will see Jerry on movie this winter, maybe on TV.

[From the Glacier Reporter, Aug. 25 1960]

HEART BUTTE NEWS

(By John Tatsey)

Contractors have been working on three school cottages and two classrooms and addition to the kitchen; all foundation in and the building will be coming up to be completed by December if weather permits.

The boys that had been running horses all went to the junior fair did not do so good but the footless Indians gathered at Heart Butte and played there stick game.

The people are just sitting waiting for Thursday when the payment will be made and hit for the tribal office.

Leo Bull Shoe has moved up to his hay meadow to start putting up hay for the winter.

Word was received from Conrad that Richard Vielle went before Judge Black to make his plea.

Stoles Head Carrier has been getting ready for winter by picking berries has been at this for a week the hot weather thinned him down.

Dr. Anderson from Portland Oregon was around Browning and Heart Butte collecting old Indian customs and other things he really like the Heart Butte country.

There will be a 2-day race meet Saturday and Sunday 27–28. Everyone welcome so come all and have a good time.

The Junior Fair was discouraging the way it was carried out being with the rodeo everyone being around the arena kicking beer cans around. Good example for the Juniors.

Report came from Starr school that the Labor Day races will be held there if it don't snow by then.

The teachers have all returned from there summer school at Havre and other parts of the State. All ready to go Monday the 29th.

Mose the trapper has finally returned to Heart Butte. He plans to trap only mink because he had Beaver last spring, he could not get a buyer and still has them.

It was good to see Francis Bull Shoe back home and at the stick game Sunday evening.

James Buffalo, Pat Kennedy from Starr school were at Heart Butte Sunday and John Little Dog and family were also at Heart Butte.

Peter Day Rider was committed to Galen Hospital last week where he will take treatment for 2 months.

There was a prowler at the school yard Saturday night knocking at doors. When Tatsey went out to investigate he found Joe Middle Rider from lower Two Medicine. Lucky Tatsey was on a vacation and no jail keys so stay away Joe.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR DWORSHAK

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I was unavoidably absent from the floor on Monday when the distinguished minority leader called to the attention of the Senate that it was the birthday of one of our hardest working and ablest colleagues. I shall now say what I would have said had I been present.

Our colleague to whom I refer, of course, is the ranking minority member of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of which I have the honor to be chairman. No member of that committee is harder working than HENRY DWORSHAK, and no member has a clearer understanding of the problems and needs of the West than does the senior Senator from Idaho; nor does any member work harder to solve those problems so far as they can be solved through Federal legislation.

HENRY DWORSHAK is an able and dedicated public servant, and I wish him many happy returns of the day.

SENATOR O'MAHONEY, OF WYOMING

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I rise today on the Senate floor to speak of a man who has shared our work over many, many years.

This not an unhappy occasion in the sense that I have the privilege and honor to call to the attention of my colleagues a tribute to this man who serves his people and his Nation with devotion and fierce courage.

He has announced that he will relinquish his post in the U.S. Senate and return to his home where the jagged peaks of the Rockies are measured only by the lofty goals for which he has always fought.

I ask unanimous consent that this resolution I have here, signed by the members of the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, be placed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

This resolution tries to tell, in words which are never adequate, of the respect and affection with which we have always regarded—and will always regard—the distinguished Senator from Wyoming, JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY.

And, while it speaks of "goodbyes"—it will always be regarded by each and every one of us, and indeed by all his colleagues, as a wish of godspeed to his home in Wyoming. There, we hope, he will remember us in the many, many years of fruitful life that lie ahead for him, as we shall remember him.

These are our words for our friend and our colleague—JOE O'MAHONEY—and we speak them with tenderness and respect.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. KEFAUVER, on behalf of himself, as chairman, and the members of the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, reported the following resolution on the occasion of the impending retirement of Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, from the Senate of the United States:

"Whereas Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY has consistently sought to improve and strengthen the basic freedoms of our country; and

"Whereas the Senator's long service has brought forth a courageous and determined stand to resist the dangerous trend toward monopoly and to shore up the American system of free enterprise; and

"Whereas in pursuance of this task he has served as Chairman of the Temporary National Economic Committee which produced a vast storehouse of invaluable data on the workings of our economic system; and

"Whereas the Senator has served as acting chairman of this subcommittee and has presided over many of its important studies and legislative hearings; and

"Whereas the Senator has brought home to all of the people the simple vital fact that tremendous concentration of economic influence in the hands of a few persons demands the constant vigilance of legislators and other public servants who will act in the people's behalf; and

"Whereas the Senator's entire career in public life will serve as a constant reminder to all Americans of his profound belief that there can be no political liberty without economic freedom: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary hereby expresses to Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY its deep appreciation for his many accomplishments in public office and his lifetime of devotion to the public interest; and further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be made a permanent part of the records of this subcommittee, and that it be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and conveys to him and his beloved spouse its heartfelt best wishes for a happy and fruitful life in the years that lie ahead."

ESTES KEFAUVER,
Chairman.
THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr.
JOHN A. CARROLL.
PHILIP A. HART.
EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN.
ALEXANDER WILEY.
ROMAN L. HRUSKA.

THE RELIGIOUS ISSUE IN THE CAMPAIGN

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, this morning, in the New York Times, the very able columnist, James Reston, has published a brilliant article on one of the seamier sides of our national political campaign.

I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed at this point in my remarks. I commend it not only to all my colleagues, but also to all readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Aug. 31, 1960]

LET THE READER BEWARE FROM NOW ON

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, August 30.—Sometimes a small incident tells more about what is happening in the politics of the Nation than all the contrived propaganda of both parties. Here is a little story that illustrates both the cunning and the weakness of the anti-Catholic campaign against Senator KENNEDY.

Last week Senator JOHN J. SPARKMAN of Alabama received a copy of a Baptist paper from Alvin H. Hopson, preacher of the First

Baptist Church of Huntsville, Ala. This paper, called the Messenger, carried an article by Jess Moody of the First Baptist Church of Owensboro, Ky., entitled, "Thomas Jefferson, the Bigot."

The article read as follows:

"Perhaps the most widely quoted statement by Thomas Jefferson—'I have sworn upon the altar of God eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man'—needs to be quoted in its full context.

"They who stand on political rostrums this fall should be aware as to whom Jefferson was referring when he wrote the words.

"Writing to a Dr. Rush in 1800, Jefferson said: 'They [the Boston Catholic clergy] believe that any portion of power confided to me will be exerted in opposition to their schemes. And they believe rightly: for I have sworn upon the altar of God eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man. But this is all they have to fear from me, and enough too, in their opinion.'"

Dr. Moody's article then concludes by saying:

"Thomas Jefferson, the founder of the Democratic Party, had nothing but hostility for the Boston Catholic clergy. The present day Democratic Party just nominated the Boston Catholic leadership as the candidate for the position of Commander in Chief of the Government of the United States. Times do change, don't they?"

THE CROPPED QUOTATION

Of course, the only thing wrong with this quotation is that Mr. Jefferson did not mention the Boston Catholic clergy in his letter to Dr. Rush. The letter was written to Dr. Benjamin Rush from Monticello on September 23, 1800. He was arguing against the establishment of a national church which would give any denomination a favored position over any other, and in no way suggested anything about the Roman Catholic Church.

On the contrary, he singled out the Episcopalians and the Congregationalists for censure, all of which was omitted from the Moody article quoted above.

Incidentally, Dr. Moody was not in his study at the First Baptist Church of Owensboro, Ky., today. He was in the office of Senator THRUSTON MORTON, the Republican National Chairman, here in Washington, and explained that he got the quotation out of a book by Saul K. Padover.

"To be honest," he said, "I have not read the complete letter from Mr. Jefferson. If you knew me, you would know I am not attempting to create any division. I certainly don't want to do that. In fact, I am spearheading a project to softpedal this bigotry, for I fear it will backlash against Mr. NIXON."

Dr. Moody, who is staying at the Texas Gas suite in the Shoreham Hotel, said he came here at his own expense to discuss some ideas he sent to Mr. NIXON, he said, on the subject of religion.

THAT OATH AGAIN

Nevertheless, this illustrates what is going on. Today's mail brings one more printed copy of the bogus and infamous "Oath of the Knights of Columbus," described as a "Roman Catholic secret order." To give it authenticity, the oath is presented as coming from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 15, 1913.

Like the Moody quote from Jefferson, however, this one fails to mention that it was put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as an example of false and libelous campaigning and described in the RECORD as spurious.

Fortunately, the anti-Catholic campaign is now so widespread and so savage that it is beginning to boomerang. There is a law of politics, similar to the law of dynamics, that every pressure creates a counter pressure, and that is now beginning to happen.

For this kind of thing affronts fair-minded people in the South as it does in the North, and while it may help the Vice President in some areas of the South, it could easily solidify KENNEDY'S strength in the large States of the North, where the election will undoubtedly be won or lost.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I strongly support the position taken by Mr. Reston in this article, and hope that the religious issue may be kept out of the campaign.

SUGGESTED CHANGES IN SENATE RULES

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, during the past 2 weeks I have offered 10 suggested changes to the Senate rules. For the convenience of Members of the Senate and for other readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I should like briefly to summarize what those changes are.

First. Senate Resolution 118 would require that a majority of the Senate conferees represent the prevailing view of the Senate in matters in disagreement with the House.

Second. Senate Resolution 361 would require that the debate on a pending measure be germane, upon the request of any Senator.

Third. Senate Resolution 364 would permit Senate committees to meet during sessions of the Senate.

Fourth. Senate Resolution 367 would permit speeches to be inserted in the RECORD in normal type, whether or not actually delivered on the floor.

Fifth. Senate Resolution 372 would create a rule permitting the previous question to be moved after 15 hours of debate, which motion, if adopted by a majority without further debate, would limit the debate on the pending measure or amendments to 1 hour per amendment and 4 hours on the bill. The previous question procedure is invoked in practically every other legislative body in the free world.

Sixth. Senate Resolution 369 deals with appeals from rulings under rule XIX, section 2, under which any Senator may require another Senator to take his seat. Under present procedure this can be done without a ruling from the Chair that the rule has been violated prohibiting any Senator from speaking disrespectfully of another Senator. My resolution would require a ruling by the Chair from which an appeal could be taken.

Seventh. Senate Resolution 377 provides that the Journal need not be read every day.

Eighth. Senate Resolution 378 would limit the morning hour to 60 minutes, and individual speeches to 3 minutes.

Ninth. Senate Resolution 384 would place a 3-hour limitation on the speech of any Senator, after which period unanimous consent would be required for him to continue.

Tenth. Senate Resolution 385 would empower the majority of any committee to convene and set the agenda and close debate after a certain time had elapsed during which a matter had been under consideration before the committee.

THE ORGANIZATION OF THE SENATE

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I should like to speak briefly on how the Senate should be organized next year to enact the Democratic platform, in the event our party's candidates are successful in the November election.

First, we should amend the rules in the 10 particulars I have outlined. I further believe it important that we should reorganize the Democratic leadership so that it will represent fully and fairly the prevailing view of a majority of the Democratic Members of the Senate. In this regard I would make the following points:

First, the leadership should be committed to enact the Democratic platform into law.

Second, the leadership should represent the majority view of the Democrats in the Senate. This majority view will support the Democratic platform.

Third, the best way to achieve these results, in my judgment, is, first, to provide for the appointment of three whips, in addition to the majority leader; one to represent the geographical area of the Mississippi Basin; the second to represent the Northeast of our country; the third to represent the South.

Then, if, as we all hope, the present majority whip the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] should become the majority leader, representing as he does the Mountain States and the Far West, we would have in the leadership both geographical and ideological representation on a fair basis for all Members of the Senate who are Members of the Democratic Party.

Fourth, we should reconstitute the policy and steering committees of our party, so that they will fairly represent both the major geographical areas and the differing ideological views of Senators.

Consideration should also be given to merging the two committees and restating their functions.

I believe their functions should be to advise the leadership on policy and on committee assignments. Careful thought should also be given to the election of those committees by the Democratic conference.

Fifth, a majority of the Democratic members of the committees, including, in some cases, the chairmen, should have signified their support of the platform in the legislative area dealt with by their respective committees. This, in my judgment, would be an essential step to enable us to support the program of the next Democratic President.

Sixth, and finally, I believe we should provide for periodical and frequent meetings of the Democratic conference at times and places convenient to the members, perhaps at lunch, in order that the leadership may report to the other Democratic Members of the Senate the recommendations which they make with respect to policy. These recommendations should be subject to full and free debate by members of the conference.

Mr. KEATING subsequently said: Mr. President, I was very much interested to hear the recommendations of my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] with reference to the reorganization of the Democratic leadership in the next Congress. Of course, I

would not presume to try to interfere with any plans which he or others might have. On our side I am very well satisfied with the organization of the Republican leadership.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEATING. I would be happy to yield, but I am so short on time. I suggest the Senator may speak on his own time after my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York refuses to yield. The Senator from New York may proceed.

Mr. KEATING. I feel certain that my distinguished friend from Pennsylvania, in referring to these changes on the Democratic side of the aisle, will share my view that it is imperative, at the very beginning of the next session, that we make determined efforts to modify rule XXII, in order to make it possible to enact meaningful legislation in the field of civil rights and, indeed, in other fields.

I invite the Senator's attention to the definite pledge in the Republican platform:

> We pledge our best efforts to change present rule XXII of the Senate and other appropriate congressional procedures that often make unattainable proper legislative implementation of constitutional guarantees.

I only regret that the Democratic platform on this subject is not quite so explicit, although I hope my friend from Pennsylvania reads into it substantially the same meaning as that of the Republican platform. The Democratic platform says:

> In order that the will of the American people may be expressed upon all legislative proposals, we urge that action be taken at the beginning of the 87th Congress to improve congressional procedures, so that majority rule prevails and decisions can be made after reasonable debate without being blocked by a minority in either House.

That is certainly a statement with which I find myself in complete agreement. I appeal to my friend from Pennsylvania, in his efforts to reorganize the Democratic leadership, as to which I would express no view. Of course he should bear in mind the important necessity of changing rule XXII, in order that we may be able to bring about action early in the next session of Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these remarks may be printed in the RECORD immediately following the remarks of the Senator from Pennsylvania, and that if the Senator desires to say anything further, his further remarks may be printed in the RECORD following my remarks on this subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New York? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my remarks may be printed in the RECORD along with the remarks of my colleague in regard to the proposed change in rule XXII.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New York? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, at the opening of the Congress in 1959 we had a bipartisan group which sought to revise rule XXII. I express the confident expectation, Mr. President, that at the opening of the Congress in 1961 the same bipartisan coalition—and I hope it will then represent a decided majority—will move to amend rule XXII effectively in accordance with the Douglas plan, as reported to the Senate some time ago by the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. President, I think everything we have seen, including my own presentation this morning on the civil rights issue, the tremendous work of my colleague from New York in that field, and the work of other Senators, demonstrates this is the key to getting anything done, and that if we wish to get anything done we must not fail when the next session of Congress opens.

NEED FOR NATIONAL MORTGAGE MARKET

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, recently Dr. Kurt Flexner, an outstanding economist, addressed the American Bankers Association on the subject: "Why We Must Soon Have a National Mortgage Market." The address was published in the Commercial and Financial Chronicle of June 30, 1960.

Some time before the recess of Congress prior to the conventions, I introduced a bill to create a national mortgage market. I did so in the hope that most careful study and attention would be given to it. I think it is necessary for us to have such a market if we are to provide adequate financing methods for the supplying of homes to American families.

I am delighted that this outstanding economist, who, by the way, is an economist with the American Bankers Association, has taken this stand and has recommended to the American Bankers Association that they should support such a move.

Such organizations as the National Association of Home Builders, real estate boards, and similar groups who are concerned with this problem have supported the idea of a central mortgage market. I earnestly hope that the American Bankers Association will do likewise.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Flexner's address, which is published in the Commercial and Financial Chronicle, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY WE MUST SOON HAVE A NATIONAL MORTGAGE MARKET

(By Dr. Kurt F. Flexner)

(Parting the curtains slightly on an ABA study now taking place on how to create an adequate secondary market for secondary mortgages, Dr. Flexner underscores the pressing need to develop such a market in order to meet the future challenging demand for housing without Government intervention. He warns that imperfections and inefficiencies in private enterprise must be solved so they do not serve as a road for Government entry. He contrasts VA and FHA with conventional mortgages, and runs down the problems that remain to be solved in order to make conventional mortgages a competitively desirable credit instrument—in yield, safety, liquidity and marketability.)

According to a report recently published by the Subcommittee on Housing, Senate Banking and Currency Committee, the demand for housing during the next 10 years will be considerably greater than it was during the decade of the 1950's. During the last decade housing starts averaged 1,200,000 annually reaching twice nearly 1,400,000. Upon what assumptions is the expected increase in the demand for housing based? Perhaps the most important is the expected population increase, which according to present indications will add 35 million human beings by 1970. Perhaps equally important, however, is the fact that gross national product is expected to increase by 50 percent, or to $750 billion in 1970. This means that there will be not only many more families in 10 years from now, but it means that the average family will have an income of over $9,000 annually, with a rise in its expenditure for housing from $800 annually today to $1,200 annually in 10 years from now.

The mortgage debt which exceeds $185 billion today is expected to reach well over $300 billion by 1970. It is already the largest single private debt in the United States. Its share of the total debt will be even larger 10 years from now.

AN IMPORTANT CHALLENGE

It is quite likely that the demand for housing in the future will develop into an important political and economic challenge for this Nation, and it is equally important that this challenge be faced squarely. The demand for housing, however, is only one of the many demands households and business make upon an economy. Even at the level of full employment the gross national product is, of course, limited by our physical ability to produce. As our population grows and as we advance scientifically and technologically, we produce more; but the total amount is always limited and must be allocated among the great multitude of demands which always exist. Unless there is significant unemployment, it is not possible at any given time to increase output in housing without reducing output in one or more other industries.

In the American economy, what we produce is determined by private, business, and public demands and is allocated generally via a free market mechanism except for that sector of the economy which is more or less planned as a result of Federal or local government intervention. When an economy operates in a relatively free market atmosphere under conditions of fairly stable prices, each sector of the economy will bid according to its conditions of demand for the available supply of goods and services. The price mechanism and the interest rate serve to equate supply and demand. The increase in the demand for housing during the next decade, therefore, will have to be met out of the supply of goods and services we produce during that time. As we have seen in the past, however, the Government sometimes intervenes by attempting to increase the supply in a particular industry, such as housing, because for one reason or another that is thought desirable.

In the most advanced economies including the United States, a certain amount of Government intervention in the different areas of the economy has been accepted and already is taken for granted. Housing has become a major issue in American politics; and in order to avoid excessive Government intervention, it is extremely important to make the housing industry as efficient as possible. In the field of finance, this means that the mortgage as an instrument of credit should be made as desirable as any other instrument of credit. Every effort should be made

to make it appeal to every type of investor so that it can compete effectively with every other type of credit instrument. There is no reason why a mortgage cannot offer in terms of yield, safety, liquidity, and marketability the same advantages enjoyed by any other credit instrument now purchased by investors who still discriminate against mortgages. In other words, if housing is to be financed privately without increased Government intervention, certain weaknesses now found in the mortgage market must be eliminated.

CONTRASTS TODAY'S MORTGAGES

Government insured and guaranteed mortgages do possess a fair degree of national marketability, but the rigidities found in the interest rates discourage investment in such mortgages at the very time when the demand for housing is likely to be greatest. One need only look at the record to substantiate this. Conventional mortgages, on the other hand, which are not subject to the same interest rate rigidities, suffer from an equally serious handicap—that is, they lack national marketability, a handicap which discourages many potential investors.

Although the conventional mortgage is considered to be too personal an instrument of credit to appeal to such institutional investors as pension funds, I believe that it is only a matter of know-how to convert these mortgages into credit instruments that will prove attractive to such investors. On the other hand, FHA and VA mortgages which have been made impersonal through insurance or guarantees are often still considered cumbersome investments by such institutional investors as pension funds and trust funds, and by others. These characteristics of mortgages are technical rather than generic, however, and with imagination and effort, whatever handicaps now exist can be eliminated.

If private enterprise can meet the challenge of increased demands in the next decade or two, it will contribute much to economic stability as a whole. An improved secondary market for mortgages will attract, if necessary, additional funds to the mortgage market to meet increased demand. This will not prove inflationary if it is done via a free market mechanism in which all industries compete equally for the available supply of credit. The price of money will determine the direction of the flow of credit. On the other hand, if private enterprise permits certain shortcomings to continue in the area of mortgage financing, it may lead to greater Government intervention. This often contributes to economic instability since the additional funds coming into the mortgage market via Government intervention are usually in addition to all other outlays which at the level of near full employment is inevitably inflationary.

The development of a strong secondary market will do much to build a strong foundation for private enterprise in the housing industry. American business enterprise has been financed on the whole without the benefit of Government insurance or guarantees and largely as a result of the existence of a highly developed secondary market. Corporate stocks and bonds are freely traded across the country. A mortgage differs, of course, initially from a corporate bond. Conventional mortgages, as I have pointed out, are too personal an instrument of credit to lend themselves to nationwide trading. Even FHA and GI mortgages are too difficult to handle in the opinion of many potential investors. These handicaps, however, can be overcome in any number of ways.

REFERS TO ABA EXAMPLE

The American Bankers Association currently is studying the problems involved in creating an adequate secondary market for conventional mortgages. We are still in the stage of analysis, and no definite conclusions have been reached on major points. It is possible, however, to give a general example to show how the conventional mortgage can be given national marketability. In general, an organization could be created, privately owned, which would issue debentures backed by mortgages. Investors such as pension funds consequently would buy the debentures rather than the mortgages. Naturally, there are many questions and problems that arise in connection with such a plan. Ownership, capital, and management are merely some. Other problems are standards to be applied for selecting the mortgages which will serve as collateral for the bonds and the type of insurance or guarantee to be applied to the mortgages or the bonds. This is not to be taken as the plan that ultimately will be proposed by the American Bankers Association, for that plan is still under consideration. It merely is intended to serve as one example of how a mortgage can be given national marketability.

The mortgage debt is the largest private debt in the United States. The housing industry is the largest industry which serves all the people in every economic group. There is no real reason why that industry more than any other needs to depend upon special privileges or special aid from the Government if weaknesses which now exist in private financing can be eliminated. Corporate bonds are purchased by investors because they are impersonal and marketable across the country and not because they are insured or guaranteed by the Government.

I think it is a mistake to take it for granted that the mortgage lacks the liquidity or national marketability or ease of handling of other instruments of credit or Government bonds. A more constructive approach, I think, would be to make the mortgage so desirable an instrument of credit for every type of investor that the question of Government intervention would be reduced to a minimum. Imperfections or inefficiencies in private enterprise should never be the road through which the Government enters into economic activity, for with some effort and imagination, inefficiencies and imperfections can be eliminated.

FIRST FLAG TO BE RAISED OVER EXTENDED EAST FRONT OF CAPITOL, FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 2, 1960

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on Friday, September 2, at 10 a.m., the first flag will be raised over the extended east front of the U.S. Capitol.

For the information of the Members of the Senate, there will be a brief ceremony at that time. The U.S. Marine Band will be present and the Marine Corps will provide a color guard.

Speaker RAYBURN has invited all Members, officers, and employees of both branches of Congress to attend the ceremonies. I ask unanimous consent that a press release issued by the Speaker of the House be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Speaker SAM RAYBURN, Chairman of the Commission for Extension of the U.S. Capitol, announced today that a brief ceremony would be held on Friday, September 2, 1960, at 10 a.m., in connection with the raising of the first flag over the extended east central front of the U.S. Capitol.

The U.S. Marine Band will play selections from 9:45 to 10 a.m. The U.S. Marine Corps will provide a color guard, the members of which will lower the flag from the temporary pole installed in the peristyle of the dome during construction (when the old east front and old flagpole were removed about 2 years ago) and will raise a new flag over the extended east front. The color guard will receive the new flag from the Speaker of the House and proceed up the main central steps and through the Capitol to the roof. As they ascend the steps, the band will play "America the Beautiful." As the flag is raised for the first time on the permanent pole located on the roof of the extended east front, and as, simultaneously, the flag on the temporary pole is lowered, a trumpeter will sound "To the Colors."

The band will then play "The Star-Spangled Banner" and, in conclusion, "Stars and Stripes Forever."

Speaker RAYBURN invites Members, officers, and employees of the Senate and House of Representatives, and the general public to attend the ceremonies to be held in the area immediately in front of the main east central steps.

THE SPACE RACE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, two of our great newspapers, the Washington Star and the New York Times, have recently printed very perceptive and well-balanced editorials concerning the space race between the United States and the Soviet Union.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the editorial entitled "Forward in Space" from the August 22, 1960, issue of the Washington Star and the editorial entitled "Perspective in Space" from the August 25, 1960, issue of the New York Times.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Star, Aug. 22, 1960]

FORWARD IN SPACE

The American-Soviet race in space continues to gather momentum in a way that makes predictions about the ultimate outcome seem altogether idle and hazardous.

Within recent days our country has scored several important advances. These have included the successful launching of the huge Echo I communications satellite and the recovery (one by a spectacular "air snatch") of the capsules of Discoverers XIII and XIV—the first recovery ever made of instruments that had been placed in orbit around the earth.

As far as the historical record goes, this is a "first" that still stands, and all Americans can take proper pride in it. Over the weekend, however, it has lost much of its luster in the light of the Soviet Union's newest reported achievement—another truly great "first" involving the safe return to earth of an orbiting "cosmic space ship" carrying two dogs and other living things, including rats, mice, flies, seeds, and fungi.

What makes the latest Russian feat seem particularly impressive is the fact that the recovered vehicle has been described as a craft weighing close to 5 tons—quite big enough to carry a human passenger or two. By way of contrast, the Discoverer satellites—which have yet to send a living thing on a successful round-trip orbital flight—weigh only about 300 pounds. This speaks for itself as a measure of the current superiority of the thrust power of Soviet rockets: They can put up payloads far heavier than those that can be put up by the family of missiles now available to us.

In view of all this, the Russians would seem to be odds-on favorites to be the first to place a man in outer space and bring him back safe and sound. Certainly, as they have just demonstrated with their "menagerie" satellite, they have what it takes to loft

highly instrumented craft of great weight into orbit. And they probably have learned a lot about the problems of maintaining life up there and preserving that life—whether a dog's or a man's—for a healthy return to mother earth.

Nevertheless, regardless of what the gambling odds are said to be, our Mercury Project continues very much in being, and we have the thrust power to carry it out. One of the seven Astronauts engaged in it will be rocketed into space on a nonorbital flight later this year, and the big orbital shot is scheduled to take place some time in 1961. There is still a chance, in short, that we will succeed in doing the job before the Russians.

In any event, the race as a whole is likely to be neck and neck for a long time to come. And maybe, if one may be optimistic for a moment, it will end in a draw, with all parties cooperating in space for the peaceful progress of mankind.

[From the New York Times, Aug. 25, 1960]

PERSPECTIVE IN SPACE

Whatever else may happen during the rest of this month, it is already clear that August 1960, will go into history as a period of major advance in man's penetration of outer space. Both the United States and the Soviet Union have demonstrated the capability of returning safely to earth objects which had been put into orbit, and Echo I has demonstrated the feasibility of using balloon satellites for communications. Of all these feats the Soviet success in returning safely to earth the living organisms which had been in orbit is technically the most impressive, but our own scientists' achievements were also of first-rate importance. In both nations very rapid and important progress is obviously being achieved.

In all candor, it must be recognized that the Soviet feat this month suggests a continued substantial lead over the United States in a number of major areas of space research capability. The huge size of the latest Soviet sputnik testifies again to the Soviet lead in the rocket power needed to send very heavy vehicles into orbit. And if the Soviet claims that the flying menagerie was landed on earth within a few miles of a preassigned point is true—and there is no present reason to question this claim—then Soviet capabilities in this important respect are obviously greater than the relatively crude recovery techniques which we have demonstrated this month. The Soviet Union, in short, seems closer to manned space flight than we are and it may accomplish that feat before the year is out.

Before the latest Soviet space accomplishment some wishful thinkers had suggested that we had forged ahead in the space race. The more accurate perspective, it is now clear, shows that we are still behind because our competitor is himself moving rapidly even as we forge ahead. Much hard work and much expensive research and experimentation lie before us if we are to make up for the advantage gained in the late forties and most of the fifties, when the Soviet Union created the prerequisites for the space lead it has enjoyed ever since Sputnik I went into orbit.

But we may also hope that someday in the not too distant future the present rivalry will be turned into a fruitful cooperation which will speed humanity's common progress into space and cut the cost for that progress.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the August 28, 1960, issue of the magazine section of the New York Times contains an excellent article which gives an emphatic "yes" to the question "Are Space Probes Worth It?"

The article deals with the problems and potentialities of our space program and the efforts we have made during recent years to explore outer space, as well as what is to come from these explorations.

I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Are Space Probes Worth It?" written by L. V. Berkner, be printed at this point in the RECORD, together with a memorandum concerning suggested changes to the Space Act.

There being no objection, the article and memorandum were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times magazine, Aug. 28, 1960]

ARE SPACE PROBES WORTH IT?

(By L. V. Berkner)

"Sites Mapped for Bases on Moon," "Suborbital Flight by Astronaut Due This Year," "Echo I Relays Voices Coast to Coast," "U.S. Recovers First Capsule From Orbit," "Soviets Bring Back 'Noah's Ark' Chamber." No month—and hardly a week—goes by without more news about man's trials and triumphs in the world of space.

In the 5 years since President Eisenhower's announcement of the U.S. space program on July 28, 1955, we have learned much, and not the least important fact is that space exploration will be expensive. In 1959, our space program cost us almost $500 million, and in 1960 it is expected that military and civilian space activities will cost more than $1,150 million.

Are such huge expenditures worth while? Although it is true that we cannot predict the full returns to mankind that will come from thorough space exploration, we can already perceive very substantial rewards from our present program. Our space expenditures should be considered a capital investment, like the construction of a great factory from which will emerge profitable products in the future.

In many respects, the situation is parallel to the system of subsidy that was necessary for the aircraft industry 30 years ago. Such subsidies made possible the creation of a new industry which not only provided us with the benefits of fast transport between any points on earth, but created employment, new sources of tax revenue and new and challenging opportunities for businessmen. At the moment, many of us do not realize that a similar situation exists with respect to space.

The practical potentialities of space exploration are sharply punctuated by the development of our capability to recover space vehicles on earth. The success this month of both the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in returning space vehicles safely marks a major step toward ease in all aspects of space operations in the future. The ability to return vehicles with safety will increase the payoffs to be anticipated from our space program in military, commercial, and particularly in scientific applications of space activity.

Just what rewards can we expect from space? Each field of research has its hopes and has its attendant hazards. These are some of the payoffs and problems:

MILITARY

The most promising military application of space vehicles is the reconnaissance satellite. Already the first craft has been launched to develop this capability. A half dozen such devices, in appropriate orbits about 300 miles above the surface, could scan during sunlight hours every point on the earth daily. If it was not considered necessary to cover the whole earth, a smaller number could do the job. The nation possessing them would have an immense defensive advantage.

Even with present techniques, it is reasonable to expect that surface objects about 100 feet across could be distinguished in the pictures sent back by a reconnaissance satellite. Radar would enable it to observe large movements, as of troops or airplanes, even through a cover of clouds.

It could also eavesdrop on communications carried on at such very high frequencies that they cannot be received over more than a limited surface distance. Indeed, the quantity of communications information that can be acquired in this way is so great that a special problem will arise in handling the data collected, so that only useful information will be sorted out.

A special application is the 24-hour satellite. This is one launched in such a way as to orbit at the same rate as the earth revolves. Thus it would appear to remain stationary (or to swing very slowly in an arc) over one spot. Here, truly, "Big Brother is watching you." Such a satellite could be used not only for reconnaissance, but to broadcast television and radio programs into another nation's territory. Jamming such broadcasts would be difficult and could be accomplished only by another satellite.

Obviously, overflights by reconnaissance satellites will raise serious problems in international relations. We consider that space begins about 100 miles above the earth's surface, but how far does a nation's territorial rights extend? If a nation considers an overflying or hovering satellite inimical to its interests, it will be impelled to take countermeasures to reduce its effectiveness, or to destroy it. Thus the possibility of a space war arises, unless agreements among nations avoid the creation of friction in this way.

There is a more reassuring aspect to the use of reconnaissance satellites. By providing dependable data to show that a nation was not preparing an attack, they could conceivably quiet the nerves of a troubled world in a time of crisis, and so help to avert a war.

To reach these goals, however, costly development is required. Instruments are still primitive and great advances and repeated tests will be called for. Much experience will be required to evaluate and comprehend the information telemetered back to earth.

INDUSTRIAL

Space activities promise to revolutionize communications—radio and television, telephone and teleprinter messages, wirephotos and radiophotos, and the like—to such an extent as to produce a whole new industry.

The number of radio channels suitable for long-distance communications by present methods is very limited. Cables can be used—across both land and oceans—but these also have limited capacity, and are very costly.

Communications by means of suitably oriented and instrumented satellites promise to change this situation entirely.

We have just seen the first such experiment, with the launching of an inflated, 100-foot metallic-coated balloon from which radio signals, sent from a highly directional antenna, can be reflected, or bounced to a distant receiver. The system will make very high frequencies—now normally confined to short-distance uses, such as television and car telephones—available for long-distance communications.

The simple reflecting sphere is but a beginning. A 24-hour, or hovering, satellite, equipped with a solar or nuclear power supply and a relay transmitter, could increase the present communications capacity between two distant points a hundredfold. A hundred such satellites properly placed would increase our worldwide communications capability by a factor of 10,000.

Intercontinental radio and television networks are elementary examples of the applications of space communications that should be available in the next decade or

so. Worldwide telephone dialing will become possible. Message costs will be cut to perhaps one-tenth their present levels.

Whole new systems of international communications will doubtless appear. One can imagine a plant manager instantly ordering materials from anywhere in the world, with detailed specifications communicated automatically.

Indeed, the remote operation of automated machines in accordance with predetermined specifications seems entirely probable. Beyond lie applications in forms we cannot now even visualize, but we can be sure that they will bring peoples closer together and create enormous industrial opportunities.

Again, a heavy expenditure of effort will be needed. Component parts of electronic circuits must reach quite new levels of reliability to last for 10 or 20 years in continuous operation on station. Even our largest present rockets could not place a heavy relay satellite in 24-hour orbit and we must await the Saturns and Novas that are now being developed.

To acquire this communications capability—with the industry and employment and other advantages that it can provide to mankind—will require the development of an intricate system of international agreements and controls.

For example, there must be agreement on the transmitters and receivers to be used. Frequencies must be allocated in detail to avoid interference among satellites or with the present short-range users of high frequencies. There must be controls to prevent commercial warfare in the form of jamming signals that would render satellites useless.

The International Telecommunications Union, an affiliated agency of the United Nations, provides a basis for such agreements. At its regular decennial meeting in Geneva last year, the ITU called a special session on space communications for 1963. Already a work group of the agency has begun studies to see how the world can deal with these revolutionary problems. Within the United States, the Federal Communications Commission has announced hearings to review and evaluate the new problems that space communications impose.

SCIENTIFIC

The immense advances in science brought about by space research were clearly evident at the assembly of the International Union of Geodesy and Geophysics at Helsinki, Finland, early this month. Illustrative of these advances were the accomplishments of Pioneer V.

As it left the earth, Pioneer V found a third belt of electrification encompassing the earth 50,000 miles above its surface. Farther out, this great rocket found that interplanetary space was permeated by a small but significant magnetic field. Then, following an eruption on the sun, it encountered a dense cloud of ejected solar particles carrying with it a strong magnetic field. As this cloud reached the earth it caused a severe geomagnetic storm. This rocket showed that decreases in cosmic-ray intensity associated with geomagnetic storms occurred in distant space as well as at the earth, so that cosmic-ray decrease is an interplanetary and not a geocentric phenomenon.

From data like these observed in space, together with the IGY observations on earth, the scientists at Helsinki pieced together an exciting and coherent picture of the earth's interplanetary environment, and of the mighty influences of a stormy sun in producing important effects on the earth. Where will this new knowledge from space lead us?

Let us consider, as an example, the benefits of space research in meteorology. At present, weather forecasts can be made with reasonable reliability only about 48 hours in advance. If we could extend our forecasts only a little, the monetary gain would be enormous.

A representative of the American Petroleum Institute recently remarked that a knowledge of climate only a few percent more reliable than we have might save oil companies $100 million a year, since they would know in advance where to ship their oil and could cut inventories elsewhere. In one way or another, almost every aspect of human activity is affected by the weather, affected in terms of actual costs of operation.

How can satellites increase the accuracy of our forecasts? One way is by observing and mapping variations in the earth's cloud cover. We know that clouds reflect back into space 10 to 12 percent of the sun's heat which otherwise would reach the earth's surface. Since it is this heat that warms the atmosphere and powers the terrestrial heat engine that gives us winds and storms, variations in the cloud cover have a profound effect upon our weather. But we do not yet know how, when, and to what extent these variations occur.

The primitive experiments now under way, such as the many cloud photographs taken by the satellite Tiros, indicate that we are on the threshold of unimagined advances in our knowledge of meteorology. In the long run, increased understanding of climatic trends may prove more important than improvements in day-to-day forecasting. Man's earthly environment changes constantly. After all, New York was in the grip of an ice age probably not more than 20,000 years ago, hardly any time in geologic terms.

We do not yet know, although we should, what will be the ultimate effects on our environment of the simple activity of burning up the earth's fossil fuels—coal and oil—and discharging the resulting carbon dioxide into the atmosphere. Improved knowledge of meteorology has an enormous bearing on mankind's welfare in the future.

Astronomy offers another example of how space activity can pay off in terms of scientific research. Satellite-borne telescopes, outside the earth's atmosphere, will show the heavens with new clarity. From these studies, it seems likely, we shall learn not only much about the origin and character of the universe, but also new information about the basic physical processes of things about us.

Finally, space exploration will extend to the moon and planets. The first steps will be taken by placing a man in orbit around the earth and bringing him back—Project Mercury. A suborbital test flight is imminent, probably before the end of the year. Then will come visits to the Moon made by unmanned craft equipped with instruments to study their targets as they circle them, and radio their findings back to Earth. Next will come unmanned vehicles that can be landed, made to gather samples of the surface, and relaunched to return to Earth; and, at length, manned vehicles.

No one can predict just what the material payoff will be, but as John A. Johnson, General Counsel of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, has said:

"It is the thought of man being projected into a totally alien environment, whether in orbit about the Earth, or standing for the first time on the Moon, or preparing to land on another planet, that makes the whole business the most exciting enterprise of our age."

Certainly, landings of instruments on the moon to relay back information will be possible within 3 or 4 years. But to take man out, to give him protection, to equip him for useful work, and to return him is a project that will require at least a decade.

The foreign affairs problems in the scientific space field are fourfold. First, there is the need for international cooperation in tracking and communicating with space vehicles. Not only must there be observation stations in different countries around the globe but there must be agreements to clear specific radio channels for space use.

Second, there must be agreements for the exchange of data received from satellites, and of the codes whereby they can be "read." Clearly, scientists of a nation cooperating in the collection of data will want to share in their interpretation.

Third, scientists of nonlaunching nations must be given access to space. Agreements permitting them to use facilities aboard space vehicles for their own experiments are necessary if we are to avoid envy and hatred—and if we are to advance science by drawing upon the best men, regardless of nationality.

Fourth, international agreement on the biological decontamination of space vehicles is of the outmost importance. If there is life on other planets, even in the most elementary forms of viruses or bacteria, it is vital that it be identified without any confusion introduced by bringing earthly forms of microorganisms.

Fortunately, international scientific cooperation in space dates from the very beginnings of space activity, under the International Council of Scientific Unions, in the organization of the International Geophysical Year. It is being continued in the work of a worldwide group known as the Committee on Space Research (Cospar), which held its first international symposium on space science in Nice in January of this year.

The United Nations, too, is working in this field through its Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space. The first U.N. International Conference on Outer Space is to be held sometime next year. Out of these discussions can come intelligent planning for the necessary steps toward international cooperation and agreement.

These are some of the payoffs that we can expect from a solid program of space research. Without international controls on the use of space, however, the possibilities for good will become sources of serious international tensions—possibly even of space war.

For the moment, we have a period of respite while nations develop new and more sophisticated forms of space activity. We must hope that the nations use it for serious discussions leading to agreements that will enable space research to exploit its existing opportunities and benefit all mankind to the full.

MEMORANDUM ON PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE SPACE ACT (H.R. 12049)

The proposed amendments to the Space Act involve three principal areas of change, relating to (1) patent provisions, (2) organization, and (3) indemnification.

Analysis of the key issues involved fails to uncover any persuasive reasons for pressing for Senate action on these amendments during the current session.

One fact is of overriding importance. A new President will take office on January 20, 1961—less than 5 months from now. The next President could well have different views as to organization and functions of the military and civilian space programs. Any changes in the Space Act at this session will have little or no effect on the space programs during these next few months, but could restrict the freedom of action of the next President.

PATENT PROVISIONS

The Space Committee has received approximately 100 letters from corporations and patent lawyers, urging acceptance of the patent provisions of the House bill. Several Members of the Congress have notified the committee that they wish to testify in opposition to any such action to change existing NASA patent provisions.

Senator O'MAHONEY has informed the committee that his Judiciary Subcommittee is surveying patent policies of all Government agencies, preparatory to possible action to establish a uniform patent policy for the Government as a whole.

The following factors would affect any attempt to act on the patent provisions during the current session:

1. The proposed changes are controversial. The House appointed a special subcommittee which spent months on the problem. Senate action would also require considerable time for committee hearings and committee discussion. Floor debate on committee proposals would unquestionably be extensive.

2. It has been alleged that the present patent provisions deter corporations from seeking NASA contracts. However, this agreement appears to be largely based on theoretical considerations and hearsay.

In recent months, industry has demonstrated increasing interest in getting NASA contracts.

3. There is obvious need for a more uniform governmentwide policy on patents. Since NASA is operating successfully under existing patent provisions, it would appear logical to defer any changes in the law until they could be related to a uniform governmentwide patent policy.

ORGANIZATION

Last year, a subcommittee of the Senate Space Committee, with Senator SYMINGTON as chairman, held hearings on governmental organization for space activities. All the witnesses unanimously recommended against changes in the Space Act, on the ground that existing problems and deficiencies could best be solved by administrative actions taken under existing law. Despite this unanimous testimony the executive branch requested certain changes in the Space Act at the beginning of this session.

The following factors would affect any attempt to act on organization changes during the current session:

1. Although the House passed a bill along the lines requested by the administration, there has been no conclusive testimony as to the need for the changes. The record fails to show a single specific illustration of anything which should be done but which cannot be done under the existing Space Act.

2. The House bill would abolish the National Aeronautics and Space Council. Without passing judgment on whether this is desirable, such action clearly is not urgent, since the Space Council has met only once this year—on January 12, 1960. No meetings have been held since the President recommended abolition of the Space Council, and the Acting Executive Secretary of the Space Council has stated that no future meetings are planned.

3. The House bill would abolish the Civilian-Military Liaison Committee (CMLC) between NASA and the Department of Defense. This already seems to be an accomplished fact, however, since there has been no sign of any CMLC activity since the resignation of its Chairman, Mr. Holaday, on April 30, 1960. No successor has been appointed.

4. The House bill would establish an "Aeronautics and Astronautics Coordinating Board" to take the place of CMLC. NASA, Department of Defense, and Bureau of the Budget recommended against statutory creation of such a Board. However, Dr. Glennan has testified that such a Board was being created by administrative action. This clearly demonstrates that there is adequate authority under existing law for the establishment of any coordinating groups or mechanisms considered necessary or desirable.

5. The House bill includes a provision (the McCormack amendment) which states affirmatively that: "The Department of Defense shall undertake such activities in space, and such research and development connected therewith, as may be necessary for the defense of the United States."

The administration objects to this language and advocates only including a disclaimer provision to the effect that: "Nothing in this act shall preclude the Department of Defense from undertaking such activities involving the utilization of space as may be necessary for the defense of the United States."

The arguments pro and con are frankly fuzzy. As a practical matter, any policy disputes between NASA and the Department of Defense would be resolved by the President, which is exactly what is contemplated by existing law.

INDEMNIFICATION

Early during the first session of the 86th Congress, NASA and the Department of Defense submitted separate but identical proposals for authority to indemnify all contractors against unusually hazardous risks involved in space and military programs. The Armed Services Committee felt that no action was needed on the Department of Defense proposal. Because of the close interrelationship, no action was taken on the NASA proposal.

At the beginning of the 2d session of the 86th Congress, NASA requested authority to indemnify only contractors engaged in research and development contracts against unusual risks. It was pointed out that the Department of Defense has possessed such statutory authority since 1952.

While the Department of Defense has had authority to indemnify research and development contractors (but not production contractors) since 1952, this authority has never been exercised. This authority is meant to cover disaster situations that could involve hundreds of millions of dollars. As a practical matter, it is hard to conceive any Government agency trying to make any such settlement except after presentation of all the facts to the Congress, particularly since no funds would be available for any such huge expenditures. In the event of demonstrated need, appropriate legislative action could be taken promptly, on the basis of actual facts rather than hypothetical conjecture.

For this reason, the proposed indemnification authority appears to provide little more than an acknowledgment that the Government will stand behind any defense contractor for any claims arising out of unusually hazardous risks in research and development contracts. Clearly, the space program will not be affected by deferring action on this proposal until the next session of the Congress.

AMENDMENTS TO HOUSING BILL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] is in the Chamber. I am informed that he desires to offer to a bill now on the calendar certain amendments which would deal with the housing situation, so as to prevent certain programs from being shut down when they expire at an early date. Will the Senator from Alabama tell us how long he thinks it will take to consider the extension amendments?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, so far as I am concerned, I would not require any time more than to make a mere explanation; and I think the explanation could be simply this: The amendments will be the identical provisions lifted from the housing bill which the Senate accepted, which are noncontroversial, and which, I think I can say, are clearly nonpartisan.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, before the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] leaves the floor, I should like to ask him if he is agreeable to the suggestion made by the Senator from Alabama, to take three noncontroversial provisions from the housing bill as passed by the Senate, and to consider them as an amendment to another bill, so that the House may act before the program expires.

Mr. CLARK. Yes; if I may have 5 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. May I ask the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] to state his view?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, if the Senator from Texas will yield to me, I am a member of the committee and am very much interested in housing. Like the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], I have been apprised of the whole situation. I am quite prepared to coincide with it, but I should like to have 5 or 6 minutes in which to interrogate the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It occurs to me, since we have been over this ground many times before, and the amendments are acceptable to the administration, that we have 10 minutes on a side. I should think that would be enough.

Mr. JAVITS. I should like to have 5 or 6 minutes. The Senator from Illinois knows why. He and I have discussed the question.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, what assurance is there that only those items will be dealt with by amendment? What will prevent other amendments from being offered to try to embody what is in the original bill?

Mr. DIRKSEN. We have canvassed the situation with respect to Senators who had intended to offer other amendments.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I ask the majority leader, what will be his position if an effort is made to expand the efforts into fields which are not contemplated by the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I would not want to pass judgment unless I had seen some of the proposals. However, I believe the Senator from Alabama would be within his rights to move to table them.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, as it relates to housing, if the Senator from Ohio means other provisions in the omnibus housing bill, I recognize the realities of the situation. The Senate passed a good housing bill. I think all of us will agree to that. But we know we do not have a chance to get that bill through Congress. There are three housing programs which need immediate attention. First, the FHA title I, home repair and improvement program will expire in a few more days; second, the college housing loan program has no funds, and, third, the community facilities loan program for needed public facilities for small towns and cities is out of funds. Perhaps it is worthwhile to note that the President requested funds for the third program I mentioned. The amendment I offer relates to these three programs only. We consider them to be noncontroversial. I certainly would oppose

the bringing up of any other amendments, and I would move to table them.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I would have to oppose any other amendments.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the measure relating to housing amendments is called up, there be a limitation of debate not to exceed 15 minutes on a side, the agreement to be in the usual form.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I agree thoroughly with the Senator as to the program. I question the propriety of the agreement. We had an agreement the other day which did not then provide for amendments. With all respect, that is what we ought to be doing. I shall not object to this request. Does not the majority leader feel, nevertheless, that he should provide for the possibility of other amendments?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I do not. If other amendments were proposed, the whole matter would be opened up, and everything we now have would be destroyed. The House has to act, and we know that these are the three things we want to have passed.

Mr. JAVITS. There will be nothing to stop any Senator from submitting an amendment anyway. There would not be any time to discuss amendments. I am perfectly willing to agree to the proposal. I shall not object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the proposed unanimous-consent request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

IMPROVED TELEVISION SERVICE AND SCHEDULE OF FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION HEARINGS

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, as the Senate knows, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and particularly the Subcommittee on Communications, has been working for a number of years on the problem of bringing television service to smaller communities. Extensive hearings have been held by this committee. In fact, my subcommittee held field hearings in five States in the West, last year, on this very subject. A report, entitled "The Television Inquiry—TV Service for Smaller Communities," was issued in December 1958.

Proposed legislation in the form of a measure regulating community antenna television systems was reported by this committee, and after extensive debate has been recommitted to the committee, for further study.

In addition, a specific bill, S. 1886, relating to certain authority relating to television boosters was passed by the Senate and the House, and has now been signed into law.

It is heartening to note that the Federal Communications Commission has moved promptly to exercise its new authority, recently voted by Congress, to regulate certain rebroadcasting activities.

The legislation was signed by the President on July 7, 1960, as Public Law 86-609. It permits the FCC to authorize unattended operation of TV translators and also to grant licenses for such devices, even though they had been constructed without prior FCC authorization.

Within 3 weeks after such legislation was approved, the FCC adopted rules to provide for the licensing of VHF and UHF translators under modest technical requirements designed to minimize the hazard of harmful interference from these low-power devices. The new FCC rules provide a reasonable period of time for existing unlicensed stations to comply with the new regulations. During this interim period, temporary authorizations will be issued for the operation of these devices.

On August 22, the FCC dispatched a team of experts in its broadcast, field engineering, and legal units into centrally located cities in the Western States, to meet with TV booster operators and to advise them how to obtain interim authority for continued operation while preparing to convert to new low-power VHF translator authorizations. The Commission is to be commended for taking the initiative in rendering this public service to the operators of these installations, many of which are located in small, isolated communities. In most instances the operators are unfamiliar with the legal and technical requirements of the Commission.

At these meetings the FCC experts explained the purpose of the new legislation and gave technical advice and assistance to such operators in filing applications for temporary authorizations under the new procedures. State and national representatives of TV repeater groups are also cooperating with the FCC staff in these meetings.

The revised schedule of meetings is as follows:

City	Place	Date	Time
Prescott, Ariz	Public Service Co. auditorium	Aug. 23	9 a.m.
Denver, Colo	State capital, senate chamber	Aug. 24	1 p.m.
Casper, Wyo	Townsend Hotel	Aug. 25	11 a.m.
Miles City, Mont	Elks Club	Aug. 27	11 a.m.
Great Falls, Mont	DeMolay Youth Center	Aug. 29	11 a.m.
Wenatchee, Wash	Regional library	Aug. 30	11:30 a.m.
Salt Lake City, Utah	State capitol, Governor's board room	Sept. 1	9 a.m.
Redmond, Oreg	Westminster Hall	do	1 p.m.
Pocatello, Idaho	City hall	Sept. 2	11 a.m.
Grand Junction, Colo	KREX-TV auditorium	do	1 p.m.
Rapid City, S. Dak	(Mr. Larry Owens, chamber of commerce, to arrange place of meeting.)	Sept. 3	2 p.m.

NEW FARM PROGRAM NEEDED

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, despite the fact that the Eisenhower administration has poured more than $40 billion into its agriculture programs, the economic plight of the Nation's farmers continues to worsen. At the same time, Government warehouses are bulging at the seams with surplus farm products that flow in endlessly.

If our present Republican farm program should continue to be followed, there is every likelihood that the situation will continue to deteriorate. The unfortunate Eisenhower-Benson policies have proven, beyond a doubt, that this Republican administration is unable to cope with the problems facing the American farmer. No wonder Vice President NIXON recently publicly dissociated himself from the Eisenhower-Benson farm policies.

In 1952 President Eisenhower promised 100 percent of parity. The parity ratio is lower today than at any time since 1940. During the last 7 years, this administration, under the guidance of Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson, has reduced parity drastically on every basic farm program in existence except for tobacco and wool, which has been maintained at roughly 110 percent. Of course, people produce wool in Secretary Benson's State and in other Western States.

FARMERS' PLIGHT WORSENS

From 1952 to 1959 farm income dropped 35 percent, and the farmer's share of the food dollar decreased by 19 percent. American farmers last year received $11 billion less for their products than they did in 1951, while consumers paid $7.4 billion more for these same food products.

At the same time, farm distress sales went up 27 percent; surpluses increased by 636 percent; farm debt rose by 43 percent; and the farmers' production expenses soared 15 percent.

In 1958 the income per person on the farm was approximately half the income per person off the farm.

With production costs rising and prices for farm products declining, the producers of our country's food and fiber, caught in this cost-price squeeze, are finding it increasingly difficult to operate.

The much-heralded Eisenhower soil bank program has proven a dismal failure. Farm income has dropped; prices have skyrocketed; surpluses have become unmanageable. As a result, the family farmer is virtually disappearing from the American scene. More than 3 million persons have been driven from the farm since 1952.

It is easier for the farmer to put his land, or at least his most unproductive acres, in the soil bank and take a job in the city than to struggle under Republican programs for a meager living on his farm. The great midwestern heartland of America is gradually becoming a vast economically depressed area.

Faced with discouragement on every side, the small family farmer feels that there is no longer hope in the land. Republican farm policies have made it easy for the large corporate interests and huge farm syndicates to seize our Nation's vast acres of farmlands.

EIGHT YEARS OF WEAK POLICIES

This administration has not offered us a sound farm program in nearly 8 years. Its policies have weakened the ability of the Government to aid farmers, have driven the young people from the land, and are stifling our small town business communities. Must we have only huge corporate farms in our country?

Only recently, after his nomination, the Republican candidate for the Presidency admitted that both the country and the farmers need a fresh approach to the farm problem. He stated it is essential that we abandon the rigid positions of the last 8 years and adopt new leaders and new programs, not wedded to the past. We have yet to hear what his proposed new programs will be.

If the past is any indication, it might be recalled that in 1954 this same man predicted that the verdict of history will be that Secretary of Agriculture Benson has been one of the best Secretaries of Agriculture in our history and that he was a friend of the farmer.

In 1956, he said that he was confident the Republican farm program was right and that if continued it would bring the farmer unparalleled prosperity.

In February of this year, the Republican candidate hailed Secretary Benson as the greatest Secretary of Agriculture in our country's history.

Now he has suddenly had a change of heart. The same Secretary of Agriculture that he hailed as the greatest in our country's history will be forced to walk the plank of political expediency if the Vice President is elected in November.

Mr. President, I must say that in this regard I agree with the Vice President. I am delighted to see him finally come around to the viewpoint the Democratic Party has taken for the past 8 years. It is always heartening to receive converts to the principles of the Democratic Party, especially one so notable as the Republican candidate for the Presidency.

But try as he may, this candidate cannot divorce himself, with a few words, from 8 years of the fantastically expensive and yet bankrupt farm policy of the Eisenhower administration.

PROGRAM COSTS SOAR

Under President Eisenhower, the cost of all Federal farm programs exceeded $7 billion in 1959 alone. Under President Truman in 1952, his last year in office, all these programs cost taxpayers less than $700 million—one-tenth of the cost last year under President Eisenhower and Secretary Benson.

Throughout the Truman administration, the farm program cost less than $14 billion.

The farmer received 90 percent of parity, could pay his taxes, bills, and feed his family. The total cost of the Eisenhower-Nixon-Benson farm programs will exceed $40 billion. Now the farmer is having trouble holding on to his land, much less making a living. Empty promises do not pay off mortgages.

Mr. President, there is no farm problem. It is an American problem. As long as human beings require food, anything that concerns the men who grow it concerns everyone.

It is not, nor is it going to be, an easy problem to solve. Great imagination, intelligence, skill, and foresight will be required. Most important, it will require human compassion and understanding—our farmers must no longer be looked upon as nothing more than mere economic units. This is a human problem as well as an economic one. As such, we must have humane solutions.

Prosperity for our farmers can be brought about only by passage of good workable legislation that will boost the income of farm families, and by revamping our lopsided national economy into some semblance of equality between industrial workers and farmers.

During the past 6 years Congress has tried again and again to legislate toward this end. Each time it was met by the veto. With the election of a Democratic President and Congress, we can begin to take steps toward curing this nagging cancer in our economy.

Mr. President, it is not only our farmers, businessmen, and consumers who have suffered as a result of our farm policies during the past 8 years.

The hundreds of millions of people—over half the world's population—who go to sleep hungry every night have also suffered.

At the present time we have over $7 billion of food in storage throughout the Nation. For the first time in history a Nation is faced with the problem of how to dispose of its food, while millions throughout the world are starving.

OVER $1,000 A MINUTE

Every day of the year American taxpayers are paying over $1.5 million rent or over $1,000 a minute to store our surplus food products even as they spoil. Last year it was $612 million; this year $700 million. Who knows to what heights this cost will rise? Rats are the principal beneficiaries while human beings both at home and abroad go hungry.

Is there any better weapon for the Communist dictators of Russia and Red China to use against us than pictures of our granaries straining at the seams with surplus food?

Mr. President, our agricultural policy is a vital part of our foreign policy. Food is the universal language. It can bring us the gratitude of the peoples of the world or it can bring us their enmity. The choice is ours.

Expert dietitians tell us that it takes from 2,500 to 3,000 calories per day for an average man to carry on his daily activities. The daily per capita consumption in most parts of Asia is 1,000 calories. For these people there is little energy left for building schools, hospitals, and highways or to defend themselves and work their farms.

If we sincerely wish to establish sound democratic governments and institutions in this area and in all the underprivileged nations of the world, we must help them to help themselves.

In sharing with them the blessing of our bountiful food supply—a supply not yet really tapped—we will earn their undying gratitude and do more to further democracy and combat communism than could be accomplished with guns and tanks.

At the same time, we shall be putting to use billions of bushels of food, storage of which is paid for by taxpayers, and which is presently inexcusably going to waste.

In doing so, there is no need to upset the world produce market or to destroy existing channels of trade. This tired old argument has been constantly used by people of little imagination to defeat any real food for peace program.

Mr. President, I am speaking of feeding the hungry people of the world who today do not and cannot buy food. They do not understand world market conditions and economic statistics. They are hungry—their sole aim in life from sunrise to sunset is to scratch enough food to keep their families alive.

To feed these people and the hungry of our own Nation will upset nothing except, perhaps, the Communists who thrive on human misery.

FOOD FOR PEACE

Mr. President, we can do this by ourselves. Better yet, we can utilize the machinery of the United Nations to distribute our surplus food to the starving millions of the world.

There could then be no charge of "Yankee imperialism" or greedy self-aggrandizement. With one bold stroke—a move that would not cost us one additional dollar—we could regain the good neighbor image of America—the true image of America—painstakingly created by Franklin Delano Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman.

Mr. President, this is a time for boldness. For too long the image of America has been allowed to deteriorate through our carelessness and through Communist propaganda into that of a money-hungry, luxury-loving, overstuffed land.

In what better way can we reveal to the world our real image and our true purposes than by offering our surplus food to the community of nations through its established organization—the United Nations?

At the same time, we will be helping to solve our farm problem and to restore dignity and prosperity to American farmers.

The mistakes of the past are over and done. Farmers will remember in November who has been for them and who has been against them. We must look to the future. As the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] has said, we must establish and explore new frontiers. Next year, under leadership of a Democratic President, an all-out food for peace program may be launched as a realistic farm program will surely be formulated.

"LAND, WOOD, AND WATER"—BOOK WRITTEN BY SENATOR ROBERT S. KERR

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, all of us know of the fine constructive mind possessed by the senior Senator from Oklahoma.

All of us know also that he is one of the great public speakers of our time.

Not all of us know, however, that he is an outstanding author.

ROBERT S. KERR has written a very informative, a very readable, and very timely book, entitled "Land, Wood, and Water."

The title was inspired by his father, Sam, who traveled horseback from Bakersfield, Mo., to Ellis County, Tex.; and thence, with his new wife, Maggie, by covered wagon to Ada, Okla., where they built a log cabin which became the birthplace of our colleague.

Senator KERR says that his parents were in search of three necessary elements to the existence of the pioneer—land, rich enough to produce their crops; wood, for the buildings and fuel; and water, clean enough for their household use—bountiful enough in the form of rainfall to produce their food, feed, and fiber.

In this magnificent book our colleague explains why the future of America and the future of the world both depend on what we do about the natural resources we possess.

Mr. President, who in our midst is more qualified to speak out on this subject?

When BOB KERR came to the Senate, he sought membership on the committees dealing with these important subjects. It did not take long for all to realize that here was a man of vision, of knowledge, and leadership in the field of natural resources.

Senator KERR now serves as chairman of the Select Committee on National Water Resources, and in that position is bringing forcefully to our attention the need for a forthright handling of the water problem of this Nation.

By his portrayal of the lack of conservation and the excess of pollution of our water resources, he has shocked most out of their complacency and won converts to his theme of land, wood, and water.

His exposé of this situation has helped in both political parties writing vigorous action planks on natural resources into both party platforms.

As chairman of the important Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors and Flood Control of the Public Works Committee, BOB KERR has brought to us some of the most important legislation ever enacted by the Congress.

I refer to such acts as the Water Supply Act of 1958, the Water Pollution Control Act, the Niagara Power Act, the Upstream Flood Control Act, the TVA Financing Act, the Omnibus Rivers and Harbors Acts of 1958 and 1960. These are only a few of the legislative monuments to this superb leader in the field of water resources.

This book will be of special interest to our Senate colleagues because although the book was published in a political year, it is singularly free from partisanship and sounds a keynote for unity.

The introduction to the book was written by our distinguished majority leader, Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON. He sets the tone of the book when he says: "Water must not be a partisan subject. Water policy simply does not belong in politics. Water is the indispensable resource for the people. It is not a resource for our parties or partisans. The issue of water is action versus inaction—to win or not to win."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator for his references to me, and I am very appreciative of the remarks he has made. I think the Senator from Oklahoma is most deserving of this commendation. I wish to inform the Senator that, after reading the book, we were so impressed with it and the need of our people to have an opportunity to read it that Mrs. Johnson and I have purchased and sent to each institution of higher learning in our State a copy of this book as a present from us.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the majority leader. The first time I visited him in his home State, he showed me the results of some of the work that he and other Texas statesmen, like the Speaker of the House, had done in this field. I am going to follow his leadership in this connection, as I have in others, and place this book in the institutions of higher learning of my own State.

Mr. President, in the same vein, Senator KERR quotes President Eisenhower as warning:

> If we are to advance agriculturally and industrially, we must make the best use of every drop of water which falls on our soil or can be extracted from the oceans.

Senator KERR recognizes that any conservation program must have broad public support. This cooperative action must stem from an enlightened and enthusiastic public opinion.

Senator KERR's book can go far toward this objective. I hope it will be read by Americans generally, especially our youth. It should be on the shelves of school and city libraries.

It is a privilege to congratulate this great public servant for his fine contribution to both the literature of America and the future of America.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield to my able colleague from Delaware.

Mr. FREAR. First, I want to congratulate the Senator from Missouri for taking note publicly of the fine work of the senior Senator from Oklahoma. The words he has spoken are true. The Senator from Oklahoma is an industrious person working for the benefit of others. The Senator from Missouri has so amply stated it that, if he will permit me, I would like to share in the statement he has made about the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am proud to share my high opinion of the Senator from Oklahoma with the able and distinguished Senator from Delaware.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PASTORE in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

REMOVAL OF CERTAIN LIMITATIONS ON DEFENSE EXPENDITURES

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, turning to another matter, I ask unanimous consent that Senate Resolution 376, a resolution for removal of certain limitations on defense expenditures, now be laid before the Senate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is raised.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Let the RECORD show that I have done my best in recent days to make this question of removal of money limitations on high priority defense items a practical matter, and that it is unfortunate those now opposed to it do not practice what they preach.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in connection with my remarks, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD a statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR DIRKSEN

Last night I took occasion to study, in some detail, the speech delivered on the floor of the Senate yesterday by the junior Senator from Missouri. Among other surprising statements contained therein I was dismayed to find that there were quite a number which were left incomplete in a most damaging way.

For example, on page 5 of the released text, the junior Senator from Missouri quotes the Deputy Secretary of Defense as follows:

"The House Appropriations Committee recommended, and the House approved, an increase of $115 million for 'airborne alert capability'. After reconsideration of this problem, we again recommended the program as proposed in January."

Here the quotation from the Deputy Secretary of Defense has been abruptly ended. If the junior Senator from Missouri had continued his quotation of the Deputy Secretary of Defense just one more sentence we would have discovered why the Defense Department again recommended the program as proposed in January. The omitted sentence reads as follows:

"Section 512 of the bill now before this committee—section 612 of the 1960 act—gives the Department the authority to increase this program if the need should arise."

Specifically, section 512(b) of the Defense Department Appropriation Act for 1961 states:

"Upon determination by the President that such action is necessary, the Secretary of Defense is authorized to provide for the cost of an airborne alert as an excepted expense in accordance with the provisions of R.S. 3732 (41 U.S.C. 11)."

This is the provision enacted on the initiative of the Senate last year. As you can see, it gives the Secretary of Defense the broadest kind of authority with respect to incurring additional expenses for an airborne alert.

As a matter of fact, it was the consensus of the whole Senate that section 512(b) provided the Defense Department with all the authority needed to incur whatever expenses were deemed necessary for an airborne alert. That was the very reason why in the bill passed by this body we did not support the House action appropriating $115 million in additional funds for an airborne alert. The additional $85 million finally enacted arose out of a compromise in conference with the House.

Now that the money has been appropriated the Secretary of Defense has decided to use it instead of relying to that extent on section 512(b) of the act.

The junior Senator from Missouri then goes on to say, on page 6 of the released text, that the letters from Secretary Gates to the majority leader are not clear, and I quote the Senator, "in fact they are misleading." Yet when I read Secretary Gates' August 9 letter to the majority leader in context with the majority leader's July 28 letter to the Secretary of Defense, I find nothing that is not perfectly clear and certainly nothing that is misleading.

The majority leader's letter states:

"This net increase of $661,608,000 was the end result of various program increases of roughly $1¾ billion and individual reductions totaling approximately $1.1 billion."

He then requests a detailed statement on Defense Department plans to utilize the funds for each of the individual items or programs provided by the Congress in excess of the budget request.

The Secretary's reply simply states that a large part of the $1¾ billion of individual items or programs for which the Congress appropriated additional funds were, and I quote, "recommended by the administration to the Senate Appropriations Committee subsequent to the January budget request." In attachment A to the Secretary's reply we find a table which shows, on the third page, that additional appropriations provided by the Congress over the President's January budget did indeed total about $1¾ billion as stated by the majority leader; the exact figure being $1,815,236,000. Of this amount, the table shows $1,371,442,000 of additions already applied by the Department of Defense to the programs designated by the Congress.

A footnote to the $1,371,442,000 figure indicates that, "Included in these amounts are the additional funds requested by Department of Defense revisions for Army modernization, airlift aircraft, Minuteman, Polaris, antisubmarine warfare research and development, Midas, Discoverer, Atlas, BMEWS, and certain air defense programs, totaling over $750 million." This is, of course, the figure cited in the Secretary's August 9 letter to the majority leader. In the light of these facts, how can anyone who has read with any degree of care the majority leader's letter and the Secretary's reply claim that the Secretary of Defense has fostered an untruthful impression?

Now, elsewhere in his speech, the junior Senator from Missouri states that "The President's January budget asked for $1,337 million for Army modernization; and there were no official or semiofficial requests made to the Congress to change that figure." Yet I find on page 1491 of part 2 of the hearings before the Defense Department Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee that the total requested of the Senate by the Department of Defense for procurement of equipment and missiles, Army, was $1,366,500,000 as compared with the $1,337 million in the President's January budget. This is $29½ million more than the amount requested in the January budget. This particular budget revision was one of many enclosed with a letter dated May 12, 1960, from the Secretary of Defense to the distinguished chairman of the Department of Defense Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations.

So we see that there have in fact been official requests made to the Congress not only to change the $1,337 million figure for Army modernization but for many other items including all those mentioned in the first paragraph of the Secretary's August 9 letter. And I include therein the Defense Department's recommendation to the Senate Appropriations Committee for $150 million more for airlift, over and above the amount requested in the January budget.

I was particularly intrigued by the remarks of the junior Senator from Missouri with respect to the antisubmarine warfare research and development program. He quotes the Deputy Secretary on this matter as follows:

"With regard to the $100 million of additional funds voted by the House for ASW research and development * * * we recommend that the remaining $58.1 million be eliminated."

In going back into the hearings to discover what words had been omitted in this quotation, I found the following on page 1537:

"We now believe that we could usefully apply $41.9 million of that amount. This would bring our 1960–61 level of obligations in this area to about $220 million, or some $20 million higher than the level previously planned."

The Deputy Secretary of Defense then went on to say:

"We recommend that the remaining $58.1 million be eliminated from the 'Research, development, test, and evaluation, Navy,' appropriation."

So we see that the Defense Department actually recommended to the Senate Defense Appropriations Subcommittee that $41.9 million for ASW research and development be added to the amount requested by the President in January. And, of course, the Defense Department has used these funds. Now, just who is doing the misleading?

It may be that the junior Senator from Missouri has a point to make, but it certainly is not clear to me what it is. The Defense Department did recommend to the Senate Appropriations Committee amounts in excess of the President's January budget, just as Secretary Gates stated in his August 9 letter to the majority leader. I see no useful purpose served by Senator SYMINGTON'S deliberate obfuscation of this issue in a fog of semantics.

The simple fact remains, that of the $1¾ billion in specific programs added by the Congress to the President's January budget request, more than $750 million of such items were recommended to the Congress by the Defense Department subsequent to January 1960. Whether or not some of these amounts were less than the amounts recommended by the House is immaterial. The fact remains that the Department of Defense on certain items did recommend to the Senate Appropriations Committee increases over the amounts requested in the January budget. And that is all the Secretary of Defense is saying.

Much was said on the floor of the Senate yesterday about the "freezing" of $621 million. Anyone who has followed the defense program closely during the last several years would know that at the beginning of any fiscal year some relatively small amount of funds are usually unallocated to specific programs. So it has been in fiscal year 1961. The majority leader was informed by the Secretary of Defense on August 9 that the Department of Defense had available for future requirements a total of $621 million. This represents only a little more than 1 percent of the total amount available for obligation in fiscal year 1961—about $51.2 billion. It represents only about 1½ percent of the amount appropriated by the Congress for fiscal year 1961, approximately $41 billion. Why, with 10 months of the fiscal year yet to go, such a modest reserve should so greatly agitate certain Members of the Senate is hard for me to understand.

You will recall that the $621 million held for future requirements was the amount shown in the Department's financial plan dated August 9. As a matter of interest, I contacted the Defense Department to learn the present status of these funds, and was informed that the Defense Department has released $107 million of the $621 million. For example, of the $17 million of military construction funds shown in the August 9 plan as available for future requirements, $3 million has already been released for the Army Reserve. The release of an additional $3 million of military construction funds is now under consideration.

I have also learned that all the additional funds appropriated by the Congress for the Samos program will also be used. The Secretary of Defense, in his August 9 letter, pointed out that this program was still under technical study but that it then appeared that another $50 million would be used for that purpose. Now that the technical study has been completed, it has been determined that all $83.8 million of the additional funds appropriated by the Congress for Samos will be needed in fiscal year 1961.

You may recall that the Secretary in his August 9 letter talked about initiating development of a new longer range Polaris missile. He pointed out that this program was not included in either the January or the revised Defense Department budget requests or in the congressional add-ons, and that the additional funds required would be found by reprograming. Now I have learned that the $33 million remaining unused for Polaris submarines and the $37 million remaining unused for Polaris missiles in the August 9 financial plan will be utilized for the development of this new longer range Polaris missile.

I understand that the transfer of these funds will be effected under the authority of section 535 of the Department of Defense Appropriation Act of 1961. This is the provision which authorizes the Secretary of Defense, should he deem it advantageous to the national defense, to accelerate any strategic or tactical missile/satellite program, by transferring for this purpose up to $150 million from other accounts.

So it is clear, as it certainly should have been from past experience, that the financial plans of the Department of Defense are living things. Changes are made all during the fiscal year as they are found necessary and desirable. And this is as it should be. We are living in times of rapid change and the defense program must not remain static. That is why the Congress has provided the Department of Defense with a considerable degree of flexibility in the utilization of its funds.

Thus, we find that in the last 17 days the $621 million held for future requirements, which seems to be burning a hole in the pockets of some of my colleagues, is now reduced to $514 million—and we still have 10 months of the fiscal year to go. All this hue and cry about freezing and impounding defense funds is much ado about very little. It may be that these funds will be used in other categories under the various transfer provisions provided in the law, or with the express permission of the Congress. But even without being privy to all the plans of the Defense Department, I am sure that by the end of this fiscal year, 10 months hence, little if any of the $514 million still available for future requirements will be left unused.

In this connection I would remind the Senate that the President stated in his special message to the Congress on August 8 that some additional funds for military personnel and operation and maintenance may be required by the new readiness measures recently undertaken by the Department of Defense. We know, of course, that additional funds will be required in fiscal year 1961 to pay for the civilian pay increases voted by the Congress earlier in this session.

One final comment. The distinguished majority leader yesterday expressed concern over the fact that the executive branch does not use promptly every dollar appropriated

by the Congress. He went so far as to suggest that failure to do so might even be unconstitutional.

Now, I do not propose to be an expert on the Constitution nor even an expert on appropriations. But, we have it on the authority of no less an expert than the distinguished chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, Mr. CANNON, that, and I quote, "Appropriations of a given amount for a particular activity constitute only a ceiling upon the amount which should be expended for that activity." Chairman CANNON goes on to say that "the administrative officials responsible for administration of an activity for which appropriation is made bear the final burden for rendering all necessary services with the smallest amount possible within the ceiling figure fixed by the Congress" (Rept. 1797, 81st Cong., 2d sess., p. 9).

In the light of the facts I have recited here today, I feel that the remarks of the Senator from Missouri on the floor of the Senate yesterday constitute a grave injustice to Secretary of Defense Gates, and a serious disservice to a better public understanding of the defense program.

AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION CONVENTION AND SPACE ACHIEVEMENTS POINT UP NEED FOR INTERNATIONAL RULES GOVERNING OUTER SPACE

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, an often overlooked aspect of recent American accomplishments in outer space is the fact that there are no rules of the road to govern space territory. While our scientists have forged ahead with amazing achievements in outer space, our laws have failed to keep pace.

This is a problem which has concerned me for some time. For several years I have urged that the nations of the world get together to formulate laws regarding territorial rights and peaceful uses of outer space. In my view, this task can best be accomplished through the medium of the United Nations.

Mr. President, this is a job which cannot be delayed any longer. With each passing day, with each new space achievement, the need for international rules for outer space becomes more imperative.

It is particularly appropriate in this connection that the American Bar Association is today holding its annual meeting in Washington. As a lawyer, I am particularly pleased to welcome these distinguished leaders of the bar to the Nation's Capital.

The ABA has, of course, done tremendous work to insure that our laws and our lawyers live up to their important roles in our society. This fine organization has led the way in insuring that our laws are up to date, and it is especially appropriate, therefore, that the ABA has pioneered in studies on the need for drafting rules for outer space.

An impressive number of leaders in the ABA have devoted considerable time to the consideration of this problem, and I am confident these studies will contribute substantially to the formulation of the needed rules.

It is my hope that recent events, in concert with the impetus supplied by the ABA studies in this field, will prod action before long. In this connection, an excellent editorial in Newsday of August 22, emphasizes the legal problems posed by recent space conquests. It points out the pressing need for reaching international agreements on outer space without further delay. This message deserves wide attention, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objecion, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FUTURE IN SPACE

Space achievements of the past few days are vivid proof that it will not be long before a human being will be shot into orbit and brought safely back to earth.

Both the United States and Russia are squarely on the verge of that momentous feat by virtue of their most recent successes. Twice in a row, the United States has recovered a capsule ejected from an orbiting satellite—the second capsule being picked off in mid-air. And now, the Russians have brought back to earth two dogs which had been orbiting for 24 hours. The space horizon thus grows ever more exciting.

That horizon, however, also grows ever more ominous for the simple reason that there are no international rules governing outer space and the conquests which surely will be made there during this generation. There is no guarantee that outer space will be used for peaceful purposes only. Nor has there been any determination made as to the territorial rights of the first nation to reach a celestial body.

These considerations—so important—have been put off far too long. Already it may be too late to come to any international agreement on these most difficult problems. Certainly the most vigorous measures toward that end must be taken now if we are to avoid what easily could be a chaotic mess in space. Scientifically, we are ready for what is ahead. Politically, we are woefully ill prepared.

STIRRING CENTENNIAL TRIBUTE TO IGNACE PADEREWSKI

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, there are few great figures in history who have left their mark more indelibly in the hearts of their fellowmen than the world-famed Polish genius, Ignace Paderewski. In this year of 1960, the centennial of the birth of the gifted artist-statesman is observed. It was my high privilege to support strongly the proposal for the issuance of a special anniversary stamp commemorating this historic centennial.

Ignace Paderewski remains for us, and will always remain, a symbol of the close and enduring ties of friendship which continue to unite our Nation with the brave people of Poland. Despite the harsh captivity they now suffer at the hands of Communist tyranny, these proud and noble people still preserve in their heart of hearts the traditional spirit of friendship which for so many years has marked the relationship between the United States and Poland.

In view of the dedication of this year to the honored memory of Paderewski, I believe it wholly appropriate to cite an eloquent address delivered at the Arlington National Cemetery by the Honorable Arthur E. Summerfield, Postmaster General of the United States, on the occasion of the recent Paderewski Centennial ceremonies. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SPIRIT OF PADEREWSKI: CHALLENGE TO OUR TIMES

(Address by the Honorable Arthur E. Summerfield, Postmaster General of the United States)

This is a solemn moment for me—as I know it is for you.

I am deeply honored to join with you in paying tribute to Paderewski on this centennial commemoration of his birth.

I want to congratulate Mr. Witkowski, the Paderewski Foundation, and the Polish American Congress on organizing this moving tribute to a great statesman and a great musician.

My assignment today is not an easy one. It is difficult, if not impossible, to reflect, in words, the towering stature of this man who walked among us during my youth and early manhood.

It is, I believe, fitting that we commemorate this man in the Valhalla of American heroes. Here, with us, are his bodily remains. But today we note and rededicate ourselves to his spirit.

Only a handful of those whose home and citizenship was in other countries lie here. Yet, if there were only one from a foreign country, it would be appropriate that he be Paderewski.

Around him sleep scores of thousands of Americans who have given their lives to build, preserve, and strengthen our country.

They would understand the passion that ruled Paderewski throughout his life in his devotion to his native Poland.

He would understand those buried here, who gave their final measure of devotion to the principles of freedom and independence.

They rest together in good and honored company.

All Americans who feel a profound love for Poland, and recognize the great contributions of the Polish people to American freedom, understand her pride in claiming Paderewski as a son. But the Polish people would be the first to recognize that he belongs to more than Poland. Through his genius, he belongs also to America and to all mankind.

For Paderewski was a genius in the truest sense of the word, and he dedicated his genius to the highest ideals in the worlds of both art and statesmanship. Beyond that, Paderewski displayed a genuine nobility of person, and a truly Christian strength of character.

No one who has seen him can ever forget the majestic head and inspired face. Nor can we forget his dignity of carriage, which often seemed to make him grow twice as tall. It was his spirit, however, that shone through, and is remembered by all of us here today.

A longtime friend of Paderewski's once said of him:

"He had boundless vitality. When he came into a room, the lights seemed to go up."

It was this inner light—this inner fire—that sustained him through his 81 years of life, and won him the admiration and reverence of all who prize the ideals for which he stood.

Few now living can remember the blaze of glory with which he burst on the American musical scene, that night in Carnegie Hall 69 years ago.

But no free peoples will ever forget the courage and devotion to country which he displayed so remarkably at the Paris Peace Conference in 1919, and as the first Prime Minister of a reborn, independent Poland.

Paderewski knew war, revolution, and tyranny even as an infant. As the merest child of 3, he saw his father cruelly thrust

into prison by the Russian oppressors in revenge for his courage in aiding the Polish patriots who fought to throw off the yoke of their eastern conqueror.

One must believe that this horror-stricken little boy had burned in his heart a sight which laid the basis for his determination in the protection of his native land.

In this faith in his beloved Poland, he persevered to the last hours of his life—never faltering—just as he persevered in seeking perfection in his musical skills, his poetry, and his role as a composer.

But his guide throughout his life was love for man. If freedom and independence demanded war and revolution, he did not waver. But his genius was in building and creating, rather than in violence and destruction.

It was the mark of this great man that when he composed the War Hymn for the Polish soldiers in World War I, the battle song carried the phrase, "My errand is not of hatred, but of love."

Similarly, in the period after World War I it might have been the easy path to distract the Polish people from their problems at home by turning to war against the Russians.

Paderewski's hatred for the Bolsheviks was no less than that of his countrymen, but he nevertheless chose the harder path of recreating a new Poland—of rebuilding its economy and its society.

Always he was guided by what he knew was in the best interests of the cause of freedom and independence of Poland.

Once Paderewski was asked who was the greater—the statesman or the artist. Without hesitation, he replied "the statesman," and then gave a definition of the term which applies so accurately to himself:

"I speak of that man of state whose courage, morality and wisdom open for humanity a greater path of destiny; of those rare spirits which, voicing the innermost hopes and visions of the race, mold the future and hold up the torch for life."

Truly, he was a statesman.

I have talked of Paderewski, the man; of some of his achievements and his principles.

But what were the motivating forces that made this man's life an object of admiration and respect for his own people, and for free people throughout the world? Wherein lay the inner spiritual strength that sustained him?

Like so many men of genius who contribute so much to mankind, Paderewski was possessed of a wide range of noble qualities of character.

Yet, in reviewing his life, I am impressed by certain ones that stand out as an index to his success.

And I am struck also by the fact that these are characteristics that have marked the men of leadership throughout the ages.

Paderewski, early in life, developed to its fullest extent the stout moral pillar of self-discipline. Throughout his life this was reflected in a strength of character that was like a beacon light to others.

It supported him in the days of the Paris Peace Conference, when he sat in the councils of the victorious Allies, and worked without ceasing to secure justice and freedom for the Polish people.

Paderewski had unwavering determination in the face of adversity. He dedicated himself unhesitatingly to a cause, no matter how hopeless it might seem at the time, or what hardships it may have inflicted on him.

Paderewski was not concerned with superficial prestige, with bluster or flamboyance. He was a gentleman to the core, in appearance, in manner, and in deed. It is clear from his life that he did not believe that erratic appearance marked the great musician, any more than he believed erratic behavior was the mark of the statesman.

Paderewski had an abiding and vital religious faith. It was a real, living presence in all the actions of his life.

When he returned to the concert stage at the unprecedented age of 62, he was fearful of what the passage of time had done to his skills. Told by his sister that he had never played better, Paderewski replied, simply, "Yes, God was with me all the time."

His sincere, lifelong religious belief won him the friendship of many distinguished churchmen of his own Catholic faith. It also won him the admiration and respect of millions from other faiths, who saw in Paderewski the living example of the Christian statesman, the Christian artist, and the Christian human being.

From the depths of his religious faith, no doubt, sprang Paderewski's quality of selflessness. He served his people always—himself never.

No one can forget the example he set for leaders of free countries when, in the fall of 1919, he voluntarily stepped out as Prime Minister of Poland.

Paderewski could easily have assumed control of his war-torn nation as dictator, but he felt that he had done his duty. He had served as the unifying force, as no other man could have done, to draw together the Polish people in their first, faltering steps toward existence as an independent nation.

When this was done, he turned the reins of power over to others. He sought not power, but a free native land.

Paderewski was possessed of an innate generosity. Less that 5 years after first visiting the United States he established an award to encourage American composers.

Throughout his life, he was a continuing benefactor of the young of his native Poland and of our own country. He encouraged them to develop their resources, in the study of music, language, and philosophy.

It was Paderewski's generosity with his own personal fortune, during and after World War I, in fact, which required his return to the concert stage in 1922.

But when I speak of his generosity, I do not mean only of his worldly goods. Far more important, Paderewski was generous with himself. Early in life, Paderewski coined a motto which he adopted as his own—"The fatherland first, art afterward."

This was his real generosity. He gave of all his talents to the cause he felt most right and important.

We must remember that Paderewski made fortunes many times over through his skill as a musician. I would hazard the guess that he was the highest paid concert artist of his age.

Yet he hesitated not an instant before turning to the service of his country when he was needed. Without regret or fear, he turned his back on the piano, and all the material riches it had earned for him.

He saw his duty as a man of genius, and directed his efforts toward helping his Polish people toward independence, and in guiding them into being a free, self-sustaining nation.

Again, when the conquerors from both East and West devastated Poland in 1939, Paderewski gave fully of himself. Almost 80 years old, he journeyed to France to accept the Presidency of the Polish Parliament in exile, and once again fulfill his destiny to unify and lead the Polish people in their fight for freedom.

He was a sick man, and could well sense that shouldering this tremendous burden of political leadership could constitute his death warrant.

He nevertheless answered this call to duty, giving his physical powers, his heart and soul, and his genius without sparing, in answer to the summons of country and conscience.

It is because of this lifelong service to his country and to the principles of freedom that I have directed the Post Office Department to issue special stamps in the "Champions of Liberty" series, honoring Paderewski.

The special stamps will be placed on sale for the first time on October 8, here in Washington, D.C.

This event will coincide with our remembrance of the great contributions made by the Revolutionary War hero, General Pulaski, to our American cause of independence.

Living in today's troubled world, we have an obligation to ourselves and our fellow man to study the qualities that made Paderewski great, and to emulate them in our own lives.

The free world cries out today for leaders and for citizens who will put moral principle first, and accept their responsibility to ward off the forces that threaten our way of life, whether external or internal.

We need today men of Paderewski's self-discipline and courage, who will not retreat before threats, who will not be bullied, who will be confident that a just cause is worthy of any sacrifice.

Too many national leaders, both then and today, would seek the easy way out, of compromise and appeasement.

Often we forget what Paderewski knew so well, that justice is its own strength. It requires only men of character and courage to take a stand and emerge victorious.

Paderewski's dedication to a cause, surpassing any thought of himself or his own personal glory, is a trait of character so essential in these times of tension.

We have seen a recent example of this in the dignified and unselfish manner in which President Eisenhower has carried himself.

But too often we see the opposite—a man retreating and maneuvering, determined to protect not the cause for which he stands, but only himself.

As we remember this great man today, we should rededicate ourselves to the abiding Christian faith that sustained him.

Finally if there is but one lesson we can draw from Paderewski's life, and one element of character to which we pay tribute, it is the generosity of spirit which he displayed.

We live today in times that test the intellect, the moral courage and the dedication of every man.

Abroad, we face the blackest tyrannies—more ruthless and deadly than civilization has ever known.

In our own ranks, too often, we face self-interest, moral cowardice, and retreat.

If we are to survive—and survive we will—we must study well the example left to us by such giants as Paderewski.

We must learn and believe, as he did, that the phrase, "Right makes might," is not an old-fashioned, out-of-date slogan.

We must feel, as he felt, that devotion and dedication to a just cause cannot but succeed in time, if we carry ourselves with determination and confidence.

We must believe, as he did, that the freedom of mankind is the highest value, and pledge ourselves to do our utmost to achieve it.

Above all, we must draw the lesson from this great patriot that the first, and all-compelling duty of genius, is to his fellow man.

Let no one who has ever heard or seen Paderewski, has read about him, or has heard of his role in history, say:

"My business is too important to take time for public affairs, or;

"I am devoted to the world of arts and cannot be bothered with political life, or;

"I am too busy taking care of the home," or;

Any of the other thousands of excuses we in public life hear every day from those who will not contribute their talents to the all-important mission of making this country.

and every country in the world, a place in which man can live in freedom and dignity.

Late in life, Paderewski said:

"The vision of a strong and independent Poland has always been the lodestar of my existence. Its realization is the great aim of my life."

Paderewski's vow was to his native land. We know from this heroic man's career that he would have taken the same vow to protect his fellow man, wherever oppressed and persecuted.

In respect for the immortal soul of the man who lies here with us, I urge that we take—each of us—this same solemn pledge—that we dedicate ourselves to pit all our talents, abilities, and energies, as he did, to achieving strength, freedom, and independence for our fellow man, in whatever country he may live, or in what state of bondage he may now be.

With courage, with determination, and with the strength borne of confidence in the justness of our cause, we shall accomplish our mission.

With God's help, we shall go forward to the final victory, when every man can say with pride, "I am free."

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, may I have the attention of the minority leader?

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, are we in the morning hour?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is in the morning hour.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

COMMUNIST PROPAGANDA IN THE CONGO

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, we read daily, hear over the radio, and see on television reports about the distressing situation in Congo Africa and in Africa generally.

Our Nation has been fortunate in the many years past to have a fine group of dedicated men and women who have gone to that continent as missionaries. I received a letter this morning which I think ought to be brought to the attention of all Members of Congress. The letter reads:

I am a missionary doctor's wife who has just returned from the former Belgian Congo. We were in the Equator Province where things have been relatively peaceful. My husband is still there and our four mission doctors are probably the only doctors left in the whole Ubangi area since the Belgian doctors have all left. Our men missionaries are still there trying to ride out this trouble, but all women and children have been evacuated.

I came home with a heavy burden on my heart—that of propaganda for Africa. For the last 5 months our evening shortwave news broadcasts from BBC and Voice of America have been jammed. As we turned along the 25-meter band there were five places where Peiping was broadcasting their lies about America in perfect American English—obviously beamed to Africa with a powerful transmitter. It disturbed me so much I had to turn it off. About every 10th word was "imperialist U.S.A." and one wonders how anyone can twist the truth into such lies. But, even worse, was that we could not find any programs from the United States to counteract these lies. Where is the Western World in this propaganda campaign? What effect are these lies having on English-speaking colonies in Africa such as Ghana, Rhodesia, Kenya, South Africa?

In our area we use the "Lingala" trade language. Broadcasts have been heard in Lingala and Swahile (another Congo trade language) originating in Moscow and Cairo. Our Belgian state man told us 6 months ago that they were aware of a school in East Germany that was teaching Lingala. Recently one of our bewildered African school teachers asked us, "Tell me, who is the worst—America or Russia?" Our people are just getting radios and are unable to judge truth from lies. Thus far they have relied upon us as missionaries to help them but "if you tell a lie long enough, they'll believe it." This is what they said about China—"The missionaries taught us to read but the Communists gave us literature." Is the same thing going to happen in Africa?

What are we as a country doing in the line of propaganda both in radio and literature? I may not be well informed but as I dialed all over our radio in Congo I could not find anything being done to counteract these lies. Can't we do something quickly to save the situation? Can't our many American missionaries who have had to leave the Congo or those still out there who know the native language be contacted and used for radio and literature and flood the country with the truth about America? If we don't, Congo and Africa are going to be a lost cause, and faster than we think.

Thank you for reading my letter—please try to impress on those in power this tremendous need and the urgency of immediate action.

I thought this subject should be called to the attention of the Senate, because I know of no group who is more familiar with the situation in Africa than those who have given their lives in this area.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I shall, if I have time remaining.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas obtained the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. FREAR. I am happy that the Senator from Kansas has brought to the attention of the Senate this grave problem in the Congo. I should like to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an AP story from Brussels dated as of yesterday, which substantiates the remarks that were made on the floor of the Senate on Monday of this week, stating the physical condition of those people who have been taken out of the Congo and transported back to their homeland in Belgium.

There being no objection, the story was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wilmington Journal-Every Evening, Aug. 30, 1960]

BRUSSELS, August 30.—The Belgian Foreign Ministry today denied a Congo atrocity charge by U. S. Senator J. ALLEN FREAR, JR., Democrat, of Delaware.

Senator FREAR told the Senate yesterday that a planeload of children whose hands had been chopped off were flown back to Belgium from the Congo a month ago.

A spokesman for the ministry said only one such case of a child whose hand and forearm had been severed had been verified so far.

He added, however, that at the start of the Congo army mutiny early in July, several children had been maltreated by mutineers.

"The situation is bad enough as it is," the spokesman said. "There is no need to invent atrocities with all the official verified accounts of rape, brutalities and looting which the Ministry of Justice commission has in its files.

FREAR declined to reveal the source of his information but later told reporters he had it on "good authority."

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the junior Senator from Texas.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Kansas for calling this subject to the attention of the Senate. I hope the Voice of America will devise means to get the story of our policies over to the people in the Congo, in Africa.

Meanwhile, while they are doing so, I do not believe our Government should send defenseless American soldiers into danger areas unarmed and with no protection. I believe it is the duty of the Defense Department, when we either draft boys into the Armed Forces or enlist them on a voluntary basis and then send them into zones of known danger where fighting is going on between hostile forces, and sometimes indiscriminate attacks are made, that our forces should either go into the territory armed or under the protection of an armed guard.

I believe the distinguished Senator from Delaware advocated the same principles here on the floor yesterday or the day before, and I wish to join him in those remarks.

There was a time in the days of Teddy Roosevelt and in the days of Grover Cleveland when Americans in different parts of the world were beaten up indiscriminately and left unconscious. Our Government demanded restitution, indemnity, and apology. We wonder what policy the Government now follows when members of the American Armed Forces can be beaten and left unconscious, and we find the Government too weak to demand indemnity and apology. What does American citizenship mean if it does not carry the protection of that flag which is back of the Vice President's desk wherever Americans lawfully go on official Government missions?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I compliment the Senator from Kansas for bringing to our attention the communication which he has given to the Senate, coming as it does from a missionary source, and indicating the want of adequate information as to activities on behalf of our Nation in the Congo and the other important parts of central Africa which he mentioned.

I merely call attention to the fact that the Congress has been generous in the granting of requested appropriations for the U.S. Information Agency. As one who has been active in the field of that legislation, as a member of the subcommittee and the committee, I would like to see more imagination, more willingness to step out into new fields, and more

willingness to be ahead of those who are our potential enemies on the part of our U.S. Information Agency.

We have been through the same situation with reference to Cuba. We have had to listen to humiliating and completely irresponsible broadcasts as to our country from Cuba; at the same time there was no adequate coverage being given to the story of America, the best friend that Cuba has ever had, broadcast to reach into the homes and the families of Cubans.

Apparently we are now waiting until a potential enemy has walked in through the airways, if we may use that term, into this important area in central Africa, and has made great progress. Then we move. I call attention to the fact that we have been generous and responsive to the requests of the U.S. Information Agency and of the Department of State in this same field, and that we have a right to expect more imagination, and more responsiveness to sense the danger before it actually is as great as it now is in that area. There should be more willingness to go on new adventures in the areas of the world in which needs are constantly cropping up, and which require this kind of attention. We need to have a clear exposition of America's position in world affairs, by which we want nothing except peace and enduring prosperity among people, which will foster peace. I think we have been very slow, and our U.S. Information Agency has been very derelict in living up to its very high responsibilities in this matter.

OUR RESOLVE IS RUNNING STRONG

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in the space age, the American people are searching for crystallization and clarification of principles of purpose and spiritual realizations needed to serve as the foundation for progress in our Republic.

In these fast-changing times, there is a constant need, not only to reevaluate and redefine goals and ideals, but also to design the methods of accomplishing such objectives.

As necessary, this means modifying old concepts and creating new ones to meet the newly emerging challenges.

Regrettably, some of our so-called leaders have felt it necessary to trample upon, or at least deprecate, the policies and programs of the past, which have served as the foundation of progress for our great country.

Personally, I think this is nonsense.

Historically, the Nation has undergone a series of successive efforts to reevaluate goals and objectives, a "necessity of life" in a free country, and in complete accord with our traditions.

In 1860, Abraham Lincoln said:

> As our case is new, so must we think anew and act anew.

In 1960, this is also true, if we are to progress as a nation.

In recent weeks, Life magazine has published a series of constructive, thought-provoking articles on national purpose.

In these articles, outstanding individuals from a great many walks of life, including politics, have presented laudable ideas. Of themselves, these have been meritorious; as well, they have stimulated additional thought among our people on our national purpose.

The August 29 edition of Life published the views of Vice President NIXON entitled "Our Resolve Is Running Strong."

In a creative, constructive way, the article reviews our progress in adhering to fundamental principles as presented in the Preamble of the Constitution, as well as adoption of different ways and means for coping with the great challenges in each era of our history.

The theme running through the article emphasizes a positive, not a negative, philosophy. Importantly, it rejects the idea that we, as a nation, have lost our national purpose. More truly, it reflects the specific ways in which we, as a nation, acting upon fundamental principles and ideas, have met, and are continuing to meet, the challenge in each era.

As an outstanding contribution to public thinking on our national purpose, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR RESOLVE IS RUNNING STRONG

(By Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON)

It is particularly appropriate that Life has stimulated a comprehensive reexamination of our national purpose at a time when the American people are making some important decisions about their future, as they are in the election of a new President.

A common denominator of agreement among the eminent contributors to this series is that the Nation has mounted insufficient response to the Communist challenge to free society.

We can all agree that we have never faced a more formidable challenge. Yet contrary to some of the other viewpoints which have been presented, it is my belief that never has the American purpose been more clear.

For me the discussion has served the very useful function of pointing up the difference between interest and purpose. Some of those who have participated seem to have been talking mostly about interests; others were truly dealing with the more elusive thing which we can recognize as purpose.

That there is a difference between the two was recognized by a man who was caught up in one of the several reexaminations of our national purpose which have already taken place in this century. Woodrow Wilson noted prophetically just before the struggle over the League of Nations, "Interest does not bind men together. Interest separates men." Only purpose, Wilson said, can unite men.

Since we are now engaged in a national political campaign, it is well to keep in mind this difference between interest and purpose. In the Wilsonian sense an interest is an end peculiar to a group or individual. It is the kind of end sought by what we call an interest group. It is not an end that recommends itself for general adoption; it sets no goal that can unite a whole people. Such a goal Wilson called purpose.

Too often we wage our political campaigns and evaluate our national posture in terms of interests. Too often the parties put forth platforms, and the candidates make campaign promises, which seek a mere compromise of conflicting interests, which propose some "splitting of the difference." Would it not be more in keeping with our best tradition if we sought a larger purpose within which our separate interests could be united in a more elevated conception of our destiny? Fundamentally, purpose must be examined in terms of what an entire people can regard as the ends of human existence and their relation to the external universe and to God.

The first problem in reexamining national purpose, then, would be to separate interest from purpose. The second would be to distinguish purpose from fulfillment.

If our purpose, as I believe it does, comes from a higher authority than ourselves, we still retain the responsibility. It rests with us, as men, and as a nation, whether we will or will not fulfill our purpose. From this point on when I speak of national purpose I will mean both the purpose that should unite us and the dedication of mind and spirit necessary to achieve it.

Life's editor in chief said before a Senate committee recently, "The founding purpose of the United States was to make men free, and to enable them to be free and to preach the gospel of freedom to themselves and to all men. That purpose has withstood all manner of trial and tribulation, stress and strain."

While I concur that this has proved to be the American purpose reduced to its purest terms, we should remind ourselves that it was not unmistakably so at the time. At the very least we should differentiate between the stated purpose and the processes of fulfillment which are revealed in the continuing thread of our history. Capability, as well as intent to fulfill purpose, is and always has been part of this unfolding destiny.

Stated in the more practical terms which then obtained, the founding purpose was to establish in the new land a society founded on principles of equality under God, dedicated to the general welfare and the blessings of liberty. These were the stated purposes written into the charter documents by the Founding Fathers—philosophers whose collective wisdom under stress we find so worthy of emulation today.

But while Jefferson said we act not "for ourselves alone, but for the whole human race," we know that the English colonies struggling for survival between the wilderness and the sea—a sea open to the warships of predatory monarchies—had not the capability to make all men free. We also know that the founders did not even have the intent to make all men free because they established the United States, partially at least, as a slave society.

Moreover the founders suffered agonizing uncertainties and soulsearching doubts as they went about the fulfillment of the great purpose, of which we can now see that they were seized. As late as the year 1774 so well-informed a man as Benjamin Franklin could say in all seriousness that he "never had heard in any conversation from any person, drunk or sober, the least expression of a wish for a separation" from England.

We now know that even as Franklin said these words, the American sense of purpose was running at full tide. In no time, as we reckon these things, independence had been declared and a war to confirm it was in progress.

Today we look back to the author of the Declaration of Independence as a man truly aware of the purpose that was flowing around him. Yet at the time even he was writing, in his "Notes on Virginia," in almost the exact vein of several of these modern essays on national purpose: "From the conclusion of this war we shall be going downhill. It will not then be necessary to resort every moment to the people for support. * * * They will forget themselves, but in the sole faculty of making money, and will never

think of uniting to effect a due respect for their rights."

The people did unite. They did rise above their material self-interest. The Constitution was written and adopted including, in the end, the Bill of Rights.

Fifty years later the Americans were speaking of a manifest destiny. The new Nation had begun to be stirred by the technological revolution which has changed the world. The age of Jackson brought the rise to prominence of the common man, politically and economically. The word democracy was becoming respectable. The United States could feel its muscle, and its face was turned westward.

But again, not all saw it so. One particularly prominent essayist of the time saw a serious absence of purpose and a dangerous national tendency to materialism. Americans, Emerson wrote, spent their money on trifles and lost themselves in seeking "after fine garment, handsome apartment, access to public houses and places of amusements." He detested what he called the mediocrity which he saw about him and wanted us to be "away with this hurrah of the masses."

There was a difficulty about democracy, but it was not the chasing after fine garments and handsome apartments. It was the revelation of a fundamental conflict in the Constitution.

As the westward movement continued, the ever-present, overriding question was: Shall the new territory be free or slave? By the middle of the 19th century this unresolved question of purpose clearly threatened to destroy the American dream.

The issue was irreconcilable. William Lloyd Garrison and the Antislavery Society held, "The right to enjoy liberty is inalienable. Every man has a right to his own body—to the products of his own labor—to the protection of law—and to the common advantages of society."

Against them Calhoun argued: "It is a great and dangerous error to suppose that all people are equally entitled to liberty. It is a reward * * * reserved for the intelligent, the patriotic, the virtuous and deserving;—and not a boon to be bestowed on [those incapable] either of appreciating or of enjoying it."

From the national dialog one would conclude the American purpose was muddy and confused.

A sure grasp of the right seemed to fail even Lincoln, who was obliged to confess as the slavery issue was joined, "if all earthly power were given me, I should not know what to do as to the existing institution."

Slowly, reluctantly, but nonetheless inexorably, the answer came to him. He declared the Negro slaves emancipated.

It might have been said, as the Civil War ended and the bitter Reconstruction began, that the national purpose was finally to make all Americans free, and by example to encourage the spread of freedom on earth. But not yet could it be said that America was ready to act to make all men free.

With the obstruction of slavery removed the Nation exploded again to the westward—over the Continental Divide to the western ocean. The expansion was coupled with industrialization. For the next three decades our people pursued their separate but converging interests with a vigor unparalleled in history.

Opportunity was the watchword in America and its sound exerted a pull on the entire Western World.

The poet's inscription for the Statue of Liberty ("Give me your tired, your poor") truly represented an invitation which was heard round the world. They came, by the hundreds, by the thousands, ultimately by the millions: Irish, Germans, Italians, Scandinavians, Poles, Slavs, and many others.

The preoccupation with the western expansion, with the industrialization, increased.

Our political men fell under the influence of the spell of economic conquest. The public dialog became strongly flavored with arguments—for example, about the survival of the fittest—that bore little resemblance to the purpose of making men free.

America abruptly entered the 20th century on a new tack. If we had lost our national purpose, we seemed to have found it again. The public dialog began to accentuate again the voices addressed to the general welfare and the blessings of liberty, to government by law and not by men, to faith in government by the people.

Theodore Roosevelt became the man of the hour by denouncing the malefactors of great wealth and by reinforcing his words with actions to restrain their arrogance.

"The only safe course," he warned, "to follow in this great American democracy is to provide for making the popular judgment really effective. When this is done, then it is our duty to see that the people, having the full power, realize their heavy responsibility for exercising that power aright."

The surge of annexation ended and the United States became the first western power, of those which had tasted its fruits, to renounce colonialism.

A voice speaking again with the ringing tones of freedom suddenly echoed over the world.

"The world must be made safe for democracy. Its peace must be planted upon the tested foundations of political liberty. But the right is more precious than peace, and we shall fight for the things which we have always carried nearest our hearts—for democracy, for the right of those who submit to authority to have a voice in their own governments, for the rights and liberties of small nations, for a universal domination of right by such a concert of free peoples as shall bring peace and safety to all nations and make the world itself at last free. America is privileged to spend her blood and her might for the principles that gave her birth."

Those words from Wilson's war message of April 1917—which pointed a new direction toward fulfillment of the American purpose to make all men free—were often mocked in the disillusioned twenties and thirties. But they proved to be fully valid in the fourth and fifth decades of the century when the always recurring assaults on freedom came from across the Rhine in 1940 and Yalu in 1950.

The American resolve to spend her might for freedom has been even more recently tested and not yet has it been found to waver. Nor, I predict, will it ever be, so far as any of us living can foresee.

In my opinion we are definitely and demonstrably a young country. We can, I am confident, put aside for this century, as far as America is concerned, Professor Toynbee's image of a dead civilization which has only its artifacts, covered with jungle vine or sand blasted in the desert sun, to recall it.

We have the vigor and imagination of youth. We are ready to go ahead and explore new approaches. We are a society of individuals. Our institutions project outward from people, not downward to people. The individual initiates, society imitates. The individual follows his endless curiosity, society builds roads that follow his footprints.

Our institutions are the creations of individuals and groups of individuals. They are not ordered into existence by the state. We have no state socialism. We have no state religion. We have no state aristocracy. Our schools—whether they be public or private—remain enterprises shared by men and women actively interested in them.

Our businesses—commercial, industrial, agricultural, and professional—number more than 10 million, 10 million separate ventures which voluntarily serve society and are voluntarily accepted by society. Our capitalists are not the few but the many. There are more than 12½ million shareholders in American business, more of them women than men. Many of our larger corporations have, in fact, more shareholders than employees.

There are, in addition, tens of millions of indirect capitalists. Every person taking out an insurance policy, contributing to a pension plan, or putting his money in a bank is indirectly investing in America.

We are also a nation of land capitalists—we have no landed aristocracy. More than 60 percent of American families own their own homes.

Our technology is surging ahead so fast that it is hard to perceive just what breakthrough in industrial productivity the immediate years ahead will bring, what 10 years will bring, or 15, or 20. Let those who blithely tell us what the gross national product of the United States or the U.S.S.R. will be in 1965, 1970, or 1975 ponder the evidence recently submitted by the Stanford Research Institute to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

The institute reminded us that even the most sophisticated predictions can go sadly awry. For example, a report to the National Resources Committee in 1937 tried to anticipate the kinds of new inventions which may affect living and working conditions in America in the next 25 years—or by 1962. In this report most of the major technological developments between 1937 and now were completely unforeseen—despite the fact that many of the Nation's then leading scientists and engineers had been consulted in its preparation.

The 1937 report, for instance, anticipated certain developments in vitamins and synthetic drugs but was silent on antibiotics. There was a long section on power but not a single gazer into the future envisioned atomic energy. Communication was treated at length but there was no hint of radar. Aircraft speeds of 240 miles at 20,000 feet were predicted—but on condition that the problem of cabin-pressurization could be solved. Jet-propulsion was not even mentioned.

It has been argued in some of the essays on national purpose, just as Emerson argued in the last century and Jefferson argued in the century before, that America is threatened by preoccupation with materialism and that we suffer a major cultural crisis. There is little doubt that our level of appreciation for art and literature leaves much to be desired, but it is my sincere conviction that we are only at the beginning of our cultural thrust.

So far, our unique achievement has been the political achievement. We still have to equal the contributions to the fine arts, to philosophy, and to unlocking the fundamental secrets of the universe which have been our heritage from the older societies. But I suggest that the greatest American achievements in these fields lie ahead. Even now we see all about us—in art gallery, in symphony hall, in scientific laboratory—new creative activity in every branch of human aspiration. And all our accomplishments, along with those of other times and countries, are immediately made available to all Americans through our unrivaled channels of print and electronics.

We cannot yet determine the full implications of the effect of massive cultural exposure on national taste and creativity. There is no previous example.

More important, in my judgment, than any of these other descriptions of our society is that we are openly prepared to share it with the world. We are, in this respect, comparable to the society which generated the creativity of the Hellenic civilization.

As Pericles said of his beloved Athens, "We throw open our city to the world, and never by alien acts exclude foreigners from

any opportunity of learning or observing, although the eyes of an enemy may occasionally profit by our liberality; trusting less in system and policy than to the native spirit of our citizens."

Finally, I believe we often fail to see the full dimensions of our Nation's purpose. In my opinion the truth is that the American purpose has continued to broaden as the country has matured and our capabilities have grown. We can see the process in retrospect, in the painful separation from England, in the establishment of government of the people, in the bloody eradication of slavery, in the great expansion and technological adaptation, in the renunciation of conquest, in the willingness to fight for freedom anywhere in the world.

I have a deep conviction that the American purpose is running strong in the 1960's.

I am struck by the fact that in the 15 years since the Communist challenge emerged in full force out of the ashes of World War II, the American people have been the principal effective force to keep it from overrunning the world. They have levied upon themselves the immense sum of $565 billion to preserve the security of the free world and contain the military threat of communism. American forces have stood guard along the frontiers of communism around the world in numbers never before sent forth by a nation for the general security.

If there have been moments of doubt and reversal, we should remember that the American Nation has dealt with a threat to freedom more virulent than any which has existed in human history and continues to deal with this threat day by day. I doubt that a greater dedication, with or without the urgency of open warfare, can be found in our own history or in that of any other people.

So much for what we are and what we have done to fulfill our national purpose.

It can never be said that we have done enough while Communist power exists in such magnitude as to threaten the total end of freedom and of humanity itself.

Several of the contributors to this series have called for action to strengthen the American purpose so that we may more adequately meet this threat.

Dr. Graham called upon the American people as individuals to look particularly to their fitness, their courage and their moral strength. I know of no better place to begin and I truly hope his message has been heard.

Mr. Gardner, in an eloquent plea for the pursuit of excellence, says, "When we raise our sights, strive for excellence and dedicate ourselves to the highest goals of our society, we are enrolling in an ancient and meaningful cause: the age-long struggle of man to realize the best that is in him."

Certainly he and Dr. Graham have supplied ringing answers to the question: What can I do?

I believe that we should also take special account of General Sarnoff's call for an unequivocal decision to win the cold war and hi point that news of this be plainly told to the world.

Mr. Luce, in his own statement on national purpose, delivered as testimony to the Senate Committee on Government Operations, accepted General Sarnoff's proposition as his own, with an amendment. In the atomic age, he suggested, no nation capable of launching a war of annihilation can be presented with the alternative of unconditional surrender. He proposed a more limited aim: severance of the state power of Russia and China from the mission of their present rulers to communize the world.

We all know that the struggle with communism must be fought without atomic war. Mr. Khrushchev himself knows that, though he has yet to convince his Chinese partner, Chairman Mao, who openly has foreseen a Communist victory, and more probably a Chinese Communist victory, from a war of general annihilation. Khrushchev in this instance is right and Mao is wrong. No one, not even the Chinese nation, will survive a general atomic war.

It is, therefore, essential to the American purpose that atomic war must be prevented. I know of only two ways this can be assured: by the maintenance on our part of invulnerable military strength, or by honest disarmament. Until the latter is within our grasp, we cannot temporize with the former.

It is essential to the American purpose that communism shall not be permitted to spread.

These are negative aspects of our national purpose to which not only most Americans, but most of the free world will subscribe. They are, as Wilson said, purposes which unite men.

Beyond this, and insofar as God grants us power to see these things, I believe we are even now witnessing a further broadening of national purposes for achievement of affirmative goals which will also unite us.

Since the end of World War II the core of American foreign policy has been support of the United Nations. Immediately second have been our efforts, still widely debated among us, to give strong economic support to the free nations. We have gone to the relief of distressed populations, rehabilitated the shattered economies of our allies and former enemies alike.

We have assisted the technological adaptation of the emergent societies. In all of these programs one can find self-interest. In fact, they have often been defended as such by their hard-pressed supporters in Congress. It could be argued that we have merely been stimulated by the Communist challenge. I prefer, as an American, to think these things would have come if communism had never spread beyond the pages of Marx and Engels.

Moreover, it is my belief that there is something more fundamental here than interest. We have already converted more than $78 billion from our own uses for these efforts, and they are certain to continue.

Most of us know instinctively that there is no more important human event occurring today than the revolution of expectations among the peoples of newly emerging nations, representing a third of the human race and uncommitted as between the free world and the Communist tyranny.

It is my firm belief that it is America's national purpose to extend the goals of the preamble of our Constitution to our relations with all men. At this point I should like to repeat these propositions:

Form a more perfect union.
Establish justice.
Insure domestic tranquillity.
Provide for the common defense.
Promote the general welfare.
Secure the blessings of liberty for ourselves and posterity.

Four of these six goals communism purports to offer mankind. That is why their cause has wide appeal. In place of two of them, justice and liberty, they demand a social discipline enforced by tyrannical state power.

I am as certain as I am certain of anything in life that these propositions were not conceived in the minds of men solely or unaided, and that they are inseparable. I am also certain that the inseparability applies not to ourselves alone but to all mankind.

I believe that the inseparability of these propositions from human destiny is the American purpose and that it will prevail.

SHOULD FEDERAL AID GO TO PRIVATELY SPONSORED SCHOOLS?

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, nationally there is recognized need for improving and expanding our educational system. To fulfill these needs, both the Senate and the House of Representatives have approved measures—although somewhat different—for giving a shot in the arm to the program.

Traditionally, the question of extending Uncle Sam's role in our educational system has been controversial. For the most part the major responsibility has been left to the States and the local communities—as it should be.

Because our Nation is having critical problems—which better educated people can help resolve, however—the present Congress has expressed its will for assuming a larger responsibility in this field.

During the debate on allocation of taxpayers' funds from the Public Treasury, the question, too, arose on the idea of allocating Federal funds to private, as well as publicly supported educational institutions.

As all of us know, there are very strong feelings on this issue. Particularly in my State of Wisconsin, the question has arisen on whether or not Federal assistance should be made available to parochial schools.

Recognizing the need for clarifying, insofar as possible, the traditional relationship between church and state, I ask unanimous consent to have a number of items printed in the RECORD:

First. Excerpts of a statement by Senator KENNEDY.

Second. A statement reviewing constitutional interpretations and decisions by the Supreme Court relating to the separation of church and state prepared by Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress.

Third. "Fighting Off Religious Prejudice," the Evening Star, August 17.

Fourth. An article appearing in the August 21, 1960, issue of the Milwaukee Journal entitled "School Bills Periled by Catholic Protests."

There being no objection, the excerpts, statement, and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXTRACT OF STATEMENT BY SENATOR KENNEDY IN AN ADDRESS BEFORE THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF NEWSPAPER EDITORS ON APRIL 21, 1960

Federal assistance to parochial schools, for example, is a very legitimate issue actually before the Congress. I am opposed to it. I believe it is clearly unconstitutional. I voted against it on the Senate floor this year, when offered by Senator MORSE.

STATEMENT REVIEWING CONSTITUTIONAL INTERPRETATIONS AND DECISIONS BY THE SUPREME COURT RELATING TO THE SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND STATE BY THE LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE OF THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

Based upon a literal evaluation, the historical record together with the relevant Supreme Court opinions will be found to provide more than adequate support for the thesis that amendment I renders unconstitutional Federal aid to sectarian educational institutions. Admirably suited for this purpose is, of course, the statement of Thomas Jefferson, in his letter to the Danbury Baptists in 1801, that the first amendment built a "wall of separation between church and state" (O'Neill, op. cit., p. 286). The significance of this conclusion would appear to be further amplified by the fact that in

the drafting of the same Jefferson had the prior counsel of Attorney General Lincoln (R. Freeman Butts "American Tradition in Religion and Education" (1950), pp. 93–94). Virtually identical in import is the assertion of James Madison, an active participant in the drafting of the first amendment to the effect that "strongly guarded [thereby] * * * is the separation between religion and government in the Constitution of the United States" (Beverly Fleet "Madison's Detached Memoranda," William and Mary Quarterly (3d ser., 1946 3: 555)).

Although proponents of Federal aid have labored valiantly to devise a correct interpretation of these statements, principally by reexamining the circumstances under which they were uttered and by offering other quotations from the writings of Madison and Jefferson favorable to their cause, they cannot erase the fact that the wall of separation concept has been frequently reaffirmed both by historians, constitutional commentators, public officials, and Justices of the Supreme Court. Thus, in his "Civil Liberty and Self-Government," published in 1852, Francis Lieber asserted that:

"It belongs to American liberty to separate entirely that institution which has for its object the support and diffusion of religion from the political government. We have seen already what our Constitution says on this point. * * * No warship shall be interfered with, either directly by persecution, or indirectly by disqualifying members of other sects, or by favoring one sect above others; and no church shall be declared the church of the state, or the established church; nor shall the people be taxed to support the clergy of all churches (Quoted by Anson Phelps Stokes. "Church and State in the United States" (1950), 3: 716–717; also quoted with approval, along with Jefferson's statement, by the Supreme Court in *Reynolds* v. *U.S.* (1868) 98 U.S. 145, 166).

Also recorded as subsequently expressing concurrence with Jefferson's "wall of separation" concept were President Grant, Elihu Root, and Justice Jeremiah S. Black who concluded that the founders of the Constitution "built up a wall of complete and perfect partition" between church and state (quotations attributed to Grant, Root, and Black are reproduced by Justice Frankfurter in *McCollum* v. *Board of Education*, op. cit., pp. 218–219). Charles A. Beard later interpreted such utterances as indicative of an intention of the sponsors of the first amendment to prevent Congress from voting "money for the support of all churches" ("The Republic" (1944), pp. 165–166, 170).

To refute the contention that the statements attributed to Jefferson and Madison have been quoted out of context and that history does not sustain the interpretation accorded to them, one need merely point to the record of consistent, literal application thereof over a period of 160 years during which the "Congress has never enacted a general appropriation bill for religion on a nonpreferential basis" (Leo Pfeffer. Church and State: Something Less than Separation. U. Chic. L.R. (1951), 19: 24). Moreover, not the slightest deviation from the aforementioned utterances can be attributed either to Jefferson or Madison during their tenure of public office. Thus, in 1784, Madison vigorously opposed a bill of the Virginia Legislature allotting funds for "Teachers of the Christian Religion" and permitting taxpayers averse to allocation of their contributions for the support of any Christian sect to designate that their payments be utilized for "general educational purposes" (quoted in appendix to *Everson* v. *Board of Education*, op. cit., p. 74). When serving as President, Jefferson and Madison also were of the opinion that not even a proclamation of Thanksgiving to God was constitutionally permissible (Stokes, op. cit., 1: 649, 697; Butts, op. cit., p. 94). According to Madison, appointments of Chaplains in the Houses of Congress and the granting of tax exemption to houses of worship contravened the prohibition of the First Amendment (Fleet, op. cit., p. 559, n. 56; Stokes, op. cit., I: 421).

Finally, reference must be made to the fact that the historical record similarly affords virtually no sustenance for the propositions advanced by proponents that Americans consistently "have been a religious people, that those who helped to frame the first amendment were the friends, not the enemies, of religion, and, therefore that they could not have intended to have religion by depriving it of constitutional support" (Pfeffer, op. cit., p. 20). According to others, the period during which the Constitution and the first amendment were adopted was marked by a widespread indifference, if not hostility, to church religion" (Stokes, op. cit., I:229–230; Charles A. Beard. "The Rise of American Civilization" (1927), p. 449). Even among those framers who could be deemed sympathetic to organized religion there was widespread acceptance of the conclusion advanced by Madison that "religion flourishes in greater parity without the aid of government" (William A. Blakey, "American State Papers on Religious Freedom" (1943), p. 194).

In the light of this historical background, it is understandable that the Supreme Court, in the recent decisions sustaining the released time programs and free bus transportation for children attending parochial schools, should reiterate that Jefferson's "wall of separation" doctrine has not lost its vitality. Thus, in *Everson* v. *Board of Education* (op. cit., pp. 15–16), Justice Black declared that: "The 'establishment of religion' clause means at least this: Neither a State nor the Federal Government can pass laws which * * * aid all religions * * * no tax in any amount, large or small, can be levied in support of any religious activities or institutions, whatever they may be called, or whatever form they may adopt to teach or practice religion. * * * In the words of Jefferson, this clause [Am. I] was intended to erect 'a wall of separation between the church and state.'"

Again, in *Zorach* v. *Clauson* (op. cit., p. 312), the Court asserted that "Government may not finance religious groups nor undertake religious instruction, nor blend secular and sectarian education."

Independently of these statements, none of the recent rulings of the Court in which they are contained lend tangible support to the thesis that nondiscriminatory Federal aid is constitutionally tenable. Pertaining as they do to State, rather than Federal, action, these decisions did not present the Court with an opportunity to pass on the validity of an appropriation of Federal tax revenues directly to denominational schools. In fact, in none of these cases was a comparable State appropriation at issue. Thus, in the Louisiana textbook decision, in which first amendment freedoms were not even pleaded by the litigants, the Court had before it merely an allocation of funds to make public school texts available on loan to pupils attending parochial and other private schools. The children, not the schools, were the immediate beneficiaries thereof; and by no stretch of the imagination could the materials provided be viewed as affording any intended, or direct, governmental assistance to the teaching of religion. All that was fostered was secular education, a matter of concern to the entire populace (*Cochran* v. *Board of Education*, op. cit., p. 375). Again, in the bus transportation case, wherein the State action sustained was declared to go to the verge of what was permissible under amendment I, the immediate recipients of the funds allocated were the parents of schoolchildren, and the primary objective sought to be promoted thereby was held to be public safety, or the avoidance of traffic accidents, a goal in which the public interest was by no means limited to the pupils in question, much less the religious schools which they attended (*Everson* v. *Board of Education*, op. cit., pp. 17–18). Likewise, in the released time controversy, the State conduct finally meriting judicial approbation also entailed no expenditure of public funds to, nor any use, and corresponding expense in terms of maintenance, of public property; that is, the school buildings, by sectarian groups. Affirmative State aid for secular education under religious auspices, or for religious instruction by denominational institutions thus not having been directly at issue in any of these decisions, they provide dubious constitutional support, if at all, to the sponsors of Federal aid to sectarian schools (*Zorach* v. *Clauson*, op. cit., pp. 306–309, 311).

What proponents of such aid persist in ignoring, when they attempt to justify Federal expenditures as benefiting primarily students in quest of a secular education, is that many of the groups operating sectarian schools are doctrinally obligated not to recognize any distinction between secular and religious teaching. To the latter "no teaching can be 'neutral'," but on the contrary must "be permeated with Christian piety." To the extent that such groups must yield to this doctrinal compulsion they would appear to undermine irreparably the constitutional merit of their contention that disbursement of Federal aid on a nondiscriminatory basis entails no more than just compensation to religious institutions for offering students electing to attend the same quality of instruction as is made available in publicly maintained schools. Indeed, the burdens imposed by such doctrinal considerations would seem destined unavoidably to render such expenditures indistinguishable from the disbursement of tax revenues in aid of religion itself. Constitutional support for the latter can be derived neither from decisions of the Court nor from opinions of the Founding Fathers (Milton R. Konvits, "Separation of Church and State: The First Freedom," Law and Contempt. Prob., op. cit., pp. 58–59; Jackson, J., dissenting in *Everson* v. *Board of Education*, op. cit., p. 24).

[From the Evening Star, Aug. 27, 1960]

FIGHTING OFF RELIGIOUS PREJUDICE—DEFEAT OF SLANDERERS DURING CAMPAIGN IS CALLED RESPONSIBILITY OF ALL

(By Ralph McGill)

According to a wire service dispatch, Mrs. Loretta Clodfelter of Knoxville, Tenn., has contributed a minor footnote to the 1960 political campaign.

The Knoxville housewife has filed suit for a separate maintenance, charging that her husband refused to allow her to take her 3-year-old son to church because "Baptist preachers are against KENNEDY for President." Mr. Clodfelter, she reports, ordered her out.

It is perhaps inevitable that the religious controversy will attract attention in the weeks ahead, with incidents preposterous, tragic and senseless.

The basic problem of the candidates is to make sure their own staffs, both at headquarters and in the various States, scrupulously avoid any political use of religion. The Nation also has a responsibility.

The mails already are filling up with a lot of hate stuff, some of it ridiculous, some of it vicious and false. It is this we need to watch. For many thoughtful persons there is a problem wholly outside the area of prejudice. These may be expected to resolve this dilemma logically and sensibly as the campaign continues, the issues are discussed, and the candidates make plain their positions.

There remains a personal and national responsibility not to permit the slanderers and smearers, professional and amateur, to practice their evil arts without being publicly revealed for what they are.

A part of the complexity of the political problem is the parochial or church-supported schools. This has never been wholly an issue restricted to the Roman Catholics, although their schools were, and are, the most numerous.

But today there is a tremendous burgeoning of parochial schools. This is especially true in the South, but it is by no means confined to that region. The national increase in per capita income, and the desire of parents for schools able to give special instruction or more individual attentions have caused a great leap forward in private schools. Churches have sponsored many of them. Until about 10 years ago the church schools were largely Roman Catholic, with Episcopalians and Presbyterians next. But today all of these have increased and there are, in addition, many Baptist, Methodist, Lutheran, and other sectarian schools initiated by churches.

Most of them are in need of money. Many of them were begun "because we ought to have a school." Others, without surveys or planning, "built on faith." A shocking number of church schools, more particularly the new ones, are not well staffed and cannot possibly make a go of providing first-rate accredited education. A substantial percentage of them have no valid reason for existence save for what might be called church vanity.

Hence, there is a growing clamor for the private parochial schools to be included in Federal aid. That this pressure may defeat public school aid is possible and tragic.

It seems to be necessary to face up to certain facts.

It is true enough that persons who send their children to private schools still pay taxes for public education. But that they should share in this is a specious argument.

The public schools are there—and they are free. The honest parents who send a child to private school must admit they do so because they want something extra. It may be they wish their child to have extra religious instruction not received in public schools. Or, the smaller classes, the emphasis on individual instruction, or, for the time being, at least, an escape from possible integration, may be the motivating factor.

But whatever it is, there is a desire for something not found in public education. A choice is made. There is no reason then why the parent who makes such a choice should not pay the bill. He should not call on the Federal Government to assist him to buy something extra for his children.

Public education will always be the backbone of our way of life, our system of government. It must not be hurt by private schools.

[From the Milwaukee Journal, Aug. 21, 1960]

SCHOOL BILLS PERILED BY CATHOLIC PROTESTS—U.S. LAWMAKERS GET LETTERS ON FAILURE TO PROVIDE PAROCHIAL AID IN PROPOSALS

(By Laurence C. Eklund)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Federal school aid legislation, placed on the "must " list for this session by the Democratic leadership, is imperiled by a deluge of letters from Catholics who oppose it.

In the last 2 weeks, Congressmen have received thousands of letters from persons identifying themselves as Catholics who object to the pending House and Senate bills because they exclude benefits to parochial schools.

This last minute, well organized letter writing campaign dramatizes a sharp difference on this issue between Senator KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, the Democratic Presidential nominee, and a large number of his fellow Catholics.

KENNEDY, who insists on aid to education as part of a "minimum" program for this resumed session of Congress, was criticized by some Catholics recently when he spoke against the Federal Government's extending support to sustain any church or its schools.

WILEY GETS 300 LETTERS

KENNEDY has consistently maintained that the separation of church and state is fundamental to our American concept and heritage and should remain so.

Senator WILEY, Republican, of Wisconsin, has received more than 300 letters from Wisconsin Catholics and Catholic organizations in the last 2 weeks urging him to vote against school aid legislation. The letters pour in at WILEY's office at a rate of about 20 a day.

Actually, WILEY already has favored the legislation. He was paired for the McNamara bill, passed by the Senate February 4, providing $928 million a year for 2 years for both school construction and teachers' salaries. Senator PROXMIRE, Democrat, of Wisconsin, voted for it.

The House-passed bill, not quite so broad, provides $325 million a year for 4 years for school construction only.

CONFERENCE REFUSED

The House Rules Committee has refused to grant the necessary joint conference between House and Senate, and action is therefore stalemated. Any conference report would have come before both House and Senate for approval.

Neither proposal allocates funds for parochial or private schools, and that is what most of the letter writers are complaining about.

Scores of letters from parish priests and the Knights of Columbus, Catholic fraternal organization, complain that the legislation would discriminate against parents of 5,090,000 children in parochial schools.

They were particularly bitter about provisions of both House and Senate bills allotting funds to the States on the basis of school age (5–17 years) population, including those in parochial and private schools, at $20 a child, while such schools were excluded from benefits. Many of them reminded WILEY that they were paying for both public and parochial schools.

DISCRIMINATORY NATURE

Here are a few typical complaints to Wiley from Wisconsin constituents:

Mineral Point Council of Knights of Columbus: "We are opposed to the discriminatory nature of the Senate bill. We have no quarrel with the public schools but object to being penalized for exercising our civil rights to educate our children in another system by paying for both systems. Under this legislation the Federal Government would count our children as a basis for distributing funds to each school district but would exclude all but the public schools from the benefits. We feel you should exert every effort to have this precedent-shattering bill defeated."

Ashland K. of C.: "It is unfair, discriminatory, and inequitable."

GREATLY DISTURBED

River Falls Catholic priest: "I am not opposed to aid for public schools for an increase in teachers salaries if this is deemed necessary. However, I am greatly disturbed at a bill that counts all the children of our parochial schools in arriving at the amount of help but counts them out as recipients of any aid distributed. This is taxation without representation. Is this bill designed to force private schools out of existence by making it impossible for them to compare favorably with our public schools? Is this aid designed to punish parents for exercising their rights granted under the Constitution?"

Sun Prairie priest: "It is a $100 million steal from the Catholics of the United States."

Burlington priest: "As a high school teacher, I take pains to point out to my students it is a violation of distributive justice for the State to require Catholics desiring their own schools to support them at their own expense and at the same time support State schools by their taxes. These bills violate justice. The system of allotting aid to States according to the number of school-age children is pure fraud."

DEFEAT IS URGED

The Knights of Columbus councils at Marshfield and Fond du Lac sent telegrams urging defeat of the legislation.

"We do not wish to pay for what we do not receive," protested a Marshfield chiropractor.

"We pay taxes, but our kids can't ride the school buses," complained a Catholic from Willard.

A Milwaukeean insisted that educational costs could best be administered through "local, State, and private initiative" and he expressed opposition to "Federal subsidies for education."

A Sun Prairie woman who said she and her family were able to take care of their 93-year-old mother without Federal aid contended, "Government handouts will be the downfall of our country."

While noncommittal as to how he might vote if the matter came before him again, WILEY replied to his Catholic correspondents that they could be sure that he would keep their thoughts in mind. He agreed with them that private and parochial schools "have made many significant contributions to our American educational and public life."

When the House bill was acted upon in May, Representative ZABLOCKI, Democrat of Milwaukee, vainly sought approval of an amendment providing construction loans for parochial schools.

The amendment was denounced by Protestants and other Americans United for Separation of Church and State as undermining an important foundation stone "in the wall of separation between church and State."

Representative THOMPSON, Democrat, of New Jersey, author of the House bill, who like ZABLOCKI is a Catholic, denied ZABLOCKI's charge that his bill discriminated against seven million children in parochial and private schools.

"Those who attend nonpublic schools do so entirely voluntarily," THOMPSON told ZABLOCKI. "This is their right, for which they choose to pay."

THOMPSON insisted that he intended his bill to relate only to public schools and public school facilities.

ZABLOCKI's amendment was ruled not germane, but even without the amendment he voted for the bill, along with the four other Wisconsin House Democrats and Republican O'KONSKI.

Republicans BYRNES, LAIRD and VAN PELT voted against it, and Republican WITHROW was paired against it.

REPORT OF U.S. CONSTITUTION 175TH ANNIVERSARY COMMISSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if the Senate acts on the housing amendments, it will be necessary for the House to act also. In view of the fact that we are in the concluding hours of the session, I ask unanimous consent that we proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1987, with the understanding that if that bill becomes the pending business, notwithstanding the agreement entered into in connection with the Freedom Commission—and this request would in no way affect that agreement

except to delay proceeding to it for about 20 or 30 minutes——

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have not made my request yet.

Mr. MUNDT. So there will be no misunderstanding, since I think the Senator is leading up to a request, may I ask how much delay would be involved?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Not over 30 minutes, because we have a consent agreement on it.

Mr. MUNDT. Would it be the plan of the majority leader to proceed with the debate on the Freedom Commission?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I would not have brought it up, if I did not have that intention.

Mr. MUNDT. I shall not object.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. It is with the understanding that the unanimous-consent agreement will not affect the unanimous-consent agreement previously entered into, and with the understanding that at the conclusion of the consideration of the housing amendments, we will take up consideration of the Freedom Commission bill and conclude action on it under the unanimous-consent agreement previously entered into.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, would the unanimous-consent agreement apply to other amendments offered to the bill, or does the majority leader confine his request to the housing amendments?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The housing amendments.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I did not understand whether the limitation applied to the housing amendments.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. There are three housing amendments. It would apply to them.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. On the housing amendments. Is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is correct.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask if by agreeing to the unanimous-consent request it will mean that any other amendment may be offered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. We already have an agreement on the three amendments to extend the programs that are being closed out.

Mr. FREAR. The joint resolution is a very good vehicle for it. Because of my interest in it, I might wish to submit some amendments. I do not want to preclude my position. However, I recognize the desirability of passing a housing bill, and I am in favor of it, and I want to see it passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The agreement has already been entered into. All I am doing is to bring it up ahead of the Freedom Commission bill.

Mr. FREAR. Then my words are useless, apparently, if that agreement has already been entered into. Perhaps I should apologize for taking the time. I thought I was reserving my right to object.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator may reserve his right. I did not gather that the Senator recognized the fact that we had entered into an agreement on the housing amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent agreement? Without objection, it is entered.

The joint resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 784) amending the act of July 14, 1960, to extend the time within which the U.S. Constitution 175th Anniversary Commission shall report to Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution is open to amendment.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I send forward an amendment and ask that it be reported. I offer this amendment on behalf of myself and the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of the bill insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 2. (a) Section 2(a) of the National Housing Act is amended by (1) striking out "1960" and inserting in lieu thereof "1961", and (2) striking out the last sentence of the first paragraph thereof.

(b) Section 401(d) of the Housing Act of 1950 is amended by striking out "$1,175,000,000", "$125,000,000", and "$50,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$1,675,000,000", "$175,000,000", and "$100,000,000", respectively.

(c) Section 203(a) of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is amended by striking out "$100,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$150,000,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the amendment en bloc? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Alabama such time as he may desire.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on June 16 the Senate passed a general housing bill, S. 3670. On June 20, the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House of Representatives favorably reported a general housing bill, H.R. 12603. Both of these bills contain provisions essential to the national welfare. Unfortunately, both bills are pending in the House of Representatives primarily because the President and his supporters oppose the enactment of general housing legislation this year.

It is clear to me that the President's opposition will prevail, and the House of Representatives will not act upon either of these bills. I am advised that those who oppose general housing legislation at this session will not obstruct the enactment of legislation to continue three programs which will expire or will become inoperative for lack of funds. These three programs are as follows:

First. The FHA title I home repair and improvement insurance program—scheduled to expire on October 1, 1960.

Second. The college housing loan program which has been without funds since November 1959.

Third. The public facility loan program which has applications on hand totaling an amount in excess of uncommitted funds.

I am reluctant to initiate an emergency action which fails to deal with housing problems in general. On the other hand, if we fail to act, three essential programs will die and the public will suffer. Faced with these two distasteful alternatives I believe that the extension of these programs, and the abandonment of general housing legislation, is the lesser of two evils. Consequently, my proposal would amend existing law as follows:

First. The FHA title I home repair and improvement insurance program would be extended for 1 year, until October 1, 1961; and the ceiling on the title I insurance authorization would be removed.

Second. The revolving fund for college housing loans would be increased by $500 million—an amount sufficient to cover the existing backlog of approximately $300 million, and sufficient to permit processing of applications to be received between now and the time that the Congress can review this program next year.

Third. The revolving fund for public facility loans would be increased by $50 million—an amount sufficient to cover the backlog of applications now on hand and to permit processing of applications to be received in the future.

These three provisions are identical with provisions contained in S. 3670 as it passed the Senate on June 16.

Mr. President, this is the third consecutive year in which the executive branch of the Government has obstructed the passage of general housing legislation. In 1958, this obstructionism succeeded and resulted in the exhaustion of the FHA general insurance authorization, the depletion of the college housing loan fund, and the depletion of contract authority for urban renewal projects. In 1959, this obstructionism was expressed through two Presidential vetoes and was climaxed by the reluctant approval of the third general housing bill passed last year. In 1960, this obstructionism will result in the expiration of the home repair and improvement insurance program, the depletion of the college housing loan fund, and the depletion of the public facility loan fund—unless these three programs are continued as I am proposing.

Mr. President, I recommend and urge favorable consideration of these three amendments to existing law.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, with deep reluctance I shall support these amendments. It appears to be the only way, operating as we do under divided government, by which we can get any kind of housing program through Congress at this session, and signed by the President. I should like to point out the inadequacy of the bill. It does not deal with the following programs which we put into the excellent housing bill that passed the Senate earlier in the session:

First, it does not deal with the FHA general insurance authorization; second, it does not deal with the urban renewal

grant authorization; third, or low-rent public housing; fourth, it does not provide for the FNMA special assistance, mainly for urban renewal housing. Fifth, it eliminates very badly needed authorization for additional housing for the elderly, which was strongly supported by the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA]. Sixth, it does not permit the FHA to move actively into rehabilitation of blighted areas. Seventh, it does not facilitate urban renewal in areas needed for expansion of hospitals and colleges. Eighth, it does not provide for facilitating cooperative housing.

In all these respects it is inadequate.

However, Mr. President, we have divided government, and under divided government, with the legislature on one hand and the executive on another, we always have to accept limited programs if we are to get anything at all.

I must in all candor admit that some of our difficulties in connection with this legislation arise not from the executive, but from those in the other body who are opposed to any housing bill. Under their peculiar, archaic rules, a few men can prevent action over there. I hope they will change their rules next year in the interest of effective representative government.

Accordingly, because I believe we should extend the home improvement program, because we do need something to be done for community facilities, and because I know institutions of higher education are desperate in their efforts to get Federal funds in order to get college housing, I shall support the bill.

I should like to ask my friend from Alabama a question or two, if he will be kind enough to respond. It is my understanding that it is the intention of the Senator from Alabama to convene the Housing Subcommittee early next year in order to write a comprehensive Housing Act of 1961.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is certainly my intention.

Mr. CLARK. Is it the opinion of my friend from Alabama that we could well include in the housing bill provisions which now deal with middle income housing, sponsored by Senator JAVITS and me, reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency, and now on the calendar, but which have no chance of adoption at this session of Congress?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I think it can be done. The Senator will recall that such a program was not included this year because we did not have the time to go into it adequately in order to incorporate it in a bill that we felt we could put through Congress.

Mr. CLARK. I assume that the Senator from Alabama will give me some support in the Senate, as he did last year, in an attempt to set up a Department of Metropolitan Urban Affairs in the executive establishment.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That has been put on the calendar in the form of a separate bill. I fully agree with the Senator on the inadequacy of the measure we are asking to put through, but we are being realistic and we are getting some things we desperately need. I am sure the Senator agrees with me.

Mr. CLARK. I thank my friend for his candid response to my questions.

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield myself 1 minute. Mr. President, Congress has no other choice but to pass this proposed legislation. We strongly recommend it. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. All of us have heard the expression about a pistol being held to someone's head. We now see a pistol being held to the heads of a hundred people.

I do not know of anyone who will not agree with us that this is completely inadequate legislation. Yet I know of few better friends of housing than the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN]. He is pretty much of a barometer in this field. If he feels it must be done—and both the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] and I agree—then it ought to be done. It is sad that it must be done this way.

I say that for this reason. It is almost inexplicable to me. The stimulation of housing is one of the root bases of American prosperity. Why? All the fears that the FHA mortgage plan, public housing, and urban renewal housing would become socialized or would become Government controlled have been found to be absolute nonsense. On the contrary, the housing industry is probably as much a private industry as anything in the country. It could not have done the job it did, for its own prosperity and future, without these governmental aids. Yet in the final analysis we are completely inhibited and prohibited from doing what is required to promote better housing.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], who is such a valued and extremely important member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, has pointed to many of the other phases of housing legislation which are contained in the Senate bill. I think all of us, whatever may be our views concerning individual details, must be deeply disappointed, even disheartened, that the comprehensive housing bill got nowhere.

I call particular attention to the fact that in the bill we sent to the other body the FHA program was reduced from one-half to one-quarter of 1 percent, an extremely important saving to the small homeowner. I hope this will be impressed upon our colleagues in the House of Representatives in terms of what we must do when we return in January.

The 12½-percent limit on what a State could get for college housing was dealt with in the bill. There were increases in the relocation allowances for families having low incomes, and for the many families in the lowest income groups who were displaced by housing projects. Substantial money was provided for State and urban renewal projects.

So there has been a real loss. We are experiencing a real reverse in passing this bobtailed housing bill. I think we ought to realize that. I think that message ought to go out to the country, because it will have a major influence in the next campaign, when candidates are asked: "What do you intend to do about housing when Congress convenes next year?"

Finally, one of the casualties of this session is the middle-income housing bill, which the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] and I had the honor to sponsor, in which the committee showed tremendous confidence, based upon what we have presented in the report. The distinguished Senator from Alabama gave fine leadership to the measure, and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] gave us help, based upon the pattern which we had established and approved in New York in the so-called Mitchell-Armour program, of providing low-interest credit to cooperatives and other reduced-rental projects, especially for middle-income families.

I should like to ask the Senator from Alabama what might be his intention concerning that phase of the program when we return in January, in view of the fact that it is falling by the wayside, although it was reported by the committee.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I believe the Senator from New York heard my answer to the question asked by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK]. I said it would be my purpose to hold meetings at an early time next year, following the convening of Congress. I see no reason why, next year, we should not have ample time to consider a middle-income housing program, with which I was greatly impressed, but which, as the Senator knows, we reported as a separate bill this year. We did this because we felt we simply had not had the time to explore the proposed program sufficiently to bring it to the floor as a part of the omnibus bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, may I have 1 additional minute?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield an additional minute to the Senator from New York.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am in accordance with the statement of the Senator concerning the inadequacy of the bill. However, let us remember that the Senate did its job. We passed a good housing bill.

Mr. JAVITS. We certainly did.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I regret, as much as does the Senator from New York, the circumstances which make it impossible for us to have that bill enacted at this session of Congress. Nevertheless, we are faced with a realistic situation; and since three items are noncontroversial and are bipartisan, I feel we ought to salvage at least those three programs.

Mr. JAVITS. Could we say, therefore, that a middle-income housing bill will be eligible for inclusion next year in the omnibus bill?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I certainly am one who would support that idea.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, first, I congratulate the distinguished Senator from New York for what he has said on this subject. The Senate passed a good housing bill weeks and weeks ago. The fact that a housing bill is not to be

enacted is not the fault of the Senate. The bill was held up in the House Committee on Rules. What we are doing today is the best we can do for the housing industry of America, namely, to pass these three items. Title I, which relates to housing repairs, will expire at midnight tonight. There would be no legislation at all on the subject if we did not pass the so-called bobtailed bill today. So we have no choice except to do what we are doing.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. I am very glad we shall have a chance to vote on the bill today. I congratulate the chairman of the Subcommittee on Housing, the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] upon bringing the bill up, even at this late moment.

I have attended every meeting of the Subcommittee on Housing and all its hearings this year. While there is more that, perhaps, we should like to have in the form of housing legislation, the three items which are in the bill constitute the bare minimum. They are all absolutely necessary for the continuance of programs which are of considerable importance to our country.

I am delighted to join with my distinguished senior colleague on the committee in endorsing the passage of the bill.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I shall yield back the remainder of my time, if the Senator from Alabama will do likewise.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, since I have no other requests for time, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments en bloc.

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the joint resolution.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the joint resolution to be read a third time.

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 784) was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "Joint resolution amending the act of July 14, 1960, to extend the time within which the U.S. Constitution One Hundred and Seventy-fifth Anniversary Commission shall report to Congress including certain amendments relating to housing."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was passed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

FREEDOM COMMISSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the unanimous consent agreement, I ask that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. 1689, the Freedom Commission bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1689) to create the Freedom Commission for the development of the science of counteraction to the world Communist conspiracy for the training and development of leaders in a total political war.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, do Senators desire to discuss the bill further?

Mr. MUNDT. I shall be glad to discuss the bill briefly.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota will state it.

Mr. McCARTHY. Does the agreement provide for one hour on the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. McCARTHY. And one-half hour on any motion or amendment that may be offered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is correct.

Mr. McCARTHY. The amendments did not have to be pending at the time the agreement was entered?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. No.

Mr. President, does the Senator from Connecticut desire to speak on this subject now?

Mr. DODD. Not at this time, except that I would like to read a wire which I received this morning from our distinguished colleague from Illinois, Mr. DOUGLAS. Senator DOUGLAS is the coauthor of this bill and is one of its most eloquent and effective advocates. His wire reads as follows:

AUGUST 31, 1960.

Hon. THOMAS J. DODD,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

I have just learned that the Senate will come to a vote on S. 1689, the Freedom Commission and Freedom Academy Act, on Wednesday before I can hope to be back for the rollcall. I want to assure you of my continuing warm support for this measure.

As you pointed out so well in your thought-provoking and challenging analysis in the Senate last Friday, the free world desperately needs to understand better and to be better prepared to meet and counteract the political, economic, and propaganda, as well as military, thrust of Communist tyranny. S. 1689 provides the essential framework and authorization for such programs of research and training, which are clearly not being carried on today.

In view of the full hearings and committee review already devoted to this bill, I hope that technical questions of Senate committee jurisdiction will not serve to prevent consideration of S. 1689 on its merits.

With the accelerating tempo of the cold war on the part of the Communist nations, we cannot safely defer action for another year on this long overdue measure.

Despite the shortness of time remaining in this Congress, therefore, I hope the Senate may give its clear stamp of approval to the crucial and basic programs that will be set up by the Freedom Commission and Freedom Academy bill. Thus we can signify once again to our friends in the free world as well as to the enemies of freedom that we are determined with all our skills to maintain human freedom and dignity against the massive forces seeking to destroy them.

With all best wishes,

PAUL H. DOUGLAS.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes on the bill.

Mr. President, we are now approaching the voting stage on what the Senate Committee on the Judiciary has stated in its report it believes is one of the most important bills ever to be introduced in Congress. It is the bill to establish a Freedom Commission, and a Freedom Academy.

Senators are well aware, generally, that the United States must do something different from what it has been doing in order to tighten our offenses in the battle against communism in the cold war. We debated this bill on the Senate floor last Friday and we discussed it at some length on the floor again yesterday. The time is now here for Senate action.

I was interested in the colloquies which took place during the morning hour, following the reading by the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] of a letter from a Christian missionary.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield to me, so that I may ask that the committee amendments be considered and agreed to en bloc?

Mr. MUNDT. Certainly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I so request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREAR in the chair). Is there objection to the request that the committee amendments be considered en bloc? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to, as follows:

On page 2, line 3, after the word "the", to strike out "free world" and insert "Free World"; in line 4, after the word "the", where it appears the first time, to strike out "free world" and insert "Free World"; in line 8, after the word "tests", to strike out "the"; in line 14, after the word "the", to strike out "free world" and insert "Free World"; in line 16, after the word "intensive", to strike out "continuous"; on page 3, line 3, after the word "the", to strike out "free world" and insert "Free World"; in line 5, after the word "the", where it appears the second time, to strike out "free world" and insert "Free World"; in line 11, after the word "the", where it appears the second time, to strike out "free world" and insert "Free World"; in line 13, after the word "the", where it appears the second time, to strike out "free world" and insert "Free World"; at the beginning of line 15, to insert "and of the dimensions and nature of the global struggle between freedom and Communism"; at the beginning of line 19, to strike out "true nature of the international Communist conspiracy" and insert "dimensions and nature of the threat"; on page 4, line 3, after the word "conspiracy", to insert "and of the dimensions and nature of the global struggle between freedom and Communism"; in line 20, after the word "Freedom", to strike out "Academy; and" and insert "Academy"; after line 21, to strike out:

"(3) The term 'joint committee' means the Joint Congressional Freedom Committee."

On page 5, line 8, after the word "United", strike out "States" and insert "States, one of whom shall be selected from the higher echelon of the State Department"; on page 7, line 11, after the word "Commission", to strike out "is authorized and empowered to" and insert "shall"; in line 16, after the word "the", where it appears the second time, to insert "Commission and"; after line 17, to strike out:

"(1) the development of systematic knowledge about the international Communist conspiracy;

"(2) the development of counteraction to the international Communist conspiracy into an operational science that befits and bespeaks the methods and values of free men, and to achieve this purpose the entire area of counteraction is to be thoroughly explored and studied with emphasis on the methods and means that may best be employed by private citizens and nongovernmental organizations and the methods and means available to Government agencies other than the methods and means already being used;

"(3) the education and training of private citizens concerning all aspects of the international Communist conspiracy and in the science of counteraction to that conspiracy;

"(4) the education and training of persons in Government service concerning all aspects of the international Communist conspiracy and in the science of counteraction to the end that they can be more useful to their Government in defeating the international Communist conspiracy."

On page 8, after line 14, to insert:

"(1) to carry on a research program designed to develop an integrated operational science that befits and bespeaks the methods and values of free men and through which the free world will be able to meet and defeat the carefully patterned total aggression—political, ideological, psychological, economic, parliamentary, and organizational—of the Soviet bloc, and through which we, as a nation, may work toward our national objectives in a systematic manner. To achieve this purpose the full range of methods and means is to be thoroughly explored and studied including the methods and means that may best be employed by private citizens and nongovernmental organizations and the methods and means available to the Government other than the methods and means already being used. This research program shall include the study of our national objectives and purpose and the development of proposals for intermeshing and integrating the full spectrum of methods and means into a coordinated, short- and long-range strategy for victory, seeking the utilization of our full potential in the public and private sectors,

"(2) to educate and train governmental personnel, private citizens, and foreign students concerning all aspects of the international Communist conspiracy, the nature of the global struggle between freedom and communism, and the science of counteraction to the Communist conspiracy."

On page 9, line 19, after "(a)", to strike out "Academy students shall be selected, insofar as is practicable and in the public interest, from a cross section of the diverse groups, within and without the United States, in which the total political war is being fought. Before accepting any student for training who is an officer or employee of a Government agency, the Commission shall first obtain the concurrence of that agency." and insert "Academy students, other than Government personnel, shall be selected, insofar as is practicable and in the public interest, from the diverse groups within and without the United States where trained leadership and informed public opinion are most needed."; on page 10, line 9, after the word "All", to strike out "other"; in line 10, after the word "to", to strike out "aid and assist the Commission in the selection of students" and insert "assign officers and employees to the Academy for designated training"; in line 20, after the word "Act", to strike out "Foreign students selected for training"; at the beginning of line 22 to insert "(c) Foreign students selected for training"; on page 11, after line 15, to strike out:

"NONACADEMY TRAINING OF ACADEMY STUDENTS

"SEC. 8. The Commission is authorized to provide students selected for training at the Academy (either before, after, or during Academy training) with such additional education and training at colleges, universities, or technical schools other than the Academy, or with such on-the-job training in industry and business as the Commission shall determine to be in the public interest."

On page 12, at the beginning of line 2, to change the section number from "2" to "8"; in line 5, after the word "to", to strike out "disseminate" and insert "disseminate,"; in line 6, after the word "without", to strike out "charge" and insert "charge,"; in line 7, after the word "assist", to strike out "persons" and insert "people"; in line 9, after the word "and", to strike out "the ways and means of defeating that conspiracy" and insert "of the dimensions and nature of the global struggle between freedom and communism, and of ways they can participate effectively toward winning that struggle"; in line 16, after the word "level", to strike out "instruction" and insert "instruction, and also to publish such research materials as may be in the public interest"; at the beginning of line 23, to change the section number from "10" to "9"; on page 13, at the beginning of line 4, to change the section number from "11" to "10"; at the beginning of line 19, to change the section number from "12" to "11"; on page 16, at the beginning of line 16, to change the section number from "13" to "12"; at the top of page 17, to strike out:

"ESTABLISHMENT OF JOINT CONGRESSIONAL FREEDOM COMMITTEE; MEMBERSHIP

"SEC. 14. There is established the Joint Congressional Freedom Committee hereinafter referred to as the "joint committee" to be composed of seven Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and seven Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. In each instance not more than four Members shall be the members of the same political party.

After line 10, to strike out:

"AUTHORITY AND DUTY OF JOINT COMMITTEE

"SEC. 15. The joint committee shall make continued studies of the activities of the Commission and of problems relating to the development of counteraction to the international Communist conspiracy. During the first sixty days of each session of the Congress the joint committee shall conduct hearings in either open or executive session for the purposes of receiving information concerning the development and state of counteraction. The Commission shall keep the joint committee fully and currently informed with respect to all of the Commission's activities. All bills, resolutions, and other matters in the Senate or House of Representatives relating primarily to the Commission shall be referred to the joint committee. The members of the joint committee who are Members of the Senate shall from time to time report to the Senate and the members of the joint committee who are Members of the House of Representatives shall from time to time report to the House, by bill or otherwise, their recommendations with respect to matters within the jurisdiction of their respective Houses which are referred to the joint committee, or otherwise within the jurisdiction of the joint committee."

On page 18, after line 8, to strike out:

"CHAIRMAN AND VICE CHAIRMAN OF JOINT COMMITTEE; VACANCIES IN MEMBERSHIP

"SEC. 16. Vacancies in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection. The joint committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members at the beginning of each Congress. The vice chairman shall act in the place and stead of the chairman in the absence of the chairman. The chairmanship shall alternate between the Senate and the House of Representatives with each Congress, and the chairman shall be selected by the Members from that House entitled to the chairmanship. The vice chairman shall be chosen from the House other than that of the chairman by the members from that House."

At the top of page 19, to strike out:

"POWERS OF JOINT COMMITTEE

"SEC. 17. In carrying out its duties under this chapter, the joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings or investigations, to sit and act at such places and times, to require by subpena or otherwise, the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The joint committee may make such rules respecting its organization and procedures as it deems necessary: *Provided, however,* That no measure or recommendation shall be reported from the joint committee or by any member designated by him or by the joint committee, and may be served by such person or persons as may be designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the joint committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses. The joint committee may use a committee seal. The provisions of sections 192–194 of title 2, United States Code, shall apply in case of any failure of any witness to comply with a subpena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section. The expenses of the joint committee shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate from funds appropriated for the joint committee upon vouchers approved by the chairman. The cost of stenographic services to report public hearings shall not be in excess of the amounts prescribed by law for reporting the hearings of standing committees of the Senate. The cost of stenographic services to report executive hearings shall be fixed at an equitable rate by the joint committee. Members of the joint committee, and its employees and consultants, while traveling on official business for the joint committee, may receive either the per diem allowance authorized to be paid to Members of Congress or its employees, or their actual and necessary expense provided an itemized statement of such expenses is attached to the voucher."

On page 20, after line 12, to strike out:

"STAFF AND ASSISTANCE; UTILIZATION OF FEDERAL DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES; ARMED PROTECTION

"SEC. 18. The joint committee is empowered to appoint and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, and staff employees as it deems necessary and advisable. The joint committee is authorized to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and establishments of the Government."

After line 20, to strike out:

"CLASSIFICATION OF INFORMATION BY JOINT COMMITTEE

"SEC. 19. The joint committee may classify information originating within the committee in accordance with standards used generally by the executive branch for classifying restricted data or defense information."

At the top of page 21, to strike out:

"RECORDS OF JOINT COMMITTEE

"SEC. 20. The joint committee shall keep a complete record of all committee actions, including a record of the votes on any question on which a record vote is demanded. All committee records, data, charts and files shall be the property of the joint committee and shall be kept in the offices of the joint committee or other places as the joint committee may direct under such security safeguards as the joint committee shall determine in the interest of the common defense and security."

And at the beginning of line 12, to change the section number from "21" to "13," so as to make the bill read:

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

"SHORT TITLE

"SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the 'Freedom Commission Act'.

"CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF POLICY

"SEC. 2. (a) The Congress of the United States makes the following findings:

"(1) The Soviet Union and Communist China are waging a total political war against the United States and against the peoples and governments of all other nations of the Free World.

"(2) Unlike the Free World, the Soviet Union has systematically prepared for this total political war over several decades. Drawing on the experience of previous conquerors and upon their own elaborate studies and extensive pragmatic tests, Soviet leaders have developed their conspiratorial version of political warfare into a highly effective operational science. Recognizing that political warfare is a difficult science making unusual demands on its practitioners, the Soviet Union and Communist China have established an elaborate network of training schools, within and without the Free World, in which have been trained large numbers of highly skilled activists. These activists continue to receive intensive training throughout their party careers.

"(3) In this total political war the Soviets permit no neutrals. Every citizen, every economic, cultural, religious, or ethnic group is a target and is under some form of direct or indirect Communist attack. The battleground is everywhere, and every citizen, knowingly or unknowingly, through action or inaction, is involved in this continuous struggle.

"(4) Since the end of World War II, the Soviets, taking full advantage of their better preparation and often superior organizational and operational know-how, have inflicted a series of political warfare defeats on the Free World. The total sum of these defeats is nothing less than a disaster for the United States and the Free World and the continuation of this political war by the Soviets confronts the United States with a grave, present, and continuing danger to its national survival.

"(5) In order to defeat the Soviet political warfare offensive and to preserve the integrity and independence of the nations of the Free World, it is imperative—

"(A) that the knowledge and understanding of all the peoples of the Free World concerning the true nature of the international Communist conspiracy and of the dimensions and nature of the global struggle between freedom and Communism be increased as rapidly as is practicable;

"(B) that private citizens not only understand the dimensions and nature of the threat, but that they also know how they can participate, and do participate, in this continuous struggle in an effective, sustained, and systematic manner;

"(C) that Government personnel engaged in the cold war increase their knowledge of the international Communist conspiracy and of the dimensions and nature of the global struggle between freedom and Communism, develop a high esprit de corps and sense of mission and a high degree of operational know-how in counteracting the international Communist conspiracy.

"(b) It is the intent and purpose of the Congress that the authority and powers granted in this Act be fully utilized by the hereinafter created Commission to achieve the objectives set forth in the preceding subsection (a)(5) of this section. It is the further intent and purpose of the Congress that the authority, powers, and functions of the Commission and the Academy as hereinafter set forth are to be broadly construed.

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 3. When used in this chapter—

"(1) The term 'Commission' means the Freedom Commission;

"(2) The term 'Academy' means the Freedom Academy.

"ESTABLISHMENT OF THE FREEDOM COMMISSION; COMPOSITION; CHAIRMAN AND ACTING CHAIRMAN; QUORUM; OFFICIAL SPOKESMAN; SEAL

"SEC. 4. There is established in the executive branch of the Government an independent agency to be known as the Freedom Commission which shall be composed of six members and a Chairman, each of whom shall be a citizen of the United States, one of whom shall be selected from the higher echelon of the State Department. The Chairman may from time to time designate any other member of the Commission as Acting Chairman to act in the place and stead of the Chairman during his absence. The Chairman (or the Acting Chairman in the absence of the Chairman) shall preside at all meetings of the Commission and a quorum for the transaction of business shall consist of at least four members present. Each member of the Commission, including the Chairman, shall have equal responsibility and authority in all decisions and actions of the Commission, shall have full access to all information relating to the performance of his duties or responsibilities, and shall have one vote. Action of the Commission shall be determined by a majority vote of the members present. The Chairman (or Acting Chairman in the absence of the Chairman) shall be the official spokesman of the Commission in its relations with the Congress, Government agencies, persons, or the public, and, on behalf of the Commission, shall see to the faithful execution of the policies and decision of the Commission, and shall report thereon to the Commission from time to time or as the Commission may direct. The Commission shall have an official seal which shall be judicially noticed.

"MEMBERS; APPOINTMENTS; TERMS; COMPENSATION; EXTRANEOUS BUSINESS

"SEC. 5. (a) Members of the Commission and Chairman shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Not more than four members, including the Chairman, may be members of any one political party. In submitting any nomination to the Senate, the President shall set forth the experience and qualifications of the nominee. The term of each member of the Commission, other than the Chairman, shall be six years, except that (1) the terms of office of the members first taking office shall expire as designated by the President at the time of the appointment, two at the end of two years, two at the end of four years, and two at the end of six years; and (2) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term. The Chairman shall serve during the pleasure of the President. Any member of the Commission may be removed by the President for inefficiency, neglect of duty, or malfeasance in office. Each member, except the Chairman, shall receive compensation at the rate of $20,000 per annum; and the Chairman shall receive compensation at the rate of $20,500 per annum.

"(b) No member of the Commission shall engage in any business, vocation, or employment other than that of serving as a member of the Commission.

"AUTHORIZATION TO ESTABLISH THE FREEDOM ACADEMY; FUNCTIONS OF COMMISSION AND ACADEMY

"SEC. 6. The Commission shall establish under its supervision and control an advanced training and development center to be known as the Freedom Academy. The Academy shall be located at such place or places within the United States as the Commission shall determine. The principal functions of the Commission and Academy shall be—

"(1) to carry on a research program designed to develop an integrated operational science that befits and bespeaks the methods and values of freemen and through which the free world will be able to meet and defeat the carefully patterned total aggression—political, ideological, psychological, economic, paramilitary, and organizational—of the Soviet bloc, and through which we, as a nation, may work toward our national objectives in a systematic manner. To achieve this purpose the full range of methods and means is to be thoroughly explored and studied, including the methods and means that may best be employed by private citizens and nongovernmental organizations and the methods and means available to the Government other than the methods and means already being used. This research program shall include the study of our national objectives and purpose and the development of proposals for intermeshing and integrating the full spectrum of methods and means into a coordinated, short- and long-range strategy for victory, seeking the utilization of our full potential in the public and private sectors,

"(2) to educate and train governmental personnel, private citizens, and foreign students concerning all aspects of the international Communist conspiracy, the nature of the global struggle between freedom and communism, and the science of counteraction to the Communist conspiracy.

"ACADEMY STUDENTS; SELECTION; GRANTS AND EXPENSES; ADMISSION AS NONIMMIGRANT VISITORS; DEPORTATION

"SEC. 7. (a) Academy students, other than Government personnel, shall be selected, insofar as is practicable and in the public interest, from the diverse groups within and without the United States where trained leadership and informed public opinion are most needed. Persons in Government service coming within the provisions of the Government Employees Training Act may be trained at the Academy pursuant to the provisions of said Act. All agencies and departments of Government are authorized to assign officers and employees to the Academy for designated training.

"(b) the Commission is authorized to make grants to students and to pay expenses incident to training and study under this chapter. This authorization shall include

authority to pay travel expenses to and from the Academy or other authorized place of training under the chapter, and authority to give financial assistance to the dependents of students during the time they are undergoing training authorized under this Act.

"(c) Foreign students selected for training under this Act shall be admitted as nonimmigrants under section 1101(a)(15) of title 8, United States Code, for such time and under such conditions as may be prescribed by regulations promulgated by the Commission, the Secretary of State, and the Attorney General. A person admitted under this section who fails to maintain the status under which he was admitted, or who fails to depart from the United States at the expiration of the time for which he was admitted, or who engages in activities of a political nature detrimental to the interest of the United States, or in activities in conflict with the security of the United States, shall, upon the warrant of the Attorney General, be taken into custody and promptly deported pursuant to sections 1251–1253 of title 8, United States Code. Deportation proceedings under this section shall be summary and findings of the Attorney General as to matters of fact shall be conclusive. Such persons shall not be eligible for suspension of deportation under section 1254 of such title 8.

"AUTHORIZATION TO ESTABLISH AN INFORMATION CENTER

"SEC. 8. The Commission is authorized to establish an information center at such place or places within the United States as the Commission may determine. The principal function of the information center shall be to disseminate, with or without charge, information and materials which will assist people and organizations to increase their understanding of the true nature of the international Communist conspiracy and of the dimensions and nature of the global struggle between freedom and communism, and of ways they can participate effectively toward winning that struggle. In carrying out this function, the Commission is authorized to prepare, make, and publish textbooks and other materials, including training films, suitable for high school, college, and community level instruction, and also to publish such research materials as may be in the public interest. The Commission is authorized to disseminate such information and materials to such persons and organizations as may be in the public interest on such terms and conditions as the Commission shall determine.

"RESTRICTIONS ON DISCLOSURE OF INFORMATION

"SEC. 9. Nothing in this chapter shall authorize the disclosure of any information or knowledge in any case in which such disclosure (1) is prohibited by any other law of the United States, or (2) is inconsistent with the security of the United States.

"SECURITY CHECK OF PERSONNEL

"SEC. 10. (a) Except as authorized by the Commission upon a determination by the Commission that such action is clearly consistent with the national interest, no individual shall be employed by the Commission until such individual has been investigated by the Civil Service Commission to determine whether the said individual is a good security risk and a report thereof has been made to the Freedom Commission.

"(b) In addition to the foregoing provisions, the Commission may request that any individual employed by the Commission, or under consideration for employment by the Commission, be investigated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation to determine whether the said individual is a good security risk.

"GENERAL AUTHORITY OF THE COMMISSION

"SEC. 11. In addition to the authority already granted, the Commission is authorized and empowered—

"(1) to establish such temporary or permanent boards and committees as the Commission may from time to time deem necessary for the purposes of this Act;

"(2) to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as may be necessary to carry out the functions of the Commission. Such personnel shall be appointed in accordance with the civil service laws and their compensation fixed in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, except that, to the extent the Commission deems such action necessary to the discharge of its responsibilities, personnel may be employed and their compensation fixed without regard to such laws: *Provided, however,* That no personnel (except such personnel whose compensation is fixed by law, and specially qualified professional personnel up to a limit of $19,000) whose position would be subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, if such Act were applicable to such position, shall be paid a salary at a rate in excess of the rate payable under such Act for positions of equivalent difficulty or responsibility. The Commission shall make adequate provision for administrative review of any determination to dismiss any employee;

"(3) to conduct such research, studies and surveys as necessary to carryout the purposes of this Act;

"(4) to make, promulgate, issue, rescind, and amend such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carryout the purposes of this Act;

"(5) to make expenditures as may be necessary for administering and carrying out the provisions of this Act;

"(6) to utilize, with the approval of the President, the services, facilities, and personnel of other Government agencies. Whenever the Commission shall use the services, facilities, or personnel of any Government agency for activities under the authority of this Act, the Commission shall pay for such performance out of funds available to the Commission under this Act, either in advance, by reimbursement, or by direct transfer;

"(7) to utilize or employ on a full- or part-time basis, with the consent of the organization or governmental body concerned, the services of personnel of any State or local government or private organization to perform such functions on its behalf as may appear desirable to carry out the purposes of this Act, without said personnel severing their connection with the furnishing organization or governmental body; and further to utilize personnel of a foreign government in the same manner and under the same circumstances with the approval of the Secretary of State;

"(8) to acquire by purchase, lease, loan, or gift, and to hold and dispose of by sale, lease, or loan, real and personal property of all kinds necessary for, or resulting from, the exercise of authority granted by this Act;

"(9) to receive and use funds donated by others, if such funds are donated without restrictions other than that they be used in furtherance of one or more of the purposes of this Act;

"(10) to accept and utilize the services of voluntary and uncompensated personnel and to provide transportation and subsistence as authorized by section 73b–2 of title 5, United States Code, for persons serving without compensation;

"(11) to utilize the services of persons on a temporary basis and to pay their actual and necessary travel expenses and subsistence and in addition compensation at a rate not to exceed $50 per day for each day spent in the work of the Commission.

"GENERAL MANAGER; APPOINTMENT; COMPENSATION

"SEC. 12. The Commission is authorized to establish within the Commission a General Manager, who shall discharge such of the administrative and executive functions of the Commission as the Commission may direct. The General Manager shall be appointed by the Commission, shall serve at the pleasure of the Commission, shall be removable by the Commission, and shall receive compensation at a rate determined by the Commission, but not in excess of $18,000 per annum.

"APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 13. There is authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, so much as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act."

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, during the colloquy engaged in by the distinguished Senator from Florida, the distinguished Senator from Kansas, and other Members of the Senate during the morning hour. It was pointed out that Congress has certainly been appropriating large amounts of funds for the purpose of fighting the cold war. Congress has been appropriating billions of dollars for mutual security.

We have finally gotten appropriations for the so-called Smith-Mundt Act and the Voice of America so they average beyond the $100 million mark. But we have failed to recognize sufficiently that it takes more than dollars and more than individuals to win the cold war. It takes individuals who know what the cold war is all about. It takes individuals who have been trained, so they can understand the devious and deep methods of the Communist movement. It takes persons who are able to go out and do battle in the cold war with a background of training similar to that had by our military men who receive training in the War College or at West Point or at Annapolis or at the wonderful new Air Academy in Colorado. It requires persons who have had special training in order to meet the specific problems presented aggressive, atheistic communism, the greatest challenge ever to face Christendom.

I am pleased that even at this late hour in the session, while there is still time for the House to act, the majority leader has been gracious enough to provide this body with an opportunity to vote today on legislation of the significance of the pending measure.

The Communists conquered nearly a billion people during a period when the Communist sphere was markedly inferior in industry, technocracy, science, military capabilities, and production. In fact, the Communist side has been inferior in practically every aspect of the cold war except for the sending of trained emissaries of communism into every country of the world. We have been sending diplomats, technicians, agricultural specialists, and military advisers; but we have sent persons who have had no adequate opportunity—because our Government has not provided such opportunity—to obtain training and background information on the methods of communism. However, such training is required if our representatives

are to be able to do an effective job out on the periphery where the battle between communism and freedom is being fought every day in the cold war.

This point was brought home very dramatically to me just this week. A young man called at my office, and wanted to talk to me, because he had seen my name on the legislation which is known as the Smith-Mundt Act. He said he was about to go to Africa, and that he had just been cleared and trained and prepared to go there as part of our cold-war offensive; but he asked me if I would tell him something about what he might expect the Communists to be doing there. I spent a considerable time talking to him, although I certainly am not an expert in the field of African politics. But I was certainly shocked when I realized that he was about to go to Africa, to fight in the battle for the minds of men, and he was about to utilize some of our millions and our billions of dollars to help preserve peace, to fight against communism and to promote freedom, and yet he was saying to a Member of the United States Senate, "Can you give me a little background information in regard to what I should expect and what I need to know about Communist tactics and targets in Africa?"

I did my best, even though I am not an authority on that subject. But he should have had an opportunity to take advantage of the facilities which will be afforded by the Freedom Commission, and he should have been able to study there for 4 or 5 or 6 weeks, in order to learn what this is all about. Fighting communism abroad in the cold war is not a job for amateurs.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wonder whether the Senator from South Dakota is prepared to yield back the remainder of the time available to him, on condition that the other side do likewise.

Mr. MUNDT. Yes. I was speaking under a time allotment on the bill. Mr. President, if the Senate is prepared to vote I shall be pleased to yield back the remaining time available to me.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Then, Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time available to the other side.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD certain remarks of mine.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KEATING

S. 1689—FREEDOM ACADEMY

I support enthusiastically the proposal to create a Freedom Commission and a Freedom Academy, which would be given the task of mobilizing America in the great battle against international communism. An imposing amount of evidence has been collected to demonstrate the need for this bold move in the cold war.

I am impressed by the wide diversity of the groups and individuals who support this bill. It has bipartisan senatorial sponsorship and is supported by the AFL–CIO and by a number of eminent professors and researchers in Soviet affairs. It is supported too by millions of Americans who recognize the importance of emphatically combating the Soviet menace.

It was my privilege, as a member of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, to participate in the hearings on this bill. Witness after witness, many representing the groups to which I just referred, testified to the soundness of this proposal and to their belief that the creation of the Commission and Academy would be a vital factor in preparing the American people to better combat the Communist menace.

Experts in foreign affairs and students of Soviet tactics have warned repeatedly about the need for increasing our knowledge about communism, its aims and objectives. In a very real and concrete sense, we must know the enemy and what he is up to. Enactment of S. 1689 would contribute significantly to the great effort which must be mounted in this field.

The organization and structure of the proposed Freedom Commission was given much careful study. The Commission is to be a seven-member independent agency with two fundamental objectives. The first, that of carrying out research to develop and synthesize a systematic approach to the cold war operations of the Soviet-Sino bloc. The second objective of the Commission would be to train Government personnel to deal effectively with the Soviet challenge.

The work of the Commission's Freedom Academy will supplement and build upon the activities of the Foreign Service Institute, other similar governmental and military programs, and the academic offerings of our Nation's colleges and universities in subjects related to government, foreign affairs, and international economics. The curriculum would be oriented to the needs of both American students and to students from other free world countries studying the United States.

I cannot let this occasion go by without paying tribute to the many dedicated Members of this body who have strongly supported and worked for this measure. Among those most deserving of commendation are the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois, Mr. DOUGLAS, the senior Senator from South Dakota, Mr. MUNDT, the senior Senator from New Jersey, Mr. CASE who cosponsored the original bill and, of course, the junior Senator from Connecticut, Mr. DODD, who yesterday addressed the Senate on this subject.

The hard work and careful planning which have gone into this measure have indeed been warranted. Mr. President, S. 1689 should be passed by the Senate and cleared for signature before we adjourn. It is a long and important step in America's cold war offensive efforts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All remaining time has been yielded back.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 1689) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES COMPENSATION ACT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1995, House bill 12383, to amend the Federal Employees Compensation Act to make benefits more realistic in terms of present wage rates, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the primary purpose of H.R. 12383 is to correct inequities that exist with respect to benefits paid to employees of the Federal Government, other than military personnel, who are injured in the performance of their duties and the dependents of those who died as a result of such injuries. The Federal Employees' Compensation Act has not been amended since 1949, and, as a result, the compensation paid to employees who were injured prior to 1946 is much less than the compensation for disability or death computed on the basis of present day Federal pay scales. At the same time the rise in the cost of living has created a further inequity.

Mr. President, I think this is a good bill and will be good legislation. The House has carefully considered it, and has passed it.

The cost of the bill is estimated to be $4 million a year. The bill has the approval of the Department of Labor, and has been unanimously reported by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have discussed this bill with the distinguished Secretary of Labor on several occasions within the last few days. He is deeply anxious that this inequity be cured; and he does advocate and urge that the bill be acted on at this session of Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 12383) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PRINTING OF LEGISLATIVE HISTORY OF COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 2001, Senate Resolution 360, authorizing the printing of the "Legislative History of the Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, 86th Congress," as a Senate document.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the "Legislative History of the Committee on Foreign Relations, United

States Senate, Eighty-sixth Congress" be printed as a Senate document, and that two thousand additional copies be printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the resolution was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

PRINTING OF "STRENGTHENING FREE WORLD SECURITY" AS A SENATE DOCUMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2002, Senate Resolution 362, to print "Strengthening Free World Security" as a Senate document.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 362) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the committee print entitled "Strengthening Free World Security", prepared by the Foreign Affairs Division of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, be printed as a Senate document, and that nine thousand five hundred additional copies by printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS ON "U.S. FOREIGN POLICY"

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2003, Senate Resolution 363, to print additional copies of certain hearings on "U.S. Foreign Policy."

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 363) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations five thousand additional copies of part 1 of the hearings entitled "United States Foreign Policy", held by that committee during the Eighty-sixth Congress, second session.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL HEARINGS RELATING TO COMPULSORY JURISDICTION OF THE INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2004, Senate Concurrent Resolution 115, to print additional hearings on Senate Resolution 94, relating to the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 115) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That two thousand additional copies of the hearings on S. Res. 94, "A resolution to amend S. Res. 196, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session, relating to the recognition of the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in certain legal disputes," be printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF REPORT ENTITLED "THE INSURANCE INDUSTRY—AVIATION, OCEAN MARINE, AND STATE REGULATION"

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2005, Senate Resolution 379.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 379) to authorize the printing of 2,000 additional copies of S. Rept. No. 1834, 86th Congress, entitled "The Insurance Industry—Aviation, Ocean Marine, and State Regulation."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the resolution was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary two thousand additional copies of Senate Report Numbered 1834, Eighty-sixth Congress, second session, entitled "The Insurance Industry—Aviation, Ocean Marine, and State Regulation", a report issued by the Committee on the Judiciary and made by its Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly pursuant to S. Res. 238, Eighty-sixth Congress.

ERECTION OF STATUE OF TARAS SHEVCHENKO

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2006, House Joint Resolution 311.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 311) authorizing the erection of a statue of Taras Shevchenko on public grounds in the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the resolution was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have printed in the RECORD a statement on House Joint Resolution 311, which is similar to a bill which I introduced in the Senate to authorize an erection of a statue to Taras Shevchenko.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the statement will be printed.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JAVITS

More than 100 years ago Taras Shevchenko hailed the first President of the United States, George Washington, and the new Republic, hoping for the day when the Ukraine will join the family of free nations.

Taras Shevchenko (1814–61) was without doubt one of the foremost Ukrainians of the modern period. His poetry has inspired the men and women of his period and later times with a renewed love of freedom and a consciousness of their identity and traditions as Ukrainians. It has been the medium through which the Ukrainians, in his day a downtrodden mass of serfs on the lands of their Russian and Polish masters, have become a self-conscious group of patriotic citizens, willing to risk their lives and fortunes in pursuit of their national independence. More than that, Shevchenko's poetry has taught them the need for human brotherhood and provided them with ideals of Ukrainian participation in the great company of free nations.

The centenary of Shevchenko's death will serve to remind his countrymen now behind the Iron Curtain of their heritage and ideals of liberty and independence. The statue to be erected in his honor in 1961 will serve notice to his countrymen that they are not forgotten by the free world.

MEMORIAL TO GEN. JOHN J. PERSHING

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2007, Senate bill 3901.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3901) to authorize the erection of a memorial in the District of Columbia to Gen. John J. Pershing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the resolution was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the American Battle Monuments Commission is authorized to provide for the erection of a memorial to the late John J. Pershing, general of the armies of the United States, such memorial to be erected (1) in accordance with the plans and design submitted by the American Battle Monuments Commission to the Congress pursuant to Public Law 461, Eighty-fourth Congress (70 Stat. 84), and (2) on that parcel of federally owned land in the northwest section of the District of Columbia bounded on the north by Pennsylvania Avenue; on the south by E Street; on the west by Fifteenth Street; and on the east by Fourteenth Street.

(b) The authority granted by subsection (a) of this section shall cease to exist unless within five years after the date of enactment of this Act (1) the erection of the memorial is begun, and (2) the Commission determines that sufficient funds are available for completing the memorial.

SEC. 2. The maintenance and care of the memorial herein authorized to be erected shall, upon completion, be the responsibility of the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 8. The Commission may accept from any source, public or private, money or other property for use in carrying out its functions under this Act; and is authorized to cooperate with interested public and private organizations in carrying out such functions.

MARY E. PASCO

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2008, Senate Resolution 381.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 381) to pay a gratuity to Mary E. Pasco.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, may I inquire the nature of the resolution?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. This is a routine resolution we always adopt. It involves the payment of 6 months' compensation to the widow of an employee of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Mary E. Pasco, widow of John Pasco, an employee of the Architect of the Capitol assigned to duty in the Senate Office Buildings at the time of his death, a sum equal to 6 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

ELECTION OF MEMBER TO THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING AND THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE LIBRARY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2009, Senate Resolution 380.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 380) electing a member on the part of the Senate to the Joint Committee on Printing and the Joint Committee on the Library.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the resolution was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That Mr. MARTIN be, and he is hereby, elected a member on the part of the Senate of the Joint Committee on Printing and the Joint Committee on the Library.

MOTION TO TABLE RECONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the votes by which the Senate acted on the measures beginning with Calendar No. 2001, Senate Resolution 360, through Calendar No. 2009, Senate Resolution 380, be reconsidered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Texas to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

JACK KENT COOKE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2012, House bill 8156.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 8156) for the relief of Jack Kent Cooke.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

EDUCATION AND TRAINING FOR CHILDREN OF VETERANS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1708, House bill 4306.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 4306) to provide education and training for the children of veterans dying of a service-connected disability incurred after January 31, 1955, and before the end of compulsory military service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with an amendment.

MALICIOUS DAMAGE TO CERTAIN COMMUNICATION FACILITIES

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I direct attention to order No. 1451 on page 9 of the calendar, S. 3560, a bill contemplated to protect the internal security of the United States by providing penalties for malicious damage to certain communication facilities.

It is my understanding the Department of Defense has requested the passage of this bill as having relationship to the security of our country. The bill was reported by the committee on May 17. The committee is headed by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND].

Is there any prospect of that bill being called up for consideration?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. There is always a prospect. There are several Senators who desire to be notified before it is called up. There is a prospect, but I have no intention to call it up at the moment. I think the pending business will require some discussion, and I want to notify Senators who desire to be notified about it. I am going to suggest the absence of a quorum. Then I will give consideration to the Senator's request. There is a notation on my copy of the calendar that certain Senators be notified.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. LUSK in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

THREATENED PENNSYLVANIA RAILROAD STRIKE

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I feel obliged to make some brief remarks about a threatened strike on the Pennsylvania Railroad, a major carrier with extensive commuter and freight service from New York to Florida and as far west as Chicago and St. Louis. I do not wish to make recommendations, Mr. President, nor to take sides; indeed, I would never interfere with orderly processes or negotiations between labor and management.

Because of the effect of this threatened strike upon my State, particularly upon the Eastern Shore which would be nearly isolated without railroad transportation, I feel compelled to address both the management and the labor unions of the Pennsylvania Railroad: "Gentlemen, I urge you to remember that you are not operating in a vacuum, and therefore must bargain in good faith and do everything within your power to bring about a sensible and swift end to your differences."

It is not exaggeration, Mr. President, to state that major industries and hundreds of thousands of citizens throughout the eastern half of the United States join with me in making this plea.

Differences can be settled, Mr. President, if parties in dispute sincerely attempt to resolve them.

THE FREEDOM COMMISSION

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, unfortunately when the Senate temporarily laid aside consideration of S. 1689 and took up the housing proposal, I was called to the reception room by a very prominent lawyer from my State. Before I returned to the Chamber, action on the housing proposal had been completed and S. 1689 had been passed.

I wish merely for the RECORD to state that I think this bill should have been sent to the Committee on Foreign Relations. I think it is clearly within the

jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Relations. I doubt that the bill will be passed by the House.

I wish to serve notice that, if a similar bill is introduced in the next Congress, I expect to raise the question of jurisdiction and to insist that a bill of a similar nature be sent to the Committee on Foreign Relations for its consideration. I do not think a bill of this character should be passed without the Department of State being consulted and, as a matter of fact, appearing before the committee. Careful consideration should be given to it, because passage of such a bill would definitely affect our foreign relations in many important respects.

TEMPORARY SUSPENSION OF IMPORT DUTY ON HEPTANOIC ACID—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12659) to suspend for a temporary period the import duty on heptanoic acid. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today, p. 18755, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, the bill passed the Senate as it came from the House with the exception of an amendment which was added at the end to provide for a different import description of waterproof cloth.

For a number of years the Customs Bureau identified waterproof cloth as that which could pass a simple test which they originally set up. A loophole was discovered by foreign producers by treating cloth so that, temporarily, it could meet that simple test, and they could thereby obtain a much lower rate of duty. The Department of the Treasury thereupon adopted a more rigid test to help close this loophole, but the Court ruled that after many years of use this test could not be changed administratively; it could only be done by legislation. The Senate, therefore, amended H.R. 12659, and in conference the Senate conferees prevailed. The bill exactly as it passed the Senate was agreed upon, and I move the adoption of the conference report.

OPPOSITION TO HOUSE BILL TO PERMIT SERVING OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ON NEW YEAR'S DAY, WHEN IT FALLS ON SUNDAY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to discuss another matter while the conference report is being considered.

I understand a bill has come to the Senate from the House, and that there is a desire on the part of some of my colleagues to have the bill placed directly on the Senate calendar, without its reference to a Senate committee.

I wish the leadership to know that I shall oppose the bill as hard as I can oppose it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. To what bill does the Senator refer?

Mr. MORSE. A bill which should go to the Committee on the District of Columbia. It is a bill which proposes that because New Year's Day 1961 falls on Sunday, we should permit the sale of liquor on New Year's Day in the District of Columbia.

Mr. President, some cities in this country have suffered the handicap of smog. Others have suffered various other types of handicaps, such as dust storms or crime waves, cyclones, and various types of bad weather. I wish to say that Washington, D.C., is becoming notorious for alcoholic breath. There is no city in the Nation in which there is a higher consumption of hard liquor per capita than the city of Washington, D.C.

I think it is a shameful thing. I think it particularly shameful, Mr. President, for it to be proposed, simply because New Year's Day falls on Sunday, that we should forget the sanctity of the day and should permit, on this New Year's Sunday, the city of Washington, D.C., to become a big drunken rendezvous.

As a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia, as I said to one of the proprietors of one of the "joints" this morning, I do not intend to put a dollar sign on the Sabbath. So far as I am concerned, to the extent I can stop the bill I serve notice I shall try to stop it. I hope that I shall have some colleagues in the Senate who will help me stop the bill.

I say to the ministers of Washington, D.C., "Where are you?" Too many of them are out raising money for new churches, rather than going to work on the problem which I think falls within their responsibility of doing something to defend the standards of morality in the District of Columbia.

In fact, Mr. President, I am shocked by the growth of the tendency to consume liquor in this country, so that one can even get a cocktail served these days in a chancery of some of the churches.

Mr. President, it is about time we come to grips with this moral problem. I should like to have the leadership know that when the bill is called up before the Senate, if it is called up, I wish to have notice, so that I can be present, because I intend to do what I can to stop the passage of the bill. I think its passage would be a shocking thing. I am against any proposal that in this year, of all years, we should open wide the bars of the District of Columbia on New Year's Day.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I know of no suggestion which has been made to the leadership on either side that we short-circuit the committee. I hope the parliamentarian and those at the desk will take judicial notice of the statement made by the Senator from Oregon and, if or when any such suggestion is made, that the committee be short circuited, that the Senator from Oregon be notified.

Mr. MORSE. I expected that cooperation from my leader, but, as a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia I thought I had a duty to serve notice as to my position.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I support the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] in his opposition to the bill. Yesterday I called this same question to the attention of the Senator from Montana, who was acting as majority leader. He has already given us assurance that we will be notified prior to either placing this bill directly on the calendar or to any consideration of the bill following that time. I join my many colleagues in opposing the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. No Senator anticipates that will be done.

TEMPORARY SUSPENSION OF IMPORT DUTY ON HEPTANOIC ACID—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12659) to suspend for a temporary period the import duty on heptanoic acid.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report on H.R. 12659.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the report was adopted.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

EXCLUSION OF LOCAL ADVERTISING CHARGES FROM MANUFACTURERS SALE PRICE—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12536) relating to the treatment of charges for local advertising for purposes of determining the manufacturers sale price. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today, pp. 18753–18754, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, there were three Senate amendments.

The House conferees accepted amendment No. 1 without change.

In regard to amendment No. 2, which recognized as qualified certain pension plans which did not qualify until some years after adoption, the House accepted this amendment with an amendment to the effect that each trust specified in the Senate amendment is to be deemed a qualified trust for the period specified in the Senate amendment if it is shown to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate that the trust has not in this period been operated in a manner which would jeopardize its beneficiaries.

The House accepted the third amendment which was offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], but the conferees agreed that the legislation should be prospective only and that no attempt should be made by the Treasury Department to give retroactive action to the amendment. Thus, the Treasury would not be in a position to continue litigation under existing law with respect to taxable years ending before December 31, 1960.

Amendment No. 1 provides that producers of minerals used in making cement may for open years prior to 1961 elect to use as the base for computing depletion the gross income which may be derived from the minerals just prior to the introduction of the kiln feed into the kiln. In effect, this provides a legislative settlement procedure for cement producers which will permit them to settle their back years on the same basis as Congress provided in the Public Debt and Tax Rate Extension Act of 1960 for future years.

Amendment No. 2: This amendment provides that certain pension trusts established under collective bargaining agreements are to be considered qualified trusts from the date they were established to the date they actually qualified. The House conferees accepted this amendment with an amendment which provides that the exemption is to be available only if the trusts satisfy the Secretary of the Treasury that they have never been operated in a manner which would jeopardize the interest of the beneficiaries.

Amendment No. 3: This amendment is designed to prevent a doubling up of deductions for State taxes in the case of accrual basis taxpayers where the doubling up is a result of the action of a taxing jurisdiction taken after December 31, 1960. The House receded from this amendment but the conferees agreed that it should be made clear that the Treasury Department should not contest cases involving deductions taken as a result of action of the taxing jurisdiction taken before December 31, 1960. In other words, the amendment is designed to be prospective only.

With the exception described under amendment No. 2, the House conferees accepted the Senate amendments on this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the action whereby the conference report was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

EXCISE TAX ON CIGARS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10960) to amend section 5701 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the excise tax upon cigars. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today, pp. 18749–18751, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I wish to call up the conference report on H.R. 10960. There were 10 Senate amendments to this bill. The House accepted amendments Nos. 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9.

The House conferees refused to accept amendment No. 2, relating to a lease to a medical clinic by a scientific organization engaged in medical research. This amendment, which was offered by Senator ANDERSON, was designed to give relief to the Lovelace Foundation. The Treasury was very much opposed to the adoption of this amendment and pointed out that this particular case was still in process of administrative determination and that action on this amendment should await such determination. While the House conferees refused to accept the amendment and the Senate was forced to recede, it was agreed that a statement should be made on the floor indicating that the Treasury should expedite the administrative determination of this case and that the national office should endeavor to have the matter finally determined.

Amendment No. 10, which provided that the pension fund of the Plumber's Local Union No. 775 should be considered to have been a qualified trust for the period May 1, 1957, to May 11, 1959, was agreed to by the House conferees with an amendment which, in effect, provided that this qualification should be deemed to be met only if it is shown to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate that the trust has not in this period been operated in a manner which would jeopardize its beneficiaries.

I ask unanimous consent that a statement on the amendments be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT SUBMITTED BY SENATOR KERR

Amendment No. 1 provides that the 85 percent intercorporate dividends received deduction is to be available with respect to dividends of a foreign corporation which were accumulated by a predecessor domestic corporation subject to U.S. income tax.

Amendment No. 2 would have amended the business lease provision of the code to provide a new exception in the case of a lease by a medical research organization to a medical clinic. The Senate receded on this amendment.

Amendment No. 3: This amendment deals with two basic subjects. The first limits the extent to which income tax liability incurred in the Virgin Islands can be reduced by subsidies, grants or similar payments. The second subject makes it plain that the Federal estate and gift tax is to apply to residents of the U.S. possessions who are also citizens of the United States.

Amendment No. 4: This amendment is intended to eliminate the filing of 1.7 million nontaxable declarations of estimated tax by (1) increasing the "other income" limit from $100 to $200, (2) providing that no declaration need be filed where the estimated tax is less than $400, and (3) eliminating the gross income test of $400 plus $600 times the number of exemptions.

Amendment No. 5: This amendment provides that expenditures by farmers for fertilizer, lime, limestone or marl can be expensed rather than be treated as a capital item required to be written off over a period of a year.

Amendment No. 6 provides a charitable contribution deduction (not over $50 a month) for school students maintained in the taxpayer's home under sponsorship of a charitable, veterans, or fraternal organization.

Amendment No. 7: This amendment treats capital contributions to the Federal National Mortgage Association as ordinary and necessary business expenses to the extent they exceed the value of the stock on the issue date.

Amendment No. 8: This amendment revises the excise tax on mechanical lighters to provide that the tax shall be 10 cents per lighter or 10 percent of the manufacturers sales price, whichever is lesser.

Amendment No. 9: This amendment treats real estate investment trusts for tax purposes in substantially the same way regulated investment companies are treated under present law.

Amendment No. 10: This amendment permits a multiemployer union negotiated pension plan established under a collective-bargaining agreement to be considered a qualified trust from the date it was established. The House receded on this amendment with an amendment requiring the trust to satisfy the Secretary of the Treasury that it has never been operated in a manner which would jeopardize the interest of its beneficiaries.

With the exception of amendments Nos. 2 and 10 described above, the House conferees receded and accepted all the Senate amendments.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I think I should say that under all the circumstances I believe the Senate conferees did everything that was reasonable and all that could have been expected of them. I thank the able chairman of the committee, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Oklahoma

[Mr. KERR], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] and the other colleagues.

Under the conference agreement on H.R. 10960, the Senate amendment to section 514(b)(3)(A) of the 1954 code was stricken. This amendment provided that a lease to a medical clinic by a medical research foundation of premises adjacent to those occupied by the foundation should be considered as related—and thus not subject to the tax on unrelated business income—if treatment of clinic patients, medical histories of clinic patients, and donated services of clinic doctors are used by the foundation for medical research purposes.

The Senate amendment was occasioned by the facts of a specific case, the Lovelace Foundation for Medical Education and Research, in Albuquerque, N. Mex. As the conference deliberations were described to me on the basis of the facts of this case as described to the conferees, the conferees in my opinion believed that the leases in question were entered into for purposes substantially related to the exercise or performance of the exempt functions of the lessor within the meaning of the exception to the definition of business leases in the existing law, and that, consequently, the Senate amendment was unnecessary.

The example contained in the report of the Senate Committee on Finance on the Revenue Act of 1950 of leases by tax-exempt hospitals to doctors' associations to use as clinics is illustrative of a general class of cases in which Congress meant leases to be excepted from the definition of taxable business leases because of the relationship of the activities and the personnel of a clinic lessee to the exempt functions of the lessor. A bona fide lease of part of the premises in its buildings to a clinic by an exempt medical research organization which engages extensively in research activities which rely on clinical material is one of the type of cases Congress intended to illustrate by the example in the 1950 report.

The House conferees were reported to me to be unwilling to legislate further on this matter until the Internal Revenue Service has had an opportunity to review on its merits the facts of the specific case which prompted the Senate amendment. The national office of the Revenue Service hitherto has not taken into account the legislative history in this Congress and in the last Congress bearing on congressional intent in this type of case as to the interpretation of the "related" exception to the definition of business leases. While the conferees understood that the case is now in the jurisdiction of the District Director's Office, it can be returned to the national office for technical advice, thus affording the national office an opportunity to review the case fully in the light of the legislative history. It is my understanding that the so-called certiorari procedure within the Internal Revenue Service for handling requests by taxpayers for referral of issues to Washington for technical advice will permit the national office to call such a case back to Washington and assume jurisdiction over it, even though the field office has rejected the taxpayer's request that it be referred here for technical advice.

I close by saying that I appreciate the services of my colleagues on the Finance Committee in trying to perfect this legislation. We have not been able to get much of a determination by the Treasury Department, and the active work of the Senate and House conferees has put this report in shape for handling. I thank the Senator from Oklahoma for his interest in it.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I appreciate the attitude of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, and wish to say to him that the conferees were all very favorable to the purpose that he had in mind, but when confronted by the position the Treasury took, and the position the House conferees took, we felt that the committee should retreat on the basis that the Treasury Department would expedite the administrative determination of these questions, and that the national office should endeavor to have the matter finally determined, and then if adversely determined, I would say to the Senator that in my judgment the committee would be disposed to look favorably upon the proposed legislation, which would be clearly limited to the matter which the Senator had in mind.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Do I not understand that the Treasury Department assured the conferees it would move to expedite this case?

Mr. KERR. I would say that we received the impression that they would do what they could to cooperate to bring that about.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the action whereby the conference report was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1997, a joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 721) for the relief of certain aliens.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, on page 1, at the beginning of line 3, to strike out "That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Consolacion M. Rapa (Consolacion M. Johnson) shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this section of this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available."; on page 2, at the beginning of line 3, to strike out "SEC. 2. For" and insert "That, for"; at the beginning of line 8, to change the section number from "3" to "2"; at the beginning of line 13, to change the section number from "4" to "3"; after line 17, to strike out:

SEC. 5. For the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Terata Kiyoshi Johnston shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this section of this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

On page 3, at the beginning of line 3, to change the section number from "6" to "4"; at the beginning of line 5, to strike out "Lorne" and insert "Loene"; at the beginning of line 8, to change the section number from "7" to "5"; after line 17, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 6. For the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Kim Hyoung Geun shall be held and considered to be the minor natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Burlin B. Hamer, citizens of the United States.

After line 22, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 7. For the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Maria Luisa Martinez, Angel Ardaiz Martinez, Franciszek Roszkowski, Stamatis Zeris, Andros Szasz, Matias T. Falcasantos, Eduardo Giron Rodrigues, Cesar S. Wycoco and Kyung Ok Ahn shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to each alien as provided for in this section of this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.

On page 4, after line 10, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 8. For the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Man-Yeh Chow shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act. The number of refugees to whom permanent residence in the United States may be granted under the provisions of section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended, is hereby reduced by one.

After line 18, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 9. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 212(a)(9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Janis Papulis may be issued

a visa and be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that Act: *Provided*, That the exemption provided for in this Act shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act.

On page 5, at the beginning of line 3, to change the section number from "8" to "10", and at the beginning of line 4, to insert "sections 1 through 6 of".

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered and agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The joint resolution is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendments to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and third reading of the joint resolution.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the joint resolution to be read a third time.

The joint resolution was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to table was agreed to.

EDUCATION AND TRAINING FOR CHILDREN OF VETERANS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is Calendar 1708, H.R. 4306.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4306) to provide education and training for the children of veterans dying of a service-connected disability incurred after January 31, 1955, and before the end of compulsory military service, which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That paragraph (1) of section 1701(a) of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out in the first sentence of such paragraph "or the Korean conflict" and inserting in lieu thereof "the Korean conflict, or the induction period";

(2) by inserting in the second sentence of such paragraph immediately after "disability" the following: "arising out of service during the Spanish-American War, World War I, World War II, or the Korean conflict"; and

(3) by adding at the end of such paragraph the following new sentence: "The standards and criteria for determining whether or not a disability arising out of service during the induction period is service-connected shall be those applicable under chapter 11 of this title, except that the disability must (A) be shown to have directly resulted from, and the causative factor therefor must be shown to have arisen out of, the performance of active military, naval, or air service (but not including service described under section 106 of this title), or (B) have resulted (i) directly from armed conflict or (ii) from an injury or disease received while engaged in extrahazardous service (including such service under conditions simulating war)."

SEC. 2. Subsection (a) of section 1701 of such title is amended by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph as follows:

"(9) The term 'induction period' means (A) the period beginning September 16, 1940, and ending December 6, 1941, and the period beginning July 26, 1947, and ending June 26, 1950, and (B) the period beginning on February 1, 1955, and ending on the day before the first day thereafter on which individuals (other than individuals liable for induction by reason of a prior deferment) are no longer liable for induction for training and service into the Armed Forces under the Universal Military Training and Service Act."

SEC. 3. Subsection (d) of section 1701 of such title is amended by striking out "or the Korean conflict" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "the Korean conflict, or the induction period".

SEC. 4. Subsection (c) of section 1723 of such title is amended—

(1) by deleting "television" and inserting in lieu thereof "open circuit television (except as herein provided)"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following sentence: "The Administrator may approve the enrollment of an eligible person in a course, to be pursued in residence, leading to a standard college degree which includes, as an integral part thereof, subjects offered through the medium of open circuit televised instruction, if the major portion of the course requires conventional classroom or laboratory attendance."

SEC. 5. In the case of any individual who is an "eligible person" within the meaning of section 1701(a)(1) of title 38, United States Code, solely by virtue of the amendments made by this Act, and who is above the age of seventeen years and below the age of twenty-three years on the date of enactment of this Act, the period referred to in section 1712 of title 38, United States Code, shall not end with respect to such individual until the expiration of the five-year period which begins on the date of enactment of this Act.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wonder whether we could get a unanimous-consent agreement to limit debate on amendments to 30 minutes, to be equally divided, and to 1 hour on the bill, in the usual form. I make that request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. As I understand, we have 30 minutes of debate on amendments, to be equally divided and controlled by the majority leader and the minority leader, and an hour of debate on the bill. I do not anticipate that we will take all the time allowed. However, I want to provide sufficient time for debate, because I do not want to get involved in lengthy discussion on any matters today.

I yield 3 minutes to my colleague from Texas.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I send to the desk and ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement in explanation of H.R. 4306.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR YARBOROUGH

The bill, H.R. 4306, is a simple bill and should not take very much of the Senate's time.

Briefly, the bill provides educational opportunity for the children of today's servicemen who die as the result of "performance of duty" in the Military Establishment of their country. The children covered by this bill would receive the kind of educational assistance that is now provided to the children of World War I, World War II, or the Korean conflict, who died of a service-connected disability. This assistance was first enacted by the Congress as the War Orphans Educational Assistance Act of 1956.

In general, war orphans educational assistance is limited to children between 18 and 23 years of age. The amount of the assistance is $110 monthly for a full-time course but not to exceed 36 months.

In addition to providing war orphans assistance coverage for orphans of cold war servicemen—that is, for the children of veterans dying of a service-connected disability incurred after January 31, 1955, and before the end of compulsory military service—the bill includes certain prewar compulsory draft periods within the eligibility provisions. Thus, educational assistance is afforded the children of veterans who died in service during the pre-World War II draft and the period between the end of World War II and the beginning of the Korean conflict. The specific dates for these between war periods are: September 16, 1940 through December 6, 1941; and July 26, 1947 through June 26, 1950.

The committee's recommended bill has been developed from a most careful study of the educational needs of the orphans of today's servicemen. Hearings on this subject were held during the first session of Congress by the Subcommittee on Veterans Affairs, with respect to a Senate bill (S. 1050) that provided a broader basis of eligibility than does the bill now under consideration.

Another hearing was held this session during the subcommittee's study of the House bill, H.R. 4306. The House bill raised two major considerations. First, as it came to us the House bill provided eligibility only for those situations involving death resulting from "extrahazardous service." Second, the House bill did not cover the between-war periods, which, in principle cannot be differentiated from the present cold war period as regards the Government's duty to provide war orphans educational assistance.

After considering the various approaches to this problem, it became apparent that—although it would not be wise to extend war orphans assistance to children of servicemen dying in situations clearly unrelated to military service, such as deaths while on extended furlough or in weekend highway accidents—the assistance should be extended to all situations in which the death of a serviceman is clearly connected with the performance of his military duty. By this standard it was found that the "extrahazardous service" concept excluded many deserving veterans. For example, servicemen traveling in military vehicles under ordinary training conditions would not be regarded as engaged in extrahazardous service in the event of death from collision or upset of the vehicle. Similarly, the marines who died in the Paris Island drowning incident would be regarded as engaged in "routine peacetime duty" rather than in extrahazardous duty.

To cover these and other equally deserving situations, the committee amended the bill to add a performance-of-duty concepts to the extrahazardous service concept provided by the House bill. We believe the committee's amendment is sound and wise in every respect, and is essential if we are to do justice to the child of a serviceman who has died as a direct result of performing military service for all. Without the committee

amendment, the bill would fail to cover many types of situations in which the death of a serviceman, in all probability, would not have occurred had he not been performing active service in the Armed Forces.

I might add here, Mr. President, that the performance-of-duty concept is essentially the same, in principle, as the workman's compensation test under State laws.

It has been said that the Congress has fully discharged its obligations to the orphans of our cold war veterans by the enactment of the Servicemen's and Veterans' Survivors' Benefits Act of 1957. Cited as discharge of our obligations are these rates of death compensation payable to the child of a cold war serviceman:

(1) Where there is no widow, the monthly payment for an only child under age 18 is $70 a month. If the child continues in school until age 21, the $70 a month would continue until that time.

(2) If the mother of the child is alive and receiving compensation, the additional compensation for the child attending school is $35 a month.

Frankly, in view of the increasing cost of education and cost of living, these death compensation rates must be regarded as totally inadequate when measured against our obligation regarding the educational needs of these cold war orphans. During the last decade, the increase in college tuition alone has amounted to 71 percent. And, of course, the item of tuition is only the basic charge for a college education. Related expenses, such as dormitory, food, books, and fees, quite frequently equal and sometimes exceed the basic tuition cost.

But even if we just look to the tuition cost itself, we are still talking about big money in relation to what the child of a deceased serviceman can afford to pay. In school year 1949, the average tuition of all colleges in the Nation stood at $249. By 1958, average tuition for all colleges had moved up to $427 an academic year, and, of course, we know that it is going on up and up next year and the year after.

Of the school year just concluded, tuition costs averaged about 9 percent higher than for the previous year. Further increases for this coming fall are already in evidence.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table referred to in the statement be printed in the RECORD at this point. It is taken from pages 330 and 332 of the Senate hearings conducted on war orphans' educational assistance during the first session of this Congress.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS, LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE

Comparison of the average annual tuition and required fees of 196 representative colleges and universities, 1949–50, 1954–55, 1957–58, and 1958–59

EXHIBIT A MAY 4, 1959

Type of institution	Number of institutions	Average tuition and required fees per academic year				Amount of increase of average tuition between—			Percentage increase		
		1949–50	1954–55	1957–58	1958–59	1950–55	1955–58	1950–59	1950–55	1955–58	1950–59
All institutions	196	$249.00	$305.00	$388	$427	$56.00	$83.00	$178.00	22	27	71
Publicly controlled	120	109.00	132.00	168	179	23.00	36.00	70.00	21	27	64
Privately controlled	76	468.00	599.00	736	820	131.00	137.00	352.00	28	23	75
Publicly controlled:											
Universities	69	123.00	158.00	212	224	35.00	54.00	101.00	28	34	82
Liberal arts colleges	19	56.00	71.00	105	117	15.00	34.00	61.00	27	48	109
Teachers' colleges	17	92.00	108.00	143	153	16.00	35.00	61.00	17	32	66
Technological schools	4	151.00	165.00	171	173	14.00	6.00	22.00	9	4	15
Junior colleges	10	15.77	18.27	25	27	2.50	6.73	11.23	16	37	71
Other professional schools	1	103.00	137.00	195	230	34.00	58.00	127.00	33	42	123
Privately controlled:											
Universities	57	465.00	600.00	732	818	135.00	132.00	353.00	29	22	76
Liberal arts colleges	14	426.00	525.00	675	744	99.00	150.00	318.00	23	29	75
Technological schools	5	598.00	736.00	962	1,042	138.00	226.00	444.00	23	31	74

Sources: U.S. Congress—Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Hearings before Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs. "Servicemen's Readjustment Assistance," 85th Cong., 1st sess., 1957. Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office, p. 55.

U.S. Congress—House Committee on Labor and Education. Hearings before a subcommittee, "Scholarship and Loan Program," 85th Cong., 2d sess., 1958. Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office, p. 814.

Unpublished data from U.S. Office of Education (1958–59 data).

[From the Wall Street Journal, May 7, 1959]

COLLEGE TUITION COSTS WILL RISE NEXT FALL FROM COAST TO COAST

Amherst, University of Cincinnati, South Dakota University, California Tech are just a few of the hundreds planning increases. Little Knox College (Old Siwash) will hike tuitions from $874 to $1,100; De Paul, from $576 to $624. Nationally, the average will be 9 percent over this year. Bowdoin and Tulsa already map raises for 1960–61. Tuitions now averaging double those in 1940, will double again by 1970, the Government predicts.

Installment lending for college grows. By the mid-sixties, college time-payment plans will be as common as auto loans today, say educators. Already banks and other lenders move into the field. The Federal Government will provide more loan funds next September.

But coeds shy away from loans, fearing debts will hinder their marriage chances.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I offer a perfecting amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have reported. It would change a date that was printed in the bill through error.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4, line 10, it is proposed to strike out the date "July 26, 1947" and insert in lieu thereof the date "January 1, 1947".

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is to make the date conform with the terminal date of other veterans' laws. By inadvertence the ending date of World War II, as defined in the Vocational Rehabilitation Act and other veterans' readjustment benefit acts was inserted in the bill, instead of the proper date applicable to the war orphans' program.

I ask unanimous consent that an explanation of the amendment be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR YARBOROUGH

The committee's bill, as reported, is intended to cover children of persons dying as a result of a service-connected disability between the end of World War II and the beginning of the Korean conflict. By inadvertence the ending date of World War II as defined for vocational rehabilitation and for other veterans readjustment benefits was inserted in the bill rather than the proper date applicable to the war orphans program. That date is January 1, 1947. Including it in the bill by this amendment merely corrects a physical error and implements the recommendation set forth in paragraph numbered (1) on the first page of the committee's report on this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and third reading of the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am very happy that the measure has reached this stage. I compliment my able colleague, the junior Senator from Texas. The Representative from my district is very much interested in the legislation. I yield back the remainder of my time on the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield back the remainder of my time on the bill.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I commend the distinguished majority leader for calling this matter up at this time. There are only a few hundred cases involved each year. It is badly needed legislation for the benefit of orphans. It has the endorsement of every veterans organization in the country. The Representative from my district, Mr. THORNBERRY, of Austin, Tex., is very much interested in it, he is also the Representative from the district of the majority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the

amendments and third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "An act to provide education and training for the children of veterans dying of a disability incurred after January 31, 1955, and before the end of compulsory military service and directly caused by military, naval, or air service, and for other purposes."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF HELIUM ACT OF SEPTEMBER 1, 1937

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 1884, H.R. 10548.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill—H.R. 10548—to amend the Helium Act of September 1, 1937, as amended for the defense, security, and general welfare of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That this Act may be cited as the "Helium Act Amendments of 1960."

SEC. 2. The Act entitled "An Act authorizing the conservation, production, and exploitation of helium gas, a mineral resource pertaining to the national defense, and to the development of commercial aeronautics, and for other purposes", approved March 3, 1925 (43 Stat. 1110), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"That this Act may be cited as the 'Helium Act'.

"SEC. 2. As used in this Act:

"(1) The term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of the Interior;

"(2) The term 'person' means any individual, corporation, partnership, firm, association, trust, estate, public or private institution, or State or political subdivision thereof; and

"(3) The terms 'helium-bearing natural gas' and 'helium-gas mixture' means, respectively, natural gas and gas mixtures containing three-tenths of 1 per centum or more of helium by volume.

"SEC. 3. (a) For the purpose of conserving, producing, buying, and selling helium, the Secretary is authorized—

"(1) to acquire by purchase, lease, gift, exchange, or eminent domain, lands or interests therein or options thereon, including but not limited to sites, rights-of-way, and oil or gas leases containing obligations to pay rental in advance or damages arising out of the use and operation of such properties; but any such land or interests in lands may be acquired by eminent domain only when the Secretary determines (A) that he is unable to make a satisfactory agreement to acquire such land or interest in land, and (B) that such acquisition by eminent domain is necessary in the national interest;

"(2) to make just and reasonable contracts and agreements for the acquisition, processing, transportation, or conservation of helium, helium-bearing natural gas, or helium-gas mixtures upon such terms and conditions, and for such periods, not exceeding twenty-five years, as may be necessary to accomplish the purposes of the Act, except that the Secretary shall not make such contracts and agreements which shall require payments by the Government in any one fiscal year aggregating more than the amount which shall be established initially in an appropriation Act and which may be increased from time to time in appropriation Acts, or if the Secretary—

"(A) determines that the national interests require the conservation of certain helium or require certain helium-bearing natural gas or certain helium-gas mixture for the production or conservation of helium, and

"(B) determines that he is unable to acquire such helium, helium-bearing natural gas, or helium-gas mixture upon reasonable terms and at the fair market value,

he is authorized to acquire by eminent domain such helium and so much of such helium-bearing natural gas or helium-gas mixture as is necessarily consumed in the extraction of such helium after removal from its place of deposit in nature and wherever found, or the temporary use of such helium-bearing natural gas or helium-gas mixture for the purpose of extracting helium, together with the appropriate interest in pipelines, equipment, installations, facilities, personal or real property, including reserves, easements or other rights necessary or incident to the acquisition of such helium, natural gas, or mixture, but the condemnation of any such helium, helium-bearing natural gas, or helium-gas mixture, shall be effected in the same manner and following the procedures established in section 8(a) of this Act, the just compensation for such condemnation to be measured by terms and prices determined to be commensurate with the fair market value, and in the temporary use of any helium-bearing natural gas or helium-gas mixture for the purpose of extracting helium the Secretary shall cause no delay in the delivery of natural gas to the owner, purchaser, or purchasers thereof, except that required by the extractive processes;

"(3) to construct or acquire by purchase, lease, exchange, gift or eminent domain, plants, wells, pipelines, compressor stations, camp buildings, and other facilities, for the production, storage, purification, transportation, purchase, and sale of helium, helium-bearing natural gas, and helium-gas mixtures: and to acquire patents or rights therein and reports of experimentation and research used in connection with the properties acquired or useful in the Government's helium operations;

"(4) to dispose of, by lease or sale, property, including wells, lands, or interests therein, not valuable for helium production, and oil, gas, and byproducts, of helium operations not needed for Government use, except that property determined by the Secretary to be 'excess' within the meaning of section 3(e) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of June 30, 1949 (60 Stat. 378; 40 U.S.C. 472(e)), as amended, shall be disposed of in accordance with the provisions of that Act; and to issue leases to the surface of lands or structures thereon for grazing or other purposes when the same may be done without interfering with the production of helium; and

"(5) to accept equipment, money, and other contributions from public and private sources and to prosecute projects in cooperation with other agencies, Federal, State, or private.

"(b) Any known helium-gas-bearing land on the public domain not covered at the time by leases or permits under the Mineral Lands Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, as amended, may be reserved for the purposes of this Act, and any reservation of the ownership of helium may include the right to extract, or have extracted, such helium, under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary, from all gas produced from lands so permitted, leased, or otherwise granted for development, except that in the extraction of helium from gas produced from such lands, it shall be extracted so as to cause no delay, except that required by the extraction process, in the delivery of gas produced from the well to the purchaser or purchasers thereof at the point of delivery specified in contracts for the purchase of such gas. If any reserved rights of ownership and extraction of helium are not exercised before production of any helium-bearing natural gas or any helium-gas mixture, the Secretary is authorized to acquire such helium in accordance with section 3(a)(2) of this Act.

"(c) All contracts and agreements made by the Secretary for the acquisition of helium from a private plant shall contain a provision precluding the plant owner from selling any helium to any purchaser other than the Secretary at a price lower than the lowest price paid by any Government agency for helium acquired from any private plant under any contract entered into pursuant to this section and outstanding at the time of such sale.

"SEC. 4. The Secretary is authorized to maintain and operate helium production and purification plants together with facilities and accessories thereto; to acquire, store, transport, sell, and conserve helium, helium-bearing natural gas, and helium-gas mixtures, to conduct exploration for and production of helium on and from the lands acquired, leased, or reserved; and to conduct or contract with public or private parties for experimentation and research to discover helium supplies and to improve processes and methods of helium production, purification, transportation, liquefaction, storage, and utilization: *Provided, however,* That all research contracted for, sponsored, cosponsored, or authorized under authority of this Act shall be provided for in such a manner that all information, uses, products, processes, patents and other developments resulting from such research developed by Government expenditure will (with such exceptions and limitations, if any, as the Secretary may find to be necessary in the interest of national defense) be available to the general public: *And provided further,* That nothing contained herein shall be construed as to deprive the owner of any background patent relating thereto to such rights as he may have thereunder.

"SEC. 5. (a) Whenever the President determines that the defense, security, and general welfare of the United States requires such action, the Secretary shall issue such regulations as he deems necessary for the licensing of sales and transportation of helium in interstate commerce after extraction from helium-bearing natural gas or helium-gas mixtures. Thereafter it shall be unlawful for any person to sell or transfer helium in interstate commerce except in accordance with such regulations or pursuant to the terms of a license issued by the Secretary, or in accordance with the terms of a contract or agreement with the Secretary entered into pursuant to this Act. For the purpose of this section, the term 'helium' shall mean helium, after extraction from helium-bearing natural gas or helium-gas mixtures, in a refined or semi-refined state for use.

"(b) Each license shall be issued for a specified period to be determined by the Secretary, but not exceeding five years, and

may be renewed by the Secretary upon the expiration of such period. No such license shall be issued to a person if in the opinion of the Secretary the issuance of a license to such person would be inimical to the defense and security of the United States. No such license shall be assigned or otherwise transferred directly or indirectly except with the consent or approval of the Secretary in writing. Any such license may be revoked for any material false statement in the application for license, or for violation or a failure to comply with the terms and provisions of this Act, the regulations issued by the Secretary pursuant thereto, or the terms of the license.

"(c) In issuing licenses under this section, the Secretary shall impose such regulations and terms of licenses as will permit him effectively to promote the common defense and security as well as the general welfare of the United States. The licensing authority herein granted shall be used solely for the purpose of preventing the transportation or sale of helium for end uses determined by the Secretary to be nonessential or wasteful, and any determination that any end use is nonessential or wasteful shall be published in the form of general regulations applicable to all transportation or sales of helium.

"(d) Whenever Congress or the President declares that a war or national emergency exists, the Secretary is authorized to suspend any license granted under this Act if in his judgment such suspension is necessary to the defense and security of the United States, and he is further authorized to take such steps as may be necessary to recapture or reacquire supplies of helium.

"SEC. 6. (a) The Department of Defense, the Atomic Energy Commission, and other agencies of the Federal Government, to the extent that supplies are readily available, shall purchase all major requirements of helium from the Secretary.

"(b) The Secretary is authorized to sell helium for Federal, medical, scientific, and commercial uses in such quantities and under such terms and conditions as he determines.

"((c) Sales of helium by the Secretary shall be at prices established by him which shall be adequate to cover all costs incurred in carrying out the provisions of this Act and to repay to the United States by deposit in the Treasury, together with interest as provided in subsection (d) of this section, the following:

"(1) Within twenty-five years from the date of enactment of the Helium Act Amendments of 1960, the net capital and retained earnings of the helium production fund (established under section 3 of this Act prior to amendment by the Helium Act Amendments of 1960), determined by the Secretary as of such date of enactment, plus any moneys expended thereafter by the Department of the Interior from funds provided in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1959, for construction of a helium plant at Keyes, Oklahoma;

"(2) Within twenty-five years from the date of borrowing, all funds borrowed, as provided in section 12 of this Act, to acquire and construct helium plants and facilities; and

"(3) Within twenty-five years from the date of enactment of the Helium Act Amendments of 1960, unless the Secretary determines that said period should be extended for not more than ten years, all funds borrowed, as provided in section 12 of this Act, for all purposes other than those specified in clause (2) above.

"(d) Compound interest on the amounts specified in clauses (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (c) which have not been paid to the Treasury shall be calculated annually at rates determined by the Secretary of the Treasury taking into consideration the current average market yields of outstanding marketable obligations of the United States having maturities comparable to the investments authorized by this Act, except that the interest rate on the amounts specified in clause (1) of subsection (c) shall be determined as of the date of enactment of the Helium Act Amendments of 1960, and the interest rate on the obligations specified in clauses (2) and (3) of subsection (c) as of the time of each borrowing.

"(e) Helium shall be sold for medical purposes at prices which will permit its general use therefor; and all sales of helium to non-Federal purchasers shall be upon condition that the Federal Government shall have a right to repurchase helium so sold that has not been lost or dissipated, when needed for Government use, under terms and at prices established by regulations.

"(f) All moneys received under this Act, including moneys from sale of helium or other products resulting from helium operations and from the sale of excess property shall be credited to the helium production fund, which shall be available without fiscal year limitation, for carrying out the provisions of this Act, including any research relating to helium carried out by the Department of the Interior. Amounts accumulating in said fund in excess of amounts the Secretary deems necessary to carry out this Act and contracts negotiated hereunder shall be paid to the Treasury and credited against the amounts required to be repaid to the Treasury under subsection (c) of this section.

"SEC. 7. The Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission may each designate representatives to cooperate with the Secretary in carrying out the purposes of this Act, and shall have complete right of access to plants, data, and accounts.

"SEC. 8. (a) Proceedings for the condemnation of any property under section 3 of this Act shall be instituted and maintained pursuant to the provisions of the Act of August 1, 1888 (25 Stat. 357; 40 U.S.C. 257), as amended, and sections 1358 and 1403 of title 28 of the United States Code, or any other Federal statute applicable to the acquisition of real property by eminent domain. The Acts of February 26, 1931 (46 Stat. 1421; 40 U.S.C. 258a–258e), and October 21, 1942 (56 Stat. 797; 40 U.S.C. 258f), shall be applicable to any such proceedings. Wherever the words 'real property', 'realty', 'land', 'easement', 'right-of-way', or words of similar meaning, are used in such code provisions or Acts relating to procedures, jurisdiction, and venue, they shall be deemed, for the purpose of this Act, to include any personal property authorized to be acquired hereunder.

"(b) In the event of disposal under section 3(a)(4) of this Act of any property acquired by eminent domain pursuant to this Act, the former owner or successor in interest of the rights therein shall have the preferential right to reacquire such property on terms as favorable as those terms whereby disposition may be made under such section.

"SEC. 9. The Secretary is hereby authorized to establish and promulgate such rules and regulations, as are consistent with the directions of this Act and are necessary to carry out the provisions hereof.

"SEC. 10. (a) The provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act of June 11, 1946 (60 Stat. 637; 5 U.S.C. 1001–1011), as amended, shall apply to any agency proceeding and any agency action taken under this Act, including the issuance of rules and regulations, and the terms 'agency proceeding' and 'agency action' shall have the meaning specified in the Administrative Procedure Act.

"(b) In any proceeding under this Act for the granting, suspending, revoking, or amending of any license, or application to transfer control thereof, and in any proceeding for the issuance or modification of rules and regulations dealing with the activities of licensees, the Secretary shall grant a hearing upon the request of any person whose interest may be affected by the proceeding, and shall admit any such person as a party to such proceeding. Any final order entered in any such proceedings shall be subject to judicial review in the manner prescribed in the Act of December 29, 1950 (64 Stat. 1129; 5 U.S.C. 1031–1042), as amended, and to the provisions of section 10 of the Administrative Procedure Act.

"SEC. 11. The provisions of the Natural Gas Act of June 21, 1938 (52 Stat. 821; 15 U.S.C. 717–717w), as amended, shall not be applicable to the sale, extraction, processing, transportation, or storage of helium either prior to or subsequent to the separation of such helium from the natural gas with which it is commingled, whether or not the provisions of such Act apply to such natural gas, and in determining the rates of a natural gas company under sections 4 and 5 of the Natural Gas Act, as amended, whenever helium is extracted from helium-bearing natural gas under contract with the United States, there shall be excluded (1) all income received from the sale of helium; (2) all direct costs incurred in the extraction, processing, compression, transportation or storage of helium; and (3) that portion of joint costs of exploration, production, gathering, extraction, processing, compression, transportation or storage divided and allocated to helium.

"SEC. 12. (a) The Secretary is authorized to borrow annually from the Treasury and credit to the fund established under section 6(f) of this Act such amounts as may be authorized in the initial appropriation Act and which may be increased from time to time in appropriation Acts and as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act and contractual obligations hereunder.

"(b) For the purpose of this section the Secretary may issue to the Secretary of the Treasury notes, debentures, bonds, or other obligations to be redeemable at the option of the Secretary before maturity in such manner as may be stipulated in such obligations. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to purchase any obligations issued by the Secretary under authority of this section and for such purpose the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use as a public debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, are extended to include any purchases of obligations of the Secretary hereunder.

"SEC. 13. Whoever willfully violates, attempts to violate, or conspires to violate, any provision of this Act or any regulation or order issued or any terms of a license granted thereunder shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $5,000 or by imprisonment for not more than two years, or both, except that whoever commits such an offense with intent to injure the United States or with intent to secure an advantage to any foreign nation, shall upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $20,000 or by imprisonment for not more than twenty years, or both.

"SEC. 14. Whenever in the judgment of the Secretary any person has engaged or is about to engage in any act or practice which constitutes or will constitute a violation of any provision of this Act, or any regulation or order issued or any term of a license granted thereunder, any such act or practice may be enjoined by any district court having jurisdiction of such person, and proper proceedings to this end may be instituted under the direction of the Attorney General of the United States.

"SEC. 15. It is the sense of the Congress that it is in the national interest to foster and encourage individual enterprise in the development and distribution of supplies of helium, and at the same time provide, within economic limits, through the administration of this Act, a sustained supply of helium which, together with supplies available or expected to become available otherwise, will be sufficient to provide for essential Government activities.

"SEC. 16. The Secretary of the Interior is directed to report annually to the Congress on the matters contained in this Act.

"SEC. 17. If any provision of this Act, or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the remainder of this Act or the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those as to which it is held invalid, shall not be affected thereby."

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR INVESTIGATION OF ANTITRUST AND MONOPOLY LAWS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senator from Tennessee. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order No. 2000, Senate Resolution 368, in which he is interested.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. What order number is that?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Order No. 2000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I withdraw that request for the moment. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

CONSTRUCTION OF NUCLEAR POWER REACTORS FOR THE ANTARCTIC

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the able Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] has been a leader on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy at all times in his advocacy of the construction of nuclear reactors in the Antarctic. He has been there and has flown over the area. He knows much about the situation. He brought to the attention of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy the need for the development of such reactors.

The Senator from Washington had prepared a statement which he intended to make on the floor of the Senate this afternoon concerning the failure of the conferees to provide enough money to construct all the reactors, but only one.

I ask unanimous consent that his statement be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JACKSON

H.R. 12326, as reported out by the conference committee, and adopted by both Houses, has a serious deficiency. The $13 million added by the Senate for the construction of nuclear power reactors for the Antarctic has been cut to a mere $3,500,000. This cut will permit meeting the requirement for only one of the McMurdo Sound reactors and does not even permit the start of work on the reactors required for the two even more remote and inaccessible inland sites, Pole and Byrd stations in the Antarctic.

The great value of the reactor applications covered by the $13 million originally put into this bill by the Senate were covered in detail in the hearings of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on the Atomic Energy Commission authorization bill this year. Based on the data contained in this record, the Congress was unanimous in the approval of a $13 million authorization for reactor plants at our McMurdo Sound, Pole, and Byrd stations in the Antarctic. Everyone apparently was for the project. The Department of Defense, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the National Security Council all testified or informed the Congress of their endorsement of the project.

Members of the Congress also made statements endorsing the project during consideration of the AEC authorization bill on the floor of the House on May 6 and the floor of the Senate on May 10. As recently as August 10, during consideration of the AEC appropriation bill, my esteemed colleague, Senator ANDERSON, on the floor of this Chamber summarized for us the interest in this project. Yes, it appears that everyone is for the project except the Bureau of the Budget.

The only testimony we obtained or correspondence we received which indicated a reluctance to proceed with the construction of the Antarctic reactors was from the Bureau of the Budget. As covered in the record of the joint commtitee hearings and most recently as summarized by Senator ANDERSON on the floor of this Chamber on August 10, the Bureau of the Budget has continually resisted efforts to proceed with this project. They have done so by artifices such as continually questioning just which agency should budget for the project. By doing this we have lost the opportunity to save money by investing in these reactors. We have also lost in international prestige and have deprived our people manning remote bases in the Antarctic of the improved living conditions and the decrease in hazards in our Antarctic operations, which would result by building reactors in the Antarctic.

We thought we had shown everyone the irresponsible position taken by the Bureau of the Budget on this item. We thought everyone recognized the financial irresponsibility of the Bureau of the Budget's position; a position which if followed will result in the loss of millions of dollars in savings in operating costs in the future.

In spite of the obvious error in the Bureau of the Budget's position—pennywise today and dollar foolish tomorrow—I am informed that the Budget Bureau's position was the deciding factor in the decision of the Senate and House conference committee to knock out most of the appropriations for this project. Senator ANDERSON objected but to no avail.

The one fortunate thing that has occurred relative to the Antarctic reactor project is the placement of an order by the AEC for the first McMurdo plant using Navy funds while the Congress was acting on the appropriation bill. Although it will be very close timewise, it appears this foresight will permit delivery of the plant in time to meet the first Antarctic requirement for a plant.

It is indeed unfortunate that this appropriation bill does not contain the funds to meet the following requirements for the Pole and Byrd stations. The Pole and Byrd station procurements must be initiated this fiscal year to permit the design, manufacture, transportation, and installation of the reactor plants in time to meet the requirements for additional heat and energy at these sites. It is essential to consider the more difficult transportation and installation problems relative to the Byrd and Pole stations, and therefore sufficient time must be allowed to cope with these problems. These plants must be thoroughly operationally tested before they are taken apart for shipment to the Antarctic. They must be off-loaded at McMurdo Sound and airlifted to Byrd and Pole stations and then they must be installed in the ice tunnels at the sites which are respectively 1 and 2 miles above sea level.

Therefore, the elimination of the funding for the other reactor plants required for the Antarctic causes us at least a year's delay in attaining the great financial and humanitarian benefits which would accrue from their installation. It is indeed unfortunate that such a shortsighted policy can be imposed on us if we are all not vigilant.

It is, of course, possible that the Navy or AEC could find the necessary funds to commit for leadtime procurement for these authorized plants. I hope they can do so and also jump the biggest hurdle to efficiency and economy we have encountered on these projects: the Bureau of the Budget.

RELIGIOUS FREEDOM AND THE BALLOT BOX—ADDRESS BY MRS. CHARLES W. TILLETT

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, Mrs. Charles W. Tillett, of Charlotte, N.C., recently delivered a most significant address entitled "Religious Freedom and the Ballot Box." Mrs. Tillett is a stanch Protestant and has been very active in the affairs of the Southern Presbyterian Church.

She is one of the ablest women in the Nation, having served as vice chairman of the Democratic Party of North Carolina, as vice chairman of the Democratic National Committee, and as a member of the board of trustees of the University of North Carolina. She has been honored by the University of North Carolina with an honorary degree of doctor of laws.

I believe her address is of such significance and is so timely that it should be made available to all. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RELIGIOUS FREEDOM AND THE BALLOT BOX

(Address by Mrs. Charles W. Tillett)

I thank you ladies and gentlemen, for your presence here this evening and I thank the women leaders in this community for their invitation to speak to you on one of the issues before us, as voters, in November 1960.

It is important to talk with American women because women can be a power in any election. They number approximately 52 percent of the eligible voters in our country.

Women are informed on world affairs and they know that two nations are contending for world leadership—the Soviet Union and the United States. The Soviet Union is plotting and planning and aiming at world subjugation. It seeks to establish despotism based on fear and force.

Standing against this order of fear and force is America, your country and mine. America is the spearhead of all the democracies that are trying to keep human rights and freedoms alive in the world.

Each one of us knows that we have a part to play. But it is so easy to forget our responsibilities—so easy to argue ourselves into thinking that this battle for freedom can be fought and won in some distant capi-

tal of the Western World—not in the South, not in North Carolina, not in Mecklenburg County, not in the voting booth in our own precinct, not in our own individual hearts. But this is where the battle will be fought and, I believe, will be won.

One of the freedoms under discussion in this election is religious freedom—one of the most basic freedoms.

A recent poll, as reported in the press, gave the religious issue the No. 1 spot for campaign issues in the South. It is useless to debate who injected the religious issue into the campaign. It is evident that Mr. KENNEDY himself presents the religious issue by simply aspiring to be President of the United States. He presents it because although he is a convinced and believing Christian, he is a member of the Catholic faith.

Our country came into being proclaiming the philosophy of religious freedom. For this freedom Protestants, Catholics, and Jews and people of all faiths gave their lives. There is no amendment to the Constitution indicating on what altar a man must offer his heart to God in order to hold public office. Our motto, "In God we trust"; our firm belief, "A public office is a public trust"; our people, a religious people preferring that a candidate have religion but possessing no right to say what religion.

Our Constitution, which Mr. Gladstone has described as the greatest political document ever struck off at one time by the mind and purpose of man, states who shall be eligible for President. He must be a natural born citizen, 35 years of age, and he must have been 14 years a resident of the United States.

It does not say, provided he is not of this faith or of that faith.

It does not say, provided he is a Baptist, or a Methodist, or a Jew, or a Presbyterian, or an Episcopalian, or a Catholic, or a Quaker.

It does not say, provided he is not one of these religious faiths.

The Founding Fathers held fast to their faith in America and they founded this country on the principle of religious freedom; but it is so easy for us to lose our faith in America—so easy to argue that if we compromise our principles on religious freedom, that somehow good will come of it. It is so hard to shed our prejudices when we go into the voting booth; so hard to stand firm on principle, when confronted by our cherished prejudices at the ballot box.

Let us remember that Americans have elected some Presidents who were not a member of any church. Abraham Lincoln was not a church member, and President Eisenhower was not a member of a church when he was elected in 1952. It is a matter of public record that he joined the church by profession of faith after his election.

Today we have running as presidential candidates in 1960, a Catholic and a Quaker, and the Founding Fathers wrote nothing into the Constitution to prevent either one of them from running or being elected.

As an American citizen, do you think that because the Quakers wait for the spirit to move them in the meeting house, Mr. NIXON will be slow to speak up at Cabinet meetings? Of course he will not.

Do you think the fact that some Quakers are pacifists should be examined in this campaign or that voters should begin to fear that the Vice President, a Quaker, might not be willing to go to the mat with the enemies of our country?

Your answer and mine is, of course, a resounding "No." Then why in the name of justice and freedom can't you and I, and all the rest of us, grant the same right to Senator JOHN KENNEDY, namely: the right to render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and to God the things that are God's?

In a democracy we can't ration religious freedom—just parcel it out to you and me. Democracy is not only a government—it is a philosophy, a way of life. We can't have freedom of religion in your house and my house and not have it in the White House.

In a democracy we can't print "freedom of worship" in the Constitution and be done with it. It must come to life in our minds and hearts, just as the written score of Bethoven's Fifth must have the skill of the musicians to play the instruments that lift it from the written page to new heights of beauty and understanding. So must it be with the principle of religious freedom in the hearts of the American people.

It isn't enough to talk about the Founding Fathers in our patriotic organizations, and say what a great heritage they left us, and then be false to that heritage when we cast our vote.

All of us face the real test of bringing alive in our own hearts and minds and in the ballot box the great principles contained in our Constitution. May I tell you that Senator KENNEDY is the son of a Gold Star Mother. Three of her sons fought for their country in World War II. One son went to war and didn't come back. He "fell with his face to the foe."

The Gold Star Mother knows the tense moments of waiting for messages—"wounded" or "missing in action" or "died in the service of his country."

When the Kennedy sons were called to fight for their country in the front lines, they were not asked whether they were Protestant or Catholics or Quakers or Jews.

They were not denied the right to serve their country in a critical hour. They were not denied the right to die for their country. One was killed in action. Another, JOHN KENNEDY, was most desperately wounded in action and recovered for further service of his country with the same valor of spirit that carried him into the front lines of the American naval service.

It would be shocking to friends of freedom all over the world if he would now be denied the highest public service because of his religion.

His religion was not a bar to his most desperate wounds. Should it now be a bar to his highest public service?

This would be a wound indeed—a wound to freedom in America and to freedom in the world.

Women know, and I do not need to tell you, that through long generations the American mother has held her infant in her arms—her heart flooded with warmth, with the thought that in a free country her little boy could be President of the United States. It was his birthright. "This could happen only in America." Shall we say now that this is no longer true.

Must the American woman write a footnote to the Constitution of the United States in the year of our Lord 1960, engulfed in a blast of religious prejudice, marking their ballots against freedom of religion? Shall they say to the future mothers of America: "Only if he is in the right denomination can your son be President"?

God forbid that we say to the Gold Star Mother, "Your son can die for his country but your son cannot be President unless he belongs to the right denomination."

Some years ago I heard Judge John J. Parker of the circuit court of appeals make a speech. It was not a political speech but he pointed out some historical facts that need to be remembered.

None of us—Protestants, Jews, or Catholics—should indulge ourselves in prejudice. We owe to much to each other.

How can a Protestant or a Catholic woman indulge herself in prejudice against the Jews?

She will not, if she reminds herself that the Blessed Saviour and the Apostles were Jews. Furthermore, the Jews gave us our Scriptures, the New as well as the Old Testament. And the Jews were the chosen people of God, and they gave us the Ten Commandments on which our moral code is based.

And if there are Protestants in the heat of this campaign who feel themselves yielding to the temptation to be prejudiced against the Catholics, they should remember that it was the Catholic Church which kept the Christian faith alive during the dark ages, and they preserved it for the future regeneration of the world.

And the Catholic Church stood firm against Nazi persecution.

And the Catholic Church has been like the Rock of Gibraltar in standing against the advance of communism.

Finally, the Jews and the Catholics owe much to the Protestants. Both the Jews and the Catholics have benefited by the magnificent part the Protestant religion has played in establishing free government and in bringing about a greater understanding on the part of government of the inherent rights of the individual.

All of us, Catholics, Jews, and Protestants, have played a vital part in establishing our western civilization. Let's stick together like true Americans. At this late date don't go off in the amen corner and pray for strength to fight each other, in the face of a powerful united foe that denounces all religion. Let's stand toegther against communism and preserve the American way of life.

Of genuine concern to many Americans is the question of the separation of church and state. Let me examine the record of Senator JOHN KENNEDY on this very matter of the separation of the church and state.

He has come out forthrightly and clearly for the separation of church and state. No Member of the Congress of the United States has a better voting record on public issues testing separation of church and state than Senator JOHN KENNEDY of Massachusetts. He has made his declaration to the Nation and the world. I accept his statement as an expression of his honest convictions and his voting record upholds it.

First, let me point out to you that Senator KENNEDY voted against Federal aid to parochial schools, even though there were some Senators who were Protestants who voted for it. Let me read from his own words from the record. He said without equivocation: "I am opposed to it. I clearly believe it is unconstitutional. I voted against it on the Senate floor this year when offered by Senator MORSE."

Second, there is the question of an Ambassador to the Vatican, if this should become a real issue again. Senator KENNEDY took a stand against it. Senator KENNEDY said: "I am opposed to it, and I said so long ago. But even though it was last proposed by a Baptist President, I know of no other candidate who has ever been asked about this matter."

And third, there is the question of signing a bill providing foreign aid funds for birth control. The prospects are remote that it would arise, but Senator KENNEDY has said: "I have made it clear that I would neither veto nor sign such a bill on any basis except what I considered to be the best public interest, without regard to my private religious views. I have said the same about bills dealing with censorship, divorce, our relation to Spain, or any other subject."

Senator KENNEDY has come out with a clarion call for more and better public education. "No problem," he has said, "touches our life more directly." Senator KENNEDY is a strong supporter of the public schools as a basic American institution, basic to our freedom and our democracy.

Our competition with the Soviets depends in part on our science training in our high schools.

Senator KENNEDY has said: "We need programs of student aid, loans, fellowships, and scholarships * * * and not limited to the

fields of science and defense. We must start now building the classrooms and dormitories our colleges already need * * * building programs which the President halted by virtue of his two housing bill vetoes. We need research grants for teachers and others outside the health and science fields. We need to find ways of meeting our colleges' growing shortage of available capital."

"Civilization" he points out, "according to the old saying, is a race between education and catastrophe."

His record is clear on the separation of church and state and one on which in good conscience you can support him. He has spoken out as a true American. He backs up his words with an unblemished record on separation of church and state for 14 years in the U.S. Congress and Senate—a record not surpassed by any American in public life.

In the face of his public statements and his established record what is it that his opponents in addition would require? Would they have him renounce his Christian faith as a member of the Catholic Church?

Supporters of KENNEDY are not voting for or against the Catholic Church. They are voting for KENNEDY as a free American worthy to be President of the United States.

He served in the Navy in World War II with a record of heroic action. He has risked his life for his country and almost lost it. His brother died for his country.

Who is there among us whose patriotism is so great that he can cast the first stone?

I, for one, shall be proud, honored, and happy to cast, not a stone, but my ballot for a true American, in the highest tradition of the separation of church and state, for a nobly great American, Senator JOHN KENNEDY, for President of the United States.

Mr. Harry Golden, well-known writer, said in his Carolina Israelite, recently, something I think we would do well to consider:

"If America elects a President who is of the Roman Catholic faith at this moment in world history, it will be worth the equivalent of 50 cobalt bombs in our ideological war against the Soviet Union. That part of the world which we call 'neutral' or 'uncommitted' may not have been able to decipher our foreign policy in recent years, and they may not have shown adequate appreciation for our military and financial aid, but they will know that our democracy still has a tremendous vitality, because at our most critical hour, a member of a minority religious group was able to win the highest political office in Protestant America."

NORMAN CLAPP, EXPERT AND UNDERSTANDING FRIEND OF THE WISCONSIN FARMER

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, a distinguished constituent of mine, Mr. Norman Clapp of Lancaster, has recently delivered a hard-hitting speech on the farm problem as seen from a Wisconsin standpoint.

Mr. President, Norman Clapp is a man of remarkable background. He is still a young man. He was on the staff of the late Senator Bob La Follette—young Bob—from 1935 to 1937 and again from 1939 to 1944. Part of this time he was the expert of the minority of the Senate Committee on Finance. He has been a smalltown newspaper edition in Wisconsin for the past decade. He has sensed the seriousness of the farm problems not only for farmers but for everyone in rural America.

In recent years Norman Clapp has been an eminently successful smalltown weekly newspaper editor. He founded his own weekly in Lancaster, Wis., and built it into a thriving publication that has repeatedly won recognition by the Wisconsin Press Association for its excellence.

But Mr. Clapp has a particular and very practical understanding of farm problems in addition to publishing and editing his smashingly successful paper in a farm community. He has been called on repeatedly by farm organizations to participate in their programs.

First. For the last 5 or 6 years at least he has been asked to serve on the drafting committee to draft the action program of the Wisconsin Farmers Union, which is then submitted to the State convention for consideration. Clapp actively served on this committee every year he was asked, including this year.

Second. In 1958 James Patton, the national president of the Farmers Union asked Clapp to serve on a similar committee to draft the National Farmers Union action program and did so.

Third. Clapp has frequently spoken to farmer-businessmen dinners sponsored by farm organizations devoted to building recognition of the common interests of businessmen and farmers.

All this is in recognition of a deep interest and very remarkable understanding of basic farm issues.

Mr. President, this speech, delivered by Mr. Clapp at Argyle, Wis., on August 25, 1960, I think is an unusual speech, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH OF NORMAN M. CLAPP AT MEETING OF PECATONICA LOCAL OF WISCONSIN FARMERS UNION IN ARGYLE, WIS., AUGUST 25, 1960

I want to talk with you here tonight about agriculture and politics—in the very best sense of the word.

Contrary to what some people say, I believe that farming and politics must go together at least for the present and foreseeable future. Otherwise we are not going to solve the life and death problems facing the family-type farm.

If we are to save the family-type farm from extinction, good farmers had better give some serious thought to their politics—and, I am sure, good politicians had better give some attention to farming and its problems.

The survival of family farming is one of the great burning issues of the 1960 elections in this country.

It has been an issue before. It was an issue in 1952, but the farmers did not realize it. They took General Eisenhower's assurances of 90 and 100 percent of parity at face value and concluded there was no difference between Democrats and Republicans on that issue. They discovered afterward how tragically they had been misled. They learned from bitter experience that the change from a Democratic administration to a Republican administration had really meant a basic change in attitude toward agriculture and particularly toward people in agriculture, the farm families.

Where the problems and needs of independent farmers as an essential part of our social and economic structure had been given top priority under Democratic administrations, there was now a new scale of values in which the sacred cows of efficiency and free market were placed above the welfare of the farmer and his family.

The Federal Government under the management of the Republican Party deliberately has set out to put American agriculture through the wringer of lower and lower farm commodity prices, on the theory that lower prices would result in less production and fewer farmers.

On the first count they were sadly mistaken. Lower commodity prices actually stimulated production as farmers struggled desperately to meet their cash requirements on falling markets.

On the second count, however, they were, even more sadly, correct. In the last 10 years we have liquidated almost one out of every five farm units in the Nation, and the great bulk of this liquidation has come under the pressure of the cost-price squeeze applied by the Eisenhower-Nixon-Benson administration.

By 1956 farmers throughout the Nation realized there was a farm issue, but they still did not fully sense its seriousness. They were distracted by other issues in the election campaign. Some dairy farmers, I suspect, were lulled into a false sense of security when Secretary Benson temporarily raised the price supports on milk from $3.15 to $3.25 to sweeten the reception of President Eisenhower's veto of the Democratic farm bill, H.R. 12, which would have restored 90 percent of parity prices on the basic farm commodities.

But any such hopes that there would be a reversal of Republican policy have long since gone aglimmering. Secretary Benson and his cohorts have driven farm commodity prices down to 80 percent of parity on the average for all commodities. Price supports on the basic commodities are down to 75 percent of parity.

And Mr. Benson, speaking for the administration, has proposed that he be given authority to set them as low as 60 percent of parity. In fact, he has proposed that the whole parity concept be discarded and in its place there would be the 3-year creeping average of market prices as a device to open the door for further drops in support-price levels.

This steady pressure from the present Republican administration has taken an enormous toll from American farmers. Total net farm income has dropped from $16 billion in 1952 to an estimated $11 billion this year. Per capita farm income is less than $1,000 per year. Per capita income off the farm is $2,200 per year, more than double the income on the farm.

Since 1952 the farmers of this country have lost $21 billion in net income as a result of falling farm commodity prices. This is quite a bill for the farmers to pay.

And this affects not only farmers. It affects the entire economy when farm purchasing power falls to the lowest ebb since 1934, as it has. It directly affects the merchant on Main Street in every village and city such as ours in this area where our communities are rooted in the farming surrounding them. And it affects the manufacturers of automobiles, farm implements, petroleum products, farm chemicals, tires, lumber, and steel.

Farmers handle a gross income of $38 billion. The market potential of such an important segment of our economy is of prime significance to the growth and prosperity of the entire economy. Keeping it in step with nonagricultural segments of our economy is essential to the maintenance of full employment of the manpower and resources of the Nation.

Here in Wisconsin alone the failure of farm income to keep up with nonfarm income has been costing us an estimated $372 million per year.

So these are some of the aspects of the issue as it has been shaped by political decisions of the last 8 years. They carry with them a special urgency in this year of 1960, because time and endurance are running out for the small farmer.

It may come as a shock to many people, but University of Wisconsin agricultural economists in a study last year reported to Governor Nelson that at 1958 prices nearly half of Wisconsin dairy farms did not return a nickel to the farm operator and his family after paying for nonlabor costs and deducting a 4-percent return on his investment. Less than 10 percent of Wisconsin dairy farms paid all such costs and returned as much as $3,000 to the operator for his labor and management.

It is a grave question as to how long the typical family type farmer can survive present trends toward higher investments and greater overhead costs in the face of lower prices and falling income.

Lack of adequate price support and the skyrocketing of interest charges are two developments directly traceable to policies of the Federal Government since the Republican administration took office. They point inescapably to the importance of political decisions in the welfare and future prospects of American agriculture.

They point also to the importance of making the right choices in this coming national election. I doubt if the family farm can survive another 4 years and certainly not another 8 years of the present brand of Federal farm policy.

This may be the last chance to save the family farm in America.

As these family units disappear and are swallowed up by larger adjacent farms, as the buildings fall into disrepair and are abandoned, they are not easily replaced. Once the land map is remade into large corporate, integrated operations, it will be too late to reverse the trend. If it is to be done, it must be done now before it is too late.

This is why I regard the survival of the family farm as one of the great issues of the coming national elections. This is why I feel farmers and all those who have a stake in rural America must give more than passing attention to the political choices we face this November.

In the tumult of political debate to come, there will be many attempts to confuse and divert farmers and the people of our rural communities from the changes needed in our national administration, if family farms and farm families are to continue as the backbone of rural America.

There will be those who will pick up the old argument that this is not a political question. They will assert that politicians keep the farm issue stirred up for their own private benefit and that everything would be better if we got agriculture out of Government and the Government out of agriculture.

Those who take such a position either seek to hide their own neglect of agriculture's interests, their ignorance of the basic problem, or—worse still—to mislead the farmer while they prepare his destruction.

The consequences of the Federal Government's withdrawal from all efforts to maintain a fair return for agriculture's contribution to our economy would be catastrophic. A relatively mild indication of what it would mean is to be found in a study undertaken by the Department of Agriculture and economists from the land-grant colleges at the direction of the Senate Committee on Agriculture. The report of this study is now published as Senate Document No. 77 of this present Congress.

The Senate committee demanded to know what would be the consequences in commodity price levels, production, and net farm income if production controls were abandoned on all commodities except tobacco, and price support levels were allowed to fall to a point where the market would absorb all current crops and the reduction of current Government inventories over a 7- to 10-year period.

The economists who made the study reported that such a program, which still is something short of complete withdrawal of the Government from the farm marketing problem, would result in an overall increase of 20 percent in farm production by 1965 and the dropping of hog prices, for instance, to 11 cents, beef cattle to $15 per hundredweight, and manufacturing milk to $2.60.

Net farm income in the Nation would drop to $7 billion, less than half of what it was in 1952 and more than $4 billion less than the present low level of farm net income.

The so-called free market is no answer to agriculture's problem. Other industries go to great lengths to protect themselves from the very free market their spokesmen prescribe so willingly for agriculture. Steel, automobiles, farm machinery, petroleum, cement—to mention only a few of the great industries—are not operating on a free market. They control their market to a great degree. They set their prices and tailor their production accordingly.

Agriculture, made up as it is by 4,500,000 separate producers, is not able to protect itself on the market unless it can organize through the good offices of the Federal Government. If we are to solve the problems of agriculture at this critical time, it will have to be done with the assistance of a Federal farm program of one kind or another. That we must recognize.

The second argument we will hear from those who wish to divert farmers and confuse their friends in the choice ahead attempts to ignore the fact that there is an important difference between the Democratic and Republican Parties in their views of the farm issue.

I have heard it said by Republican candidates this year, and I am sure you have too, that farm distress, while unfortunate, is inevitable. In sharing any blame, they display a real zeal for bipartisanship. They say we must not blame Secretary Benson, the Republican Party, or anyone else in the present administration, because, after all, they say, they are just administering the same law passed by the Democrats 10 years ago. What is more, they say, the Democrats have had control of Congress since 1955 and have failed to pass any significant changes in the law. This is what they say.

What is the record? First of all, the law they speak of authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to fix support prices anywhere between 75 percent and 90 percent of parity. Certainly it represents a great difference whether you pick the high figure or the low one. What former Secretary of Agriculture Charles Brannan did with that law under a Democratic administration and what Secretary Benson does with it under a Republican administration are as different as night and day. Secretary Brannan aimed to protect agriculture from the extremes of postwar readjustments. Secretary Benson and the policy of the Republican administration have endeavored to force a harsh readjustment upon agriculture and in the process plow under what they have apparently regarded as a surplus of farmers.

And as to changes in the law, the Democratic Congress in 1956 passed H.R. 12, which would have made basic price supports of 90 percent of parity mandatory upon the Secretary of Agriculture. President Eisenhower vetoed that bill.

In 1958 the Democratic Congress passed Senate Joint Resolution 162 to prevent any further reductions in price supports pending an effort to work out a comprehensive farm program that would meet with general approval. President Eisenhower vetoed that.

Last year President Eisenhower vetoed the wheat program passed by Congress. He vetoed the tobacco support program also passed last year.

When Democrats like LESTER JOHNSON tried to get the House Agriculture Committee to incorporate Governor Nelson's dairy program into the 1960 emergency farm income bill, every Republican vote cast in the committee was opposed to it.

Whatever the campaign orators say, the record shows that the Democratic Party and its leadership have consistently tried to bolster up agricultural prices and income. Republican leadership has consistently tried to force farm commodity prices down and leave the individual farmer at the mercy of a market over which he can have no effective control.

So as farmers make their choice of parties and candidates in the coming elections, they will do well to look at the record and remember their experience. It does make a difference to them in this life-and-death struggle.

The party they choose makes a difference. The Democratic Party is dedicated to the preservation and strengthening of the family farm. The Republican Party has proved by its record that it is willing to sacrifice the family farm to the demands of the processors for lower and lower farm commodity prices from which they coin higher and higher profits.

And finally let us hope that those who are interested in the future of family farming are not misled by the "new look" Vice President NIXON is trying to assume in preparation for his bid for the Presidency. For 7½ years Mr. NIXON has been an active part of the administration which has conceived and executed the policies which have brought agriculture to the brink of disaster. He has approved those policies. When he has had the chance, he has voted for them. He has been lavish in his praise of Secretary Benson.

To attempt to disassociate himself from either Secretary Benson or his policies on the eve of an election ought to fool no one.

This is a critical time for American agriculture as we know it and cherish it—not only as a producer of food and fiber, but also as a way of life. The family farm is the wellspring of American character in which the human traits of independence and neighborliness, initiative, and cooperation, the individual and the community have become blended in a distinctive American mold.

What happens to this kind of agriculture and to the people who share its blessings will depend in great measure, whether we like it or not, upon the decision we make as citizens this fall, on what party we choose to assume the responsibility of government, on whom we elect to office. It depends upon our choice of representatives in the Congress and, above all, our choice of a President of the United States.

We cannot afford to make a wrong choice this time.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT MEMORIAL

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 1905, H.R. 8665, a bill to establish a memorial to Theodore Roosevelt in the National Capital. This is identical with Senate bill 2561.

I have conferred with the distinguished majority leader and the distinguished minority leader and have told them I planned to make this request and to offer an amendment for myself and the Senators from New York [Mr. JAVITS and Mr. KEATING], which has been printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 8665) to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a memorial to Theodore Roosevelt in the National Capital" to provide for the construction of such memorial by the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, if the Senator from South Dakota will yield, I wish to express my appreciation to the majority leader, the minority leader, and the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] for the very able help they gave in working out this situation. I am sure the amendment takes care of the matter in splendid shape; it provides that the family of Theodore Roosevelt shall have a voice in determining the form of the memorial.

It would have been a great mistake not to have acted upon this bill, for over the past few months all of the parties interested have reached an agreement on the best way to determine a site and a design for a monument to Theodore Roosevelt. On one thing all are agreed; namely, that we very definitely should build a monument to Theodore Roosevelt.

His vigor and enthusiasm, his unyielding love of country, his warmth and deep human understanding have made him a truly great American. Now in the second half of the century in which he served as President, he has come to be recognized as one of our greatest Presidents. To small boys everywhere, the name of Theodore Roosevelt conjures up visions of a rugged, courageous approach to life as reflected in the successes of the famed Rough Riders, whom Theodore Roosevelt led so gallantly.

To those who remember or those to whom the history of his era is of special importance, President Theodore Roosevelt's part in the settlement of the Russo-Japanese War, his work with the New York City Police force, his terms as Governor of my State, his civil service reforms, his trustbusting, all bring to mind his life and accomplishments.

To leave Washington without enacting this bill on which so much work has been done would have been extremely unfortunate.

I am not prepared or fully enough informed on the mechanics of this matter to comment either on the design or the site of the memorial which this bill would permit us to start working on. The wide public interest in this project will, I know, encourage those responsible to frame their plans in accordance with the wishes of the many groups which have expressed an interest. This is as it should be. The amendment adopted today gives to the living children of President Theodore Roosevelt some measure of authority with respect to the design of this memorial. Others are interested, as am I, in this matter and look with great anticipation to the day when all of these matters will be attended to and when construction on the Nation's monument to Theodore Roosevelt will be initiated.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I should like to join my colleague in again thanking the Senator from South Dakota for developing this formula, which has broken the logjam which has continued for more time than really was proper, considering our objective.

I also wish to thank both the majority leader and the minority leader.

I hope final action will now be taken on the bill.

Now that the Senator from South Dakota has discussed the matter, I wonder whether he will have any objection to having the House bill taken up.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I have already requested that that be done, and House bill 8665 is now being considered by the Senate.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, in line 1, after the word "by", it is proposed to insert "the living children of Theodore Roosevelt,".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from South Dakota.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter I have received from Hermann Hagedorn, director emeritus of the Theodore Roosevelt Memorial Association, together with a statement he has prepared.

In placing Mr. Hagedorn's letter in the RECORD at this point, I wish to direct attention to his emphasis upon the granite panels carrying the words of Theodore Roosevelt and a bronze bas-relief of him speaking to an audience stretching out infinitely. "Such a bas-relief," Mr. Hagedorn writes, "does not require the sphere. You can take it or leave it." Under the amendment which I proposed and which has now been adopted, the approval of the living children of Theodore Roosevelt will be required before any design can be placed on Theodore Roosevelt Island for this memorial.

There being no objection, the letter and the statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THEODORE ROOSEVELT
CENTENNIAL COMMISSION,
New York, N.Y., August 27, 1960.

Hon. FRANCIS CASE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR FRANK: Your letter of the 20th was forwarded to me from my former office in New York. You will note, from the superscription, that my wife and I are now living on the west coast. We moved out here early in May.

I am grateful to you for your letter, enclosing excerpts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, reporting the debate on the TR memorial. I am distressed, of course, that the discussion ended as it did, but I am grateful for the high quality of the debate and for your own constructive attitude. I appreciate, moreover, your request for any suggestion I might care to make "with respect to what should be incorporated in the bill to insure a memorial that would convey" Mr. Roosevelt's great qualities as a man, a leader, and a symbol of the American spirit.

In view of the storm of adverse criticism which the proposed celestial sphere has aroused, I want to point out that, in the plan which the TR Association originally proposed and the Centennial Commission adopted, the sphere was a detail and, by no means, the essential feature. I have asked the present director of the TR Association, Mr. Leslie C. Stratton, to send you an extract from my final report to Congress as Director of the Centennial Commission. (A copy of the report was sent you, of course, and you may, in fact, have it in your office. The passage, referring to the memorial, begins on p. 47.)

You will find that what the TR Commission proposed was a semicircle of granite panels, 12 feet high, bearing quotations from TR (and, if it seemed desirable, from other great American leaders as well) on the moral foundations of freedom, with smaller granite tablets, or boulders, on the paths approaching the semicircle, bearing quotations on the same theme, from great leaders of the other free peoples. The Commission, that is, proposed a Sanctuary of the Free Spirit which should have significance not only for the American people but for the whole world.

In this plan, the celestial sphere, which has caused all the commotion in the press and in Congress, is, as I said above, a secondary issue. You can take it or leave it. The sanctuary is the essential thing. On the base of the sphere, the Commission proposed a bronze bas-relief of TR speaking to an audience stretching out infinitely. Such a bas-relief, however, does not require the sphere.

It could be placed in front of the granite panels on a long panel of its own.

I do not have to tell you how pertinent to TR's character and to his life such a sanctuary of the free spirit would be, or how relevant it would be to our basic need, as a free people, today, as well as to our position as leader of the free world. The activities of the TR centennial year, established, in the public mind, Elihu Root's picture of TR as "the greatest teacher of the principles of popular self-government the world has ever known." Further, in the discussion regarding our national purpose that has been going on, this past year, the wisest of those who have given their thinking to the public have pointed out that our national purpose should be what actually it has been since Thomas Jefferson, in the Declaration, broadened the idea of freedom of Britain's 13 rebellious colonies to freedom for all men. "All men are created free and equal." Our national purpose has been and still is to maintain freedom for ourselves and to encourage its spread throughout the world.

How could that purpose be more appropriately or more effectively symbolized than by the proposed sanctuary of the free spirit in which, through the proposed inscriptions, TR shall speak to the American people, and to all mankind, of the challenge and the moral and ethical foundations of freedom? Such a sanctuary would become, overnight, a magnetic place of pilgrimage for Americans and, in fact, for free peoples everywhere. For it would be not just a TR sanctuary or even an American sanctuary; but a world sanctuary of the free spirit.

All this, let me recall, is no improvisation for the purpose of diverting the attention of the Senate into new channels, in the matter of the TR memorial. It is all in the initial and the final TRCC reports (1956 and 1958).

For all men, here and abroad, the plan, as there stated, would declare anew America's purpose and, through the press, the screen, radio and TV, dramatize to ourselves

and to others, for all time, what America stands for among the nations.

Theodore Roosevelt Island was actually dedicated on July 4, 1958, as such a sanctuary of the free spirit. I enclose a copy of the brief address I delivered on that occasion.

I wish it might be possible, before Congress adjourns, to place before the Senate the plan of the TR Centennial Commission of which the sphere was actually only a detail, by no means essential to the central idea. I am confident that most of the distinguished and honorable gentlemen who have opposed the sphere would catch the significance and appropriateness of the sanctuary as a memorial to Theodore Roosevelt and a symbol of America's determination to defend, and to extend, freedom throughout the world.

Cordially yours,

HERMANN HAGEDORN.

A SANCTUARY OF THE FREE SPIRIT

(Remarks by Hermann Hagedorn, director of the Theodore Roosevelt Centennial Commission, on the occasion of the dedication of Theodore Roosevelt Island in Washington, D.C., on July 4, 1958)

It is appropriate that this island, which is the national memorial to Theodore Roosevelt, should, in this his centennial year, provide the background for the National Capital's Independence Day celebration. With the support of President Eisenhower and under the cosponsorship of some 30 national organizations aggregating millions of members, the Theodore Roosevelt Association and the Theodore Roosevelt Centennial Commission have inaugurated a movement to make our greatest national holiday once more what the President has called a day of heroic memory and challenge, a day of individual rededication to the responsibilities of freedom. It is our hope that in the years to come, this island may become a significant center of such rededication.

Purchased by the Theodore Roosevelt Association almost 30 years ago, through the contributions of men, women, and children throughout this country and in other lands, the island was presented to the Nation and placed, by act of Congress, under the beneficent eye of the National Park Service. When Congress established the Theodore Roosevelt Centennial Commission, 3 years ago, it specifically charged the Commission to make the development of the island a major objective.

The plans which the association and the Commission developed go far beyond the personality or even the achievements of Mr. Roosevelt as political leader and statesman. They deal with that fundamental need of the Republic which was closest to his heart: the need to deepen in the American people the recognition of the moral foundations of a free society and to awaken in the citizen a sense of personal responsibility toward the Government which guards his freedom, the Government which, with others like him, he actually is.

Recognizing that both the national need and Mr. Roosevelt's memory could not be better served, the asosciation and the commission, in proud alliance with the National Park Service, proposes to makes this beautiful, wild island a sanctuary of inspiration and challenge, to which men and women, boys and girls, from every section of the land—and, with them, free men and women from all over the world—may come to face the imperatives of the free spirit and to rekindle the sacred fire in their hearts.

For the spirits of the great dreamers and doers in the long struggle to establish and maintain human freedom will be their companions and their teachers here. On panels of granite the pilgrims will read living words that, in an age of ideological conflict, shall present the ideology of freedom; compelling American words, compelling words from the teachers and prophets of all the five continents.

Great spirits will walk here, great spirits will speak; and they will not leave untouched those whose hearts are open to what they have to say.

Hearing their approaching footsteps, let us, in this critical hour in history, dare to "dream greatly," as Theodore Roosevelt adjured us to do. Then, perhaps, we shall together see this island as a precious area of life-giving and life-enlarging tranquillity in this arena of fiercely contending wills, ambitions and aspirations that is the Capital of the United States, the capital of the free world. Stretch your imaginations and see, with me, on this island, the old and the young, the wise and the ignorant, the somebodies and the nobodies of this world, communing here with the spirits of the past, and finding here again the lost standards, the lost perspectives of generations less man-centered, less absorbed in the tangible, than our own. See, with me, under these overarching boughs, the four-star general, the statesman, the senator, the diplomat, standing hushed, perhaps, in an attitude of wonder, hearing in the cathedral quiet that inner voice, that a noisy, undisciplined age has, for too many, drowned out.

Searching their souls, under the impact of that voice, the man of action, the man of thought, and ordinary people from near and far, may, in this green silence, apprehend the ultimate responsibility of the free citizen, be he statesman or streetcleaner: the relation to the national security, the national greatness, of the kind of person he is and the kind of life he lives; the relation of his moral confusion and inner division to the confusion and division in his Nation; the relation of his inner peace to the unity of his Nation and to peace in the world.

As I close, I ask you to give thought to these trees under which we have gathered in this dedicated twilight. Through the years, the decades, the generations, they will grow to maturity and, at last, to grandeur. So some of us hope, believe, trust, that the pilgrims who come for an hour or a day to breathe the air of this sanctuary may find here the sustance by which men mature and grow toward greatness.

See, with me, these people, finding here, perhaps, a deeper understanding of freedom, a deeper devotion to the free spirit. See, with me, this forest, growing with the passing generations, loftier and more mysterious, until no temple built by human hands shall match it. See, with me, this island of new perceptions and widening horizons, of new faith and assurance, new life, new power, a new day; see it as the one shrine and place of pilgrimage in the world that free men everywhere shall have in common.

Let your imaginations seize upon these people, these woods, this world shrine. For it is to this vision that this sanctuary of the free spirit is dedicated.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is it understood that the bill was called up with the understanding that it was cleared with the two leaders?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I spoke to both the leaders, just prior to the quorum call; and I understood the majority leader to say that he understood it was satisfactory to the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] if the amendment were proposed.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield to me?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I think we should also include in our expressions of appreciation the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. As a matter of fact, the Senator from Georgia has yielded more than any of the rest of us could, because he felt so outraged by the design. His acceptance of this formula certainly indicates his desire to get this done.

Again I should like to thank most sincerely the Senator from South Dakota for devising this arrangement.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I thank the Senator from New York.

Mr. President, if I misunderstood in any respect the statement by the majority leader to the effect that the arrangement is satisfactory to the Senator from Georgia, I shall be glad to request, later on, that the action taken on the bill be vacated.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Senator's word is good enough for me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendment and third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H.R. 8665) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senate bill 2561 be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SALES TAX

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, during the past 2 days, bills providing salary increases for the policemen, the firemen, and the schoolteachers of the District of Columbia have been passed by the Senate.

There has also come from the District of Columbia Committee, calendar 1917, House bill 10346, relating to an increase in the District of Columbia sales tax. It is very well recognized what the situation regarding that bill would be.

I simply wish to state again, for the RECORD, that I am in favor of the bill, and I believe it should be passed. I do not think it was necessary at all to couple that bill with either of the two bills which increased the salaries of the firemen and policemen of the District of Columbia and the schoolteachers of the District of Columbia.

But I also recognize the fact that the District of Columbia will, of necessity, have to have an increase in a certain kind of tax, in order to meet its budget. On the other hand, I understand that is not an urgent matter until the Congress returns in January.

But again I state that I think a sales tax is a justifiable tax for the District of Columbia to use in raising revenue.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. FREAR. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I wish to say to the Senator from Delaware that what he has said is accurate; and we had to wear down his opposition in order to get the three District of Columbia bills to which he has referred brought to the floor ahead of the measure, reported by the District of Columbia Committee, having to do with an increase in the District of Columbia sales tax from 2 to

3 percent. That was made very plain during the course of the debate on those bills. Certainly if anyone has any doubt as to the position of the Senator from Delaware in regard to the sales tax for the District of Columbia, such a person either is dense or else does not want to ascertain the situation.

Mr. FREAR. I am grateful to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF HELIUM ACT OF SEPTEMBER 1, 1937

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10548) to amend the Helium Act of September 1, 1937, as amended, for the defense, security, and general welfare of the United States.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado will state it.

Mr. ALLOTT. Am I correct in understanding that House bill 10548 is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. ALLOTT. I expect to ask for the adoption of several minor, technical amendments; but I shall wait until my colleague is on the floor before I do so; and then I shall discuss at some little length the helium bill.

First of all, Mr. President, in 1925, Congress enacted the first Helium Act; and since that time the Government, through its various agencies, has exercised an almost complete monopoly, through the Helium Act.

Today, the situation in the United States is that the present consumption of helium is about 370 million cubic feet a year. To get some concept of what that amounts to, in terms of the need and the production of helium, let me say that the 370 million cubic feet a year now being used is 80 times the amount of helium that was being used in 1937.

Mr. President, helium is a very vital and essential part of our national defense program, our missile program, and our atomic energy program. Seventy percent of the helium gas now being consumed in the United States is used directly by the Department of Defense, the Atomic Energy Commission, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and other Federal agencies. An additional 20 percent is used in industry on Federal defense and atomic energy contracts. In other words, we face a situation today in which 90 percent of the helium now manufactured or extracted in the United States is used either directly in our defense or missile programs or in private defense plants which have contracts with the Federal Government.

Approximately 10 percent of the present production of helium gas is used in the so-called civilian industrial field, that is, by consumers who do not have Government contracts. To illustrate, helium gas is used as a shield in welding processes involving aluminum, titanium, and other lightweight metals. It is necessary in welding, where there is a presence of oxygen, to use helium noncombustible gas as a shield so that the welding process may be accomplished.

In addition to the uses which I have just mentioned, the new field of cryogenics, involving extremely low temperatures, makes helium an absolute necessity, because at the present time there is no method of getting a temperature below 20 degrees above absolute zero without the use of helium. Of course, at absolute zero molecular action ceases and all kinds of queer things happen to every substance that is exposed to such temperatures. This field, which has just opened in the past few years, offers and will offer some fantastic possibilities in overall basic science and basic research.

Mr. President, why a helium bill? A fundamental reason for the helium bill is, as I have said, that as a result of the increase in consumption, we are faced with the possibility of our supplies of helium being exhausted.

Where are the supplies of helium? Unfortunately, or perhaps fortunately, the known great supplies of helium lie mostly in the panhandle areas of Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas—I say to my colleague from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] I will get around to New Mexico in just a moment; I was just going around the circle—and New Mexico. There are no considerable supplies in Colorado, although on the western slopes there are two small possible supplies.

In the panhandle area the helium is mixed with natural gas. When I refer to the panhandle area, I refer to the great panhandle of southwestern Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, northeastern New Mexico, and perhaps, although not developed yet, the very southeastern portion of Colorado.

So the great supply of helium which is available in this country has to be developed from this one area. There are other sources of helium available also. In Arizona there are some small supplies of helium which may be developed from noncombustible gases—in other words, not hydrocarbons which can be burned—but these as yet are small and insignificant as compared with the helium which can be developed in the great panhandle area for the future of the United States.

With the great increase in consumption of helium in this country, we are faced with problems. One of the problems is, what are we going to do with this bill? What we hope to do with this bill is one of two things: to expand the Helium Act of 1925 so it is workable in present-day concepts, and present-day needs; or give the Department of the Interior the power of condemnation to take this helium or to take the wells or to take the pipelines, if that becomes a necessity, in order that we can accomplish the preservation and conservation of helium. There is no justification for this bill except upon the basis that it is a vital resource which is being wasted.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I am very happy to yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I am interested in what the distinguished Senator from Colorado has said about the power of condemnation of wells, pipelines, and sources of supply. That power is to be envisioned only in the event the industry would fail to cooperate with a Government program; is it not?

Mr. ALLOTT. That is quite true. Under the proposed bill, if the President declares an emergency, we would go into a second phase where that is possible. Under the present helium law, the Secretary of the Interior already has the power to condemn. What we are trying to do is get away from the straitjacket of condemnation, where the Secretary can contract with private suppliers or individuals or firms to develop and build the plants themselves, rather than condemn and take the land as the sole method of producing helium.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. With reference to the extraction of helium which the Federal Government, as has been pointed out by the distinguished Senator from Colorado, has shown a need for in the future, the residue gas, after the helium has been extracted, should certainly not remain in the control or ownership of the Government. I assume it would be envisoned that the residues would still be the property of the producer or pipeline and would go into the regular channels of trade or transportation as we know them to exist today. Is that correct?

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator is correct, and he has raised a question on which I think we ought to develop the legislative history right now. We have no intention by this bill in any way to interfere with the regulation of natural gas by the Federal Power Commission or by any other agency which may have the power to regulate. The only purpose of this bill is to provide the means by which we can set a helium plant literally astride a gasoline to provide for the extraction of helium. It is my hope we can do this by private investment rather than by forcing the Secretary to condemn and build his own plant.

Mr. President, before we proceed, for the sake of the record perhaps we ought to make clear exactly how important this proposal is to the national welfare.

Further increases of helium production are anticipated in fantastic proportions. We are losing the helium which comes out of the great Panhandle area, because it goes through the pipelines to industrial concerns which use gas to heat homes and for many other uses. When the gas is burned, the helium is not burned. The helium simply goes up the chimney or the flue, and is lost to us forever. The helium content of such gas on the average does not exceed one-half of 1 percent by volume, so the amount of helium which would be taken out of the gas by volume would be a very insignificant portion.

If we continue the present rate of consumption our helium supply will be exhausted, it is estimated by the people in the Department of the Interior and

by other experts—I think they are all unanimous—by about 1980 to 1985. We should bear in mind the national emergency nature of the proposed legislation.

I know the question will arise, "How will the program be financed?" At the bottom of page 17 and on page 18 of the bill there is a provision that there must be an initial appropriation by Congress to start the program. I read beginning at line 22 on page 17: "except that the Secretary shall not make such contracts and agreements which shall require payments by the Government in any one fiscal year aggregating more than the amount which shall be established initially in an appropriation act and which may be increased from time to time in appropriation acts"—

That is the first limitation. Frankly, this is the sort of situation in which one cannot ask a private individual to invest a great deal of money in a plant and then ask him to subject himself to the vicissitudes and the uncertainties of appropriations year after year. Therefore, the bill provides for a borrowing authority by the Secretary of the Interior from the Treasury, with interest which is to be compounded annually.

It is estimated that in the first instance the money will be borrowed from the Treasury, but, after the money is borrowed, it will in turn be repaid from sales. Over a 25-year period the sales of helium will not only liquidate the amounts borrowed from the Treasury but will also liquidate the interest on the notes which the Secretary of the Interior will give to the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ALLOTT. I am happy to yield to my friend from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. To whom will the sales be made?

Mr. ALLOTT. The sales will be made primarily to the Government.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Government will be the principal user of helium?

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator from Ohio was probably otherwise engaged when I went over this proposal. Today 90 percent of the helium is used directly in the NASA missile development and space programs, defense programs, in the atomic energy field, or by private industry working under Government contracts in these fields.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The statement which was made, that the executing officer would borrow the money from the Treasury and pay it back at compound interest, really would mean that the money would be borrowed from the Treasury to buy helium, let us say, and then the helium would be sold to Government departments.

Mr. ALLOTT. And to contractors.

Mr. LAUSCHE. And to contractors. What really will happen is that the Government will put up the money but will not truthfully receive the money back, because in the final analysis there will still be an expenditure by the taxpayers, though a necessary one.

Mr. ALLOTT. Perhaps from the Senator's point of view that is true. I would not argue.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It is a bookkeeping operation.

Mr. ALLOTT. No, it is far more than that.

The situation as it is today is that if the Department of Defense wishes to obtain so much helium, it must buy it. If the Atomic Energy Commission wishes so much helium, it must pay for it. We do not have Government control over helium, with the helium parceled out to departments as they wish to have it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is correct.

Mr. ALLOTT. Actually, this is a way of financing the purchases of helium by contractors and also by the various departments of Government, so that it is not all thrown into one pocket, where we let Susie, Mary, and Jane dip into it as they wish.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The point I wish to make—and if I am not correct, I am sure the Senator will correct me—is that the Government will not be making a profit, and then out of the profit paying off the debt.

Mr. ALLOTT. No, the Government will not make a profit.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The only profit——

Mr. ALLOTT. May I finish my thought for my friend?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes.

Mr. ALLOTT. The Government will have to sell the helium at a price which now has to be estimated, because they do not know what they shall contract for, in the neighborhood of $40 a thousand.

It is estimated that the $40 a thousand will make possible the amortization of the advances for the purchases of helium, which will be stored underground. It will make possible the amortization of that money and also the interest on that money over a 25-year period.

Does that answer the question of my friend?

Mr. LAUSCHE. It will amortize the money with money one branch of the Government will pay to another branch of the Government.

Mr. ALLOTT. To a certain extent that is true, but the departments would have to purchase the helium, anyway.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Therefore, an agency is being created which will have charge of the responsibilities of gathering helium, paying for it, and selling it to other branches of Government—selling a part of it, probably to private industry, amounting to some 10 percent.

Mr. ALLOTT. I do not think that is, in the strict context, an exact statement, I will say to my friend. Actually, the Federal Government is not creating any new agency. The Department of the Interior, under the act of 1925, as amended, presently has the power of condemnation. The situation is that we will simply be permitting the Secretary a flexibility in the acquisition, the storage, and the preservation of helium which he does not now have. We will not be creating any new department or any new commission.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I am not challenging the statements made by the Senator from Colorado that this may be an indispensable progam, having in mind the importance of helium to our Federal Government operations.

Mr. ALLOTT. I am sure the Senator did not have that question in his mind, and my only purpose in answering him is to try to clear up any questions that he may have in his own mind.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. For the legislative history, it can be pointed out that the storage facilities for the helium would be installations already owned completely and totally by the Government of the United States; is that not correct?

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator is correct, so far as the present situation is concerned. Conceivably 20 or 25 years or some time in the future the Government may have to acquire or make ready additional storage. But as of now the statement of the Senator from Kansas is certainly true with respect to the foreseeable future.

In further explanation of the question of my friend, the distinguished Senator from Kansas, the helium is proposed to be stored in underground storage in gas fields which have been exhausted, and so the space is available for it.

My colleague from Colorado is on the floor, and I understand he has cleared this point. In concluding, I wish to point out that on page 29, line 20 of the bill, there is a typographical error. The word should be "The," and not "Thea," as it is shown. I ask unanimous consent that that correction may be made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ALLOTT. Also for the benefit of those who may study this subject later and who might possibly be misled, there are numerous errors in the bill as it is printed in the report, and no one should ever rely upon the bill as it appears there, but rather upon the bill as it is now on the desks of Senators. This is the bill that was reported. There were errors in the copying of the bill, and I note the error at this time for the benefit of anyone who may wish to study the subject later.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further to enable me to get additional information?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. In the event the Government is required to construct the plant that will extract the helium, what does the Senator from Colorado think will be the estimated expenditure?

Mr. ALLOTT. I have no way of giving the Senator that information except that according to all the information given to the committee, and numerous conversations with the Secretary of the Interior, and particularly with the Assistant Secretary, Mr. Royce A. Hardy, it would be much higher than if the Secretary is able to contract for the facilities with private individuals or firms.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Did the Department not submit an estimate of what it would cost to build the proposed plant?

Mr. ALLOTT. No, not before the Senate committee. I am not sure whether it did before the House committee or not. There is no question but that the cost would be much greater.

I hope the Secretary will never have to exercise the power of condemnation, because to do so would raise a myriad of problems that might actually interfere with the conservation program as such.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The bill contemplates then 1 of 2 courses: One, to buy the helium from private producers and to store it; two, if that arrangement is not made, for the Government to build its own plant and condemn the necessary facilities to carry that plant into operation.

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator is correct, and it is hoped that the Government will be able to contract with private firms to produce it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I direct the Senator's attention to page 4 of the report, the last paragraph at the bottom:

> The legislation authorizes borrowing from the Treasury, in amounts authorized in regular appropriation acts, over a period of 25 years. The Department plans to borrow up to $255 million.

I will stop at that point. What would the $255 million be used for?

Mr. ALLOTT. That amount would be used for the purchase of the helium, its transportation, storage, and conservation.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is the amount of money it is contemplated would be expended in 25 years?

Mr. ALLOTT. That is correct. That is the scope of the program.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The report states further:

> Repayments to the Treasury from the helium production fund as set up in the bill in the succeeding years would amount to $500 million, fully assuring return of the amounts borrowed and interest thereon.

How would the $500 million be accumulated?

Mr. ALLOTT. Let me return to the first fundamental. The Government hopes to be able to contract this helium at somewhere around $10, perhaps a little less, maybe a little more. Then the Government would sell it and, as I stated previously, the anticipated selling price would be somewhere around $40 a thousand, in order that the amount which the Government would advance, together with the interest upon the amount, could be liquidated. That is where the $500 million would come from.

Mr. LAUSCHE. However, the Senator has stated that 90 percent of the helium would be used by some Government agency.

Mr. ALLOTT. Seventy percent would be used by a governmental agency; 20 percent by firms who are contracting with the Government in one of these fields.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Then the profit would be made on the 20 percent; or does the Senator feel that the 70 percent, for which the Government would pay 100 percent more than it originally paid to buy it, would be a profit?

Mr. ALLOTT. It would be sold to private individuals and the Government at the same price. No profit is involved.

Mr. LAUSCHE. There would be no profit, then, so far as the Government's use of it is concerned?

Mr. ALLOTT. There would be no profit, period.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I still do not understand how $500 million would be obtained from the $255 million. Where would the $245 million come from?

Mr. ALLOTT. The $245 million would come from the interest which must be paid upon this amount, and the other costs incident to the administration, including the storage of the helium.

Mr. LAUSCHE. One final question. Except for the helium that would be sold to private industry, as far as the Government is concerned, it would be a bookkeeping operation because as buyer, we would be using taxpayers' money to buy the helium, and then in selling, we would be selling to a Government agency, which would be using the taxpayers' money to pay the price.

Mr. ALLOTT. If the Senator should take that view, the answer would have to be yes; but it is no more of a changing of pockets or a bookkeeping transaction than it is at the present time.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That still does not negate what I have said.

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator simply cannot say that this is the whole Government, and then permit everyone to dip into it. The Defense Department, for example, has to pay for and buy its share of the helium it uses. NASA has to pay for and buy its share of the helium it uses.

The Atomic Energy Commission must do this. The various organizations throughout the country which have defense contracts of one kind or other with the Government would have to buy their share of helium. I really cannot see any other way, to be honest with my friend, that this operation could be handled.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I am not disputing that. When the Defense Department buys it, it uses taxpayers' money.

Mr. ALLOTT. That is right.

Mr. LAUSCHE. NASA also.

Mr. ALLOTT. Yes. Everything that is purchased by the Government ultimately is paid for by the Government with taxpayers' money. In that respect the Senator is right.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SMATHERS obtained the floor.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I am glad to yield to the Senator from New Mexico, chairman of the Military Appropriations Subcommittee, with the proviso that I do not lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I thank the Senator from Florida for his graciousness. I would not impose upon his good nature and his patience, or his time, if it were not that I felt that a report should be made to the Senators who are so patient as to be here and, better still, to the American people, on our national security posture.

OUR NATIONAL SECURITY

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I have listened to and read with great interest the various speeches on defense that have been made in this Chamber since the Congress reconvened on the 8th of August. Certainly, there is no subject more worthy of the attention of this body or more important to the welfare and security of the American people than the defense of our country.

It is the solemn duty of each of us to provide our people with a full understanding of the measures taken by their Government to assure the defense of this Nation. It is particularly incumbent upon me, as chairman of the Defense Department Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee for the past 6 years, to speak out frankly to the American people, to reassure them where reassurance is in order, to warn them where danger is evident, and to offer constructive criticism wherever needed.

First, it is essential that the American people have a proper appreciation of the nature of the threat to our national security. I believe most Americans understand that the ultimate objective of the Communists is to communize the entire world. To accomplish this objective, they rely not only on military power but also on political, economic, propaganda, and subversive means. Nor do they have any particular timetable in achieving their objective. They believe history is working for them. They are not in a hurry, because they believe in the inevitability of communism. Their scientific politics, they believe, will win in the end.

Therefore, our total national security policy must provide not only for meeting the military but also the economic, political, propaganda and subversive aspects of the Communist threat. And above all the American people should clearly understand that the threat we face is not one which is likely to recede at any time soon. Already we have lived with it for more than four decades and we may well have to live with it for another four decades.

LONG-RANGE DEFENSE OBJECTIVE

Defense, therefore, is not a matter for a particular year. Each annual defense budget is simply another increment of a continuous long-range defense program. Although each individual year's budget is important, the longer range objectives must always be borne carefully in mind.

This has been the approach of the Defense Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations. We realize that an adequate overall defense can be provided in many different ways by many different combinations of specific programs. We have listened to the defense experts long enough to realize that there is a wide range of opinion even within the Defense Department as to what constitutes the optimum combination of programs for our defense. We have debated the defense problem with our colleagues in the Senate and in the House for long enough to know that even within the Congress there is a wide range of opinion as to what constitutes a properly balanced defense effort.

We have learned to respect these differences in viewpoint. We honor the spirit and dedication of the men who directly bear the responsibility for the Nation's defenses—Secretary of Defense Gates and his Deputy, Mr. Douglas, Secretary of the Army Brucker, Secretary of the Navy Franke, and Secretary

of the Air Force Sharp, General Lemnitzer, Admiral Burke, General White, and General Shoup. These are men who spend every working hour on the problem of the Nation's defense. The Nation is fortunate indeed to have at the head of the Defense Establishment men of their experience and knowledge of military affairs.

We honor no less the vision, understanding, and knowledge of our colleagues in the House even though each year we differ with them on some of the details of the defense program. Chairman Mahon of the Defense Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee and his colleagues are men of the highest integrity, patriotism, and competence. They draw on many years of firsthand experience with the defense program, and their views are entitled to and receive the most careful consideration, not only in the Congress but also in the executive branch of the Government and the Nation at large.

Yet we do have differences with our colleagues in the House and with the executive branch and, for that matter, among the members of our subcommittee. But both in the House and in the Senate partisanship stops at the door of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittees. Our foremost concern is an adequate defense for the Nation. Although we do not agree in every detail, we respect each other's viewpoint and strive together to provide such a defense in the best way we know how.

Through the years we have tried to determine exactly what is needed and have been careful to provide those who bear the direct responsibility for the execution of the defense program with all the funds that are necessary.

Much has been said in the past year or two about the adequacy of our defense budget. That differences of opinion are brought to light and debated is sound policy, good for America. Only in that way may we be assured that consideration has been given to the best thinking that the country can provide.

Personally, I am of the opinion that the 1961 appropriation as passed by Congress is generally adequate to meet the defense needs of this hour. There are areas in which each of us, I am sure, would make changes. But viewed from the broad interests of all three services, from the statements of military experts, from the conclusions of our own members, I have confidence that the law which you so recently passed upon fulfills the needs of our military plans at the present time.

CHANGES IN REQUEST

At this point I should like to mention how I personally feel about changes in the budget which the Defense Department requests subsequent to submission to Congress.

We want Defense officials to feel free to come to us anytime the situation changes, anytime there are new requirements, anytime additional funds are needed for national defense. We are aware that the situation is changing rapidly and that the entire defense program must be kept under continuous review. We do not wish to discourage changes in the program where they are warranted and where our defense posture can be improved thereby. We do not want the Defense officials to feel that every time they make such a change they are admitting to error. It is in the interest of the Nation's defense to make such changes promptly wherever they are required. We are always ready to assist the Department in making such changes wherever the help of the Congress or the committee is needed and we hope that we can continue this arrangement in the future.

The President has already indicated that a modest amount of additional funds for military personnel and operation and maintenance may be required for the new readiness measures recently undertaken by the Department of Defense. When a final determination is made by the executive branch as to how much is needed and for what purposes, I am sure that the Senate Appropriations Committee will give the additional request a most sympathetic hearing.

ADEQUACY OF DEFENSE PROGRAM

With respect to our retaliatory forces, I feel our present position is good. My concern is with our position in the future. We have, in the last year or so, entered a new era in military technology—the era of the intercontinental ballistic missile. This terrible weapon, armed with a nuclear warhead of tremendous destructiveness, can travel at speeds of 16,000 to 18,000 miles an hour. Because of its speed and destructiveness, it is a weapon which lends itself particularly well to surprise attack. The question that confronts the Nation is how best to insure our continued retaliatory capability at a time when the Soviet Union may well have a large number of such weapons.

It is an entirely new problem to us and, for that matter, to the rest of the world. Nobody can say with certainty what is the best way to deal with this threat. One thing is clear: Mere numbers of retaliatory weapons will not solve this problem. The tremendous speed and destructiveness of the ICBM and the fact that as yet we have no system of defense against it places a very high premium on the invulnerability of our retaliatory forces.

ICBM CAPABILITIES

That is why the Senate Appropriations Committee strongly supported the increase of about $382 million in the Polaris program. Here is a retaliatory system uniquely fitted to the ballistic missile age. The Polaris incorporates into a single weapon most of the great scientific developments which have so revolutionized warfare—the nuclear warhead, the ballistic missile, nuclear propulsion, inertial guidance for navigation, as well as the latest development in hull design and ship control. With their unique ability to operate deep below the surface of the oceans for long periods of time, they are virtually immune to surprise attack.

Less than 2 weeks ago, at Groton, Conn., in company of Admiral Raborn, of Polaris fame and history, I visited the *Ethan Allan*, one of our Polaris submarines. It is a remarkable ship, about whose capabilities we are entitled to brag.

Because they can operate in the oceans of the world comprising seven-tenths of the earth's surface, these submarines can make the maximum use of the principle of dispersion.

In other words, they are not sitting ducks.

But the Nation cannot rely on just one retaliatory weapon system. The committee has fully supported the mixed force concept. Each weapon system has its own strengths and weaknesses, both with respect to its vulnerability and its effectiveness. Therefore, a variety of different systems complicates the enemy's problem both in attacking our forces and defending against them. Here is a classic case where the whole is stronger than the sum of its parts.

Recognizing this, Congress has approved in the past session increased funds above the budget requests not only for Polaris, but also for Atlas and Minuteman. Release of these funds by the Department indicates the wisdom of supplying these increases.

The committee has also fully supported the efforts of the Department of Defense to improve the survivability of our strategic missile forces. We have provided all the funds requested for hardening the Atlas and Titan teams. We have provided the funds required to develop a storable fuel for the later Titan missiles. This would permit them to be launched very quickly from their underground resting places without the necessity of raising them to the surface before they are fired.

With regard to the Minuteman, the committee has fully supported both the hardening concept and the mobility concept. Some of the Minuteman missiles will be emplaced in hardened underground sites and others will be embarked on trains which will be constantly on the move. Because the Minuteman is solid fueled, it inherently has a very quick reaction time.

MANNED BOMBER SYSTEM

In this session of Congress, the manned bomber force was not neglected either. While the 1961 appropriations provide almost $4 billion for the four ballistic missile systems, over $2 billion is provided for the manned bomber systems. Funds have been appropriated for the procurement of additional B–52's and B–58's and their accompanying tankers; for the procurement of the Hound Dog air-to-ground missile and the Quail decoy missile; for the development of the B–70, a new supersonic long-range jet bomber, and the Skybolt, a new air-to-ground ballistic-type missile with a range and speed considerably greater than the Hound Dog.

The committee felt so strongly in favor of the mixed-force concept that it added $285 million for the B–70 program. This sum was reduced to $190 million in conference with the House. But language was added to the conference report to make it clear that the $100 million provided for additional fighter aircraft, if not required for that purpose,

"shall be made available only for the B–70 aircraft program." These sums are in addition to the $75 million requested by the President for the B–70 program.

The Secretary of Defense has decided that $100 million of these additional funds would, in fact, be applied to the B–70 program during the current fiscal year. By so doing we indicated that we cannot afford to place complete reliance on even such promising ballistic missiles as the Atlas, Titan, Polaris, and Minuteman. What the future may bring as to the proper mix of ICBM and manned bomber forces is still unknown. This is a problem which both Congress and the Department of Defense must follow closely from year to year. At the present time it certainly would not be wise to place complete dependence on either system to the exclusion of the other.

AIRBORNE ALERT CAPABILITY

The Defense Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee also fully supports the Department's efforts to enhance the survivability of the retaliatory forces. The dispersal of the heavy bomber force has already been substantially accomplished, and we are glad to learn that action is now being taken to increase the dispersal of the medium bomber force. One-third of all the manned bombers and their accompanying tankers are being maintained on a 15-minute ground alert.

This is necessary and desirable, but it may not be enough in the light of the growing ballistic missile threat. Accordingly, the committee strongly supported the concept of an airborne alert capability for the heavy bomber forces. Last year we introduced into the bill, what is now section 512b. This section authorizes the Secretary of Defense, upon determination by the President that such action is necessary, "to provide for the cost of an airborne alert as an excepted expense." In other words, the Defense Department is authorized to spend whatever moneys are necessary for an airborne alert, regardless of the amount appropriated. This is the broadest kind of authority the Congress could provide.

However, as a further inducement for the Defense Department to move forward with this program, the Senate conferees supported the House action to add another $85 million for this program.

Obviously, the speed and destructiveness of the ICBM places a high premium on warning. Funds have already been provided for the construction of a ballistic missile early warning system. Construction of this system is well along. The first station is expected to become operational this year, and the other two stations will follow soon after.

Recognizing the value of the early warning system, the Congress in the present session added substantial amounts to those requested in the budget for the rapid completion of the system.

WARNING SYSTEMS INCREASED

The ballistic missile early warning system will provide about 15 minutes of warning. This is a bare minimum, and obviously any device which would increase the warning time would be of tremendous value to our retaliatory capability. The committee has therefore strongly supported the Air Force Midas and Samos satellite programs, both of which are designed to provide early warning. We supported the Defense Department's request for an increase in the Midas program and at the same time added $83.8 million to the original budget request for the Samos program. The Midas is specifically designed to provide warning of ballistic missile attack by detecting the launching of the missile at an early state in its trajectory. The Samos is designed to provide a more general type of warning of preparations for an attack.

Additional funds were also added by the Congress for the Discoverer program.

NIKE-ZEUS SYSTEM

The committee has followed with great interest the development of the Nike-Zeus program, which is designed to provide an active defense against ballistic missile attack. It is clear, from everything we have heard from the experts in this field, that the Nike-Zeus involves technical problems of the highest order of difficulty. We have provided all the funds the Defense Department feels it can properly utilize to develop this system and test its feasibility. We shall watch very closely the progress of these tests, so that we may be in a position, next year, to determine for ourselves the desirability of advancing this system into production and deployment.

PREPAREDNESS FOR LIMITED WAR

While the new ICBM threat is rightfully accorded an important place in our defense preparations, we dare not neglect the older forms of the threat to our security. Limited wars are still a very real possibility. We shall continue to need a modernly equipped and mobile Army and Marine Corps, suitably deployed so that they can move promptly to meet the threat of local aggression. We shall continue to need a global Navy and a readily deployable tactical air force capable of promptly supporting our ground forces anywhere in the world.

We recognize that the United States cannot carry this burden alone, and that our safety rests in a system of collective security for the entire free world. But we do think that the U.S. contribution to these collective security forces must be modern, mobile, and properly equipped. The committee has, therefore, strongly supported, not only this year, but in years past, as well, the modernization of our limited war forces. We added to the President's January budget a total of about $250 million for modernization. This was later reduced in conference with the House to about $160 million. It is our hope that all of these additional funds for the modernization of Army weapons and equipment will be used during the current fiscal year.

We have also supported an increase in airlift of approximately $200 million, which was added for this purpose to the President's January budget. These funds, we are informed by the Secretary of Defense, will be fully utilized.

Perhaps one of the important actions we have taken on the fiscal year 1961 Defense budget is the approval of the conventionally powered carrier—the 8th of the *Forrestal* class. We feel the carrier task forces are a most important element of our limited-war capability, as well as general war capability. They permit the United States to bring to bear a military presence in areas of the world where no other military forces can be deployed without involving very difficult international problems. With many parts of the world in a state of political upheaval, this type of military capability may grow to be extremely important to the security position of the United States.

Recognizing the threat implied by large-scale construction of enemy submarines, the Congress added over $100 million to the substantial amounts contained in the budget for antisubmarine warfare. It is hoped the Department will be given the authority to commence construction immediately of the full program as approved by the Congress.

After all, all we can do is make the funds available. If the funds are used, the Department of Defense must use them for the purpose we intend. However, we cannot force the Department to do so.

MAINTENANCE OF STRENGTH OF RESERVE FORCES

It is often overlooked that a very important part of our defense capability rests with our Reserve Forces. The Congress has always strongly supported the maintenance of properly trained, properly equipped, and combat-ready Reserve Forces. We are greatly encouraged by the very real progress that has been achieved by our Federal Reserve components in the last few years. Now that they have been relieved of the task of basic training, these forces are able to concentrate on unit training, and have reached the highest level of readiness and combat capability in our history. This evaluation has been attested to by all the officials concerned with Reserve Force matters who have appeared before our committee.

Past wars, of which the Korean conflict is the most recent example, have demonstrated the need for a powerful, ready to act, Reserve Force. I have indicated repeatedly in the past by sponsoring and supporting amendments, that I do not believe that our Regular Army should be reduced to its present size. These efforts have not been successful. Accordingly, I believe that it would be a great mistake to make marked reductions in both the size of the Regular Forces and the Reserve Forces. Therefore, as in the past several years, the committee has strongly supported the maintenance of the Army Reserve and National Guard at their present strengths—300,000 and 400,000 men respectively. We were pleased to learn that the Department of Defense has agreed to support these forces at the levels desired by the Congress.

SUMMARY OF CONGRESSIONAL INCREASES AND PLANNED UTILIZATION

In all, the Congress appropriated during this present session a total of $39,996,608,000 in the Defense Department Appropriation Act, which excludes military construction.

Do Senators realize how much money that is? For that department, for 1

year, it is more than $11 billion more than the cost of the rest of the Government. That is what it costs the American people for security.

This is about $661 million over the budget, after increases and decreases are balanced out. It is about $518 million under what the Senate would have provided, but it is $658 million over the House figure. Disregarding certain reductions made by the Congress, including those recommended by the Department of Defense, the Congress added about $1,815 million to the original request. In the Secretary of Defense's letter to me of August 9 he has indicated that about $1,371 million of this increase will be utilized this year, leaving a little over $440 million unprogramed.

Major unprogramed items include, in round numbers, $93 million for Army modernization; $70 million for Polaris; $63 million for antisubmarine warfare; $97 million for additional fighter aircraft for air defense; $84 million for B–70 procurement; and $34 million for Samos. As I have already indicated, despite his decision, I hope that these funds will be utilized this year unless there are military reasons for deciding otherwise.

We are open to reason; but we want to make this money available for the purposes for which it was intended.

FLEXIBILITY NEEDED

Mr. President, the people of this country want to be sure that our Military Establishment is provided with all the resources it needs to assure the Nation's defense. I believe the Congress in this session has to the greatest practical degree met this responsibility. But the American people should realize that many of the problems we face in the world today cannot be solved by military means and cannot be solved by simply increasing military expenditures. On the other hand, as I stated at the outset, the threat we face is many sided. It is political, subversive, economic, and psychological, as well as military. The Nation must marshal its resources and meet the threat on all fronts. Patience and diplomacy and faith and confidence in our way of life must be called forth in even greater measure and degree than heretofore if we are to deal successfully with the vexing international problems which so sorely try the patience of our people.

Therefore, it would be wise in the months ahead for the Department of Defense to scrutinize with the utmost care a variety of areas for possible increased emphasis. Some of these areas I wish to mention at this time.

I believe that consideration should be given to a more rapid Army modernization program, with particular emphasis on an up-to-date tank program and a modern communications system. In other words we should, "Step on it." We should not use a .22 if we can use a .45.

I believe that the size of our current Army and Marine Corps should be reviewed, and in doing this careful weight should be given as to their adequacy to accomplish all possible missions and objectives in both limited and general warfare.

We know we can always depend on the Marines and the Army when we have a need for them.

For possible budgetary consideration in the next year, I believe that the possibility should be explored of increasing the Polaris system to the fullest degree practical and with efficient shipbuilding. We should consider accelerating it. It is a fine weapon. It is one of the best deterrents we shall have against war, and we ought to accelerate the program as much as we can. The Navy's fleet modernization and rehabilitation program should be reexamined for possible augmentation so as to avoid the dangerous obsolescence even now threatening our fleet.

It would be surprising to many Senators if they knew how many of our so-called warships are obsolete and in mothballs.

I believe that continued emphasis, as indicated by congressional add-ons, should be applied to the anti-submarine-warfare program and that possible increases in the Navy fighter program should be considered.

Recently I had the opportunity to witness in Puerto Rico the remarkable achievement of Air Force and Army cooperation in airlifting fighting troops and equipment great distances.

In these days we cannot delay troop transportation. Decisions are effected overnight.

I believe careful consideration should be given to the possible future importance of massive airlift operations and their role in maintaining the stability and peace of the world of tomorrow. Certainly the situation in Africa has demonstrated that our airlift capability must not be limited and must be at a high state of readiness to function within an hour's notice.

I believe that we should consider not only the importance of our ICBM program, but that of the manned bomber fleet—the latter with the latest and most advanced concepts our technical geniuses can supply. The additional funds provided by the Congress will provide an answer as to the feasibility of the B–70 bomber concept and its role in future warfare. Certainly it should not be retarded by financial considerations.

Nor must the space vehicle and satellite programs already in being be allowed to wither on the vine for lack of financial nourishment. The seemingly fantastic space dreams of yesterday have already become the realities of today.

In the hands of international aggressors they might well become the nightmares of the future. We must not allow this to take place.

In summary, I believe that rapid technical changes and political and military adjustments abroad, among other considerations, all necessitate a flexible position, a willingness to change our thinking should it be deemed advisable.

Should such a careful reevaluation of these and other areas of possible strengthening reveal just one important need for implementation, then the entire review will have been more than worthwhile.

Certainly, America today is militarily able—and I say this in all sincerity—to defend itself and protect the free world in nuclear combat. We must keep it so in the future. In so doing we shall not be swayed, I trust, by financial or partisan considerations. In my opinion, there has never been one bit of partisanship when it comes to the question of appropriating money for the national defense.

The chairman of the subcommittee gets as much help from one side of the aisle as he gets from the other.

Nor shall we be misguided by aggressor nations which use pretenses of friendship or loud boasts of superiority. Instead, we must continue to build our military machine into such a power that brooks no doubt in the minds of our friends or foes alike that our might, should it ever be released, will be overwhelming. Only in this way may we continue to maintain a free world. Only in this way may we be able at some day in the future to sit down and hammer out a just peace for the future of mankind.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TALMADGE in the chair). Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I commend the Senator from New Mexico for his very excellent presentation. The Senator has had much experience in regard to this subject. His advice is well worth listening to. I was especially pleased to understand he had decided to make the presentation today.

I think the Senator has made a statement in this regard, but what is the Senator's appraisal of our position militarily, as to our ability to defend our country and to defend the free world at this moment?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I answer that in the best of faith and conscience. I believe we are ready for anything. The reason I said we should have flexibility is that, although we do not have to worry about today, we do not know what we may face tomorrow.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes. I am quite certain many other Senators, as I do, constantly receive mail complaining about waste, malfeasance and misfeasance in the handling of supplies, the acquisition and disposal of supplies. May I ask whether the committee in its hearings has gone into that subject at all?

Mr. CHAVEZ. We have gone into that in the committee. We have studied waste and malpractices in the purchasing of materials. I ask the Senator to imagine the tremendous extent of procurement in the Department of Defense alone.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Department is trying to eliminate waste and malfeasance.

The Senator knows that I am a Member on this side of the aisle. I have been assured—and I am positive—that Secretary Gates, the other Secretaries, and even those in the high military echelons are most anxious to stop waste. Some waste is bound to occur in an operation of this size. When one is spending $40 billion, some mistakes are bound to happen.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I congratulate the senior Senator from New Mexico, the chairman of the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee which deals with the armed services, for the depth and the wisdom of the statement he has made. I particularly praise the Senator and the committee for the announcement that they will continue in an even more vigorous way the modernization of our conventional forces. This will include, of course, the modernization of our airlift.

There is a need for mobility, to answer the threat of attack around the world. We must have the most modern equipment obtainable for the Army and our ground forces, I think, to give us security for the smaller wars, which most military authorities say constitute about 80 percent of the likelihood of the threat of military action.

I congratulate the Senator for his foresight, his wisdom, and the strong leadership he has taken to give us the best possible defense.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I thought it was only fitting and proper, I will say to my friend from Oklahoma, that the American people should be assured the Congress is alert as to our needs for an adequate national security.

These remarks are not made because I like to stand on the floor and talk. I think this is a necessary report to the American people, which will assure them we are ready for any contingency. We cannot relax because, though we are ready now, we do not know what we will face tomorrow. That is why I ask for flexibility. If the military leaders in the Pentagon wish to change their minds, we will go along with them, if we can.

Mr. MONRONEY. I congratulate the senior Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from New Mexico not only for the fine presentation of his subject matter but also for about 3 years' work in 1 year, which he has done this year, on the appropriation bill and the military program as a whole.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I thank my friend. I felt the American people should be advised that we are ready at the moment. I do not know what the situation will be tomorrow.

Mr. SMATHERS. The Senator is absolutely correct. I am delighted to have the Senator express his views. I join in congratulating the Senator from New Mexico for his labors in behalf of this Nation's defense and particularly for the very splendid statement he has made this afternoon.

THREATENED PENNSYLVANIA RAILROAD STRIKE

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I think we are agreed that the forced shutting down of the Pennsylvania Railroad, the largest railroad in the country, must not be allowed to happen.

The resources of the Railway Labor Act to protect the public and the Nation generally have been exhausted.

It seems to me that, in the public interest, both sides should be required to appear again before a neutral tribunal and be required to accept its decisions as final and binding. Too much of the public's interest is at stake to allow anything else.

I add that although the railroad comes only as far south as Washington, D.C., it is very important to Florida and to the southeast as a pathway to and from us on to New York and New England. It is important to us both for travel and freight. A lot of Florida's citrus fruits and other perishables, for instance, fan out into northern markets over the railroad involved.

Vital as these immediate public interests are, I suggest that the whole future of railroad service in this country may be at stake here. The purpose of the Transportation Act of 1958, for which most Senators voted, was to get the railroad industry a fighting chance to regain its strength as a servant of the people, the economy, and of the national defense.

The public and the national interest and safety must come first. An emergency of this serious nature would undoubtedly cause many Members of Congress to urge consideration and adoption of compulsory arbitration binding on both labor and management for situations like this, where the country simply must come first.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I am happy to yield briefly to my good friend from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I wish to join the Senator in what he has said. Looking at the problem from the point of view of organized labor, to which I have always been very favorable in this body and in the other body, I would say this is a time when self-discipline and statesmanship are needed equally by labor and management. I endorse what the Senator says. Although he and I might conceivably vote in a different manner on a labor reform bill, I certainly join the Senator in saying that this is the kind of thing which invites drastic legislation. If it can possibly be avoided, this should be an additional reason for avoiding it, as well as the overriding national interest.

I thank my friend.

Mr. SMATHERS. I greatly thank the able Senator from New York for those most statesmanlike assertions.

TRUE DEMOCRACY

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, in the Outlook section of the Washington Post and Times Herald of Sunday, August 14, 1960, there appeared an item about the autobiography of the Honorable D. S. SAUND, entitled "Congressman from India." In the item appeared a quotation from the book concerning my esteemed colleague, the Honorable CARL ALBERT, of Oklahoma, and his guidance as Democratic whip of the House to Judge SAUND as a new Congressman.

Inasmuch as this quotation is revealing as to both the character of my good friend CARL ALBERT and as to the spirit of our legislative body, I request unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRUE DEMOCRACY

Sixty-year-old D. S. SAUND, first Democrat ever elected to the House from his 29th California District, and the first person of Asian extraction ever elected to Congress, has just scored another first.

He's written an autobiography, "Congressman From India," published by Dutton, which provides more helpful information on what every enterprising freshman Congressman should know than about the fascinating story of his life.

Born in the small Indian village of Amritsar, SAUND graduated from the University of Panjab and came to the United States in 1920. How he subsequently was elected judge of the justice court of California's Westmoreland County, won his fight for citizenship and first was elected to Congress 4 years ago, sounds in the telling far easier than it was.

But a must for all new Congressmen are two chapters in this book—"Freshman Congressman" and "Battles on Capitol Hill." Whether from good advice or better judgment, SAUND learned quickly to do all of the right things.

In the process, his eyes were opened even wider on the democratic process.

Seems those herd-riding House leaders, of fact and fiction, never once told Saund how to vote on a bill, not even when the lines were close.

Said SAUND: "I recall many times asking the Democratic whip of the House (Representative CARL ALBERT, of Oklahoma, his opinion of how I should vote. Invariably his answer would be: 'Judge, vote your district.' What he meant was to vote the way the people in my district would want me to. He has told me several times: 'What we are most interested in is getting you reelected. Use your own judgment and follow your own convictions.' "

OCDM WASTES FUNDS ON PARTISAN PROPAGANDA

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, an incident has just been reported to me which offers shocking and disgusting proof of the complete irresponsibility in the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization.

This wasteful and boondoggling agency has not been content with silly schemes that have wasted billions of taxpayers' dollars, and with outmoded concepts which have failed to provide American people with real security in event of enemy attack. Now this bureaucratic monstrosity has extended its tentacles into the political life of the Nation.

An information bulletin dated July 29, 1960, issued by the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization at Battle Creek, Mich., featured a reprint of an article which appeared on the front page of the Chicago Tribune of July 19. This bulletin was published at Government expense and distributed by civil defense organizations. It is not only a shocking waste of taxpayers' money, but a revolting example of the misuse of governmental responsibility.

The article from the Chicago Tribune entitled, "Inquiring Camera Girl," was one of those feature stories which newspapers commonly carry asking questions of the average American on the street.

The question in this instance was "If it were your choice to make, would you rather acquire a swimming pool for your family or a bomb shelter?" One of the answers which was reproduced in the Civil Defense Information Bulletin was from an 18-year-old boy, a student, who said:

> I'd rather have a bomb shelter. There's a probability that the Democrats are going to get in in November. With their appeasement policies I think we are going to need bomb shelters. Their record has been war. Chicago would be a prime target.

I have no argument with the Chicago Tribune. What it wishes to print is its own business. However, it is inexcusable that any Government agency would reprint, at taxpayers' expense, political propaganda of this sort. Of course, it is not surprising that the boondoggling officials of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization would cite the opinion of an 18-year-old boy as authority for their ridiculous activities.

I again pay tribute to the thousands of civil defense voluntary workers who have given their services in time of natural disasters and other emergencies. They did not do so as Democrats, Republicans, or independents. It is unfortunate that the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, which, after all, is directly assigned to the Executive Office of the President, had to exploit the efforts of these patriotic men and women with such cheap political propaganda.

I will not take the time to comment on the validity of this evidently misguided 18-year-old's statement.

That is not the point.

The point is that once again our boondoggling civil defense agency has proved its ineptness and incapability of handling civil defense needs of the American people.

The Administrator of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Leo Hoegh, ex-Governor of Iowa, would do better to devote his time and that of his staff to the real needs of the American people than to meddling in the political affairs of the Nation.

The voters of Iowa gave him his chance once and defeated him on his second try for the governorship of that great State. One would think that he has learned to keep out of politics and be satisfied with his $22,500 a year sinecure at taxpayers expense.

This is just one more in a long series of hapless errors by the outmoded agency. It is my belief that it is worthy of immediate investigation by the proper committee of the Senate.

CONFERENCE OF THE ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, the past 2 years have brought the culmination in futility of this administration's foreign policy with respect to Latin America. As an American, I am afraid that I can take no pleasure nor satisfaction in the so-called diplomatic victory scored at the recent Conference of the Organization of American States at San José, Costa Rica.

I fear we have drifted into collaborating in the creation of a very dangerous political vacuum in the Caribbean for the sake of an inadequate and weak-kneed reproof to the Soviet-backed dictatorship of Fidel Castro in Cuba.

I fear that we have fallen into the trap of accepting words as the equivalent of substantive action when, as a matter of fact, the actions taken against the Dominican Republic may be enough to bring that Government down without consideration as to what will follow, whereas the empty words directed against Cuba will do the government of Fidel Castro no harm whatsoever.

Even as a verbal expression of anticommunism, the so-called declaration of San José is not very much of a forward step. Senators will recall the resolution passed by the OAS at its 10th meeting in Caracas in 1954. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CARACAS RESOLUTION

The 10th inter-American conference: Condemns the activities of the international Communist movement as constituting intervention in American affairs;

Expresses the determination of the American States to take the necessary measures to protect their political independence against the intervention of international communism, acting in the interests of an alien despotism;

Reiterates the faith of the peoples of America in the effective exercise of representative democracy as the best means to promote their social and political progress; and

Declares that the domination or control of the political institutions of any American state by the international Communist movement, extending to this hemisphere the political system of on extracontinental power, would constitute a threat to the sovereignty and political independence of the American States, endangering the peace of America, and would call for a meeting of consultation to consider the adoption of appropriate action in accordance with existing treaties.

Mr. SMATHERS. This resolution, passed in 1954, in brief, condemned the activities of the international Communist movement and expressed the determination of the American States to take "the necessary measures to protect their political independence against the intervention of international communism."

On August 28 at San José, the OAS adopted a declaration with respect to Communist intervention. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the declaration was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OAS DECLARATION OF SAN JOSÉ

The seventh meeting of consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs—

1. Condemns emphatically intervention or the threat of intervention, even when conditional, from an extracontinental power in the affairs of the American Republics and declares that the acceptance of a threat of extracontinental intervention by any American state jeopardizes American solidarity and security, wherefore the OAS is under obligation to disapprove it and reject it with equal vigor.

2. Rejects, also, the attempt of the sino-Soviet powers to make use of the political, economic, or social situation of any American state, inasmuch as that attempt is capable of destroying hemispheric unity and jeopardizing the peace and the security of the hemisphere.

3. Reaffirms the principles of nonintervention by any American state in the internal or external affairs of the other American states, and it reiterates that each state has the right to develop its culture, political, and economic life freely and naturally, respecting the rights of the individual and the principles of universal morality, and, as a consequence, no American state may intervene for the purpose of imposing upon another American state its ideology or political, economic, or social principles.

4. Reaffirms that the inter-American system is incompatible with any form of totalitarianism and that democracy will achieve the full scope of its objectives in the hemisphere only when all the American Republics conduct themselves in accordance with the principles stated in the Declaration of Santiago, Chile, which was approved at the fifth meeting of consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs, the observance of which it recommends as soon as possible.

5. Proclaims that all member states of the regional organization are under obligation to submit to the discipline of the inter-American system, voluntarily and freely agreed upon, and that the soundest guarantee of their sovereignty and their political independence stems from compliance with the provisions of the Charter of the Organization of American States.

6. Declares that all controversies between member States should be resolved by the measures for peaceful solution that are contemplated in the inter-American system.

7. Reaffirms its faith in the regional system and its confidence in the OAS, created to achieve an order of peace and justice that excludes any possible aggression, to promote solidarity among its members, to strengthen their collaboration, and to defend sovereignty, their territorial integrity, and their political independence, since it is in this organization that the members find the best guarantee for their evolution and development.

8. *Resolves*, That this declaration shall be known as the Declaration of San José, Costa Rica.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, this declaration "condemns emphatically intervention or the threat of intervention from any extracontinental power in the affairs of American Republics" and rejects the efforts of the Sino-Soviet bloc to make use of the political, economic, or social situation of any American Republic to create a wedge in the inter-American system. No mention is made of Cuba.

So far as I am able to determine the only significant difference between the Declaration of San José and the 6-year-old Caracas resolution is that the declaration "condemns emphatically" what the earlier resolution merely condemned.

Despite the 1954 promise of action, the San José Declaration proposed no concrete steps whatever to combat the menace of Sino-Soviet interference or the threat of intervention by Cuban-backed revolutionaries in the affairs of other American Republics. They completely

overlooked the attempted invasions of Nicaragua, Panama, the Dominican Republic, and Guatemala directed by the Fidelistas.

I do not know how anyone can say we have won a great victory when the San José Declaration of 1960 is in some respects weaker in its opposition to communism than was the Caracas resolution of 1954.

It appears to me that what is being held out to be a diplomatic victory is in fact clear-cut evidence that this State Department and this administration have failed, during the past 6 years, to exert significant leadership in the drive to alert other governments of this hemisphere to the danger of Communist intrusion.

ACTION AGAINST DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Prior to the adoption of the declaration, the San José conference also produced a decision on the part of the OAS to interrupt normal diplomatic relations with the Dominican Republic and to apply partial economic sanctions.

I want to make it perfectly clear that I hold no brief for the 30-year dictatorship that has existed and still exists in the Dominican Republic. I am no defender of dictatorships, whether of the left or of the right.

But I would remind the Senate that the Dominican Republic was our ally in the fight against Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy and for his help Generalissimo Trujillo was warmly thanked by the then President of the United States, Franklin D. Roosevelt, who wrote in 1942:

> The magnificent help given by the Government and the people of the Dominican Republic to the present war effort was profoundly appreciated and will never be forgotten by the people of the United States.

Apparently some people in the State Department have forgotten.

The Dominican Government is at the present time making available to the United States a part of its territory for a U.S. missile tracking station. If the Dominican Government should decide to eliminate that missile tracking station, I do not know whether our missile launching activities at Cape Canaveral, Fla., would continue to be as effective.

The Dominican Government has never abused the United States, nor threatened it. Nor has its chief condemned the U.S. television and radio; nor has the Government vilified our President, nor has it bragged of its close association with the Communists of Russia and Red China.

I would remind the Senate of John Foster Dulles' statement that, while he did not like dictators in this world of reality, he preferred friendly dictators to enemy dictators.

In this connection, it is well also to recall the French proverb that "the enemy of my enemy is my friend" and then Winston Churchill's immortal remark concerning Britain's new ally against the Nazis, the Soviet Union:

> I have only one purpose, the destruction of Hitler, and my life is much simplified thereby. If Hitler invaded Hell, I would make at least a favorable reference to the Devil in the House of Commons.

Mr. President, should we not ask ourselves—who is the major threat to this world's freedoms?

What do we conceive to be the real danger to our own Western Hemisphere and the principles enunciated in the Monroe Doctrine?

Is it the 30-year-old Government of the Dominican Republic which neither Secretary of State Cordell Hull nor any other Secretary of State from his day to this sought, in the words of Under Secretary Dillon, "to bring toppling down"? I remind Senators that we have had some outstanding Secretaries of State, including George Marshall, Stettinius, John Foster Dulles, and Dean Acheson.

Is it the Dominican Republic Government which has existed for 30 years in the Caribbean, which is the major threat to our freedoms today?

Does it threaten to set all Latin America afire? Does its leader threaten to bomb the United States of America? The answer is obviously "No."

Its Government we do not approve of, surely; its leadership is undemocratic, dictatorial. But, nonetheless, the Dominican Republic is not the major and prime threat to freedom in the Western Hemisphere today.

The principal threat and the principal enemy is international communism. And where is the fountainhead of communism today in the Western Hemisphere? It is not the Dominican Republic, but the Communist government of Fidel Castro. Every informed person knows this and most will, of course, admit it.

Yet what happened at Costa Rica? We proscribed the Government of the Dominican Republic and invoked sanctions against it and the United States and Mexico have now broken off relations with the Dominican Republic.

But what did we do insofar as Cuba and its Communist government were concerned?

We ignore the promises of action against communism contained in the Caracas Resolution of 1954 and we directed a watered-down, milk-toast, slap-on-the-wrist resolution of condemnation against the international Communists and we did not even have the forthrightness to mention the name of Fidel Castro or his Communist Government of Cuba.

Mr. President, can any reasonable person call this a great victory for freedom?

It reminds me of some brothers who before they fight, talk big—but once it starts they size up the opposition group, pick out the littlest and smallest of the opposition, beat him up then shout some belligerent words of warning at the real opponent, and then run into the house and talk about what a big victory they won.

Mr. President, who is it in the State Department or in this administration who believes that the 30-year-old Government of the Dominican Republic is a greater threat to the freedoms of the people in the Western Hemisphere than the Communist Government of Cuba?

Who really believes that the Government of the Dominican Republic needed to be ostracized whereas the Government of Cuba could go along threatening freedom without even so much as a real verbal spanking?

Oh, surely, I know some will say, well, we tried to get a strong action against Cuba, but some of the other countries would not go along.

Mr. President, I am sure that is true. But that is exactly where the State Department—and I do not like to say this—and the administration have failed in their leadership.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I commend the Senator for his remarks. I agree with him 100 percent. I, too, believe that the action that was taken toward the Dominican Republic will force that country to join with our Communist foes. Those people will have nowhere else to go, when we push them out. Where else can they go, and what else can they do, but what was done in Cuba? I agree with the Senator's statement.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thank the Senator.

If we cannot cause our friends in this hemisphere to see the difference between an ancient, static, expiring, nonexportable dictatorship which has lived 30 years adjacent to our shores and those of its other neighbors, on the one hand, and a new, inflammatory, virulent, belligerent, expanding, military dictatorship of the Communist variety which is working hand in glove with Khrushchev and Red China, on the other, then we do not know how to lead or present a case.

It is now no secret, Mr. President, that it was the intention of the State Department before the San José Conference to swap or bargain our support of a severe action against the Dominican Republic in the hopes that we could get an equally severe action by the OAS against Cuba.

In this attempt we miserably failed.

We quickly gave away our support on the first part of the proposition, but we stumbled and fumbled on the second and collapsed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "U.S. Rebuffed as OAS Meet Flops," written by Francis L. McCarthy, UPI Latin American news editor.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. REBUFFED AS OAS MEET FLOPS

(By Francis L. McCarthy)

NEW YORK.—Latin America is the big loser in the conference of Western Hemisphere foreign ministers, most experienced observers believe.

The San José recommendation—an oral rebuke to the Russians and a political slap on the wrist to the Cubans—show the Latin nations failed to grasp the grave threat to the Americas posed by the Red foothold in Cuba.

Most competent analysts describe the San José emergency conference outcome as weak and ineffectual.

The end result of the fortnight-long meeting was to debilitate rather than strengthen the parent Organization of American States. The conferees sacrificed principle for unanimity.

CUBA WINS

If any winner emerged from the conference it was Cuba. The regime of Premier Fidel Castro went to San José prepared to bolt the conference, and did so when the foreign ministers rebuffed Cuba's demand that the United States be condemned as an aggressor.

The United States did not fare well in the San José talks.

Its bill of particulars against the Reds and Cuba was generally well prepared and even better presented. However, it lacked Latin support. The U.S. compromise on final conference findings stemmed directly from the apathy of its supporters.

The San José findings against the Dominican Republic were known before the conference. No emergency consultation was required to convict the Dominicans of butting into other people's business.

Real import of the conference centered on the Peruvian challenge to Soviet interference in American affairs and the Cuban role therein.

It was this problem, probably the most serious that has faced the American hemisphere since the Spanish-American War, the conference failed properly to resolve.

The end result has been to leave the United States to seek alone a solution that will insure peace.

Mr. SMATHERS. I call the attention of the Senate particularly to this part of Mr. McCarthy's article:

Latin America is the big loser in the conference of Western Hemisphere foreign ministers, most experienced observers believe.

The San José recommendation—an oral rebuke to the Russians and a political slap on the wrists of the Cubans—show the Latin nations failed to grasp the grave threat to the Americans posed by the Red foothold in Cuba.

Most competent analysts describe the San José "emergency" conference outcome as weak and ineffectual.

The end result of the fortnight-long meeting was to debilitate rather than strengthen the parent Organization of American States. The conferees sacrificed principle for unanimity.

Mr. President, that is the point I desire to emphasize. The conference reached out and picked on the Government of the Dominican Republic. It jumped all over Trujillo, but would not pick on the man who is the real menace. They ducked Castro and avoided him. I continue to read:

If any "winner" emerged from the conference it was Cuba. The regime of Premier Fidel Castro went to San José prepared to bolt the conference, and did so when the foreign ministers rebuffed Cuba's demand that the United States be condemned as an aggressor.

Another point I wish to make is that many people say we won our point because the Cubans walked out and left the conference. The Cubans actually walked out and left because the conference would not indict the United States. They did not walk out because of the expression against them, which amounted to nothing. Cuba said it believed the United States was the belligerent and wanted the conference to indict the United States. When that was not done, Cuba walked out. As Mr. McCarthy says in his article:

The United States did not fare well in the San José talks.

Its "bill of particulars" against the Reds and Cuba was generally well prepared and even better presented. However, it lacked Latin support. The U.S. compromise on final conference findings stemmed directly from the apathy of its supporters.

The San José findings against the Dominican Republic were known before the conference.

Everybody knew what would be done. The plan was to take real action against the Dominican Republic, in the hope that something would be done about Cuba. The first point was achieved, but not the second.

Mr. McCarthy continues:

The real import of the conference centered on the Peruvian challenge to Soviet interference in American affairs and the Cuban role therein.

It was this problem, probably the most serious that has faced the American hemisphere since the Spanish-American War, that the conference failed properly to resolve.

The end result has been to leave the United States to seek alone a solution that will insure peace.

Mr. President, I fear our action last week is an error compounded, for what will be the next step? If the present Government of the Dominican Republic is toppled without provision having been made for an adequate succession, does anyone suppose that Raul Castro and the Communists will not try to move into the vacuum?

Does anyone really believe that the disorganized though democratic foes of the Trujillo regime could successfully resist the well organized and already planned Communist drive for power in this area?

Is the experience of Cuba already so distant from memory that we cannot foresee its repetition in a country less than 157 miles distant from the hemispheric headquarters of international communism?

If the Dominican Republic falls, is it not certain that the Government of Haiti will also topple, since Haiti is already beset by extreme economic and political troubles?

And if Haiti should fall, as it would without U.S. military intervention, will not the whole of the Caribbean be turned into a Communist sea and will not the countries of Central America and Venezuela soon find themselves under heavy and cumulative pressure?

The creation of a vacuum in the Dominican Republic could very well accelerate the unraveling of the inter-American system.

In this connection, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article written by Constantine Brown and published in the Washington Evening Star of August 25; and an editorial entitled "Break With Trujillo," published in the Washington Sunday Star of August 28.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Sunday Star, Aug. 28, 1960]

BREAK WITH TRUJILLO

It has been reported that there is "deep worry" in Washington following our severance of diplomatic relations with the Dominican Republic, and there certainly is abundant reason for concern.

This is no time to belabor the State Department. Its action was taken pursuant to the recommendation by the Organization of American States calling for a break in diplomatic relations and the application of limited economic sanctions in an effort to bring down the rightist Trujillo dictatorship. Our Government would have preferred to take a different course, but it has to be remembered that we cannot expect to operate within the OAS framework and also pursue an independent policy.

Nevertheless, there is grave doubt that the interests of the United States will be served by the step we have taken. And when all is said and done, it is the interests of our own country which should basically concern us.

The wisdom or unwisdom of the action taken will turn primarily on two tests. One has to do with the eventual OAS action with respect to Fidel Castro's Red-tinged Cuban regime. The outlook is considerably less than promising. There is no prospect of any coercive action even remotely comparable to that taken against Trujillo. It is virtually certain that there will be no specific condemnation of Castro, even of the slap-on-the-wrist variety. In all probability we will have to settle for a weak-kneed resolution protesting against Communist or extra-hemispheric intrusion, and even this may not name Russia or Communist China.

If this is the end result, the United States will find itself in anything but an admirable position. We will have been a party to lowering the boom on the dictatorship in the Dominican Republic, which, whatever its sins, has given no direct offense to us. But the leftwing dictatorship in Havana, which is furiously trying to undermine the United States, which has openly affronted the OAS, and which poses an incomparably greater threat to Latin American security, may very well emerge unscathed, or even stronger.

The other test, assuming that the OAS is able to pull down the Trujillo regime, which is at least doubtful, is concerned with that which may follow. After 30 years of one-man rule, there is no organized political opposition in the Dominican Republic. Thus, if Trujillo falls, who will take over? May we expect utter chaos, or will the Communists move in? These grave risks are inherent in any attempt to intervene in the domestic affairs of any country with a view to ousting one ruler without having a successor in sight or in mind. Yet these are the risks that we and the OAS are inviting in this Dominican Republic venture, and this is why there is, and should be, deep worry in Washington.

[From the Evening Star, Aug. 25, 1960]

NEW RED OPENING IN CARIBBEAN? OAS BLAST AT DOMINICAN REPUBLIC HIT AS KREMLIN MAKES OVERTURES

(By Constantine Brown)

The creation of a Caribbean pro-Soviet unit composed of Cuba, the Dominican Republic, and inevitably Haiti would have been called a ridiculous phantasy a few days ago. Now it could gradually become a reality as a result of the decisions taken at the OAS Conference at San José, Costa Rica.

There, by unanimous vote, the Government of the Dominican Republic not only has been reprimanded for the alleged attempts to instigate the assassination of President Romulo Betancourt of Venezuela. Drastic measures short of war, such as the withdrawal of the OAS ambassadors and an economic boycott, have been ordered.

But while President Eisenhower demanded legal authority from Congress to hit the people of the Dominican Republic where it hurt—mostly by withholding the Dominican share of the U.S. sugar quota—Moscow,

which seems to anticipate everything, was ready for action. Soviet official agents—the Dominican Republic does not have diplomatic relations with Communist countries—offered to barter whatever the Republic needed for Dominican sugar. Simultaneously, it was announced from Ciudad Trujillo that the Dominican radio station was negotiating for the service of the Soviet news agency Tass.

These first steps may seem inconsequential at first sight. They do not indicate in the slightest that there could be a reconciliation between Cuba's Communist puppet, Fidel Castro, and the tough dictator Generalissimo Trujillo. But Moscow and Peiping are not interested in harmony between such men. They are interested in establishing as many anti-American areas as possible in this hemisphere.

The Dominican Republic would be a highly important prize, since it paradoxically had been adamantly hostile to alien dictatorships. Before and during World War II Trujillo was bitterly opposed to the Nazis and opened the gates of his country wide to the victims of Nazism, particularly the Jews. Since the beginning of the cold war he has been equally bitterly opposed to the Soviet Union and international communism. It took a miracle—such as that performed at San José by Secretary Herter and his Latin American colleagues—to induce Trujillo to look toward Moscow for help. Trujillo and even the moderate members of the Dominican Government, as well as the rank and file of the people, were reported indignant not only at the harsh treatment they received at San José, but also because at the same time the OAS mildly rapped the knuckles of Castro, who has been guilty of far greater misdeeds, including the confiscation of legitimate properties valued at close to $1 billion.

It seems that the high priests of our diplomacy refuse to learn from the mistakes of the past. In 1946 the United Nations, at the bidding of Joseph Stalin, decided to make Spain a democracy by overthrowing Generalissimo Franco. Since it was inconvenient to send troops into Spain—as Stalin had demanded originally—the U.N. ordered the withdrawal of the ambassadors of its member nations and the establishment of an unofficial boycott. This, it was believed, would bring about another revolution and the demise of Franco's dictatorial regime.

The contrary happened. The Spanish people rallied in support of their strongly anti-Communist leader, buckled their belts and withstood the hardships of the economic blockade for several years. The cold war followed the short honeymoon between the U.S.S.R. and its former wartime allies. We needed reliable air and naval bases; Washington came to the conclusion that Spain could offer valuable real estate for the defense of the free world.

Not only were diplomatic relations with Madrid renewed and a firm friendship established, but because of the economic ravages brought about by the economic blockade we had to provide Spain with upwards of $1 billion in economic aid. The security of our bases demanded an improvement of the standard of living of the Spanish people. Spain, while still not a member of NATO, has all the same become one of the most important adjuncts in our planned defense system.

There is much talk, though little is done from the practical point of view, about the tremendous importance of Latin America and especially the Caribbean to our security. For the first time in our history, we have an enemy dedicated to our destruction right on our doorstep. The Iron Curtain has descended upon Cuba. Now there is strong possibility, judging by the most recent developments, that it will descend upon the Dominican Republic as well.

And all this is the result of a misguided philosophy of some of our leaders that while we should tolerate and try to befriend Communist dictators, we must do our best to stamp out the other kind.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, both of these articles express the same grave concern. What is to follow? Are we to get rid of one dictatorship, a static one, and get in its place one or the other of the Castro brothers, and cause an expansion of communism?

I also direct the attention of Senators to the last three paragraphs of Mr. Tad Sculz' report from San José, printed in the New York Times of August 23, in which he writes:

Fighting for survival, General Trujillo now has turned against the United States and has begun a strange flirtation with communism. If this is designed to show the United States that a mistake was made by disregarding his warnings that his regime was the only alternative to communism, this maneuver could also boomerang, both against the dictator and against the inter-American system.

In allowing the Communists to return to the Dominican Republic and to organize themselves, General Trujillo is creating the possibility that when he falls—which is regarded here now as just a question of time—the Communist Party will be the only effectively functioning political group in his country. The Dominican Republic has not seen genuine democratic political activity in the 30 years of General Trujillo's rule.

This is similar to what happened in Cuba when General Fulgencio Batista, the dictator, was ousted. The reported Communist infiltration of the Castro regime can be said to be a result of the absence of other organized political groups.

In his speech to the OAS meeting on August 18, Secretary of State Herter said:

My delegation feels that there is another approach which would constitute a practical means of preventing a recurrence of these acts that led to the calling of this consultative meeting. It might be called a preliminary approach, which might well offer a better opportunity.

This is to recommend, with the full force of this meeting of foreign ministers, that the Dominican Republic agree to receive the special committee of this body in the Dominican Republic to assure that, within a specific and reasonable period of time, free elections by the people, who in fact shall have had the right of free expression and free assembly, be held under the supervision of the committee itself, subject to appropriate safeguards to assure observance of principles in conformity with the Declaration of Santiago. There are numerous precedents for the holding of elections under international supervision. * * *

For the success of this proposal, it is essential that the powers of the committee—and they must be real—be clearly set forth and accepted. This is necessary to forestall any attempt to obstruct or water down the creation of the necessary conditions for genuinely free elections. Accordingly, if the proposal I am making commends itself to my colleagues, I would suggest that the resolution to be adopted at this meeting include a clear statement of the necessary powers, immunities and rights essential to the proper functioning of the OAS Supervisory Committee. This statement would be included in the proposal to be given to the Dominican Republic.

Should this offer be accepted by the Dominican Republic, this meeting of consultation will have the satisfaction of knowing that it has taken the best possible steps to achieve its objective by orderly and peaceful change.

If, however, this offer should be refused, we should then consider what measures under article 8 of the Rio Treaty might be most effectively applied in order to bring about acceptance of this proposal by the Dominican Government. Sanctions in these circumstances would pass beyond the purely punitive stage and would have a specific and constructive aim.

Piercing through the diplomatic verbiage, what Secretary Herter recommended was the forcing of free elections in the Dominican Republic. Considering that General Trujillo had already offered publicly, in an article written for the Miami Herald on April 6, 1960, to hold such free elections, Mr. Herter's recommendation is not, I think, up to the standard for straightforwardness which ought to be observed by this country's diplomatic representatives.

During my visit to the Dominican Republic earlier this year, as I duly reported to the Senate on my return, General Trujillo agreed to provide for a transition from dictatorship to democracy within a period of 2 years.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the article published in the Miami Herald of April 6, 1960.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRUJILLO INVITES OBSERVERS

(By Generalissimo Rafael L. Trujillo)

A very good friend of our country and of all Latin America recently discussed with me the political future of my country. He was Senator GEORGE SMATHERS, of Florida, a distinguished and even great American in the true Americanista sense of that term.

Senator SMATHERS suggested that our 1962 elections be disputed by two or more parties and that foreign observers be invited.

I reminded the Senator that our Dominican Party is an amalgam of many parties, groups, and factions, and that its function and operations are not unlike those of his own Democratic Party in the South of the United States. I agreed, however, to the desirability of having other parties enter the elections. I also agreed to the presence of foreign observers.

Regarding this last point, however, I want to make very clear—and let my words be interpreted in their exact meaning and in the spirit in which they are written—that the presence of foreign observers is acceptable only insofar as our national sovereignty is not impinged upon. Neither this nation nor any other free nation is going to permit foreigners to run their elections for them.

However, I have promised free elections, and free elections there will be. And there will be parties of opposition.

There is more to this matter of elections than appears on the surface. Oddly enough, for instance, it is the very groups who are most hostile to me who are equally hostile to implementation of the two-party electoral system.

I tell you this—and I invite you to carefully weigh my claim; the very last thing that my enemies desire is that there be held free multiparty elections in the Dominican Republic in 1962. These enemies will do all in their power to block or corrupt such an election.

This should surprise no one. If I ran for the presidency I would be elected—overwhelmingly. If any of the exile leaders were to run for the presidency, they would be de-

feated—overwhelmingly. Even many biased observers admit this.

I believe I can safely predict that the Caribbean comintern will do everything in its power to prevent the 1962 election. It is not interested in the free play of democracy. These revolutionary organizations—a tiny minority in actual numbers—have never sought power by democratic electoral processes. They will not suddenly become believers in the ballot in 1962. They will seek to degrade and corrupt these elections. They will seek to vote by bombs and bullets.

This I cannot permit and they know I cannot. Legally, as a sworn defender of our constitution, and emotionally, as a patriot, I could not permit the gains of 30 years to be destroyed by terrorism cloaked as electoral agitation.

But this situation need not arise. Peaceful elections can be held in the Dominican Republic in 1962 and they will—if they are not deliberately disrupted by calculated aggression, from Cuba, Venezuela and Puerto Rico.

I do not believe that the Dominican Republic can or should seek to become a carbon copy of the United States. Still, the example of and contact with our great northern neighbor could do much to influence our people and inform them in the ways of Anglo-Saxon democracy. Tragically, this contact has often been of a nature completely alien to democratic norms.

Normal relationship between my country and yours—as friends, neighbors, allies—has been deliberately perverted by those who would destroy our country's status as your friend, ally, and neighbor in an inter-American community of nations.

A consortium of international organizations—in which Dominican representation is the veriest minority—have long waged a calculated, lavishly financed campaign to poison every point of contact between our two countries.

Dominican visitors to the United States are frequently harassed, threatened, coerced. Dominican residents in the United States are victimized by extortion and terrorized by midnight phone calls. Money thus extracted is, however, only a drop in the huge financial budget of these mongers of hate.

Powerful radio stations in Puerto Rico—not even operated by Dominicans—beam invective at our country, calling ceaselessly for bloodshed and strife. Recruitment of dupes or coercion of victims is equally unceasing as these organizations seek to swell the ranks of armed "liberators." There are constant attempts to infiltrate communication and transportation facilities linking us with you. Mission of the infiltrators is to make a contact quite remote from the pursuit of democracy.

The instructions they transmit are not advice on the formation of peaceful political parties; they are formulas for the manufacture of bombs and Molotov cocktails. The money they seek to transmit is for no democratic political campaign; it is to finance the manufacture of those bombs and other instruments of death and destruction. The propaganda they seek to smuggle in does not call for elections nor advise on the development of the democratic process; it is an exaltation of hate, violence, bloodshed.

Similarly, any attempt to remove that relationship from the realm of violent, unthinking emotion is instantly attacked. There must never be any objective, thoughtful, unbiased—in other words, democratic—appraisal of my government and of the relationship between our two countries. Just as Senator SMATHERS has been violently attacked for suggesting a return to realism in that relationship, so will the Miami Herald be feverishly assailed for opening its pages to the other side of the story.

Democracy cannot be born through the midwifery of hate. It cannot survive in an atmosphere charged by hate. A terrorist screaming for blood is not and can never be a patriot calling for free exercise of the democratic ballot. When man is ruled by destructive emotion—thus abdicating his duty to exercise the peaceful rationality of democracy—that democracy is either stillborn or its chances of survival are almost nil.

Therefore I say: "Give us a chance to attempt our democracy in an atmosphere free of hate and fear. Let your relationship with us be a positive one. Let there at least be manifested as much zeal as that shown in official sanctions against anti-Castro Cuban refugees in curbing U.S.-based violence against our country in the United States.

The responsibility that your Senator has posed for me must also be, at least partially, assumed by you. Neither I nor my country ask for any favors. The years ahead are crucial ones and ones in which your survival is no less at stake than is ours.

As Senator SMATHERS remarked: "If the Dominican Republic falls to a Communist-dominated government like Cuba's, Haiti will go too. Then the whole Caribbean will be lost."

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, it has already been reported in the American press that, at my request, a team of professional political scientists visited the Dominican Republic for the express purpose of consulting on election procedures and on the requirements for a truly free election.

Their recommendations were transmitted to the Dominican Republic, and a copy was made available to the press. A timetable for the implementation of the recommendations, commencing with local elections in December 1960, had already been announced by the Dominican Republic.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I should like to ask several questions. I believe the Senator from Florida went to the Dominican Republic and talked over this matter with Trujillo. Is that correct?

Mr. SMATHERS. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. When the Senator from Florida did that, is it not true that at that time Trujillo said it would take about 2 years to make the change from dictatorship to a republic and to the holding of free elections, and so forth?

Mr. SMATHERS. Yes, he said he thought he could bring it about completely within 2 years—that he would have city elections in 6 months, State elections in 18 months, and national elections in 2 years. That was reported to the press at a press conference which 25 newspaper reporters attended.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. If an attempt were made to make the change more quickly, could that not easily cause trouble, and thus make it possible for the Communists to move in?

Mr. SMATHERS. Certainly; it would leave a vacuum, and then the Communists could easily move in. The Communist groups are already organized, and are down there, and are ready. I have talked to leaders in Mexico and in various other countries in that part of the world; and it is generally agreed that if such a vacuum were created, the Communists would move right in. And then the entire area would be under Communist control.

But, in addition, I believe it was ungracious for our Government to act as if it were going to force the change on Trujillo, after he had agreed to make the change. Previously he had asked our Government to cooperate with him; but our Government simply ignored him. I do not think that is quite up to the diplomatic standard our representatives should follow.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Of course, if one tries to force something on a country or on a state, there is bound to be a certain amount of reaction and resistance, which would not exist if the people of the area concerned were allowed to make the change themselves.

Mr. SMATHERS. Yes.

I should like to show how completely hypocritical the attitude of our Government's representatives was in that connection. At the end of the meeting at which they were supposed to pledge opposition to international communism, they said, "It is pledged that under no conditions will any country try to force its type of government on another." But only 2 days before that, they had done exactly the opposite.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Is it not true that too often when we funnel funds, under a program of one type or another, to a country or countries, we forget that the customs, the cultures, and even the peculiarities of the peoples in those areas must be considered, and cannot be turned or changed overnight?

Mr. SMATHERS. That is entirely correct. We are always a little naive, in thinking that because we have democracy in our country and because of our love for humanity—and certainly it is a great virtue and a great credit to us—people in other lands should have exactly the same type of government we have. But often that is impossible—at least, for the immediate future. For instance, in the Congo, 57 percent of the people can neither read nor write. Obviously, when so large a proportion of the people are uneducated it is impossible to have there, at this moment, the same type of democratic government that we have in our country. And if the people of that country are suddenly turned loose and are told to proceed on their own, the result will be chaos. It will be found that one type of dictatorship will merely be supplanted by another. People have to be educated to the point where they can establish and can maintain a democratic government.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Incidentally, do not the people of the Dominican Republic have the benefit of fine hospitals?

Mr. SMATHERS. That is correct; there are about 100 hospitals there. The hospital situation in the Dominican Republic is the best to be found in the Caribbean area.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Do not the people of the Dominican Republic also have good schools?

Mr. SMATHERS. Yes; they have more school classrooms than are to be found in any other country in Central America.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Do not the people of the Dominican Republic also have good roads?

Mr. SMATHERS. Indeed so; they have more paved roads than does any other country in Central America.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Does not that situation make the people of the Dominican Republic feel that they have received blessings under their present leadership?

Mr. SMATHERS. Of course I do not know exactly what they think.

However, one can go to Argentina and find that many of the people there still like Perón. This is not necessarily a recommendation.

I do not think there is any doubt that the average farmer or workman in the Dominican Republic is very strongly in favor of the Generalissimo. The people who do not like him are those who are educated, who know what freedom is, who want freedom of speech and democracy, but cannot get them.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. But would it not be found, if the United States were to force Trujillo out, that many people there would be ready to join with the other group and go over to the Communists, or something else?

Mr. SMATHERS. The Senator from South Carolina is entirely correct. If we exercise force in the situation, there will be grave danger.

From the beginning, the administration was kept fully informed of the negotiations to encourage a transition through free elections in the Dominican Republic. It had adequate reason, therefore, to know that what it was demanding of the Dominican Republic had, in fact, already been offered.

Moreover—and this seems to me the crux of the entire affair—my effort to assist in a transition from dictatorship to democracy, by way of free elections, was roundly condemned by the Department of State, and there were "leaked" to the press articles suggesting that in pursuing the idea of such a transition, I was acting, somehow, as "Trujillo's pal." Those stories were "leaked" because I was suggesting that a transition from dictatorship to a democracy be attempted. But now our State Department says, "We will make them do it."

I do not solicit any thanks for having attempted to arrange free elections in the Dominican Republic. When I did so, I expected a certain number of brickbats from public opinion and from the press.

But I regard it as extraordinary that the Department of State should, on the late date of August 18, 1960, embrace this concept, which earlier it had coldshouldered at a time when it might still have been possible to arrange such a transition and to forestall the deterioration which has now occurred, and which will go on at an ever-accelerating pace.

Mr. President, I hope certainly that the Caribbean situation will not fly completely apart at the seams and that a smooth transition between dictatorship and democracy is still possible in the Dominican Republic. I would appeal to all including the Generalissimo to use their good offices to bring about this transition.

But I must admit candidly that the chances for such a transition are substantially smaller than they were as little as 6 months ago and that responsibility for this deterioration in the political situation must in large measure be laid at the door of the administration.

Had work along this line been done earlier, we would not now be faced with a political vacuum, lacking, so far as I am able to determine, any means or policy to prevent the replacement of the Trujillo regime with a government which is dictatorial and which, in addition, would deliberately and systematically sabotage the interests of the United States.

Once again, I am compelled to say that I regard the failure of U.S. leadership as virtually absolute.

It will be objected that the mood of the OAS representatives at San Jose was such that no more positive action could have been put forward without rupturing the unity of the organization.

This objection, however, ignores the fact that leadership is a continuing obligation. The work of isolating Cuba should not have been left to the corridors at San Jose. We should have been alerting the other nations of this hemisphere to the danger of Cuba ever since Fidel Castro came to power and gave clear evidence that he had no intention of following the path of democracy.

Indeed, the failure at San Jose—and I do regard it as a failure—has its roots in events which preceded the Castro revolution. For it is certainly a matter of record that, having failed to encourage a peaceful transition from the dictatorship of Fulgencio Batista to a genuine democracy, our State Department precipitated Batista's overthrow and the installation of Fidel Castro.

Thus it was precisely the same sort of political bungle which we now are pursuing pellmell in the Dominican Republic that helped to create the current crisis in the Carribbean.

We have not learned the lesson, apparently, nor have we done what should have been done to bring the Cuban experience forcefully to the attention of other Latin Republics.

Now to another point. I am distressed that a few of our Latin American allies could now suggest to us that we ought to accept the good offices of a special OAS committee to help resolve our differences with the Cuban Government.

I would have thought that the attitude of the Cuban Government and its determined efforts to wreck the inter-American system and, further, to destroy through propaganda, subversion, and revolution, all the existing governments of the hemisphere, would have by this time convinced every responsible official in Latin America that compromise with communism is out of the question.

On Thursday, August 25, following this suggestion of a conciliation committee, Fidel Castro replied with perhaps the most virulent attack he has yet made on the principles of hemispheric solidarity.

"We are friends," he said, "of the Soviet Union and of the Chinese People's Republic because they have shown they are our friends."

He accused the United States of "bloody and voracious" imperialism and called this country "the enemy of progressive humanity."

He said:

> We no longer believe in your false democracy, murderer of Negroes * * * in your false liberty, sower of tyranny in our continent, your hypocritical philosophy that protects a Franco as well as a Trujillo.

He called the Pan American Union a "cloak" for "oppression and abuse, the system of domination that you have introduced among our divided peoples of America."

These remarks could only be considered a direct defiance of, and an expression of contempt for the OAS. Yet when on Thursday, August 25, Foreign Minister Raul Roa indicated that the Cuban Government might be willing to negotiate with the United States, a good many members of the Conference seemed perfectly willing to forgive and forget and accept this much too easy path.

As Tad Szulc reported from San Jose in the New York Times of August 28:

> So receptive were many Latin American delegates to [Roa's words] that they immediately interpreted it as a conciliatory attitude of Cuba. They proceeded to try to persuade the United States that Dr. Roa's delegation, in fact, constituted his regime's repudiation of communism and, therefore, obviated any further need for the Conference to address itself to the Havana regime on this subject. * * *
>
> This attitude * * * expressed the belief that Washington and Havana have gone so far apart that they should now be made to agree on concessions to each other.
>
> [When] the Castro group here indicated on Wednesday it would walk out of the Conference, this was enough to set in motion within hours a major conciliation maneuver by Latin American delegates.
>
> Their view was that the vital problem was to prevent Cuba from severing its ties with the American community and to seek to restore her faith in the system. Playing somewhat coy, Dr. Roa agreed to stay and even toned down his forthcoming speech after a group of delegations headed by Mexico produced an immensely conciliatory resolution.
>
> When Dr. Roa finally spoke on Thursday, his splendidly constructed 68 page address was hopefully searched for positive elements among his denunciations of the United States and his refusal to alter Cuba's stand on the Soviet rocket aid.

In other words, they threatened, so to speak, to walk out and break it up, and yet some had the temerity to ask the people of the United States to demean themselves, in my opinion, and say that we should ignore the remarks of Fidel Castro and the attacks made upon us.

However, despite all efforts at conciliation, Cuba would not be appeased. For what it seeks is to enlist the other members of the OAS in its campaign of vilification against the United States and, failing that, to destroy, by the process of subversion, the governments which stand in its way.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, an article from the New York

Times of August 25, entitled "Castro Challenges OAS; Stresses Amity With Reds."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CASTRO CHALLENGES OAS; STRESSES AMITY WITH REDS

(By R. Hart Phillips)

HAVANA, August 24.—Premier Fidel Castro defied the Organization of American States today and declared that "we are friends of the Soviet Union and of the Chinese People's Republic."

The revolutionary leader spoke as the foreign ministers of the American nations began consideration of the threat of Soviet intervention in the Western Hemisphere through increasingly close relations with the Castro regime.

Meanwhile the Cuban revolutionary Government seized the $7 million plant just outside Havana of the American-owned Owens Illinois Glass Co., of Toledo, Ohio. Armed militia composed of the company's employees took possession of the plant and its offices today and ordered American officers to leave.

The plant, which employs about 600 Cuban workers, supplies the greater part of the beer and soft-drink bottles utilized by Cuban industries.

The occasion for Premier Castro's speech was a meeting of several thousand women who have just consolidated all women's revolutionary organizations into the Federation of Cuban Women. The speech was broadcast by television and radio.

AUDIENCE ENTHUSIASTIC

Premier Castro's enthusiastic audience shouted and sang "Cuba, yes; Yankee, no." It shouted "down with the Organization of American States." "We will win." "Fidel, give it to the Americans hard," and other slogans of the revolution.

The Premier was interrupted by the chanting, cheering throng time after time during his 2-hour speech. It was necessary to play the national anthem twice to stop the demonstration.

Dr. Castro declared that his government "is the most solid and firm government of the American Continent because it is the only government of America that has armed its workers and peasants." "The Cuban revolution is not defended by units of tanks in the hands of a Prussian-type military caste; the security of our revolution does not depend, as in other places of America, on the number of thanks and favors that governing officials extend to the military caste, or on the flattery of the generals by the governing officials; nor does it depend on the favors of the proconsul Ambassador [U.S. Ambassador].

"No ruler who has to live from flattery to generals or servility to ambassadors can ever feel safe."

LAND SEIZURES ACCLAIMED

Another point of strength of the Cuban revolution is that "it took away the lands of the big property owners and the American companies," Premier Castro told the crowd.

"The revolutionary government is strong because it delivered these lands to workers and because along with tractors and financing it delivered rifles," he said. "The revolution is also strong because its laws, its revolutionary institutions, its justice defend those benefited by that justice."

The Cuban revolution is supported not only by the great majority of the Cuban people but by the peoples of America and the peoples of the world, Dr. Castro declared.

The Premier charged that many of the governments whose foreign ministers are meeting in San José, Costa Rica, were serving the interests of the "imperialistic" United States.

Cuba is today facing U.S. imperialism—"the rapacious and exploiting imperialism, the bloody and voracious imperialism, which here has lost some of its rapacious claws—as the vanguard of liberation of Latin America," Dr. Castro said.

Addressing the United States, he said that no longer did the Cuban people believe "in your philosophy of exploitation and privilege, or in the philosophy of gold, the gold that you rob from the work of other peoples; no longer are we disposed to follow the orders of your Ambassador; no longer are we willing to follow in tow your reactionary policy, which is the enemy of the progress of humanity."

Nor "do we believe in your false Pan Americanism with which you wish to cloak the system of oppression and abuse, the system of domination that you have introduced among our divided peoples of America," he added.

For these reasons, Premier Castro declared, Cuba is friends with "those who are our friends; we proclaim the aspiration of humanity to justice and peace, and we interchange our products with those who are willing to interchange their products with us."

The Premier told the United States that Cuba was no longer "an appendage of your economy, nor will Cuba ever again vote in the United Nations as you indicate but will vote as our dignity and conscience indicate."

He went on to say "that we will be friends of the Soviet Union and of the Chinese Peoples' Republic because they have shown they are our friends, while you have attacked and wish to destroy us; and so that you will not come to speak with us in the insolent language your proconsuls are accustomed to use in giving orders."

The women of Cuba must fight and work alongside the men for the revolution, according to Dr. Castro. He urged all the women of the island to join the Federation of Cuban Women, which will also give military training.

"The women can be useful to the revolution in everything, the women can handle arms and the women can fight," he asserted. "Thus instead of a certain number of fighters, by considering the women as fighters, we will have doubled the number."

The Premier said that feminine youth brigades were already being organized.

Mr. SMATHERS. I hope our many friends in Latin America will learn from this experience that the time has come to deal firmly and thoroughly with the Communist arrogance.

Mr. President, despite Raul Castro's intemperate statement last June that he hoped to live long enough to drop atomic bombs on New York, I do not think we, the United States, is now in any great military danger. But I do believe the other countries of Latin America are in some danger.

At this point I should like to read a telegram addressed to me by the President of Guatemala dated April 15, 1960:

GUATEMALA CITY, *April 15, 1960.*

The Honorable GEORGE A. SMATHERS,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

From information received from Caracas on April 4 I observed that Adlai Stevenson poposes Latin American disarmament—the same plan you proposed few months ago. Guatemala is ready to reduce army and institute a constabulary guard sufficient only to conserve order and peace within the country but by reason of constant menaces from the present Cuban Government we are unable to do this and on the contrary are forced to increase our tiny army to defend, in the words of our national anthem, "our country and home."

Sincerely,

MIGUEL YDIGORAS FUENTES,
President of Guatemala.

Mr. President, we should not forget that some of this crowd have already run an invasion of the Dominican Republic, of Panama, of Guatemala, and of Nicaragua. Now that they are stronger and have more arms, I think the worst is yet to come.

Plans are now being drawn up in Communist headquarters in Cuba to infiltrate and destroy all the existing governments of Latin America. Mr. Herter clearly presented this evidence to the OAS.

On this point, Mr. President, I thought Mr. Herter did a particularly good job when he presented to the OAS the information which had been gathered with respect to the Communist activities. I ask unanimous consent to have an article from the New York Times, which is a reprint of the U.S. report, printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF U.S. SUPPLEMENTAL PAPER AT SAN JOSE CONFERENCE OF FOREIGN MINISTERS

This supplement provides information on the action of the Cuban Government additional to that provided in the document presented to the Inter-American Peace Committee on August 2, 1960. This supplementary information gives added confirmation to the facts stated in the basic document of August 3, 1960; it brings out three significant additional facts, however.

1. Cuba is establishing a training program for Communist agents and guerrillas to spread the Communist revolution throughout Latin America. This is being done through an international work brigade recently established in Cuba with the support of the Soviet-sponsored World Federation of Democratic Youth.

2. The Cuban Government has opened the assault on the remaining vestige of individual liberty in Cuba—religious freedom.

3. Contradicting previous statements that the U.S. reduction of the Cuban sugar quota constituted "economic aggression," its Minister of Commerce announced it would be "more advantageous to Cuba" if the United States ceased all sugar purchases from Cuba.

SUPPRESSION OF LABOR

Labor delegations to the Latin American Youth Congress joined with the Workers Federation of Cuba (CTC) in a joint declaration of August 3, 1960, which:

A. Pledged solidarity by the Cuban and Latin American labor delegates in support for the Cuban revolution and the signing of a mutual assistance pact between the CTC and Central Unico de Trabajadoras de Chile (CUTC).

B. Hailed the Cuban revolution as opening the way to the national liberation of all Latin America, welcomed the support and friendship of the Soviet Union and Communist China, emphasized the threat of aggression by Yankee imperialism and its tool, the Organization of American States, and pledged the workers of Latin America to give their lives if necessary to repel such aggression.

C. Endorsed a movement to create a Latin American labor group to support the struggle against internal reactionaries and the forces of imperialist monopolies.

D. Alerted labor organizations to combat any effort by imperialists to use the OAS at San José, Costa Rica, as a means for attacking Cuba.

ATTACKS ON RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

The Castro dictatorship has moved to eliminate the last remaining vestige of individual liberties in Cuba—the right to freedom of worship. The Communist orientation of

the Cuban Government and its relations with the Sino-Soviet bloc concerned the church so deeply that a pastoral letter on the subject from the archbishops and bishops of Cuba was read in Catholic churches throughout Cuba on August 7, 1960. After expressing strong approval of the original social welfare objectives of the Cuban revolution, the letter said:

"In recent months, the Government of Cuba has established close commercial, cultural, and diplomatic relations with the governments of the principal Communist countries, especially with the Soviet Union. We are deeply concerned over the fact that, in connection with these events, journalists, members of the Government, labor union leaders, and even certain high Government officials have repeatedly praised warmly the way of life prevailing in those nations, and have suggested in speeches delivered both within and outside of Cuba coincidences and similarities of aims and procedures, between the social revolutions of those countries and the Cuban revolution."

This point concerns us deeply, because catholicism and communism are based on two diametrically opposed concepts of man and of the world, which can never be reconciled.

We condemn communism because it is essentially a materialistic and atheistic doctrine, and because the governments guided by it are among the worst enemies the church and mankind have known throughout their history.

COMMUNISM CONDEMNED

We also condemn communism because it is a system that brutally denies the fundamental rights of man; because, to obtain total state control of the means of production, they establish everywhere a dictatorial regime in which a small group is installed in power by using police terroristic methods on the rest of the population; because it converts all citizens into virtual slaves of the state; because it subordinates family life to the state, training children in the manner desired by the Government.

Quite naturally, the reading of this pastoral letter has produced strong reactions from the new governing group of Cuba. Some churchgoers were attacked on leaving church, and in one case a priest had to be given police protection from revolutionaries. In another case, pro-Castro elements started fighting within the church. Revolución, the semiofficial organ of the Government, in its edition of August 8, 1960, defied and threatened the church.

After a special mass at the ancient Columbus Cathedral in Havana August 9, revolutionary thugs attacked emerging communicants and insulted, threatened, assaulted and stoned them.

The following day, August 10, President Osvaldo Dorticós alluding to clashes between churchgoers and hecklers and to the arrest of two priests, said that the provocations and counter-revolutionary activities of Cuban Roman Catholics would be taken care of by "the reactions of revolutionary Catholics." (It is significant to point out that, under the law of the revolutionary government, "counter-revolutionary activity" is a crime which may be punishable by death.)

According to the statement of Dr. Castro on August 11, 1960, the "provocations of the church" were the work of "scribes and pharisees which are serving Yankee imperialism and its partner, Franco." He added:

"There is no doubt that the American Embassy has thrown into combat its last peon. There is no doubt that imperialism, the partner of Franco and his fascism, has utilized the influence of Franco so that he will mobilize as many Fascist priests as can be found to fight against the revolution."

Dr. Castro was threatening when, stating that the "responsibility of their provocation" rested on them, he said that the Government would give them "time to realize that they are in error, time to reflect and time to change their actions."

Dr. Castro, in condemning the Catholic Church in Cuba, drew a parallel between his Cuban revolution and the earthly career of Jesus Christ when he said:

"Those who condemn [the Cuban revolution] condemn Christ, and they would be capable of crucifying Christ because He did what we are doing."

RESTRICTION ON TRAVEL

The Cuban Government has recently announced that outstanding exit permits will be canceled as of August 22, 1960. This will result in a tightened official control of foreign travel by Cubans and other residents of Cuba, and is suggestive of the practice of Communist governments in this respect. This amounts to a partial raising of what may be called a "cane curtain" serving to isolate the Cuban people from normal and customary contacts with the outside world.

EFFECTIVE JUDICIAL PROCEDURE

Illustrative of the persecution of the professional classes, in this case the respected Havana Bar Association, which was disposed of its offices by a usurping group of Communist-inclined dissident lawyers, is the declaration issued by the association and published in Información on August 6, whereby the governing board:

A. Declared the professorships in the school of law at the University of Havana in dispute, warning that any lawyer performing functions inherent in the professorships would be guilty of breach of professional ethics.

B. Made public its decision to resist the action taken by a small group of lawyers who illegally occupied the association's premises.

C. Suspended the payment of bills to the association.

D. Urged lawyers to remain away from the offices of the association and not to attend meetings called by persons who did not legitimately represent the association.

A Government-inspired proposal to call a general assembly of the Havana Bar Association to elect a new slate of officers suggests that the technique used to oust legitimate officers of the Workers Confederation of Cuba may be repeated against the bar association.

CUBAN RELATIONS WITH THE SINO-SOVIET BLOC

An international work brigade, a common Communist device, has brought to Cuba about 200 persons from numerous countries, including Belgium, Sweden, Denmark, Thailand, Poland, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, the Sogaria, Rumania, North Korea, North Vietnam, Communist China, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Algeria, Spain, Cyprus, France, Great Britain, Italy, Yugoslavia, Switzerland, and all of the Latin American countries. The members of this work brigade arrived in Havanna in the first days of August 1960, and all are said to be members of the World Federation of Democratic Youth, a Communist-dominated organization.

The purposes for which the "brigadiers" have visited Cuba are to assist in the construction of an educational center in the Sierra Maestra, and to do manual work. The last stated purpose is incongruous in the light of the unemployment in Cuba at the present time.

That the work brigade may have other purposes is indicated by the statement of one of the members, who is quoted in Revolucion as saying, "We are * * * disposed to defend Cuba with arms if she is attacked."

The international work brigade device further stamps the government of Dr. Castro as being of a Communist character, and revealed the closeness of its practices to those of the Sino-Soviet pattern.

SCHOLARSHIPS TO COMMUNIST COUNTRIES

Ernesto Guevara has recently stated that a large number of scholarships would soon be given to Cubans to study technological skills in the U.S.S.R., Czechoslovakia, and Communist China, and that preparatory language courses would be offered in the University of Havana.

Speaking at the opening session of the Latin American Youth Congress on July 28, 1960, Guevara virtually stated that the Cuban revolution is Marxist. According to his statement, if the Cuban movement is Marxist, "it is because the revolution discovered by its methods the road that Marx laid out, and if we do that which is called Marxism, it is because we discovered it."

SUPPORT OF REVOLUTIONARY MOVEMENTS

On the occasion of the opening of the Latin American Youth Congress on July 28, 1960, in Havana, Ernesto Guevara eulogized a Puerto Rican rebellion movement, by saying: "And we wish to greet also one of the delegations that has suffered most perhaps in all America, that of Puerto Rico, which still today * * * keeps fighting to take the first step, perhaps the most difficult one, that of attaining at least formally a free government. And we wish the delegates from Puerto Rico to convey my greeting and that of all Cuba to Pedro Albizu Campos; we wish them to carry to Pedro Albizu Campos all our heartfelt cordiality, all our recognition for the road that he has laid out with his valor, and all our fraternal sentiments as free men toward a free man, in spite of his being in a dungeon of the self-styled North American democracy."

On August 2, at a luncheon given by the Government-controlled news agency, Prensa Latina, for the delegates to the youth congress, the director of the agency, Jorge Massetti, said: "We will continue to announce our presence to our brothers in Puerto Rico and Panama, and we will continue to tell them, 'plant bombs, throw out the gringos.'"

ATTACKS BY CUBAN LEADERS ON OAS

Recent statements of Cuban leaders have again revealed the contempt with which the OAS is regarded by the Cuban Government, and the official Cuban view that Latin American nations which support it are slaves and lackeys of the United States.

Raul Castro, Minister of the Revolutionary Armed Forces, speaking before the Workers Confederation of Cuba and the Latin American Youth Congress at Havana on August 4, 1960, stated that the United States:

"Admirals and generals advocated direct aggression against Cuba. The other trend was for multilateral action * * * an instrument was needed in order to maneuver thorough multilateral action. This was the OAS, which has lost all its prestige * * * This organization only serves to legalize the aggressions against Latin America."

He disparaged the OAS further in a television speech the following day: "We convened an OAS meeting ourselves the other day in the CTC. Representatives from all Latin America were there. We convened the revolutionary OAS at the headquarters of the revolutionary CTS. Latin-American youth leaders expressed support of 200 million Latin-American men and women for the Cuban revolution."

On August 6, 1960, Antonio Nuñez Jimenez, executive director of the National Agrarian Reform Institute (INRA), in a speech before the Latin American Youth Congress at Havana, said:

"Among the American states there is a vandal, an assassin like Trujillo. There is seated a representative of the Somoza dynasty. There is seated a little old man who dances through the fracas to show his people that he is strong, Ydigoras. Then there are seated others, and then they think that they (the United States) are going to achieve there (at San José) what they have not

achieved by bribery, bombardments, the sugar quota, the petroleum, armed aggression, etc., but I am sure that the next time I speak to you in public I shall bring to view the failure of aggressive intentions by means of the OAS also."

CASTRO REMARKS RECALLED

Dr. Castro, the Prime Minister, has more things to say about the OAS in a speech before the closing session of the Latin American Youth Congress on August 7, 1960:

"The accomplices of the Guatemalan affair were the lackeys who used the OAS to support U.S. aggression against a peaceful people, who wanted to wage a revolution in order to free themselves. You must know that the protective doctrine of the Yankees is called the Monroe Doctrine and that they have used this doctrine to make Latin America a protectorate * * * Now the same gentlemen are trying to maneuver the OAS against us. Why was no OAS meeting called when a ship laden with ammunition mysteriously blew up, after the U.S. Government had failed in its negotiations to prevent a certain country from selling us arms and munitions? Why was no OAS meeting called when the Pentagon met to formulate plans to attack Cuba?

"Yet when the U.S.S.R. declares that it will support Cuba if attacked, they do not like it. Obviously, there will not be any need of their support, if we are not attacked. The Yankees have been busy distributing our sugar quota to their servants before the OAS meets. They have been giving up our loans and offering help to their lackeys before the OAS meets. How can these slaves judge our case honestly, if they have already sold their souls to the U.S. imperialists?

"They are not going to the OAS to give us a fair trial; they are going there to watch Herter's finger and do what he bids them to do."

The meeting of Foreign Ministers, according to Dr. Castro, was no more than "a Yankee maneuver against Cuba. What does it matter if the OAS condemns us?"

OAS RIDICULED BY ROA

Foreign Minister Raul Roa, also speaking on August 7, described the OAS as a "ministry of colonies" of the U.S. Government, and said that the coming San José meeting was a new North American maneuver against Cuba. Regarding the Rio Treaty, he said it was an instrument of U.S. military policy. "This treaty like the Monroe Doctrine, was not made to help Latin America, but to aid the predominance of the United States in Latin America."

With respect to the OAS, Roa had the following to say: "We cannot contaminate ourselves with predetermined decisions of the OAS; we cannot contaminate ourselves with this atmosphere without carrying an oxygen container in our pocket, the pure and clean oxygen of the Cuban revolution. We neither surrender nor sell ourselves."

A vote against Cuba at San José would not matter, according to Roa. "We would laugh at this, because we would already have denounced all its machinations."

President Osvaldo Dorticós, on August 10, spoke of the meeting of foreign ministers as having been "called to attack our country and our revolution." He went on to say that "many of the Latin-American governments, who serve the interests of U.S. imperialism, will serve on their knees the order of their imperialistic boss." He further stated that the Government of Cuba did not feel itself obligated by the 1954 resolution of the OAS at Caracas, which called communism a threat to the Americas.

President Osvaldo Dorticós on August 13, saluted the meeting of foreign ministers at San José by stating before a mass meeting in Havana that it was invoked by imperialists. He arrogantly added that it would be the Cuban delegation, not the foreign ministers, that would speak for the Latin-American peoples.

CUBAN ECONOMIC DISCRIMINATION AND AGGRESSION

The duplicity of Cuban economic policy was made unmistakably clear on August 13, 1960, by the Minister of Commerce, Dr. Raul Cepero Bonilla, who informed a television audience:

1. That Cuba's sugar sales had increased under the Castro regime. He did not explain that these sales would result in less income for Cuba or that the cost of production of Cuban sugar exceeds the world market price for which most of the sales to countries other than the United States were made.

2. That "for the next year it would be much more advantageous to Cuba if the United States did not buy a single grain (of Cuban) sugar." He did not explain that this was a contradiction of previous statements that the reduction of the Cuban sugar quota in the U.S. market meant "economic aggression" against Cuba which, in turn, was announced as "justification" for arbitrary seizure of more than $1 billion invested by private U.S. citizens in Cuba.

3. That Cuba would not sell sugar to countries that might benefit from the reduction in Cuba's sugar quota. This warning was addressed to all countries, but the Minister of Commerce, Dr. Raul Cepero Bonilla specifically mentioned Brazil.

Mr. SMATHERS. No, Mr. President; the sights of the Castro regime are not directed north to the United States, but west to Mexico, Honduras, El Salvador, Nicaragua, Panama, Guatemala, and Costa Rica; east to Haiti and the Dominican Republic; and south to Venezuela, Peru, Bolivia, Brazil, Argentina, Chile, Uruguay, Paraguay, Ecuador, Columbia, and the Guianas.

Last month at the Congress of Youth in Havana, Fidel Castro said:

It is our duty to turn the Andes into the Sierra Maestra of the Americas.

And Raul Castro echoed malignantly:

Latin America is a field of dry grass. No matter where it starts to burn it will all burn, and we have the fire.

The U.S. Government has already shown to the OAS evidence that Cuba is establishing a training program for Communist agents and guerrillas to spread the Communist revolution throughout the hemisphere. Cuba itself has announced that it is receiving shipments of Czechoslovakian arms, that its people are armed to the teeth and with better equipment than can be found in the United States.

I have been responsibly informed that armed uprisings are already being planned in half a dozen Latin American countries.

The man who organized and executed the Canadian spy episode has now been sent by the Soviet Union to Havana; it is not difficult to imagine for what. The former Chief of Propaganda in Hungary during the Budapest butchery is now available for technical consultation in Cuba.

I warn my friends in Latin America, for whom I have the deepest admiration and affection, that Castro's communism aims to destroy them.

If Castro's communism is allowed a free hand, if we hide our heads in the sand because we face a difficult situation, the work which has gone into the building of democracy in the countries of this hemisphere will vanish in a flash.

This is precisely what the Communists want, for a securely entrenched democratic tradition is the one thing they most fear in their drive to conquer the earth.

I say to the people of the United States that the so-called victory at San José is, in fact, a diplomatic defeat of the first magnitude.

Not only did the OAS fail to set up an effective mechanism for combating communism in Cuba from whence it will spread like an infection through all of Latin America but it also permitted Cuba to get clean away with defiance of the inter-American system, and in addition created an opening for the Communists to extend their gains in the Caribbean, through an attack on a nation which, whatever the faults of its government, has constantly and consistently opposed imperialistic encroachment, both Nazi and Communist.

The net result is that Castro can proceed with his plan of appealing, through subversion, over the heads of Latin American governments to those who would destroy rather than build. Already he has labeled the OAS action at San José an act of treason.

The free peoples of the world look to the United States to lead them in their fight for survival. Those already enslaved by Communism but who cherish the memory of lost liberty look to the United States as their only source of hope.

This is a towering task which has devolved upon us.

If we are to succeed we must stand firmly by the friends who have stood by us.

Failure to do this has already resulted in a steady erosion of our influence throughout the world and a constant dwindling of the number of nations which offer us unqualified support in this struggle.

Fidel Castro has taken a firm position on the side of communism. He does not come forth with platitudes and veer with the wind from day to day, which is the course that the United States has followed.

The San José Declaration is a hollow gesture, more damaging because it gives the appearance of action when there has been no action.

We must stop deluding our friends in Latin America and stop deceiving ourselves into a sense of false security by adopting pious declarations, which dismay the Communists not at all.

We stand on the thin edge of disaster. This is no place for the timorous. This is no time for listening to those who do not realize or who refuse to admit that we are now in the throes of a tremendous struggle between the Free World and the Communist camp.

We, and our friends, must take our stand for individual liberty, or face enslavement.

Platitudes will only win us the scorn of the world. Even brave words will no longer suffice. The time has come for brave—and bold—and decisive—action.

We must stop penalizing those nations which have befriended us. We

must take our position as firmly and defiantly as the Communists have taken theirs.

We must oppose communism and its symptoms. We must stand up for the things in which we believe. We must encourage every nation and all peoples everywhere to take their stand with us and make their choice for freedom now—or the world will shortly have no choice at all.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I take this opportunity to congratulate the able and distinguished Senator from Florida for one of the finest addresses I have heard in the U.S. Senate on this subject. I feel the information the Senator has brought to the Senate today should go out to the American people all over the country, because it is my feeling that a great many of them do not understand the fundamental issue at stake. It is my sincere thought that if the people could obtain the information supplied by the Senator from Florida there would be a different feeling in the United States today toward Cuba and toward the Dominican Republic.

I ask the distinguished Senator the question: Has not the Dominican Republic been a true and loyal friend of the United States, in return for which friendship we are now willing to condemn and castigate the Dominican Republic?

Mr. SMATHERS. The Senator is correct. I said earlier that Franklin Roosevelt wrote the Dominican Republic Government a letter thanking it for its support during World War II.

No Secretary of State since Cordell Hull—we have had many liberals and some conservatives; Dean Acheson, George Marshall, and all the rest—has ever gone so far as to recommend, as Secretary Dillon did the other day, that we participate in the toppling of a government.

Mr. THURMOND. Is it not true that communism is the greatest threat in the world today, and that the Dominican Republic has been stanchly against communism, certainly until recently, when we appeared to turn our backs on her, which may have caused her to turn in the other direction?

Mr. SMATHERS. The Senator is absolutely correct. Certainly our major enemy is communism. That, I think, is the real point I have tried to make. It is important that our friends understand who is the real enemy.

I admit this fellow has a dictatorship in the Dominican Republic, which has existed for some 30 years. At times he has been a troublemaker. His has been a tyrannical government. Of that there is no question. However, Puerto Rico has lived side by side, Haiti has lived side by side, Cuba has lived side by side, all the countries of Central America have lived side by side with this fellow—without approval, but without fear of him.

After the Communists got into Cuba, immediately attacks are made against all of these countries. Then people come back from the conference and say, "Look what we did. We slapped down this old fellow, who is about to go out anyway." They ran away from communism in Cuba. To call that a victory is nothing more than a mockery.

Mr. THURMOND. Is it not true that Yugoslavia is a dictatorship, and that we have granted money and aid to the country, not knowing which way Yugoslavia will turn in the end? We knew the Dominican Republic was with us, yet we have practically forsaken her and turned our backs on her.

Mr. SMATHERS. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. THURMOND. Is it not true that under Fidel Castro Cuba has become Communist dominated, and that we might as well accept the fact for what it is? We should be on guard with respect to Cuba rather than to suspect our friend, the Dominican Republic, which has been our friend for a long time?

Mr. SMATHERS. I agree with the Senator. The real enemy is the government of Fidel Castro, because it is a Communist government whose purpose it is—some day—to rule the world and to destroy all existing governments.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I have listened with great interest to the speech by the distinguished Senator from Florida, who is without question, the foremost expert on Latin American affairs in this body. I make this statement on the basis of his longstanding, personal, and real interest over a good many years. He has, I believe, traveled in all the countries of Latin America, not once, but many times over. In other words, he is a Senator of experience, knowledge, and interest.

I must say, however, and I say this most respectfully, that I do not agree with him relative to the final outcome of the conference in San Jose in this respect. Certainly it was not a victory for us, as he stated emphatically; at the same time, I do not look upon it as a defeat because of 1 occasion 20 of the states of the Americas got together to pass a resolution against a sister republic. On another occasions 19 states got together to pass a resolution which, while not naming the sister republic, left no doubt in anyone's mind as to who is meant.

The Senator has said that at the present time Castro is moving into the direction of Central America and other areas of the Caribbean and South America. The Senator is correct. I wish to call to the attention of both the Senate and the administration the fact that this trend, and ways to forestall it, have been brought to our consideration and notice for years by the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] and only now, at long last, are we coming forward with the kind of program which will stop this penetration of the Castro columns, so to speak, and give some hope and sustenance to the peoples of Latin America, and thereby at long last possibly bring into operation on a cooperative and a collective basis the very things which the Senator from Florida has been emphasizing should be done for a good many years past.

So I agree with him in that respect, but I do not agree with him that the conference of San José has been along the lines of a failure, because I think something was achieved there.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thank the able Senator from Montana. I want him to know there is no Senator in this body for whom I have greater affection or a higher respect. I regret that the able Senator was not present when I started my little talk, because I thought I submitted evidence, which he was unable to hear, documenting why I consider the San Jose conference a failure.

I referred to the Caracas resolution of 1954, in which all of the countries of Latin America, including Cuba, went on record to say:

> We are opposed to international communism. We will resist it.

They pledged unified action against it. That was in 1954. Now, 6 years later, what sort of resolution is adopted? A resolution that says:

> We emphatically stand against communism.

They did not have the courage to name Cuba or Fidel Castro.

I do not see how we can claim the result in Costa Rica as a victory.

As I said earlier in my statement, it is like a couple of brothers, one of whom says to the other, "We are going to beat the dickens out of those fellows over there."

They pick out the smallest boy, and they both beat him up. They look at the big fellow and one brother says to the other, "I don't know whether we can beat him up."

And so they leave him alone and return home and brag about the big victory they won.

As the head of the UPI said, as Ted Szulc of the New York Times intimated, the conference was a failure. They failed to meet the issue. Their administration gambled. It put up the Dominican Republic and said, "We will ostracize the Dominican Republic if you will help us to ostracize the Communists in Cuba."

The conference ostracized the Dominican Republic, but we were such poor negotiators that we could not get the conference to set against the Cubans. So Cuba walked out the winner.

Why did the Cubans leave? Not because they were indicted. They were angry, as Raul Roa, the Secretary of State of Cuba said, because the conference did not condemn the United States.

I say to my good friend, whom I highly respect, and who is keenly interested in this problem, I do not quarrel with him about his viewpoint. But, so far as I am concerned, the conference was a failure of U.S. leadership.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. One of the pleasant things about being a Democrat is

that we can differ and still remain friends and still remain true to the ideals that we profess.

I did hear the speech of the Senator from Florida because I was present most of the time. I followed him with a great deal of interest. But he had eyes only for the President pro tempore, and I can understand why that magnet attracted him at all times.

I know that the Cuban foreign minister, Raul Roa, walked out. I know that the Cubans have concocted a cock-and-bull story to the effect that there was some sort of American plot which was to the effect that the plane in which the Cuban foreign minister was to return home was to be shot down, and therefore, he had to return early. That, of course, was an utter and complete falsehood.

But the point I think we ought to keep in mind is that even though the result of the conference was not anywhere near what the Senator from Florida and I had hoped for, even though some of the foreign ministers had to have their senior delegates sign in their places, nevertheless we must recognize the fact that the influence of Castro in Cuba is being felt in many of the other Latin American countries. This is a factor to be contended with. Some of the delegates representing these governments would like to have gone along with what we desired at the conference at San José, but because of the situation at home, they felt that they could not go all the way because they were well aware of the difficulties which might arise and confront them.

I bring that point out only to straighten the record and not to disagree too much with the distinguished Senator from Florida.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, let us clear the record further. I do not wish any reader of the RECORD subsequently to believe that the Senator from Florida was looking at the Presiding Officer and being magnetized by the Vice President. The Vice President is not in the chair. [Laughter.]

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I desire to compliment the Senator from Florida upon his outstanding work with respect to Latin American affairs, and upon the constant vigilance and the constant thought he has given to this subject. He is forthright in expressing his views concerning Latin American policy.

If his words of warning had been listened to earlier by those in authority in the administration, perhaps we would not find ourselves in the situation which confronts the Nation today at its very doorstep, and particularly at the doorstep of the State of the distinguished Senator from Florida, as it affects the very serious situation in South American and Latin American affairs.

The voice of the junior Senator from Florida has been consistent and logical on this question. I join with him in his remarks and hope that they will at least be listened to now, if they were not listened to before.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thank the able Senator from Indiana for his generous comments.

SUGAR QUOTAS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when H.R. 13062 is reported, it will be in order to proceed to its consideration. That, I inform the Senate, is the so-called sugar bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I do so only hoping that the Senator will let me do something by unanimous consent, I have no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, only for the RECORD, and for the information of the Senate, the Senate Finance Committee is meeting at the present time on the sugar bill, which has passed the House. I presume the committee expects to report, and if the measure is to be considered today, authority must be obtained for doing so. Therefore I do not have any objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAUSCHE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

JANE ADDAMS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the Congress of the United States has recently passed a joint resolution honoring Jane Addams, who is the well-known founder of Hull House and a worker for world peace. The joint resolution is now before the President for his signature.

The timeliness of this resolution brings to mind the fact that Mrs. Alice K. Leopold, assistant to the Secretary of Labor, received the Jane Addams Medal for distinguished service. This award was inaugurated by Rockford College, Rockford, Ill. I ask unanimous consent that a press release from the Department of Labor pertaining to Mrs. Leopold's receiving the Jane Addams Medal be placed at this point in the RECORD.

The press release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALICE K. LEOPOLD TO RECEIVE JANE ADDAMS MEDAL

Mrs. Alice K. Leopold, assistant to the Secretary of Labor, will receive the Jane Addams Medal for distinguished sevice, at a dinner to be held at Rockford College, Rockford, Ill., April 29.

The medal honoring Miss Addams, who is well known as the founder of Hull House and as a worker for world peace, is given periodically to a woman in this or a foreign country who has made an outstanding contribution to society in her lifetime. Among the recipients of the medal, which was established by Rockford College in 1947, have been Katharine Cornell, Ada Comstock Notestein, president emeritus of Radcliffe College, and Vera Micheles Dean, editor of the Foreign Policy Association.

Mrs. Leopold, who has been in Washington since her appointment by President Eisenhower in 1953, has had an outstanding career at a local, State, and national level, and her record of achievement has led her into extensive work in the broader scope of international activities. For example, in 1954, she was appointed as adviser to the U.S. delegation to the conference of the International Labor Organization in Geneva, Switzerland. She again served in this capacity in June 1956 and 1957. In 1956, she was chairman of the first ILO Committee to consider problems of particular importance to women—the Committee of Experts on Women's Employment, and she was influential in the governing body's decision to organize a permanent tripartite committee on women's employment which met for the first time last year. She was chosen as chairman for the meeting held in Geneva, Switzerland.

A foreign exchange program which was initiated by Mrs. Leopold in 1954 not only brought 67 Italian and French women to the United States to see how women here live and work, but the impact of this idea was such that it has continued since then with many countries and with many different groups such as the six Russian women doctors who visited here in 1957.

Mrs. Leopold's continuous work with the United Nations Commission on the Status of Women brought about a number of worthwhile conferences, and close cooperation between the U.S. delegates and Mrs. Leopold and the legislative division of her staff.

A graduate of Goucher College, Mrs. Leopold was in personnel work originally until she and her husband, Joseph Leopold, settled in Weston, Conn. Here their two sons were born. The older, Lt. Robert Leopold, USN, a Dartmouth graduate, is married and has a small son. He is stationed in Norfolk, Va. John, who was graduated from Dartmouth last June, is a lieutenant in the U.S. Army, studying Turkish at the Army Presidio in Monterey, Calif.

THE HONORABLE ALICE K. LEOPOLD, ASSISTANT TO THE SECRETARY OF LABOR AND DIRECTOR OF THE WOMEN'S BUREAU—U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

(Appointed by President Eisenhower in 1953 to post in the Labor Department.)

Married to Joseph Leopold, vice president of a New York advertising agency. They have two sons, Robert, a Dartmouth College graduate, now serving as a lieutenant in the U.S. Navy, and John, 1959, Dartmouth graduate, now a lieutenant in the Army.

Graduated from Goucher College, 1927.

APPOINTMENTS, BOARDS, AND COMMITTEES

President's Committee on Government Employment Policy, 1959.

Chairman, International Labor Organization Panel of Consultants on the Problems of Women Workers, 1959.

Chairman, International Labor Organization Committee of Experts on Women's Employment, 1956.

Adviser to U.S. delegation at annual meetings of International Labor Organization, Geneva, Switzerland, 1954, 1956, 1957, and 1959.

Committee on Economic Problems of the Aged.

National Committee on the Aging.

National Advisory Committee, National League for Nursing.

Advisory Board American Council on Women in Science.

Adviser to the Women's Africa Committee.

Executive Board, Women's Medical College of Pennsylvania.

National Girl Scout Advisory Council.

Women's Board, Norwalk Hospital, Norwalk, Conn.

Membership Committee, Women's Activities Conference, National Safety Council.

Trustee, Educational Foundation, American Women in Radio and Television.

BACKGROUND

Elected Connecticut assemblywoman, 1949–50; author of bills which were enacted on equal pay and minimum wage.

Elected secretary of state in Connecticut, 1950–53; author of first general revision since 1860 of Connecticut election laws.

Commissioner of elections in Connecticut, 1953.

Presidential appointee to Commisssion on Intergovernmental Relations, 1953–55.
Member State of Connecticut Boards and Commissions of Education, Labor-Management Relations and Public Housing.
Executive Committee, National Association of Secretaries of State.
Trustee, Goucher College.
Originator Blood Donor Program of Fairfield County, Conn.
Officer in Westport-Weston Chapter, Red Cross.
President, Parent-Teachers Association, Weston, Conn.
Connecticut State Chairman, Committee on Economic Welfare, League of Women Voters.
Vestryman Lyons Plains Episcopal Church.
Trustee, Connecticut Association for Blind.
Personnel Director, Hutzler's, Baltimore, Md., 1927–31.
Personnel Director, B. Altman, New York City, 1931–33.
Designer and manufacturer, My Town Toys.

HONORS

Connecticut's Woman of the Year, 1951.
Connecticut's Republican Woman of the Year, 1955.
Woman of Achievement, American Federation of Soroptimists.
Doctor of humane letters degree, Hood College, Frederick, Md., 1956.
Distinguished Service Citation, National Association and Council Business Schools, 1959.
Doctor of social science degree, Woman's Medical College of Pennsylvania, 1957.
Doctor of laws degree, Rutgers University, 1958.
Togetherness Award by McCall's magazine, 1958.
Charm Magazine Award, 1958.
Distinguished Citizen Award, Alpha Gamma Delta International Fraternity, 1959.
Jane Addams Medal for Distinguished Service, April 1960.

MEMBERSHIPS

National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs.
American Association for United Nations.
National Federation of Republican Women.
American Association of University Women.
Daughters of the American Revolution.
American Newspaper Women's Club.
National Consumers League.
Northfield Grange.

MINIMUM WAGE LEGISLATION

Mr. KENNEDY obtained the floor.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield so that I may make a point of no quorum?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, as the Senate knows now, the conference between the House and the Senate on the minimum wage bill has ended, and there is now little or no prospect that the conference can be successfully resumed.

As that conference is important, because it involves an important piece of legislation, and also because it throws a good deal of light on the difficulties which we have faced in this session, I think it important that we report to the Senate what happened in the conference.

As Senators will recall, the House of Representatives passed a minimum wage bill which provided new coverage for 1,400,000 people, of whom approximately 300,000 were receiving less than the amount they would receive in the House bill. The remaining number were already receiving more than the House figure. The House bill provided for a $1.15 minimum wage for the presently covered, raising the wage from $1 to $1.15. It provided a dollar minimum wage for those who were not now covered, with no step-up. There was no limitation on overtime. That was the House bill.

The Senate bill provided a minimum wage of $1.25 for the presently covered, with a 3-year step-up. It provided coverage for 4,100,000 persons. It provided for $1.25 for the newly covered, with a 4-year step-up. In addition, it contained a definition of the words "affecting commerce," and it also had a discussion, which was in controversy in the Senate, of the word "enterprise."

Those were the differences between the House and Senate bills.

We sat down in a conference composed of five Members from the majority party—of whom only four attended—and three Republicans. We were anxious to get a bill. I shall relate briefly our experience in the committee, because I think it is an illuminating experience for Members of Congress.

After the committee had met informally the first day, the New York Times published an article containing a statement by one of the conferees from the minority on the House side. The Representative said:

> The House will not yield. It boils down to the House version or no bill.

In other words, from the beginning, there was never any doubt, and the chairman of the House conferees was completely frank and honest. The personal relations in the conference were extremely cordial, but he made his opposition clear and was supported by the minority of three Members on the House side that the bill would be the House bill, or there would be no bill.

The problem confronting the Senate conferees was that our bill was quite different from the House bill. Whereas the House bill provided $1.15 an hour for persons presently covered, the Senate bill provided $1.25. Whereas the House bill provided coverage for 1,400,000, the Senate provided coverage for 4,100,000.

Whereas the Senate bill provided for overtime, for the newly covered, after 44 hours the second year, 42 hours the third year and 40 hours thereafter, the House bill had no overtime provision.

So the differences between the bills were substantial, and we were not in a position, representing the Senate, to say that it was the House bill or nothing.

To the best of my knowledge, I do not recall any conference which I have attended, in the 14 years I have been in Congress, when the conferees on the part of either the House or the Senate indicated that the bill would be either the House bill or the Senate bill, or nothing. Therefore, the Senate conferees indicated their willingness to accept some compromise.

First, we were willing to drop our request for $1.25 and to take $1.15.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] informed us that he felt the President could not accept, probably, a bill providing for $1.25, so we dropped that figure and said we would take the $1.15. I believe I have quoted the Senator correctly.

So we took the $1.15.

We then decided we would support the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY]. In my opinion, the Senator from Vermont, who has raised some question about the conference, made a constant effort to bring the conference into agreement. So far as I am concerned, I think he did everything that any single person could do to try to achieve a compromise between the House and Senate positions. He offered five different amendments. The majority of the Democrats supported three of the five amendments. We dropped the words "affecting commerce"; and we dropped the word "enterprise"; both phrases having been in controversy in the Senate. We agreed to accept the $1.15 an hour. We agreed to step up the minimum wage, for those covered, to $1.15 over a 3-year period.

We started out on the hourly coverage for those now covered at 46 hours, instead of 44. We agreed to a coverage of around 3,100,000 people instead of 4,100,000. We lowered the coverage. We accepted the House figure on minimum wage. We asked for a higher figure for the newly covered, from $1 to $1.15, and asked for a small overtime limitation. In my opinion, that was a compromise which should have been accepted.

The Senator from Vermont offered that amendment in five different forms. The record shows that the majority of the Democrats voted for that compromise on three different occasions.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I think it also should be pointed out that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] agreed to certain modifications in his original amendments, which in the opinion of some of us on the Senate side were very important. In particular, I would mention his acceptance of an amendment which I offered referring to goods coming across State lines, directly or indirectly, which took care of the jobber problem. He was also willing to substitute two establishments in two or more States, instead of three, four, or five establishments, in two or more States.

That, I think, demonstrated the further willingness on the part of the Senator from Vermont to extend his point of view in order to reach agreement on a bill. As the Senator knows, in my opinion that was an exceedingly impor-

tant modification. The Senator from Vermont was also willing to accept a modification when we discussed the amendment dealing with sales, rather than purchases, of $1,500,000 rather than $1 million, which the Senator from Oregon proposed.

Mr. KENNEDY. In addition to the dollar compromise figures, we dropped two sections which were in great controversy in the Senate. We dropped the words "affecting commerce" and the word "enterprise."

The amendments offered by the Senator from Vermont are listed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday, beginning on page 18350. Senators can form their own judgment as to the acceptability of those amendments.

The majority of the conferees on the Senate side voted for the Prouty amendments.

Some of the amendments we did not accept, but of the amendments we voted for, none of the minority Members of the Senate, except the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] voted for them. The majority of the House Members on the conference voted against every one of them, and indicated very clearly and frankly, from the beginning, that the bill would be the House bill or nothing. The effort to achieve a compromise, therefore, was in vain.

The Prouty amendment in at least one of its forms—and I believe in two of its forms—was almost identical with the final recommendations of Secretary of Labor Mitchell. They were in effect the Eisenhower administration recommendations on minimum wage; but they were overwhelmingly rejected by the conference, even though the Senate conferees accepted them, and even though they represented a sharp departure from what we thought was at least an adequate minimum wage and adequate coverage.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and I, who introduced the bill, at one time provided a figure for adequate coverage of 7 million. At one time it went as high as 11 million. When we brought the bill to the floor, the bill provided for 5 million. On the floor, the number was reduced to 4 million. We would have taken 3 million in conference.

Senators may ask, "Why not take the House bill? It represents progress."

The fact is that the experience in minimum wage legislation is that this matter does not come to the floor of Congress except every 4 or 5 years. The last time was in 1955. Before that, it was 1949. Before that it was back in the 1930's. If we accepted the House bill, we could not come back in January and begin what is the long course of laborious, controversial work. Members of Congress would feel that they had disposed of the matter.

We have not disposed of the matter. The Members of the other body have not disposed of it. The Senate has an interest in the matter. We could not go to conference and say, "We will take the work of the House." The House bill represented the views of a very slim majority of the House. We would undo everything we sought to do as to definitions, which would face us in this field in the future in the courts.

Therefore, the correct position for us to take, when it was not possible to compromise the bills, was to say, "We will not take the House bill." If it is to be the House bill or nothing, then for us it will be nothing.

Mr. President, in my judgment this problem must be attacked again in January. If we cannot get a bill this year, we will get one next year. I can assure Senators that this matter, even though it is extremely difficult to consider in committee and on the floor, will be brought to the floor again. It is a matter which should be discussed in the coming months, so that the American people may make their judgment as to what they want in the field of minimum wages.

In this conference we see in microcosm the experience of Congress. The majority of the members of the House conference oppose any work but their work. That is their privilege. But it is also the privilege of the Senate conferees not to walk all the way over to the House and accept a bill which does not provide adequate protection; to accept a bill in the name of getting the form of a bill, but without substance.

Not one member of the minority conferees in the other body voted for any compromise. They did not even vote for the Eisenhower program.

There are some Democrats who do not agree with our program. They are entitled to their views.

However, to permit 100 percent opposition, with the exception of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], to defeat a proposal for a compromise drafted along the lines of the Eisenhower administration's program in the field of minimum wages, indicates, I believe, in great measure the difficulties we have had at this session.

I assure the Senate that it is a matter which will be discussed this fall; and if the members of the Democratic Party are successful, they will come back, with the support of a President and a Vice President in the field of minimum wages, not a position of opposition.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey in the chair). Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. First, Mr. President, I salute my distinguished friend and associate on the committee, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY]. He was by all odds, I believe, the most aggressive member of the conference. He offered five different proposals.

I think the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts has, generally speaking, stated the case reasonably well.

However, there are some things to be added. The one and only amendment to the bill that was adopted was offered by the House chairman himself, Representative BARDEN. It dealt with the so-called production area. I struck that out, when we considered the bill on the floor of the Senate, and offered it as a substitute. So, actually, under the House bill there was a coverage of 1,400,000 persons. That was agreed to. But beyond that, we agreed to exactly nothing.

Mr. KENNEDY. That was agreed to because a House error struck out 4 million from the coverage. That is why there was general agreement that that would not be wise action.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That cured that; and then they also cured the so-called production-area proposal, because under the original act, without the blooper in it, there would have been coverage of 700,000. But when that was corrected there was coverage of 1,400,000.

So, as the Senator from Massachusetts has said, the problem then went to the question of the wage.

I stated that not only did I believe the President would not accept the $1.25, but that the House conferees would not accept the $1.25, nor would they consider escalation, as such, for those not now covered.

It is no secret that I would not accept escalation. For the life of me, I cannot understand why there would be a desire to project a minimum wage 4 years into the future, not knowing what the state of the economy then would be. If it were done by legislative fiat, without a shred of evidence, I would regard it as irresponsible action on the part of the Congress. So then the difficulty over escalation was laid aside, knowing that we could not agree.

Then we came to grips with the five proposals offered by the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY]. He did strike out the so-called activities affecting commerce, and substituted, in the first amendment, the words "enterprise doing business in commerce to a substantial extent." Of course he kept the idea of interstate commerce, by providing for two or more establishments in two or more States.

But then there was an alternative proposal of "or a single establishment doing business within a single State where supplies move directly across State lines," or purchases to the extent of $1 million move across State lines. I thought I made my case out very clearly. I would not hang a dollar sign on the interstate commerce clause; and I am not prepared to do so now, under any circumstances. Unless this commerce is identified without the dollar sign, I believe the commerce clause would certainly go out of the window.

Then we had an alternative proposal—substantially the same, except in that case it referred to purchases of merchandise, materials, and so forth moving across State lines, on a $1 million basis. There, they used the words " 'employer engaged in commerce' means any employer with five or more establishments in two or more States or a single employer," under the criterion of the dollar sign, to determine whether he was in commerce.

The third proposal also used the words "employer engaged in commerce," and substituted them for "activities affecting commerce," on the basis of purchases that would amount to $1 million "that have moved across a State line."

So I made inquiry. Suppose I were doing business in the State of my distinguished compatriot, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], and suppose I had an emporium in Knoxville. Suppose I bought all my merchandise from a jobber in Knoxville; and suppose the jobber got his merchandise from distributors in Nashville, Chattanooga, and Memphis. None of it actually went across State lines, as such; but it was manufactured beyond the State of Tennessee. Then the question would be, was that single employer in commerce? And the answer was, "Yes." Obviously I did not feel that I could accept that.

The distinguished Senator from Oregon offered an amendment to the Prouty amendment, and even made it more expansive, and included the words "that move directly or indirectly."

So, when we got through, the conferees rejected it.

Then we came to the next proposal; and there, instead of predicating it on the basis of purchases——

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield briefly to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MUSKIE in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Let the RECORD show that my amendment did not go to a vote, because the Senator from Vermont accepted it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct. It was a perfecting amendment; and that was also true of the change in the figure, in the one instance, from $2 million to $1,500,000.

So the committee did not have to vote upon that; but it was rejected.

Then came the next proposal; and there, instead of using purchases as a criterion, we used "annual gross sales of $1,500,000." I read the language to show the difficulty that a conferee will have:

> Any employer who derives $1,500,000 or more in annual gross sales—

Now listen, Mr. President:

> from activities depending on, or furthering, the movement or travel in commerce of persons or goods, or of communications, or otherwise requiring or enabling persons to engage in commerce, or in the production of goods for commerce.

I am frank to say that I do not know what that means, and I do not know how far it goes. I do not know what the enforcement and the administrative problems are; and under the circumstances I simply felt that I could not go along at all with that idea.

So there we were, with a House bill which was specific, definite, called for a minimum of $1.15 an hour, and did not have any escalation clause, but preserved the interstate feature. And if I must make candid confession, I would say that it could have been done on the basis of two establishments in two or more States, as well as five establishments. But in any event, the House bill preserved the interstate character of that act. So I can understand the attitude of the House conferees. After all, they have 437 Members with whom to deal, and they must go back and make their report. They voted on their bill. They had any number of bills over there. That was as much as they could get; and they did precisely what a conferee was expected to do under those circumstances, when representing the majority opinion of his body.

So, on that basis, it became quite obvious that yesterday afternoon the conference was making no progress, and probably would make no progress. And on that basis it was agreed by all present that we should take a recess, subject to the call of the two chairmen. And that ended the conference.

Mr. KENNEDY. I should like to make two points: First, in the House, the bill comparable to the bill the Senator offered, which was really the Senate bill, was defeated by only 11 votes. So there was not a large mandate by the House of Representatives in that connection.

Second, I would point out to the Members of the Senate that the conference committee was composed of four Democrats and three Republicans on the House side and four Democrats and three Republicans on the Senate side. On the Prouty amendments—on at least two out of the five—six out of the seven members of the Democratic Party voted for that compromise, which was the Eisenhower program. Six out of seven Members on the other side in both Houses voted against it.

Can anybody who has been in conference with the House and Senate say it has been possible to reach an agreement when one side or the other says, "It is our bill or nothing," and give not a single inch?

Mr. DIRKSEN. If my notes are correct—and I will have to depend on the distinguished counsel to the committee to advise me whether they are correct or not—when we considered the next to the last compromise, which I think was No. 4, in reference to the million and a half dollars in gross sales in activities moving or traveling in interstate commerce, my notes show the Senate conferees voted yeas 4, nays 3, and the House conferees voted yeas 2, nays 4.

Mr. KENNEDY. Can the Senator identify the amendment? Was that the Prouty amendment?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That was the Prouty amendment, No. 4.

Mr. KENNEDY. That carried in the Senate side.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I shall not mention the names of Senators.

Mr. KENNEDY. No, but the Senate side voted for the amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. One Senator on the majority side voted with the minority on it. So that adding them together, the yeas were six and the nays were seven.

Mr. KENNEDY. It is true that on one of the amendments three out of four on the majority side supported the amendment. On one of them they did not support it, but it still passed as the Senate position. But the Members on the other side voted against every amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes, but when we get to considering a proposal which involves $1½ million or more in annual gross sales, the votes were yeas four, nays three, on the Senate side, and on the House side the yeas two, and the nays four. Representative LANDRUM was absent and did not vote. Had he been there, he certainly would have voted "nay" on the House side. Then we would have had a vote of eight against the amendment and six for the amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY. Would the Senator care to comment on another amendment which did not come out in quite that fashion?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I quite agree with the Senator's statement. I have no quarrel with it. So there we were in a state of disagreement. I had not capitulated or retreated from the position I fought for on the floor time and time again with respect to the interstate commerce concept, and I do not depart from it now. I asserted it at length, as my distinguished friend knows, with a great deal of vigor in the committee.

Mr. KENNEDY. And with effectiveness.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I hoped it would be effective, but it was not effective enough to persuade my Democratic colleagues to vote with me.

Mr. KENNEDY. But it goes beyond this bill, and it indicates the difficulty in conference of attempting to reach an agreement satisfactory to two parties, both committed to a minimum wage bill. Both parties are committed to the title of "minimum wage," and this matter is under that cloak. Both parties say they are for a minimum wage bill, but the differences are vast, and I think it is important that those differences are brought out. When the members of the public read that members of both parties and in both the House and Senate are committed to a minimum wage bill, and are committed to a health bill, and are committed to an education bill, I think they should know that when we get right down to what kind of bill should be passed, we go in two different directions. I think our experience indicates the differences we have and the difficulties we have in trying to get legislation of this type in this session.

Mr. DIRKSEN. When we consider the broad interests involved in the bill, the number of people who came before the committee to ventilate their views on the subject, the number of people who came, in season and out, to testify to individual Members of the House and the Senate of the impact of the bill, those facts simply mean it was an important piece of legislation; and the country can take hope and find rare assurance in the fact that Members of the Senate and the House, in the best of good grace, with forebearing spirit, but with steel-like conviction, can sit there, never lose their tempers, air their views, and still produce nothing.

Mr. KENNEDY. I have never heard a happier explanation of the philosophy of those who are opposed to the bill. I grant that the discussion was good natured, as it is today, but the differ-

ences are very important, and I think they go to the issue of what I consider to be a proper one as between the parties in the coming months. I think we should make this point, because otherwise the vocabulary is identical. The Senator from Illinois and I are both for minimum wage legislation.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

Mr. KENNEDY. But the difference between the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Massachusetts is as to what kind of a minimum wage bill it is essential to have.

Therefore, it does no good for us to pledge ourselves to the general principle and then have the American people ask, "When they are both for it, and the House and Senate are for it, why don't we get a minimum wage bill?" I think the experience in this conference will demonstrate to them why.

Mr. DIRKSEN. To me it is a tribute to the truth of the conclusion that when 10 or 12 or 15 around the conference table cannot agree, we should ask ourselves, are we going to impose some kind of disagreement upon millions of people and millions of enterprise operators in the country who would be subject to interpretation, to court rule, to determine what we had written, when we did not even know ourselves what we were trying to fabricate?

Mr. KENNEDY. No, but I say to the Senator that the reason why I am discussing this matter on the floor of the Senate today is that what is at stake is a most important principle, that when we talk about great pieces of social legislation, we have to talk about what we mean. In my judgment, the House bill did not represent progress and would have insured next year that there would have been no progress. Now it remains unfinished business for the Congress and for the country; and I just feel that the American people should reach a judgment. Do they want a minimum wage of $1.25? Do they want 5 or 6 or 7 million people in interstate commerce covered? The words "affecting commerce," which have been blown up so much, are in the Landrum-Griffin bill and in the Taft-Hartley Act. We did not invent that phrase. Those words are already in previous legislation supported by a good many Members of the House and the Senate who do not support the recently passed bill. We did not invent it. It is not new. This language appeared in the Taft-Hartley Act. We did not suddenly put the words "affecting commerce" in our bill. The people covered in that bill are already in interstate commerce under the Taft-Hartley Act and the Landrum-Griffin Act. The question is, should those people in interstate commerce be paid $1.25 an hour? That is what the American people should decide.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The answer to that is that we are considering a measure dealing with labor, and when Mr. Justice Hughes was still on the Supreme Court, in the Jones & Laughlin case he carefully circumscribed how far we could go in that language.

Mr. KENNEDY. That was in the 1930's.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I read that language into the RECORD, and I uttered it on the floor.

Mr. KENNEDY. What year was that?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not have the year.

Mr. KENNEDY. It was in 1937 or 1938. The Taft-Hartley Act used the words "affecting commerce." The Jones-Laughlin case was decided in 1937. The Taft-Hartley Act and the Landrum-Griffin Act overrode the words "affecting commerce."

The National Labor Relations Board has jurisdiction over all of these firms, in retail down to $500,000. Actually, the Board could cover firms at a figure lower than that, by its own admission. To use the argument as an argument against picking up a firm with $1½ million worth of business a year, which, it is said, should not pay $1.25 or even $1.15 an hour, I think is the issue, and that is what we ought to discuss.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Of course, the Senator brought in a bill with all of these complexities and strange definitions. I always refer back to the Scripture, to words uttered long ago in one of the letters of the Apostle Paul:

> So likewise ye, except ye utter by the tongue words easy to be understood, how shall it be known what is spoken?

We came along with the language. I wrestled with it. I did not know what it meant, after weeks in the committee. I did not know what its impact was going to be.

What about the little fellow on Main Street? What about the little business establishments all over the country?

Mr. KENNEDY. What about the persons working in those little business establishments which, under the Prouty amendment, had to make $1.5 million before those persons would be covered?

Mr. DIRKSEN. We had no understanding as to how far the second part of the amendment would really go. I said, "All right. I have to see this written out in the English language, integrated into the bill."

It never was integrated into the committee print. How could one tell, unless one referred back and wrote it in? We never got around to that. These were all mimeographed suggestions, not in legislative language. They were suggestions for a possible approach. We never got beyond that point.

Mr. KENNEDY. We never did.

Mr. DIRKSEN. So it is a testimony to the fact. I say it is an assurance to the country that when we cannot agree upon what language means, we trust the day will never come when we are going to inflict those prolixities upon the American people, and particularly upon the little people who my distinguished friend knows very well cannot go out and retain expensive counsel. They are not like the United States Steel Corp. They are not like the packers. They are not like the big corporations in Pittsburgh, or in Boston, or in New York, or elsewhere.

We are dealing with the little people. They come running to their Senators and their Representatives in Congress and say, "What does this mean? What does it do to me?" Perhaps they will come after the hot breath of the sheriff is rolling down their backbones. [Laughter.]

I am not willing to inflict those uncertainties upon the people of this country. If anybody is to blame for failure here, I think it is a collective failure, with particular emphasis upon those who sponsored the bill in the first place, with these prolix definitions, which not even a Philadelphia lawyer can piece out. [Laughter.]

My friend, the Senator from Philadelphia [Mr. CLARK], has such versatility that I make an exception for him. He can piece out anything. [Laughter.]

That is where we stand. I am not unhappy about the fact that we did not put something on the statute books which would fall with great weight on and be an onerous burden on a great many people before we get through. I am not unhappy, when I can go back home to have somebody ask me, "What did you write into the act? How am I affected?" and not have to stand on the main street of my town and say, "I do not know what we did to you." [Laughter.]

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank my distinguished friend from Massachusetts for yielding to me.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. KENNEDY. Yes. I had finished my statement. I think I said I would yield to the Senator from Vermont, and then I shall be prepared to yield to the Senator from Oregon. Then I shall yield the floor, because I have finished my statement, unless Senators wish to address questions to me.

Mr. PROUTY. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator a question.

Mr. KENNEDY. Very well.

Mr. PROUTY. First, I wish to express my appreciation to the Senator and to the distinguished Senator from Oregon and to the distinguished minority leader for the very kind references made to me a few minutes ago. I appreciate those statements.

I wish to point out, Mr. President—and I think the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts will agree—that I made a very sincere effort to come up with a compromise approach at one time or another which would be acceptable to both groups.

The amendments which I offered and the statement which I made on the floor last night appear in yesterday's RECORD, starting at page 18350, so I shall not take time to discuss that in any detail.

I wish to point out to the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts that the real nub of the problem as between the two groups, I think, was in regard to the "activity affecting commerce" concept. The House conferees, I think, were adamant on that question. Certainly many Members of the Senate and many Members of the House were very much in doubt as to what the language meant.

In order to clarify the situation somewhat, in my first amendment, I substituted for the words "affecting commerce" the term "enterprise doing business in commerce to a substantial extent."

The basis for the amendment, or the primary objective of the amendment, was to develop an inflow test of a million dollars. In other words, goods flowing into a State from another State to a jobber or a wholesaler would be considered to be in interstate commerce, but if the goods were sold to other retailers in the State the goods would not be considered to be in interstate commerce.

I point out, first, that under the amendment 3.1 million newly covered employees would have been brought into the picture at a wage of $1.05 for the newly covered for the first year, $1.10 for the second year, and $1.15 for the third year. Of course, the presently covered workers would have received $1.15 immediately.

That seemed to me to represent progress. It seemed to me that was one way of bringing the House conferees closer to the point of view held by the majority of the Senate conferees.

Mr. President, I am sure the Senator from Massachusetts will agree that the amendment was voted down by the Senate conferees. The House conferees never had an opportunity to vote on that amendment. I think if the Senate conferees had agreed—had the Senator and the other Senate conferees approved the amendment—perhaps we would have been able to work out a compromise from that origin. I think that would have been a start.

The same was true with respect to the second amendment, which would have brought coverage to 3.1 million new employees. It seemed to me that was worth fighting for a little bit harder than some of us did.

I conclude by saying that the last amendment——

Mr. KENNEDY. We did accept that amendment, did we not?

Mr. PROUTY. Not the second one.

Mr. KENNEDY. The second one.

Mr. PROUTY. I think not. No. The second amendment contained the words "directly across State lines."

Mr. KENNEDY. After that was changed, we accepted the third amendment.

Mr. PROUTY. The third amendment was accepted.

The fifth amendment——

Mr. KENNEDY. We accepted the fourth amendment, did we not? Is that not correct?

Mr. PROUTY. That is correct; but the House conferees turned it down.

I wish to point out that in the fifth amendment we proposed to cover only employees actually engaged in interstate commerce, and I regret to say that was turned down by the Senate conferees. That would have brought under coverage about 2,840,000 people who are not now covered, at a definite increased wage.

I felt, Mr. President, that it would have been better if someone on the Senate side had proposed amendments to the House bill, in order that we might start amending that bill. I think, if we had done so, that we might very well have come up with a compromise bill which would have brought 2 million or perhaps 2½ million newly covered workers into the field, with consequent increases in their wage scales.

Mr. KENNEDY. As the Senator pointed out, we did accept at least two of his amendments, and there was no evidence that the House was prepared to accept either one of those, or the other, was there?

Mr. PROUTY. As to the first two amendments, the House conferees had no opportunity.

Mr. KENNEDY. When the House conferees did have an opportunity, did they accept the amendment? Can the Senator say to the Senate there was an indication that the House was prepared to accept different language from that in the House bill? Did the House conferees offer any amendment on this subject?

Mr. PROUTY. They offered no amendment, but in the case of the first two amendments, they had no opportunity to do so. I feel that we could have come up with a bill that perhaps would not have been what the Senator from Massachusetts wanted. It perhaps would not have been what the junior Senator from Vermont wanted. But we would have had a bill, and we should have had a bill, if there were a little more give and take on both sides.

Mr. KENNEDY. Let us get the record accurate. Did the House conferees ever suggest an amendment to the House bill?

Mr. PROUTY. I think they were waiting. If we had been able to resolve this concept, I think it is highly possible—I do not say this categorically, of course—I think it is entirely possible that we might have made some effort to reach eventually some agreement with the House. But inasmuch as the Senate conferees refused to consider any basic change in that concept, the House I think remained adamant. There was no need of trying to make any suggestions as long as that concept remained in the minds of the majority of the Senate conferees.

Mr. KENNEDY. I do not wish to get into an argument with the Senator from Vermont. We did accept two of his amendments. The House conferees rejected both of them. I believe the Senator has stated that the House did not favor any amendment to their bill on any occasion. The members of the conferees from the House on several occasions had said that it was the House bill or no bill. That was their view. They are entitled to that position, but I would be reluctant to see a suggestion made that the House conferees were prepared to compromise the two bills.

Mr. PROUTY. I said if either of my first two amendments had been accepted by the Senate conferees, I thought there was a possibility. I do not pretend to say that the House conferees would have accepted them. I think, however, that would have been a point from which we perhaps could have made progress.

Mr. KENNEDY. Did the House conferees every say that? Did any member of the majority of the House Members say that he would accept the amendments?

Mr. PROUTY. The amendments certainly were in line with their concept.

Mr. KENNEDY. Did they ever say that they would accept them? Did they indicate any favorable support for the amendments of the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. PROUTY. They had no opportunity to vote.

Mr. KENNEDY. Did they indicate favorably their view in any view that was held on those two amendments? I assure the Senator they did not.

Mr. PROUTY. I do not know what their reaction was. They were waiting to see what we did on our side. I think agreement on either of those amendments, or the fifth amendment, which brought employees working in interstate commerce under the act, might have resulted in real progress. I feel it would have been much better to have had a law which would have helped millions of American workers than to put this bill off for heaven knows how long and give the workers absolutely nothing. I am very sad about that particular aspect. I am sorry we did not stay at the job a little longer and see if we could not work out a reasonable compromise. I tried hard. I think the Senator from Massachusetts tried very hard to bring about a compromise. But I think we could have stayed at the job a little bit longer and perhaps achieved a worthwhile result.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield to the Senator from Oregon, and then I shall yield the floor.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to speak very briefly on the subject of the conference on the minimum wage bill. It was my privilege and honor to be associated with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] as a coauthor of the bill when it was introduced in the Senate. I rise now to commend highly the leadership of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] in his handling of this very important issue from the very beginning of the consideration of it by the Senate Labor Committee, through the last moment of the conference yesterday.

I do not know how a chairman of a subcommittee—that had jurisdiction over this bill, of which Mr. KENNEDY was on the Senate side—could have worked harder or done a better job than he did in processing that bill through the subcommittee hearings in the Senate and then through consideration of the bill by the full committee of the Senate, and then on the floor of the Senate as we debated it here.

He did another magnificent job of handling the bill in conference in recent days where it has been under consideration.

He can close his ears for a moment while I make this personal reference, because I know him to be a modest man, and I am going to speak briefly about his modesty. He has been exceedingly modest in the report that he has made to the Senate this afternoon, and in making that report I think he has omitted, because of his modesty, one

very important event that occurred in that conference, which, in my judgment is a complete answer to my good friend the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] when he indicates that maybe something more could have been done than was done.

The Senator from Vermont has talked about our defeat of his first two amendments. Of course, we defeated them because on their merits they were unsound amendments. He did not get a single Republican on either side to support him in those amendments, and we on the Democratic side also recognized their inherent defect.

But when the Senator from Vermont came along with a couple of amendments that we thought were sound in principle, and with the modifications that he agreed to in regard to those amendments, we supported them. Again the Senator from Vermont failed to produce a Republican vote on either side of that conference table in support of his position.

Even the Senator from Massachusetts had pointed out that the basic principle of those amendments was the same principle that the Secretary of Labor, Mr. Mitchell, representing the President of the United States, testified in support of when he appeared before the Senate Labor Committee.

But the event that I wish to refer to that has not been mentioned in this discussion so far is that on two occasions the Senator from Massachusetts literally polled the House conferees and asked them whether or not they were prepared to make any proposal over and above the House bill. He went down the line, and each time he got the reply that they had no proposal to make.

I do not know what more the chairman could have done to try to elicit from the House conferees their cooperation, their proposals for compromise, than he did. We were up against a stone wall, so to speak. Except for two Democrats on the House side, we were up against a group of men who made it perfectly clear they were not going to favor any compromise. There were two Democrats on the House side who were willing to go along with a compromise of the House bill, but that was not true of any other House conferee.

I do not want the RECORD this afternoon to close with the innuendo or the impression that I fear might be left by the statement made by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] that the Senator from Massachusetts could have done anything in addition to what he did. We did the best we could to try to reconcile our differences and support those Prouty amendments that we thought were deserving of support.

In our behalf, the chairman pleaded with the House conferees to offer proposals for modification of the House bill, and they adamantly refused, save and accept the two of the Democrats on the House side who supported the Democrats on the Senate side in regard to the Prouty amendments, for which we did vote, and our other suggestions for modifications of the House bill.

The Senator from Massachusetts pointed out that the House bill adopted by a majority over in the House of about 11 votes. We were advised in conference that on that particular day there was a large absenteeism in the House, and it was the view of some of our House conferees that had it not been for that large absenteeism, the House bill might not have passed in the form in which it passed. That is speculation, of course, but the important point is that the vote in the House was very close, even on the House bill. The vote in the Senate represented a large majority support of the Senate bill.

The Senator from Massachusetts has pointed out that at the conference, when there was talk about what would happen if we took something back to the House, the House conferees who were opposed to us in conference tried to convince us that the House had spoken its final word. Some of the Democrats pointed out that they would like to see the House have another chance to vote on it, and would like to take some of the proposals of the Senator from Massachusetts back to the House. Furthermore, let us keep in mind that the parliamentary situation in the House which produced the House bill was quite different from the free and open debate, with the power of amendment, that exists on the floor of the Senate. As the House conferees pointed out to us, if they had not been handicapped by the rules of the House, it is quite possible that the House would have had an opportunity to vote on an entirely different bill than the bill that they were limited to vote on, because of the restrictive nature of the House rules.

So we were in conference with a group of men who were supporting a bill which we had good reason to doubt represented the majority will of the House, and different from the bill they would have voted if they had had a free and open opportunity to vote, or at least the kind of bill that some of the House conferees would have liked to have had an opportunity to vote on.

Some House conferees told us they were satisfied that if we could get some of the suggestions of the Senator from Massachusetts back to the House, the chances were that the action of the House, with a full attendance, would have been very much different than the action of the House when the House bill was adopted in the first place.

I am sure my friend from Vermont knows how appreciative I am of his friendship and of our association together on labor legislation, on this bill and on others also, when we have tried to work out a conscionable compromise. However, I completely disagree with the impression that his recent remarks on the floor of the Senate may have left, namely, that there was something more that could have been done.

In my judgment, the only additional thing that could have been done by staying in conference, would have been to waste more time, and we do not have any time to waste in these closing hours of the session. It was perfectly clear from the position that those across the table from us took in conference, and from the position that they took in personal conversations, that there was no intention on the part of the majority of the House conferees to change one whit the House bill: it was a take-it-or-leave-it attitude on the part of the majority of the House conferees.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. I merely wish to point out that the Kitchin-Ayers bill, as opposed to the Roosevelt bill, passed the House by a vote of 211 to 203.

Mr. MORSE. Senators know how one of these conferences is conducted, but the public does not, and the present debate, if it is read in cold print might fail to tell the full story of the leadership of the Senator from Massachusetts.

In personal conferences with conferees on both sides of the table, the Senator from Massachusetts went about buttonholing conferees, in this corner of the room, in that corner of the room, in the middle of the room, in the rear of the rostrum, and all over the room. He was trying to find out from each of the conferees what his position was on various proposals which had been offered or were about to be offered.

There were individual conferences between the Senator from Massachusetts and other members of the conference, and there were group conferences. Time and time again the Senator from Massachusetts was seen by all of us conferring, one after another, with individual conferees and then with groups of conferees. That was true also of each of the other conferees. We did our best. I give the Senate my word that as their conferee, individually and collectively we did our best to try to work out a conscionable compromise on this matter.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] are my witnesses to the discussions they had with me trying to get me to change my position in regard to the concept of "affecting commerce." As the Senator from Massachusetts knows, I think it is a vital concept in this field of legislation. The Senator from Massachusetts has ponted out it is contained in the Taft-Hartley Act of 1947. It is in the 1959 Labor Relations Act. It is included also in court decisions. The clause "affecting commerce" is vital, legal interpretation of legislation in this field.

The Senator from Massachusetts and my colleagues know that I yielded reluctantly to any modification of the definition of "affecting commerce." I yielded only because I was satisfied that the language "employer in commerce" would be subject to the same interpretation. I reached the conclusion that the so-called "or" section, which provided for a million or a million and a half or 2 million—we had those three versions—either of goods and supplies purchased and brought across State lines or goods sold within a State, as an alternative, would come under the definition; and I acceded, as the Senator from Massachusetts can testify, to going along with the Prouty amendment, for which I did vote.

I am glad that the Senator from Massachusetts has pointed out the discussions we had in committee on the "affecting commerce" clause. When we

come to grips with the problem again in the next session of Congress I shall once more do what I can to have included in the legislation the "affecting commerce" clause. After a discussion of this subject matter in the months ahead, we will find more and more support for that point of view, both in the Senate and in the House.

With all credit to the Senator from Massachusetts, I wish to say to the interested groups of workers and employers that the language which the Senator from Massachusetts suggested we go along with and that we did go along with would have had the same effect, in my judgment, when it got into court as the language in the Senate bill using the phrase "affecting commerce." The precedents are pretty well settled in the U.S. Supreme Court, and the language of the Prouty amendment would have been subject to the same interpretation.

I close by saying that the Senator from Massachusetts has my pledge, come next session of Congress, no matter in what capacity he sits, that I will do everything I can as a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to have legislation passed which will give to the workers in interstate commerce the protection to which they are entitled.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] knew very well there was no confusion as to the meaning of the legal terms we sought to write into law. It was because he was opposed to the meaning that he fought us in committee, fought us on the floor of the Senate, and fought us in conference. The Senator from Illinois knows that the Senator from Massachusetts and his colleagues on the Democratic side were seeking to guarantee the full application of the commerce clause of the Constitution to all workers in America as rapidly as we could protect them, and that they ought to be covered.

Certainly there was the issue of coverage, but there was far more than the issue of coverage; there was the issue of giving support to the interstate commerce clause of the Constitution as interpreted and applied by the U.S. Supreme Court.

Furthermore, there was the issue, as referred to by the Senator from Massachusetts, of trying to make certain that workers in interstate commerce receive a decent minimum wage. The opposition, headed by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], was opposed to assuring that the many thousands of workers in the so-called small establishments doing a business of $1 million or more got that coverage and received that wage.

So the issue before the American people in the months ahead is clear: Whether they want to follow the reactionary economic philosophy of the Republicans who have fought the minimum wage coverage and fought a decent wage, or whether they want to follow the forward-looking, progressive, economic philosophy of the Senator from Massachusetts, whereby he seeks to make certain that all workers in interstate commerce, falling under the definition of the bill passed by the Senate, will receive a decent, fair minimum wage.

That is the issue. I am ready to join with the Senator from Massachusetts in taking it to the people of the country, from platform to platform, from coast to coast.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I express my thanks to the Senator from Oregon for his statement. I agree wholeheartedly with his views.

I now yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I shall not be repetitious in presenting either the facts or the figures which have been discussed by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. I shall confine my references to three or four points which I believe are pertinent to the discussion.

In the first instance, I embrace wholeheartedly the eloquent tribute expressed by the diligent and devoted Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] concerning the work of the Senator from Massachusetts and his effort within the conference. Negotiating with good conscience and determination, he sought to bring forth, if possible, a measure intended to be of assistance to those men and women of the country who, in large degree, need the benefit of better wage and hour conditions.

I believe it is important for me, as a conferee and as a member of the Subcommittee on Labor of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, to add to the admirably expressed tribute by the senior Senator from Oregon.

The well informed and effective Senator from Massachusetts was calm in our deliberations. He acted in good faith in the discussions. But, more important, the Senator was correct, in my opinion, in the positions which he stated again and again, as we advocated possible areas of solution and of compromise.

Mr. President, approximately 24 million workers in the United States are now covered by the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act, the original act of 1938, and amended from time to time. But approximately 20 million workers in this country are not now covered by the provisions of the wage and hour law.

Perhaps it is appropriate that we think again in terms of what a $1.25 per hour minimum would mean. It has been charged by some Members of this body that to raise the present minimum wage from $1 to $1.25 by steps over a period of 3 years would be inflationary.

I stand alongside those who believe there are real reasons why the present economy, the current gross national productivity, and the development which have taken place in our system of commerce and industry make the $1.25 per hour minimum a realistic figure.

In the measure reported to the Senate by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, before exemption amendments offered in this Chamber were adopted, its provisions were estimated to increase wage costs less than 1 percent of every payroll dollar in the United States, or an amount that would be only slightly more than one-half of 1 percent of the gross national product of this country. Certainly this should not cause dislocation of our economy or create any dangerous degree of inflation. I believe these to be valid and important viewpoints.

At times the genius of this body, whether on the floor or in conference, is at work when men of good intention and of good will confer in desire to adjust and compromise their varying viewpoints. As a Senator who will be in the battle for reelection in the coming weeks, I shall count it a privilege to stand by the position which was taken within the conference by the majority representatives of the Senate, a position, in most instances, of complete unanimity among the Democratic Senate conferees.

What did the Senator from Massachusetts and other Senators of the majority party attempt to do? We sought to bring out a reasonable bill—in fact, a moderate bill—because already we had, in the Senate, written in the exemptions which were to take care of the problems of Main Streets, of which the minority leader speaks. Frankly, we were aware of the hardship cases. We were cognizant of the emergency problems. We recognized the plight of many of the segments of small business; and that recognition was spelled out in the exemptions in the legislation as it was passed by the Senate.

I hope I am not misunderstood. I again make reference to the Main Streets of the Nation. I believe that in our considerations, as we expressed them in conference, we were conscious of the problems of Main Street. But we did not forget that there is an approach by some people in this country which is influenced by a Wall Street. I draw no inference beyond pointing out that there are honest differences of opinion in the Senate. They were debated. A bill was passed, and then we attempted to compromise and draft a conference report which, hopefully, could receive the endorsement of both the Senate and House conferees.

I am impressed by the quotations from Scripture on the part of my cherished friend, the minority leader. Now, I should like to recall an old poem. I shall not recite all of it. The sense of its theme calls on the individual to dedicate himself to the cause that lacks assistance, to the wrong that needs resistance, to the future in the distance, and the good that he can do.

So a job remains to be done. An issue has been joined. I shall stand, during this campaign, alongside our party's gallant and gifted fighter as he moves toward a new frontier in 1961, a frontier which recognizes not only our opportunity—we have had that—but our responsibility as well. We must fulfill that responsibility in the months ahead.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I express my appreciation to the distinguished Senator from West Virginia, who was a member of the committee which wrote the first minimum wage act in 1938.

Mr. President, I now yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I have not voted on every question exactly as has the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] during this 4-week session. And while I have an opportunity to do so, I wish to advise my distinguished colleague that it just might not

be possible for me always to cast my vote in accordance with his wishes during the ensuing 8 years.

But that aside, let me say that I have watched the junior Senator from Massachusetts wage a gallant battle. Success has not always crowned his efforts—as is the case with the minimum wage bill, which now lies prostrate on the Senate floor. But, I repeat, he has waged a gallant battle in the right direction. I have watched him and listened to him wage a determined fight for progress, and against reaction. For instance, I watched him engage in extended debate with the able and forceful junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], who frankly said that he would vote to repeal the present minimum wage law. I do not say that in criticism of the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona; that is his position, and he is, undoubtedly, proud of it.

I watched the Senator from Massachusetts wage an extended fight with the able and powerful Republican leader, the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], who only a few moments ago said that he was not unhappy that we had not passed a bill to raise the minimum wage. I dare say the junior Senator from Massachusetts, conversely, is unhappy that we have not succeeded.

He has told us of his battle with the distinguished Representative BARDEN, who upon this issue as well as upon other issues has demonstrated an unyielding determination.

For whom has the junior Senator from Massachusetts been fighting? He has been fighting to raise the wages of the millions of workers, many of whom have families, who are earning less than $50 a week. He has been fighting for the passage of an adequate medical-care bill, to give aid to the elderly who are in pain and want, and who need the strong and comforting hand of the Government to aid them with medical care and hospitalization.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. I think the point the Senator from Tennessee is making is a most important one, in attempting to give an answer to those who say the Democrats control the House and control the Senate, and that inasmuch as they control both Houses of Congress, why do they not pass all the bills to which they are committed? That challenge has been put to us.

The point the Senator from Tennessee is making is a point I wish to emphasize. If a President of the United States says, through his deputy, through those who speak for him in this body, "If you pass a medical care bill tied to social security, I will veto the whole bill, including the social security part and all the rest of it," and if the Senate conferees and the Senate are told, "If you pass a bill, in line with the platform to which you are committed, calling for a minimum wage of $1.25, I will veto the bill," then obviously the Congress has no alternative but either to enact no bill at all or to pass a bill in line with the Republican platform or with what the President calls for. That is the point.

Under those circumstances, it makes but little practical difference whether one's party has a majority in the House and in the Senate day after day and year after year. Many persons underrate the importance of the President of the United States, who has said, "Give me one-third plus one in either body." That is all he needs; then he can prevent the enactment of any piece of legislation, regardless of how much we fight for it. That is the point.

This Congress has been most illuminating to me; and I believe that what I am saying is correct: that regardless of our majority, so great is the constitutional power of the President of the United States to prevent the taking of action by the Congress, that even though we pass every bill to which we are committed in our platform, the President of the United States can veto it, and it will not become law, because one-third of the Members of the House and one-third of the Members of the Senate, plus several, are opposed to those bills.

Therefore, I say to the Senate that there are some Members of the House and there are some Members of the Senate on my own side who want to make some progress, and who supported the Kerr bill, and who, in my judgment, would have supported our proposal, offered by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], myself, and others, but who said to me, "How can we vote for the amendment, if the President will veto the bill if the amendment is added to it?" Therefore, they voted against it. In my judgment, they did so because of the extraordinary power the Constitution gives the President. If the President is in favor of such a program, it will be enacted by the Democratic majorities. But if the President of the United States in January 1961, is opposed to a $1.25 minimum wage and is opposed to the provision of medical care tied to the social security program, then I do not care what may be the Democratic majority in the House or the Democratic majority in the Senate; in any event, they will not be enacted into law.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, with that statement I agree, and I call upon my Democratic colleagues in the House and in the Senate to go with JACK KENNEDY to the people and obtain from them a verdict and a mandate. We will return here, and when we have the assistance—not the resistance—of the President and the Vice President, this country will move in the paths of progress.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will my friend yield to me?

Mr. GORE. I gladly yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think that my distinguished friend, the Senator from Massachusetts, is giving us a new slant on arithmetic. If we are to resolve this issue on the basis of an equation such as the one he has stated, one-third plus one does not leave 66⅔ percent; and the other side has 66⅔ percent of this body, and nearly that percentage in the other body.

He does not give us credit for two things: First, a sound Republican program; second, the cohesive, energizing force that we put behind our sound program.

So we march under a common banner and with a common purpose. And if in that respect we succeed, we are very happy, even though we have only one soldier on the line for every two that the other side has.

Mr. KENNEDY. The Senator from Illinois knows that, even given the numbers that we have, the other side has sufficient Members in the two Houses to prevent the taking of action. But it is quite obvious that we do not have total unanimity on our side for every program. That statement does not come as a shock or surprise to the Senator from Illinois, I am sure.

A majority of the Republican Members of the Senate voted not only for a minimum wage of $1.15 but also for a minimum wage of $1.25, even though the President said he would veto it.

So there is no doubt that there is some split in both parties.

But when at least two-thirds to three-fourths on our side favor the program of a $1.25 minimum wage and the program for social security, and the other programs, and when two-thirds of the members on the minority side are opposed to them, the President, with his great constitutional power, and in view of the division existing in the House and the Senate, is able to make mincemeat of us, and can do it every time. We can prevent him from getting the programs he wants, but he can prevent the Congress from getting the programs it wants. So if the American people do not want action, they should continue the present division in the Government.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I wish to say to my friend that I do not want to make mincemeat out of him. I want to keep him right here, 16 blocks removed from the White House. [Laughter.]

Mr. KENNEDY. The Senator from Illinois is very generous.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, I think this is a very appropriate time for me to comment on an article to which I wish to call attention. It appeared in the July 26 issue of the Wall Street Journal, which, of course, is the journal of the financial interests of the country, insofar as the expression of a viewpoint is concerned.

This particular article was written by one of the most highly respected journalists in our country, Mr. Alan L. Otten. The headline reads:

GOP Strategy—Party Aims To Show Up KENNEDY on Key Issues in Congress Session—Leaders To Split Democrats With Civil Rights Measure, Press Foreign Program—Traps Laid for Other Bills.

That is the headline of the article.

Then it goes on to show that the strategy of the GOP was to prevent successful conferences on bills—and we have had a pretty good example of that, in my judgment, in regard to the minimum wage bill.

I read a paragraph or two from the article:

Their scheme is risky but potentially rewarding. It calls for unobtrusive obstructionism against the barrage of measures the Kennedy-Johnson team is expected to throw at them.

Later the article says:

The GOP strategy could founder on either side of a narrow channel. Obstructionism could become too obvious, and present the Democrats with a new campaign issue. Or it could fail to halt "liberal" legislation, and lead to a series of politically risky vetoes.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the entire article printed at this point in the RECORD, because it makes no reference to any individual Member of Congress, which would be in violation of the rule.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and only for the purpose of intruding an observation——

Mr. MORSE. I am always delighted to have the observation of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. One of the faithful brethren on this side must have uttered something to that effect in talking about destruction without letting it appear to be destruction. It runs in my mind that a former Secretary of State said perhaps we ought to let Korea fall, but not let it appear that way. We are supposed to take the result of the "push." I am always glad to do it, because, as my friend from Oregon knows, I have never, in the whole course of debate, on the Senate floor or in conference, ever departed from what I thought was the rock of principle. For 4 solid hours the Senator and I discussed this matter up and down the Chamber, and I did not persuade him, and he did not persuade me. But I must say for him that he has been the most persistent and illogically logical person I ever saw. [Laughter.] He persists consistently in error and makes no bones about the fact that he would like to obliterate the commerce clause of the Constitution, even for the little home industries, by bringing them within the purview of the wage and hour law.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I must say the reaction of the Senator is to take us back to Korea, and he takes us back 8 years. His instantaneous response and reaction indicate to me how effective he is going to be on the stump this fall. No matter what question or issue is brought up, there is going to be an allusion to some mysterious person in the past who wanted to give Korea away—as if that had any point to what the Senator from Oregon said. [Laughter.]

Mr. DIRKSEN. Somewhere it is written that we shall be judged not so much by our sins of commission but of omission. So we will read the Good Book with all charity, with not a taint of malice, and with all forbearance, and we will say, "Ye did it not."

Mr. MORSE. Let me say to the Senator from Illinois that I have never associated with a more delightful and enjoyable obstructionist—and I say it good naturedly—than the Senator from Illinois. He does it so sweetly, but the end result is the same—nothing in the public interest in regard to legislation such as the minimum wage bill.

It is true that for 4 hours—and more—the Senator from Illinois and others on the committee have been engaged in minimum wage discussion, but the end result is clear. One can call it what he wants to, but I think it meets pretty well the analysis of the article by Mr. Otten, because "by their fruits ye shall know them," and by the result of the parliamentary strategy we have had no legislation in this field, and in other fields.

The Senator from Illinois mentioned Korea. I am surprised he did not say anything about the loss in China. But we do not hear any Republican talk about what happened in Cuba, or Laos, or Africa, or any other part of the world in which the foreign policy of the Eisenhower administration has completely failed, and as a result of which we have reached in many, many parts of the world the lowest ebb of American prestige.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield for a question.

Mr. EASTLAND. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator if he knew that an American Ambassador, a very distinguished gentleman and a great Republican, who was in Havana when Castro came to power, on yesterday went into detail, step by step, how the Republican State Department overthrew Batista and installed Castro as the dictator of Cuba, doing it when they knew he was a Marxist, and that he was a Marxist in the mildest manner of terms, and that they had information he carried a gun when he was a student in college, that he was a killer, that at Bogotá he assassinated a priest and two nuns? This plan, relating to an island adjacent to the shores of our country, was hatched on the fourth floor, and on the fifth floor the Secretary of State did not know what was happening on the fourth floor. That information is going to be made available to all the people of this country.

Mr. MORSE. I am not familiar with that information. I shall read it with great interest.

Mr. President, has my unanimous-consent request been ruled upon?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon to have an article printed?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, July 26, 1960]

GOP STRATEGY—PARTY AIMS TO SHOW UP KENNEDY ON KEY ISSUES IN CONGRESS SESSION—LEADERS TO SPLIT DEMOCRATS WITH CIVIL RIGHTS MEASURE, PRESS FOREIGN PROGRAM—TRAPS LAID FOR OTHER BILLS

(By Alan L. Otten)

CHICAGO.—The activist appearance of Nixon-Rockefeller platform policy will get its first real workout in the superpolitical August session of Congress—with GOP tacticians launching legislative assaults calculated to show that supposed Democratic vigor on civil rights is actual impotence, and to demonstrate that supposed Republican weakness on foreign policy is actual strength.

This will make headlines, but the Republican leaders intend to keep invisible an equally important part of the strategy—subtle sabotage of some crucial Kennedy-Johnson drives for liberal legislation.

And they are counting on President Eisenhower, who makes his official farewell at the convention today, to be a good party soldier and contribute all his firepower to next month's campaign on Capitol Hill.

Their scheme is risky but potentially rewarding. It calls for unobtrusive obstructionism against the barrage of measures the Kennedy-Johnson team is expected to throw at them.

CAMPAIGN AMMUNITION

The idea is to keep the Democrats from assembling a record thay can shout about to the voters—and yet to avoid a string of Presidential vetoes that might give the Democrats campaign ammunition. Typical tactics: dragging out hearings, bottling up bills in committee, blocking Senate-House conferences that often must precede final action.

It might seem embarrassment could come to the GOP from conflict between this foot-dragging portion of their doubledeck congressional plan and the let's-get-going tone trumpeted by the Dick-Rocky preconvention proclamation. And that could happen. But the danger is minimized because some of the activist ideas expressed in New York, such as creation of a batch of international confederations around the globe, are just not the sort of thing this session is supposed to get around to.

And the document, contrariwise, didn't get around to endorsing some of the things liberal Democrats want to put through this Congress, such as subsidies for schoolteachers. And some of the bugle calls were noise which will mean nothing to this Congress. The fanfare for passing out medical subsidies to old folks, for instance, leaves Mr. Rockefeller still favoring the Democratic technique for doing so—but Mr. NIXON and his congressional crew still are equally free to sabotage this and shout instead for quick action on their alternative scheme which the Democrats have blocked.

WHAT CAN ROCKEFELLER DO?

While Governor Rockefeller might not care for the idea of obstructionism, there's little he can say or do about it. The strategy is essentially an Eisenhower-Nixon product, concocted before the dramatic New York confrontation between the Governor and the Vice President. And it's little changed by the agreement.

But on some other legislative items, Candidate NIXON and the administration will move to seize the initiative from the Democrats in the special session. At a press conference here yesterday, Mr. NIXON made it clear that the administration will demand August action on past civil rights proposals not yet enacted; one added possibility, he indicated, would be a new version of an old plan to give the Attorney General power to sue to protect civil rights in all fields, including housing, jobs, and schools—rather than just voting rights. Thus the GOP will try to call the Democrats' bluff on civil rights promises which they can't deliver.

In some foreign policy fields, too, the administration may try to move first with proposals to help cope with crises in Africa and Latin America. The GOP may thus respond in part to prodding from the Nixon-Rockefeller accord, though hardly as boldly as the New York Governor would like.

This preview of next month's session emerges from talks with top administration officials, aids of Vice President NIXON, and key Republican lawmakers here for the Republican Convention that opened yesterday.

In shaping GOP strategy, Mr. NIXON has kept in close telephone touch with President Eisenhower at the summer White House in Newport, R.I. The two are expected to confer afresh when Mr. Eisenhower comes here today for "Ike Day" at the convention.

GOP DRIVE'S STRATEGY

Here are the major points of Republican strategy, part offensive and part defensive, for handling the Democratic drive:

President Eisenhower will make a strong new demand for his own school, medical care, minimum wage and other unenacted programs, and will attack Democratic counterproposals as irresponsible. Not only may

Ike deliver Congress a special message along these lines, but there's an excellent chance he'll follow up with a radio-TV talk to the Nation.

The GOP will trumpet its willingness to help enact any bill that meets administration specifications—and then will claim credit for such action, if it comes.

The Republicans will also attempt to do a far better job in telling their side of legislative controversies. Through speeches and press conferences, Messrs. Eisenhower and NIXON will take over more of the load from GOP congressional leaders DIRKSEN and HALLECK.

Most important, Republicans will delay, sidetrack and block any bill that goes much beyond administration recommendations. Despite the presence of Texas' Senator JOHNSON on the Democratic ticket, the GOP is counting on aid from some Southern Democrats, including Chairman SMITH of the powerful House Rules Committee, which can often keep bills from reaching a floor vote. This delaying action could test Democrats' willingness to stay in session past Labor Day when they will be eager to get away for campaigning. But Republicans will try to keep the operation under cover, to avoid seeming glaringly obstructive.

PREVIEW OF SPECIAL SESSION

Here at the convention, Republicans will offer a preview of their special-session approach. Nominee NIXON and other party orators are expected to harp this week on the theme that Democratic politicians will have a field day at the August session.

"They're going to be out to show the Nation how much they can do," declares a top Republican Senator, "and we're going to have to keep them from doing it."

Says a NIXON lieutenant: "We can't get much out of this session to campaign on. We'll have to campaign on our past record and future plans. What we have to do in Congress is keep our little band in line and keep the Democrats from getting anything to campaign on."

The GOP strategy could founder on either side of a narrow channel. Obstructionism could become too obvious, and present the Democrats with a new campaign issue. Or it could fail to halt liberal legislation, and lead to a series of politically risky vetoes.

"It's a fine line we must follow," one GOP House leader confesses. "We must obstruct without seeming to. We can't appear completely 'agin' everything, yet we can't let the Democrats deliver on too many of their promises or put Ike on the spot too often."

MR. NIXON'S DILEMMA

This prospect poses a special problem for Candidate NIXON. If he seems to push for too conservative legislation, he may estrange some of the independent voters he plans to woo in the campaign. If he moves too much to the left, he risks alienating his party's conservatives.

"If he strays too far into left field," warns one midwestern lawmaker, "he'll end up chasing the ball alone. We're a pretty conservative bunch in Congress."

To help blunt Democratic "do little" charges, the administration will offer the special session some fresh proposals, notably in the foreign field. One sure thing: A Castro-sped request for a $500 million fund for easy-term loans to Latin American nations for housing, land reform, schools and other projects. U.S. diplomats want Congress to act in time to permit presentation of the program to a meeting of Latin American economic ministers in September.

The administration may also ask for extension through 1961 of the lately enacted power to cut or wipe out Cuba's share of the U.S. sugar market; the present law runs only through the first quarter of next year, and waiting until then for extension might risk late or hasty action, officials fear.

Though it will scarcely be new, Mr. Eisenhower, backed by candidate NIXON, will also urge the Senate to appropriate the full $4.2 billion he originally requested for foreign aid; the House has trimmed $600 million from this sum. Dwelling on the Congo crisis, Ike may stress the need for the full $20 million he wants for a special fund to aid Africa, mainly through education. He'll demand removal of House-attached strings on use of technical assistance funds to aid African well drilling, farm operations and the like.

EMBARRASSING DEMOCRATS

Even before Mr. NIXON disclosed the administration's civil rights plans, some "liberal" Republicans hoped to embarrass the Democrats on civil rights. On the first day of the session, they plan to introduce a bill to carry out Democrats' platform promises of new aid to school desegregation, establishment of a Fair Employment Practices Commission to guarantee equal job opportunities, and the like.

On this issue, Democrats are split far worse than Republicans. Having struggled painfully to put through one civil rights bill this year, they won't even try to pass another in the extra session, and Republicans could reap a promising campaign issue.

What worries Republicans most is the expectation Messrs. KENNEDY and JOHNSON will push more boldly than ever for school aid, medical care subsidies for old folks, minimum wage increases, and farm price-support boosts outdoing administration wants. Republicans recognize the surprise inclusion of Senate Leader JOHNSON on the ticket makes this threat tougher. But they refuse to be stampeded.

By present signs, it won't be hard to keep Congress Republicans behind obstructionism. Feeling of GOP lawmakers toward the special session is pure anger. They maintain the plan was manufactured in June by Senate Leader JOHNSON for two blatantly political purposes: To use his power over legislation to force delegates to back his now-defeated presidential ambitions; and to put Mr. NIXON on the spot. Republicans believe both Mr. KENNEDY and Mr. JOHNSON will exploit the session with undisguised partisanship to advance the Democratic cause.

"WHY SHOULDN'T WE PLAN?"

"I'm going to fight hard every chance I get," declares a usually mild-mannered western Senator. "This is a politically inspired session, and I don't see why we shouldn't play a little politics, too. They're going to be out to rush everything through, and I think our course is clear; we'll just do what the southern Democrats call 'educating the people,' and talk a little while, and see how long they're prepared to stay. I'm up for election this year, and should be home campaigning, but I don't care if we stay through election day—I'm that mad."

Because of the session's special risks for Candidate NIXON, his aids hope President Eisenhower will spearhead the GOP approach. "The best thing would be for the President to carry the ball," reasons a NIXON strategist. "That leaves DICK free to maneuver for the campaign."

The Nixon men do think the GOP candidate should come out from behind the scenes whenever he can gain credit thereby. If, for instance, he can muster Republican votes to pass a moderate school aid bill close to administration wants, they would like to see him get full political mileage out of the maneuver. But the strategists frankly hope he will avoid personal entanglement in issues where the outcome is unclear and the political risks are high, such as medical care for old folks.

To help parcel out the top Republican roles, the President and the nominee will meet either in Newport or in Washington just before the Senate goes back to work August 8. Mr. NIXON wants Mr. Eisenhower to seize the offensive by sending Congress a message demanding action on major items of pending business and blasting Democratic legislative schemes. White House Press Secretary Hagerty has said Ike intends to remind Congress of the portions of his program not yet acted on, but has declined to specify the form this reminder will take.

"I hope the President can be persuaded to take a tough line," says a Nixon lieutenant. "It would solve a lot of our problems if he would get in the front lines."

NEEDED: ARTICULATION

The Nixonites want Mr. Eisenhower, with the Vice President's help, to keep up a drumfire offensive throughout the session. "I must admit," one Nixon aid says, "our side has not been articulated very well this year. The President can do more, and the Vice President too—explaining to the voters exactly what the GOP proposals are and why they're right and the Democrats are wrong. They have to handle in advance the Democratic charge that the Republicans are blocking legislation."

The GOP program does not call for complete obstructionism. Party policy will be determined on a case-by-case basis. Consider what could happen on an education bill. The House Rules Committee has refused to let a House-passed school bill go to a Senate-House conference. The Republican-southern Democrat coalition that controls the committee feared the compromise product would go far beyond administration desires.

Before Congress quit in early July, however, there were signs that the Democratic majority might accept a bill closer to administration specifications. If the Democrats act that way in August, Republicans probably will help push the bill through. The key is whether Democrats agree to make States match Federal contributions every year during the life of the program.

"Any time they come to our matching formula on the first year," one House GOP leader says, "the four Republican votes in the Rules Committee will be delivered. Then we can take the credit."

But when Democrats try to go too far, in the eyes of GOP leaders, obstructionism will come into play. Republicans will try to prevent or drag out committee hearings, committee action on bills, floor votes and Senate-House conferences. If they succeed, they'll blame the Democrats for failing to produce.

"It's easier for us to sell the idea that they were in control and couldn't deliver," contends an eastern Republican Senator, "than it is for them to claim our minority votes kept them from producing."

Says a leading House Republican: "A firm stand by our side will show how divided the Democrats are despite their platform. They can't possibly get northern and southern Democrats together on minimum wage and some of these other things."

If obstruction fails, the veto will be used almost regardless of its political risks; a social security type medical care bill, despite the political dynamite it packs, still faces probable veto by Ike.

"If the President gets bills that go beyond his recommendations, he'll veto them," one GOP Senate leader predicts. "He's prepared to veto what's necessary, but politically it's better if he doesn't have to."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, there has been a great deal of discussion about this short session and those responsible for it and what has been accomplished by it; and I think it is time for me to give a little chronology with respect to this session.

The foreign aid authorization bill, H.R. 11510, was passed by the Senate on May 2. It had passed the House on April 21. When it was in conference on July 5, we

still had a problem confronting us. Could we go home? Of course, we could not go home. We had the responsibility of coming back here and doing something about a foreign aid authorization bill.

Let us take the public works appropriations bill, H.R. 12326. It passed the House on May 25. It was reported to the Senate on June 29. It passed the Senate on August 10.

Could we have gone home prior to the Democratic and Republican Party Conventions with that unfinished work?

I see sitting next to the majority leader the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK]. I see in the back of the room the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

I recall very well the speeches by Senators on the floor of the Senate, urging that we come back—and they were correct—to finish the legislative job started in the last session of Congress. Mr. President, we had to come back.

Let us consider the minimum wage bill. That was passed June 30 in the House of Representatives. It was reported August 11. It passed the Senate on August 18. We knew in July that the minimum wage bill was still waiting for action on the part of the Congress. Could we go home, or did we owe it to the Senate to make every effort—which we have made in the past few days—to iron out in conference our differences with the House? It was our clear legislative duty to come back. Before I finish, I hope to show how wise was the decision to come back.

Let us consider the medical care bill for the aged, H.R. 12580. That bill passed the House on June 23. It was reported on August 19.

It passed the Senate on August 23. I know of no issue on the domestic front which is of greater concern to the American people than the issue of medical care for the aged. Could we have justified going home prior to the conventions of the two parties, or did we have a clear duty to come back for this short session of Congress and to do our best to pass that proposed legislation?

We passed a bill on this subject. It was not as good as some of us desired, but at least we took some step forward in the field of legislation to provide medical protection for the aged. It stands out as one of the great accomplishments of the short session of Congress, and I give my high commendation to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], for the passage of this legislation.

We ratified the Antarctic Treaty. The treaty was reported on June 23. It was ratified on August 10. Action on the treaty was waiting prior to our short recess before the Republican and Democratic Conventions.

We must also consider the mutual security bill. The bill passed the House of Representatives on June 17. It was reported on August 19. It was passed by the Senate on August 24. We still have to take final action on a conference report on that bill.

I was delighted to hear from my good friend from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] only a few moments ago, in private conversation on the floor of the Senate, that it looks as though the conference report which will come to us will show an additional $65 million is to be added by the House of Representatives. If the report shows that—and I am sure the Senator from Florida is correct—it will be further justification for the time we have taken in this short session of Congress to transact the people's business on these vital issues.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania, without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I should like to express my gratification to the senior Senator from Oregon for his reference to me and to the Senator from Tennessee as having urged the majority leader to bring us back to do the people's business after the political conventions.

I know from my own personal knowledge that the majority leader was reluctant to do so. I am confident from my own personal knowledge that his own ambitions for the presidency had nothing whatever to do with the Senate coming back after the conventions—and anybody who says they did, in my judgment, is not telling the truth.

I think we should be disappointed in the fact that we did not do more in this bobtailed session. We did not do more because we had a divided Government. So long as we continue to have a divided Government, with a President who wishes nothing done and a Congress which would like to do something, we are not going to get things done in a 4-week session.

I commend my friend from Massachusetts and my friend from Oregon for taking the time and the trouble to point out to all Senators, for once, in a reasonably crowded Senate, the fact that it was our duty to come back. We have done our duty insofar as we could do it in the face of opposition from divided Government.

I, for one, am proud we came back. I am proud of what the majority leader has done. I am proud of the position taken by the Senator from Massachusetts. I do not have a shadow of a doubt of what is going to happen in the election in November.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. President, I am nearly finished. The thesis of my remarks happens to be that we have made a remarkably fine record in spite of the dilatory, obstructionist tactics thrown in the way of the majority party.

Between January 6 and August 29, as the record shows, the Senate passed 937 bills and acted on 39,937 nominations. It has also ratified 13 treaties, including 4 ratifications during this so-called short session of the Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a list of the treaties which the Senate has ratified.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TREATIES

Antarctic Treaty, approved 66 to 21, assures that the Antarctic Continent and surrounding areas will be used exclusively for peaceful purposes, that freedom of scientific investigation will be maintained, and freezes existing territorial claims and rights in the Antarctic.

Convention of Paris for the Protection of Industrial Property, approved unanimously, 95 to 0, provides for international protection of patents, utility models, industrial designs, trademarks, service marks, and trade names.

Treaty of Friendship and Commerce Between United States and Pakistan, approved 94 to 1, provides broadened opportunity for American individuals and businesses abroad to conduct their affairs in a more effective manner.

Convention of Establishment Between United States and France, approved 94 to 1, provides broadened opportunity for American individuals and businesses abroad to conduct their affairs in a more effective manner.

Mr. MORSE. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a listing of some of the major bills we have passed during this short session of Congress.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BILLS

Public works appropriations, approved unanimously, 86 to 0, provides $4,030 million for public works projects, flood control and resources conservation and development.

Amendment to the Fair Labor Standards Act (minimum wage bill), approved 62 to 34, provides for increasing minimum wage from $1 to $1.25 over a 3-year period, and extends minimum wage coverage to over 4 million additional employees.

Stabilization of mining of lead and zinc on public, Indian, and other lands, approved 59 to 28, provides for stabilizing the mining of lead and zinc by small producers in the United States.

Milk price supports, approved unanimously without a record vote, establishes price-support levels for milk and butterfat through March 31, 1961, in order to prevent dairy prices from going lower than the market.

Aid to Latin America, approved 54 to 19, authorizes $500 million for assistance in the development of Latin America and $100 million for aid in the reconstruction of Chile.

Mutual security contingency fund, approved 59 to 14, provides an increased authorization of $100 million for the President's mutual security contingency fund for fiscal year 1961 to meet emergency needs in Africa and other areas of the world.

Mr. MORSE. I close by saying to the Senate that I think the majority leader once again has demonstrated he was willing to place his responsibilities to the Senate above any selfish political interests of his own. I think a case could have been made for urging the Senator from Texas not to have the Senate come back, from the standpoint of his own narrow, personal, selfish political interests. But he is too big a man for that, Mr. President. The Senator from Texas demonstrated, along with his great teammate and colleague, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] that they are dedicated to putting the public interest first. Their first job, as Sena-

tors, was to see to it that we came back to Washington, D.C., and did our best to finish the unfinished work which we left behind us when we went to the Democratic Convention, and when the Republicans went to the Republican Convention.

We were confronted at that time with the fact that the hearings on the Democratic platform ran from 2 p.m. on July 5 through Friday, July 8, and there were many of our leaders in the Senate whose services were needed at Los Angeles to help draft the platform which was drafted. It turned out to be a magnificent and great platform. That is another reason why the Senator from Texas was working under a handicap in those closing days of the session before the preconvention recess.

The platform committee of the Democratic Party met on July 11 to consider the drafting committee's report. The platform committee's report was submitted to the convention on July 12.

I remember the Senator from Texas saying at one time in the debate during the last days of the session prior to the recess, "What am I supposed to do? Am I to say to some of the leaders in the Senate, 'You should not go to Los Angeles'?"

The Senator from Texas went on to analyze the platform committee situation which confronted the Senators, and made the only sensible choice he should have been expected to make. He joined with the rest of us who advised that we should take a recess until the conventions were over and then come back and try to finish the job.

I close by saying the Democrats in the Senate have tried to do exactly that.

I believe Mr. Otten in the Wall Street Journal article described very accurately the strategy of our opposition, and I am perfectly willing, between now and November, to let the voters evaluate the fine record I think we have made, against very heavy odds and dilatory tactics, under the leadership of the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President——

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I had promised to yield to the Senator from Arizona.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I have only a few words to say in summation in regard to the failure of the minimum wage bill to pass the Congress and to become law.

I have read very carefully the full debate in the Senate. I recall all the arguments we had during the subcommittee discussions on this measure, and the full committee discussions.

It was perfectly obvious during the early days of consideration of the bill in the subcommittee and in the full committee that the point on which we would "hang up" would be the "commerce" definition. I think any hindsight used by the proponents of the measure in the Senate would now cause us to recognize that had we accepted the Monroney amendment we undoubtedly would have had a bill from the conference.

I say with all due respect that the Senator from Massachusetts, who, I recognize, has done a hard job, has worked diligently. He was gentlemanly at all times in yielding to the minority so that we might make our points. He was faced with an impossible task. The difference was too great. It would be impossible to pull together both sides of the Grand Canyon. That is, in effect, what he was trying to do.

I feel that had the subcommittee or the full committee or the Senate accepted an amendment which would have provided a very clear definition of interstate commerce, which I felt the Monroney amendment would have done by saying "doing business in two or more States," this trouble would not have been encountered, and today we would be discussing a report from a successful conference.

Mr. President, so that this record may be complete, I wish to repeat once again, as has been said time and again on the floor of the Senate, our objection to the new definition of "commerce." I wish to read it. It is taken from the Senate bill, section 3(s):

> Activity affecting commerce includes any activity, business, or industry in commerce or necessary to commerce or to the production of goods for or the distribution of goods in commerce.

While the words "activity affecting commerce" are contained in the Taft-Hartley Act, I suggest that the definitions of those terms in the Taft-Hartley Act are in no way comparable to the terms contained in the Senate bill on the minimum wage which was read from the Taft-Hartley Act itself.

> The term "affecting commerce" means in commerce or pertaining to or obstructing commerce or the free flow of commerce, or having led or tending to lead to labor disputes pertaining to or tending to obstruct commerce.

It is in this area that the whole trouble has developed. I suggest that next year, when a bill is drafted to cover the minimum wage, as it undoubtedly will be, the framers of the measure pay particular respect to the obvious wishes of the Senate and the House to retain the language that has always been in the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended. While the commerce clause has a wide definition or interpretation, it by no means goes as far as the Senate bill on the question of minimum wage. I feel certain that had we accepted the Monroney amendment or something like that provision, with a very clear definition, we would now have a minimum wage bill. I thank the Senator.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Michigan, who wishes to be recognized, was a member of the conference committee. I gladly defer my remarks.

Mr. KENNEDY. I wish to express my appreciation to the Senator from Arizona. He states, as always, his honestly held views accurately on one of our differences with respect to the proposed legislation.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I shall be very brief. I believe the colloquy that we have had in the past several hours has brought out the highlights of the conference and the problems that we have encountered with the House. I wish to add my voice to the praise that has been heaped upon the chairman of the conference committee, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] from both sides of the aisle, for his patience, his diligence, and his great effort to get a bill which is vital to continued social progress.

There has been constant reference to the language of the Senate version of the bill which reads "affecting interstate commerce." The courts over and over again in labor litigation have accepted this language as proper. It is stated in varying form in labor cases. The courts have ruled on the question repeatedly and have said that the interpretation inserted in the bill is proper.

Basically, what are we talking about? We are talking about raising the wages of American workers in the last half of this century to $50 a week. The difference in the wage rate between $1.15 an hour and $1.25 an hour is $4 a week. Is that too much money in this day and age to pay an American workingman to support his family and to provide the necessities of life?

I say it is not. I say that members of the conference committee from the Senate did a good job. There was no possibility of getting any agreement in this area. The Senator from Massachusetts attempted to expand coverage to approximately 4 million workers, who look to Government, in this case, to improve their lot. They are largely unorganized workers. They have nowhere else to look but to the Congress of the United States at this time. I think it is unfortunate that we could not get a bill. So far as I am concerned, I was always for $1.25 an hour. I reluctantly went along with the $1.15 in an attempt to get a bill. I think perhaps it was a mistake for me to go along on the $1.15. A difference of $4 a week should not be weighted so heavily. I wish to compliment again the chairman of the conference committee, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. This is another example of the mark of a good political leader. He will fight for a losing cause, as he has done again and again. That is the mark of a statesman.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, has the Senator yielded the floor?

Mr. KENNEDY. Yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I think there is nothing quite so futile as a post mortem, and I think that has been proven in the discussion here already. I think that when we try to determine the answer to the question, Who killed Cock Robin? which has been a good question for a long time, we are apt to waste a great deal of time.

There are some assumptions and some statements that have been made in this

debate which I think require at least a brief statement by someone on this side of the aisle, 20 or more of whom are Democrats who have been consistently, and I hope will remain consistently, against the philosophy which was embraced in the so-called Kennedy bill which came here to the floor of the Senate, and I think unwisely came here.

Let us not permit the record to indicate that this is a partisan question, because it is not and has never been. There have always been Senators on this side of the aisle, and I hope there always will be, who still believe in the philosophy which has been dominant in our party from the time it was first announced by Thomas Jefferson, that that government is best which governs least, and that that government is best which is closest to the people.

The Senator from Florida has been one who has believed steadfastly in that philosophy all of his public life and has asserted it from time to time on the floor of the Senate. That philosophy and position was well known to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts before the bill was brought to the floor of the Senate. It was well known to the Senator from Massachusetts that something like 20 Members on this side of the aisle were strongly of that opinion and conviction, and I believe it would be a mistake to have the record indicate that here was a partisan issue, because the voting and the debate on the issue show the contrary. I hope that always the contrary will be shown, because I feel so strongly that it is unsound philosophy for this particular act to reach over into the traditional limits of State and local government.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I will yield when I finish this point.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. I think this is a party question. The Senator from Florida does not have to agree with the majority of his colleagues in the party. Such lack of agreement does not make the issue less of a party issue. The majority of the Democrats supported the increase of 25 cents an hour, and will continue to do so.

The Senator from Florida is entitled not to agree. A majority of the Republicans did not agree. A minority of the Republicans agreed. That is not sudden news that there are divisions within our two parties. We have known that for some time. But the mainstream of our party is in favor of a minimum wage of $1.25. If the Senator from Florida is not—and he speaks for Florida and he speaks consistently and eloquently, and I do not make any judgment on that—he is entitled to express his opinion. I did not wish his statement that the majority of Democrats do not support this bill to go unanswered.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Massachusetts is talking about a phase of this bill——

Mr. KENNEDY. The Senator from Florida has not addressed one word to the phases that have taken place heretofore.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida——

Mr. KENNEDY. Did not the Senator from Florida say it was not a partisan matter?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I do not yield further. The Senator from Florida has not said a word about the $1.25 limit. He has addressed his remarks throughout the consideration of the bill to the question of the increased coverage under concepts which the Senator from Florida believes are completely unsound and which now at long last the Senator from Massachusetts has discovered, because he has reported to the Senate that in conference he was agreeable to two changes which, if they had been announced in the beginning, would have largely met the objections of the Senator from Florida to the bill, and which he has regarded as so unsound all the time. What are those two changes? The Senator from Massachusetts has reported that he and the other conferees agreed to drop the concept that the bill should apply under a definition that uses the words "affecting commerce" and should hold on to the time-honored, traditional, and sound definition under which interstate commerce, to be covered by the bill, must exist in two or more States.

The Senator from Massachusetts has also announced that he and the other conferees agreed to drop the other concept in the bill to which the Senator from Florida objected most vigorously—and the debate will show that to be the case—and that was the use of the word "enterprise" in such a way as to cover and include various kinds of trade associations and various kinds of organizations under which small grocery stores and other small stores of every character and description, which had come together in various joint operations to try to protect themselves against large dealers in their field, would have been brought within the coverage of the act.

The Senator from Florida is glad that the Senator from Massachusetts and the other conferees agreed in their wisdom and in their judgment, which the Senator from Florida respects in this matter, to drop these two vital objectionable elements in the philosophy of the bill. The Senator from Florida states—and there is no way to successfully contradict his statement—that those were the two concepts to which he repeatedly, over and over again, objected, not only in the debate, but also in 1949, when the same fight and the same effort was made, and when the then committee, I regret to say, came in, at that time as now, with the effort to change the concept of the law and to change its coverage, and decided, notwithstanding the customs and traditions and methods of doing business within State lines and in communities within a State, that the long arm of the Federal Government was so much more efficient than anything that could be done locally by States or by people, we should stretch out the long arm of Government and take within its jurisdiction and within its control the business of the people and the business of private enterprisers in every section of the Nation who should never be brought within the coverage of such a bill as this.

Mr. President, I have not the slightest doubt in the world that the Senator from Massachusetts, able, skillful, distinguished, and dedicated as he is, used every one of these qualities in the conference. I have not the slightest doubt in the world that the other conferees on this side of the aisle, as also on the other side of the aisle, used their skill, their dedication, their convictions, and their loyalty to what had been determined by the Senate. Knowing them as well as I do, I am sure that that was the case. I do not question it for a moment. What I question is the wisdom of the bill as originally presented and the wisdom of presenting it, when it was well known that this side of the aisle was badly split upon the philosophy embraced in the bill, and when the other side of the aisle was also badly split.

Regrettable as it is that no progress was made in conference, it is no new thing that that is the case. The Senator from Florida has had considerable experience in these matters. He has served as a conferee many times. He has found in recent weeks that there are all kinds of disappointments and all kinds of frustrations which come sometimes from our conferences with the able and dedicated Members of the other body. That is not a new thing. The thing that is distinctive in this matter is twofold; first, that it has become so clear that it was unwise to bring up the bill, when all of us knew that this side of the aisle and the other side of the aisle were badly divided. Secondly, that unwisdom has finally been recognized by the statements of the sponsors on the floor with respect to the two vitally objectionable points, which were the main points opposed by those who, like myself, were opposed to the philosophy of the bill and who stated these two objections from time to time.

Mr. KENNEDY rose.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to make one more statement, and then I will be glad to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts. Just because under the philosophy of Congress, that has been approved by the Court, it has been found wise to use the words "affecting commerce" in another field—a field where anything which restrains or restricts or interferes with the interstate commerce flow of goods confers Federal jurisdiction—does not mean at all that the same philosophy should apply in this field. I think that the decision which has been made by the conferees is a wise decision, because I still think that States and individuals and groups served and affected know better about what will suit their habit of life, their customs, their traditions, their way of rendering service far better than can be known in Washington or can be dished out in Washington by an administrator who is administering a Federal law. I am glad that the bill has failed.

Mr. President, I do not believe I will have much more to say about this matter. The Senator from Massachusetts

and the other advocates of the bill have been fair, though unwise. I believe the record will show rather conclusively that by no means are the House conferees alone speaking for a closely divided body, because the same thing was true here. On the issue presented by the Monroney amendment, which would have preserved the old interstate commerce philosophy, that to be in interstate commerce in this field there had to be business which crossed State lines, a change of one vote in the Senate would have changed the result.

On the broader, more important issue there were large numbers of Senators who did not follow the new, revolutionary, and strained philosophy which was proposed to be applied to this field. I wish to call particular attention to the fact that on the defeat of the Monroney amendment there were 23 Democratic Senators who voted for that amendment and the concept involved in it, that to be properly within the interpretation of interstate commerce in this field, the business had to be carried on in two or more States. The Senator from Florida simply expresses the hope that if this struggle is to be renewed in the next Congress, we may learn from experience that there is still a great division in both parties on the wisdom of taking this revolutionary step which is suggested; that there is still some belief in both parties that the States have the right to look into this field and control it; that there is still some conviction in this body to the effect that industries know how best to serve their people and what customs, as to the times that their business shall be kept open, and so forth, should prevail in their communities; that there is still some validity to the belief that the people and the States preserve to themselves some jurisdiction which should not be interfered with simply because another rule, not clearly applicable here, has been adopted in another field.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from Florida stated that if one vote on the Monroney amendment had been changed, the Monroney amendment would have been agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. The vote was 50 to 48 to lay on the table.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is it not true that a count of noses before the vote was cast on the Monroney amendment indicated that a majority of the Senate did not want all businesses in the United States placed subject to this bill, and that the only way the Monroney amendment was defeated was through an agreement reached which exempted hotels, restaurants, automobile agencies, implement dealers, and motel operators?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is, of course, correct. Sometimes we have to guess what is behind the curtain when such a situation develops. We did not have to do so in this matter, because in the very debate itself, it was openly promised that if enough votes could be secured to defeat the Monroney amendment—the very step which has been described by the Senator from Ohio would follow immediately—and during the course of the debate on that following amendment, as well as afterward, it was frequently mentioned that the promise had been made by the leadership, and the commitment made, that hotels, no matter how big, and no matter in how many States they did business; motels; agricultural equipment dealers; restaurants; and automobile dealers, regardless of size, regardless of whether they were in interstate commerce, by any concept, should be entirely excluded from the package of coverage of the bill.

The Senator from Ohio may remember—I hope he does—that the Senator from Florida, in commenting upon the matter then, remarked that that very step had made a hodgepodge of the bill; and the bill left this Chamber as a hodgepodge. I am glad that someone in the other body had the strength to stand up and call it what it was, and refused to adopt it because it was so clearly an illogical mess as it was sent to the other body from the floor of the Senate.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is it not a fact that to get the votes necessary to defeat the Monroney amendment, the Sheraton Hotels, the Statler Hotels, the Hilton Hotels, and the Pick Hotels, doing business in practically every large city in the country, were exempted?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is, of course, correct. I hope the Senator, by his question, and by my answer, will not have me thrown out of my apartment at the Sheraton Park. [Laughter.]

Mr. LAUSCHE. In other words, if the arrangement had not been made to exempt those businesses, the Monroney amendment would have carried, would it not?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes; and if the Monroney philosophy had been engrafted on the bill in the beginning, that plus the dropping of the word "enterprise," I think our conferees would have gone to conference with a tremendous Senate majority behind them and would have been able to speak with greater authority and would have got something worthwhile out of the conference.

But the path which was so unwise when it was entered upon was continuously followed. No one of the sponsors seemed to realize that substantially half of the Senate, in spite of all the pressure of this political year which was put upon us, did not believe in the philosophy which was then engrafted upon the bill, and could not be forced to support it because we did not believe in it. I hope our conviction will be just as strong next year as it is now.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The Senator from Florida will recall that on the night when he made his admirable summary of the features of the bill which was coming before the Senate for a vote on passage, the junior Senator from South Dakota took occasion to commend the Senator from Florida for the position he had taken and also for his analysis of the bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes. I appreciated it then, I still appreciate it, and I shall always treasure that memory.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I wanted to say that prefatory to this observation: It was my impression that basically Senators were as much offended by the proposal of the bill to define interstate commerce or commerce as being anything which affected interstate commerce as they were by the precise provisions of the bill concerning dollars and cents.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thought the provisions of the bill relating to dollars and cents never became a matter of serious discussion on the floor of the Senate. So far as the Senator from Florida is concerned, no reference to those provisions will be found in the various debates on the measure in which he participated.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The greatest offense to the convictions of many Members of the Senate was the attempt to establish the precedent of defining interstate commerce as that which affected interstate commerce. That was why the Monroney amendment had such appeal to so many of us that we thought it sought to preserve some distinction between intrastate commerce and interstate commerce.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is, of course, completely correct.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. Is the Senator from Florida saying that it was the Senate which attempted to redefine interstate commerce through language in the bill drawn directly from Supreme Court decisions?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am saying that the attempts of the sponsors of the bill to apply to this field—the Main Street business field of the Nation—a philosophy which was embraced in other legislation, completely different and which had been upheld by the Supreme Court as to that other field was unwise, illogical, and flouted the opinion of most of the people, I believe, in this country who think that local business should be controlled locally.

Mr. McCARTHY. The language of the bill and the interpretation of the bill were clearly consistent with the Supreme Court decisions, were they not?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is partly in the right and partly in the wrong. The Senator will have to admit that those decisions relate to acts such as the national labor relations law, in which the issue was to regulate and control what may interfere with the flow of goods across State lines.

If one has a store which has 40 percent of its goods which come across State lines, and there is a strike or a threatened strike in that store, of course there is some reason or some logic in applying that definition to that kind of situation.

But when it comes to applying that definition to a store which has 40 percent of its goods coming across State

lines, that would make it comply with Federal regulations and with Federal law as to its employment practices, as to its wage practices, as to its time practices, I say the bill is almost as objectionable to me as the FEPC, because it is in the same general field. It attempts to regulate purely local business by the long arm of the Federal law.

The thing in which I say the distinguished Senator from Minnesota is mistaken—he and his able and conscientious allies who were the sponsors of the bill—is in their belief that simply because the definition applied by our law is upheld by the court in one field, it must therefore be equally applicable to every other field. I say it is not equally applicable to this field, and that it is extremely unwise to apply it to this field.

Mr. McCARTHY. I suggest that the next time the same issue is before the Senate, the Senator from Florida let us write it into the law and then let the Supreme Court decide. Then we shall know whose judgment is correct, the judgment of the Senator from Florida or the judgment of Senators who support such a bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Minnesota did his best to write this language into law this time and found out, I think, that there is a tremendous body of opinion on the floor of the Senate, and a prevailing body of opinion on the floor of the House, and I believe a prevailing body of opinion in this country, who believe that that philosophy should not apply, is not wise, and will not work well in the field to which the Senator from Minnesota seeks to apply it.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator has pronounced judgment on me. I suggest that the Senate sustained my position. If he wants the judgment of the highest Court in the land, why not let it go to the highest Court? Do not say that the Senator from Minnesota and everyone who stood with him is flouting the laws of the United States.

Mr. HOLLAND. If that be the conviction of the Senator from Florida—and it certainly is—the Senator from Florida not only has the right to so state, but it is duty, representing a great people numbering almost 5 million, which he thinks he truly represents, the sentiment of the vast majority of them, to say to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota that he believes a mistake has been made here, and that mistake has finally proved its own existence as such by the complete frustration which now confronts those who have spent so much time, needlessly, on trying to impose on the people a philosophy which does not properly apply in this field.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator from Florida is not arguing, is he, that because the House of Representatives took a stand different from that taken by the Senate, the House of Representatives is absolutely right?

Mr. HOLLAND. No. I am glad that the House of Representatives agreed with the 48 Senators and the others who changed their minds at the last minute, under political pressure, that the newly proposed standard was not sound; and I am very glad that decision has come out of this futile, frustrating conference.

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not mind having the Senator from Florida express his happiness and his gladness. My only question was about the soundness of his judgment and the hesitation to let the matter go to the Supreme Court.

Mr. HOLLAND. As I understand our duty, it is, first—regardless of what the Supreme Court may do later—to vote for what we believe in. I have always tried to do that. I have done that many times when I have believed that the Supreme Court would hold otherwise if the measure went to the Court. I have done that many times knowing that the Supreme Court has already held otherwise, but I thought its decision was wrong, and I thought I had a responsibility to help correct it; and I have not hesitated to do so.

But if the Senator from Minnesota wants me simply to say on each issue, "Well, it does not make much difference what we say. Let us pass the bill that is asked for, and then let us let the Supreme Court, in its infinite wisdom, decide whether it is good for the people or not," all I say is that I do not agree in the slightest with that philosophy.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator from Florida knows that I made no such suggestion.

Mr. HOLLAND. Perhaps I misunderstood the suggestion made by my amiable friend. But it seemed to me that he suggested that we pass this measure, regardless of what we thought of it, and then let the Supreme Court pass on it. I do not agree, and I have voiced my conviction on that score freely, as I want any Senator to voice his conviction just as freely and just as long as he cares to voice it.

Mr. President, if there are no other questions to be asked by my colleagues, I yield the floor.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the following bill and joint resolution of the House:

H.R. 13053. An act to increase the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the U.S. Park Police, the White House Police, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 784. Joint resolution amending the act of July 14, 1960, to extend the time within which the U.S. Constitution 175th Anniversary Commission shall report to Congress.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 13161) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 5, 6, 35, 58, 61, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, and 85 to the bill, and concurred therein; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 16, 23, 30, 34, 37, 56, 63, and 84 to the bill, and concurred therein severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate, and that the House insisted upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, and 62 to the bill.

THE NARCOTICS CONTROL ACT AND PRESENT NEEDS

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, in 1956 while a member of the Judiciary Committee, I supported strongly and worked diligently for the Narcotics Control Act of 1956, passed unanimously by the 84th Congress. Passage of the act followed nationwide investigations establishing that illegal sellers of narcotics felt that profits from these illegal sales as a rule would offset the minor penalties imposed in case of arrest and conviction.

The Narcotics Control Act of 1956 changed all this. For the first time in our history minimum mandatory sentences brought the penalties close to being commensurate with the gravity of the crime. Now an illegal seller of narcotics upon conviction must be confined for no less than 5 years nor more than 20 years for first offense and no less than 10 years nor more than 40 years for subsequent offenses.

Suspended sentences, probation, and parole are not provided. Naturally our courts still use discretion—somewhere between 5 and 20 years for first offenders and somewhere between 10 and 40 years for subsequent offenders. As a result in those jurisdictions where the courts tend to impose the maximum penalties, there has been the greatest improvement in the narcotic situation since the enactment of this legislation.

In my own State of Maryland, resolutions have been passed by the General Federation of Women's Clubs, the American Legion of Maryland, the Civic League of Maryland and the Maryland Law Enforcement Association favoring strict enforcement of the Narcotics Control Act of 1956 as well as compulsory institutional treatment of drug addicts.

Their stand is based in large part upon the excellent and unrelenting work of the Bureau of Narcotics in Baltimore, which is headed by Dr. Harry J. Anslinger, a Commissioner with not only wide knowledge but with impressive administrative ability.

In all of our 50 States, minimum mandatory penalties against illegal narcotic sellers enacted by the 84th Congress have made it the responsibility of our Federal courts to place the welfare of society above concern for the narcotics trafficker.

In the 4 short years since enactment of this mandatory penalty law, there has been a steady trend showing a decrease in the incidence of narcotic addiction. The Federal Bureau of Narcotics gives us the encouraging report that incidence of addiction has dropped to only 1 addict in every 4,000 of our population. There has been a sharp decrease in the number of new addicts reported—indicating we may expect a continuing decrease in the incidence of narcotic addiction.

There is absolutely no doubt that the minimum mandatory penalties of the 1956 act have provided an effective deterrent against the illegal sale of narcotics. This criminal activity is no longer palatable or profitable. The risk is too great. Those who persist in this heinous crime face confinement that removes them from society almost permanently.

It is my opinion that to bolster our 1956 act which has already accomplished so much, our several States should provide compulsory commitment for narcotic addicts. The commitment should be for such periods as are necessary to effect rehabilitation, and should be followed by long periods of probation with mandatory physical examinations to detect relapse to the use of narcotics. Through the effective enforcement work of the Federal Bureau of Narcotics and of local and State officers, minimum security institutions have been found suitable and able to provide work therapy which is recommended by most knowledgeable authorities.

There is another potent and effective weapon which should be authorized to bring to an end organized narcotic trafficking in this country. Distribution of heroin is highly dangerous at the present time and cannot be effected without communication—communication by telephone. Authorized wiretapping, with certain safeguards, and by court order would strangle the nefarious narcotic traffic. We owe it to the citizens of this country to legislate this authority.

The attempt in some quarters to weaken an unwavering approach to the elimination of the unlawful traffic in narcotics in this country is highly disturbing to the citizens of this country who rightfully believe the elimination of illegal narcotic traffic should be a major concern. Mr. President, we must not relax in our battle to eliminate the parasites of our society who subsist on illegal traffic in narcotics.

IMPORTANCE OF THE CONNALLY RESERVATION

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, seldom has the cause of truth been so illy served, no American honor more subtly maligned than by the Washington Post in its lead editorial day before yesterday, August 29, "Issue Before the Bar."

The issue the Washington Post refers to is the Connally reservation to our declaration of consent to the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice.

Mr. President, the Post—surely with the best intentions in the world—is permitting its desire for "peace through law" to blind it to the facts. I do not question the motives of the Post for a moment. But I do propose to answer the Post on this subject point by point, in part in the words of Mr. Frank E. Holman, a past president of the American Bar Association, and one of the leading proponents of the Connally reservation.

First. The Post begins by asserting:

> The hottest issue to be debated before the American Bar Association meeting in Washington this week will be repeal of the Connally amendment, which is admittedly crippling the International Court of Justice.

I submit, Mr. President, the truth is: It is not our Connally reservation but the fact that neither the U.S.S.R. nor any of her satellites has ever agreed to yield to the compulsory jurisdiction of the World Court with or without reservation—it is this that is "crippling the International Court of Justice."

Second. The Post states:

> Supporters of the amendment will ask the organized bar to reverse its 1947 call for repeal. Friends of the World Court hope to crush that backward-looking movement.

The truth is: The ABA 1947 call for repeal was made at a time after World War II when we were hopefully contemplating an enduring peace. That was before Korea, before the cold war, before the U–2 incident, before the Soviet torpedoing of the summit, before the Soviet shooting down of an American plane in the Arctic and before Khrushchev established a Communist beachhead in Castro's Cuba.

It is those who want to repeal the Connally reservation who are backward-looking, wishfully thinking the world today is as it was in 1947. It is we who are forward-looking, who intend to preserve the Connally reservation until we have a world of civilized nations, a body of international law and a court we can fully respect.

Third. The Post says:

> Fortunately, the history of the controversy and the issues at stake are set forth in two excellent reports—one prepared by the Committee on World Peace Through Law and the other by the ABA's section of international and comparative law.

The truth is: the Post fails to mention the several excellent papers, prepared by ABA past presidents and others, which come to opposite conclusions.

Mr. Holman points out in a preface to his paper "The Problem of the World Court and the Connally Reservation, Postscript on World Peace Through World Law":

> The expense of publishing and distributing this pamphlet has been paid by the author personally. The cost is not tax deductible. Neither the great Ford Foundation nor any other foundation, corporation nor individual has contributed to the expense.
>
> One of the American anomalies today is that the cost of efforts to advance international programs and objectives is tax deductible and readily financed by the great foundations—the American Bar Association has received large grants from foundations to sponsor various international objectives—whereas the cost of efforts designed to protect and maintain the integrity of the Republic as an independent Nation is not tax deductible and the great foundations are not interested in contributing to such efforts.

Fourth. The Post says:

> The United States has always given enthusiastic support to the idea of world law in place of force, but has tended to shrink from acceptance of international rulings applied to itself.

The truth is: The United States has exactly once claimed domestic jurisdiction and has never shrunk from a ruling handed down by the International Court of Justice.

Fifth. The Post says:

> This device, intended to give the United States a preferred status, has actually operated as a veto in the machinery of justice.

The truth is: The Connally reservation is not intended to give the United States preferred status but to protect U.S. sovereignty. Other parties to the statute who may be parties to a dispute with the United States can claim the same reciprocal right to domestic jurisdiction.

Sixth. The Post says:

> It has worked to the national disadvantage in practice and is not necessary to safeguard legitimate American interests.

The truth is: The Post cannot name one incident when it has worked to our national disadvantage in practice and it cannot prove that it "is not necessary to safeguard legitimate American interests" because there is no way to prove what the Court, with its two Communist judges, once it had the United States legally disarmed, would seek to do.

Seventh. The Post says:

> With its numerous bases and extensive foreign trade, the United States has a greater interest in international justice than any other power. Yet it has crippled the only instrument of such justice.

The truth is: Other nations, of course, have as great an interest in international justice as we have. Certainly we have not "crippled the only instrument of such justice" because (a) the U.N. International Court of Justice, so-called, is not the only instrument of international justice—any arbitration board set up for any dispute may be an instrument of such justice and (b) it is the nonadherence of the Soviet bloc, not the Connally reservation, that is "crippling" the U.N. Court.

Mr. Holman points out:

> Another fallacious charge is that the Connally reservation handicaps the United States in litigating in the World Court matters respecting its foreign investments, its military bases, etc., and that it is to our self-interest to repeal the reservation. These matters have all come into existence through diplomatic negotiations and conferences and the nations seem to prefer that their settlement be handled at the diplomatic level rather than at the judicial level; both because they can be settled more expeditiously and because, after a long-drawn-out judicial hearing the judgment of the World Court could only be enforced by action of the Security Council, which could not function as against a veto by any member thereof.
>
> Of course, since only a State can be a party litigant, foreign interests of a nongovernment character, where only private businesses are involved, cannot resort to the World Court for settlement of disputes concerning their rights in foreign countries. In some instances a State may sue in behalf of one of its nationals, but only if the national has exhausted its remedies in the courts of the country where the national's interests are situated. This leads to the extraordinary situation of the World Court being asked to sit in review on a matter theretofore finally determined by the courts of legal processes of another country. Through this procedure the World Court in such cases—without the Connally reservation—would become a court of review or of appeal not only over American court decisions but over American executive and legislative determinations.

Eighth. The Post says:

Since all countries sued by the United States have all the rights this country claims, they can easily evade any adjudication by asserting that the dispute is within their domestic jurisdiction.

The truth is: Other nations who have accepted compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice have never cited U.S. domestic jurisdiction against us. However the U.S.S.R. has repeatedly refused to be sued before the U.N. Court.

Ninth. The Post goes on:

More serious is the fact that the United States has "impaired its leadership of the free world" by its insistence on this unjudicial practice of judging its own cases.

The truth is: U.S. leadership in the free world would be impaired if we did repeal the Connally reservation. To lead we must be sovereign and free. Certainly we would be neither sovereign nor free should we surrender our right to determine our domestic jurisdiction to the World Court which is, in Mr. Holman's words, "only a commission composed of 15 members, of which one each is a national of the United States, Great Britain, and Australia. The others are nationals of the United Arab Republic, Nationalist China, Greece, Poland, France, Mexico, Panama, Argentina, Uruguay, Norway, Pakistan, and Soviet Russia. Thus, only three judges are from common law countries, four are Latin Americans, two are from Moslem countries, two are Communist, one Chinese and one each from Greece, France, and Norway."

How can we possibly expect the free world to trust our leadership if we defer to a court in a matter of domestic jurisdiction, which has two Communist judges, the Russian and the Pole, whose concept of law is at variance with ours and whose leaders have sworn to further world revolution and the economic destruction of the United States? How can we ask the uncommitted countries to choose American democracy as against Soviet slavery and in the matter of domestic jurisdiction defer to a court upon which is represented two states which engage in such slavery—Russia and Poland?

Mr. Holman points out:

The suggestion that the existence of the Connally reservation adversely affects the achievement of world peace, in that by its restriction of the jurisdiction of the World Court it prevents nations from using the Court as a tribunal for the settlement of international disputes, is fallacious. No proof has been or can be offered of this contention. The fact of the matter is that the paucity of international litigation in the World Court has not been occasioned by the Connally reservation but by a widespread current belief by statesmen that international questions of consequence should be settled at the diplomatic level by way of negotiations and conferences and not at the judicial level. So long as the Communist countries refuse outright to use the Court, the settlement of great international issues at the judicial level is not capable of realization.

Tenth. The Post says:

Indeed three of the countries which followed the American lead in imposing this foolish restriction on the World Court—England, India and France—have recognized their blunder and given it up.

The truth is: The United Kingdom gave up her Connally-type reservation only to substitute even stronger reservations. The United Kingdom has what we might call a "drop of the hat" reservation. She can get out of the Court altogether upon notice whether the question at issue is one of a domestic or an international character. In addition, the United Kingdom's acceptance of compulsory jurisdiction excludes "disputes having reference to any hostilities, state of war, or belligerent or military occupation in which the United Kingdom is or has been involved; and disputes where the other party has accepted jurisdiction only in relattion to or for the purpose of the dispute; and disputes where the other party has accepted compulsory jurisdiction less than 12 months prior to filing the application with the Court." It also reserves the right at any time, effective upon notification to the Secretary General of the U.N., to add to, amend or withdraw any of the reservations.

France's adherence to the Court excludes "disputes arising out of any war or international hostilities or a crisis affecting the national security, and disputes with any State which had not accepted compulsory jurisdiction at the time of occurrence of the facts giving rise to the dispute."

Besides the United Kingdom, the following countries have a "drop of the hat" acceptance terminable upon notice given: Australia, Canada, Colombia, Israel, Liberia, New Zealand, Pakistan, the Philippines, Portugal, the Sudan, and South Africa.

The United States can terminate its adherence to the Court only upon 6 months' notice.

I refer Senators to the International Court of Justice Yearbook, 1958–59, page 205 through page 227, for the text of all these reservations.

Eleven. The Post asks:

Why should the United States jeopardize its standing in the free world by continuing to manifest a basic distrust of the rule of law?

The truth is: The American people, by retaining the Connally reservation, manifest a deep traditional trust in the rule of law: The rule of the Constitution of the United States over all U.S. domestic jurisdiction as determined by the United States of America. The "rule of law" by itself, undefined, is an empty phrase. We must ask the rule of what law? The law of the jungle? The law of Hitler's people's court? The law of the U.S.S.R.'s Red justice?

Mr. Holman points out some domestic questions which the World Court could treat as international except for the Connally reservation:

1. Immigration: Traditionally, a nation's right to determine the nature and scope of its immigration laws has been treated as a domestic question. But in the Declaration of Human Rights promulgated by the United Nations, there was incorporated a so-called right whereby a national of one country was to be entitled to seek refuge or migrate to another country. There has been much talk that overpopulation is a matter of international concern, to be relieved by allowing freer migration to countries of less population and greater resources. Except for the Connally reservation, the World Court could hold that nationals of overpopulated areas like China, India and elsewhere, should be absorbed by the United States.

2. Tariffs: The imposition of tariffs has also heretofore been considered a domestic matter; but such impositions may adversely affect foreign trade and the prosperity of other countries. Under the declarations and provisions of GATT, an international agency above referred to, tariff rates are made an international matter. Except for the Connally reservation, the World Court could treat such a problem as international in character and require the United States to share its prosperity with other countries.

3. Embargoes: Except for the Connally reservation, Cuba could now resort to the World Court and question our right to impose an embargo on Cuban sugar.

4. Offshore rights: These rights have become very valuable, involving fisheries, oil, gas, and other natural resources. These offshore rights are covered by the Geneva Convention whose interpretation could be brought before the World Court. Except for the Connally reservation, the World Court could alter these offshore rights and determine to what extent they should be shared with other nations.

5. The Panama Canal: The control of this waterway is essential to the safety and prosperity of the United States. We paid for it. But the 1903 Treaty with Panama, conferring all rights upon the United States, is not necessarily more effective than was the treaty of concession by which the Suez Maritime Canal Co., controlled by England and France, was to have held control of the Suez Canal until 1968. For a number of years, there have been recurring contentions by other nations that the Panama Canal should be internationalized. Except for the Connally reservation, the World Court might undertake to reconsider our rights as to the canal as now fixed by the Panama Treaty of 1903.

6. Interference with our courts: On March 4, 1949, a complaint was received and filed by the United Nations, lodged by one of its consultative organizations, condemning the United States for Judge Medina's conduct of the trial of the 11 Communists in the Federal court as a violation of the United Nations Declaration on Human Rights. This complaint was filed by the International Association of Democratic Lawyers (35 A.B.A.J. 290). Although it is true that only a member state may file a complaint in the World Court, it is easy to envision a state like Uruguay, or some Communist state, succumbing to leftwing pressures and filing complaints criticizing our courts. It will be remembered that, due to so-called leftwing pressures in Uruguay, our own State Department interfered in the execution by the State of California of Caryl Chessman. Except for the Connally reservation, Communist and semi-Communist nations could have a field day, filing complaints against the United States for its conduct of trials by its own courts where Communists and other leftwing culprits were involved.

7. Foreign aid: The World Court is accorded specific jurisdiction over the breach of an international obligation and the nature and extent of the reparation to be made for the breach of an international obligation.

Twelfth. The Post says:

One of the strongest points made by the Committee on World Peace Through Law, of which Charles F. Rhyne is chairman, is that "we and Russia as a practical matter have almost the same position on the International Court. We can both accept or reject its jurisdiction on a case-by-case basis." The U.S.S.R. can easily defend its

contempt for international justice by hiding behind the American judicial veto.

The truth is: The alleged "American judicial veto" has been used exactly once—in the Interhandel case—and this alleged "judicial veto" is, as has been shown above, no stronger than the drop of the hat veto power reserved by 12 other nations.

Thirteenth. The Post says:

The legal scholars see no danger in accepting the compulsory jurisdiction of the World Court without qualification. History shows that the Court "has acted in a highly responsible manner." With its 15 judges serving 9-year staggered terms, the Court has continuity and stability.

The truth is: Many distinguished legal scholars see grave danger in accepting the compulsory jurisdiction of the World Court without reservation. Does anyone really believe that one of the Communist judges, the Russian or the Pole, would vote against the wishes of the Kremlin in any important case?

Mr. Holman points out certain of the events connected with the United Nations justifying the Connally reservation:

Not long after the United Nations began to function it developed programs to circumvent the protective provisions of the charter and the assurances given by the State Department with respect to our domestic affairs.

In late 1948, announcement was made of a so-called Declaration on Human Rights to be followed by a Covenant on Human Rights, both of which were designed to change and distort our concept of individual rights as fixed by our own Constitution and Bill of Rights, dealing, among other things, with such domestic matters as immigration, emigration, nationality, marriage, miscegenation, and other domestic matters.

Of the significant events connected with the United Nations, which occurred during and subsequent to 1948, justifying the protection of the Connally reservation as against internationalist thinking and programs tending more and more to accord the United Nations and its various agencies control and supervision over our domestic affairs, the following may also be mentioned:

1. Mr. John P. Humphrey, the first Director of the Commission on Human Rights, bluntly stated (January 1948 issue the Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science) that what the Commission on Human Rights was proposing in its various bill of rights programs constituted intervention in matters within the domestic jurisdiction of the member states. Exposing the whole revolutionary nature of these programs, he said:

"What the United Nations is trying to do is revolutionary in character. Human rights are largely a matter of relationships between the state and individuals, and therefore a matter which has been traditionally regarded as being within the domestic jurisdiction of states. What is now being proposed is, in effect, the creation of some kind of supernational supervision of this relationship between the state and its citizens."

It is obvious that the Connally reservation is necessary to protect the United States against such a program of supernational supervision of its citizens in relation to their own country.

2. In April 1949, Mr. Moses Moskowitz, an official of one of the consultative organizations of the United Nations, publicly stated (35 A.B.A.J. 285) that under the official view of the United Nations, any matter once becoming the subject of a U.N. convention or even of a resolution, ceased to be "a matter essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of a member state." In other words, the U.N. by its own ipse dixit, could internationalize a purely domestic matter so that it lost its character as a domestic matter and lost the benefit of the protection and immunities set up in the charter with respect to such matters. Upon this theory, the U.N. could lift itself, by its own bootstraps, into a world government. Mr. Moskowitz put the matter as follows:

"Once a matter has become, in one way or another, the subject of regulation by the United Nations, be it by resolution of the General Assembly or by convention between member states at the instance of the United Nations, that subject ceases to be a matter being "essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the member states." As a matter of fact, such a position represents the official view of the United Nations, as well as of the member states that have voted in favor of the Universal Declaration on Human Rights. Hence, neither the declaration, nor the projected covenant, nor any agreement that may be reached in the future on the machinery of implementation of human rights, can in any way be considered as violative of the letter or spirit of article 2 of this charter."

It is obvious that the Connally reservation is necessary to protect the domestic affairs of the United States against this broad theory that the U.N. by its own dictum, can transform and internationalize our domestic affairs to bring them under its jurisdiction.

3. In September, 1950, the internationalists succeeded in getting the famous (or infamous) official pronouncement from the State Department (State Department Publication 3972) that "there is now no longer any real difference between domestic and foreign affairs." On the basis of such a pronouncement by our own State Department, if we did not have the Connally reservation to negative it, the World Court would have no restraint in holding that the United States no longer considers itself as having any domestic affairs over which to preserve its own jurisdiction.

Many other instances could be cited where the internationalists, in and out of the United Nations, have attempted to establish a supernational supervision over matters "essentially within the domestic jurisdiction" of the United States. The Commission on Human Rights is not the only U.N. agency that, in the years following 1948, engaged in spawning treaties designed to control and supervise many of our essentially domestic concerns. Among these agencies are the ILO, UNESCO, GATT, ITU, WHO, FAO, and many others.

For purposes of illustration, these United Nations treaties or agencies undertake to deal with the kind of teaching and textbooks to be adopted in our public school system; matters of social legislation; of economic legislation; of labor legislation; of health and socialized medicine; and numerous others, including a treaty to establish an international criminal court to try Americans in a court made up, to a large extent, if not entirely, of foreigners—a plan under which, as in the case of the Genocide Convention, American citizens could be transported overseas for trial and would be deprived of the constitutional safeguards accorded them under the laws of this country.

Without the Connally reservation, the World Court would have the power to determine which of the foregoing matters, or what part of them, are subject to the compulsory jurisdiction of that Court. It will not do to say that this vast program of "treaty law" has somewhat bogged down and that few of these treaties have proceeded to the point of ratification by the U.S. Senate. This is true for the time being. * * * But it must be kept in mind that with the coming of a new administration, whether Republican or Democrat, the internationalists may be free to revive the U.N. treaty program and, by and through this process, give the World Court compulsory jurisdiction over many matters otherwise essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States. The only deterrent to this is the Connally reservation.

Fourteenth. The Post says:

In case of emergency, moreover, the United States could withdraw from the Court in 6 months.

The truth is: In 6 months it could be too late.

Fifteenth. The Post adds:

Or in case of gross injustice it could use its veto in the Security Council against enforcement of the Court's ruling. In any event, the World Court is confined by its own statute to international cases arising under treaties, international law, and so forth—a very limited jurisdiction.

The truth is: The United States really believes in "the rule of law" and once having submitted unconditionally to compulsory jurisdiction, would not want to use the veto power.

As to the Court's alleged "limited jurisdiction," Mr. Holman declares:

Apart from all other considerations, our knowledge of and experience with the United Nations Commission on Human Rights can leave little doubt in any reasonable mind but that the World Court, if free to do so, would have no hesitation in viewing as international many matters essentially within our domestic jurisdiction.

The United Nations Commission on Human Rights also had one member each from the United States, Great Britain, and Australia; and like the World Court, the other members were from countries each having a different historical and legal background which in no way fitted them to understand and appreciate what, by the United States and its citizens, has been traditionally considered a domestic matter instead of a matter of international concern.

What reason is there to suppose that a majority of the World Court will approach or view our domestic matters any differently than the U.N. Commission on Human Rights? The members of that Commission have, for the most part, been able and distinguished citizens of mostly the same countries from which the members of the World Court were selected; quite a number were able lawyers. But, in their deliberations as members of the Commission on Human Rights, they reflected their own views, based upon their own historical and legal backgrounds. In spite of the prohibitions in the charter (like those in art. 2, subpar. 7) against intervening "in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction" of any member state, they formulated convention after convention containing proposals that affected or interfered in matters which Americans have always treated as "essentially within the domestic jurisdiction" of the United States. The World Court, man for man and in the aggregate, represents no greater ability or personal integrity than did the U.N. Commission on Human Rights. Why expect it to act differently as to our domestic affairs?

Among the many strange and unbelievable results of the deliberations of the Commission on Human Rights, was that, after 400 meetings, a majority refused to include in the Covenant on Human Rights any provision recognizing the basic American right to own private property and be secure in its enjoyment as against its arbitrary seizure by government. The reason, of course, is that in most of the countries from which the members of the Commission came, the government is free to expropriate private property when and as it deems desirable

and to provide such compensation, or none, as it sees fit. Under our concept of freedom, no man can truly be free who lacks the right to own property and be secure in its enjoyment. In the United States it can be taken or damaged, even for public use, only by what we call due process and only by providing and paying just compensation.

In connection with many other American concepts like freedom of speech and freedom of press, a majority of the members of the Commission on Human Rights, in formulating the provisions of the Covenant and of the Convention on Freedom of Information and provisions of other conventions, so little understood our concepts that these precious American rights were changed (and to us distorted) in order to conform them to a kind of common denominator agreeable to the concepts in the systems of law of other countries.

Ah, but, the Connally repealers say, the World Court can be trusted, for it has made a wonderful record for itself. What record? It has not dealt with enough cases to have any adequate record upon which to judge it. This lack of cases is, in fact, one of the "arguments" used by the internationalists as showing the need for repeal of the reservation. But in the same breath they say that the World Court has made an outstanding record for itself. The repealers cannot have it both ways. Either the World Court has handled an adequate number of cases with which to establish a record, good or bad; or it has had an insufficient number of cases to make any sufficient record upon which it may be judged. Since 1946, 21 cases have been considered by the Court. Of these, 10 were disposed of on procedural grounds. Eleven were decided on their merits. But one of these involved a reconsideration of an earlier case. The record covering the 13 years of the Court's existence, therefore, is a net of 10 cases in which the Court has rendered a decision on the merits—less than 1 case per year. Hence, all the fulsome talk about the fine record of the World Court is without basis in fact. Its record is largely that of sitting on its collective woolsack and drawing salary checks—but doing little of importance.

As already pointed out, the World Court, personally and otherwise, has been modeled almost exactly upon the pattern of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights. Nobody charged the members of this Commission personally with evil intent or lack of fairmindedness from their own point of view; but their minds simply did not and could not comprehend what matters, under American concepts, were domestic as distinguished from international. Hence, in dealing with matters like the right to own property and be secure in its enjoyment as against arbitrary seizure by government, and dealing with our other constitutional rights like freedom of speech and press, and due process, the members of the Commission failed to appreciate that, from the American point of view, they were directly violating the very terms of the United Nations Charter, particularly article 2, subparagraph 7, forbidding the United Nations or any of its agencies to deal with matters essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of a member state. The minds of the members of the Court, like the minds of the members of the Commission, are not geared to our way of thought as to what matters are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States.

The simple answer to the Connally repealers is: If they are sincere in saying that they, too, want to be sure of protecting our domestic rights, why do they wish to speculate on any basis of uncertainty as to what the World Court will do? They, themselves, admit that risks will be incurred; but they suggest that wrong decisions can be corrected by exercising our veto in the Security Council or by withdrawing from the Court on 6 months' notice. Why run any risks with our domestic rights by vesting their protection in an alien tribunal? Why not make sure of preserving those rights by retaining the Connally reservation? In other words, why buy a pig in a poke in such important matters?

"Oh, well, we cannot be hurt very much," say the Connally repealers, "even if the World Court should decide contrary to American concepts, since, because of our right of veto in the Security Council, the decision cannot be enforced against us. This is not only an unworthy argument, but essentially immoral—to say that in submitting a case to the Court, we have in the back of our heads the intention, if we lose, of repudiating the Court's decision. How can men who point the finger at the Connally reservation and say it should be repealed because it is in the nature of a self-judging reservation (which it really is not, as has been established) advocate such underhand reliance upon a doctrine of unitary and outright repudiation? This is known, in gambling parlance, as having an ace up your sleeve."

The Connally repealers also say they have another ace up their sleeves in the event the Court does not act to our satisfaction: Having formally turned over to it the decision as to what constitutes a domestic matter and finding we made a wrong gamble on the Court, we can then get ourselves out of any further gamble on 6 months' notice. The immorality of this lies in having this "out" in mind at time of repealing the reservation.

Are we going to use both these hidden "aces" as a kind of threat upon the Court that if it does not act in accord with our wishes we will just not play any longer? Under such an attitude on our part, what becomes of the high position of the repealers—who maintain that the basic reason for withdrawing the Connally reservation is to contribute to the stature and dignity of the Court and bring about better international relations generally, and eventually world peace through law—when the repealers have already tainted and destroyed any good will that might come from repeal of the Connally reservation by announcing to the world that repeal is just a gesture of good will because we have "a couple of aces up our sleeves" and if we do not like what the Court does, we will pull one or both of them out and play them, rather than submit to Court decisions we do not like?

That we are facing nothing but a sales program has been publicly confessed by our most ardent advocate of repeal of the Connally reservation, Mr. Charles S. Rhyne, who, at the July 2, 1958, meeting of the American Association of Law Libraries, stated:

"There is no reason why peace through law cannot be sold with the same verve and enthusiasm that we sell soap and other products and programs."

The following day, no less an internationalist than Mr. Dean Acheson observed:

"While it may be that peace through law may be offered for sale with the same verve and enthusiasm as soap, the chances of a consummated sale seem to me infinitely less. If you think of yourself as ringing Mr. Khrushchev's doorbell with two packages in your hand, you can, I firmly believe, have no doubt as to which is salable and which is not."

Mr. Acheson then indicated why Mr. Khrushchev would not buy the Rhyne rule of law:

"Whose rule of law? he [Khrushchev] would ask. You answer with verve and enthusiasm. Rhyne's Grade A Fancy, approved by the American Bar Association. You have a nerve, he shouts back as he slams the door. I'm the proprietor of Khrushchev's rule of Khrushchev, grade triple A, supercolossal. Guaranteed to bury you. Use it either as a tonic or embalming fluid, or both. Ask the Poles."

In every instance, our internationalists, in selling peace, resort to the cure-all promises of modern sales techniques for soap, cosmetics and hair tonics; and, as in the case of cigarettes, will soon tell you that the product is friendly to your throat. Furthermore, in all their programs they call upon America to sacrifice something of its sovereignty or control over its own affairs in exchange for some vague and distant promise that our sacrifices will so influence other nations, even Russia, that the cause of world peace will be advanced. Meanwhile, Russia and the other Communist nations pay no attention to such gestures, or they are puzzled at the spectacle of a great nation sacrificing its sovereignty on the basis of the vague and distant hopes of a sales campaign.

Of course, we all want peace. We favor settling matters by law instead of force where possible. But whose law? Under the present state of the world, all right-thinking Americans recognize that we are compelled (through no fault of our own) to deal at arms length with Russia and other nations of the Communist bloc. We all agree that we are not ready for military disarmament. No more are we ready to disarm ourselves legally and lose the right to protect our own domestic affairs, by giving up the Connally reservation.

Why should we accept merely the vague opinions of our internationalists in exchange for legal disarmament, when we refuse to accept vague and general opinions in exchange for military disarmament? Most of the internationalists who now say the Connally reservation is a deterrent to world peace, said world peace would be deterred if the Senate failed to ratify the genocide convention or if we did not go along with the covenant on human rights or with the various conventions, pacts, and treaties concocted by the Commission on Human Rights and adversely affecting our own constitutional rights and liberties. But refusing to give up control of our domestic affairs in those particulars disclosed that world peace was in nowise affected. No more will it be affected by standing firm for the Connally reservation.

In the last analysis, the issue with respect to the Connally reservation can be summed up by saying that, in view of the present state of the world and in the absence of anything but the mouthing of noble phrases by our internationalists, we should not legally disarm any more than we should disarm militarily. It will be time enough to talk about giving up the Connally reservation when Russia and the nations of the Communist bloc have filed unlimited declarations of adherence to the World Court and have furnished convincing proof that they will abide by the decisions of the Court. Russia and others of these nations have judges on the Court, but have in no way accepted its jurisdiction. * * * The Court may even conceivably become a tribunal with a majority of its members elected by the General Assembly from Communist, pro-Communist and backward countries. Our only protection against all these contingencies is to preserve the Connally reservation.

Mr. President, I have just been informed that today the House of Delegates of the American Bar Association defeated a resolution to reverse its original stand in favor of repeal of the Connally reservation. That is, Mr. President, the ABA today voted in favor of unqualified acceptance of the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice. The vote—and this is most significant, Mr. President—was 114 to 107 against repeal of the 13-year stand of the ABA for repeal of the Connally reservation. How many of those votes, I ask Senators, were influenced by the

editorial in the Washington Post and Times Herald? This is an editorial which I believe I have proven to be grossly unfair, inaccurate, and not in keeping with traditional journalistic impartiality.

TRIBUTE TO REPRESENTATIVES MADDEN, DENTON, BRADEMAS, ROUSH, WAMPLER, HOGAN, HARMON, BARR

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, two congressional districts in my home State of Indiana have been for many years ably represented in the House of Representatives by the Honorable RAY J. MADDEN and WINFIELD K. DENTON. Their districts are the first and the eighth, respectively.

Mr. MADDEN is an honored member of the Rules Committee and one of the most effective Members of the House. Mr. DENTON is the Representatives from my own district. His service on the Appropriations Committee has been outstanding.

However, Mr. President, I should like to take a few moments to call the attention of this body to six new Representatives who came to Washington when I did in January of 1959. Only one other State sent six new House Members to Washington last year for this Congress.

The unusual ability of the distinguished Representatives from Indiana has been a source of great pride to me personally and, I am sure, to the people of our State and their congressional districts.

The Third Congressional District is ably represented by a learned former Rhodes scholar who has established himself in a matter of months as an outstanding member of the House Committee on Labor and Education. This Representative, JOHN BRADEMAS, has earned an enviable reputation as a hard-working, effective Member of Congress, who has a keen and broad insight into the affairs of the Nation without losing sight of the necessity of representing his own constituents well.

The Fifth District is represented equally ably by my longtime friend, J. EDWARD ROUSH. Mr. ROUSH has devoted himself to his duties on the Science and Astronautics Committee and to working with me and others in our delegation to obtain the greatest possible flood control for his district. He has become an expert in space problems as well as in those which more directly concern the Hoosier district which he represents so well.

The Honorable FRED WAMPLER has made an enviable record as the Representative of the Sixth District. He is a valuable member of the Armed Service Committee, working especially hard on the problem of proper use of manpower. Mr. WAMPLER also has joined me in trying to solve our gigantic flood problem and in trying to attract industry to the Wabash Valley.

The Ninth District is predominately a farming area. Its Representative here is a knowledgeable dirt farmer, the Honorable EARL HOGAN. The Committee on Agriculture is fortunate to have such an outstanding man among its members. He has worked diligently to develop answers to the problems which today are robbing American farmers of the fruits of their hard work. At the same time he has been a great friend of industry and small business.

The 10th District is represented by the colorful RANDALL S. HARMON. I have found him extremely cooperative in attempting to solve Hoosier problems by joint action. I have found also that he, too, represents the people of his district ably and well.

The Indianapolis metropolitan area is represented most capably by the Honorable JOSEPH BARR. Mr. BARR's grasp of the complicated problems of banking and currency are almost legendary. He has become an important and almost indispensible member of this vital committee. In addition, no member of the House has worked longer and more diligently to represent the varied best interests of the people of such a populous congressional district.

On this final day of the 86th Congress, I wish to pay my personal tribute to all the members of our Hoosier delegation and especially to the colleagues I have just mentioned. No Senator could ask for more cooperation than I have had from his colleagues on both sides of the Capitol. The six new Members of the House, in particular, have helped restore Hoosier pride in their congressional representation. I hope the voters of our State will return them and their two senior colleagues, Mr. MADDEN and Mr. DENTON, to the Halls of Congress.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 13161) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCGEE in the chair). The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today, p. 18691, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. HAYDEN obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is my understanding that the additional funds which had been allowed by the Senate for the Office of Inspector General have once again been reduced from $1,700,000 to $1,200,000, as previously agreed to. As the Senator knows—and I am delighted that the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is present—the purpose of the Inspector General is to bring about economy, better efficiency, and more efficient administration. The purpose is to do away with duplication, waste, and inefficiency. Money is required to do this, and it would be money well spent.

Would it be safe to assume that in view of the circumstances surrounding this particular supplemental appropriation, as it affects this particular office, it would be possible for the Inspector General's Office to spend a little bit ahead of its prorated monthly needs, if the occasion arises, and return in January with reasonable assurance that the Office of Inspection General would be given consideration for additional funds?

Mr. HAYDEN. So far as the Senate Committee on Appropriations is concerned, I believe they are still satisfied with the work of the Inspector General, which has been salutary and beneficial service. I should like to see him receive what he needs. So far as I am concerned, I would be glad to urge that that be done in January.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I agree heartily with what the Senator from Montana has said. This office was established to try to make the entire administration of the mutual security program more efficient and economical, and to make sure that our dollars were well spent. For example, even under the present operation, which is without limitation, when one inspector is assigned to cover nine countries, his service cannot be as efficient as desired. So I hope that the statement of the Senator from Arizona can be substantially carried out next January. I think it is a much wiser way to do it than possibly go into the technicalities in the law, which we could go into, but which might upset the membership of the House.

Mr. HAYDEN. There is no question at all that it is prudent for the Treasury of the United States to have these inspections made. Money can be saved by doing so. That has been demonstrated.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The fact is that this is a congressional office set up under congressional authority.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. Murphy, the present Inspector General, is doing a very fine job according to the instructions given to him by Congress. He is a representative of Congress, and he is doing a fine job in his line of endeavor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is absolutely correct. He is honest, efficient, and is getting things accomplished.

Mr. CHAVEZ. He is honest and efficient.

Mr. MANSFIELD. We all have great respect for him.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I agree with what the Senator from New Mexico has said. May I make a brief remark? I am personally very disappointed that the House has been so adamant on these nine different disagreements that it had with the Senate. It acceded on only one amendment in amount. It left the language amendments unchanged. One of them we have just been discussing. But of the other two, one concerns the deobligating and reobligating authority, which means that if the appropriation is left the way it is now, either funds will be inefficiently spent for purposes for which they may not be needed, or if they are deobligated, then those funds cannot be spent for any other purpose, though it may be a very worthy purpose.

The other language change which the Senate inserted and the House would not accept instead of its own language is that notice must be submitted to the Appropriations Committees of the House and the Senate for every technical cooperation project for which money is spent.

I think that the suggestion of the majority leader with respect to reports on this program to committees of the House and the Senate, in the same way that the Appropriations Committees are now receiving reports from the Armed Forces when projects are changed, is an eminently satisfactory one, because it would give Congress notice of such change. Congress could through its committees see that such projects could not be changed if it wanted to. Now, under the House language, all projects must be submitted to the House and the Senate for approval before funds are appropriated and cannot thereafter be changed.

We know that in dealing with countries all around the world that it is almost impossible to say today what may be wise to do a year from now or 9 months from now. However, I do not intend to contest the concurrence with the House in these amendments. I believe we have done the best we can. But as one member of the Appropriations Committee who is interested in mutual security, I believe in the purposes of mutual security, and I am very much disappointed that we feel that we have gone as far as we can, and that we must concur with the House or else get no bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I agree with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and also with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], our distinguished committee chairman, that we should concur. I thought Under Secretary Dillon made a fine presentation before our committee with respect to the total of $190 million, which he asked to have restored, and which the Senate moved to restore. However, he stated that $75 million of that sum, which was the sum we would have added back to the Development Loan Fund, could be dispensed with until after the first of the year. We left in serious dispute $115 million, out of which the House by its action today has granted $65 million. I think that is as good a settlement as we could hope for under the strained situation existing, and I hope we will accept it.

I should like to say one thing more about the fund for the Inspector General and Comptroller. We brought out from Mr. Dillon that he was willing to modify the practice which has heretofore existed under which the reports of investigations have come to the State Department, and under which practice there were some, at least, who felt that the Senate and the House were not sure we were getting the full picture. He agreed to change that practice, so that duplicate reports could come, at the same time that they went to Under Secretary Dillon, to the two Committees on Appropriations, and we presented that fact very strongly and aggressively to the House conferees.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator must not forget that the Department also volunteered to send the same information to the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct, and that was a fine addition to what they agreed to. I think they showed a cooperative attitude. My feeling is that if they will put that cooperative attitude into immediate practice for the rest of the year, they will be in a strong position when Congress returns and when the first supplemental or deficiency bill for funds is considered. As mentioned by the distinguished minority whip, it may then be possible to secure full funds for the functioning of the Inspector General and Comptroller. I hope that that will be the result early next year.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Will we have reason to expect that this very onerous condition as explained by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] will again be the subject of consideration of the majority leader, who has made a fine contribution in the effort to resolve it? Do we have a right to expect that this matter will again be subject to consideration by the Appropriations Committee, with a view, when we have a better opportunity, and with the aid of the majority leader and the minority leader, and our senior representative on the Appropriations Committee, of undoing what everyone recognizes as an onerous and impossible situation?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is a question to be considered. There will be a supplemental appropriation bill next year. It will be appropriate to take up the subject at that time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I concur in some of the sentiments uttered by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts as to both frustrations and disappointments about what finally happened to the bill on the floor of the House. What amazes me, of course, over the years—and I have served many times on conference committees on this bill, and the focal point of attack by the House conferees has always been on defense support—is that by a vote of 203 to 193 the $65 million for defense support was finally restored.

Then technical cooperation was passed over, and the addition to special assistance was defeated by a vote of 176 to 216.

There was no vote on the ICA administrative expenses, and no vote on the Development Loan Fund.

I believe it was made very clear that the Development Loan Corporation could operate effectively until we got back in January, God willing—and I always add that, of course.

There was a voice vote on the administrative expenses for the Development Loan Fund. There was no vote on the so-called deobligation and reobligation authority, and no vote on the technical cooperation proviso. I believe there was a voice vote on the addition in the case of the Inspector General and Comptroller.

Mr. Murphy, who has been at my elbow so many times, in all hours of the day and night, is one of the really dedicated public servants who has sweated through many of these agonies with us, and always undertakes to do a good job.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. And objectively.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Very much so. I would not contest the report which our distinguished friend from Arizona files. I only call attention to two facts with respect to deobligation and reobligation. It appears to me that it was shortsighted on the part of any branch of Congress to insist that when an agency has approved a project and then discovers that perhaps it is not justified, or it might be wasteful, and throws it overboard, it shall lose the funds and may not, instead, bring in another project which has been carefully explored and which is believed to be economically justified. That is as shortsighted on the part of Congress as anything I can think of.

I hope the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, if the appropriate agencies come before us, will give very respectful attention to curing that difficulty.

I believe the same thing can be said about the proposal with respect to technical cooperation. The idea of trying to get a country-to-country agreement, particularly with the new countries coming into being in Africa, and then having to come back to the committees of Congress, not to follow the Senate idea of making a report, but to justify the project, hamstrings the agencies and hamstrings the executive branch.

Finally, we have put a great deal of emphasis upon shifting from grants to loans, and the subject has been ventilated freely and eloquently on the floor of the Senate for a long time. The loan program for undeveloped countries is in being and is beginning to grow. Yet the bill carries less in administrative funds and more restrictions with which the people can administer the program than before. That is not realistic in anyone's book.

I can understand, having talked with the House leadership, that there is nothing further that we can do, and that we

might as well concur in the report that is before us.

I wish to say of the majority leader, who made a determined attempt when the first conference report was before us, to see that these items were restored, that he kept his word. He became a part of the machinery on the appropriations, and undertook as best he could, along with his associates on the committee, to secure restorations of these important items.

I could charge him with failure to follow through, but I realize what the obstacles, impediments, and difficulties are. He has done a noble job in this respect and I salute him and I commend him for it.

At the same time, I share also his disappointment and his sense of frustration that there are portions of the great legislative branch that will persist in the course of error, no matter what we do in order to show them the light and try to bring them into paths of rectitude and righteousness. We have failed in that endeavor.

I do not propose to stand in the way of having the report approved. I salute the distinguished chairman of the committee. He has done a noble job. I have served as a disciple at his feet, and I know how often he has reasserted and reaffirmed his interest in this program, and how generously and how vigorously he has supported it.

So, in the hope that we can take a look at these very restrictive legislative provisos early in January, I am willing now to commend this bill to the gentle keeping of the Senate and whatever a majority of it wishes to do, with the hope that the errors can be eliminated at some future time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I concur in what the distinguished minority leader has said. The Senate has been quite patient and faithful and diligent in connection with the consideration it has given to the views of the President and the executive department. We heard the testimony and brought the original bill to the Senate. It was a bill that was generally satisfactory to the President.

Subsequently we went to conference, and the conference report was disturbing to the President, and we gave further consideration to the subject. We brought back a bill that I thought was satisfactory. The House accepted only one of the several provisions. If I thought there was anything else that we could do about it, I would ask the Senate to be patient and give further consideration to it. However, the distinguished minority leader has explored the matter in the House, as I have also explored it, and I am unable to give any encouragement to any Senator to the effect that if we should reject the conference report and send it back and ask for another conference, we would make any further progress. I think that under the circumstances the best thing to do is to accept the fact that we have been successful in the Senate but unsuccessful in the House. I am not in the position of saying whether our judgment is better than that of the House. I am in the position of saying that this is our judgment, and we have said it three times. If the House is unwilling to accept it, the best we can do is reconcile our differences as quickly and as courteously as we can. We have done that.

I pay tribute to the great leader of the Appropriations Committee. He is a constant inspiration to all who serve with him. He is one of the finest, sweetest, most gentle, effective legislators I have ever known.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the minority leader, the Senator from Arizona, the Senator from Florida, and I, perhaps when the majority leader was not listening, said that we would do our best to try to see that some of these funds, particularly at the administrative end, were considered again thoughtfully next January.

I hope that with that statement the majority leader will agree.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I certainly do.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Would the Senator add to his statement not only "thoughtfully" but also "prayerfully"?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I do not know what contribution, if any, I shall be able to make next January, but I will do whatever I can to assist.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I join with both the majority leader and the minority leader in their statements. I sat in this particular conference, and I know that some of us who were on the conference committee felt that, perhaps, there were critical statements. Personally, I feel just the reverse. I compliment the chairman of the committee and also the members of the committee of conference this time, and also last week, because unless one has been in contact with this situation I do not believe he can appreciate exactly what the Members of the Senate have been up against. I am not happy, of course, with the outcome of this effort, as are few members of the committee. At the same time, I must say that the conference committee has done excellent work. We will consider these other matters next year when Congress reconvenes.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I say to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, who was also the chairman of the conference, that, in view of the position taken by the House today, and in view of the fact that defense support is one of the most essential items in the foreign aid or mutual security program, I think what we must do is to accept the report and action of the House and approve the report.

As the distinguished Senator from Arizona remembers, there was no controversy over military assistance. The contingent fund, which was considered to be the most important single item, was left intact. I think the item with respect to defense support certainly warrants our going ahead with acceptance.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, in my opinion, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, who was also chairman of the conference, did everything anybody could do, as did other Senators in conference. Particularly, I commend the majority leader, who asked for the difficult position of membership on the conference and then asserted himself as vigorously as was possible in the conference.

Mr. President, amendments Nos. 62 and 63 relate to the Panama Canal. As to amendment No. 62, I think the Senate should recede from its amendment to the House bill. As to amendment No. 63, I think we should recede and adopt the amendment which the House has already adopted. While I do not think it gives us a perfect answer to the problem involved, which has to do with the limitation on costs for building new quarters for non-American employees at the canal, I think it makes progress, and that if we learn of something which will require additional handling, that can be taken care of next January.

Mr. HAYDEN. There is enough to take care of the situation between now and January.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I therefore ask that the Senate recede on its amendments Nos. 62 and 63 and adopt the House amendment to No. 63.

Mr. HAYDEN. That will be done.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I join with the minority leader and other Senators in paying tribute to the work of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and of the majority leader. I know that this is an old refrain now, but House conferees are very difficult.

I also express not only my appreciation but also my sympathy to those who have to serve on committees of conference. I can think of no more distasteful job that I have ever encountered in Congress.

The majority leader said he is not in a position to say his judgment is better than that of the other conferees. Not having been on this conference, I am in a position to say that I think his judgment is better and that I think the judgment of the committee of the Senate is better. I only regret that the Senate conferees have faced an impossible situation. It seems to me that if this practice continues, it will put an end to our foreign relations altogether. Then we can come home and forget about the rest of the world.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I ask that a brief paragraph in the report of the House Committee on Appropriations on the second supplemental appropriation bill, H.R. 13161, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the paragraph was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF CIVIL AND DEFENSE MOBILIZATION

It has been suggested to the Committee that there may be some inequities existing in the matching grant program for the purchase of civil defense equipment by States and their political subdivisions, and that non-legal payments have been made by OCDM in some instances. If there are inequities the legislative committee should look into the matter and take whatever action is necessary to correct such condition.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, this item deals with Federal-State matching funds for civil defense equipment used by State and local governments. What is referred to in the paragraph is the fact that field audits by the General Accounting Office show that in every State

of the Union there are cases in which the procurement of civil defense equipment was made prior to the effective date of the appropriation under which the payments were made. There was no overexpenditure of appropriation authorization, and sufficient appropriations were available.

I sought to have language incorporated in H.R. 13161 which would ratify and confirm such expenditures if they were otherwise proper.

In the judgment of the able chairman of the House Subcommittee on Appropriations which handled the bill, action by the legislative committee should be taken before the item is brought to the Committee on Appropriations. I am guided by his suggestion, and hope legislative action can be taken early in the next session. Otherwise, costly and time consuming accounting and collection activities must follow on the part of Federal, State, and local governmental units.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 13161, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U.S.,
August 31, 1960.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 5, 6, 35, 58, 61, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, and 85 to the bill (H.R. 13161) entitled "An Act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes", and concur therein.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sums of "$1,300,000" and "$2,500" named therein insert "$650,000" and "$1,250", respectively.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sums of "$275,000" and "$170,000" named in said amendment insert "$137,500" and "$100,000", respectively.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: Delete the last sentence thereof.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed, insert the following:

"PUBLIC BUILDING CONSTRUCTION AND DEPARTMENT OF SANITARY ENGINEERING

"For an additional amount for "Capital outlay, Public Building Construction" and "Capital outlay, Department of Sanitary Engineering", for construction projects as authorized by the Act of April 22, 1904 (33 Stat. 244), the Act of May 18, 1954 (68 Stat. 105), and the Act of Jun 6, 1958 (72 Stat. 183) and as submitted to the Congress in House Document Numbered 403 of June 1, 1960, such sums as may be necessary, but no obligation shall be incurred for any item or project proposed in said document which will (1) result in a deficit in the general fund of the District of Columbia, or (2) exceed the estimated cost as submitted therein to the Congress."

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named therein, insert "$2,500,000".

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum of $290,000 named therein, insert "$145,000".

Amendment numbered 56: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 56 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert "$37,500, of which not to exceed 15 per centum shall be available for salaries and administrative expenses:".

Amendment numbered 63: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 63 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert ": *Provided*, That no part of the foregoing amount shall be available for any expenses related to the construction of any quarters at an average cost in excess of $9,000 per unit".

Amendment numbered 84: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 84 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sums of "$300,000" and "$3,000" named therein, insert "$150,000" and "$1,500", respectively; and delete the proviso.

That the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, and 62 to said bill.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 16, 23, 30, 34, 37, 56, 63, and 84.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, and 62.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a summary tabulation covering the second supplemental appropriation bill, 1961, showing the budget estimates, the House and Senate versions of the bill, and the amounts finally agreed upon.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Second supplemental appropriation bill, 1961 (H.R. 13161)

Document No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	House bill	Senate bill	Conference action
	FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT				
400	President's special international program	[1] *($986,800)*		$986,800	
	Special foreign currency programs:				
S. 111	Administrative expenses, oversea surplus agricultural commodity donations	1,000,000		1,000,000	
S. 120	President's special international program	1,300,000		1,300,000	$650,000
	Mutual security program:				
	Defense support	[2]		65,000,000	65,000,000
	Technical cooperation	[2]		22,000,000	
	Special assistance	[2]		26,000,000	
	General administrative expenses	[2]		2,000,000	
	Development Loan Fund	[2]		75,000,000	
	Total, mutual security			190,000,000	65,000,000
	Total, funds appropriated to the President	2,300,000		193,286,800	65,650,000
	DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE				
	FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL SERVICE				
400	Salaries and expenses	[1] *(550,000)*		275,000	137,500
400	Transfer of sec. 32 funds	[1] (170,000)		(170,000)	(100,000)
	FOREST SERVICE				
S. 118	Forest protection and utilization:				
	Forest land management	800,000	$700,000	800,000	750,000
	Forest research	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000
	Total, Department of Agriculture	1,300,000	1,200,000	1,575,000	1,387,500
	DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE				
	GENERAL ADMINISTRATION				
400	Office of Field Services, salaries and expenses	[1](250,000)		207,500	100,000
S. 111	Great Lakes Pilotage Administration	140,000	60,000	60,000	60,000
S. 111	West Virginia centennial celebration	15,000	5,000	15,000	10,000

See footnotes at end of table.

Second supplemental appropriation bill, 1961 (H.R. 13161)—Continued

Document No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	House bill	Senate bill	Conference action
	DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE—Continued				
	BUREAU OF THE CENSUS				
403	Salaries and expenses	[1] (*$300,000*)	[3]	$150,000	$75,000
S. 118	Eighteenth Decennial Census	9,000,000	$8,500,000	8,500,000	8,500,000
	COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY				
	Salaries and expenses			284,000	24,000
	Construction and equipment			Language	Language
	BUSINESS AND DEFENSE SERVICES ADMINISTRATION				
400	Salaries and expenses	[1] (*350,000*)		291,500	200,000
	BUREAU OF FOREIGN COMMERCE				
400	Salaries and expenses	[1] (*1,200,000*)		1,000,000	500,000
	BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS				
S. 118	Limitation on general administrative expenses	(50,000)	(35,000)	(35,000)	(35,000)
S. 111	Forest highways (liquidation of contract authorization)	[1] (*80,000,000*)	27,000,000	27,000,000	27,000,000
S. 111	Public lands highways (liquidation of contract authorization)	[1] (*3,000,000*)	2,700,000	2,700,000	2,700,000
	WEATHER BUREAU				
	Salaries and expenses			50,000	
	Total, Department of Commerce	9,155,000	38,265,000	40,258,000	39,169,000
	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA				
403	Federal funds: Federal payment to District of Columbia	[1] (*7,900,000*)			
	District of Columbia funds:				
	Operating expenses:				
403	Executive office	[1](63,600)		(47,700)	(47,700)
S. 111	Department of Occupations and Professions	(72,600)	(50,000)	(50,000)	(50,000)
S. 118	Courts	(155,000)	(75,000)	(155,000)	(75,000)
	Total, operating expenses	(227,600)	(125,000)	(252,700)	(172,700)
	Capital outlay:				
403	Public building construction	[1](6,173,800)		(6,170,800)	(6,170,800)
403	Department of Sanitary Engineering	[1](3,838,000)		(3,838,000)	
	Total, capital outlay	[1](10,011,800)		(10,008,800)	(6,170,800)
	Total, District of Columbia funds	(227,600)	(125,000)	(10,261,500)	(6,343,500)
	DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE				
	FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION				
S. 118	Salaries and expenses	1,528,000	1,000,000	1,528,000	1,200,000
	OFFICE OF EDUCATION				
S. 97	Defense educational activities	[3] (*17,900,000*)	14,430,000	14,430,000	14,430,000
S. 118	Land-grant college aid	6,000,000	2,225,000	6,000,000	2,225,000
	PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE				
S. 121	Assistance to States, general	3,070,000		3,070,000	2,500,000
	SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION				
S. 121	Grants to States for public assistance	Language		Language	Language
	GALLAUDET COLLEGE				
S. 118	Salaries and expenses	82,400	80,000	80,000	80,000
	HOWARD UNIVERSITY				
S. 118	Salaries and expenses	400,400	400,000	400,000	400,000
	Total, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	11,080,800	18,135,000	25,508,000	20,835,000
	INDEPENDENT OFFICES				
	ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS				
S. 118	Salaries and expenses	57,000	28,500	57,000	28,500
	CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION				
S. 118	Salaries and expenses	157,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
	FOREIGN CLAIMS SETTLEMENT COMMISSION				
S. 118	Salaries and expenses	290,000	145,000	290,000	145,000
	GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION				
S. 118	Repair and improvement of public buildings	2,000,000		2,000,000	
S. 118	Construction, public buildings projects	5,289,000		5,289,000	
	HISTORICAL AND MEMORIAL COMMISSION				
S. 118	Civil War Centennial Commission	3,750	3,750	3,750	3,750
	U.S. Territorial Expansion Memorial Commission			Language	Language
	George Washington Carver Centennial Commission		125,000	25,000	37,500
S. 118	James Madison Memorial Commission	10,000	5,000	10,000	10,000
	THE PANAMA CANAL				
S. 111, 118, 122	Canal Zone Government:				
	Operating expenses	950,700	593,750	950,700	919,450
S. 111	Capital outlay	134,200	121,000	134,200	121,000
S. 118	Panama Canal Company: Limitation on general and administrative expenses	(732,200)	(695,600)	(732,200)	(713,900)
	Total, the Panama Canal	1,084,900	714,750	1,084,900	1,040,450

See footnotes at end of table.

Second supplemental appropriation bill, 1961 (H.R. 13161)—Continued

Document No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	House bill	Senate bill	Conference action
	INDEPENDENT OFFICES—Continued				
	NATIONAL CAPITAL TRANSPORTATION AGENCY				
S. 118	Salaries and expenses	$500,000	$250,000	$500,000	$250,000
	SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM				
S. 118	Salaries and expenses	1,381,000	1,300,000	1,300,000	1,300,000
	VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION				
S. 118	Inpatient care	6,800,000	4,185,000	4,185,000	4,185,000
	Total, independent offices	17,572,650	6,857,000	14,844,650	7,100,200
	DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, DEPARTMENTAL OFFICES				
	OFFICE OF SALINE WATER				
S. 118	Salaries and expenses	500,000	400,000	500,000	400,000
	OFFICE OF COAL RESEARCH				
S. 118	Salaries and expenses	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
	BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT				
S. 118	Management of lands and resources	1,500,000	1,350,000	1,500,000	1,425,000
S. 118	Administrative provisions	Language	Language	Language	Language
	BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS				
S. 111	Construction	2,200,000	1,800,000	2,450,000	2,050,000
	DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR				
	GEOLOGICAL SURVEY				
403	Surveys, investigations, and research	300,000	----------	300,000	300,000
	NATIONAL PARK SERVICE				
403	Construction	[1] (4,453,000)	[4]	500,000	275,000
	FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE				
S. 111	Bureau of Sports Fisheries and Wildlife: Construction	100,000	250,000	250,000	250,000
	Bureau of Commercial Fisheries:				
S. 111	Management and investigation of resources	300,000	100,000	300,000	100,000
S. 111	Construction of fishing vessels	1,000,000	500,000	1,000,000	750,000
403	Administrative provisions	Language	----------	Language	----------
	BUREAU OF RECLAMATION				
S. 118	Construction and rehabilitation	Language	300,000	300,000	300,000
S. 111	Operation and maintenance	2,200,000	(2,200,000)	(2,200,000)	(2,200,000)
S. 111	Loan program	9,652,000	----------	----------	----------
S. 111	Emergency fund	500,000	(500,000)	(500,000)	(500,000)
	Total, Department of the Interior	19,252,000	5,700,000	8,100,000	6,850,000
	DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE				
	Legal activities and general administration:				
S. 118	Salaries and expenses, general legal activities	500,000	Language	Language	Language
S. 118	Salaries and expenses, U.S. attorneys and marshals	450,000	400,000	400,000	400,000
	Total, Department of Justice	950,000	400,000	400,000	400,000
	LEGISLATIVE BRANCH				
	HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES				
	Mileage for Members of the House	----------	190,000	190,000	190,000
	Preparation of Clerk of House report	----------	8,000	8,000	8,000
	ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL				
	Office of the Architect of the Capitol: Salaries	----------	8,200	----------	----------
	Total, legislative branch	----------	206,200	198,000	198,000
	DEPARTMENT OF STATE				
	Administration of foreign affairs:				
400	Salaries and expenses	[1] (1,015,000)	----------	250,000	125,000
400	Representation allowances	[1] (27,000)	----------	----------	----------
	U.S. Citizens Commission on NATO	----------	----------	300,000	150,000
	Total, Department of State	[1] (1,042,000)	----------	550,000	275,000
	TREASURY DEPARTMENT				
	BUREAU OF THE PUBLIC DEBT				
403	Administering the public debt (unobligated balance)	Language	----------	Language	Language
452	Claims and judgments	20,322,281	20,322,281	20,322,281	20,322,281
	Grand total	81,932,731	91,085,481	305,042,731	162,186,981

[1] Not added into totals as previously carried in Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1961.
[2] Estimated previously carried in mutual security appropriations bill, 1961.
[3] Not added into totals; previously carried in Labor-HEW appropriation bill, 1961.
[4] $150,000 appropriated in Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1961.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a tabulation summarizing the budget estimates, the amounts as passed by the House, and the amounts as passed by the Senate, showing final congressional action compared with budget estimates for all appropriation bills during the 2d session of the 86th Congress.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Table of appropriation bills, 86th Cong., 2d sess.

Bill No.	Title	Budget estimates	Amount as passed		Final action, amount as approved	Increase or decrease compared to budget estimates
			House	Senate		
	1960 APPROPRIATIONS					
H.J. Res. 621	NASA supplemental	$23,079,000	$23,000,000	$23,079,000	$23,079,000	
H.R. 10743	2d supplemental	1,018,504,888	237,505,864	995,491,103	955,370,003	−$63,134,885
H.J. Res. 765	Labor supplemental	8,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	−2,000,000
	1961 APPROPRIATIONS					
H.R. 10233	District of Columbia	(242,403,000)	(237,118,276)	(240,089,152)	(239,470,433)	(−2,932,567)
	Loan authorization	(18,700,000)	(18,700,000)	(20,100,000)	(20,100,000)	(+1,400,000)
	Federal payment	34,533,000	27,533,000	28,533,000	27,533,000	−7,000,000
H.R. 10234	Commerce	799,615,000	760,522,235	738,388,300	729,624,375	−69,990,625
H.R. 10401	Interior	550,330,300	543,375,600	589,212,625	557,667,600	+7,337,300
H.R. 10569	Treasury-Post Office	4,897,853,000	4,795,414,000	4,877,014,000	4,841,914,000	−55,939,000
H.R. 11389	General Government	14,627,500	13,787,500	14,572,500	14,207,500	−420,000
H.R. 11390	Labor-HEW	4,020,221,981	4,184,022,731	4,485,788,931	4,354,170,331	+333,948,350
H.R. 11666	State-Justice-Judiciary	733,030,395	676,564,807	718,269,147	705,032,567	−27,997,828
H.R. 11776	Independent offices	8,417,397,000	8,182,067,400	8,459,412,900	8,311,893,400	−105,503,600
H.R. 11998	Defense	39,335,000,000	39,337,867,000	40,514,997,000	39,996,608,000	+661,608,000
H.R. 12117	Agriculture	4,135,263,190	3,937,943,500	4,005,222,683	3,994,097,600	−141,165,590
	Loan authorizations	(367,000,000)	(557,000,000)	(577,000,000)	(577,000,000)	(+210,000,000)
H.R. 12231	Military construction	1,188,000,000	876,145,000	1,067,227,000	994,855,000	−193,145,000
H.R. 12232	Legislative	133,413,485	100,317,660	129,870,410	129,470,410	−3,943,075
H.R. 12326	Public works	4,013,793,180	3,914,798,985	4,030,010,605	3,969,982,485	−43,810,695
H.R. 12619	Mutual security	4,281,704,000	3,589,750,000	3,989,054,000	3,722,350,000	−559,354,000
H.R. 12740	Supplemental	169,327,840	49,738,200	166,324,740	138,293,740	−31,034,100
H.R. 13161	2d supplemental	72,280,731	91,085,481	305,042,731	162,186,981	+89,906,250
	Total, 1961	72,796,390,602	71,080,933,099	74,118,940,572	72,649,886,989	−146,503,613
	Total, all bills	73,845,974,490	71,347,438,963	75,143,510,675	73,634,335,992	−211,638,498
	Total, loan authorizations	(385,700,000)	(575,700,000)	(597,100,000)	(597,100,000)	(+211,400,000)

NOTE.—Indefinite appropriations are included in this table.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 13021) to provide for assistance in the development of Latin America and in the reconstruction of Chile, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

NINETEEN HUNDRED SIXTY-TWO WORLD SPORT PARACHUTING CHAMPIONSHIPS, ORANGE, MASS.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I send to the desk a House joint resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 723) extending an invitation to the Federation Aeronautique Internationale to hold the 1962 World Sport Parachuting Championships at Orange, Mass., was read twice by its title.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I object.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I have no objection to the extending of an invitation to hold that meeting in Massachusetts. However, I am told that this measure is a precursor for a subsequent request that Congress appropriate $150,000 to finance the event.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have no such information as that. The joint resolution certainly does not provide for it.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I have no objection to the invitation to hold the meeting. I do, however, want the Senate to know that I have been informed that a request will come to the Senate for a grant of $150,000 to help finance the meeting. I shall oppose it. That is all I have to say.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 723) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was passed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

NATIONAL ARMED FORCES MUSEUM ADVISORY BOARD

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 2010, S. 3846.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3846) to establish a National Armed Forces Museum Advisory Board of the Smithsonian Institution to authorize expansion of the Smithsonian Institution's facilities for portraying the contributions of the Armed Forces of the United States, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement of the purpose of the bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3846 would establish in the Smithsonian Institution a National Armed Forces Museum Advisory Board, which would provide advice and assistance to the Regents of the Smithsonian Institution on portrayal of exhibits depicting the contributions which the Armed Forces of the United States have made to American society and culture.

The Board would be composed of 11 members, including the Secretary of Defense (ex officio), the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution (ex officio), and 9 members appointed by the President of the United

States. The members would serve without compensation but would be reimbursed for necessary expenses.

The Smithsonian Institution—

shall commemorate and display the contributions made by the military forces of the Nation toward creating, developing, and maintaining a free, peaceful, and independent society and culture in the United States of America.

In fulfilling its obligations under the act, the Smithsonian Institution would collect, preserve, and exhibit military objects of historical interest and significance.

The Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution would be authorized and directed, with the assistance of the Board, to seek land and buildings in and near the District of Columbia suitable for the display of the military collections.

The heads of executive departments and independent agencies of the Government would be authorized to transfer or loan to the Smithsonian Institution for its use without charge any suitable objects, equipment, or records for exhibition, historical, or other appropriate purposes.

There would be authorized to be appropriated to the Smithsonian Institution such sums as would be necessary for the purposes of the act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 3846) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) there is hereby established in the Smithsonian Institution a National Armed Forces Museum Advisory Board (hereinafter referred to as the Board), which shall provide advice and assistance to the Regents of the Smithsonian Institution on matters concerned with the portrayal of the contributions which the Armed Forces of the United States have made to American society and culture.

(b) The Board shall be composed of eleven members as follows:

(1) The Secretary of Defense, who shall serve as an ex officio member;

(2) The Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, who shall serve as an ex officio member;

(3) Nine members appointed by the President, (A) three of whom shall be appointed from persons recommended by the Secretary of Defense to represent the Armed Forces, and (B) two of whom shall be appointed from among persons recommended by the Regents of the Smithsonian Institution. Not less than two members appointed by the President shall be from civilian life.

(c) Members of the Board appointed by the President shall be appointed to serve for a period of six years; except that any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term, and the terms of office of the members first appointed shall expire, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, three at the end of two years, three at the end of four years, and three at the end of six years.

(d) Five members of the Board shall constitute a quorum and any vacancy in the Board shall not affect its power to function.

(e) The members of the Board shall serve without compensation but shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of their duties as members of the Board.

(f) The Board shall select officers from among its members biennially and shall make such bylaws, rules, and regulations as it deems necessary for the furtherance of its business.

SEC. 2. (a) The Smithsonian Institution shall commemorate and display the contributions made by the military forces of the Nation toward creating, developing, and maintaining a free, peaceful, and independent society and culture in the United States of America. The valor and sacrificial service of the men and women of the Armed Forces shall be portrayed as an inspiration to the present and future generations of America. The demands placed upon the full energies of our people, the hardships endured, and the sacrifice demanded in our constant search for world peace shall be clearly demonstrated. The extensively peacetime contributions the Armed Forces have made to the advance of human knowledge in science, nuclear energy, polar and space exploration, electronics, engineering, aeronautics, and medicine shall be graphically described. The Smithsonian Institution shall interpret through dramatic display significant current problems affecting the Nation's security. It shall be equipped with a study center for scholarly research into the meaning of war, its effect on civilization, and the role of the Armed Forces in maintaining a just and lasting peace by providing a powerful deterrent to war. In fulfilling its purposes, the Smithsonian Institution shall collect, preserve, and exhibit military objects of historical interest and significance.

(b) The provisions of this Act in no way rescind Public Law 722, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 12, 1946, which established the National Air Museum of the Smithsonian Institution, or any other authority of the Smithsonian Institution.

SEC. 3. (a) The Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution is authorized and directed, with the advice and assistance of the Board, to investigate and survey lands and buildings in and near the District of Columbia suitable for the display of military collections. The Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution shall, after consulting with and seeking the advice of the Commission on Fine Arts, the National Capital Planning Commission, and the General Services Administration, submit recommendations to the Congress with respect to the acquisition of lands and buildings for such purpose.

(b) Buildings acquired pursuant to recommendations made under subsection (a) of this section shall be used to house public exhibits and study collections that are not appropriate for the military exhibits of the Smithsonian Institution on the Mall in the District of Columbia. Facilities shall be provided for the display of large military objects and for the reconstruction, in an appropriate way, on lands acquired pursuant to recommendations made under subsection (a) of this section, of exhibits showing the nature of fortifications, trenches, and other military and naval facilities characteristic of the American colonial period, the War of the Revolution, and subsequent American military and naval operations.

SEC. 4. The heads of executive departments and independent agencies of the Government are authorized to transfer or loan to the Smithsonian Institution for its use without charge therefor military, naval, aeronautical, and space objects, equipment and records for exhibition, historical, or other appropriate purposes.

SEC. 5. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Smithsonian Institution such sums as may be necessary for the purposes of this Act.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

ACTIVE DUTY AGREEMENTS FOR RESERVE OFFICERS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2014, H.R. 5132.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 5132) to amend title 10, United States Code, with respect to active duty agreements for Reserve officers, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with amendments to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 265 of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952 (50 U.S.C. 1016) is amended—

(1) by striking out the words "of one-half" in the first sentence of subsection (a) thereof;

(2) by amending subsection (b)(6) to read as follows:

"(6) Except as provided in this paragraph, a person who upon release from active duty is eligible for disability compensation under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration. However, such a person may be awarded readjustment pay under this section in addition to disability compensation, subject to deduction from the disability compensation of the amount of the readjustment payment which has not otherwise been recovered. Receipt of readjustment pay shall not deprive a person of any part of any disability compensation to which he may become entitled, on the basis of subsequent service, under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration.";

(3) by redesignating subsection (h) as subsection (j) and by inserting immediately following subsection (g) the following new subsections:

"(h) Under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary concerned there shall be deducted from the monthly retired pay of a member of a reserve component who has received readjustment payments under subsection (a) and who qualifies for retired pay under any provision of title 10, United States Code, except chapter 67 thereof, an amount sufficient to recover during the life expectancy of the member one-half of the readjustment payment that the member has received.

"(i) Subsection (h) does not apply to any person to whom readjustment pay has been paid before the effective date of that subsection."

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding an election under section 265 (b)(6) of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952, before the date of enactment of this Act, to receive readjustment pay under that section, any person who has made such an election may be awarded disability compensation to which he is otherwise entitled, subject to deduction as provided in that section, as amended by this Act, of the amount of such readjustment payment. However, no such award shall be effective for any period before the enactment of this Act.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the measure is approved by the Department of Defense and has been reported unanimously by the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement prepared by the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR RUSSELL

LUMP SUM READJUSTMENT PAYMENTS FOR RESERVE OFFICERS INVOLUNTARILY RELEASED FROM ACTIVE DUTY

This bill would amend the authorization for paying a lump sum readjustment payment to members of the Reserve components who are involuntarily released from active duty after having served on active duty for at least 5 years. The basic law was enacted in 1956. This law provides readjustment payments in the amount of one-half of 1 month's basic pay for each year of active service that a member of a Reserve component has performed prior to his involuntary release from active duty. The purposes of such payments are to ease the transition to civilian life for reservists who have been involuntarily released after long periods of active duty, and to induce young Reserve officers to remain on active duty after their obligated periods of service have expired.

The committee amendments to H.R. 5132 propose to increase the basis for computing these payments from one-half of 1 month's pay for each year served to 1 month's pay for each year served. The committee decided to make this recommendation after carefully considering the somewhat different approach contemplated in H.R. 5132 as it was referred to the committee. In that form, the bill imposed a mandatory requirement that except for physicians, dentists, and veterinarians, every Reserve officer who remained on active duty for longer than 2 years had to be offered a written agreement to serve on active duty for not to exceed 6 years. Upon successful completion of service under such an agreement, the member concerned would have been entitled to a lump sum payment in the amount of 2 month's pay for each year served under the agreement. Moreover, if the agreement were terminated through no fault of the member concerned, the member would have been entitled to 1 month's pay and allowances for each year not served under the agreement. The original bill also provided that at the 14-year point in service, a Reserve officer had to be (1) released from active duty, (2) extended a Regular commission, or (3) offered a written agreement for a period long enough to qualify him for the immediate receipt of retired pay. Since there was apprehension that these provisions might result in heavy attrition against members of the Reserve now serving on active duty, the bill provided that those reservists now on active duty with 14 or more years of service would be considered to have a contract for a period long enough to qualify them for the immediate receipt of retired pay. This latter provision was vigorously opposed by the executive branch.

So far as the Department of Defense is concerned, the problem that exists in this area is that substantial numbers of young Reserve officers are needed for active duty for periods longer than they are required by law to serve, but for periods that are not long enough to qualify the officers concerned for retirement. The Navy in particular needs young officers for 10 or 12 years of service but not for a 20-year career. From the point of view of the reservists affected, the problem is that many of them have rendered valuable service for relatively long periods but reductions in force and promotion attrition frequently result in their being released from active duty before qualifying for the immediate receipt of retired pay.

The committee recognizes both of these problems. Instead of instituting a new system requiring written agreements for almost every reservist on active duty, and of permitting payments for service under these agreements even if the reservist left active duty voluntarily, the committee considered it preferable to increase the readjustment payments authorized under existing law. In following this course, the committee's amendment avoids the administrative burden and expense of executing written agreements with Reserve officers on active duty (and there are some 142,000 of these with more than 2 years of service), and it follows the precedent of conditioning readjustment payments on an involuntary release from active duty. The increased payments that would be authorized under this bill should serve both to make a short-term military career more attractive for the young reservist and to provide more equitable treatment for the longer term reservists who are released before qualifying for retirement pay.

The bill also has two relatively minor features that I shall discuss briefly. If a person received the increased readjustment payments and subsequently qualified for retired pay other than that received by reservists at age 60, for a combination of 20 years of active and inactive service, the amount of the additional readjustment payment this bill authorizes would be deducted from the retired pay the reservist received in the future. Let me stress that this recoupment does not apply to the one-half of 1 month's pay for each year of active service that is paid under existing law. The amount to be recouped is only the additional payments this bill would provide.

Under existing law, a reservist leaving active duty must choose between readjustment pay and disability compensation from the Veterans' Administration. Some of these persons have elected readjustment pay because they had a very small degree of disability, or because they were unaware of a latent disability that subsequently might entitle them to compensation from the Veterans' Administration that is more attractive than the amount of readjustment pay they have received. An election once made has been held to be irrevocable. The Veterans' Administration urged an amendment, and the committee agreed to it, which provides that a person who has elected readjustment pay may nonetheless receive Veterans' Administration compensation, but the amount of readjustment pay is deducted from such compensation. Receipt of the VA compensation is prospective only.

It is difficult to get meaningful cost estimates for a bill of this type because the cost depends on the number of reservists who will be involuntarily released in the future, and this is difficult to predict. For fiscal year 1961, the Department estimates that under existing law readjustment payments in the amount of $4,859,000 would be made. Since this bill doubles these payments, it is fair to assume that the additional cost for 1961 is the same figure—$4,859,000. This could prove to be a good investment for the Government if it attracts greater numbers of young reservists for continued active duty, and it should mitigate the hardships and disappointments experienced by reservists released to inactive duty after relatively long periods of service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCGEE in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H.R. 5132) was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "An act to increase the lump-sum readjustment payments for members of the Reserve components who are involuntarily released from active duty, and for other purposes."

EXPANSION OF FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION'S REGULATORY AUTHORITY

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1740) to amend section 202(b) of the Communications Act of 1934 in order to expand the Federal Communications Commission's regulatory authority under such section, which was to strike out lines 6 through 10, inclusive, and insert:

(b) Charges or services, whenever referred to in this act, include charges for, or services in connection with, the use of common carrier lines of communication, whether derived from wire or radio facilities, in chain broadcasting or incidental to radio communication of any kind.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I understand there has been agreement by both the majority and the minority on this measure.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

Mr. PASTORE. I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment, which is a technical, clarifying amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

REPORTS ON ACCIDENTS BY CERTAIN COMMON CARRIERS BY RAILROAD

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1964) to amend the act requiring certain common carriers by railroad to make reports to the Interstate Commerce Commission with respect to certain accidents in order to clarify the requirements of such act, which were, on page 1, line 9, strike out "It" and insert "That it"; on page 2, line 6, strike out all after "person" down through and including "more," in line 8; on page 2, line 15, after "1910" insert "(45 U.S.C. sec. 42)."; on page 2, line 21, strike out all after "Act" over through and including "Act" in line 2, page 3; and on page 3, line 3, after "1910" insert "45 U.S.C., sec. 43)".

Mr. BARTLETT. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House, which are technical in nature.

The motion was agreed to.

ANNEXATION OF CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY OF THE UNITED STATES BY THE CITY OF WYANDOTTE, MICH.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I send to the desk Calendar No. 2018, House bill 383, to authorize the annexation of certain real property of

the United States by the city of Wyandotte, Mich., and I ask for the immediate consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment: At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

SEC. 3. Nothing in this Act shall prevent the Secretary of the Interior from establishing a national migratory bird refuge on the Federal lands referred to in this Act and the closing of these lands and water areas adjacent thereto to the taking, pursuit, or capture of migratory birds, if the Secretary of the Interior considers such action necessary in carrying out responsibilities of the United States pursuant to international treaties and implementing statutes. The Secretary is further authorized to cooperate and enter into agreements with the city of Wyandotte for the recreational use of these lands where not inconsistent with the purpose for which the refuge is established.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

CONVEYANCE OF TITLE TO CERTAIN LANDS BY OREGON SHORT LINE RAILROAD

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, House bill 10586 is at the desk. I ask that it be laid before the Senate.

The Presiding Officer laid before the Senate the bill (H.R. 10586) to enable the Oregon Short Line Railroad Co. to convey title to certain lands in Idaho to the Pocatello First Corp. of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, which was read twice by its title.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, this bill enables the Oregon Short Line Railroad Co. to convey title to certain lands in Idaho to the Pocatello First Corp. of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. An amendment in the House provides that the act shall become effective only if the church pays to the United States within 1 year the present fair market value of the land, less the value of improvements not placed thereon by the United States.

When the companion bill was considered in my Subcommittee on Indian Affairs, it was developed that the United States has only a reversionary interest, to take effect if the land ceases to be used by the railroad for its purposes. Consideration was given to a formula for compensation to the United States based on the value of the reversion, rather than the full market value.

I am now informed that the church is willing to pay the United States the full present value of the land, and thus I think the bill as passed by the House should be passed by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no amendment to be offered, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

PLANNING, DEVELOPMENT, MAINTENANCE, AND COORDINATION OF WILDLIFE, FISH, AND GAME CONSERVATION — CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2565) to promote effectual planning, development, maintenance, and coordination of wildlife, fish, and game conservation and rehabilitation in military reservations. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2565) to promote effectual planning, development, maintenance, and coordination of wildlife, fish, and game conservation and rehabilitation in military reservations, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 2, 3, and 4.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 5 and 6, and agree to the same.

CLAIR ENGLE,
E. L. BARTLETT,
NORRIS COTTON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

HERBERT C. BONNER,
FRANK W. BOYKIN,
GEORGE P. MILLER,
THOR C. TOLLEFSON,
WILLIAM K. VAN PELT,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, the conference report is a unanimous one, and adjusts certain technical difficulties regarding the management of fish and game permits on Federal military reservations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. ENGLE subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a letter from the International Association of Game, Fish, and Conservation Commissioners of August 2, 1960, addressed to the two particular amendments which are under consideration in the conference report, in order to explain the action taken by this body.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION
OF GAME, FISH, AND
CONSERVATION COMMISSIONERS,
Raleigh, N.C., August 2, 1960.

The Honorable HERBERT C. BONNER,
Chairman, Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BONNER: It is our understanding that H.R. 2565, as passed by your committee and the House of Representatives and as amended in the Senate, may now be rereferred to your committee for concurrence with Senate amendments, or in the absence of such concurrence, for consideration by a conference committee.

It would appear to many of us in the States that the Senate in striking out the word "State" in line 1, page 2, of the bill and in making similar amendments in lines 8, 9, and 10 of the same page and in line 1, page 3, has turned over to the Department of Defense the authority to issue Federal permits to hunt and fish on military lands in the respective States. This, of course, has been undertaken by Federal agencies of the executive branch in the past; and while this bill, as amended by the Senate, would still provide for cooperative arrangements between the Department of Defense and State officials, it is a step in the direction of Federal domination of hunting and fishing license issuing powers.

I wonder if it would be possible for you to help us to retain the word "State" in line 1 of page 2 and also other words that would strengthen the States' position. The International Association of Game, Fish, and Conservation Commissioners worded this bill very carefully, and you and your committee were most helpful to us in getting it passed in a form that protected the States' interest. I hope that it will be possible for you to again assist us when this bill is rereferred to your committee for concurrence with Senate amendments.

I am of the opinion that it would be better to permit the bill to "lay on the table" insofar as this Congress is concerned rather than pass it as amended by the Senate.

With assurances of our highest esteem and very best wishes.

Cordially and sincerely,
CLYDE P. PATTON.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL AVIATION ACT OF 1958, RELATING TO ELIMINATION OF HEARINGS IN CERTAIN CASES

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1545) to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so as to authorize elimination of a hearing in certain cases under section 408, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 408(b) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (49 U.S.C. 1378(b)) is amended by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof a colon and the following: *"Provided further,* That, in any case in which the Board determines that the transaction which is the subject of the application does not affect the control of

an air carrier directly engaged in the operation of aircraft in air transportation, does not result in creating a monopoly, and does not tend to restrain competition, and determines that no person disclosing a substantial interest then currently is requesting a hearing, the Board, after publication in the Federal Register of notice of the Board's intention to dispose of such application without a hearing (a copy of which notice shall be furnished by the Board to the Attorney General not later than the day following the date of such publication), may determine that the public interest does not require a hearing and by order approve or disapprove such transaction".

SEC. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this Act shall apply only with respect to applications submitted to the Civil Aeronautics Board on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, this merely involves rearranging the language of the amendment, and leads to the same end as the bill as passed by the Senate.

I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

AUTHORIZATION FOR PAYMENT OF CERTAIN CLAIMS AGAINST THE NATIONAL GUARD

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1764) to amend title 32, United States Code, to authorize the payment of certain claims against the National Guard, which were, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That chapter 7 of title 32, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by adding the following new section at the end thereof:

"§ 715. Property loss; personal injury or death: activities under certain sections of this title

"(a) Under such regulations as the Secretary of the Army or Secretary of the Air Force may prescribe, he or, subject to appeal to him, the Judge Advocate General of the armed force under his jurisdiction, if designed by him, may settle, and pay in an amount not more than $5,000 a claim against the United States for—

"(1) damage to, or loss of, real property, including damage or loss incident to use and occupancy;

"(2) damage to, or loss of, personal property, including property bailed to the United States or the National Guard and including registered or insured mail damaged, lost, or destroyed by a criminal act while in the possession of the National Guard; or

"(3) personal injury or death;

either caused by a member of the Army National Guard or the Air National Guard, as the case may be, while engaged in training or duty under section 316, 502, 503, 504, or 505 of this title or any other provision of law for which he is entitled to pay under section 301 of title 37, or for which he has waived that pay, and acting within the scope of his employment; caused by a person employed under section 709 of this title acting within the scope of his employment; or otherwise incident to noncombat activities of the Army National Guard or the Air National Guard, as the case may be, under one of those sections.

"(b) A claim may be allowed under subsection (a) only if—

"(1) it is presented in writing within two years after it accrues, except that if the claim accrues in time of war or armed conflict or if such a war or armed conflict intervenes within two years after it accrues, and if good cause is shown, the claim may be presented not later than two years after the war or armed conflict is terminated;

"(2) it is not covered by section 2734 of title 10 or section 2672 of title 28;

"(3) it is not for personal injury or death of such a member or a person employed under section 709 of this title, whose injury or death is incident to his service;

"(4) the damage to, or loss of, property, or the personal injury or death, was not caused wholly or partly by a negligent or wrongful act of the claimant, his agent, or his employee; and

"(5) it is substantiated as prescribed in regulations of the Secretary concerned.

For the purposes of clause (1), the dates of the beginning and end of an armed conflict are the dates established by concurrent resolution of Congress or by a determination of the President.

"(c) Payment may not be made under this section for reimbursement for medical, hospital, or burial services furnished at the expense of the United States or of any State or the District of Columbia or Puerto Rico.

"(d) If the Secretary of the military department concerned considers that a claim in excess of $5,000 is meritorious and would otherwise be covered by this section, he may pay the claimant $5,000 and report the excess to Congress for its consideration.

"(e) Except as provided in subsection (d), no claim may be paid under this section unless the amount tendered is accepted by the claimant in full satisfaction.

"(f) In any case where the amount to be paid is not more than $1,000, the authority contained in subsection (a) may be delegated to any officer of the Army or the Air Force, as the case may be, who has been delegated authority under section 2733(g) of title 10 to settle similar claims.

"(g) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the settlement of a claim under this section is final and conclusive.

"(h) In this section, 'settle' means consider, ascertain, adjust, determine, and dispose of a claim, whether by full or partial allowance or disallowance."; and

(2) by adding the following new item at the end of the analysis:

"715. Property loss; personal injury or death: activities under certain sections of this title."

And to amend the title so as to read: "An act to amend title 32, United States Code, to authorize the payment of certain claims against the National Guard."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the House of Representatives made certain technical changes in the text of the bill. The amendments are satisfactory; and I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

PROTECTION AGAINST LOSS OF ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS BY CERTAIN FARM AND RANCH OPERATORS

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3533) to protect farm and ranch operators making certain land use changes under the Great Plains conservation program against loss of acreage allotments, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 16 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended as follows:

(1) Paragraph (3) of subsection (b) is amended to read as follows:

"(3) insofar as the acreage of cropland on any farm enters into the determination of acreage allotments and marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, the cropland acreage on the farm shall not be decreased during the period of any contract heretofore or hereafter entered into under this subsection by reason of any action taken for the purpose of carrying out such contract and, under regulations of the Secretary, shall not be decreased, for such period after the expiration of the contract as is equal to the period of the contract, by reason of the maintenance of any change in land use from cultivated cropland to permanent vegetation carried out under the contract;"

(2) Paragraph (4) of subsection (b) is amended to read as follows:

"(4) the acreage on any farm which is determined under regulations of the Secretary to have been diverted from the production of any commodity subject to acreage allotments or marketing quotas in order to carry out any contract heretofore or hereafter entered into under the program or in order to maintain, for such period after the expiration of the contract as is equal to the period of the contract, any change in land use from cultivated cropland to permanent vegetation carried out under the contract shall be considered acreage devoted to the commodity for the purposes of establishing future State, county, and farm acreage allotments under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended."

SEC. 2. Section 112 of the Soil Bank Act, as amended, is amended as follows:

(1) Paragraph (1) is amended to read as follows:

"(1) insofar as the acreage of cropland on any farm enters into the determination of acreage allotments and marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, the cropland acreage on the farm shall not be decreased during the period of any contract heretofore or hereafter entered into under this subtitle by reason of any action taken for the purpose of carrying out such contract and, under regulations of the Secretary, shall not be decreased, for such period after the expiration of the contract as is equal to the period of the contract, by reason of the maintenance of any change in land use from cultivated cropland to permanent vegetation carried out under the contract;"

(2) Paragraph (2) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) the acreage on any farm which is determined under regulations of the Secretary to have been diverted from the production of any commodity subject to acreage allotments or marketing quotas in order to carry out any contract heretofore or hereafter entered into under this subtitle or in order to maintain, for such period after the expiration of the contract as is equal to the period of the contract, any change in land use from cultivated cropland to permanent vegetation carried out under the contract shall be considered acreage devoted to the commodity for the purposes of establishing future State, county, and farm acreage allotments under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended."

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, on July 2, the Senate passed Senate bill 3533 to preserve the acreage and cropland history of land diverted to permanent vegetation under the Great Plains program. Preservation of such history is

provided for by existing law for the duration of the contract. The bill extends such preservation for a period after termination of the contract equal to the period covered by the contract.

The House added a section which makes the same provision for conservation reserve contracts that the first section made for Great Plains program contracts.

I have consulted the ranking Republican member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and there is no objection to the amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I understand that the bill is similar to one which was called on the calendar a few days ago, to which I proposed to offer an amendment dealing with the wheat problem.

Under the parliamentary situation now existing, I recognize that to propose any additional amendments to this bill at this time would mean to delay and probably to defeat the passage of the bill which now is at the desk. I would not wish to do that.

I regard the bill which has been passed by the House, which carries out the proposal of the Senator from North Dakota to protect wheat acreage allotments to those who put more of their land into the Great Plains program, as wholly desirable legislation, and I would not want it to be defeated. Consequently, I shall not propose any amendment to the bill at this time.

But I intend to offer the text of my bill at the beginning of the next session of the Congress.

I thank the Senator from Louisiana for his courtesy.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives.

The motion was agreed to.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR INVESTIGATION OF ANTITRUST AND MONOPOLY LAWS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2000, Senate Resolution 368, providing additional funds for the investigation of antitrust and monopoly laws and their administration. I request, in particular, the attention of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I may state, for the RECORD, that I believe the purpose of the resolution is to take care of the 7½-percent pay increase, plus one additional minority staff member.

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That S. Res. 238, Eighty-sixth Congress, second session, agreed to February 8, 1960 (authorizing an investigation of antitrust and antimonopoly laws and their administration), is hereby amended by striking out "$425,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$450,000."

STUDY OF TRANSPORTATION POLICIES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 1998, Senate Resolution 355, amending Senate Resolution 244 authorizing the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to undertake a study of transportation policies in the United States.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That S. Res. 244, agreed to March 24, 1960, as amended by S. Res. 328, agreed to June 28, 1960, authorizing the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to undertake a study of transportation policies in the United States, is amended on page 4, line 5, by striking out "$269,100" and inserting in lieu thereof "$282,400".

DISSEMINATION OF POLITICAL OPINIONS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order No. 1999, Senate Resolution 374.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 374) amending Senate Resolution 305, authorizing the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to undertake a study of the uses of Government-licensed media for the dissemination of political opinions, news, and so forth.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, is this a consent request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Lamentably enough, I must object.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I give the Senator notice that it will probably be called up by motion later in the evening.

INVESTIGATION OF CERTAIN MATTER BY THE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of order No. 2011, Senate Resolution 354.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 354) amending Senate Resolution 243 authorizing the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate certain matter within its jurisdiction.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the resolution was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That S. Res. 243, agreed to March 24, 1960, authorizing the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate certain matters within its jurisdiction, is amended on page 3, line 5, by striking out "$291,595" and inserting in lieu thereof "$303,120".

ORDER OF BUSINESS—AMENDMENT OF HELIUM ACT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wonder if we could get an agreement on time with respect to the helium bill. Does the Senator from Colorado have any suggestion?

Mr. ALLOTT. I have no particular suggestion, Mr. President. The junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL] has not spoken yet, and wants to.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I would object to any agreement on the time. I have two amendments I desire to offer.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS BY COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES TOMORROW MORNING BEGINNING AT 10:30 A.M., ON STOPPAGE OF WORK ON CERTAIN CAPEHART HOUSING PROJECTS

Mr. JAVITS obtained the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, the Senator from South Dakota would like to announce that tomorrow morning at 10:30, in the Committee on Armed Services, there will be a hearing on the stoppage of work on some Capehart housing projects. We shall be looking particularly into the contracts which are supposed to have been processed by Mr. Hal Hayes. In view of the fact that Congress probably will adjourn tonight, there will be no opportunity for an announcement otherwise. So I make this announcement in order that those who are interested may know about it.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have the floor. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I am very happy that these hearings will be held. There has been difficulty in my State in regard to these contracts.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is correct. There has been difficulty at Grand Forks, N. Dak.; Beale Air Force Base, Calif.; Lejeune Marine Corps Base, N.C.; and Ellsworth Air Force Base, S. Dak. The Defense Department is not getting the housing which it has under contract. The subcontractors are not

being paid. The Subcommittee on Military Construction proposes to go into the matter to see what can be done.

PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT OF THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the majority leader in order that certain bills may be passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Education and Labor, to which was referred H.R. 12458, be discharged from the further consideration of the bill, and that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 12458) to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for the work of the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, this bill would increase from $225,000 annually to $300,000 annually the authorization for appropriations of the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped.

Since 1954, when the authorization was fixed at $225,000, the costs of operation, including salaries, goods, and services, has increased. In addition, methods with respect to fiscal budgeting has been changed in such a way as to increase the expenses of the President's Committee for its post office mailing costs, the Government's share of the retirement costs of its employees, and its printing costs. These factors have pressed the Committee into a financial situation whereby it is necessary at times to solicit private organizations to bear the cost of publishing some of its printed material. In addition to this, the operating expenses have increased because the program has been set up and widely accepted with active State committees in every State.

The Committee works with employers to promote the hiring of physically handicapped, conducts a program to increase public knowledge and understanding of the problems connected with hiring the handicapped, determines the capabilities of handicapped workers, studies special employment problems of disabled veterans, and encourages the organization of State committees to work in behalf of employment of the handicapped.

H.R. 12458 has the complete approval of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Department of Labor, and the Bureau of the Budget. Letters from each of these agencies appear in the report of the House.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has expressed quite an interest in this bill. Is that correct?

Mr. HILL. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. These bills have the full concurrence of the minority.

Mr. HILL. And they have the full support of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 12458) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT TO AUTHORIZE INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH GRANTS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Education and Labor, to which was referred H.R. 10341, be discharged from the further consideration of the bill, and that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 10341) to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants-in-aid to universities, hospitals, laboratories, and other public or nonprofit institutions to strengthen their programs of research and research training in sciences related to health.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, this bill does not increase any authorization for appropriation, and it does not increase any appropriation.

The purpose of the legislation is to give the Surgeon General authority to make grants for the general support of the research programs of institutions (referred to in brief as "institutional research grants"), as well as the grants now authorized by the Public Health Service Act to support specific projects proposed by individual applicants.

The funds for the general grants would be obtained by setting aside a uniform percentage, not to exceed 15 percent, of the appropriations to the National Institutes of Health for research grants authorized in existing legislation. Applications for the general grants would be made by schools of medicine, dentistry, and public health and reviewed by the National Advisory Health Council.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 10341) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the votes by which H.R. 12458 and H.R. 10341 were passed be reconsidered.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

CLEARING TITLE TO PROPERTY BELONGING TO GALLAUDET COLLEGE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Education and Labor, to which was referred H.R. 12699, be discharged from the further consideration of the bill, and that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 12699) to cancel a deed of trust to the United States from the predecessor in name of Gallaudet College and any evidences of indebtedness related to the same transaction, to quiet the college's title to property belonging to it, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the purpose of H.R. 12699 is to clear the title to the real property owned by Gallaudet College and reconvey to the corporation free and clear of indebtedness or encumbrances all real property which was conveyed to the United States, as trustee, by the institution under its former name of Columbia Institution for the Instruction of the Deaf and Dumb, in 1872. Since 1954 the official name of the institution is Gallaudet College. The bill does not, however, change the existing provision of law which requires the approval by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare of any action which Gallaudet College may make with respect to any of its real property.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 12699) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF THE HELIUM ACT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of Calendar No. 1884, H.R. 10548, amendment of the Helium Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10548) to amend the Helium Act of September 1, 1937, as amended, for the defense, security, and general welfare of the United States.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, is it the intention of the majority leader to

bring up tonight Calendar No. 1975, House Joint Resolution 402, relating to an interstate compact to handle the traffic situation in metropolitan Washington, D.C.?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Yes, particularly if I can get a unanimous-consent agreement when two or three of these bills are passed.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator from Virginia wished to notify three or four Senators who would like to be present. He has been assured there will be no extended debate on the subject.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is fine.

Mr. ROBERTSON. No unanimous-consent request will be necessary.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The bill will be taken up for consideration this evening. I should like to get unanimous consent, because it might be necessary. I would not wish to have the bill before the Senate and find it necessary to keep it there.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Will that follow consideration of the helium bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I cannot say.

Mr. ROBERTSON. So we must remain in the Chamber?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. As is true with all the other bills, we cannot tell. I do not know whether the helium bill is going to take 30 minutes or 3 hours.

Mr. ROBERTSON. We had expected the bill would be considered prior to the helium bill.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am perfectly willing to yield to the Senator.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from New York has been very courteous. The Senator has a right to the floor, and we will wait until he finishes.

ROY W. HOWARD, COFOUNDER OF SCRIPPS-HOWARD NEWSPAPER CHAIN, RETIRES TODAY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, one of the giants of American journalism today announced his retirement. Roy Wilson Howard, cofounder of the Scripps-Howard newspaper chain, and for the past 33 years the editor of the New York World-Telegram and Sun, is stepping down from the editorship, which will be taken by another outstanding newspaperman, Lee B. Wood.

In announcing his decision, Roy Howard said: "While I am taking this step voluntarily after a hard look at the calendar, to say that I am doing so without regret would be absurd."

Mr. President, I can think of few men of Roy Howard's generation or my own, for that matter, who have shown less respect for the calendar or for the inroads that advancing years are supposed to make, and more hard-driving, loving day-by-day dedication to the demands of the profession he has been associated with since he got his first job as a small boy—two delivery routes for Indianapolis newspapers before the turn of the century.

Roy Howard's first reporting job was during his days at Manual Training High School when he was school correspondent and after graduation in 1902, Roy Howard went to work for the Indianapolis News full-time for $8 a week. It was the beginning of a brilliant newspaper career. Later, he worked in Chicago, St. Louis, and Cincinnati, coming to his adopted home town of New York City in 1906 as correspondent for the Scripps-McRae League of newspapers where Edward Wyllis Scripps later told associates he received this formidable first impression of the fast-rising 23-year-old: "Roy," he said, "will never get indigestion from licking my boots."

After serving as New York manager of the Scripps Publishers Press Association, the forerunner of United Press, he became the New York manager of UP in 1907 and by the age of 29 was its president and general manager guiding its expansion from 21 bureaus serving 267 clients to more than 100 bureaus serving some 1,350 clients. During World War I, he was a frontline war correspondent and his own best legman and news gatherer whether it meant sprawling in a trench or tapping news sources inside London and Paris foreign offices.

In 1925, the Scripps-Howard chain of newspapers was established with Roy Howard as editorial director. Two years later, the chain penetrated east of the Alleghenies for the first time when the New York Telegram joined it. The rest is journalism history, often at its exciting best. When it was still the World Telegram, one of Roy Howard's reporters was assigned to work under cover gathering material for a crime exposé while a young New York district attorney named Thomas E. Dewey was on the same track. When the proper time came, the paper's series on crime and corruption in high places jarred the public out of any complacency and helped rouse New Yorkers to the decisive exercise of their responsibilities as citizens. Under Roy Howard's leadership, the Telegram has never forsaken that crusade.

Well remembered are the Pulitzer Prizes won by several members of Roy Howard's staff, including Reporter Fred Woltman, awarded a Pulitzer Prize for his hard hitting series on Communist efforts at infiltration and subversion in the United States after World War II. Equally memorable is the firm editorial stand Roy Howard took during the McCarthy era when he refused to support extremist elements who in their zeal to root out leftists sometimes rode roughshod over individual rights and flaunted civil liberties. That was abhorrent to Roy Howard and he had the courage to say so in public print at a time when a sane, stable viewpoint on the issue was all-important.

Today, August 31, is the last day Roy Howard will serve as editor and, looking backward, his words written in 1931 at the time of the merger of the New York World and Telegram were a most fitting forecast of the journalistic tradition the paper has represented ever since.

Roy Howard said:

> The need for independent editorial utterance and effort was never greater * * * than it is today. Injustice, corruption, and greed challenge the efficiency of our social structure as boldly today as at any time in our history.
>
> We realize that no newspaper of character and force can be pleasing to all people and all factions. Frequently, a newspaper can be criticized quite as effectively by its enemies as its friends. We will see to it that the World Telegram is neither a pollyanna nor a common scold.
>
> We will essay the difficult role of being tolerant with the intolerant. We will remember that there is no such thing as journalistic infallibility. Above all, we will cherish, as a pearl of great price, a thing which we believe to be ours—a sense of humor.

Roy Howard and his newspaper have indeed lived up to those words. As a public official since 1946, I have enjoyed the support of the World-Telegram and Sun—I have also been the target of some pretty blunt editorial opinions from time to time when our views differed, and I trust that my sense of humor, too, was equal to those occasions. I know that Roy Howard and I will maintain our mutual respect and affection for many years to come. Though he resigns as editor, he will continue as president and director of the Scripps Howard Corp., and I express the hopes of all the faithful readers of the chain's 19 newspapers that his periodic byline under stories filed from almost anywhere on earth will still be with us.

I close by stating, Mr. President, that at 77 he is much too young a man to write "30"—the word which ends the stories of newspapermen generally—to his reportorial career.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. KEATING. I wish to join in the tribute to Roy Howard. He is a man of great conviction and great courage, who is in every way a great newspaperman. He is also a great gentleman, who states his views with vigor and persuasion, and who maintains the happy facility of disagreeing from time to time without being disagreeable.

As I know from my personal contacts with him and from my reading of his fine writings, Roy Howard is one who forcefully states his views, whether in private conversation or through the columns of his outstanding newspapers.

Mr. Howard has always adhered firmly to the finest traditions and the highest standards of his profession. Based on those principles, he has built an illustrious career and has become one of the Nation's most respected newspapermen. He has indeed had an illustrious career, and has made the Scripps-Howard papers powerful voices for good in our Nation.

All of us who are his friends hope that there will be many more years of fruitful effort and that happiness will attend his semiretirement, although Roy Howard, in my judgment, will never fully retire.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank my colleague. It is quite fitting that we two Senators should join in praise of Mr. Howard. I think my colleague knows what great pride he takes in the fact that New York has two Republican Senators.

Mr. KEATING. I am sure he does.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT PRODUCTIVITY COUNCILS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, there is a growing awareness among the leaders of labor and industry, and among economists and experts in the field of automation, that a nationally coordinated effort to deal with the human and technical problems of automation is becoming necessary. Both of our major political parties are committed to the pursuit of policies which will stimulate increased productivity on the part of U.S. industry, but this rise in productivity can only be achieved in a climate of labor-management cooperation.

I should like to invite to the attention of the Senate, in these closing hours of the 86th Congress, my proposed legislation, S. 3121, to create a Bureau of Productivity Councils, which points to a method by which voluntary labor-management cooperation could be fostered. During the coming session, I shall reintroduce this proposed legislation because the Congress will be called upon to devise means by which U.S. productivity can successfully meet the challenges of international trade competition in the domestic market place and in the markets of our friends and allies, as well as the challenges of the philosophic competition in the minds of the citizens of the developing nations of the free world, who are judging our system of democratic free enterprise by its ability to produce the rising standards of living which they are so desperately anxious to attain.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the July 1960 issue of Machinery, referring to my proposed legislation, and a paper presented by Dr. Francis J. Lee at the June 2 and 3, 1960, Governor's Conference on Automation at Harvard University, published by the State of Massachusetts. This paper proposes a program similar to the one envisaged in S. 3121.

There being no objection, the editorial and paper were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IF

(By Charles O. Herb)

If it is true that we as a nation cannot have more things to use and enjoy unless we produce more, and that productive efficiency is an essential factor;

If it is true that lower prices will benefit everyone, and that the only way to bring about lower prices, other than by the depression route, is through lower manufacturing costs made possible by higher productive efficiency;

If it is true that to maintain high-level employment we must have high-volume sales which can best be assured by lower sales prices;

If it is true that earning power depends on productive power and therefore increased productive efficiency provides the basis for maintenance of a rising wage scale;

If it is true that the recorded results achieved by a considerable number of manufacturing concerns show that productive efficiency can be greatly increased;

If it is true that there are serious obstacles which must be removed or substantially reduced before the rising trend in production efficiency can be substantially increased;

If it is true that some manufacturers, a few labor unions, and some associations are doing what they can to reduce these obstacles but that no concerted nationwide effort is being made; and

If so much obviously depends upon productive efficiency and the maintenance of its upward trend,

Why then, should not productive efficiency be given top rating, next to national defense, and be accorded utmost attention by the Nation's leaders in industry, labor, and Government?

Senator JACOB K. JAVITS of New York recently introduced in the Senate a bill intended to promote increased productivity in the national interest and foster peaceful labor-management relations through the establishment, in the executive branch, of a Bureau of Productivity Councils. This bill deserves the unqualified support of everyone concerned with the economic welfare of our country.

RESPONSIBILITIES OF INDUSTRY, LABOR, THE GOVERNMENT AND THE PUBLIC IN SUPPLYING SKILLS FOR AUTOMATION

(By Dr. Francis J. Lee, Manager of Training Services, Raytheon Co.)

There are two major reasons why industry automates its production—foreign competition and technological innovation. Competition is a driving force in our economy, and we have all profited from it. Up until recently, foreign encroachment has not been a serious threat. In the last few years, however, the picture has undergone rapid and radical change. European nations and the Far East are aggressively competing in world markets—with a highly modernized industrial complex to back them up. Ignoring the threat of the U.S.S.R. or the sleeping giant that is South America, the domestic competition gives us no room for complacency.

Technological innovation is like a chain reaction. Processes and products proliferate at an accelerating rate. For example, the interval between rayon and nylon was a relatively long one. After a brief period, however, Dacron appeared. And look at the multitude of synthetic fibers today. Throughout industry, it is not at all unusual for companies to announce that 30, or 40, or 50 percent of their products were unheard of 10 years ago. They accept the condition that to survive, they must innovate.

But it takes money to innovate. And as more money goes into the front end—the R&D phase—every effort must be made to control the costs in the back end—the production phase.

If you start an atomic reaction in a designed environment, with adequate control mechanisms, you have a very useful source of energy for productive work. Without the control mechanisms, you stand a good chance of obliterating yourself and a large portion of the surrounding landscape. The same is true of automation. If we don't build in the control mechanisms and the escape valves, we may very well cripple our productive capacity by trying to increase it too rapidly.

And the time is now. We are not on the threshold of the age of automation—we have entered it. In a 1955 survey by the Institute of Industrial Relations at Berkeley, 16 percent of American industry relied extensively on automated equipment and 39 percent in all expected to by 1964. Only 34 percent saw no likelihood of automating, and that percentage may lessen as new opportunities develop. That the automation equipment industry has grown from infancy in 1945 to a $7 billion business today indicates one fact—like it or not, we're on the road.

Where does the road go? To utopia or to disaster? There is today, and probably will continue to be for some time, a good deal of debate about the long-term effects of automation. On the other hand, how to make it effective is fairly clear. The characteristics and skills of the work force must change.

Automation produces a very different kind of demand on human resources. And it is going to take the combined efforts of industry, of labor, of government, and of the community to meet it. The work force must have a variety and complexity of skills and abilities. Our human resources must be expanded as never before. This means training and retraining, on the job and in the classroom, on a scale approached only by our efforts in World War II.

What are these skills? Who has to have them? How can we assure delivery at the right time, in the right place, in the right amount?

Conceptual skills will be most in demand. True automation, replacing discrete unit operations with an integrated process, requires an awareness of the problems of a total process. In the past, the major contribution of the work force was one involving manual and bodily activity. Today it is mainly perceptual, because we are extensively mechanized but not fully automated. Tomorrow, conceptual skills will be the requisite to service fully automated operations including full feedback and transfer. Indirect labor and maintenance functions will assume more significance.

A very different breed from today's lathe, milling machine, or even Keller machine operator will tend an automated line. As downtime in automated production operations is prohibitive, operators probably will have to diagnose malfunctions, select an appropriate course of action, and apply it. In essence, he becomes a supervisor.

But the number of technicians today actually is shrinking. Figures quoted on the present annual shortage range upward to 75,000. The ratio of technicans to engineers is close to 1 to 1; manpower planning authorities feel it should be 5 to 1. In the machine trades, there are not enough apprentices to make up for attrition and expansion needs.

Equally alarming, within these groups too, more general skills will be needed. Maintenance electricians will need electronics; electronic technicians will need a solid mechanical background; pipefitters will need hydraulics training. All will have to assume more supervisory responsibilities.

For some time, the office and clerical work force have been exposed to electronic data processing or office automation. Yet, between 1947 and 1957, 300,000 white-collar workers annually were added to the work force. The trend is expected to continue. But again, more complex skills are in demand. Electronic data processing requires programers, key punch operators and verifiers.

Firstline supervisors will relinquish a large share of the paperwork they have now. This blessing, however, will be hampered by the heavier demand on their conceptual skills. The supervisor of an automated system must diagnose and correct malfunctions in the work group. Authoritarian behavior will be inadequate; human relations skills of a high order must be exercised.

These go beyond a set of formulas or a series of manipulative techniques devised to get people to do the job. A sound understanding of human behavior, an appreciation of the dignity of the individual, and a willingness to apply these to mutual benefit must be evolved.

Although data processing will reduce unknowns and ease decisionmaking, the middle management echelon will have more decisions to make, and these will be centralized rather than delegated. Each manager will supervise fewer subordinates, but the remainder will be much more important. Technical competence in planning and realizing

the opportunities of automation will be imperative.

Top-level management must represent true executive skills, more leadership and less chairmanship. The concept of the "task force" should gain ground simply because its members are qualified to tackle a specific problem. New problems require new solutions. Professional managers and staff specialists can provide them.

How can such a work force be created? Who must take responsibility? In the area of responsibility, three things are immediate.

1. Step up the formation, on a local level, of industry-labor-community task forces to assess needs. Cooperation between industrial plants, labor organizations, and local and State agencies should be implemented to study present and future personnel needs.

2. Organize, on a national level, a committee on human resources. This group would promote the formation of local level task forces, counsel them on organizing their activities, systematize and integrate their findings, and provide guidance in activating their programs. Its membership could ensue from industry, labor, the Government, and the academic community.

3. Step up the pace and number of programs in vocational and technical education and training now offered. Government already contributes in this field through the National Defense Education Act. Its activities should be exploited.

Creation of a capable work force could stem from intensified apprentice training. Present programs offer a base, and there are encouraging signs that both labor and industry recognize the needs. San Francisco plumbers assess themselves a penny an hour to finance apprentice training programs. The West Coast United Steel Workers gave $6,000 to the University of California for a pilot program for upgrading workers' skills. In Cleveland, the machine toolmakers incessantly recruit high school graduating classes for their training programs.

These are but a few examples. In St. Louis, the IBEW and the Federal Bureau of Apprentice Training have cooperated in setting up an apprentice training center. Here in Massachusetts, Raytheon, in collaboration with the IAM and the IBEW, several years ago, set up full-scale apprenticeship programs for draftsmen, electronics technicians, and machine trades craftsmen.

Nationally, however, apprentice training efforts approach inadequacy. It is estimated that U.S. industry trains just 1 apprentice for every 50 skilled workers, far less than even the replacement rate.

Industry can share with no one the task of evaluating the skills of its supervisory force, its managers and professional personnel, and its top executives. A concept described as "organizational systems engineering" might be employed for this purpose. Systems engineering, just coming of age, is probably best understood when related to weapon systems.

If five engineers are designing an assembly, the lead engineer can keep abreast of progress and make sure the 9 or 11 parts will function properly. But if 5,000 engineers are designing dozens of subsystems with hundreds of thousands of parts, coordination becomes impossible.

Systems-engineering groups were developed to meet this problem, to insure that in the completed interceptor or bomber or missile everything meshes, including the capabilities and skills of the human beings who operate and maintain it.

Similarly, the industrial organization is a system of working relationships between and among individuals and groups. Individuals differ in their capacities to withstand stress, to accept shock, to endure anxiety, to absorb knowledge, and to translate that knowledge into performance. And people are the most valuable components in the industrial organization system. A reappraisal, no matter how difficult, must be made under these criteria.

ANNUAL REPORT BY SENATOR JAVITS TO THE PEOPLE OF NEW YORK—86TH CONGRESS, 2D SESSION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, this is my annual report on the 2d session of the 86th Congress; it is intended to inform the citizens of New York of the activities of the Senate and my part in them.

PEACE AND FREE WORLD LEADERSHIP

In spite of a strong Communist offensive, the United States strengthened its position of peace leadership by its policies respecting the newly emerging nations of Africa in the explosive Congo situation, by our partnership with the South and Central American countries in the Organization of American States with reference to the Dominican Republic and Cuba; and by our calm handling of the Far East crises in Korea and Laos.

Communist pressure on Japan is clear evidence of the strength of the forces with which the United States and the free world have had to contend.

The series of Soviet "cold war" thrusts over the U–2 incident, the collapse of the Paris summit conference, cancellation of the President's trip to Japan after his triumphant visit to Taiwan, the Philippines and Korea, and the Cuban crisis have been climaxed by the Moscow spy trial of U–2 pilot, Francis Powers and the Kremlin's attempt through it to indict U.S. foreign policy. But these moves appear to have failed to realize their objective.

Ratification of the United States–Japan Mutual Security Pact, for which I voted, strengthens Japan in preserving freedom and democracy. The Communists know that Japan is the most industrialized nation in the Far East, and their designs on it form part of their whole effort to divide the free world by weakening it economically. Let any businessman think for a moment what competition would be like if Japan were in the hands of the Communists who could direct its economy to the disadvantage of the free world.

I have been trying to set up a visit to the United States of up to 100 non-Communist Japanese students who participated in the "student riots" so that they could take back with them a true picture of the objectives of our people and our Government. We would thus be in a position to augment the reservoir of good will that exists between our two countries.

There has been great concern over the deterioration of relations between the United States and Cuba. The President has made it clear that the United States will adhere to a policy of nonintervention in the domestic affairs of other countries and will scrupulously observe our treaty commitments as a member of the Organization of American States. We will insist that Cuba has to respect its obligations under international law, and human rights and liberties under the OAS and United Nations charters. I am deeply concerned over this situation, and will continue my efforts to help all those who have been affected by it. Our country has shown great forbearance and skill in handling a very trying situation in a new historic partnership policy succeeding the good neighbor policy with the other American Republics; also our sugar legislation sharply reduced Cuban and Dominican sugar imports into the United States.

I believe that the decisive struggle with communism in the 1960's will be economic, but survival is primary to winning such a struggle. Therefore we must always be able to lead in the quest for world peace from a position of adequate military posture to carry out our worldwide responsibilities considering modern rocket and missile and conventional weapons and defenses against them.

As a member of the Senate Subcommittee on National Policy Machinery in the cold war I have advocated greater coordination of the objectives and policies of the United States in foreign policy and national security. Toward this end I have introduced legislation to establish the post of First Secretary of Government, as suggested by Governor Nelson A. Rockefeller, to work directly under the President and at his discretion as the equivalent of a prime minister. The Presidency has grown to be such a monumental job that we must equip our Chief Executive with a governmental organization able to assist him in carrying out his constitutional duties.

On the economic front of competitive coexistence, the United States and the industrialized countries of the free world are seeking to coordinate their aid efforts to underdeveloped countries and to work out solutions of trade and other economic problems.

I introduced legislation for a new program called expositions for peace, providing for an increase in U.S. participation in the number of trade fairs overseas and for doubling the number of foreign countries exhibiting in four major U.S. fairs.

The national economic growth of the United States and the free world can be stimulated to a remarkable degree by an upsurge in the export-import trade of all the non-Communist nations. During 1958 and 1959 the United States experienced a $7 billion balance of payments deficit in large part attributable to lack of exports. This trend was reversed during the first quarter of 1960 when U.S. exports exceeded imports at the annual rate of $3 billion; this year our balance of payments position will be substantially improved.

In order to assure continued increase and adequate economic expansion to meet our world peace responsibilities and the Soviet challenge, the following measures have been taken:

First. On March 17 the President proclaimed a program of export promotion including the extension of short-term

credit guarantees by the Export-Import Bank along with vastly increased informational and other activities by the Department of Commerce.

Second. I have introduced legislation establishing a national trade policy which would give domestic producers in danger of serious injury from imports the kind of assistance needed in an expanding U.S. economy; also legislation which would make possible the increased use of U.S. private enterprise techniques in the underdeveloped areas of Africa, Asia, and Latin America. Such legislation would also assure a steady income of foreign exchange from foreign private investments which during 1958 alone prevented our balance of payment deficit from increasing by an additional $1.1 billion a year. This bill would also encourage through a system of tax deferrals the establishment of foreign business corporations in underdeveloped free world areas. The net foreign private investment of the United States, now $3¾ billion a year, should be materially increased.

I have introduced legislation establishing a Bureau of Productivity Councils within the Federal Government which would stimulate the formation of labor-management-community councils at the grassroots level where the intimate cooperation of all the producing elements of our society are vital to spur noninflationary economic growth.

The spirit of cooperation is necessary to launch a joint effort among the nations of the free world, particularly those in Western Europe, to aid underdeveloped regions. As Chairman of the Economic Committee of the NATO Parliamentarians, I addressed the Assembly of the Council of Europe at Strasbourg, France, in May on this and other major economic problems. I believe there are excellent prospects that Western Europe will join a partnership program to raise aid and investment to the less developed nations now estimated at about $4 billion annually to 50 percent above the present effort. A new treaty nation organization, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), is now in formation of which the United States, Canada, and 18 Western European nations will be members to effectuate this objective. The removal of trade barriers in Western Europe without discrimination against the United States would not only encourage U.S. sales abroad but would also stimulate third countries to produce what they can most economically.

Another problem is that of reconciling the interests of two present European trade blocs: The six nations in the European Economic Community—France, Germany, Italy, Belgium, Holland, and Luxembourg; and the seven nations in the European Free Trade Area—United Kingdom, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Switzerland, Austria, and Portugal.

I supported legislation which was enacted authorizing the appointment of a U.S. Citizens Commission on NATO to participate with similar commissions from other NATO countries in exploring means of cooperation and unity of purpose among the NATO nations to develop democratic freedom by economic and political means.

I strongly supported the ratification of the Antarctic Treaty which seeks to keep the Antarctic region open to international cooperation, scientific exploration, and peaceful nonmilitary uses; while inaugurating a system of inspection by observers which may prove most useful in disarmament negotiation with the Soviets.

As part of the effort to further improve the U.S. balance in foreign trade payments, I joined with Senator MAGNUSON of Washington in introducing legislation to set up an international travel office to stimulate and encourage tourism to and from the United States. The bill passed the Senate and I will do my utmost to get it enacted.

Our aim to establish a lasting peace among the nations requires development of a firm basis of enforcible international law. The Connally reservation limits the usefulness and importance of the International Court of Justice (World Court) because other nations will not accept its jurisdiction in international legal disputes while we continue to reject it. I do not believe, as some claim, that removal of this reservation would represent any yielding of U.S. sovereignty—our Nation would retain jurisdiction over all domestic issues. President Eisenhower has urged that this Connally reservation be repealed as a demonstration to the world that the United States prefers the rule of law to the rule of force in international affairs. I, therefore, joined in sponsoring S. Res. 94 to repeal the Connally reservation.

Strengthening the economies of free world nations and affording a satisfactory rate of development to less developed nations constitute a prime objective of the mutual security program. I have supported the President's requests for the mutual security program as the minimum requirement for the new emphasis in U.S. foreign policy on economic integration of the free world.

Congress appropriated $3,787,350,000 for mutual security as against the mutual security authorization of $4,086,-300,000 and $4,175,000,000 requested by the President. Of the amount appropriated, $1.8 billion was voted for military aid funds, $675 million for defense support, $230 million for economic aid, $150 million for technical assistance, $550 million for the Development Loan Fund and $250 million for use in the President's contingency fund in the Congo and other emergencies. Also included in the new Mutual Security Act is a provision establishing an East-West cultural center in Hawaii and a plan for a North-South cultural center in Puerto Rico.

I cosponsored the freedom of the seas amendment to the Mutual Security Authorizations Act, directed against the Arab boycott and blockade of Israel, which gave the President discretionary power to cut off foreign aid funds to those nations who persist in interfering with the trade of other nations receiving our aid and support.

I opposed the so-called Haifa clause in U.S. Navy contracts with American owned oil tankers because it had the effect of aiding the Arab boycott, and commended the Navy for eliminating it. A similar contract clause by the Department of Agriculture for ships carrying surplus agricultural products under Public Law 480 which I have protested continues to be used, and I am working to see Federal Government departments be coordinated with the policy decision taken by the Navy.

The Arab boycott issue was also raised in connection with Senate approval of the International Development Association, but I opposed the effort to retard the joining of the United States in the IDA on this ground. The IDA makes it possible to expand use of soft nonconvertible local currencies available for loans for development purposes. It will be an arm of the World Bank with membership of 68 countries and a total initial subscription of $1 billion of which the Senate authorized a $320,290,000 5-year subscription.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AND SPACE

This is a presidential election year, and it is natural that there should be debate over our defense policy and the amounts that should be spent for defense and how these funds should be allocated. I shall continue to do everything I possibly can to assure that a complete and effective defense policy emerges from these discussions. I do not believe a case showing inadequacy has yet been made, but if it should be shown, I will work for such appropriations for defense items as are needed to assure our security.

Congress has approved a national defense budget for fiscal 1961 of $39,996,-608,000, approximately half of the Nation's total budget, and $661,608,000 more than the President's request. Of this amount $4,177,773,000 is for research and development.

The defense appropriations which I supported contain sizable increases in funds for construction of Polaris and nuclear attack submarines; continue the Army modernization program; and expand our airborne alert capability. Congress also voted $293,000,000 for construction of an aircraft carrier. I have urged the Navy to construct this carrier in the superior facilities available at the Brooklyn Navy Yard and have worked with other colleagues from New York against awarding the contract for this carrier to an out-of-State private shipyard.

At the President's request, Congress voted substantial increases in funds for nonmilitary space projects under the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. These funds will further our plans to keep moving ahead vigorously with an intensive program of scientific exploration and with the development of the large rockets essential to the conquest of outer space. The launching of Echo I and the successful recovery of

the Discoverer capsule are exciting portents of what is to come in this exploration of space and shows that we are making material progress closing the gap between ourselves and the U.S.S.R.

BUDGET AND TAXES

In his budget message, the President estimated spending at $79,800,000,000 and revenues at $84,000,000,000 leaving a surplus of $4,200,000,000. The total of the appropriations for 1961 is $82,816,000,000.

It is always essential to eliminate wasteful and unnecessary items from the Federal budget, but at a time when the cold war with the Communist world is phasing into a decisive struggle in economic competition, we have to be cautious about any relaxation of our defense and security needs and the requirements of our developing economy. In this connection the President recommended closing certain tax loopholes and the elimination of special tax privileges so that the anticipated surplus may be applied to the reduction of the national debt now about $290,000,000,000.

I also believe that a review must be undertaken of items favored under the tax law like the 27.5 percent oil depletion allowance.

I opposed repeal of the 4 percent income tax credit on dividends and while it was adopted by the Senate, it was eliminated in the Senate-House conference on the bill. I believe that the continuation of this exemption is necessary to encourage peoples' capitalism—stockholding by the general public and to provide for just taxation. I have therefore favored its retention in the law.

While the Senate Finance Committee proposed that the wartime excise tax on telephone service be eliminated, the Congress voted to continue this tax in effect at its present rate. I joined in proposing an amendment which would have given a credit against this tax for local telephone taxes, such as the standby telephone tax which the New York State Legislature adopted, in order to make at least part of this burden available for local needs such as education. However, this amendment was not adopted.

Another wartime excise tax was that on transportation. This was originally imposed as a revenue measure and to discourage civilian travel on the then crowded air, rail, and buslines. That emergency is over, and we should certainly try to eliminate the 10 percent levy, especially in view of the needs of the carriers for passenger traffic. The Senate Finance Committee recommended its elimination and I supported the committee. However, this proposal was defeated.

To study rail transportation problems, I sponsored S. J. Res. 158, which calls for a national advisory committee on rail transportation. I also sponsored the following measures dealing with the commuters problem: A bill to require affirmative approval by the Interstate Commerce Commission before discontinuance of a commuter train; a bill to give railroads the full Federal income tax benefit of tax relief granted by States and municipalities; and a bill to consent to the New York-New Jersey interstate compact to establish a bistate transportation agency which would attack the commuter crisis on the State level. This latter bill became law after the 1959 session ended.

The Congress passed a bill to assist chronically depressed areas in our Nation by creating new employment opportunities through grants, loans, and technical assistance, but failed to override the President's veto, which was based upon the high cost of this program. I supported this bill after provisions in it were eliminated which might have permitted use of these funds for inducing industry from one section of the country to move to another being helped under the legislation. I also joined in cosponsoring the bill proposed by the President to deal with this important national problem on a basis which he felt was more commensurate with our national needs.

LABOR

The Senate passed the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1960, which I supported, increasing the Federal minimum wage to $1.15 per hour in 1961, $1.20 in 1962, and $1.25 in 1963, and extending wage and hour protection under the act to approximately 4 million workers not previously covered, principally employees in larger retail and retail-service industries. The House bill called for $1.15 per hour and, as compromise proved impossible, the legislation will have to be acted on again next year. New York State benefits from a higher minimum wage uniformly applicable to all States competing in the labor market. At the same time it is important that certain retail, service, and other enterprises, by reason of size, volume, geographical, or seasonal considerations, should not suffer under the new act, and in such cases exemptions must be obtained to prevent competitive disadvantage or injustice to particular groups.

The Migratory Labor Subcommittee, of which I am a member, approved legislation relating to registration and Federal control of crew leaders of migrant agricultural workers. This follows a bill I introduced, and is an important first step to safeguard our migrant labor force from substandard working conditions. Farmers and growers too should benefit from a uniform system of a crew leader regulation. Also, the Education Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, of which I am a member, favorably reported two bills providing Federal aid for children of migrant workers to attend school full time and adult migrant workers a chance to continue their higher education.

I introduced legislation which would deal with national emergency strikes, such as last year's regrettable steel strike, by making available to the parties and to the public for its judgment facts and recommendations prepared by an impartial board of inquiry. In cases where all other means of settlement fail, my bill permits the protection of the national interest by providing for operation of the struck plants by the Government only to the extent necessary to the national health and safety, until a settlement is reached through free collective bargaining between labor and management.

I have also introduced three bills to eliminate discrimination in employment because of age.

HOUSING

The Senate passed a housing bill vital to New York's urban areas, which extended the FHA home improvement program 1 year, increased urban renewal—slum clearance—funds by $350 million, provided $500 million for loans for college housing, and extended and improved the FHA mortgage insurance program. The bill contained a number of provisions which I had sponsored, including permission to FHA to lower premium rates from one half to one quarter percent, removal of the ceiling on relocation payments for individuals, families, and businesses whose housing is being demolished in the urban renewal program, and increases in the limit which New York colleges could borrow under the college housing program.

The House failed to act on this measure, and there was enacted during the closing hours of the session legislation to extend for 1 year the title I home improvement program, provide $500 million in college housing loan funds, and $50 million in loans for public facilities in small communities.

To help meet the needs of low income families who are displaced from these areas, I joined in sponsoring an amendment providing for 25,000 units of public housing, which was adopted by the Senate. This, too, fell in the House of Representatives—it is the very minimum anyone could suggest to try to balance out a national housing program.

EDUCATION AND HEALTH

The Federal Government needs to aid the State and local governments in meeting their education needs. This is essential in our national interest under present conditions at home and abroad. The bill which I sponsored with Senator COOPER to provide Federal matching grants for school construction and to help the State to raise teachers' salaries was defeated in the Senate which then passed a bill totaling $1.8 billion over a 2-year period. A similar measure providing $1.3 billion for construction only over a 4-year period was passed by the House of Representatives. There was no opportunity for a House-Senate conference and the bill will have to be acted on again next year.

The objective of Federal aid for adequate health care insurance for our older citizens 65 years of age and over must and will be attained. Enactment of the social security bill, H.R. 12580, assures adequate medical health care for citizens over 65 who are indigent due to medical bills or are receiving old-age assistance. These number over 3 million persons. It is most regrettable that in addition, a plan could not be evolved now for the many people of moderate income estimated at 10 to 11 million who are in need of such health care insurance.

There was just no chance to work it out as is normally done here under the conditions of the brief congressional session.

The Anderson amendment could not be justified by its social security basis. It was medically inadequate in giving hospitalization rather than the preventive health care needed by 90 percent of the aged, set eligibility at 68 instead of 65 years of age, required the first $75 of expense to be paid by the individual every year, and cut benefits in an effort to trim costs; it failed to meet the basic needs of health care for our older citizens which I have advocated for over 12 years and would have overtaxed our hospital facilities and led to the frustration of even longer waiting lists.

My health care plan provided emphasis on preventive care with 12 physicians' visits and full first dollar cost coverage; eligibility for all of moderate income over 65; voluntary participation and State plans with Federal matching out of general revenues so that we could build on existing State and local health programs and insurance now covering 72 percent of the population—120 million Americans. I realize and feel very keenly that many of our older citizens wanted very much to have a bill passed at this session with a social security approach. I respect and honor them and believe that the whole matter of health care insurance for all over 65 has now been brought to a point where it has majority support and where a truly responsive and satisfactory bill will become law at the next congressional session.

The growing problem of juvenile delinquency has been causing increasing concern. I supported legislation providing for Federal financial aid to States and communities at the rate of $5 million a year for a 5-year program which would provide for training personnel as well as some demonstration projects. This is a relatively modest start to cope with this enormous problem.

As a member of the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I shall continue to push for early enactment of effective legislation on the Federal level to help with this grave national problem.

I sponsored the Health Facilities Training Act of 1960 to improve the public health through revising, consolidating, and improving the hospital and other medical facilities provisions of the Public Health Service Act. It authorizes grants for the construction of medical, dental, osteopathic, and public health teaching facilities as well as providing special project grants for postgraduate public health training and for Federal guarantee of loans for construction of group practice medical and dental care facilities. The proposed grants under this bill will permit the training of an increased number of public health personnel; improve medical care and provide other health benefits.

I have also introduced and supported legislation providing additional loans for the Federal college housing program, for classrooms and to make possible greater help for science students and teachers.

I sponsored a resolution calling for the establishment of national teachers recognition day to do honor to our public school teachers.

I have been actively interested in research and other programs designed to help with the problem of deafness and I supported S.J. Res. 127 which made Federal funds available for the training of teachers of the deaf, speech pathologists, and audiologists.

I also supported the Practical Nurse Training Extension Act of 1960 which authorized $5,000,000 a year for State grants for practical nurse training.

I introduced a bill which would make Federal aid available to help States meet the cost of caring for drug addicts based on compulsory commitment to a hospital. This legislation calls for a $2 million appropriation in the first year to be used as grants in aid for the payment of half of the cost per bed patient in the case of drug addicts in closed institutions.

I introduced legislation to eliminate the non-Communist affidavit requirement of the National Defense Education Act while retaining the oath of allegiance. The bill as it finally passed the Senate retained the loyalty oath and included language making it a criminal offense for any student to accept Federal funds who is a member of the Communist Party or other subversive organization, and provided further if he were such a member within the preceding 5 years, that he disclose and explain this fact.

SMALL BUSINESS AND CONSUMERS

I supported the Small Business Investment Act amendment which helped to make private investment in small business investment companies more attractive. It also made it easier for investment companies and small business concerns borrowing from them to operate under the Small Business Investment Act of 1958.

I encouraged further study in the problem of exports and imports as they affect small business and shall continue to give the problems and needs of small business my close attention. There is concern about competition from foreign imports. I am for broad international trade but this must be consistent with safeguarding our workers and businessmen from being hurt. I believe both can be done effectively by insisting on fair labor standards by nations exporting to us; phasing of tariff protection to give domestic business a chance to adjust to imports which are necessitated by our national trade policy; Government assistance to industries, workers, and communities adversely affected.

I sponsored legislation calling for the establishment of a Select Committee on Consumers which would deal exclusively with consumer problems. Another bill which I introduced calls for setting up a Consumer Fraud Bureau which would act as a national clearinghouse of information about "fast-buck" operators who move from State to State perpetrating consumer frauds. I also supported legislation which tightened Federal control over the use of coal tar colors in food, drugs, and cosmetics.

CIVIL RIGHTS AND CIVIL LIBERTIES

After 8 weeks of debate, the Senate passed the Civil Rights Act of 1960, and it was signed into law by the President. The bill helps further to protect the rights of all Americans to vote by including power for the Attorney General to inspect registration records and for the Federal courts to appoint voting referees where there is a pattern of local voting discrimination, who could register persons who have been denied the right to vote. It also includes provisions to put the FBI on finding and bringing to justice those guilty of hate bombings like those of schools, homes, churches, and synagogues; made unlawful interference with court orders, such as those requiring desegregation of public schools; and provided for the education of armed services personnel's children when local schools are closed to avoid desegregation.

However, the bill omitted a number of important provisions, among them, technical and financial assistance by the Federal Government to school districts wishing to desegregate; statutory for the Committee headed by Vice President Nixon which has been working to eliminate discrimination in employment by Government contractors; power in the Attorney General to bring civil injunction suits for the protection of civil rights including the right to attend a desegregated school, elimination of the poll tax in the 5 States still clinging to it and making lynching a Federal crime. I shall, of course, continue the fight for meaningful civil rights legislation which will fulfill our solemn obligation to make the constitutional guarantees of equal protection of the laws a reality to every individual, regardless of race, color, religion, or national origin.

The Senate rule on debate, rule XXII allowing of filibusters, which has caused civil rights legislation to die or be eviscerated in the Senate at the will of a small minority, must be changed, and I will join in this fight at the opening of the next congressional session when it can be made effectively.

A situation came to my attention during the session which was particularly shocking to me: Airports constructed with Federal funds in several southern cities were allowed to contain segregated dining facilities, restrooms, and waiting rooms. I proposed an amendment to forbid Federal funds for such airports, which was not adopted, and shall introduce legislation to permanently forbid this practice.

The outbreak of anti-Semitic incidents and painting of swastikas on synagogues, which began in Germany early in the year, quickly spread, shocking a world which had every right to hope that any vestiges of nazism or fascism were dead. I spoke out on the Senate floor in denunciation of these outrages and urged that they be met by quick justice, severe penalties, and with indignation in the highest circles. I also urged continued

support for the idea of a United Europe and of the work of Chancellor Adenauer in that direction.

I continued to oppose legislation restricting the power of the Supreme Court to protect the civil liberties of the individual, and no bills of this type were passed by the Senate this year. Legislation which would have permitted the denial of passports to Americans on alleged national security grounds without court review did not secure favorable action.

A major problem in law enforcement is the provision of Federal law which forbids wiretapping. While in New York and some other States it is permitted under strictly controlled court orders to aid in catching serious criminals, a pending bill would permit law enforcement officials in such States to wiretap under the control and regulation of State laws; I proposed an amendment permitting the Congress to review the effect of this bill periodically for possible abuses.

The Senate passed a clean elections bill requiring additional reporting of campaign expenditures, but it was not acted on by the House. I also supported a constitutional amendment, now submitted to the States, which will permit citizens of the District of Columbia to vote in presidential elections.

IMMIGRATION

Action in the Congress on immigration this year was limited to passage of H. J. Res. 397 which would admit approximately 5,000 refugees from Europe, and to legislation continuing the alien orphan program, which I have long supported, for another year. Because of the gag rule on immigration legislation, neither my bill, S. 1919, nor the administration bill which I also sponsored and which would have revised and brought up to date the whole immigration quota system was reported out.

Under the legislation recommended by President Eisenhower, the present quota system would have been revised to make the 1960 census the quota basis, eliminate racial and ethnic classification including those from the Carribbean and the Pacific triangle, increase quota numbers of countries in proportion to their actual immigration to the United States between 1924 and 1960, pool all unfilled quota numbers and make them available to oversubscribed countries in given areas without regard to nationality, and allow the admission on parole of refugees from persecution and oppression.

In the Senate debate I served notice that next year I would not allow my efforts to be curtailed by the threat of gag rule legislation.

POST OFFICE AND SOCIAL SECURITY

I supported the 7½ percent pay raise bill to provide adequate salaries for postal workers and other Federal employees. I have consistently joined in seeking to correct inequities in the wage level of Federal employees as compared to that for equivalent job skills of those working in private employment. I feel that the Federal Government has a clear responsibility to be a fair employer itself and to give enlightened leadership to private enterprise throughout the Nation in the treatment of its own personnel.

The Social Security Amendment of 1960 bill liberalized somewhat the provisions which allowed beneficiaries to increase their earnings above $1,200 a year. I supported an amendment to allow retired persons to earn up to $1,800 a year but under the new formula an individual who earned up to $1,500 a year would lose $1 of benefit for each $2 of earnings over the limit of $1,200. For earnings over $1,500 the formula calls for a $1 reduction in benefits for each $1 earned. The bill reduces the length of time a person must pay into the social security fund to be eligible for benefits; extends coverage to more domestic employees and additional widows and widowers. Legislation which I sponsored to extend the unemployment insurance system to Puerto Rico became law.

Other major changes in the law would drop the requirement that a person must be 50 or older to receive disability payments; extends coverage to about 25,000 survivors of workers who died before 1940, and increases payments to about 400,000 children of deceased workers. Self-employed physicians—150,000—are not yet included under social security coverage.

I have long been in favor of the basic principle of encouraging pension plans for self-employed individuals, many of whom have had no opportunities for retirement funds and pension plans such as other workers and officials often obtain. The Senate Finance Committee has proposed a number of amendments to the self-employed retirement act which passed the House of Representatives during the last session. I want to see action on a meaningful and effective self-employed retirement bill and will do my utmost to see that one is enacted.

It is most important in this election year to get out the vote irrespective of party affiliation. I have therefore proposed that posters be placed on all postal trucks urging citizens to vote this November. These posters will be appearing shortly on post office trucks everywhere.

NEW YORK STATE AFFAIRS

This session of Congress has been particularly gratifying in the close cooperation between me and my colleague, Senator KENNETH B. KEATING of New York, in matters affecting our State. With the whole New York congressional delegation we have pressed in the Congress for measures essential to New York's economy. As members of the steering committee of the delegation, on which Senator KEATING is alternate, we have been particularly alert to the necessity of securing more defense business for New York industries.

The labor situation in New York State is discouraging in a number of areas. Buffalo and the Niagara frontier, Schenectady, Rome, Utica, and Troy still remain areas of substantial labor surplus. Until these unacceptable conditions are eliminated, New York Congressmen and Senators cannot cease in their efforts that New York receive proper consideration.

I do not think New York is getting its fair share of Government contracts; awards to other areas of the country are disproportionate to what the Northeast and New York in particular are receiving. I have protested in debate in the Senate and I have been in constant touch with the Department of Defense, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration about this problem. At the same time, of course, it is essential that New York industry maintain and improve the caliber of its scientific, technical, and industrial capability and competence in order that it receive proper consideration for vital Government work. I am working closely with the New York State Department of Commerce and Governor Rockefeller's office to assure that our New York industries stay in the industrial forefront and that we do all we can to encourage and attract scientific and technical talent to our State.

The Congress voted funds for several important public works projects in New York State, including major channel and navigation work in the Rochester, Buffalo, and New York harbors. Funds were also authorized for extensive beach erosion control and hurricane protection from Fire Island Inlet to Montauk, L.I.

VETERANS

I supported veterans' legislation which would permit the conversion or exchange of policies of national service life insurance. I also supported legislation to provide veterans who served from January 1, 1955, until the end of the draft with the same benefits substantially as those granted to Korean war veterans. These include grants to veterans for education and vocational training assistance, vocational rehabilitation training, and also guarantees for direct loan assistance for the purchase of homes and farms.

Following a fight to get added Federal help for the Northport Veterans Hospital based on the overcrowding in Northport, one of the largest neuropsychiatric hospitals in the Veterans' Administration system, the Veterans' Administration has set up a 12-year program for veterans hospitals which deal in mental cases such as the one at Northport, and I have been assured that Northport Hospital would be included in the next fiscal year program.

I supported measures to aid in the education and training of veterans, those extending benefits to veterans' children, the extension of guaranteed home loan provisions, and legislation providing for the services of optometrists to veterans having service-connected eye conditions.

MISCELLANEOUS

I believe that some help from the Federal Government is necessary to encourage the spirited and historic development of the arts in our country, and to spur their enjoyment and dissemination more widely than is presently feasible. I have sponsored legislation for this purpose calling for the establishment of a U.S. Arts Foundation and

supported a bill for a Federal Advisory Council of the Arts.

I sponsored resolutions calling for the establishment of memorials in Washington, D.C., to President Theodore Roosevelt, which became law, and to the memory of Albert Einstein, the great scientist; a resolution authorizing the President to declare the fourth Friday in September of each year to be American Indian Day and to invite the public to observe the day with appropriate ceremonies; and legislation providing for payment from the war claims funds to certain organizations in settlement of war claims where such payment is to be used to rehabilitate needy victims of Nazi persecution.

I have also supported the amendment by my colleague, Senator KEATING, to H.R. 2485, dealing with the War Claims Act, which would extend reparation rights to all who are now American citizens whether or not they were citizens when their claims accrued.

AGRICULTURE

Our farm problem is not one of shortages, but rather one of surplus and plenty. The present surplus of wheat has become a major national problem in terms of public investment immobilized and high storage costs as well as in its serious effects upon the future welfare of our farmers. I voted for amendments to reduce high fixed farm price supports and to extend the conservation reserve program and to increase the acreage exemption for small farmers, which is of particular importance to New York agriculture.

I have favored more help to the farmer in research in the industrial use of farm products, in better marketing and in teaching new skills and business development in rural areas. I shall continue to work for such legislation and also for more use of surplus agricultural products in our foreign aid programs—a most important and effective way to use agricultural surpluses.

CONCLUSION

The citizens of the State of New York have responded in ever increasing numbers to express their views on matters of the national interest, as well as on problems in which they have a personal interest. It is always heartening to know that my constituents feel free to write to me about their problems or about any issues on which they have decided opinions. I assure you that your letters are welcome and receive full attention and consideration and have a constructive effect.

DISPOSITION OF SECURITIES LEGISLATION

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I wish to take this opportunity to advise the Senate of the disposition of the securities legislation that the Senate passed this year. I was honored to serve with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] on the Securities Subcommittee. First, there were two acts that the Senate amendment amended that were accepted by the House of Representatives, the Trust Indenture Act and the Investment Advisors Act. We also agreed to amendments to the Securities Act of 1933 and the Securities and Exchange Act of 1934. In the House these amendments were not accepted.

The fifth act, the Investment Company Act, received attention by the House of Representatives and certain amendments were added thereto. The bill was returned to the Senate too late in the session for fruitful conference. One of the amendments expressed an idea of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Representative WALTER, which presented a new, but in our judgment meritorious approach that I hope the committee will consider thoughtfully in the months ahead.

Mr. JAVITS. I should like to state, Mr. President, that I concur with my colleague in the decision to stand where we are in respect of legislation in the securities field. I should like all my colleagues to study this important proposed legislation, which concerns the whole business of securities, stocks and bonds in private corporations in the United States, a subject in which our people have a great interest.

Reportedly 14 million people are now direct holders of such securities. I feel also, with my colleague, that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Representative WALTER, to that bill, which affected investment companies, is an idea we certainly will wish to consider very carefully. It relates to conflicts of interest by corporate directors and officers of such investment companies, but it is hardly a subject which we can consider on the last day of the session. I believe my colleague and chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] has therefore made the right decision in suggesting that we study the subject during the recess. I regret very much that the House did not act in respect of the Securities Acts of 1933 and 1934, but I hope that we can do the work during the recess and repair the situation in the next session.

CREDIT FOR PERIODS OF INTERNMENT DURING WORLD WAR II OF CERTAIN FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.R. 7810.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. H.R. 7810, an act to credit periods of internment during World War II to certain Federal employees of Japanese ancestry for purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act and the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, the purpose of this legislation is to correct certain omissions in Public Law 545, 82d Congress, which granted Federal employees of Japanese ancestry certain seniority and compensation benefits where their grade, time in grade, or rate of compensation were adversely affected because of the security policies of the Federal Government during the World War II period of evacuating people of Japanese ancestry to relocation centers. However, consideration was not given at that time to crediting such periods as periods of service for annual leave accrual and retirement purposes. Such annual leave accrual and retirement service credit benefits generally are associated with the benefits granted by Public Law 545, 82d Congress.

H.R. 7810 would make the annual leave and retirement benefits of these employees of Japanese ancestry conform with the other benefits granted by Public Law 545.

Enactment of this measure is approved by the Civil Service Commission and the Bureau of the Budget.

The measure has been approved unanimously by Members on both sides of the aisle in the Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be offered, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 7810) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

PLACING OF BAMBOO PIPESTEMS ON THE FREE LIST

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1981, H.R. 10841.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 10841) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to place bamboo pipestems on the free lists.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point a brief statement on the bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of H.R. 10841 is to make free of duty bamboo pipestems in whatever condition of manufacture and whether bored or unbored, when imported from other than Communist-dominated countries.

GENERAL STATEMENT

Bamboo pipestems are currently classified for duty purposes under paragraph 1552 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended. That paragraph states:

"Mouthpieces for pipes, or for cigar and cigarette holders of whatever material composed, and in whatever condition of manufacture, whether wholly or partly finished, or whether bored or unbored."

These items were originally dutiable at the rate of 5 cents each plus 60 percent ad valorem. As a result of trade-agreement concessions, this rate has been reduced to 1 cent each and 15 percent ad valorem.

H.R. 10841 would provide for the free importation of bamboo pipestems only, and it provides further that the free importation would apply only to pipestems produced in other than Communist-controlled countries. Those originating in Communist-controlled areas would continue to be dutiable at the original rate of duty provided for in the tariff act.

Bamboo pipestems are used principally on corncob pipes. Present tariffs on bamboo stems prohibit their use in the manufacture of corncob pipes because of the low average unit retail selling price for corncob pipes.

No objection to the passage of the bill has been made known, including the Government departments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If there are any amendments offered to this bill, I will either move that they be tabled, or move to take up another bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be offered, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF THE HELIUM ACT OF SEPTEMBER 1, 1937, AS AMENDED

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to see if I can get an agreement following the usual form on the helium bill, debate not to exceed 30 minutes to a side on the bill and all amendments, the time to be controlled by the majority and the minority leaders.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. GORE. We could not hear the Senator.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I asked unanimous consent that we follow the usual form and have an agreement that debate on the helium bill shall not exceed 30 minutes on the bill and all amendments, the time to be controlled by the proponents and opponents, to be yielded by the majority and the minority leaders.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I object. If this unanimous-consent agreement is entered into, will amendments that are not germane to the substance of the bill as it is now written be received?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. They will not. I told the Senator they would not. That is why I have asked for the agreement, so we would not have as many amendments coming into the bill as we might otherwise have, with much irrelevant and extraneous debate, and amendments that have no relevancy to the bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. An amendment that is not germane will not be accepted?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Such an amendment will not be accepted if a consent agreement is reached in accord with the proposal of the majority leader.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I withdraw my objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The agreement, subsequently reduced to writing, is as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That, during the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 10548), to amend the Helium Act of September 1, 1937, as amended, for the defense, security, and the general welfare of the United States, debate on all amendments, motions, or appeals, and the bill shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the proponents and the majority leader: *Provided further,* That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said bill shall be received.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1884, H.R. 10548.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 10548) amending the Helium Act of September 1, 1937, as amended, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, this is one of the most important bills to come before the 86th Congress, either in this so-called bobtail session or in the main session which ended in July. This is the helium conservation bill.

I favor the conservation of helium. I know of no one opposed to conservation of helium.

The able chairman of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, Congressman WAYNE ASPINALL, and the very able and distinguished Congressman WALTER ROGERS of Texas, were largely instrumental in bringing this bill before the legislative branch of the Government.

I salute both of them for doing yeoman work. Especially do I commend them for calling before their committee and questioning the General Counsel of the Federal Power Commission. This questioning alerted me to the danger of this bill exempting all helium-bearing gas from regulation under the Natural Gas Act.

I ask unanimous consent that certain printed matter related to my remarks may be printed in the RECORD at appropriate points in my remarks.

Mr. President, I had originally planned to talk on this subject for some hours. However I do not intend to be arbitrary about this bill. The authors of the original bill in the other body and members of our own Senate Interior Committee, have worked out what are believed to be reasonable amendments which will protect the public interest. One of these is an amendment which I have drafted and without which this bill is complete unacceptable. I will call up this amendment in a few moments.

The bill, as drafted in the House, I am sure was not in any sinister manner drafted deliberately to exempt from regulation by the Federal Power Commission, which has jurisdiction under the Natural Gas Act, all natural gas bearing helium. However, this was the suspected effect of section 9 of the House bill. This matter was called to my attention as the House bill came to the Senate Interior Committee. I pay particular tribute to Representative ASPINALL and the other members of the House committee who raised that question. Evidently they were not sufficiently impressed by the testimony given by the Federal Power Commission, because the issue was not debated on the floor of the House. It was not seriously considered except in the House report.

When the bill came before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I raised the question about exemption under the Gas Act with the able Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. At that time we were almost in the process of marking up the bill. I called his attention to that defect in the bill, and I said, "I am not satisfied that the record is clear enough or that the bill is clear enough. Therefore I believe we ought to call before our committee Mr. Willard Gatchell, the General Counsel of the Federal Power Commission."

During Mr. Gatchell's testimony, and under very vigorous cross-examination, Mr. Gatchell testified that it was very clear that the provisions of the bill exempted all helium-bearing gas from the Natural Gas Act, and took away all jurisdiction over helium-bearing gas from the Federal Power Commission.

Mr. President, I am amazed at the lack of knowledge in this body on this very important helium bill. I say frankly I consider this issue so touched with the public interest that if there had not been some give and take today by both House and Senate committees, I would have stood on the floor of the Senate and spoken until the end of the session. However, I think we will now have a safeguard in the bill which will permit me not to stand in its way.

Helium-bearing gas is produced exclusively in the Panhandle area of Texas and in adjacent fields in Oklahoma and Kansas. It feeds through pipelines into

major cities of the Nation—Denver, Chicago, Detroit, and many others. I have before me and will place in the RECORD at this point, a list of States which receive natural gas from central U.S. gasfields. I also place in the RECORD a list of cities served with helium-bearing gas. For example, Ohio receives approximately 465,288,000 cubic feet of gas from central U.S. fields. Illinois receives 400 million. Pennsylvania receives 400 million. New York receives 285 million. I have a list of States which shows how important this issue is, and why Senators from these States should be alert to legislation that might affect consumers in their areas. I am amazed at the lack of knowledge on this important bill on the part of Senators. I know my friends in the Senate, who would normally be alert to this type of issue, are anxious to go home. Yet this bill could affect millions of consumers, and some of the most important manufacturing and most populous States of the country.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

States receiving shipments of natural gas, 1958 [1] [2]

[In thousands of cubic feet]

States	From west north-central gasfields	From west south-central gasfields	Total
Ohio	29,407	435,881	465,288
Illinois	33,730	411,069	444,799
Pennsylvania		400,030	400,030
New York		285,461	285,461
Michigan	51,419	231,635	283,054
Missouri	75,842	171,924	247,766
Kansas	1,315	233,960	235,275
California	1,221	183,682	184,903
Iowa	46,862	132,307	179,169
Indiana	27,108	131,240	158,348
Tennessee		146,970	146,970
Minnesota	51,659	95,005	146,664
West Virginia		138,157	138,157
New Jersey		118,479	118,479
Colorado	50,085	42,561	92,646

[1] Among States producing gas in the west north-central fields: Kansas.
[2] Among States producing gas in the west south-central fields: Oklahoma and Texas.

Principal cities served with helium-bearing gas

	Gas taps
Chicago	1,017,043
Kansas City	583,159
Detroit	879,361
Milwaukee	205,453
Minneapolis	142,546
Denver	142,732
St. Paul	91,285
Omaha	87,034
Grand Rapids	88,819
Wichita	91,536
Des Moines	71,536

Reference: Brown's Directory, American Gas Companies.

Mr. CARROLL. What have we done to correct the weaknesses in this bill? First of all, we took extensive testimony from the General Counsel of the Federal Power Commission in our Senate Interior Committee. I wish the RECORD to be crystal clear, so that any court which reads this RECORD will know what is the specific legislative intent, namely, that we are not exempting helium-bearing gas from jurisdiction by the Federal Power Commission under the Natural Gas Act. There can now be no question about that. For anyone who reads the hearings of the Senate committee, the report of our committee, my own individual views, which are a part of the Interior Committee report, and, I hope, the debate this evening. This is the first weakness we cured.

There was a second weakness which we cured by committee amendment. It is a most important issue. Not only did the House bill exempt helium-bearing gas from jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission; the House bill also prohibited the Federal Power Commission from allocating certain costs to helium, which would have resulted, in my opinion, in a $28.6 million loss to gas consumers in the Middle West and Rocky Mountains. It was the avowed intention of the House—and though I do not criticize the Members of the House for it, I recognize that they did it deliberately—to prevent the Federal Power Commission from allocating certain production costs to helium at the time it is computing the cost-of-service of a natural gas company in determining a fair gas rate to be paid by consumers.

The House, in effect, said to the Federal Power Commission, "You have no right to look at the gas company books and see what income and costs are attributable to helium."

Before I get to the issue of how this program should be financed, I wish to say that we have now restored in the bill, clearly and conclusively for the RECORD, the provision that the Federal Power Commission has jurisdiction over helium-bearing gas, and authority to allocate costs.

My arguments supporting such authority are very technical and, my individual views, printed as part 2 of the Senate Interior Committee report is a very technical exposition. I ask unanimous consent that rather than take the time of the Senate tonight, I be permitted to place in the RECORD a portion of these views, for the purpose of making a legislative history, and I shall be very glad to explain my arguments privately if any Senator wishes me to do so. It is a very complex discussion in the field of cost accounting and the allocation of costs to the benefit of the consumer.

There being no objection, the views were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POSITION OF FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

In reports of February 18 and March 2, 1960, to the House Interior Committee and May 19, 1960, to the Senate Interior Committee, the Federal Power Commission made its position clear on the sections of the various bills relating to the Natural Gas Act.

In the House:

The Federal Power Commission, in its February 18 report, made two powerful arguments against the Natural Gas Act section of the bills:

"1. * * * the bill would remove the Commission's present jurisdiction over the transportation and sale of natural gas containing helium, since the bill appears to give the Secretary of Interior exclusive jurisdiction over the sale and transportation of the helium in natural gas even before the helium is extracted.

"2. * * * authority to make cost allocations and to consider revenues from the sale of helium extracted from natural gas would be taken away by the * * * bill."

The Federal Power Commission accordingly offered four amendments to the helium bill, submitting as their purpose this strong language:

"To safeguard the jurisdiction of the Commission over the transmission or sale of helium-bearing natural gas under certificates of public convenience and necessity for ultimate consumption as fuel, and in order to preserve the vitally important jurisdiction of the Commission to make joint cost allocations in rate proceedings and to consider revenues from helium extracted from natural gas."

These arguments were essentially repeated in the March 2 report of the Federal Power Commission to the House Interior Committee, recommending two amendments.

In the House hearings, Mr. Willard Gatchell reaffirmed the position taken by the Federal Power Commission in its written reports.

Mr. Gatchell further said in the House hearings in regard to the effect on consumers' gas bills:

"There is the matter of fixing rates that is a very important phase of our operation * * * what is important is to see that the people who want natural gas service get it at just and reasonable rates as Congress has prescribed * * *. But you left out a big block of our jurisdiction, and I don't know just how we are going to be able to do that."

Mr. Carl Kallina testified in the House on the Federal Power Commission cost allocation method in ratemaking and reaffirmed that helium should bear its share of the natural-gas costs.

In the Senate:

In the May 19 letter to the Senate Interior Committee the Federal Power Commission made this alarming observation:

"The requirement that the Commission make cost allocations * * * is firmly established as a method to be followed in order to determine just and reasonable rates * * *.

"The proposed bill would prohibit such cost allocations * * * and would further prohibit the Commission from considering revenues from the sale of helium so extracted in determining the rates which should be charged for natural-gas sales.

"Thus, section 11 of this bill * * * would raise serious legal questions as to the legality of any rates fixed by the Commission for the sale of natural gas after the helium had been extracted. In such a situation the gas consumers would be expected to bear costs which under existing law and procedures would be properly chargeable to helium extraction."

After studying the Federal Power Commission reports to the House and Senate committees and reading Mr. Gatchell's warning in the House hearings, I asked that the Federal Power Commission witnesses be heard by the Senate Interior Committee.

Mr. Gatchell appearing before the committee again testified that the Federal Power Commission would lose jurisdiction under the Natural Gas Act unless the bill was amended.

He said:

"As we read section 9 of the [House] bill, if the gas contains helium, we are out. * * * We recommend eliminating section 9."

Following is the full Federal Power Commission report to the Senate Interior Committee on S. 3376:

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION,
May 19, 1960.

REPORT ON A BILL (S. 3376, 86 CONG.) TO AMEND THE HELIUM ACT OF MARCH 3, 1925, AS AMENDED, FOR THE DEFENSE, SECURITY, AND THE GENERAL WELFARE OF THE UNITED STATES

This bill, to be known as the Helium Act of 1960, would, among other things, authorize the Secretary of the Interior to regulate the sale and transportation of extracted helium in interstate commerce.

Section 11 of the proposed bill provides that the Natural Gas Act shall not apply to the "sale, extraction, processing, transportation, or storage of helium either prior to or subsequent to its separation from the natural gas with which it is commingled." This section further provides that any income received by companies from helium operations shall not be considered by the Commission in making natural gas rate determinations under sections 4 and 5 of the Gas Act, and it expressly enjoins for the purpose of such ratemaking that "no exploration, production, gathering, extraction, processing, compression, transportation, storage, or other costs which would have been incurred in the absence of the extraction of the helium shall be allocated or assigned to the helium."

The above provisions would, in our judgment, materially impair the effectiveness of this Commission's regulatory responsibilities with respect to natural gas matters. Under the Natural Gas Act the Commission is charged with seeing that rates for natural gas transported or sold in interstate commerce for resale for ultimate public consumption for domestic, commercial, industrial, or other uses are reasonable and fair to all segments of the public interest. Accordingly, the Commission under the existing certificate provisions of the Gas Act regulates the interstate operations of the natural gas companies engaged in the production, transportation, and sale of natural gas (including helium-bearing gas and helium-gas mixtures) and under the rate provisions of the act determines whether the rates and charges for these interstate sales of natural gas by such companies are just and reasonable.

The requirement that the Commission make cost allocations between the jurisdictional and nonjurisdictional phases of the operations of natural gas companies is firmly established as a method to be followed in order to determine just and reasonable rates for those natural gas sales which are subject to the Commission's jurisdiction. The proposed bill would prohibit such cost allocations between jurisdictional natural gas operations and nonjurisdictional helium operations, and would further prohibit the Commission from considering revenues from the sale of helium so extracted in determining the rates which should be charged for natural gas sales subject to the Commission's rate control. Thus, section 11 of this bill, by eliminating these essential factors from consideration by the Commission, would raise serious legal questions as to the legality of any rates fixed by the Commission for the sale of natural gas after the helium had been extracted. In such a situation the gas consumers would be expected to bear costs which under existing law and procedures would be properly chargeable to helium extraction.

In view of the adverse effect of the proposed bill upon the Commission's functions under the Natural Gas Act, and to assure that the public does not bear unreasonable costs as part of the rates for natural gas, we recommend the following amendment:

Strike out section 11 and add the following as a new section:

"Nothing in this act shall be construed as repealing or modifying the provisions of the Natural Gas Act of June 21, 1938 (52 Stat. 821; 15 U.S.C. 717–717w), as amended."

In any event, it appears to us that the language in section 11 of the bill making the Natural Gas Act inapplicable to the sale, extraction, processing, transportation, or storage of helium "either prior to or subsequent" to its separation from natural gas is unnecessary for the purpose of the proposed bill, since prior to extraction the helium unquestionably is part of the interstate stream of natural gas which properly should be regulated under the Gas Act, whereas after extraction the helium would not, even in the absence of this language, be subject to regulation under the Natural Gas Act because extracted helium does not come within the definition of natural gas contained in the Gas Act.

The Commission is in agreement with the basic objectives of this bill to facilitate the production, conservation, and utilization of helium, and we would have no objection to its enactment if amended in the manner described above.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION,
By JEROME K. KUYKENDALL,
Chairman.

AMENDMENTS CONSIDERED IN SENATE COMMITTEE

1. Jurisdiction of Federal Power Commission under Natural Gas Act: Following the testimony of the Federal Power Commission witnesses against section 9 of the House bill (sec. 11 of the Senate bill) the Interior Committee adopted an amendment designed to cure the Federal Power Commission objections.

On page 15 of S. 3376, line 13, the word "its" was changed to "the" and after the word "separation" the following words were added: "of such helium". The sentence then read:

"SEC. 11. The provisions of the Natural Gas Act of June 21, 1938 (52 Stat. 821; 15 U.S.C. 717–717w), as amended, shall not be applicable to the sale, extraction, processing, transportation, or storage of helium either prior to or subsequent to the separation of such helium from the natural gas with which it is commingled."

In regard to the amendment I stated:

"If this matter should come up in court at a later time, a producer of gas, or an integrated company that also has a pipeline, could not successfully contend, with this amendment in the bill, that it was the intent of the Congress to exempt natural gas from regulation because we have excluded helium."

Mr. Gatchell responded:

"That is correct, Senator, as I look at it. Our concern is that the Commission shall still continue its control over the transportation of gas in interstate commerce and offer the interstate sale of natural gas in interstate commerce, and that where there are joint products the Commission may consider the joint products only to the extent of determining that the gas that is consumed, natural gas that is consumed, under our Natural Gas Act bears only its fair share of those joint costs, and that it is not burdened with the cost of producing helium.

"Senator CARROLL. I want to say for the record, because the courts may some day read this record, one of the reasons that I have tried to raise this point is because I did not see it discussed on the floor of the House at the time that this bill was passed, and this bill was passed by a voice vote. This issue was not debated.

"Mr. GATCHELL. No, sir.

"Senator CARROLL. It was contained in a departmental report by, I think, the Federal Power Commission and I think it was also contained in the legislative report by the House, showing another indication of legislative intent.

"Now that we have specifically nailed this down there should be no question in anybody's mind that this is not a device or a subterfuge to take out from under the Natural Gas Act the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission.

"Mr. GATCHELL. I think you are stating what is the fact, and I had the impression that the House committee was not trying to take out our jurisdiction.

"Senator ANDERSON. It certainly was not. It said so as clearly as could be.

"Senator ALLOTT. We discussed it here, I might say, and it was our opinion that it did not.

"Senator ANDERSON. I am satisfied with this language. I think that when you say helium and refer to its separation, when you make it read the "separation of helium," I don't think you have changed it one particle. But if that satisfies you, God be with you.

"Mr. GATCHELL. Senator, I have been in so many court cases where they twist language against us, and I just did not want to go to the Commission and say to them, 'You can forget this. Everybody thinks that they are protecting you.'

"I couldn't do that. I have to have these matters considered carefully and I think this is the way to do it."

The legislative intent is now perfectly clear in light of the above comments on the effect of the Senate committee amendment.

The intent is that no jurisdiction conferred upon the Federal Power Commission under the Natural Gas Act to regulate the transportation and sale of natural gas be withdrawn or in any way impaired by any section of the helium bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CARROLL. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Let us assume that a gas producer makes a profit through the sale of helium. Will that profit inure to the benefit of the consumer who buys the gas from which the helium has been removed?

Mr. CARROLL. In the sense that the Senator from Ohio puts the question, the profit itself would not go to the benefit of the gas consumer. This is specifically set out in the House bill. I have tried to make clear, in my work on this bill, that we are not trying to interfere with the gas company's income from helium. However, I have been insisting that the costs of exploring for the gas well, extraction, production, gathering, transportation and certain other costs must be allocated between helium and the gas delivered to consumers, just as such allocation is made to any other byproduct of the gas. Under such allocation system the consumer is charged a rate which pays only for the costs, plus 6 percent on plant investment, that are incurred in producing the combustible gas he uses in his stove.

I shall place in the RECORD at this point a letter I received from the Federal Power Commission, which shows that the allocation of costs to helium, based upon hypothetical annual withdrawals of 11 million M.c.f. of helium, would save the consumers of the Nation over a period of 20 years, $28,600,000, if the volumetric system were used, as it is now used.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., June 20, 1960.

Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ANDERSON: At the request of Senator CARROLL during the hearings before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, June 15, 1960 (transcript p. 160), the Commission's staff has reexamined data concerning the volumes of helium available from the Hugoton, West Panhandle, and Keyes gas fields. The results of the study are summarized on the attached schedule which shows that the remaining helium is estimated at 218.66 billion cubic feet. Assuming approximately equal annual withdrawals over a 20-year period, the annual volume of helium from the fields mentioned would be

about 11,000,000 M c.f. per year. If the volume of gas extracted for helium were valued at 13 cents per thousand cubic feet, the annual value of the helium included in the natural gas would be $1,430,000, based on a volumetric allocation. At the end of 20 years, the sum would be approximately $28,600,000.

The foregoing volumes represent only the helium content of the gas from the fields mentioned and do not include gas consumed as plant fuel in the extraction process. The plant-use volume, however, would be several times the volume of helium extracted.

It will be noted on the accompanying schedule that the estimated recoverable gas in the fields mentioned is in excess of 37 trillion cubic feet. This volume would be the total input into the helium plants over a 20-year period if the entire helium content is extracted. The total value of such input at 13 cents per thousand cubic feet would be $4,810 million. The valuation of 13 cents per thousand cubic feet represents approximately the average cost to Colorado Interstate Gas Co. of natural gas in the fields and may be considered representative for the purpose of this submission.

Sincerely yours,

KENNETH L. SMITH,
Assistant Chief,
Bureau of Rates and Gas Certificates.

Mr. CARROLL. We are not really trying to put the Federal Government into the business of controlling the profits of helium. We are saying that helium has a new, added value as a byproduct of gas and therefore certain production costs should be attributed to it and not loaded onto the gas going to consumers. Every time there is a favorable cost allocation, the consumer is helped. That is why the consumer will get the benefit of some $28,600,000.

This authority to allocate costs was not contained in the House bill. I do not offer any criticism. The House had a certain concept. We disagreed with that concept. It is my opinion that the House will now accept the Senate version, because of the legislative record we have made and because of the soundness of our position in protecting the consumer through the regulatory power of the Federal Power Commission.

The Senator from Ohio knows that for many years, under the Natural Gas Act, the Federal Government has exercised this regulatory power.

The Bureau of Mines, under the Department of the Interior, is now operating four helium extraction plants, at Keyes, Okla., and Excell, Tex., and two smaller plants. They are Government-owned and Government-built. Natural gas comes in at one end, the helium is extracted from it, and the residual gas goes out at the other end. At present, the Bureau of Mines is the only producer of helium. The Bureau supplies helium to other Government agencies at $15.50 per thousand cubic feet and to commercial users at $19 per thousand cubic feet, f.o.b. the plants.

Helium is a very special commodity. It has now become an extremely valuable gas for use in the missile program and in space exploration. About 90 percent of the present helium supply is used in the defense effort and in space exploration.

Why do we plan to go into such an expansive program? The proposed program calls for the Secretary of the Interior to negotiate partnership contracts with the private gas industry whereby the industry will build 12 new helium extraction plants. This will mean the awarding of $225 million in helium-purchase contracts. That is what is involved in the bill we are considering in the closing hours of the session. It is estimated that including interest charges there will be more than $500 million involved before the end of the helium program, which is to continue for 25 years.

I do not intend to cast any personal reflection upon the Secretary of the Interior of the present administration. The present administration will soon be going out of power, regardless of who is elected in November. For this administration, in its closing months, to be able to negotiate $255 million worth of contracts with private industry is not, I think, in the public interest, because under the terms of the bill, as it is now, no congressional committee has any review of the contracts which the administration will negotiate.

The question of the manner in which this program is financed under the bill has been under serious attack by the General Accounting Office. The GAO charges that Congress does not have control of the program, because direct appropriations by the Congress are not needed.

I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD another document, a letter which I have written to the General Accounting Office, asking for a report on the whole helium program. I have asked for the opinion of the Comptroller General, concerning the manner in which the helium program is being financed and how he believes it ought to be financed in the future. The Comptroller General has indicated that he will submit a report by January 1 or January 15, 1961.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUGUST 27, 1960.

The Honorable JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CAMPBELL: This is a request for a full-scale study and report on the functioning of the U.S. Government helium program.

You are, I know, familiar with the bills now before the Congress affecting this program.

On May 12, 1960, you sent the Senate Interior Committee your suggestions for amendment of S. 3376, the Senate helium bill.

On August 20, 1959, and again on March 7, 1960, you submitted to the House Interior Committee your comments on the several House helium bills, H.R. 10548, H.R. 8440 and H.R. 8451.

No representative of the General Accounting Office testified at the Senate helium bill hearings.

Your representatives, however, did render helpful testimony at House hearings on March 11, 1960. At that time Messrs. John R. Kurelich, E. W. Muhonen and W. J. Schuler appeared as GAO witnesses and testified on: (1) the need to recover helium research costs, (2) your proposal to reduce the helium production fund, (3) the undesirability of financing a helium conservation program through public-debt borrowings.

In your letter of May 12, 1960, to the Senate Interior Committee you raised what seemed to me to be some very disturbing issues. You said:

"While we have not reviewed this program, we have been advised that the charges to Government agencies per 1,000 cubic feet of helium, f.o.b. Bureau of Mines plants in Texas and Oklahoma, is about one-half the cost of procurement from commercial suppliers who obtain their supplies from the same plants. We were also informed that commercial distributors procured about 83 million cubic feet of helium from the Bureau of Mines during fiscal year 1959 and that defense contractors purchased approximately 75 percent thereof for their contract requirements. We were advised that the program of the military services of furnishing helium directly to defense contractors largely has been abandoned because of various problems involving matters such as distribution, transportation, and accounting. A Government-furnished materials policy is applicable in several missile activities such as the Atlas and Titan, which require large quantities of helium; however, helium used by defense contractors in the actual production of missile components is not Government furnished. In view of the foregoing the Congress may wish to explore the long-range effect that section 6(a) may have on the cost of Government contracts involving the use of helium."

You will note that you said, "we have not reviewed this program" and farther on you suggested "the Congress may wish to explore the long-range effect that section 6 (a) may have on the cost of Government contracts."

I think that, in the light of your cursory studies, a full review of the helium program on behalf of the Congress is necessary and in order. I request that you initiate such a review as promptly as your schedule will permit, including an exploration of the effect of section 6 (a) of S. 3376 on the cost of Government contracts.

I am especially interested in a study of the following areas:

1. The total U.S. investment in helium research, development, production and stockpiling.

2. The income the United States has received from sale of helium (to Government agencies and private industry) and the sums covered into the Federal Treasury.

3. The history of the helium production fund.

4. The helium markets and customers with whom the Government trades and the purchase and resale prices.

5. Earnings and capital investment history of the Government-owned helium production plants. (Is this Government-owned program self-sustaining?)

6. Prices and sums paid private gas producers for the helium product extracted from their natural gas lines.

7. The amounts of helium furnished by the Defense Department directly to defense contractors and the amounts defense contractors procure from commercial suppliers, with prices paid.

The foregoing are suggestions for the basis of your study and are in no way intended to be the limits of the study. I am sure that a full historical analysis of the production, marketing and end use of helium by the U.S. Government will be most valuable to the Congress in its attempts to evaluate proposals made by the executive department for the conservation of this precious natural resource.

Sincerely,

JOHN A. CARROLL.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CARROLL. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It seems to me that the Senate is confronted with a rather complicated program. Is there such

urgency for this legislation that we ought to undertake to consider it and enact it in the very limited time which we have to consider it tonight? I wonder if it could not go over until the next session. I should like to know Senators views with respect to that. What is the urgency?

Mr. CARROLL. I thank the Senator for his question. It is a very pertinent question. I have had this course of action under consideration, not for two days, but for many weeks. The bill is one to which few people have given any study. The issue is difficult and complicated. As a matter of fact, in my minority views I recommended that the bill go over.

But in view of the urgent need for helium in our defense effort and in view of the fact that it is escaping into the atmosphere and is being wasted, I will not stand in the way of the bill.

I have consulted with Members of the House about it, and as I have previously said, had we not received what I think are remedial, curative amendments, I would stand on the floor all through the night and talk about the dangers in this bill, because I think the bill is that important. As I have said repeatedly, I am in complete favor with the basic purpose of this bill—to conserve helium—but I am fighting for language in the bill which will protect the interests of the gas consumers of this Nation and grant them benefits in terms of a reduction in their gas bills in proportion to the costs which can be allocated against the production of helium.

I am now convinced, because I have an amendment which I think is a curative amendment, that the bill should be passed. This amendment will make the effective date of the bill March 1, 1961. If the amendment is adopted, it will give the Department of the Interior and the big gas producing companies an opportunity to do their planning this fall and winter. They can draft plans and consider where they will locate their plants. Everything can be done except to enter into executed contracts, because the law will not become effective until March 1, 1961. It will then be reexamined, following the installation of a new administration, a new President, and a new Secretary of the Interior. The whole program can be restudied and, if necessary, strengthened. That is what I believe is the safety valve on the measure.

I have received wonderful cooperation from the Members of the House. While we cannot actually or officially call ourselves conferees, we have discussed the bill pro and con.

Therefore, I say to the Senator from Arkansas that if the amendments are adopted and if they are accepted by the House, I think they provide sufficient safeguards to carry us into next year, when a new look can be taken, if necessary, and the new administration will be able to reexamine the entire program.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It seems to me that the Senator from Colorado has very well answered, in his remarks just now, that there is not such urgency for the proposed legislation that it could not go over until the next session of Congress. I am confident that the Senator's amendments will, in his judgment, safeguard the public interest. At least, I am confident that they are so intended. However, it strikes me that in the public interest the whole matter might go over until the Members of this body and the Members of the other body can become more familiar with it and understand it better. This is a rather far-reaching program, as I see it.

Mr. CARROLL. It is a far-reaching program.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am persuaded that many Senators, possibly, like myself, may not be sufficiently familiar with the subject to vote intelligently on the bill based on their own judgments. I should have to follow the counsel and recommendations of the distinguished Senator from Colorado and other Senators. Nevertheless, I think that a program which offers, or could offer, an opportunity for some manipulations which would not be in the public interest, ought to have safeguards provided, especially when we are dealing with something so vital to our national defense as helium.

Mr. CARROLL. The Senator's argument is unanswerable except for one thing. The President of the United States has written a letter stating that helium is urgently needed for defense purposes. The Secretary of the Interior has been saying that a year's supply of helium is escaping every 45 days.

I do not know whether I have sufficiently explained the difficulty. Helium-bearing gas is escaping from the gas jets of millions of Americans.

Mr. McCLELLAN. In other words, helium must be extracted from commercial gas.

Mr. CARROLL. Exactly. The helium going into the gas burners of the people of the Nation, not being inflammable, goes up the flue. The junior Senator from Colorado has had difficulty in trying to solve the technical problems of protecting the consumer, of protecting the jurisdiction of the Federal Government, and of providing for the national interest. Much pressure is being exerted for the passage of the bill because of the large amount of helium which is going to waste. Helium has been escaping for 34 years. However, the need for helium has become more urgent now because of its use in Titan and Atlas missiles and in other phases of the missile program. I am frank to say that pressure has been put on me. Letters are being sent to members of Senate committees by the Secretary of the Interior. The pressure is on. However, I can stand the heat, and I think regardless of pressure we must write a good bill. We must protect both the national and the consumer interest. I think passage of the bill in this Congress will put the Government a year ahead in the program.

I am afraid that if we let the bill go over and start considering it all over again in January, February, or March, that will be too long.

So I thought the best I could do was hold out for an amendment providing for an effective date of March 1. These contracts, then, will not come into force until March. The new President and the new Secretary of Interior will be able to restudy the program, and we shall be moving forward in the helium conservation program.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Did the Senator say March 1?

Mr. CARROLL. Yes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That would hardly allow time for Congress to consider the matter in the next session, if in the meantime it is determined that this legislation is not sufficient to protect the national interest.

But without laboring the matter further or delaying action, I wish to commend the Senator from Colorado for his diligence and his labor on this subject. I am persuaded, at least at the moment, from my understanding of it, that he has performed a fine service for the country in preparing and developing safeguards in the nature of the amendments he has proposed. I believe he has performed a valuable service, and I wish to commend him for it.

I regret that the matter cannot go over until the next session; I think further amendments might be made.

But, again, I commend the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. I thank the Senator from Arkansas for his very gracious and generous remarks. I shall explain why we call for March 1. I was almost alone in holding out for some changes in this bill, even in my own committee, because the bill is difficult to understand. I was able to understand it because I brought in cost accountants to advise me on the technical aspects of these problems. Of course, I am not personally an expert in this field.

The reason I proposed March 1 is that the new President comes in January 20; and we know that following the election, the new President will have his representatives studying the operations and activities in the various departments. If the new President is a Democrat, his Cabinet appointees and their staffs will start working on this issue. That is why I wish to allow plenty of time after January 20 for the new President to look at this program.

I assure the Senator that I will have a report in January from the Comptroller General, and will have time to study the matter further, and I will report to the Senate, if necessary.

I thank the able Senator for his observations.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. CARROLL. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Under the provisions of the bill, as they will read in the event the agreement which has been worked out is put into effect, will the Federal Power Commission definitely have control, under existing law, over the natural gas operations?

Mr. CARROLL. Yes; the helium-bearing natural gas. This is the real question. I think the exemption was inadvertently written into the House bill language. I do not ascribe any evil motive, because many of the Members of that body felt that Mr. Gatchell, the

counsel of the Federal Power Commission, was seeing phantoms when he called attention to the exemption language. They thought this was a fight between the Department of the Interior and the Federal Power Commission, and that the Federal Power Commission wanted to get its foot in a new door. The House committee took the position that it did not want the Federal Power Commission to have jurisdiction over helium. Actually the language went much further as the FPC interpreted it, and exempted control under the Gas Act.

I am trying to make the record here in the Senate chamber as I did in my individual views. The Federal Power Commission now has jurisdiction—as we have drawn this measure—of all helium-bearing gas, under the Natural Gas Act.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Second, under the proposal made, will the allocation of costs be made in a manner that will protect the consuming public?

Mr. CARROLL. That is a very good question. I am not in complete approval of an amendment which I understand will be offered. I think the Federal Power Commission itself made a basic mistake—it was not made by either the House committee or the Senate committee—when it decided to allocate costs in the Keyes plant in Oklahoma on what is called a volumetric basis, instead of a relative market value basis. It is my understanding that of all the byproducts from gas, the only one whose costs are allocated on a volumetric basis is helium. I think the costs should be divided on the basis of the relative value of the products coming out of the well. But I cannot stand against the Power Commission and everyone else. I think they are wrong; but the issue is not of sufficient importance when viewed in the larger perspective of the program for me to stop the passage of this bill.

But as I have said to the Senator from Ohio, we have some protection—$28,600,000 worth of protection—that the Senate committee picked up for the gas consumers, besides restoring the jurisdictional right in regard to the Natural Gas Act.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Was a third item in dispute?

Mr. CARROLL. Well, I felt very strongly about this matter, as a matter of national policy. I do not like to see a lame duck administration, whether Democrat or Republican, go out of office and have the power to write $255 million worth of partnership contracts in the last days of its term. There is a presumption in law that all officials have a good intent. So I do not ascribe any evil intent to anyone. But suppose the administration now in office loses the election in November, and suppose it is going to negotiate contracts which will be binding upon this Government. I do not think that is in the best public interest. That is why I provide for the March 1 date.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That will protect against any such abuse, will it?

Mr. CARROLL. Yes.

There is another aspect that bothers me, and that is one of the questions I want the General Accounting Office to check on. There is a kind of back-door financing in the bill, which I do not like. The Comptroller General has raised questions about the wisdom of this method of financing. Last year the Republican administration was blaming the Democrats for engaging in back-door financing. But this bill is, in part, of that type.

This matter was debated in the House, and I think the debate was an intelligent one.

At this point, I am going to put my amendment on this issue into the RECORD, but I am not going to press for its adoption. However, I want the RECORD to show that this is the amendment I have in mind. My amendment is similar to the amendment proposed by the Comptroller General.

But now that I have been promised a report from the General Accounting Office on January 15, I want to take another look at the bill, when we return.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 25, beginning on line 10, strike out all through line 13, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(2) Within twenty-five years from the date of completion of construction, any funds expended for the construction of any helium plant or facility, or within twenty-five years from the date of acquisition of title by the United States, any funds expended for the acquisition of any helium plant or facility by means other than construction; and

On page 25, line 17, beginning with "bor-" strike out all through line 19, and insert in lieu thereof "appropriated for the purposes of this Act, except as provided in clauses (1) and (2) of this subsection."

On page 26, line 5, beginning with "the obligations," in line 5, strike out all through line 6 and insert in lieu thereof "amounts specified in clauses (2) and (3) shall be determined from the date of expenditure of each such amount by the Secretary."

On page 29, beginning with line 20, strike out all through line 16 on page 30, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 12. There are authorized to be appropriated and credited to the helium production fund such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act, including contractual obligations incurred thereunder."

Mr. LAUSCHE. I understand that a limitation has been placed on what may be spent under the requirement that appropriations be made.

Mr. CARROLL. This is a serious question. There is a difference of opinion about it. In other words, the Secretary of the Interior can negotiate helium-purchase contracts with the gas and oil companies, for about $225 million. What is the consideration of the contractors? It is that they will build 12 helium plants. But they will sell the helium to the Government of the United States, which has control of the market for helium. There is now $7 million in the helium fund administered by the Bureau of Mines. I think that $7 million can be used, first to fulfill contracts, without any control by the Congress. If they exhaust that fund, then they could ask Congress to authorize them to borrow from the Treasury more money with which to meet the contracts.

In my opinion the Congress now has no control over the manner in which the contracts are executed and, in my opinion, has only indirect control over the borrowing. That will be thoroughly explored in the report on January 15 from the GAO.

We know that the General Accounting Office has gone on record against back-door financing procedures for years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded to the Senator from Colorado has expired.

Mr. CARROLL. Will my colleague yield to me an additional 5 minutes?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield an additional 5 minutes to my colleague.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado is recognized for an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, at this point I wish to call up my amendment, which I think is one of the key amendments. If it is not accepted, then, as I have said to the Senator from Arkansas, I will stay here all night, if necessary.

My amendment is at the desk. May I ask that the amendment be read? It is amendment No. 1.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Colorado will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 32, after line 2, to insert the following:

SEC. 3. The amendment made by this Act shall become effective on March 1, 1961.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, my amendment merely delays the effective date of the legislation until March 1, 1961.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CARROLL. I am happy to yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I have personally felt that the act should go into effect immediately. However, there is on page 17, starting with line 16, going over to lines 4 and 5, on page 18, a proviso that the "Secretary shall not make such contracts and agreements which shall require payments by the Government in any one fiscal year aggregating more than the amount which shall be established initially in an appropriation act and which may be increased from time to time in appropriation acts."

Therefore, since we find ourselves in this position at this particular point in the session, since it is very obvious that there is going to be no appropriation for this act at this session, and since it is just as obvious that there cannot be any appropriation until the first supplemental appropriation bill, I am personally willing to take it to conference and to assure my colleague that I will support it in conference.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Senator from Colorado.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CARROLL. Is it correct that my amendment has been accepted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct. The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. If the substitute is agreed to, it becomes a part of the bill.

Mr. CARROLL. I thank the Chair.

In response to the remarks of the senior Senator from Colorado, as to whether or not I agree with his point about appropriations, unless my amendment establishing an effective date were in the bill, I think contracts which were approved and executed would be binding and $7 million could be drawn from the helium fund to fulfill them without special congressional approval. Now contracts can be drafted but a binding contract cannot be made effective until March 1, 1961.

I think this provision will meet the objection raised by the Senator from Arkansas and the Senator from Ohio. We will take a look at it next year.

I want to make the record very clear. Certainly a new President and certainly a new Secretary of the Interior will not be bound by this bill with my amendment in it. In other words, they do not have to negotiate a single contract. There is no compulsion on the Secretary of the Interior to negotiate a contract. On the other hand, if a contract is negotiated, it would become effective, under the law, on March 1, 1961.

I thank the senior Senator from Colorado for yielding me 5 minutes of his time. I think we have stated rather clearly the purpose of the bill. I want to commend the members of the committee, who have been so cooperative in this matter.

The Senate proposal restores, finally and clearly, the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission on all helium bearing gas; secondly, we tell the FPC to make cost allocations on helium.

I understand an amendment will be offered containing the words "on a volumetric basis," but I am not going to hold up passage of the bill because it does not happen to meet with my full approval.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, earlier in the day I had sufficient time to discuss the bill upon its merits and to answer questions of various Senators about it. I do not wish either to encumber the RECORD or to take much further time on the bill.

However, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter on this general subject from Mr. Kuykendall, Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, dated June 17, 1960, addressed to Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON, which letter was a part of the hearings.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., June 17, 1960.

Re H.R. 10548, 86th Congress, to amend the Helium Act.

Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ANDERSON: We have been advised that at the hearing before your subcommittee on June 15 on the helium bill, H.R. 10548, consideration was given to the language of section 9 which relates to the authority of the Federal Power Commission under the Natural Gas Act. We understand that the first clause of this section is to be amended so that the Natural Gas Act "shall not be applicable to the sale, extraction, processing, transportation, or storage of helium either prior to or subsequent to 'the' separation 'of such helium' from the natural gas with which it is commingled, whether or not the provisions of such act applies to such natural gas," and so forth. The new language which we understand is acceptable to your subcommittee is single quoted.

This amendment would make it clear that the Commission's jurisdiction over natural gas which contains helium is not to be set aside by the bill, but that the Commission would have no jurisdiction over helium while it is commingled with natural gas or after it has been extracted.

It is understood that there was agreement by the subcommittee that all joint costs of exploring for, producing, gathering, and transporting natural gas containing helium should be allocated so that helium will bear its fair share. In other words, helium is to bear some part of the cost of exploration, production, gathering, and transporting to the extraction plant, as well as all proper extraction costs and costs after extraction. This is the principle for which the Commission has been urging consideration by the Congress, and since your subcommittee is in agreement with this principle there would seem to be no difficulty.

The last clause of section 9, however, forbids the allocation to helium of any exploration, production, gathering, processing, compression, transportation, or other costs which were or would have been incurred in the absence of the extraction of the helium. Obviously, if the helium content is 1 percent in volume and the costs are divided on a volume basis, as under the present practice of the Commission, 1 percent of the exploration, production, gathering, compression, and transportation costs up to the helium extraction plant should be allocated to helium. Otherwise, the consumers of the residue (99 percent) would be carrying these helium costs.

In order to carry out the above purposes, it is recommended that the last clause of section 9 (starting in line 9 of the May 3, 1960, print) be amended to read: "and if a cost of service method is used in determining the rates of a natural gas company under sections 4 and 5 of the Natural Gas Act, as amended, there shall be excluded (1) all income received from the sale of helium, (2) all direct costs incurred in the extraction, processing, compression, transportation, or storage of helium, and (3) that portion of joint costs of exploration, production, gathering, extraction, processing, compression, transportation, or storage properly allocable to helium."

With this amendment, the bill would not cast any additional burden on consumers and it is recommended that it be adopted.

Sincerely,

JEROME K. KUYKENDALL,
Chairman.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, the situation in which we find ourselves, as the junior Senator from Colorado has previously suggested, is that we have been in conference all afternoon in an attempt to find a way in which we could stop the wastage of this very valuable asset. It is my understanding, as I am sure it is that of other Senators, that by amending this bill slightly, there will be no question—I do not think there is any question now; in my opinion there never has been—of the Federal Power Commission's losing any rights in this matter.

I call up for reading the amendments which I have at the desk.

ASSISTANCE IN DEVELOPMENT OF LATIN AMERICA AND RECONSTRUCTION OF CHILE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] may be recognized?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the House has passed H.R. 13021, which is substantially the same as the bill passed by the Senate. It provides for assistance in the development of Latin America and in the reconstruction of Chile, and for other purposes. The changes which the House has made are very minor. They strike out the $100 million, which was already carried in our appropriation bill.

I hope the Senate will agree to the House bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 13021) to provide for assistance in the development of Latin America and in the reconstruction of Chile, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was read twice by its title, considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF THE HELIUM ACT OF SEPTEMBER 1, 1937, AS AMENDED

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10548) to amend the Helium Act of September 1, 1937, as amended, for the defense, security, and the general welfare of the United States.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I ask that my amendments be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments of the Senator from Colorado to the committee amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed:

On page 29, line 13, to strike the words: "under contract with the United States".

On page 29, line 19, to strike the period and insert at the end of the sentence, the words: "on a volumetric basis".

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I think the two amendments make very clear what I discussed this morning and what has been further discussed. These are amendments which those in the House feel are necessary. I believe, or hope, the House will accept the bill without a conference if the two amendments are agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amend-

ments to the committee amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado.

The amendments to the committee amendment were agreed to.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me so that I may make a comment on the bill before it is passed?

Mr. ALLOTT. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to the great fight made by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL] on this bill. I know natural gas users, all over America, if they knew what the Senator from Colorado has done in winning this fight, would be deeply grateful to him.

I have listened to the remarks, and I have studied the committee report and the individual views of the Senator from Colorado. I know if it had not been for the fight made by the Senator from Colorado the bill would have removed the Commission's present jurisdiction over the transportation and sale of natural gas containing helium. Secondly the authority to make proper cost allocation in considering revenues from the sale of helium extracted from natural gas would have been forbidden by the bill.

I think the Senator from Colorado has made an absolutely convincing case showing that the cost of the bill, if it had been passed in original form, would have been very great for the natural gas users.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article published in the national weekly newspaper Labor, about the gallant fight made by the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CARROLL HALTS PLOT BY NATURAL GAS CROWD TO KILL REGULATION AND SOCK CONSUMERS

One of the untold stories of the recent session of Congress concerns how one Senator appears to have stopped a major segment of the powerful natural gas industry from skipping out from under Federal regulation of its prices.

The Senator whose alertness upset this "sneak play" by the gas interests is JOHN CARROLL, a progressive Democrat from Colorado. Actually, the story is not over yet. Congress still has to complete action, at its August session, on the bill involved.

But CARROLL's sounding of the alarm seems to have knocked out the worst of the "sneak play," thereby probably saving consumers of natural gas many millions of dollars a year. Here's what happened:

Back in 1958, the Interior Department asked Congress to pass a bill to conserve America's supply of helium. Helium is a rare gas that's increasingly needed in defense projects. It is found combined with natural gas in the big gas fields of the Texas Panhandle, Oklahoma, Kansas, and Colorado. These fields supply gas to millions of consumers in the Midwest and West.

TRICKY SECTION IN BILL

At present, most of the helium from these fields is not separated from the natural gas and is just wasted. The Interior Department proposed to have the gas companies separate out this helium and then to have the Government store it underground for the Nation's future needs. This idea has won general approval. However, Congress did not act in 1958.

In mid-1959, after consulting with the gas industry, the Interior Department sent to Congress a modified bill. This bill contained a trickily worded new section, concerning exemptions from price regulation under the Natural Gas Act. The new section affected all gas containing helium.

At present the Federal Power Commission has authority to regulate natural gas prices to protect the consumer, but it has not seemed very active in using that authority. In the present case, however, the FPC did spot the danger in the "sneak play" section of the new helium bill.

The FPC last winter wrote the House Interior Committee, which was considering the helium bill. The sneak play section, said the FPC, might "remove the Commission's present jurisdiction over the transportation and sale of natural gas containing helium." It would in any event, the FPC said, penalize consumers of this gas by forbidding proper "cost allocation" to the helium in the gas.

Altogether, the FPC report warned, the sneak play section would "materially impair the effectiveness of this Commission's regulatory responsibilities with respect to natural gas matters."

The House committee, however, brushed aside these protests, relying on denials from the Interior Department. The bill containing the dubious section was reported out and passed by the House in early May on a voice vote, without this issue even being raised.

HALTS STEAMROLLER

The bill then went to the Senate and to its Interior Committee. That is when Senator CARROLL, who's a member of that committee, entered the picture. The Senate committee first held only a quickie 1-day hearing on the bill. But CARROLL put a stop to the "greased skids." As he recalls it:

"I insisted that the FPC witnesses be brought before the committee. They gave unequivocal and unqualified testimony that if we left in the language of the House bill, we would exempt from regulation under the Natural Gas Act all the gas which contained helium.

"This is an issue of immense importance to the consumers of the Nation," Carroll noted. Recalling the gas industry's many previous attempts to get out from regulation, he said: "This has been one of the great national political issues in recent years."

Working with Willard Gatchell, general counsel of the FPC, Carroll then persuaded the other members of the Senate committee to rewrite the section. This rewriting, according to CARROLL, removed the worst dangers to consumers in the bill.

At present the modified bill still has to pass the Senate and then be adjusted in conference with the House bill, which contains the original sneak play section. However, thanks to CARROLL's fight, it's expected the Senate version will prevail. Thus, due to the alertness of one progressive Senator, a major dodge by the gas industry has apparently been stopped.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] for his courtesy.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I think, with the addition of the amendments offered by the senior Senator from Colorado to section 11, there is no question whatsoever about jurisdiction.

Mr. President, I yield back my remaining time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute for the bill, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H.R. 10548) was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "An act to amend the Helium Act of March 3, 1925, as amended, for the defense, security, and the general welfare of the United States."

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AVAILABILITY OF EXCESS PROPERTY TO STATE AND COUNTY AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION SERVICES

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, it is most encouraging that the Budget Bureau has given approval to a proposal making excess property available to State and county agricultural extension services. I am especially glad that Senator ELLENDER, chairman of our Senate Agriculture Committee, has introduced, by request, S. 3671, to carry out the program recommended by the Budget Bureau. This bill would place extension service on an equal status with other Government agencies receiving excess property. It would authorize the State extension services to utilize the facilities and services available to Federal agencies for the purpose of acquiring personal property, supplies and services, including the making of purchases from Federal supply service stores and Federal supply schedules required to carry out the extension program.

Last year a special subcommittee of the Government Operations Committee held extensive hearings on my bill, S. 1018, designed to make surplus property available to State extension services. As a result of these hearings and conferences with the administration, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and General Services in an administrative ruling determined that State and county extension services are by law components of State agricultural colleges, and as such are eligible to receive donations for Federal surplus personal property. The committee report on S. 1018 had the following to say:

The committee has noted the suggestion which has been made that excess Federal property could be made available to these agricultural extension agencies, were the act of May 8, 1914, further amended in such a way as to establish such agencies as an integral part of the Department of Agriculture for administrative purposes, but took the view that this should be done by the

appropriate jurisdictional committees. The committee believes that this suggestion would not only make possible the transfer of excess property from other Federal agencies to the Department of Agriculture for use by such State and county extension service agencies but would, in addition, further clarify their status with respect to their eligibility in Federal procurement and general supply support.

S. 3671 would carry out the recommendations made by the Senate Government Operations Committee.

Mr. President, the Cooperative Extension Service has an active program in over 3,000 counties. The State extension service directors have the responsibility for carrying out the educational program for the Department of Agriculture and are subject to various laws applicable to Federal employees. They are an important part of the land grant college system and as such should have the full use of Federal supply stores and GSA stores.

If this bill is adopted, procedures would be established whereby requisitions could be handled by the State extension office at a central point and the supply needs of county extension offices would be included in the requisitions issued by the State office. This procedure is now being followed in the present authority for State extension services in purchasing GSA stores supplies. S. 3671 will expand this authority to include more complete use of GSA facilities including the right to purchase under Federal supply schedules. These schedules are, in effect, contracts entered into by the Federal Government with private industry under which items are purchased by Government agencies direct from private industry. Items obtainable under Federal supply schedules would include photographic equipment—projectors, cameras, screens, and so forth—reproduction and mailing equipment, office machines—adding machines, calculators, and various types of office equipment—and equipment not stocked by regional GSA stores depots.

Mr. President, this bill would provide a means whereby the State extension services could meet a part of their needs in an orderly and sound way. It would provide a system whereby benefits of excess property would be passed on to this important agricultural agency and would set up other procedures which would result in a great saving to the State extension service and the Federal Government.

I hope that this is one of the first bills which the Senate Agriculture Committee will consider and approve during the next session of Congress.

THE SONG OF THE BANDER-LOG

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, we are told that we are at the tail end of this "bobtail" session of the 86th Congress. The "Jack-in-the-box" is ready to spring. We have only a few days, perhaps only hours, left before we pick up our marbles and go home.

What has the Senate of the United States accomplished?

We are still shooting at the majority leader's five major legislative targets, and we have not had a bull's-eye yet.

When this special session was called to order, there were many optimistic predictions of the great work which we were to do on these five issues; namely, minimum wage legislation, health insurance for the aged, Federal aid for education, housing, and common situs picketing. In one form or another, all of these issues were on the lists of the legislative "musts" named by the majority leader and his leader, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

The American people were expecting to be led across the "new frontier." What has happened? We have hardly gotten out of the garage.

The failure of the Congress to get more work done is going to take a great deal of explaining.

We heard a lot of efforts at that this afternoon by the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts and by other Senators who were seeking to explain away the lack of accomplishments at this session. The Democrats in the Congress have two-thirds of the votes. In addition, there are a number of Republicans who favor and support the five legislative "must" items laid down by the majority leadership.

Mr. President, I opposed the calling of this special session in July when we voted to do so. At that time I made my position very clear. I said, among other things:

The Congress is now in recess until August. It will return to Washington to continue its work after the presidential nominating conventions and prior to the election.

Actually, its work could have been completed before the Los Angeles convention and should have been completed. Any activity by the Congress in August will be far more political than productive.

From the first day of this session, everyone knew that the Democratic National Convention was to open on July 11. Only inept leadership or determined political strategy could have brought about a post-convention session of Congress. The first is inexcusable and the latter indefensible.

Proper planning and scheduling of legislation in each House could have brought all essential bills to the floor for final action before July 9. Determination to have and to use a post-convention session of the Congress as a political sounding board for partisan political advantage is inconsistent with the constitutional responsibilities of the Congress.

It is evident that any congressional action in August will be influenced more by its specific potentialities for November 8 than by its general benefits for the Nation in the years ahead.

Better planning—and more work—would have eliminated the need for an August session. For example, Democrats in the Senate spent 2 solid months in a filibuster against civil rights legislation designed to protect the voting rights of all those qualified to vote under State law.

In the House of Representatives, there were many weeks when the Democratic leadership scheduled for consideration no significant legislation. Now Congress is to return next month, after the national conventions in a presidential election year, supposedly to make serious and sound evaluations on a number of highly controversial and politically explosive issues.

It can't be done. Intelligent and constructive legislative results will not materialize in a politically explosive atmosphere.

An atmosphere of frenzied partisanship, which is bound to exist after the two political parties have had their conventions, is no atmosphere in which to pass on legislation of far-reaching importance.

In 1948, when I was a Representative, Congress returned to Washington after the national conventions and before the election. There was virtually nothing accomplished. It was a purely political spectacle. There was politics in practically every speech and every vote. Moreover, many Members were absent campaigning.

In spite of the important legislation that remains to be enacted, I am not at all optimistic about the atmosphere that will exist when this Congress reconvenes next month.

It was on the basis of that, Mr. President, that I voted against the motion to adjourn the session until this month. I felt there was a very great danger that Congress would be tempted to play politics with destiny. The work which at that time remained to be done in July could have been done in the regular session if we had not marked time for months earlier in the year. It should have been done before we recessed for the political conventions. Nevertheless, given the fact that some of the people's business remained undone, we should have waited until after the election to attend to it.

Perhaps it was poetic justice that this special session—charged with the spirit of a national campaign—should fail. The whole idea of a special session was a mistake from first to last. It was politically designed to gain partisan advantage. The attempt has failed.

The majority leadership returned to the Halls of the Congress of the United States with hammer in hand to construct their Los Angeles platform in these already crowded Chambers—nail by nail and plank by plank. It is not surprising that they failed.

Let us examine the record:

The minimum wage bill is dead. It passed the Senate, where I voted for it, as did many of my Republican colleagues.

A more limited minimum wage bill also passed the House. The House conferees were stubbornly adamant in their determination to hold to the House bill.

We heard a great deal this afternoon from the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts about the minimum wage conference and about the action of the House conferees. I call attention to the fact that, of the five Democratic House conferees, three of the five consistently voted against the Senator's position throughout this conference. The Senate conferees were stubborn, too. Rather than accept some measure of progress, they chose to go to the people. The people will be a little poorer for it, but that does not seem to matter.

What about health insurance for the aged? The Anderson amendment to establish a program along the lines of the Forand bill failed in the Senate. It failed by a 2-to-1 vote in the House Ways and Means Committee, and it never even got to the House Rules Committee.

The real reason the Anderson amendment failed, we are told, is because Republicans would not vote for it. The Senate is divided 2 to 1 in favor of the Democrats, and yet on important must

legislation, it is claimed that Republican votes are needed to convert two-thirds into one-half. That is not even good first-grade arithmetic.

Federal aid-for-education legislation and housing legislation, are still in the House Rules Committee. They should not be, but they are. As far as I can see, little really intensive energy on the part of the majority has been devoted to "blasting" these bills out of Rules Committee and bringing them up for action. All the activity I have witnessed in this important regard has been criticism of the committee and its members.

On common situs picketing, the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee has yet to report a bill to the Senate. The Senate has not acted and obviously will not act on this issue. We have not even sent a bill to the House, and yet from reading the news, one would think it was the House Rules Committee again which had prevented the Senate from acting.

There are a number of other issues not on the must list which nevertheless are of great importance.

What about the farm bill which has been passed by the Senate, or better yet, the one promised by the Democratic candidate? What about the several bills which would give to the Secretary of State some measure of authority with regard to passports? War-claims legislation is ready for action. We desperately need more judges, and a judgeship bill is presently on the Senate calendar. Immigration legislation is urgently needed. A depressed-area bill, which I think should be agreeable to many of us, has been introduced and is in committee.

All of these matters are of vital importance. All have been the subject of committee hearings and are ready for further action. This is a part of the Congress' unfinished business. It is the people's unfinished business. It should be attended to before we abandon our posts in Washington and head for the "hustings."

I do not for a moment deny that the Congress has done some things. The majority defeated an effort to enact a very modest civil rights measure. The Congress drastically cut the President's request for mutual security funds. We passed a resolution to tell the President how to appoint Justices to the Supreme Court. We passed some routine appropriations bills and some social security amendments.

It would seem a far cry from Kipling to the Congress—from poetry to politics—but in the first Jungle Book there is the famous Road-Song of the Bander-Log, and some of the lines I find most germane to the spirit of the present session.

As a prefatory remark, let me say that those who are familiar with the Jungle Book know that the Bander-Log was the name given to certain jungle creatures equipped with prehensile tails and accustomed to foregather in branches—not legislative branches, I hasten to add.

The Kipling lines I want to recite must not be taken as a direct parallel. Such a parallel might lose me some good friends in this body. But, as Senators hear the lines, I am certain that their poetic justice will wash away any trace of malice that might otherwise be read into them.

And so I quote from Kipling's Road Song of the Bander-Log:

Here we sit in a branchy row,
Thinking of beautiful things we know.
Dreaming of deeds that we mean to do,
All complete, in a minute or two—
Something noble and wise and good,
Done by merely wishing we could.

I cannot conclude, however, without citing one positive and affirmative accomplishment of this session. It has given Members the chance to get better acquainted—not with the great issues of our day—but with each other.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCOTT. I was interested in the obsequies by which the distinguished Senator from New York commemorates the demise of a session which should never have been born. As it was said as an epitaph on the tombstone of a very young child:

If I were to be so soon done for,
What on earth was I begun for?

I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from New York if he is aware of an article published in the Washington Star of August 31 which quotes a dispatch from Ocean City, Md., of August 30, and which in turn quotes a very distinguished Member of the majority party, the Speaker of the House, whom we all love, as saying—

The President knows little about the legislative process. Otherwise, he would not have called the special session of Congress.

I am confused. I did not know that President Eisenhower had called this August session of Congress. Since the Senator from New York has an encyclopedic memory and a knowledge which is always ready, would the Senator from New York inform me whether or not President Eisenhower called this special session of Congress?

Mr. KEATING. No; the President did not call this session. The Senator will remember that back in 1948, when he and I were Members of the House of Representatives, President Truman called a special session of Congress. It was generally conceded that he made a good deal of political hay out of it. I have assumed—I believe correctly—that the purpose of calling this session was the same as in 1948. I do not believe that the same results will eventuate. Of course, only time will tell.

Mr. SCOTT. The Senator has quoted from Rudyard Kipling. In the few minutes in which the Senator was engaged in doing so, I was reminded of one of the lesser known works of Rudyard Kipling, The Imperial Rescript, which he wrote in 1890. If the Senator will indulge me, I should like to ask him if he would indicate whether he believes that the parody I have written epitomizes the August session of Congress. With apologies to Rudyard Kipling's Imperial Rescript, my "unfinished parody" goes like this:

This is the tale of the session
The Texas two decreed
To ease the folks of their taxes,
To gain them votes in their need.
The lords of their party assembled;
East and the West they came—
LYNDON and SCOOP and HUBERT,
JACK and Mister SAM.

Some were faithful to farmers,
Some were devoted to toil,
Yes, some were loyal to labor,
And some were loyal to oil.

I must confess that I wrote this rather hurriedly, in the last 3 minutes. However, does the Senator believe that it describes the August session of Congress?

Mr. KEATING. I must say that your verse is very descriptive. If Kipling were alive today he would have real competition in my friend from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCOTT. I do not wish to compete with Mr. Kipling. Those of us who have spent most of the month of August here have been doing nothing more than kippling and piddling anyway.

I think the session has been unfortunately long because of the tragic failure of leadership. We came here hoping that the majority leader's leader would guide us into paths of enlightenment, that we would see great gains accomplished for the people of the country, that we would see at least a part of the promises made so gaily at Los Angeles realized at least to a minor degree of fulfillment, that we would see some respect for the requests of the President of the United States, who for 5 years or more has requested Congress to act in matters of the public interest, and then asked us to act on approximately 22 measures. I had hoped that we would act on more than one. Therefore, the batting average of the majority is .045, which is not even a good bush league showing.

I commiserate with the Senator from New York because he and I and others have absented ourselves from our families and loved ones and from our opportunity, perhaps, to be of some service to our constituents, in order to sit here during a fruitless, useless, bootless, footless session of Congress, for no better purpose than to enable the majority to seek vainly to achieve some political advantage from a session which unfortunately, as I said, should never have been called. The Senator from New York and I voted against holding the session, of course. I believe that time—and perhaps Newsweek—will prove us right.

I commend the Senator from New York for raising the question. We had hoped that the majority leader's leader, the junior Senator from Massachusetts, who was absent on official business in Hyannis Port last Saturday, while we were debating the medical care for the aged bill, would give us some leadership and some enlightenment and some guidance. We had hoped that as we gathered here, he would lead and unite his party. Having failed in August to lead and unite his party, one wonders whether, in view of the fact that he will have no more to lead in the Senate and in the other body than he has now, and perhaps, by the will of the people, considerably less, he will be able to do any better in January toward leading and uniting his party than he has been able to do in August. I wonder if the Senator from New York agrees with me.

Mr. KEATING. I hope that the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts will still be joining forces with the distinguished majority leader in the next Congress in trying to enact legislation, and that they will consider properly and with due deliberation the recommendations made to them by the incoming President in his State of the Union Message and other messages, and that they will give due deliberation to them. I am sure that if the next President, President NIXON, should recommend legislation along the lines of the five programs that have been mentioned, and others, the distinguished majority leader and the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] will give every consideration to that legislation.

I hope that they will agree with the new President's views on these important subjects. The distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania and I will stand shoulder to shoulder with them, when we feel they are right. Oftentimes they are right, and I have often found myself in complete agreement with the distinguished majority leader and with the Senator from Massachusetts.

I do not wish to yield the floor without saying that I bear for both of them a very real affection. I hope to serve in this body with them for many years to come.

Mr. SCOTT. I agree with the Senator from New York that both of us look forward with pleasure to serving in this distinguished body for a long time to come with the majority leader and the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts; for whom we have great respect.

However, does not the Senator from New York agree with me that it is indeed deplorable that 1,400,000 citizens will be deprived of coverage under the minimum wage bill and millions more deprived of an increase in minimum wage payments because of what some of us may be so bold as to designate partisan or petulant reactions which caused the collapse of the conference on the minimum wage bill, and caused us to substitute a demagogic issue in a political campaign rather than sincere and effective legislative action? Would it not have been better to have a bill to benefit many plain, average people, than to have an issue for two political candidates?

Mr. KEATING. I quite agree with the views expressed by the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania. As the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] has pointed out, more than 3 million would be covered—not one and a half million, but 3 million—if there had been a disposition to take the first amendment which he offered in the conference.

I think that if the conferees went back tonight, they could still meet and could still reach an agreement. I think the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts could exert his leadership upon the House Members, on the Democratic side. There are five of them, three of them constantly voting against him, and two of them with him. If he were to exert his leadership upon them to bring about an agreement, and if the views of the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] were accepted, it might well be possible to have constructive legislation now rather than just a political issue. We would have legislation which would benefit over 3 million Americans.

Mr. SCOTT. Does the distinguished Senator from New York know why the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts has been unable, so far, to exert his leadership over the Members of his own party in the other body? To me, this is a puzzlement, a matter which I cannot understand. I followed with great interest the proceedings at Los Angeles and was under the impression that the junior Senator from Massachusetts, whom we all respect, was greeted as the leader of a united party; that the Members of his party in both Chambers of Congress would hasten to follow his merest nod, indeed, his slightest beckoning, his mildest wish. But all of a sudden we find that the entire picture in the other body is a repudiation, of the leadership of the junior Senator from Massachusetts, to say nothing of this body—of which, perhaps, the less said the better—with regard to the leadership of the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KEATING. It is inexplicable to me why the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts, as the leader of his party, has not been able, at least, to convince his own party in the House of Representatives that they should produce action on at least one of the five major matters which we were called back into session to consider. I have no answer for it. The distinguished junior Senator from Massachuestts will have to answer that question himself. I am not able to answer for him.

Mr. SCOTT. I thank the Senator from New York. As the Senator knows, I come from Philadelphia, where I am a strong supporter of the Phillies baseball team, which is now at the bottom of the National League. However, although the batting average of the Phillies is unfortunately low, as the Senator from New York knows, it is considerably in excess of the batting average of the junior Senator from Massachusetts. [Laughter.]

Mr. KEATING. It is not only in excess of his batting average, but also in excess of the batting average of Congress in this special session.

Mr. SCOTT. Indeed, it is; and it makes me feel better about the future of the Phillies.

Mr. KEATING. I am sure it should.

Mr. SCOTT. Meanwhile, I rejoice in the prowess of the Pittsburgh Pirates, "than whom there is no whicher." [Laughter.]

Mr. KEATING. I agree with the Senator from Pennsylvania.

NEW NATIONS

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, a matter of great concern to us in America, and throughout the world, is the large number of new nations gaining independence and admission to the United Nations.

Of course, the mere number is of least importance in considering the whole problem.

The crux of this problem lies in the low degree of readiness, in some instances, of these various territories and colonies to attain and develop stable governments and stable economies, and to assure some degree of protection to the millions of people they undertake to represent.

This subject has long been a matter of concern to me. In April of this year, I asked the Library of Congress to compile a list of these nations, and to furnish me with selected data, of a statistical nature, reflecting the degree of progress made in these new nations. The tables they prepared are revealing, yet objective. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONS GAINING INDEPENDENCE SINCE 1941 [1]

	Lebanon	Syria	Jordan	Israel	India	Ceylon
Population	1,525,000	3,722,000	1,329,174	1,789,075	357,440,025	8,098,637.
Percent of annual growth	3.0 percent [2]	3.6 percent [2]	2.9 percent [2]	4.1 percent [2]	1.3 percent [2]	2.5 percent. [2]
Arable acres of land	691.9	8,737.5	1,186.1	981.0	324,528.8	3,498.9.
Arable land per capita (acres)	0.6	2.7	0.9	0.8	0.9	0.5.
Literacy rate				94 percent	20 percent	58 percent.
Life expectancy:						
Male				66.3	32.4	
Female				69.5	31.7	
Inhabitants per physician	1,200	5,000	6,100	450	6,000	6,000.
Road miles per 1,000 square miles:						
Improved	523.8	79.0	69.4	191.5	153.4	257.6.
Unimproved	172.8	7.1		46.0	58.4	434.2.
Electric power per capita (kilowatt-hour per year)				149 [3]	10 [3]	5. [3]
Chief source of national revenue	Fruits, tobacco, cotton.	Cotton, grains, soap.	Phosphate, wool, olive oil.	Citrus fruits, minerals, wheat, autos.	Grains, spices, textiles, minerals.	Tea, rubber, agriculture.
GNP per capita	358 [4]	142 [4]	111 [4]	982 [4]	76 [4]	130. [4]
Armed forces					357,000 [5]	
U.N. admission date	Charter member	Charter member	1955	1949	Charter member	1955.

See footnotes at end of table.

NATIONS GAINING INDEPENDENCE SINCE 1941 [1]—Continued

	Burma	Indonesia	Libya	Sudan	Morocco	Tunisia	Ghana
Population	19,677,000	84,982,000	1,091,830	10,231,507	9,823,000	3,782,480	4,118,480.
Percent of annual growth	1.0 percent [3]	1.7 percent [2]	1.3 percent [2]		1.8 percent [2]	1.3 percent [3]	1.6 percent.[3]
Arable acres of land	21,112.2	27,181.0		5,888.4	19,609.9	9,587.5	13,121.0.
Arable land per capita (acres)	1.1	0.4		0.7	2.3	2.8	3.1.
Literacy rate	40 percent	8 percent			50 percent		
Inhabitants per physician		65,000		50,000	8,800	6,700	29,000.
Road miles per 1,000 square miles:							
Improved	47.6	75.9	3.0	0.3	89.0	97.1	59.5.
Unimproved	49.8			47.0	205.3	51.6	39.2.
Electric power per capita (kilowatt-hours per year).		4 [3]	25 [3]	3 [3]	38 [3]	30 [3]	21.[3]
Chief source of national revenue.	Teakwood agriculture.	Oil, tin, rubber, rice.	Leather articles, carpets.	Cotton, gum arabic, hides.	Eggs and poultry, hides, wool.	Wheat, agriculture, minerals.	Cacao, rubber, manganese, gold.
GNP per capita	53 [4]	59 [4]	107 [4]	70 [4]	169 [4]	190 [4]	210.[4]
Armed forces		120,000 [5]					
Un admission date	1948	1950	1955	1956	1956	1956	1957.

	Guinea	Laos	Cambodia	South Vietnam	Malaya	Mauritania, 1961
Population	2,256,900	1,260,000	5,073,000	11,000,000	6,276,915	546,400.
Percent of annual growth	2.8 percent [2]	3.5 percent [2]			2.4 percent [2]	3.9 percent.[2]
Arable acres of land		2,520.4	6,177.5		5,191.6	
Arable land per capita (acres)		2.1	1.7		1.0	
Literacy rate					38 percent	
Inhabitants per physician					10,000	
Road miles per 1,000 square miles:						
Improved					99.9	
Unimproved					13.7	
Electric power per capita (kilowatt-hours per year)		1 [3]			36 [3]	
Chief source of national revenue	Bauxite, bananas, coffee.	Rice, tobacco, cotton.	Rubber, fish, minerals.	Rubber, coffee	Tin, rubber, copra.	Cattle, gum, salt.
GNP per capita	115 [4]	50 [4]	94 [4]	152 [4]	250 [4]	150 [4].
Armed forces				150,000 [6]		
U.N. admission date	1958	1955	1955		1957	

NATIONS [7] SCHEDULED TO RECEIVE INDEPENDENCE IN 1960

	Nigeria, Oct. 1, 1960	Somalia	Cameroun, Jan. 1, 1960	Togoland, Apr. 27, 1960	Western Samoa	Belgian Congo, June 30, 1960 [8]	Cyprus, 1960
Population	29,780,879	1,280,000	3,077,080	1,000,000	97,327	12,956,950	450,114.
Percent of annual growth	1.9 percent [2]	0.8 percent [2]	0.8 percent [2]	1.0 percent [2]	2.6 percent [2]	1.9 percent [2]	1.5 percent.[2]
Arable acres of land		19,711.2	17,297.0	2,391.9	81.5	121,079.0	1,072.4.
Arable land per capita (acres)		15.8	5.8	2.4	1.0	10.8	2.2.
Literacy rate						37 percent	56 percent.
Life expectancy:							
Male							63.6.
Female							68.8.
Inhabitants per physician	51,000	25,000	25,000	35,000	2,500	22,000	1,300.
Road miles per 1,000 square miles:							
Improved	82.0	41.8	24.6	35.1		69.9	746.6.
Unimproved			14.9	58.5	79.4		
Electric power per capita (kilowatt-hours per year).	4 [3]	5 [3]	23 [3]	1 [3]	21 [3]	54 [3]	139.[3]
Chief source of national revenue.	Tin, cocoa, vegetable oils.	Bananas, hides	Cocoa, coffee	Coffee, cocoa, palm oil.	Copra, cocoa	Copper, cotton	Copper, agriculture.
GNP per capita	81 [4]	39 [4]	150 [4]	150 [4]		85 [4]	415.[4]

[1] Unless otherwise noted, statistical information has been obtained from the Encyclopedia Britannica World Atlas, Geographical Summaries and Geographical Comparisons Section, pp. 1–25, Walter Yust, editor, 1959.
[2] Statistical Yearbook, Statistical Office of the United Nations, New York, 1958, pp. 21–39.
[3] Figures computed from total kilowatt-hours (Statistical Yearbook, Statistical Office of the United Nations, New York, 1958, pp. 258–264) divided by total population.
[4] Office of Statistics Reports, International Cooperation Administration, 1960. Estimates are in U.S. dollars.
[5] Washington Star, Sept. 27, 1959: C3.
[6] Only figures for entire Vietnam available.
[7] Every other nation has fewer than 100,000 men in its combined forces—which makes them little more than domestic police forces for local emergencies and natural disasters.
[8] Figures for Belgium and Luxembourg based on combined figures for both countries.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I do not, of course, insert these tables in the RECORD to embarrass anyone, or to disparage the progress these territories and countries have made so far. I think, however, that they demonstrate the need for a careful look at the realities of life. These are vital statistics. Many are missing, for they are not available.

We should not rush in to grant them full U.N membership nor to otherwise accept them in the family of nations. Surely history will record the folly of precipitate independence and premature recognition of these former colonies as nations.

I think that the United Nations should, as a practical matter, require proof of years of experience in each of these nations under a stable government. I believe this should be a prerequisite for full membership in the United Nations.

Independence is a hard-won right. It is a priceless privilege. But mere independence does not entitle a people or a government to other hard-won privileges. They must be worked for, too. An economy must be developed and stabilized. An educational system must be created and developed. A representative government, the crowning achievement of human endeavor, must be built on these foundations. Such developments do not happen overnight. They are the result of years of unselfish and dedicated effort, of struggle and of sacrifice, of self-discipline and self-denial. Certainly we in the United States, ourselves the product of a war for independence, are sympathetic and stand ready to offer moral support and encouragement to these new nations' effort to improve their lot. But we cannot do the job for them.

We cannot, as a practical matter, undertake to support them for an indefinite period, financially. They have a long period, extending at least for decades and perhaps for a century or more, to experience the responsibility of independence, and to grow and take their place on economic and other bases among the leaders of the world. It seems foolish to prematurely admit these nations, in large numbers, and permit them to assume membership in the U.N. along with the United States, and along with other countries whose civilizations have shaped world culture and have proved their worth by their endurance for centuries.

Further, we are, by permitting the admission of a large number of former colonies, greatly weakening and diluting the vote of the United States and other major powers in the United Nations.

An excellent article on this subject was published in the New York Times of August 28, 1960. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit I.)

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, France alone, has subdivided its African holdings into a large number of smaller nations, and eight of them have been approved for admission in the United Nations this week by the Security Council. These eight countries will be in a position of voting strength to outweigh the United States, Great Britain, Italy, Norway, and Sweden, with two votes to spare. Yet none of them have had any appreciable experience in self-government, no experience in the discipline of independence. They have no industrial complex to guarantee their position in the competition in the peaceful pursuits of commerce and trade.

Mr. President, it seems to me to be nothing less than tragic that membership in the United Nations is being diluted to the extent that it is bound to cause its deterioration rather than its growth as a strong power and influence in world affairs. The U.N. had a membership of 51 in 1945, a membership of 76 in 1955, and will have 97 members at the end of 1960.

At the same time, while the United Nations is trying to absorb these new nations, to digest this upswing in its membership, to adjust and accommodate them, it itself is going dangerously close to internal intervention in the Congo. Of course, I realize that the United Nations, in the case of Korea, sent troops in to fight. I think, in the Congo, that United Nations activities should be limited to evacuation of refugees and other strictly emergency activities.

Further, I think the State Department and our foreign policy planners have been remiss in not coming up with workable plans to meet these emergencies, or to head them off, wherever possible. We have, for too long, been relying on the stagnant policy of rushing in with money and other aid when emergencies strike. I think at least half of the art of diplomacy is anticipation of crises—preparation for emergencies and preventive action. For too long we have been caught by surprise by a series of emergencies which should have been predictable. The emergence of all these new nations, with their varying degrees of industrial, economic, social, governmental, and cultural development, is sure to precipitate crises. There should be a strong and positive part of our foreign policy directed toward foreseeable crises. They will surely come. In some instances the peace-loving nations of the world now have the initiative, but that will surely be lost if we do not root out the cause of discontent and strife and use every peaceful means to prevent violence and bloodshed. In too many instances lately, the State Department has stood helplessly by, ineffectually guarding the rights and property of our people. I think a firmed-up, more assertive foreign policy is critically needed, and that steps in that direction should not await the outcome of the elections in November.

In summary, I think we in the United States are making foolhardy mistakes in our attitude toward the United Nations and in our own foreign policy. Instead of providing leadership, we have reduced ourselves to such a spineless, passive role that America can be slandered with impunity, outmaneuvered in the Organization of American States, American property can be confiscated, and American servicemen can be brutally attacked without the opportunity to defend their very lives. There will be, there can be, no adequate redress for this unprovoked attack. There will be no true respect for the United States until we reestablish, by a firm and positive foreign policy, our rightful place in the affairs of the world.

Our soldiers, too, Mr. President, as the Senate knows, are stationed in more than 39 nations around the globe, and our men in uniform are in even a larger number of nations. But some of them are being beaten over the head with rifles and bludgeoned. However, so far as I am able to ascertain, no plans are being made for their protection or to hold someone accountable for such conduct. Such things have happened, not only recently, but many times over the past few years. I think that fact alone is evidence of a weakness on our part and of a retrogression and of a degeneration of our position and our prestige in world affairs. But certainly we should let others know that we are going to protect our own men in uniform just as we would protect against an invasion of our own territory.

But in addition to the drift I have outlined, it is also seriously proposed that the Connally amendment be repealed at a time when the United Nations, instead of growing strong and becoming more powerful, under the present system is being diluted and hence is growing weaker.

So even though I favor the idea of a strong world court, someday, I think it is highly impractical to make the change now; and I use that as an illustration of the trend of the time. I wish the country would be told something more about plans to deal with and to meet the conditions I have briefly outlined with reference to new territories becoming nations, instead of merely raising a hope that things will get better in the future; instead we go even farther toward taking away some of the safeguards we now have.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the exhibit to which I have previously referred be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT I

[From the New York Times, Aug. 28, 1960]

NEW AFRICAN STATES SHIFT U.N. SCALES—NEWLY INDEPENDENT STATES WILL ALTER THE POWER BLOCS THAT HAVE EXISTED IN THE WORLD AGENCY

(By Lindesay Parrott)

African states are playing a bigger part than ever before in the United Nations. The story of the U.N. and the Congo has made clearer than ever the emergence of a new group of states that must be considered and that other nations might do well to court.

For instance, Secretary General Hammarskjold's newly created Advisory Committee on the Congo has an African majority. African states having contributed a majority of troops in the United Nations force in the Congo.

The Advisory Committee was not precisely what some of the more nationalistic African states—"Africa for the Africans"—had wanted. Nor was it what the Soviet Union wanted. Nevertheless, it was strongly African, and the Secretary General for the first time was dealing with representatives, en bloc, of the new nations he more than any other single man has helped to create from former colonies, protectorates, and United Nations trusteeship territories.

SOVIET PROPOSAL

In the long Security Council debate last Sunday night and Monday morning, the Soviet delegate had proposad an Asian and African group that would meet in Leopoldville—not at United Nations headquarters—and report "daily" to the Council.

That proposal was withdrawn when it seemed to have no outside support and Mr. Hammarskjold won the right to name his own committee and have it talk with him in New York.

Nine of the fifteen participating nations are African—Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, Liberia, the Mali Federation, Morocco, the Sudan, Tunisia, and the United Arab Republic.

Meanwhile, the most recent figures on the composition of the United Nations forces in the Congo showed how much the crisis there had become "an African show." Of 14,491 troops actually in the Congo August 20, a total of 12,545 were from African states.

They are, of course, under the general direction of Mr. Hammarskjold, operating in turn under decisions of the Security Council, where Africa is much more slightly represented—the contingent currently has one member, Mongi Slim of Tunisia. The United Nations troops have a Swedish commander, Maj. Gen. Carl Carlson von Horn, and there are Irish, Swedish and Asian soldiers alongside the Africans.

The Africans, however, hold the military as well as the advisory balance, something that could not have been predicted in the United Nations a few years ago. The emergence is sharply underlined.

The situation marks a progressive development in the United Nations as the old empires have broken down since the organization began just after World War II.

In the early days, when the United Nations consisted of 51 members, with 20 Latin American states as the biggest bloc, the Western countries often could sweep the field. That is the explanation of some early Communist walkouts.

PACKAGE DEALS

Package deals, in which Western-oriented and Communist-oriented nations were admitted equally, scarcely can be said to have upset the scale. The historic factors behind the change in the balance of power include the decomposition of first the British, then the Dutch, and now the French colonial territories into the many newly independent nations.

Two upshots have become rather evident in the United Nations recently. One is that the Communist countries, originally a small group, have been given a new field in which to fish—the recently independent nations. Another is that the old colonial powers now must speak softly if they want the support of the countries they have created, or allowed to depart.

The situation of the newly emerging states here frankly has alarmed some delegates. Under the current rules, the arrangement is

"one nation, one vote"—much as New Mexico in the U.S. Senate casts a vote equal to that of New York.

Possibly, when the United Nations was set up in 1945, a system of weighted voting might have been established. It has been suggested since then by Sir Winston Churchill and others. The idea was that votes should be counted according to the amount of money and efforts various states put into the world organization.

Nobody expects any "weighted voting" proposal to get anywhere now, however. In fact, it will never be introduced. The smaller nations are too accustomed to making their speeches in the world organization, casting their votes and then looking around for technical assistance to want to change the system.

Certainly, African representatives in the United Nations are listened to with far more attention and with far more respect than would have been the case some years ago.

With special regard to the Congo situation, United Nations observers have noted that within the last fortnight some African states, such as the Congo, Guinea, and Ghana, have "talked tough," to Mr. Hammarskjold in a way that probably would have been inconceivable some years ago. Mr. Hammarskjold, the consummate diplomat, has talked back, too. His language has been more measured, but probably the firmest he has ever employed.

NO GREAT CHANGE

There is little belief among experienced diplomats, however, that the shift in voting strength means that new states will now rule the United Nations. For many years to come the great powers still must provide the financing of the world organization. The United States, for instance, still pays about a third of the total costs. And most of the new nations, although responsible for dues and assessments, are more likely to be seeking technical assistance than providing funds. Also, some of the blocs are less actual "bloc" units than informal discussion groups within the great discussion group that is the United Nations. Among the Latin Americans, for instance, Fidel Castro of Cuba and Generalissimo Trujillo of the Dominican Republic are controversial subjects.

Most of the new African states coming in this year will arrive as independent nations. But some will arrive also as members of the French community of nations. Doubtless, they will vote together with the other Africans on issues of colonialism and of African interest. How they may hold together on other questions is a matter that French diplomats admit is still a puzzle.

With 97 nations sitting in the General Assembly—more if Nigeria and Mauritania should be admitted late in the coming session—the battle of the blocs, however it goes, is certain to be long drawn out this year.

NEW MEMBERS

In the great Asian-African grouping, the Asians previously have had 20 nations and the Africans 9. This year, with the new admissions, the African states will number at least 23.

Precisely what effect the new African votes may have on the United Nations is still not clear. In the Congo crisis, some of the older African members certainly restrained some of the younger states from going overboard in demands on the United Nations.

Mr. Hammarskjold certainly took advantage of the situation. When he asked the Security Council to endorse his policy in the Congo, he probably had most of the African nations on his side.

Nevertheless, the question bears heavily on the structure of the United Nations and its utility to the world community in future years. What the African situation and the admission of the new, small nations may eventually demand are answers to the questions: Is the United Nations to be a mere voting forum, in which each nation may blow off steam and cast an equal vote with larger neighbors? Or is it to be an organization that can reach decisions, implement them, and pay for them, too?

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

AMENDMENT OF SECTIONS 22, 23, AND 24, TITLE 13, UNITED STATES CODE, AND CLASSIFICATION ACT STATUS OF BUREAU OF CENSUS EMPLOYEES

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House bill 12043, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 12043) to amend sections 22, 23, and 24, title 13, United States Code, and for other purposes.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, it has been customary during certain periods of expansion in the Census Bureau to promote career employees in the Bureau of the Census for temporary periods, after which they would revert to their former positions.

Under legislation enacted 2 years ago, referred to as the "downgrading bill," these promotions cannot now be made in a manner equitable both to the administration and to the employees concerned.

This bill is designed to correct an inequitable situation that was not intended. The bill does this by permitting these career employees to be promoted; and during the temporary period they fill more responsible positions, they will receive the salary which goes with the position. When they revert to their old positions, they will receive the salary attached to that position.

Enactment of the measure was requested by the administration, and the bill has been approved all along the line.

Mr. President, I ask for the passage of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 12043) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF CLASSIFICATION ACT OF 1949, WITH RESPECT TO POSITIONS IN LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House bill 8424.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 8424) to amend section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949 with respect to positions in the Library of Congress.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, this bill amends section 505(i) of the Classification Act of 1949, by adding appointments made by the Librarian of Congress to the list of positions presently excluded from Civil Service Commission approval.

The present requirement for approval by the Civil Service Commission of supergrades in the Library of Congress was first imposed by Public Law 85-462, the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1958. Prior to that time the Library had developed and used its own classification standards in making appointments to positions at all grade levels, and the Librarian's authority to appoint was not abridged in any way. The result brought about by Public Law 462 was not intended, and this measure is designed to correct the situation.

Enactment of this measure has been recommended by the Civil Service Commission, the Bureau of the Budget, and the Librarian of Congress.

The bill has the unanimous approval of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 8424) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

COL. JOSEPH A. NICHOLS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, there are at the desk several House bills of a private nature, and I should like to have them called up at this time.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report House bill 11322, for the relief of Col. Joseph A. Nichols, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 11322), for the relief of Col. Joseph A. Nichols.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have a brief statement on the bill printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to relieve Col. Joseph A. Nichols, retired, of liability to repay to the United States the sum of $13,590.65, erroneously paid to him as civilian salary during the period in which he was employed by the officers' open mess, Fort Benning, Ga.

STATEMENT

The claimant, born March 16, 1894, graduated with honors from The Citadel, Charleston, S.C., in June 1917, and was commissioned a second lieutenant of Cavalry, Regular Army, on October 25, 1917. He was transferred to Infantry on February 20, 1918, and

served continuously in that branch until his retirement in the grade of colonel, Regular Army, on June 30, 1950, with over 32 years' honorable service.

Following retirement he was employed by the main officers' open mess at Fort Benning, Ga., for the period January 1, 1951, through November 30, 1953, and earned a total of $13,590.65.

By a letter dated December 3, 1959, from the Retired Pay Division of the Army Finance Center, Colonel Nichols, for the first time, learned that his earnings at the officers' open mess was prohibited because his retired pay exceeded the then limitation of $3,000 (increased in 1954 to $10,000) and that he must elect to receive either the civilian pay or the retired pay. He elected to retain the retired pay.

From the evidence adduced the committee is convinced that Colonel Nichols had at all times acted in good faith and was completely unaware that his civilian salary was in derogation of the so-called Dual Compensation Act. Furthermore, to require from him collection of the civilian salary payments he received from a nonappropriated fund activity would create great hardship and extreme burden.

Since on or about December 13, 1959, he has not been employed in any manner and his sole income is his retired pay of $543 per month. His wife, Mary B. Nichols, has no income of her own and she is entirely dependent upon him for support. His fixed monthly expenditures amount to between $450 and $480. His only assets consist of an automobile worth about $800, a checking account of about $600, stocks and bonds of about $800, and a home which is subject to condemnation proceedings for which damages have not been determined.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 11322) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

JOE J. FARMER

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the next bill is House bill 11380.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report House bill 11380, for the relief of Joe J. Farmer, and request its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill (H.R. 11380) for the relief of Joe J. Farmer was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

OTIS DRINKARD

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the next bill is House bill 9715.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report House bill 9715, for the relief of Otis Drinkard, and request its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill (H.R. 9715) for the relief of Otis Drinkard was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that a statement on the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation, as modified by the recommendation of the committee, is to pay $10,000 to a trustee for the benefit of Otis Drinkard in full settlement of the claim of Otis Drinkard for the loss of his right arm approximately 3 inches below the shoulder joint as the result of injuries he sustained on April 8, 1959, while operating an extractor in a laundry at the Federal Prison Camp, Tucson, Ariz., and such payment would be made to a trustee appointed by a court of competent jurisdiction to supervise the disbursement of that amount in the best interest of the said Otis Drinkard.

STATEMENT

As is evidenced in the report of the Department of Justice on this bill, Mr. Otis Drinkard was injured while he was employed at the Federal Prison Camp at Tucson, Ariz. He was working in the institutional laundry when an accident occurred while he was operating an extractor. His injuries necessitated the amputation of his right arm 3 inches below the shoulder joint.

Mr. Drinkard, because of his status as a prisoner, has no standing to sue the U.S. Government for his injuries under the Federal Tort Claims Act. Although inmates of Federal prison and correctional institutions employed in Federal Prison Industries are compensated for injuries sustained by them in their employment, there is no authority for the payment of compensation to inmates injured while performing other tasks throughout the institution, such as the one in which the claimant was engaged at the time of his injury. There is no authority in the law, therefore, for granting compensation to the claimant for his injuries except through private relief legislation.

The Department of Justice has not taken a position on the bill, preferring to leave the question of relief up to Congress. As is obvious from the foregoing analysis, Mr. Drinkard's only hope for relief lies in legislative relief by private bill. This committee has previously taken favorable action on bills providing similar relief. In the light of the circumstances of this injury the committee further feels that under the circumstances of this case the money provided for in this bill should be paid to a court-appointed trustee in order to insure that the money will be expended in the best interest of Mr. Drinkard, and to insure that he will gain the maximum benefit from the amount provided. The committee recommends that the bill, amended to provide for such arrangements, be considered favorably.

GUADALUPE VILLARREAL, SR.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the next bill is House bill 3536.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, from the Committee of the Judiciary, I report House bill 3536, for the relief of Guadalupe Villarreal, Sr., and request its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill (H.R. 3536) for the relief of Guadalupe Villarreal, Sr. (in behalf of his minor son, Guadalupe Villarreal, Jr.) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that a statement on the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation, as modified by the recommendations of the committee, is to pay to the legal guardian of Guadalupe Villarreal, Jr., a minor, the sum of $10,000 in full settlement of all claims of the said Guadalupe Villarreal, Jr., against the United States arising out of the personal injuries he sustained on July 20, 1955, at the Elgin Butler Brickyard, Elgin, Tex., as the result of the explosion of a 37-millimeter high explosive shell.

STATEMENT

On July 21, 1955, Guadalupe Villarreal, then 8 years of age, was playing with some other children on the property of the Elgin Butler Brick Co. in Elgin, Tex. His father was employed by that firm and the Villarreal family lived in a house owned by the company contiguous to the plant and rented to the family. The children found two or three shells in a corral and pasture area on the company property. The Villarreal boy began playing with one of these objects behind the family residence. The Army report on the bill quotes the boy as describing the shell as being "about 10 or 12 inches in length and not very heavy." The Villarreal child placed the shell between his legs and began striking it with a hammer causing it to explode. The explosion caused extensive mangling of both lower legs and ankles, and shrapnel wounds to the thighs, buttocks, chest, and lip. It was necessary to amputate both legs about 5 inches below each knee in order to save the boy's life.

An examination of the fragments found at the scene and those removed from the child at the hospital, established that the shell had been a 37-millimeter shell more completely described as a "37-millimeter M–63 high-explosive shell with base detonating fuse M–58." At the hearing on this bill conducted on May 18, 1960, considerable testimony was given concerning the nature of this particular type of shell. The Army witnesses at that hearing stated that the available evidence, in the opinion of the Army, established that the item was a complete unexpended 37-millimeter shell. It was pointed out that the boy's description tallied with the specifications of such a round of ordnance in that the complete round would have been 14–09 inches in length and would have weighed 3.08 pounds. It was further explained at the hearing that Army ordnance experts feel that it was the projectile that exploded when the shell was struck with the hammer rather than the propellant powder charge in the shell casing. This particular projectile had a safety device which was designed to be released as a shell is fired and the projectile is propelled through a gun barrel so that the explosive charge can be set off upon impact. The committee is advised that the safety device could have been deactivated by the hammer blows of the child. At that point the detonating mechanism would be so sensitive that it was entirely possible that a child's tapping with a hammer could set it off.

The committee feels that the evidence establishes that the child's injuries came from a 37-millimeter high-explosive shell of the type used by the Army during World

War II. It has further concluded that the circumstances of the child's injury are such as to require provision for compassionate relief in this instance. First of all it was established at the subcommittee hearing that during World War II shells such as that described above were used in training at Camp Swift, an Army camp located within a mile and a half of the spot where the Villarreal child was injured. This committee has concluded that the emphasis that the Army has placed upon the fact that an unfired or complete round was the one which exploded and maimed the child serves to further indicate a degree of Government responsibility in this instance. Magazines for the storage of such rounds would be subject to controls to prevent unauthorized removal of ammunition yet it is obvious that this round did find its way onto the property of the Elgin Butler brickyard where it was found by the children in a pond on that property.

This committee feels that the identification of the shell involved, the fact that nearby World War II Camp Swift had a training area for weapons firing that type of shell, and that investigations subsequent to the accident turned up other military explosives in the area, 38 pieces of which were on the Elgin Butler property, all point to a Government connection to this incident. It should also be observed that the precautions regarding ordnance magazines on the Camp Swift Military Reservation were such that it is reasonable to assume that the round here involved had to be removed by military or Government personnel who would have had access to such ammunition. This committee is well aware that its conclusions in this connection conflict with those of the Army in its report on the bill which puts considerable emphasis that in a Federal tort claims case the court did not find that the plaintiff could not prove that "his injury was caused by the negligent or wrongful act or omission of any employee of the Government while acting within the scope of his office or employment." As has been observed above, this committee feels that this round was removed from Camp Swift by the unauthorized action of Government personnel and because of the fact that it was removed, a child ultimately was maimed as a result. This child's only recourse is to appeal to the Congress for legislative relief based not upon strict rules of evidence but upon general considerations of equity and justice. In the light of these circumstances, the committee has concluded that this child should be extended compassionate relief as provided for in the committee amendment with provision that the money be paid to a legal guardian to safeguard the minor's interest.

F. P. TOWER AND OTHERS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the next bill is House bill 1526, for the relief of F. P. Tower and others.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report House bill 1526, for the relief of F. P. Tower, and others, and request its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill (H.R. 1526) for the relief of F. P. Tower, Lillie B. Lewis, Manuel Branco, John Santos Carinhas, Joaquin Gomez Carinhas, and Manual Jesus Carinhas, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement in regard to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation, is modified by the amendments recommended by the committee, is to pay $578.35 in each instance to the persons and the estate named in the bill in full settlement of their claims against the United States for reimbursement of fines imposed by the Mexican Government in connection with the seizure of five American shrimp trawlers by the Mexican authorities outside the territorial waters of the United Mexican States.

STATEMENT

On April 23, 1950, five American shrimp trawlers were seized by the Mexican Coast Guard vessel *Cadete Virgilio Uribe* while fishing on the high seas off the coast of Mexico about 150 miles south of Brownsville, Tex. The American boats were intercepted by the Mexican vessel between 6 and 6:30 in the morning, and were required by the captain of that vessel to accompany it to the port of Tampico where they arrived early in the morning of the following day, April 24, 1950. The shrimp on board the five American trawlers were confiscated by Mexican customs authorities who required, as a condition of the release of the trawlers, the payment of a fine of 5,000 pesos in the case of each vessel. These fines were paid under protest on May 3, 1950, and are the fines with which this bill is concerned.

At the hearing before the Mexican harbor authorities in Tampico on April 25, 1950, the captain of each one of the five American boats estimated the distance of his boat from the coast and the depth of the water in which he was fishing at the time of the seizure. These estimates ranged from 10 to 15 miles from the coast and from 20 to 23 fathoms of water. At the same hearing the captain of the Mexican vessel, the *Cadete Virgilio Uribe*, stated that the fishing vessels were 5¼ miles from the Mexican coast where the depth of the water was 15 fathoms. However, this committee has been advised that the chart exhibited by the captain of the Mexican vessel at the hearing on April 24, 1950, bore the notation that its position was fixed at 8 a.m., on the morning of April 23, 1950. When it is realized that the fishing boats were intercepted at about 6:30 a.m., and it was not until 8 or an hour and a half later, that the position of the patrol craft was fixed, and there was a 25-mile-an-hour wind blowing from the southeast, it is clear that the vessels drifted closer to shore during that time. This committee has concluded on the basis of the evidence supplied to it that the Mexican vessel drifted 4 miles or more nearer the shore before its position was fixed as being 5¼ miles from the shore. The existence of the locally strong southeasterly wind in that area at the time in question has been confirmed by the U.S. Weather Bureau. The evidence before this committee therefore establishes that the seizures of the fishing boats occurred more than 9 miles from the Mexican coast.

This committee is impressed by the fact that there is absolutely no question but that the American vessels were more than the traditionally recognized distance of 3 miles from the Mexican coast. As has been noted, the evidence further establishes that the boats drifted with the wind about 4 miles closer to shore before the Mexican captain fixed the position of his vessel on his chart as 5¼ miles from shore. On the basis of the facts of this case this committee has concluded that relief should be extended in this instance in the form suggested by the Department of State, limiting the relief to the amounts of the fines paid by the owners of the American vessels. That Department in its report to the committee on the bill referred to Public Law 680 of the 83d Congress which provided for the payment of fines in order to secure the release of vessels seized by a foreign country on the basis of rights or claims to territorial waters or the high seas which are not recognized by the United States. In the case of these five vessels the Mexican Government claimed that its territorial waters extended 9 miles, and this was a claim which the U.S. Government could not concede. Therefore, it is clear that the situation faced by the owners of these five vessels was that now covered by the provisions of Public Law 680 enacted in 1954. In view of this fact and in view of the evidence indicating that the American vessels were actually more than 9 miles distant from the Mexican coast, this committee has concluded that relief should be granted in this case to the extent of reimbursing the owners for the fines paid by them in order to obtain the release of their vessels. The State Department has indicated that it would have no objection to the bill if the payment was so limited as to provide for reimbursement for the amounts of fines paid to the Government of Mexico. Therefore, the committee recommends that the bill be amended to provide for such a payment in each case and also to provide for the payment to the estate of one of the owners who has since died, and that the amended bill be considered favorably.

CRUM-McKINNON BUILDING CO.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the next bill is House bill 8166.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report House bill 8166, and request its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill (H.R. 8166) for the relief of Crum-McKinnon Building Co., Billings, Mont., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement on the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of this legislation is to afford relief to the claimant for services rendered the Government for the period July 1, 1954, to June 30, 1959, inclusive, consisting of janitorial services in a building occupied by the Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, in Billings, Mont.

A bill to render relief sought by the claimant was introduced in the Senate (85th Cong., 2d sess., S. 2519) and was reported favorably (S. Rept. 2043, July 30, 1958) but not in time to be acted upon by the House in that Congress.

This bill does not rewrite the lease upon which the claim is based, as did the Senate bill, because the term of the lease, including the rerental period shown therein had expired when this bill was introduced. However, the purpose of this bill and the prior Senate bill, is the same, namely, to provide equitable relief to the claimant.

STATEMENT

The claim asserted in this bill arises out of a disputed term of a lease of premises owned by the claimant and leased to the Government. The lease was for a term of 5 years at an annual rental of $31,500 which included janitor services specifically described in the lease. There was a further provision in the lease constituting an agreement to

rerent the same premises for 5 years at an annual rental of 10 percent less than the prior rental. The lease is silent as to the rendering of janitorial services in the event of such rerental.

There is conflicting evidence as to the intention of the parties as to the rendering of janitorial services for the second 5-year rental. The claimant states the second 5-year period was at a rental 10 percent less than the prior rental period without janitorial service and that understanding was conveyed orally to the Government at the time of the signing of the lease and acquiesced in by the Government and was a partial reason for the reduction in rent and so interprets the lease. The Government contends said rental price includes janitorial service based on its interpretation of a letter from claimant's predecessors under date of October 28, 1948, an excerpt of which is set forth in its report annexed hereto.

On the premise that an ambiguity existed in the lease, both parties introduced evidence extraneous to the lease to support their contentions as above described. The claimant continued to furnish the services during said rental period while still maintaining its position as to reimbursement.

The General Services Administration states that the janitorial services undoubtedly increased during the period for which the claimant seeks reimbursement (July 1, 1954, to June 30, 1959) and it is not unsympathetic to the position of the claimant.

The Comptroller General states that the furnishing of special services as part of the rental consideration has created a hardship on the lessor and, if the Congress should conclude that the lessor is entitled to relief on an equitable basis, has no objection to the enactment of this bill.

Testimony was presented setting forth that the premises were initially leased to the Government at about 25 percent lower rental than any other comparable facility in the same general area. The claimants received $1.15 per square foot while other governmental agencies were paying $2.58, $2.76, and $2.18 per square foot for comparable office space.

It was adduced that the said premises rented for $31,500 per annum with janitor service for the first 5-year rental period; $28,350 per annum (without janitorial service as the claimant contends or with such service as the Government contends) for the second 5-year period; and, $47,487 per annum for a 3-year period with general improvements and air conditioning of the premises at the expense of the lessor.

The committee is of the opinion that to distinguish the request of the claimant for its costs for janitorial services for the second rental period from the decision of the Comptroller General in the Fraser case (cited and explained herein) where the lessor, under identical lease terms, was not required to furnish such services for a second rental period, although based on a strained but probably legal foundation, is certainly inconsistent with the underlying intent of the parties; namely, a fair and reasonable return for the services rendered and received. The fine legal arguments introduced to support the Department's views although probably persuasive as to the law are not compatible with equity and good conscience.

It is therefore, on the basis of relief in equity and good conscience that the committee recommends favorable consideration of this bill as amended. The amendment constitutes a reduction of the claimant's statement of its costs for janitorial services rendered from $9,150 per year or $45,750 for the 5-year term to $5,000 per year or a total of $25,000 for said term.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the votes by which it has passed House bill 11380, House bill 9715, House bill 3536, House bill 1526, and House bill 8166—the bills on which the Senate has just now completed action.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

TABLE OF APPROPRIATION BILLS, 86TH CONGRESS, 2D SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a summary table showing the budget estimates, the final amount approved by the Congress, and the increase or decrease for each appropriation bill, compared with the budget estimates.

The 86th Congress considered that the budget estimates were inadequate in two important areas. Consequently, the amount appropriated for the Department of Labor and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare was $334 million over the budget estimate, while the Defense Department Appropriation Act was $661 million over the budget estimate.

Despite these budget increases of $1 billion for Defense and Health, Education, and Welfare, the Congress was able to cut enough fat from other budget requests, so that the total of all appropriations made by the 86th Congress was $211,638,498 below the budget requests.

In the preceding 6 years, the Congress managed to cut approximately $12.5 billion from the President's budget requests. Because of the necessity to increase appropriations for Defense and Health, Education, and Welfare, the net reduction made by this Congress was less than the average of preceding years. Nevertheless, the Congress can be proud of its record of prudently protecting the public purse, by reducing the executive branch budget requests for the seventh successive year.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Table of appropriation bills, 86th Cong., 2d sess.

Bill No.	Title	Budget estimates	Final action, amount as approved	Increase or decrease compared to budget estimates
	1960 APPROPRIATIONS			
H.J. Res. 621	NASA supplemental	$23,079,000	$23,079,000	
H.R. 10749	2d supplemental	1,018,504,888	955,370,003	−$63,134,885
H.J. Res. 765	Labor supplemental	8,000,000	6,000,000	−2,000,000
	1961 APPROPRIATIONS			
H.R. 10223	District of Columbia	(242,403,000)	(239,470,433)	(−2,932,567)
	Loan authorization	(18,700,000)	(20,100,000)	(+1,400,000)
	Federal payment	31,533,000	27,533,000	−7,000,000
H.R. 10234	Commerce	799,615,000	729,624,375	−69,990,625
H.R. 10401	Interior	550,330,300	557,667,600	+7,337,300
H.R. 10569	Treasury-Post Office	4,897,853,000	4,841,914,000	−55,939,000
H.R. 11389	General Government	14,627,500	14,207,500	−420,000
H.R. 11390	Labor-HEW	4,020,221,981	4,354,170,331	+333,948,350
H.R. 11666	State-Justice-Judiciary	733,030,395	705,032,567	−27,997,828
H.R. 11776	Independent offices	8,417,397,000	8,311,893,400	−105,503,600
H.R. 11998	Defense	39,335,000,000	39,996,608,000	+661,608,000
H.R. 12117	Agriculture	4,135,263,190	3,994,097,600	−141,165,590
	Loan authorizations	(367,000,000)	(577,000,000)	(+210,000,000)
H.R. 12231	Military construction	1,188,000,000	994,855,000	−193,145,000
H.R. 12232	Legislative	133,413,485	129,470,410	−3,943,075
H.R. 12326	Public works	4,013,793,180	3,969,982,485	−43,810,695
H.R. 12619	Mutual security	4,281,704,000	3,722,350,000	−559,354,000
H.R. 12740	Supplemental	169,327,840	138,293,740	−31,034,100
H.R. 13161	2d supplemental	72,280,731	162,186,981	+89,906,250
	Total, 1961	72,796,390,602	72,649,886,989	−146,503,613
	Total, all bills	73,845,974,490	73,634,335,992	−211,638,498

NOTE.—Indefinite appropriations are included in this table, but the above figures do not include appropriations made automatically under permanent authorizations for interest on the debt, agricultural import duties, etc. These permanent appropriations are estimated at $10,166,000,000 for fiscal year 1961.

REDUCTIONS MADE BY THE CONGRESS IN BUDGET REQUESTS OF THE EISENHOWER ADMINISTRATION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a summary table showing congressional action on budget requests during the past 7 years.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Reductions made by the Congress in budget requests of the Eisenhower administration

	Budget estimates	Appropriations	Congressional reduction
83d Cong., 2d sess., fiscal year 1955 and prior	$57,422,327,386	$54,812,457,263	−$2,609,870,123
84th Cong., 1st sess., fiscal year 1956 and prior	62,030,092,195	59,954,284,321	−2,075,807,874
84th Cong., 2d sess., fiscal year 1957 and prior	68,587,724,820	68,330,229,608	−257,495,212
85th Cong., 1st sess., fiscal year 1958 and prior	73,113,555,340	68,070,096,556	−5,043,458,784
85th Cong., 2d sess., fiscal year 1959 and prior	81,737,060,999	81,119,818,276	−617,242,723
86th Cong., 1st sess., fiscal year 1960 and prior	83,452,687,259	81,572,357,732	−1,880,329,527
86th Cong., 2d sess., fiscal year 1961 and prior	84,011,974,490	83,800,335,992	−211,638,498
Total reductions, 7 years			−12,095,842,741

NOTE.—Includes indefinite and permanent appropriations.

PLEA OF SENATOR GOLDWATER FOR SUPPORT OF REPUBLICAN TICKET IN VIRGINIA

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, on August 30 the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] went to Richmond, Va., to attempt to get support for the Republican ticket. His speech and press conference are reported in this morning's Washington Post. I ask unanimous consent that an excerpt from that speech as carried in the article may appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOLDWATER PLEADS WITH VIRGINIANS TO FORGET GRUDGE AGAINST GOP

(By Elsie Carper)

RICHMOND, August 30.—Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, Republican, of Arizona, made a flying trip into Virginia today and appealed to southerners to forget their 100-year-old grudge against the Republican Party.

* * * * *

Before he spoke at Richmond he told reporters he thought the Federal courts should stay out of the school integration question. "The Federal Government can't move into that area," GOLDWATER said. "We've never given the Federal Government that power."

REPUBLICAN PLATFORM

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, in this connection, Virginians and others will be interested in the plank in the Republican platform dealing with civil rights, with particular reference to school integration; and I ask unanimous consent that short excerpts from that platform may be printed in the RECORD at this point. It will be interesting to see whether the candidates for President and Vice President in the Republican Party will repudiate their party's platform.

There being no objection, the extracts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Equality under law promises more than the equal right to vote and transcends mere relief from discrimination by government. It becomes a reality only when all persons have equal opportunity, without distinction or race, religion, color, or national origin, to acquire the essentials of life—housing, education, and employment. The Republican Party—the party of Abraham Lincoln—from its very beginning has striven to make this promise a reality. It is today, as it was then, unequivocally dedicated to making the greatest amount of progress toward that objective.

* * * * *

We supported the position of the Negro schoolchildren before the Supreme Court. We believe the Supreme Court school decision should be carried out in accordance with the mandate of the Court.

* * * * *

2. PUBLIC SCHOOLS

We pledge:

The Department of Justice will continue its vigorous support of court orders for school desegregation. Desegregation suits now pending involve at least 39 school districts. Those suits and others already concluded will affect most major cities in which school segregation is being practiced.

It will use the new authority provided by the Civil Rights Act of 1960 to prevent obstruction of court orders.

We will propose legislation to authorize the Attorney General to bring actions for school desegregation in the name of the United States in appropriate cases, as when economic coercion or threat of physical harm is used to deter persons from going to court to establish their rights.

Our continuing support of the President's proposal, to extend Federal aid and technical assistance to schools which in good faith attempted to desegregate.

We oppose the pretense of fixing a target date 3 years from now for the mere submission of plans for school desegregation. Slow-moving school districts would construe it as a 3-year moratorium during which progress would cease, postponing until 1963 the legal process to enforce compliance. We believe that each of the pending court actions should proceed as the Supreme Court has directed and that in no district should there be any such delay.

REGULATION OF MASS TRANSIT IN THE WASHINGTON, D.C. METROPOLITAN AREA

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am about to move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of order No. 1975, House Joint Resolution 402. There are two other measures that I may have to call up by motion later in the evening, and if there is any controversy, I may have to temporarily lay this measure aside; but I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of order No. 1975, House Joint Resolution 402. I ask the attention of the Senator from Virginia and any other Senators who are interested in the measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 402) granting the consent of Congress for the States of Virginia and Maryland and the District of Columbia to enter into a compact related to the regulation of mass transit in the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I appreciate very much that the distinguished majority leader has brought this measure up for consideration. I shall be very brief in my position on it, because the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee which heard the testimony is on the floor, and, with due deference to him, he is more familiar than I with the provisions of this joint resolution.

This is a measure which has the endorsement of everyone who has considered it except the Capital Transit Co. in the District of Columbia. It has the endorsement of the Legislatures of Virginia and Maryland. It has the endorsement of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia. It has the endorsement of all the planning agencies of government that have jurisdiction over the District of Columbia or metropolitan Washington.

The joint resolution was passed unanimously by the House. It was reported unanimously by the Senate Judiciary Committee. It provides for the appointment of three commissioners, who shall study the transportation problems of metropolitan Washington.

We already know that three new bridges are being planned, and a fourth bridge has recently been proposed. Yet those four bridges will be inadequate to handle the traffic jams in the rush hours in the morning and afternoon, involving 2 million residents of Metropolitan Washington.

So it is proposed to create a commission with authority to try to work out some new rapid transit plan, either overhead or underground, and, of course, to try to work out better coordination with respect to the buses that operate from Virginia, let us say, to the District line, and the District buses, with respect to schedules, and perhaps transfers.

The joint resolution adequately takes care of the interests of the transit company. It provides that nothing in this bill shall change the charter. It provides that the commission shall not have power, over the veto of the Commissioners of the District, to act on any matter that lies exclusively within the District of Columbia. It provides that if any agency or utility company is dissatisfied with the action of the Commissioners, it will have an appeal to the Federal court.

As I said, I do not wish to discuss this matter at any great length; but I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement that I have prepared relating to what is involved.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The metropolitan area of Washington has a most complex and difficult structure, consisting of the Federal Government, the District of Columbia, the States of Virginia and Maryland, and various counties and independent cities and municipalities. This situation presents a delicate and difficult problem in the field of intergovernmental relations in reaching areawide solutions. The Washington Metropolitan Regional Conference, consisting of officials of the metropolitan area of Washington, has established an enviable record in cooperation and in seeking a solution to the grave metropolitan problems which confront similar cities throughout the United States.

The pending compact resolution accomplishes a very simple and basic objective, but a most important one. In effect, the compact centralizes to a great degree in a single agency, the Transportation Interstate Commission, the regulatory powers of private transit now shared by four regulatory agencies. It will make possible the regulations of such transit within the metropolitan area without regard to the boundaries of political jurisdiction. It would thus enable regulation of transit to meet the needs and requirements of the growing and mutually interdependent metropolitan area. It will be able to establish fair rates and produce more transit facilities for the outlying suburban areas. The commission would be able to utilize the total facilities of private transit to set rates and initiate new and additional services.

It will also be able to control and regulate the discrepancies now existing in relation to interstate taxicab fares. This problem from time to time has created adverse comment by taxicab users.

The compact is strongly endorsed by the county and local governments and by the Washington Metropolitan Regional Conference. It has been incorporated as an integral part of the mass transportation plan and is the recommended first step in connection with mass transportation. As stated, it is the first step relating to mass transportation, and is not to be confused with other steps necessary to complete and round out the entire problem.

The compact would authorize the negotiation of an interstate proprietary compact creating an interstate operating agency. By circumstance, the National Capital community is located in the States of Maryland, Virginia, and the District of Columbia. Each jurisdiction regulates transit service within its borders. Service across jurisdictional lines is subject to regulation by the Interstate Commerce Commission. The principal objective of the compact is to centralize the regulatory function in a single agency, with jurisdiction coextensive with the metropolitan area. Such centralized relocation would result in a pattern of transit service oriented to the needs of the 2 million people of the entire metropolitan area.

The compact is directed to the improvement of privately owned transit, not only through centralization of regulation, but also also by creating machinery for the consideration on a regional basis of traffic problems related to transit service. The compact represents cooperative efforts by the States of Maryland and Virginia and the District of Columbia to place the regulation of privately owned transit on the basis of the area covered rather than on the theory of Interstate Commerce Commission jurisdiction.

House Joint Resolution 402 reflects the dual status of Congress as both the National Legislature and the local legislature for the District of Columbia. With respect to this latter capacity, the resolution provides for the approval by the Congress of the compact, and directs the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to enter into and execute the compact. In its capacity as the National Legislature, Congress grants its consent to the compact pursuant to the requirements of the Federal Constitution; removes Federal jurisdiction over the subject matter of the compact, and confers appellate and enforcement jurisdiction under the compact upon the Federal judiciary.

House Joint Resolution 402 is not presented as a complete solution for the transportation problems of the Washington metropolitan area, but it is an important step in that direction. The transportation plan prepared by the National Capital Planning Commission and the National Capital Regional Planning Council states that this compact for the centralization of the regulatory function is the first step in a broader program. Other aspects of that program dealing with the construction, financing, and operation of expanded highway and rail facilities is pending before the Congress in separate legislation. Regardless of the disposition to be made of the broader program, House Joint Resolution 402 is important legislation which the committee believes should now be enacted.

The compact has been enacted by Virginia and Maryland and now reflects the public policy of those States. The objections of the Interstate Commerce Commission to the compact have been met and no other Federal agency has raised substantial objections to the compact. Labor favors the objectives of the compact and, on the basis of the amendments passed by the House of Representatives, is now satisfied with the specific provisions of House Joint Resolution 402. The compact is strongly endorsed by county and local governments and by the Metropolitan Washington Conference, which is an areawide organization composed of elected public officials.

The Department of Commerce, the National Capital Planning Commission, and the National Capital Regional Planning Council have endorsed this legislation. The Nation Labor Relations Board reported that, in view of the fact that its functions under the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, as amended, are not affected by the legislation, it had no comment to offer with respect to the desirability of passing the proposed legislation. The Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts reported that it was unable to express any opinion with regard to the legislation because the bill appeared to be one of legislative policy. The Department of Justice, the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the Securities and Exchange Commission all reported in favor of the legislation, subject to the suggestions and comments noted below.

The Department of Justice recommended that article IX, section 1, of the compact be amended to require that affirmative consent of the Congress be obtained with respect to any amendment of the compact. A similar view was expressed by the Bureau of the Budget. The Department of Justice suggested that the necessary modification could be accomplished without necessitating further legislative action at this time by the signatories by inserting a proviso at the end of section 2 of the bill which would prohibit the Commissioners of the District of Columbia from adopting any amendment to the compact without the prior consent or approval of the Congress. Articles VIII and IX of the compact leave to each signatory the procedures to be followed in adopting and amending the compact. This suggestion simply deals with the procedure to be followed by the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia in adopting amendments to the compact and, therefore, does not involve a change in the compact necessitating its resubmission to the States.

The protection written into the compact to assure the integrity of the franchise has been buttressed by the third proviso of section 3 of the bill, which provides as follows: "*Provided further*, That nothing in this act or in the compact consented to and approved hereby shall impair or affect the rights, duties, and obligations created by the act of July 24, 1956 (ch. 669, 70 Stat. 598), granting a franchise to D.C. Transit System, Inc.:" Veto power. Court review.

The committee took under consideration the various objections to the compact raised at the hearings, which set forth that the membership of the Commission should be five instead of three, at least three of whom should represent the District of Columbia; that the compact would create confusion and that it would not result in unified regulation and other criticism thereof. The committee duly considered the matters raised in connection with the compact, but concluded that the compact is a needed step in the regulation of the mass transportation for the metropolitan area of Washington, and was of the opinion that, under all of the circumstances, the compact is meritorious and should be given the consent and approval of the Congress.

The compact legislation has been enacted into law by the States of Virginia and Maryland and is supported by the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, who have requested authority to enter into and execute the compact. In addition, the compact is endorsed by political subdivisions of the States and local civic and business groups. The Washington Metropolitan Regional Conference, a voluntary association of the elected officials of the various governments within the metropolitan district favor the enactment of the compact and have presented the committee with a resolution to this effect. The compact also has the support of the major segments of the local transit industry and is opposed, so far as the committee can determine, only by the D.C. Transit System, Inc.

The compact has been negotiated by representatives of the States of Maryland, Virginia, and the District of Columbia and representatives of the utility commissions of those jurisdictions have participated in the negotiation of the compact. The compact has also been considered by the National Capital Planning Commission and National Capital Regional Planning Council as part of their study of mass transit in the National Capital region and those agencies have incorporated the compact as a step in the development of a transportation plan for the National Capital region.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. The Senator from Virginia has stated he is wholeheartedly for this joint resolution, and I wish to state that I am also.

Mr. ROBERTSON. As I have said, I hope my distinguished colleague from Michigan [Mr. HART] will tell the Senate something about the joint resolution, because he was chairman of the committee that heard the testimony on it, and, with due deference to him, he is more familiar with the measure than I am.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the Senator from Virginia has very effectively summarized the provisions of the compact. I shall undertake to respond to any questions, as I am sure the Senator from Virginia will, but the committee has unanimously recommended favorable action on the joint resolution.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have amendments pending at the desk, identified as E, and I ask that they be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments offered by the Senator from Oregon will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed:

On page 4, line 12, to delete "three" and insert "four" in lieu thereof.

On page 4, line 14, after "Maryland and" to insert "two members".

On page 4, line 17, to delete "The" and insert "Each" in lieu thereof.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendments is to provide greater representation upon the proposed Interstate Compact Commission to the District of Columbia. The measure as reported from committee provides for but three members, one each from the States of Maryland and Virginia and one from the District of Columbia. If my amendment is accepted, then four members would serve upon the Commission, one each from the States of Maryland and Virginia, and two from the District of Columbia.

Much concern has been evidenced to me from the District urging that the modification to the compact which I am proposing be adopted. It is the feeling of these District people that the modification is warranted upon the following grounds:

First. Eighty percent of the traffic subjects to regulation under the Compact Commission is represented by the District riding public as opposed to the 20

percent of the traffic which represents the riding public of Virginia and Maryland affected.

Second. Fear has been expressed that the Compact Commission, being unrepresentative, might in its decisions adversely affect mass transit in the District.

While I do not prejudge the matter, I believe that quasijudicial agencies should be considered impartial until, and unless, they prove themselves otherwise by their acts, yet, I have often pointed out that substantive rights are dependent upon the procedures through which such rights can be obtained. We are dealing here with a basic procedure. The position I advance to the Senate is that in creating a body exercising regulatory functions in the Washington Metropolitan area we should likewise safeguard, through the composition of the body we create, the interests of the dominant population group which will be affected by the actions of the body we establish.

Senators will note that I do not propose that the District shall have a majority on the commission. The District cannot dominate it. I do propose, however, that the District be represented so that it, in turn, cannot be dominated. I believe that the interests of 80 percent of the riding public deserve this protection.

Mr. President, it has been represented to me by those in the District who feel the balance of power, so to speak, in the agency to be created by this bill, would carry with it great danger for the District. They feel that there is a possibility that representatives from the State of Virginia and the State of Maryland might join together as a majority on the Commission to the detriment of the District of Columbia.

Mr. President, I repeat, it has been represented to me by those in the District who urge the adoption of the amendment that there is a possibility under the present organization of the Commission that the members from Maryland and Virginia could join together on some matter to the detriment of the District of Columbia.

I would not have offered the amendment if it had been proposed that the District of Columbia be given a majority of the Commission, but I think there is merit in the fear of those who have asked that the amendment be offered. There is always the lurking danger that representatives from the States of Maryland and Virginia might, for their own interests, coalesce, so to speak, against one member of the District of Columbia on the Commission. Because it is represented that 80 percent of the riding public comes from the District of Columbia it seems to be a bit inequitable that Maryland should have a Commissioner and Virginia should have a Commissioner and the District of Columbia should have only one Commissioner.

I think under such circumstances, Mr. President, it is rather a fair request that the number of Commissioners from the District of Columbia be increased to two, so at least the District could not be outvoted by a combination of the Commissioners from the States of Maryland and Virginia.

I wish to read to the Senate certain telegrams I have received in support of the amendment which I offered by request, which I was glad to offer, by request, in order to see to it that a fair hearing is given to the representations which have been made.

I received a telegram from Mr. Chalk, whom we all know is president of the D.C. Transit Co. This is the third and last telegram which I received from him. It states:

Supplementing my two recent telegrams regarding House Joint Resolution 402 primary beneficiary of bill is sovereign State of Virginia and primary loser is District of Columbia. As example of manner in which Virginia interests are trying to destroy District transit companies I refer you to Virginia statute section 56–338.61 enacted March 31, 1960, which prohibits transit companies of the District of Columbia from engaging in transportation within Virginia. Also call your attention to fact that alleged veto power of District Commissioner is limited to matters which are solely intrastate and all matters of conflict between Virginia and the District would be interstate not solely intrastate. District interests will be at mercy of Virginia discrimination as illustrated above.

Respectfully yours,

O. ROY CHALK.

Because the D.C. Transit Co. has such a vital economic interest in this matter, I think it is only fair to Mr. Chalk that I read another wire which I received from him. It states as follows:

Before irreparable damage is done to the D.C. Transit System and the riding public of the District of Columbia, I urge you to join in sponsoring an amendment to the Compact Commission bill House Joint Resolution 402 in order to safeguard the District of Columbia citizens who represent 80 percent of the riding public as against the Virginia and Maryland citizens who represent 20 percent of the riding public. Regulation without proper, adequate, and proportionate representation is manifestly unfair and discriminatory against the interests of the District of Columbia. The bill as presently proposed will surely cause fares to be proportionately higher for the District riding public than for the Virginia and Maryland riding public. I urge an amendment to House Joint Resolution 402 which will at least give proportionately equal representation on the Commission of the District of Columbia. Instead of one member for the District of Columbia, which represents 80 percent of the transit traffic, we urge an amendment which will permit three Commissioners from the District of Columbia, one from Virginia, and one from Maryland.

Respectfully submitted.

O. ROY CHALK.

It will be noted that I did not follow the recommendation of Mr. Chalk, who asked for a majority of District of Columbia Commissioners. I felt that would be unfair. I thought, however, in view of the interest of the riding public of the District of Columbia, it would be proper to recommend an amendment—which I did—to give to the District of Columbia two Commissioners and to Virginia and Maryland one each.

I received another wire from Mr. Chalk which I should like to put in the RECORD, in which he said:

Supplementing my first telegram regarding House Joint Resolution 402 in which I urged an amendment expanding the Commission to five members, three of which should be from the District of Columbia, please be advised that the supporters of the bill argue that no change should be made in the bill lest any change require resubmission of the compact to the Legislatures of Virginia and Maryland. The simple answer to their argument is that those two legislatures passed the compact by narrow margin without any kind of public hearings repeat without any kind of public hearings, and without public notice and without any opportunity for the D.C. Transit System or the riding public of the District of Columbia to be heard. I respectfully urge you to support the amendment providing five commissioners.

Respectfully yours,

O. ROY CHALK.

At great length Mr. Chalk testified before the Senate committee. Before I close I shall ask to have all of his testimony printed in the RECORD, if I do not read it.

Mr. President, at this time I wish to read from a portion of his testimony. Mr. Chalk said:

I would like to call the attention of this subcommittee to two of the comments made in the report of the Institute of Public Administration on the proposed Compact Commission of House Joint Resolution 402. On page 17 of the report of the Institute of Public Administration, the following conclusion is stated:

"In short, the arrangement [i.e., Compact Commission] is one of limited powers, with no assurance of effectiveness. It rates high on only one test—feasibility. It rates low on the requirements of flexibility, comprehensiveness, responsiveness to public needs and desires, and financial adequacy."

In addition to the above critical analysis, the institute has made one other observation about the proposed Compact Commission of House Joint Resolution 402. Summarizing its views as to the alternatives presented for solving the transportation problems of the National Capital region, the Institute of Public Administration made the following observations on page 24 of its report:

"The first alternative is to follow through with the proposed interstate compact regulatory agency, in full recognition of the fact that it will be of limited effectiveness in mass transportation improvement, and of little or no effectiveness in the improvement of traffic and parking controls."

From the above quoted excerpts from the report of the Institute of Public Administration, it is clear that others besides D.C. Transit find the provisions of the proposed Compact Commission to be objectionable. The only reason that no other witnesses have appeared in opposition to the proposed compact is that we of D.C. Transit are the only transit company which represents the transportation interests of the persons traveling within the District of Columbia.

The House committee report on House Joint Resolution 402 states that all the other transit companies support the bill. This conclusion is misleading, because it implies that the other transit companies represent the interests of the riders within the District of Columbia. Such fact is just the opposite from the truth. The reason the other transit companies do not oppose House Joint Resolution 402 is that they are all suburban or local in character. None of them are incorporated within the District of Columbia nor do any of them represent the interests of those persons who ride transit services within the District of Columbia. To the extent the interests of the riders of the District of Columbia differ from the interests of the riders of the suburban communities, the other local transit companies have interests adverse to those of D.C. Transit.

The principal reason the suburban companies are not opposed to House Joint Resolution 402 is that two Commissioners out of the three proposed Commissioners will have

more than ample power and authority to outvote the single representative of the District of Columbia on matters where the interests of the District differ from those of the suburban communities.

The House committee report on House Joint Resolution 402 also tends to minimize the opposition of D.C. Transit to the Compact Commission. In terms of the number of witnesses who appeared before the House committee, the House committee report implies that the opposition to the bill was slight in comparison to the support for the bill. In this connection, the report emphasized that the Virginia and Maryland transit companies did not strongly oppose the bill. An examination of the facts indicates that although D.C. Transit may only have been one of many witnesses, it accounts for 80 percent of transportation of passengers within the National Capital region. We of D.C. Transit represent 80 percent of all of the transit business done by all of the transit companies in the National Capital region. Accordingly, our testimony should be accorded four times as much weight as was accorded to the testimony of all of the suburban transit companies together.

My testimony so far has been on the general background atmosphere which has surrounded the advancement of House Joint Resolution 402. We, at D.C. Transit, do have specific objections to certain provisions which must be made before the bill is enacted into law. Our objections are primarily of two general types. In the first place, we have very serious constitutional and legal objections to House Joint Resolution 402. Our legal objections were presented to the House Judiciary Committee, are part of its printed hearings and need not be repeated here. Suffice it to say that the House report did not answer all our legal objections. Second, we have substantive objections to the provisions of House Joint Resolution 402 which we feel must be corrected before the bill can be acceptable to the Congress and to the people of the District of Columbia.

One of our major legal objections made before the House Judiciary Committee is one which also involves serious policy considerations. This objection is so serious that in 1955 President Eisenhower vetoed a similar Compact Commission for this same reason. The objection is that House Joint Resolution 402 discriminates against the District and in favor of Virginia because House Joint Resolution 402 gives the Compact Commission jurisdiction over intrastate transportation within the District while in the same bill Virginia refuses to yield to the Commission similar jurisdiction over its intrastate transportation. In passing, I would like to note that the House report on House Joint Resolution 402 makes no reply to this legal objection. On a related issue, President Eisenhower in 1954 vetoed a previous Compact Commission bill saying:

"Its failure to include the Virginia segment of the metropolitan area within the jurisdiction of the proposed Commission is a fundamental deficiency. Through this omission of an integral and important part of the greater economic community, a system of fragmented and divided regulatory authority is continued. What is worse, the Federal Government is placed in the position of treating the carriers and persons within one segment of the area on a different and discriminatory basis from those in the remainder of the area. In the absence of any substantial grounds for this differentiation, the measure is unacceptable even as a temporary expedient." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 100, pt. 12, p. 15567.)

Let me say in passing that I have heard no statement from the proponents of the resolution tonight in answer to the legal objections which were raised before the House Judiciary Committee, and I have heard no statement from the proponents of the resolution tonight in answer to the veto message of President Eisenhower with regard to a similar measure back in 1954.

To return to the Chalk testimony:

Notwithstanding the views of President Eisenhower in 1954, House Joint Resolution 402 once again fails to give the Compact Commission complete jurisdiction over Virginia instrastate transportation. Not only do we regard this omission as discriminatory and unfair, but we also regard it as illegal and unconstitutional. In the hearings before the House Judiciary Committee, we filed a memo on the illegality and unconstitutionality of this fatal error. The House report did not even comment on nor discuss this subject. It must be assumed that the House committee could find no valid legal reply.

Mr. President, I am inclined to believe the fact that the proponents of the resolution have not commented upon this legal problem in this debate on the floor of the Senate raises at least a presumption that they prefer not to discuss it.

I now return to the testimony offered to the committee by Mr. Chalk:

As I have mentioned briefly in my earlier testimony today, the proposed resolution, House Joint Resolution 402, is discriminatory against the interests of the District of Columbia and it favors the suburban communities of Virginia and Maryland.

The transit interests which the resolution discriminates against are both those of the riding public and of the transit company. The source of the discrimination is in the regulatory framework of the proposed Commission. Under House Joint Resolution 402, the new Commission would consist of three Commissioners, each a political appointment from each of the three jurisdictions participating in the compact. It is widely conceded that the Commissioner from Virginia, appointed by the Governor of Virginia, would owe his allegiance and interests to the suburban companies of Virginia origin and to the transit interests of the suburban communities of Virginia. Similarly, the Commissioner from Maryland would owe his allegiance and interests to the suburban companies of Maryland origin and to the transit interests of the suburban communities of Maryland. Only one of the three Commissioners would have a primary interest in the welfare of the riding public and the transit companies of the District of Columbia. Notwithstanding the fact that the transit operations within the District of Columbia constitute the greatest proportion, i.e., over 80 percent of all of the metropolitan area transportation in the three States, the District of Columbia would only be represented by one Commissioner out of the three Commissioners under the compact. Experience has taught regulated companies that, under similar circumstances, the downtown interests would be outvoted and would suffer to the advantage of the suburban interests.

As a suggestion to solve the discriminatory feature, we and others have urged that there be five Commissioners, of which at least three be representatives of the District of Columbia. Even this proportion is favorable to the suburbs since transit operations in the District of Columbia account for approximately 80 percent of the transit operations in the entire Washington metropolitan area. The response of the supporters of the resolution to our suggestion has been that such a change would require that the bill go back to each of the other two States for resubmission to their respective legislatures. This answer is the same response which the proponents give to all constructive suggestions for the bill notwithstanding the fact that both Virginia and Maryland passed the bill without public hearings in either case and without notice to any of the parties or interests concerned.

In response to our proposal that the interests of the District can be outvoted by the suburban communities, the proponents of the bill have argued that the interests of the District are adequately protected by the so-called veto power in article VI. There is no protection to the District in the veto power is limited to matters which are solely "intrastate". I have been advised by our attorney that, under current judicial decisions, it is quite probable that, wherever the District's interests clash with the suburban interests, few, if any, matters will be "solely intrastate." Accordingly, the veto power cannot be counted upon to resolve the problems of conflicts of interests between the District and the suburban communities.

In response to our concern about the attitudes of the various Commissioners, the House Judiciary Committee in its report on House Joint Resolution 402 makes the following observations (at p. 28):

"It has been urged that the District of Columbia, having only one representative on the proposed commission and hence only one vote, could possible suffer because of unfair, unreasonable, or collusive action by a combination of the other Commissioners from the two compacting States. Of course, such a circumstance can work to the detriment of any compacting party. The committee, however, is not apprehensive about this circumstance since under article X of the compact each of the signatories is pledged to faithful cooperation with the other signatories."

The above-quoted excerpt from the House Judiciary Committee report shows the fallacy and error in the basic premise of the Compact Commission. This basic premise is that all jurisdictions will treat the transit interests of each other on an equal footing and with equal fairness. We have positive evidence here today in black and white to prove that the Commonwealth of Virginia has no intention of the kind of "faithful cooperation" contemplated in the House report.

An example of the lack of good faith shown on the part of the Commonwealth of Virginia on the subject of faithful cooperation and fairness is a new statute which was enacted into law in Virginia on March 31, 1960. This bill represents a hostile attitude and flagrant challenge to the transit interests of the District of Columbia, Maryland and all States surrounding Virginia.

I would like to hand to the chairman and members of the subcommittee at this point the act of the General Assembly of Virginia of March 31, 1960, which is an act to provide for the regulation of special or charter party transportation. This act prohibits the carrying on of business as a common carrier for charter or special party service without first obtaining a certificate of public convenience and necessity. The new law, as most new laws of similar nature, provides the usual grandfather clause, granting companies and persons who were lawfully engaged in such business on January 1, 1960, the automatic right to obtain a certificate of public convenience and necessity by virtue of their grandfather rights. This grandfather clause is quite customary and is similar to provisions in the Interstate Commerce Act and other similar regulatory statutes.

The hostility and discrimination against the District companies is contained in the fact that the grandfather rights are limited to Virginia corporations even though non-Virginia corporations were on January 1, 1960, entitled the same grandfather status.

Section 56-338.61 of the Virginia statute of March 31, 1960, provides that the grandfather rights will not be accorded a nonresident or a foreign corporation. This means then that although we of D.C. Transit have

grandfather rights, we will be discriminated against because we are a District of Columbia corporation.

At this time I would like to hand up to the chairman and members of the subcommittee permit No. CP–468 which we obtained from the Virginia State Corporation Commission on June 17, 1957, for transportation of passengers within the Commonwealth of Virginia for special or charter party purposes.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to request that a copy of the act of the General Assembly of Virginia of March 31, 1960, and the copy of our permit No. CP–468 of June 17, 1957, from the Virginia State Corporation Commission be included at the end of my testimony as part of the printed hearings of today's proceedings.

I digress at this point to say that it is only fair to Mr. Chalk that this very pertinent testimony of his be read to the Senate, so that anyone who wishes to reply to it in the debate, when I finish, may reply to it. It is interesting to note that it has not been touched upon by the proponents of the compact. It has not been answered by the committee. In my judgment, Mr. Chalk is entitled to the courtesy at least of having the record made here and giving an opportunity to the proponents of the resolution to put on record their reply to the legal points he raises, as well as to the procedural points he raises.

I continue the reading:

When the new Virginia statute I have just referred to was first publicized, we at D.C. Transit made every effort possible to discourage the Virginia authorities from enacting it into law. All of the persons concerned admitted that the law was directed against D.C. Transit. The enactment into law of such a discriminatory bill directed at D.C. Transit is a far cry from the protests of fairness, good faith, and faithful cooperation discussed in the House Judiciary Committee report.

The reality of the regulatory pattern of the proposed three-man Compact Commission is that we of D.C. Transit have much to fear from a commission where Virginia and Maryland have two out of three votes, in circumstances where 80 percent of the transportation is within the District of Columbia.

We have urged before and we urge again that the regulatory framework of the proposed Commission be expanded from three to five members, of which at least three should represent the District of Columbia.

I again disgress from Mr. Chalk's testimony to say that I have not followed the recommendation he made to the committee that three District Commissioners be appointed to the Commission. In my judgment that would not be fair either. It would give to the District of Columbia a majority vote over Virginia and Maryland interests. What my amendment does is increase the number of District Commissioners to two, which gives the District of Columbia protection from any possible alinement of Maryland and Virginia Commissioners against the interests of what, the evidence seems to show very clearly, is a total of 80 percent of the riders. These are the District of Columbia riders, in contrast to the combined 20 percent of the riders from Maryland and Virginia. My amendment, at least, would give to the District of Columbia, so far as the number of Commissioners is concerned, an equal break with Maryland and Virginia as far as the number of Commissioners on the Commission is concerned.

Mr. Chalk's statement continues:

All of the persons with whom we have spoken about our problem in the District of Columbia have agreed that this change is a minimum change necessary to make the bill fair and equitable to the interests of the District of Columbia. The fact that the bill must go back to the Virginia and Maryland Legislatures does not militate against perfecting the bill for the minimum protection necessary for the interests of the District of Columbia.

Our objection to the three-man composition of the Compact Commission is our first substantive objection to House Joint Resolution 402. We have one other substantive objection to House Joint Resolution 402. We sincerely believe that House Joint Resolution 402 will compound, confuse and complicate the regulatory pattern in the District of Columbia, particularly in view of the imminent enact of S. 3193.

House Joint Resolution 402 has been billed as a simplification of the existing regulatory machinery. It has been argued by its proponents that it substitutes one regulatory agency for the four present regulatory agencies. It is argued by the proponents that the proposed Compact Commission would replace the regulatory functions of the PUC, the Maryland PSC, the Virginia State Corporation Commission and the ICC. This claim simply is not true.

It might well be possible to propose a Compact Commission which might replace the existing four agencies. House Joint Resolution 402 simply does not accomplish the job.

On this issue, D.C. Transit is supported by the testimony of the Public Utilities Commission at the House Judiciary Committee hearings on House Joint Resolution 402. Commissioner Kertz testified in the House hearings that one very important oversight in House Joint Resolution 402 is its failure to give to the proposed Compact Commission the PUC's responsibility for making the so-called gasoline tax determination required by section 9 of our franchise. As Commissioner Kertz testified, this gas tax determination requires as much regulatory agency effort as a full scale rate case would require. As Commissioner Kertz testified, House Joint Resolution 402 produces the curious result that the Compact Commission would regulate our rates with full-fledged rate hearings while, at the same time, the PUC would have to make a separate and independent determination of our gas tax liability under section 9 of our franchise with a full-fledged hearing on that issue. In its report on House Joint Resolution 402, the House Judiciary Committee admitted reluctantly on page 23 as follows:

"Since the compact does not give an affirmative grant of power to the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission to levy, assess, or collect taxes, it is clear that the duties of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia with respect to the determination of the liability of D.C. Transit System, Inc., for the motor fuel tax, as specified in that company's franchise, is not transferred to the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission."

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield for a question.

Mr. HARTKE. Is it not true that the majority of the transit riders are within the District of Columbia?

Mr. MORSE. According to the testimony, 80 percent of them are within the District of Columbia.

Mr. HARTKE. Is it not true also that because the District of Columbia is the seat of the Federal Government, Washington is not an ordinary city?

Mr. MORSE. That is also my position.

Mr. HARTKE. Although I live in Virginia, I am still faced with the problem of transportation into the District of Columbia. Is it not true that so far as the surrounding areas of Virginia and Maryland are concerned, their population primarily serves the Federal Government and the Federal institutions in the Federal city?

Mr. MORSE. That is true.

Mr. HARTKE. The Senator's amendment makes sense. I compliment him for bringing it to our attention. In all sincerity, the amendment will in some way, at least, make it possible for the District of Columbia, the seat of the Federal Government, to be certain that it will not in any way be discriminated against in its primary purpose of serving the Government. That is why the National Capital was established.

In my judgment, the amendment is a good one. I intend to support it.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Indiana for his statement.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. My being apprised of this situation is attributable to two factors. First, I was a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia before this session of the Senate. Second, Roy Chalk, who is a New Yorker, has gone to some pains to present to me, because he comes from my State, his side of the case.

I, too, like the Senator from Indiana, can see some justice to the situation. I am well aware of the ardent desire of Senators from the States of Virginia and Maryland to have the compact approved. As the Senator from Oregon knows, we in New York have had experience with compacts. In fact, we are now having a legal problem concerning the extent to which Congress may or may not, through the House of Representatives investigate the Port of New York Authority.

All that that shows, whatever may be the merits or demerits of that particular situation, is that at least compacts are very difficult to handle properly.

All of us are deeply interested in metropolitan transportation. We believe that the establishment of a metropolitan authority is a highly desirable step in terms of the whole metropolitan area. Many problems and difficulties arise and it is necessary to accommodate to the strains and stresses of the situation before such compacts are entered into.

I am glad to see that the Senator's amendment is not so strong and stiff as was proposed in the first instance. I think it is much more equitable to have, at least, a standoff, if the parties cannot agree, on the part of the District of Columbia and of the States of Maryland and Virginia. I think the amendment commends itself.

According to the statement, the State legislatures moved in this matter with considerable celerity. There were not

overly extended hearings. Therefore, the proponents of the compact might find that the Senator's solution, which is a reduced solution, proposed by the operator of the D.C. Transit System, would create a climate, when they enter into it, which would be most propitious for the success of the Commission.

I believe the Senator from Indiana has put his finger on the point. Ordinarily speaking, the District of Columbia is a city; Maryland and Virginia are States. As the Senator from Indiana has pointed out quite properly, the District of Columbia is the seat of the Federal Government. It is the hard core of the whole metropolitan system. Therefore, it is entitled to unique consideration. There is only one seat of the Federal Government in the United States.

My purpose in interrupting the Senator from Oregon is to state to the Senate the reason for my interest, and to express the hope that in the interest of comity, in the interest of starting the Commission under the most auspicious possible circumstances, Senators from the States concerned might themselves think it were appropriate to start the Commission most auspiciously and to accept the Senator's amendment notwithstanding that the formal steps of ratification by the respective State legislatures might be delayed.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from New York.

Before I return to a reading of Mr. Chalk's testimony, which is really an argument against the resolution—and I am certain the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] agree that Mr. Chalk——

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me, for the purpose of setting aside the present measure and bringing up a new measure?

Mr. MORSE. With the understanding that I may continue with my discussion of Mr. Chalk's testimony later.

Mr. MANSFIELD. With that understanding.

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

EXTENSION OF MIGRANT AGRICULTURAL LABOR ACT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate turn to the consideration of Calendar No. 1971, H.R. 12759.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H.R. 12759) to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 509 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by striking "June 30, 1961" and inserting "December 31, 1961."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the bill as passed by the House provided for a 2-year extension of the Migrant Agricultural Labor Act. The Committee on Agriculture amended the bill to provide for a 6-month extension, until June 30, 1961. Some objection was raised, but I understand it was the general understanding that this shorter time would be allowed.

If it is not passed, the farmers in California, Arizona, New Mexico, Texas, and similar areas cannot finance their crops for the next year; whereas if it is passed, then we shall have the next session of Congress in which to discuss this whole problem. So I think it proper that the bill be passed.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York withhold that suggestion for a moment?

Mr. JAVITS. Yes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Will the Senator from New York explain why he has suggested the absence of a quorum?

Mr. JAVITS. Yes; because I have an amendment, and I wish to finish my preparations in that connection and discuss the matter with several of my colleagues. I think the same probably may be said of several other Senators.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCGEE in the chair). The absence of a quorum has been suggested, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The Senator from Arizona has the floor.

Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona to proceed to the consideration of H.R. 12759?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Will the Chair state for the information of the Senate what is the nature of the bill that is presently before us?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 509 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by striking "June 30, 1961" and inserting "December 31, 1961."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Is this the bill that relates to Mexican migrant labor?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; it provides for a 6 months extension of existing law.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me? Yesterday I sent to the desk an amendment to H.R. 12759. I had in mind offering this amendment and pressing it as hard as I could should the Senate consider a long-term, for example a 2-year, extension of Public Law 78. I do not intend to press the amendment at this time on this bill, which is for a 6-month extension, but ask unanimous consent to insert a statement at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KENNETH B. KEATING ON H.R. 12759

Although I favor making certain changes in Public Law 78, I join with many of my colleagues who are at this time willing to permit this act to be extended for 6 months with no changes. However, I want to make it clear that I favor some changes along the lines of the amendment which I sent to the desk yesterday. I intend to join with those who have expressed reservations about this bill to see to it that it is significantly revised when this 6-month extension expires and it is again before us for action.

Section 503 of Public Law 78 relating to Mexican farm labor states that no Mexican worker shall be available for employment in any area unless the Secretary of Labor has determined and certified that (1) sufficient domestic workers are not available, (2) the employment of Mexican workers will not adversely affect the wages and conditions of domestic workers and (3) "reasonable efforts have been made to attract domestic workers for such employment at wages and standard hours of work comparable to those offered to foreign workers."

This amendment strikes the words "wages and standards hours of work comparable to those offered to foreign workers" which appears in the third proviso above. It inserts in lieu thereof the words "terms and conditions of employment at least equal to those offered to foreign workers." The net effect of this amendment would be to strengthen the intent and tone of this statute with respect to avoiding having the employment of Mexican farm workers undermine employment conditions for domestic farm workers. The Secretary already has been given such power. My amendment would simply say that instead of saying that conditions are comparable, he should see to it that conditions of domestic workers in areas where they compete with Mexican workers are "at least equal" to those for Mexicans. It seems to me that this is only fair, that Americans should receive the same protection under the law as do aliens.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, while there is quite a group of Senators present, I want to say something about Mexican labor. The average farmer, whether he is in the Southwest or New York or Michigan, could not harvest his crop without Mexican labor. There is an understanding between the Mexican Government and the American Government on the matter. Our boys do not do such work any more. In my State, and the Senator from Arizona knows it is true in his, local boys will not pull those large sacks of cotton any more. In order to harvest cotton, we must have Mexican labor. This bill would extend the act for 6 months.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I regret that the proposed legislation has come before the Senate at this late hour. The question of Mexican migrant labor has been of concern to the Congress ever since it was initiated in World War II. Year after year it is presented as temporary and emergency legislation.

Congress has given a great deal of attention to it, but has never succeeded very much in working out a satisfactory solution. Last year the President set up a special commission. The Mexican farm labor consultants' report was filed in February 1959. Congress had enough time to give adequate consideration to its recommendations, and, according to the Secretary of Labor, no such adequate attention has been given or been paid to the recommendations of these consultants.

I have in my hand a letter dated July 20, 1960, from the Secretary of Labor. Let me note again the date, July 20, 1960. The letter is over the signature of the Secretary of Labor, and these words are contained in that letter:

> On the basis of the evidence available to the Department of Labor, we subscribe to the recommendations of the consultants against any extension of the program without a strengthening of the protections for domestic employment.

Let me repeat that sentence:

> On the basis of the evidence available to the Department of Labor, we subscribe to the recommendations of the consultants against any extension of the program without a strengthening of the protections for domestic employment.

This bill is a simple extension; it provides no protection for domestic workers.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. This matter was discussed at a rather fully attended meeting of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. There is a grave difference of opinion between the membership as to the wisdom of a general or lengthy extention of this legislation; but all of us, in consideration of the lateness of the hour—and this just came up at our last meeting—and in consideration of the fact that farmers in the area affected who cannot harvest their crops in the months from January to June, but, instead, have to plant them in the early part of the year and harvest and market them later are entitled to some consideration, and in further consideration of the fact that the matter will have to be reexamined and restudied and some law enacted on the subject matter next year, or else there will be no law remaining, we felt that the really decent thing to do for the people involved would be to adopt a simple 6 months' extension.

It was simply impossible, in the short time remaining, to work out the details.

I think I am stating the matter fairly when I say that even those who agree most fully with the distinguished Senator from Minnesota that some changes are required in the act—and there are some on our committee—felt the fair thing to do was to have a 6-month extension. I am sure the able chairman of the committee will bear out my statement in this regard.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President——

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. As passed by the House, this bill would extend the Mexican farm labor program for 2 years, until June 30, 1963. The Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, in reporting on this bill, recommended an amendment limiting the extension to 6 months, that is, until December 31, 1961.

The House Committee on Agriculture held hearings on a number of bills to extend this program in March of this year. There is a considerable demand for extension of this program among agricultural producers. They say they need this labor in order to produce their crops and that there is not an adequate supply of domestic agricultural workers at the right time and place that is willing to do the type of stoop labor and other work that the Mexicans are anxious to obtain.

On the other hand, some of the witnesses felt that some changes should be made in the program when it is extended. Last year, the Secretary of Labor appointed a committee of consultants to study the program. They reported that:

> The committee has concluded that, on balance, the case in favor of renewing Public Law 78 on a temporary basis is more conclusive than the arguments against its renewal.

The committee of consultants further reported:

> The committee's support of a temporary renewal of Public Law 78 is conditioned on its being substantially amended.

The substance of the consultants' recommendations was incorporated in the McGovern bill, H.R. 11211, which was rejected by the House Committee on Agriculture, and in the Fogarty amendment to H.R. 12759, which was rejected by the House on a division vote of 51 to 138. Both of the Senators from Minnesota, together with a number of other Senators, introduced in the Senate a bill, S. 3666, which is identical in substance to the Fogarty amendment. The Department of Labor recommended that no action be taken on S. 3666 this year or H.R. 12759, because of the need for examining carefully the questions raised. The Department of Agriculture also recommended against consideration of either bill this year, indicating that it believes no changes in the program are necessary.

The authority for the program was enacted in 1951. It has been extended from time to time and expires June 30, 1961. After that date, no workers may be made available under it. June 30 falls in the midst of the period when these workers are most needed. In order to make their production plans and obtain financing, the producers must know now whether workers will be available to harvest the crop next year. The Department of Labor states that its consultants' recommendations require further consideration. The Department of Agriculture indicates that it may be opposed to them after considering them further. It is obvious that the bill needs extension immediately, at least to cover the entire producing period in 1961, and that such extension cannot wait until the executive departments have determined what proposals for changes they wish to make. Extension through 1961 will provide full opportunity for careful consideration next year of any proposed changes.

When the proposal came before the committee there was much objection to the extension of the act for 2 years. One of the chief opponents of the extension for 2 years was my good friend from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] who does not happen to be present tonight.

With the understanding that the extension would be for 6 months only, the opposition which was in the committee was withdrawn. As I understood the proposal, there would be no serious objection to the extension of the act for 6 months if the committee next year were to take up the proposal to extend it for a longer period of time, taking into consideration the suggestions made by members of the committee, or the studies made and recently referred to by my good friend from Minnesota.

It is my hope, as pointed out by the distinguished Senator from Florida and by other Senators, that the law as it now exists will be extended 6 months until December 31, 1961. It would not be proper for the law to expire in the midst of a harvest. That is what prompted the committee to agree to extend the act for 6 additional months, in the hope that next year those who now propose amendments will have an ample opportunity to present the amendments before the committee.

I give assurance that if I am elected, and if I remain the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, we shall take up the proposal next year and give full hearings to all the amendments which I understand may be proposed tonight.

I express the hope that the amendments will not be offered, Mr. President, but that we can extend the act for 6 months without further amendment.

Mr. McCARTHY. I say to the Senator that the effect of extending the act for 6 months is to extend it for another year. I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry whether any hearings were held this year before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate on this question.

Mr. ELLENDER. No; not to my knowledge. We have a subcommittee in charge of the bill, but it did not hold hearings on this bill. The House held hearings.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senate did not give any consideration to this problem, even though the committee knew the act was to expire in June and knew that if the act were not extended the farmers would be embarrassed because they could not plan for the full year?

Mr. ELLENDER. I will say to my good friend that we have divided our

committee into four separate subcommittees. The colleague of the distinguished Senator, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], is chairman of the subcommittee which deals with the farm labor situation. We were depending on the hearings held by the House. For that reason, hearings were not held by the Senate committee. It was felt the hearings held before the House were sufficient.

Mr. McCARTHY. If the hearings were sufficient, then why did the Senate Committee wait to act? When did the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry act on the bill? Was it last week?

Mr. ELLENDER. Last Tuesday, August 23.

Mr. McCARTHY. Last Tuesday. That did not give the members of the Senate much time to work on the bill, in case Senators desired to offer amendments. Obviously, the bill came to us only in the press of the closing days of this session of Congress.

Mr. ELLENDER. The House passed the bill on June 29, and it came to us on June 30 and was immediately referred to the subcommittee headed by my good friend from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona has the floor.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I have heard from both sides of the controversy. I have heard from the farmers in California and in the Southwest States who are worrying about planting their crops between now and next July. I sympathize with their plight. I believe I understand it. I have also heard from the Department of Labor. We have had communications from the Department of Agriculture.

We have heard from others who think we ought not to renew this program at this time, until there is a better device for protecting domestic labor.

I happen to come from a part of the country which, through the harvest season, gets additional labor not from Canada as we used to, but from the State of my good friend from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND]. These laborers come north for the fall, and they combine good work, which they like to do, with a sort of a vacation.

I think that a good solution to the problem would be to pass this proposed legislation, which will extend the program for 6 months, to take care of the coming work on next year's crops, and not ask for a conference.

There is grave fear that if we go into a conference with the House, the Senate, as is sometimes the case, will get the short end of it, and if we seek to extend the act for 2 years or 1½ years, there is a probability there will be no legislation at all.

We need this proposed legislation to complete harvesting of next year's crops. It seems to me such a course would represent the best solution to the problem.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I am on the committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I am very interested in the subject of labor. I should like to support the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. President, I have an amendment which is designed to quiet a lot of litigation, in situations in which the Secretary of Labor has been engaged in litigation because there are no criteria in the act which is being extended. The effort of my amendment would be to establish necessary criteria.

I understand this is a difficult and trying problem, upon which people would wish to be heard on both sides, as to the complications in the amendment, although I think its adoption is justified.

I agree with the Senator from Vermont. I think, with the kind of attention which is fixed upon the proposal now, if the bill should be allowed to pass without amendment we can get action. Would the Senator accept instructions to conferees? We do not need that. The Senator from Arizona can tell us. We all love him dearly. Would the conferees bring us back a 6-month extension, or nothing at all? I should like to agree with the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. HAYDEN. I guarantee either the House will accept this extension or there will be no law.

Mr. JAVITS. I hope my colleagues, who are as interested as I, have heard this statement.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. Is it agreeable to the Senator from New York to accept this?

Mr. JAVITS. It is acceptable to me on the basis outlined by the Senator from Vermont, with the assurance that seasonably, in the next session, we shall really have a go-round on these very grave difficulties which have arisen with respect to the act, that the Secretary of Labor shall have a full opportunity to be heard, and so shall we. On those understandings, knowing as we do that the Senator from Arizona would never reply this way if it were not so, I would say we ought to go along at this point.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I certainly share the views of my friend from New York. We have a deep interest in seeing that, while we have a program of bringing workers from Mexico, our own domestic workers are properly treated.

Mr. HAYDEN. I have no disagreement in principle with the Senator, at all.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I realize that. We have several amendments we are prepared to offer. With the understanding that certainly this will be simply an extender of 6 months, I shall not offer the amendments I had intended to offer. I join the Senator from New York, and I believe the Senator from Minnesota, in expressing the hope that at an early time these proposals will be considered by the committee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. On the basis of the discussion held and the assurances given by the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]; the senior ranking member of the minority party on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]; and the sponsor of the resolution, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]; we have about as absolute a guarantee as could be given to anyone. I urge the passage of the measure.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that some remarks of mine may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement and letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR McCARTHY

Those of us who have been interested in improving the conditions of migratory workers have agreed to the 6-month extension of Public Law 78, in order that the next Congress can have an opportunity to make a thorough study and revision of the Mexican farm labor program.

The program has always been presented to the Congress as a temporary measure to relieve a shortage of seasonal agricultural workers. In fact, however, the program has expanded greatly, with the number of Mexican nationals increasing until now almost a half-million are brought in yearly under contract.

The program has also been based upon the principle that the use of this service shall not have an adverse effect upon the employment opportunities, the wages and the working conditions of domestic migratory laborers.

The most serious charge against the operation of Public Law 78 is that it has resulted in lower wages and worse working conditions for domestic workers. A large number of social and religious groups have been concerned. So has the Department of Labor, which has the responsibility for the administration of the program. A special group of consultants appointed by the administration to study the Mexican farm labor program came to a unanimous agreement that it had several adverse effects upon domestic workers and they opposed extension of the program without a number of changes which would safeguard the rights of domestic agricultural workers.

The position of the Department of Labor is expressed in the letter from the Secretary of Labor, Mr. Mitchell:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., July 20, 1960.

The Honorable ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ELLENDER: This is in further response to your request for our comments on S. 3666, a bill "To amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, to provide protection for the employment opportunities of domestic agricultural workers in the United States, and for other purposes."

In extending for 2 years the program for recruitment of Mexican nationals for agricultural employment in the United States the bill would tighten in several respects the conditions under which such workers could be used. Mexican nationals could be used only in seasonal or unskilled employment. In addition, S. 3666 would require independ-

ent and direct employer efforts to recruit domestic workers, not only at the same wages and hours of work as those offered the Mexican workers but also at the other terms and conditions of employment as those offered the foreign workers. The measure would also require employers to pay domestic workers already in their employ at wage rates no less favorable than those required to be paid the Mexican workers. The Secretary of Labor would be given specific authority to regulate the number of Mexican workers available for any employer, to establish criteria for determining whether the employment of such workers is adversely affecting the working conditions or employment opportunities of domestic farmworkers, and to issue necessary rules and regulations.

The Department of Labor is concerned that the continued wide-scale use of Mexican nationals, approximately 450,000 annually, in agricultural employment in this country may not be in the best interests of U.S. agricultural workers and employers. For this reason the Secretary of Labor in 1959 had an independent study made of the Mexican labor program. The unanimous conclusion of the consultants, representing varying points of view, conducting the study was that there are indications that in some cases the use of Mexican workers is having an adverse effect upon the wages, working conditions, and employment opportunities of our own agricultural workers. They recommend that there be no extension of the program unless adequate remedial amendments are adopted.

On the basis of evidence available to the Department of Labor, we subscribe to the recommendation of the consultants against any extension of the program without a strengthening of protections for domestic employment. However, because of the need for examining carefully questions raised with respect to the wisdom of specific proposals to strengthen the program in the best interests of United States farmworkers and employers, we recommend that no action be taken this year either to extend or amend the Mexican labor program. The program does not expire until June 30, 1961, so that full consideration can be given to the matter in the next session of Congress.

The Bureau of the budget advises that it has no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES T. MITCHELL,
Secretary of Labor.

I should also like to include several statements and letters which indicate the opposition and reservations which individuals and groups have about Public Law 78.

The first is a statement presented by Rev. Shirley E. Greene at the hearings held by the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives. Reverend Greene appeared in behalf of the National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A. He stated:

"As a result of this long and intimate contact with migratory workers and their families and this continuing study of what is needed to accord them a measure of justice commensurate with the vital service they render to every food-consuming person in the Nation, the council's general board adopted on February 25, 1960, a resolution bearing upon the Mexican worker importation program. This I will quote in full since it sums up the position of the council on the primary subject of the session here today.

"The statement is titled 'The Future of the Mexican Agricultural Worker Importation Program (Public Law 78, 82d Cong.).' It reads as follows:

"'Whereas Public Law 78 (82d Cong.) providing for the importation of Mexican nationals for agricultural labor in the United States involves human and ethical issues of grave concern to the conscience of Christian people; namely,

"'(a) The importation program has injurious effects on the family and community life both of the Mexican nationals who are imported and on the domestic workers who, because of the presence of Mexican nationals, are deprived of employment or find it necessary to migrate in search of employment;

"'(b) Importation tends to produce a labor surplus thereby depressing wages and labor standards for domestic agricultural workers; and even if the United States has failed to make the necessary adjustments to enable all farmers to secure an equitable share of the national income there is no moral justification for perpetuation of substandard wages for agricultural labor;

"'Whereas the general board of the National Council of Churches has, from time to time, adopted policy positions which are relevant to this situation: Therefore be it

"'*Resolved,* That the General Board of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A. is opposed to the extension of Public Law 78 (82d Cong.) in its present form; but, to avoid hardships on employers and workers who have come to rely on this program, we approve the extension of the farm labor importation program (Public Law 78) in amended form for a temporary period with a specific date of final termination and with definite provisions for annual reductions in volume written into the act; and furthermore

"'Even for this period of transition, we recommend that amendments be adopted designed to bring about the following improvements in the legislation:

"'(a) Limitation of the program to temporary labor shortage situations and to unskilled, nonmachine jobs;

"'(b) Assurance that diligent efforts have been made by both employers and the Bureau of Employment Security of the Department of Labor to recruit domestic labor at a wage adequate for health and welfare before any certification of need for Mexican nationals is made by the Department;

"'(c) Removal of the "certification of need" procedures as fully as possible from undue local pressure by growers;

"'(d) Determination of prevailing wage rates for Mexican nationals by the Department of Labor at a level that will not depress wages which might be offered domestic workers or prevent their seeking such employment;

"'(e) Inclusion in the law of specific provisions with respect to promulgations of rules and regulations by the Secretary of Labor which will insure observance of the intent of the law; and adequate provision for enforcement including authorization of sufficient inspection and enforcement personnel, and appropriate penalties for violation;

"'(f) Establishment of an appeal procedure available to growers or workers where findings of violation are made; and, be it further

"'*Resolved,* That in taking this position we recognize that certain other aspects of our national policy are intertwined with the operations of the Mexican importation program and that we recognize that a responsible policy which provides for early termination of that program must also come to grips with the following related issues:

"'(a) The necessity of providing adequate enforcement of the immigration laws on the Mexican border to prevent resurgence of the vast influx of so-called wetbacks of a few years ago and strict interpretation of the provisions of the immigration laws so as to prevent circumvention of the termination of the Mexican importation program;

"'(b) The readiness of the U.S. Government to develop, with the Mexican Government, such programs of economic and technical aid as may be required at least to offset any injury the Mexican economy may suffer from the termination of the Mexican importation program; and be it further

"'*Resolved,* That the general board authorize representatives of the National Council of Churches to testify at hearings in respect to Public Law 78 (82d Cong.) along lines indicated above.'"

Another critic of Public Law 78 is Archbishop Robert E. Lucey, of San Antonio, who was one of the five members of President Truman's Commission on Migratory Labor in 1951.

A recent address of his is reported in the press as follows:

"CALLS FARM LABOR IMPORT A 'RACKET'

"ST. LOUIS.—A leading church authority on farm problems has condemned the 'powerful growers who perpetuate the ghastly international racket (of Mexican farm labor import) against the demands of public opinion and against the conscience of our people.'

"Archbishop Robert E. Lucey, of San Antonio, told a gathering here that his remarks were not intended as a universal indictment of all farmers. He noted that 'this bracero (Mexican farmworker) program has struck a deadly blow at small farmers and farmworkers.'

"Archbishop Lucey, executive chairman of the Bishops Committee for the Spanish Speaking, addressed his remarks to the 10th annual meeting of the committee. The archbishop has been an outspoken critic of Public Law 78, which authorizes the importing of bracero labor for agricultural work in the United States and is based on treaties with Mexico.

"The archbishop also lashed out at 'those Members of Congress who stand in fear and trembling before the organized might of the farm bloc ready always to vote for the strong against the weak.'

"Also taking to task certain State legislators, the San Antonio churchman said that 'in a democracy we must expect to find some legislators who are little men in large assignments; who will not risk their tenure of office for justice' sake; who see in special privileges for the strong and misery for the weak a mandate from their constituents.'

"Coming back to the large growers, he said that the large corporation farm gets its labor cheap whether the workers are Mexican nationals or domestic migrants. 'This means,' he stated, 'that the toil of the small farmer has no greater value in the market than the work of the underpaid and exploited migratory worker.'

"The archbishop cited the willingness of some growers and organized farmers to seek justice, but he said that despite their good will, the system needs revamping.

"The archbishop suggested that his listeners put themselves in the place of the large growers so that 'we can see how logical it is [for them] to demand the indefinite continuation of the bracero program.' He added:

"'Think how helpful it is to growers to flood the labor market with half a million aliens. This causes unemployment among citizen workers, depresses farm wages, makes labor unions impossible, puts the family-size farm in a bad way, and gives employers an abundance of cheap, docile laborers,' he said."

I include also some of the letters which I have received concerning the proposed extension of Public Law 78 and which indicate, I believe, the concern of members of many groups about this program. This testimony reinforces the need for the next Congress to take sufficient time to reevaluate and revise the Mexican farm labor program.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
August 25, 1960.

DEAR SENATOR: We urge you to recommit H.R. 12759 to the Senate Agriculture Committee and instruct the committee to hold hearings on this matter in 1961. The bill, as reported, would extend the Mexican farm

labor importation program for an extra 6 months, or until December 31, 1961.

We recommend postponement because many questions have been raised as to the social costs of the present program; these questions have not yet been considered by the committee in public hearings. Such hearings could easily be held next spring, since the present program is not scheduled to expire until June 1961.

H.R. 12759 as reported, is particularly inadequate in that it does not authorize the Secretary of Labor to determine the need and set standards for the employment of Mexican workers. This authorization was recommended last year by a distinguished group of impartial consultants to the Secretary of Labor.

We believe that such authorization is absolutely essential since the mass importation of Mexican farm labor without adequate regulation of wage rates and working conditions has far-reaching adverse effects on American farmworkers and family farms—segments of our economy already in serious distress.

Sincerely yours,

E. RAYMOND WILSON.

AUGUST 25, 1960.

DEAR SENATOR MCCARTHY: We understand that a bill to extend Public Law 78, which governs the importation of Mexican farmworkers, may come to the floor of the Senate during this special session. A bill to extend the program was passed by the House in June after prolonged debate. This bill, H.R. 12759, was recently voted out by the Senate Agriculture Committee.

We urge you to vote against this bill for two reasons. The program seriously undermines the wages and employment opportunities of domestic farmworkers. It is well known that they are the lowest paid, least protected and most underemployed section of our labor force. To continue the importation of low-cost foreign labor can only further depress the conditions of these workers.

Furthermore, Public Law 78 does not expire until June 30, 1961, so there is no need for hasty action at this time. A number of important measures are still pending Senate action and these should certainly have priority over a program which continues in effect until months after the convening of the 87th Congress.

As you know, Public Law 78 has been the object of widespread and thorough-going criticism. The Secretary of Labor, who administers the program, recommends against action at this time, and a committee of distinguished consultants whom he appointed to study the program has urged that it not be continued unless certain safeguards were added to protect the wages and job opportunities of American farmworkers. These safeguards have not been added. Nor has any Senate committee held hearings on this bill. We feel sure you agree that such a controversial measure should not be acted upon until such hearings can be conducted.

The enclosed New York Times editorial, which was written about an earlier bill to extend Public Law 78, declares: "The Gathings bill [now the Sisk bill, H.R. 12759] should be decisively defeated and public support given unstintingly to measures designed to protect and improve the recruitment, wages and working conditions of domestic agricultural workers."

Sincerely yours,

ELIOT D. PRATT,
Secretary Treasurer.

IMPORTED MEXICAN LABOR

The time has come for the Nation to consider the termination of the iniquitous Mexican farm labor importation program authorized by Public Law 78. Under it some half million "braceros" are brought into this country every year to harvest crops, with shockingly low wages and poor working conditions, and in competition with domestic farm labor.

Public Law 78 is due to expire next year, but the Gathings bill (H.R. 12176), approved by a reactionary Republican and Southern Democratic majority of the House Agriculture Committee, would extend its life for 2 years more. It would also take away certain powers which the Secretary of Labor now has to protect domestic farmworkers recruited through the U.S. Employment Service.

A countermeasure, however—the McGovern bill (H.R. 11211)—will be introduced when the Gathings bill reaches the floor of the House. It provides for the termination by stages of the Mexican labor program over a 5-year period, and during that time it would amplify and make more specific certain ambiguous and ineffectual provisions of Public Law 78 designed to give protection to American farm labor from unfair Mexican competition.

The Gathings bill should be decisively defeated and public support given unstintingly to measures designed to protect and improve the recruitment, wages, and working conditions of domestic agricultural workers.

AUGUST 24, 1960.

Hon. EUGENE J. MCCARTHY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCARTHY: We would like to ask your opposition to a bill which was just reported by the Senate Agriculture Committee and will soon be before the Senate. The bill is, H.R. 12759, which was reported without the committee holding any hearings. It provides for the extension of the Mexican farm labor importation program, Public Law 78, for 6 months after its current expiration date of June 30, 1961.

This proposal would continue without reform the mass farm labor importation program which has caused depressed wages, unemployment, and underemployment among American farmworkers. The 6-month extension may be a maneuver to gain a much longer extension in the Senate-House conference since the House of Representatives has already passed a bill providing for a 2-year extension.

As a consumer organization we are particularly indignant at the defense often made for this shocking program that the consumer gains from it because it provides low prices for food. We cannot and do not subscribe to this theory. No consumer wishes cheap food at the price of the exploitation of fellow human beings. As consumers and taxpayers we resent the fact that some 60 percent of the imported Mexicans are employed to plant and harvest crops which are in surplus, such as cotton. Our tax funds are then used to support the falling prices of the overproduced commodity. This is sheer economic waste and havoc.

We urge you to oppose H.R. 12759. This bill has been subjected to no public hearings in the Senate although it deals with a law which does not expire for another year. We feel that the operation of this law is so objectionable that it should be thoroughly studied by the appropriate Senate committee before any action is taken.

Sincerely yours,

VERA MAYER,
General Secretary,
National Consumers League.

NATIONAL CATHOLIC RURAL LIFE CONFERENCE,
Des Moines, Iowa, August 24, 1960.

The Honorable EUGENE J. MCCARTHY,
The U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCARTHY: Our organization reiterates its opposition to the extending of Public Law 78 as provided by the Sisk bill (H.R. 12759). We urge that the Senate postpone legislative action in this matter until 1961 at which time it can be considered with fewer political overtones.

Sincerely,

EDWARD W. O'ROURKE,
Executive Director.

AMALGAMATED MEAT CUTTERS AND BUTCHER WORKMEN OF NORTH AMERICA,
Chicago, Ill., August 24, 1960.

The Honorable EUGENE J. MCCARTHY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCARTHY: The Agriculture Committee has reported a bill extending the Mexican farm labor importation program for 6 months beyond its expiration date on June 30, 1961. It approved H.R. 12759 without providing any opportunity for witnesses to be heard—even though this legislation is highly controversial and even though a rival bill, S. 3666, was pending before the committee.

The 6 months extension may sound moderate. But it can actually be the vehicle for a 2-year extension by the Senate-House conference since the House of Representatives passed a 2-year extension.

The Mexican farm labor importation seriously hurts the American farmworker and the American family farmer. The nearly half-million Mexican braceros imported each year provide a surplus of farm labor, so that the already abysmal wages of farmworkers can be kept at their present low level, or even depressed further. The cheap labor importation also provides the means for large corporation farms, mainly in five States, to have still another unfair competitive advantage over family farms.

Last year, a group of distinguished consultants—including former U.S. Senator Edward Thye, a clergyman, a university chancellor, and a Texas migrant labor official—studied this program for a half year. They unanimously concluded that it should not be renewed without major reform to provide more protection to American farmworkers against the low-wage foreign competition. The reforms they suggested are contained in S. 3666. Yet the Agriculture Committee did not even hold hearings on this legislation or H.R. 12759.

Since the labor importation program does not expire until the middle of next year, we urge that hearings be held next year. We therefore appeal to you to oppose H.R. 12759.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS J. LLOYD.
PATRICK E. GORMAN.

NATIONAL FARMERS UNION,
August 24, 1960.

DEAR SENATOR: Considering the need for a farm income stabilization and supply management program for farmers and relating such need to the hours, wages and working conditions of hired farm labor, Farmers Union supports the view that farm workers ought to be afforded the same rights under Federal law as other workers and that these rights should be enforced by the same agency of Government.

Under present farm labor programs and existing law concerning hired farmworkers, the above policy will not be realized. Farmers Union, therefore, respectfully requests your opposition to H.R. 12759 to extend the Mexican farm labor program. Its enactment will continue to subject American family-farm operators and their wives and children to subsidized unfair competition from industrialized factory-type agricultural enterprises employing and exploiting workers with grossly inadequate wage rates, working and living conditions.

Sincerely,

JAMES G. PATTON,
President.

INDUSTRIAL UNION DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D.C., August 24, 1960.
Hon. EUGENE J. MCCARTHY,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCARTHY: We are strongly opposed to the passage of H.R. 12759, the bill extending the Mexican farm labor importation program. This bill was approved yesterday by the Senate Committee on Agriculture without hearings on it or on Senator MCCARTHY's pending bill S. 3666, which is concerned with the same program.

H.R. 12759 would continue the Mexican labor importation program without reforms of any kind, despite ample evidence that the importation of almost half a million Mexican workers each year has been a major factor in depressing the wages and preventing improvements in the working conditions of farm workers.

In 1958, the average American farm worker earned only $761 at farm work. He was able to get farm work only 128 days in the entire year. Such conditions are indefensible in the face of clear evidence that the mass importation of cheap foreign workers is a major contributing factor.

Moreover, this program continues to place the American family farmer in jeopardy. The big farm operators who use most of this cheap labor gain an unfair competitive advantage over the family farmer who hires little or no labor. (Only 50,000 farmers in the Nation use Mexican labor—a tiny fraction of all our farmers.) The availability of this cheap labor has driven many small farmers out of tomato growing, and has contributed to the accumulation of farm surpluses and the reduction in farm income.

There is a great need for reform of the Mexican farm labor program, reforms recommended by many individuals and groups including Secretary of Labor Mitchell, who administers the program, and his distinguished advisory committee.

Specific suggestions for reforms have been spelled out in S. 3666. Before this program is extended for any period, we urge that full hearings be held and that these suggested reforms, which we support, be given due consideration.

The present law does not expire until June 30, 1961. We urge you to oppose H.R. 12759, and that no action be taken on this program until next year.

Sincerely,

JACOB CLAYMAN,
Administrative Director.

AMERICAN FEDERATION
OF LABOR AND CONGRESS
OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS,
Stockton, Calif., August 26, 1960.
Senator EUGENE J. MCCARTHY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: The Senate Agriculture Committee has reported favorably a bill, H.R. 12759, which would reextend without change the program under which contract workers are imported from Mexico into U.S. agriculture. This bill may reach the floor of the Senate within a matter of a very few days.

H.R. 12759 has not received hearings in the Senate. Hearings in the House revealed vigorous and reasoned opposition from scores of religious, civic, labor, veterans, consumer, and governmental agencies and organizations. The only support for the bill springs from the employers of foreign contract labor. It is understandable that they should wish the extension of this uniquely preferential legislation. But it must be remembered that the Mexican national program, functioning under Public Law 78, profoundly affects the lives of millions of Americans aside from the 50,000 growers who employ this peculiar class of labor. H.R. 12759, which proposes to extend the bracero program in its present form, therefore becomes a matter of grave public importance. We do not have space here to develop the many reasons we feel action on H.R. 12759 is fateful to millions of our citizens. We hope you will have the opportunity to examine the record of the House hearings (March 22–31, 1960). The record reveals that Public Law 78 adversely affects American farmworkers and their families; Americans of Mexican ancestry; America's working farmers and their families; and others.

It is difficult to conceive that the Senate of the United States should consider the retention of legislation which harms so many Americans and helps so few. It is even less conceivable the Senate should act on so serious a matter without adequate discussion and reflection. We therefore specifically urge that you vote to refer H.R. 12759 back to committee when it comes to the floor. We trust that when the 87th Congress convenes in January 1961, the entire question of foreign contract labor—tied in as it is with larger questions of the farm labor market, which in turn are tied in with the question of general farm policy—will receive the careful attention it, and the Nation, deserve.

Sincerely yours,

NORMAN SMITH,
Director, Agricultural Workers
Organizing Committee, AFL–CIO.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF
LABOR AND CONGRESS OF
INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS,
Washington, D.C., August 26, 1960.

DEAR SENATOR: A bill which would greatly harm the American farmworker and family farmer has been reported by the Agriculture Committee without hearings. The measure is H.R. 12759, which would extend the Mexican farm labor importation program.

The AFL–CIO is unalterably opposed to this bill. We believe that thorough hearings should be held on this highly controversial subject before the Senate is asked to take action. Since Public Law 78, which governs the Mexican farm labor importation program, does not expire until June 30, 1961, there will be ample time for hearings early next year and for the Senate to act. We therefore urge that you oppose H.R. 12759 and that no action be taken this session on this bill.

The Mexican farm labor program has been a major factor in depressing agricultural wages. The 2,300,000 American farmworkers averaged $761 for their farmwork in all of 1958. They were able to obtain work for only 128 days in the entire year. Yet under Public Law 78, nearly a half-million Mexican farmworkers are imported into the United States each year to worsen terrible conditions of poverty and underemployment among American workers.

The family farmer, the overwhelming majority of whom use little or no hired labor, cannot compete against the cheap labor imported under Public Law 78. The Mexican labor importation program, by depressing wages on corporation farms, provides another means for driving small farmers out of existence.

For these reasons, we urge your opposition to H.R. 12759.

Sincerely yours,

ANDREW J. BIEMILLER,
Director, Department of Legislation.

AMERICAN VETERANS COMMITTEE,
Washington, D.C., August 25, 1960.

DEAR SENATOR: H.R. 12759, an extension of the Mexican Labor Import Act, Public Law 78, has cleared the Senate Agricultural Committee.

This bill has had no Senate hearings and the present law does not expire until next year. This bill is not as bad as the House bill, but it provides for no protection for American farmworkers. If this bill passes the Senate and goes to a conference committee, the chances of worsening the legislation are great.

Congress came back this session to act on several "must" pieces of legislation. Apparently, much of this "must" legislation will not receive favorable action. It would be extremely disappointing if the Senate should spend its time adopting a bad piece of legislation which extends an act that is not scheduled to expire for another year, when for one reason or another it could not act on more important legislation.

We hope that H.R. 12759 does not get scheduled for full Senate consideration. If it does, we respectfully urge that you oppose its passage.

Thank you for your attention.

Sincerely,

J. ARNOLD FELDMAN,
Executive Direcor.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, I accept the statements and the commitments made here in the Chamber with the understanding that we will remember this, and not have the same kind of situation a year from now as we have had all too often in the past. There was always the question of time running out and sympathy for the farmers who had to plant their vegetables. I think the time has come to show some sympathy for the workers, both the Mexicans who are imported into this country, and the Americans who are displaced and forced to move north to seek additional work, with all the concomitant results of displacement of families and economic disorganization that follows.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] yield for one further suggestion? May I have the attention of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY]? I suggest to my colleagues that we have printed in the RECORD the amendments that we have proposed to offer as part of the remarks on this subject. Does the Senator feel that such procedure would be satisfactory?

Mr. HAYDEN. I have no objection. I suggest that the Senator proceed to have them printed in the RECORD together with the statement.

There being no objection, the amendments were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. MCCARTHY's amendment:

At the end of the bill add a new section as follows:

"SEC. 2. The first sentence of section 503 of such Act is amended by striking out the word 'and' immediately preceding '(3)'; and by striking out the period at the end of such sentence and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the following: 'and (4) no worker shall be supplied pursuant to the provisions of this title except for seasonal employment requiring no specialised skills.'"

Amendment of Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

At the end of the bill add a new section as follows:

"SEC. 2. Clause (3) of the first sentence of section 503 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"'(3) reasonable efforts have been made to attract domestic workers for such employment, including independent and direct recruitment by the employer requesting foreign workers, at terms and conditions of employment comparable to those offered to foreign workers'."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and for which I ask immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised of this parliamentary situation. By the action of the voice vote of the Senate in accepting the committee amendments, the amendments being in the form of a substitute for the bill would automatically rule out any additional amendments. Therefore the request will require unanimous consent.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, may we hear the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Montana will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to add the following new section:

SEC. 6. Section 8e of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended, and as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by inserting in the first sentence thereof after "grapefruit," the following: "shelled walnuts, dates with pits, dates with pits removed, and products made principally of dates,".

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and the request is open to objection—I ask whether the proposed amendment relates to the Tariff Act and to the importation of dates, shelled walnuts, and other commodities that were recited therein?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in response to what the distinguished minority leader has asked, I wish to say that due to the fact that the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] was out of the Chamber temporarily, at his request I introduced this bill. He is now present and can explain it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I still reserve objection. I will be glad to yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I might add that the opposition to the amendment from agencies of the Government might be classified as rather violent. My sympathies are with the producers. I am willing to say that now, but I would not wish to lose the bill by attaching the proposed amendment to it at this time.

Mr. ENGLE. I proposed only to offer the amendment on the assumption that it would be taken to conference. I understood that the chairman of the House Agriculture Committee would take this over.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I withdraw the amendment.

THE MEXICAN FARM LABOR PROGRAM

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the proper point in the RECORD, prior to the passage of House bill 12759, a statement I have prepared on that measure.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR GOLDWATER

H.R. 12759—BRACERO PROGRAM

As the law now stands, Public Law 78, the Mexican farm labor program, is scheduled to be terminated June 30, 1961. If legislation to extend this act is not enacted this session of Congress, large segments of the agricultural industry which have relied on these workers in the past will not be able to plan their operations to harvest the 1961 crop. This means that many growers in my State, particularly cotton people, will face a serious problem in planning for next year's crop; serious for several reasons, but particularly because lending institutions require that growers, as is the case with all other buiserations and anticipated needs. A cotton farmer, for example, must be able to go to nessmen, be able to outline their future opshis banker this winter and outline for him next year's operations, or the loan needed to carry him through summer operations is going to be hard to get. The farmer, in other words, if he does not know what is going to happen to his labor supply in June, is going to be left in the lurch.

Supplementary factors to consider if this program is not extended beyond the June 30, 1961, date are:

1. The Department of Labor is going to have to plan ahead early in the year 1961 as to what to do with its employees in the field. This, of course, gets into the matter of termination of service and relocation.

2. The Department of Labor will be planning far ahead of June 30, 1961, as to where its field service people will be relocated. This means that reception centers for Mexican farmworkers will most likely be scheduled for closing June 30. It also means that recruitment programs in this area must be curtailed by June 30, 1961. Both the above considerations can be applied to State services working with the Department of Agriculture in this area.

3. Thirdly, there are budgetary provisions. The Department of Labor must plan in advance its budget requirements for administering the Bracero program. This planning, of course, must be done far in advance of June 30, 1961.

The House-passed version of H.R. 12759 would extend the Mexican farmworker program for 2 years. The Senate Agriculture Committee has reported out a bill to extend this program for only 6 months which will carry the program to December 31, 1961. The Department of Agriculture has reported that it feels it desirable that this program be extended beyond the termination date but wants action delayed until the next Congress. The Department of Labor has said flatly that it does not want this program extended until the Department is prepared to offer certain amendments to the program which the Secretary of Labor feels necessary to broaden his authority in this area.

The point is this; to my knowledge the Secretary of Labor has at this time presented no definite language or specific propositions as to how he would change this program. If the Secretary is prepared to make such recommendations by the next Congress, it is still doubtful that legislation in this area could clear through committees of both Houses and be passed by both Houses in time to continue this program without a substantial lag. This means that at the same time the Department would be taking steps to terminate the program, the Congress would be working with legislation to extend it. To the farmer who must have a reliable labor supply, this means that on June 30, he will probably lose his access to Mexican farm labor and with cotton crops to be harvested in my State during August and September, he is going to be just out of luck. It is for this reason that I ask that this program, if not extended for 2 years as the House has approved, certainly be extended until the end of 1961. This will keep the program from being broken off abruptly when the farmer most needs to count on this labor force. It will enable the Congress and the Departments of Labor and Agriculture to work out legislative changes, if any, felt to be necessary and which could then be smoothly implemented at the beginning of the year 1962. This will allow the farmer to continue planning his crops on a yearly basis with no midyear interruption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H.R. 12759) was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

STATE ACQUISITION OF CERTAIN PUBLIC LANDS FOR RECREATIONAL USE

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2757) to supplement the act of June 14, 1926, as amended, to permit any State to acquire certain public lands for recreational use, which was, on page 1, line 8, strike out all after "words" over through and including "thereafter;" in line 10, and insert "words 'or the State agency or any other agency having jurisdiction over the State park system of said State designated by the Governor of that State as its sole representative for acceptance of lands under this provision,'."

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Utah.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the amendment?

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, line 8, it is proposed to strike out all after "words" over through and including "thereafter;" in line 10, and insert "words 'or the State agency or any other agency having jurisdiction over the State park system of said State designated by the Governor of that State as its sole representative for acceptance of lands under this provision,'."

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Has the amendment gone through the processes provided by the rules of the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment being a House amendment to a Senate bill, all the Senate is required to do is to act on the acceptance of the change.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The amendment is then properly before the Senate now?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is a privileged matter and is laid before the Senate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I can get no detail as to whether the amendment was cleared with any minority member.

We would like to know who was consulted with respect to the bill and what appropriate committee would have had jurisdiction. This is a House bill, as I understand.

Mr. MOSS. No, it is a Senate bill reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I introduced the bill, which was passed with an amendment in the House this afternoon.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Who on this side of the aisle on the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the Senate has any knowledge of the bill?

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, may I respond to that question? I am not on the committee, but I am a coauthor of the bill. The bill is very important to those States that have a State park system. It is one of a series of bills through which over the last 2 or 3 years we have been working out the problems involved in setting up such systems. I hope the Senate will adopt the amendment. The amendment that came from the House is entirely satisfactory.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. I think it is fine that the coauthors of the bill agree between themselves that the amendment is satisfactory. However, I do think it should be referred to a member of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

I suggest that the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] the ranking Republican member of that committee, has seen the amendment. I assure the Senator I have never seen it. I have no objection to the amendment, but I do not think this is quite the way to proceed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, it was represented to us a moment ago that the bill pass the Senate, and that all we are dealing with at the present time is a House amendment to a Senate bill. I wanted to be assured only that it had gone through the proper procedure, and that the amendment in which we are asked to concur is appropriate. We have the word of the distinguished Senator from Utah. I thought perhaps the distinguished Senator from Idaho might have some knowledge on this subject.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I understand from the distinguished author of the bill that the House amendment is merely a restrictive amendment limited only to park lands, and I think we are making much to do about it. The Senators from Utah have no objection to it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am glad to accept the statement of the Senator from Utah, who is a coauthor and has some interest in the bill.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah assure us that the bill and amendment would not in any way affect the situation at Dinosaur National Monument, Echo Park, or any of those installations?

Mr. MOSS. It has no connection at all or no bearing on that case.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator from Utah did a fine job in preparing the park bill. I only wanted to be sure that it did not get that measure confused.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I share the view of the Senator from New Mexico. Two sponsors of the bill tell us that the amendment is proper and acceptable. Has any member of the committee which has jurisdiction over the bill expressed an opinion about the propriety of the amendment?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The author of the bill which has been passed by the Senate has expressed an opinion. The House merely added a restrictive amendment. The bill has already passed the Senate. The amendment is acceptable to the author of the bill, who is a member of the committee. The amendment is acceptable to the ranking minority member of the committee and to the ranking majority member of the committee, who was examined. It is acceptable to them. The Senate has already passed it without objection. The Senator from Utah is merely moving that the Senate concur in the simple amendment added by the House. It is a restrictive amendment, restricting the bill originally passed by the Senate.

The only mistake that was made was that the Senator from Utah did not check with the staff members at the desk. He understood it had been checked. The minority leader was within his rights to raise the question he raised because it should have been cleared with the staff. The ranking minority member has no objection. I hope the Senate will concur in the House amendment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, this is the first time in my life, in carrying the responsibility of casting my votes, that I have been called upon to sit by watching bills go through the mill. They have been bills about which I knew nothing. I do not contemplate tonight sitting here without knowing what is being passed by the Senate. I will raise objection to the consideration of any bill which under the rules of the Senate must go over. I feel embarrassed in this experience. I am sure there are other Senators also who have no familiarity with the many bills which have been rushed through the Senate. I do not propose any longer tonight to sit by watching the machine move and grind out bills, with some of them not going through the regular process, and my not knowing anything about them. I have no objection to the bill that has been discussed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senator from Ohio that this being an amendment of the House to a Senate bill, the bill need not go over.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Bills have gone through which have not been processed in conformity with the rules. I serve notice that I will raise objection to any bill being considered which must be held over for 1 day, or if the rules of the Senate have not been complied with in the processing.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Obviously the Senator does not realize that this is a privileged matter. The only mistake the Senator from Utah made is that he did not check the bill with the minority leader. It is a privileged matter. There is no reason why the amendment should not be agreed to without discussion. The House amendment has been gone into by the committee. It has been accepted by the committee. I hope we can get action on the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss].

Mr. LAUSCHE. I have just one more word to add. It is not more than a half hour since a Member of the House said to me, "You are getting a lot of cats and dogs." I am not going to stand by without learning what is going on.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, there are no cats and dogs in the House of Representatives; at least I never saw any over there.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Utah.

The motion was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 2917) to establish a price support level for milk and butterfat.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2757) to supplement the act of June 14, 1926, as amended, to permit any State to acquire certain public lands for recreational use, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 3688) to amend the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945, as amended, and the act approved December 20, 1944, as amended, and for other purposes, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 816) to set aside certain lands in Oklahoma for the Cheyenne and Arapaho Indians.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4306) to provide education and training for the children of veterans dying of a service-connected disability incurred after January 31, 1955, and before the end of compulsory military service.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8665) to amend the Act entitled "An Act to establish a memorial to Theodore Roosevelt in the National Capital" to provide for the construction of such memorial by the Secretary of the Interior.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of

the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10960) to amend section 5701 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the excise tax upon cigars.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12536) relating to the treatment of charges for local advertising for purposes of determining the manufacturers sale price.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12659) to suspend for a temporary period the import duty on heptanoic acid.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 10311) providing that certain provisions of Public Law 335 dated October 7, 1949 (63 Stat. 724) shall apply to the Mercedes division of the lower Rio Grande rehabilitation project, Texas, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

IMPORTATION OF CERTAIN ARTICLES FOR RELIGIOUS PURPOSES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR]. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 1980, H.R. 4384.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 4384) to amend paragraph 1774 of the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to the importation of certain articles for religious purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I understand that several Senators wish to offer amendments to the bill. The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] is in charge of the bill, which has been reported by the Committee on Finance. I yield the floor, so that he may explain the bill.

Mr. KERR obtained the floor.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania, so that he may present his amendment.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I call up my amendment, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, after line 11, it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. 3. The first section of the Act entitled "An Act relating to withholding, for State income tax purposes, on the compensation of Federal employees", approved July 17, 1952 (Public Law 587, Eighty-second Congress; 5 U.S.C. 84b), is hereby amended—

(1) by striking out "State or Territory" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "State, Territory, or city"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "For the purposes of this section, the term 'city' means only a city which is incorporated under the law of a State or Territory and which had a population (according to the last decennial census) of seventy-five thousand or more individuals."

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is to authorize the Federal Government to withhold amounts due for city wage taxes from wage and salary payments to Federal employees working at Federal installations in cities with more than 75,000 inhabitants in which such taxes are imposed. Fifteen cities in the States of Pennsylvania, Ohio, Missouri, and Kentucky would be assisted materially in their tax enforcement problems by passage of the amendment. The 1952 act now authorizes Federal withholding for amounts due for State income taxes.

The amendment is identical with Senate bill 2551, which was introduced by me in behalf of myself and Senators SYMINGTON, LAUSCHE, SCOTT, HENNINGS, and YOUNG of Ohio. The administration has expressed support for S. 2551, and the Treasury Department in a letter to the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, dated October 30, 1959, stated that it "favors enactment of S. 2551," and the Bureau of the Budget in a letter to the chairman, dated September 8, 1959, stated that "the Bureau of the Budget favors the basic principles of this measure to permit withholding of Federal employees' income by cities of over 75,000 population as recorded in the last decennial census."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a somewhat fuller statement explaining in detail the amendment I have offered may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I do not rise to object, but to reserve an objection until the visitors in the Senate observe decorum. There is talking all along the walls in the Chamber. I ask the Chair to admonish our visitors to be respectful of the legislative process in the Chamber.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCGEE in the chair). The Chair has been requested to readmonish the visitors around the walls of the Chamber to obey the rules of decorum in this body.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I withdraw my objection.

There being no objection, the explanation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPLANATION OF CLARK CITY WAGE TAX WITHHOLDING AMENDMENT TO PENDING BILL

The Clark amendment to the pending bill would amend the act of July 17, 1952, by authorizing the Federal Government to withhold amounts due for city wage taxes from wage and salary payments to Federal employees working at Federal installations in cities with more than 75,000 inhabitants in which such taxes are imposed. Fifteen cities in the States of Pennsylvania, Ohio, Missouri, and Kentucky would be assisted materially in their tax enforcement problems by passage of the amendment. The 1952 act now authorizes Federal withholding for amounts due for State income taxes.

The Clark amendment is identical to the bill (S. 2551) which was sponsored by Senators CLARK, SYMINGTON, LAUSCHE, SCOTT, HENNINGS, and YOUNG of Ohio. The administration has expressed support for S. 2551. The Treasury Department in a letter to the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, dated Ocotber 30, 1959, stated that it "favors enactment of S. 2551," and the Budget Bureau in a letter to the chairman, dated September 8, 1959, stated that "the Bureau of the Budget favors the basic principle of this measure (S. 2551) to permit withholding of Federal employees' income by cities of over 75,000 population as recorded in the last decennial census." Senator CLARK stated the following reasons in support of the amendment:

1. The bill imposes no new taxes. Only those taxes which are already legally due to the cities imposing the wage taxes would be withheld.

2. The courts have held many times that nonresidents must pay wage taxes to communities in which they work, where they receive certain municipal benefits on an equal basis with residents.

3. Cities withhold Federal income taxes from the payrolls of city employees. Federal withholding of city wage taxes should be authorized as a matter of reciprocity. Withholding would cost the Federal Government, which already makes several payroll deductions by machine, virtually nothing.

4. The cities would save large sums now spent in enforcement efforts by passage of the amendment and Federal employees would be saved the inconvenience, distress, and cost of having such enforcement measures taken against them.

A bill (H.R. 3151), identical to the Clark amendment, was reported (H. Rept. 872) unanimously by the House Ways and Means Committee on August 11, 1959, and the bill was passed on by the House of Representatives on February 17, 1960, after the adoption of two amendments during floor debate to bring within the coverage of the act (1) cities with more than 50,000 population in which wage taxes are levied; and (2) Federal installations within 5 miles of the city limits of qualifying cities. In a letter to the chairman of the Committee on Finance dated April 19, 1960, the Treasury Department stated that it was opposed to the floor amendments added to the House bill. To avoid the possibility of a veto the latter provisions were not included in the pending amendment.

The Finance Committee held public hearings on H.R. 3151 on June 17, 1960, and support for the bill was expressed by the American Municipal Association, the League of Virginia Municipalities, and representatives of cities and States where municipal wage taxes exist. The only opposition to the measure came from representatives of out-of-State or nonresident Federal employees who are required to pay city wage taxes under existing law because they work in municipalities levying such taxes.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, exactly what would the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania do?

Mr. CLARK. The amendment would permit Federal agencies to deduct from the salaries of Federal employees living within a city which levies a wage tax, the wage tax which is due the city, just as the city withholds from its employees the Federal income tax which is due the Federal Government.

Present law permits such a withholding in the case of State income taxes, but not in the case of a city income or wage tax. The obvious inequity with respect to the many cities in the Nation which levy such taxes and have great difficulty

in collecting them from employees of the Federal Government should be clear.

I had this experience as Mayor of Philadelphia. In almost every instance the employees are desirous to have the tax withheld from their salaries, because if it is not withheld, and it is legally due, what happens is that the city tax enforcement officials are required to file a lien on a man's car or on his house to collect not only the tax but also the interest and penalty, as well. Thus many of the employee associations have been anxious to have the withholding done, so as to prevent such action from being taken.

Mr. FREAR. The Senator said "to permit." Does that mean that the Federal agencies must deduct the tax?

Mr. CLARK. Yes.

Mr. FREAR. Then it is not permission.

Mr. CLARK. The State income tax must now be deducted. If the amendment is adopted, the city income tax will be deducted.

The bill has the approval of the administration, the Bureau of the Budget, and the Treasury Department.

Mr. FREAR. The junior Senator from Delaware has not yet approved it. Did I understand the Senator from Pennsylvania to say that it would apply to employees living within a city where employment is given?

Mr. CLARK. No; living within or working within the city.

Mr. FREAR. Or working within the city. Does that mean that employees in Wilmington, Del., who work in the Navy shipyard in Philadelphia would be subject to a Philadelphia city withholding tax?

Mr. CLARK. They already are; and if they are working in Philadelphia establishments, where thousands of citizens of Delaware now work, that tax is now deducted by the employers.

Mr. FREAR. I certainly object to the amendment. I hope the Senate will reject it. People who live outside Philadelphia, who live outside Pennsylvania, who live in another State, but are working for an agency of the Federal Government, would be forced to pay a Philadelphia tax. They do not use the streets of Philadelphia, the lights of Philadelphia, or the other facilities. Yet they would be subject to a Philadelphia city tax.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is not exactly correct, because if a person works in the city of Philadelphia, he uses its streets and its lights. He gets the benefit of police protection and fire protection. Generally speaking, he gets the benefit of all municipal services which are necessary to maintain law and order and to give him a proper place in which to work.

Mr. FREAR. I cannot agree with the Senator, because some Delawareans go up to Philadelphia in boats.

Mr. CLARK. Those who go up in boats, when they get there, nonetheless use the streets, the lights, the water, and the police protection in Philadelphia.

Mr. FREAR. But the Federal Government is charged for those services, and the Federal Government pays the city of Philadelphia. For all the facilities the Federal Government uses, the Federal Government pays the city of Philadelphia. I want the Senator from Pennsylvania to have Philadelphia collect all the taxes which are due it, but I do not want Philadelphia taking taxes away from Delawareans who live outside Pennsylvania, simply for the use of the facilities of Philadelphia.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I associate myself with the penetrating remarks of the Senator from Delaware, with whom I heartily and totally agree. I wonder if the Senator from Pennsylvania would not agree that the nonresident does not receive all the benefits of a resident of the city of Philadelphia and at least should not have to pay the full income tax that the resident pays.

Mr. CLARK. I regret being unable to agree with the Senator from New Jersey, because it occurs to me that the resident of Camden receives just as many benefits as the resident of Montgomery County when they both come into 15th and Chestnut Streets and go to work at the Philadelphia National Bank.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Does not the Senator agree, though, that the nonresident of the city does not receive all the benefits which the resident of the city receives?

Mr. CLARK. It occurs to me that since Philadephia is the place where the nonresident makes his money, perhaps he receives more benefits than does the individual who works inside the city and has to pay the Philadelphia tax.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I am certain the Senator from Pennsylvania knows that the biggest expenditure in any municipality these days is for schools for resident children. Certainly a worker from Camden or from Delaware does not get the benefit of a very fine Philadelphia education.

Mr. CLARK. The Philadelphia wage tax does not go for school benefit purposes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. What is the purpose of the Philadelphia wage tax?

Mr. CLARK. It is to support the municipality, but not the school district.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Would not the Senator from Pennsylvania see the simple justice of excluding nonresidents from the Federal collection of a city tax?

Mr. CLARK. All the major labor organizations representing Federal employees, including the American Federation of Government Employees, the National Association of Letter Carriers, the National Postal Clerks Union, and the National Association of Mail Handlers have approved the bill. It occurs to me that Federal employees themselves want it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I see my colleague from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] on the floor. He has talked to me about just such an amendment. I think he is ready to discuss it with the Senator.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, certainly I would have no objection to the Federal Government collecting the city tax from a resident of Philadelphia, but I must object to the Federal Government collecting such a tax from a resident of Delaware. I do not believe that there is no other recourse to the city of Philadelphia to collect such taxes. I know the Senator has said emphatically and rather persuasively that it is necessary to attach a lien, which costs people some money. But if he were to eliminate residents of New Jersey and Delaware, I believe he might get a little assistance from those two States, instead of resistance.

Mr. CLARK. Would the Senator from Delaware have any objection to the bill if it were amended to exclude the residents of other States?

Mr. FREAR. I would have no objection.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I had indicated that I would yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I was just about to develop the point which the Senator has just developed. Does he have any estimate of the number of people who would be affected who are inhabitants of the State of Pennsylvania or the city of Philadelphia?

Mr. CLARK. I have been arguing the case as though it were a Philadelphia case, but actually it is not. Fifteen cities are involved, including cities in the States of Missouri, Ohio, and Kentucky. As I pointed out before, the Senators from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS and Mr. SYMINGTON] and the Senators from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE and Mr. YOUNG] are cosponsors of the bill. So I cannot give countrywide figures.

However, with respect to Philadelphia and other municipalities in Pennsylvania which I know about, the overwhelming majority of the employees affected would be working in Federal installations outside the city but inside the State, but who live in the city. Therefore, I would be prepared, to accord with the position of some of my friends, in dealing with the State problem, to propose an amendment which would eliminate the interstate impact of the bill.

Mr. BUSH. I believe there is a distinction between those who are residents and those who are nonresidents working in a given community. The State of New York has an income tax for residents and one for nonresidents who work in New York. I think that is appropriate.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the Senators from Delaware, the Senator from New Jersey, and the Senator from Connecticut, I now move that my amendment be modified by adding at the end thereof the following:

Provided, however, That this section shall not authorize the Federal Government or any of its departments, agencies, or officials to withhold city wage taxes or city income taxes from the compensation paid to any Federal employee who does not reside in the State in which the city is located which levies such tax.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. The Senator from Pennsylvania and I discussed this matter at some length, before it came up on the floor. If the amendment is amended so as to eliminate its application insofar as nonresidents of a city are concerned, I believe that would be satisfactory to my colleague from New Jersey and to me and to our constituents.

In addition to the language the Senator from Pennsylvania has proposed, I think there should be added a very clear section providing for the administrative handling of this matter and for reliance on the Federal Government or on the State, as the case may be, to handle the matter, rather than to have any question raised about its administration.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator has discussed this matter with me. If the Senator from New Jersey will submit his amendment, I will accept it, if the Senator from Oklahoma will go along with me on that, as I believe he will.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I have an amendment which has been drawn by the Legislative Drafting Service; the amendment will take the place of the amendment the Senator from Pennsylvania has proposed, and will add the language for the administrative handling of the matter—if that will be satisfactory, as I believe it will.

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to accept it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the proposed modification of the amendment will be read.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I desire to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire will state it.

Mr. COTTON. Is it by unanimous consent that the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey may be added to the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That amendment is proposed to be added to the Clark amendment; and the clerk has been directed to read the proposed modification of the amendment.

Mr. COTTON. The Chair said "without objection."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. However, it is the right of the author of an amendment to accept a modification of it.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I reserve the right to object, because it is my intention to submit an amendment which would be of more far-reaching effect than the rather mild proposal offered by the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. President, will it be in order for me to offer my amendment in place of the pending amendment? I assume that I cannot, once the pending amendment is agreed to. Will it be in order for me to offer my amendment as a substitute?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that the Senator from New Jersey has offered his amendment as a substitute for the Clark amendment.

Mr. CLARK. No, Mr. President.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. My amendment adds another section to the Clark amendment, and therefore becomes a part of it, upon its acceptance by the author of the Clark amendment.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania will state it.

Mr. CLARK. Am I not entitled to modify my own amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. CLARK. Next, is it not in order for me to accept the amendment which has been offered by the Senator from New Jersey to my amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. CLARK. Is not that the present parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire will state it.

Mr. COTTON. I understand that the Senator from Pennsylvania has a perfect right to modify his own amendment. But has he the right to accept an amendment which another Senator offers to his amendment, if, as a parliamentary matter, that will preclude other Senators from offering amendments?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clark amendment is still subject to amendment by an amendment submitted by any other Senator. The acceptance by the Senator from Pennsylvania of the modification offered by the Senator from New Jersey does not change the status of the Clark amendment.

Mr. COTTON. I thought that only one principal amendment was permitted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There cannot be tertiary amendments; there can only be amendments in the second degree.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania will state it.

Mr. CLARK. Is it not in order for the Senate to pass on my amendment, as modified by the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], and then to have other amendments offered to it?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Not after the Clark amendment is agreed to.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I understood the Senator from Pennsylvania to accept the suggestion of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] as a modification of his amendment.

Mr. CLARK. That is correct.

Mr. BUSH. So a further amendment would be in the first degree, would it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No; for the Clark amendment is in itself an amendment to the bill. Therefore, another amendment would be in the second degree.

Mr. COTTON. Will it be in order for another amendment to be offered to the Clark amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware will state it.

Mr. FREAR. Do I correctly understand that the Senator from Pennsylvania will, by means of the modification, take care of the people of Delaware?

Mr. CLARK. That is correct.

Mr. FREAR. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which I offer to the Clark amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of the Clark amendment it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. 2. (a) The first section of such Act is further amended—

(1) by inserting before the period at the end of the second sentence the following: "; except that such agreement shall not provide for the collection of tax through withholding under such law from the compensation of any individual who is not domiciled in the State or Territory with which the agreement was entered into or in a State or Territory within which is located the city with which the agreement was entered into"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof (after the sentence added by paragraph (3) of the first section of this Act) the following new sentence: "For the purposes of this section, the domicile of any individual shall be in the State or Territory in which he declares himself to be domiciled if (1) he acquired such domicile, under the laws of the State or Territory before the beginning of the period for which the tax in question is imposed, and (2) within the 60-day period which begins on the date he receives a written demand for payment of the tax he makes a declaration with respect to his domicile, in writing and under oath, to the official whose duty it is to collect such tax."

(b) The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply only with respect to State and local income taxes with respect to which the date for payment established under State, Territorial, or local law occurs on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I wish the Senate to understand clearly the import of this amendment. It goes to the extent of modifying the act which was passed during the last Congress.

Let us understand the situation clearly: In the last Congress, a bill introduced by the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] directed the Federal Government to withhold from the salaries or wages of Federal employees the State tax of any State or territory levying a tax on its inhabitants—to withhold that tax, for the State or Territory, from the Federal employees.

Some of us very vigorously and strongly objected to the passage of that measure. We did not object to having the Federal Government, like any other employer, act in cooperation with States and Territories to withhold State taxes for the States, from Federal employees.

But in this country there has arisen, as all of us know, a growing dispute between States and a situation which, in the opinion of many of us, eventually

will need to be ironed out, perhaps by means of a constitutional amendment, in connection with the status of a State which levies a tax on the income of citizens of other States who are domiciled in other States, who vote in other States, who sleep in other States, but who work all or a portion of their time—and, many times, only a portion of their time—within the State levying the tax.

Many of us resist the idea of the Federal Government's persisting in injecting itself into the position of an arbiter of such a claim and prejudicing the rights of some of our States, like my own, whose citizens are having income taxes levied on them by other States by the Federal Government's making itself an agent to collect the taxes from nonresidents.

Frankly, we failed in that struggle. The bill passed, and became law. Those people, having had their pound of flesh, are back after their second pound.

The senior Senator from Pennsylvania, perfectly properly, and in behalf of his own people and for the interest of his own State, wants to extend this practice to city taxes, so that the Federal Government will withhold city taxes that are levied on its employees. In this case, of course, his original proposal would enable the Government to levy the taxes on those who do not live within the city or State.

The distinguished Senator from New Jersey has offered an amendment which takes care of that particular added pound of flesh. The proposal of the Senator from Pennsylvania provides that in this case, in the extension to cities, we will not, as we did before, inject the Federal Government into the task of collecting taxes from nonresidents.

My own amendment meets this question head on. Let there be no misunderstanding. If my amendment is adopted, it not only would alter the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania so that the Federal Government would not withhold city taxes on its employees who do not live within the State in which the city is located, but it also provides that the Federal Government will not withhold State taxes from its employees domiciled in another State.

In other words, if my amendment is adopted—and I do not want to deceive anybody—it not only puts this restriction on the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania, but it repeals the action taken by the Congress last year. It restores the restriction with relation to both city and State taxes, namely, that the Federal Government will be an agent to withhold taxes for States and cities, but only against those who are domiciled within the State. and will not inject itself into this other question.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COTTON. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey, who has offered the amendment.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I thank the Senator from New Hampshire. The Senator from New Hampshire is eminently correct, if I may echo the words of our colleague who usually occupies the seat I now occupy. He is correct in his statement of the effect the amendment would have, and he is correct in wanting it to have that effect.

I ask the Senator from New Hampshire whether the residents of his State do not pay entirely for the cost of their State and local government expenditures?

Mr. COTTON. Indeed we do. We do not have a State income tax. We do not tax people from other States who work within our State.

I will say to my friend from New Jersey that the thing which has incensed the Senator from New Hampshire—and this is the third time he has taken the time of the Senate, and he does not hesitate to take it at this late hour, to dislodge this action by the Federal Government—is that we have gone so far that a man who has been employed on railroad trains for 40 years, who lives in New Hampshire, who votes there, sleeps there, and is domiciled there, but works on a train that goes from Concord to Boston, Mass., is taxed by the State of Massachusetts on a portion of his wages in proportion to the number of miles he travels in that State.

That question is not something we can settle here tonight; but what the Senator from New Hampshire resents is having the Congress of the United States put the seal and the hallmark of its approval on that practice. It was done last year to some extent. Now the Senator from Pennsylvania wants to make the deed more gross and add to it.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Will the Senator advise me whether the State of New Hampshire collects any taxes from residents of Massachusetts for the expenses of operating municipalities and other local bodies in New Hampshire?

Mr. COTTON. No.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I wonder if the Senator realizes that New Jersey does not collect any taxes from the people of New York, for example, for operating their municipalities or local bodies.

Mr. COTTON. Indeed, the Senator does realize it, and the Senator recognizes that the Senator from New Jersey and the Senator from Connecticut are facing exactly the same situation and have vigorously opposed the practice.

The Senator from New Hampshire would like to add that the suggestion that a person who is a citizen of a State, who lives there, who pays his taxes there, who goes into another State in the morning and remains there through a portion, at least, or all of the working hours, and then returns home at night, should be taxed on income because he uses the sewers or has a drink of water or walks the streets, as any resident of a foreign nation walks the streets and has police protection, is as rank poppycock as I have heard on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. The Senator from New Jersey feels the Senator from New Hampshire has stated the matter succinctly, correctly, and exactly. The Senator from New Jersey fully supports the move now made by the Senator from New Hampshire. He feels it is desirable to have a little insurance. He offered the amendment to make sure the situation was not made worse by the amendment offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania, but the Senator from New Jersey supports the further and far-reaching amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COTTON. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I understand New Hampshire would like to prohibit neighboring States from deducting income taxes which may be due in those States from workmen from the State of New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. Not at all. The Senator from New Hampshire would like to if he could, but his amendment does not do that.

Mr. AIKEN. I was about to ask the Senator if he would not like to go a bit further and extend the amendment so as to deny any State the right to exact a percentage of parimutuel bets which are placed in a State by residents of an adjoining State.

Mr. COTTON. It is quite plain that my distinguished friend from Vermont in this particular instance has not entirely digested the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire. There is nothing in the law, there is nothing in the amendment offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania, there is nothing in the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey, and there is nothing in the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire that undertakes to say a State cannot collect from a nonresident working in that State who is domiciled in another State, because that can be done only by an agreement between the States, or probably—and I am not going into that—a constitutional amendment.

All that the Senator from New Hampshire is attempting to do is to say the Federal Government shall not make itself an agent to collect this money.

If there is a nonresident working in the State of the Senator from Vermont, that State can levy a tax on him; the State can catch him and make him pay it, undoubtedly.

What the Senator from New Hampshire is resisting and has been resisting is the Federal Government, on its own, undertaking to be a tax collector for one State against the residents of another State. That, Mr. President, is fundamentally unsound and wrong. It is one of the many inroads being made into the rights and privileges of the sovereign States of this Union day after day and month and month in this body.

That is the reason the Senator from New Hampshire asks that his amendment be agreed to. It would not preclude the State of Vermont from taking action. The State could tax the residents of New Hampshire who perhaps work in the fine factories in Vermont—we will settle that sometime—but we do not like to have the Federal Government stepping in to say, "You shall pay the State of Vermont, and we will withhold the tax from your wages if you happen to be on a mail train going through Vermont."

Mr. AIKEN. Unfortunately, the State of Vermont does not collect taxes on the

basis of "sometime." We want them now.

Mr. COTTON. The State of Vermont is getting them now.

Mr. AIKEN. I still think it would be a good idea to prohibit any State from collecting a percentage of the parimutuel bets placed by citizens of other States.

Mr. COTTON. Very well. The Senator can introduce a bill to that effect.

Mr. AIKEN. I think perhaps I shall offer an amendment.

Mr. COTTON. I am not worried about the State of Vermont getting every cent of tax which is due the State of Vermont. God bless it, nobody ever deprived the State of Vermont of one cent of tax, in the history of this Nation.

I would also undertake to venture the guess that very few Vermont bettors have lost much money at the racetracks in another State. They are such shrewd judges of horses and so tightfisted that nobody could get a nickel out of them.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I do not see either Senator from Massachusetts in the Chamber, and I think they ought to be defended.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COTTON. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I admire the vigor with which my friend from New Hampshire pleads his case. I should like to ask him a question.

Is it not a fact that if his amendment were adopted it would undo completely what we did last year, after extended debate, with regard to the permission of a State to withhold taxes on nonresidents working in that State?

Mr. COTTON. It would not undo completely the act which we passed. The act which we passed provided two things. First it provided a very legitimate and proper thing. The act we passed provided that the Federal Government could withhold the State taxes of its employees who were working within a State.

Also, however, it did another thing. It not only permitted but it compelled and required the Federal Government to collect taxes levied by a State against residents of another State. All the amendments would do is to undo the bad part of that law, not the good part.

Mr. KEATING. In other words——

Mr. COTTON. The Senator asked me a question. Let me answer it. The Senator has one of the best legal minds in this body, and I should like to make very sure I explain my amendment to him.

The State of New York, for instance, had been for a number of years before the act was passed last year collecting taxes from people domiciled in Connecticut or domiciled in New Jersey and working in New York. That practice continues.

The Senator from New Hampshire does not object to this practice being continued and being dignified and clothed with the power of the Federal Government, if the Federal Government, acting as a tax collector and withholding from its own employees, confines such withholding to those who are domiciled in New York.

The act last year provided—and the proposal of the Senator from Pennsylvania this year would extend it to the cities, as a further step, because once we started down the road it was bound to go further—that the Federal Government was going to make itself a tax collector as between residents of different States. All the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire would do would be to undo the evil part of that law. It would leave absolutely untouched the legitimate part of the law.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COTTON. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Does the Senator have any suggestion as to how the State of New York, for instance, would collect its State income taxes from nonresidents who work in and earn their living in the city of New York and, let us say, live in Connecticut or live in New Jersey? How would the State of New York go about that?

Mr. COTTON. How did the State of New York go about it before we passed the act last year?

Mr. KEATING. The act was passed last year, and the State of New York was benefited by the passage of the act. I would be very loath to see anything happen which would take away the benefit of this act from the State of New York.

This really relates more to New Jersey and to Connecticut than to the State of the distinguished Senator who offered the amendment——

Mr. COTTON. Why?

Mr. KEATING. His quarrel, I believe, is with the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts——

Mr. COTTON. Why does it relate more to those States?

Mr. KEATING. Because there are very few residents of New Hampshire who work in New York City. There are a great many from the State of my friend from New Jersey and a great many from Connecticut. If they wish to bring with them all of the facilities which are provided for them by the State of New York, while they are in New York, and if they wish to bring in private police to protect them when they come——

Mr. COTTON. I think that would be a good idea, judging what happens in New York. [Laughter.]

Mr. KEATING. If they wish to relieve the city and the State of New York from providing any of these facilities or protections, I am quite sure arrangements could be worked out whereby there would be no State income tax imposed upon them if they could possibly provide for themselves in such a way as to not need any of the public facilities provided by the city and State of New York.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COTTON. I will yield to the Senator in a moment.

Mr. President, the Senator from New Hampshire does not wish to filibuster this measure on the last night of the session. The Senator from New Hampshire is not going to keep the floor. He yielded to the Senator from New York, and the Senator from New York made a suggestion which reveals the real struggle on the floor of the Senate tonight.

The Senator from New York said that the Senator from New Hampshire should not be greatly interested in this proposal because very few people from New Hampshire work in the city of New York.

He implies that very few work in Massachusetts.

This is exactly the mental attitude of very able, very fine and very sincere Senators like the Senator from New York and the Senator from Pennsylvania. They come from huge States. They have the idea ingrained in their minds somewhere that unless thousands of people are affected it is all right to invade the rights of a few people.

The Senate itself was based upon the fact that the small States should have rights as well as the large States.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COTTON. No State in this country should be deprived of its rights. Every State has two Senators. That is why the small States have two Senators each.

I do not care if only 10 people from New Hampshire are overtaken by the Federal Government and told that the Federal Government is going to withhold taxes from their pay, to be given to Massachusetts, when these people have lived all of their lives in our State. I do not care if thousands go from New Jersey to New York. It is not a matter of numbers.

Someday I think the distinguished Senator from New York will understand and fully appreciate—when dealing with human rights; when cutting into the walls of the Constitution; when considering the situation faced when the Constitution was adopted at a time of a loose Federation of States when States had tariffs against each other and had taxes against each other's citizens, when the infant Republic was falling asunder because there was no central government and because the rights of citizens of smaller States were being overridden by other States which were larger—the importance of these protections which have been provided.

Mr. President, I am not going to retain the floor. I have offered my amendment. I shall stand or fall on it. To conclude my remarks, I simply wish to read one letter which illustrates what I have said. Then I shall surrender the floor so that my friends can take over and go ahead with their "rat killing."

This letter is written to me, and it says:

DEAR SENATOR: I have been a resident and voter in the State of New Hampshire for 40 years, excepting the years 1943 to 1946, during which time I was a resident of Boston, Mass.

I am employed by the Boston & Maine Railroad as an engineerman, and at present have a passenger run from Portsmouth to Boston and return.

As you doubtless know, Massachusetts has within the past few years enacted a nonresident income tax that I and my fellow workers consider most unfair to us as citizens of New Hampshire. February 15, this tax is to be withheld from our pay each week and is retroactive to January 1.

We live, vote, and pay taxes in New Hampshire. Our runs start in New Hampshire,

and we are paid in New Hampshire, yet Massachusetts taxes us for the miles run in that State.

Inasmuch as I have no legal representation in that State—probably nothing would be gained if I had—I am writing to you. Can anything be done about it?

Do not misunderstand me. My amendment does not do anything about that person's situation, because his taxes are withheld by the Boston & Maine Railroad. That question is something that must be adjusted in another area. But in closing, as I said in the beginning, what the Senator from New Hampshire objects to is having the Congress of the United States proceed to put the hallmark of its approval on this practice by passing a law which would compel the Federal Government to step into this dispute, to judge it, and to remove from the pockets of the residents of States who are working in another State a portion of their wages and withholding it, when we are vigorously striving and contesting to establish their rights.

Before I yield the floor, I yield to my senior colleague.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, first I wish to pay a distinct compliment to the distinguished junior Senator from New Hampshire for his defense of the rights of sovereign States, and particularly his able representation, in part, of the people of our State, whom the junior Senator from New Hampshire and the senior Senator from New Hampshire have the honor and the privilege to represent. He has presented a very forceful argument. It is sound, logical, and I hope the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. COTTON. I thank my colleague, who has been fighting for this measure all the way for more than 2 years. I yield briefly to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I wish to commend the Senator from New Hampshire for his fine illumination of this point tonight. I wonder if he would consider that, without the protection he seeks to get, a precedent could be established for the Federal Government to assist the District of Columbia in collecting an income tax for the District of Columbia on the salaries of Members of Congress?

Mr. COTTON. The Senator states a very interesting point.

I promised I would yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I wish first to commend the junior Senator from New Hampshire, the State that gave this country Daniel Webster. The Senator from New Hampshire has fought with the same vigor and force of a Daniel Webster.

I did not hear all of the Senator's speech, but I heard most of it. I do not know whether he used an early American phrase that would describe this action. Perhaps he did. I wonder if he would not agree that in large part, we have the elements of taxation without representation.

Mr. COTTON. That is precisely the case, and I thank the distinguished Senator for his very timely and apt remark.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I should like to make one further comment. I know the inequity that the citizens of New Hampshire face in paying the taxes of the State of Massachusetts. In my own State, citizens residing in New Jersey and who work in New York not only pay the New York income tax, but our residents pay more to the State of New York than do New York residents. I certainly do not want to see this body be a part of making or continuing the Federal Government as the agent for the collection of that kind of unjust tax.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I would like to ask the Senator some questions.

Mr. COTTON. I will yield first to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I wish to propound a question or two. I congratulate the Senator from New Hampshire on his clear statement of the issue, which is the further invasion of the Federal Government into the local rights of the people of the State. I believe he has made clear that he is not objecting to the States themselves levying taxes. That question should be fought out in a different forum and in a different way. But he objects to using the power of the Federal Government to do the work that the States themselves ought to be doing or that the local municipalities ought to be doing.

I should like to know if the Senator would yield to me for the purpose of propounding a parliamentary inquiry which would serve to clear up the subject somewhat.

Mr. COTTON. I am glad to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. What is the basic bill upon which we are now working? Will the Chair inform me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair informs the Senator that the Senate is presently working on H.R. 4384.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, another parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. As I understand, that bill provides for relief of import duties on religious objects, is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The Senator from Pennsylvania has offered an amendment to this bill, which refers to the relief of import duties on religious objects, and I understand that the Chair has ruled that the amendment is eligible to be received, is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The rule of germaneness does not apply.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I understand. Mr. President, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I have a couple of amendments with regard to farm legislation which I think are very important to the farmers of this country in connection with the surplus problem which we have, and therefore I ask if it would be possible for me to offer legislation with respect to the surplus problem and its solution to this bill that has to do with the relief of import duties on religious objects?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Such amendments are in order when in proper relationship to other amendments pending in terms of secondary and tertiary amendments.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I thank the Chair. I just wanted to know how far we are going with this subject. I would not use the words "cat and dog" amendment, but we are getting pretty far from the subject matter of the basic bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COTTON. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If the Senator from Iowa can find a more appropriate term than was used by the Senator from Ohio, I would suggest that he do so.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I am willing to adopt the words of the Senator from Ohio, but I wanted to make the point.

Mr. COTTON. The Senator from New Hampshire wishes to yield to one more Senator, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], after which he promises to relinquish the floor.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from New Hampshire if it is a fact that the Senator from Pennsylvania, with the amendment now before the Senate which the Senator from New Hampshire seeks to amend, gives the city of Philadelphia, if the amendment is accepted and becomes law, any privilege which is not now given under existing law to any State that levies taxes in the manner described in the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. COTTON. If I understand the question of the distinguished Senator correctly—and perhaps I do not—all that the Senator from Pennsylvania, as I understand, set out to do was exactly the thing that always happens once we have trespassed upon rights, which was to extend the trespass, so that what we did to the States last year we now do to the cities as well. The amendment of the Senator from New Jersey simply took the sting out of the matter of collecting from nonresidents of the cities. The amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire would take out of both the amendment and the existing law the provision which would make the Federal Government a tax collector as against nonresidents of both State and cities.

Mr. KERR. Under existing law, then, any State can make an agreement with the Federal Government whereby the Federal Government withholds the tax levied by the State with reference to employees eligible to have the tax withheld under existing law.

Mr. COTTON. As I understand the existing law, the Federal Government is compelled to withhold taxes for any State which officially informs the Federal Government that it has a State tax and requests that it be withheld.

Mr. KERR. That is the existing law.

Mr. COTTON. That is the existing law as it applies to employees of States and territories, but not cities.

Mr. KERR. The amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania would extend that privilege with reference to employees of the Federal Government in municipalities.

Mr. COTTON. That is correct as to the collection of municipal taxes.

Mr. KERR. Under existing law, the State of Pennsylvania, the State of New Hampshire, or any other State must withhold taxes from its employees to comply with the requirements of withholding Federal income taxes.

Mr. COTTON. That is so.

Mr. KERR. So is the city of Philadelphia.

Mr. COTTON. That is so.

Mr. KERR. As I understand the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania, it would give to the city of Philadelphia or any other city similarly located, the right to have its tax money withheld from the employees within the municipality of the tax that it is entitled to levy on those resident within the city.

Mr. COTTON. Is the Senator referring to my amendment?

Mr. KERR. No; to the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. COTTON. Under his amendment, the Federal Government would be compelled to withhold from the employees——

Mr. KERR. From the employees in Philadelphia of municipal taxes.

Mr. COTTON. Yes.

Mr. KERR. Just as Philadelphia must withhold from its employees income taxes due the Federal Government.

Mr. COTTON. That is right.

Mr. KERR. So that the Senator's amendment would not only defeat the right of Philadelphia, which seeks the same privilege now available to the States, but the Senator's amendment would also take from the States the right they now have under existing law. Is that correct?

Mr. COTTON. My amendment would take from the existing law the arbitrary power that was given to the Federal Government. But the very able Senator from Oklahoma is giving the impression to the Senate—I am sure intentionally and sincerely—that there is an exact analogy between having States and municipalities withhold Federal taxes and having the Federal Government withhold State and municipal taxes.

There is one great difference. There is no problem of residence involved in Federal taxes. It does not make any difference whether a person is a resident of the great State of Oklahoma or the great State of New York or the great State of Maine, or any other great State. The Federal tax reaches every American citizen. However, when we turn the equation around and provide that the Federal Government shall start withholding taxes for States and for cities it is a horse of a different color, in my opinion, because into that situation comes the question of whether the person from whom the tax is being withheld is actually, in justice, compelled to pay that tax.

So there is a big difference, and I wish to express emphatically my dissent from the suggestion of the Senator from Oklahoma that all we are doing is giving to the States and municipalities the same justified right that they give to the Federal Government.

Mr. KERR. I did not make that implication. The question I asked was if the amendment did not have as its sole purpose conferring upon Philadelphia the privilege which a State now has with reference to the Federal Government withholding taxes of its employees in cities.

Mr. COTTON. That is right.

Mr. KERR. That is the law now with reference to the State income tax.

Mr. COTTON. That is right.

Mr. KERR. What the Senator seeks to do—and I do not criticize him; I am only trying to get the matter clear in my mind and in the mind of the Senate—is not only to deny the privilege to the city of Philadelphia or any other municipality, but also to take from the States rights which have been conferred upon them.

Mr. COTTON. The Senator from New Hampshire made it clear that that is exactly what he seeks to do. He wants to do that only, of course, as it affects nonresidents of States.

Mr. KERR. The distinguished Senator from New Hampshire was a member of the Committee on Finance when the present law was enacted, I believe.

Mr. COTTON. He was.

Mr. KERR. Is it a fact that the Treasury Department favored the enactment of the existing law?

Mr. COTTON. That is correct.

Mr. KERR. Is it not the opinion of the Senator from New Hampshire that if Congress now repeals that law, the net result will be that the act in which that repeal is contained will be vetoed?

Mr. COTTON. No; that is not the opinion of the Senator from New Hampshire. He feels that if the amendment is adopted and that portion of the law is repealed, the Federal Government will still be withholding taxes for those who are resident and domiciled in the States, which is the vast majority, and will not be intruding itself into a situation of making decisions which it ought not to make.

The distinguished Senator from Oklahoma is a member of the Committee on Finance, and I have always listened to his opinions with great deference and respect, because he is eminently qualified as a member of that committee, and I have always listened carefully to the opinions of the representative of the Treasury Department. However, the Treasury Department has never dictated to the Senator from New Hampshire, any more than it has to the Senator from Oklahoma. The Senator from New Hampshire does not care what the Treasury Department thinks about his amendment.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator. I know he is sincere. I was only attempting to get the picture to the Senate of what the facts are with reference to the amendment.

Mr. COTTON. I thank the Senator. As usual, he is giving a very accurate picture.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, we started out with a bill for the free importation of altars, shrines, baptismal fonts, mosaics, pulpits, communion tables, and other articles of related character, to which bill the Senator from Pennsylvania has offered an amendment relating to income taxes to be collected by cities.

Now we are confronted by the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire pertaining to a subject which we debated at length last year. It would undo what we passed last year, and as the Senator from Oklahoma has pointed out, it was a bill which had the support of the Treasury Department.

I feel sure, as the Senator has intimated, if we adopt the amendment of the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, we will be doing a great injustice to the schools, hospitals, churches, and other institutions which are very much interested in the free entry of all the articles listed in the bill before us.

I hope that my colleague from New Hampshire, whose friendship I cherish, will see fit to withdraw his amendment, because it certainly will be the subject of extensive debate before we could permit the enactment at this late hour of major legislation which will completely undo existing law.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire provided I do not lose the floor.

Mr. COTTON. I simply say to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania, for whom I have the most profound respect, that he opened up this question, and he is asking for a second pound of flesh. If he will withdraw his amendment, I will withdraw mine, and the law will repose just as it was when we came here today. Otherwise, I shall press my amendment.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, if such an arrangement can be made, I shall be happy to yield the floor. But I shall not yield it unless unanimous consent is requested for that purpose.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield? I could not hear what he said.

Mr. KEATING. I shall be happy to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania for a question only. A suggestion has been made by the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire that he would be happy to withdraw his amendment if the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania would withdraw his, in order that the many religious societies which are interested in the free entry of religious monuments and other articles might have the relief to which they seem to me to be entitled.

I know that all of us, whatever our race, religion, or creed, or of no creed whatsoever, are anxious to have this done. I fear the adoption of the amend-

ment of the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire might jeopardize the basic legislation.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. CLARK. I hope the Senate is in a mood to seek a vote on the Cotton amendment, the Clark amendment, and the bill. I think I can say with some certainty that if the Cotton amendment is adopted, the bill will not pass the House before it adjourns. I have every reason to believe that if the Clark amendment is adopted, the bill will pass the House and will be signed by the President.

Of course, the Senator from New York and any other Senator who wishes to help defeat either or both amendments at this time of evening, can certainly do so, by talking at length if he wishes to do so. I ask him in all candor not to do that, but to let the Senate vote on the Cotton amendment.

If the Cotton amendment is adopted, I shall be perfectly happy to withdraw my amendment.

In my opinion, if the Cotton amendment is adopted, the bill will not become law. I think we ought to pass the bill in a form in which it will be enacted into law. I hope the Cotton amendment will be rejected.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I believe the answer of the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania is good. I am informed that there is a movement afoot to add to this measure an amendment relating to the Chicago water diversion. Unless there is a disposition on the part of interested Senators to withdraw their amendments, I very much fear that fonts, altars, pulpits, and communion tables will be in jeopardy.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield provided I do not lose the floor.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If the Senator from South Dakota correctly understands the parliamentary situation, it is that the yeas and nays have been ordered on the Cotton amendment to the Clark amendment. Therefore, the Cotton amendment could not be withdrawn except by unanimous consent; and I should object to its being withdrawn.

However, the Senator from Pennsylvania could withdraw his amendment, on which the yeas and nays have not been ordered, and that would carry the Cotton amendment down with it. In that way, we could return to the original bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota has stated a correct interpretation of the parliamentary situation.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the distinguished Senator from Vermont without losing the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. AIKEN. I am sure the Senator from New York does not realize the position in which the Senators from Vermont are being placed by this proposed legislation tonight. We bring up a bill, first, to provide for the free importation of headstones so long as they have some statuary connected with them. If this language is not properly interpreted, it will mean that the second largest industry in Vermont will go down the drain, because I think the second largest manufacturing industry in Vermont is headstones and other articles made from granite and marble, which would be disastrously and severely affected by the enactment of the bill.

If it becomes necessary to vote for the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire in order to save Vermont's headstone industry, then we will lose an equal share of the State's revenue which is now being collected from New Hampshire residents who find it more profitable to work in Vermont than they do on their own side of the Connecticut River.

New Hampshire can make an offer like this because it has other sources of revenue in the southeast corner of the State. They have an institution known as Rockingham Racetrack. It is not far from the Massachusetts border. I understand a good many million dollars a year flow up north into New Hampshire. A considerable part of this money never goes back over the border.

New Hampshire is not satisfied with that, however. Another racetrack has been established in the other corner of the State, where Massachusetts and Vermont come together, and the spending power of some Vermonters has been seriously reduced since that institution was installed.

The Senator from New York, of course, might not have sympathy for us, because only 15 minutes' drive from the Vermont border is Saratoga.

I simply ask the Senate: Please let us in Vermont keep something. We would like to keep the headstone industry. We would like to keep some of the money which has been in the State, as well. However, the Senator from Vermont is really perplexed, if he has come to the point where he has to vote for the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire in order to preserve the headstone industry of Vermont.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I must first reply to the Senator from Vermont. I think his point is well taken. I call his attention to the fact that this proposal is directed very much at Vermont, because it refers to "statuary" as defined in the law.

I know that Vermont marble is the finest there is. It is sometimes alleged that it comes from New Hampshire. I have heard that from the Senator who has offered the amendment.

His attack is directed squarely at the State of the distinguished Senator from Vermont and I am very sympathetic with him. I hope he is equally sympathetic with the fight in which I am cast, in which the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, in his eagerness and zeal to protect the interests of his own people, and in that Daniel Webster manner to which we have become accustomed—states that he is injuring those States which are now acting in accordance with the law which we passed, and are permitting this deduction to be made.

Employees in a given State who come from another State, and use all the facilities and have police and fire protection must help to provide these vital public services. They do not bring a police brigade with them. They do not bring a fire engine with them. They do not bring a full supply of drinking water with them when they come from neighboring States to work in the State of New York.

We feel that that proportion of the tax which is properly apportioned to their total earnings—that is, the earnings which they make in New York—is properly subject to the New York State income tax.

I hope the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania will take advantage of the parliamentary suggestion made by the Senator from Vermont and will withdraw his amendment. That will dispose of the parliamentary tangle into which we have gotten ourselves.

The proper way to resolve this entire problem is by establishing a joint committee on Federal-State economic relations. Many Senators, including myself, have introduced such legislation. There is much merit in the observations made by the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire. He should be heard. He should have a forum other than this body, at this hour of the night. He should be able to present his case in orderly fashion, and such a committee would be able to consider it.

I ask unanimous consent that I may yield again to the Senator from Vermont, without losing the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the Senator from New York has referred to Daniel Webster. I should like to point out that New Hampshire's second institution of parimutuel learning is practically on the spot where Daniel Webster had his case against the devil. All I say is that it is too bad that Daniel is not there now, because I think he would have another case. [Laughter.]

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Pennsylvania will see his way clear to withdraw his amendment.

Any proposal to limit the power of the States to tax the personal incomes of nonresidents earned within such States is of great interest to the State of New York. New York derives approximately $30 million annually in revenue from such taxes, primarily from New Jersey and Connecticut residents who work in New York City and other metropolitan areas of New York.

I am entirely in sympathy with the problems the distinguished Senators from Connecticut and New Jersey and New Hampshire face in this connection, and I hope they will be equally sympathetic with the efforts I am making to

see that there be no interference with this very important $30 million of annual revenue to the State of New York.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Connecticut, without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BUSH. I wish to join the Senator from New York in urging the Senator from Pennsylvania to withdraw his amendment. It happens that at this time New York and New Jersey and Connecticut, through their Governors, are in the process of negotiation respecting the matter of taxes by one State upon the citizens of another State who may earn their livelihood, or part of it, within one of those States. The fact that these negotiations are under way would compel me—regardless of how I felt about the merits of the Clark amendment—to vote to kill it, no matter which way I had to vote to do so.

Therefore, I hope very much that the Senator from Pennsylvania will withdraw his amendment, and will permit us to proceed with the bill itself, as recommended by the Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I am very grateful to the Senator from Connecticut for his suggestion and for the statesmanship attitude he has taken in this matter.

The Governors of the several States, including New York, affected by this bill are in the process of negotiation. I very sincerely hope the matter can be worked out.

I have always been sympathetic toward the Connecticut and the New Jersey residents affected by this problem. I think they have a case. I think they have a point to be made. The Governor of New York has evidenced a complete willingness to sit down with them. This has been evidenced by a number of conferences and discussions among the Governors. I feel sure that something which will be mutually satisfactory can be worked out.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from New Jersey, without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I thank the Senator from New York for yielding to me.

I should like to ask him whether in any of these discussions he has heard any suggestion beyond the possibility of equalizing treatment, so far as deductions are concerned, as between residents of New York and residents of New Jersey, and whether any suggestion has been made to give residents of New Jersey who work in New York credit for the taxes they paid to the State of New Jersey—or, in substance, something similar to the reciprocity in regard to income tax payments, which New York allows, but which is not allowed in New Jersey, simply because New Jersey does not choose to raise its revenue by levying income taxes on New Jersey residents.

Mr. KEATING. I am not familiar with the negotiations which are going on, although I know there have been negotiations. I have confidence in the fairness and good faith of those who are conducting the negotiations for my State and for the other States involved.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. If I may say——

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield further to the Senator from New Jersey, without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I thank the Senator from New York.

Let me say that I fully accept his utter good faith and sincerity here. He is not acting in character in his objection to this particular amendment; but that is an understandable fault, and he could not be expected easily to do otherwise.

The fact is—and I think I know this to be true—that in all the discussions about easing the burden of the New York income tax upon New Jersey residents, there has been no suggestion beyond a mere palliative of equalizing deductions from income received by New Jersey residents with those allowed New York residents; and there has been no suggestion of any real easing of the burden of double taxation upon New Jersey residents.

I thank the Senator from New York for yielding.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the Senator from New Jersey for his contribution.

I have not participated in the negotiations, and there is really no reason why I would have detailed knowledge about them. I have great confidence in those who are conducting them.

I am very grateful that the Senator understands the position in which I find myself—namely, that the State of New York is under attack by the Senator from New Jersey, through his amendment, probably not to the extent of the $30 million a year, but as regards any Federal employees who might be working in the State of New York and who might be coming there, daily, from the adjoining States.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from New Hampshire, without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I merely wish to make clear that I was not in any sense attacking New York or any other State. It would be a gross violation of the rules of the Senate, and I would never dream of doing it. I expect the Senator from New York to uphold his State in all its privileges and rights.

I wish to say—and I shall be brief, because at this hour it is unfortunate to have this prolonged debate—that I was amazed at the statement made by my friend, the Senator from Pennsylvania, to the effect that if his amendment were adopted, it would be passed by the House and would be signed by the President.

I have information—which I think is perhaps nearly as accurate as that had by the Senator from Pennsylvania—that if my amendment is adopted and if this matter is reopened at this time, it will not pass the House. So probably we are engaged in this struggle fruitlessly, at this late hour.

Of course, the Senator from Pennsylvania may have more of a pipeline to the White House than I have, although he is not one of the Members whom I would expect to know what the President would do in any given set of circumstances—although perhaps the Senator does.

But I believe that the best thing which could be done under the circumstances would be for the Senator from Pennsylvania to withdraw his amendment, because it opens up, in the closing hours of the session, a situation about which many of us feel very strongly, as we have stated.

The amendment will not get us anywhere. So I hope the Senator from Pennsylvania will withdraw it. If his amendment were adopted and were tacked onto this bill, it would only relieve the distress of the Senator from Vermont, by resulting in the purchase of one of the famous Vermont tombstones to be placed over this legislation. [Laughter.]

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, in reply to the statement made by the Senator from New Hampshire, I feel certain that the Senator from Pennsylvania does not have a pipeline to the White House that is not available to the Senator from New Hampshire, who, I know, is so highly regarded by the President of the United States.

I feel certain that there is no concrete basis for the statement of the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. ANDERSON addressed the Chair.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the distinguished Senator from South Carolina——

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I have a very short privileged matter.

Mr. KEATING. I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico for a privileged matter, without losing the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LAND OF THE UNITED STATES IN TRUST TO CITIZEN BAND OF POTAWATOMI INDIANS OF OKLAHOMA—RETURN OF BILL TO HOUSE

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a request from the House for the return of H.R. 7990, a bill to convey certain land of the United States in trust to the Citizen Band of Potawatomi Indians of Oklahoma, with the Senate amendments thereto, and the message of the House thereon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H.R. 7990), to convey certain land of the United States in trust to the Citizen Band of Potawatomi Indians of Oklahoma.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the request of the House may be complied with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bill and joint resolution of the Senate:

S. 3623. A bill to designate and establish that portion of the Hawaii National Park on the island of Maui, in the State of Hawaii, as the Haleakala National Park, and for other purposes; and

S.J. Res. 176. Joint resolution authorizing the preparation and printing of a revised edition of the Constitution of the United States of America—Analysis and Interpretation, published in 1953 as Senate Document No. 170 of the 82d Congress.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 1670. An act to provide for the granting of mineral rights in certain homestead lands in the State of Alaska; and

S. 3267. An act to amend the Act of October 17, 1940, relating to the disposition of certain public lands in Alaska.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, severally with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 1092. An act to provide for the construction of the Cheney division, Wichita Federal reclamation project, Kansas, and for other purposes;

S. 2195. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the western division of The Dalles Federal reclamation project, Oregon, and for other purposes; and

S. 3212. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain public lands in the State of Nevada to the county of Mineral, State of Nevada.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions of the Senate:

S. Con. Res. 86. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings on employment, growth, and price levels;

S. Con. Res. 88. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings on energy resources and technology;

S. Con. Res. 90. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the final report and indexes to hearings and reports of the Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field;

S. Con. Res. 91. Concurrent resolution authorizing the reprinting of additional copies of hearings before the Subcommittee on Agreements for Cooperation of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on Amending the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 with respect to exchange of military information and material with allies during the second session of the Eighty-fifth Congress;

S. Con. Res. 96. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of a revised edition of the Internal Security Manual as a Senate document; and providing for additional copies;

S. Con. Res. 97. Concurrent resolution authorizing the reprinting of additional copies of the Joint Committee print entitled "Summary Analysis of Hearings, June 22–26, 1959, on Biological and Environmental Effects of Nuclear War" printed for the use of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy during the 86th Congress, 1st session;

S. Con. Res. 99. Concurrent resolution to print as a Senate document a compilation of studies on United States-Latin American relations; and

S. Con. Res. 107. Concurrent resolution printing for the use of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary additional copies of certain publications of its Internal Security Subcommittee.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 8712. An act to amend the act of August 9, 1955, to authorize longer term leases of Indian lands on the Agua Caliente (Palm Springs) Reservation and the Seminole Reservations in Florida;

H.R. 12574. An act to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, so as to provide that an injured employee shall have the right to select his own physician, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 12777. An act to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, as amended, to provide increased benefits in case of disabling injuries, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 693) authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Document No. 198 of the 84th Congress, entitled "The Commission on Intergovernmental Relations," in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, as in executive session——

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, who I understand has some nominations to present, without losing the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service I report favorably 173 nominations for postmasters.

Both Senators in each State have recommended these nominations. There is no opposition to them. Everything has been cleared.

I ask unanimous consent to file the reports and to act on the nominations, since we will not be able to put them on the Executive Calendar. I ask that the nominations be confirmed.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from South Carolina for the action he has taken.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unanimous-consent request was that the names be submitted and acted upon.

Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the nominations en bloc.

Without objection, the nominations are considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask that the President be notified immediately of the nominations today confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be so notified.

(For nominations confirmed, see end of today's proceedings.)

IMPORTATION OF CERTAIN ARTICLES FOR RELIGIOUS PURPOSES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4384) to amend paragraph 1774 of the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to the importation of certain articles for religious purposes.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I wish to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KEATING. If I were to move to table the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania, and that motion did not prevail, would I then be entitled to recognition on the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that the Senator would then have lost the floor.

Mr. KEATING. A further parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KEATING. Would I then be entitled to gain the floor before action was taken on the so-called Cotton amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may make a request to regain the floor. If he speaks first and is so recognized, he then has the floor.

Mr. KEATING. What I mean is, would I be entitled to the floor prior to action on the Cotton amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment would still be subject to debate.

Mr. KEATING. The Cotton amendment is subject to debate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. KEATING. I move to lay on the table the amendment offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to table the amendment offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CLARK. The motion is to table which amendment? The Clark amendment is not the pending business. The yeas and nays have been ordered on the Cotton amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised it is in order to move to table the primary amendment, and it would take the secondary amendment with it.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so I may make a statement?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A motion to table is not debatable.

The question is on agreeing to the motion to table.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. President, I thought the Chair stated there was not a sufficient second.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There was a sufficient second.

Mr. COTTON. I withdraw the suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KUCHEL. Will the Chair state the motion before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question before the Senate is on agreeing to the motion to table the Clark amendment. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. LUSK], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 33, nays 47, as follows:

[No. 320]

YEAS—33

Allott	Cotton	Long, Hawaii
Bartlett	Curtis	McClellan
Bennett	Dirksen	Magnuson
Bridges	Dworshak	Mundt
Bush	Fong	Muskie
Butler	Hickenlooper	Schoeppel
Byrd, Va.	Hruska	Smathers
Capehart	Javits	Smith
Case, N.J.	Johnston, S.C.	Thurmond
Case, S. Dak.	Keating	Williams, Del.
Cooper	Kuchel	Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—47

Aiken	Gruening	Morton
Anderson	Hart	Moss
Bible	Hartke	Pastore
Byrd, W. Va.	Holland	Prouty
Cannon	Jackson	Proxmire
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Randolph
Church	Jordan	Robertson
Clark	Kerr	Scott
Dodd	Lausche	Sparkman
Ellender	Long, La.	Stennis
Engle	McCarthy	Symington
Ervin	McGee	Talmadge
Frear	McNamara	Wiley
Fulbright	Mansfield	Williams, N.J.
Gore	Monroney	Yarborough
Green	Morse	

NOT VOTING—20

Beall	Hayden	Martin
Burdick	Hennings	Murray
Carlson	Hill	O'Mahoney
Carroll	Humphrey	Russell
Douglas	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Eastland	Kennedy	Young, Ohio
Goldwater	Lusk	

So the motion to table Mr. CLARK's amendment was rejected.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I move to table the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON].

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to table the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON]. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY), the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] would each vote "Yea."

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] would vote "Nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 48, nays 33, as follows:

[No. 321]

YEAS—48

Aiken	Gruening	McGee
Anderson	Hart	McNamara
Bible	Hartke	Magnuson
Butler	Holland	Mansfield
Byrd, W. Va.	Jackson	Monroney
Cannon	Javits	Morse
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Moss
Church	Johnston, S.C.	Prouty
Clark	Jordan	Proxmire
Ellender	Keating	Randolph
Engle	Kerr	Robertson
Ervin	Lausche	Scott
Fong	Long, Hawaii	Sparkman
Frear	Long, La.	Symington
Fulbright	Lusk	Wiley
Gore	McCarthy	Williams, Del.

NAYS—33

Allott	Curtis	Muskie
Bartlett	Dirksen	Pastore
Bennett	Dodd	Schoeppel
Bridges	Dworshak	Smathers
Bush	Green	Smith
Byrd, Va.	Hickenlooper	Stennis
Capehart	Hruska	Talmadge
Case, N.J.	Kuchel	Thurmond
Case, S. Dak.	McClellan	Williams, N.J.
Cooper	Morton	Yarborough
Cotton	Mundt	Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—19

Beall	Hayden	Murray
Burdick	Hennings	O'Mahoney
Carlson	Hill	Russell
Carroll	Humphrey	Saltonstall
Douglas	Kefauver	Young, Ohio
Eastland	Kennedy	
Goldwater	Martin	

So the motion to table Mr. COTTON's amendment to the amendment of Mr. CLARK was agreed to.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate long. I merely wish to point out that a rather substantial majority of the Senate has voted that it does not wish to defeat the Clark amendment. It has been said that the Senate is the only legislative body in the world which is unable to act when a majority of its Members is ready to act. Under our rules that is true. A vote on the

merits of the Clark amendment can be prevented by any one Senator.

I am conscious of having taken probably more time than I should have taken on the last night before the adjournment of the Senate. I have no desire whatever to defeat the major bill to which my amendment is offered. I hope Senators will not avail themselves of their undoubted right to discuss the amendment, because in that case the only decent thing to do would be to withdraw it, and I would not wait long before I did withdraw it.

However, I say to Senators who oppose the amendment if they want to have it defeated by my withdrawing it, that is their right, under the rules of the Senate.

I hope that will not be done. I hope Senators will permit the amendment to come to a vote and that it will be passed. All I can say to my colleagues is: "I am in your hands, gentlemen. Do as you will with me."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified, offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 32, as follows:

[No. 322]

YEAS—50

Aiken	Gruening	Monroney
Anderson	Hart	Morse
Bible	Hartke	Morton
Byrd, W. Va.	Jackson	Moss
Cannon	Javits	Pastore
Carroll	Johnson, Tex.	Proxmire
Case, N.J.	Jordan	Randolph
Chavez	Keating	Robertson
Church	Kerr	Scott
Clark	Lausche	Smathers
Dodd	Long, La.	Sparkman
Engle	Lusk	Stennis
Ervin	McCarthy	Symington
Frear	McGee	Talmadge
Fulbright	McNamara	Williams, N.J.
Gore	Magnuson	Yarborough
Green	Mansfield	

NAYS—32

Allott	Curtis	McClellan
Bartlett	Dirksen	Mundt
Bennett	Dworshak	Muskie
Bridges	Ellender	Prouty
Bush	Fong	Schoeppel
Butler	Hickenlooper	Smith
Byrd, Va.	Holland	Thurmond
Capehart	Hruska	Wiley
Case, S. Dak.	Johnston, S.C.	Williams, Del.
Cooper	Kuchel	Young, N. Dak.
Cotton	Long, Hawaii	

NOT VOTING—18

Beall	Hayden	Martin
Burdick	Hennings	Murray
Carlson	Hill	O'Mahoney
Douglas	Humphrey	Russell
Eastland	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Goldwater	Kennedy	Young, Ohio

So Mr. CLARK's amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, for myself and on behalf of the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], and the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], I offer an amendment and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to add the following new section:

SEC. —. The Plumbers Union Local Numbered 12 Pension Fund, which was established by a collective bargaining agreement effective September 1, 1954, and which has been held by the Internal Revenue Service to constitute a qualified trust, under section 401(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, and to be exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of said Code, for years ending on or after June 3, 1959, shall be held and considered to have been a qualified trust under said section 401(a), and to have been exempt from taxation under said section 501(a), for the period beginning on September 1, 1954, and ending on June 3, 1959, but only if it is shown to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate that the trust has not in this period been operated in a manner which would jeopardize the interests of its beneficiaries.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the amendment is identical with several which were agreed to earlier this week on other bills. I am advised that the amendment is acceptable to the chairman. Is my understanding correct?

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, the amendment is acceptable to the Committee on Finance. It is also acceptable to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, on the basis of others which they have taken similar to it. The amendment is acceptable to the Treasury. I regard it as a noncontroversial amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk. The amendment was considered by the Committee on Finance. I should like to ask one or two questions of the Senator from Oklahoma with regard to the amendment, which relates to a rather technical question of the carryover of certain losses of a local public transit system.

My information is that the amendment is acceptable to the Committee on Ways and Means, or at least to the chairman of that committee. I am hopeful it will be acceptable to a majority of the members of the Committee on Finance. However, it is somewhat controversial and somewhat technical. I inquire of the senior Senator from Oklahoma whether he has any opinion with regard to the proposed legislation.

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Oklahoma is not averse to the measure. He things it has merit and is intended to be for the benefit of a worthy taxpayer. However, I have had occasion during the evening to discuss the amendment again with representatives of the Treasury, and they advise me that they are in opposition to the amendment and feel that they would be required to advise the Executive of their opposition to the amendment. That is the only information I can give to the Senator from Minnesota, much as I should like to be able to give him different information.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Is it the opinion of the senior Senator from Oklahoma, then, that if the amendment were offered, adopted, and added to the bill, the entire bill, including whatever it might carry to the White House, would be in grave danger of being vetoed?

Mr. KERR. That is the opinion of the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Does it appear to the Senator from Oklahoma that this will be the last tax measure upon which the Senate and Congress will have an opportunity to act in this session?

Mr. KERR. I cannot answer that question. I hope it will be; but then my hopes in that matter are not binding either on the Senate or the House.

Mr. MCCARTHY. The chances are that this may be the last tax measure, and if I were to offer that amendment now, it would prejudice and endanger everything in this bill?

Mr. KERR. I believe that is correct because, under the circumstances as I

view them, I doubt if there would be time for a conference.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, in view of the statement by the Senator from Oklahoma, and my own judgment as to the situation, I ask unanimous consent that I may have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement with respect to the proposed legislation. I withdraw my amendment.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MCCARTHY

CARRYOVER OF CERTAIN LOSSES OF LOCAL PUBLIC TRANSIT SYSTEMS

This provision relates to the net operating loss deduction. It is concerned with cases where street railways incurred large initial losses in converting to bus operations, losses so large that they cannot fully offset against income through the 2-year loss carryback or 5-year loss carryforward.

This provision provides that such losses, incurred in the period January 1, 1951, up to January 1, 1960, to the extent they cannot be offset against income through the carryback and carryforward provisions are to be treated as if they were losses sustained in the last taxable year before January 1, 1960 (or the last taxable year to which the losses may be carried if later). Thus, in effect, it generally allows an extra 5-year carryforward for these losses incurred in the years 1951–59 where they arise from conversions to bus operations. This extra 5-year carryforward will generally start with the year 1960.

This amendment treats with losses sustained in converting from a street railway system to buses by the Twin City Rapid Transit Co. of the Minneapolis-St. Paul metropolitan area. Its enactment will benefit its riders by allowing the company, for income tax purposes, an additional 5 years in which to absorb all or part of a remaining conversion loss of approximately $5,200,000.

Former management of this company has recently been convicted in Federal District Court in Minneapolis of defrauding the company at the time the company converted from streetcars to buses. The then management negligently ignored the adverse tax impact of a rapid conversion which was completed in about an 18-month period.

Had this company then been under ordinary prudent management, such conversion would have been accomplished over such period of years as would have been necessary to fully absorb the conversion loss sustained.

Small wage earners make up the core of bus riders. Values built up by them over the years should not be allowed to be forever lost because of corrupt management, over which bus riders had no control. The bus riders are the ultimate losers because the system's losses will have to be made up by higher fares. The riders will be paying Treasury a windfall not intended by Congress.

The result from a tax collection standpoint is that the Government comes out the same by the terms of this bill as it would have under ordinary careful management. The bill is not retroactive but applies to 1960 earnings on taxes payable in the year 1961 and to earnings of the company during the ensuing 4 years.

About a year ago the company was reorganized, and it is now operated under a board of directors dominated by community leaders, with a professional busman as general manager.

The Internal Revenue Code provides that any transit company may convert from a street railway to buses over a period of years, and losses thereby sustained are deductible against income. Other transit companies, when changing from streetcars to buses, took full advantage of the loss carryover provision in the law by converting over a period of many years. Treasury has recognized that this company sustained a conversion loss of $11 million.

The amendment does equity and assures to the company and its riders that the company will pay no more or no less in income taxes than it would have paid had its conversion been made over a longer period of time.

While many examples of remedial legislation such as this could be cited, perhaps the most specific in point is Public Law 189 passed by the 80th Congress in 1947. That act allowed retroactive relief to seven specified railroads involved in receivership proceedings by allowing them to utilize the 2-year net operating loss carryover benefits not otherwise allowable under the provisions of the code then in effect. Treasury made its report that it had no objection to the enactment of Public Law 189.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I offer an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to add the following new section:

SEC.—(a) The duty-free treatment provided for scrap tobacco and filler tobacco described in item B in the schedule to paragraph 2 of article II of the agreement between the United States of America and the Republic of the Philippines concerning trade and related matters during a transitional period following the institution of Philippine independence, signed at Manila on July 4, 1946, as revised by the agreement of September 6, 1955, shall apply to only such Philippine articles falling within the class specified in item B in the schedule to that paragraph 2 of article II as are certified by the Government of the Republic of the Philippines to have been allocated for exportation to the United States of America free of duty under the paragraph.

(b) This section shall take effect on the thirtieth day after the date of enactment of this Act.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I believe I am correct in saying that the provisions of this amendment are the same as those contained in H.R. 3392, which was passed by the House. I believe also that I am correct in saying that this amendment, as H.R. 3392, has been considered by the Committee on Finance. I understand there is no objection to its being accepted. It does not involve a difficult problem.

This provision is the same as H.R. 3392 which was unanimously reported by the House committee and passed by the House. Its purpose is to limit imports of certain Philippine tobaccos that may be charged to the U.S. duty-free quota to those tobacco exports licensed by the Philippine Government, for charge against the quota.

The trade agreement between the United States and the Republic of the Philippines of July 4, 1946, as revised on September 6, 1955, provides for a duty-free import quota of 6,500,000 pounds of imported scrap and filler tobaccos of Philippine origin per year. Under the agreement this quota is to be reduced in progressive stages every 3 years until January 1, 1974, when the amount of the quota becomes nil. The present quota is 5,850,000 pounds per year. The Philippine Government has historically allocated the tariff-free quota among its tobacco producers based upon their past production records. To assure that the producers will receive the benefit of their allocated portions of the quota, the Philippine Government has controlled exports of such merchandise to the United States through an export licensing arrangement. Traditionally the tobacco exported from the Philippines to the United States has been of the cigar-filler types. The Philippine Government's export licensing arrangement has also had the effect of safeguarding the interests of traditional U.S. importers of such Philippine tobacco.

Recently, however, considerable quantities of low-quality, flue-cured tobacco, grown in the Philippines, have been exported to the United States. Although such tobacco has not been licensed by the Philippine Government for export to the United States, it was shipped to a third country and later transshipped to the United States.

This provision would prevent the circumvention of the control by the Philippine Government over the exports of Philippine tobaccos to the United States by providing that U.S. customs authorities shall only admit free of duty under the Philippine tobacco quota such tobacco as the Philippine Government has licensed for export to the United States free of duty under the provisions of paragraph 2 of article II of the Philippine-United States Trade Agreement.

The Government of the Republic of the Philippines has asked for United States assistance in administering its regulations on tobacco exports and to that end has asked that the United States accept for entry under the duty-free quota only those Philippine articles covered by the quota certificates and permits to ship issued by the Philippine Government.

Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Oklahoma if he will express his views upon the amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I understand the majority leader is about ready to call up the sugar bill. I do not believe we shall be able to complete action on this bill in its entirety prior to that time. I was wondering if the Senator from Kentucky would be willing to withhold his amendment momentarily, so that while the Senate is working on the sugar bill the members of the Committee on Finance can consider the Senator's amendment.

Mr. COOPER. I do not want to hold up action on the sugar bill; but if my understanding is correct, H.R. 3392 has been passed by the House, and the Committee on Finance has no objection to it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Is the Treasury Department in favor of the Senator's amendment?

Mr. COOPER. It has been passed by the House.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I do not recall any recommendations by the

Treasury Department in connection with this item.

Mr. KERR. If my information is correct, the bill has been passed by the House. So far as I know, it is entirely noncontroversial. It has not been approved by the Committee on Finance for the very simple reason that it was not presented to that committee.

The chairman of the Committee on Finance is present. It is his opinion that the bill is meritorious. It is the opinion of the Senator from Oklahoma that it is meritorious. So far as I am concerned, I recommend its approval.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I offer an amendment and ask that its reading be dispensed with, but that it be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is at the end of the bill to add the following new section:

SEC. —. (a) Section 188 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 (relating to different taxable years of partner and partnership is amended—

(1) by striking out "if", and inserting in lieu thereof "(a) General Rule.—"if"; and

(2) by adding at the end of such section 188 the following new subsection:

"(b) Two-Man Partnership.—For the purpose of this chapter, the death of one of the partners of a partnership consisting of two members shall not, if the surviving partner so elects within one year after the date of enactment of this Act, result in the termination of the partnership or in the closing of the taxable year of the partnership with respect to the surviving partner prior to the time the partnership year would have closed if neither partner had died or disposed of his interest."

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to taxable years of a partnership beginning after December 31, 1946, to which the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 applies. If refund or credit of any overpayment resulting from the application of the amendment made by subsection (a) of this section (including interest, additions to the tax and additional amounts), or an election under subsection (a), is prevented on the date of enactment of this Act, or within one year from such date, by the operation of any law or rule of law (other than section 3760 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 or section 7121 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, relating to closing agreements, and other than section 3761 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 or section 7122 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to compromises), such election, or refund or credit of such overpayment, may, nevertheless, be made or allowed if such election is made or claim therefor is filed within one year after the date of enactment of this Act. No interest shall be allowed or paid on any overpayment resulting from the enactment of this Act.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, this amendment has been cleared by the Finance Committee as a floor amendment, and I am advised by the chairman of the committee that he will accept the amendment. And I think the Senator from Oklahoma will accept it.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MUSKIE in the chair). Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. BUTLER. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Is not this a provision, however, that the President vetoed?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes, when it was in a private bill. But this provision has not been vetoed. An explanation of the bill is to be found in the RECORD.

Mr. ANDERSON. But this is the very provision the President vetoed.

Mr. BUTLER. No, it is not. The President vetoed a private bill—and did so erroneously, I think and, I believe, without just cause. But this provision has never been before the President.

Mr. ANDERSON. How does it differ from the private bill which was vetoed?

Mr. BUTLER. It changes the partnership division, and makes the law applicable to 2-man partnerships, rather than to 3-man, 4-man, and 5-man partnerships, and so forth. Furthermore, I do not think the provision will affect any but this one person.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I have been listening as best I could to the adoption of tax amendments at midnight on the night of the sine die adjournment; and now there has been presented a bill for retroactive tax relief—a provision which has been vetoed by the President of the United States, and now is offered as an amendment at 4 minutes past 1 in the morning.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, who has the floor?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield for a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BUTLER. The Senator from Tennessee yields? I have the floor, Mr. President; and I do not yield.

Mr. GORE. I understood the Chair to recognize me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee has the floor.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I have the floor, do I not?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the amendment is subject to debate. I requested recognition, and was recognized.

Mr. BUTLER. I had the floor. How did I get taken off the floor?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I shall desist, in order to let the Senator from Maryland proceed.

Mr. BUTLER. I wish to state that the hour has nothing to do with the amendment. This is just an amendment to the income tax code. It is perfectly proper as a part of this bill. It has been passed by the Finance Committee, by a vote of 15 to 2. It happens that the Senator from Tennessee was not one of those who voted for it. If he wishes to speak against it, that is his privilege; he can speak at length, as he may see fit. But the amendment is not going to be withdrawn; I shall insist on having a vote taken on the amendment.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me, for a statement?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, in view of the controversy which prevails with regard to this amendment, and in view of the fact that unless we act on the sugar bill at a reasonable hour, I am fearful that it will not be acted on by the House, because at a much later hour the House may not be there to act. I wonder whether it will be agreeable to the Senator who is handling this measure to have the pending bill temporarily laid aside, so that we may try to proceed with the consideration of the sugar bill, under a unanimous-consent agreement. Then perhaps we can work out our problems here and can try to get both of the bills passed. But we need to get the sugar bill to conference, if there is to be a conference. The House is waiting on us. And it will not do us any good to work on this bill after the House goes out.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to ask a question: If we adopt the proposed procedure, will not it kill all chance of having the Senate pass the measure now pending and have it go over to the House?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I do not think so. I will try to get an agreement, in connection with the sugar bill, of 30 minutes on amendments and 30 minutes on the bill, so that the sugar bill may be passed and may be sent to conference; and then we shall be able to work on any other measures we have in process this evening. That is what I hope to do.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, if the pending bill is temporarily laid aside, in order to permit the Senate to take up the sugar bill, following the disposition of the sugar bill, will the bill now pending be taken up again, and will it then have its present status?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Yes, and that is what I shall ask.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending bill and the amendment to it be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 13062, the sugar bill, reported by the Finance Committee; that, in accordance with the usual form, there be not to exceed 30 minutes on amendments and 30 minutes on the bill, to be equally divided between the proponents and the opponents.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. ENGLE. With reference to the amendments, will the rule of germaneness apply?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Yes.

Mr. ENGLE. Will the Senator accept the amendments at the desk?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If they comply with the rule of germaneness.

Mr. ENGLE. I have an amendment at the desk.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. It is germane to the sugar bill?

Mr. ENGLE. I am not sure.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If it is germane, it will be in order.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, those of us who are in the rear of the Chamber cannot hear.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from California has asked whether an amendment which he has at the desk will be germane if offered as an amendment to the sugar bill. I had not previously heard of the amendment; and I now propound to the Chair or to the Parliamentarian the question whether the amendment will be germane to the sugar bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the amendment of the Senator from California will not be in order if a rule of germaneness is applied in connection with amendments to the sugar bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, that looks like a pistol effort. When the majority leader is trying to have action taken on a measure for which the House is waiting, it would not be fair for an attempt to be made to have the Senate act on an amendment which relates to dates and walnuts.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. There are plenty of other bills to which such an amendment could be proposed; and the sugar bill needs to go to conference.

Mr. ENGLE. I have discussed the amendment with the chairman, and it has been accepted by both sides.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But it has no business as an amendment to the sugar bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Furthermore, it would not be acceptable to the President, and thus we would not get a Sugar Act.

I would have no objection to having the Senator offer the amendment. As a matter of fact, I should like to see it offered as an amendment to another bill. But I do not want to have the sugar bill vetoed.

Mr. ENGLE. I do not, either.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I have grave doubts about the wisdom of collaborating in an effort to save time, if in the process of attempting to save time I am going to aid in the procedure of tying about 8 or 9 ungermane amendments to a tariff bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. But we propose that the pending bill be laid aside.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If the Senator from Texas will listen, he will understand that I said I do not want to collaborate in an effort to save time, by entering into an agreement in regard to consideration of the sugar bill, if the result will be that the time thus saved will be used for the purpose of offering numerous new amendments to the statuary bill. How far are we going?

I may as well say now that if this train of events is to continue, I contemplate offering an amendment to tie to this statuary and altar bill a prohibition against the malicious destruction of communications lines—either telegraph, telephone, or otherwise; and I also contemplate offering an amendment which will bring before the Senate the passport bill, which has not been brought up.

However, I am not going to agree to try to save time, in order to make possible a continuation of this parade. So I object.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I do not have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas has the floor.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It is said that the consent agreement is merely on the sugar legislation. I repeat, the time we shall save on sugar legislation will be devoted to this spurious and sort of foreign method of getting legislation enacted, tying it on to the altar bill and the church statuary bill. If we start with taxes, then we will get into labor laws, and all the others.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, who has the floor?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me so I may make a brief comment to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If I have the floor. I wanted to get an agreement. Perhaps we ought to go over until tomorrow.

Mr. BUTLER. I was perfectly willing not to offer my amendment, if the Senator from Pennsylvania had withdrawn his amendment. I had no desire to tack these many amendments the Senator is complaining of on to this bill. I said I would not offer it if he would withdraw his amendment. This amendment has been passed by the committee by a vote of 15 to 2, and there is no reason why it should not be offered at this time.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUTLER. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I wish the Senator would check the records of the Finance Committee. This matter was not passed by a vote of 15 to 2. The clerk polled the members of the Committee on Finance as to whether it should come to the floor. I am one who voted "no," because it is contrary to the rules of the Senate to do this kind of thing. I think that is what the vote was. I wish the Senator would check the records.

Mr. BUTLER. Is it contrary to the rules to offer an amendment?

Mr. ANDERSON. No; it is contrary to poll Members, because they should be personally present.

Mr. BUTLER. I do not know how the vote was arrived at, but there was a vote of 15 to 2 in favor of offering the amendment by the Finance Committee of the U.S. Senate.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, an amendment will be offered to give subsidies to the fluorspar mining industry. That is the next amendment in order. Last week we gave a subsidy to zinc and lead.

Mr. BUTLER. I hope my position is clear. I had no desire to encumber the bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I think I have the floor.

Last week we gave subsidies for lead and zinc. Today it is going to be given to fluorspar. It is not going to be given except after a very vigorous fight on the floor. I am not going to tolerate fluorspar being given preference when no action is contemplated to be taken on bills on the calendar that involve the very safety of the Nation. The Atomic Energy Commission, the Defense Department, and the civil defense are begging for legislation that will make it a Federal crime to maliciously destroy telegraph and telephone lines and other communication facilities needed for the security of the country. No thought is given to that proposal. The State Department is begging for legislation to enable it to stop Communists from going to the Soviet. No thought is given to that. Yet the greatest significance is being given to a lot of claptrap propositions here.

I will not cooperate, in the matter of saving time, when the Senate refuses to listen to the plea of the Civilian Defense, the Defense Department, and the Atomic Energy Commission to enact legislation that will make it a Federal crime to destroy communication lines.

How can it be said that subsidies for fluorspar are important, but the security of the country, in trying to make certain that our communication lines will be kept intact, should be looked upon indifferently? How can it be said that statuary or altar legislation is important, while in the same breath we refuse to do anything about passports?

I believe I have some concept of what the security of the country means. Not a single piece of legislation passed here tonight is as important as the passport bill and the communications bill. We are burying our heads, railroading through gifts and subsidies and relief bills, but not a word is said about the security of the country. We talk about the Congo, and Katanga, and Cuba, and East Berlin. We talk about espionage. When we are asked to do something, we turn deaf ears to the pleas of the people of the country and those who are responsible for the maintenance of security within our land.

AMENDMENT OF THE SUGAR ACT OF 1948, AS AMENDED

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.R. 13062.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is that the sugar bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 13062) to amend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I submit a substitute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state to the Senator from Illinois that a substitute is not yet in order.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I will leave it at the desk and call it up as soon as it is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the first committee amendment.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered and adopted en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The committee amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 3, line 15, after the word "subsection", to strike out "to the extent that such further purchases are in excess of an amount equivalent to the amount established under section 202(e)"; in line 23, after the word "to", where it appears the second time, to strike out "December 31, 1960" and insert "March 31, 1961"; on page 4, line 3, after the word "from", to strike out "any foreign countries, without regard to allocation, but with preference" and insert "domestic producers or from foreign countries, without regard to allocation, but among such foreign countries purchase preference shall be given", and in line 8, after the word "commodities", to insert a colon and *"And provided further,* That nothing in this Act shall be construed as a waiver of the power of Congress at any time to allocate, adjust, or readjust the sugar quotas in such manner as Congress may prescribe;".

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the Committee on Finance, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 13062) to amend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with amendments and recommend that the bill as amended do pass.

The bill, H.R. 12311, which became law on July 6, 1960, extended the Sugar Act until March 31, 1961, and delegated authority to the President to limit purchases of sugar from Cuba. The present bill, H.R. 13062, is an extension of the principles of that act with certain new authorizations and limitations until the close of December 31, 1961.

The House bill was amended by the Finance Committee by deleting a phrase that would have resulted in allocating to the Dominican Republic large additional amounts of sugar when such did not seem to be the intention of the House-passed bill. This was, therefore, in the nature of a technical amendment. A further amendment provided that no purchases for 1960 may be discontinued or deferred and authorization for such purchases shall be made in time to permit shipment of the entire amount to be received in the United States prior to March 31, 1961. The House bill would have required that the entire amount be received prior to December 31, 1960.

The bill was also amended to add the authorization to the President to purchase supplies of sugar from domestic as well as from foreign sources. The House bill would have required the President to purchase additional sugar supplies needed because of the reduction in the Cuban quota entirely from foreign sources. The Finance Committee sought to avoid this discrimination against domestic suppliers and amended the bill widening the President's discretion.

The Finance Committee also added to the bill a caveat as follows:

And provided further, That nothing in this Act shall be construed as a waiver of the power of Congress at any time to allocate, adjust, or readjust the sugar quotas in such manner as Congress may prescribe.

The Finance Committee is aware that serious problems have arisen since the last extension of the Sugar Act. Furthermore, that extension is due to expire early in 1961 and before that time sugar growers both in this country and abroad should know how much to plant. There is the problem of obtaining adequate supplies of sugar and the conjunctive problem of allocations to friendly foreign countries. It seems highly desirable that an extension of the President's authority be granted for a longer period, and the Committee recommends that the present bill, as amended, be adopted.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, for myself and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], I offer a substitute amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to strike all after enacting clause and insert:

That section 408(b) of the Sugar Act of 1946, as amended, is amended by striking "March 31, 1961" where it first appears and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1961", by striking the language "and for the three-month period ending March 31, 1961" and inserting in lieu thereof "and for each year beginning in 1961", and by inserting immediately before the colon in subparagraph (iii) a semicolon and the following: "except that any amounts which would be purchased from the Dominican Republic under the foregoing provisions of this subparagraph (iii) need not be purchased or may be purchased from other foreign countries, or domestic producers without regard to allocation."

SEC. 2. Section 412 of said Act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 412. The powers vested in the Secretary under this Act shall terminate on December 31, 1961, except that the Secretary shall have power to make payments under Title III under programs applicable to the crop year 1961 and previous crop years."

SEC. 3. Sections 4501(c) and 6412(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 are amended by striking out "September 30, 1961" in each place it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1962."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, perhaps I can summarize this whole problem in 8 or 10 minutes.

In the small hours of the morning on July 3 we completed action on a sugar bill. The President asked for flexibility and permissive power to deal with the situation whenever Cuban sugar was cut off and the Cuban sugar quota reduced, so that he would have authority to fill the deficit in the American sugar bowl by buying where he thought he should buy in the national interest.

We modified the President's request, but he had to accept it, because we adjourned and went to the political conventions.

On the 6th of July the President issued his proclamation. That was necessary under the existing Sugar Act. First the President had to make apportionments. We gave him no choice in the matter, and he had to apportion in accordance with what the law said.

Under existing law the President had to apportion 322,000 tons to the Dominican Republic regardless of what our estimate may have been of Rafael Trujillo and his associates.

There was an increase in the American sugar bowl, and the Dominican Republic got part of it. The Dominican Republic had a quota of 81,000 tons in 1959, and as a part of the increase in the sugar bowl was given an additional 50,000 tons. As the law stands today, no matter how the President or we or the Organization of American States may feel about it, the President is under a legal obligation, at least, to give the Dominican Republic another 322,000 tons, for a total of 484,000 tons.

Since all of that took place, there was a meeting in San Jose, Costa Rica, beginning in the middle of August. The meeting was attended by the foreign ministers of the American Republics, including our own Secretary of State, and long deliberations were had. When the meeting was concluded, the Organization of American States voted unanimously to condemn the Dominican acts of aggression and intervention against Venezuela, culminating in an attempt on the life of the President of Venezuela, Mr. Betancourt, and they resolved to break diplomatic relations with the Dominican Republic and to interrupt, partially, economic relations with that country.

The United States joined with other American Republics in approving this measure, so we severed diplomatic relations, but we preserved our consular relations.

Despite that meeting, attended by the representatives of Latin American Republics and the United States, we still find that under the law, as we left it in July, no matter what the embarrassment, no matter how awkward it may be, the Chief Executive of this country must still buy or authorize the purchase of and ultimately purchase 484,000 tons of sugar, unless we give him some relief from that responsibility.

It was on that basis that the House of Representatives finally passed a sugar extension bill. I am interested in only one section, which is the offensive section, section 5.

What does it provide? I shall tell Senators what it provides. I shall make it as brief and as explicit as possible. It contains a proviso which says, in effect, "If this bill, passed by the House, goes into effect, first, to get the President off the hook, there have to be collective economic sanctions agreed upon by the United States and the others pursuant to treaty."

In other words, we have to meet again, and if we wish to give relief to the President for the year 1960 the meeting has to be consummated before the 15th day of October, which is only 6 weeks from now.

But there is an additional provision in the bill which says, in effect, "Not only must there be collective, effective sanctions before the President can discontinue purchases from Cuba, but also there must be effective specific actions to implement such sanctions undertaken by a majority of the treaty signatories."

If there were 16 signatories, it is necessary that 9 of them establish, under the House bill, that they have taken effective specific actions to implement the sanctions. Most of the countries in South America do no business with the Dominican Republic whatever. How could one get a specific sanction under this amazing and fantastic language which has been conjured up in the House bill?

When collective sanctions are taken and then there are specific effective actions to implement the sanctions, the President may discontinue purchases. So the sanctions and implementation for 1960 must be agreed upon before the 15th day of October, and if there is no agreement, the President, under the House bill, is directed not to discontinue or to defer authorizations and purchases.

So the handcuffs are on the President of the United States, notwithstanding the exhibition of good will at San José, where we met with the other Latin American Republics, and where we joined in against Trujillo for his acts of aggression. Page after page of specific instances of such aggression were submitted before the Finance Committee in session this afternoon.

This substitute would simply extend the act from March 31, until December 31, of 1961, and then it would give the President the additional power that he is not forced to purchase from the Dominican Republic. He can buy from other foreign countries or he can buy from domestic producers. The provision does not mean that the President must cut off Trujillo. He can assess the whole situation. Maybe Trujillo will become a better citizen and the President can conduct himself accordingly, in determining whether he shall have additional sugar quotas. But as the question stands tonight, the President must authorize, and ultimately purchase, an additional 322,000 tons of sugar. Under the House bill he is mandated to do so by a certain date, and that date was the 31st of December.

The committee, I understand, made a change. They made the date the 31st of March. That change would provide 6 months instead of 3, and the only reason for the proposed change is to soften the impact when sugar moves to the market. But it does not remove the handcuffs from the President.

Are we going to put the President in this humiliating, awkward, and embarrassing position in the eyes of the leaders of the Latin American Republics by saying, "Congress will tie your hands, and you will deal with Trujillo whether you like it or not"? I cannot imagine a more humiliating position in which to place the President of the United States.

But that is what this complicated and prolix language in the House bill provides. I think we ought to be satisfied to extend the bill to the end of 1961, and give the President some authority to buy from other foreign countries and from domestic producers, and thereby subserve the national interest. That is the whole story. I am through.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Inasmuch as copies of the bill are not available to Senators, I was somewhat surprised to hear the Senator from Illinois read the phrase about collective sanctions. I think that is a mistaken idea. The charge of Venezuela against the Dominican Republic was made in the United Nations, and the case was referred to the Organization of American States.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. The Organization of American States is in no position to exercise collective sanctions. That organization can report to the United Nations, and then each member of the Organization of American States can individually impose sanctions if it sees fit to do so. I believe Mexico and one or two other countries have done so. There certainly would not be nine Latin American countries, in my opinion, that would impose sanctions upon the Dominican Republic because, as the Senator from Illinois has said, many of them do not do business with them.

The purpose of the bill we considered on the night of July 3, when there were two copies of the bill available for 100 Senators to read, was undoubtedly to give an enormous windfall to the Dominican Republic. I made the prediction in the Chamber that night that if that bill passed, someone would make a killing. It was not the Dominican Republic or the American interests that operate sugar plantations there that made the killing, because the President did not allot the additional 200 percent increase in quotas to the Dominican Republic. It happened to be the refiners who made the killing out of that action, because the refiners' price of sugar rose to $9.70, almost the highest in history, or at least in recent history. The price of raw sugar dropped back, but the wholesale price of sugar today from the refiners is still up at $9.70, and the refiners are doing wonderfully well on that little legislation that was passed on July 3.

The bill passed by the House provides that the President would be required to buy 320,000 extra tons of sugar from the Dominican Republic, because of the window dressing put in the bill about collective sanctions, and the implementation of the sanctions by the majority of the signatories—I think there were 19 of them—to the findings of the meeting.

The bill is another effort to force the President to buy an additional 320,000 tons of sugar from the Dominican Republic. I do not say that they should not have some increase. I do not know what that increase should be.

Mr. DIRKSEN. We have given them 50,000 tons.

Mr. AIKEN. They have a substantial allotment. I think over one-third of the sugar produced in the Dominican Republic is produced by one American sugar company there. When representatives come to my office, I do not know whether they are coming from Trujillo or from the sugar company. They all have the same end objective, and that is to sell more sugar to the United States.

It is a good company. I will say that. It is a very efficient company and one of the largest in the world, if not the largest. But the idea of saying to the President of the United States, "You will operate our domestic affairs in accord with the desires of the majority of the American States" is a fantastic idea. We do not want to start any precedents of that kind. We say we are going to conduct our domestic affairs in accordance with the desire of the majority of the states of the Western Hemisphere, and as much as I like those countries, and as much as we want to do business with them—we should do all the business we can with them—we do not want to adopt any such fantastic notion as that.

But this provision would not work. The House bill is simply another method of requiring the President to give the Dominican Republic a 200-percent increase in the quota—250,000 tons additional added to the 120,000 tons that they have now.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I doubt if the House bill provides that at all.

Mr. AIKEN. I am sure it does.

Mr. ANDERSON. I wish the Senator would point that out, because we received testimony this afternoon that it would give the Dominican Republic 130,000 tons of sugar in the House bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. They had a total of 120,000, including the 50,000 increase.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I will yield in a moment. I always like to look at the language which the legislative carpenters submit to us, and let the language speak for itself. It is easy to interpret. This is the language in the House bill. We can make the interpretation for ourselves. I skeletonize only a little, but do no violence to the text. It reads:

> If at any time after this act goes into effect, collective economic sanctions against one or more of the countries from which purchases are to be made under the provisions of this subsection are agreed upon by and between the United States and other countries, pursuant to treaty—

There are the collective economic sanctions. It does not say "or." It says "and."—

> and effective specific actions to implement such sanctions are undertaken by a majority provided in the treaty of such other treaty signatories—

Then and only then—

> the President may discontinue, in whole or in part, and for such periods of time as he may deem necessary, further purchases from such country or countries under this subsection.

That is crystal clear to me.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I find I misstated the situation. The Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Illinois are correct. The amount is 330,000 tons. We had so much testimony on the subject I understood it was 130,000 tons. I am informed that I was in error.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Now I read the rest of the language:

Except that for the calendar year 1960 unless such sanctions are agreed upon and implemented prior to October 15, 1960, no purchases under this subsection for 1960 may be discontinued or deferred and authorizations for such purchases shall—

I emphasize—

shall be made in time to permit shipment of the entire amount to be received in the United States prior to December 31, 1960.

We give the President 6 weeks in the calendar year 1960 to consummate all these sanctions. We mix up the international relations and foreign policy and the domestic sugar policy, and then say to the President, "You have 6 weeks to get these collective economic sanctions. You have 6 weeks in which to get specific effective implementation of the sanctions. If you do not do it in 6 weeks, you may not discontinue or defer the purchases."

What kind of business is this? No wonder the President is so intense about it tonight. No wonder I have had a dozen calls from the White House since 6 o'clock. This involves our relations in this whole hemisphere. This is not a matter of a few thousand tons of sugar. There is involved here the relationship of this great Republic with its sister republics in this hemisphere. If we want to do the greatest disservice that has ever been done to the hemisphere in the last half century, the way to do it is to let the House dictate this sugar policy.

I have been told that they will not take it. I do not care. I was determined to speak my piece. This issue involves more than sugar. It is more than beets and cane. This determines in large part how sweet and felicitous will be the relationships of our country with our sister republics to the south. I for one will not tie the hands of the Chief Executive, or any Chief Executive who follows him in the White House, and put him in a humiliating position. I would not do that to the man I might hate worst of all on earth, if I hated anyone at all.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I think we should take a look at the other side of the coin, because I agree this is a very serious matter. What I do not understand is this. The law we are talking about, which was passed on July 3, was fully understood by the Secretary of State and the President. They knew it when they went to San José and agreed to the sanctions against the Dominican Republic. Why did they not say to these people down there, "We have a law, passed on July 3, which requires that we do certain things. We will agree to sanctions, but you cannot ask us to violate a law, because we do not know whether Congress will repeal the law or whether they will not repeal it."

The Senator said a few moments ago that the President's hands were tied.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Does the Senator agree?

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes; but he tied them himself. At San José he could just as well have reserved the right to carry out the law passed by Congress, even though it may be a bad law—and I do not know whether it is a bad law—but they were down there with their eyes open and they knew the law existed. They knew there was such a law on the statute books. Why did they not reserve the right to agree to these things and to live up to the law passed by Congress, and come back to Congress and ask Congress to repeal the law?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I will give the Senator the answer right there.

Mr. CAPEHART. Let me state the question first.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I will give the answer right now. In the first place, this is all the President could get. We were here in the small hours of the morning. We argued back and forth over commas and parentheses and conjunctions and words. We did not give him what he wanted. At the last minute there was no choice for him but to accept it.

The second answer is, if the Senator had been Mr. Herter sitting around the conference table at San José, would he have been willing to make the confession, "I do not think we can get this out of Congress"?

What would have happened to the conference? It would have fallen flat. I have nothing more to say. I yield the floor.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I cannot agree that the President of the United States or Mr. Herter would have embarrassed themselves at San José had they frankly explained the situation in which they found themselves. I am not so certain that they did the right thing under the circumstances.

We have broken off diplomatic relations with the Dominican Republic, and we will undertake sanctions against it. That country has a dictatorship. I do not like it. A great many other people do not like it. But the country has been friendly to the United States. It has cooperated with the United States.

On the other hand, Cuba has kicked us and abused us and cussed us and embarrassed us, and it has done everything under the sun to hurt us. Yet we hear very little, if anything, about sanctions against Cuba. We are not breaking off diplomatic relations with Cuba. We do not even break off diplomatic relations with Russia. For some unknown reason—or perhaps for a known reason—we go down to San José and get ourselves bound up in a situation which is very embarrassing to this Nation, and embarrassing to the President of the United States, and we do it with our eyes open, because we knew the law was in existence when we made the agreement at San José.

It might be said that it was done on the morning of July 3, but should not have been done. I agree. I think it was wrong. Nevertheless, it was done. Are we to impose sanctions? Are we to go back upon our allies? Are we going to say that we have evidence which indicates that we have to do this, but nevertheless we shall do something else? That is the other side of the coin.

I think we must get out of this situation. I am not adverse to the proposal made by the able Senator from Illinois, but I think it is about time someone talked about the other side of the coin.

I do not mind saying that the people of Indiana are very much disappointed over this action and are very much disappointed that we shall break off diplomatic relations with a country which has never done anything to injure the United States while we continue to do business with Cuba and Mr. Castro.

How much can we take? How far can we go? To me, this kind of action simply does not make sense. Perhaps it does to others, but to me it does not make sense. I do not understand it. Frankly, I should like to know who made the decision. I might go so far as to say that I should like to have the matter investigated to find out who made the decision.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. BENNETT. I point out that in the recent Costa Rica conference, the sugar problem was not involved at all. The bill came from the House after the Costa Rica conference was finished and the reference to sanctions in the bill is yet to be developed in a later conference. Mr. Herter was in no position to speak about sanctions. He was not involved in the language of the proposal of the bill when he was in Costa Rica.

Mr. CAPEHART. There was a law when Mr. Herter was in Costa Rica which provided that under certain circumstances we would buy a certain amount of sugar from other countries, including the Dominican Republic.

Mr. BENNETT. That is correct; and the President was living up to that law.

Mr. CAPEHART. The President was living up to the law until——

Mr. BENNETT. He is living up to it tonight.

Mr. CAPEHART. He is living up to it tonight, but he has asked Congress to change the law because he made certain agreements at Costa Rica.

Mr. BENNETT. No; he made no agreements which affect this law.

Mr. CAPEHART. Then I do not understand what the able Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] was talking about. He said the President's hands were tied.

Mr. BENNETT. May the Senator from Utah point out that if the House bill is passed, the President's hands will be tied to this extent. By the bill we passed last July, we asked the President to buy 322,000 tons of sugar from the Dominican Republic before next December 31.

The House sends us a bill which provides that we shall not let the President wait until December 31; he must buy the sugar by October 15. The only way we can get out of buying it is to have further collective action—treaties; and then to have the treaties implemented, all by October 15. I think that ties the President's hands.

Mr. CAPEHART. The point I am trying to make—perhaps I have not made it—is that the President, and the Secretary of State when he was at San José, Costa Rica, knew of the law as it stands tonight, and as it stood then, passed last July 3.

Mr. BENNETT. That is correct.

Mr. CAPEHART. They knew that under the law they were required to buy X amount of sugar from the Dominican Republic.

Mr. BENNETT. That is correct.

Mr. CAPEHART. Being law-abiding citizens and Government officials, they expected to live up to the law.

Mr. BENNETT. That is correct.

Mr. CAPEHART. Why did not the Secretary of State, when he was at San José, reserve the right to buy an extra amount of sugar from the Dominican Republic and invoke sanctions?

Mr. BENNETT. They did not invoke sanctions. No economic sanctions were invoked.

Mr. CAPEHART. Does the Senator mean that other Latin American countries will not invoke economic sanctions against the Dominican Republic?

Mr. BENNETT. They do not have to on the basic of the Costa Rica Convention.

Mr. CAPEHART. In other words, is the United States the only country that will take any action? Will we discontinue buying sugar?

Mr. BENNETT. We have already bought 130,000 tons from the Dominican Republic, but the President wants the power to decide whether to buy another 322,000 tons.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. I shall support the Dirksen substitute. The House bill not only ties the hands of the President; it ties the hands of Congress. The matter of a sugar bill is domestic legislation. It is legislation which involves consumers and farmers. It has a very important bearing upon our foreign policy.

By the formula set up in the House bill, Congress delegates to a group of foreign nations, by treaties, the determination of where we shall buy our sugar. It is more far reaching than many of the proposals whereby the United States has delegated its sovereign powers to international bodies or foreign countries, than we have heard of yet.

Why are we in this predicament? We are in it because of the impotence of Congress. The Committee on Finance has not had an opportunity to hold hearings on the Sugar Act, although everyone knew that the act will expire on the last of December this year.

The House sent us a bill in July, and in the middle of the night we were running around with papers, trying to pass a bill, so that Congress could adjourn. There was not a political convention to be held for a solid week. I made the suggestion on the floor that the bill be referred to the Committee on Finance, that the committee hold hearings, and that we write a Sugar Act which would be fair and just to the farmers and consumers, and would be friendly and fair to all our foreign neighbors from whom we buy. Instead, the leadership, or the lack thereof, drove on for adjournment that night, not for the public good; the public good was sacrificed. The desire of many farmers was sacrificed.

Now a proposal is brought before us on the night we are to adjourn, whereby the hands of Congress would be tied. It would depend upon what group of foreign nations had in their control the power to decide where the United States will buy its sugar.

This is an important part of our foreign relations. It is also important domestically. Many farmers in my State would like to have an opportunity to produce sugar. They would like an opportunity to come before a committee of Congress and tell their story. But time after time they have been denied the opportunity because somebody has brought a bill before the Senate a few hours before we adjourned in the middle of the night.

Copies of the House bill are available. The substitute is not an ideal way in which to legislate. Nevertheless, we are forced to do so because the public good has been cast aside and the Congress has been maneuvered for the advantages of an individual bill.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I believe I know the Latin American republics about as well as any Senator present. I am not asking anybody's permission to talk American. I talk that way. I agree completely with the Senator from Indiana. We like to say how much we love Latin America. But when it comes to sincerity of purpose, we fail completely.

I recall the last time the Sugar Act was before the Senate. I remember Mr. Holland, of the State Department, standing outside that door, trying to persuade Senators to cut off Cuban sugar. But what are we doing about Mexican sugar? About Peruvian sugar? About Puerto Rican sugar? The Commonwealth of Puerto Rico is a part of the United States of America.

So I say in this instance that we should do the right thing, if we mean it. Let us not say how much we love Latin America and then when it comes to a showdown fail them because we only want the sugar beet growers of Nebraska to have the benefits. I want it, and I will protect it, and I will fight for them. But, by the eternal, if we intend to get along with Latin America, we will not do it by taking care of Nebraska and New Mexico sugar beet seed. We shall have to do it by getting along with them.

I know we just love Latin America—and soak her every time we get a chance, and get all her natural resources. Ninety-eight percent of the copper of Chile comes to the United States, and the rubber of Brazil comes to the United States. If we mean to get along with Latin America, let us be fair with Latin America.

This is a good sugar bill; and I agree with the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to speak on several aspects of this subject.

The Senate might well refresh its memory of the Constitution of the United States and take note of the fact under the Constitution it is the responsibility of the Chief Executive of this land to administer the foreign policy. That is a solemn obligation of the President, not of the House or the Senate.

I say most respectfully that in my opinion the House bill in its present form is not only an affront to the incumbent President of the United States, but it is also an affront to the Presidency of the United States, because in my judgment the bill in its present form is an effort by the House of Representatives to exercise prerogatives that belong to the President and to the Presidency.

The situation in Latin America is exceedingly critical. The President, as our Commander in Chief and as our leader, in this hour of crisis is in a very difficult situation, as regards Latin America, and particularly in light of the San José conference. The President of the United States, acting through his Secretary of State, is conducting himself in accordance with his constitutional prerogatives.

PREROGATIVES OF PRESIDENT IN FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. President, we are overlooking what has happened since the 3d of July. We are overlooking the fact that the President of the United States sent his foreign policy representative, the Secretary of State, to act for the President, to sit in a foreign policy conference, where evidence was taken. It was found that the Government of the Dominican Republic was guilty of certain acts that, in my judgment, clearly justified the action taken in Costa Rica and clearly justified the action that has been taken by our President.

The evidence showed that the Dominican Republic Government engaged in a conspiracy to assassinate the President of Venezuela, and followed a policy that sought to disrupt the Government of Venezuela. On the basis of that evidence, the President of the United States, acting through his agent, the Secretary of State, and in keeping with the Presidential prerogatives under the Constitution of the United States, has followed a very definite course of action.

In view of what has happened since the 3d of July—facts that we did not know early on the morning of July 3, but which are now known, I am shocked that the House of Representatives would do what it has done, and passed a sugar bill, which will embarrass the President of the United States throughout Latin America, if that action stands.

The Senate has the solemn responsibility to come to the assistance of the President and to give the House of Representatives a second chance in connection with this matter, for I refuse to believe that once reason comes to prevail in the House, the House will underwrite the course of action it has already taken in connection with this matter.

JULY ACTION BY CONGRESS UNFORTUNATE

But let us consider the situation in the early hours of the morning of July 3. There were some of us who sought to get the Senate to change the course of action it finally took, before it took it. We lost by a vote of 30 to 29. There was those of us who urged, at about 3 a.m. that morning, that the Senate grant to the President, as our Commander in Chief, an opportunity to take action as our constitutional leader in the field of foreign policy, and in that connection to exercise the prerogative and the power that he wished to exercise, namely, the power to use the discretion which, on the basis of the facts as they developed in regard to the Cuban sugar situation, caused him to determine in the weeks that followed how the sugar allotment should be handled. That is what some of us sought to give to the President, and that is what the President was requesting.

ACTION OF SAN JOSÉ CONFERENCE

Oh, it can be said that the President signed the measure we finally passed. But he did not sign it because he liked it. He signed it because he hoped the worst would not come to pass. But it did come to pass, and the President was put into this embarrassing situation on the basis of the evidence which unfolded at the Costa Rica conference.

Plots such as that by the Dominican Republic against President Betancourt of Venezuela have been cause for war throughout the history of nations. Let Senators imagine what result an assassination plot against our President by another power would bring about.

But Venezuela did not invade or attack the Dominican Republic. She sought collective action, first in the United Nations and then in the Organization of American States.

This is really a test of whether we believe in collective action to keep the peace, or whether we stay with the law of the jungle.

In my judgment the Secretary of State could not have honorably taken any other action than what he did take; the only honorable course of action open to him was to go along with the representatives of the other American States, on the basis of the evidence which was presented at the Costa Rica conference.

We can muddy these waters by bringing the Cuban situation into the consideration of the situation as regards the activities of the Dominican Republic vis-a-vis Venezuela. But I say that to bring Cuba into our consideration of that other situation is as irrelevant as talking about something Mary Smith has done when it is John Doe who is being tried for a crime.

The fact is that the Dominican Republic got a fair trial at the Costa Rica conference, and was found guilty.

In participating in that conference and that conclusion, we have followed a course of action which, under the provisions of the Constitution, the President alone has the power to follow.

DISCRETIONARY POWER SHOULD BE GIVEN PRESIDENT

Now what are we to do? Are we to say that after the Dominican Republic has been found guilty, on the basis of the evidence taken at the Costa Rica conference, we now shall say to the President, "But we are now going to force you to buy from the guilty party 372,000 tons of sugar"? That is what the House has said—to the embarrassment of the President.

What should we do? I think the Senator from Illinois has struck the correct chord. I believe we should pass the Dirksen proposal, of which I have the honor to be a cosponsor, and again should say, in effect, "Mr. President, in view of the developments since July 3, we propose to give you the discretion, as our Commander in Chief, to settle this sugar matter in accordance with your best judgment, until the next session of Congress, at which time we will hold the hearings which ought to be held and can take testimony in regard to a new sugar act."

The sugar act we passed on the morning of July 3 was one on which the House of Representatives had not held even 1 minute of hearings. It was a sugar act that Members of the House of Representatives themselves concocted, with no basis of an official record of a hearing. They dumped it into the lap of the Senate—as some of us pointed out—in those early hours on the morning of July 3, and said, in effect, to the Senate, "Take it or leave it."

There were those of us who believed then that we should meet the challenge of the House. We urged adoption of a resolution which would give the President the discretionary power that he needed, and make clear to the House that, come January, we would conduct some hearings which would give to all parties concerned, including domestic producers, an opportunity to attend the hearing and to make their case.

I said then, and I repeat tonight, that we were very unfair to domestic producers when we passed that measure on July 3.

We were unfair, too, to a good many of our friends in Latin America. We were unfair to Brazil. We were unfair to Colombia. We were unfair to Venezuela. We were unfair to El Salvador and Guatemala. We were unfair to Ecuador. We were unfair to Mexico. We were unfair to many countries of the hemisphere which have been begging for sugar allotments.

They were entitled to a hearing. As we passed that bill on the morning of July 3, there sat in the galleries of the Senate, diplomatic representatives from a whole group of Latin American countries, our friends, who were shocked by the course of action the Congress of the United States took on that early morning.

I close by saying, most respectfully, that, in my opinion, what we should do is pass the Dirksen proposal and give to the President the discretionary power he is going to need to lead us through the foreign policy crisis in Latin America. In January we can come back here and proceed to conduct hearings for a complete revision of our sugar policy, giving to our domestic producers and friends in Latin America an opportunity to make the record.

More than that, by means of this amendment, we will recognize that when we get involved in a foreign policy issue and the crisis is upon us, we rally behind the President of the United States, no matter who he is or what party he comes from; and we do not seek to undercut him and undermine him by handcuffing him and putting him in a position where he will be held up to a ridiculous posture before the eyes of our friends in Latin America and elsewhere in the world.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Will the Senator from Oregon permit me to say, lest anyone get the wrong impression, that we have been increasing our purchases of sugar from most of the Latin American countries. We have decreased our purchases of sugar from Cuba. We are keeping the sugar purchases from the Dominican Republic where they were. We have not given that country any increased business.

We gave Peru an order for 250,000 tons more of sugar than her quota called for. Peru could furnish only 165,000 tons.

We gave a very large increased order to Mexico. I do not recall what it was, but I think it was 160,000 or 175,000 tons.

We gave increased orders to the small Latin American countries that had quotas. Then we needed more sugar, so we bought 100,000 tons from Brazil. Today I understand Brazil has 300,000 tons which she would like to sell to us, and for which she would, in all probability, accept American surplus farm commodities in exchange.

Mr. President, that is very important. It is important that, as far as possible, we make these purchases where we can increase our own markets for American farm commodities. There is a great opportunity in Latin America, if we can get to doing business with them, and get sugar from them.

I think we have probably done Cuba a disservice over the years by making her a one-commodity country and dependent on sales of sugar. If Cuba diversifies as a result of our cutting our sugar purchases from her, she will be better off in the long run, although, of course, no one knows what is going to happen in the meantime.

However, we have been increasing our business with Latin American countries.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Vermont.

In closing, I want to make two points very briefly. The first is the one just made by the Senator from Vermont. We have an opportunity, as we write a new sugar bill, to strengthen our economic relations with many of our friends in Latin America.

The Senator from Vermont mentioned Brazil. He is quite right. Brazil has in storage surplus sugar; and we have in storage a great deal of surplus agricultural commodities, including wheat and other products.

I happen to know because I was briefed on it today. When we come to work out a sugar bill in January, an opportunity will be made available to us

for an exchange of substantial quantities of American surplus agricultural products, including wheat to Brazil, for sugar. That is true of other Latin American countries.

I close by saying that we are dealing here, really, not with the problem of sugar; we are dealing here with the problem of American foreign policy. We are dealing with an attempt on the part of some in Congress to intervene in American foreign policy by seeking to dictate to the President, through sugar legislation, the policy he must follow as our Commander in Chief and as our Chief in the field of foreign policy in carrying out diplomatic relations with foreign powers.

It is a form of subterfuge that the House of Representatives has engaged in, and I am for giving the House of Representatives an opportunity to correct what I think is a grievous error.

Mr. President, as one who has stood on the floor and disagreed with President Eisenhower when I thought he was wrong on many domestic issues, I plead for support of my President and your President in regard to the matter of foreign policy, to strengthen his hand, and not slap him in the face by adoption of the kind of sugar bill that has been sent to us by the House of Representatives.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I do not want to take too much of the time of the Senate; on August 24 I spoke for over an hour and a half on this subject, reviewing the various details of what took place in Costa Rica at the OAS conference. I also reviewed the history of sugar legislation, as it has developed during recent months.

As Senators will recall, I voted against the so-called Emergency Sugar Act which was sent to the White House during the wee hours of the morning just prior to our July recess. I voted against that bill for two reasons: first, since it only extended the existing law through the first 3 months of 1961, and since I do not believe it is possible for any administrator to administer what is essentially a 1-year program, over a 3-month period, I took the position that the act was actually worse than no new legislation at all. Second, I feared that once the Department of State was given any leeway at all in handling offshore quotas, the entire system of quotas would be used as a pawn in the game of international politics which the State Department is trying to play in the Latin American area—a game, I might say, at which our diplomats apparently lack quite a bit of proficiency.

In my judgment, Mr. President, my vote in July was right; my predictions have come true. The State Department has managed to pervert and rape the system of priorities set up in that act, priorities very carefully written into the law, specifying how and in what manner any reduction in Cuba's quota was to be supplied.

The San José Conference has been alluded to in this debate. An effort has been made to lead the Senate into believing that, in some manner, the House bill, as reported just a few hours ago by the Senate Finance Committee, has tied the President's hands, that it denies him the power to comply with the declaration of the OAS conference with regard to the Dominican Republic.

The fact is, Mr. President, that the San José declaration did not involve the imposition of economic sanctions against the Dominican Republic; the declaration does not cover anything except breaking diplomatic relations, and imposing restrictions upon trade in arms and weapons of war.

Mr. President, if the conference at Costa Rica of the Organization of American States had desired to impose further economic sanctions against the Dominican Republic that could and doubtless would have been done. But this was not the case at all. I read from the declaration:

> The conference agrees:
> 1. To apply the following measures:
> (a) Breaking of diplomatic relations of all the member states with the Dominican Republic.

That we have done, Mr. President; we have met that obligation, if, indeed, it can properly be called an obligation.

> (b) Partial interruption of economic relations of all the member states, with the Dominican Republic, beginning with the immediate suspension of trade in arms and implements of war of every kind.

This, Mr. President is the only sanction on commerce approved by the OAS. If the Organization of American States had desired to broaden this prohibition it could have done more, but it did not.

This bill would not tie the President's hands in meeting the terms of the San José declaration, nor, Mr. President, would this bill have any detrimental effect upon our relations with countries to the south of us, despite what some Senator may say.

What the bill would accomplish, however, is of great importance, for, in addition to protecting and assisting our domestic sugar producers, it would have enormous value in the field of foreign affairs. For one thing, it would serve notice that the Congress is not going to participate or condone, much less permit, the President of the United States to bend over backward to placate Betancourt of Venezuela.

We are in effect going on record as opposing further concessions to Venezuela or any other country unless that nation and others are willing to join us in collective action. We have heard much from the State Department about the need for meeting the crisis in the Caribbean through collective efforts. This bill says that when collective efforts are undertaken, Uncle Sam stands ready to fulfill any obligations which such action may require, vis-a-vis the Dominican Republic, but that the United States is not going to unilaterally impose economic sanctions against the Dominican Republic, far beyond those required or envisioned by the San José declaration.

The fact is, Mr. President, that the United States was outbargained in San José. We concurred in efforts to chastise the Dominican Republic—we bowed down to Betancourt's demands for action against that country, without obtaining anything more than a weak slap on the wrist by the OAS against Castro. The resolution finally adopted with regard to Cuba did not even mention that country by name. In effect, we were outtraded, and came away from San José with the bad end of the deal. I, for one, am not going to vote to make a bad bargain even worse by giving to the State Department authority to proceed unilaterally far beyond the collective action required under the San José declaration. I am not going to be a party to any more bowing and scraping before Betancourt and some of the other countries until they are willing to cooperate with us, and help us. When Betancourt decides to embargo oil sales to Cuba, when the OAS decides to invoke collective economic sanctions against Cuba, when the OAS determines to broaden its declarations against the Dominican Republic, then, and only then, should the United States even consider exercising or requesting the power which the amendment offered by my distinguished friend from Illinois proposes.

Mr. President, we are in an all-or-nothing-at-all position. The House will never accept the language of the proposed substitute even should it be adopted. The net result is we will end up with a big goose egg in the way of sugar legislation. Certainly, this result will not help the President. Furthermore, it would offer the prospect of grave injury to our domestic producers of sugar, as well as to consumers of sugar. On the other hand, rejection of the substitute will permit prompt action by the House on the bill, a bill which, I remind Senators, endorses the concept of collective action in Latin America, a concept which the Department of State has declared to be the proper one.

I urge Senators to view this matter realistically, to vote down the substitute, and to quickly approve the bill as reported by the Finance Committee.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. ERVIN. Speaking of the Constitution, does not the Constitution provide that the Congress shall have the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ERVIN. Is not the request of the President in essence a request that Congress transfer to the President, to be exercised through the State Department, the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations in respect to sugar?

Mr. ELLENDER. There is no doubt about that, Mr. President.

Let me say one more thing, Mr. President. I have heard it said that unless the President is given the authority proposed in the substitute, the United States will be left in a position where it will be unable to place itself on record as being opposed to dictatorships.

I frankly do not know whether the Dominican Republic is a dictatorship at this time. Trujillo is not in power; a

reform government is in charge there. Much progress has been made, amnesty has been given to political refugees, opposition parties are operating openly, municipal elections are scheduled for this winter and national elections next spring. These are not the symbols of a dictatorship.

But even if the Government of the Dominican Republic were a dictatorship, is not the Government of Cuba an even more intolerable dictatorship? Is not Castro, linked as he is with Moscow and Peiping, dependent as he is upon the firing squad and the all-night harangue, a dictator? And, since he is, why should the United States find it necessary to punish the Dominican Republic to appease certain governments which continue to trade with, support, and defend the Castro dictatorship? Why should Uncle Sam do all the yielding? Why must we do all the bowing?

If Mr. Betancourt and a few others want to do away with dictatorships in the Caribbean, why do they not agree to sanctions against Cuba, instead of actually deleting mention of Castro's Cuba from the weak, watered-down resolution which was finally approved by the OAS?

Mr. President, I again express the hope that this amendment will be defeated, and that the bill as reported by the Finance Committee will be approved by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the substitute amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, are there any other Senators who wish to be heard?

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the substitute amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, one or two things should be made clear before we vote. The Senate should be reminded that we are presently operating under a Sugar Act which was passed in July. Senators have not made it clear that in July we gave the President the principal thing for which he asked.

The purpose of the bill passed in July was to confer authority for the President to cut the Castro sugar quota. Under the law the President would have been required to buy more rather than less sugar from Cuba, and he did not wish to buy more sugar from Cuba. That was what the President insisted upon and demanded.

This Senator was one of those who supported the position that the President ought to be able to reallocate the Cuban quota however he wished to reallocate the Cuban quota. We could not get that. The House was absolutely adamant on that. In that respect the House had its way, but the Executive was given the principal thing the President desired, which was the ability to buy sugar elsewhere than from Cuba.

It was not so important to the administration where the sugar was bought as it was that the administration not be required to buy it from Cuba. That was the important point at the time.

It is clear to this Senator, and I suppose it is clear to other Senators, that the act told the President how he was going to buy sugar.

Insofar as the negotiations were carried on in Costa Rica, I, for one, would be curious to know what authority the President had to make an agreement without the consent of the Congress which was in violation of the act of Congress which the President signed into law. If the President has authority under his power in international affairs not to follow a law we passed in July, to which he affixed his name, then he still has the authority not to obey the law with regard to anything we write in a law now. If he has that authority under his powers in regard to international affairs, we cannot make him follow the law in this instance if we could not make him follow it in the other case.

My impression is that the President is not buying sugar from the Dominican Republic as the law directs him.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. BENNETT. So far as the Senator from Utah knows, the President made no agreement at Costa Rica involving sugar.

With respect to the agreement to buy sugar from the Dominican Republic or any other country, as outlined in the July law, I think the President has to carry out that mandate. I think the President has until December 31 to carry out the mandate.

There was nothing in the law which said the President had to buy the sugar 10 days after the law was passed. The President is not as yet in violation of the law passed last July. I think the effect of the House bill, as it came over today, would be to say to the President, "You cannot have until December 31; you can have only until October 15."

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If our distinguished Republican leader could assure us that the adoption of his amendment would not mean that we would kill the bill that we have here, this Senator would find considerable appeal to it. But I fear that that is what the result would be. The House rules are such that a single objector can prevent this bill from being considered when it goes back to the House. Unless I miss my guess, such will be its fate. If we are in that kind of situation, and it is a matter of having this bill or getting no bill, we had better take this bill, because if we do not, several things will happen that we will not like.

One of the results will be that the sugar supply of this country will be in jeopardy when we return in January. We were previously in a situation where we could buy sugar with a 6-day delivery date. Because of changes and the cessation of trade with Cuba, we must look to a 6-week delivery date, because many areas from which we will be buying sugar are much farther removed.

The domestic sugar producers, the cane producers particularly, are in an embarrassing position because they must plant their crops a year in advance. They need to know where they stand and what their acreage rights are. The beet producers are not in quite so difficult a position, but they also have a problem themselves in knowing whether they can plant their crops and if they can have some assurance that they can make a profit when they harvest the beets.

Those are the problems that we have. I for one wonder where the Republican leadership of the House of Representatives is. This bill passed in the House of Representatives, I am told, without a dissenting vote. Now the bill may go to conference and, if the amendment carries, we would attempt to impose upon the House conferees the will of the Senate, which will be a divided will compared with unanimity in the House of Representatives. As one who has participated in such a conference in July with the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], I will tell the Senate that is no easy task to overcome the House position.

I feel satisfied that those, such as the Department of Agriculture, who have the responsibility of seeing that the public gets sugar and that we do not have to buy it at an outrageous price, would rather be able to buy sugar and make available a steady supply without disrupting the market.

Insofar as concerns the statement that the President's hands are tied, I suggest that they would not be nearly as badly tied by the provision of this bill as they were by the provisions of the bill that he signed into law in July, because that bill provided he would buy sugar from the Dominican Republic. It gave him no out whatsoever.

I am sure the President has some good Republican leadership in the House, but he did not get a vote in the House of Representatives.

If the President wishes to get around the Sugar Act, I suggest that he make a treaty with some nation, bring it to the Senate, and I would be willing to vote to ratify such a treaty. That kind of approach would let him do whatever he wishes to do about the sugar quota, if he feels he must obey a mandate of the OAS. But it looks to me as though if we vote for the proposed amendment, we may very well find ourselves in a position in which we will not have an act, and our entire domestic sugar supply will have been disrupted. What we buy, we shall be buying in such a chaotic market that prices can skyrocket.

Therefore, I suggest that the bill is much better than nothing. I fear that nothing is what we will have if we do not take the bill that the Senate Finance Committee has recommended.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I point out to my colleagues certain language of the amendment, which in my judgment the House would not accept. As a consequence, there would not be a bill. The language is as follows:

> Except that any amounts which would be purchased from the Dominican Republic under the foregoing provisions of this subparagraph 3 need not be purchased or may be purchased from other foreign countries or domestic producers without regard to allocation.

In other words, under existing law Dominican Republic growers are entitled to sell a certain amount of sugar in the United States. Passage of this amendment would be a direct repeal of what we provided for in July.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. BENNETT. I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I ask unanimous consent that I may yield without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BENNETT. The point has been made, and I think there may be much merit to it, that if we pass one bill in the Senate, and the House of Representatives has passed a completely different bill, we may have no bill. I should like to ask the Senator from Illinois whether or not he believes, if the House-passed bill were adopted and became the action of both Houses, the President would accept this straitjacket on his power.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the question was addressed to me earlier this evening on two occasions, and I made a special call to make inquiry. I inquired not more than 15 or 20 minutes ago.

Mr. President, I can say with authority that if the House bill is sent to the White House, the ratio is 100 to 1 that it will be disapproved by the President of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from Illinois. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BUTLER (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND]. If he were present and voting he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I therefore withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], and the Senator from Massachustts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 62, nays 17, as follows:

[No. 323]

YEAS—62

Aiken	Fong	Monroney
Allott	Fulbright	Morse
Anderson	Gore	Morton
Bartlett	Green	Moss
Bennett	Gruening	Mundt
Bible	Hart	Muskie
Bush	Hickenlooper	Pastore
Byrd, W. Va.	Hruska	Prouty
Cannon	Jackson	Proxmire
Capehart	Javits	Randolph
Carroll	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Case, N.J.	Keating	Scott
Case, S. Dak.	Kuchel	Smith
Church	Lausche	Symington
Clark	Long, Hawaii	Thurmond
Cooper	Lusk	Wiley
Cotton	McClellan	Williams, Del.
Curtis	McGee	Williams, N.J.
Dirksen	McNamara	Yarborough
Dworshak	Magnuson	Young, N. Dak.
Engle	Mansfield	

NAYS—17

Byrd, Va.	Hartke	Robertson
Chavez	Holland	Smathers
Dodd	Johnston, S.C.	Sparkman
Ellender	Jordan	Stennis
Ervin	Long, La.	Talmadge
Frear	McCarthy	

NOT VOTING—21

Beall	Goldwater	Kerr
Bridges	Hayden	Martin
Burdick	Hennings	Murray
Butler	Hill	O'Mahoney
Carlson	Humphrey	Russell
Douglas	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Eastland	Kennedy	Young, Ohio

So Mr. DIRKSEN's amendment, in the nature of a substitute, was agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, is the amendment I have at the desk in order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair rules that the amendment is not in order.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H.R. 13062) was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, on the last vote, on the amendment of the Senator from Illinois, I voted "No." I want to be recorded as voting "No."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is so recorded.

EXPRESSION OF APPRECIATION BY SENATOR LUSK

Mr. LUSK. Mr. President, yesterday when I was not on the floor, the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] paid a tribute to me. This morning I read his statement in the RECORD. Undeserved as I know the compliment to be, I wish, nevertheless, to acknowledge it and to thank my friend for having thus given public expression to his generous sentiments.

I shall always cherish, and be grateful to him, not only for the words he uttered yesterday, but for his uniform kindness to me from the day I became a Member of this body. The distinguished Senator from Mississippi is of a warm and generous nature, a gentleman of abounding charity. I have never heard him speak ill of anyone. I consider it one of the high privileges of my life to have known him and to have enjoyed his friendship.

Mr. President, as my service here is fast drawing to a close, I trust that I will be pardoned if I detain the Senate a little longer for a few words, some of them of a personal nature. I came to the Senate last March by appointment of the Governor of Oregon, imbued with a profound sense of respect for the U.S. Senate. During my brief period of service, my association with the distinguished Members of this body, the opportunity that I have had to learn, at firsthand, the magnitude and the complexity of the problems with which the Senate must deal, and to observe the unremitting toil, the high intelligence, and the devotion to duty which are brought to the accomplishment of the task of making laws which will serve the public interest—all this has immeasurably increased the respect which I held for the Senate of the United States, and the representatives of the 50 States of the Union which compose it.

We live in these closing hours of the 86th Congress in a great moment of history, and in a time of deadly peril to our country. The decisions we make today may determine the fate of America tomorrow. There has never been a time in our history which called for the exercise of greater wisdom and prudence on the part of those in places of responsibility, or for greater faith in our free institutions of Government on the part of all our people. We have never known a more urgent need for unity—not the sort of unity which results from the suppression of freedom of religion and speech and the press, but the unity which derives from a common and lofty purpose to preserve our American ideals, and defend ourselves against the Communist threat to the destruction of our civilization. And I suggest that essential to that unity is the existence of a spirit of charity and good will among us, and a rejection of that hateful vice of intolerance, concerning which the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], spoke so eloquently yesterday.

Mr. President, as I leave the Senate, I wish to express to all of you my sense of gratitude for your cordial reception of me, and for the privilege of having served with you. I would particularly acknowledge the fine spirit of coopera-

tion manifested by my colleague, the able and distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

And I pray that in all its future deliberations and decisions, so vital to the welfare of our country and the people of the world, the Senate will have the guidance of divine providence.

IMPORTATION OF CERTAIN ARTICLES FOR RELIGIOUS PURPOSES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1980, H.R. 4384.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee will state it.

Mr. GORE. At least one Senator in the rear of the Chamber could not hear one word which the Senator from Texas uttered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1980, H.R. 4384, the bill which was under consideration before the Senate considered the sugar bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H.R. 4384) to amend paragraph 1774 of the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to the importation of certain articles for religious purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I do not know whether the Senator from Maryland is available or not.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will please be in order.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I make the point of order that the Senate is not in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. Senators will take their seats.

Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I moved that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask for a yea and nay vote. This is a motion to bring up the statuary and religious articles bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have moved to return to the consideration of the bill which was under consideration when I asked the Senator from Maryland to permit me to move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the sugar bill. I am only keeping my agreement with the Senator from Maryland and with the rest of the Senate, and I propose to keep it. If the Senate does not want to agree to the motion, that is a matter for the Senate to decide. I am agreeable to giving the Senator the yeas and nays on the motion.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee will state it.

Mr. GORE. Did not the Senator from Texas ask unanimous consent to lay aside the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas moved to proceed to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I did not ask unanimous consent. I moved to proceed to the consideration of the bill, and the Senator from Ohio has asked for the yeas and nays on the motion to proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is a sufficient second. The yeas and nays are ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG], would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 78, nays 1, as follows:

[No. 324]

YEAS—78

Aiken	Bennett	Byrd, Va.
Allott	Bible	Byrd, W. Va.
Anderson	Bush	Cannon
Bartlett	Butler	Capehart
Carroll	Hickenlooper	Moss
Case, N.J.	Holland	Mundt
Case, S. Dak.	Hruska	Muskie
Chavez	Jackson	Pastore
Church	Javits	Prouty
Clark	Johnson, Tex.	Proxmire
Cooper	Johnston, S.C.	Randolph
Cotton	Keating	Robertson
Curtis	Kerr	Schoeppel
Dirksen	Kuchel	Scott
Dodd	Long, Hawaii	Smathers
Dworshak	Long, La.	Smith
Ellender	Lusk	Sparkman
Engle	McCarthy	Stennis
Fong	McClellan	Symington
Frear	McGee	Talmadge
Fulbright	McNamara	Thurmond
Gore	Magnuson	Wiley
Green	Mansfield	Williams, Del.
Gruening	Monroney	Williams, N.J.
Hart	Morse	Yarborough
Hartke	Morton	Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—1

Lausche

NOT VOTING—21

Beall	Goldwater	Kennedy
Bridges	Hayden	Martin
Burdick	Hennings	Murray
Carlson	Hill	O'Mahoney
Douglas	Humphrey	Russell
Eastland	Jordan	Saltonstall
Ervin	Kefauver	Young, Ohio

So the motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, we were considering this bill and the Butler amendment to it when I asked the Senator from Maryland to yield the floor. I did so in order that we might consider the sugar bill, in the hope that it could go to the other body. Now that has been done. Therefore, in accordance with my understanding with the Senator from Maryland, and out of respect for his courtesy and his fairness to me, we are back at the point at which we were when he yielded to me.

Mr. BUTLER. I thank the Senator from Texas. I shall not take more than 5 minutes, at the most.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. BUTLER. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Not that it makes any difference, but the Senator from Tennessee yielded to the Senator from Texas at that time.

Mr. BUTLER. That is correct; and I will yield to the Senator from Tennessee, if he desires that I do so.

Mr. GORE. No; I shall speak after the Senator from Maryland has spoken.

Mr. BUTLER. I thank the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. President, this case is one of extreme hardship to one individual taxpayer. He was a member of a two-man partnership. His partner died. He made his tax return and paid all the taxes that he thought were due.

Five years retroactively, the Treasury levied a deficiency against him based upon the bunching of 23 months income into one tax year amounting to about $101,000. The claim draws interest of about $600 a month.

A private bill was passed by the House and the Senate, without any difficulty whatever. The Judiciary Committees of both Houses saw the justice of the bill. The Treasury said it would oppose the bill, but admitted the claim was equitable.

But after the bill had been vetoed by the President, there was only one other

way to bring the matter before the Senate, and that was the way I have pursued at this time—namely, to amend the law, so that the bill would be retroactive. Returning to the merits of the claim I remind the Senate that the fourth circuit was the only circuit in the Nation that construed the law requiring the bunching of income as in this case. If he had lived in New York, Philadelphia, San Francisco, St. Louis, or any other place in the Nation other than in the fourth circuit, the tax would never have been assessed against him, because all the other circuits construed the law so as not to require bunching. But he happened to live in the fourth circuit; and the fourth circuit—contrary to the decisions in the other circuits—decided the case against him.

Immediately after the deficiency was levied against him, Randolph Paul, one of the most eminent tax lawyers in the United States, was so outraged about the matter that he immediately went to the House of Representatives; and the House immediately acted. The House clarified the law, so that no one else could be caught by the Treasury interpretation under which this man had been caught.

The Senate did the same thing; and in its report the Senate committee very strongly indicated that it was terrible to bunch income and recommended to the Senate that the law be changed so that no one else under similar circumstances could be caught.

He then filed a writ of certiorari in the Supreme Court of the United States. The Treasury Department, through the Department of Justice, made representations to the Supreme Court of the United States to the effect that inasmuch as the Congress had changed the law, so that no one else could be caught, the question was moot, and the Court should do nothing to relieve this man. And the Supreme Court of the United States, even though there was the conflict in the circuits and even though the Court ordinarily would have accepted jurisdiction, refused to review the case.

Therefore this man is left with a liability of $101,000 arising out of the bunching of almost 2 years' income into 1 year. He is the only man who has been caught in that way; no other American citizen can be caught in that way. In my opinion the case has great merit.

Following those facts, as I told the Senate, I had no difficulty whatever in having the Senate Judiciary Committee and the House Judiciary Committee take favorable action on a private relief bill. This man should have relief. The two Houses passed the bill willingly. The bill went to the White House, and was vetoed, even though, as I have said, the Treasury admitted that the claim was equitable.

I say to the Senate that the law should never operate so oppressively; and when one citizen has, as a result of the construction or interpretation placed by only one circuit of the many circuits in the Nation, been obligated to pay a $101,000 tax, drawing interest of $600 a month, which practically has ruined him, certainly that is a hardship which this body should relieve.

When the Finance Committee heard this matter, when I told the committee what the facts were, on a poll of the committee, when the bill was first offered, the committee voted 15 to 2 to grand this man some relief and to clear the amendment which I have submitted here tonight as a floor amendment.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. BUTLER. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Did the President give a reason for his veto?

Mr. BUTLER. He gave as the reason that only one man could be relieved by such action, and that the bill would be a bad precedent.

I think the man is eminently entitled to relief; and this amendment, as it is drawn—and I placed an explanatory statement in the RECORD, 2 or 3 days ago—is very technical; but I can assure the Senate that the Treasury has not pointed out to me a single instance in which anyone else could be affected by the proposed law.

I admit it is retroactive, and I do not like retroactivity any more than anyone else does. But the Treasury has been unable to point to one case in which anyone else has been similarly treated. I say to the Senate that we should treat taxpayers fairly and impartially; and one man, under the circumstances which exist in this case, is entitled to have his tax computed on the same basis as other taxpayers.

We should treat them impartially; and one man, under the circumstances of this case, should not be forced to pay a tax that will bankrupt him.

I ask the Senate to agree to this amendment for the second time. It adopted it once, without any controversy at all. When the question came up as a relief bill from the Judiciary Committee, it was passed on the Consent Calendar. The House passed the bill on the Consent Calendar. This man is entitled to relief, and I plead with Senators to give him relief.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate any longer than the distinguished Senator from Maryland took in presenting the amendment. With one exception, to which I shall refer presently, I think the Senator presented the case accurately. I think he has presented it fairly.

Let me begin by saying that an equitable claim can be presented here on the ground of hardship. I submit, however, that all of us have numerous taxpayers who can present cases of hardship. I think this case certainly has merit. I shall not undertake to go into the technicalities. I do raise the question of the advisability of the Senate considering amendments that have not been reported from committees at this time of night, very technical amendments to the Internal Revenue Code.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. I merely wished to make the point that I felt the amendment had been cleared by the committee, had been considered by the committee, and had been cleared as a floor amendment.

Mr. GORE. To the extent that the committee was polled, the Senator is entirely correct. I think the senior Senator from Maryland was entirely fair in stating to the Senate earlier that he would not have presented this amendment except that other Senators were presenting amendments to the Finance Committee bill; and if other Members were going to do so, he said he claimed the right. And if he succeeds in that right, perhaps I have a few in my pocket. All of us have amendments which we would like to see adopted. Where do we stop in amending the Internal Revenue Code?

I said I would refer to one instance in which I cannot concede that the able Senator from Maryland was accurate. He has said this affects only one taxpayer. I submit that cannot be shown.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. I thought I said the Treasury had not been able to demonstrate to me that it affected more than one taxpayer. I have asked them repeatedly, and they have not told me of anyone else it would affect.

Mr. GORE. If the Senator said that, that is a correct statement.

Mr. BUTLER. I intended to say that.

Mr. GORE. Then it is the correct statement.

Let me point out that if later we find there is a series of taxpayers who turn up in this category, it would by no means be the first experience of the Senate in that respect. There is no way we have to determine how many other taxpayers may be similarly affected by the amendment. It is retroactive tax relief, and, insofar as I now know, it would be for the relief of a single taxpayer.

I should venture the suggestion, however, that others would suggest this proposal amends the law retroactively. The amendment is retroactively to the law. It is not relief for this particular taxpayer. I am sure the Senator will agree with that. It is a retroactive amendment to the law. Is that correct?

Mr. BUTLER. I so stated.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate. The Senator from Maryland has presented it fairly.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator spells out that this proposal will become a part of the permanent tax code. Is that correct?

Mr. GORE. As the Senator has fairly said, this is not an amendment for the relief of one taxpayer; this is a retroactive amendment of the law and would affect all taxpayers who fall within these circumstances.

Mr. MONRONEY. And it continues on and on until the amendment itself is repealed, if any taxpayer, under a similar situation and circumstances, can establish that same participation or claim.

Mr. GORE. That is right.

Mr. MONRONEY. If this man is in bad condition, if he has been unjustly dealt with, if the present President has vetoed a private bill in his relief, would it not be possible, in the new session of the Congress, with a new President, for the Judiciary Committees of both Houses, within their proper jurisdiction, to pass private bills, taking this matter up de novo in the new Congress, in the regular machinery for establishing private claims?

Mr. GORE. I think the answer is "Yes." I would support the position the President took even on a private relief bill. No showing has been made that this tax has been unjustly or unlawfully laid. A showing has been fairly made by the Senator from Maryland that a hardship has occurred, because under the provisions of the law, the tax over a 23-month period was telescoped into a 12-month period. Is that correct?

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. The income of 23 months was telescoped into 1 year, and the taxpayer was denied his day in court, because the Congress changed the law, thereby stripping him of relief, and then hit him over the head with their own amendment. It would be like going into court with a very good case, and then having the Congress change the law so that there would be no case and there would be no rights. Congress changed the rule in the middle of the game.

Mr. GORE. I respectfully suggest that the last statement is not exactly correct. Congress changed the law, but it did not change it for the period under which the law applied to the taxpayer. The tax was assessed in accordance with the law. The case has been adjudicated. The Supreme Court refused certiorari. A bill for his private relief was passed. The President vetoed it. Now we are asked to amend the law retroactively, not for the relief of one taxpayer, but for the relief of any taxpayer who might find himself in this circumstance; and we do not know how many there may be.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A division is in order. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER].

On a division, the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I had intended to offer an amendment which had been proposed by my senior colleague [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] and by me. The amendment would have provided a small measure of relief for our hard-pressed domestic fluorspar industry. This is the only remaining bill to which the particular amendment could have been offered.

In view of the fact that the tax bill now before us has been amended several times and may not get out of conference because of these additions, I have decided on my own responsibility not to offer this amendment at this time, but I express the hope that a proposal of this nature will be considered next year and that this industry will be given the consideration which it deserves because of the precarious condition in which the industry finds itself.

Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

TRIBUTES TO SENATOR LUSK

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to take this time to pay my compliments to a Member of the Senate who will be leaving us shortly. He is a modest man. He is a man of great integrity and fine character. He has served with us in a fashion which has endeared him to all of us. I refer to the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. LUSK].

I have watched him closely since he came here. I think he does us credit. I wish to have the RECORD show that I have been impressed with this man, that I believe he has made a great and a real contribution to the Senate, and that I, for one, will be sorry to see him leave this Chamber. It is with affection, respect, and comradeship that we have come to know him and as we will remember him. I hope he will visit us often and give us of his sagacity and wisdom. He has left his mark and it is a good one.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, earlier today I discussed with the Senator from Montana the statement he has just made. I wish to associate myself with his remarks and to pay my high respects and deep appreciation to the able junior Senator from Oregon for his friendship, for the manner in which he has served as a Senator from that great State, for his frequent appearances as Presiding Officer of this body, and for his complete cooperation with the leadership at all times. It has been a great pleasure to serve with him in this body.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am very happy that the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and our wonderful majority leader [Mr. JOHNSON of Texas] have paid this tribute to HALL LUSK, who is the junior Senator from Oregon at the present time. I wish to associate myself with their comments.

HALL LUSK has one of the most brilliant judicial records in the history of our State. He served not only on the circuit bench, but also for many years on our Supreme Court bench, with distinction. He is a man of ingrained judicial temperament. All my colleagues in the Senate who have come to know him have come to experience not only the wonderful judicial temperament of HALL LUSK, but also the wonderful man behind that temperament.

It has been a great pleasure for me to be associated with him these past few months in the Senate. I shall always cherish those memories.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I believe it is related that the late distinguished Senator from Virginia, Carter Glass, when he served in the House of Representatives, did not get on his feet to make a speech for 13 years, yet he was one of the most effective legislators in either the House or the Senate and won national acclaim. I think it is living proof that a person can serve quietly, unostentatiously, diligently, and render a great service to his State.

I have observed Senator LUSK. I have had the pleasure of knowing his brother, Rufus Lusk, for at least 20 years. He lives in Washington, and used to be a regular attender at all the meetings of the House District Committee, as my distinguished friend from West Virginia knows. He made a great contribution to this community.

He is a man of conservative instincts, yet never noisy and always self-effacing. What a great job he did.

I have observed Senator LUSK. He has not been window dressing like some of us, but he has always been in his place. He has presided with distinction and dignity.

Tonight it is my pleasure to salute him as a Member of this body and to wish him well.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the other Members of the Senate regarding my good neighbor from Oregon, but I also wish to say, from my heart, it has been pleasant to have him here. He has added a great deal to the representation of the Pacific Northwest in the United States Senate. I wish him well whatever he may do, whether he pursues another distinguished career in the judiciary or even, as a Democrat, tries to come back to the Senate. I shall walk across the Columbia River to say a few words in his behalf.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I wish to be associated with the laudatory remarks being made about the junior Senator from Oregon. It has been a great pleasure for me to be associated with this fine gentleman in the Senate. I have had occasion to be with him in the Senate Wednesday prayer group, and on other occasions. He has impressed me as being a man of strong character and integrity, of high principles and lofty ideals.

We shall miss him when he leaves. He has contributed a great deal as a Senator. He is a man of keen intellect and profound legal ability. His contributions in the Senate have been very worth while.

I express the hope that he will have every success and happiness in the years to come.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I know of no Senator who, having been here only a short while, has made a greater impression upon the Senator

from Florida than has the distinguished and capable junior Senator from Oregon. I have always associated him in my mind with two great jurists who served in the Senate in former years; the great Senator from Georgia, Mr. George, and the great Senator from Nevada, Mr. McCarran.

I think that he, as they did, has brought seasoned character and the fine judgment which comes from presiding in the highest court of the State. I have observed his voting, his careful consideration of the measures being debated, and his great consideration for his colleagues. He has always been conscientious in attendance. Everything about him has distinguished him as one who is truly outstanding.

We shall miss him very greatly. I think he has made a true contribution to the Senate during the few months he has been here. I wish to tell him, since I come from far-away Florida, that I shall think of him always with affection and I shall think of him frequently as having added dignity, stature, moderation, and the ability to make hard decisions, as I have seen him make them on several votes, in such a way as to command the very deepest respect of all of us.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I wish to join my colleagues in expressing my pleasure in being associated with so fine a gentleman as the junior Senator from Oregon, and to assure him of our regret that he was not elected for a full term of 6 years in the U.S. Senate. The junior Senator from Virginia regrets that because of the lateness of the hour and other pressing matters he does not have time to say what he would like to say about this splendid colleague, but he does wish to mention that he soon found out that the junior Senator from Oregon was a great admirer of Thomas Jefferson, and that endeared him to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I endorse the sentiments which have been significantly expressed at this hour this morning in reference to the splendid service, yet modest in nature, of the junior Senator from Oregon. I have been privileged to be his seat mate during the time that he has been in this body. We have chatted in amiable fashion very often. We have discussed pending measures on occasion, and we have even joked about some of the rather unusual procedures which from time to time occur in this forum.

But underlining all of this personal tribute and understanding which I now express toward him, there has been on my part a very genuine respect for the qualities of mature judgment which identified the man who now leaves his colleagues in person, but will remain with them in memory.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, it seems appropriate to complete this circle and to have a damn Yankee from north of the Mason-Dixon line and east of the Mississippi Basin join in tribute to the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon. I would like to indicate my strong concurrence in everything that has been said so far, and to leave with him the additional thought that I hope I made a friend of him, as he has certainly made a friend of me during the few short months we have been able to serve together.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I wish to join in the well deserved tributes that are being given here tonight to my friend and neighbor the junior Senator from Oregon. Judge LUSK is a man of whom it can be truly said he is a gentleman and a scholar. I wish him well in the years ahead. It has been a privilege to know him, and I look forward to a continuance of the friendship we have made in this Chamber.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I wish to join in these well deserved tributes to so good a friend as Senator LUSK. He has worthily filled the seat occupied by our beloved and distinguished colleague Dick Neuberger. I think Oregon can feel that there has been no gap in the able representation from that State in the junior Senatorship. I have been very happy to know the junior Senator from Oregon. I think he has served with great distinction. I have noted his very faithful attendance on the committees on which I share membership with him, and I certainly wish him well in the future and hope that we shall see him in these parts often.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, there are many kinds of people who populate the American States on the Pacific Ocean, and I am glad as a Californian to pay my respects to a distinguished citizen of Oregon who for many years has graced the highest judicial body in his State government, and who for the past several months has lent distinction to his State and to himself as the junior Senator from Oregon here in the Senate Chamber.

I remember very well the occasion upon which I first met Judge LUSK, when his colleague, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and his wife invited western Senators to meet Judge LUSK as he arrived here to take his oath of office. His suite in the new Senate Office Building and mine are fairly close together, but beyond that he and I have served together as members of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. I have had an opportunity to speak with him not only officially concerning the problems which confront us but also personally as to his and my State, and some of our friends, whom we find to be mutual friends.

With all of that background I wish to join those who have spoken before me and say to a very fine gentleman, a very distinguished American, and one who is a friend of all of us here in this Chamber, that I join with them in wishing for him and for his family many, many happy years in the future.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I should like to associate myself with these well-deserved remarks that have been made about our distinguished Senator from the State of Oregon. I have had many close contacts during his service here. We will miss him as he moves on again into private life.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I would feel delinquent unless I expressed to Senator LUSK my gratitude for the privilege of having been associated with him for this period, which is all too brief.

I have learned to know, Senator LUSK, of the genuineness of your spirit and character. You possess a simplicity which is tremendously rich. I could not help admiring the precision of your mind and the objectivity with which you approach all the problems which came before you as a Senator.

I can well understand why your tenure as a judge in the State of Oregon was so lengthy.

I shall always remember you most affectionately. I shall feel that I have been enriched, spiritually and intellectually, through my association with you.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I desire to express my appreciation for the privilege of having served in the Senate with Senator LUSK.

As we look at the roster of Senators and their experiences, and the fine experiences of this body, we find that more Members have served in the lower House, probably, than in any other one type of service.

They are followed by a large group of Senators who have served as Governors of their States. Then follow those who have served as judges in the lower courts.

However, I do not believe there is any Member of this body who has served on the bench as long as Judge LUSK.

As a former appellate judge, he has brought to this body the wealth of his many years of experience in the careful review of records and in the careful weighing of judgments, based upon a very careful consideration of the positions of the parties. It is that type of temperament which adds to the overall capacity of the Senate.

It has been a real pleasure to serve with Judge LUSK. I join with all my colleagues in expressing our commendation for his service, and our gratitude for the privilege of serving with him.

Mr. LUSK. Mr. President, until about an hour ago, I was disposed to resent the strange custom of the U.S. Senate to stay in session all night when it was about to adjourn. But since listening to all these very flattering words of tribute, I have decided it is a good idea to stay in session until 4 o'clock in the morning. [Laughter.]

I cannot find words to express adequately my sense of gratitude and appreciation for what has been said here this evening, and for the kind and charitable spirit which inspired your remarks.

I came to the Senate under appointment by Governor Hatfield, of Oregon, last March, imbued with a profound sense of the greatness of this tribunal.

My experience here and the opportunity that has been given me to observe the work of the Senate, the complexity and magnitude of the questions with which the Senate has to deal, the high level of intelligence, the unremitting toil, and the devotion to duty which the Members of this body bring to the task of passing laws in the public interest, have served to increase beyond measure my esteem for the U.S. Senate.

I have enjoyed my service here. At times I have felt a sense of inadequacy and, as my friend, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] says, a sense of frustration. But for me it has been a wonderful experience and a source of satisfaction to have had a few months in the Senate of the United States, endeavoring to the best of my ability to serve the country which all of us love.

The 86th Congress approaches adjournment in a great moment of history and at a time of deadly peril. It is well for our country that it is represented in the Senate by Members of the caliber of those who are here; and it should be well for the country, also, if all of us were united, not with the kind of unity that is produced by the suppression of freedom of speech and freedom of religion, and freedom of the press, but with the sort of unity which comes from a lofty purpose to preserve American ideals and a purpose to keep ourselves strong against the great evil of communism that threatens us. And this is also a time, I venture to suggest, when the country should reject the temptation presented by the ugly evil of intolerance, concerning which the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] spoke with such eloquence a day or two ago.

Mr. President, I leave the Senate regretfully. I feel that I have made friends here from whom I do not like to part; and I leave with the hope and the prayer that all the future deliberations and decisions of this great body will be guided by divine providence.

[Applause, Senators rising.]

AMENDMENTS OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1945

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3688) to amend the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945, as amended, and the act approved December 20, 1944, as amended, and for other purposes, which were, to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That the first section of the Act approved December 20, 1944 (58 Stat. 819), as amended (sec. 1-244, D.C. Code, 1951 edition), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(1) To enter into leases of, or to grant revocable permits for the use of, the public space over or under Ninth Street Southwest in the District of Columbia to an extent not inconsistent with the use of such street by the general public for the purpose of travel, and in connection with any such lease or permit to impose such terms, including but not limited to the deposit of bond or other security, and to provide for the payment of such rents or fees as the Commissioners may, in their discretion, determine to be necessary or desirable, but the Commissioners shall, in connection with entering into a lease for, or granting a permit for, the use of public space over said street in the District of Columbia, provide as a condition of any such lease or permit that such space shall not be used by the lessee or permittee in such manner as to deprive any real property not owned by such lessee or permittee of its easements of light, air, and access."

And to amend the title so as to read: "An Act to amend the Act of December 20, 1944, with respect to certain powers of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the question is on agreeing to the House amendments.

Mr. BIBLE. As a brief explanation of the purpose of the amendments, the amendments would permit the Redevelopment Land Agency of the District of Columbia to proceed immediately with the construction in Southwest Washington by permitting the bridging over or the tunneling under of Ninth Street in the southwest section. The bill as amended restricts such authority specifically to bridging over or tunneling under streets and highways in the District exclusively to the Ninth Street area. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia, as well as the authorities of the Redevelopment Land Agency, deem the passage of the bill to be of the utmost importance and essential at this session. Without its passage, the construction will not progress on this major unit. It is must legislation, I believe, for the District of Columbia.

I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

The matter has been checked thoroughly with the ranking minority member of the Senate District Committee as well as the distinguished minority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE].

The motion was agreed to.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN PUBLIC AND ACQUIRED LANDS IN STATE OF NEVADA TO COUNTY OF MINERAL, NEV.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3212) to direct the Secretary of the Interior and the Administrator of General Services to convey certain public and acquired lands in the State of Nevada to the county of Mineral, Nev., which were, on page 3, strike out all after line 15, over through and including line 2, on page 4; on page 4, line 3, strike out "4." and insert "3.", and on page 4, line 10, strike out "5." and insert "4.".

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendments is to strike section 3 from the bill and to require the purchaser of the land to purchase it as a unit, and not in parcels or parts of the entire unit. The amendments have been discussed with the ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and likewise with the acting chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, as well as with the ranking majority leader of that committee. They have also been checked with both the majority and minority leaders. I am sure they meet with their approval. I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nevada.

The motion was agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FOR THE 2D SESSION, 86TH CONGRESS

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I submit a statement from the Committee on the District of Columbia, reporting on the legislative activities of the Committee on the District of Columbia for the 2d session of the 86th Congress. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in full in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ALAN BIBLE

As chairman of your Committee on the District of Columbia, I am honored to present to the Senate a report of the activities of your committee for the 2d session of the 86th Congress.

Your committee has seen one of the busiest and I believe legislatively productive periods in some years, as the statistics and explanations I will present hereafter fully support. However, in some important areas such as the District's fiscal plight and the crisis at the juvenile court, Congress has not faced up to the realities as they exist today here and now.

Your committee is probably unique among Senate committees by virtue of the great variety of problems, running the gamut of legislative proposals, coming before it, and serving not unlike the upper house of a State legislature and city council combined. Constitutionally, the Congress is the legislative arm for the District.

Many of us believe the District's legislative housekeeping duties should be delegated by the Congress to a locally elected body, giving to this voteless National Capital City true representative self-government. However, the Congress has not yet seen fit to approve this step although the Senate has passed such home-rule legislation five times in the last 11 years.

Mr. President, since I realize the fact that few Members of this distinguished body beat a path to the door of this committee for service, I believe that my colleagues on this committee are most deserving of the gratitude of the entire Congress, the people of the District of Columbia, and the country generally for the long hours they spend in office conferences, hearings, and executive sessions to tend to the business of the Nation's Capital City.

May I further take this opportunity to express my deep appreciation to my subcommittee chairmen who so unselfishly gave of their time and energies. They are my distinguished colleague, the very effective and hard-working senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who is chairman of the Public Health, Education, Welfare and Safety Subcommittee; my warm friend and the capable junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], who is chairman of the Fiscal Affairs Subcommittee; my close friend and willing worker, the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], whose long service both in the Senate and House on the District Committees, made his work most valuable as chairman of the Business and Commerce Subcommittee; and the distinguished junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], whose great energy, skill, and experience in municipal government as the mayor of a great city, has been invaluable to our committee as chairman of the Judiciary Subcommittee.

To the other committee members, the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], a distinguished former chairman of the full committee; and to the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], whose past

service in the House, has been genuinely valuable to our committee, I wish to express my sincere thanks and deep appreciation for the hours they gave to our committee.

Mr. President, I believe the Senate this year and the Congress made real strides in the field of constructive legislation for the District of Columbia.

Probably foremost was recognition by the Congress of the great metropolitan growth of Washington, D.C., and its diversified attendant problems. For the first time and in this year of the decennial census, Congress acknowledged the Federal responsibility for aiding metropolitan development of Washington and its mushrooming suburban communities. Congress, by joint resolution, called on all Federal agencies to cooperate with development of such areas.

To implement this Federal policy declaration, the Congress created the National Capital Transportation Agency to make plans to develop new mass rapid transit facilities for the metropolitan area. Congress authorized the District to construct a $25 million sewer to connect Dulles International Airport with the District system, a far-reaching step in a long and continuing fight to keep the Potomac River sufficiently free of pollution to serve as Washington's drinking supply.

Authorization was given for the District to borrow up to $32 million to assist in this sewer construction plus some modernization of the District's local sewerage system.

Looking at the District's financial plight, I believe most strongly that Congress has no choice but to face squarely into this problem early next year. Under present revenue forecasts and based on expenditure authorizations voted by the Congress, the District will require additional revenue to finish out the current fiscal year in 1961. In my judgment, Congress must increase the Federal payment above the $25 million voted the last several years and must appropriate a sum nearer to the $32 million authorization voted several years ago. In combination with an increased Federal payment, Congress must conclude whether additional taxes in some form must be imposed on District residents to meet the expenditure-versus-revenue squeeze. Certainly, it must be an increased Federal payment or increased taxes and probably both.

In the improvement of judicial machinery, I believe it most regretful that the Congress has not seen fit to meet squarely the increasingly grave problems of the District's juvenile court. The Senate's action early last year in approving two more judges for the overburdened juvenile court has not been implemented in the other body. Instead, a deplorable situation is growing worse with the youngsters, their parents and Washington citizenry the major losers. I am hopeful that early next year, if additional judges are not the answer, then those opponents will propose a workable alternative.

A real beginning was made by the establishment of a legal aid agency whereby indigent defendants in criminal cases may secure constitutionally guaranteed legal counsel. The Senate established this agency to permit agency lawyers to represent indigent defendants, thereby taking a burden from members of the bar unskilled in criminal practice.

This committee approved a bill outlawing mandatory capital punishment in the District, the only jurisdiction in the country with such a requirement, believing the District must get into step with other States in this field.

The Senate approved legislation to protect the public from unethical practices of certain unscrupulous used-car dealers and finance companies in squeezing exorbitant finance and insurance charges from unsuspecting purchasers.

Likewise, the Senate handled legislation which was enacted into law requiring the bonding of fly-by-night home improvement contractors and making more stringent their licensing requirements.

In the field of better law enforcement, the Senate this year authorized an additional 100 policemen, bringing the total Metropolitan force up to the present strength of 2,522, only 192 men short of the authorized force. Inauguration of the canine corps to aid patrolmen has served as an additional crime deterrent.

With the help of added police vigilance, more policemen, and anti-loitering regulations as suggested by this committee 1 year ago, juvenile hoodlumism has shown a decline.

As an added incentive to attract and keep capable police officers, the Senate approved a salary increase for policemen, together with firemen, bringing this force to a higher level in pay scales for the major cities of the country, the fourth increase in the last 10 years.

In an effort to curb increasing traffic fatalities, the Senate passed legislation permitting the courts to increase jail sentences for traffic violations from 10 to 90 days.

To stop a spreading practice, the Senate approved legislation to require written prescriptions for the purchase of certain cough syrups with a high narcotic content.

Urban renewal and redevelopment occupied the attention of the Senate with approval of legislation to implement new construction and modernization of the Potomac River, District of Columbia waterfront area. Committee approval was given to a bill to permit a bridging over and tunneling under 9th Street Southwest to make possible construction of a 1,000-room hotel in the Southwest redevelopment program.

The committee authorized an investigation of the slow progress of urban renewal and redevelopment in the District after recurring complaints from residents, developers and business interests. Preliminary staff inquiries will precede public hearing slated early next year.

In the education field, the Senate authorized establishment of a junior college division at D.C. Teacher's College to meet an increasing demand for qualified teachers. As a further incentive to keeping present teachers and recruiting new instructors, the Senate approved a 7½ percent salary increase, giving to new teachers with a bachelor's degree $4,800 per annum. This increase now places the District's school system as the second highest among cities of over 500,000 population in the Nation, exceeded only by Chicago, Ill. The District will rank first for all metropolitan cities for teachers with a master's degree, with an entrance salary of $5,300.

The committee continued to show its strong interest in the free elementary school lunch program, initiated at the committee's insistence during the 85th Congress. Hearings, which were printed, pointed up the progress made to extend the service to more eligible children. As of May 31, 1960, 2,843 children from 1,709 families were participants.

In the public welfare field, the Senate approved a bill consolidating the District's public assistance laws, providing a 1-year residence requirement and making uniform the classes of relatives responsible for providing support to the dependent and needy. Hearings, which were printed, pointed up recommendations of District welfare officials governing unified public assistance improvements.

Two health regulatory measures won Senate approval. The District Commissioners were empowered in one bill to set standards and criteria for the regulation of the practice of physical therapy and a second bill empowered the Commissioners to regulate the practice of practical nursing, a step urged to meet acute needs for patient care where registered and trained nurses are not required.

The Senate approved a committee-passed bill authorizing a Federal grant to the Convalescent Hospital of Washington for construction of a 333-bed hospital for the chronically ill, the convalescent, and persons requiring nursing home care.

The committee also empowered its standing Subcommittee on Public Health to investigate the cost of medical care in the District of Columbia.

I include the report in the body of the RECORD at the conclusion of my statement. It includes a summary statement and statistical table of committee action on matters referred to it.

In connection with this activity report, I should like to draw the Senate's attention to one overall figure. The committee in the 86th Congress had referred to it for action a total of 208 matters, including Senate bills, House acts, resolutions, and nominations. The committee's active consideration of these matters stands as a commendable record in which the Senate should take justifiable pride.

REPORT OF ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, 2D SESSION, 86TH CONGRESS, AUGUST 31, 1960

The Committee on the District of Columbia received for consideration in the 2d session, 86th Congress, the following:

Senate bills	61
House bills	27
Senate resolutions	1
Senate joint resolutions	1
Senate concurrent resolutions	2
Nominations	4
Grand total	96

During the session, there were reported to the Senate from the Committee, 27 Senate bills, 21 House bills, and 2 Senate concurrent resolutions. One Senate bill and two House bills remain on the Senate Calendar.

Of the 27 House bills referred to the Senate, 5 are pending before the committee.

Twenty-two bills and acts have become public law as of this date. (August 31, 1960.)

Fifty-seven hearings were held by subcommittees on Senate bills and 17 hearings were held by subcommittees on House bills.

The full committee held hearings on two nominations.

The full committee met in executive session on five occasions.

A subcommittee field trip of an investigatory nature was made in connection with crowded conditions at the dependent children's center at Junior Village.

Following is statistical data of actions by the Senate District of Columbia Committee during the 2d session, 86th Congress:

Number of bills, acts, resolutions, and nominations referred to committee	96
Number of bills, acts, resolutions, and nominations reported to Senate	44
Number of bills, acts, and resolutions in process (hearings held)	4
Number of bills, acts, and resolutions indefinitely postponed within committee, including consolidation	17
Number of bills, acts, resolutions, and nominations awaiting final action	31

Number of bills, acts, and resolutions received during the 1st session of the 86th Congress upon which the committee has acted during the 2d session:

Senate bills reported favorably	7
House acts reported favorably	1
Senate bills in process	5
House acts in process	1
Senate bills postponed indefinitely	9
House acts postponed indefinitely	1

Comparative statistical data of action by the Senate District of Columbia Committee during the 1st and 2d sess. of the 85th Cong. and the 1st and 2d sess. of the 86th Cong.

	1st sess., 85th Cong.	2d sess., 85th Cong.	1st sess., 86th Cong.	2d sess., 86th Cong.
Number of bills, acts, resolutions, and nominations referred to committee	105	68	112	96
Number of bills, acts, resolutions, and nominations reported to Senate	42	36	53	44
Number of bills, acts, and resolutions in process (hearings held)	9	1	7	4
Number of bills, acts, and resolutions indefinitely postponed within committee, including consolidation	21	16	27	17
Number of bills, acts, and resolutions awaiting initial action	35	15	26	29
Hearings held by subcommittees on Senate bills	38	34	64	57
Hearings held by subcommittees on House bills	11	7	18	17
Hearings held by subcommittees on resolutions		3	8	
Total hearings held by subcommittees	49	44	90	74
Hearings by full committee on bills, resolutions, and nominations	4	4	7	2
Full committee meetings	9	7	7	5

The following is a list, by title and number, of all bills, acts, and resolutions passed by the Senate during the 2d session of the 86th Congress. Those that became law are indicated by the public or private law number.

S. 675, to regulate the practice of physical therapy by registered physical therapists in the District of Columbia.

S. 2131, to amend the Motor Vehicle Safety Responsibility Act of the District of Columbia.

S. 2306, to exempt from taxation certain property of the National Woman's Party, Inc., in the District of Columbia.

S. 2363, to provide for more effective administration of public assistance in the District of Columbia.

S. 2446, to amend the District Civil Defense Act so as to more adequately meet the needs of the District in case of attack or a major disaster.

S. 2671, to exempt from taxation certain property of the American War Mothers, Inc.

S. 2954, to exempt from the District of Columbia income tax compensation paid to alien employees by certain international organizations. Public Law 86–522.

S. 2979, to authorize the Administrator of General Services to make grants in cash and land to the Convalescent Hospital of Washington, D.C., Inc., for the purpose of enabling the corporation to establish a convalescent and chronic disease hospital in the District of Columbia.

S. 3194, to amend the acts of March 3, 1901, and July 15, 1939, as amended, so as to exempt the District of Columbia from paying fees in any of the courts of the District of Columbia.

S. 3195, to exempt from taxation certain property of the Army Distaff Foundation.

S. 3257, to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended, to increase the fee charged for learners' permits.

S. 3258, to amend the Alcoholic Beverage Control Act to permit the collection of excise taxes on distilled spirits by a reporting system.

S. 3304, to amend the act relating to the small claims and conciliation branch of the municipal court of the District of Columbia.

S. 3305, to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended, to increase the maximum imprisonment for traffic violations from 10 days to 90 days.

S. 3415, to exempt from taxation certain property of the American Association of University Women, Education Foundation, Inc., in the District of Columbia.

S. 3416, to provide for the restoration to the United States of amounts expended in the District of Columbia in carrying out the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act of 1958.

S. 3616, to deny to the District of Columbia, in suits on claims arising out of the negligent operation of vehicles owned or controlled by it and operated by its employees in the performance of their official duties, the defense of governmental immunity, to relieve such employees of liability in such cases to third persons. Public Law 86–654.

S. 3648, to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia on behalf of the United States to transfer from the United States to the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency title to certain real property in said District.

S. 3688, to amend the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945 so as to authorize the Redevelopment Land Agency to eliminate or restore all slum or blighted areas whether residential or nonresidential and to develop such areas for whatever uses are determined to be appropriate.

S. 3727, to provide for the bonding of persons engaging in the repair, remodeling, alteration, conversion, or modernization of residential property; to impose limitations on the assertion of mechanics' liens where payment has been made for work in connection with the repair, remodeling, alteration, conversion, or modernizations of residential property.

S. 3834, to increase the maximum amount which may be borrowed by the District of Columbia for use in the construction and improvement of its sanitary and combined sewer systems.

S. 3835, to authorize the District of Columbia Civil War Centennial Commission to plan and carry out in the District of Columbia civic programs in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the Civil War and for other purposes.

S. 3867, to exempt from taxation certain property of the National Guard Association of the United States in the District of Columbia.

S. Con. Res. 82, extending the Joint Committee on Washington Metropolitan Problems.

S. Con. Res. 101, authorizing public hearings and recommendations on the bills S. 3198 and H.R. 11135, by the Joint Committee on Washington Metropolitan Problems.

H.R. 1844, to amend the Life Insurance Act to allow the writing of group life insurance to employees of trade associations. Public Law 86–579.

H.R. 7124, to require the payment of tuition on account of certain persons who attend the public schools of the District of Columbia.

H.R. 8289, to accelerate the commencing date of civil service retirement annuities.

H.R. 9451, to amend the act of July 19, 1954, to exempt from taxation certain additional property of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States in the District of Columbia, and to provide that the tax exemption granted the property of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States in the District of Columbia shall be effective with respect to taxable years beginning on and after July 1, 1959. Public Law 86–430.

H.R. 9737, to amend the act of March 3, 1901, to eliminate the requirement that certain District of Columbia corporations be managed by trustees the majority of whom are citizens of the District of Columbia. Public Law 86–436.

H.R. 10000, to amend further certain provisions of the District of Columbia tax laws relating to overpayments and refunds of taxes erroneously collected. Public Law 86–528.

H.R. 10021, providing a uniform law for the transfer of securities to and by fiduciaries in the District of Columbia. Public Law 86–584.

H.R. 10163, to amend the Fire and Casualty Act regulating the business of fire, marine, and casualty insurance in the District of Columbia. Public Law 86–526.

H.R. 10683, to provide for the regulation of finance charges for retail installment sales of motor vehicles in the District of Columbia. Public Law 86–431.

H.R. 10684, to amend the District of Columbia Life Insurance Act to revise certain mortality tables and payments. Public Law 86–530.

H.R. 10761, to provide for the representation of indigents in judicial proceedings in the District of Columbia. Public Law 86–531.

H.R. 10921, to amend the District of Columbia Life Insurance Act relative to investment of funds by life insurance companies.

H.R. 10952, to authorize the National Society Daughters of the American Colonists to use certain real property in the District of Columbia as the national headquarters of that society. Public Law 86–675.

H.R. 10964, to amend the Life Insurance Act of the District of Columbia to provide for the regulation of the business of writing variable annuity contracts. Public Law 86–520.

H.R. 11135, to aid in the development of a coordinated system of transportation for the National Capital region; to create a temporary National Capital Transportation Agency, to authorize negotiation to create an interstate agency; and for other purposes. Public Law 86–669.

H.R. 11415, to provide for the designation of a portion of the District of Columbia as the "Plaza of the Americas", Public Law 86–460.

H.R. 11931, to amend the act of March 3, 1901, with respect to the time within which a caveat to a will must be filed in the District of Columbia. Public Law 86–674.

H.R. 12063, to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to plan, construct, operate, and maintain a sanitary sewer to connect the Dulles International Airport with the District of Columbia system. Public Law 86–515.

H.R. 12563, to amend the act to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia by increasing and changing certain fees for motor vehicles.

H.R. 12584, to amend the Uniform Narcotic Drug Act for the District of Columbia to require a physician's prescription for purchase of medicines or preparations containing one-sixth of a grain or less of dihydrocodeinone or any of its salts per fluid ounce. Public Law 86–668.

H.R. 12993, to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955, as amended.

H.R. 13053, to increase the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the U.S. Park Police, the White House Police, and for other purposes.

The following is a list of nominations confirmed by the Senate:

Randolph C. Richardson, of the District of Columbia, to be associate judge of the

municipal court for the District of Columbia for the term of 10 years, vice George D. Neilson, term expired.

Thomas C. Scalley, of the District of Columbia, to be associate judge of the municipal court for the District of Columbia for a term of 10 years.

GRANTING OF MINERAL RIGHTS IN CERTAIN HOMESTEAD LANDS IN STATE OF ALASKA

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1670) to provide for the granting of mineral rights in certain homestead lands in the State of Alaska, which was, on page 2, line 10, after "lease," insert: "insofar as the lease pertains to the quitclaimed lands,".

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Alaska.

The motion was agreed to.

DISPOSITION OF CERTAIN PUBLIC LANDS IN ALASKA

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3267) to amend the act of October 17, 1940, relating to the disposition of certain public lands in Alaska, which was, on page 1, line 7, after "value" insert "(but not less than $1.25 per acre).".

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Alaska.

The motion was agreed to.

CONSTRUCTION, OPERATION, AND MAINTENANCE OF WESTERN DIVISION OF THE DALLES FEDERAL RECLAMATION PROJECT, OREGON

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2195) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Western division of the Dalles Federal reclamation project, Oregon, and for other purposes, which were, on page 2, line 19, after "fund" insert "within a 50-year period from the date of the first delivery of water from the facilities authorized by this legislation", and on page 4, strike out lines 3 through 5, inclusive, and insert:

SEC. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for construction of the works authorized by this Act not to exceed $6,000,000, plus or minus such amounts, if any, as may be justified by reason of ordinary fluctuations in construction costs as indicated by engineering cost indices applicable to the types of construction involved herein.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, these are rather minor amendments which the House has inserted. The bill is in about the same shape as it was when it passed the Senate. I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Mexico.

The motion was agreed to.

CHENEY DIVISION, WICHITA FEDERAL RECLAMATION PROJECT, KANSAS

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1092) to provide for the construction of the Cheney division, Wichita Federal reclamation project, Kansas, and for other purposes, which were, on page 2, line 6, strike out "Act" and insert "Acts", and on page 5, strike out lines 16 through 18, inclusive, and insert:

SEC. 9. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for construction of the works authorized by this Act not to exceed $18,274,000, plus or minus such amounts, if any, as may be justified by reason of ordinary fluctuations in construction costs as indicated by engineering cost indices applicable to the types of construction involved herein.

Mr. ANDERSON. The House merely substitutes the word "acts" where the bill used the word "act." It adds a financial limitation, which is agreeable. We have cleared it with both sides of the aisle. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Mexico.

The motion was agreed to.

IMPORTATION OF CERTAIN ARTICLES FOR RELIGIOUS PURPOSES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4384) to amend paragraph 1774 of the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to the importation of certain articles for religious purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, are there any further amendments to be offered to the bill?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I wish to ask a few clarifying questions. I should like to have the attention of a member of the Committee on Finance in regard to H.R. 4384. It permits the importation of statuary for several purposes, including cemeteries. May I inquire if it is intended to permit the free importation of headstones or mausoleums, or anything of that nature when statuary comprises a part of the material?

Mr. KERR. It is my understanding that it would not.

Mr. AIKEN. It does not?

Mr. KERR. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. Headstones could not be imported free because they had a figure carved on them. Is that correct?

Mr. KERR. The Senator is correct.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask consent to place in the body of the RECORD at a point prior to the passage of H.R. 4384, a statement regarding the amendment to assist our domestic fluorspar industry, offered by myself, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

I also ask consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks, a copy of a letter addressed by Senators MURRAY, DIRKSEN, and myself to our colleagues, with an explanatory statement.

There being no objection, the statements and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR COOPER

I had joined with Senators DIRKSEN and MURRAY in introducing an amendment to H.R. 10548, to provide relief for our domestic fluorspar industry, and I had hoped that it would be possible to secure its adoption. Later we joined in proposing it as an amendment to H.R. 4348, the bill now under consideration.

Because other amendments have been added which make the final passage of the bill by both Houses very doubtful, and taking into consideration the agreement of the leaders to give our amendment early consideration at the next session, we have concluded that it would not be favorable to tie this amendment to H.R. 4348. We will press for its adoption at the next session of the Congress.

U.S. SENATE,
August 18, 1960.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: We have introduced an amendment to H.R. 10548 designed to provide some small measure of relief for our hard-pressed domestic fluorspar industry.

Fluorspar is essential to the production of steel, aluminum, atomic energy, and to the rocket and missile program. It is also used to produce aerosol products, plastics, paints, glass, enamelware, and provides the fluorine for our fluorine chemical industry.

As late as World War II our domestic fluorspar mines provided all of the fluorspar necessary to meet our defense needs. Now foreign fluorspar, the production of which has been stimulated by grants, gifts, stockpile purchases and barter contracts, has achieved a rate of production which threatens to take over completely the domestic fluorspar market.

The last Tariff Commission investigation (there have been three), reported to the Senate February 29, 1960, points out that domestic production, January to September 1959, was only 55 percent of that of the same period in 1958; that 1958 commercial shipments of acid grade fluorspar were 33 percent under the 1954–57 average; that employment in the fluorspar industry declined in 1959 by 51 percent; and that the aggregate net profits of the industry, before taxes, were only 5.4 percent for January to June 1959.

The overall condition of the industry has worsened since this report was made, and some relief now appears absolutely essential if this Nation is to have a domestic fluorspar industry.

Attached is a report of the Illinois State Geological Survey. This governmental agency is probably better advised on the fluorspar industry than any other. We refer you in particular to page 20 of the report containing a one-paragraph summary of the fluorspar problem.

Considering what has recently happened to our supply of nickel and cobalt in Cuba and the attendant Mexican repercussions, and what is happening in Africa, it seems unwise to us that we should allow our domestic fluorspar industry to close and to let the United States become completely dependent upon foreign sources for our supply. Our principal foreign sources of fluorspar are Mexico and Italy.

The amendment we have proposed would sustain domestic production at about 30 percent of our domestic consumption requirements and would enable the fluorspar mining industry to maintain itself at a de-

gree of readiness which we consider the bare minimum for national safety.

An explanation of the amendment is attached, and your support is earnestly solicited.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES E. MURRAY,
U.S. Senator.
EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN,
U.S. Senator.
JOHN SHERMAN COOPER,
U.S. Senator.

EXPLANATION OF THE PROPOSED FLUORSPAR AMENDMENT

The fluorspar amendment provides for incentive payments to domestic producers of fluorspar in order to promote mining, development, exploration and research for the material.

The payments are limited to $10 per ton on acid grade fluorspar and $7.50 per ton on metallurgical and ceramic grade. The total tonnage is limited to not more than 100,000 tons per year on acid grade and not more than 90,000 tons per year of metallurgical and ceramic grades. The maximum annual cost would be $1,675,000. The program would terminate June 30, 1965.

To receive an incentive payment the producer must first sell the fluorspar to a consumer. Captive producers are excluded from the amendment. (There are only three.) Only the smaller independent producers are eligible for participation.

The payments provided for on acid grade are less than those approved by the Senate when it passed the minerals stabilization program, which was approved by the House Interior Committee but defeated in the House. The amendment embodies the same principle as was approved last year by the Senate Interior Committee.

The amendment would not have the effect of cutting back imports, but rather would permit the domestic producers to hold on to that small portion (about 30 percent) of the market they now supply, and which, without some relief as now proposed, they will certainly lose.

The Secretary of the Interior is authorized in the amendment to establish regulations for the administration of the program, but such regulations shall assure equitable distribution of the benefits of the program—throughout the domestic industries. This means that the Secretary could limit tonnages to producers so that the program would benefit all producers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate and open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of the Senate amendments, the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to correct or make such clerical or technical changes as may be necessary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which H.R. 4384 was passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARIES OF SENATORS PROUTY AND SALTONSTALL

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I never cease to marvel at the wealth of governmental talent which comes to the U.S. Senate. I am thinking particularly today of WINSTON L. PROUTY, a Member of the Senate.

He served as the mayor of his town. He was a member of the Vermont House of Representatives, and Speaker of that distinguished body in 1947. He was elected to four terms in the National House of Representatives, and was elected a U.S. Senator in 1958. He is a stalwart member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and other committees. This is his birthday anniversary, and I wish to join in tribute and in salute to our distinguished colleague from Vermont.

Today we also observe the birthday anniversary of still another New Englander. I like him immensely. He shows that rare restraint which is in keeping with the very great New England tradition. He served as Speaker of the Massachusetts House of Representatives, and as Governor for three terms. He was chairman of the New England Governors' conference, and also of the National Governors' conference. He has been a Member of the Senate for 16 years.

He is one of those great balance wheels. It is a joy to have him around and to be able to sit with him and drink from that great font of New England wisdom.

So today it is not only Senator PROUTY's birthday, but it is also Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL's birthday. We pay tribute to both Senators.

REGULATION OF MASS TRANSIT IN THE WASHINGTON, D.C., METROPOLITAN AREA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of Calendar No. 1975, House Joint Resolution 402.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of House Joint Resolution 402 granting the consent of Congress for the States of Virginia and Maryland, and the District of Columbia to enter into a compact related to the regulation of mass transit in the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area and for other purposes.

DU PONT-GENERAL MOTORS DECISION BY SUPREME COURT

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, for the past 2½ years the junior Senator from Delaware has sought passage of legislation to protect the direct interests of a quarter of a million American investors who are threatened with heavy and in some cases confiscatory tax penalties. The threat arises, as a result of a decision by the Supreme Court in the so-called Du Pont-General Motors case whereby the Du Pont Co. may have to divest itself of its holdings of General Motors stock acquired more than 40 years ago.

If this divestiture occurs, Du Pont shareholders who receive the General Motors stock will under a ruling of the Internal Revenue Service be required to pay taxes on it at ordinary income rates.

The legislation which I have endeavored to have approved to remove the threat of this drastic penalty has now been the subject of thorough hearings before the Senate Finance Committee and the House Ways and Means Committee. Both of these committees have approved the legislation though in somewhat different forms.

I might add, that there would be a tax under these bills of approximately $75 million and, of course, Mr. President, would clearly constitute a windfall to the Treasury Department.

In addition to favorable committee action in the House and Senate, the Treasury Department has also approved this legislation as well as the Department of Justice which is charged with administering our antitrust laws.

It would thus seem that this bill now on the Senate Calendar in amendment form ought to be promptly enacted in behalf of the 250,000 American investors whom we represent here.

Indeed, Mr. President, far more than this number are involved for if divestiture occurs without appropriate legislation, the 750,000 General Motors shareholders would also be affected by the probable unfavorable impact on the value of their stock when the divestiture process takes place.

All told then, about 1 million Americans and their families—innocent victims in this long drawn-out legal battle which has now consumed more than 11 years—may bear the unjust tax consequences unless we act.

The junior Senator from Delaware had earnestly hoped that final plans to bring up this legislation before Congress adjourned could be realized.

It is a source of deep personal disappointment that he has not been able to do so because of failure to resolve some differences.

Now at this late hour it would seem unfair to precipitate a lengthy debate which appears to be impending if the issue is brought to the floor.

As an alternative, I express the hope that when the new Congress convenes in January—and if the junior Senator is present—cooperative efforts will be successfully undertaken whereby appropriate legislation can be promptly approved.

In the meantime, if the Supreme Court again reverses the decision of the lower court on the appeal taken by the Department of Justice, it is to be hoped that the assurance of congressional action in behalf of the shareholders involved will lessen the dismay and disappointment which confronts these individuals through our inability to resolve the issue at this Congress by the legislation which is now before us.

I understand also, Mr. President, that the Finance Committee has been assured by the Treasury Department that

no question of retroactivity will be involved.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I congratulate the distinguished junior Senator from Delaware for the statement he has just made in support of legislation for which he has labored so long and so patiently. I pay tribute to him for the diligent and persevering manner in which he has worked for the passage of this measure. Certainly the cause for which he has worked is just. His statement in no way indicates the lessening of interest; on the contrary, it serves notice that he is ready to continue his worthy effort.

I am sorry that he finds it necessary to lay the work aside for this session of Congress, but I am confident that the legislative record he has already established, including the approval of bills by the Committee on Finance, will constitute a strong endorsement when it is presented to the new Congress in January.

Mr. President, the senior Senator from Oklahoma also had an amendment to H.R. 5547, which embodies the text of S. 3618.

The amendment imposes a fixed duty on lead of 2 cents plus a flexible additional tax of 1 cent a pound to be applied when the price of lead falls below 13½ cents, and removed when the price reaches 14½ cents a pound, and imposing a fixed duty on zinc of 1½ cents a pound, plus a flexible additional duty of 0.7 cent a pound to be applied when the price of zinc falls below 12½ cents a pound, and removed when the price of zinc reaches 13½ cents a pound.

It is the opinion of the senior Senator from Oklahoma that that amendment should have been adopted at this session. It will be the ambition of the Senator from Oklahoma to introduce this proposed legislation and to work for its passage at the next session of Congress.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have listened to the statement just made by the able senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR]. I desire to associate myself with it. I do not know of any Member of this body who is more beloved than the distinguished junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR]. He has been very diligent in seeking to have this proposed legislation passed. I regret it has not been possible to have it scheduled before the Senate and debated at this session. I appreciate the patience, consideration, and cooperation which the Senator from Delaware always extends to each Member of the Senate. I treasure his friendship.

NUCLEAR POWER FOR OUTER SPACE

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I had intended to address the Senate on the Subject "Nuclear Power for Outer Space." The hour is late and the statement is long. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ANDERSON

NUCLEAR POWER FOR OUTER SPACE

As Chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I regard it as my duty to report to the Congress from time to time on atomic energy matters. On other occasions I have expressed my philosophy on the role of the Joint Committee. We stand as guarantors to the other Members of the Congress that all is well behind the veil of official secrecy, and that if all is not well, we will seek to tell you what is wrong.

Today I would like to report on the nuclear space program—on the program for the development of nuclear rockets and space electrical power systems. I shall tell you of the importance of these projects and propose specific national objectives for their development.

In this nuclear space program, many items can still be causes of worry. Despite dramatic technical accomplishments, the program is being administered on a low-key basis which is not as dynamic as many of us would like.

On last Monday, August 29, the Joint Committee saw classified movies of the highly successful test of the Kiwa-A prime nuclear rocket experiment which was held in Nevada on July 8 of this year. We also heard representatives of AEC and NASA discuss the future programs, schedules, and organization.

After months of delay they have finally come up with an integrated organization physically housed within AEC for the direction of the nuclear rocket program. I hope that the program will be directed with the initiative and drive necessary for success, but more of that later.

The utilization of atomic power in outer space offers the greatest opportunity for the United States to create a climate of world good will through leadership in peaceful space exploration. This matter could be as important as the hydrogen bomb debate in the early 1950's or the Manhattan project decision in 1942. Few things deserve more serious reflection, for we can now be missing a great opportunity while sowing the seeds of another prestige disaster.

The scientists and technical experts have described the atomic-space frontier. Our national laboratories like the Los Alamos scientific laboratory have come up with the ideas. We lack only policy, purpose, management, and fiscal support. The secret veto of neglect has been used with abandon. Too many men in positions of power sell American astronautics short.

There is no national policy for the utilization of nuclear rockets and other nuclear space applications. There is developmental effort, reluctantly and partially funded, but no program complete with schedule, timetables, and specific direction. There is a complex arrangement of Government agency control which has caused confusion, conflict, and the potential for wasteful duplication.

These are some of the problems in brief. I will describe them more fully later.

Nuclear rocket development is not new. It has been under way since 1955 in project Rover, at the Los Alamos scientific laboratory of the Atomic Energy Commission.

There has been substantial progress. There was a ground test a year ago of the first Rover test reactor—Kiwi-A—and that month of a second improved test reactor—Kiwi-A prime. These were experimental devices leading up to prototype design. Both successful tests have met technical expectations.

There is nothing exotic about Rover. In a chemical rocket, fuels burn, eject from the rocket and produce thrust. In a nuclear system there is no combustion. A light element such as hydrogen is passed over a nuclear reactor, is heated and thrust is produced with higher specific impulse. This scientific term "specific impulse," is only a measurement of thrust per unit weight of fuel consumed. What it all boils down to it more payload, more usable weight in outer space.

Another nuclear space application is the use of small atomic reactors to supply secondary or auxiliary electrical power for space vehicles. Here development has also been going on since 1955. The Atomic Energy Commission has been developing these reactors in the Snap program. There are several types of Snap power sources but the reactor units are best represented by the so-called Snap VIII, an atomic power source which would be capable of generating some 30 to 60 kilowatts of electricity in outer space.

These two programs in the nuclear space technology are mature. There is more than enough background information for policy formulation.

Nuclear rocket propulsion is the most advanced form of rocket boosting for this and the next decade and as the House Committee on Science and Astronautics puts it, "propulsion is the key to space travel."

Nuclear propelled rockets promise the capacity to put large payloads into outer space at an early date. They are the key to interplanetary travel, to manned expeditions to the moon, and to the safe return of astronauts from lunar or interplanetary explorations. They are the key to all that is big, important and earthshaking when we speak of astronautics.

As the chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, John McCone said last fall, "nuclear power offers to rockets the most energy per unit mass of any fuel source presently known. In fact, it is the only source of energy which promises the large quantities of power necessary to carry increasingly larger payloads into outer space."

Col. Jack L. Armstrong assigned to the Atomic Energy Commission said it another way, "The nuclear systems offer us an opportunity to take a jump over the Russians."

Almost every astronautical expert in the world, behind the iron curtain or in the free world, sees nuclear propulsion as indispensable to space exploration. Few serious published works, Russian or American, fail to say this. In fact, the Soviet publications emphasize it.

In the most recent edition of "Ordnance," the publication of the American Ordnance Association, Mr. Richard Deupree analyzes the Soviet program and foresees that their large space rocket will have a nuclear sustainer booster.

Testifying before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy this year, Dr. Krafft Ehricke said that to ignore nuclear rockets is to flirt with obsolescence. He said this:

"The universe is run by nuclear energy. Space will be conquered only by manned nuclear-powered vehicles. Planning anything else for the late sixties is, in my opinion, flirting with obsolescence almost from the start.

"I would like to express my strong conviction that the nuclear engine is for astronautics what the combustion engine is for aeronautics. It is the only means of obtaining complete independence operationally from the earth to the extent to which it is necessary to explore the planets of our solar system. I am firmly convinced that the surest way to cripple the U.S. space capability in the seventies would be to cripple its nuclear engine development in the sixties."

An industry report submitted in these same Joint Committee hearings claimed that neglect of nuclear rockets would leave the United States a second class world power.

There seems to be little need to continue this documentation. Who will question the importance of nuclear rocket development?

The experts also agree that if satellites or space vehicles are to serve any utilitarian function. They must have big blocks of auxiliary electric power which only nuclear energy can supply. Otherwise, satellites are so much junk littering the universe. Without internal power, satellites and space vehicles are relatively useless. It costs many millions of dollars to launch one of these objects from the earth, and it strikes me as wasteful not to assure that they have powerful sources of electric energy capable of generating power for long periods of time—for years rather than months.

Electric power will be needed for human needs on manned missions—for environmental controls: water, food, and oxygen regeneration. It is needed to power communications, scientific, and other equipment on manned and unmanned missions and to supply power to continuous low-thrust electrical propulsion engines. Here the experts say that the important space explorations will require electricity in the range of at least 1 megawatt—1,000 kilowatts of electricity. This can only come from nuclear power, but of all our space requirements of the future, this may be the longest leadtime item. We should get on with this job now.

The prospect of power in these major dimensions, for propulsion and support, could be the opportunity for leadership we have been seeking. Haven't we been casting about for a leap forward in which we can get the jump on the Russians? The conquest of outer space through American nuclear technology represents a golden opportunity for leadership which could capture the imagination of the peoples of the world.

In today's world, national prestige is no longer derived from military power alone—many other things are equally important. The Soviet space satellites were not military weapons but they had no little effect on the prestige of the Soviet Union. Our prestige must be raised by doing the important things in space—not multiplying the petty and unimportant. To assess what we stand to lose, we must almost rely on the quasi-axiom that no world power can allow a major area of science and technology to pass it by and hope to control even its own internal destiny.

George B. Allen, Director of the U.S. Information Agency, has represented this point of view. He said:

"Probably the most significant result of the Soviet successes is a change in the overall impression of the people of the world about the Soviet Union. In public opinion parlance we speak of this as the revised Soviet image, the change goes beyond the field of space technology. It covers all of Soviet science and technology plus Soviet military power. Before Sputnik I, few people of the world believed the Soviet was currently in a position to challenge America in the broad fields of science, technology, and production. Now the sputniks and luniks are taken as evidence that the Soviet Union is able to challenge America successfully in all these fields including production. It is hardly an overstatement to say that space has become, for many people, the primary symbol of world leadership in all areas of science and technology."

Livingston T. Merchant, Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs said:

"Soviet accomplishments in this field (outer space) are witness to strong scientific technical and industrial capabilities, organizational effectiveness and concentrated effort and they reflect growing military strength. These are sobering facts but the danger to ourselves would come not from the recognition of these facts but from the refusal to recognize them."

Now I recognize that we are doing somewhat better in terms of the number of small satellites we are putting into orbit. We are developing some sophisticated instrumentation. But the Russians are putting up much larger space vehicles, the last of which carried a veritable menagerie of animals, plus television. Only by nuclear power can we surpass the Russians on any long-term basis.

I would add another and perhaps more important consideration for our objectives should be broader than merely the attainment of prestige. To my way of thinking the nuclear space effort should be part of our atoms for peace program and our entire space effort should be dedicated to creating a world climate in which peace can become possible.

From the time of the first atom bomb and Hiroshima, we have all sought some reasonable approach to nuclear weapons disarmament. After World War II the United States went to the United Nations with a plan for control of atomic weapons, but it was blocked by the Soviets. Since then our dilemma has continued behind a facade of slogans. For 15 years we have sought to provide for our defense and yet seek safe ways to disarm.

The late Senator Brien McMahon grappled with this problem and proposed that we create a climate of peace in which responsible disarmament talks could proceed. He suggested that this climate could be created were the United States to demonstrate on a worldwide basis its willingness to use its atomic technology for peaceful purposes. President Eisenhower adopted Senator McMahon's idea and proposed an atoms for peace program.

I will not now dwell on the fate of "atoms for peace" but it is plainly evident that little has been accomplished.

Now we have another opportunity to show our willingness to use the atom peacefully and constructively. We can again pledge our dedication to the peaceful aspects of atomic energy and its use in the exploration of outer space. Perhaps this could be a start toward creating that climate of Senator McMahon's dream. Last year in a Harpers magazine article Dr. Lee Dubridge described the vast scientific, intellectual, and physical value of exploring the universe. We can donate this bounty of knowledge to the world at large and create an atmosphere in which our world problems would seem insignificant.

I have discussed the opportunity. Let's examine the problems of policymaking and administration in this nuclear-space program.

Following executive branch recommendations, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration was established in 1958 for the ostensible purpose of advancing a program of peaceful outer space development. If military space needs evolved, then under the law the Department of Defense could have jurisdiction.

In the case of the nuclear rocket, NASA took over the jurisdiction formerly exercised by the Air Force. Quite properly, and I must say commendably, the Air Force and Navy have continued nuclear rocket studies—paper analyses of possible military missions. In any reference I might make to jurisdictional conflict or duplication, I do not include these very proper Navy or Air Force studies. They should be carried forward and if necessary expanded to make sure the potential of nuclear rockets for defense application is explored.

NASA has jurisdiction over the nuclear vehicle system and under the Atomic Energy Act the Atomic Energy Commission is charged with the development of the integral nuclear reactor propulsion system. Here there is clear delimitation in the outer space and atomic energy laws. Nuclear development is under the jurisdiction of the AEC. Vehicle decisions as well as developing nonnuclear components is NASA's job.

To my way of thinking this duality of agency jurisdiction is not a serious problem. In other years and other atomic energy situations we faced and solved similar problems. In fact, in every AEC developmental effort for the military, from bombs to aircraft or powerplants for Antarctica, very workable management methods have evolved. Appropriate joint offices within the AEC were created or existing joint offices were used.

The function of such a joint office is demonstrated by the case of the nuclear submarine. The development of the submarine was handled by the Navy and the nuclear reactor system by the AEC. To assure unified direction a "two-hat office" was created and Admiral Rickover was put in charge of a naval reactors branch of the AEC. Admiral Rickover represented both the Navy and Atomic Energy Commission and unified the efforts of each.

The same arrangement has not existed in the nuclear-space program. Instead there have been two camps—and sometimes it seems like two armed camps. Early this year, I urged that an integrated office be established in the Atomic Energy Commission. Despite much talk of a proposed move toward the creation of a NASA reactors branch in the Atomic Energy Commission, to assure unified control, months and months passed and nothing happened. In the interim there has been most able direction of the nuclear work under Gen. Irving Branch and Col. Jack Armstrong.

At the Joint Committee's executive session on Monday, we were told officially of the establishment of an integrated office in AEC. But I will be interested to see whether the NASA official who heads up the office in the Atomic Energy Commission can get his orders any faster from NASA now that he is over in AEC.

Although I called attention months ago to the need for an industrial organization to be selected to get into harness with the Los Alamos Laboratory, we were told Monday that it will be many more months before they will select one.

This year the House Committee on Science and Astronautics found NASA had no program for a manned expedition to the moon in this decade. The Associate Administrator of NASA pointed out that a manned lunar expedition just could not be accomplished in this decade but said it could be accomplished in the 1970's using a nuclear rocket, a saturn sized vehicle with refueling in flight, or the so-called Nova engine.

In testimony before the same committee, General Branch said a nuclear propulsion booster could be ready for space flight in the midsixties without any trouble. He told the committee that the state of the art in nuclear propulsion is such that he was confident AEC could provide the necessary power if the vehicle were developed to use the power. General Branch also told the House committee that he was "not completely satisfied" with NASA's request for and uses of of nuclear power. He added, "We can go faster than they want us to go right now."

The agency charged with the job of promoting astronautics seems to have little desire to have powerful boosters developed for lunar exploration. NASA doesn't seem to consider the challenge of the sixties very challenging. Let's pray the Soviets have equally timid souls in their space program.

Only this year, the able chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, CLARENCE CANNON, probed this two-agency situation. He noticed that NASA had requested appropriations for work in nuclear development. In fact, Mr. CANNON found one $10-million

item identified as being for nuclear development. Mr. CANNON also found other areas of potential duplication and reminded everyone the national space laws call for the avoidance of an unnecessary duplication of effort and facilities among Government agencies. He wanted assurance that there would not be overlapping nuclear work carried forward by agencies other than AEC.

In response to Mr. CANNON'S questions the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission pointed out that he could not review NASA's budgets nor control them. The Chairman said that he was going to look into the matter but added that this was up to the Bureau of the Budget.

As I recall the purpose of the Bureau of the Budget, it is to prevent waste and duplication. But the Bureau seems so busy these days with stopping accomplishment that it can neglect its main mission. Earlier this year the Bureau cut funds for the Rover project by 25 percent. Only after a major effort on the part of the Joint Committee and the Atomic Energy Commission were these funds restored.

Now let's look at the program. NASA has published a 10-year space program but fails to list a nuclear rocket mission. There is no program for nuclear rocket demonstration.

The old NACA was sold to Congress as the proper agency to handle outer space because of alleged "in house" technical competence. But the talent doesn't seem to come into play when policy must be formulated. Perhaps NASA just gets a budget ceiling and no technical decisions can be made which would disturb the cash quota.

In a speech several years ago, I called attention to the original cutbacks of the Rover nuclear rocket project by Secretary of Defense Wilson. It was quite apparent at that time that some of the manufacturers of conventional rocket fuels and equipment were not anxious to have a nuclear competitor.

NASA appears to be following the same questionable tradition. It has taken one step in the direction of making nuclear rocket policy. They have gone outside for help. They are now going to ask the aircraft companies to study the whole thing and tell them what their policy should be for first flight testing a nuclear rocket. NASA representatives have already said the first test should be as an upper stage of a Saturn booster—a booster which won't be ready for some years. Will their contractors see it differently? I suspect not.

The question probably is no longer open and the possibility of ground launching will probably be ignored. One could also worry that some of these aircraft companies have vested interests in the chemical rocket systems—but let's be real—you have to get policy someplace.

This policymaking by contract could also fit the scheme of budgetary life. It takes months to select an aircraft company and more months for them to study. You can't spend developmental funds while you're selecting and studying. Clear-cut decisionmaking is passé.

As I understood the National Aeronautics and Space Act, a council headed by the President was established to set overall space policy. This year the administration proposed the elimination of the Space Council and interestingly enough any participation by the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission who sits on the Council. I presume that in anticipation of this legislative proposal being enacted—the Council has quit doing business.

I will not say that the administration is disinterested in policy questions relating to outer space. This year they were quick to come to Congress and for changes in the outer space patent laws and the right to turn over to private industry the patents developed with Government funds. I also suspect that they will quickly resolve the policy question of assigning radio frequencies in outer space to private industry. It seems there is neglect only when questions of major national policy are involved.

Under present programing it will be at least 1964 before a unit such as Snap VIII could be used to generate electric power in outer space. Probably it will be some years later. The fact of the matter is that there is also no policy for utilizing nuclear electric power resources.

Not only is it important to note that there is no specific program but the development of a 30-kilowatt unit is grossly inadequate for the 1960's. As I said earlier nuclear electric power sources in the range of 1 megawatt are needed, that is 1,000 kilowatts as compared to 30. Here the technical experts are also in agreement and I understand that informally the NASA program chiefs say the same thing.

Still, no program is under way to develop a 1 megawatt space atomic-electric power system. The Air Force recognized this void and initiated a study of a 300-kilowatt unit, 10 times bigger than Snap VIII, but short of the 1-megawatt goal, but here the problem of AEC jurisdiction again arises. The Air Force under the Atomic Energy Act should not develop atomic reactors. This is a job for the AEC. Surely the temptation must be great in the Air Force to violate the Atomic Energy Act and do some developmental work instead of just paper studies. Those of us who have been concerned with the preservation of civilian control in atomic energy must oppose this. Instead, the Atomic Energy Commission should be given the green light to initiate work on larger power units.

Since there is no national program for nuclear space applications, and reluctance to initiate one, I propose some national objectives. I propose that Congress, by resolution, call for the acceptance of these objectives if the Executive proves unwilling.

I urge that the following be incorporated into our 10 year outer space program and be considered as part of our atoms-for-peace program.

(1) A test flight of a nuclear rocket prototype, including operation of facilities for the generation of electricity in outer space by nuclear energy should be completed by the end of 1964. In this mission the great payload advantage of nuclear power should be demonstrated.

(2) A manned expedition to the moon utilizing nuclear rockets and nuclear electric power sources should be undertaken as soon as possible before the end of the 1960's.

(3) the maximum development possible in nuclear rockets and nuclear electric power sources (in excess of 1 megawatt) is to be undertaken so that by the end of the 1960's more extensive explorations of our solar system can be programed.

Adopting these proposals into our national program would not cause serious technical disruption. There is adequate scientific manpower and resources. I can assure you of the abundance of nuclear scientists and engineers. Available talent and facilities can be found with ease from our national laboratories and industrial installations.

But decisions are needed. For one thing there will have to be a national decision on the relative priorities of the nuclear rocket and the so-called Nova chemical rocket. One effort tends to duplicate the other and doing both might be wasteful. Here the experts again lend guidance when they say that the era of big chemical rockets will pass when the nuclear systems are developed. In addition, decisions must be made as to timetables and proper funding.

In but a few words I submit a plan. Its accomplishment would be an incomparable scientific achievement. A total nuclear demonstration in outer space surely would enhance our world prestige such as we have been seeking with atoms for peace. The technical byproducts and scientific and military value of our demonstration would be great. Being first in the world to launch unmanned and manned nuclear-space expeditions would have worldwide effects not unlike those Mr. Allen describes. Would not the eyes of the world turn back toward us as the leaders in science and technology?

There are those who leave the impression that it is unpatriotic to call for improvements in our national defense and space effort. They say we are in green pastures of strength and greatness and if we can sit silently, the world will never know the difference. This suggested ban on constructive criticism could start a system not unlike communist democratic centralism under which policy once handed down by the state it is no longer subject to criticism. Surely we can rise above this and permit the freedom to propose greatness for our Nation.

Hanson Baldwin has said that most people in Europe now accept U.S. military inferiority as a fact. Sputnik created this impression, not criticism.

In the case of nuclear space applications I end a silence of some months and plead for greatness. Let's end our melancholy mediocrity in astronautics. Let's get on with the job. Let's be the first to display the nuclear reactor as a valuable tool for the exploration of the solar system. If we try and fail, future generations can commend our pioneering spirit. If we succeed the universe can be theirs.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY IN THE 86TH CONGRESS

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement of the accomplishments of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy in the 86th Congress.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY IN THE 86TH CONGRESS

INTRODUCTION

Since its creation by the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, the role of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has remained essentially unchanged, but the scope of activities which fall under the aegis of the Joint Committee has greatly increased. The most pronounced area of increased development has been in the field of the peaceful uses of atomic energy. Perhaps it would be worth while at this point to briefly outline the functions of the Joint Committee.

First of all, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy is the only Joint Committee of the Congress which has legislative powers and responsibilities. All bills dealing with atomic energy, as provided by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, are referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Secondly, the Joint Committee has a so-called watchdog function in which the Joint Committee reviews the activities and reports of the AEC and other agencies engaged in atomic energy work to see that progress is made and the public interest is served.

A third function is the committee's informational role wherein the committee provides information to the Congress and the public on the unclassified aspects of atomic energy.

And finally, and by no means least significant, is the positive or creative function of the Joint Committee in which it recommends policies and programs and changes in order to keep the atomic energy program moving.

The major accomplishments of the Joint Committee during the 1st session of the 86th Congress may be summarized as follows:

AEC AUTHORIZATION BILL

The Joint Committee, after extensive hearings, reported out an AEC facility authorization bill for fiscal year 1960 (S. 2094 and H.R. 7537) of $179,941,000 to authorize new construction projects for the atomic energy program. The bill also authorized funds for the cooperative power reactor demonstration program and for cooperation with Euratom. It authorized certain important design and engineering studies and extended the compulsory licensing provisions for atomic energy patents for another 5-year period, to end September 1, 1964. The bill passed the Senate and House on June 15, 1959, and was approved by the President on June 23, 1959 as Public Law 86–50.

FEDERAL-STATE COOPERATION

The Joint Committee compiled information relating to cooperation between the Federal Government and the individual States in the atomic energy field prior to public hearings on this subject. Following public hearings and further consideration by the committee, the junior Senator from New Mexico and Congressman DURHAM introduced identical bills (S. 2568 and H.R. 8755) to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, to clarify the relationship and to delineate the areas of responsibility between the Atomic Energy Commission and individual States. S. 2568 passed the Senate and House on September 11, 1959 and was approved by the President on September 23, 1959 as Public Law 86–373.

The principal provisions of the bill authorized the AEC to withdraw its responsibility for regulation of certain types of materials—principally radioactive isotopes—but not over more hazardous activities such as the licensing and regulation of reactors. The bill requires compatibility of Federal and State radiation standards, and authorizes programs to assist the States to assume independent regulatory jurisdiction.

The bill also established a Federal Radiation Council to advise the President on radiation matters similar to the Council recently established by Executive order. It did not modify the basic functions of the Council but increased its membership from four to five members, plus such other members as the President shall appoint.

OTHER BILLS

The Joint Committee reported out a bill to amend section 251 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, to provide for the submission to Congress by the AEC of an annual rather than a semiannual report. This bill (S. 1197) passed the House on June 2, 1959 and was approved by the President on June 11, 1959 as Public Law 86–43.

The Joint Committee reported to the House a bill (H.R. 5105) to increase the AEC 1959 authorization by $1,300,000 for the Phermex installation at Los Alamos, N. Mex. An identical bill (S. 1228) was passed by the House on June 2, 1959 and was approved by the President on June 11, 1959, as Public Law 86–44.

This additional authorization enabled construction to proceed on the Phermex project as a part of our nuclear weapons program.

The AEC "omnibus bill" (S. 2569–H.R. 8754) passed the Senate on September 9, 1959, and the House on September 11, 1959. It was approved by the President on September 21, 1959, as Public Law 86–300.

The bill amends the Atomic Energy Act to authorize the AEC to enter into agreements for the performance by the Commission of certain services, including the reprocessing of irradiated fuel elements with material licensees (reactor manufacturers and fuel suppliers) as well as with facility licensees (reactor operators and utilities) as previously authorized.

The bill also amends the Atomic Energy Act to provide, in substance, that members of the General Advisory Committee and other AEC advisory committees will not be subject to certain conflict-of-interest statutes solely because of compensation from nonprofit educational institutions.

AGREEMENTS FOR COOPERATION

Peaceful uses

In accordance with Section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, four new agreements for the peaceful uses of atomic energy were submitted to the Joint Committee in 1959. These agreements were with Vietnam, Panama, the International Atomic Energy Agency, and Euratom.

The agreement with the International Atomic Energy Agency provides for the transfer of fissionable material for peaceful uses in accordance with the objectives outlined by the President in his atoms-for-peace speech in 1953.

The Euratom agreements provide for a cooperative effort between our country and the Euratom nations to assist them in achieving their goal of 1 million kilowatts of power from nuclear reactors by 1963–65. Also, an accompanying research and development program jointly undertaken by the United States and the Euratom nations would seek to improve the fuel cycles of these reactors with a view to ultimate achievement of economic nuclear power in that area in the foreseeable future.

In addition, eight amendments to existing agreements were submitted to the Joint Committee. These amendments were for the purpose of reflecting the present AEC policy with respect to the percentage of enriched uranium available for use in reactor experiments, research reactors and material test reactors.

MUTUAL DEFENSE

Six proposed agreements for cooperation for mutual defense purposes and one proposed amendment to an existing agreement for cooperation for mutual defense purposes were submitted to the Congress by the President in accordance with subsection 123(d) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended by Public Law 85–479. These agreements were with Great Britain, Canada, France, Netherlands, West Germany, Turkey, and Greece. In accordance with subsection 123(d) it was required that these agreements and the amendment lie before the Congress for a period of 60 days, during which time they could not become effective. Following the prescribed 60-day period if the Congress did not pass a concurrent resolution of disapproval, they would become effective.

During these 60 days the Subcommittee on Agreements for Cooperation of the Joint Committee reviewed the proposed agreements and received testimony in executive session and public hearings from representatives of the Department of Defense, the State Department, and the Atomic Energy Commission, and others desiring to testify. The subcommittee then unanimously concluded and reported to the Joint Committee that the proposed agreements and amendment were in conformance with the letter and the spirit of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended. The Joint Committee on July 13, 1959, met and adopted the report on the agreements and interposed no objections to the proposed amendment and agreement.

The mutual defense agreements with our NATO allies are intended to strengthen our NATO shield against Communist aggression.

I think it is well to note at this juncture that the Congress, and especially this body, does not normally concern itself with review of this type of executive agreement before it becomes effective. But our distinguished colleague, CARL DURHAM, then chairman of the Joint Committee, who, I regret to say, is retiring this year after 22 years of service to the country, and other members of the committee wanted to provide every assurance of full congressional consideration of matters so important as these. Therefore, in 1958 the Joint Committee amended the Atomic Energy Act to include a provision which would give the Congress an opportunity to review, and, if necessary, by concurrent resolution disapprove each such agreement. I believe that the careful attention and close scrutiny of these agreements, as evidence by the report (H.R. 672), speaks for itself.

HEARINGS

During the first session of the 86th Congress, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and its subcommittees held a total of 161 public and executive hearings. Since 25 publications, consisting of reports and hearings, were printed by the Joint Committee during the first session, amounting to over 11,000 pages. (See Joint Committee print, "Membership, Legislation, and Publications Through 86th Congress, 1st session" for a complete list.)

1. Status of the atomic energy industry (section 202):

The Joint Committee held hearings in February 1959 on the development, growth, and state of the atomic energy industry. These hearings are held annually in public session pursuant to section 202 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, and this year the major area covered was that of the country's civilian atomic power program.

2. Patents:

The Joint Committee held 3 days of public hearings in March on atomic energy patent policies and procedures. Prior to these hearings the Joint Committee staff prepared two volumes of "Selected Materials on Atomic Energy Patents" to assist individuals in preparing for these hearings. Subsequent to the hearings the Joint Committee placed in the AEC authorization bill (Public Law 86–50) a section which authorized the extension of the compulsory licensing provisions for patents relating to atomic energy for a period of 5 years.

3. Employee radiation hazards and workmen's compensation:

Five days of public hearings were held during March of this year on this important subject. The committee also published a study on the subject of hazards and compensation to employees which included the views of Federal agencies, State governments, organized labor, industry, and other interested groups. This study and the hearings will serve as basic documents for future legislative action.

4. Fallout from nuclear weapons tests:

Extensive public hearings were held on the environmental effect of radioactive fallout from nuclear weapons tests. The twin purpose of this hearing was first to bring up to date information which had been gathered since the first public fallout hearings conducted by the Joint Committee in 1957, and, second, to put before the public the varied opinions of experts in the fallout and related fields and to bring out whatever facts were available relating to this potential hazard. Testimony from scientific experts reflected that there was no danger from past tests, but that if tests are continued over the next two generations or less of the same pattern and intensity as the past 5 years, a hazard to the world's population could result.

5. Effects of a nuclear war:

The Special Subcommittee on Radiation held 5 days of public hearings on the biological and environmental effects of a hypothetical nuclear war. The experts who testified or presented papers believed that the Nation could survive an attack of the magnitude outlined for the purpose of the hearing. A summary-analysis on the testimony

was printed on August 31, 1959. The complete transcript of the hearings was published in September 1959.

The two most interesting results of the hearings were first, they showed that nuclear war of this magnitude, however horrible it is to contemplate, would not result in annihilation of human race from fallout, and secondly, it was indicated that adequate civil defense shelters would have lowered total U.S. fatalities in this hypothetical war from about 25 percent of the population to about 3 percent of the total fatalities estimated on the basis of no shelters.

6. Waste disposal:

The Special Subcommittee on Radiation of the Joint Committee held 5 days of public hearings on industrial radioactive waste disposal in January and February 1959, and also on July 29, 1959. The hearings were held for the purpose of gathering the latest data from scientific experts in the atomic energy and related fields. It was the committee's desire to bring before the Congress and the public, in layman's language, information on the various types of radioactive wastes, their management, and the AEC research and development program.

The special July 29 hearing was scheduled because of the Joint Committee's concern over the National Academy of Sciences' recommendations of possible close-off-shore ocean disposal sites for dumping low-level radioactive waste.

During the January–February hearings testimony was received from 33 scientists, and 50 technical papers on the subject were submitted for the record. Five volumes of testimony on all phases of the waste-disposal problem were printed.

7. ANP program:

The Joint Committee held its first public hearing in the 13-year history of the ANP program, on the progress that our country is making in getting a nuclear aircraft into flight. In the last 11 years of the 13 years the program has been under way, the Joint Committee has held numerous classified hearings during which its members, and particularly our distinguished colleague from the House, MELVIN PRICE, had urged both the Department of Defense and the Atomic Energy Commission to establish a concrete objective for the accomplishment of early nuclear flight.

The public hearing brought out into the open for the first time the divergence of opinion which exists within the executive agencies on the requirements and target dates for early flight. Perhaps most importantly, it brought out the difficulties within the executive agencies involved, in establishlishing clear-cut goals and setting specific dates for the accomplishments of nuclear aircraft flight.

8. Linear electron accelerator:

Public hearings were held jointly by the Subcommittee on Legislation and Research and Development on a proposal originally recommended by the President's Advisory Panel to authorize $105 million to construct a 10,000-foot linear electron accelerator capable of creating energy up to 10 to 15 million electron volts. On June 3, 1959, a bill (H.R. 7544) was introduced and referred to the Joint Committee. The Joint Committee held executive and public hearings on this subject and continued its review of this project during 1960. Congressional action taken is discussed under AEC authorization legislation, fiscal year 1961.

9. Joint Committee hearing aboard the ing aboard the nuclear submarine *Skipjack* below the waves on April 11, 1959, in order to receive a report from Vice Adm. H. G. Rickover, Chief, Naval Reactors Branch, Atomic Energy Commission, and Comdr. W. W. Behrens, commanding officer of the U.S.S. *Skipjack*, on the operation of the *Skipjack*, which had completed its sea trials on March 10, 1959, some 32 days earlier, and also to observe firsthand the operation of this outstanding submarine. It was during this trip that the *Skipjack* achieved new records of depth and speed.

10. Presentation of medal to Admiral Rickover:

One of the most pleasant assignments that the Joint Committee has undertaken this session was the presentation of a congressional medal to Adm. Hyman G. Rickover for his great contributions to our Nation. It was the initiative of the Congress last year in authorizing this medal, which we feel perhaps spurred on the Navy to promote him to vice admiral and thus assure his leadership in nuclear energy for the next few years.

11. Civilian nuclear-power seminar:

The Joint Committee held a 3-day informal seminar in January of 1959 with representatives of industry, public and private utilities, and reactor experts for the purpose of exploring the possibility of how best to achieve economically competitive nuclear power. The information obtained during these valuable talks was used by the Joint Committee in the development of the fiscal year 1960 civilian power provisions in the authorization bill.

As a result of the Joint Committee recommendations over the last several years, the AEC submitted a report of its ad hoc committee in January 1959 which closely paralleled those recommendations made by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy staff report of August 1958. The Commission also announced it was undertaking to develop a 10-year atomic-power program for consideration in the next session.

We were pleased that the Joint Committee has been able to encourage the Atomic Energy Commission to carry out the congressional mandate of 1958 to begin construction of a gas-cooled reactor prototype. It was also through the urging of the Joint Committee that definite progress was made in 1959 toward the development and construction of the convertible Hanford production reactor which will provide plutonium for weapons and, subject to further authorization, can produce large quantities of electric power.

BASIC RESEARCH FACILITIES

The Joint Committee this first session increased the requested AEC authorization for physical research by some $4 million. This was in line with its action in 1958 in stepping up AEC's physical research program. Also, largely through the efforts of the Joint Committee, funds previously authorized for physical research have been released by the Bureau of the Budget this year.

Last, but certainly not least, the Joint Committee increased the authorization for biology and medicine by $1 million for research in the area of fallout.

CLASSIFIED ACTIVITIES

In addition to the public hearings discussed above, the Joint Committee, of course, held a number of executive hearings and considered classified testimony and reports on the weapons program, test suspension and detection, the naval reactor program, and other important classified activities.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION FOR FISCAL 1961

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, a statement relating to the authorization of appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission for the fiscal year 1961.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MAJOR ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE JOINT ATOMIC ENERGY COMMITTEE DURING THE 86TH CONGRESS, 2D SESSION

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE AEC FOR FISCAL YEAR 1961

The Joint Committee held extensive hearings and reported out bills (S. 3387, accompanied by Senate Report No. 1277, and H.R. 11713, accompanied by House Report No. 1525) to authorize appropriations for the AEC for the fiscal year 1961 program.

The bill authorized $211,476,000 for new construction projects affecting all aspects of the AEC program, including production of special nuclear materials, manufacture of atomic weapons, reactor development, physical research, and biology and medicine.

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy recommended the addition of three projects to the bill submitted by the AEC:

1. Project 61–d–10, $13 million, for power reactor project for the Antarctic;

2. Project 61–f–8, Materials Research Laboratory, University of Illinois, $5,600,000; and

3. Project 61–f–9, Radiation Laboratory, Notre Dame University, $2,200,000.

The Joint Committee revised project 61–f–7, linear electron accelerator, to provide $3 million for design and engineering rather than $107,200,000 for construction at this time. As a result, the amount requested by the administration was reduced from $293,876,000 to $211,476,000.

The bill also authorized an additional $40 million for use in the cooperative atomic power program.

The bill was considered on the floor of the House on May 6, 1960, and in the Senate on May 10, 1960, and passed by both Houses in the form recommended by the Joint Committee, and signed by the President as Public Law 86–457.

JOINT COMMITTEE HEARINGS

During the 2d session of the 86th Congress from January to September 1960 the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and its subcommittees held a total of 83 public and executive hearings. Some 17 publications consisting of reports and hearings were printed by the Joint Committee during this session. (A complete list is attached at the conclusion of this statement.)

FOOD IRRADIATION

Three days of public hearings were held on food irradiation during January and March. The hearings in January were held in order to review the history and background of the program and to discuss current and proposed plans of the Defense Department, including the reasons for the sudden cancellation in October 1959 of the $7.5 million Army Food Irradiation Center. The hearings in March were held to find out what progress had been made in developing specific programs originally discussed at the aforementioned January hearings. As a result of the committee's inquiries and hearings the food irradiation research program has been kept alive.

STATUS OF THE ATOMIC ENERGY INDUSTRY (SEC. 202)

The Joint Committee held hearings in February on the development, growth, and state of the atomic energy industry. These hearings are held annually in public sessions pursuant to section 202 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954. The major focus of this year's hearings was on the Atomic Energy Commission's 10-year civilian atomic power-program. Some of the other subjects covered in the 7 days of hearings were the military reactor programs, maritime reactor

programs, AEC contract policies and how they affect industry, and industrial development and uses of radioisotopes.

FRONTIERS IN ATOMIC ENERGY RESEARCH

The Subcommittee on Research and Development held hearings in March on Frontiers in atomic energy research. These hearings included one of the first public congressional reviews of the peaceful uses of nuclear explosives (Plowshare). Also featured was a review of controlled thermonuclear reactions (Sherwood), advanced reactor applications, nuclear space propulsion and auxiliary power, and a review of direct energy conversion and solar energy systems. The purpose of the 4 days of hearings was to bring forth new and worthwhile concepts in the nuclear energy field and to bridge the gap between the men with the ideas in our Nation's laboratories and the authorities with the power to give the go-ahead in future development.

A summary analysis of these hearings was prepared in order to bring before the public, in layman's language, a concise version of these hearings.

NUCLEAR TEST DETECTION

The Special Subcommittee on Radiation and the Subcommittee on Research and Development held 4 days of public hearings in April 1960 on the technical aspects of detection and inspection controls of a nuclear weapons test ban. The purpose of these hearings was to bring to the Congress and the public in an understandable manner information on all phases of this problem. Testimony was received from over 20 scientific and technical experts who represented wide cross sections of scientific knowledge on this complex subject and many of the witnesses who testified had been outspoken on both sides of the nuclear test ban controversy. A summary analysis of these hearings was released by the Joint Committee some 2 weeks after the hearing, with the hearings themselves published in July 1960.

INDEMNITY AND LIABILITY

The Subcommittee on Research and Development and Radiation held hearings on April 26 and 27, 1960, to consider atomic energy indemnity and liability problems, and also reactor and radiation safety factors and criteria including site selection and the operations of the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards.

RADIATION STANDARDS

The Special Subcommittee on Radiation held 7 days of public hearings in May and June on radiation protection criteria and standards, their basis and use. The main focus of these hearings was to clarify some of the confusion and misunderstanding by the public and the scientific community concerning the basis and use of radiation standards. In addition it was hoped that these hearings would help achieve a better understanding of how the Federal Government and the State governments are organized to develop radiation protection standards.

Prior to these hearings the staff of the Joint Committee assembled in an advanced committee print selected material on radiation protection criteria and standards. This background material was used in connection with these hearings. The full hearings will be published in September 1960 together with a summary-analysis prepared by the staff.

COMMUNITIES

Open hearings on community problems at Los Alamos were held in Los Alamos on December 7, 1959. Testimony and statements for the record were received from AEC officials and residents of the Los Alamos community with respect to housing problems, use of the airport, AEC policy on commercial leases, a long-range plan for Los Alamos community development, and other matters.

On June 13, 1960, a public hearing was held by the Subcommittee on Communities to receive testimony from representatives of the AEC and the Housing and Home Finance Agency concerning proposed amendments to the Community Act of 1955 and the status of atomic energy communities in Oak Ridge, Tenn., Richland, Wash., Sandia Base, and Los Alamos, N. Mex.

AGREEMENTS FOR COOPERATION

The Subcommittee on Agreements for Cooperation met on June 22, 1960 to receive testimony from AEC and the State Department on proposed amendments to agreements for cooperation with Argentina, Brazil, Canada, China, Greece, Israel, New Zealand, the Philippines, Portugal, Switzerland, and Thailand and on the proposed agreement for cooperation with Indonesia. An additional agreement for cooperation between the United States and Euratom was also proposed.

On both March 30 and June 22, 1960 the Joint Committee received testimony from the AEC and the State Department on proposed agreements with the U.S.S.R. and Yugoslavia in the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

JOINT COMMITTEE HEARING ABOARD THE GEORGE WASHINGTON

The Joint Committee met in executive session aboard the Polaris missile firing nuclear submarine, the SSB(N) 598 *George Washington*, below the waves on April 9, 1960. Rear Adm. W. F. Raborn, Deputy Director, Bureau of Ships, Navy Department, reviewed, to date, the progress development program of the Polaris missile system. Following Admiral Raborn's presentation, Vice Adm. Hyman G. Rickover, Assistant Director for Naval Reactors, AEC, discussed in detail the present status of the nuclear submarine safety program. Due to the timeliness and informative scope of both presentations, it was decided that a public print of the hearings would be issued after removal of the classified information in the transcript. This print will be available in September 1960.

CONFIRMATION OF AEC COMMISSIONERS

The Senate section met in public session on March 15, 1960 to consider the nomination of Mr. Robert E. Wilson for appointment to the Atomic Energy Commission to serve the term of the late Commissioner Harold Vance as well as to receive an appointment to a full 5-year term as Commissioner ending June 30, 1965. Mr. Wilson was confirmed on March 18, 1960.

On May 27, 1960, the Senate section met in public session to consider the nomination of Mr. Loren K. Olson for appointment to the Atomic Energy Commission to serve the remainder of the term expiring June 30, 1962 of Mr. John F. Floberg, retired. Mr. Olson was confirmed as a Commissioner by the Senate on June 2, 1960.

REVIEW OF INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC POLICIES AND PROGRAMS (M'KINNEY REPORT)

The Joint Committee requested Mr. Robert McKinney, a former U.S. representative to the IAEA, to make a study of the U.S. international atomic energy programs and policies. Mr. McKinney reported to the Joint Committee on June 30, 1960, on his findings. On August 24, 1960 the Joint Committee met to review the McKinney report. The Committee then agreed, by vote of 10 to 7, to publish the report subject to two conditions normally applicable to reports by consultants:

1. The document is a study prepared for the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and is not a committee report; and

2. Such corrections and additions to the text as the author of the report may desire may be made prior to publication.

The report is in 5 volumes containing approximately 1,500 pages. It is expected to be published in September 1960.

REVIEW OF REPORTS ON TECHNICAL AND ECONOMIC FEASIBILITY OF ADDING ELECTRIC GENERATING FACILITIES TO NEW PRODUCTION REACTOR AT HANFORD, WASH.

A study by R. W. Beck & Associates was prepared at the request of the Joint Committee to review reports by the Federal Power Commission, Stone & Webster Engineering Co., and others, on the technical and economic basis for installing electrical generating facilities for the new production reactor at Hanford, Wash.

ROLE OF THE NATIONAL LABORATORIES

The Joint Committee is publishing as a committee print a report it requested from AEC on the future role of the AEC laboratories. Comments on the report were requested from industry, educational institutions, national laboratories, special interest groups, and Federal and State agencies and will be published with the report.

NUCLEAR ROCKET PROGRAM

On July 8, 1960, members of the Joint Committee visited the Nevada test site to witness the performance of a nuclear rocket power experiment. This was the second in a series of experiments aimed at developing a nuclear rocket engine for space travel.

CLASSIFIED ACTIVITIES

In addition to the public hearings mentioned above the Joint Committee held a number of executive hearings and considered classified testimony on weapons development and weapons custody. Also, testimony was received on the aircraft nuclear propulsion, Projects Rover and Pluto, the naval reactor program, test suspension, and detection activities, and the semiannual briefings from the Central Intelligence Agency.

ROVER NUCLEAR ROCKET PROJECT

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a notice and statement relating to a hearing which was held on the Rover nuclear rocket project on February 15, 1960.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HEARING ON ROVER NUCLEAR ROCKET PROJECT SCHEDULED FOR FEBRUARY 15, 1960

A hearing on the status and prospects of the Nation's nuclear rocket project, called Project Rover, has been scheduled for Monday, February 15, 1960, it was announced today by Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

The hearing will be held in executive session since a number of aspects of the project are presently classified by the executive department.

Senator ANDERSON indicated that he was concerned over heavy cuts made in AEC budget requests for the Rover project for fiscal year 1961, and the lack of clear-cut objectives for the project. In this connection, Senator ANDERSON stated:

"I am very concerned over the cuts made in the AEC construction and operating requests for the Rover project, which are being made at a time when we should consider accelerating rather than decelerating the program. Nuclear rocket propulsion, according to our best scientific calculations, is the most promising space propulsion system capable of propelling large payloads to the planets and back to the earth. As a result

of the highly successful Kiwi-A ground test experiment of last summer, I had expected that the program would be stepped up. But instead we seem to be moving into a period of stretchout, indecision, and drift comparable to the aircraft nuclear propulsion (ANP) project."

Senator ANDERSON stated that top AEC and NASA officials had been requested to testify, as well as the officials of the AEC Los Alamos Laboratory who actually carry on the research and development program. Questions which will be considered include the following:

1. The effect of cuts in budget requests for 1961 and thereafter, particularly in relation to facilities, and advanced projects beyond the Kiwi-type ground test reactor experiments;

2. The need for establishing objectives and target dates for the program, particularly as to a target for testing a flight prototype soon instead of in 1970;

3. The facilities and manpower required for an expanded and accelerated program necessary to meet urgent objectives established under No. 2;

4. The effects and necessity of security classification on the Rover program.

In a concluding statement, Senator ANDERSON stated:

"I have difficulty seeing how this project can be classified when the military have set no requirement for it, and NASA does not even mention it in its 10-year program. These agencies are so busy with projects using conventional fuels that we should consider giving AEC full responsibility for the nuclear Rover project up through the prototype testing stage."

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CLINTON P. ANDERSON, CHAIRMAN OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY, FOLLOWING CLOSED HEARING BY THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON ROVER NUCLEAR ROCKET PROJECT, MONDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 1960

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy held a hearing today on the status and prospects of the Nation's nuclear rocket project, called Project Rover, to cover the topics announced in the JCAE statement last Tuesday, February 9.

This hearing was called because of concern about the reported cutbacks in AEC requests for construction and operating funds for the Rover program and to inquire about whether, as a result of the successful ground test experiment by the Los Alamos Laboratory at the Nevada test site in July 1959, the program should not be accelerated rather than decelerated.

In order to discuss more concretely means of arriving at some definite program objectives, target dates, and organizational arrangements, which would expedite the program, our staff director wrote to the Commission and NASA, outlining our views on these matters.

In the hearing I was happy to find that John McCone, AEC Chairman, had appealed to the Bureau of the Budget last week to restore the funds for the Rover project. As I understood it, he was able to persuade them to request the full authorization of $20 million for facilities for the project but was unable to obtain any relief on actual construction funds for fiscal year 1961 or for operating funds, except by reprograming. Nonetheless, his strong support of the program is encouraging.

It was further brought out that the results of these budget cuts could stretch out the target date for feasibility ground tests of the nuclear rocket engine by at least a year. No firm objectives for flight testing of a nuclear rocket have been established, according to the testimony today but it was indicated that the general flight test dates have been moved back 2 years.

The AEC has now declassified the funding arrangements and some of the target dates for the Rover project. These may be summarized as follows:

	Original date	Wilson stretch-out (1957)	Current proposed stretch-out
1. Target dates for ground test feasibility of rocket engine	*Target* 1960	*Target* 1963	*Target* 1964
2. Target for flight test of nuclear rocket	1965	1968	1967–69

	Original AEC request to BOB	BOB request to Congress	Remarks
Construction funds:			
Authorization	$20,000,000	$13,000,000	Revised by BOB to $20,000,000.
Funding for fiscal year 1961	13,000,000	5,000,000	$5,000,000.
Funding for fiscal year 1962	7,000,000	8,000,000	Unknown.
Operating funds: Funding for fiscal year 1961	22,800,000	18,000,000	No change after AEC appeal.

This stretchout of the project and the lack of firm objectives and target dates should be a matter of great concern to the Congress and the Nation. As I pointed out in my opening statement at the hearings today (a copy of which is attached), the Director of our U.S. Information Service has indicated that our outer space propulsion program is of the greatest importance to the U.S. prestige in the world today.

Therefore, it would seem to be the part of wisdom to engage in a separate accelerated nuclear rocket program, a field in which we stand a chance to surpass the Russians in the next 10 years. Nothing in the testimony in our closed hearing indicated that the United States could not engage in a successful accelerated nuclear rocket program if the appropriations asked by AEC are supplemented somewhat and if a real impetus were given to the program at the highest governmental levels.

The Joint Committee and its staff intend to investigate this problem further. We intend to hold further hearings on this subject at appropriate times to see what progress can be made.

OPENING STATEMENT BY SENATOR CLINTON P. ANDERSON, CHAIRMAN OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY, AT HEARING ON THE ROVER NUCLEAR ROCKET PROJECT, FEBRUARY 15, 1960

I have called this hearing to look into the programs and plans for the Rover nuclear rocket project.

As you know the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has for a number of years concerned itself with the Rover nuclear rocket program. The interest of some of us goes back to early in 1955 when the nuclear rocket program was set up as a formal project at Los Alamos and Livermore.

Developments since then have confirmed our beliefs in the potential of nuclear rocket engines. The far greater prospect of growth of the nuclear system compared to advanced future chemical systems is one of the primary reasons for our interest in the Rover project. As was brought out in our public hearings in February 1958, the nuclear rocket has a specific impulse two and one half times that of conventional chemically fueled rockets.

The importance of our space program was pointed out very succinctly by George V. Allen, Director of the U.S. Information Agency in his testimony before the House Committee on Science and Astronautics on January 22, 1960, which he said:

"Our space program has an importance far beyond the field of the activity itself. It bears on almost every aspect of our relations with people of other countries and on their view of us as compared with the U.S.S.R. Our space program may be considered as a measure of our vitality and our ability to compete with a formidable rival, and as a criterion of our ability to maintain technological eminence worthy of emulation by other peoples."

The importance of looking ahead more to systems of space propulsion with a real potential beyond the chemical system now receiving the most attention in the United States is brought out in Werner von Braun's testimony before the same committee on February 2, 1960. Von Braun, during testimony concerning estimates of where the Russians would be when we finally developed the chemical Saturn system, said he thought we would have to keep running and that he thought that it was quite likely and logical that the Russians have much larger rockets under development.

Therefore, considering the importance of attaining leadership in the field of space propulsion technology and the great potential of nuclear propulsion compared to chemical rockets, we want to be assured that looking to the future, the Rover program is receiving the proper emphasis.

The recent cuts in Rover budget requests seem incongruous with the above situation. This apparent decrease in interest in the Rover program is particularly puzzling in the light of the successful nuclear rocket experiment conducted last July in Nevada.

That is why I have asked the Atomic Energy Commission, National Aeronautics Space Administration, and Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory representatives to appear here today. We want to know what the status of the program is and what the objectives are.

We have sent letters to the AEC and NASA outlining the specific items we would like to go over today. These items are as follows:

1. Present status and plans for the Rover program;

2. The effect of cuts in budget requests for 1961 and thereafter, particularly in relation to facilities and advanced projects beyond the Kiwi-type ground test reactor experiments;

3. The need for establishing objectives and target dates for the program, particularly as to a target for testing a flight prototype soon.

4. The facilities and manpower required for an expanded and accelerated program necessary to meet urgent objectives established under No. 3.

5. The effects and necessity of security classification on the Rover program.

I would like to place these letters in the record. We also sent an outline of suggested Rover program objectives, target dates, and organization to the AEC and NASA on which we would like to receive your comments today. I would like to place this suggested outline in the record also.

Now I understand that Mr. McCone is going to lead off the testimony today.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY,
February 11, 1960.

Dr. T. KEITH GLENNAN,
Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C.
Gen. A. R. LUEDECKE,
General Manager, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D.C.:

As you know the Joint Committee is very interested in the early development of the nuclear rocket propulsion system under the Rover program. We are hopeful that something constructive will come from discussions at our hearing on this subject scheduled for Monday, February 15, 1960.

In order to facilitate discussions during the hearing Senator ANDERSON asked me to supplement my letter of February 8, 1960, to outline some objectives, target dates, and organizational proposals for your consideration. We would appreciate your review and comments on these points during the hearing.

The suggested outline we have developed is aimed at first establishing firm operational objectives tied to a functional flight test schedule and with clear-cut organizational responsibilities for the program.

1. Basic performance specifications for the rocket engine for flight-test should be established immediately. These performance specifications could be based on upper stage requirements for Saturn with a target date for launching from upper stage by 1966 or 1967. However, it appears more desirable to set performance requirements independent of the Saturn research and development program to eliminate dependence on the results of another research and development effort.

2. A schedule for research and development work to meet the requirements for the commencement of ground-launched prototype tests in 1964 should be established. If the 1964 date cannot now be met, what would be the earliest date for such tests and the required schedule for research and development?

3. Responsibility for the development of the nuclear rocket through the flight test phase of an integrated prototype propulsion system should be assigned to the Atomic Energy Commission, with the understanding that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration will provide the Commission with consultation and assistance.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES T. RAMEY,
Executive Director.

NUCLEAR ROCKETRY

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "Nuclear Rocketry: How Are We Doing?" written by Jay Holmes and published in the magazine Missiles and Rockets for March 21, 1960.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NUCLEAR ROCKETRY: HOW ARE WE DOING?—UPCOMING CONGRESSIONAL HEARING MAY RESULT IN CALLING IN INDUSTRY TO SPEED DEVELOPMENT

(By Jay Holmes)

Controversy over the timetable and the means of developing America's first nuclear rocket—muffled until now by security classification of the pertinent facts—should break fully into the open this week. Further, there's the possibility that an industry contractor will be brought in to speed development.

At stake in a hearing before the Joint Congressional Atomic Energy Committee March 24, is a propulsion system capable of carrying a crew of explorers to the Moon—and perhaps later to Mars and Venus. The specialists agree that nuclear propulsion systems will be lighter and less expensive than chemicals for carrying heavy payloads for traveling long distances or both.

As the struggle behind closed Government doors gradually emerged into public sight last week, three viewpoints became apparent. Those choosing sides in the debate are lining up behind:

A high-gear program to fly a nuclear rocket as soon as technology will allow—backed by many Atomic Energy Commission officials and Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, Democrat, of New Mexico, chairman of the Atomic Energy Committee. ANDERSON has proposed bringing in an industrial contractor soon.

A program calling for full-speed ground testing but a more cautious approach to flight testing—favored by some officials of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

A slowdown—proposed by the Bureau of the Budget.

Two high AEC officials close to the nuclear rocket program—Brig. Gen. Irving L. Branch and Col. Jack L. Armstrong—have said the AEC could develop nuclear propulsion for a manned moon expedition in less than 10 years if such a requirement were given them. Armstrong said he spoke in terms of a 20,000-pound payload.

Two NASA officials—Deputy Administrator Hugh L. Dryden and Harold E. Finger, chief of nuclear engines, have reported their agency wrote to the Budget Bureau urging that AEC be permitted to conduct ground testing as fast as technology allows. However, Dryden said a manned moon expedition would be impossible in this decade regardless of progress in propulsion. Solving the problems of reentry from a lunar distance will take longer than 10 years, Dryden predicted.

Budget Bureau officials maintained their customary silence. However, word got out that the Bureau softened its slowdown stand following an appeal by AEC Chairman John A. McCone.

The controversy over the nuclear rocket—Project Rover—was brought into the open by Senator ANDERSON a week before his committee held a closed hearing February 15. He issued a statement after the first hearing and more facts came to light when the House Committee on Science and Astronautics took open testimony February 26. Still more are expected when the atomic energy group holds its open hearing on Rover, Thursday, as part of a 4-day series, "Frontiers of Atomic Energy Research."

Senator ANDERSON has proposed that, to speed the Rover development, complete responsibility be assigned to the AEC through the flight test phase, an industrial contractor be brought in soon to work with the AEC's Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory and the first flight test be scheduled for 1964 or as soon as possible thereafter.

TECHNICAL CONTROVERSY

In addition to the political dispute over funding and schedule, a second argument—largely technical—has nuclear propulsion experts divided. This latter dispute concerns the nature of the first flight test—likely to be conducted in the mid-1960's. One group favors a direct launching from the ground. Another group prefers that the first test be from orbit.

In general, AEC officials prefer ground launching while NASA's tend to favor orbital start. However, neither agency is unanimous.

Although discussions center on technical points, the argument is by no means purely technical. The AEC's Armstrong maintains stoutly that ground launching is the surest way to the first accomplishment of a feat that he says will command tremendous international prestige—the first nuclear-propelled flight in space. "I'd like to see the Stars and Stripes on this one," Armstrong told the Science and Astronautics Committee.

NASA's Finger contends that in the long run more prestige will come to the nation that accomplishes experiments more nearly related to the eventual scientific use of a nuclear rocket. "I think the first practical use of a nuclear rocket will be as an upper stage of the Nova vehicle," Finger said.

Armstrong, deputy chief of the AEC's Aircraft Nuclear Propulsion Office, has proposed the construction of the first flyable Rover by the mid-1960's. AEC calculations call for a bird weighing 40,000 pounds, with a rocket generating 52,000 pounds thrust at liftoff and continuing for more than 5 minutes. The device would carry a 1,000-pound scientific payload to an altitude of about 1,000 miles. Unprotected by a nose cone, the vehicle would be destroyed upon reentry into the atmosphere.

Finger said he believes the first nuclear rocket can be flown just as quickly if it is started from orbit. But even if the orbital flight plan should cause a delay of as much as a year, the NASA official said, he still would prefer it.

PROJECT REVIEW

Senator ANDERSON reviewed the history of Project Rover in a statement he issued at the close of the February 15 hearing. He reported that:

The project began in 1955 as an AEC-Air Force program, with a 1960 target date set for completion of the engine's feasibility ground tests. In 1957, Secretary of Defense Charles E. Wilson downgraded Rover's priority, reduced its projected funding level and stretched out the time schedule. The feasibility ground tests were rescheduled for 1963.

The AEC successfully conducted its first test of a reactor device for Rover last summer.

This winter, the program was stretched out again. At the instance of the Bureau of the Budget, President Eisenhower moved the feasibility test back to 1964. Funds requested by the AEC for the 1961 fiscal year were reduced by $12.8 million—about 31 percent. Mr. Eisenhower's 1961 budget called for $28.5 million for nuclear rocket propulsion—$23 million for the AEC and $5.5 million for NASA—which had taken over the original Air Force role of responsibility for developing nonnuclear components of the vehicle.

NASA announced at about the same time the broad outlines of a 10-year program of expected progress in rocketry. The program included no mention of a nuclear rocket. NASA spokesmen said it was not included because they did not feel sure an operational nuclear rocket could be developed within a decade. The first launching of the Nova booster—with its 6 to 9 million pounds of chemical thrust—was set for fiscal 1968 with two more the following year.

ANDERSON said before the hearing that he had believed Rover would be speeded as a result of last year's successful experiment. "But instead," he said, "we seem to be moving into a period of stretchout, indecision, and drift comparable to the aircraft nuclear propulsion project."

The Senator said the committee's examination would include the effect of security classifications.

"I have difficulty seeing how this project can be classified when the military have set no requirement for it and NASA does not even mention it in its 10-year program," he said.

Following the first hearing, committee sources said AEC officials defended the security classification on the ground that America still seems to be ahead of the Soviet Union in nuclear technology.

However, the Rover development schedule was declassified in part. ANDERSON reported that the Budget Bureau had increased its spending authorization for Rover in fiscal years 1961 and 1962 after an appeal by AEC Chairman McCone. However, no more money was allowed. The AEC had requested $20 million for construction in the 1961–62 fiscal years. The Budget Bureau cut this to $13 million. After the protest, the AEC was told that the other $7 million might be shifted to Rover by reprograming.

On March 8, ANDERSON made public a letter from John F. Floberg, acting AEC Chairman, disclosing that the Commission had reprogramed to add $8 million in construction funds and $3 million in operating money to Rover for fiscal 1961.

For the construction funds, $4.4 million was taken from Eniwetok Proving Ground construction, $1.9 million from the Tonopah Test Range in Nevada, and $1.7 million from additions to the electrical power system at the National Reactor Testing Station, Arco, Idaho. The operating funds were taken from the Euratom program.

At the Science and Astronautics Committee hearing February 26, NASA's Dryden and Finger testified they had supported the AEC's proposed schedule in a letter to the Budget Bureau. Afterward, Missiles and Rockets asked Finger whether NASA had supported AEC's request for the funds necessary to carry out the schedule.

"No," he replied. "We did not feel it was up to our agency to say whether the AEC budget should be $2.6 billion or $2.61 billion.

TRANSFER CONSIDERED

Senator ANDERSON has said the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy will consider whether Rover should be transferred entirely to the AEC.

"I frankly doubt that very effective administration of a project of this nature can be achieved through policy direction provided by an interagency coordinating committee," ANDERSON said in letters to McCone and NASA Administrator T. Keith Glennan. "I believe that one man and one staff should provide the overall project direction as has been done with the case of the nuclear submarine under Vice Adm. (Hyman G.) Rickover. * * *

"But the most important thing to get this project off the ground is that there must be a genuine sense of enthusiasm and urgency at the highest levels to give impetus to the project."

ANDERSON said he was heartened by the AEC's support of the project, "I only wish," he added, "that the rest of the executive branch, and particularly NASA and the Bureau of the Budget, would show a greater interest."

What is the mission of a nuclear rocket? The first point that must be made clear is that nuclear propulsion is justified primarily by its potential capability of delivering large payloads, of traveling long distances, or both.

Industry points out that if you think big in space travel, you must think in terms of nuclear propulsion. A nuclear reactor and its shielding make up a very large item, both of weight and cost. But as space vehicles grow larger, the time must come when the savings in propellant consumed will more than make up for the cost of the reactor system.

A nuclear reaction releases a tremendous amount of energy—millions of times as much as in the most furious chemical reaction. If we could convert all or even a large part of this energy to useful thrust, the nuclear rocket would provide specific impulses hundreds of thousands of times as great as for chemical systems.

One program in progress shows good promise of converting nuclear energy into useful thrust. Project Orion, conducted for the Advanced Research Projects Agency of the Defense Department by General Dynamics Corp., envisages a vehicle propelled by a series of low-yield nuclear explosions.

However, project Orion is in a very early study stage. No one has yet developed a plan for early construction of such a vehicle. Also, testing might run afoul of an international ban on nuclear bomb testing.

Project Rover, however, takes a more conventional approach. The rocket will carry a large tank of liquid hydrogen, which will be boiled to a gas, heated by passage through the bowels of a nuclear reactor and expanded through a nozzle. The nozzle will be regeneratively cooled by the liquid hydrogen.

The AEC calculations of the Rover nuclear rocket's specific impulse are classified. However, nuclear scientists have published assumptions in the 700–800 second range—compared with 300 seconds for the lox-kerosene combination in the Saturn and F–1 chemical rockets.

At a specific impulse 2½ times as great, it is obvious that much less propellant will be required for a specific mission with a nuclear rocket than with a chemical rocket. On the other hand, the nuclear reactor and its shielding will weigh more than the auxiliary hardware required by the chemical rocket.

Thus, for smaller tasks, the chemical rocket is more practical. But as we increase the size of the desired payload, the size of the fuel tanks, pumps, and other equipment increases in steady proportion. A three-stage vehicle based on the 6-million-pound thrust Nova cluster would stand as tall as a 24-story building. For fuel alone, the cost of launching 50 tons might run into the millions of dollars. For the many tests required to develop reliability in the vehicle, the cost is fantastic.

In the case of the nuclear rocket, however, the weight and cost of auxiliary equipment do not increase so rapidly. A reactor should not double in weight each time we double its output. As a matter of fact, if better materials can be developed, it may be possible to increase the output of a reactor with little or no increase in weight.

As we increase the total impulse of a nuclear rocket, we must increase the propellant supply. But since the specific impulse of a nuclear rocket is greater, the amount of propellant required rises more slowly than in a chemical rocket. Since the reactor weight remains relatively stable, the payload fraction of the nuclear rocket steadily increases as its size increases, while that of the chemical rocket remains stable.

TEN YEARS FOR CROSSOVER?

The specialists are far from agreement on when the crossover in favor of nuclear propulsion is likely to take place. It is certainly a decade away. And it depends on such imponderables as how fast the overall space program will actually progress in the 1960's.

The first truly economic nuclear-propelled vessel might be a spaceship to carry a fairly sizable crew of explorers to the Moon. Or a smaller group to Mars or Venus.

Meanwhile, however, smaller vehicles must be built to test the concept in operation. The first will obviously be based on Kiwi-A, the nonflying prototype engine tested successfully last July 1.

This is the nub of the flight-test dispute: A series of ground tests, including the second scheduled for next summer, is to be completed by 1963.

Next comes the construction of a flyable rocket in a time not specified but apparently about 2 years. Armstrong would launch from Eniwetok, a Pacific island where the AEC has extensive facilities for nuclear bomb testing.

Finger notes that the projected development timetable for Project Saturn, the space vehicle based on the eight-engine cluster with 1½ million pounds of thrust now under development at the new NASA facility at Redstone Arsenal, Ala.

By 1965, Finger points out, the booster should have developed a high degree of reliability and the powerful liquid hydrogen-burning upper stages should be available to propel the heavy nuclear rocket into orbit.

The NASA official feels the rocket should be started in space, after its orbit has been stabilized. The primary reason, Finger said, is that such a test is closest to the actual early mission of a nuclear rocket.

SAFETY

A second reason is the question of safety. "We take a cold reactor in orbit," the NASA official declared. "If it fires, it goes farther out. If it doesn't, it is still cold and relatively harmless."

Finger said the hazard of possible atmospheric contamination is a factor weighing against a ground launching, although not a primary one.

All the specialists agreed that the amount of atmospheric contamination caused by a Rover launching would be a tiny fraction of the contamination caused by a small nuclear bomb.

The primary question, Finger declared, is to design an experiment that will provide a maximum amount of information, and speed development to the maximum. "Let's try to design a program so that we can do a useful mission with it the first time," he said.

Armstrong maintained that a start from orbit is the most difficult way he knows to test a reactor device. It must be operated completely by remote control. Furthermore, the low level of knowledge about conditions in space makes it impossible to anticipate all the conditions that exist in orbit.

Nevertheless, Armstrong said, there are some reactors that should only be started from orbit—for instance, a SNAP II reactor, designed to provide auxiliary power in a space vehicle. "To all intents and purposes, this is an inanimate object at launching," he remarked. "We want to have the orbit stabilized and determined to be correct before we start the reactor."

Armstrong argued that the major consideration is the prestige value of sending the first nuclear-propelled vehicle into space. It isn't just a stunt, he said, because the first flight would be a small model of the ultimate primary mission of nuclear propulsion. It will have all the major components of a space ship—reactor, shielding, hydrogen tank and payload—and will lift from the ground in the same way.

SHIELDING

Since shielding on the first flight must be kept to a minimum, he said, equipment in the scientific payload would have to use tubes instead of transistors. Also on the subject of shielding, he noted that some would be necessary in any case to protect against Van Allen radiation. Not much more is needed to shield against the reactor, he added.

To help settle the issue, NASA plans to have a study of all aspects of the problem made by an industrial contractor. Finger said he hopes to circulate bids on the study within a month or two. The contract would be awarded about a month afterward, and the study would take from 6 to 9 months.

The contractor will seek to learn what type of test program will provide the most meaningful results in terms of development of the rocket. "The study may not provide us with the answers," Finger said, "but it

will give technical information on which it will be possible to base judgments."

He said the cost of the study would be paid with fiscal year 1960 funds. He declined to estimate how much would be involved.

Shielding is of course but one of a host of technical problems that must be solved in designing a nuclear-propelled vehicle. Actually, it may be one of the easiest. Everyone's design of a nuclear-propelled vehicle calls for reactor and rocket in the rear, a large liquid hydrogen tank in the middle and payload in the nose.

Since the vehicle is long and narrow, the distance between reactor and payload tends to reduce the intensity of the radiation. In addition, the hydrogen tank and its contents act as a very effective shadow shield.

In the reactor itself, the problems are not so easily solved. First and foremost is a need to develop a reactor that operates at a much higher temperature than usual. The temperature of a reactor varies according to its application and its specific design characteristics. A typical temperature for a power reactor on the ground might be in the neighborhood of 1200° F. To develop specific impulses in the range of 700–800 seconds, using hydrogen as the propellant, the temperature must be brought up to the range of 2700°–4500° F.

However, even if the temperature cannot be brought quite that high, there is still a performance gain over chemical systems. Dr. Raemer E. Schreiber, who heads the scientific group working on Rover at the AEC's Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory, has calculated that hydrogen propellant has a specific impulse of 400 seconds—the top figure for a chemical reaction—with a nuclear reactor operating at only 660° F.

Specific impulse increases with the square root of the absolute temperature of the exit gas. Thus the performance increases with temperature. Specific impulse also increases in inverse proportion to the average molecular weight of the exit gas. This is why hydrogen, the lightest element, must be chosen as the propellant.

At a specific impulse of 800 seconds, Schreiber said in an article in the fall-winter edition of the Air University Quarterly Review, about 20 kilowatts are required to produce a pound of thrust. Thus, he said, a 50,000-pound thrust engine requires about 1,000 megawatts of power. In his testimony before the House committee, Armstrong said the latest AEC calculations called for an engine with 52,000 pounds thrust for the first test.

The biggest reactors in existence on the ground put out less than 1,000 megawatts. The largest in this country, the Dresden Nuclear Power Station, started up at Morris, Ill., last year by Commonwealth Edison Co., will have a maximum output of 626 thermal megawatts. The reactor for the nuclear ship *Savannah*, to be started this year, will put out 69 thermal kilowatts. Nuclear submarine reactors have about the same capacity.

A nuclear rocket big enough to lift a 750-ton spaceship must develop upward of 2 million pounds of thrust. Hence, it requires a reactor that generates about 40,000 megawatts, more than 40 times as much as the most powerful reactor in existence today. This gives an idea of the advances in technology necessary before the nuclear spaceship can be flown. It makes clear why the most optimistic estimates of the timetable are in excess of 10 years.

THIRD POSSIBILITY

In addition to ground-launch and orbital stage, there is a third possible method of testing a nuclear rocket: as an upper stage, started on the ground but not put in operation until the chemical stage burns out.

Finger says there is no consideration of a test of this sort at first because the first nuclear rocket developed would not be of a size that would be easy to mate with an existing chemical booster.

However, some in industry have been suggesting combinations. There is some talk, for instance, about the possibility of using a Titan first stage to lift the nuclear stage above the atmosphere.

In flight-testing such a device, a trajectory would be chosen such that, if the nuclear rocket failed, it would just fall into the ocean. This would be a relatively harmless inventory of U^{235} in a noncritical configuration.

If it should fail on leaving the atmosphere, it would probably burn up on reentry. Thus the absence of a suitable nose cone is protection for those below.

As for the inbetween case, where the reactor starts too slowly and stops within the atmosphere, the amount of fission produced would be small. This is because the amount of fission products varies with the power level and time at which the reactor operates.

HYBRID NUCLEAR

Krafft A. Ehricke, of General Dynamics' Convair Division, has been pluming for an interesting hybrid nuclear-chemical engine that may combine the advantages of the nuclear booster and the nuclear upper stage lifted by a chemical booster.

Ehricke's design calls for two liquid hydrogen-lox booster engines that would give the overall system initial velocity, fed by a relatively small ringshaped lox tank. When the lox runs out, at an altitude of 120,000 to 140,000 feet, the booster would fall off, just as the Atlas booster engines. Then the hydrogen flow would be directed through the reactor for the remainder of the mission.

At last month's National Missile/Space Conference in Washington, Ehricke declared that a choice must be made soon between chemical and nuclear propulsion for the generation of booster rockets after Saturn.

Ehricke said a decision should be made this year on whether to push Project Rover or Rocketdyne's 1½-megapound F–1, which is designed to be clustered into a booster generating between 6 and 9 megapounds thrust. The development schedules for the F–1 and Rover make them closely competitive. However, the F–1 is funded for $41 million in President Eisenhower's 1961 budget, almost double the $23 million in the AEC budget for Rover.

The overall total for chemical rocket development by NASA alone is $390 million, more than 13 times as much as the AEC–NASA total for nuclear rocket propulsion.

ROVER SCHEDULE

What is the Rover test schedule? "This is not a crash program," says Armstrong. "It is moderately paced by the degree of success. Between experiments, there is construction to do."

Armstrong says the first experiment last summer, which was designated "Kiwi-A," "proved to us we were on the right track."

Another test is scheduled for the coming summer. It will be designated "Kiwi-A Prime." "We shall probably ask many of the same questions," Finger said. "Many more reactor tests will be required, to supply much necessary data," the NASA official declared. "We are hoping to move rapidly. We need money, but that is not all."

If the program were to be speeded, Finger said, there would be the problem of running several test reactors concurrently. Also, since a test releases some long-lived fission products, it is necessary to wait until the site cools before approaching it.

MATERIALS PROBLEM

Developing a high-temperature reactor, Finger declared, is largely a materials problem. "We are looking at the whole range of high-temperature materials, asking such questions as whether they are compatible with uranium compounds; will they corrode more readily under intense radiation; do they react with hydrogen at high temperature; and what are their structural and other physical properties, such as neutron cross section, when combined with uranium?"

Another major materials problem, he said, is the effect of radiation on the properties of materials at cryogenic temperatures. Liquid hydrogen, the only propellant under consideration, boils at −423° F. NASA has contracted with the Georgia Division of Lockheed Aircraft Corp. for a major research project.

"It may be possible to protect materials, such as with shielding," Finger remarked. "However, if these material tests prove negative, we may conclude that the Rover rocket is simply not feasible."

AEC's Armstrong has this view of feasibility:

"To establish the feasibility of a nuclear rocket reactor, one must in effect build a prototype. All experiments prior to that are useful and necessary tools.

"Theoretically, you could prove the feasibility of any nuclear device without regard to the end requirements as it pertains to the engineering requirements such as light weight, compactness, etc. However, you might end up with something that couldn't be built. Naturally, we do not proceed in this manner. In demonstrating feasibility, we always keep the end objective and the engineering requirements in mind."

The AEC official declined to estimate how many experiments might be required to demonstrate the feasibility. "I have tried to avoid any such indication," he said.

The time between experiments is no sure indication of the pace of the program, Armstrong continued. "If we ran two experiments in one summer, it might not be as much of an increase in pace as if we stopped one line of experimentation and built new facilities to begin another—resulting in a long period in between."

At this week's hearing, the Atomic Energy Committee will try to determine how much increase in pace is possible. James T. Ramey, the committee's executive director, has asked Dr. T. Keith Glennan, NASA Administrator, and Gen. A. R. Luedecke, AEC General Manager, to comment on this outline of suggestions by the committee:

Immediate establishment of performance specifications for the engine for flight test.

A schedule calling for ground launching at the earliest possible date.

Complete responsibility for development assigned to the AEC through the flight test phase—with the proviso that NASA will provide consultation and assistance.

"We want to be assured that, looking to the future, the Rover program is receiving the proper emphasis," Senator ANDERSON declared.

ESTABLISHMENT OF JOINT AEC–NASA NUCLEAR PROPULSION OFFICE

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a news release relating to the establishment of a joint AEC–NASA Nuclear Propulsion Office.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOINT AEC–NASA NUCLEAR PROPULSION OFFICE ESTABLISHED

John A. McCone, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, and Dr. T. Keith Glennan, Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, today

announced the establishment of a joint AEC–NASA Nuclear Propulsion Office (NPO). The new office will consolidate the work which has been carried out by organizations in each agency to develop nuclear energy for space missions.

Harold B. Finger, Chief of Nuclear Propulsion for NASA, was named Manager of the joint office. The Deputy Manager will be Milton Klein who has been Assistant Manager for technical operations of the AEC's Chicago Operations Office.

The new Office will be staffed by employees drawn from both the AEC and NASA. It will be located at the AEC headquarters at Germantown, Md.

The NPO will integrate the project Rover nuclear powered rocket developmental programs which had been carried out previously by the AEC through its National Reactors Branch of the Division of Reactor Development and the nuclear propulsion organization in NASA's Office of Launch Vehicles.

In accordance with the statutory responsibility of both agencies, the AEC will have primary responsibility in this program for the development of all reactors and their components, including those for flight missions specified by the NASA; NASA will have primary responsibility for research and development of non-nuclear components and integration of the nuclear components in engines and vehicles of rocket systems.

The Rover program was initiated in 1955 by the AEC and the Air Force. When NASA was established in 1958, Air Force responsibility in this program was transferred to NASA.

Development of the reactor system is being carried out by the Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory, operated for the Commission by the University of California. Tests of two reactors, Kiwi-A and Kiwi-A Prime, have been conducted at the AEC's Nevada test site in July of 1959 and July of 1960. A third reactor, Kiwi-A 3, is scheduled to be tested later this year.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 1663. An act directing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain property in the State of North Dakota to the city of Bismarck, N. Dak.; and

S. 3399. An act to authorize the exchange of certain property within Shenandoah National Park, in the State of Virginia, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H.R. 383. An act to authorize the annexation of certain real property of the United States by the city of Wyandotte, Mich.; and

H.R. 12759. An act to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10548) to amend the Helium Act of September 1, 1937, as amended, for the defense, security, and the general welfare of the United States.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2565) to promote effectual planning, development, maintenance, and coordination of wildlife, fish, and game conservation and rehabilitation in military reservations.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 12622) to amend chapter 85 of title 28 of the United States Code relating to the jurisdiction of the United States district courts, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

THE EISENHOWER ERA MADE POSSIBLE THE MUCH GREATER ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE PEOPLE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in a recent issue of Life appeared an editorial under the caption, "The Eisenhower Era Made Possible the Much Greater Achievements of the People."

The sentiment expressed in this editorial is worthy of wide currency, and it merits a place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. So I submit it with the request that it be included as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE EISENHOWER ERA MADE POSSIBLE THE MUCH GREATER ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE PEOPLE

In Chicago, where he won it from Bob Taft in the acrid battle of 1952, Dwight D. Eisenhower this week surrenders the leadership of the Republican Party. The record of his administration may be only one major campaign issue, since both NIXON and KENNEDY are bound to emphasize new goals and policies for a new age. But Eisenhower's record is well worth inspection.

Of the many flaws the Democrats will find in it, historians will probably agree at least on one. There is some substance to the charge that Ike has rather reigned than ruled. He has tended to assume, as you can in the Army but not in the White House, that an order once given is self-executing; a certain lack of follow-through has marred some of his best intentions, notably the rejuvenation of the Republican Party. He has been an easy boss. But that is not to echo the commoner (and mistaken) charge that he does not make decisions. Ike has made plenty of decisions. And most of them were right.

The duty he saw in taking office was to heal the wounds of 20 years of highly partisan government and chronic emergency. It was his genius to give the latent unity and good will of the American people a chance to recover and grow. He has been the least "divisive" of modern Presidents—and the most widely beloved.

Reinhold Niebuhr, no conservative, said Ike "rebuilt American conservatism into a viable political instrument." He gave a suspicious generation the reassuring experience of living safely and prosperously under a Republican government again—salutary for the people and for the Republican Party too.

Such a government had to do more correcting than innovating. In our foreign alliances, Ike's long suit, he has preserved and developed previous lines of U.S. policy, but to them he has made two contributions of enormous importance.

The first was to modernize and strengthen our military posture and bring it into the missile era on a "long-pull" basis—i.e., no more crash emergency programs or budgetary zigs and zags. Though there is room for marginal argument, the essential truth is that when Ike leaves office America will still be, as he found it, the strongest military power in the world.

President Eisenhower's second contribution was to rob the Communists of their most insidious propaganda weapon, Khrushchev's pretended guardianship of world peace. Ike personally shot down that phony Picasso peace dove. He did it by his personal dedication to peace, by his atoms-for-peace offer to the U.N., by his dramatic open-skies proposal at Geneva in 1955, by stopping the Suez war, by his serious pursuit of disarmament and by his good-will travels. He has made the cause of peace so much his own that Jim Farley, only the other day, could accuse him of "peace-at-any-price" leadership. That charge won't wash. Ike has twice faced down Communist threats of war in the Formosa Strait. He has not flinched under Russian pressure on Berlin. He took bold action in the Middle East. He has kept the peace without surrendering any point of strength. The Russian empire is no larger than it was in 1952 (in fact smaller by eastern Austria). The Chinese Empire, though larger by North Vietnam and Tibet, is surrounded by stronger and more alert free neighbors than it was before Ike and John Foster Dulles took charge.

Ike used to be called a lucky President. His luck has run out lately at Sverdlovsk, Paris, and Tokyo. But let not these setbacks be confused with flaws in the solid structure of allied political, military, and economic strength built in the Eisenhower era.

The economic performance has been especially spectacular. Abroad, the Eisenhower policies have encouraged a rebirth of private trade and investment that has lifted the whole Western World and parts of Asia to amazing levels of prosperity. Europe has never been in healthier shape. We still need a new approach to the underdeveloped Southern Hemisphere, but even Latin America has improved politically, if not economically, in Ike's time.

At home the case is open and shut. The Eisenhower economic policy has been virtually a textbook model of how to befriend and stimulate a free market system. He and his aids have handled two recessions with precise skill. Real wages and consumption have risen steadily, and profits and savings have remained healthy. He has led a tireless war on excessive Government spending which has at last brought inflation under control. The $1.1 billion surplus announced last week is a symbol of this victory for a sound dollar.

Ike's government has helped finance the building industry while it set an alltime record of 8 million new homes in less than 8 years. It has launched a whole new highway system, 23 space satellites and 20 atomic submarines. It has expanded the Union by two new States and created seaports on the Great Lakes.

Ike's government has maintained, not without difficulty, a high standard of integrity in Federal officeholders. His Cabinet has seen some stellar performers (Dulles, Brownell, Rogers, Anderson, Mitchell, et al.) and even the unfortunate Benson deserves respect for his persistent attack on Congress' scandalous farm policy.

Ike's government has appointed more scores of good judges than any previous one. This great improvement in the judiciary, essential to the Nation, is the kind of achievement to which voters and political writers give too little heed.

Ike's government has shifted the rate of Negro political and economic progress into high gear.

But all these achievements are only part of the great story of progress in the Eisenhower era. In a Nation with a constitutional Government, where freedom to act is left to individuals and unofficial groups, a full evaluation must include credit or blame for how the Nation as a whole behaves. The

greatest deeds of his era are what the people, responsive to their renewed liberty, have done for and by themselves.

Democrats charge that Ike's preoccupation with the budget has "starved" our public services. Yet total public spending—Federal, State and local—is nearly twice what it was in Truman's time and most of the increase has been in welfare (nondefense) services. Of our school system, so rightly under scrutiny, an impressive fact is how it has grown in teachers, classrooms and students, with little Federal aid. But even more important: scholastic standards have risen sharply.

Not Federal but private and local spending have changed our urban skylines these last 8 years; and distributed more books and music than ever; and produced more goods and services of every kind. The Federal Government did not develop automation, nor discover the Salk vaccine, nor make American architecture a new wonder of the world; nor cause more Americans to travel abroad than ever before; nor double the annual gifts to higher education; nor raise our birth rate to a record height. The American people did all these—and more. They did them under the benign and permissive Eisenhower sun.

A certain dissatisfaction has crept into the last months of the Eisenhower era—the anti-tailfin syndrome, the puritan nostalgia, the hunger for new national purpose. And that is healthy, for it shows that Americans have not been entirely corrupted by their own success. But let's face it: it is success, not failure, that causes our unease. Ike leaves us reunited, rested, self-enriched and newly appreciative of our liberty. As a people we are (or should be) firmly prepared for our next testing. The Kennedy or Nixon era will be different. It may be grim or it may be great. It can scarcely be more sunny or fruitful than these Eisenhower years, in which so many age-old visions of the good life first became real.

A SOUND DOLLAR IS ESSENTIAL FOR THE REPUBLICAN AND NATIONAL GROWTH PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in a recent issue of Life there appeared an editorial on the subject of "A Sound Dollar Is Essential for the Republican and National Growth Program." This editorial is so timely that I believe it merits wide diffusion among readers everywhere, and for that reason I ask unanimous consent that it be included as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A SOUND DOLLAR IS ESSENTIAL FOR THE REPUBLICAN AND NATIONAL GROWTH PROGRAM

The 1960 conventions have launched a campaign in which foreign policy will evidently be the overriding issue. Senator KENNEDY made the choice with his bold decision to attack Eisenhower's diplomatic record. Candidate NIXON attempted to mousetrap him by making it an even bigger issue. Picking Lodge for his running mate to emphasize the point, he met KENNEDY's "new frontiers" by envisioning a whole new world to be brought about by the political defeat of communism. NIXON proposes "a grand new strategy which will win the battle for freedom for all men and women without a war." He tells Khrushchev that "his grandchildren will live in freedom." He promises a complete reorganization of all relevant Government activities "into one powerful economic and ideological striking force" to go on the offensive.

In the oversimple terms of the political columnists, NIXON is running against Khrushchev, KENNEDY against Eisenhower. If that were all, NIXON should win. But precisely because foreign issues are paramount, and because a national decision to take the offensive against communism is so serious, one should defer judgment on this issue until the campaign has thrown more light on the real party difference. Senator KENNEDY may convince us that he can handle the Communist menace more surely than NIXON. So let's listen.

On another issue, however, the difference between the two parties has been rather conclusively established already. They take two distinct attitudes on the American economic system, how it works and what the Government should do about it. The Democrats, on the balance of the evidence, want to change our system; the Republicans want to encourage and develop it. The Democrats want to change it by putting more and more of it under Government control. The Republicans want to encourage it by maintaining confidence in the dollar and by stimulating private activity.

"I serve notice here and now that, whatever the political consequences, we are not going to try to outpromise our opponents * * * we are not going to try to buy the people's votes with their own money," said NIXON last week. Even if he wanted to try, the Democrats' utopian platform leaves him little or no room for it. The Republicans can only hope that their promises, because fewer than those of the Democrats, will be considered more realistic. And the Republicans emphasize one promise that should appeal to every voter who understands the real relation between his personal interest and the Nation's. This promise is fiscal responsibility, which means a sound and stable dollar.

Millions of voters will doubtless think this a stuffy and tedious issue; and there are also many who, having learned to profit from it, actively favor inflation. All those in favor of inflation should vote for KENNEDY. Not that he openly espouses inflation—but his record and his platform place on him the burden of proving that, as President of the United States, he will be a champion of fiscal responsibility. Perhaps his campaign will prove this; we hope so, for the issue is very serious. So far, the Republicans have the best of it.

Both platforms and candidates are dissatisfied with the recent "growth rate" of the U.S. economy—i.e., the annual increase (now around 3 percent) in the total output of all goods and services, from B–70's to shoeshines. The Democrats want to set a new national target of 5 percent growth a year; the Republicans refuse to pick a number but want to "quicken the pace." NIXON says the difference is not over ends but means. Certainly all Republicans including Nelson Rockefeller, who also wanted to set a 5 percent or 6 percent target, reject the means of "massive government spending, creeping inflation and far-reaching government controls"—the means that are implied in the Democratic platform.

The Democrats claim that a 5 percent growth rate will produce an extra $10 billion of Federal revenues a year and so permit balanced budgets without higher taxes, at least for the time being. But the Democratic promises, if fully enacted, would cost a lot more than $10 billion a year. Moreover, they specifically promise cheaper money and looser credit policies than the Republicans; and this, combined with their expansive attitude toward the Federal budget, is bound to make inflation a cancerous danger again—not only to Americans at home but to America's economic position in the world. As though recognizing the danger they would create, the Democrats in their platform hint at the restoration of price controls (which means ration books and/or black markets).

The Republicans, by contrast, consider a stable dollar indispensable to their growth program. That program emphasizes not bigger Federal spending but tax reform (a particular NIXON hobby), an attack on "featherbedding practices by labor and business" and other steps to encourage private "initiative and investment, productivity, and efficiency."

The Republicans' concern for a sound economy must be respected by anyone who knows anything about the world economic situation. After years of foreign aid, the dollar is no longer the world's hardest currency. If the dollar is to keep enough strength to support a strong U.S. foreign policy, then U.S. exports—and U.S. costs—must remain competitive. The Republican platform recognizes this problem. The Democrats virtually ignore it and their inflationary program would make it worse. Even if price controls could be foisted on the American public they are useless in foreign markets.

The Republican case is that the natural expansion of a stable dollar economy benefits more people than a feverish, artificial, inflationary expansion. There are two reasons for thinking so. First, the Republican formula works; it has obviously been working well these last 7 years, with personal incomes up, taxes lower and inflation under control. Nor was this a mere laissez faire achievement; it took a lot of doing. Not the least impressive part was the remarkable recovery from the whopping $12 billion Federal budget deficit of 1959—which helped end a recession but also caused a serious drain on our gold—to the $1 billion surplus just recorded for 1960. President Eisenhower and his aides, notably Secretary Anderson, fought hard for that achievement against what could have been—and under a Democratic President probably would have been—a spendthrift Congress.

Apart from the fact that it works, Republicans have another reason for their insistence on fiscal integrity and a free economic system. This is the only system compatible with the American belief in personal freedom under a strong but limited government. Said Republican Keynoter WALTER JUDD:

"Republicans believe that that government is best, not which does most for its citizens directly, but which makes it possible for most citizens to do most for themselves. * * * I can work my girl's arithmetic problem better for her than she can work it for herself. * * * And she would like to have me do it for her. But I don't do it. Not because I don't love her or want her to succeed—but because I do."

The idea of limited government was once the core of the Democrats' philosophy, which they abandoned after 1933. They thought it had been forever discredited by a series of governments that tried to do too little. It wasn't. Neither party today, as the Eisenhower record and the Republican platform both testify, will try to do too little. The Democrats promise to do too much. It is fortunate for the cause of freedom that the Republicans still recognize the eternal importance of limits.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the majority leader for a moment. We are about to return to the debate on the District of Columbia Compact Commission proposal which we were discussing some hours ago. At the time when we laid it aside, I was about to finish the argument I was making in support of my amendment.

I shall shortly return to it; but I should like to know the plans of the majority leader—whether it is in contemplation that we shall take a recess to a later time this day; or whether it is the

plan, insofar as the Senate is concerned, to adjourn sine die.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I had hoped that we would have adopted the sine die adjournment resolution before now.

We do have some nominations and some resolutions from the Committee on Rules and Administration, on which we wish to act; and we hope to pass on the compact.

If we are going to become involved in any extended debate, I would hope we would be able to consider the sine die resolution, and then take a recess until 12 o'clock.

Mr. MORSE. Then I shall proceed to make a summary argument in regard to the compact and my reasons for opposing it in its present form.

REGULATION OF MASS TRANSIT IN THE WASHINGTON, D.C., METROPOLITAN AREA

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 402) granting the consent of Congress for the States of Virginia and Maryland and the District of Columbia to enter into a compact related to the regulation of mass transit in the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area, and for other purposes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] that, as he well knows, I was one of the cosponsors, with him, of the original resolution for a compact; and I am still a stanch believer that a compact commission should be created.

However, after examination of the evidence, I reached the conclusion that the resolution as originally introduced—and I reached this conclusion as one of the authors of the original proposal—was in need of modification along the lines of the amendment I have offered, which is pending.

I shall now quickly summarize my position on it. I had been reading the argument which was presented in the testimony by Mr. Chalk, the president of the District of Columbia transit system. I shall not complete the reading of that argument; but I now ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the entire argument of Mr. Chalk be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of the remarks I shall now make.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to say that we need to keep in mind the fact that Mr. Chalk is president of the District transit system. He has a tremendous investment in that system. I think he is deserving of fair treatment, not discriminatory treatment, by the Congress. I think he is deserving of not being put in a position where the organization of the commission itself could conceivably work against his fair interest, and that is why I have offered the amendment.

I have not offered the amendment which Mr. Chalk sought. The amendment he sought was that the District of Columbia Commissioners be three in number, and that Virginia and Maryland have one commissioner, each. But I think that would be unfair to Maryland and to Virginia.

But likewise, I say most respectfully, I think the compact in its present form is grossly unfair to the District transit company, grossly unfair to the riding public in the District of Columbia, and grossly unfair to the District of Columbia as a whole.

I want the Senate to keep in mind what some of the lurking dangers of this unbalanced commission are, so far as its representation is concerned. I want to point out, as I said earlier this evening, that 80 percent of the riders who are involved in the metropolitan transit system, including Maryland, Virginia, and the District of Columbia, are District of Columbia riders. Therefore, I think we have a duty to see to it that we provide in the compact a procedure which will insure fairness in the protection of the District of Columbia transit interests, along with those of Virginia and Maryland.

My amendment proposes that the District of Columbia have two members of the commission, Maryland have one, and Virginia have one.

What will that kind of representation require? It will require that the commission really will, in most controversial issues, have to get together to work out a compromise settlement.

The real fear of Chalk and others who take his position is that what can happen under this representation system, as it has been brought to the Senate by the committee, is that Maryland and Virginia can gang up on the Chalk interests and proceed, by concert of action, to adopt commission policies which would be to the great detriment and disadvantage of the Chalk interests, the District of Columbia transit riders, who are about 80 percent of the total riding population of the metropolitan Washington area, and, in the long run, to the disadvantage of the District of Columbia itself.

I point out that there is a strong point in the argument Mr. Chalk makes in his testimony.

By the way, the attorney for the District of Columbia Transit Co. has submitted a legal brief on the legal objections of the company to the compact in its present form; and I ask unanimous consent that the brief be published in the RECORD, together with the testimony of Mr. Chalk, which I have already obtained consent to have introduced in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. Yes, I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I wonder if the Senator will be agreeable, in view of the fact that the House has gone out, and it looks as if we are going to be unable to conclude our work now, to an understanding that we resume consideration of this matter in the morning.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I thought I had an assurance from the distinguished Senator from Oregon that in 5 minutes he could summarize his speech and we could vote.

Mr. MORSE. Let me say I tried to cooperate, but if the Senator wants to get tough, he will never get the bill passed. I said I was going to try to finish this as quickly as I can, and I will if I am permitted to; but if the Senator wants to raise the issue, I have support to block passage. I do not intend to take any comment from anybody on the floor of the Senate as to how long I am going to talk. I will talk just as long as I desire. I intend to finish, and it is not going to take very long. I hope the Senator will listen to the logic of my argument, because otherwise we are going to do a great injustice to the District of Columbia transit system, and we are going to raise problems which will plague us in the next few years before the District of Columbia Committee, of which I am a member.

I am trying to avoid that and I am trying to give a warning now that if the Senate wants to adopt a very reasonable amendment which will protect Maryland, Virginia, and the District of Columbia, it will adopt the Morse amendment.

If the Senate does not wish to adopt my amendment, it can defeat it, because I have no intention—and I told the Senator from Virginia that I had no intention—and I do not appreciate the innuendo of his comment—of blocking the passage of the bill; and I have not done so. I am, however, going to finish my argument. I have been very patient and very cooperative in this matter; and now I am not going to yield to anybody. I am going to finish my argument. Senators can all go home. I will not yield to any Senator.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President——

Mr. MORSE. I do not yield to anybody.

I think there is great merit in the argument of Mr. Chalk, president of the D.C. Transit System. I may point out that article 4 of the compact provides that the expenses of the Commission shall be borne by the signatories in the proportion that the population of each signatory within the metropolitan district bears to the total population in the metropolitan district.

Take a look at that argument. What is proposed is to have a commission of three, one from Virginia, one from Maryland, and one from the District of Columbia; but the expenses of the commission are going to have to be paid on the basis of the proportion that the population of each signatory within the metropolitan district bears to the total population in the metropolitan district.

What does that mean? That means the District of Columbia is going to have to pay out of all proportion the expenses of the commission as compared with Maryland and Virginia.

It means that the two commissioners, one from Maryland and one from Virginia, have a majority vote, and can proceed to run up the expenses of the

commission. Under article 4, the District of Columbia would have to pay out of all proportion, because the large majority of the population falls to the District of Columbia.

Do not forget also, Mr. President, that we are dealing here with transit riders within the District; and most of the riders from Maryland and Virginia in the metropolitan area use private cars. The mass transportation riders are, by a large percentage, within the District of Columbia. This is another example of the discriminatory features of the compact that is being offered by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART].

What does the Senator from Oregon propose to do? He proposes only that the representation of the District of Columbia be increased by one, to give the District of Columbia two members of the commission, and to give Virginia and Maryland one each. In that way the 80 percent proportion that the District of Columbia has in the whole picture will be protected.

I think that is fair. I think that is equitable. It is the burden of my argument. It is the thesis I have been leading up to. And if Senators will give me the time to finish the thesis—and I am about through—I am making a plea for fairness and equity for the District of Columbia. I make it as a member of the District of Columbia Committee, on which I served for many years.

I can see now arising problems which will flow from the compact if the Senate adopts it in this form without the Morse amendment.

The argument of the Senator from Virginia and others is that if the amendment of the Senator from Oregon is adopted, the matter will have to go back to the Legislatures of Virginia and Maryland, and the Legislature of Maryland does not meet until 1962. That is too bad, but it is no argument in support of the claim that we ought to pass a discriminatory bill that one of the States may not have a new legislative session until 1962.

The two legislatures adopted this compact in the first instance. They were perfectly willing to adopt a compact which I believe to be discriminatory in its features in the first instance. I wish to say, in fairness to the area, the legislatures ought to be willing to have a short session, if they think it is important to act before 1962, to get the proposal corrected on the basis of the amendment I have offered.

That is my case, Mr. President. I submit my amendment.

EXHIBIT 1

STATEMENT OF O. ROY CHALK, PRESIDENT, D.C. TRANSIT SYSTEM, INC.; ACCOMPANIED BY HARVEY SPEER, COUNSEL

Mr. CHALK. Good morning, Mr. Chairman. My attitude is definitely adverse.

Senator HART. That I know.

Mr. CHALK. I would like to express my appreciation for the opportunity of appearing before this subcommittee and expressing the views of the D.C. Transit System. May I be permitted—I believe we have gone into quite a bit of detail to present our views in this matter, and I think they are all so important and there are so many complicating factors that to rush through them, I think, would be unfair to the bill. I know that you will read this, I am sure of that, but I think that I can go through it rather hurriedly.

Senator HART. We would welcome your going through it without hurry.

I have indicated that when this committee must recess, as we must, for the executive meeting of the full committee, I know that we shall not have finished—surely we shall not have finished with all of the other witnesses. Therefore, those who will not be heard, and who would like to make their statement on the record, we shall make an effort to resume the hearing this afternoon. Failing that, we shall try to hear the remainder of the testimony at the very earliest possible time next week.

Mr. CHALK. With your permission, sir, in considering House Joint Resolution 402, Congress has two separate duties to discharge. First, under the Constitution, Congress must approve all compacts between the States. The issues involved under this constitutional mandate are usually discharged without much controversy. But where, as here, the interests of the District of Columbia are involved in the compact, Congress has an additional responsibility. In such cases, Congress must pass upon the substantive effects which the compact will have upon the internal affairs of the District. In this latter case, we submit that the subject matter of the compact should be studied not only by this subcommittee, but also by the District Committees which are familiar with all the transportation problems affecting the District of Columbia. Until all of those interrelated problems are considered, Congress should not take action on a bill as important and controversial as House Joint Resolution 402. In this connection, this subcommittee may wish to note that as far back as records are available to us, we find that all compacts affecting the interests of the District of Columbia have gone not to the Judiciary Committees but to the substantive committees concerned with the subject matter of the compacts.

Before discussing the specific objections which we haye to the bill before this subcommittee today, I would like to review in a few minutes that portion of the background and history of House Joint Resolution 402 which is particularly pertinent to today's hearings.

The bill before this subcommittee today has been widely described as the first step of a three-stage overall transportation plan for the so-called National Capital region. This transportation plan originally contemplated three separate stages. The first stage contemplated the enactment and approval by Congress of a compact creating a tristate regulatory commission consisting of one representative of each of the States of Virginia and Maryland and the District of Columbia, to exercise complete regulatory jurisdiction over mass transportation in the Washington metropolitan area. The Compact Commission contemplated by the first step is the very same Commission which is the subject of the bill before this subcommittee today (H.J. Res. 402). Under the overall transportation plan, this Compact Commission was contemplated only as a temporary Commission. Later in my testimony, I will describe in greater detail the problems created by the fact that the proposed Compact Commission is intended to be only temporary. I will also point out why the proposed Commission is no longer necessary or desirable in view of the recent developments relating to the second and third steps in the three-stage series.

The second stage of the transportation plan originally contemplated the creation of a Federal agency which would be empowered to acquire and develop certain transportation facilities deemed necessary to the accomplishment of the objectives of the overall transportation plan. Under the original transportation plan, this agency was also to be only a temporary agency.

The legislation embodying the second step (S. 3193 and H.R. 11135) has already been approved and reported out favorably by both the Senate District Committee (on June 23, 1960) and the House District Committee (on June 23, 1960) and is now pending on the calendars of both Chambers. Later in my testimony, I will describe at length how the bills now pending before both Chambers have bypassed the Compact Commission of House Joint Resolution 402 and how they have rendered House Joint Resolution 402 obsolete and undesirable.

The third and final stage of the overall transportation plan contemplated the enactment of either a Federal corporation or a tristate proprietary agency to take over as successor to both of the prior two stages, with the added power and authority not only to regulate all transportation in the area but also to build, own, and operate substantially all of the mass transportation facilities in the National Capital region. This third and final stage is also embodied in and has become an important part of S. 3193 and H.R. 11135 which are now pending on the calendars of the Senate and House.

The overall transportation plan has been the subject of 5 years of study and research for which the Congress has already appropriated and expended in excess of $500,000. Since this study first began, the overall transportation plan has been the subject of extensive hearings over the years before the special Joint Committee on Washington Metropolitan Problems, appointed to study the mass transportation problem.

In May and June of 1958 the joint committee held extensive hearings on the overall transportation plan which were reported in 392 pages of printed testimony.

At the next session of the Congress, in November 1959, the joint committee held 5 full days of hearings on the overall transportation plan which were reported in 1,070 pages of printed hearings.

In the early days of this session, the administration, acting through the Budget Bureau, sent to the Congress and caused to be introduced the bills to which I have referred earlier (S. 3193 and H.R. 11135), representing the second and third stages of the overall three-stage transportation plan. These bills were subsequently the subject of still further hearings before the joint committee in May 1960, which hearings were reported in 299 pages of printed testimony.

As part of the study and research on the overall transportation plan, numerous reports and studies have, over the years, been prepared by the staff of the joint committee and by the many organizations working on the overall plan. The reports of these various groups are now so numerous and so extensive that they occupy over 15 reports weighing in excess of 20 pounds of printed testimony and material.

It has become abundantly clear to all those intimately connected with the overall transportation plan and its long-range objectives that the most effective way to accomplish the long-range objectives of the overall transportation plan was to bypass and abandon the Compact Commission of the first step and, in place thereof, to enact the long-range legislation contemplated by S. 3193. Thus, the Budget Bureau and the administration have devoted their time, energy, and attention to the second and third stages of the transportation plan and they have caused S. 3193 to be introduced and pressed forward in this session of the Congress, bypassing the Compact Commission of the first stage.

Senator HART. Mr. Chalk, may I interject at this point that the committee has been joined by the distinguished Senator from New York, Mr. KEATING, whom you probably know.

Mr. CHALK. Of course.

It is a privilege to appear before you, Senator KEATING.

The members of this subcommittee may wonder how and why the Compact Commission bill has come so far if it is so unnecessary and so undesirable. There are basically two reasons. First, the Compact Commission bill was never referred to and has never been considered by the respective District Committees of the House and Senate. Instead, the bill was sent in the House, as in the Senate to the Judiciary Committee, which regarded its role as strictly that of passing upon the constitutionality and the legal form of the resolution. Those persons who may have opposed the bill on the substantive merits, if they had been able to participate in hearings on the merits, were unable to pass any judgment on the merits of the bill since the hearings held related only to the constitutionality and the legal issues. To hold a hearing on the merits would have involved a hearing on all three stages of the transportation plan, which the House Judiciary Committee was unwilling to do.

The second reason House Joint Resolution 402 has come so far even though it is bad legislation is that it has been strongly pushed, almost as a personal crusade, by Robert E. McLaughlin, who appeared before you this morning, and who is President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and at one and the same time, Chairman of the National Capital Planning Commission, which is sponsoring House Joint Resolution 402. Instead of concentrating on the long-range transportation problems, Bob McLaughlin has given unbelievably high priority to this temporary Compact Commission and low priority to S. 3193, while at the same time his own administration has given low priority to the Compact Commission and high priority to S. 3193.

One wonders what inspires the small group of dedicated persons who are still fighting so valiantly for the enactment of House Joint Resolution 402. It certainly couldn't be the patronage involved. The pressure from these individuals for passage of House Joint Resolution 402 has been tremendous and almost unexplainable. If House Joint Resolution 402 is enacted into law, it will be due primarily to the supreme efforts of one man, Robert E. McLaughlin. He has worked so hard on the bill that he can aptly be described as the father of the Compact Commission.

One next wonders why Virginia and Maryland have been so persistent in their efforts to press for enactment of the compact bill. The interest of these two States in the Compact Commission and their great desire for its enactment can readily be seen from the advantages which they achieve at the expense of the transit riders and the people of the District of Columbia. Later in my testimony, I will show how the Governors of the States of Virginia and Maryland will gain control of mass transportation within the District without completely yielding corresponding control over intrastate transportation in their respective States.

The Congress is well aware of how the Virginia and Maryland States have long envied the sovereignty of the District of Columbia. Over the years, in various ways, such as in this bill, the political sovereignties of Virginia and Maryland have sought to exercise greater and greater sovereignty over the affairs of the District. Now, at long last, they achieve their goal by acquiring jurisdiction and patronage over the lifeline of the District.

Before describing in detail our opposition to House Joint Resolution 402 and the defects in the bill, I would like to make one further observation about the background and history of the Compact Commission.

Our problem throughout the history of this bill has been that we have been unable to get anyone to give favorable consideration to the two sets of important changes which would have made the bill acceptable to us.

The argument made by the proponents of the bill in refusing to accept our changes is that the bill must be accepted in its present form lest changes require resubmission of the bill to the Legislatures of Virginia and Maryland, which have already approved it in its present form. This argument is deceptive and misleading, because neither of the Legislatures of Virginia and Maryland had any hearings on the bill before it passed those legislatures, nor did those legislatures give any notice or opportunity for D.C. Transit System, Inc., or the interests of the District to be heard or to express their views on the proposed Compact Commission. The Compact Commission bill was pressed through the Virginia Legislature without hearings or notice to the public. The Compact Commission bill was similarly pressed through the Maryland Legislature without any hearings or notice. Once the Compact Commission was passed by those two legislatures in its present form, all parties affected by it were told they must accept it without change lest it require resubmission.

Senator KEATING. Do you know whether the actions of the Virginia or Maryland Legislatures were unanimous?

Mr. CHALK. I did not hear you.

Senator KEATING. Was the action of the Virginia and Maryland Legislatures unanimous?

Mr. CHALK. No, it was not unanimous.

Senator KEATING. Do you know what the vote was?

Mr. CHALK. I am not sure of the vote. There was, I believe, some strong opposition from labor sources.

This argument is invalid to the extent that there are serious defects and bad legislation in the proposed bill. It appears to us at D.C. Transit that it is presumptuous for the proponents to expect the Congress to enact bad legislation merely because the proponents failed to perfect their legislation in the proper manner by submitting it to all of the parties concerned before it was submitted to the Legislatures of Virginia and Maryland. Having come up with a bad bill, the proponents must now take full responsibility for making the required improvements in the bill, even if that requires resubmission of the bill to the Legislatures of Virginia and Maryland.

As the members of the subcommittee know, the House Judiciary Committee has reported out House Joint Resolution 402 with a 52-page report filed on May 18, 1960. In this report, it is stated, in effect, that the only views expressed in opposition to the bill were those expressed by D.C. Transit System, Inc. This observation is misleading.

Senator KEATING. Let me interrupt to ask counsel, if I may, whether the action of the House was unanimous in this.

Mr. GREEN. I have no figures on that.

Senator HART. My impression in earlier testimony from Congressman FOLEY was that there was no opposition.

Mr. CHALK. It was a voice vote, sir.

The committee knows the Compact Commission has been proposed and is being pressed forward by the two groups which were granted congressional funds for the purpose of making the long-range transportation study, both headed by Bob McLaughlin; namely, the National Capital Planning Commission and the National Capital Regional Planning Council.

During the 5 years of study and research, experts and specialists were retained to study and make recommendations on the overall three-stage transportation plan. The expert group retained for the study—the Institute of Public Administration in New York—filed its report, which was subsequently published by the Joint Committee on Washington Metropolitan Problems, in August 1959, under the heading "Preliminary Financial and Organizational Report Regarding Metropolitan Transportation." I have with me today several copies of their report which I would like to hand to the chairman of the subcommittee, with the request that it be included at the end of my testimony in the printed hearings of this proceeding.

I would like to call the attention of this subcommittee to two of the comments made in the report of the Institute of Public Administration on the proposed Compact Commission of House Joint Resolution 402. On page 17 of the report of the Institute of Public Administration, the following conclusion is stated:

"In short, the arrangement (i.e., Compact Commission) is one of limited powers, with no assurance of effectiveness. It rates high on only one test—feasibility. It rates low on the requirements of flexibility, comprehensiveness, responsiveness to public needs and desires, and financial adequacy."

In addition to the above critical analysis, the institute has made one other observation about the proposed Compact Commission of House Joint Resolution 402. Summarizing its views as to the alternatives presented for solving the transportation problems of the National Capital region, the Institute of Public Administration made the following observations on page 24 of its report:

"The first alternative is to follow through with the proposed interstate compact regulatory agency, in full recognition of the fact that it will be of limited effectiveness in mass transportation improvement, and of little or no effectiveness in the improvement of traffic and parking controls."

Senator HART. May I interject for the record that Senator CARROLL, of Colorado, has joined us in the course of your testimony.

Mr. CHALK. Senator CARROLL, it is a privilege to be with you.

May I assume that this report will be made a part of the record?

Senator HART. It will be made a part of the record.

Mr. CHALK. From the above-quoted excerpts from the report of the Institute of Public Administration, it is clear that others beside D.C. Transit find the provisions of the proposed Compact Commission to be objectionable. The only reason that no other witnesses have appeared in opposition to the proposed compact is that we of D.C. Transit are the only transit company which represents the transportation interests of the persons traveling within the District of Columbia.

The House committee report on House Joint Resolution 402 states that all the other transit companies support the bill. This conclusion is misleading because it implies that the other transit companies represent the interests of the riders within the District of Columbia. Such fact is just the opposite from the truth. The reason the other transit companies do not oppose House Joint Resolution 402 is that they are all suburban or local in character. None of them are incorporated within the District of Columbia nor do any of them represent the interests of those persons who ride transit services within the District of Columbia. To the extent the interests of the riders of the District of Columbia differ from the interests of the riders of the suburban communities, the other local transit companies have interests adverse to those of D.C. Transit.

The principal reason the suburban companies are not opposed to House Joint Resolution 402 is that two commissioners out of the three proposed commissioners will have more than ample power and authority to outvote the single representative of the District of Columbia on matters where the in-

terests of the District differ from those of the suburban communities.

The House committee report on House Joint Resolution 402 also tends to minimize the opposition of D.C. Transit to the Compact Commission. In terms of the number of witnesses who appeared before the House committee, the House committee report implies that the opposition to the bill was slight in comparison to the support for the bill. In this connection, the report emphasized that the Virginia and Maryland transit companies did not strongly oppose the bill. An examination of the facts indicates that although D.C. Transit may only have been one of many witnesses, it accounts for 80 percent of transportation of passengers within the National Capital region. We of D.C. Transit represent 80 percent of all of the transit business done by all of the transit companies in the National Capital region. Accordingly, our testimony should be accorded four times as much weight as was accorded to the testimony of all of the suburban transit companies together.

My testimony so far has been on the general background atmosphere which has surrounded the advancement of House Joint Resolution 402. We at D.C. Transit do have specific objections to certain provisions which must be made before the bill is enacted into law. Our objections are primarily of two general types. In the first place, we have very serious constitutional and legal objections to House Joint Resolution 402. Our legal objections were presented to the House Judiciary Committee, are part of its printed hearings, and need not be repeated here. Suffice it to say that the House report did not answer all our legal objections. Secondly, we have substantive objections to the provisions of House Joint Resolution 402 which we feel must be corrected before the bill can be acceptable to the Congress and to the people of the District of Columbia.

One of our major legal objections made before the House Judiciary Committee is one which also involves serious policy considerations. This objection is so serious that in 1954 President Eisenhower vetoed a similar compact commission for this same reason. The objection is that House Joint Resolution 402 discriminates against the District and in favor of Virginia because House Joint Resolution 402 gives the Compact Commission jurisdiction over intrastate transportation within the District while in the same bill Virginia refuses to yield to the Commission similar jurisdiction over its intrastate transportation. In passing, I would like to note that the House report on House Joint Resolution 402 makes no reply to this legal objection. On a related issue, President Eisenhower in 1954 vetoed a previous compact commission bill, saying:

"Its failure to include the Virginia segment of the metropolitan area within the jurisdiction of the proposed Commission is a fundamental deficiency. Through this omission of an integral and important part of the greater economic community, a system of fragmented and divided regulatory authority is continued. What is worse, the Federal Government is placed in the position of treating the carriers and persons within one segment of the area on a different and discriminatory basis from those in the remainder of the area. In the absence of any substantial grounds for this differentiation, the measure is unacceptable even as a temporary expedient (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 100, pt. 12, p. 15567)."

Notwithstanding the views of President Eisenhower in 1954, House Joint Resolution 402 once again fails to give the Compact Commission complete jurisdiction over Virginia intrastate transportation. Not only do we regard this omission as discriminatory and unfair, but we also regard it as illegal and unconstitutional. In the hearings before the House Judiciary Committee, we filed a memo on the illegality and unconstitutionality of this fatal error. The House report did not even comment on nor discuss this subject. It must be assumed that the House committee could find no valid legal reply.

As I have mentioned briefly in my earlier testimony today, the proposed resolution of House Joint Resolution 402 is discriminatory against the interests of the District of Columbia and it favors the suburban communities of Virginia and Maryland.

The transit interests which the resolution discriminates against are both those of the riding public and of the transit company. The source of the discrimination is in the regulatory framework of the proposed Commission. Under House Joint Resolution 402, the new Commission would consist of three Commissioners, each a political appointment from each of the three jurisdictions participating in the compact. It is widely conceded that the Commissioner from Virginia, appointed by the Governor of Virginia, would owe his allegiance and interests to the suburban companies of Virginia origin and to the transit interests of the suburban communities of Virginia. Similarly, the Commissioner from Maryland would owe his allegiance and interests to the suburban companies of Maryland origin and to the transit interests of the suburban communities of Maryland. Only one of the three Commissioners would have a primary interest in the welfare of the riding public and the transit companies of the District of Columbia. Notwithstanding the fact that the transit operations within the District of Columbia constitute the greatest proportion, i.e., over 80 percent of all of the metropolitan area transportation in the three States, the District of Columbia would only be represented by one Commissioner out of the three Commissioners under the compact. Experience has taught regulated companies that, under similar circumstances, the downtown interests would be outvoted and would suffer to the advantage of the suburban interests.

As a suggestion to solve the discriminatory feature, we and others have urged that there be five commissioners, of which at least three be representatives of the District of Columbia. Even this proportion is favorable to the suburbs since transit operations in the District of Columbia account for approximately 80 percent of the transit operations in the entire Washington metropolitan area. The response of the supporters of the resolution to our suggestion has been that such a change would require that the bill go back to each of the other two States for resubmission to their respective legislatures. This answer is the same response which the proponents give to all constructive suggestions for the bill notwithstanding the fact that both Virginia and Maryland passed the bill without public hearings in either case and without notice to any of the parties or interests concerned.

In response to our proposal that the interests of the District can be outvoted by the suburban communities, the proponents of the bill have argued that the interests of the District are adequately protected by the so-called veto power in article VI. There is no protection to the District in the veto power because such veto power is limited to matters which are solely "intrastate." I have been advised by our attorney that, under current judicial decisions, it is quite probable that, wherever the District's interests clash with the suburban interests, few, if any, matters will be "solely intrastate." Accordingly, the veto power cannot be counted upon to resolve the problems of conflicts of interests between the District and the suburban communities.

In response to our concern about the attitudes of the various commissioners, the House Judiciary Committee in its report on House Joint Resolution 402 makes the following observations (at p. 28):

"It has been urged that the District of Columbia, having only one representative on the proposed commission and hence only one vote, could possibly suffer because of unfair, unreasonable, or collusive action by a combination of the other commissioners from the two compacting States. Of course, such a circumstance can work to the detriment of any compacting party. The committee, however, is not apprehensive about this circumstance since under article X of the compact each of the signatories is pledged to faithful cooperation with the other signatories."

The above-quoted excerpt from the House Judiciary Committee report shows the fallacy and error in the basic premise of the Compact Commission. This basic premise is that all jurisdictions will treat the transit interest of each other on an equal footing and with equal fairness. We have positive evidence here today in black and white to prove that the Commonwealth of Virginia has no intention of the kind of "faithful cooperation" contemplated in the House report.

An example of the lack of good faith shown on the part of the Commonwealth of Virginia on the subject of faithful cooperation and fairness is a new statute which was enacted into law in Virginia on March 31, 1960. This bill represents a hostile attitude and flagrant challenge to the transit interest of the District of Columbia, Maryland, and all States surrounding Virginia.

I would like to hand to the chairman and members of the subcommittee at this point the act of the General Assembly of Virginia of March 31, 1960, which is an act to provide for the regulation of special or charter party transportation. This act prohibits the carrying on of business as a common carrier for charter or special party service without first obtaining a certificate of public convenience and necessity. The new law, as most new laws of similar nature, provides the usual "grandfather clause," granting companies and persons who were lawfully engaged in such business on January 1, 1960, the automatic right to obtain a certificate of public convenience and necessity by virtue of their "grandfather" rights. This grandfather clause is quite customary and is similar to provisions in the Interstate Commerce Act and other similar regulatory statutes.

The hostility and discrimination against the District companies is contained in the fact that the "grandfather" rights are limited to Virginia corporations even though non-Virginia corporations were on January 1, 1960, entitled the same "grandfather" status.

Section 56-338.61 of the Virginia statute of March 31, 1960, provides that the "grandfather" rights will not be accorded a nonresident or a foreign corporation. This means then that although we of D.C. Transit have "grandfather" rights, we will be discriminated against because we are a District of Columbia corporation.

At this time I would like to hand up to the chairman and members of the subcommittee permit No. CP-468 which we obtained from the Virginia State Corporation Commission on June 17, 1957, for transportation of passengers within the Commonwealth of Virginia for special or charter party purposes.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to request that a copy of the act of the General Assembly of Virginia of March 31, 1960, and the copy of our permit No. CP-468 of June 17, 1957, from the Virginia State Corporation Commission be included at the end of my testimony as part of the printed hearings of today's proceeding.

Senator HART. Without objection, this will be done.

Mr. CHALK. When the new Virginia statute I have just referred to was first publicized, we at D.C. Transit made every effort possible to discourage the Virginia authorities from enacting it into law. All of the persons concerned admitted that the law was directed against D.C. Transit. The enactment into law of such a discriminatory bill directed at D.C. Transit is a far cry from the protests of fairness, good faith and faithful cooperation discussed in the House Judiciary Committee report.

The reality of the regulatory pattern of the proposed 3-man Compact Commission is that we of D.C. Transit have much to fear from a Commission where Virginia and Maryland have two out of three votes, in circumstances where 80 percent of the transportation is within the District of Columbia.

We have urged before and we urge again that the regulatory framework of the proposed Commission be expanded from three to five members, of which at least three should represent the District of Columbia. All of the persons with whom we have spoken about our problem in the District of Columbia have agreed that this change is a minimum change necessary to make the bill fair and equitable to the interests of the District of Columbia. The fact that the bill must go back to the Virginia and Maryland Legislatures does not militate against perfecting the bill for the minimum protection necessary for the interests of the District of Columbia.

Our objection to the 30-man composition of the Compact Commission is our first substantive objection to House Joint Resolution 402. We have one other substantive objection to House Joint Resolution 402. We sincerely believe that House Joint Resolution 402 will compound, confuse and complicate the regulatory pattern in the District of Columbia, particularly in view of the imminent enactment of S. 3193.

House Joint Resolution 402 has been billed as a simplification of the existing regulatory machinery. It has been argued by its proponents that it substitutes one regulatory agency for the four present regulatory agencies. It is argued by the proponents that the proposed Compact Commission would replace the regulatory functions of the PUC, the Maryland PSC, the Virginia State Corporation Commission and the ICC. This claim simply is not true.

It might well be possible to propose a Compact Commission which might replace the existing four agencies. House Joint Resolution 402 simply does not accomplish the job.

On this issue, D.C. Transit is supported by the testimony of the Public Utilities Commission at the House Judiciary Committee hearings on House Joint Resolution 402. Commissioner Kertz testified in the House hearings that one very important oversight in House Joint Resolution 402 is its failure to give the proposed Compact Commission the PUC's responsibility for making the so-called gasoline tax determination required by section 9 of our franchise. As Commissioner Kertz testified, this gas tax determination requires as much regulatory agency effort as a full-scale rate case would require. As Commissioner Kertz testified, House Joint Resolution 402 produces the curious result that the Compact Commission would regulate our rates with full-fledged rate hearings while, at the same time, the PUC would have to make a separate and independent determination of our gas tax liability under section 9 of our franchise with a full-fledged hearing on that issue. In its report on House Joint Resolution 402, the House Judiciary Committee admitted reluctantly on page 23 as follows:

"Since the compact does not give an affirmative grant of power to the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission to levy, assess, or collect taxes, it is clear that the duties of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia with respect to the determination of the liability of D.C. Transit System, Inc., for the motor fuel tax, as specified in that company's franchise, is not transferred to the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission."

The above-quoted excerpt from the House report points up the fact that the proposed Compact Commission is not and can never be a replacement for the PUC so long as the major responsibility of gas tax determination is left with the PUC.

Another reason the Compact Commission is not an adequate replacement for the PUC is because of the failure of House Joint Resolution 402 to give the Compact Commission authority over the conversion program contemplated by section 7 of our franchise. Thus, although the Compact Commisison will regulate our fares and routes and services, the PUC will continue to have the duty and obligation to pass upon the timing and propriety of our conversion program. The result will be that both the Compact Commission and the PUC will have to make separate and independent determinations upon separate and independent records and evidence on the subject of routes and schedules and types of service, including conversion.

Both of the failures of House Joint Resolution 402, which I have just mentioned, are matters in which the PUC concurs with my conclusions. If there is any doubt, I recommend that the subcommittee call as a witness Commissioner Kertz, or any other member of the Public Utilities Commission itself.

House Joint Resolution 402 does not eliminate the duplication and confusion of the present regulatory machinery. The Compact Commission does not replace the four existing agencies. On the contrary, it adds a fifth regulatory agency to the four agencies already existing.

If, moreover, S. 3193 is enacted into law as we expect it will be, the Compact Commission will not be the fifth regulatory agency added to four already existing agencies, but it will become the sixth added to the five then-existing agencies.

We at D.C. Transit are not unaware of the demands being made for a simplified regulatory machinery for the transportation problems of the local area. We believe that the problems will be substantially solved by the passage of S. 3193, and that the temporary Compact Commission contemplated by House Joint Resolution 402 will be unnecessary and completely obsolete.

Although we believe that no new regulatory machinery is necessary, we are, nevertheless, prepared to make an affirmative counter-proposal to House Joint Resolution 402 for dealing with the regulatory problems within the National Capital region.

Subsequent to the hearings before the joint committee on S. 3193, we prepared and submitted for the consideration of the joint committee a proposal which would have amended the Interstate Commerce Act itself to give to the Interstate Commerce Commission all of the jurisdiction now vested in the PUC over intrastate transportation of passengers within the District of Columbia, and, in addition, give to the ICC jurisdiction over the interstate transportation of persons within the National Capital region. By this simple device, if a single regulatory machinery is desired, such machinery could be established within the framework of the ICC and the Interstate Commerce Act.

By way of summary of our substantive objections to House Joint Resolution 402, I would like to point out that our substantive objections are primarily on two basic issues:

1. The composition of the proposed Commission should be expanded from three to five members, at least three of whom should represent the District of Columbia; and

2. The confusion and complications in regulatory agency responsibility should be eliminated by transferring to the Compact Commission the gas tax determination under section 9 of our franchise and the conversion determination under section 7 of our franchise; one other way to simplify the confusion and complications which will result from the proposals of House Joint Resolution 402 is for all of the regulatory jurisdiction for the National Capital region to be transferred to the Interstate Commerce Commission itself.

Although the above changes will make House Joint Resolution 402 acceptable to D.C. Transit, I want to emphasize again our view that no Compact Commission is needed in the light of the imminent passage of the regulatory machinery of S. 3193. In this connection, I would like to repeat and reemphasize that House Joint Resolution 402 was originally proposed as and is still described as a "temporary" Compact Commission to fill the period of time until the regulatory machinery of S. 3193 can become effective. When S. 3193 is passed, House Joint Resolution 402 will become obsolete, outdated, and undesirable.

I have given the broad policy reasons why generally we find House Joint Resolution 402 obsolete and undesirable in view of the imminent passage of S. 3193. In addition to the broad policy reasons, there are technical inconsistencies between S. 3193 and House Joint Resolution 402.

For example, the Compact Commission is supposed to specify the routes over which the carriers shall operate while at the same time the Agency of S. 3193 is supposed to prepare an overall transit development program showing what routes it believes most appropriate.

Another example is that the Compact Commission is supposed to promote its concept of an integrated system while at the same time the Agency of S. 3193 is supposed to include in its transit development program its proposal for "coordinated and efficient service" on an integrated basis.

Still another example is that the Compact Commission is supposed to require transit companies where necessary to provide such additional service as it deems necessary, while at the same time the Agency of S. 3193 is supposed to enter into contracts or agreements for the provision of such additional service as it deems necessary.

Still another example is that the Compact Commission is supposed to create and develop a consulting board while at the same time the Agency of S. 3193 is supposed to appoint and create its own advisory and coordinating committees.

Still another example is that the advisory board of the Compact Commission is supposed to prepare a study of transportation services while at the same time the Agency of S. 3193 is also supposed to be making studies and recommendations.

The overlap and confusion which will result from just the few comparisons I have already made is quite obvious and points up how unnecessary and undesirable House Joint Resolution 402 will be when S. 3193 is enacted into law.

In summation, we are opposed to House Joint Resolution 402 because it will be obsolete, unnecessary and even undesirable when S. 3193 is enacted into law. But, even apart from S. 3193, we are opposed to House Joint Resolution 402 because its three-member Commission is discriminatory in composition and because its jurisdictional provisions are not sufficient for it to replace the four existing agencies. If some further regulatory machinery is needed, over and above S. 3193, it should be achieved through transferring the present PUC functions to the ICC and not by creating a fifth separate agency on top

of and in addition to the four present agencies.

I do thank you gentlemen for your indulgence.

Senator HART. Mr. Chalk, the committee thanks you for making a statement concerning a matter which is very complicated and, I think, very difficult to understand.

May I inquire if Senator CARROLL has any questions?

Senator CARROLL. I may say to Mr. Chalk that I was not here at the opening of your hearing. I have read your statement. I shall read it again.

The thing that concerns me a little bit, and I have to be very brief, because we have another meeting coming up here, but I did want you to know we shall certainly consider everything you have said, this question of the three members—do you feel that the District of Columbia just having one member would be injurious to the position of your transit company?

Mr. CHALK. I feel we would be in great jeopardy with just one member because of the prejudicial interests of the other members which have been demonstrated, such as this bill of Virginia.

Senator CARROLL. Have you ever submitted in the hearings in the House a financial statement of what your investment is, what your return is?

Mr. CHALK. It is generally known; it is on public record, sir, with the Public Utilities Commission.

Senator CARROLL. The reason I mentioned that is this: You are certainly permitted a fair rate of return as a public utility. Even though you are limited to a three-man Commission, I can understand your apprehension, but they could do nothing that would injure your rate of return from your company, because it would be confiscatory and would seem to be——

Mr. CHALK. Things of that nature have happened.

Senator CARROLL. Well, I do not think that legally they can do that, and I think it would not be the purpose of this legislation. The real problem is, how do we solve this mass transportation problem? You have been very helpful by your suggestion of putting it into the ICC. But the difficulty is, the backlog of cases is so great, I do not know how you could expedite, actually, the solution of this difficult problem by going into ICC. Nevertheless, it is something to look into.

I thought I ought to mention for the record that even though there is a three-man Commission, and I am inclined to agree with you that where you have a Virginia and Maryland and one from the District of Columbia, and that is where the great capital investment is, and this is where the great mass transportation problem is centered and must be solved, and they could both, of course, in the majority against the District of Columbia, they cannot interfere, legally and constitutionally with your rate of return in my opinion.

Mr. CHALK. Senator, this bill that was pasesd in Virginia has nothing to do with rate of return. Yet it has adversely affected our earning capacity.

Senator CARROLL. Well, then, if you should come under this compact, if that is true and we bind you by Congress approving this compact and you are substantially affected, I do not think you would have the slightest difficulty coming before the Congress or before any ratemaking body—if you had said that this body would now fix your rates and your fares—did I understand you to say that?

Mr. CHALK. That is correct, sir.

Senator CARROLL. If it is confiscatory, they will not get away with it, and they should answer for that.

Mr. CHALK. You mean they should not get away with it.

Senator CARROLL. I think no board will sustain, because Congress approves the compact, we are not going to put into the hands of Maryland or Virginia or the Commissioner of the District of Columbia, where we know we have to have a well-ordered transit system here and your investment must run into the millions of dollars—you say this is all a matter of public record. What is the capital investment in round figures of the transit system?

Mr. CHALK. Upward of—we have invested in this company—recently, we purchased $13 million worth of new equipment. The original purchase price was $13,500,000. I would say upward of $20 million-odd have been involved in this company.

Senator CARROLL. So in round figures, just so we have an investment here of $25 million by a corporation, a private corporation, that is managing our transit system in the District of Columbia. Now, to place that within the power of a commissioner from Virginia or Maryland—my point is, they could not impair that. You are entitled to a reasonable rate of return.

Mr. CHALK. May I suggest, sir, that if Maryland or Virginia acted unfairly as you say it is possible they would do, this unfair act on the part of Virginia would result in higher fares for the people of the District of Columbia. Surely, we shall get our rate of return, but you are hurting the people of the District of Columbia by letting Virginia and Maryland hurt the District transit system. There is a point you should consider.

Senator CARROLL. I think that is a good point, but again, I cannot understand why they would deliberately raise the fare to the injury of their people here. You mean to the advantage of the people in Virginia?

Mr. CHALK. I gave an example of this bill, which established grandfather rights for everybody in Virginia except those who were not Virginia corporations. And this is deliberately at us, because we are the only ones who were a District of Columbia corporation. It was directed right at our hearts and that is not favorable.

Senator CARROLL. Is that the crux of the problem, that this is really a spillover of people—I am speaking of people living in the District of Columbia and Virginia and Maryland whose duties are principally in the District of Columbia, and I just cannot conceive why they would be—when you talk about discrimination on fare, what we are really trying to do is get these people to work and get them home again, and on a transportation system, as cheaply as we can consistent with your fair rate of return.

Mr. CHALK. Senator, S. 3193 would take this entire picture into consideration. It is just about to come up for enactment. I am sure that the moment that is enacted, this entire bill and its inadequacies will be eliminated or should be eliminated.

Senator CARROLL. I am not familiar with the legislative history of S. 3193. How long has that been pending?

Mr. CHALK. This has been pending for 5 years, sir. This is the mass transit survey. Hearings were completed before Senator BIBLE weeks ago. The recommendations and the bill have been introduced by the House and the Senate, and I think they have been reported out favorably and are due for enactment at any moment.

Senator CARROLL. If we should approve this resolution——

Mr. CHALK. You came in after I mentioned that, and that is why I repeat it.

Senator CARROLL. If we should approve this resolution, which involves the Compact Commission, that would not later on, if it becomes obsolete by virtue of S. 3193, we would still be taking a step forward, would we not?

Mr. CHALK. No; you would have two commissions then, one of which is wholly unnecessary, and one probably in conflict—it is possible—with the views of the other commission. You would be creating a bit of a chaotic condition, in my opinion. It was suggested originally as a temporary expedient until stage 2, which is S. 3193, came into existence. This was the original concept. They were taking three stages: First, a temporary stage which was the tristate compact; second, a stage when the mass transit survey was created and has been created, and long hearings—and this is the result of all the hearings right in front of me—have been completed. S. 3193 is the result of that.

Now, the temporary nature has already expired.

Senator CARROLL. I thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator KEATING. May I ask one question?

Senator HART. Yes, Senator KEATING.

Senator KEATING. Does not S. 3193 contemplate a planning commission, not a regulatory commission?

Mr. CHALK. No; they are ultimately regulatory. They are given quite extensive powers.

Senator KEATING. In that bill?

Mr. CHALK. In that bill.

Senator KEATING. Just one question with reference to another comment you made about the possibility of passing the resolution resulting in higher fares for the District people at the expense——

Mr. CHALK. Because of any capriciousness that might result from the others.

Senator KEATING. It is not quite possible that an integrated system would do away with a great deal of duplication and overlapping and permit lower fares all around, rather than higher fares?

Mr. CHALK. This is contemplated under 3193.

Senator KEATING. Is it not possible under the present compact?

Mr. CHALK. I do not believe it is, sir; no, sir. Commissioner Kertz testified to that specific question.

Senator HART. Is there anything further?

Mr. CHALK. Incidentally, Senator, you inquired as to the majority in Maryland, whether it was unanimous or not. It passed by a majority of one in the Maryland Senate, which indicated a rather confused state within that area.

Senator CARROLL. Well, this is a confused situation. When you have a District of Columbia under the Federal Government, you have portions of Virginia and Maryland—I happen to live in Maryland, myself, but I never think of it as Maryland, we are so close to the District of Columbia line. We are fighting transportation all the time, and it is these dividing lines, which are legal and existing, but in another sense, very unrealistic. No sensible Commissioner from Virginia or Maryland or, I should hope, from the District of Columbia, would do anything but work for an integrated system, as the able Senator from New York has said, to reduce the fares to get better service for the people, to give you a chance to expand and convert, and give you a fair rate of return, and I hope not interfere too much with your operation. Because the decisions largely have to be made by your company in connection with this regulatory body.

Mr. CHALK. If it had built-in safeguards such as three members for the District as against two of the other, then I think it would have some element of fairness.

Senator CARROLL. May I say, there is another safeguard? We local councilmen will be seated, from time to time, watching the situation.

Senator HART. On that close vote in the Maryland Legislature—was the question of 80 percent of the volume of transit being represented by only a third, a factor in that vote?

Mr. CHALK. No, sir, that was not the issue.

Senator HART. Mr. Chalk, thank you very much.

Mr. CHALK. Thank you, Senator.

EXHIBIT 2

(Memorandum re unconstitutionality and legal inadequacy of House Joint Resolution 402, prepared by D.C. Transit System, Inc., before Subcommittee No. 3 of the Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives)

House Joint Resolution 402 is opposed by D.C. Transit System, Inc., both on substantive grounds and because, in its present form, it is both unconstitutional and legally inadequate. The substantive matters have been dealt with separately at the hearings on House Joint Resolution 402. This memorandum is limited to the constitutional and other legal issues raised by House Joint Resolution 402.

I

House Joint Resolution 402 is unconstitutional because it would be an impairment of D.C. Transit's franchise

Public Law 757, 84th Congress, 2d session (70 Stat. 598) (hereinafter sometimes referred to as D.C. Transit's "franchise"), granted to the D.C. Transit System, Inc., an exclusive franchise to operate a mass transportation system of passengers for hire within the District of Columbia and between the District and points within the Washington metropolitan area. This franchise is a binding, contractual obligation between Congress and D.C. Transit, the impairment of which by legislative act would be unconstitutional. *Grand Trunk Western Railway Company* v. *City of South Bend* (227 U.S. 544, 57 L. Ed. 633); *Southern Pacific Company* v. *City of Portland* (177 Fed. 958 (D. Ore. 1910)); *Perry* v. *United States* (294 U.S. 330, 79 L. Ed. 912); and *Hepburn* v. *Griswold* (75 U.S. 603, 19 L. Ed. 513, 526). These and other cases too numerous to include here clearly establish the limitation on the authority of Congress to impair the obligation of its contracts.

It is clear that House Joint Resolution 402, if adopted and implemented, would result in an impairment of the rights of D.C. Transit under its franchise.

House Joint Resolution 402 is part of a 3-stage program of the so-called mass transportation survey and plan for Washington which is presently the subject of extensive hearings and study by the Joint Committee on Washington Metropolitan Problems.

The mass transportation plan proposes three separate development stages. For the first stage, the plan calls for the enactment and approval by Congress of a compact creating a tristate regulatory commission consisting of representatives of the States of Maryland and Virginia and of the District of Columbia to exercise complete regulatory jurisdiction over mass transportation in the Washington Metropolitan Area. The commission proposed by the plan is the very same one which is involved in House Joint Resolution 402. Under the plan, this compact commission would be only a temporary stage as a first step in a 3-stage series.

As a second stage, the mass transportation plan calls for the creation of a Federal corporation which would be empowered to acquire and develop the facilities necessary to the accomplishment of the plan's objectives. Under the plan, this Federal corporation would also be only a temporary stage as a second step in a 3-stage series.

As the third and final stage, the plan contemplates the enactment by Maryland, Virginia, and the Congress, on behalf of the District of Columbia, of a proprietary agency by way of interstate compact which would take over as successor to both the regulatory agency and the Federal corporation. Under the plan, this proprietary agency would have the double obligation of owning and operating the major part of the transportation facilities, and, at the same time, of serving as the administrative agency which regulated the operations of those private companies which were still operating related feeder service.

House Joint Resolution 402, if adopted, would be unconstitutional as an impairment of the contract between Congress and D.C. Transit evidenced by D.C. Transit's franchise because it would represent a substantial modification of important substantive rights of D.C. Transit.

Among the substantive changes which would be made by the proposed compact of stage 1 is the jurisdiction granted the new compact commission over questions relating to the persons or companies which control transit companies and over questions relating to the transfer or other disposition of such controlling interests. This substantive provision is not present in any of the regulatory statutes of the District of Columbia which regulate D.C. Transit and under which D.C. Transit agreed to accept the franchise.

Another significant substantive change would be made by the proposed compact of stage 1 would be the change in the substantive rights presently governed by existing administrative procedures. For example, under the Interstate Commerce Act, carriers within the District of Columbia can obtain and have obtained temporary authority which, once granted, can extend so long as there is pending an application for the equivalent permanent authority which has not been finally disposed of. Because it sometimes takes years before such permanent authority rights are finally disposed of, temporary authority, once obtained, would be automatically extended under such circumstances for several years. We of D.C. Transit have just such a situation in our contract carrier authority granted to us by the Interstate Commerce Commission for our Government contract service. Under the proposed compact of stage 1, our substantive rights under the Interstate Commerce Act would be seriously and adversely affected.

Another substantial modification of important substantive rights of D.C. Transit would be in the manner and form of the regulation of D.C. Transit under the proposed compact of stage 1. Although section 12 of D.C. Transit's franchise permits the transfer of the jurisdiction of the District of Columbia Public Utilities Commission to some other agency, the franchise does not permit any transfer of the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission to any other agency and particularly to a non-Federal agency such as the tristate compact commission contemplated by stage 1 of the plan. If D.C. Transit were to be made subject to such regulatory authority on such terms and conditions, such a change in substance and form of regulation would constitute a breach of the franchise contract and a deprivation of rights to the extent D.C. Transit did not receive precisely the same substantive rights as it has had under the Itnerstate Commerce Act and the rules and regulations thereunder. To such extent, the proposed compact would be unconstitutional.

Another substantive right of D.C. Transit which would be affected by the proposed compact of stage 1 would be the inequitable and unfavorable regulatory atmosphere under which D.C. Transit would be forced to operate, an atmosphere under which D.C. Transit would never have accepted the franchise on August 15, 1956, when it accepted the more equitable and favorable atmosphere of the existing regulatory authorities.

The proposed new compact commission of stage 1 would consist of three commissioners, each a political appointment from each of the three jurisdictions participating in the compact. Thus, the commissioner from Maryland would be appointed by the Governor of the State of Maryland and would owe his allegiance and interests to the Maryland Governor. The commissioner from Virginia would be appointed by the Governor of the Commonwealth of Virginia and would owe his allegiance and interests to the Virginia Governor. Out of the three-man agency, only one would be interested in the welfare of the District of Columbia. Notwithstanding the fact that the transit operations within the District of Columbia constitute the greatest proportion of all metropolitan area transit operations in the three States, the District of Columbia would only be given one commissioner under the proposed compact. Thus the District of Columbia transit companies, which account for approximately 80 percent of the gross transit revenues of the Washington metropolitan area, would be subject to the rule of a commission where two out of the three commissioners would have a loyalty to and a preferred interest in the local suburban rural transit companies of their respective States. Such arrangement would be discriminatory to the people of the District of Columbia and to franchised transit company of the District of Columbia, D.C. Transit.

The potential damage to the people and transit companies of the District of Columbia from a three-man commission is obvious when it is recognized that the commissioners from Maryland and Virginia would be more interested in the suburgan interests of their respective States than in the transit operations within the District of Columbia. It is conceivable and quite probable that the surburban interests of Maryland and Virginia would vote together in matters involving a controversy between the interests of the intra-District operations vis-a-vis the suburban operations. Such result would necessarily follow from the fact that there is one transit company (D.C. Transit) which has virtually an exclusive franchise within the District and which is in competition with numerous other local suburban rural carriers in Maryland and Virginia. Thus, D.C. Transit accounts for over 78 percent of the transit revenues within the entire Washington metropolitan area. There are numerous matters in which the interests of D.C. Transit conflict with those of the suburban carriers in the rural areas.

The concept of one transit commission for the entire area would only be a feasible concept if all areawide transit operations were performed by one areawide transit company. Areawide regulation must necessarily be concurrent with areawide ownership and integration of existing companies.

Still another defect of the proposed compact commission of stage 1 is in the failure to resolve a conflict in jurisdiction between the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia and the proposed compact commission of stage 1 over the motor vehicle fuel tax certification provided for by section 9 of D.C. Transit's franchise. Although the new proposed commission is claimed to eliminate duplication of jurisdiction over transit operations, the result in the fuel tax matter is a serious, wasteful, and perhaps damaging duplication. The new proposed compact does not change the matter of fuel tax certification required of the Public Utilities Commission annually by section 9 of the franchise. But this certification requires independent rate-of-return determinations which would duplicate or conflict with those required separately of the proposed compact commission.

For all the above reasons, the new compact of stage 1, if adopted, would represent an impairment of the contract rights agreed upon between Congress and D.C. Transit in the franchise, as proposed, and it would constitute a deprivation of D.C. Transit rights without due process of law. The proposed new compact would, accordingly, be unconstitutional. *Grand Trunk Western*

Railway Company v. *City of South Bend, supra; Southern Pacific Company* v. *City of Portland, supra; Perry* v. *United States, supra;* and *Hepburn* v. *Griswold, supra.*

II

House Joint Resolution 402 is unconstitutional because it would be an improper delegation of congressional power

Quite apart from the impairment of contract issue, House Joint Resolution 402 would, if adopted, be unconstitutional for other very serious reasons. If adopted, it would be unconstitutional as an improper delegation of authority over intra-District transportation to a non-Federal compact commission, particularly in view of the special favored position of the Commonwealth of Virginia, which is given control over intra-District transportation while refusing to concede jurisdiction over its own intrastate transportation.

Under the proposed compact commission of stage 1 and the proposed compact proprietary agency of stage 3, Virginia would be highly favored over Maryland and the District of Columbia, at the expense mostly of the District of Columbia.

The basis for congressional authority over the District of Columbia is found in U.S. Constitution, article I, section 8, clause 17 which provides that Congress shall have power—

"To exercise exclusive Legislation in all Cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding ten Miles square) as may, by Cession of particular States, and the acceptance of Congress, become the Seat of the Government of the United States."

The effect of the above-quoted clause is to lodge sovereignty over the District in the United States and to vest exclusive legislative power in the Congress, *Metropolitan Railroad Co.* v. *District of Columbia* (10 U.S.C. 19, 132 U.S. 1, 33 L. Ed. 231). The construction of the term "exclusive" as used in the clause has occasioned sharp differences of opinion concerning the extent to which Congress may delegate its legislative power over the District. The opposing lines are perhaps most clearly drawn in the arguments which attend the perennial proposals for home rule legislation. The printed records of joint hearings before the subcommittee on home rule and reorganization of the House and Senate Committees on the District of Columbia, 80th Congress, 2d session, and before the Committee on the District of Columbia of the House, 86th Congress, 1st session, supply an extensive exposition of the pros and cons involved. To the extent that they address themselves to the legal question of the extent of Congress' authority to delegate its legislative power over the District of Columbia, those records are helpful here. They do not, however, involve the question of the constitutionality of legislation providing for the concurrent jurisdiction of three States over the internal affairs of the District of Columbia and to that extent the problem presented by the mass transportation plan goes far beyond the home rule issue and is very unique unto itself.

Since the early case of *Cohen* v. *Virginia* (19 U.S. (6 Wheat.) 262 (1821)), the first significant decision in which the U.S. Supreme Court dealt with the question whether Congress may delegate its legislative power over the District, many such decisions have been recorded. Without exception, they relate to instances of the exercise by subordinate governmental bodies within the District of powers delegated to them by the Congress. These cases include: *Washington* v. *Eaton* (29 Fed. Cas. 345, No. 17228 (C.C.D.C. 1833)); *Grant* v. *Cooke* (7 D.C. 165 (1871)); *District of Columbia* v. *Saville* (8 D.C. (1 MacArth.) 581 (1874)); *United States* v. *May* (9 D.C. (2 MacArth.) 512 (1876)); *Roach* v. *Van Riswick* (11 D.C. (1 MacArth. & M.) 171 (1879)); *Cooper* v. *District of Columbia* (11 D.C. (1 MacArth. & M.) 250 (1880)); *District of Columbia* v. *Waggaman* (15 D.C. (4 Mackey) 328 (1885)); *Smith* v. *Olcott* (19 App. D.C. 61 (1901)); *Coughlin* v. *District of Columbia* (25 App. D.C. 251 (1905)); *United States Ex rel. Daly* v. *MacFarland* (28 App. D.C. 552 (1907)); *Johnson* v. *District of Columbia* (30 App. D.C. 520 (1908)); *United States* v. *Cella* (37 App. D.C. 433 (1911)); *Welch* v. *Cook* (97 U.S. 541 (1878)); *Stoutenburgh* v. *Hennick* (129 U.S. 141 (1889)); *Metropolitan Railroad Co.* v. *District of Columbia* (132 U.S. 1 (1889)); and *District of Columbia* v. *John R. Thompson Company* (346 U.S. 100 (1953)). These cases represent litigation spanning a period of more than 130 years. No single one of the abovementioned cases provides a definitive formula for measuring the extent to which Congress may delegate its legislative power over the District. Taken together, these cases raise grave doubt as to the constitutionality of home rule legislation. Such legislation would commit power over internal affairs of the District to the people most directly concerned, the residents of the District. But if the legality of entrusting such matters to local control is questionable, it is even more doubtful that Congress may constitutionally share its jurisdiction over the District of Columbia with the States of Maryland and Virginia, particularly where, as will be shown, Virginia is favored even over Maryland.

The framers of the Constitution intended that power over the seat of the National Government should be reserved exclusively for exercise by that Government. They intended that such control be denied any one State or any combination of States other than the National Government itself. In effect, exclusive power over the seat of Government was reserved to all the States for exercise by all of them through their representatives in Congress. Indicative of their intent are the following remarks of James Madison in the Federalist Papers No. 43:

"The indispensable necessity of complete authority at the seat of government, carries its own evidence with it. It is a power exercised by every legislature of the Union, I might say of the world, by virtue of its general supremacy. Without it, not only the public authority might be insulted and its proceedings interrupted with impunity; but a dependence of the members of the General Government on the state comprehending the seat of government, for protection in the exercise of their duty, might bring on the national councils an imputation or influence, equally dishonorable to the Government and dissatisfactory to the other members of the confederacy. This consideration has the more weight, as the gradual accumulation of public improvements at the stationary residence of the government would be both too great a public pledge to be left in the hands of a single State, and would create so many obstacles to a removal of the Government, as still further to abridge its necessary independence."

Story, in his "Commentaries on the Constitution of the United States," fourth edition, 1873, volume II, section 1229, supplies us with evidence of the conditions which motivated the grant of exclusive power over the District:

"In the enumeration of the powers of Congress, which is made in the eighth section of the first article, we find that of exercising exclusive legislation over such District as shall become the seat of government. This power, like all others which are specified, is conferred on Congress, as the legislature of the Union; for, strip them of that character, and they would not possess it. In no other character can it be exercised. In legislating for the District they necessarily preserve the character of the legislature of the Union; for it is in that character alone, that the Constitution confers on them this power of exclusive legislation."

And at sections 1224 and 1226, in language equally applicable to the District clause. Story refers to the power of Congress over other areas ceded to the National Government.

"Section 1224: The other part of the power, giving exclusive legislation over places ceded for the erection of forts, magazines, etc., seems still more necessary for the public convenience and safety. The public money expended on such places, and the public property deposited in them, and the nature of the military duties which may be required there, all demand that they should be exempted from State authority. In truth, it would be wholly improper, that places, on which the security of the entire Nation may depend, should be subjected to the control of any member of it.

"Section 1226. The power of Congress to exercise exclusive jurisdiction over these ceded places is conferred on that body, as the legislature of the Union; and it cannot be exercised in any other character."

Certainly the District of Columbia, no less than the other "ceded places" is a District upon which the security of the entire Union does depend. Its importance in this respect has increased with the passage of time. The necessity for exclusive Federal control over the District of Columbia is as compelling today as it was when the Constitution was written. From these authorities, it is manifest that the Founding Fathers intended that the control of Congress over the internal affairs of the District be exclusive and that it not be concurrent with or subject to the States of Virginia and Maryland.

In *District of Columbia* v. *John R. Thompson Co., supra,* the Supreme Court of the United States described the term "exclusive" as contained in the District clause, as follows:

"But it is clear from the history of the provision that the word 'exclusive' was employed to eliminate any possibility that the legislative power of Congress over the District was to be concurrent with that of the ceding States. See the Federalist, No. 43; Elliot's Debates (2d ed. 1876), pages 432, 433; 2 Story, Commentaries on the Constitution of the United States (4th ed. 1873), section 1218."

In *O'Donoghue* v. *United States* (289 U.S. 516, 77 L. Ed. 1356), 53 Supreme Court 740, the Supreme Court commented on the nature of the District of Columbia and the necessity for national control over its internal affairs as follows:

"How different are the status and characteristics of the District of Columbia. The pertinent clause of the Constitution (art. 1, sec. 8, cl. 17) confers the power on Congress to 'exercise exclusive legislation * * * over such district * * * as may * * * become the seat of the Government of the United States.' These are the words of permanent governmental power.

"Over this District Congress possesses 'the combined powers of a general and of a State government in all cases where legislation is possible.' *Stoutenburgh* v. *Hennick* (129 U.S. 141, 147, 32 L. Ed. 637, 638, 9 S. Ct. 256). The power conferred by article 1, section 8, clause 17, is plenary; but it does not exclude, in respect of the District, the exercise by Congress of other appropriate powers conferred upon that body by the Constitution, or authorize a denial to the inhabitants of any constitutional guaranty not plainly inapplicable. Circuit Judge Taft, afterwards Chief Justice of this court, speaking for himself, Judge Lurton, afterwards as associate justice of this court, and Judge Hammond, in *Grether* v. *Wright* ((C.C.A. 6th) 75

Fed. 742, 756, 757), after reciting the foregoing clause and the organization of the District under it, said:

"'It was meet that so powerful a sovereignty should have a local habitation the character of which it might absolutely control, and the government of which it should not share with the States in whose territory it exercised but a limited sovereignty, supreme, it is true, in cases where it could be exercised at all, but much restricted in the field of its operation. The object of the grant of exclusive legislation over the District was, therefore, national in the highest sense, and the city organized under the grant became the city, not of a State, not of a district, but of a Nation. In the same article which granted the powers of exclusive legislation over its seat of government are conferred all the other great powers which make the Nation, including the power to borrow money on the credit of the United States. He would be a strict constructionist, indeed, who should deny to Congress the exercise of this latter power in furtherance of that of organizing and maintaining a proper local government at the seat of government. Each is for a national purpose, and the one may be used in aid of the other.'"

In view of these authorities, Congress relationship to the District of Columbia could be appropriately described as that of a trustee for the 50 States of the Union. Each of these States has an interest in the management of the affairs of the District. Their rights in this respect are guaranteed them by the District clause of the Constitution, and it would subvert the design of the Constitution if two of the States, Maryland and Virginia, were to be accorded favored positions of control over internal District of Columbia affairs.

The interstate compact features of stages one and three of the proposed mass transportation plan are without precedent in the annals of compact legislation. Historically, the compact device has been used chiefly for the settlement of boundary disputes between States with some extension of its use in recent years for the control and development of interstate rivers and harbor facilities. For the most part, existing compacts are nonregulatory and nonproprietary in nature. None of them involve the degree of regulation over the internal commerce of a member State contemplated by the compact proposals of the mass transportation plan. Had such regulation been included in any such compact in the manner proposed in the plan, it is safe to assume the respective compacts would never have materialized. Just as the Founding Fathers were anxious in the Constitution to preserve the independence of the District from control by States outside the District, so also do the States jealously and selfishly guard and fight for their own respective sovereignties.

The present mass transportation plan, itself, presents a glaring example of the jealous, selfish attitude on the part of the States. The plan creates a metropolitan district and purports to be areawide in the application of its transportation development, and regulatory programs. Actually, the regulatory phases of the plan are not areawide in scope. The Virginia portion of the metropolitan district is specifically exempted from the regulatory provisions of the plan. Under its State constitution, Virginia feels that it is unable to submit its internal traffic to external control. It is nonetheless interested in acquiring a share in the regulation of the critical and important internal traffic within the District of Columbia. Such an arrangement is disadvantageous for and discriminatory against the people of the District of Columbia.

In the District of Columbia, the authority of Congress is not merely paramount. It is exclusive. It is authority held in trust for the 50 States of the Union. As the cases cited above have indicated, the authority of particular States, such as Maryland and Virginia, over the District of Columbia may not be enlarged at the expense of the remaining 48.

The Congress should be alert to the precedent embodied in the interstate compact proposals of House Joint Resolution 402. Today, tristate control of mass transit is proposed. Tomorrow may see proposals for tristate administration of all local government functions. House Joint Resolution 402 is a step in that direction and subverts the intent and design of the Founding Fathers as set forth in the Constitution. The crux of any metropolitan problem which may exist in this area is the National Capital. Congress must preserve exclusive control over the District of Columbia in order to provide all governmental functions necessary to administer the District for the benefit of all of the 50 States. Such authority constitutionally cannot and should not be delegated to a tristate compact agency, particularly where one State (Virginia) gains a preferential and discriminatory position by refusing to yield its own sovereignty to the tristate agency.

III

The suspension provisions of section 3 of House Joint Resolution 402 are so vague and general that they fail to meet the minimum requirements for precise specification

In addition to being unconstitutional, House Joint Resolution 402 is legally inadequate because those of its provisions which are supposed to suspend existing statutes are so vague and general that they fail to meet the minimum requirements for precise specification.

Section 3 of House Joint Resolution 402 provides, in part, as follows:

"Section 3. [U]pon the effective date of the compact and so long thereafter as the compact remains effective, the applicability of the laws of the United States, and the rules, regulations, and orders promulgated thereunder, relating to or affecting transportation under the compact and to the persons engaged therein * * * is suspended, except as otherwise specified in the compact, to the extent that such laws, rules, regulations, and orders are inconsistent with or in duplication of the provisions of the compact: * * *."

Thus, the language proposal for suspension of the numerous complicated existing statutes is merely a general, vague catchall provision that fails to specify precisely what is being suspended, how, where, or when.

It is well settled that the inclusion of general language of suspension in legislation suspends no more than what would be suspended or repealed by implication if such legislation were enacted omitting such general language of suspension, *Great Northern Ry. Co.* v. *U.S.* (155 Fed. 945 (8th Cir. 1907), aff'd 208 U.S. 452 (1908)); *Hoague-Sprague Corporation* v. *Frank C. Meyer Co.* (31 F. 2d 583 (D.C. N.Y. 1929)). Similarly, the proposed language of section 3 of House Joint Resolution 402 suspends only such statutes as would be repealed by implication even in the absence of section 3.

The important consideration which Congress should bear in mind is that the courts do not favor repeal by implication such as is attempted by House Joint Resolution 402. *U.S.* v. *Greathouse* (166 U.S. 601, 41 L. Ed. 1130 (1897)); *Frost* v. *Wenie* (157 U.S. 46, 39 L. Ed. 614 (1895)); *U.S.* v. *Healey* (160 U.S. 136, 40 L. Ed. 369 (1895)). As the above-cited cases indicate, the courts make every effort possible to avoid repeal by implication.

Since section 3 of House Joint Resolution 402 suspends only such statutes as would be repealed by implication if the resolution were adopted without section 3, and since the courts do not favor repeal by implication, adoption of House Joint Resolution 402 in its present form, would almost certainly run afoul of the minimum requirements established by the courts. In such case, House Joint Resolution 402 would undoubtedly be held to have suspended none of the more complicated and technical statutes. The result owuld be a never-ending legal battle as to which statutes were or were not suspended and, as a result, as to the constitutionality of House Joint Resolution 402.

IV

Conclusion

For the reasons stated above in points I, II, and III, it is respectfully submitted that House Joint Resolution 402 is legally inadequate and clearly unconstitutional.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I have only a word or two to say.

For 4 years this problem has been studied by three different commissions. We appropriated $400,000 for the National Capital Planning Commission, for the National Capital Regional Planning Council, for the Commission of the District of Columbia, Maryland, and Virginia. They all united on the bill. The distinguished Senator from Oregon cosponsored the bill with me. It was passed unanimously by the House. It was reported unanimously by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary.

The interests of 2 million residents around the District of Columbia are involved. Unless we can work out something with regard to automobile traffic, because of the inadequacy of connecting bus service, ingress and egress from the District of Columbia will be simply impossible in less than 5 years. It now takes an hour, when it should take only 20 minutes, to come to the District from Virginia or Maryland.

The amendment was fully considered by these agencies. They turned it down. It was fully considered by the House. The House turned it down.

The interests of the District of Columbia would be fully protected by the three men. The one from the District of Columbia would have a veto power over anything which applied only to the District of Columbia.

The Senator talks about 80 percent of the traffic, but the District of Columbia has 700,000 people, while there are 2 million or more in the suburbs. These are the ones about whom we should be concerned.

There is nothing in the bill which would do any injustice to the Capital Transit Co. To add the amendment as the Senator admitted, will kill the bill.

I hope the amendment will be defeated and that we shall then pass the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his suggestion?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I withhold my suggestion.

ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL 12 O'CLOCK NOON TODAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, there is some executive business to be considered. I had anticipated we would consider the sine die adjournment resolution tonight. We have the compact bill and two or three others to consider. The House is going to be in session today. I wonder if we could not come in at noon and continue this discussion, as well as handle the executive calendar and pass some House bills which came over yesterday, and then look forward to passing the sine die adjournment resolution.

If that is agreeable to the Members of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business, it stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

RETIRED PAY RECOMPUTATION ACT OF 1960

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, it is now apparent that this postconvention session of the 86th Congress will soon adjourn. I had hoped that action could have been taken on a number of matters which now will have to await the 87th Congress.

Nevertheless, I would not want us to adjourn unless some note was taken—and even some action still taken at this late date—on a measure which is worth the attention of this body.

This legislation deals with the retirement pay of many veterans who have served their country well.

The bill to which I refer is H.R. 11318, the Retired Pay Recomputation Act of 1960, which passed the House last May 12.

This measure was recommended by President Eisenhower last January.

He again urged its enactment when the Congress reconvened earlier this month.

The bill relates to the so-called 1958 Military Pay Career Incentive Act. A cost-of-living pay increase of 6 percent was approved at that time, but the 100-year traditional tie-in of retired pay to current base pay was not provided.

The bill now recommended by the President would, to a large extent, correct some of the inequities in cases where men who retired 2 years ago actually receive less pay than those who are retiring today.

The 1958 act was to serve as an incentive for officers to make the service a career. It did so, but at the same time an arbitrary date of June 1, 1958, was set for the incentive period to begin.

Thus, some officers who retired before that date, today receive less retirement pay than do officers—of the same rank and service—who retired after June 1, 1958.

The President has asked that this be corrected.

It is still hoped that this bill, H.R. 11318, will receive consideration at this session so the Senate can pass it. In doing so, as Secretary of Defense Gates has said, and I quote:

> We will be keeping faith with those who kept faith with their country, particularly during the dark and dangerous days of World War II, and to all who have given the best years of their lives in loyal, honorable service in our armed services.

Mr. President, I hope that the Congress will follow the recommendations of the President and Secretary of Defense.

If we are unable to obtain action on this bill in the closing hours of this session, I am hopeful that prompt attention can be given this desirable measure in the early weeks of the 87th Congress.

In the meantime, the Senate Armed Services Committee has approved a long-needed study of the entire armed services retirement system.

I am in complete accord with such an undertaking. I am sure that this study will go a long way toward eliminating any of the inequities that exist in present law. The morale factor of our armed services is important, and I believe this bill, as passed by the House, should become law as soon as possible in order that all of our retired military personnel are on the same pay basis.

THE PENNSYLVANIA RAILROAD STRIKE VERSUS DEMOCRACY

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, critics of American democracy frequently level the charge that we show a marked incapacity to manage our own affairs.

Enemies of democracy, of course, have long been mouthing that our system carries the seeds of its own failure and eventually will wear out and fall apart.

Now, the best refutation of such bilge is performance: the day in, day out management of our affairs—private, corporate, and governmental.

History attests to the fact that our American system of private enterprise has produced the greatest abundance of any civilization in recorded time; our standard of living is the envy of the world, and we are still on the march.

Mr. President, this has all been brought about because all of us have done, and are doing, our part to make the American system work. It has come about because American citizenry recognizes our mutuality of interest, because we have played the game according to the rules.

One of the basic elements of the American system is fair play. And this accords to the other fellow his rights, and treats with him accordingly. Inherent in this great American system is responsibility: individual responsibility, group responsibility, and responsibility of employee and employer.

In view of these few, basic philosophical observations, I am somewhat dismayed to learn from the public print and other media of information, that one of the major railroads of the country, a carrier whose history parallels the growth and development of our Nation, is threatened to be struck at midnight Wednesday, August 31.

Mr. President, I would say this is not playing the game, according to our American scheme of things. We have a stable and prosperous national pastime—baseball—because we learned a long time ago that the umpire must be boss—he must run the game, he calls the play, and the players abide by his ruling. Otherwise every rhubarb on the diamond would invite a free-for-all and no game could possibly be completed.

In the case of the rail dispute at hand, the umpire has called the play and made his decision. Not only once but twice. The President appointed an Emergency Fact Finding Board to inquire into this matter and its rulings were accepted by management—although many of the recommendations would impose heavy additional costs on the railroad—but the union, because it could not have its own way 100 percent, will not go along. There are 24 brotherhoods on the Pennsylvania Railroad. It is my understanding this dispute involves only 2 of those 24 unions, affecting 20,000 employees out of a total of 75,000.

This is contrary to the American pattern and to the traditional way of settling rail disputes in this country. Implicit in the thinking that went into the Railway Labor Act was the understanding on the part of management and labor that the way to settle differences was through responsible negotiations. It has become the tradition in the railroad industry that the trains are kept running while disagreements are continuously discussed, and settlements peaceably arrived at.

The Members of this body know full well the general facts relating to the railroads of this country. We have had to deal with this question in recent years owing to the financial straits the carriers found themselves in. They need fiscal help and relief, not additional unwarranted cost burdens saddled on them. And apart from the carriers themselves, the Nation can ill afford a major railroad tieup at this time when the need is for an expanding and flourishing economy and the increased requirements of the national defense program are going to make a greater demand on the transportation system of the United States.

Mr. President, it is a truism that no strike was ever won without the support of public opinion. Every factor in this situation warrants an abandonment of a strike threat, and a continuation of negotiations until the issues have been resolved. Keep the trains running.

AUTHORIZATION TO HAVE PRINTED IN THE RECORD A SPEECH ENTITLED "THE REPUBLICAN RECORD"

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the final CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the 2d session of the 86th Congress, at such time as it is printed, a speech which I have prepared for delivery, entitled "The Republican Record."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SENATOR JAMES H. KYLE, "FORGOTTEN" AUTHOR OF LABOR DAY BILL

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, as we proceed to adjourn this final session of the 86th Congress at a time when most Americans will be preparing to celebrate what we have come to call a long weekend, on the occasion of Labor Day, let us stop and recall for a few minutes just how the legislation to establish a national holiday for labor came about.

The year 1901 was indeed an eventful year in our American history.

It was in this year that two of our greatest Americans met their death—one, the result of an assassin's bullet; the other through illness.

Most Americans know something about the first man, for he was President William McKinley, who met death as the result of bullets fired from the gun of Leon Czolgosz while attending the Pan-American Exposition in Buffalo, N.Y.

The other, also an Ohioan by birth, and another lawmaker, passed into political and public obscurity. His name was James Henderson Kyle.

It is appropriate that we should pay tribute to Senator Kyle and to remember him, for it was his bill which passed the Congress back in 1894 that established Labor Day as a national holiday.

He was a Congregational minister by avocation. And in a few short weeks, without any prior political activity to his credit, he was, from November to March, elevated from his ministry into the Senate of these United States from my own State of South Dakota.

He came to South Dakota back in 1885 as minister to the people of Iroquois and Aberdeen, S. Dak. He came from his home in South Dakota to the Senate in Washington in 1891 as neither Democrat nor Republican, but as an Independent, although he is credited—or charged—with alining himself with the Democratic Party on most of the issues of the day.

During his first term in the Senate, he became chairman of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor where he was able to further the very things which he had advocated in a Fourth of July speech in 1890 in Aberdeen—the speech which actually launched his political career.

Senator Robert J. Gamble of South Dakota, a fellow colleague of Kyle's said of him:

> He always gave special interest to the rights of the individual, the safeguarding and elevation of labor, the integrity of the home and the extension of national legislation for its protection. He also believed in the broadening and elevating influences in our national life of higher education. He specially emphasized his interest in these questions when Chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, and also as chairman of the Industrial Commission, which conducted such an extended and exhaustive investigation covering the vital and complex questions of our industrial life.

Former Gov. M. Q. Sharpe, of South Dakota, in an address in Cedarville, Ohio, on Labor Day, September 2, 1946, added:

> It is remarkable that a man trained in the ministry, whose work prior to his advent into the national scene had been in the fields of ministry, raising money for a small college, hailing from a State almost devoid of industry and devoted to agrarian life should have achieved such an important place in Congress so quickly.

Senator Shelby Moore Cullom of Illinois remarked at the time of Senator Kyle's death:

> His inclination was to deal with education and labor questions. His mind inclined to these subjects. He was always specially interested in the success of schools and colleges and in the laborers of the country and thought, rightly, that, as between the poor and the rich, the poor man was entitled to be specially cared for and protected in these days of combinations of capital and organized trusts.

This was a time in history when the John D. Rockefellers were pictured as monsters—with their hands on the throats of the common man—and when William Jennings Bryan had gained his fame and nearly the Presidency with his "Cross of Gold" talk.

Kyle was a man of few speeches, but when he did speak, he had something to say.

And it was this Senator from a new and small agrarian State who proposed legislation making Labor Day a national holiday.

And although there is some controversy as to when the idea actually originated to observe Labor Day and whether the Knights of Labor in New York City or the New York City Central Labor Union originated the observance, it has been confirmed that the Knights of Labor had nothing officially to do with the declaration of such a holiday.

The idea that a day be set apart for the laboring people was first made public by a resolution at a meeting of the Central Labor Union held on May 8, 1882, when Mr. Peter J. McGuire, then general secretary of the Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners and later vice president of the American Federation of Labor suggested the first Monday in September be made the day to pay tribute to American industry.

Mr. McGuire's reasoning behind this day was "It would come at the most pleasant season of the year, nearly midway between the Fourth of July and Thanksgiving, and would fill a wide gap in the chronology of legal holidays."

The first Labor Day observance was not held on the first Monday in September; instead, it was on Tuesday, September 5, 1882, when about 10,000 union members marched up Broadway in New York City after which they spent the remainder of the day in Elm Park with all sorts of amusements provided.

Mr. President, it is 78 years ago to the very day that we will be observing Labor Day 1960.

Numerous labor leaders spoke to the crowds from 2:30 in the afternoon until nightfall that first Labor Day observance, and the celebration was such a success, it led to the establishment of an annual affair.

The next Labor Day was on a Wednesday, September 5, 1883, and the parade on that occasion was reported as an "imposing demonstration of the Central Labor Union."

In 1884, it was decided by the Central Labor Union to hold the celebration on the first Monday in September and central labor bodies in other cities were urged to celebrate that day as a universal holiday for workingmen.

The American Federation of Labor unanimously adopted a resolution on October 7, 1884, that the first Monday in September of each year be set apart as a laborers' national holiday, and we recommend its observance by all wage workers, irrespective of sex, calling, or nationality.

In the following years, municipal ordinances officially recognized Labor Day. State legislative recognition was developed only as a result of a campaign conducted by organized labor, and 23 States had enacted Labor Day laws by the end of 1893.

Oregon was first, by passage of an original law on February 21, 1887, designating Labor Day as the first Saturday of June. This was changed to the first Monday in September in February 1893 so as to conform with the general accepted scheme of observing the first Monday of September.

Back in 1886, the A.F. of L. convention recommended that Labor Day on the first Monday in September should be observed "until it shall be as uncommon for a man to work on that day as on Independence Day."

Increased interest in setting aside a day for honoring the workers of America, and the American Federation of Labor efforts for national recognition of the day, resulted in Senator Kyle's introduction of a bill in the Senate on August 28, 1893. It read:

> *Be it enacted, etc.,* That the first Monday in September in each year, being the day celebrated and known as labor's holiday, is hereby made a legal public holiday, to all intents and purposes, in the same manner as Christmas, the 1st day of January, the 22d day of February, the 30th day of May and the 4th day of July are now made by law public holidays.

The bill was introduced during a special session of the 53d Congress which President Grover Cleveland had called so that the serious financial question confronting the country might be considered.

Similar legislation was introduced by Representative Amos J. Cummings of New York and Representative Robert E. De Forest of Connecticut.

The Kyle bill was, according to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that day, "read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor."

Representative De Forest and Representative Cummings' bills were referred to the respective House Committee on Labor.

Committee Chairman Kyle, on February 13, 1894, reported the bill to the Senate without amendment; the House Labor Committee reported favorable action on the Cummings bill on May 15 of that year.

Although there was no opposition to passage of the bill in either House of Congress, it is interesting to note some of the comment made when the bill ap-

peared on the Senate Calendar for action on June 22, 1894.

The remarks were made by Senator Kyle:

I should like to say for the information of those who do not know that something like 23 States of the United States have now settled upon the first Monday of September or the 1st day of October. In order to make the observance uniform, that all may enjoy vacation privileges upon the same day, the labor organizations of the country have united in asking that the first Monday of September be set apart as a holiday.

Senator William B. Allison of Iowa asked if "the day mentioned in the bill is the 1st day of September?"

Senator Francis M. Cockrell of Missouri informed him it was the first Monday of September, but he thought it "ought to be the 1st day of September," and moved striking of the word "Monday" and insertion of the word "day," so as to read the "1st day of September."

Senator John H. Mitchell of Oregon noted it would then fall on Sunday every few years.

Senator Cockrell told that the Fourth of July falls on Sunday and so does "any fixed holiday fall upon Sunday occasionally."

Senator Mitchell thought it should be fixed to fall on a week day.

Senator John Sherman of Ohio next commented on Senator Mitchell's remarks and thought it best to leave the date the first Monday in September if that was what the labor organizations wanted and if 23 States had already obliged with that date. He thought it better to have a weekday anyway, since he did not encourage holidays on Sunday for there "is too much old Presbyterianism in me for that."

Senator Cockrell didn't like to encourage holidays on Sunday either, but he figured if there was to be any sort of symmetry in our holiday scheme, "this one ought to be fixed on the 1st day of the month, just as we have the Fourth of July, the 25th of December, the 30th of May, and so on, for public holidays."

He didn't object to "letting it go," and thereby withdrew his amendment if anyone objected to it.

Senator Sherman next commented:

We had better leave it the first Monday, as we now create the holiday. The Fourth of July was created by the great event, and could not be changed.

Vice President Adlai E. Stevenson announced the amendment from the Missouri Senator was withdrawn.

The bill was then reported to the Senate, engrossed for a third reading, read and passed.

One day later, the Kyle bill was delivered to the House side and laid before that body.

On June 26, with the Cummings Labor Day bill already on the House Calendar where it undoubtedly could not be reached for a number of weeks it was decided by Representative Lawrence E. McGann of Illinois, chairman of the House Labor Committee, to place the Kyle bill which had the same text as the Cummings bill, before the House. This thereby caused a substitution of the Kyle bill for the Cummings bill before the House where, "There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading; and being read the third time, was passed."

Three steps remained, even though the Kyle bill had passed both the Senate and the House of Representatives before it would become a part of our Federal statutes. Three steps remained which would insure for Senator James Henderson Kyle of South Dakota the credit for having legislation passed which was indeed a commendable recognition for the common man—the workingman—the laborer.

On June 27, the bill was enrolled in both Houses and duly signed by the Speaker, Mr. Charles F. Crisp, of Georgia, and the Vice President. This was the first and second step.

Next, and finally, on June 29, 1894, it was announced by Mr. O. L. Prudent, one of President Cleveland's secretaries, that "the President on the 28th instant approved and signed the act—S. 730—making Labor Day a legal holiday."

By 1900, Labor Day was officially recognized by most of the States. Not until 1923, did the last State, Wyoming, fall into line.

In Wisconsin and Wyoming, Labor Day is set by the Governors, but in effect, they designate the first Monday in September for observance.

And at no time, as far as a search of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD indexes goes, is it disclosed that the question of changing the day of Labor Day observance been raised or discussed in the Congress.

Tradition and practice have established the first Monday in September to acknowledge the part American workers have played in the economic growth of our Nation.

Since the holiday was created by concerted action and not by fixed event of any kind, it is feasible to change the date of observance, but such a change would be complicated by the fact that Federal law and each individual State law would have to be amended, since each jurisdiction is separately controlled by independent legislation on the subject.

Samuel Gompers, when reporting to the 1894 A.F. of L. convention, stated:

National Labor Day—It affords me pleasure to be able to report that the demand made by the American Federation of Labor for making the first Monday in September of each year a legal holiday passed Congress and was made a law on June 28, 1894.

It is amazing, Mr. President, to note that in many of the papers and articles which tell about the establishment of Labor Day as a national holiday, little or no mention is given to the man who was responsible for first introducing the bill in the Congress.

I hope it has been possible to convey to those students of Americana who are interested in our past and present and future, what part James H. Kyle, a minister and U.S. Senator, played in this great event for the laboring people of the United States.

In the words of former South Dakota Governor M. Q. Sharpe:

Too few know Senator Kyle for what he was. Today our politicians, our labor leaders, our statesmen could well pause to study the life, the character, the activities, of James H. Kyle and to follow his rule of life, to support the just, to eschew the partisan, to dignify labor, and to represent all of the people of his constituency without regard to their political affiliation.

If the life of the man who conceived of a national Labor Day, who served as chairman of the first great industrial commission, which he had sponsored by appropriate legislation and which commission by its research and study laid the groundwork for better conditions for labor and better relations with labor, could but be studied by the friends and foes of labor alike, it would reveal to them a policy that might * * * eliminate much of the unrest and turmoil of these times. Senator Kyle would have made a splendid arbiter for he was able to command the respect of friend and foe alike. Perhaps we may again have a man arise to meet this emergency who can, like Kyle, create a middle ground on which all may meet, confer, and serve their Nation with the same devotion that characterized this Ohioan who made South Dakota his home.

Mr. President, a man who served his Nation so impartially and with serious dedication at all times.

KAISER INDUSTRIAL TECHNOLOGY

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, "We must be able to enjoy the results of technology, which are order and efficiency and profusion of goods—and at the same time enjoy what human beings have always held to be of supreme importance: Liberty and the possibility of spontaneity."

These penetrating words of Aldous Huxley point out quite clearly how important and meaningful our recent space explorations are to us. I, for one, am extremely proud of our industry-Government-military space team. In particular though, I am especially proud, and understandably so, of one of our community neighbors in Jackson County, W. Va.—the Kaiser Aluminum & Chemical Corp.

I have just learned that aluminum produced by that company was used in the Echo I balloon; the engines of the historymaking Discoverers XIII and XIV satellites; the X–15 rocket aircraft; and the Thor Delta and Thor Agena missiles. As many of you know, the largest aluminum rolling mill in the United States, if not the world, is the Kaiser plant in Ravenswood, W. Va.

During the 5 years that the Kaiser plant has been operating there, the company and its people have contributed a great deal to the industrial and cultural expansion of West Virginia. With their annual payroll of some $15.5 million, providing employment for more than 3,100 West Virginians, Kaiser's very presence has served as a stimulus to attract allied industries to our State.

While our experience with the Kaiser people has been primarily with their aluminum company affiliate, many of my colleagues in the Senate are familiar with the worldwide activities of Kaiser Industries Corp., its parent company, and the contribution it has made to greater international understanding. I would like to review for a moment just a few of the activities of the parent company and its affiliates since the first of the year.

In January, Kaiser Aluminum and Delto Metal Co., Ltd., one of the largest fabricators of nonferrous products in the United Kingdom, organized a new fabricating company in the United Kingdom—James Booth Aluminium, Ltd. Kaiser Aluminum International is participating with Pechiney, of France, and Spanish interests in three privately owned and operated aluminum producing and fabricating companies in Spain. In addition, Kaiser, with the French and Spanish interests, have joined in the formation of a new company to operate a reduction plant in northern Spain. Kaiser Aluminum and the Birla interests in India have completed plans to establish an integrated aluminum producing industry there. At the request of the Ghana Government, Kaiser Aluminum is sponsoring the organization of a consortium to build and operate a reduction plant.

Kaiser Center, the largest office building west of the Mississippi River and general headquarters for the Kaiser organization, has just been completed in Oakland, Calif.

Kaiser Engineers International is just beginning work on the third phase of the gigantic Snowy Mountains hydroelectric scheme in Australia. In Africa, these engineering specialists are completing the preliminary dam site work for the important Volta River project in Ghana. In addition, they have begun construction of a 100,000-ton cement plant in India.

Kaiser engineers are participating in a joint venture for the construction of Atlas operational missile launching complexes at Plattsburgh AFB, N.Y., and Walker AFB, N. Mex.

The National Steel & Shipbuilding Co., acquired by Kaiser early this year, launched in June the second of six freighters for the American Export Lines.

Kaiser Hawaii Kai Development Co., a wholly owned subsidiary of the H. J. Kaiser Co., is well along in the development of the new resort-residential city of Hawaii Kai, located on 6,000 acres near Honolulu. Initial master planning provides for 11,000 homes, business sections, and a central civic center, apartments, beach resort hotels, a golf course, and a marina with 20 miles of waterfront homesites.

Willys Motors, Inc., received contracts to produce 4,010 Jeep Fleetvan mail trucks for the U.S. Post Office Department and 5,228 commercial and military Jeep vehicles and spare parts. These latter contracts provide for 605 vehicles for the U.S. Marine Corps, 623 vehicles for the Venezuelan Army under the U.S. military assistance program and 4,000 vehicles for the Turkish Army. Willys Motors, Inc., also established Jeep assembly and distribution facilities in the Union of South Africa.

Industrias Kaiser Argentina S.A., IKA, an affiliate of Willys, and Lockheed Aircraft Corp. have established the first aircraft manufacturing venture in South America by a U.S. industry. IKA also expanded its vehicle line to include the Bergantin and Renault Dauphine passenger cars. It also makes the Kaiser Carabela passenger car and Jeep vehicles. In addition, the company established the first auto[illegible] financing company in Argentina.

Willys-Overland do Brasil, [illegible]o Paulo, Brazil, an affiliate of Willys Motors, expanded its product line through the introduction of the Aero Willys and Renault Dauphine cars.

Permanente Cement Co. has just announced plans to construct a multimillion dollar cement plant in Alaska. Dedication of Hawaii's first cement plant was held earlier this month by the company.

This brief recount of some of Kaiser's present activities points out very emphatically why we in West Virginia are so proud to have one of the growing Kaiser companies in our community.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR O'MAHONEY

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, day before yesterday I took note on this floor of the closing activities in this body of my senior colleague, Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY. I placed in the RECORD a long, long list of the legislative measures with which he has been associated during the more than quarter century of his service in the U.S. Senate.

Since my remarks last Monday he has been accorded yet another great honor. The National Committee for a Representative Congress, a nonpartisan group of public spirited citizens created to help outstanding Senators and Congressmen whose courageous positions in the public interest may excite political attacks from outside special interests or pressure groups, has just presented to my senior colleague a citation entitled: "Award for Outstanding Representative Public Service."

The text of the scroll reads as follows:

FOR AN OUTSTANDING RECORD FOR DISTINGUISHED SERVICE AS A U.S. SENATOR

In adhering steadfastly to the principles of representative government;

In rendering highly constructive services to the people of Wyoming, faithfully and vigorously representing their ideals and objectives and making many important contributions to the welfare, progress, and betterment of that State;

In standing forth as a fighting champion of the people, determined to make democracy work, and to keep government of the United States truly "Of the people, by the people, and for the people";

In serving with unflagging zeal as a judicial expert, continually alert and vigilant against the passage of any law which might abridge the constitutional protections of our citizens;

In building through his brilliant record as a U.S. Senator an enduring monument to himself by daily deeds and actions—be it highly intellectual judicial discourse in Senate debate, or kindly graciousness to an employee, each reflecting the O'MAHONEY touch of greatness, shadows from the Star of David. The outstanding record of a man gifted with the power of seeing far into the future, while not forgetting the past or neglecting the present—a man who lives but to serve his God, his fellow men, his country—with honor, courage, ability, and unswerving devotion to the public trust. A Senator of undimming eminence, wholeheartedly dedicated to faithfully serving America and democracy with unselfish disregard for any personal political consequences—another great American whose like will not be seen again.

According to the tradition of the National Committee for a Representative Congress, the group usually confines its citations to Senators seeking reelection; a recent case in point being the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, ESTES KEFAUVER.

But in the present instance, they singled out Senator O'MAHONEY's impending retirement to do him special honor. In the words of the chairman of the organization, Mr. Robert Austin, submitted to the Senator:

Although you are retiring, we feel that you have such an outstanding record of representative public service, and have authored so much legislation beneficial to the lives of all our citizens, that you certainly would be entitled to our suport if you were seeking reelection. We are, therefore, highly pleased to present to you our committee's formal "Award for Outstanding Representative Public Service," the text of which was written by your longtime friend and admirer, Charlie Kress.

I am confident that I speak the sense of this body, the U.S. Senate, in endorsing the expression of the National Committee for a Representative Congress as reflecting the sense of many, many of Senator O'MAHONEY's colleagues and friends.

I request also, Mr. President, that an editorial appearing in tonight's Evening Star be included in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A GENUINE LIBERAL

Senator O'MAHONEY sang his Senate swan song on Monday evening. Retiring at the end of this session, he has introduced the last bill that will carry his name as a sponsor. One of the tributes paid him on the Senate floor came from his junior colleague from Wyoming, Senator MCGEE, who placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a list of laws sponsored or cosponsored by Senator O'MAHONEY in his 27 years of Senate service. The list, printed in small type, filled more than two pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The laws he helped to make are many. But we doubt if the enactment of any of them required more hard work, more skill in the legislative art, more courage, or exemplified more genuine liberalism in the best meaning of a much-abused term, than what he did to prevent the enactment of bills that might have become law.

One of these was the Roosevelt court-packing proposal. Senator O'MAHONEY came to the Senate as a dependable New Dealer and a stanch supporter of Franklin D. Roosevelt. But he made his choice and fought the bill with everything he had. He helped defeat it. Years later, in 1957, he took leadership in the fight against the proposal to deny jury trials in the civil rights bill. An acknowledged champion of civil rights, he won his point, and by winning it contributed to passage of the first civil rights bill since Reconstruction.

Because he was always considered a liberal Senator, his position on these and some other proposals brought him harsh criticism as a traitor to his cause. While popular concepts of liberalism change, however, Senator O'MAHONEY never did. He leaves the Senate with a fine record. "I owe allegiance to the people only," he used to say. In return they gave him their respect—and he takes it with him into retirement.

TRANSACTION OF ADDITIONAL ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following additional routine business was transacted:

EXTENSION OF TERMINATION DATE OF MEXICAN FARM LABOR PROGRAM—TELEGRAM

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a telegram I have received from John C. Lynn, legislative director of the American Farm Bureau Federation, favoring an extension of the termination date of the Mexican farm labor program.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
August 31, 1960.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Respectfully recommend your favorable vote for H.R. 12759, Calendar No. 1971, scheduled for Senate consideration possibly today, to extend termination date Mexican farm labor program from June 30, 1961, to December 1, 1961. This would provide farmers assurance, when operating and financing plans and arrangements being made this winter and next spring, that farm labor situation would not be disrupted in middle of season.

JOHN C. LYNN,
Legislative Director, American Farm Bureau Federation.

ADDITIONAL REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following additional reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, without amendment:

H.R. 12699. An act to cancel a deed of trust to the United States from the Predecessor in name of Gallaudet College and any evidences of indebtedness related to the same transaction, to quiet the college's title to property belonging to it, and for other purposes.

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia, from the Committee on Finance, with amendments:

H.R. 13062. An act to amend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended (Rept. No. 1940).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

H.R. 1526. An act for the relief of F. P. Tower, Lillie B. Lewis, the estate of Manuel Branco, John Santos Carinhas, Joaquin Gometz Carinhas, and Manuel Jesus Carinhas (Rept. No. 1941);

H.R. 3536. An act for the relief of Guadalupe Villarreal, Jr. (Rept. No. 1942);

H.R. 8166. An act for the relief of the Crum-McKinnon Building Co., Billings, Mont. (Rept. No. 1943);

H.R. 9715. An act for the relief of Otis Drinkhard (Rept. No. 1944); and

H.R. 11322. An act for the relief of Col. Joseph A. Nichols (Rept. No. 1945).

By Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

H.R. 11380. An act for the relief of Mr. Joe J. Farmer (Rept. No. 1946).

ADDITIONAL BILL INTRODUCED

Mr. JAVITS, by unanimous consent, introduced a bill (S. 3924) for the relief of Pearl Cantor (A11581501), which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AUTHORIZATION FOR INSERTIONS IN RECORD FOLLOWING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators may be permitted to make insertions in the RECORD following the adjournment of Congress until the last edition authorized by the Joint Committee on Printing is published; but this order shall not apply to any subject matter which may have occurred or to any speech delivered subsequent to the adjournment of Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRINTING OF COMMITTEE ACTIVITY REPORTS

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, with reference to the printing of committee activity reports for the session, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing, I wish to remind the chairmen of all committees that the Joint Committee on Printing has very properly ruled that the printing of such reports, both as committee prints and in the RECORD, is duplication, the cost of which cannot be justified.

It is requested that committee chairmen decide whether they wish these reports printed as committee prints or in the RECORD, since the Government Printing Office will be directed not to print them both ways.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, August 31, 1960, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 1066. An act to revise the boundaries and change the name of Fort Donelson National Military Park, and for other purposes;

S. 1214. An act to amend the act of March 11, 1948 (62 Stat. 78), relating to the establishment of the De Soto National Memorial, in the State of Florida;

S. 1870. An act to provide for examination, licensing, and regulation of practical nurses, and for practical nursing education in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

S. 2131. An act to amend the Motor Vehicle Safety Responsibility Act of the District of Columbia approved May 25, 1954, as amended;

S. 2575. An act to provide a health benefits program for certain retired employees of the Government;

S. 2633. An act to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, and for other purposes;

S. 3416. An act to provide for the restoration to the United States of amounts expended in the District of Columbia in carrying out the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act of 1958;

S. 3648. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia on behalf of the United States to transfer from the United States to the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency title to certain real property in said District;

S. 3835. An act to authorize the District of Columbia Civil War Centennial Commission to plan and carry out in the District of Columbia civic programs in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the Civil War; to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of Defense to make certain property of the District and of the United States available for the use of such Commission; to authorize the said Commissioners to make certain regulations and permit certain uses to be made of public space, and for other purposes; and

S. 3867. An act to exempt from taxation certain property of the National Guard Association of the United States in the District of Columbia.

RECESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if no other Senator desires to address the Senate, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 24 minutes a.m., Thursday, September 1, 1960) the Senate took a recess until 12 o'clock meridian of the same day.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate August 31, 1960:

The following-named persons, who were appointed during the last recess of the Senate, to the positions indicated:

ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL

Robert A. Bicks, of New York, to be an Assistant Attorney General, vice Victor R. Hansen, resigned.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Charles H. King, of Michigan, to be a member of Federal Communications Commission for the unexpired term of 7 years from July 1, 1954, vice John C. Doerfer, resigned.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Paul A. Sweeney, of Maryland, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 22, 1963, vice John B. Hussey, deceased.

The following-named persons to the positions indicated:

NATIONAL CAPITAL TRANSPORTATION AGENCY

H. Holmes Vogel, of the District of Columbia, to be Administrator of the National Capital Transportation Agency (new position).

To be members of the Advisory Board of the National Capital Transportation Agency (new positions):

Donald C. Hyde, of Ohio.
S. Moran McConihe, of Maryland.
Harland Bartholomew, of Missouri.
William H. Moss, of Virginia.

Edward Burling, Jr., of the District of Columbia.

POSTMASTERS

MARYLAND

G. Lucille Bunting, Bishopville, Md., in place of H. R. Ringler, retired.

MICHIGAN

Marie A. Pitts, New Buffalo, Mich., in place of J. M. Littlejohn, resigned.

OHIO

Alonzo D. McGlumphy, Martins Ferry, Ohio, in place of O. C. Frantz, retired.

OREGON

John R. Nieland, Canby, Oreg., in place of H. I. Brown, retired.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Ernest R. Baker, Pickens, S.C., in place of R. T. Hallum, Jr., resigned.

TEXAS

Grattus H. Pamplin, McKinney, Tex., in place of D. O. Davis, retired.

ALABAMA

Armstead L. Hayes, Notasulga, Ala., in place of J. G. Rea, retired.

ALASKA

Thomas L. Jackson, Sr., Kake, Alaska, in place of R. R. Martin, resigned.

ARIZONA

Eva H. Sutherlin, Thatcher, Ariz., in place of F. M. Martin, removed.

CALIFORNIA

Rollo L. Van Slyke, Port Hueneme, Calif., in place of A. J. Haycox, retired.

Katherine O. Bogendorfer, Van Nuys, Calif., in place of E. D. Gibson, retired.

ILLINOIS

Mary A. Tipsord, Cooksville, Ill., in place of O. L. Dean, deceased.

MISSISSIPPI

John R. Long, State College, Miss., in place of H. E. Wamsley, retired.

MISSOURI

Anton Foss, Hunnewell, Mo., in place of J. E. White, retired.

MONTANA

Elwin Claire, Wolf Point, Mont., in place of W. B. McCracken, transferred.

NEW YORK

Robert F. Schiener, Sardinia, N.Y., in place of M. C. Cudoba, deceased.

Dorothy R. DuMond, Ulster Park, N.Y., in place of C. H. Schoonmaker, retired.

OKLAHOMA

Deryl D. Milford, Byars, Okla., in place of D. E. Jones, transferred.

PENNSYLVANIA

Floyd G. Kulp, Franconia, Pa., in place of N. L. Kulp, retired.

Milton F. Ward, Tioga, Pa., in place of R. S. Kayzer, retired.

PUERTO RICO

Roberto DeJesus Correa, Loiza, P.R., in place of H. F. Matos, retired.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Hosea A. Weathers, Fountain Inn, S.C., in place of W. J. Hill, retired.

William E. Spears, Union, S.C., in place of J. W. Wilbanks, retired.

TENNESSEE

David F. Ross, Cottagegrove, Tenn., in place of R. B. Cox, transferred.

ALABAMA

Julia G. Oliver, Panola, Ala., in place of A. G. Schmitz, retired.

FLORIDA

James V. Harper, Orange Park, Fla., in place of R. L. Luga, transferred.

IOWA

Hansel A. Lowe, Maxwell, Iowa., in place of E. L. Wood, retired.

LOUISIANA

Beatrice A. Croft, Pride, La., in place of J. L. Townsend, retired.

MINNESOTA

Sanferd B. Gullickson, Cottonwood, Minn., in place of E. M. Kolhei, deceased.

NEBRASKA

Wilber H. Roesch, Falls City, Nebr., in place of A. E. Elam, retired.

NEW JERSEY

Ralph H. Donnell, Park Ridge, N.J., in place of J. J. McNally, retired.

NEW YORK

Robert K. Baker, Argyle, N.Y., in place of A. C. Hall, retired.

Wilbur S. Williams, Hudson Falls, N.Y., in place of L. F. Howland, retired.

NORTH DAKOTA

Wilfred J. Haas, Hazen, N. Dak., in place of Ronald Keeley, deceased.

OHIO

Robert D. Fisher, Beach City, Ohio, in place of W. J. Miller, retired.

Joseph J. Smerke, Gates Mills, Ohio, in place of K. H. A. Haberecht, resigned.

Paul L. Rood, Westerville, Ohio, in place of S. O. Kreischer, retired.

OKLAHOMA

Ford H. Sims, Martha, Okla., in place of W. O. Rowsey, deceased.

PENNSYLVANIA

George D. Yoder, Ashland, Pa., in place of H. J. Betz, deceased.

William E. Thumma, Millersville, Pa., in place of J. M. Hartman, deceased.

Walter H. Hoffman, Strasburg, Pa., in place of C. W. Johnston, retired.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Inez I. Haenfler, Avon, S. Dak., in place of L. V. Marek, retired.

TEXAS

Arlene H. Burks, Blossom, Tex., in place of L. H. Clark, retired.

Milton B. Ford, Slaton, Tex., in place of T. E. McClanahan, retired.

Junius D. Metz, Waco, Tex., in place of L. C. Alexander, retired.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate August 31, 1960:

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Jimmie N. Puccio, Clio.
Thomas H. Christian, Northport.
Doctor F. Gibson, Wadley.

ARKANSAS

Rex Hutchison, Evening Shade.
Harold D. Byrd, Gassville.
Lillian T. Biggers, Hampton.
Jake M. Dunn, Pocahontas.

CALIFORNIA

Joe L. Miller, Bishop.
Elizabeth A. Waite, Cambria.
Howard C. Denton, Los Altos.
Harold E. Purpus, Millbrae.
Sylvan C. Smith, San Pedro.
Katherine O. Bogendorfer, Van Nuys.

COLORADO

Howard W. Cross, Grand Junction.

CONNECTICUT

Salvatore J. Puglisi, Middleton.

FLORIDA

Benjamin C. Grunig, Callahan.
Francis E. Earl, Tarpon Springs.

GEORGIA

Fred Daves, Jr., Calhoun.
John C. McCrary, Hardwick.
Charles L. Strickland, Jesup.
Rodolph Broach, Putney.
Horace U. Whitaker, Rutledge.

IDAHO

Albert W. Miller, Gooding.
Milan M. Casper, Rigby.

ILLINOIS

Clarence B. O'Marah, Eureka.
Raymond H. Burklund, Paxton.
Beulah B. Reynolds, Russell.
Vern W. Graham, Sugar Grove.

INDIANA

Geraldine Z. Marsteller, Russellville.

IOWA

Daniel H. Maxwell, Spencer.
Dale M. Magnussen, Traer.
Wayne C. Smith, Waterloo.
Charles E. Boyles, Woodward.

KANSAS

Eugene L. Foland, Almena.
Richard R. Simmons, Ashland.
John J. Hein, Beulah.
Earl F. Giesick, Leoti.
Elmer E. McAferty, McLouth.
Norman C. Raleigh, Medicine Lodge.
Earl A. Montford, Selden.
Clyde F. Christenson, Tescott.

KENTUCKY

Randall C. Day, Jr., Whitesburg.

LOUISIANA

Willie S. Fussell, Amite.
Boyd Wilkins, Jr., Columbia.
Sharon B. Parker, Sikes.
Herthel S. Devall, Springfield.

MAINE

Karl T. Spruce, Bradley.
Wallace H. Campbell, Fort Fairfield.
Marion P. Davis, Hebron.

MARYLAND

Donald M. Sturtevant, Landover.

MASSACHUSETTS

Edward B. Waite, Jr., Southboro.
Ruth I. Morey, South Lincoln.
Frank Baldwin, South Wellfleet.
Henry J. LaFrance, Tyngsboro.
Paul P Skorput, West Stockbridge.
Gerturude C. Bardwell, Whately.

MICHIGAN

Ralph W. Menerey, Brimley.
Paul Richard Conklin, Fremont.
Otto Klein, Jr., Harrisville.
Loraine W. Gardner, Hartland.
Robert C. Steger, Lathrup Village.
Frederick E. Reyer, Marshall.
Paul A. Racheter, Pigeon.

MINNESOTA

John P. DeGreeff, Chandler.
Marvin L. Lorentz, Hastings.
John A. Butson, Vernon Center.

MISSISSIPPI

Charles W. Erwin, Duncan.
Marie R. Shepherd, Silver City.

MISSOURI

Vincil C. Esther, Linn Creek.

MONTANA

Pearl M. Murr, Flaxville.

NEBRASKA

Raymond W. Pettinger, Burchard.
Dale W. Farmer, Callaway.
Richard A. Smith, Jr., Grafton.
Oliver T. Brown, Kenesaw.
Warren G. Schlesiger, Millard.
Stanley D. Montgomery, Royal.
Forrest H. Bahm, Shelby.
Alfred L. Madsen, Winnebago.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Gordon M. Smith, Barnstead.

NEW JERSEY

Machael A. DeLorenzo, Dover.
James L. Elberson, Wenonah.
Arlton W. Pilling, Woodbury.

NEW YORK

George M. Wood, Allentown.
Ethel Gowdey, Bloomingburg.
Mae M. Gibbs, East Nassau.
Marguerite J. Fadale, Lily Dale.
Ethel M. Hare, Limestone.
Hubert F. McMaster, Nunda.
Muriel M. Bonini, Oscawana.

NORTH CAROLINA

Elizabeth B. Brinson, Arapahoe.
Mary S. Rittenbury, Leasburg.
Elvin C. Cox, Ramseur.
Joseph P. Hamilton, Whitakers.

NORTH DAKOTA

Lillian E. Johnson, Horace.

OHIO

Frank P. Jackson, Jr., Ashley.
Harold E. Welkert, Covington.
Raymond E. Sprunk, Fremont.
Jacque E. Mintchell, Jackson Center.
Donna L. Griffith, Pedro.
Phyllis J. Dundon, Rootstown.
William J. List, Struthers.
Russell H. Miller, Yellow Springs.

OKLAHOMA

Minnie E. Kocher, Avant.
Lily J. Westfall, Carney.
Leon J. Mattox, Howe.
Tom F. Bonner, Idabel.
William W. Dorsett, Medford.

OREGON

L. Houston Valentine, Jacksonville.
Kenneth P. Lanning, Lebanon.

PENNSYLVANIA

Robert J. Talley, Chadds Ford.
John M. Harshaw, Jr., Conneaut Lake.
Thomas S. Duncan, Edinbury.
Francis G. White, Ferndale.
Francis J. Dillon, Glenside.
Clarence L. Hampton, Holicong.
Lawrence C. Viehdorfer, Karthaus.
Samuel S. Detwiler, Kimberton.
John A. Schultz, Neshaminy.
Eleanor M. Johnston, New Alexandria.
Raymond Carlson, New Stanton.
Robert Laird, Jr., Reynoldsville.
Robert V. Webster, Roaring Branch.
Henry H. Arnold, Robertsdale.
Gertrude H. Althouse, Sadsburyville.
Wilson D. Puhl, Sanatoga.
Lisle Robert Johns, Shelocta.
Donald J. Rowlands, Slatington.
Edgar F. Benner, State College.
Albert L. Bloss, Union City.
Robert C. Guth, Vanderbilt.
Charles W. J. Whitcroft, Villanova.
Lester R. Gordon, Warrington.
Stewart C. McCullough, Wattsburg.
Leona P. Waters, Wiconisco.
James J. Brogan, Sr., Woodlyn.
Dorothy G. Sacks, Woxall.
William J. Zepp, York Springs.

RHODE ISLAND

Henry K. Mook, Charlestown.
Edward C. Borders, Foster Center.
David A. Arnott, Shannock.
Reginald L. Campbell, Tiverton.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Ernest R. Baker, Pickens.
Hosea A. Weathers, Fountain Inn.
David J. Hoffman, Sharon.
William E. Spears.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Wayne E. Hansen, Mount Vernon.
Edna C. Forsyth, Northville.
James A. Muldoon, Presho.

TENNESSEE

Rubye S. Hill, Dandridge.
E. Neil Muzzall, Henry.
M. Frances Long, Palmer.
Robert A. Emerson, Saulsbury.

TEXAS

James E. Watson, Barry.
Harold O. Real, Converse.
Wayne H. Lowrance, Denton.
James E. Winder, Springlake.
Jack H. Montgomery, Weimar.
Raymond J. Hruska, West.
Gustave C. Cooper, Windom.
Robert B. Richardson, Wylie.

VERMONT

Raymond L. Domey, Marshfield.
Alfred E. Turner, Saint Johnsbury Center.
Virginia A. Peterson, South Ryegate.
Ellery G. Giles, Wardsboro.
Alton A. Ellis, West Pawlet.

WEST VIRGINIA

Margaret E. Martin, Stirrat.

WISCONSIN

Robert L. Mink, Clyman.
Oren P. Neville, North Prairie.
Roy A. McMahon, Pardeeville.
William S. DeWitt, Sayner.
Earl E. Malles, Trempealeau.
John P. Tracy, Wausaukee.
Leonard M. Rohde, Weyauwega.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 31, 1960

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Philippians 2: 5: *Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus.*

Almighty God, grant that daily we may respond more eagerly to the Master's call and dedicate ourselves anew to every noble cause that will make life blessed and meaningful for all mankind.

Teach us to recognize, in men everywhere, the bonds of our common humanity and reveal the good in others which hitherto we have failed to see because of our blindness and ignorance.

Forgive us for being guilty of those attitudes of pride and superiority, of bigotry and prejudice, which stifle and destroy the spirit of brotherhood we should cultivate and cherish.

Show us how we may break down every barrier we are tempted to raise even in religion, whose concepts and creed men honestly hold by reason of training and tradition, or choice and conviction.

Inspire us to follow the more excellent way of charity and have within our hearts a new birth of the principles of our blessed Lord.

Now may the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, the love of God, and the fellowship of the Holy Spirit be with us all. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 12993. An act to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955, as amended.

JAMES MADISON MEMORIAL COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 1; Public Law 86-417, the Chair appoints as members of the James Madison Memorial Commission the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. SMITH of Virginia, Mr. SLACK, Mr. POFF, and Mr. MOORE.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 198]

Anderson, Mont.	Grant	Murray
Auchincloss	Gray	Pilcher
Barden	Green, Oreg.	Powell
Baumhart	Hays	Preston
Blitch	Hébert	Rogers, Mass.
Boggs	Hess	Shipley
Bolling	Irwin	Smith, Kans.
Bowles	Jackson	Smith, Va.
Breeding	Kilburn	Taylor, N.Y.
Celler	Lafore	Thompson, La.
Curtis, Mass.	Landrum	Thompson, N.J.
Davis, Tenn.	McMillan	Vinson
Doyle	McSween	Willis
Durham	Magnuson	Withrow
Flynn	May	Young
Fogarty	Miller, Clem	
	Mitchell	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 380 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 13161) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2211)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 13161) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 2, 4, 27, 28a, 31, 33, 36, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 59, 65, 66, 76, and 78.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 21, 26, 28, 29, 57, 74, 79, 80, 81 and 82, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree

to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$10,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$75,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$24,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"BUREAU OF FOREIGN COMMERCE

"Salaries and expenses

"For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses', $500,000, of which not to exceed $40,000 may be transferred to the appropriation for 'Salaries and expenses,' General Administration."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 60: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 60, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$919,450"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 64: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 64, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$9,393,900"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 67: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 67, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,425,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 68: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 68, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,050,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 75: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 75, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$275,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 77: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 77, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 83: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 83, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$125,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 23, 30, 34, 35, 37, 56, 58, 61, 62, 63, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 84 and 85.

ALBERT THOMAS,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
CLARENCE CANNON,
BEN F. JENSEN,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

CARL HAYDEN,
LYNDON JOHNSON,
DENNIS CHAVEZ,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
LISTER HILL,
A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
STYLES BRIDGES
(except 2),
LEVERETT H. SALTONSTALL
(except 2),
MILTON R. YOUNG,
KARL E. MUNDT,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 13161) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

Amendment No. 1: Inserts title as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 2—President's Special International Program: Deletes Senate proposal to appropriate $986,800.

Amendment No. 3—Special Foreign Currency Program: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 4—Administrative expenses, Overseas Surplus Agricultural Commodity Donations: Deletes language proposed by the Senate. If the administration feels that this auditing should be done, the conferees have no objection to the International Cooperation Administration doing the work within presently available funds.

Mutual Security

Amendments Nos. 5 through 15: Reported in disagreement.

Department of Agriculture

Amendment No. 16—Foreign Agricultural Service: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 17—Forest Service: Appropriates $750,000 instead of $700,000 as proposed by the House and $800,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Department of Commerce

Amendment No. 18—Office of Field Services: Appropriates $100,000 instead of $207,500 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 19—West Virginia Centennial Celebration: Appropriates $10,000 instead of $5,000 as proposed by the House and $15,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 20—Bureau of the Census: Appropriates $75,000 instead of $150,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 21—Coast and Geodetic Survey: Inserts title.

Amendment No. 22—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $24,000 instead of $284,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 23—Construction and equipment: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 24—Business and Defense Services Administration: Appropriates $200,000 instead of $291,500 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 25—Bureau of Foreign Commerce: Appropriates $500,000 of which not to exceed $40,000 may be transferred to the appropriation for "Salaries and expenses, General administration", instead of $1,000,000 and transfer authority of $83,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 26—Bureau of Public Roads: Corrects typographical error.

Amendment No. 27—Weather Bureau: Deletes the Senate proposal to appropriate $50,000 for "Salaries and expenses".

District of Columbia

Amendment No. 28—Executive Office: Appropriates $47,700 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 28a—Courts: Appropriates $75,000 as proposed by the House instead of $155,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 29—Capital outlay: Inserts title.

Amendment No. 30—Public building construction: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 31—Department of Sanitary Engineering: Deletes Senate proposal to appropriate $3,838,000.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

Amendment No. 32—Food and Drug Administration: Appropriates $1,200,000 instead of $1,000,000 as proposed by the House and $1,528,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 33—Office of Education: Appropriates $2,225,000 for land-grant college aid as proposed by the House instead of $6,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 34—Public Health Service: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 35—Social Security Administration: Reported in disagreement.

Independent offices

Amendment No. 36—Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations: Appropriates $28,500 as proposed by the House instead of $57,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 37—Foreign Claims Settlement Commission: Reported in disagreement.

General Services Administration

Amendment No. 38—Repair and improvement of public buildings: Deletes the Senate proposal to appropriate $2,000,000 for construction of fallout shelters.

Amendments Nos. 39 through 54—Construction, public buildings projects: Delete Senate proposal to appropriate $5,289,000 for construction of fallout shelters in new public buildings, and delete increases in the limitation on cost of various public buildings.

Amendment No. 55—General provisions: Deletes language proposed by the Senate repealing Section 303 of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1961.

Historical and Memorial Commissions

Amendment No. 56—George Washington Carver Centennial Commission: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 57—James Madison Memorial Commission: Appropriates $10,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $5,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 58—U.S. Territorial Expansion Memorial Commission: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 59—National Capital Transportation Agency: Appropriates $250,000 as proposed by the House instead of $500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The Panama Canal

Amendment No. 60—Canal Zone Government: Appropriates $919,450 instead of $593,750 as proposed by the House and $950,700 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 61—Canal Zone Government: Reported in disagreement.

Amendments Nos. 62 and 63—Capital outlay: Reported in disagreement.

Panama Canal Company

Amendment No. 64—Limitation on general and administrative expenses: Authorizes $9,393,900 for administrative expenses instead of $9,375,600 as proposed by the House and $9,412,200 as proposed by the Senate.

Department of the Interior

Amendment No. 65—Office of Saline Water: Appropriates $400,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the House instead of $500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 66—Office of Coal Research: Restores House limitation of $200,000 for administration and supervision.

Amendment No. 67—Bureau of Land Management: Appropriates $1,425,000 for management of lands and resources instead of $1,350,000 as proposed by the House and $1,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 68—Bureau of Indian Affairs: Appropriates $2,050,000 for construction instead of $1,800,000 as proposed by the House and $2,450,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 69—Bureau of Indian Affairs: Reported in disagreement.

Bureau of Reclamation

Amendments Nos. 70, 71, 72, and 73: Reported in disagreement.

Geological Survey

Amendment No. 74—Surveys, investigations, and research: Appropriates $300,000 as proposed by the Senate.

National Park Service

Amendment No. 75—Construction: Appropriates $275,000 for construction instead of $500,000 as proposed by the Senate. The amount provided is for the acquisition of land for the Castillo de San Marcos National Monument, Florida.

Fish and Wildlife Service

Amendment No. 76—Bureau of Commercial Fisheries: Appropriates $100,000 for management and investigations of resources as proposed by the House instead of $300,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 77—Construction of fishing vessels: Appropriates $750,000 instead of $500,000 as proposed by the House and $1,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 78—Administrative provisions: Deletes Senate language authorizing the purchase of police-type motor vehicles.

Department of Justice

Amendments Nos. 79 and 80—Legal activities and general administration: Insert Senate language authorizing appeal on matters of law for either party, instead of only for the United States as provided by the House.

Legislative branch

Architect of the Capitol

Amendment No. 81—Salaries: Deletes House proposal appropriating $8,200 for salary increases of the Architect of the Capitol, the Assistant Architect of the Capitol, and the Second Assistant Architect of the Capitol. This item was deleted at the insistence of the Senate conferees who are very sympathetic but want it taken up in the regular bill next year.

Department of State

Amendment No. 82: Inserts title as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 83: Appropriates $125,000 for salaries and expenses, instead of $250,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 84—United States Citizens Commission on NATO: Reported in disagreement.

Treasury Department

Amendment No. 85—Bureau of the Public Debt: Reported in disagreement.

ALBERT THOMAS,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
CLARENCE CANNON,
BEN F. JENSEN,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, may I summarize for the membership what has been done in this conference report?

When this supplemental appropriation bill left the House, we had some 40 items in it. The bill carried in round figures about $91 million, which showed a reduction of about $27 million in round figures under the budget estimate. The bill went to the other body and the other body added about 31 items. Roughly, there were 86 amendments when we went to conference.

We bring back to you in the conference report 56 amendments on which there is no argument and on which there is complete agreement.

We bring back to you separately 30 items in disagreement. Eleven of those items have to do with mutual security and two items are, in my judgment, minor items dealing with the Panama Canal. So that leaves 17 items that are technically in disagreement when in truth and in fact, there is no disagreement.

The items added by the other body raised the House figures by approximately $214 million. This conference report reduces that $214 million increase in the amount of $208 million. In other words, when the bill left the House you had $91 million. In conference the House figure was increased only $6 million out of the increase of $214 million added in the other body.

Mr. Speaker, that is the picture in a nutshell. Your conferees have worked on this diligently and we gave it the best we have. I do hope you will adopt the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, in the absence of any questions, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 3: Insert:

"SPECIAL FOREIGN CURRENCY PROGRAM

"For purchase of Indian rupees which accrue under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1704), for the purposes authorized by section 104(m)(A) of that Act, to remain available until expended, $1,300,000, of which not to exceed $2,500 may be expended for representation."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. THOMAS moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sums of "$1,300,000" and "$2,500" named therein, insert "$650,000" and "$1,250", respectively.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 5: On page 3, line 3, insert "MUTUAL SECURITY."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, this amendment No. 5 is merely a heading, two words, "Mutual Security." We will straighten that out at the end of the session when we have disposed of the meat of mutual security.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be passed over.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEFENSE SUPPORT

For an additional amount for defense support, as authorized by section 131(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, $65,000,000.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I understand there is some opposition to this amendment. I understand the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] is opposed to it.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman going to offer a motion?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes, Mr. Speaker. I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. THOMAS moves that the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FORD moves that the House recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate numbered 6.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. In just a moment, please.

Mr. GARY. I wanted to ask for a division of the motion.

Mr. THOMAS. Will the gentleman please withhold that motion at this time and see if we cannot get along expeditiously? I want to yield time to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, this is an effort to restore to the mutual security bill $65 million which the President recommended to the defense support item.

During the consideration of the mutual security bill on the floor of the House. I offered an amendment to the bill for the defense support item bringing the total to $675 million. The amendment was defeated by a narrow

margin. The other body, in the consideration of the same bill, did raise the figure to a total of $675 million. In conference between the House and Senate the figure of $610 million was agreed on. The mutual security bill has been approved by both the House and the Senate. The other body in the consideration of this second supplemental appropriation bill added $65 million to the defense support item, taking the amount up to that authorized by the authorization bill. My effort today is to restore the full amount to the authorization figure of $675 million.

May I say this—I have said it on many occasions—that the defense support item is just as essential to the mutual assistance program as the money for guns, aircraft, and ships in our military assistance portion of the mutual security program. We provided in 1961 $1,800 million for the purely military assistance portion of the mutual security program. That money is to buy guns, ammunition, and aircraft. The defense support program is to provide economic assistance to our allies who are standing with us on the periphery of the Soviet Union and Red China. Those are the countries that have received guns, tanks, ammunition, and aircraft. Those are the countries who have troops in the field surrounding the Soviet Union and Red China. Those are the countries which are making maximum effort in a military way but who need economic aid and assistance so that their troops can have rifles on their shoulders, man aircraft, and man ships that aid and assist us in containing the Soviet and Red China aggression. It does not make sense, in my judgment, for us to give to those countries, such as Turkey, Greece, and Spain and the others that are on the periphery of the Soviet Union and Red China, unless we help them economically so that their economies will be stable. They cannot effectively man armies unless they can keep their economy strong; and believe me, this defense support provides that essential assistance to these strong countries and fine allies that are with us in this great struggle.

The statement will be made that this will take us right up to the authorization figure. That is true, but I point out to you that authorization bill cut the President's budget by $49 million, a 7-percent reduction. So, even if you vote to recede and concur in the Senate figure, the President's figure for defense support will be reduced by 7 percent.

It seems to me that if we are to get the maximum benefit from past expenditures that we have put into military hardware in our mutual security program, we must properly and adequately fund the defense support program. I believe that receding and concurring with the Senate on this item will provide vitally essential funds for those countries that are on the borders of the Soviet Union and Red China, countries which are underdeveloped, who cannot provide the soldiers and the equipment unless they are able to maintain stability and strength in their economy. It is my deep conviction and honest belief that we would do irreparable damage unless we should recede and concur in this amendment and agree with the Senate position. I hope and trust that our efforts today on both sides of the aisle will be for strength, will be for close liaison and agreement with our allies. We can show our stanchest allies that we are with them if we recede and concur and agree with the Senate.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN].

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, most of the Members know the position the Foreign Operations Subcommittee on Appropriations has taken. The House has supported the position of the committee on two different occasions. If I may, I will give you a brief résumé of the items before us.

We had long hearings this year on this item. The subcommittee then recommended an amount that it believed was sufficient. The full Appropriations Committee, when we reported the bill, supported the subcommittee. We reported the bill to the House, and the House supported the position of the committee. The distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] at that time offered an amendment to put back in the bill $50 million, and the House voted it down.

At a subsequent date the bill went to the other body and they restored in full the amount of money the House had taken out. On last Thursday we went to conference. The conferees agreed that we had a good bill, and we reached a compromise. We brought the bill back to the floor and at that time the President's message was read on the floor of the House and the House again supported the position of the committee. We made a lot of concessions in the conference. We allowed an additional $100 million for the contingency fund in the bill that has not been authorized as yet by the Congress. We put the $100 million in because the President had asked for it.

Senator BRIDGES had supported an amendment on the floor of the Senate related to an earmarking of funds for Spain.

We receded and concurred with the Senate amendment so as to provide an additional $10 million to Spain above the House allowance.

Mr. Speaker, the following morning after the Senate conferees had agreed to the conference bill and the conference report had been passed by both the House and Senate, not 13 hours later, they started hearings to put money back in this bill. I do not know that we have ever had anything like this happen before—not since my time in the House that I know of.

Senator RUSSELL, the distinguished Senator from Georgia, had the following to say when he was appointed to serve as a conferee on this bill:

> Mr. President, I respectfully ask to be excused from service on the conference committee on the bill. I was a member of the conference on the mutual security bill, and after a full and free conference, the Senate conferees unanimously agreed to the original figures in the conference bill. I do not feel that I could now represent the Senate's new viewpoint and support this effort to restore items already handled through the ordinary legislative process. As a matter of fact, I could not face the Members of the House after signing the original conference report and seriously insist that they reverse their position only a day or two after the original conference. Therefore, I ask to be excused.

That same day I received a letter from another conferee, Senator STENNIS, in which he had the following to say:

> This is just a special personal word to congratulate and commend you and to express my deep appreciation and admiration for the splendid work you have done on the mutual security appropriations bill for this year, as well as former years. Your knowledge of the various programs and the operation of each is unsurpassed and not equaled on Capital Hill.
>
> It was a treat and a revelation for me to serve as a member of the conference committee this time, and I realize even more than heretofore the wonderful contribution you are making. You gave us just a lot of sound common sense and a fine factual appraisal of the subject.

Mr. Speaker, may I call to the attention of the House the fact that we now have approximately 5,333 employees in the mutual security program scattered in about 76 nations of the world. Your committee has had a hard time handling this appropriation legislation.

In our hearings one State Department employee told the House Members: "Do not put words in my mouth."

At another time one of the witnesses who appeared before our committee said: "I have not read your report."

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have had a difficult time. May I say at this time, without approving any additional funds in this bill this mutual security program has to its credit $8,486 million against $8,111 million last year. Your committee has worked hard to bring this program under control, and I trust you will again support the position of the House as you have on the other occasions and especially when you approved the conference report on last Friday.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include letters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], and I trust it will be agreed to. It is essential to the well being, the welfare and the national security of our country. I shall also support a motion subsequently to be made dealing with the $26 million involved in what is known as special assistance. I think it ought to be clearly understood, as the gentleman from Michigan has so well pointed out, that these items have to do with the defense of our own country. They have to do with our national security.

I think it is so important that as far as I am concerned I want the roll to be called in order that we may see where our people stand.

Through the years I have supported this program. I was majority leader in the House which initiated the program. Through the years we have had various difficulties in determining what the exact amount ought to be and sometimes it was difficult to say how much. But, on the whole, I have gone along with the program when my President was in power and when the President of the opposition party was in power.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important that we consider the situation in the world today. The gentleman from Louisana is an ardent advocate of his position—and we all love him and respect him and admire him, but he cannot be infallible about these things, no matter how much time he may put in on the questions involved. But we know that in the world situation this is no time to let down our guard.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I am sorry. I cannot yield, for I have just a few minutes.

Mr. PASSMAN. The gentleman mentioned my name.

Mr. HALLECK. I did, but in a flattering fashion. I have no quarrel with the gentleman except in this instance, in which he and I just do not see alike.

Now, I think it is a misnomer—and I have said this before—to call this foreign aid. It is not foreign aid. We are not giving this defense support money, as the gentleman from Michigan said, to maintain these armies and forces just to be doing it or just to be spending that money. Of course not. What we want to do is to have some friends in the world who have some of the sinews of war, to the end that we not be isolated with the Soviet threat on our borders. Rather is it to our advantage to, so far as we can, isolate them and maintain our operations and the operations of friendly nations who still believe in freedom and have a measure of freedom or a great deal of freedom, so that we are not overwhelmed by force of arms.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for one question while he is getting some water?

Mr. HALLECK. I do not need any water, I will say to the gentleman. I do not know how much more time the gentleman from Texas can give me. If the gentleman can give me an additional minute, I will be glad to yield.

Mr. THOMAS. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. PASSMAN. Is it not true that we have already spent for this foreign aid program in excess of $128 billion since World War II? For the past 6 years, since it has been my privilege to chair this subcommittee, we have reduced the President's request by approximately $5 billion, and any time we made any reduction whatsoever, is it not true that you made the same claims that you are making today?

Mr. HALLECK. Now, let me just say to the gentleman that it was President Truman who first proposed programs like this. As I remember, it was the interim aid to France and Italy that was one of the first, and I responded to that request, and I am glad I did in the light of history.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I do not yield now. I want to answer the question. Then I remember it was aid to Greece and Turkey, and again I responded. And I do not believe the gentleman from Louisiana even would contend that those moneys were misspent or that that aid was not helpful in the defense of the free world, including the United States of America. Then we were given the Marshall plan. With respect to that I responded in a Republican Congress, may I say, and the help that has been given, in my opinion, has saved whole nations from going under the Communist yoke; nations that are now standing at our side.

Heavens on earth. Why contend about some of these things, because that has been our experience.

Now, if the gentleman will permit me——

Mr. PASSMAN. Will not the gentleman answer my question?

Mr. HALLECK. The President has told us by letters to me and other leaders and in a statement made to the press these very compelling things:

First, there is at the moment a great acceleration of events in the world that make our readiness and security measures even more critically necessary. This intensification he speaks of has come about at least in part since this mutual security budget was first approved by the House.

Second, the size of the cuts proposed will, in his judgment—and these are his exact words—"jeopardize the security of the country."

Third, postponement of these funds—and, I refer particularly, so far as I am concerned, to the two items on which this effort will be made—to January or later may, he said, irretrievably cripple us later.

The latest developments in the Congo show us what could suddenly develop during the 4 months the Congress is away. The President has got to have the funds to do the job.

Fourth, both parties and all the major national candidates are publicly on record in support of an adequate program of this kind. If we must err in these matters, as far as I am concerned, I want to err on the side of doing too much and not too little.

The President has told us of his estimate of the problem. May I say to you that, as the Speaker has just indicated—and that was followed by applause in which I joined—it is proposed that we adjourn sine die tonight. I want to join in every effort, in every way I can, to bring about that adjournment. If we adjourn sine die tonight, we will be leaving Washington, the Congress will not be in session, and then for the next 4 months the President of the United States—and he is the President of all of us—will carry the prime responsibility for the maintenance of our security.

I shall insert in the RECORD the letter addressed to me and the statement made by the President the other day, in connection with my remarks.

But he feels so strongly that to enable him to adequately defend our country these additional items, which come to only $91 million, should be in this bill, that so far as I am concerned I am going along with President Eisenhower as I have gone along with previous Presidents.

The President's letter of August 26 and his public statement of the same date follow:

Hon. CHARLES A. HALLECK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HALLECK: I am deeply disturbed by the action yesterday of the conference on the mutual security appropriation. I cannot state too strongly my belief that a cut of this size will jeopardize the security of the country.

I am writing Senator JOHNSON and Senator DIRKSEN urging that the Senate reject this conference report should, despite all our efforts, the House approve it. I hope I can count on your cooperation in leading the House to recommit the bill so that the final action can conform fully to the national interest.

Both political parties and all of the major national candidates are publicly committed to the support of an adequate mutual security program. No one can responsibly contend that this conference report and the amounts approved constitute adequacy in today's world.

In view of the worldwide scope of this program and the necessity for planning so far ahead in such an effort, time is of the essence. These critical matters simply will not wait until the Congress returns in January, then to assess the results of its actions taken now. There is at the moment such an acceleration of events in the world that we must be forearmed at all times and ready to deal with critical situations as they develop. It must be evident to the Congress from the speed with which the situation in Africa recently developed that we must stay ready and that our free world security programs, economic and military, must be kept continuously adequate. Postponement of these funds needed now may irretrievably cripple us later.

I enclose a public statement that I have just released.

I am sending an identical letter to Speaker RAYBURN.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

I am gravely concerned by the conference action on mutual security appropriations.

I have repeatedly stated that the appropriation of the full $4,086 million authorized is vitally needed. Moreover, needs which have developed since my original request, particularly the emergency in the Congo, have made necessary an additional $100 million for the contingency fund.

Only day before yesterday, by a 67–26 vote, the Senate approved the additional $100 million and at the same time increased last month's House appropriation of $3,584 million by $297 million. The conference, while approving the $100 million increase in contingency funds, virtually disregarded the Senate restoration in the basic mutual security budget. It accepted only $31 million—one-tenth of the $297 million restoration that the Senate had just overwhelmingly approved.

In short, the conference recognized the need for $100 million of new funds but at the same time slashed by $265 million the budget to which these new funds are to be added.

This cut would sharply curtail support indispensable to the defense of allies now under intensified Soviet pressure and deny aid urgently needed by other friendly nations

struggling under the gravest difficulties to make progress in freedom.

Not only are the funds now provided by the conference inadequate, but also a number of administrative restrictions were retained which would impair the management of the mutual security program.

Surely, in the world situation now confronting our country, the Congress will not accept these recommendations which fall so short of the need.

I urge that this appropriation be returned to conference. We must, for America, correct its deficiencies.

A congressional rejection of this request will hamper greatly the Nation's Chief Executive who succeeds me next January. Upon him will fall the heavy responsibility of continuing to guide our country in a troubled world. He, no less than I, must have adequate funds to do the job.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], for a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, we have just listened to a forceful and impassioned plea from the minority leader, our distinguished colleague from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] that we support this amendment.

We have under consideration the conference report on the second supplemental appropriation bill. On page 3 we find the amendment under discussion, which I understand is the one offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee and of the full committee, which, under the heading "Mutual Security—Defense Support" calls for an additional $65 million.

This amount is in addition to the billions heretofore appropriated for what is commonly known as foreign aid or a continuation of the Marshall plan, which followed World War II.

It was General Marshall, who under President Roosevelt was the active officer in charge of our national defense, who at that time told us that he did not know where he was the evening preceding the strike of the Japanese at Pearl Harbor—a statement which I have never been able to accept.

It was about that time that General Marshall adopted and gave his name to a policy which was obviously based upon the theory that the United States of America no longer with safety could depend upon its own ability to protect its future national security. It was then determined that by giving other nations aid and assistance, not only military assistance but help of all kinds, that we could purchase not only the friendship but the military support of other nations.

In pursuance of that thought, we have continued to pour out to other nations not only billions upon billions of dollars, not only tons of munitions of war but food and supplies of every kind plus technical assistance, disclosing to other nations our most improved methods of producing not only items which enter into commerce but implements of war.

Because of the help we have given her, Russia has become our rival in both domestic and warlike production, in military power, in scientific advancement. She has entered upon a conquest of the world encouraged by our contributions.

In lieu of bending our every effort to the advancement of our own ability to produce necessities as well as things desirable, and weapons of all kinds, we have expended a large part of our resources of all kinds to aid other countries and other nations which we hoped would deter the advancement of Russian might, buy us allies in other countries in time of need.

We have not only attempted to contain Russia, and in that effort often unsuccessfully, but we have established outposts, military bases of all kinds, at many points throughout the world. We have extended ourselves so far, our line of defense is so thin, that it is problematical whether we will at any of those points be able to successfully defend ourselves should war come.

This though we have placed excessive tax burdens upon our people, continued to draft them for military service, while the cost of a bare existence to the average individual goes ever higher. And the ruler of the Congo defies civilization.

My point is that our first line of defense is here at home. That that defense consists not only of the ability and knowledge to produce the most adequate weapons of destruction, but that fundamentally it depends upon our sound economic policy—that a bankrupt nation never will be able to defend itself.

As we look at the world picture given us each day by television, radio, and press, we realize and must admit that we are in a most humiliating and weakened situation. Because of our very alliances we can no longer assert our might as we wish in defense of American property, American lives, American national security.

Castro defies us. We are helpless until we have secured the consent of the other nations in the OAS, the members of the United Nations, various other international groups. Because we have surrendered so much of our sovereignty, entered into so many alliances, have the characteristic of keeping our word in a group which has no claim to consistency, we no longer are a sovereign nation, or an independent people.

This amendment for an additional $65 million offered by our distinguished colleague from Michigan [Mr. FORD] supported by that politically ambitious group of Young Republicans who seek political victory for the party in the coming election, not only seek but demand our support for this amendment, and for others which undoubtedly will be offered.

It is my feeling that as a representative of the people of my district, I am bound to speak and to vote for measures which will retain the independence of the individual and of my country, which will not destroy our sovereignty, which will continue to give us opportunity which, if rightly used, will be followed by prosperity and freedom for the individual and the States, and an unassailable position for my country.

It is with regret that I cannot on this occasion go along with my distinguished leader and his Young Turks, the partisan political shock troops of today, in support of this amendment.

In my humble judgment, foreign aid has proved to be ineffectual, an excessive burden to our people, which results in a denial, because of a lack of funds, of many things to which they are entitled, and it has not—it will not—bring us the desired results.

Moreover, and as a full and complete answer to this request, as has been stated on the floor, our President now has under his control $250 million, any part or all of which can be used by him at his discretion. Two hundred and fifty million of unused dollars.

If to insure our national security another $65 million is needed, the President has it in that $250 million. It is my understanding that today we will also be asked for $22 million for technical cooperation with other nations; for $26 million for another purpose.

Day following day requests come from industry—big and little—and from constituents, including the aged, and the members of other groups, for aid.

It is obvious that funds at our disposal, or which can be raised by taxation, however great they may be, are limited.

There is in my mind as we consider this measure a suspicion that because our political opponents accuse us of a lack of national defense, we should here on the floor, by this and two other amendments (7) and (8), answer that charge by granting an additional unneeded $113 million.

Though threatened as some have been by party leadership, unintimidated because history tells us that no nation has been able to purchase security, some cannot support this bill. That independence of the individual and security of the Nation is maintained only when a people remain strong, independent, and rely primarily upon their own ability to defend themselves. I seem to recall that in military might, in ability to defend ourselves, our presidential candidate told us, and he of all persons should know for he is at Ike's elbow, that we are in no way inferior to Russia.

A continuation of our past and present policy of casting our dollars broadcast, our technical knowledge and methods of production throughout the world, much if not all of which falls on barren ground, will produce for us nothing at all other than a humiliating submission and a continued payment of blackmail to other nations. For example, like the present proposal to give the comparatively ignorant and indolent people of the Congo American tax dollars.

Regretfully, I must refuse to go along with the demands of the minority leader [Mr. HALLECK] who sometimes jumps the party line when it does not conform to his personal ideas or with the wishes of a presently politically powerful group—the Young Turks—apparently looking

for positions of influence in what they hope to be the coming administration. In obedience to the wishes of those I represent, my vote must be cast against the granting of the additional sums called for by this amendment much as I dislike refusing to follow my politically powerful colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] who offered the amendment. The welfare of our own people should have first consideration. A vote for this amendment, that is, to add $65 million to this appropriation when the President already has at his disposal an unobligated $250 million, would be inconsistent with the principles which I have always followed.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. COFFIN].

Mr. COFFIN. Mr. Speaker, perhaps it is not often that I would join with the minority leader on a program in which he believes so passionately, but this time I do and I think a good many on our side of the aisle do. We went through this battle before. I think it is irony, I think it is hypocrisy for either party to thump the tub throughout the land in the next 2 months, calling for stronger defense, if we do not restore what is, essentially, defense moneys.

My only regret is that we cannot put back into this bill not only defense support, but also untie many of the restrictions which do not cost money, but nevertheless tie the hands of people who are expected to administer the program—the ICA Administration, the Development and Loan Fund Administration, the Inspector General.

I hope these motions are successful. I hope that these restrictions are removed. I hope that as many on the other side of the aisle will join us in our attempt to remove these restrictions. But I agree wholeheartedly with the statement that we cannot leave here in good conscience, leaving the President, who is the President of all of us, in the shape he will be in if this is not restored and if other corrective measures are not taken.

Many of you who will be leaving are coming back. I am not coming back. It is a source of great sadness to me to see that our attitude toward this essential program, which has never been more vital than it is this year, is somewhat cavalier, that at times it constitutes a virtual abandonment of our individual judgments as Members of this Congress to any committee or subcommittee, however able, devoted and dedicated it may be. On this issue, as in very few other issues, the deepest self-searching, the most keen and farsighted dedication on the part of every Member is required.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I urge not only that we restore this money to defense support as part of our vital defense effort in this vitally critical year of 1960, but that we consider with great sympathy and favor other motions that will be made to put back into this bill some flexibility, some discretion; to take off restrictions so that our administrative people can operate programs effectively, the objective of which all of us say we want. The proof of the pudding, however, is in the eating and in my opinion it will lie in how we vote on these several motions.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to our beloved friend from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, when this particular item we are considering at this time was before the committee I supported it. When the bill was on the floor here I supported a motion by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] to insert this item in the bill.

The reason for this item is this: Are we going to have placed over in Europe and other places an enormous number of soldiers of our own, or are we going to continue to try to keep those who have been carrying the burden of surrounding Russia, like Greece, Turkey, and those countries in the Far East: Korea, the Philippines, and Taiwan, and that sort of thing? Those people, if they are with us, save us from having to have a great lot of troops in our Army that we do not have now. They leave us where we are able to use our troops as sort of shock troops, to move them around from place to place where they can be of the most service.

Frankly, I do not believe that there is anything in this bill at all which is more important than the item of defense support, because it provides for the clothing and the food for a lot of these people who could not have it otherwise.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. I think the argument can logically and rationally be made by those who overall in the past have been basically opposed to the mutual security program. Even though they have voted against the program generally, here is an essential isolated program which is a part of the total. This is a vital and integral part of our own national security. They can be opposed to the mutual security program as a whole, but they could be favorably inclined to, and they could, endorse the military and defense support aspect of this vital operation.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am not an authority on this particular matter but I think I know something about the condition of our Treasury at this time. Bob Anderson, the Secretary of the Treasury, gave us quite a lecture last January 20. He came before the full committee at the request of the chairman, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]. I am frank to say that he scared some of us pretty badly by giving us a clear picture of our financial status and in no uncertain terms.

This bill, Mr. Speaker, was considered very thoroughly by the regular committee. It is not proper legislative procedure when after a committee has held long hearings and finally come to an agreement, and the other body has come to an agreement, and the conferees have ironed out their differences and brought the conference report back in full agreement relative to the foreign aid bill, that we must then accept this kind of legislative action. I contend it is a pretty black blot on the intelligence of the House of Representatives.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I would like first to explain the parliamentary situation on this bill. A motion has been made for the House to recede and concur in this amendment. I have asked that the motion be divided so that the vote will be taken on just one point, and that is whether this House is going to stick by its committee and by previous commitments or whether the House will recede and do the will of the bureaucrats and the other body. It is going to be that simple. I do not want any dollar mark involved in this, Mr. Speaker. It is purely and simply a question of principle. This House thrashed this measure out from beginning to end in the mutual security appropriation bill, and it then went to the other body. The other body put back practically all the money the House cut from the bill. Then we sat down in conference and we had a solemn agreement which, mind you, was reduced to writing. This was a written agreement. It was approved by both the House and the other body. Shortly thereafter the agreement was broken by inserting the funds in this supplemental bill. I want to ask the House this one question: Does the vice of breaking agreements which we condemn so vehemently in our enemies become a virtue when it is practiced by the Congress of the United States?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I would like to understand the parliamentary situation. In other words, if I understand the gentleman correctly, if there is a division of the question, then, the House first votes on the question of whether or not we are going to recede; is that correct?

Mr. GARY. That is right.

Mr. HALLECK. Of course, if that motion to recede does not carry, then the $65 million has been knocked out of the bill.

Mr. GARY. Then the position of the House will have been upheld. The $65 million is not in the bill. The $65 million will not be put in this bill, where it does not belong.

Mr. HALLECK. In other words, if the gentleman will yield for just one moment further, the first vote that would occur then would be on the question whether or not the House would recede.

Mr. GARY. That is correct.

Mr. HALLECK. And if the House does not recede, then we have defeated the purpose of the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD]. That will be the practical effect; is that correct?

Mr. GARY. That is correct. It will keep the $65 million out of this bill, which is as it should be, and will carry out the agreement of the House and the other body which was solemnly entered into in conference and approved by both the House and the other body. Any

other procedure, Mr. Speaker, under these circumstances will absolutely destroy our whole congressional committee system. After our committee has sat day after day, week after week, and month after month to hear these matters, if our recommendations are thrown in the trash basket, what incentive do we have to hold hearings next year and to collect information on the program? All that is left for us to do is to simply follow the bureaucrats downtown and do whatever they bid. Does the House of Representatives intend to become a puppet of the bureaucracy downtown? If so, then I say I will have no pride and feel no honor in being a Member of this great body.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the House of Representatives will rise above such action and I trust that the House will vote to recede.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished majority leader the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Briefly.

Mr. HALLECK. I want to observe that supplemental appropriation bills add money regularly to appropriations therefor made in regular appropriation bills. So there is no violence done in the action here proposed.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] has done an outstanding job, in my opinion, as chairman of the subcommittee. I know his views on legislation of this kind. I have had many talks with him, and I think he has made a great chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations. I commend him as highly as I possibly can. But the situation we are in today is no reflection upon him or his committee. We are faced with a situation where the question involved is the amount of $65 million for defense support. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] says that it is not a question of dollars but a question of principle. I did not figure that the conferees, in adjusting differences, involved so much principle as it involved ironing out differences between the two Houses. If there is any principle involved, the principle is what effect this $65 million would have upon our national defense, because defense support is a part of our national defense.

The observation made by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] in connection with supplemental bills has a binding effect, and certainly if the argument made by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] was to be followed out to its ironclad conclusion, once the conferees met and agreed and both branches approved a conference report, particularly in connection with appropriation bills, no supplemental budget could be sent up during the remainder of that fiscal year.

When the conference report came up last week, the situation was different than it is today. We are faced with a new situation from a parliamentary angle. When the conference report came up last week we were in a position where this particular motion could only be made with the greatest of difficulty, if made at all. When the original bill came up, those who believed in increasing the appropriations were faced with another primary important matter. Every effort was concentrated upon that effort to increase the appropriation.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Did the distinguished majority leader support the move made when the foreign aid bill was originally before the House to put this money back in at that time?

Mr. McCORMACK. May I say that the gentleman from Massachusetts was away from Washington on that occasion, but I sent word down asking to be paired in favor of the amendment to increase.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. FORD. It was my amendment that tried to put this money in at the time the bill was on the floor and the distinguished majority leader, before the vote was taken, helped materially in trying to get assistance in this area.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think I have answered the gentleman's question.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. I am fond of the majority leader, but I am glad to know his position on the mutual security bill because I thought he had a different position. But do you realize that the conference on the mutual security allowed $491 million more than we allowed this agency last year?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. FORD. We approved this bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is true, but last year was 1959; we are now in 1960. The world situation has changed a lot in the last year; much water has gone over the dam in the last year. The problems confronting us, grave as they were last year, are much graver this year.

In support of the amendment in connection with the $65 million, the Speaker has authorized me to state that he concurs with my position and that he hopes the amendment will be agreed to.

I might also say that in the other body the Democratic nominees for the Presidency as well as the Vice Presidency, were instrumental in this, and due to their leadership I think I can fairly say that this amount was included. But, discussing this point, if we are going to err in judgment, I prefer to err on the side of strength, rather than on the side of weakness.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I am going to talk briefly and then I am going to move the previous question on the motion of the gentleman from Michigan.

I sincerely think the motion of my beloved friend, and there is no finer Member not only in this House, but any other place, ought to be voted down. Let me see if I can summarize, because I do not think anybody can add anything to what has been said on this entire program in the last 10 years. It is pretty difficult for me to disagree with my personal friend and my beloved majority leader. But that has nothing in the world to do with this bill.

There is nothing that affects this bill today that did not affect it a week or 10 days ago when the other body marched up the hill; then when they got the word from the bureaucrats, politely and obediently marched right down the same hill.

There is nothing partisan in this matter as far as I am concerned and I do not think there ought to be any partisanship on either side of the aisle in this matter. It is all our money. We are all trying to do the right thing, and the purpose of it, if you please, is to protect us all. If there is a good part of the program—let us be frank about it—it should be this military aid. But let us see about the partisanship in the matter. Who knows who is going to be President next year? It looks to me as though it would be very close. Why should our beloved President want to bind his successor whether it be our distinguished Vice President or the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts. Why tie their hands? Let us be frank about it. This is a matter that is in the control of the President of the United States, whoever he may be. You have only 4 months before he takes office. Why cheapen the Congress? Do we not have the authority and the duty to appropriate? Is it not our duty and our exclusive jurisdiction to legislate? Then why tell us: "If you do not do this I will veto it"? I am not being partisan; I am just talking plain horsesense. I am jealous of the House and its rights and prerogatives. We are a constitutional body the same as the executive branch, and in this field it is our duty to appropriate and to legislate, and not that of any bureau.

But let us talk about a few dollars now. You have in the regular bill over $3.7 billion this year, which is, in round figures, $500 million more than last year for this program. But let us be frank again, the whole program is in ill repute. You know that and I know that. If you do not know it, go back home and talk to your people. I repeat, go back home and talk to your people if you do not think the whole program is in ill repute.

For this defense support you have $610 million. How in the world can anybody allocate that and get it into the program by January? You know it cannot be done. It cannot be spent in under 7 or 8 months. Is that all he has? Not by a jugful. In the foreign aid bill that the other body has marched up the hill one day and down the next on, there is $250 million more in emergency funds that can be used for identically this purpose. So add it up, get to your arithmetic, and that is $860 million. Can he allocate that between now and January 1? We are going to be back here—that is, the Congress is—and I hope every sitting Member is back at that time.

So, what is the urgency here now? None whatsoever. They have $860 million. I repeat, nothing has happened in

the last two weeks that would warrant an increase of one penny.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the Members of the House will vote down the amendment offered by my able, lovable, and distinguished friend from Michigan.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I have no desire to quibble over dollars in this matter. I withdraw my request that the vote be divided so that we may take the vote on the entire motion at one time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 203, nays 193, not voting 35, as follows:

[Roll No. 199]

YEAS—203

Addonizio	Forand	Moorhead
Albert	Ford	Moss
Anfuso	Frelinghuysen	Multer
Arends	Friedel	Mumma
Ashley	Fulton	Murphy
Avery	Gallagher	Nelsen
Ayres	Garmatz	Nix
Baldwin	Giaimo	O'Brien, Ill.
Barrett	Gilbert	O'Brien, N.Y.
Barry	Glenn	O'Hara, Ill.
Bass, N.H.	Goodell	O'Hara, Mich.
Bass, Tenn.	Granahan	O'Konski
Bates	Green, Pa.	O'Neill
Becker	Griffin	Oliver
Beckworth	Griffiths	Osmers
Bentley	Gubser	Ostertag
Blatnik	Halleck	Pelly
Boggs	Halpern	Pirnie
Boland	Healey	Price
Bolton	Hiestand	Prokop
Bosch	Hoeven	Pucinski
Bowles	Holland	Quie
Brademas	Holt	Quigley
Brewster	Holtzman	Ray
Broomfield	Horan	Rees, Kans.
Broyhill	Hosmer	Reuss
Burke, Mass.	Ikard	Rhodes, Ariz.
Byrne, Pa.	Inouye	Rhodes, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.	Irwin	Riehlman
Cahill	Johnson, Wis.	Rivers, Alaska
Canfield	Judd	Robison
Carnahan	Karsten	Rodino
Cederberg	Karth	Rogers, Colo.
Celler	Kasem	Rostenkowski
Chamberlain	Kastenmeier	St. George
Chenoweth	Kearns	Saylor
Chiperfield	Kee	Schneebeli
Church	Keith	Schwengel
Clark	Kelly	Sisk
Coad	Kilday	Slack
Coffin	Kilgore	Smith, Iowa
Cohelan	King, Calif.	Smith, Miss.
Conte	Kluczynski	Springer
Cook	Laird	Staggers
Corbett	Lane	Sullivan
Cramer	Langen	Taber
Curtin	Lankford	Teague, Calif.
Curtis, Mass.	Lesinski	Teller
Daddario	Libonati	Thompson, N.J.
Daniels	Lindsay	Thornberry
Dawson	Lipscomb	Toll
Delaney	McCormack	Tollefson
Derounian	McDonough	Trimble
Diggs	McDowell	Udall
Dingell	McFall	Ullman
Dixon	McIntire	Van Zandt
Donohue	Macdonald	Wainwright
Dooley	Machrowicz	Wallhauser
Dorn, N.Y.	Madden	Walter
Dwyer	Mailliard	Weis
Fallon	Martin	Wharton
Farbstein	May	Widnall
Feighan	Merrow	Wier
Fenton	Miller, George P.	Wilson
Fino	Miller, N.Y.	Yates
Flood	Milliken	Younger
Fogarty	Minshall	Zablocki
Foley		Zelenko

NAYS—193

Abbitt	Gary	Morrison
Abernethy	Gathings	Moulder
Adair	Gavin	Natcher
Alexander	George	Norblad
Alford	Gray	Norrell
Alger	Gross	Passman
Allen	Hagen	Patman
Andersen, Minn.	Haley	Perkins
	Hardy	Pfost
Andrews	Hargis	Philbin
Ashmore	Harmon	Pillion
Aspinall	Harris	Poage
Bailey	Harrison	Poff
Baker	Hays	Porter
Barden	Hechler	Powell
Baring	Hemphill	Rabaut
Barr	Henderson	Rains
Belcher	Herlong	Randall
Bennett, Fla.	Hoffman, Ill.	Reece, Tenn.
Bennett, Mich.	Hoffman, Mich.	Riley
Berry	Hogan	Rivers, S.C.
Betts	Holifield	Roberts
Blitch	Huddleston	Rogers, Fla.
Bonner	Hull	Rogers, Tex.
Bow	Jarman	Rooney
Boykin	Jennings	Roush
Bray	Jensen	Rutherford
Breeding	Johansen	Santangelo
Brock	Johnson, Calif.	Saund
Brooks, La.	Johnson, Colo.	Schenck
Brooks, Tex.	Johnson, Md.	Scherer
Brown, Ga.	Jonas	Scott
Brown, Mo.	Jones, Ala.	Selden
Brown, Ohio	Jones, Mo.	Shelley
Budge	Keogh	Short
Burke, Ky.	King, Utah	Sikes
Burleson	Kirwan	Siler
Cannon	Kitchin	Simpson
Casey	Knox	Smith, Calif.
Chelf	Kowalski	Smith, Va.
Collier	Kyl	Spence
Colmer	Latta	Steed
Cooley	Lennon	Stratton
Cunningham	Levering	Stubblefield
Curtis, Mo.	Loser	Taylor, N.C.
Dague	McCulloch	Teague, Tex.
Davis, Ga.	McGinley	Thomas
Dent	McGovern	Thompson, Tex.
Denton	Mack	Thomson, Wyo.
Derwinski	Mahon	Tuck
Devine	Marshall	Utt
Dorn, S.C.	Mason	Vanik
Dowdy	Matthews	Van Pelt
Downing	Meader	Wampler
Dulski	Metcalf	Watts
Edmondson	Meyer	Weaver
Elliott	Michel	Westland
Everett	Miller, Clem	Whitener
Evins	Mills	Whitten
Fascell	Moeller	Williams
Fisher	Monagan	Winstead
Flynt	Montoya	Wolf
Forrester	Moore	Wright
Fountain	Morris, N. Mex.	Young
Frazier	Morris, Okla.	

NOT VOTING—35

Anderson, Mont.	Hébert	Pilcher
	Hess	Preston
Auchincloss	Jackson	Rogers, Mass.
Baumhart	Kilburn	Roosevelt
Bolling	Lafore	Sheppard
Buckley	Landrum	Shipley
Davis, Tenn.	McMillan	Smith, Kans.
Doyle	McSween	Taylor, N.Y.
Durham	Magnuson	Thompson, La.
Flynn	Mitchell	Vinson
Grant	Morgan	Willis
Green, Oreg.	Murray	Withrow

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Auchincloss for, with Mr. Smith of Kansas against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Hebért with Mr. Hess.

Mr. Doyle with Mr. Jackson.

Mr. Buckley with Mr. Baumhart.

Mr. Magnuson with Mrs. Rogers of Massachusetts.

Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Withrow.

Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Taylor of New York.

Mr Morgan with Mr. Lafore.

Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Kilburn.

Mr. LANE changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. BASS of Tennessee changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. MORRISON changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. WALTER changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. MINSHALL changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. BOSCH changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. O'KONSKI changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. KILGORE changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. HOLLAND changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 7: Page 3, line 8, insert:

"TECHNICAL COOPERATION

"For an additional amount for technical cooperation, as authorized by section 304 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, $22,000,000."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. THOMAS moves that the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 8: Page 3, line 12, insert:

"SPECIAL ASSISTANCE

"For an additional amount for special assistance, as authorized by section 400(a) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, $26,000,000."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. THOMAS moves that the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TABER moves that the House recede and concur in Senate amendment numbered 8.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, this amendment would provide $26 million more which would bring the special assistance item up to the authorization figure. It has been one of the most important links in trying to keep this whole worldwide structure together. I do not believe they can very effectively get along without it. There are not enough funds on hand to meet what is required in connection with the operation of the mutual security program.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. What is in the fund at the present time?

Mr. TABER. There is not very much left.

Mr. GROSS. How much?

Mr. TABER. In this account there is $230 million.

Mr. GROSS. What is the purpose of the special assistance fund? Give us some information, since you want so much more money.

Mr. TABER. It is to help countries where they have situations arise that they are unable to take care of themselves.

Mr. GROSS. Give us some example of a situation that might arise that this fund will provide for.

Mr. TABER. When we had the Near East trouble a year ago, it took a lot of money out of this fund. Libyan and Jordan propositions took a lot of money out of it, and there are other similar situations which arise from time to time which require attention.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. Is it not true, Mr. TABER, that we have a program in Morocco, Jordan Tunisia, Bulovia, Libya and Sudan, many trouble spots in the world; we have the malaria eradication program, water supply programs, educational programs, disaster relief, Project Hope, and tropical Africa program.

Mr. TABER. Yes; but you have more than that. The most important thing that is involved in this picture are the payments that are made to these people in the Middle East and Near East, and in that part of the world where they give us rights to maintain airfields so that we can get around the world. Otherwise, we would be in a lot of trouble without something of that kind to take care of it.

Morocco, Ethiopia, Saudi Arabia, Iran and, when you get over into Pakistan and into the Far East countries, you strike that thing all the time. This is where they get the money to operate that sort of thing.

I hope the motion will be adopted.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield a minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to make an announcement before we discuss the pending matter. Roberta Levering, the 13-year-old daughter of our colleague, ROBERT LEVERING, has had a bull named "General" adjudged the grand champion of the Ohio Hereford State Fair exhibit. I thought the membership would like to congratulate Miss Roberta Levering on her splendid achievement.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN]

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, while we are attending to the American taxpayers' business, I would like to have the attention of the House.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman think we are attending to the taxpayers' business here in view of the last vote which added $65 million to a program already overloaded with money?

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, at this particular moment the mutual security program for fiscal year 1961 amounts to $8,551 million, the highest it has been in 5 years. We are now on the way back up the hill on this uncontrolled program.

May I say, Mr. Speaker, as the mutual security program started off last year, they had to their credit for special assistance $418,489,000. Today, without the funds proposed in the amendment now under consideration they have to their credit $429,489,000, which is in excess of $10 million more than they had available last year.

May I respectfully call to your attention, Mr. Speaker, that prior to this special assistance item we had an account known as the development assistance appropriation. You have not heard of an appropriation for the development assistance program for 5 years. But notwithstanding the fact that you have substituted the special assistance title for development assistance, the agency still has to its credit $57,769,000 in the old development assistance account.

Mr. Speaker, there is no justification for the amendment before the House at this time. We covered this item in our subcommittee hearings. We covered it in our full committee, and I think, with the support of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], we covered it on the floor of the House. We covered it in conference and we brought it back to the floor of the House, and, so far as I know, there has been no attempt—and as chairman of this subcommittee, it would appear that I would be let in on these things—not one attempt in the full committee, or on the floor of the House when the bill was brought up to add any funds to this appropriation. We reached a speedy agreement in conference. We came back to the floor and the House supported the position of the conferees.

I want to reiterate, if I may, that prior to this particular item of $26 million in this bill, we had the development assistance program. The special assistance program succeeded the development assistance program but they still have unexpended in that account $57,769,000. In special assistance alone at this moment you have available $10 million more than you had last year. And, in the overall program there is available in excess of one-half billion dollars above last year.

I believe the House knows that there is no justification whatsoever for any increase for this item as agreed to on several different points in our deliberations.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. The gentleman from Louisiana said nobody had taken exception to this item. I am sure his memory could be refreshed by the fact that at the time of the conference report and the signing of it I did take exception to this item, along with the defense support.

Mr. PASSMAN. Let me put it this way. There was no attempt at any point along the way in the full committee, or on the floor and back to the floor with the conference report to increase this amount. There is no need to do it today.

Let us remember, Mr. Speaker, that we represent 180 million Americans, and we have already withdrawn from the Treasury in excess of $2 billion more than we deposited in the Treasury during the first 2 months of this fiscal year. Along with that we have a public debt of over $280 billion, and we are appropriating billions of dollars in excess of what we are taking in.

Mr. Speaker, I trust in the interest of what is right and what is fair that you vote down this amendment.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER].

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Louisiana asked for the justification of this amendment. I say that the justification of the amendment rests in our continuing to accept our responsibliity as leader of the free world. If we are about to yield our leadership, then, of course, this entire mutual security program should be scrapped. But if not then we should accept our responsibility—vote to reverse the cut. Our duty in the House today is to improve our position of freedom and independence and with it the ability to extend these blessings to all who desire them.

The slashes which the opponents of this program have imposed undercuts the whole structure of American financial support to our allies and friends which is designed to help them maintain their freedom and independence.

There has been a question as to the programs which come under the scope of special assistance. I, therefore, would like to mention within the time allotted to me some of the more important aspects of this program.

SPECIAL ASSISTANCE

The difference: The Senate version appropriates $26 million for this purpose to supplement the $230 million in the mutual security appropriation bill. The House version contains no funds for this purpose.

Executive branch position: The executive branch strongly favors the Senate version. The appropriation of $26 million below the amount authorized is extremely severe. It disregards the political requirements which govern the planning and use of this appropriation, and the hard-core nature of the request of the executive branch for $268.5 million.

Part of the irreducible hard-core of the request is the $123 million programmed for Morocco and Libya—where base rights provide significant military advantage to the United States; for Jordan—which, without our support, would certainly collapse with accompanying violence which could spread; and for Afghanistan—on the Soviet border and target of major Soviet effort.

With the amount provided by the mutual security appropriation, after these four major hard-core programs, only $107 million would be available for all other requirements which total $145.5 million. To meet this reduction, a cut

of 26 percent would have to be made, on the average, in all other special assistance programs.

Yet proponents have urged the essentiality of various of these special assistance programs. The House Committee on Foreign Affairs urged maintenance of the programed figure for the special program for tropical Africa and in its report recommended a higher level for Israel. The Senate Committee on Foreign Relations recommended full retention of the tropical Africa program and of the health and related welfare activities. The House Appropriations Committee indicated that their reduction was not to affect the malaria eradication program.

In addition, examination of other special assistance programs will demonstrate that such a slash of more than 26 percent would result in incalculable loss in U.S. influence and to our interests. Programs in critical Bolivia and Haiti, in world-spotlighted Berlin, in Tunisia, Israel, and Burma, activities to support the United Nations Emergency Force and American-sponsored schools abroad would all be subject to gross curtailment or would have to be eliminated. Even the elimination of three or four of these, a course clearly not in our interests, would still make it necessary to reduce sizably the remaining programs.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GALLAGHER. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman give some credit to the subcommittee and the full committee that considered this bill? We took over 10,000 pages of transcript, 3,000 pages of printed testimony, 4 months of hearings, some of them going as late as 11 o'clock at night. We had the support of the subcommittee, the full committee and of the House and House approval of the conference. Does not the gentleman think that this item has had a pretty good going over?

Mr. GALLAGHER. Yes, sir.

Mr. PASSMAN. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I would like to compliment the gentleman from Louisiana and say that his committee did work hard and diligently on this. I would like to say, also, that the Committee on Foreign Affairs of which I am a member has worked just as hard. And it is our opinion that this amount is justified. We differ merely in approach to our national security.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GALLAGHER. I yield.

Mr. PASSMAN. Does the gentleman not realize that the Senate conferees led the House conferees into a trap? They got us to recede on the $100 million item for the contingency fund that this House has not authorized as yet. They led us into a trap and today through some misunderstanding the House is not supporting the committee.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I do not believe this was a trap. This supports the original authorization and I again request the House to support the motion of the gentleman from New York.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER].

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina.

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, during my service in the Congress I consistently have opposed appropriations for the so-called mutual security program. While I believe that the United States has a duty to assist our oversea allies in opposing communism, I have never been convinced that the huge sums we have appropriated over the years have been spent to the best economic, political, and military advantage of the United States.

Few people in our country have realized the magnitude of the foreign aid program. It is difficult for us to comprehend the extent to which our taxpayers' money has been used in all parts of the world.

In the beginning, the American people were led to believe that foreign aid expenditures would be temporary. The initial purpose in voting billions of dollars for oversea nations was to put their war-ravaged economies on a sound basis and thus protect them from the inroads of communism.

Billions of American dollars were made available for Europe and the Far East. The march of communism, to a great extent, was halted. Between 1945 and 1950 the United States had succeeded in restoring the economy of Europe, and the economic situation among our friends in the Far East had been stabilized.

Mr. Speaker, there were those in our Government, however, who looked upon foreign aid, not as a temporary measure of assistance to oversea nations, but as a permanent program for the United States. Through the years, therefore, the base of our oversea spending was extended, and the foreign aid program became an integral part of our relations with other countries.

That is the situation in which the United States finds itself today. We have become so accustomed to trying to solve our international problems with dollars that it sometimes seems we have no other foreign policy. Under such a program there is no end, of course, to the vicious cycle of oversea spending to which the United States unfortunately has been committed.

It will continue until such time as the Congress reexamines the entire foreign aid program and adopts a more realistic approach to our foreign relations. The United States cannot purchase friends overseas. We cannot persuade the world to oppose communism through grants of money. The will to survive in freedom must come from within each individual nation. Until such time as some of the nations we are helping exhibit such a will all the economic and military assistance we are capable of giving will accomplish nothing other than the insolvency of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I believe in helping those countries who indicate a genuine will to resist communism. I do not believe, however, in spending money we do not have but must borrow to support governments cooperating with the Communists, and which, in many instances, hold the United States in contempt. Since the end of World War II the United States has spent for economic assistance to oversea nations the staggering sum of $70,362 million. This tremendous sum has been appropriated year after year, and our national debt has shown a corresponding increase. With a national debt in excess of $286.6 billion the United States has a debt far greater than the combined national debts of the rest of the nations of the world. We have engaged in every type of foreign aid program from building sawmills in Formosa to providing funds for the operation of foreign universities.

One of the principal reasons, Mr. Speaker, that has made it impossible for me to support mutual security appropriations has been the corruption, mismanagement, and lack of planning that has characterized our oversea spending operations. The subcommittee for review of the mutual security programs of the House Foreign Affairs Committee issued an interim report on February 15, 1959, which reveals some startling facts. The subcommittee found that an examination of five of our economic development projects in Pakistan and Formosa demonstrated that it has been the practice of those administering the mutual security program to obligate appropriated funds for specific projects many months, and even years, before detailed plans and arrangements for carrying out the projects were formulated. This, of course, has resulted in waste and is indicative of the mismanagement in the foreign aid program.

In our military assistance program the subcommittee found that in one country the record in a motor pool showed enough tires had been supplied during the course of 1 year to make 44 tires available for every truck on hand. It also found that other examples of poor stockkeeping in our military assistance program were abundant. In one instance only one carburetor for 2½-ton truck engines was found to be in stock for an entire Army. It also found in another case that a supply of a particular ammunition item adequate for 185 years was on hand.

The subcommittee was also critical of the fact that apartment houses were found to be under construction overseas using materials and equipment that had been made available by the United States for military construction.

These are examples, Mr. Speaker, of what is happening with our money in many parts of the world. It is hard to believe that such practices can effectively advance the prestige of the United States and combat the spread of communism. During the past several months a number of countries that have received generous portions of American aid throughout the years have adopted policies inimical to the best interests of the United States. Laos, for instance,

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

has been saturated with American dollars. For the past several years we have supported practically the entire economy of Laos, but communism is still present in the country. Within the past several weeks a regime has been installed which is not to the best interests of the United States. We have been very generous with both Ethiopia and India. Yet these nations maintain a neutral position, and while accepting assistance from the United States they also accept funds from Soviet Russia.

In Africa we have assumed the burden of financing the new nations that are emerging in that troubled area of the world. Two of them, Guinea and Ghana, have been in existence for a very short time and have received large grants of American aid. I regret to say, however, that these countries are oriented toward the Soviet Union. In spite of this fact, we continue to give them our money.

We are all familiar with the turbulent situation existing in the Congo. I do not think anyone can say that a stable government exists in that former Belgian possession, or that the country's premier, Patrice Lumumba, is a friend of the United States. The administration, however, requested the Congress recently to make available $100 million for the Congo in spite of these facts.

Mr. Speaker, there is another grave area where our foreign aid expenditures are reacting to the disadvantage of the United States. Over the years our tax dollars have helped to create industries overseas which, by the use of cheap labor, are manufacturing products for sale in the United States at a price below that of similar American-made products. As a result of this practice our textile, watch, pottery, bicycle, leather, and even steel industries, to name a few, are suffering severe economic distress.

Imports of foreign-made goods are exceeding the export of American products by $4 billion annually. This has created an alarming situation with respect to the gold reserves of the United States. Since the beginning of 1958 the U.S. gold reserve has shrunk by $3.7 billion. Since 1958 more dollars have left the United States each year than have come in. This is the first time that such a situation has arisen since the Civil War, and there is no present hope in sight that the trend will be reversed. Unless something is done, however, to halt the flow of American dollars abroad the United States will soon be faced with the stark reality of a depleted gold reserve.

The textile industry has been the basic American industry most hard hit by our foreign aid operations. In a 10-year period from April 3, 1948, to June 30, 1958, the United States has paid for $141,019,000 worth of textile machinery to be installed in foreign countries. This great sum of money is in addition to vast sums we have loaned through the Export-Import Bank for the export of textile machinery.

American foreign aid funds have helped to build and equip new textile mills in Japan, India, Pakistan, West Germany, and a number of other nations. The result of this ill-advised generosity has been a flood of cheap textile products on the American market and the loss of thousands of jobs for our textile employees. Textile employment in the United States shows a steady decline; yet we in the Congress who have attempted to halt the flow of foreign-made textile products have met with no encouragement from the present national administration. The foreign aid program has helped to create a new textile industry overseas which is today in direct competition with our domestic textile economy.

Some idea of the magnitude of the problem facing the American textile industry can be seen when we realize that foreign textile products are flooding the United States at a rate equivalent to more than 500,000 bales of cotton per year. During June of this year the importation of cotton cloth established a record volume—50,720,032 square yards were imported. This volume is an increase of 41 percent over May of this year. During the first half of 1960 the importation of cotton cloth exceeded by 207 percent the volume imported during the first half of 1959.

Mr. Speaker, this is a grave matter to the people I am privileged to represent in the Congress. My congressional district has the largest concentration of textile manufacturing plants to be found in the United States. The jobs of many thousands of my constituents are at stake in this matter as well as the economic stability of North Carolina. I cannot, therefore, support any program of oversea spending which will encourage the importation of cheap textile products to this country with a resulting loss of jobs for my constituents.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for the Congress to reexamine our whole foreign aid program, together with the impact that it is having on the survival of basic American industries. We must, of course, continue to assist our proven friends in their battle for survival against communism. We cannot, however, keep up our present indiscriminate rate of spending and maintain our own economic solvency. A strong and economically sound United States of America is the best hope of mankind for survival in this tragic era. If the United States falters economically there can be no hope for the survival of the rest of the world. I believe the present hodgepodge of foreign aid programs is hindering, rather than advancing, the best interests of our Nation. It is time for the Congress to face this basic fact, and until such time as we adopt a more realistic approach to foreign aid spending I shall oppose all appropriations for such purpose.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE].

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I hope that the House will recede on this amendment. The special assistance part of the program is 13 percent of the entire U.S. economic aid. It affects 22 of the great allies and friends of the United States. As the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER] just pointed out, the $123 million of this fund is for countries such as Morocco and Libya. In Morocco we have the largest air base outside of the United States. In Jordan, if we did not have this particular kind of help at this time you would certainly have a collapse with accompanying violence, which could spread, as well as in Afghanistan on the Soviet border, and a target of the major Soviet effort.

Taking the amount provided by the mutual security appropriation, after these four major hard-core programs, only $107 million would be available for all other requirements, which total $145.5 million. To meet these reductions a cut of 26 percent would have to be made on the average in all other special assistance programs.

The Senate has programed a special program for tropical Africa, and stated that we have to have $20 million for tropical Africa. The House and the Senate recommended a higher level for Israel. The Senate Committee on Foreign Relations recommended full retention of the tropical Africa program and of the health and related welfare activities. The House Appropriations Committee stated in language that said in effect, let us not do anything to the malaria eradication program, which is an excellent program. We find ourselves in the ridiculous position of saying, do not touch the tropical Africa program; do not touch the malaria eradication program; do not touch this program, do not touch that program. But yet they made an across-the-board cut which will go deep into all of these programs.

Mr. Speaker, these programs are in critical areas such as in Bolivia, in Haiti, in the world-spotlighted Berlin, in Tunisia, in Israel, which I have already mentioned, and in Burma. They sponsor activities in the schools abroad, such as the American University of Beirut. I am sure my good chairman, who feels very strongly about the American University at Beirut, would not want to see anything done here today to hurt that particular program. Unless we restore this $26 million, all of these worthwhile programs will have to be reduced.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. I think I should apologize to the members of the Subcommittee on Appropriations handling this legislation. We did go to the other body for a conference. They had added $100 million for the Congo. The item had no hearings in our committee. We agreed to put the $100 million item into the contingency fund for the Congo that has not yet been authorized by the House of Representatives. That is why some of us on the subcommittee feel so very badly that the other body would attempt what they appear to be succeeding in doing.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, we have heard the same old specious arguments here this afternoon, the same old platitudes about how the world is going to end unless we vote added millions upon millions of dollars into this bill. I do

not know about the taxpayers in Massachusetts, Indiana, New York, Minnesota, and especially Michigan, where only a few months ago that State could not even meet their payrolls, where teachers' salaries went unpaid. Apparently everything is lovely and the goose hangs high in New York, Indiana, Michigan, Massachusetts, and other States, some of whose Representatives are the chief spokesmen this afternoon for adding more millions to this foreign giveaway. It is different in the State of Iowa, where farm income continues to go down and cost of operations for farmers continues to increase. We do not have this kind of money out there, and we would appreciate help from Michigan, Indiana, Minnesota, New York, and Massachusetts, where you are apparently so well fixed you can afford to support the spending of billions in foreign countries, whose slogan now seems to be, "You give us the money and we will give you trouble."

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Let me tell the gentleman about the goose that hangs high in Michigan. Did the gentleman ever smell a goose that has hung high a long time?

Mr. GROSS. Not for some time.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. You know after a while what happens, how it pollutes the air?

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is what this program has been doing.

Mr. GROSS. If this amendment is adopted, perhaps we should put all the rest of them in, and make this bill good and rich. Must this Nation be put through bankruptcy to convince a comparatively few people that our country cannot forever bear burdens of this kind?

Mr. PASSMAN. The taxpayers are entitled to a better break than that.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, it ought to be pointed out that this amendment is on all fours with the previous amendment as two essential elements of our total defense. There are two kinds of countries to which we give aid in these two amendments. First, those to which we are giving military assistance. Defense support is to give them enough economic assistance so they can keep in the field and use effectively the military forces we have helped them build up. Second, special assistance goes to countries with which we do not have military alliances, to which we are not giving military aid in any significant degree, but which occupy strategic positions around the periphery of the Iron Curtain or have facilities that are important to us, or whose survival as independent nations is important to the free world.

When you are playing football it is not enough to have a good end, then skip a man, have a good guard, then skip another man, and have a good tackle. You have to have a whole line, not one with gaps in it.

This special assistance goes to those countries in the line that do not get military assistance and defense support, but have to have economic assistance if they are to maintain their own independence, keep their place in the line, and keep secure the strategically located and essential air and other bases we have in those countries.

If Jordan as one such country, were to be sent a message by us at this time of internal crisis that we are cutting down special assistance for it, I think anyone can see what might easily happen there.

We must look at the total picture. We are not talking about charity or philanthropy or a giveaway. This is an essential part of our own overall defense system. If we weaken any of the elements of that defense system, we weaken the whole thing. All who voted "aye" on the defense support amendment should vote "aye" on this one also. They are on a par. After all, this is a global struggle and the Communists are operating in every country in every conceivable way against us. We cannot win by doing a good job to help some to become strong, and at the same time to do too little to strengthen other countries that are equally essential, in part because of their strategic location. We must have a total program, and these two amendments put together will give us that total program.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I would just like to observe with reference to the statement I made earlier on the amendment just adopted that this amendment now pending is the second one of the motions that I said I would support, and which I think is so essential to the security of the country. I just want to take this moment to express the hope that this motion will be supported.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, if all who voted "aye" on the previous amendment will vote "aye" on this amendment, then our total defense system in other countries is in balance, and while no one can guarantee that something may not go wrong, this the best way to insure against it. We have a resourceful and relentless enemy and if we do not adopt this amendment, we are running the risk of weak spots or gaps in our defenses.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. THOMSON].

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, it is with some reluctance that I take the well of the House at this particular point in the debate, but I feel so strongly about a principle involved that I am compelled to do so. That principle is simply to protect the prerogatives of the legislative branch of our Government.

Not only by custom, but by our very Constitution itself, the legislative is given certain prerogatives and responsibilities when it comes to appropriating the taxpayers' money.

Perhaps I am more aware of this and feel more strongly about it than do some others, by reason of my service on the House Appropriations Committee. Have you stopped to think that if we recede from the House position and agree to the amendments of the Senate, as is now being proposed, we will, in effect, be abdicating our prerogatives and our responsibilities.

Our great President has been very diligent in protecting the prerogatives of the Executive. Even though this once meant the veto of a bill which I sponsored, and which at the time was most upsetting to me, still, on reflection, I respect him as the Chief Executive for guarding the prerogatives of the Executive and maintaining the balance of power so wisely provided in our Constitution.

Similarly, though, we must zealously guard the position of the legislative, or the foundations upon which this country is built will be in danger.

I have grave differences with respect to our foreign aid program, but leaving that out and assuming for purposes of this argument that we are traveling in the right direction, the fact still remains that the Congress, after careful hearings and consideration—particularly on the part of the House—has acted in each body, compromised the differences in conference. You will note the net reduction in any of these fields is only approximately 10 percent.

We have a responsibility to see that the taxpayers' money is well spent. Each dollar should be carefully examined and justified. Under the budget process, requests start at the lowest level, go through the agency to the department, to the Bureau of the Budget, and finally to the President. Then they are submitted to the Congress. They start out with a lot of "fat" in them. No matter how closely they are scrutinized in this bureaucracy, no Secretary of a department, no Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and no Chief Executive is possibly going to discover all of them. That is why we hold, on the House side particularly, long and arduous hearings before our appropriations subcommittees, in an effort to represent the taxpayers.

As a rule of thumb, most of our subcommittees feel that if we do our work well, we should be able to save some money on every department's budget, without jeopardizing any worthwhile program.

If we recede and concur on this amendment, it simply means that we say that in the area of foreign aid, we are going to give a blank check and that no cuts will be allowed. Regardless of how I might feel about the economic foreign aid program, I could not allow this to happen without registering my protest.

Permit me to illustrate by referring to two subcommittees with which I am particularly familiar, because they are the subcommittees on which I serve.

First, I will speak as a member of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Interior Department and Related Agencies. Hearings are held first on this bill in each session, and it is the first bill to

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARY

be brought to the floor of the House in each session of Congress. This is the bill that has been characterized as the "all-American bill." It provides the funds for our public lands, for the Bureau of Mines to conduct mineral research, and so forth, for the Geological Survey, for Fish and Wildlife, for our forests, for our national parks, and our American Indians, and I could go on down the line.

In spite of the importance of all of this to our country as a whole, and particularly to the area which it is my privilege to represent, I sit in committee and search for ways in which we can cut expenditures. I do this because I know that in any government operation, there is always a place where you can save money. I further know that in saving money, oftentimes you can improve the quality of the program, by cutting out the bureaucrats which tend to "load in" by reason of any bureau's tendency to grow. Sometimes, I support cuts that are most difficult, and oftentimes refrain from trying to put in additional funds, because I know that since this is the first bill to be considered, it might well set a pattern. If we go over the budget or do not cut, then a precedent is set.

Basically, though, as I see it, I can act with clear conscience because I know that there are places for saving. In 1959, we cut the budget requests on this bill by 12 percent. This year, we started with a low base but still cut it about $7 million. In so doing, we keep the executive department's feet to the fire to practice economy in government. That is the principal weapon which was given to the Congress by the Constitution, and is a weapon to be used for good government.

The other subcommittee on which I serve is the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations. Even in this area, we make cuts in the exercise of our legislative prerogative. This year, we cut a budget request of $13 billion for military procurement by 3 percent, and made it stick in conference. Why? We did this because the evidence before our committee showed that contracting practices, and so forth, could be tightened up, and we were satisfied that we could make this cut without interfering with the defense program, but at the same time forcing, through exercise of the legislative prerogative, obtaining more for the taxpayer's dollar.

After investigation, on the House side we cut our own military appropriation for personnel and administration in the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area by 10 percent. We did this to slow down the operation of Parkinson's law, which, as you know, is the tendency of any agency to grow bigger. Even after conference with the Senate, the final action of the Congress was to cut this by roughly 5 percent. No one has complained about these cuts.

But the sponsors of this amendment say that if we cut one dime from this request for economic foreign aid, we are endangering the security of the United States. Are they prepared to take the floor of this House and say that the mutual security agency within the State Department—or the foreign aid section, as it would be more popularly referred to—is perfect; that they have no excess personnel? I doubt that. In fact, every responsible check that has been made would indicate exactly the reverse.

Yet, when we cut a budget request of $675 million by $65 million, which is less than 10 percent, on defense support, we are told by the State Department that our security is in danger.

Do not be confused by nomenclature. Defense support is not military assistance. It is simply a rather recent new terminology for economic foreign aid, devised in an attempt to get around the disrepute of the foreign aid program by that name.

We now have before us a proposition with respect to special assistance. This is still just another relatively new name for foreign economic aid. The budget request was $256 million. The House appropriated $206 million. The Senate passed the full $256 million requested. In conference, we compromised our differences and agreed to $230 million. Again, this $26 million which it is attempted to restore by this action constitutes only about 10 percent.

I fail to understand how we can cut appropriations for our own forests, for our own minerals development, and so forth—yes, if you please, how we can cut appropriations for our own military—for our own Army, Navy, and Air Force, without jeopardizing the security, yet cannot cut 10 percent on the worldwide public works program that this country seems to have undertaken, without jeopardizing our security.

If we succumb to the proposition that we must restore every dime of the Department's request, then we have completely abdicated our legislative prerogatives and responsibilities under the Constitution, to see that the taxpayers' money is well spent.

I know that we can make cuts here and probably do the program a lot of good, by forcing better management. I think the gentleman from Louisiana, who has looked into this probably more than anyone else, would agree on that.

Mr. PASSMAN. Does the gentleman agree that in the old development assistance program, of course, they have changed the name, they still have $57 million and that they have not been able to spend that for 5 or 6 years and cannot even find any way to obligate that money?

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. I am pleased the gentleman mentions that. Also his statement calls attention to the fact that names have been juggled so that foreign economic aid which was discredited is now called development loan, defense support, special assistance, and so forth—they are all new names to make foreign economic aid more palatable.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I doubt if I can add anything new to this proposition.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a brief question?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Is there any aid at all for the farmers of America in this bill?

Mr. THOMAS. I am sorry, but there is not.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the amendment offered by my distinguished, beloved, and outstanding colleague from New York [Mr. TABER] is voted down. I am going to ask for the yeas and nays on the motion.

A great many speakers on both sides of the aisle have pointed out many, many worthwhile projects in this program. There is no doubt about it. There are many, many worthwhile projects in this program. Also, there are some that have been very poorly screened and those officials who poorly screened those projects have brought that ill repute to the program that I mentioned a while ago.

Now this motion is for what? Twenty-six million dollars. The question you have to decide is whether they need that $26 million. Let me address myself to that one question. Do they need this $26 million? What do they have in this program? We appropriated less than a week ago how much? Two hundred and thirty million dollars. Now, does that $230 million tell the whole story? No, it does not. It is written in the authorization act that if any of these programs need any more money in addition to what has already been appropriated, up to 20 percent, may be transferred to a particular appropriation. Your total program is $3.7 billion. Just see how much money you could put under this program if you wanted to. Two hundred and thirty million dollars, plus 20 percent transfer, if he wants to use it, he could spend the $250 million contingency fund in this program.

Let us be practical. There is hardly that much money in the world. You have 4 months before we will be back here again. Could the President possibly put in the pipeline, allocate this much money in 4 months? Of course not. He could not possibly spend it under 6 or 7 months, and the Congress will be back here before then.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. When the bill went to the other body, $42 million in unobligated funds was stricken out in the House bill. The Senate put it back. We agreed to that. I forgot to mention that.

Mr. THOMAS. I thank the gentleman. That makes available an additional $42 million.

I respectfully ask my colleagues to vote this down on the theory that it is not needed at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 177, nays 216, not voting 39, as follows:

[Roll No. 200]

YEAS—177

Addonizio	Fulton	Morgan
Albert	Gallagher	Moss
Anfuso	Garmatz	Multer
Arends	Giaimo	Mumma
Ashley	Gilbert	Murphy
Avery	Glenn	Nelsen
Ayres	Goodell	Nix
Baldwin	Granahan	O'Brien, Ill.
Barrett	Green, Pa.	O'Brien, N.Y.
Barry	Griffin	O'Hara, Ill.
Bass, N.H.	Griffiths	O'Hara, Mich.
Bates	Gubser	O'Neill
Becker	Halleck	Oliver
Beckworth	Halpern	Osmers
Bentley	Healey	Ostertag
Boland	Hechler	Pelly
Bolton	Holland	Porter
Bowles	Holt	Price
Brademas	Holtzman	Prokop
Brewster	Horan	Pucinski
Broomfield	Hosmer	Quie
Broyhill	Inouye	Quigley
Burke, Mass.	Irwin	Ray
Byrne, Pa.	Jackson	Rees, Kans.
Byrnes, Wis.	Johnson, Colo.	Reuss
Cahill	Johnson, Wis.	Rhodes, Ariz.
Canfield	Judd	Rhodes, Pa.
Carnahan	Karsten	Riehlman
Celler	Karth	Rodino
Chamberlain	Kasem	Rogers, Colo.
Chiperfield	Kastenmeier	St. George
Clark	Kearns	Santangelo
Coffin	Keith	Saylor
Cohelan	Kelly	Schneebeli
Conte	Kilday	Schwengel
Cook	King, Calif.	Slack
Curtin	Kluczynski	Smith, Iowa
Curtis, Mass.	Kowalski	Springer
Daddario	Laird	Sullivan
Daniels	Langen	Taber
Delaney	Lankford	Teague, Calif.
Derounian	Lesinski	Teller
Diggs	Libonati	Thompson, N. J
Dingell	Lindsay	Thornberry
Donohue	McCormack	Toll
Dooley	McDonough	Tollefson
Dorn, N.Y.	McDowell	Udall
Dwyer	McIntire	Vanik
Fallon	Macdonald	Van Zandt
Farbstein	Machrowicz	Wainwright
Fenton	Madden	Wallhauser
Fino	Mailliard	Weis
Flood	May	Westland
Fogarty	Merrow	Widnall
Foley	Miller, Clem	Wilson
Forand	Miller, George P.	Yates
Ford	Milliken	Younger
Frelinghuysen	Moorhead	Zablocki
Friedel		Zelenko

NAYS—216

Abbitt	Brooks, Tex.	Dulski
Abernethy	Brown, Ga.	Edmondson
Adair	Brown, Mo.	Elliott
Alexander	Brown, Ohio	Everett
Alford	Budge	Evins
Alger	Burke, Ky.	Fascell
Allen	Burleson	Feighan
Andersen, Minn.	Cannon	Fisher
	Casey	Flynt
Andrews	Cederberg	Fountain
Ashmore	Chelf	Frazier
Aspinall	Chenoweth	Gary
Bailey	Church	Gathings
Baker	Coad	Gavin
Baring	Collier	George
Barr	Colmer	Gray
Bass, Tenn.	Cooley	Gross
Belcher	Corbett	Hagen
Bennett, Fla.	Cramer	Haley
Bennett, Mich.	Cunningham	Hardy
Berry	Curtis, Mo.	Hargis
Betts	Dague	Harmon
Blatnik	Davis, Ga.	Harris
Blitch	Dawson	Harrison
Boggs	Dent	Hemphill
Bonner	Denton	Henderson
Bosch	Derwinski	Herlong
Bow	Devine	Hiestand
Boykin	Dixon	Hoeven
Bray	Dorn, S.C.	Hoffman, Ill.
Breeding	Dowdy	Hoffman, Mich.
Brock	Downing	Huddleston
Hull	Moeller	Selden
Ikard	Monagan	Shelley
Jarman	Montoya	Short
Jennings	Moore	Sikes
Jensen	Morris, N. Mex.	Siler
Johansen	Morris, Okla.	Simpson
Johnson, Calif.	Morrison	Sisk
Johnson, Md.	Moulder	Smith, Calif.
Jonas	Natcher	Smith, Miss.
Jones, Ala.	Norblad	Smith, Va.
Jones, Mo.	Norrell	Spence
Kee	O'Konski	Staggers
Keogh	Passman	Steed
Kilgore	Patman	Stratton
King, Utah	Perkins	Stubblefield
Kirwan	Pfost	Taylor, N.C.
Kitchin	Philbin	Teague, Tex.
Knox	Pillion	Thomas
Kyl	Pirnie	Thompson, Tex.
Lane	Poage	Thomson, Wyo.
Latta	Poff	Trimble
Lennon	Powell	Tuck
Levering	Rabaut	Ullman
Lipscomb	Rains	Utt
Loser	Randall	Van Pelt
McCulloch	Reece, Tenn.	Walter
McFall	Riley	Wampler
McGinley	Rivers, Alaska	Watts
McGovern	Rivers, S.C.	Weaver
McMillan	Roberts	Wharton
Mack	Robison	Whitener
Mahon	Rogers, Fla.	Whitten
Marshall	Rogers, Tex.	Wier
Martin	Rooney	Williams
Mason	Rostenkowski	Willis
Matthews	Roush	Winstead
Meader	Rutherford	Wolf
Metcalf	Saund	Wright
Meyer	Schenck	Young
Michel	Scherer	
Mills	Scott	

NOT VOTING—39

Anderson, Mont.	Green, Oreg.	Murray
	Hays	Pilcher
Auchincloss	Hébert	Preston
Barden	Hess	Rogers, Mass.
Baumhart	Hogan	Roosevelt
Bolling	Holifield	Sheppard
Brooks, La.	Kilburn	Shipley
Buckley	Lafore	Smith, Kans.
Davis, Tenn.	Landrum	Taylor, N.Y.
Doyle	McSween	Thompson, La.
Durham	Magnuson	Vinson
Flynn	Miller, N.Y.	Withrow
Forrester	Minshall	
Grant	Mitchell	

So the motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Forrester against.

Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Landrum against.

Mr. Doyle for, with Mr. Pilcher against.

Mrs. Green of Oregon for, with Mr. Preston against.

Mr. Auchincloss for, with Mr. Smith of Kansas against.

Mr. Miller of New York for, with Mr. Thompson of Louisiana against.

Mr. Sheppard for, with Mr. Shipley against.

Mr. Magnuson for, with Mr. Barden against.

Mr. Roosevelt for, with Mr. Brooks of Louisiana against.

Mr. Kilburn for, with Mr. Withrow against.

Mr. Holifield for, with Mr. McSween against.

Mr. Hays for, with Mr. Grant against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Anderson of Montana with Mr. Hess.

Mr. Carnahan with Mr. Minshall.

Mr. Durham with Mrs. Rogers of Massachusetts.

Mr. Vinson with Mr. Taylor of New York.

Mr. Hogan with Mr. Baumhart.

Mr. Flynn with Mr. Lafore.

Mr. MACHROWICZ changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. BOGGS changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 9: Page 3, line 16, insert the following:

"GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

"For an additional amount for general administrative expenses, as authorized by section 411(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, $2,000,000."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. THOMAS moves that the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 10: Page 3, line 20, insert "DEVELOPMENT LOAN FUND".

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. THOMAS moves that the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 11: Page 3, line 21, insert the following: "For an additional amount for advances to the Development Loan Fund as authorized by section 203, $75 million, to remain available until expended."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. THOMAS moves that the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 12: Page 3, line 24, insert the following: "The limitation on the amount available for administrative expenses of the Development Loan Fund covering the categories set forth in the fiscal year 1961 budget estimates for such expenses is $2,150,000."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. THOMAS moves that the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12.

Mr. COFFIN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. COFFIN moves that the House recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 12.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. COFFIN].

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Mr. COFFIN. Mr. Speaker, if this motion to recede and concur is passed, what you will be doing is to take off a limitation on the administrative expenditures for the Development Loan Fund of $1,800,000 and substitute the figure of $1,250,000. The sum of $350,000 is involved here. This is not new money. This is merely a restriction on the administration in the Development Loan Fund.

Mr. Speaker, the hard facts of the matter are these: The Development Loan Fund is your creation. It was created a couple of years ago and it has now developed to the point where it needs its personnel to police these loans to see that engineering data which you require are supplied; to see that proper accounting is done; to see no funds are disbursed unless they are properly planned and accounted for. These are your requirements. You have a right to see that they are carried out so that the Development Loan Fund, as it reaches the full potential of its operations, remains true to the concept which you had in this Chamber when you authorized it. By tying the hands of the Development Loan Fund you not only refuse to allow them to increase their personnel to handle the workload that arises in the followup work as a loan actually gets into the disbursing stage, but you will have to reduce some of the personnel that they have now. This, my fellow Members, is false economy of the worst sort.

Mr. Speaker, I have said all I think can be said on this. This is not new money.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFIN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to commend the distinguished gentleman from Maine. His point is well taken with reference to the operation of the Development Loan Fund. It seems to me, unless the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from Maine is adopted, the effectiveness of the Fund and its operation will be seriously impeded.

Mr. COFFIN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFIN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman used the expression "your creation." Would the gentleman make an exception?

Mr. COFFIN. I would be happy to except the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I did not help to create this agency and I will not help to perpetuate it.

Mr. COFFIN. I doubt if anyone was really misled.

So, in short, Mr. Speaker, here is an important vehicle of foreign policy. It is one of the best things we have done in recent years, and here you are being asked to put a ball and chain on it by this limitation which does not save the taxpayers of this country a bloody penny.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFIN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. I commend the gentleman from Maine for offering his preferential motion because it offers the real way to save money. It merely seeks to authorize, out of the total amount in the bill, enough funds to permit good administration so that a minimum of money will be wastefully or improperly used. We hear complaints always about bad projects. The Development Loan Fund needs to have enough staff to screen properly the projects for which loans are requested so as to make sure that we get the most benefits out of the large amounts of money in the Fund.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Maine has expired.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to our beloved colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I was the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations when the first appropriation for the Marshall plan, so-called, was before the House. Out of a total of $4 billion we allowed $12 million for administrative expenses. We found that they could not use all of that money. Ever since then the amount that has been dumped in for administrative expenses has increased each year until it has gotten completely out of hand and this great big administrative machinery handling all this money has just gotten so cumbersome that you cannot make heads or tails of it. Now they have this Office of Inspector General and Comptroller. Did you ever hear of such a thing? The Inspector General also is the auditor and the two jobs are not compatible. I hope this House will not allow any increase and will not put in any of these increases which have no justification whatsoever, if you want a decent and honest Government.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY].

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, we are dealing with the first of four points in disagreement between the conferees, which are basically questions of language rather than of amounts. The first one, as has been explained by the gentleman from Maine, is a difference of $350,000 in the ceiling for administrative expenses for the Development Loan Fund. That is amendment No. 12.

Amendment No. 13 is an amendment in which the Senate version provides that funds which have been deobligated may be reobligated.

The third amendment deals with a change in the technical cooperation proviso.

Amendment No. 15, the last of the so-called language amendments, increases the ceiling for the administrative expenses of the Office of Inspector General and Comptroller.

Mr. Speaker, I have a great deal of respect for the members of the Appropriations Committee. I am certain that they sincerely feel, by insisting upon their resistance to the Senate language, that they are keeping the proper legislative reins and checks upon the executive branch. On the other hand, I think it also fair to point out that the executive branch is just as concerned about the failure on the part of the House version to include this language in these four instances as they were previously about those various reductions upon which we have been voting.

We have all criticized this mutual security or foreign aid program from time to time. We have criticized it because of the amounts contained in various parts of the program. We have also criticized it because of its administrative weaknesses, lack of efficiency, and wastefulness. I sincerely believe that the executive branch is endeavoring to improve the administration and operation and efficiency of this program. They have asked for a certain amount of flexibility. They have asked for an increase in administrative expenses to permit them, so they say, to bring more efficiency, better operation, and better administration into the program. I hope when you come to vote on amendment No. 12 and the next three amendments that the Members will take into consideration that the executive has promised that if it gets the language of the Senate version in these cases it can improve the administrative part of this program, and at the same time they state that in the long run the taxpayers will be saved money.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I am going to speak 2 or 3 minutes, and then move the previous question.

I hope this amendment of my able friend, the gentleman from Maine [Mr. COFFIN], is defeated. The reason I say that is that it is absolutely unnecessary. What does it do? It makes available about $350,000 more, an increase of 15 percent in the administrative costs. How many employees do they have in the foreign aid program already? You cannot segregate them into this compartment and that compartment. They are all over the lot. There are 11,000, but that is not all. If you add the contract personnel both at home and on the scene, you can add another 43,000 to it, making, in round figures, 54,000.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the amendment is voted down.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Maine.

The motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question recurs on the motion of the gentleman from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 13: page 4, line 4, insert "Funds appropriated under each paragraph of rule I of the Mutual Security and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1961 (other than appropriations under the head of military assistance), including unobligated balances continued available, the respective funds appropriated by this Act, and amounts certified pursuant to section 1311 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act,

1955, as having been obligated against appropriations heretofore made for the same general purpose as such paragraph, which amounts are hereby continued available for the same general purpose, may be consolidated in one account for each paragraph."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. THOMAS moves that the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 14: Page 4, line 15, insert "The proviso in the paragraph headed 'Technical Cooperation, General Authorization' in title I of the Mutual Security and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1961, is amended to read as follows: '*Provided*, That every project or activity financed from funds made available for the fiscal year 1961 for such assistance and for which an estimate has not been submitted, shall be reported to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives.'."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. THOMAS moves that the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 15: Page 4, line 24, insert "The limitation on the amount available for expenses of the Office of the Inspector General and Comptroller, as established by section 533A of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, is $1,762,000."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. THOMAS moves that the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JUDD moves that the House recede and concur in Senate amendment numbered 15.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, this amendment would increase by $762,000 the amount available for the Office of Inspector General and Comptroller for administrative expenses.

Mr. Speaker, almost all of the criticisms we hear of the mutual security program are with respect to reports of laxness, inefficiency, and waste. I have seen some of the laxness, and inefficiency, and instances of bad judgment, and so on. Sometimes we have been unable to get figures that would jibe; one set of figures would not agree with another set. So our committee last year devised this Office of Inspector General and Comptroller to center authority for inspection in one place. The chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN], sponsored it and the committee and Congress adopted it.

I do not believe we ought to put large amounts of money into any program without having some outside agency, or a separate office within the agency, with authority to inspect all operations, find out whatever is wrong, and try to correct it, or at least to expose it. I do not like to hear about bad messes only after they have happened.

Existing law vests the Inspector General with authority to investigate and stop bad practices where he finds them, and report back to the Secretary of State so the agency can correct them. This program is less than 2 years old. It has not had adequate time or opportunity to get really started. If we want to save money and everybody wants that, we must give the Office sufficient funds so it can do the job it ought to, saving your tax dollars and mine. With the $1 million already in the bill plus $762,000 proposed for this Office, it can do what we set it up to do. This seems to me so clearly a matter of good common sense and a sound way to improve the operations of mutual security program that I hope this amendment to recede and concur in the Senate amendment will be adopted.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from New York. I would like to have his observations on this.

Mr. TABER. I have had experience, and the gentleman from Minnesota has had experience, with this situation. We have found that this combination of Comptroller and Inspector General does not work at all.

For instance, on this technical cooperation program where they asked for an additional $22 million which the House refused to them a few minutes ago, we found after asking the different witnesses who were supposed to be in charge of it what they had done but we could not find out anything. We sent a couple of men downtown where they were supposed to be running a school. We were told before the men went down there that the school would be running from 1 to 5 that afternoon. They found it was not running at all—there were no students there. If we are going to have that kind of operation we never will get anywhere, and the program will not amount to anything.

For that reason I cannot go along with this item, although I would like to see somebody with the capacity and the strength to go ahead and put this thing across and have it done properly. I have been disturbed for years about this sort of thing. We have had this in front of all of us for some time, and it is not because we did not give them enough money. We gave them enough money, but there is nobody in charge who has the strength to correct the situation and do the job.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. There is no way that the Congress can appoint personnel. If the present incumbent is not satisfactory, we ought by protest to try to get rid of him. But will not the gentleman agree that we ought either to cut off funds for the Inspector General entirely and abolish the Office or else give it the funds necessary to do the job?

Mr. TABER. We should abolish the Office entirely. It is absolutely impossible to have the official that has charge of all the expenditures to do the other work, too.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Minnesota called this an outside agency. It is the most inside agency in the Government, or one of them.

Mr. TABER. It is worse than that.

Mr. GROSS. If we are going to spend money to enlarge the Government bureaucracy, let us give the money to the General Accounting Office and tell the foreign giveaway outfit that they must open up their records so the General Accounting Office can see how the billions are being spent.

Mr. TABER. That is right.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN].

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, this office came before our committee last year and asked us to recommend that they operate without limitation for the first year. We followed that recommendation and placed no limitation on its expenditures. At the end of the year they had spent twice what they said they would spend. This year they asked for $1,250,000, at a subsequent date during the hearings they raised that to $1,750,000. Then later they said "we do not even know whether that is sufficient." Your committee then recommended $1 million, and the conference agreement provided $1.2 million, which is only $50,000 below the budget estimate.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, as everyone here knows, I do not like to take a position contrary to the views of my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]; but in this particular instance it is my judgment that the position taken by the gentleman from Minnesota is correct.

We have been after the ICA and the related agencies to do a better job. There have been instances of carelessness in programing, and poor execution, limited to a very small degree, but those instances have popped up.

It was the view of the Congress last year that we should set up an Inspector General who would be responsible to ferret out and to prevent these instances that exist in the program. I think this was a good step. Personally, I believe the Office of Comptroller and Inspector General should be divided, but that has not been done.

My recollection is that the basic legislation provides it shall be one person. I hope we can change this situation, but if we are going to pin responsibility on

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARY

the Inspector General to do the job we have assigned him, then we must adequately finance his office; otherwise, the ICA will come back to us and say "Yes, you sent us to correct a situation, but you did not give us enough money to accomplish it."

I believe the position taken by the gentleman from Minnesota is sound. If we do that then I think we can look forward to a real job being done in scrutinizing the program and straightening out some of the problems that exist.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. One of the real advantages of office is that it enables us to pinpoint responsibility. Heretofore when we heard that something is wrong somewhere, it is hard to find out just who is responsible for it. Now if a Congressman sees something that does not seem proper, or a traveler comes back and asks "How does it happen that I saw so and so happening in a particular country?" the Inspector General has to have the answer—or else. I think we ought to have some place and some person from whom to get the information that is necessary.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. Is it not true that we permitted the Office to operate without a limitation on its expenses last year?

Mr. FORD. That is correct.

Mr. PASSMAN. When they came in this year they first asked for $1,250,000.

Mr. FORD. That is my recollection.

Mr. PASSMAN. And at a subsequent date they informally increased that amount.

Mr. Speaker, remarks have been made on the floor today, not only in connection with this item, but also in connection with several other amendments, that if the funds approved today are insufficient the Committee will receive sympathetically in January a request for increased funds or a relaxation of limitations and language in the bill. It is my understanding, as chairman of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, that the funds provided and the limitations approved today are the ceilings for the year, and in my opinion, it would be wise for the agency to program the funds approved today accordingly.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, it is very interesting that when the $65 million amendment was before the House, everything was sweetness and light in this foreign giveaway program; nothing at all wrong. Now we hear proponents admitting that something smells; that there has been a bad odor for a long time. I just do not understand the situation. Maybe the gentleman from Texas can help me out.

Mr. THOMAS. The gentleman from Iowa is right, as he usually is.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment, above all, should be voted down. In the first place, let us see what it does. It is admitted that there is something wrong in the office. Are you going to cure it by giving them more money? This amendment increases the amount of money the office has by what amount? Thirty-three and one-third percent. You are going to cure what is wrong by giving them more money. The office is judge and jury. The Agency ought to come in with some requested legislation to provide a sound program.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment is certainly unsound; a 33⅓-percent increase over and above the budget estimate. Why, it is unthinkable.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

The motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 5: Page 3, line 3, insert "Mutual Security".

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. THOMAS moves that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 16: Page 5, line 5, insert "For an additional amount for 'Salaries and Expenses,' $275,000; and in addition, $170,000 of the funds appropriated by section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935, as amended (7 U.S.C. 612c), shall be merged with this appropriation and shall be available for all expenses of the Foreign Agricultural Service in carrying out the purposes of said section 32."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. THOMAS moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sums of "$275,000" and "$170,000" named in said amendment, insert "$137,500" and "$100,000", respectively.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 23: Page 6, line 20, insert:

"CONSTRUCTION AND EQUIPMENT

"For the purpose of obtaining a suitable site for construction of a Coast and Geodetic Survey Seismological Laboratory, the Secretary of Commerce is authorized, on behalf of the United States, to lease from the Isleta Indian Tribe, and the Isleta Indian Tribe, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, is authorized to lease to the Secretary of Commerce, for a minimum term of 25 years with provisions for renewal, approximately seven hundred and fifty acres, more or less, of tribal land on the Isleta Indian Reservation; such land being situated in sections 5, 6, 7, and 8, township 8 north, range 5 east, New Mexico principal meridian, county of Bernalillo, State of New Mexico. Any lease entered into hereunder shall provide for an annual rental not in excess of $1,200, and shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which the tribe may jointly use that portion of the leased area not specifically needed for the Laboratory. The construction of the Laboratory, on the land leased hereunder, shall be undertaken by the Secretary of Commerce, on behalf of the United States, and the Secretary shall provide, in connection therewith, such structures, appurtenances and facilities as may be necessary or desirable in furtherance of the purposes and requirements of such Laboratory, and shall provide for the repair, maintenance, alteration, or improvements thereof."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. THOMAS moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: Delete the last sentence thereof.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 30: Page 10, line 19, insert:

"PUBLIC BUILDING CONSTRUCTION

"For an additional amount for 'Capital outlay, public building construction' for construction projects as authorized by the Act of June 6, 1958 (72 Stat. 183), including acquisition of sites; preliminary survey at the Receiving Home; preparation of plans and specifications for the following buildings: Eliot Junior High School addition, new elementary school in the vicinity of Eleventh and Clifton Streets Northwest, and Bancroft Elementary School addition; erection of the following structures, including building improvement and alteration and the treatment of grounds: Kenilworth Elementary School addition, new junior high school in the vicinity of South Dakota Avenue and Hamilton Street Northeast, Deal Junior High School addition, additional dormitory at the Youth Correctional Center, cowbarn and dairy facility at the Workhouse, laundry addition at the District of Columbia Village, children's cottages at the Junior Village, and a chapel at the Cedar Knoll School; equipment for new buildings; advanced planning for various recreation units; $25,000 for purchase of equipment for new school buildings; and permanent improvements of buildings and grounds (including purchase and installation of furnishings and equipment) of correctional and welfare institutions, and other District of Columbia buildings; to remain available until expended, $6,170,800 of which $900,000 shall not become available for expenditure until July 1, 1961, and $330,100 shall be available for construction services by the Director of Buildings and Grounds or by contract for architectural engineering services, as may be determined by the Commissioners, and the funds for the use of the Director of Buildings and Grounds shall be advanced to the appropriation account, 'Construction services, Department of Buildings and Grounds'."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. THOMAS moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30 and concur therein

with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed, insert the following:

"PUBLIC BUILDING CONSTRUCTION AND DEPARTMENT OF SANITARY ENGINEERING

"For an additional amount for 'Capital outlay, Public Building Construction' and 'Capital outlay, Department of Sanitary Engineering', for construction projects as authorized by the Act of April 22, 1904 (33 Stat. 244), the Act of May 18, 1954 (68 Stat. 105), and the Act of June 6, 1958 (72 Stat. 183) and as submitted to the Congress in House Document Numbered 403 of June 1, 1960, such sums as may be necessary, but no obligation shall be incurred for any item or project proposed in said document which will (1) result in a deficit in the general fund of the District of Columbia, or (2) exceed the estimated cost as submitted therein to the Congress."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 34: Page 13, line 14, insert:

"PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

"Assistance to States, general

"For an additional amount for 'Assistance to States, general', $3,070,000, including funds to provide project grants for public health training pursuant to section 309 of the Public Health Service Act, as amended."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. THOMAS moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named therein insert "$2,500,000".

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 35: Page 14, line 1, insert:

"SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

"Grants to States for public assistance

"The amounts made available for 'Grants to States for public assistance', in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1961, shall be available for grants for medical assistance for the aged, as authorized by the Social Security Amendments of 1960".

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. THOMAS moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 37: Page 15, line 16 after "$145,000" insert "including allowances and benefits similar to those provided by title IX of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, as determined by the Commission; expenses of packing, shipping, and storing personal effects of personnel assigned abroad; rental or lease, for such periods as may be necessary, of office space and living quarters for personnel assigned abroad; maintenance, improvement, and repair of properties rented or leased abroad, and furnishing fuel, water, and utilities for such properties; hire of passenger motor vehicles abroad; insurance on official motor vehicles abroad; and advances of funds abroad; $290,000: *Provided*, That the limitation under this head in the General Government Matters Appropriation Act, 1961, on the amount available for expenses of travel, is increased from '$10,000' to '$30,000'."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. THOMAS moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum of $290,000 named therein, insert: "$145,000".

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 56: Page 18, line 21, strike out "$125,000" and insert "$25,000:".

Mr. THOMAS. I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. THOMAS moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 56 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert: "$37,500, of which not to exceed 15 percent shall be available for salaries and administrative expenses:".

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 58: Page 19, line 6, insert:

"UNITED STATES TERRITORIAL EXPANSION MEMORIAL COMMISSION

"Funds previously appropriated under this head shall remain available until expended."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. THOMAS moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 58 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 61: Page 19, line 23, insert ": *Provided*, That $325,700 of this amount shall become available only upon enactment into law during this calendar year of legislation providing pay increases for policemen, firemen, and teachers of the District of Columbia."

Mr. THOMAS. I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. THOMAS moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 61 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 62: Page 20, line 6, strike out "$121,000" and insert "$134,200,".

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. THOMAS moves that the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 62.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 63: Page 20, line 7, strike out lines 7 through 10 and insert ": *Provided*, That no part of the foregoing amount shall be available for any expenses related to the construction of any quarters, exclusive of provision of utility connections and costs of the Canal Zone Government, at at average cost in excess of $9,000 per unit."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. THOMAS moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 63 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert ": *Provided*, That no part of the foregoing amount shall be available for any expenses related to the construction of any quarters at an average cost in excess of $9,000 per unit".

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Bow moves that the House recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 63.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to our beloved friend from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, this is an item that takes care of some building by the Panama Canal Company in the Panama Canal Zone. It concerns housing for employees of the Panama Canal Company.

I am the ranking minority member on the regular subcommittee handling this item. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON] is chairman of the committee. We have studied this problem together and we are in agreement that this housing should be built. It was first thought the housing could be built for $10,000 a unit. The House committee reduced this to $9,000 a unit, and we have gone along with this.

However, there is this problem that we face. If we have the House language of $9,000 a unit we will be required to build the housing, bring in the utilities, and prepare the landsite at $9,000, and we just will not be able to prepare the housing for that price. The construction of the housing, yes, but we will have to go into some jungle area in the Panama Canal Zone, clear it, and prepare it for building, and then bring in the utilities. This is not like many places where we build housing, where the land is already prepared and we can just move in. We will have to prepare the site. It cannot be done for $9,000 if we have to do all that. The construction, yes, but the preparation of the site and bringing in the utilities, no.

Under the Senate language we can build the housing and stay within the limitation of $9,000, and also prepare the site.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

I submit, Mr. Speaker, if we are to do what the House has urged we do, take care of proper housing for the employees in this area, we are going to have to accept the Senate limitation, make our housing construction $9,000, but give us a chance to clear the land.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, it is very seldom that I or any of our colleagues disagree with the distinguished gentleman from Ohio. I work with him in a good many activities. He is an able and distinguished Member of this body, and I mean both of those words—"able" and "distinguished." But may I disagree with him in this particular matter.

This is the picture: This is in the Canal Zone, but who set it up? The taxpayers of the United States set it up. They want to replace 500 houses. We do not object to it. It is going to have to be done. It should be done. But let us be frank about it, I think it is a young public housing project, because it is going to have to bear a subsidy of $40 to $50 per month per occupant.

This is the only point of difference: These are replacement houses, and the bill has a limitation on the amount of money they can spend on a house. The land costs nothing. The Government already owns it. So we put in a limitation of $9,000 per unit, for one bedroom, two bedrooms, three bedrooms, and, if they need it, four bedrooms; but the average must be $9,000. We have some housing in our part of the country, and I daresay you have it in your sections, that do not cost $9,000 for the house. Nine thousand dollars plus free Government land is going to build them a much better house than they have now.

I hope we can respectfully disagree with our friend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] at this time. It does not happen too often.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

The motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 69: Page 23, line 1, insert ", of which $250,000 shall be available for payment to the Parshall, North Dakota Special School District Numbered 3 for the construction of school facilities which shall be available to Indian children."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. THOMAS moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 69 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 70: On page 23, line 8, insert ": *Provided*, That the limitation under this head in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1955, on the amount available toward the emergency rehabilitation of the Crescent Lake Dam project, Oregon, is increased from $297,000 to $305,000."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. THOMAS moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 70 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 71: On page 23, line 17, strike out "Construction and Rehabilitation" and insert "Upper Colorado River Basin Fund".

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. THOMAS moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 71 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 72: On page 23, line 24, strike out "Construction and Rehabilitation" and insert "Upper Colorado River Basin Fund".

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. THOMAS moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 72 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 73. On page 24, line 1, insert:

"ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

"After August 31, 1960, the position of Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation shall have the same annual rate of compensation as that provided for positions listed in 5 U.S.C. 2205(b), so long as held by the present incumbent."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. THOMAS moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 73 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 84: On page 27, line 6, insert:

"UNITED STATES CITIZENS COMMISSION ON NATO

"For necessary expenses of the United States Citizens Commission on NATO, including personal services as authorized by section 3(4) of S.J. Res. 170 without regard to civil service and classification laws; travel, subsistence, and other expenses of the Commission and its staff; hire of passenger motor vehicles; printing and binding without regard to section 11 of the Act of March 1, 1919 (44 U.S.C. 111); $300,000, of which not to exceed $3,000 may be expended for entertainment: *Provided*, That not to exceed $100,000 may be expended for meetings and conferences pursuant to section 3(5), S.J. Res. 170; to remain available until January 31, 1962."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. THOMAS moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 84 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sums of "$300,000" and "$3,000" named therein, insert "$150,000" and "$1,500", respectively; and delete the proviso.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. May I ask the gentleman from Texas if there has been some saving made in providing for this brand new junketing commission that is being set up by the Congress and which I voted against?

Mr. THOMAS. I will say to our friend from Iowa that we just saved one-half of it. We cut it half in two.

Mr. GROSS. I commend the gentleman and the conferees. I wonder if the gentleman, before he finishes and relinquishes the floor, and I understand that he is just about to the end of the amendments, if he could give us any idea as to how much this bill, which started out to be a rather innocuous deficiency appropriation bill, has been increased since it left the floor of the House?

Mr. THOMAS. The other body added $214 million. The conferees agreed to only $6 million over the House figure and the House just voted to add $65 million more. So the total is $71 million over the House and a reduction in the Senate figure of $143 million.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for the information.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 85: On page 27, line 19, insert:

"TREASURY DEPARTMENT

"Bureau of the Public Debt

"Administering the Public Debt

"Not to exceed $375,000 of the unobligated balance of the appropriation for 'Administering the public debt,' fiscal year 1960, shall remain available during the current fiscal year for expenses of advance refunding of the public debt."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. THOMAS moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 85 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 3 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the conference report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year certain buildings at Haskell Institute in Lawrence, Kans., were found to be unsafe by engineers of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. In addition, considerable renovation of the existing utility systems at the school is badly needed.

While conditions at Haskell are now such that temporary facilities must be sought until the condemned buildings are replaced, I am indeed happy that these needs have been recognized and that the second supplemental appropriation bill approved today by the House contains emergency funds to alleviate the crisis which has developed at the institute.

Haskell's history goes back to the 47th Congress during which the Honorable Dudley C. Haskell, Representative of Kansas' Second Congressional District and chairman of the Indian Affairs Committee, was instrumental in obtaining approval of legislation authorizing the establishment of an Indian Institute.

Haskell Institute opened on September 1, 1884, on a site of approximately 280 acres of land donated by citizens of Congressman Haskell's home city of Lawrence, Kans. The first president of the school was Dr. James Marvin, a former chancellor at the University of Kansas.

Although the initial enrollment was 14 people—all boys—the institute now has a coed enrollment of well over 1,000. Haskell's student body includes young people from widely scattered reservations, largely in the Western and Southwestern United States, who do not have access to adequate educational facilities in their own communities.

The curriculum at Haskell is designed to achieve two main goals. First, in consideration of the welfare of its students who will return to their home communities after they finish school, the institute strives to train its young people for leadership, to teach them how to improve the economic conditions of their people, and to provide them with social training that will help them live happier and richer lives. In addition, Haskell prepares many of its students for vocational employment in order that they may make a living in a highly competitive economic system.

The success of the institute in achieving these goals can be seen in their 100 percent placement record established in recent years for graduates who received vocational training, and in the leaders Haskell has produced in government, industry, and sports.

The people of Kansas, and particularly those of the city of Lawrence, join with me, Mr. Speaker, in expressing our gratitude to the Honorable ALBERT THOMAS, chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee, and the Honorable CLARENCE CANNON, chairman of the full committee, as well as to the committee members, for their efforts in obtaining $2,050,000 in order that a construction start may be made at this great Midwest institute.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 8156. An act for the relief of Jack Kent Cooke;

H.R. 12383. An act to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to make benefits more realistic in terms of present wage rates, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 311. Joint resolution authorizing the erection of a statue of Taras Shevchenko on public grounds in the District of Columbia.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 4306. An act to provide education and training for the children of veterans dying of a service-connected disability incurred after January 31, 1955, and before the end of compulsory military service;

H.R. 8665. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a memorial to Theodore Roosevelt in the National Capital" to provide for the construction of such memorial by the Secretary of the Interior.

H.J. Res. 721. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens; and

H.J. Res. 784. Joint resolution amending the act of July 14, 1960, to extend the time within which the U.S. Constitution 175th Anniversary Commission shall report to Congress.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1689. An act to create the Freedom Commission for the development of the science of counteraction to the world Communist conspiracy and for the training and development of leaders in a total political war;

S. 3901. An act to authorize the erection of a memorial in the District of Columbia to Gen. John J. Pershing; and

S. Con. Res. 115. Concurrent resolution to print additional hearings on Senate Resolution 94, relating to the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10960) entitled "An act to amend section 5701 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the excise tax upon cigars."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12536) entitled "An act relating to the treatment of charges for local advertising for purposes of determining the manufacturers sale price."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12659) entitled "An act to suspend for a temporary period the import duty on heptanoic acid."

U.S. CONSTITUTION 175TH ANNIVERSARY COMMISSION

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the resolution (H.J. Res. 784) amending the act of July 14, 1960, to extend the time within which the U.S. Constitution 175th Anniversary Commission shall report to Congress, with Senate amendments, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, after line 2, insert:

"SEC. 2. (a) Section 2(a) of the National Housing Act is amended by (1) striking out '1960' and inserting in lieu thereof '1961', and (2) striking out the last sentence of the first paragraph thereof.

"(b) Section 401(d) of the Housing Act of 1950 is amended by striking out '$1,175,000,000', '$125,000,000', and '$50,000,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$1,675,000,000', '$175,000,000', and '$100,000,000', respectively.

"(c) Section 203(a) of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is amended by striking out '$100,000,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$150,000,000'."

Amend the title so as to read: "Joint resolution amending the Act of July 14, 1960, to extend the time within which the United States Constitution One Hundred and Seventy-fifth Anniversary Commission shall report to Congress, and including certain amendments relating to housing."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BYRNE]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCREASE OF SALARIES OF OFFICERS AND MEMBERS OF THE METROPOLITAN POLICE FORCE, FIRE DEPARTMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, U.S. PARK POLICE, AND WHITE HOUSE POLICE

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 13053) to increase the salaries of Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the U.S. Park Police, the White House Police, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That each employee of the District of Columbia or of the United States whose salary is fixed and regulated by the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 480) shall receive, in addition to the compensation provided by such Act, compensation at the rate

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARY

of 7.5 per centum of the basic compensation provided by such Act.

"SEC. 2. (a) Retroactive compensation or salary shall be paid by reason of this Act only in the case of an individual in the service of the District of Columbia or of the United States (including service in the Armed Forces of the United States) on the date of enactment of this Act, except that such retroactive compensation or salary shall be paid (1) to any employee covered in this Act who retired during the period beginning on the day following the first day of the first pay period which began on or after July 1, 1960, and ending on the date of enactment of this Act for services rendered during such period and (2) in accordance with the provisions of the Act of August 3, 1950 (Public Law 636, Eighty-first Congress), as amended, for services rendered during the period beginning on the first day of the first pay period which began on or after July 1, 1960, and ending on the date of enactment of this Act by any such employee who dies during such period.

"(b) For the purposes of this section, service in the Armed Forces of the United States in the case of an individual relieved from training and service in the Armed Forces of the United States or discharged from hospitalization following such training and service, shall include the period provided by law for the mandatory restoration of such individual to a position in or under the Federal Government or the municipal government of the District of Columbia.

"SEC. 3. For the purpose of determining the amount of insurance for which an individual is eligible under the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, as amended, all changes in rates of compensation or salary which result from the enactment of this Act shall be held and considered to be effective as of the date of enactment of this Act.

"SEC. 4. The provisions of this Act shall become effective on the first day of the first pay period beginning after July 1, 1960.

"SEC. 5. Any person who shall retire for age after serving at least thirty years as Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall receive an annuity during the remainder of his life equal to the salary payable to him at the time of his retirement."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ASSISTANCE IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF LATIN AMERICA AND IN THE RECONSTRUCTION OF CHILE

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 637) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 13021) to provide for assistance in the development of Latin America and in the reconstruction of Chile, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'NEILL] is recognized.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and at the conclusion of my remarks, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 637 makes in order H.R. 13021, a bill to provide for assistance in the development of Latin America and in the reconstruction of Chile, and for other purposes. It is an open rule with 2 hours of general debate.

There are four major provisions in the bill. One, recommending that steps be taken for the implementation of the policy to help South America and authorize $500 million to carry out the social development program set forth in a statement of policy that is contained in the bill.

There is also included in the bill $100 million for Chile. This is a special reconstruction and rehabilitation program that is planned for Chile because of the recent earthquakes that devastated that country.

The bill also carries $100 million for our South African neighbors, but as I understand, the chairman of the committee will offer a motion to strike that from the bill.

While this bill is an authorization, actually no appropriation will be made this year. This is to meet a special request by the President of the United States that we give aid and assistance for the purpose of the improvement of conditions of rural life in South American nations, the improvement of housing for the native population, through educational and training facilities, and for the improvement of basic sanitation facilities.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEILL. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. Would the gentleman interpret the expression he used, "educational and training facilities" to include the building of school classrooms in Latin America under the heading of aid to education?

Mr. O'NEILL. I would say possibly so.

Mr. BAILEY. So far as they cannot do that here at home, I am opposed to the legislation and to the rule.

Mr. O'NEILL. I want to assure the gentleman I have been for Federal aid to education. That was my stand on a matter that has been pending before the Rules Committee, but even though there seems to be some difficulty in being able to get it to the floor of the House, I do not believe we should vote against this bill or penalize our South American neighbors because of that.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEILL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Why the haste to pass this bill now if it cannot become effective this year? Why can we not pass it at the next session of Congress?

Mr. O'NEILL. As I understand, there is a meeting of the American nations in Bogota next Saturday, and it is the desire of the administration and the State Department that our representatives at that conference may go armed with what they expect the policy will be in the matter of brotherhood, friendship, and a spirit of willingness to help our South American neighbors.

Mr. GROSS. Is there any doubt about that as far as the United States is concerned?

Mr. O'NEILL. I, like the gentleman, am curious as to what our South American policy will be. I asked the chairman of the committee, but he could not tell me very much about what the State Department was planning. I am not acquainted with what is going on, but I honestly and personally believe this is good legislation and ought to be enacted.

Mr. GROSS. In other words, it is a promise to pay on the part of the United States; is that it?

Mr. O'NEILL. I would say that is so.

Mr. GROSS. And they must know at this meeting in South America all about our willingness to cough up money when they want it without this legislation.

Mr. O'NEILL. All I can say is this is an administration request that was brought to the Committee on Foreign Affairs by Mr. Dillon, Under Secretary of State. They seem to think there is an urgent necessity that our representatives when they go to the meeting be armed with this type of legislation.

Mr. GROSS. There are some bureaucrats somewhere that want to spend more money, I take it.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEILL. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I asked the gentleman to yield for this purpose: As you know, I am for this rule, and I certainly will be for the bill. But I would like to bring to the attention of the Members of the House that last night in Panama City a great mob of Panamanians went to the airport and there they met the Panamanian Foreign Minister who was returning from the Latin American Conference at San Jose, Costa Rica. They carried him on their shoulders—thousands of them—to the Panamanian Foreign Office, and there the Foreign Minister made this announcement, that he, the Foreign Minister of Panama, met privately and secretly with the Secretary of State of the United States of America, Mr. Herter; that they discussed the question of Panamanian sovereignty over the Panama Canal and the Canal Zone. Now, Mr. Speaker, and my friend from Massachusetts, you all know that on the resolution introduced by the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN], this House on a rollcall vote of 382 to 12 said to the

President and to the Secretary of State that any question of sovereignty over the Panama Canal must be dealt with only by revision of a treaty with Panama because the United States of America is sovereign there by treaty, an absolute sovereign.

The Foreign Minister told the Panamanians, and on the first page of the Washington Post this morning is the statement made by the Foreign Minister of Panama, that the American Secretary of State, Mr. Herter, agrees with the position of Panama, contrary to the Constitution of the United States, contrary to the law of the land, which a treaty is. I have brought this matter to the attention of the House for several years, and I now think I have the right to ask: Did the Secretary of State, Mr. Herter, meet with the Foreign Minister of Panama bilaterally or secretly at Costa Rica. If he did, what did they talk about?

The American people and the Members of this House have a right to know what agreements did they make, if any. Has the Secretary of State reported this to the President of the United States? If he did, what did he report? If he did not, why did he not? Is he going to? What is he going to report?

Mr. Speaker, it is my conclusion that the minute this Congress adjourns sine die there will be an Executive order issued by the President of the United States upon the recommendation of the Secretary of State to permit the Republic of Panama to fly its flag over all ships passing through the Panama Canal and over the Panama Canal Zone, thereby recognizing sovereignty in Panama, which will be a foot in the door, and as sure as you are sitting there, Mr. Speaker, Panama with the help of Nasser, with the approval of Castro, and the active cooperation of this Latin American Red league, is going to demand total sovereignty and kick you out of the Panama Canal. Mark my words on that.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the rule.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require and I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked to read in the morning newspapers that the Pennsylvania Railroad is expected to be closed down by a strike at midnight tonight for the first time in its 114-year history. In fact, lots of its service, both freight and passenger, has already been discontinued because trains cannot reach their destination before the deadline of midnight.

During my entire 28 years of service in this Congress I have had great admiration and respect for the railroad brotherhoods of this country, their leaders and the individual members themselves. There are 24 such railroad brotherhoods, only 2 of which are involved in this situation, representing only 20,000 railroad workers out of a grand total of 930,000 in the country. One of the unions involved is the TWU—Transport Workers Union presided over by Mike Quill. This union represents 15,000 of the 20,000 members. Incidentally, the TWU is only on the Pennsylvania Railroad and does not represent the railroad workers on any other railroad in the country. I am informed that neither the president of the TWU nor the top officials of that union have ever worked one single day for any railroad. This is very unfortunate, for I sincerely believe that if they ever had, their attitude would be completely reversed and more in line with the other 910,000 workers throughout the country.

I am not familiar with the merits of this controversy, but I do know that a neutral referee was appointed, who was acceptable to both the unions and management; that the unions rejected his recommendations and that the railroad management accepted them. Further, that the President appointed an Emergency Fact Finding Board—that the union rejected its recommendations and that railroad management accepted them.

I feel very deeply—that in the public interest—in behalf of the economic welfare of the country—and in the interest of our national defense, that this Congress should go on record as strongly urging the two unions involved, as well as the management of the Pennsylvania Railroad, not to break off their present negotiations, not to go on strike at midnight, but rather to sit in conference continuously hour by hour and day after day, if necessary, until some sort of agreement is reached.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I was necessarily absent on Monday trying to penetrate the fog of New York City coming back here in an airplane. So, I was unable to join in the many tributes paid to my friend and my old friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN]. So, before the expiration of this Congress, I would like to, with your indulgence, do that.

Mr. Speaker, it is difficult for one to say farewell to a loyal friend of 28 years. The parting is softened by the realization that while LEO ALLEN, of Illinois, is laying down his work here in Congress, he will continue to be near us.

LEO ALLEN has been a great legislator; one of our best in the 28 years he has been a Member of Congress. He is a man of courage; a man of convictions, and he never wavered in those convictions. He made friends easily and he never failed in his loyalty to one to whom he gave his friendship.

I was thrown into a close association with LEO when he first came here, when we both lived at the University Club, or as it was then called, the Racquet Club. In those early days we established a firm friendship that grew stronger with the passing of the years.

As a member of and twice chairman of the Rules Committee, he was in a strategic position where his opportunity was great to shape the course of legislation. And, of course, that prominence carried with it the need for the greatest courage and resolutions. LEO never wavered.

On the football fields of the University of Michigan and as a soldier in the First World War, he served with fidelity and distinction.

That LEO should retire at so young an age came as a great shock to his legion of friends. Illinois loses a great voice in our national affairs and the country a faithful, conscientious, and wise legislator that it can ill afford to lose.

To all of us who have been privileged to enjoy his warm friendship, his service here will ever remain an inspiration. As he goes back to his work in private life, we wish for him continued success, good health, and the fullest measure of happiness. His good wife and fine family can well be proud of the record he leaves here.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, while I am supporting the rule and this bill, I recognize that the American people are greatly concerned over our reverses of recent years throughout the world and at our loss of prestige. This is particularly so since the death of the late John Foster Dulles. Whether or not we agreed with the late Secretary, everyone recognized that he was firm in his position, that he was a man of strong character and great courage, that he knew the evil intent and purposes of international communism and that he was the one man throughout the world whom the Communist leaders in the Kremlin and elsewhere feared and respected through fear, particularly so far as our present administration is concerned.

One thing is certain, that there was no uncertainty in the leadership of John Foster Dulles. The fact that our prestige has been shaken cannot be denied.

It is only natural for the American people to ask the question, Why? One thing is certain, that the Democrats are not responsible for our loss of prestige. I can refer to a number of events that have happened but I will confine myself to Cuba. I will not refer in detail now to the poor judgment in the handling of the U–2 incident, or the failure of the summit meeting or the Japanese episode, and a number of others.

For years we have seen the direct efforts and the indirect efforts on the part of the Soviet Union to hurl themselves over Western Europe, and we found Western Europe containing them until recently, when they jumped over Western Europe and landed in Cuba under Castro. They have not only leaped over Western Europe but the Soviet Union has hurled itself over free Europe and within 90 miles of our country. Not only that, but it is using Cuba as a base to threaten

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

us in the Caribbean and, in fact, in all of South America. Cuba, under Castro, is a threat to every South American country as a Communist base directly aimed at the United States.

We have seen American citizens arbitrarily arrested, their rights under international law ruthlessly violated, Americans insulted, American property confiscated, and the Castro regime intentionally allying itself with the Soviet Union as an instrument and avenue of Soviet subversion of South American countries.

It was only the other day we witnessed Castro's latest outburst boasting of his close relationship with and reliance on the Soviet Union. We witnessed the arrogance of Castro's representative at the recent meeting of the Organization of American States. This meeting certainly produced interesting results in many respects. Even there we find the prestige of our country and her standing weakened and impaired.

Secretary Herter offered a reasonable resolution in relation to the Dominican Republic. I do not necessarily say that I subscribe completely to that resolution, but in connection with the tough resolution that was offered by other South American countries it was a reasonable one. The South America countries introduced one imposing all kinds of sanctions and breaking off diplomatic relations with the Dominican Republic. The tough resolution was adopted. We have severed diplomatic relationships with this country, with a country and people that have been friendly to us and, above all, strongly opposed to communism. As a matter of fact, the Dominican Republic and her people have been the strongest anti-Communist country and people of all the South American countries.

I do not subscribe to any dictatorship, but I recognize the fact that in practically all South American countries there is one form or another of dictatorship. I am concerned with the relationship of our country to these countries in connection with the national interests of our country. We break off relations with an anti-Communist country but retain diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union, the cause of world unrest, and also with the Castro regime in Cuba. In other words, our country did not have influence enough at the recent meeting of the Organization of American States to have our resolution adopted, and pending on the agenda was another resolution seeking direct action and placing the South American countries in direct action in connection with the Castro regime in Cuba. Secretary Herter wanted a resolution put squarely before the conference condemning the Soviet Union for their efforts to spread their influence in the hemisphere, calling upon Cuba to "reject and repudiate" such moves. We know what happened. A mild resolution was adopted. The toughest resolution possible was adopted against another country that is anti-Communist, and a much milder resolution was adopted against a regime in Cuba that openly boasts of its Communist affiliation and uses that in defiance of the United States of America and for subversive purposes among the countries of South America.

So we find on the one hand the American resolution against the Dominican Republic which was rejected would have been a much more common-sense approach than the one that was adopted. On the other hand, we find our resolution of firmness against the Castro regime also rejected. So it clearly shows that our influence and prestige among the nations of South America have been sharply impaired and weakened. These things cause us to do a little thinking and to do a little wondering, whether or not the day is approaching when we have to do some reevaluating of our foreign policy. I say that as one who has always been strong for mutual assistance. I have evidenced that today on an earlier vote. But, I recognize the fact that the national interest of my country comes first and when I see these things happen—when I see the pincer move from behind the Iron Curtain to Cuba, just 90 miles off our coast; when we see what has happened in Laos and when we realize what are going to be the consequences of what is happening there—as I say, when I see this pincer move going on, then we all must realize that what we need is strong and firm leadership—leadership that the world will respect and that the Soviet Union will also respect and know that such leadership means what they say. What we have to do is to come back to the policy of peace through strength.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution and in support of the bill. Unlike the distinguished majority leader who says he has always been for mutual security and evidenced it here today, I cannot say that. I have ever since I have been a Member of the House opposed the bills that have come here on mutual security, and I so voted today. However, this is a bill that I can support. This is a policy that I can support. I believe our relationship with Latin America is undoubtedly the most important of all the world. It has been my privilege as a member of the State Department appropriation subcommittee to travel in almost all the countries of South America and Central America and to know many of their people and to learn of their aspirations and their thinking. You hear sometimes and you read sometimes headlines of anti-Americanism. I do not think there is very much of that. I think there is a feeling of neglect by some of our neighbors to the south of us, that we have in the past shown some neglect of their problems while we have taken care of some of the problems of those who are not so close to us. I believe if we strengthen our relationship within the hemisphere that it will strengthen us in our fight for the free world. It seems to me, as I have traveled throughout much of the world, that we are looking back over our shoulders at history. We are looking at the years in the past and trying to bring them back to today. But, as you travel through the Latin American countries, it seems to me we are facing the horizon and looking forward and not looking backward—we are looking forward to an area of the world that has great possibilities and potentials not only for themselves, not only for our Western Hemisphere, but for the whole free world and for the liberation of the captive nations of the world.

I have a feeling that they are our good neighbors. They are our friends, and I think we can strengthen that friendship by the adoption of this resolution and this bill now pending before the House.

I find myself today supporting this kind of mutual security, because I think it can strengthen us. I hope that many others will consider that these are our neighbors, these are our friends, and I hope that in the debate, when we are considering these matters, that those who oppose it will not discuss too strongly the question of Cuba. I feel badly about Cuba. I agree with the majority leader. We can lead through strength and develop strength and unity in the Western Hemisphere. But let us not in anything we may say lead the Cuban people to believe that we are opposed to the Cuban people. Let us let them know that we are their friends; that it is Castro and the communistic government of Cuba that we oppose and that we of the free world, and we of North America and of the United States are still their good friends and want to bring liberty back to them.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman's statement. The gentleman will remember that I referred to the Castro government, and I know the majority of the Cuban people have friendship for us.

Mr. BOW. I did not mean in anything that I said to infer anything else from the gentleman's remarks, but I am fearful that in the heat of this debate somebody will refer to Cuba that will be an aspersion upon the people and not upon Castro and their communistic government.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. How would the gentleman explain the proposition that since we have severed diplomatic relations with the Dominican Republic we have put $8 million at their disposal; $51.9 million for Cuba in an appropriation authorized by this legislation.

Mr. BOW. I would say if we look at that we will stop, look, and listen and see why it did happen, but I cannot believe I would say that we should not take care of our neighbors. If we look at our own country where we have spent millions, we can find some difficulties there.

Mr. BAILEY. Why did we curtail the Cuban sugar quota except to deprive them of the funds necessary to finance the program the Communists are trying to carry on in Cuba? Now you are giving them a lot of money to replace that money.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. BOW. Does the gentleman want me to yield further?

Mr. BAILEY. I said, How can we justify cutting the sugar quota in Cuba in order to deprive them of funds to carry on the regime they are carrying on, and at the same time giving them cash out of the Treasury?

Mr. BOW. I would say I feel sure that as long as the Castro regime is in power none of the funds we may authorize here would be used in Cuba. But I would assume also that when the Castro regime is out, when there is democracy in Cuba, that perhaps this help would go to them. But certainly none of these funds would go to Cuba as long as Castro is there.

Mr. BAILEY. Not unless the Congress will appropriate the money authorized.

Mr. BOW. That is correct. And then it would be with the limitation that none of it should be used while Castro is there.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. Of course the gentleman says we are speaking from a position of strength. I am wondering how the adoption of this resolution and this bill will put us in a position of strength. The gentleman is aware of the fact that in the last 14 years in the Latin American countries we have poured $7,409 million of the taxpayers' money.

I want to say to the membership of this House we will only be able to speak from a position of strength when we have a firm foreign policy and stop our giveaway policy, because we are never going to buy from the other nations of the earth the respect of those people by American dollars.

Mr. BOW. I agree with the gentleman to this extent: We will not buy their friendship, but let me say to the gentleman that I have had the pleasure of meeting many fine people from many countries of Latin America and have spent considerable time with them. They are a proud people; they are not asking for handouts, and you are not going to be able to buy their friendship. They do not want handouts. What they want is our support, and that is what I want to give them. I believe this money will come back to us. I do not think this will be a handout operation.

In assessing the quality of the Latin American people let me call the gentleman's attention to what has happened in our own Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. Sure, they are American citizens, and fine citizens, but they have made wonderful strides in the development of their Commonwealth. They have done a great job. I am sure the other countries of Latin America can do likewise with support and guidance from us.

Mr. HALEY. I think the gentleman must realize that in the past 20 or 25 years our foreign policy has been an open checkbook. That is the reason we do not have the respect of the people of the earth.

Mr. BOW. Yes. But that is not the case where we have helped people to help themselves. The people who shall administer this program could well look to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico for advice and assistance in carrying out any program we may establish.

Mr. Speaker, Luis Ferre, of Puerto Rico, is one of the most loyal Americans I have ever known. He and men like him should be used by our Government in their area of the world.

Luis Ferre recently made a statement in this regard that I should like to call to the attention of the House.

This is what Mr. Ferre has to say on the subject:

But, with the permission of the chairman, I would like to add some remarks on America's general relationship with Latin America and the way in which we Republicans can most effectively advance hemispheric solidarity so needed at this time. I would be deeply grateful if you would relay this part of the record to Senator COOPER and the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee.

As I suggested, before, we Puerto Ricans have had a unique opportunity for understanding both North America and Latin America. Since the end of World War II, we know that the United States has, necessarily, been preoccupied by Communist aggression in all parts of the world. But, while largely anti-Communist, Latin America's first attention has been on another question: how to rise up out of poverty and attain the bounteous life that their northern neighbor has shown to be within the grasp of 20th century man.

Thus, we have begun to appreciate the Latin America argument that our country has tended to neglect the nations of the South. Our eyes have been on Europe and Asia, and we have too much taken Latin America for granted.

We are now obviously discomfited. Defections from the area of freedom among the Latin American nations are a major threat to our national security.

Furthermore, we acknowledge that while many of the Latin American nations must be classified as underdeveloped areas, they have a greater relative importance than many other such areas, because of their ability to so eloquently articulate complaints against the United States and because of their common Western European heritage. In Latin America, after all, college graduates, trained technicians and skilled workmen are not counted on one's fingers. On the contrary, there are millions of superbly educated people among the Latins—all too many of whom are unfortunately too ready to accept and bespeak the anti-Yanqui line because of a lack of understanding of our basic objectives and aspirations.

To be sure, the United States has extended a great deal of help to Latin America—particularly in the last few years. American free enterprise has accepted the greatest part of the responsibility. According to the Chase Manhattan Bank, for instance, private U.S. investment in Latin America amounted to more than $8 billion in 1958 alone. More than that, the Export-Import Bank has long played a significant, although too modest role in promoting Latin American development. And, more recently, the United States undertook a 45-percent share in underwriting the $1 billion Inter-American Development Bank. In addition, there is growing hope that U.S. protectionism—particularly in the form of quotas—can be eased, so that alleged domestic needs no longer so drastically depress the economies of our southern neighbors.

Moreover, during just the last couple of weeks the administration has indicated its intention to launch a further loan-development program. I heartily applaud it for the somber statistics of the want that exists in Latin America—the torrential birthrates, the meager per capita incomes, the tragic lack of sanitation and health facilities—show the need—I must say that much more must be done.

But before making one concrete economic proposal, I shall point out that there is one all-important way in which we can bolster our relations with Latin America—and particularly with the youth cadres who so energetically—perhaps with unnecessary and damaging desperation aspire and lead in the revolution of rising expectations.

The key words here are "revolution of positivism." We must reawaken the knowledge that we are a revolutionary people, that in all of history no other nation has so successfully thrown off and smashed the burdens that man has borne for so long—poverty and tyranny.

We are free and prosperous. It is only through the near achievement of the American dream that the revolution of rising expectations ever occurred in the first place.

Whether a young Latin American is more impelled toward the cause of political liberty or technological progress, the fact is that his original heroes were American—say Abraham Lincoln and the Wright brothers. The essential thing is that we forcefully demonstrate that their values are still truly alive in our modern America, that we relive their dreams every day.

That is, we must embrace the knowledge that we have been and continue to be the most revolutionary country in the world.

Our great principle is our faith in the people. As a result we have approached very near the goal of winning complete freedom for all of our citizens and have virtually eliminated class antagonisms. America's development of a prosperous, all-inclusive middle class, by the way, completely knocks the props out from under the Communist theory. The opportunity for human realization, both material and spiritual, offered by our system can be, therefore, as it has in the past, an inspiration to have-not peoples throughout the world.

The principles that have allowed us to grow, then, will link us more closely than ever with the Latin American people. They have already done so with the people of Puerto Rico—the best proof to the world of how these principles operate successfully under a free society.

However, while I espouse ideas as the most important vehicle by which America can reach and restrengthen its relations with Latin America, there is also a need for concrete, material action. The objective is both to reduce the want of the underdeveloped nations and, at the same time, to sell the West's social and cultural system. Therefore, let me add one specific suggestion:

In approaching the underdeveloped nations of all the world—not just Latin America—let us join together with the now prosperous nations of Western Europe in a plan for "prosperity with freedom." Working with Great Britain, France, West Germany, Italy, Austria, and all the other have nations of free Europe, let us enlist free enterprise as our real missionary.

Business should be encouraged to make further massive investments in the underdeveloped nations. To prove the validity of our system of industrial democracy and social responsibility, the plants established by the Western businessmen should establish high wage rates, afford a broad range of social benefits, encourage labor organization development and open up opportunities for local capital participation.

The Western Governments should get behind this movement, not only by enacting the sort of tax laws that will encourage this missionary force, to go abroad, but also by

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARY

setting aside funds and techniques to compensate investors against the risk of expropriation or other arbitrary political action. This would be a much more positive way to help our friends.

A program of this sort, needless to say, would not, and could not, meet every need. Yet if our prime reliance as a society of free men is upon ourselves, instead of big government, it seems to me that we must allow free enterprise an important role in our program of assistance to the underdeveloped gain friends and understanding throughout nations of the world. I am confident we can the Western Hemisphere if we encourage this kind of a truly missionary zeal to take hold more and more.

May I thank you for your patience to let me present our case and my views. I appreciate this opportunity very much. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, these are the words of a great American, a Latin American citizen of the United States. He deserves the confidence of the people of Puerto Rico and the States of the Union.

I hope he shall have the ear of our State Department. I am sure he can give guidance to them in this important work.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, reports of the atrocities being committed in the Congo in recent weeks have shocked the sensibilities of the entire civilized world. Reports of children coming out of the Congo with mutilated hands, the unprovoked beating of American and Canadian airmen, stories of literally hundreds perhaps thousands of criminal assaults upon members of the white minority in the Congo, certainly have stirred the emotions of the world.

For weeks, since these reports began to come out of the Congo I have waited for one of our many civil rights advocates whose hearts are always bleeding for what they call the persecuted Negro minority in the South, to rise on the floor to deplore these rapes and assaults against the civil rights of the white minority in the Congo. But, alas, I have waited until the last day of the Congress and they are silent as the tomb.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a resolution, and I would certainly hope that even though it is the last day and we are in the closing hours of this Congress, that the leadership of this body and of the other body might permit the consideration under suspension of the rules or in some other manner of this or a similar resolution.

I shall read this resolution. It is self-explanatory and it is drafted in line with the resolution which was adopted by Congress in 1958, expressing our sympathy for the Hungarian people:

Whereas the riots and disorders following the granting of independence to the Republic of the Congo resulted in heinous atrocities committed against innocent European and American men, women, and children; and

Whereas the perpetrators of these outrageous crimes were members of the Army of the Republic of the Congo; and

Whereas no apparent official effort has been made by appropriate authorities to bring to justice the criminals; and

Whereas the inhuman savagery rampant in the Congo shocks the conscience of decent mankind: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress of the United States to express through the organs of the United Nations and through all other appropriate channels, the deep sense of indignation of the United States at these acts of barbarism; and be it further

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Congress of the United States that the President of the United States express through all appropriate channels the sympathy of the people of the United States for the victims of Congolese brutality and their families.

Mr. Speaker, in connection with my remarks I shall include a copy of a preliminary report on the atrocities committed by the Congolese Army against the white population of the Republic of the Congo before the intervention of the Belgian forces. This report is dated August 1960, and is an official publication of the Belgian Government information service:

A PRELIMINARY REPORT ON THE ATROCITIES COMMITTED BY THE CONGOLESE ARMY AGAINST THE WHITE POPULATION OF THE REPUBLIC OF THE CONGO BEFORE THE INTERVENTION OF THE BELGIAN FORCES

(Report by His Excellency L. Merchiers, Minister of Justice of Belgium)

(NOTE.—On July 28, 1960, Mr. L. Merchiers, Minister of Justice of Belgium, gave to the press the following preliminary report on the atrocities committed by the Congolese Army against white people in the Congo, which motivated the intervention of the Belgian armed forces. When Mr. Kanza, Minister of the Congo to the U.N., appeared before the Security Council, he qualified these atrocities as petits abus, minor abuses. When Mr. P. Lumumba, Prime Minister of the Congo, addressed the press at the U.N., he declared that possibly a few European women had "been disturbed in their honor". Later, when in Canada, Mr. Lumumba stated that nothing of the kind had happened. When he was confronted with the declaration of the American Ambassador to the Congo, Mr. C. Timberlake, who, on his arrival from the Congo, declared that American missionaries had been raped by Congolese, Mr. Lumumba, according to the press, denied this. In the meantime, the press reported that 291 Belgian women had testified to the ignoble treatment they had suffered, that about 300 men had been brutalized and beaten and that about 20 men had been killed.)

Events in the Congo, following the mutiny of the Congo Armed Forces, rapidly took a tragic turn, which forced the Belgian Government to take urgent measures to protect white residents, both Belgian and foreign. These measures were dictated by human considerations and the imperative duty to save men, women and children who found themselves in immediate and extreme danger.

These measures had become for the Belgian Government an inescapable moral duty following the mutiny of the Congo Armed Forces which were in charge of maintaining order in the country.

A number of Congolese leaders have tried to mislead world opinion by casting doubts on the tragic reality of the facts. In view of this, the Belgian Government decided that it was its urgent duty to inform the world about the acts of violence and the atrocities that have taken place.

In relation to the scope of the mutiny, the number of persons killed seems to have been relatively small, at least on the basis of the information that is at present available. It is impossible to say at this stage how many of the people that are missing, were killed.

On the other hand, the acts of abasement of human dignity, of humiliation, of the most extreme actions against mankind and the civilized conception of human values, were the rule, as if there had been given an order to do all that was possible to humiliate men and women but to avoid before world opinion, the reproach of massacres.

The Belgian Government intends to bring all the facts to light. By royal decree of the 16th of July 1960, a commission of inquiry was created, in charge of investigating all the acts of violence perpetrated against human beings in the Congo since the day when Belgium freely and generously granted independence to that country.

In order to insure the objective and independent character of the commission, it is composed exclusively of high judges of Belgian courts. It is presided over by a counselor of the Cour de Cassation. Its three members are counselors at the courts of appeal of the realm.

The commission is not under the control of the Government: its sole obligation toward the authorities is to submit a report on its mission and findings. It has extensive powers and it can call on the cooperation of courts and judges in the country, on the police and even on private individuals.

Cases are investigated by judges, public prosecutors, members of the bar, as well as by the usual personnel of the police and the gendarmerie.

Some inquiries are conducted by women investigators who are in charge of collecting information of a very personal and delicate nature: women judges, women inquirers, social assistants and women doctors.

All these steps were taken to enable victims and witnesses to be heard at home or at a place of their own choice, with the tact and discretion required by the situation.

The Belgian radio has broadcast appeals to induce victims and witnesses who were not approached by the investigators, to take the initiative of making a statement either in writing to the Commission of Inquiry, Palace of Justice, Brussels, or of getting in touch directly with the police station of their own choice.

The commission is taking every precaution to keep its investigation as discreet as possible. It refuses to communicate the names of the victims and the witnesses and other elements of information which might help to identify the persons that were questioned.

The preliminary results of the thorough and extensive investigation which the commission is undertaking at present, are only cursorily described in the following pages.

The commission started its investigation on the 17th of July, the flow of witnesses continues and what information we possess at the present moment is only a fraction of what we shall have the profound regret to learn later.

However, it must be stressed that the facts described in the present preliminary report are among those which the commission can retain as established and proved as of now. Cases which left the slightest doubt have been omitted until they can be verified on the basis of evidence given by direct and impartial witnesses. On the other hand, it was not possible to publish in this preliminary report all the information which the commission has already verified. A complete report may be published later, probably in the form of a white book.

It is with reluctance that the often painful details that follow are published. The events are described as tactfully as possible. But in view of some of the statements which cast a doubt on the real savagery of which the whites in the Congo were the victims, the Belgian Government thinks that it is necessary to provide full information on some acts which have been proved for certain, even if the publication of them may seem offensive to certain codes of decency.

The report that follows only gives a fragmentary picture of what happened: (1) in the province of Léopoldville, (2) in the Kasai province, (3) in the Equator province.

I. PROVINCE OF LEOPOLDVILLE

A. Kisantu and Inkisi

Mrs. ——— was at home on the 5th of July, 1960, at Kisantu with her mother and four children. Around 4 p.m. African soldiers pushed her in a bedroom, and raped her, all four of them in turn. Between 7 and 8 p.m. 12 soldiers and an African gendarme came back to the house. After having pushed out the husband and the children, the 12 soldiers raped her in the same room. Altogether Mrs. ——— was raped 16 times.

Miss —— was at Inkisi with taree friends in the night of the 5th to the 6th of July. African soldiers seized her, threw her on the floor and maltreated her over her whole body in view of raping her. A Congolese chauffeur succeeded in chasing them away. Miss ——— thus escaped raping, but is at present under treatment.

On the 6th of July 1960, at Inkisi, Mr. ——— was slapped in the face and hit with rifle butts by African soldiers who took him to prison. With two other white men, whom he named, he was forced during more than 1 hour and a quarter to flatten coils of barbed wire with his bare feet.

When he was taken out of prison, he was hit in the spine with a rifle butt so hard that he fell on the ground, whereupon he was hit over the whole body in the same manner. After this, he was brutally dragged back to his home. During the night, African soldiers returned to his house and forced Mr. ——— and two other white men to stay with uplifted arms in the backyard of the house. Meanwhile, a number of soldiers attempted to rape the women in the house.

At Inkisi, on July 6 1960, Mrs. ——— only just escaped raping, thanks to a nervous crises of a friend, which frightened the assaulters.

On the 6th day of July 1960, at Inkisi, Miss ——— was at home around 8:30 p.m. with three friends, when five or six soldiers entered the house. Two or three of them dragged one of the young women in a room. When she cried for help, Miss ——— burst into the room where her friend was fighting the assaulters, but the soldiers grasped her and dragged her from one side to another of the room. They tried to rape her, tearing her clothes and hitting her. But they did not succeed. A black policeman put an end to the scene. A few minutes later, a Congolese sergeant broke into the room and tried several times to rape one of the ladies in the presence of her four children. The lady fainted two or three times. The soldier thereupon attacked another young lady and dragged her into an adjoining room from which cries for help could be heard. The soldier remained about fifteen minutes with his victim.

B. Banza-Boma

On the 5th day of July 1960, Mrs. ——— was at Banza-Boma with a very small child. Mrs. ——— said that she was two months pregnant. Soldiers forced her to come out on the barza. She was raped by four soldiers in succession.

Mrs. ——— said that around the same time a lady, whose name she mentioned, was raped at Banza-Boma.

At Banza-Boma, on the 6th of July 1960, around noon, Mrs. ——— was raped by a Congolese soldier at gunpoint, after her husband had been taken away by soldiers accompanied by the secretary of the ABAKO at Madimba.

C. Matadi

On the 8th day of July, at Matadi, the Swiss subject N—— was arrested around ten o'clock by Congolese policemen. At the Damoi camp, he was hit in the back with rifle butts, while a policeman told him, literally: "that's independence". Later he was insulted, humiliated and hit with rifle butts.

At Matadi, on July 8 around 11 o'clock, 12 Congolese policemen arrived in the city and, threatening with rifles, took away the valid male population.

Mrs. ——— had taken refuge in a house with four other ladies and children. The policemen returned to loot the house, smash the doors, and break the windows. One of the Congolese policemen entered the room where the women and children were together. He took away a girl of 14, threatening with his gun. When she heard the cries of horror and pain of the child, Mrs. ——— realized that the policeman was raping her. After that, Mrs. ——— was also raped.

When Mrs. ——— cried, the policeman put his knife on her throat. Mrs. ——— noticed traces of blood, offering proof that the girl was raped. After Mrs. ——— two other ladies were raped.

The fourth lady escaped, thanks to the intervention of an African priest and a European.

On July 8, at Matadi, Mrs. ——— was staying in a villa together with six other ladies. A Congolese patrol burst into the house, smashing the door. Several of them were wearing civilian clothes, others were in uniform. Mrs. ——— was isolated in a bedroom and raped.

Mrs. Z was at Matadi, on July 8, around 1 o'clock at noon, when three soldiers of the Force Publique came to search the house. One of them raped Mrs. Z.

D. Sanda

Mrs. ——— was arrested by approximately 10 soldiers of the Force Publique at her home in the Seke-Banza territory on July 9. She was taken to Sanda. She was assaulted, kicked over her whole body, and dragged over the ground by her hair. Around 11 o'clock at night, four soldiers, among them a Congolese noncommissioned officer, forced her, together with another lady, to work for 2 hours in the savannah under the menace of their guns. They were severely injured.

Back home, the two ladies were separated. One of them was raped three times by the noncommissioned officer, according to what Mrs. ——— heard.

Mrs. ——— herself was raped three times by three different soldiers.

The following morning, Congolese soldiers twisted her hand, which is still bandaged.

A third and a fourth lady, the latter Portuguese, could avoid being raped by offering 500 francs to soldiers during the same night of the 8–9th of July. Like the others, they were forced to pluck weeds, under the menace of death.

E. Zanzi-Kua

Mr. ——— was staying at Malanga and during the night of the 11th of July fled in the direction of Angola. A convoy of 7 cars was attacked at Zanzi-Kua near the offices of the ABAKO. One of the cars was carrying his wife and his two daughters. The car in front of his was stopped by Congolese. He tried to escape but was fired at several times. His wife was hit in the face by a bullet and dropped dead.

F. Kimpese

At Kimpese, on the 13th of July, around 6 p.m. about 12 soldiers and 100 civilians came to the house of Mr. ——— who was taken away by car with his wife and his three children below 16 in the direction of Leopoldville. The woman was separated from her husband, and in the car that took her away with her two youngest children, she was raped three times by the Congolese soldiers. They hit the child aged 9, and undressed a baby of two "to make sure that it was a boy."

Mrs. ——— was raped at Kimpese in the night of the 13th to the 14th of July, at the same time as Mrs. B. She was raped a second time, at the same time as five other women. The following day, on the road to Thysville, the women were placed in a line, and raped a third time, some of them in the presence of their children.

Mrs. A was raped four times at Kimpese in the night of 13–14th of July, in the presence of her child aged 3.

Mrs. X was raped 10 times at Kimpese in the night of the 13–14th of July, in the presence of her children, after her husband was roped and clubbed.

G. Wono (Thysville)

On the 13th of July, two families, among which that of Mrs. A at Wono, took refuge in the savannah, but they were discovered by Congolese policemen. The men were roped and pushed with a pregnant woman on a truck. Four other women were pushed on another truck and transferred to Kimpese where the women were shut in a small room with five other women and four children. Around nine at night one woman was taken out and raped, later two more underwent the same treatment, and later still Mrs. A was raped. She was taken back to the cell, but taken out again three or four times by a policeman who raped her each time.

The following day the families were pushed on a truck. At a stop, the soldiers dragged women and children into the bush and raped the former. Mrs. A was raped five or six times in the presence of her child and other children.

On the road to Thysville, she was hit in the right eye and still bears traces of it.

Mrs. A was thus raped at least 10 times.

Mr. ——— lived at Wono when on the 13th of July Congolese policemen broke into his house. They tied his hands together with telephone wire, and forced him on his knees. He was slapped in the face, clubbed and hit with rifle butts in the back and on the arms and kicked in his back and on his legs. Natives took part in this. His three companions received the same treatment. He was pushed on a truck by two Congolese, one of them holding him by the head and the other by the feet. At that moment the natives seemed to watch them with pity. While the women were pushed on the other truck, the whites were beaten again. The natives used violence trying to put rotten manioc into their mouth. At every stop between Wono and Kimpese, the prisoners were stoned and beaten by the natives. The brother of Mr. ——— escaped death thanks to a member of the ABAKO.

At Zombe, the men were roped together three by three by the neck, and were once more beaten up by the natives and the policemen.

Imprisoned at Kimpese, they had to lie down on the cement floor. They were obliged to urinate in their trousers and forced to drink from a cup in which the blacks had urinated. They were repeatedly beaten until dawn.

During the transfer to Lukala, they were beaten once more by the soldiers, beaten again at Lukula, and sent to Thysville, where they were looked after by a doctor.

H. Camp Hardy

On the 4th of July, after the 4 days of festivities which had marked the proclamation of independence, the whites noticed

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARY

that excitement among the Congolese soldiers was growing. At night, this excitement had become disquieting.

Armed with machetes, the threatening Congolese soldiers told their officers that they were now the masters. After they had broken into the munition depots, they were in fact so.

On the 5th, the officers assembled on the hill overlooking the European city, with their wives and children. In the night of the 5th and 6th of July, whites were detained in their houses. On the 6th, a Congolese delegation, which included Mr. Diomi, a Congolese cabinet minister, tried to restore calm among the Congolese. It saw how three officers from another camp had been seriously wounded by the Congolese soldiers, and brought back, some of them in a state of collapse, on stretchers to Camp Hardy. The same evening there was an intervention of President Kasavubu and Premier Lumumba and the officers returned to their home.

From the 7th to the 10th, the whites resumed work normally, but the Congolese did not show up.

On the 11th, in the afternoon, armed black soldiers disarmed the officers and noncommissioned officers, put them in prison, after having taken away their possessions, and beaten them with rifle butts.

At the same time, the whites of Sonankulu were imprisoned in the Thysville goal. They were humiliated, stripped, spat in the face, beaten, and ridiculed.

Finally, officers from the two camps and civilians among whom there were priests whose beard they attempted to burn, were locked in the same cell. They were left without anything to eat or to drink. It is true that some of them were given some water, but it seemed to come from the latrines. Others were permitted to have somebody send for food at home, but in the case of one soldier who fetched food, the wife of the officer who gave it to him was raped.

As to the acts of violence committed against men, following cases may be mentioned:

On the 6th of July, at Thysville, a man named C was taken by Congolese soldiers to Camp Hardy, under the hostile shouts of the population. He was beaten and, among others, he was hit with a rifle butt in the back.

The man named V was at Thysville, Camp Hardy, on the 5th and 6th of July. He was put in prison for 2 days without food, under the menace of an automatic weapon, with his wife and three children below 12. After he was set free, he was arrested again on the 11th around 3 o'clock in the afternoon. He was stripped like the others, hit with fists, feet, and rifle butts. Two of his companions were mortally wounded. For 2 more days they were left without drink or food. Soldiers attempted to drown them in a barrel filled with water, but a sergeant prevented them from doing so.

Mr. ——— lived at the military Camp Hardy at Thysville. On the 6th of July, and again on the 11th and 12th of July, he was beaten by native soldiers.

M, a Belgian officer, said that the situation deteriorated in the camp at Thysville on the 5th of July. The officers were practically prisoners, and two of them were beaten with sticks and stoned. On the 11th of July, M was put in a prison cell after having been beaten and hit with a rifle butt. For about 3 days, he and the other prisoners were without food or drink. At a certain moment, they received water, but M thinks that it was water from the latrines.

After the men had been made defenseless, the majority of the white women were raped.

Raping scenes have been described by the victims in lurid terms. The Congolese soldiers attacked all the women, even those that were visibly pregnant, women that had recently given birth to a child, and sick women. To get what they were after, they committed acts of violence and threatened with their weapons. In a great many cases, they threatened the children with death to make their mothers give in.

Some women were raped by a great many men in succession and could not tell the number of assaults committed against them. In many cases, these scenes took place in the presence of children and, in particular, in the presence of the children of the victims.

Some ladies sacrificed themselves to avoid the worst for their children or for a sick friend. Not all the girls escaped the soldiers' brutality.

It must be noted, that some of the victims lost consciousness as a result of the acts of violence. When they thought that their victims were dead, the soldiers ran away.

Of the 29 white women that have already been questioned by the Commission, 19, or two-thirds of them, have admitted that they were raped. This figure only includes the cases of rape certified by the statement of the victim, excluding the numberless attempts at rape.

Some women escaped the acts of violence, either by feigning absence (one of them shut herself up with her girl for 2 days in a washroom), or thanks to the intervention of a Congolese soldier who remained faithful.

These cases of rape present a serious danger of venereal contagion.

A FEW CONCRETE EXAMPLES

As stated already, the man named "V" was at the Hardy Camp, Thysville, on the 5th and 6th of July. He was imprisoned for 2 days without food, and his wife and three children aged less than 12, under the menace of an automatic weapon. After he was freed, he was arrested again on the 11th of July, around 3 o'clock in the afternoon. He was stripped, like the others, and hit with fists, feet, and rifle butts. Two of his companions were mortally wounded. For 2 more days they were deprived of food and drink. Soldiers tried to drown him in a barrel filled with water, but a sergeant prevented them.

On the same day (11th of July), his wife was assaulted in her bedroom. She was hit with fists and rifle butts by six soldiers, who got hold of her and made deep cuts in her arms, of which the Commission has found traces. They stripped her of her underwear and raped her. Six soldiers held her tight and motionless, while an undetermined number of soldiers raped her. They stood in line while waiting for their turn. Her three children were present at the scene crying loudly.

Other soldiers got hold of her daughter aged less than 12 and raped her several times.

Shortly afterward, three soldiers again entered her room and raped Mrs. Z in turn. While one of them raped her, the two others held her motionless. The children were again present.

Shortly after they left, other soldiers came to the house and raped Mrs. Z in the same manner.

These scenes continued from dusk until dawn.

Six of the European women living in the same street had been raped in the same circumstances.

The following day, the soldiers came back, but they found the house barricaded by the women. They set fire to the curtains, but a Congolese sergeant major stopped them and chased the soldiers away.

On the 13th, the soldiers again penetrated the house, but, despite the menace of weapons, Mrs. Z fled to the house of a neighbor where her children were able to join her.

The child of 11 who was raped was not questioned by the Commission. Her state of health does not permit it for the moment.

On the 11th of July, Mrs. ——— accompanied by her husband and two children, left Malanga-Gare, from a point known as Bloc 110. They were arrested by civilians of the ABAKO, searched, imprisoned, and beaten all night. They were all taken to Thysville, where they arrived on the 12th toward midnight. Mrs. ——— was alone in a cell with her children aged less than 7, when a group of about 10 soldiers arrived. One of them held her by the arms, another by the legs, a third held his hand on her mouth to prevent her from screaming, a fourth pulled her hair and slapped her face. She was raped a dozen times in the presence of the children who huddled in a corner together. This scene lasted from 2 till 4:30 in the morning. The family was saved by a white doctor.

As told already, M, who lived at the Hardy Camp at Thysville, was beaten twice by Congolese soldiers on the 6th and the 11-12th of July. His wife was the victim of acts of violence committed by four African soldiers. On the 11th, toward 6 p.m. two soldiers attempted to rape her. A third soldier succeeded. This lady said that nine-tenths of the white women at Camp Hardy were the victims of similar brutalities.

Mrs. ——— was on the 11th of July at the home of Mrs. B at Camp Hardy, Thysville, with a small child, while her husband had been put in prison by Congolese soldiers. The latter broke into the house, where, besides the aforementioned ladies, were Mrs. C 7 months pregnant, and Mrs. D with her small child. Mrs. A was taken back to her house. Soldiers started a fight to know who would have Mrs. A, who finally was handed over to two of them who belonged to the transport unit of Camp Hardy, and who both raped her. Later, she was taken back to Mrs. D's home, where she met Mrs. E, F, and G who told her that they had also been raped.

In the evening of the 12th of July, these ladies were taken back to their respective homes, except Mrs. B who later told Mrs. A that she had been raped by a Congolese soldier while she was alone. Mrs. A found her home looted.

Mrs. A was at Camp Hardy at the home of Mrs. B with Mrs. C, where all three of them were raped by Congolese soldiers in the presence of the children. The soldiers also scratched and hurt a baby of 9 months old.

Mrs. A was raped 10 to 15 times during two consecutive nights.

Mrs. ——— was at Camp Hardy at Thysville. She was pregnant. When she came home, two Congolese soldiers were waiting for her, and, menacing her with their weapons, pushed her into a room. One of them raped her once, the other twice. While one of them was raping her, the other was pointing his gun at her. Mrs. ——— is in danger of miscarriage.

On the 11th of July, toward 8 p.m., in the Thysville military camp, five or six soldiers searched the house of Mrs. ———. The first one who raped her, had previously taken her by the throat. She was raped by four soldiers. The fourth stayed with her all night to protect her against new assaults.

Mrs. ——— was at Camp Hardy, Thysville, on the 11th of July. Toward 9 in the evening, Congolese soldiers of the transport unit broke into her house. They hit her with rifle butts, put an automatic gun in her neck and a bayonet on her chest. Three or four times attempts were made to rape her. Soldiers pulled hair from her pubis and tried to make her swallow it. A soldier thrust his fingers, covered by something rough like sandpaper, into her. She was severely torn and fainted without recovering until the next day. She presumes that they continued their acts of torture. The scene took place in the presence of her son, aged 11.

Mrs. ——— is still under medical care.

Mrs. ——— was raped at gunpoint in Camp Hardy, Thysville, on the 11th of July, toward 6 o'clock at night, immediately after the arrest of her husband.

Toward 8 a.m. on the same day, the Congolese soldiers returned and again raped Mrs. ———, as well as a neighbor, threatening them or their children. The raping continued during the whole night of 12–13th of July. The scenes often took place in the presence of the children, among whom were two boys of 17 and 13 and a girl of 12.

The sentries, who were posted by a noncommissioned Congolese officer for the protection of the women, were the first to break into the house.

Mrs. ——— was at Camp Hardy, Thysville, when her husband was arrested on the 11th of July by Congolese soldiers. They searched the house and attempted to rape her in front of her son, aged 4, saying: "We are going to beat up your husbands and have a good time with you." She was hit with a rifle butt, and one of the children bit a soldier's leg. Three soldiers slapped the boy and put a bayonet to his heart, menacing him with their rifles, ready to shoot. They tried to rape Mrs. ———.

The soldiers burnt the hand of the mother with a lighted cigarette to show the child what they would do if she continued to put up resistance.

The boy was finally taken to another room. Mrs. ——— was raped continually from 6 till 8:30 p.m. At least a dozen Africans abused her. They left when they thought she would die.

On the 11th of July, Mrs. ——— and her family were in a convoy of seven cars with people being evacuated towards Angola. At 8 in the evening, the last four cars were stopped at Sensikua (Songolo). The captives were taken to the ABAKO offices. All of them were beaten by civilians with belts, feet and fists. Mrs. ——— was dragged by the hair from one room to another. The following day they were taken by Congolese soldiers to Camp Hardy, Thysville.

In the night of 12–13th of July Congolese soldiers attempted to rape Mrs. A, as well as Mrs. B and Mrs. C in the sentries' room, in the presence of their children. Some of them held the women, while others attempted to rape them. One of the soldiers threatened Mrs. A with his bayonet. Mrs. A's resistance was broken and she was finally raped by one soldier, and taken to a cell with her two young children who witnessed the scene. The soldiers returned to take away the children, whom, it seemed to her, she heard crying in the sentries' room. In the cell she was raped again by two soldiers. One held her by the throat, while the other abused her. At one moment, six soldiers were surrounding her. One of the soldiers who raped her, violently grasped and twisted her right breast. She was shouting at the top of her voice. Later, her children were brought back to her. She could hear her neighbor crying loudly, Mrs. B, who was the victim of the same acts of brutality.

A soldier returned to the cell, and exhibiting himself, demanded that Mrs. A yield to him. He threatened to take her little girl away, if she did not consent. Nevertheless, she resisted, but was slapped repeatedly in the face.

Mr. ——— confirmed that part of his wife's statement relating to the scenes they experienced together, and said that the men had been maltreated. He himself had been beaten, his shoes stolen and he was bound hands and feet. He was also beaten by members of the ABAKO.

He heard the cries of women, he recognized the sound of his wife's voice and realized that she was being raped.

Also at Camp Hardy, Thysville, in the night of the 11th of July, a group of about 10 soldiers, some of them drunk, came to the house of Lieutenant A, where they found his wife, Mrs. B, and a family of friends C.

The soldiers got hold of Mrs. A and Mrs. B, and took them to the room where their children were sleeping. Mrs. B was raped, even though she was pregnant for 5 months, by two soldiers in succession, who had threatened her children aged 5 and 3 so that she could fear for their lives. Mrs. B is at present receiving medical treatment. In the same room, Mrs. A was raped by soldiers on the bed in which the children slept. Mrs. C, who was taken to another room, was raped after soldiers had begun to hit her baby 9 months old.

Mrs. A the wife of a Belgian officer at Camp Hardy, Thysville, gave life to a baby on the 2d of July and left the hospital to return home. On the 11th, her husband and other Europeans were arrested by Congolese soldiers. She stayed at her home with three ladies and four children. Congolese soldiers came to search the house. They told Mrs. B and Mrs. C to go home. One of them slapped Mrs. B in the face, and tightly pressed her throat with a muffler, before taking back Mrs. C.

Mrs. A heard loud cries and learned that the soldier had tried to rape Mrs. C. Around midnight, after several attempts by Congolese soldiers to enter the house, six soldiers broke the windowpanes and penetrated into the bedroom where they found Mrs. A and her children, and Mrs. C and her child. They took away the child from Mrs. C and gave it to Mrs. A, dragged the mother in the living room from where loud crying could immediately be heard. While Mrs. A was in bed with two children, the soldier made four attempts to rape her, even though she was still torn and had several stitchings following her recent confinement.

Even though the act could not be fully perpetrated in view of the state of the victim, rape remains an established fact. Mrs. A said that during the night soldiers slapped her little boy aged 3½ because he cried. Meanwhile, Mrs. C had come back, she went to sleep with Mrs. A, and lost consciousness. Later she declared that five or six soldiers had raped and beaten her. Mrs. D told her later that although 2 months pregnant and under medical care, three soldiers had raped her. Mrs. A heard from Mrs. E that this woman had been raped countless times by the soldiers.

Mrs. X was at Camp Hardy at Thysville, when 17 women and children were evacuated by train on July 7. On the 11th, her husband was arrested. She was alone with her two children and was harassed several times by the soldiers. Her windowpanes were broken, soon a soldier crashed into the room, threw her on the floor and raped her. Another soldier came to the house the same day and raped her too. About noon, five soldiers arrived. They pointed their bayonets at her chest, threatening to kill her. All five raped her. She was thus raped by seven soldiers.

On July 11, at about 6:30 p.m., Mrs. X, at Thysville, received soon after the arrest of her husband, the visit of soldiers who searched the house and took away the money. One of her friends who was present was raped by a soldier under threats. This person was raped twice more between the 11th and the 13th of July. Mrs. X herself was raped on the morning of the 12th, although she was the mother of a 6-week-old child.

Mrs. X lived with her husband, an officer, and her two children, 7 and 10 years of age, at Thysville. On July 11, five soldiers rushed into the house. Three of them pushed her into the bedroom and each one raped her. They stole $300, in Belgian francs. On July 12, Mrs. X went to Mrs. B, where she found Mrs. C. Five soldiers broke the door down with their bayonets. Mrs. A was raped by two soldiers, one of them was among those who had raped her the day before. She heard that Mrs. C was raped also. She thinks—as nearly all the victims state—that a very great number of white women in Camp Hardy were raped. They are at present under medical care.

On the 12th, the civilians were released thanks to the intervention of Minister Ganshof van der Meersch and Mr. Diomi, Congolese Cabinet Minister.

On the 13th, the officers were released thanks to Minister Bomboko and to a newspaper man—a German, it seems. A convoy reached Leopoldville the same day. On the road, the refugees were injured and stoned. The soldiers first tried to send the men back to Thysville: a little further, they attacked the convoy and shot at it. The refugees were able to reach the airport thanks to the Belgian paratroopers.

II. KASAI PROVINCE

Luluabourg

In the afternoon of July 9, the soldiers of the Force Publique at the General Gilliard Camp, seized the munitions dump; they disarmed the officers and the noncommission Belgian officers and pushed them all, with their families, into the mess hall. Some of the commissioned and noncommissioned officers were molested and beaten. A lady and an adjutant who were driving to the camp, their car full of children, were subjected to gunshots.

Early in the evening of the 9th, a Belgian civilian who was inside the camp, was seriously wounded by a shot fired by a Congolese soldier. Taken to the hospital of Luluabourg, he was on the operating table when the soldiers attacked the hospital twice with machineguns. The surgeon who was operating on the wounded man could not give him the necessary care. A little later, about 20 men who were under siege in the Imokasai building, rushed out and succeeded, under the fire of soldiers, to evacuate the sick and the personnel of the hospital. After they left, it was completely ransacked. The wounded man died soon after his transfer from the hospital to the Imokasai building.

Immediately after the first turmoil, about 1,500 Europeans retrenched themselves in the Imokasai building; they soon were besieged by the Congolese troops who began to fire on them around 8 p.m. (July 9). The siege, with intermittant gunshots and machinegun fire, went on until the arrival of the paratroopers on the evening of the 10th. Some of the besieged were wounded. During the siege, the soldiers asked the besieged to surrender their arms but they refused.

A few Belgian members of the Congolese Security Service and their families had taken refuge in the Building of the Service at 9 p.m. They also were attacked by gunfire. Other Europeans had taken refuge in the Pax hospital.

On July 10, at 7 a.m., the doors were demolished and the place was ransacked by a Congolese military patrol. A noncommissioned soldier coming into a room where he found Mr. X, fired twice. Mr. X was hit in the belly while he had his hands in the air and while he cried: "Don't shoot, we have no arms."

As for the families who could not reach the Imokasai building, many of them were subjected to grave maltreatment. At the end of the afternoon of the 9th, jeeps and trucks with soldiers had spread through the town; the soldiers shot at passing cars, they looted houses and maltreated Europeans.

At about 7 p.m., a European civilian who was standing on his doorstep, was killed by two shots, fired by four soldiers in a jeep. Two families, comprising several children each, were molested and beaten. Mrs. Z was raped under threats by two policemen, in her house. Then the two families were taken to the military camp. The cars stopped in front of the prison and a crowd gathered, the soldiers declared that the prisoners had shot at them. The crowd got

excited, the two mothers were undressed, molested and beaten. They were imprisoned; the husbands were beaten, one of them still shows traces of the beatings. Mrs. Y was taken out of her house and raped on the road, in the presence of her three children and her husband who had been beaten before. Other women, among them an old lady, were undressed, molested, and humiliated in public.

In the afternoon of July 10th, the Belgium paratroopers arrived in Luluabourg. The whites were evacuated partly that same day, partly the next day.

III. EQUATOR PROVINCE

Boende

Boende was the end of the road for several government officials and settlers of the region. The sector seemed quiet until the 10th of July. On the 11th, as a result of the bad news from Ikela, the settlers and the officials tried to evacuate the women and the children. The settlers planned to come back, the officials wanted to remain at their posts. Their families left from Djolu, Befale, Bokutola, Befori and Lingomo, but the Congolese had already put up roadblocks at the instigation of the Force Publique (army) in order to prevent the whites from leaving. All those who were stopped on the roads, even if they tried to avoid Djolu by going to Bangui (former French Congo) by way of Libenge or Lisala, were sent to Djolu by the soldiers of the Force Publique.

As soon as they were arrested, they were searched and robber of their money and valuables. The men were allowed to keep their trousers, their shoes and shorts were taken away. They were bound tightly. Women and children were separated from the men. The number of prisoners at Djolu increased steadily. All of them were severely beaten by rifle butts, they were slapped and kicked, they were spat upon and injured by the soldiers, policemen, and also by civilian Congolese incited by the soldiers. Finally, the soldiers had to protect the prisoners against the native population who wanted to torture the white men and abuse the white women. The Congolese had herded together 40 white men, as many women and at least 8 children.

The imprisoned women were publicly raped, several of them with a child in their arms, surrounded by soldiers, policemen, and Negro civilians who all had penetrated into the cells.

Eight children were present, in tears, during these repeated rapes which went on the whole night of the 11th to the 12th of July, accompanied by armed menace; often the menaces were directed at the children in order to intimidate the mothers.

The wife of an official who resisted was knocked down by the Congolese.

At daybreak, the missionaries of Djolu who had also been arrested, arrived. There were three sisters, their clothes in shreds, their capes torn away, who had been maltreated. A special inquiry on this case is underway.

Some people arrived who had been wounded by firearms: a lieutenant and an official. A doctor was prevented from taking care of the lieutenant; later he received permission to do so, he put on a bandage but this was immediately torn off by a Congolese soldier who wounded the eyebrow of the injured man.

From the 12th of July, between 6 and 7 a.m., the transportation was done in the following manner: a dozen men, tightly bound so that when one of them fell, all the other followed. They were beaten. The same day, everybody was put on trucks. A lady suffered from a heart condition: a doctor finally was authorized to help her. When he arrived, he was driven away. They left for Mompono and arrived about 3 p.m. On the road, the native population insulted the prisoners, spat on them, threw sand, and sticks. Finally the Congolese soldiers who often stopped the convoy, were forced to protect the prisoners.

At Monpono the men were again locked up. At the prison there was a colonist wounded by three bullets in the thighs and one in the arm.

About 6 p.m., the prisoners were untied by a Congolese commander, taken to Boende on the 13th and to Léopoldville on the 14th.

A FEW TESTIMONIES

Trouble started again on July 11, in the region of Djolu. In a mission post of that region, Father X received a number of refugees, among them a man seriously wounded by a shot from a Congolese soldier. On July 12, Father X was arrested by two soldiers; he was beaten on his back and knees. He was forced to lie flat and later on to run. The refugees and the nuns were forced out of the Mission. The same day, July 12, the nuns, according to the testimony of one of them, were put in jail with two ladies and a baby. Negro soldiers attacked one nun and after a fierce struggle, raped her. Later, they attacked the second nun. Two men trampled her underfoot. The nun lost consciousness and another nun said the sister had died. The soldiers were frightened and fled while the other soldiers reproached the attackers for having killed, which was not allowed. At 5:30 a.m., the white prisoners, men and women, were taken to another prison. All of them were in the nude, the nuns and missionaries included, their hands bound in the back. They were locked up in a hut where already 20 women and children had arrived. The soldiers asked why the nuns were not members of the party of Lumumba and if they had sexual intercourse with the missionaries. They promised each sister a soldier for the night. Trucks brought the captives to Monpono under the limits of the black population.

On the 12th of July, Mrs. A, 4 months pregnant, was standing with her two young children, in a group of men and women: a number of drunken soldiers arrived. They bound the men, hand and foot, and beat them. There were five women and seven children. The women were taken to a dark room. All of them were raped several times. Mrs. A was raped 10 times. Three children, aged 7 to 9, were present at these scenes. Later, Mrs. A met nuns whose clothes had been torn and who told her that they had been raped at the Mission.

When Mrs. A was taken from Djola to Mompoka, the group of whites was attacked by an excited crowd. Several Europeans were wounded by the natives, armed with spears.

Mr. X of the Djola district declares—his statement being confirmed by his wife—that his wife was arrested by drunken soldiers on July 11, locked in a jail, together with four other ladies, while three sisters were imprisoned elsewhere.

The five ladies were raped, each of them at least 20 times, in the presence of seven children. Mrs. X having resisted, was horribly beaten with a rifle butt and with fists all over her body. One of her companions offered herself to avoid her daughter, age 8, being raped.

The soldiers came in relays. Black policemen joined the rapers.

Meanwhile Mr. X, together with 20 other men and 2 missioners were imprisoned. The men were bound, lying on the ground. All of them were hit 50 times with rifle butts. Mr. X witnessed the following scene; a Belgian officer was wounded. A doctor wanted to operate. In the midst of the operation, he was hit by a rifle butt. The officer howled in pain: the sergeant who had thrown the doctor to the ground hit the officer in the face with his rifle.

While the whites were taken by truck from Djola to Monpono, Mrs. X had a heart attack. A doctor tried to take care of her, a black sergeant threw her from the truck. She remained unconscious for a long time.

On the evening of the 12th, Mr. X was allowed to visit his wife. She had lost her memory. Her memory returned partially when she returned to Belgium.

An officer at Djolu, was attacked by soldiers of the Force Publique. He came to the assistance of the white people and was shot at by an automatic gun. He was wounded in the thigh. He was kicked and wounded in the face by rifle butts. Notwithstanding his wounds, he had to walk for a while to the Dongo prison where he was bound and locked up. The black soldiers prevented the doctor from taking care of him. The women in the group (eight of them, five among them nuns) were raped by the soldiers. The men were brutalized.

Mr. X states also that several whites he had seen had been tatooed by the Negroes: they had cut the white men with a knife, making a vertical mark between the eyes.

In the night of July 11, the Djolu post was evacuated by convoy. The convoy was stopped for a moment and the men were separated from the women. The women were brutalized and raped all night by the soldiers and the police. One woman who resisted was knocked down in the presence of her eight children. At dawn, three nuns joined the group. Two had been raped. Mrs. Y declared that she had been raped at least 20 times. During that time, the men, bound hand and foot, were beaten.

Mr. Z, head of a plantation, states that on July 11, he was taken to the prison of Bokokolo. Women and children were separated from the men. The men were bound, hand and foot, and then roped together: they were maltreated all night long. They heard the cries of the women and children, and of a lieutenant of Djolu who was seriously wounded. The black soldiers prevented a doctor from taking care of him; they beat the patient and the doctor with rifle butts.

On July 12, the nuns of the mission arrived in a pitiful state. They had been raped. A missionary who was with them, had seen the soldiers enter a place where women were hiding and come out later boasting to the husbands that they had had intercourse with their wives. The same day, the prisoners were taken by convoy to Monpono: on the road, at all the villages, roadblocks were put up to permit the local population to beat and insult the prisoners.

On the evening of July 11, Mrs. G and her family left Djolu. Arrested by Negro soldiers, they were taken to the Djolu prison, men were separated from women. A hundred to a hundred and fifty Negroes (soldiers, policemen, and civilians) came to the prison. Mrs. G was standing up with her 2 months' baby in her arms. In that position, Mrs. G, held by Negroes, was raped by others, all the while menaced by rifles. During that night, Mrs. G was raped about 20 times. She was hurled on the floor, the Negroes threw themselves on her. They tore her underclothes, tore at her pubic hair. The other women were also raped in the presence of their children. During the night of July 11, several Negroes tried to rape a 7-year-old girl. Then Mrs. G was again raped. All that time, the prisoners were menaced by guns. Mrs. G's baby was so maltreated that the mother considers it a miracle that it is still alive. The Negroes threatened to cook mother and child and eat them.

During that same night, Mrs. G was authorized to look for food and care for the baby and for her husband who was locked up with other men in a special room. She saw there a number of men, bound hand and foot, roped together, their faces bloody, half naked. Several had broken teeth. In order to feed them, she had to put a bottle to their lips and she had to give them soaked bread. A lieutenant, wounded in the leg by

gunfire, was lying in a pool of blood, his eyes and teeth bloody.

Mrs. G came back then, under armed guard, to the place where the women were kept: the rapes went on; at dawn she was taken to another room where she was raped again.

A number of nuns joined the prisoners. Three among them said that they had been raped. On the 12th of July, at about 8 a.m., the prisoners were led to the camp of Monpono. On the road, they were attacked by natives who shot arrows at them, throwing spears and sticks. Three soldiers again raped her on the road.

Mr. X states that on July 11, a convoy of cars was organized in Djolu, in order to evacuate the women and children. The first car was able to escape. The second one was destroyed by gunfire and the driver was hit. The third one was halted. The soldiers stole everything that the occupants had in their possession. The men were hit with rifle butts, bound together, hands behind their backs. At regular intervals, the soldiers loaded their guns, menaced the prisoners and hit them. Civilian Negroes did the same.

White women were locked up opposite the place where the occupants of the car were held. About 10 p.m., the men heard screams and shouts. Next morning, the white women declared that all night long they had been raped an undetermined number of times by soldiers and civilians. According to the testimony of every white woman, all of them were raped at least 20 times, in the presence of their children.

This preliminary report does not include all of the types of atrocities committed by the Congolese. In some cases men were castrated and women's breasts were cut off. These victims were forced to eat their own flesh.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 13021) to provide for assistance in the development of Latin America and in the reconstruction of Chile, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 13021, with Mr. THORNBERRY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I speak today in support of the bill H.R. 13021. This bill contains four major provisions, it contains a rather detailed expression of the sense of Congress in regard to the U.S. policy toward Latin America, and includes several recommendations for the implementation of that policy. Most Members of Congress will agree with the statement which is contained in section 1 of the bill.

Second. It authorizes an appropriation of $500 million for a new social development program in Latin America.

Let me emphasize here that no appropriation of funds under this authorization has been made or will be made during the present Congress. Any requests submitted to the next Congress would be based on a carefully worked out program and would only be for such amounts as may be fully justified.

Third. Mr. Chairman, the bill authorizes an appropriation of $100 million for rehabilitation and assistance to the Republic of Chile. This money was made necessary by reason of the great damage by earthquake and flood, which is still fresh in the minds of all of us.

Fourth. The bill also authorizes for the fiscal year a suspension of the application of section 551 of the Mutual Security Act as far as it applies to sections 411(b) and 411(c) of the act. This bill will give greater flexibility in meeting increased administrative costs which were not anticipated when the budget was prepared 12 months ago.

The bill as reported by the committee also includes an authorization for an increase in the contingency fund by an amount of $100 million. Mr. Chairman, it is the understanding, as I announced to the Committee on Rules yesterday, that as soon as the bill is open for amendment, the Committee on Foreign Affairs will propose an amendment striking section 4(a) which provides for the increase in the authorization for the contingency fund.

There has been some opposition to this authorization of $500 million in this bill on the ground that a detailed program for the use of the money has not been presented to the Congress. The argument has been made that if an appropriation is not yet needed, there is no point in voting an authorization, and the question "Why the hurry?" has been asked, and I am sure it will be asked here repeatedly this afternoon.

Let me say emphatically that action on this authorization is urgently needed and is vitally important to our foreign policy in Latin America. Let me say further that it makes a great deal of good sense for this Congress to vote this authorization before a detailed program of expenditures of the money has been worked out.

Let me just pause a moment to tell this House that before the executive branch did anything on this bill—and this is brought out in a colloquy between Mr. O'HARA and the Under Secretary of State, which appears in the hearings contained on pages 24 and 25—that Mr. Dillon also said this, that this bill, before it was presented in the other body, was taken to both the Democratic nominee for President and the Democratic nominee for Vice President, and they both approved it and supported the bill in the other body. It was also taken by the Executive to the Republican nominee for President and received full support. Mr. Dillon, when questioned as to the immediate need for this authorization, also spelled out the great emergency that exists. Let me say that he is already on his way to Bogotá for the meeting down there next Monday.

The bill carries language spelling out that the authorization is subject to such further legislative provisions as may be enacted. Both the authorizing committees and the Appropriation Committees will have a look at the program next year, and, as I just said, every project must be justified. I think that the emergency existing at Bogotá next Monday demands immediate action to give the Latin Americans definite assurance that it is the congressional intent that we are ready to do something to support their new social program. This is an emergency, and I think we certainly should give the Under Secretary of State the definite power to negotiate next week with people that I think we are going to depend on for friendship and support for a good many years.

I think every one of us here today will agree that the question as to whether or not the nations of Latin America go Communist will be determined by the Latin Americans themselves. It is basically an internal matter. The United States is in a position to give assistance, and the timing and effectiveness of our assistance may tip the scales in the right direction.

The fact remains, however, that the United States cannot shield the Latin American countries from communism or cannot drive out communism once it has gained a foothold. The responsibility rests with the government and people of the individual countries, and their action will determine the result.

Recent events have convinced the President and the Secretary of State that the Governments of Latin America are ready to make a new start in dealing with the problems of improving the living conditions and that they realize that fundamental and far-reaching reforms have to be undertaken.

The record of the Castro regime in Cuba has contributed substantially to this new attitude on the part of the governments of this hemisphere. Let me emphasize the fact that the Governments of Latin America are even more disturbed by what has happened in Cuba than we are in the United States. They recognize that the Castro line has great appeal to the malcontents and radical elements in their own countries, and that they face a danger of revolution and chaos.

The key event in this new movement on the part of the countries of Latin America to get underway a program of basic reform which will bring about a direct and tangible improvement in the lives of their people is a meeting which will begin on September 5—next Monday—in Bogotá, Colombia. This meeting, convoked by the Council of the Organization of American States, is the Third Meeting of the Special Committee to Study the Formulation of New Measures for Economic Cooperation. It is of vital importance that the U.S. representatives at this meeting be able to offer concrete evidence of support for the new programs which the Latin American nations propose to undertake.

These programs of social development have not yet been worked out. Before the United States appropriates funds to assist in these programs, our representatives have told the Latin American governments that it will be necessary to have specific programs worked out and justified in detail, and, even more important, that these programs will have

to be accompanied by basic legislative and institutional reforms in such matters as tax structure, land tenure, and legal procedure in order that new facilities provided under these programs may produce the benefits which are intended.

The Latin American governments understand that they have to undertake fundamental and painful readjustment. Many of them hesitate to undertake such readjustments unless there is assurance that money will be available to carry forward the social development programs which are necessary. It is, therefore, of vital importance that the Congress by approving this authorization give encouragement to the governments of Latin America to go ahead with the reforms and adjustments which are essential if the well-being of their people is to be significantly improved.

This is no time for us to take a "wait and see" attitude, or to tell our neighbors to the south to come back again next January. If we approve this authorization today, we can have hope that the Bogotá Conference will be successful and that a new era may be beginning in Latin America. If we fail to approve this authorization today, it is my judgment and that of those who are responsible for our foreign policy that the Bogotá Conference will not be a success, that the effect on the people of Latin America will be most discouraging, and that the Communists and the Castroites will find more receptive listeners to their propaganda.

I will not take the committee's time in discussing the authorization of $100 million for Chile. It is estimated that the total cost of reconstruction will be $450 million. The United States has already made some contributions through the Export-Import Bank, and it is my understanding that other nations will participate. There can be no doubt that Chile desperately needs this $100 million, and it is entirely consistent with our policy toward nations which have suffered catastrophes of this nature to make help available.

With respect to the increase in availability of administrative funds, let me elaborate on the issue involved. Section 551 of the Mutual Security Act reads as follows:

SEC. 551. Limitation on the use of the President's Special Authority.—The authority contained in section 403, 451, and 501 of this Act shall not be used to augment appropriations made pursuant to sections 103(b), 408, 411(b), and 411(c) or used otherwise to finance activities which normally would be financed from appropriations for administrative expenses.

This provision was put in at the initiative of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations in 1959. Its purpose is to prevent the use of the contingency fund or other discretionary authority of the President to increase the authorization for administrative funds above that specifically approved by the Congress.

The administrative funds authorized and subsequently appropriated this year are based on budget estimates prepared a year ago. Events of recent months have changed the world situation significantly with the result that it will be necessary for the United States to establish personnel in a number of new locations which were not contemplated when the budget was made up last year. Further than that, it is true that the recent pay raise enacted by the Congress has imposed a severe burden on the administrative funds available.

For these reasons, the Executive strongly urges that for the current fiscal year the restriction contained in section 551 be suspended in order that action can be taken to deal with the urgent problems with which we are confronted. The provision contained in section 4(b) of the bill does not repeal section 551, and that limitation will continue in effect after the current fiscal year even though favorable action is taken by the Congress on the bill before us.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the gentleman on an excellent statement and join with him in recommending this proposal very strongly.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I note that the bill was introduced by the gentleman presently in the well of the House by request. Is there any significance to that?

Mr. MORGAN. The message came up from the executive branch. The executive communication is set forth in full on page 40 of the printed hearings. It is not unusual for the chairman of any committee to introduce bills by request.

Mr. GROSS. Another question, if the gentleman will yield further. How did the committee arrive at the figure of $500 million?

Mr. MORGAN. That was the figure requested by the executive branch. The gentleman knows that the President sent a message to Congress, both branches of Congress, to be delivered when we returned. The $500 million figure was included in the President's message.

Mr. GROSS. So the gentleman received a letter or a communication from the President, or from someone in the executive branch of the Government, asking for $500 million and the Committee on Foreign Affairs dutifully put $500 million in the bill; is that about it?

Mr. MORGAN. That is correct, sir. I think we did our duty after hearing the presentation made by the Acting Secretary of State. I have already said that each and every project will have to be justified. This is a figure to be taken to Bogotá next Monday. I am certain everybody in this Congress, whether he is for or against foreign aid, recognizes that the Executive has initial responsibility for our foreign policy. The people who are running the Government now think that $500 million is the amount of money that will help to hold Latin America from going communistic. And the amount will have to be justified next year.

Mr. GROSS. Does not the gentleman think, since this is half a billion dollars, that we have some responsibility to the taxpayer?

Mr. MORGAN. I think we have a responsibility. I can assure the gentleman that next year, if the Democrats are in the majority and I head the Committee on Foreign Affairs, a detailed program for Latin America will have to be justified.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman states that the emergency here is that our representatives are going to a conference and they must have this authorization; in other words, what the gentleman is saying to this Congress and what he is saying to the American people is that if our representative goes down there and he does not come there with half a billion dollars in his hand, he is not welcome. That is about it?

Mr. MORGAN. No, I am not saying that, sir. I do not agree with that statement, nothing like it. I am saying that our negotiator has to go down there with a definite expression of congressional intent. And as I said every dollar will have to be justified before it is appropriated.

Mr. HALEY. If the gentleman will yield further, is there any representative of any other government going down there with his checkbook in his hand, other than a representative of the American Government?

Mr. MORGAN. I think the gentleman will find that many of the countries of Latin America who are going to be at Bogotá next week discussing this program are prepared to make extreme financial sacrifices and undertake basic reforms in order to make this program effective.

Mr. HALEY. I might say this, that I hope they bring some money to put in with this amount of money.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. If these people are prosperous and are going to be able to offer these amounts themselves, if they are doing so well, why go down there with a blank check for $500 million? Why are we sending a delegation down there with a blank check up to $500 million, if these other countries are going to come in with some money?

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. As I understand it, our representative, the Under Secretary of State, Mr. Dillon, is already on his way down there. He could not wait until he got this authorization. He is already on his way down there so he will be certain to be in a position to give enough of it away, without any question.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Of course, I will say to the gentleman from Virginia, he may be pretty confident that the House of

Representatives at least, when it comes to giving away money all over the world, will fly a blank check down to him. It will be there.

Mr. GARY. He can spend it, too.

Mr. GROSS. He will be able to spend it, too, when he gets it.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ANDREWS. Can the distinguished chairman of the committee tell me whether or not this is the total amount planned to be expended in the South American countries, or is it a downpayment on an overall long-range program?

Mr. MORGAN. It is an overall long-range program. I can assure the gentleman that the $500 million will not be spent for several years. As I said previously, every dollar will have to be justified.

Mr. ANDREWS. I read recently that the head of one of the South American countries proposed to be helped by this money said that the plans for the development of his country would cost approximately $4 billion. Can the gentleman tell us how much the planned program for these South American countries will finally cost?

Mr. MORGAN. Of course the gentleman cannot know any such figure, because no such program has ever been worked out. This is a social development program, which includes better housing and improvement of education and basic sanitation. There are no big projects in this authorization. We might not use anywhere near the $500 million we are asking here. This is a statement of congressional intent, to show that this Congress really is ready to cooperate.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. I would like the gentleman to explain to me the language appearing on page 4, beginning in line 12, providing that this is supposed to support the strengthening of free democratic trade unions to raise standards of living through improved management-labor relations.

What are we going to do down there, charter a lot of labor organizations? I should like to hear some explanation of this proposal.

Mr. MORGAN. Of course the gentleman knows that this is similar to language that is already in the Mutual Security Act, under which we operate all over the world. We are not going around organizing labor unions. We just encourage their establishment and development on a free and democratic basis because wherever you have free labor unions you do not have communism.

Mr. HALEY. What we are doing is that we are going to South American countries and meddle in their domestic affairs. We are going to send a bunch of termites who are spending our money all over the world down there to spend some more of our money.

Mr. MORGAN. If we do not help these people, and the gentleman lives closer to South America than I do, some day we will be sorry.

Mr. HALEY. If we stay out of Latin America and let them settle their affairs down there without interference by the Federal Government, I think everybody will be better off and you will not have to spend this money.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman think the improvement of labor-management relations in South America would result in more imports into this country to displace more American workingmen?

Mr. MORGAN. No, I do not think so. On the other hand these labor unions ought to help reduce competition from cheap labor. I do not think it will hurt our foreign trade. There is nothing in this authorization to establish any factories in competition with American industry. This is a social development program, under which we are going to raise the standard of living of these people.

Mr. GROSS. How are you going to raise their standard of living without their marketing their products in this country? This is the best market for any foreign country.

Mr. MORGAN. If we did not have this trade with Latin America, where we already export almost $4 billion a year, we would be in bad shape. Our overall export situation would suffer. They are our best customers.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, and we are getting plenty from them, too.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. This is a question of the foreign policy of the United States of America. Under the Constitution, the foreign policy is under the President. We are simply implementing in this Congress the foreign policy laid down by the President. I might add too that when we are implementing it, we are following out the program put in each of the platforms of each of the two parties and the people that are here objecting are the minority in each of the Republican and the Democratic Parties who want to go back rather than forward with the platforms that each of the parties have adopted just recently. Now when the parties have set up what they want to do and how they will run the country in the next 4 years, I think each of us should inspect his own conscience. While we may differ as to amount, I do not think we can cancel the whole policy of the United States that has been in operation these many years and now turn back on this minor bill, especially in regard to Latin America which certainly has been our good friend and some of our best customers so far.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I am sure my distinguished colleague from my own State of Pennsylvania is aware of the current Panamanian situation. I hope he would have some opinion to express even though we do not have too many of the facts at this point.

Mr. MORGAN. I can assure the gentleman I am aware of the situation. I have examined the same press articles as the gentleman from Pennsylvania and I can assure the gentleman, I stand behind the resolution sponsored by the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. FLOOD. I hope the chairman will inquire of the Secretary of State as to just what the intention is.

Mr. MORGAN. I intend to do so.

Mr. FLOOD. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, let me first make a statement with reference to the earlier remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD]. I hope he has not left the floor, because after his statement on Panama earlier, we called up the Department of State and the following is a summary of the telephone conversation.

During the meeting in Costa Rica, Secretary Herter met both in public and in private sessions with each of the Latin American Foreign Ministers. The Foreign Minister of Panama raised the issue to which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] has referred. This also was raised in both open and private sessions of the Conference. Secretary Herter made no commitments. He admitted that this was a problem that had to be explored further, but no time was given or arranged as to when the problem could be resolved. There are many factors in our country that have to be considered and the Foreign Minister was advised as to that effect.

Mr. Chairman, the distinguished chairman of our committee [Mr. MORGAN] has explained the bill before us. May I add a few remarks about what seems to me to be the importance of it.

Mr. Chairman, the United States has an enormous stake in Latin America. No one needs to argue that point. First, from the standpoint of our security. We simply cannot be safe here no matter how much money we pour into our own defenses in this country if the Latin American countries are enticed away or scared away, or if they lose confidence in the stability and dependability of the understanding and support of the strongest country in the Western Hemisphere. Some people talk easily about the United States going it alone. They do not want to bother with Europe or Africa or Asia—as if we could ignore happenings there. Mr. Chairman, even they, I think, would admit that it is necessary as a minimum to have this whole hemisphere stable and secure, if the United States itself is to have the kind of national security that will allow us to cut down our expenditures for national defense and to use more of those funds for civilian purposes here at home.

Mr. Chairman, look also at the economic considerations. Reference has been made to how much aid we have

given to them. Well, we also sell $3½ billion to $4 billion worth of goods each year to Latin America. We buy a lot from them in exchange. We import oil from Venezuela, coffee from Brazil and other countries, bananas from Central America, metals from Chile and Bolivia, and so on.

It is one of the best illustrations of mutual trade between complementing economies from which both sides profit, that I know of anywhere in the world.

U.S. capital in the amount of about $11 billion is invested in Latin America. So when you consider the economic stake, it is tremendous.

Now, why this bill at this time? The administration had been preparing for some time, so we were advised, an overall program of this sort for Latin America. It has recognized that there is taking place in the world what has been called a revolution of rising expectations. The United States is probably more responsible for this revolution than anybody else. I spoke about this here several years ago. We in the Western World developed our high standard of living primarily because of certain ideas or concepts of our forefathers. They wrote "We hold these truths to be self-evident; that all men are created * * *". That is, they and we believe that there is a Creator. Man is created in His image. Man was given the capacity to make moral judgments; to reason; to listen to a small voice called conscience and then decide what is right and what is wrong. As a child of God, he had a sense of importance which made him respect himself and his neighbor. He had faith that his Creator wanted him to have a better life and would help him to get it, if he worked in harmony with moral laws. So our forefathers worked hard, and they made headway. When they were oppressed in Europe, they came to this country. Their philosophy and faith and the system based on them were sound, and there followed wonderful results.

Then what did we do? We took the concepts and values that meant so much to us, and shared them with people all around the world, just as everyone wants to share with his friends anything that he has found is good. Some of us were personally involved in this sharing. We spent years abroad trying to share our medical skills and our spiritual beliefs and values. You might say we went to countries which were sleeping giants and woke them up. We knew that we were doing a lot of good to the persons who came into our clinics when for example, we removed cataracts so that a man who was blind could see. But I suspect many of us did not realize to what extent we were changing the whole world; that we were starting a revolution which was irreversible. To many people who for centuries had been resigned in fatalism to hunger and illiteracy and disease and squalor, we brought our ideas and concepts as to the rights and worth of man; and they are not resigned to a status of inferiority any longer. They have seen what free men in the West have been able to do and they are determined to do the same. They are not going to continue to live any longer as they have been.

They are determined to have not only better material rewards but also equality of status as human beings. They are not willing to be treated as "lesser breeds without the law," with others looking down upon them as backward peoples. They are not going to accept an inferior position any longer.

Mr. Chairman, that revolution can no more be stopped than you can put a baby that has been born back into its mother's womb. The problem is how to help and guide the revolution, so that it will benefit the peoples themselves and the world, instead of harm them.

I remember a former Secretary of Agriculture being before our committee a decade or so ago. He said "We must find some way to get stability in areas of instability." I said, "I think probably that is right, because it was we who created the instability."

The countries of Asia and elsewhere had been stable for centuries. We took to them ideas and concepts that showed them it is possible for them also to improve their lot. They are going to move ahead one way or the other.

This revolution is on the march in Latin America. If we do not help them in a way that is constructive and sound and mutually helpful, then they will get help from somewhere else that they believe will enable them to get ahead.

That means they will accept Communist help, even though it will turn out to be the opposite and such action by them will cost us many times as much in the end as this bill could possibly cost. This is the situation behind the bill before us.

Why did not the administration present such a bill earlier? The basic reason is that while we have given a good deal of aid in Latin America, some of it has not been too productive because some of those countries have not seen the necessity to make certain essential changes in their own laws, in their tax structure, in land tenure, and in legal procedures, without which changes significant improvement is not possible.

It was not useful or wise to expand aid programs in Latin America, or elsewhere, until the cooperating countries are willing to do certain things themselves. Without that kind of action on their part, our aid would be palliative, but not curative.

Mr. Chairman, I have often thought that probably the biggest mistake Mr. Stalin made in his whole career was to start the invasion of South Korea, because it woke up the sleeping Western World. We have had testimony before our committee by our highest military authorities that if Stalin had delayed the Communist attack on South Korea 2 more years, while our miiltary strength continued to deteriorate, he could have conquered us and the world. But the revelation of their objectives and purposes, and the exposure of our own weaknesses in the West, woke us up and we moved to rebuild our own strength and that of many other allied countries.

I daresay, Mr. Chairman, that Mr. Khrushchev may find that the biggest blunder in his career was to pull off the Castro operation in Cuba, if it proves to have revealed to all of us in the Western Hemisphere our weaknesses and the things each of its countries must do, individually and collectively, if they are to avoid the fate of the people of Cuba, and the hemisphere come to disaster.

Some have called this the Castro bill. It can be thought of that way only in terms of what Castro's actions in Cuba have done to awaken the countries of this hemisphere to what is already happening and what can happen in the future. There is an increased realization that they cannot delay longer in making the changes necessary to make outside aid more effective than in the past. Many of the countries are now prepared to do the things that will better enable them to get started on the right road. They have been shocked into action by what has happened in one Latin American country.

Mr. Dillon testified: "It is the new realization in Latin America that really made us feel that the time was right and that we should join in this to help them." So there are two main reasons why this bill is before us today: First, it is to give important and needed help to people who are our close friends and neighbors. Second, representatives from all these countries are going to meet next week with our representatives in Bogotá, and we want our representatives to be able to show that we are prepared to help them do the things that will enable them better to meet their problems.

The whole of Latin America is in need of increased attention if they and we together are to cure the grave difficulties and prevent the spread of unrest and disquiet there and eventually in our own country.

The chairman of our committee has made clear that we cannot say now just exactly what this program will be. No money will be made available for any projects until they have been carefully worked out and justified before our committees next year. No money is requested at this time. What we are doing is enabling our negotiators when they meet in Bogotá next week to demonstrate that the Congress of the United States recognizes the long overdue necessity for joint action to improve the conditions about which we are so concerned and that to the extent agreements can be worked out that are sound, Congress is willing to give such aid next year, project by project, as will produce economic and social development in the hemisphere, and the resulting greater security to all.

What is the alternative to such action? It is certain disintegration. So I think this proposal is sound, prudent, and necessary, and I am confident the Congress will overwhelmingly adopt it.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I favor the passage of H.R. 13021, a bill

to provide for assistance in the development of Latin America and in reconstruction of Chile, and for other purposes.

Three years ago I went to South and Central America to determine if we were not giving too much military assistance in that area and if we were not giving too little aid in the economic field.

I came back with the definite opinion we should limit our military assistance because we found in some cases it was not used for internal security but sometimes used to maintain dictators in office.

I found there was a crying need for more economic aid in the very fields which this bill provides $500 million for; namely, improvement in the conditions of rural living and land use; second, improvement of housing and community facilities; third, improvement of educational systems and training facilities; and fourth, improvement in basic sanitation facilities.

Then this bill provides for $100 million for the reconstruction and rehabilitation of Chile. Certainly to help Chile after her great disasters from earthquakes and floods is but a humanitarian act and such assistance is absolutely necessary to help Chile maintain financial stability.

The bill also provides for increase of the contingency fund by $100 million.

The President has made this request to meet sudden developments such as has happened in the Congo and where other critical situations may develop. I believe this should be done.

This policy of economic aid for Latin America is long overdue and I certainly am glad it is being brought up at this time.

I strongly favor the passage of this bill.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON].

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, I take no pleasure in opposing the distinguished chairman and my colleagues on the Foreign Affairs Committee. I compliment the chairman as being a devoted man and an able leader, but I say this is the worst piece of legislation I have seen come to this floor in the years which I have been a Member of this body.

My good friend from Minnesota [Dr. JUDD] has just said, and so has the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, that they are unable to tell you what this money is for. Of course, they cannot tell you. No one knows. It is a rabbit-out-of-the-hat proposition.

I wholly agree with what the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW] and our majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMICK] has said about temperance in this debate; that we should not say those things which would give ammunition to those who oppose us; to those elements who would hang on to every opportunity to make propaganda unfavorable to our country. I shall try not to do that.

I think this is "do something." That is what it is, "do something," but to do something we commit this Nation to $500 million, for something we do not know about.

There are two schools of thought. Some say, "Oh, this is a gesture." I would hate to think this is only a gesture. That would be dishonest to our friends and neighbors in Latin America. The fact is it is a long-term commitment in sums which are undefined, but it has been estimated to run into billions of dollars. For what? Well, there are some platitudes expressed. We are going to raise the standard of living, we are going to do many of those things which some of us oppose doing in this Nation, that is, furthering and encouraging socialism in Latin America.

But what a travesty this was down in San José; tragic that our people should agree to pass a major sentence upon a nation which has given us no difficulty, and a slap on the wrist to a regime which is obviously an agent of international communism. I shall say no more about that. I would like to say a great deal more but it is not good to furnish propaganda to those who really do not need any more furnished. They can dream it up themselves. It is not a compliment, either, to this Congress or to our friends to the south that we should come here with this type of legislation in order that our people down in Bogotá next week may tell the Latin American leaders that we are going to work out a program; that we are committing ourselves over the years to untold billions for some nebulous and vague type of cooperation. In other words, "to do something, just something, because we find ourselves in an untenable position, because we have let the attitudes between ourselves and our neighbors deteriorate. So we rush in with dollars. It is dollar diplomacy. That is what they have been talking about in Latin America, lo, for a half century and we will prove it by adopting this bill. We should know by this time, Mr. Chairman, that it takes more than dollars to make friends around this world. A rush to shower more money on Latin America is not going to put a mad dog of the Caribbean in the pound.

The great colossus to the north. Dollar diplomacy. And yet we are proving exactly what they say by holding this thing out in front. So, if we want "to do something," then we should strike out this second section. We should strike it out and leave the policy statement in the first part of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I am for aid to Chile. That nation has suffered terribly by reason of the recent earthquake. They need help, but I shall offer an amendment to strike out section 2 of this measure which authorizes the appropriation of $500 million. With the first section, our people in Bogotá, meeting next week, will have the authority and the prestige to develop something to present to the next Congress meeting in January 1961.

I am not willing to write a blank check on the taxpayers of this country, beginning with one-half billion dollars as a first payment, without knowing what it is for. I am not willing at any time to commit this Nation to a policy of socializing other nations.

In addition, Mr. Chairman, now is the time to determine who are our friends and who are not. It is time also to exercise loyalty to those who are stable and to exhibit sternness toward those who are spreading the disease of communism in the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR].

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, I think everyone in this Chamber and almost every person in our country wants to do what is necessary to help our friends to the south. We want to preserve our friendship and our neighborliness with Latin America. We are willing to do what is necessary in that respect. We are willing to spend what is necessary. But, we want to know what we are spending and for what it is being spent.

Now, what, monetarily, is in the bill before us here today? Three items: $500 million for Latin America generally; $100 million for Chile; and $100 million additional to the contingency fund, which is generally thought to be for Africa; in fact, it has been said it is for Africa. As to the latter, the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee has said he will move to strike that from the bill, because it was enacted into law a few days ago in connection with other legislation. That leaves us, therefore, with a bill authorizing $600 million.

Now let us look briefly at what has been happening. One day last week—Friday, I think it was—we passed legislation providing $100 million for the contingency fund, but we were in so much of a hurry to pass that legislation that we passed it without prior authorization. Secondly, today we have added to a bill previously passed by this House money which will also be used in our foreign aid or mutual security program. This was done hastily, and, in my opinion, not as a fully considered step. Now again we have before the House a bill requesting $700 million, pared down to $600 million, which is in addition to the other two steps to which I have made previous reference. In great haste, in the closing days of the Congress, we are here asked for these great sums of money. And, I think the Members of this body ought to know, in the light of our desire for speedy adjournment, that if we enact this legislation before us now, that that does not end the matter. This bill has to go back to the Senate again, because there are changes in wording which will require action by the other body.

As I have said, in this bill we are asked to authorize an appropriation of $600 million. As to the $500 million for Latin America, there is no program proposed. We do not know how the money will be spent. We do not know what it will be spent for. I should like to call the attention of this body to the fact that I hold in my hand here the hearings upon this bill for $600 million.

These are the hearings, in this little pamphlet. There was one man who testified before the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Under Secretary of State, Mr. Dillon. There is also a statement in here from the Department of the Treasury. There is a statement in

opposition by the Citizens Foreign Aid Committee. That is the extent of the hearings which are printed for the Committee on Foreign Affairs and upon which the decision to report this bill out was made; the statement by Mr. Dillon, the cross-examination by members of the committee, the statement by the Treasury and the statement by the Citizens Foreign Aid Committee.

I say to you, Mr. Chairman, that a measure of this importance ought not to be presented to this House with no more study, no more investigation than is contained in these hearings.

It was said earlier that we must take this action because there is an emergency; we must show our support of those who will represent our country at Bogotá. Mr. Chairman, we have shown our support of what may be necessary for our representative at this coming conference at Bogotá to have. That was shown by the action of the other House in passing the two bills which were combined to make the one before us today. It was shown by the action of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs in reporting this bill out. I think we have shown a great willingness to do, I repeat, all that is necessary to support our friends and neighbors in Latin America, our friends and neighbors to the south of us. But to come before the Congress in this fashion, in the closing hours of the session, with a program which has been no more carefully worked out than this, it seems to me is a very unusual step and one which ought to be considered with the greatest of care.

A question was asked here a little while ago as to whether or not this $500 or $600 million would be the total cost of the program to be inaugurated here. I know of no one who has made himself familiar with the information that we have on these proposals who believes that this is other than a downpayment on a very long-term and expensive program.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAIR. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MORGAN. I want to inform the gentleman—I am sure he has this information—that in the President's message he definitely urgently requests speed in this authorization. I have a letter in my hand from the Secretary of State, since his return, in which he again urgently asks immediate adoption of this authorization. The reason the committee moved with such speed is because of the demands of the short session and the urgency suggested to the committee by the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. ADAIR. I understand the position of the chairman, and he has been eminently fair in this matter. My position with respect to that, however, is that even though there is this great demand for action we ought to take time to explore the matter in more detail. If it means taking more time of the Congress I think that ought to be done rather than to try to embark upon a program of this sort, with these hearings which I consider were inadequate.

Mr. MORGAN. The gentleman knows that the time of the Congress is not what is involved here. It is a question of the meeting at Bogotá next Tuesday. That is the only meeting that will be held this year. The gentleman knows also that the President made this request back in July. The President could not make his request earlier because the Organization of American States had not had their final meeting until sometime near the end of June. It is just the way this matter has developed. Nobody is really responsible except that when Congress returned for this special session, the President, members of the executive branch, Members of Congress, and members of the committee felt that we had no excuse for going to Bogotá without some expression of congressional intent.

Mr. ADAIR. I would say to the gentleman that if it is for use at Bogotá, first of all, as I pointed out a little while ago, we have shown the disposition of Congress to give the representatives of this country what support they need.

Second, even though the conference will meet on the 5th, which I believe is the date, we could have taken a few more days, we could have heard a few more witnesses, we could have explored the matter a little more fully.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAIR. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The President has sent a good many messages to Congress. Is it not true that he sent, probably in the same message about which the gentleman from Pennsylvania is talking, a 21-point program? Is the gentleman from Pennsylvania equally as interested in the other 21 points of the program and does he acquiesce in everything the White House sends down here?

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAIR. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. I want to commend the gentleman for the statement he has made here today, and I concur in the greatest part of it. The gentleman asked why there is a sudden urgency here for this particular program. I want to give the gentleman the benefit of what I think is the urgency. The American people are beginning to find out a little more about this giveaway program. They are beginning to find out a little bit about its costs. So this Congress now has been confronted with first, the regular appropriation, and second, an emergency and supplementary program. The only emergency about this program is that they want to get the Congress of the United States committed to a program about which nobody can tell you the cost, and nobody can tell you what the money is going to be used for. In other words, the gentleman has correctly stated that this is just a downpayment on something that we do not know where it is going to go, what for, who is going to spend it, or anything else. The American people when they once catch up with this program are going to demand that it cease, because if you put this program to a vote of the American people I predict it would be defeated better than 9 to 1.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAIR. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Mrs. CHURCH. May I offer this testimony to the gentleman from Indiana, who with some others including myself has long urged greater attention to Latin America. There is no Member of the House who approaches the problem of foreign affairs with greater interest and greater regard for the welfare of this Nation. For many years where the mutual security legislation has been under consideration, the minority on the Foreign Affairs Committee, of which the gentleman speaking is a very honored member, has published a report, in which we have insisted that more attention be paid to Latin America and its problems. We have thought that that assistance has been too long delayed. Will the gentleman in fairness to himself not repeat the statement which he made at the beginning of his remarks, that where these programs are brought up in detail for consideration, there is no one who will give more attention to the needs and the programs of Latin America than the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. ADAIR. I thank the gentlewoman from Illinois.

If there were before us today nothing but the question of assistance for Chile, I do not think there would be anybody against it. I think anyone would be willing to give what is needed. That is my position. We want to do what is needed, but this is not the way to do it. It is our hope and intent to do all that is necessary to preserve the integrity of our hemisphere, the friendship of its peoples and prevent the spread of communism.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HALEY].

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this program. I think it is a bad program. Nobody has explained to me the necessity for this hasty action.

Mr. Chairman, the day the House of Representatives reconvened was the 25th anniversary of the death of the beloved Will Rogers—the part Indian Oklahoma cowboy who started out as a comedian and wound up recognized as one of the great political philosophers of our time.

A bronze, remarkably lifelike statue of Will Rogers stands in the corridor just outside this Chamber. And if that statue could see, could hear, what we are being called on to do here today, I am sure that he would repeat—and repeat with sadness and emphasis—something he said three decades ago.

Will Rogers said—unfortunately with more truth than humor—that "our foreign policy is an open book—a checkbook."

We are meeting here today to prove—I fear—that what Will Rogers said 30 years ago is still the truth—to prove that our administrations, our Government, learns slowly, if it learns at all. We have a problem in our relations with some of our Latin American neighbors.

And what is the answer of President Eisenhower, and of the administration's

foreign policy advisers, of the President's State Department, his international cooperation administration, to this problem? It is, as we can all plainly see, what Will Rogers called an open book—an open checkbook.

In my years in Congress, Mr. Chairman, I have been puzzled by these foreign aid programs of ours. What started out to be doubt as to their usefulness soon turned into certainty that if they had any usefulness, it was not usefulness to the United States. And lately, that certainty has turned, in my mind and in my heart, to disturbance and outrage that we in Congress are asked year after year to continue these programs—and that year after year, we knuckle under to those demands of the administration.

But, in all candor, I must say that my sense of outrage over past administration requests in the foreign-aid field pale into near insignificance in comparison with my feelings about this proposition which is before us today. This proposal that we start an entirely new foreign-aid program—that we authorize the spending of a cold half a billion dollars of the taxpayers' money to start it—can be characterized, in my mind, in only one way: It is an indecent proposal.

It is so outrageous that the administration should have blushed with shame when it advanced the idea. And it is a proposal so indefensible that I cannot understand how any Member of the Congress can vote to approve it and then go home and find any way in which he can defend that vote. I will not need, when I go home, to defend my vote. My vote will be against this—and my vote will represent, not just what JIM HALEY thinks, but what an overwhelming number of his constituents, regardless of party, think also.

Mr. Chairman, I know that I should not call a proposal by the President of the United States offensive unless I have grounds to base that charge. I do have those grounds.

This proposal is offensive because it was made recklessly and without thought—as the expedient but haphazard answer to a problem to which the administration, after slumbering for 7 years, suddenly awakened just a few short months ago. It is misleading because it was first laid before us as an emergency matter; but the administration now has confessed that this immediate outlay we have been asked to approve is nothing more than the downpayment on another long-range foreign-aid program. And it is outrageous because the administration, although insisting that it must have this money, has no plan for its use.

And it is—in essence—just another scheme designed to confuse the American people and to confuse the membership of the Congress. The foreign aid program, as we all know, started out as a relatively simple thing after World War II. But the schemers and the do-gooders quickly realized that the only way to keep it not only alive but growing was to conceal some of its aspects.

As a result, over the years, we have been asked to vote for more and more hidden appropriations, for more and more lump sums for distribution for programs about which the administration refuses to tell us anything, and for more and more devices which, while actually foreign aid, have labels which are meant to conceal—if not meant outright to deceive this body and the American people.

This proposition we are faced with today is but another of those devices. We are told that there is a great emergency in our relations with our Latin American neighbors. But we are not told what that emergency is. We are told that this money is an absolute necessity to meet that emergency. But we are not told—because the administration's own spokesman cannot tell us—how this money will be used.

Moreover, we are told that the reason that the so-called emergency exists is that we have not heretofore included the Latin American nations in our foreign aid programs to any material extent. That statement is demonstrably untrue. It takes a little tracking down in a complicated maze of records and subterfuges—but when tracked down, the records show, Mr. Chairman, that in 14 years of foreign aid we have extended a helping hand to the Latin American nations in the amount of $7,900 million.

We are asked today to approve this outlay of another half a billion dollars to launch a new program which in the long run will amount to untold billions more. But we are given no opportunity to make any study of the proposal, or of the supposed need. Even if we had the opportunity, we could make no intelligent study—nor could the distinguished members of our foreign affairs and appropriations committees—because the facts needed for intelligent study are not available.

They are not available, Mr. Chairman, because the administration has not made any such facts available. The administration has not made the facts available because it has no facts, not even any plans, to lay before us. President Eisenhower's spokesman, Under Secretary of State Douglas Dillon, said so himself. In an official appearance before the foreign aid committee, Secretary Dillon said, in effect, "we sure do need the money. But we do not know what we are going to do with it when we get it."

The cold truth, it appears to me, is that there is no need at this time for any such program as is proposed here. The cold truth is that this half a billion dollars will be of more use to our own country and our own taxpayers if it is used to begin a reduction of the national debt. And, Mr. Chairman, if it is an absolute must that we just throw away another half a billion dollars, I think the time has come when we throw it away in our own country, for the supposed benefit of our own taxpayers, rather than to throw it away in lavish programs for the benefit of the people of other lands.

I plead with all of you, on both sides of the aisle, to examine your consicences and examine your hearts—and then join me in an effort to defeat this bill.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT].

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I think this is one of the most important and most timely subjects we could discuss here today.

Almost lost amid the fanfare and fireworks of this election year has been the aching problem of Latin America. It is time that we had a discussion of this subject, of what we are doing, and what we are not doing, to settle the seething ferment in our own hemisphere.

The 20 Republics of Central and South America and of the Caribbean are closer to us—and more important to us—than any other area of the world. They buy more of our goods and sell us more of theirs than any other group of nations. Theirs is the world's fastest growing population. Their continued friendship, from a cold and selfish military standpoint, is indispensable to our safety.

Today Latin America is a churning cauldron of conflict, of keyed up emotions and long-smothered aspirations gasping for air. The problem it poses cannot be swept under the rug, nor solved by a gesture. We must not allow it to be obscured in our preoccupation with other matters.

The President, obviously shaken by the recent turn of events, has called upon Congress in an 11th hour move to pass this bill to authorize $600 million for Latin American grants. One hundred million is for reconstruction in earthquake-smitten Chile.

The specific uses to which the remainder would be put are not entirely clear. We are told only that this authorization will strengthen the hands of our negotiators at the Inter-American Conference in Bogotá next month, and that the funds will probably go for potable water systems, vocational and technical training, and land utilization and settlement programs.

Let us not belittle the request. These are worthy goals. Yet the yawning need is not simply for more money. The problems will not be solved merely by money. The need is for a new outlook, for a new understanding, for a new approach.

We need to ask ourselves some searching questions. Why, in a land just 90 miles off our coast which owes its very independence to our sponsorship, can a man hold power while playing cozy games with the Communists and making our Nation the whipping boy of his ridiculous rantings?

Why is there such an unmistakable wave of sympathy throughout Latin America for "Castroism" as it is called? Why did the attempted "Good Will Tour" of our Vice President turn into a series of riots? Why did Guatemala succumb completely to the Communist lure 6 years ago? And what must we do today to reverse the situation?

Part of the answer lies in the unmistakable appeal of Castro's land reform promises throughout a region of the world where 1.5 percent of the people own more than half of all of the tillable acreage. In Venezuela, 90 percent of the land is owned by 3 percent of the people.

In most Latin American countries, the preponderant majority are tenant farmers, impoverished, deeply in debt and

without hope. Mired in the futility of a 20th Century feudalism, they see no promise of a brighter mañana through the slow and orderly processes.

Part of the answer lies in their tragic history of heartbreaking disappointments with corruptible leaders—and with the fact that the United States has too often been identified in Latin minds with unpopular and undemocratic local regimes which often have dispensed our largesse as though it were their own patronage and sometimes used our military assistance for their own internal purposes in the manner of police states.

A part of the truth is that they have seen in us the symbol of self-assumed superiority. The fact that we for the most part have refused even to try their language and have required them instead to use ours for communications between us has rancored.

And a part of the answer lies, of course, in the aggressive nature of the Communist propaganda menace. When the Voice of America was forced through a shortage of funds in 1953 to abandon its wave length to Guatemala, this was snapped up immediately by the Soviets and a few months later that country fell to the Red Arbenz regime.

Communist China, concentrating on Latin America as one of its chief targets, last year induced more than 400 Latin American opinion makers to visit its country. Students, educators, labor leaders, writers, and even political leaders were given expense free trips. Going one step further, Peiping and Moscow weekly beam throughout Latin American countries 74 hours of Spanish language broadcasts and 28 hours in Portuguese, the language of Brazil in which we seldom offer any broadcasts.

Where do we start in recapturing our lost prestige and in recreating the friendship so carefully nurtured over the years through the good neighbor policy? Let us start by showing that we stand for something, not only against something. Let us exert an influence in every country for regular, free elections—for the guarantee of individual liberties—for nonviolent local self-determination.

We could demonstrate that land reform may be achieved without Communist confiscation through a sort of Latin-American FHA, where we could join 50–50 with friendly governments not in gifts but in loan guarantees for tenant farmers to buy small parcels of their own to be paid out over the long pull from their own crops. Nothing stabilizes a people like home and farm ownership.

A friend of mine who is on a teaching fellowship in Central America says, "Most students do not have the money needed for books." Why not set up mobile lending libraries with inexpensively bound copies of the good American books in Spanish?

And let us require all our Government employees—and encourage privately employed Americans throughout Latin America—to learn their language. Our diplomats should stop giving the impression of cultivating only the cream of local society—the limousine and fur set—and of being disinterested in the "great unwashed," the average people to whom the Soviets are making their fervid appeal.

Labor leaders in Latin America often are the first targets of Soviet propaganda. Let us beat the Communists to the punch by an exchange program, bringing labor leaders here for visits in the homes of local American union officers—radio commentators for visits with American newscasters—teachers with teachers and newsmen with newsmen.

Let us show, in deeds as well as words, that we want not only to be understood but to understand them. Above all else, let us keep the reservoir of good will that we have left by behaving honorably. Let us never truckle to the corrupt nor appear to offer bribes. Honest respect begets true friendship which is infinitely better than pretended affection. "There was a time," sadly recalled an old Latin American hand with our Bureau of Public Roads, "when palabra ingles (the English word) meant something everywhere in the hemisphere. Today it means nothing." Let us make it mean something again.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, for better or worse, and I think it is all for the better, the doors to the tomorrow are open. Peoples all over the world are flocking to those doors, new governments, and back of those governments, people, people who in the past have not had enough food, not enough dignity, not enough opportunity, not an equitable share in the sunlight. They yearn to leave the narrow life behind. Now they are rushing for the open door to a promising tomorrow. I would not want to see my country try to hold them back. I would like my country to be in the position of helping them go through the door and reach a brighter and more wholesome tomorrow. We are in one of the great periods of the long history of the world, a period of dynamic change as mankind climbs to a higher plateau than any we have known. In that climb it is my prayer that our beloved country will lead.

What is proposed here? This is nothing complicated. Either we live with our neighbors in the climate of true hemispheric solidarity or we will not survive. We cannot continue to take for granted their friendship unless we have shown to them that in us they have, indeed, a friend. It is not enough that we should supply a buying market for their coffee, their bananas, their oil, and their other products. They would wish stabilization in this buying market in order that their economies would not be subject to uncertain fluctuations. Whether working together in cooperation something in this direction can be achieved, I do not know. I can only hope that progress in this direction can be made.

But there are ways, sound and constructive ways, of expanding the gainful activities of our neighbors and doing it in a way that the benefits will go deeply into the grassroots. Working together the American Republics can raise the living standards of people who no longer are content endlessly to grapple with poverty and who, in this period of unrest all over the world, are rushing toward the open doors of a promising tomorrow.

May I stop for a moment to say that I have warm regard for my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana, and I agree with my colleague, the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH], that Ross ADAIR makes a fine contribution to our committee. He says that the measure we are now considering should have been presented to our committee in January and then it might have been received, possibly with favor, if I understood the gentleman's remarks.

But, Mr. Chairman, the problem was not here in January. There was a developing storm in the Caribbean, and my colleagues will note that I do not pronounce the word Ca-ribb-ean. No pirate ever sailed on the Ca-ribb-ean. These storms daily gained momentum. It is an easy way out to put the blame on someone in Cuba or somebody elsewhere. We may not approve of what someone in a foreign land is doing, and we may regret his attitude toward us and wish that it were more in the approach of mutual understanding, but the foreign policy of our country I feel strongly should be built upon noninterference in the domestic affairs of another nation, and criticism, either friendly or unfriendly, of foreign personalities could give the unintended appearance of interfering in the domestic affairs of another nation. So I have sought always to avoid in my discussions on international matters reference to personalities.

Wherever you find disorder and you find large gatherings of people, you will find some cause or causes of discontent. It well may be that their emotions have been worked up, and that there has been an organized effort to excite but, nevertheless, at the bottom is something that is bothering people and makes them responsive.

The unrest in Latin America has been spreading. This unrest the Communists will seek with ever-increasing drive to utilize for purposes of ultimate enslavement. The fact is, that in a democratic government the peoples of any land, the peoples down to the humblest, will be benefited and dignity and contentment given to their lives, exactly as it has been done in our own beloved country.

We have our struggles and our shortcomings and sometimes we are slow in reaching desired objectives, but always we make progress and always the concept and the practice of social justice expands. So will it be in all the countries to the south of us, and as the peoples of those lands are rushing to the open doors of a promising tomorrow we as a good neighbor, working cooperatively with them, must lead the way. With them we must work to find some way, some program for social advancement, a program that will reach into the lives of the little people and will give brightness to their days and dignity and hope.

It is a most strengthening development in our hemispheric relations that the nations of this hemisphere are meeting at Bogotá to work out such a program. Our neighbors attending this conference

want some evidence that our great country is interested. That is all, just a showing of our interest and our sincerity. I do not like to hear this called a blank check or that Secretary Dillon is going down to give away money as a giveaway, or as a bribe for friendship. All of that is poppycock. This bill does not carry one cent of real money. It is an authorization, an authorization for appropriations that later may be made for a program that first must be submitted to and approved by the Congress. It is merely an evidence of our good intent to cooperate with the other American States when a program has been developed that these American States believe will be constructive and sound and attain the desired objective.

I was concerned when Secretary Dillon appeared before our committee. An authorization does not necessarily mean that any money is going to be appropriated. In Illinois we have been interested for many years in the Cal-Sag project, and it was 20 years after the voting of the authorization before 1 cent was appropriated to begin work. I said:

Mr. Secretary, is not this an idle gesture? Can we honestly go down there and say that because we have authorized it that means we are going to back it up with an appropriation?

I further said:

Won't they regard this as merely an idle gesture and therefore something dishonest?

This is Mr. Dillon's answer to my question and his answer is important, and I trust will be carefully noted by my colleagues:

I see your problem but if there is, as we hope, substantial support for this program in the Congress, I think they will take that as an indication of what may come in the future. Certainly I think they will look at the fact that when this program was approved by the Senate, both of the nominees for executive office, for President and Vice President, of the Democratic Party voted in favor of this, and do favor this program, and they know that this program is also favored by the present administration, including the Republican candidate on the other side.

I think they can be assured of support by the Executive, maybe modified in accordance with the way the new Executive will look at this matter next year.

Certainly I have talked with Senator KENNEDY in his capacity as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, and he favors this program and was very pleased that it was not spelled out in greater detail, because while he thought that this was a good idea and that it was necessary to give the Latin Americans an idea of our support he felt the new administration, whichever it might be, should have an opportunity to take another look at and spell out the details of how this would be handled.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, the problem here is whether we strengthen the hand of our United States representatives who are now leaving to negotiate next week on Latin America at the Bogota Conference. We should recognize our good friends and neighbors of Latin America and actually give them equal treatment with the countries the United States has previously aided under the Marshall plan.

As many of you know, there has been much criticism because the United States had first moved to aid European countries. Many of us know that it was because they had to be aided immediately to repair war damage and dislocation from world. That is an industrial area that had to be restored under the threat of aggression, and the threat was immediate at that time.

In Latin America are some of the best customers and best friends we in the United States have in this entire world. We are a Western Hemisphere republic. and these countries are neighbors and also Western Hemisphere people. We have the same heritage, and all face many of the same problems.

I would like to point out to you that this bill for economic aid to Latin America is a bipartisan measure, that in each of the Republican and Democratic parties, the leaders have said that we favor a program of this type for Latin America.

The Republican platform of 1960 has this quotation on Latin America and other countries:

In Latin America, Asia, Africa and the Middle East, people of ancient and recent independence have shown their determination to improve their standards of living, and to enjoy an equality with the rest of mankind in the enjoyment of the fruits of civilization. This determination has become a primary fact of their political life. We declare ourselves to be in sympathy with their aspirations. * * * We will encourage the countries of Latin America, Africa, the Middle East and Asia, to initiate appropriate regional groupings to work out plans for economic and educational development. We anticipate that the United Nations Special Fund would be of assistance in developing such plans. The United States would offer its cooperation in planning, and the provision of technical personnel for this purpose. Agreeable to the developing nations, we would join with them in inviting countries with advanced economies to share with us a proportionate part of the capital and technical aid required. We would emphasize the increasing use of private capital and government loans, rather than outright grants, as a means of fostering independence and mutual respect. The President's recent initiation of a joint partnership program for Latin America opens the way to this approach.

I would like to say to the House this is a joint partnership program approach for Latin America, that not only President Eisenhower but our previous President, Harry Truman, of the other party, has recommended economic aid, and technical assistance for the Latin American countries. Likewise, it is a constructive extension of the good neighbor policy that was proposed and entered into under President Roosevelt. It was a bipartisan approach.

May I point out that not only the Republican nominee for President, Mr. NIXON, but also the Democratic nominee for President, Mr. KENNEDY, have approved this bill and recommend the program.

Previously in 1959 both Senator JOHNSON and Senator KENNEDY, the presidential and vice presidential candidates, voted on foreign aid and favored such aid programs, and this was before politics of a predetermined nature of 1960 came into question.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, we find that when the 1959 foreign aid program was before the Senate, both Senator JOHNSON and Senator KENNEDY voted against a cut in the Development Loan Fund authorization. In 1959 both Senator KENNEDY and Senator JOHNSON voted against an amendment to require the President to submit a detailed estimate, country by country, on future foreign aid requests.

It is particularly appropriate to consider that second point here because there has been some comment made by the opponents to this bill that there should be submitted detailed country by country estimates on this kind of a foreign aid request. As we know, on this kind of social and economic aid program, such kind of a prior country by country estimate is impossible, because at Bogotá we are going to consult as to how these various countries can help themselves, then how we in the United States can work in partnership with these Latin American countries for peace and progress. So we must wait until these programs are set up country by country by consultation and cooperation. These proposals must be worked upon by our people in the State Department, and under the mutual security program, as well as the various programs such as the Development Loan Cooperation Fund, the Export-Import Bank, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and others.

Mr. NIXON on May 21, 1958, expressed his sincere interest in Latin America. This proves that the Latin American interest and approach is a bipartisan policy. I will put that statement of Vice President NIXON in the RECORD.

It is as follows:

We must prove that * * * when private enterprise comes into Latin America * * * we do so not for the purpose of keeping in power a group of the elite (nor) of making the rich richer and keeping the poor poorer * * * but that * * * our policies are designed * * * to raise the standards of living of the miserably poor people all over Latin America * * * through a program of private enterprise of the 20th century enlightened type * * * combined with government assistance in those areas where private enterprise cannot do the job.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out further that I attended the Rio Economic Conference as an observer in 1954. At that time I recommended that the United States adopt a policy which would result during the current administration in $1 billion in economic and development aid through loans of the type of the Marshall plan aid or similar aid for nations in the Latin America and the Caribbean area. Since this proposal in

1954, the U.S. Government has to date already obligated $398.2 million in mutual security for nonmilitary assistance aid to Latin America.

On August 25, 1960, the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, of which I have been a member for almost 14 years, voted to report out the present bill introduced by our chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN], which we are discussing here, authorizing an additional $600 million in aid for Latin American nations. The $600 million authorization has already passed the other body and has been approved by the presidential candidates of both parties.

I am pleased to advise you that with this current $600 million new authorization, the total that has been obligated previously and presently authorized will be $998.2 million worth of U.S. economic aid for Latin America. As I stated to you, my recommendation in 1954 had been $1 billion, after having studied this matter and attended the Rio Economic Conference to see firsthand what the problems were, and I am glad to see that such a constructive program has now been implemented by the administration.

I would also like to point out to you that the U.S. sugar program of quotas and imports from Cuba into the United States and from various other countries, and territories of this country has always been a bipartisan program, supported by both the Republican and Democratic parties, so that I was glad to see that when we finished the last session of the Congress in the House on the last evening, the new sugar program of 1960 went through by not a disputed vote but by a unanimous voice vote.

I would like to point out that in the hearings on this bill before the House Foreign Affairs Committee, I questioned Secretary Dillon on the possibility of a proposal under this aid program, in connection with this $600 million authorization. As you know, I come from the city of Pittsburgh and the city of Clairton, Pa., known as the iron, steel, oil, coal, copper, aluminum manufacturing cities. I had questioned Mr. Dillon on whether we could not have the kind of a program that would try to use the surplus secondhand automobiles of this country, surplus trucks, railroad cars and equipment, motorcycles, and bicycles. My feeling is that if the Latin American people get transportation, that they will quickly progress and open up the backward areas, and resources, that are so badly needed. I am quoting from the hearings of the House Foreign Affairs Committee on the current bill for Latin American aid:

Mr. FULTON. I am interested particularly in transportation because I feel that will open new areas and enable localities and their people to move from isolation and poverty to progress, and access to resources and markets.

So this program then should include railroads, river transportation and roads, and would likewise include bridges and public works, would it not?

Mr. DILLON. That is correct. Roads are one of the main needs. For instance, in the Peruvian program, there is a very good region on the eastern slope of the Andes which had never been settled because it is hard to get across the Andes. You have to build roads through there and as soon as they are built, people move in and begin to settle there.

Mr. FULTON. I am glad to see that you are proposing to extend the Public Law 480 program, the distribution of U.S. agricultural surpluses abroad, as you have mentioned in your statement chiefly to Chile, but also throughout Latin America. I feel that is a very good move, as we in the U.S. Government should move promptly to dispose of our U.S. agricultural surpluses for good purposes among our friends and neighbors in Latin America who are among our best friends and customers.

Secondly, is there any way under this program where you could finance the moving of secondhand railroad equipment, automobiles, trucks, motorcycles and bicycles, as well as used planes and aviation equipment out of the United States, and put the South American people on good roads and in modern equipment? They might do better for themselves and it certainly would create whole new industries, create new employment, new uses of oil, steel, copper, electrical equipment and would certainly stimulate U.S. industry, increase employment and create millions of new customers for the basic industries of the United States and Latin America.

Mr. DILLON. That is something we will have to investigate.

At the time of the testimony of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD], before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs on Friday, June 17, 1960, during a meeting of the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs, the following colloquy occurred:

Mr. FULTON (to Congressman FLOOD). The question then comes, should there be a corollary to your approach to the Monroe Doctrine that would say that within the various countries of the Western Hemisphere there should be mutual agreement against armed aggression and to forbid external pressures against the peace and security of the people of another country by subversive methods.

Mr. FLOOD. My answer is yes.

Mr. FULTON. You agree it would almost be necessary to have the Monroe Doctrine enlarged because one country is used as a base and then the operations are from there within the Western Hemisphere. So, that it is really a requirement of more than the Monroe Doctrine principles.

Mr. FLOOD. That is right.

Mr. FULTON. You use the Monroe Doctrine as a base for a change of U.S. policy in our hemisphere. I would go further than the Monroe Doctrine and add this policy as a necessary corollary for the protection of the individual countries and peoples in North and South America from armed attack and subversion by any outside power in Europe, Asia, or Africa, and also defend each country against armed attack, or outside pressures and subversion against the peace and security, by any other country of this hemisphere.

Mr. Chairman, we need a strong, firm U.S. policy for the Western Hemisphere based on the Monroe Doctrine and broadened to suit current needs, when we are faced with threats to our hemispheric security and progress through military power and new forms of subversion.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY].

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I asked for this time because there are one or two points I wanted to make in connection with this legislation and a few questions I would like to ask the Chairman of the Committee. From the examination that I have made of our foreign aid program all over the world, I have learned that we have made so many mistakes in administration, we have lost so many friends, that I hoped we would give greater attention to our activities in Latin America, to strengthen Western hemispheric ties and to establish a stronger democracy in the Americas.

In the debate here today, we have talked about sending our representatives to Bogotá with an indication of congressional intent. Even without this legislation, they will go to Bogotá with congressional intent clearly indicated because we have the mutual security program and its many provisions already in use or available for use.

I strongly support increased American aid to the countries of the Western Hemisphere. In a recent foreign policy address in my district, one of the main suggestions I made for improvement in our foreign aid program was that we should place primary emphasis on the development of the Western Hemisphere so that it can be economically independent and self-sufficient, permitting us to present a cohesive force of free peoples as democracy's answer to Communist slavery.

The bill which we are considering today contains a statement of policy for which I commend the Committee. I am disturbed, however, about section 2, which provides for an authorization of $500 million. I do not know how much will be needed for an adequate program in Latin America, and there is not any evidence that anyone else has factual knowledge to support any particular figure. What concerns me most is the fact that the administration apparently feels that a statement of policy must be accompanied by a definite dollar figure in order that our Latin American neighbors may be convinced of our sincerity. If this be true, it is indeed a sad commentary on the respect with which we are regarded. Is the ghost of dollar diplomacy haunting us even in the Western Hemisphere?

The report from the Foreign Affairs Committee states that they have been assured that the executive branch will not request appropriation of these funds until "comprehensive programs for their use have been worked out." In the absence of such programs, I question the wisdom of even authorizing such an appropriation, since we have found from past experience that earmarking of funds almost automatically leads to hasty, wasteful expenditures.

Once we have approved this authorization, we might as well face the fact that when we convene next year we will be asked to appropriate funds under it for any purposes to which the administration has in the meantime committed American support, whether we like them or not.

We will be told that as a result of this authorization the Latin American countries have been led to believe that $500 million will be appropriated, and if we do not appropriate that amount our southern neighbors will consider it a breach of faith.

Let any who feel this is an overstatement analyze the position in which we find ourselves today. We are told that we have to pass this bill because of what the Latin American countries have been

led to believe by the administration and that a failure to pass the bill will cause resentment among Latin American countries and a resulting loss of American prestige.

Step by step, then, we are led along the path beyond the point of no return.

In the past it has been established that the earmarking of funds in advance of detailed plans for their use has led to expenditures that were neither worthwhile nor economically sound. In those cases we were speaking of earmarking of appropriated funds. In this case, however, the administration has earmarked $500 million for Latin America not only before appropriation, but even before authorization, and now—today—we are told that we have to approve this extra-legal action or the foreign policy of the United States will suffer. I believe this constitutes a serious usurpation by the administration of a function which belongs to the Congress. There ought to be some way to stop administrative personnel from putting the Congress in this position.

Let me ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs [Mr. MORGAN] why it is necessary, in this bill, to authorize an additional $500 million at this time. Why can we not use existing mutual security funds?

Mr. MORGAN. First I would like to explain to the gentleman that the Committee is not claiming any credit for the statement of policy. The statement of policy was offered in the other body by Senator MANSFIELD, Senator CAPEHART, and Senator MORSE. The House Committee on Foreign Affairs just added several small amendments. So credit for the statement of policy, which the chairman agrees is a very good one, goes to the other body.

Of course, the Chairman has to agree with the gentleman from Virginia that authority already is contained in the Mutual Security Act, and that what he suggests possibly could be done. But the dollar sign is necessary if we are going to make any progress, if we are going to move ahead with this new social program outlined in the bill for Latin America.

Mr. HARDY. Could we not accomplish the stated policy under existing authority? The Development Loan Fund was created for purposes such as these. Loans, as well as grants, can be made by the International Cooperation Administration. There is a substantial appropriation for special assistance, and one for defense support, and we have just increased the President's contingency fund by $100 million. Are there not any number of pockets in which funds could be found if specific dollar commitments were needed at Bogotá?

Mr. MORGAN. I think the gentleman is correct. But I want to say that the real incentive for this program does not come from this country, but it came out of the meetings held over a series of months by the Organization of American States.

Mr. HARDY. I appreciate that. But I repeat this one thought. The purpose we need to accomplish is to state a proper policy and then undertake to effectuate that policy through intelligent, imaginative use of existing legislation. That is what I would hope that we will do.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, when the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] discussed this bill earlier in the general debate he asked the direct question, "Why is this legislation necessary?" I want to ask the same question, "Why is this legislation necessary?"

Yesterday morning I was told that there would be no more meetings of the Rules Committee. Later in the day a meeting of the Rules Committee was held and this legislation was reported. Nobody in the House as far as I am informed knew anything about the existence of such legislation.

They refer to it as an emergency; an emergency, I ask you, that takes precedence over the welfare of the boys and girls of America that need the school construction bill that is presently bottled up in the Rules Committee?

I want to read from the Washington Daily News of today an interview with Judge SMITH, chairman of the Rules Committee. During the course of the interview the reporter wanted to know the judge's position, and he said:

> I just paddle along and take a licking when it comes, but I don't let it worry me.

He said:

> I've never conceived the role of the Rules Committee to be to report out for consideration on the floor everything everybody wants. Why, some of those bills are Rube Goldberg things.

A little later the article stated:

> The reason, in his view, is simple: The Federal Government's got no moral or constitutional right to get into the field of public education.

In other words, what my colleagues and I are trying to do for the boys and girls of this country is a Rube Goldberg proposition, in his view.

I am just making the point that this proposition is inexcusable as it appears before the House today for consideration. You are not giving these countries the money, you are just taking the opportunity to ram down the throat of the House an authorization for a new spending program abroad.

When the President took it on himself to chide and even laugh at the Democratic Members of the House because of their impotency and inability to agree on a program, I thought the "honeymoon" was over.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL].

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, the Congress of the United States and this House finds itself today in a peculiar political box from which I can see no chance of escaping without doing great damage to our international relations throughout the world. This is the practical aspect of the matter before us today.

It has been said that there is no urgency. Do you not feel that the growing Communist strength in Cuba is an urgent matter for the United States? Those who say there is no urgency, do you mean that there are no serious disputes between the inter-American states which is dangerous to the security of the United States and the free people of the world? When you say there is no urgency, do you mean that there was no emergency which caused the meeting of the Organization of American States? Can it be said that there is no urgency in the concern of our Latin neighbors about the tremendous impact of the economic revolution taking place all through Central and South America? Their votes at every conference reflect their concern over the feelings of their people. Do you mean that we in the United States should not recognize the Latin American attitude of today as an urgent matter?

Do you mean to say, when you say that there is no urgency, that you believe the Western Hemisphere is not really the bulwark of freedom for the free people in our fight against communism but rather that we are just going to open up Latin America to the Communists because those who object to this proposal do not have a good alternative? I have heard none mentioned here today.

Some do not like the dollar sign. I do not like it either. But it takes dollars properly used to effect the programs the Latins themselves have been urging to faster economic changes in a peaceful manner. Because we do not like the dollar sign are we going to open the door and let the commies come in and take over all of Latin America?

Do you mean to tell me there is no urgency in the meeting at Bogotá where the economic ministers will meet to determine a progressive and affirmative program for Latin America?

Do you mean to tell me there is no need in Latin America for the program as the Secretary testified before our committee program on page 5 of the hearings:

> Such an authorization would provide a framework within which we and our friends from Latin America can develop new and more effective plans and programs for attacking the problems of social progress.
>
> We envisage that the conference should agree upon the basic objectives of a program for social development which gives primary attention to needs in three broad areas: First, improvement of the conditions of rural living and land use; second, improvement of housing and community facilities; and, third, improvement of educational systems and training facilities.

Yes; that need is there. There is no question about that. We all know it and recognize it—no one here today disputes it.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY] was correct when he said that there is no need for authorization, except for the money amount. Legally and technically you can accomplish all of the objectives of this Latin program, as pointed out by the Assistant Secretary on page 27 of the hearings under the mutual security program. But this bill is to emphasize our interest in

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Latin America. It is demonstrative evidence of our sincere desire. Many people have insisted upon emphasis in Latin America, foreseeing the very difficulty we are in at this minute. The President's brother as far back as 1953, reported to the President of the United States the need for a new look at Latin America. The Foreign Relations Committee in the Senate and the Foreign Affairs Committee in the House have long ago reported on the economic revolution taking place in Latin America and the need for an affirmative and strong program and leadership by the administration. So what we have to do and what we are faced with today is the necessity for the Congress, even though we have existing legislation, to emphasize to Latin America and to the world that we want to do something and, finally, at long last, we are moving to answer the urgent needs in Latin America. All those who have advocated emphasis in Latin America are going to have their opportunity today to vote on a bill which provides a part of that emphasis.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. HARDY. I am in complete accord that we need to do something to emphasize attention on Latin America and our attention to the needs down there. But would we not be in better shape to direct that attention be paid under the full resources of the existing law rather than providing additional funds just because somebody said we need a dollar sign?

Mr. FASCELL. If you could explain that in Latin America that would be fine, but the facts of life are that this bill is labeled a Latin American bill. This is the only way that clear emphasis can be had and the gentleman knows this. This is the only way you are going to get this idea across that the President finally recognizes the need for a new approach and the Congress is asked to support this new approach, notwithstanding that everything sought to be done can be done under existing law and obviously and admittedly has not been done. It would not do any good simply to reiterate support for Latin America under the mutual security bill at the Bogotá Conference.

Admittedly this bill—nor dollars alone—is not the sole answer to Latin America's economic needs—nor to communism in Latin America—but it does represent the United States' effort to improve an important facet of the whole problem.

This must be followed with a strong nonmonetary effort on the part of the United States and Latin American countries to formulate affirmative political and economic programs and climates conducive to free world objectives.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

STATEMENT OF POLICY

SECTION 1. (a) It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) the historic, economic, political, and geographic relationships among the American Republics are unique and of special significance and, as appropriate, should be so recognized in future legislation;

(2) although governmental forms differ among the American Republics, the peoples of all the Americas are dedicated to the creation and maintenance of governments which will promote individual freedom;

(3) the interests of the American Republics are so interrelated that sound social and economic progress in each is of importance to all and that lack of it in any American Republic may have serious repercussions in others;

(4) for the peoples of Latin America to continue to progress within the framework of our common heritage of democratic ideals, there is a compelling need for the achievement of social and economic advance adequate to meet the legitimate aspirations of the individual citizens of the countries of Latin America for a better way of life;

(5) there is a need for a plan of hemispheric development, open to all American Republics which cooperate in such plan, based upon a strong production effort, the expansion of foreign trade, the creation and maintenance of internal financial stability, the growth of free economic and social institutions, and the development of economic cooperation, including all possible steps to establish and maintain equitable rates of exchange and to bring about the progressive elimination of trade barriers;

(6) mindful of the advantages which the United States has enjoyed through the existence of a large domestic market with no internal trade barriers, and believing that similar advantages can accrue to all countries, it is the hope of the people of the United States that all American Republics will jointly exert sustained common efforts which will speedily achieve that economic cooperation in the Western Hemisphere which is essential for lasting peace and prosperity; and

(7) accordingly, it is declared to be the policy of the people of the United States to sustain and strengthen principles of individual liberty, free institutions, private enterprise, and genuine independence in the Western Hemisphere through cooperation with all American Republics which participate in a joint development program based upon self-help and mutual efforts.

(b) In order to carry forward the above policy, the Congress hereby—

(1) urges the President through our constitutional processes to develop cooperative programs on a bilateral or multilateral basis which will set forth specific plans of action designed to foster economic progress and improvements in the welfare and level of living of all the peoples of the American Republics on the basis of joint aid, mutual effort, and common sacrifice;

(2) proposes the development of workable procedures to expand hemispheric trade and to moderate extreme price fluctuations in commodities which are of exceptional importance in the economies of the American Republics, and encourages the development of regional economic cooperation among the American Republics;

(3) supports the development of a more accurate and sympathetic understanding among the peoples of the American Republics through a greater interchange of persons, ideas, techniques, and educational, scientific, and cultural achievements;

(4) supports the strengthening of free democratic trade unions to raise standards of living through improved management-labor relations;

(5) favors the progressive development of common standards with respect to the rights and the responsibilities of private investment which flows across national boundaries within the Western Hemisphere;

(6) supports the consolidation of the public institutions and agencies of inter-American cooperation, insofar as feasible, within the structure of the Organization of American States and the strengthening of the personnel resources and authority of the Organization in order that it may play a role of increasing importance in all aspects of hemispheric cooperation; and

(7) declares that it is prepared to give careful and sympathetic consideration to programs which the President may develop for the purpose of promoting these policies.

AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 2. In order to carry out the purposes of section 1 of this Act, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President not to exceed $500,000,000, which shall remain available until expended, and which the President may use, subject to such further legislative provisions as may be enacted, in addition to other funds available for such purposes, on such terms and conditions as he may specify. The Secretary of State shall keep the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House currently informed about plans and programs for the utilization of such funds.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 4, line 4, strike the word "gradual" and on page 4, line 5, strike the words "common markets" and insert in lieu thereof "economic cooperation".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 5, line 5, strike the last number "2" and insert in lieu thereof "1".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 4, after line 11, insert the following: "(4) supports the strengthening of free democratic trade unions to raise standards of living through improved management-labor relations;" and renumber the following subsections.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 5, line 7, strike "Secretary of State" and insert in lieu thereof "President" and in lines 8 and 9, strike "Secretary" and insert in lieu thereof "President".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BURLESON: On page 5 strike out line 5 and all that follows down through line 17 on page 5, and renumber the following sections accordingly.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, in earlier remarks I indicated that in my opinion the effort in this legislation was to "do something."

Mr. Chairman, to leave in the statement of policy in this measure does something—I must say parenthetically I am not even enthusiastic about that but it makes clear our intent to discuss a program of assistance in Latin America. I think it is indicative of the interest of the people of this country that we are willing to discuss common and mutual problems.

Let our people in Bogotá next week discuss these problems on the basis of

the policy statements which are clear and concise in the first section, and delete this authorization which carries a promise that has no basis. It cannot be justified by any available information. I am for the Chilean aid. As I recall it, we have already sent about $25 million down there, and the estimate is it will take about $400 million to rehabilitate Chile after this catastrophic earthquake which occurred not long ago. The Chilean people need help. They have applied for an Export-Import Bank loan and I hope they will be able to qualify for it. All Latin America will be aware of our response to this situation.

So we leave that in the bill, and we leave these other things in the bill. As I understand it, the appropriation is provided for in the last section. That being the case, we would come out with a bill to assist Chile; we would come out with a bill which says that our people will, in conference and discussion with people of Latin America, devise programs to bring before this Congress at its next session, for its consideration.

Mr. Chairman, this proposal is without precedent. To have legislation of this nature and in this form presented to us is not complimentary to this Congress, it is not complimentary to our friends in Latin America. We are taking our friends in Latin America for a bunch of idiots, if I must be so blunt as to say so. But remember my colleagues we are making a promise, we are committing ourselves to undefined obligations and unidentified programs. Oh, yes, we are committing ourselves for a long time in advance, starting with $500 million. Why, eventually you will be looking at requests for billions of dollars. But I had rather look at a program like that which has substance, which has a plan, which has a purpose, which has described goals, than to bring in 15 cents' worth of a bill like this and ask me to support it. If and when aid to Latin America is decided upon it should be in a businesslike, orderly way, without setting a precedent like this. We justify "do something" by adopting the first and third sections of the bill. Then you have something for our people to talk about and to negotiate about next week in Bogotá.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. What the gentleman is saying is that we are starting a program here that no one has said what it is going to cost. We do not know whether it is $500 million or what this program will cost. The gentleman says, let us take the language of the resolution or certain parts of it, let them go down there and come back and submit to the Congress of the United States a program that we know where we are going, what we are going to spend, and so forth. That is all the gentleman is asking for.

Mr. BURLESON. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ADAIR. Is it not true that under the gentleman's proposal there would be much money or little money sent down there as if we adopt the bill in its present form? Would any appropriated funds be available immediately?

Mr. BURLESON. No funds will be available under the authorization until appropriated but certainly the representatives of the United States meeting with Latin American officials will commit us to this sum.

Mr. ADAIR. It would be an indication of our intent and desire to help them.

Mr. BURLESON. That is true, and there is clearly expressed in this bill a statement of policy. With that statement of policy and the action of the Congress in adopting the first section, will give our people all the prestige they will need to carry on the negotiations.

I trust, Mr. Chairman, that the amendment I offer will be accepted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas is a most valuable member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and I certainly value his friendship and his work on the committee over a period of a good many years. And, I regret that today I have to rise in opposition to one of his amendments.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment strikes at the very heart of the bill. I cannot guarantee to this House that if we vote for this $500 million authorization that Latin America will not go Communist. But, let me say, that if we do not approve this $500 million authorization, we will knock the Bogotá Conference in the head. This is the heart of the bill, and if we adopt this amendment we will give the nations of Latin America a push in the wrong direction. I think this $500 million is vitally needed. It has been urgently requested by the President of the United States. Under Secretary of State Dillon made several appearances on the Hill not only before committees, but he conferred with the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and he visited me. I know he visited all the nominees for President and Vice President, and they approved this authorization. It is urgently needed. Our representatives are going to Bogotá next week, and I think this House will be making a terrific mistake if they adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Chairman, I address my remarks only to the sections of this bill which refer to Latin American aid, as I am unalterably opposed to the section which authorizes additional sums to the contingency fund to be used to stabilize the Communist-inclined government of the Republic of the Congo. It is my understanding, however, that the section dealing with an additional sum for the President's contingency fund will be eliminated by a committee amendment, which I certainly intend to support.

Mr. Chairman, by submitting this legislation to Congress on the eve of adjournment, the administration has presented us with the kind of dilemma posed by the question, "Have you stopped beating your wife?" The news of the administration's request for funds to embark on a new socially significant cooperative program with Latin America has been flashed to all the newspapers in that region. A refusal to enact this legislation could be interpreted by our friends in Latin America as congressional rejection of a program which they urgently require and have been urging for some time. On the other hand, congressional assent perforce implies that we give our wholehearted approval and support to the administration's proposal in its present form.

I retain grave doubts with regard to the authorization. I have no quarrel with the $100 million which is earmarked for reconstruction in Chile. All of us, I am sure, are sympathetic with the Chileans' heroic efforts to rebuild their country from the rubble left by a series of earthquakes.

My reservations pertain to the $500 million fund.

I am perturbed, in the first place, by the proposal's vagueness. We are told that the Inter-American Bank will probably administer the loan part of the program, amounting to 85 or 90 percent of the total. We are assured that the bank will apply certain fiscal criteria so that the loans will not be devoured by inflationary procedures. But, then again, we are informed that definite arrangements are yet to be worked out in Bogotá.

No one in the administration has yet made clear how the new program is to be coordinated with the existing mechanisms for aid to Latin America—the Export-Import Bank, the IMF, the IBRD, ICA, Public Law 480 loans, and the Development Loan Fund.

The administration has been unable even to tell us how they arrived at the figure of $500 million. It is a first installment, on we do not know what. In Secretary Dillon's words, "It could as well have been a different figure."

We are confronted with the argument that the administration has to go to Bogotá with the express backing of Congress spelled out—that the Latin Americans are weary and wary of repeated U.S. expressions of eagerness to cooperate, followed by inaction.

I am fearful that this hastily devised and vague legislation rammed through Congress in the waning hours of an emergency session may have the effect of raising the Latin American peoples' hopes beyond our ability to fulfill them.

The timing of the new aid program troubles me almost as much as its amorphous framework. Coming as it did on the eve of the Organization of American States meeting in Costa Rica to discuss the tense situation in the Caribbean, it unfortunately gave the appearance of a bribe dangled before the Latin American

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARY

Republics to support our position. It is no secret that the plan is referred to by many Latin Americans as "the Castro plan."

Secretary Dillon testified to the Foreign Affairs Committee that the timing of the proposal was an unfortunate coincidence—that plans have been in the mill for some time. According to Mr. Dillon, Castro's excesses have jarred Latin American leaders into a realization that social reforms in their countries are essential if chaos is to be averted. In other words, the Latin Americans themselves are now ready to take the necessary measures to overhaul their archaic economic and social structures which are essential if our aid is to be effective. He further pointed out that the visits earlier this year to Washington of Prime Minister Beltran of Peru and President Lleras Camargo of Colombia helped to convince the administration that Latin America needed funds for social-type reforms, while President Eisenhower's visit to South America reinforced this view.

I can but wonder why it took visits of the heads of state to convince the administration that conditions in Latin America are ripe for the kind of instability and chaos that invites Communist meddling. What were our diplomats in the 20 American Republics reporting in the last several years? What about the repeated warnings and pleas of the Latin American delegates to inter-American conferences?

Despite my misgivings in connection with this measure, I believe a well-rounded program of hemisphere economic cooperation to be the most effective weapon against the misery and unrest which make a desperate people willing to turn to alien doctrines in the hope of change.

The meeting which convenes next week in Bogotá presents an opportunity to hammer out, in cooperation with the other American Republics, methods to meet the challenge of Latin American stagnation and poverty. Also, I am aware that congressional rejection of this measure pledging our cooperation could have a demoralizing effect on the conference. For that reason I shall not oppose the measure on final passage provided an amendment has been adopted eliminating an additional sum for the President's contingency fund—section 4 of H.R. 13021.

At the same time, I sincerely believe this legislation could be further improved by cutting out reference to a specific figure. By adopting the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON] we can retain the intent of this legislation, that is, the bipartisan support of Congress for a program of economic cooperation with the American Republics, without including a figure which all of us know was arrived at hastily and without due study. Only after the Bogotá Conference, when the administration has some firm idea of the kind of program we expect to undertake with our Latin American neighbors, can Congress authorize funds intelligently. For that reason, Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened attentively to the statements of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] who is leading the support for this bill on the minority side and I have listened to the statements by the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs [Mr. MORGAN] on behalf of this bill and up to this moment I have no information as to how, when, or where the half billion dollars is to be spent. I am perfectly willing to yield at this time if either of these gentlemen or anyone else speaking in behalf of this bill will tell me specifically how, when, and where the money is to be spent.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. The gentleman has been advised repeatedly that no one now knows exactly how, when, or where this money will be spent, if and when it is appropriated. The bill does not appropriate any money. It recognizes that we have to do something. What that something is to be, they are going to try to work out in Bogotá. If they come out with something sound and constructive, the proposals will come back to the Congress next January. If they do not, they will not. It is as simple as that.

Mr. GROSS. Do some members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs or some of the bureaucrats downtown lie awake dreaming up these proposals?

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. Of course the gentleman knows they spend practically all of their time down there figuring out how to give away this money.

I want to say this: The gentleman says he does not know how it is going to be spent. You think we ought to go ahead. Suppose the people who go in here and recommend this program say, "We want to put this money down there to support the Castro government." What about that?

Mr. JUDD. There is not going to be any money until and unless the Congress appropriates it next year. If it does appropriate funds, the Congress can work its will and provide that not a cent will go to Castro. To decide not to vote this aid to any of Latin America because some money conceivably might go to Castro through our own negligence would surely be seeing a ghost under the bed.

Mr. HALEY. The distinguished gentleman from Minnesota is not that naive. This authorization is a promise on the part of the U.S. Government to pour another half a billion dollars down assorted rat holes. You are committing this Government, you are committing the taxpayers of the United States to provide half a billion dollars whenever you authorize it. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] has been here long enough so that I know he is not that naive.

Mr. GROSS. Of course this is a promise to pay. My friend from Florida is exactly right. All we have heard this afternoon is platitudes, nothing but platitudes and specious arguments about the necessity for spending some money somewhere, but nobody knows where. This would be one of the greatest injustices yet perpetrated on the taxpayers of this country, if this bill is adopted with section 2 in it.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. I queried Mr. Dillon and asked him if he had any idea how the money was to be spent. The testimony, although it is not definitive, nevertheless gives some idea of what they propose to do with the money. Mr. Dillon said:

> Well, we mean by that if a country is willing to put up funds for new land resettlement programs, is willing to make an effort to broaden their tax base, for instance, so that there will be a progressive income tax—

That is talking about the various South American countries.

> and less tax on individual farmers—make reforms of that nature—if they are ready to set up agricultural credit institutions and make their own government funds available for them, well then we think there is a chance of success in the program, and we would pitch in and help.

Mr. GROSS. I assume this is the same Douglas Dillon who sat down in an office in the Capitol Building the other day, just off the Chamber, and pressured the House leadership to put $65 million in the deficiency appropriation bill earlier today. The gentleman can get his own time to read Dillon's statement. Someone else read it a while ago. He provides no specific information, and I am not interested in his statement. The chairman and the ranking minority member of the Foreign Affairs Committee say they have no idea of the projects. Let us get down to earth on this proposal. Let us strike out section 2, provide a a blank check for half a billion dollars to be taken from the pockets of the taxstatement of policy, and refuse to issue payers of this country.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for recognition.

Mr. Chairman, for the last several days there has been talk all around here that we were going to pass a resolution that in the future by appropriations we might do something for our friends in these Americas. I do not know how you feel about it, but I can tell you how I feel about it. I know that there are forces on this earth that are working against everything that a loyal American loves and treasures. I do not know who across either ocean is going to be standing by us when the time comes in the clash of little worlds that are thrown at each other. I know this, that we live in the most dangerous period of the Christian civilization that we know and enjoy. I know these forces would destroy not only the things that we treasure and love, but they would destroy us. When that time comes, these Americas must stand together or we are going to have no more Americas. It seems to me that you might just as well strike the enacting clause

out of this resolution as to adopt the amendment offered by my distinguished and beloved colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON]. These people have been led to believe that we are going to do something about this. If they had not been led to believe a thing like this, it would be another matter. But these people in South America with the blood that flows through their veins are a proud people. They are a little suspicious at times, I will agree, but they are a proud people and they believe that through our administration, and there is only one administration of foreign affairs at a time, that before the next American conference takes place, we must have something like this to offer to the people of South America to prove to them that we are interested in them—whether they have a democracy in name or even whether they have a democracy at all. They have the best that they can afford. I remember President Roosevelt was telling me one time that Mr. Vargas, the President of Brazil, was up here—President Roosevelt said to him, "You are a dictator." He said, "Of course, I am a dictator. You cannot govern a country where only 5 percent of the people are literate under what you call a democracy because they do not understand it."

It is going to take them years to learn what democracy is and what democracy means.

The Secretary of State called me on the telephone and he expressed his deep interest in this thing, hoping that we would not be misunderstood by our neighbors to the south who, I think, in the years to come are essential to our retaining our way of life.

So I do trust that this committee will vote down this amendment and let us go on and do what we are expected to do.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GROSS moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I just listened to the distinguished Speaker of the House. I thought surely he would shed some light on how this $500 million would be spent, but he provided no light. In other words he, too, is asking us to hand over a blank check to those emissaries who will go to the Bogota Conference. The distinguished Speaker says the South Americans have been led to believe thus and so. Who led the South Americans to believe thus and so? Are we rubberstamps in the House of Representatives? Are we to be ignored in these deals that have been made on the basis of spending half a billion dollars?

The Speaker mentioned dictatorships in South America. Will the price tag on this bill eliminate the dictatorships in South America? You know the answer.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. Have we not heard for years, and years, and years, this giveaway talk: Unless we go ahead and appropriate this money, this country or that country is going to fall to the Communists? Have we not poured $100 billion of the American taxpayers' money out to the far reaches of the earth? And apparently we are today in worse shape than when we started this giveaway program.

This is never going to help anybody, and it is not going to make us any friends. You cannot buy friendship. People must in the first place want something and want to work for it. American dollars will never buy friendship.

Mr. GROSS. Certainly, the $100 billion we have sent across the oceans ought to indicate who is standing with us and who is not standing with us. The Speaker implies that unless this bill is approved there will be no nation standing with the United States. Where are these nations today?

In Korea, for instance, we have two full divisions and are augmenting our forces, and we are maintaining the 7th Fleet in Far Eastern waters at terrific expense to this Nation. Who is standing by us in Korea? Turkey has had 5,000 men in Korea. They are withdrawing all but about 500 of these troops. The British maintain in Korea an honor guard. Australia and Canada have only token forces stationed there. Who is standing by us in Korea and elsewhere? And yet we are asked to spend still another half billion dollars, and for what? We ask the question and we get no answer.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the preferential motion.

Mr. Chairman, matters such as this, of course, have been the subject of debate and controversy here in the Congress of the United States through the years. I know the attitude, the persistent attitude, of some like the gentleman from Iowa. I do not deny to him the right to have his views about these matters, but I must say that I was impressed with the remarks of the Speaker of the House.

This program that we are now considering, like many others that we have considered, I believe is vital to the defense and the security of our own country. I know there are some who still believe that the United States of America can just go it alone; but I do not believe the enlightened opinion, majority opinion of the people of this country feels that way about it. I do not feel that we can, and that is the reason I have supported so many of these programs, believing that they were in the best interests of our own country.

I am going to vote against this amendment for that reason.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HALEY) there were—ayes 39, noes 119.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BENTLEY: On page 5, line 9, strike out the word "expended" and insert in lieu thereof "June 30, 1962."

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe I will take the 5 minutes to explain the amendment, which is very simple. It merely puts a time limit on the authorization. As the language in the bill now reads, the authorization is indefinite; in other words, "available until expended."

The purpose of my amendment is to terminate the authorization at the end of fiscal 1962. It would require the executive branch to come up with plans and programs and to justify a new authorization by the end of fiscal 1962, which I believe will constitute a safeguard on the part of the Congress and at the same time would provide no limitation on the authorization at this moment.

I sincerely think an authorization is desirable. I intend to vote for the authorization, but I do think we should have some time limitation so that the executive branch can come back to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and present new plans and programs when they are devised so that the Congress may know what is going on.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY].

Mr. Chairman, I feel this amendment is not necessary to protect the Congress. No appropriation can be made under this authorization without the approval of the Appropriations Committee, and a vote by the Congress. On the other hand, the limitation the gentleman offers in his amendment will take some of the edge off of our position at the conference in Bogotá, and will be interpreted, I am sure, as indicating some doubt on our part and a reservation with reference to our position.

Mr. Chairman, I trust the amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BENTLEY: Page 5, line 13, strike out the period after "specify", insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That none of the funds made available pursuant to this section shall be used to furnish assistance to any country in Latin America being subjected to economic or diplomatic sanctions by the Organization of American States."

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is merely to strengthen any action that may have been taken or may be taken in the future by the Organization of American States against any member countries. I am sure that all Members of the House have certain countries in mind in this respect. I understand this amendment is acceptable to the administration. I understand it is acceptable to the Foreign Affairs Committee, and I do not believe it

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARY

is necessary to take any more time. So, unless there is some question on the amendment, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, the chairman is not opposed to the amendment. He feels the amendment strengthens the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SPECIAL AUTHORIZATION FOR CHILEAN RECONSTRUCTION

SEC. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President not to exceed $100,000,000, which shall remain available until expended, for use, in addition to other funds available for such purposes, in the reconstruction and rehabilitation of Chile on such terms and conditions as the President may specify.

MUTUAL SECURITY CONTINGENCY FUND

SEC. 4. (a) Section 451(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, which relates to the President's special authority and contingency fund, is amended by striking out "$150,000,000" in the first sentence and substituting "$250,000,000".

(b) Section 551 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, which relates to limitation on the use of the President's special authority, is amended by inserting before the period ": *Provided, however,* That the aforementioned authority may be used during the fiscal year 1961 to finance activities which normally would be financed from appropriations made pursuant to sections 411 (b) and 411(c) of this Act".

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MORGAN: On page 6, strike out line 1 and all that follows down through line 6; and on page 6, line 7, strike out "(b)" and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 4.".

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment simply strikes out the request for increased authorization in the contingency fund. I ask for its adoption.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. May I ask why this is done, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. MORGAN. Well, the gentleman knows that the Committee on Appropriations has already approved the increase in the contingency fund. They increased it from $150 million to $250 million, and the authorization is no longer necessary.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. THORNBERRY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 13021) to provide for assistance in the development of Latin America and in the reconstruction of Chile, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 637, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. ADAIR. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ADAIR moves to recommit the bill H.R. 13021 to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the noes had it.

MR. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and eighteen Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on passage of the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 3861) to provide for assistance in the development of Latin America and in the reconstruction of Chile, and for other purposes, a similar bill to the one just passed by the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

PRICE SUPPORT FOR MILK AND BUTTERFAT

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 636 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 2917) to establish a price support level for milk and butterfat. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the usual 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], and pending that I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, as the reading of the rule indicates this is a rule making in order the consideration of the bill S. 2917, to establish a price support level for milk and butterfat. The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate and is an open rule. The bill will be explained when we go into the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use, and ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Mississippi has said, this resolution makes in order the consideration of the bill S. 2917, a bill which will change slightly the price supports for milk and butterfat for the period which will expire on March 31, 1961. The members of the Committee on Agriculture, from which this measure was reported, and I understand was unanimously reported, will of course explain in full the exact content and purpose of this measure.

Mr. Speaker, I have asked permission to speak out of order at this time so I may, as the oldest member of the Ohio Republican delegation, in point of service, at least, call the attention of the House to the fact that three very distinguished Members of this body, three very distinguished Ohioans, will leave the Congress voluntarily when the Speaker's gavel falls for the sine die adjournment of this session.

These three gentlemen I have mentioned include, first of all, a man who has served with great distinction 28 years in this House, Representative WILLIAM E. HESS, of the Second Congressional District of Ohio. Mr. HESS originally served, as you will recall, on the Committee on Military Affairs, and then later has served his country just as ably and well as a member of the important House Committee on Armed Services.

It has been my pleasure to know Representative HESS, BILL HESS, as we all know him and love him, since he was a small lad. His father, also named William E. Hess, was long one of the outstanding citizens of Ohio. He was one of my warmest personal friends, and

helped start me on my political career some 43 years ago,

BILL HESS, as a member of the Committee on Armed Services, has saved this country untold millions of dollars. Many of you will recall that as chairman, and as ranking member, of a special subcommittee investigating defense contracts and military spending he and his colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT], working together exposed a great deal of waste and extravagance in military procurement, and brought about economies which saved millions, even hundreds of millions, of dollars of the taxpayers' money.

WILLIAM E. "BILL" HESS retires from Congress of his own volition, although the people of his own congressional district and those of us who have served with him here urged him to continue his service here. It will be difficult to fill his place in the Congress of the United States, or in the hearts of those of us who learned to know him and to love him for the real gentleman that he is, and always has been.

Then, Mr. Speaker, we will lose from this Congress, when the final gavel falls, another Ohioan, A. D. BAUMHART, JR.—DAVE, as we call him—from the 13th Congressional District of Ohio. He has served 8 years in the Congress of the United States. He was first elected to the 77th Congress, from which he resigned to enter the service of his country in the United States Navy, where he had a brilliant career as a naval officer and true patriot.

DAVE BAUMHART also served his party well in the State Republican organization of Ohio, and in the Republican National Committee here in Washington. He was, for a great while a member, and still is, a Member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and also of the Committee on Space and Astronautics, where he has served ably and well. He is a man, as you all know, of charming personality and of great ability. He is in the prime of life. I am sure he will soon take an important place in the business and industrial life of our country. We all regret to see him make the decision, of his own volition, to retire from these legislative halls.

Then, Mr. Speaker, I call attention to the retirement of a third Member of our Ohio delegation, JOHN E. HENDERSON, of the 15th Congressional District, and of Cambridge, Ohio. JOHN E. HENDERSON, or "JACK," as we all know him, has served three terms in the House of Representatives. For a time, he was a member of the important Committee on Banking and Currency and, more recently, of course, has served with great distinction on the Committee on the Judiciary of the House. JOHN HENDERSON is a very able lawyer. He has a fine and wonderful family. We all regret that he has determined he should return to the private practice of law, rather than to continue his labors and service here in the Congress of the United States where he has served so ably and so well.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding. On this side of the aisle, and I am sure on both sides of the aisle, we will miss all the Members that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] has spoken of who will not return to the Congress next year.

Mr. Speaker, I would particularly want to pay tribute to our colleague of the Ohio delegation, JACK HENDERSON. JACK came to the Congress the same year I did, in the 84th Congress. We have been close friends both socially and legislatively since that time. The gentleman from Ohio remarked about Mr. HENDERSON retiring from the Congress to return to his native State of Ohio to practice law. Mr. Speaker, this is a departure from the usual proverb, on Capitol Hill that is the the only way to leave the Congress is to die or to be defeated. But here we have an outstanding young Member of the Congress who has performed yeoman service for his country and for his party, and by his own volition, he has elected to return to his native State of Ohio. Certainly, the great loss that will be sustained by the Congress, we hope, will be recaptured by his native State of Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. I am glad the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] has taken this occasion to speak of these three Members, my colleagues in the House from the great State of Ohio, who are leaving this year from the Congress of the United States. Time does not permit me to speak of them individually, but I just want to say to each one of these colleagues who is retiring that my association with them through all the years has been most pleasant. They have been able, effective Members of the House of Representatives. They have been conscientious representatives of the people of their districts, of the great State of Ohio, and of the United States of America. I am sorry to see them leave, but upon their determination to leave, which seems to be final, I wish them the best in all the years to come.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I thank the minority leader very much and yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, we Ohio Republicans are losing three of our most useful and beloved Members. Each has his own legitimate reasons for leaving this body, but we let them go very reluctantly. Indeed, our delegation will be longing for them in the succeeding sessions.

JOHN HENDERSON—Judiciary Committee—is a quiet fellow but such a firm, strong pillar of loyal Americanism. It is hard to part with him. Our loss will be his family's gain. His charming wife leaves her own mark on our delegation. May many years of joyous companionship be theirs.

DAVE BAUMHART—Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and Science and Astronautics—is another one of our stalwarts. In between his services here in this House he served us all through the Republican National Committee, and what an understanding person we always found him to be. But good luck to you in all you do, DAVE.

To me, to have BILL HESS—Armed Services—leave this body is a peculiarly poignant regret. He and his lovely wife were in and out of our home in the years when my good husband represented the 22d District of Ohio. In these 20 years of my incumbency he has been a tower of strength and a wonderful friend. We in the delegation will miss his stories, his guitar, and his songs. Here in the House we shall be wishing for his forceful, quiet opinions and his smiling sanity. To you and Stella, BILL, my warm and affectionate good wishes. May long years of satisfying memories and pleasant living lie ahead of you.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BETTS].

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, the State of Ohio is extremely unfortunate in losing the services of three of its Members of Congress, WILLIAM HESS, A. D. BAUMHART, JR., and JOHN HENDERSON. Each of these men is retiring voluntarily after rendering distinguished service to their respective districts as well as to the Nation.

BILL HESS has been a respected and valuable member of the Armed Services Committee for many years and has contributed much to the solution of difficult and complex problems of defense.

DAVE BAUMHART, whose congressional career was interrupted by military service during World War II, has been an outstanding member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries as well as the recently formed Committee on Science and Astronautics.

JOHN HENDERSON'S abilities while serving on the Banking and Currency and Judiciary Committees was recognized by his colleagues of both parties.

All of these men are capable public servants—admired and respected by everyone who has known and worked with them over the years. As one who has been a close personal friend of each of them, I want to express my affection for them as well as my sadness at their departure from Congress. I join all of our colleagues in wishing them the very best of everything in the future.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHERER].

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, the Ohio delegation is losing three outstanding Members of the Congress who, for different reasons, have decided to retire. However, there may be others of us who, after the November 8 elections, will wish that we had followed their example and retired voluntarily. I am confident, however, that BILL HESS, DAVE BAUMHART, and JACK HENDERSON, because of the outstanding service they have rendered and the high esteem in which they are held by their constituents, would have been returned to the 87th Congress by overwhelming majorities had they decided to seek reelection.

While I have known DAVE BAUMHART and JACK HENDERSON since I came to the Congress, and there are no two finer men who ever served in this body, the Hess and Scherer families were friends and

neighbors before I was born. We lived on the same street in the same precinct.

No man had finer parents than BILL HESS. His father was a stalwart uncompromising Republican but one of the most universally liked men I ever had the privilege of knowing. I do not believe that I would be in the Congress of the United States if it were not for the late William Hess, Sr. It was he who encouraged me and gave me my first opportunity in political activity. BILL HESS has all of the same fine qualities, character, and personality as did his parents. He, too, is universally liked and respected, not only by the people of the Second Congressional District who have returned him to this Congress time and time again over the last 30 years but also by his colleagues in the Congress and the many friends he has made in all parts of the United States during his many years of outstanding, dedicated, and unselfish service to his country.

The districts which BILL HESS and I represent in the Congress include the greater Cincinnati area. In one sense it might be said that they overlap. This creates problems political and otherwise that sometimes are difficult to resolve. As I have said and acknowledged many times before, ever since I came to the Congress 8 years ago BILL HESS has been a tremendous help to me. In all that time there has not been a single instance of animosity or ill-will. There has not been one instance when problems and difficulties have not been resolved without rancor and with the utmost mutual understanding and respect. This has been possible because BILL HESS is the kind of a man his colleagues here in the House know him to be. For this relationship, I am deeply and profoundly grateful.

By BILL HESS' retirement not only the people of Cincinnati but the country are losing an able, dedicated, and conscientious Representative in the Congress of the United States.

I join with all of you in wishing BILL and his good wife Stella many years of a well-deserved and happy retirement.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCCULLOCH].

Mr. MCCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, Ohio will be without the able, effective, and experienced services in the next Congress, of three of its outstanding Members, who are voluntarily retiring.

WILLIAM E. HESS, dean of the Ohio delegation in years of service and chairman of the Republican delegation in the House was really a young Republican when he was first elected to Congress in 1928.

He came from a family schooled in public affairs and even before 1928 he had been off to the war and had had 4 years' service on the Cincinnati City Council.

He was the young friend and protege of the late great Nicholas Longworth, long-time Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives. His work on the several committees on which he served was always most carefully done but his work on the old Naval Affairs Committee throughout World War II, and in the meantime, with the exception of 2 years when he was not a Member of Congress, as a member of the Committee on Armed Services, has been outstanding.

His calm and persuasive approach to some of the most difficult and important problems of our times will be remembered a long, long time.

A. D. BAUMHART, JR., is voluntarily leaving us, too. I have known DAVE favorably and well for almost a quarter of a century.

DAVE was a handsome young State senator when I was a member of the Ohio House of Representatives in the late thirties. He was an able State senator and was soon sent to the U.S. House of Representatives. Soon thereafter we were in World War II and DAVE resigned to enter the Navy where he served more than 50 months with courage and distinction.

He was again elected to the House in 1954, was the State and regional whip and he leaves a record of the best. We will sorely miss his able appraisal of the trend of the times, and the courage of his nonconformity with the majority, when his conscience so dictated. Do visit and advise us often.

And JOHN E. HENDERSON is voluntarily leaving us at the very beginning of what would have surely been a long and effective tenure in the House of Representatives.

He too was schooled in the general assembly of Ohio and his influence was felt from the very first meeting of his first committee.

Near the end of the 85th Congress he became a member of the House Committee on the Judiciary. His wide knowledge of the law, his logical and just thinking, along with his courage marked him as an able lawyer and a dependable legislator from the very first.

He will be sorely missed by every one of his colleagues on the Judiciary Committee and his district; his State and his Nation will miss his good services with the end of the 86th Congress.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the three gentlemen from Ohio who are leaving Congress this year.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHENCK].

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the very fine remarks about our colleagues who are retiring this year.

Mr. Speaker, it has been a great privilege and one for which I shall always be grateful to serve here in the Congress of the United States alongside some really great and stalwart Americans. I refer, of course, to many, but more especially my colleagues from the great State of Ohio.

Somehow, Mr. Speaker, the members of our Ohio delegation are really quite special and our association together has not only been really pleasant but my colleagues from Ohio have performed very outstanding service in the best interest of our entire Nation. Fortunately, members of the Ohio delegation have each been assigned to most of the major committees of the House. There is a spirit of close friendship and a willingness to help each other in every possible way.

Mr. Speaker, no Member of the House from the State of Ohio, to the best of my knowledge, has ever told another Member from Ohio how he should vote on any issue but to the contrary has always been willing to furnish any and all information possible to any colleague upon request. This has been extremely helpful to each of us many times and has enabled us to better understand the measures recommended by the various legislative committees.

Mr. Speaker, three of the very valuable and highly respected Members of the House from the State of Ohio are voluntarily retiring this year. I refer, of course, to the Honorable WILLIAM HESS, the Honorable DAVE BAUMHART, and the Honorable JOHN HENDERSON. It has been a real privilege and honor to serve with them. We shall miss each and every one of them. Not only because they are strong and great legislators who have always placed the good of our Nation first in their thinking, their actions, and their decisions, but they have also been understanding and true friends to each of us.

Mr. Speaker, I shall miss them very much personally. I want to express to each of them my deep personal appreciation for their friendship and to express the very sincere hope that each of them and their families have many more happy, healthful, and fruitful years.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join the many friends of BILL HESS, JOHN HENDERSON, and DAVE BAUMHART. They are all men possessed of ability and imagination. All three have been industrious and accomplished a great deal of good for their districts, the States, and the Nation. We shall miss them, but we wish them continued success in whatever fields they enter upon their retirement.

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. COOK. I, as a Democratic Member, am glad to join my colleagues on the other side of the aisle in paying well-deserved tribute to these three colleagues from Ohio who are leaving. I wish them well throughout the future. I am sorry to see them leave—in a certain sense, at least.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, coming from the neighboring State of West Virginia across the river from Ohio, I would like to join with my good and able friend [Mr. BROWN], in paying tribute to our three retiring colleagues from the Buckeye State—Representatives HESS, BAUMHART, and HENDERSON. DAVE BAUMHART served with me on the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, and helped us write the record which resulted in the choice of this group as the Committee of the Year by nationally syndicated columnist Holmes Alexander.

I would like to speak a particular word or two about JOHN HENDERSON. Not only does he represent the congressional district directly across the Ohio River from the northern section of my own West Virginia district, but his office for the past 2 years has been directly across the hall from mine. I would like to thank JOHN HENDERSON and his fine staff for all of the help which they have given me and my own staff. I recall the first day I came to the Old House Office Building, before my own office was open or available, and I stumbled into JOHN HENDERSON'S office. There I was warmly greeted by Representative HENDERSON'S top assistant, L. Vincent Monzel, who gave me office space until such time as I could get settled in my own office. It was one of those fine gestures of courtesy which one always associates with Congressman HENDERSON'S staff personnel.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we shall miss these fine members in the years to come, and I hope the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] will allow me to make the observation that I trust I shall be here in this body next January to greet their successors.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I believe the many statements we have heard from various Members of the House testify to the love and affection we all hold for the three retiring Members from Ohio, BILL HESS, DAVE BAUMHART, and JACK HENDERSON.

I believe that I express the wish of each and every one of us when I say, godspeed to all of you, may you have good health and many long years of happy and successful life.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to have this opportunity to have a few minutes to pay tribute to our three distinguished colleagues, BILL HESS, DAVE BAUMHART, and JACK HENDERSON, who are retiring from the Congress. Delighted as I am to have this oportunity to say a few words, it is not without a deeper feeling of such sadness and regret at losing from our daily midst three wonderful friends.

Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives will suffer a serious loss in their retirement. Not only their respective congressional districts, but all America will lose valuable public servants, men whose dedication to their country's welfare has always been foremost. The plaudits that one could say about any one of these fine gentlemen would fill many pages of this RECORD. Each possesses many wonderful attributes and exemplary qualities that words cannot adequately describe.

Mr. Speaker, we are proud of our Ohio Republican delegation in the Congress. It possesses an esprit de corps of which we are all justly proud. Our delegation meetings are punctuated with goodhearted joking and raillery. We have a motto in our delegation, "When you've got a man down, kick him." We have all had our share of kicks and will miss having these three distinguished Congressmen around to be the recipients of our motto, but wish them godspeed and the best of luck in their future endeavors.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, my colleague JOHN HENDERSON has decided to retire from Congress and return to the practice of law in Ohio. Although I well understand the many personal problems which beset one with growing children, who has to live most of his life away from home, I am sorry to see JOHN HENDERSON leave the Congress. It is my hope that he will enjoy the rewards which his diligence merits. I have enjoyed his friendship and I extend my best wishes to him and his family.

Mr. Speaker, the 13th District of Ohio has been well represented by my colleague and good friend, DAVE BAUMHART, who has decided to pursue a career in private industry. DAVE and I served together in the Ohio State Legislature many years ago and I have enjoyed his friendship over a long period of time. He is a gentleman of integrity, exceptional ability, and friendly personality. DAVE BAUMHART has always carried the best interests of his constituents close to his heart and he has served them with fidelity and loyalty. As my colleague and friend leaves the Halls of Congress to reenter private industry, he has my best wishes for happiness, good health, and many years of success.

Mr. Speaker, the decision of my able and distinguished colleague, WILLIAM E. HESS, to retire from Congress will be regretted by many of his colleagues. He has enjoyed conspicuous success and is a gentleman of complete good will even to those opposing his viewpoints. As BILL turns to the tranquillity of private life, I express for him the high regard in which I hold him. Many deserving words of praise have been said of our able colleague, who has been a conscientious legislator, and who leaves many warm friends in Congress. I am sure BILL HESS will take with him the kind thoughts and good wishes of his colleagues, and I am happy to add mine to those already expressed.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the public service of Mr. HESS, Mr. BAUMHART, and Mr. HENDERSON.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

INCREASING DAIRY PRICE SUPPORTS

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to include and make a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following letter which I received from the Michigan Milk Producers Association, signed by Glenn Lake, president:

MICHIGAN MILK PRODUCERS ASSOCIATION,
Detroit, Mich., August 24, 1960.

The Honorable ALVIN M. BENTLEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BENTLEY: On August 19, the Senate passed bill S. 2917 to increase dairy price supports for the balance of this marketing year from the present $3.06 to $3.22 per hundredweight for manufacturing milk. A companion bill, H.R. 12238, is now before the House Agricultural Committee.

In urging your support of H.R. 12238, we wish to call your attention to the following facts:

1. For a number of years dairy farmers have been the victims of rapidly rising costs and lower milk prices.

2. Lower milk prices paid to farmers have not brought about a reduction in milk production. From 1952–59 minimum price supports have been reduced from $3.74 to $3.06. In 1952 dairy farmers marketed 97.7 billion pounds of milk for total cash receipts of $4.6 billion. In 1959 dairy farmers were compelled to market 112.6 billion pounds in order to get the same $4.6 billion cash receipts.

3. While prices paid to dairy farmers have been forced down, prices to consumers have gone up. In 1954 the national average retail price for a quart of milk was 22.5 cents—in 1959 it was 24.9 cents, an increase of $1.104 per hundred pounds to the consumer, while price supports to dairy farmers were reduced $0.68 per hundredweight.

4. Increasing support levels to $3.22 would cost the Government only 3.5 million additional dollars for the same amount of dairy products as purchased by the CCC last year. However, this would mean an additional $180 million to the Nation's dairy farmers, $8 million to Michigan.

For these and other reasons we urge you to request the Agricultural Committee to report the bill out and we earnestly solicit your favorable support on passage of the bill.

Sincerely yours,

GLENN LAKE,
President.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 201]

Alger	Forrester	Miller, N.Y.
Anderson, Mont.	Grant	Mitchell
Ashmore	Green, Oreg.	Moore
Auchincloss	Hargis	Murray
Ayres	Hays	Powell
Barden	Hébert	Preston
Baumhart	Hess	Rains
Bolling	Holifield	Riley
Brooks, La.	Irwin	Rogers, Colo.
Buckley	Jackson	Rogers, Mass.
Canfield	Johnson, Md.	Shipley
Cederberg	Kilburn	Sikes
Celler	Kluczynski	Sisk
Chamberlain	Lafore	Smith, Kans.
Davis, Tenn.	Landrum	Springer
Dawson	Lipscomb	Taylor, N.Y.
Diggs	Loser	Thompson, La.
Dooley	McDowell	Thompson, N.J.
Doyle	McSween	Udall
Durham	Macdonald	Vinson
Evins	Machrowicz	Whitener
Fogarty	Magnuson	Willis
Ford	Martin	Wilson
	Mason	Withrow

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 359 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

PRICE SUPPORT FOR MILK AND BUTTERFAT

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 2917) to establish a price-support level for milk and butterfat.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 2917, with Mr. KEOGH in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOEVEN] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may extend their remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, as the House sponsor of the measure before us, I hope that the House will speedily adopt this bill. It is designed to stabilize dairy prices so that our farmers can be spared a drop in prices for the balance of this marketing year.

This is not an unreasonable bill. It sets price supports on manufacturing milk at $3.22 per hundredweight instead of the present $3.06. It sets the price level on butterfat at 59.6 cents per pound instead of the present 56.6 cents.

Actually the price support levels proposed in this bill represent the average market prices of the past marketing year. The legislation will simply make certain that a price drop does not happen for the balance of the marketing year.

During the hearing before the Rules Committee on our dairy bill yesterday, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'NEILL] asked me if this bill would raise milk prices to consumers. I pointed out to him that milk producers today are receiving 18 percent less than they were in 1952. Yet, consumers are paying 5 cents a quart more. In other words, there is very little relationship between the prices farmers receive and the prices paid by consumers.

Mr. Chairman, few people work as hard as our dairy farmers do for so little income. Furthermore, the costs of operating a dairy farm are one-third higher today than they were 10 years ago.

Let us pass this modest effort to protect our dairy farmers. It is not a solution to the farm problem, but it is a worthwhile step related to one commodity.

What is needed is a comprehensive family farm income bill of the kind some of us fought to have passed throughout this congressional session. We were fought every step of the way by all the power and propaganda the administration and the Department of Agriculture could muster.

Mr. Benson has instructed the President to veto five major bills passed by the Congress in the last 5 years. The President vetoed comprehensive legislation to set price support levels at 90 percent of parity in 1956. He vetoed a milk price support bill in 1957 that would have set support levels at $3.25 per hundredweight. He vetoed a bill in 1958 to prevent farm prices from falling below 1957 levels. He vetoed the 90 percent parity wheat bill in 1959.

Now, Mr. Benson is opposed even to this bill that simply holds dairy prices from falling below average market prices. If we pass this bill and the President signs it, that will be the kind of clear-cut repudiation of Mr. Benson by both the Congress and the White House that is long overdue.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill, S. 2917, as passed by the Senate and reported by the House Committee on Agriculture. I am a sponsor of a similar bill, H.R. 12364.

The announced support prices for the 1959–60 marketing year are $3.06 a hundredweight for manufacturing milk and 56.6 cents a pound for butterfat. These prices are 77 percent of the parity equivalent as of the beginning of the marketing year.

The average prices received by farmers for the previous marketing year, ended March 31, 1960, were $3.23 for manufacturing milk and 59.5 cents for butterfat.

This average can give us little comfort, because many farmers actually received only the farm lower support price paid by the Government. In fact, nearly 10 percent of the nonfat milk solids marketed by farmers during the year were bought by the Government at its low prices. During the 1959–60 marketing year the Commodity Credit Corporation purchased 136 million pounds of butter and 50 million pounds of cheese. The Agriculture Department also purchased 857 million pounds of nonfat dry milk. Additional purchases of milk were made to supply the school milk programs and the military. Clearly a substantial number of farmers received only 77 percent of the parity price for their production.

Under this administration the dairy farmer has been caught with rising costs and decreasing returns for his efforts. Farm income has dropped almost 25 percent while the cost of living has risen 6 percent during the past 8 years.

This price situation is having a long-range effect on American farming which could be disastrous to our future food supply. Recent 1960 agriculture census figures provided me by the Department of Commerce demonstrates my point.

For example, the figures for Dodge County, a dairy producing county, as is my entire district, show that the total number of farms decreased from 3,954 in 1954 to 3,641 in 1959 and the number of milk cows decreased from 73,002 to 70,524 over the same period. Dane County farms decreased from 5,094 to 4,614 in number, Jefferson County from 2,782 to 2,414, Columbia from 2,615 to 2,309 and Waukesha County from 2,669 to 1,883 in number over the 5-year period. The population of milk cows decreased in Dane County from 87,967 in 1954 to 83,963, in Jefferson County from 42,814 in 1954 to 38,756 in 1959, in Columbia County from 29,642 in 1954 to 27,392 in 1959 and in Waukesha County from 35,744 to 25,978 during the 5-year period.

This clearly demonstrates a trend away from the farm. The cost-price squeeze is driving people away from the farm. This not only causes the uprooted farmer the economic hardship of leaving his calling to learn another trade or business, but it also has serious repercussions in the small towns where the merchants see their customers leaving the farm to live, work, and shop in the city.

I also want to call your attention to the warning signal provided by the statistics showing that our average farm population is growing older. For example, the average age of Dodge County farmers rose from 46.4 to 47.3 years of age between 1954 and 1959. This reflects the fact that young people are not going into farming. There is no future for the young man raised on the farm to stay on the farm and take over when his father has to retire. The return for his effort is too small. When this generation of farmers is gone the United States will be hard put to find the know-how necessary to keep the Nation's and the world's granaries and food bins filled.

Similar statistics can be cited for each of the other four counties in my district and, I am sure, for other areas across the Nation.

This is what we are concerned with in considering this measure to increase support levels to approximate the average prices received by the farmer over the past year. We can and must act now to stop the tide carrying farmers away from the land. In the years ahead we will need an adequate and continuing supply of dairy products to meet all domestic needs and the needs of the food for peace program in crucial areas abroad.

This bill will provide the dairy farmer with a slightly better return for his efforts and also will serve as a floor to prevent his prices from slipping further during this marketing year.

I urge you to vote in favor of this bill.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in objection to this bill and hope that it will not pass. I will vote against the bill. As I understand the situation at the present time is this:

First. Price support 75 percent parity or about $3.05 per 100 pounds.

Second. Market price about $3.25 per 100 pounds.

Third. Small volume of dairy products going into CCC stocks.

Fourth. Market is strong for milk and dairy products.

Fifth. The feed milk ration is favorable.

If this legislation is enacted my understanding is that the future situation will be as follows:

First. Price supports will be increased to about $3.22 per 100 pounds up to about market.

Second. The support price will cause increased stocks to go to CCC, thus increasing cost of farm program.

Third. It will mean very little to dairy farmers but will be a windfall to processors who happen to have stocks of butter, cheese and dried milk, and other products.

This is a poor time, with conditions as good as they are under the present situation to be monkeying with the farm program. As I understand it, if this bill passes, this is what will happen.

This is bad legislation. It is not good for the farmer and I am sure it will cost the consumers more and also will raise the cost of the farm program by millions of dollars as far as the Federal Government is concerned.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation to increase the support price for milk. I am delighted to see this Congress take action which recognizes the need of our dairy farmers. I have the honor to represent one of the most important dairy farming districts in the Nation, the 32d of New York. Dairy farming is today the single most important business in the great industrial State of New York.

Yet, for months, Mr. Chairman, I have been wondering whether, when we talk about farming and the farmers, we have not been forgetting about the dairy farmers of upstate New York. We have been anxious to raise the price of grains, which only serve as added costs to the dairy farmer. And while this has been going on, the income of the New York State dairy farmer has been steadily going down. According to a report recently issued in my State, and confirmed by the Department of Agriculture in a letter to me, the blend price of fluid milk in the New York milk marketing order area is expected to drop by some 19 cents per hundredweight below the price paid to farmers in 1959. I think it may well prove, judging by the way events are moving, that the ultimate price paid to our farmers will be even less than that before the year is out.

Needless to say, such a drop spells real trouble for our dairy farmers. Action must certainly be taken to help the dairy farmers, and it should be taken quickly.

This bill is a step in the right direction. It raises the floor under milk prices at a most critical time. I am hopeful that by passing this legislation we may set in motion a chain that will arrest the current skid of milk prices in New York State and begin to secure some measure of justice for our dairy farmers. We must set the price of milk back up where it will begin to cover the farmer's costs of production. This we must do promptly.

I therefore am glad to join in support of the bill and urge its adoption by a substantial majority.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I am supporting this bill. I would like to submit my statement before the Dairy Subcommittee, Committee on Agriculture, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C., June 8, 1960, in support of this bill:

Mr. Chairman, I am honored to appear before your subcommittee in behalf of my bill (H.R. 12394) to benefit Iowa milk producers by increasing the support price of manufacturing milk to $3.25 per hundredweight and butterfat to 59.6 cents per pound. At the present time, milk is supported at $3.06 per hundredweight and butterfat at 56.6 cents a pound, which is 77 percent of parity. I would like to see dairy supports returned to the 90 percent of parity level, and feel that dairy farmers are entitled to this support price, but agree with many of my colleagues that it is not realistic to press for that figure at this time.

Our dairy farmers cannot continue in business when their income has dropped almost 25 percent and their cost of family living items has gone up 6 percent during the last 8 years. An adequate supply of dairy products for domestic and foreign needs is jeopardized as more and more dairy farmers are caught in the cost-price squeeze and are forced out of business.

Dairy farmers and processors make an important contribution to our national economy, and they deserve a fair return on their investment and labor. In many areas today, dairy farm families are required to labor 3,300 hours each year to earn 56 cents an hour on an investment of $32,000 in plant and equipment.

It is significant to state, Mr. Chairman, that the census recently taken in Iowa showed that the small towns and rural areas are losing population very rapidly. The stability of these communities in my district, as in many others, hinges very much on the economic well-being of the dairy farmer because the dairy farmer produces the monthly milk check or cream check, and the protection of his investment in plant requires constant improvement or repair.

While the retail price of milk has been increasing, the farmer's share of the retail price has been decreasing. In 1952 the farmer's share of the retail price was 51 percent. In 1959 it was only 43 percent, a decrease of 8 percent during the 7-year period.

In 1959 an urban worker's family of three paid $195 for the same quantity of dairy products—milk, butter, cheese, and ice cream—that it bought in 1952 for $191. But farmers in 1952 received $100 for these dairy products as compared with only $88 in 1959. Processors and distributors, however, increased their take for their services from $90 in 1952 to $107 in 1959.

The dairy industry is made up of some 1,200,000 farmers and over 10,200 creameries, milk-drying plants, condenseries and other processing and distribution firms. The dairy plants employ more than 250,000 workers and carry an annual payroll of over $500 million.

I believe that the small increase in support levels provided for in my bill would enable many of our dairy farmers to remain in business by providing a realistic floor to dairy income, and thereby assure the production of sufficient dairy products to meet domestic and foreign needs. It has been shown that the support level of manufacturing milk prices and fluid milk prices fall very closely along with each other; when one goes down, they all go down, when one goes up they all go up.

Our dairy farms carry a tremendous potential for good will in this tension-torn world. CARE packages have given a new lease on life to countless people in the free world; and milk has been introduced to schoolchildren in many foreign countries through the school milk programs carried out under Public Law 480. However, we have made only a beginning in sharing our food with the underprivileged people abroad.

In our own country we still have citizens who are inadequately fed to whom a greater distribution of dairy products should be made.

Another factor which we must consider is that the public is constantly demanding higher quality milk and dairy products—greater cleanliness and better flavor. Today, therefore, the dairy farmer attends schools, learning what diets to feed his cows so that the production will have the best flavor. Disease which used to be spread through the use of dairy products has been practically eliminated. All of this means that our dairy farmers have to make higher and higher investments and incur greater and greater costs of production.

It has been estimated that to maintain America's high standard diet, our dairy farmers by 1975 must produce 48 percent more dairy products than they are producing now.

To enable our dairy farmers to meet the higher costs of living and of production, to insure the continuance of a strong dairy industry, and to assure the production of enough dairy products to meet domestic and foreign needs, Mr. Chairman, I believe that the small increase in the support price for manufacturing milk called for in my bill is essential, and I hope that this subcommittee will see fit to report this legislation to the full committee.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the bill will pass and be signed by the President.

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Chairman, I heartily endorse this legislation which would give security to the Nation's dairy farmers. I am proud to say that I introduced a bill, H.R. 3349, in January of 1959, practically identical to the one now being debated here on the floor today.

Dairying is one of the basic industries of Idaho and it forms a small but highly important part of the Nation's agricultural economy.

While I was in Idaho earlier this month, I was able to visit with a number of dairy farmers in the First Congressional District. Some of them were doing well, but the great bulk of them—mostly the small operators, who are the backbone of the industry—were caught in the same cost-price squeeze that has been draining the American farmer everywhere.

The prices these dairy farmers are receiving for their products in the marketplace are, relatively speaking, very low. The dairy farmer has had good years but I can say emphatically this is not one of them. While he has been getting these low prices, the cost of operating his farm and of feeding and clothing his family has increased many times over. In the end, and I have seen it happen all too often, he is forced to leave the land—to sell his farm and go to the city to compete there in an ever-dwindling job market.

I think the dairy farmers in Idaho and in the Nation deserve a fair shake. We can take a big step forward in helping them by passing this legislation which provides support prices on milk for manufacturing purposes at $3.25 per hundredweight and 58.6 cents per pound for butterfat.

We must not adjourn tonight without adopting this measure. I hope that next January there will be other, constructive legislation relating to our dairy farmers which can be debated more carefully, earlier in the session. I hope such new legislation will go even farther in alleviating the conditions which now trouble the industry. I urge all of the members, therefore, to support the bill now under

debate which would raise the basic support prices for milk and butterfat to a more realistic level, one more in tune with the economy.

Mr. COAD. Mr. Chairman, on this last day of the session we are considering a farm bill which will give some assistance in helping the farmers who need assistance so desperately. This bill will raise dairy price supports from $3.06 to $3.22 per hundredweight. This level of price support serves to raise the floor under the market for the market price of milk is presently higher than this figure. However, this will effectively raise the floor level and in this manner serve to stabilize the dairy industry at a higher price level and for this urgent reason this bill should be enacted.

Mr. Chairman, the farm situation is so critical in the Midwest that farm auctioneers are already booked up months ahead. They are going to sell out the family farmers who have struggled so valiantly against the harsh economics of increasing production at lower prices. This philosophy which has been espoused and practiced by the Republican administration has brought economic ruin to many of our farm people. This I say is cruel treatment to some of the finest of American citizens. I am told that in some communities up to 25 percent of the family farmers are going to be liquidated. This is a great tragedy. It is a useless and a needless tragedy. It need not have happened and it should not have happened.

Mr. Chairman, it is my sincere hope that Preisdent Eisenhower will sign this bill. It is the last opportunity the President has to redeem, if in such a small way, the glowing campaign promises which he made while a candidate for office in 1952. In 1952 Mr. Eisenhower promised 100 percent of parity in the marketplace by pledging himself to the continuation of the 90 percent supports. We know that during the eight sessions of the Congress Mr. Eisenhower has never lived up to any of the promises he made to the farmers of America. But now, as one of his last official acts of signing farm legislation he has this opportunity of doing a little for the American farmers who are engaged in dairying.

But if Mr. Eisenhower vetoes this bill, as he has vetoed five other farm bills, he will have a record of 100 percent against our farmers. It will prove that what he said earlier this year about relaxing his demands on farm legislation were just so many words spoken in the arena of politics.

Mr. Chairman, our farmers cannot afford the luxury of having their livelihoods cast about as the whim of politics may choose. Our farmers need assistance. They need assistance in balancing production at a fair price so that their families can live as first-class citizens. It is not fair that the American people should expect the farmers of our land to subsidize the grocery bill forever. The American farmer deserves the best, but he has been receiving only crumbs. By passing this bill and by the President signing this bill will be a step in the right direction.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. JOHNSON], the chairman of our Subcommittee on Dairy and Poultry.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I am very glad the House will have the opportunity to vote today on S. 2917, to raise the support price for milk for manufacturing purposes to $3.22 per hundredweight and for butter to 59.6 cents per pound. The present floor under dairy products is $3.06 per hundredweight for milk and butter at 56.6 cents a pound.

I was delighted to see the bipartisan support given the bill when it was introduced, debated, and passed in the Senate. The Senate bill was introduced by my Wisconsin colleague, Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE, and was cosponsored by the ranking Republican member of the Senate Agriculture Committee, Senator AIKEN, of Vermont. The following Senators also cosponsored the bill: Senator YOUNG and Senator BURDICK, of North Dakota; Senator MUNDT, of South Dakota; Senatory KENNEDY, of Massachusetts; Senator HUMPHREY and Senator MCCARTHY, of Minnesota; Senator SYMINGTON and Senator HENNINGS, of Missouri; Senator MAGNUSON and Senator JACKSON, of Washington; Senator PROUTY, of Vermont; Senator MORSE, of Oregon; Senator CARLSON, of Kansas; Senator MCNAMARA, of Michigan; and Senator WILEY, of Wisconsin. These 18 Senators represent 10 States from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

In the House, a similar bill was introduced by me, and by the following Congressmen: HOGAN, of Indiana; KASTENMEIER and FLYNN, of Wisconsin; WOLF, of Iowa; and BREEDING, of Kansas. In addition, last session similar bills were introduced by Congresswoman PFOST, of Idaho; Congressmen REES of Kansas, and MCGOVERN, of South Dakota.

This is not a sectional bill, nor is it a one-party bill. It benefits all parts of the country and is advocated by Democrats and Republicans alike. The names of its sponsors show that. I also say in all sincerity that this bill, if enacted, will benefit our entire Nation and the free world abroad in helping assure an adequate supply of healthful, nutritious dairy products. We want to make certain that our own schoolchildren, many of whom are returning to their desks this week, will have a steady supply of milk, butter, and cheese under the school lunch programs. We want to assure our unfortunate needy at home that they can count on these nutritious foods in their diets on a year-round basis. They are not getting that now.

In addition to the people of this country who need more milk and dairy products, there are starving people around the world, with no dairy products. They die of malnutrition; they die of diseases caused by inadequate food. If we do not help them, many of these people will die or they will be forced to turn to Communist countries for assistance. That is what we mean by "food for peace."

Communist victories resulting from the U–2 incident, the summit breakup, the Cuban revolution, the overthrow of governments in Africa and Asia—all these are headline news. These problems are complicated and difficult to solve. But the strongest protests we received resulted not from these world-shaking events, but from the cutbacks in the availability of powdered milk last fall. The ambassadors of the United States to 92 countries protested. State departments of education and welfare from all parts of this country protested. The voluntary agencies, primarily religious groups, protested against cutbacks of nonfat dry milk to the people of this country and to the people of abroad. By the simple method of raising the price supports to a specified level which will stay the same throughout the season, we can prevent these cutbacks and we can assure an adequate supply of milk and dairy products to meet the most urgent needs in our States, in our armed services, wherever they may be, and among the freedom hungry people whose friendship we must have to survive against Communist competition.

The price supports provided in S. 2917 are exactly the same as the average actual market price received by farmers for the entire 1959–60 marketing year. This bill simply guarantees the dairy farmers a higher floor on a year-round basis and assures minimum supply requirements with little or no added cost to either the consumer or the taxpayer. There need be no additional cost to the taxpayer because the milk and dairy products can be moved quickly from dairy plants to consumers without expensive storage costs. There need be no additional cost to consumers because the national level of prices to the farmers are approaching the price support level which this bill would provide for a year-round basis. What this bill will do, in effect, is to stabilize the price to the farmer from day to day and month to month on a year-round basis.

In this way the farmer knows what he can count on, in and out of season, just as the minimum wage legislation puts a year-round floor under salaries and wages.

Personally, I would like to see dairy farmers receive considerably higher prices and income. The reason this bill does not ask for that is the time element. We offer for your approval today a level of dairy price supports which is so moderate that it should not result in added taxes or added prices to consumers. Its twin purposes are to assure the farmers of a definite dollars-and-cents minimum price and to assure the Nation that we will have enough dairy products to meet our most urgent needs in all of the 50 States and in the most crucial parts of the world.

In view of the modest and simple nature of the bill, in view of the bipartisan support it has received in Congress, and in view of the speed and unchallenged voice vote with which this bill passed the Senate, I now urge the Members of the House to vote for the adoption of the identical text of the measure as approved by the Senate without any amendments, so we can send the bill to the President immediately.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill S. 2917, which is temporary legislation. It only estab-

lishes the support level for manufacturing milk and butterfat at approximately present market levels for the remainder of the milk marketing year ending March 31, 1961. The average price received by farmers for the marketing year ending March 31, 1960, was $3.23 for manufacturing milk and 59.5 cents for butterfat. The bill would tend to stabilize prices at about this level by establishing the support price at $3.22 and 59.6 cents for manufacturing milk and butterfat, respectively; thus preventing the possibility of a price decline which, in view of cost increases since April 1, 1958, would present a different problem to dairy farmers.

The Department of Agriculture is opposed to the bill contending that it is not advisable to fix by law a specific support price for a particular marketing year without regard to current production and consumption conditions. There may be some merit in this contention, but the fact remains that our entire farm population, including the dairy farmer, are in a tough price-cost squeeze at the present time. We all know that farm income has been declining while the costs of farm operations continue to rise.

Representing a great agricultural district, I want to vote for legislation which will protect the farmer's income whenever I have an opportunity to do so. The American farmer is entitled to his fair share of the national income and I shall continue to do my part in affording him that fair share to the best of my ability. Hence I fully support S. 2917.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PIRNIE].

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending measure and wish to associate myself with the remarks that the distinguished ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture made.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. WESTLAND].

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, I am very much interested in any program that could benefit the dairymen, and I believe S. 2917 will benefit not only the dairymen of my own congressional district, but will also benefit the dairy farmers of the Nation.

This is a simple and moderate piece of legislation. S. 2917 seeks to increase the basic support for manufacturing milk from the present $3.06 to $3.22 a hundredweight and to increase the basic support for butterfat from 56.6 to 59.6 cents.

The proposal would be effective only through the present marketing year. Its principal effect would be simply to prevent dairy prices from going lower than the market. It would mean an increase in the present income of dairymen and would prevent these dairymen from suffering further drops in their incomes.

The average price received by farmers during the past marketing year was $3.23 for manufacturing milk and 59.9 cents for butterfat. This bill would tend to stabilize prices at about this level and prevent the possibility of a price decline. Because the support level that would be established by this legislation is so near to the average price received by the farmers there would be little if any additional costs.

Mr. Chairman, let me quote from letters I have received during the past few weeks to show the problems the dairy farmers of my district face. One farmer wrote:

> There has been a squeeze put on the dairy farmer the past few years that is getting worse all the time. The cost of living and the cost of almost everything we buy has increased, but the price of milk is as low as ever.

From another letter I quote:

> As you know, the cost of producing milk has been going up for several years as has the cost of living, farm machinery, most of our feed supplies and all other equipment. In the meanwhile, the prices we get for our product has declined considerably during the past 8 years.

Another farmer wrote:

> I am writing you because I'm a dairy farmer and am having a very hard time paying our bills from the price of milk. The cost of operating our farm is so high.

These are a few examples of the hardships faced by dairymen in my district. I believe S. 2917 will help these dairy farmers in a small way to meet the economic squeeze they find themselves in today. It is for this reason I support this legislation.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES].

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I confess I speak more in dismay over what is happening here, and more for the record, than in the hope of changing the outcome of the vote on this bill.

I have a deep conviction which I have often expressed that it will be impossible to solve our pressing and urgent farm problems unless we can somehow manage to keep politics out of farming.

Every Member present knows that we have gone so far in the direction of political intervention in agriculture that the main political effort is no longer directed toward the solution of the farmers' problems. It is aimed at achieving the maximum political benefit in partisan politics.

That is the tragedy and failure of this bill. It is politics, pure and simple. It is not aimed at the solution of the dairy problem. It is aimed at November 8. It is not aimed at the economic well-being of the dairy farmer. It is aimed at the dairy farmer's vote.

This bill was born in politics. It is brought forth here, in an atmosphere heavy with the politics of a presidential campaign, in a session where politics predominates, with all of the haste and confusion which characterizes political measures. No bill so conceived and so considered can bring lasting benefit to American farmers.

I trust Members will listen when I say that I know of no industry more complex, where the factors which enter into the price structure are so many and varied, than the milk industry. Yet this bill, if it has any meaning at all, puts the U.S. Congress squarely in the business of establishing dollar and cent levels of minimum milk prices. It puts Congress in that business, not when a calm study of the entire problem is possible, but at the tag end of an unprecedented session when the mind of every Member is directed toward the political campaign even now under way. It puts the Congress in the business of setting a price in a complex industry for political reasons and with the hope of political gain. The precedent we establish here today carries the promise of untold mischief for the future.

Moreover, while the political timing of this bill may be excellent, its economic timing is bad. Milk prices are now, more than ever before in our recent history, being set in a comparatively free market. There is competition for milk in numerous markets. Milk prices are above current support levels. This bill is political tinkering with a market which, if it needs anything, needs freedom from the heavy hand of a Congress bent on getting out of Washington at the earliest possible time.

Finally, this bill is meaningless as far as current prices to dairy farmers in the great producing areas are concerned. In Wisconsin, milk producers today are being paid in excess of the present support level. Even under this bill, the best estimate I have indicates that Wisconsin farmers are receiving more than 12 cents above the support level it provides. The only excuse for this bill is the expectation that it will convince the farmer that something is being done for him. It will not, however, affect his milk check.

I cannot support a meaningless bill. I cannot support a political gesture. I refuse to be party to legislation which can only place the farmer deeper and deeper in the mire of politics. I look toward the day when we can move in the other direction—away from political intervention and toward a real solution to the dairy and other farm problems.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman who has just addressed the House says he is amazed at the situation now confronting the House. I want to say to him that I am amazed that he should take the well of the House and indict so severely his own colleagues in both Houses of the Congress, charging them with playing politics in connection with this bill. I suppose the gentleman who addressed the House is up and above politics. If that was not a political speech that you have just heard, I have never heard one. What reason is there for you to indict the Republican members of the House Committee on Agriculture and the distinguished Senators who represent the gentleman's party in the other end of this Capitol by saying that they are playing politics with the welfare of the farmers of America? Are we playing politics when we bring out a bill here that puts a floor under the price that the farmers are now receiving? You have admitted that we are not increasing the farmer's check. The bill does not pretend to incease the farmer's check.

It only pretends to do what it says, to put a floor under the price. The gentleman has a perfect right to vote against this bill and tell the farmers that he is voting against this bill, but do not indict the whole membership of the House and the other body.

In opposing this bill the gentleman, of course, is again placing his stamp of approval upon the program of Ezra Taft Benson whose program will lead irresistably and inevitably to bankruptcy and ruin for the farmers of America. Go back to your district and tell your farmers that you are proud of Benson's record, which you have helped him to write. I think it will be a very difficult thing for you to do. You will have to sit down on the "tongues of all the wagons" of your district and explain to your farmers the record you have helped to write here in the Congress of our great country.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that any member of the House Committee on Agriculture is a political demagog nor do I believe that those who are supporting this bill are prompted by partisan politics. May I say to the gentleman from Wisconsin, perhaps your farmers will agree with the position you are here taking. That is their privilege. If the President signs this bill he will, from the White House, repudiate Mr. Benson and all that he stands for. If he does not sign it he will turn his back on all the dairy farmers of the country.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE].

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I am going to support this bill. It should not do much harm and it might do some good.

I heard it spoken so many times that this bill is not going to have any effect on producers dairy prices. Also we have heard that the farmers' prices are made in Washington, but somehow or other we find that the dairy farmers' prices are not made entirely in Washington. The support level is at 77 percent of parity, but the market price is considerably higher. So now we have to move support prices to the market level. This is not going to mean that everybody is going to get the support level, and, Mr. Chairman, I have a number of tables which will show you where each State stands in relation to the support level:

TABLE 1.—*Prices paid producers for milk of manufacturing grade, by States, 1959, compared with U.S. average prices and price-suppor levels for manufacturing milk*

State	Average price paid	Average test	Price per point of test	Price per hundredweight at U.S. average test	Deviation from U.S. average price	Deviation from U.S. support price [1]	Price per 3.5 test milk	Deviation from U.S. average price (3.5)	Deviation from U.S. support price at 3.5 [2]
New York	$2.99	3.84	$7.79	$2.94	−$0.23	−$0.12	$2.73	−$0.21	−*0.11
Ohio	3.32	3.97	8.36	3.16	−.01	+.10	2.93	−.01	+.09
Indiana	3.40	4.01	8.48	3.20	+.03	+.14	2.97	+.03	+.13
Illinois	3.21	3.73	9.60	3.25	+.08	+.19	3.01	+.07	+.17
Michigan	3.24	3.81	8.50	3.21	+.04	+.15	2.98	+.04	+.14
Wisconsin	3.12	3.68	8.48	3.20	+.03	+.14	2.97	+.03	+.13
Minnesota	3.00	3.48	8.62	3.26	+.09	+.20	3.02	+.08	+.18
Iowa	3.06	3.65	8.38	3.17	0	+.11	2.93	−.01	+.09
Missouri	3.34	4.22	7.91	2.99	−.18	−.07	2.77	−.17	−.07
South Dakota	2.82	3.50	8.06	3.05	−.12	−.01	2.82	−.12	−.02
Kansas	3.28	3.86	8.50	3.21	+.04	+.15	2.98	+.04	+.14
Virginia	3.37	4.26	7.91	2.99	−.18	−.07	2.77	−.17	−.07
North Carolina	3.47	4.51	7.69	2.91	−.26	−.15	2.69	−.25	−.15
Georgia	3.36	4.49	7.48	2.83	−.34	−.23	2.62	−.32	−.22
Kentucky	3.33	4.33	7.69	2.91	−.26	−.15	2.69	−.25	−.15
Tennessee	3.39	4.43	7.65	2.89	−.28	−.17	2.68	−.26	−.16
Alabama	3.27	4.32	7.57	2.86	−.31	−.20	2.65	−.29	−.19
Mississippi	3.37	4.38	7.69	2.91	−.26	−.15	2.69	−.25	−.15
Arkansas	3.32	4.26	7.79	2.94	−.23	−.12	2.73	−.21	−.11
Oklahoma	3.36	4.09	8.22	3.11	−.06	+.05	2.88	−.06	+.04
Texas	3.39	4.30	7.88	2.98	−.19	−.08	2.76	−.18	−.08
Montana	2.86	3.80	7.53	2.85	−.32	−.21	2.64	−.30	−.20
Idaho	3.23	3.77	8.57	3.24	+.07	+.18	3.00	+.06	+.16
Wyoming	2.99	3.45	8.67	3.28	+.11	+.22	3.03	+.09	+.19
Colorado	3.10	3.71	8.36	3.16	−.01	+.10	2.93	−.01	+.09
Utah	3.04	3.64	8.35	3.16	−.01	+.10	2.92	−.02	+.08
Washington	3.10	4.24	7.31	2.76	−.41	−.30	2.56	−.38	−.28
Oregon	3.65	4.39	8.31	3.14	−.03	+.08	2.91	−.03	+.07
California	3.28	3.84	8.54	3.23	+.06	+.17	2.99	+.05	+.15
United States	3.17	3.78	8.39	3.17	0	0	2.94	0	(2.84)

[1] U.S. support price=$3.06 for U.S. average test milk.

[2] U.S. support for 3.5 percent milk=$3.06÷3.78=8.10×3.5=$2.84.

In Minnesota we are fortunate in receiving for manufactured milk 20 cents a hundred higher than the support level. There is only 1 State higher than that, Wyoming. But now let us look at the State of Washington. They receive 30 cents a hundred less than the support level. That means we are getting 50 cents a hundred more than the State of Washington. And, you can go down the line where Illinois is getting 19 cents more, Idaho 18, California 17, but then you go down to the State of New York it is 12 cents below the support level, and going down further into North Carolina it is 15 cents below the support level; Alabama 20 cents below the support level, Montana 21 cents below the support level, and Georgia 23 cents below the support level:

TABLE 2.—*Ranking of States in prices paid producers for milk of manufacturing grade, 1959, as compared to U.S. average support level*

[Price paid as compared to U.S. support level (cents percent)]

Wyoming	+0.22
Minnesota	+.20
Illinois	+.19
Idaho	+.18
California	+.17
Kansas	+.15
Michigan	+.15
Wisconsin	+.14
Indiana	+.14
Iowa	+.11
Ohio	+.10
Colorado	+.10
Utah	+.10
Oregon	+.08
Oklahoma	+.05
South Dakota	−.01
Virginia	−.07
Missouri	−.07
Texas	−.08
New York	−.12
Arkansas	−.12
Kentucky	−.15
Mississippi	−.15
North Carolina	−.15
Tennessee	−.17
Alabama	−.20
Montana	−.21
Georgia	−.23
Washington	−.30

TABLE 2.—*Ranking of States in prices paid producers for milk of manufacturing grade, 1959, as compared to U.S. average support level*—Continued

[Price paid as compared to U.S. support level (cents percent)]

The following tables also point out the prices that are paid and the deviation on butterfat:

TABLE 3.—*Prices paid producers for butterfat in cream, 1959, by States, compared to U.S. average and support level prices*

State	Price butterfat	Deviation from U.S. average	Deviation from U.S. support level
Maine	61	+1.9	+4.4
Vermont	61	+1.9	+4.4
New York	52	−7.1	−4.6
Pennsylvania	53	−6.1	−3.6
Ohio	49	−10.1	−7.6
Indiana	50	−9.1	−6.6
Illinois	50	−9.1	−6.6
Michigan	60	+.9	+3.4
Wisconsin	62	+2.9	+5.4
Minnesota	64	+4.9	+7.4
Iowa	63	+3.9	+6.4
Missouri	51	−8.1	−5.6
North Dakota	61	+1.9	+4.4
South Dakota	60	+.9	+3.4
Nebraska	60	+.9	+3.4
Kansas	55	−4.1	−1.6
Maryland	49	−10.1	−7.6
Virginia	50	−9.1	−6.6
West Virginia	47	−12.1	−9.6
North Carolina	50	−9.1	−6.6
South Carolina	51	−8.1	−5.6
Georgia	51	−8.1	−5.6
Kentucky	45	−14.1	−11.6
Tennessee	45	−14.1	−11.6
Alabama	51	−8.1	−5.6
Mississippi	50	−9.1	−6.6

TABLE 3.—*Prices paid producers for butterfat in cream, 1959, by States, compared to U.S. average and support level prices*—Con.

State	Price butterfat	Deviation from U.S. average	Deviation from U.S. support level
Arkansas	50	−9.1	−6.6
Louisiana	50	−9.1	−6.6
Oklahoma	53	−6.1	−3.6
Texas	49	−10.1	−7.6
Montana	61	+1.9	+4.4
Idaho	58	−1.1	+1.4
Wyoming	60	+.9	+3.4
Colorado	58	−1.1	+1.4
New Mexico	57	−2.1	+.4
Arizona	57	−2.1	+.4
Utah	57	−2.1	+.4
Nevada	63	+3.9	+6.4
Washington	58	−1.1	+1.4
Oregon	61	+1.9	+4.4
California	62	+2.9	+5.4
United States	59.1	0	0

Now, this is where the problem comes, and I think even though this bill is not going to hurt anything, we must be careful that we do not force the price of butter too high, because we can lose some markets.

Last year the price of butter went up a little bit and we lost markets to oleomargarine. But, lo and behold, when prices dropped a little bit we never got the market back again. So let us be sure that we do not force dairy farmers to lose their market for butterfat.

Referring again to these prices, Minnesota stands at the highest, paying 7.4 cents more than the support level. Tennessee is at the bottom. Kentucky is at 11.6 cents below the support level.

TABLE 4.—*Ranking of States in prices paid producers for butterfat in cream, 1959, as compared to U.S. average price and price support level for butterfat*

State	*Price paid as compared to U.S. support level*
Minnesota	+7.4
Iowa	+6.4
Nevada	+6.4
Wisconsin	+5.4
California	+5.4
Maine	+4.4
Vermont	+4.4
North Dakota	+4.4
Montana	+4.4
Oregon	+4.4
Michigan	+3.4
South Dakota	+3.4
Nebraska	+3.4
Wyoming	+3.4
Idaho	+1.4
Colorado	+1.4
Washington	+1.4
New Mexico	+0.4
Arizona	+0.4
Utah	+0.4
Kansas	−1.6
Pennsylvania	−3.6
Oklahoma	−3.6
New York	−4.6
Missouri	−5.6
South Carolina	−5.6
Georgia	−5.6
Alabama	−5.6
Indiana	−6.6
Illinois	−6.6
Virginia	−6.6
North Carolina	−6.6
Mississippi	−6.6
Arkansas	−6.6
Louisiana	−6.6
Ohio	−7.6
Maryland	−7.6
Texas	−7.6
West Virginia	−9.6
Kentucky	−11.6
Tennessee	−11.6

I should like also to point out how the parity equivalent of manufacturing milk is set. This is interesting and if we are to understand price supports on dairy products we should understand this, since the parity equivalent has been going down until this year. In "Agricultural Prices," January 1960, it states:

AGRICULTURAL PRICES, JANUARY 1960

PARITY

Current procedure for computing the parity equivalent for manufacturing milk as approved by the Secretary of Agriculture provides that (1) the parity equivalent for manufacturing milk shall be determined on the basis of the relation of (a) the average price received by farmers for all milk sold at wholesale to plants and dealers for the period July 1946 through the December preceding the date of computation to (b) the average price paid f.o.b. plant by processors for all milk sold by farmers for use in production of American cheese, evaporated milk, and butter and byproducts during the same period; (2) data for each year are to be added annually until 10 full calendar years are included in the comparison; (3) thereafter the parity equivalent during any calendar year will be determined on the basis of the relation between the averages of the respective series for the 10 calendar years immediately preceding.

The factor to be used during a particular calendar year is computed in January of that year using price data available at the date of computation. The factor to be used during 1960 is 80 percent, which compares with 80.2 percent during 1959. The parity price for all milk wholesale, $4.99 per hundredweight based on data for January 1960, multiplied by 80 percent, results in $3.99 per hundredweight, the parity equivalent for milk for manufacture based on data for January 1960. This parity equivalent applies to the national average price for all milk of average milkfat content used for the principal manufacturing purposes, calculated on an annual basis. It should be noted that the parity equivalent for milk for manufacturing is not in itself a parity price but rather is an administrative determination of an operating differential which is subject to revision as additional data become available or as experience indicates that the same purpose might better be achieved by calculating and applying revised differentials.

I shall not go any further with these statistics, but I invite Members to read them.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KEARNS].

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to my colleague that I admire his courage. He is a member of the Committee on Labor, with me. He still has his interest in labor problems as well as farm problems, and we appreciate so much what he has given to the Committee on Labor along with his interest in agriculture.

Mr. QUIE. I thank the gentleman. I wish we were as successful in getting $1.15 as a minimum wage as we are now in getting $3.22 for milk.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PELLY. The gentleman referred to the situation in the State of Washington. I would like to ask, if this bill passes whether it will mean an increase in price to the milk consumers in my State of Washington.

Mr. QUIE. I do not think it will. The processor does not have to pay the support level, and I doubt that fluid milk prices in the State of Washington will be affected by this bill. I attempted to add an amendment which would have made each processor who sold to the Government certify that he paid the support level to the producer, but my amendment did not carry in the committee.

Here is my amendment:

Provided, That the lender upon or vendor of any milk, butterfat, and the products of such commodities shall certify that during the previous twelve-month period such lender or vendor has actually paid all producers from whom any such commodities were purchased not less than the support price established pursuant to this subsection.

The purpose of this amendment is to require that any handler selling to or obtaining loans upon manufactured milk products must pay the minimum support price to farmers from whom he obtained these commodities. In order to be eligible for CCC loans or purchases, the handler would be required to sign a certificate that he paid the minimum support price on all dairy products he purchased from farmers.

I am not going to offer it here because I think it will hamper the bill, since I understand this is the last day of the session. But the only way we are going to make sure the producer will get the support level is to put an amendment of this nature onto the bill.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. DIXON].

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, provisions of S. 2917, Senate Report No. 1592, which would increase dairy price supports for the remainder of the current marketing year to $3.22 per hundredweight for manufacturing milk and 59.6 cents per pound for butterfat would tend to reverse the trend of recent years toward a more favorable balance between milk production and the consumption of dairy products.

First. Higher prices would increase milk production: Higher support prices would be a stimulus for increasing milk production. More reasonable supports have encouraged milk production to level off at around 125 billion pounds during the past 4 years. In the early fifties, under a high guaranteed support price, milk production shot upward creating the serious dairy surplus problem. High support prices set the stage for milk production to increase from 116.6 billion pounds in 1952 to 125.5 billion pounds in 1956. The market could not absorb this added production and it was taken off through purchases of dairy products under the support program.

Second. Higher support prices could reduce consumption, increase food costs: Higher support prices very likely would reverse gains that have been made in increasing the consumption of dairy products. This would result in substituting Government purchasing for consumer buying of dairy products. Butter which faces strong competition from

lower priced spreads could be seriously damaged.

Third. Higher support prices could increase Government purchases and costs: Overall dairy purchases under price support during the last 2 marketing years have gone down. Higher support prices bringing increased production and reduced consumption could push purchases up.

Even if purchases were not increased as a result of the dairy support increase, Government costs would go up $5 to $10 million on the basis of current purchasing levels because of higher purchase prices.

Fourth. Fixed support price by legislative action bad precedent: Fixing a specific level of dairy price support by law for a marketing year without regard to current production and consumption conditions is highly inadvisable. The law now requires the Secretary of Agriculture to support prices to producers for milk and butterfat at such level from 75 to 90 percent of parity. The law now leaves to the Secretary the determination of a support level within the authorized range that will accomplish the objectives of the act. The support prices of $3.06 for manufacturing milk and 56.6 cents per pound for butterfat—both reflecting about 77 percent of parity—for the current 1960–61 marketing year were set after taking into consideration the production and consumption pattern for the year.

Fifth. Cash receipts from milk and butterfat estimated record for 1960: At current support levels, estimates are that cash receipts from farm sales of milk and butterfat in 1960 will reach $4.7 billion, the highest on record.

Sixth. Increased Government activity robs free market interplay: With reduced purchases of dairy products by Government under support, the market operates more freely in performing various functions of storage, pricing, and inventory holding. Any increase in Government activity through larger purchasing tends to rob the market of these functions and destroy prices.

Seventh. Other crops would like a guarantee of 80½ percent of parity.

I am privileged to include a statement from our Secretary of Agriculture:

STATEMENT BY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE EZRA TAFT BENSON, AUGUST 6, 1960

S. 2917 to arbitrarily raise dairy supports is based on political expedience and not sound economics. Since adjusting price supports to more realistic levels in 1954, the industry has been moving steadily forward to a balanced position which will make 1960 the best year in history for dairying. Farmers are now getting 85 percent of parity for all milk.

This legislation is a step backward. If enacted it will lose market for farmers, increase prices to consumers and pile up surpluses in Government warehouses at heavy costs to farmers and other taxpayers.

It is inconceivable that legislation would be sponsored to repeat the price-depressing buildup of surplus from which we have just emerged. Congress should quit tinkering with the dairy industry.

S. 2917 should, in the best interests of farmers and the entire dairy industry be decisively defeated.

FACTS REGARDING PROPOSED INCREASE FOR DAIRY PRICE SUPPORTS

First. Cash receipts for the current marketing year are expected to be the highest on record—$4.7 billion. This improvement in the dairy situation is a reflection of many constructive factors.

Second. Dairy producers as of the middle of July were receiving 85 percent of parity on all milk sold at wholesale. The average price received was $4.90 per hundredweight. It should be noted that there are no controls of dairy production.

Third. With the needed adjustments in price support levels, which occurred under this administration, the situation improved dramatically. As output has come more nearly in line with commercial demand, price support purchases fell sharply.

Fourth. The price support is not necessarily the market price. It is only true when the price support level is unrealistic and market destroying. For example, during 1959 the average market price for manufacturing milk was $3.23 per hundredweight compared with a price support of $3.06; for butterfat the average price received was 59½ cents per pound compared with a price support of 56.6 per pound. During the first 4 months of the current marketing year prices have been above that received a year earlier.

Fifth. Currently cheese is selling in Wisconsin for 34.9 cents per pound. Even if this price support proposal became law the current price is about 1 cent above the indicated support price. Thus farmers who sell to cheese plants will not get more under this proposal. On the other hand it will have adverse effects. It will stimulate increased production which will go into Government storage and once more place the dairy industry in a surplus position. Farmers need markets not more warehouses in which to store dairy products. The present prices above the support level indicate that the current program is working and that production is going into markets.

Sixth. It should be noted that in addition to the direct price support program, legislation is in effect which authorizes expenditures to increase the consumption of whole milk among schoolchildren in the United States. The Government pays the cost of milk consumed by the children over and above the quantities included as part of the lunches served under the school lunch program. This program has grown from approximately 500 million pounds in 1955 to 1.2 billion pounds in 1959. It is expected to be even higher in 1960.

Seventh. Also, a program was inaugurated to increase the consumption of fluid milk by personnel in the military services and Veterans' Administration hospitals. The legislation was broadened in 1958 to include the Coast Guard and Merchant Marine Academy. The CCC has reimbursed these agencies for part of the cost of milk used over their normal purchases. The reimbursement rate has been approximately the amount which CCC otherwise would have spent to purchase, store and handle butter and nonfat dry milk under the price support program. The total milk used by these services has more than doubled with the program.

Eighth. Contrary to the impression of many people the current level of price support for dairy products is not at the minimum permitted by law. The current level of price support was set at 77 percent of parity.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD].

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, before we vote on this bill, I would like to make several things very clear. First, we are voting on a bill which provides for $3.22 support level on manufacturing milk with a butterfat content of 3.86. Many people have said and many newspaper reports have carried stories in Wisconsin that this particular bill provided for $3.22 on the basis of Wisconsin pay prices. That is not the case. This assumption is not true. The pay price for manufacturing milk in Wisconsin is based on the 3.5 butterfat test and almost all milk producers and processors will find that fact clearly set forth on the pay receipt.

On the basis of this bill, for 3.5 milk, the support level will be raised from $2.77 to $2.92. This comes about through raising the price support on 3.86 butterfat content milk from $3.06 to $3.22.

How will this affect the price of cheese in Wisconsin? The cheese-pay price on the Green Bay board closed on Friday of this past week at 35 cents a pound. This is not assembled cheese and the Government buys only assembled cheese which would aid from seven-eighths cents to 1¼ cents per pound. Under the terms of this particular bill the price support level will be raised to 34¼ cents. It will be below the market price at Green Bay which was 35 cents as of the close of the market last Friday. And you add to that seven-eighths of a cent to 1¼ cents before the Government would get this unassembled cheese, which would make the price the Government would have to pay, according to the Green Bay market, 35⅞ cents to 36¼ cents.

I personally feel that action needs to be taken by the Congress in order to freeze the parity equivalent of manufactured milk. We have seen since 1946 the increase in fluid prices throughout the United States. The parity equivalent of manufactured milk has gone from approximately 88 percent to 82.5 percent. The manufactured milk producing areas have suffered tremendously. As far as the farmer is concerned the parity equivalent is the important think to keep in mind.

I have had legislation before the House Committee on Agriculture which would freeze the parity equivalent on manufactured milk so that we would have a constant parity equivalent. The dairy industry could make plans on a long-term basis only in this way. This would be a better way of attacking the problem facing the manufacturing milk producer. It would be a sounder solution to change the parity equivalent because of the

changes which have taken place in the milk market. My bill would have improved prices to farmers in Wisconsin. This bill does nothing for the pocketbook of my milk producers and for that I have deep regrets.

I am supporting the passage of this bill, but I do want farmers particularly back in my Wisconsin congressional district to understand that on the basis of the Chicago butter market, on the basis of the Green Bay cheese market, this particular bill is setting a floor which is much lower than the market price. It is much lower than the projections for the manufactured milk prices in Wisconsin through the period of time this legislation will be in existence. I think everyone realizes that this bill is only good until April 1 of 1961.

Below is a chart listing the present support prices, present Wisconsin pay prices, and the future price support levels under this bill:

	Present support level	Support level under this bill	Present Wisconsin market prices
Manufacturing milk:			
3.86 butterfat content	$3.06	$3.22	$3.41
3.5 butterfat content	2.77	2.92	3.10
Cheese	.32¾	.34¼	.35
Butter	.58	.604	.63
Dry milk, nonfat milk solids	.12	.12¼	.12½

Before a vote is taken on this short-term proposal, I think there are some basic facts which should be understood regarding the dairy industry.

First. Cash receipts for the current marketing year are expected to be the highest on record—$4.7 billion. This improvement in the dairy situation is a reflection of many constructive factors.

Second. The dairy industry through promotion and realistic assistance by the Government has continued its progressive advancement toward balancing its output with effective demand for dairy products.

Third. By the end of 1959, production was only a little in excess of the demand at market prices. This is a great change from the surplus position which existed in the dairy industry only a few years ago. This surplus was generated because dairy products were being priced out of their markets.

Fourth. There are many Members of the Congress who believe that the price support is necessarily the market price. This is not necessarily so. It is only true when the price support level is unrealistic and market destroying. For example, during 1959 the average market price for manufacturing milk was $3.23 per hundredweight, compared with a price support of $3.06; for butterfat the average price received was 59½ cents per pound compared with a price support of 56.6 cents per pound. During the first 4 months of the current marketing year prices have been above that received a year earlier.

Fifth. Some Members of Congress may vote for this bill on the mistaken assumption that farmers will get more for their dairy products. I wish to point out that currently cheese is selling in Wisconsin for 35 cents per pound. Even if this price support proposal became law the current price is more than 1 cent a pound above the indicated support price. Therefore, it is the sheerest political demagoguery to assume that farmers in my district will get more money for their milk next month or the months following because of the passage of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, if the majority party really wants to help the Wisconsin dairy farmer let them pass the free flow of milk bill introduced in this session of Congress by 10 members of their party and 10 members of my party. This legislation would be a major accomplishment and would be truly meaningful to the farmers of Wisconsin. Our Wisconsin farmers must move 85 percent of our milk production outside our State boundaries. At the present time only 15 percent of our milk production can move outside our State in the form of fluid milk because of the unrealistic sanitary standards established as milk barriers against the free flow of USPHS Code approved milk.

The Republican and Democratic platform committees, meeting in Chicago and Los Angeles, respectively, were asked to include in their platforms a pledge endorsing the free movement of milk bill. What happened? The Democratic platform committee turned its back on the midwest dairy farmer and rejected any mention of support for this important legislation.

What did the Republicans say in Chicago? The Republican platform says: "We pledge free movement in interstate commerce of agricultural commodities meeting Federal health standards."

Mr. Chairman, the point I make is quite clear. The free-movement-of-milk bill not only had the support of the Eisenhower administration through a favorable report from HEW, it was supported by the Republican Party in its platform. It is a great disappointment to Wisconsin dairy farmers that this legislation has not been acted on in the Congress with its 2 to 1 Democratic majority.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, our lovable and good friend from North Carolina, the chairman of the Agriculture Committee, just reached the height of absurdity when he said, believe it or not, that we were here talking politics. What did the leaders call us back for? To get a start on the campaign.

Mr. COOLEY. I did not call you back.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Oh, well, who did? Your leaders, your candidates for President. Get up and answer instead of grumbling. Politics? Of course they were talking politics. Obtaining political advantage was the purpose of our return. But who is the gentleman from North Carolina, the chairman of the Agriculture Committee, Mr. COOLEY, to criticize the gentleman from Wisconsin, JOHNNY BYRNES? Did we ever have a more able, conscientious, patriotic, and effective legislator here on either side than JOHNNY BYRNES? Not since I came here in January of 1935. You know that and my lovable friend from North Carolina, who grows tobacco in such large quantities—you remember when he had his picture in that expensive brochure with Walter Reuther paid for by the union. The gentleman does not talk politics? Neither does his party. Little else has been talked this session. Reuther gives the orders to KENNEDY and KENNEDY sends them on to JOHNSON, and the instructions or rather the requests follow on down to us, to the Speaker and the gentlemen over there. Politics? Nobody is engaged in politics. Oh, no.

Yes, boo some more. It always hurts you when you get the truth.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSEN].

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, first I want to say I am in support of this bill to increase the level of price supports for milk and butterfat, Although I do not feel it will have much effect one way or the other in helping to make that essential boost so badly needed in the farm economy in the Midwest, every little bit helps and we are grateful for small favors.

Mr. Chairman, here we are in the last night of this session of the 86th Congress. We are getting ready to quit. What have we done to solve one of the great domestic problems in this Nation of ours? Both Mr. KENNEDY and Mr. NIXON claim the farm problem is the greatest one domestic problem facing us today, and I fully agree. But we are getting ready here today to run out on the farmers before our job is done. Why can we not stay here another week and do something for the farm economy of the Nation? I say that in all seriousness. Here we are expending $600 million a year in grain storage on a huge surplus which is worth nothing to anybody except, perhaps, what we can give away to feed our own people and to feed hungry people abroad. What is being done to help do something to whittle away that surplus—nothing. Why no farm bill this year? Might I ask now in all seriousness, Who is responsible for the fact that nothing has been done? There is no answer but the majority of this House is responsible. You cannot evade your responsibility for not doing anything to try to help boost up the Midwest farm economy of this Nation. You cannot escape that responsibility.

The fault is not all yours because we have had an unsympathetic Secretary of Agriculture standing in our way. But the American people will not, in my judgment, let you hide behind the alibi of a possible veto. After all, the President cannot veto a bill unless we pass it and, if the leadership in Congress is sincere, there is no excuse whatsoever for the failure to give the farmer his day in court. Who knows, the President might sign a good farm bill. It is our solemn duty to at least lay such a bill on his desk.

Responsibility for not having done something worth while for the farmers of America must rest squarely upon the

shoulders of the leadership now in control of the Congress. I say that in all seriousness. Yet, here we are getting ready to quit and walk out on the farmers of the Midwest and do nothing about our number one domestic problem. Oh, yes, we have had these brilliant campaign promises, especially at the convention at Los Angeles just last July. Why are you gentlemen not going to help me bring up the level of price supports? Yes, I was delighted to hear the Democrats had pledged themselves to bring up our farm economy to a level of 90 percent of parity. Yet, here you are, getting ready to quit tonight. We could stay here next week and do something on the green acres program which has already been adopted by the House of Representatives. Or, if you prefer, bring up some other equally good measure and I will support it as I always have in the past. You can and you should do something to improve our agricultural life. I tell you, my friends, you can get more votes by doing that than by going home and making a few speeches this coming week. The people want results, not alibis. They want action, not promises. Only the politicians want the issue, while the people plead for a solution.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. I yield to my friend from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KEARNS. Do you not feel that the proposals made by Vice President NIXON might solve the problem?

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. I would say, inasmuch as Mr. NIXON is incapacitated for a couple of weeks, that it would not hurt if the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] and the other Members stayed here to try to do something to boost the farm economy and try to balance off the campaign.

I have found from experience, 22 years of it here in the Congress, that if a man does his job the folks back home will take care of his campaigning. We must try always to keep partisan politics out of agriculture, but I can say very frankly here tonight that regardless of which side of the political aisle you sit on it will be to your advantage to bring out and pass a good farm bill. But if you do nothing, the people back home will hold you accountable and properly so.

At this late hour I implore you to not forsake the people of rural America whose economic future rests in your hands.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I was going to ask the gentleman from Minnesota to yield. I am on your side to try to help the farmers.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. May I say that I have great appreciation for the splendid job the gentleman from Missouri has done through the years on behalf of the farmers. I regret I did not have time to yield to him.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I wanted to tell the gentleman that if he would offer his green acres bill as an amendment to this bill I am sure that if he got half the support on his side that he would on our side we could get that bill passed tonight.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. H.R. 12000, the green acres bill, is ready to go. Mr. JENSEN and I have tried to get it seriously considered.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. We do not have a rule on it. Offer it as an amendment to this bill. Let us go with it. I would like to see how many votes we could get over there. I do not know whether the gentleman realizes it or not, but this House has passed farm legislation that the President has vetoed. Will you not answer that question?

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Yes; I will answer. The gentleman is partially correct.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Has not the President vetoed farm legislation he voted for?

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Let me say to the gentleman that it is our responsibility to pass legislation. Yes, the President has vetoed farm legislation I have voted for. That is his decision.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I insist: Has not the President vetoed some legislation the gentleman from Minnesota voted for that would help the farmers? Answer that question.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. I am answering your question. After we discharge our duty in passing legislation, then it is up to the President to sign or veto the bill.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I am not going to yield for any other purpose.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. It is our responsibility to pass farm legislation, I repeat to my good friend from Missouri. That comes first. What the President does is then his responsibility, not ours.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. We passed it. Get your President on the right side; we are ready to go.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (c) of section 201 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U.S.C. 1446), as amended, is further amended by adding the following new sentence to be inserted immediately after the first sentence: "Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions, for the period beginning with the enactment of this sentence and ending March 31, 1961, the price of milk for manufacturing purposes and the price of butterfat shall be supported at not less than $3.22 per hundredweight and 59.6 cents per pound, respectively."

The CHAIRMAN. There being no amendments, under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. KEOGH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (S. 2917) to establish a price support level for milk and butterfat, pursuant to House Resolution 636, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

The bill was read a third time.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Would it be possible by unanimous consent to return to the amendment stage?

The SPEAKER. It would not. The previous question has already been ordered. All amendments and all debate are exhausted.

The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FULTON) there were yeas 171, noes 32.

So the bill was passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPEAKER EMPOWERED TO DECLARE A RECESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during this legislative day it may be in order for the Speaker to declare a recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR EDUCATION AND TRAINING FOR THE CHILDREN OF VETERANS

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 4306) to provide education and training for the children of veterans dying of a service-connected disability incurred after January 31, 1955, and before the end of compulsory military service, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That paragraph (1) of section 1701(a) of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

"(1) by striking out in the first sentence of such paragraph 'or the Korean conflict' and inserting in lieu thereof 'the Korean conflict, or the induction period';

"(2) by inserting in the second sentence of such paragraph immediately after 'disability' the following: 'arising out of service during the Spanish-American War, World War I, World War II, or the Korean conflict'; and

"(3) by adding at the end of such paragraph the following new sentence: 'The standards and criteria for determining whether or not a disability arising out of service during the induction period is service-connected shall be those applicable under chapter 11 of this title, except that the disability must (A) be shown to have directly resulted from, and the causative factor therefor must be shown to have arisen out of, the performance of active military, naval, or air service (but not including service described under section 106 of this title), or (B) have resulted (i) directly from armed conflict or (ii) from an injury or disease

received while engaged in extrahazardous service (including such service under conditions simulating war).'

"SEC. 2. Subsection (a) of section 1701 of such title is amended by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph as follows:

"'(9) The term 'induction period' means (A) the period beginning September 16, 1940, and ending December 6, 1941, and the period beginning July 26, 1947, and ending June 26, 1950, and (B) the period beginning on February 1, 1955, and ending on the day before the first day thereafter on which individuals (other than individuals liable for induction by reason of a prior deferment) are no longer liable for induction for training and service into the Armed Forces under the Universal Military Training and Service Act.'

"SEC. 3. Subsection (d) of section 1701 of such title is amended by striking out 'or the Korean conflict' and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'the Korean conflict, or the induction period.'

"SEC. 4. Subsection (c) of section 1723 of such title is amended—

"(1) by deleting 'television' and inserting in lieu thereof 'open circuit television (except as herein provided)'; and

"(2) by adding at the end thereof the following sentence: 'The Administrator may approve the enrollment of an eligible person in a course, to be pursued in residence, leading to a standard college degree which includes, as an integral part thereof, subjects offered through the medium of open circuit televised instruction, if the major portion of the course requires conventional classroom or laboratory attendance.'

"SEC. 5. In the case of any individual who is an 'eligible person' within the meaning of section 1701(a)(1) of title 38, United States Code, solely by virtue of the amendments made by this Act, and who is above the age of seventeen years and below the age of twenty-three years on the date of enactment of this Act, the period referred to in section 1712 of title 38, United States Code, shall not end with respect to such individual until the expiration of the five-year period which begins on the date of enactment of this Act."

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to provide education and training for the children of veterans dying of a disability incurred after January 31, 1955, and before the end of compulsory military service and directly caused by military, naval, or air service, and for other purposes."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DETERMINATION OF RETAIL PRICE FOR PURPOSES OF EXCISE TAX ON CIGARS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 10960) to amend section 5701 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the excise tax upon cigars, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2214)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10960) to amend section 5701 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the excise tax upon cigars, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 2.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1 and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: On page 3 of the Senate engrossed amendments, line 17, strike out "SEC. 5" and insert "SEC. 4"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: On page 9 of the Senate engrossed amendments, line 5, strike out "SEC. 6" and insert "SEC. 5"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with the following amendments: On page 11 of the Senate engrossed amendments, line 2, strike out "SEC. 7" and insert the following: "SEC. 6".

On page 11 of the Senate engrossed amendments, line 12, strike out "marle" and insert the following: "marl".

On page 11 of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out lines 16, 17, and 18, and insert the following:

"(b) LAND USED IN FARMING.—For purposes of subsection (a), the term 'land used in farming' means land used (before or simultaneously with the expenditures described in subsection (a)) by the taxpayer or his tenant for the production of crops, fruits, or other agricultural products or for the sustenance of livestock."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: On page 15 of the Senate engrossed amendments, line 20, strike out "SEC. 8" and insert "SEC. 7"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: On page 15 of the Senate engrossed amendments, line 18, strike out "SEC. 9" and insert "SEC. 8"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: On page 17 of the Senate engrossed amendments, line 7, strike out "SEC. 10" and insert "SEC. 9"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: On page 18 of the Senate engrossed amendments, line 5, strike out "SEC. 11" and insert "SEC. 10"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 11. The Pension Fund, Plumbers' Local Union Numbered 775, which was created May 1, 1957, as a result of an agreement between Plumbers' Local Union Numbered 775, of Suffolk County, New York, affiliated with the United Association of Journeymen and Apprentices of the Plumbing and Pipe Fitting Industry of the United States and Canada, and the Suffolk County Plumbing and Heating Contractors Association, Inc., and which has been held by the Internal Revenue Service to constitute a qualified trust under section 401(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, and to be exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of such Code, shall be held and considered to have been a qualified trust under such section 401(a), and to have been exempt from taxation under such section 501(a), for the period beginning May 1, 1957, and ending May 11, 1959, but only if it is shown to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate that the trust has not in this period been operated in a manner which would jeopardize the interests of its beneficiaries."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the bill and agree to the same.

W. D. MILLS,
AIME J. FORAND,
CECIL F. KING,
NOAH M. MASON,
JOHN W. BYRNES,
Managers on the Part of the House.

HARRY F. BYRD,
ROBT. S. KERR,
J. ALLEN FREAR, Jr.,
RUSSELL B. LONG,
By HARRY F. BYRD,
JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
FRANK CARLSON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10960) to amend section 5701 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the excise tax upon cigars, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

CERTAIN DIVIDENDS FROM CERTAIN CORPORATIONS

Amendment No. 1: This amendment adds a new section to the bill as passed by the House which amends section 243 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 by adding a new subsection (d). Under the new subsection (d), the 85 percent intercorporate dividends received deduction is to apply with respect to dividends paid by a foreign corporation out of its earnings and profits if such earnings and profits were accumulated by a predecessor domestic corporation which was subject to the income tax under chapter 1 of the 1954 Code (or corresponding provisions of prior law). The new section of the bill also contains a technical amendment to section 861(a)(2) of the 1954 Code. These amendments apply to dividends received after December 31, 1959, in taxable years ending after such date.

This new section added by Senate amendment No. 1 is substantially the same as H.R. 12036 as passed by the House.

The House recedes.

DEFINITION OF BUSINESS LEASE

Amendment No. 2: Senate Amendment numbered 2 would add a new section to the bill, relating to exceptions to the definition of business lease.

The new section would add a sentence at the end of section 514(b)(3)(A). This sentence provides that a lease to a medical clinic by a scientific organization engaged in medical research of premises adjacent to those

occupied by such scientific organization shall be considered a lease entered into primarily for purposes substantially related to the organization's exempt purposes and functions (and thus shall not be considered a business lease), if the treatment of patients of the medical clinic, their medical histories, and donated services of doctors of the medical clinic are utilized by the scientific organization for medical research purposes.

The Senate recedes.

PROVISIONS RELATING TO POSSESSIONS OF THE UNITED STATES

Amendment No. 3: This amendment adds a new section 5 to the bill, relating to limitation on reduction in income tax liability incurred to the Virgin Islands and to the estate and gift tax treatment of certain citizen residents of possessions. Except as noted below (and except for technical clarifying amendments), the text of Senate amendment numbered 3 is the same as H.R. 5547, as passed by the House.

Both H.R. 5547 and the Senate amendment, with two exceptions, provide that tax liability incurred to the Virgin Islands pursuant to the income tax provisions equivalent to those of the United States, as made applicable in the Virgin Islands by the Naval Appropriations Act, approved July 12, 1921, or pursuant to section 28(a) of the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands, is not to be reduced or remitted in any way, directly or indirectly, whether by grant, subsidy, or other similar payment, by any law enacted in the Virgin Islands.

The first exception relates to United States and Virgin Islands corporations and, in general, provides that subsidies can be paid to these corporations under much the same conditions as those under which income tax exemptions are presently available in the case of U.S. corporations carrying on a trade or business in most other U.S. possessions (sec. 931 of the Code). The second exception relates to citizens of the United States (both those who are citizens by reason of the special Act of Congress relating to the possession, and those who are citizens by reason of birth in the continental United States, naturalization, etc.) who are bona fide residents of the Virgin Islands and permits the granting of subsidies in much the same manner as bona fide residents of Puerto Rico may claim an exemption from U.S. income tax with respect to their income derived from sources within Puerto Rico (sec. 933 of the Code). With respect to this second exception, the Senate amendment contains a provision (not in the House bill) under which gain or loss from the sale or exchange of any security (as defined in section 165(g)(2) of the Code) shall not be treated as derived from sources within the Virgin Islands.

Both H.R. 5547 and the Senate amendment provide (in effect) that United States citizens who are residents of a possession, and whose citizenship is derived from citizenship of that possession, are to be subject to the estate and gift tax imposed by the United States, in general, to the same extent as in the case of nonresidents not citizens of the United States.

The effect of this, in the case of the estate tax, is to impose the U.S. estate tax with respect to the portions of the gross estate of these citizens of U.S. possessions who are residents of the possessions at the time of their death, only with respect to that part of their gross estate which at the time of their death is situated in the United States. The effect, in the case of the gift tax, is that one of these citizens and residents of a U.S. possession at the time he makes a gift will be subject to the gift tax if, but only if, the property transferred is situated within the United States. For this purpose stock issued by a corporation is considered property situated within the United States only in the case of domestic corporations, but the making of a gift of stock of a domestic corporation, or any other intangible property with a situs within the United States is subject to the gift tax only if the donor resident of the possession is engaged in business in the United States at any time during the year in which the gift of the stock is made.

The House recedes with a clerical amendment.

MODIFICATION OF FILING REQUIREMENTS FOR DECLARATIONS OF ESTIMATED TAX BY INDIVIDUALS

Amendment No. 4: Senate Amendment numbered 4 adds a new section to the bill, relating to requirement of declaration of estimated tax by individuals.

Present law (sec. 6015 of the Code) provides that, for an individual with no more than $100 of gross income from sources other than wages or salaries, a declaration is required if his gross income is expected to be more than $5,000; however, no declaration is required by a married person if the gross income of the married person and his spouse is expected to be not more than $10,000 (nor from a head of a household or a surviving spouse if his gross income is expected to be not more than $100,000). For an individual with more than $100 of income not subject to withholding, a declaration is required if his gross income from all sources is expected to be more than $600 per exemption plus $400.

Under Senate amendment numbered 4, section 6015(a) is amended so as to (1) provide that no declaration is to be required if the estimated tax can reasonably be expected to be less than $40, (2) eliminate the gross income test of $400 plus $600 times the number of exemptions, and (3) increase from $100 to $200 the minimum gross income which can reasonably be expected to be received from sources other than wages without becoming liable to file a declaration.

The House recedes with a clerical amendment).

EXPENDITURES BY FARMERS FOR FERTILIZER

Amendment No. 5: This amendment adds a new section to the bill as passed by the House which adds a new section 180 to the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. Under the new section 180 a taxpayer engaged in the business of farming may elect to treat as expenses which are not chargeable to capital account expenditures (otherwise chargeable to capital account) which are paid or incurred by him during the taxable year for the purchase or acquisition of fertilizer, lime, ground limestone, marl, or other materials to enrich, neutralize, or condition land used in farming, or for the application of such materials to such land. The expenditures so treated are to be allowed as a deduction. For this purpose, "land used in farming" means land used (before or simultaneously with the expenditures described in the preceding sentence) by the taxpayer or his tenant for the production of crops, fruits, or other agricultural products or for the sustenance of livestock.

The House recedes with clerical amendments and with a technical amendment clarifying the definition of the term "land used in farming".

CHARITABLE CONTRIBUTIONS FOR CERTAIN STUDENTS MAINTAINED IN TAXPAYER'S HOME

Amendment No. 6: This amendment adds a new section to the bill as passed by the House amending section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to charitable contributions and gifts). Subsection (a)(1) of the new section of the bill amends section 170(c) of the 1954 Code so as to include within the definition of "charitable contribution" amounts treated as paid under the new subsection (d) (described below) for the use of organizations described in section 170(c) (2), (3), or (4), i.e., religious, charitable, scientific, literary, educational, veterans, fraternal, etc., organizations.

Subsection (a)(2) of the new section of the bill inserts a new subsection (d) in section 170 of the 1954 Code and redesignates the present subsections (d) and (e) as (e) and (f), respectively. Under paragraph (1) of the new subsection (d), amounts paid by a taxpayer to maintain an individual (other than a dependent or a relative) as a member of his household during the period that the individual is a full-time student in the twelfth or any lower grade at an educational institution located in the United States and is a member of the taxpayer's household under a written agreement between the taxpayer and an organization described in paragraph (2), (3), or (4) of section 170(c) of the 1954 Code to implement a program of the organization to provide educational opportunities for students in private homes are to be treated as amounts paid for the use of the organization (and thus will be treated as charitable contributions).

Paragraph (2) of the new subsection (d) contains two limitations on the amounts paid within the taxable year to which paragraph (1) applies. First, the amounts to which paragraph (1) applies are limited, for each taxable year, to an amount equal to $50 times the number of calendar months during the taxable year which fall within the period in which the student is a member of the taxpayer's household under the agreement described above. Second, paragraph (1) does not apply to any amount paid by the taxpayer within the taxable year if the taxpayer receives any money or other property as compensation or reimbursement for maintaining the student in his household during such period.

Under the Senate amendment these new provisions apply with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1959.

The House recedes with a clerical amendment.

CAPITAL CONTRIBUTIONS TO FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

Amendment No. 7: This amendment inserts in section 162 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to trade or business expenses) a new subsection (d), relating to capital contributions to the Federal National Mortgage Association. The new subsection provides that, for purposes of subtitle A of the 1954 Code, whenever the amount of capital contributions evidenced by a share of stock issued pursuant to section 303(c) of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act exceeds the fair market value of the stock as of the issue date of such stock, the initial holder of the stock is to treat the excess as ordinary and necessary expenses paid or incurred during the taxable year in carrying on a trade or business.

Amendment numbered 7 also amends the 1954 Code to insert a new section 1054 in the provisions of such Code relating to special rules as to the basis of property. The new section 1054 provides that, in the case of any share of stock described above, the basis of such share in the hands of the initial holder is to be an amount equal to the capital contributions evidenced by such share, reduced by the amount (if any) required by the new section 162(d) to be treated (with respect to such share) as ordinary and necessary expenses paid or incurred in carrying on a trade or business.

These amendments are to apply with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1959.

The substance of this amendment is the same as the substance of H.R. 7885, which passed the House of Representatives on June 27, 1960.

The House recedes with a clerical amendment.

MECHANICAL LIGHTERS FOR CIGARETTES, CIGARS, AND PIPES

Amendment No. 8: Section 4201 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to tax on pens and mechanical pencils and lighters) imposes, upon the sale by the manufacturer, producer, or importer of mechanical lighters for cigarettes, cigars, and pipes, a tax equal to 10 percent of the price for which so sold.

This amendment provides that the tax on the sale by the manufacturer, producer, or importer of the mechanical lighters described above is to be 10 cents for each lighter but not more than 10 percent of the price for which so sold.

This change in tax is to apply only with respect to articles sold by the manufacturer, producer, or importer thereof on or after the first day of the first month which begins more than 10 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The House recedes with a clerical amendment.

REAL ESTATE INVESTMENT TRUSTS

Amendment No. 9: This amendment amends the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide substantially the same tax treatment for real estate investment trusts as present law provides for regulated investment companies. Real estate trusts are organizations specializing in investments in real estate and real estate mortgages, while the regulated investment companies specialize in investments in stock and securities.

Under present law, regulated investment companies which distribute 90 percent or more of their ordinary income are taxed only on their retained earnings. Thus, the distributed earnings are taxed only to the shareholders. This same general type of tax treatment is accorded by amendment numbered 9 to real estate investment trusts, effective with respect to taxable years of real estate investment trusts beginning after December 31, 1960.

The substance of this amendment is the same as the substance of H.R. 12559, which passed the House of Representatives on June 29, 1960.

The House recedes with a clerical amendment.

PENSION FUND, PLUMBERS' LOCAL UNION NUMBERED 775

Amendment No. 10: This amendment adds a new section to the bill as passed by the House which provides that the Pension Fund, Plumbers' Local Union Numbered 775, shall be held and considered to have been a qualified trust under section 401(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, and to have been exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of such Code, for the period beginning May 1, 1957, and ending May 11, 1959.

The House recedes with an amendment. Under the conference agreement, the trust is to be deemed to constitute a qualified trust (and to be exempt from tax) for the period specified, but only if it is shown to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate that the trust has not in this period been operated in a manner which would jeopardize the interests of its beneficiaries.

W. D. MILLS,
AIME J. FORAND,
CECIL R. KING,
NOAH M. MASON,
JOHN W. BYRNES,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the conference agreement on H.R. 10960 merits the support of the membership of the House. The House passed version of this bill contained a provision dealing with the determination of the tax base for purposes of the importation of the Federal excise tax on cigars. Under the bill State or local taxes imposed on cigars as a commodity were to be excluded from the tax base. The Senate in acting on this legislation added 10 substantive amendments. Many of these amendments were provisions that had been contained in bills previously passed by the House.

The first amendment added a new subsection (d) to section 243 of the Internal Revenue Code so that the 85 percent intercorporate dividend received deduction would apply with respect to dividens paid by a foreign corporation out of its earnings and profits, if such earnings and profits were accumulated by a predecessor domestic corporation. This Senate provision is substantially the same as the House passed version of H.R. 12036. The House accepted the Senate amendment.

The second Senate amendment dealt with unrelated business income of a tax-exempt organization and would have provided that a lease to a medical clinic by a medical research organization of premises adjacent to those occupied by the organization would be considered as an activity related to the organization's exempt purpose and function under certain conditions. In the consideration of this Senate amendment the conferees were informed that certain matters of tax administration that would be corrected by this amendment could still be remedied by administrative action. The Senate receded from its position on this amendment.

The third Senate amendment pertained to the limitation on reduction of income tax liability incurred to the Virgin Islands and to the estate and gift tax treatment of certain citizen residents of possessions. The text of this Senate amendment is the same as H.R. 5547 as it passed the House except for certain technical and clarifying amendments. The House conferees accepted the Senate amendment.

The fourth Senate amendment related to the requirement for declaration of estimated tax by individuals. The purpose of the amendment is to relieve taxpayers with only small amounts of income from the burden of filing such estimates. It is anticipated that this amendment will help both the taxpayer and the Government. The House accepted the Senate amendment with a clerical amendment.

The fifth Senate amendment clarifies the law as to whether farmers are required to capitalize or expense certain soil treatment processes. The Senate amendment makes it clear that these expenditures are to be allowed as a deduction. The House conferees accepted the Senate amendment with certain clerical amendments and with a technical amendment clarifying the definition of the term "land used in farming."

The sixth Senate amendment pertains to the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code controlling the deductibility of charitable contributions and gifts so as to allow the deductibility of amounts paid for the maintenance of certain children in the taxpayer's home during the time the children are attending school in the United States. The House accepted the Senate amendment with a clerical amendment.

The seventh Senate amendment pertains to capital contributions to the Federal National Mortgage Association and is the same as the substance of H.R. 7885 as it passed the House. Under the amendment whenever the amount of capital contributions to FNMA exceeded the fair market value of the stock as of the issue date of such stock, the initial holder of the stock is to treat the excess as ordinary and necessary expenses incurred in the conduct of a trade or business. The House accepted the Senate amendment with a clerical amendment.

The eighth Senate amendment pertains to the Federal manufacturers excise tax applicable to mechanical lighters and would change the existing tax of 10 percent of the price for which sold to a tax of 10 cents for such lighter but not more than 10 percent of the price for which sold. The House accepted the Senate amendment with a clerical amendment. I should add as a personal view that I think this is a bad amendment and I opposed it in the conference.

The ninth Senate amendment is the substance of H.R. 12559 as it passed the House and pertains to the income taxation of real estate investment trusts. The amendment would provide substantially the same conduit tax treatment for real estate investment trusts as present law provides for regulated investment companies. The House accepted the Senate amendment with a clerical amendment.

The 10th Senate amendment pertains to the status of the pension fund of the Plumbers Local Union No. 775 in terms of whether or not it is a qualified trust under the applicable provisions of the Internal Revenue Code. The House accepted the Senate amendment with an amendment.

Mr. Speaker, for the most part the amendments approved in the conference agreement are meritorious and for that reason we present to the House a unanimously approved conference report on the part of the House conferees.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, your House conferees have reached agreement with the conferees of the other body on the bill H.R. 10960, which, you will recall, related to the determination of the retail price for the purposes of the Federal excise tax on cigars. The material contained in the House bill dealing with this subject was accepted by the other body and was not in conference. The other body did, however, add 10 substantive amendments to the bill unrelated to the specific subject of H.R. 10960, and these amendments were in conference.

The first of these amendments provided that a dividend received from a foreign corporation out of earnings and profits inherited from a predecessor corporation which was a taxable domestic U.S. corporation shall be subject to the regular intercorporate dividends received credit applicable to dividends received from a domestic U.S. corporation. This amendment is identical with H.R. 12036,

which passed the House under unanimous consent on August 24, 1960. Under the conference agreement, this amendment was retained.

The second amendment added by the other body provided that a lease by a medical research organization to a medical clinic on premises adjacent to those occupied by the research organization shall be considered as being primarily for the basic purpose of the research organization if treatment of patients in the clinic, their medical history, and donated services of doctors in such clinics are used by the scientific organization for medical research purposes. This amendment was retroactive to years beginning after December 31, 1950.

Under present law rental income received under certain of such leases is taxable to the otherwise tax-exempt medical research organizations unless the leased property is used for a purpose which is related to the functions of such exempt organizations. However, whether or not the leased property is used for such a related purpose is determined by the facts and circumstances of each case and this amendment was designed to overcome what was considered by the other body to be too narrow an interpretation of the term "related" in the case of medical research organizations and their associated clinics.

The Treasury Department objected to this amendment on the ground that the determination of related purpose was essentially a factual determination which should be made on a case-by-case basis by field representatives of the Internal Revenue Service. The conferees deleted this amendment. However, the conferees were given assurance by the Treasury Department that it will expedite consideration of pending cases by the field representatives of the Internal Revenue Service so that the taxpayers involved may avail themselves of the administrative remedies provided by law and obtain a prompt decision in the matter.

The third amendment made by the other body corresponds substantially to the language of H.R. 5547 which was passed by the House on September 9, 1959. That bill was designed to limit certain tax advantages applicable to the Virgin Islands under the income tax laws and the estate tax laws. The House bill had been reported by the Finance Committee with several amendments relating to the Virgin Islands income tax provisions: First, a later effective date—since Senate action on this bill has been held up for a year; second, the present amendment, unlike the House bill, provides that gain or loss from the sale or exchange of securities shall not be treated as derived from sources within the Virgin Islands—and thus would not be eligible for any credits which the Virgin Islands government might extend. This amendment was deemed desirable since the mere fact that some security transaction took place within the Virgin Islands would not prove that the gain arose from Virgin Islands business. The other two amendments were essentially technical. Under the conference agreement, this amendment was retained.

The fourth amendment made by the other body was one of several amendments originally proposed by the Treasury and contained in H.R. 9625, the Technical Amendments Act of 1960. This related to the requirements for filing a declaration of estimated tax. The major effect of this amendment is that no declaration is to be required if the estimated tax of an individual can reasonably be expected to be less than $40. Your conferees were of the opinion that this new provision would aid both the taxpayers and the Treasury in eliminating paperwork with respect to about 1.7 million annual declarations of estimated tax which show small or no tax liability. Under the conference agreement this amendment was retained.

The fifth amendment made by the other body adds a new section to the bill as passed by the House and provides that a taxpayer engaged in the business of farming may elect to deduct the cost of fertilizer and lime in the year in which it is paid or incurred rather than treating such cost as a capital expense to be prorated over the beneficial life of such items as the Internal Revenue Service has required in some recent cases. Your conferees were advised that this amendment is declaratory of the present practice of the field offices of the Internal Revenue Service. Under the conference agreement this amendment is retained with certain clerical amendments which clarify the definition of the term "land used in farming."

The sixth amendment made by the other body would allow taxpayers a charitable contributions deduction for amounts paid to maintain an individual—other than a dependent or relative—as a member of his household during the period that the individual is a full-time student in the 12th or any lower grade at an educational institution located in the United States provided such individual is a member of the taxpayer's household under a written agreement between the taxpayer and certain tax-exempt organizations, which implements a program of the organization to provide educational opportunities for students in private homes. Under this amendment, the amount of such charitable deduction is limited, for each taxable year, to an amount equal to $50 times the number of calendar months during the taxable year which fall within the period in which the student is a member of the taxpayer's household under the agreement described above. However, this amendment does not apply to any amount paid by the taxpayer within the taxable year if the taxpayer receives any money or other property as compensation or reimbursement for maintaining the student in his household during such period. A number of House Members have introduced bills providing $600 dependent's exemption for the taxpayer in these circumstances. The Senate amendment provides this as a charitable contribution deduction instead. If a taxpayer qualified for the full $50 for 12 months, he would get the $600 deduction.

Under the amendment made by the other body, these new provisions would apply with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1959, and under the conference agreement this amendment was accepted.

The seventh amendment made by the other body related to nonrefundable capital contributions made to the Federal National Mortgage Association. This amendment has substantially the same effect prospectively as the bill that passed the Congress last year but was vetoed because of the retroactive effect resulting from an amendment made thereto by the other body. As amended by the other body, this amendment is prospective only and is substantially similar to H.R. 7885 which passed the House on June 27, 1960. Under the conference agreement, this amendment is retained.

The eighth amendment made by the other body provides that the present 10 percent manufacturer's sales tax on mechanical lighters shall be either 10 percent of the manufacturer's sales price or 10 cents per lighter, whichever is the lesser. Your conferees were advised that this bill would overcome a competitive disadvantage that domestic manufacturers of such lighters are under as compared to the manufacturers of imported lighters. Your conferees were advised that the Treasury Department has no objection to this amendment and, accordingly, under the conference agreement, this amendment is retained.

The ninth amendment made by the other body amends the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide substantially the same treatment for real estate investment trusts as present law provides for regulated investment companies. Under present law, regulated investment companies which distribute 90 percent or more of their ordinary income are taxed only on their retained earnings and the distributed earnings are taxed only to the shareholders. The same type of tax treatment is accorded to real estate investment trusts with respect to taxable years of such trusts beginning after December 31, 1960.

The substance of this amendment is the same as that of H.R. 12559, which was passed by the House on June 29, 1960. Under the conference agreement, this amendment is retained.

The tenth amendment made by the other body provides that a certain union pension fund shall be held and considered to have constituted a qualified employees' trust under section 401(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, and to have been exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of such code for the period beginning May 1, 1957 and ending May 11, 1959. Under the conference agreement, the substance of this amendment is retained with an amendment along the lines provided for certain pension funds in the conference agreement on H.R. 12536 which conditioned retroactive qualification of such funds only upon a showing to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate that the trust has not in the period in question been operated in a manner which would jeopardize the interests of its beneficiaries.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXCLUSION OF LOCAL ADVERTISING CHARGES FROM MANUFACTURERS SALE PRICE

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 12536) relating to the treatment of charges for local advertising for purposes of determining the manufacturers sale price, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2213)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12536) relating to the treatment of charges for local advertising for purposes of determining the manufacturers sale price, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses, as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1 and 3 and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 5. (a) The Iron Workers' Mid-America Pension Fund, which was established by an indenture executed on January 30, 1957, as a result of an agreement between various locals affiliated with the International Association of Bridge, Structural, and Ornamental Iron Workers and three employer associations, and which has been held by the Internal Revenue Service to constitute a qualified trust under section 401(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, and to be exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of such Code, for years ending on or after December 17, 1958, shall be held and considered to have been a qualified trust under such section 401(a), and to have been exempt from taxation under such section 501(a), for the period beginning on January 30, 1957, and ending on December 16, 1958, but only if it is shown to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate that the trust has not in this period been operated in a manner which would jeopardize the interests of its beneficiaries.

"(b) The Pattern Makers' Pension Trust Fund of Chicago, which was established by an agreement and declaration executed on April 28, 1958, between the Pattern Makers' League of North America, Chicago Association, and the Pattern Manufacturers' Association of Chicago and Vicinity, and which has been held by the Internal Revenue Service to constitute a qualified trust under section 401(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, and to be exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of such Code, for years ending on or after February 25, 1959, shall be held and considered to have been a qualified trust under such section 401(a), and to have been exempt from taxation under such section 501(a), for the period beginning on April 28, 1958, and ending on February 24, 1959, but only if it is shown to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate that the trust has not in this period been operated in a manner which would jeopardize the interests of its beneficiaries.

"(c) The Pipe and Refrigeration Fitters Local 537 Pension Fund of Boston, Massachusetts, which was created on September 1, 1955, as a result of an agreement between Local 537 of the United Association of Pipe Fitters and Refrigeration Fitters and the Heating, Piping, and Air Conditioning Contractors, Boston Association (now known as Mechanical Contractors Association of Boston), and which has been held by the Internal Revenue Service to constitute a qualified trust under section 401(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, and to be exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of such Code, for years ending on or after November 10, 1959, shall be held and considered to have been a qualified trust under such section 401(a), and to have been exempt from taxation under such section 501(a), for the period beginning on March 1, 1956, and ending on November 9, 1959, but only if it is shown to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate that the trust has not in this period been operated in a manner which would jeopardize the interests of its beneficiaries.

"(d) The Annuity Plan of the Electrical Switchboard and Panelboard Manufacturing Industry of New York City, which was created May 16, 1956, as a result of an agreement between Local Union Numbered 3, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, and the Electrical Manufacturers of New York, Incorporated, and which has been held by the Internal Revenue Service to constitute a qualified trust under section 401(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, and to be exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of such Code, shall be held and considered to have been a qualified trust under such section 401(a), and to have been exempt from taxation under such section 501(a), for the period beginning May 16, 1956, and ending May 22, 1957, but only if it is shown to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate that the trust has not in this period been operated in a manner which would jeopardize the interests of its beneficiaries.

"(e) The District Council No. 19 Welfare Fund, now known as Painters District Council No. 19 Welfare and Pension Fund, which was first created as of May 1, 1947, as a result of an agreement between Painters District Council No. 19, Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators and Paperhangers of America, of the State of New Jersey and painting contractors signatory to the union agreement, and which has been held by the Internal Revenue Service to constitute a qualified trust under section 401(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, and to be exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of such Code, shall be held and considered to have been a qualified trust under such section 401(a), and to have been exempt from taxation under such section 501(a) and under section 165(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939, for the period beginning January 1, 1954, and ending August 6, 1956, but only if it is shown to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate that the trust has not in this period been operated in a manner which would jeopardize the interests of its beneficiaries.

"(f) The Local Union Numbered 377 Pension Fund, which was created October 13, 1952, as a result of an agreement between Local Union Numbered 377, Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators and Paperhangers of America, of the State of New Jersey and Painting and Decorating Contractors of America, Hudson County Employers Chapter, and which has been held by the Internal Revenue Service to constitute a qualified trust under section 401(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, and to be exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of such Code, shall be held and considered to have been a qualified trust under such section 401(a), and to have been exempt from taxation under such section 501(a) and under section 165(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939, for the period beginning October 13, 1952, and ending April 1, 1958, but only if it is shown to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate that the trust has not in this period been operated in a manner which would jeopardize the interests of its beneficiaries."

And the Senate agree to the same.

W. D. MILLS,
AIME J. FORAND,
CECIL R. KING,
NOAH M. MASON,
JOHN W. BYRNES,
Managers on the Part of the House.

HARRY F. BYRD,
ROBT. S. KERR,
J. ALLEN FREAR, JR.,
RUSSELL B. LONG,
By HARRY F. BYRD,
JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
FRANK CARLSON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12536) relating to the treatment of charges for local advertising for purposes of determining the manufacurers sale price, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

ELECTION AS TO BASE FOR DETERMINING PERCENTAGE DEPLETION DEDUCTION IN THE CASE OF MINERALS USED IN MAKING CEMENT

Amendment No. 1: To determine the percentage depletion allowance under present law, it is necessary to multiply the percentage rate applicable to the particular mineral by the value of the mineral at the point at which the mining process ends. This point is referred to as the "cutoff point." In the case of many mineral industries, this cutoff point has been the subject of uncertainty and litigation. Included in this group is the cement industry.

In order to resolve the cutoff question for 1961 and future years, Congress in the Public Debt and Tax Rate Extension Act of 1960 modified section 613(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. As amended, this statutory provision established specific cutoff points for numerous minerals, including those used in the manufacture of cement. This cutoff point for cement-producing minerals (except for preheating of the kiln feed) occurs just prior to the introduction of the kiln feed into the kiln. This cutoff point is derived from a ruling published by the Treasury Department in 1953.

Although the recent legislation determines the cutoff point for the cement industry for future years, it does not settle this question for any open years prior to 1961. Senate amendment numbered 1 permits taxpayers mining minerals used in making cement to elect to apply, for the years prior to 1961, the cutoff provisions adopted in the Public Debt and Tax Rate Extension Act of 1960. If a

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

taxpayer fails to make the election, the cutoff point in his case of these years would be determined under existing law.

Under the amendment, if the taxpayer makes the election, it will apply to all of his mineral properties used in making cement and, in general, to all of his taxable years beginning before 1961 which are open on the date of the enactment of the bill. However, the making of the election resolves only the point at which the cutoff occurs and does not deal with any other matters which may be in issue, such as the method of computing the gross income at that point. The election must be made by the taxpayer on or before the date which is 60 days after the date of the publication of final regulations on this provision. Once made, the election is irrevocable.

The House recedes.

INCOME TAX EXEMPTION AND DEDUCTIONS FOR CERTAIN PENSION PLANS

Amendment No. 2: Under present law, a pension trust is qualified for income tax exemption only if it meets certain requirements relating to coverage of employees and nondiscrimination of contributions or benefits. Where the pension trust is properly qualified, not only is it exempt from Federal taxation with respect to its income, but contributions paid to it by an employer on behalf of his employees are deductible for Federal income tax purposes. Senate amendment numbered 2 provides that certain pension trusts shall be deemed to constitute qualified trusts, and to be exempt from tax, under the Federal income tax laws for the period of time specified in the amendment with respect to each such trust. The trusts are as follows:

(1) The Iron Workers' Mid-America Pension Fund.

(2) The Pattern Makers' Pension Trust Fund of Chicago.

(3) The Pipe and Refrigeration Fitters Local 537 Pension Fund of Boston, Massachusetts.

(4) The Annuity Plan of the Electrical Switchboard and Panelboard Manufacturing Industry of New York City.

(5) The District Council No. 19 Welfare Fund, now known as Painters District Council No. 19 Welfare and Pension Fund.

(6) The Local Union Numbered 377 Pension Fund.

Under the conference agreement, the House recedes with an amendment under which each trust specified in the Senate amendment is to be deemed to constitute a qualified trust (and be exempt from tax) for the period specified in the Senate amendment, but only if it is shown to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate that the trust has not in this period been operated in a manner which would jeopardize the interests of its beneficiaries.

LIMITATION ON ACCELERATION OF ACCRUAL OF TAXES

Amendment No. 3: This amendment adds a new subsection (d) to section 461 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to general rule for taxable year of deduction). Paragraph (1) of the new subsection (d) provides the general rule that, in the case of a taxpayer whose taxable income is computed under an accrual method of accounting, to the extent that the time for accruing taxes is earlier than it would be but for any action of any taxing jurisdiction taken after December 31, 1960, then, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate, such taxes are to be treated as accruing at the time they would have accrued but for such action by such taxing jurisdiction.

Paragraph (2) of the new subsection (d) provides that, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate, paragraph (1) is to be inapplicable to the extent that its application would (but for such paragraph (2)) prevent all persons (including successors in interest) from ever taking such item into account.

Amendment numbered 3 also provides that the new section 461(d) is to apply to taxable years ending after December 31, 1960. In this respect it is to be noted that the rule of law that a tax liability is accruable on a certain date such as the assessment or lien date has developed over a long period of years through court decisions and is a basic concept which the Internal Revenue Service has recognized in numerous rulings. Several States in recent years have changed this accrual date from January 1 to December 31 in order to provide an extra accrual date for State taxes. This amendment, which would be effective for years after 1960 and thus put the States and taxpayers on proper notice, would change the law to provide for only one accrual for State taxes in any one taxable year where the State legislature has changed the accrual date, and would thus eliminate the additional deduction available under existing law. This legislation is prospective so that taxpayers who have acted in good faith in taking such deductions in the past under existing law will be treated uniformly and not be subjected to retroactive action on the part of the Treasury Department.

The House recedes.

W. D. MILLS,
AIME J. FORAND,
CECIL R. KING,
NOAH M MASON,
JOHN W. BYRNES,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, there are three amendments that were adopted to this particular bill which passed the House by unanimous consent. The first amendment is in the form of a legislative settlement of a situation existing in the limestone and cement manufacturing business. Over the years from 1951 through the year 1960 legislation was necessitated by the action of the Congress prior to the recess in passing the provision changing the cutoff point for depletion purposes. This is a very satisfactory settlement, I believe, and will eliminate a great number of court cases. This was recommended by the industry and by the Treasury.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I join in urging my colleagues in the House to support the conference agreement on H.R. 12536. This legislation as it passed the House dealt with the status of local advertising charges for purposes of the manufacturers excise tax. It provided that in the case of advertising arrangements under certain circumstances the charge for advertising was to be excluded from the tax base.

The Senate in acting on this legislation added three substantive amendments.

The first of these amendments pertained to the percentage depletion deduction in the case of minerals used in making cement. The amendment relates to the so-called cutoff point to which the statutory depletion rate is applicable. Congress has recently passed legislation dealing with this matter for taxable years after December 31, 1960, and the purpose of the Senate amendment is to provide a solution for open years prior to 1961 by establishing a similar cutoff point. It should be made clear that this tax treatment would be based on a taxpayer election and if the taxpayer desires not to make the election, the cutoff point in his case for open years would be determined under existing law. The House accepted the Senate amendment.

The second Senate amendment pertains to the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code affecting income tax exemption and deductibility of contributions with respect to certain pension plans. The House accepted the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The third Senate amendment arises from the fact that several States have recently enacted legislation which has enabled accrual basis taxpayers to claim that they are entitled to deduct in 1 taxable year property taxes for 2 taxable years. To deal with this situation the Senate amendment would deny an accrual basis taxpayer the right to deduct more than 1 year's State taxes in 1 Federal taxable year. The conferees in agreeing on this amendment have made it clear that the legislation is to be prospective so that taxpayers who have acted in good faith in taking deductions in the past under existing law will be treated universally and not be subjected to retroactive action. The House accepted the Senate amendment.

Mr. Speaker, the conference agreement should be adopted.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, your House conferees have reached an agreement with the conferees of the other body on the bill, H.R. 12536, relating to the treatment of charges made for local advertising for purposes of computing the manufacturer's sales price in determining the base to which the manufacturers' excise tax is to be applied.

Mr. Speaker, all of the language of the bill that passed the House is in the bill that passed the other body and was not a subject matter in the conference. The other body did, however, add three substantive amendments to the bill unrelated to the specific subjects which were in the bill as passed by the House, and these were in conference.

The first of these amendments provides an election as to the percentage depletion cutoff point for years prior to 1961 in the case of limestone and other minerals when used in making cement.

The problem arose because of the uncertain status of present law following the Supreme Court decision in the case of United States against Cannelton Sewer Pipe Company.

In 1953 the Treasury published Revenue Ruling 76 which permitted in the case of minerals used in making cement the inclusion in the base for percentage depletion the value added by processes other than preheating of the kilnfeed which took place prior to the burning of the limestone in the kilns. These processes were primarily crushing and fine grinding. As you will recall, various lower court decisions, principally the Dragon Cement case, permitted in the case of certain limestones including the value of the finished cement in the depletion base. It was in respect to these

cases that the Congress adopted section 302 of the Public Debt and Tax Rate Extension Act of 1960 which provided a statutory cutoff point for minerals used in making cement which was substantially the same as that provided by the 1953 Treasury ruling.

Following the Supreme Court decision in the Cannelton case, there is considerable uncertainty as to the exact requirement of prior law. On one hand, the Dragon case might still be good law. On the other hand, following Cannelton the definition of mining in these situations might be held to include only crushing of the limestone and not the grinding that was allowed under the 1953 ruling and the 1960 legislation.

The amendment permits taxpayers entitled to depletion on minerals used in making cement to elect to calculate their percentage depletion deduction on the basis of the 1960 legislation for open years prior to 1960. This election, which is irrevocable, would foreclose the taxpayer from litigating the issue. Your conferees were advised that the Treasury Department favored this amendment on the basis that it was a reasonable settlement from the standpoint of the United States interests. It is estimated that under this amendment the industry would be required to make additional taxpayments in the neighborhood of $170 million. We have also been advised that 95 percent of the industry favors this amendment and could be expected to make use of the election provided. Your conferees accepted this Senate amendment.

The second amendment deals with six named pension plans which were established pursuant to the collective-bargaining negotiations and were in operation prior to the time that qualified status as tax-exempt employee plans was achieved. During this time of operation as nonqualified pension plans, the employers were not eligible for a deduction with respect to their contributions and the investment income of the pension trust was taxable. All of the six plans involved ultimately achieved qualified status. The amendment provides that the six plans will be treated as qualified pension trusts for periods varying in each case, but covering the time between the inception of such pension plans and the time when they received qualified status.

Under the conference agreement the substance of the amendment made by the other body is retained except that the language thereof has been changed in a manner which requires that it be shown to the satisfaction of the Secretary or his delegate that during the period from the inception of each of these pension funds to the date on which they qualified as tax-exempt employees' funds it is shown to the satisfaction of the Secretary or his delegate that each of these funds have not been operated in a manner which would jeopardize the interests of the beneficiaries of such funds. Under this language the trusts involved can achieve qualified status, and tax exemption, without meeting all of the formal requirements of sections 401, 503 and 504. Instead of the formal requirements it will only be necessary to show that the trusts have not been operated in a manner which would jeopardize the interest of its beneficiaries.

The third amendment added by the other body denies an accrual basis taxpayer the right to deduct more than 1 year's State or local taxes in one Federal tax year where the bunching arises because of an action of the taxing jurisdiction taken after December 31, 1960. This amendment deals with an abuse situation called to our attention by the Treasury in the bill which I introduced by request, H.R. 9625. The original Treasury proposal, unlike this amendment, would have applied to State or local action taken in 1960.

In the ordinary operation, the new rule would simply postpone the deduction to a later year. The amendment gives the Treasury regulatory authority to limit this new rule wherever its application would result in the complete denial of deduction for some item, such as, for example where the taxpayer goes out of business. Your conferees accepted this amendment.

It is my view, which is reflected also in the statement of managers, that this amendment is a change from present law and accordingly any double deduction to which a taxpayer may be entitled by reason of the acceleration of the accrual date of State or local taxes prior to December 31, 1960, will be considered as a proper deduction in those years. In many of these situations the taxpayers had Treasury rulings to this effect. The law, until it is properly amended, should apply equally to taxpayers with and to those without rulings.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HEPTANOIC ACID

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 12659) to suspend for a temporary period the import duty on heptanoic acid, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2212)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12659) to suspend for a temporary period the import duty on heptanoic acid, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the text of the bill and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the bill and agree to the same.

W. D. MILLS,
AIME J. FORAND,
CECIL R. KING,
NOAH M. MASON,
JOHN W. BYRNES,
Managers on the Part of the House.

HARRY F. BYRD,
ROBT. S. KERR,
J. ALLEN FREAR, JR.,
RUSSELL B. LONG,
By HARRY F. BYRD,
JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
FRANK CARLSON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12659) to suspend for a temporary period the import duty on heptanoic acid, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate amendment to the text of the bill adds a new section 2 providing that in order to insure a correct interpretation of the provision "waterproof cloth" in paragraph 907, Tariff Act of 1930, it is hereby declared that it was and is the true intent and meaning of paragraph 907 to limit the term "waterproof", when applied to cloth, "wholly or in chief value of cotton or other vegetable fiber, whether or not in part of India rubber," to cloths of a kind generally used in the manufacture of articles which are designed to afford protection against water to the extent expected in raincoats, protective sheeting, dress shields, umbrellas, and similar articles. The new section 2 also provides that even when cloth possesses water repelling characteristics, it is not classifiable as waterproof cloth within the meaning of paragraph 907, Tariff Act of 1930, unless it is of a kind generally used in the manufacture of articles of the class specified in the preceding sentence.

The House recedes.

Under the conference agreement the title of the bill is amended to read "An act to suspend for a temporary period the import duty on heptanoic acid, and for other purposes."

W. D. MILLS,
AIME J. FORAND,
CECIL R. KING,
NOAH M. MASON,
JOHN W. BYRNES,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. Has there been added to this conference report on heptanoic acid anything in regard to velveteen imports?

Mr. MILLS. What this amendment has to do is a redetermination by law of what we mean by waterproof material. We are amending section 907 of the Tariff Act to make certain that only materials that are actually used here for waterproof purposes will come within the purview of that particular paragraph of the Tariff Act. There is a voluntary quota on the amount of velveteen that is shipped into the United States. This

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

would not have anything to do with the quantity of velveteen that would come in.

Mr. FULTON. So that then this conference report does not contain the amendment of the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. MILLS. Yes; it contains that amendment as agreed to in conference.

Mr. FULTON. That keeps velveteen from being considered as waterproof.

Mr. MILLS. No. It does not prohibit the importation of velveteen. This has to do only with the avoidance of duties. It does provide for velveteen to come in under the paragraph of the Tariff Act fixing the duty on velveteen if the waterproofing question is not involved.

Mr. FULTON. Then, I must object.

Mr. MILLS. Of course, paragraph 907 fixes the duty on waterproof material.

Mr. FULTON. Then, I must object.

Mr. MILLS. Well, there is no question of objecting. The question is on the passage or the adoption of the conference report by a majority vote.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I join with the able chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means in recommending to the House the adoption of the conference agreement on H.R. 12659.

It will be recalled that this legislation as it originally passed the House provided for the suspension of import duty on heptanoic acid for a period of 3 years. During the consideration of this legislation in the House we learned that this acid is produced as a byproduct of nylon manufacture and is used in the United States as a specialized lubricant primarily for military purposes.

The Senate in its consideration of this legislation amended the bill with a new section adopted to insure a correct interpretation of the provision "waterproof cloth" in paragraph 907 of the Tariff Act. The new Senate amendment in effect clarifies the meaning of the term "waterproof" when applied to certain cloths to cloths of a kind generally used in the manufacture of articles which are designed to afford protection against water to the extent expected of raincoats, protective sheeting, and so forth. The House conferees accepted the Senate amendment.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

Mr. FULTON. A division.

The SPEAKER. What does the gentleman want a division for?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman withhold that until the Chair receives a message from the Senate?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Out of consideration for the Senate, I certainly will.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 13161) entitled "An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to Senate amendments Nos. 3, 16, 23, 30, 34, 37, 56, 63, and 84 to the above-entitled bill.

The message further announced that the Senate recedes from its amendments Nos. 7 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, and 62.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Michigan insist on his point of order?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I must; I have been told to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan makes the point of order that a quorum is not present. Evidently no quorum is present.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. At the request of the gentleman who asked me to make the point——

The SPEAKER. The Chair has already declared that a quorum is not present.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I will make it later, then.

The SPEAKER. Without objection a call of the House is ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 202]

Alger	Grant	Osmers
Anderson, Mont.	Green, Oreg.	Pilcher
Ashmore	Hays	Pirnie
Auchincloss	Healey	Preston
Barden	Hébert	Rains
Bass, Tenn.	Hess	Riley
Baumhart	Jackson	Rogers, Colo.
Boggs	Johnson, Md.	Rogers, Mass.
Bolling	Keith	Rogers, Tex.
Bowles	Kilburn	Shipley
Brooks, La.	King, Calif.	Sikes
Buckley	Kluczynski	Sisk
Canfield	Lafore	Smith, Kans.
Celler	Landrum	Taylor, N.Y.
Curtis, Mo.	Lankford	Teller
Davis, Tenn.	Loser	Thompson, La.
Diggs	McDowell	Thompson, N.J.
Dingell	McSween	Udall
Dooley	Macdonald	Vinson
Doyle	Machrowicz	Weis
Durham	Magnuson	Whitener
Evins	Martin	Widnall
Fisher	Mason	Willis
Ford	Minshall	Wilson
Forrester	Mitchell	Withrow
Gilbert	Moore	
	Murray	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 353 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

HEPTANOIC ACID

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have some explanation of this matter.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I was in process of explaining that this is an amendment adopted in the Senate I believe by unanimous approval, to a bill that passed the House by unanimous consent.

The Senate amendment endeavors to correct an interpretation of the provision "waterproof cloth" which is contained in paragraph 907 of the Tariff Act of 1930. What we are doing is enacting a regulation of the Treasury Department, Bureau of Customs, with respect to what constitutes waterproof cloth. This matter was recomended to us by the Treasury Department and the Department of Commerce, this being necessary, so we were told, to plug a loophole in the Tariff Act in order to prevent materials from coming into the United States that are not to be used for waterproof purposes under the waterproof paragraph at a much less tariff duty that they would have to pay if they came through under the proper tariff paragraph. It is that simple.

It has nothing whatsoever to do with the quantity that may come in, but we are determined, as far as the conference committee is concerned, to insure that when things come into the United States from abroad, they must pay the rate of duty prescribed by law and that they should not be permitted to come in in violation of the intention of the law and the interpretation of the law by the Bureau of Customs.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KEARNS. I have the utmost respect for the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, and may I say that I would like to just acquiesce in his program, if he feels this is for the best interests of this country.

I would like to interject that this is the birthday of Dick Simpson, who was formerly a Member.

Mr. MILLS. And we miss him greatly.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. The question comes up on the type of procedure this is. This is an original bill covering heptanoic acid. Then it goes over to the other body and, late in the evening of Friday, with not many present, there is added an amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island who puts in a provision with respect to velveteen and waterproofing.

Mr. MILLS. No. This is not a provision affecting velveteen.

Mr. FULTON. It changes the kind of listing on the ordinary waterproof cloth that comes into the country. This actually affects the district represented by the gentleman from New York, Mr. BECKER.

Mr. MILLS. Let me explain to the gentleman what it does. It has to do with the definition of "waterproofing." If material comes into the United States

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

for the purpose of being used for waterproof purposes, it will continue to come under this paragraph. However, if it is not to be used for that purpose—take gingham that is coming in here as dress material, and not to be used as a waterproof material at all, should it be permitted to enjoy a lesser rate of duty because they can smear something on it and make it possible to be classified as a waterproof cloth, as interpreted by the court? We do not think they should be permitted to make a shambles of provisions of the tariff law, and that the people who import these things into the United States ought to pay what the law requires them to pay and what it is intended they should pay.

Mr. FULTON. Then the question, Why was this put on as a rider by a Senate amendment to the House bill when it was not in the House bill?

Mr. MILLS. If the gentleman will pardon me, I introduced the bill some weeks ago at the request of the Treasury Department, and after the Treasury Department developed the language; and I was told that the Department of Commerce also recommended it. Although the State Department is against it, the other departments of the Government are for it. The Treasury Department, through the Bureau of Customs, is the one that has to collect the tariff duties, and we are trying to assist them through this legislation in collecting what the Congress has intended what shall be paid in the way of a duty on this particular kind of cloth.

Mr. FULTON. One more question. Did Congressman FRANK BECKER of New York have notice ahead of time that this was going to be put on suddenly tonight?

Mr. MILLS. I do not know that he did. I do not know that I did, but we operate here in a legislative body consisting of two groups, and certainly the other group has a right to pass judgment on matters of this sort, and if they want to amend our bills, we cannot deny them that opportunity. They have not called me to tell me when they are proposing an amendment, and I am sure they have not called anyone else over there. But, we have it before us, accepted unanimously by your House conferees in the spirit of trying to make the Tariff Act operate in the way it is intended to operate with respect to what is waterproof cloth and not let somebody import material into the United States in a way contrary to what is intended under the Tariff Act.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may extend their remarks on the conference reports just adopted.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, as it passed the House, the bill, H.R. 12659, simply provided for a 3-year suspension of the import duties on heptanoic acid. The Senate amended the bill by adding a new section relating to the definition of the term "waterproof cloth" as found in paragraph 907 of the Tariff Act of 1930. The purpose of this amendment is to close a loophole in the tariff laws, whereby certain cloth can today be imported as waterproof cloth and pay a lower rate of duty than that which would apply if the cloth were not able to be entered as waterproof cloth. The amendment would do this by providing that the term "waterproof cloth" shall be limited to cloths generally used in the manufacture of articles designed to afford protection against water, and by further providing that cloth possessing water-repelling characteristics shall not be classifiable as waterproof cloth unless it is of a kind generally used in the manufacture of such articles.

The House receded and accepted the Senate amendment.

ACQUIRING CERTAIN PUBLIC LANDS FOR RECREATIONAL USE

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill—S. 2757—to supplement the act of June 14, 1926, as amended, to permit any State to acquire certain public lands for recreational use.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, effective as of September 21, 1959, subsection (b)(1)(A) of the Act of June 14, 1926 (44 Stat. 741), as amended by the Acts of June 4, 1954 (68 Stat. 173, 174) and of September 21, 1959 (73 Stat. 571; 43 U.S.C. 869), is hereby amended by inserting after the word "State" the words "(including any agency or instrumentality thereof)" and by substituting a colon for the period at the end thereof and by adding the following thereafter:

"*Provided, however,* That should any State fail in any one calendar year to secure the maximum herein specified, other than small roadside parks and rest sites, additional conveyances may be made thereafter to that State pursuant to any application on file with the Secretary of the Interior on the last day of said year, to the extent that the conveyances would not have exceeded the limitations of said year."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 4, after "(A)" insert: "of section 1".

Page 1, strike out line 8, and insert: "words 'or the State park agency or any other agency having jurisdiction over the State park system of said State designated by the Governor of that State as its sole representative for acceptance of lands under this provision,'"

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVEY CERTAIN LANDS TO MINERAL COUNTY, NEV.

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill—S. 3212—to direct the Secretary of the Interior and the Administrator of General Services to convey certain public and acquired lands in the State of Nevada to the county of Mineral, Nev.

The clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nevada?

There was no objection.

The clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior or the Administrator of General Services, if the lands described in paragraph (1) of this section come within his jurisdiction for disposal purposes, shall issue to the county of Mineral, State of Nevada, upon the payment by the county into the Treasury of the United States, not more than five years after the Secretary or the Administrator has notified the county of the purchase price, which shall be an amount equal to the sum of the costs of extinguishing any adverse claims to the lands to be patented, the costs of any necessary survey, and the fair market value of the lands as determined by the Secretary or the Administrator after the appraisal of the lands by contract appraisal or otherwise, a patent or deed for the following described lands, situated in the State of Nevada and comprising approximately two thousand and forty acres (all range references are to the Mount Diablo base and meridian):

(1) The south half of the south half of section 22; the southeast quarter of section 32; all of section 28; the northwest quarter, the northeast quarter, the southwest quarter, and the northwest quarter of the southeast quarter of section 33; the northwest quarter of the northeast quarter, the northeast quarter of the northwest quarter, and the northwest quarter of the northwest quarter of section 34, township 8 north, range 30 east, but the Administrator of General Services shall not issue a deed for the northeast quarter of the northwest quarter of section 34, township 8 north, range 30 east, until such time as this land shall have become available for disposal as surplus property as described by the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended.

(2) The northwest quarter of the northwest quarter of section 4; the northeast quarter, the west half of the southeast quarter, and the northeast quarter of the southeast quarter of section 5, township 7 north, range 30 east, but the Secretary of the Interior shall not issue a patent for the west half of the southeast quarter and the northeast quarter of the southeast quarter of section 5, township 7 north, range 30 east, until such time as this land shall be returned by the Department of the Navy to the Department of the Interior.

(3) The north half of the northwest quarter and the northwest quarter of the northeast quarter of section 10, township 7 north, range 29 east.

SEC. 2. The conveyance authorized by this Act shall be made subject to any existing valid claims against the lands described in the first section of this Act, and to any reservations necessary to protect continuing uses of those lands by the United States.

SEC. 3. Nothing contained in the preceding provisions of this Act shall be construed to preclude the county of Mineral, State of Nevada, from purchasing, in accordance with

such preceding provisions, only such portion or portions, by legal subdivision of the public land surveys, of the above described lands as such county elects, nor shall the purchase by such county of only a portion or portions of such lands be construed to constitute a waiver or relinquishment of any of its rights under this Act to purchase, in accordance with such preceding provisions and by legal subdivisions of the public land surveys, the remainder of such lands, or any portion thereof.

SEC. 4. All moneys received from the conveyance of lands under the terms of this Act shall be disposed of in the same manner as moneys received from the sale of public lands, except that moneys received as reimbursement for costs of appraisal, surveys, and extinguishing adverse claims may be used by the Secretary for said purposes without appropriation..

SEC. 5. The lands described in section 1 of this Act shall be segregated from all forms of appropriation under the public land laws including the mining and mineral leasing laws, from the date of approval of this Act until the Secretary shall provide otherwise by publication of an order in the Federal Register.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 3, strike out all of section 3.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FEDERAL COAL MINE SAFETY ACT

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill—S. 743—to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act in order to remove the exemption with respect to certain mines employing no more than 14 individuals.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I regret very much the objection of the gentleman from Ohio to the consideration of this legislation. I had hoped to come into the well of the House to plead the cause of one-quarter million miners who labor in underground darkness in order that we, of this Nation and of the world, might have light.

The proposed amendments to the mine safety law contained in S. 743 happen to be Republican proposals, approved in the other Body at the suggestion of Senator COOPER of Kentucky, which proposals are understood to be a compromise between the large and small coal operators on the extent to which we would remove the exemption in the present law effecting mines employing less than 15 men and apply this exemption to mines employing 7 men, or less.

S. 743 passed almost unanimously in the Senate. It was approved on a 29-to-1 vote in the House Labor Committee and certified to the Rules Committee. No rule was granted by this committee.

The legislation is predicated for the need of throwing greater safeguards around the 35,000 miners employed in these small mines.

The mine safety law passed in 1953 has resulted in reduction of one-half the fatalities and crippling injuries that took place in the industry prior to the approval of the mine safety law. At present, fatalities and injuries in the larger mines, subject to Federal inspection, are 1.08 fatality or injury to every million tons of coal mined; while in the small mines, employing less than 15 men, fatality or injury is 2.80 for 1 million tons of coal mined.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this additional authority granted the Federal mine inspectors may cost operators of these small mines an extra outlay covering the installation of proper safety devices but I also submit, Mr. Speaker, that you cannot measure the matter of safety in dollars and cents involved in making these changes to insure greater safety.

The gentleman making the objection to the amendments represents a District in the city of Cincinnati, Ohio. He has no miners in his District. He does have a handful of small operators carrying on mining activities in the bordering State of Kentucky.

The gentleman would put a dollar sign on this proposal in order to protect the profits of these operators at the expense of the lives and health of the miners working under unsafe conditions imposed by the operators.

If the gentleman of Ohio takes advantage of a technicality in the House procedure, he must accept full responsibility for himself and his political party in blocking legislation needed to afford the same degree of safety that other miners enjoy in the mines presently under Federal inspection.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Education and Labor Committee, I would like to comment on S. 743. First of all I must acknowledge that this legislation has been backed in principle at least by the administration. Nonetheless this bill is admittedly controversial, and needs most careful consideration.

This bill seeks to remove the exemption frequently granted to mines employing less than 14 persons from certain provisions of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act. On the surface this may not sound controversial, but the effect of such a removal of this exception might be considerable. Certainly in the closing hours of this session this bill could not be adequately discussed, nor its merits fully debated.

As the report on this bill states, the intent is to promote safety in small mines. It has been rigorously argued, however, that pasage of this bill would have little or no effect on the safety of small mines. It has also been alleged that this bill might have a disastrous effect on those employed in these mines by depriving them of their livelihood.

Unfortunately these arguments and allegations have not been made before our committee, and there has been no opportunity to determine their validity. However, if these allegations are true, enactment of this bill might cause considerable numbers of mines to be thrown out of work. Such an outcome could hardly be called constructive, though the resulting unemployment might indeed bring about a reduction of the present accident rate.

Although I served as a member of the subcommittee which considered this bill, I am far from satisfied that the economic consequences might not be serious. I for one feel we should not add to the problems of the already ailing coal industry by legislation which has not been adequately considered.

This bill (S. 743) was discussed by only one witness, Marling Ankeny, Director of the Bureau of Mines. His testimony took only 17 minutes. No witness representing small coal mine operators was given the opportunity to discuss this bill, and, more particularly, the provisions which distinguish S. 743 from similar legislation under consideration in 1959.

The bill has a number of so-called "softening" provisions, which it is claimed would protect small mines from undue expense and hardship resulting from application of Federal regulations. Perhaps these provisions would have the desired result. On the other hand it surely would have been reasonable to hear testimony from those who might be thus protected.

Under these circumstances, Mr. Speaker, it is my feeling it is just as well that hasty action has been avoided.

Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, I have discussed this bill during the day, and indeed on previous occasions, with a number of my colleagues. I have found that a number of others, including perhaps more on the other side of the aisle than on my own, feel this whole question should be examined more thoroughly at a later date.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, I objected to the attempt to push S. 743 through the House of Representatives by unanimous consent on the very last day and during the closing hours of the 86th Congress without debate. This is important legislation but those who oppose it certainly have a right to be heard and present to the House their arguments in opposition instead of having it railroaded through the Congress in a few seconds. The proponents had 2 years to bring this measure to the floor and can not now complain about anyone who merely asks the right of the opponents to be heard. When the proponents of this bill in the House tell the people for whom they speak that a naughty Republican is responsible for this legislation being sidetracked they should also tell them about their own negligence in bringing this bill to the floor for 2 years especially since they have been in control of the House with almost a 2-to-1 majority.

SELECTION OF PHYSICIAN UNDER LONGSHOREMEN'S AND HARBOR WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill—H.R. 12574—to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor

Workers' Compensation Act, so as to provide that an injured employee shall have the right to select his own physician, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 7 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act is amended to read as follows:

"MEDICAL SERVICES AND SUPPLIES

"SEC. 7. SELECTION OF PHYSICIAN.—(a) The employer shall furnish such medical, surgical, and other attendance or treatment, nurse and hospital service, medicine, crutches, and apparatus, for such period as the nature of the injury or the process of recovery may require.

"(b) The employee shall have the right to choose an attending physician from a panel of physicians to be named by the employer subject to the provisions of subsection (c) of this section. If, due to the nature of the injury, the employee is unable to select his physician from a panel and the nature of the inquiry requires immediate medical treatment and care, the employer shall select a physician for him from the panel. Nothing contained in this section shall limit the right of the employee to make a second choice of physician from such panel. The deputy commissioner may, under rules prescribed by the Secretary, permit an injured employee to select a physician not on the panel when specialized services are needed or in unusual circumstances. The deputy commissioner shall have authority to determine the necessity, character, and sufficiency of any medical aid furnished or to be furnished and shall have authority to order a change of physicians or hospitals when in his judgment such change is desirable or necessary.

"(c) The deputy commissioner shall approve the qualifications of the panel of physicians named by the employer and shall determine the number of physicians to be named. In determining the size of the panel, he shall take into account the number of competent, suitable, and impartial physicians conveniently available to the community in which the medical service is required. Every employer shall post the names and addresses of the physicians on his panel in such manner as to afford his employees reasonable notice thereof.

"(d) If the employer fails to provide the medical or other treatment, services, and supplies required to be furnished by subsection (a), after request by the injured employee, or fails to maintain a panel of physicians as required by subsection (c), or fails to permit the employee to choose an attending physician from such panel, such injured employee may procure such medical or other treatment, services, and supplies and select a physician to render treatment and services at the expense of the employer. The employee shall not be entitled to recover any amount expended by him for such treatment or services unless he shall have requested the employer to furnish the same and the employer shall have refused or neglected to do so, or unless the nature of the injury required such treatment and services and the employer or his superintendent or foreman having knowledge of such injury shall have neglected to provide the same; nor shall any claim for medical or surgical treatment be valid and enforceable, as against such employer, unless within twenty days following the first treatment the physician giving such treatment furnish to the employer and the deputy commissioner a report of such injury and treatment, on a form prescribed by the Commission. The deputy commissioner may, however, excuse the failure to furnish such report within twenty days when he finds it to be in the interest of justice to do so, and he may, upon application by a party in interest, make an award for the reasonable value of such medical or surgical treatment so obtained by the employee. If at any time during such period the employee unreasonably refuses to submit to medical or surgical treatment, the deputy commissioner may, by order, suspend the payment of further compensation during such time as such refusal continues, and no compensation shall be paid at any time during the period of such suspension, unless the circumstances justified the refusal.

"(e) Whenever in the opinion of the deputy commissioner a physician has not impartially estimated the degree of permanent disability or the extent of temporary disability of any injured employee, the deputy commissioner shall have the power to cause such employee to be examined by a physician selected by the deputy commissioner and to obtain from such physician a report containing his estimate of such disabilities. If the report of such physician shows that the estimate of the physician has not been impartial from the standpoint of such employee, the deputy commissioner shall have the power in his discretion to charge the cost of such examination to the employer, if he is a self-insurer, or to the insurance company which is carrying the risk.

"(f) All fees and other charges for such treatment or service shall be limited to such charges as prevail in the same community for similar treatment of injured persons of like standard of living, and shall be subject to regulation by the deputy commissioner.

"(g) The liability of an employer for medical treatment as herein provided shall not be affected by the fact that his employee was injured through the fault or negligence of a third party not in the same employ, or suit has been brought against such third party. The employer shall, however, have a cause of action against such third party to recover any amounts paid by him for such medical treatment in like manner as provided in section 33(b) of this Act."

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to concur in the request of the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota for the passage of this bill.

Mr. WIER. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The SPEAKER. The question is on passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMPENSATION UNDER LONGSHOREMEN'S AND HARBOR WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill—H.R. 12777—to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, as amended, to provide increased benefits in case of disabling injuries, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 6 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, as amended (33 U.S.C. 906), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 6. (b) Compensation for disability shall not exceed $70 per week and compensation for total disability shall not be less than $18 per week: *Provided, however,* That if the employee's average weekly wages, as computed under section 10, are less than $18 per week, he shall receive as compensation for total disability his average weekly wages."

SEC. 2. Section 9(e) of the said Act is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(e) In computing death benefits the average weekly wages of the deceased shall be considered to have been not more than $105 nor less than $27 but the total weekly compensation shall not exceed the weekly wages of the deceased."

SEC. 3. Section 14(m) of the said Act is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(m) The total money allowance payable to an employee as compensation for an injury under this chapter shall in no event exceed in the aggregate the sum of $24,000: *Provided,* That this limitation shall not apply to cases of permanent total disability or death: *And provided further,* That in applying this limitation there shall not be taken into account any amount payable under section 908(g) for maintenance during rehabilitation or any amount of additional compensation required to be paid under this section for delay or default in the payment of compensation or any amount accruing as interest upon defaulted compensation collectible under section 918 of this title."

SEC. 4. The amendments made by the foregoing provisions of this Act shall become effective as to injuries or disability sustained on or after the date of enactment.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3, after "That" insert "subsection (b) of".

Page 1, line 6, strike out "SEC. 6.".

Page 2, line 15, strike out "chapter" and insert in lieu thereof "Act".

Page 2, beginning in line 20, strike out "section 908(g) of this title" and insert in lieu thereof "section 8(g)".

Page 3, line 2, strike out "section 918 of this title" and insert in lieu thereof "section 18".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIER. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota in support of this bill.

Mr. WIER. I thank the distinguished minority leader of the Committee on Labor for his cooperation.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York.

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WEIR], the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KEARNS] and the majority and minority members of the Committee on Education and Labor for favorably reporting the pending bill H.R.

LIBRARIES

12777 as well as the bill just passed by the House, H.R. 12574, amending the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, so as to provide that an injured employee shall have the right to select his own physician, and for other purposes. Particular credit for this legislation goes to the author of both these bills, the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. ZELENKO] to whom the longshoremen and harbor workers in every port of the United States owe a deep debt of gratitude. Speaking for the Brooklyn longshoremen and port workers, I acknowledge that debt. I trust that before we adjourn sine die tonight the other body will act favorably on both these bills.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT ACT

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 3688) to amend the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945, as amended, and the act approved December 20, 1944, as amended, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3 of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945 (60 Stat. 790), as amended (sec. 5–702, D.C. Code, 1951 edition), is amended—

(a) by redesignating the definitions designated "(b)" through "(r)" as "(c)" through "(s)", respectively;

(b) by inserting after the definition of "Agency" in such section the following new definition:

"(b) 'Blighted area' means any area, whether residential or nonresidential, or a combination of residential and nonresidential, which is substandard within the meaning of section 2 of this Act, regardless of whether the buildings in such area are used or will be used after redevelopment for human habitation.";

(c) by striking "an area" in the definition of "Project area" and inserting in lieu thereof "a blighted area"; and

(d) by inserting in the definition of "Redevelopment company" after the words "project area", the phrase "or part thereof".

SEC. 2. Subsection (a) of section 5 of such Act (sec. 5–704(a), D.C. Code, 1951 edition) is amended by striking "section 7(i)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 7(h)".

SEC. 3. Paragraph numbered (2) of subsection (b) of section 6 of such Act (sec. 5–705, D.C. Code, 1951 edition) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Such plan may provide for the redevelopment of areas which are residential or nonresidential in character, or a combination thereof, and such areas may be redeveloped for (i) residential uses, (ii) nonresidential uses, or (iii) a combination of residential and nonresidential uses, as the Planning Commission and the District Commissioners may determine appropriate to facilitate the proper growth and development or redevelopment of the community in accordance with sound planning standards and to afford maximum opportunity for the redevelopment of the project area by private enterprise."

SEC. 4. The second sentence of subsection (b) of section 7 of such Act (sec. 5–706(b), D.C. Code, 1951 edition), is amended (a) by striking "than publicly owned properties" and inserting in lieu thereof "publicly owned properties which are not to be devoted to public use"; (b) by striking the words "and District" in the last clause of said second sentence; and (c) by inserting immediately before the period at the end of subsection (b) the following: "; and the District Commissioners are authorized to transfer any real property owned by the government of the District of Columbia to the Agency for such sums or other consideration as may be agreed upon: *Provided,* That the District Commissioners may not transfer any such real property until the expiration of thirty days from the date upon which a report of the facts concerning any such proposed transfer is submitted to the Committees on the District of Columbia of the Senate and House of Representatives."

SEC. 5. The first section of the Act approved December 20, 1944 (58 Stat. 819), as amended (sec. 1–244, D.C. Code, 1951 edition), is amended by adding the following subsection:

"(1) To enter into leases of, or to grant revocable permits for the use of, the public space over or under the streets and alleys of the District of Columbia to an extent not inconsistent with the use of such streets and alleys by the general public for the purpose of travel, and in connection with any such lease or permit to impose such terms, including but not limited to the deposit of bond or other security, and to provide for the payment of such rents or fees as the Commissioners may, in their discretion, determine to be necessary or desirable, but the Commissioners shall, in connection with entering into a lease for, or granting a permit for, the use of public space over the streets and alleys of the District of Columbia, provide as a condition of any such lease or permit that such space shall not be used by the lessee or permittee in such manner as to deprive any real property not owned by such lessee or permittee of its easements of light, air, and access."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That the first section of the Act approved December 20, 1944 (58 Stat. 819), as amended (sec. 1–244, D.C. Code, 1951 edition), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(l) To enter into leases of, or to grant revocable permits for the use of, the public space over or under Ninth Street SW. in the District of Columbia to an extent not inconsistent with the use of such street by the general public for the purpose of travel, and in connection with any such lease or permit to impose such terms, including but not limited to the deposit of bond or other security, and to provide for the payment of such rents or fees as the Commissioners may, in their discretion, determine to be necessary or desirable, but the Commissioners shall, in connection with entering into a lease for, or granting a permit for, the use of public space over said street in the District of Columbia, provide as a condition of any such lease or permit that such space shall not be used by the lessee or permittee in such manner as to deprive any real property not owned by such lessee or permittee of its easements of light, air, and access."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to amend the act of December 20, 1944, with respect to certain powers of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE CONTROL ACT

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 3258) to amend the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

THE DALLES FEDERAL RECLAMATION PROJECT, OREGON

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2195) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the western division of the Dalles Federal reclamation project, Oregon, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That for the purpose of furnishing water for the irrigation of approximately five thousand five hundred acres of arid land in Wasco County, Oregon, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct, operate, and maintain the western division of the Dalles Federal reclamation project, Oregon. The western division shall consist of the following principal works: a main pumping plant to be located at a site on the Columbia River; a booster and relift pumping plants with reregulating reservoirs; and a distribution system.

SEC. 2. (a) In constructing, operating, and maintaining the western division of the Dalles project, the Secretary shall be governed by the Federal reclamation laws (Act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and Acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto).

(b) The period provided in subsection (d) of section 9 of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, as amended, for repayment of construction costs properly allocable to any block of lands and assigned to be repaid by the irrigators may be extended to fifty years, exclusive of a development period, from the time water is first delivered to that block or to as near that number of years as is consistent with the adoption and operation of a repayment formula as therein provided. Costs allocated to irrigation in excess of the amount determined by the Secretary to be within the ability of the irrigators to repay within a fifty-year period shall be returned to the reclamation fund within a fifty-year period from the date of the first delivery of water from the facilities authorized by this legislation from net revenues derived by the Secretary of the Interior from the disposition of power marketed through the Bonneville Power Administration, which are over and above those required to meet any present obligations assigned for repayment from

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

such net revenues. The term "construction costs" used herein shall include any irrigation operation and maintenance costs during the development period which the Secretary finds it proper to fund because they are beyond the ability of the water users to pay during that period.

(c) Power and energy required for irrigation pumping for the western division of the Dalles Federal reclamation project shall be made available by the Secretary from the Dalles Dam powerplant and other Federal plants interconnected therewith at rates not to exceed the costs of such power and energy from the Dalles Dam taking into account all costs of the dam, reservoir, and powerplant which are determined by the Secretary under the provisions of the Federal reclamation laws to be properly allocable to such irrigation pumping power and energy.

(d) That portion of the cost of constructing the works authorized by this Act which the Secretary finds to be properly allocable to the conservation and development of fish and wildlife, in accordance with the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (48 Stat. 401, as amended, 16 U.S.C. 661, and the following), together with the portion of the operation, maintenance, and replacement costs allocated to this function, shall be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable under the reclamation laws.

SEC. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for construction of the works authorized by this Act not to exceed $6,000,000, plus or minus such amounts, if any, as may be justified by reason of ordinary fluctuations in construction costs as indicated by engineering cost indices applicable to the types of construction involved herein.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 19, after "fund" insert "within a fifty-year period from the date of the first delivery of water from the facilities authorized by this legislation".

Page 4, strike out lines 3 through 5, inclusive, and insert:

"SEC. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for construction of the works authorized by this Act not to exceed $6,000,000, plus or minus such amounts, if any, as may be justified by reason of ordinary functions, in construction costs as indicated by engineering cost indices applicable to the type of construction involved herein".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CITIZEN BAND OF POTAWATOMI INDIANS OF OKLAHOMA

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 640) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate be requested to return to the House the bill (H.R. 7990) to convey certain land of the United States in trust to the Citizen Band of Potawatomi Indians of Oklahoma, with the Senate amendments thereto, and the message of the House thereon.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHEYENNE AND ARAPAHO INDIANS

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 816) to set aside certain lands in Oklahoma for the Cheyenne and Arapaho Indians, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That there are hereby eliminated from the Cheyenne and Arapaho subagency reservation at Concho, Oklahoma, approximately four thousand nine hundred acres of land considered excess to the present school and agency reserve needs. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to convey to the Cheyenne and Arapaho Tribes a fee simple title to approximately three thousand nine hundred acres of such lands, together with the improvements thereon. Approximately one thousand acres of such land shall be transferred by the Secretary of the Interior to the Attorney General for use in connection with the El Reno Reformatory. The land transferred to the Attorney General shall be selected in a reasonably compact unit that will cause a minimum disruption in the agricultural program now conducted by the Bureau of Prisons. The title of the tribes to any land conveyed pursuant to this section shall be subject to no exemption from taxation or restriction on use, management, or disposition because of Indian ownership.

"SEC. 2. The Indian Claims Commission is directed to determine in accordance with the provisions of section 2 of the Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1050), the extent to which the value of the title conveyed by this Act should or should not be set off against any claim against the United States determined by the Commission."

Amend the title so as read: "An act to convey certain lands in Oklahoma to the Cheyenne and Arapaho Indians, and for other purposes."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONSTRUCTION OF CHENEY DIVISION, WICHITA FEDERAL RECLAMATION PROJECT, KANSAS

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1092) to provide for the construction of the Cheney division, Wichita Federal reclamation project, Kansas, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to construct, operate, and maintain the Cheney division, Wichita Federal reclamation project, consisting of a dam, reservoir, and related facilities near Cheney, Kansas, on the North Fork of the Ninnescah River, Kansas, for the purposes of furnishing water for municipal uses, controlling floods, facilitating irrigation, enhancing recreational opportunities, preserving and propagating fish and wildlife, and for related purposes.

SEC. 2. In constructing, operating, and maintaining the works authorized by this Act, the Secretary shall be governed by the Federal reclamation laws (Act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and Act amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto), except as is otherwise provided in this Act.

SEC. 3. Construction of the project shall not be commenced, and no construction contracts therefor shall be awarded, until a contract or contracts complying with the provisions of this Act have been entered into with the city of Wichita under which it shall have obligated itself to repay to the United States, within a period of not more than 40 years from the time water is first made available from said works, those portions of the Federal costs of constructing, operating, and maintaining the works herein authorized which are allocated to municipal water supply, and interest on the unamortized balance of the amount of construction costs so allocated including interest during construction. If any net revenues are derived from temporary water supply contracts, prior to the end of the repayment period for water furnished from, by, or through the works authorized herein, the construction cost obligation of the city may be decreased by that portion of the amount of any such net revenues which bears the same proportion to the total amount of such net revenues as the amount of the project costs allocated to municipal water supply bears to the total Federal costs of constructing the project. Interest shall be at the average rate, which rate shall be certified by the Secretary of the Treasury, paid by the United States on its marketable long-term securities outstanding on the date of this Act and adjusted to the nearest one-eighth of 1 per centum. Upon the completion of the payment of the city's construction cost obligation, together with the interest thereon, the city shall have a permanent right to the use of that portion of the storage space in the project allocable to municipal water supply purposes.

SEC. 4. Contracts may be entered into with the city of Wichita pursuant to the provisions of this Act without regard to the last sentence of subsection (c) of section 9 of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939.

SEC. 5. The Secretary is authorized to transfer to the city of Wichita the care, operation, and maintenance of the works herein authorized and, if such transfer is made, to deduct from the obligation of the city the reasonable capitalized equivalent of that portion of the estimated operation and maintenance costs of the undertaking which, if the United States continued to operate the works, would be allocated to flood control and fish and wildlife purposes. Prior to taking over the care, operation, and maintenance of said works, the city shall obligate itself to operate them in accordance with criteria specified by the Secretary of the Army with respect to flood control and by the Secretary of the Interior with respect to fish and wildlife.

SEC. 6. The Secretary may make such reasonable provision in connection with the works of the Cheney division, Wichita Federal reclamation project, in accordance with section 2 of the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (48 Stat. 401, as amended, 16 U.S.C., sec. 661, and the following), as he finds to be required for the preservation and propagation of fish and wildlife, and to acquire approximately 2,500 acres of land for wildlife management purposes within and adjacent to Cheney Reservoir. A minimum pool of approximately ten thousand acre-feet shall be maintained in said reservoir for fish life. An appropriate portion of the construction cost of the Cheney division of the project shall be allocated as provided in said Act and it, together with the portion of the construction cost allocated to flood control and the portions of the operation and maintenance costs allocated to these functions or the equivalent capitalized value thereof,

shall be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable under the Federal reclamation laws. Appropriate portions of the project area may be made available by the Secretary of the Interior to the Kansas Forestry, Fish and Game Commission for fish and wildlife management as provided in sections 3 and 4 of said Act.

SEC. 7. The Secretary may, upon conclusion of a suitable agreement with any qualified agency of the State of Kansas or political subdivision or agency thereof for assumption of the administration, operation, and maintenance thereof at the earliest practicable date, provide minimum basic public recreation facilities at or near Cheney Reservoir and the cost thereof incurred by the United States shall be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable under the Federal reclamation laws.

SEC. 8. Expenditures for Cheney Reservoir may be made without regard to the soil survey and land classification requirements of the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1954 (67 Stat. 261, 266–267).

SEC. 9. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be required to carry out the purposes of this Act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 6, strike out "Act" and insert: "Acts".

Page 5, strike out lines 16 through 18, inclusive, and insert:

"SEC. 9. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for construction of the works authorized by this Act not to exceed $18,274,000, plus or minus such amounts, if any, as may be justified by reason of ordinary fluctuations in construction costs as indicated by engineering cost indices applicable to the types of construction involved herein."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks on the last two bills at the conclusion of the action taken thereon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, S. 1092, to authorize construction of the Cheney division of the Wichita reclamation project, and S. 2195, to authorize the western division of the Dalles reclamation project, are both meritorious measures and I am glad to support their passage even though there has been no opportunity for debate. Normally I would not be agreeable to passing bills authorizing projects involving expenditures in the amounts involved in these bills under such a procedure because I believe every Member of the House should be fully informed on what is involved. However, because of the situation we find ourselves in with respect to time and the urgent need for immediate authorization of these projects, I am convinced that they should not be held up.

I want to assure my colleagues that the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee has given detailed and studied consideration to both of these measures and has recommended their enactment. The committee found both projects to be engineeringly and economically feasible, and the provisions of S. 1092 and S. 2195 are consistent with present law and policy relating to the authorization and construction of reclamation projects.

S. 1092 provides for construction of the $18,274,000 Cheney division in Kansas. Construction and operation of the Cheney Dam and Reservoir would provide an urgently needed supplemental water supply for the city of Wichita, a high degree of flood protection in the Ninnescah Valley and much needed fishing, hunting and recreational opportunities in the area.

S. 2195 provides for construction of the $5,649,000 western division of the Dalles project in Oregon. Water would be pumped from the Columbia River to provide a firm water supply for 5,420 acres adjacent to the city of The Dalles. Some 2,340 acres in valuable orchard crops now receive an inadequate water supply from ground water pumping. The area has been declared a critical ground water area by the State and unless a new source of water is obtained, the existing valuable orchard economy will be lost. More than 90 percent of the area will be in fruit production and the project will not contribute in any way to our agricultural surplus problems.

MINERAL RIGHTS IN CERTAIN HOMESTEAD LANDS, ALASKA

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1670) to provide for the granting of mineral rights in certain homestead lands in the State of Alaska.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alaska?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the United States hereby quitclaims as of the date of this Act or as of the date of issuance of patent, whichever is later, to the patentee or to his lawful heirs if title to the lands prior to the date of this Act had by devise or succession passed out of the patentee, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to oil and gas deposits in lands in the Kenai Peninsula in the State of Alaska patented to homestead entrymen pursuant to homestead entries on which all requirements of the homestead laws had been complied with prior to July 23, 1957, except for the actual submission of acceptable final proof.

SEC. 2. Nothing in this Act shall affect the validity of any lease issued under the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437; 30 U.S.C. 181 and following), as amended, or any rights arising thereunder, or any of its terms and conditions except that quitclaim under the terms of this Act of any oil and gas deposit covered by such a lease shall vest in the grantee all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to such lease, including the right to all rentals, royalties, and other payments accruing after the date of quitclaim and including any authority that may have been retained by the United States to modify its terms and conditions.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 10, after "lease," insert "insofar as the lease pertains to the quitclaimed lands,"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISPOSITION OF CERTAIN PUBLIC LANDS IN ALASKA

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 3267) to amend the act of October 17, 1940, relating to the disposition of certain public lands in Alaska.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alaska?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act of October 17, 1940 (54 Stat. 1191; 48 U.S.C. 353, note), is hereby amended—

(1) by striking out the words "$1.25 per acre" appearing in section 2 thereof and by substituting therefor the words "their fair market value as determined by the Secretary by appraisal or otherwise";

(2) by adding a new section 3 thereto reading as follows: "The State of Alaska may, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, select any of the lands described in section 2 of this Act in partial satisfaction of land grants made or confirmed by the Act of July 7, 1958 (72 Stat. 339, 340), subject to the terms and conditions of that Act."; and

(3) by adding a new section 4 thereto reading as follows: "Notwithstanding the provisions of section 2 of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior may sell to each of those persons who, on August 1, 1959, had on file in the Anchorage Land Office of the Bureau of Land Management, a valid application to purchase lands under this Act, the lands described in his application at the prices heretofore recommended by the Alaska Rural Rehabilitation Corporation but at not less than $1.25 per acre."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, after "value" insert "(but not less than $1.25 per acre)"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HAWAII NATIONAL PARK ON MAUI, HAWAII

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 3623) to designate and establish that portion of the Hawaii National Park on the island of Maui, in the State of Hawaii, as the Haleakala National Park, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, effective July 1, 1961, the detached portion of the Hawaii National Park which lies on the island of Maui is hereby established as a separate unit of the national park system to be known as Haleakala National Park. The park so established shall be administered in accordance with the Act entitled "An Act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes", approved August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535), as amended and supplemented, and in accordance with any other applicable provision of law relating to the Maui portion of Hawaii National Park.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MERCEDES DIVISION, LOWER RIO GRANDE REHABILITATION PROJECT, TEXAS

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 10311) providing that certain provisions of Public Law 335 dated October 7, 1949 (63 Stat. 724) shall apply to the Mercedes division of the lower Rio Grande rehabilitation project, Texas.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior, in addition to the authority granted by Public Law 85-370, April 7, 1958 (72 Stat. 82), is authorized to act pursuant to the last sentence of section 1 of the Act of October 7, 1949 (63 Stat. 724), but subject to the exceptions therein contained, in the construction, rehabilitation, operation, and maintenance of the lower Rio Grande rehabilitation project, Texas, Mercedes division.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "therein contained," and insert "contained in the Act of April 7, 1958."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AGUA CALIENTE AND SEMINOLE RESERVATIONS, FLA.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 8712) to amend the Act of August 9, 1955, to authorize longer term leases of Indian lands on the Agua Caliente (Palm Springs) Reservation and the Seminole Reservation in Florida.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the second sentence of the first section of the Act entitled "An Act to authorize the leasing of restricted Indian lands for public, religious, educational, recreational, residential, business, and other purposes requiring the grant of long-term leases", approved August 9, 1955 (25 U.S.C. 415), which is amended to read as follows: "All leases so granted shall be for a term of not to exceed twenty-five years, except leases of land on the Agua Caliente (Palm Springs) Reservation and on the Dania, Brighton, and Big Cypress Indian Reservation for the Seminole Indians in Florida, which may be for a term of not to exceed ninety-nine years, and except leases of land for grazing purposes which shall be for a term of not to exceed ten years."

(b) The third sentence of the first section of such Act of August 9, 1955, is amended by inserting after "residential, or business purposes" the words "(except leases the initial term of which extends for more than seventy-four years)".

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 8, strike out "which".

Page 2, line 2, strike out "Reservation and on the Dania, Brighton, and Big Cypress Indian Reservations for the Seminole Indians in Florida," and insert "Navajo, Torres-Martinez, and Dania Indian Reservations."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended to read: "A bill to amend the act of August 9, 1955, to authorize longer term leases of Indian lands on the Agua Caliente (Palm Springs), Navajo, Torres-Martinez, and Dania Indian Reservations."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMORIAL TO THEODORE ROOSEVELT IN THE NATIONAL CAPITAL

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 8665) to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a memorial to Theodore Roosevelt in the National Capital" to provide for the construction of such memorial by the Secretary of the Interior, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 1, after "by", insert "the living children of Theodore Roosevelt,".

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES "THE COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS"

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 693, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman what this resolution provides?

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, this provides for the printing of 4,600 copies of House Document No. 198 of the 84th Congress entitled "The Commission on Intergovernmental Relations."

Mr. SCHENCK. May I ask my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan, whether the resolutions he is calling up provide for the printing of this material in order to help the various committees of the House and the other body; that such material can now be printed as additional copies at a much lower cost; that each of these resolutions was brought up under unanimous consent, and I ask my colleague if these resolutions are being called up in accordance with our discussion.

Mr. LESINSKI. The gentleman has stated the situation correctly according to our discussion as to all bills reported out of the subcommittee.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed four thousand six hundred additional copies of House Document Numbered 198 of the Eighty-fourth Congress, first session, entitled "The Commission on Intergovernmental Relations", of which four thousand shall be for the use of the House Committee on Government Operations, three hundred copies for the House document room, and three hundred copies for the Senate document room.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

U.S. DEFENSE POLICIES IN 1959

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the resolution, House Resolution 545, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the document entitled "United States Defense Policies in 1959" by

Charles H. Donnelly, Library of Congress, be printed as a House document.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GOVERNMENT PROGRAMS IN INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the resolution, House Resolution 578, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Government Operations two thousand five hundred additional copies of House Report Numbered 2712 of the Eighty-fifth Congress, second session, a survey and handbook of Government programs in international education.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMUNIST TARGET—YOUTH

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the resolution (H. Res. 601) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be printed fifty thousand additional copies of the report prepared and released by the Committee on Un-American Activities, Eighty-sixth Congress, current session, entitled, "Communist Target—Youth", for the use of said committee.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

1960 UNITED STATES CENSUS OF POPULATION

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the resolution, House Resolution 604, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed additional copies of the State editions of the publication entitled "1960 United States Census of Population" so as to furnish twenty-five copies to each Member of the House of Representatives: *Provided*, That the copies received by each Member shall contain only the population figures of the State from which he is a Representative.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRICE SUPPORT AND PRODUCTION ADJUSTMENT ACTIVITIES

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution, House Resolution 641.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, which subcommittee did this resolution come from?

Mr. LESINSKI. It came from the subcommittee of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOUNTAIN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed 16,000 additional copies of the report filed by the Committee on Government Operations entitled "Price Support and Production Adjustment Activities": *Provided*, That these additional copies be printed in conjunction with the regular press run of this report when ordered printed by the House.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF REVISED EDITION OF CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the resolution (S.J. Res. 176) authorizing the preparation and printing of a revised edition of the "Constitution of the United States of America—Analysis and Interpretation," published in 1953, as Senate Document No. 170 of the 82d Congress, and ask for its immediate consideration.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, there are a number of these bills, if I am right about it. A lot of it is political propaganda. Why does not the gentleman tell us what they will cost?

Mr. LESINSKI. I beg to differ with my colleague from Michigan. These are reports authorized by various committees of the Senate.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Which committee does it come from?

Mr. LESINSKI. The Committee on House Administration. Our committee held hearings on it. As I understand we had completed the group of resolutions dealing with various committees of the House.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. If I have the floor.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Ohio says this is beyond the control of the House. What if somebody should object to one of these bills coming from the other body?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does the concurrent resolution now before us come from the Senate?

Mr. LESINSKI. It is a Senate joint resolution.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. A joint resolution to do what? To reprint copies of the Constitution of the United States?

Mr. LESINSKI. For printing a revised edition of the Constitution of the United States of America.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. That is an amazing thing to come from any body of Congress, especially from the other body.

I withdraw my reservation of objection if we are to make a reprint of the Constitution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas the Constitution of the United States of America—Analysis and Interpretation, published in 1953 as Senate Document Numbered 170, Eighty-second Congress, serves a very useful purpose by supplying essential information;

Whereas such document contains annotations of cases decided by the Supreme Court of the United States to June 30, 1952; and

Whereas many cases bearing upon the analysis and interpretation of the Constitution have been decided by the Supreme Court since June 30, 1952: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Librarian of Congress is authorized and directed to have prepared a revised edition of the Constitution of the United States of America—Analysis and Interpretation, published as Senate Document Numbered 170, Eighty-second Congress, which shall contain annotations of decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States after June 30, 1952, construing the several provisions of the Constitution. Such revised edition shall be printed as a Senate document, and three thousand and twenty-nine additional copies shall be printed, of which two thousand two hundred and five copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives and eight hundred and twenty-four copies shall be for the use of the Senate.

SEC. 2. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums, to remain available until expended, as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

DISTRIBUTION OF COPIES OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD TO FORMER MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 3036) to authorize the distribution of copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to former Members of Congress requesting such copies, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, has the committee which the gentlemen represents passed on this bill as to its merits and as to whether it should be done? It is not up to the House to pass everything that is put in front of it unless they think it is the right thing to do. I would like to

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

have that kind of explanation on every one of these bills and resolutions that are called up like this.

Mr. LESINSKI. I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman from New York. The Subcommittee on Printing of the House Administration Committee considered these resolutions.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

AUTHORIZING THE PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF THE HEARINGS ON EMPLOYMENT, GROWTH, AND PRICE LEVELS

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 86.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Joint Economic Committee one thousand additional copies of the hearings on employment, growth, and price levels, held by that committee during the first session of the Eighty-sixth Congress.

The Senate concurrent resolution was agreed to and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF THE HEARINGS ON ENERGY RESOURCES AND TECHNOLOGY

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 88.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Joint Economic Committee one thousand additional copies of the hearings on energy resources and technology, held by that committee during the first session of the Eighty-sixth Congress.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF THE FINAL REPORT AND INDEXES TO HEARINGS AND REPORTS OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON IMPROPER ACTIVITIES IN THE LABOR OR MANAGEMENT FIELD

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 90.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Government Operations not to exceed three thousand additional copies each of parts 2 and 3 of the final report of the Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor and Management Field (S. Rept. 1139, Eighty-sixth Congress, second session), pursuant to S. Res. 44 and S. Res. 249, Eighty-sixth Congress.

The Senate concurrent resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have an explanation on that.

Mr. LESINSKI. This authorizes the printing of not to exceed 3,000 additional copies each of parts 2 and 3 of the final report of the Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field, at a cost of $2,597.

AUTHORIZING THE REPRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON AGREEMENTS FOR COOPERATION OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 91.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be reprinted for the use of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy two thousand additional copies of the hearings before the Subcommittee on Agreements for Cooperation of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on Amending the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 with respect to exchange of military information and material with allies during the second session of the Eighty-fifth Congress.

The Senate concurrent resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF A COMMITTEE PRINT CONTAINING THE REPORTS OF THE STATES TO THE SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL WATER RESOURCES ON THEIR WATER RESOURCES AND PROBLEMS.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 94.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, has the gentleman's committee had hearings on this?

Mr. LESINSKI. Personally I did not, but the Subcommittee on Printing did.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

AUTHORIZING THE PRINTING OF A REVISED EDITION OF THE INTERNAL SECURITY MANUAL

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 96.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is there any limitation on the number of copies that are to be printed?

Mr. LESINSKI. Five thousand additional copies at a cost of about $3,000.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution as follows:

Resolved, by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed as a Senate document a revised edition of the Internal Security Manual; and that five thousand additional copies be printed for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The Senate concurrent resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING FOR USE OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY 6,000 ADDITIONAL COPIES OF COMMITTEE PRINT

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 97.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if the gentleman can tell me whether this is going to keep the Government printing presses busy until the next session of the Congress.

Mr. LESINSKI. The Senate has passed on this already. This is simply concurrence.

Mr. GROSS. What is the gentleman's opinion? Does he think this will keep the plant busy over there until the next session?

Mr. LESINSKI. These are very important.

Mr. GROSS. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be reprinted for the use of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy six thousand additional copies of the Joint Committee print entitled "Summary-Analysis of Hearings,

June 22–26, 1959, on Biological and Environmental Effects of Nuclear War" printed for the use of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy during the Eighty-sixth Congress, first session.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STUDIES ON UNITED STATES-LATIN AMERICAN RELATIONS

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution (S. Con. Res. 99) to print as a Senate document a compilation of studies on United States-Latin American relations.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, in view of the half billion dollars this afternoon that went to this cause, I wonder if the gentleman could tell me how many copies will be printed and the cost of it.

Mr. LESINSKI. Ten thousand copies at an estimated cost of $12,077. The gentleman understands we appropriated money this afternoon and we should have some place to work from, and I think this will furnish the way.

Mr. GROSS. Could you tell us where this $500 million will go?

Mr. LESINSKI. No; I could not say.

Mr. GROSS. We could not find out this afternoon. When will those be available, do you know?

Mr. LESINSKI. They should be available, I imagine, in a month or two.

Mr. GROSS. In a month or so. Well, that will be a little late for the campaign, will it not?

Mr. LESINSKI. That will be November 8.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, will they be available for members of both parties?

Mr. LESINSKI. Yes; to the members of both parties.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there shall be printed as a Senate document a compilation of the studies on United States-Latin American relations prepared under the direction of the Subcommittee on American Republics Affairs of the Committee on Foreign Relations, pursuant to S. Res. 330, agreed to July 31, 1958, as amended by S. Res. 31, agreed to February 2, 1959, and S. Res. 250, agreed to February 9, 1960.

SEC. 2. There shall be printed ten thousand additional copies of such Senate document. Such additional copies shall be for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Subcommittee on American Republics Affairs.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMPILATION OF STUDIES ON U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution (S. Con. Res. 100) to print as a Senate document a compilation of studies on U.S. foreign policy.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, how many copies of this will be printed, and what is the cost?

Mr. LESINSKI. Ten thousand; $19,000.

Mr. GROSS. This went up, then, to about $2 a copy; is that right?

Mr. LESINSKI. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. I object, Mr. Speaker.

PUBLICATIONS OF INTERNAL SUBCOMMITTEE

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution (S. Con. Res. 107) printing for the use of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary additional copies of certain publications of its Internal Security Subcommittee.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what will that cost?

Mr. LESINSKI. Five thousand four hundred and fifteen dollars.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. How many copies?

Mr. LESINSKI. I have not the number of additional copies.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there shall be printed, for the use of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, the numbers of copies specified of the following publications of its Internal Security Subcommittee:

(1) The Effect of Red China Communes on the United States (Hearing before the Subcommittee To Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act and Other Internal Security Laws of the Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate, March 24, 1959), five thousand copies;

(2) Statement by J. Edgar Hoover (S. Doc. 80, Eighty-sixth Congress, second session), ten thousand copies;

(3) The Revival of the Communist International and Its Significance for the United States (Committee Print, Eighty-sixth Congress, first session), five thousand copies;

(4) Contradictions of Communism (Committee Print, Eighty-sixth Congress, first session), twenty thousand copies;

(5) Report of the Subcommittee To Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act and Other Internal Security Laws to the Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate, for the Year 1958 (Committee Print, Eighty-sixth Congress, first session), ten thousand copies; and

(6) The Communist Party of the United States of America—A Handbook for Americans (S. Doc. 117, Eighty-fourth Congress, second session), twenty thousand copies.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROGER WILLIAMS NATIONAL MONUMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 3830) to provide for the establishment of the Roger Williams National Monument.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may we have some information as to where the monument will be established?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes. Might I say before answering the question, I received a letter from that grand gentleman and American and statesman, Senator THEODORE GREEN, on August 29, in which he said:

As this is the last bill which I will sponsor as a Member of the U.S. Senate, I am very much interested in having the measure considered by the House of Representatives before adjournment.

Now, the report of the Senate committee shows that it will be located on four acres of land. The development would include razing of unsightly structures, landscaping, and the construction of a small museum in honor of Roger Williams.

Mr. GROSS. Where?

Mr. McCORMACK. That will be in Providence.

The location selected for the national monument by the local sponsors, as described in the published "College Hill Demonstration Grant Study" report, conducted by the Providence City Plan Commission in cooperation with the Providence Preservation Society and the Housing and Home Finance Agency, is in the oldest part of the city of Providence in an area proposed for urban renewal and redevelopment.

Mr. GROSS. And the cost, if the gentleman will be good enough to tell us?

Mr. McCORMACK. The proposed area is about 4 acres in extent and according to the Senate report the cost of land acquisition is estimated at about $900,000 and the development at $1,100,000.

Mr. GROSS. In other words, this is a $2 million bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. According to the report of the Senate committee.

Mr. GROSS. Two million dollars?

Mr. McCORMACK. According to the report of the Senate committee.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to take up the time of the House this evening, but I think an expenditure of $2 million ought to be discussed and therefore I am going to have to object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following Members be permitted to extend their remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and to include extraneous matter:

Mrs. DWYER.
Mr. DEROUNIAN.
Mr. VAN ZANDT.
Mr. CUNNINGHAM.
Mr. ARENDS.
Mr. HALPERN.
Mr. MILLER of New York.
Mr. QUIE.
Mr. MOORE.
Mr. NELSEN.
Mr. CHIPPERFIELD.
Mr. WEAVER in three instances.
Mr. CURTIS of Missouri.
Mr. JENSEN.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I will object unless the gentleman includes all the Members of the House. Why discriminate?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes; I will.

Mr. HALLECK. These requests were submitted to me as the leader on our side for submission to the Chair. I trust the gentleman will not object.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Will the gentleman include all of us? I want to be included, too, and my friend from Iowa, Mr. GROSS.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] have permission to extend his remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and to include extraneous matter; and I make the same request in behalf of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

HOMELAND DAY

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. REECE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana.

There was no objection.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on this coming Saturday, September 3, delegations of members of the diets of all Lander of the West German Federal Republic are going to join in Berlin the chosen representatives of the East German Landsmannschaften, representing the more than 12 million people expelled at the end of World War II from the part of Germany east of the Oder-Neisse line now under Communist Polish and Soviet Russian administration as well as the people living under Communist rule in the so-called Soviet occupied zone of Germany.

The delegates are convening in the big Berlin assembly hall named in honor of the late Berlin Mayor Reuter.

I have been invited to address this meeting. Other speakers, who will address this truly all-German preliminary parliament are going to be the Minister President of the land Schleswig-Holstein, Herr von Hassel, who is one of the leading younger members of Dr. Adenauer's party.

Due to a heavy schedule of official duties I found myself unable to go abroad at this particular time and have, therefore, sent a message to the meeting in Berlin. Under unanimous consent, I am presenting this message included in the RECORD.

AUGUST 31, 1960.

HERR HANS KRUGER, M.D.B.,
Berlin-Lichterfelde,
Wildenow Str., Germany.

DEAR PRESIDENT KRUGER: Upon the festive occasion of your Homeland Day I ask you to convey to the chosen delegates of the people of all Germany my personal greetings. I sincerely rejoice in your commemoration and in the principles which you emphasize, because we Americans share and uphold these same principles.

We Americans are a people whose hearts are filled with an all-consuming love of our country, not merely the original 13 Colonies, not merely the Midwest or the Pacific coast, but all of these United States of ours.

We Americans cherish freedom because we once offered our lives to win freedom. And we cherish unity because we once fought a bloody Civil War to preserve unity. The words which our great Daniel Webster spoke 130 years ago: "Liberty and Union, now and forever, one and inseparable," are known by heart to every American and are as valid today as a century ago.

I believe, your people too cherish these ideals and, if I am not mistaken, your Prussian anthem states that your fathers died for the cause of liberty.

It is 40 years ago this summer that the people of East Prussia by exercising their elementary right, to speak for themselves, proved their maturity as patriotic citizens of a free commonwealth. Their position showed a marked kinship to American political ideals. For the United States will always be for the right to national and individual freedom of all peoples. This includes the right to self-determination.

Furthermore, the United States by the Treaty of Rio de Janerio of 1933 and by the Principles of Inter-American Solidarity adopted at Buenos Aires in 1936 has solemnly proclaimed "the proscription of territorial conquest" and that, in consequence, they "will not recognize any territorial arrangement which is not obtained by pacific means, nor the validity of the occupation or acquisition of territories that may be brought about by the force of arms."

These principles are neither empty words nor pious protestations; they are part and parcel of U.S. foreign policy. They have been reaffirmed in the Atlantic Charter of 1941 and by incorporation into the United Nations Declaration of January 1, 1942, have assumed international character. The latter declaration has been sworn and subscribed to by the plenipotentiaries of 26 nations, including Soviet Russia and Poland.

We should not and we cannot recognize the illegal annexation through violence by Soviet Russia of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania; and, therefore, as to the part of Germany east of the Oder-Neisse line likewise, we should not recognize "the validity of occupation or acquisition of territories * * * brought about by the force of arms."

It is conformity with this as well as in harmony with an opinion of our greatest Chief Justice, John Marshall, stated as early as 1828, that the holding of territory is a mere military occupation, "until its fate shall be determined at the treaty of peace," that this Government has on July 20, 1960, again declared that "the final delimitation of the western frontier of Poland shall await the peace settlement" and has insisted as "an obvious prerequisite for the peace settlement" upon "the reestablishment of a representative and responsible German Government capable of negotiating and concluding a peace treaty on behalf of the entire German people and of assuring fulfillment of such a treaty."

In the meantime, I feel certain that you will not sleep upon your rights. "Vigilantibus et non dormientibus jura subveniunt"—"the laws aid those who are vigilant, not those who sleep upon their rights"—and that you will firmly insist, time and again, that the rule of law shall ultimately prevail.

The foremost Berlin-born American citizen in our entire history, Francis Lieber, who contributed more than two-thirds of the articles to the Hague Convention on Land Warfare, wrote over a century ago: "The supremacy of the law is an elementary requisite of liberty." And your great philosopher, Immanuel Kant, inspired one of the most eminent legal minds of our day, Roscoe Pound, to these words: "The law is the highest inheritance the sovereign people has; for without the law there would be no sovereign people and no inheritance."

Sincerely yours,

CARROLL REECE.

THE AMERICAN BAR'S STRANGE POLITICAL ACTION

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, there seems to be a growing tendency on the part of certain people in our country to wish to avoid actions which they feel might be construed to be political. I am not certain what their concept of "political" is, but I am aware of the fact that their failure to take action because of political consideration where, by any fair standards, they are required to take action can amount to the worst sort of politics.

I am distressed to learn that the Labor Relations Panel of the American Bar Association last Sunday decided to postpone a decision on a serious matter of alleged unethical conduct on the part of a politically prominent lawyer until

their midwinter session so that they would not be interfering in the fall political campaign.

What is the matter at hand? The American Weekly of July 17, 1960, contained an article entitled "For the Defense," by Neil Hickey. In this article is the following statement:

ROBERT KENNEDY, author of the recent rackets exposé, "The Enemy Within," once was a close friend of Williams, but their careers since have forced them into opposing camps. "I think the 200 lawyers who take their money from the Teamsters are legal prostitutes," KENNEDY told the American Weekly. "Most of them are criminal lawyers. They spend their time trying to keep Mr. Hoffa in office rather than representing the union membership."

Now Mr. Speaker, I think everyone knows that the Teamsters leadership under James Hoffa has been no political friend of mine. Indeed I am on their purge list and it has sought to defeat me by financing whomever my opponent may be in almost every election I have been in. However, I know several lawyers who represent the Teamsters Union and I know they are not "prostitutes" in any sense of the word. They are honorable members of an honorable profession.

It is difficult enough to keep impressed upon the American public the importance to our personal liberties of the principle that good lawyers should represent people and groups accused even of the most reprehensible of crimes without members of the bar undermining this important public concept by ill-considered public statements. It is a basic part of our concept of justice that every person and every organization whatever they may be accused of should be ably represented by counsel. Where would this concept be if lawyers felt that they were going to be judged by the clients they represented rather than by their own conduct in representing, whomever might be their clients, ethically and to the best of their abilities? Such a statement as that attributed to Robert Kennedy is more than ill considered. It is both libelous and unethical.

When a section of the American Bar Association chooses to duck its responsibility of clearing up an allegation of unethical conduct of a member of the bar, in this instance Robert Kennedy, simply because Mr. Kennedy has a brother running for President of the United States in the November elections we have a very dangerous situation. Far from this group of the American Bar Association avoiding politics by this decision they have involved themselves deeply in politics. But for politics they would have taken action; because of politics they fail to take action.

In concluding these remarks I want to make it quite clear that I do not know whether Mr. Kennedy made the libelous and unethical remarks attributed to him or not. I know it should be quite easy to determine whether he did or he did not. If he did not make them let that be publicly established. If he did make them he certainly should be called sharply to task immediately by those in the legal profession who are elected or appointed by their fellow lawyers to preserve the fine name and the ethics of a noble profession.

DEMOCRATS KILL CONSERVATION RESERVE

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, one of our most valuable and effective farm programs is about to expire without congressional action. I am referring to the conservation reserve program. On December 31, 1960, the Department of Agriculture will no longer have the authority to enter into new contracts for the retirement and conservation of productive farmland. For all practical purposes, this authority has now ended because contracts for next spring's crops should be made this fall.

The conservation reserve is the long-range program under which farmers voluntarily contract to take general cropland out of production and devote it to the conservation of soil, water, and wildlife for periods of from 3 to 10 years. The national average payment for these conservation practices is $13.50 per acre per year.

We all know that during World War II farmers were urged to step up production. They responded magnificently. After the war, the wartime supports were continued and surpluses began to build up. Government controls for the main part have failed to balance supply and demand. Surpluses continue to mount. After the war, farmers were caught in a vicious cost-price squeeze which still continues to plague them and makes the transition to a prosperous market economy even more difficult. The conservation reserve program, though no cure-all or magic answer, has been a sound and constructive attempt to improve the farm surplus and income problems.

This is one farm program that makes sense. It has proved itself in operation. It has reduced surpluses, thus helping the taxpayer. It has benefited the general public by preserving for future generations the productive capacity of our soil, by conserving our water resources, and by establishing favorable conditions for our wildlife and game. The farmer has found this program extremely beneficial. Since it is completely voluntary, the farmer is not burdened with compulsory bureaucratic controls. Individual farmers can scale down their own particular operations to fit their own labor and cost needs. Farm income has been improved not only by rental payments, but by improved market prices. Soil erosion is being checked, farm ponds and waterways are being erected and better hunting and fishing are being provided. All these advantages make the program attractive.

If it were not for the conservation reserve program we would have right now another 183 million bushels of corn, another 61 million bushels of wheat and another 490,000 bales of cotton. On the basis of data from contracts, performance reports, and applications, the Department of Agriculture has computed the former cropping use of the total 1960 acreage and the production that would be expected at average yields appropriate for the quality and location of the land. The following table shows these acreage and production estimates for the leading crops:

Former cropland use	Estimated former acreage	Estimated normal production
Corn	4,600,000	183,200,000 bushels.
Wheat	3,100,000	61,600,000 bushels.
Cotton	660,000	490,000 bales.
Peanuts	148,000	132,000,000 pounds.
Tobacco	15,000	23,300,000 pounds.
Oats	4,100,000	139,600,000 bushels.
Barley	1,600,000	42,500,000 bushels.
Soybeans	1,100,000	21,200,000 bushels.
Sorghum grain	3,800,000	109,000,000 bushels.
Flaxseed	600,000	4,400,000 bushels.
Cropland hay and pasture.	5,000,000	7,600,000 tons (hay equivalent).

There are now nearly 28½ million acres of crop land in the conservation reserve. Some 75,432 farm families throughout the Nation participate in the program. In my home State of Iowa alone there are 7,690 such families who are retiring and conserving 656,221 acres. Total rental payments in Iowa since the beginning of the program through the 1959 crop year have been $11,342,737.14.

Payments to Iowa's sister-States in the Midwest have been as follows: Kansas, $30 million; Michigan, $10.8 million; Minnesota, $39.8 million; Wisconsin, $11.3 million; Illinois, $8.1 million; Indiana, $9.6 million; Ohio, $8.1 million; Nebraska, $13.6 million; Kentucky, $8.9 million; North Dakota, $37.9 million; and South Dakota, $28.7 million.

Early this year I introduced legislation which would have extended and expanded this valuable program. In addition, my bill would have allowed the Department of Agriculture to use our surplus grain for Federal rental payments. To date, there has been no action to extend the program. The Democratic-controlled Committee on Agriculture has refused to act and the Democratic-controlled House of Representatives defeated a conservation reserve amendment to the ill-fated wheat-feed grains bill on June 22, 1960, by a voice vote. This Republican supported amendment would have extended and expanded the program along with authorizing payments-in-kind, limiting payments to $7,500 per year and limiting to 25 percent the amount of land any county or community could retire.

The record then speaks for itself. In spite of their two-to-one majority in the Committee on Agriculture and in the House and the Senate, the Democrats have refused to act. In spite of their own 1960 platform which pledges "an orderly land retirement and conservation program" congressional Democrats have declined to act. In spite of the fact that the administration has repeatedly asked for action, and in spite of 11 bills to extend this program that have been introduced by Members from both sides of the aisle, and in spite of many moans, groans, and crocodile tears about the

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

farm problem, this Democratic controlled 86th Congress has failed to act.

The outright failure and the downright refusal of this Democratic-controlled Congress is just one more example of the Democrat Party's fundamental attitude toward agriculture during the last 6 years: There was no action, there is no action, there will be no action.

DILLON RESERVOIR IN MUSKINGUM COUNTY, OHIO

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HENDERSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, as this congressional session approaches its closing days, I take particular pleasure in noting that final action has been taken by the Congress to appropriate the fund required to complete the construction of the Dillon Reservoir on the Licking River in Muskingum County, Ohio. This action marks the last chapter of a stormy legislature history.

During my first campaign for Congress in 1954, I had the temerity to suggest to the people of the 15th District of Ohio that if they would send me to Washington as their representative, I would work for the completion of this much needed project and would see that it was completed. This was a particularly ambitious undertaking in view of the fact that the project, though authorized in 1938, had received cool and even hostile treatment through the years.

The first funds were appropriated in the early 1940's followed by other appropriations in succeeding years until 1951 during the Korean incident when Congress authorized additional money. There was a progressive decrease in the congressional enthusiasm for the project in these years. When I came to the 84th Congress in 1955 the project, with about $9 million already expended, was in a state of deteriorating suspended animation. Materials were rusting in storage. Wind and weather had washed and eroded earthworks that had been built in former years. The increasing indecision of the years had intensified differences of opinion as to the propriety of the project. In 1954, the Congress failed to act on the budget recommendation, and consequently in 1955, and 1956 the measure was omitted from the budget. Dillon's prospects were dark, indeed.

In 1956, a ray of sunshine appeared. It was in that year through the approval of an unbudgeted item in the public works appropriations bill that the Congress included an appropriation of $1,500,000 to resume construction. It was a great moment for the people of the Muskingum Valley. I want to point out that although I had worked unceasingly to obtain funds for the project and had expended much effort in that direction, it required coordinated assistance and cooperation from many sources to obtain this breakthrough. Legislation is more than a one-man undertaking. A Member must call upon his colleagues to help him. Many Members of the House, and many Members of the Senate, from Ohio and elsewhere, demonstrated their friendship and their interest in southeastern Ohio and its serious flood control problems. Their interest was inspired, not by my efforts alone, but by the tremendously convincing arguments advanced by private citizens, civic and business organizations of the 15th District. Seldom has a community effort been so well coordinated and so effective in conveying the facts about a problem affecting the property and lives of people in a given area.

In each succeeding year, the Congress has reaffirmed its action and appropriated additional funds, concluding with the final appropriation of $4,223,000 this year. This makes a total of approximately $23 million appropriated for this feature since I came to Congress.

The reservoir is nearing completion. Many details remain to be worked out, but the dam and the other major structures are about finished. On October 2, 1960, this great project is scheduled to be formally dedicated. It will mark a new milestone in the flood control of the Muskingum River. Fourteen other dams had brought under control all of the Muskingum tributaries except the Licking River. Dillon will tame its angry torrents, protecting some 90 miles of Muskingum Valley from Zanesville to Marietta. The protection thus afforded the Muskingum Valley adds too to the control of floods in the valleys of the Ohio and Mississippi. We of southeastern Ohio are proud that the promise and hope which the Congress held out to us so many years ago has been fulfilled.

For myself, and for the people I represent, I wish to express our most profound appreciation to those of my colleagues in the House and the Senate who have cooperated with me in making the realization of this project possible. It will stand as a lasting monument to the responsiveness and genuine sympathy of our Government for the needs of its people.

THE KINZUA DAM

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mark the end of a long and tragic struggle. I refer to the battles which I and others in the Congress have waged to save the Seneca Indians from the so-called Kinzua Dam on the Allegheny River.

In the past 21 days, three last ditch assaults have been made on the ramparts of an intrenched opposition. The final effort has now expended itself. The momentum of Congress on this issue is today clearly irreversible. The time has come to lay down our arms and devote ourselves to minimizing the suffering. And let no one doubt that within a short time the wheels of progress will grind upon the Seneca nation of Indians in western New York, and that these stalwart people will suffer exceedingly.

It is not my intention here to call up the merits of the case once again. They have been often discussed in the Chambers of this House, pro and con, according to the good order of government. And had the will of the House of Representatives prevailed over the U.S. Senate, the last chapter of this story might have contained a happy ending. I thank each of you who supported me on this issue.

Standing here in this great Capitol Building, which is a shrine to freedom and justice, my mind moves across the rolling hills and valleys of Pennsylvania into the southern tier of New York State where stands, for yet a while, the reservation of the Senecas. These happy lands, whether sparkling in the late summer sun, shrouded with the mists of autumn, or buried under the deep snows of winter, are hallowed grounds to the Seneca. It is the land itself which is the symbol of their heritage and the last one vestige of what was originally theirs.

And yet, for all their heritage which called them to be a people unto themselves, the Senecas have become citizens of the highest order. They have demonstrated their loyalties a thousand times over. Their dedication to service during the armed conflicts in which this country found itself engaged was an example of sacrifice on the highest plane. Loyalty and bravery, those natural virtues of the Seneca, made of him an exemplary soldier. Many of the sons of the Seneca Nation won from our country the highest awards that any nation could give. They thereby enriched and broadened the meaning of their own culture and their own history.

And now, against a backdrop of historic invulnerability assured by the father of our Nation, George Washington himself, comes the bulldozer, the grader, the modern machine to strip from this sacred land of the Senecas the last traces of their valued legacy and to flood it with the waters which our modern civilization must have to quench its thirst.

I ask you to have no pity for the Seneca for he would countenance none himself. In the months and years that I have fought this matter, never has a Seneca asked me for pity for his situation. Rather, in every instance, he has sought to find a valid means to solve both problems: his own and that of the demanding rigors of the industrialized nation in which we live. He has asked only for a fair and complete study of those alternatives. The matter is closed now without that opportunity.

Let those who speak on behalf of modern progress realize at least what the sacrifice must be to those who will lose their homes. A home because it is modest is no less valued by him who lives there. Indeed, it is all the more cherished, especially when it represents to him the great history of his forefathers.

MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Could we stand by while Plymouth Rock was heaved onto a pile to construct a breakwater? Could we gracefully step aside to have the monument to George Washington razed to make way for a limited access highway? Could we remain silent while Yellowstone National Park was subdivided for low-cost housing? I, for one, would not. And so I acknowledge the magnificent efforts of the Senecas to preserve, in the most orderly fashion available, that which is much more important to them—the land.

Kinzua will be erected. There will be flood protection. Downstream cities will have their water. The Seneca lands of history will be no more.

But over the entire episode will hang the cloud of doubt and uncertainty—the realization that while millions are being spent, there might have been a better way, there might have been another method, to accomplish the same thing without destroying a portion of this Nation's legends. We will now never know. It is too late, the demands were too great and the arguments, carefully avoiding any reference to what goes on in the minds of these quiet Senecas, too strong.

I, for one, must go on record, Mr. Speaker, as the Representative of these people, to state that the doubts will linger in my mind. Although this file is closed, it will be forever stamped with the question mark of what might have been.

We must turn now, as the Senecas have already done, to the future. We must seek to alleviate, in a small fashion, the great transition which must now take place.

The Kinzua Dam will come. Let it come, then, in an atmosphere charged with the spirit of brotherhood and cooperation that can demonstrate that this Nation, in the face of modern progress, will not forget the people who first called this Nation theirs. Let us not, either here assembled or in our own hearts, forget that our actions have no value unless they result in the great good of the individual human being on both sides of each controversy.

THE MINIMUM WAGE

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Education and Labor Committee, I must rise today to comment on the breakdown of the minimum wage conference. Some facts might add perspective to the picture. The original Roosevelt and Kennedy bills would have caused widespread unemployment and put many small operators out of business. After our committees carved those bills up and eliminated many of the inequities, there remained only one major issue to be resolved: Should the Federal Government be given jurisdiction over businesses which operate purely within a single State?

It would appear that Mr. KENNEDY, with fine and impartial scorn, will accept no bill which does not, in principle, expose all small businesses to the eventual heavyhanded jurisdiction of the Federal Government.

This apparently was dictated by the little collection of national labor leaders with which he consults on such matters, but I do not think it represents the opinion of either the American laboring people or our small business operators who are having enough trouble as it is with interference from Washington.

The Democrats have, by their insistence on such broad Federal responsibility, denied affected workers a 15 percent increase in pay and eliminated any extension of coverage for this year.

I hope we can now close up the Congress and spare the American people any more political maneuvering at the taxpayer's expense.

U.S. ADMINISTRATION OF THE RYUKYU ISLANDS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the genleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to authorize a contribution to the Government of the Ryukyu Islands for the purpose of providing compensation for use of private property and damage to persons and property arising from acts of the U.S. forces before the entry into force of the Japanese Peace Treaty.

This bill is designed to clear up the last major outstanding problem in the U.S. administration of the Ryukyu Islands. Since 1958, the use of land in the Ryukyus by our forces has been conducted on a basis which is mutually acceptable to the people of Okinawa and to our administration. This Congress has just enacted Public Law 86-69, which for the first time places a proper legal foundation under the annual appropriations which this Congress has made for expenses connected with the U.S. administration of these islands. The present bill authorizes a contribution by the United States to the indigenous Government of the Ryukyu Islands to enable it to provide equitable compensation to the inhabitants of Okinawa for the period prior to the treaty of peace with Japan.

The bill is introduced at this late date in the proceedings of the 86th Congress in order that it may be referred to the Foreign Affairs Committee and, by that committee, to the interested agencies of the executive branch for comment. The sponsors intend to reintroduce a bill along these lines early in the next Congress, at which time they hope to have the benefit of the views of the executive agencies. It is the full intention of the sponsors that when the bill is reintroduced a ceiling amount for the contribution to be made by the United States shall be inserted.

Since this matter will be taken up in greater detail in the next Congress, the background is set forth only briefly at this time.

Between the termination of hostilities with Japan in 1945 and the entry into force of the treaty of peace with Japan on April 28, 1952, the United States exercised exclusive powers of administration in Okinawa as a military occupation under the laws of war. Unlike the situation in Japan, however, it was solely a unilateral and not an interallied occupation, and also unlike the situation in Japan, it was a direct military government, and the Government of Japan was allowed to exercise no authority whatever. During this period, land and buildings required by the Allied Forces in Japan was requisitioned through the Japanese Government, and the Japanese Government made compensation to the owners. In the Ryukyus, however, extensive requisitions of land were made without compensation by any authority. Finally, after the peace treaty, some compensation was effected for the period beginning July 1, 1950, but this was on an inadequate basis.

It has never been questioned that, in justice, the inhabitants should be compensated by some authority for the use of their property during the pretreaty period. Compensation has been delayed by uncertainty with respect to legal responsibility and the urgency of other problems. The theory of this bill is that, independent of and apart from any question of legal responsibility, the United States should make the resources available to the local government of the Ryukyu Islands to settle this matter on an equitable basis.

When a ceiling amount is determined for the sum to be contributed by the United States, the sponsors of this bill intend that it shall not include any sums for the initial period that our forces were in the Ryukyus, which resulted from the war against Japan. However, we stayed in the Ryukyus and, commencing long before the Japanese Peace Treaty went into effect, built vast bases there in order to protect our own long-range security interests. For that period it is equitable—assuming that the United States could not be found legally responsible—that we furnish the funds necessary for fair compensation.

Included also in the contribution authorized by this bill are so-called tort claims—injuries and losses resulting from accidents and acts of U.S. personnel. The amounts are small, but there are a number of cases that are very important from the human point of view, involving, for instance, civilian deaths and dismemberments in a munitions explosion and the crash of a U.S. bomber.

We have spent vast sums in Okinawa in the interest of our security. Our bases there would be greatly weakened or even made useless by a disaffected population. We would be pennywise and pound foolish if we did not make possible the satisfaction of the reasonable and equitable requests of the people to

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

be compensated for their losses resulting from the actions of our forces well after hostilities had ceased.

POSTAL OFFICIALS' PROPAGANDA RELEASES

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I informed the House of Representatives that I was directing a letter to the Postmaster General asking him under what authority various postal officials were issuing propaganda releases urging that people write to Members of the U.S. Senate and urge that they vote against the bill H.R. 12595. This bill passed the House overwhelmingly and has to do with the illegal practice of moving 4-cent letter mail by air. I called the Postmaster General's attention to section 401, Public Law 86–561, which makes it illegal for any person or agency in the Post Office Department and other branches of the Government to use any time or money in an effort to promote or defeat legislation pending before the Congress. A copy of my letter to the Postmaster General follows:

AUGUST 19, 1960.

The Honorable ARTHUR E. SUMMERFIELD,
Postmaster General,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR GENERAL SUMMERFIELD: A number of persons from various sections of the country have written me about the lobbying activities of postal officials, particularly postmasters and regional office officials, in opposition to H.R. 12595.

This activity is in direct violation of section 401, Public Law 86–561.

I would appreciate knowing if this illegal lobbying has been carried out with the permission of your staff or at their direction.

I would also appreciate knowing what steps are being taken to inform postal officials of the fact that they are in violation of section 401 when they engage in lobbying activities against legislation pending before Congress.

This is a matter of great concern to me, and I regard it as a very serious situation that these employees have engaged in this illegal action. I would appreciate an early reply.

Sincerely yours,

GLENN CUNNINGHAM,
Member of Congress.

A reply to my inquiry was received from Mr. Herbert B. Warburton, General Counsel for the Post Office Department, as follows:

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL,
Washington, D.C., August 22, 1960.

Hon. GLENN CUNNINGHAM,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear CONGRESSMAN CUNNINGHAM: Postmaster General Summerfield is out of the city and therefore I am taking the liberty of replying to your August 19 letter to him. Your inquiry apparently stems from the circumstance which you referred to in your August 17 telegram to the West Palm Beach, Fla., postmaster; namely, that he had distributed a mimeographed letter to some of that office's patrons concerning the movement of first-class mail by air on a space-available basis.

Postmaster McLester advised you in his August 18 letter that he based his action on section 844.131g of the Postal Manual. That section provides:

"Conduct on his own initiative a positive patron relations program. He shall extend every reasonable assistance to the press and other public information media in the gathering of news about the Postal Service in his community. As the spokesman for the Post Office Department in his community, he shall develop and disseminate information promoting patron understanding of the Postal Service so that they may realize the maximum benefits of good mailing practices. He shall make himself available to civic and community organizations as a speaker, and in other capacities, to promote public understanding of available postal services and facilities, thereby helping patrons to use the Department's facilities and services most economically and effectively for them and for the Department."

Postmaster McLester already has informed you that he was not acquainted with the provisions of Public Law 86–561, and while this headquarters' staff has not directed any of this Department's field service personnel to conduct an activity in violation of that restriction, and certainly has not allocated any portion of its funds "for publicity or propaganda purposes designed to support or defeat legislation proposed or pending before Congress," it is immediately taking action to clarify the meaning of that restriction to its field personnel.

The following instruction will be placed in the next Postal Bulletin which will be issued on August 25, 1960, with respect to the restrictive provision of Public Law 86–561:

"DRAFT OF BASIC INSTRUCTION TO POSTAL FIELD SERVICE

"In view of widespread public interest recently expressed in the Post Office Department's program to airlift first-class mail, your attention is called to the following provision of Public Law 86–561:

" 'No part of any appropriation contained in this Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any individual, corporation, or agency included in this Act, shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes designed to support or defeat legislation proposed or pending before Congress.'

"When acquainting the public with the Department's position on postal service matters you should not employ any postal funds for publicity or propaganda for the purpose of requesting postal patrons to influence Members of Congress with respect to their votes on any pending legislation."

Sincerely yours,

HERBERT B. WARBURTON,
General Counsel.

A copy of the general order calling attention to section 401 of Public Law 86–561 to which Mr. Warburton refers in the above letter follows:

[From the Postal Bulletin, Aug. 25, 1960]

ALL POSTAL INSTALLATIONS—AIRLIFT, FIRST-CLASS MAIL

In view of widespread public interest recently expressed in the Post Office Department's program to airlift first-class mail, attention is called to the following provision of Public Law 86–561:

"No part of any appropriation contained in this act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any individual, corporation, or agency included in this act, shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes designed to support or defeat legislation proposed or pending before Congress."

When acquainting the public with the Department's position on postal service matters, postal employees should not employ any postal funds for publicity or propaganda for the purpose of requesting postal patrons to influence Members of Congress with respect to their votes on any pending legislation.—Bureau of Operations, August 25, 1960.

After receiving the above letter from Mr. Warburton, my office personally contacted him to make certain that he would specifically instruct various post office officials in this matter and that the instructions would include a prohibition against any time, even a visit to the editor of a local newspaper, being spent by employees for propaganda purposes. I am sorry that the above general order is not specific, as I was hopeful it would be.

So that the Congress might know of the propaganda effort carried on by the Post Office Department in violation of Public Law 86–561, I am including here several illustrations of how the law has been violated:

First. Regional post office officials have directed official memorandums to all of the postmasters urging that they lobby against this bill, as illustrated by the following office memorandum, Post Office Department, under date of August 5, 1960, from the Acting Regional Operations Director, Wichita, Kans., to all postmasters within that region:

AUGUST 5, 1960.

OFFICE MEMORANDUM, POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT, FROM ACTING REGIONAL OPERATIONS DIRECTOR, WICHITA, KANS., TO POSTMASTERS

I am sure you have heard of the controversy going on at this time over the so-called Cunningham bill, H.R. 12595. This, as you are aware, will deliver a crippling blow to the entire distribution system of the Post Office Department, if it is passed by the Senate and becomes law.

Please look over the enclosed material very carefully just as soon as possible, then go to the editor of your local newspaper and discuss this subject with him, suggesting it would make a timely editorial for your newspaper. If the editor does not see fit to run an editorial, perhaps he would run a news item and quote you as the source of the material.

Anything you can do to get this information to the public will be appreciated. Please send clippings of any publicity that is given on this to me promptly.

Second. A similar lobbying effort originating in the Boston regional office of the Post Office Department:

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT, RELEASE, BOSTON REGIONAL OFFICE, BOSTON, MASS.

Since 1953, the Post Office Department has been transporting 4-cent letter mail between certain areas of the country on an experimental basis. The airlines have been carrying this mail when and to the extent that space is available.

This has meant that an ever-growing volume of ordinary first-class mail has been delivered to its destination up to 48 hours earlier than would otherwise have been the case. Since business mail comprises about 80 percent of all first-class mail the boon to businessmen is readily apparent. About 5 million regular first-class letters are now being "airlifted" each day.

This is progress toward the Post Office Department's announced goal of next-day delivery of first-class mail anywhere within the continental United States.

Realization of this goal will be prevented if a bill, which passed the House of Representatives last July, should achieve passage

LIBRARIES

in the Senate and should escape or overcome the Presidential veto. The Cunningham bill, H.R. 12595 would specifically forbid the transportation of regular first-class mail by air. The basis for this action was alleged loss of revenue to the railroads, a specious argument as the Post Office Department pays the railroads $340 million annually in transportation costs and less than $3½ million annually to the airlines for this service.

Airlifting of first-class mail in New England began in mid-June 1960 giving service for Boston mailers to Cleveland and Chicago. It can be expected that this service will be expanded to include other larger cities in New England if the Department is allowed to continue and expand this service.

In addition many large users of the mail have been benefiting by the airlifting of first-class mail between New York and various points in the country.

We urge all those who are interested in providing quicker and better mail service to communicate with their Senators in opposition to the passage of the Cunningham bill, H.R. 12595.

Third. A bulletin originating in West Palm Beach, Fla., under the date of August 7, 1960, having only the signature "Your Postal Employees," and the content of this bulletin follows:

WEST PALM BEACH, FLA.,
August 7, 1960.

DEAR PATRON AND FRIEND: Would you pay for two seats aboard an airliner and use only one?

Of course you wouldn't but that's just what Congress will ask you to do should it enact the Cunningham bill, H.R. 9488.

For some 7 years the Post Office Department has placed ordinary first-class mail aboard airliners whenever the volume of airmail failed to fill that space already paid for. This resulted in improved mail services for 1½ billion pieces of mail per year without additional cost to our taxpayers.

The proposed legislation would require your postal service to abandon this space—even though paid for in advance resulting in a slower movement of your mail at a possible increased cost.

Won't you write or wire your Senator, urging his opposition to this bill—H.R. 9448. Your postmaster would appreciate a copy of your efforts, that he might show his postal people that others do care for improved mail service.

The need is for immediate action as the Senate may have bill under consideration in next day or two.

Please help us to help you.

YOUR POSTAL EMPLOYEES.

DEAR SIR: I do not wish to get my mailman into trouble, so I will not mention my name and address, but I am wondering if he is permitted to engage in preparing and distributing this sort of information during his working hours.

Sincerely,

AN INQUISITIVE TAXPAYER.

When I received this propaganda piece from a citizen in West Palm Beach, Fla., I wired the postmaster at West Palm Beach, as follows:

I have received a copy of a mimeographed letter headed "West Palm Beach, Fla., August 7, 1960" and addressed "Dear Patron and Friend" and signed "Your Postal Employees" which was apparently distributed by post office employees to homes and businesses in the West Palm Beach area in the course of their Government duties. This letter contains grossly inadequate and wrong information in urging recipients to write their Senators and express opposition to H.R. 9488. It states "your postmaster would appreciate a copy of your efforts." By what authority are employees engaging in this propaganda effort which is clearly in violation of Public Law 86–561?

I received a reply under date of August 18, 1960, which was signed by R. L. McLester, postmaster, West Palm Beach, Fla. Mr. McLester's reply is as follows:

U.S. POST OFFICE,
West Palm Beach, Fla., August 18, 1960.

Hon. GLENN CUNNINGHAM,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CUNNINGHAM: I have your telegram of August 17 in which you raise the question regarding the dissemination of information to postal patrons of the West Palm Beach area concerning the movement of first-class mail by air on a space available basis.

The authority under which this information was made available to the patrons of the West Palm Beach Post Office is contained in the Postal Manual, section 8844.131 which contains the following statement:

"It shall be the direct responsibility of the postmaster to conduct on his own initiative a positive patron relations program. He shall extend every reasonable assistance to the press and other public information media in the gathering of news about the postal service in his community. As the spokesman for the Post Office Department in his community, he shall develop and disseminate information promoting patron understanding of the postal service so that they may realize the maximum benefits of good mailing practices."

With respect to the question you raised concerning violation of Public Law 86–561, I am not acquainted with the detailed provisions of this law. Accordingly, I am referring this question to the Office of the General Counsel, Post Office Department, Washington, D.C., and to other top officials in the Post Office Department in Washington and they will respond to your question.

I trust this information is that which you desire.

Sincerely yours,

R. L. MCLESTER,
Postmaster.

Mr. Speaker, these are flagrant violations of the law as contained in section 401, Public Law 86–561. Furthermore, these are flagrant violations of the intent of Congress. This is positive proof that various officials of the Post Office Department have used appropriated funds with which to lobby against legislation pending before the Congress. This violation of the intent of Congress is bad enough in itself, but equally shameful is the misinformation that is contained in these various bulletins. The information contained in the propaganda piece issued by the West Palm Beach, Fla., Post Office is especially nauseating to those of us who know that the statements are not in the least accurate. In the other bulletins no attempt has been made to be fair and only a one-sided argument is given. The facts in the matter have not been placed before the American people by the Post Office Department and only their side of the story has been told, which all of us know is a weak defense of an illegal practice of airlifting 4-cent mail, which they have no legislative authority to engage in.

The overwhelming sentiment in the House of Representatives is that the Post Office Department stop this illegal practice, as shown by the tremendous vote in favor of the passage of H.R. 12595. I would presume that an overwhelming number of the Members of the House of Representatives would also be opposed to the propaganda efforts engaged in to defeat this legislation in the other body, in violation of the intent of Congress as clearly stated in section 401, Public Law 86–561.

Mr. Speaker, I am referring this material to the Department of Justice and to the Comptroller General and I am asking that they take appropriate action which is so clearly called for. Section 401, Public Law 86–561 has been violated freely by Post Office Department officials and I trust that the Department of Justice and the Comptroller General will take speedy action in this matter.

HON. JOE HOLT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. LIPSCOMB] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, my California Republican colleagues have asked me to express for all of them our best wishes to Congressman JOE HOLT as his service in the House of Representatives draws to a close. We know that whatever he chooses to do in the future he will accomplish with the same keen zest and outstanding ability that has characterized his faithful service in this body.

Congressman JOE HOLT deserves the thanks of all the citizens of the Los Angeles and entire southern California area for his untiring efforts on their behalf. JOE HOLT came to Congress as the youngest Member, fresh from the Korean battlefield where he served as a Marine Corps combat veteran.

He has proven after 8 successful years that he has the ability to legislate and get things done. He has been a leader in the House of Representatives, and was elected to the office of secretary of the Republican Policy Committee of the House of Representatives.

His work on the Education and Labor Committee has brought a great deal of benefit for better education in California and America. He has fought for labor legislation that is fair to both employer and employee; and above all, to protect the general public.

On the Military Operations Subcommittee, he has worked hard for better defense for America and has always demanded that Los Angeles get its fair share of defense contracts to protect the jobs of our citizens.

He was the leader—and got results—during the recent campaign against narcotics to improve the coordination between Federal departments involved in the enforcement of narcotics and local governments. Due to his diligent work, a stronger and more friendly relationship exists between the United States and Mexico; and our border relations

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

have been strengthened and improved. Thank to him, a more alert, intelligent, and antinarcotics enforcement program is in effect.

Representative JOE HOLT has earned the respect and admiration of his colleagues by his courage of convictions and dedication and service to the community and country.

We regret his decision not to seek reelection which we know he would have won handily. His service to the Nation will be missed in the 87th Congress.

HON. DONALD L. JACKSON

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the gentleman from California [Mr. LIPSCOMB] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana.

There was no objection.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, in behalf of the Republican delegation from California, I wish to pay tribute to an outstanding Member of the House of Representatives, Congressman DONALD JACKSON, who is retiring from office at the conclusion of this session of Congress.

Congressman DON JACKSON has served his country with distinction for many years. He came to the House in 1946, shortly after having concluded 5 years of service in the U.S. Marine Corps during World War II.

In Congress, Congressman JACKSON distinguished himself by his outstanding work on such assignments as the House Foreign Affairs Committee and the House Un-American Activities Committee. He is a stanch foe of communism and the menace it represents. He has acted with clarity and force on many matters of importance before the Congress.

It was with regret that we learned of his decision to retire from the House of Representatives for he has been a tireless worker in behalf of the welfare of our country and for the residents of the 16th District of California whom he served so ably.

We shall miss having Representative DON JACKSON as a colleague. We will miss his day-to-day friendship. We wish him well in the years ahead.

REPEAL OF TELEPHONE EXCISE TAX

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RANDALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, during the July recess, I was asked again and again by constituents, "What happened to the repeal of the telephone excise tax?" Frequently, I would hear the comment, "You fellows ran out on us," and such expressions as "You fellows promised to get rid of this tax, and then reneged." The answer to these questions is that not all of us here in Congress "reneged" because the first vote on this Tax Rate Extension Act of 1960 was 204 yeas to 181 nays, and the vote on final passage was 229 yeas to 174 nays. While the bill passed, a little computation will show that in one case 53 percent was for—and 47 percent against the bill. In the final vote 57 percent was for and 43 percent was against. This high percentage of protest shows not all of us forgot what we had said in the letters to our constituents.

Preliminary to these remarks, I think I should say that during 1959, I received over 3,000 letters urging the repeal of all emergency wartime taxes, including local and long distance telephone excise taxes and all excise taxes on the transportation of persons. I answered this mail saying I was in favor of repeal.

We all knew these were wartime taxes, enacted in 1942 after Pearl Harbor. Yet I was afraid these measures, if continued year after year, might come to be regarded as a permanent part of the tax structure. It began to look like we were never going to run out of emergencies. It even appears that telephone service was classed as a luxury, or at least, for some reason, was put along side club dues, nightclub entertainment, liquor and tobacco. The truth of the matter is that the telephone is a daily necessity and the only household utility so taxed by the Government.

Previous Congresses in years gone by had promised to repeal the tax and now after nearly 15 years since the cessation of hostilities, an excise tax still remained. The public accepted the tax without complaint during World War II because money was needed to execute the war effort and abnormal taxes were needed. A second purpose was served in discouraging telephone use, because the Government needed the communication lines clear and open for essential calls.

Congress finally—in 1959—repealed the tax on general or local telephone service and part of the tax on transportation of persons—to become effective July 1, 1960. Then on June 8, 1960, about 20 days before the effective repeal date, there came before the House the Public Debt and Tax Extension Act of 1960, which had as one of its provisions the continuance or reinstatement of the telephone tax.

In the floor debate by members of the Rules Committee—and other Members, it was very clearly pointed out that this measure was served up to the House under an arrangement which would preclude or prohibit the offering of any amendments. It came to us under a gag rule because the provision about the extension of telephone taxes and transportation taxes was served up to us in a package, along with the increase of the debt limit and corporate tax provisions. There was no way to get a separate vote on the repeal question. The House was placed in the position where it would have to swallow the pill all at once. In order to vote against the telephone excise tax and other emergency taxes, we had to vote against the whole bill. Had we been permitted to offer amendments, certainly there would have been many amendments to make the repeal of the local telephone tax permanent and against its extension.

What happened on June 8 was that the will of the House was never separately tested on the repeal of the telephone excise tax. It is my opinion that it is wrong to have such a gag rule on any tax bill. But even if at times it is necessary, then because of the promise of repeal made in 1959, these particular excise taxes should have been brought out in a separate measure so the Members could express their views, and could vote the will of their constituents.

Mr. Speaker, I asked for this time today to use this medium to make it very clear to the people of Missouri, and to the people of the eight counties of the Fourth Missouri District that their Congressman on June 8, 1960, voted against the gag rule, as is shown on page 12123 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—and thus voted against the extension or revival of the telephone excise tax. On paper, the vote appears in the "Nays" column in black and white; but on the floor of the House, it was loud-shouting "No." There is no doubt but that the closeness of the vote can be interpreted as a clear expression of strong protest against the closed or gag rule; or the "take it or leave it" package deal, which included the reinstatement or extension of telephone excise taxes.

It was suggested during the debate that if one voted against the extension of such excise taxes, he might be guilty of fiscal irresponsibility. My answer is that in addition to fiscal responsibility, another responsibility exists, and it may be called personal responsibility. Personal responsibility transcends fiscal considerations because it encompasses or included an obligation to stand by and to keep our pledges or promises—both expressed or implied.

By its vote of June 8 the House can be observed doing a right-about-face, because the people had lived in anticipation or expectation for almost a year, waiting for the repeal date of July 1, 1960; and I can report to you that the people of my district are not only disappointed—they are disgusted at the turn of events.

Yes, July 1, 1960 has come and is past. That was the day the people had been promised a reduction in excise taxes would become effective. But did they get it? Look at your own phone bill for the answer. Included in every June telephone bill of the Southwestern Bell Telephone Co. was a little leaflet which contained the following:

> If you think it is unfair to pay an extra $1 on every $10 worth of telephone service, write your Congressman now.

Sadly enough, this suggestion is just a little late. Now that we are adjourning, it would do little good for the folks back home to write at this time, but I, for one, hope they will write during the next Congress and so inundate each Congressman with such a deluge of protests against this telephone tax that there will be no

more gag rules and that this discriminatory excise tax will be forever repealed.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following Members be permitted to extend their remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and to include extraneous matter:

Mr. ROGERS of Florida in two instances.
Mr. GEORGE.
Mr. ZABLOCKI.
Mr. PHILBIN in two instances.
Mr. O'BRIEN of New York.
Mr. KOWALSKI.
Mr. BAILEY.
Mr. FLOOD, to include extraneous matter in his special order, today.
Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts.
Mr. WOLF.
Mr. BARR.
Mr. PROKOP.
Mr. McDOWELL in two instances.
Mr. ZELENKO.
Mr. McFALL.
Mr. MOELLER.
Mr. McGOVERN.
Mr. IKARD.
Mr. DULSKI.
Mr. DELANEY.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the distinguished majority leader if he has any idea how much these extensions are going to cost the taxpayers of America, and if we have enough paper on order to bundle this stuff all up, and what great subject it is that we are going to tax the taxpayers approximately $1,500 for insertions in the RECORD. If he can give me that information, I would be very glad to have it.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, the gentleman knows that the gentleman from Massachusetts is simply making requests for Members on the Democratic side. The distinguished minority leader made a number of similar requests. I am unable to give my colleague the information he seeks except to say that this is the ordinary procedure. This is probably the last night of the session and that is why there are an unusual number of requests.

Mr. HALEY. Can the gentleman tell me what the subject matter is that is to be put in the RECORD at a cost, I believe, of $1,500?

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, my colleague knows that I am simply a conduit through which the unanimous-consent requests of Members on my side are put before the House. I am not quite sure, but I would venture to assume that during the course of the year I may have asked such permission for the gentleman from Florida himself. Of course, I cannot say that definitely, as I do not know. But, with reference to the question asked by the gentleman, I am unable to answer that. I am only too glad to act as a conduit for the Members who have asked me to do so.

Mr. HALEY. I might say to the distinguished majority leader that he has never had to make any such requests for the gentleman from Florida because I think I can always take care of my own requests.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is true, of course, but the gentleman from Massachusetts would consider it a great honor if he had the opportunity to make such a request sometime for the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. I wonder then if the gentleman from Massachusetts would do this. As long as we have put everybody in the book, so to speak, why does the gentleman not ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days or 5 weeks to extend and to revise their remarks and let us get it all in at one time.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I say to the gentleman in all seriousness that there will be a number of resolutions offered later which are necessary in connection with the adjournment sine die. One of the resolutions in connection with extensions in the RECORD, after the Congress adjourns, will provide for certain limitations, in other words, that matters inserted in the RECORD must be confined to matters that took place prior to adjournment and, of course, that is necessary to protect Members. I would assume that Members who are getting that permission now recognize the fact that the resolution permitting insertions in the RECORD after the adjournment of the Congress, until the last RECORD is printed, contains of necessity certain words of limitation as to what matters such insertions may cover and that they must be confined, as I understand, to incidents or matters that have happened prior to the adjournment of Congress.

Mr. HALEY. I might say to the distinguished majority leader that the gentleman from Florida is well aware of that situation. I withdraw any objection I had, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that we have spent billions of dollars here today I think that spending $50,000 for Members to put their remarks in the RECORD might be worth while. I think it would perhaps take that to cover what we have done.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to inquire from the distinguished majority leader if it is not most unusual for a Member to ask to insert his remarks in the RECORD at an added cost of $1,300 to $1,500, whichever it was? I am amazed that such a request should be made. I do not recall in my 12 years of service here of hearing a single Member asking that his remarks be inserted in the RECORD at an added cost of $1,300 to $1,500, whichever it was.

Mr. McCORMACK. In reply to the gentleman from Florida I said that I, like my friend from Indiana, am just a conduit through which are funneled the requests of Members on my side, as the gentleman from Indiana is on his side.

In relation to the specific inquiry made by the gentleman from Iowa, I cannot answer for any Member, and I would respectfully suggest that he ask the Member for whom I submitted the request the question that he asked me.

Mr. GROSS. The question I would like to ask the gentleman is whether during his long years of experience here this is not most unusual?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am not, of course, going to answer any question which constitutes a reply in connection with another Member's actions. I would answer if it had been my own action, were I making the request for myself; but I do not intend to get into a colloquy with the gentleman from Iowa or any other Member over the request of a Member on either side to extend his remarks in the RECORD at a cost estimated by the Government Printer.

Mr. GROSS. I just want to say to the gentleman from Massachusetts——

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman can have his opinion; he has a right to it.

Mr. GROSS. Yes; I understand.

Mr. McCORMACK. But I do not think the gentleman should ask me to answer for somebody else.

Mr. GROSS. Just let me say that if I come back to the House next session I shall offer a resolution to curb this sort of practice, because it cannot be condoned, in my opinion. The gentleman does not have to answer that. It is an abuse of the prerogatives of a Member of Congress and should not be tolerated by the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, might I ask the majority leader if he can reply as to whether or not my name is included on the list of extensions of remarks?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am thoroughly acquainted with my friend. Do you want me to ask for you? Why do you not ask for yourself? I will yield to you to ask for yourself.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There is one consent request already pending.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, during this colloquy my attention has been called to the fact that one of the outstanding Members of this House, a man who is very much interested in the welfare of the taxpayer, a man who is the cloakroom favorite candidate for President of the United States, placed in the RECORD or asked that there be placed in the RECORD, a certain extension of remarks; but when he found out, and I have it here now, that it cost $540, he just said he would not burden the taxpayers with that additional amount; and withdrew his request to insert the remarks in the RECORD.

The gentleman to whom I refer is a a very distinguished Member of this body and I think he ought to get credit for this. As I said, at one time I had considered, and I hope he does not misunderstand me, recommending him to be nominated for President of the United States. He is a man of great discrimination, a man who really has the welfare of the country at heart, a man with political courage.

I recall when one of these civil wrongs bills, whatever it was, was up here, the gentleman was one of the few Members of my party, if not the only one north of the Smith & Wesson—I mean, the Mason-Dixon line—who voted against that bill.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

I think he ought to get credit now for saving the taxpayers $540 for not putting this in the RECORD.

I refer, of course, to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARMON], "the man who brought the front porch back."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THOMPSON of Texas). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

BEEF AND PORK IMPORTS

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that additional remarks be included in the permanent RECORD along with those which I made in the House on August 29, 1960, page 18217.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY PROGRAM

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the Special Subcommittee of the Federal-Aid Highway Program, of which I am a member, has been in existence for almost 1 year now. During this time, the staff of a dozen or so counsel and investigators, under the direction of the chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota, has been combing the country for scandals in the multi-billion-dollar Interstate Highway System. While getting the crooks is important and I am in favor of it, this is not the only thing this committee ought to be doing. Then, too, it should be noted that what our subcommittee has done to date would convince even a man from Mars that it has not borne out the charges yet, made in some of the press and some of the Democratic colleagues' press releases, that our exposes would make Teapot Dome seem like a child's game of marbles and would dwarf in comparison the sordid Dave Beck-Jimmy Hoffa episodes uncovered by the McClellan Labor Rackets Committee of the Senate.

Thus, far, we have held two hearings: one of them involving vertical bridge clearance and another dealing with fraud in Oklahoma, which case admittedly was not completely investigated. Also, it should be noted that, just when it appeared that the subcommittee could get its teeth into a real meaty scandal involving alleged millions of dollars of right-of-way irregularities in the State of Massachusetts, the chairman has unilaterally decided that there will be no more hearings until after the November election in order to keep any "political considerations" out of the probe.

Now this decision represented a complete reversal of the Chair's earlier position, for we Republican members of the subcommittee had been informed that there would be further hearings after the conventions of the two political parties but before the November elections.

What occurred between early May and June 20 that would account for this press release indicating a complete change from earlier positive assurance to the committee? I suggest a clue can be found in the Boston Traveler, dated May 13, 1960, which first broke the news that the Bureau of Public Roads had "uncovered evidence of hundreds of thousands of dollars in our appraisals in Massachusetts' Federal-aid highway program." Carried under the headline "U.S. Probes Appraisals for Massachusetts Roads," this story was front-page stuff in the Boston Traveler. I include at this point in the RECORD, the article referred to above:

[From the Boston Traveler of May 13, 1960]

U.S. PROBES APPRAISALS FOR MASSACHUSETTS ROADS

(By Tom W. Gerber)

WASHINGTON.—The U.S. Bureau of Public Roads has uncovered evidence of hundreds of thousands of dollars in overappraisals in Massachusetts' Federal-aid highway program.

And the Bureau has launched a two-pronged investigation of the Massachusetts Department of Public Works' land value estimates for rights-of-way for Federal-aid highways.

BUREAU CUT OFF PAYMENTS FOR LAND TAKINGS HERE

Atop this, the Traveler learned today the Bureau in January cut off payments to the State for right-of-way land takings based on DPW appraisals.

This action was taken pending exhaustive audit of each suspected overappraised land parcel in highway rights-of-way.

A top source said the Bureau has made no payments to the State for acquiring rights-of-way since Federal funds were shut off 4 months ago.

And it was learned Massachusetts is the only State in the Nation currently under this restriction.

Under normal practice, the Bureau makes progress payments for acquiring needed highway rights-of-way without audit.

This helps speed construction of the Nation's $37 billion, 41,000-mile highway program. Audits normally are conducted later.

Engineer-appraiser-accountant teams from the Bureau's project examination division have been investigating the Massachusetts DPW's right-of-way land appraisals for several months.

More than 100 suspected swollen appraisals are under scrutiny.

And only last week, the Bureau hired the Washington, D.C., valuation engineering firm of Beasley & Beasley, to doublecheck the Bureau's findings.

This professional appraising firm often has worked under Government contract. It has been hired in the past by the Navy and the Army Corps of Engineers in addition to the Bureau of Public Roads.

Three years ago, some of the evidence uncovered by this concern led to Federal indictments in the Indiana highway scandals.

The Traveler learned three land parcels in eastern Massachusetts, valued by State-hired appraisers at about $100,000 each, only were worth between $30,000 and $40,000 in the opinion of Government appraisers.

The Department of Justice here has been informed of these preliminary findings, the Traveler learned. It was reported "watching" the investigation.

OVERAPPRAISALS IN TWO CATEGORIES

Bureau agents discovered what they considered to be overappraisals both in the costly Interstate Highway System and in the so-called primary, secondary, and urban program in Massachusetts.

The Federal Government pays 90 percent of the costs under the interstate program and splits the costs 50–50 with the State for primary, secondary, and urban projects.

The Traveler learned the Bureau's systematic analysis of the State's right-of-way land appraisals done on a sample basis.

Bureau agents, including former FBI men, are examining more than 10 percent of roughly 1,000 right-of-way land appraisals accomplished by the State last year.

However, one source said the sampling included the three in the $100,000 bracket. He said the State's questionable appraisals generally appear to be between 25 to 50 percent too high according to Federal standards.

Two separate sources told the Traveler many of the State's appraisals were "unreasonable, unsupported, and erroneous." Both sources used the same words.

The investigation was touched off late last year when the State failed to provide satisfactory documentation for land appraisals required for highway rights-of-way.

A Traveler source said it soon was "obvious" much of the data in the State appraisals was erroneous.

However, this source refused to rule out the possibility the bloated appraisals represented merely errors of judgment.

But he pointed to the fact some estimated land values in the DPW appraisals failed to coincide with appraisals of similar nearby land.

PROFESSIONAL PROBERS COSTLY TO GOVERNMENT

He also pointed to the fact the Bureau had hired the firm of professional appraisers "at considerable cost to the Government."

He said this wouldn't be done unless "substantial sums" were involved.

It was reported the investigation had not yet reached the point where appraisers, property owners, and DPW employees were being questioned, with a view toward more drastic action by the Government.

The Massachusetts DPW usually hires private appraisers to make land value estimates. They are paid from $500 to $1,000, depending on the scope of the appraisal job.

If the land is believed to be worth more than $25,000, two appraisers are hired. For the most part, these appraisers are local real estate operators.

PROBE REPORTED PLANNED IN TWO STAGES

The investigation was reported to be planned in two stages.

Now under way is the first stage to determine the basis for the suspected high appraisals.

The second stage would be to make certain that none of the appraisals was set before the right-of-way land was examined.

While the Bureau has shut off payments to the State for acquiring right-of-way land, construction progress payments still are being made.

It was reported this part of the highway program in Massachusetts was not under unusual examination.

In previous years, all Federal payments under the cooperative highway construction program were cut off in Indiana and Arizona when scandals racked their State highway departments.

DI NATALE AWARE OF FEDERAL PROBE

State Public Works Commissioner Anthony N. Di Natale issued a statement Sunday suggesting he was aware of the Bureau double-barrelled inquiry.

He announced he would "cull out and fire incompetents" hired by the DPW as property negotiators and appraisers on highway projects.

This subcommittee, authorized by the House to investigate irregularities in the Interstate System has proved to be a

most reluctant dragon, when Massachusetts is concerned. This alarming situation has been known by the subcommittee since January of 1960, when the Bureau of Public Roads first learned of it, cut off all payment on all Massachusetts Federal-aid projects, and began a vigorous investigation on its own initiative. And as noted above, it has been noted in the Boston press since May 13, 1960. Yet, even though the staff independently determined that there was substance to these allegations of a conspiracy to defraud the Government, this subcommittee had made no move to have the staff, assisted by the Bureau of Public Roads, prepare this case for hearing.

This inaction should be contrasted with the alacrity with which this subcommittee pounced upon some newspaper clippings exposing alleged irregularities in Tulsa, Okla., and which resulted in a series of hearings during the first week of May of this year. So eagerly was the Oklahoma matter pushed, that the grand jury evidence was presented in open hearings shortly after several contractors were indicted and even before they could be given a fair trial in a court of law. It is also interesting to note that the present Governor of Oklahoma, whose presence as a witness was demanded by me to explain why he had rewarded unfaithful State highway officials with increased pay and job security, was not called as a witness.

May came and went and still there was little interest in Massachusetts. So did June and July. But, in the words of a familiar song, "The days grow short as we reach September." On August 16, 1960, the Bureau of Public Roads, in a letter from Mr. Ellis L. Armstrong, Commissioner, referred the results of their investigations to the subcommittee and to the Department of Justice for "its review and any action it may deem to be appropriate." This letter has been released to the press and reported in the Boston Traveler on August 17, 1960. I therefore include it in the RECORD at this point in my remarks:

[From the Boston Traveler, August 17, 1960]

LETTER TO HOUSE UNIT DETAILS ROAD PROBE

(Traveler Washington Bureau)

WASHINGTON.—Following is the text of a letter transmitting reports on the Massachusetts Federal-aid highway program from the Bureau of Public Roads to the House Subcommittee on the Federal-Aid Highway Program:

Hon. JOHN A. BLATNIK,
Chairman, Special Subcommittee on the Federal-Aid Highway Program, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BLATNIK: Reference is made to the review by this Bureau of certain appraisal practices in the State of Massachusetts which has been continuing since the beginning of this year and with certain aspects of which members of your staff are familiar. As a result of information that fee appraisers retained by the State of Massachusetts, in connection with Federal aid projects, were submitting inadequate or misleading information in appraisal reports to justify appraisals far in excess of true market value, the Project Examination Division of this Bureau in cooperation with your field offices undertook a special review in January of this year. In addition, at that time the Bureau required that no payments be made to Massachusetts reimbursing it for the cost of the acquisition of right-of-way on Federal-aid projects, except after final audit of such property involved.

BUREAU CONTINUES SPECIAL REVIEW

After several months of review, the Bureau retained the firm of Beasley & Beasley, of Washington, D.C., to make new appraisals of certain selected projects in Massachusetts, including a primary Federal-aid project in Wakefield and an interstate project in Attleboro. At the same time the Bureau continued its own special review. The firm of Beasley & Beasley has now submitted its first reports containing its appraisals in Wakefield and the southerly part of the interstate project at Attleboro. Copies of these reports are forwarded herewith.

An analytical and comparative review of these Beasley appraisals and those of independent fee appraisers retained by the State is now under way. This analysis to date reveals that certain fee appraisers retained by the State, by using misleading information and ignoring available data, placed values on selected properties far in excess of values that could be supported by available true market data. For example, sales of improved properties were reported as unimproved and were used to support prices in land far in excess of the true land value. At the same time, the appraisers ignored pertinent sales of unimproved property in the immediate vicinity of the subject properties which, if used, would have justified the assignment of much lower values.

CASES INVOLVE LARGE SUMS

For the most part these selected cases involved extensive properties and large sums of money. The Bureau has made no payments in reimbursement to Massachusetts on any of these properties.

A preliminary detailed analysis of these selected cases is now in our files and available to your committee. This analysis, together with other independent information which has come to the attention of this Bureau, support a conclusion that certain fee appraisers employed by the State have been subjected to pressures which comprised their independence. Such analysis and such other information have been and are being submitted to the Department of Justice for its review and any action it may deem to be appropriate.

If there is any further information on this subject which you desire, please do not hesitate to call us.

Sincerely yours,
(Signed) ELLIS L. ARMSTRONG,
Commissioner of Public Roads.

On August 17, 1960, the Boston Traveler carried an article written by its correspondent Tom W. Gerber, under such headlines as "Land Appraisals Boosted 300 P.C.," "Excesses Run Into Millions of Dollars," and "High State Official Is Under Suspicion," I ask that this article dated August 17, 1960, also be printed at this point in the RECORD, as well as similar articles appearing in the Boston Herald, dated August 18, 1960, entitled "U.S. Pledges Complete Probe of Massachusetts Highway Land Cost"; in the Boston Traveler on August 18, 1960, entitled, "Massachusetts Highway Scandals Worst Yet"; in the Boston Herald dated August 19, 1960, entitled, "FBI to Probe State Scandal in Land Taking"; and in the Boston Traveler, dated August 19, 1960, entitled "GOP Demands Action in Massachusetts Roads Probe."

[From the Boston Traveler, August 17, 1960]

MASSACHUSETTS HIGHWAY SCANDAL

(By Tom W. Gerber)

WASHINGTON.—Excessive land appraisals in the Massachusetts Federal-aid highway program run into the millions of dollars, the Traveler learned today.

A high State official is under suspicion in the racket, believed the largest yet in the Nation's $50 billion highway construction program.

These facts came to light as the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads filed a preliminary report to Congress on a 3-month investigation of highway land takings in Massachusetts.

The results of this inquiry and other data already have been turned over to the U.S. Justice Department for "any action * * * it may deem appropriate."

The preliminary investigation report was prepared by Beasley & Beasley, an independent Washington valuation engineering firm retained by the Bureau of Public Roads to look into the Massachusetts situation. Its inquiry is continuing.

Three years ago, evidence uncovered by this firm in another BPR investigation led to Federal indictments in the Indiana highway scandals.

The current report does not name the Massachusetts official under suspicion in the land appraisal racket.

However, the Traveler learned the official and certain accomplices subjected highway right-of-way land appraisers employed by the State to "pressures which compromised their independence."

These appraisers were hired by the State, mostly last year, to set values on land the State would take for construction of Federal-aid highways.

In some cases, their appraisals were up to 300 percent higher than detailed valuations determined by Beasley & Beasley. These cases involved extensive land tracts.

THREATS GO WITH BLOATED APPRAISALS

The Traveler learned the bloated appraisals were submitted in some cases under threat of losing the State's business if the fee appraisers failed to comply.

However, the Federal Government will not have to pay for these excessive land-taking costs.

The BPR in January cut off payments to Massachusetts for highway right-of-way takings based on State department of public works appraisals.

The Federal Government usually reimburses the State for 90 percent of the costs of land taking and construction of the vast Interstate Highway System within the State.

It also pays the State half the cost of land taking and construction under the so-called primary, secondary, and urban highway construction program.

Most of these facts were contained in a Beasley & Beasley report forwarded by the BPR to the House Special Subcommittee on the Federal-Aid Highway Program.

Two thick volumes of investigation results and an accompanying letter were sent to the subcommittee that has been investigating reported abuses in the interstate highway program nationwide.

The report dealt with alleged land appraisal excesses in Wakefield and part of an Interstate Highway 95 project in Attleboro and North Attleboro.

Two additional volumes were expected to be sent to the subcommittee within a few days with additional details on the Attleboro-North Attleboro project.

The valuation engineering firm, which previously has worked under contracts with the Army, the Navy, and the BPR, is expected

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

to complete a study of the Gardner area next month.

In addition to this study, the Bureau's project examination division has been investigating suspected land valuation excesses in Massachusetts since January, when Federal payments were halted.

The Bureau's agents still are operating within the State.

The letter transmitting the reports to Rep. JOHN A. BLATNIK (D-Minn.), subcommittee chairman, told how some excess appraisals were devised.

The letter said "certain fee appraisers retained by the State" used misleading information and ignored available data that would have supported lower valuations.

Thus, the letter said, sales of improved properties were reported as unimproved and were used to support prices for unimproved nearby land far in excess of true value.

The letter continued:

"At the same time the appraisers ignored pertinent sales of unimproved property in the immediate vicinity of the subject properties which, if used, would have justified the assignment of much lower values."

Thus, if there was a $30,000 house on a lot worth $10,000, the land alone would be appraised for $40,000 to justify an excessive valuation for a property to be taken in the vicinity.

The Traveler learned the puffed valuations were on only a small percentage of the properties involved in land takings in the Wakefield and Attleboro-North Attleboro areas.

The investigation showed land appraisals were reasonably accurate on smaller properties.

Yet, the Traveler's sources said the excessive valuations would run into "millions of dollars"—considerably more than originally suspected when the investigation first was undertaken.

And the State already has paid for some land takings based on these overvaluations, the Traveler learned.

But no Federal money has reached the hands either of the State official or the appraisers involved. The appraisers are paid fees based on their work.

Normally, the Federal Government would reimburse the State half of the highway improvement cost under the primary, secondary, and urban Federal highway program.

The project in Wakefield, now in the construction stage, involved a widening of Route 128.

It is a 3.3-mile stretch skirting Wakefield's northern boundary from North Avenue to the Saugus River, including the Lowell Street interchange.

It originally was planned in 1956, designed in 1957 and authorized for acquisition in 1958 and 1959. The State filed its required declaration of land taking in August 1959.

The Attleboro project on which the investigation still was incomplete, involved two stretches of interstate highway totaling 6.6 miles.

The first part extended 4.5 miles from the Rhode Island line in South Attleboro through industrial-commercial property to a point north of Thacher Street.

The second stretch was 2.1 miles from just north of the proposed Commonwealth Avenue interchange to a point north of Kelley Boulevard.

Hundreds of land tracts are involved in the land-taking process that will clear the way for the new highways. The exact number still is undetermined as the investigation continues.

The precise number of fee appraisers involved in the overvaluations also was undetermined. It was believed to be a comparatively small number.

A Traveler source said some of the appraisers apparently worked actively with the State official while others were "coerced."

Since Federal money didn't change hands, any official charges against these persons, based on Justice Department investigation, probably would be something like conspiracy.

Under State procedure, appraisals approved by the State department of public works are sent to a five-member real estate review board for review.

However, this group meets only once weekly and lacks facilities for investigating the basis on which the submitted appraisals were determined.

[From the Boston Herald, August 18, 1960]

U.S. PLEDGES COMPLETE PROBE OF MASSACHUSETTS HIGHWAY LAND COST

(By Tom W. Gerber)

WASHINGTON.—The chairman of a Federal highway investigating subcommittee Wednesday pledged a "complete rundown" on excessive appraisals in Massachusetts' Federal aid highway program.

Representative JOHN A. BLATNIK (Democrat, of Minnesota) told the Herald his group was "going to find out" about U.S. Bureau of Public Roads' evidence that overvaluations totaled "millions of dollars."

GOP MEMEER WANTS FASTER ACTION

BLATNIK, whose subcommittee was formed to watchdog the biggest construction undertaking in world history, said he hoped to send investigators to Massachusetts "within a month."

But the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, Representative GORDON H. SCHERER (Republican, of Ohio), told the Herald the investigation should be started immediately.

"There's no reason why the subcommittee staff should not conduct a complete investigation at this time," SCHERER said.

SCHERER, reached Wednesday night soon after his return from Cincinnati said the Massachusetts highway scandals were "far worse than in Oklahoma."

SCHERER said he expected to have a further statement on the Massachusetts highway scandals after he had studied BPR reports sent to the subcommittee.

The subcommittee in May held hearings on the Oklahoma highway scandal. Evidence was developed on falsified reports, payments for work not done, death threats, and juggled claims.

MEETING AUGUST 24

BLATNIK said the subcommittee would discuss the evidence of bloated appraisals for right-of-way land in the Massachusetts highway program at an executive session August 24.

The Minnesota Congressman said subcommittee experts would evaluate data obtained by the independent valuation engineering firm of Beasley & Beasley and other material in BPR files before investigators were sent to the Bay State.

"I want to make this perfectly clear," BLATNIK said. "The situation in Massachusetts will be given a complete rundown."

However, he said hearings on highway right-of-way appraisals in Massachusetts certainly would not be held before Thanksgiving.

BLATNIK said no hearings would be held until after the November elections.

POLITICS CHARGE FEARED

"We could be accused of playing politics," he said.

But SCHERER disagreed. He noted the Beasley & Beasley reports and BPR-developed information already had been turned over to the U.S. Justice Department for "appropriate action."

"The committee would be more justified going into Massachusetts before any possible indictments are returned than afterward," he said.

The BPR reports to the subcommittee and other information obtained by the Herald implicated a high Massachusetts official in the excessive appraisals racket.

However, the official was not named in the reports.

But it was learned he exerted "pressures" on State-hired fee appraisers to "compromise their independence," in making true market value appraisals.

UP 300 PERCENT

Some of these appraisers actively cooperated in the puffed-appraisal racket while others were coerced by the threat of losing State business if they failed to cooperate, the Herald learned.

Some appraisals for large land tracts were as much as 300 percent over subsequent appraisals by Beasley & Beasley, it was learned.

The valuation engineering firm from Washington, D.C., was hired by the BPR in May to investigate and doublecheck information developed by the BPR's project examination division since January.

That was when the Federal Government shut off land-taking reimbursements to the State under the Interstate Highway program and the so-called primary, secondary, and urban program pending a full audit.

The Federal Government pays the State 90 percent of the land-taking and construction costs under the $50 billion Interstate program and half the land-taking and construction costs under the primary, secondary, and urban system in the State.

TWO AREAS COVERED

However, despite this 8-month holdback of Federal funds, the Herald learned the State already has paid for some of the land that was excessively appraised.

The BPR report to the subcommittee, prepared by Beasley & Beasley, covered Federal aid highway projects in two Massachusetts areas—Wakefield and Attleboro-North Attleboro.

The Wakefield project was a widening of Route 128 along a 3.3 mile stretch around the community's northern bulge. This is under the primary road program.

The Attleboro-North Attleboro project was in two parts of proposed Interstate Route 95.

NO COMPARISON

The first stretched for 4.5 miles from the Rhode Island line in South Attleboro through costly industrial and commercial property to a point near Thacher Street.

The second was a 2.1 mile segment from north of the proposed Commonwealth Avenue interchange to a point just north of Kelley Boulevard.

However, the Beasley & Beasley reports on these projects contained only painstaking appraisal of each land parcel involved in the highway construction.

There was no comparison with State appraisals.

This was contained in other BPR data not sent to the subcommittee, but to which the subcommittee was given access.

A Herald source said two additional volumes covering other land appraisals in the Attleboro area would be sent to the subcommittee of a later date.

MANY VALUES UPHELD

In addition, the Herald learned another Federal-highway project in the Gardner area also was under BPR and Beasley & Beasley review.

Study and analysis of this area was expected to be ready next month.

The Herald's source said hundreds of land tracts were involved in the two 4-inch

thick reports sent to the subcommittee. However, he said only "a small percentage" of the appraisals erceived by Beasley & Beasley had been found to be valued excessively.

Generally, he said, the larger tracts were overvalued while smaller plots taken under eminent domain were appraised with reasonable accuracy.

Nevertheless, the Herald was told authoritatively the total overvaluation in Massachusetts would run into "millions of dollars."

At the outset of the investigation this spring, it was believed the overvaluations would range only in the hundreds of thousands of dollars.

HOW WAS IT DONE

In a letter transmitting the report to the subcommittee, Public Roads Commissioner Ellis L. Armstrong told how fee appraisers justified excessive valuations.

The letter to BLATNIK said State-hired appraisers used "misleading information" and ignored "available data" that might support a true valuation.

"For example, sales of improved properties were reported as unimproved and were used to support prices in land far in excess of the true value," the letter said.

And the Herald learned these appraisers sometimes ranged as far as several miles from the property they were supposed to be appraising to find more costly land they could cite to support an inflated appraisal.

UP TO LAWYERS

The Herald's source emphasized the suspected appraisers and the State official involved never collected Federal funds. This money was shut off in January.

However, intentional overappraisals submitted in expectation the State would be reimbursed with Federal funds possibly could be considered conspiracy.

But this was up to the Justice Department to determine.

Meanwhile, both the BPR and the Beasley & Beasley investigations continued.

[From the Boston Traveler, August 18, 1960]

MASSACHUSETTS HIGHWAY SCANDAL WORST YET

(By Tom Gerber)

WASHINGTON.—Preliminary evidence indicates the Massachusetts highway scandal is bigger than all six under congressional investigation in other States put together, an informed source said today.

The source, which is close to the investigating subcommittee, would not name the other six States currently under probe.

However, he said the Massachusetts situation also involved more money than scandals previously uncovered in Arizona, Indiana, and Oklahoma.

The Executive Council today rejected a proposal to halt State land-damage payments during the Federal investigation of the Massachusetts highway scandal.

Councilor Augustus Means, sole Republican member, proposed the freeze and cast the only vote recorded in favor.

He called attention to the Federal Bureau of Public Roads investigation of Massachusetts land appraisals in the Federal-aid highway program.

"Something is apparently brewing in the Department of Public Works and the U.S. Government," he said. "This body should not continue to approve any more land damages until the matter is cleared up."

Councilor Joseph R. Crimins, one of seven Democrats voting against the motion, said a halt in payments would hurt small property owners whose homes had been taken for new highways.

Democratic Councilor Patrick J. McDonough bitterly attacked Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL (Republican, of Massachusetts) and the Herald and Traveler.

He said the newspaper's stories about the Federal investigation were "phony and padded" for the benefit of SALTONSTALL.

"SALTONSTALL will have all kinds of Federal men here to produce phony headlines," he said.

He told the council that similar Federal investigations are going on in every State of the Union. No single State is being singled out, he said.

Representative JOHN A. BLATNIK (Democrat, of Minnesota), chairman of the highway investigating subcommittee, said his group will make a complete rundown on evidence that excessive land appraisals in the Massachusetts Federal-aid highway program totaled millions of dollars.

BLATNIK said he hoped to send subcommittee investigators to Massachusetts within a month.

ASKS PROBE RIGHT NOW

But the ranking subcommittee's minority member, Representative GORDON H. SCHERER (Republican, of Ohio), suggested the investigation should begin immediately.

In an exclusive story in yesterday's Traveler, the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads reported it had evidence of bloated appraisals for right-of-way land in the Massachusetts highway program.

The BPR report to the subcommittee covered Federal-aid highway projects in Wakefield and Attleboro-North Attleboro. The report was prepared by Beasley & Beasley, a valuation firm from Washington, D.C.

The report and other information obtained by the Traveler implicated a high Massachusetts official in the excessive appraisals racket. The official, however, was not identified by name.

PRESSURES EXERTED

But it was learned he exerted pressures on State-hired fee appraisers to compromise their independence in making true market value appraisals.

Some of these appraisers actively cooperated in the puffed-up appraisals, while others, it was learned, were coerced with threats of losing State business if they didn't cooperate.

Some appraisals for large land tracts were as much as 300 percent higher than appraisals subsequently made by Beasley & Beasley, it was learned.

The firm was hired by the BPR in May to probe into information developed by the Bureau's project examination division since January.

During January, the Federal Government suspended land-taking reimbursements to the State under the interstate highway program and the so-called primary, secondary, and urban program pending a complete audit.

The Federal Government pays the State 90 percent of the land-taking and construction costs under the $50 billion interstate program. It pays half the land-taking and construction costs under the primary, secondary, and urban system in the State.

BLATNIK told the Traveler his subcommittee will discuss the evidence of bloated appraisals in Massachusetts at an executive session August 24.

Subcommittee experts will evaluate it before investigators are sent into the State, he added:

"I want to make this perfectly clear," he said, "the situation in Massachusetts will be given a complete rundown."

But he surmised that hearings on the evidence would not be held before the November elections. Otherwise, he added, "we could be accused of playing politics."

SCHERER disagreed, noting that the Beasley & Beasley reports already have been turned over to the U.S. Department of Justice for appropriate action. He said:

"The subcommittee would be more justified going into Massachusetts before any possible indictments are returned than afterward."

In addition to the Wakefield and Attleboro-North Attleboro projects, the BPR also is reviewing another Federal-highway project in the Gardner area, it was learned.

Study and analysis of this area is expected to be ready next month.

Hundreds of land tracts were involved in the two 4-inch-thick reports sent to the subcommittee. But only a small percentage of the appraisals received by Beasley & Beasley had been found to be valued excessively, a source said.

In general, he explained that the larger tracts were overvalued while smaller plots taken under eminent domain were appraised with reasonable accuracy.

Nevertheless, the total overvaluation in Massachusetts would run into "millions of dollars," it was reported.

[From the Boston Herald, Aug. 19, 1960]

FBI TO PROBE STATE SCANDAL IN LAND TAKING

(By Paul Costello)

The FBI will be called in within 1 week to investigate the alleged millions of dollars in excessive appraisals for rights-of-way in the Massachusetts Federal-aid highway program.

The Herald learned Thursday night that the U.S. Justice Department has been kept informed of the preliminary investigation of large-scale land damage frauds by the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads and it has decided to call the FBI into the case.

THREE INVESTIGATIONS

The FBI inquiry will be conducted separately from the Bureau of Public Roads investigation and from the investigation being conducted by the independent valuation engineering firm of Beasley & Beasley.

All that remains to be completed before the FBI steps in is the filing of a formal request by the Justice Department and the completion by the Bureau of Public Roads of its final draft of the preliminary report based on its 7-month Massachusetts study.

The BPR broke the scandal Wednesday in a letter to a special House subcommittee set up as a watchdog on the billion dollar Federal-aid highway program throughout the Nation.

The FBI entrance into the scandals comes on the heels of announcement Wednesday by subcommittee chairman, Representative JOHN A. BLATNIK (Democrat, of Minnesota), that preliminary reports of BPR and Beasley & Beasley warranted a "complete rundown" on excessive appraisals in Massachusetts' Federal-aid highway program.

BLATNIK said then that he hoped to send committee investigators into Massachusetts within a month.

TURNS OVER FILES

However, the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, Representative GORDON H. SCHERER (Republican, of Ohio), told the Herald that there was no reason why staff investigators shouldn't start on the case at once.

The Bureau of Public Roads turned over its files in the case to the Justice Department Wednesday. The Justice Department, on the basis of BPR information, decided to call in the FBI.

The evidence presented by the BPR showed that at least one high State official has been implicated in the right-of-way scandal.

This official has not been identified pending submission of evidence to a Federal grand jury, but the Herald learned he exerted "pressures" on State-hired fee appraisers to "compromise their independence," in making true market value appraisals.

Beasley & Beasley, which was hired by the BPR in May to doublecheck and develop evidence uncovered by BPR investigators

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

since January, has reported some appraisals were inflated by as much as 300 percent.

STARTED IN JANUARY

The BPR launched its review of the Massachusetts phase of the Federal highway program in January after shutting off land-taking reimbursements to the State as the result of reports of widespread abuses here.

The Federal Government reimburses the States for 90 percent of the cost of land taking and construction under the $50 billion interstate program and pays 50 percent under the primary, secondary, and urban road construction program.

The preliminary BPR report, which is the basis for the FBI being called in, covered Federal-aid projects in Wakefield along Route 128 and in the Attleboro-North Attleboro area on Interstate Route 95.

The investigation by the FBI will be a brand new study. The BPR material will be used only to supply leads for FBI agents to follow.

Under usual procedures the FBI would turn over the results of its investigation to the Justice Department, which then must decide whether to seek indictments before a Federal grand jury.

STORMY SESSION

In a stormy session of the executive council on Beacon Hill yesterday as Democratic councilors defended the department of public works and the Furcolo administration in the right-of-way scandal.

The storm broke when the lone Republican on the council, Augustus G. Means, of Essex, introduced a mild motion requesting that the council refrain from acting on pending land-taking cases until the Federal investigation has been completed.

The council defeated the motion 7 to 1 and then approved 39 land-taking damage awards.

Means, who reminded the councilors that "it is this honorable body" that must in the last analysis pass on all land takings, said "something is brewing in the department of public works * * * and I urgently request that we suspend action until it is apparent these land takings are in order."

Councilor Joseph Ray Crimmins (Democrat, of Somerville) seconded Means' motion "just to get this out in the open," and then challenged Means to produce evidence of wrongdoing in the DPW.

The strongest comments came from Councilor Patrick J. McDonough (Democrat, of Boston), who charged the published stories out of Washington on the Massachusetts investigation are "phony, padded stories for the benefit of one LEVERETT SALTONSTALL."

[From the Boston Traveler, Aug. 19, 1960]

GOP DEMANDS ACTION IN MASSACHUSETTS ROADS PROBE

(By Tom W. Gerber)

WASHINGTON.—Republican Members will seek a showdown Wednesday on their demand that a congressional subcommittee begin an immediate investigation of the Massachusetts highway scandal.

They will press their demand in an executive session of the House Highway Investigating Subcommittee headed by Representative JOHN A. BLATNIK (Democrat, of Minnesota).

WANT TO DEFER PROBE UNTIL AFTER ELECTION

BLATNIK and the other 12 Democratic members of the 19-man group want to put off any inquiry until after the November election. They don't want to embarrass the Massachusetts Democratic administration and thus indirectly Democratic presidential nominee Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY.

Representative GORDON H. SCHERER (Republican, Ohio) is expected to lead the minority fight for an immediate inquiry.

Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL (Republican, of Massachusetts) said the BPR's "shocking charges * * * must be investigated to the fullest."

"This, I am confident, responsible Federal authorities will do," he said.

"Personally, I know nothing more of this matter than what I have read in the newspapers. But to pass this matter off merely as election-year politics demonstrates careless disregard for the taxpayers' interest and public trust."

Although the subcommittee has not yet sent its investigators to Massachusetts, the Federal Bureau of Public Roads is pressing ahead with its inquiry. Moreover, the FBI is expected to launch an independent investigation next week.

The BPR investigation already has turned up evidence that Massachusetts appraisers inflated right-of-way land appraisals for Federal-aid highways by millions of dollars.

The BPR turned over its preliminary files in the case to the Justice Department on Wednesday for "appropriate action." The Justice Department, in turn, decided to call in the FBI.

HIGH STATE OFFICIAL UNDER SUSPICION

A high State official is under suspicion, it was learned, of pressuring State-hired appraisers to "compromise their independence" by inflating their estimates of land values.

The independent appraisal firm of Beasley & Beasley, hired by the BPR to check the right-of-way properties, has indicated some values were ballooned by as much as 300 percent.

The Federal Government reimburses States for 90 percent of the cost of land taking and construction under the $50 billion Interstate Highway program, and 50 percent under the primary, secondary, and urban road construction program.

Since the BPR shut off reimbursements to Massachusetts last January, however, no Federal money has been paid out for the inflated appraisals.

Federal courts nevertheless could prosecute participants in the inflated scheme for conspiracy to defraud.

And while the subcommittee is investigating these alleged right-of-way irregularities in the Bay State, I commend to its attention the possibility that there may be some liberties taken with the Federal purse in the awarding of contracts for consulting engineering work by the Massachusetts Public Works Department. I especially would like the subcommittee to investigate the possibility that these contracts may have been awarded on a political patronage basis to J. L. Hayden Associates and to Thomas Worcester, Inc., both Massachusetts firms. Of prime concern should be: Are any of these moneys and large funds being returned to the campaign coffers of the party faithful? The basis for my information and concern are some recent newspaper clippings from the crusading Boston Herald, which some good public-spirited citizen of the State of Massachusetts recently sent to me. Because some Members of the House do not read the Boston papers and because I want to be helpful to the chairman of my subcommittee, I request that the newspaper articles just mentioned also be printed at this point in my remarks. They are articles entitled: "Parkway Brochure Cost $46 Each," in the Boston Herald dated August 23, 1960; " 'No Comment,' Says Ricciardi", in the Boston Herald on August 23, 1960; "Thomas Worcester Charged With $180,784 Tax Evasion" in the Boston Herald on August 23, 1960; "Company Made Payments on Bogus Bills, Trial Told" in the Boston Herald on August 25, 1960; "$23,000 Brochure Job Sublet for About $5,000," in Boston Herald on August 25, 1960.

[From the Boston Herald, Aug. 23, 1960]

PARKWAY BROCHURES COST $46 EACH

(By David Farrell and Wayne Hanley)

The Furcolo administration paid $46 per copy for 500 "Commemorative Brochures" on the proposed President Adams Parkway, the Herald learned last night.

STUDY STILL GOING ON

Some $23,000 of the taxpayers' money was shelled out to J. L. Hayden Associates, Inc., one of the administration's pet consulting engineering firms, for preparing the 44-page, 9-inch by 12-inch brochure.

The money was spent by the Massachusetts Department of Public Works at the suggestion of Governor Furcolo despite the fact that the Federal Government is spending $25,000 for a study of the feasibility of establishing such a parkway.

Furcolo and his newly appointed commissioner of public works, Jack Ricciardi, announced last week that a parkway from Faneuil Hall, Boston, to Plymouth was being considered. The existing portions of the Southeast Expressway from Boston to Quincy as well as the Plymouth Bypass would be incorporated in the new roadway that calls for construction between Quincy and Kingston, according to the Governor.

Just why the souvenir booklet which is largely a collection of pictures and facts researched from various historical books and societies, was not put together by the DPW's regular staff of public relations consultants has not been explained.

Ostensibly the brochure was prepared to help influence the Federal Government on the necessity of constructing another parkway through the South Shore to Plymouth in addition to the expensive Southeast Expressway and Route 3A.

More likely, according to one leading Democrat, the huge outlay was made to supply Governor Furcolo with some publicity aimed at garnering votes for him along the South Shore in his bid to unseat Senator Saltonstall. The timing of the announcement during the current political campaign would seem to bear this out, especially since the brochure was prepared last winter.

Most State House and Capitol Hill observers see little or no chance of an additional highway—which by the DPW's own conservative estimate would cost a staggering $76 million—being built by the State or Federal Government along the South Shore in the foreseeable future.

"IF APPROVED" CLAUSE

That the State has no intention of spending a dime of its own for construction of the parkway is manifest from the tenor of the statements by Furcolo and Ricciardi when they launched the trial balloon about the road last week. Both officials qualified their statements about the proposed parkway with a handy "if approved by the Federal Government" escape clause.

The Federal officials who are studying the feasibility of establishing (not necessarily constructing) a President Adams Parkway were in Boston the last week of July conferring with representatives of the Boston office of the Federal Bureau of Public Roads and the State public works department.

One official at the Bureau of Public Roads told the Herald he was sure the Federal Government would balk at constructing any

HOUGHTON LIBRARIES

great amount of new roadway for the parkway and would insist on using existing roads like Route 3A or the entire length of the Southeast Expressway when it is completed through Hingham, Norwell, Hanover, Pembroke, and Kingston to the Plymouth Bypass.

He pointed out that a freeway to the western suburbs, as recommended in the 1948 master highway plan, would have to be built before the South Shore gets another new highway, especially if the Massachusetts Turnpike Authority is unable to finance extension of the turnpike from Weston to Boston.

STARTED IN 1959

The firm which authored the expensive brochure is one of the up and coming professional engineering firms in Massachusetts. J. L. Hayden Associates, Inc., doing business at 1340 Soldier's Field Road, Brighton, was incorporated on April 9, 1959.

The firm's incorporation papers, on file at Secretary of State Joseph Ward's office, show that John L. Hayden, of 14 Richland Road, Wellesley, is president and treasurer. Clerk is Philip A. Brancucci, lawyer, of 10 Arlington Street, Cambridge. The corporation's three directors are listed as Hayden, Brancucci, and Alice P. Kavanaugh, of 54 Kenmore Road, Medford.

J. L. Hayden Associates is only one of four related firms whose president is Hayden and whose offices are at 1340 Soldier's Field Road. Other corporate papers on file at the statehouse reveal that Hayden is also president of Hayden, Harding & Buchanan, Inc.; Hayden, Harding & Buchanan Engineers, Inc.; and Polytechnical Engineering, Research & Sales Co., Inc. This latter firm is known as Persco.

All of these firms, with the exception of Persco, have been the recipients of several lucrative consulting engineering contracts from the Furcolo administration in recent years.

MANY CONTRACTS

There are many consulting engineering firms doing business with the Department of Public Works which lets the vast majority of its engineering work out on contract to private firms on the grounds that the department does not have enough qualified engineers to handle the tremendous work load occasioned by the State's huge road program.

A check of the DPW's contracts with these firms shows that the Hayden companies have been unusually successful in convincing State officials not only of the value of their work but also of the diversity of their capabilities.

Following is a rundown of some of the Hayden firms' contracts with the DPW and its division of waterways:

1. A $921,000 lump sum contract to Hayden, Harding & Buchanan, Inc., and Charles A. Maguire & Associates for consulting engineering work on the Inner Belt. The two firms presumably are splitting the work.

2. An $878,000 contract to Hayden, Harding & Buchanan Engineers, Inc., for consulting engineering on a portion of Interstate Route 195 which runs between the Rhode Island border at East Providence and New Bedford.

EIGHTEEN-MILLION-DOLLAR COST

The firm's slice of this roadway is a segment between Fall River and Westport. Estimated construction cost of this piece of roadway is $18 million and the engineering fee granted H., H. & B. Engineers, Inc., amounts to 4.88 percent of this or $878,000. Through last May the firm had received a half million dollars for the work it had done to date. Although consulting engineering fees for highway construction jobs generally run about 4½ percent, the 4.88 percent fee to the Hayden concern is not unusual.

3. A $225,000 consulting engineering fee for work on a $6 million construction segment of the same road, Interstate Route 195, between Seekonk and Swansea. This contract also involved H., H. & B. Engineers, Inc.

4. A $148,000 contract for J. L. Hayden Associates for an extensive study of the State's highway needs as well as recommendations for a detailed program of future construction in Massachusetts. This presumably was the study that resulted in the billion-dollar-highway program that Furcolo unsuccessfully recommended to the legislature this year.

5. An $84,000 contract for J. L. Hayden Associates to review and study for possible revision and rewriting the DPW's manuals, guides, and specifications.

WATERWAYS PROJECTS

6. A contract between the division of waterways and J. L. Hayden Associates for consultant services on certain waterways projects. As of last January the Hayden firm was paid $8,811 for its work, principally survey work, on Quequechan River in the Fall River area where the river's channel was being relocated.

Hayden, Harding & Buchanan, Inc., and Polytechnical Engineering, Research & Sales Co. were incorporated on April 7, 1955. Hayden, Harding & Buchanan Engineers, Inc., was incorporated April 30, 1957, while J. L. Hayden Associates was formed on April 9, 1959.

[From the Boston Herald, Aug. 23, 1960]

NO COMMENT, SAYS RICCIARDI

State Public Works Commissioner Jack Ricciardi, of Wellesley, late yesterday gave a "no comment" answer to State Auditor Thomas J. Buckley's 154-page report sharply criticizing the DPW.

Ricciardi, a former deputy commissioner, said he had just received the bulky document and asked for time to study it.

CONTRACTS CITED

Buckley's report made mention of a deputy commissioner who received an average of $14,000 annually as a consultant for more than 2 years.

It also singled out for criticism the granting by the DPW of 44 separate under-$1,000 contracts to a single painting contractor as a "device to circumvent the laws."

It was pointed out that under State law only contracts of $1,000 or more require competitive bidding. The 44 contracts referred to in the audit of the highway division of the DPW were "each for $125 less than the statutory limit of $1,000."

Buckley reported they went to one painting contractor for work confined to a single section of the East Boston Expressway.

The report also criticized payment of $775,812 for corrective construction at the Roy C. Smith Bridge on the Southeast Expressway near the Neponset Interchange in Dorchester. The payment was made, the report said, despite a ruling from the attorney general that the contractor was at fault.

Buckley also questioned the award of a lump sum contract for $84,000 for professional engineering services which should have been performed on a cost-plus basis; "overruns" on construction projects due to consistent failure of preliminary plans to show either the terrain or the makeup of the area with any degree of accuracy; changes in a connecting roadway contract on a road in Philipston at a cost of $83,000 despite the attorney general's disapproval, and failure of leases for gas stations and restaurants to spell out responsibility for local real estate taxes.

PAYMENTS HELD UP

The Buckley report did not identify the deputy commissioner involved as a consultant, but Ricciardi readily admitted the State auditor had him in mind.

The audit also charged the Federal Bureau of Public Roads has held up payments of $6,721,817 on land damage cases, pending the outcome of its probe into claims of overpayment for land taken for federally aided roads.

The same Federal agency, the report said, has withheld approval of a bridge at Fall River due to a question concerning the safety of steel girders. The report says welding problems have arisen and that as a result the Bureau has not been billed for $655,296 for this project.

Buckley's report contends that specifications for highway construction failed to properly identify the type of terrain. It said many examples were shown of ledge being found instead of earth and other variances.

Because of the varying charges for removal of peat, earth or rock, Buckley said the overrun charges on one contract in Methuen amounted to $76,000.

The report also cited a Middleboro contract where overrun charges of $222,778 were made on one contract for gravel borrow alone. In the same contract, Buckley said the overrun for digging out peat came to $44,500.

REVIEW AUDIT CITED

The State auditor also took issue with payment of $9,894.48 to a consultant for a review audit of one of Buckley's own audit reports on the department.

Buckley pointed out that his previous criticism of leasing of parking lots without bids resulted in the DPW's cancellation of contracts and the advertising for bids.

A comparison of the bids, he said, showed the high bids will amount to $70,578.60 annually, whereas the negotiated leases on the same lots amounted to $7,020 per year.

[From the Boston Herald, Aug. 23, 1960]

THOMAS WORCESTER CHARGED WITH $180,784 TAX EVASION

Thomas Worcester, 63, president of Thomas Worcester, Inc., Boston engineering and construction firm, went on trial before Judge Charles E. Wyzanski, Jr., and a jury in U.S. district court yesterday charged with evading income taxes totaling $180,784.

Worcester, of Putnam Street, Waltham, is charged with evading personal taxes totaling $74,582 for 1950, 1951 and 1952, also taxes of $106,202 allegedly owed by his firm for the fiscal years 1950 and 1951. The Government alleges he filed false returns understating his own and the corporation's income.

It is charged that his personal net income during the 3 years involved totaled $263,156 but that he reported only $112,162 in his returns.

Also, that the company's net income for the years 1950 and 1951 amounted to $209,114, but that only $48,457 was listed in the returns.

Assistant U.S. Attorney Norman A. Hubley, in his opening to the jury, said the Government would show that Worcester channeled large sums out of the firm and into his own hands. He said the funds were diverted to two other concerns through fictitious expense charges.

[From the Boston Herald, Aug. 25, 1960]

COMPANY MADE PAYMENTS ON BOGUS BILLS, TRIAL TOLD

Philip W. Murphy, former comptroller of Thomas Worcester, Inc., Boston engineering and construction firm, testified in U.S. district court yesterday that the company made large payments to another firm on the basis of "fictitious" bills and vouchers.

Asked by Lewald the purpose of the Ross Turner concern, Murphy said, "Mr. Worcester needed to have a considerable sum of money and the partnership was formed in

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

order to bill the Worcester company for services, and the Worcester company in turn would make checks payable to Ross Turner & Co."

Murphy, a resident of East Bridgewater, was called as a Government witness at the trial of Thomas Worcester, head of the engineering and construction firm, on income tax evasion charges.

SAY $180,784 EVADED

Worcester, 63, is charged with evading taxes to totaling $180,784 by filing false returns for himself and his firm. Included are personal taxes of $74,582 allegedly owed for 1950, 1951, and 1952, and $106,202 allegedly owed by Thomas Worcester, Inc., for 1950 and 1951. Judge Charles E. Wyzanski, Jr., is presiding at the jury trial.

Murphy, under questioning by Assistant U.S. Attorney George H. Lewald, testified that payments totaling $105,240 were made by the Worcester company in 1949 to a newly organized firm called Ross Turner & Co., which had been set up in an office on State Street.

The firm was a partnership whose members comprised Worcester, Murphy, and two other employes of the Worcester firm. Murphy, who worked as comptroller directly under Worcester, said the payments were made purportedly for "engineering services" rendered to the Worcester company by Ross Turner & Co., but that actually no services were made. The checks covering the payments, said Murphy, were signed by Worcester and himself.

[From the Boston Herald, Aug. 25, 1960]

$23,000 BROCHURE JOB SUBLET FOR ABOUT $5,000

(By David Farrell and Wayne Hanley)

The consulting engineering firm which was handed a $23,000 contract for preparing 500 commemorative brochures on the proposed President Adams Parkway sublet the job to a Boston advertising agency, the Herald learned last night.

JOB TURNED OVER TO AD AGENCY

J. L. Hayden Associates, which was paid $46 a copy for each of the brochures, turned the job over to Parsons, Friedmann & Central Advertising Agency of 69 Newbury Street almost immediately after signing the contract with former State Public Works Commissioner Anthony DiNatale.

DiNatale quit his post as head of the DPW recently but was commissioner on December 8, 1959, when the agreement between the State and the Hayden firm was set up.

Although mystery continued to shroud some aspects of the brochure, several developments were uncovered by the Herald.

Here are the known facts in the strange case:

Commissioner DiNatale and John L. Hayden of Wellesley who is president of J. L. Hayden Associates and two other firms which have been paid hundreds of thousands of dollars in the past year for consulting engineering work in a variety of DPW projects, including the updating of DPW manuals and publications, signed a contract December 8 providing for the parkway brochure.

Shortly thereafter Hayden or one of his representatives called Robert Friedmann, treasurer and account executive of the advertising agency, and requested the agency to go to work immediately on the project.

It is not clear whether Hayden made the call because his secretary reported that he had "gone on vacation" and she "didn't know when he would be back" when the Herald attempted to question him about the brochure.

At any rate, the agency contacted Winthrop Printing & Offset Co., of 141 West Second Street, South Boston, and asked the firm to quote a price on the job.

It was explained the job had to be done as fast as possible even if it involved overtime.

The firm submitted a price somewhere in the vicinity of $2,000 and was given the job.

Roy E. Orrall, an executive of the printing firm, said his company printed the brochure but referred all questions about it to Friedmann.

Raymond E. Parsons, of South Weymouth, president of the advertising agency, said he was not familiar with all of the details of the brochure.

ABOUT $5,000

He did say the total value of the job was "about $5,000" and this included the printing of the brochures as well as the creative work the agency put into the preparation of the original copy.

Parsons indicated he thought his agency was given the job because the firm had considerable experience in producing historical material. The famous folder on Boston's "Freedom Trail," was considered an outstanding guide on the city's historic sites, was prepared by his agency.

"I can say that we were entirely ethical," Parsons said. "We prepared the brochure at a price customary for such work. It was within the normal price range that any agency would have charged."

Parsons indicated that the total cost for the agency and printing company's efforts did not exceed $5,000.

SEVERAL MYSTERIES

Several mysteries still remain in the strange case of the parkway brochure:

1. Why did the Furcolo administration pay Hayden Associates $23,000 for a job that apparently was worth considerably less?

2. Why the tremendous Christmas rush to complete the job "as fast as possible," even if it meant overtime? The brochure was not released to the press until last Friday, August 19—some 8 months after it was completed.

3. Why do DPW records show that the work on the brochure was done between January 11, 1960, and February 3, 1960, when it now has been established that the work was jammed through in December 1959?

4. Why was a professional engineering firm that was busy with a multitude of other department of public works contracts chosen to do a brochure that was primarily a historic and scenic guide that was more properly the work of an advertising agency?

[From the Washington News, Aug. 23, 1960]

HIGHWAY CHARGES FLY ON HILL

Representative GORDON H. SCHERER (Republican, of Ohio) today charged a Democratic-controlled investigation committee is deliberately covering up a Massachusetts road-building scandal which is "the granddaddy of them all."

Representative SCHERER, ranking minority member of the House Highway Investigating Committee, said the road building skullduggery being investigated by the committee "looks like peanuts" compared with the Massachusetts situation.

He flatly accused Committee Chairman JOHN A. BLATNIK (Democrat, of Minnesota) of arbitrarily deciding to stop "all further hearings because the Massachusetts scandals had to be kept under cover until after the election."

"He's a liar," Representative BLATNIK retorted. "We've been in touch with the Massachusetts situation all the time. There's no change in tune."

I do not know if the "political considerations," referred to by the Chair, means that to expose this Massachusetts matter prior to election would be embarrassing to some Democratic politicians in the Bay State who are offering their credentials to the voters this fall. Nor do I know if exposure would prove to be a Teapot Dome or another Hoffa-Beck episode. But I find this forbearance is a remarkable thing under the circumstances and, I fear, it will serve no worthy cause other than to obscure the true facts which the public ought to know and to undermine public confidence in the objective of an important committee of Congress. Accordingly, I urge our subcommittee to move into Massachusetts forthwith and prepare this hearing as soon as possible, letting the chips fall where they may. This alleged scandal has been known since January and further delay cannot be justified on any ground other than narrow political expediency.

OTHER UNFINISHED BUSINESS

There are also other areas of our highway program which I have long urged in vain that our subcommittee investigate and inform the Congress. These areas raise the questions of whether congressional policies are sound and are being administered properly by both Federal and State officials. It may be that these matters are not as "glamorous" as exposing corruption and laying hold of some scandals whose perfidy is rightly aired before the bar of public scrutiny, but they are nonetheless important. Without being exhaustive, the following list of objectives ought to engage the attention of our forum:

1. The reevaluation of the provisions for extending the Interstate System beyond 40,000 miles; and, if this policy is sound, establishment of a standard to determine when and where such extensions shall be made.

2. A reevaluation of the decision that the system shall serve both local needs and through traffic as well, together with some clarification of the policy vis-a-vis the location of interchanges.

3. A review and clarification of the policy regarding design standards relating to the use of multiple-lane highways as opposed to two-lane highways and design standards of interchanges.

4. Review and clarification of the policy regarding construction of the Interstate System between population centers, and connecting links into population centers.

5. Review and clarification of the policies regarding route locations as such decisions are related to the economic impact of the highways on the affected community.

6. Review and clarification of the policies relating to promotion of an integrated highway system and their implementation in the system's projects to date.

7. Reevaluation of the present policies relating to highway bridges over navigable waters with the view to developing different but adequate standards for bridge construction under the Federal Bridge Act.

8. Reevaluation of the policy providing for payment of the costs of relocation of utilities on highway right-of-way on to highway construction.

9. Clarification of reasons for the wide variation between the cost estimate of

1955, upon which the 1956 act was based, and the revised cost estimate submitted to Congress in 1958.

10. Investigation of the extent to which defense needs become the determining factor in route location and mileage.

Mr. Speaker, this entire highway program will be up for reappraisal by the Congress early in the next year. Unless some of these areas indicated above are explored, there simply will not be any record of facts and evidence which can form a solid foundation for the Congress to legislate upon or to base an informed examination of the present laws. If the new Congress is to raise some $13 billion in new revenue to help this Interstate System out of its financial dilemma, such inquiries as I have suggested must be answered. I would feel that I have failed to protect the best interests of all Americans, including my own constituents in the First District of Iowa, if I did not take this last opportunity in the waning days of this Congress to renew my demands, voiced on the floor of the House on May 26, 1960 (see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pp. 11322–11325) and often in committee hearings, that these areas be timely explored. I sincerely hope that this can and will be done and that when the new Congress returns in January, we can have the benefit of such investigations.

PUBLIC FINANCE

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the gross public debt of the United States now stands at $288½ billion. The manner in which this huge public debt is managed means a great deal to the American people. If it is managed wisely, the prospects for healthy and sustained economic growth will be enhanced; if it is managed improperly, all of us will suffer.

Because debt management is so important to the American people, it is indeed unfortunate that some of the Members of this body have seen fit to strike out, irresponsibly and emotionally, at the efforts of the Treasury to handle our $288½ billion debt in a sound and sensible manner. On August 25, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS], assisted by some of his associates on the other side of the aisle, presented a lengthy discourse on recent and prospective debt management actions. The statements made by these gentlemen cannot be allowed to go unanswered.

My sole purpose today is to separate fact from fancy, truth from fiction. Several volumes would be required to give full treatment to all the erroneous points made by the gentleman from Wisconsin. Thus I shall have to content myself with a brief discussion of some of the more flagrant errors and misrepresentations.

But before I do that, it is important to point out that, as usual, the gentleman from Wisconsin and his associates continue to play the old tune of their Party—they are unhappy with the higher earnings that peoples' savings naturally earn in a prosperous economy. To hear these gentlemen talk, we would have to conclude that the millions of Americans who own some $42 billion of Savings Bonds should not be receiving 3¾ percent on their savings, as contrasted with less than 3 percent a few years ago. We would have to conclude that the American citizens who hold 22 million accounts in mutual savings banks, 25 million accounts in savings and loan associations, and over 37 million accounts in savings accounts at commercial banks should not receive the higher earnings on their savings that they have been receiving in recent years. We would have to conclude that the 112 million people with savings in the form of life insurance should not benefit from the higher interest rates that reduce the premiums on their policies. And we would have to conclude that the many millions who have savings in private pension plans and in Social Security should not benefit from the higher interest earnings that will add to their comfort in their years of retirement.

The fact is, of course, that interest rates rise in a prosperous economy simply because the demand for credit rises at such times. We might for a time be able to keep rates from rising by creating new money—by forcing the Federal Reserve to pump new bank reserves into the system—but the ultimate cost would be disastrous inflation and a precipitate rise in the cost of living. And when the gentleman from Wisconsin refers to the rapid rate of economic growth in Western Europe, he conveniently fails to point out that the most rapid growth has been experienced by precisely those countries which have permitted interest rates to respond to the forces of demand and supply and the impact of appropriate monetary policies. West Germany, which effectively stabilized her currency in 1948, is the prime example, but many others could be listed.

The first major point the gentleman from Wisconsin makes about debt management (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, August 25, pp. 17710–17719) is that the Eisenhower administration has failed to take advantage of "golden opportunities" to lengthen the maturity of the public debt, which he admits is too short. The debt is indeed too short in maturity, and to postpone effective actions to lengthen it can only lead to severe difficulties later on, as more and more of the Government's outstanding securities get closer and closer to maturity.

But the gentleman fails to point out that most of the dangerous shortening of the public debt occurred between 1946 and 1952, when an earlier administration took almost no advantage of the artificially low interest rates then prevailing to put the debt in better shape. In that period, only $5 billion of marketable securities maturing in over 5 years were sold. From 1953 to the present, the Treasury has sold $51 billion of such securities, or 10 times the amount under the previous administration. The facts speak for themselves.

The gentleman strikes out at the administration's request for removal of the harmful and capricious 4¼ percent interest rate ceiling, which prevented the Treasury from engaging in any debt lengthening at all for almost a year. He states that "committees of the Congress, including the Joint Economic Committee, reviewed the merits of the administration's plea for a free hand and came out confirmed in the conclusion that there was no persuasive need for the elimination of the 4¼ percent statutory ceiling * * *."

What are the facts? The responsible legislative committee, the Ways and Means Committee of this body, did indeed review the need for removal of the ceiling, and on February 29, 1960, favorably reported a bill (H.R. 10590) which, for all practical purposes, would permit the ceiling to be exceeded. The gentleman knows very well why this bill never received consideration on the floor of the House; it was blocked by the militant liberal group of which he is a member. But it is a flat misrepresentation to state that committees of the Congress turned down the administration. The only responsible legislative committee in fact saw clearly the need for action and reported out a bill to this end.

The most surprising of the statements of the gentleman from Wisconsin are those directed at the new and promising debt management technique referred to as "advance refunding," in which investors holding Government securities with some time to maturity are induced to exchange for new long-term securities. Observers who have genuine interest in sound restructuring of our huge public debt, and who are not motivated by partisan considerations, agree that this technique provides the best method for achieving some meaningful debt extension.

Indeed, one would think that the gentleman himself thought so, if his past actions are indicative of his beliefs. Just short of a year ago, on September 4, 1959, the House was considering H.R. 9035, which included an amendment to the Internal Revenue Code for the express and declared purpose of facilitating advance refunding. What were the gentleman's remarks concerning this legislation? His precise words were: "* * * this is a good bill." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 105, pt. 14, p. 18169.)

What are the gentleman's objections to advance refunding? He stoutly maintains that it would be far preferable to achieve needed debt extension by selling new long-term bonds for cash, and he roundly criticizes the Under Secretary of the Treasury for pointing out, in a recent speech, the elementary fact that long-term bond sales for cash absorb funds that would otherwise be available for other types of long-term securities. He refers to the Under Secretary's remarks as a "kind of midsummer madness."

I suggest that the shoe is on the other foot; if there is any "midsummer madness" involved, it is not on the part of the able Under Secretary of the Treasury, but the gentleman who so rashly and immaturely criticizes him. What the Under Secretary said, in essence, is that heavy cash sales of long-term bonds

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

should not be used to achieve all of the debt extension that is clearly desirable. While some debt extension should surely be achieved in this way, the massive job to be done requires use of new and less disruptive techniques. When a new long-term bond is sold for cash, new savings are absorbed; if large amounts are sold, the effect is to deprive home-building, State and local governments, and other borrowers of the long-term savings they need—and which the economy needs.

An advance refunding would not, however, absorb long-term savings, because the technique would involve the exchange of one Government security for another. A long-term investor would simply replace one security which he now owns, and which has 5 to 10 years to run, with a new security with 20 to 30 years to run. The debt would indeed be extended, but without robbing residential construction, State and local governments, and other long-term borrowers of the funds needed for their important projects.

But the gentleman is not content to stop with his unreasoned condemnation of the Under Secretary's remarks—he goes further, and recommends strongly that the Treasury sell large amounts of long-term bonds for cash in periods of recession. This would indeed be a foolish and dangerous thing to do. It is precisely at such times that, although interest rates are of course low, the construction industry and State and local governments should be receiving a maximum amount of long-term savings, to promote their own activities and thus to stimulate economic recovery.

The fact is that nothing worse could be done, to stunt recovery from a recession, than for the Treasury to flood the long-term capital market with bonds at such times. It is indeed very surprising to hear a member of the opposition party advocate such a course of action; in so doing, he is acting directly contrary to the advice of the party's leading economic advisers. For example, Professor Seymour E. Harris, of Harvard, who is reported to be one of Senator Kennedy's closest advisers, has said:

> Selling long-term Government securities in the midst of a recession is foolish and costly. * * These securities compete with private enterprise and keep rates up.

This statement was in testimony before the Senate Finance Committee in mid-April 1958.

Mr. Speaker, much more could be said about the economic fallacies, misrepresentations, and distortions in the remarks of the gentleman from Wisconsin before this body on August 25. But these few points which I have discussed today make it perfectly clear that partisan considerations have been permitted to cloud the discussion of a very important issue. If we are to achieve a high and sustained rate of economic growth, provide abundant employment opportunities, and prevent further rises in the cost of living, we shall certainly not be able to do so by engaging in shallow and misguided attacks on the very policies which are necessary to achieve these vital goals. Sound debt management is only one of these policies, but it is an important one. It is toward clarifying this important issue that my remarks have been directed today.

WILDLIFE, FISH, AND GAME CONSERVATION IN MILITARY RESERVATIONS

Mr. BONNER submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 2565) to promote effectual planning, development, maintenance, and coordination of wildlife, fish, and game conservation and rehabilitation in military reservations:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 2222)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2565) to promote effectual planning, development, maintenance, and coordination of wildlife, fish, and game conservation and rehabilitation in military reservations, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 2, 3, and 4.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 5 and 6 and agree to the same.

HERBERT C. BONNER,
FRANK W. BOYKIN,
GEORGE P. MILLER,
THOR G. TOLLEFSON,
WILLIAM K. VAN PELT,
Managers on the Part of the House.

CLAIR ENGLE,
E. L. BARTLETT,
NORRIS COTTON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2565) to promote effectual planning, development, maintenance, and coordination of wildlife, fish, and game conservation and rehabilitation in military reservations, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Section 1 of the House bill provided for issuance of special State hunting and fishing permits and authorized the Commanding Officer of each reservation to administer such permits as agent for the State if the particular cooperative plan so provided. The Senate amendment struck out reference to the State. The conference accepted the House provision.

Section 3 of the bill as passed the House directed the Secretary of Defense to expend funds collected or transferred in accordance with agreed cooperative plans. The Senate amendment omitted the authority to transfer these funds. This provision referred to funds that already might be in the hands of local Commanding Officers under existing plans. It was the sense of the conference that the transfer of such funds could best be handled through provisions in the individual cooperative plans.

The Senate amendments to section 5 excluded application of the law to national forest lands and Taylor Grazing Act lands. The action of the conference accepted these exclusions from the operation of the act.

HERBERT C. BONNER,
FRANK W. BOYKIN,
GEORGE P. MILLER,
THOR C. TOLLEFSON,
WILLIAM K. VAN PELT,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the conference report on H.R. 2565, to promote effectual planning, development, maintenance, and coordination of wildlife, fish, and game conservation and rehabilitation in military reservations, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE CAPTIVE NATIONS—KEY TO PEACE

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. DULSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, during the official observance of Captive Nations Week in the third week of July, a number of significant addresses were made throughout the country. I should like to bring to the attention of Members of the House the address given by my friend and colleague, Mr. FEIGHAN, on July 20 in Buffalo, N.Y. This address was given before a civic luncheon in the Golden Ballroom of the Hotel Statler-Hilton, sponsored by the Kiwanis Club of Buffalo in cooperation with the Buffalo Citizens Committee to Observe Captive Nations Week.

The title of my colleague's address is a very fitting one, "The Captive Nations—Key to Peace." Congressman FEIGHAN, as one of the sponsors of the congressional resolution which established Captive Nations Week, presented a realistic analysis of the human elements involved in the cold war. He points out that the overwhelming majority of the people in the captive nations behind the Iron Curtain have not and will not support the men in the Kremlin in times of peace or war. This opposition by the common man behind the Iron Curtain is a powerful deterrent to war because no dictator will start a war in face of the prospect that his empire will rise in revolt and defeat him from within.

Congressman FEIGHAN calls for a hard-hitting political action program in support of the people of the captive non-Russian nations, and suggests six major guideposts as the outlines of his program. These suggestions are timely for all who understand that the cold war is fundamentally a political conflict and that political action is necessary if we are to regain our position of leadership in the free world community.

Under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD the address of my colleague, Mr. FEIGHAN:

THE CAPTIVE NATIONS—KEY TO PEACE

(Address of Hon. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, U.S. Representative, 20th Ohio District)

The great issue of our times is foreign policy and the conduct of our foreign affairs. This opinion is made self-evident by the realization that the question of a hot war or a just peace will be resolved by the kind of foreign policy we support and the manner in which we carry it out. There are, of course, other important national issues and grave domestic problems such as an ever expanding free economy, full employment, civil rights, health protection for the elderly, the strengthening of our educational systems, urban renewal, and the human upsets of automation. Important as all these problems are they stand in the shadow of the challenge to our survival as a nation, and as a civilization, presented by the determined forces of international communism. If we fail to face up to this challenge and thus lose the struggle with the Russian Communists, these domestic problems will have no importance or relevance whatever. They will be disposed of summarily by the ruthless dictatorship which awaits any free nation falling under the rule or domination of imperial communism.

The history of some 40 years of Communist aggression warns us that we are in a life or death struggle with the highly organized forces of tyranny. We did not create this contest. We were forced into it in 1947 when it became crystal clear that we had no other alternative—except gradual and peaceful surrender. It was then, you will recall, the Russian Communists were attempting the take-over of Greece and Turkey by armed aggression, when the subversive task forces of communism were gnawing away at the democratic governments of Western Europe, when Moscow was directing the Chinese Reds in the take-over of mainland China and when the Red Army stood guard over the ruthless imposition of alien regimes upon the nations of Central and North Europe. The Presidential decision to stand firmly in support of the freedom-loving people of Greece and Turkey was a far-reaching one. It went far beyond the immediate requirements of these two countries. That decision signaled a determination to hold back the Red wave of Russian aggression on all fronts. Hindsight gives perspective to the magnitude and the wisdom of that decision and the courage required to make it.

As a Nation we were ill prepared for this sudden shift to a wartime footing. We had dismantled the greatest military striking force in history within 12 months after the Japanese surrender. We had "brought the boys back home." Our defense industries had reverted to the all out production of consumer commodities and other nonmilitary products. We had gone back to doing business as usual, in both our domestic and international affairs. We had but recently won a world wide victory for freedoms cause, a war to end all wars. This victory promised our people a long and happy era of peace in which justice was assured for all nations and all people. All these promises were written into the Charter of the United Nations. These were the war aims of the United States. These were the war aims of all the allied nations except one—Soviet Russia. The strange alliance which admitted imperial Russia into the camp of free men was exposed as a massive deception of the hopes, the rights, and the aspirations of the common man the world over. In the stark reality of this awakening we, as a Nation, entered what the Honorable Winston Churchill so aptly termed "the cold war."

Many chapters of sacrifice and heroic action have been written since, by men and women and indeed by children who know the blessings of freedom. All Americans sense the importance and accomplishments of the Marshall plan, the stand on Greece and Turkey, the Berlin airlift, and the refugee assistance programs just as they honor the resolute Presidential actions taken in Korea, the Formosa Straits and in the Middle East crisis. The hard lessons of the past have brought home to us the imperative of the military shields against further Communist armed aggression which NATO, CENTO, and SEATO provide for ourselves and for all free people. Yes, we have learned a great deal in the days and years of the cold war. But I say we have not learned enough about the nature of the enemy who openly boasts that they will bury us, that they will communize the world and thus cast upon our children—if not ourselves—a mode of life which makes death a welcome visitor.

In our national efforts to build a defensive shield against Communist aggression, a matter of first priority, we gave more attention to armaments and alliances than we did to the basic human values and aspirations involved in the struggle. When we awakened to this shortcoming, we then limited our concern for the rights and the hopes of the common man to the free world community, thus neglecting in large measure the almost one-third of humanity behind the Russian Iron and Bamboo Curtains. By overly friendly relations and dealings with the Russian leaders and the various Communist regimes they have imposed upon once free people, we have cast serious doubts upon our willingness, our ability and our determination to weather the ideological storm which grips the world. The common man behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains has been shaken in his confidence in the United States as the citadel of human freedom. All too many leaders in the free world community have become convinced that the destiny of their nation requires a flexible position somewhere between the United States and Imperial Russia, a position which will permit them to shift gears gracefully when the winner becomes reasonably apparent. The newly emerging nations on the African Continent, the newly independent nations of North, South, and Southeast Asia, and the Middle East demonstrate a restless uncertainty in setting their course toward maturity and secure sovereignty. It is this uncertainty in the camp of free men which emboldens the Russian Dictator Khrushchev to taunt, to insult, to threaten, and to pour infamy upon the United States of America.

The time has come for a deep and realistic revision of our foreign policy. The hour is late, but I believe we still have time not, a moment of which can be wasted on such meaningless catch phrases as "agonizing reappraisal," "realinement of relationships," and "flexible adjustments." What we need is a simple recognition of the fact that those who seek to wipe out civilization as we know it, are anchored with a vulnerability which they cannot overcome and which haunts the inner sanctum of the Kremlin. The Russian vulnerability is a deeply human one. It is caused by the aspirations of hundreds of millions of non-Russian people in the captive nations for freedom and national independence. No less than 20 once free and independent nations have been overrun and occupied by the Russian Communists during the past 40-odd years. The regimes imposed upon these nations do not and cannot represent the freely expressed will of the people. Representative government has been denied these people and the mode of life imposed upon them generates a revolutionary spirit which can burst forth with devastating violence and retribution against the oppressor. This vulnerability is compounded by the fact that the number of people who support the Communist empire falls far short of a margin of safety. There are no more than 70 to 80 million Russians in the empire, together with some 5 million non-Russians who are reliable members of the Communist Party. This is the mortar of the empire, just as it is a most realistic evaluation of the human resources at the command of the dictatorship which threatens to bury us. While we may and should regret the tragedy of history which has denied the Russian people a chapter of individual liberty and freedom, we must not allow our pity to cloud the honest judgment of history. Having had no experience with liberty and freedom, we must not expect the Russian people to rally to freedom's cause. Nor should we condemn them for their support of a regime which has brought greater glory to the concepts of a Russian empire than the wildest dreams of Czar Peter. Forgive them for they know no better. Political realism in this hour of terrible trial requires that we know the truth and face it with a feeling of compassion, accepting the duty of saving the Russian people from the evil leaders who see in them a tool to accomplish their selfish ends.

It was in this spirit that the Congress of the United States enacted Public Law 86-90, and made possible this national observance of Captive Nations Week. As sponsor of this law in the House of Representatives, I assure you that a long, deliberate, and careful study of all the evidence available, covering a span of 40 years, stands behind the language and spirit of this Federal law. The unanimous enactment of this law by Congress is eloquent testimony of its nonpartisan character and urgency. More than anything else, it carries a message of decision and the promise to enter a new phase of the cold war by carrying the political war into the heartland of the enemy.

Permit me to examine with you the language and intent of this law.

To begin with, this law takes official recognition of the fact that Communist aggression against free and independent nations began in the period of 1917–18 rather than in 1945, as all too many of our people have been led to believe. For it was during this period that a series of national independence movements, very much like that of our Founding Fathers, brought about the disintegration of the Russian czarist empire. Many nations long oppressed and exploited by the Russian aristocracy dissolved their political bonds with the empire and declared their national independence. The only nation of the empire failing to take such action was the Russian nation. In these circumstances the Bolsheviks seized control of the Russian nation and quickly consolidated their power. With the Russian nation as a base of operations and support, the Bolsheviks launched campaigns of subversion, terror and armed aggression against the newly independent nations. Between the years 1918 and 1921, the Russian Bolsheviks destroyed the national independence of White Ruthenia, Ukraine, Georgia, Armenia, Turkestan, Cossackia, and Idel-Ural.

The second wave of Russian Communist aggression took place in 1939. Soviet Russia then an ally of Hitler, destroyed the national independence of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

The third wave of Russian Communist aggression took place in the 1945 and thereafter, when in violation of the Atlantic Charter and the Charter of the United Nations, the national independence of Poland, Czecho-Slovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Albania, and Yugoslavia was destroyed.

The fourth wave of Russian Communist aggression took place in 1948 when the Red regime was imposed by military force upon the people of mainland China.

The fifth wave of Communist aggression instigated by Moscow covers the enslavement

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

of East Germany, North Korea, North Vietnam, and Tibet.

Public Law 86–90 thus recognizes that all the once free and independent, non-Russian nations of this vastly expanded Russian empire have suffered a common fate. Time, in terms of the date of their captivity, no longer has any practical point. They all suffer a common captivity. None will be free until all are free. And all must be free if freedom is to be secure anywhere in this relatively small world in which we live. This is a reality of the life or death struggle in which we are engaged.

The spirit of this law recognizes that while these nations are now deprived of their independence, the hopes of their peoples have not been broken. The common man in these captive nations aspires for a return of his liberties, his freedoms, and the blessings of national independence. These aspirations stand as a powerful deterrent to war and the best hope for a just and lasting peace. The scheming despots in the Kremlin will not dare to launch world war III so long as these embers of freedom burn. We dare not fail to kindle this human fire because such failure is an invitation to the Russian tyrants to launch a hot war.

These are the outlines of a new and realistic foreign policy toward the Russian Communists. These are the outlines of a foreign policy of free people, who, knowing the power of their moral and political ideals, are confident of the future and fearless in defense of justice. Public Law 86–90 is a mandate from the American people to engage the enemy on his home grounds, to carry the political fight to the heartland of the Russian Communist empire and to exploit the human vulnerability of that empire as a positive action in support of world peace.

For all too long we have been on the defensive. Our Nation has grown weary of simply reacting to Communist actions. We have too often been second best in international political situations which demanded nothing short of unquestioned victory.

The summit conferences were initiated by the Russians. They needed a world propaganda platform and rigged the agenda to advance their evil purposes. We reacted to their initiatives, accepted the substance of their agenda rigging and ended up on the short and rather dirty end of the stick.

Personal diplomacy was initiated by Khrushchev as a means of securing a cloak of badly needed respectability. He arranged official visits to free countries and world tours for himself in order to demonstrate his contempt for the leaders of the free world. The State Department harangued and maneuvered President Eisenhower into this Russian bear-trap which, when sprung, found the subversive agents of Khrushchev showing contempt for President Eisenhower in Japan.

Khrushchev proclaims that the Monroe Doctrine no longer exists because the new Russian ruling class refuses to recognize its claims. By this he means that the entire world is his bowl of cherries and he will pick the cherry he feels is ripe regardless of in whose orchard it grows. What a contrast this is to the action taken by our State Department "Soviet Experts" at the time of the Hungarian Freedom Revolution. You will recall the revolution broke out on October 23, 1956, and that by October 28, the Hungarian patriots had rid their country of the Russian oppressors. A revolutionary regime took over and there was a political hiatus for 5 days. Then the State Department, allegedly concerned about the delicate feelings of the Communist dictator Tito, sent him the following cabled assurance of our national intentions in the late afternoon of Friday, November 2, 1956. "The Government of the United States does not look with favor upon governments unfriendly to the Soviet Union on the borders of the Soviet Union."

It was no accident or misjudgment of consequences which led the imperial Russian Army to reinvade Hungary at 4 a.m. on the morning of November 4, 1956. The cabled message to Tito was the go ahead signal to the Russians because any American school boy knows that Tito is Moscow's Trojan Horse. It took less than 48 hours for him to relay this message of treason to his superiors in the Kremlin. All the world knows the terrible consequences of that go ahead signal. This act of infamy was buried in the noise of the 1956 presidential campaign and the moral revulsion which followed in the wake of our failure to respond to freedoms call in captive Hungary. As we approach the promised new era in the conduct of our international affairs. I suggest the time is opportune for a full scale, bipartisan congressional investigation of this infamy. This would provide an appropriate answer to Khrushchev's rejection of the Monroe Doctrine.

No doubt you are asking yourself what, specifically, can be done to support and advance the cause of the captive nations without plunging the world into a hot war. This is a fair question that requires a straightforward answer.

I will take the last part of this question first because it rates the highest priority. Of one thing I am certain. That is the Russian Communists will launch a hot war when they believe they have a 50–50 chance of winning. They will not start 1 minute sooner or hesitate 1 second longer. There is nothing we can do to alter this basis of judgment while the Russian leaders adhere to what they call the doctrines of Lenin. While the Russians now appear to claim that war between communism and capitalism is not inevitable they have not abandoned war as an instrument of imperial policy. They are simply saying they now believe they can conquer the world without a hot war. Their belief is based upon a supposition that the free world, particularly the United States, is crumbling from within thus making a hot war unnecessary. Since I believe we are not breaking up from within, though we have slipped from a position of unquestioned military superiority, and I do not believe we can convert the Russian leaders from their belief in Marxism-Leninism, I propose the following courses of action as necessary to our survival.

The first is a high-speed rebuilding of our military defense capabilities. We must regain and hold a large margin of superiority over the Russians in all fields of defense preparations. This includes the immediate strengthening of our international treaty alliances. The 50–50 chance factor must never be attained by the Russian leaders.

The second is a hard hitting political action program in support of the people of the captive, non-Russian nations. I suggest the following specific actions be undertaken.

1. That the Voice of America be regarded as a political instrument, a mass media means of strengthening our alliance with all the captive peoples. Today it is nothing more than a nonpolitical news service, lacking color, imagination, and sympathy for the oppressed. The present overweighted broadcasting in the Russian language should be corrected, with major emphasis on the languages of the captive nations.

2. Our exchange of persons and cultural exchange programs must be revised and a note of realism interjected in their application to the captive nations. In particular, the exchange of persons program with the Soviet Union should be abolished because it is a fraud. They allow no one but hardcore Communists to visit the United States, most of whom are propaganda specialists rather than students, teachers, engineers, labor leaders or farmers. The public report of these so-called specialists issued upon their return to the Soviet Union are uniformly incorrect, incomplete, and generally slanderous of our free way of life. The people we send to the Soviet Union are no doubt well intended, but they tend to pose as experts on conditions of life under communism upon their return to the United States. Many of these 8-day or 6-week authorities have perpetrated dangerous misjudgments and illusions upon the American people. We need a rapid step-up in our exchange-of-persons program with the countries of the free world. I have observed these programs at work in the United States and in many countries of the free world and I am convinced of their merit. More funds are needed to expand these free-world programs and the money saved by abolishing the exchange programs with the Soviet Union could be used for this purpose.

3. The United Nations should be regarded as a sounding board to expose and espouse the legitimate aspirations of all the captive nations. The Security Council, the General Assembly, and all organs of this body should be regarded as tools to advance the cause of free men, including the emancipation of the captive nations.

4. The United States should test the power of sanctions held by the United Nations, the expulsion of nonconforming member nations, by causing the Russians to abide by the United Nations resolution on Hungary or be expelled from membership in the United Nations. The United Nations resolution on Hungary condemns the Russian aggression against Hungary and calls upon the Russians to evacuate their military, political, and economic forces from that country. To date the Russians have demonstrated a studied contempt for that resolution. It is time they were made to conform or be expelled from membership. The survival of the United Nations must never be regarded as more important than human rights and justice.

5. The next President of the United States should reverse the international road posts pointing away from Washington by convening a meeting of the leaders of all free nations there to discuss our common problems and to hammer out a program of action to save the world from a third war and to win a just peace. The formula of invitation should be simple. Only those who believe in and will support the aspirations of the common man for self-government and democratic institutions should be welcomed at the conference table. This would be freedom's summit conference. The next President of the United States would go a great distance toward recapturing the political initiative by swift action in this direction upon assuming responsibilities of leadership.

6. We must prepare the American people psychologically for the prospect of more freedom revolutions, like that launched by the Hungarians. This does not suggest that we can or should stimulate them. It merely recognizes that such total political revolutions are a natural outcome of the oppression and human exploitation going on behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains. We may not know when or where the next will occur, but we must know that the destiny of free men demands that we be prepared to associate our Nation and other free countries with this healthy wave of the future. We must not be caught unprepared or stupefied by the power of revolt against tyranny, as we were in the case of Hungary. We are a nation born in the revolutionary spirit—we will live or die by the measure of our devotion to our political heritage.

As we face the challenge to our survival as free men, I leave you with this thought. In our daily lives we have learned that time and tide wait for no man. This same law of nature born with the divine order of the world, exercises a compelling influence upon the affairs of all nations. There are problems

which will not wait for determination, and there are situations which demand immediate and resolute decisions. We may not, we must not fail to keep our appointment with destiny. We are destined to lead the peoples of the earth out of the darkness which has fallen upon so many nations—to that golden era of peace with justice for all nations and all peoples.

THE CRUSADE FOR PEACE WITH JUSTICE

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, in the official observance of Captive Nations Week throughout our country, from July 17 through 23, many fine programs were arranged by public-spirited citizens. These programs served to alert the American people to the importance of the aspirations of the people in the captive nations for freedom and national independence toward the winning of a just peace. All these activities were in accordance with the spirit of Public Law 86–90, more popularly known as the Captive Nations Week observance law.

It was my privilege to take part in the weeklong program of activities planned by the Buffalo Citizens Committee to Observe Captive Nations Week. While in Buffalo I had the opportunity to see firsthand the outstanding work accomplished by the Buffalo committee. All the religious faiths conducted prayers and religious ceremonies in the respective churches and synagogues on the opening day of the week's program. A civic ceremony was held on Sunday, July 17, the highlights of which were the reading of Mayor Sedita's proclamation, the placing of the flags of 14 of the captive nations in a colorful array around two large American flags at McKinley Monument, and talks by several leading citizens of Buffalo. On the following Tuesday the Erie County Bar Association conducted a ceremony on the meaning of justice to free men in a special term of supreme court. On Wednesday the Kiwanis Club of Buffalo sponsored a civic luncheon in the ballroom of the Statler Hilton Hotel, where I was privileged to be the speaker. During the week public displays on the captive nations, the cultures of the peoples of those nations, and the true face of Russian communism were shown in several banks, department stores, the lobby of the city hall, and at the Ukrainian Home.

This fine program was climaxed by a freedom rally in Kleinhans Music Hall on Saturday evening, July 23. Mayor Frank A. Sedita was the speaker at this rally which also featured the native songs and dances of the captive nations.

Mayor Sedita has established himself as a real leader in the just cause of the people of the captive nations. He was the first mayor to establish an official city committee to observe Captive Nations Week. He urged similar action upon the mayors of some 18 metropolitan centers of the United States. The committee he appointed was chaired by Dr. Edward M. O'Connor, director of special projects at Canisius College, who is known well for his many years of leadership in government programs to assist the victims of Nazi and Communist tyranny, and to emancipate the captive nations from the yoke of imperial Russian communism.

The address delivered by Mayor Sedita at the freedom rally was a forceful call to the American people to launch a crusade for peace with justice. It set forth the basic causes of war and marked out the guideposts to peace. This address stands as a challenge to the American people to demand that our National Government be rid of those appeasers who seek a status quo with the Russians and that our foreign policy, together with its execution, be returned to a moral foundation which befits our national heritage.

Under unanimous consent I include the address of Mayor Frank A. Sedita in my remarks:

THE CRUSADE FOR PEACE WITH JUSTICE

(Address of Hon. Frank A. Sedita, mayor of Buffalo, delivered during Captive Nations Week observance at the freedom rally, Kleinhans Music Hall, Buffalo, N.Y., July 23, 1960)

What a fitting close this is to our weeklong observance of Captive Nations Week. How better could we end our program than with a freedom rally? The pleas to be made by individual spokesmen for many of the captive nations will give true voice to the feelings, the hopes, and the aspirations of our proven allies behind the Iron Curtain. The dances and songs of the captive people we will see and hear this evening will speak eloquently for cultures and a way of life which no tyrant, no dictator can remove from the hearts and minds of those oppressed by imperial Russian communism. And we, who enjoy the full blessings of human freedom, shall be reminded of our high moral obligation to those who look to us for emancipation from their present state of human bondage. I believe that we, as a nation, shall respond to this call, convinced of the obligations we carry as free men and confident of the victory which awaits our common cause.

The members of the Buffalo Citizens Committee to Observe Captive Nations Week which I had the honor to appoint have brought great credit to our city and have won well-deserved acclaim for themselves. I am proud of what Buffalo has done to observe Captive Nations Week and to serve as honorary chairman of this great committee. I say that what we have done to carry out the spirit and purpose of Public Law 86–90 is a solid and practical work of peace.

We cannot be satisfied with works which seek only the prevention of war. We must work with all the energy and ingenuity at our command to win a just peace. For only in the winning of a just peace can we prevent the outbreak of a hot war. Twice in the generation of many of those gathered here tonight, including myself, we have seen two world wars result from the limited and negative objective of simply preventing the outbreak of armed conflict.

Prior to World War I the prevention of war was governed by what I prefer to call the "peace of empires." This was the handiwork of the Conferences of The Hague. While the imperial powers attending those Conferences failed to reach full treaty agreements as to how this peace would be maintained, they did, nevertheless, arrive at an understanding of status quo.

This understanding of status quo held that the territories of the then existing empires, without regard to the freely expressed will of the people concerned, were inviolate—they were not subject to change. This understanding among the imperial powers lasted but a few years. Kaiser Wilhelm found this loose understanding uncomfortable and the world was thereby plunged into its first global war. It is interesting to note, in this connection, that the then Czar of Russia first proposed the concept of a "peace of empires" at the Hague Conference.

World War I brought about the demise of the German, Austro-Hungarian, czarist Russian and Ottoman Empires. The British, French, and Dutch Empires suffered mortal blows from which they have never recovered, nor can they expect to recover at this midpoint of the 20th century.

The Russian czarist empire, meanwhile, was reconstructed under the reactionary banner of communism. This was done at the expense of the national independence of Ukraine, White Ruthenia, Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Turkestan, Idel-Ural, and Cossackia.

In 1934 a new dictator arose who promised the people of Germany a new and vast empire which he claimed was destined to last a thousand years. When he set about creating this promised empire the cry was heard, "We must prevent war." The voices of morality in the affairs of nations cried out then for a just peace, a just settlement of disputes which accorded with the freely expressed will of the peoples involved. But these voices went unheeded. The Munich Conference followed—a black mark in history when the demands of the tyrant on the march were met by appeasement. Prime Minister Chamberlain returned to London, an umbrella in one hand and a useless piece of paper in the other hand—calling out to the British people "Peace in our times." The Munich appeasement of the Dictator Hitler prevented war—but for how long? A few short years thereafter all humanity was plunged into the most devastating war in all history.

Now what are the political results of World War II. The empire of Hitler is nothing more than a black mark in history. The British, French and Dutch Empires are dismembered for all times. But the empire of Russian communism is vastly expanded, stretching like an octopus over the newly occupied territories of Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Albania, mainland China, Tibet, East Germany, North Korea, North Vietnam, Croatia, Slovenia, and Serbia. The tentacles of the Russian octopus now reach out to seize and strangle every free nation in the world, including the United States. Here in the Western Hemisphere one of those tentacles hangs heavy over Cuba.

Faced with the full realities of this dismal record of mankind's failure to prevent war, who can deny that the relentless quest of a just peace must be our only goal? Who can say that the present Russian demand for the recognition of a status quo is nothing but the demand of Tzar Nicholas II for a "Peace of Empires," dressed up in 20th century stalking clothes? Who believes that a just peace can be won by appeasing dictators on the march—in this case Khrushchev?

We must put an end to the last remaining empire in the world. This we can do by working with all the power and skill at our command to bring about its peaceful dismemberment. This we must do or suffer the same fate as has befallen the score of once free and independent nations now jailed in the Russian prison of nations. The leaders in the Kremlin have made it clear they leave us no other alternative.

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

It is these beliefs which find me shocked at the revelation made by Congressman FEIGHAN on Hungary. I do not doubt for one moment the accuracy of the astounding charge he has placed on the doorstep of the State Department. He is a recognized authority on world communism and a keen student of the internal workings of the Federal Government. All who know him respect his courage and admire his fearless honesty.

But I ask you, what has happened to us as a people, as a great Nation, under God, to permit such an immoral action by our State Department to go unnoticed and unpunished? My heart aches when I think about those gallant people of Hungary, with little more than their bare hands, rising up against the Russia oppressor and in 5 heroic days driving the Red army from their beloved homeland. No one who loves liberty will ever forget those who paid the supreme sacrifice in winning that historic victory over the Russians. Think of the women, from aged grandmothers to school girls not yet in their teens, who fought side by side with the manhood of Hungary. I hang my head in shame to think that our Government would be a party to putting the Hungarian nation back in Russian chains. Only yesterday our friend, Dr. John Juhasz, reminded me that at this very hour there are hundreds of Hungarian youth who took part in that freedom revolution now languishing in the Communist jails of Hungary. There they await death by execution upon reaching their 21st birthday. Almost 4 years have passed since their incarceration so the whole world knows the tender age of all when they rose in support of freedom's cause.

No doubt you have thought of the full meaning of that message sent by the State Department to the Red dictator Tito for relay to Moscow. That cruel message said, and I quote Congressman Feighan, "The Government of the United States does not look with favor upon governments unfriendly to the Soviet Union on the borders of the Soviet Union." Permit me to analyze the full political meaning of that message.

First, it accords a finality to the geography of the U.S.S.R. It admits of no change in the status on the captive, non-Russian nations of the Soviet Union. Such great nations as Ukraine, Armenia, White-Ruthenia, Georgia, Turkestan, and Cossackia are condemned to permanent slavery.

Second, it accords de facto recognition to the Communist regime imposed by Moscow on Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. Our Government has said over and over again that we will never recognize the forced incorporation of the Baltic States into the Soviet Union. Yet the Government of the United States has done exactly that by this declaration of foreign policy cabled to Tito. Could anyone imagine a legally constituted government in any of the Baltic States, a government which represents the freely expressed will of the people, being friendly toward the Soviet Union? Of course not. Only a rump Communist regime such as exists today in all three of the Baltic States could hold out such friendship. Let us not forget that Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania are on the borders of the Soviet Union. The State Department's declaration to Tito condemns the Baltic States to a permanent life under an alien Communist regime, despite promises to the contrary.

Next, what about Poland, Czecho-Slovakia, Rumania, Bulgaria, and mainland China? All these captive nations are on the borders of the Soviet Union. I do not mention Hungary here because the State Department's cable to Tito had clear and specific application to that captive country. All these nations were thus sentenced to a miserable life under Communist regimes which defy the will of the people involved and would not remain in power 1 hour without the Red Army standing guard over their reign of terror. No freely elected government in captive Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, or mainland China would have feelings less than utter contempt for those who rule over the Russian prison of nations nor would they stand idly by once enslavement of any nation by the Russians.

Now what about East Germany, North Korea, North Vietnam, Albania, Yugoslavia, and Tibet? They do not have common borders with the Soviet Union but they are part of the Russian Communist empire. Are they alone entitled to be free and independent? I think not, not by the language of the State Department policy cabled to Tito. Rather, I would read that cable to Tito to mean that our State Department had accepted a status quo with the Russian Empire, with Titoland remaining under the protection of Moscow.

Congressman FEIGHAN in his address before the civic luncheon last Wednesday, called for a full-scale bipartisan congressional investigation of our Government's response to the Hungarian freedom revolution, including the cable sent to the Red dictator Tito. I am convinced this must be done to clear away the dark clouds of doubt which hang heavy over our national honor. I hope you will agree with me and that you will raise your voices with the responsible leaders of Congress, urging them to take immediate action.

What we have done together this week to defend the human rights of the people of the captive nations is only a beginning. It is a significant beginning but our crusade does not end with this freedom rally tonight. Our fight for peace with justice for all nations and people must be maintained every hour of each day until we win through to victory. We are joined in our work by millions of Americans who have taken part in similar programs throughout our country during this week. We must spread this spirit of duty and dedication to freedom's cause, to every country of the free world. To this end I pledge to you my unwavering support.

I pray God's blessings upon our work, that we may have the strength, the wisdom, and the courage to continue the fight for true freedom and full justice for all men, for all nations, for all time.

PUBLIC LAW 86–90—FACT AND FICTION

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important and timely actions of the 86th Congress was enactment of Public Law 86–90, more popularly known as the Captive Nations Week Resolution. This past July hundreds of committees made up of public spirited citizens observed Captive Nations Week in accordance with the provisions of this law. The response of the American people to the high purposes of this law have been most gratifying, and harbor well for the future of freedom's cause.

It was to be expected that the leaders of the Kremlin and their agents everywhere in the world would level a blistering attack against the high purposes of this law. Khrushchev and company have not disappointed us in this respect. It will be recalled that Khrushchev opened the attack the day after the President signed the bill into law, which was the same day Vice President NIXON arrived in Moscow. These attacks by the Communist leaders have not ceased and we can expect them to continue.

It was my privilege to cosponsor Public Law 86–90 with our distinguished majority leader, the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK. I have therefore followed the actions in support of this law throughout the United States as well as the Russian Communists' attacks against it.

A timely and highly informative article on Captive Nations Week appeared in the summer edition of the Ukrainian Quarterly, titled, "Public Law 86–90—Fact and Fiction." The author of this article is Dr. Edward M. O'Connor, director of special projects at Canisius College in Buffalo, N.Y., and a realistic student of the Russian problem. This article analyzes the reaction to Public Law 86–90 by Russians on both sides of the Iron Curtain. Attacks by Russians on the other side of the Iron Curtain were expected, but attacks by Russians living on this side of the Iron Curtain is another matter. Dr. O'Connor points out that the lines of Russian attack on both sides of the Iron Curtain have dangerous parallels which have raised a number of basic questions among well-informed observers of the Communist conspiracy. To correct these dangerous trends, he proposes the formation of an American Committee for the National Independence of Russia to provide a haven for political action by those Russian emigrees who are convinced of the inalienable right of all nations and people to liberty, freedom, and national independence.

Among the features of this article is an analysis of Vice President NIXON's reactions to the challenge made by Khrushchev on Public Law 86–90. As a highly skilled observer of international political events, his examination rises above the much publicized "kitchen debate" to analyze the broad implications of Khrushchev's challenge and the Vice President's response. This feature alone would qualify this article as a must reading for those millions of Americans who have been asking, Why is our policy toward the Russian Communists such a failure?

The article to which I have referred, written by Dr. O'Connor, is as follows:

PUBLIC LAW 86–90—FACT AND FICTION

(By Edward M. O'Connor)

Russians on both sides of the Iron Curtain are engaged in a concerted effort to discredit the Captive Nations Week resolution (Public Law 86–90), enacted last year by Congress. This assault against a Federal law, which does nothing more than officially recognize the importance of the national independence movements within the present-day Russian Empire as a deterrent to war and the key to peace with justice, was launched by none other than Nikita Khrushchev himself. Within a matter of hours after President Eisenhower signed the resolution into law, Khrushchev was confronting Vice President NIXON with the question: "How could you do this to us?" The Vice President had just arrived in Moscow, ostensibly to open the American Exhibition, to

find the Kremlin leaders in a state of shock as a result of the political bombshell launched by Congress. Time and time again, in the days which immediately followed, Khrushchev would call upon groups of Russians to bear testimony for the Vice President as to whether they considered themselves as captive. The response was always the same: "No. No. Peaceful coexistence."

This proved nothing new because Public Law 86–90 does not define the Russian nation as a captive nation. The spontaneous response Khrushchev got from the Russians did, however, confirm the common sense of not defining them by law as "captives."

The results would have been radically different if the Vice President had visited any of the captive, non-Russian nations of the Soviet Union and there had Khrushchev raise the same question among the native population. It was poor political judgment in the first place for the Vice President to restrict his visiting time in the Soviet Union to the Russian nation. In reality he did not tour the Soviet Union as claimed because Russia is not the Soviet Union, it is but one of the nations of the Soviet Union. This neglect of the majority peoples of the Soviet Union reduced the political impact of Public Law 86–90 and compounded the serious error of equating Russia with the Soviet Union. On the other hand it would have been an act of political wisdom and statesmanship if the Vice President had under these circumstances demanded a revision of his itinerary to allow for visits to several captive, non-Russian nations. The Khrushchev reaction to the Captive Nations Week resolution should have made this course of action self-evident. Here was a golden opportunity for the Vice President to publicly reject the Russian demands for status quo by officially assuring our proven allies in the captive non-Russian nations that the United States would never recognize the finality of their captivity. Lost opportunities such as this, where a logical followthrough was called for, are characteristic of the failure to understand the nature of the threat we face and a timid reluctance to use power of our political ideals in winning a just peace.

Nevertheless, the noisy and frantic efforts by Khrushchev to discredit Public Law 86–90 were helpful in making all the people of the Russian empire aware of its contents and purposes. The controlled press and other mass media of the empire featured the Khrushchev statements but in so doing gave excellent publicity to the fact that, at long last, we Americans had officially recognized the national independence movements as the most powerful political dynamic behind the Iron Curtain. In a very real sense the deep-rooted fears of the ruling class in Moscow were so aroused that they inadvertently violated their first rule of propaganda, which is, never to publicize the explosive political ideals of free men. Communist organs in the free world took the line from Moscow and gave additional propagation to the "Captive Nations" concepts of the public law. It is no exaggeration to estimate that Russian Imperial Communism suffered a severe net loss as a consequence of these initial reactions, based upon deep-rooted fears that the United States was about to stimulate the explosive dynamics of the national independence movements within the empire. The new aristocracy, the new elite class can never forget it was the national independence movements which contributed to the collapse of the Russian Empire of the Czars in 1917, that the national independence movements would have disintegrated the U.S.S.R. during World War II but for the racial policies and imperial intentions of the Nazis. Freedom riots in East Germany in 1953, in Poland during 1956, and the all-out efforts by the Hungarians to regain their national independence in 1956 serve to remind the Russians that they are sitting on a human powder keg many times more powerful than intercontinental missiles and hydrogen bombs.

The initial reaction of the Russian leaders to Public Law 86–90 was too useful to the cause of free men to expect them to continue it for very long. Their tactics have now shifted to a reliance on polemics as a means of propagating "Russian truths" with respect to the captive, non-Russian nations. Khrushchev laid down the new line in his propaganda article which appeared in the October 1959 issue of Foreign Affairs under the title of "On Peaceful Coexistence." Here Khrushchev introduces the techniques of confusion, false comparison and distortion of the language of the law. For example, he charges the law contemplates "rolling back communism" which language is not included in the law, nor does the language of the law express this intent. In fact, the law expresses the opposite conviction. Rather than the concept of "roll back" which carries overtones of a hot war the law recognizes the practical prospects of spontaneous, internal political explosions on a scale which can end the cold war and bring peace with justice to all humanity. Political realism dictates that we recognize the possibilities of a chain reaction should another full blown revolution break out anywhere within the empire. This almost happened during the Hungarian revolution as the Poles, Ukrainians and Slovaks demonstrated a restiveness which alarmed the Russians. Had the U.S. Government and other free world nations given any support, even political, to the Hungarians it is entirely possible the chain reaction of revolutions would have resulted. Once this chain reaction gets underway there will be no stopping it. The Red army will be of little use in these circumstances, it is multinational and as such will prove unreliable. The Hungarian revolution proved this basic Red army vulnerability as the non-Russians in it, particularly the Ukrainians, quickly went over to the side of the Hungarians, taking tanks, guns and ammunition with them.

There are not enough Russians in the Empire to hold it together in the face of internal revolutions reaching from the Baltic to the Caspian Seas. Dependable estimates on the number of Russians in the Empire range from 70 to 90 million but the more realistic figure is in the neighborhood of 70 million. World War II losses among the Russians were exceedingly heavy due to the fact the non-Russians refused to fight in support of communism. The latest population figure on the Soviet Union is 207 million, which means the non-Russians number not less than 117 and more likely 137 million. Added to this are some 90 million non-Russians in the more recently occupied nations of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, and East Germany. One can readily understand how unpleasant it must be for the Russian aristocracy to contemplate the prospects of over 200 million non-Russians rising up in revolt, demanding their national independence. It is this haunting specter which causes Khrushchev and company to demand that the free world recognize a status quo, that is, to cause the people of the free world to join with the Russians in an all-out effort to preserve their prison of non-Russian nations.

Khrushchev resorted to the old trick of false comparison in his article which appeared in Foreign Affairs when he asked how Congress would react if the Mexican Parliament called for the "liberation" of Texas, Arizona, and California. Obviously he sought to compare favorably the status of the non-Russian nations of the U.S.S.R., with these States. There are absolutely no grounds for valid comparison. To begin with the people of Texas, Arizona, and California consider themselves as free, self-governing and loyal Americans. The people of Ukraine, Latvia and Armenia, for example, do not consider themselves as free or self-governing and to call them Russians, loyal or disloyal, would be a grave insult to their national heritage. If there is a national independence movement underway in Texas, California, or Arizona this is the best kept secret of the century. On the other hand it is a matter of common knowledge that the national independence movement is gaining momentum in every non-Russian nation behind the Iron Curtain. No one can deny that the people of Texas, Arizona, and California have full, popular representation in the Federal Government, unless they have never heard that a rugged Texan named Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON is the majority leader of the Senate, and another son of Texas, SAM RAYBURN, is Speaker of the House, that a revered Senator named CARL HAYDEN from Arizona, has long been a powerful voice in our national affairs, or for that matter that Vice President NIXON is a native of California. No rational individual may claim that the people of Lithuania, Byelorussia, Estonia, Cossackia, and Idel-Ural, for example, have a representative voice in the affairs of the Russian Presidium or the Communist Party. These are but a few of the many pertinent comparisons which could be made if space permitted.

Khrushchev also claims that the Soviet People consider the passage of the Captive Nations Week Resolution by Congress as an act of provocation. Now, just who are the "Soviet People?" If such people do exist it is pertinent to ask, how and when did Khrushchev test public opinion on this vital issue? The fact is, however, that the false concept of "Soviet People" was created by the new ruling class as a means of disguising the realities of life within their empire. Khrushchev and company would like the people of the free world to believe that communism had purged the 207 million peoples of the Soviet Union of their ethnic diversity, of their respective native languages, of their individuality, of their centuries-long customs, traditions and aspirations. Such a distortion of reality would create the mirage of a homogeneous people, a united people working harmoniously and enthusiastically for the goals of communism. What communism has in reality failed to accomplish during forty some years of organized terror and oppression Khrushchev now seeks to hide under a propaganda rug labeled "Soviet People." The people of the captive, non-Russian nations of the Soviet Union would consider it an act of grave hostility if we referred to them as "Soviet People." So too would the Russian people because their national characteristics and aspirations have not changed during the course of the past two centuries and they are proud to be called Russians. At the time of Stalin's death in 1953 the triumvirate of Malenkov, Beria and Molotov took great pains in the funeral orations to distinguish the Russian people as the "superior people" of the Soviet Union, the people upon whom the government and Communist Party could always count for loyal support. The so-called Council of Nationalities which is part of the Government apparatus but which exercises no power is additional proof that the Kremlin is compelled to recognize the multinational character of the empire. So it is clear that Khrushchev seeks to create confusion when he makes reference to the existence of a "Soviet People."

The Captive Nations Week Resolution has also provoked a negative reaction from some Russian activists living in the United States. This was to be expected because there are covert individuals and organizations at work in our country for the preservation of the Russian empire no matter what form of government is in control of it. Some have no quarrel whatever with the present regime,

some would prefer a monarchy to the Communist Party, some would prefer more individual freedom for all the peoples of the Soviet Union but all have one thing in common—a determination to preserve the Russian empire no matter what the consequences may be.

The most articulate Russians living abroad who pose as spokesmen for the Russian emigration consider the national independence movement behind the Iron Curtain as a frightful heresy, as an invention of Hitler and the antithesis of everything Russian. It is a well-known fact that a harsh ideological discipline is exercised over many Russians living abroad which explains this unnatural state of affairs. This discipline is by no means exclusively Communist because doctrinaire groups of non-Communist Russians follow the same line as Khrushchev with respect to the non-Russian nations of the Soviet Union. Where Khrushchev regards the population of the U.S.S.R. as Soviet people, the doctrinaire Russians in the free world consider everyone in the U.S.S.R. as a Russian, more or less. Both points of view are imperialistic, seeking to conceal the true identity of the peoples of the submerged nations who are no more Russian than was Patrick Henry.

It is a startling fact that there is not one organization or committee in the United States or elsewhere in the free world working for the national independence of the Russian nation. On the other hand every captive non-Russian nation of the Soviet Union has at least one national organization or committee in the United States working in support of its national independence. Similar committees are established in Canada, Great Britain, France, Italy, Germany, Turkey, Indonesia, and other free countries. The obvious conclusion is that Russians on both sides of the Iron Curtain are unmoved at a time in history when the powerful human appeal of the national independence movement has changed the political complexion of South and Southeast Asia, the Middle-East and Africa. Subjugated people everywhere are demanding their national independence, viewing this course as the road to individual liberty, progress and human dignity. Great empires have collapsed before the tidal wave impact of this movement. Nor has the dynamics of this movement spent its full power against the resistance to change in the non-self-governing areas of the free world. Hard won victories have strengthened its forward motion to the point where cold logic requires us to recognize it as the wave of the future. It is only a matter of time before the remaining remnants of imperialism in the free world will give way to the popular demands for self-government. One fact of mid-twentieth century life must be clear to all responsible statesmen. That is, the alternative to granting genuine self-government to non-self-governing people is the use of armed force. Those who resort to this alternative have found that the results do more to strengthen the solidarity of the non-self-governing people than anything their leaders could possibly do in this direction. For every martyr in the cause there are hundreds of new political activists created. In these circumstances armed force is a weapon of tyranny and the answer of mankind to tyranny has invariably been revolt.

It would be a grave error to assume that the non-self-governing people behind the Iron Curtain, that is the people of the captive non-Russian nations, have been immunized from these rapidly moving political developments in the free world. No Iron Curtain, no power of the police state is able to seal out or filter great ideals or political movements, particularly those which now grip two-thirds of the population of the earth. These ideals find a fertile ground in all the captive, non-Russian nations behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains because historical developments in all these nations have been moving steadily in the same direction. This historical process has been slowed down by czars and commissars but it cannot be disrupted or diverted from its course.

Articulate Russians in the free world, particularly in the United States, seem unwilling or unable to grasp the significance of these worldwide trends. They see the Russian Empire, whether it be the Soviet Union or some other forced and unnatural political arrangement of the Eurasian Continent, as divorced from the rest of the world, perhaps another world, and certainly not subject to the deep political reformation taking place in our world. Herein lies a great human tragedy for Russians on both sides of the Iron Curtain. It has been the ages-long role of émigrés from tyranny and oppression to work and sacrifice, in the countries of their adoption, for the emancipation of the people in the homeland, for the removal of both persons and systems which nourish tyranny, human degradation and suffering.

The Polish, Lithuanian, Armenian, and other émigrés living in the free world during the course of World War I played a major role in securing support for the national independence movements in their homelands, resulting in the national emancipation of these nations from the yoke of the old imperialism. Meanwhile Russians in the free world, that is, White Russians, were working and fighting for the restoration of the Czarist Russian Empire, thus preparing the way for the new imperialism of the Russian Bolsheviks. Now some 40 years later we find this same peculiar state of mind exists among the émigré Russians, even those who recently came to our shores, based upon the statements, charges, and writings of the articulate among them. The real victims of this political sterility among the émigré Russians are the Russian people behind the Iron Curtain. It is little wonder then that the Russian nation has failed to produce a national patriot, that imperial-minded tyrants have been able to employ the Russian people as tools in their schemes and that the Russian people have failed to undertake one, single uprising against the Communist regime during the past 40 years. In the absence of political stimulation from their compatriots in the free world, stimulation which is compatible with the hopes and aspirations of free people, it would be both unfair and unrealistic to expect the Russian people to oppose the Red imperial regime. Having had no experience with freedom and self-government as we know it, the Russian people should not be condemned for failure to demonstrate a strong yearning for their national independence. The Russian émigrés who have lived in and enjoyed the benefits of our free, open society, who have seen first-hand the full meaning of national independence, cannot be excused lightly for their failure to advocate national independence for the Russian people. Prudence requires a careful examination of the causes which impel the Russian émigrés to pursue a course of action which spells certain disaster for the Russian nation and grave consequences for the rest of humanity.

Turning to the reaction by Russian émigrés to Public Law 86–90 we find an abundance of evidence reflecting the political sterility of their thinking. The views made public in both the English and Russian languages can be broken down into these main categories:

(1) That Public Law 86–90 is the handiwork of skilled Nazi agents operating in the United States and holding a powerful influence over the Senate and House of Representatives. To support this charge it is claimed that many of the captive nations named in the law were nothing more than creations of Hitler's propaganda machine. Cossackia and Idel-Ural were singled out for special treatment as nonexisting nations.

The facts: All the nations named in the law as captives established their national independence during the period of 1917–18 or before. Concerning those nations which established their national independence during the period 1917–18, which seem to be more at issue than the others, documentary evidence on all may be found in two official sources: (a) the Reports of the Select Committee To Investigate Communist Aggression, 83d Congress, and, (b) Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States with Russia (1918), three volumes published by the Government in 1931.

Comment: Hitler and nazism were unheard of until the 1930's, making it difficult to understand how his propaganda machine could have been responsible for events of the 1917–18 period. It is understandable why official Russian history seeks to conceal the true identity of these submerged nations but we are not Russians nor are we subject to control by Russians. The official records of the U.S. Government are a far more reliable source on political questions relating to the Russian Empire. Such charges as Nazi agent influence on Congress are also a good example of "Russian truths," so well known to the natives of central-east Europe.

(2) That Congress indulged in racism by enacting Public Law 86–90. To support this charge it is claimed that some of the nations included in the law are primitive, tribal groups who lack national identity and having been under Russian domination so long must now be considered as Russians. The racism angle is developed in the context of inciting primitive, tribal groups to think they are not Russians.

The facts: In no manner, directly or indirectly, is racism referred to in the law. On the contrary the law is a sharp indictment of racism and those who attempt to impose their racial superiority theories and beliefs upon others. All the law does is identify clearly established nations which are held captive by Russian Communist imperialism.

Comment: It appears that on the basis of "Russian truths," to recognize the true identity and aspirations of any submerged people is to engage in racism. This is typical of the upside-down thinking which is so characteristic of Communist propaganda. It will be a sad day when free Americans hesitate to see oppressed people in their true lights for fear of being charged with racism.

(3) That Public Law 86–90 has for its objective the dismemberment of Russia and as such is an unfriendly act toward all Russians. To support this charge two claims are made. The first is that many non-Russian people do not want to be separated from "Mother Russia." The second is that any suggestion that the present geography of the U.S.S.R. is subject to revision will stiffen the support of the Russian people behind the Communist regime.

The facts: The law expresses no intent to dismember Russia. On the contrary the Russian nation as such is not even mentioned in the law. There is no reliable evidence to support a contention that it is "captive" and it could not in truth be so recognized. The logical assumption involved in this omission is that Congress studiously avoided any action which could be construed as interference in the internal affairs of the Russian nation.

Comment: In examining this charge a distinction between the Russian nation and the Russian Empire is imperative. Whereas the law recognizes the right of the non-Russian people to freely choose a national life to their own liking, it provides likewise for the Russian people. Here the basic question of the national independence movements in the

captive, non-Russian nations comes into proper focus. It is clear that the very nature of these independence movements herald the dismemberment of the Russian Empire. The political concept of national independence is the antithesis of the political concepts of empire and all forms of imperialism. Moreover, this historical process will eventually bring a form of national independence to the Russian nation. As the captive non-Russian nations emerge into national independence and freedom, separating their destinies from the present forced relationships with Moscow, the national frontiers of the Russian nation will be secured and the Russian people can live as they please behind those frontiers.

As to the claim that many non-Russian people do not want to be separated from "Mother Russia," it is pertinent to raise the question: "Why get so inflamed about Public Law 86-90 if this claim is true?" History teaches us that national independence movements are based upon the will of the people involved—if they don't want their political independence they won't fight for it. In this connection it should be noted that a political smokescreen has been organized by Russian activists and their collaborators called the "Federalists." This is a group of alleged non-Russians who want to preserve the Russian Empire through a vague system of federal union. Investigation has revealed that most of the members of this group are Russians, along with a handful of non-Russian opportunists, concerning whom a strong suspicion exists that they receive financial rewards for use of their names. This enterprise serves as a reliable barometer of the strength behind the national independence movements as the emigre Russians would not go to the trouble and expense involved in the "federalist" adventure unless a disruptive counteraction was sorely needed.

As to the second claim, the effect of which is that unless we accept the present geography of the U.S.S.R. as unchangeable the Russian people will stiffen their support of the Communist regime, a number of timely questions must be raised. The first is, should the American people desert their political and moral ideals in exchange for a dubious hope that the Russian people will be too strong in their support of the regime? What about the majority peoples of the Soviet Union, the non-Russians—how will they feel toward us if we turn our backs on their legitimate aspirations for national independence? Will bowing to the imperial sensitivities of the Russian people, which the emigres now claim they have, drive the captive non-Russian people into the hands of the enemy? In truth, can anyone claim that the ordinary Russian people would object to actions taken by the people of the captive, non-Russian nations which would lift from their backs the twin burdens of communism and imperialism?

(4) That Public Law 86-90 is essentially an anti-Russian law, an act intended to inflame the American people against the Russian people. This charge is based upon a claim that the United States has no right to blame the Russian people for the many Communist crimes against humanity, or for Communist aggressive policies of world conquest.

The facts: In no manner does the law blame the Russian people, as such, for either Communist crimes against humanity or Communist schemes directed toward world conquest. The law simply recognizes that the struggle of the peoples of the captive non-Russian nations of the U.S.S.R. central Europe and Asia for their national independence, liberties, and freedoms constitutes a powerful deterrent to war and one of the best hopes for a just peace. Common sense dictates that so long as these captive peoples are pulling in the opposite direction to that pursued by the Russian Communist leadership the dangers of war are reduced and the hopes for a just peace increased. No dictator, Communist or otherwise, can launch a successful war under conditions wherein the vast majority of the peoples under his control will seize upon the internal conditions war creates to destroy the very system which supports the dictator. This is as true today as it was 20 years ago, despite intercontinental missiles and hydrogen warheads, because in the final analysis wars are won or lost by people.

Comment: There is a tendency among the Russian emigration to give credit to the Russian people for everything behind the Iron Curtain which does not offend the conscience of civilized people and to disclaim Russian responsibility for all that is evil or offensive to free people. Frequently an effort is made to put all the blame of communism on the non-Russian peoples of the empire. They remind you Stalin and Beria were Georgians and Mikoyan is an Armenian. They forget that Lenin, Molotov, Malenkov, Suslov, Bulganin, Zhukov, Gromyko, and Khrushchev, just to name a few of the real leaders, are all solid Russian products. Over a century ago a French visitor to the Russian Empire, Marquis de Custine, was warned as he was about to depart for home that he should speak no evil about the Russians regardless of the truth of this statement else great calamities would befall him. We in our times are passing through the same experience, unless we praise the Russians, regardless of how untrue such praise may be, we are charged with being anti-Russian. A great loss to the current body of Western knowledge and thought on the Russian character would have occurred if Custine had been driven from the path of truth by threats of dire consequences. No American could display less courage or dedication to truth under the circumstances which prevail today. If being truthful makes us anti-Russian then let us accept the charge as a compliment to our heritage.

These are the reactions, in summary form, of the most articulate among the Russian emigres to enactment of Public Law 86-90. No claim is or can be made that these reactions reflect the thinking of all the Russian émigrés or for that matter a majority of them. In the absence of any positive public reactions to Public Law 86-90, or public objection to the position taken by the articulate Russian émigrés, the entire Russian emigration stands in the shadow of doubt created by those who represent themselves as the leaders. This is a situation which should bring forth the enlightened and realistic elements in the emigration, those who have grown weary of the constant embarrassments caused by the reactionary but articulate elements. Those among us who wish only the best for the Russian nation and people in the future would welcome the support of responsible individuals and groups in the Russian emigration.

Meanwhile, thought should be given to steps which could be taken to fill the gap in the ranks of the national independence movement by the failure of the Russian emigration to produce such leadership. Solidarity of purpose is the keynote of this movement and this solidarity could be strengthened by the cooperation of our Russian friends in the emigration. Therefore, consideration should be given to the establishment of an "American Committee for the National Independence of Russia." This would undoubtedly require initiative by well informed Americans to get the committee organized and functioning. With time, enlightened and responsible emigre Russians would gravitate to the committee and become active in its work. Eventually this committee would emerge as the true voice of the Russian people, working hand in hand with the national committees supporting the independence movements in the non-Russian nations behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains. Thus a vital unity of purposes would be welded in a critical area of international political affairs which is now beset by confusion, uncertainty, and imperial mischiefmakers. The attainment of this goal of unity presents a real challenge to all thinking Americans. An American Committee for the National Independence of Russia therefore merits serious consideration.

MINIMUM WAGE BILL

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to offer my praise to the Members on both sides of the aisle in upholding the conferees on the minimum wage bill that we had up. We did not acquiesce with the Senate, and I think the people of America will approve it.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1526. An act for the relief of F. P. Tower, Lillie B. Lewis, the estate of Manuel Branco, John Santos Carinhas, Joaquin Gomez Carinhas, and Manuel Jesus Carinhas;

H.R. 3536. An act for the relief of Guadalupe Villarreal, Jr.;

H.R. 7810. An act to credit periods of internment during World War II to certain Federal employees of Japanese ancestry for purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act and the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951;

H.R. 8166. An act for the relief of the Crum-McKinnon Building Co., Billings, Mont.;

H.R. 9715. An act for the relief of Otis Drinkard;

H.R. 10341. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants-in-aid to universities, hospitals, laboratories, and other public or nonprofit institutions to strengthen their programs of research and research training in sciences related to health;

H.R. 10586. An act to enable the Oregon Short Line Railroad Co. to convey title to certain lands in Idaho to the Pocatello First Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints;

H.R. 10841. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to place bamboo pipe stems on the free list;

H.R. 11322. An act for the relief of Col. Joseph A. Nichols;

H.R. 11380. An act for the relief of Mr. Joe J. Farmer;

H.R. 12458. An act to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for the work of the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped;

H.R. 12699. An act to cancel a deed of trust to the United States from the predecessor in name of Gallaudet College and any evidence of indebtedness related to the same transaction, to quiet the college's title to property belonging to it, and for other purposes;

H.R. 13021. An act to provide for assistance in the development of Latin America and in the reconstruction of Chile, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 723. Joint resolution extending an invitation to the Federation Aeronautique Internationale to hold the 1962 world sport parachuting championships at Orange, Mass.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in

which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 383. An act to authorize the annexation of certain real property of the United States by the city of Wyandotte, Mich.;

H.R. 5132. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, with respect to active duty agreements for Reserve officers, and for other purposes;

H.R. 10548. An act to amend the Helium Act of September 1, 1937, as amended, for the defense, security, and the general welfare of the United States; and

H.R. 12759. An act to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 3846. An act to establish a National Armed Forces Museum Advisory Board of the Smithsonian Institution, to authorize expansion of the Smithsonian Institution's facilities for portraying the contributions of the Armed Forces of the United States, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1545. An act to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so as to authorize elimination of a hearing in certain cases under section 408;

S. 1740. An act to amend section 202(b) of the Communications Act of 1934, in order to expand the Federal Communications Commission's regulatory authority under such section;

S. 1764. An act to amend title 32, United States Code, to authorize the payment of certain claims against the National Guard;

S. 1964. An act to amend the act requiring certain common carriers by railroad to make reports to the Interstate Commerce Commission with respect to certain accidents in order to clarify the requirements of such act; and

S. 3533. An act to protect farm and ranch operators making certain land use changes under the Great Plains conservation program against loss of acreage allotments.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2565) entitled "An act to promote effectual planning, development, maintenance, and coordination of wildlife, fish, and game conservation and rehabilitation in military reservations."

THE INFORMED CITIZEN WILL RULE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the 86th Congress will adjourn this week. Since it convened a year ago last January, this Congress has legislated on highly important problems, both domestic and international. It can boast of some great accomplishments and unfortunately must answer to the people for a number of major legislative omissions and failures.

The American people are entitled to know the true facts concerning our present economic situation and our international problems if they are to make an intelligent decision on the course we should follow in the future.

A prosperous and expanding economy is absolutely necessary if our Nation keeps pace with its annual increase in population. Steel production is the No. 1 example of industry, generally. When the 4 months' strike terminated last November, the industry started to operate at 96 percent of capacity. The backlog and new orders were completed and the industry was back to normal in 3 months. Employment in steel has diminished monthly since last March. Reports now indicate the administration will order a speedup on defense orders. New car production will stockpile for the next 2 months to increase employment so as to restore confidence and optimism before the presidential election on November 8.

The true facts are that almost one-fifth of America's capacity to produce is now idle. The number of unemployed is about 5 percent of the labor force and an additional 2,500,000 workers are compelled to work part time because full-time jobs are not available. The head of a family who works part time is out of the purchasing market. Food, rent, clothing, and other of life's bare necessities consume his part-time check.

VETO AND THREATS TO VETO

There must be a large increase in our economic growth and production to meet our national needs. From 1947 to 1953—Truman administration—our average annual rate of economic growth was 4.7 percent. In contrast, from 1953 through 1959—Eisenhower administration—our average annual economic growth was reduced to 2.3 annually.

Republican leaders in Congress and the threat of Presidential veto have defeated or blocked numerous legislative programs. These projects if enacted into law would have restored full employment, purchasing power and prosperity to millions. Several billion dollars in additional Federal income tax would have enriched our U.S. Treasury. This additional industrial production would have given employment to many now unemployed or working part time.

These legislative programs were blocked or defeated by veto or threat of veto with the aid of Republican votes and some reactionary Democrats; to wit:

First. A practical farm program.

Second. Housing program.

Third. Flood control and natural resources projects.

Fourth. School construction programs for all American schoolchildren.

Fifth. Distressed area legislation.

Sixth. A highway construction program which is unhampered and inefficient.

Seventh. The Small Business Administration has been crippled by Executive appointments. Thousands of loan applications have been rejected by an unsympathetic Commission.

Eighth. Antistream and lake pollution projects.

Ninth. White House opposition curtailed an adequate old-age medical plan and threat of veto defeated adequate minimum wage legislation.

HIGH INTEREST—TIGHT-MONEY POLICY

One of the main reasons for lack of buying power by millions has been the high interest rate and tight-money policy started in March 1953 by former Secretary of the Treasury, George Humphrey. Billions of dollars have been siphoned from the consuming public throughout the Nation by the administration's high interest gouge. This includes the American farmer as well as the working men and women in the cities and towns. It has increased the interest burden on our $288 billion indebtedness as well as on all National, State, county, municipal, and township bonds. This is an example of the siphoning process that resolves to the benefit of the bankers, insurance companies, and money lenders. High interest rates increase all prices. They saddle an additional burden on the cost of raising a family, buying a house, automobile, household appliances, and the cost of capital to conduct a small business. Since the Eisenhower-Nixon administration has been in power, the cost of living has been on a steady upturn.

HIGH COST OF LIVING

The consumers of America too often hear the sad news from Washington that the cost of living has again risen. In 1957 and 1958, the cost of living ascended the scale each month for 17 consecutive months. When Members of Congress made efforts to investigate the reason for this inexcusable profiteering and rise in the cost of living, we were met with opposition from the White House advisers and the Eisenhower leadership in both Houses of Congress. Former Secretary Douglas McKay who was in the President's original Cabinet, speaking to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce convention in 1953, said and I quote:

Big business is now in the saddle.

AGRICULTURE

I do not need to remind the farmers of Indiana that their income and their economy started on the skids and declined immediately after the special interest groups succeeded in appointing Ezra Taft Benson as Secretary of Agriculture. Under the Roosevelt and Truman administrations, the farmer's prosperity was recognized as the major essential to maintain national prosperity. Under Eisenhower and Benson, the farmer soon discovered that the treadmill of rising costs and falling prices was leading to the complete bankruptcy of the small farmer throughout the country. Several bills have been passed by the Congress that would greatly benefit the small farmers of the Nation, but the Benson influence at the White House was effective in defeating or obtaining a veto of this legislation. The farmers of America cannot be prosperous when the agriculture policies of the U.S. Government are determined by food processors and speculators. They are succeeding in "farming the farmer" as in the regrettable days of 1921 to 1930. Several years ago, one of Secretary Benson's firstline assistants said that too many people are trying to farm who do

not understand the complex problems of agriculture. His inference was that they should leave the farms so that eventually our farm economy would be concentrated in expert farm organizations under the ownership of large corporate farm-owners. When millions of farmers have ample purchasing power for automobiles, tractors, machinery, and other products, it soon reflects in factories and retail stores in cities and towns.

LABOR

One of the several unfortunate provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act gave States the right to supersede Federal law if State labor laws were in conflict. Since 1948, thousands of companies have closed their factories or industries and moved to low-wage States, especially in the South. Many new industries have located in these low-wage areas. The textile industry has almost abandoned the Eastern States and moved to the low-wage areas. Indiana has lost hundreds of old and new industries by reason of this low-wage "quirk"—section 14B in the Taft-Hartley law.

The American economy in the last session was rendered another crippling blow by the enactment of the Landrum-Griffin Act which turns back to the States control over vast areas of labor now covered by the Federal act. This in most States will destroy the fundamental protection of the worker's right to organize and bargain collectively. The present National Labor Relations Board is another example of repeal by appointment. Under the Eisenhower administration, this quasi-judicial agency has postponed and delayed numerous union cases and displayed extreme partiality to management. Several appointees to the board and to the post of General Counsel have come directly from the ranks of employer lawyers or labor-relation consultants.

The Landrum-Griffin bill is a union-labor destroying piece of legislation. It provides many expensive and nonessential mandates. For example:

Fifteen days prior to each union election, notice thereof must be mailed to each member at his last known address. This procedure is very expensive and serves no useful purpose.

Secret ballot even though the office is uncontested—another costly and useless procedure.

And, the union must obtain bonds for corporate surety approved by the Secretary of the Treasury. This gives a "bond fee bonanza" for certain privileged bonding and insurance companies.

Other useless provisions are intended to drain the union's treasury. The act has other conflicting procedures, such as, civil suits against unions in Federal courts by the Secretary of Labor, and, private individual members can be sued in State courts.

RIGHT-TO-WORK LAW

The voters in Indiana, Ohio, California, and other areas spoke with overwhelming majorities November 1958 against the antilabor laws like the phony named right-to-work legislation. In the 1959 Indiana legislature the Governor and Republican legislators succeeded in rejecting the voters' mandate.

Provision 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act sets out the only instance in our history where a Federal law provides that a State law shall be superior when each is in conflict. This provision was enacted by the antilabor forces so that low-wage States could shackle unions and pass so-called right-to-work laws. Thus in 19 right-to-work States workmen were denied protection against laws curbing labor unions and bargaining rights. Federal laws should not promote economic competition between States but instead should bring about national unity. Right-to-work laws passed in Indiana and other States, in general, curb internal operations of unions, curtail the right to strike, restrict picketing, limit labor management agreements, limit land and property leasing and purchasing by unions regardless of need, and contain other shackling limitations.

The Kansas Attorney General and Supreme Court in 1958, labeled the slogan of "right to work" is in itself a fraud. Heads of numerous industries have spoken out against the so-called right-to-work laws and I will quote a few:

The Southern Coal Producers Association head, Joseph E. Moody, told a New York panel:

> The best interests of the employers are served by strong, secure union leaders. The open shop could weaken that position.

John Snyder, head of U.S. Industries, Inc., declared:

> As an employer, I am firmly opposed to any so-called right-to-work law.

Missilemaker Dan Kimball, formerly Secretary of the Navy, and now head of Aerojet-General Corp., has stated:

> Right to work is bad for the employee, for the employer, and for the State—I am against it.

In the area of management, I have had a great industrialist say to me in a discussion of right-to-work laws:

> In steel we have great and well publicized differences with the union; but if unions did not exist we would have to invent them, for there is no way to deal with the great masses of persons, we employ. The only way in which unions can do a responsible job is for the unions themselves to be secure in their existence.

Numerous churches and church organizations have gone on record opposing the so-called right-to-work law, to mention a few: The National Council of Churches of Christ in the United States representing 38 million church members, and the 171st general assembly of the United Presbyterian Church; and also, the Board of Social and Economic Relations of the Methodist Church stated:

> Such laws are miscalled right-to-work laws since they do not oblige anyone to give an individual a job. Their real menace lies, however, in denying by law the possibility of increasing the quality of human freedom.

The Rabbinical Council of America holds that the so-called right-to-work laws are a camouflage, a gimmick to unionism.

The preponderance of Catholic Church opinion has spoken against these anti-bargaining laws. The Reverend Benjamin Masse, S.J., stated:

> The overwhelming majority of Catholics justify the union shop in theory and practice and oppose the present campaign to outlaw it.

Unfortunately, the State of Indiana is the only major industrial State whose legislators and Governor permitted these so-called right-to-work laws on our statute books.

I firmly believe that the great number of employers and employees in the Hoosier State will arouse this fall and elect legislators who will repeal this law in the 1961 session.

CIVIL RIGHTS

During the last dozen years, the Congress has made remarkable progress on civil rights legislation. In the 85th Congress, we passed the first civil rights bill in 82 years; in this session we made further progress. The Eisenhower-Nixon leadership in this field has been talkative but very slow on action. Any law to be effective must have enforcement in the executive department. Practical enforcement of the 1957 law would have avoided the unfortunate incident at Little Rock, Ark.

LABOR AND COMMUNISM

The American voters should realize that our taxpayers are spending billions each year to fight the cold war and curtail communism. After World War II, international Communist leaders concentrated on controlling American labor. It was great Americans like Phil Murray, William Green, George Meany, Walter Reuther, Dave McDonald, George Harrison, and other leaders who saved American labor from this Communist conspiracy. These labor leaders have also successfully spearheaded the drive to oust dishonest and racketeering officials from the labor movement. These men realize that an elected labor official is in conscience bound to exercise the same diligence and trust to union members as a public official owes to his constituents. These American labor leaders personally supervised, over the years, a program to help union labor in the free European nations to successfully resist the Soviets from taking over labor in these areas. For several years after World War II delegations from American labor unions have spent many months in these countries aiding in this fight against communism. The American people should realize that our greatest protection against Communist infiltration in their efforts to sabotage our economy is free and unhampered union labor in America. Lenin, years ago, stated that the most fertile field for Communist expansion and control was in the field of labor unions and the schools.

OLD-AGE MEDICAL CARE

Millions of our pioneer citizens can thank Senator KENNEDY and Senator JOHNSON, and the vast majority of Democratic Members of Congress for arousing public opinion on medical and hospital aid to the aged. Republican

congressional leaders supported legislation of this type only when forced by the vast majority of the American people. The White House threat of veto was the main reason for the failure of an even more extended medical bill for our older folks. In the last 7½ years, it has been demonstrated that the power of the President can spell success or defeat for legislation of this nature when it is considered in Congress. The failure of ample wage and coverage in the minimum wage legislation is an example.

OUR GREAT HIGHWAY BUNGLE

The above is a subtitle for a news story on page 45 of the July 1960 Reader's Digest. This article should be read by all taxpayers and unemployed workers because it partly explains our stagnant economy. The Congress passed the $31 billion national highway construction project almost 4 years ago. The Eisenhower brain trusters have curtailed and stalled this necessary undertaking so successfully that after 4 years, it is relatively not much further than the blueprint stage.

We in Indiana know of the graft, racketeering, and inefficiency identified with the project in the State. The Readers Digest article tells the facts in detail why it has been a gigantic bungle in Indiana and other States. This project should have been operating in full force over 2 years ago. Millions of workers could have found employment not only on the actual construction of highways but steel, cement, brick, excavation, lumber, and all kindred industries throughout the Nation. Imagine the enthusiasm, leadership, and immediate cooperation Presidents Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry Truman would have applied to a mammoth project of this type.

FISCAL IRRESPONSIBILITY

When Candidates Eisenhower and NIXON were campaigning for office, they made many promises to the American people. Let us examine some of the discrepancies between word and deed. In 1952 Candidate Eisenhower promised to reduce taxes.

PERFORMANCE

The Library of Congress Research Department estimates this administration has collected 515 billion 727 million dollars in taxes, and that is almost as much money as all other Presidents from Washington to Truman combined, collected in taxes. Those 32 other Presidents collected a total of 586 billion 112 million dollars.

In 1952 and 1956 Candidates Eisenhower and NIXON promised to reduce Government expenditures.

To date this administration has spent more money than any other administration in the history of our country. The latest compilation shows that this administration has spent 533 billion 8 million dollars, and the Library of Congress estimates that by the end of this year, this figure will reach $579 billion. Truman spent $360 billion in 8 years, and Roosevelt spent $374 billion in 12 years, including cost of World War II. A Democratic Congress has cut the President's budget requests each session; at the present time, our cuts total $24.3 billion in 8 years.

He also promised to balance the budget:

The administration's total deficit now stands at $18¼ billion.

He also promised to reduce the national debt:

Since this administration has been in power, the national debt has increased from $266 to $288 billion.

REPUBLICANS ECONOMIZE AT EXPENSE OF PUBLIC INTEREST

This administration talks long and loud about economy when matters of benefit to the general public are involved. The White House tried to cut or defeat the vocational education program, funds for schools in federally impacted areas, medical research, Pure Food and Drug Administration, water pollution control, rural library service, housing, school construction, distressed areas, and flood control. On the other hand, when it comes to matters which benefit the privileged few, this administration has been anything but economical. The American people have spent $10 billion more for interest under the Eisenhower administration than they did under Truman's, and will be spending $13 billion more this year for interest on public debt than during the last year of Truman's administration. Those sums of money would more than pay for all the programs for the people which this administration calls extravagant. Recently, the administration tried for another increase in interest rates, but the Democratic Congress rejected the request. When it comes to waste in foreign aid and military procurement, economy goes out the window. Of course, waste in those areas benefits big industry, business, and the moneylenders. Indeed, it is ironical that a President who campaigned on a platform of economy should prove to have the most wasteful and extravagant administration in the history of our country.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Our unfortunate experiences during the last 7½ years in both hemispheres cannot be listed in one speech. We will read and hear volumes of political propaganda in the next 2 months in an effort to justify the Eisenhower-Nixon foreign policy. We have had political diplomacy starting with the President's campaign promises in 1952 to free the satellite nations; that was followed by his state of the Union message in January 1953 to unleash Chiang Kai-shek so that he could conquer the Chinese mainland. Americans remember the Aswan Dam fiasco which led up to the Suez Canal sacrifice—our failures and mistakes in countries throughout the world, particularly in South America and Africa, testify to the ineptness of our foreign policy—as of today the Soviet conspiracy has succeeded in taking over numerous countries including the establishing of a beachhead, in Cuba, just 90 miles from our shores.

Most newspapers hailed the Geneva Conference of 4 years ago as an Eisenhower triumph, 2 months later Khrushchev and Bulganin were traveling throughout the Middle East and Asia calling the United States leaders warmongers. Then came Vice President NIXON's unfortunate invitation to Khrushchev to visit our country; he was given the red carpet treatment to use our platforms for his insidious Communist propaganda. The aftermath of this visit was our President being insulted in Paris. Later his invitation to visit Japan was recalled. It is time that the American people became aware of the protecting umbrella spread out by most newspaper publicity and also some television and radio commentators tending to picture our procession of international bungling events as diplomatic victories.

WILL HISTORY REPEAT?

Older citizens recollect the penalty our Nation paid after 12 years of Republican policies in the 1920 period. Former Secretary of the Treasury Andrew Mellon was our economic and fiscal dictator during three Republican administrations. We remember the basic governmental philosophy was to disregard legislation affecting the lower income bracket citizen—legislate abundance to those who need it least. The result was a breakdown of purchasing power from the masses of people, both urban and rural. This led to closed mills, factories, retail stores, banks, farm foreclosures, and bankruptcies.

Those of us who lived through that regrettable period can detect the result of the same governmental policies on the economic horizon that brought disaster to our economy 30 years ago.

THE DEMOCRATS' REPLY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] is recognized for 2 hours.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I have been reading parts of Operation Veracity, and I was rather intrigued by reading the statement of the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. THOMSON], who stated in his discussion, or in one of his discussions, on Operation Veracity that in 4 out of the last 7 years the Democratic controlled Congress has cut the President's budget request for water research and development. He also said the actual cost of converting sea water went down further and faster during the Eisenhower-Nixon administration than during all previous known history. This is a remarkable achievement.

Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasure of serving on the Interior Committee for 4

of the years that I served in the Congress. During the first year that I was on the Interior Committee, the original Saline Water Act was up for renewal. That act, incidentally, passed unanimously. All the Republicans and all the Democrats on the committee supported it. But, I can recall that during that period the then chairman, of the committee, Mr. ENGLE, and the now chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], both chided the administration for the slowness by which they were making progress with the Saline Water Act.

Actually in 1955 it was a Democratic Congress that extended the program to 10 years with a total authorization of $10 million over this period. It was a Republican 83d Congress, with President Eisenhower in the White House, a Republican House and a Republican Senate, that appropriated only $800,000 for this program. That is the amount that was authorized. In three Democratic Congresses since 1954 the President requested $6,424,000 and Congress appropriated $6,555,000. I want to remind the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. THOMSON], that he said:

> In 4 out of the last 7 years the Democratic-controlled Congress has cut the President's budget.

In all those years the Democratic-controlled Congress appropriated as much as or more than the President requested.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. METCALF. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Was that good or bad?

Mr. METCALF. That was good, that was definitely good. This is one of the finest programs that is under way in the United States. We should have appropriated twice as much.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. You mean the Republicans did something good?

Mr. METCALF. The Democrats did something good by appropriating more money than the President requested. And they should have appropriated twice as much and we would have if we had not had opposition from your side of the aisle.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Some of them over here wanted to save that money for foreign aid.

Mr. METCALF. This is a better program than foreign aid.

Mr. Speaker, I should be glad to yield to the gentleman from Wyoming, if he wishes.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I had the feeling that we were getting a little afield. In the first place, I did not look up the total appropriation; I do not know whether the figure is correct, that the President requested $6,400,000 and that the Congress appropriated $6,500,000 in the last 6 years. I assume it is, because of the respect I have for the gentleman from Montana. Even so, all that would prove is that in some years you blow hot and others cold, just like in defense. When Sputnik goes up you appropriate a lot of money and think that that is going to take care of your past errors in cutting the same appropriations. Regardless of that, the statement stands, and it is proven by the gentleman's own words, that the statement in the Democratic platform that the Republicans have tended to scuttle this program is, to state it mildly—I do not want to be too severe—a misstatement of fact.

Mr. METCALF. The statement is accurate and, Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will permit me, I shall ask unanimous consent to put in the RECORD the amount of the appropriations for every year that this program has been in effect.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Does the gentleman from Montana have at his fingertips the statement of the Democratic platform with regard to this?

Mr. METCALF. The statement is:

> We will support and intensify the research effort to find an economical way to convert salt and brackish water.

The Republicans discouraged this research which holds untold possibilities for the whole world. My statement was that back in those days when we passed the second authorizing act, many members of the committee, Democratic members, criticized the administration for doing just this, discouraging this research. My statement was that we have appropriated more money than the President asked for, and that the administration of this program has been discouraged by the people downtown under the White House.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. I think it stands uncontroverted—and that is all I set out to show—that the statement and inference in the Democratic platform, that the Republicans had discouraged this work will not stand the test of close scrutiny. Actually, the Republicans and the Republican administration went forward with a very good program and one that has had good effect. The fact remains that in 4 out of the last 7 years the Democrat-controlled Congress has cut the President's budget requests for this program. The gentleman suggested that the gentleman from Wyoming was on the Interior Subcommittee that considered this appropriation, and that is true. As a matter of fact, I may have supported, and I think I did, some of the modest cuts, because I thought it was a way of encouraging progress, but progress with economy, to the taxpayers' benefit. The last 2 years our subcommittee's action under the chairmanship of the able gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] has been unanimous in this area, I believe. That does not change the fact that the Democrat platform writers indulged in fiction instead of fact, necessitating in the public interest Operation Veracity.

I am not, in my statement, trying to indict the Democratic Congress. But whoever wrote that platform tried to make it look as though the Republicans had dragged their feet and discouraged research and tried to stop it, and when they said that they simply were not staying within the facts, as the gentleman from Montana himself has recited them.

Mr. METCALF. The Republicans have certainly dragged their feet in developing this very important program. I should expect that the gentleman from Wyoming, having formerly been a member of the Interior Committee and very familiar with the program, probably supported it in its entirety in the Appropriations Committee, because he and I both know the value of the program.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. I supported the program.

Mr. METCALF. If the gentleman will let me run along, and if the gentleman from Illinois will yield to me further, I will mention some of the criticisms that have been made of the administration in this program. The gentleman will recall that the man who is in charge of this program is the former chairman of the Interior Committee, an ex-Congressman from Nebraska, who has not been as wholehearted in spending enough money to put this program in operation as he could be. While a great deal of progress has been made in the water program since 1958, the Department of the Interior has been contented with gradual progress and has not regarded the program with the sense of urgency which Congress contends it should have.

I am reading from the report of the Committee on Government Operations, House Report No. 2551, which confirms the statement made in the Democratic platform, the study criticized by the gentleman from Wyoming.

> The Office of Saline Water has not taken full advantage of Federal scientific laboratories to perform research on saline water conversion problems.
>
> It is questionable whether adequate efforts are being made to obtain for the researches within the United States the full benefits which could be obtained from foreign researches.
>
> Private industry is keenly interested in the design and manufacture of desalinization equipment and would undoubtedly respond quickly and positively if encouraged to advance desalinization research, engineering, and plant construction on a large scale.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. From what is the gentleman reading?

Mr. METCALF. I am reading from the 31st report of the Committee on Government Operations, 85th Congress, 2d session, House Report No. 2551. These are the conclusions, and, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to put these in the RECORD at this point at greater length.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Reserving the right to object, just so the record will be clear to the people of the country, we all know and the people of the country should know that the fact is that this Government Operations Committee is controlled by the Democrats in the Congress, the committee membership is 19 Democrats to 11 Republicans, and it is a majority report, and this committee one of the most partisan politically motivated committees in the House of Representatives. It is a self-serving statement of that committee.

Mr. METCALF. If I may renew my request, this report will be put in the RECORD.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. METCALF. If there are any minority views available they can be put in alongside this report, but I did not find any minority views, any criticism by the Republicans of the conclusions made by this subcommittee and adopted by the full Committee on Government Operations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

The material referred to follows:

CONCLUSIONS

1. The demand for water in many areas of the United States is expanding at an enormous rate, and unless these demands are met soon, our Nation is certain to face hardships and economic retardation so severe as to impair our national economy and security.

2. While a good deal of progress has been made in the saline water program since 1952, within the framework prescribed by the limitations of the Saline Water Act, the Department of the Interior has been contented with the gradual progress and has not regarded the program with the sense of urgency which Congress intended it should have. Illustrative of the Department's attitude is the fact that the Department has, in the past 2 years, deferred or cut back admittedly important projects on the ground that the fiscal and other limitations in the Saline Water Act would preclude such work, yet has not recommended modification of those limitations.

3. It does not appear that any desalting process now in being or under development offers promise of overcoming the difficult problems standing in the way of producing fresh water from sea water in large quantities and at costs economically competitive with other sources in most areas. Moreover, these problems are such that their solution will have to be preceded by a dramatic scientific breakthrough. However, the committee has seen no evidence that such a breakthrough is imminent.

4. The economical production of fresh water from saline water is a complex problem, as difficult perhaps as that of developing methods of using atomic energy for economical production of electric power. The committee believes that the importance of the task and the need for new ideas and new techniques to solve the problem will demand all the ingenuity and engineering know-how that can be brought to bear. The committee is convinced that there must be a larger and more sustained effort in both basic research and development of saline water conversion methods than is possible at the present rate of expenditure by Government and industry. The Office of Saline Water must substantially increase its efforts in advancing both basic research and pilot-plant work in the saline water conversion program. Such effort would be facilitated by amendment of the Saline Water Act to eliminate the financial authorization restrictions now present in that act, and by appropriation of sufficient additional sums to enable such work to proceed promptly and without deferment.

5. Localities whose fresh water needs can be met by conversion of saline water often differ greatly in climate, topography, salinity of the available water, quantities of water required, uses for the fresh water, cost or availability of fuel, labor, materials, and so forth. The committee recognizes that no single process now in view is superior to all others at all locations and in all circumstances. The committee therefore agrees with the OSW policy of concurrently investigating and developing as many different processes and methods as possible.

6. Estimates given the committee concerning saline water conversion costs vary widely not only among different processes but also among different methods of the same process. Moreover, the more optimistic cost estimates are either admittedly preliminary or strongly hedged. Also, the fact that the added costs of pumping, transporting, storing, and distributing the water are largely or completely omitted makes it difficult to compare the costs of converted water and of water from natural sources. These cost uncertainties are a major handicap to the committee in attempting to reach firm conclusions about the present state of progress, and reasonable expectations as to future developments, in the saline water program.

7. The Office of Saline Water has not taken full advantage of Federal scientific laboratories to perform research on saline water conversion problems.

8. The Office of Saline Water is substantially understaffed, with resulting excessive workload and impairment of its efficiency and ability to advance the saline-water program as rapidly as Congress intended.

9. The cooperation and coordination which Congress intended should be made in the saline-water program by the Department of the Interior, Department of Defense, and other Federal agencies have not been attained. No joint projects have been initiated and only one cooperative agreement has been executed between the agencies. Although there has been liaison on some projects, it is the opinion of the committee that more could and should have been done in effectuating the cooperation and coordination necessary to mobilize the full resources of the Government in achieving the objectives of the Saline Water Act.

10. Considerable work is being done on saline-water conversion in many countries throughout the world. It is questionable whether adequate efforts are being made to obtain for the researches within the United States the full benefit which could be obtained from foreign researches.

11. The OSW has made some contacts with research groups in various countries. However, it has given very little attention to the possibility of cooperating in saline-water research endeavors or projects with research groups and governmental agencies in the countries of Latin America, several of which have widespread and pressing need for economical methods to desalt sea and brackish water.

12. Private industry is keenly interested in the design and manufacture of desalination equipment, and would undoubtedly respond quickly and positively if encouraged to advance desalination research, engineering, and plant construction on a large scale.

13. The progress of the OSW program is being hampered by unduly small allocation of funds for basic research, by deferring research and testing in pilot plants of many promising processes which are ready for such work, by lack of a Federal seashore laboratory for saline-water research, and because contractors are frequently uncertain of getting the long-term financial support from OSW needed for continuity of research-staff effort.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I happen to be a member of the Committee on Government Operations. I resent what the gentleman from Wyoming said in regard to the partisanship of this committee. I happen to be chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Operations and the gentleman from New York [Mr. RIEHLMAN] is the ranking member on that side of the aisle. I will say in the last 6 years of my chairmanship of that subcommittee that about 9 out of 10 of our reports have been unanimous as far as the Republicans and Democrats are concerned on that committee. Many of the reports on the committee are unanimous and, of course, there are some slightly different viewpoints in some minority reports, of course, as there are in any committee, but I certainly resent the statement of there being partisanship on this committee.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I should like to agree with the gentleman from California. I am not a member of the Committee on Government Operations, but the distinguished gentleman from Chicago [Mr. DAWSON] is chairman of that committee and I think it is certainly unfair to charge his committee with political partisanship, or making any similar sort of a charge against this committee, when the distinguished gentleman from Chicago, the chairman of that committee, has actually leaned over backwards to be fair and nonpartisan. That is something that has been acclaimed by the press throughout the country, and I think everybody in this Congress knows what an extremely diligent job he has done in trying to be fair to both sides in the conduct of his committee. I am sorry to see that under my special order such a charge is being made against this committee, when everyone in this House knows that Mr. DAWSON has served as a model chairman in conducting his committee in a fair and impartial manner.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. I am sorry the gentleman thinks the charge of Democratic partisanship is such a shocking charge.

Mr. PUCINSKI. The gentleman did not say Democratic partisanship—the gentleman said political partisanship.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. OK then, political partisanship.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I do not think the distinguished chairman of that committee has ever used that committee for political purposes.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. We do not want to debate that on your time, but sometime, if you would like, we can debate it, and I can speak from my own experience.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. REUSS. On this question of partisanship on the part of the Committee on Government Operations, I happen to be a member of the committee too. As I understand it, the portion of the committee report quoted was a unanimous committee report concurred in by both the minority and the majority. It happens that the minority ranking member of the House Committee on Government Operations is the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] who can certainly never be accused of a lack of partisanship for his side of the aisle. I hope

there is no suggestion that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] was not as zealous in protecting his side of the aisle.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. May I correct you right there? I could never be accused of what?

Mr. REUSS. A lack of partisanship.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Oh, yes, yes, yes; just within the past 3 weeks Mr. DAWSON, chairman of that committee, when we happened to get a little equal publicity on a subcommittee report called me over and I went over, and when I showed him that they had been 2 or 3 weeks ahead of us, he said, "You lack aggressiveness." He said, "You are not partisan enough." I said, "You tell that to Mr. Moss." Although I do not know whether he did or not.

Mr. REUSS. Now the same implicit accusation comes from your side of the aisle and I just want the RECORD to show that I just do not think it is true.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. No, no. You see he said I was not aggressive enough. Think of that. Is that not something?

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I believe the point to be made is that the Democratic Party has carried out and will carry out this pledge in our platform:

> We will support and intensify the research effort to find an economical way to convert salt and brackish water.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I refuse to yield until the gentleman from Montana has completed his statement.

Mr. METCALF. I have pointed out where no committee of this Congress has discouraged this research which bears out the second sentence in the Democratic platform.

Then I have pointed out here that the Democratic-controlled Congress had appropriated more money for this program than was asked for by the administration or permitted by the Bureau of the Budget. In 3 of the years we have appropriated $400,000 that was asked for by the administration. So I feel with all this discussion that a complete answer has been given to the statement of the gentleman from Arizona that the charge leveled by the gentleman from Wyoming has not been answered.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I wonder if the gentleman from Montana when he revises his remarks would include a table showing from the inception of this program to date, including fiscal year 1961, the budget requests and the final appropriation bills for each of the fiscal years? If he does that and examines that himself he will find that the statement he is making is false.

Mr. METCALF. I will be delighted to include that table, and I have asked unanimous consent to include such a table, and I intend to include such a table.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. I think the only thing I set out to prove was that any inferences that the Republican administration had not supported this program was contrary to the fact.

I know the gentleman from Montana and myself both left the Interior Committee in January of 1959 to go to other duties, but there are other members of the committee here on the floor who can furnish information about the program. This matter was actively supported by our former colleague from Nebraska, Dr. Miller, who is now head of the program. It is reported to me that there was a bill submitted some time ago to this House asking for an expanded program and an enlargement of the program. But that this bill and two others have never been given the courtesy of a hearing before the Interior Committee, or any action by this session of Congress.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield.

Mr. METCALF. I may say that the Democratic candidate for the Presidency was interested in the subject and the Democratic candidate for Vice President of the United States, Senator JOHNSON, has introduced the bill the gentleman is talking about, S. 3557, but the gentleman knows the impossibility of getting it cleared for action because of the recess and the short session.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. I came back here on the 14th or 15th of August, interrupting a campaign to get to work, but we did not do a thing during the rest of that week.

Mr. METCALF. The gentleman did not interrupt any more important campaign than I did. The gentleman knows which party it was which took such pointed notice of a quorum or the lack of a quorum.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I must refuse to yield further for a moment. I asked for this special order to lament the fact that the 86th Congress, just a few hours from adjournment, is not going to meet one of the great challenges of 1960, and pass a minimum wage bill.

As a member of the House Labor Committee, my colleagues and I on the subcommittee that drafted this legislation worked extremely hard.

We put in long hours listening to very difficult and tedious testimony. Our colleagues in the other body, the Labor Committee headed by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], did likewise.

In the bill that we finally reported to the House from the Labor Committee we had tried to reflect the problems and the difficulties that had been reported to us by various witnesses. We believe we had come to this House with an extremely fair bill. This bill recognized the fact that we were moving into an entirely new area of fair labor standards. This bill recognized that when the Fair Labor Standards Act was passed in 1938, 56 percent of the American labor force was engaged in production, while only 44 percent was engaged in services. The Congress of the United States very wisely and properly, 22 years ago, excluded service employees and applied fair labor standards primarily to industrial workers.

Our committee recognized the fact that in ensuing years an industrial revolution had occurred in this country. Today, in 1960, 56 percent of the American labor force is engaged in services, and only 44 percent in production. In other words, out of a labor market of 65 million people, only some 24 million today enjoy the protection of fair labor standards, but the overwhelming number of 41 million working people in America today enjoy no fair labor standards. Therefore, we brought before this House a bill that reflected a great deal of understanding that when we move into the field of services with fair labor standards minimum coverage, we must consider the inherent problems of those services. We said at the time that bill came before the House that it was a fair bill. This bill would have extended coverage to some 4.5 million additional workers who need relief most earnestly today.

Instead, a substitute bill was rammed through this House, a bill which had narrowed down that coverage to some 1.4 million people, and then, with the unfortunate amendment that was tacked on in the rush, without any discussion, we eliminated another 700,000 of those now covered. So that the net gain of this bill passed by the House would have been 700,000. We had hoped that the Senate might correct many of the shortcomings, and the Senate did. In the Senate the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], again recognizing the many problems that would be involved in moving too fast in this field, came along with a fine, fair bill.

Even in conference, after that bill was adopted by the Senate, the distinguished chairman of that committee, the Senator from Massachusetts, made further concessions, recognizing that there are certain Members in this Congress who feel that perhaps applying the fair labor standards to purely intrastate commerce might set a dangerous precedent. The distinguished Senator from Massachusetts and the three Democrats on that Senate committee acquiesced to a narrower definition of a business enterprise. They accepted the House version of five establishments doing business in two or more States, and added a further provision that would exclude any business enterprise from coverage unless it brought in from out of State a million and a half dollars worth of goods for resale in the State.

The Senator also acquiesced in bringing down the level, the original $1.25, and agreed to settle for $1.15. So the Senate conference committee was perfectly willing to report out a bill that would have met the problem. It would have extended the coverage to some 3.7 million people, yet would have reflected to a great extent the very thing that so many men in this House complained

about. What happened? The will of the whole Congress was frustrated by four men, three of them Republicans.

Mr. Speaker, during the last 2 days I have sat in this House and patiently listened to long debates under special orders here by my Republican friends on a project they called Operation Veracity. Well, the fact of the matter is that this project would not be complete unless these gentlemen are willing to admit to us here in the Congress and to the Nation that we are not going home tonight or tomorrow morning with a fair labor standards extension and with improvement in the minimum wage law; and, incidentally, a law that the President wanted. His own Secretary of Labor appeared before our committee and asked for a bill. It certainly came close to the bill that your committee reported out. The President at one time, I understand, had threatened to recall the Congress if it did not deal with the Fair Labor Standards Act or a revision of that act. In my own district I asked the people in a survey whether they felt that the Fair Labor Standards Act should be improved, and 71 percent of the people of my district said "Yes." I believe that my people reflect the feelings of all Americans. And yet here is a House and a Senate and a President and a Nation that recognizes the need for improving our Fair Labor Standards Act, and four men, three of them Republicans, can frustrate the will of the whole Nation. I hope that my friends will talk about this when they talk about veracity. That is a fancy word. I prefer to stick to the simple word "truth." And, the fact of the matter is that no matter how our Republican colleagues on this side of the aisle from now until November 8 will try to chop up this record, they are going to have to admit that not only in minimum standards but in issue after issue that came before this Congress we have been frustrated by their opposition. There is no question in my mind but what these gentlemen have the same responsibility to the people of the United States on that side of the aisle that we have on this side of the aisle.

And, as a matter of fact, I would like the RECORD to show that when Operation Veracity was started, the gentlemen had 2 hours on 2 successive days. And, I think if any of you will take the trouble to look at the RECORD, you will find that the architects of Operation Veracity refused instance after instance to yield to any cross-examination until the last remaining moment of their time. I want the RECORD to show that when this discussion started today we did not hesitate one moment to yield to the gentleman from Wyoming to ask his questions and interrogate the gentleman from Montana.

But, I should make one more point, and then I will be very glad to yield. I made the statement the other day that progress has been made in this Congress, and it certainly has been made. I lament the fact that we cannot go home with a minimum wage bill, but certainly there has been progress made in the 86th Congress. I think I can go home and proudly recite the record of this Congress, and I need not apologize for many of the bills that we have passed here. We have passed a great deal of this legislation, particularly legislation that the administration today is boasting about, with Democratic support. And the record of this Congress in the last 8 years will show repeatedly that if it had not been for the statesmanlike attitude of the Democrats in this Congress, in supporting those bills they felt were wise and sound, the President would have been in an unhappy box.

The Democratic committee has prepared some interesting figures. Let us look at the record. In 1953, on a vote to increase the Air Force, 83 percent of the Democrats voted for it; 98 percent of the Republicans voted against it. In 1954, to maintain the Army, 79 percent of the Democrats voted for it—this is 1954 when we had a Republican in the White House—and 98 percent of the Republican Party voted against this legislation. In 1956, to increase the Air Force, 93 percent of the Democrats supported this legislation and 88 percent of Mr. Eisenhower's own men in this Congress opposed that legislation. In 1958, to increase the Army, 84 percent of the Democrats voted for this legislation while 71 percent of those of his own party opposed this legislation. In 1959, to increase the airlift, 68 percent of the Democrats supported this legislation and 90 percent of the Republicans voted against it.

Then let us take a look at some figures on foreign policy. What degree of support did the President get from the Democrats and what degree of obstruction did he receive from members of his own party? The House voted to increase funds for international educational activities and 66 percent of the Democrats supported this legislation and 88 percent of the Republicans opposed it.

On the House vote to avoid crippling amendments in the Trade Agreements Act extension in 1955: 65 percent of the Democrats supported it and 64 percent of the Republicans opposed it.

On the Senate vote for 2-year instead of 1-year extension of the Agricultural Trade Act, 86 percent of the Democrats supported this action and 84 percent of the Republicans opposed it.

In the House passage of the Health for Peace Act in 1960, 91 percent of the Democrats supported this legislation and 67 percent of the Republicans opposed it.

Mr. Speaker, I think everyone who is in this House may be proud of the fact that in the last 3 weeks of this bobtailed session we certainly have tried to avoid as much as possible purely partisan political discussion. And I can say, if we look at the RECORD for those 3 weeks, we will find that the Members of the House have certainly conducted themselves very much contrary to the predictions that were made before the session began. There were dire predictions that these 3 weeks were going to be spent on nothing but bitter political partisan backbiting.

If I have taken the floor of the House today, if other Members of the House are taking the floor today, it is only because in the last 2 days before the adjournment of Congress, our colleagues on the Republican side have taken time to launch this Operation Veracity. Certainly I do not think that this Congress could adjourn without at least those on this side who have been supporting decent, sound legislation, who have gone along in helping the President, being given a chance to state our case.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Illinois and I concur in his remarks. I would like at this time to discuss briefly the question of research in minerals. I quote from the Democratic platform:

> We will resume research and development work on use of low-grade mineral reserves, especially oil shale, lignites, iron ore taconite, and radioactive minerals. These efforts have been halted or cut back by the Republican administration.

Here is what the truth squad from the opposition says.

Let me use as an example oil shale research conducted at the Bureau of Mines Experimental Laboratory at Laramie, Wyo. I want to discuss the question of liquid fuels and mineral resources, and I want to go back a little further than the truth squad wanted to go back. Let me go back to 1946 when my colleague, then Representative JENNINGS RANDOLPH, now senior U.S. Senator from West Virginia, was a Member of the House. He offered legislation to provide for a study of liquid fuel. The Congress approved the legislation. We appropriated $15 million for the purpose of studying liquid fuels, gasification, hydrogenation, and other processes of converting coal and lignite into high octane gasoline or into lubricating oil.

Under that act, enacted in 1946, by 1952, we had set up subareas and substations for the conduct of this investigation and this research in Missouri, where they were engaged in the hydrogenation of coal. We set up one at Birmingham, Ala., engaged in the gasification of coal converted into liquid fuel. We set up another one at Bristol, Pa. We had the main operation set up in connection with the West Virginia School of Mines under the control of the Bureau of Mines, a station at Morgantown, W. Va.

When the Republican administration came in following the 1952 election, the distinguished gentleman who became chairman of the Appropriations Committee—and I am referring now to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]—immediately tried to cover back out of the $15 million we had appropriated in 1946, into the Treasury, $4,800,000 of that $15 million that had not been expended.

I objected on the ground that it was legislation on an appropriation bill, and the Speaker sustained me. The next day I went over to the Bureau of Mines and reminded them that they had an act that had been passed in 1946 that gave them contract authority. They went ahead and contracted for a research bureau at Morgantown under the control of the Bureau of Mines that cost

$2,800,000, and they bought $600,000 worth of modern equipment before Mr. TABER succeeded in covering back into the Treasury the remainder of that $2,800,000.

What happened following the 1952 election when this Republican administration came into power, that wants to take credit for all of the improvements in the field and study of mineral resources? What happened?

I led the fight. On a number of occasions I have had oil company representatives walk into my office and stand across the desk from me and say, "Congressman, when coal is processed into high-octane gasoline and lubricating oil the oil industry will do it, not the coal operators."

Now, after the big slush fund that went into the campaign of 1952, what happened in 1953? They cut the appropriation for this big research unit at Morgantown, W. Va., half in two. They cut so deep into it that we closed this laboratory at Louisiana, Mo., we closed this oil shale plant at Rifle, Colo., at Birmingham, and at Bristol, Pa. What then do we expect? You know that the oil people and the people who produce gasoline do not want any competitive fuel.

At one time at this research center at Louisiana, Mo., they produced high-octane gasoline that came within 6 cents a gallon of the wholesale price of gasoline. After researches that had been carried on at Morgantown last year, I began pleading with them to install an atomic reactor over there. The reason I did that was that to break coal down into its component parts takes 32° F. The cost of conventional fuels to create that heat is what causes coal to be made into high-octane gasoline through the hydrogenation process. What is happening now? The Bureau is operating over there and they are not carrying on the necessary researches. Still the Republican Party wants to take credit for developing our national resources. They have thrown every obstacle possible in my path to try to say this.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. No; I will not yield. Take your medicine. It is coming to you.

They threw everything possible in the way of West Virginia's developing its unmined reserves of coal by processing them into high-octane gasoline and lubricating oil, because they are under the control of those who contribute to your campaign fund. Take it and like it.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. No, I will not yield further at this time. I think we have demonstrated a desire to be fair. We are going to be fair. Certainly at the proper time I shall yield to my colleagues on this side. I think I have already demonstrated that, and I will do that.

The thing I would like to ask the gentleman from West Virginia is this. We keep hearing the statement, and throughout this whole Operation Veracity we kept hearing the statement that we had 283 Democrats and 153 Republicans in the House, and almost a similar ratio in the Senate. Some time ago the President mentioned at one of his press conferences this rather large ratio of Democrats to Republicans.

One thing that I think these men fail to understand, and I wonder if the gentleman from West Virginia would agree, is that while certainly within our own party, as within the Republican Party, there are differences, the very dynamics of the Democratic Party are that we have differences within our own party. We respect the gentlemen from the South who speak when they do not agree with our own viewpoint on many issues. I have gotten the impression that while we may in the Democratic Party honestly disagree, throughout this Congress I have noticed that our friends on the Republican side have opposed legislation not necessarily because they opposed it on the merits but because it might give the Democratic majority in this Congress some sort of an advantage—perhaps, a point or two—in the opinion of the public. Would the gentleman agree that this exists during this session?

Mr. BAILEY. That is true. Now I would like to say at this point, if the gentleman will yield to me, the distinguished gentleman from Wyoming said that my language was kind of rough. I will agree that it was, but the truth is rough and sometimes the truth is necessary and it is necessary at this point to keep the record straight. I have no apologies to make to anybody. It is the truth.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I do not yield for a parliamentary inquiry. I promised to yield to the gentleman from Michigan and I trust that my colleague will understand.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. I was just going to ask the Chair if a point of privilege of the House would be in order.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Now I am not familiar with this Operation Veracity you call it, or this counteroperation so I cannot talk very much about that. But you did refer to the membership in the House on both our side and your side and you did refer to the President's statement. That is the point I wanted to make. When you complain about this, you have folks enough to bring it out on a petition, if you want to; do you not?

Mr. PUCINSKI. Not in these closing days and closing hours of the session. But may I just make one point clear. The conferees had recessed to reconvene at the call of the Chair. Now I am not sufficiently skilled in the mechanics of parliamentary procedure, but I am inclined to think in this particular situation it would be rather difficult in these closing hours for us to try to bring out a minimum wage bill under suspension.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. It would, but we are on the same Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Yes; and I have certainly enjoyed serving on that committee with the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], and he has taught me a lot of things.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. And it was my vote, was it not that got this thing out to the full committee; do you remember that?

Mr. PUCINSKI. That is correct.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. And now may I ask this question? In view of the very fine statement you are making and in view of the fact that some of these Members of the veracity group are not here, do you not think in fairness to everybody that we should have a quorum call?

Mr. PUCINSKI. Oh, no.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Now, you fellows can laugh all you want to, but we are going to stay here until morning anyway, as I understand, and I think the gentleman is entitled to an audience.

Mr. PUCINSKI. May I remind my colleague that many Members of the House have been on the floor all day and they must take the time to attend to necessary business in their offices and they must have to leave the Chamber to get something to eat.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I will ask your commander in chief over here, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD]. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Now to show the typical fairness of the Democrats of this House, I am very glad to yield to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. THOMSON].

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. I thank the gentleman but I was beginning to wonder. May I simply say when you cannot meet an argument head on, then you throw up some wild charges. I would say to the gentleman from West Virginia that there is more coal in the State of Wyoming and probably in a very small part of Wyoming than there is in the entire State of West Virginia, and that I show no partisanship between coal or oil or gas or what-have-you. We are interested in and support both the development of shale oil and the production of hydrocarbons from coal. As far as the charge of campaign contributions is concerned, there have been no campaign contributions that have come this way with any strings attached and I wish every Member of the House could so state, and I think they probably would.

But getting back to the point, nothing has been said by the gentleman from West Virginia or anyone else with regard to the statement contained in the RECORD of August 29, page 18197, relative to the Republican program for research. It was on the way way back in 1946, but that is ancient history. Since that time the Eisenhower administration in 1956 went to the country and the record was certainly approved.

Mr. PUCINSKI. The gentleman does not like us to go back to 1952 and 1953 which he calls ancient history. I think throughout these 2 days of Opera-

tion Veracity I kept hearing one statement made repeatedly which was that it was the Democrats who had failed to act in 1947 and 1948 to strengthen the missile program and put our country in a position of sound strength in this field. In some instances it is ancient history. Apparently it is all right if ancient history helps you but you object when it hurts you.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. The gentleman knows there has been no setback in this carbonization program, coal carbonization, or any other of these programs of that nature. If he has any facts I would welcome their being brought into the argument, but the fact is, I would say to the gentleman, that the gentleman from West Virginia talks about Roswell, Colo., and the oil shale work being stopped up there. The principal research in this field is being carried on at Landy. The operation at Rifle ceased to be a research operation and turned into a mining operation which proved successful. The Union Oil Co. took it over. That being the situation we did not see any use in spending further taxpayers' money on it.

The fact remains that the Subcommittee on Appropriations dealing with Interior and related agencies for the past 2 years in this Congress—and I hope the gentleman from West Virginia is here because I do not recall his appearing before our committee and asking for any increase in coal research funds. The principal work in coal research and oil shale is being conducted at Landy. The subject matter has been handled by the committee in a nonpartisan way. We went ahead with the recommendation in the committee report. I congratulate the Democrats for it. That does not bear out the indictment placed in the Democratic platform.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I believe the gentleman from Wyoming has made his point, and he will understand if I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. In the RECORD of August 29, page 18196, my colleague on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Mr. HOSMER, ended his part of the so-called Operation Veracity, and his remarks included the 12 points in which he set forth his viewpoint upon the atomic energy program.

I would like to say that I have been on the joint committee since it was started in 1946. I think I know pretty well what the record is. I know that when we started into the postwar area and we had finished with the increased weapons program we turned to the development of peacetime use of the atom. That was long before the atoms-for-peace program of the Eisenhower administration. Years before that we were seeking new uses for atomic energy in the form of isotopes and other uses.

In Mr. HOSMER's article which I referred to, he takes a great deal of credit for many of the things that were started back in the days before the Eisenhower administration. I want to call attention to some of them, and I think they will be of benefit to the people who are interested in getting the truth of this matter. I read from this little résumé here some of the things which have happened.

In the first place, they said if we turned atomic energy over to the private industry that they will do the job of bringing electricity to the American people. The majority of the Democrats on the committee thought we were still in the days of research and development, and it was unprofitable for private industry and it took hundreds of millions of dollars to pass through that period of development to the point where we were attaining our goal in electricity. We thought so in 1954, and do so now in 1960. The record proves this is true.

In 1955 Mr. Strauss predicted that the United States would have 2 million kilowatts of atomic power capacity by the end of 1960. In June 1958, Mr. Strauss revised his estimate and said we would have only 400,000 kilowatts in operation by the end of 1960. At one point 3 million kilowatts at the end of 1964. Nothing more has been heard of the 1955 prediction of 2 million kilowatts. It is very doubtful that we will ever be anywhere near that much. We will be lucky to achieve in fact 20 percent of the Eisenhower appointee to the AEC prediction by the end of the year 1960.

In more than 7 years the Republicans have initiated only one power reactor, and that on pressure from the Democrats on the joint committee. This is a small reactor of 66,000 kilowatts, and now they are having trouble over the reactor's location.

Mr. HOSMER referred to the nuclear submarine program and took a great deal of credit for that. The naval reactor program was initiated and placed on a firm basis by President Harry Truman prior to the Republicans taking office. It was under the Truman administration that Adm. H. G. Rickover was appointed and headed up the naval reactor program and it is primarily due to Admiral Rickover's leadership and competence that we have unquestioned world leadership in nuclear powered naval vessels. Far from supporting Admiral Rickover, this administration, until recently, has done what it could to discredit him. It was under the Republican administration that the Department of the Navy proposed to pass over Admiral Rickover for promotion, thus requiring his retirement within a short time. This effort to drive out of the public service one of our most valuable public servants was prevented by the Democrats in Congress.

We told the administration that if they did pass him over we would put a rider on an appropriation bill in the Congress, which would promote him to the next step and keep him in the service for another 5 years. He was kept in the program. We have pushed through the Congress appropriations which will now make it possible for us to have 30 nuclear powered submarines in operation by the time that our authorization and appropriation is extended.

So, it has been the Congress that has been pushing it, it has not been at the administration request. It has been at the request of the Congress and a pushing of a Democratic Congress that this result has been achieved.

My friend spoke about the international atomic energy conference at Geneva. I attended those conferences officially, and I say that the Eisenhower administration has muddled the international atomic energy program. They set up the International Atomic Agency at Geneva. One of our former colleagues, Mr. Cole, is Chairman of it. Mr. Cole came back and protested to members of the committee and protested to the administration that they were cutting the throat of the International Atomic Agency through their bilateral agreements with various countries in the world. They were going to scuttle the International Agency and deal directly with these various governments.

There was very little that the International Atomic Energy Agency could do working against each other in that way, that the International Atomic Energy Agency should not be continued unless it can bring up a program which is a good program, and that is not caught up in bilateral agreements sponsored by the administration.

There have been reactors built during the past 7 years, as Mr. HOSMER points out. There have been large expenditures of Federal funds, but the atomic power program continues to drift without a clear sense of direction or a positive objective. The Republican administration continues to oppose a strong and effective Federal program and the result is that we are far behind where we could be and should be as of the present time.

I might point out that in every year except one we have increased the international appropriation for research and development in the reactor field, sometimes half and sometimes double that which was asked by the administration.

Now, I do not have time to take up all the other points, but I just want to put the truth on the record, and I believe that my statement today will stand on the record as substantiated.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I thank the gentleman. I think everyone in this House who has known the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD], and his very sincere, tireless, dedicated service on the Atomic Energy Committee, will certainly agree that the gentleman from California has made one of the really great contributions in trying to help lead this Nation into a field of profound success against tremendous obstacles.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, before I sit down, I want to thank the gentleman for those kind remarks. I ask unanimous consent on the part of my colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. BOWLES], who is detained and cannot come to the floor, to insert his remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOWLES. Mr. Speaker, last Friday the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] alerted me that he and several of our other colleagues on his side of the aisle had decided to examine the Democratic platform here on the floor this week.

The fact that they saw fit to refer to their plans as Operation Veracity indicated that their approach to the Democratic platform would not be entirely complimentary.

I must say in all frankness that while I appreciate the gentleman's invitation to come and listen, the fact that it was to the Operation Veracity gave me second thoughts and awakened memories. I had been reading the Republican platform and had been encouraged by its theme "Building a Better America." I had been heartened because both that concept and the Democratic concept of the rights of man seemed to at least put the stamp of approval of both parties this year on the elemental fact that we are entering a new era, at home and abroad, and that hopefully the bickering and bitterness of some previous political campaigns would now at long last be put behind us.

None of us really needs to be reminded of some of those past campaigns for most of us have lived through them and would prefer to forget them.

But Operation Veracity hardly seemed to change the name of the notorious Republican truth squad which huffed and puffed across the country in 1952, dragging its tawdry veracities in the wake of President Truman's campaign special.

Many Americans must have agreed with President Truman's response on Columbus Day, 1952, that there were a good many truth squads in Columbus' time who went around repeating, "The world is flat, the world is flat."

I had hoped that in 1960 we had finally emerged beyond the truth squad stage, and until recently I thought I had good grounds for hope.

All of us who worked on the 1960 Democratic platform were especially conscious of our responsibility to be fair and conscientious. That is why in the short version of the Democratic platform which I read to the national television audience at our convention we deliberately omitted any reference to the word "Republican." That is why, I like to think, the 1960 Democratic platform has earned such widespread acclaim for its constructive tone, an evaluation made, incidentally, by many of our leading Republican newspapers.

That is also why, I am sure, my distinguished counterpart, the chairman of the Republican platform committee, Mr. Charles Percy, said in his press release of Friday, July 15:

> I have studied the Democratic platform carefully. The great value of a political platform is that it provides the basis for wide-ranging discussion of the great issues confronting us as a people. It is one of the most important parts of the educational process in American democracy. * * * Both parties seek a better America. Men of good will seeking identical goals are working hard in both parties to develop our programs for America.

Mr. Percy then went on to raise legitimate questions about the different approaches of our two parties. But the tone was right, the questions were constructive, and the purpose of promoting an intelligent statement of the issues for the American people was clear. I admired Mr. Percy for it.

Many of us who participated in the writing of the Democratic platform also took silent pride in the days that immediately followed its adoption, when it was widely regarded as having had a constructive influence on the Republican Convention deliberations. Indeed, perhaps even Members on the other side of the aisle will forgive me my personal feeling that our platform played a certain role in the midnight talks between the Vice President of the United States and the Governor of New York.

Under these circumstances I am sure that many Republican leaders throughout America will be as discouraged as I am over what now appears to be an irresistible temptation by the Irredentists of the Republican Party to return to their tactics of yesteryear. "Truth squads" and "operations veracity" seem to have an unalterable appeal—usually to those who are most vehement in their overstatements of the partial truths of their own position.

As I glanced through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS of the last 2 days, I was struck with what little progress we have really made. The gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] refers to this campaign as one between the youngsters and the grownups. He talks of new frontiersmanship, just the way the Vice President attempted to sidetrack the foremost economic issue of this campaign by ridiculing it as growthmanship.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES] finds our platform outrageous.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] finds it disturbing and demoralizing.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. DEROUNIAN] finds it full of fabrications.

The gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. BASS] asks us to apologize.

The gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. THOMSON] accuses us of having a complete lack of faith in free enterprise coupled with plain demagogy and boyish gamesmanship.

The two gentlemen from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES and Mr. LAIRD] cannot resist following in the footsteps of the late Senator from their State by depriving us in the Democrat Party of the "ic" which we wish to have at the end of our name.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] enlightens us with the following:

> I observe that one of two things is true about this Democratic platform statement that the Republican failure in the economic field has been virtually complete.
>
> Either the statement was an intentional falsehood, or the framers of the Democratic platform picture a new frontier in which there is no prosperity, no individual incentive, no pursuit of personal happiness, but only a superstate all-powerful over miserable individuals and one which is probably at war.
>
> In 1934 Henry A. Wallace wrote a book "New Frontiers."
>
> Apparently, the new frontiers at which the 1960 Democratic platform framers gaze are the depression frontiers of 1934.

And all this remarkable cacophony of McCarthyism and innuendo is summed up by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. THOMSON] as a conscientious attempt to focus the light of truth on the current political campaign.

This is the light of truth as seen by that long line of soothsayers who stretch from Murray Chotiner to Senator SCOTT. I am perfectly prepared to believe that our colleagues here, like some others in their party, have again been victimized by that long line of petty researchers and small-minded ghostwriters who glory in scoring or misscoring debater's points down at the Republican National Committee.

Some 27 pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD have now been devoted to their new operation on the truth. Let me select, more or less at random, just a few matters for comment:

First. The gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] reports that the topic sentence of the following Democratic platform paragraph is in error:

> Over the past 7½-year period, the Republicans have failed to balance the budget or reduce the national debt. Responsible fiscal policy requires surpluses in good times to more than offset the deficits which may occur in recessions, in order to reduce the national debt over the long run. The Republican administration has produced the deficits—in fact, the greatest deficit in any peacetime year in history, in 1958–59—but only occasional and meager surpluses. Their first 7 years produced a total deficit of nearly $19 billion.

The gentleman suggested we revise the first sentence to read, as follows: "Over the past 7½ years, the Republicans balanced the budget in fiscal years 1956, 1957, 1960, and 1961."

If we are to go in for revisions, I suggest that the gentleman's revision be revised, as follows: "The Republicans balanced the budget in fiscal years 1956, 1957, and 1960 with a total surplus of $4.3 billion. They left a deficit in fiscal years 1954, 1955, 1958, and 1959 totaling $22.5 billion. The total deficit over the last 7½ years has thus been $18.2 billion."

Our platform refers to a total deficit of "nearly $19 billion" based on the 1960 estimates of $1 billion surplus for fiscal year 1960 available on July 12 when our platform was adopted. On July 20 the figure of a $1.1 billion surplus for fiscal year 1960 was first released.

Second. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] has called our attention to the platform statement that the Republicans years of power "have consisted of two recessions, in 1953 and 1954 and 1957 and 1960, separated by the most severe peacetime inflation in history."

He is concerned about the dramatic price rises immediately after World War II, which were caused by Republican insistence on removing our wartime price controls. As Price Administrator and Economic Stabilizer during and immediately after World War II, I can assure the gentleman that most experts consider it both reasonable and generous not to include the March 1946 to March 1947 period as part of our peacetime economic history. On the other hand the years of Republican inflation from 1955 to 1956 were 2 years removed from the Korean war and far removed from price control.

Wholesale prices, whose fluctuations are a better measure of inflation than those of consumer prices, rose about 24 percent between 1945 and 1947. Before the end of the Truman administration,

these prices decreased—during 1951 to 1953—only to rise again under the next Republican administration.

Third. Let me turn quickly to national defense. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] denies that our conventional military forces have been dangerously slashed.

Yet throughout the years of the Eisenhower administration these cuts have continued, recently falling most heavily on our ground strength for fighting limited and conventional aggression. Our divisions were first reduced to 18 in spite of the pleas of Democratic Members of Congress for a force of at least 19. Progressively the cuts have gone on. From 20 divisions to 18; from 18 to 16; from 16 to 15. And now our ground forces stand at 14 combat strength divisions.

The gentleman challenged me to produce the administration statements which admit that our conventional military forces have been slashed for reasons of economy. Here are a few:

Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, Chief of Staff of the Army during the Eisenhower administration, has stated that the first three Eisenhower defense budgets "were not primarily based on military needs. They were squeezed within the framework of preset, arbitrary manpower and fiscal limits."

Gen. Maxwell Taylor, also a Chief of Staff during the Eisenhower administration, wrote in Look magazine on December 22, 1959:

> Budget making has been allowed to control strategy although the defense budget is developed in such a way that no one really knows how much combat power the United States is getting for its dollar. * * * The budget makers have become the real strategy makers. Military programs needed to implement our policy can be made or broken by those who decide how to spend the military dollar. Unfortunately, the decisive power is in the hands of men who are not strategists, but rather fiscal experts.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] told us yesterday: "We have never been in a position where the Polaris program has lacked for funds at any time during this administration."

But the reason there was never any lack of funds was precisely that more funds were appropriated by the Democratic Congress than the administration was willing to use. We all know that we have lost a full year in the construction of three Polaris submarines, delayed from fiscal year 1959 to fiscal year 1960 by a Bureau of the Budget decision to freeze funds appropriated by Congress for this specific purpose over and above the administration's request.

Fourth. Lastly let me refer to some of the statements we have heard on subjects of interest to our American farmers. Take our rural electrification plank as an example.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] suggested that the Democratic platform was in "bad need of facts" when it stated that—

> The Democratic Congress has successfully fought the efforts of the Republican administration to cut off REA loans.
>
> It—
>
> The Republican administration—
>
> has sought to cripple rural electrification.

We all know that the Republican administration adopted a policy of no new starts on hydroelectric dams, and we have had none except for those projects initiated at Democratic insistence. The result has been to cut off a new supply of abundant low-cost wholesale power. Anyone who looks at the wholesale power rate map the co-ops have drawn up will see the effects of this policy on the power costs which the co-ops must pay and pass on to their members.

We all know that Republican policy has deliberately raised interest rates and has annually tried to limit severely the amount of REA loan funds available, despite the fact that these co-ops have a perfect record of repaying these loans with interest. In the years from 1953 through 1960, the administration requested a total of $1,149.3 million in REA electric loan funds. The Democratic Congress forced through additional appropriations, raising the aggregate total to $1,815 million. That is more than a 33-percent increase forced through by a Democratic Congress—and the record shows that it was needed.

In the meantime the Eisenhower administration would have done away with the REA if its legislative proposals had been accepted, according to Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN, of Vermont, the senior Republican on the Senate Agriculture Committee, in a statement reported by the UPI on May 22, 1959:

> Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN, Republican, of Vermont, accused Agriculture Secretary Benson today of an attempt to put American farmers "still more under the thumb" of giant banking and corporate interests.
>
> AIKEN, senior Republican on the Senate Agriculture Committee, said he would do all he could to block Benson's proposal to create a bank to replace the U.S. Treasury in financing of rural electric power and telephone systems.
>
> Benson made the proposal in a speech at Cedar Rapids, Iowa, last night.
>
> AIKEN, in a Senate speech, said the Benson plan was an attempt to do away with the Rural Electrification Administration. * * *
>
> AIKEN said Benson's proposed bank would force possibly one-third of the REA cooperatives to give up the ghost and sell out to the utility interests.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on at length, but I prefer to close. I know that several of my colleagues have things to say. Let me add just this:

Today is August 31 and there are only 69 days left until the election. The Democratic platform attempted to address itself to the real questions which face the American people. They are not questions that invite further displays of politics as usual. They invite serious, constructive debate. They are questions like these:

How can we build defense forces of sufficient strength and flexibility to deter aggressions of all sorts, large or small?

How can we at the same time elevate arms control to a new position of equal priority so that an arms race will not once more lead to unlimited catastrophe?

How can we speed up our national rate of economic growth on which our policies both at home and abroad so directly depend?

How can we provide that delicate balance of national and local leadership which will enable us to move ahead effectively in the great moral effort to assure equal right to all Americans?

The themes of our two platforms this year are both addressed to these goals. Most Americans are, I hope, ready to enlist in the cause of building a better America not a more bitter one. Likewise we are all, I hope, dedicated to the implementation of the rights of man.

If this is indeed a critical election, as I think both parties agree, I earnestly hope that it can be conducted from now on in a manner befitting the solemnity and importance of the hour. I can think of no better note on which to conclude these remarks, which will be my last in the House of Representatives.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I hope that the architects of Operation Veracity who have made a strong point of the fact that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. BOWLES], chairman of platform committee of the Democratic Party could not be here during their exercises, will take the trouble to read his remarks. I have seen them. It is unfortunate that he cannot be with us here this evening, but I hope that they will read that statement, because I think they will find many of the answers they have raised.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS].

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] for the leadership he is showing here this evening on the reexamination of Operation Veracity. I am not sure I know what Operation Veracity proves, but it does seem to me, Mr. Speaker, that it proves conclusively one thing, and that is that its authors and architects just have not learned to read the footnotes. Take one of the big issues which Operation Veracity purports to make. In the Democratic platform it is set forth, and I think it is a modest and true statement, and I quote: "Republican failure in the economic field has been virtually complete."

Now, Operation Veracity attempted to answer that Democratic platform plank by pointing out—and here I quote from Operation Veracity—that "Financial assets of individuals increased more than 2½ times from $373 billion at the end of 1952 to $956 billion at the end of 1959." Well, to accept this naked statement sounds indeed as if the Republican Party had done wonders during the last 8 years. However, what Operation Veracity did not include was the footnote to that statistical statement in the President's Economic Report of January 1960, which footnote says: "Data prior to 1954 do not include individual holdings of corporate securities and therefore are not comparable with subsequent data."

So, Operation Veracity was comparing apples and oranges and this particular assertion becomes quite meaningless. It is too bad that the authors just did not look at the footnotes. It is too bad, too, that they do not look at the subborn facts of our economic life; the fact that

LIBRARIES

there are today in this country more than 4 million unemployed; that is, more than 5 percent of our American labor force; that today nearly 8 million family units are living on less than $2,000 a unit per year; that farm income continues to decline and has decreased 23 percent under the Republican administration.

That steel production——

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will permit me to interrupt for a moment, the gentleman should be extremely careful in reciting these indisputable facts because during the debate on Operation Veracity, whenever those of us on this side cited those very tragic statistics, we were immediately tagged "prophets of doom and gloom." The Republican Party has never wanted to face up to the facts.

Mr. REUSS. Yes. This is a charge hurled at all of us on the floor of this House and elsewhere who have chosen to inform the American people of some of the problems facing us in the economic sphere and to make constructive suggestions for meeting them.

I think the problems of this country in the economic field will not be solved by sweeping them forever under the sofa. They must be examined. Constructive solutions must be proposed. That is precisely what the Democratic platform does.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity granted me by the gentleman from Illinois to participate in this discussion. I would commend to all who choose to read in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the debate going on by the adherents of the Democratic and Republican platforms the particular point I made, that it would be a good thing for the authors of Operation Veracity to read the footnotes in the President's own economic reports.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I am sure all fair-minded Americans will be grateful to the gentleman from Wisconsin for his contribution this evening.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I should like to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, my colleague on the Atomic Energy Committee, Mr. PRICE.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to compliment and congratulate my colleague from Illinois for the service he is rendering in making this presentation possible here tonight. We have considerable time while we are waiting for the final conclusion of this session of Congress and this is a good way to spend it, to set the record straight.

I have had the opportunity to be on the floor through much of Operation Veracity. During yesterday's session I, through the kindness of the Member on the other side who handled that debate, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] was able to get into part of it. I attempted to reply to some of the questions asked by the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. BASS]. But I was then at some little disadvantage because I had had no previous warning of what the substance of his statement would be. He asked many questions in his prepared presentation. I was able, even without advance warning, to supply him answers to many of his questions.

He asked, for instance, if anyone could name anyone in high position in the Republican administration who made any assertions as to the position of the United States versus the Soviet Union in the space program. Offhand I was able to give him the names of two high administration officials who subsequently resigned because of disagreements, and because of their feeling that budgetary restrictions had placed us at a disadvantage in our space and military programs.

In the meantime I have been able to search through various publications, through some congressional hearings, and I have come up with a number of names of people high in the Republican Party who have been disturbed at the inadequacy of the administration's program of research and development, both in the space program and in our military program.

For the edification of those who participated in Operation Veracity I ask unanimous consent at this time to include in the RECORD at this point my full compilation in reply to the questions asked by the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. BASS] and others who participated.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to is as follows:)

THE GREATEST DEBATE: IS THE UNITED STATES BECOMING A "SECOND BEST" MILITARY POWER?

Background

For the first time in the proud history of our country, responsible military and civilian leaders are sounding solemn and repeated warnings that a hostile foreign nation may soon be able to threaten our very national survival, while we lack sufficient retaliatory power effectively to deter such threats. They see the next few years as a time of gravest national danger. They call for an all-out effort to increase our military strength before it is too late.

At the same time, President Eisenhower, Vice President NIXON and our top official military authorities are giving flat assurances that our military strength is adequate to any challenge; that there is no serious threat to continued peace and prosperity; that no special or additional effort is called for.

This difference in view certainly involves the highest stakes of any question which has ever divided our Nation's leaders. Even the grave issues at stake in the Civil War or in World Wars I and II did not involve possible threats to the basic survival of our country.

With this "greatest debate" resounding daily in newspapers, magazines, books, and speeches, most ordinary Americans are understandably concerned and confused. We are in much the position of a man in the prime of life listening with increasing horror while two groups of doctors hotly discuss whether or not he has a serious disease which is likely to be fatal unless he quickly and drastically changes his current pleasant way of living. There is every urge to believe the hearty cheerful doctors who say he's in good shape, and to dismiss as alarmists the other group of doctors who diagnose a serious ailment. But what if the cheerful doctors are wrong? What if their optimism is simply based on professional unwillingness to admit their earlier treatment has been inadequate? What if he finally finds out that the more pessimistic diagnosis was right—only when it is too late to begin the necessary corrective action? Isn't it better to err on the side of caution in such a case?

I. IS THERE A MISSILE GAP?

A. Background facts

The latest, most powerful, and dangerous weapon of warfare is the ballistic missile with a nuclear warhead. This missile is being made today by the United States and by the Soviet Union in two types, the intercontinental (ICBM) with a range of more than 5,500 miles and the intermediate range (IRBM) which can travel more than 1,200 miles.

The United States at present has one type of ICBM—the Atlas—in operational position. Our total current operational force is reliably reported to be "less than a handful" and these are in exposed bases. In the IRBM range, our total current operational force consists of a few dozen Thor missiles in the United Kingdom. By the end of 1960 the United States hopes to have two nuclear submarines armed with Polaris missiles in operation, with others following in 1961 and 1962. The Minuteman, a "second generation" solid fueled ICBM to operate from hardened bases, is in advanced stages of research and development.

It is uniformly agreed that the Soviet Union currently has more powerful rocket engines at its disposal than does the United States. The number of Soviet ICBM's currently in operational position is believed to be at least three times as many as the United States has and this disproportion is expected to continue at least through 1962. In addition the U.S.S.R. is believed to have hundreds of IRBM's in operational positions.

Current debate in this area bears not so much on the existence of a missile gap as on its significance, and whether we are making sufficient efforts to overcome it.

B. The official view

President Eisenhower: "There has been no place that I can see where there has been any possibility of gaps occurring" (Aug. 27, 1958).

"Today the so-called missile gap is being rapidly filled" (Oct. 20, 1958).

"We are rapidly filling the gap that existed; and in some ways I think that our scientists have already achieved what we would call even more than equality, particularly in types and kinds, even if not in numbers" (Oct. 21, 1958).

"The so-called missile gap of 6 years ago is speedily being filled" (Oct. 22, 1958).

"Our military missile program, going forward so successfully, does not suffer from our present lack of very large rocket engines, which are so necessary in distant space exploration. I am assured by experts that the thrust of our present missiles is fully adequate for defense requirements" (Jan. 20, 1960).

C. Other views

Former Secretary of Defense, Neil H. McElroy, after public challenge from Senator SYMINGTON, reluctantly conceded in a public news conference early in 1959 that the Soviet ICBM's lead in ICBM's would grow to a 3-to-1 advantage in a few years compared to the U.S. position.

Secretary of Defense, Thomas S. Gates, Jr., in testimony before a House subcommittee on January 13, 1960, admitted that a small missile gap will exist during the next 3 years, having also testified that his predecessor had announced the 3-to-1 ratio.

Senator THRUSTON MORTON, chairman of the Republican National Committee: "We are behind in missiles—let's face it. We didn't do the research when we should have—but forget that—it's on the conscience of the American people. I guess, I for one, didn't get up and make a speech when I should have, and did not vote for an appropriation when I should have" (Feb. 16, 1960).

Lt. Gen. James M. Gavin, former Chief of the Army's Research and Development: "We are now entering a missile-lag period in which the Soviets will have a steadily in-

creasing ICBM striking capability which we will be unable to match for several years. We are in mortal danger and the missile lag portends trouble of a serious nature" (August 1958).

Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, former Chief of Staff, U.S. Army: "We are now threatened with a missile gap that leaves us in a position of potentially grave danger" (Nov. 24, 1959).

"Having a well-developed skepticism toward information tending to inflate the strength of an enemy, I have been slow to accept the reality and the significance of the so-called missile gap. Reluctantly, I have concluded that there is indeed such a gap, which, in combination with other factors, has a most significant bearing upon our military security" ("The Uncertain Trumpet," 1959).

The New York Times: "The Soviet Union will have at least 150 ICBM's in operational readiness in 1961, according to the latest intelligence estimates of the United States. If the estimates are correct, the Soviet Union will have at least a 3-to-1 superiority over the United States in intercontinental missiles. In the coming year, the United States will have fewer than 50 ICBM's ready to fire" (Feb. 2, 1960).

Walter Lippmann: "The controversy about defense arises from the fact, which nobody denies, that the Soviet Union is several years ahead of us in the production of missiles and in the exploration of outer space. The Russians have more missiles. They have bigger missiles capable of carrying bigger loads and they are far ahead in the whole art of guidance of missiles. * * * The real situation, which is the source of our peril, is that because in this vast field [missiles] the Soviet Union has gotten its research and development effectively organized, and because the Soviet Union is allocating to it all the resources that it requires, the gap is not becoming narrower, it is becoming wider. Not only did they have a head start but they are now running faster" (Feb. 2, 1960).

Des Moines Register: "No official has denied that Russia is several years ahead of us in this area of accomplishment (ICBM's and powerful rocket engines). It is this lead or advantage that weakens the claims of confidence and superiority President Eisenhower makes for the immediate present. It gives strength to the critics of the administration's defense program so far as to what the future may hold" (Feb. 4, 1960).

Senator STUART SYMINGTON, former Secretary of the Air Force, has led the Democrats in emphasizing that there is an increasing and strategically serious missile gap. He has said: "The facts are that a very substantial missile gap does exist and the administration apparently (will permit it to) increase" (Jan. 27, 1960).

II. IS THERE AN OVERALL DETERRENT GAP?

A. Background facts

The overall defensive strength of the United States and our ability to deter aggression clearly depend on our total military power relative to that of the Soviet Union, rather than on relative strength in any one type of weapon, even one as important as ballistic missiles.

Current discussion in this area reflects general agreement that as of now the United States disposes of military power which is extremely strong, probably more or less on a par with that of the Soviet Union, and probably adequate to inflict unacceptable retaliatory damage on any enemy who might attempt major aggression.

The areas of disagreement are whether our current retaliatory strength is dangerously exposed and whether, given present relative rates of increase in overall strength, the United States may not in the next few years be confronted with a preponderance of Soviet military power which changes the present strategic balance in a manner which could endanger our national survival.

B. The official view

"The President was asked whether he might not be at a disadvantage in talks with Premier Khrushchev because of the prospects that the United States would be second best in the missile field. President Eisenhower replied that he would enter the negotiations with 'no feeling of inferiority' and that he was not 'a little bit frightened' or in the 'slightest degree disturbed'." (New York Times, Jan. 14, 1960.)

"We have created a great deterrent strength—so powerful as to command and to justify the respect of knowledgeable and unbiased observers here at home and abroad" (Feb. 21, 1960).

Vice President NIXON: "There is no part of our record of which we are more proud than in the area of national security. * * * It is time to quit selling America short. We are not a second-rate country, with a second-rate military strength and a second-rate economy. * * * No aggressor in the world today can knock out the deterrent striking power of the United States and its allies. This is the case today and it will continue to be so in the future" (Jan. 27, 1960).

"Engaging in a numbers game in which we compare the numbers of missiles, airplanes, submarines, or carriers we have with those possessed by our potential opponent is a completely fallacious method of determining whether we have the strength we need" (Feb. 8, 1960).

Secretary of Defense Gates: "The impression that the Soviet Union has outdistanced [us] * * * is not supported by the facts. There is no deterrent gap. * * * It is the conclusion of those who have analyzed the matter that even a surprise attack by all the missiles the Soviets could muster would not suffice to destroy enough of our retaliatory strike forces to enable (the enemy) to make a rational decision to attack" (Jan. 13, 1960).

Dudley C. Sharp, Secretary of the Air Force: "We are producing as many missiles as we think we need for a sensibly balanced program. * * * There is no overall deterrent gap" (Jan. 24, 1960).

Gen. Nathan Twining, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff: "I do not believe any nation today or in the foreseeable future has the military power to destroy us or to attack us without receiving unacceptable destruction in return" (Feb. 9, 1960).

Gen. Lyman Lemnitzer, U.S. Army Chief of Staff: "Assuming that we carry out military progress at the present rate, we will have the capability of deterring general or limited war for the next 2 or 3 years" (Feb. 4, 1960).

C. Other views

Gen. Thomas S. Power, head of the Strategic Air Command: "With only some 300 ballistic missiles (half ICBM and half IRBM) the Soviets could virtually wipe out our entire nuclear strike capability within 30 minutes" (Feb. 2, 1960).

(NOTE.—The President the following day spoke of this as a "parochial viewpoint.")

Joseph Alsop, well-known columnist (commenting on an earlier speech of General Power's in which his estimate of 150 ICBM's as the Soviet requirement appeared): "The number is not large. It is, for example, only 10 months of the production capacity of our own Atlas ICBM plant, if the Atlas production line were working on a three-shift basis instead of a business-as-usual basis" (Jan. 26, 1960).

"How can anyone be so sure that Nikita S. Khrushchev was lying in late 1958 when he stated that Soviet ICBM's were already 'in serial production'? How prove that he was deliberately misleading, more recently, when he seemed to say that a single Soviet factory had turned out 250 ICBM's last year? If he was telling the truth, Khrushchev must now have at least 150 operational ICBM's" (Jan. 28, 1960).

Maj. Gen. John B. Medaris, former chief of the Army Ordnance Missile Command: "I do not think the United States is in a defenseless situation today (but) if we do not change our approach to things, the future is going to be worse 5 years from now" (Feb. 18, 1960).

The Gaither report (a study made by leading experts in 1957): "It portrays a United States in the gravest danger in its history. It pictures the Nation moving in frightening course to the status of a second-class power. It shows an America exposed to an almost immediate threat from the missile bristling Soviet Union. It finds America's long-term prospects one of cataclysmic peril" (reported in Washington Post, December 1957).

The Rockefeller Brothers Fund, Inc., a report: "The possibility cannot be ruled out that the Soviet leadership, if it secures a clear superiority in the arms race, will use this advantage to blackmail or to attack its major opponent without warning. That possibility must at all costs be forestalled. * * * Under present conditions, and for as long as necessary, the strength of the Western deterrent must be maintained, with clear realization that this cannot be done easily or once and for all. * * * The underlying basic Soviet danger (of expanding Communist power and isolation of the United States) has not been as well understood in the United States as it should be. Certainly the situation will not be changed by a lull in the crises which have served to keep the United States awake" (December 1957).

Mr. Khrushchev "reiterated that the Soviet Union was the 'most powerful country in the world from the military standpoint' " (New York Times, Mar. 2, 1960).

III. IS THERE A LAG IN SPACE EXPLORATION?

A. Background facts

The Soviet Union startled and impressed the world when it successfully orbited the first earth satellite in 1957. The Soviets have continued to score important firsts in this challenging area. The United States also has made some important advances in this field, despite some disappointing failures.

Two Soviet achievements in space exploration in 1959 served to focus further public attention on the status of the U.S. program. The Russians sent a rocket to the moon; another rocket enabled them to photograph the far side. These dramatic successes brought a critical examination of American efforts.

The superior thrust of Soviet rockets—600,000 to 800,000 pounds against the 350,000-pound thrust of our Atlas ICBM—is considered the principal reason for the Soviet space lead. Our Saturn rocket will have a 1½-million-pound thrust, but 2 or 3 years will elapse before this rocket becomes operational.

B. The official view

President Eisenhower (speaking with regard to the Soviet Union's launching of Sputnik I in October 1957): "It does not raise my apprehensions, not one iota.

"Now, for the life of me, I cannot see any reason why we should be using or misusing military talent to explore the moon" (November 1959).

C. Other views

General Medaris: "Unfortunately we already are second rate in space. No one will even argue that point any more" (Missiles and Rockets magazine, Feb. 1, 1960).

(Note: In the same issue General Medaris described President Eisenhower's contention that the Armed Forces have no business in exploring space as utter nonsense.)

Ernest Stuhlinger, Director of the Army Research Projects Laboratory at Redstone

Arsenal, Huntsville, Ala.: "We are in a meager second place, everywhere in space" (Feb. 3, 1960).

Clarke Newlon, executive editor of Missiles & Rockets: "There is an almost universal feeling * * * that the Nation's space program is at present on dead center; that the present administration fails to recognize its importance; that we have no real space plan; that no significant action will be taken until we have a new head of Government" (Dec. 14, 1959).

Walter Lippmann: "The deep weakness in the administration's position is not that we cannot deter the Soviet Union in 1963. It is that in the general field of rockets and the exploration of space we are not even holding our own. We are falling behind" (Jan. 28, 1960).

The Atlanta Constitution: "President Eisenhower's assurances that all's well with U.S. missiles and space program, and his rebuke to generals and others who say it's not so, add more uncertainty to the already confused public mind" (Feb. 4, 1960).

"Dr. Wernher von Braun said today that the United States would not overtake the Soviet Union in the space race for several years "despite the accelerated development of superthrust rockets" (reported in New York Times, Feb. 2, 1960).

New York Herald Tribune: "The U.S. space effort is still hamstrung by inadequate financing, by divided authority, by lack of a clear affirmation of national purpose. * * * We are second, and not even second among equals; we still are getting there—into space—latest with the leastest" (Jan. 6, 1960).

Aviation Week: "Each step in the unbroken chain of Soviet space pioneering achievements has indicated that their lead in this field is increasing with the passing of time. Despite all of the official drum beating from the White House, Pentagon, and National Aeronautics and Space Administration aimed at convincing the American people that we are catching up with the Soviets, the sad record of achievements indicates we are still losing ground" (Nov. 2, 1959).

IV. HAS THE U.S. SUFFERED A SIGNIFICANT LOSS OF WORLD PRESTIGE AS A RESULT OF RECENT SPACE AND MISSILE DEVELOPMENTS?

A. Background facts

The dramatic Soviet achievements in developing missiles and in exploring space during the past 2½ years have been acclaimed throughout the world. Our own progress in these fields, while substantial, suffers by comparison.

The Russians have pressed to the full the propaganda advantages which have accrued. Many people believe that their successes have damaged U.S. prestige.

B. The official view

President Eisenhower was asked a question about catching up with Russia in the field of exploration "in view of the international prestige at stake." Replying to the specific question whether he did not feel it was at stake he said: "Not particularly, no" (Jan. 26, 1960).

C. Other views

George V. Allen, Director of the U.S. Information Agency: "The achievement of placing in orbit the first earth satellite increased the prestige of the Soviet Union tremendously, and produced a corresponding loss of U.S prestige, due primarily to the contrast" (Jan. 22, 1960).

Hanson W. Baldwin, New York Times military analyst: "The Russians got to the moon first; they preceded us into solar space; they put the first living thing in orbit, and hence, in the area of international psychology and politics they are far ahead in the establishment of prestige. * * * The global damage * * * done to the U.S. prestige is incalculable, but there is no denying it has been immense" (Jan. 17, 1960).

The Milwaukee Journal: "The men delegated to keep tabs on the Nation's oversea prestige say it is suffering because of a national lag in space exploration. The President blandly says that our prestige isn't at stake at all. To say the least, this makes for confusion. To say the most, it appears that President Eisenhower is not much worried about whether the Nation is second best in the space age (Feb. 1, 1960).

The Washington Post (dispatch from Leipzig, East Germany): "Important is a subsurface change that has been caused by the shift in the world balance of power since the first Soviet sputnik, 2½ years ago. The idea seems to be gaining ground among the East Germans that the Soviet Union rather than the West may represent the wave of the future whether one likes it or not. This has produced a certain inclination to make one's personal peace with the Communists" (Mar. 1, 1960).

Dr. George B. Kistiakowsky, science adviser to the President: "I need not discourse on the scientific and technological contest with the Soviet Union which today involves our national prestige, and tomorrow, perhaps, our very survival" (Feb. 13, 1960).

V. ARE WE PROPERLY USING OUR INTELLIGENCE ESTIMATES?

A. Background facts

The key factor in determining the adequacy or inadequacy of our defense is, of course, our strength relative to that of the Soviet Union. Our knowledge of Soviet strength is estimated on the basis of carefully compiled and analyzed intelligence information. Intelligence work recognizes two major ways of making such estimates: to evaluate enemy strength in terms of his capabilities—i.e., the most he could do with the resources he has; or in terms of his intentions—i.e., what, on the basis of all known evidence, we believe he will do or has done with the resources he has. The first is the more conservative basis and has traditionally been the primary guideline of U.S. intelligence judgments.

However there has recently been an indication of a change in U.S. policy toward reliance on the second approach.

B. The official view

Secretary of Defense Gates: "Figures (of Soviet ICBM output) that have been testified to in years past * * * were based on Soviet capabilities. This present one is an intelligence estimate of what we believe (the Soviet) will probably do, not what (the Soviets are) capable of doing" (Jan. 20, 1960).

C. Other views

Brig. Gen. Thomas R. Phillips, retired (after citing a number of examples of enemy change of plans): "So much for intentions, or what the opponent probably will do. He can change his mind overnight; and no matter how solid the information you may have today, it can be a trap tomorrow" (Reporter magazine, Feb. 18, 1960).

Joseph Alsop: "The national intelligence estimates may be correct to the last decimal. Pray God they are. But they may also be wrong by a considerable margin. If the estimates of the Soviet ICBM's are wrong, even by a very narrow margin, the error can be fatal. Basically, therefore, it is not merely foolish, it is really criminal to use the national estimates as precision instruments which show how little we need to do. Common prudence demands insurance against error in the ICBM estimate. The national interest demands measures, such as the airborne alert, to end the total vulnerability of the American deterrent. And sound practice demands that the use of mere estimates as precision instruments be abandoned and condemned, as wholly pernicious and improper" (Feb. 10, 1960).

Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY: "I think the administration, the President, reached his judgment in good faith and he's not going to play with the security of the United States. But I think it's extremely difficult to make a correct assessment with precision as to what a dictatorship is doing.

"Therefore I should err on the side of safety. Men who have the same information as the President—Power, Ridgway, Gavin, and Taylor—come to the exact opposite conclusion. If we're moving in a position of peril, I would err on the side of caution" (Feb. 21, 1960).

VI. HAS OUR MILITARY POSITION BEEN WEAKENED BY GIVING PRIORITY TO BUDGET CONSIDERATIONS?

A. Background facts

The Eisenhower-Nixon administration came into office promising substantial cuts in all Government expenditures, including defense. "More bang for the buck" was a well-publicized campaign slogan. Defense expenditures were in fact sharply curtailed—from $43.6 billion in fiscal year 1953 to a low of $35.5 billion in fiscal year 1955. Such expenditures have gradually been increased again since 1955, reaching $40.9 billion in fiscal year 1960. Meanwhile, however, other Government expenditures were increasing even more sharply so that defense has represented a generally decreasing portion of the total Federal budget—from 58.8 percent of the total in fiscal year 1953 to 51 percent in fiscal year 1960. Similarly our defense expenditures have represented a decreasing proportion of our total gross national product—from about 12 percent in 1953 to 8.5 percent in 1959.

Many thoughtful people have raised serious questions as to whether these cutbacks in total and relative defense expenditures have been wise in a period in which military technology has been changing rapidly and weapons systems have become increasingly costly, while the Soviet Union has greatly increased its military power.

The administration has often denied that any necessary or desirable military expenditures have been withheld for budgetary reasons. Yet there is mounting evidence that the limits on our defenses have frequently been more related to an administration concept of what the Nation could afford than in terms of objective judgments of the defense we need.

B. The official view

President Eisenhower (at his news conference on February 17, 1960) was asked if any money had been withheld from any needed weapon. The only answer he gave in addition to stressing the policy of adequacy was: "I get tired of saying that defense is to be made an excuse for wasting dollars. I don't believe we should pay 1 cent for defense more than we have to."

Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL speaking on the status of our national defense: "Certainly there is no intention on the part of the President of the United States or any of the officials in the Pentagon to mislead the citizens or Members of Congress as to the military strength we have or as to the military strength we should have in the future. Certainly there is no intent, as the President of the United States has said with great emphasis, to put budget balancing above the national security" (Feb. 19, 1960).

C. Other views

Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor: "Budget making has been allowed to control strategy although the defense budget is developed in such a way that no one really knows how much combat power the United States is getting for its dollar. * * * The budget makers have become the real strategy makers. Military programs needed to implement our policy can be made or broken by those who decide how to spend the military dollar. Unfor-

tunately, this decisive power is in the hands of men who are not strategists, but rather fiscal experts" (Look magazine, Dec. 22, 1959).

"We must prepare for personal sacrifice in giving up luxuries and paying more taxes. * * * Bluntly I am talking about a military budget of from $50 to $55 billion a year for the next 5 years, instead of today's $41 billion" (Look magazine, Jan. 19, 1960).

Joseph Alsop (deploring the President's giving expense as a reason for a nuclear test ban): "Surely this singular choice of reasons for a high policy decision of truly immeasurable import, reveals a mind gripped by one idea to the point of total obsession. Surely it shows a man driven by a single purpose almost to the point of mania. * * * If you think about a nuclear test ban primarily in terms of possible budget cuts, how do you think about a missile gap? You think about it, the answer seems to be, primarily in terms of the threat to the budget, and hardly at all in terms of the threat to the United States" (Feb. 8, 1960).

The Raleigh News & Observer: "President Eisenhower may be the absolute exception but in history the most mistaken men in the conduct of nearly every new war have been the old soldiers who learned their ways and did their fighting in past ones.

"The changes in war and weapons since Eisenhower was in command in World War II have come at a greater rate than at any other time in the history of human conflict.

"Furthermore in his 70th year the President's preoccupation with defense has clearly become more fiscal than military" (January 1960).

Gen. Thomas R. Phillips: "But the evolution of U.S. military policy has been held back by budgetary fixation on the 'New Look' strategy of sacrificing a flexible military organization to a single weapon for massive retaliation and by jealousies among the three service empires. The result today is that the U.S. forces are not suited to our needs and that the United States in the past 6 years has fumbled until Khrushchev could say confidently: 'Now it is clear that the United States of America is not the world's most powerful military power'" (Reporter magazine, Feb. 4, 1960).

Chalmers M. Roberts: "The problem in Washington is one of attitude. It is an attitude which attempts to comfort those at home who are alarmed at the military slippage by talking about 'balanced forces' and about not competing with the Russians 'missile for missile.'

"It is an attitude toward the other free nations of the world which the United States professes to lead in the East-West struggle, an attitude in which budget balancing and the sanctity of the dollar appear supreme" (The Washington Post, Jan. 6, 1960).

Hanson W. Baldwin: "Closely circumscribed dollar guidelines have clearly inhibited and slowed this country's exploration of space. Moreover, they promise to continue to do so, despite our past disappointments" (the New York Times, Jan. 17, 1960).

VII. ARE THESE APPROPRIATE SUBJECTS FOR PUBLIC DISCUSSION?

A. Background facts

The Eisenhower-Nixon administration has obviously been embarrassed by the mounting public concern over shortcomings in our defense program. The President and the GOP are particularly sensitive to criticism in this area, since major emphasis in the 1952 and 1956 elections was placed on Eisenhower's great knowledge and ability in the defense field. Once again "peace" has been billed as the top campaign appeal of the GOP for 1960.

In this situation the administration has sought to silence critics by implying that our defense position is not a suitable subject for public discussion. Reviving the GOP treason charge techniques of 1952 and 1956, they have even sought to imply that such critics are disloyal or guilty of giving aid and information to a potential enemy.

Thoughtful observers have been disturbed by this attempt to silence sincere questioning in an area that goes to the very heart of public policy.

B. The official view

President Eisenhower (exchange in press conference):

"Question: Sir, there seems to be sort of an attitude of kissing off defense adequacy. * * * Your Republican leaders seemed to think any question of adequacy here is partisanship.

"The PRESIDENT: I've spent my life in this and I know more about it than almost anybody, I think * * * those people that are trying to make defense a partisan matter are doing a disservice to the United States" (Jan. 14, 1960).

Vice President NIXON: "One of the strengths of a free society is that our policies are submitted to constant, searching criticism by those who disagree with them. Criticism can become destructive, however, when by emphasizing alleged weaknesses and overlooking acknowledged strengths it has the effect of making the United States appear to be a 'sitting duck' to potential aggressors" (Feb. 8, 1960).

Senator EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, Senate GOP leader: "The comment on the submarines we have compared to the Soviet Union, the number of ships in different categories compared to the Soviet Union, the discussion of bases—I don't think that these things ought to be paraded across the front page" (the Washington Post, Feb. 14, 1960).

Gen. Nathan F. Twining, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff: "We have great strength, we are a powerful country, and I do not think we should downgrade our capabilities as a nation to the Russians. That is what gives me cause for concern—this downgrading of our capability. It looks like we are going to get licked every day. I am afraid that the public will become frightened some day. It sometimes appears to me that there is an element in this country that thinks 'Gentlemen, we better be Red than be dead.' It is a serious thing" (Jan. 13, 1960).

Murray Snyder, Assistant Secretary of Defense (report in Life magazine): "Snyder * * * has counseled top Defense officials to 'kick the teeth in' of reporters who dare question U.S. defenses and suggested that critics of the program are undermining national confidence and security" (Feb. 8, 1960).

C. Other views

The Washington Post (referring to Dirksen comment above): "Such premises seem to us fallacious on two counts. The first is the notion that the Russians are being treated to a lot of information they do not already have. If their intelligence is half as good as there is reason to think that it is, they have a pretty accurate knowelge of what the United States possesses in military capacity.

"The second is the implication, connected with the above notion, that such knowledge should be secreted. It may be important to safeguard the details of weapons, but in the broad sense a deterrent is only as good as a potential adversary believes it to be. Most of the criticism of American defenses concerns inadequacies 2 or 3 years hence, some of which may yet be remedied. If present military power is as great as defense officials say that it is, then the administration ought to want the Russians to know about it. That is the way to prevent miscalculation.

"Some of the criticism may indeed be wrongly based or ill informed. But for administration spokesmen to imply that criticism of the defense program is therefore destructive—or to insinuate as General Twining did the other day that there is something disloyal in questioning the performance—is to assume a degree of sacrosanctity and infallibility that Americans have not customarily accorded their national leadership.

"How, pray tell, are persons who are just as sincere in their concern for the country as the President is in his to attempt to increase the defense effort except through public comment and discussion? The attempts to stigmatize the exercise of criticism are far more frightening than the bogeys of a garrison state which apologists are so fond of invoking" (Feb. 14, 1960).

Aviation Week magazine: "We respectfully disagree with the thesis that public speeches and newspaper articles contribute little to the progress of the space research program. Without the violent public reaction expressed through these media after Sputnik I and the resultant Soviet space achievements, this country would very probably have no space program worthy of the name. * * * We think that even more public prodding is necessary to stir the very top levels of our Government into an understanding of the basic contribution space research can make to humanity and also to the competitive problem we face with the Soviet Union in this respect" (Nov. 2, 1959).

UP-TO-DATE POSTSCRIPT

Newsweek reports as follows:

The real reason for the long-awaited Cooldige committee report on disarmament was hushed up and eventually discarded: It insisted there's a serious missile gap and that it's dangerous for the United States to negotiate on disarmament while it lags in ICBM's. Ike ordered the report withheld from circulation among top Government officials (Apr. 11, 1960).

Mr. PRICE. Then I would like to give one or two prominent names of Republicans who have expressed their worry and concern over our position both militarily and in other scientific areas.

Yesterday, when I attempted to answer without advance preparation I was challenged by my good friend from Wyoming as to the date of the statements made by the men whom I had quoted. I will admit that the recollections that came to my mind then were of dates that were back in 1956 and 1958, but my whole research in the meantime makes it possible for me tonight to bring these exceptions to the present program up to date.

For instance, I can give some quotations from responsible Republican leaders as late as June of 1960. I should like to refer to a statement by Governor Rockefeller, who certainly cannot be classified as a Democratic critic of the present administration. But Governor Rockefeller stated that "The forces for limited war are inadequate." He then went on to recommend the immediate expenditure of additional money to correct that situation. That does not refer to any particular scientific program, but I think it is essential that in keeping up the military strength of this country we give some serious thought to the forces for the conduct of limited war.

I should like to go back a little further in the Rockefeller opinions on this, to the Rockefeller report in 1958, which stated:

There is grave reason for concern with respect to the workings of the budgetary processes.

This is one of the challenges thrown out by the speakers in the Operation

Veracity, that we were challenged to show where any budgetary considerations had interfered with our space or military programs. This is a direct reference to a budgetary restriction, and a reference to the concern that people who are interested in our national security have over budgetary considerations when it comes to adequate preparations in this field. This is the Rockefeller report from which I am quoting.

The report then refers to reductions which have taken place since the Korean war in our expenditures for the Armed Forces. The report refers specifically to the effect on the Air Force and the Army. In making such references, it stated:

> The result has been serious imbalance in our military preparedness. Recent budgetary ceilings could be maintained only by a reduction of forces in all services and processes which has been slowly going on for the past 3 years. The budgetary squeeze affected not only force levels, it also slowed down our research effort in many fields causing us to lose ground to the U.S.S.R. Recent military expenditures are therefore insufficient to maintain even our current force level, and events have made clear the inadequacy of these levels.

The above expressions were in an introduction to the chapter entitled "Budget for National Security." It must be emphasized these are not Democratic criticisms. These are criticisms from the Rockefeller report.

Robert C. Sprague, who introduced himself as a conservative Republican, and who was the chairman of the Gaither Committee, which prepared its report at the request of the President and for the President on the status of our national defense, testified before the Subcommittee on National Policy Machinery of the Senate Committee on Government Operations on February 24, 1960, not 1954, not 1956, nor 1958, but February 24, 1960.

He said that he considered our present military program inadequate to the needs, and also that he considered the deficiencies a threat to our survival, and also that he thought there ought to be a higher ratio between defense expenditures and gross national product than now obtains.

These were people actually outside the Government. Perhaps Rockefeller at the time he made the statement in 1960 was in the State government, but he was a high spokesman for the Republican Party, and he had served in official capacities in the Eisenhower administration.

But with reference to the point that they have made that no spokesman of the administration has said that, I just want to refer to Secretary of the Army Brucker who testified before the Senate Defense Appropriation Subcommittee in May 1960, to the effect that the Army had recommended and specified additional requirements were needed for modernization of the Army and an airlift for the Army, but that such recommendation had been cut back by the Department of Defense and by the Bureau of the Budget.

He went on to say "the decision was made adversely to us," meaning the Department of the Army.

I could go through congressional hearings and bring out name after name of people high in the administration who have been critical of the effort put forth and the restrictions put upon the efforts made when it comes to national preparedness.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I cannot let this moment pass without congratulating the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] for his profound contribution in his work on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. Next month we in the State of Illinois are going to have the great honor of seeing the first large privately developed electric powerplant powered by atomic energy opened to serve that vast area. The Dresden powerplant is to be opened. It was built by the Commonwealth Edison Co. You know men seeking public office frequently play footloose and fancy free with slogans, and they like to brand a lot of us Democrats as Socialists and various other things every time we try to do something. Yet, if it had not been for the determined efforts of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] and his great and sincere and dedicated contribution on the Joint Atomic Energy Committee and his great assistance to private enterprise to see that private enterprise developed this great atomic power for private use, this plant would not be opening next month. I think not only in the Midwest, not only the people in Illinois and not only the people of Chicago, but, yes, the people of America and the world certainly can be proud that we have a man like Mr. PRICE on this committee who has helped to guide research in this atomic energy field so that today, contrary to the frequent accusations we hear from our colleagues, private enterprise is benefiting from that research which has been paid for through the Government and the taxpayers' money.

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I have requested a few moments from the time of the distinguished gentleman from Illinois so that I could ask a specific question of my friends on the other side of the aisle.

First, I would like to give some background for my question, dealing with the general subject of space, in view of the fact that I am a member of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, and that this subject is close and dear to my heart. Yesterday, the distinguished gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. BASS] took the well of the House and spent some 20 or 25 minutes, as I recall, putting over the point in most emphatic terms that the Republican Party had responded to the challenge of the space age, that the Republican Party was well aware of the gravity of the situation; that they had done all that was possible and that very commendable progress was being made in the field of space activities. This statement, of course, was challenged by many of us on the Democratic side of the aisle.

Last April the distinguished chairman of the Republican congressional campaign committee, Mr. MILLER, appeared in Salt Lake City at the Republican organizing convention.

As the keynoter of that convention, in referring to me, he stated that the Congressman from the Second Congressional District of Utah was a Congressman who in effect had been downgraded, and who was a Congressman with little responsibility in Congress. As evidence of that fact he recited my membership on the Space Committee.

I call attention to the fact incidentally that membership on the committee includes such distinguished men as the present majority leader, the distinguished JOHN MCCORMACK, and by the former Speaker of the House and former minority leader, JOSEPH MARTIN.

The question I should like to ask Mr. MILLER, and may I say incidentally that he was on the floor a few minutes ago. I saw him leave. So in order to be fair I shall indicate here my intention. I shall write him a letter tomorrow morning and I shall send him an excerpt of what I am here stating and shall ask him in the letter to make a reply either in the RECORD or to me personally.

So I want this to be perfectly fair. The question I ask him is: Did he or did he not make the statement that it is evidence of the downgrading, or lack of importance and influence of a Congressman, that he is appointed a member of the Space Committee?

If his answer is "Yes," that he did make the statement, then, Mr. Speaker, that in itself is evidence of the allegations contained in the Democratic platform: namely, that the Republican Party has not fully appreciated the gravity, and the magnitude of the space challenge. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that from those very words we have authoritative confirmation of our allegation that the Republicans have neither understood this problem nor taken adequate steps to solve it.

If his answer should be that he did not make the statement, then, of course, I shall immediately ask that the newspapers that reported this particular article make a public retraction.

I think the public is entitled to know whether or not the Republican Party feels that the work of the Committee on Science and Astronautics is an unimportant work and that the members who serve on that committee are doing unimportant work for their country. We are entitled to know the answer to that question.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, in 1959, there came before the House of Representatives the authorization bill for the NASA fiscal 1960 budget. This bill called for the authorization of $485 million to finance the activities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, for fiscal 1960. This was the administration's own bill. It contained the administration's own figure, and a modest figure, I might say. This bill was submitted by the administration to this committee with the request that it be endorsed by the committee. The committee approved the bill, as I recall, unanimously. It was reported out to the floor of the House. If my memory serves me correctly, and I think I am correct,

the record will show that when it came up for a vote there were approximately 90 Republicans who voted against the bill. That represented the great majority of the Republicans who cast a vote. The record will also show that a majority of the Democrats voted for the bill. So here, Mr. Speaker, you have the anomalous situation of the administration's own bill, with its own figure, $485 million, as I recall, to finance our space effort, coming before us, and being turned down by those who should have been its stanchest supporters.

I might say that if there had been 10 more votes against that particular bill it would have failed, and our entire space program would have stood in serious jeopardy of failure, and might even have failed altogether.

To me, Mr. Speaker, this is serious. It indicates one of two things: either the Republican Members of this great body felt that the Democrats were sure to pass the bill, and therefore saw this as their opportunity to get in a few economy votes, or they failed to realize the seriousness of this situation. If we put the latter interpretation on their vote, we must assume that they had no comprehension at all of the seriousness of the space challenge. I leave it up to them to choose which horn of the dilemma they want to impale themselves on. But to me, Mr. Speaker, this is eloquent testimony in confirmation of what the Democrats have been saying all along, that the Republicans have been slow to rise to this new challenge of the space age.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BRAY. All I wanted to do was to direct a question to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. KING], who has just been speaking. He mentioned the gentleman from New York [Mr. MILLER]. Mr. MILLER is not in the room, and has not been all the time the gentleman spoke. I have not seen him for some time .

I would like to ask the gentleman from Utah [Mr. KING] this question: Since he knew he was going to mention Mr. MILLER, the Congressman from New York, did the gentleman notify him you were going to direct a question at him before you directed the question?

Mr. KING of Utah. In answer to the gentleman, may I say I did ask the gentleman from Illinois, the present occupant of the well, whether he would yield to me and I asked him at a time Mr. MILLER was on the floor. By the time I got the floor, Mr. MILLER had slipped out.

Mr. BRAY. The gentleman does not answer the question.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I refuse to yield further. I think the gentleman from Utah answered the question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] will continue.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I must confess when I requested this time to make my remarks this evening I did not realize that an analysis of the Republicans' Operation Veracity by my colleagues on this side would develop into a Democratic antideception depth charge that would bring all of our colleagues on this side of the floor to the rescue.

I think we have certainly brought to light many more things that have been said in the last 2 days in this Operation Veracity. I should also like to point out that during the last few days while many of us sat here listening to Operation Veracity, on any number of occasions we asked the managers of the time to yield to us, but for reasons known best to themselves they declined.

We on this side did not make a point of order that a quorum was not present in indignation when you gentlemen would not yield.

I yield now to the gentleman from Utah, who was addressing the House at the time of the quorum call.

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, just before the quorum call I was in the process of asking a question of the gentleman on the other side, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MILLER]. I regretted the gentleman from New York [Mr. MILLER] was not in the room at the time. He had been prior thereto. Now that he is in the Chamber I should like to repeat my question to establish this point for the record.

By way of brief preface, may I say that on yesterday the distinguished gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. BASS] spent considerable time in pointing out to the House that the Republican Party was well aware of the seriousness of the space challenge, that it understood the gravity of the situation before it, and that it had done everything possible to meet this challenge, and that progress in the field of space was satisfactory in every respect.

Last April, as I recall it, at the Republican organizing convention in Salt Lake City, the honorable gentleman from New York [Mr. MILLER] was the keynote speaker. He is reported in both Salt Lake City daily newspapers as having said that the Congressman from the Utah Second Congressional District, namely myself, had very little influence in the House of Representatives, and that as evidence of that fact he had been appointed a member of the newly formed Committee on Science and Astronautics.

I should like to ask the distinguished gentleman from New York whether that statement was made by him?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New York to reply. I just want to remind him that the last time I did this we got a quorum call. I now yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MILLER of New York. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. I may say that if I had known the gentleman from Utah was going to pose this question, if he had called me at any time during the day and told me he anticipated making this statement, I certainly would have been present.

I will say that I recollect very vividly keynoting the convention in Utah to which he refers. I am certain that I made no comment concerning the gentleman from Utah in the course of my prepared remarks. I did have a press conference and I think perhaps I was asked the question as to the position of the gentleman from Utah [Mr. KING] on our Committee on Space. I would like to assert at this time we do indeed stress this area, it is a very important one. We are having a conference of our candidates in Washington, and we had a 2-hour session tonight on this very subject. But I think probably when I was asked the question in Salt Lake City concerning the gentleman I probably remarked along the line that I had not heard very much about the gentleman, I did not know very much about his work on the committee, and therefore I might have some doubt about his effectiveness on the committee, although I do not doubt at all he was honest.

Mr. KING of Utah. In order to make this crystal clear, does the gentleman now deny that membership on the Space Committee in itself constitutes evidence of having been downgraded in the Congress of the United States?

Mr. MILLER of New York. May I say that outside of the majority leader and the former minority leader of the House, is there anyone else in the House who is a member of the Space Committee, and a member of any other committee of the House?

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I am a member of the Space Committee and a member of no other committee. And, I would like to say that the gentleman from Utah [Mr. KING], is one of the hardest working and most effective members of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics.

Mr. MILLER of New York. I might say I am delighted to hear it.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, let me make mention, while the gentleman from New York [Mr. MILLER] is on the floor, that in the Minneapolis papers recently there has been a little story about Congressman WIER having been, so to say, degraded as a member of the District Committee, where freshmen usually serve. Now, I hope that that had no connection with your presence in this gathering at Minneapolis. Being a member of the District Committee is really refreshing.

Mr. MILLER of New York. You are not trying to say that I made such a statement?

Mr. WIER. I am just asking the question if in that statement in Omaha you might have said something about Congressman WIER in the Minneapolis program.

Mr. MILLER of New York. I might have. I was there.

Mr. WIER. Well, I would gather that it was closely related and that it was probably made by you.

Mr. MILLER of New York. No; it was not. It was made by your opponent. I think the voters in your district will decide that.

Mr. WIER. Oh, indeed they will.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. While the gentleman from New York [Mr. MILLER] is on the floor, I would like to propound a question to him. There is an article in Roll Call today which quotes you as saying that you believe the Republican Party has a great chance of taking away the district from the most distinguished woman in the Pennsylvania delegation, Mrs. KATHRYN GRANAHAN. Now, the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania [Mrs. GRANAHAN] was elected in 1958 by about 42,000, in 1956 by about 50,000, and in 1952 by about 40,000. So, I would like to know who is giving you the information.

Mr. MILLER of New York. Well, of course, you have to remember that we have had Members on this side of the aisle who had records just exactly like that and who lost their seats.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Well, I happen to be the leader of the Democratic Party in Philadelphia.

Mr. MILLER of New York. I am delighted to know that.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. And I know something about the district, and I know when you make a statement like that you certainly do not know what you are talking about. And, I ask you where you got your information.

Mr. MILLER of New York. We will see after the November race.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. I hope you are not getting it from that great distinguished junior Senator in the other body who does not know anything about Pennsylvania, Mr. HUGH SCOTT.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that those words be stricken from the RECORD. He is talking about a Member of the other body. He cannot do that.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, if the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania and the other Members on this side will permit me to yield to those that I had promised to yield to earlier and we continue showing what a complete mockery Operation Veracity is, I think that not only Mrs. GRANAHAN but a lot of the Democrats who are trying to come to Congress will be here after November 8.

So, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the very charming and distinguished lady from Idaho [Mrs. PFOST].

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN] criticized a passage in our Democratic platform which reads, as follows:

> The Democratic Congress has successfully fought the efforts of the Republican administration to cut off REA loans.

In criticizing the platform reference, the Republican truth squad said:

> Now REA has been in existence 25 years. The Eisenhower administration has been in office a little over 7½ years—in other words, about 30 percent of the time of REA existence. Yet, 45 percent of all the loans approved in REA history were approved during the Eisenhower-Nixon administration.

Now, Mr. Speaker, REA co-ops are very important to my State of Idaho. Their transmission lines carry power to the rural homes of thousands of Idahoans and additional power is desperately needed at this time.

Now, Mr. Speaker, for the Republicans to come out at this 11th hour—virtually on the eve of election—with the statement that they have really loved REA all along is a bit like a deathbed decision to reform. This will be somewhat difficult for the thousands of managers and directors of the 1,000 REA co-ops to swallow. Two months of promises will not make these men—Republicans, independents, and Democrats alike, forget the past 8-year record.

The REA co-ops have many problems but there are two of major concern to them: First, adequate wholesale power at rates they can afford to pay; and, second, financing through REA at reasonable interest rates.

Here is the Republican record on these two major areas in which the Federal Government must cooperate if the REA co-ops are to survive and grow.

On power supply the Republican administration adopted a policy of no new starts on hydroelectric dams, thus cutting off this source of abundant, low cost wholesale power. Anyone who looks at the wholesale power rate map which the co-ops have drawn up will see the disastrous effect this policy has had on the power cost the co-ops must pay and then pass on to their members.

On the matter of financing, the Republican Administration attempted to cripple the REA co-ops in two ways. First, they have annually tried to severely limit the amount of REA loan funds available, despite the fact that these co-ops have a perfect record of repaying these loans with interest. In the years from 1953 through 1960, the administration requested a total of $1,149.3 million in REA electric loan funds. Democratic Congresses forced through additional appropriations, raising the aggregate total to $1,815 million. That's more than a 53 percent increase forced through by Democratic Congresses—and the record shows it was needed.

Had it not been for the fact that the Democratic Congress wrote the laws under which an REA Administrator must make loans and forced through these necessary higher loan fund authorizations the REA co-ops would not have had adequate loan funds.

Only the aggregate REA electric loan authorizations for the 1953–60 period—budget request and actual authorization—are included in the following.

Year-by-year figures are:

[In millions]

	Administration asked	Congress authorized
1953	$100.0	$100
1954	155.0	180
1955	90.0	170
1956	195.0	260
1957	170.3	414
1958	179.0	179
1959	150.0	342
1960	110.0	170

With the Democratic Congress in this way protecting the REA co-ops from this Republican onslaught, the Republicans tried another device—they tried to raise the interest rates the co-ops must pay, raise it high enough to cripple the co-ops they now profess to love. The REA co-ops, their members, directors, and managers are aware that the Republicans have continued a barrage of raise-the-REA-interest-rate propaganda unleashed by Benson and other GOP spokesmen. Only a Democratic Congress thwarted this attack.

No rural electric co-op manager, no director, no farmer will forget this persistent, destructive, three-pronged attack on the REA organizations of America. No Republican campaign-time lullabies can wipe it out.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK].

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ULLMAN] have permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, when President Truman dedicated the Hungry Horse Federal Dam he told those there to "take a good look at it—the dam—because it is the last of its kind you will see for a long time if the Republicans get in."

Truman was right. Under the pressure of GOP policies, the development of our natural resources has almost come to a halt.

The simple fact of the matter is that the Republicans, concerned with the needs of the few, do not have the vision, imagination, or boldness needed to properly develop our natural resources.

Budgeting has hurt conservation as has the veto of the antipollution bill of 1960, by the granting of oil leases in wildlife refuges and by the shocking award of unwarranted mining claims in national forests.

Other development has been hurt by vetoes of two rivers and harbors bills, by the giveaway of such sites as Hells Canyon, and by in general restrictive policies.

We are already feeling the pinch of the Republican policies in natural resources, but if we follow these shortsighted policies in the future, the result will be disastrous.

To feed the more than 230 million Americans of 1975, we will need twice as much water as we now have, twice as much food, and three times as much power. We may need an additional 3,500,000 acres on which to grow food.

Programs to prepare us for the challenges of the new frontier are needed, as is vigorous and enlightened leadership to carry them out.

The Democratic program for the future calls for:

Resource advisers in the Office of the President, charged with long-range responsibilities in the proper development of natural resources.

A capital budget to distinguish wise investment in self-liquidating resource projects from current operating expenditures.

A Youth Conservation Corps to improve the forests.

Giant power systems for low-cost electricity over regional transmission lines.

Comprehensive development of river basins for flood protection, irrigation, navigation, recreation, and electric power.

Increased recreational opportunities.

Pollution control.

A public-power yardstick to regulate private-power rates.

Soil conservation.

Comprehensive national water resource policy, under which, with the cooperation of State and local governments and private groups, will be developed a balanced, multiple-purpose plan for each major river basin, to be revised periodically to meet changing needs.

Most of all, we will eliminate the Republican slogan of "no new starts" and pick up where Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman left off.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois, our very able colleague, for yielding me of his limited time, as I know how many other Members have statements they want to put in the RECORD.

I could not help wonder a few minutes ago when the gentleman from Indiana seemed distressed when our young but very able and respected colleague from Utah raised the question of what another Member from New York had said why he displayed such great excitement, making a point of order of no quorum and forcing a call of the House. I do not recall during the debate, when the Republicans had their special orders, that any of the Members on our side of the aisle made a point of no quorum, or tried to interrupt the proceedings in any way.

Mr. PUCINSKI. The gentleman's recollection is absolutely correct.

Mr. BLATNIK. Why such concern tonight about making reference to another Member when he does not happen to be on the floor at the time? Just yesterday, on the floor of the House, under a special order requested and granted in advance, a Member on the minority side, a colleague of ours on the Public Works Committee and on the Highway Investigating Committee, put into the RECORD 7 full pages of personal statements, tables, and reports from the Federal Bureau of Roads, and not once did he extend the courtesy of notifying any Member on our side, and least of all the chairman, who is now speaking.

I am glad to see the gentleman here on the floor, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER]. I use his name only because he is on the floor. We have had an opportunity to discuss this personally this morning, following a session of the Public Works Committee. I let the gentleman know what I thought of the tactics at that time.

These hit-and-run tactics that we have just seen demonstrated by the gentleman from New York, when he was quoted as saying one thing and then claimed he was misquoted—and chances are he was, and I hope he was, because he gave us a very different version of what he had intended to say or thought he had said back in Utah, and now in repeating what he had said for the RECORD.

The same thing happened yesterday. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] referred to one of our two major hearings conducted by the special investigating committee on the interstate highway program. He made reference to one of these hearings, known as the Oklahoma hearing, as follows, and I quote from page 18429 of the RECORD, dated August 30:

> The second great exposé dealt with the State of Oklahoma. And apparently some internal, largely political, problems were involved there.

I must admit that there was considerable trouble in Oklahoma that made me quite concerned. But what did he say originally in our committee? What did he say in the very closing minutes of a week-long session of intensive interrogation and presentation of witnesses under most difficult circumstances, firmly but fairly, with not one witness being abused or maligned? What did the gentleman from Florida say on that date? You will find it in the printed record of our highway subcommittee hearings on page 358, in the very closing minutes after 5 days of hearings, on an occasion when he had very recent recollection of what had transpired during the previous days of committee hearing. I quote from the printed hearings of the committee:

> Mr. CRAMER. I, too, want to say I congratulate the staff for the very fine job they did. This has been an extremely exhaustive investigation, and I think a most objective one. I want to congratulate them for the fine work they have done, along with the chairman. I, too, feel that good has come out of this already and much more will in the future.

Talk about Operation Truth, about truth squads, what we ought to have is mention of what truth means before it is used so loosely and irresponsibly in example after example that has come to our attention. The ranking minority Member, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHERER], and again I only use his name because I see him here on the floor of the House, 10 days ago in a large press release prepared in advance, abused and maligned the committee and the chairman, attributing to the chairman political motives in the conduct of the hearings and repeated, as he had in the past, the motives of the committee itself. He has referred in the past to the staff and to other members of our committee as hatchetmen. He has insulted the distinguished senior colleague and chairman of our full committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCKLEY], by assigning to him and attributing to him this scathing, vitriolic, unmitigated at- and the charman of the full committee.

He put out this press release on Monday, 10 days ago when he knew that 2 days later, on Wednesday of that week, there was to be held an executive session of our committee in which the points to which he had made reference would be discussed before the full membership of the committee. So our committee met on Wednesday, 2 days after he released this scathing, vitriolic, unmitigated attack on everybody in the committee—the staff, the chairman, the subcommittee, and the chairman of the full committee. The purpose of the investigation was to give full briefing, a face-to-face report and rundown by our committee staff counsel to the full committee membership informing them of what they had been doing this past 3 months and what they intend to do and to what degree these cases are unfolding. I, as chairman, then stated that now was the time for any member to raise questions that may be disturbing them. The gentleman from Ohio maintained interesting and self-incriminating silence on the grave charges he had raised 2 days earlier in his press release. Now I call that hit-and-run tactics, and I say so publicly here on the floor of the House and in the presence of the two minority members to whom these remarks are directed. I say that this is an indefensible twisting of the truth and I charge here that they have insulted the members of the committee and cast irresponsible but grave and serious doubts on the conduct and purpose of our committee. I want the RECORD to show that these two gentlemen from the very beginning, even before the committee was created, have attacked and questioned in very unrestrained terms the motives of the committee; that the two gentlemen appeared in person before the subcommittee of the House Committee on Administration and opposed the appropriations for this highway investigation. They opposed it, of course, on the ground that the amount asked for the investigation was too much. But when we asked them what they recommended, they said they had given it no consideration and they had no recommendation to make. The record will show all three House Members of the minority on that appropriations subcommittee subsequently voted against this request for funds to conduct this tremendous intricate, important, and difficult investigation of the highway program.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD in further detail to try to clarify some of the misstatements that were put in the RECORD yesterday and on previous occasions, and I thank the gentleman from Illinois for the time he has so generously given to me.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, so, here is the story of highly irresponsible behavior of the minority members.

Twice within the past 10 days the Special Subcommittee To Investigate the Federal-Aid Highway Program has been subjected to vitriolic hit-and-run attacks. The first such attack was made by the ranking minority member of [illegible] subcommittee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHERER], through the medium of a press release which contained wild allegations which he did not have the temerity to repeat when an executive session of the subcommittee was called.

The second ranking minority member, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER], chose the floor of the House as the forum for his attack just yesterday.

I have tried my best, as chairman of this subcommittee, to direct its affairs in a way that is calculated to keep the investigation free from political overtones. I call upon the Members of the House to

witness that the injection of political considerations originates entirely from the other side and I have no recourse except to set the record straight.

The gentleman from Ohio and the gentleman from Florida are well aware of the rule in equity that a complainant must come into court with clean hands. Their public pronouncements scarcely fall within the purview of this rule.

I have no hesitancy in charging now that they have been obstructionists from the very moment this subcommittee was conceived. They opposed the appropriation of funds for its operation. The gentleman from Ohio has insulted the chairman of the parent committee. Both he and the gentleman from Florida have impugned my integrity and the gentleman from Ohio has gratuitously insulted other individual members of the majority. He has publicly proclaimed that hard-working, dedicated staff members are political hatchetmen. I see sitting near me, on the majority side, another colleague from Florida, my good friend JIM HALEY, who on every occasion, including on the floor of the House, has most vigorously supported our investigation and urged that adequate funds be provided for this tremendous task.

The minority gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] yesterday made a great point in his remarks to the House that there have been only two investigations by what he disparagingly chose to term "this great crusading subcommittee."

So that there will be no question about what he said, I quote from page 18429 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in which he states as follows:

> There have been two investigations; one of them was directed at the Bureau of Public Roads. It was an effort to try to show that a decision was made in regard to bridge clearance, that instead of a 17-foot bridge clearance, as the Department of Defense had recommended—and some of the majority apparently were in favor of it—they established a 16-foot bridge clearance.

Now, I am not quite sure just what the gentleman from Florida was trying to say. However, I can tell you that the record before the subcommittee discloses these undisputed facts:

First. Army staff studies were made in 1952 and again in 1955 in the Office of the Chief of Transportation, Department of the Army, which showed that the military services were designing, procuring, and had in stock thousands of items of excessive dimensions and weight; that there had been a tendency on the part of military planners to use experience of the past for current and future planning; that from the transportation aspect this type of planning was no longer practical, and that another war would be one of quick movement demanding fluid supply lines.

Second. Army technical manuals reflected in 1953, 1954, and 1956 that the current ordnance inventory contained weapons which, when loaded on a transporter, varied in height from 13 feet 6½ inches, to 15 feet ½ inch. The Corps of Engineers, the Navy, and the Air Force all had essential items exceeding 14 feet.

Third. The configuration of the Atlas missile was known in 1954. The difficulties in moving it by highway from California to Cape Canaveral were known in 1956. The witness, Mr. Leonard, testified that nobody in the Department of Defense ever bothered to learn from him what difficulties he was experiencing.

Fourth. The act of 1956 specified that the standards for the Interstate System were to be adequate to accommodate the types and volumes of traffic forecast for the year 1975. When the standards fixed the minimum vertical clearance at 14 feet the Department of Defense was not consulted. But neither did the Department of Defense make any effort to alert the Bureau of Public Roads or the American Association of State Highway Officials to the fact that the 14-foot standard would seriously impair the ability of the military to move expeditiously with the oversized items then known to be in the ordnance inventory.

The 14-foot standard was officially adopted on July 17, 1956. The testimony shows that the issue as to its adequacy for military movements was not raised until 6 months later. Thereafter there occurred a classic example of bureaucratic indecision.

From July 17, 1956, to January 27, 1960, when the standard was finally raised from 14 to 16 feet, the total elapsed time was 3 years, 6 months, and 10 days, during which over 2,000 affected bridges or structures were built. This was unconscionable, incredible, inexcusable, and indefensible delay.

It is to be remembered in this connection that you will still have uncorrected a gigantic obstacle course of thousands of substandard underpasses which will continue to strangle the mobility of military units which may, in the future, be trying to make their way across those stretches of the System.

And what has been the cost in terms of the taxpayers' dollars? We know from the testimony that the Bureau of Public Roads made a "guesstimate" in March 1958 that it would cost $100 million to go to 16 feet and $228 million to go to 18 feet. The Bureau's first firm estimate was not calculated until March 1959. At that time the Bureau said it would cost $875 million to build future bridges, to raise and rebuild those already completed or under way, and to raise and rebuild bridges on existing facilities that had been incorporated in the System. These figures were for a 17-foot standard.

Six months later, because bridges continued to be built, the figure became $1,123 million for 17 feet. When the 16-foot standard finally became official in January of this year the estimate became $925 million. It is not inconceivable that the administration will now claim that this final decision saved $198 million.

The vociferous minority, during the course of the hearings, valiantly tried to associate the urgency of a higher standard with the time when the Russians put sputnik into orbit. They have endeavored to create the impression that responsibility can be limited only to the 2,259 bridges built since 1956. They have argued that if the move to a higher standard was made immediately after sputnik it would only have cost $40 million to raise the bridges built from 1956 up to that time and another $13 million to modify the design of the bridges yet to be built. They have also elicited testimony that to convert as of now would cost only $176 million and that, therefore, by some complicated reasoning that I cannot comprehend, the loss between the time of sputnik and the present is only $123 million.

We now come to the second investigation by the subcommittee which the gentleman from Ohio, in his press release, characterized as, and I quote, "an investigation which had political overtones involving a factional fight within the Democratic Party. The present Governor of Oklahoma is the leader of one of the factions which was helped by the hearings. It is significant or maybe it is merely a coincidence that his brother is a member of our investigating committee." The gentleman from Florida, propagandizing on the same identical line, stated here in the House that "apparently some internal, largely political, problems were involved there."

The gentleman from Ohio and the gentleman from Florida, as evidenced by the foregoing quotations, demonstrate that their gift for distorting facts is virtually indescribable.

Now, what are the true facts? The evidence in the Oklahoma situation established conclusively that serious inspection deficiencies existed at both the Federal and State levels and that the inspection and investigative machinery of the Bureau of Public Roads failed to bring to light the deplorable conditions subsequently shown by the subcommittee staff to have prevailed during almost the entire construction period. The unrefuted testimony was that the contractor did, in fact, ignore the specifications; that substandard materials were used during construction; that there was improper weighing of materials; that there was falsification of test reports and test samples; that there was double billing for material and overpayment for materials; and finally, that there were shortages of materials in the finished highway. Expert witnesses estimated that the deficiencies in the completed road were in excess of $524,000. The testimony also disclosed that a former Oklahoma highway commissioner, in violation of a State statute, held a hidden 25 percent interest in a construction company that participated in a lucrative subcontract for sodding on one of the projects in question, during the period of his service as a member of the highway commission.

I would like to cite one more instance to illustrate how well the gentleman from Florida can blow hot and cold. He is critical now of the way the subcommittee and the staff has operated, but I would like to quote to you from page 358 of the printed record of the Oklahoma hearings and these are Mr. CRAMER'S own words:

> Mr. CRAMER. I, too, want to say I congratulate the staff for the very fine job they did. This has been an extremely exhaustive investigation and I think a most objective one. I want to congratulate them for the

fine work they have done, along with the chairman. I, too, feel that good has come out of this already, and much more will in the future. I am extremely gratified and encouraged to learn of the committee established by the State highway officials, because I am thoroughly convinced that if this problem is not tackled and licked on the State level it can only result in additional Federal intervention and additional Federal bureaucracy, and thus taking away some of the responsibilities and rights that the States presently have in this program.

I am glad to see that the State highway officials are accepting that responsibility and going forward, and likewise the Bureau of Public Roads, on having had these facts called to their attention.

Both the gentleman from Ohio and the gentleman from Florida have publicly accused me of handcuffing the committee and the staff between now and November. They have clearly implied that all investigative activity has been suspended. Once again they are guilty of indefensible twisting of the truth. I want the RECORD to show that there has been no slackening of investigative activity and there is no intention of suspending any investigative activity. I do serve notice on the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle that as long as I am chairman of this subcommittee we will not hold public hearings in any manner until such time as there has been a full and complete investigation and the ascertainment of all available facts.

The gentleman from Ohio and the gentleman from Florida both know full well that the objective of this subcommittee has been to operate in a nonpartisan manner and that we will definitely give judicious consideration to any complaints that we receive and that we do not propose for one moment to engage in any witch hunt or badger any whipping boys.

I want the RECORD also to show that both the gentleman from Ohio and the gentleman from Florida during the course of hearings that we have held consider it to be their principal duty to serve as defense counsel for the present Republican administration. The gentleman from Florida particularly pursued the rather novel defense that the reason the Oklahoma scandals were not disclosed earlier came about because no one bothered to tell the Bureau of Public Roads what was going on in that State. He knows as well as I do that nothing can relieve the Bureau of Public Roads or other agencies of the Government from the responsibility of ferreting out wrongdoing wherever it may occur.

The gentleman from Florida made a particular point on Tuesday of inserting in the RECORD the official documents of the Bureau of Public Roads which shows the substantial progress being made on what has been termed "this greatest of public roads programs in the history of the world." He conveniently forgot to mention the undeniable fact that no one really knows to what extent conditions similar to those found in Oklahoma exist elsewhere in the United States. The subcommittee is engaged even now in investigations which we are pretty certain will show that highways elsewhere have been built without regard for specifications.

The gentleman from Florida has also tried vainly to assert the premise that the only good things that ever happened in Federal aid to highways came about as a result of the Eisenhower administration. He completely ignored the record which shows that Federal aid to highways invariably has come through the urging of Democratic administrations and support from the Democratic-controlled Congresses.

It was a Democratic administration in 1933, backed by a Democratic Congress, that made Federal funds available for secondary roads. It was a Democratic administration in 1939 that foresaw the need for transcontinental superhighways. It was a Democratic Congress in 1944 that passed legislation stepping up Federal aid for the postwar years and which designated the 40,000-mile national system of interstate highways. It was a Democratic Congress in 1952 that made the first specific authorization of funds for the Interstate System. It was a Democratic Congress that enacted the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 which authorized the 13-year program for completion of the interstate and a sustained level of financial help for the primary, secondary, and urban systems.

Surely the gentleman from Florida must have had his tongue in his cheek when he made the following statement with reference to the passage of the 1956 Highway Act:

> It was largely because of the President's strong leadership and the support he had among the Republicans in Congress that the program enacted was a responsible one, providing adequate funds for construction, and the establishment of a trust fund to be replenished with earmarked road-user taxes; also there was tremendous Democratic pressure to finance the program out of the general fund.

Those of us who were in Congress at the time have no difficulty in remembering that the administration originally proposed that this program be financed through a bond issue. Neither do we have any trouble in remembering that the then Secretary of the Treasury, George Humphrey, successfully induced Senator BYRD to insert the Byrd amendment in the 1956 act which has caused most of the financial difficulties that have plagued the program in recent years.

The gentleman from Florida was also most careful not to tell you Members of the House how the administration in 1956 which, as you all know was a presidential election year, played fast and loose with the highway trust fund and used it as a vehicle by which to proclaim to the American public that the administration had ended fiscal 1956 with a surplus of $1.626 billion.

The highway trust fund was created on July 1, 1956, and the Secretary of the Treasury immediately transferred $1.98 billion in unpaid bills to the trust fund but did not turn over one red cent of revenue which had been collected from highway users during fiscal 1956. The road-user taxes were earmarked, all right, but not for the purposes of paying highway bills.

It is a matter of official record that in fiscal 1956 the Treasury collected $2.944 billion from American motorists but every dime of this was used to create the mythical surplus. Without application of this $2.944 billion to general fund purposes the administration would have concluded the year with a deficit. According to Republican reasoning it was perfectly all right to saddle the trust fund with a mortgage of almost $2 billion.

Let it be noted for the record that the gentleman from Ohio has admitted publicly the truth of what I have just stated. In a speech to the American Association of State Highway Officials in Boston last October, in discussing the financial crisis that had developed in the highway program, the gentleman from Ohio said this:

> The trust fund absorved, as was not contemplated, approximately $1.5 billion of highway obligations due and owing on the effective date of the 1956 act.

Even then he could not get the figure straight because there is no doubt about the fact that the total was $1.98 billion.

The gentleman from Florida also conveniently forgets to tell you that while the administration collects at the present time almost $4½ billion annually from highway users, more than $1½ billion goes to the general fund and not into the highway trust fund. I say to the gentleman from Florida and also to the gentleman from Ohio that the fiscal policies of the present Republican administration have eroded and seriously jeopardized the basic principles of the 1956 legislation to keep financing and construction in balance.

The present administration has evidenced no compunction about using the highway trust fund as a handy market for U.S. short term notes but has shown great reluctance to loan money to the trust fund even though the law says it shall. On those occasions when moneys have been advanced from the general fund to the trust fund there has been insistence by the administration on repayment before the end of the fiscal year despite the fact that the act provides that such advances shall be paid when the Secretary of the Treasury determines that moneys are available in the trust fund for such purposes. The administration conveniently construes this to mean that repayment shall be made for the convenience of the Treasury and not for the convenience of the trust fund. I think it is quite obvious that such a limitation on the length of time in which the trust fund can be of a debtor to the general fund certainly was not the intention of Congress when this provision was included in the act.

The inconsistency of the position of the gentleman from Florida is best evidenced by the statement that the highway program is actually ahead of schedule. Anybody who knows anything about the situation knows that under present circumstances the Interstate System cannot possibly be completed by the target date of 1972. The administration has publicly admitted that it is not possible to complete the system until 1975 or later.

The gentleman from Florida would also have us believe that the administration is not responsible for the stretchout of the program. The plain fact of the matter is that there has been a stretchout and that during the past year it was carried out under the disguise of what the Bureau of Public Roads chose to label "reimbursement planning." One Department of Commerce official described it as "essentially a scheduling of obligations for Federal-aid highways to avoid the embarrassment of default on Federal contractual obligations made necessary by the financial policy enacted by Congress in the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1958."

Most of us remember that Congress moved in 1958, with administration approval, to provide a shot in the arm to a sagging economy and to ward off a threatening recession by increasing the allocations to both the interstate and the A–B–C programs. In the process it suspended for 2 years the pay-as-you-go Byrd amendment to the 1956 act which limited interstate apportionments to an amount not to exceed the forward estimates of available cash.

The gentleman from Florida complains that the action of Congress in 1958 was responsible for depleting the trust fund and that this created the situation where reimbursement planning became necessary. In reply I wish to state very emphatically that if the Treasury had not shortchanged the trust fund to the tune of nearly $2 billion in 1956 the financial crisis would never have occurred and the necessity for the 1959 increase of 1 cent to the Federal gasoline tax might well have been avoided.

In conclusion, I want to reiterate what I said before, that the injection of politics into this situation came from the other side of the aisle. Under the circumstances, and in view of the personal attacks on me, I have no alternative except to make a vigorous reply and to cite the undisputed facts which the gentleman from Ohio and the gentleman from Florida so casually skirt. I also want to make it very plain once again that the investigations by this subcommittee will be carried out in an orderly manner and that hearings will be held only after there has been full and complete investigation and ascertainment of all available facts.

I am sure that I speak for the majority members of the subcommittee when I say that we have every intention of being objective and that our primary concern is to conduct thorough but fair hearings to sustain the integrity of the program and to continue to maintain the public confidence in this gigantic program.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota for his contribution.

Mr. Speaker, I can yield only very briefly. I have promised to yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks immediately following the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and also make the same request for my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS].

Mr. SCHERER. Reserving the right to object, since I have been attacked on this floor I take this time to——

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I refuse to yield to the gentleman at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio is proceeding under a reservation of the right to object.

Mr. BROWN of Missouri. Under the circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my request.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman briefly.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I thank the gentleman for his courtesy.

The distinguished gentleman from Minnesota has been unjustly attacked. I do not think there has been a more dedicated member of the Public Works Committee than the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK]. I find myself placed in the position of defending a man who has dedicated himself to the public roads program, who has demonstrated his great capabilities in this House, yet he has been attacked and castigated with prejudice and vituperation emanating from some members of our committee.

I thought we had approached this situation with a great feeling of concord and a great feeling of dedication to improving our highway program; and I feel that it is a shame that at this late hour so much time is spent in criticism of this worthy and dedicated man.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I apologize to the gentleman but I cannot yield further. I would like to summarize if I may.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Before the gentleman from Illinois reclaims his time I hope he will bear with me to let me say that I think this is a time to dedicate ourselves to the improvement of the program and to come to the defense of a man who has proven himself time and time again one of the great stalwarts, one of the great patriots, one of the great statesmen of the House of Representatives. To have him in the position of being so severely criticized is something that cannot remain unanswered.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I again must apologize to the gentleman. I have about 20 seconds left.

When I asked for this simple little special order to discuss and lament the fact that we did not get minimum wage legislation in this session of Congress because of the actions of our Republican colleagues on the left of the aisle and their failure to act in conference, I did not realize that we would be overwhelmed by so many facts that have completely demolished the chicanery of the Republican operation the other day which they called Operation Veracity.

For the benefit of my colleagues, the National Democratic Committee has prepared an analysis of the Democratic and Republican platforms, and I think if we have not covered any of the points that the architects of Operation Veracity raised the other day, I am sure that as I present these facts here the question will be answered.

One thing is certain. After listening to my friends during this evening, we may be divided in our own party on occasion, but the fact is millions of people every day in America are reminded of the great progress of the Democratic Party by the simple little gadget they have in front of their steering wheel in their cars, and every day they know that when they put that lever in "D" they are in the Democratic Party and they are driving forward. When they put that lever in "R" they are in the Republican Party, and they are going backward.

In the past few days we have heard a lot of talk about the Republican platform adopted at Chicago last month.

The Democratic National Committee has prepared a comparison of our platform with that of the Republicans and added the essential last comparison of "performance."

It would seem to me, Mr. Speaker, that in the field of platform performance, the Republicans are a lot of talk. In a most cynical way they pattern their platform to sound like ours, but leave out the all-important specifics.

Their platform of 1952 was meaningful. They promised much and it remained to be seen what they would produce.

The platform of 1956 was less meaningful because they had 4 years to perform and failed.

This platform of 1960 has no meaning at all. They have had 8 years to show what they could do and they have not done.

I am sure these facts, figures, and statements, will help to clear the air.

[From the Democratic Digest, September 1960]

FACTS TO FILE: PLATFORMS AND PERFORMANCES

Americans have long been conditioned to taking party platforms with a grain of salt. Belief in the cynical summary that "platforms are something to run on, not stand on" is widespread. On top of such skepticism is the fact that this year, on many matters, the platforms of the two parties seem to say about the same thing.

How, then, is the voter to evaluate the platforms? Facts to File this month seeks to document two points: (a) That there are, in fact, substantial differences in the positions of the two parties, differences reflected in the wording of specific sections of the platforms, despite GOP attempts to mask these differences in generalities. (b) That even where the platforms seem to say about the same thing, there is a real difference in the probabilities of specific undertakings being carried out. This difference can best be judged from the past records of the parties. Selected examples illustrating these two points are cited below:

DEFENSE

Democratic platform

The new Democratic administration will recast our military capacity in order to provide forces and weapons of a diversity, balance, and mobility sufficient in quantity and

quality to deter both limited and general aggressions.

Our military position today is measured in terms of gaps—missile gap, space gap, limited-war gap * * *.

This is the strength that must be erected: Deterrent military power * * * balanced conventional military forces * * * continuous modernization * * * intensified research and development.

GOP platform

We have, and will continue to have, the defenses we need to protect our freedom.

The strategic imperatives of our national defense policy are these:

Highly mobile and versatile forces.

A nuclear retaliatory power that can survive surprise attack, strike back, and destroy any possible enemy.

National determination to employ all necessary military capabilities so as to render any level of aggression unprofitable.

Unremitting modernization * * * development and production of new strategic weapons.

Performance

Budget considerations have come first in the Eisenhower-Nixon years. As a result all authorities agree that we have lost the preponderance of military power over the Soviet Union which we had in 1953. In spite of growing gaps, GOP legislators in five votes between 1953 and 1959 voted against increased military strength, while Democrats supported such measures.

Here are the votes:

Vote	Percent of Democrats for	Percent of Republicans against
1953: To increase Air Force	83	98
1954: To maintain Army	79	98
1956: To increase Air Force	93	88
1958: To increase Army	84	71
1959: To increase airlift	68	90

DISARMAMENT

Democratic platform

A primary task is to develop responsible proposals that will help break the deadlock on arms control. * * * This requires a national peace agency for disarmament planning and research.

GOP platform

We are * * * ready to negotiate and to institute realistic methods and safeguards for disarmament, and for the suspension of nuclear tests.

Performance

Requests by the Senate Disarmament Subcommittee that the status of the Government's arms control division be improved have gone unheeded by the Eisenhower-Nixon administration. Democratic proposals for special agencies to work on arms control measures have received no support from the GOP. Negotiations have been unimaginative and, on occasion, undercut by the military because the GOP administration lacked coordination and leadership.

ECONOMIC GROWTH

Democratic platform

Our economy can and must grow at an average rate of 5-percent annually. * * * We pledge ourselves to policies that will achieve this goal without inflation.

GOP platform

We must quicken the pace of our economic growth to prove the power of American free enterprise to meet growing and urgent demands. * * * We therefore accord high priority to vigorous economic growth.

Performance

U.S. gross national product has averaged an annual increase of only 2.4 percent in the GOP years since 1953, whereas it averaged 4.6 percent from 1947 to 1953, under Truman. A Senate study emphasized that this slow growth was a direct result of Eisenhower-Nixon tight money and similar policies.

INFLATION AND TIGHT MONEY

Democratic platform

A Democratic President will put an end to the present high-interest, tight-money policy. * * *

Among those remedies [for inflation] are monetary and credit policies properly applied, budget surpluses in times of full employment and action to restrain administered price increases in industries where economic power rests in the hands of a few.

GOP platform

We reject the concept of artificial growth forced by * * * loose money policies. * * *

We favor: * * * use of the full powers of Government to prevent the scourges of depression and inflation.

Performance

The GOP tight-money policy has given gigantic profits to moneylenders. It has greatly increased Federal, State and local government costs. (Almost $10 billion in additional Federal interest payments alone.) It has added about $4,000 to the interest costs on a $15,000 home mortgage. It has slowed down economic growth. With all this it has not stopped inflation. Since 1952 the cost of living has risen about 11 percent.

AGRICULTURE

Democratic platform

To achieve income parity, we propose production and marketing quotas * * * loans on basic commodities at not less than 90 percent of parity, production payments, commodity purchases, and marketing orders and agreements.

GOP platform

We pledge:

Use of price supports at levels best fitted to specific commodities * * *. Promises of specific levels of price support * * * are cruel deceptions.

Performance

Parity ratios fell from more than 100 percent to 77 percent in 7 GOP years, while the Republican President vetoed three price support measures. In a typical vote in Congress in 1958, more than 80 percent of the Democrats voted for high price supports, and more than 75 percent of the Republicans voted against.

FOREIGN POLICY

Democratic platform

American foreign policy in all its aspects must be attuned to our world of change. * * *

We shall expand world trade in every responsible way.

We shall support practical measures to ease the necessary adjustments of industries and communities which may be unavoidably hurt by increases in imports. * * *

We recognize and welcome the irresistible momentum of the world revolution. * * * We shall identify American policy with the values and objectives of this revolution. * * * We shall place our programs of international cooperation on a long-term basis.

The Democratic programs of economic cooperation will be aimed at making it as easy as possible for the political leadership in these countries to turn the energy, talent, and resources of their peoples to orderly economic growth. * * *

We shall keep open the lines of communication with our opponents. Despite difficulties in the way of peaceful agreement, every useful avenue will be energetically explored and pursued.

GOP platform

The preeminence of this Republic requires of us a vigorous, resolute foreign policy—inflexible against every tyrannical encroachment, and mighty in its advance toward our own affirmative goals. * * *

Carrying forward under the Trade Agreements Act, the policy of gradual, selective—and truly reciprocal—reduction of unjustifiable barriers to trade among free nations. We advocate effective administration of the act's escape clause and peril-point provisions to safeguard American jobs and domestic industries against serious injury. * * *

In Latin America, Asia, Africa, and the Middle East, peoples of ancient and recent independence have shown their determination to improve their standards of living, and to enjoy an equality with the rest of mankind. * * * We declare ourselves to be in sympathy with their aspirations.

We propose a further evolution of our programs for assistance to and cooperation with other nations, suitable to the emerging needs of the future. * * *

The Eisenhower-Nixon administration has demonstrated its willingness to negotiate in earnest with the Soviet Union to arrive at just settlements for the reduction of world tensions. We pledge the new administration to continue in the same course.

Performance

While the objectives of both parties in foreign affairs are, as they should be, the same, the performance record of Democratic administrations has been one of vigorous and positive action and initiative to advance these objectives (e.g., the founding of the U.N.; the Marshall plan; NATO; the point 4 program). The Eisenhower-Nixon administration, on the other hand, has been content to carry out earlier Democratic policies in a routine and unimaginative way and to act only in response to Soviet initiatives, and then only late in the day and on a minimum basis.

GOP congressional positions have reflected this essentially negative approach. A few examples from votes in Congress:

	Percent Democrats supporting	Percent Republicans opposing
House vote on point 4 program (1950)	86	80
Senate vote to maintain needed level of Marshall plan aid (1951)	79	87
Senate vote to increase military aid to Europe (1951)	56	97
House vote to increase funds for international education activities (1953)	66	88
House vote to avoid crippling amendments in Trade Agreements Act extension (1955)	64	64
Senate vote for 2-year instead of 1-year extension of Agricultural Trade Act (1958)	86	84
House passage of "Health for Peace" Act (1960)	91	67

SMALL BUSINESS

Democratic platform

We pledge: action to aid small business in obtaining credit and equity capital at reasonable rates * * * vigorous enforcement of the antitrust laws.

GOP platform

We favor * * * spurring the economy by fostering new and small business, by continued active enforcement of the antitrust laws.

Performance

The number of business failures increased by 94.3 percent between 1952 and 1959, while the total number of businesses in existence increased only 2.6 percent in the first 6 GOP years.

From 1952 to 1959, manufacturing firms with assets of more than $100 million increased their sales by 63 percent and their profits after taxes by 77 percent. In the same years, sales by firms with assets of less than $1 million increased only 20 percent, and their profits after taxes only 2 percent.

HOUSING

Democratic platform

We support a housing construction goal of more than 2 million homes a year (primarily for) middle- and low-income families. * * *

Special mortgage assistance, with low interest rates, long-term mortgage periods and reduced downpayments. * * *

Substantial low-rent public housing. * * *

Direct Government loans for housing for older people.

GOP platform

We support * * * adequate authority for the Federal housing agencies to assist the flow of mortgage credit into private housing * * * for middle- and low-income families. * * *

Effort to clear slums. * * *

New programs * * * for the elderly and nursing homes. * * *

Performance

Even with the slump in housing, Republican majorities voted against housing bills and in 1959 the President vetoed housing bills twice. Among other objections, both veto messages said programs for the elderly, urban renewal and low-rent public housing were either "entirely unnecessary" or "excessive." Eighty percent of the Democrats consistently voted for these measures. A 1960 bill to ease mortgage money has been threatened with a veto.

JOBS AND WAGES

Democratic platform

We will reduce current unemployment to a minimum.

If recessionary trends appear, we will act promptly with countermeasures. * * * We pledge to raise the minimum wage to $1.25 an hour and to extend coverage to several million workers not now protected.

GOP platform

We must raise employment to even higher levels. * * *

We pledge * * * upward revision in amount and extended coverage of the minimum wage to several million more workers.

Performance

GOP recessions have raised the unemployment plateau higher each time, with 5 percent of the labor force out of work most of the time since 1954.

Republicans viewed a $1.25 minimum wage as inflationary, thus forced $1.15 into the bill enacted by the House. The GOP also opposed coverage of an additional 7½ million workers.

In a showdown Senate vote on August 18, 1960, on increasing the minimum wage to $1.25 and expanding coverage, 75 percent of Democrats led by Senator KENNEDY supported the measure; 55 percent of the Republicans opposed it.

EDUCATION

Democratic platform

Financial support, within the traditional framework of local control * * * will take the form of Federal grants to States * * * including classroom construction and teachers' salaries.

GOP platform

We pledge * * * a program of Federal aid for school construction. * * * We believe * * * direct contributions * * * for teachers' salaries can only lead * * * to Federal domination and control of our schools.

Performance

Every year since 1953 Democrats have tried to enact legislation providing for Federal aid for school construction and teacher salaries. GOP promises of "full support" came easy, but the White House was silent and NIXON "vetoed" education aid with his tie-breaking vote (February 3, 1960). Nearly two-thirds of House Democrats voted for, and more than two-thirds of the Republicans voted against, school aid in 1960.

PUBLIC WORKS AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Democratic platform

The Democratic administration * * * will begin again to build multiple-purpose dams, hydroelectric facilities, flood-control works, navigation facilities, and reclamation projects.

Federal action is needed in planning, coordinating and helping to finance [water and air] pollution control. The States and local communities cannot go it alone.

GOP platform

We pledge * * * development of new water resource projects throughout the Nation.

Strengthened Federal enforcement powers in combating water pollution. * * * Federal grants for the construction of waste disposal plants should be made only when they make an identifiable contribution to clearing up polluted streams.

Performance

In 1956, 1958, and 1959 President Eisenhower enforced the GOP maxim of "no new starts" by vetoing bills for much-needed flood control and reclamation projects. The Democratic Congress overrode the 1959 veto. In 1960 the President vetoed a bill to help communities build sewage disposal plants, saying water pollution was "a local problem."

MEDICAL AID FOR THE AGING

Democratic platform

The most practicable way to provide health protection for older people is to use the contributory machinery of the social security system.

We reject * * * the indignity of a means test—a pauper's oath.

GOP platform

We pledge * * *

Revelopment of a health program that will provide the aged needing it * * * through a contributory system, protection against burdensome costs of health care.

Performance

Democrats in Congress have attempted to legislate a plan based on contributions to the social security system and requiring no means test. Republicans balked, but political expediency brought forth a GOP proposal of grants based on a means test, the cost to be shared by already overburdened States.

THE BOX SCORE ON SUPPORT OF PLATFORM OBJECTIVES, 1953–60

Here is an accurate record of Democratic and Republican votes in Congress in the past 8 years for and against various measures advancing progressive goals. While both 1960 party platforms endorse such goals it is clear that only the Democratic Party has actively supported them.

Goals	Senate			House		
	Number of votes	Percent Democrats for	Percent Republicans for	Number of votes	Percent Democrats for	Percent Republicans for
To liberalize and extend reciprocal trade agreements	8	84	57	14	76	53
To increase and stabilize farm income and develop soil conservation programs	71	77	34	21	78	27
To encourage rural electrification co-ops	6	86	24	5	93	30
To develop new water resource projects	16	82	87	22	72	43
To expand coverage and increase minimum wage and unemployment compensation	20	72	30	10	78	53
To aid depressed areas	9	83	24	4	76	24
To foster small business	7	75	12	3	92	66
Aid to education	11	77	36	13	65	57
To promote slum clearance and home financing	34	80	29	23	86	34

Nine examples of how the records of the candidates differ in support of platform objectives

NOTE.—From 1947 through 1950 Senator KENNEDY and Vice President NIXON served together in the House of Representatives. During this period they were called upon to vote on many issues covered in the platforms. The following examples of contrasting votes are clear-cut proof of their differing basic beliefs as related to the objectives expressed in the two 1960 party platforms.

	How the candidates voted	
	KENNEDY	NIXON
Foreign aid: Vote to cut military aid to NATO countries almost in half, RC 188 Aug. 18, 1949	Against	For.
Foreign trade: Vote to continue reciprocal trade agreements for 3 years instead of 1, and without crippling amendments, RC 81 May 26, 1948	For	Against.
Minimum wage: Vote to exclude 1,000,000 workers from minimum wage protection. Considered the key vote on minimum wage legislation, RC 172 Aug. 10, 1949.	Against	For.
Agriculture: Vote to increase appropriations for 1947 soil conservation payments by $129,000,000, RC 119 July 18, 1947	For	Against.
Small business: Vote to insist on stronger protection of small business in "basing-point" bill allowing "price fixing" by certain heavy industries, RC 231 Oct. 14, 1947.	do	Do.
Housing: Vote to cut low-rent public housing and housing research program, and to put program on unsound year-to-year basis, RC 119 June 29, 1949.	Against	For.
Social security: Vote to replace contributory insurance features for disabled workers with a noncontributory "public assistance" handout scheme, based on need, not on right. The substitute also provided less coverage, and lower benefits. This is considered a key vote in social security legislation, RC 217 Oct. 5, 1949.	do	Do.
Public power: Vote to restore funds for Missouri Valley and Bonneville development transmission facilities, RC 40 Apr. 25, 1947	For	Against.
REA: Vote to include $300,000,000 for REA loans in urgent deficiency bill, RC 14 Feb. 24, 1947	do	Do.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 203]

Adair	Forrester	Passman
Alger	Frazier	Patman
Allen	Glenn	Pilcher
Anderson, Mont.	Grant	Powell
	Green, Oreg.	Preston
Andrews	Griffin	Rains
Anfuso	Griffiths	Reece, Tenn.
Auchincloss	Hargis	Riley
Baker	Harrison	Rivers, S.C.
Barden	Hays	Rogers, Colo.
Baumhart	Hébert	Rogers, Mass.
Belcher	Holland	Rostenkowski
Blitch	Horan	Roush
Boggs	Jackson	Shelley
Bolling	Jarman	Shipley
Bow	Johnson, Md.	Sikes
Bowles	Kelly	Siler
Boykin	Kilburn	Sisk
Brooks, La.	Kluczynski	Smith, Kans.
Broomfield	Lafore	Smith, Va.
Buckley	Landrum	Spence
Budge	Lankford	Steed
Celler	Loser	Sullivan
Coffin	McDowell	Taylor, N.Y.
Colmer	McGinley	Taylor, N.C.
Cooley	McMillan	Thompson, La.
Davis, Tenn.	McSween	Thompson, N.J.
Diggs	Macdonald	Tuck
Dingell	Machrowicz	Utt
Dooley	Madden	Vinson
Doyle	Magnuson	Walter
Durham	Martin	Weaver
Evins	Mason	Wharton
Farbstein	Mitchell	Widnall
Fisher	Moore	Wilson
Flynn	Murray	Withrow
Fogarty	O'Brien, Ill.	Zelenko
Forand	O'Konski	

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THOMPSON of Texas). On this rollcall 316 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

SPACE AND MISSILE GAPS

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, for the first time since 1812 there is doubt about our Nation's ability to defend itself.

In an age of space and missiles, this country is at the wrong end of the space gap and at the wrong end of the missile gap.

These are not partisan election year charges. Rather they are the considered opinions of the country's top military strategists and the men in charge of our scientific arsenal.

Lt. Gen. James M. Gavin, former Chief of Army Research and Development, warned that we are in mortal danger.

Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, former Army Chief of Staff charged we were threatened with a missile gap "that leaves us in a position of potentially grave danger."

Ernest Stuhlinger, Director of the Army Research Projects Laboratory at the Redstone Arsenal, said only a few months ago that "we are in a meager second place everywhere in space."

These fears have been echoed by many others. Even Senator THRUSTON B. MORTON, chairman of the Republican National Committee conceded we were behind in missiles. But, as Senator KENNEDY has pointed out, the current discussions of defense center on how our retaliatory strength compares with the Russians today. The real issue is not how we stand today, but tomorrow—not in 1960, but in 1961 and 1962 and thereafter. Those are the critical years. If we are behind today, what will happen tomorrow. There is no sign that this administration will heed its experts.

Yet, when the Democrats left office in 1953, we were the strongest Nation in the history of the world. The free world looked to us for guidance and help, knowing we had the strength to live up to our commitments. There was no missile gap, no space gap. We had men minding the store who were not afraid of making hard decisions. They could have kept pace with the Russians. They could have dispelled the current doubt of our friends and allies.

General Taylor, closer to the situation than most Americans, put the blame for our lag on the "budget makers." He charged that the budget makers had become the "strategy makers."

Instead of making the hard and possibly unpopular decision to spend more money to make America safe, the Republicans went down to Madison Avenue to find slogan writers to lull America into a false sense of security.

While Russia was working night and day to catch up with us, we heard about "more bang for a buck."

While the Russians were preparing to turn their rockets to the moon we were told about maximum safety at minimum cost—an expression that has become a Republican cliche since it was first used in 1953.

And while the facts piled up, we were told we cannot afford to build military strength by sacrificing economic strength.

And, I am sure, if the Russians send a man to the moon while the Republicans are still in the White House there will be some new slogan to tell us all is well.

The stakes are too high for policy to be formed by the budget makers and the slogan makers. America needs to face up to the crisis and needs a leader who can make the hard decisions to keep our country safe. The cornerstone of peace, in this day and age, is an adequate defense. Defense is our investment in peace.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I am going to propound a unanimous-consent request, and I would like the gentleman from Ohio to have the opportunity to reply. That is a courtesy that should be given to a gentleman whose name is mentioned in debate.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman reserves the right to object.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, I have just listened to the attack made upon the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] and myself by the chairman of our subcommittee. Let me say at the outset I do not retract or modify in any respect any statement I have made on the floor of this House or anything I have said in any speech made in connection with the operation of the Highway Investigating Committee of this House of which I happen to be the ranking Republican minority member. I am not going to make any charges, but I am going to take a few minutes to tell you the facts, then let you be the judge of whether any accusations that the gentleman from Minnesota has made are correct.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from California for attempting to give me this opportunity to reply.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California for a unanimous-consent request, but if he does not get it through this time I will not yield again.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks immediately following the remarks of the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Would the gentleman mind extending his remarks before mine instead of after them?

Mr. BROWN of Missouri. That is satisfactory to me. I ask unanimous consent that my colleague from Indiana, Mr. BRADEMAS, may extend his remarks in the RECORD, and I also ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have just finished talking with the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee [Mr. MILLS] about the outlook for our proposals to grant tax relief to small business so our merchants can plow back earnings for expansion.

The chairman tells me that these proposals are very much alive and will get every consideration when his committee

undertakes a general overhauling of the tax structure in January.

This is heartening news; and, as a member of the Small Business Committee I rise today in the final hours before adjournment to urge the Members to discuss small business tax relief with the folks back home and start a grassroots ground swell for this most necessary legislation.

Small business is the very heart of the free enterprise system. One of the facets of our American way of life that must be preserved is the freedom of opportunity for a man to start a new business of his own choice and build it into a successful concern.

In other years, when our population was smaller and more rural in nature, the climate for small business was healthier than it is today in this swiftly changing world. And, in all honesty, if this climate is not changed, I fear for the future of small business.

It is a fact that small concerns cannot get access to adequate capital today. Whether money is loose or tight, the Main Street merchant or the small manufacturer has few places to turn for equity capital or long-term loans. Studies we have made in our Small Business Committee show that 99 percent of long-term insurance loans to business go to large concerns borrowing $50,000 or more per loan. Substantially more than three-fourths of insurance company loan money flows into the multimillion-dollar corporations.

The commercial banks try to take care of the short-term capital needs of our merchants and small manufacturers; but banks are limited under the law—and rightly so—to working capital loans, not long-term money for capital improvements.

For years now, the Government has tried to fill a portion of this void by supplementing private capital sources with loans by the Small Business Administration. Some of our concerns in southwest Missouri have been saved by loans from the SBA; but the SBA does not even begin to fill the vast need for small business capital.

Two years ago, we passed the Small Business Investment Act to create another source for long-term loans and equity capital for small business. The program is just barely off the ground; it is a system with great potential, if developed properly; but no one would contend that even the investment companies will meet the tremendous capital needs of small business.

Small business, especially new concerns, must be able to plow back a portion of their earnings into the business for growth and expansion. And the truth is that the present tax structure makes such plowbacks extremely difficult, if not impossible.

Just when a man gets to doing business, buying and selling more merchandise, adding additional warehouse space or buying new trucks, he gets hit with a big bite from the Department of Internal Revenue; and there goes his capital.

Small businessmen are patriotic Americans. Everyone recognizes that we must all shoulder our share of the tax requirements in these very complex and dangerous hours of history. But the present business tax structure hits the small or new business a much more serious blow than it hits big business, because big companies are not so dependent on retained earnings for capital. They can go to investment banks, insurance companies, pension funds, and so forth, for new capital for expansion. Small concerns have no such sources. Most of them must rely on retained earnings.

For these reasons, I have been urging tax revisions to help small businesses retain more of their earnings for capital expansion ever since I got to the Congress. Our Small Business Committee has made many appeals to the Ways and Means Committee on this subject. We got some minor revisions in 1958; and they were welcome, indeed. All of us commended the Ways and Means Committee for this action; and I feel sure that most Members want to grant still more relief for small business when the tax laws are revised again.

My own bill, H.R. 473, would permit a small business to retain 20 percent of its annual earnings, up to $25,000, for plowback investment in strengthening the business. This is one way to help solve this problem, and I think H.R. 473 is a sound bill. I shall continue to press for this measure.

But if there is a better way, if it can be done through adjustments of the general tax level or by changes in the regulations on deductible items, or however it might be done, I am willing to join with anyone on any worthwhile legislation that will accomplish our purpose.

Small enterprise is being stunted by an unhealthy climate—few sources for capital and a tax structure that limits reinvestments of earnings.

Trustbusting and antimonopoly actions certainly have their place in preserving the free enterprise system. But the best way to prevent unhealthy giantism and concentrations and monopoly is to maintain a business community climate where small concerns can get or retain capital and compete with the giants.

I urge the Members of this House to talk with your merchants and manufacturers about this problem this fall, and let us make tax revision for small business a must item on the next year's agenda.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, the nearly 8 years of Republican administration have resulted in a lop-sided prosperity under which the rich got richer and the poor got poorer.

Let us compare the prosperity of big business and the prosperity of the man who works for a living during these 8 years.

On one side of the ledger we find these facts: Between 1952 and 1959 total corporate profits increased by 43 percent; profits of large corporations increased by 76 percent; dividend payments increased more than 50 percent; and total interest income increased more than 100 percent.

On the other side of the ledger we find these figures: In March of 1960 there were 142 communities in 29 States where more than 6 percent of the workers were unemployed. In several major cities—Detroit, Pittsburgh, Buffalo, and Providence—almost 1 in 10 were out of work.

Many of these communities would have qualified for assistance under the depressed areas bill vetoed by the President.

The President explained he vetoed the legislation because, he contended, it "would squander the Federal taxpayers' money where there is only temporary economic difficulty, curable without the special Federal assistance provided in the bill."

Yet the statistics prove that many of the depressed areas which would have been helped had been so designated for more than 5 years. Most of the other areas had been so designated for 2 years.

Democrats in Congress have pressed for Federal help to encourage new industry and create more jobs in these areas, but twice these bills were vetoed by the President.

Under the Republicans we have had two recessions, one in 1953–54 and the other in 1957–60. In between we had the most serious inflation in our Nation's history.

Under the Republicans our rate of economic growth has dwindled to one-third of the rate of the Russians.

The Democrats feel that our economy must grow at an average rate of 5 percent annually and our platform pledges that we will achieve this goal without inflation.

The Republicans, in their platform, promise economic growth, but their tight-money policy of the past was one of the main depressants of the economy. The high interest rates might be good for bankers, but not for small businessmen. These policies certainly were not good for the consumer caught in this price squeeze, especially those consumers forced to live on fixed incomes.

The Jim Jones of the Republican convention, hailed as the sign of the future, is a fictitious myth. The Republican Jim Jones had increased wages and prosperity during the Eisenhower years, according to a key Republican speaker at the convention. But a New York newspaper located a real live Jim Jones and he had another story to tell. Living in a crowded apartment, working in a shop struggling for a union, seeing prices steadily increase while his wages were held stationary, he was forced to give up his vacation because he didn't have the money to go anywhere.

The son of the real Jim Jones was unemployed—one of the statistics ignored by Republican prophets of prosperity.

The increase in the rate of economic growth will help every Jim Jones. It will make jobs plentiful without distorting the economy. It will help us move toward a balanced budget. And it will provide moneys for the public sector of the economy, the public works, the schools, the hospitals, so badly needed throughout the country.

The problems of the present are severe enough, when left to drift unaided by Government, but they are minor when considered in the light of future developments.

Automation is right around the corner. We need to plan for automation so that men and women will be trained and ready for the shifting patterns of employment.

The present administration admires the past and looks to the status quo for guidance. This timid policy is not what made our country great.

The Democrats look to the new frontiers of the future, confident that the people of America will make the sacrifices necessary to meet successfully the challenges of the future.

We offer to the American people a program for the future. We offer vigorous leadership to direct these efforts. We rest our case on deeds, not words, on sincerity, not slogans.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at the conclusion of all other special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, would the gentleman mind putting his remarks before mine instead of afterwards?

Mr. EDMONDSON. Not a bit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Agriculture, I appreciate the opportunity to make a few remarks in connection with the farm problem—admittedly, the most critical domestic issue confronting the Nation today.

There is more wrong with agriculture than Secretary Benson. Dropping the controversial Secretary of Agriculture from any future Cabinet will not solve the farm problem. Making him the scapegoat for deep-rooted Republican farm policies, I predict, will not fool the farmer.

This administration has used what I call the seven times seven formula for dealing with the farm problem.

Total costs and losses on farm price support under the President, the Vice President and Secretary Benson has amounted in 7 years, to seven times more than for the 20 years under Roosevelt and Truman administrations, Mr. Speaker, which our Republican friends have smeared as spending administrations.

Republican farm policies have cost the taxpayer $31 billion, but they have failed to help the surplus or the farmer. The size of the commodity surplus in Government hands has multiplied seven times to almost $8 billion. The agricultural payroll has swelled from 65,000 in 1952 to 85,000 in 1959—and, Mr. Speaker, the Republicans call the Democrats bureaucrats.

During this period, 900,000 farm units were liquidated to decrease the surplus, but the surplus increased.

It is now clear that the real goal of the administration's farm policy is not to reduce the surplus but to run the small, independent farmer out of business. The goal, I fear, is to substitute for him the large corporate farm, making the proud farmer a foreman or laborer on his own lands, or running him off to the city to join the unemployed.

Our Republican friends admire the so-called IBM efficiency of the big farm, as they do the cold, calculating IBM efficiency of big business. What they have always failed to admire is the rugged individualism of either the small farmer or the small businessman. Their traditional dislike of the independence of the worker, who was too courageous to be intimidated by the big boss, is too well known to discuss again.

Adhering to the traditional reverence of things past, the Republicans view the agricultural surplus as a liability. The Democrats take a different view of the situation and offer plans and programs to return the American farmer to prosperity with dignity, and turn surplus food to an instrument for a better America and for world peace.

For the Democrats, the solution of the agricultural program is one of the challenges of the sixties.

The Democratic platform pledges, in clear language, a positive action to raise farm income to full parity of income levels and to preserve family farming as a way of life.

As Senator KENNEDY has said, this strongest pledge ever given to the American farmer by any political party in history means that farmers shall receive returns for their labor, for their managerial skills, and for their investments which are equal to the returns received for comparable human talents and resources in other types of enterprises.

I concur with the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts when he says that the farmer and his family have done more for America and received less for it than possibly any other group in our Nation.

The Democrats pledge a policy to raise farm prices and incomes; to use surplus food at home to benefit the nutrition for all needy Americans; to reserve a food supply for the hazards of modern war; a dynamic "food for peace" program abroad; and a long-range program for low-income farms, credit, research, and new rural industries.

We Democrats offer deeds not words. Our proof is in the doing. We have done and will do again. The Republicans have not done and will not do in the future. Their policy is the past. Ours is the future.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD preceding the remarks of my colleague, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

TOWNSEND INFLUENCE FOR IMPROVED SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the social security amendments adopted by this Congress fall far short of the needs which face the people of our country. Despite our Nation's great wealth and ability to produce in abundance, there are still millions of citizens who live on inadequate incomes and suffer needless distress. Many of the other free nations of the world are far ahead of us in this important field.

The social security program is now 25 years old. Much progress has been made but the program is still shamefully inadequate. Minimum benefits amount to only $8 a week. The age requirement of 65 for men is much too high in these days of automation when increasing numbers of workers find it difficult to get jobs at 50 years of age.

Twenty-seven years ago when the Townsend pension movement was founded, Dr. Francis E. Townsend advocated many of the provisions which are now part of the social security law.

Other Townsend proposals have received substantial support in the Congress and will most likely be enacted at some future time.

Dr. Townsend envisioned the end of poverty among old folks when he proposed a Federal pension plan for all citizens at age 60 on a pay-as-you-go basis. He sought full benefits for disabled persons regardless at what age disability came.

I am glad that the new law will contain such a provision for disability benefits. I was disappointed that the age requirement for men was not reduced to age 62 as approved in the Senate. I was especially disappointed that an adequate medical care provision was rejected and replaced by a meaningless public assistance medical aid program that will require a pauper's oath before any aid is given. Congress also failed by not increasing income limitations to at least $1,800.

These are all Townsend proposals that were made 27 years ago. Dr. Townsend still lives at the ripe old age of 93. He takes pride in the part he has played in the long march forward for pension legislation for the senior citizens of the Nation.

Throughout the Nation he has many faithful followers who carry on the fight for social justice. Much progress has been made. Much more needs to be done. So long as millions of our aged citizens are without adequate means for proper housing, food and medical care the long hard fight for social justice will continue.

A Nation that is worried about its surpluses and the challenge of automation cannot afford to delay much longer in meeting the needs of its underprivileged and aged citizens.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. This is before my remarks?

Mr. PORTER. Yes.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

STRATEGY FOR PEACE

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, this country is losing out in the race for men's minds because we have no strategy for peace.

We are pouring billions of dollars into defense alliances and economic assistance, but we are undermining this aid by failing to project the purpose and idealism which underlies our actions.

Young nations and young men, who formerly turned our way for guidance and help, are today, in many parts of the world, questioning our motives. They see no consistent policy which they can trust.

We are in trouble because this administration moves from crisis to crisis. In the age of the fire engine, we are still using the bucket brigade approach to peace. Unfortunately, in our haste to put out the fire, we sometimes use buckets of oil instead of water.

The latest incident in Japan showed our advance planning for the President's trip was inadequate. Someone misjudged the temperament and feelings of the Japanese youth and someone miscalculated their effectiveness.

The summit was doomed to failure even before the U–2 incident. It was doomed because for the last 8 years we have failed to build the long-term strength essential to successful negotiation.

The poor timing of the U–2 incident, and the embarrassing coverups in its aftermath, were not the true issues. The real issue is the lack of a plan or a policy for dealing with a crisis of this magnitude.

When World War II ended, the Democrats had a strategy for peace that called for saving Western Europe from communism without resorting to war. It was a successful strategy. It was implemented by the Marshall plan and Point Four. It was protected by a military might here at home that made an all-out war an impossibility.

Today we need the same strong leadership for peace that Harry Truman offered this country. We need deeds, not slogans. We need a plan for peace.

The Democratic Party, in this election, offers such a plan. It is not an easy plan. In the words of Senator KENNEDY, it is a plan that calls for sacrifice. But the goal is survival.

The cornerstone is a defense so formidable as to leave no doubt that an attack on the United States would surely be followed by the destruction of the attacker.

But a stalemate of nuclear terror is not the answer. The Democrats offer proposals to end nuclear tests under workable safeguards, cutting back nuclear weapons, reducing conventional forces, preserving outer space for peaceful purposes, preventing surprise attack and limiting the risk of accidental war.

The plan calls for a national peace agency for disarmament planning and research to coordinate and direct this operation.

The program also calls for an increased exchange program directed toward the young people of the world, the students and new leaders. It calls for a national policy making machinery for assembling facts, making decisions and coordinating action.

The plan calls for a shift in emphasis from military to economic aid as quickly as conditions permit. And, looking to the future, it calls for planning to use the manpower and material released from the arms race to meet our backlog of public needs.

This program substitutes decision for drift in the quest for peace. It is the kind of program which made us the leader of the free world.

OPERATION VERACITY

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHERER].

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Arizona for yielding so that I can further reply to the gentleman from Minnesota.

As I said, I am not going to make any changes, but I am just going to tell you some things about the highway investigating committee and then let you gentlemen determine whether some of the charges that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] and I have made are true.

Back in 1956 when this highway program was started and there was going to be this expenditure of billions of dollars, both the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] and I, time after time, in speech after speech, suggested and urged that the majority authorize the Roads Subcommittee of this House to conduct a surveillance of this program. There was no question but that such a surveillance of the program was necessary when we have the expenditure of that kind of money.

Now, heading the Roads Subcommittee was a distinguished Member of this House, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON]. He had guided through this House all of the highway legislation. He is a Democrat. He is the most informed Member of this Congress on highway legislation and highway problems. He is recognized as such throughout the United States by people who are interested in the highway program.

Finally, in September 1959, just a year ago, after repeated urgings by the minority that such a committee be appointed, when we were approaching an election year such a committee was appointed by the majority. But, what happened? Was the gentleman from Maryland, GEORGE FALLON, named chairman or given authority to proceed; was the outstanding Member of this House, the man who had more knowledge about highways and highway programs than anyone else, retained as chairman? No, he was not. He was kicked downstairs. Why? Simply because the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCKLEY], who is never here, decided that he wanted——

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I want the gentleman's words taken down.

Mr. SCHERER. Almost never here. Well, I will withdraw that.

The gentleman from Maryland, Mr. GEORGE FALLON, was kicked downstairs simply because GEORGE FALLON was more interested in building highways for this country than he was in following the political dictation of the Tammany boss from Brooklyn. And, that is the reason GEORGE FALLON, the Democrats' outstanding Member in this House insofar as highway legislation is concerned, was not appointed chairman.

Then what happened? Everyone in this House and in this Congress knows that investigating committees are usually composed of an equal number from the majority and from the minority. Witness the recent Labor Rackets Committee in the Senate. It had four Republicans and four Democrats.

Most of the time, of course, on an investigating committee, there is one more Member of the majority party. But the chairman of the full committee—and I am not blaming the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK]—but the chairman of the full committee, in this political year, loaded this committee lopsidedly 13 to 6. For the first 6 months that this committee functioned, Mr. BUCKLEY would not give the minority one clerk, or counsel. We worked in the dark for 6 months. Do you wonder why we charge this with being a political committee?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHERER. No; the gentleman from Arizona has the floor.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Would the gentleman repeat his statement, I did not hear it?

Mr. SCHERER. I said that for 6 months after, you loaded this committee 13 to 6.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I mean the reason the gentleman will not yield.

Mr. SCHERER. I thought the gentleman said he did not hear what I said.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I did not hear what the gentleman said about not yielding.

Mr. SCHERER. The gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] has the time and I cannot yield; and I am asking him not to yield until I finish.

For 6 months after this committee was organized we had no representation on the staff, although we requested it time and time again. And then what happened? There was no hesitation in this election year to begin an investigation of the Bureau of Public Roads, or of the Defense Department, which was under the Eisenhower administration. I am not saying that we should not have conducted that investigation into vertical clearances. I am saying that was proper. But there was no hesitation on the part of the majority to do that in an election year. But then what happened? We were supposed to have hearings after the conventions.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHERER. I decline to yield. We were told that we were going to have hearings after the conventions.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I see that the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] is very reluctant to yield, so I shall withdraw my request.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, may I say to the gentleman from Alabama that I have yielded to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHERER]. When the gentleman has finished, if I have sufficient time left to make a few points that I want to make, I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. SCHERER. The gentleman from Alabama is just trying to interrupt my presentation. He does not like what I am saying.

I will tell you what happened. We had no hesitancy investigating an agency of this Government under the Eisenhower administration and we were going to have hearings, we were told, after the conventions. But what happened? The handpicked staff of this committee reported to the chairman of this subcommittee on June 9 that there was substantial evidence of a conspiracy to fraudulently increase appraisals in the State of Massachusetts. Immediately an announcement was made by the chairman of this subcommittee, without consultation with the minority, without any meeting of the committee, that there would be no more hearings this year. You may draw your own conclusions. I am telling you, the irregularities we looked into were peanuts compared to the scandals in Massachusetts. That is what has them agitated. That is why all these charges against Mr. CRAMER and me are made, simply because we complained about these derelictions and political shenanigans.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield just on that point?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield briefly.

Mr. BLATNIK. The gentleman makes some powerful statements when he compares the situation in Massachusetts with the rest of the cases. The gentleman does not have any more idea than the rest of us about the comparative status of that case. We said a week ago this morning that that will be investigated from top to bottom. The gentleman sat right alongside of me for 2 full hours and never said one of the things he is now saying on the floor. Why? Tell the whole membership of the House why.

Mr. SCHERER. I will tell you why: because your staff for the first time admitted they had done practically nothing, and they knew since January that these scandals existed in the State of Massachusetts; yet they have done practically nothing.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for some factual corrections?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. The gentleman from Arizona would like to take a few minutes to comment on the Democratic Operation Against Veracity.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. This is not veracity, this is complete lack of veracity.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I do not yield further.

Mr. Speaker, tonight we have had an attempt to counteract Operation Veracity. I am sorry that the gentleman who conducted it did not see fit to let us know that he intended to conduct it, otherwise I might have heard more of it. But I think I heard enough to know that this as a counteroperation was not successful.

You may have thought that maybe I am getting a little tired of this operation. As a matter of fact, my good friend from Texas [Mr. ROGERS] said to me this morning, "You have been putting this veracity out so long, I wonder if you have got any left."

I think I do, because I am certainly going to do my best now to take that barb that has apparently stunned some Democratic Members so badly and seared their flesh, and reinsert it where it belongs.

Let me tell you where I think it belongs. It does not belong on most of the Members of the House of Representatives on the Democratic side. It does not belong on the delegates to the Democratic Convention. It does not belong on the voters who are registered, and who belong in the Democratic Party. It does belong on the people who drafted the Democratic platform, and I say with all the candor at my command that those people made some statements which cannot stand the light of day. The only reason we have had this operation is to try to prove to this country and the gentlemen on both sides of the aisle, the persons in both parties in this country, that a platform is no longer a dead document as soon as it is read at a political convention. As far as I am concerned, a platform is a living document which lives from one convention to the next, and the convention which adopts it will have to be responsible for the contents thereof.

We have made remarks concerning the veracity of statements in the Democratic platform. There has been some talk tonight about certain parts of it. I would just like, though, to repeat those statements upon which there has been no comment by the gentlemen on the Democratic side at least while I was here, and again, I say I am sorry I was not notified that the Democratic operation would be going on tonight, otherwise I would have been here for the whole thing.

In the first place, this platform said that under the Republican administration the medical care for veterans has deteriorated. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES], the ranking minority member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, I think very conclusively stated that was not the situation.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. AYRES is not the ranking member of that committee. Mrs. ROGERS is. This is just to keep the record straight, for veracity.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I thank the gentleman, and I accept his correction. Mr. AYRES is the next ranking minority member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee. As far as the quotation from the platform that the Republicans had adopted an antilabor policy, I have not heard anybody say anything about this so-called Republican antilabor policy. We said that such a policy never existed, and proved it. Do you know why I think nobody talked about it? Because so many of the people over on the Democratic side voted for the Landrum-Griffin bill. We were pleased that you did and proud that you did because without your votes, it would not have passed. I do not blame you. I would not comment on it either if I were you.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. The gentleman may recall when he was carrying on "Operation Veracity" the other day, several of us tried very hard to get him to yield at the point and at the time when the antilabor question was under discussion and refusal uniformly met our requests that the gentleman yield.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. The gentleman knows exactly why the refusal was made. I did not have time to yield, unless I did so at the expense of colleagues who had material prepared for the occasion.

Mr. EDMONDSON. But, we endeavored to call to the gentleman's attention the fact that the appointment of antilabor people to the National Labor Relations Board is a clear-cut instance of antilabor policy by this administration and no opportunity was given to us to do that in the course of the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. The gentleman knows full well why the gentleman refused to yield.

The gentleman also knows that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] just had 2 hours of special orders, and if the gentleman forgot to mention this during those 2 hours, I am very sorry. But I state again there has been nothing said which indicated that the Republicans ever adopted an antilabor policy. I still say in light of the remarks of the gentleman from Oklahoma that nothing has been said.

Mr. EDMONDSON. The gentleman knows that the Democratic platform includes that charge in it regarding antilabor appointments to the NLRB and it is a part of the Democratic platform, and we only have one edition of the Democratic platform being printed and not two editions.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I did not say anything about that part of the Democratic platform which might have been telling the truth. I am talking about the parts that do not tell the truth.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The gentleman has discussed the platforms. I have copies of both platforms here. I wonder, if in the interest of veracity the gentleman would explain to those

of us who are somewhat troubled, what this language means that is found on page 11:

> Diligent administration of the amended Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 (Taft-Hartley Act) and the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 (Landrum-Griffin Act) with recommendations for improvements which experience shows are needed to make them more effective or remove any inequities.

What does that language mean? I am pointing out to you the precise recommendation and language of the Republican platform. If I have ever seen intentional ambiguity, it seems to me that this is as delightfully an ambiguous statement as one could possibly make. So if the gentleman could clarify this for us and say, "No, you are not really antilabor," I would be very, very happy.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. The gentleman is a very well educated man. He knows the difference between ambiguities and outright distortions of the truth. As far as ambiguity is concerned, I do not see any reason why I should explain it to a gentleman as well educated as the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Democratic platform is quite precise and that is why I am so confused, when I read the Republican platform. We put out our platform first and you had a chance to put out yours after we had put out our platform.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. As far as the other allegation is concerned, there was an allegation in the Democratic platform that the Republicans had had two recessions and that in between the two recessions there was the greatest inflation in peacetime. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] pointed out that in 1 year under the Truman administration the cost of living went up 20 percent while in the entire Eisenhower administration, it went up only 11 percent.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Does the gentleman recall in 1945 when the war came to an end; was the gentleman a Member of the Congress at that time?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. No, the gentleman was not, and neither was the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Well, I had been serving in the Budget Bureau during the war years, so I was thoroughly cognizant of the anti-inflation program at that time. I will recall for the gentleman's benefit as well as for the benefit of the Members of the House that Congress withdrew the power of credit control which the Federal Reserve had been exercising. That was in the 80th Congress. They pretty well sabotaged price control. I recall I had a bet that the Congress would extend it and even though they did extend it, it was so badly extended that I paid off on the ground that I had really lost even though a bill carrying that name had gone through.

Now, the Republican Congress had withdrawn from the President the effective tools to hold the cost of living in line until the economy could catch up with the tremendous backlog of demand which had built up during the war. The gentleman may recall that during the war years the Congress was timid about giving the President the amount of tax increase he had asked for to enable him to take care of the tremendous postwar inflation. He was left naked in that storm by the action of the Republican Congress.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Of course the gentleman is adopting the technique which we found to be prevalent in the Democratic "Operation Lack of Veracity." The gentleman has not answered the point in the Democratic platform we protest, but is trying to make another point. The gentleman has not answered the accusation which we made that the statement in the Democratic platform that between the two recessions was the greatest inflation in peacetime was a false statement. Figuratively, he is talking about sticks when the subject has been centered on stones.

Does the gentleman want to address himself to the mendacious statement in the Democratic platform?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I would like to know the page of the platform.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. The gentleman can find the page on his own time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Let me simply say——

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I cannot yield to the gentleman further.

Then there is another statement that the budget was not balanced during the 7½ years of the Eisenhower administration. The budget was balanced in the years 1956 and 1957, 1960, and 1961. There has been no attempt by the Democratic Operation Lack of Veracity to take this point up at all.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield.

Mr. EDMONDSON. On page 19 of the platform immediately following the reference to the 7½-year period appears this line:

> The Republican administration has produced a deficit; in fact, the greatest deficit in any peacetime years in history in 1958 and 1959, but only occasional and meager surpluses.

So there is a recognition of your occasional surpluses as well as your record-breaking peacetime deficit.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. That is just exactly the point I am trying to make. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for he has made it so much better than I could. But why should you say there was not a balanced budget during the Eisenhower administration when later on you say there were these surpluses. How could there be surpluses without balanced budgets? The difficulty with this whole platform is that you did not appoint a committee to clean it up; the Republican platform committee did. Now, after this—you are going to be a member of the party for a long time—make sure that they do this, will you?

Mr. EDMONDSON. The gentleman from Arizona probably had as much to do with the writing of the Democratic platform as did the gentleman from Oklahoma, and the gentleman from Oklahoma was not at the convention any more than was the gentleman from Arizona. But I hope, though, that when the gentleman comments on lack of veracity in the Democratic platform he will recognize the fact that the same paragraph states that after the 7½-year record of deficits, the same paragraph states that you did have a surplus occasionally.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I did not say the whole thing was untrue; certainly, there are true statements in the platform. The only difficulty I have is that there is not as great a percentage of true statements as I think there should be.

Mr. EDMONDSON. As I have said, it states your 7½-year record and also states there was occasional surplus.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I am sorry, all I can do is take what your platform says, not what you think it means. It says there was never a balanced budget.

Mr. EDMONDSON. That is not what it said. I have the exact language if you would like me to read it.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I have read it many times.

Mr. EDMONDSON. The line to which you make reference——

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Yes; read it.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Is the first sentence of the paragraph and it says that during the past 7½-year period the Republicans have failed to balance the budget or reduce the national debt.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Or reduce the national debt.

Mr. EDMONDSON. That is the statement. It goes on to say that you have had occasional surpluses but you also had the biggest peacetime deficit in history. I would like to hear the gentleman deny that.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. As far as I am concerned, I am talking about what the platform says, not what you think it says.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I will take the responsibility for this paragraph if the gentleman will yield.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I have yielded to the gentleman.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Let the gentleman from California read something:

> Over the past 7½-year period—

Notice the word "period"—

> the Republicans have failed to balance the budget or reduce the national debt.

That is true.

> Responsible fiscal policy requires surpluses in good times to more than offset the deficits which may occur in recessions, in order to reduce the national debt over the long run. The Republican administration has produced the deficits—in fact, the greatest deficit in any peacetime year in history, in 1958–59—but only occasional and meager surpluses.

Note the last statement:

> Their first 7 years produced a total deficit of nearly $19 billion.

I say the gentleman quibbles if he tries to apply a period of 7½ years to a 1-year period.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Let me ask the gentleman what he means by the word "budget." Does not "budget" mean 1 fiscal year?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. No; not when you talk about 7½ years.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. This is Operation Veracity, and I thought the name was well understood. Apparently, I was mistaken.

Now, as far as saline waters are concerned, there is an allegation that the Republican administration had discouraged research in saline waters. The gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. THOMSON] stated that this was not the situation, and showed it was not the situation.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. METCALF. I pointed out to the gentleman from Wyoming I was on the Interior Committee with the gentleman from Arizona when the Republican administration was criticized for its slowdown of this saline water or brackish water program. I pointed out to the gentleman from Wyoming that every year the Democratic Congress appropriated more money than had been asked for by the President or the Budget Bureau, and I told the gentleman from Wisconsin and the gentleman from Wyoming, and secured permission to put in the record a table of the budget requests for appropriations for every year since this operation went into effect in the 82d Congress.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. If the gentleman from Montana will look at the RECORD for today he will find there a documented statement of the history of the saline water program. I had that placed in the RECORD today. I am sure the gentleman after he reads that, and I will say to the gentleman every fact and every figure is documented, he will change his mind and I will also say that the Republican Party is the party which really carried on the saline water program. The facts and figures prove that.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. It is also true that the first bills which were introduced for the saline water project were introduced by Republican Members of the House, two from the State of California. It is also true that the first money which was put in the saline water program was put in by an amendment in the other body by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. JENSEN. No one in this Congress has been more interested in the saline water program than JENSEN.

Mr. METCALF. I have no quarrel with that. I have nothing but praise.

Mr. JENSEN. And I happen to be a Republican, and the Republican record is 100 percent on that issue.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged motion. I move we adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Has the gentleman from Arizona yielded for that purpose?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I have not, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Arizona yield for that purpose?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. A motion to adjourn is in order at any time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Not when another Member has the floor.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield to me for the purpose of making a motion to adjourn?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I do not yield for that purpose.

Mr. METCALF. And I do not propose to labor this point, because I have permission to put this matter in the RECORD tomorrow. But, I want to say to the gentleman from Iowa and the Committee on Appropriations that I am going to put tables in the RECORD that are taken out of the official record of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. JENSEN. They are all in there.

Mr. METCALF. To show you that in the Republican 83d Congress the appropriation was only in the amount requested, and in every Democratic Congress since we have increased the budget and increased this program over and above the amount requested by the Republican administration.

Mr. JENSEN. I still stand on the record that I put in, which is documented with facts and figures. And, you cannot change them, my friend.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. May I say to the gentleman from Montana that this is a matter of which I have some personal knowledge.

Mr. METCALF. We were both on the committee when this second authorization bill was passed.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. The gentleman is correct. There was a bill passed by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs which encouraged the further activation of the program. There is no doubt of that. However, the Democratic platform says that the Republicans have been responsible for slowing it down. This I deny.

Now, there was a supplemental budget request sent up this year. The request was for $500,000, but the Appropriations Committee returned $400,000. I am sorry that they did not return the whole amount, but they did not. And this, of course, I do not need to tell the gentleman, is a Democratic Congress. So, the sword is going to cut many, many ways.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield in all fairness I must tell the House the truth about that supplemental bill. The $100,000 by which we reduced that budget was by unanimous agreement of every member of that committee, both Democrats and Republicans. Now, that is a fact, and the members of that committee will tell you the very same thing that I have told you.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. I thank the gentleman from Arizona for yielding. I want to congratulate him for the way in which he has handled this Operation Veracity. I think it was handled very well.

There is one point I would like to mention. I see many Members on the floor of the House who may be able to help me out. I quoted in my remarks on Monday last, appearing at page 18197 of the RECORD from the Democratic platform with respect to depletion allowances, where the platform said:

> We shall close the loopholes in the tax laws by which certain privileged groups legally escape their fair share of taxation. Among the more conspicuous loopholes are depletion allowances which are inequitable.

It is my understanding that the Democratic candidate for Vice President has made it quite clear that this did not apply to oil and gas, for which I am deeply grateful, because of the importance of that industry to my area and to the Nation as a whole. But also in the State I represent and in areas many others represent there are other minerals. I happen to represent oil. We have coal which I previously mentioned, we have iron, taconite, copper, cement, and clay, and other minerals. Since this statement does not seem to apply to oil and gas, I wish some of these Members would tell me which one of these other industries it does apply to. I am sure the people who rely upon those industries for their jobs and livelihoods would be interested. I am sure it would give us a great deal of light upon some of these other statements with regard to research, et cetera, that have been made.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent on behalf of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. WEAVER] that he be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD prior to the remarks of the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES]; and following his remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARRIS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER].

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I wish time permitted, but I understand that there is an effort being made to expedite matters. I had hoped to have the opportunity to answer charge by charge the statement made by my distinguished colleague from Minnesota.

However, let me say this: First, the record will clearly show that all Republicans on the Roads Subcommittee voted for funds in the organization of that committee.

Second, the record will show that the minority has at all times wanted adequate funds, but they have taken the

position that money should not be squandered. And when the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK] suggested that we were not asking for a specific amount of money, the reason was that we had no information on which to base a request although we made it clear we were for adequate funds; we had been furnished absolutely no information, had not been consulted with as to the makeup of the staff of the committee.

Let me say with regard to the only argument I have with the majority and with the chairman of the subcommittee, that after we were served notice by our staff that there was substantial evidence of wrongdoing in a number of States, including Massachusetts and Florida, as examples, it was my position, knowing these facts, that we should go forward with hearings and we would be derelict in our duties in not doing so. It was the position of the chairman, as evidenced by statements to the press on June 20 and subsequently, in the committee, that there was no intention to hold hearings prior to the election. That was the difference between our positions. I termed the position of the majority one of handcuffing the committee between now and election. To this the chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK], takes exception. Existing facts and future developments, I am sure, will sustain my position which I stated before in yesterday's RECORD beginning at page 18428. And I repeat that statement at this time.

Further, if all of these things are to be exposed, if this is, as one of the members of the subcommittee said, something that would make the Teapot Dome Scandals look like child's play, then I say let us get them out into the open. Let us do it now. Let us not let the elections hamper these investigations. Let us get them under way. I have a duty to inquire into and find out why they have not been under way in the past except in one State, Oklahoma, when matters in some six other States may also need thorough hearings. That is the criticism I have. I repeat it now. I can understand why it gives the chairman such discomfort that he should even question the motives of those of us who demand action, but I still think my criticism is justified.

Because of my determination that this subcommittee should be objective and constructive—fearless in its approach to all matters—I have been under constant attack. Early this year, information—false information—was leaked about the executive sessions of this committee to Drew Pearson, who manages to have at least two anti-Cramer columns every election. Headlines at home thus carried the story that I was somehow opposing the committee—when the facts are that I was the first member of the Roads Subcommittee on Public Works to ask for such a surveillance group, supported it wholeheartedly in its establishment and announced my support of sufficient funds to run it.

In executive session recently, I was served with a veiled threat that if I persisted with my demands for hearings in Massachusetts—and some other politically explosive States, my hometown papers would be reminded of Drew Pearson's article. The next day by coincidence my local papers repeated Drew's charges, with added fuel heaped on by my opponent. Under these circumstances, I cannot remain silent—the threat has been carried out—but I shall persist in my objection to handcuffing the committee until after the election—or at any time for that matter.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks immediately following the remarks of the gentleman from Minnesota on this same subject matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, in relation to statements about the Highway Subcommittee, as a member I feel that I have an obligation to correct the RECORD. I will first point out that the main argument is just the old situation, that never in the history of the House of Representatives so far as I know has the minority given orders to the majority. In this case the minority wants to give orders, and when they cannot they holler foul play. But let me point out that the gentleman from Florida testified before the Committee on Accounts, of which I am a member, in opposition to funds for this highway committee. As the result of his testimony the two Republican members of the committee who were present and voting voted against funds for that committee. If that is not opposition to a committee, I do not know what it is.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. METCALF. I want to make one comment upon the question propounded by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. THOMSON] as to the depletion allowances. I share the opinion of the Democratic Party on these various loopholes. I do not want to go into the whole question of depletion allowances.

As to the question of oil and other things in Wyoming, the State of Montana has just as much oil and twice as much coal. There are many areas, however, and I will be glad to extend my remarks, whose representatives made appearances before the Committee on Ways and Means where we sought to correct errors in the depletion allowances, without destroying the depletion allowances and drilling benefits. The Gore amendment that passed the House was unanimously approved. There are other things that have not been taken care of to make even our depletion allowances, drilling benefits, and so forth, equitable in the minds of the people in the industry.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. I admire the stand of the gentleman from Montana on this point because I had occasion a couple of weeks ago to talk with one of our mutual friends from Montana who told me the gentleman from Montana had courageously made 10 or 11 TV appearances in Billings, Mont., criticizing the depletion allowance on oil and gas. He told me that, and that even though he disagreed, he admired the gentleman for his forthrightness.

Mr. METCALF. Let us hope he will keep that attitude.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. May I ask the gentleman from Montana, Does he or does he not agree that this has no application to oil or gas or minerals?

Mr. METCALF. I agree with the Vice President, I do not think it has any application to either oil or gas or the minerals.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. How about this coal that the gentleman says his State has twice as much of as we have? I disagree with that. Does it have any application there?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I should like to call the attention of the gentleman from Montana to the fact that he said some of the things in the platform with respect to inequities in the depletion allowance were taken care of in the Gore amendment. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the Gore amendment was passed before your platform was written.

Mr. METCALF. I only used that as an analogy to indicate that what was referred to in the Democratic platform was the kind of thing that was treated in the Gore amendment.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I do not know and I am sure the Members would like to know what you mean by that generality, and what you are doing to do?

Mr. METCALF. I mean by that generality that there are other things in that area such as lime, glass, coal, and so forth that should be taken care of without infringing either on oil or minerals.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Were they not taken care of by the Gore amendment?

Mr. METCALF. Some were and some were not. I think the Gore amendment made great progress and saved us a lot of embarrassment in defending some of the other matters of depletion allowance, but I think there are other things in that general area, and the gentleman from Wisconsin knows just as well as I do and he has attended the same hearings and read the same reports, and he knows that there are other things that need to be taken care of to make this whole depletion allowance equitable and just.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. What did the Democratic platform mean? What items or what areas are you now talking about? You had the Gore amendment before the convention.

Mr. METCALF. I have told the gentleman from Wyoming that I agree we should eliminate oil and minerals.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I would ask the gentleman from Wisconsin if he feels that this might not be another instance where the Democratic platform apparently does not mean what it says. It seems to be subject to all sorts of interpretations. In other words, depletion allowance does not mean depletion allowance and the word "budget" does not mean budget. It means whatever some of their members apparently want it to mean at the time.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. From what the gentleman from Montana said, I got the impression that what they are talking about, when it comes to correcting inequities, had been corrected just a few weeks prior to their convention through the Gore amendment.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. As I understand it, depletion allowance comes down to a depletion allowance for sand and gravel and I have quite a bit of sand in my district and I am very unhappy about this, and I think others are very unhappy.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Always to my friend, the gentleman from Oklahoma, on the subject of depletion allowances.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I want to join my friend, the gentleman from Montana, in expressing thanks to the gentleman from Arizona for his generosity in yielding to us for questions and comments on what he has had to say here today.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Can we conclude from the gentleman's position in commenting on the Democratic platform that it is the Republican position that there are no inequities of any kind in the depletion allowance framework of our laws and that we should not have any adjustments or changes in the law?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I think the Republican platform speaks for itself.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Would the gentleman state the Republican position on this?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. The Republican position, as I recall, in the platform states that there should be a reasonable depletion allowance. Now the word "reasonable," as the gentleman knows, can be construed in the light of the exigencies of the situation as they might arise, and I am sure the gentleman wishes the Democratic platform had that nice word "reasonable" in it also.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I happen to be one of those who believes that we can have some adjustments and some equitable changes in our depletion allowances, and I personally would like to see some increases in the depletion allowance for our hard rock minerals which I think are vital to help a number of areas in this country; and also for coal. I think that should be increased.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Does the gentleman think there should be any decrease in the depletion allowance?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I think it is possible there are areas where decreases should be voted also. I would be willing to let the facts justify the decrease where the facts will prove the need for a decrease.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. In other words, you like the Republican platform.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I would say this. I am not prepared to say the Republican platform is shot through with mendacity which the gentleman seems to think is the case with the Democratic platform.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Oh, no, the gentleman is not correct. The gentleman from Arizona has stated consistently that the Democratic platform is not shot through with mendacity but there are certain instances in which so many people have taken such liberties with the truth and with the spoken word that some of us felt it necessary to call it to the attention of the people of this country.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a further observation?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I have listened with as open a mind as I think a Democrat from Oklahoma can summon for a Republican political speech to most of the gentleman's presentation. The gentleman has in his "Operation Veracity" totally failed to point out really solid substance for the allegation that the Democratic platform was full of inaccuracies and untruths.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I did not say that. I did not say it was full of untruths and inaccuracies. It does have quite a few, however.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I have heard you out and I do not think you have made your case on a single allegation. I think Operation Veracity can more properly be known as Operation Inaccuracy——

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. If I may interrupt, the gentleman is just like the old owl down in the swamp: The more light I shine in his eyes the less he can see.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. I would like to remind the distinguished gentleman from Arizona that the sponsor and the author of the depletion allowance was the senior Senator, the late Senator Neely, of West Virginia. The matter was written into the statute books in 1927. I am very much surprised to see the Republicans so interested in this program that originated as a Democratic program.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I might say to the gentleman that we have never claimed to have a monopoly on good ideas; we certainly do not.

Mr. BAILEY. You are doing it right now.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. I think it was in January of this year that some of us including the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS], and myself had quite a floor debate on this matter of depletion. In the light of that discussion I am not surprised that the Democratic platform would stand for reducing the depletion allowance on gas and some other numerals. All I can say is that it demonstrates a fractionated party, that would have it mean one thing in our area, another thing in New York, and still another thing in West Virginia. Actually depletion allowances represent fair taxation necessary to provide an adequate supply of oil and gas and other minerals for this country. In our State oil, gas, coal, uranium, trona, taconite, iron, bentonite, and I could go on and on, are all important. I would like to know just which depletion allowances are loopholes and inequitable as the Democrats see it. I think they have an obligation to forthrightly state just what their platform means in such a general charge.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Did anybody reply to the Republican refutation of the Democratic statement that the Food and Drug Administration was being neglected, and so forth?

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Certainly.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I do not know what our exact responsibility on this platform charge is, but I do recall a Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare who reportedly resigned because of considerable difficulty in the handling of polio vaccine.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Of course, what the Democratic platform stated was that the Food and Drug Administration had been starved for lack of funds.

Did anybody say anything about the weakening of the transportation system? We have had lots of talk about internecine strife in the Public Roads Committee. However there was an allegation that in the Democratic platform there was a horrible weakening of the transportation system throughout the country. Did anybody mention that in the Democratic Operation Lack of Veracity deal with it?

I guess not.

Of course, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] tried to talk about the statement of the Democratic platform that the Republican failure in the field of economics was virtually complete, and I recall he said something about our economy being so bad. Here we have half-a-trillion-dollar country. We have had growth at a healthy rate. And yet the gentleman says this is not really true at all because in the President's Economic Report there is a footnote, mind you, that might indicate otherwise. Since when does a footnote overshadow the plain facts? What kind of myopia is this which looks so hard at the footnotes that the context of the main work is lost?

The charge of virtually complete economic failure cannot stand.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Certainly.

Mr. WRIGHT. I am not sure just what our responsibility in that regard is.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Let me state your responsibility as I see it. The Democratic platform has stated that the failure of the Republican administration in the field of economics has been virtually complete. Those are very strong words. You should defend them.

Mr. WRIGHT. May I inquire of the gentleman from Arizona if he is satisfied with the rate of economic growth?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Now, if the gentleman is going to talk about the words "virtually complete," I will yield to him, but if he wants to make a speech I do not yield.

Mr. WRIGHT. I am a little curious that the gentleman is satisfied with the rate of economic growth that has been attained under the Eisenhower administration, which averages 2.4 percent annually, when we have an experience prior to that time and economic growth of an average of 5.4 percent.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. You are talking about some war years in that 20 years, and I am sure you do not mean to do so. I do not claim to be satisfied with that rate of growth. I do not think I would be satisfied with the 5 percent or even a 10-percent rate of growth. I want the country to grow as does the gentleman from Texas. Where we differ is that I believe the growth of the economy will occur by the encouragement and propagation of the private sector of the economy. The Democratic Party is replete with promises to expand with the emphasis on expansion in the public sector.

Mr. WRIGHT. I agree with the gentleman's conclusion. One of the things I suppose would be the immediate abandoning of the administration's hard money policy which has restricted and stifled the country's economic growth. Will the gentleman agree with that?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Let us talk about the hard money policy for a while. Although some persons would like to believe otherwise, money really is a commodity subject to the laws of supply and demand, like any other commodity. When you have an expanding economy the money supply is taxed; in other words, there is often not enough money when you have an expanding economy. If the economy is going downhill you have plenty of money. It is characteristic of an expanding economy that for a period in that expansion there is a shortening of the supply of money and a hardening of the interest rate.

Mr. WRIGHT. I am curious as to the gentleman's position. Is the gentleman trying to maintain that the present administration has not had anything to do with the raising of interest rates and does the gentleman maintain this just simply happens, it has not been artificially manipulated?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I state it has not been artificially manipulated. In fact, if it had been artificially manipulated down, instead of having only an 11-percent increase in the cost of living during this administration, you would have had a 30- or 40-percent increase. If you push the interest rate you are going to push the cost of living down by increasing the supply of money up. You cannot have your cake and eat it, too, whether it is in flour or greenbacks.

Mr. WRIGHT. Has the gentleman forgotten that one of the first acts of this administration which occurred only 9 days after it took office was the act of the Secretary of the Treasury in suddenly increasing the yield on Government bonds which had been paying only 1⅞ percent interest to 2¼ and 2½ percent interest? In that one fell swoop of the pen you increased the public indebtedness by $30 million and set off this chain reaction. Has the gentleman forgotten that?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I do not think the gentleman believes that. I do not think the gentleman believes the administration did this on purpose, if it really happened. The gentleman knows that no matter who was President of the United States, if this occurred it was probably necessary.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GUBSER. Is it not possible, particularly with a 2 to 1 majority, to pass legislation directing the Federal Reserve Board to loosen money? I would inquire further of the gentleman whether anyone on the Democratic side of this controlled Congress has ever introduced such a bill or whether any of the controlled committees has considered any such bill.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. The gentleman knows the answer to that question.

Mr. GUBSER. It is probably insincere to be talking about loose money and not doing anything about it when you control the Congress 2 to 1.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I wonder if the gentleman from Texas, who talks about hard money, is really the enemy of the people who have been paying life insurance, social security, buying Government bonds that the Government sought to have them buy. I wonder how he feels about them and what has been done to them under the attitude he expresses.

THE LATE HONORABLE EDWARD F. McGRADY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in the recent death of the Honorable Edward F. McGrady of Newtonville, Mass., the country has lost one of its truly great citizens, and I have lost a valued friend. "Eddie" McGrady led a long and constructive life, in the field of labor, in the field of government, and in the field of business. His friends were countless in number.

"Eddie" McGrady worked in the press room of various Boston newspapers, and in the ranks of labor was a constructive leader for many years in the American Federation of Labor, and achieved international fame as top-labor troubleshooter during the first administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt. He served in an outstanding manner for a number of years as Assistant Secretary of Labor. He later became associated with the Radio Corp. of America as vice president and director, maintaining his associations with this company and its affiliates for a number of years.

In any position in which he served, "Eddie" McGrady did so with outstanding ability, and in an honorable and trustworthy manner. He was truly one of the greatest men I have ever met. I valued greatly his friendship. I shall miss him very much.

To his daughters and other loved ones left behind, Mrs. McCormack joins with me in extending to them our heartfelt sympathy in their great loss and sorrow.

ANALYSIS OF DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, the Democratic platform on housing, though true in its one basic statement, is very misleading, due to the fact that the year selected—1950—for comparison was an extraordinary year. It was nearly 40 percent greater than the previous year and the following year.

A more fair or normal comparison would have taken the last year of the Democratic administration, 1952.

Following is our analysis:

ANALYSIS OF DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM—HOUSING

"Today our rate of homebuilding is less than 10 years ago."

As far as total number of nonfarm dwelling starts is concerned, this statement is probably true by a very narrow margin, a margin actually less than the probable error involved in these statistics.

The year 1950, to which this statement obviously refers was, unitwise, the largest year in the history of home construction with 1,396,000 nonfarm units started. This total for 1950 barely surpassed the total for 1959 (by 18,000 units, countrywide). Since an 11.3 percent average error (on the low side) was shown for private nonfarm starts in 1959 as a result of the new counting system started by Census a year ago, there is a legitimate question as to the accuracy of this comparison since the difference in the 2 years compared is somewhat less than 1½ percent.

The year 1950 was actually the one freak year in recent housing statistics. The unusual volume of this year, which was over 20 percent above the year preceding, 1949, or the year following, 1951, resulted from the telescoping of housing starts as a result of the building industry's anxiety to get under way before the imposition of the credit and material controls which followed the outbreak of the Korean conflict in June 1950.

When you take the last 7 years of a Democratic administration and compare it to the first 7 years of the Eisenhower administration, it is a different story. During the 7 years of the Eisenhower administration, 8,400,000 nonfarm dwelling units were started as compared to 7,091,000 nonfarm dwellings started during the last 7 years of a Democratic administration. This is an increase of nearly 18½ percent under a Republican administration.

Total number of nonfarm dwelling units started

TRUMAN ADMINISTRATION

Year:	*Dwelling units*
1946	671,000
1947	849,000
1948	932,000
1949	1,025,000
1950	1,396,000
1951	1,091,000
1952	1,127,000
Total, 7 years	7,091,000

EISENHOWER ADMINISTRATION

Year:	*Dwelling units*
1953	1,104,000
1954	1,220,000
1955	1,329,000
1956	1,118,000
1957	1,042,000
1958	1,209,000
1959	1,378,000
Total, 7 years	8,400,000

When dollar volume is considered, 1959 is far and away the greatest year in housing history with estimated dollar value of total nonfarm residential starts $23.3 billion compared to $14.4 billion in 1950.

As a matter of fact, during 6 of the 7 years of the Eisenhower administration estimated dollar value of housing starts exceeded the best year under the Truman administration, 1950.

For the 7 years 1946 through 1952, total estimated dollar value of nonfarm residential construction was $74.2 billion. During the 7 years 1953 through 1959, total estimated dollar value of nonfarm residential construction was $126.7 billion * * * an increase under the Eisenhower administration of 70 percent.

Estimated dollar value of nonfarm residential construction

TRUMAN ADMINISTRATION

Year:	*Dwelling units*
1946	$5,126,000
1947	7,735,000
1948	10,278,000
1949	10,001,000
1950	14,445,000
1951	13,124,000
1952	13,496,000
Total, 7 years	74,205,000

EISENHOWER ADMINISTRATION

Year:	*Dwelling units*
1953	$14,333,000
1954	15,715,000
1955	18,971,000
1956	17,969,000
1957	17,525,000
1958	18,893,000
1959	23,280,000
Total, 7 years	126,686,000

Another way of looking at private and public residential construction is as a percentage of the gross national product. Since January 1, 1953, under the Republican administration an average of 5.9 percent of GNP has been devoted to housing. This is an increase over the 5.5 percent of the years 1946 through 1952 under the Truman administration * * * an increase of about 8.8 percent.

Private and public residential construction versus gross national product

TRUMAN ADMINISTRATION

Year	Gross national product	Residence construction,[1] percent of GNP
1946	$210,700,000,000	3.7
1947	234,300,000,000	5.0
1948	259,400,000,000	5.8
1949	258,100,000,000	5.7
1950	284,600,000,000	6.7
1951	329,000,000,000	5.5
1952	347,000,000,000	5.4
Total, 7 years	1,923,100,000,000	5.5

EISENHOWER ADMINISTRATION

1953	$365,400,000,000	5.4
1954	363,100,000,000	5.9
1955	397,500,000,000	6.4
1956	419,200,000,000	6.0
1957	442,500,000,000	5.6
1958	441,700,000,000	5.8
1959	479,500,000,000	6.3
Total, 7 years	2,908,900,000,000	5.9

[1] Includes maintenance and repairs.

(In all honesty it must be noted that the percentage of gross national product for the atypical, or freak year, 1950 when housing starts were telescoped in anticipation of Korean conflict controls is the highest in the 14 years covered, 6.7 percent. This figure can be compared with the high of 6.5 percent of gross national product for the Eisenhower administration in 1955 or with 1959 when construction equalled 6.3 percent of gross national product.)

Another valid approach to housing statistics compares the dollar volume spent for private, new residential construction with the total amount of gross private domestic investment.

During the 7 years of the Eisenhower administration, 29 percent of the gross private domestic investment was in private, new residential construction compared to 24.5 percent during the 7 years of the Truman administration—an increase of over one-fourth.

It is significant that this index shows 1959 as the top year. In 1959, private residential construction represented 31.4 percent of the gross private domestic investment compared to 29.1 percent for the year 1950 on which the statement in the Democratic platform is based.

Private new residential construction versus gross private domestic investment

TRUMAN ADMINISTRATION

Year	Gross private domestic investment	Residence construction, percent of GNP
1946	$28,100,000,000	17.1
1947	31,500,000,000	23.8
1948	43,100,000,000	23.4
1949	33,000,000,000	29.1
1950	50,000,000,000	28.2
1951	56,300,000,000	22.2
1952	49,900,000,000	25.7
Total, 7 years	291,900,000,000	24.5

EISENHOWER ADMINISTRATION

1953	$50,300,000,000	27.4
1954	48,900,000,000	31.5
1955	63,800,000,000	29.3
1956	67,400,000,000	26.3
1957	66,600,000,000	25.5
1958	54,900,000,000	32.8
1959	71,100,000,000	31.4
Total, 7 years	423,000,000,000	29.1

"A healthy expanding economy will enable us to build 2 million homes a year in wholesome neighborhoods for people of all incomes.

"At this rate, within a single decade we can clear away our slums and assure every American family a decent place to live."

This is obviously a desirable, although somewhat utopian, goal.

The present rate of new home-construction starts is estimated at 1,200,000 for 1960. The figure in the Democratic platform would call for 66⅔ percent increase. At today's prices, this would aggregate $38,784,480,000 for housing. On the basis of today's economy, this amount for home construction would amount to 9.8 percent of the gross national product. (Of course, it is suggested that such a magnitude of housing would be constructed under an economy which was considerably expanded.)

It is obvious that were the economy to increase at the proposed rate of 5 or 6 percent a year this goal of 2 million home-construction starts a year would not be achieved until the latter part of the decade, unless a considerably larger portion of the gross national product were devoted to homes than is predicted by even the most optimistic of economists.

Data from the National Housing Inventory covering a 6⅔-year period between 1950 and 1956 indicates there were then an estimated 3,400,000 nonfarm units which would be classified by the Bureau of the Census as dilapidated. In addition, there were 4–5 million units that were in good condition but lacked one or more of the basic plumbing facilities.

"The Democratic administration will end the neglect of our older citizens. We shall assure them not only health care but employment for those who want work, decent housing, and recreation."

More has been done to provide housing for elderly people during the Eisenhower administration than in any similar period in the history of the country. More than 20,000 private or public units, especially designed for the elderly have been built or started in the last 3 years alone.

One of the proudest achievements of this administration is that it inaugurated the first Federal measure to help elderly people to get good housing—further, it has done more to help elderly people get good housing than any other administration since the founding of the Republic.

In his state of the Union message in 1956, President Eisenhower asked the Congress to revise Federal housing laws "to meet the needs of the growing number of older people." From his proposals came a three-part program written into the Housing Act of that year.

One part of the program that is having spectacular acceptance relates to the provision of private rental housing for elderly persons by nonprofit groups such as churches, labor unions, fraternal groups, and similar associations.

As a result of President Eisenhower's recommendations, and the implementing action by the Congress in the Housing Act of 1956, such nonprofit groups have been able to obtain attractive FHA-insured mortgages, and applications have been rolling in in baleload quantities.

In 1959 the administration carried the program a step further by sponsoring legislation to facilitate building FHA housing for elderly rental projects on a profit basis as well as the previous nonprofit basis.

As a result of these two developments, we find beautiful projects being constructed in all parts of the country.

Consider this abbreviated list of projects now in being:

Royal Oaks Manor (Presbyterian), California; Carmel Hall (Roman Catholic), Detroit, Mich.; Michigan Christian Home Association, Grand Rapids, Mich.; OEA Senior Citizens, Omaha, Nebr.; Bethel Methodist Home, Ossining, N.Y.; Evangelical Lutheran

Good Samaritan Society Home, Hobart, Okla.; St. James House of Baytown (Episcopal), Baytown, Tex.; Douglas Gardens (Jewish), Miami, Fla.

As of April 30, 1960, more than 71 projects with nearly 9,000 living units were either completed or on the road to completion. Meanwhile, scores more were moving up into the pipeline and the number of applications coming in can be counted in the hundreds.

However, this is only one part of the program.

Other changes were made. For example, low-rent public housing projects were opened to single elderly persons, 65 or older. Ever since 1937, single persons had been denied admission to such projects.

Further, elderly families were given priority of admission; and the Public Housing Administration was authorized to help local authorities build or remodel dwellings specifically designed for the elderly.

As a result, more than 12,000 units of public housing designed especially for the aging have been added to the public housing supply in 3 years—in addition to the housing of many thousands of elderly families in standard units.

"A new Democratic administration will expand Federal programs to aid urban communities to clear their slums, dispose of their sewage, educate their children, transport suburban commuters to and from their jobs, and combat juvenile delinquency."

This statement involves in part programs currently conducted in housing and home finance under the community facilities administration and the urban renewal administration.

More American cities are engaged in urban renewal than any similar period in history—436 communities—more than double the previous number—have 750 renewal projects under way—four times as many as before 1953.

More has been done to help localities plan for sewers, water systems, schools, than any similar period in history—advances made to plan 1,300 public works projects involving a total construction cost of nearly $3 billion.

More cities and metropolitan areas are engaged in planning for the future than any similar period in history—an administration first in urban planning, with grants made for comprehensive planning in 90 metropolitan areas and urban regions and in 1,140 smaller towns throughout the country.

Before the Eisenhower administration, the term urban renewal was unknown. It is a new concept and phrase, created in 1954, for solving the long-standing problem of urban deterioration and decay of our urban areas through combined use of public and private efforts in the urban community. This is not just clearing slums—it is also restoring and preserving good areas and preventing new slums from developing.

More than 1,000 towns and cities throughout the country now have comprehensive local plans, known as workable programs for community improvement, to solve their major housing, planning, traffic, and land use problems through a coordinated attack. No such total community programs existed before 1954.

At the President's recommendation, the Congress has authorized since 1953 $1½ billion in Federal grant funds to aid towns and cities to redevelop and rehabilitate their slum and blighted areas—three times as much as was authorized before 1953.

Under the present administration, the number of towns and cities carrying out renewal projects has more than doubled, totaling 436, and the number of projects is more than 750—four times the number initiated before 1953.

Federal assistance on these earlier projects, moreover, was provided only for clearing slums already in existence.

There were no provisions for preventing slums from coming into existence. So the battle was a losing one from the beginning. It was as if we had built a hospital filled entirely with operating rooms, but with no place for patients to get well and forestall an operation.

The Republican administration (and Republican Congress) in the historic Housing Act of 1954 initiated an entirely new approach to the slum blight problem—the total approach.

Another farseeing program introduced by this administration (in 1954) is the planning program designed to help metropolitan areas combat the new phenomenon in American life known as "suburban sprawl."

This was the first such constructive Federal legislation of its kind.

At the end of 1959, there were 94 urban and metropolitan areas receiving planning assistance.

In addition (due to another provision of the 1954 Housing Act), more than 1,000 small municipalities were also receiving assistance.

AMERICA STILL LEADS FROM STRENGTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY] is recognized for 25 minutes.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that I think it is very significant on the eve of adjournment, after this marvelous presentation by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES], to note that he served on the Labor Committee with me and to remember that, running for the Office of President, both RICHARD NIXON and JACK KENNEDY have served on that same committee, and I think that the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] did a wonderful presentation to show his merit in how he has had his background before he moved over to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I regret there was not time during the presentation by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES], to give our answer in detail, but I simply call to the attention of the House that position on transportation in the platform is correct.

In addition to the sentence the gentleman referred to, "Over the past 7 years, we have watched the steady weakening of the Nation's transportation system," there also appears the following by way of further detail, "Railroads are in distress. Highways are congested. Airports and airways lag far behind the needs of the jet age."

The critics cannot deny these observations.

The gentleman also made an allegation that the Democratic platform sought economic expansion entirely through further public spending. This is a completely unfair representation of the party position as expressed in the platform. What the platform actually says about economic growth is as follows:

> The new Democratic administration will confidently proceed to unshackle American enterprise and to free American labor, industrial leadership, and capital, to create an abundance that will outstrip any other system.
>
> Free competitive enterprise is the most creative and productive form of economic order that the world has seen. The recent slow pace of American growth is due not to the failure of our free economy but to the failure of our national leadership.
>
> We Democrats believe that our economy can and must grow at an average rate of 5 percent annually, almost twice as fast as our average annual rate since 1953. We pledge ourselves to policies that will achieve this goal without inflation.

It goes on to suggest ways this can be done—not only through an end to tight money and proper control of inflation but also by securing full employment, by giving aid to distressed areas, by planning for automation, and by a whole host of specific proposals that would favor the development of our free competitive enterprise system.

I do not want to intrude further except to say that it is not a fair presentation of the issue to suggest that the Democratic platform seeks expansion only by further public outlays. We have very specific recommendations for expansion on the private side.

I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the accomplishments of the United States hold a more commanding lead over the rest of the world than ever before. American production is so great that while the world is suffering from want, our problems are due to surpluses. However, despite this, there are those in America today who would deprecate America and the things for which we stand—the freedom and dignity of man.

I want to briefly discuss with you the knowledge and information that I have as to America's lead. While that lead is general, I shall principally discuss that which has to do with our military strength. Our American military strength has been a subject in which I have been interested for many years. I have been a member of the Armed Services Committee of the House for 8 years, and for 35 years have been a member of the Armed Forces either on active duty or reserve.

Each year I discuss our military strength, our progress, and our stated goals. In order to properly understand and evaluate our progress a background will be given which means that some remarks will be repetitious of developments previously discussed. I will point out the phenomenal progress that the United States has made in the last few years and I will compare our military strength of today with that of Russia.

THOSE WHO WOULD CALL OUR COUNTRY SECOND RATE

For some years we have been hearing the false and foreboding cry that the United States has become a second-class country, that we are weak in comparison with Russia in many fields, that our

poor defense capabilities and the "missile lag" are threatening us with destruction. This foreboding cry has been echoing and reechoing in the press, on radio, television, and the platform. Some columnists, commentators and politicians have had a field day deprecating our country and its accomplishments.

The attacks on the strength of the United States comes from several groups; the motives of each group are different, but their cries of alarm are much the same. These attacks are launched against several areas of our national life, but I will principally discuss those which pertain to our military strength.

On the American scene especially in an election year, it is impossible to ignore as important an issue as defense with all of its policies, propaganda, and developments. The American people must decide which statements are for political expediency and those that are real.

A second group which has added to the demand for greater defense appropriations are confirmed socialists or statists who are exponents of greater and greater spending regardless of the purpose of that spending and of increased Government control. This group has the misguided belief that such riotous spending is a wise method of redistributing the wealth. They are also the ones anxious to propose a Federal solution to every human problem. They are fascinated by the size and complexity of the Federal machine and want to see it strengthened to the point where it would not only dominate but annihilate free, private life in America. There is in America a group who believes that the average American does not know how to spend his money; that the all-knowing Federal Government should take more and more from him and spend it as the all-wise Government thinks is best for him. Several members of this group are writers and well known to us in Washington. They are leaders in this clamor for defense spending. Their goal is government expansion, they are not especially interested in defense; they would be equally strong advocates of spending for harbors, parks, canals, schools, public power, or forests if that special brand of spending could be made popular with the people.

A third group who says that we are faced with destruction unless we spend more money are armament salesmen. In order to sell their special missiles or weapons, they tell the American people that we are faced with destruction because of Russia's great military power, unless we spend another billion or more for defense, especially the missile or gadget which they are marketing. On the whole, our manufacturers in the arms business are doing a superior job, but several have resorted to the most incendiary allegations regarding the U.S. weakness and Russia's strength to high pressure the American people and force the Government to buy their special missiles or weapon, whether this weapon is needed or not.

A fourth voice in the clamor about American military strength is made up of dedicated officers of our military services, who naturally believe that their respective services are not being used sufficiently in our military planning. The officers of each service want more defense money. If our country would give to each service all of the defense dollars it wants and to each armament salesman what he says the military should buy, all of the production and wealth of America could not quench their insatiable appetite. We would destroy ourselves by national bankruptcy just as surely as a Communist military force could do. We already are spending more than 60 cents of every Federal tax dollar for national defense—a total in excess of $40 billion a year. We must make decisions as to our military plans and procurement that will give us the best defense and yet not wreck the United States by riotous spending. It was that wily architect of communism, Lenin, who predicted that the United States someday would spend itself into ruin.

THE MISSILE LAG

The missile lag has become a popular subject of discussion for those who would glibly say that America is behind Russia and that "pinch penny" policies of this administration have starved our defense. Exactly what is the missile lag to which they refer?

Immediately after World War II both Russia and the United States began the development of long-distance surface-to-surface rockets. Our project in this field was NX–774. It was ordered canceled on July 1, 1947. Today we can see that this was an unfortunate decision, for it was not until 1953 that the United States really revived the long-distance, surface-to-surface missile project. Russia had at least six years head start on us in this field and it is an outstanding achievement that we have been able to catch up and even pass Russia in most phases of military missiles despite her advantage.

After we abandoned our program, Russia continued her program to the limit of her capacity. In fiscal year 1950 we spent only a half a million dollars for both our intercontinental ballistic missile program and our intermediate range ballistic missile program. During fiscal 1960, which closed on June 30 this year, we spent $3.5 billion on missiles.

It is important that the American people understand the facts as to when the "missile lag" took place and also as to whether the "missile lag" exists today. This situation is well documented by the remarks of Congressman MAHON, Democrat of Texas, chairman of the subcommittee on defense appropriations, on the floor of the House on May 9, 1956, during the debate on the defense appropriations bill—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 6994—for fiscal 1957.

Another important fact is that immediately after World War II the Soviets began an intensive program for the development of the ICBM (intercontinental ballistic missile). This country did not. We are trying now to make up for lost time, and whether we will be able to do it remains to be seen.

Later in that same year, on July 19, 1956, I commented on this statement of Congressman MAHON, and this statement appears on page 13599 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date:

The ICBM field, I must admit, is one in which there is no definite knowledge as to whether the United States or Russia is ahead in technical progress. We know Russia began her extensive intercontinental development just after World War II. We did not start until a few years ago. The element of time is the one concession we must grant the Soviets in this field. If we are behind, it is because of our inaction in the years between the end of World War II and the conclusion of fighting in the Korean conflict.

When Congressman MAHON made that statement in 1956, "We are trying to make up for lost time, and whether we will be able to do it remains to be seen," there was real doubt as to if and when we could catch up with Russia in the long-distance ballistic missile race. Today we can definitely say that we have caught up with Russia in the missile race. Except for the fact that Russia today has rockets with a greater thrust than ours, we are definitely ahead of Russia in all phases of the missile race.

I would like to point out exactly what we have spent in the purchase of missiles in the last several years. I requested the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress to provide the actual figures of missile production and procurement. Fiscal 1951 was the first year for which such figures were available. The figures are as follows:

Fiscal year:	*Total spent (millions)*
1951	$21
1952	169
1953	295
1954	504
1955	718
1956	1,168
1957	2,095
1958	2,737
1959	3,339
1960 (estimated)	3,500
1961 (estimated)	3,479

These figures certainly refute the statements that our country has been niggardly in our expenditures for missiles in recent years. In addition, since fiscal 1958 we have had separate appropriations for the Federal space program which I will point out later.

OUR MILITARY PROGRAMS MUST BE CONSTANT—NOT SPASMODIC

One of the most difficult problems in national defense is to keep a defense that will meet America's need. We must not allow Russia to guide us in that field. Our military strength must not be one that ebbs and flows as the Kremlin smiles or frowns. The policy of feast or famine has dominated our military thinking for too many years. Such a program is unduly expensive and places us in danger of enemy aggression when we are at our low ebb of strength.

The abandonment of our long-distance missile program in 1947 placed us at a disadvantage with Russia. Our military planning, just as our farming, business, and personal planning, must

be made in an orderly manner. This we are trying to do and I believe we are succeeding.

In May 1957, Congress, I think erroneously, cut the defense budget submitted by the President. Many of us who were aware of the Russian threat attempted to prevent this cut, especially in certain fields of military development. This attempt to restore part of the defense cut was made on May 29, 1957, and the vote is found on pages 8097 and 8098 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date. Our attempt was defeated. It is interesting that this vote was just 4 months and 6 days before Russia launched sputnik on October 4, 1957.

It is especially interesting that almost without exception those in Congress today who are crying about the "missile lag" and blaming the administration for what they term "Russian superiority" in missiles and space, voted on May 29, 1957, against restoring the cut in the President's military budget.

DESPITE CANCELLATION OF MISSILE PROGRAM IN 1947, TODAY THE UNITED STATES IS AHEAD OF RUSSIA IN MILITARY MISSILES

Exactly where do we stand in the missile field?

The phenomenal progress that the United States has made in the intercontinental ballistic missile field from 1953 to the present is one of our greatest technological and industrial accomplishments. Our country cannot buy an intercontinental ballistic missile in the same manner as you would go to the grocery store to buy a loaf of bread. The missiles we are firing today are missiles that within the last few years were taken from the drawing boards to operational success.

The Atlas missile overcame early structural defects to the place where 37 firings have been a success, to a phenomenal accuracy at ranges up to 9,000 miles. Those shots had a greater degree of relative accuracy than if a golfer made 37 holes in one at a distance of 300 yards. Today, with the Atlas missile we can drop a nuclear warhead, 100 times as powerful as the bomb that was dropped on Hiroshima, on any target in Russia. While Russia had 6 years start on the United States in the ballistic missile field, in my opinion the Atlas missile is a better combat missile than Russia has produced. I must hasten to admit that Russia has rocket engines with greater thrust than ours, which are useful in space exploration, but not on the battlefield. We have recently fired Atlas missiles more than 9,000 miles with pinpoint accuracy. That is a far greater distance than is necessary for military usage. Our new missile, the Minuteman, has less thrust and distance than either the Atlas or the Titan, for we do not need this great a thrust for any military usage.

Atlas missiles are coming off the production line faster than we are building bases. It costs $150 million to build an Atlas base which will house 10 missiles for firing, which is many times the cost of the missile itself. Firing an Atlas ICBM is not like firing a roman candle. When it is fired you must rebuild its launching pad. It is true that we can speed the building of Atlas bases, but to do so would slow the newer intercontinental ballistic missiles which are on the way. Our next ICBM is the Titan, which has been successfully fired and will be placed on site ready to fire soon.

OUR NEWEST ICBM'S, THE TITAN AND MINUTEMAN, WILL BE PROTECTED FROM ENEMY SNEAK ATTACKS

For structural reasons it is difficult to fire the Atlas from a hard stand, but a Titan missile can be fired easily in that manner. A hard stand is a silo in the ground where the missile is stored for firing and is given almost total protection from an enemy sneak air or missile attack. Such protection is understandably most important, for an enemy's first objective in a surprise attack would be to destroy our power of massive retaliation at the very beginning of hostilities.

Next in line is the solid propellant Minuteman, a far cheaper missile that can be fired easily from hard stands or easily carried for firing in planes or on trucks and trains, which would prevent an enemy from destroying them before they are fired, as their location would not be known by a potential enemy. Polaris submarines capable of firing atomic warheads from concealed locations under the sea for thousands of miles with great accuracy are going into operation. It would take hours to set forth our missile and other military strengths, but I can assure you that America is not a second-class country but is far stronger than Russia, and we intend to keep it that way.

UNITED STATES LEADS IN SPACE

I am uncertain as to the value of many phases of our satellite and space program especially as it may have to do with military strength. However, we are definitely in the race with Russia in this field and regardless of the value it ultimately may have, it unquestionably has a strong effect on world opinion.

Our Government abandoned the long-distance missile program which was the forerunner of the space program, back in 1947. Naturally they did not see the embarrassment that would result in the abandonment of the program, when on the 4th day of October 1957 Russia placed Sputnik I in space.

However, thanks to the brilliance and capability of American scientists and technicians, the United States today can say that space travel is almost "all-American." Russia is superior in only one field of space, and that is that she has produced rockets of greater thrust than has the United States and these rockets are able to place in orbit heavier objects than we are able to place in orbit. The reason for this is their 6-year start in the field which they took advantage of while we had abandoned it.

The United States is now working on the Saturn project which, when it is fully operational in 1963 will move us far ahead of Russia in this field of thrust.

To date the United States has launched 26 satellites of which 14 are still in orbit; Russia has launched 8 of which 3 are still in orbit. The record shows our achievements in space are far greater and more useful than those of Russia, even though we entered this field much later than Russia.

The three Vanguards made great early discoveries in space including the earth's magnetic field and solar X-ray. The Explorer sent back the first photographs of the earth. The Pioneer went into orbit around the sun and sent back radio messages from 22.5 million miles. The Discoverer XIII marked the first reentry and recovery of a capsule from orbit in space. Echo, the 100-foot balloon circling the earth where all the world can see, is also a milestone in developments in space. Tiros sent back 23,000 photographs of clouds and signaled disturbances which became the basis for new techniques for weather forecasting. Midas marked the beginning of new infrared detection of foreign missile launchings.

On and on American achievements dwarf Russian accomplishments in the field of space. Space is becoming an all-American highway. The last year has been a sad one for those who would disparage our country and call us a second-class power. Our spending in the Federal space program since fiscal 1958 is as follows:

Total expenditures

	Million
1958	$139
1959	404
1960	715
1961 (estimated)	1,013

AIR DEFENSE

When our long-distance surface-to-surface missile program was abandoned in 1947 we continued our antiaircraft missile, the Nike. For this reason we are and have always been far superior to Russia in our missile defense against planes. As Russia fell behind us in the quality and quantity of long-distance bombers we have been able to cut down on our expenditures for antiaircraft defense and add this money to the building up of a stronger attack capability.

One great problem confronting us today is whether it will be possible to build up a defense against ballistic missiles. We are developing such a program. The principle involved is that we intercept the ballistic missile with an atomic missile that will destroy by its explosion the warhead that is approaching our country with a speed of thousands of miles per hour. It is complicated, but great progress has been made, and it may be a success. It is the Nike-Zeus program. It is similar to many programs on which we have worked during the last several years. Many of these programs are successful; many are not. However, one does not know whether these will succeed until they have been tried. Such efforts have contributed heavily to our military costs.

AMERICAN PLANES VERSUS RUSSIAN PLANES

It is interesting to go over the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the last 4 or 5 years and read statements to the effect that Russian planes are far better than ours. Four years ago there was a great demand that we buy more and more B–52 bombers to "catch up" with Russia.

On July 19, 1956, in answering the demand that we should construct more

and more of these planes, I made the following statement on the floor of the House, which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date:

A few years ago we made that mistake when we assumed that the B–36 was the zenith of our large bomber development. Before 10 percent of the B–36's were finished they were obsolete because of the greater efficiency of newly developed jet bombers over the propeller-driven bomber. If today we should go all out for the production of B–52's, in a few years we could have the air literally filled with them; we would have ignored research and planning for far better planes which I personally know are on the drawing board.

Today even the strongest exponents of defense spending could not make such a demand, for it is apparent that we are far ahead of Russia in quality and quantity of long-distance bombers. We are today, however, going ahead with the development of the B–70 bomber, a plane far ahead of anything of this type in the world.

The decision to go ahead with the development of this bomber is very interesting. We had credited Russia with greater progress in her antiaircraft missile than she had actually made. It was earlier thought that by the time the B–70 could be developed and in use the Russian antiaircraft missile would have progressed to such a place where the B–70 would not be feasible. However, the success of our U–2 plane and the failure of Russia to be able to destroy it in the air points to the fact that the B–70 will have some years of utility after it becomes operational before Russia will have advanced to the place where she can intercept it.

OUR RESERVE FORCES ARE STRONGER THAN EVER BEFORE

The citizen soldier is an absolute necessity to our military strength. Being a reservist for 35 years myself, I am never satisfied with the progress and strength of our Reserve Forces. However, we have reached a standard of training and efficiency much higher than ever before. The National Guard and the organized Army Reserve are carrying out the heritage left to them by the early militia which fired the first shots at Concord and Lexington. The same high standards exist in the Reserve Forces of the Air Force, Navy, and Marines.

U.S. TRAINING OF FRIENDLY MILITARY FORCES ABROAD

The United States has for some years been sending military missions abroad to assist in the training and equipping of military forces in friendly countries and to prepare them to resist Communist aggression. This program should not be confused generally with our foreign aid program. While I have not been in total agreement with all these programs, I visited each of our military assistance missions adjacent to the Bamboo and Iron Curtains.

Perhaps no one thing that our country has done has so encouraged resistance to Communist aggression as has this program. There are today more than 200 divisions of troops in friendly foreign countries that have been trained under this program. One of the strongest evidences of the success of this program has been the fact that Russia has bitterly and violently verbally attacked all progress in this field.

OVERALL MILITARY DEVELOPMENTS

In order to properly understand our overall military developments and determine whether we are making progress, standing still, or allowing our military strength to wane, I will go back and present figures from just before the Korean war to date. I will leave out the period of the actual Korean war for that should not be compared with peacetime expenditures.

As of June 30, 1949, there were 419,000 persons in the Air Force. This number had decreased to 411,000 by June 30, 1950, which was just as the Korean war commenced. Today the strength of the Air Force is 845,000 men.

The strength of the Army has increased from a total on June 30, 1950, of 632,000 to the present 870,000 men.

The manpower of the Navy on June 30, 1949, was 450,000. In June 1950, just as the Korean war started, it was 382,000. Today naval manpower stands at 630,000.

On June 30, 1949, Marine strength was 94,000. This figure was allowed to drop to 77,000 by June 30, 1950, just as the Korean war started. Today the Marine Corps strength is 170,000.

As to appropriations, which I will discuss next, an interesting fact is that for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, just 6 days after the Korean war began, the Army had failed to spend 21 percent of its total appropriation. The following are the defense expenditures for 1949 through 1961, excepting 1951, 1952, and 1953, when the Korean war was in progress.

Fiscal year:	*Expenditures (Millions)*
1949	$11,994
1950	11,887
1954	40,336
1955	35,532
1956	35,791
1957	38,439
1958	39,062
1959	41,233
1960 (estimated)	41,200
1961 (estimated)	40,995

WILL THERE BE WAR?

The danger of war is very, very remote. It is true that Russian greed and conquest have in the last few years been thwarted and that she will resort to any action short of war to gain her goals. We in America did not understand Russia for we had had very few dealings with her. For 5 centuries Russia has been seeking a final frontier which she never finds. Russia's relentless march of expansion and attempted expansion has continued from generation to generation regardless of whether she was ruled by the early Ruriks, the later Romanoffs, or the Communists under Lenin, Stalin, or Khrushchev. Russia has used many vehicles for this expansion—Pan-Slavism, the church, and for the last 40 years, world communism. The Russian appetite for conquest has devoured 46 nationalities speaking 61 languages.

Russia, however, has been extremely cautious of risking battle unless the odds are overwhelmingly on her side. In many instances Russia has backed away from planned conquests, even of a very weak country, when it became evident that the country would fight for its freedom. As soon as Russian expansion has been resisted, she either moves to another frontier for new conquests or she cajoles, talking peace and war alternately, attempting to divide friends. Cold war is not new—Russia has practiced it for 500 years.

It is impossible to rationalize by our standards, the frowns and smiles—the wild threats and friendly promises—the rapid contradictions—the startling inconsistencies—the insane ravings—the puerile bragging—and obvious brazen falsehoods of the Kremlin. It is part of the cold war. The cold war is the Russian substitute for battle. She is becoming increasingly aware that she cannot gain her ends by war with us so she is placing all of her energies into the cold war. She will not intentionally resort to war for she realizes that war would mean her destruction.

America must remain strong—strong militarily, strong economically, but above all she must retain the spiritual strength of a free, God-fearing people. That is and will remain the basis of American strength. We must make our course clear to all so that there will be no danger of misunderstandings whereby Russia will mistake our intentions and fall into a war through misadventure.

THE U–2 INCIDENT WILL NOT LEAD TO WAR

The U–2 incident did not cause the failure of the summit conference—nor will it lead to war. The U–2 incident, while somewhat embarrassing to the United States, is in a practical sense far more embarrassing to the U.S.S.R., for it shows that just at the time Russia desires to appear strong to all her satellites and the uncommitted world, she is at the mercy of America who can fly at will over her country—something that she cannot do to us.

The U–2 incident is especially embarrassing to those in our own country who have been alleging the military superiority of Russia. It is apparent to all that our air superiority together with our leadership in the production of small battlefield nuclear bombs place Russia absolutely at our mercy. That fact will discourage Russia more than any other factor from risking war with us.

Before the proposed summit conference, Russia became aware that the United States would stand up to her; that we would not surrender the freedom of the free world to Communist tyranny. From the Russian viewpoint the summit conference had to be stopped, for her failure to obtain her goals at this forthcoming conference would have increased the mounting problems with her satellite countries. So Russia seized on the U–2 incident as an excuse for canceling the summit conference which she was going to cancel anyway.

I am certain that Russia today regrets making an issue of the U–2 incident, for in so doing she publicized to the world her own weakness and our strength. Russia, in fact, publicized to all her friends and her enemies that the United States could fly over her territory—something which she could not do to us.

AMERICA STANDS UP TO RUSSIA

Today America is beginning to understand Russia. With that understanding has come the will to stop the Russian aggression which has threatened to overrun the world. Russia screams and threatens us as her aggression is thwarted.

Unless Russia radically changes the pattern of behavior toward other countries which she has followed for over five centuries, then we can predict with reasonable accuracy the course that the Russian Bear will take in the months and years ahead. Isolated and detached incidents of Russian behavior are difficult to interpret. History is full of incidents maneuvered by Russia that have confused other countries when a real understanding of their philosophy and design would have left little doubt as to Russian intentions. The smiles and promises of the Kremlin can inspire hope, confidence, and trust that will lead unwary countries into the black, treacherous pit of delusion and slavery. Unless properly understood, the foreboding growls and threats of the Khrushchev Russian Bear can cause panic and submission through fear, when in reality the Soviet threat is a bluff—a bluff, however, which has gained her a substantial part of the world because few asked to see her "hole" card.

Russia has shown greater ability at winning conferences after a war than she has at winning a war. This is not a reflection on the Russian soldier, for he has been capable and brave, especially in the defense of his homeland.

If our country had understood Russian philosophy and history, we would not have been "out-generaled" in conferences at Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam. Germany would have destroyed Russia except for the heroic efforts of England and the United States; yet Russia is the only country that gained territory as the result of World War II. Russia acquired Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, part of Finland, East Germany, Eastern Poland. Even greater than this, Russia gained satellite countries which she holds under the iron heel of her armed forces—Poland, East Germany, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, and Rumania. Russia was able to obtain control of all of these countries because the United States and England did not understand Russian history, philosophy, and goals. They naively believed Russian promises and allowed her to gain advantages by lies, deceit, broken treaties, and armed force. At no time did Russia take any real military risk except when Germany had invaded her and she had made every effort to avoid that risk, even to the extent of offering to join Hitler in his war against England and France. A proper understanding of Russian aims and procedures, which even a casual study would have given us, probably would have kept Central Europe and the Balkans outside of the Iron Curtain.

It is sad and disturbing that many in America, after our many experiences with Russia, still fail or refuse to see Russia in her true light. There are still those so naive that they believe Russia honestly intended to work at the summit toward a solution of the Berlin question that would not have sold West Berlin into Communist slavery. There are also those who believe that kind words will change the Russian Bear into a dove of peace.

However, it is encouraging that many in our Government are learning from the experiences of the past. When Russia was definitely moving into Iraq, Lebanon, and the Near East, President Chamoun of Lebanon asked the United States for assistance. The United States landed Marines in Lebanon on July 14, 1958. Khrushchev immediately demanded that we withdraw our troops and hinted dire consequences unless we did so. In a few days, American army, air, and naval forces had the situation well under control. It is significant that before all of our forces were landed, Khrushchev, realizing that the United States was serious, made unusual gestures of friendliness toward the United States. Russia respects strength.

RUSSIAN PROBLEMS AND WEAKNESSES

Russia is beset with many problems—problems that will cause her increasing difficulties in future years. As we look into the future, we can see many critical problems facing Russia—problems that may partially account for the loud and boisterous threats of today. The most critical problem facing Kremlin leaders is probably Berlin. It is the only place in the world today where one can so readily observe results of freedom in West Berlin and of communism in East Berlin by merely crossing the street. Berlin is a brightly lighted show window where all can see by contrast the well-kept, prosperous shops and busy, happy people of West Berlin as contrasted to the shoddiness and drabness of the regimented way of life that is communism. This is causing the great crisis in Berlin today. Russia feels that she can no longer afford to permit this illustration of communism's failure—that she must extinguish the lights in this show window.

Tito, while still maintaining communism in Yugoslavia, is demonstrating that it does not have to be tied to Russian-brand communism and is shouting his independence of Russia; but Russia has not felt sufficiently secure to slap down this unruly offspring.

China, the "sleeping giant" of the past, has been awakened by Russian Communists. While there is no open break between Russia and China, it is apparent that the "honeymoon" is over; and tensions are increasing. The 300 years of enmity will not tend to ease these tensions. Russia may some day wish that she had let China sleep.

As for Soviet publicity in the field of space, she impressed the world by placing the first satellite in orbit. However, the U.S. development in that field since then clearly demonstrates to all the world that we are now ahead of Russia.

Russia is also aware that we are well ahead of her in quality if not quantity of battlefield missiles, although she was working in that field earlier than we. Recent tests of the Polaris fired from an atomic submarine point out the lead that the United States has taken over Russia in the military field.

Today economic strength is absolutely necessary for any real military strength. One of Russia's great weaknesses is that basically she is weak economically although she has publicized some sensational scientific achievements. I personally believe that despite Russia's tremendous efforts she can never achieve stable economic strength under communism.

Despite the Soviet claims of progress, the Russian worker today has to work 8 percent longer than he did 32 years ago in 1928 to provide his family with the seven essentials of food. In the United States, on the contrary, the average American worker works half the time he did in 1928 to earn the money for those same seven food essentials. A comparison as to the amount of labor it takes to supply the necessities of living shows: an average worker in Moscow has to work 4 times longer than a man in New York for beef and milk; 8 times longer for eggs; 9 times as long for butter; 21 times as long for sugar; and 8 to 16 times as long for clothing as does the man in New York. There are serious scarcities of food in Russia and her satellites, especially East Germany. Despite all of her efforts, Russia is plagued with scarcities.

The manner in which Russia will attempt to solve these problems will dominate the pages of history of tomorrow.

WHAT SHOULD BE OUR ATTITUDE TOWARD RUSSIA

International and domestic events have been running against Russia. Her recent frantic ravings and actions attest to this. Russia will go to any ends short of war to change or thwart the direction that the U.S. leadership is taking against communism today. The United States and her citizens must not be confused by Russian actions as we and the others in the world have been in the past. We must learn to understand Russia. Every threat and vile accusation that Russia makes against us, every insult and condemnation is a tribute to our strength, to our understanding, to our nobility of purpose, and to our accomplishments in the cause of freedom.

We are refusing to sell or barter our freedom or that of our friends just to get along with Russia. America must remember that freedom is reserved for only the Godfearing, who are strong and brave. If we will stand strong and firm for freedom, Russia cannot prevail against us. Russia will never attack us unless she misinterprets our kindness for weakness, our chivalry for cowardice. We owe it to ourselves and the world to make our course ahead crystal clear, so that no country can mistake our position of Christian brotherly love and tolerance for cowardice and weakness. Our strength should never assert itself in bragging or aggression. It should be the calm, friendly assurance that comes from being fully prepared militarily, from being well informed, and from a knowledge that right makes might.

UNITED STATES IS PREPARED TO RESIST LIMITED AGGRESSION

There are those who believe that the only defense which America needs is a

capability to blast a potential enemy to destruction with nuclear bombs. That view is certainly erroneous.

In our discussing modern armament, we too often forget the fact that the most priceless ingredient in any armed force is the training, courage, patriotism, and integrity of the men in that armed force. In our American forces today, those elements are of the highest.

Throughout history military leaders have placed undue reliance on certain weapons or on one military theory, such as the reliance of France upon the Maginot Line. Many, including some generals, today say we should place our reliance on a nuclear bomb attack aimed at total destruction. Some want more and more ICBM's. A bill was introduced a few days ago to build 100 atomic Polaris submarines that would cost $10 billion. Our own experience in Lebanon in May and June of 1958 demonstrates that we have problems that an atom bomb will not solve. There have been 19 wars since we first dropped the atom bomb on Hiroshima. Yet, no country has used a nuclear weapon in any of these wars. If we relied altogether on the massive destruction by nuclear weapons we might someday find ourselves in the terrible position of having to start a nuclear war ourselves in self-protection.

Perhaps more important but less dramatic is our capacity to prevent and stop limited and small wars before they develop into a world holocaust. In the military vernacular, they are called brush wars. In peacetime the United States should have a capable, well-trained and equipped Army, Air Force, and Navy as we have today. The Army has an excellent family of missiles—the Corporal and Redstone, which will soon be replaced by superior Sergeant and Pershing missiles. It would take scores of pages to set out the new and modern weapons, nuclear and conventional, which the Army, Navy, and Air Force have aside from the intercontinental ballistic missiles which I discussed earlier.

I recently participated in practice helicopter landings from a carrier on the beach at Vieques off Puerto Rico. Our advance in techniques in beach landings was certainly a far cry from my experiences in beach landings in World War II. We are rapidly arming our servicemen with the newest, finest, and most modern of equipment for all operations.

We must be ready to take care of American interests at all times, and not merely rely on one gadget. A humorous story about a gentleman from Georgia illustrates this point. Before the commencement of the Civil War a Mr. Sylvaneus Lee, in a speech advocating war with the North, said vehemently that the South could whip the Yankees with cornstalks. After the war while he was making a speech as a candidate for public office in Georgia, a member of his audience took him to task, saying, "How can we trust your judgment when you told us before the war we could whip the Yankees with cornstalks?" Mr. Lee quickly retorted, "Yes, we could have, but those damn Yankees did not use cornstalks."

American preparedness must include all phases of armament.

RIOTOUS SPENDING FOR DEFENSE COULD DESTROY AMERICA

There is a terrific demand from many sources that America should spend more and more money on national defense. Too many in America believe that money is the answer to everything. I frankly doubt that there are more than a few fields in our military today where more expenditures would increase our military strength. I am certain there are fields where we could decrease our expenditures without reducing our military capabilities.

The military has always been expensive. The rapid change in military weapons is increasing that expense manyfold. Until 500 years ago military weapons were the club and sword, the stone, the spear, the bow and arrow. Then gunpowder and the weapons associated with it were used for the next 500 years. Just a little over 40 years ago the airplane entered warfare, and just 15 years ago the atom bomb was exploded. The development of the ballistic missile is in the same period. The weapons of today are obsolete tomorrow. The expense is terrific. Russia did not have the resources to keep pace in the field of airplanes. We have far surpassed her today as is shown in the U–2 incident.

We must spend our dollars carefully or we will wreck our country as the wily Lenin prophesied. We are working ceaselessly in our attempt to cut down the great waste of the American dollar. Only a few weeks ago we passed legislation which we believe will save millions of dollars in the transportation of servicemen's furniture and baggage. We have also passed legislation which we believe will save the taxpayers' money in the letting of contracts for the furnishing of equipment and ammunition. We are trying to eliminate those who are inefficient in spending our military funds. The job of insuring American defense without injuring our economic well-being is a difficult one, and I assure you that we will do our best to do just that.

My remarks have been primarily directed to our military strength for the reason that it is a field in which I feel that I am qualified to speak with some authority. Furthermore it is a field in which today there are those who would disparage America and are taking special delight in attacking our military strength. However, I hasten to point out that we must never change our attitude about certain American principles—principles of American strength which were the same yesterday, today, or the future. Four years ago I expressed them thus, and they apply today as surely as they did then:

I fear that, in the beating of drums and the blowing of bugles, we may forget that the real strength of America does not lie in our armed might, in our marching battalions, in our ships and tanks and guns. The real strength of America lies in its free, unregimented people, a nation under God, dedicated to the freedom and dignity of the individual, a free people that have produced the greatest economy and the highest standard of living on earth. Without that great economy and without that free unregimented people, all of our Armed Forces would become "as sounding brass or tinkling cymbal."

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY] did not have a political presentation to make to the House. I think we have had about enough politics for one night. So, Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. HARRIS]. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and sixty-two Members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move the call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 204]

Alger	Glenn	O'Konski
Allen	Grant	Passman
Anderson, Mont.	Green, Oreg.	Patman
Andrews	Griffin	Pilcher
Anfuso	Griffiths	Powell
Ashley	Hargis	Preston
Auchincloss	Harrison	Rains
Baker	Hays	Reece, Tenn.
Barden	Hébert	Riley
Baumhart	Hess	Rivers, Alaska
Beckworth	Horan	Rivers, S.C.
Blitch	Jackson	Rogers, Mass.
Boggs	Jarman	Rooney
Boiling	Johnson, Md.	Rostenkowski
Bow	Kee	Shipley
Bowles	Kelly	Sikes
Broomfield	Kilburn	Siler
Brown, Mo.	Kirwan	Sisk
Buckley	Kluczynski	Smith, Kans.
Budge	Lafore	Smith, Va.
Canfield	Landrum	Spence
Celler	Lankford	Steed
Colmer	Loser	Sullivan
Curtis, Mass.	McDowell	Taylor, N.Y.
Davis, Tenn.	McMillan	Teague, Tex.
Dent	McSween	Thompson, La.
Diggs	Macdonald	Thompson, N.J.
Dingell	Machrowicz	Tuck
Dooley	Madden	Utt
Doyle	Magnuson	Vinson
Durham	Martin	Wainwright
Farbstein	Mason	Walter
Fisher	Miller, George, P.	Wharton
Flynt	Minshall	Widnall
Fogarty	Mitchell	Williams
Forand	Montoya	Wilson
Forrester	Mumma	Withrow
Frazier	Murray	Yates
Gilbert	O'Brien, Ill.	Zelenko

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARRIS). On this rollcall, 313 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate returns to the House the bill (H.R. 7990) entitled "An act to convey certain land of the United States in trust to the Citizen Band of Potawatomi Indians of Oklahoma," pursuant to House Resolution 640.

THE OIL IMPORT QUESTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, the program of mandatory limits on oil imports into the United States was first imposed in March 1959—for political reasons. Under the guise of safeguarding our national security, imports of oil into the country have been sharply curbed. The real reason for this program has been to satisfy the profit-hungry motives of certain American producers and thus appease those in our political life who speak for them.

The political pressures for increased protection for the domestic coal and oil industries have continued unabated. The result has been that energy-consuming regions, such as New England, have either suffered higher prices or been denied the economies that a free market system should guarantee.

One of the most blatant exertions of political pressure on the Department of the Interior, which administers the mandatory oil import quota program, took place May 31 when a group of 16 Members of the House met with Secretary Fred A. Seaton and other Department officials to press for a further cut in residual oil imports. I was deeply shocked when, the following day, the Interior Department reduced the quotas of residual oil imports by almost 50 percent.

Such a drastic reduction sounds hardly possible, but it is true. Residual fuel imports in regions 1–4, which includes New England, averaged about 491,000 barrels daily between January and June of this year, but were set at only 249,999 barrels a day for the next quarter. For the last quarter of this year, a quota of 415,000 barrels per day has been established.

This figure is very close to the 400,000 barrels per day requested by the National Coal Policy Conference and is far short of the 560,000 barrels a day recommended by the Petroleum Industry Research Foundation.

It is also about 20,000 barrels per day less than for the corresponding period in 1959 when we in New England had a very mild winter.

What bothers me even more is the fact that the quotas established both in the past and future do not take into consideration any expansion of the industrial growth in this region. East coast residual fuel oil sales increased by about 7 percent in both 1958 and 1959, and yet despite this indicated growth and ignoring future growth, our quotas have not even been kept level, they have been cut.

As an example of natural growth which has not been taken into consideration are the steel industries that we have in regions 1–4. During the last quarter of 1959 they were on strike. During the last quarter of 1960 they will be operating.

How much residual fuel do they plan to use? Every indication is that their needs will amount to 26,000 barrels a day more than in the same period last year. I am delighted, of course, that they will need this amount, but I cannot understand why this increased demand was not included when the quota was fixed.

On June 2 the president of the National Coal Association, Stephen F. Dunn, said the bituminous coal industry was "extremely gratified that the Department of the Interior has cut residual oil quotas."

Mr. Speaker, we in New England and other energy-consuming areas are something less than extremely gratified by this Interior Department move toward a controlled economy, direct subsidy for certain domestic interests, and higher prices for us, the consumers.

It is time for us to take a serious second look at the implications of the mandatory oil import quota program. We in New England, who are particularly dependent on residual oil for power generation, industrial uses, shipping and apartment house, school, and hospital heating, have a right to know why we cannot purchase residual oil at the reasonable and low prices that a free economy should guarantee us.

At this point I wish to refer to a study on "Fuel and Energy Use in the 1960's," prepared by the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston. The report points out that New England is a have-not region with respect to fuel and energy. Hydroelectric power damsites are almost fully developed in our region, and we must import all of our coal, oil, and gas.

The Reserve bank report says that "unless present import barriers are removed or some radically new and cheap fuel such as nuclear fission is developed, New Englanders will be forced to spend more of their income for fuel and energy in 1970 than they do now."

Already we in New England are feeling the first indications of such pressure. In mid-July of this year the price of residual fuel was increased 15 cents a barrel. Translated, this means that it will cost New Englanders about $10 million a year.

I submit that an area which has suffered greatly already because of loss of industries to low-wage areas should not be forced to pay more for power at the same time, thus further weakening our competitive industrial position.

The domestic coal industry has sought to persuade us that in the name of national security, oil imports should be strictly curtailed so that more coal will be mined and available in event of a national emergency. Needless to say, the real motive of this industry is to cut off competition from oil in the hope that domestic consumers will switch to or remain with coal.

The national security argument, in relation to coal, simply does not hold water. The Reserve bank's report points out that "the total reserves of recoverable coal in beds over 4 feet in thickness could supply the needs of the entire country—at present rates of consumption—for about 20 years" and that "there is no danger that supplies will run short in the Northeast during the next 10 years."

The report says that "oil competition has probably been the most effective factor in keeping coal costs down during the last 12 years," and that "there is still surplus capacity in the coal industry and prices are lower than they would be without residual fuel imports."

No one need believe that we in New England are planning to do serious harm to the coal industry. Coal consumption in New England has remained at a remarkably steady level since 1949. The Federal Reserve predicts that if there is a freely available supply of residual oil imports, coal prices and consumption in our area may even move up slightly in the coming decade.

Moreover, the best estimates indicate that even sharply increased prices for residual oil would not return to the coal industry the bulk of the market which residual oil now occupies. The only consumers who would find it practicable to convert from residual oil to coal would be utilities and certain pulp and paper firms which have dual burning plants, the other 75 percent of the residual oil consumers would be forced to pay highly inflated prices just so that the coal industry could force a quarter of the market to make the costly readjustment to coal.

Mr. Speaker, we New Englanders are not complaining about minor costs in our regional economy. The potential cost to us of oil import quotas are tremendous. The best estimates show that there is a difference between world crude-oil prices and domestic crude-oil prices of approximately 50 cents a barrel. This is a conservative estimate of the average price differential. Some studies have shown a much greater differential. In 1958 New Englanders consumed about 236,000 barrels daily of residual oil, gasoline, distillate oils, diesel oil, and kerosene. If the absence of competition prompts domestic oil producers to raise their prices in a seller's market, the annual cost of these products to New Englanders would increase by $118 million or $50 per family or $11.85 per person.

Of course we have not experienced such a sharp price rise—yet. But all the essential ingredients for such a rise are present—most importantly, a lack of foreign competition to keep domestic oil and coal prices in line.

The study of the Federal Reserve bank concludes that prices of residual oil, which are especially important to us in New England, can only be maintained if present import quotas are constantly revised upward in the years to come.

The bank's best estimate is that if the oil import quota system is designed to induce the domestic petroleum industry to produce an increasing percentage yield of residual oil, a price increase of well over $1 a barrel probably would be necessary. Because of modern and improved refining techniques in the United States, most producers can earn far more money, under current prices, by refining most of their crude oil for products other than residual oil.

The Reserve bank's best estimate is that if the oil import quota system is designed to return some of the industrial fuel markets to the coal industry, a price increase of 50 cents a barrel for residual fuel would be necessary.

Mr. Speaker, the bank estimates that a 50 cents a barrel price increase in resid-

ual oil would cost New England's economy $30 million every year.

Today our Nation is locked in a deadly struggle for survival with the Soviet Union. This is not a struggle in which we can afford to do half our best. Our total, dedicated effort will be required for survival alone.

Under such circumstances, how long can we afford uneconomic and restrictive trade policies which mean inefficiency and waste in our Nation's economy?

The so-called national security argument in favor of restricting oil imports has been shown to be a shabby, unsupportable assertion.

I submit that the greatest danger to our national security is national self-deception, the belief that we can prosper when we squander our national wealth of uneconomic and outdated economic practices.

Let those who really believe in free enterprise show their sincerity by doing away with the costly and economically dangerous oil import quota program. We in New England are forced to bear the heavy cost in dollars of this program. But the whole Nation suffers if our free economy is shackled in times when our very survival is dependent on our economic health and vigor.

FLY THE FLAG FOR FREEDOM ON ELECTION DAY

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill today calling on the President to issue a proclamation calling on Americans to fly the flag for freedom each national election day. The practice, I hope, will remind all Americans of the occasion of election day and their duty to preserve their Government by becoming a part of it.

Following is its text:

The President shall issue a proclamation in each even-numbered year, calling upon the American people to display the flag of the United States on the Tuesday next after the first Monday in the month of November in that year as a reminder on the occasion of election day of the duty of all citizens to preserve their Government by being an active part of it.

Mr. Speaker, I realize that this bill cannot become law this late in the 86th Congress. But I do expect it will be referred to the Judiciary Committee of which I am a member and I hope the various executive agencies involved will submit their reports during the coming adjournment. In that way, when I reintroduce the measure in the 87th Congress, much of the preliminary work will have been completed and we can adopt it promptly.

I am pleased to report to the House that conventions of both Democrats and Republicans in the State of Michigan have endorsed the proposal and emphasize that my measure should be viewed as a nonpartisan, patriotic proposal, which should attract universal support.

I was first stimulated, Mr. Speaker, to draft this measure by a distinguished journalist of the district I represent, Mr. Carl Saunders, editor of the Jackson (Mich.) Citizen Patriot. Mr. Saunders, as many of my colleagues will recall, is a Pulitzer Prize-winning editorialist, a great American and one devoted to the principles of Americanism and Christian freedoms. Mr. Saunders was responsible for focusing the attention of Americans on the real significance of Memorial Day by reserving a portion of that day of solemn observance for an annual prayer for peace.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD a resolution of the Jackson County (Mich.) Republican Committee endorsing Mr. Saunders' original proposal:

Whereas we believe that the new 50-star American flag should be honored by establishing the tradition that it be displayed throughout the land from Maine to Hawaii and from Florida to Alaska on all election days as a symbol of the privilege of the citizens of this democracy to freely select by secret ballot the candidate of their choice: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Congress be asked to pass a resolution and the President of the United States to issue a proclamation declaring every election day a great patriotic occasion letting all men know that the banner which has led patriots into battle since the days of the Revolution also calls upon all citizens to preserve their Government by being an active part of it, and that all citizens should fly the flag as a symbol of freedom on election day; be it further

Resolved, That the Jackson County delegates propose this resolution for adoption by the Republican State Convention and urge the Members of Congress, regardless of their politics, to establish this proud tradition of flying the American flag on election day throughout our great democracy as a symbol of our freedom.

CONSTRUCTION OR RECONDITIONING OF VESSELS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, a prime example of legislation that once served a useful purpose, since voided by changes and shifts in our economy, is section 502(d) of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. It applied to the construction or reconditioning of vessels to be operated in foreign trade from ports on the Pacific coast. It provided that the lowest responsible bid by a shipbuilder on the Pacific coast shall be approved by the Government if such bid is not more than 6 percent higher than the lowest responsible bid of an Atlantic coast shipbuilder.

This 6-percent differential was a subsidy designed to place west coast shipbuilders in a competitive position with east coast yards. It recognized the lack of suitable manufacturing facilities for ship components on the west coast, and the distance from eastern supply sources. Furthermore, there was a need for adequate shipbuilding facilities on all coasts to be available in the event of a national emergency.

There was reason for the differential in 1936. With the coming of World War II, however, and the demands of supplying our forces in the far Pacific, there was a great industrial expansion in the west coast area. This pace continued through the postwar era. As a result, the competitive disadvantage of west coast yards, which justified a compensatory differential in 1936, has been corrected by the impressive development of manufacturing facilities and steel production facilities in that area.

Not only has the imbalance been leveled out, but, in some cases, is now tilted in favor of west coast shipyards. There is evidence to show that in recent bidding on a major dry cargo vessel the bids submitted by west coast shipyards were the lowest, even without the advantage of a differential.

The House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, in recommending enactment of H.R. 8093, the bill to eliminate this differential, reports that:

In the light of these developments, this bill is needed to remove a provision which under today's conditions gives west coast shipyards a discriminatory advantage over those on the east coast, gulf coast, and Great Lakes.

The reasonable legislation of 1936 has, by a paradoxical change in circumstances, become the basis for unreasonable discrimination in 1960.

The elimination of the 6-percent differential is now necessary to restore east coast, gulf coast, and Great Lakes private shipyards to competitive equality with Pacific coast shipyards.

It is expected that the Congress will remedy this situation before it adjourns.

THE UKRAINIAN CONGRESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ADDONIZIO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, the occasion of the 20th anniversary of the Ukrainian Congress suggests an opportunity to consider several broad subjects which concern our country today. The Ukrainian Congress Committee of America represents more than 2 million Americans of Ukrainian ancestry in various Ukrainian organizations throughout the United States. However, ideologically it represents much, much more. It stands for the hope of Ukrainian independence from the Soviet Union; it stands for the liberty of all countries behind the Iron Curtain; it stands for worldwide freedom from tyranny, dictatorship, and aggression. In essence, it is based on those beliefs upon which the United States was founded—the undeniable rights of the individual to do as he pleased, so long as it was reasonable, and to have a voice in the government under which he lived.

The Ukrainian Congress task is particularly important today because it reminds us graphically, by showing us the fate of the Ukraine and other captive nations, of our beliefs and keeps us aware of their value.

It seems to me that being aware is very important to all of us right now, at the midpoint of the 20th century. We must be well informed of existing situations and then try to meet them as best we can with the means at our disposal. This is why the Ukrainian Congress is so important to the United States and to Congress and to all Americans. Its single purpose is to educate us to existing conditions, as it discovers them in regard to the Soviet Union. Its particular purpose is to educate us to the aims of the Soviet Union directed against our way of life, thus reminding us just what our way of life is and how we can protect it.

Americans of Ukrainian ancestry in the United States are particularly qualified for this task, for many of them have experienced, and have friends and relatives who have experienced, the horrors of the Red regime since the collapse of Ukrainian independence in 1920. They have escaped or filtered across Russian lines for the last 40 years and bring with them tales of what Russian domination is really like. The fact that comes to light first is that the Soviet Union is not one united country. It is made up of many small countries such as the Ukraine, Turkestan, Georgia, Lithuania, Armenia, and many others. They all declared their independence after World War I. They were all taken under Soviet rule in the ensuing years. Like the Ukraine, they all have their own languages, heritages, culture, and political structures. In truth, the Soviet Union can be nothing more than a giant with clay feet—a restless conglomeration of many unwilling nations held in bondage by Moscow. It becomes obvious that it can be nothing more than a loosely knit political unit, dependent on propaganda to prevent the world from guessing its internal divisions, and on the economic resources to be derived from its unwilling members. From time to time, Khrushchev appeases these countries by assuring them of their independence. In 1957, he referred to the Ukraine as "a truly free and independent nation." But that condition is only a fact in the hearts of the patriots of these countries.

The list of crimes Khrushchev has perpetrated in the Ukraine during his career is in itself a good example of the treatment accorded all the captive nations. He was one of the Communist leaders when the manmade famine ravaged the Ukraine from 1930 to 1933 and killed many people. He was directly engaged in the purges in the Ukraine actually to make way for himself to become the first secretary of the Communist Party. During the thirties these purges wiped out more than 400,000 Ukrainians. As first secretary of the party, he was involved in the horrible massacre of Vinnitsa, when 10,000 Ukrainians were killed. In 1946, Khrushchev liquidated the Ukrainian Catholic Church and continued the repression of the Ukrainian Orthodox Autocephalic Church. In 1954, he removed many young people from the Ukraine to virgin lands. Throughout the last 10 years he has continued his repressive policies against the protests of the Ukrainian people.

This is why the Ukrainian Congress is dedicated to proving to the rest of the world the real nature of the Soviet Union. The Soviet tyranny it fights against is a very real threat, but Soviet propaganda is effective. We need all the information and advice it can disseminate in the struggle against the Soviet myth. Like all prosperous peoples, we Americans tend to be all wrapped up in our way of life. Let us not really believe the Soviet myth is harmless. I think the Ukrainian Congress succeeds in convincing us of this fact. I wish it well in their continued pursuits on this, its 20th anniversary.

LET US BE FAIR WITH SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFICIARIES WHOSE RETIREMENT INCOME IS SUPPLEMENTED BY INDUSTRIAL PENSION PLANS—LET US ADOPT LEGISLATION TO BLOCK CUTBACKS IN SOCIAL SECURITY INCREASES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation designed to protect many of the beneficiaries of industrial pension plans from a practice that I understand is fairly widespread and which I feel is not only contrary to the public interest but also contrary to the desires and intentions of Congress.

It has come to my attention that a number of industrial pension plans are tied in more or less directly to the Federal social security system. Under some of these arrangements beneficiaries of the plans are guaranteed a certain fixed dollar retirement benefit, with the company agreeing to supplement the individual's social security benefit to bring it up to this specific fixed figure. Under these plans, therefore, whenever social security benefits are raised, as they have been frequently raised in the past to keep up with rising living costs, the total return for these pension plan beneficiaries remains the same instead of increasing correspondingly, and the employer reduces his own contribution to the total accordingly.

While the original plan was no doubt well intended, it is having the practical effect of depriving these individuals of an increase in social security benefits which Congress intended they should have, an increase provided because of the increasing demands of a rising cost of living. In practical effect, the money which the Government is paying out, supposedly to its citizens in the form of increased social security benefits, is in such cases actually being added to the assets of employers rather than employees. These employees end up getting nothing to meet the added cost of living and they find their own pension income frozen fast while other people around them, direct recipients of social security, have the benefit of an increase.

From every point of view it seems to me that this procedure is undesirable and I believe that Congress should take action to prevent it.

The legislation which I am introducing today provides that where such arrangements exist, and whenever an employer's contribution to a pension plan correlated in this way with social security is reduced as a result of an increase in social security benefits, then the Federal taxes due and payable from this employer are increased by the amount of the reduction.

I believe that my bill states a fairly simple legal proposition adequate to meet the situation. However, there are many different types of industrial pension plans and it is possible that to deal with the whole situation fully and fairly a somewhat more complex piece of legislation may be needed. I am introducing this bill at this time, however, so that the staff of the Committee on Ways and Means may have an opportunity to study the general principle and so that members may also have an opportunity to consider its desirability.

In the meantime, I intend to make a further survey of such types of industrial pension plans, and in the event I am fortunate enough to be returned by my constitutents to serve in the 87th Congress, I will propose such legislative additions or improvements to this present bill as my study indicates seem desirable.

No social security system, in my judgment, can fully and adequately meet all the needs of retired persons. We must look of course to industry to develop effective retirement programs to supplement social security payments, and every encouragement should be given to industry to undertake such programs. I have no desire to discourage such action. It is my sincere belief, however, that the type of industrial pension program that permits the company's contribution to a joint plan to go down every time the governmental portion goes up—or in other words for Government benefits that have been increased with the express intention of benefiting retired workers to be utilized instead to benefit the industry itself—is not a desirable program, is harmful to the morale of retired persons, is contrary to public policy, and actually produces a result contrary to the one for which Congress authorized the added social security benefits.

The pressures of increased living costs which have in the past led to improvements in social security benefits concern every retired person. We must, I believe, make certain that governmental action designed to help retired persons in meeting these increased costs cannot be funnelled off into directions that do not accomplish the result Congress had in mind. Surely our retired citizens must not be allowed to find themselves on this kind of a treadmill—running hard just to stay in one place.

I believe that our retired persons must be permitted to live out their lives with

dignity, with respect, and with a reasonable measure of mental and economic security. I believe my legislation will correct a situation, which, however well-intended originally, has proved to be most unfortunate. I believe it is a step in the right direction, and I urge my colleagues to give my bill their earnest consideration as well as their support.

The text of the bill follows:

H.R. —

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that employers having pension plans under which payments are correlated with social security benefits shall be subject to an additional tax in cases where increases in such benefits result in a reduction in their own contributions under such plans and are not passed on to their retired employees

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) part I of subchapter D of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to pension, profit-sharing, stock bonus plans, etc.) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 405. PENSION PLANS CORRELATED WITH OLD-AGE, SURVIVORS, AND DISABILITY INSURANCE BENEFITS.—In any case where—

"(1) some or all of the employees of an American employer (as defined by section 3121(h) (other than paragraph (1) thereof)) are covered by a private pension or other retirement plan under which the payments made to an individual by such employer are based upon the difference between (A) a total figure fixed by or under the plan, and (B) the amount of the monthly insurance benefits to which such individual is entitled under title II of the Social Security Act, and

"(2) the amount of the payment or payments by the employer to or on behalf of such individual under the plan for any period decreases when the amount of the monthly insurance benefits which are payable to such individual for such period under such title II is increased (whether such increase is one which is provided by law for beneficiaries generally or for one or more classes of beneficiaries, or is a result of a change in the individual status of such indvidual for purposes of such title),

then the aggregate amount of the taxes otherwise payable by such employer under section 1 or section 11 (as may be appropriate) for the taxable year in which occurs the period described in paragraph (2) shall, under regulations of the Secretary or his delegate, be increased by an amount equal to the net decrease resulting in such employer's payments to or on behalf of all individuals under the plan as described in such paragraph (2) during such taxable year. For purposes of applying the increase provided for in the preceding sentence, an employer otherwise exempt from payment of the taxes imposed by sections 1 and 11 shall be considered to be liable for the payment of such taxes (before the application of such increase) in the amount of zero."

(b) The table of sections for such part I is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"Sec. 405. Pension plans correlated with old-age, survivors, and disability insurance benefits."

SEC. 2. (a) Section 1(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to cross-reference) is amended to read as follows:

"(d) CROSS-REFERENCES.—

"(1) For definition of taxable income, see section 63.

"(2) For increase in tax in certain cases involving pension plans correlated with old-age, survivors, and disability insurance benefits, see section 405."

(b) Section 12 of such Code (cross-references relating to tax on corporations) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(9) For increase in tax in certain cases involving pension plans correlated with old-age, survivors, and disability insurance benefits, see section 405."

SEC. 3. The amendments made by this Act shall apply only with respect to taxable years beginning on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, for nearly 8 years now the Republican administration has used the forum of Government to extol the merits of the free enterprise system and the virtues of rugged individualism. But they have consistently failed to practice what they preach. They have made a mockery of the free enterprise system by stifling small business with high interest rates and legislating in favor of the monopolistic interests of big business.

We Democrats have come to expect protection of special business interests by Republicans. It is their tradition and they are great believers in the traditions of the reactionary past.

While by administrative decree and legislative vote they steadily undermined the interests of small business, their sloganmakers were at work promising fairplay to the small businessman.

Their platform, adopted at Chicago last month, brings to date their double standard of saying one thing and doing another. Their platform calls for "spurring the economy by fostering new and small business, by continued enforcement of the antitrust laws."

But their record of nearly 8 years in office does not balance with their campaign promises.

In that period the number of small business failures increased by 94.3 percent. The number of businesses in existence increased by only 2.6 percent in the first 6 years of GOP domination. Only one in two small businesses started today has a chance of surviving for more than 2 years.

In contrast, these same years were the greatest period of big business merger and amalgamation in our history.

Evidently what is good for big business is not necessarily good for small business.

In the Congress it was the same story. When the Republicans controlled the 80th and 83d Congresses, they failed to enact one law to improve antitrust legislation.

By contrast, the four Democratic Congresses walked where Republicans feared to tread and, as a consequence, laws like the Celler-Kefauver Anti-Merger Act are on the books, as well as improved laws against price discriminations and tie-in sales.

KEFAUVER's startling hearings on antitrust also took the public inside of big business and showed them why things cost so much today.

Small business was hurt most severely by the high interest rates sponsored by this administration. Low-interest credit and capital are essential to the survival of small business.

But, as Senator KENNEDY has said, "Our task now is not to fix the blame for the past, but to fix a course for the future."

The Democratic platform does just that. It charts a course for the new frontier of the sixties.

The platform offers relief from the slow strangulation of the Republican years and pledges programs to:

Aid small businessmen to obtain credit and equity capital at reasonable rates. The loan program of the Small Business Administration will be accelerated and the independence of the agency protected.

Protection against the growth of monopoly and administered prices through vigorous enforcement of the antitrust laws.

Strengthen the Robinson-Patman Act to protect small business against price discrimination.

Obtain an equitable share of Government contracts for small and independent businesses.

The Democratic platform promises to protect "the right of every businessman, large and small, to trade in an atmosphere of freedom from unfair competition and domination by monopolies at home and abroad."

What the Republicans now piously promise in generalities—but have failed to deliver in nearly 8 years—the Democrats will do in specifics.

Let us not forget, regardless of what laws Congress passes, it is the administration of the law that is most important. The Republican-dominated agencies have fallen woefully in doing what they had promised to do when they had the opportunity.

Things will get done under a Democratic President and with a Democratic Congress, not because it is good politics, but because the policies are right and because the Democratic Party is steeped in the tradition of the future and dedicated to equal prosperity for all.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a resolution for concurrence in the Senate amendments to H.R. 10128, to authorize Federal financial assistance to the States for constructing school facilities. The resolution is as follows:

"That immediately upon adoption of this resolution the bill (H.R. 10128) to authorize Federal financial assistance to the States to be used for constructing school facilities, with the Senate amendments thereto, be, and the same hereby is, taken from the

Speaker's table, to the end that the Senate amendments be, and they are hereby, agreed to.

Mr. Speaker, State and local school districts cannot alone bear the financial burden required to provide the expanding educational needs of today. The financial support of the education of the children and young people of the United States is a joint responsibility of all divisions of our Government—Federal, State, and local.

The House bill and the Senate bill specifically provide that there shall be no Federal intervention in schools, the curriculum and the instructional programs.

I favor the provision in the Senate bill which provides that each State can decide how much of its annual allotment it would use for school construction and how much for teachers' salaries.

Mr. Speaker, the people of America understand and we can justify the major part of our expenditure of $38 billion to $40 billion each year on military programs, including sputniks, rockets, guided missiles, and other worthy Federal defense and domestic programs. But the people do not understand why their Federal Government continues to neglect the vital and extremely important responsibility of assistance to education.

We all know the United States gives billions of dollars to foreign countries each year. I have opposed and voted against these wasteful expenditures. But most of the people do not know that last year our Federal Government agreed to pay $237,000 to improve teaching in Philippine schools; $1.18 million for better schools and vocational training in Thailand or Siam; and $2.1 million for educational facilities in Korea. In varying amounts, every year our Government has spent millions for aid to education in Burma, Cambodia, Free China, India, Indonesia, Laos, Vietnam, Afghanistan, Ceylon, and a host of other countries in Asia, Europe, Africa, and South America. Yes, and even Yugoslavia, a Communist country. Some of this may be good for our international policy. But what about our educational problems right here at home?

Mr. Speaker, the effort of Missouri school districts to provide needed school buildings is reflected by the issuance of $328,651,805 in bonds during the last 10 years. The outstanding bonds of school districts increased from $33,527,473 on June 30, 1949, to $277,146,002 on June 30, 1959—an increase of 726 percent.

Despite heroic efforts, many Missouri school districts are losing in their battle to provide classrooms for their increasing enrollments. One hundred and thirty-nine districts are bonded to 80 percent or more of their bonding capacity. Eighty-five of the one hundred and thirty districts are bonded to 90 percent or more of bonding capacity.

A total of 3,958 additional classrooms were needed last year in all school districts in the State. The estimated cost of these classrooms and other needed building facilities was $129,949,713.

The bonds that may be issued by school districts are limited by the State constitution to 10 percent of their assessed valuations. This was increased from 5 percent to 10 percent by a constitutional amendment adopted in 1952. This gave all school districts additional leeway in issuing bonds. Districts experiencing substantial enrollment increases for the most part have now issued the maximum bonds and can vote additional bonds only as present bonds are paid.

We must recognize and appreciate the limitations of local tax revenues. It is unrealistic to assume and expect State and local sources of revenue to be sufficient to provide the educational facilities so vital to our national security and future of the United States.

The need for expansion and improvement of our educational facilities demands the breadth, strength, and flexibility of a financial structure that only the Federal Government can provide. The benefits from education transcend all State and local lines. It is a national problem and the Federal Government must share in the financial responsibility. If we are to prevail as a free and prosperous Nation, we must become as interested in launching educated men and women as we are in launching satellites.

Great education comes from dedicated teachers and dedicated teachers are entitled to salaries commensurate with the importance and responsibilities of their position as teachers. State laws properly set up high standards and qualifications for schoolteachers, requiring many years of education and special training, but the expense to the person seeking to so qualify for a teaching career and the inadequacy of teachers' salaries have created a critical shortage of teachers.

Mr. Speaker, I have supported and voted for all Federal aid to education bills presented in Congress. If reelected, I shall do so again at the next session of Congress. The Federal Government can no longer afford to neglect the necessity of providing financial assistance to our schools.

I cannot help feeling—and I hope others will realize it—that our teachers are our first line of defense. In fact, they always have been, but we have never talked about it enough. Our schoolteachers, who are so grossly underpaid, are the quiet force in this country that molds our most precious resource—our children. The full impact of the valuable service teachers give to the people of this country and its future, in a sense, will ultimately guide the destiny of the world. We must find a way to provide for our school systems the additional financial support which they so urgently need.

BOWLES ASKS REPUBLICANS TO JOIN IN "BUILDING A BETTER AMERICA, NOT A MORE BITTER ONE"

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. BOWLES] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOWLES. Mr. Speaker, last Friday the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] alerted me that he and several of our other colleagues on his side of the aisle had decided to examine the Democratic platform here on the floor this week.

The fact that they saw fit to refer to their plans as "Operation Veracity" indicated that their approach to the Democratic platform would not be entirely complimentary.

I must say in all frankness that while I appreciated the gentleman's invitation to come and listen, the fact that it was to be Operation Veracity gave me second thoughts and awakened memories. I had been reading the Republican platform and had been encouraged by its theme, "Building a Better America." I had been heartened because both that concept and the Democratic concept of the rights of man seemed to at least put the stamp of approval of both parties this year on the elemental fact that we are entering a new era, at home and abroad, and that hopefully the bickering and bitterness of some previous political campaigns would now at long last be put behind us.

None of us really needs to be reminded of some of those past campaigns, for most of us have lived through them and would prefer to forget them.

But Operation Veracity hardly seemed to change the name of the notorious Republican truth squad which huffed and puffed across the country in 1952, dragging its tawdry veracities in the wake of President Truman's campaign special.

Many Americans must have agreed with President Truman's response on Columbus Day, 1952, that there were a good many truth squads in Columbus' time who went around repeating, "The world is flat, the world is flat."

I had hoped that in 1960 we had finally emerged beyond the truth squad stage, and until recently I thought I had good grounds for hope.

All of us who worked on the 1960 Democratic platform were especially conscious of our responsibility to be fair and conscientious. That is why in the short version of the Democratic platform which I read to the national television audience at our convention we deliberately omitted any reference to the word "Republican." That is why, I like to think, the 1960 Democratic platform has earned such widespread acclaim for its constructive tone, an evaluation made, incidentally, by many of our leading Republican newspapers.

That is also why, I am sure, my distinguished counterpart, the chairman of the Republican platform committee, Mr. Charles Percy, said in his press release of Friday, July 15:

> I have studied the Democratic platform carefully. The great value of a political platform is that it provides the basis for wide ranging discussion of the great issues confronting us as a people. It is one of the most important parts of the educational process in American democracy. • • • Both parties seek a better America. Men of good

will seeking identical goals are working hard in both parties to develop our programs for America.

Mr. Percy then went on to raise legitimate questions about the different approaches of our two parties. But the tone was right, the questions were constructive, and the purpose of promoting an intelligent statement of the issues for the American people was clear. I admired Mr. Percy for it.

Many of us who participated in the writing of the Democratic platform also took silent pride in the days that immediately followed its adoption, when it was widely regarded as having had a constructive influence on the Republican convention deliberations. Indeed perhaps even Members on the other side of the aisle will forgive me my personal feeling that our platform played a certain role in the midnight talks between the Vice President of the United States and the Governor of New York.

Under these circumstances I am sure that many Republican leaders throughout America will be as discouraged as I am over what now appears to be an irresistible temptation by the Irredentists of the Republican Party to return to their tactics of yesteryear. "Truth Squads" and "Operations Veracity" seem to have an unalterable appeal—usually to those who are most vehement in their overstatements of the partial truths of their own position.

As I glanced through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS of the last 2 days, I was struck with what little progress we have really made. The gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] refers to this campaign as one between the "youngsters" and the "grownups." He talks of "new frontiersmanship," just the way the Vice President attempted to sidetrack the foremost economic issue of this campaign by ridiculing it as growthmanship.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES] finds our platform "outrageous."

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] finds it "disturbing and demoralizing."

The gentleman from New York [Mr. DEROUNIAN] finds it full of "fabrications."

The gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. BASS] asks us to "apologize."

The gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. THOMSON] accuses us of having a "complete lack of faith in free enterprise" coupled with "plain demagogery" and "boyish gamesmanship."

The two gentlemen from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES and Mr. LAIRD] cannot resist following in the footsteps of the late Senator from their State by depriving us in the "Democrat" Party of the "ic" which we have at the end of our name.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] enlightens us with the following:

> I observe that one of two things is true about this Democratic platform statement that the Republican failure in the economic field has been virtually complete.
>
> Either the statement was an intentional falsehood, or the framers of the Democratic platform picture a new frontier in which there is no prosperity, no individual incentive, no pursuit of personal happiness, but only a superstate all-powerful over miserable individuals and one which is probably at war.

In 1934 Henry A. Wallace wrote a book, "New Frontiers."

Apparently, the new frontiers at which the 1960 Democratic platform framers gaze are the depression frontiers of 1934.

And all this remarkable cacophony of McCarthyism and innuendo is summed up by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. THOMSON] as "a conscientious attempt to focus the light of truth" on the current political campaign.

This is the light of truth as seen by that long line of soothsayers who stretch from Murray Chotiner to Senator SCOTT. I am perfectly prepared to believe that our colleagues here, like some others in their party, have again been victimized by that long line of petty reseachers and smallminded ghostwriters who glory in scoring or misscoring debater's points down at the Republican National Committee.

Some 27 pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD have now been devoted to their new operation on the truth. Let me select, more or less at random, just a few matters for comment.

First. The gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] reports that the topic sentence of the following Democratic platform paragraph is in error:

> Over the past 7½-year period, the Republicans have failed to balance the budget or reduce the national debt. Responsible fiscal policy requires surpluses in good times to more than offset the deficits which may occur in recessions, in order to reduce the national debt over the long run. The Republican administration has produced the deficits—in fact, the greatest deficit in any peacetime year in history, in 1958–59—but only occasional and meager surpluses. Their first 7 years produced a total deficit of nearly $19 billion.

The gentleman suggested we revise the first sentence to read as follows:

> Over the past 7½ years, the Republicans balanced the budget in fiscal years 1956, 1957, 1960, and 1961.

If we are to go in for revisions, I suggest that the gentleman's revision be revised as follows:

> The Republicans balanced the budget in fiscal years 1956, 1957, and 1960 with a total surplus of $4.3 billion. They left a deficit in fiscal years 1954, 1955, 1958, and 1959 totaling $22.5 billion. The total deficit over the last 7½ years has thus been $18.2 billion.

Our platform refers to a total deficit of "nearly $19 billion" based on the 1960 estimates of $0.1 billion surplus for fiscal year 1960 available on July 12 when our platform was adopted. On July 20 the figure of a $1.1 billion surplus for fiscal year 1960 was first released.

Second. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] has called our attention to the platform statement that the Republican years of power "have consisted of two recessions, in 1953–54 and 1957–60 separated by the most severe peacetime inflation in history."

He is concerned about the dramatic price rises immediately after World War II, which were caused by Republican insistence on removing our wartime price controls. As Price Administrator and Economic Stabilizer during and immediately after World War II, I can assure the gentleman that most experts consider it both reasonable and generous not to include the March 1946–March 1947 period as part of our "peacetime" economic history. On the other hand the years of Republican inflation from 1955–56 were 2 years removed from the Korean war and far removed from price control.

Wholesale prices, whose fluctuations are a better measure of inflation than those of consumer prices, rose about 24 percent between 1945 and 1947. Before the end of the Truman administration, these prices decreased (during 1951–1953) only to rise again under the next Republican administration.

Third. Let me turn quickly to national defense. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] denies that our conventional military forces have been dangerously slashed.

Yet throughout the years of the Eisenhower administration these cuts have continued, recently falling most heavily on our ground strength for fighting limited and conventional aggression. Our divisions were first reduced to 18 in spite of the pleas of Democratic Members of Congress for a force of at least 19. Progressively the cuts have gone on. From 20 divisions to 18; from 18 to 16; from 16 to 15. And now our ground forces stand at 14 combat strength divisions.

The gentleman challenged me to "produce the administration statements which admit that our conventional military forces have been slashed for reasons of economy." Here are a few.

Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, Chief of Staff of the Army during the Eisenhower administration, has stated that the first three Eisenhower defense budgets "were not primarily based on military needs. They were squeezed within the framework of present arbitrary manpower and fiscal limits."

Gen. Maxwell Taylor, also a Chief of Staff during the Eisenhower administration, wrote in Look magazine on December 22, 1959:

> Budgetmaking has been allowed to control strategy although the Defense budget is developed in such a way that no one really knows how much combat power the United States is getting for its dollar. * * * The budgetmakers have become the real strategymakers. Military programs needed to implement our policy can be made or broken by those who decide how to spend the military dollar. Unfortunately, the decisive power is in the hands of men who are not strategists, but rather fiscal experts.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] told us yesterday:

> We have never been in a position where the Polaris program has lacked for funds at any time during this administration.

But the reason there was never any lack of funds was precisely that more funds were appropriated by the Democratic Congress than the administration was willing to use. We all know that we have lost a full year in the construction of three Polaris submarines, delayed from fiscal year 1959 to fiscal year 1960 by a Bureau of the Budget decision to freeze funds appropriated by Congress for this specific purpose over and above the administration's request.

Fourth. Lastly let me refer to some of the statements we have heard on subjects of interest to our American farmers. Take our rural electrification plank as an example.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] suggested that the Democratic platform was in "bad need of facts" when it stated that:

The Democratic Congress has successfully fought the efforts of the Republican administration to cut off REA loans. It (the Republican administration) has sought to cripple rural electrification.

We all know that the Republican administration adopted a policy of no new starts on hydroelectric dams, and we have had none except for those projects initiated at Democratic insistence. The result has been to cut off a new supply of abundant, low-cost wholesale power. Anyone who looks at the wholesale power rate map the co-ops have drawn up will see the effects of this policy on the power costs which the co-ops must pay and pass on to their members.

We all know that Republican policy has deliberately raised interest rates and has annually tried to limit severely the amount of REA loan funds available, despite the fact that these co-ops have a perfect record of repaying these loans with interest. In the years from 1953 through 1960, the administration requested a total of $1,149.3 million in REA electric loan funds. The Democratic Congress forced through additional appropriations, raising the aggregate total to $1,815 million. That is more than a 33 percent increase forced through by a Democratic Congress—and the record shows that it was needed.

In the meantime the Eisenhower administration would have "done away with" the REA if its legislative proposals had been accepted, according to Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN of Vermont, the senior Republican on the Senate Agriculture Committee in a statement reported by the UPI on May 22, 1959.

Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN, Republican, of Vermont, accused Agriculture Secretary Benson today of an attempt to put American farmers still more under the thumb of giant banking and corporate interests.

AIKEN, senior Republican on the Senate Agriculture Committee, said he would do all he could to block Benson's proposal to create a bank to replace the U.S. Treasury in financing of rural electric power and telephone systems.

Benson made the proposal in a speech at Cedar Rapids, Iowa, last night.

AIKEN, in a Senate speech, said the Benson plan was an attempt to do away with the Rural Electrification Administration.

AIKEN said Benson's proposed bank would force possibly one-third of the REA cooperatives to give up the ghost and sell out to the utility interests.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on at length, but I prefer to close. I know that several of my colleagues have things to say. Let me add just this:

Today is August 31 and there are only 69 days left until the election. The Democratic platform attempted to address itself to the real questions which face the American people. They are not questions that invite further displays of politics as usual. They invite serious, constructive debate. They are questions like these:

How can we build defense forces of sufficient strength and flexibility to deter aggressions of all sorts, large or small?

How can we at the same time elevate arms control to a new position of equal priority so that an arms race will not once more lead to unlimited catastrophe?

How can we speed up our national rate of economic growth on which our policies both at home and abroad so directly depend?

How can we provide that delicate balance of national and local leadership which will enable us to move ahead effectively in the great moral effort to assure equal rights to all Americans?

The themes of our two platforms this year are both addressed to these goals. Most Americans are, I hope, ready to enlist in the cause of building a better America, not a more bitter one. Likewise we are all, I hope, dedicated to the implementation of the rights of man.

If this is indeed a critical election, as I think both parties agree, I earnestly hope that it can be conducted from now on in a manner befitting the solemnity and importance of the hour. I can think of no better note on which to conclude these remarks, which will be my last in the House of Representatives.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I include a memorandum on the impact of expenditure ceilings on the defense program, taken from official hearings, in the RECORD at this point of my remarks:

IMPACT OF EXPENDITURE CEILINGS AND OTHER FUND RESTRICTIONS ON THE DEFENSE PROGRAM IN RECENT YEARS

CEILING OF $38 BILLION

In May, 1957, Secretary of Defense Wilson issued an order freezing defense expenditures for fiscal year 1958 at $38 billion. At the time this order was issued, Defense spending was running at a rate equivalent to $42 billion a year. As part of this expenditure ceiling, the Army, Navy, and Air Force were directed to reduce the amounts available for obligation during fiscal year 1957 by $500 million. The directive to make this cutback was issued on May 22 so that all of the cutback had to be made during the month of June.

The sharp and abrupt cutbacks in Defense obligations and expenditures resulted in curtailment and elimination of many programs which had been justified to, and approved by, the Congress. Even more disastrous, however, was the fact that these abrupt cutbacks were made at a time when the economy was faltering.

As a result, these Defense cutbacks, which were made to "save" $2 billion in Defense expenditures, served to trigger the recession of 1958. One by-product of this recession was the fact that the Government suffered a budget deficit of $12.4 billion in fiscal 1959—the largest peacetime deficit in the history of the Nation.

IMPACT OF SPUTNIK

On October 4, 1957, the Soviet Union placed the first earth satellite into orbit. As a result of Sputnik I, and of hearings held by the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, the administration submitted a supplemental appropriation request for fiscal year 1958 to the Congress on January 8, 1958. The rigid Defense expenditure ceiling of $38 billion was also adjusted upward.

Ever since sputnik, the Department of Defense has avoided the issuance of any documents formally establishing a Department of Defense budget ceiling. Instead, the emphasis has been placed on expenditure targets, objectives, estimates, etc. Thus, while formal rigid expenditure ceilings no longer exist, the ceiling psychology still exists and serves as a brake against acceleration or expansion of defense programs.

QUOTATIONS REGARDING BUDGET CEILINGS

The following are representative quotations regarding the existence and impact of budgetary ceilings and similar administrative limitations on Department of Defense programs:

Impounding of Marine Corps funds (hereings before Senate Appropriations Committee, Department of Defense appropriations for 1958, pp. 266–267):

"Senator SYMINGTON. The decision was made to cut heavily the Marine Corps, and the money was appropriated in the amendment to prevent that being done.

"But I see it was done anyway, so apparently there was a difference of opinion.

"Do you know what the $40 million was going to be used for instead of what the Congress requested?

"General PATE. By the Defense Department?

"Senator SYMINGTON. Yes.

"General PATE. I do not.

"Senator SYMINGTON. Do you, General Moore?

"General MOORE. No, sir. It was impounded and $31 million in the appropriation, 'Military personnel,' Marine Corps was placed in reserve, and together with another $20,963,000 reverted to the Treasury. That is $31,853,000 out of the total $41,148,000.

"There was more than one appropriation involved."

"Imposition of Expenditure Ceiling Without Knowledge of Its Impact on Defense Program" (hearings before Senate Appropriations Committee, Department of Defense appropriations for fiscal year 1958, pp. 412, 415–416, 465, 471, 941–942):

"Senator SALTONSTALL. For the fiscal year 1958, which is the appropriation that we are talking about now, the estimated expenditures of the Department of Defense are a little over $38 billion; is that correct?

"Mr. MCNEIL. That is about correct, Senator SALTONSTALL; yes, $38 billion.

"Senator SALTONSTALL. At the rate that they are running, or are estimated to run, as you foresee it now, they will run nearer $42 billion than $38 billion; is that correct?

"Mr. MCNEIL. They are running, at least during the last 2 or 3 months, at a rate of about $42 billion; that is correct.

"Senator SALTONSTALL. The purpose of this directive here is, as contended by the Senator from Missouri—I would agree quite fully with him on that—that the purpose of the directive is to make sure where you are going, as to whether you are going nearer $38 billion, which is the estimate originally that was submitted to the Congress, or are going to run nearer $42 billion; is that not correct?

"Mr. MCNEIL. That is correct.

* * * * *

"Senator SALTONSTALL. As far as the program of procurement is concerned, and contracts, and what it will do to the Air Force, the Navy, or the Army, that has to be worked out, and you can't tell this committee at the present time just what the effect of this directive will be; is that not correct?

"Mr. MCNEIL. That is correct."

* * * * *

"Senator ROBERTSON. At the present rate of expenditure, what would the actual expenditures be for fiscal 1958?

"Mr. MCNEIL. For fiscal 1958, we will try to work that out and get a more precise figure.

"As I mentioned, in response to Senator SALTONSTALL a few minutes ago, in the last

few months the rate of expenditures has been at the rate of about $42 billion.

"Senator ROBERTSON. If that rate continued, it would be $42 billion for fiscal 1958; is that correct?

"Mr. MCNEIL. That is right, if it continued at that rate. I do not think it would necessarily do that.

"Senator ROBERTSON. Not necessarily.

"And your May 21 directive, in the part of overall planning, you started curtailing expenditures in fiscal 1957 with a view to keeping fiscal expenditures in 1958 down to $38 billion?

"Mr. MCNEIL. Or very close to that.

"Senator ROBERTSON. That could involve a cut of $4 billion, a cutoff or a cutback, or whatever you call it.

"Mr. MCNEIL. We do not know yet whether this rate of the last 3 or 4 months would continue at this rate during all of next year. It is possible that it would drop off to some extent during the middle of the year, or even in the latter part of the year.

"This may be a mere temporary hump, but it is almost certain that unless the program is extended, and those things which must be carried on are carried on, while those things that can wait or be delayed are sorted out, these expenditures will run above the $38 billion.

"Something will probably have to be done, and I mention that in my statement. As I say, I was trying to bring this to the attention of the committee in my statement this morning.

"Senator ROBERTSON. The distinguished Senator, my great friend from Missouri, said, or rather he intimated, that the first consideration was a fiscal one and the fiscal one indicated that you needed to keep expenditures for 1958 down to $38 billion.

"You discussed that action without knowing definitely to what extent it may delay and impede the development of bombers, missiles, et cetera.

* * * * *

"Senator SYMINGTON. Right.

"Now, Mr. Secretary, you say: 'We have been informed that considering the anticipated revenues of the Government and the statutory debt limit, expenditures for the Department of Defense must not substantially exceed the budget estimate of $38 billion during the coming year.'

"Fundamentally, that is what we are really talking about; is it not?

"Mr. MCNEIL. It is one of our real problems.

"Senator SYMINGTON. Would the answer to my question be 'Yes' or 'No'?

"Mr. MCNEIL. There are quite a few problems, but I would say that was one of the prime problems; yes, sir.

* * * * *

"Senator SYMINGTON. You say in your statement that we have been informed that these expenditures 'must not substantially exceed' and so on.

"Mr. MCNEIL. That is for 1958, sir.

"Senator SYMINGTON. I am not much on definition of how rigid a ceiling is or is not—but are you saying that the Bureau of the Budget is saying you must try to live within this figure? Is there a difference in rigidity you are talking about now?

"Mr. MCNEIL. Yes, sir.

"Senator SYMINGTON. So from here out the programs presented by the President to the Congress really do not mean much, do they?

"Mr. MCNEIL. I think they do.

"Senator SYMINGTON. If you feel that the amount of money is as you have already testified, and that expenditures must be held down, and that is the chief reason for these directives, what you are really saying is you are not going to let the Department of Defense have the money necessary to implement the program.

"Mr. MCNEIL. It does not move quite that way, sir. There is no question that the—well, I might call it a ceiling—is much more rigid for 1958 than it was in 1957."

* * * * *

"Senator SYMINGTON. At this point is it not an entirely fair statement to say that the fiscal situation became completely dominant as against the force situation?

"General BOGART. I think so insofar as the directive is concerned.

"Senator SYMINGTON. There could be no other answer, could there?

"General BOGART. I don't think so.

"Senator SYMINGTON. That would seem especially true in that you were not told what part of the forces to cut. It was strictly a matter of dollars as against security; is that not correct?

"General BOGART. That is true, sir."

After-the-fact acknowledgment that there had been a rigid $38 billion expenditure ceiling on Department of Defense expenditures (hearings before House Appropriations Committee, supplemental defense appropriations for 1958, pp. 239–240, and hearings before the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, inquiry into satellite and missile programs, pp. 257–258):

"Senator SYMINGTON. Now, you refer to the $38 billion expenditure ceiling, in the memorandum that the President sent met, as 'not as an arbitrary limit on defense spending but as a step taken by the administration to keep military spending in appropriate balance with the requirements of the Federal Government as a whole.'

"Testimony by top civilian officials of the Department of Defense challenge this statement. As I mentioned, the Assistant Secretary (Comptroller) said there had always been some guidelines and restrictions; but now these were rigid ceilings. That was his statement.

"What would you comment on that?

"Was it an arbitrary limit on defense spending or wasn't it?

"Secretary MCELROY. Well, there was a limit for a period but, of course, since then, as I think is well known, there has been a change.

"There has been relief in the spending for the fiscal year, so while there was an attempt to set a limitation it was found that that was not right in relationship to the needs of defense and that it was relaxed to the extent of several hundred million dollars.

* * * * *

"Secretary GATES. I imagine what he is talking about, Mr. FLOOD, is the fact that everyone knows we were operating under an expenditure ceiling in the early days of this fiscal year and there was a holdup of money by the Bureau of the Budget in apportionments in regard to controlling expenditures. This is a costly thing to do in the long run.

"Mr. FLOOD. Then if there is, as a fact, a holdup——

"Secretary GATES. There was.

"Mr. FLOOD. In the allocation of appropriated funds, it was not the fault of the Congress in the development of the nuclear program as of today; it is not the fault of the Navy or the Department of Defense, but the 'Pooh-Bah' at the Budget who substituted his thinking for everybody's and said you could not have this money and you did not get it.

"Is that correct? 'Pooh-Bah' is my word, not yours.

"Secretary GATES. Well, I think——

"Mr. FLOOD. Well, it is Gilbert and Sullivan's, as a matter of fact, but they were good, too. You go on and tell me something.

"Secretary GATES. Yes, sir. I think that the policy of the administration was for a balanced budget and not an increase in the debt limit. The Bureau of the Budget was carrying out the policy of the President in this respect, and this caused an expenditure target to be placed on the departments of Government, including the Department of Defense This slowed up apportionment procedures, and in some instances delayed obligation of money and procurement of materiel in various departments, including the Navy and the bureaus of the Navy. I think that is what Admiral Rickover is talking about.

"This has been partially corrected. We now have a change in the expenditure targets we were originally working toward."

Impact on air force research and development of Department of Defense directive of August 17, 1957 withholding 10 percent of research and development funds (hearings before House Appropriations Committee, supplemental defense appropriations for 1958, pp. 345–6):

"Normally in the research and development appropriation early in July the Air Research and Development Comand, having had the proposed fiscal year program, is able to immediately start initiating new research and development contracts and continuing previous contracts for effort which is still in the overall research and development program. However, new obligations were frozen as of June 30, 1958, so that no new obligations could be incurred without specific approval from the Office, Secretary of Defense. In addition, an expenditure amount for research and development within the overall Air Force expenditure objective was established, which the research and development program should not exceed during fiscal year 1958. Further, about August 17, 1957, the Office, Secretary of Defense, directed a reduction under research and development programs and the Department of Defense in the amount of 10 percent.

"The effect of the above actions was to immediately halt contractual action pending analysis of the fiscal year 1958 program and to establish actions so that the Air Force could live within the directives as issued. In this respect, the Air Force directed the Air Research and Development Command to reduce all work effort type contracts by 5 percent so that under the restrictions the most balanced research and development program could be maintained in fiscal year 1958. The funds for the operation and maintenance of research and development centers and test bases were put on a minimum operating base by reduction of local purchase to the minimum need to maintain mission stock levels; by the reduction of overtime for all programs except the ballistic missile test program, and by the reduction of civilian personnel. These actions served to slow down the operation of the research and development effort for a period. Although certain contracts with universities and nonprofit organizations were terminated upon the expiration of existing contracts, complete cooperation was received from most contractors to the point that the Air Force scientific effort was not deferred. The research and development contractors in effect worked 30–60 days past the expiration time of the contract in order to give Air Force time to evaluate effect of these actions on the research and development program and in order that the scientists and engineers working on Air Force programs would not shift to other projects and be lost for the remainder of the fiscal year.

"Upon review of the overall research and development program, the Air Force made the decision to support the research effort to the utmost allowable under the expenditure ceiling and effect release of enough additional expenditures to bring the research program back into phase so that contracts could be written for new work as well as continuing of work which had been all contracted from fiscal year 1957 funds. The Air Force reduced the fiscal year 1958 program by the approximate 10 percent as directed

by the Office of Secretary of Defense. This was done by deferring and deleting many projects which had been planned for implementation in the fiscal year 1958 President's budget estimate. On October 24, however, the Air Force began to take actions to place the research and development effort back on the original planned basis for fiscal year 1958. Additional expenditure allowances were provided in order that obligations and expenditures could be achieved in normal manner for the balance of fiscal year 1958. On November 7, 1957, the Air Force relieved the Research and Development Command from the 5 percent reduction of effort-type contracts.

"The research and development program is now proceeding as expeditiously as possible toward fulfillment of the program during fiscal year 1958."

Army strength was cut by impounding fiscal year 1959 funds (hearings before Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, major defense matters, pp. 14–16, 59):

"Senator JOHNSON. Do you have some $200 million for previously approved procurement in 1959 that has been held up?

"General TAYLOR. $210 million, I am informed.

"Senator JOHNSON. All right.

"Now, summarizing—and I want to be as brief as possible because I have only 5 minutes—the Congress said they wanted you to to have a 900,000-man Army. That has been reduced to 870,000 by impounding funds. Yes or no?

"General TAYLOR. Yes; that is my understanding, sir.

"Senator JOHNSON. The Congress said it wanted you to have $210 million more for procurement than you have been authorized to spend; correct? Yes or no?

"General TAYLOR. Yes, sir.

"Senator JOHNSON. Has there been any other cutback or reduction in fiscal year 1959 Army funds that you are aware of?

"General TAYLOR. Yes; the Congress appropriated $37 million for modernization and $6,250,000 for construction which have not been made available to the Army. In addition, there are the funds associated with our increased strength which have been held back.

* * * * *

"Mr. WEISL. General Taylor, do you know why the $210 million fund appropriated by the Congress and recommended by the Defense Department was withheld?

"General TAYLOR. My understanding was that it involved the considerations of expenditures; that it was desired to spread out the expenditures more into 1960 and 1961.

"Mr. WEISL. Who made that decision?

"General TAYLOR. I would say that it came down through fiscal channels from the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

"Senator JOHNSON. Where did he get it?

"General TAYLOR. Sir?

"Senator JOHNSON. Where did he get it?

"General TAYLOR. I would not know, sir.

"Senator JOHNSON. By the fiscal channel, do you mean the Director of the Bureau of the Budget?

"General TAYLOR. I would not know, sir."

The Secretary of Defense was not permitted by the Budget Bureau to ask the Senate for any funds for fiscal year 1960 in excess of the budget request submitted to Congress in January 1959 (hearings before Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, major defense matters, p. 304):

"Mr. STANS. We did not take issue with the Department of Defense determinations as to the position they should take on the House add-ons and on-the-House cuts. We did make suggestions as to what we thought might be the best way to handle them, but the determination was to be made by the Secretary of Defense, and I am not sure that we have all of the details yet as to how the Secretary is going to make the presentation.

"The only limitation that was imposed upon him was that in the aggregate the Secretary would not ask for a greater budget for the Department of Defense than appeared in the budget document last January."

Fixed budget ceilings failed to reflect changing world conditions (hearings before Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, missiles, space, and other major defense matters, pp. 190–191):

"Mr. WEISL. We have been told, General Taylor, that while the Department of Defense and the various services have had guidelines on expenditures, there really never was a budgetary ceiling on expenditures. What is your view on that?

"Has there been a budget ceiling on defense expenditures?

"General TAYLOR. I think that perhaps we are just playing on words, Mr. Weisl. Certainly, for practical purposes there was a finite limit on what we could count upon, and each year that amount was essentially the same.

"I often point out that the split between the services was almost exactly the same for at least 4 years; 23 percent to the Army, 28 percent to the Navy, and 46 percent to the Air Force, giving a suggestion of a frozen pattern, which I don't think corresponded to the changing world conditions.

* * * * *

"Mr. WEISL. In your book you state as follows:

"The fact that there is a ceiling of around $40 billion on the defense budget is a reminder to each Chief that all military programs, however disparate in character, are in fact competitors for a fixed number of dollars.

" 'This consideration tends to color the attitude of individual Chiefs toward the program of sister services. It tends to make disinterested judgments more difficult than would be the case if it were possible to form judgments without such regard for fiscal consequences. The fixed defense budget by accentuating the interservice struggle for funds has become the prime cause of the service rivalry which is undermining national confidence in our military programs.'

"Would you like to comment on that?

"General TAYLOR. No, I think unfortunately, that the statement is accurate. I am sure that each Chief has always tried to sit in judgment honestly and dispassionately, but I know very well that we all think in terms of the effect on the budget of decisions on new weapons, for example. I think that explains to a degree why the Army and the Navy have been very reluctant to support, say Bomarc. I am equally certain that that is one of the reasons why the Navy and the Air Force have been reluctant to support Nike-Zeus; namely, the ultimate effect upon a fixed budget.

"Mr. WEISL. In your judgment, has the fixed ceiling on the military budget kept pace properly with changing world conditions?

"General TAYLOR. Well, I would say, sir, even without any analysis of the defense budget, that it is hard to believe that the world has not changed in the last 4 or 5 years. Yet our military budgets have been virtually the same within a variation of 1 or 2 percent."

Fiscal year 1960 funds provided by Congress for Army modernization were withheld by Bureau of the Budget (hearings before Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee missiles, space, and other major defense matters, pp. 229, 252, 262):

"Mr. WEISL. Last year Congress added funds to the budget for Army modernization. Are these funds being used fully?

"General LEMNITZER. The answer to your question is 'No.' I would like to tell you how the funds have been used, so that it may be clear as to why I give the answer 'No.' The total amount of money that was appropriated by the Congress over and above that which was in the President's 1960 budget amounted to $382.6 million. Now, $164.2 million of these funds are being used to cover a deficiency in the funding of the fiscal year 1960 direct obligational program for procurement of the Department of the Army, which totaled about $1.372 billion. This deficiency resulted from the Office of Secretary of Defense funding program including assets which failed to materialize, but these assets were beyond the control or influence of the Army.

"I might explain what I mean by that.

"Under the mutual security program, the Army provides some of its equipment right out of its inventory to assist our allies. We are normally reimbursed for that equipment so that we can replenish our inventories. The total amount of reimbursements which the Department of Defense estimated we would get did not materialize, and $164 million of the $382 million were used to cover deficits of this sort; $43.4 million of the total of $382 million will be used for modernization. This amount will be used to increase the Army's fiscal 1960 direct obligational program and it will be used in our so-called PEMA budget, that is, the 'Procurement of equipment and missiles, Army.' Of the $382 million, $175 million has been placed in reserve by the Bureau of the Budget for utilization in financing the fiscal year 1961 program. That gives the complete status of the total amount appropriated by the Congress in the fiscal year 1960 budget.

"Senator STENNIS. What was the last figure?

"General LEMNITZER. $175 million.

"Mr. WEISL. Has this amount been put in reserve?

"General LEMNITZER. It has been placed in reserve by the Bureau of the Budget.

"Mr. WEISL. Why hasn't the Bureau released these funds? It was the clear intent of Congress to use that money to modernize your Army?

"General LEMNITZER. I can't answer that. You will have to ask the Budget.

"Mr. WEISL. Did you protest against reserving that money and not using it for modernization of the Army?

"General LEMNITZER. We have requested apportionment of these funds on a number of occasions.

* * * * *

"Senator CANNON. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

"General, we know you are concerned about modernization of the Army, and, of course, as you know, Congress did earmark certain funds for use in modernization.

"I understand you have testified that the Army protested the decision of the Bureau of the Budget in withholding some of these funds that were earmarked for use in modernization; is that correct?

"General LEMNITZER. I wouldn't use the word 'protest.' We asked for the funds. We made a strong case for them. Our request was not approved, but we didn't protest or complain.

"Senator CANNON. You didn't complain. You just asked for them but didn't get them?

"General LEMNITZER. That's right.

"Senator CANNON. But at the time you asked for them, you felt they were very necessary; is that correct?

"General LEMNITZER. We did.

"Senator CANNON. Do you believe these funds are of such importance to our national security that new, or perhaps stronger, efforts should be made to dislodge these funds?

"General LEMNITZER. Well, of the funds that you referred to, Senator Cannon, only $175 million remain available in reserve. I think that is what you referred to.

"We would like to get those funds. We have asked for them, and we probably will make another attempt to get them.

"Senator CANNON. I don't think that quite answers my question, General. The question was: Do you think that these funds and the use for which they are intended are of such importance to the national security that new or perhaps stronger efforts should be made to dislodge these funds from the Bureau of the Budget reserve? I am thinking not only of your own efforts, but efforts on behalf of the Congress.

"General LEMNITZER. We need these funds for modernization of the Army, and as we have testified before various committees of the Congress, we have made a strong case for our modernization program. We need these funds.

"Senator CANNON. And in your opinion they are very important to our national security.

"General LEMNITZER. Yes; insofar as they will improve the capability of the Army to accomplish its mission."

* * * * *

"General LEMNITZER. We would be better equipped with this $175 million. I wouldn't want to give the impression to this committee that the Army can't carry out certain commitments, because it can and will. We can do it better with more modern equipment, as I have attempted to state here this afternoon.

"Senator STENNIS. I know you would do your best, but it is just unthinkable that you would have to go up against better weapons than you have yourself.

"With all the money that we spend, with all the resources we have, the know-how, the technology and everything, it is just unthinkable that we would have to go up against someone else who had better weapons, better equipment, and therefore someone who would place us at a disadvantage to that extent.

"This money is available and appropriated, yet is withheld. Who is holding it up? Is it the Director of the Budget, Mr. Stans? That is where the funds are locked, is it not?

"General LEMNITZER. I don't know who the individuals are; the best information I can give you is that it has been placed in reserve by the Bureau of the Budget."

* * * * *

Budget limitations prevented Navy from submitting its military requirements for fiscal year 1961 (hearings before Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, missiles, space, and other major defense matters, pp. 280–282, 329):

"Mr. WEISL. In other words, you were given guidelines as to what plateau you must not cross regardless of how much you needed?

"Admiral BURKE. We were given two planning guidelines, sir.

"One was to build a budget based upon our NOA last year less 10 percent of the procurement, military construction, and research and development. That was to be the basic budget.

"The other one was the basic budget plus that 10 percent plus half a billion dollars. We submitted both budgets to the Department of Defense, based on those guidelines, sir.

"Mr. WEISL. Those guidelines were money limitations; isn't that right?

"Admiral BURKE. Yes, sir.

"Mr. WEISL. Not requirement presentations?

"Admiral BURKE. They were money limitations; yes, sir.

"Mr. WEISL. But the fact is that three fleet ballistic missile submarines as recommended were denied; long leadtime requirement for six additional fleet ballistic missile submarines were denied, and seven conversions were denied. Is that correct?

"Admiral BURKE. Yes, sir; I did that in order to——

"Mr. WEISL. You did that?

"Admiral BURKE. Yes, sir.

"Mr. WEISL. But it wasn't because you thought it should be done, but because of the guideline and the money limitation. Is that correct?

"Admiral BURKE. Yes, sir.

* * * * *

"Senator JOHNSON. What you are saying is that you are following the budget judgment instead of the military judgment. The military judgment is one thing, and the budget estimate is another. You made the recommendations based on military judgment. Then you got restrictive budget guidelines and you compromised by following the guidelines.

"Admiral BURKE. We put our most important items in our budget, in the basic budget, and the next most important items in the add-on, sir.

"Senator JOHNSON. And the budget does not contain items that, in your military judgment, you feel you should have.

"Admiral BURKE. It doesn't contain as many items as we originally asked for; no.

"Senator JOHNSON. It eliminated three Polaris submarines, also long leadtime procurement for six additional Polaris submarines. Does that mean you believe the budget provides all the funds that should be provided for the Polaris submarines?

"Admiral BURKE. I might explain that a little bit, sir. I think that people in the Department of Defense should speak for themselves on this——

"Senator JOHNSON. They will. I want you to speak for yourself. Do you think the budget includes all the money it should have for the Polaris submarines and missiles?

"Admiral BURKE. Not now, sir, because we have completed our tests on the Polaris submarines. It is a wonderful machine, sir.

"Senator JOHNSON. The answer is 'No.'

"Admiral BURKE. Yes, sir.

"Senator JOHNSON. And you think the budget ought to include more money for the Polaris submarines?

"Admiral BURKE. Yes, sir."

Withholding of funds results in gap in deploying Polaris submarines (hearings before Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, missiles, space, and other major defense matters, pp. 282–283):

"Mr. WEISL. In fiscal years 1958 and 1959, the Congress provided funds and authority to proceed with nine Polaris submarines; isn't that correct?

"Admiral BURKE. Yes, sir.

"Mr. WEISL. Despite this, is it not true that the executive branch refused to release the funds for submarines 7, 8, and 9 during fiscal year 1959?

"Admiral BURKE. They were held over until fiscal year 1960.

"Mr. WEISL. I know, but the Congress provided for the use of those funds in 1959, and they were deferred, were they not?

"Admiral BURKE. Yes, sir.

"Mr. WEISL. Is it not also true that the 1960 budget contained no funds for construction of additional Polaris submarines, except for advanced components for submarines Nos. 10, 11, and 12?

"Admiral BURKE. That is correct, sir.

"Mr. WEISL. Isn't the withholding of the funds appropriated in 1959, and the failure to request additional funds in 1960, resulting in a sharp decrease, or a gap, in the deployment of Polaris submarines after the first nine?

"Admiral BURKE. Not a sharp decrease, sir. What we can do, of course, will be to deploy about three submarines per year, because that is what we are building per year.

"Mr. WEISL. I understand that, but if you had used the money that you asked Congress to give you and for which you pleaded so eloquently, you wouldn't have had that gap; isn't that true?

"Admiral BURKE. Yes, sir; that is correct.

"Mr. WEISL. Obviously you cannot make up for that leadtime now. Once leadtime is lost, it is lost forever, isn't it?

"Admiral BURKE. Yes, sir."

Expenditure limitations prevented Air Force from requesting additional programs for fiscal year 1961 (hearings before House Appropriations Committee, revisions in 1960 and 1961 Air Force programs, pp. 38, 40):

"Mr. MAHON. Let me get this clear: The add-ons which you have presented us today are not all the add-ons you requested of the Department of Defense in connection with this presentation?

"General WHITE. That is correct, sir.

"Mr. MAHON. What was the stumbling block with these additions and why did you not get the funds and approval, or do you know?

"General WHITE. Yes, sir; I know. It is an expenditure problem. We must abide, by service, as to the expenditures that can be made in any given fiscal year.

"Mr. MAHON. Is your expenditure limitation for fiscal year 1961 $18.6 billion?

"General FRIEDMAN. $18.6 billion; yes, sir.

"General WHITE. These addenda bring us up to that figure.

"Mr. MAHON. Were you not already up to that point?

"General FRIEDMAN. We were. But, on a comparable basis—although we dropped out some $500 million and we put in $300 million—the space programs and the missile programs spend out at a higher rate than the types of programs which we deleted. Therefore, on an expenditure basis we net out. The point is that we cannot use the additional $140 million without exceeding the $18.6 billion expenditure.

* * * * *

"General FRIEDMAN. For the Minuteman, we asked for an amount of $20.7 million more in our initial discussions than is shown in the addenda here.

"Mr. MAHON. Why was it reduced?

"General FRIEDMAN. It was reduced on the basis which General White discussed, that this appeared to be the maximum funds we could apply and still remain within the expenditures reflected in the President's budget.

"General WHITE. May I put it this way: The list that you have read adds up to the amount of expenditures which we have deleted by our proposed changes.

"Mr. MAHON. I see the point."

THE ROLE OF THE ROBINSON-PATMAN ACT IN THE ANTITRUST SCHEME OF THINGS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the American Bar Association is one of the great institutions of our contemporary society. Its membership includes all of the great lawyers, jurists, and professors of law that have contributed so mightily to the advancement of our Nation. The achievements of this organization and its members need not be recounted for they are well known throughout the entire country.

During this week in Washington, the American Bar Association is holding its

83d annual convention. At this convention the members are discussing and deliberating various propositions deemed to be of such importance as to merit attention and consideration by the learned group of lawyers in attendance. These discussions, of course, are being led in each case by outstanding members of the profession.

It is noteworthy, I believe, that the Robinson-Patman Act was one of the topics chosen to be discussed by the antitrust section of the association. One of the lawyers selected by the American Bar Association to expound upon the legal intricacies, ramifications, and significance of that act was an attorney recognized by all informed persons as being a complete master of the subject, an attorney of national renown and acknowledged by the antitrust legal fraternity as a leading authority in this field of the law. He is Mr. Everette MacIntyre, general counsel for the Select Committee on Small Business of the U.S. House of Representatives.

There are perhaps many members of the American bar who excel in the field of antitrust law. In my opinion Mr. MacIntyre stands without a peer among those that have attained this high degree of perfection. Mr. MacIntyre's accomplishments are outstanding, not only because of his superb professional talent but also because he has dedicated himself to the application of his knowledge and skill unstintingly in the public interest.

The Robinson-Patman Act like the Sherman Act has had a great impact upon the commerce of our country. The proper interpretation of the act, therefore, is a matter of importance not only to the legal profession, but to all of the people managing the 5 million businesses operating in our country.

For the above reasons, I wish to invite the attention of the Members of the Congress to the following enlightening and authoritative dissertation upon this technical subject that Mr. MacIntyre delivered before the antitrust section of the American Bar Association on August 30, 1960, here in Washington:

THE ROLE OF THE ROBINSON-PATMAN ACT IN THE ANTITRUST SCHEME OF THINGS—THE PERSPECTIVE OF CONGRESS

(By Everette MacIntyre)

The perspective of Congress on the subject of our discussion, or any other subjects, is its understanding of the subject matter. Of course, no individual is authorized to speak for the Congress and to state its views or understanding regarding any subject matter. The understanding of the Congress about any matter is expressed in the action it takes and in its resolutions. Of course, the reports of the committees, upon which Congress acts, are often looked to for information about congressional intents. Therefore, when it was suggested to me that I discuss the perspective of Congress regarding price discrimination and the Robinson-Patman Act, it was agreed that the only way to determine the perspective of the Congress is by recorded expressions which present congressional perception and congressional intents.

When attention is directed, first, to the records of the thing or things which motivated Congress to enact the Clayton Act (1914),[1] as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act (1936),[2] it is noted that Congress acted in an effort to solve a problem by which it was troubled; and second, further examination shows that the problem was created by the practice of price discrimination.

The records clearly show that Congress understood what the problem was, what it was doing to meet it, and that it believed the public interest required the enactment of the Clayton Act and the Robinson-Patman Act. However, in view of the fact that in recent years many apparently well-informed individuals have argued about not only the economic significance of the practice of price discrimination, but, also, even the meaning of the term "price discrimination," it would seem worthwhile to discuss those aspects of our subject.

The term "discrimination" ordinarily is considered to be a simple word of the English language. Webster defines it as a distinction in treatment and as an unfair or injurious distinction. The injury attaches to the person who suffers the distinction of receiving disfavor in treatment.

Today we hear much about discrimination. All of the discrimination that is alleged to be taking place does not involve discrimination in price, but the subject of our discussion is concerned only with price discrimination. Therefore, the action to which we are directing our attention is that of a seller of commodities in discriminating in price between and among purchasers to whom he sells, in that the seller distinguishes some purchasers of his commodities with disfavor through charging them higher prices than he charges other purchasers for goods of like grade and quality. This is the definition of the term "price discrimination" serving as a basis for our discussion today.

We are concerned not only with the meaning of the term "price discrimination," but, also, with the significance of the practice of discriminating in price. Recently, we have heard much argument about the economic significance of price discrimination. According to one school of thought, the practice is a manifestation of competition. Another school of thought holds that it is the antithesis of competition. To the latter it is a practice destructive of competition and the creator of monopolies. How did Congress perceive the practice of price discrimination when it viewed it as a problem to be dealt with in 1914, again in 1936, and how does it perceive it today?

The Commissioner of Corporations, in a report on the transportation of petroleum, May 2, 1906, informed Congress about action by the Standard Oil Co. in inducing and receiving the advantages of rebates from several railroads on a very large volume of business in the transportation of petroleum. In that report it was stated: [3]

"The Standard has therefore been able by reason of its discriminating freight rates to sell oil, when necessary to meet competition, at prices which were profitable to itself, but which left no profit to a competitor. Having thus destroyed competition in large sections of the country, the Standard there charges prices several cents above the cost of manufacture. Railway discriminations, in connection with price cutting, have thus enabled the Standard to obtain monopoly profits of enormous amount.

This price discrimination in favor of a large multiple-market operator, and its use of those advantages in discriminating between and among its customers in widely separated markets to destroy its competitors, is the outstanding aspect of price discrimination brought to the attention of the Congress before enactment of the Clayton Act in 1914. The history of that aspect paralleled the history of the operations of the Standard Oil Trust and the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey.

The beginnings of the organization which developed into the Standard Oil Co. was a modest partnership between a 23-year-old commission merchant, John D. Rockefeller, and his partner, M. B. Clark. They expanded that partnership by investing $4,000 in an oil refinery plant, which had been started by Mr. Samuel Andrews. In 1865, Mr. Rockefeller became a full partner with Mr. Andrews, and the business became one of the most flourishing of the 25 oil refinery firms in Cleveland. Within 2 years, the partnership was expanded to include the refineries of five additional firms. This was the first step in a long series to establish one of the largest industrial combinations. By 1874, over 50 percent of the refining industry was represented by what had become known as the Standard Alliance. This loose federation became the Standard Oil Trust after 1882. By this time its relative size had given it a degree of market power in both its buying of services and goods, and its selling of coal oil or kerosene. This market power was exercised to secure favored treatment from railways in the transportation of the oil and other supplies for Standard Oil Trust. The advantages thus gained were utilized by Standard to discriminate between and among its customers located in widely separated markets for the purpose and with the effect of destroying competing oil refinery firms.[4]

In a report under date of August 5, 1907, the Commissioner of Corporations informed Congress that the business of each of Standard's competitors largely was confined to a limited area and to a limited number of towns within such area—first, by reason of the fact that their volume of business was small, and, second, that their resources did not permit the direct-delivery methods utilized by Standard. The direct-delivery methods utilized by Standard enabled it to make sales and deliveries of kerosene to all sections of the country, including those where it faced no competition. In these markets where it did not face competition, Standard was enabled to, and did, charge monopoly prices, and, by reason of the high prices thus obtained, it was further enabled, in competitive areas and towns, to reduce its prices to a point which left no profit for the independent concerns.[5]

In the course of its investigations of trusts, Congress found that Standard first acquired its position as a multiple-market operator

[1] 15 U.S.C. secs. 12–27.

[2] 15 U.S.C. 13.

[3] Transportation of Petroleum, Garfield's report (1906), p. 3.

[4] The Commissioner of Corporations, in part I of his "Report on the Petroleum Industry," May 20, 1907, in referring to the position of the Standard Oil Co. in the petroleum industry, at pp. xviii–xx, in his letter of submittal of the report, stated:

"Scandalous railway discriminations obtained by the Standard in its earlier years as against its competitors did more than all other causes together to establish it in its controlling position.

"Another important element in the control over the industry is secured by the Standard through its marketing methods. It uses very generally the bulk system of delivery to retail dealers by tank wagon—a cheaper, safer, and more convenient method of delivery than in barrels. This not only reduces the cost of marketing greatly, but also has eliminated largely the jobber from the business. Dealing thus directly with the retailer, the Standard is enabled to arrange for such local price differences as it may desire for the purpose of destroying local competition, without disturbing its prices over any large section of its trade."

[5] See pt. II of the Report on the Petroleum Industry by the Commissioner of Corporations, dated Aug. 5, 1907, p. 28.

through merger with a number of previously independent competitors. In order to effectuate the control of these companies, the Standard Oil Trust was organized in 1879. It encompassed about 40 companies, which controlled a large percentage of the total oil-refining capacity in the United States. Thus, what started out as a small company in the period of 1860–65, as only 1 of about 30 refining companies, had by 1879 grown to a position having powerful monopoly control over prices in many local markets in an industry which previously had given the public the benefit of price competition. Generally, it is agreed that powerful monopoly control such as this over prices in a number of separate markets is what enables a large seller to discriminate in price regularly or at will between and among its customers and the communities in which the customers are located. Of course, it is recognized that a small seller without market power can and on rare occasions engages in spasmodic price discriminations, but these discriminations ordinarily are not regarded as having any economic significance. The price discriminations which are practiced by the seller frequently or regularly and at will with devastating effects flow as actions from the seller who has market power approaching monopoly control over prices in the markets in which he operates. It is clear from the record that the Standard Oil Co., to which we have made reference, had such market power and control of prices in many local markets.

As a result of its investigations of trusts, Congress was informed that the trail blazed by Standard in the petroleum industry, which included, first, the acquisition of market power and multiple-market control through merger with competitors, and then the use of that market power to discriminate in price to destroy the remaining competition, had shown the way to monopolists and would-be monopolists in other industries, who quickly proceeded to imitate Standard's practice of price discrimination. Included among the latter were the tobacco, sugar, biscuit and steel industries. The monopoly power thus acquired and abused by those in the petroleum and tobacco industries was challenged as violative of the Sherman Antitrust Act. The Supreme Court of the United States disposed of those challenges in 1911. It held that the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey was a monopoly in violation of section 2 of the Sherman Act and decreed a dissolution of that combination.[6] The Standard Oil Cos. of today resulted from the dissolutions. A similar ruling was handed down against the American Tobacco Co.[7] Later the combination and restraint of trade having monopoly control over prices in the sugar industry was challenged successfully under the Sherman Act.[8] In some of these cases, effort was made to defend the challenged monopoly control over prices on the ground that this power and position had been acquired as a result of the use of a lawful practice, namely, the practice of price discrimination. For example, attorneys for the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey argued before the Supreme Court of the United States that Standard should not be broken up as a monopoly because it had acquired its position as the result of lawful competitive methods.[9] In the later Sugar Institute case, representatives of the defendants expressed a strange idea of just what constituted discriminatory treatment. They confused discrimination with competition. They condemned price reductions because the sellers were either not willing or able to provide all buyers with the same reductions. Therefore, they undertook to maintain all prices at a high "competitive" level, contending that for any one seller to reduce prices below that "competitive" level, even though he treated all of his buyers equally, was engaging in unethical, noncompetitive and discriminatory conduct.[10] Many of these ideas about the meaning of the economic significance of the practice of price discrimination have persisted.

They have served as the wellspring for other ideas from which has arisen the argument that the Clayton Act, the Robinson-Patman Act, and other legislation against price discrimination, constitute legislation against competition and are, therefore, basically in conflict with the Sherman Antitrust Act and our national antimonopoly policy underlying it. It is for this reason that our discussion today is belaboring the definition of the term "price discrimination," and the recorded expressions of the perspective of Congress regarding the economic significance of price discrimination.

References have been made to the information available to the Congress from the Commissioner of Corporations about the economic significance of the practice of price discrimination. That and similar information was not only available to the Congress, but, also, to the President of the United States and to others. Study of this information prompted President Woodrow Wilson in 1913, in one of his first messages to the 63d Congress, to call for legislation to prohibit price discrimination and unfair trade practices. In doing so, he stated:

"We are sufficiently familiar with the actual processes and methods of monopoly and of the many hurtful restraints of trade to make definition possible, at any rate up to the limit of which experience has disclosed. These practices, being now abundantly disclosed, can be explicitly and item by item forbidden by statute in such terms as will practically eliminate uncertainty, the law itself and the penalty being made equally plain."

Congress was responsive to that call for legislation. First, it enacted the Federal Trade Commission Act, which became law September 26, 1914.[11] In that law, unfair methods of competition were made unlawful. Congress enacted the Clayton Antitrust Act,[12] section 2 of which made price discrimination unlawful where the effect may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly in any line of commerce. That law was approved October 15, 1914.

President Wilson was highly elated over the prospects provided by this legislation for action against monopolistic practices and conditions.[13]

The perception of Congress into the economic significance of the practice of price discrimination is vividly recorded in the committee reports on the bill, which became the Clayton Act.[14] In those reports, references were made to the price discrimination practices of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey and the American Tobacco Co., and to the great market power these multiple-market operators had acquired and abused through the use of price discrimination, with the result of destroying competition and creating

---

[6] *Standard Oil Co.* v. *United States*, 221 U.S. 1 (1911).

[7] *United States* v. *American Tobacco Co.*, 221 U.S. 106 (1911).

[8] *Sugar Institute, Inc.* v. *United States*, 297 U.S. 553.

[9] *Standard Oil Co.* v. *United States*, 221 U.S. 1, 84. The attorneys argued that: "(Defendant's) control was but the result of lawful competitive methods, guided by economic genius of the higher order, sustained by courage, by a keen insight into commercial situations, resulting in the acquisition of great wealth, but at the same time serving to stimulate and increase production, to widely extend the distribution of the products of petroleum at a cost largely below that which would have otherwise prevailed, thus proving to be at one and the same time a benefaction to the general public as well as of enormous advantage to individuals."

[10] 15 Fed. Supp. 817, 865–879.

[11] 15 U.S.C. 41–50 (1958).

[12] 15 U.S.C. 12–33 (1958).

[13] Shortly after President Wilson signed the Clayton Antitrust Act and the Federal Trade Commission Act, he wrote in a private letter:

"With similar purpose and in a like temper the Congres has sought, in the Trade Commission bill and in the Clayton bill, to make men in a small way of business as free to succeed as men in a big way, and to kill monopoly in the seed. * * * It is our purpose to destroy monopoly and maintain competition as an only effectual instrument of business liberty. * * *" (Letter of Woodrow Wilson, Oct. 17, 1914, in 3 The Public Papers of Woodrow Wilson, 189–190.)

[14] The Clayton Act of 1914 originated with the bill H.R. 15657, introduced by Mr. Clayton on Apr. 14, 1914, 51 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 6714 (1914). Sec. 2 of this bill prohibited discrimination in price between different purchasers, with the purpose or intent to destroy or wrongfully injure the business of a competitor of either the purchaser or the seller. Sec. 2 did not contain any proviso excepting discriminations made in good faith to meet competition.

H.R. 15657 was reported out on May 6, 1914, and the report, H.R. No. 627, 63d Cong., 2r sess., 8–9, showed that the sec. 2 prohibition of price discrimination was confined to a well-known, common, particular form of discrimination. Thus, the report stated, in part:

"Sec. 2 of the bill is intended to prevent unfair discrimination. The necessity for legislation needs little argument to sustain the wisdom of it. In the past it has been a most common practice of great and powerful combinations engaged in commerce—notably the Standard Oil Co., and the American Tobacco Co., and others of less notoriety, but of great influence—to lower prices of their commodities, oftimes below the cost of prices of production in certain communities and sections where they had competition, with the intent to destroy and make unprofitable the business of their competitors, and with the ultimate purpose in view of thereby acquiring a monopoly in the particular locality or section in which the discriminating price is made. Every concern that engages in this evil practice must of necessity recoup its losses in the particular communities or sections where their commodities are sold below cost or without a fair profit by raising the price of the same class of commodities above their fair market value in other sections or communities. Such a system or practice is so manifestly unfair and unjust, not only to competitors who are directly injured thereby but to the general public, that your committee is strongly of the opinion that the present antitrust laws ought to be supplemented by making this particular form of discrimination a specific offense under the law when practiced by those engaged in commerce."

S. Doc. No. 583, 63d Cong., 2d sess. (1914), made the same statement for the Senate Judiciary Committee in its report on H.R. 15657.

In its report upon the bill to enact the Clayton Act—S. Rept. No. 695, 63d Cong., 2d sess., 1 (1914), to accompany H.R. 15657, the Senate Committee on the Judiciary said:

"Broadly stated, the bill, in its treatment of unlawful restraints and monopolies, seeks to prohibit and make unlawful certain trade practices which, as a rule, singly and in themselves are not covered by the act of July 2, 1890 (the Sherman Act) or other existing antitrust acts and thus, by making these practices illegal, to arrest the creation of trusts, conspiracies, and monopolies in their incipiency and before consummation."

monopolies. The practice of price discriminations was viewed as evil and as contributing to high prices far above the market value in some sections of the country. It was noted that those who had sufficient market power to discriminate in price had charged high prices in some markets to subsidize the lower prices involved in the discriminations, with the effect of eliminating competition in the areas where the lower prices were charged.

The legislation Congress enacted in 1914, making it unlawful to practice price discrimination in certain situations, was hailed not only by President Wilson, but by small business enterprises and the public generally as a step in the right direction. However, these champions for the free and competitive enterprise system were in for some unpleasant surprises. It was found that somehow someone had slipped into the antidiscrimination provision of section 2 of the Clayton Antitrust Act the proviso which made that section of the law unoperative against price discriminations when made "in good faith to meet competition." When that proviso was being debated in Congress, concern was expressed about the possibility of it "pulling the teeth" from the law. The fears which were expressed about the possible effect of the good faith proviso of the Clayton Antitrust Act of 1914 have been proven to have been well founded. In the first 20-year period, after the enactment of the legislation, it was found that the good faith proviso had made the law somewhat ineffective for use against destructive price discriminations.

Congress wanted to know why the law was ineffective. It requested the Federal Trade Commission to investigate the matter. That was done pursuant to Senate Resolution 224, 70th Congress. On December 14, 1934, the Commission submitted its final report on that investigation.[15] In that report, the Commission stated that the then existing law, as it had been interpreted, permitted destructive price discriminations "when made in good faith to meet competition." The Commission reported that such good faith provision of the law virtually nullified the provisions in the Clayton Act, which were directed against price discriminations.[16] The Commission proceeded to recommend that the law be amended and that the nullifying provisions be eliminated.[17]

The Commission rejected suggestions which had been made to the effect that the Sherman Antitrust Act [18] be relied upon and used to halt destructive price discriminations.[19]

Resolutions were introduced in the House of Representatives, providing for a congressional investigation of the trade practices of big-scale buying and selling organizations.[20] These resolutions provided for investigations to be made by a special investigating committee, consisting of seven Members of the House; four Democrats and three Republicans. It was under the chairmanship of Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN, Democrat, of Texas.

The Committee found that injurious price discriminations were widespread, and were being practiced particularly in the food industry. It was found that in many instances the big chains were demanding special price concessions and coercing small suppliers into granting special concessions, with threats of putting up their own manufacturing plants. In other instances they were playing the suppliers off against one another, forcing suppliers of nationally advertised products to meet the prices of small, exclusive suppliers who could not, in practice, market to the independent trade. The big corporate chain food retailers who were receiving the benefits and advantages of these discriminations were, in turn, utilizing these advantages in their selling, with the result that independents were being driven out of business. The chains were getting price concessions and secret rebates far beyond anything that was justified by the suppliers' cost differences. The investigations revealed, for example, that prior to 1935 the Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co. had been receiving on an annual basis $6 million in off-the-invoice discounts and another $2 million a year in brokerage fees on its purchases. These widespread and growing practices were found to be destructive of competition and creating monopolistic conditions, but the congressional committee was not able to find that the existing law provided any prospect for any effective relief. It was unable to conclude differently from the Federal Trade Commission that "The Commission has no evidence which would establish that price discrimination by chain stores has not been in good faith to meet competition and there is good ground to conclude that in many cases it has been for that purpose." [21]

In the light of the facts uncovered during the course of investigations of big-scale buying and selling in 1935–36, it was not difficult for one to see why the law against price discrimination had broken down. One of the main reasons was the defect in the law pointed out by the Federal Trade Commission in its report on the chainstore investigation. That defect was the provision which allowed the sellers who were discriminating in price to defend on the ground that they were meeting competition in good faith.

Bills were introduced in both the House and the Senate to overcome the defects in the laws against price discrimination, including the loophole which permitted discriminations "made in good faith to meet competition".[22]

Extensive hearings were held by the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, and by the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate on these proposals to strengthen the laws against destructive price discriminations. Representatives of many of the large corporations which had been practicing price discrimination voiced strong opposition to these legislative proposals. However, the committees reported favorably on the Robinson and Patman bills, and recommended their enactment into law. The report of the Committee on the Judiciary to the House on the Patman bill contained the following statement:

"Your committee is of the opinion that the evidence is overwhelming that price discrimination practices exist to such an extent that the survival of independent merchants, manufacturers, and other businessmen is seriously imperiled and that remedial legislation is necessary." [23]

The bill introduced in the Senate and reported by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary followed the FTC's recommendations literally in that it contained no reference whatever to good faith or to meeting of competition. The House bill, on the other hand, contained the language of the statute today. The Senate bill was amended on the floor of the House by insertion of the good faith clause of the old Clayton Act. The conference committee agreed upon the language of the House bill.

The conference report to the House on the resolution of the differences between the Senate and the House bills is quite significant on the good faith provisio in the light of subsequent developments.

Congress passed the Robinson and Patman bills overwhelmingly. Only 16 votes were recorded in opposition in the House of Representatives, and none in the Senate. The enactment was completed on June 16, 1936, and President Roosevelt signed the Robinson-Patman Act on June 19, 1936.

A few of the facts relating to the passage of the Robinson-Patman Act have been cited to demonstrate that in effect the 74th Congress accepted its responsibility and met one of the really serious problems of the day when it strengthened the laws against destructive price discrimination.

The congressional action in thus strengthening the law against the practice of price discrimination was not sufficient in and of itself to eliminate the practice, although it was noted that much progress was made in that direction. Countless well-intentioned firms attempted to correct their trade practices voluntarily. The Federal Trade Commission pursued others with prosecutions. In some instances the prosecutions were prolonged and costly, with relief delayed and

---

[15] S. Doc. 74th Cong.—The Federal Trade Commission Final Report on the Chainstore Investigation.

[16] Ibid., p. 90.

[17] Ibid., pp. 96–97.

[18] 15 U.S.C. 1–7 (1958).

[19] S. Doc. 4, 74th Cong.—The Federal Trade Commission Final Report on the Chain Store Investigation, pp. 86–87.

[20] H. Res. 203, H. Res. 239, 74th Cong., 1st sess. (1934).

[21] S. Doc. 4, 74th Cong., FTC Final Report on the Chain Store Investigation (1934).

[22] H.R. 8442 (introduced by Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, Democrat, of Texas), and S. 2154 (introduced by Senator Joseph Robinson, Democrat, of Arkansas), 74th Cong., 2d sess. (1935).

[23] Mr. Utterback was the chairman of the conferees for the House and therefore not only presented the conference report to the House but also served as manager of the bill when it was reported to the House by the conference committee for consideration.

With reference to the "good faith" provision, the conference report contained the following statement:

"The Senate bill contained a further proviso—That nothing herein contained shall prevent discrimination in price in the same or different communities made in good faith to meet competition."

This language is found in existing law, and in the opinion of the conferees is one of the obstacles to enforcement of the present Clayton Act. The Senate receded, and the language is stricken. A provision relating to the question of meeting competition, intended to operate only as a rule of evidence in a proceeding before the Federal Trade Commission, is included in subsection (b) (H. Rept. 2951, 74th Cong., 2d sess. 6, 7 (1935) (on H.R. 8442)).

That aspect of the conference report on the bill which became the Robinson-Patman Act was further explained by Mr. Utterback, the manager of the House conferees in the following language: "This does not set up the meeting of competition as an absolute bar to a charge of discrimination under the bill. It merely permits it to be shown in evidence. This provision is entirely procedural. It does not determine substantive rights, liabilities, and duties. They are fixed in the other provisions of the bill. It leaves it a question of fact to be determined in each case, whether the competition to be met was such as to justify the discrimination given, as one lying within the limitations laid down by the bill, and whether the way in which the competition was met lies within the latitude allowed by those limitations"2 (80 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 9418, daily ed. June 15, 1936).

Therefore, it was made clear that the Congress never intended the "good faith" proviso to be construed as a carte blanche exemption to violate the bill so long as a competitor could be shown to have violated it first. Particular care was exercised to make clear that the law was not to be used in practices of oppressive discriminations in violation of the obvious intent of the bill.

uncertain. In the meantime, Congress again investigated and studied monopoly problems, including the practice of price discrimination. This time the investigation and study was made by the Temporary National Economic Committee, under the chairmanship of Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY. The final report of that investigation was made March 31, 1941. It contains many recommendations for strengthening our antimonopoly laws. One recommendation was directed to systematic discriminations practiced through the use of basing-point systems and zone-pricing systems.

The Temporary National Economic Committee recommended that Congress enact legislation declaring such systematic discriminatory pricing systems to be illegal per se.[24] Congress did not enact legislation as thus recommended.

With the tools provided by the Congress through the Robinson-Patman Act, the Federal Trade Commission continued its laborious task to eliminate destructive price discriminations. It met with considerable success.[25] Opposition to this success arose, grew and stiffened. It took the form of arguments by representatives of firms accused and found to be discriminating in price, and by others, that price discriminations were evidence of competition and should not be interfered with. It was argued that the Robinson-Patman Act was a law against "effective competition." This argument was made not only to the Federal Trade Commission in briefs in the cases which were being litigated, it was repeated in law review articles. However, the Federal Trade Commission continued its enforcement activities. One of its notable cases was that in which it challenged price discrimination practices in the portland cement industry.[26] The Commission was successful in that proceeding. That success prompted representatives of the firms which had been found to be discriminating in price to ask Congress to legalize their price discriminating methods and systems. Elaborate lobbying activities were undertaken in support of that request.[27] The arguments made to the Congress in the course of these lobbying activities to the effect that price discrimination practices and systems should be legalized, were predicated upon the further argument that price discrimination was evidence of effective competition,[28] and became persuasive in that instance, and Congress passed a bill which would have had the effect of legalizing some of these price discrimination systems and methods.[29] That bill was vetoed by the President of the United States during June 1950.

Failure to secure approval of legislation which would have legalized many types of price discrimination, prompted representatives of firms using these price discrimination practices to "reeducate" not only the leaders of the American public regarding what should be considered as "competitive" and what should be considered as "monopolistic" practices, but, also, to "help the courts understand the problem." Arguments in support of this program were set forth in articles, books, and speeches, which were expected to come to the attention of Government officials, legislators, and judges. The crux of these articles was to the effect that price discrimination and other practices previously found to be monopolistic by the Congress, were, in fact, "competitive," and that laws directed specifically against such practices are laws inconsistent with an antimonopolistic policy for free and unfettered competition.

These plans and programs, along with the writings which followed, gave rise to a new body of literature regarding the laws against price discrimination. Arguments appeared in many writings describing antitrust laws prohibiting price discriminations as being inconsistent, if not in conflict, with our basic antitrust law, namely, the Sherman Act of 1890.[30]

In the meantime, the courts took note of these writings. A number of opinions and decisions appeared, in which it was noted that in many of these writings "experts" had contended that the Robinson-Patman Act was basically inconsistent with the Sherman Antitrust Act because it interfered with price discriminations which were said by these "experts" to reflect vigorous competition. The Supreme Court of the United States in the case of *Standard Oil Co. of Indiana* v. *Federal Trade Commission*, reflected a leaning to this view.[31] In that case the Court held that a giant concern such as the Standard Oil Co. of Indiana, notwithstanding the provisions of the Robinson-Patman Act, is privileged to discriminate in price with the effect of destroying its competitors and substantially lessening competition and tending to create a monopoly, so long as such giant concern is able to show that it has accomplished all of those things in "good faith" in meeting an equally low price of a competitor.

One of the authors of the Robinson-Patman Act, Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN, Democrat, of Texas, took the position that this decision in the Standard Oil Co. of Indiana case had so crippled the Robinson-Patman Act that legislation was needed to remove the effects of that decision.

Therefore, at the opening day of the 84th Congress, he introduced a bill [32] which would have removed in large part the effect of the decision in the Standard Oil case. MR. PATMAN'S bill would have restored the law to

---

[24] S. Doc. No. 35, 77th Cong., 1st sess.—Final report and recommendations of the Temporary National Economic Committee—and it was stated:

During the last 20 years basing-point systems and variations of such systems, known technically as "zone pricing systems" and "freight equalization systems," have spread widely in American industry. Many of the products of important industries are priced by basing point or analogous systems, such as iron and steel, pig iron, cement, lime, lumber and lumber products, brick, asphalt shingles and roofing, window glass, white lead, metal lath, building tile, floor tile, gypsum plaster, bolts, nuts and rivets, cast-iron soil pipe, range boilers, valves and fittings, sewer pipe, power cable, paper, salt, sugar, corn derivatives, industrial alcohol, linseed oil, fertilizer, and others.

The elimination of such systems under existing law would involve a costly process of prosecuting separately and individually many industries, and place a heavy burden upon antitrust enforcement appropriations.

We therefore recommend that the Congress enact legislation declaring such pricing systems to be illegal.

[25] See *Corn Products Refining Co.* v. *FTC*, 324 U.S. 726; *FTC* v. *Staley Mfg. Co.*, 324 U.S. 746; *FTC* v. *Morton Salt Co.*, 334 U.S. 37.

[26] FTC Docket No. 3147, *In the Matter of Cement Industry et al*, 333 U.S. 683.

[27] App. A, pp. 229–247, H. Rept. No. 2966, 84th Cong., 2d sess., entitled "Price Discrimination and the Robinson-Patman Act," a report by the Select Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives, December 19, 1956.

See the report entitled Lathan, "The Politics of Basing Point Legislation," 15 Law & Contemp. Prob. 272 (1950). This report was reprinted in the record of the "Hearings on Price Discrimination," before the House Select Committee on Small Business, 84th Cong., 1st sess., 541–579 (1955). See also Simon, "The Case Against the Federal Trade Commission," 19 U. Chi. L. Rev. 297 (1951), and answers to that attack on the FTC, Wallace and Douglas, "Antitrust Policies and the New Attack on the Federal Trade Commission," 19 U. Chi. L. Rev. 684 (1952). Additional materials relating to that matter may be found in "Price Discrimination," H. Rept. No. 2966, 84th Cong., 2d sess. 35, 36 (1956).

[28] For articles relating to that matter, see Adelman, "Effective Competition and the Antitrust Laws," 61 Harv. L. Rev. 1289 (1948); Burns, "If You Are In Business You Are Probably Guilty," 28 Barron's Weekly 5 (1948); Clark, "Toward a Concept of Workable Competition," 30 Am. Econ. Rev. 241 (1940); Hilder, "The Attack Upon Delivered Price Systems," 14 Geo. Wash. L. Rev. 397 (1948); Kittelle & Lamb, "The Implied Conspiracy Doctrine and Delivered Pricing," 15 Law & Contemp. Prob. 227 (1950); Mason, "Current Status of the Monopoly Problem in the United States," 62 Harv. L. Rev. 1265 (1949); Mason, "Let's Stop Kicking Business Around," American magazine, May 1948; McAllister "Price Control by Law in the United States," 4 Law & Contemp. Prob. 273 (1937); Oppenheim, "Federal Antitrust Legislation: Guideposts to a Revised Antitrust Policy," 50 Mich. L. Rev. 1139–1244 (1952); Simon, "Price Discrimination to Meet Competition," U. Ill. L. Forum 575, 581–83 (1950); Smith, "Effective Competition: Hypothesis for Modernizing the Antitrust Laws," 26 N.Y.U.L. Rev. 405 (1951).

[29] S. 1008, 81st Cong.

[30] See also a speech made in the House of Representatives of the United States regarding this subject entitled "The Effect of Lobbyists' Propaganda on Our Supreme Court," (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 103, pt. 12, pp. 16159–16169). See also how reliance upon those articles by the Supreme Court of the United States was carried over and borrowed by the judges of other Federal courts for their use as a basis for their decisions in cases against the application of laws prohibiting price discrimination. *Standard Oil Co.* v. *Brown*, 238 F. 2d 54, 57 (5th Cir. 1956).

[31] 340 U.S. 231 (1951).

[32] H.R. 11, 84th Cong. H.R. 11 would have amended subsec. (b) of sec. 2 of the Robinson-Patman Act to read as follows:

Section 2(b) of an act approved October 15, 1914, as amended (15 U.S.C. 13(b)):

"SEC. 2(b). Upon proof being made, at any hearing on a complaint under this section, that there has been discrimination in price or services or facilities furnished, the burden of rebutting the prima facie case thus made by showing justification shall be upon the person charged with a violation of this section, and unless justification shall be affirmatively shown, the Commission is authorized to issue an order terminating the discrimination: *Provided, however*, That unless the effect of the discrimination may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly in any line of commerce it shall be a complete defense for a seller to show that his lower price or the furnishing of services or facilities to any purchaser or purchasers was made in good faith to meet an equally low price of a competitor, or the services or facilities furnished by a competitor."

The bill then came up for debate and vote by the House on June 11, 1956, at which time it passed overwhelmingly by the vote of 394 yeas, 3 nays, and 35 not voting (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 102, pt. 7, pp. 10051–10052). The matter then was considered by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary and was reported favorably by that committee in Senate Report No. 2814 on July 27, 1956. But since that was the date on which the Senate adjourned sine die for the 84th Congress, the bill failed to receive consideration on the floor of the Senate. The rules provide that a report of that nature cannot be taken up on the same day it is made without unanimous consent. Since Senator Bricker, of

the point where price discriminations, proven to have the effect of substantially lessening competition and tending to create a monopoly in any line of commerce, could not be defended by the utilization of the "good faith" proviso.

Mr. PATMAN's bill passed the House of Representatives on June 11, 1956, by a vote of 394 to 3. It failed of passage in the Senate because it was not taken up in that body until the closing days of the session and unanimous consent was required for it to be considered. One Senator objected, and, therefore, the bill was not considered in the Senate. Since then, similar bills have been introduced, but none has reached the floor of either the House or the Senate for consideration.

In 1956, when the provisions of Mr. PATMAN's bill (H.R. 11) and an identical bill (H.R. 1840) were being presented to the House of Representatives for consideration, the House Committee on the Judiciary reported that—

"Price discriminations favoring preferred buyers present a danger to the competitive enterprise system which is inconsistent with the policy of the price discrimination statute. Firms can abuse their superior market position and engage in discriminatory practices that eliminate small suppliers and small retailers from the competitive scene. In practical effect the law as presently construed allows the private interest of a discriminator to outweigh the public interest in preserving competitive opportunity at all levels of business activity. H.R. 1840 would reassert that the public interest in protecting the economy against discriminations which may substantially lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly must prevail over private interests served by discrimination." [33]

When no legislation developed out of these efforts to strengthen the Robinson-Patman Act against the practice of price discrimination, there appeared to be an upsurge in the use of the practice. Many complaints poured in to the Small Business Committees of the Senate and the House about large, multiple-market sellers using the practice of price discrimination with the effect of eliminating competition.

In the meantime, small business firms victimized by these price discriminations have struggled to protect themselves to the extent provided under existing law. A small wholesale baking firm, doing business in Santa Rosa, N. Mex., found that a large competitor doing business at locations in several States, including Santa Rosa, was selling bread at discriminatory prices and at prices at levels below cost in Santa Rosa, with damaging results to the small baker in that community. The small business firm brought suit under not only subsection (a) of section 2 of the Robinson-Patman Act but also under section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act. The latter section of the law makes it unlawful for a seller to sell at unreasonably low prices. In that instance, the small firm was successful, and its success was sustained by the Supreme Court of the United States in 1954.[34] However, further efforts by other small business firms to utilize section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act have met with failure.

On January 20, 1958, the Supreme Court of the United States by a 5 to 4 decision held that section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act is available only for criminal prosecutions by the U.S. Department of Justice, and, therefore, cannot be utilized by small business firms in private litigation for damages or for injunctions.[35] The reasoning underlying the Court's decisions in these cases was that section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act is not a part of the Federal antitrust laws. Immediately the chairman of the House Small Business Committee, Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN, Democrat, of Texas, introduced H.R. 10243 (85th Cong.), which would have redefined the term "antitrust laws" appearing in section 1 of the Clayton Act, so as to include section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act. No action was taken on that proposal.

Before the conclusion of the 85th Congress, the rising tide of complaints from small business firms about price discriminations prompted the House Small Business Committee to create a special subcommittee to look into the matter. That special subcommittee held hearings regarding small business problems stemming from price discrimination practices in the distribution of dairy products. The subcommittee has continued its activities in the 86th Congress and has made two reports to the House of Representatives on its investigations and hearings.[36] In these reports, the subcommittee made findings that small and independent processors and distributors of dairy products have been providing a substantial amount of price competition at low, nondiscriminatory prices. The large, competing, multimarket processors and distributors met that competition by selling at discriminatory prices in various markets, and, in some instances, in making sales at prices, apparently, below cost. The subcommittee concluded that these discriminatory pricing practices of the large processors and distributors threaten the continued existence of large numbers of small and independent processors and distributors of dairy products.

Subcommittee No. 5 of the House Small Business Committee in the 85th Congress, and again in the 86th Congress, has made investigations and studies of price discrimination practices in the distribution of various food items. In the course of these investigations and studies a large amount of testimony and other evidence has been received to the effect that price discrimination practices in the sale and distribution of food is widespread. Representatives of small and independent food distributors testified that the large corporate food retailers are inducing and receiving the benefits of these price discriminations with devastating effects on their small and independent competitors.

Quite recently the Federal Trade Commission issued a report entitled, "Economic Inquiry Into Food Marketing," in which it was stated that during the period from 1948 to 1958, approximately 100,000 independent food retailers disappeared.

Members of Congress, mindful of these circumstances, have introduced a number of legislative proposals designed to strengthen Federal legislation against the practice of price discriminations. These legislative proposals are pending.[37]

The first of these bills, introduced in the House of Representatives at the beginning of the 86th Congress (H.R. 11) was designed to plug up the loophole in the Robinson-Patman Act made by the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in 1951 in the case of the *Standard Oil Co.* v. *Federal Trade Commission*, 340 U.S. 231. Another, H.R. 8841, would empower the Federal Trade Commission to enter temporary cease and desist orders where it would be in the public interest to do so, pending the resolution of long, drawn out litigation against price' discrimination practices. H.R. 10235 would amend the Federal Trade Commission Act by adding a new section containing the substantive law now appearing in section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act, and, in that connection, providing that the small business firms victimized through violations of the substantive provisions would be entitled to proceed with private litigation for damages and for injunctions.

Committees of Congress have not acted on these proposals. However, the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce did hold hearings on H.R. 10235 on June 16 and 17, 1960.

From these circumstances, it is readily apparent that Congress in 1960 is faced with and troubled by a problem not unlike the problem it faced and acted upon in 1914 and again in 1936; that is, the problem of price discriminations which have the effect of substantially lessening competition and tending to create monopolies. Incident to this problem facing the Congress is the question of whether we want monopoly in this country, even when it results from acts and practices carried on in good faith. Also to be considered are the arguments of those who use the practice of price discrimination to the effect that price discrimination is a form of vigorous competition and should not be interfered with by laws which prohibit price discrimination. Congress is called upon to weigh these arguments against the facts which at this juncture appear to inform the Congress that the practice of price discrimination is anticompetitive. As carried on in many sections of the country and in many industries today, it appears no different in its effects from the price discriminations previously practiced by the Standard Oil Trust in earlier years. The effects have been shown to susbtantially lessen competition and tend to create monopolies.

In conclusion, personally I think that if Congress at this late date should find that all it has learned heretofore about the practice if price discrimination is wholly inaccurate, and that instead of price discrimination havng the effect of substantally lessening competition and tending to create monopolies is, in fact, a competitive practice, then Congress would be justified in repealing the Robinson-Patman Act and all of the Federal laws which prohibit price discrimination. On the contrary, if Congress should confirm its previous findings about the deleterious effects of price discrimination on competition, then it should make the laws which prohibit the use of that practice, more effective.

Reaffirmation by the Congress of its earlier findings on these matters would help to make more effective our antitrust legislation against price discriminations. We should have more of what is good and less of what is bad.

Ohio, Republican, objected to the bill receiving consideration, he prevented it from being taken up.

On January 3, 1957, at the opening of the 85th Congress, Representative PATMAN, Democrat, of Texas, reintroduced the same bill in the House, and likewise Senator KEFAUVER introduced again a companion bill in the Senate at the same time. By coincidence, Mr. PATMAN's bill in the House in the 85th Congress also bore the number H.R. 11 and Senator KEFAUVER's bill in the Senate the number S. 11. During March, April, and May 1957, the Antitrust Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, held hearings on S. 11 and reported the bill to the full committee. The full committee did not act on the bill before the 1st session of the 85th Congress ended. The House Judiciary Committee did not hold hearings on H.R. 11 in the 85th Congress.

[33] H. Rept. 2202, 84th Cong.

[34] *Mead's Fine Bread Co.* v. *Moore*, 348 U.S. 115.

[35] *National Milk Co.* v. *Carnation Co.*, 355 U.S. 373, and *Safeway Stores* v. *Vance*, 355 U.S. 389.

[36] H. Rept. 2713 (85th Cong.), and H. Rept. 714 (86th Cong.).

[37] The bills referred to include the following: H.R. 11, H.R. 212, H.R. 2215, H.R. 8841, and H.R. 10235 (86th Cong.)

REVISING IMMIGRATION LAWS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ADDONIZIO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the splendid platform adopted by the Democratic National Convention contains the following wise and forthright section on immigration:

We shall adjust our immigration, nationality and refugee policies to eliminate discrimination and to enable members of scattered families abroad to be united with relatives already in our midst.

The national-origins quota system of limiting immigration contradicts the founding principles of this Nation. It is inconsistent with our belief in the rights of man. This system was instituted after World War I as a policy of deliberate discrimination by a Republican administration and Congress.

The revision of immigration and nationality laws we seek will implement our belief that enlightened immigration, naturalization and refugee policies and humane administration of them are important aspects of our foreign policy.

These laws will bring greater skills to our land, reunite families, permit the United States to meet its fair share of world programs of rescue and rehabilitation, and take advantage of immigration as an important factor in the growth of the American economy.

In this World Refugee Year it is our hope to achieve admission of our fair share of refugees. We will institute policies to alleviate suffering among the homeless wherever we are able to extend our aid.

We must remove the distinctions between native-born and naturalized citizens to assure full protection of our laws to all. There is no place in the United States for second-class citizenship.

The protections provided by due process, right of appeal, and statutes of limitation, can be extended to noncitizens without hampering the security of our Nation.

We commend the Democratic Congress for the initial steps that have recently been taken toward liberalizing changes in immigration law. However, this should not be a piecemeal project and we are confident that a Democratic President in cooperation with Democratic Congresses will again implant a humanitarian and liberal spirit in our Nation's immigration and citizenship policies.

I have repeatedly called the attention of this House to the need for making basic changes in our immigration law, as proposed in the Democratic platform. While the lack of substantial progress in this important field of our national policy is deplorable, nevertheless I have been heartened by the number of limited improvements that have been enacted in recent years. The outstanding examples are the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 and Public Law 85–316, approved September 11, 1957.

The Refugee Relief Act made it possible for over 200,000 people to enter the United States outside the quota limits of the McCarran-Walter Act.

Public Law 85–316 has made it possible for other special classes of aliens to enter, notwithstanding the restrictions of our basic law.

The present Congress has seen some humanitarian improvements even if they are of limited applicability. The alien orphan adoption provision and tubercular alien provision of Public Law 85–316 were extended. Public Law 85–363, passed last year, was designed to reunite families both by improving the method of allocating visas among the preference groups within each quota and by granting nonquota status to many aliens who had been on waiting lists for a number of years. Public Law 86–648 is a modest contribution to our participation in World Refugee Year. It expands the Attorney General's authority to parole refugees into the United States and to grant them permanent resident status. It is a deep disappointment to me that the unfortunate Italian nationals who have been displaced from their ancestral homes in Tunisia are not eligible for entry under this new refugee law. A measure providing for the issuance of 5,000 special nonquota immigrant visas to these refugees and their families was introduced by me in the Congress after reading the moving report on this tragic problem made by the Honorable Juvenal Marchisio, National Chairman of the American Committee on Italian Migration. Surely, the plight of these people, so graphically described by Judge Marchisio, merits our compassion and assistance.

Despite the shortcomings and limitations of these measures, I have gladly supported them, but emergency legislation is not sufficient to mitigate the harshness of the quota system. As the Democratic platform declared, "this should not be a piecemeal project." We must enact basic amendments to our immigration code—amendments which would eliminate completely the unjust, discriminatory national origins provisions from the law.

The Refugee Relief Act was designed to take care of an unusual situation to be sure but it demonstrated that this country is capable of absorbing fresh blood over and above what the national origins quota provides. The quota after all is not holy writ, as some would like to think. It is not the ideal, the perfect one and only method of determining how many immigrants shall enter the United States or who they shall be. It is in fact an anachronism, granting even that it made some sense in 1924 when it was adopted. It is based on a theory of racial superiority and inferiority which we have long since rejected. It would have our quotas set, from now until eternity, presumably, on the basis of the racial composition of the United States in 1920—40 years ago. Moreover, the racial homogeneity principle of the national origins system is not being realized in actual practice because most of the quota visas available to natives of the preferred countries, such as Great Britain are not being used, while we have at the same time had very large immigration from Western Hemisphere countries which do not come within the strictures of the quota at all.

With each passing year the national origins concept becomes more ridiculous. It will most certainly be replaced with a more realistic system some day—it is just a matter of time. This should not be looked upon as just another "all in due time" matter. It is inevitable that the national origins principle will be abandoned. Inevitability, however, should not be used as an excuse for not facing up to the problem.

I have long sponsored legislation providing for a complete revision of the discriminatory and inequitable Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 against which I voted. Among its other accomplishments, my bill would replace the national origins quota system with a unified quota which would establish standards of individual qualifications, rather than race, for determining the admissibility of immigrants. This system of selection would be a realistic substitute for the national origins quota system, which is so heavily weighted in favor of those who have no need or desire to come to the United States. To illustrate: Of the total quota authorized under the Immigration and Nationality Act, almost 42.2 percent goes to Great Britain and Northern Ireland and this allotment is largely unused. Italy has 3.6 percent of the total quota, or 5,666 persons. This contrasts with the last two decades of the 19th Century when about 960,000 immigrants—including my own parents—entered the United States from Italy. In the first decade of this century, 2,045,877 persons came here from Italy, an annual average of over 200,000. During the same 10-year period, over 167,000 Greeks migrated to this country, an average of over 16,000 a year; under the McCarran-Walter Act 308 Greeks are entitled to enter the United States each year.

In addition to providing a substitute for the national origins formula, the legislation advocated by me would effect other needed reforms, including abolishing certain loss of nationality provisions which apply only to naturalized citizens; establish better procedures to review deportation and exclusion orders; and increase efficiency by creating a single agency to administer the immigration laws instead of splitting these functions between the Justice Department and the State Department.

The most important change offered by this bill is, of course, the unified quota system to substitute for the national origins provisions of the present law. I have explained the workings of this system a number of times on this floor, as have others. It is sufficient at this time to say that an apparently reasonable and workable substitute has been offered in place of the present formula which so many Americans find objectionable. It should be given a chance to stand or fall under our democratic process.

Ours is, after all, a Nation of immigrants. Were it not for immigration there would be no United States. Washington would still be largely a swamp, New York City, a primeval forest, and Chicago, a spot on the tall grass prairie whose silence was broken only by the sound of the wind and the occasional hoofbeat of buffalo.

Immigration is not a necessary evil which must be kept to a minimum. It

is a positive factor which has contributed to our growth as a nation. Andrew Carnegie, Joseph Pulitzer and Albert Einstein, were immigrants who contributed greatly to our national treasury of human achievement. The contributions of the 40 million other immigrants of the last hundred years are no less important.

No responsible person today advocates a complete abandonment of our regulations over immigration. Reasonable qualitative and quantitative controls must be maintained. All that is asked is that these regulations be shorn of their few—but basic—inequitable and racially discriminatory principles. It is most unfortunate that during the past 7 years we have lacked strong and sustained executive leadership in effecting revision of our immigration policy but I look forward to early action in the next administration when a "Democratic President in cooperation with Democratic Congresses will again implant a humanitarian and liberal spirit in our Nation's immigration and citizenship policies."

THE REPUBLICAN PARTY'S PLATFORM STATEMENT ON HOUSING

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ADDONIZIO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, I have just finished reading the Republican Party's platform statement on housing. I find it to be a hypocritical farce tailored to fool the people.

The statement uses journalistic techniques to convey the impression that the Republican Party is dedicated "to achieving the national objective of a decent home in a suitable environment for every American."

Two elements are missing from their pious and pompous analysis of the housing crisis: Specifically what they are going to do about it in the future and specifically what they have failed to do about it in the past.

Unless a Democrat comes to the White House in January, the "suitable environment" of the Republican platform, will continue to be a slum for 22 million Americans.

Twice major housing legislation was passed by the Congress and twice it was vetoed. A third bill was signed only because the Democrats salvaged it from a Republican veto. We felt we would take what we could get until we changed the occupancy of the White House.

The already critical problem of housing was further complicated when the administration resorted to a tight money, high interest policy. These rates sabotaged the program of the Federal Housing Administration, an agency which some Republicans thought was "socialistic."

Another index of the housing situation under the Republicans is the frequency of foreclosures. The Federal Home Loan Bank Board's estimate of nonfarm real estate forclosures on one- to four-family dwellings has increased an amazing 145 percent during the nearly 8 years of Republican administration.

The problem will get worse before it gets better. If the expected growth of families continues in the sixties, the Nation must either "double up" or must bring the annual rate of home production up to 2 million units a year.

Among the many objections raised in vetoing the housing bills, the President stated that the programs for the elderly, urban renewal and low-rent public housing were either "entirely unnecessary" or "excessive."

In the light of these actions, the Republicans continue to paint a glowing picture of what will happen in the housing situation if RICHARD NIXON becomes President.

Although the Republicans platform refers to "stubborn and deep seated problems" in the way of decent housing, I submit, Mr. Speaker, that these problems are the Republicans themselves.

The fact is that they just do not believe in alleviating the housing crisis by Federal assistance because they know this position would lose them votes. It is as simple as that.

The Democratic platform promise of "the right of every family to a decent home" is merely the carrying on of a Democratic belief, not the coining of a Madison Avenue slogan to substitute for a lack of conviction about what is needed in housing.

The Democrats, in their program to meet the challenges of the new frontier of the sixties, support a housing construction program of more than 2 million homes primarily for middle and low income families.

We favor special mortgage assistance with low interest rates, long-term mortgage periods and reduced down payments for the home building industry.

We also support substantial low-rent public housing and direct Government loans for housing for older people.

We propose a 10-year program to eliminate slums and blight and for the restoration of cities and depressed areas.

Our program is clear. It spells out in detail what we believe as Democrats and how we intend to reach our goal. We only regret that the Republican platform writers did not have the same candor.

METHODIST CHURCH LEADERS IN INDIANA CALL FOR REPEAL OF RIGHT-TO-WORK LAW

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of Members of Congress a statement by a group of prominent ministers of the Methodist Church in Indiana calling for repeal of Indiana's so-called right-to-work law.

I believe that many fairminded citizens will agree with the statement of these churchmen that "in the name of freedom the present right-to-work law denies freedom, compelling, as it does, all of industry to observe the open shop, thus negating free collective bargaining."

This law has been in effect in Indiana since 1957. It has had a fair trial. Now, this group of Methodist ministers has reached the conclusion that by destroying union security, the so-called right-to-work law creates an unbalance between labor and management harmful to the worker because his collective bargaining position is weakened, and equally harmful to management because the union cannot guarantee that nonunion members will honor a no-strike pledge in a labor-management contract.

METHODIST MINISTERS FROM THROUGHOUT INDIANA SIGN STATEMENT

The statement was signed by Rev. Lynn Garth, pastor of the Stull Memorial Methodist Church of South Bend, Ind., a highly respected minister of the Methodist Church in my State, who is chairman of Christian Social Relations of the 1960 Northwest Indiana Annual Conference of the Methodist Church, and a group of other Indiana Methodist churchmen. These include Rev. A. Summers Clark, of Westfield; Rev. Robert Smith, of Indianapolis; Rev. Vernon Bigler, of Terre Haute; Rev. Warren Anderson, of Dyer; Rev. Edward Boase, of South Bend; Rev. Robert Fields, of Kentland; Rev. Warren S. Saunders, of Goshen; Rev. Lyle Loomis, of West Lafayette; and Rev. Victor E. Ramsey, of Boswell.

I believe it is pertinent to note also that the statement of these clergymen supports the collective bargaining plank of the Democratic Party platform for 1960, adopted at Los Angeles, which pledged repeal of the Federal authorization in the Taft-Hartley Act for all right-to-work laws.

As a member of the Methodist Church in Indiana myself, I am particularly pleased to insert the statement of these Methodist clergymen in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The statement follows:

TEXT OF METHODIST MINISTERS' STATEMENT

We believe that members of the clergy are obligated by their calling to speak strongly and forthrightly on all issues affecting the rights of man. To react timidly in the face of controversy is moral and social cowardice. To speak with honest conviction on issues inherent in the so-called right-to-work law enacted by the Indiana Legislature in 1957 is our desire and the intent of this statement.

We believe in the democratic process in labor-management relations. We believe that in the name of freedom the present right-to-work law denies freedom, compelling, as it does, all of industry to observe the open shop, thus negating free collective bargaining.

We are particularly concerned over an evergrowing trend to sell ideas and legislation by "labels." Advertised as protection for a minority, the so-called right-to-work law is, in effect, a restriction of the freedoms of organized labor and management. We oppose the efforts of proponents of this law who proclaim themselves as the protectors of the rights of the worker, when, in fact, they have molded a legal instrument detrimental to the worker. By destroying union security, the so-called right-to-work laws creates an unbalance between labor and management harmful to the worker because his collective bargaining position is weakened, and equally harmful to management because the union cannot guarantee that nonunion members will honor a no-strike pledge in a labor-management contract.

Significant in evaluating the true purpose of this legislation is the list of organizations which supported its passage: the Indiana State Chamber of Commerce; the Associated Employers of Indiana; the Indiana Manufacturers Association; the Indianapolis Chamber of Commerce; and the Indiana Right-to-Work Committee, a group supported by industry contributions. These organizations are acknowledged as self-interest associations. Their primary purpose is to work for the interests of the employer. However commendable their other programs for Indiana might be, it is improper to translate this self-interest to a guise of protecting the rights of workers.

TERM "RIGHT-TO-WORK" MISLEADING

The misleading nature of the term "right-to-work" has been recognized by the various States where the issue has been on the ballot as a referendum. The States of Washington, Ohio, Idaho, and California refused to permit proponents of this measure to use the words "right-to-work" on the ballot because the phrase is deceptive. This law guarantees no one the right to work or the right to any particular job.

The arguments for the so-called "right-to-work" law have no real basis in fact. The Indiana "right-to-work" law has not attracted new industry that added to the prosperity of the Hoosier State, and has not curtailed the number of strikes.

Although proponents of the present law have falsely convinced many persons that it is a step toward the control of corruption, we find nothing in the present right-to-work law that can prevent corrupt labor practices. We recognize that corruption has entered the union movement in some few instances and in this respect we strongly urge the use of existing legislation to combat corruption in the labor movement.

U.S. SUPREME COURT HAS UPHELD UNION SHOP

Those who honestly support this law because they believe it to be morally valid, actually ask a question on the meaning of freedom. At what point do you decide the limitations of a person's right to do as he wishes when there exists the very real question of his obligations to his fellow man? Specifically, we get to the question of whether union membership as a condition to employment is a violation of man's personal or constitutional liberties. The answer is simple. The U.S. Supreme Court has unanimously declared that the union shop does not violate the Bill of Rights or any other American constitutional freedoms.

Government, consequently, has three courses of action. By legislation, it could compel the union shop. But even labor doesn't want this. It can compel the open shop, as has happened with the so-called right-to-work law. The third course, is no action at all—the Government can keep hands off. In other words, if a company and a union agree voluntarily that all employees represented by the union must become members, the Government would leave them free to do so. Traditionally, this middle-of-the-road approach has been the American legislative policy.

ISSUE OF UNION OR NONUNION SHOP SHOULD NOT BE DETERMINED BY GOVERNMENT

We seek freedom for laboring people. We point out that certain types of compulsion are not incompatible with freedom in a complex society. Whenever people work together in groups, decisions made and rules adopted by the majority must be binding upon all. Collective bargaining is posited upon the democratic framework in which management and representatives of a majority of the workers jointly reach agreement incumbent upon all. The issue of nonunion or union shop should be one item which is open to free collective bargaining and not determined by Government. We believe that the right-to-work law should be repealed in order that workers may be neither compelled to work in an open shop nor compelled to work in a union shop except through democratically determined labor-management contracts.

TEACHERS' SALARIES

Mr. KASEM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. KASEM. Mr. Speaker, I address the House today on the matter of teachers' salary and pertaining to our responsibility. To many things we attribute the fact that our Nation has accomplished the highest material standard of living in the world. The free enterprise system wherein a person may give free reign to his creative abilities, the bountiful endowments of nature that gave us a broad new land, rich in resources and fertile in the temperate zone, and other things are given much credit for our great accomplishments. Two factors that were paramount in the creation of this high standard of material achievement, I call to our attention for the purpose of making my point this day. We are a nation, and as such we believe in free public education.

First is the fact that the Founding Fathers in every way set out that we were a nation, and not a confederation of states. In fact, the whole history of the formation of our Constitution and Nation led us to the compelling necessity of rejecting the idea of forming an alliance or association of states that resulted in less than a nation. This idea is manifest in almost every line of the Constitution, in the placement of powers in the Federal Government of regulating all matters of interstate concern. Not only does the Constitution refer to the United States as a nation, but it is so in the heart of every American. Can you find one who places allegiance to his State above his allegiance to the Nation?

Indeed, it is this fact above all others that caused us to develop into the great industrial and world power that we are. Within the confines of that Nation were all the elements necessary to produce a great economy unfettered by State lines to inhibit the interchange of goods, ideas, communications, and persons. We had a courageous and progressively oriented pioneering people confronted with vast underdeveloped areas unburdened with the feudalistic suppression from which they fled. Individual creativeness and ingenuity was never provided with so abundant an opportunity.

That same Constitution threw out its cloak of protection over the liberties we now regard as basic in the new territories as well as the old, and the mind of man was free to operate and communicate within its fullest capacity. But, alas, with all these glories, the task could not have been performed without the development of understanding and skills.

It is toweringly apparent that one of the essential steps to bring us along the way was our commitment to a system of universal education—even mandatory—so that the opportunity for understanding and the development of skill would be available to all. But the benefits of education extend far beyond the material. Indeed, that may be only incidental to the process of education. For material benefits are diminished and rendered a nullity if there is not the capacity to appreciate and enjoy the world in which we live. The chief aim of education is the broadening of the mind and the extension of horizons.

In yet another sense, education is the passing of the accumulated learning of man collectively and historically to man individually.

At the core of this is one individual. The teacher. That most sacred of ministries who tills and nourishes the mind that it may blossom to its fullest. The teacher is the giver of the abundant life. The teacher gives the firmest security of self-reliance by the conquest of ignorance.

No structure of stone nor mortar, no electronic device, no book nor journal, and no visual aid can be more than a tool of the teacher. It can never replace the teacher.

The doctor may cure our ills, the lawyer may protect our rights, the engineer may build our structures, the scientists may explore the unknown, but each is the product of our teachers. Each is a human being with a life outside his profession, and so it is with the teacher. It is this truth that makes the teacher the most indispensable element of the most indispensable of all human programs for the more abundant life—education. And, it is this that makes it necessary to provide for the nonprofessional needs of the teacher. It is this truth that entitles the teachers to great and honorable recognition and to share commensurate with their contribution in the material benefits their profession plays so important a part in creating.

Who shall pay the teacher? Teachers should receive their compensation from the general public that benefits from the system built around them. It is well established that the local government of the area they teach in, as well as the State government, has the duty of contributing to her compensation. But does not the teacher in a sister State serve me as directly as the teacher in my own community or the teacher in another part of my own State? Does not her teaching as much improve my country and my fellow citizens? Does not her teaching go to those who will buy my products and sell me theirs, those whom I will defend and who will defend me, those who can and will come to my State, as well as to whose State I have the right to go? Have I not the same interest in the child of Mississippi and Vermont that I have in the child around the corner? These questions are undeserving of replies because the answers are so patently in the affirmative. Then, it must follow that my duty and my interest requires that I contribute to those teachers' pay.

Arguments that this threatens the sacred cow of local control are specious and irrelevant. Specious because there is no such threat. Irrelevant because there is

no inherent relationship between control and contribution to compensation.

We must act at once to meet the challenges that face us from the ancient tyrannies in ever-changing forms that would suppress and diminish our liberties—challenges that will be forever with us, and come from within and without our boundaries. Challenges that only an enlightened populace can recognize and repel.

Our indebtedness to our teachers is incalculably great and is owing from all levels of our government. We must recognize this fact at once, and we of the National Government must proceed forthwith in all haste to make our contribution in substantial quantity to expedite the educational processes of the entire Nation by providing adequately for the teacher.

SMALL BUSINESS AND THE NATION'S FREEDOMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, never in the country's history has there been such a wave of bankruptcies as is sweeping the Nation today. The great toll of bankruptcies which took place in the dark days of 1933, even when the economic foundations of the Nation seemed to be crumbling, set a record which many of us thought would stand for all time. Yet that record was almost doubled in the fiscal year just ended.

An era of prosperity? We hear it constantly said that these recent years of big-business Government have given us unprecedented prosperity. But if this is true, how is it that independent business firms are failing at an ever-increasing rate? How is it that a few vast corporate empires, whose domains extend not only across this Nation but across most of the non-Communist world, are rapidly taking over control of the productive wealth of this country?

Today I want to say some things about small business and large freedoms. I hope the Members will consider these things most carefully in the coming political campaigns. Are the things I wish to say political? Let me answer this way:

POLITICAL DECISIONS MUST BE MADE TO SAVE SMALL BUSINESS

The Declaration of Independence was a political decision. If we maintain any of the ideals expressed in that political decision of 180 years ago, it will be because we make some right political decisions today and in the year ahead.

None of us doubts that one of the main purposes of government is to help business. The purpose is to help all of our citizens in ways which best enable them to advance themselves economically. To do this, political decisions must be made, or must be neglected at the Nation's peril. The ways in which the Federal Government designs its tax system directly affect the well-being of all, and the way chosen largely determines which businesses succeed and which fail. The ways in which the Federal Government manages its money system, the ways in which it manages its patent system, the ways it designs and enforces trade and antitrust laws are all political decisions which play a leading role in determining whether small business survives and prospers or whether the economic affairs of the Nation are taken over by a few corporate giants. The ways in which the Federal Government dispenses its vast subsidies for research, development, and experimentation also play a leading role, as does the way in which it divides the money it spends—and this is equal to the wealth of empires—for all of the many industrial and consumer products it buys for defense purposes.

One reason that I hope the Members will talk about small business in their political campaigns is that I think this is the only way the voters will get the facts. The commercial organs of communication will be proclaiming, as they are today, that all is well with small business, and that the present big-business Government has done all kinds of wonderful and tender-hearted things to nourish and care for small business. As chairman of the Select Committee on Small Business in the House of Representatives, I have had the not-very-pleasant experience of seeing developments that are not good. It has been my experience to learn of some very ugly facts which do not support the claims and propaganda.

SMALL BUSINESS IN THE COMING POLITICAL CAMPAIGNS

Another reason why I hope you will talk about small business is that I hope all of the Members, both Democrats and Republicans, will make some resolves and promises that they intend to keep. The rapid changes which have been taking place in the organization of the country's economic affairs are of deep concern, not just to small business people, but to everybody. Our political freedoms are at stake as much as our economic freedoms.

In criticizing, as I have, and as I expect to continue doing, the way big business has handled its stewardship of the Federal Government over these past 7½ years, let me say again that I have never claimed all virtue for the Democratic Party and all fault for the Republican Party. While it is true that the previous Democratic administrations of President Truman, President Roosevelt, and President Wilson took some giant strides toward the ideal of fair and equal opportunity for business enterprises of all sizes, large and small alike, the Democratic administrations never did all they should have done—and I said so at the time—at least I said so during the Roosevelt and Truman administrations. Those administrations adopted at times policies which were bad in my view, and I criticized them at the time. I could not do less than criticize the bad policies of this Republican administration.

Just what is happening to small business? Let me describe the trends. Then, I will venture to suggest some of the causes of these trends.

BANKRUPTCIES NOW HIGHEST IN HISTORY

In the fiscal year 1960, as I have pointed out, more business firms, farmers, and individuals filed bankruptcy petitions than ever before in our history. Some 110,034 bankruptcies were filed, a figure which compares with the peak year of the great depression of 70,049 bankruptcies. Furthermore, the trend is not down. It is up. In the fiscal year just ended, there were approximately 10,000 more bankruptcies than in the previous fiscal year, and that year covered a long period of business recession.

During the 7 fiscal years that this administration has been in office, there have been 550,000 bankruptcies—almost 3 times the number of bankruptcies which occurred in the previous 7 years of Mr. Truman's administration.

As I go along, I will insert statistical tables in the RECORD so that there may be no doubt as to the source of my figures.

Number of bankruptcy petitions filed in the United States

7 fiscal years 1947–53	201,246
7 fiscal years 1954–60	550,761

Source: Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts.

The rate of small business failures has gone up by leaps and bounds since this administration took office. Dun & Bradstreet reports that during the past calendar year there were more than 14,000 failures among the business firms which it lists. These were all small firms though they were among the better established and more substantial small firms. Dun & Bradstreet does not list all of the business firms in the country. On the contrary, it listed last year 2,746,000 business firms in operation, whereas the Department of Commerce reported that all of the business firms in operation totaled almost 5 million.

Now what is the rate of small business failures, considering that there have been more business firms in some years than in others? Dun & Bradstreet reported that failures last year amounted to 52 firms for each 10,000 firms in operation. As I have indicated, this rate has gone up by leaps and bounds. During the first 7 years of this administration, the average rate of business failure was 46 failures for each 10,000 firms, or almost twice the average rate of the 7 previous years.

Number of business failures, 1946–59

Year	Number of failures	Failure rate per 10,000 listed concerns
1946	1,129	5
1947	3,474	14
1948	5,250	20
1949	9,246	34
1950	9,162	34
1951	8,058	31
1952	7,611	29
Total failures and average rate, 7 years	43,930	24
1953	8,862	33
1954	11,086	42
1955	10,969	42
1956	12,686	48
1957	13,739	52
1958	14,964	56
1959	14,053	52
Total failures and average rate, 7 years	86,359	46

Source: Dun & Bradstreet, Inc.

It has been a distressing thing to me that on previous occasions both the Small Business Administration and some of the Members on the other side of the aisle have attempted to minimize this increasing rate of business failures by comparing it to the average of 100 years. What poor reasoning it is to think that a yearly failure rate of 52 firms for each 10,000 firms in operation is really not so bad because during the Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover administrations the failure rate averaged in excess of 100 firms for each 10,000. Those were the years when the great national chains were sweeping across the country, squeezing out tens of thousands of independent merchants and wholesalers, and when the huge manufacturing corporations were rooting out tens of thousands of smaller manufacturing firms. Surely we have learned enough to know where this kind of thing ends. But then I wonder?

FEW CORPORATE GIANTS GAINING CONTROL OF THE NATION'S ASSETS

In 1952, the corporate giants in the manufacturing fields had already acquired a lion's share of all of the corporate assets. Those corporations with $100 million of assets, or more, had in that year, according to official reports of the Federal Trade Commission and the Securities Exchange Commission, 52 percent of all the assets of corporations engaged in manufacturing. By the end of last year, 1959, corporations of this giant size had increased their hold over the assets of the country to 62 percent. If this trend is not stopped, it will mean that a few giant corporations will control all of the manufacturing of the country in less than 20 years. It will also mean these corporations will control most, if not all, of the distribution and retail business of the country. Many of these giants already have their own distribution systems, their chains of retail outlets, their own transportation and utility systems, their own mines, and, in many instances, their own consumer finance agencies; and they are rapidly advancing in all of these fields.

Growth of assets of firms with $100,000,000 and over of assets compared with growth of assets of firms of all sizes, 1952–60

Year (4th quarter)	Total (all asset sizes)	Firms with $100,000,000 assets and over	Firms $100,000,000 and over as percent of total
	Millions	*Millions*	*Percent*
1952	$165,965	$85,502	51.5
1953	171,241	92,797	54.2
1955	190,086	108,625	57.1
1957	221,534	131,993	59.6
1959	244,175	150,250	61.5
1st quarter 1960	247,745	155,313	62.7
Percentage change, 1952–60	49.3	81.6	

Source: Federal Trade Commission and Securities and Exchange Commission, Quarterly Financial Report of Manufacturing Corporations.

In the utilities, transportation, and distribution fields, the concentration of business during this administration has proceeded at no less a pace. Recently the Federal Trade Commission made a survey to see what had happened in food retailing in this country between 1948 and 1958. The FTC's report shows that corporate chains having 11 or more retail stores increased their share of the Nation's food sales from 29 percent in 1948 to 44 percent in 1958, 10 years later. In the same period, sales by independent retailers dropped from 58 percent of the Nation's total to 25 percent.

BIG BUSINESS PROFITS UP, SMALL BUSINESS PROFITS DOWN

Consider what has happened in the profits picture. Since 1952 the smaller manufacturing firms, those with less than $1 million of assets, have increased their sales by 20 percent, though their profits have gone up only 2 percent. The big firms, those with more than $100 million of assets, have increased their sales by 63 percent and their profits by 77 percent. Everywhere we find increasing big business profits and big business taking over more and more of the productive resources of the Nation, and small business losing out:

Percent change in sales and profits of manufacturing corporations, 1952–59

	Sales	Profits after taxes
Firms with assets of—		
Under $1,000,000	+20	+2
Over $100,000,000	+63	+77

Source: Federal Trade Commission and Securities and Exchange Commission, "Quarterly Financial Report, U.S. Manufacturing Corporations."

Why is small business losing out? The answer lies in big-business favoritism in all of the vital business policies of this administration. I will invite the Members' attention to each of these, but first it must be acknowledged that, to an important extent, prosperity for small business is tied to the general prosperity of the Nation. And the general prosperity of the Nation is not good.

THE RICH ARE GETTING RICHER

We are hearing a great deal these days about the increase in real income per family, which has been brought about during the Eisenhower Administration. But we do not hear about the very deceptive aspects of this average, nor the fact that this administration has shifted income from the great mass of consumers over to the families of great wealth. True, the average family income of the country has gone up while the rich have gotten richer and the poor have gotten poorer.

Earlier this year, the National Bureau of Economic Research released the results of a survey of national wealth which found their way into very few newspapers. The New York Times, which has never been guilty of overemphasizing news about favoritism of the rich nor guilty of reporting at all on the doings in high finance, mentioned the National Bureau's survey under the heading "The Rich Are Getting Richer."

The simple fact is that the Roosevelt and Truman administrations brought about a more equal distribution of the wealth of the country; and the Eisenhower administration immediately set out on a counterrevolution, and has been concentrating the wealth in the hands of the few again. Said the New York Times:

> The nationwide survey disclosed that during the 20 years that began with the stock-market crash and ended in 1949 there had been a period of more equal distribution of personal holdings. The reversal of this trend was clearly evident in 1953, the study reported, when 1.6 percent of the country's population held 30 percent of the Nation's personal wealth.
>
> The study reported that the same year this minority top-income group "owned at least 80 percent of the corporate stock held in the personal sector, virtually all of the State and local government bonds and between 10 and 35 percent of each other type of property." Estimates were based on an analysis of estate-tax returns, the study explained.

I cite the National Bureau of Economic Research on these facts about the redistribution of wealth to avoid any suspicion that I am citing researchers having a political bias in favor of Democratic policies. The National Bureau of Economic Research is headed by Dr. Arthur Burns who was formerly Chairman of President Eisenhower's Council of Economic Advisers. Furthermore, if we can believe the news reports, Dr. Burns is today chief economic adviser to Vice President NIXON.

How is it that the wealth has been shifted from the many to the few? There are two main reasons. One simple reason is that the big corporations have been acquiring more and more of the Nation's wealth. Indirectly this wealth accrues to the stockholders.

The other reason, and one which is equally simple when we cut through all of the rigmarole and propaganda, is the administration's high-interest policy. Any fairminded person who examines the facts must agree, I think, that the ways the administration has increased personal income from interest is no less phenomenal than its raising the satellite balloon to the upper stratosphere.

PERSONAL INCOME FROM INTEREST MORE THAN TWICE THE FARM INCOME

Let us consider this: The official Department of Commerce reports show that personal income from interest has been increased from $12.1 billion in 1952 in successive jumps of $2 to $5 billion each year—in good times and in bad times—until now personal income from interest is at the rate of $27.1 billion per year. If you have any housewives complaining to you about the high cost of food and saying that she thinks the Nation is paying the farmers too much, just call her attention to this: The Nation is paying the farmers $12.2 billion per year; it is paying the personal interest income receivers $27.1 billion per year; and you will be safe in pointing out, too, that the number of families who share in this personal interest income are equal to only a very tiny fraction of the 5 million farm families in the country.

One way to get a pretty good idea of how few families share to any significant extent in the personal interest income is this: U.S. savings bonds, which an

individual can buy for $18.75 on a payroll savings plan, and which the Government campaigns to sell to individuals, are no doubt the most widely held of any kind of interest-paying paper. Last year the Federal Reserve Board published a survey which shows that even these savings bonds, which are relatively widely held, are owned mostly by a few families. The survey shows that 74 percent of the American families own none of these bonds, and at the other end of the scale 5 percent of the families own 87 percent of all the bonds outstanding:

Farm income and personal interest income, annual rates, 1952–July 1960

Year or month	Farm proprietors income	Personal income from interest
	Billions	*Billions*
1952	$15.3	$12.1
1953	13.3	13.4
1954	12.7	14.6
1955	11.8	15.8
1956	11.6	17.5
1957	11.8	19.6
1958	14.0	20.8
1959	11.8	23.5
1960 annual rates: [1]		
January	11.3	25.2
February	10.4	25.5
March	10.1	25.9
April	11.7	26.2
May	12.1	26.5
June	12.5	26.8
July	12.2	27.1
	Percent	*Percent*
Increase: 1952 to July 1960	−20.2	+124.0

[1] Seasonally adjusted annual rates.

Source: Joint Economic Committee of the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, Economic Indicators, July 1960; data supplied by the U.S. Department of Commerce.

HIGH INTEREST POLICY HAS REDISTRIBUTED THE INCOME

High interest? Yes, it makes the rich richer and the poor poorer. Today we hear all kinds of elaborate arguments to justify the administration's high-interest policy—claims that it helps the little man by fighting inflation, will lengthen the term of the Federal debt, and all that sort of thing. But when this administration first took office, it was much more arrogant and plain spoken in its reasons for raising interest rates. One of the first acts of the administration, in February of 1953, was to bring out a bond issue on which it deliberately set a give-away interest rate. There could be no doubt that this policy would raise interest rates throughout the economy. Many people were flabbergasted. Eight Members of the Senate wrote a protest to the Secretary of the Treasury, and they got a blunt answer. Secretary Humphrey's answer was that he considered interest rates under the previous Democratic administration had been "artificially low," and the administration intended to shift more of the income to what he called the savers. In plain words, this administration has been dividing the spoils among its backers. It did not like the more even distribution of income which had been brought about under the New Deal and Fair Deal administrations, and it set about to restore the comfortable and favored status of those families who gain their livelihood by clipping bond coupons.

One result is that many millions of middle-income families who purchased new homes in suburbs in the early postwar years now find they cannot pay school taxes and meet the expenses of suburban living, and are trekking back to the cities, while the much-discussed city slums are yet to be cleared. Small businesses are many and they are scattered throughout the Nation. A high average family income is not the same as a high national income in which a great majority of families enjoy a fair share.

SMALL BUSINESS PROBLEM NO. 1—CREDIT

While we are considering this administration's tight-money and high-interest policies, let me point out how this has served in a very direct way to squeeze out small business.

We now have a record which gives spectacular proof of what any sensible administrator should have known all along. The proof is that big business has first claim on the available supply of bank credit. Its credit needs are supplied first, and small business gets only what is left over. The reason is obvious. Not only are the banks inclined to cater to their biggest depositors, but there are all kinds of interlocking financial connections between the big finance and the big industrial and commercial corporations. To see the pattern of these mutual back-scratching arrangements, you need look only at how the big financial, industrial, and commercial firms have interlocking boards of directors.

Consider, then, the factual record of what happens to bank credit in a cycle moving from relatively easy credit to extremely tight credit. October of 1955 was a period of relatively easy bank credit. From that date on until November of 1957, credit was made progressively tighter.

BIG BUSINESS HAS FIRST PRIORITY ON BANK CREDIT

There was, of course, a large increase in bank credit in this period as there was also a large increase in the volume of business being done, and a tremendous expansion of business facilities. How was the increased credit distributed? In October of 1957 when credit was tightest, the corporate giants—those with more than $100 million of assets—had 66 percent more bank credit than they had had 2 years earlier. At the other end of the size scale, those firms with $50,000 of assets, or less, had 3 percent less bank credit than they had had 2 years earlier.

Had bank credit gone to the big firms only because the big business industries were those making the principal expansion? No. Contrary to everything we were told before these facts became known, this was not merely a question of which industries were expanding. When you go down the list industry-by-industry, you find that it was the big firms in each and every industry that got the lion's share of bank credit in the period when credit was tight. It was the exceptional industry that the smaller competitors got any increase in credit at all. In most industries, the small firms had even less credit in 1957 than they had had 2 years earlier.

Percent change in amount of member bank loans to smallest and largest size classes of business firms between October 1955 and October 1957

Business of borrower	Business firms with assets of—	
	Less than $50,000	More than $100,000,000
All businesses	−3.0	66.4
Manufacturing and mining:		
Food, liquor, and tobacco	−33.5	104.5
Textiles, apparel, and leather	−38.7	47.7
Metals and metal products	−18.2	151.2
Petroleum, coal, chemicals, and rubber	−16.2	138.1
All other	−7.2	119.2
Trade:		
Retail trade	3.4	33.7
Wholesale trade	−10.6	134.7
Commodity dealers	−18.8	20.2
Other:		
Sales finance companies	−32.5	5.9
Transportation, communication, and other public utilities	31.2	40.0
Construction	−7.7	310.0
Real estate	−24.9	19.9
Service firms	4.6	9.3
All other nonfinancial	6.0	96.1

Source: "Financing Small Business," report to the Committees on Banking and Currency and Select Committees on Small Business, U.S. Congress, by the Federal Reserve System, pts. 1 and 2, Apr. 11, 1958, p. 377.

What actually happened in this period was this: As the Federal Reserve raised interest rates up to the stratosphere, the big corporations postponed their long-term financing. They stayed away from the insurance companies and the bond market, but went to the commercial banks and got the money they wanted on short-term loans. They were waiting for the next recession, when interest rates would be brought down, to enter into long-term debt contracts. In other words, the tight-money, high-interest policy caused the big corporations to take up more of the available supply of bank credit than they would have wanted if interest rates had not been raised.

PRESENT MONEY POLICY MAKES BIG BUSINESS BIGGER AND SMALL BUSINESS SMALLER

It is not enough that the policy of alternately squeezing and loosening credit produces in recession times a surplus of bank funds which might be lent to small business. It is only in the periods of general business expansion that either large or small firms make an effort, or are willing, to undertake any substantial expansion or to make large outlays for new equipment. Thus, by the time recession comes the small firms find that whatever capacity additions to their industries might have been attractive have already been made by their big competitors in the previous boom periods. It is in this way that the new cost-saving equipment is acquired by the big competitors in the boom periods and operated to the competitive disadvantage of the small firms in the recession squeeze. It is also in this way that relatively more of the total business capacity is acquired by the big competitors.

Now this is a point I cannot emphasize too strongly: When the Federal Government takes an action which cuts small business off from bank credit, it cuts off about the only source of credit small

firms have. It is a sad commentary on our capitalistic system—a system of which we are so proud—that only the very big corporations can actually obtain long-term loan capital and equity capital. Small business in this country is a part of the capitalistic system—and a very important part—yet in all practical respects it is cut off from all long-term capital save only that which the small business people can draw from their personal family savings.

I grant you this is no new problem.

The new reforms of Woodrow Wilson's administration were as much an effort to break the Wall Street monopoly control over credit as they were an effort to enact trade and antitrust laws, which, as President Wilson put it, should "make a man in a small way of business as free to succeed as a man in a large way of business."

WOODROW WILSON'S MONEY REFORMS REVERSED

One of the main reasons for establishing the Federal Reserve System was to create 12 regional money centers, under public control, which would break the stranglehold of the Wall Street money center, under private control. Woodrow Wilson put it this way:

> The plain fact is that control of credit—at any rate of credit upon any large scale—is dangerously concentrated in this country. The large money resources of the country are not at the command of those who do not submit to the direction and domination of small groups of capitalists, who wish to keep the economic development of the country under their own eye and guidance. The great monopoly in this country is the money monopoly. So long as that exists our old variety and freedom and individual energy of development are out of the question. A great industrial nation is controlled by its system of credit. Our system of credit is concentrated. The growth of the Nation, therefore, and all our activities are in the hands of a few men who, even if their action be honest and intended for the public interest, are necessarily concentrated upon the great undertakings in which their own money is involved and who necessarily, by very reason of their own limitations, chill and check and destroy genuine economic freedom. This is the greatest question of all, and to this statesmen must address themselves with an earnest determination to serve the long future and the true liberties of men.

The credit monopoly is still the No. 1 problem threatening our freedoms. Other statesmen since Woodrow Wilson have, indeed, addressed themselves in a determined way to the problem, but with only incomplete success. And such success as was achieved has been eliminated by the present administration.

The 12 regional Federal Reserve banks have long since ceased to be a source of credit other than minimum amounts in the form of 15-day bank loans. Short-term credit—that is, bank credit—is all extended from only one of these banks—the Federal Reserve Bank of New York—and this is all funneled out to the economic system through the private Wall Street banks.

THE RFC BYPASSED WALL STREET CONTROL

The much-hated RFC provided a bypass to the concentrated private control over long-term credit and equity capital, and did so with conspicuous success in the Roosevelt and Truman administrations. It made several billion dollars of long-term loan capital available to several hundred thousands of firms that did not have the blessings of Wall Street, as well as to a great many municipal and local governments. It brought about new industries; it created strong competitors in industries previously under monopoly control; and it sparked one of the highest rates of industrial development that the country has known. With all this, the RFC paid its expenses and made a profit for the Government. It also made a profit for the private banks to which the administration turned over its assets for liquidation.

As we know, one of the first and foremost objectives of the great political crusade of 1952 was to eliminate the RFC, to eliminate it quickly, and to pour salt on the earth where it had stood. Our Republican colleagues will remember that when they were in control of the Congress in 1953, they lost no time in repealing the RFC legislation.

Of course, there had been, unfortunately, what we call scandals. A couple of White House assistants had obtained fur coats at the wholesale price and, as I recall, a deep freeze found its way into the White House basement. These incidents were made the basis for a massive and sustained political campaign, aimed, not at correcting the improprieties, but at eliminating outright the rivalry for the Wall Street monopoly.

It would be interesting to know how the value of these fur coats and deep freezes compare to the value of all the gifts which have gone into the White House and overflowed onto the President's Gettysburg farm since President Eisenhower has been in office.

My point is neither to question nor to condone the personal propriety of the gift giving and the gift taking. I simply point out that these matters have not been the object of a massive crusade to clean up the mess in Washington when there was no longer any RFC to be eliminated. And what is more important, I point out that a vital national problem has been intensified, and no alternative solution to the problem has been adopted. True, the Small Business Administration has a loan program which is played up as something of tremendous help to small business. This program was provided for by the same legislation that killed the RFC. Today, of course, administration spokesmen cite the Small Business Administration loan program as one of the administration's great constructive contributions to small business, and nothing is said of the point that this small provision for small lending was retained, not so much to help small business as to overcome opposition to removing the larger help which the RFC provided. Manifestly, the RFC was considered to have lent too much, and to firms that were somewhat more than tiny.

SMALL BUSINESS IS MORE THAN 99 44/100% "PURE" OF ANY SBA HELP

Small business is still up against a financing problem and a bigger problem than ever before. And it is as plain as the noses on our faces that something must be done and done promptly to help make credit available to small business—or there will soon be no small businesses.

From time to time, particularly at election time, the country is flooded with pamphlets, press releases, and oratory describing the financial assistance which SBA has given to small business. The bare facts are that during the 7 years the SBA has been operating its loan program, through June 30, 1960, it has made loans to 16,471 different business firms. Furthermore, it has disbursed on these loans Federal funds amounting to $542,739,000. Surrounded by the right kind of oratory, this record is most impressive. But let me take a moment to put the record in perspective.

There are at present some 4,690,000 business firms in operation and even by SBA's definition, 98 percent of these are small businesses. SBA's 16,471 loans mean, therefore, that it has made loans to only forty-four one-hundredths of 1 percent of the business firms in operation. Let me put it another way: We are educated to believe that Ivory soap's slogan of 99 44/100 percent purity is just about the ultimate in freedom from impurities. Well, it happens that 99 60/100 percent of the business firms of the country have been free of the impurity of any SBA money over the past 7 years.

Let us look at it another way. During the 7 years when SBA was supposed to be helping to meet the credit needs of small business, the corporations were investing $184 billion in new plants and new business equipment, to say nothing of the several scores of billions these corporations invested in inventories, in real estate, in financial enterprises, and in tools and equipment which are supposed to have a useful life of only a year, such as those the automobile companies acquire each year for changing the models of their automobiles.

This means, then, that the approximate half billion of Federal funds which SBA lent to small business amounted to thirty one-hundredths of 1 percent of the amount of funds which the corporations were investing in new plants and equipment. So on a dollar basis, small business has been 99 70/100 percent free of SBA credit assistance over the past 7 years.

Corporate investment in new plant and equipment, 1953–60

[Billions of dollars]

Period:	
1953 (last 3 months)	6.0
1954	22.4
1955	24.2
1956	29.9
1957	32.7
1958	26.4
1959	27.7
1960 (first 6 months)	15.0
Total	184.3

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, except estimates for last 3 months of 1953 and first 6 months of 1960, which are based on allocations of data for previous periods.

I would venture the guess that any one of the top corporations of the country has invested more funds in new plant and equipment in the past 7 years than SBA has lent to all of the almost 5 million small-business firms of the country.

To illustrate, from the time SBA's loan program began operations through December of last year, General Motors invested, according to published reports, $3.4 billion in new plant and equipment, not including special tools. This was more than six times as much as the SBA had lent to all the small businesses of the country for all purposes—inventory and otherwise—through June of 1960.

At the end of last year, after a large part of its loans had been repaid, SBA still had outstanding $362.4 million. At that time the gross debt of all the corporations in the country amounted to $335.9 billion. So it is apparent that SBA's contribution to business credit amounted to approximately one-tenth of 1 percent of the corporate debt.

If we added in the amount of private bank funds which have been advanced in connection with SBA's loan program, and added in the amount it has lent under the Small Business Investment Act, the picture would not be changed. SBA's record would still be a microscopic dot on the map of American business. Specifically, the private banks have lent small firms in connection with SBA's program $193 million, which they might or might not have lent had there been no SBA. As for the small-business investment companies, SBA has licensed, as of today, only 126, and lent them a total of only $6.5 million.

SECRET ORDERS TO "PHASE OFF" HELP TO SMALL BUSINESS

During the past 5½ years, Congress has appropriated to SBA all of the funds the administration has asked for, and more; and the Small Business Committees of both the Senate and the House have urged the SBA to step up its lending program. But this has been a case where you can lead a horse to water but you cannot make him drink. The SBA people have very effective ways of discouraging small business people from filing applications, and they have very effective ways of putting the successful applicants to all kinds of trouble and expense for such things as professional appraisals, professional accountants, lawyers, and so on. And, finally the successful applicant who perseveres and gets past all this delaying rigmarole usually has to be able to pledge ready assets worth at least three times the amount of the loan he applies for.

I do not say this to reflect on the hard work or the good intentions of the conscientious SBA employees, and I think very probably all of these people are conscientious and are trying to do a good job for small business. The fact is that these people must live with the policies that are laid down to them and do the best they can within these policies.

Recently, investigations of the Senate Small Business Committee uncovered a confidential policy directive in which Mr. Wendell Barnes, then SBA Administrator, had written all of his regional offices last August instructing these offices to cut down even on the small lending program which SBA had developed. Mr. Barnes' instructions to his regional directors were to "moderate demands for credit from the Government."

He said:

> We should phase off any activity that tends to attract applicants or encourages program expansion. I would include in this the avoidance, where possible, of speeches before groups, which are seeking information on the business loan programs and calls on banks which might encourage referrals of borrowers.

In plain words, the Administration's policy was to avoid even giving small business people any information about its loan program.

A great many small business people have been shocked at the publication of this letter. Frankly, I cannot say that I was either shocked or surprised. There was really not much new about the policy. I am confident, furthermore, that this policy has not been one that Mr. Barnes thought up by himself. He was simply carrying out orders from higher up in the Administration.

What should be done?

I would recommend three things, and I hope that you will think well enough of these recommendations to discuss them with your constituents this fall. Needless to say, these recommendations are not personal inventions of mine. They represent a line of thinking developed by many people who have studied and considered the problem.

A FLEXIBLE TAX POLICY TO REDUCE PUBLIC AND PRIVATE DEBT

First, we must stop the policy of squeezing credit in every period of business expansion, and stop the policy of maintaining a high level of interest rates during both boom and recession periods. I will suggest in a moment an alternative to the tight-money, high-interest policy. The tight-money, high-interest policy has accomplished none of the good things which have been claimed for it, and it is bringing about some very bad things. It is putting the brakes on economic growth in two respects: First, it is operating quite directly on small business, preventing them from expanding and even squeezing many of them out of business; whereas a healthy and expanding small business population contributes mightily to the Nation's growth.

Second, by taking the purchasing power out of the pockets of the middle- and low-income classes and putting it into the pockets of the high-income groups, the high-interest policy is cutting down consumer demand. And this is retarding growth even of the big corporations. This is a high price to pay for a policy which does not accomplish what has been claimed for it; and clearly the policy has not accomplished what has been claimed for it. It has not stopped any price increases. Rather, the high interest rates have added to business costs and have increased prices.

THE HIGH INTEREST POLICY HAS INCREASED BOTH PUBLIC AND PRIVATE DEBT

All the pious nonsense we have been hearing about raising interest rates to encourage savings has had a lot of people gazing up to the heavens while the country is being marched right off the gangplank. "The interest rate is a wage to the savers, and a cost to the borrowers," Chairman Martin likes to say, as the Federal Reserve goes along propagandizing for the high-interest policy. The money managers in this administration well know that the middle- and low-income families do not and have not saved any larger percentage of their income when interest rates were high than when they were low. In fact, the overwhelming majority of the American families have done just the opposite—for the simple reason that in periods of high interest rates, they have had less to save.

Raising interest rates to shift income from the mass of consumers to the banks, to the finance and insurance companies, and to the high-income families, on the theory that income thus diverted will be saved and invested instead of being spent for the necessities and comforts of life, might be justified if the administration had any reason at all to believe that this policy actually helps the Nation. But it has no such reason. There is no such reason to be found in common sense; and there is no such reason to be found in the disasters which have followed all previous periods in which this policy has been tried.

The obvious reason why the policy of shifting income to the wealthy fails is that the income is spent anyway. A savings and investment by one group, or one family, results in an equal amount of debt for other groups, and other families. But does a mounting debt—consumer and business—mean that the national income will be as high as if the debt had not occurred?

No; and here is precisely the road to disaster. As more and more consumer purchasing power is drained off to pay the interest on consumer debt, and to pay the interest on the business plant and equipment, there is less consumer purchasing power to buy what the plants can turn out. Business plant and equipment is utilized less—to produce real income—and the whole income of the Nation falls. The whole process snowballs. Increasing the debt load on consumers and raising interest rates at the same time means still more purchasing power drained off to pay the interest, more debt, and more diversion of purchasing power. In the end, the people who are getting the money have nothing to invest it in, because consumers are already in debt up to the point that they have any prospects of paying, and there is no need for any more productive capacity, because consumers cannot buy what the existing plants can turn out.

BIGGEST SUBSIDY GOES TO THE MONEY LENDERS

Subsidies? What do we mean by "subsidies"?

I read in the morning newspapers an account of a speech which a prominent insurance executive made yesterday to the convention of the American Bar Association here in Washington, where

lawyers from all over the country and England are meeting to hear speeches about what our different public policies are and should be. This gentleman wants to eliminate what he calls "farm subsidies" and to cut back on veterans' benefits.

According to the Washington Post and Times Herald this morning, Mr. James F. Oates, who is president of the Equitable Life Assurance Society, told the lawyers that "income taxes could be reduced 12 percent if farm subsidies were eliminated."

Further, the Post reports that Mr. Oates "called many veterans' benefits as well as the farm subsidy program 'wasteful spending'."

What can we call this administration's high-interest policy, except a subsidy to the insurance and other financial companies, plus a few wealthy families?

The interest cost on the Federal debt has now risen to the second biggest item of expense in the budget, being second only to defense expenditures. The interest cost on the Federal debt is now far more than the costs of all the benefits to veterans and their dependents and survivors—in fact, it is almost twice as much.

In other words, the Nation is paying almost twice as much to carry the debt we incurred because of war as it is paying to the veterans, and the dependents of veterans, who had to fight the wars.

Furthermore, this interest cost is at least twice what it would have been if interest rates had been left at the 1952 level. Actual payments have risen from $6 billion in 1952, up to a total of $9.6 billion for this year. The high-interest policy which the administration immediately adopted in 1953 has meant that the Government has paid out billions in extra interest charges which could have been used to reduce the debt. Instead, we have had to increase the debt.

Except for defense, here are the top items of expense in the administration's budget for the present fiscal year:

	Billions
Interest	$9.6
Agriculture	5.6
Veterans services and benefits	5.5
Labor and welfare	4.6
Commerce and housing	2.7
General Government	1.9

Source: Budget of the United States for the fiscal year ending July 1961, page 913.

Now what has the high-interest policy done to the distribution of the income?

BIGGEST DEBT INCREASE IN HISTORY UNDER THIS ADMINISTRATION

Never in all history has there been such an increase in debt as has occurred under this administration. Most of the talk, of course, is about the Federal debt and how inflationary this is. But the plain fact is that the Federal debt, and, in fact, all public debt, is a very small part of the picture. In the first 7 years of this administration the net Federal debt has increased at an average rate of $2.9 billion a year. Net debts of the State and local governments has increased at an average rate of $3.4 billion a year. But the net private debt has been mounting at a rate of $34.4 billion a year.

In case there is any question of my use of the figures on net debt, I might point out that the observation still holds if we compare increases in the gross debt. The gross Federal debt between the end of 1952 and 1959 increased by $42.7 billion. In the same period, the gross private debt increased by $300.4 billion.

Net private and public debt

[In billions of dollars]

Year	Total public and private debt	Private debt	Federal debt	State and local Government debt
1945	406.3	139.9	252.7	13.7
1952	555.2	306.5	222.9	25.8
1959	846.4	547.5	243.2	55.6
Average yearly increase, 7 years, 1945–52	21.3	23.8	−4.2	1.7
Average yearly increase, 7 years, 1953–59	41.6	34.4	2.9	4.3

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, "Survey of Current Business."

Consumer debt has almost doubled. It has ballooned from $27.4 billion at the end of 1952 to $52 billion at the end of last year. Counting the mortgages on nonfarm homes, total consumer debt has gone up by $93.4 billion in these past 7 years:

Net consumer debt

End of year	Total	Consumer debt	1- to 4-family nonfarm residential mortgages
	Billions	*Billions*	*Billions*
1946	$30.3	$8.4	$21.9
1952	83.0	27.4	55.6
1959	176.4	52.0	124.4
Average yearly increase in 7 years, 1946–52	*Percent* 7.5	*Percent* 2.7	*Percent* 4.8
Average yearly increase in 7 years, 1953–59	13.3	3.5	9.8

Source: Department of Commerce, "Survey of Current Business," July 1960.

Between 1952 and the end of July 1960, the personal interest income receivers received a total of $48.7 billion more in interest income than they would have received in this period if personal interest income had not been increased above the 1952 level. But in approximately the same period—to the end of 1959—consumer debt, including home mortgages, increased $93.4 billion. In fact, consumer debt, exclusive of home mortgages, has almost doubled—it has increased by roughly $25 billion.

NATIONAL INCOME FAILS TO KEEP PACE WITH EXPANSION OF DEBT

As we might expect, national income has not kept pace with this mounting debt—public and private. In 1952 the net public and private debt amounted to 190 percent of the national income of that year. By 1959, the debt had risen to 212 percent of the national income:

Total net public and private debt compared with national income

End of year	Amount of debt (billions)	Percentage of national income
1952	555.2	190
1959	846.4	212

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, "Survey of Current Business."

In the private sector of the economy, the debt picture is even worse. In 1952 the net private debt amounted to 124 percent of personal and business incomes, after taxes. By last year, private debt had risen to 157 percent of all personal and business incomes:

Total net private debt compared with net private income [1]

End of year	Amount of debt (billions)	Percentage of net private income
1945	$139.9	91
1952	306.5	124
1959	547.5	157

[1] Disposable personal income plus corporate profits after taxes and payment of dividends.

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, "Survey of Current Business."

The new plants have been built, and other new business equipment has been purchased; but the new plants and equipment for which the debt was incurred are not being used to the same extent to produce real income. Furthermore, the fact that consumer purchasing power is being drained off by the high-interest policy is not the only contributing cause. The new business capacity is not being used to the extent that it should be used for the reason that more of this capacity is under the control of the monopoly corporations. These corporations can, and inevitably do, follow high-price and low-production policies rather than the low-price and high-production policies which help the whole country when business capacity is divided among smaller competitors.

GOVERNMENT SHOULD ADOPT AN EFFECTIVE ANTI-INFLATION POLICY, INCLUDING A FLEXIBLE TAX POLICY, TO BE CARRIED OUT BY THE PRESIDENT

No; the high-interest, tight-money policy is not the way to try to restrain inflation. It is squeezing out small business; it is putting more of the productive resources of the country under monopoly control; and it is hurting consumers.

Surely we ought to know enough by now to know where a policy of high interest and mounting debt leads. It leads to a breakdown of the whole economic system and a breakdown which is repaired only after a wholesale debt cancellation through inflation.

It is an astonishing thing to hear the official money managers in this administration hark back to the interest rates of the 1920's, to try to show that present interest rates really are not so high. It is as though the good old days of the 1920's represent an ideal these people

think they should try to maintain. We might wonder where these people were during the 1930's. Possibly they were secluded in their walnut-paneled board rooms, still dreaming of the good old days of the 1920's.

No; the Government absolutely must adopt a more sensible and sane policy of trying to restrain inflation.

I would strongly urge that you give the most careful consideration to a flexible tax policy to be used in place of the high-interest policy—to accomplish the things which the high-interest policy is supposed to accomplish but has notably failed to accomplish.

The President should have authority, it seems to me, to raise taxes when the Government wishes to restrain spending, and to lower taxes promptly when the first signs of recession make their appearance. Such a policy would offer many advantages.

First, when a recession appears, a tax reduction would stimulate spending because it would make available income which consumers could actually spend. The present policy of making more credit available to the banks has proved a notable failure in stimulating spending. This is like a policy of trying to push on a piece of string. In recession times, the banks do not lend the money, even when they have it to lend. The Government can choke off a boom and bring on a recession by pulling on the purse strings, but it cannot push on the purse strings.

A second great advantage of a flexible tax policy is that when business taxes are raised, they would be raised more or less evenly on all kinds of business. The policy of tightening credit simply chokes off small business credit and prevents the small firms from expanding along with the big firms.

Finally, the revenue from an increase in taxes in a boom period would go to reduce the Federal debt. The present policy of raising interest rates simply increases the profits of the banks, insurance companies, and the high-income families.

Certainly the Federal budget should be balanced in reasonably good times, and the Federal Government should reduce its debt in prosperous times. I am strongly in favor of this, although I do not wish to leave the impression that I hold the distorted view that inflation has been caused solely, or even largely, by increases in the Federal debt.

If we listened to all the propaganda we hear these days about the Federal debt, we would think building another veterans hospital is highly inflationary, but building another resort hotel at Miami Beach is a wholesome and stabilizing influence on the economy. Yet the truth is that few thoughtful people would conclude that increases in the public debt are any more or less inflationary than increases in private debt.

SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT ACT SHOULD BE EXPANDED

The second thing which should be done to help give small business access to capital is to expand the small business investment program. The Small Business Investment Act, which was introduced in the Senate by Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON, of Texas, and in the House by me, would appeal, I think to everyone who really wants to find a permanent solution to this problem. Certainly it is a step in the right direction to a permanent solution. The central idea of the Small Business Investment Act is that the small business investment companies are operated by private individuals who have invested a large amount of their own money. These private companies will make their own investment decisions, and as they grow, they will pay back the Government capital and get the Government completely out of the picture. They are profit-making organizations, intended to make profits, and the intention of the act is that they may take risks. They may take risks just as bold as the good judgment of the private operators dictates. In other words, the intention of the act was to help create a new kind of service where none existed. It should not be very difficult to make the small business investment program a growing and a really effective program. The interest which has been expressed in it has been tremendous, but here again the SBA has proceeded to license these new investment companies with great deliberation and excessive caution. Under an administration of less deliberate hold-back, private individuals would form a great many more of these companies, even under present law.

In addition, however, the law needs amending to authorize the small business investment companies to operate on a more realistic scale. The bill which became the Small Business Investment Act was actually the second bill that Senator JOHNSON introduced in an effort to get this program established. His second bill was a considerable mark-down and whittle-down from his first. It is my belief that Senator JOHNSON scaled down his request after negotiations with the administration, and the whittle-down was accepted in an effort to draft a bill which the President would accept and not veto.

The authorization should now be scaled up in two respects.

First, the present authorization calls for the SBA to invest only $150,000 in the subordinated debentures of these companies, in which case private individuals put up $150,000 of their own money. This should be increased. A $300,000 investment firm cannot help many small businesses, and it hardly justifies full-time attention of competent managers. Senator SPARKMAN has recommended that the capital be increased to $1 million, and this seems to me a good and reasonable recommendation that should be adopted.

The second defect of the present program is that it builds a fence around each of these small business investment companies insofar as they might pledge their assets jointly and issue stock or debentures to raise private capital. In other words, there is no regional capital bank, and no national board which can issue securities that would be attractive in the national markets. This defect was fully recognized, I believe, at the time the legislation was passed, but here again practical considerations required that the defect be accepted.

I sincerely hope that next year, under a new administration, legislation will be improved along the lines I have indicated. If these small business investment companies are to make any real impact, they must be allowed to expand, and they must be allowed to organize in ways whereby they can attract private capital.

A NEEDED SHIFT IN CHANNELS OF FEDERAL RESERVE CREDIT

My third recommendation for helping solve the small business credit problem is in the field of more adequate bank credit. Several steps are needed. One, the Federal Reserve System should be required to return to the practice of making more of its credit available through the 12 regional Federal Reserve banks, rather than making it all, or substantially all, available through the New York Federal Reserve Bank.

Second, the Federal Deposit Insurance Company should have its activities confined to operating an insurance program. At the present time, it is meddling in the affairs of the private banks, telling them what kind of loans to make and what kind of loans not to make, and so on. This is not good for the small business concerns needing bank credit. I assure you I would not like it if my life insurance company came around every day or so and told me what time to go to bed, what to eat and what not to eat, and otherwise instructed me in how to care for my health.

Several other things should be done to strengthen the small independent banks of the country. It is vital, in my view, that these banks become stronger and more profitable. The small local banks are a vital cog in the system of credit for other small business concerns. Yet, under present conditions, the prospect that independent local banking will give way to a few national chains of holding company banks is very real, indeed.

SMALL-BUSINESS PROBLEM NO. 2—TAXES

More could be said; but this is, in general terms, the small-business financing problem as I see it. This brings us to a closely related problem—taxes.

BIG BUSINESS HAS NUMEROUS SOURCES OF FUNDS NOT AVAILABLE TO SMALL FIRMS

I have already alluded to the point that the big corporations have several sources of funds which are not open to the small firms. They can issue bonds and find an acceptable market for them through the usual Wall Street channels. The same is true of issuing stock. And the big corporations have first call on commercial bank credit. Yet all the funds which the corporations raise from all these sources are only a supplement to the funds they accumulate from retained earnings and depreciation allowances.

Over the past 8½ years, the corporations have invested some $335 billion in modernizing and expanding business facilities including inventory expansion. No less than 63.4 percent of this total came from funds accumulated within the year—after paying taxes and dividends to the stockholders.

Sources of corporate funds used for investment and working capital, 1952–60

[Billions of dollars]

	Total new funds used	Funds from internal sources			
		Retained profits	Depreciation allowances	Total internal funds	Internal funds as percent of total
					Percent
1952	30.8	7.4	10.4	17.8	58
1953	30.4	7.9	11.8	19.7	65
1954	22.2	6.3	13.5	19.8	89
1955	50.3	10.9	15.7	26.6	53
1956	47.9	10.5	17.3	27.8	58
1957	42.5	8.9	19.1	28.0	66
1958	30.7	6.1	20.2	26.3	86
1959	53.0	9.1	21.5	30.6	58
1st half 1960 [1]	27.0	5.0	10.8	15.8	
Total, 8½ years	334.8	72.1	140.3	212.4	63

[1] Estimated.

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, "Survey of Current Business."

How is it then, under a 52-percent income tax rate, the giant corporations are able to retain enough income to pay handsome dividends to the stockholders and still have enough funds left over to provide for more than half of their vast expansions?

The truth is that the big corporations are shifting the Federal income tax. They have the market power to do it, and they are shifting the tax onto somebody else—mostly onto consumers, sometimes onto their small suppliers, and sometimes onto labor. I know of no dispute about this, either in academic circles or among big business executives. The only point in dispute is the question of exactly how much of the income taxes is shifted. Obviously, the amount varies with the corporation, depending upon its control over the market. But at least we know that the giant corporations take pretty much what they feel they need to be able to satisfy the stockholders with good dividends and, at the same time, put about an equal amount of money into expanding the corporation.

PRESENT TAX STRUCTURE CREATES A FORCED INVESTMENT IN BIG CORPORATIONS

It used to be thought that a high principle of the capitalistic system was that people with money to invest would build a new plant in the hope of getting their money back, plus a profit out of future sales to consumers. We now have a system under which the corporate managers make consumers pay for the new plant before it is built. Under this system the corporate managers decide how the earnings to the stockholders will be invested. They keep these earnings and invest them in whatever way they please. But, of course, the stockholders are usually happy with this arrangement because it means they avoid having to pay taxes on their earnings and then finding a new investment for them.

This is a kind of forced system of investment in which the corporate managers feel they must branch out and expand the corporation, even if they make the corporation too big to be most efficient. A distinguished economist has recently described the corporate managers' compulsion to expand this way:

[T]hey will do this even though the marginal productivity of capital, even though profit opportunities, are greater elsewhere.

In short, capital does not flow, necessarily, into its most profitable uses. The pattern of allocation may be as arbitrary as it would be under government direction, and may be more so. (Prof. Melville J. Ulmer, "Some Reflections on Economic Power and Economic Theory," De Economist, May 1959, Amsterdam, the Netherlands.)

Where is the power of small firms to shift taxes on to consumers and then reach into the consumers' pockets to take whatever funds they wish to have for modernization and expansion? Of course, there is very little of such arbitrary power in the hands of small business. In the case of small business taxes are very large and very real, and they are taking away any real chance to accumulate growth capital from the firms that need growth capital most and are least able to obtain it from outside sources.

The problem is, I believe, generally recognized. The question is, Who will do something about it—and when?

SMALL BUSINESS TAX RELIEF PROMISED

In his first state-of-the-Union message, in 1953, President Eisenhower called for an overhaul of the Federal tax laws, saying:

We should now remove the more glaring tax inequities, particularly on small taxpayers; reduce restraints on the growth of small business; and make other changes that will encourage initiative, enterprise, and production.

This announcement launched the Treasury's famous complete rewrite of the tax laws, which the Congress enacted, with its eyes closed, in 1954. This revision of the tax laws turned out to have in it some very striking encouragement for big business and even some for high-income individuals. In fact, it had some encouragements of this nature that turned out to be so conspicious that the administration later came back and asked that they be toned down. In all this melee, however, the promised removal of the inequities on small business got overlooked.

These inequities became a matter of administration concern again, however, when the next presidential election year rolled around. Several small-business tax bills had been introduced in Congress which were receiving some public attention. The President, early in 1956, set up a Cabinet Committee on Small Business, with instructions to make recommendations on taxes and other small-business problems. The Cabinet Committee made its recommendations in August of 1956, and these were widely publicized. The one tax recommendation which would afford some substantial relief was one to reduce the effective income tax rate on small corporations from the then 30 to 20 percent. More specifically the proposal was to reduce the rate on the first $25,000 of income of all corporations; but this would help the small corporation a great deal, while making no significant reduction for the big corporation. The total expected cost to the Treasury was estimated at slightly more than half a billion dollars.

TAX RELIEF PROMISED AND PROMISED

In the political campaign that followed, many promises were made that this tax recommendation would be carried out—and somewhow the impression got around that this meant promptly. In his speech accepting the Presidential nomination at the Cow Palace in 1956, President Eisenhower spoke of the speed with which his dynamic forward-looking programs were going, saying:

Specific money programs of action are being pushed for all of these, the most recent being a new 14-point program for small businessmen which was announced early in August. And the everyday well-being of people is being advanced on many other fronts. This is being done, not by paternalistic regimentation. It is done by clear-cut, aggressive, Federal leadership and by releasing the illimitable resources and drives of our millions of self-reliant individuals and our thousands of private organizations of every conceivable kind and size.

On October 22, just a couple of weeks before the election, the President made public a telegram he had sent to a small business group, saying that he had already put into effect the Cabinet Committee's proposals which did not require legislation, and that he was moving ahead with legislative proposals which he would present to Congress, when it came back in January, to put its other recommendations into effect. At the top of the President's list was the promised tax cut from 30 to 20 percent, and this was the item which received the headlines in the newspapers.

When Congress convened in January, following the elections, Senator FULBRIGHT and several others introduced bills to carry out this promise. But without making headlines, the Secretary of the Treasury, George Humphrey, quietly but firmly advised the tax committees it would be premature to consider putting the promise into law. After some of us in Congress made some pointed demands that the Cabinet Committee recommendation be enacted as promised, the President himself wrote, in July, to the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, saying:

It would be ill-advised to consider the recommendation, because—

He added—

of the substantial revenue loss it would entail.

THE PROMISE HAS NOT BEEN KEPT

Another presidential term is now drawing to a close. But in these past 4

years the administration has not yet recommended, nor has it done anything but oppose passage of this recommendation.

In simple fairness this proposal should be enacted at the beginning of the next Congress. I sincerely hope it will be. I hope also that should any of the candidates for office this fall make promises to support this legislation, they will also specify the time when they expect to support it.

This legislation would help not just small corporations, but also the unincorporated firms. We passed in the last Congress a change in the tax laws which gives to small firms the option of being taxed as a corporation. So, this reduction from taxes for the small corporation, if we can pass it, will be helpful to any operator of an unincorporated business who wishes to accumulate earnings in the business, for purposes of expanding the business, without having to pay individual income taxes on these earnings.

Frankly, the need for revisions in the tax laws to give small business a better break are much more extensive than I have indicated, and I wish that I had specific recommendations for handling these revisions, which I do not have. I would like to see a careful and impartial study made of the whole tax structure, to see just what can be done to bring about a more even impact of taxes. This is a matter of no small consequence, because, obviously, the Federal tax structure can change the whole structure of American business. Indeed, it seems clear that it is doing so, and at a very rapid rate.

SMALL BUSINESS PROBLEM NO. 3—PREJUDICE FAVORING BIG BUSINESS IN GOVERNMENT PURCHASES

Let me now review one of the other big reasons why 100 or so big corporations have mushroomed into vast empires, in recent years, and are rapidly gaining control over most of the Nation's productive resources and markets, while the rest of the business population becomes less and less a factor in the economy.

Let me make an imaginary suggestion to you. Suppose I were to suggest that the government of some great nation—I need not name the nation—was about to place a great deal of business with certain private business firms of that nation. Suppose that I were to suggest that the amount of business orders to be placed with these firms within a short period of 10 years would be equal to all the income produced last year, say, in Great Britain. Or, let us say that the amount of this business to be placed exceeds the value of all the goods and services—both public and private—produced in Canada last year. You would be impressed, I am sure, that that is a great deal of business.

HOW TO DESTROY THE COMPETITIVE ENTERPRISE SYSTEM

Suppose I suggested also that the government of that great nation which has, let us say, 5 million different business firms—is about to place all this business with only 100 business firms. I suspect that you would be shocked by such an idea. Certainly, if such a volume of business, greater than the whole production of Canada and Great Britain, were to be placed with only 100 business firms on terms which assured these firms that they would be paid for all the expense they cared to incur plus a fat profit, you would expect some drastic changes in the competitive relations between these 100 firms and the other 5 million firms of the nation. You would expect that in the course of 10 years these very fortunate 100 firms would be vastly enlarged in financial power, they would come to have the newest, most expensive, and most productive equipment, that they would have technical processes not available, nor yet even known to their competitors, that they would have staffs of technicians, scientists, and a vast store of know-how and patents their small competitors did not have and could expect them to have other superior competitive advantages. You would expect these 100 firms, now blown up to giant size and towering above their competitors, to be in a position to root out their rivals and take over any and all of the commercial markets of the country.

Yes, I have no doubt that, if the Members thought that such things as I have described were about to be done, they would expect some dire consequences. Certainly they would expect these things to bring about some radical changes in the competitive system of business in that nation.

Well, of course, all of these things I have described have already been done, right here in our own Nation. The vast amount of business I have described has already been placed over the past decade, and it has been placed with only about 100 business firms. And the results have been no different from those you would expect.

MORE BUSINESS GIVEN 100 CORPORATIONS THAN THE WEALTH OF NATIONS

In the past 10 years, the Department of Defense has purchased some $223.5 billion worth of goods from private business firms. This vast aggregate includes purchases of every known article of commerce and industry, as well as many not known. It includes all imaginable kinds of goods—both civilian and military. And, of course, many that were military yesterday are civilian today.

The official reports of the Department of Defense show that no less than 70 percent of all these vast purchases have been made from about 100 corporations. In other words, in placing approximately $156 billion of business over the past 10 years, with only 100 or so different business firms, it has placed with these firms several times as much business as is done in a year in such a nation as, say, Canada. In fact, this is more than four times the value of all the goods and services—both public and private—produced in Canada last year.

To get another idea of just how vast this is, let me point out that it is more than the combined national incomes of Canada, the United Kingdom, Italy, and France.

Gross national product and national income of selected foreign countries

[In billions of U.S. dollars [1]]

Country	National income	Gross national product
Canada	25.6	33.8
France	36.4	48.0
Germany	42.2	54.4
Italy	21.0	26.7
United Kingdom	51.1	63.8
Total	176.3	226.8

[1] At official exchange rates at end of year; income figures for the year 1958.

Source: International Monetary Fund, "International Financial Statistics."

I will insert in the RECORD a table made from the Department of Defense's various reports on this subject. The reports which have been issued on this matter have been issued at irregular intervals, and the different reports have not always covered the same number of months. In several instances, furthermore, the periods of time covered by the reports overlap; but the seven reports which have been issued over the past 10 years, taken together, cover these years completely. We cannot say what the precise percentage is of the total value of the purchases that have been made from the 100 largest contractors in the whole 10-year period, but in no part of the 10-year period was the percentage less than 64 percent; and in most parts of this period, the percentage of the Department's purchases going to the 100 largest contractors was in the neighborhood of 70 percent and above. The largest share of the total purchases made from only 100 contractors occurred in fiscal year 1958, when the 100 largest contractors received 74 percent of all the Department's business.

How $224 billion of defense production has been distributed in various periods during the 1950–60 decade

SHARE TO 100 LARGEST CONTRACTORS

Period:	Percent
July 1950–June 1953	64.0
July 1953–December 1954	68.8
January 1955–December 1956	69.6
July 1956–June 1957	68.4
July 1957–June 1958	74.2
July 1958–June 1959	73.8
January 1959–December 1959	73.2

Source: Department of Defense annual reports of contracts awards and occasional reports of awards to the 100 largest contractors.

The 100 largest contractors are not always the same identical firms in each of these periods. As the contractors are ranked from the first largest on down, there is always some shifting of firms in positions around the 100th position. In other words, a corporation which is ranked, say, the 105th largest contractor in one period, may move up to the position of 95th largest in the next period, while the 99th largest moves down, and so on. But in general the same 100 or so favored firms have been the favored firms throughout. They have grown fat

and powerful on Government business, and, just as we would expect, they are using this power to advance themselves in civilian markets at the expense of the less favored concerns.

PROMISES TO GIVE SMALL FIRMS A FAIR SHARE OF UNCLE SAM'S PURCHASES

This matter has been a topic of many promises and, I have no doubt, good intentions—but good intentions are soon forgotten. In truth, any suggestion which threatens to disturb the ways in which the Pentagon distributes the country's vast wealth is likely to set off some formidable big business action, even if such a suggestion comes from the President of the United States. Dividing up the wealth of empires is no playful pastime which is taken lightly by the power centers of big business and big finance.

I have already referred to President Eisenhower's 1956 telegram to the small businessmen in which he reported that the administration had already put into operation such of his Cabinet committee's recommendations as did not require legislative actions. According to the Wall Street Journal's report of that telegram, the President had already "called for a comprehensive review of Government procurement policies aimed at increasing small business' share of Uncle Sam's purchases."

Perhaps it would have been better had that comprehensive review not been made. In the fiscal year after it was made small business' share of Uncle Sam's purchases dropped to 17 percent from a previous year's share of 18 percent, and the share has not risen since. Small business concerns, which the Federal agencies generally define as firms having no more than 500 employees, were awarded 16.6 percent of the Federal agencies' purchases in the fiscal year 1959, the last year so far reported.

SBA SET-ASIDE HAS PROVED INEFFECTIVE

Now, of course, there is a program called the "SBA set-aside" which I believe is considered to be the administration's main answer to the several laws passed by Congress declaring that our national policy is to place a proportionate share of Uncle Sam's purchases among small business concerns. Under this program the Small Business Administration reviews certain of the purchases which the other Federal agencies propose to make, and in certain particular purchases the SBA may recommend that the purchase be "set aside" for small business. Such recommendations are made where the item to be purchased is typically a small business product and a sufficient number of small business firms are known to be able to supply the product to assure strong competition in the bidding for the contract. The Federal agency in question may or may not comply with SBA's recommendation.

Now, it seems to me that there has been a considerable boasting, and no little confusion, about the achievements of this "set-aside" program. What does the scoreboard show?

Value of contracts awarded by the Department of Defense

Fiscal year	Value placed with all firms	Share placed with small business firms	
		Total	From SBA set-aside
	Billions	*Percent*	*Percent*
1954	$16.8	25.3	0.6
1955	18.5	18.0	1.0
1956	20.9	17.0	1.2
1957	22.6	17.0	2.4
1958	21.8	17.0	3.1
1959	22.7	16.6	3.7
1960	21.3	16.1	3.7

Source: Department of Defense, monthly reports.

In the fiscal year 1954, the Department of Defense made 25 percent of its purchases from small business. Six-tenths of 1 percent of Uncle Sam's purchases went to small business by reason of the SBA set-aside program. In fiscal 1959, 16.6 percent of the purchases went to small business, and 3.7 percent of these purchases went to small business by reason of SBA's set-aside efforts. Despite all the boasting, SBA's set-aside program has not increased the share of Government business placed with small firms, so to find any accomplishment that the SBA has made in this field, we are left to imagine that small business' share of Uncle Sam's purchases would have declined even more than it has declined, had SBA not been in the picture.

This quite remarkable tendency of the Federal agencies to concentrate all of the Government's business in a few top corporations, has, of course, been a matter of deep concern to Congress for many years. Laws have been passed declaring that the agencies shall follow a policy of awarding Government contracts on a basis of advertised, competitive bids, that these agencies shall place a proportionate share for small business, and so on. Congress has, furthermore, created a small business agency and passed annual appropriations for it in an effort to create an arm of the Government that would see that these policies are carried out. If anything has changed as a result, the changes are not clearly visible.

It is comforting to know that in certain of its operations, the Department of Defense takes an overall look at its problems and our military posture relative to the industrial resources of the country. It is my belief, furthermore, that in certain aspects the Department's planners actually do some planning and budgeting so that in some matters there is a degree of central and coordinated direction. I believe, for example, that the Department's planners recognize that they should watch to see that there is at least a minimum of industrial capacity in each of several categories sufficient to supply the Department's need under certain emergency conditions. In other words, the Department maintains what it calls a "mobilization base" of private industrial corporations. Consequently, there have been times, I am told, when the Department has maintained certain large corporations on a sort of make-work basis, buying these corporations' products for which it had no particular need, on the theory that these firms should be kept in business in case they are needed in the future.

THE NATIONAL POLICY IGNORED

As to any simple budgeting or coordinated effort to carry out the congressional mandates that a proportionate share of its contracts shall be placed with small business, no visible steps have ever been taken. Each of the various military services handles its own placement of Government purchases and in the final analysis, the several thousand separate contracting offices make the decisions as to where the business is to be placed. On a dollar value basis, better than 85 percent of all the contracts are awarded on the basis of negotiation rather than by advertised, competitive bid. I do not suggest that competition is absent from all of the contracts placed after negotiation. On the contrary, competition can be and in many cases is as strong in the negotiation prices—depending upon how much the contracting officer negotiates—as it is in the case of advertised, competitive bids. But, the area of competition left open is of little benefit to small business. The big corporations use the Government's money to subsidize their quest for the competitive contracts and take a handsome profit on the subsidy.

What happens, of course, is that the big items such as missiles and planes almost inevitably go to the big corporations. No one can be sure what a fair price is for such items at the time the contract is made, least of all the contracting officer. So, the price agreed upon is usually made comfortably large on the theory that in the end the Renegotiation Board will take back any excessive profits that accrue from the contract. The practice of the Renegotiation Board is to allow the company to keep as profits a certain percentage of the total dollar volume of business the company has done with the Government during the year. So, this means that as soon as the big corporation sees that it has accumulated a few millions of dollars it will have to return to the Government at the end of the year, it goes after the hard to get competitive contracts, even if it has to take these contracts at a below-cost price. This expands the volume of the company's Government business and hence increases the amount of Government profits it can keep. In other words, the company makes money even if it loses money on the contracts it takes away from the small competitors.

This seems to me a very foolish policy of the Government, to allow its money to be used by the big corporations to drive out the small competitors. It also seems to me a very foolish policy of the Government to make purchases equal, as I have said, to the total wealth of many large nations and place all this business with only a few corporations. But this is not the end of the foolishness yet.

SMALL BUSINESS PROBLEM NO. 4—THE GOVERNMENT'S DISCRIMINATION IN ITS RESEARCH GRANTS AND PATENT POLICY

When we listen to our television sets and hear some of the corporations' claims about all of the research and development work they are doing, and all the progress they are making in projecting the Nation's science and technology into the world of the future, many of us are no doubt much impressed, as I am. The claims which some of these companies make for themselves make it seem as though each of them is a sort of one-firm geophysical year.

What the ad writers do not tell us is that the taxpayers are paying for most of this research and experimentation with new products and new processes. The taxpayers are paying for it, furthermore, not through any roundabout way of reasoning on my part, but in direct grants of money right out of the Federal Treasury.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT FINANCES TWO-THIRDS OF ALL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

The country has spent, in the past 4 years, about $42 billion. According to estimates of the National Science Foundation, this is about equal to the total amount spent in the country for these purposes between 1860 and 5 years ago. The amount is increasing principally because the Federal Government is pouring more and more funds into these purposes.

The National Science Foundation estimates that, taking all spending—public and private—for all kinds of research, experimentation, and technological development, the country is now spending about $12.4 billion per year. The Federal Government is footing the bill for $8 billion, or a little more than two-thirds of the total. Private industry is spending about $4 billion, or about half the amount the Government is spending.

Sources of funds for research and development in the United States

[Millions of dollars]

Sector	1953–54	1956–57	1957–58	1958–59 (estimated)	1959–60 (estimated)
Federal Government agencies	2,740	4,960	6,130	7,050	8,079
Industry	2,240	3,260	3,660	3,794	3,971
Colleges and universities	130	170	180	316	374
Other nonprofit institutions	40	70	80		
Total	5,150	8,460	10,050	11,160	12,430

Source: National Science Foundation, "Reviews of Data in Research and Development," December 1959.

So far, so good. I have no complaint about the country's spending a great deal of money for research, experimentation, scientific and industrial advancements of all kinds. Even more of the country's resources and brains should, in my opinion, be put into these pursuits, even though, as the figures indicate, we are now spending for these things more money than the total income in several nations of the world. But the next question is who is doing all this research; who is getting the benefit of the money; and who will control for the future the fruits of all this effort?

UNCLE SAM IS FINANCING INDUSTRIAL CONCENTRATION

The answer is more frightening than anything most of you could imagine.

Most of the Government's share of the cost of the research, experimentation, and development work is being handled by the Department of Defense in the form of grants handed out to private companies, and to some extent, to the universities. These grants are being made, not just for what we could reasonably call military items, but for all kinds of industrial technical development—all kinds of industrial processes, new products, metallurgy, chemistry, and so on.

Perhaps the Members will by now not be shocked, if they do not already know, that substantially all of these grants are going to a few giant corporations. In 1956, 89 percent of all the grants the Department of Defense made went to the 100 largest receivers of these grants. Since that time, the total amount of money being granted has been going up and up, and so, too, has the percentage of the total grants going to the 100 largest receivers. In 1959, the 100 largest contractors got 93 percent of the total.

Amount of grants made by the Department of Defense for experimental, developmental, and research work

Fiscal year	Total grants (in billions)	Percentage made to 100 largest firms
1956	$2.4	88.7
1957	3.0	91.0
1958	3.7	90.9
1959	4.9	92.9
1960	(1)	(1)

[1] Not available.

Source: Department of Defense annual reports.

This is a most astonishing policy, even considering all we know about this administration's single-minded favoritism to big business in other fields. All objective researches into the question of how discoveries and inventions are made show that most of the inventions have been, and are being made, not by the giant industrial corporations, but by small research groups and individual inventors. Why in the name of all reason, may we ask, would not this administration try to encourage and take advantage of all the technicians and inventive brains we have in this country? Why give these few big industrial corporations the money with which to hire so many scientists and technicians and largely waste their time? You might think that the leaders of big business and big finance who have such a powerful say in everything the Government is now doing would know better than to allow this to go on, even in his own self-interest.

UNCLE SAM IS FINANCING A PATENT MONOPOLY

I hate to say more, but the worst is yet to come.

Who do you suppose gets to own and control the patents on the inventions made at Government expense?

The Department of Defense not only allows, but encourages, the corporations to acquire the patents on the inventions they make through research paid for by the Government.

This was too much even for the administration's first Attorney General, Mr. Herbert Brownell. In 1956, the Department of Justice made an investigation of the Defense Department's handling of research and development grants, and in November of that year, the Attorney General issued a report condemning this policy of allowing the private firms to acquire the patents on inventions paid for by the Government. This report pointed out that processed foods, penicillin, electronic devices, and a long list of other "present-day commercial products were all originally developed under research and development programs for defense purposes." Said the Attorney General's report: "Present patent policy may well be one of the major factors tending to concentrate economic power."

And what has the administration done about the warnings of its own Attorney General? Nothing.

In view of what I have said about the administration's policy of concentrating the Government's vast amount of purchases with only a few giant corporations, its policy of turning over to the top corporations the tremendous sums Congress has appropriated for research, and, finally, its policy of allowing the corporations to acquire and control the patents on the fruits of this research, I believe my recommendations are self-evident.

The only cure to this situation I know of is to have a President in the White House tell his Cabinet officers to change these policies and mean what he says.

THE "NEW LOOK" IN ANTITRUST ENFORCEMENT

I come now to the antitrust laws, I believe we are all agreed that without good antitrust laws and real enforcement of these laws small business in no nation can survive in any degree of independence and freedom.

The spectacle which this administration has made of the antitrust laws is not pleasant to contemplate.

The spectacle began with an all-out-effort to achieve a "new look" for the antitrust laws by means which are, I believe, unprecedented in our history. To put the matter bluntly, one of the administration's earliest and most highly advertised projects was one aimed at "brainwashing" the Federal judges. In brief, there sprang into being a highly touted group known as the Attorney General's Committee To Study the Antitrust Laws, who let it be known that their mission was to modernize and revitalize the antitrust laws.

In truth, this committee was mostly a bunch of big-business lawyers who specialize in defending big corporations in antitrust suits—and who, incidentally, had recently been suffering a los-

ing streak. This group also had, to assist them in their labors, certain members of the staff of the antitrust enforcement agencies, such as Mr. Kintner, the present Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, and Mr. Bicks, who served as secretary to the group.

A small minority of law professors and academic economists were also appointed, presumably for window dressing, but fortunately for the country this minority, in the end, turned out to be more windowbreakers than window dressers.

While the Attorney General's committee recommendations were being drawn, there seems to have been a shift in political sentiment in the country. At least there was a change in the control of Congress. In the end, the committee decided to direct its recommendations, not at the Congress for changes in the laws, but to the Federal courts with subtle instructions for reinterpreting the laws. The whole operation was very slick, very pious and high-minded, and merchandised with the best of the Madison Avenue techniques. Their report is smoothly persuasive—to the casual reader—but of course you will not be surprised to learn that it was rigged with some boobytraps the lawyers hoped the judges would step into. There were also some very plain and pointed recommendations to the enforcement agencies—the FTC and the Department of Justice—as to how they should adopt new ways of enforcing the antitrust laws.

Never to my knowledge has the executive branch of the Government before undertaken a lobby directed at our courts. But the Attorney General saw to it that a copy of this report reached the hands of every Federal judge in the land; and there were all sorts of bar association shindigs arranged to acquaint the Federal judges with the importance of this report. As matters turned out, there is little indication that this big effort has had any effect at all on our Federal judges, in which case we have reason to hope that this sad chapter in our country's history will not be repeated.

As to the effect of the "new look" on the enforcement agencies, however, that is another matter. In this fertile soil both the committee's recommendations and its Madison Avenue techniques have taken root and flowered while effective antitrust law enforcement has steadily gone from one step of deterioration to another. The first step was that of adopting one of the main recommendations of the brainwashing project, namely the practice of settling the pending antitrust suits by private, out-of-court negotiations and, furthermore, settling the new suits to be brought in the same manner.

This practice is still with us.

The next stage was one which was not recommended. This period saw the administration's first FTC Chairman resigning from his post after he had been discovered participating in a case from which he was disqualified—disqualified by reason of the fact that the case involved one of his previous law clients—and it saw the Assistant Attorney General in charge of antitrust and his top assistant leaving office about the time they were discovered speculating in the stocks of corporations which were about to merge, and which merger it was the duty of these offenders to approve or disapprove.

The spectacle now draws to a close with a kind of traveling circus featuring the comedy team of Kintner and Bicks, whose act consists of quick changes from judicial robes, prosecutor's wig, and barker's uniform—one speiling off the numbers while the other takes turn passing out the snake oil.

ANTITRUST BY CONSENT

The administration's practice of issuing antitrust complaints and then settling these complaints by consent decrees can be an extremely dangerous practice—one which could turn antitrust law enforcement to political manipulations of the worse kind. It can be, and has been, most unwholesome. The Members may recall, for example, the famous consent decree which the Attorney General negotiated in the A.T. & T. case. When the Committee on the Judiciary of the House tried to investigate that settlement, along with the whole consent decree practice, the Department of Justice refused to give the committee any records. It did, however, develop the fact that Attorney General Herbert Brownell had worked out the settlement with an A.T. & T. official at a weekend party down at White Sulphur Springs, W. Va. The Judiciary Committee then turned to the private companies for the records and obtained a memorandum which an A.T. & T. official had written concerning his conversations with the Attorney General. The A.T. & T. official gave the following description of the Attorney General in response to this official's suggestion that the case be dropped:

He reflected a moment and said in substance that a way ought to be found to get rid of the case.

Consequently, he thought that we could readily find practices that we might agree to have enjoined with no real injury to our business.

He said if we tried we could certainly find things of that sort that could be used as a basis for a consent decree.

He said the President would understand this also and that if a settlement was worked out he could get the President's approval in 5 minutes. (See p. 54, "Report by the House Committee on the Judiciary on the Consent Decree Program of the Department of Justice.")

The inherent challenges to good government in this sort of thing speak for themselves.

But there is another aspect of this consent settlement matter which has been the basis for my many criticisms of it, as well as most of the other criticisms that have been made in Congress. The aspect is that these settlements, even if they are the kind that put an end to the monopoly situation, as the public has a right to expect, the business firms, the individuals, and the State and local governments who have been directly injured by the monopoly practice are cut off from their usual opportunity of bringing a private suit and recovering damages.

THE "GUILTY" NOT YET GUILTY

Now it seems to me that considerable confusion has recently developed over what is supposed to have been a change in policy in the administration, and perhaps in the FTC, concerning these consent settlements. The Department of Justice did announce a change in policy which seems to have given the impression that it is now accepting consent settlements in cases where the State and local governments have been damaged by a monopoly practice only when the company admits guilt and allows his admission to be entered in a judgment of the court. This policy, if it had actually been put into practice, as some of the States attorneys general seemed to think, would permit the States to sue on the basis of the admission of guilt in the same way they could sue and recover damages if the case were tried before a court and the court rendered a verdict of guilty.

All the speeches and press releases and news stories and telegrams we have had in recent weeks about this matter, frankly, had me confused, so I inquired just what the score is. Actually, the score on the new policy is zero. I have been told, and I do not doubt it, that the Department of Justice has taken some action to try to get an admission of guilt entered in the judgments of the court in two cases. But so far these have not been accepted. In the meantime, the consent settlement business continues to boom.

THE CONSENT DECREE BOOM CONTINUES

The record of the Federal Trade Commission in entering decrees in antimonopoly cases is as follows:

	1958	1959	1960
Total	53	63	57
Consent decrees	30	54	49
Contested cases	15	9	8
Dismissals	8	5	

The record of antimonopoly civil decrees entered by the Department of Justice in each of the fiscal years shown is as follows:

	1958	1959	1960
Total	27	33	24
Consent decrees	23	23	22
Contested	4	10	2
Of those contested:			
Won	3	5	1
Lost	1	5	1

Prior to Mr. Kintner's reign at the FTC, it was the practice of that agency never to accept a consent settlement without a judgment and a finding of fact. If I am correctly informed, it is now the FTC's practice never to do otherwise. From the standpoint of individual private rights, an FTC order without a judgment and finding of fact is not quite the same as one under the Sherman Act, in that an individual cannot sue on the basis of the record. From the standpoint of the general public's rights, however, there is very little difference.

Without such a judgment and finding of fact, neither the courts nor the public—nor as for that matter future Federal Trade Commissioners—can determine whether or not a company which has been charged with violating the antitrust laws is continuing the same practice it has consented to abandon.

What shall we hear of the great rash of new antitrust complaints which we have been hearing so much about from Mr. Kintner and Mr. Bicks in their campaigns to win reappointments to their jobs? As for my part, I would say, "Congratulations. Go to it. Break all the records you can in issuing complaints." In the meantime, however, I, for one, am not particularly amused. I will be delighted to see what comes of all this complaint issuing when these have ripened into some real results.

The biggest complaint I have heard about all of these compaints so far is that they tend to be directed at the little man and have very little in them that could actually break up a big monopoly.

Let me remind the Members that there are two parts to the Sherman Act which is supposed to be our charter of freedom against monopoly.

Under section I, you bring charges to break up a conspiracy—a price fixing conspiracy, a conspiracy to control production and allocate markets, and so on. You may bring either a civil or criminal charge or both under section I. If you bring a criminal charge, the case may, in the end, result in a fine, which is usually inconsequential to a large corporation. Under civil proceeding, you may get an injunction against continuing the conspiracy. And, if you take a consent order, you simply get a promise that the companies will not in the future violate the law they should not have violated in the first place.

Section II of the Sherman Act is quite another matter. This is the one you use to bust up trusts, and to get injunctions against individual companies doing whatever it is they should not do.

Needless to say the very weak section I of the Sherman Act has become the favorite method of the administration's antitrust activity. It is under this section that almost all the complaints are being brought, and it is these complaints that are also being settled out of court.

Let me quote from a paper delivered by a distinguished antitrust lawyer, Mr. Abe Fortes, before the Antitrust Section of the American Bar Association, last April. Here is what Mr. Fortes says after analyzing the Department of Justice's antitrust record:

A stranger, indeed, might get the impression these days—totally unwarranted—that our antitrusters think that all American business is the same size. There is little evidence that they are aware of the major grievance of small business. That major grievance is big business: That is, business bigger than they are.

Tucked away in the Sherman Act, largely unnoticed in recent years, is section 2, the monopoly provision of the act. In 1957, at the seminar on protracted cases at the New York University Law Center, Mr. Bicks, the able acting head of the division, assured the Federal judiciary that there would be a decline in the big case problem because the Department was instituting fewer cases under section 2. He pointed out that in the years 1946 to 1948, 46 percent of the Government's cases were brought under section 2. But in 1955 to 1957, only 19 percent of the cases instituted involved section 2.

In examining the cases which the Department filed in 1959, I have found that only 6 out of the 63 new cases instituted by the Department in any way involved section 2. Actually, only two of these cases substantially involved monopoly problems, and neither touched the central nervous system of our economy. One involved postage meters and the other concerned zig-zag sewing machines.

Now the Antitrust Division is entitled to sympathetic understanding for its aversion to these cases. Winning a section 2 case and getting effective relief from the courts is not child's play. But the enforcement of section 2 is fundamental to our society; fundamental to the preservation of competition; and fundamental to the operation of antitrust generally. Its enforcement is essential to provide the framework for an economy hospitable to the existence of a multitude of independent business units—the conception upon which many of our institutions, principles, and policies depend. I do not believe that enforcement of this section is beyond the competence of the Government.

* * * * *

Indeed, small—or smaller business—may have reason to fear that the Government's current enforcement emphasis may inadvertently have the effect of insulating our giant companies from real competition. I refer to the policy, described by Mr. Bicks in his 1959 year-end report, and exemplified in the cases filed last year and this by the Department and the FTC, to devote the Department's resources to the antimerger crusade to the virtual neglect of section 2. (Source: American Bar Association Section of Antitrust Law, vol. 16.)

FREEDOMS AT THE CROSSROADS

Our antitrust laws and small business, it seems to me, are at the crossroads. It may be that we are beyond the crossroads and cannot turn back. Many people seem to think so. Frankly, I hope we can turn back and make the turn we should have made—toward more effective antitrust laws and more effective law enforcement.

When we consider the changes which have taken place in both business and Government, even within the span of our own memories, we cannot doubt, I think, that there is a serious question whether our experiment in freedom may be drawing to a close. There was a day when our country offered something very near the ideals of economic freedom. Every citizen could choose his economic pursuits. The door of opportunity was open in all lines of trade and in manufacturing. And the kind of competition which Adam Smith envisioned as providing a natural regulation of prices and automatic self-regulation of the other aspects of our economic affairs did, in fact, prevail. That day has long since passed.

More and more of the Nation's economic activity has shifted from a system of independent, competitive enterprise to a planned, controlled, and regulated system of giant monopoly enterprise.

None of us here need to be reminded that political freedoms and economic freedoms go hand in hand. We have all seen the practical demonstrations of how great concentrations of economic power influence our press, our radio, our television—all of the means of human communication, including, not the least of all, communications within the national business organizations, such as the National Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, and even the associations of professional men.

Are these political considerations? Yes; the organization of our economic life cannot be otherwise than political. The corporations themselves are creatures of law, and, indeed, the whole course of business is a creature of law. This is one of the main purposes of government—to help business—to help all citizens of the country advance themselves economically.

The ways in which the Federal Government imposes its taxes; the way in which it hands out its subsidies, and its vast payments for research, experimentation, and defense production; the ways in which it manages its money system; the ways in which it manages its patent system; and the ways in which it arranges and enforces its trade and antitrust laws are all political decisions which have a leading role in determining which businesses survive and prosper and which are squeezed out. They are political decisions and play a leading role in determining how employees, consumers, farmers, and all other groups in the country share in the productive wealth of our country.

REPORT ON THE 86TH CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, as the 86th Congress draws to a close, it is fitting that we look back over our work and take inventory of our legislative effort and achievements. Although this second session was interrupted for the political conventions, Congress returned to complete such work as was feasible.

The post-convention session was not designed to embark on any new fields of legislation. It was called to finish vital work which could not be overlooked in view of current world conditions. If Congress had not returned, the President would have been justified in recalling Congress for this purpose and politically making the most of it.

History will record that this Congress worked under extremely difficult circumstances to draft laws which would best meet the urgent needs of the American people and survive the threat of veto. A working coalition between conservative Democrats and the Republican minority combined to develop control over the legislative output. Liberal hopes to legislate on the problems of unemployment, sluggish economic growth, high interest rates, urban blight, and the crucial medical problems of the aged, were put aside.

The President's veto threat hung ominously over the Congress throughout its deliberations and was often employed to cut the substance from worthwhile measures.

During this election year partisanship took its toll. The entire governmental

process appeared frustrated, awaiting the stimulation of fresh spirit and new blood from the autumn elections. America could ill afford this political delay, but a fresh start is on its way.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS—THE COLLAPSE OF PERSONAL DIPLOMACY

Failure at the summit resulted from the personal diplomacy which characterized American foreign policy during the past 8 years. This commenced with the personal diplomacy instituted by the late John Foster Dulles and was climaxed with the President's disastrous mission to the summit.

Personal diplomacy provides headlines and glamour for its participants, but seldom in history has it proven to be a capable substitute for positive policies of state developed in orderly process. The current state of disorganization in the Department of State directly results from emphasis on personal diplomacy.

The personal magnetism of the President, operating without firmly established policies of state, could not stem the tide of bitterness developing against America. The ill-timed U–2 incident was a stupid mistake which could not be corrected. Premier Khrushchev intended to sabotage the summit. Our Government could not have provided him with a handier tool.

Throughout the world, people pray for a stable peace and the machinery which can insure it. America has failed to provide positive leadership in this regard. Our policy of supporting friendly dictators has lost us other worthwhile friends. Our belated awareness of the plight of the Latin American republics now threatens inter-American solidarity. Our belated interest in the aspirations of the people of Africa now makes our participation seem almost too late.

American foreign policy has too often and in too many places been associated with American investment for high and quick profits. Loans and aid have been offered in combination deals which brought in American business and investment. It is no surprise that our official representatives should be jeered and even stoned in Latin American countries, when American funds find their way into investment there at fantastic interest rates which range from 20 percent in Peru, 24 percent in Chile, to 36 percent and 40 percent in Brazil and Argentina. If American capital abroad is participating in the extortion of such exorbitant rates of interest in the underdeveloped areas of the world, it would be doing this Nation a grave disservice which no "policies of state' could correct.

On this point I took the floor on May 12, 1960, to criticize a $2 million loan by the Development Loan Fund to a savings and loan association in Lima, Peru, which was founded by the Prime Minister of Peru. That housing loans are critically needed in Peru is unquestioned. However, I was astounded that our Government should prefer to loan to a bank owned by the country's prime minister. In our dealings with the foreign governments we should insist on the same degree of political morality as we expect from our own public officials.

If we are to return to our former position of world leadership, we must reaffirm our devotion toward world peace, make manifest our concern for the underdeveloped, the underprivileged, the suppressed, the neglected, the forgotten people who constitute most of the population of the world. Dollar diplomacy must give way to human diplomacy. Dollar profit alone has no place in this program. Good will can profit our Nation much more. The reconstruction of our foreign policy must be the prime goal of a new administration.

THE DEFENSE OF AMERICA

Throughout the political discussion of this autumn considerable attention will be directed toward the condition of our national security. American superiority is unquestioned in many fields. The atomic submarine and the great polar adventures it has made possible are unexcelled. The U–2 incident proved American ingenuity in world observation by man in flight. The development of rocket warfare, however, raises serious doubt about the usefulness of big Navy carriers and the effectiveness of expensive military bases throughout the free world.

It appears that the Russians will place man in space at an early date. On the other hand, there are grave doubts that the highly publicized American astronauts will reach space before their eligibility for social security benefits. If our Nation suffered a lag in space development prior to 1952, it is obvious that the gap widened at a discouraging rate since.

The bitter fact is that the defense lag in America has resulted mainly from administration policies. Defense contracts have frequently been let to provide economic stabilization for industry rather than to fulfill essential defense needs. Large production contracts were repeatedly granted for obsolete military hardware, when production should have been halted with the development of the prototype weapon. Billions of dollars of this obsolete military hardware have been shipped to our bases abroad and to our allies in the free world, frequently to remove the stockpiles of obsolescence from the American scene.

There is no doubt that the grave cost of defense production could be substantially reduced with no impairment to the national security if defense production were founded a little bit more on patriotism and considerably less on profit.

Perhaps the greatest failure of executive responsibility has occurred in the administration of the Department of Defense. Deterioration began with the present administration's call for businessmen in Government. They came with empty brief cases, served for short periods of time, and departed with plush Government contracts. In most cases, they left the Government service with more know-how than they brought in. As they returned to their private corporations after brief periods in the Government service, they brought to their permanent employers experience in the methods of Government procurement and a contact with those in authority to make executive decisions as to who should get the contract.

In Government service, a man cannot serve two masters. He seldom can be loyal and devoted to the Government knowing that his permanent career is with the private corporation which has loaned him for temporary Government work.

However, the deterioration of leadership in the Department of Defense is the most tragic circumstance of all. In this special area we had the right to expect the most from our Executive, particularly in view of his military experience. In this field, where the greatest economies and efficiencies could have been effected, America has been let down. The high office of Secretary of Defense has been bandied around as though it were a small town postmastership. It is inconceivable that anyone could have occupied this vital position without an unflinching obligation to see the job through the President's term or terms. How can responsible administration of Defense result when there have been three different Secretaries and eight different Deputy Secretaries assigned to this task, each with his own policies, each with his own set of advisers, each with his limited experience?

The complete overhaul of the Department of Defense is of the highest priority. The head of the Department should under all circumstances pledge to remain at his post as long as he is needed by the Executive who appoints him. The continuity of command decisions must not be interrupted. Wasteful practices and procurement must be abolished. Contracts must be granted competitively under procedures established by law without abusing the privilege of suspending proper laws through an emergency declaration which has characterized procurement during the past 8 years.

Such production as is needed must be carried on at the lowest possible cost to the taxpayer, using publicly owned plants and facilities as are available. Emphasis must be upon such defense procurement as is truly needed for the defense of America, rather than for the stabilization or the profit of corporations friendly to the administration.

Furthermore, the $4½ billion spent by the Federal Government in research and development which has considerable civilian value, should be made available to all of the productive forces of America. It is not the private property of the defense contractor who was adequately compensated for this work.

CIVIL RIGHTS

The most cherished civil right guaranteed to all citizens by the Constitution is the right to vote. The persistent resistance of some areas of the South to this fundamental guarantee constitutes a tragic blight which must be removed from the American scene.

During the course of this legislative session, I testified before the appropriate committees and frequently debated in support of a meaningful civil rights bill. A working coalition between southern Democrats and midwestern Republicans

collaborated to suppress civil rights legislation as well as other important legislation in the area of education, minimum wage, medical aid for the aged and housing.

In the 2d session of the 86th Congress, it took the mounting pressure of 219 signatures to dislodge this vital legislation from the Rules Committee stranglehold. As a member of the Civil Rights Steering Committee, I was proud to participate in the organization of this effort. If the power of the House Rules Committee is to be restrained, and if a comprehensive human rights program is to develop, it must be done through a revision of the rules of the 87th Congress.

The Voting Rights Act of 1960, which was finally passed, was a watered-down version of our original bill. The new law made it a crime to obstruct the enforcement of a court order relating to voting rights. It also made interstate flight from civil rights offenses a Federal crime. It provided for the retention of Federal election records and in addition provided for the appointment of referees to protect voting rights.

In my opinion, the administration has not exhausted efforts to insure voting rights and to provide equality in housing, or employment opportunities. The reservoir of regulatory power in these vital areas remains substantially untapped. The Federal Government has not attempted to regulate the elimination of discrimination and prejudice in employment, housing and education.

It remains for a new Congress and a new administration to aggressively attack the disease of prejudice and bigotry which weakens America. Fair employment practices and decent housing are certainly as important as voting rights and must be provided for. Intolerance at home must be fought as vigorously as it must be fought abroad.

On this very point any effort to inject religious bigotry into the coming national elections must be as vigorously opposed as we must oppose racial intolerance. It is all the same fight. Forces are now at work to inject religious bigotry side by side with racial intolerance into the coming elections. America must reject such a campaign of hate and repudiate those who foster it.

TAXES: LOOPHOLES AND RELIEF

The crushing burden of State, Federal, and local taxes has become one of the most critical problems of our times. Under our Federal tax system, every increase in salary or wages automatically results in an increase in taxes. During recent years, State and local taxes have had the most precipitous rise to provide our growing population with better highways, better schools, and better cities.

Most outspoken criticism has been directed toward Federal expenditures, most of which are spent for the national security. The great Federal debt of $289 billion results principally from the unpaid balance due on the cost of World War II and the Korean conflict. It is regrettable that wartime profits were not adequately taxed at that time. It is also significant that the debt made an increase of almost $30 billions during the past 8 years. This resulted more from tax loopholes created by the Revenue Act of 1954 than it did from the high cost of the Korean conflict.

Most Americans who complain about Federal expenditures fail to recognize that of the total Federal expenditure of over $77 billion in fiscal year 1960, almost $42 billion were spent for national defense, $3½ billion for the foreign aid programs related to the national security, $2½ billion for atomic energy research, $5½ billion for the cost of services to veterans, present, past, and future. In addition $9.2 billion were spent in fiscal 1960 to pay interest on the Federal debt which had almost doubled from $5.8 billion in 1952 because of administration policies which favored more return on the dollar to the lenders.

Therefore, after $5½ billion had been spent on the farm support program, slightly over $10 billion remained for all of the other important functions of the Federal Government including its frequently criticized welfare programs.

In my judgment the American people cannot expect any substantial Federal tax reduction until our Nation's leadership can develop foreign policies which can permit a reduction in the costly program of national defense and the frequently wasteful program of foreign spending. If world conditions could have permitted a $10 billion reduction in defense spending, the Nation would have been on its way to debt reduction and a more secure domestic economy.

As long as our Nation faces an angry and upset world, and contributes to this international delinquency, there is little hope for Federal tax reduction. For this reason I have diligently attacked tax loopholes and resisted tax reductions for special groups.

Earlier this year, I waged an almost one-man fight against a tax-escape bill which was loaded with benefits for bankers and businessmen doing business abroad. This bill, H.R. 5, in its original form, would have made it possible for a transfer of assets abroad by American corporations without the payment of capital gains taxes to the U.S. Treasury. In addition, this bill would have exempted from taxation the fabulous banking profits of our American banks in foreign countries.

As a result of my efforts, this bill was drastically modified to considerably meet a substantial portion of my objections.

THE MYTH OF THE BALANCED BUDGET

During the coming months much will be said about the balanced budget which was achieved in fiscal 1960. Completely obscured to the public will be the fact that during the past 8 years, $29.4 billion have been added to the Federal debt.

It may be entirely coincidental that budget surpluses occurred in fiscal 1956, 1957, and 1960, conveniently for the national elections involved.

In analyzing the fiscal operations of the Government, the American people should also be aware of the fact that the surplus for fiscal 1960 was in no small part due to the extraordinary contribution to the Federal Treasury by the so-called independent Federal Reserve bank.

In fiscal 1959, when the Nation was facing a $12½ billion deficit, the bank could only make a $491 million contribution. In 1960, however, this contribution was multiplied to $1,093 million. Thus, in order to balance the budget for fiscal 1960 and in order to show a political surplus, the Treasury had to call on the Federal Reserve Board to double its previous contribution. At the same time, heavy defense spending was deferred until July 1, 1960, the beginning of fiscal 1961.

When the true circumstances are brought to light, the 1960 balanced budget will prove to have been a fraud on the American people.

HOUSING AND URBAN TROUBLES

It is no secret that the cities of America are in trouble. The large urban centers of industry, finance, commerce, and culture, which have been the very heartbeat of our country, are suffering from decay and delay. Cities have been neglected at the hands of the rural-dominated State governments. Their tax base has been eroded by the shift of industry to outlying areas, by the loss of business to the suburban areas of population growth, and by the population movement to areas of improved housing and school facilities.

In desperation, the cities turned to the Federal Government for help in a bold and courageous program of urban restoration and preservation. There is no substitute for good housing, good schools, and good living in close proximity to the place of employment. The migration of people away from the areas of employment has more than offset the great gains which the American worker has made in reduced hours of daily work. The average American suffers more frustration and more anguish proceeding to and from his job than doing his daily work. He could enjoy almost one extra month of pleasant living each year, if he could conveniently live near his job.

It is for this reason that urban renewal and preservation of central city life has become a major American problem. The repeated efforts which have been made to continue and expand this program have met with resistance and repeated veto by the President. If a positive step forward is to be made in restoring to the city some of its lost integrity, leadership must be dedicated to the elimination of slums, blight, and the crime which they breed.

It has been firmly established that highway improvement alone cannot meet the problem of transporting large masses of people through urban areas. It will be necessary to develop an adequate Federal program for the creation of a mass transportation system in every urban area.

The only possible way to reverse the trend toward central city abandonment and hopeless traffic congestion is to develop an urban renewal program combined with a mass transportation system. By 1975, 80 percent of an estimated 215 million Americans will reside in our

urban areas. For most Americans this will mean doubling the present transit time to and from work. Unless this problem is immediately approached, by 1975 the average American will spend more time going to and from his job than he spends at work. It is high time for our Nation to concern itself more critically with the problems of the overwhelming majority of the people who now live in cities.

SOCIAL SECURITY—LITTLE CHANCE

Frustrated in efforts to obtain the legislative strength to pass a worthwhile medical care program for the aged as a part of social security coverage, Congress was forced to accept a compromise which merely increased the Federal share of medical care provided by the States to the indigent and to the needy aged not on relief rolls.

Social security recipients, who must work to survive while in retirement, will gain a slight advantage from a new provision in which the earnings limitation is raised from $1,200 to $1,500 annually under a complicated formula. For every $2 earned over $1,200 up to $1,500, the recipient will lose $1 of benefits. If he earns over $1,500, he will lose $1 of benefits for every $1 earned. This provision eliminates the former language under which a recipient would forfeit a month's pay if he earned $1 additional. Another section of the new law removes the age limitation on eligibility for total disability.

The 1960 changes in the social security program are only a small part of the tremendous work that must be done to bring the social security program up to date. In improving medical benefits for the indigent, the legislation serves to provide them with better medical services than the thrifty, low income, near-indigent can afford. The new Congress must make it possible for all recipients of social security to qualify for health benefits in retirement as a matter of earned right, without charity or proof of poverty by prepayment of premium during their working years. In addition, steps must be taken to substantially increase the limitations on allowable income to permit a decent standard of living in retirement. Steps must also be taken to reduce the retirement age of men from 65 to 62.

RUNAWAY FATHERS

During the course of the current session of Congress, I continued in my efforts to revise social security regulations to facilitate the location of runaway fathers. It is reliably estimated that family abandonment costs the taxpayers almost a million dollars each day. There is every indication that these costs will multiply unless steps are undertaken to reconcile runaway fathers to their family obligations. In this connection, I have prevailed upon the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to liberalize regulations relating to social security records and making them available to appropriate public authorities seeking to locate fathers of abandoned families on public relief.

As result of an article which appeared in the American Weekly magazine of July 24, 1960, discussing my efforts on the runaway father problem, hundreds and hundreds of letters have poured into my office describing the pathetic and desperate plight of countless abandoned families. Some runaway fathers developed a pattern of abandonment, leaving neglected families in several States and then moving on.

The present relaxation of social security regulations facilitating the search for runaway fathers is only a partial solution to the problem. It provides no help for abandoned families who are not public charges and who are attempting to solve their own support problem. In the next session of Congress I will endeavor to initiate and support legislation which will make interstate flight from family responsibility a Federal offense. Only in this way can the integrity of the American family be protected. Only in this way can we hope to save hundreds of millions each year to pay for the neglect of runaway fathers.

TANK PLANT CONTROVERSY

As Congress adjourns, a House Armed Services Committee investigation continues into the circumstances under which the Cleveland Ordnance Plant was bypassed on a recent $35 million defense contract. This inquiry is being conducted at my request after I learned that rigged bidding procedures prevented use of the Cleveland Ordnance Plant although an expensive Army survey recommended the Cleveland facility as being the most desirable and economical. As I predicted, this contract for the construction of the M–113 armored personnel carrier was finally awarded to the Food Machinery Corp., of San Jose, Calif.

On numerous occasions I took the floor to object to favoritism in contract awards. I succeeded in taking my case to the committee for a complete and thorough investigation of this unnecessary waste of taxpayers' money.

It is impossible for me to believe that production of the M–113 vehicle could economically take place anywhere else as long as the Government owned a tremendous and almost fully equipped plant in which the taxpayer already had an investment of $132 million, and which involved a Federal expenditure of almost $1 million each year to maintain it in idleness.

It is impossible for me to believe that a former Assistant Secretary of the Army, now hired as a consultant to the California plant, had nothing to do with this contract. My suspicion was also aroused when I learned that the chairman of the board of the successful bidder was actively participating in the fund raising campaign of a presidential candidate.

Cleveland's loss is California's gain. While the Cleveland tank plant lies idle, perhaps the finest facility of its kind in the world, a far less capable plant in California is bursting at its seams and advertising for the skilled workmen who are abundant and idle in the Cleveland area.

We cannot rest until we restore the Cleveland ordnance tank plant to full productive use, in either public or private work. Cleveland needs the 5,000 new jobs it will provide.

FEDERAL BUILDING FOR CLEVELAND

A $47 million Federal building for Cleveland is finally a reality with site acquisition and planning funds now available through approval of Senate and House committees. Site selection is now under way. By the summer of 1961, construction should begin on the largest building on the Cleveland scene in this generation.

In addition to long-term economies, the public will be better served by consolidating Federal business into one building from the present 33 scattered locations. Service to the public should be improved.

This new Federal building affords another tremendous advantage to Cleveland. It will become the pivot for the development of an adjacent urban renewal project. This should result in the construction of additional office buildings and high-rise residential apartments designed to provide suitable living accommodations for officeworkers who desire the additional living time which urban living permits.

This successful project is the result of the tremendous cooperation between local, State, and Federal officials as well as the unity of the entire Cleveland congressional delegation. I was pleased to have the responsibility of starting this project off in early February 1960 and seeing it consummated within a 5-month period. A fighting, unified congressional delegation can produce untold benefit for a progressive community.

POSTADJOURNMENT PLANS

After the close of this session and until January I shall be available almost daily at my Cleveland office, 506 Federal Building, on Cleveland's Public Square. The telephone number is Cherry 1–7900. My staff and I will be available to carefully consider any special problem or matter relating to the Federal Government. I will try to see personally every person who calls. One of the most important functions of a Congressman is to have personal knowledge of the problems of his constituents. It is also the responsibility of a Representative to translate and interpret the vast and complicated affairs of our Government in the most understanding way to every citizen. It is from these discussions that I learn firsthand of the effectiveness of Federal laws and of their administration.

It is also my intention to attend public meetings in various parts of my congressional district to personally discuss legislative matters with constituents at a time and place convenient to them. If I am to continue to legislate wisely, I must keep in close touch with my community in order to understand its problems. This is the very essence of democracy.

CONDITIONS IN THE POST OFFICES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time today in order to share with my colleagues a number of communications I have received concerning conditions in post offices, and among postal workers throughout the country.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation was founded on the principle of the dignity of the individual. I am disturbed by the fact that over the past few years postal workers have been frequently made to feel that they are slackers and that somebody has to police them and swing a whip or else they will not do a good day's work.

Postal workers are loyal Americans who are proud of the job they do. Any individual will do a more thorough and conscientious job if he is allowed the initiative and responsibility which contributes to improved morale.

In the name of efficiency, various methods have been installed in many post offices, with the professed objective of achieving more orderly and efficient service to the people. The objective sounds fine. We have had scientific management since the days of Frederick Taylor, and factories, businesses, and administrative agencies alike have benefited from these advances in efficiency. The Federal Government has work simplification programs, and the Bureau of the Budget has been working assiduously to extend these programs throughout the executive branch. This is all very fine—even though I have seen some administrative agencies which must subscribe to a sign I saw the other day: "Think: There must be a harder way to do it."

EMPLOYEE MORALE

Efficiency is an objective toward which every agency must strive. My only point is that when you undermine employee morale in the name of efficiency, you are destroying the very goal you seek. When you spread seeds of suspicion among loyal and hard-working employees, when you force older workers and disabled veterans to meet the same speedup standards as an able-bodied man in his twenties, you are not producing efficiency. No, the result is likely to be resentment. Given confidence and initiative, the average human being will go out of his way to contribute more to do a better job. Postal workers are proud of their jobs, proud of their service to the people of the United States of America, and they want to do a better job. But if you stand over them with a whip, Mr. Speaker, they will gradually lapse in doing only so much as is absolutely required and no more. That is a simple rule of human psychology.

This is the reason why I have raised objections to the so-called "distribution guides system" through which the Post Office Department has attempted, through a complicated set of filled-out forms, to raise the efficiency of the post office. When I voiced these objections, I began to get letters from many industrial concerns who were worried lest I was starting a drive against modern industrial efficiency practices. Nothing could be further from the truth. Private industry has made many long strides with its efficiency programs. I think particularly of a wonderful company in my own congressional district, the Schurman Construction Co. Its president, Al J. Schurman, and its vice president, John Riedel, have frequently talked with me about the fact they hired a trained psychologist, Dr. Madeline Peil—formerly a fellow member of the Marshall College faculty while I taught at Marshall—to work out an efficiency system which took into account the feelings of the workers themselves.

THE POST OFFICE AND HUMAN RELATIONS

It suddenly occurs to me, Mr. Speaker, that what the Post Office Department needs is a trained psychologist—or even a human being with common sense to explain human reactions—to review some of the so-called efficiency plans of the Post Office Department.

Mr. Speaker, in an election year we will hear all sorts of contentions that everything one party does is right and everything the other party does is wrong. I am not one who subscribes to the theory that we had the millennium in every aspect of human life prior to 1953 and we have been steadily going to pot in a hand basket since January 20, 1953—even though this makes an interesting argument. Therefore, I am not in the slightest embarrassed by those who argue that if we have had peepholes in the post offices under Jim Farley and Democratic administrations—and Republican also—for nearly a century, therefore they must be useful items.

Mr. Speaker, on January 18, 1960, I called attention to the presence of these peepholes in remarks to be found on pages 662 and 663 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. On January 25, 1960, some exception was taken to my remarks in data presented by several Members. I believe that the discussion served to put this issue into better perspective. Certainly we need some system to prevent mail thefts and protect the integrity of the mail. The Post Office Department, which appears to have a stake in the peephole system, will constantly call attention to individuals who have been allegedly caught through use of this system. But is it really the best and most effective system for catching criminals?

POSTMASTER BASS AND PEEPHOLES

My colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BASS] who served as a postmaster for 6½ years stated during the January 25 discussion:

I do not think the lookouts or peepholes in post offices serve the slightest purpose because I do not believe there are enough crooks in the postal service to demand the use of such an instrument. I do not think they are used very often. I think the expense of building them far exceeds the value that they perform for the postal service because I do not believe we have that many crooks in the postal service in the United States of America.

Mr. BASS further commented that—

Nothing is more important to the postal service, in my opinion, than the sanctity of the mails.

He went on to add:

However, in stating what I did, I am of the opinion that this really time-worn practice of lookouts is outmoded, because the average employee going into the postal service at the present time is so much under surveillance by his own fellow employees who have also this deep-seated desire to observe the sanctity of the mails, that this business of having an individual look at him through a lookout, in my opinion is unimportant. Every employee of the Post Office Department is a postal inspector in his own right because he is so proud of the institution for which he works that he is going to see that the sanctity of our mail is continuously preserved.

Mr. Speaker, I wish it were possible for me to reveal the full names of everyone who has written to me about the peepholes in the post offices, but so many employees have said that their jobs or their status might be endangered if their names are used publicly. Mr. Speaker, I believe that this fact in itself reveals an unhealthy situation among workers in the post offices. I do not believe that the best working conditions are those in which the workers are seized by fear and limited in their freedom of speech.

LETTERS FROM POSTAL WORKERS AND OTHERS

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I would like to include excerpts from some of the letters I have received:

JENNINGS, MO.,
January 28, 1960.

Representative KEN HECHLER,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I read with interest the article in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch concerning peepholes in our post offices.

I have a brother working for the postal department. He had a nervous breakdown in April 1959, was hospitalized for 2 months. He has always complained of being constantly watched at his work. His doctor said it was odd, but he had three other patients from the Post Office Department, with the same complaint. My brother broke down again last December and is now in the veterans hospital.

I sincerely hope you will continue your investigation and bring better working conditions to the postal employees.

Sincerely yours,

RUTH EPPLE.

FEBRUARY 18, 1960.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE HECHLER: Your remarks in a House speech with reference to inspectors of the Post Office Department are of great interest to me.

We have several inspectors assigned permanently at our post office. Several months ago another group of inspectors were sent to make a general survey. From all indications they will be here several more months. Recently another inspector was assigned to assist one of the local inspectors in the investigation of a "slowdown." Ironically, this investigation of a so-called slowdown was started 1 month prior to the installing of a speedup system which the Post Office Department calls the distribution guides system.

Many employees have come to me and told of being subjected to star chamber type hearings by these two inspectors. They told of being intimidated, threatened, and of coercive methods being used to get them to sign written statements. If the employees being questioned mentioned that they thought the morale was low in the post office, these inspectors did not seem to be interested in the morale of the employees, but would try to force the employees to give the names of employees who were not happy with their work.

These employees who were questioned were told to keep the questioning secret. I know

that many have been questioned but are afraid to tell anyone.

This type of intimidation had created an atmosphere of fear in this post office. I have always had the utmost respect for the postal inspectors in their role of safeguarding the U.S. mail and seeing that regulations are adhered to. The lookout galleries of the inspectors have never concerned me. But many employees fear they are being watched from the inspectors' lookouts, and I wonder if these inspectors' lookouts are being used to observe and listen to employees.

The atmosphere that exists on the workroom floor of this post office is more of what you would expect to find in a concentration camp or prison than what you would expect to find in a U.S. post office. These tactics are no doubt being used in many other post offices. Any assistance that you may give toward eliminating the fear that haunts employees in the post office will be greatly appreciated.

Respectfully yours,

(Name withheld by request).

———, N.C.,
March 29, 1960.

Representative KEN HECHLER,
Member of Congress, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

SIR: I was pleased to read in the press that the post office peepholes were irksome to you, too. It's a wonder that someone hasn't thought of closed-circuit television cameras over every cashbox too. The main office of our post office has just been air conditioned and because of new air ducts they have had to move and install about another hundred peepholes. What a waste of money and space.

(Name withheld.)

———, TENN.,
January 31, 1960.

Hon. Representative KEN HECHLER,
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: It is encouraging to see that you are opposed to the practice of installing peepholes for spying purposes in postal installations. I agree with you 100 percent (as do most clerks, carriers, and personnel other than management) that this device is similar to Nazi and Communist tactics. Further, it is an unnecessary expense to the taxpayer.

Of course, I would like for my name to be kept confidential in this matter as the post office has other vicious practices such as placing in an employee's record file a letter attesting to his inefficiency, disloyalty, insubordination, or any other charge that might strike a supervisor's fancy without the employee having knowledge of the charges.

In our post office there are over 50 of these peepholes. When this building was erected the old style rather plain, slotted metal peepholes were installed and were apparently satisfactory until about 3 years ago when they were replaced by the new type. I might point out that new lighting, air conditioning and other improvements were and still are much more greatly needed than peepholes. We have been using green shade reflector lights with 40-watt bulbs over the cases for a number of years. You can understand why a high percentage of us wear glasses.

Yours sincerely,

(Name withheld by request.)

———, MO.,
January 25, 1960.

Hon. KEN HECHLER,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: It was with considerable interest that I read your statement relative to peepholes in the post office. Having spent better than 37 years in the post office and visiting many others, I can appreciate your statements. While it is true, as Mr. Harding states, they are designed primarily for watching employees suspected of stealing or tampering with the mails, I have heard employees state they had been warned by supervisors that they should discontinue certain practices as inspectors might be watching. The mere thought of having someone spying on you strikes terror to the hearts of many people and something should be done to correct it. We appreciate your efforts.

Very truly yours,

(Name withheld).

———, W. VA.,
January 19, 1960.

Representative KEN HECHLER.

MY DEAR SIR: This morning the Parkersburg News carried an article headed "Swearingen Defends Post Office Catwalk." It seems you have called such a method of deterring evildoers "vicious, un-American, and an insulting spy system." I think you are right.

I am the cleaning man in one of these new post offices, and I was formerly a third-class postmaster. On the first day of each month the postmaster unlocks the door and I can wipe out the cobwebs and dust. Our postmaster is a prince of a man and, while all of the employees know the catwalk is there, we are not made to feel that he doesn't trust us. But who knows what his successor may be like?

My experience and feeling is that postal employees—whether they be inspectors, postmasters, clerks, carriers, or what not—are not deserving of such a secret-police method of treatment.

Respectfully yours,

(Name withheld).

———, CALIF.,
January 22, 1960.

Hon. KEN HECHLER,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I hope that this is but one of many letters you will receive as a result of your action on the matter of post office peepholes. These lookouts provided for the inspection service have been a subject of controversy for a long time. In fact, the length of time they have been used without change should cause us to be suspicious of their effectiveness in modern supervisory practices. It is time that a realistic appraisal was made of the results obtained through the means of the "catwalks" and whether their installation and maintenance is justified.

The lookouts are intended for the exclusive use of postal inspectors when they have a jacketed case against an employee or an office. Observations are supposed to be limited to the case at hand. Many postal offenders have been detected and apprehended through the use of the lookouts. Also a greater number of cases have been solved by other means.

Most new employees resent the lookouts because they do not understand their purpose. Gradually they accept them as a necessary evil and pay little attention to the numerous one-way windows and the ever present possibility of secret surveillance. There is little difference between post office lookouts and a "stakeout" as used in police work. However, their presence does have a demoralizing effect on both the employees and the supervisors of the post office.

Postal employees cannot help but feel that the lookouts are necessary because their immediate supervisors lack both the ability and authority to locate and discipline postal offenders. This may have been true at the time when the lookout system was started. Supervisors in the post office are now selected on the basis of their overall ability, consideration being given to their honesty, integrity, experience, loyalty, and those qualities which make them particularly capable of directing men in the best interest of the postal service. A supervisor is responsible for the training, performance evaluation, production, conduct, and discipline of the employees under his jurisdiction. Any condition which would tend to lessen the employee's respect for supervision should be carefully appraised.

Most cases of criminal acts in the post office could be solved if the inspection service solicited the cooperation of the immediate supervisor through the head of the establishment and took advantage of the experience and ability of the supervisor, as well as his knowledge of the personal habits and work status of the employees concerned.

Failure to do this amounts to a bypassing of command which is demoralizing to the supervisor involved. Bringing postal offenders to justice is as much a part of a supervisor's responsibility as it is that of any branch of the service.

The sooner we, as supervisors, are permitted to carry out this important part of our responsibilities the sooner there will be a marked improvement in the morale of all postal employees.

I am pleased that you are taking action and hope that you will take a realistic approach to this matter of peepholes, carefully weighing the costs, both in dollars and morale, against any benefits that may result in continuing this method of law enforcement. I am not satisfied that the lookouts are the best method, and feel that there must be some other and better method of spotting criminal offenders in the post offices.

I will be only too glad to assist your efforts in whatever way I can.

Respectfully yours,

(Name withheld.)

KRUSE, OUTCALT & UNDERCOFFER,
Cincinnati, Ohio, January 26, 1960.

Congressman KEN HECHLER,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HECHLER: I was very interested to read in the Cincinnati Enquirer your charges about the gestapo-like policy of the postal inspectors. I congratulate you on your forthright statements which were certainly very well taken. I have been extremely troubled about the same situation for some time and the matter came particularly to my attention when a very fine client of mine was arrested by the inspectors on peephole evidence. I am enclosing a copy of a memorandum I prepared in this case which I am certain you will find extremely interesting. As indicated in the memorandum this man's case was tried two times; the first trial resulting in a jury which hung, 11 to 1, in favor of acquittal; the second time, the man was acquitted. In spite of this and many, many repeated efforts on our behalf we have been unable to get this man reinstated to the postal service even though he has been proven not guilty and, in fact, found not guilty by 23 of 24 jurors who heard his case.

We have made repeated attempts to do something about this and Congressman WILLIAM E. HESS was most helpful and cooperative but nevertheless no one in the Post Office Department will take any proper action to see that justice is done. It seems that everything you try to accomplish in the Post Office Department on this case runs up against the same blank wall, the fact that no one in the Post Office Department wants to dispute the almighty word of the postal inspectors. I realize a considerable amount

of time has gone by on this but I do feel that you will be interested because of your remarks. If you think that there is anything you can do to see that justice is done in this case I certainly would be eternally grateful for your efforts.

Very sincerely yours,

PETER OUTCALT.

To Whom It May Concern:

On October 31, 1958, Nelson Conner was acquitted by a jury in U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Ohio, Western Division, of charges of theft and embezzlement from the mail. This was at the conclusion of two long and tedious trials. Subsequent to this, Attorneys Peter Outcalt and Harry A. Abrams requested of H. C. Rumble, Regional Operations Director, of the U.S. Post Office in Cincinnati, Ohio, that Mr. Conner be reinstated as a letter carrier and granted backpay.

On January 22, 1959, Mr. Rumble notified Mr. Outcalt and Mr. Abrams that the case has been reviewed by representatives of the Chief Postal Inspector, Washington, D.C., and that a recommendation was made to the effect that Mr. Conner was not to be reinstated in the Post Office Department. This so-called investigation was made, as far as can be ascertained, on the basis of having talked to the postal inspectors who had charge of the prosecution of Mr. Conner's case and it did not include talking to Mr. Conner or interviewing witnesses who testified on his behalf. It is, therefore, felt that the so-called investigation was an attempt by the Chief Postal Inspector to justify the action of his subordinates to wit: the local inspectors for the Post Office Department who caused the arrest of Mr. Conner. Therefore, it is felt that this investigation did not, and could not ascertain all of the facts in the case.

We, as Mr. Conner's attorneys, are setting forth here a résumé of the background of Mr. Conner's employment and subsequent activities in the post office up to, and including the day of his arrest, with the hope that this will result in justice being done to Mr. Conner by leading to his eventual reinstatement with all backpay.

Mr. Conner is married and resides at 4900 Shirley Place, Cincinnati 38, Ohio. He has four children, one of whom graduated from the West Point Military Academy in June 1958, where he was captain of the baseball team. This son is now stationed on active military duty in the Hawaiian Islands. Two of Mr. Conner's daughters attend the University of Cincinnati on scholarships and one daughter is in high school. Mr. Conner was employed by the Post Office Department on October 8, 1928. From that time until the date he was arrested by the post office inspectors, he has been a hard-working and conscientious individual, has lived very modestly and at the time of the alleged offense, had a mortgage on his home and was driving a 1946 automobile. From October 8, 1928, he worked continuously in the Post Office Department in various capacities for approximately 29 years. During that time he bore an excellent reputation and had the respect of everyone in the community including persons associated with him in the Post Office Department, individuals to whom he delivered mail and the people who knew him in the community in which he resided. Just a few months prior to the alleged offense there was a suspicion of mail being rifled at the place of business of one of the customers on his route and Mr. Conner was taken into confidence by the post office inspectors in the investigation of this case. As a result of his cooperation in the investigation, the culprit was apprehended by the postal inspectors. This case where an employee of Bond Clothes, the addressee, was opening and rifling mail matter, was similar to the instant one.

Mr. Conner does not smoke, drink or gamble and is a highly respected member of the St. Peter and St. Paul United Church of Christ.

The alleged offense charged against Mr. Conner occurred on June 18 and 19 of 1957. The post office inspectors were concealed in the lookout in the post office on June 18 and they stated they saw Mr. Conner put two letters in a magazine case which was adjacent to his letter case. These inspectors testified that they thought the letters went into a magazine. It is customary that when letters appear in a letter carrier's mail which does not belong to that particular carrier for him to put the letter aside for the carrier who actually had the route. The particular letters involved in this case belonged on the route of letter carrier, Sam Conover, whose case was directly alongside of Mr. Conner's and it was customary for Mr. Conner to put mail belonging to Mr. Conover's route in the magazine rack between their two cases in order to facilitate delivery of such mail. There was ample testimony in the trial that this was a perfectly proper method of handling the mail and at least one of the Government witnesses even testified that they saw Mr. Conover at one time remove some of this mail from the magazine rack indicating, to any reasonable mind that Mr. Conner's idea in putting the mail in the magazine rack was to get it into Mr. Conover's possession. These two particular letters on June 18 apparently got inside of the magazine inadvertently and the magazine was finally delivered to one Edna Rains, a customer on Mr. Conner's route. Mrs. Rains later saw the letters, which were unopened and not tampered with and she subsequently returned them to the Post Office Department. There is absolutely no question that Mr. Conner had no intention to take the two letters because he certainly could have very easily appropriated them along his route and abstracted the contents. Certainly, one who steals mail would not place it in a magazine and then deliver it to a customer. As indicated before, these letters were intact when repossessed by the Post Office Department.

It was also charged that Mr. Conner took two other letters on the 18th day of June, one of which was found in the misthrow case and one of which was found by a clerk who was resorting mail at night. Neither of these letters was ever found in Mr. Conner's possession.

That night, the postal inspectors prepared four test letters. The next day, namely June 19, 1957, the inspectors again watched through the peephole claiming that they saw Mr. Conner put another letter addressed to an addressee not on his route in his letter pouch. This was one of the test letters. As he left the post office to go on his route he was apprehended by the postal inspectors and taken to their office. He was searched and there was found in his letter pouch, one of the test letters which was intact and unopened and which Mr. Conner claimed unquestionably was inadvertently included in his mail. It must be pointed out that this letter was placed in the mail given to Mr. Conner by the inspectors on the night before. While he was in the inspectors' office, Mr. Conner was searched and during this search there was no marked money, or glue or anything indicating thefts or embezzlement found on his person. After an exhaustive search of his pouch by employees of the postal inspector, one of the test letters which was unopened and had not been tampered with was located in his pouch. The inspector and his investigative aids went over the mail carefully three times but could only locate one test letter. It was claimed that a substitute letter carrier in delivering the mail in the pouch later in the day found the other test letter and returned it to the post office inspector's office. It is the most earnest contention of Mr. Conner that these two test letters must have gotten into his mail entirely by accident. The inspectors themselves overlooked one of the test letters in examining his pouch. There was ample evidence in the trial of the case that such misthrows are an ordinary occurrence in the course of a letter carrier's duties. The evidence showed that Mr. Conner apparently followed his usual custom in regard to the other two letters of putting them in the magazine case where Carrier Conover, got possession of them. At any rate, they were delivered by the proper carrier to the addressee and were intact and not tampered with.

At no time was there any evidence or testimony whatsoever that Mr. Conner had, in his pocket or on his person, any moneys belonging to anyone other than himself, nor was there at any time any letter found in his possession which was tampered with nor opened. Mr. Conner had a locker at the Post Office Department which was never locked and to which the postal inspectors and all other employees of the Post Office Department could always gain access. Mr. Conner, after his apprehension, strenuously denied any guilt although examined practically the whole day long by three representatives of the Post Office Department during which time he was not given permission to call his wife, make bond, or retain an attorney.

Mr. Conner produced the maximum number of character witnesses allowed to him during his trial and has obtained letters from individuals attesting to his good reputation and character. Practically everyone who knows this man in connection with his work as a letter carrier or who has come in contact with him during his civic and church work would be very willing to testify to his honesty, integrity, and good character. All of the evidence introduced in the trial was merely suspicion because no one could definitely state that they saw him take a letter, open one, or have a mutilated or opened letter in his possession. There was never any evidence that he had in his possession the contents of any letter which he handled as a mailman. Mr. Conner is extremely well regarded by the mail carriers in the Cincinnati Post Office and if the rules of court had permitted, many more of them would have been glad to testify on his behalf.

Mr. Conner was actually tried twice, the first jury having been deadlocked 11 to 1 for acquittal and if it had not been for the fact that one of the jurors had fallen from his chair while the jury was deliberating, Mr. Conner would have undoubtedly been acquitted at the first trial. In fact, this jury was so incensed after being discharged that many of the members cried, and some of them even expressed the opinion that a law suit should be filed against the post office inspectors who brought the charge.

A strong indication of the bias and prejudice on the part of the inspectors can easily be seen by the following example. Before the first trial, Mr. Conner was indicted under indictment No. 9345 in which he was charged with embezzling six letters. After the hung jury in the first trial, the inspectors brought in numerous other letters which had been rifled, accused Mr. Conner of having taken them and had him indicted under charge No. 9382 for doing so. There was not one iota of evidence indicating that they were ever in his possession.

During the second trial, the court upon motion of the counsel for the defendant, withdrew all of the counts of the second indictment from the consideration of the jury stating there was no basis whatsoever for

having charged Mr. Conner for such offenses. In the remaining count, the jurors found Mr. Conner not guilty. We have here a situation where two juries at two different times were almost unanimously in favor of Mr. Conner, indicating that a wrong had been done to him and having completely vindicated him as hereinbefore stated.

As a result of the unjust arrest of Mr. Conner, he has suffered considerable financial loss and anxiety and he and his family have undergone a tremendous amount of privation, embarrassment, and discomfort. Although his friends have tried to be of help to him, he has not been able to secure any permanent employment because of his age and he has gone in debt securing the necessary money for his defense and for the maintenance of his family. Now that he has been acquitted he certainly is entitled to reinstatement to the post office where he has spent the best years of his life. We believe that a thorough investigation of all the facts, including an interview with Mr. Conner and his witnesses would show conclusively that his plea for reinstatement is just and proper. It would clearly indicate how baseless and unwarranted the charge was against him. To do otherwise than to reinstate Mr. Conner and give him back pay for the time he has been separated from the postal service would be completely disregarding the American jury system and making a mockery of the civil service regulations under which he worked.

It is interesting to compare this case with one involving the arrest of a water meter reader in Cincinnati by the name of Robert Lyons. He was charged with the murder of a customer along his route and indicted for first degree murder. Although he had previously confessed to this offense, he repudiated that confession on trial and was acquitted by a jury. Being an employee of the city of Cincinnati, the city civil service commission then considered his case and based upon his acquittal, immediately reinstated him as an employee of the city because of the jury verdict. The city civil service commission felt that in view of the finding of the jury, he was entitled to be reinstated.

In this case we have a vastly different situation inasmuch as Mr. Conner has, from the very beginning, denied any guilt and the entire case was built on a group of capricious assumptions made by the postal inspector and his employees. We sincerely believe that the arrest of Mr. Conner was the result of overzealousness on the part of the Post Office inspector, who was attempting to have someone arrested in order to conclude an investigation which was causing him a great deal of trouble. Two juries which heard the case were satisfied of Mr. Conner's innocence and it is certainly not asking too much for the Government to reinstate him to his former position.

Respectfully submitted.

PETER OUTCALT,
HARRY A. ABRAMS,
Attorneys for Nelson Conner.

———, W. VA.,
January 27, 1960.

Hon. KEN HECHLER,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: When we officers in the Federal prison service found it necessary to cite an inmate for misconduct there was a space at the bottom of the form for us to indicate whether or not we had advised the inmate that we were "writing him up." And, if we were to answer that question negatively the writeup was disregarded by the officials—because they felt that the inmate was entitled to know that we had initiated action in his case. Contrariwise in the postal service where they are dealing with respectable citizens instead of convicted criminals, there isn't 1 instance out of 100 when the employee is acquainted with the fact until he is in receipt of a letter from the postmaster. Even though the foreman has observed the activity of the employee and decided to write details of that observation to the postmaster, in most instances the employee is wholly unaware of any such until he receives the official letter from the postmaster.

Both the Post Office Department and the Federal prison service are parts of the same Federal Government and it seems ridiculous to accord a convicted criminal more consideration than is accorded a respectable citizen.

Yours respectfully,

(Name withheld).

———, CALIF.,
January 1960.

DEAR SIR: My heartiest congratulations to you on your exposure of post office peepholes. I am a post office employee and for obvious reasons I cannot sign my name. After all, Drew Pearson might be hiding in your filing cabinet.

The alibi that the postal inspectors use is that the peepholes are necessary to catch dishonest employees. That's plain nonsense. I know most of the several hundred employees here in the post office and not a one of them would put as much as a 4-cent stamp in his or her pocket. I've seen them pick up stamps that have come off letters and put them in a box that we have for that purpose.

A POSTAL WORKER.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
January 24, 1960.

Representative KEN HECHLER,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: A men's room into which the notorious spy peepholes peered was converted into a women's room. From the buzzing conversation among the women at the time, which I could not help overhearing, since I "swept" the mail sorted by the women sorters, they had no assurance that these peepholes were not being literally "manned."

Sincerely,

(Name withheld).

———, W. VA.,
January 22, 1960.

DEAR SIR: I am a postal clerk at the ———, W. Va., post office and I was once disciplined for an infraction of the rules that could have been observed only from the "peepholes." Of course any shirking of work observed from the peepholes is not ignored. Why should it be?

For obvious reasons I cannot disclose my identity.

(Name withheld).

———, MICH.,
January 22, 1960.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C.
(Attention Representative HECHLER):

The following is submitted for informational purposes relative to peepholes.

This device installed in ceilings is approximately 30 inches by 18 inches, 8 to 10 inches in depth; has a one-way view mirror, costs from $41 to $45 per unit to the post office and a prime vendor is Metal Products Co., Ferrysburg, Mich.

(Name withheld).

———, GA.,
January 1960.

Hon. KEN HECHLER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Thanks so much for speaking up for the postal employees in regards to the peepholes. I know of no other business that stoops to such low tactics.

Most post offices are small. There are about 70 men that work in the one I work in and we have three wheels who watch at all times to be sure we stay busy. Each route at all stations is more than 8 hours long and so you have to keep on the ball to even get most of your route done each day. There is no time to "goof" off, but as usual most bosses think that is the only reason we even work for the Government. They can't seem to realize that it is also our country that we are working for. And they are also employed by the same Government as supervisors, not slavedrivers.

Sincerely,

(Name withheld).

CHARLESTON, W. VA.,
January 19, 1960.

Representative KEN HECHLER,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I read your article in today's paper, and being a postal worker I enjoyed it. Peeping is only one of many things they do to us. Sometimes I believe if the Russians took over our country, they wouldn't treat the postal employees any worse than we experience at present.

Sincerely,

(Name withheld).

OJAI, CALIF., *January 19, 1960.*

Hon. KEN HECHLER,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I have been wondering when someone in Congress would comment on the practice of the Post Office Department, in requiring lessors of new post office buildings to provide "inspection galleries," with peepholes and one-way observation panels in all new construction. According to an article on UPI wire, as published in today's San Francisco Chronicle, I see that you have taken issue with this practice.

I can tell you something about it. As a trustee of the Ojai Civic Association, I have been connected actively with the construction of a new post office building, which we are leasing to the Government for 10 years. When we got the specifications on which we made our successful bid, we were astonished to find in them a clause describing the inspection gallery with its appurtenances. Since this post office is to serve a small city of 4,000 population, in which nearly everybody knows everybody else, and, of course, all the post office employees, we felt that this was an insult to them, and a reflection upon their integrity, and it met with universal disapproval among our citizens.

Nevertheless, it had to be, so we had our architect design accordingly. This meant that we had to increase the proposed ceiling height, construct the gallery, and provide the expensive lookouts, and so forth, required, with the net result that we had to increase our bid and rental to compensate, by over $6,000, thereby adding 8.6 percent (or more) to the cost of construction.

Now, I maintain this: that even if petty peculations by post office employees were to go undetected for a long time, it would take a lot of dishonesty to offset the additional cost of the building; furthermore, in a small community like ours it insinuates that our respected and loyal fellow citizens, who work for the Government, are potential crooks. I think that the blow to their self-respect far outweighs the protection, so expensively gained. It may be necessary—and probably is—in a large metropolitan area, but I question the policy in small towns, for in the long run we all pay for it both in trust and taxes, or revenue.

I wish you luck in your investigation.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN A. DRON, Sr.

———, ARK.,
January 22, 1960.

Representative KEN HECHLER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE HECHLER: As the wife of a postal employee I was interested in the article which appeared in the Thursday morning, January 21 edition of the Commercial Appeal (Memphis, Tenn.) relative to the peephole policy of the Postal Department and your move of an investigation of same.

My husband served in the Army during World War II and was cleared for handling security documents; he worked with the Corps of Engineers and handled estimates of thousands of dollars; yet in his work with the Post Office Department he never knows when he or his work is being scrutinized by a "Peeping Tom." Who peeps on the "Peeping Tom"? Is he entrusted with security documents? Are his estimates valued at thousands of dollars?

Being a member of the fairer sex I should be ashamed to admit that maybe some of the "girls" are not above suspicion in the postal department, but no one peeps on them, well, the men I know who are connected with the postal department should be and are so far as I know, entirely above suspicion.

Another point that I would like to bring out here is that actually when they do the work to which they are assigned, they have little time to pry into pieces of mail. At our local post office they are so afraid that the boys will cost the Government for services that they do not render that someone is always piling work on them before they can finish their regular job even if you have to clock out to finish it on your own time. At the present time my husband is handling the civil service work, gratis, yes, he has to work up his own programs and give them on his own time because it was a policy established by the post office, but no means of recompense was established at the same time. I admit it is a service to humanity and to our fellowmen, but when the Corps of Engineers give a service to humanity in the high water fights, the boys are paid for overtime.

I suppose you, as I, wondered in your childhood why the postal buildings were so tall, well until our affiliation it escaped my knowledge that such a waste of space as you see in 20- to 25-foot ceilings is all to accommodate the "peepers." Such a waste in materials in construction and such a waste in upkeep might trim some from the budget.

Another thing, why don't you see that it is published that the funds from the post office go into the general fund and then the public harps on the cost of postal service.

Any other Federal agency that I know anything about has a break in the shift for coffee, statistics prove that you work more efficiently when this is an established policy, but the poor postal clerk must be on the alert all the time, he never has time to have a cup of coffee, unless someone brings it to his window for him to drink and then the supervisory personnel thinks this might not add to the dignity of the office, so unless you are a city carrier and duck in someplace for a quick cup, you dare not stop because the peeper might be there.

Postal employees are human just as the rest of us, for the most part they are honest people trying to make an honest living, and although they don't get the breaks most Federal employees think of as a part of their job, they try to make the best of the situation, but it certainly does not add to a harmonious working condition to know that in doing your best, some Peeping Tom might not approve of your method of handling the work.

The Arkansas scheme for dispatching the mail requires that you know about 1,000 towns and the method of mail service each has—with the thought of someone watching you sort the mail it is a little disconcerting and yet if you make a mistake you are called on the carpet? How many peepers as well as how many other people could sort the 48 States if someone were looking or you had the feeling someone was looking and it isn't always the women who have the intuition that gives them the suspicion.

We hope this investigation will make for righting some policies which undermine your morale and will create more favorable working conditions in more harmonious situations.

Sincerely,

(Name withheld).

———, FLA.,
January 22, 1960.

Representative KEN HECHLER.

DEAR SIR: I read your article in the newspaper about postal "spying" and I can say that it really was the correct title for it. I have been in the Government service and in the Post Office for the past 34 years, and I can tell you that the majority of postal employees resent this underhand Russian-type method that is used.

Their comeback that they caught about 50 Christmas help stealing by this method was amusing to me. I don't know if you knew why this happened, but I can tell that during the Christmas rush this office hired men to work in the post office they didn't know anything about them. They were just cheap labor to use, so that they would not have to work the regulars and pay us overtime. Every year the postal service does this, and then they come out with a sweet letter telling you that the mail increased 40 percent, and they appreciate the good work of the regulars in getting the mail out during the holidays. The morale in the post office is the lowest in history, and if the authorities keep on treating the employees like this it will get lower. We are the lowest paid Government workers, and I doubt if we even get a raise this year.

Each year we handle more mail with less help, and we are allowed less overtime, due to the use of scab labor. I am hoping that Congress will do something about this. Another thing they use regular subs for as many hours as they want, but I feel and our union feels that everybody should be paid 1½ for all hours over 40 hours, but so far Congress has not done anything about it. Thanking you again for putting this Gestapo method before the public of the way the post office spies on all their faithful employees.

Sincerely yours,

(Name withheld.)

DEAR SIR: I have read an article in the newspaper concerning a statement you made in regards to peepholes in post offices as being "vicious, un-American, and insulting." I congratulate you, sir, and wish we had more that thought the same as you.

I am an ex-postal clerk and I want to tell you that you have only touched the surface on the slave-labor working conditions under which a sub postal clerk earns a living. I started in the employ of the Post Office Department in July of 1956 and quit in April of 1957. A total of 10 months. During those 10 months I never worked with a more discouraged group of men in my life. To prove my point—when I started, I started with a group of 32 men and when I left there were 14 left. This was better than average. Average amounted to about 50-percent quit rate in 6 months. I would like to list a few of the regulations under which a sub postal clerk works.

He can be worked 12 hours a day; 7 days a week. During those 12 hours he is allowed a half an hour to eat. He has to punch a timeclock and is allowed no more than 6 minutes over 30 minutes. During that time he is allotted to eat, he has to ride an elevator to the basement, stand in line for his food, eat, and then ride the elevator to the third floor.

Contrary to all labor and Government laws he is not paid any overtime for hours worked above 40 hours a week.

Getting back to those peepholes. These peepholes are all over. Even in the restrooms. The toilets are not partitioned for this reason but are lined up open as if for cattle. Besides these peepholes being everywhere there are supervisors in every aisle keeping constant watch. Everybody is given a number on a card and as you are moved from place to place this number is your name.

The sub clerk is given a different time every day to report and he does not know it till about the time he leaves the previous day. When he reports for work he usually works 6 hours till he is permitted to eat. He then returns and works 6 more hours without a regulation break if he is needed. He also can be compelled to report for work and work only 2 hours for 2 hours' pay for a day. There also is a regulation that states that only an 8-hour break is required from the time you leave your job till you are to report again. For instance, and this had happened to me and others, you start to work at 12:30 p.m. and work the following day till 1 a.m. You then are told to report for work at 9 a.m. the same day for another 12 hours. Remember that you are standing most of this time. If you decide you want a coke, you can get and drink it at the coke machine, but you are not allowed to sit down.

As you are working under these conditions you are given schemes to study on your own time. Now these schemes are pretty rough because you can imagine learning every street in the St. Louis area for zones besides your own scheme for carriers in your zone which are constantly changing.

I hope that I am not making this letter too long but these are just a few of the grievances connected with that job. Some of the others that are there but which I will not go into detail are: The arrogance and Hitlerite attitude of some supervisors. Having to buy, rent, or make your own equipment to study with. How you are written up for forgetting your badge one time, etc.

When I left the post office the last day (I put in 12 hours from 6 p.m. to 6:30 a.m. the following day), I felt as I laid that badge on the counter like a man would have felt, I am sure, as if he was let out of prison.

I went to work for the Air Force the following Monday and I couldn't help but wonder how the same Government that I was working for now ran the Post Office. It was as different as night and day.

When I worked for the Post Office I wrote the postmaster of the city of St. Louis and told him that a sub clerk job was a disgrace to the U.S. Government and I still believe it. Thank you for your time, sir.

RICHARD A. VOGEL.

ST. LOUIS, MO.

———, OREG.,
January 26, 1960.

Representative KEN HECHLER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: In the Portland Oregonian Sunday, January 24 there was an article "Democrat Raises Rumpus on Postal Peephole Cost." It was, of course, concerning you and your wanting a peek at the post office's budget for peepholes. Well, I'm not a Democrat, but in this instance I'm with you.

——— opened its new post office just a few days ago. Inasmuch as my husband is a letter carrier, we watched the progress while it was under construction. One day it was far enough along so that we could go in. It was all very nice—but what were those cupboard-like corridors with windows at intervals (these windows have special glass, too).

My husband told me they were for spying. I could hardly believe my ears. Such things were done in medieval times, but this is 1960 and the United States.

I really doubt that the general public knows that post offices have peepholes. If so, why hasn't something been done about them. It seems to me the peephole budget could be eliminated and the money put to a much more honorable and better advantage—namely, a postal pay raise. I would really like to know just how many of those on the peephole committee could exist on less than $300 a month? We have to—and on it raise a family, buy food, clothing, etc. And let me tell you it really hurts when there are medical, dental, and drug bills.

Anyway, more power to you, and I hope you get a peek at the budget for peepholes. I, too, would like a peek, but I know I'd just froth at the unfairness of it. Ask them why the peephole system isn't used in banks where we do hear about robberies and pilfering. And I doubt that a bank employee is checked on as closely as a postal employee before he is hired—and on top of it they have to be spied upon—what a slap in the face that is.

Sincerely,

(Name withheld.)

PANAMA WARNS UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, a United Press International dispatch from Panama City, Panama, dated August 30, 1960, quotes Foreign Minister Miguel A. Moreno, Jr., as warning the United States that it must act promptly on Panamanian demands to fly the Panama flag over the Canal Zone "if it wishes to avoid new violence."

Events on November 3 and 28, 1959, when Panamanian mobs attempted to invade the Canal Zone, clearly show what did happen on two previous occasions, precisely as predicted by me far in advance.

Unless this threat is met with adequate action by our Government, we are due for more trouble at Panama. If the Panamanian Government is unable or unwilling to restrain radical elements in Panama from organized violence such as that which occurred last November, the United States should warn Panama publicly that any future efforts to invade the Canal Zone will be repelled.

But more important than this attempt for political blackmail by Panama is the statement by Foreign Minister Moreno that Secretary Herter, in recent bilateral talks with him in San José, "accepted the flag claim of Panama but did not give any assurances."

That, Mr. Speaker, is a shocking revealment of moves yet undisclosed to the people of the United States, which require the full spotlight of public scrutiny. Does this acceptance mean that the Secretary of State has come to an agreement with the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Panama to fly the Panamanian flag over the Canal Zone? Because of its potential significance, does it mean that the Secretary of State will recommend to the President the formal display of the Panama flag over that strip of U.S. territory after the Congress adjourns? Until the statement of Foreign Minister Moreno is denied or clarified by the Secretary of State, the sovereign people of the United States and their Congress must assume that the stage is set for further surrenders at Panama.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Government Operations is now engaged in an inquiry into subversive influences in the Department of State with respect to the conduct of our isthmian policies. The indicated UPI dispatch supplies further evidence of the necessity for such inquiry into the operations of our State Department, which has completely demonstrated its inability or unwillingness to defend our isthmian policies against Bolshevist-inspired attacks.

The people of the United States have become tired of such attempts at political blackmail. They demand that we stand up for our treaty-based rights and policies with respect to our constitutionally acquired territory of the Canal Zone and terminate what has been an era of pusillanimous surrenders at Panama.

The indicated UPI dispatch as quoted in the August 31, 1960, issue of the Washington Post follows:

PANAMA WARNS UNITED STATES ABOUT FLAG

PANAMA CITY, PANAMA, August 30.—Foreign Minister Miguel Moreno tonight warned the United States it must act promptly and fly the Panamanian flag over the Panama Canal Zone "if it wishes to avoid new violence."

Moreno spoke to a crowd chanting nationalist slogans calling for Panamanian sovereignty over the Canal Zone. Moreno was hailed for reasserting Panama's rights to the zone at the San Jose Foreign Ministers' Conference, particularly the flag demand.

The foreign minister said U.S. Secretary of State Christian Herter, in bilateral talks, accepted the flag claim of Panama but did not give any assurances.

PANAMA INTRIGUE: CONGRESS MUST INVESTIGATE

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on numerous occasions I have addressed the House on the crucial subject of the Caribbean. The location of that vast sea on one of the great crossroads of the world, because of the Panama Canal, gives it the highest strategic importance with respect to the security of the Western Hemisphere, which has been marked for conquest through the paralyzing method of Communist subversion.

How far has this program for conquest progressed? Already the drive for control of the Caribbean is well advanced, with Cuba, on the northern flank of the Atlantic approaches to the Panama Canal, a Soviet captive, and Venezuela, on the southern flank, a center for subversion. These form a double pincer movement with the Panama Canal as the key target.

In Panama radical elements, fanned by well-trained Communist mentors, have focused their efforts on worldwide agitations to obtain recognition of Panamanian sovereignty over the Panama Canal and Canal Zone, with the display of the Panama flag over the zone as the crucial issue. In addition, the Panama Government has made official request of the United States for such display.

When this demand became known to the people of the United States, thoughtful citizens instinctively recognized that, in view of recent history, such display would be tantamount to flying the red flag of the Soviet Empire over United States territory. They deluged the Congress with letters from individuals and resolutions from organizations voicing strong opposition to surrendering to that extortionate demand.

The first result of this opposition was passage by the House of House Concurrent Resolution 459 on February 2, 1960, after a notable debate, by the overwhelming vote of 381 to 12. The purpose of this measure was to prevent such display unless authorized by treaty.

Later, on February 9, the House adopted the Gross amendment to the Department of Commerce appropriation bill, which provided that no part of its appropriation should be "used to construct a flagpole, platform, or any other device for the purpose of displaying the flag of Panama in the Canal Zone, the sovereign control of which is vested in the U.S. Government by virtue of longstanding treaty."

Could anything, Mr. Speaker, be clearer as to the intent of the Congress, which under our Constitution is representative of the sovereign people and of the States, than these actions? I think not.

Notwithstanding their clear import, agitations continued in Panama, especially in the Spanish language press, for recognition of Panamanian sovereignty over the Canal Zone and for formal display of the Panamanian flag as evidence of that sovereignty. This, coupled with a discreet silence on the part of the Department of State and opposition to corrective measures in the Congress, clearly indicated a determination on the part of subordinates in that Department to recommend flag display to the President.

So obvious was this determination that I addressed the House at length on June 23 urging that our isthmian policies be defended against Bolshevist attack and quoted State Department letters which confirmed my suspicions as to its intentions.

In fact, so shocking were these letters quoted in my address of June 23, that on two subsequent occasions I warned the House that, after adjournment, the State Department would recommend display of the Panamanian flag over the Canal Zone in violation of the intent of the Congress. In addition, I wrote the Secretary of State on June 30, 1960, apprising him of essential facts and serving notice that should the flag of Panama be displayed over the Canal Zone with the knowledge of his Department that Members of the Congress would press for his impeachment. Also, I wrote to the chairman of the Committee on Government Operations urging an immediate investigation of the Department of State to identify what, in effect, has been a treasonable influence on the conduct of our isthmian policies.

Published in a brief statement to the House on July 1, 1960, these letters have evoked many favorable comments from people in various parts of the country

and Members of the Congress. The latter support, Mr. Speaker, I am particularly gratified to report, comes from members of both major parties.

Among the revealments growing out of publication of these letters was information to the effect that the late Secretary of State Dulles, subsequent to the 1956 Suez crisis, issued an order to the Caribbean area directing that no officer of the State Department discuss the surrender of U.S. sovereignty over the Canal Zone or in any way equate the situation at Suez as a precedent for Panama. I promptly wrote, on July 7, 1960, to the Secretary of State requesting a copy of this order of Secretary Dulles.

On July 14, 1960, the Secretary of State, in reply to my first letter, evaded the crucial question presented. He stated that he would be guided by the "same concern for national interest and constitutional responsibility" which governs all—his—activities as Secretary of State. Thus, his reply merely deferred the answer one step.

Hence, on July 20, I addressed the Secretary in another letter inquiring whether his concern required him to maintain the unquestioned sovereignty of the United States over the Canal Zone or does it permit him to authorize or allow the display of the Panamanian flag there as a symbol of Panamanian authority.

Again I assert that from the official record it is clear there are subversive influences in the Department of State which are aiding and abetting Soviet penetration of Cuba and the entire Caribbean area, and Panama itself. All of this is with the purpose and intent of divesting the United States of any control over the Panama Canal, the overthrow of the Monroe Doctrine, and the establishment of Soviet satellites throughout the Americas.

Mr. Speaker, the fires of communism are burning fiercely in the Caribbean regions. How can anyone who really desires to quench the conflagration be so naive or complacent as to believe that this can be done by adding the combustible of the display of the Panamanian flag as evidence of Panamanian sovereignty over the Canal Zone? And how, Mr. Speaker, can anyone in authority in our Government be so naive or complacent as to fail to realize that such action would inevitably be accepted by Panama and so regarded by the world at large as the first step toward Panama's ultimate goal of nationalization of the canal?

These questions, Mr. Speaker, are of such transcendent consequence, not only to the United States but also in this hemisphere, that they cannot be ignored or evaded. They present investigatory problems to the Congress of the highest importance to our national security.

In order that all the correspondence on this subject in my possession may be easily available to the Congress and the Nation, I quote the letters above referred to as follows:

JUNE 30, 1960.

HON. CHRISTIAN A. HERTER,
Secretary of State,
Department of State, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: As shown by documentation in my address to the House on June 23, 1960, copy enclosed, it is clear that subordinates in your Department are determined to engage in the treacherous act of raising the Panama flag over the Canal Zone contrary to specific provisions of an act of this Congress and in violation of our treaty rights.

On two subsequent occasions, I have warned the House of Representatives that promptly after Congress adjourns your Department plans to recommend to the President that Panama be allowed to fly its flag over the constitutionally acquired domain of the United States known as the Canal Zone. These assertions have not been denied.

Accordingly, in view of the failure of your Department to recognize our Nation's legal position, I am writing you to give notice that should a formal display of the Panama flag over the Canal Zone be made with the knowledge of your Department, Members of the House, who are clothed with constitutional authority in this regard, will press for your impeachment.

The Congress is representative of the sovereignty of the people under our Constitution and the members of your Department are their employees.

With assurances of my highest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Member of Congress.

JUNE 30, 1960.

HON. WILLIAM L. DAWSON,
Chairman, Committee on Government Operations, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The determination of subordinate elements in the Department of State to authorize a formal display of the Panama flag over the constitutionally acquired territory of the United States known as the Canal Zone has been announced and commented upon on the floor of the House without denial from that department.

Because wresting control of the Panama Canal from the United States is a prime Communist objective for the takeover of the Caribbean area and for discrediting the United States in the eyes of the world, any such position is evidence of subversive influences in the Department of State, because it is in disregard of authority conferred upon that Department in administering our treaty obligations.

Enclosed herewith is a copy of my address to the House on June 23, 1960, and a copy of my letter of June 30, 1960, to the Secretary of State.

Because of the seriousness of the situation at Panama, I urge you as chairman of the Committee on Government Operations to start an immediate investigation of the Department of State to identify the persons responsible for what, in effect, has been a treasonable influence on the conduct of our Isthmian policies.

Sincerely yours,

DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Member of Congress.

JULY 7, 1960.

HON. CHRISTIAN A. HERTER,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Since publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on July 1, 1960, of my letter to you of June 30, I have been reliably informed that, in 1956 subsequent to the Suez crisis, the late Secretary John Foster Dulles issued an order to the Caribbean area to the effect that no officer of the State Department was to discuss the surrender of United States sovereignty over the Canal Zone and Panama Canal or in any way to equate the situation at Suez as a precedent for Panama.

Because of the bearing that this order may have on the Panama flag matter, a copy of it is respectfully requested.

Sincerely yours,

DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Member of Congress.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., July 14, 1960.

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: I have your letter of June 30, 1960, in which you refer to the problem of whether the United States will accede to the request of the Government of Panama that its national flag be flown in the Canal Zone.

In fulfilling my responsibilities in this matter I shall be guided by the same concern for national interest and constitutional responsibility which governs all of my activities as Secretary of State.

Most sincerely,

CHRISTIAN A. HERTER.

JULY 20, 1960.

HON. CHRISTIAN A. HERTER,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Your letter of July 14, 1960, relative to flying the Panama flag in the Canal Zone I must consider as evasive of the question presented. It merely defers the answer one step.

Therefore, may I ask: Does your "concern for national interest and constitutional responsibility which governs all of (your) activities as Secretary of State" require you to maintain the unquestioned sovereignty of the United States over the Canal Zone or does it permit you to allow the flag of Panama to be authorized or permitted to be displayed there as evidence of Panamanian sovereignty? And this in defiance of the action of the Congress and the House of Representatives (Gross amendment and H. Con. Res. 459, 86th Congress).

This matter is of such consequence that it does not admit of evasion.

Sincerely yours,

DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Member of Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., August 3, 1960.

The Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: I acknowledge the receipt of your letter of July 20, 1960, addressed to the Secretary, in further reference to the matter of the United States displaying the Panamanian flag in the Canal Zone.

It is the policy of this Department to protect the rights which the United States enjoys under the treaties in force between this country and the Republic of Panama, and any decision that may be taken in the matter of the display of the Panamanian flag in the territory of the Canal Zone in evidence of Panama's titular sovereignty with respect to the Zone will be in accord with that policy.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM B. MACOMBER, Jr.,
Assistant Secretary.

AUGUST 29, 1960.

HON. CHRISTIAN A. HERTER,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have received State Department letter of August 3, 1960, signed by Assistant Secretary William B. Macomber, Jr., concerning the display of the Panamanian flag over the territory of the Canal Zone.

If this is your reply to my communication of July 20, I must consider it is another evasion on this subject. It is again not responsive to my query. Moreover, it furnishes further grounds for belief that subordinates

in your Department are not wholeheartedly in accord with the historical policy in this matter indicated by congressional actions.

In this regard, international Socialist elements are believed to be exerting their influence to weaken the sovereign status of the United States in international affairs.

Our position in the Canal Zone under treaty is strong. This must not be changed to one too weak for the defense of this strategic territory against Bolshevist attack. Our present Isthmian policy must not become diluted through the efforts of Socialist groups.

Congress has evidence that one of the most powerful Socialist organizers in the world today is attempting to affect or control our agencies of Government. Two distinguished labor leaders have challenged this radical leadership and charged that we are being led to positions out of step with traditional American labor aims.

The files of our Government from 1942 onward will enable you to identify the organizations and personalities concerned with attempts to stir up trouble in Panama. Unhappily, the information will show that native American organizations are not guiltless in the attempt to injure U.S. military power.

The display of the Panama flag over the Canal Zone without a modification of our treaty agreements with Panama would, as you must know, be one of transcendent consequences. As such, it does not admit of evasion in your position with the Congress.

In these general connections, it is vitally important for the Congress and executive departments always to bear in mind the following considerations: first, that the United States is bound by treaty with full responsibility for the maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection of the Panama Canal, and that the Canal cannot serve two masters; second, that any diminution of this authority must inevitably weaken the ability of the U.S. Government to meet its objections in the premises; third, that the open and avowed declaration of policy of the Panamanian Government is the ultimate nationalization by Panama of the Canal; and fourth, that the official display of the Panama flag in the Canal Zone would not be the last step to satisfy Panamanian demands, but the first for such nationalization.

Sincerely yours,

DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Member of Congress.

And now, Mr. Speaker, I insert at this point an article from the first page of the Panama City Star and Herald for Friday, August 26, 1960, with headline "Moreno and Herter Holds Private Talks."

MORENO AND HERTER HOLD PRIVATE TALKS—SESSION FOLLOWS SPEECH—PENDING PROBLEMS REPORTED TOPIC OF CONFERENCE

(By Carlos Sole Bosch)

SAN JOSE, COSTA RICA, August 25.—Foreign Minister Miguel Moreno, Jr., of Panama, met privately with U.S. Secretary of State Christian A. Herter last night.

The conference followed Moreno's speech before the Organization of American States in which he warned that U.S. delay in meeting Panama's demands for the raising of its flag in the Canal Zone is contributing to tension between the United States and Panama.

There was no official announcement on the topics discussed between Moreno and Herter. But sources close to the Panama delegation said the Foreign Minister and the Secretary of State discussed matters related to problems pending between the two countries.

In addition to the flag question, Moreno referred in his speech before the Foreign Ministers to another problem which he said contributes to tension between the two countries. This is the double scale of wages in effect in the Canal Zone which Moreno charged works to the detriment of Panamanians employed there.

Panama's claims for the display of its flag in the Canal Zone as recognition of its sovereignty have been intensified since last November 3, when the Independence Day celebration was marked by an attempt to carry the flag into the Canal Zone. The attempt resulted in a clash between the Panamanian demonstrators and Canal Zone police and U.S. Army troops at the boundary line.

The November 3 incidents resulted in a visit to Panama by Under Secretary of State Livingston Merchant as presonal representative of President Dwight D. Eisenhower. After a series of conferences with Panamanian officials, Merchant issued a statement expressing official recognition of Panama's "titular sovereignty" over the Canal Zone.

The Panamanian Government has had pending before the State Department for the past 8 months an official request for the display of the Panamanian flag in the Canal Zone. In his speech before the OAS conference yesterday, Moreno said Panamanians are hurt by the delay by North American authorities in heeding the express will of the Government and people of Panama that the Panamanian flag be raised regularly in the Canal Zone "as a living symbol of our sovereignty in that strip of land of the Panamanian nation."

Moreno also noted in his speech that President Eisenhower already was on record as favoring a "visual evidence" of Panama's sovereignty in the zone.

The Panamanian Foreign Minister has received more than 200 congratulatory messages from Panama and Costa Rica for his address. The San José newspaper, "Prensa Libre" said today that Moreno "stole the show with his vigorous pronouncement." Similar praise was expressed by other Costa Rican newspapers.

Moreno also has received cables of congratulation from a number of Panamanian organizations in the capital, Colon, David, Chitré, and Puerto Armuelles. Among these are the Lions Club, the first department, the Association of Professors, the Association of Chiriqui Newsmen, and the Union of Brewery Employees. Numerous personal messages also have arrived for Moreno.

PROGRESS REPORT ON CLASSICS OF AMERICAN DEMOCRACY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA], is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today as the 86th Congress nears the end, I think to take an honored place in the legislative history of our country, I have asked, and graciously by unanimous consent my colleagues have granted me, time to present another progress report on the program known as the "Classics of American Democracy," and which it was my great honor and distinction to offer for the consideration of the Congress and of the U.S. Information Agency on behalf of a distinguished group of my constituents and other Chicagoans of outstanding stature.

This is a program to win the hearts and the minds of people everywhere. Its amazing success, I would say its unprecedented success, has in my opinion been the most significant development in our changing world in recent years. It is based upon our faith that the classics of democracy that gave inspiration and guidance to the Founding Fathers of our own United States would have, if translated into native languages and made available at grassroots, an influence no less profound on the thinking and on the political soul-searching of the men and women whose destiny in this generation, as was that of our forefathers in their generation, is to preserve the independence newly come to them in a fabric of government as pure as the mind and heart of man can weave.

WAR OF IDEAS AND PHILOSOPHIES

At this moment, more than ever before perhaps, the American people are aware that economic and military means are not sufficient in the worldwide battle for the minds and hearts of men. Important as our economic aid programs are, and important as are the alliances, of which the United States is the main bastion, they have not by themselves sufficed fully to engage the energies of the free world on behalf of the ideal of human dignity and a world order under the rule of law. The cold war remains a battle of philosophies, a war of ideas.

A great weakness of the free world remains the fact that it has had no common or universal fund of political doctrine. Most of the great works of democratic political thought, produced from time to time in the various countries, as it were the bible of democracy, have not in fact been available in other countries and other languages. This includes not only works originating in America but works originating variously throughout the modern Western World.

ORIGINATED BY CHICAGO GROUP IN 1954

On several previous occasions I have discussed this question before the House. In 1954, I presented studies which established these facts and presented a plan, originated by a committee of my constituents, for action by the U.S. Information Agency to remedy this appalling lack. In this advocacy I was very proud to have the powerful and thoughtful support of the Chicago Daily News and the Christian Century.

Too much credit cannot be given to that small group of dedicated Chicagoans. It is no exaggeration to say, and the report of progress I am about to make will bear me out, that in the development of the program of its conception has come one of the great vital forces of our times.

Members of the Chicago group were Dr. Jerome Kerwin, chairman of the Charles R. Walgren Foundation, University of Chicago; Dr. Harold Fey, executive editor, Christian Century; A. T. Burch, associate editor, and Van Allen Bradley, literary editor, Chicago Daily News; Dr. Richard P. McKeon, professor of philosophy, University of Chicago, and State Department visitor to the universities of India; Emery T. Filbey, vice president emeritus, University of Chicago; John McGinnis, president, Pennsylvania Lodge 225, Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen; and Thomas B. Stauffer, of the faculty of Wilson Junior College.

Mr. Stauffer has a rich background of experience in the foreign service. The fact that nowhere were such classics of democracy as "The Federalist" available in translated editions, and at grassroots,

made a deep impression on him. The more he mingled with peoples in foreign lands and found none who had knowledge of the classics of democracy that had inspired our forefathers, the greater became his wonder and bewilderedness.

At the time he assembled the Chicago group at its first luncheon, "The Federalist" had been translated into only one language, and that edition was out of print.

Mr. Stauffer has been invaluable and indispensable to the Chicago committee, to the U.S. Information Agency, and to me in the pursuit of his vision to the reality of great accomplishment, as will appear as I continue in this report of progress.

OUTSTANDING PUBLIC SERVICE IN JOURNALISM

The reports in the Chicago Daily News from its foreign correspondents in all parts of the world did much to alert the American people and to stir their interest. These reports showed that books on democracy nowhere were available at grassroots while Communist literature was everywhere. I have said before, and I think it should be repeated, that in the publication of these reports from correspondents of recognized authority the Daily News performed an outstanding public service.

Likewise, the Christian Century, with its wide and influential circulation, made large contribution to building popular demand for a program directly to reach and win the hearts and minds of people by imparting to them that faith in democracy that comes only from understanding.

POLL OF REPRESENTATIVE AMERICAN LEADERS

In 1957, I was able to report to the House that, partly in response to the overwhelmingly favorable results of a poll which I had undertaken of representative leaders of opinion throughout the country the classics of democracy program had been adopted as part of the policy and plans of the U.S. Information Agency.

The responses I received from the representative Americans, of whom I had requested suggestions in compiling a list of classics of democracy, to constitute as it were a bible of American democracy, were very thoughtful, informative, and illuminating.

I have from time to time reported on the progress and uniform success of the Agency carrying out this plan, especially since the Agency has been under the vigorous leadership of Ambassador George Allen.

Last year I presented on April 8, a very extensive report of the success overseas of this program as conducted by the Agency. I now will present further reports from the Agency and from the public overseas.

SIGNIFICANT FACTS THAT STAND OUT

These reports, I think, establish three significant facts: First, the continued successful activities of the U.S. Information Agency. Second, the fact that the idea of the classics has been so successful that other agencies in addition to the U.S. Information Agency have entered the field. And thirdly, that, as the sponsors of the program long ago predicted, the treatment of the free world as a philosophical and moral system rather than as a military or economic power group, has rallied to itself some of the best and most active minds in the various countries.

To the first point, the report of the Agency and the number of books produced under its sponsorship and their sales, speak sufficiently. There are also a variety of reviews and comments, or various classics publications, from various countries.

FIRST ARABIC EDITION OF FEDERALIST

The second point requires amplification. There is now for the first time in any Asian language—now for the first time after nearly 200 years, now in the decades when the historic peoples of Asia are seeing the results of adapting Western technology to strengthen the life of their own rich cultures—now at last for the first time in any Asian tongue, there is a complete edition of "The Federalist Papers."

"The Federalist Papers," next to the Constitution itself, are the most marvelous and the most characteristic intellectual product of America. A full text has now been produced in Arabic. This publication is so new that I do not as yet have any figures of sales or any reviews or comments.

But the important facts about this edition are two: the publisher and the translator. The publisher is Franklin Publications, a commercial venture which as I understand it is operated by a consortium of American publishers with the explicit purpose of making American books of all kinds more widely available abroad. The procedure as I understand it is that Franklin recommends a list of likely titles and those desirable for each country are selected by a distinguished panel of leaders of opinion in each of the several countries.

The "Arabic Federalist" was produced in this way and I understand that both "The Federalist" and others of the classics titles will in due course be produced in a variety of Asian countries. I think it is of historic importance that commercial publishing has found it expedient to have its action concur with the long-term objective which the classics program of the U.S. Information Agency has sought to advance.

TRANSLATOR OF THE ARABIC FEDERALIST

I said that the second feature of this edition which deserved comment was the translator. The great danger and the secret defeat of a large-scale translation program is that the words and thoughts of great geniuses should be defaced and obscured by routine translators who understood neither.

Franklin Publications have by their integrity and prestige secured for the Arabic Federalist, a man who is a worthy colleague of the original author. Jamal Mohammed Ahmed, the translator, is an intellectual and political leader in his own country, a man of considerable reputation as an orator and stylist, in a language which prides itself on its poetic power. He was educated in economics and political science in England and in English. He is now one of the senior diplomatic officers of the Sudanese Republic and has had a leading role in its achievement of nationhood.

As an African his words will be heard throughout that continent; as a Moslem his words will be heard from the pillars of Hercules to the volcanoes of the Philippines. It should be a matter of pride to all Americans that anyone with his active and responsible role in the modern world should find the time or think it an important service to his people to translate and comment thoughtfully upon some 172-year-old articles from the daily papers of New York City—namely, "The Federalist Papers."

WORLD RESPONSE TO CLASSICS' STIMULATION

The third aspect of the progress of the classics on which I propose to report was the extent to which the opinion forming elements in the various countries had responded to the stimulation of the philosophical classics of democracy, and had themselves begun to propagate these ideas.

We must be respectfully aware that the result of such advocacy of philosophical democracy is not, either necessarily or in the short run, any simple-minded alinement with or advocacy of the policies or the culture of the United States. It is rather the development of a climate of world opinion in which peace and the rule of law will become possible while each of the many historic cultures maintains its own individuality.

Nevertheless, and taking special account of his distinguished position, in two of the great cultural matrices of mankind, we may feel especially pleased that Jamal Mohammed Ahmed, the translator of the "Arabic Federalist," has thought fit to recommend that "The Federalist Papers" be universally used in the high schools.

It has not been convenient to obtain a verbatim translation of the introduction by Jamal Mohammed Ahmed to "The Federalist" but I have in his own words a skeleton abridgment which states as its concluding point:

CONCLUSION

"Federalist" as a specimen of original sources Arab readers need today; the many points of contact between the development of American nationalism and Arab nationalism.

A proposal that "The Federalist" be included in university syllabuses of political theory; selections of it to be read in secondary schools in classes of training for citizenship. Reasons given briefly.

APPEAL OF FEDERALIST IS UNIVERSAL

It is one of the historic distinctions of "The Federalist" papers that in every generation and in every country, since its publication, the constitutional, the orderly, and the moderate among those who are active in political life have turned to it for both inspiration and practical devices.

We have one of the most striking examples of this in the correspondence of Thomas Jefferson. As U.S. Minister to Paris and as a friend of James Madison, he had been among the first in Europe

to receive a copy of the first edition of "The Federalist" in book form. We have his own account of how he read passages of "The Federalist" to the Compte Mirabeau and to constitutional moderates in the French Revolution and how they worked together to produce the first French translations in 1789.

Modern parallels are not lacking. One of the great human forward stride of mankind of the postwar years is the establishment of independent states for the people of Africa. It is reported, on what authority I am uninformed, that when the committee of the new West African nations met to debate the possibilities of a West African or General African Federation there was mention of "The Federalist" and a desire expressed that each member might have a copy to study as a guide in the attainment of an African Federation built on the pattern of our American federation.

As chairman of the African Subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I am deeply interested in the new emerging nations of that continent. I was pleased to hear that The Federalist was proving helpful, and hope that the report given me is accurate.

CLASSICS MAKE UNPRECEDENTED RECORD

Mr. Speaker, here is the record up to March of 1960, the classics of American democracy that have been printed in foreign languages, the sizes of the editions, the sales prices. Considering that at the time the program first was proposed by the distinguished Chicago committee there was no available translation of even "The Federalist" in a single foreign language, it is an unprecedented record of accomplishment:

Foreign editions of classics of democracy

	Language	Edition size	Retail price
Dewey, John: "The Public and Its Problems."	Spanish	16,000	$0.82
Dewey, John: "Freedom and Culture."	Arabic	5,000	.75
	Chinese	2,000	.50
	French	2,000	1.54
	German	6,300	1.00
	Greek	7,000	.67
	Kannada	2,000	.42
	Korean (4 editions)	8,000	.90
	Marathi	2,500	.62
	Portuguese	5,500	.64
	Gujarati, in process.		
	Farsi, in process.		
	Hindi, in process.		
	Malayalam, in process.		
Emerson, Ralph Waldo; "Emerson's Essays."	Arabic	5,000	.90
	Telugu	1,000	.40
	Tamil	2,000	.21
	Kannada	1,000	.26
	Malayalam	2,000	.32
"Basic Selections From Emerson"; editor, E. Lindeman.	Greek	4,000	1.50
	Korean	3,000	1.00
	Bengali	5,000	.32
"Selections From the Works of Emerson"; editor, Hans Hartmann.	German	5,000	2.33
"The Portable Emerson"; editor, Mark Van Doren.	Hindi	10,000	.31
	Chinese	6,000	.43
	Gujarati	5,000	.32
	Marathi	5,000	.32
Franklin, Benjamin; "Autobiography of Benjamin Franklin."	Arabic	5,000	.25
	Burmese	5,000	----------
	Chinese	4,000	2.00
	French	3,000	1.90
	German	4,000	----------
	Greek	7,000	.83
	Gujarati	5,000	----------
	Hindi	8,000	.63
	Hebrew	5,000	----------
	Indonesian	10,000	----------
	Kannada	2,000	.58
	Korean	5,000	----------
	Malayalam	1,000	.37
	Portuguese	6,000	1.20
	Marathi	5,000	----------
	Telugu	3,000	.42
	Urdu	5,000	.94
	Vietnamese	3,000	.37
Hamilton, Madison, and Jay; "The Federalist Papers."	Italian	3,000	2.56
	French	2,000	9.60
	German	1,600	7.41
	Spanish	10,000	.87
	Portuguese	1,500	2.10
	Vietnamese	2,000	.35
	Assamese, in process.		
	Bengali, in process.		
	Korean, in process.		
Hume, David; "Selected Writings," edited by Charles W. Hendel.	Spanish	25,000	1.09
Hand, Learned; "The Spirit of Liberty."	Burmese	6,000	.42
	French	2,000	2.86
	German	6,500	6.19
	Greek	2,000	.67
	Sinhalese	2,500	.21
	Telugu	1,000	.31
	Turkish	23,000	----------
Jefferson, Thomas; "Thomas Jefferson"; editor, Gilbert Chinard.	Burmese	5,000	3.84
	French	1,500	1.71
	Spanish	3,000	4.76
"Jefferson: Champion of the Free Mind"; Phillips Russell.	Malay	5,000	.34
	Japanese	17,000	.28
	Farsi	2,000	.32
	Gujarati	2,000	.31
	Marathi	2,000	.42
	Urdu	5,000	.21
	Bengali, in process.		
"The Life and Selected Writings of Thomas Jefferson"; Adrienne Koch and William Peden.	Bengali	3,000	.26
	Gujarati	5,000	.32
	Hindi	5,000	.32
	Marathi	5,000	.32
"Jefferson—A Great American's Life and Ideas"; Saul Padover.	Chinese	4,000	.32
	French	3,000	.83
	Greek	1,800	3.42
"Thomas Jefferson and American Democracy"; Max Beloff.	Italian	3,000	2.40
"Thomas Jefferson"; Gene Lisitsky	English (India)	10,000	$0.32
	Arabic	5,000	.30
	Bengali	3,000	.34
	Chinese	3,000	.32
	Gujarati	3,000	.16
	Hindi	10,000	.32
	Indonesian	10,000	.06
	Japanese	3,000	.47
	Korean	2,000	.40
	Marathi	3,000	.16
	Oriya	3,000	.32
	Punjabi	3,000	.32
	Sinhalese	2,500	.20
	Tamil	10,000	.05
	Telugu	10,000	.05
	Urdu	5,000	.32
Lincoln, Abraham; "Lincoln Reader"; editor, Paul M. Angle.	Arabic	4,000	.84
"Abraham Lincoln"; Emil Ludwig.	Bengali	1,100	.52
	Chinese	6,000	.23
	Gujarati	2,500	.42
	Hindi	5,000	.42
	Japanese	3,000	.56
	Kannada	2,000	.32
	Malayalam	2,000	.26
	Marathi	2,500	.42
	Oriya	3,000	.32
	Persian	1,500	.32
	Sinhalese	2,500	.20
	Telugu	2,000	.42
	Turkish	4,000	.35
	Tamil	2,000	.63
	Portuguese	100,000	.10
	Kannada, in process.		
	Assamese, in process.		
"Abraham Lincoln: Log Cabin to White House"; Sterling North.	Burmese	12,000	.42
	Bengali	5,000	.32
	Gujarati	2,000	.32
	Hindi	8,000	----------
	Japanese	7,000	.41
	Kannada	3,000	.30
	Marathi	2,000	.42
	Malayalam	2,000	.42
	Malay	5,000	.67
	Sinhalese	2,500	.21
	Urdu (New Delhi)	5,000	.42
	Urdu (Karachi)	3,000	----------
	Vietnamese	3,000	----------
	Bengali (Dacca), in process.		
	Chinese, in process.		
	Telugu, in process.		
"Abraham Lincoln: The Prairie Years and the War Years"; Carl Sandburg.	Hebrew	3,000	1.25
	German	5,000	8.49
	Spanish	3,000	5.39
	Arabic, in process.		
"Abraham Lincoln"; Benjamin P. Thomas.	Arabic	4,000	.29
	Chinese	3,000	1.15
	Greek	5,000	1.67
	Korean	6,000	2.00
	French	3,000	2.54
	Spanish	8,000	1.76
	Slovene	2,500	1.66
	Japanese (vols. I and II)	1,500	1.94
	German	5,000	3.81
	Serbo-Croatian	2,500	1.13
	Portuguese	5,000	----------
	Turkish (2 volumes)	12,000	1.12
	Chinese (2d ed.)	6,000	----------
Locke, John; "2d Treatise on Government".	Spanish	25,000	.90
Mill, John S.:			
"Essays on Liberty"	Arabic	4,000	.56
"Considerations on representative Government".	Arabic, in process.		
Thoreau, H. D.; "Walden or Life in the Woods".	Arabic	4,000	.75
	Chinese	8,000	.43
	Bengali	5,000	.32
	Portuguese	4,000	.68
	Telugu	5,000	.63
	Korean	5,000	1.20
	Greek	1,000	.42
	Tamil	1,500	.42
	Spanish	15,000	.33

Foreign editions of classics of democracy—Continued

	Language	Edition size	Retail price		Language	Edition size	Retail price
"To a Different Drum: The Story of Henry David Thoreau"; Charles Norman.	Spanish	73,000	$0.11	Wilson, Woodrow W.; "The Wilson Reader"; edited by Frances Farmer.	French	2,000	$2.35
					Chinese	5,750	.50
					Gujarati	2,000	.31
De Tocqueville, Alexis; "Democracy in America."	Italian	10,000	.48	"The Story of Woodrow Wilson"; David Loth.	Chinese	12,000	.25
	Japanese	5,000	.33		Tamil	1,500	.10
	Spanish	3,000	5.20		Portuguese	6,000	.27
	Burmese	10,000	.21		Malayalam	17,000	.10
	Italian:						
	Vol. I	2,000	3.84				
	Vol. II	2,000					

Representative sales figures, foreign editions, classics of democracy (through November 1959)

Title	Language	Date of publication	Size of edition	Number of copies sold	Title	Language	Date of publication	Size of edition	Number of copies sold
Dewey, J.; "The Public and It's Problems."	Spanish	September 1958	15,000	15,000	"Thomas Jefferson;" Gene Lisitsky	Indonesian	March 1955	3,000	3,000
Dewey, J.; "Freedom and Culture."	Korean	June 1958	8,000	6,500	"Abraham Lincoln"; Carl Sandburg.	German	September 1958	5,000	2,100
"Emerson's Essays"	Kannada	August 1956	1,000	1,000	"Abraham Lincoln"; Benjamin Thomas.	Chinese	January 1959	6,000	5,900
Do	Bengali	1956	5,000	1,500	Thoreau; "Walden"	Telugu	June 1958	5,000	3,500
Franklin; "Autobiography"	Hindi	November 1958	8,000	5,000	"The Wilson Reader"; Fr. Farmer, editor.	Gujarati	February 1958	2,000	1,000
"The Federalist Papers"	German	September 1958	1,600	1,000	"Story of Woodrow Wilson"; David Loth.	Tamil	June 1957	15,000	10,000
Do	Spanish	May 1957	10,000	10,000					
Hand, Learned; "The Spirit of Liberty."	Turkish	April 1954	23,000	23,000					

Classics of democracy published under program of Franklin Publications, Inc.

1. Dewey, John, editor, "Living Thoughts of Thomas Jefferson":
Language, Arabic (Beirut).
Number of copies published, 3,000.
Date of publication, 1957.
Number of copies sold, 2,000.
Retail price, £2.50 ($0.80).

2. Dewey, John, editor: "Living Thoughts of Thomas Jefferson":
Language, Indonesian.
Number of copies published, 3,000.
Date of publication, 1959.
Number of copies sold, 2,000.
Retail price, 20 rupiah ($0.50).

3. Dewey, John, "Human Nature and Conduct":
Language, Farsi.
Number of copies published, 2,000.
Date of publication, 1956.
Number of copies sold, 2,000.
Retail price, 70 rials ($1.75).

4. Dewey, John, "Reconstruction of Philosophy":
Language, Arabic (Cairo).
Number of copies published, 3,000.
Date of publication, 1958.
Number of copies sold, 1,900.
Retail price, 30 piasters ($0.85).

5. Dewey, John, "Reconstruction of Philosophy":
Language, Farsi.
Number of copies published, 2,000.
Date of publication, 1958.
Number of copies sold, 2,000.
Retail price, 60 rials ($1.50).

6. Hamilton, Jay, Madison, "Federalist Papers":
Language, Arabic (Beirut).
Number of copies published, 1,500.
Date of publication, 1959.
Number of copies sold, —.
Retail price, £10.00 ($3.10).

PUBLIC RECEPTION OF TRANSLATED CLASSICS

Mr. Speaker, I heartily congratulate and warmly commend the U.S. Information Agency for the rapidity and the efficiency with which it has moved in the translation and the distribution of the classics. My congratulations and commendation also go in full measure to the Franklin Publications and other private publishers.

But what has been the public reception of these classics once they were translated and made available in native tongues? That is the test of how well or how poorly the sponsors of the program judged. Here is the record, furnished me as of March of this year:

USE AND EFFECTIVENESS OF "CLASSICS OF DEMOCRACY" PUBLISHED ABROAD UNDER THE USIA BOOK TRANSLATIONS PROGRAM

FRENCH EDITION, "THE FEDERALIST PAPERS"

Since the question of federalism has become a political issue of basic importance in West Africa, interest in "The Federalist" is high in that part of the world. In Dakar, e.g., copies of the French translation of the American Constitution have been widely distributed among political leaders, and the local USIS mission reports that the U.S. Information Center in Dakar has six copies of the French edition of the "Federalist Papers" in constant circulation and considers it one of the most useful books in the collection. Especially during the framing of the Mali Constitution, the book proved to be of great value to Government and political leaders.

In Europe itself, the French translation of "The Federalist" continues to serve as a beacon for political and information leaders concerned with the question of European integration. E.g., a very laudatory review appeared in the April 1959 issue of the German monthly "Der Föderalist" which particularly praises "the brilliant introduction by A. Esmein." A review in the "Bulletin Critique du Livre Francais," March 1958, has this to say: "This series of articles published in the United States in 1788 is rightly considered the most pertinent analysis of the federal system. It is fortunate that at a time when so many dream of federalism, this book can be welcomed in Europe, and particularly in France."

Lastly, two statements made by persons prominent in the European integration movement:

"I believe one can but appreciate the timeliness of this new edition because, basically, 'The Federalist' is a classical text, in its way as irreplaceable as 'The Spirit of the Law' or 'The Social Contract.'" (Pierre Duclos, professor of international relations, Paris.)

"In reading this classic of federalism, which this book is, you notice quickly that, despite all differences, the experience of the 'Fathers' of the American Constitution provides us with a source of inspiration and enrichment." (Alexandre Marc, Belgium; author; director general of the International Center for European Reconstruction; vice president of the executive committee of the European Federalist Movement.)

GERMAN (AUSTRIAN) EDITION, "THE FEDERALIST"

In the German-speaking world, the Federalist Papers, in a highly praised German translation, continue to have an impact on persons interested in constitutional questions and the vital issue of federalism. This is reflected in the reviews which have appeared in the German, Austrian and Swiss press. The Neue Zurcher Zeitung, one of the most influential European dailies, called it a masterwork of political world literature (NZZ, Oct. 23, 1958), while one of the leading German papers, the Suddentsche Zeitung (May 9–10, 1959), pointed up the usefulness of this book to responsible citizens of the German Federal Republic: "This isn't the place to enumerate the wealth of stimulating ideas. But we should say that a serious study of these essays will help, help more than any other political writings, in understanding the tasks our state faces as well as those that reunification will bring with it. Everyone who wants to concern himself with matters concerning our Federal Government should consider this book compulsory reading." And as influential a journal as the Vienna monthly, Wort und Wahrheit, wrote in its May 1959 issue, in part: "Nowhere has the principle of federalism as a restraint on the exercise of power been more effectively demonstrated than in the United States; and up to our day, it has not found advocates more capable than the authors of the 'Federalist Papers.' These essays are, as shown by a survey of recent writings, not only of considerable importance to the theory about federal government, but they also provide instructive insights into American political thought. Above all, every discussion about federalism * * * will have to go back to this collection of essays because everything worth saying about democratic federal government is said therein."

IMPACT OF "THE FEDERALIST" IN ITALY, FRANCE AND GERMANY

One of the results of the availability of the "Federalist Papers" in foreign languages has been that it has helped in stimulating the study of American constitutional

thought and of the question of federalism. Indeed, in Italy the publication of "The Federalist" has produced something like a chain reaction, making possible various courses and seminars, as well as the publication, in Italian USIS-assisted translations, of such volumes as "The Growth of American Thought," by Merle Curti, Corwin's "The Constitution and What It Means Today," and "Studies in Federalism," edited by Bowie and Friedrich. Special seminars on "The Federalist" have, for example, been held in Rome in July 1956 and, on a national basis, at the University of Pavia in March 1958. The proceedings of the Rome seminar were published last year in a volume entitled "La Nascita degli Stati Uniti."

In France, USIS Paris assisted in November 1957 in arranging a seminar for French students and young adults on "Federalism in Theory and Practice," using the French Federalist as a basic text. Similarly, it has served, in German, as text for a semester-long seminar on federalism given at the Free University Berlin during the spring of 1959.

PORTUGUESE (BRAZILIAN) EDITION, "THE FEDERALIST"

Typical of the reception given by scholars and political leaders to the Portuguese edition of "The Federalist Papers" is a lengthy review which appeared in several papers in Rio Grande do Sul area last July, written by Paulo Brossard de Souza Pinto, State Deputy in Rio Grande do Sul and professor of law, stating that this book "has not lost its actuality" and that "it is a classic of political and constitutional bibliography," Professor Brussard goes on to say: "In Brazil a version of 'The Federalist' of unknown authorship appeared more than a century ago. This was in the remote year of 1840 when the regency was terminated and the assembly, with Antonio Carlos at its head, declared the majority of young Pedro II. Now, after so much time, Editora Nacional de Direito has published a new edition of 'The Federalist,' this famous book that Ruy (Barbosa) called a reservoir of immortal lessons in the science of constitutions" (Correio do Povo, July 14, 1959).

VIETNAMESE EDITION, "THE FEDERALIST PAPERS"

This translation came out in June 1959 in an edition of 2,000 copies of which, 8 months later, all but 400 copies have been sold. This is considered a most unusual success for this type of material in Vietnam.

LINCOLN SESQUICENTENNIAL

The publication and sale of books on Lincoln during 1959—the year of the Lincoln sesquicentennial—clearly reflected the tremendous significance of his life, utterances, and writings to the growth of democracy throughout the world. During 1959 alone, 23 editions of books by and on Lincoln, totaling 292,000 copies, were published overseas under the Agency's translation program, with many others, published previously, still in print.

Particularly noteworthy among these is an Arabic translation of the "Lincoln Reader" which was published in Damascus, Syria, in an edition of 4,000 copies (at a retail price of 84 cents per copy) and was sold out within 6 weeks; a second edition, published completely at the Syrian publisher's own expense, was more than half sold some months ago. This same publisher, considered Damascus' most active, also released in 1959, with USIS assistance, a 6,000-copy Arabic edition of a Lincoln biography for young readers and added this comment, as quoted in a report from USIS Damascus: "It is enough to know that each of these books sold more copies than any other I published in 1959."

In preparation for the Lincoln Year, a 5,000-copy translation of Carl Sandburg's "Abraham Lincoln: The Prairie Years and the War Years" was published in Vienna with USIS assistance. A preface for it was written by the Honorable Dr. Heinrich Drimmel, Austrian Federal Minister of Education, in which he stresses that Lincoln's "House divided speech" is today as applicable to the whole world as it was, in 1858, to the Union. After having read this biography in its German edition, the renowned German novelist, Frank Thiess, wrote to its publisher: "Whoever reads this book will know more about America than a hundred contemporary reports could tell him; and if he understands it properly, he could know as much about America as if he had lived there for many years. I place this biography published by you above all others I've read in recent years."

An indication of the impact of classics of democracy—be they in form of biographies or translations of original writings—can be found in these sentences from a Bengali review of a Lincoln biography by Sterling North: "Abraham Lincoln's name is a symbol of equality, freedom, and national solidarity to all the people of the world. * * * It is but too well known that Lincoln * * * was the first man to try to establish real democracy in the world. * * * The study of any biography of Abraham Lincoln is a must, especially for the people of newly developed countries like Pakistan. * * * As a citizen of a newly developed country, I now realize how precious his ideals can be to the people of my country. * * * May the translators' efforts enable the people of this country to follow the ideals of Abraham Lincoln and enrich their personal life as well as that of the nation." (Markin Parikrama, Dacca, Feb. 1, 1959).

BOOKS BY AND ON JOHN DEWEY IN KOREA

John Dewey is one of the best known philosophers and educators in Korea and his works are exerting a profound influence on Korean educational thought. Next to the authors of the world's great novels, few writers are as widely translated and read in Korea as John Dewey. The total number of copies of the six books by or on Dewey which have to date been published in Korea with or without Agency assistance amounts today to over 30,000; one USIS-supported title, "Freedom and Culture," has gone through five printings in the past 5 years. Dewey is regarded by Koreans as America's greatest thinker, and his influence on Korean life is so varied as to make accurate evaluation of all its effects impossible. The Korean translation of his book, "Experience and Education," is used as a text at the largest women's university in Korea, while Irwin Edman's "John Dewey," containing selections from all his major writings, is widely used as a text in several Korean universities. The Dewey centennial in January 1960 was widely observed throughout Korea.

Characteristic of the high esteem in which John Dewey is held in Korea as a force working toward the adoption of democratic ways is this paragraph from which an article which appeared in the January 1960 issue of the periodical Sasangge (The World of Thought), written by Professor Hyung-chin of Sookmyung University: "John Dewey * * * has played as great a role as the ancient, storied Augustine, Aquinas, Bacon, Descartes, Locke, and Comte. * * * It is a fact that the North American Continent will play a central role in world civilization for at least several generations to come. Dewey, who, following Jefferson, Paine, Emerson, and James, greatly influenced the growth of America's civilization, is indeed a giant star shining over the 20th century." Similarly, the dean of the Graduate School of Ewha Women's University of Seoul, wrote in the October 1955 issue of Saikyoyook (The New Education): "We should modestly try to learn from Dewey. We kneel down before him and gladly accept his teachings. Only in this way, I believe, will Korean education be able to enjoy a renaissance and advancement in the future."

CLASSICS OF DEMOCRACY IN SPANISH EDITIONS

Spanish translations of the classics of democracy have enjoyed success throughout the Spanish-speaking world. It is believed that some titles, written over a hundred years ago, were translated into Spanish for the first time through USIS initiative. The authors and the titles of their works have long been familiar to many Latin Americans, especially those active in the fields of law and political science. Translations of American and European works in these fields often refer to these classics, but they were only available in the original.

Prepublication interest in the works of Locke, Hume, and Thoreau caused the first printings to be raised from 10,000 to 25,000 copies. It is expected that these editions, for which USIS has only preliminary sales reports, will go out of print within a year of publication date. They will be welcomed in all Spanish-speaking political, legal, and university circles. No reviews have yet appeared and few are expected, since classics, even when they do appear for the first time in Spanish, are seldom reviewed.

Ralph Gabriel's "Selections From the Federalist Papers" ("El Derecho de Gobernar") was an immediate best seller in Latin America. The then unheard-of edition of 10,000 copies was sold out within a few months of publication. Its immediate success was partially due to the interest centering around the 1957 Argentine constitutional reform debate which coincided with its publication. Appearance in an inexpensive format was considered of such major importance that some newspapers treated it as a news item rather than relegating it to the review page. The title has been out of print for 2 years and USIS is presently negotiating with the publisher to arrange for a 100,000-copy low-price edition destined to retail at 15 pesos (about 18 cents).

FRENCH EDITION, "THE SPIRIT OF LIBERTY"

The French translation of Learned Hand's "Spirit of Liberty," published in Paris in 1957, has made a profound impression on French readers. This is, for example, strongly reflected in many of the reviews which discussed this modern classic of democracy:

"The extraordinary fame of the author in the United States is exemplary and helps to understand the country. Learned Hand is an eminent judge, a profound humanist, a great citizen, a man of great learning. This book is a message which reaches beyond all frontiers, addressed as it is to all those who are concerned with the future of human values" (Echo de Tourami, May 7, 1958).

"Individual pages of his belong already among those of the breviary of democracy, in the most lofty sense of this word" (Echo Républicain, Feb. 21, 1958).

"He touches upon the whole existence of a people, and in reading this book you gain a vivid image of the United States—an image as diverse as life itself and far removed from the clichés which are much the prevalent" (Republique du Centre, Feb. 26, 1958).

"The figure of the author comes to life in these essays, and he * * * becomes a symbol of that moral inspiration which animates the best spokesmen of the American community" (Bibliography Bulletin of the National Institute of Education, Paris, December 1958).

John Dewey's "The Public and its Problems," published late in 1958 in an edition of 15,000 copies, was an immediate sellout.

Sandburg's "Lincoln—The Prairie Years and the War Years," published in late 1957, while having relatively poor sale, has been a critical success. While it deals with a well-known subject, the fact that it is the original presentation of a major writer caused it to be well reviewed. On January

19, 1958, the daily Clarin proclaimed "Lincoln" to be "a great book, by a great poet, about a great man." Clarin later followed with two special reviews in the Sunday supplement sections of July 20 and August 25, 1958. Ficcion, the important literary bimonthly, presented a three-page review in its March–April 1959 issue. La Prensa devoted two-thirds of its Sunday supplement literary page to a well-illustrated review of Sandburg's "Lincoln" on February 9, 1958.

In addition to Sandburg's work, USIS Buenos Aires succeeded in placing a special Spanish-language edition of McNeer's "America's Lincoln" which was published in 42,000 copies and was sold out within weeks through bookstores and kiosks throughout Latin America.

PRESS OF FREE WORLD ACCLAIMS CLASSICS

Mr. Speaker, since the start of the classics of democracy program the press of the free world has been filled with editorials such as those I now bring to the attention of the House, reading from translations that Mr. Theodore R. Jaeckel, Acting Chief of the Translations Branch of USIA's Information Center Service, graciously has furnished at my request:

TIN MOI, SAIGON

ON THE CONSTITUTION

When a nation is founded, its main structure is its constitution. As a man should have a skeleton, a nation should have a constitution in order to support itself. It is thanks to her Constitution that the present United States of America can be a powerful country holding high the torch of democracy and freedom.

When the United States recovered her independence and was drafting her Constitution, Messrs. Alexander Hamilton, James Madison, and John Jay had in turn written for several months to analyze, explain, and discuss each article of the American Constitution. They endeavored to convince the American people to adopt their new Constitution. Up to now their essays still are valuable documents for the politicians.

The book "On the Constitution" is the translation of the aforesaid essays and as Vietnam is advancing on the path of freedom and democracy, this book is a very precious document for those who are interested in the executive and legislative questions.

[From Bulletin Critique du Livre Francais]

FRANCE

(Hamilton, A., Jay, J., Madison, J.)

The "Library of Federalist Texts and Studies," the aim of which is to revive the concept of federalism, has chosen to inaugurate its work with the series of articles which were published in the United States in 1788 and which are rightly regarded as the most searching analysis of the federal system.

The success achieved by this book is well known; it was translated into several languages and published in France by Gaston Jèze and A. Esmein. It is fortunate that at a time when many dream of federalism this book should be available in Europe and particularly in France; it is to be hoped that it will find the widest possible audience.

MY OPINION ON THE PUBLICATION OF "THE FEDERALIST"

(By Pierre Duclos, chairman of courses at the Institute of Political Studies of Paris, professor at the Institute of Higher International Studies and at the International Institute of Studies and Diplomatic Research)

I don't see how we can do otherwise than appreciate the reissuing of this work, for "The Federalist" is fundamentally a classic test, as irreplaceable of its kind as the Spirit of Laws or the Social Contract.

The French version had been out of print for many years. I still remember the precautions taken, 30 years ago, by the librarian of the faculty of law when he would place in your hands the only copy, tattered, unstuck, practically in pieces, which the faculty owned. I still wonder what has become of this relic.

In other words, the new edition published by the U.E.F. which was wise enough to select the excellent version by G. Jèze with an introduction by A. Esmein, together with a preface by a well-known specialist on American matters, is extremely timely. Once again the French public will have the opportunity to acquaint itself with this classic work well known to former generations of practicing lawyers.

For my part, I agree completely with the laudatory comments about this publication which were carried by the Revue Francaise de Science Politique.

ABOUT A RECENT PUBLICATION

(By Alexander Marc, author, professor at the University Institute of European Studies in Turin, director-general of the International Center of European Formation, vice president of the Central Committee of the European Federalist Movement, and member of the Belgian Center for the Study of Problems of European Sociology and Economy)

Out of print for many years and finally republished in the collection of federalist texts and studies, the famous work by A. Hamilton, J. Jay, and J. Madison, "The Federalist," has astonished those not already familiar with it by its quality of great timeliness.

Of course, the problems now confronting the European nations differ greatly from those which were faced almost two centuries ago by the Thirteen States of North America. Nonetheless, in reading this classic of federalism, we become rapidly aware that, despite all the differences, the experience of the Fathers of the American Constitution remains for us a source of inspiration and enrichment.

In the course of my own work, I have frequently had cause to observe how the example of the American States struggling toward unity enlightens and encourages the militants of the European movements.

Let us pay homage to this work, which belongs to the heritage of mankind.

ISRAEL

From Freiheit, Tel Aviv, January 7, 1960 (Alexander Hamilton, James Madison, and John Jay, "The Federalist"):

"For the ordinary educated man it is no shame when he finally becomes impatient and demands to know, what is 'The Federalist'. It treats of the 85 articles in which the three authors try to convince the three States in which each resides to accept the newly written but not duly ratified Constitution. The 85 articles appeared in three newspapers under the pseudonym 'Publius' from October 1787 to May 1788. In penetrating style the pros and cons of the Constitution and the Articles of Confederation are carefully weighed. Opponents of the Constitution are politely and seriously treated and the refutation is underscored by discussing historical documentation on practical grounds and theoretical considerations.

"One can call special attention to the fact that there is not a single demogogical statement in the articles. These authors who, on the one hand, drew on expert knowledge and created a treatise on the theory of the federal state, but on the other hand, had to convince themselves as well as their readers that this form of government guaranteed manifold benefits for the future."

AUSTRIA

From Austrian Law Review, Vienna ("The Federalist," by Alexander Hamilton, James Madison, John Jay):

" 'The Federalist' up to now has not been completely translated into German—in the English language it was last read in C. Van Doren edition—and had therefore hardly any influence on the study of law in the German speaking areas. The present complete edition in German makes it now possible for every student of government, politics, or history to familiarize himself with the contents.

"Ermacora, as the editor of the work, has also written a valuable introduction. In it he sketches the historical development of the alliance between the English colonies in North America, the Declaration of Independence and finally the creation of the Constitution, the adoption of which Hamilton, Jay, and Madison recommend in their articles. Finally, however, and this should be especially noted, Ermacora, using 'The Federalist' as a basis, examines four theoretical problems of fundamental importance; he shows thereby that this published work not only is of political-historical importance but that its theoretical value is conveyed to the reader, as a direct connection is established between the legal problems and the presentation of the authors."

GERMANY

From South German Newspaper, Munich (Hamilton, Jay, Madison: "The Federalist," edited by Felix Ermacora, German translation by K. Demmer, Manzsche, publisher, and University Bookstore, Vienna, 496 pp., 32 German Marks):

"In his little book about the 'Spirit of America' Golo Mann comes to the decision that the United States of North America is the greatest development that the genius of European statecraft has produced. The difference between here and over there has been artificially created; it does not make sense. The first German edition of the 'Federalist Papers' reminds one of this thesis in a double fashion, first, because, the three authors by each sentence and with each page draw from an honorable inheritance from antiquity and European sources, and, secondly, because this German edition of the 85 articles now appears 170 years after their original publication.

"They were printed in New York newspapers during 1787 and 1788 and in the same year came out in book form. German language literature about these basic works on state and constitutional theory composes less than a dozen titles of which the majority was published in the third quarter of the 19th century. The 'Federalist Papers' appear to have been forgotten by then and the Constitution of the United States disappeared from the German consciousness as the citizens in the new German state felt superior compared to the American citizens living under this great experiment in government. The United States was the land where disgraced relatives were sent when they became a nuisance to their families. Thereby the 'Federalist Papers' could have given an answer to a very pressing German question of that time—the transition from a confederation of states to a federal state.

"The America Confederation of 1777 reserved to the individual States all rights except those considered as common defense, welfare, and individual freedom. The Continental Congress appealed to the States for support in their decisions but were seldom upheld. This occurred often as local interests took priority over the common good, and by 1787 in Philadelphia an agreement to support a Congress and an executive office was entered into. The creation of a Supreme Court was the final work of the Convention.

In order to convince the citizens of New York State of the need for this Constitution, Hamilton, Jay, and Madison wrote their articles—and the results were full and complete.

"If one asks about the reasons for the success of these political articles, one must mention their excellent style of writing. The opposition to the Constitution concedes defeat, and the reader feels as though he is in a position as judge and jury. He takes over as a conscientious citizen a position guaranteed to him. The 'Federalist Papers' associate the common names of 'federal', 'state', and 'democracy' and with all the theoretical tests the discussions concerning the citizen and the state are well aired.

"The innumerable ideas that one can mention are not too important. However, what can be said is that our primary task, the union of our country, can be better understood if one will deeply study these articles.

"Everyone in the country who is connected in any way with Federal problems should make this book required reading."

From Echo of the Times, Recklinghausen (Ruhr):

"'The Federalist': Two disciplines are assisted: With this reference work the German language edition of the 'Federalist Papers' the historian is aided in his research, since these articles by the North American legislative historian derive from the most reliable sources and the historian's task is made easy.

"Additionally, this work serves also the political scientist, for here the American parliamentarian of the classical period for the first time attempts to present the outline of a theory of the Federal state which further attempts to distinguish the points which separate the Democratic and the Republican Parties. The 'Federalist Papers' not only leads to the founding of the political parties in the United States, but Alexander Hamilton, James Madison, and John Jay have in their incisive articles presented to the people of New York a constitutional theory which in turn grew from a federation of States to the present (Federal) United States of America.

"It is humorous to read that the problems of the American Founding Fathers were practically the same which bother us here today including, for example, details of freedom of the press (p. 475). For the issuance of these articles we are thankful to Felix Ermacora as well as the publishing house."

BRAZIL

From Correio do Povo, Porto Alegre, Brazil, by Paulo Brossard de Souza Piuto, professor of law, University of Rio Grande do Sul:

"After the 4th of July 1776, which marked the independence of the 13 British colonies in North America proclaimed by the Congress that extra-legally had met in Philadelphia, the Congress took steps to decide under what ties the new States should live together, especially concerning foreign affairs. From this effort resulted the Articles of Confederation, a document approved a year later but which, because of the resistance of Maryland, had only entered into force in 1781. Experience, however, early showed that the confederative system did not meet the common needs. Anarchy, insecurity, and discredit were the characteristics of those times. It is enough to remember that the Continental Congress itself was not respected, nor were its acts obeyed. Without the power to tax in the Congress, financial affairs of the confederation remain the responsibility of the separate States. Beset by creditors, the Congress was forced to change its site. According to George Washington, 'In each State there was a deposit of inflammable material that could explode with a single spark.'

"At last the Congress decided to convoke an assembly with the express and sole object of revising the Articles of Confederation, in order to make a Federal Constitution adequate to the needs of the Government and the Union. This was in 1787. The Convention assembled in May under the presidency of Washington, delegate from Virginia, in Independence Hall, yet today religiously preserved in the heart of Philadelphia. The debates were agitated as in all assemblies, to the point that Franklin at one point counseled his colleagues to take recourse in prayer. Even so, on the 17th of September, a majority of the delegates signed a new code, to which good fortune was reserved.

"But the effort of the Federalists in trying to give the former colonies an efficient national government was not yet finished. For the project elaborated in Philadelphia to be transformed into the Constitution of the United States it was still necessary to obtain the ratification of at least 9 of the 13 States. It is easy to imagine the differences that multiplied among them and, for various motives, the strong opposition to the type of government proposed.

* * * * *

"Hamilton was one of the signers of the Constitution who had stood out in the debates in Philadelphia. A lawyer of 30 years of age, he had been private secretary to Washington, a colonel of infantry, a representative of New York in the Continental Congress, and one of the proponents of the Philadelphia meeting (the other was Madison). He was to be the first Secretary of the Treasury and the most important adviser to Washington on internal affairs, as well as organizer of the financial system of the Union and administrator of unusual capacity. His reports are considered works of a statesman more than merely fiscal statements. So great was his political ability that Ruy Barbosa, the great Brazilian liberal, had words of admiration for the least liberal of ministers of George Washington, pardoning in Hamilton antiliberalism that Barbosa would not tolerate otherwise in anyone.

"Like Hamilton, James Madison had participated in the Continental Congress, had been the most active member of the Philadelphia Convention, and one of the signers of the Constitution. Later he was to fight for 10 amendments, known now as the Bill of Rights, and become Secretary of State under Jefferson and later President of the Republic for two terms. Member of Continental Congress, John Jay, diplomat and politician of prominence, did not participate in the Philadelphia Convention because he was Secretary of State. Later he would be President of the Supreme Court as the first Justice of the Nation.

"Such were the authors of 'The Federalist,' a compilation of 85 articles in defense of the Constitution. They were signed by Publius, pseudonym for the three statesmen, and appeared in New York newspapers from October 1787, until May of the following year. Of the 85 articles, 5 are by Jay, 14 by Madison, 51 by Hamilton, with the authorship of the others being uncertain.

* * * * *

"With this popular origin and written at the end of the 18th century, 'The Federalist' had not lost its timeliness. It continues to be read. It is a classic in the bibliography of political and constitutional works. Successfully reedited in the United States, it was translated in France, Germany, Brazil, Argentina, Italy, Mexico, and elsewhere. For Jefferson it was 'the best commentary that had ever been written on the principles of government.' Modern writers also do not underestimate its worth. Willoughby, for example, sees in it a guide for interpreting the supreme law in the United States. Beard calls the book the greatest of all commentaries for interpreting the Constitution. Foreigners have also exalted its merits, such as Sumner Maine, Guizot, Esmein, Jèze.

"In Brazil, more than a century ago, appeared a version of 'The Federalist' of unknown editorship. It was in the remote year of 1840 when the Regency was ending and the young Emperor Pedro II was reaching his majority. At that time the Empire was far from attaining the form that it later obtained, and only the first outlines of the parliamentary system were beginning to appear.

"Now after so much time has passed, published by the National Law Press, appears a new edition of 'The Federalist,' the famous book that Ruy Barbosa called 'The reservoir of immortal lessons in the science of constitutions.' It should be read and studied."

REBIRTH OF DEMOCRACY'S IMMORTAL LITERATURE

Mr. Speaker, the above are typical of editorials appearing in many newspapers. I would say they reflect the wide interest the classics of democracy program has stirred and the depths that have been reached in the minds of the peoples today in the thinking, the precepts and the governmental philosophies of our forefathers. I cannot understand how for so long such immortal documents of democracy as "The Federalist" remained untranslated and practically unknown in foreign lands until on the suggestion of the Chicago committee and in the wisdom of the Congress and of the USIA a new birth was given to democracy's immortal literature. As I stated at the beginning of these remarks, the amazing success of the classics of democracy program, the reception of the books that gave inspiration to our forefathers by others in foreign lands as sources of inspiration and patterns for the building of new nations in a modern world, this indeed is one of the most significant and heartening developments of recent years.

I am extending my remarks to include a biographical sketch of Jamal Mohammed Ahmed, one of whose many distinctions is that he first of all persons translated into Arabic, "The Federalist," and I am told by scholars did a wonderful job:

U.S. INFORMATION AGENCY,
Washington, D.C., April 19, 1960.

Jamal Mohammed Ahmed, Sudanese Ambassador to Ethiopia, and translator for the Arabic edition of the "Federalist Papers":

Born 1917 at Waddi Halfa, Sudan. Attended Khartoum primary and secondary school and Gordon Memorial University, now the University of Khartoum. Took advanced studies at the University of the Southwest at Exeter, England, and at Balliol College, Oxford, where he received his Ph. D. in history. His doctoral thesis was entitled "The Intellectual Background of Egyptian Nationalism."

After his return to the Sudan, he taught at the Sudan Institute of Education at Bakht Er'Ruda, and for a time was editor of a children's magazine published by the Sudanese Ministry of Education.

During 1948–49, he was clerk-assistant to the Sudanese Legislative Assembly. In 1949 he joined the staff of the University of Khartoum. In 1955 he became senior warden of the university working in close association with the president of the university on student affairs.

In October 1956, Mr. Ahmed was appointed Ambassador to the Arab States—Iraq, Jordan, Syria, and Lebanon (not Egypt), and in

1957 he presented his credentials to the Iraq Government. In 1959 he was assigned Ambassador to Ethiopia.

CEDAR RAPIDS AND THE SPACE AGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. WOLF], is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, in these closing days of the 86th Congress, I think it most appropriate to inform you and my colleagues of what the great strides that have been taken in our national space effort have meant to people who live and work in our local communities. In particular, I direct your attention to Cedar Rapids, Iowa, a community which I am immensely proud to represent in Congress. There, in the heartland of America, has settled one of the young giants of the electronics industry. It is making contributions, not only to our space effort but to our national defense and will undoubtedly have immeasurable influence on our future. I refer to Collins Radio Co., a firm that has in a few short years established a worldwide reputation for its outstanding research and development capabilities and the unquestioned reliability of its electronic component manufacturing.

Now why did Collins Radio, out of all the cities and localities in our country, choose Cedar Rapids, in which to establish its multimillion-dollar operation? I believe it chose Cedar Rapids principally because that city has within it the great, wholesome American qualities of character, enthusiasm and driving energy that have always been demonstrated by its people and that exemplify the American image. That is why Collins Radio came to Cedar Rapids. And that is why I, too, after traveling to the far ends of the country, settled near Cedar Rapids to live, raise my family and invest my life's work.

In the 2 years I have participated in the work of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, it has compiled a record of activity which I believe is unparalleled in scope and import to our national future. We have conducted 58 investigations, held 265 hearings and heard some 658 witnesses. Among the areas which we investigated and in which we expressed vigorous committee interest and guidance were satellites for world communication, international telecommunication and space communications, international control of outer space, space propulsion, Project Mercury (the man-in-space program), NASA-military management of electronic equipment and many, many others, all of which have great significance to Collins Radio and the community of Cedar Rapids, and to which my committee has made many important contributions.

Right now, circling the globe a thousand miles high, is the Project Echo satellite, which I am sure many of my colleagues in the House have seen. Collins Radio is working hard in association with this program, a work in which the people of Cedar Rapids can justly take pride.

During my tenure here in Congress, I have traveled to the far reaches of the world for the committee, checking satellite tracking equipment and other electronic gear, as well as working on international scientific projects. On these trips, I have witnessed the products of Collins Radio being employed in our vital tracking stations across the Pacific. After driving down a jungle trail for 90 miles, it was a thrill to find a piece of Collins Radio equipment which has become an indispensable part of our tracking facilities.

I am thrilled by the fact that from this community, so representative of industrious, intelligent Americans, where hard-thinking and fast-acting American businessmen chose to settle and develop a vital organization like Collins Radio, have come the products which are the result of an industrial genius that is now playing and will continue to play an indispensable role not only in our advances into outer space but also in the building of our national bulwark of strength and security.

I am also, in all humility, proud that I have had the privilege of serving the people of Cedar Rapids in the House of Representatives and on the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, thereby rendering to those who sent me here the greatest possible pursuit of their local interests. In the 2 years in which I have participated in the committee's activities I have gained much in my own personal development by listening to and talking with the leaders of our country in every field of endeavor—from research and development in agriculture to the exploration of the deepest reaches of the ocean's floor. I think this has helped me to be a better Congressman, and has given me an unparalleled opportunity to assist my people in achieving and furthering our common interests.

From the grassroots of America come the know-how, the energy, the willingness to work hard, and through an unquestioned belief of my people of Cedar Rapids in wholesome American principles have come the products of a thriving organization, Collins Radio. It is in this way that I believe I am helping my constituents to continue to live lives that are meaningful and in which their children can reap the benefits of their parents' industry. This, in turn, has been made possible by our free system of life that has become a symbol of intellectual freedom to mankind everywhere. From the cornfields of Iowa—the heartland of America—in Cedar Rapids, Iowa, has come leadership in the space age.

MINIMUM WAGE BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, as you all have noted in the daily papers there has been a breakdown in the Committee of Conference on the minimum wage bill—at least up to this moment.

As a representative of that committee I feel that some erroneous statements ought to be corrected.

I was not a bit surprised to find in the record of the other House within a few minutes after the apparent breakdown and stalemate of the conference the immediate attack upon the chairman of the Senate conferee group and sponsor of the Senate bill.

This of course, is the usual political maneuver to place upon another the fault for your own failures.

I note that the question has been asked in the other House by the distinguished Member of that body who, as a member of the conferees, says that he does not know why the conference failed and that he sympathized with the thousands of workmen and their families who would have had their standard of living raised.

Mr. Speaker, there is no secret as to why the conference broke down. I happened to be present in the room on the third floor when the Rules Committee met and I heard the interrogation of certain members of the Rules Committee when they questioned the chairman of the Labor Committee and the minority ranking member—and I heard their answers—and very frankly, sir, the conference died aborning because if records were kept of that meeting of questions and answers made, you will find that there was a positive position taken that there would be no bill except the House bill.

There were some amendments offered—there were some attempts made to compromise. I want to note here that one of the members of the minority party in the Senate offered five separate compromises, and after some discussion the sponsor of the Senate bill accepted each and every one of the proposals that had been amended to allow for some decent coverage and a reasonable rate of increase. However, I believe that the conferees will admit that at no time was there a break in the minority House membership's position and in plain language—they rejected each and every proposal.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that some of these proposals offered were very far afield from the original intent of the law in which we were hoping to cover a few million of our workers who are not covered by the protective covenants in law and to give a reasonable increase in pay to those already covered.

There are in America 20,700,000 workers who are covered by the act originally passed in 1938 and amended to the present figure of $1 minimum and 40 hours maximum in 1955.

There are yet in America approximately 10 million workers who are not protected and covered by a minimum wage and maximum hour law. I want to call to your attention that if the House proposal would have passed, it would have covered, at the very maximum, approximately 700,000 workers and because of the limitation placed in the bill as to the type of coverage, it is very probamatical whether any more than 20 or 25 percent of this number would actually receive any pay increases.

The majority party conferees were willing to accept five compromise proposals. Some of these were offered by a member of the minority party and accepted by the majority members from

the Senate in a sincere effort to try to reach some kind of agreement.

Mr. Speaker, compromise is a two-way street and no compromise is possible when any one group takes an adamant and unflinching position that there can be no compromise except on their terms.

No fault can be found with Senate Democratic conferees, especially the openminded, sincere approach taken by the sponsor of the Senate bill—the junior Senator from Massachusetts.

As proof of the sincerity and willingness to compromise these differences between the two bodies, the Senate majority agreed to the following proposals either en toto or as amended.

The agony of the situation was caused by the deliberate standpatism of the four votes of the House conference group. At no time was any amendment or even a suggestion of willingness to listen to any proposal of compromise offered by this group, either individually or collectively.

The proposals in one form or another covered the following areas in which disagreement appeared between the House and Senate bills:

COVERAGE TEST

I. (a) Eliminate activity affecting commerce concept in Senate-passed bill.

(b) Substitute for the "Activity affecting commerce" concept the term "employer engaged in commerce."

(c) "Employer engaged in commerce" means (1) any employer who has two or more establishments and who operates such establishments in two or more States; or (2) any employer who derives $1½ million or more in annual gross sales from activities depending on, or furthering, movement or travel in commerce of persons, or goods, or of communications or otherwise requiring or enabling persons to engage in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce.

(d) The substitution of the new coverage test would result in the elimination of 3(t) (1), (2), (3), (4), and (5) in the Senate-passed bill. All exemptions in the Senate-passed bill would be retained, including the $250,000 establishment exemption.

WAGE RATES

II. Minimum wage rate for presently covered workers: $1.15.

III. Minimum wage rate for newly covered workers: $1, $1.05, $1.10.

IV. Overtime for newly covered workers:

COVERAGE TEST

I. (a) Eliminate activity affecting commerce concept in Senate-passed bill.

(b) Substitute for the "Activity affecting commerce" concept the term "employer engaged in commerce".

(c) "Employer engaged in commerce" means (1) any employer who has two or more establishments and who operates such establishments in two or more States; or (2) any employer who derives $100,000 or more in annual receipts from interstate sales.

(d) The substitution of the new coverage test would result in the elimination of 3(t) (1), (2), (3), (4), and (5) in the Senate-passed bill. All exemptions in the Senate-passed bill would be retained, including the $250,000 establishment exemption.

WAGE RATES

II. Minimum wage rate for presently covered workers: $1.15.

III. Minimum wage rate for newly covered workers: $1.

IV. Overtime for newly covered workers:

V. Number covered: 2,840,000.

COVERAGE TEST

I. (a) Substitute for the "Activity affecting commerce" concept the term "Employer engaged in commerce".

(b) "Employer engaged in commerce" means (1) any employer who has two, three, four, five, or more establishments and who operates such establishments in two or more States; or (2) any employer who purchases for use in his business operations (exclusive of purchases for general maintenance, repairs or capital improvements) merchandise, materials or supplies which have moved across State lines and which amount in annual dollar value to $1 million or more as measured by the preceding calendar or fiscal year.

When you realize that the standpatters were determined not to open the door to a reasonable coverage amongst the 10 million workers in these United States working at wages substandard to our way of life you can easily see the position certain men of good intentions found themselves placed in.

First of all, let us understand one thing. When we agreed to certain changes in the definition of commerce we were wandering far away from the real intent of the law and that was to bring under the coverage of this legislation the peoples in our Nation who are on the lowest rung of the economic ladder.

Congress must have some conscience of this need or it would not have passed a 10-percent and a 7½-percent increase for Federal employees whose base pays were from 2 to 10 times as much as the workers not covered by any law or even those covered by the present law.

If any person can justify this position, then he must indeed have a flexible conscience or a twisted concept of the needs of our peoples.

We are all aware of the impact for a sudden shift in our level of prosperity upon the business and economic life. However, the first to suffer and the last to recover are those amongst us whose incomes are limited to the necessities and in some cases less than the needs of families.

These citizens are the first to appear on the relief rolls and I sincerely believe that the difference in taxes paid for relief and charity handouts in some cases exceed the amounts required to pay a living and decent wage.

These people have no reserves and we play a legislative hoax upon them by talking about new coverage when the House bill would only cover 1 out of every 14 persons unprotected by a minimum wage law. We are talking of wages and hours and fail sometimes to consider the proposals offered in their effects upon the economics of commerce and industry within our respective States.

I attach hereto a letter received recently from the Secretary of Labor and Industry of the State of Pennsylvania, Mr. William L. Batt, Jr.

AUGUST 26, 1960.

The Honorable JOHN H. DENT,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOHN: As you know, the Senate has now passed the Kennedy minimum wage bill providing coverage for 4 million additional workers and an increase from $1 to $1.25 per hour.

The House bill was a much weaker version providing additional coverage for only 700,000 more people and raising the minimum to $1.15 an hour.

It is of the utmost importance to several hundred thousand workers in Pennsylvania and their families, struggling to make ends meet on subminimum wages, that the more liberal Senate version prevail in the joint conference committee. It is equally important to the manufacturing and business communities in the State, many of whom are paying $1.25 and over and who are competing with companies in other States, particularly in the South, paying substantially less than $1.25, that the Senate amounts and coverage be accepted.

Since you are one of the two Pennsylvanians representing us on the conference committee, I hope you will present these views to the conference and do your best to bring a strong bill out of those meetings.

If we can be of any help to you in providing data on the impact of this minimum wage in Pennsylvania, we will be happy to do so.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM L. BATT, Jr.

This is not new—this opposition to a change of the minimum wage law by those who have exerted so much influence both on the floor of this House and in this conference committee.

These are the same people, organizations and representatives who fought social security, unemployment compensation, the original wage and hour bills, and every progressive move sponsored in the last 20-odd years by the Democratic Members of Congress.

Where would this Nation be today if the people who emasculated the minimum wage and maximum hour law had been successful in their fights to keep these important props in our economy from the statute books.

In all of these legislative battles the arguments of States rights, interstate and intrastate commerce were used to its worth noting in passing that the NLRB has established benchmarks in their jurisdictional claims in labor disputes that make our modest attempt to seek coverage for unprotected workers a very reasonable proposal.

Is it not strange that for the purpose of policing labor disputes establishing bargaining rights and applying fines and penalties to a group of workers in a given area of employment are considered to be an interstate employment but when it comes to paying a minimum wage to these same employees they are considered as being in intrastate employment.

Frankly, if the NLRB had not assumed jurisdiction in many of these cases chaos would have resulted from the conflicting findings and opinions handed down by the various State agencies and the Federal agency.

So then it will be if we were to break down and pass minimum wage legislation creating unfair and burdensome differences in wage levels within like industries making competition in some cases impossible.

I know and I believe most of you know what would happen to our economy overnight if the Social Security Act, the Unemployment Compensation Act, the Federal-State relief systems, the farm

subsidy programs, the Federal procurement spending would be repealed or abolished.

Gentlemen, this is no time to move backward or to stand still.

We must continue in a democratic way within the range of our constitutional rights to provide the greatest good for the greatest number.

A WICKED FALSEHOOD EXPOSED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time in order to expose a wicked falsehood which has gained considerable circulation throughout much of the country. I would like to think that, by giving it this public exposure and thoroughly documenting the utter fraudulency of its character, I might thereby lay finally to rest an ancient myth. Unfortunately, this would probably be too much to hope, since the spurious nature of this particular falsehood has been properly exposed many times in past years, only to have it lie dormant for a season and then be revived in all its malignant ugliness.

This ancient fraud has quite obviously been revived this year in an effort to injure the presidential candidacy of Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY. I would feel as strongly about it, I am sure, if it were being used to discredit the candidacy of RICHARD NIXON or any other American. For it is evil in and of itself, and the fact that this year its intended victim is quite obviously Senator KENNEDY neither adds to nor detracts from its malicious falsity.

The presidential nominee of the Republican Party has made numerous high-sounding statements disavowing any intention to use Senator KENNEDY's religious affiliation against him. Vice President NIXON has said that religion will not be an issue in the campaign except to the extent that the candidates themselves may discuss it. Unfortunately, this is not quite true. The Vice President, if he has sought in any way to discourage his willing followers and helpers from injecting this matter into the campaign, apparently has no influence with a great many of them.

THE PHONY OATH

In the last few weeks a document has been distributed in my home town and county, placed under the doors of our people, handed out surreptitiously at night, and it must be appearing in some of your districts as well. The Library of Congress reports that inquiries concerning it are arriving at the current rate of 1,000 a day. A wicked document, this thing purports to be an oath of the Knights of Columbus, and it is as phony as a $3 bill.

Now, lest there be any mistake, let me make myself clear, I am a Protestant, I am a Mason, I am a Presbyterian—a kind of a dry-cleaned Baptist—but we live in a country which guarantees to every American the right of freedom and the right of free participation in his government regardless of his race or his color or his creed. We live in a country which was founded upon a belief that a religious test should never be used against a man so as to disqualify him from public office. This is one of the basic guarantees of our Constitution. We make it meaningless if we behave otherwise.

In order to give this fraudulent document an aura of respectibility those who pass it out say it is taken from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 62d Congress, 3d session, volume so and so, February 15, 1913—that makes it look authentic, does it not? Of course, it appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, but let me tell you the context in which it appeared. They do not tell you this when they pass it out. It appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a result of a congressional investigation into the fraudulent misrepresentation of the oath of a fraternal body. It appeared as an example of the most horrid, the most diabolic, the most evil type of thing that we can do in America, and that is to misrepresent what our fellow Americans say and what our fellow Americans stand for.

Some one said that if there is so much smoke there is bound to be fire. That is not necessarily true. The smoke might be caused by a stink bomb. In this case, it is.

There have been so many inquiries stimulated by the increasingly widespread distribution of this spurious document that the Library of Congress has printed a statement to give to all who inquire, in order that the truth of its utterly fraudulent character may be fully understood. Following is the text of the printed report published by the Library of Congress:

STATEMENT CONCERNING THE FRAUDULENT CHARACTER OF THE ALLEGED KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS OATH

The so-called oath of the Knights of Columbus formed the basis of one of the charges in the contested election of Eugene C. Bonniwell against Thomas S. Butler, of the Seventh Congressional District of Pennsylvania, in the 62d Congress, and was printed as an exhibit, not as being the oath of the order, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, February 15, 1913 (p. 3216). The committee report on the case (H. Rept. No. 1523 of the House Committee on Elections, No. 1, 62d Cong.) was also printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 15, 1913 (pp. 3215–3221).

Mr. Bonniwell's fourth charge (p. 3216) referred to the circulation of "a blasphemous and infamous libel, a copy of which is hereto attached, pretended to be an oath of the Knights of Columbus, of which body the contestant is a member." He added: "So revolting are the terms of this document and so nauseating its pledges that the injury it did not merely to the contestant but also to the Knights of Columbus and to Catholics in general can hardly be measured in terms."

Mr. Butler, the contestee, said (p. 3219): "I believe the circulation of this paper known as the Knights of Columbus oath, notwithstanding my sincere efforts to suppress it, and spurious as I believed it to be, was of disadvantage to me and lost rather than gained votes for me."

The committee, while seating Mr. Butler, concluded: "This committee can not condemn too strongly the publication of the false and libelous article referred to in the paper of Mr. Bonniwell, and which was the spurious Knights of Columbus oath, a copy of which is appended to the paper."

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 29, 1915, contains (p. 2721) the findings submitted by Representative Kettner, of California, of a committee of Free Masons in California, who examined the ceremonials and pledges of the Order of Knights of Columbus. The committee said: "We find that neither the alleged oath nor any oath or pledge bearing the remotest resemblance thereto in matter, manner, spirit, or purpose is used or forms a part of the ceremonies of any degree of the Knights of Columbus. The alleged oath is scurrilous, wicked, and libelous, and must be the invention of an impious and venomous mind."

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 4, 1915 (pp. 3017–3020), in connection with remarks by Representative Gallivan, of Massachusetts, contains a report, presented by him, of the commission on religious prejudice of the Knights of Columbus, in which there is a review of the various prosecutions for criminal libel "in printing or publishing or defaming by means of the alleged oath." The same number of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD (p. 3021) contains also the abovementioned report of the committee of Free Masons.

REVOLTING EXCERPTS

The bogus oath is in some places so revolting that I shall not ask its reprinting here. May it suffice for me to tell you that this spurious, fraudulent, wicked instrument which falsely purports to be the oath of this fraternal body, refers to all Protestants as damnable, contains statements erroneously purporting to show that the Knights of Columbus promise that they will have no opinion of their own but will unhesitatingly obey each and every command that they may receive from their superiors in the militia of the Pope, and contains one particularly nauseating and thoroughly objectionable paragraph in which the members of this order are represented as promising to wage relentless war against all Protestants and Masons, to extirpate them from the face of the whole earth, to crush their infants' heads against the walls, in order to annihilate their execrable race.

This violent, objectionable document, falsely represented as the oath of this fraternal body of Catholic men, is quite obviously distributed in an effort to poison the minds of the people against all Catholics and thus, in this particular instance, to do injury to Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY in his presidential aspirations. In one version of this spurious reproduction which I have seen, the following words appear on the bottom of the sheet on which it is printed:

This is just one reason why I could never support a Catholic for President. Can you?

In another printing of the fraudulent document, the following words appear at the bottom of the sheet:

I have seen this in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Therefore, I know that it is true.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE OF MASONS

In 1915, a body of Free Masons in the State of California was privileged to examine the true Knights of Columbus oath in order to report upon the utter and total fraudulency of this phony oath. Two of them were 33d degree Masons. Two of them were past grand masters of the Masons of California. All of them were distinguished Masons. Their report, which appeared in the

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shortly after its completion, and which was directed to Judge Paul J. McCormick, of Los Angeles, reads as follows:

We hereby certify that by authority of the highest officer of the Knights of Columbus in the State of California, who acted under instructions from the supreme officer of the order in the United States, we were furnished a complete copy of all the work, ceremonies, and pledges used by the order, and that we carefully read, discussed, and examined the same. We found that while the order is in a sense a secret association, it is not an oath-bound organization, and that its ceremonies are comprised in four degrees, which are intended to teach and inculcate principles that lie at the foundation of every great religion and every free state. Our examination of these ceremonials and obligations was made primarily for the purpose of ascertaining whether or not a certain alleged oath of the Knights of Columbus, which has been printed and widely circulated, was in fact used by the order, and whether if it was not used, any oath, obligation, or pledge was used which was or would be offensive to Protestants or Masons, or those who are engaged in circulating a document of peculiar viciousness and wickedness. We find that neither the alleged oath nor any oath or pledge bearing the remotest resemblance thereto in matter, manner, spirit, or purpose is used or forms a part of the ceremonies of any degree of the Knights of Columbus. The alleged oath is scurrilous, wicked, and libelous, and must be the invention of an impious and venomous mind. We find that the order of Knights of Columbus, as shown by its rituals, is dedicated to the Catholic religion, charity, and patriotism. There is no propaganda proposed or taught against Protestants or Masons or persons not of Catholic faith. Indeed, Protestants and Masons are not referred to directly or indirectly in the ceremonials and pledges. The ceremonial of the order teaches a high and noble patriotism, instills a love of country, inculcates a reverence for law and order, urges the conscientious and unselfish performance of civic duty, and holds up the Constitution of our country as the richest and most precious possession of a Knight of the order. We can find nothing in the entire ceremonials of the order that to our minds could be objected to by any person.

MOTLEY HEWES FLINT,
Thirty-third Degree Past Grand Master of Masons of California.
DANA REID WELLER,
Thirty-second Degree Past Grand Master of Masons of California.
WM. RHODES HERVEY,
Thirty-third Degree Past Master and Master of Scottish Rite Lodge.
SAMUEL E. BURKE,
Thirty-second Degree Past Master and Inspector of Masonic District.

THE TRUE OATH

Recently, for the first time, in an effort to set the record completely straight, the Knights of Columbus has released for public inspection the true oath actually taken by members of the order in their fourth degree. That actual and true oath is as follows:

I swear to support the Constitution of the United States. I pledge myself, as a Catholic citizen and a Knight of Columbus, fully to enlighten myself upon my duties as a citizen and conscientiously perform them entirely in the interest of my country, regardless of all personal consequences. I pledge myself to do all in my power to preserve the integrity and purity of the ballot and to promote respect for law and order. I promise to practice my religion consistently and faithfully, and to so conduct myself in public affairs and in the exercise of public virtue as to reflect nothing but credit upon our Holy Church, to the end that she may flourish and our country prosper to the greater honor and glory of God.

The order has offered a $25,000 reward to any person or persons who will furnish proof that the alleged oath so freely and falsely distributed has ever been taken or subscribed to by the Knights of Columbus, or that Protestants or Masons ever have been referred to directly or indirectly in the ceremonials of the Knights of Columbus, or that the language of the above recited is not the true obligation. Needless to say, there have been no takers.

COURT HISTORY

There is, in fact, quite a lengthy court history surrounding the distribution of this infamous fraud. It dates back many years. Without attempting to present an exhaustive account of all the legal cases which have arisen from the distribution of this spurious oath, I shall mention herein a few such cases in order that it may be fully understood that courts of law have looked into this question quite thoroughly:

THE CASE OF L. J. KING

In May 1929, one L. J. King, a pretended ex-priest, was arrested at Homer City, Pa., and charged with criminal libel for having circulated the bogus oath in connection with anti-Catholic meetings which he was conducting at that place. On June 5, 1929, as the case was about to be presented to the grand jury, the defendant appeared in court and waived the sending of a bill of indictment to the grand jury and entered a plea of nolo contendere.

Hon. J. N. Langham, presiding judge, after directing that sentence be suspended upon payment of costs, addressed the defendant and stated that he undoubtedly knew that the document was libelous and untrue, that if we are to serve our Lord and Master, we must cease to interfere with denominations that do not agree with us; that the accused should, in his own pulpit, strive to propagate religion and observe the American principle of fair play and that if he failed to recognize this admonition he would be at once ordered before the court for sentence.

THE MORRISON CASE

This was an action of criminal libel brought by E. M. Lawless, editor of the Waterville Sentinel, against A. M. Morrison and G. E. Morrison, father and son, editors and publishers of the Mankato Morning Journal of Mankato, Minn. The libel consisted in charging Lawless with having taken the bogus Knights of Columbus oath. The trial was held in Waterville, Minn., Wednesday, July 29, 1914.

A SENSATIONAL TRIAL

The trial was a most sensational one from many points of view. It was presided over by Judge George J. Dressel. The district attorney who prosecuted the case was Francis J. Hanzel, of Montgomery, prosecuting attorney for Le Sueur County, who was assisted by Attorney Thomas Hessian, of Le Seuer. The defendants were represented by Owen Morris, of St. Paul. The small country courtroom was crowded to the very limits of its capacity, and the spectators filled every available inch of space, having come in from the surrounding country to hear the case tried.

It is of more than passing importance and a matter of gratification to the order, as it was a compliment to him, that the Reverend Thomas Billing, the resident Methodist minister, was chosen on the jury without challenge by the complainant and that he was also made foreman of the jury.

The defendants took the witness stand but made no attempt to establish the authenticity of the bogus oath. They threw themselves on the mercy of the jury, claiming that there was no intention to libel Mr. Lawless. They were not cross-examined by the county attorney.

The jury returned a verdict of guilty, which was read by the foreman, Rev. Thomas Billing, and the court imposed a jail sentence of 30 days on each of the defendants, from which they took an appeal to the district court.

The case was called for trial in the district court at Le Sueur, Minn., February 25, 1915. The defendants entered a plea of guilty and the court imposed a fine of $25 on each defendant, which they paid.

THE BEACH CASE

In the summer of 1923, A. H. Beach, of St. Paul, engaged in the distribution of anti-Catholic literature and distributed copies of the bogus Knights of Columbus oath in various parts of the United States. His attention was called to the fact that this alleged oath was false and libelous and demand was made that he discontinue its publication. The demand having been ignored, the matter was presented to the county attorney who sent for Beach. Under threat of prosecution he entered into an agreement with the county attorney that he would discontinue the sale or circulation of the pamphlet. The county attorney stated that he desired to be lenient with Beach because he was a crippled and indigent appearing individual. However, notwithstanding this agreement, it was found in the summer of 1928 that Beach had resumed the publication of the alleged oath, and on November 15 he was indicted for criminal libel by the grand jury of Ramsey County. On November 19, 1928, he entered a plea of guilty and was sentenced to six months in the workhouse and fined $500, the sentence being suspended on his promise not to repeat the offense.

There have been many other similar cases, all of them resulting in findings of guilt on the charges of libel against those who knowingly and intentionally distribute this false oath. One of them was a case involving a man named Charles A. Swift, which was tried in St. Johns, Newfoundland, on February 18, 1913. Another arose in the State of California where a Socialist editor named H. S. Turner was found guilty upon trial by jury in the superior court, and where this verdict was affirmed in the court of appeals, the case being styled as *People v. Turner* (28 Cal. Ap. 766, 154 PAC. 34).

Another publisher named David J. Gordan was similarly convicted of criminal libel for having published the bogus oath in California. Also, in the State of Oklahoma, a similar finding was returned in the case of the State of Oklahoma against Roy Crane. The foregoing should be sufficient to establish beyond a shadow of a doubt that the courts have thoroughly investigated and uniformly found this false oath to be utterly fraudulent.

OTHER FALSEHOODS

There are other ancient and proven canards which are reported to be finding circulation during this political season, all of which are equally false and all of which have as the target of their poison barbs the presidential candidacy of Senator KENNEDY. There is, for instance, a scurrilous work known as the "Awful Disclosures of Maria Monk." This purports to be the autobiography of a nun. In truth, it was written by a demented woman of ill repute in 1832. This fraud was revived in Wisconsin earlier this year.

The people of Wisconsin also have been treated to printing which contains the false charge that Abraham Lincoln was assassinated by Catholics after he had voiced a warning against catholicism.

Only this week, in Wednesday morning's issue of the New York Times, the disinguished newsman James Reston reports on yet another grotesque distortion of truth which has received distribution, obviously aimed at American Catholics and at Senator KENNEDY directly.

Mr. Reston writes concerning the distribution of an article written by a man in Owensboro, Ky., which flagrantly misquotes a famous writing by Thomas Jefferson in such a way as to make it appear that President Jefferson was writing against the Boston Catholic clergy in his famous letter to Dr. Benj. Rush on September 23, 1800, in which Jefferson declared his "eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man."

The article in question then made reference to the nomination of "the Boston Catholic leadership as the candidate for President this year."

Mr. Reston points out that the writer of this article had gratuitously changed the meaning of Thomas Jefferson's famous letter which in truth made no reference whatever to the Catholic clergy.

Then, Mr. Reston relates that he could not find the author of this distorted article at his office in Owensboro, Ky., but did find him in the office of the Republican national chairman here in Washington, where this man admitted, according to Mr. Reston, that he had not read the complete Jefferson letter which he had taken the liberty of paraphrasing and misquoting.

Apparently this particular incident was the result not so much of outright malice as of careless research and faulty memory, for the perpetrator of this misquotation, who is now in Washington working actively in the Republican campaign, is quoted in Thursday morning's edition of the Washington Post as having issued a public retraction and apology.

Nevertheless, this illustrates the readiness with which many people are willing to believe the worst about another person's religious faith and to repeat and distribute falsehood without checking carefully into its veracity. Who knows what will come next in this campaign of calumny?

It seems extremely clear to me that each of these wicked frauds is fundamentally and deeply irreligious in character. It has been my privilege to serve as an elder in the Presbyterian church and as a member of the permanent Judicial Commission of the Presbyterian Church of the U.S.A. My own religious orientation, therefore, is quite clearly a Protestant one. Yet I am deeply offended, as I believe any Christian should be deeply offended, at the distribution of such utterly wicked and thoroughly false attacks upon another body of Christians.

People who are receiving these spurious and totally misleading documents are entitled, I think, to know the truth. Perhaps those who have been passing them out did not know they were false. Assuming them innocent of such knowledge, I think they are also entitled to know the truth.

A MATTER OF RIGHT AND WRONG

To me, this kind of thing just comes down to a matter of right and wrong. Just as it is wrong to bear false witness against one's neighbor, it seems to me wrong to pass out a bogus paper against someone else and represent it to be the truth. This, to me, is all part of the Golden Rule—that we should do unto others as we would have them do unto us.

As a Protestant and a Mason, I would keenly resent anybody passing out such a thing and calling it a teaching of my church or an oath of my lodge. If I am a good American, I think I should resent it also when this is done to others, and that I should have the courage to speak out against it.

I have no quarrel with anyone who because of sincere conviction wishes to vote for the Republican candidate. I have no quarrel with anyone who holds a sincere religious conviction in which he prefers one church to another, nor do I attempt herein to dissuade any such person from such a conviction. My quarrel is with a demonstrable falsehood which compounds its culpability by taking on the habiliments of a religious garb.

CONSTITUTIONAL GUARANTEES

Many people, as a result of the distribution of part-truths and half-truths, have become seriously disturbed about the safety of their country if a member of the Catholic faith should be elected to the White House. They show, it seems to me, a rather shocking lack of trust in their fundamental constitutional guarantees. The basic freedoms of our country, for which Catholics as well as Protestants have died, could not be set aside short of constitutional amendments. These, as you know, could never come unless they were approved by a two-thirds majority in both Houses of Congress and then ratified by three-fourths of the States.

Moreover, Senator KENNEDY himself has quite emphatically demonstrated that he is his own man and not subject to influence by an outside force, ecclesiastical or otherwise. Long before he ever was mentioned for the Presidency, he demonstrated his own belief in the long-established American principle of the separation of church and state by voting against public funds for parochial schools. He has stated his forceful opposition to the sending of an Ambassador to the Vatican.

He has unequivocally declared his stanch adherence to the complete separation of church and state, and has emphatically announced that no force, ecclesiastical or temporal, would ever be allowed to come between him and the performance of his duty to the American people if he should be elected as our President. What more can we ask?

There are things which I, as a Protestant, cannot fully embrace about the Catholic Church. Yet this has nothing to do with the qualifications of an individual to serve in public office. There are certain things about some of our other faiths which I personally do not fully embrace, yet it would be quite wrong for me to argue for instance that a worshiper of one of these other churches should be disqualified from serving as our President simply because of my own philosophical disagreement with some particular doctrine of his church.

I am not trying to suggest that everyone who wishes to support some candidate other than Senator KENNEDY is motivated by religious prejudice or influenced by fraudulent representations. That, of course, would be a ridiculous conclusion. Yet I do believe that, in nominating this man, his party has demonstrated its faith in the basic soundness of the American people. The Democratic Party, in nominating a man who is a member of a minority religious faith, has manifested its belief in the toleration and the good will of Americans.

WHAT AMERICA STANDS FOR

Let me ask you quite seriously: Do we want to say to the world that Dublin, Ireland, can have a Jewish mayor, that Catholic France can have a Protestant Foreign Minister, that even Israel can have a Mohammedan in its Cabinet, and that we, the Nation that has set ourselves up as the freest nation and the most tolerant nation of all, cannot allow a Catholic to serve in the highest office in the land?

Do we want to say to ourselves that we, who set ourselves aloft as a nation that believes in brotherly love and religious toleration and in the separation of church and state—for which JACK KENNEDY has very firmly asserted his belief—that in this free Nation we automatically disqualify about a third of our citizens at birth simply because of the church in which their parents worship? If so, perhaps we should have told that to JACK KENNEDY's brother before he died for our country in World War II?

Perhaps we should have told that to my colleagues who served with me in the Fifth Air Force—my very good friends who were Catholics who died defending the freedom of our country? Perhaps we should have told it to JACK himself

before he so ably distinguished himself defending his country and risked his life to save the lives of others.

No, my friends, that is not America—I do not know what it is, but it is not what I was brought up to believe. It is not the America that I want my children to grow up in, and I do not think it is the America that you want your children to grow up in. Because the religion that our people profess, including the people who either knowingly or unknowingly distribute such fraudulent documents is not a religion that teaches hate, but one that teaches brotherly love. It is a religion that looks forward to a day when we can create such an atmosphere of friendliness and understanding and mutual good will that "the lamb and the lion can lie down together" and men can "beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning hooks; and nation shall not lift up sword against nation; and neither shall they learn war any more."

This day, though it may seem afar off, is the promise of our Scriptures and is the goal toward which we should be striving. We shall not attain it by peddling stale falsehoods against our fellow men. We shall not achieve it through motivations of fear and prejudice and hate. We shall move toward it only as we try to understand one another, tell only the truth about one another, and follow the injunction to do unto others as we would have them do unto us. This is the reason why I, as a Protestant and a Mason but mainly as an American citizen and as one who would aspire to be a good Christian, have taken this time to discuss this matter.

WHAT REPRESENTS THE TERM OF A REPRESENTATIVE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, as my congressional career draws to a close, I would like to comment on a problem which has aroused controversy since the Constitutional Convention. I refer to the question of how long a Representative's term should be.

Throughout our history the 2-year term has caused a good deal of discontent, but there appears never to have been a concerted effort to bring about a change. My remarks arise from a deep-seated conviction that the term should be lengthened to 4 years.

That the Founding Fathers favored a short term is clear. But a close reading of the Federalist No. 52 reveals that they were not quite as dogmatic as some suppose. The authors held that the degree of frequency of elections "does not appear to be susceptible of any precise calculation, and must depend on a variety of circumstances."

And the circumstances have changed today to an extent undreamed of in 1787. One such change has been the profound alteration of our way of life by the related developments of communication and transportation. When our Constitution was written the means of communication were decidedly limited—there were no radios or telegraph or telephones; the mails could not have been too swift in the absence of airplanes and a rail and highway network. Today, on the other hand, people know the issues and know what their legislators are doing. The focus has shifted to Washington to the extent that national politics are probably better understood and more popular than State and local politics. This change has come about with the growth of our daily newspapers and the wire services, the speed of radio and the immediacy of television. And today Congressmen avail themselves of our transportation facilities to visit their districts much more frequently than early Congressmen did. Representative Charles Vursell pointed this out 5 years ago when he noted the close tie which today exists between legislator and constituents as a result of modern communications.

When an election is always coming up within 2 years, it is necessary to engage in a kind of perpetual campaigning. This is true, of course, only in those parts of the country where the two-party system functions as it should. From personal experience as a Congressman representing a district closely divided between Democratic and Republican voters, I know that campaigning is not limited to the few months before election day. It means trips to the district almost every weekend and appearances before the multitude of organizations which characterize our society. Indeed, campaigning can become a state of mind, an end in itself.

In addition to the physical and mental demands imposed on candidates, campaigning in a two-party district costs money. We are committed to the idea that the public needs and deserves extensive publicity for informative purposes. This means literature and postage, stickers and billboards, radio and television, and other means of advertising and publicity—all of which cost money. Surely the necessity to repeat the campaign process every 2 years is an extravagant waste financially. Do we want to limit office to those independently wealthy men who can afford a costly campaign every 2 years?

No one denies that the legislative tasks confronting Congressmen today are highly complex. It takes time to learn the details of lawmaking, of how committees operate. And the subject matter of legislation has expanded enormously in the wake of technological progress and population growth. Back in 1789 Congress met 5 months a year, but today it meets almost twice that time. Comparative studies make it quite clear that today there are more bills introduced, more laws enacted, more subjects discussed, more committee meetings and reports, more mail, and more visitors. Writers of the Federalist, No. 53, foresaw such growth:

> No man can be a competent legislator who does not add to an upright intention and a sound judgment a certain degree of knowledge of the subjects on which he is to legislate. * * * The period of service ought, therefore, in all such cases, to bear some proportion to the extent of practical knowledge requisite to the due performance of the service.

Influence is essential if a Congressman is to be effective, and it is all too apparent that no freshman Representative can in a 2-year term secure any appreciable influence in terms of understanding the mysteries of House procedure and getting a hearing from leaders in the Chamber. And in 2 years a Congressman does not have time to make a broad record by which he may be fairly judged. This encourages the doing of many personal favors and the enactment of pork-barrel legislation to benefit constituents at the expense of the rest of the Nation.

Some have held that the short term tends to push Representatives into the background; that is, the House plays third fiddle to the Senate and White House.

Mr. Speaker, you said yourself 2 years ago that "I have always thought we would have a more independent House of Representatives if Members were elected every 4 years."

President Dwight Eisenhower similarly expressed his preference for a 4-year term at a press conference in 1955. He believed a longer term would encourage more good men to seek the office.

The Legislative Reference Service has reported to me that the total number of resolutions to lengthen the term of Representatives which has been introduced between the 1st and 86th Congress is about 120. In two-thirds of the resolutions a 4-year term is proposed. An unusually heavy attack on the 2-year term was made in the 85th Congress when no less than five resolutions called for a change of term length, four of which called for 4-year terms.

In spite of all this activity over the years, only two resolutions have been reported out of committee. They were House Joint Resolution 120, 59th Congress, in 1906, and House Joint Resolution 220, 67th Congress, in 1923. In the first instance the House rejected the measure, and in 1923 there was no further action beyond the report.

I would like to see a renewed interest in this problem and a concerted effort in the immediate years ahead to effect such a change. Over the 20 years that I have served in this great body, I have become more and more convinced that a 4-year term would make Congressmen better legislators and more responsive to their constituents. Furthermore, in these days of ever-increasing pressures, it would be conducive to the Member's good health.

NARCOTICS ADDICTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, narcotics addiction, despite increasing efforts by all levels of government to combat its serious effects, remains as a major social and criminal problem. Although the number of addicts in the country has not materially increased in the past few years, they have not decreased either.

Regrettably, the relationship between addiction and crime is becoming more

and more pronounced. To quote from a New York City Police bulletin on narcotics:

> The prolonged and continued use of drugs is a costly practice. It swirls its victims into a maelstrom that flings them from drugs to crime—and then back to drugs again. Because many employers shun addicts as undesirable employees, these people are left without work and therefore without money. The addict must have drugs and his only solution is to turn to crime. Consequently both male and female find themselves involved in such lawbreaking as petty thefts, larceny, prostitution, shoplifting, burglary, robbery and even murder.

In 1956, the Daniels subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee reported that drug addiction was responsible for approximately 50 percent of all crimes committed in the larger metropolitan areas and 25 percent of all reported crimes in the Nation.

This in brief, is the grim picture of the consequences to our society of the continued existence of narcotics addiction at a high level.

If this scourge is to be lessened it can only be accomplished through the vigorous carrying out of an overall plan for the treatment and control of addiction, in which plan all levels of government as well as religious, educational, private and public social agencies should be included. This is why I cosponsored and strongly supported the resolution adopted by this House last spring calling for a White House conference on narcotics.

Such an overall plan should have three primary goals:

First. Control of production and distribution of narcotics—legal and illicit.

Second. Treatment, supervision and control of individuals presently addicted to narcotics, including those who have committed crimes and those who have not.

Third. The prevention of new or increased addiction.

Broken down even further, such a program might include a revamping of the Federal laws relating to narcotics, and the adoption by the States of adequate public health legislation and penal provisions in this respect; an increase of treatment facilities and the adoption of laws encouraging addicts—including both those who have committed crimes and those who have not—to undergo treatment procedures; and, an increased distribution of educational material alerting the public to the dangers of narcotics and of the measures available to combat addiction.

At present there are three hospitals in the country devoted to the treatment of addicts, the Federal institutions at Lexington, Ky., and Fort Worth, Tex.. and the New York State hospital for juvenile addicts in New York City. Some private facilities are also available but the total is woefully inadequate for the need.

Along with Senator JAVITS and our colleague, Mr. ANFUSO, I sponsored a bill for the establishment of a Federal narcotics hospital in New York State to be jointly operated through arrangements with the State, its political subdivisions, and neighboring States. This was intended to partially fill the serious gap in treatment facilities that now exists.

I am also pleased to cosponsor with Mr. ANFUSO, a bill to provide for grants-in-aid to the States for the treatment of narcotic drug addicts in so-called closed institutions, that is, hospitals providing a drug-free environment with maximum supervision and with minimum contact with the outside world. The condition of desperate lack of funds in the States to enable them to provide the essential facilities for treatment of addicts could be eased by this bill and I urge its speedy enactment.

But other legislation is necessary as well. If the menace of narcotics is to be lessened, not only must addicts be helped to help themselves, but sellers and purveyors of dope must be penalized to the fullest extent possible. Drug traffic must be made so costly to those engaged in it illegally as to discourage potential distributors. To this end I have introduced a bill today to provide that for a third or subsequent offense against the Federal narcotics laws, an offender shall be imprisoned not less than 15 years nor more than 60 years and fined not more than $20,000. Existing statutes only provide that, for a second or subsequent offense, imprisonment shall be for not less than 10 nor more than 40 years and the fine shall not be more than $20,000.

It is intended that the psychological impact of a possible third offense penalty of a severe nature should act as a deterrent to drug traffickers or "sellers," the human vermin who prey on the weaknesses of their fellowmen.

But for those who are merely victims of addiction, who possess small quantities of drugs for personal use only and are not engaged in the sale or distribution of narcotics, I believe that we should make every effort to help them to rehabilitate themselves and to become contributing members of society once more. In addition, I believe that those who are convicted under Federal laws other than the narcotics statutes, and who are addicts, should likewise be granted the opportunity for rehabilitation.

Existing laws do provide that violators of Federal laws who are addicts can be sent to hospitals for treatment and rehabilitation. However, I do not believe that they allow for sufficient flexibility in the treatment of such addicts. Nor, do existing laws specifically differentiate between those who violate the Federal narcotics laws by engaging in the sale or distribution of narcotics, and those who are merely victim-possessors and who might benefit from treatment.

I have been working on legislation aimed at meeting the objections to the existing laws and providing for the more flexible handling of addicts who violate Federal laws including the narcotics laws. I intend to introduce several bills when Congress convenes in January, which, I hope, will offer more encouraging procedures for the treatment of addicts.

Among such bills will be one that will make it a Federal offense to possess a certain amount of narcotics without being involved in the sale or distribution of such drugs. The purpose of such a bill will be to differentiate in terms of penalties and sentencing between those who are sellers and purveyors of narcotics and those who are merely victim-possessors. Alternative modes of sentencing the latter class of persons will be provided, each with the objective of promoting the widest program of treatment and self-help so as to enable addicts to become cured and fit and ready for community living. Particular features of such bills will include liberal use of probation and parole measures, expert supervision and the periodic undergoing of medical tests by those being helped, and, the setting aside of convictions where addicts become rehabilitated.

Such bills will rely on State and local support measures in the effort for rehabilitation.

In addition, I shall also consider the introduction of measures to provide assistance to State programs of education and research in the narcotics field and of public enlightenment about ways and means of combatting the narcotics scourge.

The existence of a national narcotics problem with all of its complications, demands the development of policies and programs designed to promote a nationwide effort to combat this menace. I have tried to indicate briefly something of the scope of the problem and the diversity of the remedial measures which must be undertaken by all levels of our society.

I believe that bills of the type which I have described will help immeasurably in the fight against the distribution of narcotics, in the treatment, supervision and control of addicts, and in the encouragement of State and local efforts in this field. The seriousness of the narcotics menace requires that we give our most earnest consideration to proposals to overcome it.

FACTUAL STORY OF WOLF FOOD FOR PEACE PLAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. WOLF], is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, it is gratifying after years of very diligent effort to see the Republican Party adopt the United Nations food-for-peace proposal. It is disturbing that they are attempting to give the impression that they developed it in the past 3 months. We Democrats have spent many, many hours over the past 2 years working over this proposal but we welcome this new support, however late. We hope that this declaration is not merely an election-year appeal by the Republican administration, but in the light of the past record of Republican political expediency, it does give that appearance. So often, the Republicans have adopted humanitarian Democratic proposals to win an election and then dropped them immediately after the election. But this I pledge, Mr. Speaker: That regardless of what happens the day after election, I will still be working just as diligently to get some of our God-given abundance

into the hands and mouths of needy and starving people.

In the interest of accuracy, I wish to introduce into the RECORD the various historical facts regarding the United Nations food-for-peace idea.

March 26, 1959: On that day, the day before Good Friday, I proposed the food for peace through the United Nations plan. At that time, I stated:

It is my suggestion that this Congress seriously consider aiding economic expansion by the use of American agricultural resources through the United Nations. * * * To these ends, I am proposing that the Congress of the United States authorize the President to make food and fiber available to the United Nations or its appropriate agencies. * * * I propose that we demonstrate our responsibility as the world's most fortunate independent democracy by using food and fiber resources to aid other nations in the improvement of their living standards.

April 27, 1959: Fellow Congressmen joined me in sponsoring the food-for-peace plan. The bill made available to the United Nations up to $250 million worth of food and fiber resources held in surplus by the Commodity Credit Corporation. The food was to be used in underdeveloped areas for three purposes: First, national food and fiber reserves; second, education and educational programs such as school lunch programs and school clothing programs; and, third, community development projects where nations had capital to pay for resources but not for labor.

June 18, 1959: Because the food for peace through the United Nations bill was bottled up in committee, I sponsored the food-for-peace idea as an amendment to the Mutual Security Act. At that time, I pointed out that if my food-for-peace plan was enacted and implemented over a 10-year period, we would save $1,140,000 in storage costs.

Congressman KING, of Utah, stated on the floor in support of the plan:

This is one of the very rare occasions in which liberal and conservative can join hands in support of legislation which represents the best interests of each. * * * In the name of fiscal responsibility, in the name of agricultural and economic stability, in the name of kindness, charity and decency, in the name of progress and opportunity, I urge your support.

One of the ranking Republican members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Mr. WALTER JUDD, of Minnesota, states:

This is a most appealing amendment because we have surpluses and the world has hungry people. But I cannot feel it is wise for us here today to accept this amendment. * * * It would place a burden upon the United Nations which that organization is in no position to handle.

The amendment was voted down 96–47. Only three Republicans stood in favor of the United Nations proposal.

April 21, 1960: I again introduced the United Nations food-for-peace proposal as an amendment to the 1960 Mutual Security Act.

Mr. SMITH, of Iowa, on that day, stated:

I think the only way we can have a change of administration of world food distribution this year is by a program operated through the United Nations. I know we are not going to get it through this administration in Washington because the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of State are in agreement that the rate we are pushing wheat now is the greatest that we should push it despite the fact that Russia is constantly gaining in its percentage of the world wheat market.

I also read a letter from the Deputy Under Secretary General of the United Nations, Martin Hill, who said that the United Nations was ready, willing, and able to carry out the United Nations food-for-peace plan.

Mr. JUDD again spoke for the Republicans and against the United Nations food-for-peace plan by saying that the United Nations had no administrative machinery for handling such a complicated operation. This was said, even though the United Nations Secretariat agreed that it could handle the new job, which would operate similarly to the way a letter of credit operates in the commercial world. On this day, the plan was again defeated 93 to 46, with only 2 Republicans voting for the food-for-peace plan.

June 20, 1960: Vice President NIXON, the presidential nominee of the Republican Party, reversed the Republican position of just 2 months earlier and spoke out in favor of the United Nations food-for-peace plan:

Immediately prior to the summit conference the President, in discussions with his staff, in which I participated, developed a proposal which meets these objectives and which can lead to a major breakthrough in getting surplus food to hungry people abroad. He was considering presentation of this proposal for the first time at the summit conference in Paris.

The first step would have been to call a conference of all the surplus-producing nations, including the Soviet Union. These nations would then work out a joint proposal for a multilateral program under which the food surpluses of all nations which desired to participate would have been turned over to United Nations' agencies for distribution to the hungry people of member nations. The recipients of the United Nations food would be those unfortunate people who still are unable to supply themselves with an adequate diet either by their own agricultural efforts or by exchange of goods. The distribution would be handled in such a manner as not to disturb commercial markets.

Let me emphasize that I do not suggest that this proposal is a cure-all for the farm or for the world's problems. It does, however, have these obvious merits: It will not be harmful to our friends and allies since they will participate in the program. It will not be subject to the criticism directed against unilateral U.S. aid since it will be administered through the United Nations. It will be in the best American humanitarian tradition in expressing concern for and offering assistance to less fortunate people. It will serve the cause of peace and freedom by giving hungry people the food which will help provide them with the necessary energy to build independent, free societies which can resist foreign domination from any quarter.

Every one of these points which Vice President NIXON made in North Dakota obviously had to be made in favor of the Wolf food-for-peace proposal because this was the only United Nations food-for-peace proposal in Congress at that time. By his remarks on this day, Vice President NIXON reversed the stand of the Republican Party on the Wolf-United Nations food-for-peace plan and endorsed it.

July 27, 1960: The Republican platform calls for intensification of the food-for-peace program, including new cooperative efforts among food surplus nations to assist the hungry peoples in less-favored areas of the world.

The Democratic Party in its platform, also endorsed the Wolf-United Nations food-for-peace proposal:

We will no longer view food stockpiles with alarm but will use them as powerful instruments for peace and plenty. * * * With wise management of our food abundance, we will expand trade between nations, support economic and human development programs, and combat famine.

August 22, 1960: Senator FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and I introduced a concurrent resolution which embodies the United Nations food-for-peace proposal. It calls on the United States to take the initiative in the United Nations in developing plans whereby all members of the United Nations will work together in furnishing food and fiber to underdeveloped areas without, of course, disturbing normal markets.

For all of us who have supported this plan, it has been a long hard road. It has meant many trips by myself and my staff to the United Nations at my own expense to work out details of this proposal. It has meant almost daily selling this idea to Members of both parties. We have diligently tried to convince them of the value and necessity of using our agricultural commodities in a new and creative way. I am happy and gratified that platforms of both political parties and the two presidential candidates, Vice President NIXON and Senator KENNEDY, have expressed their agreement with the United Nations food-for-peace plan.

Mr. Speaker, I want the record to show that following passage of Senate Resolution 116 in the Senate, I attempted today to gain unanimous consent to bring this resolution up in the House of Representatives. The chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee approved, the Speaker of the House agreed, the minority leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] refused to agree to consideration of the resolution. I want the record to show that the Republican leader of the House personally blocked this resolution, notwithstanding the fact that the Acting Secretary of State Douglas Dillon said in support of this resolution:

The President wished to be assured that such an initiative (S. Res. 116) would elicit the support of Congress.

Mr. Dillon outlined completely the President's proposed program in his statement to the committee.

It is unfortunate that the final demonstration of support for the U.N. food-for-peace idea was stopped on the very threshold of passage by the very leader

of the President's party in the House of Representatives.

I am satisfied, Mr. Speaker, that when the new Congress convenes next year under Democratic leadership that the U.N. food-for-peace program will become a reality.

CONGRESSIONAL INSPECTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LIBONATI] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I have requested 1 hour to speak on special order upon three subjects. First, the report of the Congressman on the inspection and tour of the factories and industries in Italy that were the recipient of aid under the Marshall plan for the reconstruction and expansion to strengthen the economy of the Republic. Second, to speak on the interesting reunion of General Klein and General Teucci in Rome and such incidents thereto of interest. Third, the report of Subcomittee No. 3 of the Committee on the Judiciary on the visit to the prisons at Terre Haute, Ind., Chillicothe, Ohio, and Ashland, Ky., in company with counsel of the subcommittee, Cyril Brickfield, and various Government officials.

It was early morning on the 15th day of September, 6:22 a.m. that the session adjourned sine die. A small group hurried, scurried and ran to Washington travel center stations to embark, fly, or road-tumble to New York City.

The flight to Europe from Idlewild, aboard Alitalia, at 4 p.m. in the afternoon, was a glorious sensation—we appreciated the study objectives of our visit to Italy at the behest of the Italian Government.

It was at Ispra—Varese—that we first experienced the wonderful hospitality and friendship of the Italians toward the good will official messengers of the United States. And the same feelings continued throughout our visits to Turin, Genoa, Venice, Milan, Pavia, Novara, Milan, Florence, Rome, Salerno, Naples, Palermo, and Catania.

We were proud of our lineage and were welcomed by everyone with a loyal enthusiasm typical of the Italian people. Although the schedule was a tight one, we tried to please everyone interested in the American inspection tour of factories and industries that had received aid under the Marshall plan. And, being politicians ourselves, we gave way to the requests of the Italian politicians, such as mayor and prefect, to visit the plants and their intimates in the areas that we visited.

It was not an easy task being on the working end from 8:30 a.m. to 9:30 p.m. for the better part of 3 weeks. It is needless to say that the Congressmen saw very little of Italy except on the scenic side while en route from one factory site or shipyard to another.

The Members of the Congress, their wives and children in attendance, were: Congressman Paul A. Fino and his wife, Esther; Congressman Dante B. Fascell and his wife, Jeanne Marie; Congressman Roland V. Libonati and his wife, Jeannette; Congressman Alfred A. Santangelo and his wife, Betty; Congressman John H. Dent and his wife, Margaret; Congressman Emilio Q. Daddario and his wife, Berenice; Congressman Domenico V. Daniels and his wife, Camille; Congressman Robert N. Giaimo and his wife, Mariam; Congressman Silvio O. Conte and his wife, Corinne. Congressman Fascell's daughter, Sandra, was with us, as was Congressman Giaimo's daughter, Barbara.

Also accompanying us was our amiable Deputy Sergeant at Arms of the House, Thomas Iorio and his wife, Clara.

It was unfortunate that two of our colleagues who were most instrumental in the arrangements with the Italian Government, because of circumstances beyond their control, were unable to go with us—Congressman Peter Rodino and his wife, Marianna, and Congressman Hugh J. Addonizio and his wife, Doris.

Congressman Victor Anfuso and his wife, Frances, met us in Rome and attended our meeting with the Honorable Segni, Italian Prime Minister.

The distinguished Ambassador, Manlio Brosio, ever interested in cementing the friendly relationship between the United States and Italy, determined that a second visit to Italy by a congressional delegation of Italo-Americans—first visit in the fall of 1957—would create a most favorable impression upon the minds of the Italian people in visiting the industries of Italy, especially those whose expansion and construction had received aid through the operation of the Marshall plan. It was felt that the visit would reflect the growing interest of the American people in the exceptional progress made by the Italian industrialists and industries in contributing to the national and local economies of the nation. This progress was only realized through the saving of the defunct Italian industries, through the beneficence of the American people.

Dr. Paolo Savino, of the Embassy staff, perfected arrangements with the congressional group and the Italian industrialists, through the Hon. Carmine de Martino, then Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs and presently a Member of Parliament.

It was through the direct efforts of Mr. de Martino that the Italian arrangements were perfected. He is a great leader and is loved throughout Italy. To him must go the credit for the arrangements for our entertainment, comfort of travel, and the hospitality in every section we visited, by the officials and distinguished citizens in attendance at the luncheons and dinners given in our honor. We feel a great warmth toward him for his kindness and pro-Western fortitude. He is truly a great friend of the United States.

It is with pleasure that I record the names and addresses of our hosts in Italy, at this point. It is needless to say that, of the many praises that we could use to show our heartfelt appreciation for their many kindnesses and courtesies, to say nothing of the high respect and honor that they heaped upon us, and especially upon our wives, that we only say, "Thanks, from your American cousins, who stand side by side with you in defense of the liberties of nations."

It was a signal honor to be welcomed at the railroad station in Rome by the President of the Republic, Giovanni Gronchi, who had delayed his trip to America in order to greet us and converse with us, individually. Another memorable occasion was our meeting with the former Premier, Antonio Segni, in his offices in Rome and, in true American spirit, we asked of the welfare of the present Premier, Amitore Fanfani, who typifies the American policy of the solidarity of the family, with opportunity to own land and a home, in order that their children be given the full advantage and opportunities of education for the betterment of a future generation of citizens.

Another highlight was the luncheon given by the Honorable Giovanni Leone, President of the Chamber of Deputies. We would be remiss if we did not mention the wonderful luncheon and dinner given by Carmine De Martino and his lovely wife.

It was a high privilege to converse with these men who stand out as the important government personages of the nation.

The operations of the industries in all of Italy were under ideal conditions, such as the most modern of machinery and the most modern types of buildings that were properly ventilated and lighted with expansive glassed-in building effects. The factories are situated far from the towns, primarily as a precaution dictated by war experiences in that the location is distant from the homes of the people and will prevent casualties under a bombing war.

The skilled trades, such as mechanic in the auto industry, average $3 per day with other fringe benefits in accordance with the Italian law. The powerful labor unions in Italy have devised a sliding scale affecting wages in conformity with the ability of the local economy to pay and the cost of living and from these two are determined the formula which prevails as the working wage scale. It was felt that some of the salaries are not adequate enough in the skilled trades, but nevertheless the cost of living in Italy is hardly comparative to that in the United States and, naturally, our viewpoint in this area would be subject to correction.

At this point I am incorporating in this report, a general chart touching on salaries in Italy and fringe benefits in Italian factories. At least it shows the relative categories and salaries fixed in this field:

MILAN, *November 23, 1959.*

Re: Salaries in Italy

The following figures (in Italian liras) pertain to present salaries in Milan in the field of commerce (salaries in industry are different) for male employees over 21 years of age, for a 48-hour week. Different regions of Italy may vary slightly, for example in basic salaries, but insurance costs, taxes, etc., are the same throughout Italy. The cost of living (COLA) addition varies from time to time.

Each employee is placed in a category, depending upon the work he performs.

[Italian lire]

Category	Description	Basic monthly salary	Cost of living addition	Total without deductions	Deductions from salary
A	Department head	95,849	4,459	100,308	Income tax: on 20,000 to 80,000, 4.40 percent; above 80,000, 8.80 percent.
B	"Concetto" employees (can work without direct supervision).	From 62,837 to 72,984	3,354 for all	From 66,191 to 76,338	
C	General office workers (supervised)	From 48,294 to 52,188	From 2,119 to 2,496	From 50,413 to 54,684	Complementary tax (A, B, C categories only): Above 45,000, 1.65 percent. Social insurances: 4.57 percent.
D	Workers performing miscellaneous jobs (as porters, etc.)	From 44,893 to 48,251	From 1,859 to 2,093	From 46,752 to 50,344	
E	Mechanics	From 45,285 to 53,540	From 1,989 to 2,340	From 47,274 to 55,880	

Additions to above salaries: (1) An increase of 4 percent on the total without deductions every 3 years (5 times); (2) a 13th month salary (paid at Christmastime); (3) merit additions, judged by the individual firm; (4) family allowance: $57.37 per month maximum (this paid by government insurance) by firm and insurance in turn pays allowance to employee).

Additional costs to the firm (beyond basic salary and cost of living addition):

(1) Social insurance stamp (varies according to salary from 64 lire for salaries up to 33,400 lire per month, to 158 lire on salaries of 97,100 lire per month, etc.) (covers pension, death, TB, unemployment, orphans).

(2) Social insurance additions, 16.65 percent of salary.

(3) Family allowance insurance, 25.50 percent on a maximum of 22,500 (or 5,737.50) monthly.

(4) Sickness insurance, 6.21 percent.

(5) Workers' housing, 1.72 percent.

(6) Leaving indemnity—varies according to categories.

Deductions from employees' and workers' salaries:

(1) Income tax: from 20,000 to 80,000 salary, 4.40 percent; more than 80,000, 8.80 percent.

(2) Complementary tax (applies to categories A, B, C only), 1.65 percent on amount over 45,000.

(3) Social insurance, 4.57 percent.

EXAMPLES OF COSTS OF EMPLOYEES TO THE FIRM

(1) Employee with 60,000 monthly salary (basic salary plus cost of living addition) would cost the firm as follows: (per month) in addition to 60,000 salary:

Family allowance contribution to Government Insurance	5,737.50
Fixed social insurance	104.00
Social insurance integration	7,680.00
Sickness insurance	3,936.00
Workers' housing	690.00
All of the above on the 13th month amount	1,000.00
Total	17,847.50

(Or 31.41 percent of 60,000.)

Plus indirect costs as follows:

1/12 of the 13th month amount	5,000
Leaving indemnity 1/12 of 65,000	5,414.50
Total	29,262.

(Or 48.78 percent of 60,000.)

(2) Worker with $40,000 monthly salary (basic salary plus cost of living addition) would cost the firm as follows (per month) in addition to $40,000 salary:

Family allowance contribution to Government insurance	$5,737.50
Fixed social insurance	76.00
Social insurance integration	5,120.00
Sickness insurance	2,424.00
Workers' housing	460.00
All of the above on the 13th month amount	666.65
Total	14,484.15

(Or 36.21 percent on $40,000.)

Plus indirect costs as follows:

1/12 of the 13th month amount	$3,333.35
Leaving indemnity	1,666.65
Total	19,484.15

(Or 47.71 percent on $40,000.)

Examples of costs of employees and workers to the firm:

An employee earning 40,000 lire monthly will cost the firm in addition 21,413 lire or 53.53 percent per month.

An employee earning 50,000 lire monthly will cost the firm in addition 25,329 lire or 50.66 percent per month.

An employee earning 60,000 lire monthly will cost the firm in addition 29,262 lire or 48.78 percent per month.

An employee earning 80,000 lire monthly will cost the firm in addition 37,073 lire or 46.34 percent per month.

An employee earning 100,000 lire monthly will cost the firm in addition 44,913 lire or 44.91 percent per month.

A worker earning 40,000 lire monthly will cost the firm in addition 19,484 lire or 48.71 percent per month.

A worker earning 45,000 lire monthly will cost the firm in addition 21,206 lire or 47.12 percent per month.

A worker earning 50,000 lire monthly will cost the firm in addition 22,914 lire or 45.83 percent per month.

A worker earning 55,000 lire monthly will cost the firm in addition 25,093 lire or 45.62 percent per month.

A worker earning 60,000 lire monthly will cost the firm in addition 25,847 lire or 44.74 percent per month.

Some examples of real earnings in our firm:

[Italian lire]

	Categories					
	B	C	D	D (lower category)	E	E (lower category)
Basic salary	73,984	51,349	47,934	37,474	48,673	47,934
Cost-of-living addition	3,354	2,119	2,093	1,859	2,340	2,093
3-year increases	11,352		2,018		7,475	2,001
Merit increase					10,000	
Bonus	18,779				26,000	16,200
Normal extra work			10,000			
Total	107,469	53,468	62,045	39,333	94,488	68,228
Less insurances	4,911	2,444	2,836	1,797	4,318	3,118
Less taxes	5,574	1,464	1,725	772	3,535	1,985
Plus family addition			10,790		1,430	
Net	96,984	49,560	68,274	36,764	88,065	63,125

But, nevertheless, it was a wonderful sight to see the heavy machinery in the automobile plants, steel companies, and shipyards stamped with huge letters, Erie, Pa., Pittsburgh, Pa., Gary, Ind., and so forth—it gave us a nostalgic feeling. This is what the United States had done for Italy.

Everyone was so good to us, we were called their liberators. Italy has not forgotten its debt of gratitude to the United States and its citizens.

At the various affairs, one of our number was chosen to answer the greetings extended to us. It was with great joy and admiration that the Italian officials present sat in wonder, listening to a Congressman speaking in the Italian tongue. Although several were very fluent, as our dear colleagues Messrs. Fino, our senior leader, Chargé de Affaires, Daddario, Conte, Santangelo, Fascell, and Giaimo, yet Iorio, Assistant Sergeant at Arms, Dent and I, with a Neapolitan flourish of dialect, were also accepted as linguists of extraordinary ability, perhaps the Italians were a little charitable in their enthusiasm. We, at least, felt that our every action annealed the close friendship between two great nations.

Those men who accompanied us, Cons. Pierluigi Alvera, Capt. Ugo Callery, and Cons. Elio Pascarelli and his sweet signora, Teresa, were painstaking in our behalf. We were proud to be in their gracious and meticulous care. The many services were given with clock-like precision, with no delays and without confusion. Each did a marvelous job and realized that we were appreciative of their work of perfection.

At Rome we attended the special visit of Pope John to the cathedral and His Holiness upon his departure came to greet us as dignitaries from a great nation.

NAMES AND ADDRESSES OF OUR HOSTS IN ITALY

Ispra (Varese): Centro Studi Nucleari del C.N.R.N., Dott. Ing. Gianfranco Franco, Direttore del Centro Studi Nucleari di Ispra, Via (Erva, 31, Milano).

Turin, Fiat (visit, lunch, presents, and transportation): Prof. Ing. Vittorio Valletta, Presidente della Fiat, Corso Marconi, 10, Torino; Ing. Giovanni NASI, Vice Presidente della Fiat, Torino.

Turin, Unione Industriale: Dr. Ermanno Gurgo Salice, Presidente Unione Industriale, Via Fanti, 17, Torino.

Turin, mayor (dinner): Avv. Amedo Peyron, Sindaco della Città di, Torino.

Genova, mayor (lunch): On. Avv. Vittorio Pertusio, Sindaco della Città di, Genova.

Genova, Ansaldo (visit of the shipyards): Avv. Federico de Barbieri, Presidente dell' Ansaldo, Piazza Carignano, 2, Genova.

Genoa, Ansaldo: Ing. Giuseppe Rosini, Amminstratore-Delegato dell'Ansaldo, Genova; Ing. Federico Lombardi, Direttore Generale dell'Ansaldo, Genova.

Genoa, Consorzio Autonomo Porto di Genova (Port Authority—visit of the harbor): Gen. F. Ruffini, Presidente del Consorzio Autonomo Porto di Genova, Genova.

Genoa, Cornigliano S.p.a. (steelmills—visit, lunch, and transportation): Dr. Enrico Redaelli Spreafico, Direttore Generale della Cornigliano S.p.a., Genova; Ing. Saverio Cesaroni, Cornigliano S.p.a, Genova.

Venice, Port Authority and Unione Industriale (visit of the harbor and industrial plants at Porto Marghera): Comm. Renzo Vidal, Vice Presidente dell'Ente Zona Industriale di Marghera, Venezia.

Milan, Innocenti: Ing. Luigi Innocenti, Vice Presidente, Via Pitteri, 81, Milano; Ing. Giuseppe Lauro, Amministratore-Delegato e Direttore Generale della Innocenti, Milano.

Milan, mayor: Dott Prof. Virgilio Ferrari, Sindaco di, Milano.

Milan, Chamber of Commerce (reception): Dr. Ing. Eugenio Radice Fossati, Presidente della Camera di Commercio Internazionale.

Milan, E.N.I. (visit): Dr. F. de Peverelli, E.N.I., San Donato Milanese.

Pavia (visit, lunch): Cav. del Lavoro Vittorio Necchi, Pavia.

Novara, Sovietá Montecatini (visit): Ing. Pietro Giustiniani, Amministratore-Delegato della Montecatini, Milano.

Milano, Alfa Romeo (visit) and present: Dr. Balduccio Bardocci, Presidente dell'Alfa Romeo, Milano.

Florence, Officine Galileo (visit): Prof. Francesco Scandone, Vice Presidente della Galileo Corporation of America, New York.

Florence, Pontedera, Piaggio (visit and lunch): Cav. del Laboro Armando Piaggio Pontedera (Pisa).

Rome, World Trade Fair (EUR Area) (lunch and visit): Dr. Ferenc Nagy, President of the World Trade Fair EUR, Roma.

Rome, Italian Red Cross (visit): Avv. Edoardo Roccetti, Presidente della Croce Rossa Italiana, Roma.

Rome: The Honorable Giovanni Leone, Presidente dalla Camera dei Deputati Roma (reception and lunch); Avv. Coraldo Piermani, Segretario Generale della Camera dei Deputati (visit of the Palazzo Montecitorio), Roma.

Rome, Confindustria (reception buffet and important contribution to the whole visit in Italy): Cav. del Lavoro Dr. Alighiero de Micheli, Presidente della Confindustria, Piazza Venezia, 11, Roma; Cav. del Lavoro On. Ing. Quinto Quintieri, Vice Presidente della Confindustria, Roma.

Salerno, mayor (reception in the City Hall): Gr. Uff. Alfonso Menna, Sinadaco di, Salerno.

Salerno, Cathedral (visit and reception): S.E. Arcivescovo Mons. Demetrio Moscato, Primate di, Salerno.

Salerno, International Center for Vocational Training of Migrants: Ing. Mario Alati, Ingegnere Capo del Genio Civile di, Salerno.

Castellammare, Navalmeccanica Shipyards (visit and cocktails): On. Dr. Giorgio Tupini, Presidente della Navalmeccanica, Napoli.

Napoli, Banco Di Napoli (reception-buffet): Cav. del Lavoro Ivo Vanzi, Presidente del Banco di Napoli, Napoli; Cav. del Lavoro Dr. Stanislao Fusco, Direttore Generale del Banco di Napoli, Napoli.

Palermo, mayor (lunch at Villa Igea): Dr. Salvatore Lima Sindaco di Palermo.

Priolo, Sincat-Edison (visit, lunch, and transportation): Ing. Carlo Ciriello, Consigliere Delegato della Edison, Milano; Ing. Vittorio de Biasi, Presidente della Sincat, Priolo (Siracusa); Dr. Aldo Romoli, Direzione Sincat, Corso Sempione, 2 Milano.

Foreign investments in Italy, including U.S. money, are increasing. The gold and dollar reserves of $3.2 billion are only exceeded by the United States and West Germany.

The natural resources of Italy are negligible as far as contributing to these remarkable industrial successes—poor in coal and oil, with only about one-half of its iron needs—makes it difficult to understand.

But the Italian economists are in unison in stating that the change from the agriculturally supported economy began with the aid of the United States (right after the war), totaling $4½ billion under the Marshall plan.

The sound money policy promulgated by succeeding Italian governments resulted in growth without inflation.

Italy, the cultural cradle of the arts, weighed down in its economy by increasing population—increasing 50 percent from 1900 to 1945—and lack of employment—one-ninth of population—has had a rebirth of industrial activity. In West Europe it is enjoying a boom of prosperity of sales that is a challenge to the great nations experienced in controlling the trade markets of the world.

This startling change that started 15 years ago has moved Italian industrialists, traders, bankers, designers, and engineers into the global scale of competition.

This surge of strength in the competitive economic field is having its impact on business all around the world.

Italian projects—everything from shoes to dresses; from hydroelectric dams to Fiats are captivating sales markets everywhere—in 3 years Italian exports have increased 30 percent.

We have won the love of the Italian people—the Italian workers, peasants, businessmen and industrialists from Turin to Toranto and from Po Valley to Sicily attested.

The Marshall plan—spring of 1948—stimulated progress on the economic and social fronts. Italy can be proud of her achievements with Marshall plan aid reconstruction, reforms, continuing measurable prosperity—now a boom—and continued growth of democratic institutions including the vital effect of free labor unions.

It caused the turning back of the spread of communism—the stomach kind—and loosened the growing Kremlin grip, strengthened by Communist stooges, in Italy.

Further the real determination displayed by the Italian Government to meet its obligations under treaties with the West—the rearmament program, European integration and others.

The uncertainties of the international situation at times dimmed the optimistic approach toward internal unity but somehow the crisis was always averted by the selection of a strong leader.

The Marshall plan achieved directly agrarian and fiscal reforms—meaning land for peasants and much needed increased revenues from income taxes—to be added the creation of $160 million annual fund for the development of the depressed areas of the south—a survey search for natural resources—gas in Sicily, and so forth.

Italy made progress through national revenue collections, that is, first half of fiscal year 1950–51 total of Lit643 billion nearly equal to the collections for the whole year previous to the Marshall plan.

Bank time deposits more than doubled, Lit87 billion at end of 1948 to Lit198 billion at end of 1950. And other forms of savings deposits at banks rose from 564 billion to 791 billion in the same period. Postal savings doubled the 1948 figure reaching Lit658 billion by December 1950. Finally, the commitments budget deficit declined Lit822 billion.

The predominant overall aid to Italy is military in scope, supervised and directed by the Department of Defense. The role of the Foreign Operations Administration is negligible in proportion. It operates a small productivity program as well as a technical assistance program in Sardinia and Somaliland—Italian trusteeship. The U.S. Information Agency handles the information program. There is a growing need for a central administrative control over these three agencies in order to prevent overlapping and duplication of services.

It can be honestly stated that the reconstruction program in Italy has now been completed. The economic aid program played an important part in its success. The Italians, have, through the recovery period, attacked many obstacles that prevented the advancement of better standards of living—being the lowest among European countries. The Cassa de Mezzogiono Fund was established—100 million lires a year for 10 years—to finance an integrated program for the development of the poverty stricken southern Provinces. At first American aid was given to start this program, but presently the Italian Government bears the cost. A key project in this program is a land reform program—thousands of peasant families are resettled on small homesteads—often on land unused by several land barons who received compensation for its releases. Peasant incomes increased, housing projects resulted and revolutionary seizures of lands ceased. The total effects upon the political front resulted in pro-Communist administrations being defeated. Our aid was an offset to communistic appeal among the poor.

It is said that in certain instances American aid made some Italians rich and the vast majority have been unaffected—that this served to freeze the archaic economic structure of Italy—yet no one can deny that with the earning power of the common man increased through new opportunities of employment, even at the old stand, the increased strength of the national economy

resulted in the financing of new reforms to relieve the economic pressures upon the less fortunate to grant new opportunities for their betterment. But in spite of the lack of resources, and the need for the modernization of Italy's economic institutions, Italy has in part and will in the future solve these problems themselves.

It is well said that, had not the United States, in its first postwar program, initiated the Marshall plan as an approach to the economic problems of European nations, NATO might never have been born. NATO came soon after. It was wholly military.

We, the members of the delegation, respectfully submit this report to the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, it is my very happy privilege to speak for the record the very interesting experiences that my good friend, the distinguished Gen. Julius Klein, had in Rome at a reunion with General Teucci, who, like Marshal Balbo, so fondly remembered Chicago in 1933 when the Italian air armada visited the World's Fair and renewed his old friendship with the then Captain Klein, who entertained him during that memorable visit.

Everyone in the Chicago area remembers Julius in his distinguished career as a newspaperman in the days of the criminal court. He was in attendance at many celebrated criminal trials, and his writings enamored him to thousands of admiring citizens. His unique style of reporting won for him great fame in the newspaper world.

His service under Douglas MacArthur in the Pacific and the author of the original Army combat public relations plan added to his distinguished services. A much decorated veteran who has time and again been sent to Europe on confidential missions to interview authorities there on extra-European problems which directly affect European policies and actions. It was considered a job well done in accordance with the remarks of Hon. STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, Hon. ESTES KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, Hon. STUART SYMINGTON, of Missouri and Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin. Many features of the report and some of the policies recommended have already been adopted.

His qualifications and ability to conduct study missions given him by our Government, based upon his experience with military and national defense problems, are acknowledged by everyone. He has received the congratulations of men high in the ranks of our military control. His acceptance by European leaders is reflected in their many confidences that were entrusted to him in many separate conferences at the behest of our Government. He has been unfailing in his love for his country and stands out as one of the great Americans of our time.

We of the Illinois delegation are especially proud of the great services that this patriot from Chicago has rendered to not only our Government but in its effect in the defense of the liberty-loving nations of the world.

The following insertions are indicative of the true greatness of our esteemed friend:

REUNION IN ROME—CHICAGOAN MEETS OLD COMRADE

ROME, Italy, July 1.—In 1933, Marshal Italo Balbo and his famous armada flew to the Chicago World's Fair. In this group, as aide to Marshal Balbo, was 1st Lt. A. Giuseppe Teucci. The Chicago host to the Italian visitors was the late Lt. Gen. Roy D. Keen, then commanding general of the 33d Infantry Division, Illinois National Guard. His aide was 1st Lt. Julius Klein. When the Italian and American aides met they did not dream that 27 years later they would meet again after many dramatic experiences.

Lieutenant Teucci returned with Balbo to continue his service in the Italian Air Force, where he had a brilliant career. Later he became air attaché at the Italian Embassy in Berlin during Hitler's regime. Teucci was a royal officer, loyal to the King only. Klein continued his career, became a colonel and general officer under General MacArthur, receiving many decorations and citations for his service as a combat officer.

Before the war Julius Klein's sister Frances, who was born in Chicago, met and married a well-known Czech textile manufacturer—Nathan Ticho. When the Nazis invaded Czechoslovakia, the two Ticho brothers were arrested and their factories confiscated. The brothers were taken to the Dachau concentration camp.

Mrs. Ticho, who retained her American citizenship, was permitted to go to Switzerland. All efforts to gain the release of Nathan Ticho from the concentration camp failed. The children were held as "hostages," until finally freed through the intervention of American authorities.

Finally, General Klein and his brother, Dr. Ernest L. Klein, prepared a telegram which was translated and dispatched by the late Chicago Judge Sbarbaro to Marshal Balbo. In the telegram General Klein, then colonel in the 33d Division, reminded Balbo of their friendship during Balbo's visit to Chicago and recalled the picture which Marshal Balbo autographed for the then lieutenant.

Balbo replied immediately from Libya where he was stationed, saying: "I received your cable. Will help you. Have instructed your old comrade and friend, Teucci, who is now my air attaché in Berlin, to try to help you get your brother-in-law out." (Signed "Balbo.")

The day the cable arrived in Chicago, news reached America that Balbo was shot down and killed over Libya. All hope was given up then that Klein's brother-in-law would be released. But Teucci in Berlin had received the order in time from Balbo and went to Goering with Balbo's last wish. Goering issued an order for release, and Teucci immediately went to the concentration camp. When he arrived, he learned that Nathan Ticho's brother had been killed a day earlier, but he got there in time to save Klein's brother-in-law. On his release, Nathan Ticho went to Switzerland to join his wife and they returned to Chicago.

But the story doesn't end here. When Mussolini, after his rescue by Hitler, again assumed full power over the Fascists, the royal officers of the Italian Army remained loyal to the King; and Teucci, who was then in Berlin, refused to go along with the Fascists. He was arrested by the Gestapo and put into a concentration camp in Oranienburg, not far from Dachau. He remained there for part of the war and was turned over by the Nazis to the Italian Fascists for trial. Finally, he escaped and joined the underground. When the Americans landed in Italy, he was one of the first Italian high-ranking officers to be selected by the Americans to reactivate the Italian Army and Air Force. He ended his career as a full general and chief of the Italian Air Force. He has recently retired and was appointed head of the Italian Officers' Organization of Italy.

And now General Klein and General Teucci met again—Klein as a retired major general and Teucci as a retired general of his country. General Teucci gave a cocktail party in his home for Dr. Ernest Klein and his wife, and General Klein and his wife in Rome recently. They reminisced about their meeting 27 years ago, and General Teucci told General Klein that the remaining members of the old Balbo squadron will celebrate the 30th anniversary of their historic flight with a reunion in Chicago, where they hope to meet many American comrades who were with them during their visit to the 1933 Chicago World's Fair.

The Tichos still reside at 5240 North Sheridan Road. Their eldest son is now a famous physicist at the University of California and was one of the young men who worked on the Manhattan project. Another son, who graduated from the University of Chicago, is a practicing attorney in Chicago. Another one is a well-known TV director.

The Daily American of Rome, Italy, reported the Teucci-Klein reunion as follows:

"Maj. Gen. Julius Klein (retired) of Chicago, now in public relations, is a current guest at the Excelsior, where he had a reunion the other night with Italian Lt. Gen. A. Giuseppe Teucci, also retired. The two men were both lieutenants during Balbo's historic mass flight to Chicago in 1933—Klein as aide to the commanding general of the 33d Infantry Division, Teucci as aide to Balbo; and it was Teucci, when he was air attaché in Berlin in 1940, who was responsible, by interceding with Goering, for the release of Klein's brother-in-law, Nathan Ticho, from the concentration camp at Dachau. The two ex-generals plan another reunion in Chicago in 1963, to celebrate the 30th anniversary of the Balbo flight."

[From the Rome (Italy) Sunday American, July 17, 1960]

A FRIENDSHIP OF 17 YEARS RENEWED IN ETERNAL CITY

Two generals have just shaken hands in Rome—and sealed a firm friendship that bridges 17 momentous years.

A friendship which once saved a father and son from the horror of almost certain death in Dachau.

It began when Gen. Giuseppe Teucci—then a colonel—flew into Chicago after a feat that thrilled the world and set a milestone in aviation history.

Twenty-five Italian Air Force planes had just crossed the Atlantic en masse, led by the nation's youthful air minister Gen. Italo Balbo. It was a pioneering achievement.

And it captured the imagination of pioneering America.

August 1933 * * * Chicago is in holiday mood. The World's Fair is being staged there. And half the Windy City turns out to roar a massive welcome to Balbo's 100 flying heroes from the Old World.

BALBO'S FLIGHT

Balbo has shunned aces for the flight. "He wanted to show it could be carried out by ordinary pilots," Teucci explained years later.

But Chicago is giving them the back-slapping, hero's treatment. They're feting the Italians in prohibition era bars. They're stopping them in the street for warm handshakes.

For Balbo's men haven't only proved that mass transatlantic flights are possible. The

second purpose of their trip: to carry a message of friendship and good will from Italy to the United States.

And Chicago even names a street "Balbo Avenue" in honor of it all.

And it's against that setting that Teucci's friendship with Maj. Gen. Julius Klein began. Teucci was Balbo's pilot and aide. Klein—a captain then—was aide-de-camp to General Keen, named to host the Italian fliers.

And before the 25 planes took off again after 4 days of VIP treatment, Klein and Teucci had become firm friends.

They began writing to each other, sending photographs of their families. The war clouds gathered. But the letterwriting went on.

WAR INEVITABLE

It's 1937. War seems inevitable. And Teucci is sent to Berlin as air attaché at the Italian Embassy. His is a difficult, delicate mission. There are the regular calls on Hermann Goering, the endless round of conference * * *.

But he still has time for "my American friend."

And soon that friendship is to be put to a severe test.

From Klein—later to become the highest ranking Jewish officer in the American forces—comes a dramatic letter. "My brother-in-law and his son are in Dachau. I'm worried about them. Can you do anything to get them released?"

A similar letter went to Balbo.

And Teucci acted.

Off to Goering's office went an official memorandum. Then the Luftwaffe boss summoned Teucci.

They talked about the two Czech Jews now languishing in the Nazi concentration camp. Explained Goering frankly: "It will be very difficult, you know. The only person who has full powers in matters like this is Himmler."

Teucci pleaded: "But these are close relatives of a very good friend of mine."

And Goering promised: "I'll see what I can do."

LETTER ARRIVES

Teucci heard no more * * * until a letter came to tell him the two had been freed and were safely in America.

Says Teucci: "I only did the right thing. It was a simple act for the sake of my friend."

One of the two men he saved now holds a high teaching post in the United States.

America entered the war. Italy was now an enemy. Klein went on active service. And all links between the two friends were severed.

Soon another testing time looms for Teucci.

The Allies have attacked "the soft underbelly of the Axis." Fascism is crumbling, Mussolini resigns, is imprisoned, then freed by Skorenzy's commandos.

Italy has no choice. On September 8, 1943, it surrenders unconditionally to the Allies—while in the north Mussolini counters the action of King Victor Emmanuel by setting up the Italian Social Republic.

Teucci is summoned again to Goering's office for his most dramatic—and the last—meeting with the top Nazi. He asks the Italian: "Where do you stand? Will you stay here and continue to serve Mussolini's regime, or do you intend to obey your King?"

"I must follow my King's orders," replied Teucci.

"I understand completely. You are a military man. It's the obvious decision," said Goering.

The Germans arrested Teucci and other high ranking Italians and sent them to a prison camp near Berlin. Later they were transferred to a jail in Verona—then to another camp at Novi Ligure, near Alessandria.

NIGHT OF FULL MOON

A full moon bathed the Alpine foothills the night Teucci, an admiral, and other top officers decided to make their desperate escape bid. The war was destined to last several more months. And they wanted to serve their embattled nation.

They knew their Italian guards would turn a blind eye. But suddenly out of the shadows loomed a patrol of Germans. "Where are you going?" they demanded.

Replied Teucci: "We're off to hunt partisans."

"Good hunting," quipped the Germans—and let them pass.

They reached the mountains, and the partisan groups harassing their German invaders. Teucci was assigned a group of men.

And until the war ended he was to be known simply as "Guido" by his comrades on one of World War II's strangest battlegrounds.

Gone was his smart blue uniform. Instead he wore a pair of khaki slacks, a sweater and a beret. The only concession to his past as a pilot for Balbo—killed earlier in the war over Libya—and air attaché in Berlin: His pilot's wings pinned to that sweater.

War's end saw Teucci leading his men down from the mountains and through the rejoicing streets of Genoa.

But his air force career was not yet over. Italy was reconstructing a sound future within the framework of the Western alliance. Its military might was being built up again.

And Teucci was sent to command the air force war college in his native city of Florence. He was promoted general. Later he was appointed to a top post at the defense ministry.

Then became commander of the air force's vital third zone.

Klein meanwhile had left the American Armed Forces. He set up a thriving public relations organization in Chicago. He was making a name for himself in the hurly-burly of politics, and in other spheres of public life.

PRAISE FROM CONGRESS

His work was praised from the floor of Congress. Senators of all parties hailed his mission to Europe as an unpaid consultant for a key subcommittee.

He restarted his letter-friendship with Teucci. Once, during his globe-girdling travels, he came to Rome. But Teucci wasn't in town.

But finally they have met up again—for the first time since those Chicago days in 1933. Klein thanked him personally for his moves that saved his two relatives.

They chatted over old times—and fixed a date to meet again in September.

Teucci—he went on the reserve last year, is now president of the Italian Air Force officers' elegant club in Rome—said: "It was wonderful to meet again.

"Now we're discussing the possibility of holding a big reunion in Chicago in 3 years time for the pilots of the Balbo flight and our American comrades.

"But I don't think there are many of us left * * *."

[From the Rome (Italy Daily American, July 1, 1960]

PASSING PARADE

Maj. Gen. Julius Klein, retired, of Chicago, now in public relations, is a current guest at the Excelsior, where he had a reunion the other night with Italian Lt. Gen. A. Giuseppe Teucci, also retired. The two men were both lieutenants during Balbo's historic mass flight to Chicago in 1933—Klein as aide to the commanding general of the 33d Infantry Division, Teucci as aide to Balbo; and it was Teucci, when he was air attaché in Berlin in 1940, who was responsible, by interceding with Goering, for the release of Klein's brother-in-law, Nathan Ticho, from the concentration camp at Dachau. The two ex-generals plan another reunion in Chicago in 1963, to celebrate the 30th anniversary of the Balbo flight.

JULIUS KLEIN PUBLIC RELATIONS., INC.,
Washington, D.C., August 31, 1960.

The Honorable ROLAND V. LIBONATI,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LIBONATI: Regarding the telephone conversation today between you and my associate, General Klein, I take great pleasure in enclosing herewith the story, "Reunion in Rome" and also the newspaper account which appeared in the Sunday American in Rome.

* * * * *

During the visit of Marshal Balbo, I was commanding officer of the 106th Cavalry—Illinois National Guard, and as you may recall, I was later chief of staff of the Illinois National Guard. I had the pleasure of meeting you some several years ago at a luncheon to discuss an award for Nate Gross. I hope that I may have the pleasure of seeing you soon again. I have my permanent headquarters in Washington.

Sincerely yours,

KENNETH BUCHANAN,
Major General, U.S. Army, retired, Vice President and General Manager.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee No. 3, which handles legislation affecting Federal prisoners, I visited, during August 9–12, 1960, the Cook County jail in Chicago, Ill., the U.S. penitentiary at Terre Haute, Ind., the Federal reformatory at Chillicothe, Ohio, and the Federal correctional institution at Ashland, Ky. Mr. Cyril F. Brickfield, committee counsel, accompanied me. Mr. Roy Guenzel, Federal jail inspector, acted as our escort and representative of the Federal Bureau of Prisons during the entire series of visits.

COOK COUNTY JAIL

The Cook County jail is used by the Federal Bureau of Prisons in the Chicago area for the confinement of persons awaiting trial in the Federal courts or convicted Federal offenders sentenced to brief terms. An average of slightly more than 3,000 Federal prisoners daily are confined in this manner in various local county jails or other non-Federal institutions throughout the country. In order to insure that these Federal prisoners have adequate custody and care, a program of jail inspection and ratings has been in use by the Bureau of Prisons for the past 30 years. The total cost of all services incident to the custody and care of such prisons runs about $3,200,000 annually or about $2.85 per day per prisoner. Of more than 3,000 local jails in this country, about 800 are approved for Federal use.

On the morning of August 9 Mr. Brickfield and I met Inspector Guenzel at the jail and Warden Jack Johnson escorted us on a tour of the facilities, including three of the cellblocks, the culinary and bakeshop department, the hospital and medical areas, the chapel, schoolrooms, laundry, several of the shops, the yard, and several offices. During the course of the tour we met and discussed jail problems with Assistant Warden Frank

Trankina, Steward Arthur Davis, Protestant Chaplain Louis King and several others.

Warden Johnson feels that the presence of Federal prisoners in his jail causes a number of problems. Even without the Federal prisoners the jail would be seriously overcrowded. The Federal population runs between 25 and 60 on any given day, and an entire 60-man tier is set aside for Federal use. The Federal prisoners are also provided more extensive medical treatment than the local prisoners, although the services of U.S. Public Health Service personnel for this purpose tends to minimize this problem. The Federal prisoners typically are required to make several appearances in court, the Federal judges require more examinations of the prisoners for psychiatric, medical, and social data, and these factors add to the burden of traffic through the jail.

While Warden Johnson deals with the jail inspector in connection with overall confinement practices, he works chiefly with the local U.S. marshal on matters pertaining to the individual inmates that are committed, the visitors they are to be allowed, the type of custody they require, and so on. The problem of keeping out contraband—narcotics, alcohol, and so forth—is an ever-present one. Also, with a heavily populated institution a large number of the prisoners must sit in idleness, and it is a trying job for the warden to find meaningful work to occupy their time.

Considering the limitations of the facilities under which the Cook County Jail is operated, Warden Johnson is, in my opinion, doing a very satisfactory job for the Federal prisoners committed to his care.

U.S. PENITENTIARY, TERRE HAUTE, IND.

Arriving at the Terre Haute institution on the morning of August 10 we met in the warden's office for a briefing session attended by Warden Wade T. Markley; associate warden—business—E. H. Saunders; associate warden—custody—H. J. Davis; associate warden—treatment—J. E. Baker; Chief Medical Officer, E. C. Rink; and Superintendent of Industries L. R. Parham. Warden Markley first explained how the institution functioned administratively. The associate warden—business—handled such departments as personnel training, business and fiscal, culinary, farm, and the inmate commissary. The associate warden—custody—was responsible for the custody of the penitentiary's 1300 inmates, for the physical maintenance of the institution, all construction, and such services as power, water, and sewerage. The associate warden—treatment—supervised the religious, educational, vocational training, social work services, and the prisoner classification program. The superintendent of industries ran the woolen textile mill and the furniture refinishing factory. The chief medical officer, a commissioned officer of the U.S. Public Health Service, heads the medical, psychiatric, and hospital services. All these departments employed and trained varying numbers of inmates. Except for about 10 percent of the inmates, who had just been received, were in the hospital, had been segregated for punitive reasons, or were being held for transfer elsewhere, all inmates had job assignments.

The warden described the daily routine of the inmates and the manner in which each case is handled from the time of admission to the time of release. After being studied and observed in the admission-orientation for a month following commitment each inmate follows a program of work, education and vocational training, religion, recreation, and other activities that is developed for him by the institution's classification committee, composed of the heads of the major departments. For example, the institution is well equipped with leisure time activities, including many types of athletics, an extensive program of academic classes, hobby shop, music, Alcoholics Anonymous chapter meetings, religious activities, social education, library, radio and television.

Based on my observations of other institutions it appeared that Terre Haute is one of the best designed prisons in the Nation and I was pleased to learn that its superior facilities are devoted to a relatively youthful population, upon whom I feel the most intensive rehabilitative efforts should be concentrated. While the average age of the inmate population is about 30, the largest group falls into the age 23 to 26 bracket. Each of these men differ individually, and hence the program is widely varied in order to have a range of activities that will meet the equally wide range of problems that these prisoners present. Warden Markley reported that the population contained a hard core of about 100 prisoners who are potentially dangerous and most difficult to reach by any known technique. These men suffer from character disorders and are sometimes referred to as psychopaths or sociopaths. Some display elements of psychosis. In my opinion more should be done in the way of corrective treatment for this group of men. It is apparent, however, that the relatively small staff is doing the best it can under the circumstances. With a population of 1,300 the institution has an employee complement of 227, which must be distributed on round-the-clock shifts 7 days a week. The Federal Bureau of Prisons is presently contracting for the construction of a maximum custody institution in southern Illinois, to which I understand some of the more difficult cases will be transferred.

I asked the warden how the new sentencing legislation approved by this committee in 1958 was working. While the courts are not committing many men under the newly authorized indeterminate sentencing procedures, the courts are making increased use of the procedure which permits them to commit prisoners to Federal institutions for a 3- to 6-month period of study before a final sentence is formulated. This has substantially increased the work of the staff, for they try to provide the court with extremely full information in each case, including medical, psychiatric, and social data as well as vocational, educational, and other needs of the defendant. Also, because the courts are still committing most offenders under the old definite sentencing system, the institution is still faced with the problem of handling inmates who have extremely disparate sentences although they may have substantially similar backgrounds and offenses.

After the briefing in the warden's office we visited the dining room and kitchen, the social service offices, the educational department, the hospital, the chapel, the library, segregation cell, and dormitory quarters, the maintenance shops, the furniture refinishing shop, the woolen mill, and the farm. I was impressed by the attractive architecture of the penitentiary, and it served to demonstrate that a prison does not need to be grim, forbidding, and repellent. The buildings are as nearly fireproof as modern architecture can make them. Construction is of reinforced concrete frame, with brick walls backed by concrete blocks which are left unfinished on the interior to present a pleasing and artistic touch.

The variety of the educational program was particularly extensive and included courses at all levels from the beginning grade up to and including some college subjects. Attendance at the school is not compulsory except for those who are functionally illiterate, but about half the population is engaged in some type of educational or vocational training work. The school is open 5 evenings a week under the supervision of the education staff. Both personnel and inmate teachers are used. The library has a particularly attractive setting, and I was impressed at its size and organization.

The chapel has an atmosphere that harmonizes greatly with its purposes, and it is equipped with interchangeable altars for the various faiths. It is open at all times.

The hospital is well-equipped, and I would say that it compares favorably with most hospitals of similar size in the free community. However, the penitentiary has only one psychiatrist, and it is apparent that for the many personality problems in its inmate population more psychiatrists are needed.

Unlike some of the prisons I have visited Terre Haute has individual cells for a major proportion of its population; the cell units that I visited seemed remarkably clean and sanitary. In my conversation with Warden Markley I learned that most inmates appreciate the privacy of an individual cell. This type of housing is also an asset to the penitentiary for the control of a relatively unstable and youthful population.

The industrial activities of the prison appear to furnish a most desirable type of training. The furniture refinishing shop provides an economical service to the Government, and the finished items, which look like new furniture, bear evidence of the training skills acquired by the inmates assigned to this activity. The machinery and operations of the woolen mill appeared to be complex for a prison industry, and the products were of high commercial quality despite the

fact that none of their inmate workers had any previous training in this work before their commitment to Terre Haute.

Terre Haute has one of the largest farms in the Federal prison system. Of the 2,700 acres comprising the prison reservation, about 2,000 acres are under cultivation. Buildings and grounds occupy about 120 acres, and the balance is made up of roads, walks, pastures, and some areas of wooded or otherwise untillable land. Generally the farm crews constitute about 15 to 20 percent of the total population. More than one-third of the institutional requirements for fresh vegetables and fruit is produced on the farm, and it produces nearly 100 percent of its meat requirements. For the minimum custody inmates assigned to the farm a new dormitory is under construction. This building, which would have cost about $1 million if constructed by commercial contract, will cost slightly more than $600,000 with the use of inmate labor.

FEDERAL REFORMATORY, CHILLICOTHE, OHIO

At Chillicothe we also met in the warden's office for a briefing session before touring the institution. Chillicothe now has the largest concentration of Federal Youth Corrections Act cases of any institution in the Federal Prison Service, a total of 694. This represents 55 percent of the population, as compared with 30 percent 2 years ago, I was told. The change in the composition of the population from those serving predominantly adult sentences to those serving youth sentences has gradually changed the mission of the reformatory. The average age of commitments is 20.9 years; the offenders with regular adult sentences and juveniles serve an average of 18 months and the youths an average of 20 months.

I learned from Warden Walter Jacquot and his Associate Warden A. E. Pontesso, that although the youth cases are generally not as sophisticated or as criminally oriented as those receiving adult sentences, they usually come from deplorable home backgrounds characterized by neglect and indifference. Usually they have little or no work experience and have built up a pattern of failure since early childhood—failure in school, failure in a work situation, failure in the military service, and failure to establish worthwhile, wholesome interpersonal relationships.

With the foregoing in mind Warden Jacquot sees the staff's job as one of carefully planning a series of successful experiences in line with the individual's capabilities so that he may gain a self-concept that will enable him to compete with individuals in a free society. This requires a careful evaluation of his weaknesses and a planned institutional program that will enable him to correct his deficiencies in every area. The first step seems to be to motivate the individual to improve himself, and here the indeterminate features of the Youth Act provide the greatest possible motivation for change. Improving himself through the pursuit of academic studies, vocational training, and a generally improved attitude toward his fellows and toward his supervisors follow naturally once he has made up his mind that his release depends on the effort he makes toward self-improvement. Goals set by the classification committee must be met before he can be considered for release, and the Youth Division of the U.S. Board of Parole furnishes complete cooperation in enforcing this policy.

We were shown the three types of quarters at Chillicothe—cell house, open dormitory, and room dormitory, preferred by inmates in the order listed, and Warden Jacquot explained how the inmate earned better quarters and assignments. After the initial 30-day admission and orientation period the inmate goes automatically to a post orientation unit, and from that point he must earn his promotion to better quarters until he reaches an honor unit with additional privileges. The quarters officer is responsible for recommending quarters change and this procedure encourages a cooperative relationship between the officer and his charges. Upon inspecting the quarters I found them neat and clean.

For about an hour we attended a classification committee meeting, were furnished copies of the admission studies of those inmates scheduled to be classified, and were able to follow the discussion of the committee members concerning recommendations for programing. I was especially impressed with the efforts made to establish realistic goals for each individual classified. Also, the caseworkers as well as other committee members took the time to outline patiently each man's program and to explain the reasons for custody and work assignments.

The reformatory has an interesting vocational training activity, the airplane mechanics school, and Mr. R. O. Smith, its principal, conducted us through it. The school, he told us, has maintained a fairly constant enrollment of about 60 students for the past 20 years. During that period about 1,300 young men have been trained to meet Federal Aviation Agency standards. Ninety percent of those receiving FAA licenses are employed by the aviation industry upon release. Although the school appears to be a relatively expensive training program, the potential cost is substantially reduced by acquiring surplus planes, engines, and equipment from the Air Force. For example, the school recently acquired an H–19 helicopter from the Air Force. In my opinion, Chillicothe's airplane mechanics school is one of the finest training programs that I have seen in a penal institution.

The chair factory, a unit of Federal Prison Industries, Inc., is a very businesslike operation. I learned from its superintendent, Mr. Arthur E. Bogan, that the factory produced 5,318 chairs in July of this year.

We visited most of the vocational training areas of the institution. Training registered under the Ohio State Apprenticeship Council is provided on a full-time basis in several shops, including the machine, plumbing, auto mechanics, sheet metal, electric, cabinet, paint, and brick shops. Trainees attend classes in related training for 2½ hours a week in order to master the mathematics, blueprint reading, and other subjects allied to their specific trade training. The reformatory also offers training in welding, and on-the-job training is furnished to men in the cooking and baking school. In addition, the various construction crews and maintenance details such as laundry, clothing room, landscape, orderlies, janitors, file clerks, typists, and so forth, provide excellent training for the men, although these are not officially designated as vocational or on-the-job training. Since many inmates cannot be trained in highly skilled trades, these maintenance assignments serve to help them develop good work habits and find their own levels of employment.

The approved apprentice program in 17 separate trade areas which meet the requirements set up by the U.S. Bureau of Apprenticeship and the Ohio State Apprenticeship Council mean that the inmate receives something concrete in the way of recognition for his accomplishments and assurance that the training he receives will be accepted at face value by employers after his release. It also serves as a valuable guide to the treatment staff in evaluating the effectiveness of the vocational training program. Excluding the airplane mechanics school, there are about 300 inmates active in the vocational training program.

Day school classes were in session when we visited the school. Compulsory day school is primarily for near illiterates and those who need refresher courses in grammar and junior high school subjects in order to qualify for formalized training programs. Night school gives those inmates with the background, capability, and interest an opportunity to earn high school credits. The school is State approved and is chartered under the name Sherman High School. Each year from 30 to 50 students earn high-school graduate diplomas. Total enrollment in night school is about 250.

Upon inspecting the dining room I picked up a few interesting facts about feeding 1,260 hungry young men from Food Administrator Ray Bethel. For example, each inmate consumes 6.8 pounds of food per day, which is about one-third above the national average. To serve a spaghetti dinner like the one served to us in the dining room that day took 400 pounds of spaghetti and 800 loaves of Italian bread. Average consumption of bread per day in addition to hot rolls, biscuits and other bakery products runs one-half loaf of bread per day per inmate. The total cost per day per inmate, including farm costs, averaged about 52 cents. This low figure was attained in large part by efficient farm production, which also provided employment and training for about 85 rural-type youths.

FEDERAL CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION, ASHLAND, KY.

Upon reaching the Ashland institution we talked to several members of the staff in the office of Warden Richard J. Heaney. We learned that the role of the institution had changed in the 20 years since it had received its first commitments in 1940. The physical facili-

ties were originally planned for adult offenders, many of whom served relatively short terms for violations of the Internal Revenue liquor laws. The treatment and training needs for this group of offenders were relatively simple, and hence space for education and vocational training activities were limited. These deficiencies became marked when in 1953 it was decided that Ashland would serve as the diagnostic training and treatment center for Youth Corrections Act commitments from the courts in the eastern half of the United States. Since 1953 the mission of the institution has continued to change. In June 1957 the institution held 424 Youth Act commitments, but this figure had dropped to 245 by August 1, 1960. In place of the somewhat older youth offenders the institution now has 258 of the older juveniles, many of whom have serious emotional problems. These younger offenders present a greater challenge for institutional treatment and training and make the need for improved facilities more urgent.

The first step in the institution's long-range plan of development is to build a new education library building joined to the main corridor. I am personally hopeful that this building will contain space for hobbycraft activities, for my experience in the boys' camp I founded at Coloma, Wis., suggests that this type of activity is extremely helpful in working with difficult youngsters. Once the new education building is completed, the staff will then return the present improvised education center to its original purpose as a dormitory. An additional room-type security dormitory would also be valuable in controlling the more difficult youths.

Ashland has a new chapel, and I was impressed with the fact that all of the construction—conversion of a dining room bay—and the fabrication of the accessories was done by the youthful inmates under the supervision of the staff. The institution has two chaplains—Catholic and Protestant—on full-time duty, as had the other two institutions we visited, and they conduct weekly and special worship services, religious education classes and choirs, besides doing a great deal of personal counseling.

The training the youths receive in the maintenance shops seems to me a realistic way of equipping them for worthwhile jobs in the community. We also visited the vocational training shops in the industries building, where training is given in auto mechanics, welding, and woodworking and where a number of youths are assigned for preliminary vocational evaluation.

We sat in for a short time on the classification committee meeting and observed the manner in which the committee handled the cases of one inmate who had been committed under the new observation and study procedure and another whose program was being reevaluated. The problem in the first case, which was sent to Ashland for pre-sentence examination, seemed to be how to motivate the young car thief to participate in the educational and vocational training program in the event of his commitment to a prison institution. It illustrated quite well the need for everyone within the institution to work together: the psychiatrist, the chaplain, the caseworker, the quarters officer and the work supervisor, each having an important part to play in the youth's treatment and training program. The committee recommended a Youth Act commitment, which would guarantee his supervision and control for a period of 6 years with parole eligibility at any time that he might earn it. This was the way I had hoped the new procedure would work, for it has been my observation that the courts need the advice of the institution staff in imposing sentences.

The other case was a young man who had been at Ashland for 17 months. During this time he had received his general educational development certificate; he had been trained to be reasonably proficient in a number of construction skills; he had participated in the religious educational program and the choir; he had taken an active part in the junior chamber of commerce chapter—sponsored by the local junior chamber of commerce—and he had advanced to minimum custody and honor quarters. After reviewing these reports the committee recommended that he be given an early parole hearing.

The institution has the same problem as so many other similar institutions elsewhere. In the 20 years since it was constructed the city of Ashland has been growing up around it. It is usually desirable that this type of institution be located at least a short distance removed from densely settled communities. However, the community takes a great interest in the institution and the warden encourages this community support. The Kiwanis Club and other organizations frequently visit the institution. When a small fire occurred in the industrial unit the night before my visit the city fire department assisted in putting it out. The institutional athletic teams play games in the community with outside teams. While the location of the institution so near the community might be expected to be an inducement for escapes by the youthful inmates, the escape rate is quite low.

As a result of my visits to the three Federal institutions I had to conclude that a remarkably fine job was being done in the light of the relatively limited resources of funds, manpower, and facilities. It appeared to me from sitting in with the classification committees of the three institutions that the new sentencing procedures approved by this committee in 1958 are working out well. The cases being committed for observation and study are receiving particularly thorough handling, and the extensive information this new procedure provides the courts should do much to ease the burdensome problem of sentencing for the courts, particularly in the more complex cases.

In summary, I visited these Federal institutions not so much to inspect them but to learn about them. I found them characterized by an exceptionally high level of management. I earnestly recommend to my fellow Congressmen that they take a greater interest in their Federal prisons. Their visits, I am sure, would be as instructive as mine have been.

URBAN RENEWAL IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, it is becoming increasingly clear that the present urban renewal program in the District of Columbia is in very great trouble.

The Reverend Robert G. Howes recently made a study of urban renewal in the Nation's Capital, a study which was commissioned by the National Conference of Catholic Charities. He testified on April 26, 1960, before subcommittee No. 2 of the Committee on the District of Columbia of the House of Representatives. At that time he said that—

> The present direction of urban renewal in the District of Columbia is most unfortunate from the point of view of the District which has the dimensions of disaster from the point of view of urban renewal elsewhere in the country.

The Senate District of Columbia Committee recently ordered a staff investigation of Washington's multimillion-dollar redevelopment program; and this week, on August 29 members of the Committee on the District of Columbia of the House of Representatives called for a study of the urban renewal program.

It is to be hoped that this study will be searching and thorough.

The urban renewal agencies of the District of Columbia have cleared a 500-acre tract in Southwest Washington with Federal funds, and so far have succeeded in having built there a high-rise apartment house with very expensive and costly rentals.

What happened to the people who lived there, and what concern has been shown for their welfare? We know that one day the bulldozers moved in, and these fine people had to move out. Many of these families have moved in with other families in other sections of the Nation's Capital—so that many one-family homes are now occupied by several families. This has helped to spread the blight.

Having failed in Southwest Washington, the planning and urban renewal agencies have embarked on an ambitious urban renewal program in Northwest Washington known as the Adams-Morgan urban renewal project. Here their plan calls for the destruction of a fine residential neighborhood on Lanier Place and the substitution of a parking lot for the fine homes on the street.

To find out what happens to the people involved in these urban renewal programs I turned to the testimony of the Reverend Robert G. Howes before the Committee on the District of Columbia; and I include it here as part of my remarks in the hope that it will thereby

be made available to those who will study the city's urban renewal programs:

STATEMENT OF THE REVEREND ROBERT G. HOWES, DIOCESE OF WORCESTER, MASS.

Father HOWES. My name is Rev. Robert G. Howes. I'm a priest of the Diocese of Worcester, Mass. I'm a graduate student of city and regional planning at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, author of a staff study on urban renewal in Southwest Washington, D.C., known as "Crisis Downtown," which I believe the committee has a copy of. If the committee doesn't have it, I would be glad to provide it.

I am speaking this morning with the approval of the auxiliary bishop of Washington and I am speaking also in the framework of reference of this church study which was commissioned by the National Conference of Catholic Charities.

I think it must be said in the beginning—I am paraphrasing now—that our interest in urban renewal continues in Southwest Washington to be an interest in the human aspects of renewal.

My testimony is long because we feel that the present direction of urban renewal in the District of Columbia is most unfortunate from the point of view of the District which has the dimensions of disaster from the point of view of urban renewal elsewhere in the country, which I am sure you gentlemen know much more than us is a burning topic. What happens in urban renewal in Southwest Washington we are convinced is of much more than local significance. The first Federal urban renewal grant in the Nation went to the Redevelopment Land Agency of the District of Columbia for urban renewal in Southwest Washington.

Again I paraphrase. I skipped.

Monograph 3 of the "Comprehensive Plan for Washington" issued by the National Capital Parks and Planning Commission in June of 1950 noted:

"The Congress has indicated that it regards the District of Columbia as a pilot example for the Nation as a whole in the application of the Housing Act of 1949. This applies to both public housing and redevelopment projects. Typical solutions for both programs should thus be sought."

Another indication of the national notice that was visited upon this project in Southwest Washington, is cited from the fact that one of the major urban renewal cases in the country, *Berman* v. *Parker,* which was decided in the context of Southwest Washington's situation is the lead article in the 1953 fall issue of the Journal of the American Institute of Planners:

"Perhaps no urban district in the United States has been so widely discussed over the past year as the Southwest Survey Area of Washington, D.C. The interest of planners, architects and others has been nationwide. They think of Washington as a symbol of good planning, a model for other communities. Successful planning and redevelopment in the shadow of Capitol Hill could very well promote urban planning and redevelopment everywhere."

Again omitting much, as urban renewal gropes its way through these first difficult years of its existence, the lessons of urban renewal under the very nose of the Congress in the Nation's Capital are not lost on planners and politicians across the country. It is essential, then, that the purposes of the Congress in setting up the urban renewal program should be realized in southwest Washington.

What were those purposes? There is time here but for the briefest of reviews. Mr. William Slayton, who is still active, I believe, in the urban renewal situation in Washington said in Law and Contemporary Planning in the summer of 1954 that it required only the briefest survey of the testimony taken prior to the Housing Act of 1954 which created urban renewal to know that the purpose of the Congress in setting up the urban renewal program was primarily a housing purpose, a social purpose.

There is other testimony included in our text.

Launched and annually financed as part of housing legislation, there is no room for doubt that in the mind of the Congress urban renewal was meant to have a major housing orientation. Private desires to the contrary, the Federal urban renewal program was created as part of the specific National Housing Policy.

And what has happened subsequently? Again, omitting much. On the 23d of June, 1958 the then Administrator of Housing and Home Finance Agency, Mr. Albert E. Cole, who formerly, I think, met with some of you gentlemen, made this very significant statement to the National Housing Conference here in Washington. This statement, I submit, has been quoted repeatedly around the country and in church I am sure we are going to see that it is quoted again. I think it sums up perfectly the tragedy of southwest Washington:

"Urban renewal was not created because of the needs of the city, but because of the needs of the citizen. I suspect that if you went about the country asking various people what urban renewal is all about, you would get a lot of different answers. You would be told that urban renewal is intended to save downtown business, or to clear up traffic congestion, or to restore worn-out areas to the tax rolls, or to create the City Beautiful, or to get rid of unsightly slum buildings.

"All of these things are worthwhile dividends of an urban renewal program. But none of them are the things that initially impelled the Nation to launch first the slum clearance and urban redevelopment program and later to broaden it into urban renewal. This program came into being because of people. It took account not just of the economic costs, but even more of the social cost of decaying neighborhoods and urban communities. This is what most of us used to talk about when urban renewal was starting. You don't hear much of that kind of talk anymore, and I think that's disturbing. As we get more and more involved in the demanding and complicated undertakings that urban renewal entails, we seem to have less time for the people whose hopes we are trying to fulfill."

In such a context, gentlemen—and again I beg your pardon for stretching the context, but we are dealing with a pilot project of something that is of vital importance to the urban areas of the Nation and something which will, I have no doubt, be debated in the very near future on the floors of Congress as it has been repeatedly in the recent past—in such a context, reports from urban renewal cities in various sections of the country have been highly disturbing. Instead of providing housing where the need is greatest, time and again accusations have been raised by responsible civic observers that this in fact is what is going on:

First, public participation requirements of the "workable program" do not seem to extend to the accommodation of serious civic dissent.

Second, plans originally designed to meet housing need are changed in the process of renewal to spell out greater densities, higher rents, and, presumably, increased profits.

Three, relocation, despite bulky reports and plans, is not in reality living up to the substantive requirement of the "workable program."

Four, the interest of the private entrepreneur weighs heavier than the interest of the community as a whole, more so even than the interest of the citizens displaced from the project area.

Again I shall omit a number of references.

Mr. ABERNETHY. They will be included in the record.

Father HOWES. Yes, sir.

I do not, of course, claim infallibility for each of the judgments that are in the record, but have not been stated this morning. I do say they are highly significant. The statements include references to Mr. Lewis Mumford, Jane Jacobs, Prof. Herbert Gans of the Institute of Urban Studies at the University of Pennsylvania, Charles Abrams, the former executive secretary of the National Housing Conference, Lee F. Johnson. Hardly, I think, unimportant witnesses. I do suggest that the Nation's pilot urban renewal project in Southwest Washington needs to be viewed in precisely such a context as they provide. I am concerned with how urban renewal went in Southwest Washington as a human experience.

Did it help meet the housing need of the District where that need was the greatest? Did it honestly involve the citizens of the District in its evolution in terms of long-range planning? Has renewal in southwest Washington operated to advantage of the commonwealth, and I speak as John Ihlder did many years ago in terms of the District of Columbia as a whole, not as just one part of it, to the advantage of the commonwealth rather than the private interests?

"Crisis Downtown" details the original proposals for southwest Washington. I shall not repeat them here except to remind the committee that these proposals back in the early part of this renewal process were specifically rejected by those in charge of District renewal.

These proposals called for a heavy upgrading of southwest Washington. They are now, it seems to us, being brought in by the back door when they were rejected at the front door of District planning.

I shall not repeat here the full testimony of "Crisis Downtown" except to quote to you the statement of the National Capital Planning Commission to the District of Columbia Commissioners on October 24, 1952. Again, this is completely in the context of the great District houser whose inspiration, post mortem, has been great upon us, Mr. John Ihlder, who said much the same thing. This is what the NCPC told the Commissioners in 1952:

"It is completely unrealistic to propose that the lower income population of southwest Washington be displaced to be housed"—in Mr. Ihlder's term—" 'elsewhere'. Locations 'elsewhere' simply are not to be found in sufficient quantity and near enough to places of employment to meet this vital requirement of most low-income families."

And what the Redevelopment Land Agency itself stated in its relocation plan for southwest Washington area, project area B, submitted to the District Commissioners on the 16th of January 1953—this is the RLA itself, whose Executive Secretary tells us only too recently, well, of course, it's impossible to put these poor people on valuable downtown land.

"The Agency is convinced that housing of this type"—you remember, gentlemen, that one-third of the rental housing in area B was to be at a $17 per month per room limit—

"The Agency is convinced that housing of this type can and will be constructed in area B. Private low-rent housing constructed under these provisions will be an important addition"—this is the RLA itself; not the opposition—"will be an important addition to the reservoir of housing available for families to be displaced. * * * Many families temporarily rehoused early in the undertaking of this project or whose dis-

placement occurred during the later stages can be taken care of in new housing within the project area."

Instead, the facts are only too eloquent, the situation in Southwest Washington has become so tragic that even the Urban Renewal Administrator himself, Mr. David M. Walker, chose the city of Washington on October 1, 1959, last year, to make one of the most drastic comments that has ever been made on the subject of the Federal urban renewal program. Mr. Walker made his remarks to the Potomac Chapter of the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials whose recent national president was the executive secretary of the Redevelopment Land Agency. Mr. Walker said after his study of Washington, and take a trip to Southwest Washington if you want to see what Mr. Walker was speaking of:

"If urban renewal becomes a program with public housing down at one end and luxury and semiluxury housing down at the other, leaving out a whole gray area in between,"—says the Urban Renewal Commissioner—"this program can go no place but into disrepute, and there it belongs."

On July 17, 1959 we addressed the District Commissioners for the National Conference of Catholic Charities and we said at that time:

"Before this rent ceiling is lifted"—the proposal was to eliminate the $17 per month proviso for one third of the housing in area B—"Before this rent ceiling is lifted careful thought should be given to the result, a strange sort of creature in the midst of the Nation's Capital, his head in the clouds of upper income and"—to quote the redevelopers—" 'gracious living,' his feet in the solid earth of public housing and nothing in between."

Before the District Commissioners in a public hearing on plans for what was then known as the Northwest Washington project, Rev. C. Shelby Rooks, speaking for the Washington Urban League, on July 29, 1959 made the same point:

"The announced objectives for Southwest all included housing for every income group.

"But what has actually happened? Housing there, either built or proposed, is either public housing or luxury and near luxury housing, with a vast desert between."

Is it too much to hope that the Urban Renewal Commissioner himself had read some of the testimony before the District Commissioners in the care of Southwest Washington?

The rest is in the record. Not only has the Redevelopment Land Agency raised densities and eliminated need housing in Southwest Washington, but the serious prospect has been raised that much the same thing may be under way at what was called last fall when the Archdiocese of Washington protested it through the director of Catholic Charities, the Northwest renewal project. The excuse is pleaded that downtown land is too valuable for the poor people to live on it. Surely, in a democratic society, such an argument will not stand long.

The excuse is pleaded that in fact the majority nonwhite displacement has been accommodated in decent, safe, and sanitary housing, to use Mr. Ihlder's term again, "elsewhere." If this is the case, then Washington has found a solution to the problem which frets every major city in the Nation. If this is the case, then there is not overcrowding in other sections of the District, there is not social friction which caused one of the national magazines recently to focus rather unfavorably on the District of Columbia, there is not location of displacees in far-out housing where shopping and transportation become major difficulties. The excuse is pleaded that—and gentlemen, this has been pleaded to my face by those responsible for renewal in the District of Columbia—residents of the project area have no title to the land. But, surely, their title in a need housing situation is at least as great as the title of the out-of-town redeveloper and his "gracious-living" prospects.

Clearly, whether its relocation has been adequate or not, the Redevelopment Land Agency has created two ghettoes in Southwest Washington: one for the rich and the nearly rich, and one for the very poor. It has, I submit, not solved Washington's own housing problem. Certainly, as time goes on and urban renewal moves across the face of the District, displacement into other slum areas from the Southwest will complicate the picture. I daresay, from what I have been reading in the Washington papers, this has already complicated the picture. Without any doubt, as a pilot example, Southwest Washington has failed the Nation when it comes to the primary purpose of the entire Federal urban renewal program; namely, to meet the housing needs of our citizens.

The second human question: Were the residents of the District honestly involved in the renewal experience? At the initiation of the experience the Executive Secretary of the Redevelopment Land Agency said in the Journal of the AIP, and reference is here:

"The (Redevelopment) Land Agency has maintained that the planning of southwest Washington should be by the democratic process, that the ideals, desires, and aspirations of the citizens of Washington should be permitted to have a strong influence on the plan itself."

Once again there is not time for a lengthy inquiry. Suffice it to note that at point after point in the southwest Washington urban renewal experience objection was raised by responsible civic groups within the District. There is no evidence available to us that such objection seriously ever influenced renewal thinking, much less renewal action.

As is only too well known, the District of Columbia does not have an elected government. Neither does it have political parties. In the absence of such, citizens of the District express themselves through various local civic and social organizations. Two of the more universal of these organizations are the Citizens Association and the Civic Association. I remind you gentlemen strongly of the resolution which was passed by the Federation of Citizens Associations of the District of Columbia. This is not the Southwest Citizens Association, the District Federation of Citizens Associations, on the 12th of June 1958:

"Whereas the redevelopment project in the southwest section of the Capital City is now in its fifth year and is considered to be a pilot project for other cities in the United States and"—this is significant—

"Whereas the policies and procedures in effect in the administration of this program have resulted in hardship, injustice, and inequity being inflicted upon many of the former residents of the southwest, some of whom have also suffered financial loss, as well as physical and psychogenic illness.

"*Resolved*, That the District of Columbia Federation of Citizens Associations urgently requests congressional investigation (to present) repetition of deficiencies revealed in the southwest project." In the Washington Evening Star for December 15, 1959, this news item appeared:

"The Southwest Civic Association"—this is the other group—"the Southwest Civic Association last night assailed the Redevelopment Land Agency and others for their failure to provide adequate relocation of families uprooted by their programs. Though no formal motions were passed, the temper of the discussion clearly indicated the group's ill feeling toward several aspects of current slum clearance activities. Referring to the RLA as a showpiece and stating that it 'disregarded the people entirely,' Mr. Calhoun (civic association president, Mr. Leon S. Calhoun) said 'When redevelopment is carried on this way, it can't come to a good end.' "

Time and again the Washington Housing Association, the Metropolitan Washington Chapter of the National Association of Social Workers, the Washington Urban League, the Washington Board of Trade, the archdiocese of Washington have appeared before public hearings to protest various important aspects of the District urban renewal program.

I skip again.

By no stretch of the imagination, in such a context, can Washington's southwest urban renewal experience be said to have been a popularly engineered achievement. Here again, as a pilot project, there is the dimension of disaster in this fact for urban renewal projects throughout the Nation.

In terms of the District's own future, and in terms of future urban renewal projects in other cities, how does southwest Washington stand? Still, as before, the emphasis is human, not fiscal. Statistics and charts, in southwest Washington, as elsewhere, can be deceptive. Figures from the southwest, for instance, show impressive plus totals on the side of some physical improvement after relocation. Renewal's earliest objective is almost always the most rundown area of the city. In such a circumstance, it is relatively easy to spotlight physical betterment in the lot of those displaced. But as renewal moves along into sections less blighted and as the total housing supply decreases at certain income levels, things may not be so bright.

Urban renewal is not a one-night stand; it's pretty much of a continuing operation. We are not in any way saying that more indoor bathrooms and better stoves and firmer plaster for the first batch of relocatees are unimportant. What we are saying is that renewal needs to be estimated in depth and in length. It is far more important to judge how the first urban renewal project meets the basic problems of housing, public relations and general human values than to sit back simply with separate statistics and conclude from a column of figures nicely placed and colorfully frameworked that all is well. Even fiscally, while it can quite easily be demonstrated, and has been demonstrated in Washington, that more direct tax revenue is forthcoming from new construction in the project area than came from previous slums and that the tax drain consequent upon a poor housing section of the city is in fact eliminated by demolition, realism compels us to assess against this increased expenditures in other slum areas and an eventual fiscal explosion when there's just no place left for these displaced lower income families to crowd into. In short by ignoring the problem of need housing, urban renewal in Southwest Washington has no more solved that problem than does the ostrich solve his problem of privacy by sticking his head in the Sahara. It remains. It is, if anything, aggravated by a nonhuman renewal bias. Sooner or later it will return to haunt any city which allows itself to be sold a bill of fiscal goods, a bill which in itself as I have just indicated is of extremely dubious ultimate worth.

My conclusion from all this is simple. Urban renewal in Southwest Washington has not met the clear paramount purpose of the Federal urban renewal program. In the process, even though it is my feeling that the real issues have not been clearly presented to the citizens of the District, responsible civic opposition all along the line expressed in the only method open to those citizens of the District of Columbia has not been honestly accommodated. Besides, there remains a strong suspicion that the private interests in Southwest Washington urban renewal weighed at least as heavy as the common good.

I want to get one more quotation in. I have just two more paragraphs and then I'm through.

This particular quotation I think is extremely significant with regard to the private interests. If we were speaking as civic persons we could add to this statement and if the committee wishes we may, but this for now, Conrad Wirth of the National Capital Planning Commission put his finger, we think, on something pretty significant when he remarked in December 1955. These words, I suspect, and the testimony of Mr. Hannan will bear even greater significance. I quote Mr. Wirth:

"Pressures are strong and constant for haste and for immediate action on this proposal or that blueprint. These pressures are very great and they often come from the most unexpected places. Experts, with skills in the realms of concrete and currency * * * these special skills are usually accompanied by a vast knowledge of ways and means of bypassing those whose interests and vision extend beyond the immediate project into which concrete can be poured."

There is a decisive need at this time for a change in the direction of the District's urban renewal program. I speak still, be it emphasized, to the human aspects of that effort. In the peculiar situation of the District of Columbia, those who represent its citizens should be given enlarged powers of control to insure that the interests of all District citizens will in fact be promoted. But the solution to this problem goes deeper, and this you gentlemen would perhaps be interested in pursuing at another time.

"Crisis Downtown" called for "greater and more continuous substantive supervision of renewal * * * at the Federal level." I repeat that plea today with the added urgency of another year of studying these matters in the planning school, one of the best in the country, if I may be pardoned a little chauvinism. Here at the threshold of the HHFA and, more significantly, of the Congress itself is a most critical situation. Had the stated Federal purposes in setting up the urban renewal program been rigidly applied to the Redevelopment Land Agency from the beginning, this situation might never have arisen. Southwest Washington, as we wrote the Federal Urban Renewal Administrator, Mr. David M. Walker, last September, might well have been a "beacon of hope" to those of us in other metropolitan areas who have been seriously disturbed by renewal's failure to contrive needed housing. For the survival of the program itself, and I cannot stress this point sufficiently—I am not an opponent of urban renewal—for the survival of the program itself there is need for heavy self-purgation at the present time. I urge again that Federal controls over urban renewal be increased on the substantive level. If this does not happen, if for want of more coherent Federal direction this program continues to limp from one controversy to another in city after city, who can foresee the ultimate consequences?

One thing is now and forever certain in Southwest Washington, as elsewhere: the pyramids of Egypt were built with the sweat of slaves; our shining new cities cannot and must not be built on the suffering of our less fortunate citizens.

* * * * *

On the 17th of July last, I appeared before the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to speak at a public hearing on urban renewal in Southwest Washington as representative of the National Conference of Catholic Charities. I said at that time:

"The vocabulary of urban renewal has become an integral part of our national language. The fact of urban renewal has in city after city confronted neighborhoods and whole communities with new problems and profound perplexities. It is in the context of this flux and turmoil that we appear here today. We are not, as churchmen, primarily concerned with concrete and bulldozers. It is not our wish nor our purpose to enter into technical discussion of urban politics or urban economics. We are concerned with the human aspects of upheaval in downtown, USA. We are concerned with proper relocation practices, with justice and charity in the administration of these gigantic changes, with the commonwealth as more important than any particular interest. It is in the context of this concern and keenly conscious of the far-reaching complexities of present urban renewal method that we appear here today."

Since then, under the editorship of myself and Rt. Rev. Msgr. John O'Grady, secretary of the conference and veteran Catholic houser, the National Conference of Catholic Charities has published "Crisis Downtown," a study for church guidance of the modus operandi of urban renewal in Southwest Washington. I speak now in the context of that study, in the framework of 2 years' study of city planning at MIT, and, it must be strongly emphasized, in the same terms of reference as those I have just cited above vis-a-vis our statement of July 17 last.

What happens in urban renewal in Southwest Washington, I am convinced, is of much more than local significance. Were it otherwise and we as a national church organization would never have entered the picture. The first Federal urban renewal grant in the Nation went to the Redevelopment Land Agency of the District of Columbia for urban renewal in Southwest Washington. *Berman v. Parker*, a classic case in urban renewal chronology, was decided by the U.S. Supreme Court in the fall of 1954 in the context of Southwest Washington. By the simple fact of its position as National Capital but, more significantly, by the repeated decision of renewal personnel all along the way, Washington, D.C., has been put forward as a major urban renewal example to the rest of the country. Monograph 3 of the "Comprehensive Plan for Washington" issued by the National Capital Parks and Planning Commission in June of 1950 noted (p. 39):

"The Congress has indicated that it regards the District of Columbia as a pilot example for the Nation as a whole in the application of the Housing Act of 1949. This applies to both public housing and redevelopment projects. Typical solutions for both programs should thus be sought."

In the 1953 fall issue of the Journal of the American Institute of Planners, the lead article (by Robert F. Wrigley, Jr.) read:

"Perhaps no urban district in the United States has been so widely discussed over the past year as the Southwest survey area of Washington, D.C. The interest of planners, architects, and others has been nationwide. * * * They think of Washington as a symbol of good planning—a model for other communities. * * * Successful planning and redevelopment in the shadow of Capitol Hill could very well promote urban planning and redevelopment everywhere" (p. 189).

In January of 1957, the then Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, Mr. Albert E. Cole, called southwest Washington "a dramatic demonstration of urban renewal * * * a signpost and symbol for the rest of the country." In April of 1958, President Eisenhower messaged participants in ground-breaking ceremonies for the first new construction in Southwest Washington: "The Nation's Capital can lead the way in restoring hope and strength to areas of likely deterioration in the great cities of our land." There is further evidence, but the pattern is perhaps already clear. As urban renewal gropes its way through the first difficult years of its existence, the lessons of renewal under the very nose of the Congress in the Nation's Capital are not lost on planners and politicians across the country.

It is essential, then, that the purposes of the Congress in setting up the Federal urban renewal program should be realized in Southwest Washington. What were those purposes? There is time here but for the briefest of reviews. Opening the hearings of the U.S. Senate Banking and Currency Committee from which emerged urban renewal back in 1954, Senator HOMER CAPEHART, chairman, stated (p. 1):

"This committee is very concerned on how and to what extent this bill will help the ordinary wage earner and low-income person to acquire better living accommodations and a better environment in which to bring up their families. Every member of this committee is also concerned with the problem of helping to provide good and decent housing for our Negro citizens and other minority groups. Too long have these groups been on the outside of a good housing program, and before I vote for any provisions in this bill, I shall have to be satisfied that a substantial volume of better housing will be provided for them."

To the same hearings, Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, long a champion of the basic idea of redevelopment in our troubled urban areas, remarked (p. 93):

"When we got the original (urban redevelopment) bill through Congress, it was the intent that a considerable proportion of those displaced were to be rehoused in the areas which were cleared * * * (I am distressed) by the new uses which you are developing for these areas, not to house low-income groups but to house those in upper income groups or higher income groups and for business purposes."

Housing and Home Finance Administrator Albert E. Cole told the committee (pp. 93, 94):

"Having in mind all of the program * * * we certainly intend to and will carry out to the best of our ability that objective; namely, that upon redevelopment the needs of these people in low incomes must be given a preference."

Said Commissioner of the Federal Housing Administration, Guy Hollyday (p. 77):

"Low-income families * * * are being forced to move. * * * Unless they are adequately housed, the problem of overcrowding and blight is not solved, it is just moved from one part of the city to another."

Launched, and annually financed, as part of housing legislation, there is no room for doubt that in the mind of the Congress it was to have a major housing orientation. Private desires to the contrary, the Federal urban renewal program was created as part of the specific national housing policy, namely to facilitate via government aid "the production, at lower costs, of housing of sound standards—adequate housing for families with incomes so low that they are not being decently housed—reduction of the costs of housing." As part of a larger mechanism, it is entirely true to contend that urban renewal could not of itself do the whole housing job. Nevertheless, the fact remains clear and constant—urban renewal was expected to do something. Federal moneys were to be poured into our cities and private enterprise was to be invited to participate in the effort not only to raise up shining towers of luxury living downtown and to redress the tax base but, primarily, to improve the housing conditions of our people. Speaking to the National Housing Conference on June 23, 1958, here in Washington, the then Administrator of HHFA, Albert E. Cole put the case extremely well:

"Urban renewal was not created because of the needs of the city, but because of the needs of the citizen. I suspect that if you went about the country asking various people what urban renewal is all about, you would get a lot of different answers. You would be told that urban renewal is intended to save downtown business, or to clear up traffic congestion, or to restore wornout areas to the tax rolls, or to create the city beautiful, or to get rid of unsightly slum

buildings. All of these things are worthwhile dividends of an urban renewal program. But none of them are the things that initially impelled the Nation to launch first the slum clearance and urban redevelopment program and later to broaden it into urban renewal. This program came into being because of people. It took account not just of the economic costs, but even more of the social cost of decaying neighborhoods and urban communities. This is what most of us used to talk about when urban renewal was starting. You don't hear much of that kind of talk anymore, and I think that's disturbing. As we get more and more involved in the demanding and complicated undertakings that urban renewal entails, we seem to have less time for the people whose hopes we are trying to fulfill."

In such a context, reports from urban renewal cities in various sections of the country have been disturbing. Instead of providing housing where the need is greatest, time and again accusations have been raised by responsible civic observers that this in fact is what is going on:

(a) The public participation requirement of the "workable program" does not seem to extend to the accommodation of serious dissent.

(b) Plans, originally designed to meet housing need, are changed in the process of renewal to spell out greater densities, higher rents, and, presumably, increased profits.

(c) Relocation, despite bulky reports and plans, is not in reality living up to the substantive requirement of the "workable program."

(d) The interest of the private entrepreneur weighs heavier than the interest of the community as a whole, more so even than the interest of the citizens displaced from the project area.

I shall not take the time of this committee to detail the charges. One or two comments must suffice. Said Lee F. Johnson, then executive vice president of the National Housing Conference, in "Housing Yearbook, 1955" (p. 14):

"Slum clearance and urban renewal are not self-contained programs. They can never get off the ground until there are enough low-rent and medium-rent dwellings to rehouse displaced slum dwellers and all who wish to escape slum environments. As presently practiced, slum clearance intensifies slum conditions instead of eliminating them."

Charles Abrams, veteran New York houser and professor, told the U.S. Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, May 14, 1959:

"This urban renewal program while it does help cities get rid of slums, has developed into a device for displacing the poor from their footholds to make way for higher rental dwellings which those displaced cannot afford. Thus, the lowest income family remains the forgotten family, though it is still the most home needy in the American family circle."

Speaking of the operation of title I (renewal redevelopment) in New York City, longtime urban sociologist Lewis Mumford said recently:

"I regard the present application of title I as a betrayal of its original intention. It is now employed as a method of giving aid to builders and investors who have no need for Government aid, whereas its original purpose was to help reduce slum densities which had created the high values the land now brings."

Jane Jacobs, editor of Architectural Forum, was even more blunt in her commentary on the subject:

"Title I in its very nature is a track for the gravy train. It hands great chunks of the city over to officially anointed barons, makes city rebuilding and city commerce into a monopolistic setup for the favored few. Whether their motives are pure or greedy is beside the point. It simply doesn't work. There is not a title I project in the entire United States which has revitalized its surrounding city. Title I just pushes the problems of the city from one place to concentrate them in other places and makes them worse in the process."

Writing of Boston's West End renewal project in the February 1959 issue of the Journal of the American Institute of Planners, Prof. Herbert J. Gans, of the Institute of Urban Studies at the University of Pennsylvania pulls no punches:

"American redevelopment planning so far has proceeded on the assumption that relocation is secondary to redevelopment. Thus, great pains are taken with planning for clearance and reuse of the site, but plans for the present occupants of the site are treated as byproducts of the redevelopment proposal. The real cost of relocation is paid in various ways by the people being moved out. Under present conditions the redevelopment of American cities is economically possible only because of the hidden subsidies provided by the residents of the area to be cleared."

In 1958, the Philadelphia Housing Association published a survey of relocation in the city covering a period from May 1955 to April 1957. It concludes (p. 2): "Only 3 out of 10 displaced families moved to satisfactory housing. Seven out of ten moved to housing below housing code standards."

I do not, of course, claim infallibility for each of these judgments. I do say they are highly significant. I do suggest that the Nation's pilot urban renewal project in Southwest Washington needs to be viewed in precisely such a context as they provide.

Again, I am concerned with how renewal went in Southwest Washington as a human experience. Did it help meet the housing need of the District where that need was greatest? Did it honestly involve the citizenry of the District in its evolution? In terms of long-range planning, has it operated to advantage of the commonwealth rather than the private interest?

"Crisis Downtown" details the original proposals for Southwest Washington. I shall not repeat here, except to emphasize what the National Capital Planning Commission told the District Commissioners on October 24, 1952: "It is completely unrealistic to propose that the lower income population be displaced to be housed elsewhere. Locations elsewhere simply are not to be found in sufficient quantity and near enough to places of employment to meet this vital requirement of most low-income families." And what the Redevelopment Land Agency itself stated in its relocation plans for Southwest Washington area B, submitted to the District Commissioners as of January 16, 1953: "The Agency is convinced that housing of this type, i.e., rentals of $17 per month per room, can and will be constructed in area B. Private low-rent housing constructed under these provisions will be an important addition to the reservoir of housing available for families to be displaced. Many families temporarily rehoused early in the undertaking of this project or whose displacement occurred during the later stages can be taken care of in new housing within the project area."

Instead, the facts are only too eloquent, the situation in Southwest Washington has become so tragic that even the Urban Renewal Administrator himself, Mr. David Walker, chose Washington, D.C., as the location for one of the most drastic comments which has ever been made on the entire renewal program. Said Mr. Walker to the Potomac Chapter of the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials on October 1, 1959, 1 month after we had completed our study of Southwest Washington:

"If urban renewal becomes a program with public housing down at one end and luxury and semiluxury housing down at the other, leaving out a whole gray area in between, this program can go no place but into disrepute—and there it belongs."

On July 17, 1959, urging the District Commissioners not to abandon the principle of lower middle income in Southwest Washington, we had pleaded:

"Before this rent ceiling is lifted careful thought (should) be given to the result—a strange sort of creature in the midst of the Nation's Capital, his head in the clouds of upper income and 'gracious living,' his feet in the solid earth of public housing and nothing in between."

Before the District Commissioners in a public hearing on plans for Northwest Washington, Rev. C. Shelby Rooks, speaking for the Washington Urban League, on July 29, 1959, made the same point:

"The announced objectives for Southwest all included housing for every income group * * * But what has actually happened? * * * Housing there, either built or proposed, is either public housing or luxury and near-luxury housing, with a vast desert between."

The rest is in the record. Not only has the Redevelopment Land Agency raised densities and eliminated need housing in Southwest Washington but the serious prospect has been raised that much the same thing may be under way at what was called last summer, when the archdiocese of Washington protested it through the director of Catholic Charities, the Northwest renewal project. The excuse is pleaded that downtown land is too valuable for the poor people to live on it. Surely, in a democratic society, such an argument will not stand long. The excuse is pleaded that in fact the majority nonwhite displacement has been accommodated in decent, safe and sanitary housing. If this is the case, then Washington has found a solution to a problem which frets every major city in the Nation. If this is the case, then there is not overcrowding in other sections of the District, social friction and location of displacees in far-out housing where shopping and transportation become major difficulties. The excuse is pleaded that residents of the project area have no title to the land. But, surely, their title in a need housing situation is at least as great as the title of the out-of-town redeveloper and his gracious-living prospect.

Clearly, whether its relocation has been adequate or not, the Redevelopment Land Agency has created two ghettoes in Southwest Washington one for the rich—the nearly rich, one for the very poor. It has, I submit, most probably not solved Washington's own housing problem. Certainly, as time goes on and urban renewal moves across the face of the District displacement into other slum areas from the Southwest will complicate the picture. Without any doubt, as a pilot example Southwest Washington has failed the Nation when it comes to the primary purpose of the entire Federal urban renewal program; namely, to meet the housing need of our citizens.

Second human question. Were the residents of the District honestly involved in the renewal experience? Early in the process, the director of the Revelopment Land Agency opted for democracy in the program of urban renewal for the District. Said John Searles (Journal of the American Institute of Planners, winter 1954, p. 38):

"The (Redevelopment) Land Agency has maintained that the planning of Southwest Washington should be by the democratic process—that the ideals, desires and aspirations of the citizens of Washington should be permitted to have a strong influence on the plan itself."

Once again, there is not time here for a lengthy inquiry. Suffice it to note that at point after point in the Southwest Washington urban renewal experience, objection was raised by responsible civic groups within the District. There is no evidence available to us that such objection seriously influenced renewal thinking, much less renewal action. But suppose we listen to some of the voices.

As is only too well known, the District of Columbia does not have an elected government. Neither does it have political parties. In the absence of such, citizens of the District express themselves through various local civic and social organizations. Two of the more universal of these organizations are the Citizens Association and the Civic Association. On June 12, 1958, the Federation of Citizens Associations of the District of Columbia adopted this resolution:

"Whereas the Redevelopment Project in the Southwest Section of the Capital City is now in its fifth year and is considered to be a pilot project for other cities in the United States and,

"Whereas the policies and procedures in effect in the administration of this program have resulted in hardship, injustice, and inequity being inflicted upon many of the former residents of the Southwest, some of whom have also suffered financial loss, as well as physical and psychogenic illness,

Resolved, That the District of Columbia Federation of Citizens Associations urgently requests congressional investigation * * * (to prevent) repetition of deficiencies revealed in the Southwest project."

In the Washington Evening Star for December 15, 1959, this news item appeared (p. B–10). "The Southwest Civic Association last night assailed the Redevelopment Land Agency and others for their failure to provide adequate relocation of families uprooted by their programs. Though no formal motions were passed, the temper of the discussion clearly indicated the group's ill-feeling toward several aspects of current slum clearance activities.

"Referring to the RLA as a showpiece and stating that it 'disregarded the people entimely' Mr. Calhoun (Civic Association President Mr. Leon S. Calhoun), said 'when redevelopment is carried on this way, it can't come to a good end.'" Speaking for the District chapter of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, President Rev. E. Franklin Jackson on September 30, 1959, accused the redevelopers of building "for whites alone" and urged his associates to "tell the Redevelopment Agency and the Commissioners that they are creating a breeding ground for the very conditions (i.e. of crime and delinquency), they seek to eliminate and correct." Time and again, likewise, the Washington Housing Association, the Metropolitan Washington Chapter of the National Association of Social Workers, the Washington Urban League, the Washington Board of Trade have appeared before public hearings to protest various aspects of the District renewal programing. The last president of the Southwest Citizens Association, with a long record of public protest, told us this past summer: "We could never get any definite word of the planning. The first thing we knew, often, was when we saw a map in the newspaper. The (RLA) staff was largely inexperienced. It came in with little knowledge of the community. We had a constant quarrel with the caliber of men they sent in and with the way they did their work. I don't think any of them knew where they were going from month to month * * * the arrogance of these people." On August 2, 1959, that stout renewal watchdog of the Washington Post, Robert C. Albrook, wrote:

"Misleading official talk—whether well-meaning, unintentioned, deliberate or otherwise—ought not to be repeated about the Northwest Second Precinct renewal program. * * * Good logic, economics and sound planning undoubtedly support the concept that land uses in the downtown central city area ought to be upgraded. * * * But the community no longer can afford to fool itself that this is correcting the real problems of slums. That problem is human. Clearly, redevelopment as practised so far—publicly in Southwest and privately in Georgetown—is not the answer to this problem."

By no stretch of the imagination, in such a context of question, can Washington's Southwest urban renewal experience be said to have been a popularly engineered achievement. Here again as a pilot project, there is place for very serious doubt.

In terms of the District's own future and in terms of future urban renewal projects in other cities, how does Southwest Washington stand today? Six years ago, veteran District of Columbia houser John Ihlder warned (Journal of the American Institute of Planner, Winter 1954, p. 38):

"L'Enfant's plan, by omission, has plagued Washington with notorious inhabited alleys * * * Do the Southwest redevelopment plans * * * take account of the community as a whole, or are they designed to 'upgrade' only the Southwest with little consideration for effects upon other sections of the city? * * * Where are these displaced people to go? The official city plan gives no evidence. What effect will their removal have in 'downgrading' other sections of the city? Will it be analogous to that of the alleys that supplemented the L'Enfant plan?"

Still as before the emphasis is human not fiscal. Statistics and charts, in Southwest Washington as elsewhere in the country, can be deceptive. Figures from the Southwest, for instance, show impressive plus totals on the side of physical improvement after relocation. Renewal's earliest objective is almost always the most rundown area of the city. In such a circumstance it is relatively easy to spotlight physical betterment in the lot of those displaced. But as renewal moves along into sections less blighted and as the total housing supply decreases at certain income levels, things may not be so bright. Late in December 1959 Boston City Councillor Gabriel F. Piemonte was interviewed by the Christian Science Monitor with regard to urban renewal in Boston. Here is an excerpt from the report of that interview:

"'I am disgusted with the shortsightedness of the Boston Redevelopment Authority for failing to provide needed safeguards to insure that middle-income and low-income housing will be built in current renewal project areas,' Mr. Piemonte says. 'The whole purpose of legislation granting slum clearance aid was to create better housing conditions * * *. Originally one of the main purposes of this (West End Renewal) project was to provide middle-income housing,' he says. 'But what is happening now? We have a group of upper income and luxury apartment buildings' * * *. Mr. Piemonte receives many letters of complaint from families which must move from areas designated for redevelopment—with nowhere to go but other 'blighted neighborhoods.' Many of the families have had to move twice within recent years as the growth of redevelopment projects seemed to dog their steps, Mr. Piemonte says."

In Washington as in Boston and elsewhere in the urban area of the Nation, we must learn to look far ahead. Urban renewal is not a one-night stand, it's pretty much of a continuing operation. We are not in any way saying that more indoor bathrooms and better stoves and firmer plaster for the first batch of relocatees are unimportant. What we are saying is that renewal needs to be estimated in depth and in length. It is far more important to judge how early renewal meets the basic problems of housing, public relations, and general human values than to sit back simply with separate statistics and conclude from a column of figures that all is well. Even, fiscally, while it can quite easily be demonstrated that more direct tax revenue is forthcoming from new construction in the project area than came from previous slums and that the tax drain consequent upon a poor housing section of the city is eliminated by demolition, realism compels us to assess against this gain increased expenditures in other slum areas and an eventual fiscal explosion when there's just no place left for displaced lower income families to crowd into. In short by ignoring the problem of need housing, urban renewal in southwest Washington has no more solved that problem than does the ostrich solve his problem of privacy by sticking his head in the Sahara. It remains. It is, if anything, aggravated by a nonhuman renewal bias. Sooner or later it will return to haunt any city which allows itself to be sold a bill of fiscal goods, a bill which in itself as I have just indicated is of dubious ultimate worth.

My conclusion from all this is simple. Urban renewal in southwest Washington has not met the clear paramount purpose of the Federal urban renewal program. In the process, even though it is my feeling that the real issues have not been clearly presented to the citizens of the District, responsible civic opposition all along the line expressed in the only method open to those citizens has not been honestly accommodated. Besides, there remains a strong suspicion that the private interests in Southwest Washington urban renewal weighed at least as heavy as the common good. Perhaps Conrad Wirth of the National Capital Planning Commission put his finger on something pretty significant when he remarked back in December of 1955:

"Pressures are strong and constant for haste and for immediate action on this proposal or that blueprint. These pressures are very great and they often come from the most unexpected places. Experts with skills in the realms of concrete and currency * * * these special skills are usually accompanied by a vast knowledge of ways and means of bypassing those whose interests and vision extend beyond the immediate project into which concrete can be poured."

There is a decisive need at this time for a change in the direction of the District's urban renewal effort. I speak still, be it emphasized, to the human aspects of that effort. In the peculiar situation of the District of Columbia, those who represent its citizens should be given enlarged powers of control to insure that the interests of all District citizens will in fact be promoted via the urban renewal program. But the solution goes deeper than this.

Crisis Downtown called for "greater and more continuous substantive supervision of renewal * * * at the Federal level." I repeat that plea today. Here at the threshold of the HHFA and, more significantly, of the Congress itself, is a most critical situation. Had the stated Federal purpose in setting up the urban renewal program been rigidly applied to the Redevelopment Land Agency from the beginning, this situation might never have arisen. Southwest Washington, as we wrote the Federal Urban Renewal Administrator, Mr. David M. Walker, last September, might well be a beacon of hope to those of us in other metropolitan areas who have been seriously disturbed by Renewal's apparent failure to contrive needed housing. For the survival of the program itself, I urge again that the Federal controls over urban renewal be increased on the substantive level. If this does not happen, if for want of more coherent Federal direction the program continues to limp from one controversy to another in city after city, who can foresee the ultimate consequence?

One thing is now and forever certain in Southwest Washington as elsewhere. The

Pyramids of Egypt were built with the sweat of slaves. Our shining new cities cannot and must not be built on the suffering of our less fortunate citizens.

AGREEMENT ON THE USE OF THE INDUS RIVER

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, we hear so much about the things that do not go well in various places around the world under our mutual security program that it is worth while once in a while to call attention to the successes, which are far more numerous.

One of the most remarkable achievements in this decade is the decision by the Governments of Pakistan and of India, after long difficulties and apparently hopeless obstacles, to resolve amicably their difference over the division and use of the waters of the Indus River Basin. They are to sign on September 19 an agreement to use the waters of these various rivers for the benefit of both.

Last fall President Ayub Khan of Pakistan went to India in person to talk with Prime Minister Nehru. Prime Minister Nehru is now going in person to Karāchi to sign this agreement which is the first step toward strengthening that great subcontinent which has been a prime target of the Communists all these years—and, of course, will remain so.

Sometimes we hear it said, Look at all the money we have put into such-and-such a country and it has weakened or gone down. The suggestion generally is that we should give up because of a loss or setback here or there. But the Communists do not quit when some project of theirs goes wrong. At one time they almost had Italy. They failed to get it, but they are still working to get Italy. At one time they were on the verge of gaining control in Greece. They failed as the result of the Greece-Turkey assistance program from the United States. But the Communists are still working to get Greece. At one time it seemed almost certain they would win in France. They failed, but they are still working on France.

In Iran, they were within a hair's breadth of getting control during the Mossadegh period. They failed; Iran turned even more strongly to the free world. But the Communists work as hard as ever against the Iranian Government. They do not quit when they have a defeat. They redouble their efforts.

They started the war in Korea and they were defeated, but they are still working to achieve their objective, one way or another. The Huks in the Philippines at one time seemed almost unbeatable. They were pretty nearly destroyed. But there is a remnant and it still works on. The same is true in India. They got control of one province for a time, were turned out of power, but they are working as hard as ever to come back.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman said a moment ago, I believe, that the Communists were defeated in Korea. I just wanted to make sure that I had understood correctly the remarks of our colleague, because I think that is a fairly remarkable admission from a gentleman who speaks frequently for his party on the matter of foreign policy.

Mr. JUDD. The Communists were defeated in Korea, but tragically we did not go ahead to take the victory. That is precisely what I said and what I have said for 10 years, here and in many other places. I shall be glad to document that for the benefit of the gentleman, if he wants me to do so.

My point is that along with our few failures thus far we ought also to call attention to the many successes that have been achieved by patient, imaginative, constructive efforts on the part of leaders of good will, plus friendly efforts by other countries in the free world. This agreement by the two countries which were in great difficulty in south Asia is a dramatic illustration.

Frequently, you hear people speak of the great subcontinent containing India and Pakistan with surprise or even complaint that there is not complete unity. But what do they expect? If you think of India and Pakistan as one great peninsula projecting off the southern border of Eurasia, just as Europe, excluding the Soviet Union, is another great peninsula, projecting off the western border of Eurasia, then you note, that the Indian Peninsula has more land than the European Peninsula. It has more people than the European. It has more languages than the European Peninsula. It has more races than the European. It has more religions than the European. The problems of India and Pakistan are enormously more complicated than are those of Western Europe.

We do not expect the countries of Western Europe to achieve unity all at once. Yet we tend to expect that in Asia. The miracle is that despite the almost insurmountable obstacles, these two new countries, India and Pakistan, while determining to be free and independent and to develop self-government, have worked on until now the world is about to see the fruition of one of the great cohesive movements in history, and in the face of so many divisive forces at work everywhere.

The resolution of the Indus Basin problem is momentous—the greatest event of its kind that ever happened. There should be praise for the statesmanship of Prime Minister Nehru and President Ayub and their representatives who arrived at the necessary compromises which made agreement possible.

I want to pay tribute, also, to Mr. Eugene Black, President of the World Bank, and Mr. Cliff, Vice President of the World Bank, and their representatives, under whose calm and expert "good offices," reconciliation between these two great countries has begun. It shows what can be done when there is the will from within and proper assistance from without.

There should be praise for the farsighted interest on the part of friendly countries and the Bank in promoting the financing which will make effective the construction of the works called for in the settlement.

This Congress deserves some of the praise for a diplomatic and international triumph through its action relative to the Indus contained in the mutual security legislation.

Not the least in expressing heartfelt thanks to all concerned will be the 40–50 million people in the Indus Basin whose livelihood will be preserved and enhanced.

For more than 4,000 years of recorded history the Indus Basin has witnessed the ebb and flow of civilization between central Asia and the plains of India. Hindu and Mongul invaders alike crossed it on their way south. During all this time the Indus River Basin was the breadbasket of the Punjab in undivided India. Irrigation canals installed under the British made it the greatest irrigation system in the world.

With the partition of India in 1947 this ancient river system was divided between the two newly independent states of India and Pakistan. With control of the upstream waters of all but one of the main rivers of the system in the hands of one of the countries—India—a dispute immediately broke out regarding use of the waters. On some occasions the controversy became so bitter, so violent, that war itself was threatened. Energies which might better have been used on constructive tasks, such as development, were unproductively absorbed.

Briefly, the plan devised by the World Bank provides that India should have the use of the waters of the three eastern rivers—the Beas, the Ravi, and the Sutlej—and that the downstream irrigated areas, formerly supplied with waters from these three rivers, should in the future be supplied with water from the three western rivers—the Indus, the Jhelum, and the Chenab—through a series of diversion and link canals. The plan also provides for hydroelectric installation, storage areas, and drainage improvements to assist in controlling salinization of irrigated lands in Pakistan. Under it, too, India will be enabled to complete and operate her ambitious Rajasthan Desert irrigation plan. The whole system will provide by far the largest irrigation system in the world.

About 14 million acre-feet of water will be transferred by these link canals for irrigation use on approximately 4.3 million acres of crops in Pakistan. There will be additional water for roughly 5 million more acres of cropland in Pakistan, and the water to be made available to India will irrigate about 4 million acres there. The plan also calls for installation of hydroelectric power in west Pakistan.

It is estimated that the total cost of the system of works to achieve the planned results will be on the order of

$1 billion. This is way beyond the capacity of India and Pakistan to finance. And in fact beyond the capacity of any other country to provide. The World Bank evolved a plan to make available this sum and has obtained assurances from friendly governments of their readiness to help. These friendly governments are Australia, Canada, Germany, New Zealand, and the United Kingdom, as well as ourselves. In addition India and Pakistan are contributing sums within their resources and the World Bank is also making loans. The Bank's plan provides that all funds required to meet the cost of the plan shall be turned over to an Indus Basin Development Fund to be administered by the Bank.

So, in addition to the skill exercised in bringing India and Pakistan together on a treaty, we also have the rare accomplishment of establishing a multilateral financing arrangement.

Prime Minister Nehru has announced that he will be going to Karāchi on September 19 to sign the Indus Treaty with President Ayub. At the same time the friendly countries, including, of course, ourselves and the Bank, will sign the Indus Basin Development Fund Agreement and it is expected that a Development Loan Fund loan, as a part of our assistance, and an International Bank for Reconstruction and Development loan, both loans to Pakistan, will be signed at the same time. Thus will be put together at one time and in one place all the necessary actions to implement the settlement.

I salute India, Pakistan, the World Bank, and the several friendly governments who are cooperating in this gigantic effort to feed people, produce economic development, build good relations, and promote freedom and peace in south Asia and the world.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS].

TO AMEND THE HELIUM ACT OF SEPTEMBER 1, 1937

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 10548) to amend the Helium Act of September 1, 1937, as amended, for the defense, security, and the general welfare of the United States, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That this Act may be cited as the 'Helium Act Amendments of 1960.'

"SEC. 2. The Act entitled 'An Act authorizing the conservation, production, and exploitation of helium gas, a mineral resource pertaining to the national defense, and to the development of commercial aeronautics, and for other purposes', approved March 3, 1925 (43 Stat. 1110), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'That this Act may be cited as the "Helium Act".

"'SEC. 2. As used in this Act:

"'(1) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior;

"'(2) The term "person" means any individual, corporation, partnership, firm, association, trust, estate, public or private institution, or State or political subdivision thereof; and

"'(3) The terms "helium-bearing natural gas" and "helium-gas mixture" mean, respectively, natural gas and gas mixtures containing three-tenths of 1 per centum or more of helium by volume.

"'SEC. 3. (a) For the purpose of conserving, producing, buying, and selling helium, the Secretary is authorized—

"'(1) to acquire by purchase, lease, gift, exchange, or eminent domain, lands or interests therein or options thereon, including but not limited to sites, rights-of-way, and oil or gas leases containing obligations to pay rental in advance or damages arising out of the use and operation of such properties; but any such land or interest in lands may be acquired by eminent domain only when the Secretary determines (A) that he is unable to make a satisfactory agreement to acquire such land or interest in land, and (B) that such acquisition by eminent domain is necessary in the national interest;

"'(2) to make just and reasonable contracts and agreements for the acquisition, processing, transportation, or conservation of helium, helium-bearing natural gas, or helium-gas mixtures upon such terms and conditions, and for such periods, not exceeding twenty-five years, as may be necessary to accomplish the purposes of the Act, except that the Secretary shall not make such contracts and agreements which shall require payments by the Government in any one fiscal year aggregating more than the amount which shall be establish initially in an appropriation Act and which may be increased from time to time in appropriation Acts, or if the Secretary—

"'(A) determines that the national interests require the conservation of certain helium or require certain helium-bearing natural gas or certain helium-gas mixture for the production or conservation of helium, and

"'(B) determines that he is unable to acquire such helium, helium-bearing natural gas, or helium-gas mixture upon reasonable terms and at the fair market value,

he is authorized to acquire by eminent domain such helium and so much of such helium-bearing natural gas or helium-gas mixture as is necessarily consumed in the extraction of such helium after removal from its place of deposit in nature and wherever found, or the temporary use of such helium-bearing natural gas or helium-gas mixture for the purpose of extracting helium, together with the appropriate interest in pipelines, equipment, installations, facilities, personal or real property, including reserves, easements or other rights necessary or incident to the acquisition of such helium, natural gas, or mixture, but the condemnation of any such helium, helium-bearing natural gas, or helium-gas mixture, shall be effected in the same manner and following the procedures established in section 8(a) of this Act, the just compensation for such condemnation to be measured by terms and prices determined to be commensurate with the fair market value, and in the temporary use of any helium-bearing natural gas or helium-gas mixture for the purpose of extracting helium the Secretary shall cause no delay in the delivery of natural gas to the owner, purchaser, or purchasers thereof, except that required by the extractive processes;

"'(3) to construct or acquire by purchase, lease, exchange, gift or eminent domain, plants, wells, pipelines, compressor stations, camp buildings, and other facilities, for the production, storage, purification, transportation, purchase, and sale of helium, helium-bearing natural gas, and helium-gas mixtures; and to acquire patents or rights therein and reports of experimentation and research used in connection with the properties acquired or useful in the Government's helium operations;

"'(4) to dispose of, by lease or sale, property, including wells, lands, or interests therein, not valuable for helium production, and oil, gas, and byproducts, of helium operations not needed for Government use, except that property determined by the Secretary to be 'excess' within the meaning of section 3(e) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of June 30, 1949 (60 Stat. 378; 40 U.S.C. 472(e)), as amended, shall be disposed of in accordance with the provisions of that Act; and to issue leases to the surface of lands or structures thereon for grazing or other purposes when the same may be done without interfering with the production of helium; and

"'(5) to accept equipment, money, and other contributions from public and private sources and to prosecute projects in cooperation with other agencies, Federal, State, or private.

"'(b) Any known helium-gas-bearing land on the public domain not covered at the time by leases or permits under the Mineral Lands Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, as amended, may be reserved for the purposes of this Act, and any reservation of the ownership of helium may include the right to extract, or have extracted, such helium, under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary, from all gas produced from lands so permitted, leased, or otherwise granted for development, except that in the extraction of helium from gas produced from such lands, it shall be extracted so as to cause no delay, except that required by the extraction process, in the delivery of gas produced from the well to the purchaser or purchasers thereof at the point of delivery specified in contracts for the purchase of such gas. If any reserved rights of ownership and extraction of helium are not exercised before production of any helium-bearing natural gas or any helium-gas mixture, the Secretary is authorized to acquire such helium in accordance with section 3(a)(2) of this Act.

"'(c) All contracts and agreements made by the Secretary for the acquisition of helium from a private plant shall contain a provision precluding the plant owner from selling any helium to any purchaser other than the Secretary at a price lower than the lowest price paid by any Government agency for helium acquired from any private plant under any contract entered into pursuant to this section and outstanding at the time of such sale.

"'SEC. 4. The Secretary is authorized to maintain and operate helium production and purification plants together with facilities and accessories thereto; to acquire, store, transport, sell, and conserve helium, helium-bearing natural gas, and helium-gas mixtures, to conduct exploration for and production of helium on and from the lands acquired, leased, or reserved; and to conduct or contract with public or private parties for experimentation and research to discover helium supplies and to improve processes and methods of helium production, purification, transportation, liquefaction, storage, and utilization: *Provided, however,* That all research contracted for, sponsored, cosponsored, or authorized under authority of this Act shall be provided for in such a manner that all information, uses, products, processes, patents and other developments resulting from such research developed by Government expenditure will (with such exceptions and limitations, if any, as the Secretary may find to be necessary in the interest of national defense) be available to the general public: *And provided further,* That nothing contained herein shall be construed

as to deprive the owner of any background patent relating thereto to such rights as he may have thereunder.

"'SEC. 5. (a) Whenever the President determines that the defense, security, and general welfare of the United States require such action, the Secretary shall issue such regulations as he deems necessary for the licensing of sales and transportation of helium in interstate commerce after extraction from helium-bearing natural gas or helium-gas mixtures. Thereafter it shall be unlawful for any person to sell or transfer helium in interstate commerce except in accordance with such regulations or pursuant to the terms of a license issued by the Secretary, or in accordance with the terms of a contract or agreement with the Secretary entered into pursuant to this Act. For the purpose of this section, the term "helium" shall mean helium, after extraction from helium-bearing natural gas or helium-gas mixtures, in a refined or semirefined state suitable for use.

"'(b) Each license shall be issued for a specified period to be determined by the Secretary, but not exceeding five years, and may be renewed by the Secretary upon the expiration of such period. No such license shall be issued to a person if in the opinion of the Secretary the issuance of a license to such person would be inimical to the defense and security of the United States. No such license shall be assigned or otherwise transferred directly or indirectly except with the consent or approval of the Secretary in writing. Any such license may be revoked for any material false statement in the application for license, or for violation or a failure to comply with the terms and provisions of this Act, the regulations issued by the Secretary pursuant thereto, or the terms of the license.

"'(c) In issuing licenses under this section, the Secretary shall impose such regulations and terms of licenses as will permit him effectively to promote the common defense and security as well as the general welfare of the United States. The licensing authority herein granted shall be used solely for the purpose of preventing the transportation or sale of helium for end uses determined by the Secretary to be nonessential or wasteful, and any determination that any end use is nonessential or wasteful shall be published in the form of general regulations applicable to all transportation or sales of helium.

"'(d) Whenever Congress or the President declares that a war or national emergency exists, the Secretary is authorized to suspend any license granted under this Act if in his judgment such suspension is necessary to the defense and security of the United States, and he is further authorized to take such steps as may be necessary to recapture or reacquire supplies of helium.

"'SEC. 6. (a) The Department of Defense, the Atomic Energy Commission, and other agencies of the Federal Government, to the extent that supplies are readily available, shall purchase all major requirements of helium from the Secretary.

"'(b) The Secretary is authorized to sell helium for Federal, medical, scientific, and commercial uses in such quantities and under such terms and conditions as he determines.

"'(c) Sales of helium by the Secretary shall be at prices established by him which shall be adequate to cover all costs incurred in carrying out the provisions of this Act and to repay to the United States any deposit in the Treasury, together with interest as provided in subsection (d) of this section, the following:

"'(1) Within twenty-five years from the date of enactment of the Helium Act Amendments of 1960, the net capital and retained earnings of the helium production fund (established under section 3 of this Act prior to amendment by the Helium Act Amendments of 1960), determined by the Secretary as of such date of enactment, plus any moneys expended thereafter by the Department of the Interior from funds provided in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1959, for construction of a helium plant at Keyes, Oklahoma;

"'(2) Within twenty-five years from the date of borrowing, all funds borrowed, as provided in section 12 of this Act, to acquire and construct helium plants and facilities; and

"'(3) Within twenty-five years from the date of enactment of the Helium Act Amendments of 1960, unless the Secretary determines that said period should be extended for not more than ten years, all funds borrowed, as provided in section 12 of this Act, for all purposes other than those specified in clause (2) above.

"'(d) Compound interest on the amounts specified in clauses (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (c) which have not been paid to the Treasury shall be calculated annually at rates determined by the Secretary of the Treasury taking into consideration the current average market yields of outstanding marketable obligations of the United States having maturities comparable to the investments authorized by this Act, except that the interest rate on the amounts specified in clause (1) of subsection (c) shall be determined as of the date of enactment of the Helium Act Amendments of 1960, and the interest rate on the obligations specified in clauses (2) and (3) of subsection (c) as of the time of each borrowing.

"'(e) Helium shall be sold for medical purposes at prices which will permit its general use therefor; and all sales of helium to non-Federal purchasers shall be upon condition that the Federal Government shall have a right to repurchase helium so sold that has not been lost or dissipated, when needed for Government use, under terms and at prices established by regulations.

"'(f) All moneys received under this Act, including moneys from sale of helium or other products resulting from helium operations and from the sale of excess property shall be credited to the helium production fund, which shall be available without fiscal year limitation, for carrying out the provisions of this Act, including any research relating to helium carried out by the Department of the Interior. Amounts accumulating in said fund in excess of amounts the Secretary deems necessary to carry out this Act and contracts negotiated hereunder shall be paid to the Treasury and credited against the amounts required to be repaid to the Treasury under subsection (c) of this section.

"'SEC. 7. The Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission may each designate representatives to cooperate with the Secretary in carrying out the purposes of this Act, and shall have complete right of access to plants, data, and accounts.

"'SEC. 8. (a) Proceedings for the condemnation of any property under section 3 of this Act shall be instituted and maintained pursuant to the provisions of the Act of August 1, 1888 (25 Stat. 357; 40 U.S.C. 257), as amended, and sections 1358 and 1403 of title 28 of the United States Code, or any other Federal statute applicable to the acquisition of real property by eminent domain. The Acts of February 26, 1931 (46 Stat. 1421; 40 U.S.C. 258a–258e), and October 21, 1942 (56 Stat. 797; 40 U.S.C. 258f), shall be applicable to any such proceedings. Wherever the words "real property", "realty", "land", "easement", "right-of-way", or words of similar meaning, are used in such code provisions or Acts relating to procedure, jurisdiction, and venue, they shall be deemed, for the purposes of this Act, to include any personal property authorized to be acquired hereunder.

"'(b) In the event of disposal under section 3(a)(4) of this Act of any property acquired by eminent domain pursuant to this Act, the former owner or successor in interest of the rights therein shall have the preferential right to reacquire such property on terms as favorable as those terms whereby disposition may be made under such section.

"'SEC. 9. The Secretary is hereby authorized to establish and promulgate such rules and regulations, as are consistent with the directions of this Act and are necessary to carry out the provisions hereof.

"'SEC. 10. (a) The provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act of June 11, 1946 (60 Stat. 637; 5 U.S.C. 1001–1011), as amended, shall apply to any agency proceeding and any agency action taken under this Act, including the issuance of rules and regulations, and the terms "agency proceeding" and "agency action" shall have the meaning specified in the Administrative Procedure Act.

"'(b) In any proceeding under this Act for the granting, suspending, revoking, or amending of any license, or application to transfer control thereof, and in any proceeding for the issuance or modification of rules and regulations dealing with the activities of licensees, the Secretary shall grant a hearing upon the request of any person whose interest may be affected by the proceeding, and shall admit any such person as a party to such proceeding. Any final order entered in any such proceedings shall be subject to judicial review in the manner prescribed in the Act of December 29, 1950 (64 Stat. 1129; 5 U.S.C. 1031–1042), as amended, and to the provisions of section 10 of the Administrative Procedure Act.

"'SEC. 11. The provisions of the Natural Gas Act of June 21, 1938 (52 Stat. 821; 15 U.S.C. 717–717w), as amended, shall not be applicable to the sale, extraction, processing, transportation, or storage of helium either prior to or subsequent to the separation of such helium from the natural gas with which it is commingled, whether or not the provisions of such Act apply to such natural gas, and in determining the rates of a natural gas company under sections 4 and 5 of the Natural Gas Act, as amended, whenever helium is extracted from helium-bearing natural gas, there shall be excluded (1) all income received from the sale of helium; (2) all direct costs incurred in the extraction, processing, compression, transportation or storage of helium; and (3) that portion of joint costs of exploration, production, gathering, extraction, processing, compression, transportation or storage divided and allocated to helium on a volumetric basis.

"'SEC. 12. (a) The Secretary is authorized to borrow annually from the Treasury and credit to the fund established under section 6(f) of this Act such amounts as may be authorized in the initial Appropriation Act and which may be increased from time to time in Appropriation Acts and as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act and contractual obligations hereunder.

"'(b) For the purpose of this section the Secretary may issue to the Secretary of the Treasury notes, debentures, bonds, or other obligations to be redeemable at the option of the Secretary before maturity in such manner as may be stipulated in such obligations. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to purchase any obligations issued by the Secretary under authority of this section and for such purpose the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use as a public debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which

securities may be issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, are extended to include any purchases of obligations of the Secretary hereunder.

" 'SEC. 13. Whoever willfully violates, attempts to violate, or conspires to violate, any provision of this Act or any regulation or order issued or any terms of a license granted thereunder shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $5,000 or by imprisonment for not more than two years, or both, except that whoever commits such an offense with intent to injure the United States or with intent to secure an advantage to any foreign nation, shall upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $20,000 or by imprisonment for not more than twenty years, or both.

" 'SEC. 14. Whenever in the judgment of the Secretary any person has engaged or is about to engage in any act or practice which constitutes or will constitute a violation of any provision of this Act, or any regulation or order issued or any term of a license granted thereunder, any such act or practice may be enjoined by any district court having jurisdiction of such person, and proper proceedings to this end may be instituted under the direction of the Attorney General of the United States.

" 'SEC. 15. It is the sense of the Congress that it is in the national interest to foster and encourage individual enterprise in the development and distribution of supplies of helium, and at the same time provide, within economic limits, through the administration of this Act, a sustained supply of helium which, together with supplies available or expected to become available otherwise, will be sufficient to provide for essential Government activities.

" 'SEC. 16. The Secretary of the Interior is directed to report annually to the Congress on the matters contained in this Act.

" 'SEC. 17. If any provision of this Act, or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the remainder of this Act or the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those as to which it is held invalid shall not be affected thereby.

" 'SEC. 3. The amendment made by this Act shall become effective on March 1, 1961.' "

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to amend the Helium Act of March 3, 1925, as amended, for the defense, security, and the general welfare of the United States."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE V OF THE AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1949, AS AMENDED

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 12759) to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That section 509 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by striking 'June 30, 1961' and inserting 'December 31, 1961'."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object until I have asked some pertinent questions.

The SPEAKER. The Chair asked if there is objection, and any gentleman always has the right to object.

Mr. BAILEY. I have no intention of continuing my right to object if I can have some reasonable answers to some questions I desire to ask.

This is the so-called Mexican labor bill, is it not?

Mr. GATHINGS. Yes, it is.

Mr. BAILEY. I understand the Senate has cut down the extension of that legislation to approximately 6 months.

Mr. GATHINGS. Six months, yes.

Mr. BAILEY. May I inquire the expiration date that is on the books now?

Mr. GATHINGS. It expires on June 30, 1961.

Mr. BAILEY. Why the necessity of bringing it up when the law does not expire until June 30, 1961? All this Senate amendment does is continue it 6 months.

Mr. GATHINGS. It is a 6-month extension.

Mr. BAILEY. These Mexican laborers you are bringing in are exempt from the income tax and social security tax. You bring most of them in under contract and they are paid 50 cents a day. The testimony in the hearings on the migrant labor bill shows that at that price you can produce tomatoes in the southern part of California and sections of Texas and ship them to New Jersey and sell them more cheaply than those who grow them in fields right next to the Campbell Soup Co. can produce them.

Mr. GATHINGS. The gentleman does not mean they come over here and work for 50 cents a day.

Mr. BAILEY. The majority of the contractors pay 50 cents an hour, and the same kind of labor in New Jersey and New York is paid 80 to 85 cents an hour.

This bill should be sent to the Labor Committee where it belongs, because it is purely a labor proposition. It belongs in the Labor Committee, but it has been handled in the Agriculture Committee. If I can have the assurance that in the future it will be handled by the Labor Committee, I will withdraw my objection.

Mr. GATHINGS. I have nothing to do with that. That is out of my authority or jurisdiction. That is left up to the Speaker or the Parliamentarian of the House.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SISK. I believe the gentleman was on the floo. at the time the gentleman from New York [Mr. SANTANGELO] gave his report on the review of this program, was he not?

Mr. BAILEY. Yes. I remember the gentleman's comments on it when the bill came up.

Mr. SISK. I think the gentleman will agree with me that the gentleman from New York had some reservations at the time this bill was considered.

Since that time he has made a survey of this entire program. I want to say the gentleman did find some abuses, but basically I think the report, and I believe my friend, the gentleman from West Virginia, will agree with me, indicated that a great many of the charges made against this program were unfounded and were not completely fair. I would hope the gentleman from West Virginia would at least permit us this 6 months' extension for this reason, the people who grow the crops, particularly the food crops, find it necessary if they are to be able to plan for the year ahead. The present program expires on June 30. That means the crops which will be started in this coming year will not be able to be harvested if there is no assurance of some labor supply. With this additional 6 months, it will guarantee that the farmers of the country who are handling, as I say, particularly, the food crops, an opportunity to go ahead with the assurance that they have those crops harvested. Of course, at the present time I appreciate the objections and concern of my friend from West Virginia. As he knows, he and I share concern for our domestic workers and the great many unemployed people in this country, but at the same time we do have problems in certain areas with the harvesting of these crops and, as I say, I hope my good friend will see his way clear to go along with us at least for this 6 months' extension.

Mr. BAILEY. I will say to the gentleman from California that my inclination is to withdraw my objection, but I want you to know you are not going to be back here at the expiration of your 6 months extension demanding to make this type of lousy legislation a permanent proposition, as you proposed in your original bill this year, and then cut it down to 2 years, and now it is cut to 6 months. Again, I say it is lousy legislation which cannot be justified, in view of the situation of these farm people out there. You know I tried to handle the matter under the minimum wage bill by bringing these large agricultural units under the minimum wage bill, but I did not get to first base with it and I know of no other way, and I call it to your attention that you cannot continue this kind of legislation without my objection.

Mr. Speaker, in order not to hold up the House I withdraw my reservation of objection, but you are going to hear from me next year.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNEXATION OF REAL PROPERTY BY CITY OF WYANDOTTE, MICH.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 383) to au-

thorize the annexation of certain real property of the United States by the city of Wyandotte, Mich., with amendments of the Senate thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

On page 2, after line 4, insert:

"SEC. 3. Nothing in this Act shall prevent the Secretary of the Interior from establishing a National Migratory Bird Refuge on the Federal lands referred to in this Act and the closing of these lands and water areas adjacent thereto to the taking, pursuit, or capture of migratory birds, if the Secretary of the Interior considers such action necessary in carrying out responsibilities of the United States pursuant to international treaties and implementing statutes. The Secretary is further authorized to cooperate and enter into agreements with the city of Wyandotte for the recreational use of these lands where not inconsistent with the purpose for which the refuge is established."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING EXCHANGE OF PROPERTY WITHIN SHENANDOAH NATIONAL PARK, VA.

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the Senate bill (S. 3399) to authorize the exchange of certain property within Shenandoah National Park, in the State of Virginia, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior may accept title to approximately 37.44 acres of land within the authorized boundaries of the Shenandoah National Park, said land fronting on United States Highway Numbered 211 and being more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at park monument H–8, thence with the park boundary line the following courses and distances: north 51 degrees 57 minutes, east 2,242.0 feet to park monument H–9; south 26 degrees 40 minutes, east 51.0 feet to park monument H–10; south 32 degrees 40 minutes, east 340.0 feet to park monument H–11; south 11 degrees 35 minutes, east 190.0 feet to park monument H–12; south 41 degrees 26 minutes, east 329.0 feet to park monument H–13; thence crossing Pass Run south 57 degrees 00 minutes 36 seconds, west 1,871.32 feet to a marked white oak tree near the northeast edge of the fire road on top of Piney Mountain, thence north 58 degrees 36 minutes, west 771.16 feet to the point of beginning.

In exchange for the aforesaid land the Secretary is authorized to convey on the basis of approximately equal values a parcel of park land containing 38.58 acres, being more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at park monument P–153, a point in the center of Route 666, Virginia Department of Highways, thence with the park boundary line the following courses and distances; north 66 degrees 27 minutes, west 345.0 feet to park monument P–152; north 41 degrees 08 minutes, east 705.0 feet to park monument P–151; north 63 degrees 01 minutes, west 302.0 feet to park monument P–150; north 30 degrees 38 minutes, east 1,110.0 feet to park monument P–149; south 74 degrees 36 minutes, east 443.0 feet to park monument P–148; north 41 degrees 33 minutes, east 109.0 feet to park monument P–147; south 69 degrees 50 minutes, east 668.0 feet to the center of the said Route 666; thence leaving the courses of the park boundary line and following the alinement of said Route 666 for the following courses and distances; south 36 degrees 26 minutes, west 436.0 feet; south 33 degrees 45 minutes, west 398.0 feet; south 29 degrees 39 minutes, west 388.0 feet; south 13 degrees, 55 minutes, west 100.0 feet; south 04 degrees 16 minutes, west 70.0 feet; south 32 degrees 37 minutes, west 49.0 feet; north 89 degrees 45 minutes, west 43.0 feet; north 66 degrees 43 minutes, west 50.0 feet; north 89 degrees 26 minutes, west 100.0 feet; north 73 degrees 39 minutes, west 78.0 feet; north 84 degrees 11 minutes, west 45.0 feet; south 72 degrees 08 minutes, west 100.0 feet; south 43 degrees 17 minutes, west 50.0 feet; south 30 degrees 57 minutes, west 73.0 feet; south 47 degrees 22 minutes, west 70.0 feet; south 65 degrees 32 minutes, west 68.0 feet; south 80 degrees 05 minutes, west 130.0 feet; south 51 degrees 40 minutes, west 118.0 feet; south 66 degrees 51 minutes, west 36.0 feet; to the point of beginning.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read a third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVEYING PROPERTY TO CITY OF BISMARCK, N. DAK.

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the Senate bill (S. 1663) directing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain property in the State of North Dakota to the city of Bismarck, N. Dak.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress asembled, That in order to clear the title to the property hereinafter described the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed, without consideration, to the city of Bismarck, North Dakota, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the following described tract of land, together with all buildings and other improvements thereon, situated in the city of Bismarck, North Dakota:

Part of the southeast quarter of section 5, to township 138, range 80, beginning at the southeast corner of such section, thence due west for 1,786 feet, thence north 25 degrees and 46 minutes west a distance of 1,122.5 feet, thence north 66 degrees and 39 minutes west a distance of 454.9 feet, thence north 33 degrees and 22 minutes west a distance of 679 feet, thence north 25 degrees and 24 minutes west a distance of 610 feet, thence around a 30-degree 49-minute curve to the right a distance of 374.4 feet, thence due east 66 feet south of the quarter line of such section 5 a distance of 1,103 feet, thence due south a distance of 1,214 feet, and thence due east a distance of 1,220 feet, and thence due south a distance of 1,360 feet to the point of beginning.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

U.S. ARMY MUSEUM

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 3846) to establish a National Armed Forces Museum Advisory Board of the Smithsonian Institution, to authorize expansion of the Smithsonian Institution's facilities for portraying the contributions of the Armed Forces of the United States, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Missouri if this will provide for any new buildings.

Mr. CANNON. It provides for the expansion of the facilities of the Smithsonian Institution to cover the area which for 2 years a commission has been considering, with a view to the establishment of a U.S. Army Museum. The museum was suggested by the President. After extensive consideration it has been decided to recommend instead the expansion of the facilities of the Smithsonian Institution to serve the purpose.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman assures the House that this will not require—and I have read the bill carefully, and I find no prohibition, you understand, against the building of a new structure—the gentleman from Missouri is assuring the House that this new museum will not require a new building. Is that correct?

Mr. CANNON. I assure the gentleman that absolutely no structure can be erected anywhere for any purpose without Congress providing money through an appropriation bill.

Mr. GROSS. That is quite different.

Mr. CANNON. There is no provision here for money for the erection of a building.

Mr. GROSS. That is quite different, because your bill reads:

There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Smithsonian Institution such sums as may be necessary for the purposes of—

And there is no prohibition in the bill against the construction of a brandnew building anywhere within the District or in the adjacent area.

Let us get this straight one way or the other. Either you can build a new building or you can build an addition to the Smithsonian Institution. Which is it?

Mr. CANNON. It is neither. It is merely an authorization.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I am not prepared with an amendment. I do not like to oppose this bill, but I do not believe that we are warranted in going ahead here with a new big Smithsonian building to be constructed, I do not think we ought to build a brandnew building.

This ought to go into the Smithsonian Institution or some structure already erected.

Mr. Speaker, I must object because I have no amendment prepared to prohibit the building of a new building.

MEMBERS OF THE U.S. GROUP OF THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY PARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 689, 84th Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the U.S. Group of the North Atlantic Treaty Parliamentary Conference the following members on the part of the House: Mr. HAYS, Mr. SMITH of Mississippi, Mr. DENTON, Mr. ANFUSO, Mr. COAD, Mr. CANFIELD, Mr. CORBETT, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, and Mr. BARRY.

CEREMONY IN CONNECTION WITH RAISING OF THE FIRST FLAG OVER EAST CENTRAL FRONT OF THE CAPITOL

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that a brief ceremony will be held on Friday, September 2, 1960, at 10 a.m., in connection with the raising of the first flag over the extended east central front of the U.S. Capitol. Members and their staffs are cordially invited to attend this ceremony.

PROTECTION OF AGENCIES FORMED UNDER INTERSTATE COMPACTS FROM UNWARRANTED FEDERAL INTRUSION

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the the RECORD, and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill (H.R. 13269) to protect an agency formed under an interstate compact to which Massachusetts is a party from unwarranted Federal investigation or regulation. It relates to the New England interstate water pollution control compact, to which congressional assent was given by an act of July 31, 1947, 61 Stat. 682.

The need for this bill results from the assertion of Federal jurisdiction over the Port of New York Authority, an agency formed under an interstate compact. The Constitution requires the consent of Congress to an interstate compact, and that consent usually contains a clause reserving the right of Congress to alter, amend, or repeal its consent.

Such reservation was made both in the case of the New England interstate water pollution control compact and in the case of the compact setting up the Port of New York Authority.

A committee of the Congress undertook an investigation of the Port of New York Authority. It based its right of investigation principally on the grounds that the consent of the Congress to the compact creating the agency had been necessary, and that the Congress had reserved the right to alter, amend, or repeal its consent. It argued that if the Congress had the right to alter, amend, or repeal its consent to the compact, it must necessarily have the right to investigate operations under the compact in order to determine whether it should exercise such right.

This right of investigation was challenged by the two States, but was upheld by the Congress, and three officers of the Port of New York Authority were found in contempt of the Congress for failure to produce documents demanded by the committee.

On August 22, 1960, just prior to the House debate on the citations for contempt, the Governor of New York sent a telegram to a Member of Congress reading in part, as follows:

> We are therefore faced with an assertion of Federal power to control State and municipal agencies which would wrench our system of government from its established foundations. As Governor Rockefeller and Governor Meyner put it in their joint directives on June 25, 1960, to the port authority "the subpena at issue appeared to us and our legal advisers to constitute a novel intrusion by the Federal Government into areas reserved by the Constitution to our respective States, and to constitute a precedent which could subject various agencies of State government throughout the Nation to be similarly answerable to Federal authority."

I made an argument in support of the above view in the debate regarding the citations for contempt. It appears on page 17322 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The same principle relied on to justify the investigation of the Port of New York Authority seems applicable to other agencies formed under interstate compacts as to which the Congress reserved the right to alter, amend, or repeal its consent.

The bill which I am filing seeks to protect the commission which operates under the New England interstate water pollution control compact from the application of this principle. It amends the act which granted the consent of Congress to this compact by changing the section reserving the right of Congress to alter, amend, or repeal its consent.

That section, which is section 4 of the act, now reads: "The right to alter, amend, or repeal this Act is expressly reserved."

In its amended form it will read:

> The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is expressly reserved, except that nothing in this section shall be construed to confer on the United States any right to investigate or regulate any act performed under this compact.

This change disavows any Federal rights of investigation which are claimed to flow from the reserved right to alter, amend, or repeal the congressional consent. That is its only effect, as it refers only to rights arising under this one section, and will have no effect on any rights which the Federal Government may have under the Constitution or other statutes.

The Federal Government is of course properly concerned with some State operations, where for example the use of Federal funds is involved, and the bill which I am filing will not affect any such situation. And neither it nor the compact will impair the rights or jurisdiction of the United States over the waters which are the subject of the compact. Those rights are specifically reserved in the act granting the consent of Congress to the compact.

One reason for choosing the New England Interstate Water Pollution Control Compact as the subject of this bill was the fact that the New England Interstate Water Pollution Control Commission recently wrote me a letter expressing apprehension over the legal developments incident to the investigation of the Port of New York Authority. The letter reads as follows:

> DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The New England Interstate Water Pollution Control Commission is an agency of the New England States and New York State administering an interstate compact for the control of pollution of regional waters.
>
> We are cognizant of and view with concern recent efforts to impose Federal control over the operations and internal management of agencies established under interstate compacts.
>
> H.J. Res. 615 now pending in the present Congress would assert Federal jurisdiction contrary to the purposes and intent of approved interstate compacts, and its adoption would establish a precedent detrimental to Federal-State and interstate relations.
>
> We are further aware of the proposal to use contempt citations against officials of an interstate agency for refusing to submit its files on internal administration to a congressional committee. Certainly Congress should not act on any citation for contempt of interstate agency officials until judicial clarification of congressional powers in this matter is ascertained.
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> ———— ————.

I believe that the apprehension of the commission is justified, and that action must be taken to guard against Federal intrusion of State agencies formed under interstate compacts. The operations contemplated under the New England interstate water pollution control compact are State operations. The fact that instead of being conducted by one State, they are conducted cooperatively by several States does not change that fundamental fact.

The Federal Government should no more seek to investigate the agency of the States operating under this compact than it should to investigate the operations of the Massachusetts Department of Public Works.

The rights of Federal investigation claimed with regard to the Port of New York Authority are inimical and prejudicial to the whole interstate cooperation movement fostered by the Council of State Governments, and which has encouraged the formation of interstate compacts.

One purpose of the emphasis on interstate cooperation was to find a way of avoiding the constant growth and concentration of Federal power, and to make provision for the States to assume responsibilities and act effectively in matters of local interest as to which State cooperation was desirable.

The President's Commission on Intergovernmental Relations favored the use of interstate compacts, saying:

> Through regional compacts interstate cooperation can minimize the need for regional administration by the National Government.

Commissions on interstate cooperation have been formed in many States to encourage this development. It was my privilege to serve for 6 years on the Massachusetts Commission on Interstate Cooperation, and I have long been concerned with interstate compacts.

As a member of that commission, and as a member of the committee on the judiciary of the Massachusetts Legislature, I had to do with the initiating of interstate compacts; and as a member of the House Committee on the Judiciary here, I have been concerned with the approving of interstate compacts by the Congress.

In none of these connections did I ever hear it suggested that a right of the Federal Government to intervene in operations under interstate compacts would arise either as a result of the requirement of congressional consent, or as a result of the reserved right of Congress to alter, amend, or repeal its consent.

I submit that it was never thought of or intended that such a right would so arise, and that the effort made by the bill which I am filing to prevent such a result is constructive and in the public interest.

This bill is being filed near the end of the session. But its filing may yet serve a useful purpose, as the bill will be printed and be available for consideration by interested parties during the interval between the sessions of the Congress. A similar bill can be filed in the next Congress.

Massachusetts is a party to other interstate compacts as to which similar bills could be filed, but at this time I am filing only this one bill.

Many other States are of course parties to a great many interstate compacts as to which the same questions arise which are dealt with in the bill which I am filing. I suggest the need for this type of legislation to those Members who may, as a result of the investigation of the Port of New York Authority, be concerned as to the integrity of agencies operating under interstate compacts to which their States are a party.

The need for this bill is also indicated by an excellent editorial in the Boston Herald of August 30, 1960. It finds that the investigation of the Port of New York Authority has raised a serious challenge to States rights. I include this editorial as part of my remarks:

UNITED STATES VERSUS TWO STATES

The Port of New York Authority is a billion-dollar creation of New York and New Jersey under a congressional grant for an interstate compact. Many in the two States believe it has got too big for its breeches, that it is building bridges, tunnels, and airports, that pay, and neglecting more important community needs that don't pay, like public transportation. Many wonder if this half-public, half-private body has arrogantly assumed to itself the destiny of the country's biggest metropolitan area.

But that, we submit, is a problem for New York and New Jersey. It is not a problem for the United States.

Yet the chairman of the authority, Austin J. Tobin (salary, $60,000), and two other officials have been cited by the House for contempt for failing to produce on subpena the intimate internal details of its operations. A large mass of materials including minutes of meetings revealing the nature and extent of the authority's operations was produced by Mr. Tobin and others, but this did not satisfy Representative CELLER, chairman of the Antitrust Subcommittee of the House, who insisted on all the authority's records.

Representative CELLER insists that Congress must have all the records in order to determine if the authority is living within the terms of the interstate compact. The Washington Post and Times Herald agrees.

We do not agree.

What Congress did in granting the compact between New York and New Jersey was to approve a joint operation by the two States. The information that the authority supplied was enough to show whether the terms of the compact had been exceeded.

How the operations were conducted within the terms of that compact is the business only of the two States. Mr. CELLER, in seeking confidential memorandums and purely internal information was intruding into details beyond the scope of Congress.

This is material such as Congress cannot demand from the President or from any executive department of the National Government. To demand it from the creature of two State governments is even less justifiable.

The Port of New York Authority differs in no essential way from the Boston Port Authority except that two States instead of one fathered it.

The Governors of New York and New Jersey have flatly denied the right of Congress to intrude.

Governor Meyner, of New Jersey, has pointed out that the authority officials took seven packingcases of information down to Washington for the subcommittee, but "apparently the subcommittee was more interested in establishing a record to hold these people in contempt."

Whether the two States have adequately supervised the operations of the authority is much open to question. But the possible dereliction of the States does not validate the entrance of the Congress.

Massachusetts has entered into 10 Congress-approved compacts with other States, including such matters as Connecticut River and Merrimack River flood control, New England higher education, New England water pollution, and the return of parolees and probationers. If Mr. CELLER has his way, the confidential interior operations of these agencies must be laid open to Congress on demand, even though it is doubtful if the Legislature could command such data against the refusal of the Governor.

Mr. CELLER has raised a serious challenge to States rights.

THE HONORABLE GRAHAM A. BARDEN, OF NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, our courageous colleague, GRAHAM BARDEN, is voluntarily retiring from Congress. I have cherished his friendship for many long years. We attended law school together at the University of North Carolina in the days before World War I, and from that time until now we have been closely associated with each other. We actually started our active service in this House on the same day, but because I had been elected in a special election I became his senior in service. For more than a quarter of a century we have served together here in this House. I know him well.

GRAHAM BARDEN, by his intelligent devotion to duty, his unswerving fidelity to truth, his great integrity, and by the honest and courageous manner in which he has discharged the many functions of high office, has distinguished himself in the service of his country and has won the love and affection of his colleagues. GRAHAM BARDEN's character is the tower of his strength. His work here has far surpassed his wages. He has earned the right to live the rest of his life as he pleases. He has achieved greatness and because of his achievements he will be long remembered. I have not only enjoyed my associations with this great and good man, but I have likewise enjoyed the friendship of his lovely wife and the members of his family and I shall miss all of them when we return for the convening of the next session.

May Heaven light his pathway and may the Lord bless and keep him.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. HIESTAND].

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to join the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] in paying tribute to our chairman today but to be a former chairman, the very able gentleman from North Carolina, GRAHAM BARDEN. He has been an inspiration to all of those on the Committee on Education and Labor for many years; to me certainly for the time I have been on the committee. His example might well be followed by almost any chairman, with his exemplary fairness, patience, and yet firmness in carrying out the will of the committee. I salute him not only as a friend but as a great statesman.

Mr. COOLEY. I thank the gentleman. I now yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER].

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to join the dean of the North Carolina delegation in paying tribute to one of North Carolina's most outstanding sons, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN]. GRAHAM BARDEN before coming to Congress was a successful attorney at New Bern, N.C., and an outstanding member of the bar of the State of North Carolina. He was judge of the court in Craven County, N.C., and was elected to the 74th Congress. As the gentleman from North Carolina has stated and as we all know, he is a fearless, outstanding leader. Though many may have disagreed with GRAHAM BARDEN, he was always fair in his conduct and operation in the handling of legislation. The State of North Carolina is very proud of his service in the Congress, and it is my opinion and I think the opinion of the people of North Carolina that in the retirement of GRAHAM BARDEN they have lost a great statesman in the Congress

of the United States. He could have stayed here indefinitely had he run for reelection. There is no shadow of doubt but what he would have been sent back to the Congress. I have a personal admiration for him, and I hope that he and his family enjoy the happy days that I am sure he will have in his retirement. But, knowing him as I do, I know he will not retire, because he will be active in civic, religious, and other affairs in his home town and in the State of North Carolina. I shall miss his association here in the House.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER].

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleague and the dean of our delegation, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], yielding to me in order that I, along with him and the others here, may undertake to express my appreciation of the work and the service of our mutual friend, the gentleman from North Carolina, GRAHAM BARDEN, who recently announced his retirement as a Member of the Congress.

I know of no citizen in North Carolina who enjoys the universal respect of his people in a greater measure than does GRAHAM BARDEN. He is, to be sure, a loyal and outstanding son of the Tar Heel State. In the words of the toast of our State, I think that we may say that GRAHAM BARDEN truly represents the expression in that toast that in the land of the longleaf pines the weak grow strong and the strong grow great. Certainly all agree that GRAHAM BARDEN is a great man.

His service in this House, his service as judge of the courts of his area, his service as a member of the general assembly of North Carolina were in each instance covered with the sort of performance which gives his constituents the proper grounds for being proud and appreciative of him. I personally appreciate the many kind acts that he has done for me as a Member of this body. His attitude of not being a dominating individual as far as his colleagues from North Carolina are concerned but one of great concern and one of understanding will remain as one of the fondest memories that I have in my association with him. As he returns to the beautiful home that he has on the Trent River just out of New Bern, N.C., and to live there among his friends and neighbors, including some of my relatives, I want to say to him that Mrs. Whitener and I look forward to seeing him on many occasions in the future, and we wish for him and his lovely wife and family all of the happiness which their outstanding service to their State and Nation entitles them to enjoy.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina for yielding to me.

Last spring it was my great pleasure to make the presentation of the George Washington Award of the American Good Government Society to the Honorable GRAHAM BARDEN, of North Carolina. The remarks I made then I meant and I mean them now.

GRAHAM BARDEN came to the Congress of the United States just a few months before I did. I got here a few days late in the 74th Congress. He was here for the beginning of that Congress and I got to know him shortly after. He sat on the Democratic side of the aisle and I sat on the Republican side. But through years we became great friends.

It became my happy privilege to be in that home of which some have spoken on the Trent River down in New Bern, N.C. And so I know something about GRAHAM BARDEN and the people who live in his community. I know something of the great affection they hold for him, an affection and a regard that impelled them to return him to the Congress of the United States time after time after time. And may I say, as some have said before me, that had he chosen to remain a Member of this body he would continue to be with us here. But he chose to retire. Because he has made that choice I certainly wish him well, as I do his wife and his fine family. Certainly he deserves the best that this country can give.

I know, of course, that many in this body at times disagreed with the stands that GRAHAM BARDEN took. Sometimes I disagreed with him. Sometimes I agreed with him. But there was one thing about GRAHAM BARDEN everyone always knew, and that is, that what he believed in he was ready to stand for, ready to make his stand known in the debates here on the floor of the House of Representatives.

Even those—and I say this advisedly—even those who disagreed with him most violently, on occasion, would yet grant to him complete sincerity of conviction, the highest degree of integrity and a firm belief that GRAHAM BARDEN always said and did exactly what he believed.

I am sorry that GRAHAM has elected to leave us. We could well use his services here in the Congress of the United States in the years ahead as we have used them in the years that have gone by.

But I trust he will come back to see us often, because I for one, as I am sure is true of every Member of this body, will be only too happy to have him among us again.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague from North Carolina [Mr. LENNON].

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Speaker, the fall of the gavel in ending the 86th Congress, brings to a close the distinguished legislative careers of a great many very able and distinguished Members of this body. There are two men from North Carolina who fall in that category, the Honorable GRAHAM A. BARDEN, and the Honorable CARL T. DURHAM. These two men are entirely different in their personalities. Both had long and distinguished records of public service in the State of North Carolina before they came to Washington. Nothing that could be said here this evening would point out to any of you who have known them for a long time the attributes and character of these two men. With their friends and personal acquaintances and in their personal dealings and in their social life they were as soft as velvet, but in the hard decisions that had to be made from time to time they could be and they were as hard as tempered steel itself.

I cannot believe that any man who has come to our great body from our beloved State of North Carolina at any time in history has had more courage, more raw courage, than GRAHAM A. BARDEN. I believe if the thinking people of America would turn to the record of this great man during his tenure of service here, if they would see and understand what I believe to be the facts, they would know that time and again he has been the man who has stood against those who would go beyond what he believes the constitutional concept of government is. Yet he has been the friend of all those who would let him be friendly.

Certainly in the field of education and in the field of labor law no man is better known in America than GRAHAM A. BARDEN. I say frankly and I believe most of those who are within the sound of my voice will agree with me that few men in this body have contributed more to the understanding of labor reform laws and education. He believed in both.

CARL T. DURHAM is one of the most beloved characters of any of our Members. He came to Washington less than 25 years ago, but during that time he has become known as a great authority in the field of atomic power. Serving as chairman and vice chairman of the great Joint Committee on Atomic Energy he has contributed much in this field.

It is certainly a great honor to me and a personal privilege to be permitted to stand here tonight and pay respect to these two great North Carolinians. We will miss them, but they will continue, I believe, in North Carolina, the great fight they waged on the floor and in the legislative committees of Congress. Their voices still will be heard here in one way or another.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues from North Carolina and the minority leader, and others, in paying tribute to a great American and an outstanding legislator. GRAHAM A. BARDEN always impressed everyone he met as being first a gentleman. He impressed everyone he met as being a man of strong convictions, a man who legislated in accordance with his convictions. He impressed everyone with his intellectual honesty.

He is a man who has been devoted to duty. He has given untiringly of his time in connection with his work in committee and in the performance of his duties on the floor of the House. I have a profound respect for GRAHAM BARDEN. As I said on a previous occasion, referring to another colleague of ours, while we did not always agree, I have a profound respect for him because I knew that he is intellectually honest. GRAHAM BARDEN is a man possessed of intellectual honesty. He leaves this body voluntarily. He has many years of life ahead

of him. Knowing him as we do, we know that he will not lead an inactive life, but will lead a very active one in whatever pursuits he may engage in in the years that lie ahead. I value very much the friendship that exists between GRAHAM BARDEN and myself, and I shall always treasure it. To GRAHAM and to Mrs. Barden and their loved ones I wish every happiness and success in the years that lie ahead.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS].

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, it is with somewhat mixed emotions that I rise to join my colleagues on the floor of the House, not only my colleagues from the State of North Carolina, but from other States as well, in paying a public tribute to GRAHAM BARDEN. I am delighted to have the opportunity of testifying in public to the very high regard I have for this distinguished North Carolinian, but am saddened at the thought that he is retiring from public life and that his great talents for leadership and as a legislator will no longer be available to the people of his district, the State of North Carolina, and our country.

I knew "HAP" BARDEN personally long before I came to Congress, and our relationships have always been cordial and friendly. Our wives have also been close friends for many years and they have been especially close to each other since we are neighbors in the same apartment house here in Washington.

Of all the people I have had the privilege of being associated with during my almost 8 years in Congress, "HAP" BARDEN stands out in my mind as one of the most outstanding. We have just heard the distinguished majority leader describe him as a man of strong convictions. I concur in that appraisal but would go one step beyond it and say that he is one man who has demonstrated over the years that he has the courage of his convictions. I have seen him on the floor of this Chamber stand by those convictions despite enormous pressures brought upon him to recede from them. When the history of this period has been written, I predict that the record will show that few Members of Congress have left a deeper imprint upon this body than GRAHAM BARDEN.

"HAP" as he is affectionately known by his friends, voluntarily leaves the service of his district, his State and his country. I have no doubt that he could have remained here indefinitely had he chosen to do so. But after having fought the good fight here, he now longs to return to the more peaceful and placid life he enjoys so much on the banks of the Trent River down in eastern North Carolina. As he does so and begins to live again among his family and friends in that community, I join all of his friends here in this body in extending to him and to his family my very kindest regards and sincere good wishes for long life, good health, and a full measure of happiness in the years that lie ahead.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, when I first came to the Congress in January 1943, I was assigned to the Committee on Education.

Its chairman, and the first under whom I was privileged to work, and from whom I learned a very great deal, was GRAHAM BARDEN. I do not know of any one person in the House who made a deeper impression on me personally. He had such a solidness, such courage and rocklike firmness when he had thought a thing through and decided what he believed to be the right position. But with the firmness was an unfailing kindliness, a sensitiveness to the problems and respect for the views of a new member of his committee.

In recent years our work here has not brought us so closely together, but I have never failed to be impressed by his presentation of his position on any issue—his directness, his honesty, his clarity. So, although our relationship has not been as intimate as I would have liked because his chief responsibilities and mine have generally been in different lines, there has been a special feeling of friendship for him—more like that of a son looking up to a father, or a follower looking up to a guide—in the relationship between GRAHAM BARDEN and myself.

I join with his host of friends in paying tribute to him today for the tremendous contributions he has made in the field of education. The first bill on which I worked in the House, and under his guidance, was the Vocational Rehabilitation Act which bears his name. Some were opposed to doing anything in this field that would take the Federal Government into education the least bit. Others favored steps that would have meant practically Federal control. But GRAHAM BARDEN said: "No, let us do the right thing, let the Federal Government do what it should to get the best program of vocational rehabilitation without going beyond the bounds of its proper role and responsibility. I am grateful for all I learned from him during these 18 years. I join in wishing him and his family every good thing in the years to come.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to my colleague from North Caroline [Mr. FOUNTAIN].

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for the privilege of joining my colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] and others in the House, in expressing my sincere regrets that our distinguished and able colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] has decided to retire from this great body. I am happy to join in the many fine tributes which have been paid this great American, not alone by Members of this House, but by countless numbers throughout the land. North Carolina and the Nation are losing a great and dedicated public servant.

When "HAP" BARDEN announced his decision to retire from this body and return to the community life of his hometown, all of North Carolina was grievously shocked. It was an unpleasant surprise, for his people wanted him to remain here. In fact, for a while they felt that he was letting them down. It took them some time to become reconciled to the fairness of his decision to himself, his lovely wife and family. Before being satisfied about his decision, however, countless numbers of our people urged him to change his mind and seek reelection. The entire North Carolina delegation and more than 100 others in this great body, individually and collectively, did the same thing. They knew that once GRAHAM BARDEN, after careful deliberation on any matter, made up his mind, he was not likely to change it. Nonetheless, in this instance their interest in the welfare of our Nation prompted them to try.

Like many other dedicated public servants North Carolina has sent to this great body "HAP" BARDEN had the esteem and the respect not alone of his own constituency but of thousands upon thousands of people throughout the country who even when they disagreed with him admired his unexcelled courage and intellectual honesty. No one ever had any doubt about where GRAHAM BARDEN stood in a given situation. When he analyzed a situation and made up his mind, there was no question about where he stood.

"HAP" BARDEN was and always will remain a friendly man. The name "HAP," given to him by friends many years ago, is a tribute to his great quality of friendliness. In his work here he was very frank, sometimes too frank for his own popularity in some areas, but in his frankness those of us who know him caught the spirit of his great convictions and his determination to stand by them at all cost. One thing in particular which impressed me about "HAP" BARDEN—sometimes seemingly a small thing but an important one—was his keen understanding of human nature. He could not and will never be fooled by anyone. In my opinion, this quality of seeing beyond the words of those with whom he dealt, together with his great qualities of understanding and love for his fellow man, enabled him to be the great legislator that he was. I wish I had time to give you a true picture of the esteem in which he is held by the people of his district. However, I am sure you know it from having known him. In addition to the many fine qualities to which I have referred and which others have already described, "HAP" BARDEN has a great sense of humor. This quality enabled him to express himself in righteous indignation against the desecration of any principle for which he stood without incurring the wrath of understanding opponents who knew him. This body will sorely miss "HAP" BARDEN. In our limited social gettogethers here in Washington we will also miss his lovely and charming wife whose personality and loving devotion have been to him a tower of strength through all of his public experience.

I therefore want to join others who have spoken here in the early hours of the morning in expressing the sincere hope that "HAP" and his lovely wife, "Aggie," will have in their retirement from the hustle and bustle of the difficult and trying experiences here in Washington an abundance of good health, happiness, and enduring friendships wherever they may be and in whatever they may undertake together during the years that lie ahead. If she could be here this morning, I am confident that Mrs. Fountain would join me

in my simple expressions of love and devotion for this great couple.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KEARNS].

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, as the ranking member of the Committee on Labor, and having served with GRAHAM BARDEN for 14 years on that distinguished committee, I would like to refer to him as the "Old Pro." I will never forget when we had the Landrum-Griffin bill up for consideration, when he took the floor we had a standing ovation for him, and I remember yielding him 25 minutes of my time on this side so he could make that last speech to put over the bill.

I will tell you something else. Whether you are Democrats or Republicans there will be very few men who ever come to the Congress, or who ever leave the Congress, who will be as highly respected as GRAHAM BARDEN.

On July 1, the day before Congress recessed for the national conventions, I had the members of my side of the committee, and some of our distinguished congressional leaders from both sides of the aisle, as well as members of the White House staff, over to my office for a little party in honor of GRAHAM. At that time our side of the committee gave me their signatures for a stainless steel tray which I had made and which I personally delivered to the chairman this morning in his office. The inscription on the tray, following the signatures, reads as follows: "Members of the committee who appreciated the privilege and good fortune of working with this distinguished American who served his country so well and who had their utmost respect and support."

So to GRAHAM BARDEN may I say, "You are going fishing, but we are going to be fishing for another man like GRAHAM."

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR].

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, as the junior member of the North Carolina delegation and the junior Member of this Congress, I wish to endorse the remarks made by my colleague. I feel honored to have served for even a few weeks with Mr. GRAHAM BARDEN.

For more than a quarter of a century he has served his district and his Nation in a very outstanding manner. I wish for him and his wife many years of happiness and many more years of useful public service.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am greatly honored to have the opportunity to express my deep feeling of friendship for GRAHAM BARDEN. I have never known a man for whom I held a higher regard. I am indeed happy that it was my lot in life to have been afforded the opportunity to meet and know this man and his lovely wife and family. His many kindnesses and courtesies, which were so badly needed when I first came to the Congress, will never be forgotten. In fact, I can never think of the Congress of the United States without thinking of GRAHAM BARDEN. To me, he is the true exemplification of an indispensable element of representative government. Much more could be said on the merits of this great American, and it is most difficult to sum up in a few words the things that ought to be said. However, if I were required to make such a brief summation, I would say, "GRAHAM BARDEN is the kind of man that you like for your children to know."

I wish for GRAHAM, his lovely wife Agnes, and their children and grandchildren all the happiness in the world.

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES].

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, it is my purpose and my privilege to pay my own tribute to GRAHAM BARDEN.

Mr. BARDEN was chairman of the Education and Labor Committee for 4 of the 6 years during which I was privileged to serve on that committee. I have never known a man to be more fair, more zealous and more of a mind to do the right thing at all times than is GRAHAM BARDEN.

He is not only a mentor under whom I was proud to work, but he is also a friend whose friendship and approbation I value very highly.

This is a man who epitomized manhood itself, and in his character and in his makeup may be found most of the good things which we prize as human beings and as members of the human race. He has strong, but well-considered viewpoints. Because of his faith in the principles he holds dear, he always speaks with a certain ring of truth which makes him one of the most persuasive of men.

I am sorry that he is leaving the Congress. He will be sorely missed, and he will never be adequately replaced. However, I am glad, in a way, that he will be able to spend the time that he desires to spend in his beloved North Carolina with his fine wife, his family, and his grandchildren, and to enjoy the fruits of the work and also the results of that work which he has earned so richly. So, as he leaves the halls of the Congress, I say to him, and I say this on behalf of myself and Mrs. Rhodes, that he knows he has friends here who will never forget him and who always will be available for any service that he may desire to call upon us to perform.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, concerning our friend GRAHAM BARDEN, I want to say that I happen to know that more than 100 Members of this body urged him to reverse his decision and to remain here and to continue in the service of his country. But, as pointed out by our colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOUNTAIN], when GRAHAM BARDEN makes up his mind, he makes up his mind. There is not enough pressure to be brought to bear upon him to remain here. I think he was invaluable. He was worthy of the confidence of his constituents and the love and the affection of the Members of this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, no Member's retirement from this body in history has caused more profound regret throughout the entire United States than that of GRAHAM BARDEN. The Nation recognized in GRAHAM BARDEN one of the greatest, most courageous and fearless national leaders of modern times. GRAHAM BARDEN's love for the man who labors by the sweat of his brow was demonstrated a thousand times by acts and legislation which prevented his unfair exploitation by pressure groups and selfish interests. GRAHAM BARDEN's devotion to the cause of real education and the freedom of education is one of the highlights of this national era. GRAHAM BARDEN's integrity, leadership, and forthrightness will always be a personal inspiration to me. Mrs. Dorn shared GRAHAM BARDEN's love for his beloved University of North Carolina, and she joins me in wishing for him and his fine family many, many years of happiness.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, the time has come to bid farewell to GRAHAM A. BARDEN as his retirement from the House of Representatives approaches. Some months ago when my colleague and warm personal friend issued the announcement that he would retire at the end of this session of the Congress, I had hoped, but in vain, something would occur that would change his mind and that he would agree to remain with us. Of course, I knew that he wanted to go home to New Bern but there was so much pressure from his fine constituency for him to reconsider, that I thought he might possibly give in to their desires.

Mr. Speaker, time does not permit nor is my vocabulary adequate to pay due tribute to an outstanding statesman—"HAP" BARDEN. HAP's retirement from this House leaves a void that probably will never be filled. He came to the Congress almost 26 years ago and he has rendered unfailing service to the people of the Third District of North Carolina. His retirement from public life brings to a close a legislative career that began in the North Carolina Legislature and reaches its peak with his distinguished service in the House of Representatives. He has occupied not only a most important position of leadership in this body, but a warm and affectionate spot in the hearts of all his colleagues. There have been many occasions when he has been opposed by his colleagues on both sides of the aisle regarding issues and legislation but never without obvious respect and admiration for his sincerity and ability. It has been said often in jest that HAP has the most even temper of any Member of the House of Representatives—always mad. This, of course, is not true. Underneath his rugged exterior he possesses one of the kindest and most sympathetic dispositions I have ever known. While HAP would never knowingly hurt anyone, he would certainly never dodge a legislative fight. No man in the Congress has been more firmly

dedicated to his legislative duties, and he has gained an outstanding reputation as a fearless leader.

In the 4 years that I have had the privilege of serving the Eighth District of North Carolina in the House of Representatives, I have been close to HAP BARDEN. Mrs. Kitchin and I have enjoyed the friendship of HAP and his charming wife Agnes, and proudly count them among our close and dearest friends.

In the retirement of my colleague and fellow North Carolinian the Nation loses an outstanding public servant, and I shall indeed miss him. HAP BARDEN will leave behind him a record of accomplishments, without taint or blemish, and the people of North Carolina and America are justly proud of his record.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I can honestly say that the Honorable GRAHAM ARTHUR BARDEN, the distinguished Democratic chairman of the Committee on Labor and Education, is one of the most valuable legislators in the Congress.

He was dominant in the exercise of the prerogatives of the powers of his office. Although many may disagree with his position on major legislation relative to education and labor, none can deny that he was solid in his antagonism to liberal legislation affecting education and labor. I personally like a person who is unswerving in matters that he or she feels honestly are not good for the citizenry of the Republic although I personally disagree with his position on the legislation.

Congressman BARDEN maintained his own views regardless of the opposition.

There are times when potent leadership must be assertive in its opposition. It is like a supreme guidance to travel slow and meditatively. It may delay progressive thinking but not necessarily destroy what eventually will come to pass. A slowdown sometimes is constructive in the finality of the passage of operative law.

This soldier, lawyer, and legislator gave invaluable services to his Nation. His retirement is a real loss. He was pointed in his understanding of legislative problems. He was honest and laborious in everything that he considered a legislative prerogative. We will miss our good friend who always sought the leveling influence of compromise in the areas of legislation that he felt were contributory to the welfare of our Nation.

We of the Illinois delegation, in honest desire, wish that in his retirement he enjoys the best of life's offerings—health and happiness to be enjoyed with his fine family.

The Nation, the State of North Carolina, and the citizens of our great Republic have lost a patriot and statesman whose absence will be noted in the Halls of the Congress. We, your colleagues, will sadly note your absence. God bless you and yours. We bid you Godspeed.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, it was with deep regret that I learned that my good friend and colleague, the Honorable GRAHAM A. BARDEN was voluntarily retiring from this distinguished body. We know him better as "HAP," since his jolly nature and happy disposition earned him that nickname. His fearlessness and his friendship have been a source of strength to me.

He has contributed an outstanding service to his district, our State, and the Nation since he began his service in the Congress.

After serving admirably in the U.S. Navy during World War I he attended the University of North Carolina, earning his LL.B. degree. While at the university he was an outstanding football player.

During his prominent career he taught school, practiced law, and served several terms as a judge of recorder's court of Craven County, before being elected to represent Craven County in the North Carolina General Assembly. He distinguished himself as a member of the North Carolina General Assembly by his ardent support of public schools; and gained such widespread and favorable attention he found no difficulty in winning a seat in the 74th Congress. He has been reelected to each succeeding Congress. Very early in his congressional career he was appointed to the House Committee on Education, later becoming chairman of that important committee, now known as the Committee on Education and Labor. He also served as chairman of the House Committee on Libraries.

Mr. BARDEN has had a prominent role in many acts of legislative importance in the fields of labor and education. One of his most outstanding accomplishments was in the preparation of legislation which expanded the vocational education program throughout the Nation. This has provided many the opportunity to train in vocation service. This act bears his name with that of Senator George. Another act he has highly instrumental in was the Barden-La Follette Act, which makes vocational training possible for all types of physically handicapped people.

Congressman BARDEN was also active in the passage of the Taft-Hartley bill. And was also a leader in the passage of the Landrum-Griffin bill which was designed to control corruption in the unions.

"HAP" has never been a quitter; he has always displayed that rare quality known as courage; and is possessed of common sense. Of him it can be said that he has given faithful and distinguished service.

His retirement is a loss not only to the people of North Carolina but also to our entire Nation. Indeed, he will be greatly missed.

But while his retirement is our loss, I hope he will gain much from his well-earned rest, relaxation, the joys of spending more time with his devoted family, and many pleasant hours spent fishing.

I wish "HAP" and his lovely family many, many years of good health and contentment and hope they will come back often to see us.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I certainly would not want to leave Washington without expressing my regrets over the fact that my colleague and personal friend, GRAHAM BARDEN, has decided to retire from Congress. The Nation and entire world, in my opinion, has suffered a great loss by Mr. BARDEN's decision to retire from the Congress of the United States. He has always been a tower of strength and has prevented more obnoxious legislation from passing the House than any other Member of Congress since I have been a Member of this great body. He is one of the leading exponents of constitutional government in the United States and its seems that that vintage is getting very scarce in his country. I have witnessed on numerous occasions, Mr. BARDEN's influence in preventing legislation from being enacted that would have completely circumvented our Constitution and would have placed in the hands of the Federal Government powers which were intended by our Founding Fathers to remain in the hands of the individual State governments. I certainly can understand why Mr. BARDEN has decided to retire as it is certainly no pleasure to serve on a committee or in any body where the cards are stacked against you. I know GRAHAM BARDEN has had an uphill fight since the day he was selected as chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee in order to at least preserve a part of the Constitution and prevent us from having a total Central Government.

He was responsible to a great extent for the passage of the Taft-Hartley Act, a law which if properly administered, would curtail a number of the terrible strikes we have witnessed here in this country during the past few years. He was also the tower of strength in the passage of the Landrum-Griffin bill which also if properly administered would at least do something to curb the activities of some of our power-drunk labor leaders.

I certainly do not believe in stacking any committee with any group whether they be liberal or conservative, to the extent that a chairman cannot properly administer the affairs of the committee. In fact, I think the Ways and Means Committee, who has jurisdiction of selecting Members to serve on the individual legislative committees, should consult with the chairman before they assign any new Member to a committee, as the chairman is responsible for the type of legislation that is reported from his committee, and he should be given some preference as to who is assigned to his committee.

I wish for Mr. and Mrs. Barden good health and happiness during their retirement years and hope I will have an opportunity to join him on several fishing trips at a future date.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to say that as one travels down the pathway of life, he is sometimes privileged to meet rare and truly brilliant personalities.

Such a personality is GRAHAM A. BARDEN, a colleague with whom it has been a real honor to serve in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. BARDEN will no longer be with the House of Representatives, having determined to pursue the course of private

life. As he leaves this Chamber, one is quickly led to think of the high quality and fine character of this man, an individual whose great ability, firm convictions, and high principles make him, in effect, shine forth like a bright light.

During the 9 years that I have served in the House of Representatives, the Honorable GRAHAM A. BARDEN has served as an example for me, for one becomes completely convinced that in emulating a man of this sterling nature he spontaneously enhances his own nature. Firm of fiber as he is, he epitomizes the grand quality of those stalwarts who have gone before him, of those men in our Nation's history who activated those principles which functioned to make this country truly great.

It is my earnest wish that more men of his quality will come to the Halls of the Congress.

I shall always cherish the privilege that has been mine in serving in the Congress with Mr. BARDEN. May his future years harbor a bounty of health and happiness, for through his dedicated service he has earned a heavy harvest of reward.

He has been a man competent to the struggle, possessed of a perseverance born of deep faith in what he considered right. Great, then, is his reward, for he reaps the satisfaction that comes only to those who have labored hard, fought a fair fight, and adhered unflinchingly to principle.

Wherever GRAHAM A. BARDEN walks, he will have my admiration for a companion.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, during my short service in Congress I have had one experience that stands high among the most pleasant ones of my entire life, the privilege and honor of becoming acquainted and associated with many Members of the U.S. Congress. Among these I regard my esteemed colleague, Hon. GRAHAM A. BARDEN, as outstanding in several respects, for his strength of character, courage, ability, and dedication to the causes he believes are just and right.

Long occupying a position of great power and influence as chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor, he did not use his position as a weapon of domination and abuse but rather as a medium of great service to his country and to his people.

The real measure of a man may often be discovered by his reaction to power and authority vested in him. GRAHAM BARDEN'S career and record in Congress reveal that he has understood that authority is always accompanied by responsibility and that power may become tyranny without wisdom. Again and again during his long congressional career he has demonstrated his deep wisdom, keen sense of responsibility, dedication to the causes he believed to be right, and has stood steadfastly by his convictions in the face of many partisan political pressures.

I regret to see this my respected and esteemed friend retire from Congress, but I wish for him and his good and lovely wife many, many happy years in quiet and peaceful retirement among the scenes and among the people they love so much.

RETIREMENT OF THE HONORABLE CARL DURHAM

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, our beloved colleague, CARL DURHAM is voluntarily retiring from Congress. During his long service here he has won the love, affection, and esteem of his colleagues. He has made a record of which his loved ones, his friends, and his constituents can be justly proud. He has at all times been worthy of the confidence of the people he has so well and ably represented and by the simplicity of his life and the kindliness of his manner, and by his great devotion to duty, he has endeared himself to all of us. For many long years he has been a dedicated and a devoted public servant and he has made many grand contributions to the welfare and the happiness of the people of his district, State, and Nation. He is taking kindly the counsel of the years and gracefully surrendering the things of youth and the great burdens of high office and is going home to the people he loves and to the people who love him. CARL DURHAM has always been gentle and kind and thoughtful. Actually, as much as I shall miss him, I am delighted that he has made the great decision to be kind to himself and to fish and to hunt and to live just like he wants to live. He leaves this hall with the love and affection of every Member of this House. As chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, he has learned a lot about the world in which we live and about the dangers that are lurking in the days ahead. In magnificent fashion he has discharged every duty which has been assigned to him and has proven himself to be a great American.

While CARL DURHAM is leaving us and retiring from Congress, he will never actually retire. I am certain that he will always be available and will give to his country the benefit of his sound advice and counsel.

Our good wishes go with him, may God bless and keep him.

I yield now, Mr. Speaker, to my colleague from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER].

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, CARL T. DURHAM and I came together to the 76th Congress. I had known CARL for many years previous to that time. He is a graduate of the University of North Carolina. He served his profession of pharmacist entirely at Chapel Hill, N.C. In all probability, he was counselor to more students that attended the University of North Carolina than any other man who ever lived or resided for any period of time in Chapel Hill.

As the dean of our delegation has said, he was a gentle person. He was able; faithful to the trust imposed in him here. He always enjoyed the work of the Committee on Armed Services and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. He now returns to the mellowness of the university, the campus, the town of Chapel Hill, and to the surrounding area where he will enjoy life in the outdoors, because he is a lover of nature. As has been said, he enjoys hunting and fishing. He will smoke his pipe in peace.

I wish him many, many enjoyable days throughout the remainder of his life, for it can be truly said, when you look at the composition of the House of Representatives and see the many types of men reflected, that CARL smoked his pipe and enjoyed the fellowship here and the respect of the membership of the House and of those who knew him personally. I shall always remember the pleasant companionship of this fine friend. I wish him happiness, to which he is so justly entitled.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to our colleague from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS].

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join my colleagues from North Carolina, and from other States as well, in paying a public tribute to CARL DURHAM as he voluntarily retires from Congress. As the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina who just preceded me said, CARL DURHAM lived for many years before coming to Congress in that quiet and peaceful village of Chapel Hill where is located the University of North Carolina.

I first came to know CARL DURHAM at Chapel Hill many years ago when I was a student there. The warm friendship I formed with him at that time has continued down through the years. When I came to the House in the 83d Congress, he was among the first of the older Members to extend to me the right hand of fellowship. This friendship has never been marred by a single incident and I have profited greatly from it, not only because of the personal nature of it but because I felt that I could rely upon him for guidance and counsel in the area of his special legislative interest.

As has already been so well said, CARL DURHAM has rendered outstanding service to our country in the important positions he has held here in the House, as a member and Chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and as a member of the important Committee on Armed Services. The people of his district can ill afford to lose the services of this outstanding Congressman but he has well earned the rest he now claims for himself. He can go back to that quiet little village of Chapel Hill and enjoy the remaining years of what I hope will be a long life in the full realization that he has contributed his fair share to the progress, the development, and the security of our country.

CARL DURHAM is a quiet, gentle person and during the many conversations I have held with him over the years I have never heard him speak harshly about any man. I doubt if he has an enemy in the whole wide world, and this is something that can be said about very few men who have been active on the political scene. As he takes leave of this body, I know he will carry with him the affection, esteem, and high regard of the Members on both sides of the aisle.

AS CARL DURHAM surrenders his important position here on the national scene and enters upon his retirement, I

wish for him all of the good things of life and express the hope that it may be a long one and that the years ahead will be filled with happiness.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity to pay a few words of tribute to two great North Carolinians who are retiring from the Congress, CARL T. DURHAM and our good friend, GRAHAM A. BARDEN. I have known both of these men for 22 years. While we have been of different political faiths, I have learned to respect them very highly.

Throughout the years I have served on the Rules Committee, each of these wonderful legislators, and they have been great legislators, have appeared before our committee many times representing their respective committees. The greatest tribute that I can pay to both these gentlemen is the fact that whatever they might say before our committee was always taken by us as being the exact truth. Never once did either gentleman every try to misrepresent any bill or any feature of it. Both were absolutely honest and frank in their explanations of the measures that came under their jurisdiction. It became a saying within the Rules Committee that when GRAHAM A. BARDEN or CARL T. DURHAM asked for a rule on a bill they were entitled to receive it promptly. We could depend on everything they said, and everything they did. Our committee always had great confidence in their knowledge and their honesty of purpose. Never once have they been other than men of the highest character and the greatest political and moral courage, as well as exceptionally able legislators. So it is a pleasure for me to join in the so well deserved tributes that are being paid to each of these men.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE].

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have the opportunity to join with my colleagues of North Carolina and other Members of the House in paying this well deserved tribute to one of the finest men I have had the privilege of knowing, CARL T. DURHAM.

I have had the privilege of knowing CARL since I first came to the House in the 79th Congress. Coming here at that time, it was my good fortune to be assigned to the old Military Affairs Committee. CARL T. DURHAM was one of the leading members of the committee at that time. He had several assignments as a subcommittee chairman. I remember one of them was on strategic materials. I was assigned to his subcommittee. We formed a close friendship in those days.

Later on, in the first session of the 79th Congress, by legislative act the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy was set up. I was fortunate then to be among those selected as members of the joint committee. CARL T. DURHAM was one of those original members. As he leaves the joint committee which he has headed as chairman and vice chairman under a system of rotation between the House and the Senate he will leave only two original House Members on that committee.

I served also on the House Armed Services Committee with CARL for a period of 14 years. I served on his subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee. For the past 6 years I have been the vice chairman of the subcommittee headed by Mr. DURHAM. So it has been a great privilege and a pleasure to me to have had this close association with such a good, kind, and considerate man. I have learned much through my association with CARL T. DURHAM. Frequently I went to him for advice and counsel. He was a true gentleman. He was a great legislator. I want to wish him well in his retirement. It is a well-deserved retirement. He accepted it as his own decision. He could be of great service for many long years in the House of Representatives, but he is entitled to the rest he now seeks, and I join with his colleagues and his friends in wishing him well in his retirement.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. WESTLAND].

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege to be associated with CARL DURHAM during the past 2 years as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. This may seem like a short time nevertheless I felt I got to know CARL DURHAM quite well and I count him as a friend even though this period was all too brief. During that time and in the counsels of the joint committee, I learned to respect this man and to respect his views. As one other gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER] has previously stated, CARL DURHAM sort of smoked his pipe in peace and used his brain power to the benefit not only of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy but to the benefit of the public and the world at large. CARL DURHAM is an asset, I believe, a great asset to the Congress of the United States, to the Joint Committee and to the welfare of this Nation. Some of us have already said that Carl has complete mental integrity and honesty. This I thoroughly confirm. Although we are of different parties, CARL DURHAM and I have much in common and it has been a privilege to see the man in action, to see him quietly and decisively analyze problems that came before the committee and to hear him make his speech or his short talk on the subject at hand. That talk generally was rather decisive, and I might say the room was quiet when CARL DURHAM spoke, for his words were well worth listening to. Someone has also said CARL DURHAM is an outdoor man. I found we had a mutual interest in the game of golf about which we spoke frequently. I believe CARL DURHAM leaving this Congress is a real loss, for his counsel will be missed. But, I too wish him the best of luck as he goes into retirement from the Congress a well deserved period of enjoyment.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to our distinguished majority whip, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to have this opportunity to join in this tribute to this good and lovable man. The word "gentleman" in reference to CARL DURHAM carries with it more than a mere parliamentary connotation, because if there ever was a gentleman in every sense of the word in this or any other body, it was this gentleman from North Carolina. Few Members have served this Congress, few have served this generation as well as the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM]. When he has spoken on atomic energy matters, or defense matters, every Member of the House gave him the kind of attention that the substance of his message always deserved.

Mr. Speaker, I join all other Members in regretting that these two great North Carolinians and outstanding Americans, CARL DURHAM and GRAHAM BARDEN, have chosen to retire from this body. The great State of North Carolina has sent many imminent men to this House, including my own chairman, Mr. COOLEY, who now occupies the well of the House. Among North Carolina's most eminent men are the gentlemen to whom we pay this tribute today. We wish them many happy and useful years in the life that lies before them.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished minority whip, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, to all the fine things that have been said here about these two outstanding North Carolinians, GRAHAM BARDEN and CARL DURHAM, I just utter hearty "Amen" of understanding.

It has been my privilege to serve better than 20 years with each one of these men, and to know them well. I am truly sorry they are leaving Congress. I am sorry they are leaving because they are fine, intellectual, outstanding individuals whom we will not only miss personally, but we will miss their valuable service in this great body.

I probably knew CARL DURHAM a little more intimately than I did GRAHAM BARDEN due to the fact that we worked together on the old Military Affairs Committee for many years and then the House Armed Services Committee. In the many, many times I have been with him in committee and on the floor of the House it has always interested me to almost see CARL's mind functioning as it did, trying to get to the root of all the problems that confronted the committee and then finally come out in his own particular way with an analysis of the situation as he saw it, very clear, very concise, and very pointed. He was thorough in his approach to these important problems, and I listened to him with profit. He was sound. He was constructive. He was objective. He was the type of fellow one could properly call a friend, and I am proud to call him my friend.

I have repeatedly said of service in this great body, that one of its richest rewards is that we become acquainted with outstanding individuals such as these two Members from North Carolina who are going to retire.

Along with many other colleagues on both sides of the aisle, I join in wishing that they may enjoy all the fine things they have long wanted to do. I wish for

them the best in all the years to come. I am proud of my friendship with these two great men.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ALEXANDER].

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I have mixed emotions when I think of our friend and colleague, Hon. CARL T. DURHAM, leaving us. I am happy for him to have a well-deserved rest, but am well aware of how keenly he will be missed.

CARL DURHAM is completing his 11th term as a most able Representative of the Sixth District of North Carolina.

When I came here 8 years ago as a freshman Congressman his wise counsel and warm friendship meant much to me. I still value most highly his guidance and his friendship.

His competence and loyalty have been felt on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, where he served with distinction as its chairman. He is also a highly valued member of the Armed Services Committee.

CARL DURHAM is a most effective Member of Congress in a quiet, unassuming way. He has always gotten along exceptionally well with his fellow Members; is much admired and deeply respected. He has been an outstanding Member of Congress, a credit to the district he represents, the State of North Carolina, and our country. He will be sorely missed.

I wish him happiness and good health as he returns to North Carolina to enjoy life in leisure.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOUNTAIN].

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, there is little of genuine substance that can be added to what has already been said about our distinguished colleague CARL DURHAM, who like our great friend "HAP" BARDEN, has made the decision to retire from public life to return to his fine home in the beautiful and restful community of Chapel Hill, N.C., the seat of the oldest State university in America.

However, I would feel that I had made a great omission if I did not seize upon this opportunity to join the dean of our delegation, the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], and others, in paying my personal tribute to this true friend and great public servant. The same things which many of us have said about "HAP" BARDEN are applicable to CARL DURHAM, except in a different sort of way. Like "HAP" BARDEN, CARL DURHAM is a man of great courage and conviction. He simply has a different type of personality and way of expressing himself. He is a kind and gentle man, always friendly and never forgetting the limitless possibilities in other men with whom he deals.

CARL DURHAM is a man of great vision and learning. He grew up in an atmosphere of intellectual curiosity. In addition to his own personal efforts, the spirit of the community in which he lived was a part of him and his life in the Congress.

CARL DURHAM, like "HAP" BARDEN has been a friend of mine since I came to this body as a freshman in 1953. On many occasions, I have called upon him for help and advice in connection with matters affecting the people of the district which I represent, matters concerning which he had peculiar knowledge and background because of his long years of experience on the Armed Services Committee. He never turned me down. Even when at times it was obvious that our efforts would be in vain, he never said no. He cooperated fully with the sympathetic understanding which means so much to new and younger Members of this body. Yes, CARL DURHAM was and always will be a friend of man. In his retirement, North Carolina and the Nation are losing another great and dedicated public servant who, like "HAP" BARDEN, has been a statesman of the first order. The loss of men like these would be frightening to us if we did not know of the caliber and competence of their worthy successors whom you will meet next January. At the same time, all of North Carolina knows that CARL DURHAM, after more than 20 years of faithful and devoted public service on the part of the people of his district, State, and Nation, has earned the right to spend the remainder of his life in his home community among his close personal friends there. I have frequently heard him say how much he looked forward to doing certain things which time here never seemed to permit—the little things, the simple things which really count and bring happiness.

You know, the remainder of us in the North Carolina delegation will feel the loss of these two great men, "HAP" BARDEN and CARL DURHAM, probably more than anyone else. We have depended upon them, and upon the dean of our delegation, Mr. COOLEY, who will still be with us, for leadership in their respective fields and in so many areas in which we are naturally interested. Their wisdom and understanding will not be with us on the immediate scene. Our decisions will be more difficult; but we can take consolation in the fact that the spirit of these two men is still here and that their great convictions and courage will be a source of inspiration and incentive in our continued efforts here, should the people of our respective districts see fit to return us.

It is hard to find words to express one's feelings when our friends leave our midst, particularly when they have meant so much to us. Words just never seem adequate for an occasion such as this, but at least we know how we feel.

In concluding this personal tribute to CARL DURHAM, this man of great stature, I want to join his many friends in wishing for him during the years that lie ahead an abundance of the very best things in life—good health, happiness and a continuation of enduring friendships. If Mrs. Fountain could be here in person, I am confident that she would join me in everything I have said, except in her way, she could probably say it better.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, some weeks ago when I read in the newspapers that CARL DURHAM had announced he was not going to seek reelection, I made remarks about him on the floor of the House on that occasion. As a matter of fact, my remarks were made in an effort to try to prompt a grassroots urge from the people of his district that would influence CARL to be a candidate again.

CARL DURHAM is one of the outstanding Members of this body. He has wielded a powerful influence in the deliberations of this body, particularly in the field of national defense and in the field of atomic and nuclear energy. There is no Member of this body who has contributed more to the national defense of America than has CARL DURHAM, and no man has contributed more toward progress in the field of atomic energy and nuclear energy than has this great American, this son of North Carolina.

I join with my North Carolinian friends in the House and the other friends of CARL DURHAM in wishing for him every happiness for many years to come.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in paying tribute to CARL DURHAM. We will miss his presence here on the floor but this House and this Nation and indeed the whole free world are much better off today for his untiring efforts here in behalf of freedom. Mrs. Dorn joins me in wishing for CARL DURHAM and his family much continued success and every happiness.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, as we approach adjournment of this session of the Congress, I am saddened by the fact that two able and patriotic sons of North Carolina are retiring from this body at the end of the year. My beloved colleague, the Honorable CARL DURHAM, of the Sixth Congressional District of North Carolina, has served his constituents with great distinction for 22 years. He has played a vital role as chairman and vice chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy in the development, use, and control of atomic energy, and today is a ranking member of the House Armed Services Committee.

I, of course, regret CARL'S decision to retire but I respect his reasons for doing so, and now as he returns to North Carolina, may he have the time to do some of the things he has wanted to do for many years but which have been precluded by the pressures of official congressional duties.

It has been my privilege to serve with him on the House Armed Services Committee and I deeply appreciate the advice and counsel which he has given me from time to time since I arrived on the Washington scene. In this association, I have come to know and admire his outstanding qualifications.

In going back to Chapel Hill to join his friends and loved ones, I am sure that CARL will not lose interest in public affairs and I feel North Carolina will continue to receive the benefit of his wise counsel gained through long legislative experience.

I wish for CARL DURHAM in his retirement many years of good health and happiness as a reward for the outstanding service he has rendered our Nation.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members

who desire to do so may have the privilege of extending their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER].

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, the words said by the majority leader in reference to his reaction to the announcement of the retirement of our distinguished friend, Hon. CARL DURHAM, constitutes, I am sure the feeling of most of us who know and love this outstanding North Carolinian.

As has been well said here, Mr. DURHAM was adviser and counselor to many thousands of students at the University of North Carolina over a period of many years that he served in that community in an unselfish manner, which was so typical of the man whom we honor here this evening. CARL DURHAM to me is one of the most gentlemanly men that I have ever known. Within the past few days he has again manifested that spirit as he brought here to Washington the young gentleman who was recently nominated by the Democratic Party as the candidate for his seat in the House of Representatives. I had the privilege of meeting with this young man on several occasions, and his heart was full of appreciation for the fatherly interest which our friend, CARL DURHAM, had shown to the gentleman in helping him to orient himself as he moves forward during the future years of service as successor to Mr. DURHAM. I join with all who have so eloquently expressed their appreciation for the life and works of our friend, CARL DURHAM, in wishing for him a complete happiness as he returns to the quiet life of Chapel Hill and the life of the nimrod and the hunter in North Carolina.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, it is with sincere regret that I have learned that our colleague and my friend, the Honorable CARL DURHAM, has decided to retire from the House of Representatives.

Mr. DURHAM and I came to the Congress together in 1939.

Shortly thereafter, Mr. DURHAM was assigned to the Committee on Military Affairs, of which I was also a member. We continued on the Committee on Military Affairs until the establishment of the Committee on Armed Services in 1947.

We have both continued to serve side by side on the Committee on Armed Services until the present time.

In addition, for a period of 10 years I served with Mr. DURHAM on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, of which he has had the distinction of serving as Chairman and Vice Chairman.

It has been my privilege, therefore, to have been intimately associated with this distinguished American throughout his career in the Congress of the United States.

During his congressional service, Mr. DURHAM has been closely connected with all phases of national defense policies. But in all of his legislative assignments and responsibilities, he has been a faithful Member who has discharged his duties wisely, faithfully, and consistently.

As chairman of important subcommittees of the Committee on Armed Services, he has done much to promote and assure the security of our Nation and the free world.

Mr. DURHAM stands out in the Congress of the United States as the leading authority on the stockpiling of vital and strategic materials so essential to our security. His foresight in this important area of national defense has contributed greatly to our security position.

My best wishes for happiness and contentment go with this distinguished, soft spoken, wise American as he leaves this body to go into retirement.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I want to join in the tributes being paid CARL DURHAM, an outstanding American statesman who has contributed so much to the successful implementation of American atomic policies as well as to the other broad fields of military security.

Few men have had such wide respect for their legislative specialties. Any position which CARL DURHAM took in the field of atomic energy was bound to be one of great logic.

All of us in the House in addition know CARL DURHAM as a gentle and kind person who has inspired the respect and affection of us all.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in saying a few words in behalf of my good friend, Dr. CARL DURHAM, who was sworn in as a Member of Congress on the same date and the same hour as I was in 1939. Dr. DURHAM will be greatly missed by not only the Members of Congress but by the people throughout the United States, as he was one of the leading members of the House Armed Services Committee and was an authority on atomic energy.

I have thoroughly enjoyed Dr. DURHAM's friendship during the 22 years we have served as Members of the House of Representatives, and will look forward to seeing him often during his retirement.

I wish for him all the happiness and good health possible during these years of retirement.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues in paying honor and expressing esteem for Representative CARL DURHAM. I was not permitted to serve with him very long as he is now leaving this body and I have been a Member for only a few weeks. However, I have been an admirer of Mr. DURHAM for many years.

During a long span of public service, he has demonstrated integrity, from which he has never wavered. He has given a full measure of his time and energy and talents to the duties of his office. He has aided in keeping this country strong and free. I wish for CARL DURHAM many more years of happiness and useful public service.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely regret that our distinguished colleague from North Carolina, the Honorable CARL DURHAM, has found it desirable to retire voluntarily from the House of Representatives.

Having served with him here for 18 years, during about half of that time on the House Committee on Armed Services, I have learned to respect and admire Mr. DURHAM. Few men are better informed on subjects in which they have specialized. In the field of atomic energy and in the military field, CARL DURHAM is an expert. That knowledge has been invaluable to him in connection with legislation dealing with these subject matters.

CARL DURHAM leaves behind him a legacy of distinguished service to his country. I join with his many friends in Congress in extending to him and his family best wishes for happiness and good health during the years ahead.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, prior to coming to Congress, I was not acquainted with CARL DURHAM, but many of my friends who did know him invariably spoke of him as being about the finest gentleman you ever saw. During the 4 years I have been privileged to know and be associated with him, I have come to that identical conclusion. On every occasion, under all circumstances, he is a gentleman in every sense of the term. No Member of the House is held in higher respect and esteem by those who know him than CARL DURHAM.

It has been said, "Gentility is neither in birth, wealth, manner, nor fashion—but in the mind. A high sense of honor, a determination never to take a mean advantage of another, an adherence to truth, delicacy, politeness toward those with whom we have dealings, are its essential characteristics." CARL DURHAM has all of these characteristics and has maintained them through the performance of his trying duties in one of the most important, influential, and sensitive positions in the Congress as chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

No Member of Congress whom I have known has approached the performance of his duties more conscientiously or with a deeper sense of personal responsibility than CARL DURHAM. In the histories that will be written of this period there will certainly be a chapter devoted to the use and development of atomic energy. CARL DURHAM's name will as certainly be listed high among those whose good common sense, courage, and vision made immense contributions to the wonders of this, the atomic age.

I join my colleagues in expressing regret that CARL has seen fit to retire and in wishing him many years of happy retirement in an atmosphere more restful and peaceful than that in which he has labored so long and so well.

RETIREMENT OF SENATOR O'MAHONEY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. THOMSON].

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, on this eve of adjournment of the 86th Congress, I want to take this opportunity to pay tribute to Wyoming's senior Senator, JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, who is retiring after 25 years of service to his State and to the Nation.. Senator

O'MAHONEY, or Senator JOE, as he is affectionately known in the State of Wyoming, first came to Cheyenne, Wyo., in 1916 as editor of the Cheyenne State Leader. In 1917 he came to Washington as Secretary to Senator John B. Kendrick. His devotion to the Congress is evidenced by the fact that by choice and prerogatives of seniority he now occupies the same suite of offices that he came to when he served Senator Kendrick. After this service, he returned to Wyoming to practice law. In 1933, with the Democrat victory, he was singled out and appointed First Assistant Postmaster General of the United States. In November 1933, on the death of Senator Kendrick, he was appointed to fill the vacancy. Since that time he has served four full terms and one short term, over a quarter of a century in the Senate of the United States.

I must frankly state that I have never worked to elect Senator JOE to the U.S. Senate, but as a Republican, I have admired him.

Mr. Speaker, Senator O'MAHONEY is a man of great conviction. What he believes in he fights for all the way. After he thinks things out he does what he thinks is right.

I remember, for myself, his opposition to the so-called packing of the Supreme Court. He stood steadfast in that case for what he believed, in spite of partisan political pressures.

I may say that it has been my privilege to serve as the sole representative of the State of Wyoming in this body for the past 6 years, and may I say just as I have said on many occasions, both privately and publicly in the State of Wyoming during that time, because I have felt it so deeply, this: On many basic issues we have differed, and differed widely, but our differences were genuine, and I am sure that we were both motivated by what we thought was best for the country. But, when it came to something for the State of Wyoming or for the area we represented, particularly in the State of Wyoming, never could I have found a more kindly, guiding, helpful individual than Senator O'MAHONEY. Not once in the 6 years that I have served here have I ever called upon him for assistance in regard to a bill pertaining to our State that that help was not forthcoming immediately. Often were the times I called on him for assistance because I have always served in the minority and because of his close and long friendship with the majority leader and with the Speaker of this body, and at all times he responded. He is dedicated to our State and to those things that go to improve it, and the living memorials that he leaves in the State of Wyoming, the things that are good and will be good for the future are too many to even mention on the floor of this House. I can think of no greater tribute than to say that Senator O'MAHONEY was a strong adversary and a stanch ally. You would like to have him on your side under any circumstances.

On six occasions, as I have mentioned, over the past 25 years, Senator O'MAHONEY has submitted himself to the supreme test in the State of Wyoming, the judgment of the people of our State; and in each case he was given their favorable and resounding verdict by being elected to the United States Senate.

I have known his wife, Agnes, well. In the city of Cheyenne her name is revered and she has a host of friends. Both the Senator and Mrs. O'Mahoney have been in ill health. I hope that his being relieved of some of his arduous duties will have a therapeutic effect for both of them. Speaking for myself and for their host of friends in Wyoming I wish them well and Godspeed and the best of everything, which I am sure will be theirs.

Senator O'MAHONEY has written on the statutes of the United States a memorial that will live forever, to which I cannot add. He will always be remembered for his great service to Wyoming and to the Nation, and, I might add, to the world.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I join the gentleman from Wyoming in the tribute he has paid to Senator JOE O'MAHONEY. I first met JOE O'MAHONEY when he was Assistant Postmaster General and throughout the years there has been a close and continuing friendship between us.

JOE O'MAHONEY is a man of strong convictions. He is a real, a sincere progressive. Like myself, he believes that government, in practical operation, operates to serve the weak. The strong do not need it. That does not mean that he felt that government in practical operation should destroy the strong, but he felt that in practical operation the strong, not needing it, government must operate to serve the weak. And by that, I refer to social security, unemployment compensation, attacking monopolies, fighting for the best interests of the small and independent businesses, always on the side of legislation to meet abuses and strengthen the family life of our country, and thereby our country itself.

JOE O'MAHONEY is a man of broad and understanding views. His relationship with his fellow men is one of understanding. He has been truly one of the great legislators of the period of time in which I have served in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, he has suffered much in recent months, even in the past several years. He has performed his duties under great physical difficulty. But the grim determination of this man is evidenced by his adherence to duty even under great physical pain and difficulty.

JOE O'MAHONEY leaves the halls of Congress with the knowledge that the legislative life of our country has been enriched and improved upon as a result of his service in the U.S. Senate. I wish for JOE O'MAHONEY and his loved ones every happiness in the years that lie ahead.

HON. TOBY MORRIS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, among the beloved and distinguished Members of this body who will not return to the next Congress is our colleague from Oklahoma, my longtime personal friend, TOBY MORRIS. TOBY and I were first elected to this House in the 1946 election and served together in the 80th Congress. TOBY represented at that time the Sixth District of Oklahoma, and he represented it continuously until after the 1950 decennial census when our State was redistricted. As a result of the 1950 census Oklahoma lost two seats in the House. Thereafter the Sixth and Seventh Oklahoma Districts were consolidated into one district, so that the present Sixth District is almost a combination of the two former districts, the Seventh District having been represented by a former colleague, Mr. Wickersham, who will serve in the next Congress.

In the recent Oklahoma primary election, Mr. MORRIS carried his own part of the district, the old Sixth District area, by an overwhelming majority. He carried the county in which he was reared, Cotton County, Okla., by about 4 or 5 to 1. He carried the county in which he now lives, one of the largest counties in the State, Comanche County, by 4 or 5 or 6 to 1. The difference between the two candidates in that election was less than 500 votes out of more than 80,000 votes, each carrying his own old district. Had it not been for the redistricting of Oklahoma, TOBY would have served continuously in this body ever since his first election without any question of doubt, because he always has carried that part of the district 2, 3, and 4 to 1.

TOBY MORRIS has had a fine career as a Member of this body and as a member of the bench and bar of Oklahoma. Before he came to the House of Representatives he had served for many years as a district judge, which is the trial court of general jurisdiction in Oklahoma. He had an enviable record of having been reversed by the appellate courts of Oklahoma as few times as any judge who ever served in our State from any district. He was an eminent jurist indeed.

Every Member of this House knows how well TOBY MORRIS has served his district, his State and his country. As a member of the Committee on Armed Services and as a member prior to that time of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, his service has been distinguished and outstanding. Few men can boast a more distinguished record of service in the House. None can boast greater fidelity to his trust.

Mr. ANDERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON of Minnesota. I merely want to say that I have never known a finer gentleman than TOBY MORRIS of Oklahoma. It is going to be a distinct loss to the House of Representatives to see him leave this body.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BELCHER].

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues from Oklahoma in paying tribute to one of the finest friends I have in the House of Representatives. Although TOBY MORRIS was a great district judge prior to the time he came to the Congress and I was practicing law in Oklahoma, I never had the privilege of trying a case before him. But upon coming to the Congress 10 years ago, he and I became close friends. TOBY is a friendly man. He is easy to be friends with. I do not know of a single Member in this House of Representatives who has as many friends as he has and is as well respected as TOBY. I certainly believe he is one of the hardest working, sincere, and consicentious Members I have ever known in the House. I wish for TOBY and Mrs. Morris a very happy and successful retirement.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Maine [Mr. MCINTIRE].

Mr. MCINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I, too, join in expressing the pleasure that has been mine and Mrs. McIntire's in getting acquainted with Mr. and Mrs. Toby Morris. We are apartment neighbors and it has been a real pleasure to us. Serving here in the House of Representatives with TOBY has given me a further opportunity to observe his diligent work in relation to his district and to the problems that come before this body. I have enjoyed his personal friendship and I quickly join with those who have expressed themselves with regard to their acquaintanceship with TOBY. It has been their pleasure to know him longer than have I and Mrs. McIntire and I join in extending our very best wishes to TOBY and Mrs. Morris, wishing them many, many years of health and happiness in the years that lie ahead.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON].

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, Washington is going to miss TOBY MORRIS and Mrs. Morris. Many of us here in the House will miss his wonderful counsel and his warm friendship. I do not believe I have ever met a man in public life who is more fearless or more courageous in his championship of causes in which he believes than TOBY MORRIS, of Oklahoma. I never met a man who had greater love of humanity, a more sociable nature, or greater kindness in his general makeup than TOBY MORRIS, of Oklahoma. He is a man who loves to tell a story and to hear a good story. You can always enjoy the humor of TOBY MORRIS in conversation, and I do not believe in the many times we have visited and exchanged stories that I ever heard him say an unkind thing about any human being. I do not believe I ever heard him say anything with malice in it about anyone.

I do not know, either in my experience here in the House or elsewhere of any person who has a keener interest in the law and in the lawmaking process than Congressman TOBY MORRIS, of Oklahoma. To many of us he will be missed, and I want to join my colleagues in wishing to him and to Mrs. Morris a happy time on their return to Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TRIMBLE].

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues from Oklahoma and others in paying tribute to this great man, a man of ability and great intellect. These qualities he brought to bear in service to his country. He is courageous, and like a sturdy oak of the old windswept prairie, it is a comfort to have him on your side.

TOBY, we wish for you in the years that lie ahead all the happiness that you and your family so richly deserve.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield.

Mr. WOLF. I would just like to say as a freshman Member who came here 2 years ago that some of the soundest advice I have received came from TOBY MORRIS in the very first days. He was a good and loyal friend and I have called on him many times. There is a tear in my eye as I say goodby to him.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED].

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, it has often been said that anyone can be a good winner, but that it takes a real champion to be a good loser. I know that my colleagues feel as I do as we have seen TOBY MORRIS demonstrate here lately that a real champion can accept the adversity of a defeat.

One of the great privileges and pleasures I have had since I came here has been to serve as a fellow representative from the great State of Oklahoma with TOBY MORRIS. I have never known a man who had greater courage of conviction and sincerity of purpose in his work in the public service in Congress. I cannot help but feel that his passing from this scene will be a greater loss to his district, to the State of Oklahoma, and to the Nation than it is to him. I join with our other colleagues in wishing for him the best of everything in the years that lie ahead.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in summary, may I say of TOBY MORRIS that we all appreciate his fine work and his intellect, but one thing more I must mention—his great heart. He has a big heart that encompasses all mankind, a heart that has compassion for all mankind and especially for the underprivileged. He has also a strong and courageous heart, the courage of his convictions even irrespective of political consequences. He was a beloved Member of this House. His friends are legion. We all wish him and his lovely wife, Laura Morris, the richest blessings of life in the years ahead.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to express my friendship and admiration for the Honorable TOBY MORRIS. Mr. MORRIS has served his country with exceptional skill and devotion as a Member of the House of Representatives. He is one of the outstanding Americans of this trying period. It has been my pleasure to know and work with the gentleman for nearly 14 years. His service in this body and on the Committee on Armed Services has been constructive and of a nature to occupy a prominent place in the annals of our country when the history of this period is written.

Mr. MORRIS was born in Granbury, Hood County, Tex., in 1899, moving with his parents to Comanche County, Okla., in 1906, and to Cotton County, Okla., in 1913. During the First World War he enlisted, at the age of 18, in the U.S. Army, serving successively as private, corporal, and sergeant with the 110th Combat Engineers, attached to the 35th Division, from October 1917 to May 1919.

Back at home, he studied law in his father's law office and was admitted to the bar in 1920. He served his county as court clerk from 1921 to 1925, and as prosecuting attorney from 1925 to 1929. From 1929 to 1937 he engaged in the private practice of law in Walters, Okla., and from 1937 to 1946 he was district judge of the 21st judicial district of Oklahoma.

Ever alert to the needs of his community, State, and Nation, Mr. MORRIS has been active in the Red Cross, Boy Scouts, Salvation Army, Community Chest, Rotary Club, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and American Legion. He is a past post commander of the American Legion.

TOBY MORRIS is one of the soundest gentlemen I have ever met. As a legislator, he is a man who has always tried to render public service that contributed to the welfare and progress of the people, not only of his district and State, but of the entire United States. It has been my pleasure to develop a friendship with him, a friendship that I value very much and that I shall always cherish.

TOBY MORRIS is not only a great legislator and a great friend but also a great American. He is a man whose associations with his fellow men are an inspiration for all others to follow.

I could mention many contributions made by our friend but his outstanding record as a Member of this House speaks for itself. We shall all miss him very much, and we wish him every happiness and success in the years that lie ahead.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, when I came to the Congress in 1949, TOBY MORRIS was my next-door neighbor on the sixth floor of the New House Building. In the climate of that association ripened a friendship that has been very dear to me. TOBY MORRIS has made a mighty contribution to the Congress. He has won and held the esteem and the affection of his colleagues on both sides of the aisle. I have never heard a Member of the House say anything about TOBY MORRIS that did not reflect admiration of his integrity, his keen ability, his fairness, and the gentle

qualities of a warm heart. Knowing TOBY MORRIS has enriched my life, and I have the faith that for such as he the good Lord of us all has in store an abundance of blessings multiplied.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, the first political speech of which I have any clear recollection was one made by TOBY MORRIS. The year was 1934, and I was a boy of about 11, living in Duncan, Okla. I still can remember the vigorous figure of the young man who was TOBY MORRIS earnestly expressing his views of the needs of our Nation. TOBY was that year a candidate for Congress, and, as I recall, his candidacy was not at that time successful.

One of the things I have come to admire so greatly about TOBY MORRIS, however, is the dogged determination with which he approaches any task which he firmly believes to be right. This same trait caused him to persevere, when probably a lesser man would have capitulated, until twice on separate occasions his devotion has been recognized and rewarded by his constituency for two different stretches of congressional service.

I remember also the trait of deep honesty and uncompromising principle which has characterized TOBY'S service here. While I have known one branch of his family rather intimately in Texas, I came to know TOBY after we both began to serve here.

He has never flinched in the face of popular demand, if he believed a course of action to be right for his country.

So to TOBY MORRIS I join my colleagues in wishing all that is good and gracious, all that is fine and true, for he richly deserves it.

Mr. COAD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to all of the Members of the House that TOBY MORRIS has been a real friend to me. Not only to me has he been a friend, but I have observed TOBY MORRIS, as he has circulated among the membership. He has wide counsel and a great understanding of the problems of our time. I can say that TOBY MORRIS is a stanch supporter of the American farmer. During the years I have served in the House of Representatives, TOBY MORRIS and I have had many conversations together and many meetings in our offices—some lasting almost to midnight to try to work out the perplexing problems facing the American farmer. I certainly want to pay tribute to him as a great American, as one who is able to foresee the problems that are facing our people, and as one who acts forthrightly to deal with the problems confronting us. I think he has been a great Member of the House of Representatives and I am sure, if he so chooses, the time and the opportunity will come when he can return here.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I want to join in the tributes being paid TOBY MORRIS. He has been a friend to all of us who have served with him in the House, and it has been a genuine pleasure to know someone who has such a friendly feeling for all.

TOBY MORRIS has always conscientiously served in the best interest of the people of his district and the Nation. We shall greatly miss him in the coming Congress.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, because of the vicissitudes of politics, which seem at times to become more and more unpredictable, our esteemed and beloved friend and colleague, Congressman TOBY MORRIS, of Oklahoma, is again leaving the House.

It has been my very high privilege to serve, not only in the House for some years with him, but also on the House Armed Services Committee.

This most able, distinguished and gracious gentleman from Oklahoma is a trained and experienced lawyer and judge, who has always brought legal learning, sound judgment, great ability, idealistic dedication, and unexcelled patriotism to our deliberations.

A sincere and great American with whom the interest of our country always comes first, TOBY MORRIS is especially respected and admired for his mastery over legal questions, and particularly his deep knowledge of constitutional law, which time and time again he is called upon with telling effect, to enlighten and guide Members of the House and committee. He is a recognized authority on defense and related questions coming before our committee.

TOBY MORRIS has been a very conscientious, able, patriotic Congressman and a very dear friend to many Members of this body.

I personally deeply cherish his friendship and I am most grateful to him, especially for the solid and most valuable contributions which he made to my committee.

TOBY MORRIS has endeared himself to all of us. He will always remain in our hearts and minds as a fine and noble Christian gentleman, loyal to his friends, able and effective in his work, and unselfishly devoted to the cause of our great country.

I am sure that all of the Members of the House join with me in wishing Congressman MORRIS and his family every measure of success and happiness in the future.

THE HONORABLE LEE METCALF AND THE HONORABLE LEROY H. ANDERSON

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to pay tribute to two very fine friends of mine who are completing their services in the House of Representatives today. I have had an opportunity to serve with both of these gentlemen on a committee. One of them, particularly, sat by my side for a number of years on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I refer to my very good friend, a man who has helped me a great deal in my service, LEE METCALF, of Montana, and his colleague, LEROY ANDERSON, of Montana, both of whom are completing their service at least for the time being in the House of Representatives. I particularly wish to express my deep gratitude and my personal appreciation for the help that LEE METCALF rendered to me on my arrival in Washington some 6 years ago. It was my pleasure to be assigned to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and to sit just below him on that committee. LEE was a man and has been a man throughout his service during my years here who has been very devoted not only to his constituents and the people of his district but to his State and to our Nation. He is a man who has very strong convictions. When LEE had made up his mind on a given subject or a given issue, he stood steadfast regardless of those who might be opposing him or regardless of the odds that might be against him. Certainly I know that the type of service he rendered to our committee and to the House will be long remembered by the people, his constituents, of the great State of Montana.

Of course, it is my hope that he will continue to serve his State and his Nation in the other body where he is at the present time seeking a position.

With reference to his colleague and my very good friend, LEROY ANDERSON, I want to also say I had the opportunity to serve with LEROY on the Committee on the Interior and Insular Affairs where during the past 2 years he has rendered outstanding service on that committee, having filled a spot that was vacated at the time that LEE moved over to the Committee on Ways and Means.

He has been devoted in his attention to the needs of his constituents, he has been particularly concerned and interested about matters affecting the Indian tribes in the State of Montana and throughout the West. He has been particularly interested also in irrigation and reclamation and water development which are so vital to the great State of Montana. He has been a great deal of support for me and for others who have from time to time sought projects which were needed in developing the water and the national resources of our western area.

So I take this opportunity for a few moments to pay tribute to these two great men.

Going back for a moment to my good friend, LEE METCALF, his service on the Ways and Means Committee has been outstanding from the very fine things I have heard said about him in and during his service on that committee. I am sure he will continue that outstanding work in the other body starting with the 87th Congress.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], a fellow member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I am very pleased that my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK], has brought to the attention of the House the fact that it is about to lose the services of these two distinguished westerners. I have had the pleasure of serving with both of them; have come to know them both

well, to admire both of them, and I know that in the departure of Congressman METCALF and Congressman LEROY ANDERSON we are losing two stalwarts and two good public servants. I believe I know Congressman METCALF a good deal better than I know his colleague, because we came to the House together in the 83d Congress and enjoyed together the fellowship of the 83d Club. I have been deeply impressed by his conscientiousness, by the long and tireless hours that he devotes to public service, and by the way in which he fights for causes, which are often very difficult to serve and to put across in this body. If the Indian people of the United States have a better friend in the Congress of the United States than LEE METCALF of Montana, I do not know who that man is. If the miners of America have a better friend than LEE METCALF, I do not know who he is. In fact, if the working people in general of the State of Montana and the entire Nation have a stronger, truer friend in these Halls than LEE METCALF, of Montana, I would like to hear his name. It has been an inspiration to serve with him, and I am confident that he will be returning to Washington when January comes around and that we will have the opportunity to serve with him and to be associated with him for many years to come as a servant of the people in the Halls of the Congress.

Mr. SISK. I thank the gentleman for his kind remarks. Certainly in the retirement of the entire Montana delegation which, of course, was composed of these two gentlemen, those of us who particularly have been intimately associated and worked with them shall miss them, but we will be looking forward to hearing many good things from them in further service to their State and to their Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and I further ask unanimous consent that other Members desiring to do so may extend their remarks regarding the retirement of the two great, distinguished gentlemen from the State of Montana in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

HON. EDNA SIMPSON

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, when the next Congress convenes in January it will be the first time in nearly 2 decades that there will not be a Simpson from Illinois on the roster of the House. I rise tonight once more to pay tribute to an illustrious Congressman who served his country well, but particularly as he would want me to do, to pay tribute also to the gracious lady who succeeded him, with reluctance, with difficulty because of her sorrow, but with dedication and brilliance. Quiet, beautiful of spirit as well as of mien, determined to do her best for her district, she has, during her 2 years of service, grown in strength, grown in stature, at least in our appreciation of her stature, and lent a spirit of understanding and friendliness to this whole House. She has built an admirable record of service on her two committees; House Administration and Interior and Insular Affairs.

No one can ever forget her courage, and no one could ever say that she could be pressured into any action against her convictions. She has shown discretion. I repeat that she has shown brilliance. But to all of us she has given a constant warm memory for a man whom we loved here, and a reason for loving her, too.

And, Mr. Speaker, I think she would not find it remiss if I put in the RECORD of the House that she is probably the only Member from any district who has ever served a full term, without ever addressing either the Speaker or her colleagues, or letting her beautiful, soft voice be heard. Without so doing, moreover, she has seen that every need of her district has been met.

We hail EDNA SIMPSON tonight. We are glad that she served with us. We know how proud her husband would be of her. And we bear witness that she has served her district and her country with distinction.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. CHURCH. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, may I add my small voice to the very eloquent address which the distinguished gentlewoman has made with respect to our lovely, lovable colleague. I had the honor of serving with her late distinguished husband, Sid Simpson, on the Committee on Agriculture for many years. He was one of our outstanding Members. I have also counted it a privilege, indeed, to serve as a colleague of Mrs. SIMPSON during her service in the House.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 days within which to extend their remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, our industrious and greatly admired colleague, EDNA SIMPSON, is voluntarily retiring from Congress. During her short service in the Congress of the United States she has won the love, affection, and esteem of her colleagues, both Democrats and Republicans. No Member's retirement has caused more regret than that of EDNA SIMPSON. Her integrity, honesty, and reliability will be an inspiration to all that have had the privilege of serving with her and those who follow.

For many years I had the honor to serve in this body with her late husband, Sid Simpson. Like him, she has served the 20th District of Illinois, the State, and Nation with distinction.

We of the Illinois delegation wish that in her retirement she enjoy health and happiness.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mrs. GREEN of Oregon (at the request of Mr. ULLMAN), for an indefinite period of time, on account of illness.

To Mr. AUCHINCLOSS (at the request of Mr. HALLECK), for August 31, on account of illness.

THE SUGAR ACT

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, while we are waiting here to be informed about the Senate action, I would like to point out that the extension of the Sugar Act, which was done yesterday, was done by unanimous consent. There was no discussion at all. Many of us were not conscious of the particular terms of it or that it was coming up at that time. It is my hope that when the Senate bill is sent over here——

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PORTER. I yield.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I hope that under the circumstances my friend will defer what I know would be a very interesting commentary until the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture is present.

Mr. PORTER. I was seeking merely to establish a few factual preliminaries for what I trust will develop into an interesting debate, if not at this early hour in the morning, then later today.

Mr. FLOOD. I was just expressing the hope that the gentleman will not anticipate the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture in a very delicate situation at later than 3 o'clock in the morning.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I see that the bill has arrived from the other body so I yield back the balance of my time.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. McGOWN, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 8424. An act to amend section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949 with respect to positions in the Library of Congress.

H.R. 12043. An act to amend sections 22, 23, and 24, title 13, United States Code, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 13062. An act to amend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HALLECK. Would it be in order for a unanimous-consent request to be made to send the bill that has just come from the Senate to conference?

The SPEAKER. That would be up to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. HALLECK. In other words, if he submitted a unanimous-consent request to send the matter to conference, that could be considered subject to an objection?

The SPEAKER. It could be.

CITIZEN BAND OF POTAWATOMI INDIANS OF OKLAHOMA

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 7990) to convey certain land of the United States in trust to the Citizen Band of Potawatomi Indians of Oklahoma, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to convey to the Citizen Band of Potawatomi Indians of Oklahoma, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to approximately 57.99 acres of land more particularly described in section 2 of this Act, subject to the right of the Absentee Shawnee of Oklahoma, Sac and Fox of Oklahoma, Kickapoo of Oklahoma, and Iowa Tribe of Oklahoma to use the Potawatomi community house that may be constructed and maintained thereon. The title of the tribe thereto shall be subject to no exemption from taxation or restriction on use, management or disposition because of Indian ownership.

"SEC. 2. The property referred to in the first section of this Act is more particularly described as follows: Lot 1 (northwest quarter of northwest quarter) and north half of lot 2 (north half of southwest quarter of northwest quarter) and the part of the north half of the southeast quarter of the northwest quarter laying west of the east right-of-way line of Oklahoma State Highway Numbered 18, all in section 31, township 10 north, range 4 east of the Indian meridian, in Pottawatomie County, Oklahoma, and containing 57.99 acres more or less.

"SEC. 3. The Indian Claims Commission is directed to determine in accordance with the provisions of section 2 of the Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1050), the extent to which the value of the title conveyed by this Act should or should not be set off against any claim against the United States determined by the Commission."

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to provide for the conveyance of certain land of the United States to the Citizen Band of Potawatomi Indians of Oklahoma."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. FEIGHAN, for 5 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. CANFIELD, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. HALPERN, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. WOLF (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK), for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LIBONATI (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK), for 1 hour, today, and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK) for 30 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. McCORMACK, and to include extraneous matter and tables.

Mr. COLMER and to include a speech by the distinguished gentlewoman from Michigan [Mrs. GRIFFITHS].

Mr. BERRY in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. TABER to revise and extend his remarks, and to include certain tables.

Mr. QUIE, during his remarks on S. 2917, the dairy price support bill, and to include tables.

Mr. ALFORD to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include an article.

Mr. CLEM MILLER in one instance and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LAIRD to revise and extend his remarks on S. 2917 and include some charts.

Mr. McCORMACK, and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GILBERT.

Mr. FASCELL.

Mr. BRADEMAS.

Mr. PRICE in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BONNER to extend his remarks in the RECORD and give a report of the activities of the Merchant Marine Committee during this session of Congress.

SENATE BILLS AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1689. An act to create the Freedom Commission for the development of the science of counteraction to the world Communist conspiracy and for the training and development of leaders in a total political war; to the Committee on Un-American Activities;

S. 3901. An act to authorize the erection of a memorial in the District of Columbia to Gen. John J. Pershing, to the Committee on House Administration; and

S. Con. Res. 115. Concurrent resolution to print additional hearings on S. Res. 94, relating to the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, to the Committee on House Administration.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Adminstration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following title, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 3313. An act to amend section 200 of the Soldiers and Sailors Civil Relief Act of 1940 to permit the establishment of certain facts by a declaration under penalty of perjury in lieu of an affidavit, and for other purposes;

H.R. 4826. An act for the relief of Arthur E. Collins;

H.R. 6597. An act to revise the boundaries of Dinosaur National Monument and provide an entrance road or roads thereto, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6871. An act to amend title III of the Public Health Service Act, to authorize project grants for graduate training in public health and for other purposes;

H.R. 7758. An act to improve the administration of oversea activities of the Government of the United States, and for other purposes;

H.R. 10921. An act to amend section 35 of chapter III of the Life Insurance Act for the District of Columbia; and

H.R. 12326. An act making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority and certain study commissions, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1066. An act to revise the boundaries and change the name of Fort Donelson National Military Park, and for other purposes;

S. 1214. An act to amend the Act of March 11, 1948 (62 Stat. 78), relating to the establishment of the De Soto National Memorial, in the State of Florida;

S. 1870. An act to provide for examination, licensing, and for regulation of practical nurses, and for practical nursing education in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

S. 2131. An act to amend the Motor Vehicle Safety Responsibility Act of the District of Columbia approved May 25, 1954, as amended;

S. 2575. An act to provide a health benefits program for certain retired employees of the Government;

S. 2633. An act to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, and for other purposes;

S. 3416. An act to provide for the restoration to the United States of amounts expended in the District of Columbia in carrying out the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act of 1958;

S. 3648. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia on behalf of the United States to transfer from the United States to the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency title to certain real property in said District.

S. 3835. An act to authorize the District of Columbia Civil War Centennial Commission to plan and carry out in the District of Columbia civic programs in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the Civil War; to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of Defense to make certain property of the District and of the United States available for

the use of such Commission; to authorize the said Commissioners to make certain regulations and permit certain uses to be made of public space, and for other purposes; and

S. 3867. An act to exempt from taxation certain property of the National Guard Association of the United States in the District of Columbia.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 3313. An act to amend section 200 of the Soldiers and Sailors Civil Relief Act of 1940 to permit the establishment of certain facts by a declaration under penalty of perjury in lieu of an affidavit, and for other purposes;

H.R. 4826. An act for the relief of Arthur E. Collins;

H.R. 6597. An act to revise the boundaries of Dinosaur National Monument and provide an entrance road or roads thereto, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6871. An act to amend title III of the Public Health Service Act, to authorize project grants for graduate training in public health, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7758. An act to improve the administration of oversea activities of the Government of the United States, and for other purposes;

H.R. 10921. An act to amend section 35 of chapter III of the Life Insurance Act for the District of Columbia; and

H.R. 12326. An act making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and certain study commissions, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares the House in recess until 12 o'clock noon today.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 37 minutes a.m.) the House stood in recess until 12 o'clock noon, Thursday, September 1, 1960.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Jets—Aid to Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 31, 1960

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, recent events in Latin America have focused new attention on the Caribbean, Central, and South America.

More and more Americans are becoming increasingly aware of their economic difficulties. We are also recognizing the tremendous economic interdependence which almost inextricably binds us.

A modern-day miracle is making its helpful contribution in solving at least a part of the problem of our southern friends.

The helper? Jet speed. The faster you can get from here to there, the more people are going to take the trip.

This proposition, proven by scientific studies, looms large today as a potent factor in bolstering the economies of numerous Latin American countries. For today is the jet age, and a 575-mile-an-hour jetliner gets people from here to there 40 percent faster than ever before.

Thus comes the obvious conclusion: Where the jets go, more people are going. The nearly 1 million U.S. visitors who traveled to the Caribbean, Central, and South America in 1959 spent almost $200 million in the area.

Even a 20-percent increase in this travel, which experts predict the jet airliners can easily generate, would mean an extra $40 million poured directly into the economic bloodstream of those countries this year.

Proof that reduced travel time brings increased travel is compiled in a survey made by Pan American World Airways, pioneer carrier which has been serving virtually all of Latin America for three decades.

As further proof, three Caribbean resorts whose air facilities enabled them to be among the first spots to welcome jet service last year recorded impressive travel gains.

In Puerto Rico, which Pan American has made the jet capital of Latin America with some 62 jet flights a week currently, travel figures practically shot off the chart under the impetus of the faster, more luxurious service. Puerto Rico's visitor count zoomed from about 270,000 in 1958 to a staggering 331,000 last year. Similarly, the number of visitors to Nassau rose from 178,000 to 264,000, and Jamaica shot up from 170,000 to 191,000.

Jet speeds combine with the changing work pattern of U.S. employees to provide even brighter prospects for Latin American vacation spots. "The paid vacation of from 2 to 4 weeks has become almost universal in the United States," the Pan American survey notes. "This circumstance would appear propitious for an increase in vacation travel to more distant points." This is especially significant in view of the fact that the survey found approximately 52 percent of the clipper travelers were vacation travelers.

And as a final bright note, the traveling public has obviously taken instantly and enthusiastically to jet travel everywhere on all airlines.

Ukrainian Congress Committee of America—A Tribute on Its 20th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES A. BURKE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 31, 1960

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, this year we commemorate the 20th anniversary of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America. It is fitting that we salute the leaders of this organization from the floor of Congress, for their service to Ukrainians and to the United States has been very valuable.

One of the great problems facing new Americans is the difficulty of adjusting to a completely new national environment. The Ukrainian Congress Committee has played an important role in helping our new Ukrainian citizens adjust to their new country. It has served as something of a bridge between the old country and the new, the old way of life and the new. In so doing, it has kept alive some of the finest traditions of the Ukrainian people which have found their place solidly in our American civilization. However, the greatest contribution of this organization has been to keep alive in Americans their dedication to freedom everywhere by their insistence upon freedom for the Ukraine.

Ukrainians everywhere, America salutes you.

Six Outstanding Conservatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 31, 1960

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, there appeared in the New York Times magazine an article entitled "A Conservative Sets Out His Credo" by BARRY M. GOLDWATER. In this article he names six outstanding conservatives and sets forth his reasons for listing them. I desire to include this portion of the article from the New York Times magazine of July 31, 1960, which lists the six outstanding conservatives named by Senator GOLDWATER with his reasons:

SIX OUTSTANDING CONSERVATIVES NAMED BY GOLDWATER, WITH HIS REASONS

Roosevelt: This man displayed his conservative bent by recognizing the lessons of history which showed that the proper use of power could preserve peace in the world.

Hoover: This conservative President showed to the world the intense interest of the conservative in the problems of his fellow men. His whole life has been a dedication to the solution of these problems.

BYRD: Senator BYRD, being a true conservative, recognizes the obvious lessons of history which tell us that no individual, business, or government can forever spend money that is not at hand.

WILLIAMS: I could include Senator WILLIAMS for the same reasons I have discussed in Senator BYRD'S case, but, in addition, Senator WILLIAMS recognizes that history has taught us that dishonesty in government creates contempt for the government. And he has devoted a great part of his career to ferreting out dishonesty where it exists.

KIRK: Professor Kirk's writings are probably the clearest ever done on the conservative philosophy and I list him because a reading of his works will give a person an immediate understanding of what conservatism means.

ALGER: I have selected Congressman ALGER because he typifies a new and young group of conservative politicians who know that we must study the past if we are to make progress in the future. That is the one point on which all conservatives agree. That is why none of them wants to try the mistakes of yesterday in the solving of the problems of tomorrow.

Twentieth Anniversary of Ukrainian Congress Committee of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 31, 1960

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, there are some 2½ million Americans of Ukrainian ancestry in this country. This fall the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America is marking the 20th anniversary of its founding.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of a letter I have written on this occasion to Prof. Lev E. Dobriansky, who, for more than a decade, has led the Ukrainian Congress Committee.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUGUST 31, 1960.

Prof. LEV E. DOBRIANSKY,
Chairman, Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.

DEAR PROFESSOR DOBRIANSKY: On the occasion of the 20th anniversary of the founding of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America this fall, I want to express to you the sorrow and anguish I feel, in common with the members of your committee, at the continuing plight of the Ukraine under Russian Communist domination. The committee which you have led for more than a decade has helped to insure that all Americans remember our stake in the aspirations of other peoples for freedom and respect for the dignity of man.

It may be that the Iron Curtain is now more perforated than it was in the era of Joseph Stalin and that the repressive policy of the Soviet Union toward its national minorities is somewhat lessened. But the fact remains that the Soviet Union is a ruthless totalitarian state which has not changed its nature or policies in any essential respect.

As one who joined in sponsoring the Senate resolution last year to establish Captive Nations Week, I would like to note again your tireless efforts and devoted service on behalf of its successful establishment and annual observance. Freedom-loving Americans, whatever their national backgrounds, are indebted to you and to all those who serve with you in the cause of human freedom.

Sincerely,

CLIFFORD P. CASE,
U.S. Senator.

A Message to the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 31, 1960

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, the year 1920 saw the end of the Ukrainian National Republic. Less than 3 years of independence were granted to the people of the Ukraine when their state was crushed by Russian troops and the last free Ukrainian forces were compelled to flee the country. The flame of freedom which had flickered so long in the breasts of the Ukrainians—and had burned brightly for so short a time—was once again nearly extinguished.

Twenty years later, in 1940, at the First Congress of Ukrainian-Americans in Washington, D.C., the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America was formed. In the years between 1920 and 1940 the Ukrainian people suffered the oppressive tyranny of Communist rule. When the Red army was conquering the Republic its troops followed their usual policy of killing, raping, and generally terrorizing the population. In 1930 the order for compulsory collectivization of the land was put into effect accompanied by the forceful dispossession of the peasants. Two years later an artificial famine, instigated by the Russians, caused the death of approximately 5 million Ukrainians. During the 1930's also, the Moscow purge trials found their counterpart in similar purges of Ukrainian artists, writers, intellectuals, and even Communist Party members. Finally, in the years 1937 to 1939 the infamous massacre of Vinnitsa took place. Under the supervision of Nikita Khrushchev, First Secretary of the Communist Party of the Ukraine, and known to the people of the country as the "Hangman of Ukraine," over 10,000 Ukrainians were brutally killed and buried in mass graves.

In the 20 years since 1940 when the Ukrainian Congress Committee was formed, Soviet atrocities have not lessened. During World War II Russian partisans ravaged the countryside and robbed and murdered the population. At the end of the war Soviet troops once again occupied the country liquidating in the process the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA) which fought so gallantly against Hitler. Since 1946 the Ukrainian Catholic Church has been suppressed, thousands of Ukrainian youth resettled in the wastes of Siberia, and the general oppression of the people continued.

There is, however, one great difference between the period before 1940 and the 20 years that have elapsed since then. The Ukrainian Congress Committee has brought all the facts of Russian brutality into the light of day. It has shown Americans that the U.S.S.R. is not a monolithic unity as the Russians claim but rather a grouping of many nations under Moscow's iron heel. All is not smooth sailing in the Soviet Union if thousands of people must be liquidated because of their opposition to the regime. Khrushchev's true nature was pointed out by the committee long before the free world saw him in the light of Hungary. This accomplishment of the Ukrainian Congress Committee cannot be overestimated. We are engaged in a struggle with communism which is mainly an ideological one. It has long been said of Americans that we are a sleeping giant. We awake slowly but once awakened, move quickly. In the present life-and-death contest between democracy and Soviet dictatorship we can no longer afford the luxury of sleeping late. It is for this reason that we owe such a great debt of gratitude to the committee. It is necessary that we be constantly reminded what communism is and what fate awaits those who are conquered by it. We must know our enemy in order to vanquish him. This is the unique educational contribution of the Ukrainian Congress Committee for which I wish to thank and congratulate all its members on this 20th anniversary.

Ohio's Library Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. MOELLER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 31, 1960

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, in the debate over the passage of S. 2830 to extend the Library Services Act for 5 years several of my colleagues from Ohio argued that Ohio had adequate library service and that the intangibles tax which supports Ohio libraries was so productive that it was unnecessary to extend the act, citing $21,261,612 as the amount spent for libraries.

However, the distribution of this amount does not support the contention of my Ohio colleagues. On the contrary it points up how great is the need for assistance in many rural areas of the State.

Sixteen million dollars or 75 percent of that total, went into the nine metropolitan counties in which are situated the cities of Cleveland, Cincinnati, Columbus, Toledo, Dayton, Akron, Canton, Youngstown, and Lorain.

Nineteen million dollars or 90 percent of the total, went into the above counties and adjacent industrial counties containing such cities as Warren, Hamilton, Lima, Ashtabula, Springfield, Salem, Mansfield, Steubenville, Newark, and others.

Thus 31 counties received $19 million or 90 percent of the total library income in 1959; 57 counties had to exist on 10 percent of the total or approximately $2,200,000.

What does this mean to the libraries in some of these 57 counties?

Adams County had a total of $6,526 on which to operate two libraries in the county, located in the communities of Peebles and Manchester. This is not enough to hire one librarian and rent a building, to say nothing of buying books, which is the library's reason for existence; yet this amount had to be divided among two libraries. How could such a library or libraries even begin to think of buying a bookmobile to serve the small towns and rural areas in the county? A bookmobile itself costs $15,000 to purchase and another $15,000 annually to operate.

How could a county like Carroll in northeastern Ohio with a library income of $17,713, get an additional $30,000 to establish bookmobile service? If it received 100 percent of the tax collection in that county, which it didn't, there wouldn't be enough to do this.

How could Union County in central Ohio with a library budget of $27,000, which you might consider adequate, pick up an additional $30,000 to start bookmobile service?

Monroe County in 1959 had a total intangibles collection of $10,509. How much library service will that provide? Noble County had a collection of $6,170, of which only $4,000 could be spared for the library. Pike County had a total of $6,333, not much better. Vinton County had $4,417. The library there received 100 percent of the tax collection, which sounds wonderful, but it still is only $4,417.

Most of Ohio's libraries are small. Of the 270 tax-supported libraries in the State 51 have an annual budget of less than $5,000; 93 less than $10,000; 123 less than $15,000; 144 less than $20,000; 161 less than $25,000. Personnelwise, 191 libraries have 5 or less employees; 231 libraries have 10 or less employees. Only 39 have more than 10.

Less than 1,000 books each year are added by 117 libraries; less than 2,000 books are added by 181 libraries.

Many libraries in Ohio are handicapped in their efforts to provide basic library services. Consequently many residents of rural areas still have sadly inadequate library service. A great many have none at all.

Hail to the Ladies of Hadassah

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 31, 1960

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, hail to the Ladies of Hadassah.

Welcome to New York. May their convention be an outstanding success and their visit to Gotham thoroughly delightful.

I refer, Mr. Speaker, to the forthcoming 46th National Convention of Hadassah, the Women's Zionist Organization of America, being held in New York from September 11th through the 14th at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel.

The greeting extended herewith, I am sure, reflects the good wishes of all of us in this Congress of the United States to these wonderful women on this significant occasion.

Most of us in Congress are proud to have among our constituents the dedicated, public-spirited ladies who comprise the membership of Hadassah.

For more than four decades, these dedicated women, who number more than 318,000 in some 1,290 chapters throughout the United States and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, have been in the forefront of civic and community programs, and have energetically participated in such significant areas as youth activities, education, and cultural and humanitarian causes.

Founded for the purposes of conducting health work in Palestine, now Israel, and of fostering Jewish ideals in the American-Jewish community, and strengthening the principles of democracy, Hadassah not only carries on the previously mentioned activities in the United States, but maintains and operates a network of medical institutions and educational programs in Israel.

Through participation and leadership in numerous community activities throughout the Nation, Hadassah members have contributed immeasurably to the enhancement of American spiritual and moral values. Foremost among their objectives have been the advancement of the principles of freedom and human rights and the promotion of greater human understanding.

They have proposed a broad-scale health-for-peace program, under which the most advanced know-how in public health training, medical research and the application of effective resources for warring on the scourges of mankind, would be shared with the less fortunate peoples of the world.

In Israel, Hadassah's activities have been centered upon medical, educational and youth programs and include, among other things, the maintenance of health welfare stations, support of child guidance, school hygiene and dental service clinics, and, participation in a land reclamation program. Among its most outstanding achievements have been its maintenance of hospitals, a nurses training school, and vocational rehabilitation centers.

The idealism and energetic efforts of Hadassah to bring to Israel the most modern medical care facilities, educational opportunities and public health institutions have contributed immensely to the vitality of that nation as democracy's outpost in the Near East.

Organized on a voluntary basis, this outstanding group of women has financed and supported these magnificent contributions through dedicated volunteer work.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that it is particularly fitting and memorable that the convention is dedicated this year to the 100th anniversary of the birth of Henrietta Szold, under whose wisdom and initiative Hadassah was organized in New York in 1912. Her life and work will be highlighted throughout the convention and plans will be made for the celebration of the Henrietta Szold Centennial Year, commencing in December.

The achievements of Miss Szold, whose vision and energy provided the impetus for much of Hadassah's progress, will be highlighted. One of her phrases, "Make my eyes look to the future", uttered to an artist while posing for a bust a few days before her death, will constitute the theme for the convention.

Miss Szold's life was devoted to the health and well-being of the people in the Holy Land and of Jewish immigrants to America. She was a great welfare worker and an even greater humanitarian and was the originator of the education, child guidance, and social welfare concepts now practiced so abundantly in Israel. She was designated as one of the 100 great American women of the century. Her memory is revered universally today, and her interests were the primary function of Hadassah from the day it was founded.

The zeal and fidelity with which the members of Hadassah have pursued these objectives was exemplified in the dedication, on August 3 last, of the magnificent. new Hadassah-Hebrew University Medical Center near Jerusalem. This memorable occasion, which will be a "showcase" depiction at the convention, will be one of the thrilling features of the gathering.

I know my colleagues from New York City join with me in extending warm welcome to the ladies of Hadassah, and salute them as they meet for their annual convention. May their stay be pleasant and may they return often.

Mr. Speaker, again I say—"Hail to the Ladies of Hadassah!"

Weaver's Annual Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHIL WEAVER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 31, 1960

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, every year I have made an effort to keep my friends and neighbors in the First Congressional District completely informed as to the activities of the Congress. I have from time to time made special reports which have been universally greeted with favor.

Once again this year I am making such a report to my constituents which, under leave to extend my remarks, I now place in the RECORD:

WASHINGTON, August 31, 1960.—The 86th Congress is now history—so, let's look at the record:

Defense: We are the most powerful nation on earth and we'll remain that way. We have built a well-balanced, flexible and retaliatory force to keep the peace.

Economy: We wound up the fiscal year with a $1 billion surplus. Prospects are bright for an even better surplus next year.

Socialist trends: Although still strong among the "big spend" boys, much of the socialistic legislation was blocked.

Farm problem: The big failure of the 86th Congress. The leadership refused to work for a sound solution to the problem.

DEFENSE POSTURE

As a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense I have concentrated for 2 years on the effort to build a balanced, flexible defense program geared to keeping the peace.

Bombers: Still the backbone of our retaliatory force. We have a fleet of heavy bombers capable of delivering a devastating nuclear blow anywhere in the Communist empire—ready around the clock.

Missiles: Already squadrons of Atlas ICBM's are operational; Titan soon to be in the operational category; Minuteman, highly mobile and therefore less vulnerable from attack, is well ahead of schedule; Polaris has passed its tests and the first missiles will be on station with the fleet this fall. We'll have close to 50 of these missiles at sea by spring. Intermediate missiles backing up our "at home" force we have shorter range missiles stationed abroad, near Communist borders, capable of dealing severe blows to selected targets.

Intelligence: Always a risky business, our intelligence agents have been able to paint a truer picture of Soviet capabilities. We are ahead of the Soviets in military matters. They have some interesting gadgets and have made some spectacular propaganda splashes. But responsible leaders of both parties agree we are stronger. Democrat GEORGE MAHON of Texas, chairman of the Committee on Defense Appropriations has this to say: "We have a greater overall striking ability than the Soviet Union. This Nation is stronger than any nation in the world today."

BUDGET ECONOMY

The big-spend boys were in the saddle as the 86th Congress got under way, but a determined effort by the Republican minority backed up by the potent Presidential veto helped to hold the line against bigger government, more inflation. However, the pressure is still there.

Supporters of big-spend and giveaway programs such as subsidies for airports, schools, socialized medicine, area redevelopment, and urban renewal are still fighting.

If we want the Federal Government to be all-powerful, all-supporting, they have the proposals. If all the spend-ourselves-rich bills had been passed, it has been estimated our annual budget would be in excess of $125 billion and you would foot the bill.

LABOR REFORM

In one area, the cleanup of some underworld elements in labor, the 86th Congress made real progress. Enactment of the Landrum-Griffin bill will go down in history as a great step forward.

The bill was enacted after years of investigation, months of hearings that developed a sordid story of corruption, vice, and undue political pressure by some in the labor movement. Enacted into law last year, the cleanup drive has already begun.

But the Hoffa-Carey crowd is still a potent force. Many will recall that AFL–CIO Vice President James Carey wrote an open, threatening letter to everyone who supported sound labor-management reform legislation. I was the recipient of one of those letters. I am proud to have been among those who stood up to be counted in favor of good legislation to protect the rank and file of labor.

SOCIALIST TREND

There is a saying that in Washington they have more solutions than the country has problems. Every local problem becomes a national crisis and they turn to Uncle Sam for a solution—always a costly one and always involving more government, a bigger bureaucracy.

The billion-dollar emergency housing proposal is an example; private builders are keeping abreast of the housing needs; never in history have so many owned their homes, and yet, there are those in the House and Senate who want the Government to expand in this field, and to finance directly home buying and homebuilding.

This would mean Government control and absolute standardization. Every home in America would look exactly alike. We would become one gigantic collective housing development.

NEGLECT OF FARMERS

The Democrats have a 2-to-1 margin in both the House and the Senate and control all of the committees of the Congress, and yet they were unable to come up with a reasonable, fair, and just solution to the farm problem.

Several proposals were made including the old Brannan plan in new clothing. Only one major farm bill, a modified wheat program, came out of the House Agriculture Committee and northern Democrats teamed up to kill it. The Senate passed a wheat bill which would have cut both acreage allotments and support prices.

There are several reasons why sound farm legislation cannot be written under the prevailing circumstances.

Sectionalism: In the Senate, the four ranking Democratic members of the Agriculture Committee are from the Deep South; are interested in sugar, peanuts, tung nuts, cotton, and tobacco. Peanuts are one of the support crops and are involved in setting parity payments and, in a literal sense, the price support level depends on the size of baseball crowds. In the House, the top nine Democrats on the committee come from the South. The chairman is a tobacco farmer. Therefore it is difficult to generate enthusiastic support for wheat or grain crops.

Partisanship: Unfortunately our farm citizens have been the victims of political maneuvering of the most cynical kind.

There are those in Congress who obviously prefer a political issue to a solution. Proposal after proposal went down the drain or into pigeonholes. Senate Majority Leader LYNDON B. JOHNSON, when listing "must" legislation after reconvening of Congress, pointedly ignored the farm problem. The Democratic presidential nominee has a solid Benson voting record. Every sound program has been watered down until nothing workable remains.

I personally have introduced or supported a number of major and workable proposals; the wheat marketing bill, industrial use of surpluses proposal, payment in kind, the Weaver farm plan.

Any one of these proposals would help ease the farm situation. As always I stand ready to cooperate with anyone in Congress who advances constructive proposals along these lines.

RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

This Congress has seen major advances for two vitally important resource development and protection projects. Construction has begun on Red Willow Dam. Construction funds for Salt-Wahoo have been included this year. I was happy to head up the presentation to the House Appropriations Committee on both projects in 1959 and 1960.

Mr. Speaker, I was this year highly honored by the Civic Affairs Associates, Inc., by receiving a certificate of merit. This group represents a conservative point of view and believes in freedom of Americans, both in the economic and political sense.

That certificate is signed by Mr. Alex Akerman, Jr., vice president-secretary, and Mr. Biehl P. Clarke, president, and it reads as follows:

Certificate of merit for service in behalf of economic and political freedom. The Honorable PHIL WEAVER, Congressman from Nebraska, has demonstrated by his voting record that he is an advocate of economy in government, limited government, free enterprise, economic growth with stability, and equality under the law. On key roll-call votes during the 86th Congress, as selected by the Free Citizen's Voting Record, Congressman WEAVER scored in the top 20 percent of the House of Representatives in his support of these principles of sound and forward-looking government. In recognition thereof, the board of directors of the Civic Affairs Associates, Inc. awards this certificate of merit.

By the Board of Directors, August 19, 1960.

ALEX AKERMAN, Jr.,
Vice President-Secretary.
BIEHL P. CLARKE,
President,
Civic Affairs Associates, Inc.

Twentieth Anniversary of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 31, 1960

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of the 20th anniversary of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, I am happy to have this opportunity of saluting the 2½ million Americans of Ukrainian descent.

The domination of the formerly independent countries behind the Iron Curtain by the Soviet Union is of continuing concern to the United States. The Ukraine was the first and largest of these independent countries to be taken into the Soviet Union in 1920. Since that time the Ukraine has been stripped forcibly of its culture, the profits of its economy, and many of its most talented citizens—of practically everything except an apparently undying desire for freedom and self-determination, kept alive by such organizations as the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America that speaks for its enslaved people in the Ukraine. This fall the Ukrainian Congress celebrates the 20th anniversary of its efforts in educating the American public of the desires of the captive nations for independence from Soviet rule.

Although the Ukraine lost its independence in 1920, the Ukrainian Congress keeps us informed of recent atrocities of the Soviet Union and attempts at revolt in the Iron Curtain countries. The present Soviet Government, led by Khrushchev, "The Hangman of the Ukraine," has continued an oppressive policy as it did in the 1920's and 1930's. Instead of mass slaughters, purges, and artificial famines, "silk glove" methods of subjection are used. A vast apparatus

of subverters, infiltrators, and informers is active both within and without the Soviet Union. A man will not necessarily be sent to a slave labor camp, although they still exist; he will be deprived of his job or arbitrarily decided against in a court. An action, whether truly subversive or not, will be reported by a fellow worker. It is necessary that the Soviet Government be less conspicuous in these tyrannical objectives, while Khrushchev tries to establish a favorable impression of the Communist system throughout the world. Nevertheless his tactics are equally as effective as the strong-arm methods of Stalin 10 and 20 years ago. It is sometimes easy to be deceived by the master salesman, Khrushchev. I take pride in congratulating the Ukrainian Congress for working ardently to prevent the United States and the world from falling under his spell.

Congressman Moore To Tour District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 31, 1960

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, as this session of the Congress draws to a close, I am sure that perhaps more than at any other time all of us are looking forward to the opportunity to return to our respective States and to visit and talk with the people whom we have the honor to represent here in the Congress.

This would seem to be particularly true this year for the reason that this recessed session of the Congress had initially generated great hope in the minds of the people that we would give serious consideration to a number of pieces of legislation that remained to be acted upon when we adjourned for the national party conventions in July of this year. This recessed session has been a failure in that regard, and it is for the best interests of the country that we adjourn and return to our States to make our peace with the people we represent.

The First Congressional District of West Virginia is a very short trip by air from Washington and during these past 2 years, as well as since coming to the Congress, I have made every effort to spend as much time in my district among the people I represent even while the Congress was in session. So many times this necessitated flying out and flying back on the same night while always returning to my district on Friday and Saturday for the purposes of holding district office hours in my district office in Moundsville, W. Va.

This has permitted me to better help and assist the people in my district and has made me better acquainted on just how the folks back home feel on particular legislative issues. It has also served to bring the people of the First Congressional District and their Congressman closer together.

Since first being elected to the Congress in November 1956, I have followed one fundamental rule; that is that I attempt to carry out the duties of my office in such a manner that as a Congressman I was easily accessible to the people I represented; rather than come to Washington and forget the people that had elected me. It was and still is my sincere desire to bring the office of the U.S. Congressman closer to the people. As a direct result of this pledge, I have made a great number of personal appearances and speeches in the seven counties which I represent. Very rarely do I accept a speaking engagement outside my Congressional District even though ofttimes I am requested to go to various other parts of the country. It has been my practice to the best of my ability and physical endurance to be a full-time representative for my people.

In keeping with another established practice, I wish to announce that I am making final preparations for my annual visit to a number of communities in the First Congressional District. I have made arrangements for office space in various courthouses and post offices and other civic buildings where it will be convenient to meet and privately discuss problems with individuals who might want to see me. Individuals who for one reason or another I have not had an opportunity to talk with and who might have problems in which I as their Congressman, might be of assistance. In preparation for this annual visit, I am, therefore, looking forward to adjournment as a time when I might make myself completely available to my constituents in their own hometowns.

The following schedule has been arranged and in each instance the time shown is the local time in that particular community where constituents and friends may have the opportunity to meet and talk with me privately on matters of personal, community, or State concern:

September 22, Thursday: Hancock County, 10 a.m. to 12 noon, city building, Chester; 1:30 p.m. to 4:30 p.m., courthouse, New Cumberland.

September 23, Friday: Hancock County, 10 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., post office building, Weirton.

September 26, Monday: Brooke County, 9:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. courthouse, Wellsburg.

September 28, Wednesday: Ohio County, 9:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., post office building, Wheeling.

September 30, Friday: Wetzel and Marshall Counties, 9:30 a.m. to 12 noon, city hall, Cameron; 1 p.m. to 4 p.m., Bank of Hundred, Hundred.

October 3, Monday: Wetzel County, 9:30 a.m. to 12 noon, courthouse, New Martinsville; 1:30 p.m. to 4:30 p.m., city hall, Pine Grove.

October 5, Wednesday: Taylor County, 9:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., post office building, Grafton.

October 6, Thursday: Marion County, 9:30 a.m. to 5 p.m., courthouse, Fairmont.

October 10, Monday: Marion County, 9:30 a.m. to 12 noon, post office, Farmington; 1:30 to 4:30 p.m., city hall, Rivesville.

Until such time as we reconvene in January, it is my intention that my district office in Moundsville will remain open to the general public 6 days a week and as a result of this, I have scheduled no courthouse visits for Moundsville, but my constituents from that area are invited to bring any problems that they may have at any time to me personally in my district office.

These visits in the various cities and towns are as informal as we can possibly make them, and workers, businessmen, and housewives are urged to drop by for a chat. No appointments are necessary and all persons are welcome to come as "they are" to see and visit with their Congressman. I hope the tour this year will be as successful as it was last year when we had several hundred people each day stop by our "mobile" office to let me know their feelings on various matters.

As I have stated, my district office, located in the Mercantile Bank Building in Moundsville, is open 6 days a week to serve the residents of the First Congressional District. When I am out of the office on official business, there is always a competent member of my staff available to answer questions or assist persons with their problems. I always welcome having my friends call upon me whenever my services might be of particular assistance.

The Record of the 86th Congress—Report to the People of the Fourth District of Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 31, 1960

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, at the end of each congressional session, I have reported to the people of my district on my votes and actions as their Representative in Congress.

The report which I am submitting today deals with the record of the 86th Congress. It outlines the major issues considered by our National Legislature since January 1959 when this Congress first convened. It also contains a tabulation of my votes and positions on all major bills.

I believe the voters have the right to know how their Congressman represented them in Washington. For this reason, I have prepared these reports annually, had them printed at my own expense, and made them available to the residents of the Fourth District.

In addition, I have kept my constituency informed of my actions through newsletters, radio and television reports, and periodic visits to the district while Congress was in session. I have tried to represent my district to the best of my ability, and to give a full account of my work in Congress. I hope that my efforts and position on issues will meet with the approval of the people who have sent me here to represent them.

THE 86TH CONGRESS

The 86th Congress convened on January 7, 1959. Its first session lasted until September 15, 1959. I remember that date vividly because, after an all-night session of Congress, I had to rush to New York to be present at the opening session of the United Nations General Assembly. It was my privilege to serve as U.S. delegate to that 14th General Assembly, and to represent our Nation at that world forum.

The 2d session of the 86th Congress began on January 6 of this year and is ending tonight.

In the course of these 2 sessions, the 86th Congress, led by Democratic majorities in the House of Representatives and in the Senate, established a constructive record of legislative achievement. I will list it in a detailed table appended to this report.

First, however, I would like to make this observation: President Eisenhower's prediction that the Democratic-controlled 86th Congress would engage in a "cold war of partisan politics" was never realized. The Democratic majorities in Congress did not waste their time on partisan bickering. They set about doing their work, keeping the interests of the people and the security of our Nation uppermost in mind.

As a matter of fact, on a number of issues important to the Nation, the President received more support from the Democrats in Congress than he did from the members of his own political party.

THE ATTITUDE OF THE ADMINISTRATION

The reverse, however, was not often true. A number of needed and constructive Democratic-sponsored bills either ran headlong into a Presidential veto, or were stopped in their tracks by a threat of a veto. Proposals to advance a solution to the problem of chronic unemployment and economically depressed areas, to promote home ownership and stimulate lagging home construction, to clean up the polluted waters of our Nation, to provide adequately for the medical care needs of our elder citizens—these and other bills belong to the category of legislation stymied by the present administration's recalcitrant attitude toward the human needs of our Nation.

SOME SOLID CONGRESSIONAL ACHIEVEMENTS

Nevertheless, the Democratic majorities in the 86th Congress were able to bring forth some solid legislative achievements.

Important advances were made in the field of labor legislation through the enactment of a major bill to curb abuses and racketeering in the field of labor-management relations, and through the preparation of the groundwork for the enactment next year of an effective minimum wage bill.

The first-mentioned bill was not perfect by any means. Certain corrective and improving amendments are needed, and I certainly hope that they will be enacted by the next Congress. I believe that there is considerable support for such amendments.

Further, the 86th Congress pioneered in approving legislation to provide for some of the medical care needs of our elder citizens, by removing—in accordance with the proposals I made as early as 1953—the age 50 requirement for the payment of disability benefits under the Social Security law, and by making several other important improvements in that law.

The enactment of legislation to safeguard each citizen's right to vote, the updating of veterans' benefits, the provision of health benefits and salary adjustments to Government employees, the strengthening of our national defense, and the introduction of a multilateral approach in some phases of our foreign policy programs, were among the numerous solid accomplishments of the 86th Congress.

EXECUTIVE LEADERSHIP WANTING

There are some fields, however, in which the Congress is not designed to provide leadership to our Nation. Policy decisions and new programs in those instances must come, under our Constitution, from the Chief Executive and his administration. National defense and foreign policy are foremost in this category. In these fields, Congress can modify, approve or reject Executive plans—but the leadership has to come from the executive branch of our Government.

This is so because only the Chief Executive has all of the information, the facilities, and the responsibility under the Constitution to initiate policy decisions and programs in these areas.

And it is precisely in these fields that Executive leadership has been found wanting.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AND SECURITY

During 1959 and the first 8 months of 1960, Congress appropriated over $80 billion for our national defense and security. This was more than one-half of our entire national budget for the 2-year period, and exceeded the President's requests by approximately $1 billion.

In spite of this tremendous expenditure of money, many Representatives and national leaders have repeatedly pointed out that our defense effort is not keeping up with the critical demands of our times.

There is no question that our defense is stronger today than it was 2 years ago, but so also is the Soviet capability to strike a lethal blow against our Nation. The evidence available shows that the Communists are still ahead of us in the field in which their striking power is concentrated, the field of intercontinental missiles, of space satellites, and the like.

And, on our part, we are not closing that gap fast enough.

There is also ample evidence that money is being squandered by our military services while many of our national defense needs go unmet. This is the area in which the record of the present administration is most disappointing. One would imagine that, with a lifetime of military experience behind him, the President would have been able to carry out the much-needed reorganization of our Military Defense Establishment, and to command enough public support to do that job well. Yet little, if anything, has been done in that direction.

Neither the reorganization laws enacted by Congress, nor the congressional exposure of waste in military procurement, have been of much help in remedying the situation. The Executive has made virtually no progress in unifying our defense forces, in eliminating duplication, in providing for better planning, in introducing more thorough inspection of military procurement, and in eliminating waste.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

The situation in the field of foreign affairs is also less than satisfactory.

The present administration has been coasting to a large extent on programs devised by earlier Democratic administrations and supported—at times for lack of anything better—by Democratic majorities in Congress. Some of these programs were devised to meet conditions existing 10 or 20 years ago. They lack maximum effectiveness and efficiency today.

The administration's attitude over the past 2 years seems to have been "Let's just keep on going, and rush to Congress for more money whenever our lack of foresight and planning blow up in our face."

Unfortunately, money alone cannot solve world problems. Further, many Democrats in Congress who have supported the administration on foreign affairs legislation are getting tired of being asked to appropriate more money every time a problem develops abroad. This is no way for the United States, the leader of the free world, to conduct its foreign policy.

The 86th Congress has been successful in correcting some—but certainly not all—of the shortcomings in this field.

First, it tightened up the administrative controls on the expenditure of money under our foreign policy programs. It established the office and approved the appointment of a comptroller to oversee the mutual security program. It placed numerous specific restrictions on the disbursement of funds under this legislation. It continued careful and thorough investigations of administrative practices and policy decisions in the field of foreign relations.

Further, the 86th Congress injected new emphasis into our international undertaking by approving U.S. participation in the International Development Association, intended to provide assistance, on multilateral basis, to the underdeveloped countries, and by establishing the Inter-American Development Bank.

LEGISLATIVE LEADERSHIP FOLLOWS

These are only a few of the major achievements of the 86th Congress.

The table which I am submitting with this report lists many more bills which were considered or approved by this Congress. The disposition of each bill, and my vote or position on it, are shown in the table.

I want to add that it has been a great honor for me to represent the 4th District of Wisconsin in the 86th Congress. It is my hope that my record on the issues will meet with the approval of my constituents.

Rollcall record of Congressman CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, 86th Cong.

	Total roll and quorum calls	Rollcalls	Not voting	Quorum calls	Absent on quorum calls [1]
1st sess.	162	78	0	84	1
2d sess.	206	93	0	113	3

[1] Absence on quorum call does not necessarily mean a legislative day's absence.

Voting record of Congressman CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, 86th Cong.

Stand	Issue	Status
	NATIONAL DEFENSE AND INTERNAL SECURITY	
Voted for	Defense Department appropriations: $39,000,000,000 in 1959, $40,000,000,000 in 1960	Became law
Voted for	Extension of the draft law until July 1, 1963	Became law.
Voted for	A 3-year extension of the Renegotiation Act to provide for recovery of excessive profits on defense contracts	Became law.
Voted for	Legislation to strengthen control of quality of officer personnel of Regular Army, Navy, and Air Force	Became law.
Voted for	Bill to provide for State cooperation in atomic energy activities, particularly in field of peaceful uses	Became law.
Voted for	Authority for National Aeronautics and Space Administration programs: $485,300,000 in 1959, $970,000,000 in 1960	Became law.
Voted for	Authority for Atomic Energy Commission programs: $229,900,000 in 1959, $211,400,000 in 1960, including power reactor plants for the Antarctic.	Became law.
Voted for	Construction program of modern naval vessels: $110,000,000 in 1959, $157,900,000 in 1960	Became law.
Voted for	Construction projects at military installations and bases, in United States and abroad: $1,200,000,000 in 1959, $1,100,000,000 in 1960	Became law.
Voted for	Change in Criminal Code to permit prosecution for espionage committed outside the United States	Died in Senate.
Voted for	Legislation to authorize Secretary of State to deny passports to persons furthering international communism	Died in Senate.
Voted for	Legislation to clarify term "organize" as used in Smith Act to make it apply to continuing Communist activities	Died in Senate.
Voted for	Bill to expedite procedures for review and execution of deportation orders against undesirable aliens	Died in Senate.
Voted for	Legislation to broaden provisions of Foreign Agents Registration Act	Died in Senate.
	INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS	
Voted for	Improvement and continuation of the mutual security program, including technical cooperation, military assistance, and other programs.	Became law.
Voted for	U.S. participation in the International Development Association to provide multilateral assistance to underdeveloped countries	Became law.
Voted for	H.R. 5 to provide tax incentives to encourage investment of private capital in underdeveloped countries	Died in Senate.
Voted for	Payment to American nationals of war damage claims from enemy-alien vested funds	Died in Senate.
Voted for	Lump-sum payment from vested enemy-alien funds for relief and rehabilitation of needy victims of Nazi persecution	Died in Senate.
Voted for	Admission of approximately 5,000 immigrants as part of international effort to promote resettlement of remaining European refugees	Became law.
Voted for	Legislation to authorize U.S. Government to enter into international cooperative program in health research, training, and planning.	Became law.
Sponsored	Resolution authorizing appointment of U.S. Citizens Commission to explore prospects of closer unity among NATO nations at a NATO convention.	Adopted.
Voted for	Resolution to authorize U.S. participation in International Bureau for Protection of Industrial Property, pursuant to a treaty	Became law.
Sponsored	Zablocki resolution calling for restoration of freedom to the captive nations	Approved by House.
Sponsored	Zablocki resolution opposing the admission of Red China to the U.N.	Approved by House.
Sponsored	Humphrey-Zablocki resolution relating to the promotion of peace through reduction of armaments	Died in House.
Voted for	Establishment of and U.S. participation in an Inter-American Development Bank	Became law.
Voted for	Adjustment in U.S. subscription to the International Monetary Fund and to the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.	Became law.
Voted for	A 3-year extension of the President's authority to implement terms of the International Wheat Agreement	Became law.
Voted for	Legislation giving preferential immigration status to relatives of citizens and permanent residents of the United States	Became law.
Voted for	Resolution authorizing President to designate week following July 4 as Captive Nations Week for prayer for freedom of people behind Iron Curtain.	Became law.
Favored	Resolution urging international agreement for suspension of nuclear weapons tests under proper safeguards	Adopted in Senate.
Voted for	Legislation granting President's request for special assistance to Latin America	Became law.
	GOVERNMENTAL REORGANIZATION	
Voted for	Admission of Hawaii to the Union as the 50th State	Became law.
Voted for	Legislation to facilitate orderly transition of Alaska from territorial to statehood status	Became law.
Voted for	Bill to restore authority of Administrator of Rural Electrification Administration to approve or disapprove loans	Vetoed by President.
Voted for	Establishment of permanent Advisory Committee on Intergovernmental Relations to help solve problems between Federal, State and local governments.	Became law.
Voted for	Amendment to Communications Act to exempt news-type programs from "equal time" requirement for political candidates on radio-TV.	Became law.
Voted for	Public Buildings Act of 1959, to coordinate and establish Federal policy governing construction and maintenance of Government buildings.	Became law.
Voted for	Amendment to Communications Act to limit "equal time" provisions for duration of 1960 campaign to major party candidates	Became law.
Voted for	Amendment to Communications Act to fix penalties for acceptance of "payola" and other abuses	Became law.
Favored	Legislation to require regulatory agencies to establish procedures to protect against improper influences	Died in House.
Voted for	Extension of the "antikickback" law now covering cost-plus contracts to apply also to all negotiated Government contracts	Became law.
Favored	Legislation to strengthen Federal elections law governing campaign contributions and expenditures	Died in House.
Voted for	Legislation to restrict number of negotiated contracts and require more competitive bidding in military procurement	Died in Senate.
Voted for	1960 civil rights statute to safeguard voting rights of every American citizen	Became law.
Voted for	Salary revision for postal and classified Government employees	Became law.
Voted for	1 year's extension of President's authority to propose Government reorganization plans to Congress	Died in Senate.
Favored	Legislation providing for appointment of public defenders in U.S. district courts	Died in House.
Favored	5-year program of payments to State and local governments in lieu of taxes for Federal lands; thorough review of this problem	Died in House.
Voted for	Resolution providing for creation of Commission to plan national observance of 175th anniversary of our Constitution (for 1964)	Became law.
Voted for	Strict accounting for moneys expended by Congressmen and congressional investigating committees; making such reports available to public.	Became law.
	NATIONAL ECONOMY	
Voted for	Federal loans, training assistance and other aids to stimulate industrial redevelopment in economically depressed areas	Vetoed by President.
Voted for	Increase in minimum wage and extension of coverage to retail concerns operating in 2 or more States	Died in conference.
Voted for	Emergency Home Ownership Act, to authorize Treasury to purchase FHA and VA-insured mortgages to stimulate home construction.	Died in Senate.
Favored	The Housing Act of 1960	Died in Rules Committee.
Voted for	Reduction of the cabaret tax from 20 percent to 10 percent	Became law.
Voted for	Legislation to curb undemocratic and racketeering practices in labor-management relations	Became law.
Voted for	Approval of President's request to raise permanent limit on national debt by $2,000,000,000, provide temporary additional raise in ceiling.	Became law.
Voted for	Bill to raise interest rate on savings bonds up to 4¼ percent to compare with high rates paid large investors on Treasury bonds	Became law.
Voted for	In 1959, a 1-year extension of corporate and excise tax rates; bill provided for repeal, in 1960, of telephone and transportation taxes	Became law.
Voted against	In 1960, continuation of telephone, transportation, and certain other excise and corporate tax rates	Became law.
Voted for	The Self-Employed Retirement Act, to allow tax deductions to professional self-employed persons for limited pension plan contributions.	Died in Senate.
Voted for	Bill to permit personal income tax deduction for all medical expenses incurred by taxpayer in care of dependent parent over 65	Became law.
Voted for	Temporary 1-cent increase in Federal gasoline tax to help finance interstate highway construction	Became law.
Voted for	Federal grants, through fiscal year 1963, for primary and secondary highway systems, and their urban extensions	Became law.
Voted for	Extension, until June 30, 1961, of the Airport Act and continuation of Federal aids, on 50-50 matching basis, for airport improvements.	Became law.
Voted for	Increase from $500,000,000 to $725,000,000 in the lending authority of the Small Business Administration	Became law.
Voted for	Amendments to the Small Business Investment Act to facilitate extension of credit to small business concerns	Became law.
Voted for	Amendment to Clayton Antitrust Act to strengthen enforcement of antimonopoly statutes	Became law.
Voted for	Authority to permit Federal Reserve Board to lower reserve requirements of member banks, expand money supply	Became law.
Voted for	Legislation limiting holding company control of savings and loan associations	Became law.
Sponsored	Resolution calling for thorough investigation of factors causing inflation and program to combat inflationary trends	Pending.
Voted for	Requirement that bank mergers have approval of Federal Reserve Board, Comptroller of Currency, or FDIC, to assure against monopoly.	Became law.
Voted for	Stopgap Housing bill approved before adjournment on Sept. 1, 1960	Became law.

Voting record of Congressman CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, 86th Cong.—Continued

Stand	Issue	Status
	VETERANS AND SERVICEMEN	
Voted for	Bill authorizing $100,000,000 for direct housing loans to veterans	Became law.
Voted for	Revision of the veterans' pension system, increasing non-service-connected pensions, based on need, for veterans, providing benefits to widows of World War II veterans, and making other changes.	Became law.
Voted for	Grants to aid totally disabled veterans to acquire specially equipped housing	Became law.
Voted for	Legislation providing for control of estates of incompetent veterans	Became law.
Voted for	A 2-year extension of the veterans' home and business loan program	Became law.
Voted for	Waiving payment of premiums on national life insurance policies for certain totally disabled veterans	Became law.
Voted for	Bill to permit conversion or exchange of national life insurance policies to a new, modified plan	Died in Conference.
Voted for	Education and training benefits for children of veterans who died of service-connected disability after Jan. 1, 1955	Became law.
Voted for	Provision of additional compensation for disabled veterans with more than 3 children	Became law.
Voted for	Program of educational, home purchase, and rehabilitation benefits for veterans with more than 180 days of active duty after Jan. 31, 1955.	Became law.
Voted for	Bill to equalize retirement and retainer pay of Armed Forces personnel who did not benefit under the increase of May 1958	Died in Senate.
Voted for	Restriction on the employment of retired commissioned officers of Armed Forces by defense contractors	Died in Senate.
Voted for	Bill authorizing involuntary retirement after 20 years' service of Air Force and Army officers who fail to meet requirements for promotion 3 or more times.	Became law.
Voted for	Additional compensation for certain disabled veterans (H.R. 7211)	Became law.
Voted for	Provision of services of optometrists to veterans with service-connected eye conditions	Became law.
Favored	Authority to permit certain veterans to continue vocational rehabilitation courses until completed	Died in Senate.
Voted for	Provision of incentive pay for service on nuclear-powered submarines	Became law.
Voted for	Amendments to the Reserve Officer Personnel Act to equalize promotion opportunity in various branches of Armed Forces	Became law.
Voted for	Legislation to provide a $100-a-month pension to holders of Congressional Medal of Honor	Died in Senate.
Voted for	5-year extension of the period during which families of veterans have preference for admission to public housing projects	Died in Senate.
Voted for	Legislation to authorize posthumous award of appropriate medals to the four chaplains	Became law.
	AGRICULTURE	
Voted for	A 2-year extension of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act for sale of surplus farm commodities abroad	Became law.
Voted for	Legislation proposing wheat referendum: 25-percent reduction in planting acreage, and 90 percent of parity price supports; or, removal of acreage controls and drop supports to 50 percent of parity.	Vetoed by President.
Voted for	Reduce wheat acreage allotment by 20 percent, fix supports at 85-percent parity; or, remove all production controls, allow supports to drop to feed-grain level.	Defeated in House.
Voted for	Reduce wheat acreage allotment by 25 percent, fix supports at 75 percent of parity provide payments for land withdrawn from active production.	Defeated in House.
Voted for	A 2-year extension of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act authorizing refinancing of loans on family-size farms	Became law.
Favored	Establishment of a Commission on Problems of Rural Counties and Smaller Communities	Died in House.
Voted for	Extension, to Mar. 31, 1961, of the Sugar Act; giving President authority to cut and readjust Cuba's quota	Became law.
Voted for	Requirement that marketing quotas for rice be established when total supply exceeds normal	Became law.
Voted for	Establishment of an Agricultural Research and Development Commission to find and promote new industrial uses of farm products	Died in conference.
Voted for	Improvement of administration of Secretary of Agriculture's authority over loans to farmers and ranchers	Died in Senate.
	NATURAL RESOURCES	
Voted for	Increased effort in combating water pollution with Federal grants to local governments for construction of needed facilities	Vetoed by President.
Voted for	$500,000 appropriation to begin thorough study of water pollution problem in lower Lake Michigan and Great Lakes	Became law.
Voted for	Legislation increasing rental fees for oil and gas leases on public lands	Became law.
Voted for	Establishment of an Office of Coal Research to find new uses for coal, encourage production and conservation	Became law.
Voted against	Increased diversion of water from Lake Michigan through the Chicago Sanitary Canal	Died in Senate.
Voted for	Administration of national forests on basis of multiple use and sustained yield of products	Became law.
Favored	Expanded and accelerated program of conversion of sea water and other saline water to beneficial uses	Died in House.
Favored	Granting consent of Congress to the Great Lakes compact	Died in House.
Voted for	Legislation to authorize Federal cooperation with educational institutions and private organizations in research and training programs on fish and wildlife resources.	Became law.
Voted for	Omnibus rivers and harbors bill, for flood control and navigation works projects	Became law.
Voted for	Legislation authorizing issuance of permits for prospecting for phosphate on public lands	Became law.
Voted for	Bill authorizing the TVA to issue revenue bonds to finance additional power facilities within the area it serves	Became law.
	SOCIAL SECURITY, HEALTH, AND WELFARE	
Voted for	Social Security Act Amendments of 1960, removing the age 50 requirement for payment of disability benefits, providing medical care assistance to the aged under federally approved State plans, and improving various other provisions of the social security law.	Became law.
Voted for	Omnibus housing bill of 1959, increasing FHA loan authority by $8,000,000,000, reducing downpayment requirements, providing grants for urban renewal, and containing other provisions.	Became law.
Voted for	Extension of the Voluntary Home Mortgage Credit program to aid buyers in smaller communities to find financing	Became law.
Voted for	A 2-year extension of the life of the Civil Rights Commission	Became law.
Voted for	Extension of benefits under the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act to jobless whose State payments expired before Apr. 1, 1959.	Became law.
Voted for	Increase in benefits under Railroad Retirement and Unemployment Compensation Acts	Became law.
Voted for	Increased maximum expenditures under the special school milk program	Became law.
Voted for	A 5-year extension of programs for training public health personnel and advanced training of professional nurses	Became law.
Voted for	A 4-year extension of the Federal air-pollution control program and $5,000,000 a year for research projects and technical assistance to local health authorities.	Became law.
Voted for	Health insurance program for Federal employees	Became law.
Voted for	A 3-year program of aid to school districts for school construction	Died in Rules Committee.
Voted for	Increased Federal contribution to land-grant colleges for resident teaching grants	Became law.
Favored	Limited Federal assistance to local communities and nonprofit agencies to combat juvenile delinquency	Died in Rules Com.
Voted for	Health benefits program for retired civil service workers	Became law.
Voted for	Study of effects of automobile exhaust fumes on public health; requires report to Congress in 2 years	Became law.
Voted for	Establishment of national register of persons whose automobile drivers' licenses have been revoked	Became law.
Voted for	Authorizing Post Office to seek court orders to curb use of mails for distribution of obscene and/or fraudulent matter	Became law.
Favored	Establishment of Youth Conservation Corps to work in national forests	Died in House.

Federal Schools Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHIL WEAVER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 31, 1960

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most insidious proposals made during the 86th Congress was the attempt to steal from the American people their right to control their own educational facilities and turn it over to a high-priced bureaucracy in Washington. Fortunately for the American people this bit of chicanery was blocked by the men and women in this Congress who still believe as I do that the people themselves should control their own future and that a government subsidy means government control.

I believe the school aid bill as proposed this year was a bad one. The measure would have taken away control of school construction and handed it over to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in the name of a national emergency which does not actually exist.

Mr. Speaker, I will concede that there are areas in this country where there is a shortage of classrooms and teachers. However, these areas are relatively few in number and the problems can be solved at the local—or at worst, the State—level. I say at worst advisedly because I do not think schools should be controlled at the State capital any more than I think they should be controlled in Washington. Education is a problem for the people themselves to handle and one which they alone are capable of handling in a truly democratic manner and with the best interests of everybody kept uppermost in mind.

As far as Nebraska is concerned, I would like to point out that the Federal aid program would have, in actuality, placed us deeper in the hole. The program was designed—or so it was claimed—to help those States which have small populations and small tax bases. Actually, Nebraska would have gotten a couple of million dollars out of the program while New York was getting some $26 million. By comparison Nebraska would have been further and further behind New York.

This type of legislation involves what is known as matching funds. In other words, to take part we have to put up half the money and supposedly "get as a gift" half of the money from Uncle Sam. The truth is that we put up all the money, both the local contribution and the national contribution. The trouble is that instead of dealing through an elected school board at the local level we have to add the costs of supporting a massive Federal bureaucracy.

All in all, for the people of Nebraska, this is bad legislation. No matter how you cut it, it still comes out a trifle ripe and unsavory.

For these reasons I have opposed this legislation from the very beginning and I still oppose it.

Dedication of Headquarters Building of National Association of Life Underwriters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 31, 1960

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, my remarks on the forthcoming dedication of the new headquarters building for the National Association of Life Underwriters:

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR THURMOND

The National Association of Life Underwriters will dedicate its new headquarters building at 1922 F Street NW., Washington, D.C., on September 11, 1960. The association was founded in 1890 by 105 courageous individuals to combat the evils then rampant in the life insurance business. From that time to the present day, it has devoted itself to the improvement of ethical practices in the life insurance business and to the education of the public concerning the advantages of life insurance. During the past year, under the leadership of a true southern gentleman from Columbia, S.C., President William S. Hendley, Jr., the membership reached an alltime high of more than 78,000 members. As an association composed solely of fieldmen, the national body has always led the way in agents' activities and has stood as the spokesman and adviser of the life underwriters of America. In addition, the association has always stood for the principles upon which this country was founded—such as thrift, industry, individual initiative, economy, and a sound fiscal policy. As one of the oldest trade associations in the United States I salute the National Association of Life Underwriters on its 70th year of achievement and welcome it to its new permanent home here in Washington.

Congressman Kowalski Cites Interdependence of Management and Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STANLEY A. PROKOP
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 31, 1960

Mr. PROKOP. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week, our Connecticut colleague, Hon. FRANK KOWALSKI, delivered a penetrating and thoughtful address to the 1960 Legislative, Political, and Educational Conference of the Connecticut State Labor Council, AFL–CIO, at Hartford, Conn.

The interdependence of management and labor is brought out strikingly by Mr. KOWALSKI in this address.

Under unanimous consent, I bring to the attention of the House the text of this address by Congressman KOWALSKI:

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN FRANK KOWALSKI, 1960 LEGISLATIVE, POLITICAL, AND EDUCATIONAL CONVENTION, CONNECTICUT STATE LABOR COUNCIL, AFL–CIO, HARTFORD, AUGUST 29, 1960

My political philosophy is rooted in the firm belief that people—their needs and aspirations—are the most important concern of government at every level.

It is on the basis of this philosophy that I have made my decisions and cast my votes in Congress. My goal has been to represent, not any special group, but all the people of Connecticut.

In our complex modern society, no man, no group can be an island, aloof and apart from other men and other groups. Legislation that affects one segment of our economy necessarily affects other segments.

The impact of every law that affects business and industry, for instance, is felt to some degree by every worker.

I have worked hard for the working men and women of this country and my State in particular, because I believe in the great social programs which are so badly needed. But, I am also pleased to report to you, as representatives of organized labor in Connecticut, that I have worked hard for industry and business in our State. I have done this because I am convinced that by doing so, I was working in the best interest of our economy as a whole.

With this in mind, last year I initiated legislation to curb the tragic growth of interstate tax barriers. My bill, H.R. 7715, which was designed to stop the taxing of the income of industry in our State by other States, was the first piece of legislation in this field. The enactment of my original proposal into law helped not only Connecticut industry and business, but served to protect your jobs.

During the past 2 years, I have been visited by many representatives of business and industry from Connecticut seeking my help to secure defense contracts. Impressed by these visits, I found that during the years 1956, 1957, and 1958 primary defense contracts in our State dropped from $1¼ billion to $900 million and finally in 1958 to about $800 million. In other words, while the six Republican Congressmen and the two Republican Senators sat on their big fat hands during these years, Connecticut lost almost a half a billion dollars in defense orders. Oh, the military budget remained about the same, Connecticut defense orders went to other States. This loss of contracts cost the working men and women of Connecticut about 30,000 jobs. I am proud to report to you that I have been successful in helping Connecticut plants to secure defense contracts and by doing this I have helped our working people.

The problem of foreign competition has been of great concern to some of our industries in Connecticut. It's easy to criticize the administration on this point, but the solution of this problem is not readily apparent. There are many complicating factors. For example, in 1959 exports from the United States totaled $16.3 billion; our imports amounted to $15.2 billion. We exported $1.1 billion dollars worth of goods more than we imported. In Connecticut alone in 1956 (which are the latest figures I have) our exports amounted to $280 million and provided employment for 20,000 workers. We have to import if we want to export, but we can destroy our industries in the process.

Establishment of realistic import quotas is one approach to this problem. I have worked hard in this regard and am happy to report with considerable success. International Silver of Meriden, for example, was threatened with destruction by import of flatware from Japan. Quotas on flatware saved the situation.

In this connection, on the recommendation of Connecticut businessmen, I urged the Secretary of State to include in the U.S. delegation to GATT (world organization to study import-export arrangement next month in Europe) representatives of industry and labor. I consider foreign competition one of our most serious problems and pledge my time and energies to it.

I cite my concern over these problems of industry and business, and I have mentioned some of my activities in behalf of the business community, mainly to prove my point that ours is an interlocking economy, in which we all have an important stake.

I am frank to say that I am seriously concerned about the present state of our national economy. Despite the insistence of Madison Avenue publicists that Utopia is already here, there is much evidence to the contrary and there are ominous signs of even more alarming things to come.

During the recent presidential primary campaigns, many Americans were made uneasily aware, for the first time, of the plight of such areas as West Virginia. The President's veto of the depressed areas bill, a bill which I was proud to cosponsor, cannot hide the fact that many areas of our country are still plagued by unemployment and poverty.

There should be no complacency over the state of our economy when the Nation's steel industry is working at only 50 percent of capacity, when railroads such as the New Haven have become a national disgrace, when living costs have moved steadily upward despite solemn pledges to the contrary that we were given 8 years ago, and when millions of our fellow-Americans able and willing to work are without jobs.

These tragic facts are all the more calamitous when it is realized that the United States should be exerting every possible effort to meet the economic threat offered by the Soviet Union. There is evidence that the Soviet Union, working full blast, is today producing as much steel as we are.

Just last week, a Yale economist, Associate Professor Raymond Powell declared that the growth of the Soviet economy will continue to outstrip ours in the years ahead. He pointed out, as have other economic experts, that Russia's rate of industrial expansion in recent years has been more than double that of the United States.

The Soviet threat will grow still more dangerous unless America gets dynamic, aggressive leadership. A report to the Joint Economic Committee of Congress last year on the lag in the growth rate of our economy said flatly: "The blame must fall primarily upon the Federal Government."

Industry must be encouraged to grow and expand. Such encouragement can come only from strong leadership in the White House, a leadership which will reverse the trend whereby the rate of increase in our gross national product has been allowed to drop from the 4.6 percent a year of the Truman administration to the 2.4 percent of the Eisenhower years.

Nor is it our economy alone that requires new leadership. Great social problems have been neglected or given only cursory attention. The challenge which they pose must be met if America is to keep its rendezvous with destiny.

We like to think of the United States as first and foremost in every field; so it may startle you when I say that we are 50 years behind some European countries in social programs.

We need, for example, a Federal program of medical aid for our older citizens under the social security system. Just recently we who believe in such a program lost a battle in Congress, but I promise you we have not lost the war.

I shall fight harder than ever for a Forand-type program, and I am firmly convinced that this November the American people will declare themselves by their ballots as overwhelmingly in favor of such a program.

We need a Federal program of aid to education. There must be Federal assistance to the States, not only for school construction but for teachers' salaries.

We should have a Federal program of loans and scholarships, to insure that every qualified young American can have a full education. We must provide assistance to our colleges and universities so that they will not have to turn away qualified applicants.

We need a broadened program of housing and urban renewal, to remove the blight of slums from our cities and to assure the right of every family to a decent home.

We must build housing for our senior citizens at costs which will permit them to live in dignity on their reduced pensions and retirement incomes.

We need civil rights legislation that will guarantee to every American, in the North as well as in the South, the right to live his life in freedom, equality, and dignity. We need strong leadership from the White House to guarantee him his right to vote, the right of his children to attend first-class schools as first-class citizens, and the right of every member of his family to full citizenship, with all its benefits and privileges.

We need an end to punitive legislation—whether it be directed against labor or management. I have been condemned in some quarters because I voted all the way against the Landrum-Griffin bill which was adopted last year. I was right in my vote. I would vote the same way if the issue were before the Congress again today. I cannot in conscience support any legislation designed to punish one part of society because such punishment seems the popular thing at the moment.

We need new minimum wage legislation. But this is not enough. What about the older workers, those over 45 years of age who cannot get jobs because they are too old? What about the handicapped and those forced to work in jobs not covered by a minimum wage? Well, my views on these questions are crystal clear. It is my fixed opinion that there can be no discrimination because of age; that every man in this Nation is entitled to an opportunity for a job; that every American who is willing to work must be paid a living wage. The employer in our competitive society, however, will say, "But if I am to survive in business I am entitled to a dollar's worth of work for a dollar's pay." I agree, and so there must be provided appropriate incentives to encourage the employer to hire an older worker, to hire the handicapped, and to pay these workers a living wage. I suggest one incentive might be to give the employer a percentage rebate on his income tax for employing our older workers and our handicapped. If I am returned to Congress, I shall introduce such legislation.

I am also proud to tell you that I have recently introduced legislation which is designed to give our working men and women the right to employment with the company for which they work when a plant moves to a new location in the United States. I deplore the practice of some managers to refuse job priorities to their workers when the company moves to another State or new community. I promise that I shall fight for this legislation. Most important, we must bring management and labor together, under White House leadership, for study and discussion of mutual problems. One problem that should be receiving such attention at this time is that of automation, and its effects in the years ahead.

No, we have not reached utopia yet. Still facing us are problems which are vast and awesome. The new frontier which Senator JACK KENNEDY has laid out for us offers a tremendous challenge.

With strong leadership, and with unshakable determination, we can solve these problems. Let it not be said that when the challenge came, we did not meet it. Let us dedicate ourselves to new effort, for America and for mankind, toward a finer and a better life for all.

In a new and fighting leadership—inspiring each of us to work for economic strength and social justice—lies our hope for the future and all it can mean to America and the world.

Memorial Day Should Be on Monday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. BARR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 31, 1960

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a resolution which would establish Memorial Day on the last Monday of May. This has been a pet project of one of our great Indianapolis citizens, Mr. C. Walter McCarty. "Mickey," as he is affectionately known in Indianapolis, has argued for many years that there is a tendency to regard Memorial Day as merely a holiday for recreation when it falls within the middle of the week. He also goes ahead to argue that if Memorial Day always fell on Monday, then patriotic and religious services could be observed on Sunday, and still give the average taxpayer an opportunity for recreation.

I agree with Mr. McCarty that the Nation would have an opportunity to return to the original meaning of Memorial Day if it were established that this holiday would always fall on Monday. This year I returned to Indianapolis for the Memorial Day services, and Memorial Day did fall on Monday. It seemed to me that the city and its patriotic and religious organizations did have a chance to slow down and think about the real significance of Memorial Day. The services were by far the most impressive that I have seen for many years.

We live in a busy and hard-working society. But surely all of us can take time at least once a year to think of the debt that we owe the men and women who have given their lives for this country.

Next week the Nation will celebrate Labor Day. Labor Day always falls on Monday, and the Nation has followed a policy of combining a weekend of recreation with the time for paying tribute to the men and women who work for a living. I certainly agree that this country should set aside a Monday to memorialize the men and women of our labor force. I also contend that an equal amount of respect should be paid to the people who died for this country.

Travel Abroad by the Foreign Affairs Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 31, 1960

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, one of the most difficult jobs confronting the Committee on Foreign Affairs is keeping track of how well the mutual security program operates in order that any deficiences may be called to the attention of those responsible for the administration of the program for appropriate action and that when necessary legislative remedies may be provided.

The full development of information relating to mutual security operations is ordinarily accomplished during the course of hearings before the Foreign Affairs Committee or its subcommittees. Leads as to matters to be followed up during hearings are developed primarily from field observations made by members of the committee and the committee staff during visits to countries receiving U.S. assistance.

COMPLETION OF PLANS AND COST ESTIMATES

A case in point involves projects for the construction of factories, land development and other major undertakings which were observed by visitors to countries, particularly in Asia, to have become bogged down, that is, U.S. money had been set aside to finance such projects but even after the elapse of 2 or 3 years the actual construction work was not making visible progress. An analysis by the Foreign Affairs Committee developed the fact that the basic trouble was that at the time when U.S. officials and a foreign government agreed that a particular construction project should be carried out, U.S. funds were set aside—obligated—for that purpose. After the agreement the two Governments then undertook to make surveys,

draw plans, prepare detailed cost estimates, and the recipient country to enact necessary enabling legislation. Frequently the recipient country got cold feet with respect to the project after it had explored fully what it would cost and what the impact on local interests would be.

After exploring and analyzing this situation the Committee on Foreign Affairs took the initiative in writing into the Mutual Security Act section 517, "Completion of Plans and Cost Estimates, which requires that before mutual security funds can be obligated for a project, engineering and financial plans, together with detailed cost estimates, must have been completed.

INSPECTOR GENERAL AND COMPTROLLER

Another example of the results of observation by Foreign Affairs Committee members in countries where the mutual security program is in operation has been the establishment of the Office of the Inspector General and Comptroller. Members of the Foreign Affairs Committee have found in their contacts with U.S. officials who are engaged in carrying out mutual security operations in foreign countries that these officials are often very frank in pointing out deficiencies in the program. Rather than there being a conspiracy of silence to hide mistakes, there are usually a number of Americans connected with the program in every country who recognize waste and inefficiency when it exists and who are sincerely desirous of having it corrected. Frequently these people have in the past pointed out the shortcomings of program operations to their superiors. Unfortunately there has been difficulty in getting this type of information into the hands of top level officials where appropriate corrective action can be taken.

In order to provide a channel for getting such information to senior officials responsible for the mutual security program and to establish an organization capable of following up indications of waste and inefficiency the Foreign Affairs Committee last year took the initiative in establishing the Office of the Inspector General and Comptroller, reporting directly to the Under Secretary of State who has overall responsibility for the mutual security program.

If it had not been for field observation by committee members who found that criticisms of the program initiated by Americans employed in the program were not getting through to the proper officials in Washington, this action would not have been taken.

OVERPROGRAMING OF MILITARY ASSISTANCE FUNDS

Probably the most spectacular example of this kind occurred in 1956 when the Foreign Affairs Committee took the lead in reducing the Executive request for an appropriation for military assistance by $1 billion. There were loud cries that this action would wreck the program and that the committee was acting in a most irresponsible manner. The next year, however, the Pentagon reported that it had, as a result of its own reevaluation of the entire military assistance program, cut the program back not only by the $1 billion required by the Congress, but an additional $500 million.

This was a case where the observations of Foreign Affairs Committee members of the overprograming of military assistance preceded the recognition of the true facts by the top officials in the Pentagon.

Take a personal example. I have been a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs for 22 years. For many years I have had a particular interest in Latin American affairs and was formerly Chairman of the Inter-American Affairs Subcommittee and am now ex-officio ranking Republican member of that subcommittee. During the period of the Communist-controlled government in Guatemala under Arbenz I was disturbed with the force of communism in this hemisphere. When Castella Armas' forces overthrew the Communist Government I advocated assistance to Guatemala to keep it in the free world column.

In the fall of 1957 I was selected to undertake a study mission to several countries in Latin America to determine the strength and potentiality of communism in that part of the world and also to determine if we were spending too much money for military assistance and not enough for economic purposes in that area.

I selected Franklin J. Schupp, staff consultant on the Committee on Foreign Affairs and who is also consultant for the Inter-American Affairs Subcommittee, to accompany me on this mission. Mr. Schupp has had considerable experience—having been a member of the U.S. Intelligence Division in that area during World War II. He speaks Spanish fluently.

Through our efforts, especially because of Mr. Schupp's experience and contacts, as soon as we arrived in Venezuela we immediately began to obtain valuable information as to Communist activities in South and Central America. As we went further north we found serious trouble brewing. We relayed all this information not only to the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee but also to the proper officials in Washington.

Just recently I was interviewed concerning this trip by a writer whose sole purpose was to smear Members of Congress who had traveled abroad. Because of the secret nature of the information we obtained I did not mention this phase of the trip to him or tell him who we saw or what we did. Nor under the circumstances did I feel obligated to discuss the second purpose of our trip or furnish him a personal travelog as to where we stayed or what we did, etc.; nor did I tell him that on this trip I spent considerably more than $800 of my own money.

As a result he wrote a very critical article which implied we were not justified in making the trip and it had no official purpose. I answered these unwarranted charges and other erroneous statements in the press the day after his article appeared.

As to the second objective of our trip we found very serious criticism of the large amounts of money we were spending for military purposes. It was felt that in some instances it was not being used for internal security but was being used frequently to keep dictators in power.

We also found there was a great need for more economic aid in such fields as health, sanitation, education, and agriculture.

All this we reported back to our chairman and discussed our findings with members of the Subcommittee on Inter-American activities. We found general agreement in that committee as to our findings.

Later, under the very able leadership of the chairman of the subcommittee, ARMISTEAD SELDEN, JR., a report was issued recommending less military spending. Military expenditures in the area have been limited and there is now pending a bill for $600 million for economic loans for this area which may be passed by the Congress before we adjourn.

From my personal experience I have found that it is of the utmost importance when we have the responsibility for the mutual security program that we follow through and find out just how the money is being expended.

The Foreign Affairs Committee has set up a subcommittee for the specific purpose of investigating and reviewing the mutual security program. I am a member of that subcommittee.

The Foreign Affairs Committee is one of the three committees that has been authorized by the Congress to request from the House Administration Committee money for this purpose.

It is my judgment these investigations have saved hundreds of millions of dollars to the taxpayers, which is a thousandfold more than the expenses incurred by Members on these trips.

Voting Records of South Dakota Congressman on REA Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 31, 1960

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, a few months ago, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. BERRY] placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the voting tabulations of several organizations that score the voting records of Members of Congress. Mr. BERRY's insertion covered his and my voting record as tabulated by these certain organizations.

Since the electrification of farms and ranches in South Dakota is very vital to the people of our State, I believe that it would be helpful to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the evaluation of votes affecting REA that have been cast by members of the South Dakota delegation. The National Rural Electric Cooperative Association is a nonpartisan highly respected organization with

which some of our most distinguished South Dakota REA leaders are affiliated. This organization with the authorization of its board of directors compiles and evaluates the voting record of all Members of Congress so that interested citizens may know whether their Congressmen are voting for or against the best interests of rural electrification.

Below is the compilation of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association for Members of Congress from South Dakota who are seeking election this year:

	Total REA votes	Favorable REA votes	Unfavorable or missed REA votes	Percentage of favorable REA votes
Congressman BERRY (elected 1950)	37	15	22	40
Congressman MCGOVERN (elected 1956)	18	18	0	100
Senator MUNDT (elected Senate 1948)	48	17	31	35

Let's Keep the Record Straight on the Saline Water Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 31, 1960

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, August 25, 1960, the senior Montana Member in the other body took issue with the plank in the 1960 Republican platform which pledged "continued Federal support for Republican initiated research and demonstration projects which will supply fresh water from salt and brackish water resources."

He objected to the claim that these research and demonstration projects had been Republican initiated, stating:

> The saline and brackish water program was first proposed by the Democratic Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY on March 19, 1949.

In connection with this saline water program the 1960 Democratic platform has this to say:

> We will support and intensify the research effort to find an economical way to convert salt and brackish water. The Republicans discouraged this research, which holds untold possibilities for this whole world.

The reference to Republican discouragement of this saline water research is completely false. An even more flagrant untruth was included in the 1956 Democratic platform, as follows:

> The program of obtaining a large new source of fresh water supply from salt water has begun by the Democratic Party but has been allowed to lapse by the Eisenhower Republican administration. It will be resumed and accelerated.

As that great Democrat Al Smith often said: "Let's look at the record."

As to who first proposed the saline water program, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shows that while the senior Wyoming Member of the other body may have been the first to introduce a saline water bill in the other body, he was antedated by Republicans, Fletcher, Phillips, and McDonough in the House of Representatives. Mr. Fletcher introduced a saline water bill, H.R. 5777, on March 9, 1948; Mr. MCDONOUGH introduced a saline water bill, H.R. 6031, on March 29, 1948; and H.R. 3650 on March 21, 1949; Mr. Phillips introduced a saline water bill, H.R. 265, on January 3, 1949. No affirmative action was taken by the Congress on any saline water bill in the Democratic controlled 81st Congress.

In the 82d Congress, also Democratic controlled, the first saline water bill to be introduced was H.R. 6 by Mr. Phillips, a Republican, on January 3, 1951. Other saline water bills introduced in that session were H.R. 7 by McKinnon, of California, a Democrat; S. 5 by the senior Wyoming Member of the other body on January 8, 1951, H.R. 6578, a so-called clean committee bill by Mr. ENGLE on February 14, 1952. Mr. Phillips and Mr. McKinnon also introduced revised saline water bills, H.R. 6704 and H.R. 7185, respectively. House hearings were held on these five House bills. The saline water bill, H.R. 6578, was passed by the House on June 2, 1952.

When the saline water bill was brought up in the other body on June 21, 1952, the House bill, H.R. 6578, was made the order of business in lieu of S. 5, which was indefinitely postponed. A South Dakota Republican Member of the other body moved that all after the enacting clause be stricken from H.R. 6578 and his amendment or bill be inserted. The other body approved the Case amendment and the House accepted the amendment. The bill was signed into law on July 3, 1952.

It can be seen from this record that the initial saline-water authorization bill as passed by the Congress was a bill written and introduced in the other body by a Republican.

Of course, authorization of a saline-water program means nothing if funds are not provided to implement it. Let us again look at the record to see who was responsible for obtaining the initial funds to implement or start the saline-water program.

Three and a half days before adjournment of the 82d Congress, Department of Interior representatives appeared before the Senate Appropriations Committee of the other body with a request that $400,000 be allowed to initiate the saline-water program. The Democratic chairman of that committee refused to even hear testimony on the matter. Here is what he said:

> I cannot imagine anything more important than being able to take the salt out of ocean water. Of course, it is important. It requires a great deal more time than we have to consider. That is my opinion. We cannot do that in the last 3½ days.

And again:

> Under those circumstances, you should give our committee a little more than 3½ days. We will hear you in January.

When the supplemental appropriation bill came up on the Senate floor on July 3, 1952, it was the same South Dakota Republican Member of the other body that presented and obtained approval of an amendment providing for $125,000 to initiate the saline water program.

The record also shows that when the Case proposal was made on July 3, 1952, the senior Wyoming Member of the other body, who was given unwarranted credit by the senior Montana Member of the other body for having been the first to introduce a saline water bill, actually opposed the granting of the initial funds to initiate the saline water program—saying that it should go over to the new Congress in January 1953.

Let us look at the record with regard to the Democratic claim in their 1956 platform that the saline water program has been allowed to lapse by the Eisenhower Republican administration, and in their 1960 platform, that Republicans discouraged this research.

Here is the record of the funds requested, appropriated, and obligated for the saline water program since its inception in fiscal year 1953:

SALINE WATER RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

	Budget request	Appropriated	Obligated
Fiscal year 1953	$400,000	[1] $125,000	$172,543
Fiscal year 1953 supplemental	50,000	[2] 50,000	
Fiscal year 1954	400,000	400,000	398,445
Fiscal year 1955	400,000	400,000	398,258
Fiscal year 1956	600,000	600,000	596,364
Fiscal year 1957	600,000	[3] 550,000	509,963
Fiscal year 1958	1,159,000	[3] 725,000	724,986
Fiscal year 1959	1,369,400	[3] 1,182,960	[4] 1,241,968
Fiscal year 1960	1,355,000	1,755,000	1,714,040
Fiscal year 1961	1,355,000	1,355,000	
Fiscal year 1961 supplemental	500,000	400,000	

DEMONSTRATION PLANT PROGRAM

Fiscal year 1960	300,000	300,000	1,583,932
Do	1,550,000	1,550,000	
Fiscal year 1961	2,040,000	2,040,000	

[1] Of the $125,000 appropriated by the Democratic controlled 82d Cong. at the insistence of Republican Senator Case, only $5,755.45 was obligated as of Dec. 31, 1952, all for administrative purposes. The first research contracts, totaling $35,000, were recorded as obligations on Jan. 31, 1953, after the Eisenhower administration took office.

[2] Requested and approved in 1953 under the Eisenhower administration.

[3] Appropriations shown reflect reduction of Eisenhower budget request by Democratic-controlled Congress.

[4] Includes $63,000 of reappropriated unobligated balances of prior years.

It is apparent from the above tabulation that less than $10,000 was obligated for the saline water program under the Democratic administration and it was all for administrative expenses. The first obligation for the actual research and development phase of the program did not take place until January 31, 1953, after the Eisenhower administration had taken office.

It is also of note that in 1957, 1958, and 1959, the Democratic controlled Congresses reduced the appropriation for the saline water research and development program below the budget request of the Eisenhower administration. Certainly it will be clear, to anyone who reads the record, that the Democratic performance on the saline water program is completely at variance with their platform statements.

Mr. Speaker, I have been a member of the Subcommittee for Interior Department Appropriations for the past 18 years. As an ardent supporter of this saline water program from its inception, I felt it necessary during the House Appropriations Committee hearings on the Interior Department appropriation bill for fiscal year 1958 to call attention to the lack of truth in the 1956 Democratic platform reference to the saline water program. It just was not true that the program had been allowed to lapse under the Eisenhower administration, in fact the exact opposite was true, and I felt the record should be cleared. The people are entitled to the truth when these false claims are made by the Democrats. That is why I have here again spoken out on the subject.

The people are entitled to have the facts.

Twentieth Anniversary of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. MILLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 31, 1960

Mr. MILLER of New York. Mr. Speaker, the record of Soviet conquest and suppression is a long one and the freedom-loving nations which have been ground to pulp under the spiked heel of Russian imperialism are numerous.

It is paradoxical in this year of 1960, while the global ambitions of the Communists take on renewed vigor, that the subjugated peoples within the Russian periphery outnumber their masters and yet are unable to obtain the freedom for which they have struggled so tirelessly.

The sadistic slaughters of Hungary, Poland, and East Germany still are fresh in the world's mind, but the rape of those other nations who fell before the Red onslaught in earlier conquests somehow have been obscured by the three subsequent wars involving troops of most of the civilized and uncivilized world. Many of us are inclined to forget that long before these Soviet outrages shocked the West, millions of other peoples had sacrificed their lives and liberties to this relentless and barbaric conspiracy.

We sometimes overlook the fact that many nations were engulfed by the Soviet hordes so long ago that their names now are unfamiliar. Few today recall that Kirghiz, Kazakh, Tadzhik, Turkmen, Uzbek, Azerbaijan, Idel-Ural, Cosackia, and Byelorussia are formerly free countries whose 63 million people now are enslaved by communism.

The names of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania are more familiar because they were comparatively recent conquests and we know of Georgia because it was the birthplace of Joseph Stalin.

But the largest of all these captive nations, Ukrainia, is thought of by most Americans only as a historic part of Russia itself. The 42 million survivors of Russia's genocidal decimation of the Ukraine today constitute the largest population bloc among nations engulfed by the Soviets and is approximately half as large as that of Russia itself.

This fall, Mr. Speaker, the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, which is made up of Americans of Ukrainian descent or birth, will observe its 20th anniversary and I think it fitting that we and the rest of the Nation pay tribute to these people who have suffered so much and so long under communistic oppression.

Few peoples in history have kept the spirit of independence alive so long under such adverse conditions as the Ukrainians. As most of us here are aware, the present lord of the Kremlin, who denounced our President and demanded an apology from him for the U–2 flights, reached his lofty position as head of the Communist world by literally walking over the bodies of Ukrainians he had slaughtered.

I shall not describe here the countless murders carried out on Nikita Khrushchev's orders in the Ukraine, but shall say that hundreds of thousands of men, women, and children were wiped out and that parks and playgrounds have been built by the Russians atop the mass graves in which many of them were buried.

Despite the enormity of the persecution they have suffered at Soviet hands—Ukrainian people at home and abroad consistently keep alive the flame of freedom with which they someday hope to touch off the fire of liberation.

Those Ukrainians who have been fortunate enough to escape from behind the Iron Curtain and settle in this country as well as those of Ukrainian ancestry who were born here are dedicated to this exacting battle for independence.

The Ukrainian Congress Committee, in spearheading this effort in America, has set an example unsurpassed by any other nationalistic group.

The congress is primarily an educational medium and disseminates information about communism. Most of its material is gathered from those among its membership who actually have witnessed these Russian atrocities and the development of communism.

Ukrainian Congress Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANCHER NELSEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 31, 1960

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to bring to the attention of the American people the 20th anniversary of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America. On this occasion I wish to felicitate its chairman, Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky; its policy board, among whom is Prof. A. A. Granovsky, of the University of Minnesota; and its membership of 2½ million Americans of Ukrainian ancestry dedicated to the never-ceasing struggle against Soviet despotism.

Their efforts have not been solely aimed at the liberation of their beloved Ukraine, a land of a rich and renowned culture, a land of great fertility, of abundant mineral resources, and fast-flowing rivers. The efforts of the committee have also encompassed the painstaking exposition of the facts of Soviet brutality in all the dozen non-Russian nations caught in the web of Russian imperialism.

Through the 20 years of its history, the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America has nurtured hope in the breasts of those afflicted by Communist persecution. It has given solace and encouragement to those with loved ones in those unfortunate areas. And it has shown the American people the value to our national security of these captive nations and how their cause and their fight is also our cause and our fight.

The tasks of the committee have been well done, the spirit imbuing the committee a patriotic one. One can sincerely wish for the successful continuation and speedy accomplishment of its objectives.

Congressman Gilbert's Annual Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB H. GILBERT
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 31, 1960

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, this is my first report to the people of the 23d District of New York, whom I have the honor to represent in the Congress of the United States, as I took office as their Representative on March 11, 1960. I wish to tell them of my efforts in connection with legislation beneficial to them, as well as to sum up for them the work of the 2d session of the 86th Congress.

The Democratic Party has always had the best interests of the people at heart; urgent needs of the vast majority of our citizens have been recognized and understood, and programs formulated and fought for, to help them and to correct injustices. The Republican Party has not changed; the favored few are still the chief concern of the Republicans. The President's promises regarding civil rights, housing, Federal aid to education, aid for our elder citizens, to name a few, remain unfulfilled. I am certain that under a Democratic President, who would exert real leadership, we shall be able to show a greater record of achievement in behalf of the people of our country.

Although much has been accomplished by the 86th Congress, much remains undone; the progressive and liberal program, which most of my Democratic colleagues and I favored, was violently opposed in every instance by the coalition of southern Democrats and Republicans, and many of the bills passed fell far short of the goals that had been

set. The threat of a Presidential veto was ever present when bills for the general welfare of the people were considered. When we consider these obstacles, and the difficulties which had to be overcome, the Democratic record in Congress is one of hard work and achievement, although I had hoped for greater results.

CIVIL RIGHTS

I arranged to be specially sworn in as a Member of Congress immediately after election, and before my certificate of election was received in Washington, as the bitter battle on civil rights was being waged. I was anxious to take part in the debate and to have the opportunity to cast my vote in favor of a strong civil rights bill. At the time the bill was finally passed, I stated:

To those of us who will not rest until every vestige of discrimination has been wiped out, the bill as passed is a grave disappointment, and we feel many regrets over the lost provisions of the bill. At best, we have passed only moderate legislation; it is merely a short step forward, and a great distance still lies ahead toward our goal of complete equality for all.

Some satisfaction can be felt in our victory for equality in one of the fundamentals of our democracy—the voting booth. The voting referee system withstood every major assault, and if properly enforced, it promises to give the Negro free access to the polls for the first time since the days of the Reconstruction.

Powerful opposition prevented enactment of many provisions which would have been extremely helpful to those now subjected to discriminatory practices; one of these provisions included FEPC principles relating to Government contracts.

Our joy in the victory we have achieved for civil rights today is overshadowed by our losses, but we have reason to believe that the day is not too far distant when all our citizens will enjoy true equality. I, for one, pledge my untiring efforts for the benefit of all those who suffer under the scourge of discrimination.

On the day I took office, I introduced bills to prohibit discrimination in employment, to withhold Federal aid from schools which discriminate between students by reason of their race, color, religion, ancestry; an anti-poll tax bill; an antilynching bill; a bill to prohibit Federal funds to be used in housing where discrimination exists; to prohibit segregation of passengers because of race or color; to prohibit certain acts involving importation, transportation of explosives with intent to destroy or damage communal buildings.

I shall continue to fight for effective civil rights legislation until all the evils of discrimination based on race, color, religion, which still exist in our Nation, have been completely destroyed.

PAY RAISE FOR POSTAL AND CLASSIFIED FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

As a member of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I had the opportunity to work for the highest possible pay increase for postal and classified employees. I maintained that an increase of at least 9 percent would have to be granted if the employees were to be given adequate help. They had been suffering real hardships for years; they were struggling under the burdens of ever-increasing living costs and high taxes. I was happy when our committee took favorable action on the bill providing for the 9-percent increase.

Thereafter, when it appeared that there would be an unconscionable delay in bringing the pay increase bill before the House for action, a petition was placed on the Speaker's desk to discharge the Committee on Rules from further consideration of the bill. Although I was engaged in a serious primary contest in my congressional district, I made a special trip from New York to Washington for the sole purpose of signing the discharge petition, and then returned immediately to New York to continue with my arduous campaign schedule. I felt it was imperative for Congress immediately to take favorable action in behalf of the employees.

Again, because of strenuous opposition and the threat of a Presidential veto, a compromise was necessary, and an increase of 7½ percent was agreed upon. I was compelled to go along with the compromise figure, for this was better than nothing. The bill passed. The President, as usual impervious to the sad plight of the workers, vetoed the measure—and I was happy to vote to override the veto. Those of us who have the welfare of the workers at heart were successful, and had the strength to override, so that our postal and Federal employees were assured of a pay raise which would to some extent alleviate their hardships.

MEDICAL CARE FOR THE NEEDY AGED

Until the Congress has the benefit of strong leadership, which would be shown by a Democratic President, there will be no comprehensive, adequate plan to meet the medical needs of our senior citizens. Medical and hospital care for the elderly must eventually be devised as part of the time-tested social security insurance system.

I am grieviously disappointed in the bill which was finally passed. This is a "pauper's oath" type of medical care. Responsibility is placed on the States and this means that the entire program will be unwieldy and totally inadequate. It is believed that many States will adopt the programs, and equally, many will not. There is no guarantee that our elderly citizens will get any help at all in many instances.

Several excellent plans were proposed, but defeated, and it was discouraging to have to accept a plan which, while it will do no harm, will not do much good, and falls far short of my expectations.

The Forand bill would have provided the necessary assistance, and I introduced a bill identical with the Forand bill, in the House, to indicate my strong support.

I shall continue to give of my best efforts to the end that the situation will be corrected and our senior citizens given adequate help, as soon as it is possible to secure passage of a good, effective medical aid bill.

ADDITIONAL IMPORTANT LEGISLATION

I am in favor of increasing the minimum wage to at least $1.25 and extending coverage to millions who are not protected under the present law. I introduced legislation to effect this purpose. Unfortunately, Congress did not take final action on this legislation. I confidently look forward to its passage early in 1961.

The housing shortage remains acute and our efforts to pass effective housing legislation this year have proved futile. Great numbers of Americans still merely exist in substandard dwellings; those in the low and middle income brackets must rely on the Federal Government for help. The present program covering public housing units must be greatly expanded also to care for elderly persons and single persons. The Republicans have scuttled the effective public housing program as originally provided for by the Democrats.

I am keenly disappointed that we have been unsuccessful in our efforts to secure final passage of the vitally needed Federal aid to education and school construction bill. It is deplorable that we have ignored the sad plight of our public school system. The youth of our Nation are the future of our Nation. The shortage of at least 140,000 classrooms throughout the United States and the great shortage of teachers combine to cheat 10 million children of the school facilities and education which are their right.

I introduced a bill to provide for Federal grants and contracts to carry out projects with respect to techniques and practices for the prevention, diminution, and control of juvenile delinquency, and for the training of personnel. Juvenile delinquency has reached terrifying proportions throughout our Nation. Our young people are our hope in the years ahead; on them will fall the burden of the preservation of our democracy. It is incumbent upon the Federal Government to recognize its duty and obligation to our young people; investments of necessary funds, time, and effort must be made now to help our youth; there is a crying need for more research on causes and prevention of delinquency. This Congress has also been denied the opportunity to vote on this necessary legislation.

Our immigration laws must be liberalized. I introduced a bill to supersede the present law, known as the McCarran-Walter Act, for it is discriminatory, unfair and undemocratic.

I also introduced numerous bills to liberalize present social security laws; to lighten the taxload; to repeal excise taxes; to assist our veterans; to provide for retirement of Federal employees after 30 years service at full annuity.

Adequate defense of our Nation remains one of our primary concerns and its attendant problems require much of our time and effort in the Congress. To maintain our leadership in this atomic and space age challenges our best efforts and study, and the consideration of these programs is time-consuming. Our mutual security program has my support. Under this law, foreign aid in the military, technical cooperation, and economic brackets is extended to many countries throughout the world, including the new nations of Ghana, Libya, Nigeria, and Israel, to name a few.

I am sorry that space limitations prevent my discussing in detail all legislation and subjects important to my constituents. I trust that this report will explain, to some degree, what I have

tried to accomplish and what progress has been made by the 86th Congress. I am proud to be a Member of this great legislative body and assure my constituents that I shall continue to work for their best interests.

BRONX CONGRESSIONAL OFFICE

I maintain a congressional office at 1004 East 163d Street, telephone Ludlow 9-7280, which is open daily. I invite my constituents to call there and discuss any requests or problems they may have. I am pleased to have them write me at my Washington office and give me the benefit of their views regarding legislation. A warm welcome awaits those who call at my Washington office, 1723 New House Office Building, when they visit the Capitol.

Efforts To Obtain the Support of President Eisenhower and Vice President Nixon for the Preservation of the Historic Buildings Near the White House Were Without Success, Citizens Committee Declares; Senator Kennedy's Bill Would Save Buildings for Cultural Purposes

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 31, 1960

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, some 30 national and local organizations representing millions of Americans rallied to save the historic buildings near the White House: the Dolly Madison house, the Benjamin Tayloe house, and the great Belasco Theater which had very deep connections with America's cultural life.

Among the organizations fighting to save these great buildings was the General Federation of Women's Clubs with 5 million members; the National Federation of Music Clubs with 600,000 members; the National Music Council with 1,228,000 members; the American Federation of Musicians with 270,000 members; and the Central Labor Council, AFL–CIO, of Greater Washington. The support of the 15 million member AFL–CIO for the preservation of these historic buildings is assured because of the strong support given to this cause by the American Federation of Musicians and the Central Labor Council, AFL–CIO.

On July 13, 1960 the Citizens Committee To Save Lafayette Square in the Nation's Capital reported to one and all that efforts to obtain the support of President Eisenhower and Vice President NIXON for the preservation of these historic buildings were without success.

The Committee declared:

Efforts to obtain the support of President Eisenhower for the preservation legislation were unavailing.

It would appear that the only remaining hope is intervention by a new administration next year. There is indication that the General Services Administration will not be ready to start razing the buildings for perhaps 2 years, giving us time for an all-out effort next year with the new administration.

Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY introduced a splendid bill, S. 3280, on March 24, 1960, to preserve and maintain the Dolly Madison house, the Benjamin Tayloe house, and the Belasco Theater for historical, cultural, and civic purposes.

In introducing this bill Senator KENNEDY said:

There is pending before the Public Works Committee a plan to locate the Court of Claims in Lafayette Square. This means that many of the historic buildings now fronting that square will be torn down. The Dolly Madison house, the Benjamin Tayloe house, and the Belasco Theater have long served as an inspiration to generations of Americans who have visited their Capital City. Certainly, before any irrevocable action is taken to destroy these buildings to provide a site for a courthouse, other sites should be investigated.

New York City's famed Carnegie Hall was recently saved through the efforts of a committee of distinguished citizens who were able to interest Mayor Robert Wagner and Gov. Nelson Rockefeller in preserving this great cultural institution.

In Chicago the famed Garrick Theater, built in 1892, the same decade the Belasco Theater and Carnegie Hall were built, was saved recently through the efforts of a citizens committee headed by Mayor Richard J. Daley, of Chicago. Involved in the efforts of Chicago citizens to save for cultural purposes one of the city's great theaters was a court decision. Judge Donald S. McKinlay decided that private owners of a property such as the Garrick Theater can be forbidden to destroy such property on grounds of esthetics. In support of his decision, Judge McKinlay cited a 1954 Supreme Court decision which unanimously upheld the power of the District of Columbia to include in a slum-clearance project the destruction of a department store that was in no way a slum building. The Supreme Court held that District of Columbia authorities had the right to decide that the District of Columbia should be beautiful as well as sanitary and could consider artistic values in deciding what should be destroyed and what should be saved.

I include as part of my remarks the July 13, 1960, report of the Citizens Committee To Save Lafayette Square in the Nation's Capital; the text of a broadcast by the distinguished concert manager, Patrick Hayes; and the text of S. 3280, introduced by Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY.

The material follows:

1960 REPORT OF THE CITIZENS COMMITTEE TO SAVE LAFAYETTE SQUARE IN THE NATION'S CAPITAL

Belatedly, we wish to report on the status of the fight to save the old buildings on the east side of Lafayette Square.

Some 30 national and local organizations rallied to the cause in cooperation with the citizens committee.

The first effort to obtain hearings before the Senate Public Buildings and Grounds Subcommittee, before which legislation was pending, succeeded in that hearings were granted and held on May 23.

Proponents—supporters of the pending bills to save the buildings and to restore the Belasco—made a completely overwhelming argument for the record. The only substantial opposition came from Marvin Jones, chief judge of the Court of Claims, and Eugene Worley, chief judge of the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, who argued that the site was needed for a building for them for convenience and that to switch to another site would cause too great a delay in construction of a needed court building.

At the hearings and in the behind-the-scenes maneuverings, they were greatly assisted by Judge Jack Martin, Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, who is a former administrative assistant of President Eisenhower (and the late Senator Taft) in charge of congressional liaison.

The opponents of the preservation legislation were taken by surprise when General Services Administration Franklin Floete, responding to the new pressure which had been built up in opposition to razing the east side of the square, testified that there was another, and perhaps better, site for the courthouse.

However, despite Mr. Floete's surprise move to accommodate our desires and despite the very convincing showing at the hearings, the Senate Public Works Committee voted to authorize the courthouse construction on Lafayette Square. Only when their vote was announced after a secret meeting was it revealed that Mr. Floete had been secretly forced to produce still another prospectus, putting the courthouse back on Lafayette Square.

It was clear that the lobbying effort of two or three of the opponents of the preservation legislation, namely the judges and their friends in Congress and in the administration, had succeeded in reversing Mr. Floete's recommendation and in forcing approval of the site for Judge Jones.

Efforts to obtain the support of President Eisenhower and Vice President NIXON for the preservation legislation were unavailing.

It would appear that the only remaining hope is intervention by a new administration next year. There is indication that the General Services Administration will not be ready to start razing the buildings for perhaps 2 years, giving us time for an all-out effort next year with the new administration.

Recommendation: It is urged that every effort be made following the inauguration in January to get the ear and the understanding of the new President. If he wishes, he can refuse to spend the money authorized for the new courthouse which the congressional committees have approved.

Acknowledgement: The committee and its officers wish to acknowledge with deep gratitude the highly intelligent and dedicated effort which has been made by people too numerous to list in the effort to save Lafayette Square. Only an invincible combination of behind-the-scenes politics and official apathy have robbed you of success to date. Certainly the absence of success is no measure of the devotion and effort brought to this problem by the many supporters of this committee.

The committee also wishes to thank and to acknowledge the help of Senators JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, EDMUND S. MUSKIE, EUGENE J. MCCARTHY, and ERNEST GRUENING, and of Congressmen FRANK THOMPSON and HARRIS B. MCDOWELL, JR., who made every possible effort in our behalf before and after the Public Works Committee's vote. Thanks go also to the Washington Post and Times Herald and the Evening Star for their fine editorials and their numerous news columns which supported us completely.

CARL LEVIN,
Chairman.
HOBART A. SPALDING,
Vice Chairman.
MARIE A. HURLEY,
Secretary.

BROADCAST BY PATRICK HAYES, WGMS, AUGUST 28, 1960, WOODWARD & LOTHROP

Good afternoon. They did it out in Chicago. They did the unexpected and the wonderful. They saved an old empty building from being torn down for esthetic reasons alone, because it is an historic landmark, a theater, rich in memories, still attractive to the eye. The theater and building are known as the Garrick, built in 1892, 1 year after Carnegie Hall was built. It is a combination office building and theater, and in the heyday of show business it was one of Chicago's leading legitimate theaters. In recent years the theater was used only for motion pictures, and not too successfully, and the offices upstairs were occupied by tenants.

The march of progress in Chicago has produced a master plan for a huge downtown center which will involve tearing down a few blocks of old buildings, some of them tremendous in size, to make way for the new and even bigger buildings. The Garrick is just across the street from one side of this proposed complex of buildings, and its real estate and parking potential are obvious—tear down the Garrick, build a new and bigger building, including substantial parking facilities. This is the modern, downtown, march of progress.

The owners of the Garrick applied some time ago for a wrecking permit from the city of Chicago. A citizens committee, headed by Mayor Richard J. Daley himself, intervened. The permit was refused by the city. The owners took the matter to court, seeking an action that would force the city of Chicago to grant the wrecking permit. This is where matters stood a few weeks ago when we commented on this Garrick situation, bearing in mind always the Belasco situation here in Washington. Last Tuesday Judge Donald S. McKinlay gave his decision, after a personal inspection of the premises and long reflection on the law involved. He decided that an architectural landmark can be saved, that a wrecking permit can be denied, that owners of a property such as the Garrick can be forbidden to destroy it even though they own it—and esthetic reasons alone suffice as a basis for his decision. The Garrick had been declared an architectural landmark in 1958 by the appropriate city commission.

There is a lot involved here, which might affect similar situations across the country. Judge McKinlay pointed out that what he was doing was essentially a new interpretation of a municipality's police power. He said that a clear legal right to a wrecking permit is not an absolute right when the public esthetic interest is involved. I think we should all pause here and say "Hallelujah." Judge McKinlay says that the public esthetic interest can come first in the march of progress.

In support of his decision, Judge McKinlay cited a 1954 Supreme Court decision which unanimously upheld the power of the District of Columbia to include in a slum clearance project the destruction of a department store that was in no way a slum building. He said that the Supreme Court held that District authorities had the right to decide that the District should be beautiful as well as sanitary and could consider artistic values in deciding what should be taken and what left. Are you listening, members of the Citizens' Committee To Save Lafayette Square? A judge out in Chicago is giving you the answers, from a case right here in the District of Columbia, on which he based his decision to save the Garrick in Chicago.

The Garrick case deals with the same values, artistic and esthetic values, but differs in that it upholds the power of a city to deny a private owner the right to destroy his own property. Judge McKinlay was frank to say he knew of no similar case. Lawyers for the owners promptly said that the decision would be appealed to the Illinois Supreme Court. That decision will be one to watch for. Meanwhile, it is more than encouraging to realize that there are a few Athenians among us in positions of influence. To return to the Chicago story of the Garrick Theater, and bearing in mind that the Belasco Theater here on Lafayette Square is in jeopardy, it is ironic to note that in Chicago a court saved the Garrick, while here a courthouse may lose us the Belasco.

S. 3280, INTRODUCED BY SENATOR JOHN F. KENNEDY

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Public Buildings Act of 1959 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sections:

"SEC. 18. The Administrator is authorized to conduct a joint study together with the National Capital Planning Commission and the Commission of Fine Arts, for the purpose of determining the feasibility of constructing, near the Supreme Court of the United States, adequate facilities to house the Court of Claims, the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, and the Tax Court of the United States. As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this section, the Administrator shall submit a report on the results of such study, together with such recommendations as he may deem advisable, to the Committees on Public Works of the Senate and House of Representatives.

"SEC. 19. In keeping with the national policy of protecting and preserving historic American buildings and sites for the inspiration and benefit of the people of the United States, the Administrator shall preserve and maintain the Dolly Madison House, the Benjamin Tayloe House, and the Belasco Theater, on Lafayette Square in the District of Columbia, for historical, cultural, and civic purposes. The Administrator is authorized and directed to restore the Belasco Theater to a condition at least equal to its condition at the time it was acquired by the Federal Government. The National Park Service, and the District of Columbia Recreation Department, shall advise and assist the Administrator in the restoration and management of the Belasco Theater as a municipal art center."

Quaboag Settlement Towns Observe 300th Anniversary

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 31, 1960

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, of all congressional districts represented in the 86th Congress the Third Congressional District of Massachusetts, which I have the great honor and privilege to represent, will have achieved a most impressive record of noteworthy anniversary observances by several communities within its borders, a record that cannot be surpassed or even approached by other districts which do not possess the rich historic associations of these charming Massachusetts communities.

During the first and second sessions of this Congress, now in its closing days, it has been my good fortune to direct the attention of the House to historic anniversary observances in my district, observances of prominent dates going back to the very beginnings of this great land. A little less than a year ago in this House, I lauded the outstanding communities of Princeton and Westminster on the occasion of their 200th anniversary celebrations.

Earlier this year, the House took official recognition of the 300th anniversary of the city of Marlboro, another community in my district, by adopting unanimously my resolution, House Resolution 535, extending congratulations and expressing the appreciation of the Federal Government to the citizens of Marlboro for their splendid services to the Nation during the past 300 years.

A few days before the recess of Congress, early in July, it was again my good fortune to bring to the attention of the House another noteworthy anniversary in my district—that marking the 175th anniversary of Gardner, that great progressive community of northern Worcester County. The same week, I directed the attention of the House to the 225th anniversary of Upton, another lovely outstanding community in my district.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I am indeed pleased and proud to bring to the attention of the House the 300th anniversary of the settlement of Quaboag Plantation in my district. From this early settlement came the town of Brookfield which in turn gave rise from land within its original boundaries to the present day prosperous and progressive communities of Warren, West Brookfield, North Brookfield, East Brookfield, and New Braintree.

Joining with the mother town of Brookfield, these communities will formally celebrate the 300th anniversary of the settlement of Quaboag Plantation with a 3-day program of festivities to be held next month on September 16, 17, and 18.

These six communities with remarkable records of achievement were all settled by pioneer colonists in the very earliest days of American history. Families residing in these towns today can trace their beginnings to these early settlers who helped to carve American civilization out of the wilderness and forge the great tradition, eventful history and proud heritage which have made our Nation what it is today among the peoples of the world.

Communities sprung from the Quaboag Plantation have played a vital and important role in the historic beginnings of this Nation and the townspeople of West Brookfield, which is the original settled part of Quaboag, take pride in the fact that the Constitution of the United States reflects the early draft of the Massachusetts constitution written in that town by one of its distinguished citizens, that great Revolutionary patriot, Judge Jedediah Foster.

A leading member of the Provincial Congress during 1774 and 1775, Judge Foster after whom Foster's Hill was named—the site, incidentally, of a historical pageant next month during the anniversary celebration in West Brookfield—was elected in 1779 by the town of Brookfield as a delegate to the Massachusetts State convention called for the sole purpose of forming a new constitution. This convention appointed him to

the drafting committee and town tradition says that while John Adams rendered valuable aid on the same committee, it is actually Judge Foster who drafted the constitution in the form finally adopted.

This draft was written in Judge Foster's hand in the Foster homestead on Foster's Hill, local historians assert.

Massachusetts takes pride in the fact that its State constitution, more than any other, was copied by the Federal Convention in framing the Constitution of the United States.

A statement appearing in the Boston Gazette of November 9, 1779, lends credence to the contention of the townspeople that Judge Foster's role in the drafting of the constitution was far greater than that of John Adams. This report states that Judge Foster's death was hastened by the long and arduous time he spent laboring on the new constitution.

Historians will continue their research on this vital point in the years to come, but there is no dispute, Mr. Speaker, on the fact that this Massachusetts State constitution to which Judge Foster contributed so much was the model of the Constitution of the United States.

This Massachusetts landmark in self-government saw these doctrines spelled out for the first time in any written constitution of the world: the separation of the three judicial, legislative and executive powers, the modification of the veto power so that it could be overruled by two-thirds of each legislative house, the express dictum that revenue bills should originate in the lower house with the power of amendment by the upper house, the writ of habeas corpus and other provisions no less vital to human dignity and freedom from oppressive powers of the State.

Thus did the little community of Brookfield, whose name is so descriptive of its natural features in this pleasant, gently rolling New England countryside, contribute so much to constitutional government throughout the world.

Judge Foster died before his great work was ratified by the people of his State. While on a mission to Fort Ticonderoga, he suffered a chill during a crossing of Lake Champlain in an open boat. He never recovered from this illness and died at the age of 55 on October 17, 1779.

Two of his sons, Dwight and Theodore, later served as U.S. Senators at the same time representing the States of Massachusetts and Rhode Island, respectively.

The histories of these six outstanding communities—the four Brookfields, New Braintree and Warren—are truly inspiring accounts of the lives of great men and women and the sacrifices they made in building a strong Nation. It is not even possible in the brief time available to me to recite the highlights and accomplishments of these communities because the separate history of each town abounds with feats of great courage during pioneer days and incidents which touch upon the growth and progress of our land.

The history of Brookfield goes back to 1660 when the first settlers arrived from Ipswich to make their homes in what is now West Brookfield. This was the land of the Quaboags, a branch of the Nipmuc Tribe of Indians. The nearest white settlement was 30 miles away. These early settlers had received the approval of the general court for a land grant described as Ipswich New Plantation, an area some 6 square miles near the so-called "Quoboag" ponds, but Indian troubles prevented these settlers from fulfilling the grant's stipulation that 20 families settle there within 3 years. In later petitions, dated 1667, 1670, and 1673, the growth of the settlement is recorded so that by the winter of 1673 the town was properly organized.

Douglas Edward Leach in his scholarly work, Flintlock and Tomahawk, describes the early Quaboag settlement as follows:

> Here on a hilltop overlooking the forest for miles around, lay the tiny frontier village of Brookfield, otherwise known as Quaboag. A comparatively new settlement, this village in 1675 contained perhaps 20 families all told. In addition to being a farming community, Brookfield was important as a stopping point on the Long Path which ran from the vicinity of Boston across Massachusetts to Springfield on the Connecticut River. Indeed scarcely a town in all of Massachusetts could claim the distinction of being more isolated than Brookfield.

Savage Indian raids in 1675 devastated the small settlement and it is only in 1686 that the resettlement of Brookfield started with pioneers coming from Marlboro, Springfield, Suffield, and Hadley to build anew in what had become again an area of desolate wilderness.

Brookfield grew slowly since the times were troubled. There was the constant threat of Indian warfare and the few perilous periods of uneasy peace did not further the settlement of frontier settlements far removed from their neighbors.

Despite the hazards, Brookfield continued to grow. Town records show that several Brookfield men fought in the War of the Austrian Succession during 1744 to 1748, notably at Louisbourg, then known as the French Gibraltar at Cape Breton. Many more fought in the French and Indian wars of 1754 to 1763 where Brookfield men gained valuable military experience.

Revolutionary War records show that in 1773 Brookfield "was ready to assist, and in every legal and proper way, maintain its rights and liberties." On April 19, 1775, two companies of minutemen marched from Brookfield for Boston and the town furnished several hundred men for service, including senior officers who first learned to fight in the French and Indian wars.

While formally incorporated as a town in 1848, West Brookfield is the original settled part of the original Brookfield. Within its borders is the original town burial ground. Many of the events attendant to the 300th anniversary exercises will take place in West Brookfield.

A famed old hostelry there is Ye Olde Tavern, which is reported to be the second oldest inn in Massachusetts. Originally built in 1760, it has been in continuous operation and has entertained such notables as Gen. George Washington, Jerome Bonaparte and his bride.

West Brookfield has many historic associations with the early growth of the Nation. It was the home of the Merriam family, famed publishers of Webster's Dictionary, and first publication of this noted work took place in West Brookfield. The Merriams in 1876 endowed the town library which still bears the family name.

The incorporation of North Brookfield as the second precinct of Brookfield took place on March 28, 1750. The State legislature approved its incorporation as a separate town on February 28, 1812.

North Brookfield engaged in the early manufacture of shoes. The industry grew to the point that about 1,000 workers were engaged in this work by 1875.

East Brookfield is the newest of the Brookfield towns, the State legislature approving its incorporation as a separate town on March 24, 1920.

Warren was founded as the town of Western on January 16, 1741, of land taken from Brookfield, Brimfield and what records describe as the "easterly part of what was Kingfield." It later was named after the great patriot, Gen. Joseph Warren, when it became evident that the name of Western would conflict with the town of Weston in the eastern part of the State. It was decided to change from Western to Warren in 1834.

In pioneer days, its main industry was agriculture but the waters of the Quaboag were soon used as early as 1793 by grist mills. By 1837, cotton and woolen mills were established along the Quaboag.

The name of New Braintree, formed from the original Quaboag plantation, originates from old Braintree, Mass., whose residents were granted land which became Braintree Farms and eventually New Braintree.

New Braintree was set apart as a town on January 31, 1751, taking in Braintree Farms and parts of Brookfield and Hardwick. On August 23, 1775, the legislature made the district a town.

Mr. Speaker, the communities of the original Quaboag Plantation will mark the 300th anniversary of the founding of the original settlement on Foster Hill with appropriate ceremonies on September 16, 17, and 18.

Foster Hill is named after Judge Jedediah Foster. I have already touched upon his outstanding work in drafting the Massachusetts constitution. Foster Hill was the site of Judge Foster's home where he had his law office and where he worked on the original draft of the State constitution.

It can be said that Foster Hill saw the birth of the historic Constitution of the United States and it is most appropriate that Congress grant official recognition to the founding of the first settlement of this historic spot. That is why I am introducing an appropriate resolution extending felicitations of this House to those Massachusetts towns which have sprung from the Foster Hill settlement 300 years ago.

Foster Hill and the environs are truly places of great historic importance and

interest. The original Boston Post Road passes over Foster Hill. It is along this highway that Benjamin Franklin, while serving as Assistant Postmaster General, personally measured the miles and helped drive the stakes where workmen came later to set the milestones. Today an unbroken line of 11 such milestones are cared for by the citizens of the original Quaboag Plantation.

On Foster Hill are such history-laden places as Indian Rock, the site of the Fortified House, the well where Major Wilson was shot, the site of the first and second meetinghouses, the first burial ground and the Whitefield Rock from which George Whitefield, celebrated evangelist who was one of the founders of Methodism, preached on October 16, 1740, during his first trip to America.

The Quaboag Historical Society has placed suitable granite markers at these seven historic spots on Foster Hill, which is a mecca for visiting historians and writers seeking material on colonial days. In addition, the society has engaged in considerable research activity throughout the area for many years. Members of the group took the initiative in 1910 in formulating and carrying out the successful program commemorating the 250th anniversary of Quaboag Plantation.

The Quaboag area is the birthplace of such famous Americans as Lucy Blackwell Stone, the noted reformer and prominent advocate of woman's rights. Born at West Brookfield on August 18, 1818, she is remembered for her organizing abilities and staunch stand for woman's rights. She helped to organize the American Women's Suffrage Association and served as president until 1872.

The great Connie Mack, outstanding figure of the baseball world, was born at East Brookfield on December 22, 1862. He grew up in an atmosphere where baseball was greatly encouraged and became early in life a capable and skillful player, so much so that he was recruited for play in the big leagues to become one of the most solid, dependable men of organized baseball as well as one of baseball's most celebrated and famous managers and leaders.

George M. Cohan, the famed American actor, author, and producer, while born in Providence, looked upon North Brookfield as his home and spent his boyhood in the Quaboag area where he received his early religious, family, and school training.

At an early age he began writing plays and popular songs, besides appearing on the legitimate stage and doing comedy roles in vaudeville.

He wrote and produced many plays and musical revues and appeared as an actor in most of them. Many Americans hold fond memories of such Cohan productions as "Forty-five Minutes From Broadway," "Get-Rich-Quick Wallingford," "Seven Keys to Baldpate," "The Song and Dance Man," and "American Born." Among his many song hits was "Over There," which was the favorite of two continents during World War I.

In his autobiography, Cohan describes his happy days in the Brookfields where he grew up and later spent many vacations.

Cohan, the only actor to receive a Congressional Medal, was noted for his sincerity, sense of honor, and fairness as well as for his kind nature and charity. He befriended many stage folks during his lifetime and was ever ready and willing to extend a helping hand to show people on the way up or to those unfortunates "at liberty" between jobs. He gained the reputation of never turning away an appeal for help whether from the high or the lowly.

The contributions of such men as Connie Mack and George M. Cohan have been so great that they will never be fully evaluated. They were men of honor, achievement, and greatness who will continue to be an inspiration to American youth for years to come.

Mr. Speaker, elaborate community programs will herald the 300th anniversary of Quaboag Plantation during the 3-day observance commemorating the settlement of this area on the weekend of September 16, 17, and 18.

Exactly 50 years ago the 250th anniversary celebration attracted some 15,000 people to West Brookfield and it is expected that this number will be doubled for the impressive program arranged for this year's observance.

Under plans arranged by a committee of leading citizens from each town, which is headed by Dr. Louis E. Roy of West Brookfield, the opening day program will be devoted to local homecoming observances in the various communities. These local programs will be followed on Saturday, September 17, with a major celebration to take place in West Brookfield, the highlights of which will be a parade and historical pageant.

The closing of the Quaboag observance will be held on Sunday with religious commemorative services in the various churches in all of the towns.

Dr. Roy and his committee, made up of members designated by the boards of selectmen of the original Quaboag settlement towns, have been working for more than a year to arrange an observance which should long be remembered by townspeople and the many visitors who will be attracted to the area.

West Brookfield, the original location of the Quaboag settlement, was selected by this committee as the site for the main observance of the 300th anniversary ceremonies because Foster Hill was the original plot on which the early settlers staked their claim 300 years ago. During the 250th anniversary celebration, an Indian battle was reenacted on Foster Hill and this year the historical pageant will take place at this site.

It is interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, in this respect that the Richardson family of West Brookfield, owners of a farm on which Foster Hill is located, is again making available this historic site for an anniversary celebration. The following note of appreciation appears in the official program for the 1960 celebration:

At this time when we gather for this 300th anniversary with our friends and guests from far and wide, we are aware that this broad area of Foster's Hill, once the scene of a great experiment in community living, is now the private property of the Richardson family. Indeed we are mindful that this has been true for 101 years.

We pause, then, to consider the remarkable fact that a single family has offered its land area three times for a historic celebration; once in 1860 for the 200th anniversary of Quaboag Plantation; a second time in 1910 for the 250th; and now for the 300th in 1960. This is "open house" on a grand scale. This, in itself, is historic.

The historic pageant to be given on Foster Hill will have a 200-member cast under the direction of Gordon V. Bennett. The pageant-drama, entitled "The Book of Quaboag," was written by Mrs. Mildred McClary Tymeson of West Boylston with the assistance of the pageant committee, which formulated ideas and thoughts upon which the pageant is based. Members of the pageant committee are Miss Marguerite C. McKelligett of Warren, chairman, and the Misses Mary F. Leach and Britta D. Jeppson.

The pageant will portray the growth of democracy as seen in the history of the Quaboag Plantation with many of the events depicted having actually taken place on Foster Hill where the production will be staged.

Taking part in the pageant will be members of the Improved Order of Red Men, Lassawa Tribe of East Brookfield, and the Degree of Pocahontas, who will portray Indians and their squaws, the Daughters of the American Revolution and the Grange. The pageant is in three acts, the first opening with a scene set in 1659 and ending with a spectacular Indian war and fire. The second act opens in 1775 and covers the Revolutionary War period.

The final act is set in 1960 and depicts the growth of the area and hopes of the Quaboag community for the future.

The opening event in the Quaboag celebration will take place on September 9 when a coronation ball will choose "Miss Quaboag" from the queens of the various communities in the plantation who will reign during the entire celebration period.

On September 16, each town will register former residents and hold homecoming programs in the evening. A full day of events will take place on September 17 at West Brookfield, beginning with a 2-hour parade with floats, bands and marching units. The Eighth Air Force is furnishing a band for the parade and will also give a helicopter and jet salute to the Quaboag communities during the parade. Doll and antique carriage parades will also be held during the day.

A firemen's muster will be held in the afternoon and a square dance is scheduled for the evening on the town common. The day's events will conclude with a fireworks display on Foster Hill.

The parade committee with Milton C. Richardson as chairman has been working to make the parade one of the largest ever to be conducted in western Worcester County. Among the units registered are more than 60 floats, 12

bands, and 17 fire department and civil defense units. Included will be an old-time steam calliope, old cars, stage-coaches, high bikes and small cars.

Units going back to colonial and Civil War days will participate, including the Whitcomb Rangers in colonial military dress complete with muskets, and the Massachusetts 9th Light Battery, which goes back to the Civil War, will parade, complete with its horse-drawn cannon and cavalry.

Assisting Mr. Richardson for the parade events are Lee Boyce of Brookfield, parade marshal, Raymond Clark of West Brookfield, assistant marshal, Mr. and Mrs. Edward Shumate, youth groups, Mr. and Mrs. Raymond Burke, military units, Mr. and Mrs. Ernest DeAngeles, baby and doll carriage events, and Paul Walker, old time transportation.

In addition to the pageant on Sunday afternoon, September 18, there will be water ski events by the Lake Wickaboag Ski Club and tours of historic homes in the area from 5 to 8 p.m.

In honor of the 300th anniversary celebration, the Tri-County Coin Club of Warren is sponsoring a commemorative medal made of bronze and measuring one and a quarter inches in diameter which has attracted wide interest among collectors. One side bears the seal of the town of Brookfield showing Ayer's Tavern on Foster Hill where early pioneers spent 3 days under siege fighting off marauding Indians. The other side has the seal of the Tri-County Coin Club, an outline of Worcester, Hampshire, and Hampden Counties circled with a wreath.

Dr. Louis E. Roy is serving as celebration chairman for the West Brookfield activities. He is also chairman of the executive committee, which has been working for more than a year to make this year's anniversary a success. The executive committee is made up of the chairmen heading local celebrations in the Quaboag towns participating in the 300th anniversary events. These chairmen are Richard C. McNeaney of East Brookfield, Horace L. May of Brookfield, John S. Irish of North Brookfield, William N. Wright, Sr., and Karl P. Meacham of Warren, cochairmen, and John S. Grazier of West Brookfield, secretary.

Assisting Dr. Roy and his executive committee are the following chairmen of the various events and activities of the Quaboag anniversary observance:

Programs, Wright and Henry J. Burt, of Brookfield, editor; advertising, Charles F. Ballou, of West Brookfield; parade, Milton C. Richardson, West Brookfield; essay contest, Miss Mary F. Leach, Brookfield; finance committee, John S. Irish; publicity, Stedman B. Howard; good coordination, Mrs. Donald Graveline, Warren; safety, Horace L. May, Brookfield; grounds, Milton C. Richardson; square dance, Louis E. Roy; commemorative book, John Grazier; reception, Robert DeWitt Lane, East Brookfield; commemorative stamp, Mrs. Ruth Thompson, and old costumes, Mrs. Fred Smith.

These and many other public spirited citizens of the Quaboag towns have worked out a truly impressive program for the entertainment of their neighbors and friends and the many visitors from communities near and far who will be attracted to West Brookfield for the anniversary celebration. As it can be seen, Mr. Speaker, the program which has been arranged for this outstanding event, while comprehensive is simple and dignified. It is in keeping with the cherished and long remembered programs which took place during the 200th and 250th anniversary observances in this same community. Those are memorable celebrations which will be relived again this year in the Quaboag Plantation towns.

Mr. Speaker, in recognition of this 300th anniversary of the settlement of Quaboag Plantation, I am introducing a special resolution extending greetings and felicitations of the House to the towns of Brookfield, West Brookfield, North Brookfield, East Brookfield, Warren and New Braintree, all in my congressional district, on the occasion of this outstanding anniversary.

I know that my colleagues will be pleased to join with me in paying tribute to these outstanding communities which make up the original Quaboag Plantation. These communities, like most New England towns, owe their origins to the bitter sacrifices and hard work of their pioneer founders.

These early settlers were a devout and patriotic people. Among their first acts when establishing new settlements was the erection of places of worship. Next followed the establishment of meeting houses, schools, and libraries. In silent testimony to their industry, bitter travail and heavy labors are the famed rows of stone walls which abound in the New England countryside. From this rock-strewn soil and rugged hills, these pioneers wrung a hard-earned living for themselves and their families.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, these pioneers have left our Nation with a tradition, a way of life, a civilization which live to this day in the heritage which is so fortunately ours.

As I have said at the outset of my remarks, I know of no other congressional district in this land that can boast areas so rich in historic interest and historical contributions as the Quaboag towns and the other communities in my district which celebrated noteworthy anniversaries this year. I am exceedingly proud to represent these magnificent American communities in the Congress and am highly privileged to hail, salute, and congratulate the towns of the Quaboag Plantation on the occasion of the 300th anniversary of this pioneer settlement.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include the text of my resolution at this point in the RECORD:

Whereas the year 1960 marks the 300th anniversary of the settlement of Quaboag Plantation in Massachusetts, which later became the towns of Brookfield, West Brookfield, North Brookfield, East Brookfield, Warren, and New Braintree; and

Whereas from the time of settlement in 1660 the people of these communities have figured conspicuously in the founding and growth of this Nation; and

Whereas the observance of the 300th anniversary of the settlement of Quaboag Plantation is being celebrated with impressive community ceremonies, large public gatherings and widespread participation of Massachusetts citizens; and

Whereas Brookfield, West Brookfield, North Brookfield, East Brookfield, Warren, and New Braintree are progressive communities rich in historic interest, distinguished for their fervent civic spirit, and faithfully devoted to American institutions and ideals; and

Whereas these communities are well known for their patriotic contributions to these United States and noted for their famous sons and daughters who distinguished themselves in many fields of endeavor and in many facets of American civilization; and

Whereas the observance of the 300th anniversary of the Quaboag Plantation will be celebrated with impressive exercises in the various communities and a joint celebration in West Brookfield on Foster Hill named after Judge Jedediah Foster, one of the principal authors of the Massachusetts Constitution which formed the basic pattern of the Constitution of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives extends its greetings and felicitations to the people of Brookfield, West Brookfield, North Brookfield, East Brookfield, Warren, and New Braintree, Mass., on the occasion of the 300th anniversary of the founding of the settlement of Quaboag Plantation and the House of Representatives further expresses its appreciation for the splendid services rendered to the Nation by the citizens of these communities during the past 300 years.

Ukrainian Congress Committee of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES J. DELANEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 31, 1960

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I feel it is a privilege to be able to pay tribute to the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, which, this fall, will celebrate its 20th anniversary.

This organization, which represents some 2½ million dedicated Americans of Ukrainian ancestry, has given, and continues to give, valuable service in exposing certain myths about Soviet Russia and in proposing concrete ways and means to defeat Moscow in the cold war.

When we think of captive nations, we are apt to think only of Hungary, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, and other countries not within the geographical boundaries of Soviet Russia. All too often we forget that within the Soviet Union itself are at least a dozen captive nations, each with its own history and its own culture.

Of these, the Ukrainian Nation, with over 215,000 square miles, is the largest in area, and with some 40 million people, is the largest in population.

Because of their fierce spirit of independence and undying love of freedom the Ukrainians have been made to suffer

the most cruel persecutions that the Reds could devise. We remember the horrible Moscow-made famine of 1932 and 1933, in which millions of people died, the mass murder at Vinnitsia in 1937, and the vast purges and deportations carried out under the personal direction of Khrushchev in the late 1930's and after the German retreat in 1943.

Despite these unspeakable cruelties, the Soviet tyrants have not been able to extinguish the spirit of the Ukrainian people, and it is in this spirit that the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America carries on the fight to win the liberation of captive nations throughout the world.

A Bill To Amend Certain Sections of the Sugar Act of 1948

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 31, 1960

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, today, I introduce, for appropriate reference a bill to amend certain sections of the Sugar Act of 1948.

This measure is designed primarily to allow for the progressive expansion and growth of the domestic sugar industry and makes extensive changes in the theory and procedure of the quota provisions of the Sugar Act.

My purpose in introducing this bill at this time is to allow the Department of Agriculture, Members of Congress, and the House Agriculture Committee ample opportunity during the interim to study and comment on this extensive departure from the current methods of prorating quotas under the Sugar Act.

Present unsettled conditions prevailing in some of the areas which supply sugar for U.S. consumption have had a chaotic effect on the stability of the sugar industry, not only domestic but foreign as well. I feel that in the interest of stability, Congress should make the extension of the Sugar Act one of the first orders of business next year and I think it advisable that all points of view be explored before action is taken on this important legislation.

Briefly, I would like to summarize the changes this proposal would make in the present law.

First. The Sugar Act and related provisions of the Revenue Code are extended through the calendar year 1964.

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of reasons why the Sugar Act should be extended for a 4-year period.

Protection such as that afforded by the Sugar Act is essential to the continued existence of the domestic sugar-producing industry. Assurance of the continuance of such protection is vital to forward planning by the domestic industry.

Farmers must plan their cropping and rotation practices in advance. Four years is only one cropping cycle in the domestic beet area. Most of the sugar produced from 1961-crop beets will not be marketed until 1962 and a part of it will probably be marketed in 1963.

Four years is the approximate life of a single planting of cane in the mainland cane area.

Four years covers only two cuttings or approximately one-half the life of a single planting of sugar cane in Hawaii.

Four years, although covering four cuttings in Puerto Rico, represents only one-half the life of a single planting of cane.

The value of our sugar farms, factories, and refineries is well over a billion and a half dollars. More than $100 million must be spent each year to improve agricultural practices and to replace and modernize farm and factory equipment.

These huge investments are vital to the continued efficiency of the domestic sugar-producing industry. A short extension of the act would increase the element of risk and thereby endanger the future efficiency of the domestic sugar-producing and processing industry.

In addition, hundreds of thousands of workers are employed on farms and in factories producing and processing sugar crops. It is manifestly unfair to these workers to require them to live in a constant state of uncertainty through short-term extensions of the Sugar Act.

Second. Any changes in foreign quotas which are made after the enactment of this bill are to be made on the following basis:

Each foreign area has a quota base which is equal to the quota it would receive under existing law on the basis of a determination of domestic consumption of 9,400,000 tons. Each foreign area will receive such pro rata share of any increase, from any level and whenever occurring, as is necessary to bring its quota up to its quota base but its quota cannot exceed its quota base. Its quota base can be changed only in the event of the unexcused failure of a foreign area to market its quota, in which case the Secretary may decrease the quota base of the short area and increase the quota base of other foreign areas pro rata by the amount of the short fall.

Third. Any change in domestic quotas are to be made as follows:

In the event of any decrease in the consumption determination, from any area and whenever occurring, domestic and foreign quotas alike will be cut pro rata. In the event of any increase, foreign areas will share with domestic areas, but only to the extent necessary to bring their quotas up to their quota bases, after which the initial increase will go pro rata to the domestic areas.

Fourth. Domestic area deficits will be allocated first to other domestic areas, with any amount that domestic areas taken as a whole are unable to fill to be reallocated to foreign areas.

Fifth. Foreign area deficits will be allocated pro rata to domestic and foreign areas alike, with any amount that domestic areas taken as a whole are unable to fill to be reallocated to foreign areas.

Sixth. Under this bill, the President has the authority throughout the extension of the act to set the Cuban quota at any amount not exceeding what would otherwise be required. The difference, if any, is to be treated as a deficit pursuant to section 204, subsection (c) of the proposed bill.

This provision is similar to the one now in effect which empowers the President to deal with situations in which the national interest or the supplies for domestic consumers might be jeopardized.

Mr. Speaker, as I indicated at the outset of my remarks, the broad objective of this bill is to permit the progressive expansion of the domestic sugar industry not by changing the quota bases of our foreign suppliers but rather by affording to domestic beet and cane sugar producers the increase occasioned by the growth of the American sugar market.

It also provides a measure of stability to both foreign and domestic sugar producers by permitting them ample time for the advance planning so necessary to their efficient operation.

I feel that the approach embodied in this bill is fair and entirely consistent with the broad objectives of the Sugar Act. I realize that this session is rapidly growing to a close and that there will not be time for extensive study of the provisions of this proposed legislation. I am hopeful, however, that the Congress and the Department of Agriculture will consider this approach over the interim so that this important matter can be acted on early next session.

The text of the bill reads as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 202 of the Sugar Act of 1948 is amended to read as follows:

"PRORATION OF QUOTAS

"SEC. 202. (a) The quota and quota base for the Republic of the Philippines shall be 980,000 short tons, raw value, in compliance with section 211 of the Philippine Trade Act of 1946.

"(b) The quota base for Cuba shall be 3,119,655 short tons, raw value.

"(c) The quota bases for foreign countries other than the Republic of the Philippines and Cuba shall be—

Country:	*Short tons raw value*
Peru	95,527
Dominican Republic	81,457
Mexico	64,809
Nicaragua	14,026
Haiti	7,015
Netherlands	3,731
Taiwan	3,624
Costa Rica	3,616
Panama	3,624
Canada	631
United Kingdom	516
Belgium	182
British Guiana	84
Hong Kong	3

"(d) The quota bases for domestic sugar producing areas shall be—

Area:	*Short tons raw value*
Domestic beet sugar	2,043,480
Mainland cane sugar	628,799
Hawaii	1,140,461
Puerto Rico	1,192,499
Virgin Islands	16,261

"(e) Whenever a determination or revision (referred to in this subsection as a 'new determination') is made (pursuant to section 201) of the amount of sugar needed to meet the requirements of consumers which differs

from the determination or revision (referred to in this subsection as the 'old determination') previously made, the Secretary shall revise the then existing quotas (referred to in this subsection as the 'old quotas') by promulgating new or revised quotas (referred to in this subsection as 'new quotas') as follows:

"(1) If the new determination is less than the old determination, the new quota for any area under subsections (b) through (d) shall be equal to the product of its old quota multiplied by the quotient of the new determination less the Philippine quota divided by the old determination less the Philippine quota.

"(2) If the new determination is greater than the old determination, then—

"(A) The new quota for any area under subsection (b) or (c) shall be equal to the lesser of—

"(i) the product of its old quota times the quotient of the new determination less the Philippine quota divided by the old determination less the Philippine quota, or

"(ii) its quota base.

"(B) The new quota for any area under subsection (d) shall be equal to the product of its old quota times the quotient of the new determination less the sum of the new quotas for areas under subsections (a) through (c) divided by the sum of the old quotas for areas under subsection (d).

"(3) The Secretary may adjust the quota for any area by an amount not exceeding 10,000 tons, but the total of such adjustments shall not exceed 25,000 tons at any one time, and for the purposes of establishing or revising quotas pursuant to paragraphs (1) and (2), no such adjustment may be taken into account.

"(4) The allocation of any deficit pursuant to section 204 shall not change the quota of any area for the purposes of this subsection, but any change in the quota of any area made pursuant to subsection (f) of this section shall change the quota and quota base of such area for all purposes.

"(f) Whenever in any year any foreign country with a quota or proration thereof of more than ten thousand short tons fails to fill such quota or proration by more than 10 per centum and at any time during such year the world price of sugar exceeds the domestic price, the quota or proration thereof for such country for subsequent years shall be reduced by an amount equal to the amount by which such country failed to fill its quota or proration thereof, unless the Secretary finds that such failure was due to crop disaster or force majeure or finds that such reduction would be contrary to the objectives of this Act. Any reduction hereunder shall be prorated in the same manner as deficits are prorated under section 204."

SEC. 2. Section 204 of the Sugar Act of 1948 is amended to read as follows:

"PRORATION OF QUOTA DEFICITS

"SEC. 204. (a) The Secretary shall from time to time determine whether, in view of the current inventories of sugar, the estimated production from the acreage of sugarcane or sugar beets planted, the normal marketings within a calendar year of new-crop sugar, and other pertinent factors, any area will be unable to market the quota for such area.

"(b) If the Secretary determines, pursuant to subsection (a), that any domestic area will be unable to market its quota, he shall allocate the amount of the deficit so determined to the other domestic areas in proportion to the quotas then in effect for such areas. The Secretary shall reallocate the amount by which he determines that any domestic area will be unable to fill its allocation under this subsection to other domestic areas on such basis as he may determine, and shall reallocate to foreign areas, on such basis as he may determine, the amount by which he determines that domestic areas taken as a whole will be unable to fill such deficit.

"(c) If the Secretary determines, pursuant to subsection (a), that any foreign area will be unable to market its quota, he shall allocate the amount of the deficit so determined to all other areas having quotas under section 202 in proportion to the quotas then in effect for such areas. The Secretary shall reallocate the amount by which he determines that any domestic area will be unable to fill its allocation under this subsection in the same manner as is required for reallocation under subsection (b). The Secretary shall reallocate to foreign areas, on such basis as he may determine, the amount by which he determines that any foreign area will be unable to fill its allocation under this subsection.

"(d) In making any allocation or reallocation of a deficit pursuant to this section, the Secretary is authorized, in his discretion, to vary from the amount otherwise required to be allocated to any area by an amount not exceeding 10,000 tons, but the net total of all such variances shall be zero."

SEC. 3. Subsection (b) of section 408 of the Sugar Act of 1948 is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of title II of this Act, the President may determine or redetermine the quota for Cuba, in any amount not greater than that otherwise required pursuant to title II, at any time and from time to time prior to January 1, 1965. Any such determination or redetermination shall become effective immediately upon publication in the Federal Register of the President's proclamation thereof. The Secretary shall allocate or reallocate any difference between the Cuban quota as so proclaimed by the President and the Cuban quota as otherwise required by title II in the same manner as is prescribed by section 204 for allocation and reallocation of deficits."

SEC. 4. Section 412 of the Sugar Act of 1948 is amended to read as follows:

"TERMINATION OF ACT

"SEC. 412. The powers vested in the Secretary by this Act shall terminate on December 31, 1964, except that the Secretary shall have power to make payments under title III under programs applicable to the crop year 1964 and previous crop years."

SEC. 5. Sections 4501(c) and 6412(d) (relating to the termination and refund of taxes on sugar) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 are amended by striking out "September 30, 1961" in each place that it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1965".

Our Ballistic Missile Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 31, 1960

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, in October of 1956 Soviet Russia launched sputnik with the usual propaganda dramatics to be expected from the Communists. There then followed many utterances of people in positions of responsibility critical of our missile program. For the most part, this criticism represented nothing more or less than self-serving conclusions for political purposes.

As the ranking member of the House Committee on Armed Services, having legislative jurisdiction over our defense organization and program, I determined that the Congress and the country should have the facts. At that time I initiated an objective study of our missiles program from its very inception. In the RECORD of January 20, 1958, I inserted a memorandum embodying the results of this study. Again in 1959 I initiated a further study of the program and prepared a memorandum on my findings. This was inserted in the RECORD of February 1, 1960, by our distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

With a view to making certain that we always have the facts, not mere speculation or preconceived conclusions without foundation in fact, I initiated a further study to bring this whole matter up to date. The following is a memorandum which sets forth the factual history with respect to ballistic missiles:

BALLISTIC MISSILES [1]—A HISTORY

INTRODUCTION

Major military weapons never spring forth full-blown overnight. The first operational B–17 took a decade to develop. The B–29 and B–52 are likewise the outgrowth of years of effort.

Similarly with modern rocketry. Though in America it began 17 years ago, it turned seriously to long-range ballistic missiles only 7 years ago.

Not until fiscal year 1953 were expenditures in any 1 year on long-range ballistic missile programs even as much as a million dollars.

Since 1953 these programs have advanced with impressive speed. Today they involve the expenditure of 10 times as much each day as was spent in all of fiscal year 1952.

In the early postwar years military studies slowly advanced American ballistic missile knowledge. Propulsion, guidance, heating and weight problems appeared very difficult. Their solution obviously was costly. Yet, the level of effort remained low and sporadic. Moreover, critical data controlling warhead weights were unknown. Until 1953 the operational feasibility of long-range ballistic missiles seemed far distant to those in authority. As a result, these programs were deemed unworthy of major effort. To be sure, one such program, the forerunner to Atlas, was started as long as 14 years ago, in 1946, but it died 3 years later in the 1949 defense cutbacks. The program was reviewed in 1951 but even then only as a component development effort.

From World War II to 1953, due partly to skepticism as to the practicality of long-range ballistic missiles and due also to emphasis on strategic bombers, our missile effort, such as it was, went mainly into such air defense missiles as Nike-Ajax, Terrier I, and Falcon. Some short-range ballistic missiles and some relatively slow nonballistic aerodynamic type long-range missiles did receive some support. Corporal and Redstone are examples of the former and Snark and Navaho of the latter. Long-range ballistic missile efforts, however, were held down to low-support studies.

Viewed in retrospect, therefore, it is hardly remarkable that as of 1960, 15 years after World War II, American long-range rocketry is in some respects matched or surpassed by the Soviets. That result was foreordained by years of low-priority attention and lack of funds while the Soviets evidently were advancing their rocketry full blast.

What is remarkable is how rapidly the intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM) and intermediate range ballistic missile (IRBM) programs of the United States have advanced in less than 6 years. The speed

[1] Intercontinental and intermediate range.

of this advance in so short a period augurs well for the Nation's security. It is convincing testimony to the competence of our scientists and engineers.

YEARS 1942–46

The year 1942 marks the beginning of our World War II rocket program. The work was principally on solid propellants, which burn like cigarettes within the rockets. It was carried forward with military support, by the Office of Scientific Research and Development. From it evolved our World War II artillery rockets, air-to-surface rockets, rocket boosters for airplanes, other special rocket motors, and our first serious efforts to propel rockets with liquid fuels. During the summer of 1945 this work produced the Army Wac Corporal, a rocket fueled by nitric acid and aniline.

When World War II ended, the Allied Nations placed scientific teams in Germany to analyze that nation's technical accomplishments in rockets and missiles. A number of the best German scientists and engineers were induced to go to Russia and to the United States. The United States, however, pressed this effort less aggressively than the Soviets.

In the latter part of 1946 the Russians identified other scientists and technicians associated with German missile programs. Hundreds of them were removed to Russia. German research facilities and production plants were stripped of machinery, instruments, blueprints, and missiles or missile components. These two were shipped to Russia. Thus the Russians were able to exploit German missile technology. The indoctrination of Soviet scientists and technicians was thereby facilitated, and they acquired faster the know-how to bring uncompleted German ideas to practical realization.

The advantage the Soviets achieved due to their early decision to develop and extend this German missile technology is evident.

YEARS 1946 TO 1950

This period is one of halting, low-level efforts on long-range ballistic missiles.

In 1946 several potentially useful programs had been started. As captured V–2 rockets were used up, the development of American designed and produced rockets began.

For instance, the Army arranged in 1946 to rebuild the V–2's. In the so-called "Bumper" program, the V–2 was converted into a first-stage booster rocket. It carried a second rocket, the Wac Corporal, which in turn carried scientific instruments to high altitudes. Maximum speed attained during these later tests was about 5,200 miles per hour—maximum altitude, about 250 miles. The standard V–2 performance was 3,600 miles an hour and 100 miles maximum altitude.

The year 1946 marked also the Air Force's first attempt on the ICBM. The program, known as the MX–774 at Convair, was intended to advance long-range rocket techniques. It turned out, however, to be rather short lived. The defense slashes of 1949 terminated this program. For the next several years Convair used corporate funds to carry on MX–774 weapons studies at low financial levels.

In 1946 the Air Force also established the Snark and Navaho programs. These were long-range, airplane-type guided missiles, not the ballistic type. However, from the liquid propellant rocket booster to be used with Navaho grew the high thrust liquid propellant engines for today's Atlas, Thor, and Jupiter.

Also in the late 1940's the Navy developed the first version of its Viking, a high altitude scientific research rocket.

YEARS 1950 TO 1953

The development of the Army's Redstone, a 200-mile tactical ballistic missile, was begun in 1950. Not until 1953 was the first Redstone missile fired, a flight test that was only partially successful. Much of the information obtained from this and subsequent Redstone firings was applied to the Jupiter when that program was initiated in late 1955.

In the design of long-range ballistic missiles, weight is critical. Generally speaking, it takes about 200 pounds of launching weight to place 1 pound of warhead on a target several thousand miles away. Because the first atomic warheads weighed 9,000 pounds, clearly a major reduction was required in nuclear warhead weight for missile use.

During the 1946–53 period the Atomic Energy Commission embarked on a program of atomic weapon improvement which resulted in lighter and higher yield nuclear warheads.

It was on January 31, 1950, that development of thermonuclear weapons was permitted to go beyond low-priority studies in the United States. On that date the President directed the Atomic Energy Commission to proceed with this development.

However, during this entire period the significance of warhead improvement was not applied to the problem of long-range ballistic missiles. For this and other reasons, long-range ballistic missile development languished. The warhead problem, therefore, became one of the central factors in the delay of American progress on such missiles. During this slack period in the United States, the Soviets appear to have gone full speed ahead with their own long-range ballistic missile programs.

In October 1950, Mr. K. T. Keller, president of Chrysler Corp., was appointed Defense Department Director of Guided Missiles, with authority to institute a Manhattan-type project for missiles. However, after analysis of the missile programs, Mr. Keller decided against a Manhattan-type project on the grounds that it would take a year to institute such a program. In 1953 Mr. Keller was asked to remain with the new administration. He resigned late that year at his own behest.

Missile feasibility studies started in 1949 by the Rand Corp. were completed in the fall of 1950. These studies confirmed the military worth of long-range ballistic missiles. Subsequently, in January 1951, the decision was made by the Air Force to resume studies of the MX–774 weapon, redesignated Atlas. This program however was given only a long-term, low priority objective—that of determining whether a large 5,000-mile ballistic rocket was then technically feasible. Six months later, in June 1951, the Atlas project was formally reactivated.

On June 16, 1953, Secretary of Defense Charles E. Wilson ordered a review of the guided missile program to identify and eliminate duplication. He stated that "a continuous effort should be made to standardize on one missile for production and use by all military departments, wherever, within the employment limitation of each type of missile, standardization appears to be practicable." As a part of this review a group of civilian scientists headed by Dr. John von Neumann was requested to review the strategic missile programs. It was later known as the Strategic Missiles Evaluation Committee.

Between fiscal years 1951 and 1953 the ICBM program grew from a half million to $3 million per year.

YEAR 1954

The Strategic Missiles Evaluation (Von Neumann) Committee reported in February the highly significant possibility of achieving a major technological breakthrough on warhead size and expressed its conviction that other technical problems associated with the development of ICBM's could be resolved in a period of a few years. The Committee also recommended the formation of a special management organization to assure early ICBM availability.

As for technical factors, the Von Neumann Committee recommended that the ICBM project be completely reoriented to take advantage of the advancing warhead technology, thus permitting relaxation of guidance tolerances and propulsion requirements. The Committee also noted the potential desirability of an IRBM.

Nine days later the Assistant Secretary of Air Force (R. & D.) approved the broad reorientation of the program recommended by the committee.

Accordingly, the Air Force set up a group to study the Von Neumann report and define the organizational realinement required to accelerate the ICBM. From June through August major management and procedural changes were placed into operation. A streamlined organization under the Air Force Research and Development Command was set up. It was known as the Western Development Division (WDD) and became an autonomous group responsible for directing and coordinating the effort toward primary objectives. Under the command of Brig. Gen. B. A. Schriever, Atlas became WDD's basic mission.

During the Castle tests in the Pacific through the period of March to May 1954, the feasibility of developing a smaller lightweight, high-yield thermonuclear weapon was proven, thus confirming the soundness of the Von Neumann's Committee recommendations.

YEAR 1955

By spring the Atlas program was expanding rapidly. The $3 million program in fiscal year 1953 had grown to $14 million in fiscal year 1954, to $161 million in fiscal year 1955.

In February the Killian Committee (Technological Capabilities Panel) recommended that concurrently with the ICBM effort, an IRBM program be initiated to develop a missile of 1,500-mile range.

In June the Scientific Advisory Committee (formerly the Strategic Missile Evaluation Committee) recommended that two ICBM's be developed concurrently in order to assure earliest attainment of an operational capability. In September the President approved assignment of the highest priority to the ICBM research and development program. The same month the Titan ICBM project was established in supplementation of the Atlas program to provide the desired multiple approach.

In November the Secretary of Defense approved the formation of the Defense Ballistic Missile Committee and ordered organizational changes in the military departments to handle the ICBM and IRBM programs. At the same time he approved a program of two 1,500-mile intermediate range missiles subsequently named Jupiter and Thor. The Jupiter was to be launched either from land or sea. It was intended that Thor would be based upon experience already gained in the Atlas program, while Jupiter would be based on experience gained by the Redstone Arsenal team from the V–2 and Redstone missiles.

The Secretaries of Army, Navy, and Air Force at once implemented the new organizational program.

The Air Force placed its ICBM and Thor programs under the already established Air Force Ballistic Missile Division initially called the WDD.

A joint management committee was established by the Army and Navy for the Jupiter program. The Navy created the Office of Special Projects and assigned to it responsibility for the technical development of the sea-based IRBM. As a corollary to the Jupiter program, which employed a liquid propellant, the Navy also began studies of a

solid propellant version to reduce shipboard logistical problems.

Five hundred and fifteen million dollars of Defense funds were reserved to carry out these programs. In December the Secretary of Defense presented to the President and his advisers the new organizational alinement and the long-range missile programs. The President then assigned the highest priority to these programs.

YEAR 1956

On January 20, in order to assure a common interchange of technical information, as well as provide competent guidance for all the programs, the Scientific Advisory Committee was transferred from the Air Force to the Office of the Secretary of Defense. On the same date this committee presented certain recommendations to assure that the long-range ballistic missile programs would proceed at maximum speed. The office of a special assistant for guided missiles to Secretary of Defense was established, first with Dr. Murphree and later Mr. Holaday occuying this key position.

In February, the Army activated the Army Ballistic Missile Agency at Huntsville, Ala., under the direction of Brig. Gen. J. B. Medaris.

In September, the Jupiter C, a multistage test vehicle, was fired. It went 3,300 statute miles, rose to 680 statute miles, and reached a maximum velocity of 13,000 miles per hour. During the same period the Air Force X–17 re-entry test vehicle flight tests clearly demonstrated that the reentry problem was solvable.

In October, the Scientific Advisory Committee recommended initiation of a new, smaller, solid-propellant IRBM with improved capability of being launched from a submarine.

In November, the Secretary of Defense reviewed Service responsibilities for operational use of the IRBM. He assigned responsibility for operational deployment of land-based IRBM's to the Air Force and ship-based IRBM's to the Navy. Also in November the development of the Polaris (solid propellant) IRBM program (including six submarines) was approved by the Secretary of Defense, and the Navy was authorized to terminate its participation in the Jupiter program.

The next month, following Navy withdrawal from the Jupiter program, separate Army and Navy Ballistic Missile Committees were established under the chairmanship of the respective Service Secretaries.

YEAR 1957

In August the estimated operational capability date for Atlas was changed from March 1959 to June 1959. In December an accelerated program of 9 squadrons of 10 missiles each was approved. The Titan, alternate to Atlas, program was reduced from 4 to 2 test missiles per month and the completion date for the first operational squadron was set back. During this period it was decided to discontinue the Navaho airplane-type missile project which had become obsolescent because of the progress in the development of long-range ballistic missiles.

The President, in October, reaffirmed the highest national priority for both Jupiter and Thor systems to obtain an IRBM capability at the earliest practicable date and provide for continuance of both missiles until one proved successful. The Army was authorized in November to produce the Jupiter at a rate of five missiles per month. Four Jupiter 15-missile squadrons were to be established with the operational date of the first squadron to be December 1958.

Also to be operational in December 1958 was the first squadron of Thor, with three more 15-missile squadrons scheduled for a later date.

The decision was made to launch Polaris missiles from submarines only.

Nearly $1.4 billion was spent on ICBM and IRBM programs in fiscal year 1957.

YEAR 1958

Flight tests proved the performance of the Atlas guidance system, and the integrity of the airframe. Among the successful test flights in the development series, one Atlas was placed in earth satellite orbit in December. Other flights demonstrated the operational radio-inertial guidance system.

A schedule was approved for four squadrons of Titan in hardened bases. Components of the missile system were delivered, and a few of them tested.

Research and development of Minuteman were begun. Minuteman is to be a solid propellant, three-stage ICBM and will carry a nuclear warhead up to 5,500 nautical miles. It will be guided by a self-contained, all-inertial system.

Flight tests of Thor, Jupiter, and Atlas revealed a problem in the failure of certain components of the turbopump assembly used to pump propellants into the main engine. The difficulties were isolated and corrective modifications developed. Later flight tests verified success of the modifications.

The first Royal Air Force students entered training in the United States under USAF instruction in May in accordance with Government-to-Government agreements for the RAF to man and command all Thor units in the United Kingdom. During the year, the Thor guidance system was improved, permitting an average impact accuracy better than that originally specified and by the last of the year Thor was meeting its production schedule with operational missiles being shipped to England for deployment.

The initial increment of the first Jupiter squadron was ready for deployment in December. Consideration was given to deploying them to Italy.

The President, in November, approved a nine-submarine Polaris program. The initial operational capability date of the first Polaris submarine was advanced to late 1960. Later it was again advanced to early 1960, with four more following at 3-month intervals.

Congress appropriated $90 million for the Minuteman program in excess of the amount in fiscal year 1959 President's budget. This amount was applied against the fiscal year 1960 program (i.e., approved for utilization beginning July 1, 1959).

Congress also appropriated $609 million over the President's budget for Polaris; the President released $309 million of this on December 23 for development and for conversion of a surface ship to a tender for submarines and for a sixth nuclear-powered ballistic missile launching submarine.

The total spent in fiscal year 1958 was more than $2 billion.

YEAR 1959

Flights of the operational prototype Atlas which began in April had little initial success and the planned date for achieving a limited operational capability was changed from June to September. Considerable effort was devoted to determining the causes of the malfunctions that resulted in the explosion of four out of five Atlas missiles launched before June 30, and how to correct them. Since June 30, causes of the malfunctions have been corrected and the first launch by the all-military team on September 9 at Vandenberg Air Force Base was successful. A plan to improve the system's survivability and provide a faster reaction time was approved. Beginning with the third squadron, the complexes, each with three missiles and three launch positions, will be about 18 nautical miles apart, and, to shorten missile launching time, all squadrons from the third on will have individual missile launchers. Beginning with the fifth squadron, each missile will be dispersed to a separate firing point.

At Vandenberg, the first complex of three soft launch sites for the Atlas missile became operational in September 1959. This is a unique complex and is scheduled to phase out of the ballistic missile effort to support the Samos and Midas satellite programs as more Atlas squadrons become operational.

Progress to date on the Titan resulted in approval of an increase in the number of squadrons from 4 to 11. Each squadron will have 10 missiles. The first six squadrons will be organized into three complexes, each with three launchers, and the missiles will have radio-inertial guidance. The complexes will be about 18 nautical miles apart. In the 7th through 11th squadrons, the 9 launchers will be at least 18 miles apart and guidance will be all-inertial.

Prototype Minuteman missiles were fired from silo launchers, verifying the feasibility of launching Minuteman missiles from underground launchers of the silo type.

The total planned Thor force was reduced from nine squadrons to four, all deployed in England. In January it became evident that the construction, installation, checkout, and modification effort in England would require more time and personnel than was originally planned. This caused about a 4-month delay in turning over the first squadron to the RAF. In June, RAF–USAF representatives drafted preliminary procedures for declaring the U.S. squadrons "satisfactorily operational" in conformance with a governmental agreement.

The operational version of the ablating nose cone for Jupiter was flown on all missiles fired this year and has proved to be completely satisfactory. Two operational type nose cones were recovered with all their payloads in perfect condition. One of these carried biomedical experiments in support of National Aeronautics and Space Administration programs. A site for two Jupiter squadrons was selected in southern Italy. Each squadron of 15 missiles will be deployed in 5 sites, with 3 missiles at each, all launchers to be more than 11 nautical miles apart.

All major objectives of the Polaris program to date have been achieved. The launching system for the first Polaris submarine, the U.S.S. *George Washington*, passed its tests. The launcher for the next submarine class entered development; it will accommodate the 1,200-mile missile as well as the 1,500-mile missile planned for 1962. The first Polaris submarine was launched in June and is being completed. The sixth submarine will have several improvements, one being a greater operating depth. On July 1, contracts were let for the seventh, eighth and ninth submarines. The first submarine will probably become fully operational in late 1960 and the remainder will follow at 3- or 4-month intervals.

In 1959, Congress appropriated $85 million for Atlas and $87 million for Minuteman in excess of the amounts included in the fiscal year 1960 President's budget. These amounts were approved for utilization in the fiscal year 1960 programs (i.e., beginning July 1, 1959).

On June 24 the President released $300 million Polaris money (the remainder of the $609 million mentioned earier) for obligation in fiscal year 1960 for the seventh, eighth and ninth Polaris submarines.

YEAR 1960 THROUGH AUGUST 23

The second Vandenberg complex of three soft launch sites for the Atlas missile, which will become operational toward the end of 1960, is to be used primarily for crew training.

The Atlas program was delayed during 1960 by labor disputes. The effect of these delays on the Nation's overall strategic missile posture will not be very significant because of the soft nature of these first squadrons.

The planned number of Atlas squadrons has been increased to 13. Nine of these squadrons will be hard, that is, they will be protected so that their ability to fire will not be affected even by a near miss of a nuclear weapon. The successful developmental flight tests included one of 9,000 miles. During the past year an all-inertial guidance system for the Atlas missile was flight tested and achieved the specified accuracy. This system will make it possible to give the later Atlas squadrons greater dispersal and shorter reaction time and will eliminate the radar elements which are vulnerable to the effects of enemy weapons and electronic countermeasures.

Tests of the Titan weapon system indicate that the causes of the previous failures have been remedied. It is expected that this weapon system will attain operational capability on schedule.

Much of the development was on the advanced Titan system. Features of this missile include noncryogenic storable fuels, an all-inertial guidance system, and increased range. An in-silo launch capability permits reduction in exposure time and improves the reliability of the system.

During 1960 the planned force level was increased to 14 squadrons, the last 8 of which will be equipped with the advanced missile. The first Titan squadron is programed to be operational by the end of next year (1961).

The Minuteman program proceeded essentially on schedule with the critical problem of propulsion being effectively solved. Tests of the mobile concept began in June 1960 on trains manned by Air Force crews. It is expected to become operational about the summer of 1962.

The number of Thor squadrons to be activated was reduced from five to four, late in 1959. These four squadrons have been turned over to the Royal Air Force of England.

A firm, long-range, combat training launch schedule has been developed for the Thor program with the Royal Air Force. The launches will take place at Vandenberg Air Force Base, Calif.

The Jupiter R. & D. firing program was completed on February 4, 1960. The Jupiter construction program in Italy is proceeding according to schedule.

The Turkish Armed Forces have agreed to accept the Jupiter weapon system in a joint effort to implement NATO strategic planning.

On July 20, 1960, the last major test milestone prior to operational deployment was passed when two Polaris missiles were launched from the U.S.S. *George Washington* (SSBN 598) while submerged and went over 1,000 miles to the target area.

There is now no doubt that the first two Polaris submarines will deploy as scheduled toward the end of 1960. Other submarine construction is proceeding on schedule. Fourteen submarines are fully funded and long leadtime items for five additional submarines have been approved.

Development of a Polaris missile with a range of about 2,500 miles is now under consideration. The additional range will be made possible by a more efficient propellant and by lighter engine cases, nozzles, and guidance components.

Early in 1960 the development of an air-launched ballistic missile, Skybolt, was announced. Launched from airborne bombers of the B–52 type, the Skybolt will be designed to follow a ballistic trajectory above the atmosphere and strike a predetermined target over 1,000 miles away.

Among the many advantages of such a weapon system are its ability to remain aloft on an alert status within relatively close range of an aggressor; and, through its ability to remain hidden, to formidably discourage surprise attack plans.

The Skybolt is programed to become operational in 1964.

The President asked for and got all the funds that could be effectively used at this time for maximum acceleration of these programs in fiscal year 1961. The amounts available for these programs are:

	Billion
Atlas	$1.1
Titan	1.0
Minuteman	0.7
Polaris	1.3
Total	4.1

SUMMARY

Today and for the near future, our deterrent and retaliatory capabilities depend largely on the ability of current Air Force and Navy jet bombers to survive enemy attack on the ground and in the air and to deliver nuclear weapons. However, with passage of time, potential enemies' ability to destroy jet bombers on the ground and in the air may be improving faster than the jet bombers' ability to survive, thus weakening their deterrent qualities. Therefore, in 1955 we gave highest priorities to our IRBM and ICBM programs.

The Atlas, our first ICBM, started in 1946, canceled in 1949, begun again at low priority in 1951, accelerated in 1954, finally became operational in 1959. This missile is the beginning of the ballistic missile phase of deterrence. We can strike a large portion of the earth with 5,500 nautical mile range Atlas missiles launched from this country. On the other hand, potential enemies have Atlas-type missiles also and our Atlas missiles are vulnerable to surprise attack by them. Therefore, we are hardening and dispersing our newer Atlas-launching sites and developing other ICBM's, Titan and Minuteman, which will be in even harder sites. Titan was begun in 1955 as a backup in case Atlas failed. Minuteman, a smaller, solid-propellent, three-stage rocket was begun in 1958. The newer missiles, widely dispersed will be capable of launching on shorter notice, so that some of them could be launched before enemy missiles destroy the sites, assuming we got sufficient warning.

The least vulnerable deterrent seems to be our Polaris-launching submarines, because they are hard to find. Polaris, begun in late 1956, will be operational late in 1960 with the availability of the first submarine.

Thor and Jupiter were approved in late 1955 and they were available for deployment about 3 years from the development initiation date. These land-based IRBM's supplement the deterrence of ICBM's and Polaris.

From an expenditure of one-half million dollars in fiscal year 1951, programs for IRBM's and ICBM's will exceed $3 billion in the current fiscal year. Missile programs in the research stage quickly overtake and obsolete those in production. Therefore programs are designed so as to meet current needs without stockpiling missiles that will soon be outdated. Furthermore our scientific and technical talents are being taxed to the fullest on existing and scheduled missile programs. The evolutionary stages of missile development and the utilization of technical manpower make it unfeasible and uneconomical to pour more money and men into "crash programs" that tend to disrupt the sound and orderly missiles program now projected to give the United States full deterrent power.

Department of Defense obligational program for missile systems,[1] fiscal years 1946–60

[Millions of dollars]

Fiscal year	IR/ICBM programs	Other surface-to-surface missile programs	All other missile programs	Grand total, all missile programs
1946 and prior	2	19	51	72
1947		20	38	58
1948	.3	36	45	81
1949	.1	45	53	98
1950		65	69	134
1951	.5	185	598	784
1952	.8	239	818	1,058
1953	3	403	760	1,166
1954	14	336	717	1,067
1955	159	398	911	1,468
1956	526	387	1,368	2,281
1957	1,401	603	2,502	4,506
1958	2,150	639	2,391	5,180
1959 (total)	2,946	685	3,269	6,900
1960 (total)[2]	3,303	509	3,173	6,985
1961 [2]	3,424	383	3,155	6,962

[1] Program data reflected in this table cover the development and capital costs involved in missile programs, i.e. the cost of bringing missile systems to operational status plus the costs of procuring missiles and related equipment for operational purposes. These data include all procurement, construction, and research and development programs directly associated with missile programs. These figures do not include military pay, operation and maintenance costs for operational missile units and sites, and include only those shipbuilding and aircraft costs directly associated with providing missile capability.

[2] Fiscal year 1960 data are preliminary estimates; fiscal year 1961 data represent projected programing on Feb. 19, 1960.

NOTE.—Estimates are subject to revision due to program adjustments.

Area Army Reserve Program at Amherst USAR Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 31, 1960

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, on July 28, 1960, I had the privilege of reviewing the activities of the area Army Reserve program at the Amherst USAR Center, 100 North Forest Road in Williamsville, N.Y.

Lt. Col. Ellsworth C. Davis, Buffalo subsector commander, presented the overall picture on area reserve facilities, and Col. Walter S. Walls, commanding officer of the 338th General Hospital, a Buffalo Reserve unit, explained the role of the professional man in the Reserve program.

In a discussion of the General Hospital's 2-week training program at Camp Drum, N.Y., where it operated a field-type hospital under tentage, I realized that with the ever-present threat of war and surprise attack which exists today, the military preparedness of our country depends more than ever before upon the readiness of our Reserve Forces. I feel very strongly that the Army Reserve must be maintained in a state of training that will allow it to be ready for employment in an emergency with the least possible delay. Based on what I saw of this training in my immediate area, I feel that this program is being maintained at a maximum level at the present time, and

that the individuals participating are making a worthwhile and patriotic contribution to the Nation's preparedness.

I also had occasion to observe the awarding of a commendation ribbon to Maj. Don T. Edgmon, Regular Army adviser to the Reserve program, for his outstanding performance of duty in Korea, by Col. Dennis J. McMahon, commander of the northern New York sector. Major Edgmon also received a letter of appreciation from headquarters, Republic of Korea Army, signed by Yo Chan Song, lieutenant general, Chief of Staff.

Social Security Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHIL WEAVER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 31, 1960

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, there is a growing problem having to do with the care of the elderly citizens of our country who have spent a useful life and who have now reached the time when they, by rights, should be able to relax and enjoy their declining years.

All too often these remaining years are not pleasant ones. The inroads of age have often so weakened the body that it becomes prey to disease.

To combat these ailments incident to age is an expensive business. Doctors' fees have gone up—due largely to the fact that they must have more and more equipment and equipment is becoming more and more expensive. Hospital bills, too, are becoming more costly. Here, too, the need for new equipment and the expense of nursing and other assistance have increased costs. Naturally, medical bills reflect some of this increase.

It is conceded by all that the costs of medical care have gone up for the aged as these costs have gone up for everyone.

Many proposals have been made relative to this situation. Perhaps the most famous in recent years has been that introduced by my good friend and colleague, Hon. AIME FORAND. Known as the Forand bill, this legislation stirred up a great deal of interest throughout the Nation during the 86th Congress. It stirred up, too, a great deal of bitter opposition.

Recognizing the need for assistance to the elderly, I was nevertheless very much opposed to the compulsory socialized medicine feature of the Forand bill. I am still very much opposed to this compulsory medical care program.

For one thing, dramatic progress has been made by the insurance industry of this country along these lines. Only a few years ago it was impossible to get medical insurance for those over 65. Now, there are a score of companies offering this type of medical insurance. These programs have met with instant approval and are doing well.

I also do not like the idea of the Federal Government through the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare dictating to any individual which doctor he or she should see and how much he or she should be charged. This smacks to me of "big brotherism" of the worst type.

Finally, I think that the problem as it now exists is not a permanent one. As insurance companies take up more and more of the load the need for public assistance in this field will become less and less.

For these reasons the State-Federal partnership program which we adopted here appealed to me as it did to a great many others on both sides of the aisle.

I am glad that we are moving in the humanitarian direction of assisting the people who need assistance. I am equally glad that it is being done by the States and will be controlled by the States and not the Federal bureaucracy.

Opening Battle Lost for Social Security Medical Aid Program—But Fight for Objective Will Go On

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK KOWALSKI
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 31, 1960

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, we who believe in a social security program of medical aid for our senior citizens may have lost a battle this past week but we have not lost the war.

I, for one, intend to carry on the fight until we have enacted into law the kind of program that the overwhelming majority of the American people want.

It is significant that when the Senate acted on the Anderson-Kennedy amendment, which would have established an insurance-type program of medical care for the elderly, under the social security system, only one Republican Senator voted for it.

When that vote came up, where was the vaunted "new Republicanism"? Where were the so-called Republican liberals?

It is significant also many of the very arguments which have been used against the social security approach to the problem of medical aid for senior citizens are the selfsame arguments that were used against the Social Security Act itself when it was adopted a quarter of a century ago.

The plan for medical aid under social security is being called socialistic by its bitter opponents; it is called regimentation. In 1936, the Republican National Committee referred to social security as a counterfeit insurance policy. Would it dare make such a charge today, after 25 years during which it has proved to be one of the greatest pieces of legislation ever adopted in America?

Mr. Speaker, the social security approach to medical aid for senior citizens is a sound, practical approach. It would utilize governmental machinery already established and whose worth is proved by 25 years of successful experience. It would not involve the huge subsidies to private interests which the President advocated in his program. And, above all, it would not involve the obnoxious means test.

To those who believe that we need an insurance-type program, it is heartening to find that the New York Times has editorially reaffirmed its support of the social security approach to this problem.

It is heartening, too, to find that the people of America are supporting us in this fight. This support comes not alone from senior citizens, but from Americans of all ages. The people, Mr. Speaker, want a medical care program under Social Security, and the voice of the people will be heard.

Operation Veracity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NEWELL A. GEORGE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 31, 1960

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, in the closing days of the Congress, a number of my friends on the other side of the aisle undertook an operation they termed "veracity."

Subsequently, experts in various fields were assigned homework in order that they could come prepared with statements to be read into the RECORD. Seldom were Democratic Members given an opportunity to reply to the baseless and untrue charges with respect to the Democratic platform.

Considering platforms, Mr. Speaker, there is a great difference between the Democratic and the Republican. History establishes the fact that the Democratic platform lists objectives which members of our party conventionally strive to attain.

On the other hand, any close observer of the administration during the past 7 years and 8 months most certainly knows that the Republican platform is nothing more than window dressing and that promises made by the Old Guard of the GOP are completely disregarded after the votes are counted.

In my newsletter of August 25 I gave a few concrete examples of the insincerity of the Republican leaders now in charge of the administration. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include this letter as part of my remarks:

An impressive legislative program faced the House as it reconvened following the party conventions. The countdown is slow, however, as the House awaits action by the Senate. Those who are striving to enact needed legislation are forced to deal with pseudo-statesmen who sponsored a civil rights bill containing no major advances knowing full well that it could not receive serious consideration before Congress adjourns. They will not succeed in fooling the people—especially those of their home States of Pennsylvania and New York. It is

cheap and cruel to use the civil rights issue as a legislative blockade in an attempt to stifle needed legislation.

To date, this Congress has passed 676 measures which are now public law. An additional 38 bills scheduled for the law books failed of enactment because of a Presidential veto.

Area redevelopment: Yesterday—less than 2 months ago—a second veto of a redevelopment bill to assist depressed areas took place. Today special emphasis is placed on such a measure by the administration and it is one of 21 recommended for congressional action at this abbreviated recess session.

Agriculture: Yesterday bills passed by the Congress were vetoed which would have raised farm income, curtailed production, and reduced the existing surplus. Today the administration criticizes the farmers for growing more surpluses and urges congressional action. While farm income has been dizzily dropping, the taxpayers' investment in surplus commodities has risen to $8,700 million.

Water: Yesterday a public works appropriation bill which would have stepped up the Nation's flood control and water conservation programs was vetoed. Yesterday, also, the water pollution control act met a veto. Today the administration, through the Surgeon General, states flatly that the construction of water supply and pollution control facilities has lagged far behind national needs and that the United States is headed for a water crisis unless we do a much better job with our water resources.

Education: Yesterday threats of a veto confused the issue and different approaches were taken in aid to education measures by the House and Senate. Today the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare estimates that in Kansas, alone, there will be an increase of nearly 50,000 children in school by 1963. Two thousand more teachers and as many classrooms will be needed solely for the additional number of students. With almost a 9 percent increase in students, the cost cannot be absorbed from current State and local tax revenue.

Politics in reserve: Yesterday the bank discount rate was 4 percent. Today—since last July—it has been lowered by the Federal Reserve Board to 3 percent. Recently lending power has been increased by pumping reserves into commercial banks through the purchase of Government securities by the Federal Reserve Board and by a reduction in reserve requirements. All this action in an election year—and in the interest of our economy it should have taken place long ago.

A Statement Concerning a Bill To Provide Compensation for Disability or Death Resulting From Injury to Employees in Employment Which Exposes Employees to Radioactive Material, and for Other Purposes

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT ZELENKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 31, 1960

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, the industrial use of radioactive materiels continues to increase dramatically in the United States, and consequently the number of workers will continue to increase from the present thousands to a far more substantial and significant proportion of the total working force as the years go by.

The problem of radiation hazards in industrial safety is unique. Many workers are today, and many more will be tomorrow, exposed to varying degrees of radiation in their day to day work.

Fifty years of experience in workmen's compensation within the United States makes brilliantly clear the fact that our State governments will be unable to protect workers from the hazards of radioactive materiel. Neither in the areas of adequate benefits, medical care, rehabilitation, nor in administration will the States provide adequate protection to workers injured from exposure to radioactive materiel.

Where the States have been unable to meet their responsibility, the Federal Government has assumed its obligation. Many years ago the Congress of the United States extended the protection of workmen's compensation to the longshoremen through the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act because the States were unable to do so. In the same manner workers who are exposed to radioactive materiels should be extended protection under Federal law.

This bill is presented to the Congress in order to meet our present responsibility to workers exposed to radiation. The bill is modeled from the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act. However, because of the unique problems created by radiation exposure, the substantive sections of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act have been substantially rewritten to meet the need.

On the other hand, the administrative sections of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act have been adopted in toto because they would, first, utilize the experience of the present personnel; and second, give us an administration of this new program at the least cost to the U.S. Government.

Section 2 of the bill makes use of the definitions from the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act which on the whole would apply, but redefines injury and radioactive materiel.

Section 3 sets up a presumption. This is undoubtedly the most important change required in law to meet the unusual effects of persons exposed to radiation. Where ordinary diseases of life can be causally related to exposure to radiation activity, it is imperative that a method of determination of causal relations be presumed in law since medical science is unable to distinguish the exact cause of the disease. To do less is to deny compensability to all claims where the injury results from an ordinary disease occupationally caused by exposure to radiation. Like all legal presumptions, section 3 is rebuttable.

Section 4, section 5, and section 6 follow the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act. Section 7(a) sets up a waiting period of 3 days with full compensation if the disability lasts for more than 14 days. This is the recommendation of the International Association of Industrial Accident Boards and Commissions. Section 7(b) fixes the maximum amount of benefit payments at 90 percent of the average weekly wage of all employment covered by the act and further provides that it be corrected annually to the nearest dollar by the Secretary of Labor.

Section 8 provides for an employer panel of a reasonable number of competent physicians. However, the Deputy Commissioner is extended the authority to determine the reasonableness of the size of the panel and that the panel include the professional competence necessary to compete with the specialized and extraordinary treatment needed for care.

Section 9 deals with the compensation for disability. Because of the unusual nature of radiation injury, disability is treated differently from the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act. Temporary total disability is treated simply as a wage loss, and the maximum weekly payment is fixed at 90 percent of the employee's average weekly wage but not to exceed the maximum amount fixed by the Secretary of Labor. Section 9(b) deals with temporary partial disability and provides a weekly payment of 90 percent of the difference between the average weekly earnings of the employee before the injury and the average amount which he is earning or is able to earn in suitable employment thereafter. Here, however, the disability, though partial, is only temporary with no permanent effects. Where the disability is permanent, the impairment of the wage-earning capacity of the workman shall be estimated from the nature and degree of the injury and his compensation or other periodical payment shall be for the lifetime of the employee.

However, the maximum amount may not exceed the maximum amount fixed by the Secretary of Labor. Most important, the Deputy Commissioner may make an evaluation based upon his estimation of the employee's fitness to continue the employment in which he was injured or to adapt himself to some other suitable occupation. Subsections 5 and 6 of section 9 conform with the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act.

Section 10, dealing with compensation for death; section 11, dealing with the determination of pay; section 12, dealing with the guardian for minors or incompetents; and section 13(a), dealing with notice of injury or death all conform with the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act.

Section 14(a), which pertains to the time limitation for filing of claims, has been written to meet the needs of injury induced by radiation. Its main feature is that the statute of limitations for filing a claim shall not become operative until 1 year after the person claiming benefits knew or by exercise of reasonable diligence should have known of the existence of such impairment and its causal relationship to his employment and that he incur a loss of wages or has an impaired capacity to earn.

The remainder of the bill conforms to the language of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act. It has been repeated because it was intended if amendments were made to the

Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act that the Congress should deal with them separately from those dealing with injury by radiation.

Section 38 provides that the administrative sections of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act when amended shall apply equally to the proposed bill. This was done because the administrative features of both laws should be in conformity and improvements to one would equally be improvements to the other. It is on the whole with the substantive features that amendment and separation from the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act was felt necessary.

While jurisdiction for overall legislature on compensation matters involving industrial workers lies within the Committee on Education and Labor, the radiation hazards in industry has been the subject of study by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and the Research and Development Subcommittee of that group, headed by our distinguished colleague, the Honorable MELVIN PRICE, held extensive hearings to explore the possibility of Federal legislation. I wish to acknowledge that the legislation I have introduced today has its origins in the findings of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. I am pleased to announce that Congressman PRICE will join me in cosponsoring this bill.

A Deserving Tribute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 31, 1960

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, as this session draws to a close I would like to compliment a Member of this Congress for his hard work and diligent service not only to the Congress but to the people of his district—Congressman JOHN H. DENT, of the 21st District of Pennsylvania.

He came to the Congress less than 3 years ago and has made an outstanding record on the Committee of Labor and Education, Subcommittee of Labor Standards, and as a conferee on important legislative enactments. It has often been said that experience is the best teacher. This is so true in the case of Congressman JOHN H. DENT. He has had better than a generation of experience and leadership in the legislative halls of his State, where he served for over 22 years—17 of these years as the Democratic floor leader in the State senate.

Few, if any, public servants in Pennsylvania have equaled the record he has carved out as both a leader in the senate and as a Member of this Congress.

The legislative work experience and seniority are two of the most important factors. To know what to do and to have the seniority to back up the know-how is important to the people of any district and to the State from which the Member comes. As we all know, the southern Members of Congress control most of the committees simply because of seniority. Congressman DENT has pointed out time and time again that because of the northern Members not being given the support for continued service in Congress that their constituencies have to pay higher taxes and more taxes and receive less from the National Treasury than the constituency of many of the Southern and Western States.

Congressman DENT has pointed out that the recently passed medical aid bill for the aged, despite all of his efforts and those of us who thought to the contrary, was made a part of the relief system of this country, there are States that receive as much as 80 percent contribution toward the cost of this aid whereas Pennsylvania only receives 50 percent.

This is true in all forms of handouts from the Federal Government—public works, defense spending, stream and river development, power projects, aid to education proposals, relief, welfare, and on and on. Equality in taxes and equality in service can only be had by continuing in Congress men who have the know-how and fight and will work for fair and equitable treatment for their respective States and districts.

No man in Congress fights harder than JOHN H. DENT for his district and his people. His ability to handle himself in debate is well known and recognized by every Member on the floor. His reports to all the people are hard hit and factual. Many Members of Congress read them with keen interest. He seldom misses a session of Congress and then only because of committee meetings or sickness.

Time and time again—from his very first week in the Congress of the United States—he has pointed out the weakness of the Reciprocal Trades Agreements, never giving an inch in his determination to protect the jobs of his constituency. There is no question but what his clarion voice has been heard and has awakened the conscience of many of the Members of this Congress who are lately coming to realize the impact of foreign importation from low standard countries of the consumer goods that are replacing American workmen daily and shutting down American production facilities.

His speeches in the RECORD on glass, rubber, sporting goods, residual oil and the many other products that have felt the heavy hand of import strangulation have rallied many Members of Congress to his side and his fight to reevaluate our position in world trade and foreign aid.

Congressman DENT is, by no stretch of the imagination, an isolationist, but no man can deny the sincerity of effort to help our neighbors without reducing American standards of life.

In the next few months a new session of Congress will be convened and every facet of American life, whether it be the farmer, the manufacturer, small businessman, the laborer, or the soldier, he will be able to count on the efforts of Congressman JOHN H. DENT in his continuing fight for American prosperity and world peace.

I am proud to be a Member of this Congress and happy to have served and to have known JOHN H. DENT, a great public servant.

Federal-State Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 31, 1960

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, during the period in which he has been chairman of the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations of the House Government Operations Committee, our distinguished colleague, the Honorable L. H. FOUNTAIN, has established a national reputation as an authority in the field of Federal-State-local relations.

On June 28, 1960, Congressman FOUNTAIN spoke before the 52d annual meeting of the Governors' conference at Glacier National Park, Mont. His address, which I include as an extension of my remarks, reflects his common sense, his wisdom and his deep understanding of this important and complex subject. I commend it to our colleagues.

The address follows:

FEDERAL-STATE RELATIONS

(Address by Congressman L. H. FOUNTAIN, Democrat, of North Carolina, at the 52d annual meeting of the Governors' conference, Glacier National Park, Mont., June 28, 1960)

I appreciate this opportunity to participate in your discussion this morning on the subject of Federal-State relations. I deem it a high privilege and a great honor to be asked to speak before such an imposing assemblage of our Nation's chief executives as are gathered here amid the beautiful surroundings of Glacier National Park on the occasion of your 52d conference.

More than a century ago that wise and penetrating foreign observer, De Tocqueville, sensed the importance of the American Federal system to the vitality of our democratic political institutions.

In his classic, "Democracy in America," published in 1835, De Tocqueville wrote:

"The Federal system was created with the intention of combining the different advantages which result from the greater and the lesser extent of nations; and a single glance over the United States of America suffices to discover the advantages which they have derived from its adoption.

"In great centralized nations the legislator is obliged to impart a character of uniformity to the laws which does not always suit the diversity of customs and of districts; as he takes no cognizance of special cases, he can only proceed upon general principles; and the population is obliged to conform to the exigencies of the legislation, since the legislation cannot adapt itself to the exigencies and the customs of the population, which is the cause of endless trouble and misery. This disadvantage does not exist in confederations. Congress regulates the principal measures of the National Government, and all the details of the administration are reserved to the provincial legislatures. It is impossible to imagine how much this division of sovereignty contributes to the well-being of each of the States which compose the Union. In these small communities, which

are never agitated by the desire of aggrandizement or the cares of self-defense, all public authority and private energy is employed in internal amelioration. * * * It is generally believed in America that the existence and the permanence of the republican form of government in the New World depend upon the existence and the permanence of the Federal system."

This commentary, I submit, is as valid today in its general principles as in de Tocqueville's day. In the Federal principle we have an admirable political concept well suited to the conditions of a country as large and diverse as ours. This extraordinary political invention of the Founding Fathers has weathered the tests of time and adaptability to changing conditions.

The clear-cut division of functions between the States and the National Government, while appropriate in the early days of the Republic, in time gave way to a sharing of certain responsibilities in response to the advent of new economic and social conditions. Various methods of intergovernmental cooperation, like the grant-in-aid and the tax credit device, were found to assure the continued workability of our Federal structure. The challenge is now ours to discover practical methods for further strengthening the Federal system to better serve contemporary America and future generations.

Political inventiveness is sorely needed if we are to deal successfully with the newer problems of government, such as those associated with the growth of metropolitan complexes. We can no longer safely rely exclusively on existing methods of intergovernmental cooperation. Here State government has a major responsibility—and a great opportunity—to contribute to the solution of metropolitan area problems. Effective State leadership in meeting this challenge would constitute incontrovertible evidence of the vitality of State government.

It has been said that the extension of Federal legislation into program areas traditionally a State responsibility has come about because of inactivity on the part of the States. While true in part, this is far too simple an explanation for a very complex situation. Unquestionably, the States can and must be more responsive to public needs if they are to occupy the position of equality which is rightfully theirs in the Federal structure.

It is not merely a question of shoring up the States to preserve in actuality as well as in theory the division of powers. The Federal Government needs help. With the demands of national defense, international relations, and space exploration increasingly requiring more of the Federal Government's energies, it is only logical that the States should equip themselves to assume more responsibility for domestic programs.

Even in the traditional service areas, the numerous tasks confronting the States and their local governments are tremendously important and demanding today. Permit me to cite but one example—education.

In Jefferson's words: "If a nation expects to be ignorant and free in a state of civilization, it expects what never was and never will be." With great international and domestic problems confronting the Nation today, education is more than ever before the key to world peace and our very survival.

History offers ample evidence that democracy cannot flourish where a people are uneducated, politically inactive, or fail to understand their binding common interests.

What, then, are the necessary conditions for a satisfactory educational system?

It is not necessary, or probably desirable, that all teachers be paid the same salary scales throughout the country—so long as the salaries paid teachers are adequate to attract the best qualified persons to this extremely important profession. It is not necessary that all schoolbuildings be built according to the same specifications—so long as these buildings are safe and efficient and we have adequate school facilities to accommodate the student population. It is not necessary that the curriculum from one school district to the next be as alike as the products of an automated assembly line—so long as our schools are providing the essentials for active participation in a highly industrialized democratic society, and beyond that, seek to challenge our children to develop their minds to the fullest extent of their potential.

No, centralization and uniformity are neither essential for nor will they necessarily produce the excellence which our Nation must attain in education and other public programs. But a centralized program sometimes becomes a necessary expedient for satisfying public needs when those who have the primary responsibility wait too long to take effective action. It is axiomatic that the less we solve public problems at the State and local levels, the more such problems will be dealt with at the national level. Whether we like it or not (and I am one of those who doesn't), the consequence will almost surely be a further concentration of power in the Federal Government if the States and localities neglect their responsibilities. Let us never forget that the Members of Congress and the President are elected by the same people who elect State and local officials. If the needs on the local and State levels are not met, most assuredly these same people will call upon the President and especially the Congress for action.

While it is true that some States have pioneered in recent years with imaginative programs for dealing with matters such as broadening employment opportunities, special housing needs, and temporary disability insurance for workers, the States have not done all that they might for meeting public problems falling within their competence. It is most encouraging that the council of State governments annually takes stock of many of the matters requiring the attention of the State governments in its program of "Suggested State Legislation." State accomplishment in response to those suggestions, however, is not equally encouraging.

I am reminded in this connection of several outstanding examples of State legislative leadership demonstrated earlier in the century.

We are all aware that workmen's compensation laws were enacted by all of the States on their own initiative and, significantly, this remains a field in which there is no apparent pressure for Federal participation. (However, it might be noted parenthetically that some of these State programs are badly out of date and in need of considerable improvement.) The State of Wisconsin in 1932 led the way with an unemployment compensation plan which served largely as the model for Federal legislation 3 years later. And a number of States contributed to the development of the public assistance programs upon which our Federal grant legislation was patterned.

Unfortunately, the notion is still widely held that Government services are of a fixed kind and amount which remain constant as our economy grows. Many Government activities, on the contrary, are intimately related to economic growth and technological progress, both as a consequence and a stimulant.

Witness, for example, the new regulatory problems created by the use of atomic energy and the use of powerful chemical pesticides which contribute so mightily to agricultural productivity. Such advances in technology increase our consumable private income but are not without their social costs. So, too, the growth and concentration of population in metropolitan centers necessitates proportionately larger Government expenditures to cope with the resulting problems of water supply, air and water pollution, traffic congestion, and commuter transportation.

When difficult problems arise, the solution is not to turn back the clock to some romanticized golden age of the past. Nor is there so easy a solution as sending these problems to Washington on the grounds that the Federal Government has access to the more productive tax sources. The need, rather, is for all units in our Federal system to go forward with imagination, initiative, and determination in dealing with the complex problems of our time.

Much remains to be done, not only in anticipating and planning for emerging governmental responsibilities, but also in dealing effectively with older problems. Certainly, the States have before them a tremendous opportunity to strengthen themselves through constitutional revision and appropriate legislation aimed at facilitating effective and responsible government at the local level. As a very minimum, the States should enlarge the home rule powers of local governments to an extent commensurate with their administrative capabilities and their fiscal needs and capacities.

It is my firm conviction that we must have strong local self-government in this country if we are to preserve our Federal system. Monopoly is no more desirable in government than it is in science or industry. The free competition of ideas and a broad base of participation in the political affairs of the Nation are indispensable ingredients of democracy.

Throughout our history, we Americans have demonstrated a genius for adapting our political institutions to new conditions and new problems, although the time lags have sometimes given cause for concern. Unencumbered by slavish adherence to rigid political dogmas, while steadfastly devoted to the heritage of our democratic ideals, we have been a Nation of political pragmatists. This national trait is pointedly reflected in Grover Cleveland's famous remark: "It is a condition and not a theory which confronts us."

With the active support of your organization, the Federal Government last year created a permanent Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. In view of the fact that the President has entrusted the leadership of the Commission to a very able gentleman who needs no introduction to this conference, I am all the more hopeful that the Commission will become an important and constructive force in helping to plot a sound and orderly course for the future development of intergovernmental activities.

I believe deeply in our Federal form of Government and in the desirability of preserving and strengthening this remarkable political institution; but there are no easy solutions or automatic mechanisms for doing so. Constant vigilance and hard work are the price we must pay for democratic institutions.

It is my sincere hope that in the decade of the 1960's we will see an era of close and rewarding cooperation among the levels of Government—Federal, State, and local—and a resurgence of State leadership in governmental affairs.

While I have this chance, permit me to conclude by striking just one other brief note in the presence of you, whose leadership and statesmanship will play such an important part in determining the future destiny of our beloved Nation and of generations yet unborn. As was pointed out in your very thought-provoking and stimulating discussion yesterday morning, beyond any question, we are living in dangerous times testing whether our Nation or any other nation so conceived and so dedicated shall long endure.

Consequently, in this hour while the world is in a turmoil and the redemption for governments and mankind is being worked out

in so many mysterious ways; and while we are engaged in a deadly, devastating contest over the integrity of the individual versus the authority of the State, which will determine whether the philosophy of Jesus Christ or the philosophy of communism shall prevail. I believe with all my being that it is wise and necessary for all of us, in public and in private life, to call upon the Master Architect of the Universe for more faith in Him, for a better understanding of His magnificent purpose in our lives, and for a greater courage and determination to carry out the many glorious, though difficult, tasks which both He and the people of America have committed to our care.

In words written by Franklin Delano Roosevelt, but never uttered by him before his death: "The only limit to our realization of tomorrow will be our doubts of today."

Gen. Robert L. F. Sikes: Citizen, Soldier, Legislator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL G. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 31, 1960

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, today I had the pleasure of attending a luncheon in honor of our friend and colleague, ROBERT L. F. "BOB" SIKES, of Florida. This luncheon was given by the Reserve Officers Association to honor BOB SIKES in recognition of his long years of devoted service to the U.S. Army and the Army Reserve and to celebrate his promotion to the rank of brigadier general.

All of Florida is proud of this accomplishment of the dean of our delegation who has served with such distinction and honor for 20 years in Congress. His great interest in the building and strengthening of the armed services of our country is well known to the Members of this body, particularly because of his effective service on the House Appropriations Committee concerned with the defense of our Nation. As one of Florida's outstanding citizens and legislators BOB SIKES has now added another feat to his accomplishment of service and I know I can speak for all of my colleagues not only from Florida, but from both Houses of the Congress when I say "Congratulations, General SIKES."

The luncheon was presided over by John T. "Jake" Carlton, executive director of the Reserve Officers Association of the United States, who has and is doing a magnificent job in helping to keep the U.S. Army Reserve as a ready and active force. Following are remarks made by the national president of the Reserve Officers Association, Maj. Gen. Carl T. Sutherland, U.S. Army Reserve, and the remarks of the former national president, Maj. Gen. STROM THURMOND:

MESSAGE FROM THE NATIONAL PRESIDENT ON THE OCCASION OF LUNCHEON IN HONOR OF R. L. F. SIKES, A BRIGADIER GENERAL OF THE U.S. ARMY RESERVE

Please express to General SIKES my deep regret that I cannot be present with you today as ROA pays tribute to him, recognizing his great achievements as a citizen-soldier as well as a nationally recognized leader in the Congress. BOB SIKES for many years has been one who has exhibited great capacity for leadership and his new estate prepares him for broader service in the years to come. We are proud of him. As national president of ROA, I am especially pleased to pass to him the honor of again serving as ROA's legislative advisory chairman. Knowing BOB SIKES as I do I am confident that he will respond willingly to this call for service. My best wishes to you all on today's happy occasion.

CARL T. SUTHERLAND,
Major General, U.S. Army Reserve.

BOB SIKES has served national defense far beyond the call of duty in three elements of his activity.

First, he has taken seriously his duties as a Reserve officer and has carried forward his own personal training in order to make himself best qualified in his field. That achievement we particularly recognize today.

Second, as a Member of the Congress and a key member of the Appropriations Committee he has by diligent application to his duty become one of the best informed men in the Congress on military matters. Against this broad background he has contributed to the sound military strength we have today. We know also that he has gained his achievements in this field frequently against great odds. But fighting against odds neither dismays nor deters a man like BOB SIKES.

And third, and perhaps most important, BOB SIKES has combined his efforts in three roles: as citizen, as soldier, and as legislator to contribute to a substantially greater public understanding of our military needs as well as a better working relationship between the civilian components and the Regular services. In a true sense BOB SIKES has served the one Army concept and in so doing has encouraged development of a similarly satisfactory relationship between the Reserves and the Regular services. All of these have made our national defense forces more effective today than at any time in a peacetime period. We, therefore, honor him today for what he is and for what he has done and for what he now stands ready to do in the future.

STROM THURMOND,
Major General, U.S. Army Reserve.

Hon. Dean P. Taylor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEO W. O'BRIEN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 31, 1960

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, in these closing hours of the 86th Congress, I want to pay my respects to the Honorable DEAN P. TAYLOR, of Troy, who has represented the 31st District of New York in this House for 18 years.

Mr. TAYLOR is not a candidate for reelection, although he could have had renomination and reelection without any doubt.

He has earned surcease from his labors in Congress, but as the Representative of the 30th District, which borders his, I deeply regret his decision.

Politics is not unknown in this august Chamber and there were occasions when DEAN TAYLOR and I were on opposite sides on some of the perplexing national problems which confronted us.

But, Mr. Speaker, when it came to matters for the common good of the area we represented, we worked as a team.

It was easy to work with Mr. TAYLOR. He is a gentleman of the first rank, kindly, tolerant, and understanding. In his retirement, the Capital District of New York will lose an able champion. I wish him well in the days ahead as do his countless friends in Washington and elsewhere.

Paul Cunningham, Gifted ASCAP Leader

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 31, 1960

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the music world and the Nation were shocked and deeply saddened just recently to learn of the unexpected passing of Paul Cunningham, late distinguished president of the American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers, ASCAP, and at the time of his death director of public affairs of that great American organization.

Mr. Speaker, it was my melancholy duty on Wednesday, August 17, to serve as an honorary pallbearer at the funeral services of this dear friend, celebrated by a solemn high requiem mass at St. Patrick's Cathedral in New York City.

Among other honorary pallbearers on this sad occasion were representatives of the U.S. Senate, well-known composers, members of the broadcasting industry and of the music publishing firms, the American Legion, the legal profession, and prominent figures of the entertainment world, including ASCAP President Stanley Adams, Morton Downey, Paul Whiteman, Nick Kenny, Meredith Willson, Harry Woods, Frank Weldon, and the longtime collaborator with Oscar Hammerstein II, the great American composer, Richard Rodgers.

A successful songwriter in his own right, possessed of impressive talents, Paul Cunningham unselfishly devoted much of his life to the betterment and improvement of the lot of songwriters and musical artists.

There was an endearing warmth and joviality in the personality of this great man, a magnetic charm, appealing sincerity, and easy sense of humor that captured the hearts, tenaciously held the affections of a multitude of friends, and drew the admiration of a legion of people in every part of the country.

His vital exuberance and faith and assurance in his cause inspired optimism and won for him the confidence and support, not only of his fellow professionals, but of people in every walk of American life, from Members of Congress to humblest citizens in the byways and highways of America.

There was a depth of understanding and sincerity in Paul Cunningham's makeup, a quality of loyal dedication, an unbounded faith in the rightness of his aims and objectives that won for him the ready cooperation of his fellows.

Only a broad, big man of genuine ability, quiet patience, charity in his heart, and sheer determination could succeed as he did, in bringing and keeping together the ofttimes discordant elements of the popular musical world.

More than a devout spirit of dedication was required for this difficult task. Rare, diplomatic talents, knowledge of human nature, a bright, clear mind and exceptional ability to keep conflicting and divergent interests and elements solidly lined up behind the greater cause, were of the essence of his responsibility and achievement.

Above all, untiring and indefatigable efforts, and exhausting, energetic work, were required to carry forward his brave, well-conceived crusade for the songwriter, and to answer the many appeals for his sage advice and unstinted assistance.

Paul Cunningham died with his boots on, worn and exhausted by his seemingly never-ending labors. Unwilling to spare himself, he worked and fought to the very end to further and advance the cause of the people and the profession he loved and in that sense he was a true martyr to his high ideals and their cause.

Many very distinguished Americans have preceded him in the leadership of ASCAP, but none could ever exceed him in sincere dedication or in mobilizing behind the worthy cause of ASCAP, such complete understanding, unity and public support.

Paul Cunningham will go down in the illustrious history of ASCAP and his times as a superb creative talent and a forceful, tactful and diplomatic crusader, who brought better understanding between the members of his own organization and inculcated better, more realistic and sympathetic appreciation of the objectives of ASCAP than ever before into the hearts and minds of the Congress and the American people.

ASCAP and the songwriters of America owe to Paul Cunningham—tireless leader, inspiring crusader, brilliant and beloved interpreter of men—a very great debt for his long-sustained, unselfish and selfless devotion to its aims and aspirations.

The Congress is deeply indebted to him for bringing to our midst a keener and deeper comprehension of the serious problems of songwriters and composers and the great injustice being done to many of them by oldtime, outmoded discriminatory national laws that should and must be changed if fairness, impartiality and justice is to be done.

The best service any of us can render to the enduring memory, and noteworthy contributions of Paul Cunningham is to continue to strive for his ideal of justice for all American composers.

I am sure that his distinguished successor as president of ASCAP, the able and popular Mr. Stanley Adams, will carry on the great traditions of this famous society.

In his struggles and travail, anxieties and sacrifices, there was one great sustaining force that stood out above all others in the life of Paul Cunningham and that was the love, loyalty, devotion, and help of his life partner and beloved wife, Florrie, who survives him. Through every trial and tribulation, and there were many in the long, busy life of this inspiring and beloved man, this good, devoted woman stood beside him at all times with a fortitude and love that knew no bounds to lift his spirit and to give him the strength, inspiration, and courage to carry on his work with unabating and ever-increased vigor.

As a Representative in the Congress of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, which even before it joined with the other Colonies to form a new Nation was foremost as a cultural leader in the New World, I wish to add my humble tribute to this great worker in the musical vineyard. Paul Cunningham's valiant battles in Washington and elsewhere, on behalf of his musical colleagues and fellow writers, will not be in vain, but will stimulate renewed efforts and final victory.

He has left a great gap in the ranks of music's leadership. It will be a fitting perpetuation of the memory of this distinguished gentleman of song when the Nation finally provides, both at the Federal and State level, adequate protection for the musical property of all creators, and sufficient guarantees that they will continue to create works of genius, to the everlasting gratitude of all Americans.

Florrie is now alone with her memories of a kind, generous, and devoted husband and a respected and beloved public figure who won the heart of America. Better than anyone, she knew and understood the loving, charitable nature and deep spiritual qualities of this gifted leader. She best understood his innate modesty, his self-effacing humility, his implicit faith in his God.

And she best observed as a daily living reality the stirring example of the broad humanity of Paul Cunningham, his love of country and his love of his fellow men, regardless of race, color, or creed.

Paul Cunningham was my dear friend; he was a dear, loyal friend to very many people. We cherished and loved him in life, and now we sorrowfully join in mourning his passing from the American scene where he achieved so nobly and so well. We pray devoutly, as we believe truly, that the good Lord will keep and cherish him in his heavenly home.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD as part of my remarks, the New York Times account of Mr. Cunningham's passing:

[From the New York Times, Aug. 15, 1960]

PAUL CUNNINGHAM OF ASCAP WAS 70—SOCIETY PRESIDENT, 1955–58, DIES—LYRICIST FOR "I AM AN AMERICAN," "TRIPOLI"

Paul Cunningham, a songwriter and director of public affairs of the American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers, died yesterday of a heart attack in his home at 60 Sutton Place South. His age was 70.

Mr. Cunningham wrote the lyrics for several hundred songs, including "I Am an American," "The Shores of Tripoli," and "Please Take a Letter, Miss Brown."

From 1955 to 1958, he was president of ASCAP. He was named to its board of directors in 1945.

Born in New York, Mr. Cunningham received a bachelor of arts degree from Manhattan College in 1914. He then worked for a music publishing company as a singer and staff writer. For several years, he and his wife, the former Florence Bennett, played in vaudeville as Cunningham and Bennett.

Among the other songs on which he collaborated were "Have a Smile for Everyone You Meet," "Coronation Waltz," "All Over Nothing at All," "That's How I Believe in You," and "You Can't Make a Fool Out of Me."

Also "Piggy Wiggy Woo," "Hats Off to MacArthur," "Four Buddies," and "From the Vine Come the Grapes."

Last year, Mr. Cunningham was appointed by President Eisenhower to serve on the advisory committee of Washington's proposed National Cultural Center.

He leaves his wife.

Treasury Use of Advance Refunding Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK IKARD
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 31, 1960

Mr. IKARD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the Members to recent use by the Treasury of authority granted under legislation passed in September 1959.

The Members will recall that H.R. 9035, which became law as Public Law 86–346, authorized the Secretary of the Treasury to designate certain exchanges of Government securities, referred to as "advance refundings," as nontaxable exchanges. There were only seven votes cast against H.R. 9035 on passage.

The first use by the Treasury of this authority under Public Law 86–346 was to permit exchanges of the accrual-type series E savings bonds for the series H bonds, which pay interest semiannually, with postponement of the income tax due on the accrued E-bond interest until final cashing or maturity of the H-bonds. Such exchanges are especially attractive to our retired citizens who are desirous of obtaining current interest income rather than a lump payment at maturity. Between January 1, when such exchanges were first authorized, until August 25, the shifts from E- to H-bonds totaled $231 million.

With respect to marketable securities, the Treasury's first use of the new authority was last June, when almost $4 billion of a topheavy $11 billion bond issue coming due in November 1961 was shifted to 1964 and 1968. This operation has somewhat reduced the problems involved in handling the maturity issue in November 1961. Moreover, the June operation clearly demonstrated that advance refunding can be a useful debt management technique.

Mr. Speaker, I bring this matter to the attention of the House because of the crucial importance of sound debt management in our economy. Unless our debt is managed in a sound manner, we will severely complicate the problem of achieving a maximum sustained rate of economic growth and preventing a rise in the cost of living. Moreover, debt

management, along with sound fiscal and monetary policies, is part of the framework of domestic financial policies that must support a U.S. dollar in which people both at home and abroad will have confidence.

Advance refunding, which the Congress approved last year by passage of H.R. 9035, is a highly technical subject. However, informed students of debt management agree that our public debt is today too short in maturity, and they also agree that advance refunding is a promising technique for achieving some lengthening of the debt.

The fact that the marketable debt is too short in maturity is indicated by the heavy proportion of short-term maturities—almost 80 percent come due within 5 years, as contrasted with only 50 percent in 1946. If effective steps are not taken to extend the debt, Treasury debt operations will occur more frequently and in much larger amount. This will tend to keep the Government securities market in a state of disturbance and also complicate the flexible application of monetary policies. Moreover, a constantly shortening debt involves other dangers; in particular, the shorter the maturity of the debt, the closer to money it is. Consequently, a big buildup in short-dated debt involves some of the same dangers as an excessive buildup in the money supply.

Granted that debt lengthening is at this time an important objective, how best achieve it? Experience has shown clearly that it is very difficult to sell large amounts of long-term bonds for cash. As was pointed out to the Committee on Ways and Means last year, there is competition for long-term funds from Government-guaranteed and aided debt—such as FHA and VA mortgages—from State and local government securities, the interest on which is exempt from Federal income taxes; and from business flotations of securities. Although some people might argue that the Treasury could sell huge amounts of long-term bonds when interest rates are low, and apparently save interest in the process, this technique is unacceptable. This is because interest rates fall to their low points only in recessions, and heavy sales of long-term Government bonds at that time would run the risk of absorbing savings that would otherwise go into residential construction, business expansion, and State and local government projects. This would impair chances of business recovery and probably intensify the recessionary pressures.

Advance refunding, although a relatively new technique, affords a highly useful and practicable device for achieving some much-needed lengthening of the public debt without disturbing the economy. Under this approach, long-term investors who hold Government bonds that were once long-term but are now drawing closer to maturity, would be offered the opportunity to exchange into new long-term issues. Inasmuch as an advance refunding would be merely a switch of one security for another, it would not disrupt the market as would large issues for cash, nor would it absorb new savings that could support economic growth and expansion.

If the Treasury sold, say, $3 billion of new 25-year bonds for cash, I am advised it would have to pay at least 4 percent, and probably considerably more. But the same amount of debt extension could probably be handled through advance refunding with an increase of perhaps about 1 percent on the interest rates paid on certain outstanding bonds now carrying a 2½ percent rate. That is, holders of some of the 2½ percent bonds maturing between 1965 and 1972 would be offered the privilege of exchanging for new 20- to 30-year bonds. In return for agreeing to extend their holdings some 15 to 25 years, these holders would get, and properly so, a rate of about 3½ percent instead of the 2½ percent they are now getting. As a practical matter, no one would be willing to extend debt for such a period without earning a suitable interest return.

In this way the Treasury, simply by agreeing to pay 3½ percent instead of 2½ percent, achieves some meaningful and highly beneficial lengthening of the debt, but with a minimum of impact on the economy and on our financial markets.

One point that some people seem to have overlooked is that the 2½-percent bond, from the standpoint of the market, is not a 2½-percent bond at all. These securities are selling in price from a little less than 89 cents on the dollar up to about 95 cents on the dollar. Their true interest return in the market today is not 2½ percent, but varies from about 3.35 percent to 3.75 percent. Thus, what the Treasury would trade with the investor is a new security whose yield in the market will be comparable to the yield on outstanding Government securities of similar maturity.

This is a desirable market transaction, in which an investor agrees to extend his investment for a considerable period, in exchange for a somewhat higher interest return. All parties to the transaction gain—the investor, by getting a more competitive interest return; the Treasury, by achieving a more manageable debt structure; and the American people, as a result of better debt management.

The basic principle of advance refunding is not new; in fact, it was used, successfully, in 1951. At that time, holders of almost $20 billion of 2½-percent bonds maturing in 1972 were offered the privilege of exchanging into new nonmarketable, 2¾-percent bonds maturing in 1980.

Annual Convention of the Squires & Constables Association of Pennsylvania, Inc., Clearfield, Pa., August 30, 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 31, 1960

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, Clearfield, Pa., in my congressional district was the site of the 1960 convention of the Squires & Constables Association of Pennsylvania, Inc., on August 29 through 30.

The arrangements for the convention were made by the convention chairman, R. P. Neal, of Clearfield, assisted by Justice of the Peace Charles McClure, of Curwensville, Pa. One of the features of the convention program was the annual banquet attended by public officials and the delegates and their wives. It was my privilege to deliver the banquet address on the subject, "Law, Order, and Justice—At Home." The address follows:

LAW, ORDER, AND JUSTICE—AT HOME

(Address by JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, Member of Congress of the 20th District of Pennsylvania, at the annual convention of the Squires & Constables Association of Pennsylvania, Inc., Clearfield, Pa., August 30, 1960)

It is always a pleasure for me to speak to constituents of mine, and to other citizens of the State of Pennsylvania.

Tonight I am particularly fortunate to be able to address you not only as citizens of Pennsylvania, but also as officials of our local governments.

Being in Congress for as long as I have—some 20 years now—so much of one's time is taken with national and international problems, it is most important that we should be reminded every now and then of the workings of government on the State and local levels.

Frankly, you have given me a splendid opportunity to do this—and especially in the hometown of your popular first vice president, Mr. R. P. Neal, of Clearfield, Pa.

There is no better reminder of the importance of local government, it seems to me, than the very name of your organization—the Squires and Constables Association of Pennsylvania.

The word "constable" is taken from two Latin words—"comes stabulum"—the companion or master of the stables.

Well over a thousand years ago the constable was the most important official of government. When nations were often no larger than our average size county of today, the constable was the keeper of the horses—the cavalry. He was the chief military man for the count or lord of the shire. It was his duty to maintain law and order among the people of that county.

Today the duties of a constable are not very different from those of a constable at the time of King Alfred or King Edward the Confessor.

It is true: You no longer have to ride herd on a Robin Hood in Sherwood Forest, you do not have to keep bowstrings tight, nor sharpen arrows. You no longer have to chase highwaymen on horseback nor ride circuit throughout the county.

But whatever the means you use your job is the same—the maintenance of law and order in the locality in which you were elected to office.

Besides constables you other members of this association are called squires. Squire, the law dictionary tells us, is a short form of "esquiree," which in ancient times was defined as "a title of dignity next above gentleman." That title, "squire," was recognized by our own Supreme Court of Pennsylvania in the case of *Call* v. *Foresman*, decided in June 1836. The court said in that case: "* * * the import of the word 'esquire' or 'squire' is, in popular parlance of which the court will take notice, precisely the same as that of 'justice.'"

Thus your title "squire" means two things: "Gentlemen"—which you surely are—and "justice"—which you certainly

must be. You are the "conservers of justice" in your respective bailiwicks.

The office of the justice of the peace, like that of constable, goes deep into antiquity—to the formation of England into one united country and into the earliest stages of the formation of what we know as the common law—the basis of our own system of law—equity and justice.

Indeed, much of our early common law—which is still law today—began, I have no doubt, at the bench of a county justice of the peace whose name is lost in history, but whose decisions remain important to and binding on us today.

In order to be prepared for this occasion—I set out to determine just what the duties are of constables and justices of the peace. That was a colossal task, believe me.

I found a remarkable little book, called "Dill's Constables Guide in Pennsylvania," which details hundreds of duties the constable must perform.

Then I found one entire volume, and part of another, containing two complete titles of the Pennsylvania Code of Law which describes the many and varied duties of Pennsylvania justices of the peace and constables.

These functions would take all night to enumerate—let alone discuss. Indeed, Frederic W. Maitland, writing in 1885, practically despaired of his task to set forth the many jobs which you officers are required to do. "Long ago," he said, "lawyers abandoned all hope of describing the duties of a justice in any methodic fashion, and the alphabet has become the one possible connecting thread." Only by using an alphabetical system was he at all able to bring any semblance of order to his task.

But I do not have to tell any of you what your duties are. You know that they touch practically every facet of the lives of people and every activity—public or private—in your community. You know also that you have civil and criminal responsibilities of every conceivable description. You know and respect—as all men do—that every squire and every constable is charged with, in his community, the maintenance of law and order and the preservation of justice.

As citizens of Pennsylvania we, like every citizen of every community, have a certain amount of civic pride and an awareness of the desirability and the necessity of helping that community grow and prosper within the framework of law—order and justice.

It is, of course, the duty of every man so to conduct himself through the principles of good citizenship—that his immediate locality might prosper and grow. But the special task of guaranteeing that this might be accomplished is yours.

You have sought the opportunity to make your contribution to the community through election to the public office which you hold. As citizens we look to you for the accomplishment of these ends. Past experience tells us that our trust in you has been well placed.

The name of your organization contains another key word. That word is "association." The term "association" means a combining or a drawing together.

You have entered this organization in order to raise and discuss common problems, the solution to which will greatly enhance the effectiveness of your job in your locality.

Applied to justices of the peace and constables, "association" has yet another meaning. It demonstrates very well that the tasks of each—constables and justices of the peace—are inseparable. They dovetail with one another. The work of squires and constables cannot be separated. We cannot have one without the other. Law and order serves no purpose at all unless it is maintained in a just manner—by giving to each man his due.

Worded a little differently, your organization is "the maintenance of law and order associated with the preservation of justice."

Now the name of your association raises a question: Squires and Constables of Pennsylvania Associated—for what purpose? Your purpose, I suggest, is the noblest cause which any man can serve. That cause is the pursuit of peace. In the towns, cities, and counties in which you work your job is the maintenance of the public peace through the proper administration of justice.

Peace and good order on the local level create an atmosphere in which the proper functioning of government may be pursued on each of the larger levels of society. The elected positions which you hold are the very basis, the foundation, upon which all governmental activity must rest in order that a productive, prosperous, and peaceful world might be achieved.

The world does not rest easy today. We are not engaged in a shooting war, but the largest portion of our Government financing and the greatest attention of the Federal Government is devoted to an effort to prevent war by maintaining our country in the strongest possible position.

But simply because we have not drawn battle lines, and are not dropping or dodging atomic bombs, does not mean that we are at peace.

There is no peace for the people in the Congo. There is no peace in Tibet. There is no peace in Cuba. Indeed, there is little else but tension, apprehension, and grief.

In every one of these instances these disastrous events began with the breakdown of local government. The improper administration of law and order and justice at home was the initial cause of the ferment resulting in these difficult situations.

Thousands of people from Tibet have been driven from their homes. Property of all kinds has been confiscated in Cuba, with no attempt being made to pay the owners even part of its worth.

The new independent government of the Congo collapsed before it began operations. Because there was no strength in local administration.

These things do not appear to have any great immediate concern to us here in Clearfield, Pa., tonight. I say it does not appear to be of concern to us. But, indeed, it affects us greatly.

Four hundred years ago it mattered little to the American Indians if Spain and England had a naval battle in the English Channel. It didn't make any difference to Europeans if the Sioux and Blackfoot Indians had a fight on the Great Western Plains. Indeed, they weren't even aware of it.

But now the world is a different place. It does make a difference to the continuation of life and the pursuit of happiness as we know it if a child is starving in the interior of India, or if the grass hut of a Congolese is burned and the family in it obliged to flee.

The world is now a little place and the misfortunes of all people affect all others. If all these things affect us, or tend to disturb our daily lives, what must be done to remedy the situation?

The answer to that question lies in the very fact that you are squires and constables. It lies in the successful accomplishment of your commission. As we said before—you are charged with the maintenance of law and order, you are the guardians of justice, the preservers of the peace.

The world community is simply the sum total of many smaller societies, the basis of which is the family and the local community, the small town and the county.

There can be no peace throughout the world unless there is first peace at home. The human body is not a properly functioning organism unless each of its parts is well. One bad apple destroys the barrel.

Use whatever example you wish, the same argument applies to all human society. Peace for all men will be attained only when peace comes to every man. And peace can come to the world at large only when it is realized by each small group of people in local communities throughout the world.

That is your job. Your job is the maintenance of law and order—and the preservation of justice at home. This job properly done—and that depends entirely upon each of you—is both necessary and sufficient to ensure peace in the world.

William Shakespeare asked the question: "What's in a name?" Certainly, it seems to me, the name of your organization, Squires and Constables Association of Pennsylvania, has in it at least part of the answer to the age-old search by man for peace.

I read recently a one-verse poem which appeared in Poetic Justice in 1947. It pertains to justices of the peace, and it goes like this—

"I'm important in the county;
I'm a justice of the peace
And I disbelieve defendants
When they contradict the police."

That little verse illustrates, I think, just one of the many difficulties which your job entails—the very hard job of determining what, in a given set of circumstances, is the just decision to reach.

It also illustrates, however, that the determination of justice is your job, and in order that it be done properly we can listen with careful attention to the Roman emperor, Justinian, who said 2,000 years ago, "Justice is the constant and perpetual will to allot to every man his due."

The positions which you squires and constables hold under the laws of the State of Pennsylvania are local in nature. Your jurisdictional boundaries are, relatively speaking, small. The people over whom you have authority are few, and the direct effect of your official duties does not extend beyond your municipality or your county.

But in a larger sense the effects of your labors and the proper conduct of your office extend far beyond your town, your city, or your county.

As the very basis of justice through law and order you are, indeed, the cornerstone upon which the greatest hopes and dreams of all mankind rest—peace in all the world.

Ukrainian Congress Committee of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 31, 1960

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, later this year a significant anniversary will be celebrated throughout the Nation—the 20th anniversary of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America.

This committee has been a leader in the battle against the wiles and insidious methods of the Soviets. We in Congress have often turned to this group for information and discussion about the captive nations behind the Iron Curtain.

I would feel remiss indeed if I did not pay my respects to this organization and pay sincere tribute to its work these past 2 decades. The road ahead is difficult to see, but we know that with guidance

from above, the right of every man to be free will be guaranteed.

The way may be long, but we will march together toward dignity and peace for men everywhere.

The San Joaquin County, Calif., Medical Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. McFALL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 31, 1960

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I would like to insert in the RECORD today a few remarks about what I consider to be one of the most progressive, social-minded medical societies in the country. It is a society in which I have great pride.

Throughout the United States and around the clock, physicians are continuously rendering medical care to those in need of their services. Individually, the physician's responsibility does not stop with rendering medical care to his patients. His spare time is taken up with continued postgraduate education, active participation in civic affairs, and with the socioeconomic aspects of medicine.

The physician's individual social conscience and his desire to adequately respond to the broad aspects of public service to which his profession is dedicated finds its expression in the policies and actions of his local county medical society. My county medical society is the San Joaquin Medical Society of California and covers the counties of San Joaquin, Calaveras, and Tuolumne.

My medical society is not large—at least by California standards. Its membership is 225 and the society has kept growth through the years with the exploding population in that area of California.

In reviewing the accomplishments of San Joaquin Medical Society it is impossible to find a program established by the society that did not, in a major part, stem from public need or desire. Dr. C. A. Luckey, president of the society, refers to this public awareness as being "patient oriented." My society has an emergency call system which guarantees the availability of a physician 24 hours a day. It has an established public service committee to which patients may bring their grievances. The society has a code of cooperation with all news media in order to enhance the accurate reporting of all medical news. The society is active in matters pertaining to school health, encouragement of adequate hospital beds, and nurse's recruitment. It has established a poison control information center in an attempt to cut down on the number of accidental deaths from poisoning. It operates a community blood bank which serves 26 hospitals in 5 counties with all of their blood needs.

To continue to recite the various public service activities that have become so much a part of county medical societies throughout the United States does not, however, set my county medical society apart.

The main reason for my pride in my county medical society is its leadership in the field of socioeconomic problems of medicine, and equating medical care to the patient's ability to pay, and in guaranteeing medical care for all regardless of the patient's ability to pay.

All of us are familiar with the tremendous strides being made by prepaid medical care programs in the United States. As early as 1952 the San Joaquin County Medical Society began a detailed study of prepayment and came up with three conclusions:

First. That the local medical profession must assume a position of leaderfession should sponsor adequate prepaid medical care programs that are as broad as possible in their coverage.

Second. That the local medical profession should sponsor adequate prepaid medical care programs agreeing to accept adequate fees as full payment thereby giving patients the certainty of coverage and the predictable costs that they desire. This sponsorship should be available to all service plans, insurance carriers, and all other prepaid medical care programs including those financed by governmental funds.

Third. That the local medical profession must assume responsibility and leadership in the area of "quality control." This is done in San Joaquin County by medically reviewing all claims so as to evaluate the type of medical care being given and to correct deficiencies by education or disciplinary action.

Realizing these purposes, on March 1, 1954, the physicians of the San Joaquin County Medical Society set up a separate corporation called the Foundation for Medical Care of San Joaquin County. Ninety-seven percent of the active physicians of the medical society are members of the foundation. This corporation is designed specifically to study the problems of bringing medical care within the reach of the population of this area, regardless of their ability to pay.

The standards established by the foundation for medical care give voluntary prepaid medical insurance plans a realistic criteria upon which to base their policies. It helps to improve the type of coverage offered in these policies and, in general, raise the standard of prepaid medical care contracts. A person seeking this type of coverage has, under the foundation's plan, the certainty of coverage which he so desperately seeks.

One of our most important foundation concepts is based upon the belief that most physicians are willing to adjust fees downward for people with low incomes. The foundation believes that a great deal of medicine's predicament is due to the inability of doctor and patient to get together on their financial arrangements; that is, both are reticent about discussing it. Because of this reticence, an administrative mechanism that sets up guideposts is needed. The foundation has, therefore, established a fee schedule which represents an accumulation of usual fees for this area. By and large, these fees represent what is actually being charged. Above this schedule, the doctors will not go. Any adjusting of the schedule is downward.

At the present time the San Joaquin Foundation for Medical Care sponsors 65 programs underwritten by 14 insurance companies and the Blue Shield Plan of California. Approximately 20 percent of the residents of San Joaquin County are covered by these programs.

One of the newest programs to come under foundation sponsorship is one in which the foundation has dealt directly with the Federal Government in establishing a comprehensive prepaid medical care plan for employees of the Federal Government. My medical society's foundation plan is 1 of 40 different health benefit plans approved by the Bureau of Retirement and Insurance of the U.S. Civil Service Commission under Public Law 86–382 signed into effect September 28, 1959. Sixteen counties in California participate in this program through the San Joaquin Foundation for Medical Care. All of these counties have foundations for medical care patterned after the parent organization in San Joaquin County. Their cooperation with the San Joaquin Foundation for Medical Care in its contract with the Federal Government allows the foundation's comprehensive program to be available to approximately 80,000 Federal employees and their families in the 16 California counties. Over 3,000 physicians and surgeons are now participating members of these various foundations. For the purpose of the record, let it be shown that the other California counties are San Diego, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, Kern, Tulare, Kings, Fresno, Merced, Madera, Stanislaus, Tuolumne, Calaveras, San Joaquin, Santa Clara, and Sonoma.

More than anyone else, Dr. Donald C. Harrington of Stockton is responsible for the establishment of the San Joaquin Foundation and for its vigorous growth during its first years. Dr. Harrington is the president of the San Joaquin Foundation for Medical Care and has been since its establishment in 1954. Dr. Harrington has been quoted as saying that the foundation's Federal employees contract is the most comprehensive prepaid medical care program ever offered in the great Central Valley of California. The foundation's Federal program operates on the service concept and with one or two minor exceptions gives complete coverage for all physicians' services. Surgery is covered in full as are the services of the assistant surgeon, anesthesiologist, radiologist, and pathologist.

Consultations with all specialties are covered without charge to the patient.

Extensive out-of-hospital coverage is provided for each Federal employee enrolled in the program. The program stresses early diagnosis as the best preventive medicine and covers such items as examinations and well-baby visits.

Before us in this Congress has been the difficult problem of providing medical care for those in the old-age groups. As we conclude this session, it is unresolved, but in my opinion, the next Congress must present an adequate solution to the people.

I am proud of this forward-looking group of physicians who are blazing new trails for bringing care to more people, for whom the organizational methods of yesterday are not good enough but who are willing to face and help solve today's problems with initiative, courage, and original thinking. They are acutely aware of the specific problems of bringing medical care to our older people for which this Congress has sought and is seeking an adequate solution. While they and I may not entirely agree on every issue, I am proud to know we can depend on their advice and assistance in arriving at a solution to the medical care problem that will be equitable to all segments of our population.

Four Steps to a Stronger Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. QUIE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 31, 1960

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, one of our most difficult domestic problems centers on the rural area of America.

As a farmer myself, I present my views today—not in an attempt to add to the growing literature of partisan bickering on the subject, but in a sincere effort to contribute to an earnest public study of a problem which affects not only agriculture but the economic well-being of all America.

It seems to me that those who discuss the farmers' problems have a twofold responsibility: A responsibility to examine the root causes and current aspects of the problem, and a responsibility to recommend steps for our Nation to follow to eliminate the causes and solve the problem.

Only by meeting these twin responsibilities will a discussion on the farm problem contribute to its solution.

Acknowledging these responsibilities, let us begin by surveying the dimensions of American agriculture.

U.S. FARM PEOPLE ARE THE STRENGTH OF OUR AGRICULTURE

The true dimensions are as vast as the spirit of our Nation's farm people.

This is because, first of all, agriculture is people.

Farming is more than just an industry. It is more than just another way to earn a living. It is a way to live a life.

The tremendous achievement of agriculture in this country is not a tribute to machines. It is a tribute to the mastery over machines by people who, dedicated to life on the land, have provided our Nation with the greatest outpouring of food and fiber the world has ever seen.

American farm people are the strength of our agriculture.

They are also a vital resource for our country in the cold war.

Today the United States is tooling up for an intensified production duel with the Soviet Union. The goal is not only top production honors, but world prestige for our philosophy of freedom. That is why this competitive race is important.

But, if Americans want to become encouraged over their country's economic power, they should consider the record of our agriculture. In no other area of activity does America prove its superiority over other nations, and other systems, more than in the field of agriculture.

The victory for America is so lopsided as to be almost embarrassing.

One American farmer produces enough to feed and clothe 20 people. In contrast, one Russian farmer produces enough to feed and clothe only three, or at the most, four people.

This victory for U.S. agriculture reflects not only the incomparable skill and mastery of the farmer over his great trade. It illustrates the fact that American abundance in food production is a great resource and must be put to the best uses.

For, American production has been, and must continue to be, an invaluable tool for peace in the cold war. Guns and nuclear weapons may deter aggression, but food for hungry stomachs and clothes for shivering backs win adherents for freedom—and adherents are needed to turn the balance in the cold war in freedom's favor.

If farm production has accomplished all this—and if it carries the potentiality for further achievements—is production itself the farm problem?

The answer is "No." Production in itself is not the farm problem. Far from it. Our farm production is a blessing which presents us with the moral challenges to devote our overabundance to the best possible use for ourselves and others.

What is the farm problem?

The problem is this:

Our Nation's farmers are not, generally speaking, receiving an adequate return for their management, investment, and labor. It is ironic but true: The very people who have placed modern agriculture at the service of America, the very people who have built agriculture as a giant potentiality for peace—our farm people—are themselves not sharing as they should in our Nation's prosperity.

This is the farm problem.

Every full-scale problem is surrounded in some way by misconceptions. This is true of the farm problem.

One misconception is typified by the complaint we hear from some quarters that the American farmer himself has produced the farm problem.

Nothing could be further from the truth. The farm problem is not farmer caused. The responsibility lies elsewhere. Far from causing the problem, the farmer has been victimized by it.

Another misconception is that the farm problem only concerns farmers. This, also, is untrue. The farm problem affects everyone. America is an economic unity. Trouble for one economic segment means trouble for the entire economy.

Now, if we have discussed the heart of the farm problem, what are the root causes of that problem?

I believe there are four main causes, four central reasons why farmers are not receiving adequate returns for their labor. Let me list them.

First. Government-stored commodities are depressing prices.

Second. Production from the land continues greater than demand.

Third. Farmers' costs have increased greater than their gross income.

Fourth. Farmers' bargaining power has not been fully developed.

What course should the Nation take to remove the causes of the problem?

First, let me point out what course the Nation should not take.

This is the course of partisan politics—the course which, in 1960, may be the path of least resistance.

Our political parties should not try to outpromise themselves or each other. They should not engage in a duel of accusations at the expense of agriculture.

This means that our parties and our candidates should not try to treat the symptoms but the illness itself. A variety of politically sponsored "aspirin tablets" or sedatives should not be administered to agriculture.

Political barbs and partisan accusations should be allowed to lie idle. On one hand there has been a great effort in the current campaign to blame the Secretary of Agriculture, who has administered our farm laws for the past 7½ years, for all the troubles that beset agriculture. On the other hand, there has been a strenuous counter effort to blame Democratic-controlled Congresses for not passing remedial legislation to help agriculture.

Nothing can come of these accusations but a crop of trouble for agriculture.

Instead, let us try to solve agriculture's problem as coolly and objectively as we can.

To do this, we must label some current prescriptions for agriculture as exactly what they are—sedatives and tranquilizers.

One sedative prescription argues that high price supports will restore agriculture to health. High supports in themselves have not been helpful. Recent history is replete with examples. In 1954, for instance, price supports on dairy products stood at 90 percent of parity but all milk at wholesale sold at 84 percent of parity. This year, with supports at 77 percent of parity, all milk at wholesale has sold at 85 percent of parity, since supply is now more closely balanced with demand.

Another sedative-type prescription has insisted that low price supports would help the farmer by reducing production. This is unsound. All primary producers tend to produce to the best of their ability, no matter what the price. Farmers produce from fence row to fence row—and I've never yet seen the farmer who decided in the spring whether or not he would plant the back

40, depending on the price he could receive for his commodities.

So let us now toss into a cocked hat the bromides that high supports or low supports in themselves will serve to bring production to a controllable level, thus raising farmers' income.

Now, what steps should our Nation follow to provide sound assistance to farmers?

Probably the best way to survey the recommendations is to assemble all in a "cause and cure" order, matching the causes of the farm problem with the suggested cures.

First cause: Government-stored commodities are depressing prices.

Cure: Congress should enact legislation to insure that Government-stored commodities will not be sold on the domestic market for less than 105 percent of full parity.

Under the operation of our present law, whenever the market price reaches 105 percent of the current support level, plus normal carrying charges, surpluses come back onto the market, holding prices down at the support level. Under our price support programs, we made an effort to withdraw commodities from the market in order to create a lesser supply, thereby attempting to balance supply and demand, holding prices to the support level. The program of selling at 105 percent of parity serves to hold prices down below the support level, making it a price ceiling rather than a price floor.

By taking this remedial step, Congress could act to relieve the psychological and actual price depressant influence of the surplus. After harvest, if this action were taken, prices could then work up toward full parity in the marketplace, meaning increased income for farmers.

Second cause: Production from land continues greater than demand.

Cure: Enactment of a payment-in-kind program which would use the surpluses themselves, through negotiable certificates, to pay farmers to reduce production.

The payment-in-kind program would have a twofold effect. First, it would serve to bring surpluses down to a normal carryover level. Second, it would balance supply and demand.

May I say here that the objective should always be to balance supply and demand—not to eliminate all Government-held commodities? We must continue to hold adequate stocks of food in reserve just as we hold other resources for future use.

Third cause: Farmers' costs have increased greater than their gross income.

Cure: Continued support of anti-inflation measures.

Inflation is a familiar word to American farmers—because inflation is a very real enemy of agriculture. Farmers have been hit harder by cheap money than any other group of Americans. The fact that for years major national leaders have been warning of inflation, have been urging a greater awareness of its dangers, makes the problem no less acute. The trouble is that because "inflation" is a familiar byword in America, we may become less than alert to its menace.

Anti-inflation measures are never popular. They call for more than a determination to balance the U.S. budget. Spending for spending's sake without worry of red ink deficits is a time-recorded temptation, especially in an election year.

But farmers who are concerned in improving their status in our economy will continue to urge that Congress and the administration discharge a full measure of responsibility in enabling our country to live within its means. Thrift in practice is no less important in Government than in farm management and household planning.

By holding down inflation, the Government halts a possible stampede of rising costs which could plague the farmer and jeopardize his future along with all other Americans.

Fourth cause: Farmers' bargaining power has not been fully developed.

Cure: Encouragement for expanded marketing agreements and orders as well as an intensified search for new uses and new markets for farm commodities.

Because the people of agriculture have not yet fully developed their bargaining power, they are not receiving the prices to which they are entitled. The cure lies in greater encouragement for marketing agreements and orders—as well as with an expanded research.

Few Americans have a greater stake in research than farm people. Laboratory findings to pave the way for new uses of farm products may have direct bearing on farming's future. Yet, unfortunately, only 1 percent of the total budget allotted to agriculture has been devoted to research.

We cannot afford to neglect research. To inadequately provide for this vital arm of the total operation is not a saving—but a costly oversight which can shortchange today's needs and tomorrow's demands.

Believing that Congress had a responsibility to be of concrete assistance to agriculture, on February 29, 1960, I introduced H.R. 10770, which would provide a payment-in-kind program for products of wheat, corn, oats, rye, barley, grain sorghums, soybeans, and flaxseed, and would provide that Government-held grains not be sold for less than 105 percent of full parity. No action has been taken by the Congress on this bill.

In order that immediate action be taken, I introduced on August 22, 1960, House Joint Resolution 794, a joint resolution which would in broader language provide for a payment-in-kind program for the above-named grains.

Under the payment-in-kind proposal, farmers would have the opportunity to idle their wheat and corn and other feed grain acreage in return for rental payments in kind from surplus Government stocks. The payments would actually be made in the form of negotiable certificates which cooperating farmers could either sell or redeem for the surplus grains. The exact rate of payment would be based on local land values and production costs.

Farmers participating in the program would be required to idle at least 10 percent of their wheat allotments or corn or feed grain acreages. In addition, the idled land must be devoted to protective vegetative cover which could not be harvested or grazed. The program would apply to approximately 60 percent of the Nation's cultivated land, emphasizing the continuing importance of land retirement and soil conservation in the national interest and in furtherance of a sound national agricultural policy.

The resolution would also increase the release price on Government-held stocks to 105 percent of full parity, plus reasonable carrying charges, a provision that the Commodity Credit Corporation, whenever a commodity was sold due to its going out of condition, replenish its stocks forthwith by purchase from the market.

Oats provides an excellent example of how this provision would operate. Last year the demand for oats was strong because of the small crop. Market prices advanced. CCC, however, was able to dispose of its stocks at 63 percent of parity—5 percent above the current support price of 60 percent of parity—plus carrying charges. This tended to keep prices down even though oat supplies were in seasonal balance. Under the new proposal, CCC would not be able to release its stocks of oats for less than 105 percent of parity—5 percent above the full parity price.

I am disheartened, as I realize now this session is drawing to a close and it is impossible to enact this greatly needed piece of legislation which would have the greatest beneficial effect on farmers' prices at this time when farm income is low.

In January, if I am returned to Congress, I will work with renewed vigor for this type of program, for Government policies which will keep our total economy sound, that is, holding inflationary or recessionary aspects to a minimum. And, if the conferees on the agricultural research bill do not compromise their differences this session, I will be working next session for increased research for new uses and new markets for the products which we are raising in such great abundance on our American farms.

This, coupled with our humanitarian programs providing food for needy people at home and abroad, I believe will help farmers' income increase to the point where farmers can again receive their proportionate share of national income.

NICAP UFO Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD G. WOLF

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 31, 1960

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an urgent warning by Vice Adm. R. H. Hillenkoetter, former Director of the Central

Intelligence Agency, that certain potential dangers are linked with unidentified flying objects—UFO's. Admiral Hillenkoetter's request that Congress inform the public as to the facts is endorsed by more than 200 pilots, rocket, aviation, and radar experts, astronomers, military veterans, and other technically trained members of the National Investigations Committee on Aerial Phenomena. Among them are Rear Adm. H. B. Knowles; Col. Joseph Bryan III, U.S. Air Force Reserve; Lt. Col. Jas. McAshan, USAFR; Lt. Col. Samuel Freeman, U.S. Army Reserve, Aviation; Mr. J. B. Hartranft, president, Aircraft Owners Pilots Association; Capt. R. B. McLaughlin, Navy missile expert; Mr. Frank Rawlinson, physicist, National Aeronautical and Space Agency; Dr. Leslie Kaeburn, space consultant, University of Southern California; former Air Force Maj. William D. Leet, with three officially reported UFO encounters while an Air Force pilot; Frank Halstead, 25 years as curator, Darling Observatory; Rear Adm. D. S. Fahrney, former chief of the Navy missile program; Col. R. B. Emerson, U.S. Army Reserve, head of Emerson Testing Laboratories; Prof. Charles A. Maney, astrophysicist, Defiance University; Capt. W. B. Nash, Pan American Airways.

The "NICAP Report on Secrecy Dangers," with documented evidence on UFO's, was first submitted confidentially to me, and to several other Members of Congress, including Senator LYNDON JOHNSON. In a reply to NICAP, July 6, 1960, Senator JOHNSON stated that he had ordered the staff of the Senate Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee to keep close watch on UFO developments and to report on any recent significant sightings and the Air Force investigations of such sightings.

Although I have not had time for a detailed study, I believe the conclusions of these experienced NICAP officials should be given careful consideration. Certainly their sober evaluations should be completely disassociated from the obvious frauds and delusions about UFO's which unfortunately have been publicized. The NICAP report is stated to be the result of a 3-year investigation—its conclusions based only on verified visual, radar, and photographic evidence by trained, reputable observers.

On August 20, 1960, NICAP sent me the following statement to be added to the original report:

There is a growing danger that UFO's may be mistaken for Soviet missiles or jet aircraft, accidentally causing war. Several Air Defense scrambles and alerts already have occurred when defense radarmen mistook UFO formations for possible enemy machines. NICAP agrees with this sober warning by Gen. L. M. Chassin, NATO coordinator of Allied Air Services:

"It is of first importance to confirm these objects * * * the business of governments to take a hand, if only to avoid the danger of global tragedy. If we persist in refusing to recognize the existence of these UFO's we will end up, one fine day, by mistaking them for the guided missiles of an enemy—and the worst will be upon us."

Today, this danger may surpass the one cited in NICAP's report: That the U.S.S.R. might spread false rumors that the UFO's are secret Red devices which have mapped all the U.S. and allied targets and could be used as surprise-attack weapons. (Some Americans already suspect hidden fear of UFO's as the reason for secrecy.)

We are sure you will agree it is imperative to end the risk of accidental war from defense forces' confusion over UFO's. All defense personnel, not merely top-level groups, should be told that the UFO's are real and should be trained to distinguish them—by their characteristic speeds and maneuvers—from conventional planes and missiles. This is not in effect today.

Second, the American people must be convinced, by documented facts, that the UFO's could not be Soviet machines.

Certainly every Member of Congress will agree that any such danger of accidental war—even if slight—must be averted in every possible way. It is also important to prevent any unfounded fear that the UFO's are secret enemy devices.

After discussing the subject with colleagues, I am certain that there is real concern by many Members of Congress. Without necessarily accepting all the conclusions of the NICAP Board of Governors and technical advisers, we are convinced that a thorough study of the UFO problem should be made. Pending such action, I believe that publication of the NICAP report will help to reduce the dangers cited by Vice Admiral Hillenkoetter and the other NICAP officials.

For those Members desiring to do so the previously mentioned confidential report can be obtained upon request at the National Investigation Committee on Aerial Phenomena, 1536 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

Statement Concerning the Activities of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, House of Representatives, 86th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT C. BONNER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 31, 1960

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, it is with much pleasure and pride that I make this report on the activities of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries during the 86th Congress.

The past 2 years have brought many challenges to this committee, and I, as chairman, am delighted to point to a solid record of real accomplishment. I sincerely feel the work done by this important committee has been most constructive.

During the 1st session of the 86th Congress the committee and its subcommittees held a combined total of 122 meetings. Twenty-two pieces of legislation considered by the committee were enacted into law.

In the second session 221 meetings were held by the committee and its subcommittees. Twenty-seven measures reported out of the committee became law.

During this Congress the committee carried on its traditional role of striving to strengthen the American merchant marine better to enable it to serve the national interests in its dual capacity as a vital link in our transportation system and as a military and naval auxiliary in readiness for emergencies. Reported legislation included measures designed to facilitate and make more flexible the private financing of essential new ship construction through Government guaranteed loans or mortgages; to strengthen and modernize the important domestic and nearby foreign trades through authorization of the exchange of certain war-built vessels for more efficient vessels now in the reserve fleets; to ease the burden of the ship replacement program by extending the statutory life of subsidized vessels from 20 to 25 years; to extend for another year interim legislation to permit the continued use of the dual rate tariff system by steamship conferences, pending completion of current congressional studies; to increase the ceiling on construction-differential subsidy in order to help keep American operators on a parity with their foreign competitors in the face of rising shipbuilding costs in the United States; and other proposals contributing in various ways to the health of our merchant marine.

One of the most important and complex matters to be handled by the committee was a bill to establish pilotage requirements for oceangoing vessels using the newly opened St. Lawrence Seaway.

On an even stronger record than in the previous Congress the committee considered our vital role in the polar regions and reported an amended icebreaker bill to authorize the construction of three modern icebreaking Coast Guard cutters. The reported bill was a successor to the legislation which overwhelmingly passed both Houses in the 85th Congress for an atomic-powered icebreaker. Through shortsightedness in the executive branch the atomic icebreaker bill was vetoed by the President.

Other legislation extended the concept of vessel construction subsidy to our vital fishing fleet under certain conditions. One major bill recognized the economic importance of sport fishing and authorized specialized research into marine game fish matters.

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the 86th Congress began with a number of hearings to obtain information regarding the functions of the administrative agencies that fall under its jurisdiction. We have found in the past that this was a most satisfactory and efficient manner in which to organize the committee and initially orient the new members to their responsibilities.

Soon after Congress convened the committee also initiated extensive hearings relative to specific operations within its purview. Hearings were held in

Washington on: the progress of the atomic shipbuilding program; special problems relative to the present status and the future of the Panama Canal; oceanography; and the Merchant Marine Academy, our splendid institution for the training of competent young men to serve our merchant fleet in peace and war.

These hearings aided the Members in their understanding of the important work and legislation with which they would be concerned in the 86th Congress. These hearings consisted of reviewing past and existing legislation. The valuable information concerning the various agencies involved assisted the Members in background material.

The establishment of four standing subcommittees and four special subcommittees during the 86th Congress points to the significant and diverse fields of inquiry with which the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries is concerned in the course of its work.

The four standing subcommittees that were established are: Subcommittee on Merchant Marine, HERBERT C. BONNER, of North Carolina, chairman; Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation, FRANK W. BOYKIN, of Alabama, chairman; Subcommittee on Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Navigation, EDWARD A. GARMATZ, of Maryland, chairman; and Subcommittee on Panama Canal, LEONOR K. (Mrs. JOHN B.) SULLIVAN, of Missouri, chairman.

These four subcommittees mainly handled business relative to the subject indicated by their designated names. However, at times the full committee heard subjects which were of the broadest general interest, irrespective of subcommittee scope of jurisdiction.

The four special subcommittees that were established are: Special Subcommittee on Steamship Conferences, HERBERT C. BONNER, of North Carolina, chairman; Special Subcommittee on Oceanography, GEORGE P. MILLER, of California, chairman; Special Subcommittee on Ocean Freight Forwarders, T. A. THOMPSON, of Louisiana, chairman; and Special Subcommittee To Study Merchant Marine Academy, HERBERT ZELENKO, of New York, chairman.

In the following overview of the work done by the committee during the 86th Congress, principal legislation and investigations are presented in terms of the several categories of the committee's jurisdiction. The work of the individual standing and special subcommittees will be set forth under the categorical heading indigenous to each.

MERCHANT MARINE

No phase of the committee's activity is less important than any other. But, as always, the greatest volume of legislation related to merchant marine matters.

In the committee's view, it is essential that the needs of the maritime industry be kept under constant review in order that we might keep the national policy up to date with regard to the merchant marine.

We had laid emphasis on the importance of adapting nuclear energy to merchant shipping in earlier years. So one of the first steps in this Congress was to hold hearings on the progress of the atomic shipbuilding program commenced several years ago. The world's first nuclear-powered merchant ship, the NS *Savannah*, was authorized several years ago. She is now nearing completion in a leading shipyard in New Jersey. We wondered, "Where do we go from here? How is the *Savannah* project going? What is next?"

Hearings showed that the initial project was going well, with only the normal impediments found with any prototype project. Maritime officials urged authorization of further atomic-powered vessels—preferably tankers—in order to advance the program. Other Government witnesses proposed the go-slow signal until the *Savannah* project had proved itself. While no action was taken in the field, I believe the burden of opinion in the committee was to do everything possible to take another step and proceed with authorization of another vessel, without waiting for final appraisal of the *Savannah*. It was recognized that, first, atomic power has proved its usefulness in seaborne craft and, second, lessons already learned would mean a signal advance for a modern American merchant marine.

During the second session, the Subcommittee on Merchant Marine held extensive hearings on the Defense personnel transportation policy.

It was called to the attention of the committee that rather drastic action had been taken by the Department of Defense in connection with military and dependent travel. Under current policy, action is being taken which will virtually remove all support of commercial sealift capability in the transportation of military personnel and their dependents, with corresponding increase of airlift through the maximum use of the Military Air Transportation Service.

The hearings were to develop the facts on this situation through testimony from officials of the Department of Defense and the Department of Commerce, so the committee could receive an understanding of these policy developments for guidance in future study of the needs of the merchant marine. The present policy by the Department of Defense will undoubtedly affect the shipping policies of the U.S. merchant marine. The committee feels that the implications manifest in this action should bear close scrutiny in the future and, if necessary, further exploration be made.

Extensive legislation concerning the U.S. merchant marine was handled by the committee during the 86th Congress.

Three major amendments to the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 were important pieces of legislation.

First, an amendment that extends the life of certain vessels from 20 to 25 years was passed into Public Law 86–518. This amendment has a dual effect of not only conforming the statutory life of postwar-built vessels to their actual life, but it also eases the annual burden of required reserve deposits of eligible merchant ship operators by spreading the depreciation charges and amortization payments over 25 years, rather than 20 years.

A second bill authorizes American operators to exchange certain war-built vessels they presently own for more modern and efficient war-built vessels owned by the U.S. Government.

Still another bill amends the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 with respect to insurance of ship mortgages giving more flexibility to merchant ship financing. The bill enacted into law authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to insure ship mortgages up to 75 percent—and in some special cases up to 87½ percent—of the actual cost of construction, reconstruction, or reconditioning of the vessel mortgaged. Under past law in order to qualify for insurance the mortgage had to be placed on the vessel before it was delivered by the shipbuilder.

In recent years it has become increasingly evident that the gap between American and foreign shipbuilding costs is widening. Under existing law the United States may assume as a construction differential subsidy no more than 50 percent of the bid price of an American shipyard. In some recent biddings in the important maritime replacement program the existing ceiling on construction differential subsidy would work a serious hardship on the American operator. The basic concept of our subsidy system is that the American operator be placed on parity with his foreign competition in both construction and operating costs. While the committee was reluctant to remove the ceiling on construction subsidy altogether, it seemed only fair and reasonable that the ceiling should be lifted so as to maintain the advantage of reasonably equal competitive status through parity. Accordingly, favorable action was taken upon a bill to increase the construction differential subsidy to 55 percent, to be retroactive to June 30, 1959, and to expire 2 years after enactment.

Through this legislation those operators who otherwise would have been hurt by the recent increase in the construction differential would be protected, and at the same time the Congress would be compelled to review the matter again within a reasonable period.

Since the enactment of Public Law 781, 83d Congress, to amend title XI of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 to make Government insured private financing of ship construction available, the Congress has found it necessary from time to time to consider perfecting amendments. Two major measures were acted upon by the committee and enacted into law in this Congress to strengthen this important feature of the 1936 act. One of these bills is designed to facilitate federally insured private financing of ship construction by authorizing public bond issues. The other bill, approved by the committee and enacted into law, would provide greater flexibility in private financing of ship construction by authorizing a delay in placing a mortgage on a newly constructed vessel, if the loan secured by the mortgage is to

be used to make the downpayment on other vessels to be constructed, without depriving the owner of the privilege of obtaining Government insurance of the mortgage. Thus, it would be possible for an operator who plans to replace a fleet of vessels to pay in full for the first vessel in his replacement program and to mortgage that vessel subsequently to obtain the downpayment on other vessels. In this manner a shipowner would have the opportunity to make the most economical use of his own funds and to select, within the limits of his own resources, the most favorable time for private borrowing.

Several bills affecting the wages, insurance benefits, and general welfare of the merchant seamen were reported, passed, and signed during the 86th Congress. Specifically they include a bill that transfers from the Department of Commerce to the Department of Labor certain functions in respect to insurance benefits and disability payments to seamen for World War II service-connected injuries, death, or disability; clarification of prohibition against arrestment of seamen's wages; and an amendment to the Revised Statutes relative to the disposition of money and effects of deceased seamen.

Public recognition of the gallant action of the SS *Meredith Victory* was authorized by a public law citing extraordinary achievements of this ship during the Korean conflict. On December 21, 1950, the SS *Meredith Victory*, a dry-cargo vessel, successfully undertook an emergency evacuation of refugees from Hungnam, Korea. This evacuation will rank forever, the committee feels, among the great accomplishments of the U.S. merchant marine. It is with great pride that we recognize the achievements of the SS *Meredith Victory*.

The Merchant Marine Act of 1936 contains a provision to the effect that in the event the bid of a west coast shipbuilder is no more than 6 percent higher than the lowest responsible bid of an Atlantic coast shipyard, then the Pacific coast shipbuilder will be automatically awarded a construction contract for a subsidized vessel, provided the ship operator has its principal place of business on the Pacific coast and will operate in and out of that area. In recent years there has been a growing belief that this differential provision is both obsolete and discriminatory.

Legislation has been considered which would eliminate the differential. The committee held extensive hearings on such proposals and ordered one of the bills favorably reported to the House. However, due to the adjournment of Congress, no final action was taken.

In view of the strong regional feelings on this legislation it appears that it will probably be again introduced in the next Congress. In anticipation of further action and in the interests of attempting to resolve the conflicting testimony of Government and regional shipbuilding interests, I have requested that the General Accounting Office, in conjunction with the Maritime Administration, review the record and endeavor to establish the facts concerning relative shipbuilding costs in various parts of the country.

The committee considered and acted upon a number of other bills affecting the merchant marine in varying ways.

FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE CONSERVATION

An extremely important area within the scope of the committee's jurisdiction concerns the marine and fresh water fisheries of the United States, both sport and commercial. The somewhat related field of wildlife conservation also receives much attention from the committee.

In the recent past, due to increased public interest and attention to the importance of the Nation's fish and wildlife resources, new problems and demands have been created for the committee.

One of the most important matters referred to the committee relative to the fisheries and wildlife conservation was a bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to undertake comprehensive studies of the migratory marine fish that are of specific interest to recreational fishermen of the United States. This bill received wide support, and after favorable committee action became Public Law 86–359.

The scope of the authorized studies would include species of fish inhabiting the offshore waters of the United States and species of migratory fish which spend a part of their lives in the inshore waters of the United States. Research is to be on a broad scale, including but not limited to growth rates, research on migrations, identity of stocks, variations in survival, environmental influences, and other aspects for the development of wise conservation policies and constructive management activities.

In the realm of research and study the committee was also concerned with the effects of insecticides and other pesticides upon fish and wildlife. Section 2 of the act of August 1, 1958, enacted into law by the 85th Congress, did provide for studies of this type. Public Law 86–279, under the 86th Congress, now states that the studies to the purpose of preventing losses of our invaluable natural resources due to insecticides and other pesticides be extended. A sum of $2,565,000 per annum is authorized to carry out the objectives of this study.

One of the major legislative matters in the fisheries field was a bill to provide assistance to segments of the fishing industry that have suffered undue hardship by reason of the operation of the reciprocal trade policy of the United States. The need for the legislation developed from the depressed economic conditions in the New England fisheries, due to losses resulting from imports of frozen fish fillets at prices below the American cost of production. These depressed conditions have left the New England fishermen with obsolescent vessels and poor prospect of replacement with newer and more modern vessels, particularly since under U.S. law American fishing vessels must be constructed in U.S. shipyards. Not only is the American fisherman at a disadvantage with regard to capital cost of ship construction, but testimony revealed that there had been instances where relief recommended by the Tariff Commission under the Trade Agreements Assistance Act of 1951 had been denied through failure of executive approval. This bill would authorize construction differential subsidies for new fishing vessels to be operated in a fishery suffering injury from which escape clause relief had been recommended by the Tariff Commission and—after House-Senate conference agreement—other vessels to be operated in a fishery found by the Secretary of the Interior to be injured or threatened with injury by reason of increased imports not the subject of a trade agreement tariff concession. The subsidy provisions are similar to those prevailing with regard to subsidized merchant vessels, although limited to 33⅓ percent, exclusive of national defense features. The bill, as it passed the Congress, authorized an annual appropriation of not more than $2½ million to carry out its purposes. It is believed that enactment of this legislation may point the way to the salvation of certain of our major fisheries suffering from extreme foreign competition.

Other bills dealt with the establishment of new fish hatcheries and the clarification and improvement of administration of existing laws.

COAST GUARD

In past years there have been numerous proposals to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to improve and regulate safety measures on seaborne craft. The committee has recognized the importance of such measures and has endeavored to improve safety in the operation of large and small vessels both at sea and in the inland and coastal waters.

The U.S. Coast Guard maintains a great responsibility in marine safety. In order to increase Coast Guard efficiency in this area the 86th Congress authorized the Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating to prescribe further regulations governing existing lifesaving equipment, firefighting equipment, and other safety techniques and systems. This act, Public Law 86–244, also includes special duties to be performed by crew members in the event of an emergency. It is important to note that the bill provides for these regulations to apply to all foreign vessels carrying passengers from ports of the United States, unless otherwise prescribed by specific treaties of international agreement.

The efficiency and effectiveness of the U.S. Coast Guard was increased by Public Law 86–474 by improvement in certain basic statutes relating to the Coast Guard organization, composition, and personnel administration. This bill brings the organization of the Coast Guard into line with newly developed responsibilities and places it more closely into appropriate relationship with the other military services.

One of the most important matters to be acted upon by the committee in this Congress was a bill to establish pilotage requirements for oceangoing vessels in their navigation of U.S. waters of the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence River, and to provide a basis for a regulated pilotage system to meet those requirements.

Until the enactment of this bill there were no statutory requirements for the pilotage of ocean vessels navigating the Great Lakes. However, the great increase in the volume of ocean shipping entering the Great Lakes as a result of the opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway made establishment of such requirements urgent and essential in the interest of maritime safety.

Distinctive conditions and diversified factors, including international problems, encountered in the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence River area created a complex situation which complicated the final development of a bill that would provide a workable solution of the knotty problems involved. The committee considered legislation introduced prior to the opening of the seaway, and held many hearings before reaching a satisfactory solution which seems to reconcile all of the major conflicts in this many-sided situation.

Though refinements may have to be made in the newly enacted legislation, I am confident that it will provide a sound framework for effective regulation and greater maritime safety in the waters of our "fourth seacoast."

Additional emphasis was placed on safety with the passing of Public Law 86–159 which authorizes the Coast Guard to sell fuel and supplies to vessels or crafts unable to procure these items from other sources. This is a measure designed to protect the health and safety of ships and personnel.

Modern icebreakers are needed to carry out the Coast Guard's responsibilities as required in the national interest. To this end the committee again reviewed the action taken in the 85th Congress to authorize an atomic-powered icebreaker. Without minimizing the importance of such a vessel, the committee modified its earlier position and reported a bill calling for the construction of three modern icebreaking Coast Guard cutters without specifying propulsion systems. These vessels are to be capable of operating in the arctic and antarctic regions. The bill further authorized a feasibility study of the use of atomic propulsion in such vessels. The bill passed the House but did not receive final congressional action.

Other bills concerning the Coast Guard and its activities that were passed by the 86th Congress and signed by the President were an authorization for the U.S. Coast Guard to sell certain and specific utilities in the vicinity of a Coast Guard activity not available to local and indigenous sources; and two bills that increase the limitation on basic pay of civilian lighthouse keepers and increase the retirement pay of certain members of the former Lighthouse Service.

PANAMA CANAL

Pursuant to the authority granted by the House of Representatives, the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, appointed a Board of Consultants on Isthmian Canal Studies to investigate short- and long-range plans for the operation, improvements, and other matters relating to the adequacy of the Panama Canal. The report on these investigations was made public during the 2d session of the 86th Congress.

These investigations were brought about by increasing attention to the rapid growth of sea traffic through the Panama Canal. The increase has narrowed the gap between capacity and traffic demand to the point where concern was aroused as to the future capacity of the canal. The investigation was mainly threefold whereby consideration was given to the ultimate potential of the present canal; the feasibility of lock-canal crossings at other sites across the isthmus; and the suitability of a sea-level canal in the Canal Zone and elsewhere.

The conclusions and recommendations on these considerations disclose that the principal justification for large additional capital expenditures for the Panama Canal is to increase its potential capacity for handling all ships requiring transit between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans but that before approving any plans for increasing this capacity it is necessary to compare estimated future traffic and potential capacity under different plans; that it is doubtful if any reasonable plan to construct a sea-level canal in the Canal Zone could be carried through without serious danger of a long interruption to traffic at the time of cutover from the present lock canal; and that the feasibility of a canal at some other site across the isthmus should be studied further.

A bill enacted into law by the present Congress reduces the interest burden on the Panama Canal Company. By amending provisions of the Canal Zone Code relative to the handling of the excess funds of the Panama Canal Company the bill reduces the total amount of funds on deposit with the Treasury upon which interest must be paid.

Another act increases annuities paid to noncitizen retirees formerly engaged in the construction and operation of the Panama Canal.

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEES

Summarized briefly, the work of the four special subcommittees during this Congress was as follows:

(a) Special Subcommittee on Ocean Freight Forwarders: This subcommittee continued its investigation of the important ocean freight forwarding industry which was commenced in early 1956. In this Congress the subcommittee developed and reported to the full committee proposed legislation based upon its comprehensive studies. Legislation was reported to the House but failed of final passage in the closing days of the second session due to unresolved disagreement in a House-Senate conference.

(b) Special Subcommittee on Steamship Conferences: Following extensive staff studies in the 2d session of the 85th Congress a special subcommittee was established to make a thorough review of the steamship conference system and the adequacy of the regulatory provisions of the Shipping Act of 1916. This special subcommittee held comprehensive hearings in all port areas of the country and took testimony from ocean carriers, importers and exporters, Government officials, and many others.

In view of the voluminous and complex record and the fact that the House Judiciary Committee was concurrently conducting a parallel study of related aspects of the conference system and existing regulatory statutes, it was impossible in this Congress to devise and act upon appropriate corrective legislation. In order to avoid the possibility of serious disruption in ocean shipping, interim legislation was reported out and acted upon to continue the status quo in regard to the legality of the dual rate system for another year, until June 30, 1961.

(c) Special Subcommittee on Oceanography: Immediately upon the publication of the first portion of a report of a Committee of the National Academy of Sciences recommending a coordinated national program in the field of oceanography, a special subcommittee was appointed to study such report, review the scope of oceanographic activity in the United States and ascertain the problem areas which would require legislation. The subcommittee has been most active throughout this Congress, having held numerous and thorough hearings and attended various oceanographic meetings as well as visited institutions and other installations involved in this field.

Several legislative measures were considered but in all the circumstances no final legislative action was taken on most of these because further study appeared to be required. However, favorable action was taken upon two bills to give greater flexibility and efficiency to the Coast and Geodetic Survey and the Weather Bureau in their oceanographic activities.

(d) Special Subcommittee To Study the Merchant Marine Academy: In recent years there has been growing impetus to strengthen the status of the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, N.Y. Several legislative proposals to this end have been before the Congress. In connection with this subject, the committee learned that serious questions had been raised concerning the administration of the Academy, the condition of its facilities, its curriculum, and student and staff morale. These matters were the subject of a series of hearings by a special subcommittee in the latter part of 1959. Further inquiry into certain aspects of these matters are currently under review.

As a result of the subcommittee's investigation, it appeared that a number

of improvements were in order to increase the efficiency of the institution and the officials of the Department of Commerce and the Maritime Administration were so advised.

The committee acted upon an Administration proposal to clarify the status of personnel at the Academy. The bill passed the House but did not receive final action in the Senate.

CONCLUSION

I feel that from the standpoint of the work of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries the two sessions of this Congress have been most productive. As is always the case, we could not handle all the meritorious legislation pending before us. In addition, our studies into the various fields under the committee's jurisdiction disclose a number of matters which should be gone into in the near future.

Finally, I wish to take this means to express again my sincerest thanks to all of the members of the committee on both sides who gave so generously of their time to carry forth the committee's program.

SENATE

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 1, 1960

(Legislative day of Wednesday, August 31, 1960)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, God, who putteth down the mighty from their seat, and exalteth the humble and the meek, as this hallowed Chamber so shortly will be left empty and silent as the tumult and shouting dies, and the captains and the kings depart, may those who have here spoken and acted according to their convictions for the welfare of the Nation and of the world, even as they turn their faces homeward, breathe in their hearts the prayer—

Still stands Thy ancient sacrifice,
A humble and a contrite heart,
Lord, God of hosts, be with us yet—
Lest we forget, lest we forget.

We come solemnly conscious that before the gavel falls for another session, and once again prayer is heard in this place, the stewardship which has been exercised here by the consent of the people will be judged by those who hold the sovereign scepter of the ballot.

Across the weeks ahead, the reverent gaze of the Nation will be, not on stately legislative halls, but upon unadorned, yet sacred, voting booths set up from sea to sea, in which, free from spying eyes, every citizen dowered with the precious franchise can be alone with his own conscience, none daring to molest or make afraid.

We thank Thee that that is our America, and that amid all the contentions and convulsions of these volcanic days, whatever be the verdict of the people, still we can say with utter confidence—God lives and the Government at Washington still stands, and with Thy help will continue to stand as the beacon light of truth for all the earth.

Will Thou bless and strengthen all that here has been worthily done as Thy servants in the ministry of public affairs have followed flickering lights amid the encircling gloom.

And now may the Lord bless you and keep you; may the Lord make His face to shine upon you and be gracious unto you; may the Lord lift up the light of His countenance upon you and give you peace—peace in your own hearts, peace in this dear land of ours, and a just peace throughout all the earth, now and evermore.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, August 31, 1960, was dispensed with.

EXPRESSION OF APPRECIATION TO THE SENATE STAFF

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I shall make a brief remark about the attachés and staff of the Senate. I never cease to marvel at their patriotism, their loyalty, their diligence, and their understanding of the Members of this body. I do not know what would happen to this institution if we did not have the most dedicated and loyal staff I have ever observed in any institution. I wish to express my deep appreciation to each and every individual, from the newest page boy to the most senior employee. I should like to call all of their names, but that would take longer than they would wish.

But I do want them to know that I believe every Member of the Senate is understanding and appreciative of their diligence, their patriotism, their loyalty to their jobs, and their devotion to their country.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. First, Mr. President, I concur in the observations of the majority leader with respect to the staff. But I go a little further; I think we ought to thank them for their forbearance. They become so familiar, I think, with our weaknesses, our failures, and our foibles; and yet with Christian charity they forbear with us and they carry on.

Frankly, as an institution I do not know what the Senate would do without them.

I have often thought of myself as sort of out in front, by the grace of God and the sufferance of the voters. But what would we do if we did not have people at our right hand and at our left hand, to hold them up.

Long ago, according to the Sacred Parchment, a great patriarch was watching the battle—not knowing, of course, how it would fare. When he held up his arms in supplication to the Lord, the tide of battle went with him. But when, through fatigue and weariness, his arms dropped to his sides, the tide of battle turned against his people. Two of his kinsmen saw that; one was his brother-in-law. So they hastened up the hill, and one stood on one side and one stood on the other, while Joshua, the great captain, carried on; and the Book says they supported him and they held up his hands until the sundown; and the victory was won.

Mr. President, the staff have held up our hands, always, in every session, until the sundown, when the victory was won. So, out of grateful hearts, we thank them; and I know I bespeak the gratitude and appreciation on the part of all our Members on this side and all Members in this body.

ORDER FOR CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that it be in order to call the calendar today, for the passage of the bills and other measures on the calendar to which there is no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCGEE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

RESOLUTION OF SUPREME COUNCIL, KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS, ATLANTA, GA.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted at the 78th annual meeting of the Supreme Council of the Knights of Columbus at Atlanta, Ga., opposing the repeal of the Connally reservation.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS,
New Haven, Conn., August 26, 1960.

To the Members of the U.S. Senate:

At the 78th annual meeting of the Supreme Council of the Knights of Columbus at Atlanta, Ga., August 18, 1960, the following resolution in opposition to the repeal of the Connally resolution was adopted unanimously:

"Whereas a World Court was established by the United Nations in 1945, said Court to be composed of fifteen judges, not more than one from each participating nation, which World Court is designed to be superior to the domestic courts of each nation that participates in the Court; and

"Whereas the resolution of Congress, committing and binding the United States to

participate in the World Court and to accept its jurisdiction, was amended by a resolution sponsored by Senator Tom Connally of Texas to provide that such Court shall have no jurisdiction over disputes with regard to matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States "as determined by the United States"; and

"Whereas there has been introduced in Congress, Senate Resolution 94, which has for its purpose the repeal of the Connally amendment, and

"Whereas we must never surrender the right and sovereignty of the United States of America to decide and determine its domestic and internal affairs and issues: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Supreme Council of the Knights of Columbus, in annual meeting assembled opposes the giving of the World Court any right, power, or jurisdiction to decide what are the domestic and what are the international issues and disputes of the United States of America, and favors the retention of the Connally amendment."

Sincerely yours,

LUKE E. HART,
Supreme Knight.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BENNETT:

S. 3925. A bill to grant certain oil and gas lessees a preference lease right upon revocation of Public Land Order No. 2199, dated August 29, 1960; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 3926. A bill to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by employers engaged in commerce or in operations affecting commerce, and to provide procedure for the collection of wages lost by employees by reason of any such discrimination; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

EQUAL PAY FOR EQUAL WORK

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, for many years now I have at each session introduced a bill providing for equal pay for equal work for women. This year I have not introduced the bill. However, for the record I wish to introduce it today, although I am aware of the fact that nothing can be accomplished on it in the closing hours of this session. However, I want the record to be clear, and I therefore introduce the bill so that notice will be served that come next January it will be introduced immediately, and I shall press for action on it before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare during the course of the session.

I wrote the opinion of the War Labor Board which sustained the majority decision of the War Labor Board during the war providing for equal pay for women so far as cases falling under the jurisdiction of the War Labor Board were concerned. The principle was sound then and, in my judgment, it has remained sound ever since. I am glad to have the record show that the Democratic Party in its platform has recognized the soundness of the principle and that it is one of the pledges the party has made to the Nation.

I ask unanimous consent that my bill may be received, appropriately referred, and printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3926) to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by employers engaged in commerce or in operations affecting commerce, and to provide procedure for the collection of wages lost by employees by reason of any such discrimination, introduced by Mr. MORSE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Women's Equal Pay for Equal Work Act of 1960".

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby finds that the existence in industries engaged in commerce or in operations affecting commerce of wage differentials based on sex—

(1) depresses wages and living standards of employees necessary for their health and efficiency;

(2) prevents the maximum utilization of the available labor resources;

(3) tends to cause labor disputes, thereby burdening, affecting, and obstructing commerce;

(4) burdens commerce and the free flow of goods in commerce; and

(5) constitutes an unfair method of competition.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. When used in this Act—

(a) "Person" means an individual, partnership, association, corporation, business trust, legal representatives, or any organized group of persons.

(b) "Commerce" means trade, commerce, transportation, transmission, or communication among the several States or between any State and any place outside thereof.

(c) "Affecting commerce" means in commerce, or burdening or obstructing commerce or the free flow of commerce, or having led to or tending to lead to a labor dispute burdening or obstructing commerce or the free flow of commerce.

(d) "Employer" includes any person acting directly or indirectly in the interest of an employer in relation to an employee but shall not include the United States or any State or political subdivision of a State, or any labor organization (other than when acting as an employer), or anyone acting in the capacity of officer or agent of such labor organization.

(e) "Employee" includes any individual employed by an employer.

(f) "Wages" means all remuneration for services performed by an employee for an employer, including (1) board, lodging, or other facilities customarily furnished by an employer to his employees, and (2) any other benefit customarily provided by an employer to, for, or on behalf of his employees as an incident of their employment.

PROHIBITION OF WAGE RATE DIFFERENTIAL BASED ON SEX

SEC. 4. No employer engaged in commerce or in operations affecting commerce shall discriminate between employees on the basis of sex by paying to any employee wages lower than those which he pays to employees of the opposite sex for work of comparable character on jobs the performance of which requires comparable skills, except where such payment is made pursuant to a seniority or merit increase system which does not discriminate on the basis of sex.

ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 5. (a) The Secretary of Labor—

(1) shall prescribe such regulations as he deems necessary and appropriate for the administration of this Act, including regulations to provide standards for determining work of a comparable character on jobs the performance of which require comparable skills;

(2) may investigate and gather data regarding the wages, hours, and other conditions and practices of employment in any industry subject to this Act, and may enter and inspect such places and such records (and make such transcriptions thereof), question such employees, and investigate such facts, conditions, practices, and matters as he may deem necessary or appropriate to determine whether any person has violated any provision of this Act, or which may aid in the enforcement of the provisions of this Act;

(3) may enter and serve upon any employer found by the Secretary, after notice and hearing in conformity with sections 5, 6, 7, and 8 of the Administrative Procedure Act, to be engaged in or to have engaged in any violation of section 4 of this Act an order requiring such employer (A) to cease and desist from such violation, and (B) to pay to each employee who has been adversely affected a sum equal to the aggregate amount or value of the wages which such employee has been deprived by reason of such violation plus an additional equal amount as liquidated damages; and

(4) may enter and serve upon any employer found by the Secretary, after such notice and hearing, to have discharged or otherwise discriminated against any employee on account of any action taken by such employee to invoke, enforce, or assist in any manner in the enforcement of the provisions of section 4 of this Act, an order requiring such employer to reinstate such employee, or to remove such discrimination, and to pay to such employee a sum equal to the aggregate amount of value of the wages of which such employee has been deprived by reason of such discharge or other discrimination plus an additional equal amount as liquidated damages.

(b) For the purposes of any investigation conducted under paragraph (2) of section 5(a) of this Act, the provisions of sections 9 and 10 of the Federal Trade Commission Act (relating to the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents) (15 U.S.C. 49, 50), shall be applicable to the jurisdiction, powers, and duties of the Secretary of Labor.

(c) Any order entered by the Secretary of Labor pursuant to paragraph (3) or paragraph (4) of section 5(a) of this Act shall be subject to judicial review, and shall be enforced judicially, in the same manner and with the same effect as provided by section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 45) with respect to orders issued thereunder by the Federal Trade Commission, except that in any proceeding before any court for the review of any order issued under paragraph (3) or paragraph (4) of section 5(a) of this Act the findings of the

Secretary as to the facts shall be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence.

WAGE RESTITUTION

SEC. 6. (a) The Secretary of Labor is authorized to supervise the payment of any amounts for which any employer has been finally determined to be liable under any order for payment under clause (A) of paragraph (3) or paragraph (4) of section 5(a) of this Act. Any sum so recovered by the Secretary on behalf of any employee under this subsection shall be held in a special deposit account and shall be paid, on order of the Secretary, directly to the employee. Any such sum not paid to an employee because of inability to do so within a period of three years shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

(b) No wage restitution shall be made with respect to any violation of this Act for any period which preceded by more than four years the date of commencement by the Secretary of Labor of the proceeding in which such restitution is ordered.

INJUNCTIONS

SEC. 7. The district courts, together with the District Court for the Territory of Alaska, the United States District Court for the District of the Canal Zone, and the District Court of the Virgin Islands, shall have jurisdiction upon application made by the Secretary of Labor, for cause shown, to restrain any violation of section 4 of this Act. No court shall have jurisdiction, in any action brought by the Secretary of Labor to restrain any such violation, to order the payment to any employee of any wages of which such employee may be deprived by reason of such violation.

GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

SEC. 8. (a) In any contract made and entered into by any executive department, independent establishment, or other agency or instrumentality of the United States, or by the District of Columbia, or by any corporation all of the stock of which is beneficially owned by the United States (all of which are referred to hereinafter as agencies of the United States), for the manufacture or furnishing of any materials, supplies, articles, or equipment, or the rendition of any service, there shall be included stipulations under which the contractor (1) is required to compensate all persons employed by him in the manufacture or furnishing of such materials, supplies, articles, or equipment, or in the rendition of such service, in conformity with the requirements of section 4 of this Act and (2) shall be subject to all other provisions of this Act with respect to the compensation of such persons.

(b) Unless the Secretary of Labor shall by order otherwise determine and permit, no contract shall be awarded by the United States or any agency thereof to any person finally determined to have violated any of the provisions of this Act or of any stipulation entered into in compliance with subsection (a) of this section, or to any firm, corporation, partnership, or association in which such person has a controlling interest, until three years have elapsed after the date of final determination that such violation has occurred. The Comptroller General is authorized and directed to distribute to all agencies of the United States a list containing the names of such persons.

POSTING

SEC. 9. Every employer subject to this Act shall keep a copy of this Act posted in a conspicuous place in or about the premises where any employee is employed. Employers shall be furnished copies of this Act by the United States Department of Labor on request without charge.

APPROPRIATION

SEC. 10. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 11. This Act shall take effect one hundred and twenty days after the date of its enactment.

PROVISION OF A GOVERNMENT FOR AMERICAN SAMOA—AMENDMENT

Mr. LONG of Hawaii submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 222) providing a government for American Samoa, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I shall now suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas withhold that suggestion until some insertions can be made in the RECORD? I believe that will save time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Yes.

Mr. President, I am so indebted to the Senator from Oregon for the great contribution he made last evening in connection with the Sugar Act and the expediting of the work of the Senate, that I want to express to him my appreciation. I think he and the minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN] performed a great service for this country, which should long be remembered.

Mr. MORSE. I appreciate the kind words of the senior Senator from Texas; but I wish him to know that the obligation is quite the other way around. The senior Senator from Oregon will always be indebted to the senior Senator from Texas for his very great assistance on so many, many occasions and for his great inspiration here as the majority leader of the Senate.

Mr. President, I had prepared a series of speeches on a number of subjects, which I thought it might be necessary for me to deliver. However, I doubt that it will be necessary—although in case it should be, I can always recall them from the Public Printer.

However, to save time, I shall request the making of sundry insertions in the RECORD.

SENATOR CLARK'S PROPOSED AMENDMENTS OF THE SENATE RULES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, first, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the body of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Senator CLARK Versus the Majestic Ooze." The editorial was published on August 30 in the New York Herald Tribune. Despite the title of the editorial, Mr. President, its content for the most part is in commendation of the Senator from Pennsylvania for his proposals for modifications in the rules of the Senate.

Mr. President, proposals for those modifications have my complete endorsement and support. I have assured the Senator from Pennsylvania that I will stand shoulder to shoulder with him, next January, as he seeks to reform the rules of the Senate.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the N.Y. Herald Tribune of Aug. 30, 1960]

SENATOR CLARK VERSUS THE MAJESTIC OOZE

The U.S. Senate has its own venerable ways, sticky with tradition, of oozing majestically down its chosen legislative paths. Its procedural rules are hoary, the privileges of its Members jealously guarded, its progress as a result often maddeningly slow.

Senator CLARK, of Pennsylvania, has lately been offering a series of rules changes aimed at expediting its work. He hopes for action on them when the new Congress meets in January.

Carefully worded and wrapped with safeguards, they are not, on their face, radical changes. But they could have a radical effect on the course of Senate debates, and thus on the handling of the Nation's business.

One would allow a majority of the Senate to take action on any given matter, after 15 hours or more of debate, by voting to "move the previous question." In effect, this would be a flank attack on cloture eliminating the need for the cumbersome procedures of rule XXII. "It is my opinion," argues Senator CLARK, "that the Senate can no longer afford the luxury of unlimited debate, if we are to attend to the legislative business of the country."

Another far-reaching change would allow a Senator to raise a question of germaneness. At present, Senate debate wanders all over the woodlot and back. As an example, Senator CLARK computed that during 2 successive days of debate on the minimum wage bill 15 percent and 40 percent, respectively, of the total spoken time was devoted to the business officially at hand. The proposed change would not be a blanket requirement of germaneness, but it would allow a majority to keep the debate from being sidetracked by a garrulous minority.

A further change would make it no longer possible, as it is at present, for one Senator to block the meeting of all 16 standing committees and all 86 subcommittees of the Senate while the Senate is in session. Another would take away the power of one obstruction-minded Senator to insist on the wholly unnecessary and time-wasting reading of the preceding day's journal. A fifth, which we greet with less enthusiasm, would allow unmade speeches to be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD just as if they had been delivered to an empty chamber.

As Senator CLARK has pointed out, the only way the Senate has been able to work effectively under its present rules is by unanimous-consent agreements. And this is altogether too precarious a dependency for a body on whose action—or inaction—the fate of the Nation may turn.

Reserving the right to object, as a Senator, for parliamentary reasons, often says, we think Senator CLARK is on the right track.

PROBLEMS OF HUNGRY CHILDREN IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I happen to be chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Health, Education, Welfare, and Safety, of the Committee on the District

of Columbia. As the Senate knows, since 1957 my subcommittee has been very much concerned with and interested in, and has conducted investigations upon the general subject of the problems of hungry children in the District of Columbia. These studies have led us, of course, into a consideration of some of the very serious slum conditions which exist in the District of Columbia, particularly among the Negro population.

As chairman of the Public Health, Education, Welfare, and Safety Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia, I am particularly pleased to bring to the attention of Senators a report prepared by Miss Imogen Thompson, supervisor of the free elementary school lunch program. Miss Thompson, a professional social worker employed by the Department of Public Welfare, has presented a challenging analysis of the family structure and background of those children who are participating in the free school lunch program. As one who has been very concerned about the effect upon children of the disgraceful conditions bred by poverty in far too many homes in Washington, I am glad to learn from the report that, as of May 31, 1960, 2,843 children from 1,193 families were receiving in the elementary schools at least one square meal a day. I am also pleased to learn that the screening process as to eligibility resulted in only 97 children being taken from the program. That there was room for honest differences of opinion in these 97 cases is demonstrated, in my judgment, by the fact that 82 of the children discontinued from the program were from families receiving public assistance. Only 15 children from 8 nonpublic assistance families were disqualified.

These statistics indicate clearly to me that the doubts voiced by many, when the appropriations for this worthy free lunch program were before the Congress, to the effect that it would lead to abuse are baseless and unwarranted by the facts.

When only 15 children cut of almost 3,000 are screened from a program of this type, one-half of 1 percent, I do not believe that feared abuse has been demonstrated.

As a matter of fact, my present concern is that children who should be participating, may not be. When school opens next month, I hope that the teachers and principals will be alert to the signs and symptoms of the need for participation on the part of their pupils.

I shall look forward to receiving continuing reports upon the progress being made in this important area, because of my deep conviction that we fail in our responsibility if we fail to provide for children under our care and supervision.

The report also shows, in the analysis of the family structure, the existence of allied problems. There are detailed the difficulties faced in securing housing by large families and problems of poor health associated with economic deprivation. Much needs to be done in these areas. It is a reproach to each of us that we permit the continued existence of these remediable conditions.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the report to which I have alluded, be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE ON FREE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM SEPTEMBER 29, 1959, THROUGH MAY 31, 1960

On September 22, 1959, the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia established the free elementary school lunch program under the joint direction of the Superintendent of Schools and the Director of Welfare. The responsibility of the schools was to determine initially which children would receive the free lunch and to provide the lunches. That of the Department of Welfare was to determine the continuing eligibility of the children to receive the free lunch and to provide services to the family to enable it to provide lunches through normal processes. The report which follows accounts for some of the activities and experiences of the Department of Public Welfare in carrying out its responsibility.

From the beginning of the program late in September, 1959, through May 31, 1960, the Department of Public Welfare completed investigations on 1,193 families involving 3,154 children for whom application for free elementary school lunch was made. Of these families, 324 were active with the Public Assistance Division, 27 with the Child Welfare Division, and 842 were not currently active with either agency.

The findings of these investigations resulted in the recommendation for continuance of free lunches for 2,843 children in 1,079 families and discontinuance of lunches for 97 in 47 families (82 children in 39 public assistance cases, and 15 children in 8 nonpublic assistance cases). The primary reason for discontinuance was a change in the family situation. For example, a parent who had been incapacitated was now able to be back at work; a parent who had been unemployed had found work; or a mother who had been ill was now sufficiently recovered to do some housework and prepare three meals a day for her family. A few families who had no change in the home situation, were helped to see how they could provide good lunches for their children.

Additionally, for children in 67 families, no recommendation was made because children had moved to another area, where the school lunch program was not available.

In their investigations, the social workers discovered that many of these families have extremely poor housing, low standards of housekeeping and personal care, poor health, undesirable leisure-time activities and many marital problems, as well as behavior problems in children which seem to result from the family situation.

Most of these families were not receiving help from social agencies, with the exception of services given by the welfare department's social workers of the free elementary school lunch program, although there is need of this, if such services were available. Many seem cut off and isolated from community life other than that of their immediate neighborhoods. Some live a hand-to-mouth existence, literally not knowing when the next meal will be or where they will be living next year or month.

Many of these people have no connection of any kind with churches and for some, if they go at all, children are "sent" to Sunday school rather than accompanied by parents. This lack of religious affiliation means that one of the primary sources of moral teaching is closed off from some who need it most. Families have volunteered various reasons for not being able to attend church services. Often the families feel they do not have the proper clothing for presentable appearance in church. If carfare is necessary to reach church, this money is used instead for food.

There is a noticeable lack of family unity. Seldom do members of a family join together in participating in any activities. There are comparatively few homes where the family joins in a meal together at a table. It has been obvious in many instances that this could not take place since there was only one small table and a limit of two or three chairs.

There is very little long-range planning of meals. Usually, food is purchased from day to day as needed. In a few instances, breakfast was treated as an important meal while in other families the children simply "grab" anything they can find, perhaps food left over from the night before. One mother who was in the last uncomfortable stages of pregnancy sent her 4-year-old out to the neighborhood store for food. The older children had gone to school without breakfast and at 9:30 a.m., this pregnant mother and her three preschool age children were going to have peanut butter sandwiches for breakfast. Diets are generally starchy. Meat is not found regularly in menus and, if used, the cheapest possible cuts are purchased. Fruits are generally found too expensive and are only purchased where there is an overabundance on the market and the price is low. Vegetables are usually greens of one kind or another. Desserts are a rarity.

The economic problems of these families are tremendous. For the most part, rents are excessively high, except in National Capital Housing Authority units, for extremely poor housing, and household equipment is equally poor. In fact, housing is one of the major problems, especially for the large families where overcrowding is the rule, not the exception. As is the usual case, families with many children suffer most since the cost of adequate housing is prohibitive. In many instances, the wage earner is making as much as he or she can, with respect to work-experience, age, natural ability, and education. Many large families have parents in the 27–34 year age range, which adds to the problems the possibility of even more children and increased financial burden.

A considerable number of older employable children and unwed mothers are depending on one or both parents to provide for them. Most of these parents have small incomes and are usually not able to meet their own needs adequately, even without the burden of their older children.

Some of the families, especially the larger ones, seem surprisingly stable. This does not mean that things are, or have been good, but rather that the families have been able to hold together through very bad times. However, even in these families there were signs that indicated possible trouble in the future, particularly with young children. There is need for service to them now which might forestall future family and personal disintegration.

The brightest spot in the entire picture has been the acceptance by these families of the social worker and the genuine appreciation the mothers have expressed at the opportunity to discuss their situations, regardless of whether or not any tangible help might be forthcoming. Some mothers observed that since their children have been receiving school lunches, they have seemed

much more alert and energetic. Other mothers said that the adequate lunches served have sharpened their children's appetites for the evening meal. Still others have noticed that their children are learning about sitting at a table throughout an entire meal rather than wandering about at the slightest provocation. With the families interviewed thus far, the lunches are meeting a real need and in some instances, they are the only well-balanced meal the children receive in a day.

Staff social workers continue to work with a few of these families, when they have time, and refer them to appropriate social work and other agencies when indicated. If the staff were able to visit a larger proportion of the families more than once, it is probable they would find more situations which need agency service.

The following two cases may help to illustrate the type of service needed by many of these families.

Case A: When visiting the N family in connection with the application for free elementary school lunch for Billy, age 7, our worker observed his twin brother, Tommy, who can neither walk nor talk. Although the family has lived here several years, Mrs. N had never taken the children to clinics. Even the school did not know that Billy had a retarded twin brother. The department of public welfare social worker arranged a diagnostic examination at the Gale School Clinic for Retarded Children. Mrs. N was most cooperative, and took responsibility in taking the retarded child to various clinics for various tests, as directed, and was meticulous in keeping appointments. She takes excellent care of Tommy and is anxious to keep him with her. The clinic plans to give continuing service to this family, and approves of the mother's plan to keep Tommy at home. At least, for the time being, with supportive help from the clinic, Tommy will be better off at home than in an institution, and the cost of care, obviously, will be considerably less.

Case B: Mr. and Mrs. B ages 33 and 28 are the parents of 10 children. Five of these are of school age and receive free school lunches. Both parents have had little formal education. They have shown a genuine love for their children and are trying very hard within their limitations to give their children a good home. Mr. B has been employed by a nearby county refuse department for 12 years. He feels very secure in this job. While he might earn more as a construction worker, he feels the problem of bad weather limiting his income would be a risk too great to undertake.

The B's exemplify many of our family situations which will continue to require school lunches for many years. The added supplementation of lunches works in a positive direction. The children are in need of this added food in order to maintain good health and the parents in turn need this help in order to met other necessities. Obviously, there are other services in the community which are also necessary in helping, i.e., nursing service, clinics, clothing depots, and settlement houses. In receiving these services and the support of the community, the B's are able to keep their family together giving them the love and emotional security which will in turn help the children to become productive and useful citizens.

Families, at times, recognize problems but do not know where to turn for help. A case in point is that of a childless couple which has cared for an orphaned 9-year-old girl most of her life. The couple realized the importance and emotional value of adoption for this child and for themselves, but with limited income did not believe they could pay an attorney to handle the case. The social worker arranged for them to go to the Legal Aid Bureau to receive the needed help.

Many young children are left unattended in their homes, while the parents go out to work. In one family, where the mother had deserted, the father had two school age children take turns staying home from school to care for the preschool age children.

Some mothers have told of their discouraging court experiences. Fathers will refuse to accept family responsibility, or will often mistreat a wife to the point of requiring a court hearing. In some instances enough of an impression is made so that the home situation is somewhat better for a few weeks. Other fathers are only made more angry and do less for the family. It might be helpful if some followup arrangement could be made in order to help these fathers understand the importance of their family responsibilities.

We must not lose sight of the importance of keeping families together, and giving them whatever supportive help is necessary in order that they may be able to rear their children in a healthy environment to be useful citizens in the years to come. Many parents, whose lives and homes seem quite desolate in many respects, still are able to give their children the feeling of being wanted and loved, at least part of the time. This must be encouraged in every possible way. The whole community—churches, civic groups, in fact everyone—has a responsibility in this.

Because work with most of these families has to be of an aggressive nature in which the social worker visits the home rather than waiting for the client to keep an appointment, it is important that a social worker be as accessible to them as possible, hopefully with an office base somewhere in the neighborhood in which the family lives, such as in a school, settlement house, housing development, etc., where the families could reach her. Many mothers are not able to leave their small children to go across town to keep an appointment with a social worker, although they could go a block or so down the street if a social worker was there.

FAMILIES OF CHILDREN RECEIVING FREE SCHOOL LUNCHES—A STATISTICAL SUMMARY

Children in 1,079 families were recommended for continued participation in the free school lunch program during the past school year. Below is presented a statistical summary of some social and economic characteristics of these families.

On the whole, these were large families. The average number per family was 7.2 persons for families not receiving public assistance, and 6.3 for families receiving public assistance. These figures are substantially larger than the average number of persons in an ADC family, which was 4.6 in April 1960.

The total number of children for whom continuance of free lunches was recommended was 2,843, an average of 2.6 per family. This average was substantially the same for families receiving assistance and for those who were not.

Employment was regular for 50 percent of the families; intermittent for 11 percent, and seasonal for 2 percent. In 37 percent, there was no employment at the time the families were interviewed. This includes public assistance family in which no wage earner was in the home.

Both parents were working in 5 percent of the cases. The father was the wage earner in 37 percent of the families, the mother in 16 percent, and some person other than the parent in 6 percent.

The median monthly income of all families was $225, for families not receiving public assistance $233, and for families receiving public assistance $191.

Some significant differences between the families receiving assistance and those not receiving it were:

1. Both parents were in the home in 61 percent of families not receiving public assistance but in only 19 percent of families receiving assistance.

2. Overcrowding was evident for families receiving assistance as well as for those who were not. However a substantially larger percentage, 59 percent, of families not receiving public assistance were living under such overcrowded conditions in comparison with 43 percent of families receiving public assistance.

3. Poor management of family income was recorded as a major problem in 40 percent of families receiving public assistance but in only 14 percent of families not receiving public assistance.

4. Poor health of child or children was considered to be a major problem in 21 percent of families not receiving assistance but in only 13 percent of families receiving public assistance. Poor health of adult members was recorded in about the same percentage for both groups—35 and 33 percent, respectively.

5. The problems of alcoholism and lack of parental interest were recorded for a slightly higher percentage of families not receiving public assistance than for those who were.

FREE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM

TABLE 1.—*Families interviewed for free school lunch: Action recommended, public assistance status and color*

Action recommended	Total	Color		Public assistance status	
		White	Nonwhite	Not receiving assistance	Receiving assistance
Total families	1,193	38	1,155	869	324
Percent	100.0	3.2	96.8	72.8	27.2
To continue free school lunch	1,079	35	1,044	818	261
Not to continue free school lunch	47	1	46	11	36
No action recommended [1]	[2] 67	2	[2] 65	40	27

[1] Families either left jurisdiction or withdrew request for free lunch.
[2] 10 not reported as to race.

TABLE 2.—*Families of children for whom continuance of free lunch was recommended: Number of persons in family, and public assistance status*

Number of persons in family	Total	Public assistance status	
		Not receiving assistance	Receiving assistance
Total	1,079	818	261
2	25	17	8
3	63	43	20
4	102	66	36
5	129	84	45
6	114	71	43
7	153	116	37
8	145	121	24
9	135	111	24
10	97	87	10
11	52	45	7
12	34	29	5
13	17	15	2
14	7	7	----
15	2	2	----
16	1	1	----

TABLE 2.—*Families of children for whom continuance of free lunch was recommended: Number of persons in family, and public assistance status*—Continued

Number of persons in family	Total	Public assistance status	
		Not receiving assistance	Receiving assistance
17	2	2	
18	1	1	
Average number of persons per family	7.2	7.5	6.3

TABLE 3.—*Families of children for whom continuance of free school lunch was recommended: Number of children in family and public assistance status*

Number of children in family	Total	Public assistance status	
		Not receiving assistance	Receiving assistance
Total	1,079	818	261
1	44	34	10
2	91	69	22
3	117	78	39
4	149	101	48
5	162	117	45
6	159	124	35
7	131	107	24
8	116	96	20
9	55	48	7
10	31	23	8
11	16	14	2
12	5	4	1
13	3	3	

TABLE 4.—*Families of children for whom continuance of free school lunch was recommended: Number of children attending school, and public assistance status*

Number of children attending school	Total	Public assistance status	
		Not receiving assistance	Receiving assistance
Total	1,079	818	261
1	113	84	29
2	186	139	47
3	239	167	72
4	227	183	44
5	156	114	42
6	95	78	17
7	36	29	7
8	20	17	3
9	7	7	

TABLE 5.—*Families of children for whom continuance of free lunch was recommended: Number of children receiving free lunches and public assistance status*

Number of children receiving free lunch	Total	Public assistance status	
		Not receiving assistance	Receiving assistance
Total	1,079	818	261
1	266	202	64
2	275	204	71
3	277	208	69
4	150	114	36
5	79	62	17
6	24	21	3
7	7	7	
8	1		1

TABLE 6.—*Families of children for whom continuance of free school lunch was recommended: Presence of parents, and public assistance status*

Presence of parents	Total	Number of families			
		Not receiving assistance		Receiving assistance	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total families	1,079	818	100.0	261	100.0
Both parents in home	546	497	60.8	49	18.8
Mother only in home	443	262	32.0	181	69.3
Father only in home	27	18	2.2	9	3.4
Other person, no parent in home	63	41	5.0	22	8.4

TABLE 7.—*Families for whom continuance of free school lunch was recommended: Number having major problem or problems in addition to inadequate income, and public assistance status*

Problem	Total	Number of families—			
		Not receiving assistance		Receiving assistance	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total families [1]	1,079	818	100.0	261	100.0
Inadequate income	1,079	818	100.0	261	100.0
Poor health of adult member(s)	374	288	35.2	86	33.0
Inadequate personality of parent	158	123	15.0	35	13.4
Poor health of child or children	204	169	20.7	35	13.4
Pressures of employment	122	111	13.6	11	4.2
Poor management	218	115	14.1	103	39.5
Alcoholism	55	46	5.6	9	3.4
Lack of parental interest	85	72	8.8	13	5.0
Other problems [2]	95	63	7.7	32	12.2

[1] Total is less than sum of entries since some families have two or more major problems.
[2] Includes large medical bills due to prolonged illness, ow educational level, inadequate housing, etc.

TABLE 8.—*Families of children for whom continuance of free school lunch was recommended: Monthly income, and public assistance status*

Monthly income	Total	Number of families	
		Not receiving assistance	Receiving assistance
Total	1,079	818	261
No income	29	28	1
Under $100	52	44	8
$100 to $149	129	87	42
$150 to $199	230	152	78
$200 to $249	210	141	69
$250 to $299	193	158	35
$300 to $349	120	111	9
$350 to $399	48	40	8
$400 and over	29	26	3
No fixed income	9	9	
Not reported	30	22	8
Median income	$225	$233	$191

TABLE 9.—*Families of children for whom continuance of free school lunch was recommended: Identity of wage earners in the family*

Wage earner	Families	
	Number	Percent
Total	1,079	100.0
No wage earner	[1] 397	36.8
Father	400	37.1
Mother	171	15.8
Both father and mother	49	4.5
Person other than parents	62	5.7

[1] Includes 240 families receiving public assistance.

TABLE 10.—*Families of children for whom continuance of free school lunch was recommended: Character of employment of wage earners*

Character of employment	Families	
	Number	Percent
Total	1,079	100.0
No employment	[1] 398	36.9
Intermittent	115	10.7
Seasonal	25	2.3
Regular	541	50.1

[1] Includes 240 families receiving public assistance.

TABLE 11.—*Families of children for whom continuance of free school lunch was recommended: Length of residence in the District of Columbia, and public assistance status*

Length of residence	Total	Number of families	
		Not receiving assistance	Receiving assistance
Total	1,079	818	261
Less than 1 year	14	14	
1 to 4 years	88	67	21
5 to 9 years	139	103	36
10 to 14 years	101	68	33
15 to 19 years	141	110	31
20 to 24 years	96	70	26
25 years or more	136	96	40
Unknown or not reported	35	31	4
Born in the District of Columbia	329	259	70

TABLE 12.—*Families of children for whom continuance of free school lunch was recommended: Current or previous service from Public Assistance Division*

Service from Public Assistance Division	Total	Number of families		
		Not receiving assistance		Receiving assistance
		Number	Percent	
Total	1,079	818	100.0	261
Not known to Public Assistance Division	500	500	61.0	
Previously known to Public Assistance Division:				
Application rejected	174	174	36.7	
Case closed	120	120		
Currently known to Public Assistance Division	267	6		261
Unknown or not reported	18	18	2.2	

TABLE 13.—*Families of children for whom continuance of free school lunch was recommended: Number of persons in family, number of rooms in dwelling unit occupied by family, and public assistance status*

A. FAMILIES NOT RECEIVING PUBLIC ASSISTANCE [1]

Number of persons in family	Total families	Number of families occupying specified number of rooms									
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9 or more	Unknown
Total	818	42	60	89	165	138	218	46	19	6	35
2	17	5	5	------	4	1	------	------	------	------	2
3	43	6	7	11	9	5	4	1	------	------	------
4	66	9	11	14	9	10	9	1	1	1	1
5	84	3	15	17	26	11	11	------	------	------	1
6	71	4	3	12	21	14	12	1	------	1	3
7	116	5	10	13	22	25	25	8	4	------	4
8	121	4	4	8	26	18	46	6	------	------	9
9	111	3	4	4	22	25	37	4	4	1	7
10	87	2	1	6	15	17	36	7	2	------	1
11	45	1	------	3	6	8	18	6	2	------	1
12	29	------	------	1	5	2	11	5	2	------	3
13	28	------	------	------	------	------	2	9	7	3	3

[1] 59.3 percent of families were living under overcrowded conditions, as measured by hte standard of 1.5 or more persons per room.

B. FAMILIES RECEIVING PUBLIC ASSISTANCE [2]

Number of persons in family	Total families	Number of families occupying specified number of rooms								
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8 or more	Unknown
Total	261	6	30	41	46	42	60	13	6	17
2	8	------	4	2	2	------	------	------	------	------
3	20	2	5	4	6	------	2	------	------	1
4	36	2	8	12	6	2	3	1	------	2
5	45	1	6	9	10	8	6	2	------	3
6	43	------	4	5	7	13	11	1	------	2
7	37	------	1	6	7	16	12	1	1	3
8	24	------	1	1	2	5	7	2	2	4
9	24	1	1	2	4	6	7	2	1	------
10	10	------	------	------	1	1	4	2	2	------
11	7	------	------	------	1	------	5	------	------	1
12	5	------	------	------	------	1	2	1	------	1
13	2	------	------	------	------	------	1	1	------	------

[2] 42.5 percent of families were living under overcrowded conditions, as measured by the standard of 1.5 or more persons per room.

TABLE 14.—*Families of children for whom continuance of free school lunch was recommended: Monthly rent paid, and public assistance status*

Rent	Total	Public assistance status	
		Not receiving assistance	Receiving assistance
Total families	1,079	818	261
Rent free	31	24	7
Under $35	99	92	7
$35 to $49	152	126	26
$50 to $64	305	199	106
$65 to $79	279	211	68
$80 to $94	97	73	24
$95 or more	75	62	13
Not reported	41	31	10

THE REPUBLICAN PLATFORM AND FOREST CONSERVATION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, if the Republican platform plank on forestry is an example of the material used to construct the rest of the platform, the whole structure is doomed to topple because it is made of rotten wood.

The Republican forestry plank was sawn from a cull log by a mill noted for its mismanufacture of its products.

I ask unanimous consent that the pertinent portions of the platform be printed.

There being no objection, the extracts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A strong and growing economy requires vigorous and persistent attention to wise conservation and sound development of all our resources. Teamwork between Federal, State, and private entities is essential and should be continued. It has resulted in sustained conservation and resource development programs on a scale unmatched in our history.

It is clear, also, in the results of continuing administration-encouraged forest management practices which have brought, for the first time, a favorable balance between the growth and cutting of America's trees.

We pledge continued forestry conservation with appropriate sustained yield harvesting, thus increasing jobs for people and increasing revenue.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, first I would like to deal with the Republican claim that their practices have brought, for the first time, a favorable balance between the growth and cutting of America's trees.

I shall demonstrate, first, that a balance occurred prior to the year 1953, and secondly that it does not mean a thing.

After over 6 years of extended work, in 1958, the U.S. Forest Service published a 700-page compendium entitled "Timber Resources for America's Future"—Forest Resource Report No. 14, January 1958.

On page 56 of the forest resource report, table 32, is headed "Growth and cut by softwood and hardwood, and by section, 1952."

I call attention to the year. It is not 1953. It is 1952, so we know that this table is going to tell us what the condition was in 1952. I also point out that anyone with even a slight knowledge of forestry knows that trees take years to grow and a favorable or unfavorable balance between growth and cut cannot be obtained by action taken in 1 year. So if there was a favorable balance in 1952 in a significant amount, it probably existed in 1951 and possibly even in 1950.

The table on page 56 shows our wood growth and cut by growing stock which is all timber over 5 inches in diameter and is computed in cubic feet. It also shows growth and cut for live sawtimber which is all timber over 9 inches in diameter for eastern softwoods, 11 inches for hardwoods, and 10 inches for western softwoods and is computed in board feet.

For growing stock overall there was a growth of 14.24 billion cubic feet in 1952 and a cut of 10.76 billion cubic feet. Overall growth in 1952 was 1.32 times cut and thus in balance. I also point out for hardwoods the growth was 2.21 times the cut, while for softwoods—of which we consume twice as much—the reverse was true; growth of softwoods was but 93 percent of cut.

The overall sawtimber growth-cut ratio was 98 to 100—with hardwood sawtimber growth 1.58 times the cut but softwood sawtimber growth only 77 percent of cut. On one thin, meaningless statistic hangs the absurd Republican claim that there is a favorable balance between the growth and cutting of America's trees.

The Democratic Party has not claimed that due to its policies, for the first time the growth and cutting of America's trees is in favorable balance. Why has it not?

The answer is plain. The technical experts on forestry say that "overall growth-cut comparisons have little significance."

I ask unanimous consent that the pertinent portions setting forth this position in "Timber for America's Future," pages 55–56, and table 36 be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the extracts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OVERALL GROWTH-CUT COMPARISONS HAVE LITTLE SIGNIFICANCE

One of the most natural comparisons to make in attempting to appraise in simplified terms the complex timber situation is to determine whether growth exceeds, or is less than, cut. Total growth has been compared frequently with total cut in the past by interested groups including the Forest Service, but this is gross oversimplification and unless carefully qualified and explained may well mislead the reader or conceal important relations.

There are four main reasons why an overall growth-cut relationship has relatively little significance:

1. The mature old-growth forests of the West are still being cut. These forests show little net growth, but heavy volumes. Until these old-growth areas are harvested and replaced by new second-growth forests, it can be expected that cut will continue to exceed growth in the West. To incorporate this unusual growth-cut relationship into overall national figures would be inappropriate.

2. Growth-cut relationships between hardwoods and softwoods are significantly different and softwood and hardwood species are not generally interchangeable in their merchantability and utility. In overall comparisons adverse softwood relationships may be overbalanced by favorable hardwood relationships, thus concealing softwood deficits.

3. Equally important or perhaps more important than whether growth exceeds, or is less than, cut is the level at which such relationship occurs. In other words, a balance between growth and cut at 1952 levels is of little significance if future requirements will bring a demand for cut (and growth to meet it) at much higher levels.

To carry the illustration to an extreme, there would be a balance between growth and cut if there were no growth and no cut. A balance is not significant unless it is at a sufficiently high level to meet the country's needs. As is shown later, growth needs to increase greatly over present levels in order to meet projected demand.

4. Growth-cut relationships are frequently different depending on whether they are expressed in terms of sawtimber or growing stock. Usually growing-stock growth-cut ratios are more favorable than those for sawtimber. In other words, growth-cut ratios are better when merchantable trees of all sizes are considered than when consideration is given only to the larger and generally higher quality trees. So long as most of the cut comes from sawtimber (84 percent), whereas growth is more equally distributed among the large and the small trees, the tendency is for timber to decline in average size. In this situation, an excess of growing-stock growth over cut will appear when sawtimber growth and cut are no more than in balance. If sawtimber ratios are favorable, growing-stock ratios are likely to be even more so; but a favorable growing-stock ratio may be misleading if the sawtimber relations are not also considered. That is why growth-cut information for sawtimber is more significant than that for growing stock.

In view of the above qualifications, the more significant growth-cut comparisons—although all are deficient with respect to the question of whether they are at adequate levels—are those pertaining to eastern softwood and eastern hardwood sawtimber, and by these groups for the North and the South. Growth-cut ratios for western species have little meaning.

TABLE 36.—*Growth and cut by softwood and hardwood, and by section, 1952*

Species group and section	Growing stock			Live sawtimber		
	Growth	Cut	Ratio of growth to cut [1]	Growth	Cut	Ratio of growth to cut [1]
	Billion cu. ft.	*Billion cu. ft.*		*Billion bd. ft.*	*Billion bd. ft.*	
Softwood:						
North	0.82	0.70	1.17	2.47	2.37	1.04
South	3.56	3.05	1.17	14.50	11.72	1.24
West and coastal Alaska	2.63	3.74	.70	11.04	22.46	.49
Total	7.01	7.49	.93	28.01	36.55	.77
Hardwood:						
North	3.84	1.24	3.10	9.60	4.33	2.21
South	3.24	2.01	1.62	9.52	7.88	1.21
West and coastal Alaska	.15	.02	6.48	.27	.08	3.31
Total	7.23	3.27	2.21	19.39	12.29	1.58

[1] Ratios computed before rounding.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, while the claim that overall growth and cut are in balance could have been made for 1952, the fact remains that it is meaningless. I know of no other reports which have been published by the United States Forest Service which lend any credence to the Republican contention that a favorable overall balance between timber occurred for the first time during the Eisenhower administration's tenure. I also point out again that in 1958 the Forest Service said any such comparison has little significance.

What is our real timber situation? The Forest Service published 22 highlights of our timber situation on pages 102–109 of their report. I shall list the headings because they show the facts in a striking manner:

First. "Continued Expansion of the Nation's Economy Is Expected."

Second. "Potential Demand for Timber Products Is Strikingly Upward."

Third. "The United States Must Continue to Rely Chiefly on Domestic Timber Resources."

Fourth. "The Nation Has no Surplus of Commercial Forest Land."

Fifth. "One-fourth of the Forest Land Is Poorly Stocked or Nonstocked."

Sixth. "Three-fourths of the Forest Land Is in the East, but Two-thirds of the Sawtimber Volume Is in the West."

Seventh. "Total Timber Volumes are About the Same as in 1945."

Eighth. "Heavy Reliance is Placed on a Small Group of Species."

Ninth. "Timber Quality Is Declining."

Tenth. "Timber Growth Is Increasing."

Eleventh. "Most Eastern Species Now Have Favorable Growth-cut Ratios."

Twelfth. "One-fourth of Timber Cut Is Not Utilized."

Thirteenth. "Destructive Agents, Principally Insects and Disease, Take Extraordinary Toll."

Fourteenth. "Fifty-two Million Acres Need Planting."

Fifteenth. "Forest Productivity Poorest on Small Farm and 'Other' Private Ownerships, Especially in the South."

Sixteenth. "Forest Productivity Best on Public and Forest Industry Ownerships."

Seventeenth. "Inadequate Stocking Is the Most Significant Factor in Reducing Productivity of Recently Cut Land."

Eighteenth. "Improved Stocking, Control of Destructive Agents, Accelerated Planting, and Better Utilization Are the Four Best Possibilities of Increasing Timber Supplies."

Nineteenth. "The Key to Adequate Timber Supplies in the Future Lies With the 4.5 Million Farm and 'Other' Private Holdings."

Twentieth. "Growth Needed To Sustain Future Timber Demands Is Much Greater Than 1952 Growth."

Twenty-first. "Projected Growth Is Far Short of Needs."

Twenty-second. "The Overall Outlook."

For point 22, I ask unanimous consent that the entire section be printed at this point.

There being no objection, the section was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

22. THE OVERALL OUTLOOK

1. The Nation's need for timber to supply demands of a growing population will be strikingly greater than today or at any time in the past. If per capita use of timber products increases only 4 percent by 2000 as indicated by medium projections of demand, total wood consumption will be 83 percent greater than in 1952, primarily because of an estimated 75-percent increase in population. There is the potential to meet that need if forestry knowledge and skills are applied promptly and with utmost vigor and determination.

2. There is sufficient standing timber, plus what will be grown, to supply either medium or lower timber demands each year until 2000. This cannot be done, however, without serious adverse impacts on timber inventories and growth unless there are much more rapid advancements in forestry than indicated by recent trends.

3. There is no timber famine in the offing, but some shortages can be expected, especially of softwood sawtimber of the preferred species and grades, and especially after 1975. There is no danger of timber becoming a surplus crop.

4. Prompt and very substantial expansion and intensification of forestry in the United States is necessary if timber shortages are to be avoided by 2000. This is due to increases in future timber demands over present consumption—largely because of expected expansion of the population rather than increases in per capita demand. The necessary intensification in forestry will have to be in addition to what could be expected by extending the trends in forestry improvements of recent years. This acceleration in forestry will have to come soon, and very largely within the next two decades, because otherwise it will be too late for the effects to be felt by 2000. The degree of forestry intensification needed is much larger and far greater than the general public or most experts are believed to have visualized.

5. If there is a 15-percent reduction in sawtimber consumption per capita and if there could be a drastic switch in the consumption pattern from softwoods to hardwoods, timber removal and growth could be kept in balance after 1975 even if there is no intensification of forestry beyond recent trends.

6. The American people may find themselves getting along with somewhat less timber than would be needed to meet medium projected timber demand, and there may be a rise in the price of timber products in relation to competing materials.

7. The effects, if they occur, of not meeting timber demands, of growth deficiencies, of shortages in some softwood species, sizes, and grades, and rises in relative price probably will not be felt very much until after 1975.

8. Much progress has been made in forestry in recent years. The undesirable effects of not meeting timber demand and of rising prices need not occur if the American people achieve within the next few years a degree of forestry on all commercial forest land roughly equivalent to that which is practiced today on the better managed lands.

Forestry is not a short-time proposition. Where this Nation stands in timber supply in the year 2000 will depend largely on actions taken during the next two decades. Recent encouraging forestry trends must continue. But this is not enough. Acceleration of these trends is vital, and to a degree that will startle many of us. There

are no grounds for complacency. If the timber resources of the Nation are to be reasonably abundant at the end of the century and if our children and their children are to enjoy the same timber abundance that we ourselves know, standards and sights must be raised. The potential of the land is adequate. The opportunity is there.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I think the record speaks for itself. What has the Republican administration done to hinder private forestry? It has attempted to eliminate from the budget funds provided by the Clarke-McNary Act for Federal-State cooperative tree planting and forest management. This was in the fiscal year 1955 budget. For fiscal 1961, it has cut back cooperative tree planting funds to two-thirds of the amount available in 1952.

The administration attempted to cut back the funds for cooperative firefighting assistance to the States in fiscal 1955 and 1956.

Here is an interesting item appearing in the Republican policy statement:

Teamwork between Federal, State, and private entities is essential and should be continued.

It was a Democratic Congress in 1943 which revised the Internal Revenue Tax Code to provide legislation designed to aid timber companies in the practice of forestry. Some tax experts say the aid was not justified. The timber companies say it is. I do not seek at this time to pass judgment, but to my knowledge it is the only Federal tax relief for forestry purposes afforded timber companies. It occurred under a Democratic administration with a Democratic Congress. I do not know of one Republican-initiated measure to aid private forestry that has become law in the last 8 years. These 8 years have been used by the Republican administration to try to destroy the forest policies developed by the great Republican Senator Charles L. McNary.

Turning to public forestry on our national forests, the situation is the same.

Secretary Benson's vaunted "Program for the National Forests," submitted in 1959, is a classic example of the Republican substitution of talk for action. Secretary Benson said he was going to start this program in fiscal year 1961 with a $41.3 million increase in fund requests. The Congress thought so well of the program that it acted ahead of the Benson schedule, and over his protest, to provide in excess of $10 million in fiscal year 1960 to advance the program 1 year with 25 percent of the needed increase.

The fiscal year 1961 Eisenhower-Nixon-Benson budget was $18.5 million short of the needed money outlined by Mr. Benson just 1 year ago. Congress added an additional $4.5 million to this budget request.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE] published tables in the RECORD on June 8 which show that in the period fiscal years 1955–61 the Republican budget requests for the national forests have totaled over $150 million below Forest Service estimates of needs. Congress has added $37.5 million to these inadequate requests. The Republican budget for the national forests for fiscal year 1961 proposed only sufficient money for 42.7 percent of the maximum funds needed for the "Program for the National Forests."

On forest development roads, four times this administration has opposed increases in the authorization. Four times Congress has made increases from $24 million in the 83d Congress to $40 million in the 86th Congress. Four times the Republican administration has opposed an increased authorization for forest highways. Congress had raised the authorization from $22.5 million in the 83d Congress to $33 million in the 86th Congress.

By excessive reliance on timber purchasers for forest development road construction on national forest timber sales, this administration has reduced national forest revenues by close to $260 million in the period of fiscal 1953–61. This has had the effect of denying the 682 national forest land counties $65 million in payments in lieu of taxes prescribed by law for public schools and public roads. This is but one of many examples of how this administration has disregarded its responsibilities. In 1953, its first year in power, the counties lost $2.5 million. This is double the average annual losses in the 1940–52 era. By fiscal year 1961 the annual county school and road losses had climbed to almost $12 million.

With its misguided policies for the national forests this administration even manages to damage local government.

During its 8 years in power this administration has done less about reducing the backlog of national forest lands needing reforestation than any national administration since Coolidge's.

Franklin D. Roosevelt reduced the backlog of national forest lands needing reforestation by 223,000 acres in 1 year. This is almost as much as this Republican administration has done in 8 years.

The acid test is not whether one administration did more than its predecessor. The test of history is, Did this administration fulfill its obligation to America's future?

By any measure you wish to apply, the Eisenhower-Nixon-Benson administration has failed to meet its obligations to future generations.

By using the misleading and insignificant fact that timber cut and growth is technically in balance, the Republican Party trys to create the illusion that all is well in our forests.

It is the future that counts, not the past—the Republican Party was conceived in the past. It lives in the past. The Republican Party does not know how to honor an obligation to the future of America.

In 1950, Lyle Watts, then Chief of the Forest Service, said:

Our generation has an obligation to the next, to use its resources wisely and not hand our children a depleted, wornout country.

In 1958, Dr. Richard McArdle, the present Chief of the Forest Service, said:

Within the next 10 years 48 billion trees need to be planted, mainly on small ownerships, if the wood requirements of a larger population are to be met by the year 2000.

In 1960, in testimony before the Senate Appropriations Committee, Chief McArdle, speaking of the national forests, said:

I am very unhappy with the progress we are making in reforesting the more than 4 million acres in the national forest system which should be planted. They are not producing timber they should produce. They are not serving watersheds. They are not serving recreational purposes. They are not serving the public in any way that they should. This is not the kind of statement I would like to make to you, Senator, or to this committee; but you asked me my opinion, and I am telling it to you frankly.

Mr. President, if a homebuilder put a plank in an FHA-insured house of as low a quality as this Republican platform plank, even under this administration, it would fail the FHA inspection.

The Republican forestry plank fails the American people.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

Address entitled "Some Aspects of American Foreign Policy," delivered by Senator FULBRIGHT before American Bar Association, Washington, D.C., on September 1, 1960.

By Mr. FONG:

Letter written by him, addressed to the Honorable FRANCIS E. WALTER, chairman, Immigration and Nationality Subcommittee, House of Representatives, relating to discrimination against the peoples of Asia in immigration matters.

FUNDS FOR FIRE PREVENTION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have received a telegram dated August 30 from Mr. Howard Miller, president of Harney County Stockgrowers, Burns, Oreg., in which he alludes to the importance of undertaking the reseeding of burned-over rangelands.

For 8 long years this administration has opposed adequate funds for fire prevention. It has opposed adequate funds for natural resource development. It has opposed adequate funds for range rehabilitation.

The people are becoming aware of these facts as this year's critical fire season exposes the inadequacy of our defenses against forest fires.

I am sure that administration apologists will be able to conjur up some figures to show that these have been the best 8 years for conservation. They can recite ritual to the effect that anyone who criticizes the Republican record on conservation does not serve the national interest.

The facts speak for themselves. Year after year Congress has had to restore national resource program cuts or try to increase inadequate budget requests. For 8 years the Democrats have had their hands full just trying to keep the conservation ship from floundering on the shoals of indifference. It is time for

the Nation to select a new captain who understands conservation and wise use of our national resources.

The record of the Democratic Congress clearly shows that our party has such leadership.

I ask unanimous consent that the telegram to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BURNS, OREG.,
August 30, 1960.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

Range fires burned 40,000 acres Harney County of which 30,000 acres Federal lands. Imperative emergency funds be made available to 7,000 acres BLM lands. Conservation of soil necessary. Seeding should start early September. Your assistance needed. Thanks,

HOWARD MILLER,
President, Harney County Stockgrowers.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN PROPERTY TO THE STATE OF HAWAII

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD my reasons for opposing the transfer, without compensation, of certain land in Hawaii. I imagine that the bill for that purpose will be introduced again in the next session of Congress. I hope that in the interval the two Senators from Hawaii will talk to their constituents about it, because this bill violates the Morse formula.

There are many Senators who have had similar land transfers who have accommodated themselves to the Morse formula. Just the other day the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] accepted the Morse formula in regard to a somewhat similar transfer in Kentucky. I hope that when the Senators from Hawaii come back next January it will not be necessary for me to object to the bill again, but that the Morse formula will have been written into it when it is introduced at that time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MORSE

S. 3269 would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey, without consideration, a roadway consisting of approximately 33 acres to the State of Hawaii. Report No. 1859 on this bill indicates that the Government acquired the property in question in 1945 by condemnation at a cost of approximately $13,000 for the purpose of servicing various naval storage facilities.

The Department of the Navy is now studying the legal question of whether the roadway could be conveyed to Hawaii pursuant to section 5(e) of the Hawaii Statehood Act (Public Law 86-3). Such a determination has not yet been made.

In view of the fact that this roadway would be conveyed to the State for public purposes, a payment of 50 percent of fair market value should be made. An amendment to achieve that purpose is attached.

"On the first page, lines 5 and 6, strike out 'convey by quitclaim deed, without consideration,' and insert in lieu thereof 'and in return for the payment of an amount equal to 50 per centum of the market value of property conveyed as determined by the Secretary after appraisal, convey by quitclaim deed'.

THE PENNSYLVANIA RAILROAD STRIKE

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, last night I made a statement concerning the seriousness of the threatened strike on the Pennsylvania Railroad. I am confident that all the Members of the Congress, both in the House and the Senate, recognize the seriousness of this situation. There is a question as to whether or not there are adequate laws whereby the Government can stop this strike if it is not agreeably settled between labor and management. I feel that the majority and minority leaders should confer with the executive branch to see whether or not there are adequate laws with which the administration can handle this situation, which is unquestionably a national emergency. If there are not adequate tools to deal with this problem, then Congress should stay in session and enact legislation with which to deal with it.

I am not taking any position with reference to the merits of the dispute as between management or labor. I do not think it is a question only of whether management or labor is right. The public interest goes beyond that of either labor or management. The interest of the general public is paramount. I do not think that, in the interest of the welfare of the American public, we can sit idly by and have the largest railroad system in this country shut down, with the resultant chaotic conditions.

The time to take action is now and not after the damage has been done.

Down in my area, the Delmarva Peninsula is supplied by this one railroad. There are several hundred carloads a day of feed that are needed to feed our poultry and animals, because it is an area that is deficient in the production of feed grains. It is impossible to move those feed grains from the Midwest by truck. We all know what will happen if the strike is not settled and the railroad is shut down. In New York, Philadelphia and other eastern Pennsylvania cities, the delivery of food supplies will be disrupted. This is a situation which should be dealt with before Congress adjourns and it is my understanding there is a serious question as to whether or not we have adequate laws to cope with the situation.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I, too, wish to make some remarks on this subject this morning. When collective bargaining breaks down, as the Senator from Delaware has so properly noted, the public interest steps in. In the steel strike the President appointed a group to make findings of fact, and the prestige of the President was therefore thrown into the fray to settle the strike. Public opinion is the one thing which speaks out, but public opinion has to be expressed in order to make itself heard. Therefore, as the Senator from Delaware has suggested, additional law is needed, we should not go home until we enact it.

Secondly, I hope the President of the United States will now give his attention to the very grave emergency, in order to set into motion some factfinding machinery that will bring about a settlement of the strike. We know it is a time for statesmanship by labor and management, but we also know it is public opinion which is necessary in order to bring the matter to a point where it can be settled. I have suggested one way, and the Senator from Delaware has suggested another.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator from New York. I hope labor and management will get together and agree to keep the railroad running pending a final settlement. While it is not a public utility, the Pennsylvania Railroad has a monopoly on transportation in our area, and both labor and management have a responsibility to the general public.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, the crisis in the Congo and in other areas of the world should make the country awake to its responsibilities to conditions here and to the strike on the Pennsylvania Railroad. It is incumbent on us to seek a settlement which is fair to labor and management. We should not condone, but correct.

TRIBUTES TO LEADERSHIP, SENATORS, AND STAFF MEMBERS

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, this could conceivably be my last day in the Senate as a Member of this body. I certainly hope it is not. Should that misfortune come to me, I wish to express before I leave my great admiration for the leader of our side of the aisle, Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, and for the leader on the other side of the aisle, Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN, plus the two men who have very ably assisted them, Senator MIKE MANSFIELD and Senator TOM KUCHEL. I think there has been no time I have gone to any of them and been denied a reasonable request. They have been cooperative not only with me but, in my observation, with all the other Members of the Senate. They deserve praise, not criticism.

Mr. President, I also wish to state that the staff members who have been working on this floor have been most cordial, most cooperative, and always at one's service. To them I express my sincere thanks and appreciation.

I observe the chairmen of the two major committees on which I serve are on the floor today, Senator BYRD of Virginia, and Senator ROBERTSON, of Virginia. There have been times, Mr. President, during my tenure in the Senate, when agreement was not always had between the chairman of a committee and the junior Senator from Delaware, but nevertheless these Senators have always given me my day in court. They have given me the permission to talk, sometimes at more length than I deserved. They have at no time denied a reasonable request.

Senator BIBLE, of Nevada, the chairman of the District of Columbia Committee, is not on the floor now, but he also has been a very good friend of mine and has worked hard for the people of the District of Columbia although they are not his constituents.

Mr. President, we have had a long session. We have probably set a record on yea-and-nay votes. This has been a session which has challenged every Member of the Senate. It has been one which has been interesting not only for us but also for the people.

I agree with the leadership that it is time we go back to our States. This is probably the day we shall go.

In conclusion, I express again my sincere thanks to all of those with whom I have had contact during these 12 years of delightful service as a Member of the U.S. Senate.

CIVIL RIGHTS AND RULE XXII

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, this will probably be the final day of this session of Congress. I simply wish to say a word in explanation about what may have seemed to some Members of the Senate to be a rather undue insistence on my part, in constantly bringing before the Senate the civil rights issue.

I point out that there is now on the calendar, under the heading of "Resolutions and Motions Over Under the Rule," Senate Resolution 386, which I submitted, a resolution discharging the Committee on the Judiciary from further consideration of S. 958, relative to school desegregation programs.

Mr. President, my aim was to pictorialize and to place before the leadership in the Senate an opportunity for dealing with and bringing up civil rights legislation. That aim has been realized in these last days of the session, which I thought was perfectly appropriate, by the resolution which is on the calendar.

My purposes in so doing have been twofold. First, I wished to emphasize the fact that this issue deserves to rank with equal priority with any other issue on which we have acted in this brief session or on which we have failed to act, be it minimum wage legislation, health care for the aged, or ratification of the Antarctic Treaty. Second, I wished to emphasize to the Senate a point which will come up early next year, which I should like to make my closing subject upon this issue to the Senate.

We are bound to have, in the atmosphere we face today, grave difficulties and serious disorders in parts of the South today. When one fails to give tongue, when one fails to give an opportunity for expression, to the deeply held frustrations and the deeply held beliefs of difficulties people feel they experience, Mr. President, one is bound to have what results from any suppression, which is some kind of an outbreak in an extra legal way.

Mr. President, the whole purpose of people like myself in asking for debate and consideration and a fair appraisal of important legislation in this field is to give tongue to what man's aspirations require.

Mr. President, I have been pressing for action with respect to the school desegregation issue. Is it not much better that whatever is done in that field shall be done under governmental auspices, with an outlet for what the law requires in an orderly and considered way—indeed, in a moderate way—than that people should feel somehow or other they must take the law in their own hands, since they cannot get anywhere any other way? This has been the experience of government for centuries.

I thought it might be well to put the matter in focus as this short session comes to a close, in which session we have done nothing about the problem, notwithstanding the state of tension which exists in such an important and valued part of our country.

Finally, Mr. President, I should like to state that when we return to session in January there is no question about the fact that a group of us, I believe on both sides of the aisle, will open the effort to deal with rule XXII.

Mr. President, the imbedded opportunities for extended debate or filibuster, as it is called, allowed by that rule represents the primary reason, at every stage, why we cannot proceed effectively in the field of civil rights legislation and why we cannot proceed in other fields which are very desirable, in my view, for the national interest. So the struggle will open, Mr. President. Let no one be confused as to that. The struggle will begin at the opening of the Congress in January 1961, to amend rule XXII, I hope in accordance with the Douglas plan. This will unquestionably be followed, before the session is very much older, by affirmative civil rights legislation, certainly, as a minimum of the kind which the President has asked for, and I hope more extensive than that, to implement the agreed upon positions taken by both political parties in their platforms.

ADDRESS BY ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the other day I read with a great deal of interest a copy of the address of Mr. Arthur J. Goldberg, special counsel, AFL–CIO, and general counsel, United Steelworkers of America, given on the occasion of an award with which he was honored by Roosevelt University, Chicago, Ill. Mr. Goldberg gave an outstanding address and I believe it merits careful consideration by my colleagues. I invite to their attention particularly Mr. Goldberg's comments suggesting the establishment of a permanent National Council of Labor-Management Advisers, tripartite in nature, to advise the President and to make recommendations to him in the area of broad policy matters relating to labor-management relations. In this connection, Mr. Goldberg states:

> The purpose of the Council should be to try to restore that sense of common purpose which we had during the war and which we need so desperately now.
>
> The Council, out of their experience, should seek to recommend bold and imaginative programs to encourage the Nation's economic growth and health, and to advance both our business enterprise and our labor movement. It should seek to develop programs for reconciling the great benefits to be derived from automation and the great burdens in human terms which develop from the impact of automation. It should seek to define the role of Government and of management and of labor in implementing our national goal of achieving full production and full employment.
>
> In addition to this role of advising and recommending programs to the President for submission to the Congress, the Council should formulate programs for management and labor to follow in advancing industrial peace and minimizing industrial conflict.

Mr. President, I wish to commend Mr. Goldberg for this speech, which I consider to be industrial statesmanship on his part.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of Mr. Goldberg's address of August 17 be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG, SPECIAL COUNSEL, AFL–CIO GENERAL COUNSEL, UNITED STEELWORKERS OF AMERICA, ROOSEVELT UNIVERSITY, CHICAGO, ILL., AUGUST 17, 1960

I am honored by this award of Roosevelt University and grateful to my friends and colleagues who have joined in tendering me this dinner.

This affair, happily, has a larger purpose than the presentation to me. It celebrates the 15th anniversary of the establishment of Roosevelt University which, in this short period, has truly met Disraeli's test of a university: "a place of light, of liberty, and of learning."

President Sparling, the founder and distinguished head of Roosevelt, has, on this and many other occasions, generously acknowledged the support of the American labor movement to the university, symbolized by grants from the William Green Memorial Fund, the Philip Murray Memorial Foundation, the Sidney Hillman Foundation, and many international and local unions of the AFL–CIO. In supporting the university, the labor movement has, in a practical way, implemented its objective, expressed in the AFL–CIO constitution: "to promote * * * the education of the labor movement and to protect and strengthen our democratic institutions and enjoyment of the rights and liberties to which we are justly entitled and to preserve and perpetuate the cherished traditions of our democracy."

Roosevelt University is doing pioneering and outstanding work in the field of labor education under the fine leadership of Frank McCallister. And Roosevelt's very existence arises from the determination of President Sparling, and the other founders of the institution, to forward the democratic ideal of civil rights for all our citizens.

During the last 15 years the labor movement and Roosevelt have joined in many common undertakings to advance our democratic ideals by joint programs of combating discrimination and advancing workers' education.

From its very beginnings, labor leaders have participated in the governing body of this great educational institution. Three of Roosevelt's trustees are representatives of labor—certainly to be favorably compared to a grand total of about 15 labor board members in all institutions of higher education in our country. Thousands of national and local union officers and members have benefited from participation in Roosevelt's courses and training programs.

Roosevelt University is not indebted to the labor movement—the labor movement is indebted to Roosevelt University for its gen-

erous recognition of the role and interest of labor in higher education.

I hope that this celebration of the 15th anniversary of the establishment of Roosevelt University will stimulate more substantial participation and support by labor to Roosevelt and to other institutions of higher learning throughout the United States.

From its very beginnings, the labor movement in this country has been a stanch champion of our country's public educational system. Today, in every State legislature, in every local community, and in our National Congress, the AFL–CIO, its affiliated unions, and its central bodies, are in the forefront of the fight to obtain much-needed aid to education. The meeting of the executive council of the AFL–CIO, just concluded here in Chicago, urgently has called for the overdue enactment by the Congress of an aid-to-education bill.

President Meany, on behalf of the labor movement, has on many occasions stated the willingness of the members of the AFL–CIO to bear their fair share of the tax burden involved in providing an educational system adequate to meet the needs of our growing and expanding population and the burdens which the space age imposes upon present and future school generations.

I venture the hope that the labor movement will intensify its support to that necessary and essential part of our higher educational system represented by our private colleges and universities, so well exemplified by Roosevelt University.

These private institutions, properly called liberal colleges, are not supported by tax dollars. They must carry on with private contributions and endowments. Yet our country, as well as the labor movement, cannot get along without them. They play an indispensable role in our overall system of higher education. They provide for the educational needs of hundreds of thousands of our young men and women, most of whom are the sons and daughters of working people. Even more importantly, our private colleges and universities are the symbols and examples of free and independent scholarship, necessary for a truly liberal education.

The AFL–CIO itself, its international unions and their local bodies, and foundations sponsored by the labor movement, are contributing generously to private colleges and universities through grants and scholarships. There are, of course, many demands upon a worker's pay envelope. Yet, let us reflect upon the fact that if the members of the AFL–CIO were to contribute as little as 10 cents per member each week for higher education, the AFL–CIO could establish its own educational foundation and make grants totalling $70 million a year toward higher education in America.

It is to the credit of American corporations, with a slight assist from the tax laws, that they have recognized the stake of business in higher education. I trust that the labor movement will increasingly recognize its own obligations in this important aspect of American life.

When Roosevelt University was established 15 years ago, World War II had just ended. Overnight, a peace-loving America demobilized its 15 million citizens army. We cut back our enormous wartime budget. We curtailed the manufacture of ships and arms and we scaled down our weapons research and development programs. We did this in our understandable anxiety to return to our traditional, peaceful way of life.

As part of this demobilization, we also dismantled the wartime agencies established in the management-labor area to further the war effort. We disestablished the War Labor Board—that great tripartite agency which so effectively implemented the voluntary no-strike, no-lockout pledge on the part of labor and management. We terminated the War Manpower Commission and the War Production Board, which, largely through voluntary means, and by cooperation between labor and management, mobilized our manpower and our industrial plant and made this Nation a great arsenal of democracy.

Freedom-loving Americans have learned the hard way that we too precipitately and naively demobilized our Army and armament, in light of the threat continuing to this day to the free world by the totalitarians in the Kremlin.

By referring to the demobilization of our wartime agencies, I do not want to express or imply that we wrongly terminated these labor-management agencies. On the contrary, it was again a testimonial to our devotion to peace and freedom that we ended all wartime controls over business and labor as quickly as we did.

I do mean to express my regret that, in terminating these wartime labor agencies, we too hastily abandoned that sense of common interest and mutual purpose of labor and management which provided such substantial support for our war effort.

During the war, both labor and management were truly conscious of President Franklin D. Roosevelt's admonition that "heedless self-interest is not only bad morals, but also bad economics"—an admonition which still holds true today.

In expressing concern that labor and management, along with the rest of our people have lost some of the single-minded dedication of World War II war years, I do not denigrate the great achievements of both free industry and free labor in the last 15 years, operating without the inspirational uplift which motivates all people in a great common crisis.

Our industrial plant has been tremendously improved during the last decade and a half, under our free enterprise system and the leadership of business.

Our collective bargaining process, during the same period has played a tremendously productive role in bringing about a better life for the people of our country. In these collective bargaining advances, I am proud that our free trade unions have led the way.

In the last 15 years a drastic departure has been made from the traditional put it in the pay packet attitude of collective bargaining. The major achievements of collective bargaining, since 1949 particularly, have been in the fringe area. The word "fringe" is an unprepossessing word, but it serves as an umbrella which covers gains and accomplishments of tremendous social importance.

Before the great report of the Daugherty-Cole-Rosenman steel board of 1949, collectively bargained pension plans were negligible. Today, millions of American workers, organized and unorganized, have company-paid pension plans. I can tell you from my own experience in steel, that these plans, supplementing inadequate social security benefits, represent the vast difference between a worker retiring in dignity and one retiring in want. Not only do these plans provide valuable additions to social security, but also they have stimulated the improvement of social security itself so that the unorganized, as well as the organized, segments of the work force have benefited from the successful advances negotiated by the labor unions.

In the area of social insurance encompassing hospitalization, sick benefits, medical care and the like, results have been even more spectacular, due to the lack of any substantial Government programs. In 1949, there were very few insurance programs in existence in American industry providing for these needs, and what did exist were almost totally paid for by the employees themselves. Now, under the plans prevalent in many industries and negotiated by collective bargaining, workers enjoy comprehensive hospitalization and surgical protection, life insurance, sickness and accident benefits—all of them fully paid for by the employers. Here too, the existence of these plans, like the existence of private, collectively bargained pension plans, has stimulated prospects of improving social security so that a worker, upon retiring, will be protected in his health needs. These developments, and others which could be mentioned, like supplementary unemployment benefits, have had extraordinarily beneficial impacts upon the security and well-being of the American worker and his family.

In a world at peace and progressing at a normal pace, we could continue to rely upon our normal and traditional processes in both labor and management. But we have not won the peace and the world is not moving at a normal pace. We are confronted with both the cold war and the accelerated pace of automation.

We live in an age of revolutionary technological change and in an age of extraordinary international tension.

Traditional practices, which have served us so well, and which would continue to do so if we were really at peace, must be adapted to a period where our whole way of life is being challenged. Traditional practices, which served us so well, must be adapted to an age when our industrial society is being transformed by technological advance.

Both the Democratic and Republican platforms, recently adopted, recognize these facts.

The Soviet Union pursues twin objectives of perpetuating the cold war and, at the same time, transforming its industrial and economic life. To meet this challenge, America must make sure that both our military establishment and our industrial way of life remain superior in all respects to the Russians. In doing so, we must be conscious at all times that our objective is not the same as the Russians—even as stated in their own propaganda terms. On the contrary, as the Democratic platform so well says: "Our objective, however, is not the right to coexist in armed camps on the same planet with totalitarian ideologies; it is the creation of an enduring peace in which the universal values of human dignity, truth, and justice in law are finally secured for all men everywhere on earth."

With respect to safeguarding and strengthening our military security, labor and management can play their part as citizens by supporting our public programs designed to this end. I am proud of the record of the labor movement in this regard.

To meet the challenge of an automation age, labor and management can make a unique and indispensable contribution. American business and American labor must jointly recognize two important facts. One is that automation is necessary and indispensable if we are to remain the greatest industrial producing country of the world. Labor must recognize this and business too.

It is not generally appreciated that a significant part of our industrial plant in America is antiquated. Responsible economists have estimated that more than $75 billion of our $300 billion worth of plant and equipment is obsolete or rapidly becoming so. Business must accelerate the rate of plant and equipment improvement and replacement.

The labor movement on its part should be prepared to support proper programs to stimulate the rapid replacement of this obsolete plant and equipment and should take a fresh look at programs designed to stimulate this necessary business activity.

On the other hand, business must face up to the fact that in these modern times and with a modern labor movement, human values must be preserved in an automation age. We cannot tolerate the abuses which took place during the first industrial revolution. Business must recognize that we must

develop the necessary programs to insure that the blessings of automation do not become the burdens of widespread unemployment. The business community must recognize that neither business alone, nor labor alone, nor both of them in collective bargaining, can meet all of the problems arising from automation, and that public programs are necessary to protect against the hardship and suffering which can result from automation.

Our country cannot maintain its leadership of the free world with recurring recessions, with permanent unemployment and underemployment, and with waste of our unused plant capacity and manpower. Our economic health and that of the world depends upon an America fully utilizing its great technological and human resources. We need this at home and we need this abroad. We must always remember that the first basis of a sound foreign policy is a sound and healthy way of life at home—a way of life possible only with a high rate of economic growth and development.

In recognition of the fact that these extraordinary times require the restoration of the same sense of common purpose which labor and management achieved in World War II, President Meany, on behalf of the labor movement, made a formal proposal to President Eisenhower for a labor-management conference to discuss important issues in the labor-management field on a broader basis than is possible in collective bargaining. Meetings looking to this end are now under way and I am sure are being hopefully looked to by all thinking citizens.

I should like this evening to make a proposal for the consideration of the labor-management meetings which are taking place. I am sure that everyone here will understand that this proposal is a personal one which reflects no one's thinking but my own—not George Meany's, nor Walter Reuther's, nor George Harrison's, who are conducting the discussions for labor—and perhaps I should add, in light of my own personal, political activities, not those of the Democratic candidate for the Presidency.

I propose that the labor-management meetings give consideration to recommending to the new administration, which will take office next January, the establishment of a permanent National Council of Labor-Management Advisers. This Council, in my view, should be tripartite in character, consisting of an equal number of representatives of labor, management, and the public.

Tripartitism proved its value in World War II. I do not have to tell this audience of the great contributions made by such men as Dr. George Taylor, Dr. Frank Graham, Bill Davis, Wayne Morse, and others too numerous to mention.

I would suggest that the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Commerce and the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers be ex officio members of this Council.

To insure the participation of top representatives of labor and management, the members of the Council should not be required to serve full time, but, rather, expected to devote as much time as the important functions of the Council require. Surely, we can rely on the patriotism and sense of duty of the members of the Council to guarantee this. The Council, however, in my view, should have a permanent and adequate full-time staff, recruited, like the members of the Council, on a tripartite basis from the best men and women available in these segments of our society.

As its proposed name indicates, the Council should advise the President; its value would be that it is a Presidential Council. Any downgrading of its function would make its work useless and ineffective.

The Council should advise and recommend. It should not be a third legislative body. I am not proposing, nor would I support, any form of corporate state. The Council would not and should not have any political or legislative functions.

The Council should not interfere with our established and tried methods of collective bargaining. It should not take over or infringe on the functions of either labor or management.

I am suggesting an agency to assist in helping our free institutions work in these troubled times, not to displace them.

The Council should not displace or supersede the normal activities of the Department of Labor, the Department of Commerce or the Council of Economic Advisers. The Council should complement and supplement the activities of these established Departments and Agencies of our Government. The essential purpose of the Council, rather, should be to bring the experience and wisdom of labor and management and public experts in the field to the great problems posed to labor, management and the country by the cold war and automation. The purpose of the Council should be to try to restore that sense of common purpose which we had during the war and which we need so desperately now.

The Council, out of their experience, should seek to recommend bold and imaginative programs to encourage the Nation's economic growth and health, and to advance both our business enterprise and our labor movement. It should seek to develop programs for reconciling the great benefits to be derived from automation and the great burdens in human terms which develop from the impact of automation. It should seek to define the role of Government and of management and of labor in implementing our national goal of achieving full production and full employment.

In addition to this role of advising and recommending programs to the President for submission to the Congress, the Council should formulate programs for management and labor to follow in advancing industrial peace and minimizing industrial conflict. One of the means for doing this might be by providing a continuing and expanded basis for the labor-management meetings now under way. The Council might provide the staff for these meetings and the studies necessary for constructive recommendations from the meetings. It might extend these conferences so they will take place both on an industrial and on a local level, thus insuring the participation of top leaders of labor and management in the various industries and localities.

Such a council may very well consider the advisability of convening periodic and enlarged White House conferences of labor and management which will bring to Washington thousands of the men and women at all levels who work day by day in this area. White House conferences have made significant contributions in the fields of education and social security. Similar White House conferences on labor-management problems could, in my opinion, contribute greatly to a better climate between labor and management.

Again, I wish to emphasize that, in all of this, I do not propose to exclude the indispensable role of the Executive and the Congress in formulating and enacting programs, but, rather, I propose to help the President and Congress by bringing the experience and wisdom of both management and labor to bear upon the issues.

There is one operational role which the Council might very well be given. The Council could properly be entrusted with the responsibility of dealing with disputes of the character which we have come to term "national emergency disputes." One dividend of the recent prolonged conflict in steel has been the growing recognition that the Taft-Hartley injunction method is onesided, does not help to settle the underlying dispute and is a wholly unsatisfactory method of dealing with disputes of this character. The President, Secretary Mitchell, Dr. George Taylor of the board of inquiry in the steel dispute, other public officials, labor relations experts, and large sections of the press, have demonstrated their lack of faith in the national emergency injunction provisions. It is clear that we must seek a better way of asserting the public interest in disputes of this character.

One of our most prominent public officials has gone so far as to propose compulsory arbitration as the solution. I must respectfully and emphatically disagree with this proposal. Compulsory arbitration is incompatible with both our free economy and our free labor movement. Compulsory arbitration would have serious and deleterious effects on the functioning of both labor and industry.

My proposal, rather, is that we should return to the concept, symbolized by the War Labor Board, of enlisting eminent men, selected on a tripartite basis and respected for manifest fairness, experience, and patriotism, to help settle great disputes by mediation, factfinding, and recommendations which, though not binding, will help the conflicting parties find satisfactory common solutions to their problems.

In suggesting that the proposed Council handle emergency disputes, in lieu of the present unsatisfactory Taft-Hartley procedures, I want to emphasize that this, in my opinion, should be an incidental, rather than the main purpose of the Council, which should be to advise the President in the development of constructive policies and programs.

I frankly do not know whether or not this proposal of mine has any merit. But whether or not it does, it is highly important that, confronted by powerful challenges, all of us, educators, labor leaders, businessmen, public officials, and citizens, reflect upon the fact that these are extraordinary times and that new and imaginative programs are required for the solution of labor-management problems, as well as the many other problems affecting the country at large.

Out of this reflection undoubtedly will come other and more constructive proposals for developing new programs and constructive solutions from which every American will benefit. There certainly will be differences in our respective approaches, but surely we will all be motivated by a common purpose—a purpose so well stated in the AFL–CIO constitution: "to strengthen and extend our way of life and the fundamental freedoms which are the basis of our democratic society."

NATIONAL ARMED FORCES MUSEUM ADVISORY BOARD

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on August 31, 1960, the Senate kindly granted me unanimous consent for the purpose of inserting in the RECORD a report to President Eisenhower from his Committee on the American Armed Forces Museum.

I had hoped that this material could be inserted in the RECORD at the end of the text of the bill (S. 3846) on page 18588 of the RECORD for that day, but the text was not available immediately, and for that reason I am inserting it at this time:

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Committee which you appointed to consider proposals for the establishment of an American Armed Forces Museum respectfully submits this report.

1. The Committee feels that the magnitude of American military achievement, the greatness of America's contributions in the cause of freedom, and the supreme importance of deterring war in the present age clearly point to the need for an effective and comprehensive museum-type exhibition in Washington, D.C., of the contributions that the Armed Forces of the Nation have made and are making toward creating, developing, and maintaining a free, peaceful, and independent society and culture in the United States. Such an enterprise requires the collection, preservation, and exhibition of military objects of historical significance together with the provision of appropriate means and materials for studying the meaning of war, its effect on civilization, and the role of our Armed Forces in maintaining a just and lasting peace.

2. The Committee believes that such a dynamic museum should give full and comprehensive coverage to American military history beginning with the first colonization. The past, present, and anticipated contributions of all military forces—land, sea, and air—should be included. Within this context the origin and development of particular weapons, military institutions, tactics, and the panoply of warfare peculiar to our Nation should be covered.

As an exhibition dedicated to objective history, it should portray war as realistically as possible. The demands placed upon the full energies of our people, the hardships endured, and the sacrifices called for in order to achieve and maintain our independence and our constant search for world peace should all be clearly demonstrated.

The marshaling of the Nation's total resources in time of war, the broad activities of the homefront and all the related institutions of national security should be depicted. The exhibits should describe the extensive peacetime contributions the Armed Forces have made to the advance of human knowledge in science, nuclear energy, polar and space exploration, electronics, engineering, aeronautics, and medicine. Although the deeds of the Nation's military heroes should be chronicled, great emphasis must also be placed on the contributions and life of the average man and woman of the Armed Forces, and particularly on the contributions of the nonprofessional citizen soldier.

The Committee believes that such an exhibition should have a vital role in interpreting, through dramatic display, significant current and future problems affecting our national security. Exhibits might be featured which deal with the structure and significance to world peace, of NATO and other international security organizations to which the United States is a party, the scientific-political-military significance of earth satellites and outer space exploration, the great advance in weapons technology and their consequences for world peace and national security, and the technical and political problems encountered in devising adequate controls in the use of modern weapons. Through a dynamic educational program which could be extended throughout the Nation by means of radio and television, the exhibition could serve as a great center of public information.

Opportunity for research and scholarly investigation in history should also be provided through a study center containing technical writings in the field of military science and related subjects, documents, and other source materials of use to military analysts and historians. These research materials should in general be related to the objects in the public exhibitions and study collections of the museum. Students should also have access to reference and study collections of artifacts not on public exhibit.

3. Since its earliest days, the Smithsonian Institution has been concerned with the collection, preservation, study, documentation, and exhibition of articles related to military and naval history. For some years the specialized work of the Smithsonian Institution in this field has been organized as a department of Armed Forces History, now in the Museum of History and Technology. In addition, significant military exhibits in the fields of aeronautics and space have been included in the program of the National Air Museum since its establishment by the Congress in 1946.

Since the military collections of the Smithsonian Institution are divided between the Museum of History and Technology and the National Air Museum, their essential responsibilities, plans and interrelationships require brief comment: The National Air Museum is specialized in its work. It was authorized by the Congress to "memorialize the national development of aviation," without distinction between military and civilian. The National Aeronautical Collections include both military and civilian developments and equipment and the Air Museum concerns itself with the entire development of aviation, not exclusively with militarily important applications of aviation. In light of this the Air Museum features the "famous firsts," military or civilian, and supplements the exhibits of the Museum of History and Technology with typical and progressive examples of applied aeronautical developments adapted for military use. Plans are now being prepared by the Air Museum for a permanent building on the Mall between Fourth and Seventh Streets on Jefferson Drive. This site has been assigned to the Air Museum by the Congress.

The exhibits of the Museum of History and Technology are comprehensive. It was authorized by the Congress to memorialize the growth of all aspects of American life. It has long been an accepted doctrine at the Smithsonian that the full history of the United States can be most meaningfully displayed if the social, legal, political, cultural, scientific, industrial, economic, military, moral, and other aspects of this growth are presented not only as important in themselves, but also as closely correlated phenomena. Thus, American military and naval history is presented as an integral part of American technological and cultural history and its interrelation with American technological and scientific advances is clearly portrayed.

In the new building of the Museum of History and Technology now being constructed on the Mall between 12th and 14th Streets, 33,000 square feet have been allocated to display collections related to the history of the development of the military, naval, and air forces of the United States. An additional 18,000 square feet have been assigned to military and naval study collections which will be open to the public on appointment. Many general facilities of the new building, such as a library, auditorium, and cafeteria will be available for the use of those who come principally to see the military exhibits or for special lectures and programs. The general technical services in the fields of preparation and preservation of museum objects existing for the entire museum, will likewise be available to the staff of the Department of Armed Forces History.

The staffs of the National Air Museum and the Museum of History and Technology devote much of their efforts to scholarly research. The Smithsonian Institution functions in part as one of the Nation's major study centers and issues a series of publications on military history and related subjects which is anticipated and well received throughout the world.

4. The present and planned facilities and programs of both the Museum of History and Technology and the National Air Museum only partially meet the need for an effective and comprehensive exhibition of the contributions of the Nation's Armed Forces as described above. The traditional memorabilia of warfare (small arms, rifles, edge weapons, uniforms, insignia, and heraldry) can readily be displayed in the halls of military history and exhibits programed for the new museum buildings. However, no building on the Mall could properly be large enough to house and display such huge objects as self-propelled field artillery, heavy ordnance, tanks weighing many thousands of pounds, naval vessels and equipment, and future rockets and missiles. Space limitations make it impossible to portray effectively how earlier wars were fought through the reconstruction of trenches, fortifications, or cantonments.

The Committee has considered possible ways in which the broad sweep of military history could be more effectively presented and the role of the armed forces in creating a peaceful world could be emphasized. It believes additional facilities are needed beyond those presently existing or planned at the Smithsonian Institution. However, such facilities should be under the direction of the Smithsonian Institution and serve as a supplement to the exhibitions and study collections maintained in any building on the Mall. A sufficiently large area in or near Washington, D.C., should be acquired which will permit construction of buildings suitable for the display of large and heavy objects adjacent to an open-air display of the evolution through the years of military tactics, both offensive and defensive, as seen in trenches, fortifications, and other full-scale constructions. The possibility of locating this area on tide water should also be considered so as to provide anchorage for historic naval vessels.

The Committee believes these additional facilities would not only permit the Smithsonian Institution to maintain its present integrated graphic presentation of military history but would provide it with the opportunity to expand greatly its exhibition potential, to provide added study space, to demonstrate more comprehensively the impact of the Armed Forces on American culture, medicine, engineering and science, and to interpret significant problems affecting national security. Within this context, we believe an institution will emerge which can develop the two themes emphasized in your letter to the Committee as of highest significance: "an exposition of the contributions which military forces have made to American society and culture; and an analysis of the meaning of war in today's civilization."

5. The Committee believes this broadened concept should be subjected to continuing study with the objective of developing detailed procedures for its realization. Hence, it recommends that a permanent Advisory Board to be known as the National Armed Forces Museum Advisory Board be created by statute to provide advice and assistance to the Regents and the staff of the Smithsonian Institution for this purpose and to guarantee sustained interest in the project. In particular, this Board should also make recommendations as to the following: (a) Location, size, architectural style, and cost of the new facility; (b) choice of an appropriate name. The Committee recommends that "The National Armed Forces Museum" be considered as a suitable title.

6. Although some funds for the project could undoubtedly be raised by public subscription, the Committee feels the magnitude of the undertaking and the national and honorary character of the institution require that it be fully financed by appropriation of the Congress. However, the Committee recognizes that gifts and bequests will be received and should be encouraged.

7. Some who have considered the feasibility of an American Armed Forces museum have visualized a large monumental building centrally located in the Nation's Capital. At one time several members of your Committee supported this viewpoint, but after full consideration of the merits of such a proposal, the Committee has now agreed upon the conclusion outlined above. The Committee's study of European military museums has clearly shown that Armed Forces museums of very high quality can be organized in a variety of ways to fit different and special national needs. The American solution to the problem of creating a suitable Armed Forces museum must also be typical of our Nation and of our unique military history. In this connection, therefore, it is important to remember that the Smithsonian Institution in its present buildings and in its new museum now being constructed on the Mall has already evolved and institutionalized a number of the fundamental principles and requirements for an American military museum. By continuing to draw upon the experience and guidance furnished by the Smithsonian Institution within the concept of the plan described in this report, the Committee believes a positive step forward will have been taken toward developing an Armed Forces museum which will be specifically fitted to our special national situation.

8. The Committee does not believe the proposals contained in this report, if realized, would encroach upon the activities of any other Government-operated military collection, nor need it preclude the creation of specialized collections devoted to technological subjects or those which are primarily of organizational interest.

The Committee believes in seeking authorization for this proposal that no modifications should be made to Public Law 722, 79th Congress, approved August 12, 1946, which established the National Air Museum, nor any other authority of the Smithsonian Institution be rescinded to bring this project to completion.

9. Accordingly, there is attached hereto for your consideration a draft of proposed legislation providing for the establishment of a National Armed Forces Museum Advisory Board, expansion of the Smithsonian Institution's facilities for portraying the contributions of the Armed Forces of the Nation, and for other purposes.

Respectfully yours,

EARL WARREN,
Chairman, President's Committee on the American Armed Forces Museum.

(Members of the Committee: Clinton P. Anderson; Leverett Saltonstall; Clarence Cannon; Overton Brooks; Thomas S. Gates, Jr.; John Nicholas Brown; Nelson A. Rockefeller; H. Alexander Smith; Leonard Carmichael, Executive Director.)

THE PUBLIC CAMPAIGN AGAINST OBSCENE LITERATURE—RESOLUTION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, earlier in this session of Congress, I introduced a bill, S. 2123, to provide stiffer penalties for dealers in obscene materials. The fast growing racket of obscene and pornographic publications and films has invaded the American home and has become a menace to grownups and children alike. In asking for new laws I called attention to the fact that the obscene literature trade has become a half-billion-dollar a year business. The Post Office Department estimates that up to 1 million children will receive unsolicited pornographic literature this year.

Our laws have been ineffective thus far in combating this menace. The penalities under the present laws, which provide for fines up to $5,000, are inadequate. These illicit dealers, making thousands of dollars a year, regard fines as a mere cost of doing business. The bill that I introduced requires mandatory prison sentences for second and succeeding violators. I certainly hope that this legislation will be enacted in the near future.

I have stressed, however, at the time I introduced this bill, that strengthening the Federal laws must be only one part of the broader program. The major portion of the battle against obscene material must be carried out by State and local authorities, who must stamp out the base of operations of these dealers in filth. Furthermore, there is the need to draw the attention of parents and the public at large to this danger. Community support must be mobilized in order to make law enforcement effective.

The call for community support has produced much response during the last year. Citizen committees have been organized in many parts of the country in order to aid in the struggle against obscene literature. Various church groups have been most active in this public awakening.

Recently, I have had the pleasure of placing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a resolution by the St. Catherine's Society of Milwaukee, calling attention to the need for alerting the public to the increasing menace of obscene literature, and commending the Post Office Department for its excellent national leadership in this endeavor. Today, I should like to place in the RECORD a recent resolution by the Lutheran Laymen's League dealing with the same subject.

I should like to preface this resolution with a few words from the letter written to me by Mr. Paul Friedrich, executive director of the Lutheran Laymen's League and which says:

We want to make it clear that we do not ask for any form of censorship that will interfere with any person's constitutionally guaranteed right of free speech. Fundamentally, we feel that this is a moral and spiritual problem that can best be solved by proper moral and spiritual education and enlightenment. It is our hope that our States and also our National Government will convene conferences of all interested persons and groups, so that through the free exchange of thought the best approaches and solutions may be arrived at.

I should like to have the resolution by the Lutheran Laymen's League printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION 60–04—IMMORALITY, VIOLENCE AND BAD TASTE IN PICTURES, PROGRAMS AND PUBLICATIONS

Whereas decent citizens of the United States and Canada are becoming increasingly disturbed by the prevalence of immorality, violence, and bad taste in publications, motion pictures, television and radio programs, and in the mass communications media generally; and

Whereas the fundamental values of respect for God, for human life, for marriage, home and family, for property, for virtue, for good name and reputation are being degraded and eroded by these unwholesome influences and materials; and

Whereas these evils can be combated and rooted out only by the united and persistent efforts of all decent citizens; and

Whereas we Lutheran laymen, as followers of the Lord Jesus Christ, must be in the forefront of the battle for decency and morality: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Lutheran Laymen's League, assembled in convention in Minneapolis, Minn., from July 9 to July 13, 1960, hereby—

(a) Commends and supports the producers of all acceptable publications, motion pictures and television and radio programs for recognizing and discharging their moral responsibilities in this respect;

(b) Commend the Postmaster General of the United States for his diligent efforts to "clean up the mails";

(c) Encourage current efforts in the two Houses of the U.S. Congress to convene a conference of Federal, State and local officials, together with representatives of other interested groups, to study this matter and make recommendations for ways and means to deal with the problem effectively;

(d) Take the necessary steps to have a delegate from the Lutheran Laymen's League and also a delegate from the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod participate in such a conference;

(e) Make a determined effort, as individuals and as a group, to see to it that none of these offensive influences come into our own homes by way of publications and television and radio programs, and that we and the members of our families pledge ourselves to choose our entertainment outside the home carefully and in accordance with God's word;

(f) Pray fervently and frequently that Almighty God will strengthen each one of us, our families, our communities and our nations, so that we may overcome the dissemination of these unwholesome influences and lift our society to new and higher levels of morality, virtue and decency; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be released to the public press for publication and that copies be sent to the appropriate officials of the motion picture industry, the radio and television industries, the publishing industry, to Members of the Congress and to other public officials and civic and religious leaders who are or should be interested in this matter.

REGULATION OF MASS TRANSIT IN THE WASHINGTON, D.C., METROPOLITAN AREA

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, House Joint Resolution 402, which will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 402) granting the consent of Congress for the States of Virginia and Maryland and the District of Columbia to enter into a compact related to the regulation of mass transit in the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area, and for other purposes.

THE FREEDOM COMMISSION

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, when the history is written of the achievements of this extra postconvention session of the Senate, I am one of those who believe that the salutary action taken so promptly and emphatically by the Senate yesterday in the approval of S. 1689, the bill to create the Freedom Commis-

sion for the development of the science of counteraction to the world Communist conspiracy for the training and development of leaders in a total political war, is going to rank high on the list of achievements of this session.

I have been gratified by the interest displayed by the radio-TV networks and the news media, and the way this important achievement has been covered and reported by most of the metropolitan papers of the country. There have been a few instances in which the reporters of the papers and, for some reason or other, the city desks have missed the story growing out of the Senate's most important action yesterday, but by and large this historic action has received the kind of widespread publicity which it deserves. It is certain to receive much more.

I think that in the arguments made yesterday before the Senate enacted this proposed legislation it was not emphasized sufficiently that the Russians for a long time have operated their concept of an academy of this type. Years ago when I served on what was then known as the Dies committee of the House of Representatives, and which is now known as the House Committee on Un-American Activities, we explored and studied what was then known as the Lenin Institute in Russia where, back in the 1930's, Russia trained personnel to do its propaganda and espionage jobs.

It should have been said yesterday, and I now say it for the RECORD, that in the United States the Communists themselves have also maintained training institutions and academies to train their operatives here in America. There was a time when some of the representatives of the Dies committee attended as undercover students one of these Communist institutes on 13th Street in New York City, and there have been at times as many as four or five of these Communist training institutes flourishing in America. So it was well that the Senate in its wisdom, proving once again that it can meet an emergency by acting rapidly when a need arises, passed this proposed legislation yesterday to provide a Freedom Academy in America.

I still hope that before the House adjourns, it will suspend the rules to approve S. 1689, which in the House is sponsored by Representative A. SYDNEY HERLONG, of Florida, and Representative WALTER JUDD, of Minnesota. Whether the measure can be disentangled from the rule situation over there or not, I believe a great forward step was made by the Senate yesterday.

I ask that there be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a copy of S. 1689, which was introduced by myself and Mr. DOUGLAS and Mr. CASE of New Jersey in the form that it passed the Senate, in order that those who are interested may study the measure more carefully.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Freedom Commission Act."

CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF POLICY

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress of the United States makes the following findings:

(1) The Soviet Union and Communist China are waging a total political war against the United States and against the peoples and governments of all other nations of the Free World.

(2) Unlike the Free World, the Soviet Union has systematically prepared for this total political war over several decades. Drawing on the experience of previous conquerors and upon their own elaborate studies and extensive pragmatic tests, Soviet leaders have developed their conspiratorial version of political warfare into a highly effective operational science. Recognizing that political warfare is a difficult science making unusual demands on its practitioners, the Soviet Union and Communist China have established an elaborate network of training schools, within and without the Free World, in which have been trained large numbers of highly skilled activists. These activists continue to receive intensive training throughout their party careers.

(3) In this total political war the Soviets permit no neutrals. Every citizen, every economic, cultural, religious, or ethnic group is a target and is under some form of direct or indirect Communist attack. The battleground is everywhere, and every citizen, knowingly or unknowingly, through action or inaction, is involved in this continuous struggle.

(4) Since the end of World War II, the Soviets, taking full advantage of their better preparation and often superior organizational and operational know-how, have inflicted a series of political warfare defeats on the Free World. The total sum of these defeats is nothing less than a disaster for the United States and the Free World and the continuation of this political war by the Soviets confronts the United States with a grave, present, and continuing danger to its national survival.

(5) In order to defeat the Soviet political warfare offensive and to preserve the integrity and independence of the nations of the Free World, it is imperative—

(A) that the knowledge and understanding of all the peoples of the Free World concerning the true nature of the international Communist conspiracy and of the dimensions and nature of the global struggle between freedom and Communism be increased as rapidly as is practicable;

(B) that private citizens not only understand the dimensions and nature of the threat, but that they also know how they can participate, and do participate, in this continuous struggle in an effective, sustained, and systematic manner;

(C) that Government personnel engaged in the cold war increase their knowledge of the international Communist conspiracy and of the dimensions and nature of the global struggle between freedom and Communism, develop a high esprit de corps and sense of mission and a high degree of operational know-how in counteracting the international Communist conspiracy.

(b) It is the intent and purpose of the Congress that the authority and powers granted in this Act be fully utilized by the hereinafter created Commission to achieve the objectives set forth in the preceding subsection (a) (5) of this section. It is the further intent and purpose of the Congress that the authority, powers, and functions of the Commission and the Academy as hereinafter set forth are to be broadly construed.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. When used in this chapter—

(1) The term "Commission" means the Freedom Commission;

(2) The term "Academy" means the Freedom Academy.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE FREEDOM COMMISSION; COMPOSITION; CHAIRMAN AND ACTING CHAIRMAN; QUORUM; OFFICIAL SPOKESMAN; SEAL

SEC. 4. There is established in the executive branch of the Government an independent agency to be known as the Freedom Commission which shall be composed of six members and a Chairman, each of whom shall be a citizen of the United States, one of whom shall be selected from the higher echelon of the State Department. The Chairman may from time to time designate any other member of the Commission as Acting Chairman to act in the place and stead of the Chairman during his absence. The Chairman (or the Acting Chairman in the absence of the Chairman) shall preside at all meetings of the Commission and a quorum for the transaction of business shall consist of at least four members present. Each member of the Commission, including the Chairman, shall have equal responsibility and authority in all decisions and actions of the Commission, shall have full access to all information relating to the performance of his duties or responsibilities, and shall have one vote. Action of the Commission shall be determined by a majority vote of the members present. The Chairman (or Acting Chairman in the absence of the Chairman) shall be the official spokesman of the Commission in its relations with the Congress, Government agencies, persons, or the public, and, on behalf of the Commission, shall see to the faithful execution of the policies and decisions of the Commission, and shall report thereon to the Commission from time to time or as the Commission may direct. The Commission shall have an official seal which shall be judicially noticed.

MEMBERS; APPOINTMENTS; TERMS; COMPENSATION; EXTRANEOUS BUSINESS

SEC. 5. (a) Members of the Commission and the Chairman shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Not more than four members, including the Chairman, may be members of any one political party. In submitting any nomination to the Senate, the President shall set forth the experience and qualifications of the nominee. The term of each member of the Commission, other than the Chairman, shall be six years, except that (1) the terms of office of the members first taking office shall expire as designated by the President at the time of the appointment, two at the end of two years, two at the end of four years, and two at the end of six years; and (2) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term. The Chairman shall serve during the pleasure of the President. Any member of the Commission may be removed by the President for inefficiency, neglect of duty, or malfeasance in office. Each member, except the Chairman, shall receive compensation at the rate of $20,000 per annum; and the Chairman shall receive compensation at the rate of $20,500 per annum.

(b) No member of the Commission shall engage in any business, vocation, or employment other than that of serving as a member of the Commission.

AUTHORIZATION TO ESTABLISH THE FREEDOM ACADEMY; FUNCTIONS OF COMMISSION AND ACADEMY

SEC. 6. The Commission shall establish under its supervision and control an advanced training and development center to be known as the Freedom Academy. The Academy shall be located at such place or places within the United States as the Commission shall determine. The principal functions of the Commission and Academy shall be—

(1) to carry on a research program designed to develop an integrated operational

science that befits and bespeaks the methods and values of free men and through which the Free World will be able to meet and defeat the carefully patterned total aggression—political, ideological, psychological, economic, paramilitary, and organizational—of the Soviet Bloc, and through which we, as a Nation, may work toward our national objectives in a systematic manner. To achieve this purpose the full range of methods and means is to be thoroughly explored and studied including the methods and means that may best be employed by private citizens and nongovernmental organizations and the methods and means available to the Government other than the methods and means already being used. This research program shall include the study of our national objectives and purpose and the development of proposals for intermeshing and integrating the full spectrum of methods and means into a coordinated, short and long range strategy for victory, seeking the utilization of our full potential in the public and private sectors.

(2) to educate and train Governmental personnel, private citizens, and foreign students concerning all aspects of the international Communist conspiracy, the nature of the global struggle between freedom and Communism, and the science of counteraction to the Communist conspiracy.

ACADEMY STUDENTS; SELECTION; GRANTS AND EXPENSES; ADMISSION AS NONIMMIGRANT VISITORS; DEPORTATION

SEC. 7. (a) Academy students, other than Government personnel, shall be selected, insofar as is practicable and in the public interest, from the diverse groups within and without the United States where trained leadership and informed public opinion are most needed. Persons in Government service coming within the provisions of the Government Employees Training Act may be trained at the Academy pursuant to the provisions of said Act. All agencies and departments of Government are authorized to assign officers and employees to the Academy for designated training.

(b) The Commission is authorized to make grants to students and to pay expenses incident to training and study under this chapter. This authorization shall include authority to pay travel expenses to and from the Academy or other authorized place of training under the chapter, and authority to give financial assistance to the dependents of students during the time they are undergoing training authorized under this Act.

(c) Foreign students selected for training under this Act shall be admitted as nonimmigrants under section 1101(a)(15) of title 8, United States Code, for such time and under such conditions as may be prescribed by regulations promulgated by the Commission, the Secretary of State, and the Attorney General. A person admitted under this section who fails to maintain the status under which he was admitted, or who fails to depart from the United States at the expiration of the time for which he was admitted, or who engages in activities of a political nature detrimental to the interest of the United States, or in activities in conflict with the security of the United States, shall, upon the warrant of the Attorney General, be taken into custody and promptly deported pursuant to sections 1251–1253 of title 8, United States Code. Deportation proceedings under this section shall be summary and findings of the Attorney General as to matters of fact shall be conclusive. Such persons shall not be eligible for suspension of deportation under section 1254 of such title 8.

AUTHORIZATION TO ESTABLISH AN INFORMATION CENTER

SEC. 8. The Commission is authorized to establish an information center at such place or places within the United States as the Commission may determine. The principal function of the information center shall be to disseminate, with or without charge, information and materials which will assist people and organizations to increase their understanding of the true nature of the international Communist conspiracy and of the dimensions and nature of the global struggle between freedom and Communism, and of ways they can participate effectively toward winning that struggle. In carrying out this function, the Commission is authorized to prepare, make, and publish textbooks and other materials, including training films, suitable for high school, college, and community level instruction, and also to publish such research materials as may be in the public interest. The Commission is authorized to disseminate such information and materials to such persons and organizations as may be in the public interest on such terms and conditions as the Commission shall determine.

RESTRICTIONS ON DISCLOSURE OF INFORMATION

SEC. 9. Nothing in this chapter shall authorize the disclosure of any information or knowledge in any case in which such disclosure (1) is prohibited by any other law of the United States, or (2) is inconsistent with the security of the United States.

SECURITY CHECK OF PERSONNEL

SEC. 10. (a) Except as authorized by the Commission upon a determination by the Commission that such action is clearly consistent with the national interest, no individual shall be employed by the Commission until such individual has been investigated by the Civil Service Commission to determine whether the said individual is a good security risk and a report thereof has been made to the Freedom Commission.

(b) In addition to the foregoing provisions, the Commission may request that any individual employed by the Commission, or under consideration for employment by the Commission be investigated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation to determine whether the said individual is a good security risk.

GENERAL AUTHORITY OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 11. In addition to the authority already granted, the Commission is authorized and empowered—

(1) to establish such temporary or permanent boards and committees as the Commission may from time to time deem necessary for the purposes of this Act;

(2) to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as may be necessary to carry out the functions of the Commission. Such personnel shall be appointed in accordance with the civil service laws and their compensation fixed in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, except that, to the extent the Commission deems such action necessary to the discharge of its responsibilities, personnel may be employed and their compensation fixed without regard to such laws: *Provided, however,* That no personnel (except such personnel whose compensation is fixed by law, and specially qualified professional personnel up to a limit of $19,000) whose position would be subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, if such Act were applicable to such position, shall be paid a salary at a rate in excess of the rate payable under such Act for positions of equivalent difficulty or responsibility. The Commission shall make adequate provision for administrative review of any determination to dismiss any employee;

(3) to conduct such research, studies and surveys as necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act;

(4) to make, promulgate, issue, rescind, and amend such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act;

(5) to make such expenditures as may be necessary for administering and carrying out the provisions of this Act;

(6) to utilize, with the approval of the President, the services, facilities, and personnel of other Government agencies. Whenever the Commission shall use the services, facilities, or personnel of any Government agency for activities under the authority of this Act, the Commission shall pay for such performance out of funds available to the Commission under this Act, either in advance, by reimbursement, or by direct transfer;

(7) to utilize or employ on a full- or part-time basis, with the consent of the organization or governmental body concerned, the services of personnel of any State or local government or private organization to perform such functions on its behalf as may appear desirable to carry out the purposes of this Act, without said personnel severing their connection with the furnishing organization or governmental body; and further to utilize personnel of a foreign government in the same manner and under the same circumstances with the approval of the Secretary of State;

(8) to acquire by purchase, lease, loan, or gift, and to hold and dispose of by sale, lease, or loan, real and personal property of all kinds necessary for, or resulting from, the exercise of authority granted by this Act;

(9) to receive and use funds donated by others, if such funds are donated without restrictions other than that they be used in furtherance of one or more of the purposes of this Act;

(10) to accept and utilize the services of voluntary and uncompensated personnel and to provide transportation and subsistence as authorized by section 73b–2 of title 5, United States Code, for persons serving without compensation;

(11) to utilize the services of persons on a temporary basis and to pay their actual and necessary travel expenses and subsistence and in addition compensation at a rate not to exceed $50 per day for each day spent in the work of the Commission.

GENERAL MANAGER; APPOINTMENT; COMPENSATION

SEC. 12. The Commission is authorized to establish within the Commission a General Manager, who shall discharge such of the administrative and executive functions of the Commission as the Commission may direct. The General Manager shall be appointed by the Commission, shall serve at the pleasure of the Commission, shall be removable by the Commission, and shall receive compensation at a rate determined by the Commission, but not in excess of $18,000 per annum.

APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 13. There is authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, so much as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

FREEDOM ACADEMY

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I call to the attention of the Senate a most challenging, inspiring, and thought-provoking editorial in support of the Freedom Academy, which appeared in the great Cincinnati (Ohio) Inquirer on August 25.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IF WE ARE TO SURVIVE

Some of us are dazed by the rocket triumphs of the Soviet Union, awed by the

mountainous military manpower of Red China. Do they constitute the greatest threat to the survival of the United States and the free world?

No. We can build missiles and rockets. We can contrive—in fact we already have—an awesome deterrent force to deal with outright military aggression.

The Reds are fighting the war—and winning—in another dimension, where we have no present ability even to join the battle.

Here is a paragraph from a report of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary which could well be described as some of the most important words you may ever read:

"The Communists have conquered nearly a billion people during a period when their sphere was markedly inferior in industry, technology, science, and military capabilities—in fact, inferior in almost everything except power-seeking know-how. The Soviets have been able to expand their empire during this period of inferiority, because they have developed a science of protracted conflict in which they are able to gradually increase their relative power position, using a well-integrated combination of political, economic, and military methods while avoiding a sufficient provocation to invite massive retaliation. Central to their science of protracted conflict is their skill in political and economic warfare."

The report spells it out: The Communists are highly trained cold war specialists. They are professionals at the art of a new form of conflict and conquest. Their capabilities in political and economic warfare are not inborn—they are the result of a massive development and training period extending over several decades.

They have not only a vast fund of knowledge of the methods and means of subversion and propaganda; they have competent managers to orchestrate their efforts and they have highly skilled operators in every sphere of cold war activity.

They are the professionals in this field.

We are the amateurs—and the unorganized amateurs at that.

For the most part we are standing around reassuring ourselves in the knowledge that ours is the better way of life, while the agents of Communist imperialism pervert the youth of the world, the students, professors, scientists, politicians, labor leaders, businessmen, industrialists, to a heinous misconception of where their best interests lie.

Do you find it inconceivable that anyone in a free or even neutral country could be "sold" the concept of slavery inherent in communism? It is being done. While you are reading this editorial, hundreds will have been entrapped by the worldwide Communist conspiracy.

We, the West, started mankind on the road to freedom and independence. Who is capitalizing upon and taking credit for the apparent advances of this movement today? Communists. In the Far East, the Middle East, Africa—even deep within our own hemisphere.

They have turned our flanks, in military parlance. And as Winston Churchill phrased it during World War II, we find them attacking now our soft underbelly.

Isn't it time we did something about it? Yes; it is time—if there is time.

The Senate Judiciary Committee report from which we quoted was one giving approval to a bill—actually there are companion Senate and House bills—to develop a science of counteraction to the Communist cold war techniques.

The legislative proposal would create a Freedom Commission—and a Freedom Academy, to train and develop leaders from throughout the free world in effective leadership in the cold war.

No such agency now exists, and although a number of agencies touch upon the field, none does what the Communist world is doing, on anything like the scale the Communists are doing it. Our Foreign Service Institute trains our career foreign officers, but it is not equipped to train cold war leaders from this and other free countries. The National War College and its subordinates, the Army War College, Naval War College, and Air University, must treat political warfare only as a footnote subject. The role of the Central Intelligence Agency is not adequate—as experience has proved.

A cold war development and training center—a Freedom Academy—may sound impractical or visionary. But is it?

Unless we wish to see freedom everywhere nibbled to death, at an ever-increasing pace, we had better create some such facility for defending ourselves, and counterattacking, in the cold war. Let your Representative and Senators know that you're strongly in favor of the proposed West Point for political war.

The Communists have its equivalent, and have been turning out graduates of distinction for years.

Today they're taking the world away from you.

Mr. MUNDT. Should it occur that the House does not act in these concluding hours of the session—and I suspect that this is the final day of this extra session of the Congress—let it be said that this effort will go on, and that this bill will be introduced in the next Congress. I am convinced that something as important as this measure to the success of freedom and to the defeat of world communism and to the preservation of world peace will be quickly adopted in the new Congress, if it is not in fact approved by the House of Representatives before we adjourn today.

THE DEFENSE RECORD

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, yesterday morning, after the minority leader refused to agree to the Senate's voting on a resolution it be the sense of the Senate that expenditure ceilings on high priority defense items be removed, he asked unanimous consent that, in connection with his refusal, he be allowed to insert a statement in the RECORD.

I was surprised to note this morning that the statement he thereupon inserted had little to do with this resolution. Rather it was a criticism of a talk I made on the floor last Friday.

Inasmuch as the minority leader said in his statement that he had studied my talk in some detail last Saturday, I am sorry he did not give me a chance to see his reply until today. I am sure he did not handle it this way with the premise that we would adjourn last night, because that is not the manner in which the minority leader operates.

In his analysis of my talk he said that I had done a grave injustice to the Secretary of Defense. That is not correct. During the debate on Friday I stated:

> The present Secretary of Defense has my respect, and I do not criticize him in any way from the standpoint of his being a great American patriot. I do, however, criticize his judgment.

That was the way I felt then, and that is the way I feel now.

I have heard on good authority that the Secretary of Defense is not happy about the consistent fiscal limitations applied to his operations, presumably by the Bureau of the Budget.

I did and do believe that the letter from the Secretary of Defense was misleading, because of the following three points on which it was far from clear in presenting the facts.

First, the administration asked for less, not more, money than was in the President's message.

Second, the administration did not request the increases made by the Congress, although it did accept part of them, and the Secretary's letter would certainly suggest that the administration recommended all of them.

Third, the administration then froze funds in an amount comparable to the total increase made by the Congress.

Mr. President, in due course I will answer in detail the assertions contained in the memorandum put in the RECORD last night by the minority leader, and make it available for the permanent RECORD.

Let me repeat again today, however, that despite all the belated protestations that have been made about increasing our defenses in accordance with purported recommendations by this administration, the record is clear that the initiative lay with the Congress.

Moreover, high priority programs have been held up by arbitrary expenditure ceilings and similar devices.

As we now go to the country on the record, the minority leader would appear to be attempting to change that record so it will look as if the administration had done what the facts show the administration has not done.

That was the reason why I submitted my resolution, after I found out that such vital programs were being held up as the B–58 procurement; construction of missile bases and maintenance of training bases; the number of military personnel; the ICBM procurement program—that is the long-range, intercontinental missiles—B–70 development; Navy ship construction; and Army modernization.

Mr. President, I mentioned that I was going to file a complete report for the permanent RECORD, and I certainly do not intend to take the Senate's time today to deal with all of these inaccuracies.

But, let me give just one example of what the minority leader has referred to as statements in my speech which were "left incomplete in a most damaging way." He quotes my talk of last Friday as follows:

> The House Appropriations Committee recommended, and the House approved, an increase of $115 million for "Airborne alert capability." * * * After reconsideration of this problem, we again recommend the program as proposed in January.

It is clear from that statement that the Deputy Secretary of Defense testified the administration did not want the increased money approved by the House for airborne alert capability, but rather preferred to have that money not made available, as they wished to maintain the airborne alert program as proposed in January.

In other words, they did not want additional funds for airborne alert.

There is nothing incomplete about that. The minority leader, however, criticizes me for not having gone on to cite the Deputy Secretary of Defense's testimony in which he makes reference to a section in last year's appropriations act and in this year's appropriations act giving the Department of Defense authority to increase its airborne alert program if it decided to do so. That section of the act has been referred to time and again. In fact, just last June, when the appropriations bill was before the Senate, I not only referred to that provision, but I quoted it in full before the Senate.

I then went on to point out at that time that this language in no respect reflects the sense of the Congress that we should make preparations for airborne alert at this time. In fact, I said: "Regardless of any language, nobody will be able to snap his fingers and obtain it."

Moreover, I pointed out that as some of the equipment and trained personnel needed for an airborne alert would take 18 months to obtain, it was necessary to make the funds available and use them at this time if we were ever to have the capability when it was decided it was needed.

Consequently, Mr. President, I deny categorically the accusation of the minority leader that failure to cite again this section in the act in any way changes or leaves incomplete the clear-cut assertion that the administration's position at that time was this: They did not even want to take the initial steps to prepare for a sufficient airborne alert capability.

Mr. President, let me cite just one more of the illustrations which the minority leader has labeled "incomplete in a most damaging way."

He quotes the following testimony from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, which I had included in my August 26 talk, in regard to antisubmarine warfare.

> With regard to the $100 million of additional funds voted by the House for ASW research and development * * * we recommend that the remaining $58.1 million be eliminated.

When the Secretary of Defense wrote the majority leader and stated that the administration had recommended an increase in funds for antisubmarine warfare research and development, I cited this record to show that what had really taken place was that the House had added money, and that the administration had expressed its disapproval of most of what the House had added.

This is a far cry from having the administration recommend an increase.

The facts are that the House recommended the increase and the administration said they did not need most of it.

I would not want Congress to adjourn and have us go back to our communities without presenting a few additional facts for the record with respect to just who was and is responsible for the present lag in our defense posture.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. While the Senator is discussing the topic of who is responsible for the defense lag, I should like to make this comment about the service the Senator from Missouri has rendered to the country in the past several years, as he has persistently, insistently, and courageously sought to focus attention of the American people on our security posture.

I know it has not always been easy for the Senator from Missouri to do so, because he has been under terrific fire from time to time in the form of very unfair criticism and personal abuse. However, he is about to discuss who was responsible for the fact that there has been a lag in our defenses. In that connection I wish to focus attention for just a second or two on the fact that the Senator from Missouri is responsible for a great shift in Republican policy in the field of defense. They are talking a different language now than they did last year. I am satisfied that they recognize in their inner councils that there is no answer to the Senator from Missouri. Thus we find them, in Chicago at their convention, and in their press interviews of recent day, and the President himself, shifting ground in order to accommodate themselves to the facts which the Senator from Missouri has brought out for several years.

A great deal of credit is due to the Senator from Missouri for the fact that now the administration has at long last—and it is long overdue—started to do something about filling up the gaps in our defenses.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am very grateful to the senior Senator from Oregon for his comments. I first had the pleasure of knowing him when he was a member of the Senate Committee on Armed Services. He was one of the most constructive and intelligent members who ever served on that committee. He gives me undue credit. I am grateful for it, of course, but cannot agree with it. I believe that Governor Rockefeller has had a good deal to do with the changed position of this administration on defense. There is one great difference between the work of the Governor of New York in this field and the work of many other people in his party. He has studied the matter. After studying it, as has been the case with many other worthy citizens, he has come to three conclusions. The first is that we are not doing enough. The second is that we can afford to do more. The third is that if we do not do more, in a short time we will be in the kind of trouble that the Senator from Oregon and I have been worried about for a long time.

Now that world tensions have come to the point where the Governor of New York and members of his commission, the Gaither Committee, the Johns Hopkins Study Commission, the members of the CED Commission, et cetera, are shown to have been right, based on present world tensions, instead of representatives of and advocates of this administration facing frankly the fact that they were wrong, they are attempting to saddle the previous administration with the fact this country has not done what should have been done in this field. They have not been willing to give the facts to the American people.

I might add, in response to the Senator from Oregon, that representatives of this administration do not try to saddle on anybody else the present great gap to our disadvantage in ground forces, the present great gap to our disadvantage in submarines, and the present obvious gap in the space field. Because it is a new field, where there have been rapid changes, they attempt to prove that another administration was responsible for the missile gap.

Now here are a few facts which should be part of the RECORD, so the people of the country may decide who is responsible for what with respect to the subject we are discussing this morning.

First. From 1946 through fiscal year 1953—the last year under a Truman budget—$3,450 million were spent on military missile programs.

Second. When the Eisenhower administration took office in 1953, it inherited a fiscal year 1954 budget which had been prepared by the Truman administration. The defense part of the Truman budget was cut $5¼ billion by the Eisenhower administration. Most of this cut was taken from the Air Force, and resulted in a substantial reduction in research and development moneys and other funds for missiles.

Third. In fiscal year 1954, the funds for missiles were cut about $100 million below those in the last year of the Truman administration—that is from $1,166 million to $1,067 million.

Mr. President, on the basis of this figure alone, what a farce it is for people to talk about a previous administration being responsible for any missile gap.

Fourth. During 1946–53, the rocket engines now used in the Atlas intercontinental ballistic missile—in production—and the Thor intermediate range ballistic missile—which is also in production—were developed for the Navajo project. Prior to 1953, the United States had already developed or had under development the Terrier, the Sparrow, the Nike, the Matador, the Snark, the Hermes, the Navaho, the Rascal, the Lark, and the Atlas missiles.

Fifth. Prior to 1953, the United States had developed the atom bomb and had tested the first hydrogen device, the latter having been ordered into development by President Truman in 1950.

Sixth. By the time the Eisenhower administration came in, the research and development for the Atlas ICBM program had developed to the point where it was characterized by General Schriever—the officer in charge of the project—as follows:

> By 1953, impending solution of most of the problems [for developing the Atlas ICBM] allowed design and initial construction of Atlas vehicles.

Seventh. Yet, for years the Atlas was not given a national priority and has never been put on a full production basis.

Eighth. No one was producing ICBM's in the 1940's or, to the best of our knowledge, the early 1950's. The state of the art had not progressed to that point either here or in the Soviet Union. However, when both countries were ready

to begin production, the Soviet Union went ahead, while the United States gave a higher priority to fiscal objectives than to the ICBM program. Even the administration finally admitted that this policy resulted in a situation in which the Soviets would have at least a 3 to 1 advantage over us in this field.

That ratio was announced by Secretary of Defense McElroy in January 1958.

Ninth. In the last year under the budget of the previous administration, the fiscal year 1953—and to me this is very significant—12.1 percent of our gross national product was spent on our military defense, while this year the administration's program calls for spending 7.8 percent of our gross national product. So we see that despite the fact everybody now agrees that the Communist menace is more serious today than it was, say, 7 or 8 years ago, we are spending much less of our national income for defense than we spent at that time.

Tenth. Throughout the last 6 years, Democrats in and out of the Congress have been warning of the dangers, urging that more funds and efforts be devoted to defense, and bringing the facts out to the American people. These efforts have been met by soothing statements which tended to create a sense of complacency among the American people.

Despite efforts on the part of Democrats to increase our military strength, build up our strategic forces, improve the mobility and modernity of our Army, step up our Polaris missile program, and so forth, the administration has refused to change or accelerate its programs.

Eleventh. Failure to spend funds made available by the Congress during the past 3 years has resulted in less operational capability in the long-range missile field, less modernity and mobility for our ground forces, less modernity and capability in our naval forces.

For example, last year the Congress added $382.6 million for Army modernization, of which only $43.6 million was allowed by the administration to be spent for this purpose. An even more recent example is that this year the Congress added $394 million over and above the President's budget request for the Polaris, while the Department of Defense first objected to any increase and then announced that it would use only $312.3 million of this increase.

So later I shall answer in detail the statement placed in the RECORD by the minority leader yesterday. I told him today I planned to take the floor to reply to his statement as soon as I could get the floor. It is of the utmost importance that the American people be given all facts which will not help a possible enemy. Based upon this record just presented to the Senate, the idea that anyone would have the temerity to say that the relative decline in the defense strength of the United States as against that of the Soviets rests on something that was done say 10 years ago is, to me, one of the most fantastic efforts to misrepresent I have listened to in a long, long time.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I desire, on behalf of the people of my State, to commend the distinguished Senator from Missouri for his forthright, frankly spoken, honest appraisal of our defense situation.

The Senator from Missouri knows that the people of my State hold him in high esteem. I have transmitted to him during the past year numerous invitations from my State for him to appear at public functions. They have not been of a partisan nature. I do not believe a single invitation was to a partisan political meeting. They have come from different groups which were interested in the defense of the country. Knowing of the deep knowledge of the distinguished Senator from Missouri on this subject, they wanted him to speak at statewide meetings when his duties here permitted, so that they could learn from him at first hand more about the situation in which we find ourselves today.

I commend the distinguished Senator from Missouri for his courage, his candor, his sound knowledge, and his true approach, free from all partisan bias. I commend him for the very convincing manner in which he is, day after day, telling the American people of our dangers and of the necessity for girding ourselves to meet those dangers.

The Senator from Missouri has rendered distinguished service, over and above party, to all Americans. I commend him for continuing his very deep studies of the defense situation for the benefit of all the people of the Nation, and, indeed, of all the people of the free world.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I am very grateful to the able junior Senator from Texas for his kind comments. Especially inasmuch as his State has much of the Air Force and much of the Army and Navy, he has been interested in this subject for many years. He has great patriotic interest in the future security of the United States. I may add that whenever he would like to have me come to Texas, it will be a great pleasure.

Mr. President, I should like to point out how unfortunate some of the discussion on defense is getting to be, from the standpoint—regardless of politics—of the people's right to know. I found out that a good many of the highest priority items in the defense program were being held up; and that this was due to fiscal limitations. Therefore I submitted a resolution stating it was the sense of the Senate that we eliminate any fiscal ceilings on high priority items, where that was occurring at this time. Much to my surprise, I could not obtain consent from the minority leader to bring that resolution before the Senate for a vote.

This morning, after the late session last night, I picked up the RECORD, and found that instead of the statement by the minority leader having something to do with my resolution request—it was a long and, in my opinion, misleading and inaccurate analysis of a talk I made on the floor of the Senate last Friday.

I noticed in the RECORD—what the minority leader said about the junior Senator from Missouri. He said that he "felt that the remarks of the Senator from Missouri on the floor of the Senate yesterday constituted a serious disservice to a better public understanding of the defense program."

Mr. President, the facts and the figures have been placed in the RECORD today; and now let the Senate and the American people decide who has created a serious disservice from the standpoint of proper presentation of the truth.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAUSCHE in the chair). Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield to my friend, the Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point, again—as I have several times before—a table showing, in millions of dollars, the expenditures for long-range ballistic missiles during previous administrations and the present administration.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[In millions of dollars]

Fiscal year	IR ICBM programs	All missile programs
1946	1.9	70
1947	0	58
1948	.3	81
1949	.1	98
1950	0	134
1951	.5	784
1952	.8	1,058
1953	3.0	1,116
1954	14.0	1,067
1955	159.0	1,470
1956	526.0	2,270
1957	1,401.0	4,470
1958	2,150.0	5,107
1959	2,945.0	6,913
1960	3,303.0	6,534

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I have said before that the Senator from New York is a great expert in the military field and also in many other fields; in fact, as I listen to him discuss the various problems that face the American people, I think we are most fortunate to have him in the Senate, to explain major problems in every field.

But in regard to the figures he has placed in the RECORD, those figures show that in the first year of the Eisenhower administration, nearly $100 million—$99 million, to be exact—less was spent for missiles than in the last year of the previous administration. I can well remember when in the spring of 1953 the Secretary of Defense said he was going to take $5 billion out of the Air Force and give the American people a better Air Force. The senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] asked, "Why do you not take $10 billion out, and give them a much better Air Force?"

As a result of the serious reductions in missile effort forced by this action all missile programs were retarded. As a result of the continuing lag in the missiles program, the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Development, of this administration, resigned

in protest, because, he said, and this was as late as 1956—that proper priority was not being given to missile development in the United States.

The way this argument has to some extent been euchred into an argument solely about missiles is rather clever. But everyone knows that our Army is but a small fraction of the size of the Russian Army; and that our Army is not as modern as the possible aggressor. I am glad that no one has attempted to saddle that gap on the previous administration.

Everyone knows that the Soviets have in operation many times more submarines than the United States has. I am glad no one has attempted to saddle that gap on the previous administration.

Everyone who has studied the subject knows that we have an airlift gap. I am glad no one has attempted to saddle that gap on the previous administration.

Everyone knows that we accomplished a remarkable technical feat a few days ago when we put up and recovered an 84-pound satellite. I say that with complete sincerity, but a few days ago the Russians put up and recovered a capsule that weighed over 10,000 pounds. Experts in the field of space assert we are well behind in the thrust which is so important to our space defense efforts, actually also to all space effort.

One of the great military analysts of this country said this week we are behind in space developments because the Russians started their program in 1954, but we did not start ours until 1958.

I am glad no one has attempted to say that another administration should be criticized for that gap.

I am one who agrees that the United States of today could defeat the United States of 1952; but I think what is important is to compare our strength today as against that of the possible enemy and not as compared to what it was in 1952.

I have here some testimony submitted before the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services. This testimony was given only this year. The counsel for the committee stated, in questioning the Secretary of Defense:

Mr. Secretary, the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) has provided a summary which shows that the Department of Defense has underestimated the funds required for IRBM's and ICBM programs each and every year since 1955. I read from his official summary:

For fiscal year 1955, the budget request for IRBM and ICBM programs was $40.9 million. The amount finally programed was $158.9 million.

For fiscal year 1956, the budget request was $159.3 million. The amount finally programed was $526.3 million.

Mr. President, I honestly never realized myself until I looked over these figures, how far ahead this Congress has been of the administration in this field.

I read further from that same testimony:

For fiscal year 1957, the budget request was $858.9 million. The amount finally programed was $1,400.9 million.

For fiscal year 1958, the budget request of the Department of Defense was $1,937.3 million. The amount finally programed was $2,149.8 million.

For fiscal year 1959, the budget request was $2,391 million. The amount finally programed was $2,945.6 million.

For fiscal year 1960, the budget request was $2,522.8 million. The amount finally programed was $3,303.3 million.

Now, here we have clear and convincing evidence that the Department of Defense underestimated by millions and millions of dollars during each of the last 5 years the amount of funds actually needed for the development and production of missiles. The total of such errors was over $2½ billion. But at the same time we are presented with charts which come from the Defense Department and are used in an effort to show that the missile lag created by the fiscal policies and disinterest of this administration is, in some strange way, really the fault of another administration.

At one point in this connection, the eminent counsel for the committee, Mr. Weisl, asked the Secretary of Defense:

Can you explain to this committee why the Defense Department has been so consistently wrong in underestimating the amounts required for ballistic missiles programs?

The Secretary of Defense, Mr. Gates, replied:

Secretary GATES. I can only explain it, Mr. Weisl, to the effect that this is a new program, a new art in terms of years. It is changing extremely rapidly, and is under continuous review. It relies on tests, and there are continuous changes in it. It is not unusual for the Department of Defense to reprogram in all of its procurement programs.

Mr. President, this Nation has never utilized its full production potential in either the development or the production of long-range missiles.

The facts are that the Congress has consistently furnished the funds requested and often more than the amounts requested for these high priority programs. This makes it clear where the responsibility for the defense lags rests.

This, Mr. President, is the record, let it speak for itself.

SUGAR LEGISLATION

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I should like to read from a UPI ticker tape:

The Democratic-controlled committee turned thumbs down on a Senate-passed bill granting President Eisenhower unrestricted power to prevent "bonus" shipments of sugar from the Dominican Republic.

It first rejected, 19 to 11, a Republican proposal that the House accept a Senate amendment to a House-passed bill granting the power with strings attached.

Then the committee voted, 18 to 11, to direct its chairman, Representative HAROLD D. COOLEY, Democrat, of North Carolina, to block any House move to accept the Senate amendments and to refuse to permit compromise negotiations unless the Senate specifically requests it.

I repeat the last line:

Then the committee voted, 18 to 11, to direct its chairman, Representative HAROLD D. COOLEY, Democrat, of North Carolina, to block any House move to accept the Senate amendments and to refuse to permit compromise negotiations unless the Senate specifically requests it.

If I understand the rules of the Senate, or of Congress, that, in effect, means they are going to block any chance of any consideration of that legislation in this session of Congress.

It is my understanding, in view of the fact that we have passed the bill in the Senate and the bill is now before the House of Representatives, that the Senate does not have the power, even if we wish to, to appoint conferees.

To confirm this, I am addressing my question in the form of a parliamentary inquiry. Under the rules, in the present situation, could the Senate request a conference at this moment if it wished?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the absence of the papers being before the Senate, there would be no power in the Senate to request a conference. For the Senate to have the power to act, the papers would have to be before the Senate.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Chair. That was my understanding.

Mr. President, this is not a question of who asks for a conference first. I think it goes beyond that. I would like the RECORD to be clear that this is an arbitrary effort to block further consideration of the legislation. As the rules have been interpreted unless those papers are returned, the Senate is powerless at this particular time to act.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I ask the Senator from Delaware if he has not been in the Senate long enough to realize that, having amended the bill as the Senate did last night, the House probably will not agree to it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No. The Congress is a joint body. I think the Senate or the House, on any measure, always has the right to express the opinion of its membership on any legislation. It is always customary, when there is a difference of opinion between the two bodies, at least that the matter be negotiated by a conference committee and that an effort be made to reach an agreement. At least an effort should be made.

Today I have been asked the question several times whether or not the Senate would ask for a conference or wait for the House. I want the RECORD to be clear that it is not within the power of the Senate under the rules of the Senate, to request a conference, unless the papers are returned from the House.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is true. There is so much difference between the bill as passed in the House and the Senate that I am surprised the Senator did not anticipate that there would be no sugar bill. Also, the Senator knows the sugar legislation runs out next month. Then the United States will be left in a predicament. Then the people of the United States are going to be the ones to suffer because we have no program for buying sugar. Do not be surprised if the people will have to buy sugar at an increased cost of 25 percent. Because the Senate

passed a bill so out of line with what the House passed, as I see it, there is no chance at all for the two Houses to get together.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I call attention to the fact that the Senate approved the measure which left here yesterday, not by a close vote, but by a vote of 62 to 17. Certainly, a vote such as that is entitled to consideration and recognition by the other body. If it means there will be no sugar legislation because of that action then we should refuse to adjourn. We should postpone adjournment for other reasons, as I pointed out earlier wherein we are faced with a complete shutdown of the largest railroad in the country. Congress before adjourning, should be sure we have laws on the statute books to deal with this emergency. Notwithstanding the fact that I and all the other Members would like to go home today, we should stay here and finish the people's business and here are two fields that need our attention.

If that means we must stay here tomorrow, or next week, let us stay. Let us make sure we provide this Government adequate machinery with which to deal with these emergencies.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. BENNETT. I should like to remind the Senate again that twice the House has sent us a bill without giving the machinery of the Senate time to operate. The House both times has sent the bill to the Senate on the day when the Senate expected to adjourn. The Finance Committee has been given no opportunity to hold hearings, no opportunity to consider the bill more than simply to rush it to the Senate so that the Senate could act.

I was in the conference on the bill we passed on July 2. We had Mr. COOLEY'S promise that he would send the bill to us the first day of the session, so that the Senate Committee on Finance could consider it. He sent the bill to us on the last day of the session. I think this was a calculated program.

When the Senate is scolded because it will not agree with the House, under pressure, I resent it. I think the House has completely refused to cooperate. It has deprived us of our constitutional right to participate in the legislative process.

Regardless of the merits of the bill, it seems to me this is an affront to the Senate. I think the House is at fault, not the Senate.

There are often disagreements with respect to bills. There should be an opportunity for men of good will to work out disagreements. This procedure gives the Senate no opportunity to work out anything.

I agree with the Senator from Delaware that the burden is not on the Senate, but the burden is actually on a majority of the members of the Committee on Agriculture of the House, on the 18 men who presume to tell the Senate and the country that if we do not take exactly what they wish to give us we shall have no rights. I do not like that kind of an approach.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from Utah. I think this is not only an affront to the Members of the Senate, but also an affront to the American people. I think the House should be reminded of the fact that they cannot have a sine die adjournment until the Senate concurs. The House Members should be told that we are going to stay in session until we do complete the business for which we are being paid.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me, so that I may propound a question of the Senator from Utah?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may do so without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Delaware? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. HRUSKA. The Senator from Nebraska would like to make an inquiry of the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT]. There was a meeting of the Committee on Finance yesterday, was there not?

Mr. BENNETT. That is correct.

Mr. HRUSKA. Was the committee furnished with copies of the hearings of the House Committee on Agriculture on the sugar bill?

Mr. BENNETT. The committee was not furnished with anything except a copy of the bill as it came from the House.

Mr. HRUSKA. Did the members of the Committee on Finance have the benefit of any discussion or debate which occurred in the House in regard to the bill, as recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD?

Mr. BENNETT. The Senate had no benefit from that. Actually, all of the debate which took place on the House bill is contained in approximately one column of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. There was no real debate on the House floor. There was no opportunity for us to consider the bill carefully. We were not only not furnished with the record of hearings in the House committee, but also we were denied the opportunity to have hearings of our own.

I do not think that we in the Committee on Finance are obligated to make decisions on the basis of hearings in another committee. I think we should have the opportunity to exercise our full legislative rights and responsibilities. We should have time to consider a bill of this kind.

This is twice now, in 2 months, this situation has occurred. The House committee has sent us a bill, put a gun at our heads, and said, "Take it, or there will be no bill," under circumstances which make it impossible even for us to examine the purposes behind the House bill.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President——

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, as the Senator from Utah has pointed out—and I am also a member of the committee—twice this bill has been sent to us on the closing days of the session, without allowing adequate time even for the committee to properly consider the bill.

We did have before our committee yesterday, as the Senator from Utah has pointed out, representatives of the Department of Agriculture and of the State Department. To that extent in that limited time, we did have the benefit of their opinions. However, I do not think that is a constructive way to pass legislation. The bill should have been sent to the Senate, as promised in the last session, early this session. In that way we could have had adequate time for consideration. This bill should not have been sent to us at the last moment.

To again yield to the House on the basis of "Take what we give you or you will get nothing" is not proper. I think it is time for us to notify the House that we are willing to stay in session for a period of time until perhaps the House will reflect more soberly on the actions it has taken.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President——

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a brief comment?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HRUSKA. The Senator from Nebraska made inquiry for a copy of the hearings of the House Committee on Agriculture, and was told there were none. The Senator from Nebraska made a request for a report on the bill. There was no report.

I looked in vain through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for some clue to the bill, for some explanation given of the sugar bill passed in the House, and I was unable to find more than a column and a half in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, most of which was taken up by a reprinting of the text of the bill and the committee amendments thereto, and the formal waiver of objections to taking the bill up at once. There was a voice vote, without any debate or discussion whatsoever.

The statement of the Senator from Utah is borne out by the fact that my search was negative. I am glad to know it was an accurate search.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President——

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. To keep the record straight, we all know the House passed the bill unanimously. We know the bill came to the Senate. We know that the committee met and the committee made some minor revisions in the bill.

I think each Senator will have to agree that if the bill had been passed in the Senate as reported by the committee we would not find ourselves in the trouble we are in today. That being so, that is the situation we face.

What has happened? The House committee has already met. The House committee has voted again unanimously, I understand.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The vote was 18 to 11.

Mr. BENNETT. I beg the Senator's pardon. The vote was not unanimous.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. They have turned down the proposal by a large majority.

Mr. BENNETT. It was a majority. It was a party-line vote except for one Member on the other side of the aisle voting with the Republicans.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, do I still have the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware has the floor.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from South Carolina, but I wish to have it understood that I still have a right to the floor.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Nothing has been done. We find ourselves in this position because we in the Senate undertook, without committee hearings and without all the information Senators desire, to pass a bill on the floor of the Senate. We have to acknowledge that.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President——

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. When we passed the bill, we found ourselves in the position we are in at the present time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President——

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I feel that the people of this Nation are going to suffer on account of it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I say that the Senate had access to what information we could get in 1 day. But that is the wrong way to expect the U.S. Senate or any committee of the Congress to act. We did the best we could. We reported a bill to which was offered an amendment on the floor of the Senate. This amendment was approved by a vote of 62 to 17.

Certainly we are not going to say that 62 Members of the Senate did not know what they were doing. I think by all lines of reasoning the House has a responsibility to recognize this and not to say, "We will not accept any conference unless the Senate requests it." The House knows, as explained before, that under the rules of the Senate we could not request a conference if we wished to do so. Our hands are tied. The only thing we can do, so far as we are concerned in the Senate, is to refuse to adjourn sine die until the House changes its mind.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. I wish to confirm and to support what the Senator from Delaware and the Senator from Utah have said.

There is some history which has been forgotten, apparently. The history is that the bill came to the Congress a year ago early this last spring, sometime in February. The sugar people of this country—both the cane sugar people and the beet sugar people—were begging for a bill a year and a half ago. When we got into the situation at the very end of the last session, we were "shotgunned" into a marriage with a kind of sugar bill. No one liked it. My vote, I think, will indicate how I felt about the situation, because I even failed to vote, as the Senator from Utah will remember, for the conference report.

This practice of taking a local issue, such as the sugar issue, which is primarily local, and making it an international tool and holding a gun to our heads, must sometime be stopped. We Senators must show that we are willing to stop it.

For example, last night when he had the measure before us for consideration, I was one of the first to ask for a copy of the bill. It took me a half hour to get it and, as far as I know, I had one of the very few copies of the bill in the Chamber.

That practice is not legislating, and we know it. It is not the fault of the Senate that we did not have copies of the bill. It is not the fault of the Senate that we did not have a report on the bill. It is not the fault of the Senate that there were not more adequate hearings on it. However, I will say that I do not think we need hearings. We understand what it is about, and it is about time the Senate stood up and said to the House, "We also are a legislative body in this Government and we are going to stand up and claim our rights once in a while."

I wish to thank the Senator very much for yielding to me.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Colorado for his remarks. I agree with him that the situation is not the fault of the Senate. I am not saying that the bill that passed the Senate, was perfect even though I voted for it. We respect the position of the House and are willing to sit down with their conferees as men of good will and try to work out a solution of problems. Certainly neither side should sit back and say, "We are right. Take it or leave it."

But the Senate should not vote for a sine die adjournment unless we had settled the pending question before we returned home.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I take it that the Senator from Delaware is arguing for a sugar bill. What this Congress has gone through since last year in regard to sugar legislation should prove to all of us that we ought to do away with this sugar program at the very first opportunity, and that opportunity is now. I do not think Americans realize what the program is costing the consumers of the United States. It does not protect the producers and it does not protect the consumers. It does not protect many foreign countries. It does protect some. By reason of the act consumers must pay at least 1 cent more per pound for sugar than they would otherwise pay.

The sugar program is designed to protect and stabilize the profits of big sugar companies and refiners at a very high level, and the consumers pay for that. Producers do not get the benefit.

We can take care of our domestic producers in the same manner in which we operate the wool program now.

I think perhaps we should produce more in this country than we have been doing. If we do away with this program, the world price of sugar will rise, I presume, as much as 1 cent a pound. I have no way of knowing exactly how much. It will rise some. The price the United States will pay for offshore sugar will go down below what we now pay.

We must remember, however, that these offshore operations are largely American-owned operations. Some plantations are 100,000 to 150,000 or more acres in size in different parts of the world, and they make large profits by reason of the Sugar Act. The additional cost of sugar is added to the food bill of the American consumer.

It is time that we did away with the program, time that we got through with it. I do not know how many agents the Dominican Republic may have in this country. We hear there are many of them. Some of them openly represent the Dominican Republic. Some are prominent people. I do not know how many representatives of the sugar industry are located in Washington, D.C., but we know there are some because we only have to look at the gallery to see them at most any time.

We know that such representatives in some ways can be helpful to Members of Congress. But I think now we have had demonstration enough of the subterranean actions that go on in the sugar industry, particularly in relation to foreign countries, and we ought to make up our minds that we shall be done with it. It is getting to be pretty borderline material that we have to put up with.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I certainly agree with what the Senator from Vermont has said. I think the time is long overdue when we should reappraise the necessity of any sugar act at all. However, that is not the question here. I am sure the Senator from Vermont will agree with me that what we were voting on yesterday was not whether to get rid of the Sugar Act. The Sugar Act has a certain limited time to run under the existing law and we could not repeal it at this moment without violating contracts. What we were voting on yesterday was whether or not we should force the President to buy from the Dominican Republic, under Mr. Trujillo, an additional 320,000 tons of sugar at this higher price. The Senate last night said, in answer to that question, that we would give the President authority to stop buying that sugar if he felt such action would be in the best interest of our country.

Mr. AIKEN. We can buy the sugar from American producers.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Or offshore at a lower price.

Mr. AIKEN. Or we can buy from other countries in the Western Hemisphere that will take their pay in American farm commodities that we have in surplus.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am in complete agreement with the Senator from Vermont, but I emphasize again that what we were doing last night was not deciding whether we need a sugar act or not. We were deciding whether

in the Sugar Act, which is already a law, we should give this additional bonus to the Dominican Republic.

I am sure that the Senator from Vermont will agree with me that we should not give them the additional 320,000-ton allotment at this time. What I suggest is that the House should cooperate and at least sit down and consider an endorsement of the President's request.

The House has refused even to consider any conference at all, and the Parliamentarian has advised us that the Senate, under the rules, cannot request a conference unless the House first requests it or returns the papers to the Senate. That is the point I make at this time. I do not think we should go home with a law on the statute books under which it is mandatory that we give to Trujillo this additional 320,000 tons of sugar.

I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I wish to say one more thing. Even though we have no new law and the President is forced to buy 300,000 more tons of sugar from the Dominican Republic this year, and if, by so doing, we could get rid of this program, which I say has now become a questionable program, it would be money well spent to do so. Then let us look after our own farm people, and let us, to the extent necessary, do business with other countries that produce sugar and that are willing to do business with us.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I will support the Senator from Vermont in reappraising the value of any program.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I share the disappointment of my colleagues over the apparent unwillingness of the House to cooperate in enacting, at this session, a satisfactory bill for our sugar industry.

I recall what happened on the final day of the session in July when this body was forced to take precipitate action, and without mature consideration, because the sugar bill was sent over in the final hours of the session. The Senator from Vermont has indicated his displeasure with the sugar program because, he alleges, the consumer does not benefit from it.

I should like to interpose a few points concerning the sugar-beet producers of our country. My State is the third largest beet-sugar-producing State in the Nation. In Idaho there are many thousands of acres of land which could be utilized for the production of sugar beets instead of producing some of the commodities which are in surplus today.

Much is said about maintaining the family sized farm units in this country. Nothing would contribute more in my State—and I am sure this is true also of other western States—to the successful operation of the small irrigated unit than expanding the sugar quota for these farms.

It is difficult for war veterans who homesteaded on some of our irrigated Federal projects in Idaho to understand why they are denied the opportunity to expand their sugar production at a time when our Government is purchasing sugar at premium prices from other countries.

Something should be done. I do not know whether it would be better to discontinue the sugar-control program. Certainly it is not entirely successful as it is being managed at this time. I agree with my colleagues that the Congress has a joint responsibility in endeavoring to solve some of these problems which so vitally affect our farmers.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I now yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I share emphatically the views of the distinguished Senator from Delaware that we should not consider a sine die adjournment until the sugar issue is resolved. The distinguished Senator from South Carolina has pointed out that if sugar prices go up it will be the responsibility of the Senate. If sugar prices go up our consumers will be injured, and that too would be the responsibility of the majority in this body. The House, to this point, has stubbornly turned down any effort to resolve this issue. They just sit back and say, "Take it or leave it. We will not consider anything else."

I should like to ask my friend from Delaware if he does not believe that since the question involves our international relations and similarly is a matter of great domestic interest, about which the President of the United States has shown considerable concern, that there is a very real possibility that if we do not resolve the issue now we will be called back by the President to resolve this vital issue.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. There is a possibility of that because, as I pointed out to the Senator from Vermont, what we are doing if we do not act is not to let the Sugar Act die, and we are not in any way affecting the termination date of the act. I agree fully that consideration should be given to the possibility of extending it. Certainly it needs revision. Twice in succession we have had delivered to us from the House a sugar bill on the last day of the session, with the position taken by the House, "You take this bill, or you will get nothing." Yesterday by a vote of 62 to 17 the Senate, after considering the matter, voted for its own version of how the Sugar Act should be drafted. That was done by a vote of 62 to 17.

The very least the House can do is to extend us the courtesy of sitting down and listening to the viewpoint of the Senate, to see if we cannot resolve our differences and work them out.

I want to make the record very clear where the responsibility lies if such action is not taken. I believe we would make a serious mistake if we adjourned sine die without insisting upon the House giving consideration to the Senate views on this very important measure, and which is considered to be so important by the President.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. We find ourselves in this predicament because of the mismanagement by the State Department in this field, and all of us must acknowledge that fact.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I have the floor. I will yield for a question. However, I should like to reply to the Senator's statement. The State Department had nothing to do with the fact that the sugar bill came to us from the House of Representatives on the last day that Congress is supposed to be in session. The State Department is not responsible for the fact that the House has taken its present adamant position. I am not interested in getting into an argument on the policy that the State Department has pursued, and whether that policy is right or wrong. I am merely pointing out here that when the Senate passes a bill by an overwhelming majority, we are entitled to consideration by the House on our position. I do not say the House must accept that position. But certainly we are entitled to consideration by the House. That is all I am interested in.

I know the Senator from Kansas has been on his feet for a long time, and I know that the Senator from South Carolina wishes to discuss the whole field of international relations, and I will yield the floor. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina for a question.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I should like to ask the Senator a question. Is it not true that we would not be in this situation today if it were not for what has happened in Cuba and in the Dominican Republic? We would be going ahead with our quotas. We would not be in this situation if it were not for what has happened in Cuba and in the Dominican Republic. We have been paying the Cubans 2 cents above the world price for sugar. We have been doing that to create good feelings toward us on their part. Instead of that, we know the situation we are in today. So far as the Dominican Republic is concerned, we kicked over the traces there and decided not to take the sugar from them that we had agreed to take, according to law. Now we find ourselves fighting in the House and in the Senate as to what we are going to do, because the State Department has got us into this mess. Is that not true?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I will only say that if the foresight of the State Department were as good as the hindsight of the Senator from South Carolina, we would not find ourselves in many of our present difficulties.

THE PERIL POINT STUDIES OF THE U.S. TARIFF COMMISSION

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, some time ago the State Department released the list of items upon which it intended to negotiate this fall at the conference of nations affiliated with the GATT—the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. The U.S. Tariff Commission is now engaged in peril point studies of these products and will recommend to the President that each individual item remain on the list for possible tariff cuts or be removed from the list because further tariff cuts would jeopardize the domestic industry.

When that list was first released, it became evident that this was to be a set of negotiations which would concentrate primarily on chemical items. There are 15 dutiable schedules in the Tariff Act, of which chemicals make up 1. There are 97 paragraphs covering chemicals in that schedule and out of that 97 only 16 have not been included and these cover such items as dynamite, phosphorus, opium, and similar items which have special treatment. About 400 chemical products are listed for possible duty reductions.

Congress knows very little about how these lists are made up and what motivates those who make up the lists. Perhaps there is some logical reason why chemicals were of particular significance in this round of negotiations; however, in the light of the present competitive situation I cannot understand why the State Department suddenly proposes to reduce duties on so many chemical products. It will be interesting to see what the Tariff Commission finds by way of peril points on these chemicals.

This is but one of our many industries that are today faced with serious competition from the low labor producing countries and I assume the Commission will take into account the potential plight of the United States in time of war if excessive imports have closed down or seriously injured segments of the chemicals industry. It is certainly one of the most important of our industries, especially in time of international danger and one cannot help being a bit curious as to why it is now called upon to bear the brunt of the pending tariff reductions.

THE EXPANSION OF COMMUNISM

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, recently many citizens of my State have written expressing their concern on the worldwide expansion of communism. Before this short session of Congress adjourns I want to state my personal opinion concerning this insidious philosophy and to review the programs which I have supported which have been designed to curb this atheistic movement.

In the first place, so that there can be no question in anybody's mind, let me say that I believe, in fact I know that communism is an international conspiracy, atheistic and materialistic, which denies human liberties in any form and which has as its ultimate objective the overthrow by force and violence of all free governments and the eventual domination of the entire world.

At no time have I ever been misled by the various overtures that the Communists have from time to time extended to the free world. Since the Communist philosophy is not based on a moral code, to a true Communist there is no such thing as falsehood. Consequently I have always known that the Communist nations will enter into any agreement if it suits their purpose since they have no intention of considering any of them when their own ends have been served.

This is the history of our relations with the Soviet Union. Without exception they have violated every international agreement which we signed in good faith.

Neither am I lulled into any apathy concerning the menace which our country faces from the Communist Party in the United States. On many occasions Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, has testified before committees of Congress that the Communist Party is today a serious threat to our internal security.

On occasions it is difficult for me to remain calm when some Americans who know better are taken in by Communist propaganda, or are hoodwinked into advocating programs which would weaken this Nation in its ability to resist Soviet aggression in this cold war.

So far as I am concerned, the biggest issue before the United States today is the question of our national survival. So long as I have anything to do with it, no governmental actions will be taken which would in any way allow the possibility that this great American political edifice dedicated to human liberties and the dignity of men should be conquered by these modern-day barbarians.

As a Republican, I am proud of what my party has done since it has been in office to contain Communist expansion and to eliminate Communist infiltration in our own society. What is past is over, and there is no point in castigating particular individuals for errors in judgment. Nevertheless, the American people must learn from the experiences in the past in order that we can protect the future.

The fact is that under the last Democrat administration the Communist espionage agents in the United States had a field day. The public is familiar with the Alger Hiss case, with Remington, with the atom spies and others. The public recalls that when Congress in 1950 passed the Internal Security Act—for which I voted—President Truman promptly vetoed the measure and it had to be passed again in both Houses by two-thirds majority. Constantly in the days before the inauguration of President Eisenhower, Congress and the Democrat President were engaged in bitter disputes. The House Committee on Un-American Activities and the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee were trying to root out the Communists in Government service, while the Executive called the whole process a "red herring."

In the field of foreign affairs there is no question who must calculate the aggressive intentions of the international Communist conspiracy. It was the Democrat administration which participated in the secret conferences at Yalta, Teheran, and Potsdam, as a result of which millions of square miles of territory and hundreds of millions of human lives were allowed to be brought under Communist domination.

There was a man in the U.S. Senate named Joe McCarthy, from the State of Wisconsin. There were many things which Senator McCarthy did with which I did not agree, but there is not a Member of the Senate today who will deny that Joe McCarthy did much to dramatize and pinpoint the menace of communism to human freedom both here and abroad.

Since the Republican Party took office, what has been accomplished? In the first place, in 1954 we enacted the Communist Control Act. Under this law, the Subversive Activities Control Board was empowered to outlaw the Communist Party and prohibit members of Communist organizations from serving in certain representative capacities. This Board acted quickly and declared that the purpose of the Communist Party was to overthrow the United States by force and violence. The Communist Party appealed to the Federal courts, and the case is now waiting disposition by the U.S. Supreme Court. Frankly it is fantastic to me that a decision reaffirming the findings of the Subversive Activities Control Board has not yet been rendered.

In the 84th Congress, the Senate, of which I was a Member, voted unanimously for a resolution which identified the Communist Party of the United States as a part of the international Communist conspiracy.

It is inconceivable to me how any fact so clear to every Senator, regardless of party, seems so difficult for the Supreme Court to discover.

Other provisions of the law for which I have voted make it possible to grant immunity to witnesses testifying before congressional committees in order to encourage witnesses to reveal the secrets of the Communist conspiracy. Heavier penalties are now imposed for concealing persons and harboring fugitives. Government pensions and retirement benefits are denied employees convicted of felonies. The citizenship of persons convicted of engaging in treason, joining a movement to overthrow the Government by force and violence, or plotting against the Government can now be revoked. Recognizing the true nature of the cold war, the law now provides that espionage is a capital offense if committed at a time when no formal state of war exists.

It was the Republican Party that created the Internal Security Division in the Justice Department to give exclusive attention to the vigorous prosecution of the antisubversive laws. It was the Republican Party that ordered the Communist Party and the Labor Youth League to register under the Internal Security Act. It is the Republican administration which has deported more subversive aliens and barred the entry of more potentially subversive aliens than at any time in the preceding 20 years.

It is not my intention at this time to analyze the entire foreign policy of the United States. There are some phases of the foreign policy with which I disagree. There are many with which I agree. The record will reflect to any objective person, however, that in the past 8 years the free world has been strengthened both militarily and economically and is better prepared to defend itself from aggression. As a Member of the Senate, I have constantly voted for every proposal which in my

opinion would be likely to stem the tide of Communist expansion. I have voted consistently against any measure which I felt was inimical to our national interests.

When all is said and done, the Communists depend upon force, both economic and military, as instruments for their conquests. The United States of America must therefore remain economically solvent and must possess the most powerful Military Establishment on the face of the earth.

There are certain specific measures which I believe we must pursue in the days ahead and which I personally shall support vigorously.

First, I have been opposed and shall remain opposed to the recognition of Red China by this Government. In my opinion, we made a tremendous mistake years ago in the recognition of the Soviet Union. This is one mistake which should not be repeated.

Second, I urged the passage of the Senate bill to permit the Secretary of State to deny passports to persons suspected of sympathizing with the Communist movement. We should do everything possible to hinder agents of the Soviet Government in the conduct of subversive and espionage activities in this country.

Third, I believe the Communist Party should be brought under the direct control of the Subversive Activities Control Board; if the Supreme Court of the United States does not render a decision recognizing the conspiratorial nature of this so-call "party," I shall immediately introduce proposed legislation to attempt to establish that fact by law.

In my opinion, the manner in which the American people deal with the menace of communism should not be a partisan political issue. It must be faced by Americans, because if we do not retain our freedom we shall obviously not be able to enjoy the luxury of disagreeing with one another in political forums. It seems clear to me that by now all three branches of our Government—legislative, executive, and judicial—should recognize that international communism is a deadly menace to human liberties throughout the world. It cannot be combated with half-hearted measures. Its agents must be eradicated from our society. Our citizens must be alerted to the peril we face. It may be that in the days ahead all of us will have to make sacrifices. Whatever the price may be, Americans are willing to pay it for the survival of our Nation and the maintenance of our way of life.

As a U.S. Senator from the State of Kansas, I hope this brief statement makes my position perfectly clear to all concerned.

TARIFF PROTECTION AND ASSISTANCE TO DEPRESSED AREAS

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement which I intended to make yesterday relating to assistance to depressed areas.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SCHOEPPEL

The Democrat platform which was adopted at the convention in Los Angeles on July 12, 1960, expresses great concern with the plight of so-called depressed areas. It proposes to cure their problems by imposing additional obligations to be financed through added tax burdens on every American citizen.

I know that there are many communities in Kansas which are deserving of help, and I certainly will do my utmost to see that a workable law is enacted. However, the Los Angles platform has distorted the facts. It states that: "The Democratic Congress twice passed bills to provide this help. The Republican President twice vetoed them." This is only a half-truth since actually the Republican Party and President Eisenhower endorsed a program of aid which would have been workable. A Democrat-controlled Congress so overloaded this program that it would have imposed a crushing burden on other communities as well as adding still another factor to contribute toward inflation, thus raising our costs and impeding our sales in world markets. Accordingly, the responsibility for a complete lack of any constructive legislation in this important area rests with the Democrat Congress.

Unfortunately, many of our depressed areas once enjoyed thriving domestic industries which have lost their competitive position because of foreign imports. Our continued policy of lowering the protection afforded American industry inaugurated with the Trade Agreements Act of 1934 was endorsed in the majority's report of the Commission on Foreign Economic Policy, which was filed on January 23, 1954. This Commission included among its members David J. McDonald, the president of United Steelworkers of America.

It is perhaps not generally known that the entire concept to accept the destruction of American industry, including all of the hardships which this entails for the workers affected as well as the communities in which they live, was endorsed by Mr. McDonald. Surprisingly, we was quite willing to suggest additional obligations to the taxpayer in lieu of the wages which the workers affected would have earned.

In an individual statement included in the report of the Commission, Mr. McDonald expected that perhaps as many as 100,000 workers might be threatened directly or indirectly with loss of their jobs as shown in the following statements:

"It is proposed that a policy be adopted by the Congress to assist and promote necessary adjustments by companies, workers, and communities whenever injury results from increases in imports traceable to tariff changes.

"When the President finds it in the national interest to lower a tariff below the peril point, or to maintain a tariff concession despite a finding of injury or threat of injury by the Tariff Commission in an escape clause action, the affected companies, their employees, and the communities in which they are located should become eligible for assistance under an adjustment assistance program.

"Companies and communities affected should become eligible for a technical assistance program.

"Companies and communities found eligible should have access to financing assistance necessary to their adjustment programs.

"Companies found eligible should have the privilege of accelerated tax amortization on new plant and equipment for the purpose of introducing new products or expanding production in lines other than those affected by tariff changes.

"Companies and communities found eligible should receive special consideration in the letting of Government contracts.

"ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE FOR WORKERS

"Employees of companies found eligible for this program should also be eligible for adjustment assistance, in case they are not able to locate alternative employment promptly. This might take the form of a special unemployment compensation program administered through our present Federal-State machinery but financed by Federal funds.

"Provision should be made in case situations arise where neither companies nor communities succeed in diversifying to new lines of production and the workers face a major vocational adjustment problem. Present unemployment insurance benefits are inadequate to meet this need. Since this displacement would be the result of our national trade policy, Federal responsibility is clear. States where the impact happens to fall heaviest should not be penalized in a program designed to benefit the national interest.

"These unemployment benefits should extend for a longer period than is presently provided, but be limited in duration. Maximum benefits should exceed those now available. Benefits should cease once suitable work is found. If a worker takes a new job at substantially lower pay than his old job, he should be entitled to a supplemental benefit for a limited period to make up part of the difference.

"In addition to special unemployment insurance, a fully adequate adjustment program for workers would involve (a) an intensive counseling and placement program to help workers locate alternative jobs as nearly as possible equal to their previous employment; (b) special training allowances, similar to the current veterans' programs, to finance employers' costs in connection with inplant training programs or to cover approved courses of training in approved institutions; (c) special moving allowances, where a finding is made that a job is available elsewhere and payment of moving expenses up to a fixed amount in an individual case can aid in relocation; (d) for any older workers who prove unemployable, provision should be made for eligibility before 65 for retirement benefits under the old age and survivors insurance program, without prejudice to their rights at regular retirement age."

I cannot accept the thesis that the American people should assist our friends abroad by imposing greater burdens on themselves to aid particular communities where such a course would not be necessary if we maintained a realistic tariff policy. In fact, every time additional taxes are imposed they must be factored into the prices of all the goods and services which we sell. Hence, the implementation of this program would, in and of itself, make it more difficult for us to compete effectively in world markets where our products still enjoy a comparative advantage.

I certainly want to assist those areas that are experiencing difficulties because of changing defense requirements, the depletion of their natural resources, or a complete change in the character of the goods and services which our people demand, thereby obsoleting both skills and equipment. The program recommended to the Congress by the President would have accomplished these objectives without embodying a vast new spending spree. It was confined primarily to extending loans and technical assistance so that affected communities could adapt themselves to new conditions.

Since January 1954 when the report of the Commission on Foreign Economic Policy was

filed, we have twice extended the trade agreements program, and within a few months there will be a further effort to reduce our tariffs in connection with the GATT negotiations that are forthcoming.

At the time that GATT was created, it was contemplated that all member countries would truly operate on a reciprocal basis and that any tariff reductions that were granted to one country would be extended to all. In the meantime, we have seen the evolution of the European Common Market as well as the so-called Outer Seven. Undoubtedly, there will be new federations established in other areas of the world so as to enable their producers to secure the advantages of mass production and mass marketing.

I certainly endorse these endeavors as they will contribute to the peace of the world and strengthen our Western allies. However, it is sheer folly for us to ignore these steps by contemplating further reductions in our own already limited tariffs if such action has the effect of displacing American jobs and reducing the revenues of the State of Kansas.

If the local tax base is narrowed, the only recourse left to enable the States to maintain their schools, hospitals, and other facilities which have traditionally been under their guidance and control is to authorize some form of Federal assistance. However, every time this expedient is adopted by the Congress, we compound our problems and make it even more difficult for American industry to compete effectively in world markets.

I am not dealing in idle speculation. Our adverse trade balance is a matter of record, and it is most disturbing that we have been losing gold to other countries at a rate which cannot continue. In fact, at the present time if all of the contingent claims were presented, I doubt that there would be sufficient gold for us to maintain any form of monetary stability. Yet, in spite of this fact, we find in the Democrat platform an endorsement for "an end to tight money." This can only mean that the proponents of this conception are willing to see the Federal Reserve System lose its independence.

I have long favored aid in the form of lower interest rates for farmers, home owners, veterans, and others who have special needs. However, if the general level of interest rates in the United States is lowered below that prevailing throughout the world, those who have a claim on our foreign exchange will quickly convert their assets into gold and remove it from the country. I can imagine no worse calamity inasmuch as this would bring disastrous inflation with all of the havoc that has always accompanied such action throughout recorded history in every country of the world.

I am anxious to increase world trade as evidenced by my sponsorship of Public Law 480, 83d Congress. It has promoted the sale and exchange of our agricultural surpluses for strategic materials and foreign exchange that our Government and citizens may use to their advantage. I have also endorsed other measures to promote the expansion of world trade in a manner which would raise living standards for everyone. However, any unbiased review of the actions which have been taken since 1934 indicates that we have lowered our tariffs in many cases without securing compensating benefits to stimulate our exports, which was the intent of the Congress in authorizing the Trade Agreements Act.

As I have already indicated, it must now be obvious to all that we cannot increase taxes on those areas still able to compete in the world's markets. A subsidy for those in distress by the Federal Government will ultimately reduce the living standards of all of our people as well as jeopardize our ability to maintain our military and industrial strength in the New World of the 1960's.

For many years a theory prevailed that other countries were spending more dollars than we were making available to them by accepting their products. Many people believed that this so-called dollar gap had to be closed through a continuous reduction in our tariffs as well as a massive and growing foreign aid program. There may have been some validity to this theory immediately after the end of World War II when other industrial nations were reconstructing their plants and were largely dependent on America for food, fiber, and raw materials to rehabilitate themselves.

An examination of the gold and dollar holdings of the other countries in the free world today shows that these assumptions no longer apply. For 9 of the past 10 years there has been a deficit in our balance of payments. This results from many causes including foreign investment as well as our foreign aid programs. Furthermore, we have made very substantial contributions to international agencies so that they could provide dollar exchange for projects in underdeveloped countries which utilize the products of our fields, mines, and factories.

Our foreign aid program which was amply justified as a means of strengthening the unity of the free world must not be converted into a plan whereby Americans have a perpetual obligation through their generosity to finance other nations. No self-respecting country wants this kind of help. In fact, they would far rather secure long-term loans. Nevertheless, under past programs we have furnished our competitors with the most advanced production facilities as well as training in our advanced scientific, engineering, and management techniques. America's mass production economy was made possible because we had a large continental market with a population of 180 million people who could be served without crossing a customs border.

The advent of the European Economic Community, better known as the Common Market, as well as the formation of the Outer Seven, to which I have already referred, will provide these nations with all of the advantages we have enjoyed in lowering their production costs through mass production and merchandising. It should be expected that these lowered costs will not only assist them in exploiting their own markets, but assist their producers in making sales within the United States. Hence, there is still a further reason why great caution should be exercised in granting any additional tariff concessions.

In many industries our costs are higher than those prevailing abroad because wage levels are higher here, thus contributing to the American standard of living. Furthermore, every producer must charge a price for his product which will enable him to meet the added costs of social security, of which I heartily approved, as well as the high level of general Federal taxes which provide the principal defense for the free world.

Western Germany and Japan have forged ahead in world competition since our Government has assumed the burden of protecting them from Communist attack. Without in any way deprecating their abilities or the enlightened policies of Chancellor Adenauer and his economic minister, Ludwig Erhard, who is dedicated to free enterprise, it is important for us to realize that our assumption of the obligations of their defense has aided them in offering more competitive prices for comparable goods throughout the world.

There are a number of concrete steps which we can take even under today's difficult conditions to remedy these situations. The most important is to increase our economic productivity. The Republican platform provides guidance which the Congress and the next administration must clearly follow. It states that:

"We therefore accord high priority to vigorous economic growth and recognize that its mainspring lies in the private sector of the economy. We must continue to foster a healthy climate in that sector. We reject the concept of artificial growth forced by massive new Federal spending and loose money policies. The only effective way to accelerate economic growth is to increase the traditional strengths of our free economy—initiative and investment, productivity and efficiency. To that end we favor—

"Broadly-based tax reform to foster job-making and growth-making investment for modernization and expansion, including realistic incentive depreciation schedules."

Today other nations in many instances have more modern plants than our own, and present high taxes and unrealistic depreciation allowances make it difficult to modernize our industry to maintain our position in the forefront of productivity. I know that it is sometimes difficult for some Americans to acknowledge the fact that we are not always the most efficient and productive nation in the world in every line of commerce. However, Leslie Gould, the financial editor for the New York Journal-American, in an article which appeared on July 18, 1960 clearly shows that the United States in order to meet Red threats must revise its taxes.

Mr. Gould's editorial follows:

"UNITED STATES, TO MEET RED THREAT, MUST REVISE ITS TAXES

"(By Leslie Gould)

"The big threat to the United States in the immediate years is the economic war rather than a shooting, atomic war.

"The latter is always a threat and will continue so as long as communism enslaves such a large mass of the world's people.

"So far the Western World, particularly the United States, has failed in its dealings with the Communists. This is partly because too many in and out of Government still think you can do business with them. Also, this same mistaken judgment accepted the Russians as allies—which they never were—and the Red Chinese as simple agrarian reformers.

"REDS PUSH TRADE WAR

"The Communists have one goal—world domination. To succeed, they must destroy the United States as a world power. This they can never do so long as the United States keeps its powder dry—stays powerful militarily and, most important, economically.

"While the Communists rattle the sword—or rather wave their missiles—their major push today is in the economic field. This should be just what the doctor ordered, for the American system of private enterprise has in peace brought workers here the highest living standards ever attained anywhere. In war, this power has won two world wars, and in doing so not only saved the Western democracies but also Russian communism.

"UNITED STATES GAVE $11 BILLION

Ironically, the greatest help the Russians got in building up their industrial might was from the United States, which poured into Russia $11 billion of Lend Lease—much of it machines, tools, equipment. That debt has never been repaid.

"Since the war, the U.S. aid program amounting to $47 billion has succeeded far beyond any dreams. As a result, two of the former enemies—Germany and Japan—today are highly competitive allies.

"So, American industry faces the double challenge—that from Iron Curtain countries, with their slave labor and no consideration for profit, and from our Western World allies.

"UNITED STATES LOSES ADVANTAGE

"The United States in this transition has lost the advantage of the most modern, efficient mass producing industries. Our competitors—thanks to aid paid for by U.S. taxpayers, which includes American private business—have equally as efficient plant, and in some industries more modern.

"These competitors have the advantage of cheaper labor, although this is not as much an advantage as figures might indicate. Foreign wages are more often than not understated and labor is not always as efficient or skilled as American.

"As much, if not more of a factor, in America being priced out of the world markets are taxes. These are confiscatory, being 52 percent for corporations, and for individuals from 20 to 91 percent.

"TAXES SOCIALIZING UNITED STATES

"So, America under the heavy burden of taxation is half-socialized. The Govment is in the ideal position of only sharing in the profits and not in the losses. In Russia, where the Government owns everything, Moscow gets all the profits, but it also foots the bill for the losses.

"Foreign producers have another competitive advantage—taxes are often remitted on exported products.

"So, tax revision should be high up on the legislative programs of both parties seeking office this November."

Perhaps one of the best indications of the difficulties which confront American producers is shown by the automobile industry. Thirty years ago, before the enactment of the trade agreements program, U.S. exports of automobiles accounted for more than 10 percent of total production. Today they represent a very small portion of the total, and the influx of foreign cars has assumed an important dimension. American workers are paid higher wages, and I certainly hope that we will always have the highest wage scale prevailing anywhere in the world. In order to make this possible, we must have adequate and efficient production facilities which are completely modern to enable them to earn these wages.

A part of the difficulty in the automobile industry may be attributed to the fact that we do not use quotas and we have no restrictions on the conversion of dollars into foreign exchange to purchase goods anywhere and bring them into the United States. We have conducted our tariff negotiations solely with a view to lowering tariff barriers although other countries as they reduced their tariffs imposed quantitative controls on American producers which were far more restrictive than tariffs. These steps have virtually eliminated American markets in many areas of the world for those products in which we formerly had a strong comparative advantage.

Small business is directly affected when-even our large major industries slacken the pace of their operations. When this happens they are confronted with a smaller demand for the goods and services which they furnish to the larger firms. In many cases, through their engineering, assembly, and marketing processes, they provide a means for their suppliers to sell their goods in world markets.

The Congress has been vigilant in protecting the American standard of living through the establishment of laws with respect to minimum wages and the maximum number of hours in the workweek when interstate commerce is involved. In order to achieve America's goal for more leisure, our producers must pay a premium for overtime work. Again, may I make it completely clear that I endorse these trends and look forward to their expansion in the years ahead. However, they make it more expensive for domestic manufacturers to use their production equipment to its maximum capacity.

In spite of these self-evident facts, we continue to permit foreign producers to ship goods into the United States which are manufactured under labor conditions which would be totally unacceptable if they were adopted by a domestic producer. Certainly we cannot meet the competition of foreign goods through a reduction in America's living standards, but instead we must develop even better skills and techniques and a more effective use of our raw materials.

The problems which have affected automobiles are similar to those in other industries such as barbed wire, aluminum, textiles, pottery, gloves, copper and brass imports, and countless other products which have assumed an increasing importance in our markets, thus displacing American labor. Unemployed workers anywhere in the United States represent a loss of potential consumers for other firms, including those in Kansas. Furthermore, as unemployment grows the demand for the products of our farms declines.

I shall make every effort to see that the funds accumulating in the Export-Import Bank through the disposal of our agricultural commodities are made available to American industry for their foreign activities. Under Public Law 480 which I sponsored, this will increase purchasing power in other countries and thereby provide an opportunity for their citizens to purchase some of the goods which are now being sent here rather than being consumed in the countries where they are produced. However, I am unalterably opposed to the use of these funds by American firms to manufacture goods which will be sold in the United States.

I am not an isolationist in any sense of the word as the unity of the free world is of paramount importance in meeting the threats of Communist expansion, but I will never support programs to create jobs in foreign countries at the expense of my fellow Kansans. With wisdom and perseverence we can expand world trade for the benefit of everyone without sacrificing any segment of our economy. This can be done by returning once again to good, old-fashioned Yankee bargaining.

With the new economic blocs that are now being formed and a complete change in our balance-of-payments position, there can be no justification for any other course. Certainly the answer to our problems does not lie in the provision of funds to assist depressed areas by those who are still independent and strong. The recommendations in the platform of the Democratic Party can only destroy the foundations of our free society. Their apparent easy solution will actually present far more problems than it can possibly solve.

My opposition to the adoption of the legislation they have advanced must never be attributed to any callousness on my part for the needs of my fellow citizens. I am determined to introduce legislation which will make it possible for them to better use their skills, abilities, and resources without lowering American living standards in order to compete in the markets of the world.

AMENDMENT OF TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, there is on the Calendar No. 1991, House bill 6462, to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, so as to provide for certain payments for the relief and rehabilitation of needy victims of Nazi persecution, and for other purposes.

I urge that the Senate pass this bill. It is technically an amendment to the Trading With the Enemy Act. In substance, however, it is a measure which makes possible use of funds which were owned by persons who were persecuted by the Nazis, and who died without heirs, for the benefit of needy and surviving former persecutees who are now in the United States.

The policy of the United States has for years been that former persecutees should be able to recover the property which was sequestered during the war because they were—though the first victims of Hitler—technically "enemy nationals." Four years ago, the Congress provided that property of such persons who had died without heirs—mostly killed in Hitler's concentration camps—should be used for assistance in the United States to needy survivors. Thousands of claims to such property were filed by the duly designated successor organization, the Jewish Restitution Successor Organization, which had previously performed a similar task in the American Zone of Germany. H.R. 6462 merely provides a bulk settlement of these thousands of existing claims.

The Trading With the Enemy Act imposes a ceiling of $3 million on these claims. H.R. 6462 settles them for $500,000. The Office of Alien Property supports this amount, and it seems fair as a prompt settlement.

A bulk settlement is in the interest of both the U.S. Government—which would otherwise be faced with administrative costs of an enormous amount in proportion to the total of the claims—and the surviving persecutees, who are in desperate need.

SENATOR FROM NEW YORK

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, earlier today, during the course of a discussion by the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] concerning the defense posture of the United States, and in reply to a request by the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] that he yield, the Senator from Missouri referred to the Senator from New York in a manner which I hope and pray I have misinterpreted. However, in view of the way the statement was made, I must remark on it. The Senator from Missouri referred, in my opinion, in a rather snide way to the fact that the Senator from New York was a military expert.

Mr. President, I think the Senator from Missouri was more correct than he knew in referring in that way to the Senator from New York, because Senator KEATING has a distinguished service record. He was a sergeant in World War I. He was a colonel in World War II and served for 3 years overseas. He is now a brigadier general in the Reserves.

He wears the Legion of Merit with oak leaf cluster, and American, European, and Asiatic Theater ribbons with three battle stars. He is a member of the Order of the British Empire.

Mr. President, I think those honors in themselves enable the Senator from New York to be adjudged a military expert. Certainly his record is inspiring.

He has considerably more of a record than some of our colleagues can brag about on the floor.

I hope I am wrong in my interpretation of the way in which the Senator from Missouri addressed the Senator from New York. If I am wrong, I certainly shall make proper comment on it.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am happy to yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I express my gratitude for the reference made to me by the distinguished Senator from Arizona.

The present mood of the Senator from Missouri was precipitated by the fact that I had inserted in the RECORD a table which completely devastates his argument. That table has been placed in the RECORD four times before; and each time, following its appearance, the Senator from Missouri held forth as he did this morning.

He and I have been longtime friends. He lived in my city for a time. He is married to a delightful lady who is the daughter of one of my dear friends, former Representative Wadsworth.

I join in the hope expressed by the Senator from Arizona that we have misinterpreted the remarks of the Senator from Missouri. I do not pose as a military expert. I do not contend I have a special amount of knowledge of this subject. I have never contended that. However, I have a fair knowledge of arithmetic, and I am able to read a table, particularly, the one to which I just referred, and which precipitated the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Missouri. In any event, I am very grateful to the Senator from Arizona for the complimentary things he said about me. Despite my years of military service, I certainly disavow being an expert on military affairs.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I think both the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] and the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] may be laboring under a misapprehension. I was in the Chamber when the distinguished Senator from Missouri referred to the military experience of the Senator from New York, and I believe he was speaking from the heart, because, as the Senator from Arizona has pointed out—and the Senator from Missouri knows it—the Senator from New York served as an enlisted man in the First World War, kept up his interest in military affairs between the wars, and at the present time is at least a brigadier general, if not a major general, in the Reserves. So I think the statement was made in good faith—not in a sarcastic vein, but in full recognition of the military experience the Senator from New York has had.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the Senator for his remarks; and I hope the interpretation he has placed on the remarks referred to is correct.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, as I said, I sincerely hope I was in error in the understanding I had; and if I was, I make the proper amends.

INVESTIGATION AND PROSECUTION OF CRIMES AND CIVIL ENFORCEMENT ACTIONS UNDER LABOR-MANAGEMENT REPORTING AND DISCLOSURE ACT OF 1959

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, early this year the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare appointed two staff members for the purpose of legislative oversight on the Landrum-Griffin Act, which was passed last year. The purpose of this small staff is to observe the operations of the Department of Labor with respect to the Landrum-Griffin Act.

Mr. President, the minority member of that small staff has prepared a brief review of the activities of the Department of Labor under this act. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INVESTIGATION AND PROSECUTION OF CRIMES AND CIVIL ENFORCEMENT ACTIONS UNDER THE LABOR MANAGEMENT REPORTING AND DISCLOSURE ACT OF 1959

The Secretary of Labor and the Attorney General in February 1960 entered into a memorandum of understanding purporting to define the areas of responsibility and the procedures in the investigation and prosecution of crimes and civil enforcement actions under the act.

Under this agreement the Labor Department investigates all civil violations and five categories of criminal violations—those arising from the law's reporting provisions, both union and employer, union trusteeships, bonding of those handling union funds, and the payment of court imposed fines by a union for a union official. The Labor Department also will conduct investigations and present the issues involving grant of an exemption by the Federal Parole Board for individuals convicted of certain crimes which bar them from holding union office, or from serving as labor relation consultants, or in similar capacities.

The Department of Justice has been delegated the investigation of criminal charges dealing with embezzlement of union funds, payment of court-imposed fines by an employer for a union official or employee, prohibition of criminals or Communists in the matter of holding office, extortionate picketing, deprivation of rights of union members by force and violence, and the making and acceptance of payments or loans by employers to employees, unions, or officers of employees of unions.

This agreement recites that it was entered into pursuant to the provisions of section 607 of the act authorizing the Secretary to enter into interagency agreements and section 601 of the act which gives the Secretary the power to conduct investigations when he believes it necessary in order to determine whether any person has violated or is about to violate the act.

Apparently the Secretary and the Attorney General are proceeding on the assumption that section 601 is the basic provision of the act giving the Secretary overall and exclusive authority to conduct investigations of violations of the act both civil and criminal and that under this section he, and he alone, controls, regulates, and administers all the enforcement provisions of the act, except where he elects to delegate his authority. This is apparent not only from the language and terms of the agreement itself but also from the Labor Department's own press releases.

The memorandum states that "section 601 imposes upon the Secretary the responsibility for conducting investigations of persons who have violated or are about to violate any provisions" of the act. The memorandum further states that "it is desirable and essential that the areas of responsibility and the procedure in connection with the investigations, prosecutions of offenses and civil enforcement actions be the subject of formal agreement." It also states—"nothing in this memorandum shall be construed to affect the investigative jurisdiction of the Department of Justice under other statutes." In the Secretary's 6-month report on the act's enforcement there is found the following language: "the Secretary of Labor delegated to the Department of Justice authority to act as agent of the Department of Labor on a case by case basis in certain investigations involving alleged criminal acts."

The only conclusion to be drawn from this is that the Secretary regards himself as sole possessor of all investigating authority in this field under section 601.

But this was obviously not the intention of the Congress in enacting this provision. Section 601 was inserted in the act in order to insure that the Secretary have the broad investigatory power he has under other statutes he administers and which is possessed by a number of other Federal agencies in investigating violations of the statute which they administer. It was intended to confer upon the Secretary discretionary authority in the matter of investigations supplemental to that specifically given him in other sections of the act. The section was clearly not intended to provide basic authority to control all the enforcement provisions of the act.

If the Secretary is correct that section 601 gives him exclusive investigatory power covering all violations of the act, a curious situation has been created by Congress. For example, sections 304 and 402 require the Secretary to investigate violations of the provisions of titles III and IV. There is, however, no such specific mandatory direction to the Secretary to investigate violations of certain other provisions of the act. Section 502, for example, the bonding provision, provides only criminal penalties for violation of the section and does not require the Secretary to investigate. The same is true with reference to section 503, Loans to Officers. According to the Secretary's concept of his authority, he alone would have the power to investigate violations of those sections under section 601. However, section 601 provides discretionary authority only. Therefore if the Secretary, exercising this discretion, decided not to investigate, presumably there could be no investigation and the matter would be ended. Thus, Congress must be deemed to have intended that the criminal provisions in this act be investigated and enforced not by the Department of Justice in the usual manner, but rather as and to the extent that the Secretary of Labor sees fit. It is unlikely that Congress intended any such result which would give unlimited power to the Secretary.

Some questions arise, for example, it is conceivable that the Secretary might take the position that if he determines upon investigation of an individual's complaint that the allegations are not supported by sufficient evidence—does this mean that the matter is closed and that the Justice Department cannot investigate the same charges even where it might have come to a different conclusion as to the sufficiency of the evidence? If the Secretary, to take another example, exercising his discretion, elected not to even undertake an investigation, would this prevent the Justice Department from going ahead with its own investigation if it felt that a violation had occurred? If the Secretary decided that the Justice Department

was too vigorous in its investigation and prosecution of labor unions, could he, for example, revoke some or all of the delegation?

Another point to explore is whether the Secretary had any particular design or purpose in mind in the assignment of violations to be investigated. Was the intent to permit the Secretary to control the enforcement provisions insofar as labor unions are concerned? For example, it is difficult to understand why, under the agreement, violations of 503(b) relating to the payment of fines of a labor official by an employer are investigated by Justice while the same violations by a labor union come under the jurisdiction of the Secretary. Generally, it seems that the agreement delegates to Justice violations of the type traditionally associated with that Agency (those involving force, violence, etc.) while reserving to the exclusive jurisdiction of the Secretary the more complicated and subtle criminal provisions dealing with unions. In any event it would seem that it would not be amiss to inquire what considerations governed the assignment of investigative jurisdiction in the agreement.

INVESTIGATIVE JURISDICTION OF ENFORCEMENT PROVISIONS OF REPORTING AND DISCLOSURE ACT

1. CIVIL ENFORCEMENT

(By individuals)

Title I. Bill of Rights: Section 102 gives a union member a right to sue a union in a Federal court, including the right to injunctive relief for violating his rights.

Title V. Safeguards—Fiduciary: Section 501(b) provides in certain cases for suit in Federal court by a union member for the benefit of the union where a union official breaches his fiduciary duty and the union refuses to act.

2. CIVIL ENFORCEMENT

(By Secretary of Labor)

Title II. Reporting Requirements: Section 210 gives the Secretary of Labor power to institute a civil action in Federal court for appropriate relief, including injunctive relief for violations or possible future violations of these provisions. (Labor Department investigates.)

Title III. Trusteeships: Section 304 requires the Secretary upon a written complaint to investigate certain violations of this title and, where he finds probable cause to believe a violation exists, to sue in Federal court for relief, including injunctions. (Labor Department investigates.)

Title IV. Elections: Section 402 contains a provision permitting a union member who has exhausted his remedies to file a complaint with the Secretary. The Secretary must investigate and where he finds probable cause must sue for appropriate relief. (Labor Department investigates.)

Title VI. Miscellaneous Provisions: Section 601 gives the Secretary supplemental authority to investigate when he believes the act has been or will be violated.

3. CRIMINAL PROVISIONS

Title II. Reporting: Section 209 provides penalties for violations of the reporting provisions of Title. (Labor Department investigates.)

Title III. Trusteeships: Sections 301 and 303 contain the criminal provisions. (Labor Department investigates.)

Title V. Safeguards for Labor:

Section 501(c) [Embezzlement] (Justice Department investigates).

Section 502 [Bonding] (Labor Department investigates).

Section 503(a) [Loans by Labor Organizations] (Labor Department investigates).

Section 503(b) [Payment of fines by an employer] (Justice Department investigates).

[Payment of fines by Labor Organizations] (Labor Department investigates).

Section 504 [Prohibition against holding offices by certain persons] (Justice Department investigates).

Section 505 (Amendment to Sec. 302 of Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, as amended, relating to payments by employers to representative of employees, employer associations, consultants, etc.) (Justice Department investigates).

Title VI. Miscellaneous Provisions:

Section 602 [Extortionate Picketing] (Justice Department investigates).

Section 610 [Deprivation of rights by violence] (Justice Department investigates).

CORRECTION OF ERROR REGARDING SALARY OF CHAIRMAN OF SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have been asked to make the following request:

I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency be discharged from further consideration of the bill, H.R. 13066, to amend section 4(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended, and that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of the bill.

The purpose of this bill is to correct an error which was made in the enactment of Public Law 86–619, approved July 12, 1960. This act amended the Federal Power Act, the Communications Act of 1934, and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934. Its purpose was to make it clear that members of the Federal Power Commission, the Federal Communications Commission, and the Securities and Exchange Commission would serve after the expiration of their terms until their successors should be appointed and qualified, but not beyond the expiration of the next following session of Congress.

Inadvertently, the Federal Executive Pay Act of 1956, which set the salary of the Chairman of the SEC at $20,500 a year, was amended to provide that "Each Commissioner shall receive a salary at the rate of $20,000 a year * * *". No such change in the salary of the Chairman was intended by either the House or the Senate in enacting Public Law 86–619. H.R. 13066 would correct this error by specifically providing a salary of $20,500 a year for the Chairman of the SEC.

This request has been approved by the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON]; and by the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the ranking minority Member present. It has also been approved by the minority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Committee on Banking and Currency will be discharged from the further consideration of House bill 13066; and the bill will be read by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 13066) to amend section 4(a) of the Securities and Exchange Act of 1934, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas for the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 13066) was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

PERMISSION FOR WATER USERS' ORGANIZATION TO DO PORTIONS OF CONSTRUCTION WORK ON MERCEDES RECLAMATION PROJECT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have a very unusual private bill. It is designed to permit water users to use their own organization, their own personnel, and their own equipment, in order to save money. The Bureau of Reclamation and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget are in approval; and the House has passed the bill unanimously. The bill, H.R. 10311, is at the desk; and I move that the Senate now proceed to its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate a bill coming over from the House of Representatives.

The bill (H.R. 10311) providing that certain provisions of Public Law 335 dated October 7, 1949 (63 Stat. 724), shall apply to the Mercedes division of the lower Rio Grande rehabilitation project, Texas, was read twice by its title.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the enactment of the legislation is urgently needed at this time because construction of the project is already underway. If the water users are to be permitted to do any part of this construction work, the authority therefor must be made available immediately.

Enactment of H.R. 10311 will not result in any additional cost to the Federal Government. As a matter of fact there should be a saving in cost to the Federal Government and certainly there would result a saving in cost to the water users' organization.

The Mercedes division of the lower Rio Grande rehabilitation project in Texas was authorized by the act of April 7, 1958, and the Hidalgo and Cameron Counties Water Control and Improvement District No. 9 executed a repayment contract dated July 18, 1958, for the return of the cost of the project. The district has indicated a desire to do a portion of the construction and rehabilitation work with its own personnel and equipment but the authorizing act contains no authority for such a procedure. Enactment of H.R. 10311 would provide the needed authority.

Under the procedure which this bill authorizes, the district could contract with the United States to do certain portions of the work and be reimbursed for the work performed. Designs and specifications for the work to be undertaken by the district would be subject to prior approval of the Bureau of Reclamation

and the work performed would be subject to Bureau inspection and acceptance. The Department of the Interior believes that this authority would allow the district to perform portions of the work more effectively and efficiently than would ordinarily be possible under usual Bureau of Reclamation contract procedures.

Mr. President, the Secretary of the Interior endorses the project. The Bureau of the Budget has no objection to it. I have cleared this measure with the minority leader, and I have discussed it with the ranking members of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, last night I made inquiry about the bill. After the inquiry, I examined the report on the bill. I feel that the purposes sought to be achieved by the bill are worthy; and the objections which I raised last night were made on the basis of not knowing what was in the bill. Today, after having learned of it, I urge that the bill be passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 10311) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas subsequently said:

Mr. President, earlier in the day the Senate passed H.R. 10311, providing that certain provisions of Public Law 335 dated October 7, 1949 (63 Stat. 724), shall apply to the Mercedes division of the lower Rio Grande rehabilitation project, Texas.

Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

GREETINGS TO PRESIDENT EISENHOWER AND FORMER VICE PRESIDENT GARNER ON THEIR COMING BIRTHDAYS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, my colleague, Mr. YARBOROUGH, has Senate Resolution 383, which involves two distinguished Americans. The minority leader and the chairman of the minority policy committee have cleared the resolution. I believe it is noncontroversial. I certainly concur in the sentiments expressed in it. I should like to yield at this time to my colleague, to permit him either to read the resolution or to make a statement about it.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 383.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 383) extending greetings to President Eisenhower and former Vice President John N. Garner on the occasion of their coming birthdays.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the adoption of the resolution is requested by the Texas Heritage Foundation. These two distinguished Americans were each born in the State of Texas; and of the people born in Texas since that State entered the Union in December 1845, these two gentlemen have attained the highest offices in our Federal Government. It is providential that both of them are still living. Former Vice President John Nance Garner is 91 years old. President Eisenhower is 69. President Eisenhower will celebrate his 70th birthday and former Vice President Garner will celebrate his 92d birthday after the adjournment of the 86th Congress and before the convening of the 87th Congress. The Texas Heritage Foundation supports this resolution for the joint commemoration which it plans in Texas. One of the birthdays will fall in October, and the other in November.

I ask that the resolution be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Committee on the Judiciary, before which the bill has been pending, will be discharged from further consideration of the resolution; and, without objection, the resolution is agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 383) was agreed to, as follows:

Whereas the two Texas-born Americans who have reached the highest governmental offices since Texas entered the Union are both still living; the Honorable John Nance Garner, age ninety-one, and the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, age sixty-nine; and

Whereas both will celebrate their birthdays after the adjourning of the second session of the Eighty-sixth Congress; and

Whereas Dwight David Eisenhower, the thirty-fourth President of the United States, born in Denison, Texas, will celebrate his seventieth birthday this year;

Whereas Mr. Eisenhower, having graduated from the United States Military Academy in 1911, followed his chosen career in the United States Army and soon after the entry of the United States in World War II was appointed Commanding General of the European Theater of Operations; and

Whereas in December 1943, Dwight D. Eisenhower was given the title of Supreme Commander, Allied Expeditionary Forces, and as such directed the successful invasion of Europe leading to the surrender of Germany in May 1945; and

Whereas, having been named Army Chief of Staff, Mr. Eisenhower's promotion to the rank of permanent General of the Army came in April 1946; and

Whereas, although retired from active duty in the Army to accept an appointment as president of Columbia University in 1948, Mr. Eisenhower took a leave of absence from Columbia from December 1950 to February 1951 when President Truman appointed him Commander of Allied Powers in Europe, with the task of organizing the armed forces of NATO; and

Whereas in 1952 this distinguished American was elected to the country's highest office, President of the United States; and

Whereas another distinguished American, also a native son of Texas, John Nance Garner, the thirty-second Vice President of the United States, born in Red River County, Texas, will celebrate his ninety-second birthday this year; and

Whereas John Nance Garner was a self-taught lawyer and held his first public office from 1893 to 1898 as county judge of Uvalde County, Texas; and

Whereas John Nance Garner was elected to the Texas House of Representatives in 1898, serving through 1902, and beginning in 1903, served thirty years in the United States House of Representatives from the Fifteenth Congressional District of Texas, and was Speaker of the House of the Seventy-second Congress; and

Whereas in 1932 the people of the United States, on the basis of his achievements in national affairs, elected Mr. Garner to the Office of Vice President, in which Office he ably served from 1933 to 1941; and

Whereas John Nance Garner is the only man in history to preside in uninterrupted succession over both Houses of the Congress, first as Speaker of the House of Representatives and then as Vice President of the United States; and

Whereas, in addition to his other public duties, John Nance Garner has made great contributions to the preservation of the Texas heritage, having assisted in founding the University of Texas Memorial Museum; and

Whereas the Nation owes these two distinguished men, so large a part of whose lives have been spent in public service, a grateful salute and best wishes on the approach of their respective birthdays: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate hereby extends its warm greetings and best wishes to these two distinguished Americans on their birthday anniversaries which, in the case of President Eisenhower, will occur on October 14, 1960, and, in the case of John Nance Garner, will occur on November 22, 1960.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Senate is directed to transmit properly certified copies of this resolution to President Eisenhower and to Mr. Garner.

AID TO EDUCATION

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, as the session draws to a close, I should like to express my deep regret and keen disappointment that Congress has been unable to agree on a Federal aid to education bill.

Senators are aware that a bill was passed in this body earlier this year. In my judgment, that was an excellent bill, providing as it did Federal assistance for school construction and for teachers' salaries on a matching fund basis with the States. The bill gave the States the option of utilizing the Federal grants either for construction or for teachers' salaries, or for both, in such proportions as the States might decide. The bill also was very clear in its explicit prohibition of any possibility of Federal control over State and local education.

Senators will recall that the House passed a bill, in a smaller amount, dealing only with school construction, and containing, as it passed the House, the so-called Powell amendment.

It is a source of keen regret to me that, because of the situation in the Rules Committee in the House, it was impossible to get the two bills to conference and to work out a compromise bill which could receive the approval of both Houses of Congress and the signature of the President. Next year we must do better.

I am happy to note that both party platforms call for Federal aid to education, the Democratic platform being more specific and including grants for

teachers' salaries as well as for school construction.

Senators will recall the rather exciting events on the floor of this body when, after an initial rebuff, under the leadership of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], by a very close vote, the so-called Monroney-Clark amendment was adopted, giving the States the option of using Federal money either for teachers' salaries or for school construction.

The substance of the Monroney-Clark amendment has been incorporated into the Democratic National Platform. I am confident that when our party succeeds at the polls next November, our new President and Vice President will stand firmly on that platform and recommend enactment of a Federal aid to education bill along the general lines of the one that passed the Senate this year.

I hope, God willing, to be here to assist in that effort; and I am confident that an overwhelming majority of the Democratic Senators will support the Democratic platform, so that, with leadership from the White House, we can look forward to enactment of the kind of bill called for by the platform.

I am equally confident that our Democratic colleagues in the other body will so reform their rules next January as to make it impossible for a small, benighted, conservative group who comprise half the Rules Committee, consisting of Members of both parties, to prevent legislation recommended by standing committees of the House from coming to a vote on the floor.

I make these comments in the closing hours of this session in order to assure those who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and the press that, in my opinion, the Democratic Party will pass a good Federal aid to education bill early in the next session, a bill which will comply in all material respects with our party platform.

MONETARY POLICY

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I turn now to another matter.

Senators will recall the debates in this body during this session and the session which preceded it with respect to tight money and high interest, and the problems of financing the Government debt. It is perhaps not inappropriate for those of us who stood firmly in support of an easier credit, lower interest policy to point out that because of our objection, to the proposed increase in the debt ceiling, the Treasury was unable to go ahead with financing of Government indebtedness at interest rates which would have imposed an unconscionable burden on future generations of Americans.

I point out again the shocking increase in national debt charges which took place during the 7½ years of the Eisenhower administration because of the deliberate policy of both the Federal Reserve—despite its alleged independence—and the Treasury of the United States.

I think we can all take justifiable pride that we did not yield to the President in increasing the debt ceiling. Had we done so, I am confident that between them the Federal Reserve and the Treasury would have foisted on the American people billions and billions of dollars of high-interest, long-term Government bonds which would have been a permanent drag on our economy and a constant brake on our efforts, through a sound fiscal policy, to balance the budget and reduce the debt.

I note with considerable concern, Mr. President, that despite the fact that the Treasury is able to refinance a large part of our short-term debt in long-term bonds at very much lower interest rates than the statutory interest rate ceiling, the Treasury is still making no effort to refinance our short-term debt. During the years past we were told of the necessity for raising the interest-rate ceiling on the debt and the great need to get billions of dollars of short-term debt funded into long-term debt. This was considered a serious matter, yet the Treasury is making no move in that regard whatsoever now. Quite to the contrary, the Treasury intends to refinance relatively long-term Government bonds, bonds which have a maturity in some instances of almost 10 years beyond the present date, into higher interest Government bonds of a 20- or 25-year maturity.

Mr. President, the fallacy of this policy was pointed out strikingly in the debate in the other body about 10 days ago.

I should like for the Members of this body to know that many of us—including, I am sure, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]—look with grave skepticism at this policy of the Treasury. I am sure I speak for the other Senators when I say we hope that once the Congress adjourns the Treasury will turn its endeavors toward refinancing the short-term debt so as to get it into long-term securities.

I deplore again the apparent policy of the Treasury to refinance long-term debt at even higher rates of interest than present bonds provide.

Mr. President, I am confident that when we return in January with a Democratic administration we shall carry into effect, through a new and enlightened Secretary of the Treasury, and perhaps with new leadership in the Federal Reserve Board—although that is not necessarily required—the program laid down in the Democratic platform, which is a lower interest policy, an easier money policy, in times when the productive capacity of our Nation is not being fully utilized, in times when unemployment is increasing instead of decreasing, in times when the threat of inflation has pretty well gone out of the picture.

I am confident, as a result of those sound policies laid down in the Democratic platform, we shall see monetary and debt management policies next year which will be in the interests of all the people of the United States and which will contribute to a maximum growth of our economy, a maximum stabilization in the cost of living, and maximum employment. All these objectives are specified in the Employment Act of 1946, and all have largely been ignored by the Eisenhower administration.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

THE HUMAN PROBLEMS OF THE PENNSYLVANIA RAILROAD STRIKE

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, 14 years ago when I first came to the Congress, when travel by railroad was more common than it is now, I was in the Pennsylvania Station in Washington one day and noticed a lady with two little children in a corner of the station. She was weeping and obviously distraught. I was bold enough to inquire what was the trouble. She explained that she had come from North Carolina, had gotten as far as Washington, wished to go to Philadelphia to see some relatives, but did not have the money to go further. I may have been a "sucker"—we all often are—but I helped her to get to Philadelphia.

That incident had a rather strong impression on me, when I read this morning in the newspaper about the lady who got into the station last night. She arrived in Washington en route to Philadelphia with an ailing elderly aunt. It was heartbreaking for her to discover that the train service had stopped. Plaintively she said, "I do not know what to do. My aunt is very sick." She finally decided to take a bus.

Another unfortunate man with eight children, traveling to Albany from Salisburg, N.C., on railroad passes, discovered to his chagrin that the rest of the trip was going to cost money that he apparently did not have.

I cite these examples, Mr. President, because I know a railroad strike creates very serious human problems, that it creates anguish and distress to which none of us can be indifferent.

I have no knowledge about the merits of the controversy. I understand that efforts are being made to resolve this dispute. I have inquired at the National Mediation Board as to what is being done. I have expressed the hope that the strike can as quickly as possible be brought to a close.

It would be presumptuous on my part to suggest any solution.

Furthermore, I have no set position as to whether further legislation is necessary. I share with my colleagues from Delaware and many others the hope that this strike can be speedily settled.

As I have said, it involves very important human problems. I wish to say that I look upon the strike as very serious, and I hope with all my heart that something can be done quickly to resolve the issues between the parties.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE OF AMERICA

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, it is a signal honor and privilege to salute the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America on the occasion of the forthcoming celebration of the 20th anniversary of its founding. Established in

1940, this dedicated and patriotic committee has brought new vigor and fresh spirit to the historic concept of freedom in America and throughout the world.

The Ukrainian Congress Committee was created with the high and sacred objective of securing for their native Ukraine the same democracy and freedom its sons and daughters had found in America. It set as its goal, as well, the strengthening of the United States in its role as the bulwark of freedom in a world where freedom faces the constant and deadly peril of the Communist design for conquest.

This distinguished organization represents some 2½ million Americans of Ukrainian descent. By the noble purpose of their mission and the dynamic quality of their endeavor, these stalwart fighters for freedom have won the respect and admiration of their fellow Americans.

At this time of commemoration, it is well for us to recall that the valiant Ukrainian people are not Russian at all, but are enduring the captive fate of so many other brave nationalities that have been forced into bondage by the Soviet regime. It is for this reason that we join our hearts and hopes and prayers with our American friends of Ukrainian descent in the high cause of the liberation of their brethren, enslaved behind the Iron Curtain. The lights have gone out for these silent millions, save for the flickering spark of hope that only their spiritual courage keeps alive.

In the name of our common brotherhood under God, let us, as free men, pledge our unremitting zeal and energies to the end that the spark may one day flame again into the bright and cherished light of freedom so long denied to the courageous people of the Ukraine.

TRIBUTE TO AMBASSADOR URGUPLU

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, it is unlikely that any representative of a foreign government who has served in Washington in recent memory was more popular or more highly respected than former Ambassador Ali Suad Hayri Urguplu of Turkey. During his stay in this country the Ambassador and his equally popular wife endeared themselves to a wide circle of friends, both official and nonofficial.

His able work in bringing additional understanding to the problems affecting Turkish-American relations served notably to help bring our two countries closer together. In particular, I recall how firmly he reflected Turkey's adamant stand against international communism and his dedication to preserving the free world alliance against this conspiracy.

The outstanding success with which Ambassador Urguplu and his wife represented their native land in the United States was eloquently testified to by the high words of praise accorded them when they returned to their homeland. The tributes paid the Ambassador reflected not only upon his personal popularity and that of his wife, but also attested to the official gratification that he had handled Turkish-American relations with such tact and skill.

Following his service in this country, Ambassador Urguplu was transferred to the post of Ambassador of Turkey in Spain, where I understand he served with his usual distinction. According to recent reports, he has now returned to his homeland, where he is temporarily attached to the foreign office in Ankara while awaiting a new assignment.

It goes without saying that the many Members of the Senate, as well as other Americans in official and nonofficial status who came to know him during his tenure in this country, wish him well in the days ahead. He exemplifies the finest in Turkey's heritage and traditions, as well as the firm bonds of friendship between Turkey and the United States which we all hope will grow even stronger in the future.

It is my hope that Ambassador Urguplu will have the continued opportunity to serve his country in the able manner he is so obviously capable of doing.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may supplement his able remarks?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I yield to my distinguished friend from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to be here in the Chamber at the very moment that the distinguished Senator from New York is voicing these words of praise and appreciation of Ambassador Urguplu. It was my very great pleasure to become well acquainted with him in his work while he was here in Washington. I thought he was one of the most effective representatives of a free people that I have had the pleasure to know during my 14 years of service in Washington.

We had several subjects in which citizens of my State had interest, and sometimes pressing interest, to them in Turkey to take up with him. Always I found him showing not only interest, but he always had enough time personally to handle those matters, always to the great satisfaction of the people in my State who had those problems, and certainly to the great satisfaction of the representatives of the people of Florida here in Washington. I found him always a splendid representative and exemplar of the freedom-loving and fearless people of Turkey, who in spite of the fact that they look across many miles of narrow sea frontier and many miles of land frontier directly at the Soviet, they do so fearlessly and with every intention of standing up for the freedom which they cherish, and standing up along with ourselves and other advocates of freedom throughout the earth.

I think he was a splendid representative of the Turks, and I am glad to speak this word.

May I say that in addition to his splendid representation of his people in the field of handling business, I found him always one of the most popular of the foreign representatives in Washington, and he and his lovely wife, Madam Urguplu, were regarded by Mrs. Holland and myself as among the finest people whom we met here representing other countries, and we always found it a source of delight to be with them.

I gladly join my distinguished friend in speaking that appreciation of the Urguplus, and we regret the fact that we no longer have them here to represent their great and free people. I thank the Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I am grateful to my friend from Florida for those remarks. I first became acquainted with Ambassador Urguplu when he and I were delegates to the Interparliamentary Union. He was then a member of the Turkish Parliament. He has had a political background. He has a great capacity for friendship. He has a winning manner.

He has certainly represented his country admirably in Washington, and I wish for him all the best in the future.

TRIBUTE TO TELEPHONE PAGES TO THE MINORITY

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to two young men on our side of the aisle who work constantly and efficiently to keep things in order in the Republican cloakroom. At times, that is quite an assignment. This is, in a sense, "ringing" praise for two young men who are very much used to ringing, for I would estimate that they expeditiously handle 300 or 400 telephone calls a day for the members of the minority side—which shows how busy we are on this side. I have no knowledge about how busy they are on the other side, but I presume just as busy or perhaps even more so. For myself I extend my gratitude to Russell J. Call and Harold W. Perkins. Russ and Harry have done a fine job. They amply deserve a note of recognition.

A FINE TELEVISION SERIES CONTRIBUTES TO RAISING TV STANDARDS AND TO AMERICA'S UNDERSTANDING OF ITS HERITAGE

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, many Americans, including a great many Members of the House and Senate, have expressed concern in recent months over the content of television programs. Many have feared that this great medium of expression was being perverted to shows glorifying crime, sex, violence, sadism, and corruption.

It is a pleasure to cite a contrast to this trend and to praise a sponsor who is meeting the demand for quality television. I refer to "Our American Heritage," a series of historical dramatizations sponsored by the Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States.

This award-winning series of last year will start its second season on Friday, October 21, on the NBC–TV network. The programs, produced by Mildred Freed Alberg, in collaboration with the editors of American Heritage magazine, will re-create dramatic and exciting "moments of decision" in the lives of such great Americans as Alexander Hamilton, Theodore Roosevelt, and Andrew Jackson. Veteran broadcaster and globetrotter Lowell Thomas will introduce the programs and narrate on the

significant contributions to our American heritage of the historic events and figures portrayed.

This series should rate high on the viewing list of all Americans who take pride in our great heritage and the men who made it great, and who are concerned about the lack of knowledge and understanding of our traditions among many Americans today.

SUPPORT FROM ORGANIZED LABOR FOR SENATOR KENNEDY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, one of the tests of the standing of a man in American public life is the support he receives in his own neighborhood and community and district and State. I have been looking over the proceedings of the AFL–CIO Third Constitutional Convention, held at San Francisco, Calif., last September. I am pleased to note the position taken by the delegates of the Massachusetts delegation at that convention in regard to Senator JACK KENNEDY. One of the leaders of organized labor in the Massachusetts AFL–CIO Council is Mr. Kenneth Kelley. Mr. Kelley, at the San Francisco convention, made very clear the stanch and loyal support of the Massachusetts AFL–CIO Council for JACK KENNEDY. For example, in the course of his remarks, he said:

> We in Massachusetts have consistently supported him in his campaigns both for the Congress and for the Senate and we are supporting him in his campaign for the U.S. Presidency.

As one who has served with Senator KENNEDY on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare for some years, and as one who has differed with him with regard to some policies in the field of labor legislation, I wish to say that I am very much pleased by the unity of labor support which he enjoys in the State of Massachusetts. I am saying to the AFL–CIO council of my own State that in my judgment he is deserving of the support in the State of Oregon from organized labor, just as he has received it in the State of Massachusetts.

At the same San Francisco convention last year another very distinguished and able labor leader in this country, Mr. Joseph D. Keenan, of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, made one of the finest statements in regard to the qualifications of Mr. KENNEDY that were made at the convention. I am pleased to learn that Joseph Keenan is doing all he can in behalf of taking the qualifications of Mr. KENNEDY to the councils of organized labor in the United States.

THE SUGAR BILL AND THE COLD WAR

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I will say a few words today on the sugar bill which went through an exhausted Senate at 10 minutes of 3 this morning, and the relationship of this bill to the cold war.

Tragically, it has become a truism to say that we are losing the cold war. What is the result of this succession of defeats?

I tried to sum it up in a statement which I made last April to the Veterans of Foreign Wars when I said:

> One-third of the human race is in prison.
>
> If you go to the Austrian side of the Hungarian border, you can see one of the outer walls of this prison. It is lined with barbed wire. Every few feet there is a sentry box manned by armed guards with orders to kill those who seek to escape.
>
> If you go to West Germany, you may meet people and hear stories of those who have been fleeing from the prison through the Berlin subway for the past 15 years.
>
> If you go to Hong Kong or Macao, you will meet people and hear stories of those who have fled from the prison that calls itself the Chinese Peoples Republic. You might even see some of these refugees actually in flight, with Red guards pursuing and shooting at them. Residents of Macao have seen such things more than once.
>
> If you go to the Indian side of the Tibetan border, you may see similar sights.
>
> Nothing as monstrous as this has ever happened in the whole history of mankind. The masters of this intercontinental slave empire have proclaimed their intention of expanding. Their octopus tentacles have reached to Cuba, which is only a few miles from the American border.

That is the picture of defeat, and it is an appalling one. How have these present-day Pharaohs advanced so far?

I submit, Mr. President, that their advance has been due in great measure to the fact that the effective leadership of the so-called free world does not yet understand what the cold war is and what must be done to win it.

The cold war began 112 years ago when Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels stated, in their Communist manifesto:

> The Communists disdain to conceal their views and aims. They openly declare that their ends can be attained only by the forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions.

The warriors of the cold war received their marching orders 40 years ago when V. I. Lenin said:

> We repudiate all morality that is taken outside of human, class concepts. We say that our morality is entirely subordinated to the interest of the class struggle.

The effective leadership of the free world has never really accepted the terrible reality behind the words I have just read.

Year after year, in country after country, and continent after continent, the effective leadership of the free world makes the same terrible blunders over and over again because of this continued flight from reality. I call them blunders out of charity. Other people use a harsher word.

"Betrayal."

Let me remind Senators of some of these "blunders."

We blundered in Yugoslavia when we chose Tito over Mihailovich.

We blundered at the end of World War II when we sent back to Stalin's slave camps thousands of Russians who had fled to us seeking asylum from his tyranny.

We blundered in China when we forced Chiang Kai-shek to accept field marshals of the Communist cold war into his own anti-Communist government.

At 10 minutes of 3 this morning we blundered again when we voted to strike at the economy of the Dominican Republic, which had been our ally in the cold war which has now advanced to the Caribbean. At 10 minutes of 3 this morning we passed a bill which ostensibly gives the President discretion in the allotment of sugar quotas assigned to the Dominican Republic and domestic producers. What we were actually doing, was saying once more to all the world that the United States of America does not stand by those who stand by her.

What right do we have to express surprise at the continuing success of the Communists in this cold war?

What right do we have to express surprise at the fact that today, as we stand here on this floor, one-third of the human race is in prison?

This country has suspended diplomatic relations with the Dominican Republic because, it is alleged, the Government of the Dominican Republic was guilty of aggression against another Latin American country. I do not say this is true, I say this is the charge, the alleged basis of our action.

But, Mr. President, we have not severed diplomatic relations with Cuba; yet Cuba has several times taken aggressive action against other Latin American countries. For instance, the Castro government mounted an actual invasion of the Dominican Republic, sent an armed force in government-owned aircraft to spearhead this invasion.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That was when the State Department was working with Cuba, was it not?

Mr. EASTLAND. From the testimony which will be released, I think it will be shown that the State Department is responsible for the installation of Castro as a Communist dictator in the Caribbean. I think that has endangered the cities of the United States, if I correctly understand what has happened there.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Was not that the beginning of our sugar trouble?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct.

Mr JOHNSTON of South Carolina. We would not be talking about sugar today if it had not been for the misdeeds of the State Department.

Mr. EASTLAND. Certainly that is correct.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I noticed the Senator referred to barbed wire fences along the border of Hungary. I have been there and have seen them. I think it would be well for people to go there and see them. For about 5 miles before one reaches the border, along what is supposed to be a main public road, the houses and other buildings are in a state of decay. Is not that so?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. When one reaches the border, he sees not one barbed wire fence, but several barbed wire entanglements, about 6 or 8 feet high. In between the barbed wire entanglements is plowed ground. It is kept plowed so that if anyone attempts to cross the border, he can be tracked. Also, mines are laid between one barbed wire entanglement and another.

In addition, about every 500 yards there is a tower in which is stationed a rifleman whose duty it is to prevent anyone from crossing the border.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct. Is it not a fact that for the past 4 years we have not stood up to communism, but that our attitude has been one of retreat, retreat, retreat, as one country after another has come within the influence of communism?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes; and did we not start that immediately after the end of the war? It was "You take half and we will take half." That was the kind of compromise which was made.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct. But in 1952 I thought it had been brought into balance. Now we see the Communist sweep in Africa, in the Caribbean, in South America, and all over the world.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. In Korea, we took a little part and gave the Communists the rest. We said, "You take this and we will take this little part down here." Then it was not very long until the Communists had stirred up trouble in our part of the territory.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It was the same way in Vietnam. We said, "You take this half; we will take that half."

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct. How could we compromise when we were always giving away something the Communists did not have?

The Communists said to the free world, "You take half and we will take half"; but it ended with the Communists getting both halves, because we have not had strong leadership in the United States since 1952.

I said Castro had mounted an armed invasion against the Dominican Republic. Testimony before the Internal Security Subcommittee, and photographs in the possession of the subcommittee, establish this beyond question. No more aggressive act by one Latin American nation against another can be imagined than the actual mounting of an armed invasion. But we have not even criticized the Castro government for this action.

What did we do? We apologized to them on the basis of lies told by the dictator of Cuba.

But we have moved against the Dominican Republic.

It is the executive branch of the Government which has taken this action against the Dominican Republic, just as it is the executive branch of the Government which helped to bring Castro into power, and which tolerates him today. In asking for authority to cut the Dominican sugar quota, the Executive proposed that the legislative branch of the Government also bring sanctions against the Dominican Republic. In approving a bill to grant that authority, the Senate assented. I hope we shall hear no more of this.

Mr. President, the legislative branch of the Government represents the people of the United States. And the people of the United States, Mr. President, are not enemies of the Dominican Republic, and do not regard the Castro dictatorship in Cuba as just another agrarian reform movement. The people of the United States, Mr. President, are considerably more realistic than the executive branch of this Government has been, on the question of who our friends are, and who our enemies are.

The people of the United States, Mr. President, are going to repudiate an administration that is patient with our enemies and rough on our friends, an administration which has not merely tolerated, but has actually let Government officials connive at, the revolutionary replacement of a friendly government in Cuba, which resulted in the establishment of a Communist beachhead 90 miles from our shores. If we here in the legislative branch should show ourselves equally unrealistic with regard to where the interests of this country lie, I think the people of the United States might very soon get around to the point of repudiating us.

Mr. President, there is danger to the Western Hemisphere. Specifically, there is danger to all Latin America. But, Mr. President, that danger does not come from the Dominican Republic, which for 30 years has been on the same side as the United States, which fought with us against the Nazi threat to take over the world, and which has been fighting with us against the Communist threat to take over the world.

No, Mr. President, the threat to the Western Hemisphere and to the nations of Latin America is from the world Communist conspiracy, and this threat is focused through the Communist dictatorship in Cuba.

Trujillo and Castro are both dictators. But Trujillo does not threaten the United States, does not insult us, does not steal the property of our Government and our people, does not threaten to bomb us. Castro has done all of these things. So what do we do? We slap Castro on the wrist, and kick Trujillo in the teeth.

News stories last week informed us that the administration had decided to prohibit the use of foreign aid funds for the purchase of sugar from the Dominican Republic. As these news stories pointed out, this decision of the administration was designed to prevent countries which receive foreign aid dollars from spending them to buy Dominican sugar.

This decision of the administration was in the same vein as the President's request for authority to end the purchase of Dominican sugar and to purchase this sugar elsewhere. This is the issue involved in the pending bill.

I have already expressed myself respecting the complete lack of justification for this move, and I shall not repeat what I have already said. But I want to call attention to the fact that up until the very day of this announcement of the move to ban the use of foreign aid funds for the purchase of Dominican sugar, and in the face of far greater provocation than the Dominican Republic ever gave us, the administration has continued to make foreign aid funds available for the purchase of Cuban sugar.

In Cuba, more than a billion dollars' worth of American-owned business and property has been "intervened," as the Cubans say—which means taken over by the Government without just compensation—or stolen. This has included at least 36 American-owned sugar mills, worth some $200 million.

On July 2, Congress passed a new sugar quota law giving President Eisenhower authority to reallocate sugar imports; and the following day, the President cut Cuba out of the import quota, and gave her share of the sugar quota to other areas, including Hawaii and the Philippine Islands.

In spite of this action, the International Cooperation Administration continued, after July 2, and in fact, until Thursday of last week, to let charters for Cuban sugar purchases. This was done, I am given to understand, on the theory that contracts for this foreign-aid sugar already had been signed. The fact remains that ICA continued to buy Cuban sugar for foreign-aid shipment, even after the President had implemented an act of Congress to cut off purchases of Cuban sugar.

It has been argued that there was justification for this policy, in spite of its apparent inconsistency with the action of Congress and the action of the President, because at least some of the mills from which ICA was buying sugar were still in the possession of American-owned companies. And it is said that the foreign country which gets an ICA grant for sugar negotiates for itself with a broker or supplier; and that when such a country buys from A, who buys from B, who buys from a Cuban sugar mill, there is nothing we can do about it.

Mr. President, I do not consider these arguments justification for what I consider to have been a weak-kneed policy on the part of ICA.

It is my view, Mr. President, that any authorization by the ICA for payment of U.S. funds for Cuban sugar constitutes a sort of backhanded recognition by the U.S. Government of Castro's seizure of the American-owned sugar properties in Cuba.

Perhaps it should be said that the ICA is in a tough spot when a beneficiary country of our foreign-aid program wants to buy Cuban sugar. But even if it is in a tough spot, Mr. President, I do not think the Government of the United States should confine its protection of American interests to easy spots. Most of the time, it is in tough spots that Americans and American business interests most need the protection and support of their Government. I think our

Government has leaned over backward far too much and far too long in tolerating Castro's aggression against U.S. citizens and U.S. property.

It is most important, Mr. President, in connection with the legislation before us, that we recognize that the ICA up until it was decided to cut off availability of ICA funds to buy Dominican sugar, went ahead with the purchase of Cubar sugar for foreign consumption after Cuban sugar purchases for U.S. consumption had been halted by act of Congress and order of the President.

We have here additional evidence of both the inconsistency and the lack of realism of the administration. This Government made a gesture of cutting off purchases of Cuban sugar; but the ICA at least continued, up to last Thursday, to permit such purchases for foreign consumption under the aid program, thus giving backhanded recognition to Castro's seizure of American property. On the other hand, in the case of the Dominican Republic, where no American property has been seized, the administration is going right down the line to cut off the purchase of Dominican sugar for both domestic consumption and foreign aid use.

Is it any wonder that the prestige of the United States in Latin America is at a very low ebb? Is it any wonder that Latin American nations have doubts about the wisdom of lining up with the United States against Communist aggression, when they see us taking only halfhearted measures against the Communist dictatorship which has been established in Cuba under Castro, while we crack down on the Dominican Republic, the most strongly anti-Communist nation in this hemisphere?

WHAT HAS HAPPENED TO H.R. 10?

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, it has been most disappointing to me to note that the Senate Democratic leadership has not taken any action to again call up for debate H.R. 10, the self-employed voluntary pension plan bill. This bill was intermittently debated on the floor over a period of about 2 weeks just before Congress recessed for the national conventions. Unfortunately, it was replaced as the pending matter of business on the last day before the Senate recessed, and since we reconvened it has not been called up for further debate. Evidently, the distinguished majority leader and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] do not think this legislation is of sufficient importance to include it on their "must list."

This legislation is most important to the self-employed of our Nation because its enactment would provide some degree of security in permitting this segment of our population to set aside a small portion of their income for retirement purposes. This legislation has been before Congress over a period of the last 8 years and has received widespread support. All persons now subject to the self-employment tax, and, in addition, doctors, ministers, and Christian Science practitioners, would be eligible for the benefits of H.R. 10. Also covered would be owner-manager-employees of corporations, and the employees of self-employed persons. It provides pension benefits for the self-employed which are already enjoyed by most corporate employees.

The enactment of H.R. 10 would permit self-employed persons to set aside a portion of income each year for retirement purposes, and this income would not be taxed until withdrawn as retirement benefits. A self-employed individual could be covered under a plan only in those years in which he has income from personal services, and the deduction each year would be limited to $2,500, or 10 percent of earned income, whichever is smaller.

It should be emphasized that this is a self-help measure and will provide retirement security for the self-employed without any expenditure of Government funds. In effect, this is a tax postponement measure and does not remove the liability from paying tax on the income when it is finally received by the self-employed individual. A major portion of the tax loss to the Treasury in the early years would be recouped in the later years and would insure that these individuals would have adequate income for their old age without depending on Uncle Sam for a Federal "handout."

Along with other members of the Finance Committee, I have worked diligently wtih officials of the Treasury Department and with representatives of the various self-employed groups in trying to arrive at a bill which is acceptable to everyone. It has taken considerable time and hard work to get a bill which meets the need, and which has the Treasury's approval, thus avoiding any likelihood of a Presidential veto. It is regrettable that all this hard work and effort will go for naught, if Congress adjourns without taking action on this important bill. In my opinion, we should not adjourn until H.R. 10 and other important bills still pending have been enacted into law. I urge the distinguished majority leader to call up H.R. 10 for debate so that this bill can be passed and these needed benefits conferred upon the self-employed of our Nation.

SENATOR McGEE'S ADDRESS TO THE WESTERN RESOURCES CONFERENCE—EDITORIAL FROM THE CHEYENNE STATE TRIBUNE

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, recently the distinguished junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE], the colleague of the beloved senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], addressed the Western Resources Conference in Boulder, Colo. I have before me an editorial, published in the Cheyenne, Wyo., State Tribune, which discusses that address and quotes significant passages of it. Both the address and the editorial show the real stature which the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE] is attaining in the Senate, Mr. President; and I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Cheyenne State Tribune, Aug. 29, 1960]

LET THE PUBLIC IN ON IT

If you've ever tried to approach an understanding of water resource and supply problems, solution of which is absolutely vital to everyone, you will agree with a recent statement by U.S. Senator GALE MCGEE, Democrat, of Wyoming.

In an address at Boulder, he said:

"For all too long water experts, resource engineers, and assorted technicians have spent a disproportionate amount of time talking to each other, usually in a professional jargon unintelligible to the rest of us. Along the way, there has been altogether too little effective communication with the man on the street. What use, one is entitled to ask, is there in calculating the coefficient of N in an unlined channel unless a channel gets built in the first place?"

The Senator then added, most pertinently, that water problems will not be solved unless the public does catch on to what it is all about. In his words:

"Without popular understanding of both the magnitude and urgency of the problem of water resources: without a public disposition to accept—or even demand—greater tax expenditures for water, there can be little hope for major strides forward. Without it, moreover, professional and scientific advances in the field remain largely academic exercises, or possibly suffer a worse fate—that of being drowned in a sea of public apathy."

If you can appreciate the great scope of the problem now, you may be appalled by what's ahead (also in Senator McGEE's words):

"The Department of Commerce has come up with an estimate that between now and 1980 we are going to have to invest through all government levels, from Federal to local, and through private instrumentalities, well in excess of $200 billion in the development of our water resources. This figure is based upon a most conservative estimate, which may in fact be on the low side, that our gross national product will increase only 2.7 percent per year. A more rapid growth rate—say of 4 or 5 percent—would inescapably mean proportionate increases in water demands.

"To put it differently, the per capita consumption of water is expected to double—or according to some projections—even to quadruple in the next quarter century. At present rates our population will nearly double by the year 2000. Simple arithmetic calculation suggests the magnitude of the new demands for water which lie immediately ahead of us.

"From the Public Helath Service we have learned that between now and 1965—scarcely 5 years hence—we shall need to spend over a billion dollars a year on a local, State and Federal basis just to catch up with the sewage and waste treatment needs which will exist by that date."

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER [Mr. Moss in the chair]. The Clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REGULATION OF MASS TRANSIT IN THE WASHINGTON, D.C., METROPOLITAN AREA

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 402) granting the consent of Congress for the States of Virginia and Maryland and the District of Columbia to enter into a compact related to the regulation of mass transit in the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the Morse amendments.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am very glad we are back, at long last, on the compact. It was my desire to dispose of it as expeditiously as I could, from the very beginning. I sought only to make the argument in support of my amendment that I was committed to make. I had no intention at any time to engage in any prolonged debate on this matter. I am perfectly willing to let the record speak for itself, so far as the length of my discussion is concerned.

I shall summarize very quickly my position on the amendment which is pending at the desk, and which has already been stated and is the pending business of the Senate. As a member of the District of Columbia Committee, I have been a stanch supporter and defender of private ownership of the mass transportation system in the District of Columbia.

It will be recalled that back in 1956 it was more than a possibility—for a time it seemed to be a probability—that there was going to be such a complete breakdown in the transportation system of the District of Columbia that the Government itself might very well have to take it over. There were public hearings on the matter at that time, in which the senior Senator from Oregon made it clear over and over again that he believed the mass transportation system of the District of Columbia should be turned over to private ownership and that private ownership should get some assistance from the Government, if necessary, because of certain peculiar conditions which exist in the District of Columbia in the mass transportation system.

I urged then that the system be given certain tax relief. I urged then that certain consideration be given to the transit company in regard to maintenance. To make a long story short, as a result of those hearings, the present D.C. Transit System came into being. We have enjoyed private ownership of that system ever since. I am not saying, Mr. President, it is a perfect operation; but I am saying that the private mass transportation company in the District of Columbia is doing a remarkably fine job, comparatively speaking.

As a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I am frequently apprised of some of the mass transportation problems of other cities in this country. I think we are indeed fortunate that we have a mass transportation system which is as well operated, under private ownership, as is the one in Washington, D.C.

Mr. President, I have made these comments because they lead to my expression of concern about the compact which is before the Senate. It is well known, by both the proponents and opponents of the compact, that Mr. Chalk, who is president of the private transportation company in the District of Columbia, is vehemently opposed to the compact in its present form. He testified at great length in opposition to it. I filed for the RECORD last night a very lengthy legal brief that his counsel presented in opposition to the compact.

Mr. President, I know enough about how these things develop into trouble zones to justify my prediction here this afternoon that I think the Senate is buying a lot of litigation.

Now that Congress is going to force this down the economic throat, so to speak, of a private company in the District of Columbia, I think, instead of its being a successful operation, as I think it could be, the Senate will be passing a measure this afternoon that is going to create a great many problems in the mass transportation system in the Metropolitan Washington area.

I was very much opposed to the position Mr. Chalk took when he sought to have the Commission comprised of three members from the District of Columbia, one from Virginia, and one from Maryland. I thought it exceedingly unfair on his part, and said so; and I spoke as one of the original sponsors of the compact resolution. I stand by that sponsorship. I think there should be a compact. I think there should be a metropolitan commission created. I am all for the objectives of it, Mr. President; and when I offer the amendment I am offering, I am not opposing the commission concept for a mass transportation commission for the Metropolitan Washington area.

What I am trying to do as a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia and as one of the original sponsors of the compact resolution itself is to prevent trouble. I think this is the time to prevent trouble. I think this is the time to iron out some of the difficulties which have arisen with the private management of the District system.

I wish to repeat, before I close, two or three vital statistics. The fact is that 80 percent of the riders in the metropolitan area are District of Columbia riders. Although the mass transportation system serves outside the District, to some extent in Virginia and Maryland, the overwhelming majority of the riders come from the District. Most people from Virginia and Maryland travel in private cars. A relatively small percentage of them, in comparison with those from the District of Columbia, ride on the mass transportation vehicles. That is one of the things which is causing all of the opposition on the part of Mr. Chalk, the president of the District of Columbia Transit System.

Mr. President, it is said that the District of Columbia Commissioner on the Commission, will retain a veto over the so-called intrastate problems. That sounds good, but the problems are not black or white. The questions of interstate or intrastate problems are mixed in connection with the operation of a metropolitan area mass transportation system.

When one gets to the border between the District of Columbia and Virginia or to the border between the District of Columbia and Maryland it is very difficult, in the operative facts of individual disputes, to determine whether one is dealing with an intrastate problem or interstate problem.

If there is a Commission dealing with the problem as to what shall be the policy of the company at the border of the District of Columbia in regard to a border terminal, for example to mention one possible hypothetical case, would it be an intrastate or interstate problem?

If one is dealing with the question of connecting bus lines between Kensington, Md., and the District of Columbia, is one dealing with an interstate or intrastate problem?

If there are two Commissioners on the Commission who can line up against the District of Columbia Commissioner, then we feed the fear that Mr. Chalk seems to have, about which he is so disturbed.

I happen to think that if there were two Commissioners from the District of Columbia, one from Virginia, and one from Maryland we would remove most of the basis for Mr. Chalk's fear. This is one reason why I supported the amendment I was asked to offer. I offered it by request in the first instance, in order to have it receive full consideration. I am satisfied, at least upon the basis of everything I have heard yet in the debate, that the weight of the argument is in favor of the position Mr. Chalk has taken.

Mr. President, I pointed out last night in our discussion that article 4 of the compact provides:

> The expenses of the Commission shall be borne by the signatories in the proportion that the population of each signatory within the metropolitan district bears to the total population in the metropolitan district. The signatories agree to appropriate for the expenses of the Commission their proportion of the budget and to pay such appropriation to the Commission.

Mr. Chalk takes the position that this is unfair to him, because the personnel of the Commission are not appointed on a proportionate basis as far as the transit user population is concerned. Although the Commission expenses will be charged on a proportionate population basis, nevertheless the controlling votes will not be on a proportionate riding public basis.

Again, the Commissioners from Virginia and Maryland could hypothetically gang up against the Commissioner from the District of Columbia, could run up the expenses of the transit system, could approve high expenses, and since the larger user population is on the District side, it would mean in effect the District of Columbia riders could have to pay a larger proportion of the expenses resulting from their decision.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the

Senator from Oregon may yield to me with the understanding that he will not lose his right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY FORMER PRESIDENT TRUMAN

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a distinguished American, a former Member of the Senate, a former President of the United States, is visiting the Capitol today.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair, in order that we may receive former President Truman.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate (at 3 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.) took a recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

Former President Truman entered the Chamber accompanied by Senator JOHNSON of Texas and Senator DIRKSEN.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. My colleagues in the Senate, it is my proud privilege to present to you today one of our most distinguished former Senators, one of America's great statesmen, Harry Truman from Independence.

[Applause, Senators rising.]

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, Mr. Leader of the majority, Mr. Leader of the minority, and fellow Members of the U.S. Senate. I have told you time and again that the happiest service I have ever spent in politics was spent right back there in the back row in this U.S. Senate.

If I had not been quite so energetic or had let someone else attend to more business at the time, perhaps I might still be here. I do not know whether Missouri would have stood me that long or not, but I would have been perfectly willing to try.

I appreciate the privilege of being asked to come in to say "howdy," and to let you know what I have told you time and again, that I think service in the Senate of the United States is the happiest work for a politician. If SAM RAYBURN were here, he would probably try to have me take that back. He has tried it time and again, but has never succeeded in converting me from that opinion.

[Applause, Senators rising.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I know that the President would be pleased to see each of you, and we will remain in recess for another 5 minutes. I hope you can all come by and say "howdy."

At 3 o'clock and 49 minutes p.m., the Senate reassembled, on being called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. CANNON in the chair).

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7990) to convey certain land of the United States in trust to the Citizen Band of Potawatomi Indians of Oklahoma.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the following resolution:

H. Res. 643. *Resolved*, That a committee of two members be appointed by the House to join a similar committee appointed by the Senate, to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that the two Houses have completed their business of the session and are ready to adjourn, unless the President has some other communication to make to them.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 721) for the relief of certain aliens.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 745) relating to the sine die adjournment of the Congress, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 746) relating to the signing of enrolled bills and joint resolutions, notwithstanding the sine die adjournment of the two Houses, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H.R. 2074. An act for the relief of Eric and Ida Mae Hjerpe;

H.R. 4306. An act to provide education and training for the children of veterans dying of a disability incurred after January 31, 1955, and before the end of compulsory military service and directly caused by military, naval, or air service, and for other purposes;

H.R. 4428. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of John David Almeida; a minor;

H.R. 5396. An act to amend title 28 of the United States Code to provide for transfer of cases between the district courts and the Court of Claims and for other purposes;

H.R. 7618. An act for the relief of H. P. Lambert Co., Inc., and Southeastern Drilling Corp.;

H.R. 7877. An act for the relief of Vladislav Fotich;

H.R. 11561. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Army to convey part of lock and dam numbered 10, Kentucky River, Madison County, Ky., to the Pioneer National Monument Association for use as part of a historic site;

H.R. 11573. An act to provide for the free entry of an electron microscope for the use of William Marsh Rice, University of Houston, Tex., an electron microscope for the use of the University of Colorado Medical Center, Denver, Colo., and for other purposes; and

H.R. 12993. An act to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955, as amended.

REGULATION OF MASS TRANSIT IN THE WASHINGTON, D.C., METROPOLITAN AREA

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 402) granting the consent of Congress for the States of Virginia and Maryland and the District of Columbia to enter into a compact related to the regulation of mass transit in the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area, and for other purposes.

Mr. MORSE. I was pointing out that I do not believe the compact in its present language removes the fears of Mr. Chalk in regard to the proportionate powers of the Commissioners in respect to the circumstances of the operation of the Commission.

This is another case where I think we ought to give very great heed to the position of a private entrepreneur, who is trying to maintain a transit system in the District. He ought to be encouraged, not discouraged. I believe that we should accede to any reasonable position he takes in regard to the compact.

My next and last point is that there is serious question as to where the administration stands on the compact. I shall refer in a moment to the testimony of Commissioner Kertz, given at the hearings on the compact, which shows no enthusiasm for it.

The fact is that the Bureau of the Budget, so far as I know, has refused to support the compact because, apparently, it preferred the enactment of the National Capital Transportation Act of 1960, S. 3193, which passed in July. S. 3193, in the opinion of many of its opponents, has become obsolete, or at least partially unnecessary, and House Joint Resolution 402, which authorizes the compact, was originally planned to precede S. 3193, not to follow it.

It is true that Commissioner McLaughlin supports the compact; but I have received no information, up until this moment at least, that he speaks for the White House, for the Bureau of the Budget, or for the Public Utilities Commission, on this issue.

I turn now to the testimony of Commissioner Kertz, given at the time the hearing on the compact was held before the House Committee on the Judiciary. I shall read only a few excerpts from the testimony in the interest of saving time, because I am as desirous as any one could be to reach an early vote.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entirety of Mr. Kertz's testimony and his cross examination be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF HAROLD A. KERTZ, MEMBER, PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. KERTZ. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is Harold A. Kertz. I am a member of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia.

I would like initially to emphasize a point which Commissioner Hayes made with respect to what we refer to as section 9 of the District of Columbia Franchise Act.

He posed the problem which would arise by the new compact commission whereby it would determine rates, whereas, under the present thinking, the question of determining whether or not D.C. Transit was or was not exempt from motor-vehicle gasoline taxes would still be determined by our District of Columbia Public Utilities Commission.

That is my interpretation, in any event, of the resolution as I read it.

I would like to make this point: That by leaving with the Public Utilities Commission the determination of whether or not there is or is not an exemption of motor-vehicle fuel tax, the work burden on our Commission will be as great as it presently is.

In other words, we would have to go through the entire procedure which we would normally go through with respect to a rate proceeding—we go through it every year, at the end of August of each year—in order to determine whether or not there is a tax payable or not payable.

So this particular 402 would not relieve our Commission of the burden which it is now carrying with respect to D.C. Transit.

Mr. LIBONATI. Would not your work be somewhat duplicated?

Mr. KERTZ. Absolutely.

Mr. LIBONATI. It would be duplicated?

Mr. KERTZ. It would be a duplication of work.

Mr. LIBONATI. Well, that is not good, is it? That is not good?

Mr. KERTZ. I would say not. Certainly it is not economical.

Now, in the District, and, of course, in the surrounding counties, we have a transit problem. There is no question but that transit in the area would and could be improved if first we could integrate the present transit companies on a regional basis and, second, if we were able to overcome the barriers now imposed by jurisdictional limitations.

Thus far, I am in favor of this resolution, because I recognize that there exists a need to simplify and to integrate the regulatory power so that coordinated policies for the area as a whole could be formulated and executed.

However, I have certain reservations as to whether 402 will accomplish the degree of integration and coordination which we have heard spoken of today in such glowing terms. In my mind, the mere simplification in the regulatory process cannot produce any assurance that it will solve the transit problem or even attain some of the desired ends for which the sponsors have spoken so glowingly this morning.

If we had but one company, one transit company operating in the District and the surrounding area, I believe that this resolution would be the perfect solution. But my experience with regulating transit companies—and I may say owning them and operating them—leads me to a conclusion that where we have a situation where there is one large major company and three or four smaller companies who service the fringe areas it becomes almost a practical impossibility to reach the degree of coordination and that degree of integration which this bill seeks to accomplish.

For example, the organic utility laws of the District, of Maryland, and of Virginia, are basically identical. There is very little difference between our respective utility laws. And yet, the fact is that the rates allowed by each jurisdiction differ in large degree.

The query is: Would the present legislation permit of a uniform rate of return with resultant uniform fares? I doubt it very much. It just cannot work for this reason: The facts with respect to each company are so varied—their operational costs vary, their labor costs, their overhead, their equipment and maintenance, their garage facilities, all vary—we could never attain anything near a uniform rate of return or a uniform fare system.

If we do not have a uniform rate of return, and if we do not have a uniform fare, just what would this bill accomplish?

If this bill as presently drawn could accomplish those objectives, then again I am for it.

The question of routing under the proposed legislation also poses a very difficult regulatory problem. The new Commission would be empowered to examine the adequacy of existing patterns of routes, to prescribe route changes or an entirely new plan of routing, if necessary, to provide adequate transportation service.

That sounds simple. But if you try to translate that principle into practice, then you encounter great difficulty. It is one of the few things that are almost impossible to accomplish under any set of circumstances, facts, or laws.

We have heard earlier the question of what would happen if, for example, the new Commission sought to institute a through service from a point in Maryland, say, to a point in Virginia.

The question there arises, what company is better able to provide that service? It must be remembered that D.C. Transit has an exclusive franchise in the District of Columbia, and this bill, as presently drawn, says that none of the rights, obligations, and duties and responsibilities of D.C. Transit shall be changed or affected in any way.

I am looking at it purely as if I were regulating as a member of this new Commission, how would I go about putting in a new service from Wheaton, Md., to Alexandria, Va.?

On the question the Congressman raised a moment ago with respect to political pressures, there would be plenty of them, and we would find soon that this would be regulation by man and not regulation by law.

If it was not, the best thing we would have would be a trading off of one advantage, one gain against another gain. And I cannot see but that nothing but confusion would result. We would end up with a transit situation, in my opinion, which would be worse than it is today.

A great deal has been said about the D.C. Transit System franchise. For example, under the D.C. Transit franchise at the present time, rates are based upon a system rate base. Yet, the new law says nothing about a system rate base. It does say that—it does use somewhere in these pages the phrase, "gross operating revenue basis."

That would mean that as far as the Virginia companies are concerned, their rates would be determined on a gross operating revenue basis. But what about D.C. Transit? At the present time we have a system rate base.

In the future, the company hopes there will be a switchover to a gross operating revenue basis, but we do not know when that will take place; if it will take place.

I think the problem deserves more study. I came here today without any prepared statement. In fact, these notes I made on the plane last night coming down from the north.

There are so many problems which can be foreseen which this bill will not provide the remedy for. I agree with Chairman Hayes and General Welling, my colleagues on the commission, that it is desirable that we move forward, that we recognize the existence of a need.

But whether this is the answer remains to be seen.

I intended to say more, but I will be glad to respond to any questions the committee may have on anything I have said so far.

Mr. TUCK. We thank you very much.

Do you have any questions?

Mr. LIBONATI. I want to thank him for his frankness and his honesty in his position. He faces the issue with an understanding of the whole problem, and he has the courage to determine for himself what his experience dictates to his conscience.

I think that is a wonderful thing, and we appreciate having a witness like you before us.

Mr. KERTZ. Thank you.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall read a few paragraphs of what Commissioner Kertz said. His testimony appears on page 168 of part I of the hearings on House Joint Resolution 402 before the House Committee on the Judiciary on August 26, 1959.

So this particular 402 would not relieve our Commission of the burden which it is now carrying with respect to D.C. Transit.

Mr. LIBONATI. Would not your work be somewhat duplicated?

Mr. KERTZ. Absolutely.

Mr. LIBONATI. It would be duplicated?

Mr. KERTZ. It would be a duplication of work.

Mr. LIBONATI. Well, that is not good, is it? That is not good?

Mr. KERTZ. I would say not. Certainly it is not economical.

Now, in the District, and of course in the surrounding counties, we have a transit problem. There is no question but that transit in the area would and could be improved if first we could integrate the present transit companies on a regional basis and, second, if we were able to overcome the barriers now imposed by jurisdictional limitations.

Thus far, I am in favor of this resolution, because I recognize that there exists a need to simplify and to integrate the regulatory power so that coordinated policies for the area as a whole could be formulated and executed.

However, I have certain reservations as to whether 402 will accomplish the degree of integration and coordination which we have heard spoken of today in such glowing terms. In my mind, the mere simplification in the regulatory process cannot produce any assurance that it will solve the transit problem or even attain some of the desired ends for which the sponsors have spoken so glowingly this morning.

If we had but one company—one transit company * * *.

I digress to say that Commissioner Kertz is a past transit company executive, a past transit company owner. He is a man having professional knowledge and expertness in the field of mass transportation. Listen to the reservations he sets forth in his testimony about the compact which is being offered to the Senate this afternoon, without any attempt to meet the strenuous and vigorous objections of the head of the D.C. Transit System, which Congress is proposing to put under the Commission, which Mr. Kertz says would be organized on such a discriminatory and unfair basis.

If anyone believes that that will produce harmony in the area transit problem; if anyone believes that that will augur well in the future for a solution of the area transit problems; then he has not had the experience I have had for many years as a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia in respect to the very difficult and complex transit problems of the Metropolitan Washington area.

I continue to read from the testimony of Commissioner Kertz:

If we had but one company, one transit company operating in the District and the surrounding area, I believe that this resolution would be the perfect solution. But my experience with regulating transit companies—and I may say owning them and operating them—leads me to a conclusion that where we have a situation where there is one large, major company and three or

four smaller companies who service the fringe areas, it becomes almost a practical impossibility to reach that degree of coordination and that degree of integration which this bill seeks to accomplish.

For example, the organic utility laws of the District, of Maryland, and of Virginia, are basically identical. There is very little difference between our respective utility laws. And yet, the fact is that the rates allowed by each jurisdiction differ in large degree.

The query is: Would the present legislation permit of a uniform rate of return with resultant uniform fares? I doubt it very much. It just cannot work for this reason: The facts with respect to each company are so varied—their operational costs vary, their labor costs, their overhead, their equipment and maintenance, their garage facilities, all vary—we could never attain anything near a uniform rate of return or a uniform fare system.

Commissioner Kertz, in the rest of his testimony, sets forth very specific hypothetical problems, and throws great doubt on the workability of the compact in its present form. I offer his testimony as having some bearing, at least, on the position I have taken that we ought, at least, to try to get those who will be affected by the operations of the Commission to come in at the beginning with an acceptance of the program. If by making some slight changes in the compact, such as the amendment at the desk will do, we will accomplish that degree of harmony among those who will be affected, I think the amendment should be adopted.

Mr. President, I had two main purposes for making this legislative history. One was to set forth the arguments of the president of the D.C. Transit System, who is vigorously opposed to the compact, who has served clear notice by his position that he does not like any part of it, and who, after all, is operating under a franchise and a charter which Congress granted.

When we granted that charter to Mr. Chalk, we assumed some obligations of our own as a Congress, too. In a sense, Mr. Chalk is our employee. In a sense, he is our official, he is our agent, because of the residual power of Congress over District of Columbia affairs.

I raise the question: Is it fair to impose upon Mr. Chalk, our agent, to whom we have given the franchise and the charter to operate the D.C. Transit System, a compact creating a Commission which he tells us he considers to be discriminatory and unfair to him? I think it calls for a long look before we take that step.

So I have sought to make the legislative history. I have sought to make it perfectly clear that Mr. Chalk had his opportunity, in the legislative history, to make official his warning as to what he believes the pitfalls of the compact are.

The second point is that I believe certain ounces of modification in the compact would be worth a pound of prevention of difficulties. In its present form, the compact will not cure those misunderstandings which have already developed; in fact, I fear the misunderstandings will be entrenched.

I understand that the compact provides that the Commissioner in each of the jurisdictions will have veto power over so-called intrastate matters. I have already pointed out that what is interstate and what is intrastate in a metropolitan mass transportation system often is very difficult to determine.

Even that jurisdictional question is going to be the cause of a good many disputes. I am also aware that the compact provides that any one of the parties to it can get out of it with a year's notice. I think that is one safeguard for the District Commissioners, but it is not necessarily a safeguard for the company. It does not necessarily follow that Mr. Chalk will be in a position in which he can force a withdrawal of the District simply because he finds the situation has become very unsatisfactory.

However, I think that is one of the safeguards to which Mr. Chalk has not given the degree of emphasis that I would he had given to it. I believe that provision of the compact gives us at least an opportunity to put this on a 1 year trial. If it does not work out, the Congress will have to come to grips again with this problem should any dispute arise as a result of a lack of harmony which may develop in the Commission.

Mr. President, I offer my amendment, and I am ready to vote on it. I hope that if my amendment is not agreed to, the Bureau of the Budget will prevail and the President will see fit to veto the joint resolution, because I think there is much to my point of view that the compact no longer is really necessary, in view of the passage of the National Capital Transportation Act.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, if the Senator from Oregon will yield——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CANNON in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I think the Senator from Oregon may be interested in a letter I received this morning from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia. I believe it will be helpful to read the letter into the RECORD, in order to help make the kind of legislative record the Senator from Oregon is interested in making, and which he has been making in his typically helpful and thorough fashion. Therefore, Mr. President, if the Senator from Oregon will permit me to do so, I wish to read the letter into the RECORD at this time. It reads as follows:

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
Washington, September 1, 1960.

Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JAVITS: It has come to my attention that the point is being made in the debate on House Joint Resolution 402 that the members of regulatory Commission created by the compact, consisting of one member each from Maryland, Virginia, and the District of Columbia, does not afford adequate protection for the interests of the District of Columbia.

I want to assure you that the compact is a matter of great importance to the District of Columbia and that the interests of the District of Columbia are properly protected and safeguarded by the provisions of the compact. I actively participated in the negotiations of the compact with representatives of Maryland and Virginia; and I can assure you that serious and conscientious consideration was given by all of the negotiators for the protection of our local interests while, at the same time, achieving a metropolitan-wide approach to the regulation of transit.

The local interests are safeguarded by article VI of the compact, which gives each of the three Commissioners a veto power over any order proposed by a majority of the Commission relating to matters solely intrastate or solely within the District of Columbia. In order to understand the full effectiveness of the provision, it must be understood that most of the routes and service in the metropolitan area are located and is performed solely within the District of Columbia. There is no doubt in my mind that this provision is sufficiently comprehensive to protect the interests of the District of Columbia public and the companies serving our city.

Further protection for the District of Columbia is afforded by section 2 of article IX, which would permit the District of Columbia to withdraw from the compact if the administration of the compact by the Commission was inimicable to the best interests of the District of Columbia. A withdrawal by any party terminates the compact and reestablishes the preexisting condition of separate regulations.

I trust you will find these remarks and assurances helpful in your consideration of this measure, which is perhaps the most important measure affecting the District of Columbia during my tenure in office.

Respectfully yours,

ROBERT E. MCLAUGHLIN,
President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia.

Again, as part of the legislative record, and if I may have the concurrence of the distinguished Senator from Oregon to continue at this point, I wish to point out that one of the events which could bring into action the right of withdrawal would be the allocation of these expenses, to which the Senator from Oregon has so eloquently referred. That matter is dealt with in article 6, section 1, of the compact, which gives an absolute requirement that the Commissioners of the District of Columbia must approve the allocation, which is based on a budget made in the preceding year. So I believe we would have an absolute right to expect that this would have a strong bearing on the question of whether they stayed with the compact or not.

Mr. MORSE. I think it is a very important check on the expense matter. However, I do not think it removes the possibility and the great danger of arguing and hassling over the matter, particularly if the Maryland commissioner and the Virginia commissioner believe that certain items should be approved.

Mr. JAVITS. I think the Senator from Oregon knows the spirit in which I am attempting to complete the record in cooperation with the Senator from Oregon, because he has made a very splendid legislative history which I think will be very helpful, regardless of what happens to the compact.

Again, with the approval of the Senator from Oregon, I should like to state that I am advised that the right to withdraw, under section 2 of article 9, is an unqualified and absolute right, and that it stands alone in the compact, and also is an unqualified legal right. I think

that point should be made clear in connection with our understanding of the situation under which the question of approval of the compact is being considered here, in order to nail down the proposition that there are no strings of any kind or character, legal or otherwise, tied to the absolute right of withdrawal.

Mr. MORSE. I completely agree with the observation of the Senator from New York, and I join him in nailing down that interpretation for the legislative history.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution is open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 402) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the joint resolution was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

DISSEMINATION OF POLITICAL OPINIONS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask for the immediate consideration of Calendar 1999, Senate Resolution 374, amending Senate Resolution 305, authorizing the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to undertake a study of the uses of Government-licensed media for the dissemination of political opinions, news, and so forth.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

Mr. THURMOND. I object.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I now move that the Senate proceed to consider Senate Resolution 374.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, let me ask the number of this measure.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is Calendar 1999, Senate Resolution 374.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana that the Senate proceed to consider the resolution.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

COMMISSION ON PRESIDENTIAL OFFICE SPACE

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield to me?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 1911, Senate bill 3524.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read by title, for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 3524) to provide for a Commission on Presidential Office Space.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Dakota?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3524) to provide for a Commission on Presidential Office Space, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works, with an amendment on page 3, after line 4, to strike out:

(a) approve all design, construction, interior decorating and landscaping plans;

(b) determine the methods for selecting and approve the selection of the architect, the general contractor, and the subcontractors who will perform the construction work subject to such conditions and limitations as may be contained in appropriations made for such work;

(c) generally supervise the progress of such design and construction work;

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

(a) after consultation with the President, approve all design, construction, interior decorating and landscaping plans;

(b) determine the methods for selecting and approve the selection of the architect;

(c) to the greatest extent practicable, utilize the services of the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, in awarding contracts for the performance of the construction work subject to such conditions and limitations as may be contained in appropriations made for such work; and in supervising the progress of such design and construction work;

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is hereby established a commission to be known as the Commission on Presidential Office Space (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission"). It shall be the duty of the Commission to initiate and carry out a program of construction and remodeling in accordance with proposals (a) and (c) of plan one of the report of the President's Advisory Commission on Presidential Office Space, dated May 31, 1957, including remodeling of the east wing of the White House and construction of the necessary access tunnels.

SEC. 2. (a) The Commission shall be composed of seven members as follows:

(1) Two Senators appointed by the President of the Senate;

(2) Two Representatives appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives;

(3) Three persons appointed by the President of the United States from the executive branch or from private life.

(b) A vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers but shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment was made.

(c) The Commission shall elect a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members.

(d) Commission members appointed from the Congress and the executive branch shall serve without additional compensation. Commission members appointed from private life shall receive $50 per diem when engaged in the performance of Commission duties. All Commission members shall receive reimbursement for necessary traveling and subsistence expenses incurred by them in the performance of Commission duties.

(e) Within the limits of its appropriations, the Commission is authorized to appoint such personnel, without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, and to make such expenditures as, in its discretion, it deems necessary.

SEC. 3. In the performance of its duties the Commission shall—

(a) after consultation with the President, approve all design, construction, interior decorating and landscaping plans;

(b) determine the methods for selecting and approve the selection of the architect;

(c) to the greatest extent practicable, utilize the services of the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, in awarding contracts for the performance of the construction work subject to such conditions and limitations as may be contained in appropriations made for such work; and in supervising the progress of such design and construction work;

(d) take measures to assure that all lumber, fixtures, and other materials removed from the Executive Mansion or other buildings are carefully examined by appropriate Federal or other authorities for the purpose of segregating and safeguarding any of such materials which are of such historical importance that they should be permanently preserved;

(e) provide for (1) the preservation of any such material which is of permanent historical importance and (2) the sale, donation, destruction, or other disposition of the remainder of such material in the manner most consistent with its symbolical value and without commercial exploitation;

(f) from time to time, but at least once annually submit to the Congress and the President a report on the progress of the work under its supervision. Upon the conclusion of its work the Commission shall promptly submit a final report;

(g) the Commission shall cease to exist thirty days after the submission of its final report.

SEC. 4. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the expenses of the Commission, including funds for such construction, remodeling, renovation, and equipment as the Commission may determine to be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I call up my amendment, which has been printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from South Dakota will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, in line 11, after the word "tunnels," it is proposed to insert a colon and the following:

Provided, That proposal (a) of said report shall be modified to provide for renovation and remodeling of the old State, War, and Navy Building to provide Presidential office space.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, does the bill provide for the making of a study as to how the old State, War, and Navy Building can be renovated, so as to provide the needed additional office space to the President?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It does. It would express the sense of the Senate that a commission be created for that purpose.

Mr. HOLLAND. But it does not provide any authorization; it does not provide any funds for construction?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It does not provide any funds for construction. I may say I am not optimistic that it will be considered on the other side of the Congress at this time. The reason why it was brought out of the Public Works Committee is so the next President, whoever he may be, would not be subject to the charge, if he sought additional office space, that he was seeking self-aggrandizement. Both the Senate and the House have created new office space for themselves. The Presidential office quarters are cramped. We thought it should be the expression of the Senate that a commission on Presidential office space should be created so that adequate space could be provided.

Mr. HOLLAND. I think it is a laudable purpose, and I approve of it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 3524) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

TRIBUTES TO SENATORS MURRAY OF MONTANA; O'MAHONEY OF WYOMING; AND GREEN OF RHODE ISLAND

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, when the 87th Congress meets next January, it will be the first time since January of 1937 that the Senate will begin deliberations without Senators MURRAY, O'MAHONEY, and GREEN. There are no brighter jewels in the crown that is the U.S. Senate.

When I came to Washington 2 years ago, I had already known of the reputations of these great Americans. In the brief period I have been here, I have come to know, to respect, and to love these Senators as the full and true living symbols of service and statesmanship that they are.

Together they represent nearly 255 years of life as Americans, more than 83 years of public service, and some 75 years in the Senate. It is America's loss and a loss to the free world that these great men have chosen to retire.

Senator MURRAY's service in the Senate dates from 1934. His public service began in 1906, when he was elected a county attorney. In all, he has given 29 of his 86 years in service in public office.

Senator O'MAHONEY's service in the Senate also dates from 1934. He has been a congressional secretary and an Assistant Postmaster General, giving, in all, 26 of his nearly 76 years to service in public office.

Senator GREEN, whose vigorous appearance and keen outlook belie his nearly 93 years, has been a Senator since 1937. Before this he was Governor of his State. He has given 28 of his years in public office, including unusually important service as chairman of our Committee on Foreign Relations.

TRIBUTES TO ASSISTANT LEADERS AND SENATE STAFF

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, there have been many deserved and fine tributes paid in recent hours to the majority and the minority leaders.

I know I speak for the Senate in its entirety when I express my appreciation for the wonderful assistance we have had throughout the session from the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] our Democratic whip, and his counterpart on the Republican side, the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL].

My closest association has been with Senator MANSFIELD. I do not know how we on the Democratic side could have had a more courteous, a more kindly, or a more cooperative whip than the Senator from Montana has been. Speaking for myself, I thank the Senator from Montana for the many wonderful courtesies he has extended me throughout the session.

Mr. President, every employee of the Senate is deserving of commendation in these closing hours, and every man who sits at the desk, the Parliamentarian, the Assistant Parliamentarian, the Secretary of the Journal, the Journal clerk.

We have also a group of employees in the Senate to whom I do not think we can too frequently express our appreciation. I refer to the official reporters. I do not know how they take it. I do not know how they begin to serve the length of hours they toil in the Senate, but they are a group of such dedicated public servants I am glad to raise my voice in appreciation of their service. It goes without saying that this tribute extends unqualifiedly to Placidino Zagami, known affectionately to us as Dino.

Mr. President, I used to sit on the other side of the aisle, and when I sat over there, I received then, as I have ever since I removed myself to this side of the aisle, courteous cooperation from a man who received a high tribute in the Senate the other day in a whole series of speeches. I refer to Mark Trice.

I want Mr. Trice to know, as we come to the end of this session, that I wish him best wishes for everything good in life, and I hope he will remain in the service of the Senate for many, many years to come.

Mr. President, as always, when one mentions some and omits others, he runs the risk that some will think he is not appreciative of what they have done. So I conclude by saying that I am very appreciative of the work the page boys have done for us. I hope that they are getting the education that we trust this job will give to them, an opportunity that will lead them into training for future public service.

Last of all, Mr. President, I wish to express my appreciation to some of our able floor aids. I refer to Jim Wilson, Bobby Baker, Jay McDonnell, and Harry MacPherson. I do not know what we Senators would do if we did not have them at our beck and call to keep us informed as to what is going on when we arrive on the floor of the Senate after an absence therefrom, and their assistance in helping us with the calendar and their assistance in a multitude of other services they render for us.

I think it reflects again creditably upon LYNDON JOHNSON and MIKE MANSFIELD on our side, and Mr. DIRKSEN and Mr. KUCHEL on the other side, that, under their leadership, there has been such a fine selection for the Senate staff, and I think we are all fortunate that their judgment has proven to be so sound.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I want to associate myself with the statements my colleague from Oregon has made about this good and great man, MIKE MANSFIELD. He is a gentle man. He is a wonderful friend. He is one of the most patriotic public servants I have ever known. And I just do not know how the Senate could function without him. He does not know what it is to be selfish. He gives freely of his time and talent. He is one of the most modest men I know. Yet he can be one of the toughest.

TRIBUTE TO SENATE LEADERSHIP

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I should also like to express my own appreciation for the courtesy of the leadership on both sides of the aisle and for the help that has been given me and other Senators by the employees on the minority side.

First of all, let me say I think it was very fine that the Senator from Oregon should have called attention to the service performed by the assistant leaders as well as by the respective majority and minority leaders. The Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] is the soul of honor, the soul of courtesy and fairness, and the same could be said of our assistant minority leader, TOMMY KUCHEL, of California. I think there is no man on the floor who would say he regarded either assistant leader as other than the soul of honor and fairness in his attempt to serve the membership on both sides of the aisle.

I also wish to pay my personal respects and appreciation to Mr. Trice, the secretary for the minority; to his assistant, Bill Brownrigg; to Mr. Dompierre; to Mr. Russ Call; and to others. They are a tower of strength to all of us when we need them, and we need them every day.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the statement of the Senator from South Dakota concerning the minority employees, and the statement of the Senator from Oregon concerning the majority employees.

JURY TRIALS IN CONDEMNATION CASES

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I cannot let this session of Congress close without making a brief statement for the RECORD that as a member of the Judiciary Committee I am mindful of the bad situation regarding the right of trial by jury in condemnation of land cases, which was brought to light by the Appropriations Committee in

the hearings on H.R. 11666. We passed the Department of Justice appropriation bill, but only after the House receded from its position to cut off all funds to pay commissioners, who take the place of juries in far too many of these cases.

Mr. President, whenever either party demands a jury trial in these important cases, often involving a man's own home, he should get such a jury trial. Nine years ago the Senate passed two bills expressing this right, but the House would not act and a rule of court went into effect denying this right.

Federal judges have the power to overrule a jury trial demand and it appears that they may be using this power too freely.

I should like to see this matter studied. A recent case in the Supreme Court—United States against Hon. Pierson Hall—shows a rather acute situation developing around denial of jury trial rights. The record of the hearings on H.R. 11666 bears this out.

We should consider whether the time has come to enact a law definitely protecting the right to trial by jury in these cases.

AMENDMENT OF LONGSHOREMEN'S AND HARBOR WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be temporarily laid aside in order that the Senate may proceed to the consideration of House bill 12574, from the House Committee on Education and Labor. I understand it is noncontroversial. I have cleared it with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] and the distinguished minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN]. I should like to have it considered. There will be no extended debate on it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the bill (H.R. 12574) to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, so as to provide that an injured employee shall have the right to select his own physician, and for other purposes, which was read twice by its title.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 12574) to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, so as to provide that an injured employee shall have the right to select his own physician, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 12574) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REPORT BY AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION COMMITTEE ON COMMUNIST TACTICS, STRATEGY, AND OBJECTIVES

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, the Committee on Communist Tactics, Strategy, and Objectives of the American Bar Association has just filed with the association a report which is one of the finest expositions of Communist aims and purposes which I have ever seen.

Incidentally, it is interesting that this report, compiled by a committee of distinguished lawyers who have made a deep study of communism, recommends that the American Bar Association and local bar associations should establish committees to conduct a program of education on the nature, objectives, and tactics of communism, and its dangers to our rights and freedoms, and to contrast affirmatively the basic fundamentals of communism with the liberties under the Constitution of the United States.

I am convinced that this report is deserving of the widest possible circulation, and I know it will be of interest to every Member of this body.

I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that this report, together with the footnotes, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT BY THE AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION COMMITTEE ON COMMUNIST TACTICS, STRATEGY, AND OBJECTIVES

RECOMMENDATIONS

The committee recommends the adoption of the following three resolutions:

"Whereas, the need for understanding the true meaning of Communism and its methods, as contrasted by liberty under law as provided by the Constitution of the United States, has never been more real and urgent than now; and

"Whereas, it is of particularly vital importance that our youth should have an objective explanation of the true nature, sinister meaning, and ulterior purpose of communism in contrast with our system of constitutional government, so that they may be alerted and be better able to deal with the world wide totalitarian system of communism and thus preserve the freedoms of our American heritage: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the American Bar Association recommend to State and local bar associations that they establish committees to conduct a program to provide addresses and literature to school assemblies and civic organizations to explain the nature, objectives and tactics of Communism, and its dangers to our rights and freedoms, and to contrast affirmatively the basic fundamentals of communism with the liberties under the Constitution of the United States; and be it further

"Resolved, That the President of the American Bar Association shall appoint a special committee consisting of eminently qualified members of this association, whose objective shall be to implement this resolution, which special committee shall report to the house of delegates at the next succeeding midyear and at each succeeding annual meeting concerning its progress in this educational program."

"Resolved, That printed copies of this report of the special committee on Communist Tactics, Strategy, and Objectives submitted to the house of delegates be distributed to the members of the American Bar Association, to State and local bar associations, libraries and civic organizations. The extent of the distribution and the cost thereof to be subject to the approval of the board of governors."

"Resolved, That the special committee on Communist tactics, strategy, and objectives be continued."

REPORT

Foreword—The peril we face

The heightened world tensions under which we live today are attributed directly to the impact of aggressive international communism. Forces of evil are at work to destroy our basic freedoms which alone make the American heritage a meaningful reality. We have accepted those freedoms as part of our democratic life with much the same complacency as we breathe the air around us. Too often we think of democracy as something automatic: a blessing which is ours by right of inheritance—once fought for and cherished—but for which we, in our day, no longer need be called upon to sacrifice "our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor."

What has happened on the world stage since the last meeting of this Association compels recognition, particularly by lawyers, of the urgent necessity for a comprehensive objective analysis of the meaning of communism, its threats to constitutional liberties, its tactics, strategy and objectives, to the end that we may protect ourselves and our institutions against an enemy whose declared intention is to destroy the freedoms hard won at Valley Forge.

Today, as never before, it is the obligation of the American Bar to protect our freedoms and make liberty under law a rewarding reality. This can be achieved only by blocking the advance of the Communist program which seeks to weaken the fibre of American life.

America is threatened today as never before. The military might of the Fatherland of world communism, Red China and Red satellites now controls over one-third of the earth's surface and one-fourth of the world's inhabitants. Likewise, our Nation is threatened from within by the American Communist Party, and its followers. They already have established beachheads of subversion around the world and in organization after organization here and abroad. Within ninety miles of our mainland another is being built by the Communists in the once peaceful island of Cuba which this Nation liberated from tyranny at the turn of the century. The Red beachhead in Cuba is being developed as a base from which military as well as propaganda attacks can be mounted against the United States and Latin America.

Following the proposed Khrushchev visit to Cuba, it can be reasonably anticipated that efforts will be made to install bases for missiles and a submarine base. Soviet and

Red Chinese technicians are already on the scene and others are coming in increasing numbers. Red radar tracking will be an important arm of Soviet intelligence in keeping our missile base at Cape Canaveral under surveillance. Red provocateurs will increasingly encourage Panamanians to seize the Panama Canal in the pattern of Nasser's seizure of the Suez Canal. The danger in this situation was highlighted by the testimony of George V. Allen, Director of the U.S. Information Agency before the House Foreign Relations Committee, that communists are spending $100 million in a "hate America" campaign spearheaded in Cuba where the Reds seek to establish bases close to the United States.

Senator KENNETH B. KEATING said the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee has evidence that 1,000 Chinese communists have entered Cuba to enlist the support of their 30,000 countrymen there, and that there has been a steady movement of Soviet engineers and technicians through East Berlin to the Caribbean.[1]

Gus Hall, general secretary of CPUSA in the January 1960 issue of Political Affairs has this to say about Cuba:

"The revolutionary development in Cuba * * * is an inspiration to the peoples' forces throughout this hemisphere."

When called before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee on February 2 and 3, 1960, Hall showed his contempt for constituted authority by taking refuge behind the fifth amendment even in those matters he had proclaimed to the world through the Communist press.

The vast expanse of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans no longer gives us the necessary protection. Already our Armed Forces have dispatched missiles with surprising accuracy more than 9,000 miles in less than an hour. We must assume the Soviets have similar missiles.

Advances of Soviet science make possible instantaneous assaults which could be devastating beyond description. Fifth columns already organized to rise up as instantaneous armies of occupation make it necessary to insure that our security agencies are equipped to meet them with legal authority. Time is running out if we are to protect ourselves from within. There needs to be a more realistic appraisal of the menace which confronts our way of life and prompt and decisive action on the part of all Americans and particularly our lawmakers and courts to find a way to "* * * provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity."

The recommendations for legislation, which were overwhelmingly adopted by the house of delegates of the American Bar Association upon the recommendations of this committee in February 1959, have not been acted upon by the Congress. Legislation is urgently needed to protect the national security in areas in which Government agencies are now handicapped, either under existing law, or lack of law. The Congress and the executive departments of our Government should give more serious consideration to the studies and recommendations of the Commission on Government Security headed by former President Loyd Wright, of this association. In the meantime, absent of such curative legislation, Soviet agents carry on their treacherous acts under the protective shield of our Bill of Rights.

The Supreme Court has stated in *Barenblatt* v. *United States*, that to suggest that the Communist Party "were just an ordinary political party from the standpoint of National Security, is to ask this Court to bind itself to world affairs which have determined the whole course of our national policy since the close of World War II—and to the vast burdens which these conditions have entailed for the entire Nation."[2]

It is heartening to note the Court's conclusion (in Barenblatt):

"We conclude that the balance between the individual and the governmental interests here at stake must be struck in favor of the latter."[3]

As a result of its past and continued study of Communist tactics, strategy, and objectives your committee looks to the future with unfeigned fear—for, as the apathy toward the Communist peril continues, the danger increases in direct proportion.

One peril has been conspicuous by its absence in the news of the day. Nikita Khrushchev, who has finally emerged as the unquestioned dictator of the Soviet Union and the acknowledged spokesman for world communism, in addressing the Supreme Soviet on January 14, 1960, blueprinted the Soviet view of modern war with these words:

"In the old days battles started along frontiers. Now war will begin in the rear of countries. All industrial and strategic centers will be attacked within the first hour. The war will start differently and develop differently."[4]

In the report to the Supreme Soviet, Khrushchev intimated that Soviet science had new achievements and referred to an "even more formidable and perfect * * * a fantastic weapon." No doubt this statement was made for propaganda purposes; but it is entirely possible that when the head of the Soviet Union thus spoke of new weapons, he had some basis for such statements.

Is it possible that the Soviets now have the neutron bomb?

The neutron bomb is beyond the stage of scientific theory; it is just a question as to when it will become a reality and who gets it first. No major power has officially admitted that it is working on the neutron bomb, but it must be presumed that all major powers have placed it high on their priority of crash programs. The neutron bomb will destroy life but not property and, therefore, will be far more practical than the atom or hydrogen bombs. Its devastating power stems from its lethal dosages of radiation of sufficient strength to penetrate buildings and bomb shelters. From scientific data, it appears that the neutron bomb would be a lightweight weapon which could be delivered in quantity from submarines or smuggled in by saboteurs who could use delayed detonating devices.

The explosion of a neutron bomb would develop very little fallout, and areas would not long remain contaminated. A Fifth Column could take over promptly after saboteurs performed their treacherous deeds. It would be too late for the security agencies, the armed forces, the Congress or the courts to take corrective action. Responsibility, however, always finds a final resting place.

The propaganda of communism must be met with truth, and the lies of communism must be exposed.

To illustrate, the United Press International, on June 13, 1960, carried two conflicting dispatches. A dispatch from Moscow reported a Pravda story on June 13 that Khrushchev had recaptured the Kremlin majority who supported his policy—"that the world should disarm and that countries with opposing political systems can live together peacefully." The other dispatch came from Tokyo and quoted an editorial from the official Communist press, the Peiping Peoples Daily, as follows:

"The primary task of Eisenhower's tour is to interfere in the internal affairs * * * hold down the just patriotic struggle of the people of these countries, shield the jackals of the United States."

The UPI dispatch further reported that "Communist China's propaganda outlets called upon Asian people to teach him (the President) a 'good lesson'."

Out of one side of the mouth Soviet communists continue their false propaganda of peace, while out of the other side of the mouth, the Chinese communists continue their campaign of vilification. Thus it is apparent that a fundamental ideological but not political quarrel is taking place throughout the communist world over orthodox Leninism. On one side is Khrushchev who takes the position that communism can be achieved universally by peaceful means because it is the "scientific" inevitable next step in civilization; on the other is Mao Tze-Tung who insists that the war against "imperialism" is essential to the success of communism. Mao does not believe in a cold war but wants an immediate atomic war. This quarrel is having far-reaching effects throughout the world now.

Under these grave circumstances, as individuals devoted to the preservation of free and democratic government under law, lawyers must alert the American people to the nature of the communist menace and what can be done to meet it. Beyond that, every American needs to know how he can aid our security agencies, such as the Federal Bureau of Investigation, in discharging its duty of protecting our internal security.

The purpose of this report, therefore, is to put into the hands of American lawyers a brief résumé of the fundamentals of communism, its current tactics, strategy and objectives with suggestions for meeting this menace, of gravest import to America, and to the dwindling part of the world as yet free or "uncommitted."

The fundamentals of communism

To understand communism, it is necessary to start with the basic premise that communism is a way of life. Just as the world's great religions—Judaism, Christianity, Mohammedanism, Buddhism and others—are a way of life—so also is communism. Beyond that it is a worldwide conspiracy to which its adherents bring the discipline of soldiers and an unswerving fanatic dedication.

Communism started over 100 years ago with the Communist Manifesto written by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels. Its menace to the free world began with the Bolshevik Revolution in 1917. Since then its great actionists, Lenin, Stalin, and now Khrushchev, have never deviated from certain basic principles. Although, Khrushchev denounced Stalinism as the Cult of the Personality in 1956, at the 20th Congress of the Communist Party in the Soviet Union in 1957, he said:

"But we do not criticize Stalin as a bad Communist as far as the interests of the working classes are concerned. God grant that every Communist should fight for the interest of the working classes as Stalin did."[5]

After Khrushchev succeeded in destroying the "Saviour Complex," built up around Stalin, a reoccurrence of the Cult of the Personality is now being built up around Khrushchev.

A favorite Communist tactic is to ask the question: "What is wrong with communism?" Intelligent and well informed people may not have a ready answer, although they may condemn communism for its aggression, tyranny and state ownership.

What, then, do Communists believe, and why is the Communist way of life so diametrically opposed to Western civilization?

[1] New York Herald Tribune, June 25, 1960.

[2] *Barenblatt* v. *U.S.* 1959, 360, U.S. 109, 79 S. Ct. 1081.

[3] Ibid.

[4] New York Times, January 15, 1959.

[5] J. Edgar Hoover, "Masters of Deceit," 1958, p. 51.

There are four basic concepts which are the cornerstones of communism and upon which the Marxist-Leninist way of life rests. The following fundamental concepts give the Communist the reason and excuse for his revolutionary violence and amoral conduct:

All that exists is the result of the interaction of material things struggling against each other and adapting their forms to the nature of the struggle. Thus, the creation and everything in existence came about as the result of the forces of nature; hence, there is no design in the universe.

Man is a product of his environment and has developed through natural selection to his present form. He has cultivated certain muscles, as, for instance, the brain, which thus makes him intellectually but not physically superior to other animals.

The moral code of any era is determined by the necessities of the time and place. Lenin said: "We do not believe in eternal morality, and we expose all fables about morality."[6] Lenin further stated: "Morality is that which serves to destroy the old exploiting society. Communist morality is the morality which serves this struggle."[7] Thus, it is not wrong to kill, lie, cheat, nor steal if done for the cause. In other words, to the Communist the end justifies the means.

The supernatural is a device invented by the ruling class to control other classes. It is impossible to believe in a God and in dialectical materialism at the same time. Atheism is a requirement for membership in the Communist Party.

Hence, Marx stated "Religion is the opium of the people." Lenin said:

"Religion is a kind of spiritual gin (Vodka) in which the slaves of capital drown their human shape and their claims to any decent life."[8]

As a substitute for religion communists developed a militant crusade for atheism since,

"Atheism is a natural and inseparable part of Marxism. Consequently, a class conscious Marxist party must carry on propaganda in favor of atheism."[9]

Although frequently invoking the name of the Diety, Khrushchev said: "I think there is no God. I freed myself long ago from such a concept. I am a partisan of a scientific point of view, and science and faith in supernatural forces are irreconcilable opinions."[10]

Earlier Khrushchev said: "We Communists, the Soviet politicians, are atheists."[11]

Fundamental Communist principles

The phenomenal growth of the communist conspiracy gives confidence to communists for the future. In June, 1957, Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev, during the course of an interview before a nationwide American television audience, proclaimed:

"I can prophesy that your grandchildren in America will live under socialism."[12]

In a similar vein, William Z. Foster, Chairman Emeritus of the Communist Party, USA (CPUSA), dedicated his book, "The Twilight of World Capitalism": "To My Great-Grandson Joseph Manley Kolko Who Will Live in a Communist United States."[13]

Implicit in all communist propaganda is the premise that communism is invincible and that its triumph is inevitable. Communism is portrayed as the irresistible "wave of the future," against which all opposition is futile. This theme was spelled out in detail recently by the authoritative Soviet theoretical publication, "Kommunist," in an article stating that "Communism is the highest stage of social progress. All the peoples of the globe are moving toward it inexorably and will inevitably come to it."[14]

Communist Internationalism

To assert its leadership of the World Communist Movement after the successful Bolshevik Revolution of 1917, the Soviet Union created an international organization called The Communist International, commonly known as The Comintern. In 1920, the Comintern adopted 21 conditions for membership, a veritable constitution for international communism. Several of the conditions demanded blind subservience, unquestioned loyalty and duty to defend the U.S.S.R. against all its enemies.[15]

In 1921, the Communist Party (CP) in the United States submitted to the 21 conditions of membership and became a section of the Comintern. The CPUSA retained its Comintern membership until November, 1940, when it withdrew as a tactical maneuver to evade the provisions of the Voorhis Act. This Act required registration with the Attorney General by any organization subject to foreign control which engaged in political activity. Although the Comintern itself was dissolved in 1943 in a tactical move to express "friendship" between the U.S.S.R. and its allies, the CPUSA's allegiance to the Soviet Union has neither ceased nor decreased.[16]

The 12-Party Declaration issued by Communist bloc nations in November, 1957, reiterated the obligation of the international Communist movement to defend the Soviet Union at all costs.[17] Under the international discipline of the Communist movement, Communist parties throughout the world carry out Moscow's orders without question. All Communist parties are united by the common ideology of Marxism-Leninism, and maintain close "fraternal" relations with each other.

Relations are sustained in various ways. Important meetings—congresses and conventions, for example—provide opportunities for visits by Party leaders to other nations. Thus, two representatives of the CPUSA, along with representatives from practically all other Communist parties, attended the 21st Congress of the CP of the Soviet Union in Moscow in 1959. The two American Communists naturally traveled under the safety of passports issued by the U.S. Government. The international cohesion of the Communist movement is aided by Communist publications applying the principles of Marxism-Leninism. These publications provide a clearing house for policy guidance on theoretical and practical questions, and lay down the Party lines. Thus when the Soviet Communists decided on the program of the Cold War, Duclos, the French Communist leader, spoke to American Communists through the pages of the French party magazine. Duclos said Browder should be deposed—he was. The Parties' major theoretical publication in the United States is called "Political Affairs," and lays down the Party line.

The U.S.S.R. exercises complete control over this international conspiracy. It commands the support of communist parties in the free world to the extent of engaging in activities which are essentially traitorous.

In a similar manner communist parties in other countries have the support of the party in the Soviet Union and in other lands. At the 17th National Convention of the CPUSA held in New York City on December 10, 1959, American communists received greetings from 50 communist parties in foreign countries including the Soviet Union and Red China.[18]

Communist Principle of Class Struggle

A key principle in the communist movement is the communist concept of the class struggle. This concept pervades all communist theory and practice. According to Marx, history has been a series of class struggles which will end in a new period or stage of society. The current class struggle, communists hold, is being waged between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, the capitalists and the workers, the exploiters and the exploited, the rulers and the ruled.

To communists, the class war has never deviated down through the years though it has assumed various forms in different eras. In early times, the class struggle was between the slave owners and the slaves. In a later age, it was between the feudal lords and the serfs. Finally, the present day class struggle is centered between the Free World and the Soviet World. Strangely, this does not exist between the peasants in the Soviet Union and their well fed masters and the luxury living rulers of the CPSU. The result of this struggle, communists believe, will be the collapse of capitalism and the emergence of the Reign of Communism.

Communists' preoccupation with the class struggle arises from their dedication to the "class war," whether it be a small local dispute or a huge clash between the Soviet Union and the capitalist nations. For communists, every day is an engagement in the never-ending class war.

According to communists, the class struggle does not exist solely in the field of practical action. It exists also in the arena of ideas, in the realm of the mind. Hence, in the communist view, there is continual clash of ideas, of theories, and of ideologies.

Many well-informed people have been led by communist propaganda to believe that the Soviets in fact recognize Western civilization and the necessity of changing its traditional Marxist-Leninist concepts. Let Khrushchev himself supply the answer. Here are his words:

"Some people in the West are saying that the Soviet Union has supposedly changed its policy and therefore it has become easier to talk with us. This, of course, is incorrect. We were born communists, we live as communists and we will not die but will continue to make progress as communists."[19]

The Soviet Communists have made a studied effort to put Khrushchev on a level with Lenin himself. Certainly Khrushchev has never departed from the fundamentals of "class struggle." In 1958, Khrushchev asserted:

"We do not renounce class warfare. Class warfare will last as long as capitalism exists."[20]

Communist Principle of Deceit

The principle of deceit governs all communist tactics and practices. Lenin made this abundantly clear when he said:

"It is necessary to be able to agree to any and every sacrifice, and even—if need be—to resort to all sorts of stratagems, maneu-

---

[6] V. I. Lenin, Selected Works, 1905 (International Publishers, N.Y., 1943), vol. IX, pp. 478 and 479.

[7] Ibid., pp. 477 and 478.

[8] V. I. Lenin, Selected Works, 1905 (Int'l Publishers, N.Y., 1943), Vol. XI, p. 658.

[9] Yaroslavsky, E., "Religion in the USSR," p. 53.

[10] Moscow Radio Broadcast, March 27, 1958.

[11] Pravda, November 29, 1957.

[12] J. Edgar Hoover, Masters of Deceit (New York: Henry Holt, 1958), p. 3.

[13] William Z. Foster, "The Twilight of World Capitalism" (New York: International Publishers, 1949).

[14] The Current Digest of the Soviet Press, February 3, 1960, p. 3.

[15] Theses and Statutes of the Communist International. Adopted by the II Congress, July 17th-August 7th, 1920. (Publishing Office of the Communist International, Moscow, 1920), pp. 29–30.

[16] Earl Browder, "The Way Out" (New York: International Publishers, 1941), p. 191.

[17] Political Affairs, December 1958, p. 87.

[18] J. Edgar Hoover, FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin, March 1960, p. 9.

[19] Current Digest of the Soviet Press, December 16, 1959, p. 3. (Khrushchev's Speech to Soviet Journalist Congress, November 14, 1959.)

[20] Speech at Tatarany, Hungary, Pravda, April 9, 1958.

vers, and illegal methods, to evasion and subterfuge." [21]

"The strictest loyalty to the ideas of Communism must be combined with the ability to make all necessary practical compromises, to 'tack' to make agreement, zigzags, retreats and so on." [22]

Stalin was equally blunt:

"Words are one thing—deeds something entirely different. Fine words are a mask to cover shady deeds." [23]

While Lenin was referring specifically to the trade-union movement, his words are equally applicable to communist attempts to infiltrate and subvert non-communist organizations. Since the CP claims to be the "political party of the working class," communists concentrate their infiltration efforts principally on the labor movement, although no influential non-communist group is immune to communist efforts to subvert it. Communists, however, are not interested in improving wages or working conditions. They are concerned only in manipulating trade-unions to accomplish communist aims.

Soviet trade unions are completely unlike those in America and exist essentially to further the communist cause. They are also used in the Soviet Union to keep down wages and increase production. This was made abundantly clear by Khrushchev when he said: "We must make trade unions a genuine Leninist school of administration and management, a school of communism for the millions of workers and employees. It is quite obvious that for this the Party must give the unions more practical assistance in their work." [24]

During Khrushchev's visit to the United States he met with a group of labor leaders in San Francisco on September 20, 1959. The Americans advanced our traditional views on the trade union movement which were denounced by Khrushchev during a violent exchange of words with Walter Reuther. The Soviet account of this meeting [25] was most inconsistent with the report of the American labor leaders.[26] The incident is a valid illustration of Soviet disregard for truth and the facility with which the communist propaganda machine can distort the truth for propaganda purposes.

Communist Use of Aesopian Language (or Double Talk)

A manifestation of the communist principle of deceit is the use throughout the international communist movement, of a jargon or phraseology peculiar to the communist. Aptly known as Aesopian language, it grew originally out of the writings of Karl Marx, Friedrich Engels, Lenin and Stalin. It was developed for protective purposes in getting over the "revolutionary message" of the communist conspiracy under the guise of legality and thus thought the deceitful use of words to more easily infiltrate various stratas of life. This cryptic and involved phraseology, obscure to the uninitiated, permeates all communist publications.

There are two reasons why this complicated language is utilized. First, in every important pronouncement which provides communists with a guide to thought and action, there must be a strong reminder of their goal—the dictatorship of the proletariat through force and violence. This is constantly embodied in such Aesopian phrases as "strengthen Marxist-Leninist ideology and Bolshevik discipline."

Second, and equally important, communists must be instructed in the penetration of noncommunist mass organizations through which the masses can be directed and guided along the communist line in any particular period. This responsibility is conveyed through the communist directives, repeated over and over, "to broaden contact with the masses."

Thus, Aesopian language or double talk is a prominent communist deceptive device to fool noncommunists. Communist Aesopian language always has two sides—the deceptive line for public consumption and the real Party line to advance communism. Hence, the terms uttered by communists are vastly different in actual meaning. For instance, when communists demand "restoration of the Bill of Rights," they are seeking to eliminate legal opposition to communism, stop prosecution of communists, and grant amnesty to those presently in jail.

To further illustrate: Communists refer to their cause as a "Historic Mission." This Aesopian term, to communists, means the seizure of power, the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the abolition of capitalism, and the formation of the new, communist society. As the vanguard of the proletariat the communist party has as its "Historic Mission" the direction of the proletariat struggle toward a communist society.[27]

Communist Theory of Revolution

The inherently specious nature of communism is clearly illustrated by the current claim of its propaganda that communism can be attained without the use of force and violence. Realizing full well that a violent revolution will be necessary to overthrow capitalism, Marx, Engels, and Lenin made no effort to conceal the fact. Marx and Engels, in the concluding paragraph of The Communist Manifesto proclaimed:

"The Communists disdain to conceal their views and aims. They openly declare that their ends can be attained only by the forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions. Let the ruling classes tremble at a Communistic revolution." [28]

Lenin was equally forceful when he declared:

". . . As long as capitalism and socialism exist, we cannot live in peace; in the end, one or the other will triumph—a funeral dirge will be sung over the Soviet Republic or over world capitalism." [29]

However, because of the handicap that this basic element of communist theory has imposed on communist parties throughout the free world, contemporary communist leaders attempt to convey the impression that, in certain cases, it may be possible for communists to gain power by peaceful means. Khrushchev elaborated on his theory in his address to the 20th Congress of the CP of the Soviet Union in 1956. He said then that "the working class in a number of capitalist countries . . . is in a position . . . to capture a stable majority in parliament, and transform the latter from an organ of bourgeois democracy into a genuine instrument of the people's will." [30]

The utter deceit of this tactical maneuver is that Khrushchev is equally insistent that "The Marxist-Leninist doctrine is the banner of the international workers' movement and every communist party, if it is a genuinely communist party, is sacredly guided by this doctrine. Therefore, it is only natural that when meeting representatives of communist parties they express their fidelity to the revolutionary ideology of Marxism-Leninism.[31]

Since the initiation of Smith Act prosecutions and the findings of the U.S. Supreme Court that the CPUSA advocated force and violence, the Communists have carried on a vigorous campaign to conceal their true aims.[32] Even the Soviets in their false peace propaganda have sought to lull the Western World into a feeling of false security that they seek only peaceful means to accomplish their purpose.

Again their deeds prove false their propaganda. The December 1959 issue of the World Marxist Review summarizes a Communist textbook entitled, "Foundations of Marxism and Leninism," designed to replace the 1924 book by Stalin on "Problems of Leninism." Here it is made crystal clear that force and violence is part and parcel of the Communist revolution in the following words:

". . . The Marxist-Leninists, while noting the possibility of a peaceful revolution, nevertheless also see the inevitability, in a number of cases, of a sharp aggravation of class struggle. In countries where the military-police machine of the reactionary bourgeoisie is strong, the working class will encounter fierce resistance. There can be no doubt that in a number of capitalist countries the overthrow of the bourgeoise dictatorship by armed class struggle will be inevitable." [33]

Despite current communist propaganda to the effect that communism can be achieved through peaceful means, Gus Hall, now general secretary of the CPUSA, swore under oath in 1934 that he would use force and violence to overthrow the United States Government.[34] There is no reason to doubt that Hall still holds this conviction.

Communist Meaning of World Peace

Equally deceptive is the so-called peaceful coexistence campaign which has been featured so prominently in communist propaganda of recent years. Peaceful coexistence was the predominant theme of all Khrushchev's remarks during his visit to the United States in September, 1959. He defined, interpreted, and explained it, crediting Lenin with having bequeathed this principle to international communism.

Actually, Lenin's writings prove convincingly what a hollow mockery the term peaceful coexistence is for communists. They are engaged in a continuous war aimed at achieving the ultimate world-wide victory of communism. Lenin insisted that the contention that lasting peace is possible under capitalism is "a most reactionary method of consoling the masses." He called it a means for "distracting their attention from the sharp antagonisms and acute problems"

---

[21] V. I. Lenin, Selected Works (New York: International Publishers, 1943), Vol. X, p. 95.

[22] Ibid., p. 138.

[23] Joseph Stalin, Works (Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1953), Vol. 2, p. 285.

[24] Speech, at 20th Congress CPSU: Tass, February 14, 1916.

[25] "To Live in Peace and Friendship," p. 238–257.

[26] New York Times, September 22, 1959.

[27] J. Edgar Hoover, "Masters of Deceit," p. 345.

[28] Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, The Communist Manifesto (New York: International Publishers, 1932).

[29] Lenin, Selected Works, op. cit., Vol. VIII, p. 297.

[30] Soviet World Outlook—A Handbook of Communist Statements, Department of State Publication 6836 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1959), p. 114.

[31] Ibid., p. 33 (Tass, April 2, 1958).

[32] *Dennis* v. *United States*, 341 U.S. 494.

[33] Senate Internal Security Subcommittee Report, Khrushchev Strategy and its meaning for America, 1960., p. 27 and 28, World Marxist Review, vol. 2, No. 12, December 1959, p. 43.

[34] Statement by J. Edgar Hoover, Director, FBI, Concerning the 17th National Convention, Communist Party, U.S.A., December 10–13, 1959, to the Subcommittee to Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act and other Internal Security Laws of the Committee of the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, 86th Congress, 1st Session (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1960) pp. 1, 10.

with illusions of an "'ultra-imperialism' of the future." [35]

Not only do communists regard a lasting peace as being impossible under capitalism, but they insist that it can be achieved only under communism. According to Lenin, "outside of Socialism there is no deliverance of humanity from wars." [36] Eugene Dennis, national chairman of the CPUSA, echoed this thought in February, 1960, when he said:

"Unlike capitalism—a socialist society, by its nature precludes oppression and wars of conquest and aggression. In the socialist lands * * * there is no material basis or other incentive for aggrandizement, territorial plunder, or war profiteering." [37]

While allegedly striving for a lasting peace, Communists regard violence as an inevitable concomitant of the collapse of capitalism and the birth of the socialist society. Paradoxically, revolution is the only guarantee of lasting peace. Until then, peace, for Communists, is only a respite which allows time to prepare for the next war. It is only a temporary, tactical peace designed to enable the U.S.S.R. to build its strength for the final, inevitable, all-decisive combat which will result in the total destruction of capitalism.

Communist propaganda on peaceful coexistence deliberately glosses over the vital distinction which communist theory makes between a temporary and a lasting peace. In so doing, it attempts to create the impression that Communists are working toward the achievement of a lasting peace; whereas they are actually interested only in a temporary peace until the time is ripe for the successful final assault on capitalism.

Since Khrushchev has credited Lenin with formulating the principle of peaceful coexistence, it is well to recall what Lenin said regarding campaigns for peace. Lenin declared that "every 'peace programme' is a deception of the people and a piece of hypocrisy unless its principal object is to explain to the masses the need for a revolution, and to support, aid and develop the revolutionary struggle of the masses that is starting everywhere." [38]

During his visit to the United States Khrushchev used as a major theme in addresses and statements the subject of "peaceful coexistence" 26 times." [39]

In plain English, when Khrushchev urges peaceful coexistence, he is telling communists that there must be time to remove the obstacles to final communist victory and security. Likewise, through his use of the "Big Lie" technique, he hopes to lull the Western world into a further state of complacency of unpreparedness and disarmament while not departing from the traditional communist concept of world revolution. When Khrushchev speaks of "peaceful coexistence" it must be remembered that Lenin wrote, "great historical questions can be solved only by violence." [40]

"The adversaries of socialism are apprehensive about our progress, which furnishes graphic evidence of the superiority of the socialist system over the capitalist system. A competition is unfolding between these two systems. We stand for the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems and for competition between them in the economic sphere."

Continuing, Khrushchev used communist "double talk" to make his point and adhere to Marxist-Leninist doctrine when he said:

"When it comes to relations between the socialist and bourgeois ideologies there can be no coexistence, and we do not hide the fact. What is progressive has always won out over what is obsolescent and moribund." [41]

The Red Chinese Marxist leader, Mao Tse-Tung, who is now in an ideological conflict with Khrushchev over Leninist orthodoxy, used more expressive language when he said:

"Every Communist must grasp the truth that political power grows out of the barrel of a gun, in fact, we can say that the whole world can be remolded only with the gun." [42]

Communist Concepts of Imperialism and Colonialism

As the peaceful coexistence campaign illustrates, even words are used by communists as weapons in the class struggle. Thus, the phrase "people's democracy" is used to disguise the ruthless dictatorships which communists have inflicted on the European satellite nations. When this country found it necessary to send troops to Lebanon in 1958, Communist propaganda castigated us as "imperialists." Yet, when Soviet troops had brutally suppressed the Hungarian uprising in 1956, they were "liberating" Hungary from the threat of "fascist counter-revolutionaries."

Communist propaganda charges that the United States is attempting to impose its economic and political domination over Canada and Latin America merely to increase the profits of American business. This charge, however, completely ignores the fact that we granted independence to the Philippine Islands and commonwealth status to Puerto Rico in accordance with the desires of the majority of the populations of those two countries, and statehood to Alaska and Hawaii.

Our action in the case of the Philippines and Puerto Rico contrasts sharply with the manner in which the predatory Communist empire has expanded. The Baltic Republics of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia were forcibly incorporated into the USSR. Communist governments were imposed on the European satellite nations by the ruthless suppression of non-Communist political parties. Communists gained power in China, North Korea, and North Vietnam through armed aggression. The uprisings in East Germany, Hungary and Tibet, and the millions of refugees from Communist tyranny attest to the need for force to maintain communism in control.

Yet, Communists are still not satisfied. Khrushchev summed up the imperialistic nature of communism—an inherent characteristic because of communism's dedication to world conquest—when he boasted:

"We Bolshevika are a ravenous people. What we have achieved in the past is very little. We want more and more." [43]

Communist Concepts of Democracy and Freedom

In spite of the fact that communism retains control through fear and its counterpart force, Communists, from Lenin to Khrushchev, insist that communism is the highest form of democracy. In 1917, Lenin claimed that "in capitalist society we have a democracy that is curtailed, wretched, false; a democracy only for the rich, for the minority." [44] Khrushchev reaffirmed this view in 1958 when he asserted that "bourgeois democracy is the democracy of the rich." [45]

As opposed to the "veiled dictatorship of wealth" which passes for democracy in non-Communist nations, Communists offer "proletarian democracy" which, they hold, is a democracy of the toiling masses directed against exploiters. As the Program of the Communist International, adopted in 1928, explained:

"The Soviet form of State, being the highest form of democracy, namely proletarian democracy, is the very opposite of bourgeois democracy, which is bourgeois dictatorship in a masked form." [46]

Yet, the freedoms which we take for granted—freedom of speech, the press, assembly, and religion—are unheard of in practice in any Communist country. The late Andrei Y. Vyshinsky, former Soviet representative to the United Nations, spelled this out unequivocally when he said:

"In our state, naturally, there is and can be no place for freedom of speech, press, and so on for the foes of socialism. Every sort of attempt on their part to utilize these freedoms must be classified as a counterrevolutionary crime." [47]

Soviet law makes a mockery of the claim that communism insures full freedom. Clauses in the Soviet constitution guaranteeing such elementary rights as freedom of speech, the press, assembly, and religion, are nullified in practice by insisting that they must be exercised "in conformity with the interests of the working class, and in order to strengthen the social system." These "rights" cannot be used to criticize the Soviet state. Under communism, freedom is, in effect, the duty to support the official Party position and not the right to criticize.

The record of communism is one of mass enslavement and death, of the complete deprivation of individual freedom, and of a total disregard for the inherent dignity of man. The appalling loss of human life during the forced collectivization of Soviet agriculture, the terror of the infamous purge trials, the extensive use of slave labor, the forcible expansion of the Communist empire during and after World War II, and the brutal suppression of the uprisings in East Germany, Hungary, and Tibet belie communism's assurances of democracy, liberty and freedom.

Communists Talk Peace but Defend War

Communist peace claims are shorn of their hypocrisy when the basic Marxist-Leninist principles are examined. War is a means of revolutionary change so long as it serves the interests of communism and so long as conditions are proper for a Soviet "just war."

Lenin laid down the principle from which there has been no deviation, as follows:

"If war is waged by the proletariat after it has conquered the bourgeoisie in its own country, and is waged with the object of strengthening and extending socialism, such a war is legitimate and 'holy'." [48]

Khrushchev in effect reiterated Lenin on September 30, 1959, in an address to Chinese Communist leaders when he said:

"Marxists have always recognized only * * * just wars and they have always condemned imperialistic aggressive wars. This is one of the characteristics of Marxist-Leninist theory." [49]

To the Communist there are just and unjust wars. Just wars are those fought for "liberation" from "capitalistic slavery" and in defense against foreign attack. Unjust wars are those fought against the Soviet or would-be satellite states or by capitalist states among themselves (unless the Soviets

---

[35] Collected Works of V. I. Lenin (New York: International Publishers, 1942), Vol. XIX, p. 187.

[36] Ibid. (1929), Vol. XX (Book I), p. 114.

[37] Political Affairs, February, 1960, p. 62.

[38] Lenin, Selected Works, op. cit., vol. V, p. 237.

[39] Note 31, Ibid., p. 35.

[40] Lenin, Selected Works, 1943, p. 313.

[41] Current Digest of the Soviet Press, January 13, 1960, p. 4 (Khrushchev talk to Power Plant Builders' Conference, November 28, 1959).

[42] Note 31, Ibid., p. 25.

[43] The Washington Post and Times Herald, April 22, 1958, p. A-5.

[44] Soviet World Outlook, op. cit., p. 54.

[45] Ibid., p. 55.

[46] Program of the Communist International (New York: Workers Library Publishers, 2d edition, 1933), p. 37.

[47] Andrei Y. Vyshinsky, The Law of the Soviet State (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1948), p. 617.

[48] Lenin, Selected Works, vol. VII, 1943, p. 357.

[49] The New York Times, October 1, 1959.

would benefit).[49] Thus, to communists it was a just war to march on Poland after the 1939 union between Moscow and Berlin but, of course, when Germany invaded Russia, it became an unjust war.

The Marxist-Leninist doctrine bans all unjust war but this doctrine obviously is a part of Communist double talk designed to disarm genuine peace-loving peoples.

The true Soviet view has best been expressed by Marshal Boris M. Shaposdnikov who was Stalin's military adviser, in these words:

"We are interested in the question whether preventive war can be justified * * * such a war, provided it is of a progressive and revolutionary type * * * will be a just war. There will be a moment when revolutionary masses * * * must resort to arms. The fact that, in such a struggle, it may be valid to enter into a preventive war needs no further explanation. The initiation of war does not deprive such a war of its inherently defensive character." [51]

The peril to America rests on the fact that Marxist-Leninist doctrines and morals would justify Communists to make an unannounced, unprovoked, sneak attack upon the United States as a just war designed to bring the United States under the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Lenin's sanctions are implicit in his teaching:

"Only after the proletariat has disarmed the bourgeoisie will it be able, without betraying its world historical mission, to throw all armaments on the scrap heap." [52]

COMMUNIST TACTICS AND STRATEGY

Communist Meaning of Tactics and Strategy

Tactics have been defined by Stalin as "the ways and means, the forms and methods of fighting that are most appropriate to the concrete situation at the given moment and are most certain to prepare the way for strategic success." "Tactics," he said, "are a part of strategy, subordinated to and serving it." [53] By tactics, Communists means the immediate decisions, measures, and action which must be taken to achieve Communist objectives. Tactics vary rapidly in keeping with rapidly changing conditions, but the broad essential outlines of strategy remain unchanged.

Stalin has described the function of strategy to be "to determine the main direction which ought to be taken by the working-class movement, and along which the proletariat can most advantageously deliver the main blow at its enemy." [54] Strategy represents a detailed analysis of all possible forces available in the struggle for a world Communist society. It is the grand, overall blueprint of the conflict.

In Communist strategy, the assumption is that a clash with the non-Communist world is inevitable; therefore, all Communist sources of strength—economic, political, military, propaganda, etc.—are to be used where they are strongest and most productive of desirable results. By the same token, non-Communist sources of strength are to be hit and destroyed where they are the weakest and least productive.

Since all Communist parties are modeled after the CP of the Soviet Union and are, for the most part, minority groups striving for power, they use common tactics. Nevertheless, while these tactics are basically identical, they are applied with skillful diversity and flexibility depending on local social, economic, and political conditions. The current Communist economic-political offensive has not resulted in the abandonment of such traditional Communist tactics as propaganda, the united front, and the infiltration and subversion of non-Communist groups. These are now being implemented by extensive programs of economic and technical assistance, exchange of visitors, and diplomatic maneuvering.

In applying tactics, Communists are not bound by any legal, moral, or ethical scruples. Any action—legal or illegal, moral or immoral, peaceful or violent, open or covert—becomes automatically justified if it advances the cause of communism. Since their morality is relative, depending solely on the immediate needs of the class struggle, Communists have never hesitated to use such tactics as armed aggression and guerrilla warfare, individual and mass terrorism, abrogation of treaties, espionage, and sabotage to promote Communist objectives.

Existence of Underground Apparatus

The concept of an illegal, secret, or underground apparatus paralleling the legal, open or aboveground CP is a basic Communist tactic. In the words of Lenin, Communists "must everywhere create a duplicate illegal apparatus, which, at the decisive moment, could help the Party to perform its duty to the revolution." [55]

Thus, in every country where Communists are unable to carry on their work lawfully, they invariably resort to a combination of lawful and unlawful work. The CP of the Soviet Union originally came into existence as an underground group. The CPUSA is essentially the same type of clandestine body as that which was established and developed by the Bolsheviks in Russia and is likewise the product of decades of Communist underground activity.

The purpose of an underground organization is to provide the CP with a hard-core leadership protected by maximum security measures designed to survive government action and to preserve the continuity of the CP organization and its program under the most adverse conditions. The underground apparatus of the CPUSA has existed since the Party was founded in 1919. Under conditions favorable to the Party, it has contracted, while during periods unfavorable to the Party it has expanded, but at all times, the apparatus has remained in existence.

Mr. Khrushchev's visit to the United States was the signal to American communists that the time was ripe to shift from covert to open activity. With the 17th convention of the CPUSA last December, the CPUSA overnight transformed itself into a militant, aggressive organization dedicated to inject Marxist-Leninist concepts into the mainstream of American life.

Archie Brown, a longtime Communist leader, was a candidate for the San Francisco Board of Education last November. He polled 33,000 votes, or 13 per cent of the votes cast. He attributed his success to Khrushchev's visit and speeches on peace.[56]

The extent of the organization and control of the underground over the open phase of the Party's activities appears to vary in direct ratio to the pressure, applied against it by the government. This pressure, in the United States, for instance, can take the form of anti-Communist legislation, such as the Smith Act of 1940, the Internal Security Act of 1950, and the Communist Control Act of 1954, or it can be brought about by the various congressional or state committees investigating communism.

Aggression as Means to End

Primarily by means of the tactics of open or concealed aggression, communism has grown from a handful of Lenin's followers in 1917 to an international movement now comprising a billion people. To Communists, since the end justifies the means and since the proletariat and the bourgeoisie are engaged in a permanent state of war, there is no question of aggression or nonaggression, but only one of offensive and defensive movements in a ceaseless battle between sworn enemies.

Communist aggression as we know it today, started with the establishment of the Soviet Union. The following examples of such aggression are most vivid:

Soviet Georgia, whose independence was recognized in May, 1920, was invaded by Stalin in February, 1921.

The Ukraine was forcibly annexed by the USSR in December, 1922.

Poland, with whom the Soviets negotiated a nonaggression Treaty in 1932, was invaded by the Soviets from the east in September, 1939, while the Nazis invaded from the west.

Finland was invaded by the USSR in November, 1939.

Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania were all forcibly annexed by the Soviet Union in August, 1940.

China (1945–1949), Malaya (1945–1954), the Philippines (1945–1948), Indochina (1945–1954), and Greece (1946–1949) were all wracked by Communist civil wars.

Rumania, Bulgaria, and Hungary, with whom peace treaties were signed by the USSR in September, 1947, were invaded by Soviet troops in April, 1948, August, 1948, and February, 1949, respectively.

Korea was the scene of a bloody war between Communist aggressors and United Nations forces from 1950 to 1953.

Tibet was invaded by Chinese Communist forces in 1950.

Hungary was crushed by Soviet troops which moved in to put down the October, 1956, revolt against the local communist government.[57]

That Communists have not changed their views on aggression was made plain by Khrushchev in his speech before the 20th Congress of the CP of the Soviet Union in 1956. He said then that "there is no doubt that in a number of capitalist countries the violent overthrow of the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie and the sharp aggravation of class struggle connected with this are inevitable." [58]

Propaganda as Weapon

Propaganda has become the most powerful single weapon in the Communist arsenal as the means of arousing the masses, luring them toward communism, and preparing and organizing them for revolutionary activity. Propaganda is viewed by Communists as a tactic to be used constantly and in close coordination with other tactics. It is utilized both to supplement military, conspiratorial, diplomatic, or economic measures and to substitute for them when these measures are impossible, impractical, unproductive, or uneconomical.

The beginning of modern communism was dramatized by "The Communist Manifesto," published in 1848 by Marx and Engels. This Communist "classic" in itself is little more than propaganda. For the next half century, the ideas of Marx and Engels were kept alive, with virtually no organization, backing, or support, by the propaganda of their adherents. Marx and Engels did not

[49] Short History CPSU, 1945, pp. 168–169.

[51] Boris M. Shaposhnikov, "Brain of the Army," 1928, vol. III, p. 251.

[52] Lenin, Collected Works, 1942, vol. XIX, p. 366.

[53] Stalin, Works, op. cit., Vol. 5, p. 169.

[54] Ibid., pp. 166–167.

[55] Lenin, Selected Works, op. cit., Vol. X, p. 202.

[56] J. Edgar Hoover, Testimony before the House Sub-committee on Appropriations, February 8, 1960, p. 41–42.

[57] The 1957 World Almanac and Book of Facts (New York: New York World-Telegram and The Sun, 1957), pp. 186, 208, 403.

[58] The Communist Conspiracy, Strategy and Tactics of World Communism, Committee on Un-American Activities, House of Representatives, 84th Congress, 2d Session, House Report No. 2240 (Washington: Government Printing Office), May 29, 1956, Part I, Section A, p. xi.

concern themselves seriously with problems of organization, tactics, and strategy. They dealt with ideas and events, which are the weapons of propaganda.[59]

In the years since Marx and Engels, leaders of the international Communist movement, have valued and utilized propaganda above all other types of activity. As far back as 1902, Lenin stressed the necessity for "propaganda and agitation among all strata of people."[60] In 1939, Stalin noted that "if our Party propaganda for some reason or other goes lame then our entire state and Party work must inevitably languish."[61] Eugene Dennis, now national chairman of the CPUSA, has urged the CPUSA to "improve every aspect of our mass agitation so as to reach and convince millions of workers and progressives and set them in motion."[62]

Communist propaganda aimed at non-Communist Americans is intended to "educate" the masses along Marxist-Leninist lines and to gain their support in order that the masses may be maneuvered and mobilized into eventual revolutionary action for the overthrow of the Government. No segment of the population and no sphere of activity in this country has been overlooked or neglected by Communists as targets for their propaganda—particularly youth.

Of the torrent of propaganda which has flooded the world through the years, Communist propaganda has been the most expertly conceived and executed. In falsehood, imagination, audacity, intensity, volume, and effectiveness, Communist propaganda on a world-wide scale dwarfs all other propaganda efforts in history.

Exploitation of Cultural Exchanges

The tactical use to which Communists have put cultural exchanges has gone far beyond the original purpose of promoting mutual understanding through expanding people-to-people relationships.

On the surface, there is seemingly a favorable balance between the number of delegations which the United States and the USSR have exchanged. In the past two years, both countries have exchanged approximately 1,500 people each, involving more than 100 projects of each country. But, in addition to using some of these groups for intelligence activities, the Soviets further violate the purpose of such exchanges by deliberately restricting the free flow of ideas through the controls they establish on their groups. Each Soviet group has its "spokesman" who not only speaks for the group, but also insures that members of the group do not become ideologically disoriented through contacts and discussions with Americans.

Perhaps the greatest disparity in the approach of the two countries to expanded people-to-people contacts involves tourists. Originally, the major theme of Soviet propaganda was that the United States maintained an "iron curtain" against tourists because of a law which required fingerprinting aliens. When that objection was removed by the waiver of fingerprinting requirements, Soviet propaganda switched to the theme that excessive cost prevented extensive tourist travel from the Soviet Union to the United States.

The so-called tourists the Soviet Government has permitted to travel here differ markedly from their American counterparts. In the first place, Soviet "tourists" come here in groups and not individually or as members of small parties as is customary with Americans. In the second place, Soviet groups show an amazing similarity of interests and occupations. One group, for instance, will be composed entirely of scientists; another group wholly of economists; and so on. Moreover, these "tourists" groups are not interested in sightseeing, but rather in obtaining specialized technical and scientific data. In short, Soviet tourism is used as another form of espionage, just another method of collecting valuable information in the ceaseless intelligent efforts which the Soviets direct at this country.

Weapon of world trade

Next to the propaganda weapon, trade has become the most important tactic employed by the U.S.S.R. in the past several years. Trade is now being utilized as an economic and political instrument in the struggle for the victory of communism.

Behind the Soviet decision to use economic transactions as political weapons is the belief of Soviet leaders that the decay of capitalism predicted by Marx and Lenin can be accelerated. The emphasis on a substantial expansion of trade relations both with the Communist nations and with non-Communist countries serves as a phychological weapon. Apart from the inherent benefits of economic relations between nations, plans for intensified trade and financial aid lend themselves to propaganda exploitation. The Russians have developed as masters in publicizing successfully whatever promises they have made to other countries, often out of all proportion to their actual performances.

The long-term objectives of the Soviet bloc in its economic relations with the free world are (1) to supply their economy, especially the industrial-military base, with imports that help the bloc become more powerful and less dependent on the non-Communist world; (2) to drive wedges among non-Communist nations at every opportunity; (3) to increase the reliance of non-Communist countries on the Soviet bloc for markets and supplies, thereby making the free world more vulnerable to Communist pressure; and (4) to prevent, by trade and credit manipulation, any defections of neutral or uncommitted nations to the side of the West.

The economic tactic has been employed by the USSR in its frequent purchases of large quantities of various commodities to propagandize their so-called position as a "friend" of underdeveloped or "colonial" nations. In early 1960, for instance, the Soviets signed a deal with Cuba for the exchange of a million tons of Cuban sugar annually at the world price in exchange for Soviet machinery. The Soviets loudly proclaimed the agreement to be an act of friendship with Cuba, a nation long subjected to "American economic domination."

What the Soviets did not admit was their purchase in September, 1959, of 330,000 tons of Cuban sugar below the world price.[63] Neither did the Soviets publicize the fact that the United States had an agreement with Cuba whereby we paid that country about three cents per pound above the world sugar price.[64]

Building Communism with Non-Communist Hands

As a minority group such non-Communist countries as the United States, the CP is dependent on the support of non-Communists for the achievement of its goals. To gain this support and to extend its influence beyond the orbit of its own membership, the CP ceaselessly endeavors to maintain and expand its contact with people in all walks of life.

The importance which Communists attach to non-Communist support is indicated by their incessant repetition of the phrase "contact with the masses." The CP considers the masses as subject to continuous exploitation under the capitalist system. It has arrogated to itself, as the "political party of the working class," the "duty" of leading them to their eventual "emancipator" under a Communist form of government.

Leaders of the Communist movement are well aware that the proletariat must be "educated" if the ultimate overthrow of the capitalist system is to be accomplished. For this reason, the "political education" of the masses along Marxist-Leninist lines has always been regarded by Communists as of primary importance. Thus, the tactics of propaganda and agitation are directed at the masses with the objective of maneuvering and mobilizing them for action and conscious participation in the building of the new socialist order under the Communist banner.

The desires and the will of the party are also transmitted to large masses by means of non-Communist, nonpolitical organizations. People belong to various organizations for special purposes and needs. But as far as Communists are concerned, these organizations are to be exploited as mere "transmission belts" to enable a small party of revolutionists to enlist the support of the unsuspecting masses.

Gus Hall, general secretary of CPUSA, on behalf of the party's national secretariat, issued a directive on May 19, 1960, which said under the heading "Reaching Out to the Masses":

"It is necessary here that primary attention be given to the relationship of our Party leading forces with other left-progressive leaders who are active in the field of peace activities. Even where differences exist or may continue to exist, mutual agreement can be established for a common effort."[65]

The above document further stated: "The task continues to be that of supporting and helping to build and influence mass peace movements among them, church and other organizations."

Tactic of Infiltration

Infiltration is one of the oldest and most widely used of Communist tactics, long advocated by Lenin and other Communist leaders and theorists. Infiltration gives the CP a foothold among non-Communists, helping Communists to disseminate their propaganda and to extend their influence in areas of society which would normally be closed to open Communist activity.

Lenin instructed that "in all organizations without exception—unions and associations, primarily proletarian, and also organizations of the nonproletarian, toiling and exploited masses (political, industrial, military, toiling, cooperative, educational, sports, etc., etc.), groups or nuclei of Communists should be formed."[66] The tactic of "boring from within" the labor movement was also enunciated by Lenin.[67]

Communist use of the Trojan-horse tactic, first announced in 1935 by Georgi Dimitroff, then general secretary of the Comintern,[68] has been faithfully and extensively used ever since. Gus Hall, general secretary of the CPUSA, reiterated the need for infiltration at the 17th national conven-

---

[59] "William Benton Reports on the Voice of the Kremlin," 1956 Britannica Book of the Year (Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc., 1956), unpaged feature article.

[60] Lenin, Selected Works, op. cit., vol. II, p. 101.

[61] Joseph Stalin, Problems of Leninism (New York: International Publishers, 1934), p. 629.

[62] Political Affairs, September 1946, p. 809.

[63] Facts on File, 1959, p. 324.

[64] Facts on File, 1960, p. 58.

[65] Memorandum dated May 19, 1960, addressed "To all State Organizations," "To all National Committee Members"—by Gus Hall.

[66] Lenin, Selected Works, op. Cit., Vol. X pp. 169–170.

[67] V. I. Lenin, "Left-Wing" Communism, An Infantile Disorder (New York: International Publishers, 1940), p. 38.

[68] Georgi Dimitroff, The United Front (New York: International Publishers, 1938), p. 52.

tion of the CPUSA in December, 1959. He declared: "We want to participate in, organize, and lead the broadest of the united front movements—on every level—in a thousand ways, in 10,000 places, on 100,000 issues—if possible, with 180 million people." [69]

On February 8, 1960, J. Edgar Hoover, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, testified before the House Subcommittee on Appropriations: "We now have 160 known or suspected Communist front and Communist infiltrated organizations under investigation. These various fronts exploit every susceptible segment of American society."

Most cynical and sinister are Communist attempts to penetrate Negro organizations. Communists are always claiming to champion the rights of the Negro, but their primary interest is in causing racial tension and creating embarrassing or dangerous situations which will aid and abet the Communist cause at the expense of the Negro.

Fronts as a Screen

The front organization is a screen or cover behind which many of the political, agitation and propaganda activities of the CP are carried on. Communists in the United States—as elsewhere throughout the world—have long made extensive use of fronts as a tactic to camouflage the real source and direction of their subversive operations.

The utility of fronts was recognized years ago by both Lenin [70] and Stalin.[71] They held that mass organizations, or "transmission belts," under the influence and direction of the CP, are indispensable in mobilizing, organizing, and maneuvering the masses to bring about the transition from capitalism to communism.

In 1926, the then secretary of the Comintern, Otto Kuusinen, popularized the tactic of "transmission belts." He stressed the necessity of creating "a whole solar system of organizations" working under the domination and guidance of the CP.[72]

Communists exercise great pains to hide the Communist origin and character of their fronts. Fronts are given highly innocuous, idealistic, or patriotic names to conceal the true reason for their existence. To give an aura of legitimacy and respectability, Communists resort to the familiar practice of exploiting prominent persons. An impressive list of notable and distinguished persons is compiled to serve as window dressing for a front. Communists know that the names of scientists, educators, writers, clergymen, and other well-known individuals associated with a Communist front will have a favorable effect on the unsuspecting.

Before World War II, many Communist front organizations in this country were affiliated with various international Communist fronts. The enactment of the Internal Security Act of 1950, however, prompted American fronts to relinquish their formal ties abroad.

The current relationship between international fronts and their American counterparts is manifested in the World Youth Festival, which has been held every two years since 1947. These festivals, sponsored by two international Communist front organizations—World Federation of Democratic Youth and the International Union of Students—have been conducted solely for the propaganda benefit of Soviet Russia. A number of young Americans, many of them members of various Communist youth fronts in this country, have attended these festivals as delegates or visitors.

[69] Statement by J. Edgar Hoover Concerning the 17th National Convention, Communist Party, U.S.A., op. cit., p. 5.

[70] Lenin, "Selected Works," op. cit. Vol. IX, p. 6.

[71] Stalin, "Problems of Leninism," op. cit., pp. 29–32.

[72] The "Communist," May 1931, p. 413.

Espionage Activities

Espionage and sabotage are two more important Communist tactics. As the number one target of world communism, the United States naturally is the prime objective of Soviet espionage.

The U–2 incident seized by Khrushchev as the vehicle to sabotage the recent ill-fated Summit Conference further illustrates Communist deceit and hypocrisy. The Soviets stole the secrets of the atom bomb through espionage and numerous other scientific breakthrough. Even while Khrushchev was touring the United States on his peace mission in 1959, Soviet officials were violating their hospitality by carrying on espionage in that two Soviets were photographed by FBI agents when they were carrying on negotiations to secure the secrets of U. S. cryptographic machines.[73] The Soviet views espionage as it does "just" wars. If the espionage is to benefit the Soviet Union, it is just. If it harms the Soviet Union, it is unjust. While Communist spies denounce wire tapping, the Soviet Union installs microphones in United States Embassy Offices, as demonstrated when Ambassador Lodge at the United Nations produced the Great Seal of the United States from the office of our Ambassador to Russia containing a clandestine listening device.

Congressman Gallagher of New Jersey rendered a distinct service to the country when he inserted a long list of names of Soviet espionage agents who had been exposed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 19, 1960. Much additional evidence of Soviet espionage has been publicly disclosed.

Since the United Nations presentation by Ambassador Lodge, the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee in June 1960, issued as a public document a 63-page Summary of Soviet Espionage sent to the Attorney General by J. Edgar Hoover. This document reflects great credit on the FBI in ferreting out espionage and it is obvious that the FBI knew and reported the existence of Soviet espionage.

On the other hand, the West German Defense Minister, Franz Joseph Strauss, was quick to charge publicly that there were 40,000 Soviet espionage agents working in West Germany and that more than 2,000 Red spies had been caught.

In recent years, an overall expansion of Soviet bloc intelligence activities against the United States has taken place. There has been a widespread use of "legal" agents operating under the guise of diplomatic status. Soviet defectors state that between 70 and 80 per cent of Russian officials in this country are members of Red Intelligence services. There are indications, further, of a general tightening-up of the organizational structure of the Soviet Intelligence apparatus.[74] [75] [76]

The importance that the USSR is currently attaching to the value of these intelligence agents is vividly borne out by the sharp increase in the number of Soviet diplomatic personnel assigned to this country in recent years. Intensified Communist espionage efforts in the United States expose the utter fallacy of the ear of so-called peaceful coexistence.[77]

[73] Expose of Soviet Espionage, May 1960, FBI Report to Attorney General issued by Senate Internal Security Committee, June 1960.

[74] New York Mirror, June 8, 1960.

[75] 1960 Appropriation, Testimony of John Edgar Hoover, Director, FBI, Before the House Subcommittee on Appropriations on February 5, 1959, p. 30.

[76] "Citizenship—A Call to Duty," Address by J. Edgar Hoover, Director, FBI, at the Biennial Convention of Junior Order United American Mechanics, Morris Harvey College, Charleston, West Virginia, June 16, 1959.

[77] Ibid.

Information sought by Communist espionage agents is extensive and varied, including the following subjects: Scientific research and development, with particular attention to atomic energy, missiles, radar defense, electronics, and aeronautics; the strength, deployment, training methods, strategy, and tactics of the Armed Forces, as well as ordnance, weapons, and military equipment; the intelligence and counterintelligence agencies of the United States, and possibilities for penetration; international relations of the United States; weaknesses of prominent Americans in their public and private lives that can be exploited for intelligence and propaganda purposes; and anti-Soviet political opposition groups, refugees from the USSR and satellite countries, and nationality groups in the United States.[78]

The techniques used in Communist espionage operations are typified by the case of Rudolph Ivanovich Abel, a Colonel in the Soviet Security Service, who was uncovered by the FBI in June, 1957, and is now serving a 30-year sentence for espionage.

Abel entered the United States by way of Canada on a passport which had been issued originally to a naturalized American citizen of Lithuanian extraction. Abel set up headquarters in New York City, ostensibly as a commercial photographer. In his properly equipped studio, he had three shortwave radios, a tape recorder, a miniature camera, a number of hallowed-out items—such as a wooden pencil, a shaving brush, cuff links, etc.—for concealing microfilm messages, along with other paraphernalia.

Twice a week, Abel tuned in to Russia on one of his radios, receiving carefully encoded instructions. Then, using a second code, he deciphered the messages for transmittal to his subordinates. When forwarding informa to the USSR, he placed his microfilmed data in one of the numerous "dead drops"—bottoms of park benches, under fences, and the like—designed by his Soviet superiors. These messages were eventually picked up and sent to the Soviet Union by other members of his espionage network.

It is significant that Abel can have visitors in the Atlanta Federal prison, although our Ambassador to the USSR as of June 12, 1960, has not been able to see Francis Powers, the pilot of the U2. Nor does the United States have knowledge as to how the confession was extracted from Powers although it is known that the Soviet spy Abel so far has remained silent and his rights are protected by our Courts.

Sabotage Potential

Although there is no conclusive evidence of Soviet-directed sabotage in the United States at the present time, in the event of a national emergency or a war with the United States, the USSR possesses capabilities to conduct sabotage and to otherwise disrupt the internal security and national defense efforts of our country.

Members of the CPUSA and its adherents are capable of organizing saboteur units or teams of varying sizes. Intensive sabotage could be expected to be timed or coordinated with a surprise Soviet military attack, coming just before, coincidentally with, or immediately after the initiation of open hostilities. The Soviet sabotage capability is enhanced by the vulnerability of American industry which makes possible strikes or slowdowns in many industrial plants.

In addition, Communists possess other disruptive or subversive capabilities, with their objectives of infiltration of the Government and the Armed Forces, the penetration of non-Communist organizations, and the use of front organizations. Communists could be in a position, and even now seek, to undermine the confidence of the American people in their Government, its policies, its institutions, and its leaders; to impede defense

[78] Masters of Deceit, op. cit., p. 302.

production, transportation, and communications through strikes or slowdowns; to reduce the efficiency of the armed services by adversely affecting morale and the will to fight; and to cause civil disturbances and panic.[79]

There are a number of obvious Communist sabotage targets in the United States.[80] Transportation sabotage targets include dock and other shipping facilities, important railroad junctions and yards, bridges, canal locks, and airports. Communications sabotage targets include transmission lines, power stations, and the more important controls and switchboards. Sabotage targets in basic industries, without which a modern war cannot be successfully waged, include supplies of coal, iron, steel, and related items. Vital defense installation targets include atomic energy, electronic, and chemical plants. Sources of food and water supply targets include warehouses, grainfields, cattle and sheep herds, reservoirs, and sewerage systems.[81]

World Conquest

The ultimate objective of communism, made abundantly clear by its principles and by its tactics and strategy, is world domination. Communist teachings, from the time of Marx, have consistently proclaimed that capitalism is moribund and is historically destined to be superseded by communism.

Khrushchev has been particularly voluble on this point. During his visit to the United States last year, he repeatedly stressed the theme that "capitalism is an outmoded system which is doomed to inexorable death" and that "the future belongs to communism."[82] In the same vein, William Z. Foster has predicted that the capitalist system is dying "regardless of its desperate struggle to survive."[83]

This optimistic view is explained by the Communist dogma that the triumph of communism is inevitable because it has already been determined by laws as valid as those which govern the physical sciences. It is for this reason that Communists regard themselves as "riding the wave of the future" toward their "rendezvous with destiny."

Communist propaganda does not stop with the claim that communism is invincible and that its triumph is inevitable. Its propaganda attempts to depict the Communist orbit as a world of peace, progress and prosperity in contrast with the non-Communist world, which is allegedly characterized by social unrest, economic exploitation, and political upheaval. Through this technique, the ultimate victory of communism is represented, not only as a historical inevitability, but as the conquest of right over wrong and of good over evil.

Communists realize, however, that, in order to attain their ultimate goal, they must accomplish a number of short-range, more immediate objectives designed to leave the non-Communist opposition hopelessly weakened, divided, and confused in the face of the Communist challenge. These transitional goals will, naturally, vary to some degree in different non-Communist nations, depending on local conditions. For this reason, the discussion of these short-range aims has been limited to those which are generally valid throughout the non-Communist world.

Cripple National Defense

Communists respect only power, and hence they are well aware that strong non-Communist military forces are the strongest deterrent to their program of world conquest. Conversely, the weaker a nation's defense, the easier it becomes for Communists to seize power either from within or from without.

Communists therefore try in all possible ways to demoralize and weaken the armed forces of non-Communist nations. They follow Lenin's dictum that Communists cannot "attain power or consolidate it except by absolutely disintegrating the old army."[84] The Comintern in 1920 outlined the steps to subvert armed forces by indicating that a "persistent and systematic propaganda and agitation is necessary in the army, where Communist groups should be formed in every military organization."[85]

In the United States, propaganda and agitation aimed at the armed forces have always been designed to lower morale, undermine discipline, discredit officers, exploit petty grievances, promote pacifism, and even incite rebellion. Immediately after World War II, Communist propaganda capitalized on the natural desire of American soldiers to return home from overseas. Protest demonstrations by American servicemen took place in the United States, in Europe and in the Far East. As a consequence, our military strength was drastically reduced over the vigorous objection of our military leaders.

Today, Communist propaganda paints an enticing picture of the great number of schools, hospitals, and roads which could be constructed in the United States if the money being expended for our defense and for military assistance to our allies could be diverted to "peaceful" purposes. But American Communists soft pedal the tactics of Khrushchev's saber rattling; the Soviet armament race which places an economic burden through higher taxes upon every American family.

Throughout the postwar years, Communist propaganda has unqualifiedly condemned every action we have taken to strengthen ourselves and our allies against the threat of further Communist aggression. The obvious Communist objective is to weaken the national defense not only of our Nation but of the entire free world in preparation for further Communist aggression.

During the past several years, Communists have engaged extensively in espionage activity in order to procure the military secrets of non-Communist nations. While ostensibly our allies during World War II, the Soviets were successful in obtaining information regarding our most closely guarded secret, the atom bomb.

Communist espionage has not been limited to the United States, however. In August, 1954, for instance, a former intelligence officer in the Japanese Army confessed to spying for the Soviet Union. In March, 1956, the Government of Iran expelled the Assistant Military Attaché of the Soviet Embassy for spying. In December, 1956, a Finnish citizen was convicted of furnishing the USSR secret information on Finland's military forces. In January and February, 1957, two Soviet diplomats were expelled from Denmark for espionage activity. In January, 1957, two Swedish engineers, employed by the firm which was constructing Sweden's underground air and naval bases, were arrested as Soviet espionage agents. In November, 1958, a Swiss Army officer confessed that he had furnished classified military data to Czech espionage agents.[86]

Yet, in the face of the demonstrated military might of the Communist bloc and the use to which it has been put in North Korea, North Vietnam, East Germany, Hungary, and Tibet, Communist propaganda advances the lie that Communist military forces are maintained only for "defensive" purposes.

Weaken Internal Security

As the nation which is the principal barrier to further Communist expansion, the United States is being tested daily by persistent attacks on the domestic front from the CP, its fronts, and sympathizers. These onslaughts are aimed at weakening our internal security programs so that Communists will be unmolested in their subversive activities. The primary targets of these attacks are our courts, the Congressional committees which have been so successful in keeping abreast of Communist activities in this country, the laws and regulations which comprise our security programs, police departments, the armed services, and the FBI.

In Communist propaganda, American courts are branded as "class instruments" dedicated to the preservation of the capitalist system and its exploitation of the masses. Congressional investigating committees are picketed and condemned for conducting "red-baiting" investigations. The laws and regulations designed to keep our Government free from Communist infiltration are under continuous Communist fire as "repressive" and "reactionary." Communist smear campaigns are specially bitter in their assaults on the FBI. Their deliberate aim is to discredit the FBI in its responsibilities for protecting the Nation's internal security in the hope of causing its withdrawal from this vital field.

All of these attacks, of course, are in line with the basic Communist objective of destroying those elements in any free society which are actively resisting the further propagation of communism.

Undermine National Economy

A strong, vigorous economy is one of the soundest bulwarks against the Communist penetration of any non-Communist country. For this reason, another short-range Communist objective is to weaken and disrupt all non-Communist economies as "proof" that capitalism is incapable of ministering to the best interests and welfare of the working class.

Communists incite strikes and slowdowns to disrupt industrial production and create economic unrest. During 1959, for example, Soviet and satellite diplomats were expelled from both Mexico and Argentina, when they were detected directing street riots and industrial strife in conjunction with local Communists.[87]

The extensive program of Communist economic aid to under-developed nations is now being accompanied with propaganda warnings of the alleged harmful effects of aid from non-Communist nations. Communist economic aid which is given, however, is intended to enhance the popularity of Communist nations, as well as to encourage the development of the economies of non-Communist countries along the Communist pattern.

In a gross oversimplification, Communist propaganda claims that Western—particularly American—economic aid is planned to keep underdeveloped nations in a permanent

[79] Ibid., pp. 303–305, and Fendall Yerxa and Ogden R. Reid, The Threat of Red Sabotage (New York Herald Tribune, Inc., 1950), pp. 3–10, 28–29.

[80] Ibid.

[81] Masters of Deceit, op. cit., pp. 303–305.

[82] Soviet World Outlook, op. cit. p. 172.

[83] The Twilight of World Capitalism, op. cit., p. 17.

[84] Lenin, Selected Works, op. cit., Vol. VII, p. 174.

[85] The Communist Conspiracy, op. cit., Part I, Section C, pp. 41–42.

[86] Patterns of Communist Espionage, Report by the Committee on Un-American Activities, House of Representatives (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1958), pp. 5–6.

[87] The New Leader, April 4, 1960, p. 8.

colonial status because it is concentrated on agricultural or light industry rather than heavy industrial development. Communist propaganda contends that only Communist nations are genuinely interested in advancing the heavy industrial development of underdeveloped countries. In short, Communism seeks to identify itself with nationalism and to align the West as opposed to self-determination.

Yet, if underdeveloped nations accept long-term Communist aid for investment in heavy industry, the almost inevitable effect is that native labor, transportation, power, and raw materials will be devoted, to a large extent, to such enterprises which hold no immediate promise of an improvement of the general standard of living.

This, of course, was the decision of the Soviet leaders when they decided to transform the USSR into an industrial nation at the expense of the living standards of the people and is the policy which is being pursued today in Red China.[88]

International trade is also used by the Communist bloc as both an economic and a political weapon. For them, foreign trade is a form of economic-political warfare intended to promote international communism. Since Communist foreign-trade agencies are controlled by the State, Communist nations can buy, barter, or dump any commodity at the appropriate time to exploit any economic vulnerability of the Free World nations.

In payment for Czech military aid in 1955, Egypt sold its cotton to the Soviet bloc below the world price. Later, when the market price rose, the Czechs sold the Egyptian cotton to West European countries lower than the world price, at a profit despite their agreement not to sell to Egypt's regular customers.[89] Another case involved tin, of which the Soviet Union has been a traditional importer. Yet, during 1957 and 1958, the Soviet Union sold sizable quantities of tin on the world market at well below the market price. This maneuver substantially disrupted the export markets of such nations as Malaya, Indonesia, Thailand, and Bolivia, causing serious economic and social repercussions in these nations.[90]

Communist bloc nations, at the same time, are attempting to develop their own economies in an effort to prove that communism has the answer for those countries which are striving to transform themselves from an agricultural economy to a growing industrial economy in as short a period as possible.

Exploit Racial Strife

Communism resorts to a cynical exploitation of racial strife in its ceaseless efforts to advance Red totalitarianism. Racial violence, hatred, and bigotry throughout the world are grist for the Communist propaganda mill. Such incidents are used by Communists to show Communist "concern" for the victimized race, to turn that "concern" to political, economic, and propaganda advantage, and to inflame the victimized race against non-Communist governments.

In the United States, the Negroes, the largest minority group in the country, have been subjected to intensive and extensive communist agitation and propaganda. Communists have tried to make the Negroes more conscious of discrimination and to create in them an attitude of bitter resentment and hostility toward the rest of American society. They hope that this will encourage Negroes to look to the Communist Party for leadership.

An additional objective of Communist exploitation of racial strife in this country is to produce an anti-Americanism effect on the rest of the world, especially among the nations of Africa and Asia. Any hatred which can be generated against the United States is, of course, helpful to the cause of world communism.

Communist efforts to exploit the grievances of minority groups throughout the free world are particularly hypocritical in light of the repression of the national minorities in the Soviet Union and incontrovertible evidence of widespread anti-Semitism there and in the European satellite nations.

Create Domestic Disunity

A nation strongly unified in all the basic aspects of its national life is not susceptible to easy conquest either by a fifth column or by another nation of equal military strength. Communists recognize that the chances of seizing power militarily, by insurrection, or peaceful means are much greater if they have first divided and weakened the target nation as much as possible—socially, economically, and politically.

For this reason, communists make every effort to demolish national unity, to divide a country's citizens into bitter, warring factions so that they cannot unite in a common effort to defend their freedom from destruction. Lenin said that for communists to conquer a more powerful enemy they must take advantage of and exploit "even the smallest 'fissure' among the enemies."[91] In keeping with this objective, communists seek everywhere to divide nations into opposing factions: labor and management, Negro and white, young and old, native born and foreign born, "liberals" and conservatives, "people" and government, students and teachers, etc.

Much labor strife in this country in the past four decades can be attributed in part, at least, to communist success in disseminating the Marxist doctrine that there is a natural, fundamental, and irreconcilable antagonism between labor and management. This is not to imply that labor in general has been imbued with communist ideology or has been responsible for most labor-management difficulties. But it is an indisputable fact that a number of unions in the Congress of Industrial Organizations were, until their expulsion in 1949–1950, dominated and controlled by communists who used their positions to promote class hatred and labor antagonism toward management.

Discredit United States Foreign Activities

Communists throughout the world are continuously attempting to discredit the United States in the eyes of the world in order to lower our Nation's prestige and influence. To accomplish this, communists belittle or derogate United States activities abroad, claiming that this country is motivated by purely "selfish," "aggressive," imperialistic" interests and is desirous only of enslaving, economically and politically, the rest of the world. The world-wide communist propaganda machine strives assiduously to plant the seeds of anti-Americanism in the minds of people in every country.

Communist criticism of United States foreign affairs also has the secondary objective of reducing the free world's resistance to communist subversion and aggression. The Soviet Union has the assistance of the CPUSA and other Communist Parties around the world to heap vilifications upon our Foreign Service. Honest differences and disagreements between this country and other nations are magnified beyond all proportion and truth. The emotions of various peoples are aroused by communists to strain the traditional bonds of friendship the United States enjoys with so many other countries. The manifestation of anti-American sentiments gives communists an opening wedge in their efforts to shatter the unity of noncommunist nations in the defense against world communism.

On the occasion of President Eisenhower's visit to Latin America in February 1960, Radio Peking broadcast in Spanish that the President was trying to "deceive the peoples of Latin America" with promises of friendship. At the same time, the radio said, "The Latin-American people know well that the trips of the so-called peace messenger are synonymous with increasing war preparations" on the part of the United States.[92]

The storming of the American Embassy in Tokyo, Japan, was carried on by a communist-inspired and organized mob designed obviously to discredit our President on his trip, and their success was a slap in the face to world recognized leadership our President has given to furthering peace.

The communist campaign to discredit the United States throughout the world has also been accompanied by propaganda bent on emphasizing the "superiority" of life in the communist bloc. Moreover, the noncommunist world is reminded that only communists can offer true and lasting solutions to the world's pressing problems. The 21st Congress of the CP of the Soviet Union in 1959 spelled out that claim in a resolution to the effect that "the ideas of communism have become the leading force of our time."[93]

This propaganda has been implemented by practical efforts to crystallize such divergent elements as revolution, nationalistic patriotism, dissatisfaction, and idealism throughout the free world into at least a conscious anti-American or at best a strongly pro-communist pattern of activities. Trade exhibits, economic and technical assistance, exchange of visitors, and diplomatic maneuvers are all designed to portray communist nations as genuinely interested in "peaceful" coexistence and competition as opposed to the "warmongering" activities of the United States.

Neutralize World Organizations

Communists look upon noncommunist international organizations such as Red Cross, the Boy and the Girl Scouts, and numerous others as instruments of the capitalist world and therefore obstacles to the propagation of communism. These organizations, of course, are motivated by the loftiest of ideals and are dedicated to the betterment of all mankind. Communists reason that, since these organizations are not under communist control, they must be capitalist-dominated and hence anti-communist.

The Red Cross, despite its long record of good works and public service, has been maligned repeatedly by communists. In this country, communist propaganda has alleged that the Red Cross "discriminates against strikers, radicals, foreigners."[94] The Boy and Girl Scouts, who provide important moral and practical training in preparation for life in a democratic society, have been derided by communists as preparing "staunch defenders of and fighters for capitalism."[95]

---

[88] Ibid., April 18, 1960, pp. 3–4.

[89] The Evening Star (Washington, D.C.), October 9, 1959, p. A–18.

[90] The New York Times, October 9, 1959, p. C–14.

[91] Lenin, Selected Works, op. cit., Vol. X, p. 112.

[92] The New York Times, February 25, 1960, p. C–10. (Government Printing Office, 1959), p. 51.

[93] Great Plan of the Soviet Union, Resolution of the 21st Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (London: May, 1959), p. 61.

[94] The Working Woman, December, 1934 p. 9.

[95] Daily Worker, March 25, 1927, p. 4.

The Soviet Union has sabotaged the work of the United Nations since its very inception. Its chief weapons have been the veto, cast nearly 90 times, and the boycott, whereby Soviet delegates have walked out of Security Council proceedings. In addition, the USSR has refused to participate in such United Nations agencies as the International Monetary Fund, and others.[96]

The irony of the communist bloc's refusal to collaborate fully with the United Nations is that communist countries never lose an opportunity to use the United Nations as a sounding board for their propaganda. Thus, world communism has abused the prestige of the United Nations for its own purposes and contributed little, if anything, to increase the United Nations as an agency dedicated to promoting world peace.

Destroy Unity of Free World

The most powerful deterrent to world communism is the unity of the free world, headed by the United States. Mainly through the efforts and determination of this country, acting by itself or in concert with friendly nations, the advance of communism throughout the world has been slackened. To a great extent, opposition to communism has been possible because of economic, military, and political alliances between free world nations which are fully cognizant of the inherent falsity of communist claims and of the danger which world communism represents to the freedom and liberty of all mankind.

Communists continually strive to drive wedges between noncommunist nations by fomenting distrust or dissension among them. Khrushchev's deprecation of West Germany during his recent trip to France illustrates the communist intent to split the West. Khrushchev has tried to arouse the age-old enmity of the French against Germany by creating new distrust and fear of a strong, prosperous West Germany. Communists everywhere have exploited recent antisemitic incidents in West Germany, claiming that the alleged resurgence of Nazism is a threat to world peace. Meanwhile, the world's most prolonged antisemitism continues in the Soviet Union. Senator THOMAS J. DODD in a scholarly report asked the question: "Did the communists instigate the epidemic (of swastikas) or did they simply exploit it for 'cold war' purposes?" [97]

Communists endeavor to persuade uncommitted countries to become neutral or anti-American, if not pro-communist. On his recent Asian tour, Khrushchev boasted of Soviet industrial and economic might, while portraying the United States as a declining power. Moreover, he continually referred to the USSR's devotion to "peace" and its policy of peaceful coexistence, reciting the unilateral reduction of Soviet armed forces, his proposal in the UN for total disarmament, and the Soviet plan for banning nuclear testing. To keep neutral Indonesia and Afghanistan in line, Khrushchev granted $250,000,000 in credits to the former and reminded the latter of past Soviet credits, adding that more economic aid could be extended by further agreement.[98]

Nations of the free world have, of course, many different values. They are united, however, in their determination to preserve the one overriding value they all enjoy—freedom. This mutual, steadfast determination to preserve freedom is the free world's most potent weapon against additional communist expansion. It is for this reason that communists are devoting such a large portion of their time, energies, and funds to their efforts to disrupt the solidarity of the noncommunist world.

LAW AS A COMMUNIST WEAPON

Law as an Instrument of Peace

In their relentless quest for world domination, communists seek the fullest protection of the law as a weapon to aid their cause. In the countries over which they have established control, they use it as an instrument of force. In the countries they are seeking to subvert, they abuse it and use it to shield their subversive activities. It is, therefore, a double-edged weapon which communists wield with ruthless efficiency to undermine the foundation stones of democracy, liberty and freedom.

To comprehend fully the overall threat which communism presents, it is vitally important to understand the extent to which communists use law as a weapon in their relentless attack upon the free world.

Communists analyze the subject of law and judicial process from the same perspective they analyze all other aspects of human relations. To communists, the law is not rooted in the mind of man per se. On the contrary, it is rooted in the material conditions of life. All judicial and political concepts and practices are viewed as outgrowths of the economic structure of society. To communists, law of its very nature is inseparable from the state, and as the state is an organ of force, law amounts to nothing unless there is force behind it to compel obedience. Therefore, behind the present-day legal structure of communism, there is the iron fist of the dictatorship of the proletariat, i.e., the ruling CP.

In view of Lenin's statement that "dictatorship is power based upon force and unrestricted by any laws," the inference is clear: Communists regard force as primary and law as secondary. Law is merely the instrument of force. This interpretation of law is in direct contradiction to the legal concepts of Western civilization.[99]

The late Andrei Y. Vyshinsky, the purge expert and one-time prosecutor for the USSR, stated that "law is merely the will of the dominant class, elevated into a statute." There is ample evidence that the party directs the law both in legislation and in administration. Whatever party officials want enacted into law is enacted by the state-controlled legislatures; whatever the party wants the courts to do with criminals is done.[100]

The Soviet Constitution contains one very elastic clause which can be utilized to accomplish anything the Soviet rulers desire under guise of lawful authority. Chapter 1, Article 11, provides: "The economic life of the U.S.S.R. is determined and directed by the State national-economic plan, with the air of increasing the public wealth, of steadily raising the material and cultural standards of the working people, of consolidating the independence of the USSR and strengthening its defensive capacity." [101]

Thus the Soviet Constitution establishes legitimacy for anything they wish to accomplish under the broad provision "strengthening its defensive capacity."

Role of Soviet Courts

The courts, according to Soviet legal authorities, must follow the CP's directives, Vyshinsky said:

"A court of whatever sort is an organ of the authority of the class dominant in a given state, defending and guarding its interests." [102]

Another Soviet authority has stated:

"In our Soviet State the courts are considered a part of the leading political apparatus and care should be taken, by appropriate measures, that the courts actually are instruments of the policy of the Communist Party and the Soviet Government." [103]

Role of Soviet Public Prosecutor

An integral part of the courts in the U.S.S.R. is the public prosecutor. According to Lenin, this official has the responsibility of seeing that "not a single decision of a single local authority be divergent from the law." The public prosecutor, established by the Soviet Constitution, is organically bound to the courts.

The public prosecutor has the duty of carrying out tasks conferred on him by the CP or by the Soviet Government. This means that the party, while not exercising penal powers, nevertheless gives instructions to the public prosecutor to execute party wishes, even to purging Party members. It is the obligation of the prosecutor to advise the court of the policies of the party and the Government so that the Communist regime may be protected and enhanced.[104]

Role of Soviet Judges

In the U.S.S.R., all judges are "elected"; however, it is obvious that only those judges are permitted to run for office who are subservient to the regime, and who are approved by Communist Party leaders. In other words, the "election" of judges is actually an appointment of judges who will render the "right decisions" for the Communist cause.

The Soviet system also provides for the "people's assessor," who enjoys all the rights of a judge and participates in hearing and deciding cases before the court. The assessor, too, is "elected." One judge and two assessors serve the state in hearing and deciding cases.[105]

Soviet Judicial System

The jury system is called by Communists a "bourgeoisie-democratic" feature which perhaps had value after the end of feudalism, but not for a socialist society. Vyshinsky condemned the jury system as "the bulwark of that order of social relationships which rests on private capitalist property."

Soviet trials are marked by the objectionable feature that the accused appears in open court following a secret pretrial investigation, during which he is denied the aid of legal counsel. Except for reasons of state, cases are examined in open court after such secret pretrial. This allegedly "guarantees" the legality of trials and supposedly "insures" that the rights of citizens are "respected."

In the Soviet Union when the matters under examination concern military and other state secrets, as well as sex crimes, the trials can be held in closed courts. Since it is possible for the CP or the Government to label almost any criminal offense a crime against the state and one involving state secrets, in practice Soviet citizens can easily

---

[96] Primer on Communism (New York: Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 1956), pp. 42–43. Soviet Political Agreements and Results, Staff Study for the Subcommittee to Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act and Other Internal Security Laws of the Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, 86th Congress, 1st Session (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1959), p. 51.

[97] U.S. News and World Report, March 28, 1960.

[98] Facts on File, 1960, pp. 17, 7071.

[99] Lenin, Selected Works, op. cit., Vol. VII, p. 123.

[100] Vyshinsky, op. cit., p. 13.

[101] U.S.S.R. No. 12 (27), page 28 (1959), "Constitution—Fundamental Law of the Union of Soviet Socialistic Republics."

[102] Ibid., p. 500.

[103] Professor Polyansky, "Party Directives and Penal Justice," Vestnik Moskovskovo Universiteta (Moscow University Bulletin), Vol. XI, 1950, quoted in Bulletin of the International Commission of Jurists, No. 3, November, 1955, p. 34.

[104] Vyshinsky, op. cit., pp. 497, 498.

[105] Ibid., pp. 506, 510.

be denied the open trials so blandly prescribed by the Soviet Constitution.[106]

Toward a Soviet America

It is not difficult to speculate as to what type of legal system communists would install in this country should they ever achieve their goal of a communist America. William Z. Foster, chairman emeritus of the CPUSA, visualized such a possibility and described it in his book, "Toward Soviet America":

"The Soviet court system will be simple, speedy, and direct. The judges, chosen by the corresponding Soviets, will be responsible to them. The Supreme Court, instead of being dictatorial and virtually legislative, as in the United States, will be purely juridical and entirely under the control of the C.E.C. (Central Executive Committee). The civil and criminal codes will be simplified, the aim being to proceed directly and quickly to a correct decision. In the acute stages of revolutionary struggle special courts to fight the counter-revolution will probably be necessary. The pest of lawyers will be abolished. The courts will be class-courts, definitely warring against the class enemies of the toilers." [107]

Use of Courts for Propaganda Purposes

The complete contempt and disrespect of the communists for the American judicial system has been displayed time and time again since the beginning of the American communist movement. No better propaganda opportunities present themselves than trials involving leaders or members of the CP. Communists regard such trials as public forums from which they can proclaim the communist ideology.

"A Communist must utilize a political trial to help the revolutionary struggle. Our tactics in the public proceedings of the law court are not tactics of defense but of attack. Without clinging to legal formalities, the Communists must use the trial as a means of bringing his indictment against the dominant capitalist regime and of courageously voicing the views of the Party." [108] William L. Patterson, former national secretary of the International Labor Defense (ILD) and later executive secretary of the Civil Rights Congress—both activities in defense of communists—once observed:

"The class struggle begun on the streets or in the shop is carried into the courtroom."

"A lawyer has to concern himself only with the juridical aspects of the case. He is not asked to engage in the political defense of the accused, but his legal defense of the accused, because of the nature of the cases the ILD is engaged in, becomes at once political.

"The ILD believes that only mass pressure can bring about the release of a class war prisoner; that pressure must be supplemented by legal defense. The legal defense must be of the most expert character. Every legal technicality must be used." [109]

The agitation and propaganda benefits to be gained from the courtroom were first recognized in this country at the trials of communist leaders who were arrested in August 1922, during the national convention of the CP in Bridgman, Michigan. The party's top echelon considered the question of the policy to be followed during these trials and concluded that advantage should be taken of the opportunity to reach the American people with communist propaganda. Charles Ruthenberg, then the party's general secretary, and other communist officials thereupon took the witness stand to state the fundamentals of communism. The testimony they gave received extensive publicity, with the result that millions of Americans, for the first time, were subjected to communist propaganda.[110]

Communist defendants usually demand a trial by jury to enable defense witnesses and their lawyers to propound communist tenets to the judge, jury, and spectators. Sometimes the defendant pleads his own case. Trials of communists arrested during clashes between police and demonstrators are widely publicized in the communist press. During such trials, communists seek to use the courtroom as a means of protesting against "brutal" police methods.

The celebrated Smith Act trial in New York City in 1949 affords a perfect example of Communist tactics in American courts. The trial involved 11 members of the national board of the CPUSA who had been indicted for violating the Smith Act. The trial began in January 1949, and ended the following October with the conviction of all defendants. The trial was the longest Federal criminal case in United States history. Press coverage was the most complete since the 1935 trial of the Lindbergh kidnapper.[111]

Eugene Dennis, one of the defendants, acting as his own counsel, made the opening address to the jury. He stated that he and his codefendants would show that the CP "is the political party of the most forward-looking American workers—and that it does not bear the remotest resemblance to the fantastic 'conspiracy' painted by the prosecution." [112]

A number of contempt citations were handed down by Judge Harold R. Medina, the trial judge. During the course of the trial, Judge Medina found it necessary to jail four of the defendants for contempt of court. The defense counsel themselves were adjudged guilty of 40 different contempts. At the conclusion of the trial, certain defense attorneys and Dennis were sentenced for contempt of court.[113]

Thousands of telegrams and postcards were sent to Judge Medina by Communists and their sympathizers. Within one day, after jailing three of the defendants, John Gates, Henry Winston, and Gus Hall (now general secretary CPUSA) for contempt of court, the judge received more than 3,000 telegrams, all defamatory or insulting.[114]

The trial was the most picketed trial in American history. Almost daily, there were communist demonstrations and picket lines in Foley Square in front of the United States Courthouse where the trial was held. At times, pickets numbered several thousand. Scores of policemen, mounted and on foot, had to be assigned to control the crowds.[115]

At the 1952 Smith Act trial—also held in New York City—of another group of secondary communist leaders, the CP was disappointed at the failure of the trial to produce as much publicity as it had hoped for. As the trial progressed and the lack of publicity became apparent, the defense strategy changed. Party leaders decided that the trial should be terminated as speedily as possible.

Communists always strive to have the final word at their trials, the occasion of the sentencing of communist defendants is invariably used by them to proclaim their innocence and to dramatize their convictions as "political" or "class war" prisoners.

At the 1949 trial of the communist leaders, the defendants were determined to squeeze the last ounce of propaganda from the sentencings. Two of them, Gilbert Green and Henry Winston, addressed the Court before their sentences. Green declared that he was "guilty of no crime" but was being imprisoned because of his "political beliefs." Winston stated that he stood before the judge "branded as a criminal who committed no crime whatever." [116] When Robert Thompson, another defendant, rose to address the court with a long prepared statement before sentencing, the judge pointed out that the court had no desire to hear a political speech. The entire text of Thompson's speech was later printed in a communist publication.[117]

Communist Defense Tactics

The CPUSA, viewing the United States as the "enemy," has devised various methods for evading exposure and prosecution at the hands of this "enemy." The International Labor Defense, the forerunner of all communist legal arms, published a pamphlet some years ago entitled Under Arrest! How to Defend Yourself in Court! What To Do When Arrested and Questioned! This document is the basic outline followed by communists over the years. According to this pamphlet, the policeman "is a servant of the boss class" and "is your enemy." Defendants were instructed to give their name but nothing more, not even an address. "Have no faith in fake promises of the cops or the district attorney," was the warning issued. Defendants were urged to demand a jury trial so as to "have much more opportunity to raise class issues." [118]

This pamphlet provides the key to the defiant attitude exhibited by communists in court. The "capitalist courtroom" must be used "as a forum from which the workers on trial expose before their fellow toilers the true nature of the courts—as a tool in the bosses' economic and political oppression." Communists were urged by the pamphlet to quote the Declaration of Independence, Thomas Jefferson, Abraham Lincoln, and Woodrow Wilson in support of their right to revolution.[119]

Reminiscent of the procedure followed to the letter by the defense in the 1949 Smith Act trial, causing weeks of delay, the pamphlet instructed that the "defense" challenge the entire panel of prospective jurors on the ground that it is composed of people whose social and economic interest will prejudice them against the defendant." [120]

Role of Communist Lawyer

Although very few of the more than 200,000 lawyers in the U.S. are communists, these few communist lawyers have given much aid to the Communist Party. They have given assistance to the party's organizational apparatus and projects, to its numerous front groups and enterprises, and to the promotion of the communist cause in the judicial, legislative and executive agencies of our Government. More than 100 communist lawyers were identified in sworn public testimony before the House Committee on Un-American Activities in the

[106] Ibid., pp. 507, 516–517, 519.

[107] William Z. Foster, "Toward Soviet America" (New York: International Publishers, 1932), p. 273.

[108] Johannes Buchner, The Agent Provocateur in the Labour Movement (New York: Workers Library Publishers, N.D.), p. 52.

[109] The Communist Party of the United States of America, What It Is, How It Works, A Handbook for Americans, Subcommittee To Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act and Other Internal Security Laws of the Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, 84th Congress, 2d Session (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1955), p. 89.

[110] Benjamin Gitlow, I Confess (New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., Inc., 1940), pp. 136–146, 150–152.

[111] Life, October 24, 1949, p. 34.

[112] Political Affairs, September 1949, p. 25.

[113] The New York Times, October 18, 1949, p. 1.

[114] Life, October 24, 1949, p. 34.

[115] Ibid.

[116] Daily Worker, March 27, 1956, p. 8.

[117] Political Affairs, January 1954, p. 7.

[118] The Communist Party of the United States of America, What It Is, How It Works, op. cit., p. 88.

[119] Ibid., pp. 88–89.

[120] Ibid., p. 89.

decade from 1947 through 1957. Since a communist owes his primary loyalty to an international revolutionary conspiracy, the anomaly of a communist lawyer is apparent. A communist lawyer's first allegiance is to the CP itself and in direct conflict with his oath to uphold the Constitution.

A group of Los Angeles lawyers, who had quit the CP in disillusionment in the latter 1940's described their party experiences. Most of them had been recruited into the CP after other lawyer members had induced them to attend informal "legal" discussion groups where they were gradually exposed to Marxist philosophy. When they actually joined the party, the new recruits were placed in a special lawyers' group, whose membership was kept secret. There they received intensive indoctrination aimed at guiding their thinking along accepted CP channels. Communist lawyers are not allowed to disagree with party theory and policies. They either abide by party dictates or leave the party.

The behavior of defense counsel in the 1949 New York Smith Act trial was in complete accord with the party's standard courtroom strategy. Throughout the long trial, a group of defense lawyers indulged in a spectacular display of abusive and disruptive conduct. These lawyers were determined to interrupt the legal proceedings by any means and to introduce communist propaganda at every opening as long as the trial continued.

The CP's position regarding congressional committees investigating subversion has always been to challenge the very existence of such bodies. It has also instructed its members, who are subpoenaed to appear as witnesses before these committees, to refuse to furnish any information relative to communist activities. To insure complete resistance to congressional committees, communist lawyers are often assigned to communists who have been subpoenaed.

In appearances before the HCUA as counsel to uncooperative witnesses, many Communist lawyers have further violated the ethical standards of the bar by a display of contemptuous and abusive behavior. The HCUA on occasion has found it necessary to have such counsel escorted from its presence in order to permit a hearing to proceed.

In an effort to obtain a picture of some of the special services which can be performed for the CP by members operating from the vantage point of the legal profession, the HCUA reviewed the public record of a number of lawyers who have been identified as party members in sworn testimony. This record shows that such lawyers have:

Capitalized on their membership in the legal profession to recruit fellow lawyers into the CP;

Misapplied their legal training by assisting communists to circumvent the law in order to carry out Party objectives;

Served in secret communist cells aimed at espionage and influencing United States policy toward communist goals, while holding responsible legal positions in the United States Government;

Carried out important duties as functionaries of the CP itself;

Acted as legal advisors to, and accepted leadership roles in, communist front organizations built around civil rights and other popular themes and issues;

Exploited the prestige of their profession in the course of running for public office;

Devised legal bulwarks for the protection of the Communist Party, its members and organizations under its control.

Thus, although relatively few in number, communist lawyers have been of substantial assistance to the communist cause. While some activities involve the promotion of communist aims in fields far removed from the atmosphere of courts or administrative and congressional hearing rooms, a basic element in all of them has been a deliberate exploitation of the lawyer's special status as a member of the bar. This is well illustrated by the past activities of some members of the National Lawyer's Guild who have lobbied against executive and legislative programs designed to curb the effectiveness of the communist conspiracy in this country.[121] Under the mantle of the legal profession, the communist can operate as an ostensibly respectable and influential member of the community, despite his dedication and subservience to communist doctrine and directive.[122]

Communist Attacks on Constituted Authority

Communists constantly deride the system of law and order that prevails in this Nation. The founders of our form of Government, for example, have been characterized in the communist press as those who prepared the country for "the capitalist frame-up."[123] The Constitution of the United States has been described as "the handiwork of a family circle of land speculators and bankers who carried its adoption in the face of intense opposition by the threat of withdrawing credit from those who failed to support its ratification."[124]

The Supreme Court, congressional committees, and law enforcement agencies find that they are daily targets for communist vituperation. The Supreme Court, for instance, is depicted as "striking heavy blows at American freedom" when a decision it renders restricts communist activities.[125] However, when the Supreme Court reversed the Yates case on June 17, 1957[126] on the ground that teaching and advocating the abstract doctrine of forcible overthrow of the U.S. Government was not punishable under the Smith Act, a top communist functionary termed it the greatest victory the CPUSA ever won.[127] The Daily Worker editorialized on June 19, 1957, as follows: "The curtain is closing on one of our worst periods." And, the Sunday Worker on May 11, 1958, condemned legislation to remedy defects in laws protecting national security as disclosed by Supreme Court decisions.

Congressional committees are labeled by communists as "the stooges of the American imperialist interests for whatever 'job' is to be done anywhere in the world in the name of 'saving the world from communism'."[128]

Communist front groups play a major role in efforts to destroy the confidence and respect of the public in constituted authority. The degree to which this phase of Communist activity exists in our country today is revealed by the testimony of J. Edgar Hoover earlier this year that the FBI then had under investigation 160 known or suspected Communist-infiltrated organizations.[129]

A particularly deadly weapon used by Communist front organizations in incursions on constituted authority is the smear attack. One of the most recent attacks of this nature was a major campaign designed to cripple the antisubversive programs of Congress, abolish the HOUA, and discredit J. Edgar Hoover and the FBI.

The campaign was launched in the fall of 1957 by a Communist front known as the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee (ECLC). Mass meetings throughout the country, a barrage of letters and petitions to Members of Congress and public officials, and similar agitation and propaganda activities were sponsored and encouraged by the ECLC in an attempt to undermine the security programs and weaken the security agencies of the Federal Government. The goals of the ECLC were:

Destruction of the HCUA;

Extinction of the investigative powers of Congress and the states in the field of subversive activities;

Restriction of important functions of the FBI in its investigation of subversive activities;

Creation of a general climate of opinion against the exposure and punishment of subversion.[130]

The mass mob attack and disruption of the hearings of the HCUA in San Francisco earlier this year reflected the growing brazenness of Communists in this country. This mob action was in the pattern of the Communist mob action in Japan insulting the President of the United States and recent similar cast in Italy.

Beachhead of Subversion

What it would mean to this country if Communists were successful in eliminating the FBI operations in this area are revealed. J. Edgar Hoover testified before the House Subcommittee on Appropriations early this year that during the 1959 fiscal year alone, 97,438 security matters were received by the FBI for investigation.[131]

Mr. Hoover pointed out that the FBI's "operations over the years have clearly revealed that the Communist Party of the United States is a tightly knit, hard core of conspiratorial Reds committed without question to the international goal of ultimate world domination." Mr. Hoover added that "As long as this Soviet-dominated apparatus exists in the United States, there will remain among us an aggressive force of dedicated fanatics, constantly at work to destroy the American way of life. It is a beachhead of subversion within our Nation."[132]

Meeting of the Communist menace

Fountainhead of Freedom

The massive challenge which the world communist conspiracy hurls at the world today must be met. The massive offensive of subversion directed at this Nation must be exposed and destroyed. Otherwise, freedom will disappear not only in this country but also in the entire world, for the United States stands today as the principal if not the only power capable of preventing the Red tide from engulfing the universe.

The fainthearted in our society may question whether or not the job can be done—whether or not we can successfully meet the challenge and turn back the offensive directed at us by world communism.

The scholarly and well documented study prepared by the Foreign Policy Research Institute of the University of Pennsylvania recently issued by the Senate Internal Security

---

[121] Communist Legal Subversion, The Role of the Communist Lawyer, Report by the Committee on Un-American Activities, House of Representatives, House Report No. 41, 86th Congress, 1st Session, 1959, pp. 16, 17.

[122] Ibid, pp. 2–3, 4, 5, 7–8, 9, 17–18.

[123] John Reed, "Hooray for the Constitution!" The Voice of Labor, Vol. I, No. 3, Joint Council of the Shop Committees, September 15, 1919, p. 5.

[124] The Communist, December 20, 1919, p. 4.

[125] The Worker, July 5, 1959, p. 7.

[126] *Yates* v. *U.S.*, 354 U.S. 298.

[127] House Subcommittee on Appropriations on the Department of Justice, January 16, 1958, p. 173.

[128] The Worker, August 9, 1959, p. 10.

[129] '61 Appropriation, Testimony of John Edgar Hoover before the House Subcommittee on Appropriations, February 8, 1960, p. 43.

[130] "Operation Abolition," the campaign against the House Committee on Un-American Activities, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Government security program by the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee and its affiliates. Prepared and released by Committee on Un-American Activities (Washington: Government Printing Office), November 8, 1957, pp. 1–2.

[131] 1961 Appropriation, op. cit., p.40.

[132] Ibid.

Subcommittee makes the following interesting observation:

"The Soviets have assiduously exploited the world's fear of nuclear war to the extent that numbers of people have come to feel, like Bertrand Russell, that it would be preferable to let communism take over the world rather than to resist and risk a nuclear exchange that would mean the end of civilization. This, undoubtedly, is the conclusion that Khrushchev would like to see more generally accepted." [133]

Former President Herbert Hoover gave the answer to such a viewpoint in a speech in February 1960. The fundamental strength of the American people, he said, has sustained us through crisis after crisis in the 184 years this Republic has existed. We can, he said, defeat our enemies, including what he termed the spread of the Karl Marx virus in our society, by sustaining and expanding the fundamental strength of the American people. But to do this, he admonished, we must take a firm stand against the evils that beset us and reaffirm our devotion and dedication to freedom of men.[134]

Former President Hoover's emphasis on the need to reaffirm our dedication to freedom of men was an extension of the key thought expressed by President Eisenhower in his state of the Union message last January. President Eisenhower declared that "our own constitutional system, and the ideals which sustain it, have long been viewed as a fountainhead of freedom." [135]

Protect Our Constitutional System

To maintain this "fountainhead of freedom" which our constitutional system represents is the responsibility of every citizen, but it is the special responsibility of the ABA, whose members are sworn to uphold and defend it. We must reinforce the judicial process against Communists who abuse this freedom in seeking to destroy it.

The bar must be alert to its particular responsibilities to defend vigilantly our liberties and traditions. The terrible consequences of the success of the Communist movement should lead the bar to a new and deep appreciation for the existence of our form of government and the freedom of the individual under law.

Ours is a form of government that acknowledges each individual soul and respects human dignity destined by the very nature of man to be full of creativeness, diversity, change, and growth. It is with this realization that such basic individual rights as freedom of speech, of the press, of assembly, and of religion take on new meaning. The American judicial process holds these rights in trust for the use of the American people.

Correct Deficiencies in the Law

With the knowledge that the communists use every legal loophole to further their conspiratorial efforts in our society, we must dedicate ourselves to eliminating the loopholes that now exist. The Special Committee on Communist Tactics, Strategy and Objectives of the ABA in earlier reports has focused attention on such weaknesses and will continue in this effort until they have been eradicated.

While encouraging response has followed previous recommendations of this committee, there has been no final corrective action by the Congress and these issues have not been pressed to completion. Communists never let up in the constant struggle against us. The American Bar must not let up in its determination to block them at every turn. For this, deeds, not mere words, are required.

Therefore, we reiterate our pleas that the recommended legislative action approved by the House of Delegates in February 1959, be adopted in the following areas:

Smith Act of 1940

The word "organize" should be defined to include a continuing process so that the statute of limitations cannot be successfully invoked. The Supreme Court held that the CPUSA was organized in 1945—the year the CPUSA was reconstituted after a year's existence as the Communist Political Association—and hence any indictment after 1948 was invalid under the statute of limitations. Legislation should be promptly enacted to restore the current enforceability of state sedition laws.

This act should be amended to make it a crime to teach and advocate violent overthrow of the United States Government. The Supreme Court held that mere teaching and advocating the overthrow of the Government was not a violation of the Smith Act unless such teaching and advocating incite to action.[136]

The Government should not be forced to delay invoking judicial process until the damage has been done. Americans must be protected from that which goes beyond the discussion stage and tends to incite efforts to overthrow the Government by force.

Security of Government Employees

Legislation should be enacted to enable the executive branch of the Government to determine and dismiss, if necessary, those who are security risks in both sensitive and nonsensitive Government positions.[137]

Each branch of the Government should be empowered to dismiss any employee who refuses to answer, before a congressional committee or before duly authorized officers of either the executive or judicial branches of the Government, queries concerning Communist Party, Communist front, or other subversive affiliations.[138]

Aliens

The executive branch of the Government should be empowered to interrogate aliens awaiting deportation concerning their subversive activities and associations. They should include the power of the executive branch of the Government to deport aliens who are Communists at any time after they enter the United States.[139]

The following incident recently came to light which highlights the necessity for corrective action. Irving Potash was deported in 1955 after being convicted under the Smith Act in 1949 and sentenced to a 5-year prison term. After his deportation to Poland he reported to Moscow and was sent to Red China and finally returned to Poland. He secretly returned to the United States where he was arrested by the FBI on January 4, 1957. On January 18, 1957, Potash was sentenced to a 2-year prison term and fined $1,000 for illegal entry into the United States and was released on August 26, 1958. The Immigration and Naturalization Service immediately arrested him and tried to deport him again.

Potash is now in New York under supervisory parole, and while under the supervision of the U.S. Government he is serving as National Labor Secretary for the National Committee of the CPUSA. In March 1960 Potash broke his parole by helping to plan a secret meeting of the CPUSA and going to Chicago, Illinois. Again the Immigration Service intervened and despite the fact that Potash had worked with Soviet, Chinese and Polish Communists, despite the fact that he served International Communism, despite the fact he had been deported after his conviction of advocating the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force and violence, the United States Attorney in New York ruled Potash could not be held.[140] He cannot be deported because the Communists will not grant him a visa to return to Poland. Thus by not issuing a visa a Communist satellite can put a capable agent to work while he is under what amounts to Government supervision.

Passports

The executive branch of the Government should be empowered to deny passports to persons knowingly engaged in subversive activities designed or intended to further communism. Clear and unequivocal criteria and standards governing issuance of passports should be established by legislation.[141] It is submitted that membership in the CPUSA is an overt act against the American people and our Government should be able to protect itself against their doing harm to the United States abroad. As a people we cannot organize against communists unless the state is given some operational powers that will meet the needs of actual survival.

Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1948

This Act should be made effective by requiring agents of foreign principles, who are outside the United States but who are disseminating their political propaganda within the country, to label their propaganda for what it is.[142]

Communist Lawyers

The right of the individual States to refuse to admit lawyers and to disbar lawyers who are members of the CP or who refuse to testify concerning their communist activities should be made clear.[143]

Congressional Committees

The record of the HCUA and the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security is one of accomplishments and achievements despite the fact that they have been the targets of inspired propaganda attacks designed to curb their effectiveness. Continuation of these committees is essential to the enactment of sound security legislation.[144]

Need for Education and Leadership

Confining ourselves to a role of action as legal antagonists of communism is not enough. It is also the responsibility of each of us to lead a concerted campaign dedicated to educating everyone in the Nation to the threat which communism presents. At the same time, it is our duty to inculcate in everyone a new belief in and a new respect for the American way of life. Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON asserted last year that "just as Mr. Khrushchev expresses his belief that our grandchildren will live under communism, we should just as vigorously express our conviction that freedom and not communism is the wave of the future." [145]

J. Edgar Hoover has insisted that Americans can defeat communist ideology and—at the same time—reinforce the structure of our own democracy by the combined process of exposure and education:

"Every exposure of communism's false premises, inherent contradictions, deceitful

---

[133] Khrushchev Strategy and Its Meaning for America, Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, 1960, p. 20.

[134] Vital Speeches, Mar. 15, 1960, p. 325.

[135] Ibid., Feb. 1, 1960, p. 231.

[136] *Yates* v. *U.S.*, 354 U.S. 298. See resolution IV approved House of Delegates February 1959 of ABA Special Committee Communist Tactics Strategy and Objectives Report.

[137] Note 136 and Joint Report with Committee on Individual Rights and Affected by National Security, Approved by House of Delegates, February 1960.

[138] Note 136 Resolution IV C.

[139] Note 136 Resolution IV D.

[140] N.Y. Mirror, June 3, 1960, p. 24.

[141] Joint Report of Committee on Individual Rights as Affected by National Security, and Committee on Communist Tactics, Strategy and Objectives, approved by House of Delegates, February 1960.

[142] Ibid. Note 136, Resolution IV E.

[143] Ibid., 136.

[144] Ibid., 136.

[145] Vital Speeches, October 15, 1959, p. 18.

tactics, and empty promises helps to shatter its ideological appeal and to fortify against its psychological pressures. But, in this struggle for men's minds, exposure is not enough. Exposure must be complemented by a long-range educational program with a dual purpose. This program must encompass, not only a penetrating study of communism, but also a thorough grounding in the basic principles of our individual freedom under law. This educational program must be designed to train people to think and to distinguish between truth and error." [146]

Mr. Hoover has given seven basic instructions to those who lead in the fight against communism:

Alert yourself—learn the true nature and tactics of communism.

Make civic programs for social improvement your business.

Exercise your right to vote; elect representatives of integrity.

Respect human dignity—communism and individual rights cannot coexist.

Inform yourself; know your country—its history, traditions and heritage.

Combat public apathy toward communism—indifference can be fatal when national survival is at stake.

Attack bigotry and prejudice wherever they appear; justice for all is the bulwark of democracy.[147]

Former President Harry Truman in his recent book "Mr. Citizen" makes this sage observation:

Time is on our side if we know what we are doing and where we are going.

Time is always on the side of free people * * *. We believe in justice and freedom and a good life for everyone and no interference in the internal affairs of anyone. We do not seek to impose our way of life or system of government on any nation.[148]

With these guide lines, the ABA can do its part in combatting communism through a program of exposure and education by arousing lawyers and the general public to help carry on the task. It is shocking to note the number of Americans who condemn communism, yet have not the vaguest notion of the evil which the word encompasses. In this world-wide conflict, free people everywhere are involved. The law cannot compel devotion or patriotism. The call must go out to every corner of the land to awaken and alert every American to the danger. Together we must develop a positive, energetic course of action, based on a knowledge of communism's illusion and a revitalization of our inherently superior strength, and to bring about widespread understanding of the superiority of liberty under communism. Thousands of programs contrast to life under the tyranny of Red Fascism.

The tremendous success of the recently inaugurated Law Day, USA, is just a sample of what can be done. Law Day, USA, has helped immensely to bring home to Americans the contrast between individual freedom under law and political oppression under Communism. Thousands of programs have been held each May 1 in schools, courtrooms, churches, and meeting halls throughout America. Hundreds of organizations have cooperated with the ABA and the American Heritage Foundation. Proclamations have been issued by mayors, governors, and the President of the United States. The broadest impact has come from the local observances where lawyers, judges, teachers, and other citizens from all walks of life have been reminded of their reliance upon law in daily affairs and in their hopes for world peace. These activities are a striking contrast to the May Day celebrations in Communist countries.[149]

The ABA can urge local and state bar associations to develop lecture programs. Specially trained practicing lawyers could speak before high school students, business and fraternal organizations, and church groups on the theme of the advantages of democracy over communism, stressing the duty of each citizen to know the full facts about communism and to interest himself actively in public affairs. It requires a special and extra effort on the part of each of us to join in such a campaign. Members of the ABA should be the greatest foes of communism. Lawyers are certainly "firmly grounded in and inspired by the principles and traditions of our Nation." The legal profession serves as the ultimate guardian of the Bill of Rights and the protector of our freedom. Never before has the responsibility of the bar been so great to assume leadership in the fight against communism to preserve the American way of life. It is our call to duty.

It is the deep conviction of the members of this committee that the American Bar Association could render a useful and lasting service if it took leadership in furthering public education on the superiority of our American way of life under law over the tyranny of the Soviet Dictatorship and its worldwide alliance with Communist parties in various countries of the world.

To this end the committee urges that the American Bar Association call upon State and local bar associations to initiate programs in which qualified members of the bar address school assemblies and special convocations as well as civic organizations for the purpose of contrasting life under our Constitutional Republic with life under communist dictatorship, and to explain the nature, objectives, and tactics of communism and its dangers to our rights and freedoms and to the government of the United States.

To start this program the committee urges that the President of the American Bar Association appoint a committee of eminent and qualified members of the Association to implement this program and to report to the House of Delegates at the next midyear meeting and at each succeeding annual meeting concerning its progress.

Your Special Committee on Communist Tactics, Strategy, and Objectives suggests that if the Special Committee is authorized to be appointed by the President of the American Bar Association, it consider the following suggestions for recommended procedure: (1) The procurement of bar association members with a sufficient background of study of the nature, meaning, and purposes of international communism in relation to American Constitutional Government to enable them to speak interestingly, challengingly, and informatively; (2) Request each secondary school and college to arrange to have a designated member of the bar appear at an assembly or special convocation of its entire student body upon a convenient occasion and date, in this, and each succeeding school year, to address the convocation on the subject of Communism, What It Is and What It Means; and contrast it with liberty under law provided by our Constitution; and (3) Before each annual meeting of the American Bar Association to make a written report, which report shall include, but not necessarily limited to, a statement of the names of the speakers and a list of the schools and colleges at which they have spoken.

The committee cannot close this report without a word of tribute to Julius Applebaum, a member of this committee for many years, who was called to his reward last May. Loyal, capable, tireless, and dedicated, Julius Applebaum was first an American and then an advocate and defender of the profession. Since he contributed materially to the outline and format of this report, this committee therefore unanimously agreed that his name should be appended hereto.

Respectfully submitted.

Henry J. TePaske, Chairman; Peter Campbell Brown, Vice Chairman; Julius Applebaum (deceased); James S. Cremins; Ray Murphy; Louis B. Nichols; C. Brewster Rhoads; Kendrick Smith; Jackson A. Wright; Louis C. Wyman.

[146] J. Edgar Hoover, "Communist Illusion and Democratic Reality," December 1959.

[147] "Citizenship—A Call to Duty," op. cit.

[148] Harry S. Truman, Mr. Citizen, pp. 307–308.

[149] American Bar News, April 15, 1960, p. 1.

THE MILWAUKEE LEGAL AID SOCIETY'S DEDICATION TO JUSTICE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, it has been said that one of the most important rights of an American citizen is his right to equal, unbiased and timely justice. It is essential to our American way of life that everyone, whether rich or poor, is entitled to representation by counsel, to his day in court and to the equal protection of the law.

The legal profession has considered it its duty to uphold these rights. The profession has recognized that whenever these rights are denied to anyone, our democratic form of government is weakened. Furthermore, those who are deprived of their rights fall easy prey to ideologies which are hostile to our own. The organized bar has therefore endorsed the position that it is its patriotic as well as its professional duty to safeguard these rights for all persons regardless of financial means.

It is this spirit of public service which has caused members of the legal profession in many large cities to provide legal services for those of their citizens who cannot afford to pay for the professional help that they require. There are now 210 legal aid offices in the country, which is more than a 2½ times increase over the number 10 years ago. In addition, there are 128 volunteer committees of bar associations rendering legal aid service in small communities.

The city of Milwaukee has an impressive tradition in providing this service to its needy citizens. The Legal Aid Society of Milwaukee handled more than 5,000 new cases last year. The Milwaukee Legal Aid Society is supported by the Community Fund and is a member of the Community Welfare Council. These legal aid facilities are also made possible through the aid of numerous lawyers in the city of Milwaukee. The society utilizes also the services of law students at the Marquette University Law School. Lawyers' wives also play a prominent role in this activity, by providing the society with an excellent volunteer service.

Today, in commending the Milwaukee Legal Aid Society for its excellent public service, I should like to list the members of the board of directors of the society: Charles B. Quarles, president; Hon. F. Ryan Duffy, first vice president; Edmund B. Shea, second vice president; Maud Swett, secretary-treasurer; Hon. John A. Decker; Albert B. Houghton; John R. Jones; Mrs. George Lines; and Dr. Ralph P. Sproule.

I should also like to mention the staff of the Milwaukee Legal Aid Society: Mrs. Julia B. Dolan, executive attorney; Roger W. Finnegan, assistant attorney; Francis J. Demet, assistant attorney; and Elsie Bornfleth, office secretary.

REPORT OF PLANNED VISIT BY NIKITA KHRUSHCHEV TO UNITED NATIONS AT NEW YORK

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I have read on the ticker the announcement that the Soviet Premier, Nikita Khrushchev, plans to go to New York, to the United Nations, on September 10.

I am somewhat dismayed that Khrushchev should be again coming to this country, within 4 months of the time he canceled his invitation to President Eisenhower to visit the Soviet Union. One cannot help wonder why he should choose to come to this country in the middle of our presidential election campaign. Will he seek to defeat one of the candidates by damning him with faint praise? Will he seek to elect one or another of the candidates by heaping scorn and ridicule upon him? These are the questions which are implicit in the announcement on the ticker this afternoon.

Mr. President, I think we should resolve here and now that we will not let Mr. Khrushchev influence the outcome of our national elections, and that we will make certain neither party seeks to use him as a foil in the campaign.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I have listened with keen interest to the remarks of my colleague from Idaho. It is inconceivable to me, and I am sure it is inconceivable to any Senator, that the visit of Nikita Khrushchev to this country, and any pronouncements he may make while here, would in any wise influence the American electorate, regardless of their party affiliation, and their choice, under the democratic process which we have in this country, of President of the United States.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I wish to join the Senator from Idaho in the affirmation that it is absolutely inconceivable that the American people would ever allow any such longtime conspirator and revolutionist as Nikita Khrushchev, with a fantastic reputation for saying what he does not think and thinking what he does not say, to mislead them in a presidential election. If anything, it will be good experience for our people in demonstrating what I think is, without question, the fact. When it comes to the Khrushchevs they are very sophisticated. The same is true of American national elections. I think none of us need to have any fear on that score. However, I thoroughly agree with the Senator that it ought to be said, and the better that it be said from both sides of the aisle.

REMOVAL OF COPYRIGHT RESTRICTIONS ON "PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG"

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from the further consideration of House Joint Resolution 704, and that the resolution be passed. It would give to the U.S. Government copyrights on a song and the "Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated.

The resolution (H.J. Res. 704) was read, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the musical composition "Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag", covered by copyright EU399400, granted to Irving Caesar on June 3, 1955, assigned by Irving Caesar to Congressman Louis C. Rabaut by an instrument recorded in the Office of the Register of Copyrights in assignment record book 942 at page 57, and assigned by Congressman Louis C. Rabaut to the Congress of the United States by an instrument recorded in the Office of the Register of Copyrights in assignment record book 943 at page 451, is hereby declared to be in the public domain.

SEC. 2. The Joint Committee on Printing is authorized and directed to cause to be prepared three arrangements of the musical composition "Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag" suitable for use in nonprofessional performances. One arrangement shall be for vocal, one for band, and one for orchestral performance. The Joint Committee on Printing shall cause to be printed and distributed one hundred copies of each such arrangement to each Member of Congress and to the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico.

SEC. 3. The Joint Committee on Printing shall cause copies of the arrangements authorized by section 2 to be printed for sale to the public through the Superintendent of Documents, and shall cause additional copies to be printed from time to time for such purpose in such quantities as may be necessary to meet public demand.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 704) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DISSEMINATION OF POLITICAL OPINIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 374) amending Senate Resolution 305, authorizing the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to undertake a study of the uses of Government-licensed media for the dissemination of political opinions, news, and so forth.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the proposed Senate Resolution 374 would appropriate $150,000 for the Subcommittee on Freedom of Communications for monitoring and doing other work in the collection of information as required by the resolution creating the subcommittee, and to enable it to make the report required by Senate Resolution 305.

A long time ago in the first broadcasting act there was an equality of time provision in the broadcasting acts as applied to political broadcasts.

This Congress varied that time-honored law in September 1959, by Public Law 86–274, providing that the equal time provisions should not apply to bona fide newscast, bona fide news interview, bona fide news documentary—if the appearance of the candidate is incidental to the presentation of the subject or subjects covered by the news documentary—or on-the-spot coverage of bona fide news events—including but not limited to political conventions and activities incidental thereto.

The same law of September 14, 1959, provided that:

The Congress declares its intention to reexamine from time to time the amendment to section 315(a) of the Communications Act of 1934 made by the first section of this act, to ascertain whether such amendment has proved to be effective and practicable.

Therefore in 1959, when the Congress amended the Communications Act of 1934 to vary its equal time provision, Congress in the same act declared that it intended to keep on a constant reexamination to determine whether that relaxation of the equal time provision had been effective and practicable.

In carrying out the mandate of Public Law 86–274, the Senate this year adopted Senate Resolution 305 declaring, after reciting the laws and the changes—

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

(1) Federal policy on uses of Government licensed media for the dissemination of political opinions, news, and advertising, and the presentation of political candidates; and

(2) a review and examination of information and complaints concerning the dissemination of news by such media.

And directs that this subcommittee report back by January 31, 1961.

I think the reasons for the needed appropriation are set forth cogently and briefly by the distinguished chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, the Honorable WARREN G. MAGNUSON of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, recommending that this money be appropriated, which is printed in the report on this resolution at page 2. In the interest of time, unless there is a necessity for doing otherwise, I will not read Chairman MAGNUSON's letter in full to the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration when it was reported to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. I note that the Senate approved a resolution on June 14 of this year which provided $35,000 to carry on this specific investigation. As I recall, the amount originally requested was $45,000, but that my amendment reduced that amount to $35,000.

What is the purpose of this new resolution? Why is more money being requested? Is this money to be used for some new and different investigation?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I am glad that the distinguished Senator from Louisiana has asked that question. At the time the orginal resolution was passed and $35,000 was appropriated, it was argued on the floor of the Senate that since the Federal Communications budget carried an item labeled "Monitoring," which listed a figure in excess of $1 million, that the Federal Communications Commission would monitor these programs and this resolution would be a mere duplication if we appropriated money under the resolution to monitor political programs. I will confess to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana that I did not then know, and I did not argue to the contrary, that the Federal Communications Commission does not do one bit of monitoring when it comes to monitoring the content of the programs.

The $1 million appropriated was intended to be used to monitor stations' wavelength strength, to see that they do not reach out beyond the length that they are authorized to use. It is a technical monitoring. The appropriation did not contemplate the monitoring of the content of programs. The Federal Communications Commission advises us that they do not monitor one word of the programs.

So we were left without any money for monitoring. We have received some complaints already. We know that complaints will grow in number, and we have no money for monitoring. We have a staff of majority and minority counsel, with no money available, to find out whether the complaints are justified.

The Federal Communications Commission does not monitor one word of any program. The type of monitoring that the Federal Communications Commission does is engineering monitoring, to see that stations keep the proper equipment, the proper wavelength, and have the proper broadcast equipment from an engineering standpoint.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I recall, the Senator said when we considered the original resolution, S. Res. 305, that there would be two employees of the subcommittee; is that correct?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. There were two then.

Mr. ELLENDER. There was one for the minority——

Mr. YARBOROUGH. There were two counsels. They have not even hired a stenographer or a secretary to answer mail.

Mr. ELLENDER. How much of the $35,000 appropriated has been spent?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Only the salaries of those two gentlemen.

Mr. ELLENDER. What have they accomplished since they have been on the payroll?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. They have made extensive studies. They are collating material.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I recall, the Senator stated in June that only one complaint had been received at the time, and that one originated in Texas. Have there been additional complaints?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. There were complaints during the Democratic Convention in Los Angeles about two different stations at that time, as to their programs night after night—not just one program, but night after night. We had no money to investigate.

The majority and minority counsel asked for tapes. I believe there have been complaints since then. There was one complaint from Florida. This was before our subcommittee was created. A jurisdictional question arose. In Florida a group of men filed application for a bank charter. In the town there was one bank and one radio station, and the group that owned the bank and the radio station hired a newscaster, who made it his business every day to talk about everyone who owned stock in the other bank. There was a complaint about that. From what we have heard, most of these complaints will be one-station complaints, not network complaints, and will arise, probably, within a State or a district. We could give other illustrations. These complaints must be investigated. That is why we have a majority and a minority counsel on the subcommittee.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I recall, during the debate on the Senate resolution, the statement was made on the floor of the Senate that something like $300,000 was spent by the FCC to monitor programs.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. That statement was not made by the Senator from Texas. It was made by someone else. We did not dispute it, because we did not know that no monitoring was done of content. We thought that if the FCC did it we did not want to duplicate that monitoring, so we did not resist it. I believe the distinguished Senator from Illinois and the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] were the ones who made that statement.

Mr. ELLENDER. But that statement is in the RECORD. I think the distinguished Senator from Illinois also made a similar statement.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I did not state it, because I did not know that no monitoring was done as to content. We did not want to duplicate it.

Mr. ELLENDER. Am I to understand that the $150,000 being requested is to be used only for monitoring?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. No; not only for that.

Mr. ELLENDER. How many additional employees will it be necessary to hire to carry on this work?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. A budget has been worked out by the staff for this purpose. The staff has consulted experts in the commercial field. The budget is contained in the report. I ask unanimous consent that the budget, printed in the report, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the budget was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Supplementary budget of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to make a study of the uses of Government-licensed media for the dissemination of political opinions, news, and so forth, pursuant to S. Res. 305, as amended by S. Res. 374, for the period Sept. 1, 1960, through Jan. 31, 1961

Position	Number	Base salary (per annum)	Gross salary (per annum)	Monthly salary (gross)	Total for period of budget (gross)
Professional staff: Investigators for (4 months)	2	$4,080	$8,968.51	$747.37	$5,978.96
Total	2				5,978.96
ADMINISTRATIVE					
Contribution to civil service retirement fund (6½ percent of total salaries)					388.63
Contribution to employees health benefit programs (Public Law 86-382, effective July 1, 1960)					54.08
Monitoring expense (4 hours per day for 60 days, 240 hours at average $15 per hour, projected to mass 20 units)					72,000.00
Travel (inclusive of field investigations) 5 persons, 4 months					27,860.00
Rental of recording equipment, 50 States, 2¼ months at average of $50 per month per unit, average 2 units per State					12,500.00
Communications (telephone, telegraph, postage, etc.)					2,000.00
Contingent fund					29,218.33
Total administrative expense					144,021.04
Grand total					150,000.00

NOTE.—Funds requested, S. Res. 374, $150,000.

Mr. ELLENDER. A budget is shown in the report, but it does not show the number of employees that it is anticipated will be employed.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. No.

Mr. ELLENDER. The first item is "Contribution to civil service retirement fund—6½ percent of total salaries—$388.63." I presume that item is for the two employees provided under the original resolution.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I say quite frankly that counsel for the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee told me that he would recommend that we not hire any more employees. We think we can save the Government some money by having some of this work done by contract. The private monitoring services who have been contacted would charge about 2½ times what our budget is. Our staff estimates that we could get it done for 40 percent of what a private monitoring service would charge for it. We will try to get the job done as cheaply as possible. It will not be my objective to spend all this money, but to turn some of it back in January.

Mr. ELLENDER. I notice an item of $72,000 in the budget——

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. "Monitoring expenses—4 hours per day for 60 days, 240 hours at average $15 per hour, projected to mass 20 units." Who would get that money?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. The people that must be hired to do it with the machinery that they have. The bids we have received from private monitoring companies are all higher than that.

Mr. ELLENDER. Would they furnish the subcommittee with recordings of the programs?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Yes. If it is TV, then it is kinescope.

Mr. ELLENDER. It is necessary to play those recordings back.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. If it is a recording, I presume so.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is that the way the investigation is to be done, by letting the staff do it?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Yes. The majority and minority counsel will do it.

Mr. ELLENDER. In other words, those two lawyers will listen to or view these recordings and decide for themselves whether or not there has been a violation of the law with respect to the equal-time provision?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I am sorry I did not fully understand the Senator's question.

Mr. ELLENDER. Are we to understand that the two lawyers who will be hired by the subcommittee will play back these recordings to find out whether or not there has been a violation of the law?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. They will study it. That is the purpose of hiring the staff. If it is TV, it will be kinescope, with sound and picture.

Mr. ELLENDER. I notice an item in the budget for travel expense, $27,860. Who would do that traveling?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. The counsel, and also assistants, if they must be hired. They cannot travel everywhere if there are complaints in more than one city. In that case they have to hire assistants. We had that situation in Los Angeles, because complaints came in from there so rapidly. I listened to one of those programs, and I did not think it came within the scope of fair comment. I saw a program on one station that I thought was one of the bitterest political programs that I had ever seen in my life, and I thought I had seen something of that kind of thing in Texas.

Mr. ELLENDER. I notice that the travel item is for five persons, over a 4-month period. That indicates to me that the Senator will have additional workers, in addition to the two counsels that are provided by the original resolution.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Unless we can make some contracts and get this done cheaper than we can do it by hiring people, we will have to hire other people. The three committee members will have to do some work on this too.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator mean that the committee members will travel around the country?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Yes; if we have complaints.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will it be necessary to hold hearings?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Yes. Of course I want to do something else in the fall too. We will not set out to waste any money.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am not saying that the subcommittee would set out to waste money.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. But as chairman of the subcommittee, I will do my duty.

Mr. ELLENDER. Now, as to these two counsels who will listen to review the tape recordings, would they, too, be the sole judges of what programs would be reviewed?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. The committee will direct its staff, and the subcommittee will direct its counsel, just as subcommittees of the Senate normally do.

Mr. ELLENDER. I notice the amount of $29,218.33 in the budget for a contingency fund. What will that money be used for?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. There is an itemized breakdown that was presented to the full committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. It is not in the report.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. No; it is not in the report. However, there is an itemized breakdown that I would like to present to the Senator. I can find it here, I believe. It was presented to the subcommittee and then to the full committee.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a comment while he is looking for that statement?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ELLENDER. I want to get this information for the benefit of the Senate.

Mr. McGEE. I am a member of the subcommittee. I sat in on some of the deliberations of the subcommittee, and I believe I am familiar with the way these figures came into being, and attempted to be realistic about it. It is almost a case of pioneering in an area where complaints have been registered and very little has been done. Whether complaints are real or substantial, we want to know whether someone is a crackpot, for example, and it may require recommendation for some kind of preventive or restrictive or guiding legislation that should be passed. The complaints have come in on the local level, rather than on the network level, and from all quarters of the country.

To decide whether a complaint is a legitimate complaint, or from a crackpot, someone must go out and investigate it. There is uncertainty as to how heavily these complaints will be filed at the peak of a political campaign. We do not know. We try to guess as intelligently as one can do so on a completely new ground. There is no expectation that it will take $150,000, as a certainty; it may turn out to be necessary to spend only $50,000 or $40,000, or less. We do not know what the problem is for sure. We only know that complaints have been filed. We know that complaints have to be looked into, to find out whether they are from quacks or losers, or whether there is a substantive basis for them. Investigating them is the only way in which we can determine that. We may come out with a recommendation that we do nothing more.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will the Senator tell us about some of the complaints he has received? Who makes them?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I should like to answer that question.

Mr. McGEE. The committee has received several complaints.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. The chairman has received a great many such complaints. One which I received the other day was from a Republican State senator in Pennsylvania, who complained about his opponent, who is a radio announcer. He thinks it is unfair to let the announcer be on the radio every day as an announcer, campaigning in that way.

We have received an inquiry from a Representative in an adjoining State. Other complaints have been received. We expect more of them. We have endeavored to inform Democratic and Republican State chairmen of all the States of the Union of the existence of this subcommittee. Complaints were sought to be made in the past, but those who made them did not know to whom to complain or what to do.

Mr. ELLENDER. Why could not that work be handled through facilities of the FCC?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Because the FCC has no monitoring service.

Mr. ELLENDER. Could not the FCC investigate complaints, just as the committee would?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. It has not been done in the past. That is why this subcommittee has been created as a watchdog committee. It would not do much good to investigate after a candidate has been defeated in an election. Our duty is to make certain that he gets fair treatment before the election.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will the Senator explain how the contingent fund would operate?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. It operates like other contingent funds.

Mr. ELLENDER. It totals to $29,218, a rather substantial portion of the $150,000 for which the Senator is asking.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. We do not have a red cent in the fund to buy tapes or to buy equipment or to pay other expenses. We cannot expect people to give us their kinescopes on television. There will be certain expenses that will not come under other categories, such as paying telephone bills or for the rental of tape recording equipment. It does not include funds for kinescopes. It does not come under travel. We do not know how much we will spend. This is an attempt to be modest, after consultation by the staff with a number of private recording agencies and private monitoring agencies. That is the only way in which we can proceed, there being no Government service to utilize.

We have talked with the Federal Trade Commission. They do some monitoring, but not of this kind. Their

monitoring is of advertising. Their employees go out into the field to investigate. At night, they listen in hotel rooms. They invite people to send in complaints. They receive lots of information from the complaints which are filed. However, they do no monitoring of this type. Their monitoring is of the advertising of all kinds of commercial products.

We can assure the Senator that we are not trying simply to get rid of the money; we shall use it in such a way as to warrant the confidence of the committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not know what good the subcommittee will do, but I know that once subcommittees are created, there is no end to them. I have been complaining about that for a long time. Twelve years ago, we spent $140,000 a year for Senate special investigations; now the amount is more than $4 million annually.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. In my opinion, the greatest weakness in the Senate is its failure to hire enough employees. We do not have enough to investigate properly.

Mr. ELLENDER. In my judgment we have more than enough employees around here.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I am a member of the Subcommittee on Education. I think that education is one of the great fields of weakness in our Government. Admiral Rickover has said that the improvement of the educational system is more important than the missile race.

The Subcommittee on Education does not have one employee. It has no secretary or stenographer. I serve as chairman of the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs. We have a counsel who works part time there and part time on the subcommittee which handles migratory labor. We borrow him to assist us on the Subcommittee on Education.

However, that is not our present issue.

Mr. ELLENDER. When Senate Resolution 305 was considered by the Senate in June, I warned that this new subcommittee would wind up as a more or less permanent body. I fear it will follow the same course as the old juvenile delinquency subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee. As Senators remember, we created that subcommittee with the hope of getting sufficient evidence over a period of a year or two to cure the evils of juvenile delinquency. This was supposed to have been done through the expenditure of $75,000. But the truth of the matter is that since the establishment of this subcommittee in 1953 we have spent more than $950,000 on it, and although no positive results have come from its activities, it is still in operation. It seems that the more money the subcommittees get, the more they spend.

Mrs. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I understood the Senator from Texas to say that he had received a complaint from a candidate who said that a radio announcer is his opponent, and that the announcer is getting an undue advantage.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from Louisiana inquired whether the Federal Communications Commission did not have the authority to handle such a situation. Does it have that authority?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I think it has such authority.

Mr. LAUSCHE. But the Senator from Texas said that after the election it would be too late for the Federal Communications Commission to act; that after the election any remedy which might be proposed would be useless to the man who was injured. Is that correct?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. That is correct. The FCC does not have such a monitoring service.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Does not that bring us to the position where the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, in a political campaign, will have to become the agency which will determine whether there is fairness in the broadcasting of political news? The committee now is Democratic by a substantial majority. The committee would be saying that unfair practices have been followed and that programs have been prejudicial. What would be the situation 2 years from now, if the committee majority should be Republican?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. The situation would be the same as with every committee of Congress.

Ours is a two-party political system which generates, some time, one party in the majority, and the other party in the minority.

I have enjoyed the tributes paid to the majority leader and the minority leader, and to the majority whip and the minority whip. Right now I want to add my word of commendation to them. I have not heard a Senator on this side of the aisle claim that he received unfair treatment from the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] or the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], nor have I heard a Senator on the other side of the aisle claim that he received unfair treatment from the majority leader or the majority whip, merely because they belonged to opposite political parties.

When judges are appointed to the bench, some are Republicans and some are Democrats. They are appointed because of the faith that they will be fair in their judgments.

We do not expect that the President who will be elected in November, if he is a Democrat, will seek to punish all the Republicans in the country. Similarly, if a Republican should be elected President, we would not expect him to punish all the Democrats. If we could not have faith in the public officials, regardless of the party to which they belong, our democratic system of government would collapse, and we would find our Government usurped by a dictator.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator is comparing unlike with what he claims is like. He is asking that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce become an executive agency to supervise fairness in broadcasting. That function belongs to the Federal Communications Commission.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. The reason is that in 1959 we relaxed the rule of equal time. So long as there was an ironclad rule of equal time the Federal Communications Commission had a rule of thumb to follow. It was clearcut.

We have experimented with this problem. When Congress passed a law last September, it provided that we experiment, and we declared our intention to reexamine the whole problem. So we are seeking to reexamine, to determine whether we were right when we repealed the requirement for equal time and said that if a person appeared on a newscast or a news documentation, there was no requirement, and we relaxed it further this fall by the resolution permitting the granting of free time.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator is abandoning his position, then, that the committee will step out and correct abuses during the campaign. That is, the committee will either make a study, anticipating the passage of needed legislation, or it will exercise executive function. It is one or the other. I should like to know which function we will exercise.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I think our duties are set forth in Senate Resolution 305. We are to examine, investigate, study, and review the problem and report back to the Senate; and we are to employ technical, clerical, and other assistants, on a temporary basis, to study complaints.

The committee does not have any authority to fine someone or to admonish a station. That is solely within the province of the FCC.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What, if anything, has been done about the Pennsylvania case, to which the Senator referred?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Furthermore, we shall investigate to see whether stations live up to a high standard of fairness. One purpose is to ascertain whether they are abusing the privilege, since Congress repealed the provision in 1959.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I agree with what the Senator said a moment ago that we cannot wait until the barn has burned down. It is necessary to step in before an election takes place and to take action.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. But we cannot fine or cancel a license. We may call the attention of a station to the fact that what they are doing is manifestly unfair, according to certain standards. All we can do is recommend that the law be changed, if we find it is being abused.

The mere fact that there is a place where they can come and where opinions can be given is of importance. They might thus be required to follow rules of fair play, rather than indulge in any abuse. But we can only provide for fair standards.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I read from page 3 of the report:

> Monitoring expense (4 hours per day for 60 days, 240 hours at average $15 per hour, projected to mass 20 units)—

What does that mean?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. It means that if it were going on in 20 different cities at one time. And judging from the complaints, we think that is a very moderate number.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That would be while they would be working four hours a day?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Not over four hours a day. We thought it would be too expensive to have monitoring all the way through. But there are spot announcements, and so forth. If we doubled the number of hours, of course this amount of money would be wholly inadequate. This is a guess.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If the effort is to reach and to deal with the conditions in the elections, the agency to do that would be the Federal Communications Commission.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Yes, if punishment were to be meted out.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Under the law, is there power in the Federal Communications Commission?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. To do what?

Mr. LAUSCHE. To make certain that the license which is granted is not abused—in other words, that equal time is afforded, and that one side is not favored.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. The agency has the power, but no funds or facilities.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If we provide the agency with the funds, could it do the monitoring? In other words, instead of having the Congress do the work, why not give the money to the Federal Communications Commission, and have it do the work?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. When this law was passed in September of last year, the Congress stated that it would reexamine this amendment from time to time; and in September 1959, it was stated on the floor of the Senate, when the law was being passed—it was stated by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] and other Members—that it is necessary to have some kind of supervision or watchdog committee or something of the sort, to see whether the law was adequate or should be changed. The Congress itself was experimenting, and said it was doing so by means of providing for the setting up of three types.

The committee was appointed in September of last year; but we have had no funds with which to function, up to now. If we are ever to function, funds must be provided. Certainly the committee should either be discharged from this assignment or the committee should be given this modest amount of money.

In making our report, which we are required to make in January, we will recommend that the law be left on the statute books; but of course the newscasters should be given the necessary latitude, and so forth. But these funds are needed in order that the investigation be made, to determine whether the directions given to them have been carried out as intended and whether they have given equal time.

Of course we are not infallible; we can make mistakes, too.

This subcommittee is trying to do a job which, in my opinion, should be done. If the Senate wants some other group to do the work, at least the work should be done by some group, somewhere; I am absolutely convinced of that.

Mr. LAUSCHE. In other words, a study should be made. But the committee should not begin to exercise executive power in connection with this Commission; because if it did that, it would never come to an end.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. The committee has no intention of doing that.

AMENDMENT OF PART II OF THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUSK in the chair). Does the Senator from Texas yield to his colleague?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague may yield to me, in order that I may request the consideration of Calendar No. 1711, Senate bill 3228, a measure which has been cleared with all, and is not controversial; and we need to send it to the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Then, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider Senate bill 3228.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read by title, for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 3228) to amend the provisions of part II of the Interstate Commerce Act which authorize certain operations within a State as a common carrier by motor vehicle engaged in interstate or foreign commerce if State authorized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3228) to amend the provisions of part II of the Interstate Commerce Act which authorize certain operations within a State as a common carrier by motor vehicle engaged in interstate or foreign commerce if State authorized, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the second proviso to paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of section 206 of the Interstate Commerce Act is amended to read as follows: "*And provided further:* That on and after the effective date of this amendment, no certificate under this part shall be required for operations in interstate or foreign commerce by a common carrier by motor vehicle operating solely within a single State and not controlled by, controlling, or under a common control with any carrier engaged in operations outside such State, if such carrier has obtained from the commission of such State authorized to issue such certificates, a certificate of public convenience and necessity authorizing motor vehicle common carrier operations in intrastate commerce and such certificate recites that it was issued after notice to interested persons through publication in the Federal Register of the filing of the application and of the desire of the applicant also to engage in transportation in interstate and foreign commerce within the limits of the intrastate authority granted, that reasonable opportunity was afforded interested persons to be heard, that the State commission has duly considered the question of the proposed interstate and foreign operations and has found that public convenience and necessity require that the carrier authorized to engage in intrastate operations also be authorized to engage in operations in interstate and foreign commerce within limits which do not exceed the scope of the intrastate operations authorized to be conducted. Such operations in interstate and foreign commerce shall, however, be subject to all other applicable requirements of the Interstate Commerce Act and the regulations prescribed thereunder. Such rights to engage in operations in interstate or foreign commerce may not be transferred apart from the transfer of the corresponding intrastate certificate, and the transfer of the intrastate certificate without the interstate or foreign rights or the termination or restriction in scope of the intrastate certificate shall terminate, or similarly restrict, the right to engage in interstate or foreign commerce. Such rights shall be subject to suspension or termination by the Interstate Commerce Commission in accordance with the provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act governing the suspension and termination of certificates issued by the Interstate Commerce Commission. The Interstate Commerce Commission may impose reasonable requirements with respect to the filing with it of certified copies of such State certificates and other appropriate statements and data, and compliance with applicable requirements established by and under the authority of statutes applicable to interstate and foreign operations administered by the Interstate Commerce Commission, as conditions precedent to engaging in interstate and foreign operations under the authority of such State certificate. In accordance with such reasonable rules as may be prescribed by the Interstate Commerce Commission, any party in interest, who or which opposed in the State commission proceeding the authorization of operations in interstate or foreign commerce, may petition the Interstate Commerce Commission for reconsideration of the decision of the State commission authorizing operations in interstate or foreign commerce, and upon such reconsideration upon the record made before the State commission, the Interstate Commerce Commission may affirm, reverse, or modify the decision of the State commission, but only with respect to the authorization of operations in interstate and foreign commerce."

SEC. 2. Subsection (a) of section 206 of the Interstate Commerce Act is further amended by inserting at the end thereof a new paragraph as follows:

"(4) Any person who or which on the effective date of this paragraph was in operation solely within a single State as a common carrier by motor vehicle in intrastate commerce (excluding persons controlled by, controlling, or under a common control with, a carrier engaged in operations outside such State), and who or which was also lawfully engaged in such operations in interstate or foreign commerce under the certificate exemption provisions of the second proviso of section 206(a)(1) in effect prior to the effective date of this subsection, and has continued to so operate since that time (or if engaged in furnishing seasonal service only, was lawfully engaged in such operations on the effective date of this paragraph during the season ordinarily covered by its operations, and has so operated since that time), except in either instance as to interruptions of service over which such person had no control, the Interstate Commerce Commission shall issue to such person a certificate of registration authorizing the continuance of such transportation in interstate and foreign commerce if application and proof of operations are submitted as provided in this subsection. Such certificate of registration shall not exceed in scope the services authorized by the State certificate to be conducted in intrastate commerce, and shall be subject to the same terms, conditions, and limitations as are contained in

or attached to the State certificate except to the extent that such terms, conditions, or limitations are inconsistent with the requirements established by or under the Interstate Commerce Act. If the effectiveness of the State certificate is limited to a specified period of time, the certificate issued under this paragraph shall be similarly limited. Operations in interstate and foreign commerce under such certificates of registration shall be subject to all other applicable requirements of the Interstate Commerce Act and the regulations prescribed thereunder. Certificates of registration may not be transferred apart from the transfer of the corresponding intrastate certificate, and the transfer of an intrastate certificate without the corresponding certificate of registration, or the termination or restriction in scope of the intrastate certificate, shall automatically terminate or similarly restrict the certificate of registration. Such certificates of registration shall be subject to suspension or termination by the Interstate Commerce Commission in accordance with the provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act governing the suspension and termination of certificates of public convenience and necessity issued by that Commission."

All rights to engage in operations in interstate and foreign commerce under the provisions of the second proviso of this subsection existing prior to the effective date of this paragraph shall cease and terminate, but any carrier lawfully engaged in interstate and foreign operations on the effective date of this paragraph, pursuant to such provisions, may continue such operations for 120 days after the effective date of this subsection and, if an appropriate application for a certificate of registration is filed within such period, such operations may be continued pending the determination of such application. The Interstate Commerce Commission shall prescribe the form of such application, the information and documents to be furnished, the manner of filing, and the persons to whom or the manner of giving notice to interested persons of such filings. Issues arising in the determination of such applications shall be determined in the most expeditious manner and, so far as practicable and legally permissible, without formal hearings or other proceedings. A notice of intent to engage in interstate and foreign operations accompanied by certified copies of State certificates filed with the Commission as evidence of authority to operate in interstate or foreign commerce under the former provisions of the second proviso of section 206(a), shall be prima facie proof that the applicant is engaged in interstate and foreign operations and the scope thereof.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, let me say there is no objection to the bill, but I wished to note, for the record, the fact that the senior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] was very instrumental in having the committee accept two amendments which appear in the bill.

Mr. SMATHERS. That is correct; and if the Senator from Illinois had not mentioned the fact that the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] had been most active in that connection, I would have mentioned it. My very able and distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from California, the minority whip, Senator KUCHEL, has made to me recommendations which have been incorporated in this measure.

I may point out that the cooperation of Senator KUCHEL has been very helpful in bringing about a meeting of the minds on this legislation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida likewise has been diligent and he has waited all week to have this bill acted on. I told him we would call it up, but that if there were controversy about it, we would not consider it. But there is no controversy about it.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill? Ordinarily I would be strongly inclined to favor anything that the Senator from Florida favors, because I have very great respect for him, although of course he and I do not always agree.

Mr. SMATHERS. I shall be very glad to explain the bill.

The subject matter of the bill was presented by the Interstate Commerce Commission about 2 years ago. At that time the National Association of Railroad and Utility Commissioners objected to the bill as then proposed.

We sent the bill back, and had our counsel and their counsel get together; and over the course of the next year they were able to work out satisfactory language.

Thereafter there was objection from western truckers. Once again, we sent the bill back; and once again we were able to obtain agreement.

We now have agreement on the part of the Interstate Commerce Commission, the National Association of Railroads and Utility Commissioners, and the American Trucking Associations for the trucking industry. All of them favor this measure as a desirable step, insofar as it concerns the regulation of intrastate truckers who make it their business to engage in interstate and foreign commerce. By means of this measure we give to the public utility commission of each State the authority to regulate their own truckers who are, in fact, intrastate truckers, but who wish, by the nature of the business, to carry interstate business from time to time within the confines of a State.

When they make an application for an intrastate certificate before the State commissions after this measure is enacted, it will be necessary for such applicants to indicate whether they also wish to engage in interstate and foreign commerce within the State. State commissions under this bill will have jurisdiction over such requests of intrastate truckers to engage in interstate commerce.

I think there is no objection to the bill, except by one individual trucker in the Southwest, and I believe we can solve his problem. But other than that, substantially all of the industry is very much in favor of the proposal.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Will the Senator from Florida describe the amendments?

Mr. SMATHERS. Certainly. The amendments of the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] provide the commission additional authority, for which we had not provided. In addition to giving the bill an effective date of October 1, 1960, the amendments provide that certified copies of State certificates filed with ICC as evidence of authority to operate in interstate and foreign commerce under the former provisions of the second provision of section 206(a), shall be prima facie proof that the applicant is lawfully engaged in interstate and foreign commerce and the scope thereof. The Senator from Louisiana knows there are various types and classes of truckers; he is aware of that, I am sure, from his experience.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Well, I have not had any experience in that field.

Mr. SMATHERS. At any rate, we had to change the bill in the respects I have mentioned.

I shall be delighted to read a very clear statement about the bill, if the Senator from Louisiana wishes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I think the Senator's explanation has been adequate. I congratulate him for the long and diligent efforts and the hard work he has devoted to this field. I understand that the subject dealt with here is very complicated; and I am ready to have the vote taken on the bill.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thank the Senator from Louisiana.

I wish to point out that the minority whip, the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] has had very great interest in this matter, and has offered amendments which have made it possible for overall agreement to be arrived at in the industry. He deserves a great deal of credit.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, today I rise to speak in favor of S. 3228, a bill to amend the second proviso of section 206(a)(1) of the Interstate Commerce Act with respect to intrastate motor carriers operating in interstate commerce.

This legislation would permit State regulatory commissions to grant the right to motor common carriers operating within their State to engage in interstate or foreign operations.

This bill, if enacted, would change the present law and would affect operations in the future. A specific procedure would be authorized so that a State could make grants of authority to motor common carriers possessing intrastate rights. Our bill contains certain provisions which would have the effect of preserving the presently existing rights of motor carriers. It is not, and never has been, the intention of our committee to seek to curtail in any way any operating rights or authority issued to carriers by State certificates registered under the second proviso and I can assure all operators that none of their present existing rights and privileges will be lost.

This is a somewhat technical bill and certain opponents to the legislation have voiced objections because in their opinion, they feel the problem should be given more study and that they were not certain as to what this bill actually would accomplish. For those who read the report carefully and this floor debate, they will find that this is a piece of legislation which would be of benefit to the trucking industry and to our national transportation policy.

A great amount of work has gone into the present bill. It is a legislative proposal which has the support of most groups within the trucking industry and

it is satisfactory to the regulatory bodies of the various States throughout our Nation.

The National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners has approved the bill as it was reported by the committee and I understand that the commissioners are also in favor of certain technical amendments which will be offered on the floor today.

I wish to commend the representatives of the American Trucking Associations and most particularly, Mr. Robert J. McBride, director, legislative research, regular common carrier conference, who has worked on this problem for several years and is thoroughly familiar with all aspects of this legislation. Mr. McBride, with a lifetime of experience in the transportation industry, has rendered valuable service not only to his own conference, but to the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and also to individual Senators who are members of the committee. I personally want to pay my high respects to Mr. McBride. He has been a faithful and good advocate of his industry. He has always offered his suggestions and advice in a constructive manner and I believe he has kept in mind the best interests of our country and its national transportation policy in so doing. He will shortly enter retirement for a second time and I know that many Members in this body will miss his able counsel.

On this legislation I have been advised by my own regulatory body, the Kansas Corporation Commission, through its chairman the Honorable Harry G. Wiles, that the commission favors enactment of S. 3228.

I have also been in communication with Mr. J. R. (Bob) Halladay who is the managing director of the Kansas Motor Carriers Association at Topeka, Kans. He has advised that—

We are hopeful that the measure, as reported out by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, will pass during the current session of Congress.

Mr. Halladay speaks for the Kansas motor carriers. I can assure him that I have a high regard for his opinions on transportation legislation involving the trucking industry.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the body of the RECORD at this point a telegram received from Chairman Wiles; a letter received from Mr. Halladay; a letter addressed to me written by Robert J. McBride concerning S. 3228; and a letter which I have received from Jesse W. Dillon, chairman of the National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners, special committee to study motor carrier interstate registration authority.

There being no objection, the telegram and letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOPEKA, KANS., *June 30, 1960.*

Hon. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL,
U.S. Senator from Kansas,
U.S. Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Please be advised that Kansas Corporation Commission favors S. 3228 reported out of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on June 15. Urge your support of same.

HARRY G. WILES,
Chairman, Kansas Corporation Commission.

KANSAS MOTOR CARRIERS ASSOCIATION,
Topeka, Kans., July 1, 1960.

Hon. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: We would appreciate receiving an up-dating on the status of S. 3228 (the proposal to repeal the second proviso of section 206(a)(1) of the Interstate Commerce Act, concerning interstate operations by motor carriers operating solely within one State).

A number of Kansas carriers are interested in this proposal. We were hopeful that the measure, as reported out by your Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, would pass during the current session of Congress. We understand, however, that Senate floor action has been deferred and that there apparently now is some talk of additional amendments.

We would appreciate having your appraisal of the prospects for passage in this session, along with any information concerning any contemplated amendments. The effects of such amendments, of course, may well affect the support for the measure which was expressed by carriers, regulatory officials, and others at the time it was reported out by the committee.

Many thanks.

Sincerely,

J. R. HALLADAY,
Managing Director.

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA,
STATE CORPORATION COMMISSION,
June 24, 1960.

The Honorable ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR SCHOEPPEL: At the 1959 Convention of the National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners, a resolution was adopted setting up a special committee to cooperate with the Interstate Commerce Commission in a study concerning any difficulties arising under the registration of intrastate certificates with the Interstate Commerce Commission, as authorized in the second proviso of section 206(a)(1) of the Interstate Commerce Act. This section provides that a motor carrier engaged in operations solely between points within one State may, by registration of its intrastate certificate, transport interstate traffic within the limits of that intrastate certificate.

In conformity with the resolution, the President of the National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners appointed a committee of five State commissioners to cooperate with the Interstate Commerce Commission. I was named as chairman of the committee. Our committee has met several times with Commissioners Howard G. Freas and Rupert L. Murphy, members of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and, after a great deal of consideration, agreed on an amendment to the Interstate Commerce Act which we think will be fair to the interstate carrier as well as the intrastate carrier.

On June 7, 1960, I mailed Senator GEORGE A. SMATHERS the proposed amendment, a copy of which is attached hereto. Senator SMATHERS has introduced the proposed legislation and the number of the bill is S. 3228. The bill was reported out of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on June 15. This proposed amendment was approved by our committee and the executive officers of the NARUC.

Our association is quite interested in this legislation and we shall appreciate it if you will give it your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

JESSE W. DILLON,
Chairman, NARUC Special Committee To Study Motor Carrier Interstate Registration Authority.

AMERICAN TRUCKING ASSOCIATIONS, INC.,
Washington, D.C., June 24, 1960.

Subject: S. 3228 (S. Rept. 1648).

The Honorable ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR SCHOEPPEL: Certain abuses harmful to the for-hire motor carrier industry can be corrected, we feel, by enactment of a compromise bill, S. 3228, favorably reported to the Senate June 22, 1960. Enactment at this session is imperative.

For many years, the Interstate Commerce Commission and the American Trucking Associations sought the remedy to proliferating rights stemming from an obscure provision of the Interstate Commerce Act. This is the so-called second proviso of section 206(a)(1).

Today we have the legislative vehicle to accomplish this without injuring any present intrastate carrier or any present interstate motor carrier.

The measure was worked out in conferences between the National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners and the Interstate Commerce Commission.

American Trucking Associations, representing the motor carriers, endorses the measure. We urge your support of S. 3228 in the compromise version which, we believe, amply protects the interests of both intrastate and interstate motor carriers, and assures a nice balance of authority between the State regulatory bodies and the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Attached for your convenience is a fuller explanation of the provisions of the proposed bill, S. 3228 (S. Rept. 1648).

Respectfully yours,

R. J. MCBRIDE.

S. 3228 (S. REPT. 1648)

The compromise bill would amend the second proviso of section 206(a)(1) as to future registration of intrastate certificates with the Interstate Commerce Commission. Registration would be permitted where a single State common carrier obtains from its State regulatory body an intrastate certificate issued after public notice by publication in the Federal Register of the filing of the intrastate application plus the indication that the applicant wants to engage in interstate commerce; also, where the State commission, upon consideration, has found that public convenience and necessity require that the carrier be authorized to engage in both intrastate and interstate operations. Except for the method of certification, such interstate operations will be subject to all applicable requirements of the Interstate Commerce Act.

The ICC is empowered to impose reasonable requirements as conditions precedent to engaging in interstate operations under authority of the registered State certificate.

The ICC will establish rules under which any person who opposed the authorization of operations in interstate commerce in the State regulatory proceeding, may petition the ICC for reconsideration of the decision made by the State commission. Such reconsideration shall be on the record made before the State commission. The ICC may affirm, reverse, or modify the decision of the State regulatory body in respect to interstate operations.

Existing motor carriers upon application shall be issued certificates of registration by

the ICC authorizing continuance of their operations. In making such application a "Notice of Intent To Engage in Interstate and Foreign Operations" accompanied by copies of State certificates will be prima facie proof that applicant is engaged in interstate commerce and the scope thereof.

Such certificates of registration shall be subject to the same terms as contained in the State certificate and subject to all applicable requirements of the Interstate Commerce Act, including suspension and termination.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I understand that the Interstate Commerce Commission approves of this legislation because it will be a much-needed improvement over the present statutory provisions.

Enactment of S. 3228 will prevent the continued creation and multiplication of interstate rights without an adequate consideration and determination of the question as to whether or not there is any public need for such rights. It has adequate safeguards to protect the presently operating trucker and I believe this legislation is in the best interest of developing a sound transportation policy.

I am glad to lend my support to this legislation and urge its passage.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] has had an extremely great interest in this matter and has done a great deal of work in helping arrive at the overall agreement.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement on Senate bill 3228.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SMATHERS

This is a bill to amend the so-called second proviso of section 206(a)(1) of the Interstate Commerce Act under which intrastate motor carriers are allowed to register their State certificates with the Interstate Commerce Commission and thus be authorized to engage in interstate and foreign commerce within the confines of the single State in which the motor carrier is authorized to operate.

This registration procedure was provided by the Motor Carrier Act of 1935, now part II of the Interstate Commerce Act, under which interstate motor carriers were brought under Federal regulation.

In 1935 when the act was passed it was considered that the importance of the intrastate motor carrier participation in interstate and foreign commerce would be of minor importance. Consequently, intrastate carriers were given the privilege of registering their State certificates with the ICC and thereby automatically obtain the right to engage in interstate and foreign commerce. The ICC has no choice but to accept these certificates for registration and to allow the carrier to engage in interstate and foreign commerce.

Since the end of World War II motor carrier transportation has greatly expanded and become more complex. Numerous unanticipated abuses have arisen which in the public interest require correction. A number of these abuses relate to improper transfers of certificates to ineligible carriers engaged in multiple State motor carriers operations that should, but do not have, ICC approval; and the splitting of State operating authority with the intrastate rights being retained by the original holder and the interstate portion of the rights being sold to an ineligible carrier.

When considering the issuance of operating rights on intrastate traffic, the State commission is required to limit its consideration to the intrastate aspects of the operation, and evidence pertaining to interstate operations are inadmissible in the record. It should be pointed out that there is use of intrastate certificates to join interstate carrier operations which often result in the formation of important interstate motor carrier routes without ICC approval.

In view of all this there has been general agreement that the abuses that have come into existence require correction.

At the conclusion of the hearings on S. 2417, to amend the "Second Proviso," there was agreement on some points among the interested parties but failure of agreement on others. The parties were directed to get together and if possible produce an acceptable draft of a bill. S. 3228 was later introduced to clarify the extent of agreement reached.

The bill approved by the committee is acceptable to the National Association of Railroad and Utility Commissioners on behalf of the State commissions and to the Interstate Commerce Commission. The bill was worked out by and was sponsored by both groups. The bill has been endorsed by the American Trucking Associations for the trucking industry.

The approved bill would amend the second proviso as to future registration of intrastate certificates with the Interstate Commerce Commission. Registration would be permitted where a single State common carrier obtains from its State regulatory body an intrastate certificate issued after public notice by publication in the Federal Register of the filing of the intrastate application plus the indication that the applicant wants to engage in interstate commerce; also, where the State commission, upon consideration, has found that public convenience and necessity require that the carrier be authorized to engage in both intrastate and interstate operations. Except for the method of certification, such interstate operations would be subject to all applicable requirements of the Interstate Commerce Act.

The ICC would be empowered to impose reasonable requirements as conditions precedent to engaging in interstate operations under authority of the registered State certificate.

The ICC would establish rules under which any person who opposed the authorization of operations in interstate commerce in the State regulatory proceeding, may petition the ICC for reconsideration of the decision made by the State commission. Such reconsideration would be on the record made before the State commission. The ICC would be authorized to affirm, reverse, or modify the decision of the State regulatory body in respect to interstate operations.

Existing motor carriers upon application would be issued certificates of registration by the ICC authorizing continuance of their operations. In making such application a "Notice of Intent to Engage in Interstate and Foreign Operations" accompanied by copies of State certificates will be prima facie proof that applicant is engaged in interstate commerce and the scope thereof.

Such certificates of registration would be subject to the same terms as contained in the State certificate and subject to all applicable requirements of the Interstate Commerce Act, including suspension and termination.

It should be emphasized that all the present rights of intrastate motor carriers engaged in interstate and foreign commerce would be preserved by this bill.

BRIEF EXPLANATIONS OF AMENDMENTS TO S. 3228

Since S. 3228 was approved by the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, certain perfecting amendments have been found necessary to meet objections subsequently raised to the bill as reported.

The amendments accomplish the following:

The clarifying amendments on pages 5 and 8 requested by the National Association of Railroad and Utility Commissioners will set forth more fully the method and procedure to be followed by the Interstate Commerce Commission in the issuance as well as the sale and transfer of certificates of registration from one person or carrier to another person or carrier. These amendments will insure continuance of the existing law with respect to issuance, sale, and transfer of operating authority.

The change on page 9, line 18, is the addition of the word "lawfully" for the purpose of establishing the fact that the holder of the certificate of registration has been found to be lawfully engaged in interstate commerce.

A new section 3 is added to provide a specified effective date of amendment; namely, October 1, 1960.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the committee amendment be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 3228) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the provisions contained in part II of the Interstate Commerce Act concerning registration of State certificates whereby a common carrier by motor vehicle may engage in interstate and foreign commerce within a State."

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas subsequently said: Mr. President, a while ago action was taken on the bill of the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] in the absence of the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL]. I refer to Senate bill 3228. At that time we thought the amendments which had been unanimously agreed to by the leadership and by the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] and his committee and by the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] had been stated. However, they were not. Therefore, by inadvertence, an amendment which was to have been offered from the floor and had been agreed upon by both sides was omitted from the bill.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be so amended, in order to carry out the intention of all concerned; namely, that the Kuchel amendment be adopted, and that the bill as thus amended be deemed, again, to have been passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill as amended is as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the

second proviso to paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of section 206 of the Interstate Commerce Act is amended to read as follows: "*And provided further:* That on and after the effective date of this amendment, no certificate under this part shall be required for operations in interstate or foreign commerce by a common carrier by motor vehicle operating solely within a single State and not controlled by, controlling, or under a common control with any carrier engaged in operations outside such State, if such carrier has obtained from the commission of such State authorized to issue such certificates, a certificate of public convenience and necessity authorizing motor vehicle common carrier operations in intrastate commerce and such certificate recites that it was issued after notice to interested persons through publication in the Federal Register of the filing of the application and of the desire of the applicant also to engage in transportation in interstate and foreign commerce within the limits of the intrastate authority granted, that reasonable opportunity was afforded interested persons to be heard, that the State commission has duly considered the question of the proposed interstate and foreign operations and has found that public convenience and necessity require that the carrier authorized to engage in intrastate operations also be authorized to engage in operations in interstate and foreign commerce within limits which do not exceed the scope of the intrastate operations authorized to be conducted. Such operations in interstate and foreign commerce shall, however, be subject to all other applicable requirements of the Interstate Commerce Act and the regulations prescribed thereunder. Such rights to engage in operations in interstate or foreign commerce shall be evidenced by appropriate certificates of registration issued by the Interstate Commerce Commission which shall be valid only so long as the holder is a carrier engaged in operation solely within a single State, not controlled by, controlling, or under a common control with a carrier engaged in operation outside such State, and except as provided in section 5 and in the conditions and limitation stated herein, may be transferred pursuant to such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Interstate Commerce Commission, but may not be transferred apart from the transfer of the corresponding intrastate certificate, and the transfer of the intrastate certificate without the interstate or foreign rights or the termination or restriction in scope of the intrastate certificate shall terminate, or similarly restrict, the right to engage in interstate or foreign commerce. Such rights shall be subject to suspension or termination by the Interstate Commerce Commission in accordance with the provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act governing the suspension and termination of certificates issued by the Interstate Commerce Commission. The Interstate Commerce Commission may impose reasonable requirements with respect to the filing with it of certified copies of such State certificates and other appropriate statements and data, and compliance with applicable requirements established by and under the authority of statutes applicable to interstate and foreign operations administered by the Interstate Commerce Commission, as conditions precedent to engaging in interstate and foreign operations under the authority of such State certificate. In accordance with such reasonable rules as may be prescribed by the Interstate Commerce Commission, any party in interest, who or which opposed in the State commission proceeding the authorization of operations in interstate or foreign commerce, may petition the Interstate Commerce Commission for reconsideration of the decision of the State commission authorizing operations in interstate or foreign commerce, and upon such reconsideration upon the record made before the State commission, the Interstate Commerce Commission may affirm, reverse, or modify the decision of the State commission, but only with respect to the authorization of operations in interstate and foreign commerce."

SEC. 2. Subsection (a) of section 206 of the Interstate Commerce Act is further amended by inserting at the end thereof a new paragraph as follows:

"(6) Any person who or which on the effective date of this paragraph was in operation solely within a single State as a common carrier by motor vehicle in intrastate commerce (excluding persons controlled by, controlling, or under a common control with, a carrier engaged in operations outside such State), and who or which was also lawfully engaged in such operations in interstate or foreign commerce under the certificate exemption provisions of the second proviso of section 206(a)(1) in effect prior to the effective date of this subsection, and has continued to so operate since that time (or if engaged in furnishing seasonal service only, was lawfully engaged in such operations on the effective date of this paragraph during the season ordinarily covered by its operations, and has so operated since that time), except in either instance as to interruptions of service over which such person had no control, the Interstate Commerce Commission shall issue to such person a certificate of registration authorizing the continuance of such transportation in interstate and foreign commerce if application and proof of operations are submitted as provided in this subsection. Such certificate of registration shall not exceed in scope the services authorized by the State certificate to be conducted in intrastate commerce, and shall be subject to the same terms, conditions, and limitations as are contained in or attached to the State certificate except to the extent that such terms, conditions, or limitations are inconsistent with the requirements established by or under the Interstate Commerce Act. If the effectiveness of the State certificate is limited to a specified period of time, the certificate issued under this paragraph shall be similarly limited. Operations in interstate and foreign commerce under such certificates of registration shall be subject to all other applicable requirements of the Interstate Commerce Act and the regulations prescribed thereunder. Certificates of registration shall be valid only so long as the holder is a carrier engaged in operation solely within a single state, not controlled by, controlling, or under a common control with a carrier engaged in operation outside such State, and except as provided in section 5 and in the conditions and limitations stated herein, may be transferred pursuant to such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Interstate Commerce Commission, but may not be transferred apart from the transfer of the corresponding intrastate certificate, and the transfer of an intrastate certificate without the corresponding certificate of registration, or the termination or restriction in scope of the intrastate certificate, shall automatically terminate or similarly restrict the certificate of registration. Such certificates of registration shall be subject to suspension or termination by the Interstate Commerce Commission in accordance with the provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act governing the suspension and termination of certificates of public convenience and necessity issued by that Commission."

All rights to engaged in operations in interstate and foreign commerce under the provisions of the second proviso of this subsection 206(a)(1) existing prior to the effective date of this paragraph shall cease and terminate, but any carrier lawfully engaged in interstate and foreign operations on the effective date of this paragraph, pursuant to such provisions, may continue such operations for 120 days after the effective date of this subsection and, if an appropriate application for a certificate of registration is filed within such period, such operations may be continued pending the determination of such application. The Interstate Commerce Commission shall prescribe the form of such application, the information and documents to be furnished, the manner of filing, and the persons to whom or the manner of giving notice to interested persons of such filings. Issues arising in the determination of such applications shall be determined in the most expeditious manner and, so far as practicable and legally permissible, without formal hearings or other proceedings. A notice of intent to engage in interstate and foreign operations accompanied by certified copies of State certificates filed with the Commission as evidence of authority to operate in interstate or foreign commerce under the former provisions of the second proviso of section 206(a), shall be prima facie proof that the applicant is lawfully engaged in interstate and foreign operations and the scope thereof.

SEC. 3. The effective date of this amendment shall be October 1, 1960.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the action we have just now taken be reconsidered.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, was my motion to lay on the table the majority leader's motion to reconsider put to the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It was; and the motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated.

The resolution (S. Res. 389) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Presiding Officer to join a similar committee of the House of Representatives to notify the President of the United States that the two Houses have completed the business of the session and are ready to adjourn unless he has some further communication to make to them.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I will withhold the resolution, if the Senator does that. It is not a sine die resolution. It is a resolution to notify the President.

Mr. KEATING. If it is a resolution to notify the President, that is fine, and I withdraw the suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 389) appointing a committee to join a House committee to notify the President of the United States of the proposed adjournment of the session was considered and agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair appoints as members of the committee on the part of the Senate the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

REQUEST OF DOMESTIC CARPET INDUSTRY FOR RELIEF FROM IMPACT OF IMPORTS

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the callousness of the U.S. Department of State and its foreign-minded personnel has, in my opinion, reached new heights. In this instance I am referring to the State Department's attitude toward the request of the domestic carpet industry for relief from the impact of imports of Wilton and velvet carpets by implementation of the provisions of article XXVIII of the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs.

Article XXVIII of the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs provides that—

> On the first day of each 3-year period, the first period beginning on January 1958, a contracting party may modify or withdraw concessions included in the appropriate schedule annexed to this agreement.

The American Carpet Institute has applied to the U.S. Government to modify or withdraw its concessions with regard to Wilton and velvet imports, and in the future to apply the present rate of duty to imports during any calendar year up to an amount equal to 5 percent of domestic consumption for the 12-month period ending June 30 of the preceding year; and on imports in excess of 5 percent of domestic consumption, all concessions should be withdrawn or a flat duty of 40 percent ad valorem should be imposed. The low duty quota should be allocated among exporting countries on the basis of their history of exports to this country.

Mr. President, the Wilton and velvet carpet industry is a perfect example of a domestic industry which has suffered the impact of imports for years without relief and at all times has had its problems completely ignored by the U.S. Government—particularly the executive branch.

From 1948 to 1950 the duty on Wilton and velvet imports was 30 percent ad valorem, and during this period imports were generally on the rise but averaged only about 5 percent of domestic consumption. From the beginning of 1951 through the middle of 1956, the duty on such imports was 25 percent, and during this period imports increased to approximately 12 percent of domestic consumption. In 1956, again in 1957, and again in 1958, the duty on such imports was reduced, and it stands today at 21 percent ad valorem. With each decrease in duty, imports have increased substantially. They rose 52 percent in 1959, and in the first quarter of 1960, they increased 60 percent. Imports of Wilton and velvet carpets are now approximately 23 percent of domestic consumption.

Mr. President, the mushrooming of imports of Wilton and velvet carpets does not reflect a recapture by foreign producers of the domestic American market which was lost during the war. On the contrary, there were very few imports of such carpets prior to the war, and very little foreign capacity for the production of them. In 1939 the United States imported 200,000 square yards. In 1959—20 years later—these imports stood at 7,012,000 square yards. Based on the first quarter rate, 1960 imports will reach 10 million square yards.

Mr. President, the American Carpet Institute has attempted to utilize the provisions of the Reciprocal Trade Act to protect itself from the impact of this tremendous surge of imports. In 1958 proceedings were instituted before the Tariff Commission under the "escape clause." In its decision, handed down in January 1959, the Tariff Commission, in a 3–2 decision, denied relief, and a majority of the Commission indicated that there was no imminent danger to the domestic industry from imports. Now, slightly over a year later, these imports have almost doubled, rising from 12 percent of domestic consumption to 23 percent.

On July 2, I introduced, along with a number of other Senators, Senate Concurrent Resolution 113, which would express the sense of Congress that the relief under article XXVIII of the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs, which has been requested by the American Carpet Institute, should be granted. This morning I received a copy of a letter from Assistant Secretary of State, William B. Macomber, to the Honorable HARRY F. BYRD, chairman of the Committee on Finance, expressing the views of the Department of State on this resolution. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of this letter be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUGUST 25, 1960.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Your letter of August 11, 1960, requests the views of the Department of State on Senate Concurrent Resolution 113 which, if approved, would express the sense of the Congress that the President should take action under article XXVIII of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade to increase the duty on Wilton-type carpets by modifying the trade agreement concession applying to these products.

The American Carpet Institute has submitted to the Committee for Reciprocity Information of the Trade Agreements Organizations a formal brief proposing that the President take such action. The Institute has also made an oral presentation of its position during the public hearings now being conducted by that Committee in preparation for the forthcoming tariff negotiations.

We have discussed the Institute's proposal with industry representatives. In these discussions we have explained that our carpet producers have direct recourse to the safeguarding procedure specified by the Congress in section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended, noting that if, after a thorough investigation, including public hearings, the Tariff Commission finds increased imports are causing or threatening serious injury to domestic producers, it submits a report to the President who is authorized to increase tariffs or impose quotas on imports to remedy the situation.

After completing such an investigation with respect to Wilton-type carpets in January, 1959, the Tariff Commission reported a finding of no serious injury. It therefore made no recommendation to the President to take action to withdraw or modify the tariff concession applying to these products. We have also explained to industry representatives that they may request a new investigation if they believe the competitive situation has changed. We believe the escape-clause procedure should be followed in cases of this kind.

Article XXVIII of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade permits withdrawals and modifications of tariff concessions but calls for other concessions as compensation. We have therefore found it generally advantageous to limit our article XXVIII actions to making technical adjustments in our tariff concessions which may be required, for example, by customs court decisions or special legislation. This approach has strengthened the bargaining position of our negotiating teams in their efforts to enlarge the scope of our trade agreeemnts and to obtain new concessions of benefit to United States exports. This will be an important consideration in the forthcoming multilateral trade conference which has been organized for the purpose of negotiating mutually advantageous tariff reductions.

Although the proposed resolution would not have the force and effect of law, the Department of State believes that its approval is not desirable.

The Department has been informed by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM B. MACOMBER, JR.,
Assistant Secretary
(For the Acting Secretary of State).

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I will not take the time of the Senate to read the letter in its entirety. It is sufficient to say that it is in the usual nonpertinent and condescending language utilized by the Department of State to categorically reject any thoughts of concern over the damage to American interests and American jobs. In spite of the fact that the American Carpet Institute has been before the Tariff Commission as late as last year and obtained the usual unfavorable split decision, the State Department indicated that it would refuse relief and recommend another approach to the Tariff Commission under the escape clause. It is true that the situation of the American carpet industry is much worse now than it was last year, but the majority of the Tariff Commission has made it abundantly clear that it is just as insensible to the destruction of an American industry and the loss of American jobs as is the U.S. Department of State and that any industry is wasting its time and money to seek relief in that quarter.

Mr. President, when will this Congress put a stop to this "Americans last" doctrine? This matter is a constitutional responsibility of the Congress and it is our duty to remedy this situation. It is obvious that in the field of trade the State Department and the executive branch have adopted a policy of "foreigners first," and I sincerely hope that the American people will wake up and demand that their interests be given some consideration by the Congress.

HUMAN EVENTS

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I note in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for August 31, page 18312, a speech by one of my distinguished colleagues, complaining of

and attacking anti-Catholic propaganda in the present political campaign.

I agree with this position. I deplore and condemn such propaganda and attacks. However, I am concerned about one sentence in the speech, which reads as follows:

There will be organizations and publications—like the Ku Klux Klan, the falsely named committee for constitutional government, and a magazine called Human Events, to mention just three—that will peddle messages of suspicion and falsehood, that will attempt to rally prejudice in place of reason.

I happen to be a regular reader of the weekly newsletter Human Events and I am amazed that anyone would bracket Human Events with the Ku Klux Klan. That publication stands for racial and religious tolerance and never, to my knowledge, has it published anything in consonance with the Ku Klux Klan or similar racial and religious prejudice groups. Human Events has never "peddled" messages of suspicion and falsehood, or attempted to rally prejudice in place of reason. There has been nothing in Human Events which could be even remotely interpreted as agreeing with or encouraging "hate groups."

In its current issue Human Events has printed a statement which includes the following statement:

Our position on KENNEDY is simple: Human Events champions the right of a Catholic to become President of the United States. We oppose the Senator solely because of his political philosophy. Human Events regards Adenauer and De Gaulle—both Catholics—as the two greatest living European statesmen.

In closing, Mr. President, I wish to make my position clear on this subject. I do not believe that religion has any connection whatsoever with politics. When a man seeks public office, he should be judged on his merits as a candidate and not because of his creed or any religion belief he has.

I think that ought to be settled very definitely in the minds of the people of this country before the campaign proceeds further in this Nation.

U.S. PERSONNEL IN CHAOTIC CONGO SHOULD BE ARMED OR WITHDRAWN

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, an article appeared in the August 30, 1960, edition of the Oakland Tribune, Oakland, Calif., entitled "U.S. Personnel in Chaotic Congo Should Be Armed or Withdrawn."

This article was written by a great statesman and our distinguished former colleague, William F. Knowland, and I think it deserves the attention of every Member of this body, as well as every thinking American.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Knowland's observations concerning the welfare of Americans in the Congo printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. PERSONNEL IN CHAOTIC CONGO SHOULD BE ARMED OR WITHDRAWN

The beating of eight U.S. airmen, who were on a peaceful mission, by native forces in the Congo is an atrocious and disgraceful business. It is completely unjustifiable or defensible by any standards, and immediate action should be taken.

General Van Horn, commander of the U.N. Forces in the Congo, put on an unprecedented show of force and displayed his anger when he saw the bloody and battered Americans. Well, he might. These victims were unloading a cargo of signal equipment for use of the U.N. when pandemonium broke loose and a wild mob of civilians and soldiers began shouting "Kill! Kill!" They pounced on the unarmed Americans, beat them unmercifully with rifles and clubs. The airmen had no means to defend themselves, which is a ridiculous and tragic situation.

The United States has protested vigorously against the attack. U.N. Under Secretary Ralph Bunche has protested against another Congo attack on U.N. headquarters in Stanleyville where the airmen were beaten. Later, two Swedes, one Liberian and one Australian were arrested by the natives.

What good will protests do? Probably none. The native governments lack control. The country is in chaos, and the Swedish general in command of U.N. Air Forces in Léopoldville, reports that civil and military authority in the Congo has broken down almost entirely. The safety of white technicians and others who are still in the country is in jeopardy.

In view of these conditions, it is incumbent on the United Nations authorities to take immediate and vigorous steps. Under the circumstances we cannot see that protests to impotent governments are going to be effective, or perhaps even recognized. Premier Lumumba's government is not entitled to our moral or economic support.

U.N. officials are reported to be considering an order to their troops to shoot if necessary to defend themselves. Well they might. The present situation is like sending police to deal with armed bank robbers and then telling them to wait for orders from headquarters before using their guns in defense. It is absurd and unrealistic.

Men ordered into an armed area of chaotic civil war, where the natives have been deliberately inflamed by their leader for reasons of their own, should have the right to carry arms and use them if they are attacked. The United States certainly should insist on this right for its personnel.

If the United Nations command does not forthwith arm its personnel and authorize them to use those arms in self-defense then the United States should withdraw all American personnel.

The American people will not tolerate our men being subjected to brutal attack without the means to defend themselves.

We need another Theodore Roosevelt who sent word to a bandit chieftain, Raisuli by name, who had kidnaped an American citizen by the name of Perdicaris.

"Perdicaris alive or Raisuli dead." It got results.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, this is something I believe in very forcefully. We have observed the pitiful condition of the American airmen, who were flying on a mercy flight and landed in the Congo, where they were brutually beaten up and attacked by Congo forces, though they were unarmed and had nothing with which to defend themselves.

If we are going to send American boys abroad on dangerous missions, they should at least have basic preparation in order to defend themselves when they are attacked. These men not only would have been brutually attacked, but also they would have been murdered if some other troops of some other United Nations unit had not arrived to interfere.

I think it is time we started to stand up in regard to a few of these things, instead of weakly submitting or apologizing for American actions in the world.

I commend the Senator from Florida for his remarks yesterday on the Cuban situation. I do not know how much longer we are going to put up with the Castro stand. He has insulted us and has confiscated our property, yet the American people and the people of many of the associated American countries in this hemisphere hesitate to do anything about it, except to give a little slap on the wrist.

I think the American people favor toughness. I think the American Government should be tougher. It should have a firmer position.

I venture to say, Mr. President, unless we do so we shall be sorry not only in the years ahead but also in the immediate months ahead.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I concur in the remarks of the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire. I think when we draft these boys into action or permit them to enlist in the Armed Forces, when they are given orders to travel halfway around the globe in U.S. planes, they have a right to expect the protection of the people and of the Government of the United States. It is a sad day in the world when we put these men in uniform, send them out utterly defenseless, and then take a weak-kneed approach in regard to any mistreatment of them.

These men were beaten insensible and left for dead on the airfield. The time has passed when this Government ought to tolerate that treatment. We ought not to send those boys on these assignments, or, if we send them and if they are not armed themselves, they should be provided an armed guard.

I think the position of our flag among the nations of the world is not enhanced by that kind of weak-kneed approach.

CONSTITUTION PROVIDES NO RELIGIOUS TEST

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Independent, Anderson, S.C., newspaper, entitled, "U.S. Constitution Says: 'There Shall Be No Religious Test'."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. CONSTITUTION SAYS: "THERE SHALL BE NO RELIGIOUS TEST"

The 13,000 messengers attending the Southern Baptist Convention in Miami Beach "overwhelmingly" adopted a resolution opposing election of a Roman Catholic to be President of the United States.

The name of Senator JOHN KENNEDY, a leading candidate for the Democratic nomination, was not mentioned in the resolution, but there is no doubt it was aimed at him.

The resolution said in part:

"When a public official is inescapably bound by the dogma and demands of his church, he cannot consistently separate himself from these.

"This is especially true when that church maintains a position in open conflict with our established and constituted American

pattern of life as specifically related to religious liberty, separation of church and state, the freedom of conscience in matters related to marriage and the family, the perpetuation of free public schools, and the prohibition against the use of public money for sectarian purposes.

"Therefore, the implications of a candidate's affiliations, including his church, are of concern to the voters in every election.

"In all cases, a public official should be free from sectarian pressures that he may make independent decisions consistent with the rights and privileges of all citizens."

Does this view represent the thinking of all Southern Baptists? Certainly not.

In the first place, while professing to do otherwise, the resolution contradicts one of the basic principles upon which this country was founded.

The U.S. Constitution states: "There shall be no religious test for office."

The convention's resolution insists there should be a religous test put to every public official. It is saying, in effect, that a man's religious affiliation—a highly personal and spiritual matter—should take precedence over his ability and fitness for the office.

Catholics were among the signers of the Declaration of Independence and were active in the adoption of the Constitution.

Catholics have been elected to every kind of public office in the United States, except the Presidency. Numerous Catholics have been members of the U.S. Supreme Court. Others have been notable leaders in Congress. Many have been or are Governors of the various States.

In this country there are 40 million American citizens of the Catholic faith. Their political views are as varied as those of Baptists or any others of Protestant faith.

It has been proven time and again that Catholics have, and will again, vote against Catholics if they consider the Protestant candidate the abler man. Should Baptists or any other Protestants take the unsound view that a man should be barred from public office even though he might be the abler man?

The Founding Fathers of this Nation made it clear that they meant separation of church and state to apply equally to all—that domination of government by any particular denomination is undesirable.

The myth that any Catholic officeholder is a pawn of the Pope long since has been dispelled. Does the Vatican dictate to the Governments of France or West Germany? Gen. Charles de Gaulle is a prominent Catholic. So is Chancellor Konrad Adenauer. Former Prime Minister Louis St. Laurent of Canada is a leading Catholic. Khrushchev, on the other hand, is a deadly enemy of Catholicism—and the feeling is mutual.

In a recent discussion of the Catholic viewpoint, Msgr. Francis J. Lally, editor of the Pilot, America's oldest Catholic news weekly, was asked this question by U.S. News & World Report:

"What, in general, would be the church's advice to a Catholic voter called on to choose between a Catholic and a non-Catholic candidate for any public office?" The answer was:

"The church's advice is very, very plain. The Catholic is directed to choose for public office the man who has the highest ability, who is at the same time a man of personal integrity.

"It's according to these rules that Catholics have voted in the past, and conscientiously will vote in the future. Religion doesn't enter into it at all.

"Thus, adult Catholics have, without ever asking a question of their neighbors, in recent times, voted for a Presbyterian, a Baptist, an Episcopalian, a Quaker, and a Congregationalist for President—just to name the winners.

"They've done this without ever asking a single question about the religious commitments of these people. This, I think, has been an expression of Catholic confidence in the fact that a man's religious commitments are not something that he forces upon his neighbors.

"All that Catholics ask of their neighbors at the present time, or at any time when a Catholic presents himself for public office, is that their neighbors return them precisely the same confidence."

Can Protestants afford, as Americans, to do any less?

Is Senator KENNEDY the best man for the job? That is the question.

First the Democratic convention must decide if the party thinks so. Then the American people should vote without regard to the nominee's religious beliefs.

If the view should ever prevail in this land that a sincere, God-fearing, Christian of Catholic faith should be rejected in favor of a shallow hypocritical Christian of Protestant faith, then we shall have become politically bankrupt. It would then be time to shut up the shop and turn the United States over to the godless Commies who, as the record plainly shows, are the champion Catholic haters of all.

EXTENSION OF THE SUGAR ACT

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, in my judgment Congress will be shirking its duty if it goes home without passing an extension of the Sugar Act.

I wish to read certain information I have received from Mr. Larry Myers, who has the responsibility for administering the present act in the Department of Agriculture. He told us:

There will be adequate supplies of sugar to satisfy the needs of the United States without supplies from Cuba or the Dominican Republic if we take action soon enough, but we cannot wait until March 31, or any date approximate thereto, and then get legislation and hope to get supplies coming in here by April 1. A hiatus in supplies from the end of the first quarter until new supplies come in could be disastrous.

I ask Senators to note that language. He points out it could be disastrous to this country to have a hiatus in the supply situation, which may come about if we wait through the first quarter of next year.

He further said:

Until last July, we had 5 million tons from domestic sources and 4.6 million from foreign. Of that 4.6 million, 3.5 million came from nearby areas—Cuba, Dominican, Mexico, Haiti, Central America. About 1.1 million came from distant sources, such as Peru and the Philippines. If we omit Cuba and the Dominican Republic, then we have to rely on distant sources for something over 1.5 million tons. We have no doubt of our ability to get the sugar in, but we turn from sugar that is 6 sailing days away to sugar that is 6 sailing weeks away, and we must have leadtime for it, and I think March 31 is a most unfortunate date for this act to end, in view of the fact that we will have a new Congress taking time to get organized and to legislate.

Mr. President, that is an extremely unfortunate situation. If Senators desire to leave, they should recognize that if we leave without acting on an extension of the Sugar Act we shall be faced with what appears to be a chaotic situation throughout the world, so far as world sugar is concerned, and we also shall face what may be a shortage of sugar in the United States during the early months of next year.

Furthermore, Mr. President, this Senator is strongly of the opinion that we cannot have two, three, or four foreign policies. The House Committee on Agriculture cannot have one foreign policy, the President a different foreign policy, and someone else another foreign policy. If the Committee on Agriculture of the House will not permit the Congress to act, I suggest the President should negotiate a treaty to meet this problem and present it to the Senate, so that the Senate can act without having the treaty referred to the House, in order that we may have a single foreign policy for the United States.

I am not prepared to say the President is right or wrong about the action with respect to the Dominican Republic, but I do say we cannot have two, three, four, or five foreign policies at one time and hope to get anywhere with them.

I hope, if the House continues to try to tie the hands of the President in this regard, that the President will negotiate a treaty with some foreign power, to agree that action could be and would be taken when sanctions had been voted or recommended by the Organization of American States. I, as one Senator, would expect to vote to ratify such a treaty in the event the President negotiated it.

HAWAII AND HENRY KAISER

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. Mr. President, it is axiomatic that healthy competition fosters the freedom and high standards of living we cherish so much in our great Nation. I am proud that our newest State is following this American tradition so emphatically. Never has competition been so keen, and never has the spirit of American enterprise been so vigorous as it is today in Hawaii.

In the past, Hawaii has been dependent upon the military, sugar and pineapple for her livelihood. Since the war, however, income from our tourist trade has increased by more than 1,000 percent. Economists are predicting that within a few years this quickly expanding industry will surpass our two basic agricultural commodities in providing income.

Where before only the wealthy could afford its luxuries, Hawaii is now available to people of moderate means, and they come from all parts of the country.

Many government and business leaders of Hawaii have helped make this enormous growth of tourism possible. Most of these leaders have been longtime residents of the islands, and we honor them.

However, one of the most explosive forces behind Hawaii's growth of tourism came to Honolulu in 1954. He is Henry J. Kaiser, a man with big plans who is changing the face of Honolulu. No current history of Hawaii is complete without an account of Mr. Kaiser and his works. I ask unanimous consent to place into the RECORD a recent newspaper article which catches some of the essence of this remarkable man.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Journal American, July 1960]

HE CAME, HE SAW, AND STAYED TO IMPROVE "PARADISE"

(On the Line—By Bob Considine)

HONOLULU.—The most explosive thing that ever happened to Hawaii was not the bombing of Pearl Harbor. It was the arrival in Honolulu in 1954 of Henry John Kaiser. Topheavy with exploits as an industrialist and wartime shipbuilder, the bald and bustling tycoon had come here for a vacation.

As a result of that "vacation" the face of Oahu has undergone sharp change. So has the tempo of this Pacific paradise. Seems that Kaiser was offended by the fact that it was so difficult to rent a hotel room on Waikiki Beach, and so frustrating to arrange for passage here. He rented a house on Kahala Beach, out past Diamond Head, and decided then and there that the islands were too good to hide from millions of Americans.

A thousand obstacles were thrown in his hard-driving path. With incredible agility and energy he vaulted over them. When he was told that he could not build a hotel on Waikiki Beach because there wasn't any more beach left, he brought in acres of sand and lengthened that historic strand.

When his friend Conrad Hilton estimated that 300 rooms would be enough, Kaiser scoffed and built or is building 5,000. When he was told that the "old families" frowned on his presence, he made them like him.

We called on Henry J. to hear him dip into the future. It is an experience as stimulating as a plunge into the turquoise surf. In the airy office he maintains in one of his buildings which changed the skyline on Oahu, the globular 78-year-old sports-shirted tycoon sat surrounded by architects' drawings, maps, building materials, and his friends Eddie Albert and that fine showman-educator's wife Margo, radiant in her billowing muumuu.

Kaiser builds cars in Israel, Argentina, and Brazil, makes steel and aluminum in the United States and many other places, works the biggest gypsum deposit in the world in Mexico, is making planes, kitchenware, missiles, plutonium, and building dams and vast power stations. But his great driving passion at the moment is the creation of Hawaii Kai, a city of 75,000 located beneath towering Koko Head a few miles out of Honolulu.

He speaks of it as if it were finished, as indeed it is in his nimble mind.

"It will cost a billion dollars," he began. "Nobody thought I could get the land, to start with. It's 6,000 acres of the old Bishop estate and it just lay there doing nothing—though it's the most beautiful place in the whole Pacific. My wife and I built a house near it but I couldn't look around me without feeling annoyed that others couldn't share that part of the world.

"So I got it and inside here (he tapped his highdomed head) I can see it now. Hawaii Kai will be the pilot plant of an entirely new concept in living and learning. Our homes and hotels will be a part of our school system. Each living place will be connected with a coaxial cable over which people of all ages can take instruction in any of the arts, science, trades, and humanities. We'll have 50 or 100 channels.

"The world's finest instructors will be on our televised faculty. Hawaii Kai will show the rest of the country the right road to educating its people. Just think of the tens of thousands of young Americans who cannot get into our universities today, for want of money or because of crowded conditions. Sheer and unforgivable waste, that's what it is. In Hawaii Kai they could get that schooling."

We asked him where he'd get the 75,000 persons, and what they'd do for a living.

"We've got a list of 1,500 mainland firms which should want to be a part of Hawaii Kai's science sector—where we will provide an electronic brain calculator for their use. I see firms like General Electric, Convair, and those electronic empires establishing laboratories in Hawaii Kai, turning it into a beehive, but one without chimneys throwing ugly smoke against the sky. It will be finished in 5 years."

Kaiser leaned back in his high-backed desk chair and boomed:

"To be alive in such an age,
With every year a lightning page,
When men speak strong for brotherhood,
For peace and universal good,
When miracles are everywhere,
And every inch of common air
Throbs a tremendous prophecy
Of greater marvels yet to be."

That's Henry J. all over.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

VOLUNTARY PENSION PLANS BY SELF-EMPLOYED INDIVIDUALS—(H.R. 10)

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement with respect to proposed self-employed retirement legislation which we have had under consideration in the Senate for the better part of this year. As every Senator knows, there are 19 million people involved, 7 million self-employed and approximately 12 million employees of the self-employed. Those of us who are strongly in favor of the proposed legislation believe that without giving to the self-employed people some remedy, we permit an existing tax inequity to continue to discriminate against them. The proposed legislation would make it easier for these citizens to set aside certain moneys to take care of themselves in their declining years, and to do so with certain tax advantages, which they do not now have but which are available to other groups of our citizens.

Consequently, we think that until this inequity has been eliminated, we shall have certain discriminations within our tax laws. The time is past due when these discriminatory tax provisions should be removed.

The Senate Finance Committee reported what I thought was a very good bill insofar as its provision applied to the self-employed designed to eliminate these inequities. It added certain other features recommended by the Treasury Department, which some of us did not exactly approve, within the field of corporate-owner-management programs. Nevertheless, in order to get the bill approved, we felt we could accept them and we did.

The bill came to the Senate floor for discussion. We discussed it off and on for the better part of 3 days prior to our adjournment for the convention. The very able junior Senator from Louisiana offered an amendment which he felt, if it were adopted, would make the entire program at least more realistic. This amendment, which I would accept and cosponsor, would make the measure more equitable by providing that those self-employed who would set aside certain sums of money for pension purposes pay a tax on half of that amount of money at the time they put it aside and then, of course, pay the tax on the balance of the money when they retire and receive the money.

The able Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] offered another amendment which would have permitted those persons who are self-employed, and who were independent operators, to go into the field and buy certain Government bonds up to an amount of $300 a year. Those bonds would not have matured until the holder reached the age of 65. I think it would have been very helpful in providing once again security for those people who now do not have it in their declining years. This amendment has considerable merit in that the bond purchase plan would only be available to those not covered by any other retirement plan.

We have now come to the end of this session. We have once again run out of time. Obviously, there is considerable opposition to the bill. I have talked with both the minority leader and the majority leader about it. They indicated at one time they were willing to keep us here to talk about it, but the opposition of certain Senators is so strong and so determined that we would probably be here throughout the balance of the fall. So realistically this matter is now one for priority attention when the Congress convenes in January.

I do think that the result of the discussions we have had thus far has been to sharpen the issue. I think we have made great headway. I think we have improved the bill since it came to the Senate from the House.

I and other sponsors of the measure believe that the progress which has been made, plus the assurances which I have been given by the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee as to his great interest in the bill, now that it has been amended, and his assurances that we will have friendly and early consideration of the bill at the next session of Congress, we have every reason to be hopeful that the present inequities in the tax laws with respect to the self-employed will be eliminated, and that we have very good prospects of passing this proposed legislation in the immediate future.

I think it is important to emphasize the view that we should make it possible for people who do not work for some big corporation, who may not be an officer of it or an employee, but who work for themselves—whether they be barbers, real estate operators, sign painters, or whatever their occupation—to make it possible for them under our tax laws to set aside certain sums of money by which they will be able to look after themselves when they reach retirement age. We should try to change in some respects the attitude of encouraging everyone to look to the Government to provide for them when they get into the golden years, when they are no longer working, and used enough money—enough income

coming in to be able to take care of themselves with dignity.

I believe it is important that we pass this type of legislation so that those in that category can provide for themselves in their later years at a time when they are working and productive.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I am happy to yield to my colleague from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I wish to say how much I appreciate the fact that my colleague has sponsored this proposed legislation and has kept on consistently fighting for it. I am glad that at least his voice is being raised for that old-fashioned idea of frugality and attempting to save during one's active years, which seems to be a sort of outworn objective in most modern thinking.

Whether the bill is passed or not—and I realize some of the tremendous pressure which is being brought against it as my colleague does—I think my colleague is rendering a real service in calling attention to the fact that this modern philosophy of trying to get all we can from government and putting no importance at all upon the old-fashioned virtues of forbearance from spending everything one is making, and putting a little something away, hoping that independence will be attained and one can face the future in his older years with the assurance that he will be comfortable with his loved ones. He has done a great service. I wish the RECORD to show that I completely approve it. I take off my hat to him for what he is doing.

Mr. SMATHERS. I am grateful to my very able and generous colleague for his kind comments. He has been one of the great workers in this particular field, and has helped considerably. I am grateful to him. I am sure that the self-employed people, who themselves would like to put aside some money to take care of themselves in their declining years, appreciate the work that he has done.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I congratulate the Senator for the diligent and energetic work he has devoted to the effort to have the resolution adopted. The Senator knows that I differed with him, but that to a considerable degree we have been able to resolve our differences. It has been my view that if this type of tax advantage were to be granted it should be done in a way which would be consistent with the principles that exist in various other retirement programs for which Congress administers the funds. I am not saying that Congress should in any way administer the way the money is to be invested in private plans. I insist that the tax treatment should be consistent with the principle of taxation that is in effect with respect to our own retirement fund, Federal employee retirement funds, the railroad employees fund, social security, and other funds. The tax treatment used in connection with those funds is that if a person gets the benefit of tax deferral for the employer contribution, he pays a tax on the part that he personally contributes. When the same person is both the employer and the employee—the self-employed, in other words—it seems to me that, insofar as people look upon themselves as their own employer, they are entitled to set aside half of the amount for a retirement program, tax free, with the other half being subject to taxation. Under these conditions there would still be a very substantial tax advantage compared to existing law. It would place them in line with what we have done for ourselves in our own program. We pay no taxes on the Government's contribution to our retirement until we retire.

We have made a great deal of headway toward meeting objections that have been made, especially those that were made to the bill originally. The Senator knows that there is still objection to it, yet because of the Senator's diligence we are a great deal further toward reaching an agreement on a bill that will be fair to everyone.

Mr. SMATHERS. I am grateful to the able Senator from Louisiana for his remarks. I am particularly appreciative of the fact that he offered an amendment, of which I and other Senators are cosponsors, which, if adopted, would constitute an effective argument against the objection that we were giving special tax treatment to these persons, as distinguished from railroad employees or Government retirees for example.

The amendment of the Senator from Louisiana brings us a great deal nearer to the eventual passage of the bill than we would be if the amendment had not been offered. Therefore, I believe he deserves a great debt of gratitude from those who are interested in the bill and who look forward to its ultimate passage. He has rendered an invaluable service.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I am happy to yield to my distinguished friend, the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. I join with the distinguished and able junior Senator from Florida in the view that this is a problem that deserves and requires the full consideration of Congress. The retirement policies which the Government of the United States sponsors or permits in its tax structure through social security programs and others are a vital part of the American way of life, and a vital part of solving the great problem of the security of the people in the years beyond income producing years.

We need very much to examine the whole question of corporate pension plans and dividends and stock options, and the excesses to which some have gone in this field. It requires the committees of both Houses of Congress to study the problem in its overall phases. I know the able Senator will go into this matter next year and deal with it from the bottom up and from the top down.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thank the able Senator from Tennessee for his comment. I thoroughly agree that the overall problem needs study. The only place we separated in our pursuit of the general subject was on the question as to whether or not we should include this program of retirement for the self-employed, or hold it up until we had considered all the retirement programs, or proceed to these as we get to them. However, there is no question in my mind of a need for what he has said with respect to a consideration by a committee or a subcommittee of the Senate and the House on the effects of the overall retirement programs, and how much is needed and how well the programs work together. There are about 7 million people who find themselves in the position, because of their self-employment, where they are confronted by obstacles in their efforts to set up retirement programs themselves. We ought to eliminate inequities where we can and as early as we can. I appreciate the contributions made by the Senator from Tennessee. He has been consistent in his attitude in that regard. I thank him for his remarks.

SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT—PENNSYLVANIA RAILROAD STRIKE—SUGAR ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 745, which was read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress shall adjourn on Thursday, September 1, 1960, and that when they adjourn on said day, they stand adjourned sine die.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas propose to make a statement?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that action on the resolution be withheld.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am as desirous of adjourning as is any other Member of the Senate, but I am very much concerned about two situations with which we are confronted. One is the strike on the Pennsylvania Railroad. While I am not an expert in this field, I have been advised that perhaps the executive branch has used all the resources possible under the existing Railway Labor Act to cope with the situation. I suggested earlier today that the majority leader and the minority leader confer with the executive branch to see if the administration felt it had adequate authority under existing law to cope with what I consider to be an extreme emergency, and then I hoped that the Senate would stay in session until we could act.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I believe that has been done.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The distinguished Senator from Delaware raised that question earlier in the day. I share his solicitude and concern. As a matter of fact, I think half a dozen Senators have

spoken about the possible impact of this strike. So I made inquiry at several sources at the White House.

I am advised that they have the instrumentalities; they have the tools. The matter has taken its regular course. I believe there have been 4½ months' arbitration before the present impasse was reached. Now I am advised from that source, and also indirectly from the Secretary of Labor, that there is nothing more that we can do at the moment. They believe that under the instruments which are available for composing this controversy, they can move forward without additional action by Congress.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I appreciate that statement. In my State, this is the only major transportation services we have. It is very vital to us that the trains begin to move again. I appreciate knowing what the Senator has said. With that assurance, one of my questions is eliminated.

One other question relates to whether or not we should adjourn prior to taking action on the President's request for a modification of the present Sugar Act.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am glad the Senator from Delaware has raised that question, because it anticipates what I propose to say.

I believe I can say with authority that the President of the United States is very unhappy that we have not taken appropriate action to provide him with the necessary flexibility and latitude to deal with the sugar problem. I must say, though, that the Senate—and I say it in testimony to the distinguished majority leader, who has been very helpful in the matter—by a 4-to-1 vote on a substitute proposal, fully acceptable to the Senate, worked its will. But when that bill, as amended, left the door of this Chamber, it was beyond the control of the Senate. It is my understanding that the Senate, under the rules, could not even ask for a conference. If I am wrong, I ask that the Chair, on the basis of any parliamentary advice, correct me. However, I believe I am correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senator that it is not in order at this time to ask for a conference, the papers not being in the possession of the Senate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I understood so. So we could not even ask for a conference, notwithstanding what appeared on the news ticker this morning with respect to the other body and whether the Senate would request a conference. We were in no position, under Senate rules, to do so. Therefore, our hands were tied; and if no action emanated from the other body, that, I thought, was it.

When the President was apprised of this matter, frankly he was very unhappy, and for a very good reason, because he identifies it with a hemisphere situation and the possibility, always, of a critical turn of events.

This was coupled with the question whether Congress might be called back into extraordinary session. I think I can say with authority that the President has no more desire to convene a special session of Congress than do the Members of returning to Washington, particularly in this season, when we look forward to going home, mending a few political fences, and, I think, doing a little campaign work. However, there can be no conclusive answer to that question. I can give the Senate this answer, at least: It will be determined, I believe, by the unfoldment of events and circumstances; and if a critical situation or a really pressing dilemma developed, then perhaps the President would have no choice except to say, "I am sorry, but I must call you back." We hope, of course, that such a situation will not eventuate.

Nevertheless, I express my own disappointment, as well as that of the President of the United States, that action could not be consummated on the bill. What the Senate did is to its everlasting credit. I felt tremendously heartened by the response last night to the amendment in the nature of a substitute. That would have taken care of the situation in its entirety. However, since it was not done, we have no choice except to abide the result and, I believe, to abide the verities of the situation. I have been here long enough to know reality when I see it.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from New York without losing the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, like other Senators, I have given some thought to this matter as a lawyer. I do not pretend to be an expert on sugar, but as a lawyer I think there is at least a very serious question as to whether the law which we passed in July requires the President to buy sugar or whether, by virtue of his constitutional powers in respect to the foreign policy of the United States, and, indeed, the words of the statute which we passed, which, at least, are, in part, an authorization, the President might not, under proper legal construction stay his hand and not buy at all. There is at least grave doubt whether the statute requires him to buy, although some argue that it does.

The significance of that is this: I think at least the Senate vote demonstrated that an overwhelming majority of this body believes the supply of sugar, even if it should fall slightly short, though I am informed that domestic producers are well able to keep us from being short—but even if it should fall slightly short, I think the evidence showed that the overwhelming sentiment—and I think it represents the overwhelming sentiment of our people—is that our unity with the other American states, in their determination to do what they did with respect to the Dominican Republic, is, to the American people and to the great majority of this body, superior in importance to having a specific exact supply of sugar according to quota.

We are taking only about 330,000 tons out of 10 million which are in use or in storage.

I say this so that the President of the United States might, from some of us—and I know exactly how the Senator from Illinois feels about it—have some encouragement if he feels that the overriding foreign policy interest of the United States commands—and I believe he feels that way, certainly, from what he expressed to us—that we shall forgo the necessity of even a little more sugar for the American people, who did without a great many things in World War II, rather than compromise either the President's power in foreign affairs or the foreign policy of the United States in terms of its unity with other American Republics.

I join with my colleague in his great disheartenment over the fact that this is the situation in which we should have placed our President. But there it is. I hope he may be at least encouraged by some such judgment as that which I have taken the liberty to express, and which others may wish to express.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New York for the contribution he has made to the discussion. Earlier today I appealed to him to evaluate the legal situation, to see if we might find some remedy there.

I talked with the leadership in the other body until daylight this morning. Both sides of the aisle have been fully consulted. It is a parliamentary situation. Some Members feel strongly that they will not call up the Senate bill. I hope, however, that no one will mistake the failure to act in the other body for any division in this country, because I thought it was a great tribute to the U.S. Senate last evening when the Senate voted 62 to 17, to carry out, in effect, the President's recommendations.

That overwhelming sentiment of the U.S. Senate should be clear to any would-be enemy of this country.

I am convinced that if the statute does not offer any relief, the President will find ways and means which, in his judgment, will protect the country until Congress reconvenes.

I had hoped that we could pass a bill such as was offered in the nature of a substitute by the Senator from Illinois last night. But a few men do not see it that way. However, a large majority of the Senate believe that way, and a majority of the people of the country have that sentiment and are united in this cause.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, there was a significance in that vote, over and above any domestic implications it may have had from the standpoint of the sugar industry. There was no comfort for any dictator in that vote; and if they get the idea that there could be an admixture of domestic policy and international policy to give them comfort, I think that vote should dispel any such idea.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I heartily concur in what the Senator from Illinois has said.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUSK in the chair). Does the Senator

from Texas yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I wish to commend the majority leader and the minority leader for the action we took last night. It was convincing. Certainly it was overwhelming proof that the Senate does not wish to have a sugar quota go to the Dominican Republic.

I deeply regret that action was not taken in the other body. It is very questionable, in my opinion, whether the President is not bound—my judgment is that he is bound—to purchase the quota amount from the Dominican Republic. This certainly would not be understood by our friends and neighbors in the Organization of American States. Perhaps the American people can go without this sugar as a consequence of the action of the other body.

I must say—and I have expressed this view before—that this is not the only subject which should be before us today and that there are other matters of immediate and important concern that seem to me to militate against our adjourning at this time. I have expressed my view to the minority leader.

I shall vote against adjourning. But I shall not ask for a yea-and-nay vote, as apparently the disposition is to adjourn.

I thank the majority leader for yielding to me.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to my delightful friend, the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I should like to say that it is very unlikely that there will be any sugar shortage in this country, whether the President buys 300,000 tons from the Dominican Republic or not. I understand there is at present a very large supply of sugar in the United States, all of which has been acquired at the higher level which we have been paying. As the expiration of the Sugar Act program draws near—on March 31—it is very unlikely that the owners of this high-priced sugar would have any desire at all to hold it off the market or hold it for a higher price—knowing perfectly well that when the act expires, the United States can go into the world market and undoubtedly can buy sugar for a lower price than the price for which we have been buying it in the last few years.

I think we shall, of necessity, have to have some action to protect the domestic producers of sugar in this country, in order to see to it that they continue to produce a good percentage of our requirements. I think it is about one-third of what we consume at the present time. We may have to increase that—and doubtless will. But I would have little fear of a shortage of sugar or any increase in the price of sugar, because only foolhardy operators would undertake to do that.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wish to have a vote taken as soon as possible, because we have a measure which must go to the House, and the House is waiting to receive it.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me briefly at this time?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. First, Mr. President, to emphasize the point as to the legal authority of the President: The President may have advice from some quarters that he has to buy sugar under the act we have passed. I think there is grave doubt on the subject. But I think it almost inconceivable that the President's authority would be questioned if he considered it an authorization, rather than a directive.

Also I find it very difficult to understand what the remedy would be in such a case. The President has every right to exercise his constitutional authority in the handling of our foreign policy in the highest national interest; and we are dealing here with a foreign policy question.

I feel that in the construction of this law, the concept of authorization, rather than direction, would certainly be the one encouraged.

I feel that the Senate has made it clear—and I believe this represents the view of the overwhelming majority of the American people—that the overriding national interest requires us to support the President's unity with the other American Republics in the action which they initiated at San José.

I hope very much that these observations by us may prove helpful to the President.

I should like to state that I, too, shall vote against the motion to adjourn sine die; and I wish to state that my basic reason is my deep feeling that some minimal civil rights legislation should have been adopted at this session in an earnest effort to live up to the campaign platforms of both parties, and that it was at least "must" legislation, considering the grave situations in certain parts of the country, and was at least equivalent in importance with the minimum wage bill, the bill for medical care for elderly people, and other measures with which we dealt so extensively.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I renew my request, and ask to have the question put on the question of agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUSK in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 745) was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the concurrent resolution was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am prepared to ask that the Senate continue in session. I hope the Senate will vote on any measures which may be called up and on the pending measure. I hope they will not be too controversial.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, before the Senate adjourns, I wish to announce that if I had been present and voting on roll number 76, March 3, 1960, I would have voted "yea" on the motion of the distinguished majority leader to direct the Sergeant at Arms to request the attendance of absent Senators.

Mr. President, under the sine die adjournment resolution, which has just now been adopted, is it not a fact that if the Senate has not concluded its business by midnight, automatically upon the raising of a point of order the Senate will then be adjourned sine die, by order of the Presiding Officer?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

AUTHORIZATION FOR THE SPEAKER AND THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I send to the desk House Concurrent Resolution 746, and request its immediate consideration.

The resolution (H. Con. Res. 746) was read and, by unanimous consent, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That notwithstanding the sine die adjournment of the two Houses, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate be, and they are hereby, authorized to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

AUTHORIZATION FOR THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE TO MAKE APPOINTMENTS TO COMMISSIONS OR COMMITTEES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution for which I request immediate consideration.

The resolution (S. Res. 392) was read and, by unanimous consent, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That notwithstanding the final adjournment of the present session of the Congress, the President of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized to make appointments to commissions or committees authorized by law, by concurrent action of the two Houses, or by order of the Senate.

TENDER OF THE THANKS OF THE SENATE TO THE VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I send to the desk another resolution for which I request immediate consideration.

The resolution (S. Res. 390) was read and, by unanimous consent, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the thanks of the Senate are hereby tendered to the Honorable RICHARD M. NIXON, Vice President of the United States and President of the Senate, for the courteous, dignified, and impartial manner in which he has presided over its deliberations during the second session of the Eighty-sixth Congress.

TENDER OF THE THANKS OF THE SENATE TO SENATOR HAYDEN

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I send to the desk another resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 391) as follows:

Resolved, That the thanks of the Senate are hereby tendered to the Honorable CARL HAYDEN, President pro tempore of the Senate, for the courteous, dignified, and impartial manner in which he has presided over its deliberations during the second session of the Eighty-sixth Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered, and unanimously agreed to.

AUTHORIZATION FOR SECRETARY OF SENATE TO RECEIVE MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, it was

Ordered, That notwithstanding the final adjournment of the present session of the Congress, the Secretary be, and he is hereby, authorized to receive messages from the House of Representatives.

PRINTING AS SENATE DOCUMENT OF RECORD OF LEGISLATIVE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF 2D SESSION, 86TH CONGRESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the record of legislative accomplishments of the 2d session of the 86th Congress be printed in the RECORD and as a Senate document.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUMMARY OF MAJOR LEGISLATION

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, it has been customary for many years for both the majority and minority leaders of the Senate, at the close of a session of Congress, to put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and have printed as a Senate document their respective statements on the record of Congress.

At this time, I ask unanimous consent to have printed such a statement from the minority side in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and to have the same printed, with any necessary revisions and corrections after the adjournment of Congress, as a Senate document, and also to print, after the adjournment of Congress, as a Senate document, a summary of major legislation of general interest.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INDEX TO ACTIVITIES AND ACHIEVEMENTS DURING THE REPUBLICAN ADMINISTRATION, 1953–60

1. "The Stewardship of Veterans Affairs Under the Republican Administration, 1953–60," by Senator BRIDGES.
2. "The Housing Record of the Republican Administration, 1953–60."
3. "Development Loan Fund First Proposed by Republican Administration, Reports on First 26 Months of Operation," by Senator BUTLER.
4. "Agricultural Accomplishments Under the Republican Administration, 1953–60," by Senator AIKEN.
5. "The Republican Record of Accomplishments in Atomic Energy, 1953–60," by Senator HICKENLOOPER.
6. "The Republican Record on Behalf of Small Business, 1953–60," by Senator BRIDGES.
7. "Farm Credit Improvements Under the Republican Administration, 1953–60," by Senator ALLOTT.
8. "The Republican Record on Labor-Management, 1953–60, A Summary," by Senator DIRKSEN.
9. "Commerce, Transportation, Business—A Brief Survey of Advances in These Fields Under the Republican Administration, 1953–60," by Senator SCHOEPPEL.
10. "St. Lawrence Seaway Accomplishments—The World's Greatest Waterway System Developed By and Under the Republican Administration," by Senator WILEY.
11. "Accomplishments of the Republican Administration in Natural Resources and Conservation, 1953–60," by Senator MUNDT.
12. "Republican Responsibility Versus Democratic Reaction in the U–2 Incident and Summit Blowup," by Senator BUSH.
13. "The Republican-Created Commission on Civil Rights—A Summary of Its Accomplishments," by Senator CASE of New Jersey.
14. "Accomplishments of U.S. Space Exploration Under the Republican Administration," by Senator KUCHEL.
15. "The Accomplishments of the Federal Communications Commission During the Republican Administration," by Senator BRIDGES.
16. "President Eisenhower's Travels Abroad," by Senator SALTONSTALL.
17. "The Republican Administration's Record of Impartial Federal Law Enforcement, 1953–60," by Senator COOPER.
18. "Facts and Figures on the Public Debt and Interest Charges Since 1900—The Fiscal Record of the Two Political Parties," by Senator WILLIAMS of Delaware.
19. "Fighting for Freedom—At Home and Abroad," by Senator BRIDGES.
20. "The Nation's Progress in Education, Social Security, Health, and the General Welfare Under the Republican Administration," by Senator SMITH.
21. "U.S. Foreign Policy Under the Republican Administration, 1953–60," by Senator BRIDGES.
22. "Accomplishments of the Export-Import Bank During the Republican Administration, 1953–60," by Senator BENNETT.
23. "Accomplishments of the Farmers Home Administration Under the Republican Administration, 1953–60," by Senator ALLOTT.
24. "Major Accomplishments of the General Services Administration Under the Republican Administration, 1953–60," by Senator PROUTY.
25. "Accomplishments of the Federal Power Commission During the Republican Administration, 1953–60," by Senator COTTON.
26. "Accomplishments of the Federal Trade Commission Under the Republican Administration," by Senator KEATING.
27. "The Stability of the Dollar; the Tax Reduction Record; the Budget and Debt Management Record; and the Advances Made by the Treasury Department During the Republican Administration, 1953–60," by Senator BRIDGES.
28. "Lincoln's Principles and the Republican Party Can Best Lead the Nation in the 1960's," by Senator SALTONSTALL.
29. "The Proud Record of the Republican Party in Enfranchising Citizens of the District of Columbia," by Senator CASE of South Dakota.
30. "Accomplishments of the Federal Aviation Agency Under the Republican Administration," by Senator BRIDGES.
31. "The National Purpose," by Senator SALTONSTALL.
32. "Accomplishments of the U.S. Information Agency During the Republican Administration," by Senator SCOTT.
33. "The Progress Made in the U.S. Postal System Under the Republican Administration, 1952–60," by Senator BEALL.
34. "Improvements in Military Procurement Practices Under the Republican Administration," by Senator CURTIS.
35. "Civil Rights and the Republican Administration," by Senator CASE of New Jersey.
36. "The Nation's Economic Welfare Under the Republican Administration, 1953–60," by Senator MORTON.
37. "Progress Report of Federal Home Loan Bank Board During the Republican Administration, 1953–60," by Senator DWORSHAK.
38. "Summary of Major Accomplishments in the Cooperative Farm Credit System During the Republican Administration, 1953–60," by Senator CAPEHART.
39. "Civil Rights—At Home and Abroad," by Senator FONG.
40. "Our Defense Position—Present and Future," by Senator SALTONSTALL.
41. "What Price Social Welfare to the American People," by Senator GOLDWATER.
42. "Agricultural Accomplishments At A Glance, 1953–60."
43. "The Use of Intelligence Agents and Russian Espionage in the United States," by Senator HRUSKA.
44. "A Sound Record of Accomplishments for our Senior Citizens," by Senator JAVITS.
45. "The Economic Standards of the Republican Administration, 1953–60," by Senator CARLSON.

THE STEWARDSHIP OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS UNDER THE REPUBLICAN ADMINISTRATION, 1953–60

(By U. S. Senator STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, chairman, Senate Republican policy committee)

Under the leadership of the Nation's best loved and most respected wartime military commander the Republican administration has, since 1953, substantially advanced the affairs of those who have defended the Republic and its flag against aggressors who have sought to deprive men of freedom and the world of peace.

The Republican Party, since its founding a little more than a hundred years ago, has traditionally respected the Nation's responsibility, as George Washington said, "to care for him who shall have borne the battle and his widow, and his orphan." The Republican administration has enhanced its already splendid record in the field of veterans' affairs by a number of major accomplishments as follows:

Compensation and pensions

1. Compensation for the wartime disabled was increased twice, once in 1954 and again in 1957.

2. Legislation was enacted in 1959 which provides more equitable treatment of needy veterans and modernized the veterans' pension program. This legislation also provides pension benefits to widows of World War II and the Korean conflict on the same basis as those for widows of World War I veterans.

Medical benefits

1. Thirteen new veterans' hospitals have been opened and there has been a substantial increase in the number of hospital beds in operation and the average number of patients treated in VA hospitals throughout the year.

2. A $900-million program has been developed and approved to modernize the veterans' hospital system. The first $75-million increment of this 12-year program was included in the 1961 budget.

3. A new Presidential policy was established which authorizes the continued operation of 125,000 beds in the VA hospital system and gives the Administrator of Veterans Affairs the authority to shift and adjust the number and type of beds from one

area to another to coincide with population movements and the changing diagnostic demands for hospitalization.

4. The Medical Research program of the VA has been broadened and strengthened, thus enhancing the quality of medical care for veterans and contributing generally to the health and welfare of the Nation.

Education and training

1. Legislation was enacted in 1956 to provide educational assistance to orphans of war veterans. Since then a total of 19,000 war orphans have received benefits under this act.

2. Two million eight hundred and eighty thousand veterans have received training under VA education and training programs since 1953.

3. One hundred and five thousand disabled veterans have received vocational rehabilitation training benefits since 1953.

Home loans

1. Between 1953 and 1960, a total of 2,639,140 loans to veterans were guaranteed or insured by the VA.

Insurance

1. New benefits have been provided for the GI insurance policyholder, including additional disability insurance, additional conversion rights and liberalized standards for reinstatements.

2. A new investment formula for insurance trust funds allows the investment of these funds at higher rates of interest. Increased earnings will mean increased dividends to policyholders.

Management

1. The VA went through a major reorganization which resulted in economies and improved service to veterans.

2. Modern electronic machines have been installed for the insurance operations and to process the compensation and pension payments. This will result in improved efficiency and economy.

3. The personnel program has been strengthened, resulting in improved morale and efficiency of employees.

4. The stature of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs has been heightened by having him serve more directly as the adviser to the President in veterans' matters. This includes attendance at Cabinet meetings when matters under discussion involve the VA.

5. The public image of the VA has been improved vastly through sound personnel and management practices.

Figures show scope of activities under Republicans

Summary statistics give a picture of the scope and growth of veterans' benefits from 1954 to 1961 as follows:

	Fiscal year 1954	Fiscal year 1961	Increase
Total VA budget	$4,282,591,740	$5,397,291,000	$1,114,719,260
Compensation payments	$1,730,915,000	$2,066,288,000	$335,873,000
Pension payments	$715,635,000	$1,715,807,000	$1,000,172,000
Regular insurance dividends	$182,300,000	$250,000,000	$67,700,000
VA hospital beds in operation	114,244	121,456	7,212
Average daily patients in VA hospitals	103,491	111,600	8,109
Outpatients visiting	2,152,000	2,279,600	127,600

	June 30, 1954	Estimated June 30, 1961	Increase
Principal value of loans guaranteed:			
Cumulative	$23,948,000,000	$51,640,000,000	$27,692,000,000
Outstanding	17,580,000,000	32,350,000,000	14,970,000,000
Direct loans:			
Cumulative	346,000,000	1,525,000,000	1,179,000,000
Outstanding	298,000,000	1,200,000,000	902,000,000

II

THE HOUSING RECORD OF THE REPUBLICAN ADMINISTRATION, 1953–60—A STATISTICAL REVIEW IN SUMMARY FORM

More houses built than during any similar period in history—nearly 9 million new dwellings, 25 percent more than in the preceding 7 years.

More people now own their own homes than at any similar period in history—three out of every five American families are homeowners, compared to slightly more than one out of two 10 years ago.

More housing for elderly people, and more done to house elderly people than any similar period in history—more than 20,000 private or public units especially designed for the elderly built or started in the last 3 years.

More housing for college students than any similar period in history—more than 37,000 dormitory units for students, teachers, and nurses in training, financed with loans, compared to 13,000 units before 1953.

More American cities engaged in urban renewal than any similar period in history—436 communities—more than double the previous number—have 750 renewal projects under way—four times as many as before 1953.

More done to help localities plan for sewers, water systems, schools, than any similar period in history—advances made to plan 1,300 public works projects involving a total construction cost of nearly $2 billion.

More cities and metropolitan areas engaged in planning for the future than any similar period in history—with grants made for comprehensive planning in 90 metropolitan areas and urban regions and in 1,140 smaller towns throughout the country.

Housing records broken

During this administration the Nation has experienced an amazing growth of home ownership—more families now own, or are buying their own homes than ever before—62 percent compared to 55 percent in 1950. The number of homes owned by their occupants has risen to more than 30 million in the past decade, an increase of over 30 percent.

Since January 1, 1953, until April 30, 1960, housing records have been broken in all directions, testimony to a dynamic as well as well-ordered, well-balanced economy.

Since the beginning of 1953, the number of homes and other dwelling units (apartments, etc.) constructed or started is close to 9 million, compared to 7,100,000 in the 7 postwar years before 1953.

Value of this construction since the beginning of 1953 totals $133 billion, nearly double the dollar value of new homebuilding in the preceding years. Another $45.5 billion has been spent on home maintenance and repairs.

The Federal Housing Administration alone insured more than 2¼ million mortgages on homes to a value of $24.3 billion, and in addition, insured more than 9 million FHA property improvement loans.

Turning to the field of federally assisted low rent housing, the number of (PHA) units started was 127,000.

The administration's anti-inflation policies have paid off in housing. Construction costs in the last 7 years have risen only 16 percent, compared to 66 percent in the preceding 7 years.

During the 7 years of the Republican administration, construction was started on well over 1 million new dwelling units annually, reaching the near record of 1,553,000 units in 1958 under the revised, more complete census system of reporting.

Nineteen hundred and fifty-nine a record housing year

These figures cover a 7-year period. But how about the recent past?

Nineteen hundred and fifty-nine was a big year for housing:

More money—$23⅓ billion—was spent on home construction than ever previously recorded—which does not include a further $7 billion spent for maintenance and repairs.

The Federal Housing Administration in 1959 wrote insurance on 549,600 housing units—the highest number for any year since FHA was established.

Housing for the elderly

One of the proudest achievements of the present administration is that it inaugurated the first Federal measures to help elderly people to get good housing.

In his state of the Union message in 1956, President Eisenhower asked the Congress to revise Federal housing laws "to meet the needs of the growing number of older people." From his proposals came a three-part program written into the Housing Act of that year.

One part of the program that is having spectacular acceptance relates to the provision of private rental housing for elderly persons by nonprofit groups such as churches, labor unions, fraternal groups, and similar associations.

As a result of President Eisenhower's recommendations, and the implementing action by the Congress in the Housing Act of 1956, such nonprofit groups have been able to obtain attractive FHA-insured mortgages—and applications have been rolling in.

In 1959, the administration carried the program a step further by sponsoring legislation to facilitate building FHA housing for elderly rental projects on a profit basis as well as the previous nonprofit basis.

As a result of these two developments, we find beautiful projects being constructed in all parts of the country.

Consider this abbreviated list of projects now in being:

Royal Oaks Manor (Presbyterian), California; Carmel Hall (Roman Catholic), Detroit, Mich.; Michigan Christian Home Association, Grand Rapids, Mich.; OEA Senior Citizens, Omaha, Nebr.; Bethel Methodist Home, Ossining, N.Y.; Evangelical Lutheran Good Samaritan Society Home, Hobart, Okla.; St. James House of Bayton (Episcopal), Bayton, Tex.; Douglas Gardens (Jewish), Miami, Fla.; Vine Court, Church Homes, Inc., Hartford, Conn.

As of April 30, 1960, more than 71 projects with nearly 9,000 living units were either completed or on the road to completion. Meanwhile, scores more were moving up into the pipeline and the number of applications coming in can be counted in the hundreds.

However, this is only one part of the program.

Other changes were made. For example, low rent public housing projects were opened to single elderly persons, 65 or older. Ever since 1937 single persons had been denied admission to such projects.

Further, elderly families were given priority of admission; and the Public Housing Administration was authorized to help local authorities build or remodel dwellings specifically designed for the elderly.

As a result, more than 12,000 units of public housing designed especially for the aging have been added to the public housing supply in 3 years—in addition to the housing of many thousands of elderly families in standard units.

Nursing homes

In 1959, the Administration sponsored legislation to make FHA insurance available for the first time for nursing homes.

This proposal had been long in preparation. Shortly after its passage, hundreds of applications were being received by Housing Agency field offices. Unofficial sources report 2,000 or more interested sponsors hope to use the program aids to expand skilled nursing care throughout the country to provide care for the aging and for other invalid or semi-invalid persons.

Urban renewal

Before the Eisenhower administration, the term "urban renewal" was unknown. It is a new concept for solving the longstanding problem of urban deterioration and decay of our urban areas through combined use of public and private efforts in the urban community. This is not just clearing slums—it is also restoring and preserving good areas and preventing new slums from developing.

More than 1,000 towns and cities throughout the country now have comprehensive local plans, known as workable programs for community improvement, to solve their major housing, planning, traffic, and land use problems through a coordinated attack. No such total community programs existed before 1954.

At the President's recommendation, the Congress has authorized since 1953 $1½ billion in Federal grant funds to aid towns and cities to redevelop and rehabilitate their slum and blighted areas—three times as much as was authorized before 1953.

Under the present administration, the number of towns and cities carrying out renewal projects has more than doubled, totaling 436, and the number of projects is more than 750—four times the number initiated before 1953.

Slum prevention as well as cure

Federal assistance on these earlier projects, moreover, was provided only for clearing slums already in existence.

There were no provisions for preventing slums from coming into existence. So the battle was a losing one from the beginning. It was as if we had built a hospital filled entirely with operating rooms, but with no place for patients to get well and forestall an operation.

A Republican administration and Congress in the historic Housing Act of 1954 initiated an entirely new approach to the slum blight problem—the total approach. This total approach included the following:

Special provisions for mortgage insurance under FHA.

Section 220 for new building or rehabilitation in urban renewal areas.

Special provisions for mortgage insurance under FHA section 221 to provide low-cost housing for families displaced from urban renewal areas.

Special grants for urban planning assistance.

Special grants for demonstration projects that would enlarge our fund of knowledge on urban renewal problems.

Since the problems connected with slum blight are all-inclusive, the approach to them to be effective must also be all-inclusive. Any integrated campaign must be based on a workable program initiated by the local community. Such a program should cover all aspects leading to urban decay—the enforcement of local housing and building codes, the rehabilitation of housing and neighborhoods, the upgrading of municipal services, the effective planning for the orderly growth and development of the community.

Communities adopt a workable program as a condition of receiving Federal financial assistance in the urban renewal field.

New solutions for old problems

Among studies made during 1959 was a survey in depth of the relocation housing program (sec. 221), designed to provide privately built housing for moderate and low income families displaced from their homes by urban renewal, code enforcement, and other forms of public action.

Since its inception in 1954, a total of 105,378 units has been certified as eligible for section 221 FHA mortgage insurance; in 1959 the number certified was 17,915. No such relocation housing assistance existed before 1954.

A search for solutions of another type took place in 18 locations throughout the country by way of the test tube demonstration grant program. No such grants were authorized before 1954.

The purpose of this program is to create practical know-how in the field of urban renewal. Through assistance given to carefully selected pilot projects, its aim is to enlarge our fund of knowledge and produce practical information of use to cities everywhere.

Suburban sprawl

Another farsighted program introduced by this administration in 1954 is the planning program designed to help metropolitan areas combat the new phenomenon in American life known as suburban sprawl.

This was the first such constructive Federal legislation of its kind, and at the end of 1959 there were 94 urban and metropolitan areas receiving planning assistance.

In addition, through another provision of the 1954 Housing Act, more than 1,000 small municipalities were also receiving assistance.

III

DEVELOPMENT LOAN FUND FIRST PROPOSED BY REPUBLICAN ADMINISTRATION REPORTS ON FIRST 26 MONTHS OF OPERATION

(By U.S. Senator JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER, of Maryland)

The development Loan Fund, first formally proposed by President Eisenhower in his special message to Congress on mutual security in 1957, received 585 separate loan applications amounting to $3.68 billion from 59 countries in the first 26 months of the Fund's operation. During this same period, DLF committed $948 million in approved loans and guarantees.

The report, issued June 13 and covering the 26 months to January 1, 1960, was the first detailed annual report to be issued by the new agency.

The Development Loan Fund was created in 1957 as a part of the mutual security program. It extends long-term loans for economic growth projects which may be repaid in the currency of the borrowing country instead of dollars (often referred to as "soft loans"). The Fund operates with close similarity to the Export-Import Bank, in that it makes loans for specific projects rather than providing general economic assistance for countries, as under various titles of the mutual security program.

The Fund started operations early in 1958 with an appropriation of $300 million and authorizations for the fiscal year 1959 of an additional $625 million.

According to the report, transportation and communications projects formed the largest category of enterprise assisted by DLF, with 36 loans totaling $299,300,000.

This category accounted for 32.2 percent of all loans approved.

It included $151,950,000 in loans for the rehabilitation or modernization of railways; $100,950,000 in loans for highway projects; $23,500,000 for ports and waterways; $16,300,000 for telecommunications; and $6,600,000 for airports.

Among the projects assisted were highways into potentially productive but now largely inaccessible areas of Malaya, the Philippines, Ecuador, Paraguay, Honduras, Peru, Haiti, and Iran; harbors and anchorages in East Pakistan and Indonesia; railways in Indonesia, Taiwan, India, Spain, and Pakistan; and telephone and telegraph systems in Liberia, Uruguay, Paraguay, Iran, and Korea.

Industry and mining accounted for 22.9 percent of loans approved, with 33 loans and 1 guaranty totaling $213,130,000. A large proportion of this amount went to India. Other loans will help establish or expand industries in Guatemala, Thailand, Liberia, Tunis, Greece, India, Taiwan, Korea, the Philippines, Bolivia, Indonesia, Nigeria, Turkey, and other countries. They will also stimulate mining in Turkey and Jordan.

Power projects, and multipurpose projects including important power developments, accounted for 15 loans totaling $180 million—19.5 percent of the total. Among these are loans for five large hydroelectric projects in Greece, East Pakistan, Yugoslavia, Korea, and Taiwan. Other loans will assist thermal plants or power distributions systems in Turkey, Yugoslavia, Spain, West Pakistan, Lebanon, and Thailand.

Thirteen loans and one guaranty totaling $64,836,000 were made to intermediate financing institutions in the nature of development banks in 10 countries—Somalia, Iran, Israel, Turkey, Pakistan, the Philippines, Taiwan, Korea, Guatemala, and Lebanon. These institutions in turn will relend the funds to small business enterprises in their respective countries.

Food and agriculture projects—mostly irrigation and drainage projects—accounted for eight loans totaling $54,940,000; and water supply and community development for five loans totaling $29,600,000. In addition, three loans totaling $87,250,000, each embracing a variety of purposes and functions related to general economic development, were made, respectively, to Argentina, Israel, and Iran.

Though DLF has been in operation for more than 2 years, the first year was spent largely in organization and in processing and investigating incoming loan proposals, and no annual report was issued.

IV

AGRICULTURAL ACCOMPLISHMENTS UNDER THE REPUBLICAN ADMINISTRATION, 1953–60

(By U.S. Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN, of Vermont)

1. Total agricultural assets are at an all-time high of $208.2 billion as of January 1, 1960.

2. Owner equities on January 1, 1960, were $37 billion above January 1, 1953, and hit a new peak of $184.2 billion.

3. Farm ownership is at a record high, and there is a smaller proportion of tenants than ever before.

4. Farm foreclosures are near an all time record low.

5. Total financial assets of farmers, including farmer cooperatives, have risen from $16.7 billion in January 1953, to $19.4 billion, January 1, 1960.

6. Farm debt amounts to only 11½ percent of the value of farm assets.

7. The standard of living on farms is the highest in history, measured in terms of electrical appliances, automobiles, and other conveniences owned by farm families.

8. Repeal of Federal taxes on gasoline used in tractors and other machinery saves farmers $60 million a year.

9. Farmers in 1954 were benefited by the largest tax reduction in history.

10. Per capita farm income rose from $838 in 1950 to $960 in 1959.

11. Well-administered emergency livestock feed programs have helped farmers and ranchers overcome effects of drought, floods, and other natural disasters.

12. Approximately $600 million a year has been extended in disaster and drought aid since 1953. Such aid enabled families to stay on the land.

13. The Water Facilities Act was amended to provide for direct and insured loans for certain soil and water conservation activities in all States to conserve the Nation's water and soil resources. Prior to this amendment, the act had applied to 17 Western States only.

14. Upon the Republican administration's recommendation of July 31, 1953, Congress authorized (in the Watershed and Flood Prevention Act of 1954) State and local agencies to undertake flood-prevention work and agricultural phases of water management in watersheds.

15. Legislation has been passed which has held down the accumulation of surpluses by the Government by an amount estimated to total $14 billion through adjustment in price supports, Public Law 480, and the soil bank.

16. A major reorganization of the Department of Agriculture was effected in 1953 to improve the quantity and quality of its services to the farmer.

17. The bipartisan National Agricultural Advisory Commission was established in 1953 to review agricultural policies and work with the administration in developing and administering farm programs.

18. Social security coverage was extended to farmers in 1954, ending 19 years of discrimination.

19. The Rural Electrification Administration continues to meet the growing demand for electric and telephone service in rural areas, including the expanding needs of rural industry. More than one-third of all REA electrification loans have been made since January 1953. During this 7½-year period, about 925,000 new consumers have been added to the lines of REA-financed electric systems. In calendar year 1959, five out of six of these were nonfarm consumers. An estimated 1 million subscribers have received new or improved telephone service since January 1953 as a result of the REA telephone loan program. Electric loans in fiscal 1960 amounted to more than $200 million; telephone loans exceeded $100 million.

20. The rural development program is raising living standards of those on the lowest rung of the economic ladder through the cooperation of the Federal Government and local authorities and private leadership. Work is progressing in 30 States and Puerto Rico.

Stabilization

21. The payment-in-kind export program for grain and cotton came into being in 1956 and 1958. This program resulted in higher prices to producers. This also resulted in fewer commodities coming to CCC—a saving to the Government.

22. The new uniform grain storage agreement rates in effect July 1, 1960, will mean saving between $85 million and $100 million yearly. The 19 percent lower storage rates generally represent a net saving to farmers who use commercial facilities.

23. More than $20 billion worth of food and fiber was moved out of storage and into use at home and abroad in less than 7 years through disposal programs designed for the needy and drought and storm relief and to help the free nations throughout the world.

24. More than 28 million acres of farmland have been taken out of production by the conservation reserve program of the soil bank and put to soil conserving uses. These acres would have otherwise added to surpluses, whereas participating farmers are now adding to their income, thus making unprecedented strides in the conservation of soil, water, forests, and wildlife resources.

Credit

25. Total credit extended farmers by the Farmers Home Administration during fiscal 1960 is estimated at $310 million, compared with $228.7 million in 1953. Arrangements were made in 1959 for FHA credit to more fully meet the needs of part-time farmers. Loans totaling $12 million will be made in rural development counties in 1960; the 1959 total was $10.2 million.

26. The agricultural credit system was made more responsive to farmers' needs. The Farm Credit Administration was made an independent agency.

Exports

27. The food-for-peace program was set in motion by President Eisenhower and is enabling the United States and other food-exporting nations to better share their abundance with people in the free world. It is helping to feed hungry people, is supporting economic development of friendly countries, is providing additional outlets for U.S. farm production, and is helping to develop future markets.

28. Exports of farm commodities grew from $2.8 billion in 1953 to an all time high of $4.7 billion in fiscal 1957, and for the past 3 years have averaged about $4 billion per year. Exports in fiscal 1960 are estimated at $4.5 billion, the second highest total on record.

29. The agricultural attaché system was returned to USDA from the State Department to make more effective efforts to expand foreign markets for farmers.

Forest Service

30. Operation Outdoors was set up to expand family recreational facilities in the national forests. In 1953 35.4 million people visited the national forests; in 1959 the number was 81,521,000. The Forest Service has built 7,036 new family units for camping and picknicking and rehabilitated 8,973. It has also built 23 new winter sports areas, 38 new swimming places, and 10 new organization campsites.

31. A new milestone was reached by the Forest Service in 1959 when for the first time 2 billion trees were planted, double the 1958 record.

32. Timber cut in national forests is at the rate of 8.3 billion board feet, the highest on record. The yield of the national forests is being sustained and constantly increased. The income from these sales largely offsets the cost of running the national forests.

33. National forest receipts passed the billion dollar mark in 1958. It took 50 years to collect this amount from use fees and the sale of forest resources. In 1959 receipts hit $142.7 million. At this rate it will take less than 10 years to collect the second billion dollars.

34. Progress has been made in reducing forest fire losses and in 1957 they were reduced to an alltime low.

Marketing

35. The special milk program was inaugurated in 1954. The program in 1960 operated in 83,000 schools and child care institutions, where nearly 2.4 billion half pints of milk helped improve diets of our children.

36. The school lunch program absorbs large quantities of plentiful foods and improves diets of 13 million participating children. Fiscal 1960 purchases totaled $540 million. Complete meals in 1960 were increased more than 1 billion over the 1 billion served in 1951.

37. About 60 million people in 82 foreign countries have been receiving food and fiber donated by the United States. Over 4 million American people are sharing in our abundance through donations of surplus foods.

38. In periods of oversupply, 906 million pounds of meat products, poultry, and eggs worth $388 million were bought for the school lunch program, welfare institutions, and needy people. Cattle, hog, poultry, and egg prices were thus bolstered without the Government getting into the meat business.

39. Producers of dairy products, one of the mainstays of agriculture, will receive estimated cash receipts of $4.7 billion in 1960, an alltime high.

40. A major consumer health protection measure, the Poultry Products Inspection Act, went into effect January 1, 1959. During the first year nearly 5 billion pounds of poultry were examined and certified as wholesome.

Research

41. Appropriations for agricultural research have been increased by 117 percent since 1953. Much of this has gone into successful research to find new uses for our farm abundance, and to develop new crops for current needs.

42. Research workers in 1959 discovered the mechanism of plant growth. In a major breakthrough they isolated a pigment that controls germination, flowering, and seed formation.

43. Important new facilities were established to insure future agricultural progress and livestock health. Among these is the Plum Island Animal Disease Laboratory, Long Island Sound, where diseases foreign to our country are being studied for control purposes. Native diseases will be studied at the new National Animal Disease Laboratory at Ames, Iowa. Victories have been registered in the battle against two serious livestock diseases—screwworm infestation in cattle in the Southeastern United States and vesicular exanthema in hogs.

44. New concepts in eradication of insect pests have resulted from the successful use of radiation in the sterile-male method against screwworms in Florida.

45. Success was achieved in the campaign to help wipe out an outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease in Mexico which, had it spread, would have meant incalculable losses for U.S. stockmen.

46. The drive to eradicate brucellosis from the United States passed a milestone in June 1960, when New Hampshire became the first State completely free of the disease. Twenty-four other States have almost eliminated the disease. (Brucellosis is a primary threat to the Nation's cattle; in man it is known as undulant fever.)

Soil conservation

47. The Great Plains Conservation Program was established in 1956 and is operating in 351 countries. A total of 12 million acres was covered by cost-sharing contracts as of May 1, 1960. The long-range purpose is to minimize drought, flood, and wind erosion damage in the Western States once embraced in the Dust Bowl.

48. The number of soil conservation districts asisted in 1959 totaled 2,865 compared to 2,493 in 1952. The land of 21 States, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands is covered by soil conservation districts.

49. In recognition of the Nation's mounting need for water conservation, this Department has stressed protection of watersheds. As of June 1, 1960, 236 local watershed projects in 45 States were receiving assistance. Authorizations for planning assistance had been extended to 549 projects in 48 States.

50. The importance of water to farm and city people has been stressed by this administration. The first Soil and Water Conservation Advisory Committee was established, and meets regularly to plan for the future.

51. The internal revenue law was amended, to permit farmers and ranchers to deduct

from their taxes expenditures made for installing certain soil and water conservation practices.

V

THE REPUBLICAN RECORD OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS IN ATOMIC ENERGY, 1953–60

(By U.S. Senator BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, of Iowa)

The Atomic Energy Commission programs for developing the uses of atomic energy have been reshaped and organized in the past 7 years to place full emphasis upon the President's fundamental policy, announced in 1953, that this great new source of energy should be dedicated to man's betterment—not to his annihilation.

Under this policy, the Republican administration has taken the first steps toward economic benefits, both in this country and among our friends in other nations, has accomplished sound progress in the search for new knowledge, and has promoted the peace of the world through scientific and economic cooperation, and through providing the free world with a defensive shield of atomic weapons.

Background

When the Republican Party took office, the Nation was rich in opportunities for peaceful utilization of atomic energy, and the full weapons potential also remained to be developed. An international deadlock—unbroken since 1946—prevented all constructive international cooperation in the field of atomic energy. The Federal Government held a monopoly of ownership of atomic energy facilities and of atomic knowledge. Late in 1952, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy had reported that "Since spring, 1950 * * * there has been no major project whose purpose is to achieve a reactor directly advancing industrial power." The United States had a strong stockpile of atomic weapons, but thermonuclear bombs had only recently been tested. The first nuclear-powered submarine was still on the way. Major production plants were under construction in the years after the outbreak of the Korean conflict. The United States was still largely dependent on imports for the raw materials of nuclear power and nuclear weapons.

All of these situations were left to the Republicans when Mr. Eisenhower took office in January 1953.

International

The international deadlock was broken when, on December 8, 1953, President Eisenhower made a world-applauded address before the United Nations General Assembly, and brought forth the first fresh approach to this problem since 1946: that peaceful boons from atomic science could be achieved by united effort, and need not wait until the intricate problem of weapons control was solved.

Since that time, 42 nations, and the city of West Berlin, have joined with the United States in bilateral agreements to develop and apply this new source of energy to economic betterment and human welfare throughout the free world.

The nations of Western Europe formed the Euratom community to develop and build nuclear power stations in cooperation with the United States.

The International Atomic Energy Agency, which President Eisenhower proposed in his historic address, has become an actuality with 70 nations cooperating for peaceful uses of the atom. The Organization of American States is moving forward with atomic sciences and applications.

In recent months there have been conferences between the Western Allies and the Soviet Union on means of ending the menace of nuclear warfare, and weapons tests have been suspended.

The United States has given comprehensive libraries of atomic energy information to 58 countries, and 5 international organizations. It has made or authorized grants to 19 nations to assist in research reactor projects, and is making grants of research equipment.

Our Nation has allocated more than three-quarter billion dollars' worth of uranium 235 for sale or lease to friendly nations, and has provided deferred payment for the fuel for power reactors overseas. An equal amount has been made available for similar purposes in the United States.

The United States initiated the first International Conference on Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy in 1955 in which 72 nations participated. In this and in the second United Nations Conference on Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy held in 1958, this country presented for unlimited use a great volume of data to assist further progress in beneficial uses. Cooperation in the application of atomic energy to the welfare of man has become a living fact throughout the free world.

The new atomic charter

The President's pledge before the world in 1953 was swiftly supported in 1954 by a new charter for the peaceful development of atomic energy in the United States, and for cooperative work with other nations. This notable legislation of the Republican administration—the Atomic Energy Act of 1954—opened the door for private ownership and development of atomic power. It ended the Federal monopoly on atomic science and technology. It authorized and energized international cooperation for all peaceful purposes. It made possible the rapid advances of the last 6 years in applying atomic energy to mankind's betterment.

Atomic power

The United States leads the world in atomic power today, a leadership measured not in the production of high-cost kilowatts, but in the basic technology and variety of approaches to the problem of competitive costs for power. Industry is cooperating fully in the attack on this problem.

Eight nuclear powerplants that were not even on the designing boards when this administration took office are now operable, and 21 additional plants have been authorized for construction, either by Government or by industry.

Most of the plants are relatively small, but we can expect—on the basis of plants already authorized—a total of some 1,400,000 kilowatts of electricity on the line by the end of 1964. Most of this capacity will come into operation during 1960, 1961, and 1962.

A survey of expenditures and commitments for nuclear reactors, as of the end of 1959, showed that about $1.7 billion was being invested in civilian and military reactors under construction or active development by the Government and industry. About $1 billion of the total was for civilian projects and the remainder for military projects, including more than $650 million for naval powerplants.

This administration has formulated and adopted as guidelines for the Nation's development of civilian nuclear power these five broad objectives:

1. To reduce the cost of nuclear power to competitive levels in high-cost energy areas of this country by 1968.

2. To assist friendly nations now having high-energy cost to achieve competitive levels in a shorter period.

3. To support a continuing long-range program to further reduce the cost of nuclear power.

4. To maintain the U.S. position of leadership in the technology of nuclear power for civilian use.

5. To develop breeder-type reactors to make full use of nuclear energy latent in both uranium and thorium.

The Republican administration has laid plans for an aggressive 10-year effort to accomplish these objectives. We are laying down detailed programs for efficient development. With expanded industrial cooperation, we believe this effort will make it possible to achieve economic nuclear power in high-cost areas of the United States by 1968 with two types of reactors—those cooled with water, and those cooled with organic materials such as benzene derivatives. We believe that, later on, it will be possible to attain economic costs in wider areas of the country.

The Republican administration is continuing its pattern of cooperative development under Federal leadership with the vigorous support of publicly and privately owned utilities.

The leadership of this administration has produced and will continue to produce technology, and to promote development so that, before this country must have nuclear energy to supplement conventional fuels in meeting the ever-growing energy needs of this expanding economy, nuclear power will be available at competitive costs.

Nuclear merchant ships

Late this year, the world's first nuclear-powered merchant ship, the NS *Savannah*, will begin initial test operations in domestic waters. When initial operations are successfully completed, the *Savannah* will visit various ports on both coasts of North America, after which a cruise in foreign waters will be scheduled.

Operation of this vessel will carry over into ships of peace the success of the Navy's developing fleet of nuclear craft. Plans for other merchant ships, and for increasingly efficient nuclear plants, are under development.

The United States is extending into this promising field the technological leadership it already has demonstrated in design, construction, and operation of power reactors.

The promise of research

The flow of knowledge and ideas from research in the atomic energy sciences which has contributed to this Nation's advances has been broadened and expanded.

The Atomic Energy Commission's major laboratories have been strengthened and provided with new facilities for research in physical, medical, and biological sciences. Research in colleges and research institutions has been largely increased. For the current year, there were 1,083 contracts for research of this kind that in total amounted to $52 million—an increase of 75 percent in numbers and more than 185 percent in dollar amounts over 1953.

A portion of this research is directed toward producing useful power from heavy hydrogen in the fusion reaction—the field of controlled thermonuclear research. Encouraging first results have been won, and each year sees further gains.

This program is for the future, but to make sure that this Nation and the world gain every possible advantage from this field, our research in controlled thermonuclear power has been expanded several hundredfold, and the results made available to the public, to science, and to industry.

Every practical use for nuclear energy that our scientists and technologists can extract is being fully exploited.

The United States is investigating the possible peaceful uses of nuclear explosives (the plowshare program).

Many peaceful applications such as scientific measurements, excavation, exploitation of natural resources, production of power and isotopes, and the development of new industrial chemicals appear to be feasible. Initial experiments are being considered in excavation, power and isotope production, and in oil recovery. No detonation of nuclear devices has been authorized.

Initial tests have been successfully completed in a series of experiments leading toward the use of nuclear energy to propel space vehicles.

Lightweight, compact nuclear batteries—actually miniature electric plants—are being developed for a wide range of applications, including power for space vehicle instruments. They give promise of having other practical uses—to power remote weather stations and navigation aids, and as power sources for isolated stations.

Radioisotopes

Since 1953 the use of radioisotopes in research and in practical applications has increased threefold. As tools of research, as diagnostic and therapeutic devices in medicine, and as adjuncts of industrial operations, these radioactive varieties of chemical elements have already yielded the equivalent of large dividends on the tax investment in atomic energy.

The ills of a million medical patients are being diagnosed or treated with the aid of radioisotopes each year—a rapidly developing program urged by the Republican administration.

In agriculture, radioisotopes have opened the way to new and more accurate knowledge of the action of fertilizers on crops, of weedkillers and other chemical aids to agriculture. Radiation applied to plant genetics has assisted in developing rust-resistant strains of oats and wheat, and stronger, higher-yielding strains of peanuts. The screwworm fly—that costly pest of the cattle industry—has been practically eradicated from the Southeastern States, and the campaign of eradication is being extended.

In industry, savings through the use of isotopes have been increasing rapidly since 1953 and further savings lie ahead. Radioisotopes are being used to preserve food and avert food contamination, to improve sewage disposal, to combat sewage and stream pollution, and to increase industrial safety.

Many isotope applications have become standard practice for an entire segment of industry.

Over 90 percent of the tire fabric and 80 percent of the tin cans made in the United States now are controlled in production by radioisotope thickness gages. Similar devices are contributing to the efficiency of steel rolling mills.

To hasten realization of these, and of other benefits from the use of radioisotopes, the Atomic Energy Commission has undertaken, with the encouragement of the Republican administration, a development program to discover new uses of public benefit, to increase training and understanding in industrial uses, and to make larger quantities of radioisotopes available at lower cost.

Over 1 million curies of radioisotopes valued at $20 million have been shipped to doctors, researchers, industries, and private processors.

Industrial participation

The great increase of industrial participation in the atomic energy program, and the growth of international cooperation, were made possible by the grants of authority under the new charter, the Atomic Energy Act of 1954. Under the previous law, a vast body of scientific and technical knowledge necessarily was held secret.

Since passage of the act, the United States has established a privately owned atomic energy industry, licensed, regulated, and inspected to assure the public health and safety.

This progress would not have been possible without the success of vigorous efforts to place in the public domain, accessible to all, most of the nonweapons technological data previously held secret by the Government. This enormous, but careful, release of information has been accomplished without compromising the essential defense and security of this country.

Indicative of this progress is the rate of declassification of technical reports during the last 6 years. In 1954 fewer than 9,000 reports had been declassified; by 1960 the total had grown to more than 30,000.

In addition, the United States has made strong efforts to see that the technical information produced in the atomic energy program has been assembled into reports and distributed. In 1954 some 300,000 individual copies of reports had been placed on deposit at libraries through the country for open use by scientists and engineers; by 1960 this number of documents had grown to over 2,400,000. The reports also have been made available through public sale.

Health and safety

The Republican administration has actively enforced safeguards for the public health in every phase of atomic energy activity.

It laid down the licensing and regulation procedures for U.S. industry, based on years of experience and research in Government operation.

It established a Federal Radiation Council to advise on safety standards, and a Reactor Safeguard Committee to review licensed reactor installations from the standpoint of safety—both bodies afterward being given a statutory charter by the Congress.

This country has readily made available to the use of all nations its knowledge and techniques in the fields of radiation safety—the basis for an unprecedented record of safety in the Federal atomic energy program which has received numerous safety awards—so that this vast new source of energy may be put to work for mankind with a minimum of hazard.

Production

During this administration, a complex of production plants was completed which pours out a steady flow of uranium 235 and plutonium for production of the nuclear weapons that guard the free world, and for the production of power in nuclear reactors.

The United States has become the world's leading producer of uranium ore. In fact, the rate of discovery and the flow of raw materials in this country became so large that, since 1957 and 1958, it was necessary for the Government to announce a limitation on development and purchase to bring the domestic supply, plus its commitment for imports, more nearly in line with requirements. This contrasts with the inadequate supplies of uranium up to the mid-1950's—under another administration.

Atomic defense

The United States has, of course, continued to produce and improve powerful weapons for the defense of the free world.

The noblest product of this Nation's atomic energy program is the shield for the peace of the free world. The number of weapons has increased many fold in total numbers as well as in the variety and military usefulness of fissionable material. New designs have been introduced, and others are under development, which greatly simplify the logistic problems of nuclear weapons use, and which meet specific military requirements. As a result of these gains, increased emphasis became possible on defensive weapons to protect the people of the free world from airborne or missile-borne attack.

The contribution of atomic energy to free world defense goes far beyond the design and production of weapons and new methods for their delivery. It has made possible a fleet of nuclear-powered warships without equal in the world.

The first nuclear-powered submarine was launched in January 1954. Since that time, the *Nautilus* and other nuclear submarines—the *Skate*, the *Seawolf*, the *Triton*—have cruised thousands of miles beneath the surface, have crossed and recrossed the North Pole beneath the ice, have circled the globe while submerged. They are the first true submersibles in the world, as contrasted with the earlier submarines which were actually surface craft capable of submerging.

This achievement, unique in the world, has added greatly to the international stature of the United States as a pioneer in technology, and as a leader in atomic energy development.

This administration has been prompt to seize upon and exploit our lead in this important aspect of defense.

We are building a nuclear navy, presently including 37 atomic submarines, constructed or authorized—10 already are operating—3 surface vessels, a missile armed cruiser and destroyer, and an aircraft carrier.

We are developing small portable nuclear power stations for use in remote regions such as on the DEW-line radar warning system.

Summary

The progress of this Nation in all aspects of atomic energy during the Republican administration has been sound and rapid—in peaceful uses of this new source of energy and its products, in developing power, and in promoting human welfare in this and other countries.

Equally, this awful power has been harnessed for the defense and protection of the free world.

The promise for mankind's betterment, and for peace, is strong and encouraging.

The progress is steadily forward.

VI

THE REPUBLICAN RECORD ON BEHALF OF SMALL BUSINESS, 1953–60

(By U.S. Senator STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire)

American small business has grown and prospered more in the 7½ years of the Republican administration than at any time during the previous 20 years.

Today, there are 4,666,000 businesses in the United States, an alltime high, and 95 percent of them are small enterprises.

The Small Business Administration, created in 1953 by the Republican 83d Congress upon recommendation of the Republican administration, now is a permanent agency, by act of Congress in 1958—upon the recommendation of President Eisenhower.

Twenty thousand business loans have been made by the Small Business Administration for an aggregate of about $930 million, of which about $787 million have been furnished by SBA, the remainder coming from local banks and lending institutions which participated.

SBA loans of all types—though running high into the thousands—have been good loans in more than 98 cases out of 100. Fewer than 2 percent of all SBA loans have been written off as losses. This record attests to the character of those who are the backbone of our economy—the small businessman.

Enterprises in all States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands have been aided.

The Small Business Administration's activities extend far beyond the lending program.

More than 9,000 disaster loans have been made—at 3 percent interest—to owners of homes, businesses, and charitable institutions damaged or destroyed by floods, storms, droughts, or other natural disasters. These loans have amounted to some $96 million, with local banks furnishing about $3½ million and the SBA furnishing the remainder.

The Congress declared, in creating the agency, that particular effort should be di-

rected toward helping small businesses to participate in Government contracts and services.

Under what is called the joint set-aside program, SBA has worked closely with other Government agencies to get proposed Federal purchases, sales, and services specifically earmarked for competitive bidding by qualified small enterprises. The results in this case have been great. More than 79,700 contracts, valued at nearly $5 billion, have been channeled into small businesses by this program.

Similar services by SBA include certificates of competency, which go to concerns showing their capacity to perform specific Government contracts. About 700 of these certificates have been issued, resulting in contracts amounting to $105 million.

Another program is called registration of facilities. Under it, small concerns are placed on appropriate bidders' lists. There are approximately 46,600 firms registered with SBA under this program.

A popular SBA program is that of research and development which is carried on at Government expense and the findings or benefits passed on to small concerns not individually able to do it themselves.

Other SBA projects provide small plant production surveys and regular listings of new products and processes which small firms might want to take up.

The Small Business Administration's management assistance program has been of widespread value. The agency publishes a variety of technical aids for small manufacturers, wholesalers, and retailers, which are distributed free upon request. Nearly 8 million of these have been distributed.

This program includes special management courses offered by public and private schools and other institutions. Instituted 6 years ago, this project has been offered in 275 institutions for a total of 800 courses. More than 24,000 small business owners and managers have attended. The cost is borne by tuitions.

Financial grants have been made to schools and colleges across the country for specific small business management research studies. These findings are later released, in published form, to small businesses.

The Small Business Investment Division, created by Congress in 1958, helps finance small firms at the local level.

This program has generated (mid-June) over $80 million in funds, mostly private, which are available for long-term loans and equity financing of small businesses through privately owned and operated Small Business Investment Companies (SBIC's), licensed by the Small Business Administration.

Already, more than 100 SBIC's have been formed. They are located in all parts of the country. Hundreds of small firms have been financed by these SBIC's in a wide variety of industries.

SBA helps small businesses through loans to State and local development companies. This is to help establish diversified industries in local communities through Government cooperation with local citizens. In this way, SBA has helped to finance some 50 projects in 19 States totaling some $10 million.

The small business record of the Republican administration is one of outstanding assistance in helping to keep the national economy healthy and prosperous and to provide jobs.

VII

FARM CREDIT IMPROVEMENTS UNDER THE REPUBLICAN ADMINISTRATION, 1953–60

(By U.S. Senator GORDON ALLOTT, of Colorado)

As a young lawyer in the farm community of Lamar, Colo., many years ago, I saw firsthand the hazards which beset the farmer and have marveled since that time at the courage and self-reliance with which the American farmer approaches his problems.

Situations outside his power, such as drought, wind, and erosion, create havoc. Other conditions over which he has no control also occur. In these the farmer and rancher can rightly expect assistance from their Government.

Since the beginning of my service in the Senate, I have sought new legislation to simplify the national farm credit laws. Every means should be utilized to help the farmer help himself by alleviating the problem of obtaining suitable and adequate financing at the time it is needed.

Farmers and ranchers have traditionally demonstrated the ability to handle their myriad of problems with the least possible Government interference. An outstanding example of the Government working shoulder to shoulder with the farmer is the cooperative Farm Credit System under this Republican administration.

Summary of major accomplishments in the cooperative farm credit system

Legislative Accomplishments

Beginning with the Farm Credit Act of 1953, in the first year of the Republican administration, a series of laws have consituted major steps in increasing farmer participation in ownership, improving credit service, reducing Federal Government investment and subsidies in the system, and strengthening the system in other ways. Important features of each law are summarized below:

A. Farm Credit Act of 1953 (Public Law 202, 83d Cong.):

1. Established congressional policy of increasing borrower participation in ownership of the Federal farm credit system.

2. Again made the Farm Credit Administration an independent agency in the executive branch of the Government.

3. Improved coordination through changing the basic organization of the Governor's staff.

4. Increased farmer participation in the management and control of the farm credit system through establishment of the Federal Farm Credit Board and through an increase in the elected members of the district farm credit boards.

5. Provided for increased decentralization and for delegation by the Farm Credit Administration to the Federal land banks and the production credit corporations (FICB's after January 1, 1957) of certain powers and duties of the Administration over the Federal land bank associations (formerly national farm loan associations) and the production credit associations.

The 1953 act was the foundation for the subsequent laws. It restated the objectives of the cooperative system, and directed the Federal Farm Credit Board to make recommendations of means for carrying out these objectives. The following acts were based on recommendations made by the Federal Farm Credit Board.

B. Farm Credit Act of 1955 (Public Law 347, 84th Cong.):

1. Federal land banks:

(a) Loan service of land banks to part-time farmers was expanded; more than 30,000 loans amounting to about $160 million were made to part-time farmers through 1959.

(b) Permitted land bank loans to be closed on the basis of appraisals by land bank designees.

(c) Eliminated the restriction that loans to farming corporations be limited to livestock operations so that land banks may make loans to closely held or family-type farming corporations. Loans totaling about $24 million were made to 387 such corporations through 1959.

(d) Increased the land bank loan limit from $100,000 to $200,000. Since the 1955 act about 777 loans were made for amounts exceeding $100,000.

2. Production credit associations:

(a) Authorized the production credit associations to pay dividends on class A (investment) stock without requiring like dividends to be paid on class B (voting) stock.

(b) Removed restrictions on guaranty funds of production credit associations, thereby giving the associations more freedom in the use of their capital funds to meet the credit needs of their members.

3. Banks for cooperatives:

(a) Provided a plan under which the borrowers from the banks for cooperatives will gradually acquire ownership of the banks and retire all Government-owned stock in the banks.

(b) Provided for retirement of Government-owned stock in the banks through quarterly stock purchases by borrowers and from net savings of the banks.

(c) Reorganized the Central Bank for Cooperatives and provided for election by its borrowers and by district banks for cooperatives of three members of the seven-member board of directors. Directors not so elected are appointed by the Governor.

C. Farm Credit Act of 1956 (Public Law 809, 84th Cong.):

1. Merged the production credit corporation in the Federal intermediate credit bank in each farm credit district, thereby simplifying the district organization and effecting a saving in operating costs.

2. Provided a plan under which production credit associations will gradually acquire ownership of the credit banks and retire all Government-owned stock in the banks.

3. Authorized the distribution of credit bank earnings on a patronage basis to the production credit associations and other financing institutions (OFI's). Patronage dividends must be paid in stock (to production credit associations) or participation certificates (to OFI's) as long as there is Government capital in the banks, but thereafter such dividends may be paid in cash.

4. Authorized each district bank to borrow from and lend to each of the other district banks.

5. Authorized the credit banks to discount or purchase loans with maturities up to 5 years.

6. Broadened the purposes for which production credit association loans may be made.

7. Remove the credit banks from budget control under the Government Corporation Control Act, effective January 1, 1959. This gave the credit banks the same authority as the land banks and the banks for cooperatives to expend corporate funds without regard to certain restrictive statutes.

D. Farm Credit Act of 1959 (Public Law 86–168, 86th Cong.):

1. It transferred from the Farm Credit Administration to the Federal land banks responsibility for making appraisals in connection with Federal land bank loans. The designee program was retained but the requirement of a second appraisal was repealed. It transferred land bank appraisers from the Farm Credit Administration to the land banks, except that certain appraisers were retained by the Farm Credit Administration on the staffs of the chief reviewing appraisers, to be known as farm credit appraisers.

2. The 5 percent interest rate limitation on farm loan bonds was repealed.

3. The $200,000 maximum loan limit applicable to land bank loans was repealed but loans exceeding $100,000 continue to require Farm Credit Administration approval.

4. The face amount of a land bank loan may exceed 65 percent of the appraised normal value of the farm by the amount of stock which is paid for out of the loan.

5. The names of the national farm loan associations and the secretary-treasurers of

such associations were changed to "Federal land bank associations" and "managers" respectively.

6. The Federal land banks were authorized to make unamortized or partially amortized loans under rules and regulations issued by the Farm Credit Administration.

7. The status of employees of the farm credit banks was clarified and employees of the district banks are exempt from the provisions of civil service laws and rules and regulations and various other laws relating to Federal employees.

E. Other legislation:

1. Banks for cooperatives:

(a) Authorized the Central Bank for Cooperatives and regional banks for cooperatives to issue consolidated debentures.

(b) Enlarged the board of directors of the Central Bank for Cooperatives to 13 members.

2. Federal land banks (Public Law 55, 84th Cong.): (a) Authorized Federal land banks to purchase certain remaining assets of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation.

3. Developments and improvements in loan service:

Many improvements in credit service resulted from the foregoing legislation. The developments and improvements listed below are partly the result of and partly in addition to the authorities and changes provided in the legislation.

(a) Credit extended reached peak levels. Total amount loaned by all banks and associations, excluding interagency loans and discounts, increased from $2.2 billion in 1953 to $4 billion in 1959. Loans outstanding December 31 increased from $2.2 billion to $4.4 billion during the same period.

(b) The total volume of bonds and debentures issued, the principal source of funds used in making loans, reached peak levels, increasing from $1.4 billion in 1953 to $3.3 billion in 1959. This period provided a good test of the ability of the banks to market their securities under varying conditions ranging from recession and credit ease to high levels of business activity and credit restraint. No applicants were denied loans because of a lack of funds during this period.

(c) The making and discounting of intermediate-term loans for capital purposes, such as machinery, farm improvement and foundation livestock, were tried out experimentally in 1954 and approved on a permanent basis in 1956. By June 30, 1959, such loans had grown to a total which constituted about 12 percent of all loans held by the Federal intermediate credit banks.

(d) In 1956 production credit associations, on an experimental basis, began entering into agreements with purchasing cooperatives to help finance their members when buying supplies. Such arrangements have now been made with hundreds of supply cooperatives and a number of independent supply dealers in several farm credit districts.

4. General operating improvements:

As in the case of developments in loan service, improvements in other phases of operations have resulted partly from the legislative changes and partly from administrative action.

(a) In accordance with the 1953 act, numerous delegations of authority have been made by the Farm Credit Administration to the Federal land banks and to the production credit corporations (and Federal intermediate credit banks since they were merged under the 1956 act). These delegations have had the effects of streamlining operations and reducing the personnel required in supervision of the system.

(b) Although the work has increased, indicated by a doubling of the total loan volume outstanding, substantial reductions in personnel employed have been made in both the Farm Credit Administration, the supervisory organization, and the banks and associations supervised.

(c) Major adjustments of standards used in appraising farms for land bank loans, in order to adapt loan policy better to changing agricultural conditions, were made in 1954 and 1958.

(d) Although substantial amounts of Government capital in the banks and associations were repaid to the Treasury, their total net worth was increased:

[Millions of dollars]

	Dec. 31, 1953	Dec. 31, 1959	Change
Government capital	277.2	219.2	−58.0
Farmer capital	185.4	336.4	+151.0
Surplus and reserves	531.9	650.2	+118.3
Total net worth	994.5	1,205.8	+211.3

VIII

THE REPUBLICAN RECORD ON LABOR-MANAGEMENT, 1953–60

(By U.S. Senator EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, of Illinois)

Minimum wage

In 1955 the minimum wage under the Fair Labor Standards Act was raised from 75 cents to $1 and the Department of Labor has continuously recommended an extension of minimum wage protection to several million additional workers.

The average weekly wage in the Nation's manufacturing industry has jumped from $69.60 for a 40-hour week when Mr. Truman left office to $91.20 (as of May 1960) under the Republican administration.

Unemployment insurance

The benefits of the unemployment insurance program were extended under the Republican administration to provide, for the first time, permanent coverage for 2.6 million ex-servicemen. Coverage was also extended to 2.4 million Federal employees and 1.2 million employees of small businesses.

Temporary additional benefits were initiated for those whose payments had been exhausted during periods of high unemployment; this action greatly relieved personal hardship and helped to stabilize the economy.

Legislation was sponsored and enacted under which advances were made to States for unemployment compensation purposes where State benefit funds were seriously depleted.

The States were actively encouraged to improve their unemployment compensation benefits. Since 1953 all States have made improvements in their unemployment compensation laws. All States, except one, increased the benefits under their plans; as a result, average weekly benefits have been increased by 40 percent and maximum duration of benefits has been extended more than 2 weeks.

The Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act was materially strengthened by increased benefits and extended periods of coverage.

Labor-management legislation

The Republican administration sponsored and supported the enactment of legislation to encourage and permit greater participation of union members in the affairs of their unions and to rid labor-management relations of racketeers and crooks.

Collective bargaining

It has been the firm policy of the Republican administration to strengthen and promote the processes of free collective bargaining. The administration has conducted a continuing and vigorous campaign to encourage a better understanding between labor and management and to improve the entire tenor of labor-management relations.

In 1959 there were 27.5 percent fewer strikes involving 46.9 percent fewer workers than in 1952, demonstrating a remarkable improvement in general industrial peace in spite of the prolonged steel strike which, by itself, accounted for over three-fourths of the man-days idle which occurred during the year 1959.

In 1959 agreements were concluded without appreciable work stoppage in a great many major industries, including anthracite coal, electric and gas utilities, west coast longshore, paper and petroleum refining.

Occupational safety and health

Enforcible saftey standards, regulating equipment, processes, and work places, were established for longshoremen and ship repair workers, which will greatly reduce the hazards of their work.

Field offices in the major ports of the United States provide safety services to the maritime industries, State governments, Federal agencies, and labor unions.

Comparisons are being made of existing State safety regulations with American safety standards. These studies will assist States in improving their safety regulations and promote greater uniformity in such standards.

Four President's Conferences on Occupational Safety have been held in the past 7 years. The conferences, under the chairmanship of the Secretary of Labor, have provided a forum for all groups, large and small, to discuss means of reducing work injuries.

Maximum use of manpower

The Department of Labor, under the Republican administration, has made comprehensive analyses and projections of the manpower resources of the Nation covering the present decade and, in advance, the decade 1960–70. It has informed leaders in industry, education, unions, and local and State governments, and mobilized public action and resources to meet the manpower requirements of the future.

Youth in the labor force

The Department of Labor, through its Bureau of Labor Standards, has promulgated and administered a broad program to meet the developmental needs of the young worker to fill job opportunities. Services cover a broad range, including the distribution of effective advisory information to employers.

A program, designed to prevent school dropouts and to keep children in school until they have received the maximum educational training commensurate with their abilities, has been highly successful.

Cooperative arrangements were made with 9,271 high schools for testing and counseling about 300,000 seniors in 1959. A new edition of the Occupational Outlook Handbook, covering employment outlook for about 600 major occupations, was issued in November.

Older workers

The Republican administration has vigorously promoted the employment of older workers by employers so that the crucial deficit in our human resources can be effectively met during the coming decade. Educational programs to dispel unfounded beliefs as to older worker employability and specialized counseling and job placement, in conjunction with the affiliated State employment services, have been emphasized and expanded.

Women workers

The Department of Labor has placed new emphasis upon the activities of the Women's Bureau and elevated its head to the position of an Assistant to the Secretary. Much progress has been made in securing legislation to promote the welfare of women workers. A number of new programs have

been initiated to expand opportunities for women, in higher level jobs and new occupations.

Farm labor

The use of foreign labor has been rigidly scrutinized to insure that it would not adversely affect the employment of domestic farmworkers. In addition, the Department of Labor, operating on its own initiative and with the cooperation of the President's Committee on Migratory Labor, has encouraged the development of State standards in the migratory farm labor area. Of the 28 State migratory farm labor committees which now exist, 22 have been established since the President's Committee was created in August 1954. The emphasis of both the Federal and State committees has been in securing adequate housing, transportation, child labor, and crew leader legislation codes.

Equal job opportunity

More progress has been made in the last 7½ years in eliminating discrimination in employment than ever before. Each year the nondiscrimination clause in Government contracts has taken effect in 7 million contractual transactions involving over $25 billion in goods and services. The President's Committee on Government Contracts (of which Vice President NIXON is Chairman and the Secretary of Labor, Vice Chairman), set up by President Eisenhower to make that clause effective, has been very successful in its task. An increasing number of skilled positions and promotions are becoming available for Negro workers.

Employment of veterans

The Republican administration has maintained a vigilant campaign to insure the full observance of the reemployment rights of veterans. In the past 7 years the Department of Labor has handled 53,000 ex-servicemen's cases. Of these, only 1½ percent had to be referred to the Department of Justice; the remainder were settled to the satisfaction of all parties concerned through discussion and negotiation.

Since 1952 almost 10 million veterans were placed in jobs through the local offices of our Federal and State employment service; a great many of these veterans received individual employment counseling.

Pension and welfare funds

As a first step, protection was provided beneficiaries of pension and welfare funds through a disclosure act requiring reporting of financial operation of funds to the Secretary of Labor. The Department has continuously pressed for legislation essential to make the act effective and enforcible.

Cooperative efforts with the States

The Department of Labor has since 1953 placed particular stress upon improving the wages, hours, and working conditions of America's working men and women through action by State and local communities. Gratifying results have been achieved by close cooperation with State authorities; more progress in good labor legislation has been made by State legislatures since 1953 than in any comparable period since the basic labor laws were originally enacted.

Substantial headway has been made in minimum wage legislation. Thirty-five States now have minimum wage laws. Since January 1953 five States have enacted such laws for the first time. In five more States, which already had such legislation, new and improved laws were adopted. In addition, 10 States raised their statutory minimum limits.

Because of legislative action since the Republican administration took office in 1953 to date, workmen's compensation benefits of $40 or more are now being paid in 30 jurisdictions, with 16 of these providing benefits of $50 or more.

Major improvements in child-labor laws were made in about a dozen States from 1953 to date. In the same period, the number of States having Fair Employment Practices Acts, prohibiting discriminatory practices of employers, employment agencies, and unions, has increased from 8 to 16.

Enforcement of fair labor standards legislation

Diligent efforts have been made to prevent unscrupulous employers from taking advantage of their employees and unfairly competing by violating the provision of fair labor standards legislation.

In fiscal year 1959 a total of 1,360 enforcement actions took place under the Fair Labor Standards Act and the Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act.

This is the largest number of cases litigated in any year since these acts have been in effect and more than twice the number of cases which occurred in 1955.

In the last 7 fiscal years, more than $60 million has been paid to over 700,000 employees by employers who had violated the minimum wage and overtime provision of these laws.

This represents approximately 20 percent more back wages than was collected in a comparable period under the previous Democratic administration.

Since January 1953, almost 300 firms and individuals have been ruled ineligible as a result of violating the Davis-Bacon Act and related legislation. This is in striking contrast to a total of only four actions imposed in the entire 17-year history of this law from 1935 through 1952.

Administrative improvements

The establishment services of the Department of Labor have been evaluated and many new programs initiated to improve the skills and employment opportunities of the labor force, to provide statistical and other essential data to labor, management, and the public; the Washington and field offices have been reorganized and the career service strengthened.

International affairs

To achieve U.S. foreign policy objectives, the Government's international labor activities have been strengthened. Labor attachés have been increased from 35 to 62 and the United States has provided effective leadership in the International Labor Organizations. These efforts have been reinforced by active cooperation with American trade unions.

IX

COMMERCE, TRANSPORTATION, BUSINESS—A BRIEF SURVEY OF ADVANCES IN THESE FIELDS UNDER THE REPUBLICAN ADMINISTRATION, 1953–60

(By U.S. Senator ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL, of Kansas)

Good times mean more jobs, good wages and decent profits; and under the Republican administration times have never been better.

The gross national product has soared from $345 billion in 1952 to over $500 billion today. The Department of Commerce, under the Republican administration, helped make our economy strong.

In January 1953, when the Republican administration took office, the average weekly wage in manufacturing was $69.60 for a 40-hour week. Today, it is $91.20.

Transportation

The long overdue St. Lawrence Seaway was finally made a reality by the relentless efforts of the administration, turning the Great Lakes areas into our "fourth seacoast."

It was formally opened in 1959 by Queen Elizabeth and President Eisenhower.

The NS *Savannah*, the world's first nuclear merchant ship, was launched in 1959 by Mrs. Eisenhower. It is a joint project of the Maritime Administration and the Atomic Energy Commission.

The National System of Interstate and Defense Highways was begun in 1956 and is now progressing as rapidly as available funds will allow. The Federal financing of these highways is on a pay-as-you-go basis, thus directing the financial burden toward the users of the highways rather than the general taxpayer.

Exhaustive transportation studies were completed with a view to stimulating competition and reorganizing those Government departments directly concerned.

Over 500 commercial-type Federal activities have been abolished; for example, the Inland Waterways Corporation's Federal barge line was sold to a private firm, turning a deficit liability into a taxpaying asset.

Scientific and technological research

In 1960 the Coast and Geodetic Survey began a full-scale oceanographic examination which will add to our knowledge of the sea and will undoubtedly uncover new sources of food, fuel, and metals. The Survey's modernized seismic wave warning system saved hundreds of lives following the recent Chilean earthquake.

In basic scientific research the National Bureau of Standards is now in the vanguard, contributing significantly not only to business but also to our national defense and space efforts.

The research work of the Weather Bureau has brought us near to a major breakthrough in understanding and predicting the weather of the world. The successful launching of the Tiros weather satellite captured the attention of the entire world.

The installation of advanced computers in the Patent Office has revolutionized its patent search procedure, making it feasible to speed up processing of an accelerating number of patent applications.

Business statistics and services

Taking its cue from the President's special message to Congress in March 1960, the Department's Bureau of Foreign Commerce launched an extensive export promotion program.

It is expected that this export drive will contribute significantly to the attainment of new markets and profits for American business and, in so doing, create new jobs and minimize the deficit in our balance of international payments.

The Bureau of the Census, operating with the latest electric computers and tabulating machines, is completing the decennial census of population in record time and with unparalleled accuracy and efficiency.

Various commercial statistics now compiled by the Bureau of the Census have been of great assistance to private business planners.

The Office of Business Economics has become the oracle to the question, "How is business?" Its basic indexes are used by economic prognosticators and planners with greater reliance than ever before. Government, labor, and business can now plan for tomorrow without relying on the divining rod approach of yesterday. The story depicted by these economic statistics dramatically demonstrates the strength of the free enterprise system.

The Business and Defense Services Administration was set up in 1953 with 25 industry divisions to provide American business with up-to-date information and advice. Its Office of Area Development was established to cope with the problems of diversifying industry and relieving chronic unemployment. Mindful of the chaos in Government during World War II, the administration created the National Defense Executive Reserve, consisting of business and professional men who would occupy key posts in the event of an emergency.

President Eisenhower proclaimed 1960 as Visit the U.S.A. Year, and it is expected that in 1960 there will be a 20-percent increase over 1959 in the amount of money spent by visitors to the United States. This money will help to relieve the balance of payments deficit, without the use of artificial controls.

To demonstrate the strength of our free enterprise system and to achieve better international economic relations, the Office of International Trade Fairs has stimulated the U.S. participation in 83 oversea fairs in 28 countries since 1954. By this means, the administration, in cooperation with free enterprise, is helping sell more American products in previously untapped foreign markets.

The Republican administration has diligently administered the Export Control Act to assure an embargo on trade with Red China and to prevent strategic commodities from falling into the hands of the Communists.

X

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY ACCOMPLISHMENTS—THE WORLD'S GREATEST WATERWAY SYSTEM DEVELOPED BY AND UNDER THE REPUBLICAN ADMINISTRATION

(By U.S. Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin)

The St. Lawrence River, together with the Gulf of St. Lawrence and the Great Lakes Basin, provides a continuous waterway extending 2,342 miles into the heart of the North American Continent from the Atlantic Ocean. They constitute the greatest inland water system in the world.

The St. Lawrence Seaway project, connecting these waterways with the Atlantic Ocean, was created by law May 13, 1954—and was a Republican-sponsored project from start to finish. The $124 million seaway was established as a self-sustaining and self-liquidating enterprise. Construction activities were financed by proceeds from revenue bonds issued to the Secretary of the Treasury. The cost of operations, payment of interest, and the repayment of borrowings are financed from toll revenues.

Although the St. Lawrence Seaway in its generally accepted scope extends only from Montreal to Lake Erie, it is nonetheless a vital part of the St. Lawrence River-Great Lakes Waterway. It provides the connecting link between the lower reaches of the St. Lawrence River and the Great Lakes.

By the use of 15 locks, oceangoing vessels and large lake-type vessels are raised or lowered a total of 552 feet. This is the highest total elevation that large vessels are lifted or lowered in any waterway of the world. The St. Lawrence Seaway provides navigation facilities for large ships with cargo carrying capacity up to 8,500 tons for oceangoing general cargo vessels and up to 25,000 tons for lake bulk-type vessels.

The St. Lawrence Seaway from Montreal to Lake Erie is operated under concepts, principles, and laws which distinguish it from other waterways in the United States and Canada.

The seaway is international in character. The navigation facilities are located in both Canada and the United States.

The seaway is operated by governmental corporations of two countries, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation of the United States and the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority of Canada. Each corporation is given certain powers and obligations for carrying out the responsibilities of its respective laws. The Seaway Development Corporation has authority to make arrangements and negotiations with the Seaway Authority of Canada on the operation and maintenance of the seaway.

The major accomplishments of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation are as follows:

1. The St. Lawrence Seaway was opened to deep-draft vessels on April 25, 1959, on a toll basis. During the 1959 navigation season, 6,595 cargo vessels transited the seaway with 20½ million tons of cargo. The income derived from the seaway was sufficient to pay all operating costs and to return to the Treasurer of the United States $2,150,999 as a payment on the accrued interest and debt of the Corporation. The U.S. portion of the seaway is operated with a small number of employees. The total employment in June was 179.

2. The U.S. portion of the seaway, which consists of the Eisenhower and Snell locks, the 10-mile Wiley-Dondero Channel, dredging in the Thousand Islands and in the South Channel at Cornwall, as well as the construction of the related navigation facilities including floating plant, has for all practical purposes been completed. The Corporation constructed jointly with the Seaway Authority of Canada the Cornwall-Massena International Bridge. This was done under a tight construction schedule which was reduced in time from 7 to 5 years.

3. All arrangements with the Seaway Authority of Canada, and the Power Authority of the State of New York and the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario were made and the work coordinated in order to meet the completion schedule of the agencies in the two countries involved.

4. The St. Lawrence Seaway Development Comporation completed a study and negotiated an agreement on tolls with the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority of Canada. The agreement was approved by the President on February 25, 1959, and later made the subject of an exchange of notes between the United States and Canada.

5. The St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation and the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority of Canada prescribed operating rules and regulations for vessels transiting the seaway. These joint regulations are uniform throughout the seaway.

6. The construction of the seaway, exclusive of interest during construction, was financed for about $124 million. This is well within the $140 million borrowing authority authorized by the Congress to construct the U.S. portion of the seaway.

XI

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE REPUBLICAN ADMINISTRATION IN NATURAL RESOURCES AND CONSERVATION, 1953–60

(By U.S. Senator KARL E. MUNDT, of South Dakota)

More progress has been made between January 1953 and May 1960 in the intelligent conservation, prudent use, and orderly development of America's priceless natural resources, than in any comparable 7-year-plus period in our history.

With the Republican Party giving true meaning to national conservation goals, these have been some of the salient accomplishments:

1. Vast new sections of the arid West have been opened to productive life through the Republican administration's insistence on accelerated construction of reclamation dams and reservoirs.

2. Unprecedented increases in the production of hydroelectric power have contributed to a blossoming of industrial development throughout many of the Western States.

3. Our great network of national parks has been expanded and revitalized.

4. Fish and wildlife conservation has moved forward at a rate unmatched in previous history.

5. Effective steps have been taken to insure wise development of our mineral resources.

6. During fiscal year 1959, the Department of the Interior's Bureau of Land Management took in revenues of over $136,700,000 from the conservation and development of the Nation's public domain lands. Since 1785, total revenues from the lease and sale of public domain lands and resources have exceeded $2 billion. The significance of the fact that more than half of this sum has come in since January 1953 needs little emphasizing. At the same time—recognizing the growing values of public domain lands under departmental management—a set of stringent anti-speculation policies have been adopted to provide full protection of the public interest.

7. The urgent short-term and long-range water needs of the Nation are being met through imaginative new programs.

8. Statehood has been won for Alaska and Hawaii, thus opening vast new resource reserves to increased productivity and development.

9. Important new programs have been launched to conserve and develop the human resource represented by our Indian population.

This list consists of only the highlights of a massive total conservation upsuge that has, directly or indirectly, helped to better the lives of all Americans under the Republican administration.

These striking accomplishments, achieved through forward-looking programs, are in close accord with the basic conservation philosophy of the Republican Party.

Promotion of cooperative planning and effort—teamwork—in natural resource conservation and development has been a cornerstone of the positive resource policies of the Eisenhower-Nixon Republican administration. This teamwork approach has paved the way for a resource development effort by both public and private enterpise without parallel in our history. The 1953–60 period seems certain to go down in history as our most golden era in resource progress.

The Republican Party is keenly aware of the fact that today's generation has a solemn obligation to conserve our physical and scenic resources for tomorrow's children. At the same time, the Nation's high standards of living give ample proof that intelligent conservation and orderly development of natural resources are compatible.

Reclamation

Today—after nearly 50 years of the Federal Government's reclamation program which was proposed and started by the Republican Party under President Theodore Roosevelt—some 7,500,000 acres of irrigable land in the 17 Western States are served by reclamation projects. Power-generating capacity stands at more than 5 million kilowatts. Crops produced with reclamation water are worth nearly $1 billion a year.

These are impressive figures.

But far more impressive is the record of accomplishment in the more recent 1953–60 Republican years. This Republican administration has underway the largest water resources construction program in history—a record $1.2 billion was requested in the 1961 budget for flood control, navigation, irrigation, power, and related water resources projects.

In the field of reclamation, since 1953 the Republican administration has sponsored, and Congress has authorized, 51 reclamation projects, or project units, including the billion-dollar Colorado River storage project, the largest reclamation undertaking ever approved in a single piece of legislation.

Included also were the Glendo unit of the Missouri River Basin project in Wyoming, recently dedicated; the Talent division of the Rogue River Basin project in Oregon; the Trinity River division of the Central Valley project in California; the Lavaca Flats, Mirage Flats extension, and O'Neill units of the Missouri Basin project in Nebraska.

Taken together, these 51 new projects or project units will have a storage capacity of nearly 42 million acre-feet—an increase of 50 percent over the Bureau of Reclamation's storage capacity in mid-1953.

These 51 new projects will ultimately provide full or supplemental irrigation water for nearly 890,000 acres of land—an area larger than Rhode Island and a 12 percent increase over the total irrigable acreage of reclamation projects for the 1953 crop year.

Their hydroelectric powerplants will deliver each year about 8½ billion kilowatt-hours of energy—an increase of one-third over the total energy generated at Bureau hydroelectric plants during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953—the last fiscal year planned by the Truman administration.

Over the same 7-year period, on some of these projects and on units of others authorized earlier, the administration has undertaken 44 new construction starts including nine supplementary projects, and involving a total present and future investment of nearly a billion dollars.

For the 8 fiscal years ending June 30, 1961, the Department of the Interior has had or requested a total of $1,765 million appropriated for the work of its Bureau of Reclamation. In other words, nearly $1 out of every $3 made available for reclamation activities since 1902 ($4,723 million) will have been appropriated during the Eisenhower administration.

This impressive financial support for western resource development has been possible in spite of record peacetime defense costs, and in spite of the fact that in every fiscal year but one, the Congress, controlled in every session but one by the Democrats, has failed to appropriate as much money as the Republican administration requested for reclamation work.

The importance of the reclamation program to the West cannot be overestimated. Bureau of Reclamation projects deliver annually about 260 billion gallons of water for 106 municipalities and 68 industrial entities scattered throughout the West. Irrigation water is delivered to more than 128,000 farms, embracing more than 8 million acres. These farms produce crops valued at nearly $1 billion annually. The daily activities of nearly 10 million persons who live on farms in industrial areas and in cities provided with water from reclamation projects are vitally affected by these artificially developed supplies of lifegiving water.

These, then, are some of the spectacular accomplishments in reclamation by the Eisenhower-Nixon Republican administration in the short span of a little more than 7 years. The results of this achievement have contributed immeasurably to the economic stability, not only of the West, but the Nation as a whole.

In addition to authorization of the billion-dollar Colorado River storage project, which will store and transport water for consumption in a four-State, semiarid area larger than New England, a second far-reaching legislative accomplishment of the Eisenhower-Nixon administration was the enactment of legislation to provide loans and grants for local construction of small (less than $5 million in Federal participation) reclamation projects and distribution systems for existing reclamation irrigation projects. This program—long advocated by western water user groups—was not finally authorized until 1955, yet a total of nearly $40 million had been appropriated for loans and grants by early 1960, and other requests were awaiting final action.

A third highly significant legislative milestone of this Republican administration in regard to reclamation was passage of Public Law 85–500, known as the Water Supply Act of 1958.

This act provides authority for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior to make provision for storage, not only for immediate but also for future water supply needs in connection with Federal multipurpose projects, thereby permitting the Federal Government and local interests to share equitably in the benefits of multiple-purpose construction.

Hydroelectric power

Some indication of the almost incredible scope of the natural resource accomplishments of the Republican administration may be found in an examination of the results achieved from a single phase of conservation in a single area of America.

The Pacific Northwest today, with its plentiful and low-cost hydroelectric energy—increasing more than twofold in the years since 1953—is the strong right arm of a burgeoning era of progress and prosperity. In little more than 7 years, the Federal Government's Columbia River power system grew from two multipurpose dams—Bonneville and Grand Coulee with an installed capacity of 1,814,400 kilowatts—to 17 multipurpose projects completed or under construction with an ultimate installed capacity of 7,818,650 kilowatts.

Currently, the Pacific Northwest region has 161 hydroelectric plants with nearly 10,600,000 kilowatts of installed capacity—two-thirds of them completed or placed under construction during this administration.

Presently under construction, scheduled, or under active consideration are 74 additional projects with an installed capacity of nearly 12 million kilowatts. Half of this capacity is either actively under construction now, or firmly scheduled.

Since 1953, power generated at Federal dams in the Pacific Northwest has totaled 228.3 billion kilowatt-hours—a figure nearly 3½ times greater than that for the preceding 10 years. During this some period, generation from non-Federal dams nearly doubled.

Over $1.5 billion has been allocated to power facilities in the short span of something more than 7 years, a fourfold increase over the total for the previous 10 years due to the progressive construction of hydroelectric dams by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the Department of the Interior's Bureau of Reclamation, together with the transmission facilities of Interior's Bonneville Power Administration. As of May 1, 1960, more than $647 million has been repaid to the U.S. Treasury from power revenues—all of this under the Republican administration.

Recreational resources

Probably in no other area of our national life are the immediate demands being placed on an invaluable resource by the explosive nature of our population growth more dramatically illustrated than in the increasing pressures on America's recreational resources.

Fantastic as they have been, the Nation's population gains do not begin to approach the corresponding rate of increase in outdoor recreational activities by countless millions of Americans.

In our national parks, for example, there were just 1 million visitors in 1920. By 1959 this figure had risen to over 62 million—an increase of more than 6,000 percent—and the upward curve was continuing.

In the progressive years of the Republican administration, the Department of the Interior spearheaded intensified efforts of recreational planners at all levels of government to provide wholesome outdoor recreational facilities for the multiplying millions of Americans today—and to assure at least corresponding benefits for the generations yet unborn.

Through the dynamic programs of its agencies, the Department, in less than 8 years, has achieved advances in this important era of national life unmatched in previous history. These were some of the accomplishments:

1. The National Park Service, with its 10-year program, Mission 66, made spectacular forward strides in preserving, protecting, and improving the irreplaceable national park system. At the same time, since January 1953, more than 600,000 acres have been added to the system, and a number of new areas have been established within the jurisdiction of the National Park Service, including the establishment of the 29th national park in the Virgin Islands. The total budget for the National Park Service for the first 4 years of Mission 66—a sum approaching $300 million—exceeded the total for the 13 years prior to this administration.

2. The Bureau of Reclamation, whose prime responsibility is development of irrigation for the water-hungry West, established important new water recreational facilities in the arid areas of the Nation through the creation of great manmade lakes at reservoirs.

3. The Fish and Wildlife Service carried out far-reaching programs to provide abundant supplies of fish and game for recreational hunting without depleting wildlife resources.

4. In less spectacular, but equally important ways, the Bureau of Land Management and the Bureau of Indian Affairs made positive contributions to improving and increasing America's recreational facilities.

Under Mission 66, the National Park Service—which administers about 180 areas of scenic, scientific, or historical importance—made rapid strides during the Republican administration years in restoration and development of park areas.

When this long-range program was inaugurated in 1956, the Nation's parks were neither staffed nor equipped to protect their irreplaceable features, nor to provide proper facilities for the increasing millions of visitors—expected to reach or surpass a total of 80 million when Mission 66 is completed. Lodging and eating facilities were inadequate and outmoded. Interpretive services for proper park enjoyment were lacking, while priceless park features were deteriorating.

From mid-1956 to early 1960, the Park Service, through the investment of more than $100 million, provided new and better park roads, trails, parkways, visitor centers, museums, campsites, utility systems, and a variety of interpretive services throughout the Nation. The sign, "A Mission 66 Project" became a familiar landmark to millions of traveling Americans. Again, all of this under the Republican administration.

During the same period, private enterprise invested more than $17 million to provide new hotels, lodges, motels, restaurants, and other accomodations which allow park visitors to do more than merely drive through park areas.

In the years of the Eisenhower-Nixon Republican administration the Department of the Interior moved to salvage some of the remaining potential park areas when it requested Congress to approve legislation which would authorize the acquisition of at least three additional national shoreline areas.

In 1959, the national wildlife refuges administered by the Department's Fish and Wildlife Service recorded some 10 million visitors—in contrast with about 3.5 million in 1951.

Like other owners of land in scenic areas away from metropolitan centers, Indian tribal groups during the progressive years of this administration have become increasingly aware of the attractiveness of certain reservation areas to sportsmen and tourists. The White Mountain Apache Tribe in Arizona, for example, has on its reservation about 80 percent of that State's trout stream mileage. It created a large manmade lake in a mountain setting, stocked it with fish, and laid out 500 summer cottage sites for lease. In this and other ways, the Indians during this administration—with the encouragement of the Bureau of

Indian Affairs—developed important new recreational resources for the enjoyment of many Americans.

Recognizing America's swiftly growing interest in water recreation, the administration won congressional approval of recreation as one of the specific beneficial uses of the gigantic upper Colorado River storage project.

This enormous project will contribute not only large amounts of water for irrigation and hydroelectric power generation, but also, because of the positive conservation leadership of this administration, will create a great network of manmade lakes which will provide many hours of wholesome recreation for our growing population in years to come.

Use of the manmade reservoir lakes of the Department's Bureau of Reclamation has mounted phenomenally during the Republican administration. In 1955, some 10 million people visited and enjoyed the water recreational facilities of reclamation reservoirs. By 1959 a total of 19.5 million persons used these recreational resources—an increase of almost 100 percent in about 5 years.

Fish and wildlife conservation

Typical of the greater recognition given during this administration to the need for improved conservation of our fish and wildlife resources was the reorganization of the Department's Fish and Wildlife Service under the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956.

Under this far-reaching legislation, the sport fisheries and wildlife and the commercial fisheries activities of the Department were divided into separate bureaus of the Service under a commissioner. A new Assistant Secretary of the Interior was designated to supervise all fish and wildlife programs.

A spectacular action under this administration was the laying of the necessary groundwork for establishment of the 9-million-acre Arctic Wildlife Range, an area three times as large as any existing American national wildlife area. When the action is completed, the total of national wildlife areas will soar close to 27 million acres—protected for present and future generations of Americans.

In the period of little more than 7 years, a total of 23 refuges, with a total acreage of 114,152 in 22 States, were added to the national wildlife refuge system, and action was begun for the establishment of several others.

Another outstanding action was passage of the new $3 duck stamp law designed to greatly accelerate additions to the network of national waterfowl refuges in the four flyways. The Duck Stamp Act of 1958 ended the diversion of duck stamp funds for other than refuge purposes. Under it, all net revenues on stamp sales are earmarked for selection and acquisition of habitat for waterfowl.

Highly important in the conservation and development of the Nation's fish and wildlife resources were these additional departmental actions during the Eisenhower-Nixon Republican administration:

1. A controversial issue which had been unsolved for many years—oil and gas leasing on refuges—was settled by prohibiting such activity on national wildlife refuges in the 48 contiguous States except in case of oil drainage.

2. In the interest of the salmon fishery of the Northwest, the Department of Interior actively urged that no further dams be built on the Middle Snake River in Idaho below the mouth of the Imnaha until other possibilities for water storage on that river system had been thoroughly explored and considered.

3. Amendments to the Coordination Act of 1946 were sponsored by the Department and now make possible enhancement of fish and wildlife values, as well as the mitigation of losses of such values in Federal water development projects. These amendments make improvement of fish and wildlife a specific purpose of Federal water resource projects—making fish and wildlife an equal partner in this resource development field.

4. The Federal aid program administered by the Fish and Wildlife Service resulted in new high marks of conservation progress. The magnitude of this program may be judged by the expenditures since January 1953. A total of some $150 million—Federal aid and State funds combined—was invested by the various States on Federal aid projects for the restoration of game, and nearly $50 million for the restoration of fish. This, of course, did not include restoration projects wholly financed by the States. In the Federal aid fish restoration work, States completed or initiated construction of 186 lakes with a total surface of 25,000 acres. For the restoration of game, States acquired in fee title, through the Federal aid program, approximately 1¼ million acres of land at a cost of more than $45 million, about one-third of which is being used for waterfowl management.

5. In addition to the 23 new refuges established in the national refuge system, the Department of Interior also brought about the establishment of more than 40 new units in the system of cooperative areas—Federal lands operated as wildlife management areas by the States under agreements developed by the Fish and Wildlife Service.

6. Research in the early years of the administration proved a definite link between unwise use of pesticides and the destruction of several species of desirable birds, land animals, and fish. As a result of these findings, the Department supported legislation which authorizes long-range studies on the effects of pesticides and to recommend formulations and practices which would not endanger fish and wildlife. A measure of the growing importance attached to this program may be seen in the fact that the 1958 appropriation of $280,000 was increased to $2,565,000 in 1959.

At the same time, departmental programs aimed at combating various forms of threats to our commercial fisheries resources made important progress since January 1953. For example, explosive increases in the abundance of sea lampreys in the Great Lakes in recent years brought about the destruction of the once valuable lake trout fisheries in Lake Huron and Lake Michigan and greatly reduced the trout population in Lake Superior. During the productive years of this Republican administration, the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries developed electrical barriers to kill spawning adult lampreys, and chemical lampricides to kill developing lamprey larvae in the spawning stream gravels. These methods show excellent promise of reducing the lamprey populations to low levels so that the valuable lake trout fishery can be restored.

Here, too, the Republican concept of teamwork between Federal, State, and local agencies, together with private industry, has led to a unified approach to the problems of our commercial fishing industry.

7. A program of standards development for inspection of fishery products was initiated by the Department's Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, and was carried out in close cooperation with the industry. The result has been development of five voluntary U.S. standards for major fishery products. These standards define the characteristics of good quality fish and are available to everyone.

Sound public land management

During fiscal year 1959, the Bureau of Land Management took in revenues of over $136,700,000 from the conservation and development of the Nation's public domain lands. Since the Bureau was created in 1946, revenues have totaled more than $1.2 billion. Over 80 percent of these revenues have come in since the Republican administration took office in 1953. Since that year revenues have exceeded appropriations by more than 6.4 to 1.

Major developmental actions affecting the resource programs of the public domain in recent years have included the opening of some 20 million acres of northern Alaska lands to mining and mineral leasing development. The area is known as PLO 82 and is adjacent to Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4. The opening of these lands to exploration and development may pave the way for major new economic development for the new State.

Of no less importance to the conservation of public lands has been the recent improvement of fire detection and suppression methods in the Western States. The Bureau has placed into effect regulations to carry out the Department's responsibilities under Public Law 167, which provides for multiple use of surface resources on public lands and protects the public interest in those resources through regulatory provisions. Public Law 167 represents the most important change in the mining laws since enactment of the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, and constitutes one of the most vital conservation measures in history.

Minerals and metals programs

Twice, in 1957 and 1958, the Republican administration presented a comprehensive minerals program to the Democratic-controlled Congress. Congress failed both times to enact this recommended legislation. The only significant portion of the two major minerals programs which was authorized by Congress was the long-range domestic minerals exploration plan. This legislation established the Office of Minerals Exploration within the Department of the Interior. The program of this office provides for the sharing of the risk between the Government and private industry to carry out minerals exploration projects which would not normally be undertaken with private capital alone.

The administration has also recommended passage of S. 1537, which would establish policy guidelines by the Congress, to be followed by the Government in recommending and establishing minerals programs. The effect of such legislation would make the maintenance of a sound and healthy minerals industry a major consideration of the Federal Government. It has not been enacted.

The Department of the Interior's Bureau of Mines continues its emphasis on research involving high-temperature and special-structural metals, and is attempting to develop new uses for materials having unusual properties.

An outstanding accomplishment of the Bureau during 1959 was the development of a method for making shaped castings of molybdenum at the Electrometallurgical Research Laboratory at Albany, Oreg. Recently, deposition of high purity tungsten into simple controlled shapes by a novel process developed by the Bureau has generated tremendous interest among the designers of missiles. Its possible application in helping to solve the problems incident to high-temperature alloys is significant.

Emphasis was placed by the Department's Geological Survey on the development of new geologic concepts, techniques, and tools to aid in the search for mineral deposits and to determine the water supplies of the Nation.

As a result of geochemical research, a tungsten deposit was located in western Colorado, and new methods of interpreting rock alterations and geochemical anomalies led to a major discovery of silver-lead-zinc ore in Utah. About $11,760,000 for geologic and mineral resources surveys and mapping will be expended during the 1960 fiscal year.

After failure of the Democratic-controlled Congress to enact either recommended program, quotas on imports of lead and zinc were imposed by President Eisenhower, October 1, 1958. In conjunction with moderately increased consumption, these quotas served to improve the situation of these two commodities during 1959. Mine production of lead and zinc have increased.

By proclamations dated March 10 and April 30, 1959, the President provided for regulating imports of crude oil and its principal products into the United States. Subsequently, regulations were issued implementing the proclamations and establishing in the Department of the Interior an Oil Import Administration under the direction of an administrator and an Oil Import Appeals Board.

This program was initiated to encourage a healthy climate for domestic oil exploration.

Mineral resource development

Under the Eisenhower-Nixon policy of "creative conservation," the years since January 1953 have witnessed a period of rapid economic growth and scientific advancement despite substantial defense stockpiling of strategic materials. During this period, the Nation's mines and mineral plants have sustained a high level of output and, largely through improved technology, developed new resources to meet future needs.

At the beginning of the Republican administration, petroleum production from the public lands amounted to some 80 million barrels a year.

Today, just a little more than 7 years later, annual production has soared to more than 142 million barrels—enough oil to heat 5 million homes.

In 1949, 124 billion cubic feet of natural gas was extracted from public domain lands.

By early 1960, this total had been raised to nearly 446 billion cubic feet—an increase of more than 300 billion cubic feet in a decade.

In 1949, there were some 22,000 outstanding mineral leases on public lands in the United States covering slightly over 19 million acres.

Today, after little more than 7 years of this Republican administration, over 107 million acres are covered by more than 132,000 leases.

As with water and land resources, the spectacular advances in mineral resource development since January 1953 have been made possible in large measure by the successful sponsoring by the administration of vital new legislative measures.

Passage of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act in 1953 marked the beginning of Federal mineral leasing of offshore submerged lands and the rapid expansion of private exploratory development investments in mineral production.

Providing legal sanction for the application of modern-day multiple-use land management, Public Law 585 of 1954 opened the door to mining and mineral leasing development on the same tracts of land. This law was followed a year later by two laws, one authorizing the extraction of uranium and other source materials from lignite coal deposits, and the other permitting mining claims on some 7.2 million acres set aside as power and water sites in 24 States.

In 1955, Congress passed Republican-backed legislation often described as the most important single conservation measure since passage of the Taylor Grazing Act of 1934. Public Law 167, the Multiple Surface Use Act, had the effect of unlocking immense values of surface resources on millions of acres in dormant and abandoned mining claims.

Early in the administration the Department of the Interior initiated an incentive program to encourage exploration for domestic sources of critical and strategic minerals and metals by providing for Government participation in the costs and risks involved.

The program is unique in that for the first time a joint effort was made by the Government and private industry for minerals exploration. The results have been highly satisfactory, adding substantial mineral reserves to the Nation's resources.

Meeting our water problem

Realizing that the enormous demands for water will continue to increase as our population expands and our standard of living rises, the Eisenhower administration has pursued with urgency a vigorous program to find an economical means of converting saline water.

The Department of the Interior's Office of Saline Water has already made a sevenfold reduction in the cost of converting salt water to fresh water, and the outlook for the future is bright, despite the fact that the Democratic-controlled Congress has refused in 4 years out of the last 7 to appropriate as much money as requested for this program.

Saline-water conversion pilot-plant tests give strong indication of a breakthrough in preventing the formation of scale on distillation equipment. Scale formation is one of the major technological problems in distillation processes. This exciting new development will be utilized in the first of five saline-water-conversion demonstration plants to be built by the Department of the Interior. U.S. Senator FRANCIS CASE, of South Dakota, has established himself as a farsighted statesman in pushing this program from the start.

One of the plants will work by an electrodialysis process and will be located in the northern Great Plains in Webster, S. Dak. It will be designed to convert brackish water to fresh at the rate of 250,000 gallons per day.

Imagine the blessings which will be brought to the arid area of this country, and to the world, if we can be successful in this program. Republican leadership will assure success, if it is at all possible.

Statehood won for Alaska and Hawaii

Congressional approval of the Republican platform promise and President Eisenhower's request that both Alaska and Hawaii be admitted into the Union, was largely due to the persistence of the Eisenhower administration's ardent statehood advocate, Secretary of the Interior Fred A. Seaton. As spokesman for the administration, Secretary Seaton helped lead both statehood campaigns.

Indian affairs

The policies of the Republican administration have struck at the root of the problems of the American Indian and mark a turning point in the history of Indian affairs in the United States.

In 1953, only 79 percent of the Indian children between the ages of 6 and 18 on reservations were enrolled in school. For the current school term, the figure is 93 percent, and when the new term begins in the fall there will be facilities to meet the educational needs of all school-age Indian children on reservations throughout the United States, most, of course, being located in the Western States.

During this administration, the Department has taken positive steps to repair the damages of past educational deficiencies among adult Indian people. Today, an adult education program is being conducted at 80 locations, and 3,000 Indians and native Alaskans are enrolled.

Since 1956, the Bureau of Indian Affairs also has conducted a program of vocational training in trade schools and on-the-job training in industrial plants.

In conclusion

Never in our history has there been such progress, in so short a time, to benefit so many people, as the progress made under the Republican administration in its two terms.

XII

REPUBLICAN RESPONSIBILITY VERSUS DEMOCRATIC REACTION IN THE U–2 INCIDENT AND SUMMIT BLOWUP

(By U.S. Senator PRESCOTT BUSH, of Connecticut)

We have long been aware of the North-South conflict within the Democratic Party, and the rifts which exist between the radical wing and the moderates and conservatives.

But a more serious division has recently arisen on an issue which never should have been injected into partisan domestic politics. I refer, of course, to the discordant voices in the Democratic Party since the U–2 espionage plane incident and the collapse of the summit conference.

Who speaks for the Democratic Party on foreign policy, and the related issues which involve the security of the United States, and the safety of every American family?

Is it Adlai Stevenson, who claims President Eisenhower gave Khrushchev a "sledge hammer and a crowbar" to wreck the summit conference?

Or is it Jim Farley, who says Stevenson attempts to use the U–2 incident "to 'sledge hammer and crowbar' another disastrous nomination for himself as the apostle of appeasement out of the Democratic Party"?

Is it JACK KENNEDY, who said the President should "apologize" or "express regret" to Khrushchev for the flight of the U–2 over Soviet territory?

Or is it LYNDON JOHNSON, who shouted to the Washington State Convention at Spokane: "I am not prepared to apologize to Mr. Khrushchev. I am not prepared to send regrets to Mr. Khrushchev"?

I have said this issue should never have been injected into partisan domestic politics. But since the Democrats have done it, I say to you that we are fortunate as we proceed to nominate our candidate for President.

We can leave it to the Democrats to accuse each other of being, in Mr. Farley's words, "apostles of appeasement." We can let the Democrats imply, as Senator JOHNSON did, that if a certain Democrat were elected President he might feel compelled to "apologize" or "express regret" to Khrushchev.

The Vice President's demonstrated ability

We have a candidate for our Presidential nomination who has demonstrated—in Moscow—his ability to stand up to Khrushchev, and refuse to knuckle under in response to truculent threats.

We have a candidate who has demonstrated—in Latin America—his physical courage under assault by Communist-led mobs.

We have a candidate who, by his long service on the National Security Council, knows what must be done to preserve the freedom of the United States and of the free world.

We have a candidate, tested and trained for the job, supremely qualified to assume the grave responsibilities of the President of the United States.

We have a candidate who will be a worthy successor to our great President, Dwight D. Eisenhower, a man who knows the Eisenhower policies and is ready to build upon that firm foundation to a greater America—RICHARD M. NIXON.

What the U–2 accomplished

I should like now to discuss the U–2 incident and the torpedoing of the summit conference by Mr. Khrushchev in terms of what these events mean to us as Americans.

The flights of the U–2 planes over Soviet territory which have taken place over the past 4 years have given the United States information of incalculable value.

We have learned the location of the Russian missile bases, planes, submarines and centers of arms production, including atomic

plants. Photographs taken at the extraordinary height of 70,000 feet have revealed these vital target areas with striking clarity.

The penetration of the borders of the Soviet Union by our planes has disproved Khrushchev's boasts about the invulnerability of his air defenses. It now appears conclusive that the Soviet's antiaircraft missiles have been unable to reach our planes flying at heights of 70,000 feet, and that Pilot Powers' plane was downed only after a "flameout" forced him to descend to lower levels.

This knowledge was essential to the defense of the United States and of the entire free world. Committed as we are not to strike the first blow against any nation, our security has depended upon our ability to retaliate against any attack upon us or our allies with instant, terrible destruction. To retaliate effectively, we must know where the vital targets are, and we must know that SAC, our major retaliatory force, can get through to them.

The U–2 flights gave the men with responsibility for our defenses—President Eisenhower, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the civilian Secretaries of our armed services and others within a limited circle—the knowledge they had to have to plan a safe level of our own military power. This information was not available, for obvious security reasons, to Senator SYMINGTON and other critics who have been demanding billions of dollars more in spending for defense.

Intelligence operations must continue

President Eisenhower has suspended U–2 flights over the Soviet Union for the balance of his term. We shall have to depend on other methods, including photo reconnaissance satellites which soon will be in the skies, for gathering this information which the United States must have for her protection, and the protection of the free world.

Our intelligence operations must continue, by whatever means are available, until the Soviet Union accepts President Eisenhower's offer to have the United Nations conduct "open skies" surveillance over the entire world.

The collapse of the summit conference was a blow to the hopes of the British and others among our allies, who believed that face-to-face meetings by the heads of states could bring meaningful progress toward peaceful coexistence.

But it also resulted in a strengthening of the unity between the United States and her allies. Mr. Khrushchev's vitriolic denunciations of President Eisenhower have sent a wave of revulsion around the world, and have drawn the nations of the West closer together. There is going on, among our allies, a realistic reappraisal.

Here at home, the breakdown of the summit conference also calls for reappraisal of our position in the world, and of our responsibilities. On assignment by the Senate Committee on Armed Services, I have visited our military outposts, not only in Western Europe, but also in the Far East. I have been with the 6th Fleet, in the Mediterranean, and the 7th Fleet in the straits of Formosa and the Philippine Sea. I believe I have some understanding of the dangers we face and of the extent of our commitments throughout this troubled planet.

Communists make coexistence seem unrealistic

To me, talk of peaceful coexistence has seemed unrealistic in view of Communist China's bitter enmity of the United States. It might have been possible to reach agreement with the Soviet Union on control of atomic weapons, for it is as much in her interest as ours to keep this terrible destructive power out of the hands of the Chinese Reds. But it is hard to see how we could reach significant overall disarmament agreements with Russia when we are committed to resist aggression by Communist China in the Far East.

In this unstable area, the Chinese Communists are constantly probing for weak spots. Had it not been for the 7th Fleet, a constant reminder of the power of the United States, I believe many small nations in the East would already have been crushed by the Reds.

Now that world tensions have been heightened by the breakdown at the summit, America must face the unpleasant fact that we may well become involved in at least small wars, and possible fairly large ones in the Far East.

The summit collapse may prove to be a blessing in disguise if it awakens the American people to reality.

We must accept risk; pay price

If we are to maintain our exposed positions all over the world we must recognize the risks and be willing to pay the price.

Now that our Western Allies have been restored, with our help, to positions of economic strength, we must call upon them to do more in the common defense.

But even should our allies share more of the costs, we must still pay a large price for our security.

That price means greater expenditures for defense, for scientific and space research and for education, including scientific and vocational training.

It means giving up some of our luxuries, and the "business as usual" philosophy.

It means an unceasing search for ways to achieve economies in our National Government; a ruthless war on waste and extravagance wherever found; and a system of priorities in Government spending which "puts first things first." Failure to face up to these necessities could mean higher Federal taxes.

As Americans and as Republicans, as the party of responsibility, we have a solemn obligation to place these facts before the people.

The times are too serious for a campaign in which unpleasant facts are obscured, the sky is the limit on promises, and the question of who is to pay if promises are fulfilled is conveniently ignored. Both parties have conducted this kind of a campaign in the past, although I believe our opponents have sinned in this respect far more than have we.

And I believe the American people will respond to a campaign of truth and honesty. In times of stress in this great Nation, the people have always risen to the occasion. So shall it be in this troubled year of 1960.

XIII

THE REPUBLICAN-CREATED COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS—A SUMMARY OF ITS ACCOMPLISHMENTS

(By U.S. Senator CLIFFORD P. CASE, of New Jersey)

Perhaps the most dramatic and far-reaching legislative accomplishment of this Republican administration was the enactment, for the first time in 82 years, of the Civil Rights Act of 1957, followed by the Civil Rights Act of 1960.

In 1957, the then Attorney General Herbert Brownell, Jr., representing the President, made a request to the Congress for a full-scale public study regarding the denial of the right to vote and other deprivations of equal protection of the laws because of race, color, religion or national origin which allegedly were being perpetrated against certain minority groups in this country.

The Republican administration asked for a full-scale public study, declaring that it should be objective and free from partisanship, broad, and at the same time, thorough. These were the reasons that the administration felt a bipartisan commission, independent of the Congress, could best, fairly, and objectively appraise the civil rights situation as it exists in the United States. In response to this request, Congress established the Commission on Civil Rights as a part of the first civil rights act passed since 1875. On September 9, 1957, the President saw his wishes come to fruition when he signed the civil rights bill.

The contents of the act

Specifically, the Civil Rights Act of 1957 directed the Commission to (1) investigate allegations in writing under oath or affirmation that certain citizens of the United States are being deprived of the right to vote and to have that vote counted by reasons of their color, race, religion, or national origin; (2) study and collect information concerning legal developments constituting a denial of equal protection of the law under the Constitution; (3) appraise the laws and policies of the Federal Government with respect to equal protection of the laws under the Constitution.

Staffing the Commission

On November 7, 1957, the President nominated the following members of the Commission: Stanley Reed, retired Supreme Court Justice, chairman; John A. Hannah, president of Michigan State University; John S. Battle, former Governor of Virginia; the Reverend Theodore M. Hesburgh, president of the University of Notre Dame; Robert G. Storey, Dean of the Southern Methodist University Law School; and Assistant Secretary of Labor J. Ernest Wilkins. Shortly thereafter, Mr. Justice Reed resigned. The President then nominated Dr. Hannah to be chairman and Doyle E. Carlton, former Governor of Florida, to be the sixth member of the Commission.

The Senate confirmed the nominations on March 4, 1958. On February 18, 1958, the President nominated Gordon M. Tiffany, former attorney general of New Hampshire, to be Staff Director of the Commission. This nomination was not confirmed by the Senate until May 14, and it was not until this time that the Commission could effectively proceed with its task.

Thus, with 16 months remaining before its report was due to be presented to the President and the Congress, the Commission went about its job of making findings of fact and recommendations to the President and Congress.

On January 19, 1959, J. Ernest Wilkins died, and the President nominated Dean George M. Johnson, a Commission staff member, to replace Mr. Wilkins as a member of the Commission. The Senate confirmed Dean Johnson's nomination on June 4, 1959.

The Commission report

On September 9, 1959, the Commission's first report was presented to the President and the Members of the Congress. Of the 14 recommendations made, 13 were unanimous. Only one of the six Commissioners dissented on the 14th recommendation.

The patience and care of the President in selecting the members of this Commission to deal with the very delicate problem of civil rights was rewarded by the report and by the recommendations which these members so carefully formulated.

Perhaps the most important recommendation made was the voting registrar proposal which would deal with cases of discrimination against any citizen because of race, color, creed, or national origin in exercising his franchise.

Shortly after the report was presented, the Congress, just prior to its adjournment and at the request of the President, extended the life of the Commission for another 2 years. Both the administration and the Congress recognized the important contributions being made by the Commission in the field of civil rights, and thus endorsed its work.

The recommendation for voting registrars soon captured the interest of many Mem-

bers of Congress and of the administration. Hearings were held in early January 1960 on the Commission's proposals. At the same time, the administration, on the basis of the Commission's findings regarding discrimination in voting, proposed the "voting referee plan."

After 2 months of debate by Congress, the administration's referee plan was adopted and signed into law by the President this spring. The Commission had also urged the preservation of voting records, which became a provision in the 1960 Civil Rights Act signed by the President. Other recommendations made by the Commission which did not require legislation have been considered and initiated by Government agencies.

Commission studies voting, housing, education, justice, and employment

Initially, the Commission, because of the limits of time, only considered civil rights activities in three areas. These were voting, housing, and education. Although recommendations were made in all three fields, one of the Commission's most important accomplishments so far concerns education. Two conferences have been held, one in 1959 in Nashville, Tenn., and another in 1960 in Gatlinburg, Tenn., where public officials from States which had proceeded with desegregation of their schools appeared before the Commission, and met together to discuss their common problems.

These were the first such conferences held under Federal sponsorship. Generally, the educators attending the conferences found it helpful to exchange views and share their experience in dealing with similar problems.

The Commission recently announced that it had decided to expand its field of inquiry into two additional subject areas. These are public employment and the administration of justice. These studies are just beginning and the Commission hopes to appraise civil rights in these areas, thus making a positive contribution through findings and recommendations.

The Commission's next report is due on September 9, 1961. This report will include findings and recommendations in the fields of voting, housing, education, administration of justice, and public employment.

XIV

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF U.S. SPACE EXPLORATION UNDER THE REPUBLICATION ADMINISTRATION

(By U.S. Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL, of California, Senate Republican whip)

The accomplishments and aspirations of the U.S. space exploration program under the Republican administration can be divided into the following sections for a clear-cut picture of what the United States has done and is doing:

1. Organization and resources.

2. A scorecard detailing competition with the U.S.S.R.

3. A brief survey of the U.S. space program as evidenced in the successful shots in that program.

4. A delineation of important milestones in the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's ten-year plan.

Organization and resources

When NASA declared itself to be ready for business on October 1, 1958, it began work on:

A. Completing the several programs which were initiated by the Advanced Research Projects Agency of the Department of Defense.

B. Developing a sound but bold and imaginative long-range plan with specific projects for the next 2 years calling for concentrated attention to the need for more powerful launch vehicles and a program of satellite and deep space flights that will approximate 26 major flights in each year.

C. Integrating the efforts of the 8,000 people inherited from the great NACA organization with the 2,400 fine people of the Jet Propulsion Laboratory and the 5,500 people who made up the famous Von Braun group at the NASA Marshall Space Flight Center, and the developing 2,000-man operation at the new Goddard Space Flight Center at Greenbelt, Md., and drawing together a headquarters staff of more than 550 people in Washington.

D. Creating this new organization when the eyes of all the world placed the United States in the spotlight of the space race.

As of July 1, 1960, the NASA will be operating at a $915 million annual rate as compared with a $335 million annual expenditure rate 21 months earlier. (The grand total of all U.S. missile programs from an obligational standpoint for fiscal year 1961 is estimated at $6,962 million, subject to revision.) With a total of more than 18,000 people—one-third or more of them professional people—NASA represents the Government's greatest research organization and, in many ways, its most unique. Its product is new knowledge and the development of the techniques necessary to acquire that knowledge and apply it for the benefit of mankind.

Competition with the U.S.S.R.

The U.S.S.R. appears to excel the United States in the thrust of its rocket-powered launch vehicle system. Their substantially higher thrust level has permitted them to undertake spectacular missions requiring the carrying of relatively advanced guidance equipment in addition to the payload instrumentation—a combined weight substantially beyond that which we have been able to fly.

In spite of this advantage, it seems clear that the United States has clearly bested the Soviet Union in the breadth and depth of its program development and particularly in the quality, quantity, and importance of the scientific results of its flights.

It is reasonable to believe, however, that the steady growth of the U.S. program, the obvious willingness of the United States to share its information and competence with other nations, and the beneficial and, at times, striking information being derived from the U.S. experiments is beginning to make itself felt as a positive counterforce to any Soviet propaganda.

Highlights of the Nation's space exploration program (with some remarks about results of the U.S.S.R. program): The direct exploration of space by means of unmanned vehicles traveling in space began on October 4, 1957, with the launching of Sputnik I by the U.S.S.R. In the intervening 30 months there have been launched successfully 22 additional earth satellites which have yielded much scientific information about the space environment by radio telemetry of data to the ground. Three satellites were launched by the U.S.S.R. on November 3, 1957, May 15, 1958, and May 15, 1960.

The United States has launched 19 satellites, the first on January 31, 1958, and the most recent on May 24, 1960. Five were called Explorers, launched by Jupiter C's in three cases, Thor-Able II in one, and Juno II in one.

Three were Vanguards.

Seven were Discoverers, launched by Thor-Agena A's.

One used an Atlas for the communications experiment, Project Score.

One, the meteorological satellite of Project Tiros, was launched by a Thor-Able IV.

One, the navigation satellite Transit, was launched by a Thor-Able Star.

One, the missile early warning satellite Midas, was launched by an Atlas-Agena.

Seven space probes have been launched since October 4, 1957, three by the U.S.S.R., four by the United States.

All of the U.S.S.R. space probes were directed toward the moon; one launched on January 2, 1959, was claimed by the Russians as having passed within a few diameters of the moon and went into an orbit around the sun.

The second, launched on September 12, 1959, hit the moon, or so the Russians said.

The third, launched on October 4, 1959, passed close enough to take pictures of the far side of the moon and was deflected by the gravitational field of the moon to return toward the earth.

The first U.S. space probe, launched on October 11, 1958, traveled to a distance of 70,700 miles.

The second, launched on December 6, 1958, traveled to a distance of 63,580 miles.

The third, launched on March 3, 1959, went into orbit around the sun, communication with it being maintained to a distance of 407,000 miles.

The fourth was launched on March 11, 1960, inward toward the orbit of Venus, and on May 8 was at a distance of a little more than 8 million miles from the Earth with data still being received by telemetry.

Each of the satellites and space probes has produced much information on various aspects of the space environment itself and of environmental conditions within space vehicles. Many of the missions have been directed toward scientific objectives relating to the Earth and its atmosphere and ionosphere. To illustrate the types of information returned, you may consider the return from Sputnik II, Lunik III, Pioneer V, and Tiros I.

Sputnik II was launched into an elliptical orbit with initial perigee of 140 miles and initial apogee of 1,038 miles inclined at 65 degrees to the equator. It carried the dog, Laika, for measurement of physiological reaction of an animal to space flight. Its instruments measured cosmic rays, solar ultraviolet, and X-radiation. Temperature and pressures within the satellite were measured.

Significant solar influence on density in the upper atmosphere was noted from measurements of fluctuations in satellite drag which were directly correlated with solar activity. Cosmic ray counting rate increased with height, not understood at the time, but later found to be associated with the Van Allen radiation belt discovered with the instruments in Explorer I.

Lunik III apparently produced the first pictures of the far side of the Moon. Lunik III demonstrated maneuverability in a large spacecraft, the successful storage of pictures on film and their later transmission back to Earth, according to the Russians. Apparently no further scientific data were obtained because of early failure of the power supply or transmission system.

The Pioneer V space probe, weighing 94.8 pounds, was accelerated to a velocity of 24,869 miles per hour in an orbit about the sun inclined inward toward the orbit of Venus. Its period is about 311 days. Its perihelion is about 74,700,000 miles, which is about 18 million miles closer to the Sun than the orbit of the Earth.

Long-range projection of the trajectory forecasts that Pioneer V will be farthest from the Earth—183 million miles—in September 1962 and that the Earth and probe will approach within 16 million miles in November 1965.

Because of the eccentricity of the probe orbit, the probe again will come within 15.6 million miles in April 1966. A closer approach than this will not occur until 1989 when the the two will come within 2 million miles of each other, according to present estimates.

The probe carries instruments to measure charged particles in space, i.e., an ionization chamber and Geiger-Mueller tube to measure total radiation, and a triple coincidence cosmic ray proportional counter. The probe also carries a micrometeorite counter, a

magnetometer, and instruments for measurement of temperature and attitude. Power is furnished by solar cells mounted on paddles. There are two transmitters, designed to permit communication at distances up to 50 million miles—although there are now indications that degradation of the batteries may halt transmission between 10 and 20 million miles.

Tiros I is a 270-pound satellite which carries two television cameras to observe cloud formation and transmit the pictures to stations on the ground.

It was launched in a nearby circular orbit with perigee of 435 miles and apogee of 468 miles with a period of 99.15 minutes. It is stabilized by spinning, thus maintaining a fixed direction in space. Pictures are obtained when the satellite is in that part of its orbit where the camera sees the sunlit portion of the earth.

The satellite is provided with tape recorders which can record as many as 32 pictures for later transmission to the ground stations.

Thousands of pictures have been obtained of cloud formations.

Tiros promises a major forward step in observations of major storms and frontal systems.

On the basis of this and future meteorological satellites, it is hoped to develop within a few years an operational system for routine use in weather forecasting.

Space travel by man

For present purposes, the NASA is interested in the bearing of the information obtained on the prospects for space travel by man. The data obtained on the pressure, density, and temperature are required for rational design of any spacecraft, whether carrying man or instruments. Similarly, data on the ionosphere are of interest because of the electrical charging of the vehicle and its effects on radio communication from the vehicle and on its drag.

One of the major results of the first satellite launchings was the discovery by James A. Van Allen and his colleagues of a belt of charged particles trapped in the magnetic field of the earth which produced radiation on striking a space vehicle.

Further studies have shown that the structure of this region is quite complex and the outer zone varies in extent with solar activity.

We have learned considerably about outer space, but much basic information is yet to be obtained before man ventures very far away from the Earth. Specifically, there are formidable technical developments needed to assure the success of manned journeys to the Moon and to the planets of the solar system.

The U.S. long-range plan for space exploration

Listed below are the highlights of the 10-year plan developed by NASA and presented to the Congress early in 1960. It is to be noted that forecasting research and development activities for many years in the future is a questionable procedure.

What can be undertaken 2 years from now depends on what is learned in experiments to be undertaken in the intervening 2 years. Nevertheless, in a rapidly moving technology involving long leadtimes, it is possible to identify objectives which should be possible of accomplishment given normally accelerated advancement of the technologies involved and assuming an adequately paced funding program.

Under these ground rules, the following listing represents certain long-range objectives of the U.S. space exploration program:

NASA mission target dates

Calendar year 1960:

First launching of a meteorological satellite.

First launching of a passive reflector communications satellite.

First launching of a Scout vehicle.

First launching of a Thor-Delta vehicle.

First launching of an Atlas-Agena-B vehicle (by the Department of Defense).

First suborbital flight of an astronaut.

Calendar year 1961:

First launching of a lunar impact vehicle.

First launching of an Atlas-Centaur vehicle.

Attainment of manned space flight, Project Mercury.

Calendar year 1962:

First launching to the vicinity of Venus and/or Mars.

Calendar year 1963:

First launching of two-stage Saturn vehicle.

Calendar years 1963–1964:

First launching of unmanned vehicle for controlled landing on the Moon.

First launching Orbiting Astronomical and Radio Astronomy Observatory.

Calendar year 1964:

First launching of unmanned lunar circumnavigation and return to Earth vehicle.

First reconnaissance of Mars and/or Venus by an unmanned vehicle.

Calendar years 1965–1967:

First launching in a program leading to manned circumlunar flight and to permanent near-Earth space station.

Beyond 1970: Manned flight to the Moon.

XV

THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION DURING THE REPUBLICAN ADMINISTRATION

(By U.S. Senator STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire)

Progress in the common carrier services

The past 7½ years, during the Republican administration, have seen unprecedented expansion, growth, and modernization in all segments of our common carrier communications industry and in the services it furnishes to the public and the national defense.

In the domestic telephone field, the number of telephones has increased from 48 million to more than 70 million, plant investment has doubled from $13.3 to $26.5 billion, and operating revenues have grown from $4.4 billion to $8.5 billion.

During this period, the rates for interstate telephone services subject to the jurisdiction of the FCC have undergone little change. In 1953, the FCC permitted the Bell System to make a general increase of 8 percent in interstate long-distance telephone rates. However, in 1959, as a result of action initiated by FCC, these rates were reduced by about 3 percent.

The first comprehensive formal investigation of all interstate private line telephone and telegraph services and the rates therefor, was instituted by the Commission in 1956. During the course of these proceedings, the Commission, on an interim basis, ordered reductions made in the rates for certain private line telephone services, while permitting the carriers to effect interim increases in other private line telegraph rates. A final decision in this proceeding is expected this year.

The Commission has also fully implemented a program for the prescription and periodic revision of depreciation rates applied by all of the Bell System companies. This program is safeguarding the public against excessive accruals for depreciation expense (amounting currently to more than $950 million annually in the Bell System).

In the domestic telegraph field, although public demand for the message telegraph services of Western Union has steadily declined, Western Union is becoming a major source of supply for private line telegraph facilities required by industry and Government, particularly the national defense agencies. Since 1953, the Commission has authorized Western Union to extend or supplement its lines by addition of more than 2 million telegraph-channel miles and recently authorized construction by Western Union of its first transcontinental radio relay system which, when completed, will be used principally to furnish private line services to Government and commercial subscribers.

In the international segment of the communications industry during this Republican administration, the Commission issued authorizations in connection with the installation of submarine telephone cables to Europe and Puerto Rico, and (prior to statehood) to Alaska and Hawaii. These new facilities have vastly increased the capacity of the overseas communications systems which, theretofore, had been furnished almost entirely by radio. This development has also made possible the introduction and expansion of overseas services of all kinds, particularly customer-to-customer private line telephone and telegraph services and "backbone" global communication facilities needed by the Defense Departments.

The participation in international telegraph and telephone conferences has increased extensively in recent years. The U.S. delegation to the Administrative Telegraph and Telephone Conference held in Geneva in the fall of 1958 was headed by Commissioner John C. Doerfer, their chairman. Common Carrier Bureau personnel have been very active in technical study groups and committees which have met at frequent intervals.

Progress in the safety and special radio services

The safety and special radio services encompass the activities necessary for the discharge of the Commission's responsibility with respect to the licensing of stations for purposes other than broadcasting or common carrier. This group represents the use of radio by industry, business, forestry, ships, planes, police, etc.

The growth and expanded utilization of radio communications in the safety and special radio services is illustrated by the following statistics:

Total authorizations outstanding:	
June 30, 1953	232,111
May 30, 1960	637,166
Total transmitters authorized:	
March 1, 1953	584,797
June 30, 1959	[1] 1,728,947

[1] 1960 tabulation of total authorized transmitters not yet available. It is expected the increment over 1959 will be sizeable in view of tremendous increase in the citizens radio service.

The significant policy and rule developments contributing to this development since 1953 are listed and briefly described and evaluated below.

1. Implementation by Commission rules as well as by changes to the Communications Act recommended by the Commission pursuant to the Safety of Life at Sea Convention of 1948. This convention became effective in 1952. The result of these changes has been greater usage of radio by ships on the high seas, and concomitant enhanced safety to life and property.

2. Implementation by Commission rules as well as by changes to the Communications Act recommended by the Republican administration pursuant to the Agreement for the Promotion of Safety on the Great Lakes by Means of Radio between the United States and Canada, which became effective in 1954. The result of this program has been increased usage of radio with correlative increased safety for life and property on Great Lakes shipping.

3. Further development of the Commission's radio equipment type acceptance program, with special reference to the marine

and the aviation radio services, has resulted in greater standardization of optimum technical requirements.

4. Furtherance of a universal radiotelephone calling and distress frequency and integration of safety systems for radiotelephone equipped ships by requiring ships and coast stations using the 2 megacycle radiotelephone frequency to maintain a listening watch on the 2182 kilocycle frequency.

5. Pursuant to authority contained in Public Law 321, approved during the Republican 83d Congress, which amended section 319 of the Communications Act, waived generally the construction permit requirement for most categories of stations in the safety and special radio services. This has reduced unnecessary paperwork by the public and the Commission.

6. By a series of channel splitting proceedings, have reduced the channel separation standards and increased technical requirements in most of the Safety and Special Radio Services. This development, flowing from technological developments, has greatly increased the possible utilization of the same frequency space available.

7. Adopted new policy governing assignment of frequencies in the 72–76 megacycle band so as to permit continued usage of this band for nonbroadcast repeater-control links without causing harmful interference to reception on adjacent television channels 4 and 5.

8. Consolidated previous Highway Truck Radio Service, Urban Transit Radio Service, and Intercity Bus Radio Service into a new Motor Carrier Radio Service, which permits more effective usage of frequency space allocated thereto, and extends permissible radio usage to urban, in addition to suburban areas.

9. Extended by appropriate body of rules the CONELRAD program to all the Safety and Special Radio Services. This system minimizes the navigational aid an attacking enemy might obtain from radio emissions.

10. By clarification of the rules governing the Special Industrial Radio Service, and by the creation of the Manufacturers Radio Service, the Business Radio Service, and the Telephone Maintenance Radio Service, made private radio communication available to all segments of the Nation's business and commercial enterprises.

11. Revised rules governing the Citizens Radio Service which created more categories of radio stations thereunder, added and changed frequencies available thereto, and eliminated certain eligibility restrictions, with the result that private communication radio has become available to all citizens for both business and personal uses.

12. Implementation by Commission rules of the 1956 amendment to the Communications Act which requires certain vessels carrying more than six passengers for hire to be fitted with radiotelephone installations. Again, safety of life and property has been enhanced by this program.

13. Creation of new aeronautical search and rescue mobile radio station, thus aiding in such safety operations by aircraft.

14. Certain microwave bands of frequencies made available on a regular basis to licensees of airborne navigational aids, thereby facilitating greater efficiency and safety in air travel.

15. Creation of Local Government Radio Service, which permits non-Federal governmental entities to use radios for administrative traffic, as well as multiple usage for a variety of public safety functions, thereby implementing the Republican administration's policies respecting States' responsibilities.

16. Following survey of communications needs in Alaska, revised rules governing frequency usage in Alaska so as to employ geographical frequency assignments. This has resulted in more efficient frequency usage in that State which has special communications problems. Elsewhere in the continental United States, some geographical sharing of frequencies has been instituted also in the Industrial Radio Services, thereby effectuating greater frequency economies.

17. Implementation by Commission rules of legislation permitting licensing of aircraft radio stations to aliens under certain controlled conditions. This facilitates the flow of international air traffic without interruption to radio communications.

18. Specific plans for Radio Amateur Civil Emergency Service (RACES) have been approved and RACES licenses issued. These plans delineate civil defense functions whereby certain amateurs are authorized to participate in such defense functions during national emergencies, using certain regularly allocated amateur frequencies.

19. Study of competing needs and usages for frequencies above 890 Mc. (microwaves). At present, microwave utilization in the Safety and Special Radio Services is limited for the most part to short term developmental grants. A Commission report and order, which looked toward opening areas of the microwave spectrum to regular private usage in these services, is now in abeyance pending Commission action on requests for reconsideration.

20. Study of competing needs and usages for frequencies in the frequency range 25 to 890 Mc. Analysis of information presented to the Commission and ultimate rulemaking proceedings flowing therefrom are expected to result in further increased effective frequency utilization.

Progress in the broadcast services

The broadcast services include standard broadcast (AM), frequency modulation (FM), television (TV), and associated auxiliary services.

1. Establishment of the nationwide television system. During the past 7 years a major achievement of the Commission has been its activities in guiding, promoting, and fostering the establishment of a nationwide television system. Between 1953 and the present, the number of authorized TV stations has increased from 283 to 717. Whereas in 1953 television stations were limited primarily to the major metropolitan centers, today there are one or more stations operating in over 300 separate communities. Similarly, the number of TV sets in use has grown from 21 million to over 52 million and the percentage of homes with TV sets has grown from 40 to 87 percent. Over 80 percent of the homes with TV now are able to receive four or more TV stations. In addition to these figures, there are 150-odd translator stations. Thus, almost every person in the United States is within the reach of at least one television signal. Thus, in the past 7 years, television has become an integral and pervasive element in American life providing education, entertainment, and news to practically the entire American Nation.

The Commission has played a major role in speeding applications and devising methods of permitting stations to go on the air in as many communities as possible within the shortest time feasible, consistent with the requirements of due process. The Commission has also been engaged in intensive study to find ways and means of encouraging a further expansion in the growth of TV stations.

To provide this fantastic growth in the number of television stations on the air required, under the law, long and complex public hearings on hundreds of competitive applications for these stations. It is estimated that half a million pages and 125 million words of testimony and exhibits were involved. The analysis of this vast amount of testimony by the Commission's staff, the oral arguments on each case before the Commission, the rulings on the literally thousands of exceptions filed by the parties, the writing of the final decisions in all of these cases, and the defense of the scores of appeals to the courts was, indeed, a monumental job. The Commission and its limited staff literally devoted themselves night and day to this task in order to make this accomplishment possible.

2. Further growth of radio: Concomitant with the phenomenal development of TV has been a steady and continuing expansion in aural radio, both AM and more recently FM. The number of authorized AM stations in this period has grown from 2,524 to 3,541. The Commission has been able to grant licenses to more and more stations to serve as local outlets for their communities. Whereas in 1953 there were approximately 1,300 cities and towns with one or more radio stations, the number has now grown to approximately 2,000. More recently there has been a revived interest in FM broadcasting and the Commission has given every encouragement to the growth and advancement of this service. The number of authorized FM stations has grown from 743 in 1953 to 1,023 in 1960.

3. Color TV: In December 1953, the Commission established the rules and regulations for a compatible color TV system. Within the framework established by the Commission there has been a gradual and steady development of this improved service, which may over a period of time replace black-and-white television in substantial part.

4. Educational TV: The Commission has recognized the importance of reserving TV channels for the exclusive use of educational organizations and has resisted any efforts to divert such channels to other uses. The Commission has authorized 70 stations scattered throughout the United States and its possessions. Recently, in December 1959, the Commission authorized an experiment in airborne TV for educational purposes which has potentialities for promoting nationwide educational networking.

5. Subscription TV: One of the most knotty problems which the Commission has been called upon to resolve is the proper role of a subscription TV service in the United States. The Commission was acutely aware of the overwhelming public interest in maintaining the present system. At the same time, it recognized the desirability in the public interest of encouraging experimentation and growth of a new service. Accordingly, the Commission in March 1959 established the basis upon which tests could be made to ascertain the public interest in and the need for a subscription TV service without damage to the present system.

6. TV in rural areas: The Commission is keenly aware of the public interest in providing TV service to as many people as possible, including the scattered populations in rural areas for whom TV is particularly important. The Commission has authorized 300 translator stations whereby small communities in isolated areas can obtain service at relatively low cost. It is now exploring other means of encouraging the widespread utilization of TV by rural communities.

7. New technical development in the radio art: The Commission has been active in providing for wide experimental development of stereophonic radio.

8. Since 1952, regional and bilateral broadcasting agreements have been negotiated. These agreements are designed to give domestic broadcasters as much protection as possible from harmful interference which might otherwise be caused by broadcasters outside the country, while at the same time recognizing that the available broadcast channels must be shared on an equitable basis with neighboring countries. Outstanding among these agreements are the North American Regional Broadcasting Agreement and the United States-Mexican Radio Broadcasting Agreement. Both deal with the standard AM broadcast band. The

former was signed in 1952 and ratified in 1959, concurrently with the latter.

Progress in field engineering and monitoring

The Commission has a field organization which assists in the discharge of its obligations under law and treaty. Field engineering and monitoring work is performed by staff located in a Washington headquarters and 49 offices and monitoring stations throughout the United States and Puerto Rico. It consists of three basic activities—enforcement, application processing and licensing, and monitoring. Enforcement includes the physical inspection of radio stations to determine compliance with the Communications Act, Commission Rules and Regulations, and other laws; investigation of interference complaints and unlicensed operations; and administration of parts 15 and 18 of the rules covering industrial, scientific, and medical equipment. Application processing and licensing covers licensing of stations and examination and licensing of radio operators, both amateur and professional; issuance of safety certificates to ship owners or licensees; and examination of applications for compliance with rules governing antenna placement, marking, and lighting. Monitoring covers the identifying, observing, and measuring processes which help insure proper operating procedures and signal characteristics of radio stations.

A list of major accomplishments and advances in the performance of these activities follows.

1. Completion of the conversion and modernization of our long range direction finding system. This has provided greatly increased accuracy and efficiency of operation.

2. Establishment of two TV mobile enforcement units and two microwave mobile monitoring facilities. This has improved our enforcement capability.

3. Relocation from rented to surplus Government property of two monitoring stations. This has reduced operating expense and increased efficiency. We have also relocated an additional monitoring station with resultant increased effectiveness and accuracy of operations.

4. Establishment of two marine offices (Tampa, Fla., and San Pedro, Calif). This has significantly increased our effectiveness and efficiency, especially in the small boat field.

5. Institution of an interim licensing procedure at 22 marine offices. This has expedited the issuance of operating authority to new licensees of small boats, and this is important to their convenience and safety.

6. Complete revision of the examination and grading procedure for the examination and licensing of a possible quarter of a million applications for commercial class radio operator licenses annually. This has reduced delays and increased efficiency.

7. Inspection and certification of approximately 500 Great Lakes vessels annually as required by international agreement with Canada. This new undertaking will improve operation and increase safety on the Great Lakes.

8. Establishment of 33 Cooperative Interference Committees in accordance with the policy of the administration to provide increased self-help in solution of interference problems by commercial "user organizations." The number of Television Interference Committees (similarly organized and sponsored) for clearing amateur interference was also increased from 293 to 529.

9. Cooperative arrangement with the Department of Defense to provide for the tracking and reporting of telemetering information of high altitude balloons for improvement of weather observations.

Progress in frequency allocations, treaty work, and technical standards

Allocation of the radio spectrum among the conflicting claimants for its use is a continuing responsibility involving in some way nearly all segments of the Commission's activities. Since radio waves cross both State and national borders, allocation work is carried on at both national and international levels. Securing maximum utilization of frequencies in a crowded spectrum also involves continuing review of technical standards to make sure that each radio station uses no more spectrum space than necessary. Considerable progress has been made in each of these two related areas of activity since 1952.

1. A wholesome reorganization of international radio frequency allocations resulted from a series of international radio conferences between 1947 and 1951. Thereupon, the Commission adopted a 4-year program which, with industry cooperation, was completed successfully. Thousands of assignments to individual radio stations were changed. Other nations took concurrent action. The result was to bring about more effective worldwide usage of that part of the radio spectrum useful for long-distance communications.

2. In addition to implementing the agreements of the earlier conferences, the Commission engaged in a 2-year preparatory study, in cooperation with the Department of State, to prepare for a major international radio conference which was held in 1959. From the standpoint of the United States, this conference was highly successful, providing a basis for more satisfactory and more efficient spectrum usage in the future. The U.S. delegation was headed by an FCC commissioner.

3. The Commission has participated in the negotiation of several bilateral arrangements with Canadian and Mexican telecommunication regulatory bodies. These have provided more effective transborder communications and have minimized the number of cases of harmful interference between stations operating on either side of the border.

4. Commission support has aided the establishment of frequency allocations and site protection for radio astronomy and allied scientific work. Without such action, scientific operations in this new field would be greatly handicapped. The job is not yet finished.

5. A program of type acceptance and type approval of radio transmitting equipment used in most radio services has been instituted. These programs call for actual tests of equipment to determine their suitability for licensing before use of the equipment is authorized. By thus screening transmitting equipment before licensing, the use of substandard or poorly designed equipment is reduced or eliminated. This has greatly reduced radio interference in the radio spectrum and has eased the burden imposed upon industry of showing compliance with necessary technical regulations.

6. A very serious threat to the effective use of high frequency communications—interference to the various radio services by incidental radiation devices such as industrial radio frequency heaters and medical diathermy machines—has been brought under control by adoption of new rules and strenuous enforcement procedures which include hearings and court injunctions. As a result, the incidental radiation (which conservatively has been estimated currently to amount to about 160 million equivalent watts of power) from these industrial and medical machines has been confined by the new regulations to specific narrow bands in the radio spectrum or has been eliminated by effective shielding methods. Communications involving safety of life and property thereby have been made more safe and more effective.

7. New technical standards have been adopted which reflect the improved state of the art in all radio services. Some examples of the new standards include:

(a) Technical standards and regulations providing for color television;

(b) Split channel standards in land mobile communications service which effectively doubled the number of channels available to such important services as police, highway emergency, taxis, industrial, and telephone communications;

(c) Single sideband provisions which permit more effective communications in less spectrum space than conventional systems;

(d) Standards limiting the spurious, or undesired, radiation from transmitters and receivers.

The combined effect of such standards has been to reduce the potentialities of harmful interference between various radio services, to provide better broadcast and television service to the public, and to facilitate more effective communications to all radio users.

Conelrad and NIAC

The Commission, in cooperation with the Air Force, has instituted and administers a highly important defense measure. This is the program known as Conelrad (CONtrol of ELectromagnetic RADiation). The purpose of Conelrad is to minimize the radio navigational information which might be obtained from U.S. radio stations during the time of air attack while at the same time providing for the use of these radio facilities for defense purposes. From its inception in 1953 to the present, the Conelrad program has expanded and has satisfactorily proved its worth to authorities responsible for military and civilian safety in time of enemy attack. Conelrad facilities and procedures also have been found to be of great value during peacetime emergencies such as occur during floods or tornadoes.

Under authority set forth in Executive Order No. 10312, the Commission has established a National Industry Advisory Committee (NIAC) consisting of representatives from each of the organized radio services licensed by the Commission. The purpose of this committee is to further formulate and develop plans to be used in the event of a national emergency such as (1) development of standby emergency communication facilities, (2) development of plans to restore normal communications as soon as possible after the Conelrad radio all clear, and (3) to assist the military and Federal, State, and local civil defense officials. The first accomplishment of the NIAC was the finalization of an interim plan to provide broadcasting facilities for "national program" on an emergency basis.

Forty-eight State industry advisory committees have also been established. These committees have somewhat the same duties as the NIAC, but on the State and local level. Several of these State industry advisory committees have established State defense networks (FM) for use in preattack and postattack conditions.

Legislative activities

In 1953, the demand for broadcast communication services and facilities reached an alltime high. The Commission was at a serious disadvantage in meeting this demand because of certain amendments to the Communications Act, which were enacted in 1952.

In general, these amendments imposed a rigid system of separation of functions prohibiting the Commission from consulting its staff on technical questions in adjudicatory proceedings; established a detailed procedure requiring the issuance of prehearing notices to applicants even in those cases where a hearing appeared inevitable and where such fact was obvious to all known parties in interest; and made provision for the filing of a protest to the grant of any license made without hearing upon such vague and indefinite grounds as to enable parties whose interest in such proceedings was primarily delayed to unreasonably prolong the institution of needed broadcast service.

Recognizing the need for eliminating unnecessary detail, reducing the volume of paper work, and speeding up the hearing procedure to facilitate the provision of better communication service to the public, the Republican administration instituted a persistent legislative program in an effort to persuade Congress to relieve it from onerous and unnecessary statutory obstacles which impeded the attainment of its statutory mandate "to make available * * * to all of the people of the United States a rapid, efficient, nationwide * * * wire and radio communication service."

With each succeeding Congress since 1953, the Commission has proposed amendments to the so-called protest provisions of the Communications Act with the view toward preventing protests filed against the grant of applications from being used for the purpose of delaying the institution of new radio and television service to the public.

In 1956, Congress enacted the Republican administration's proposal authorizing it to deny a protest, after oral argument, without a full evidentiary hearing, upon a finding that the facts alleged by the protestant, even if proved true, would not be grounds for setting aside the grant. Congress also enacted the Commission's proposal authorizing it, in the exercise of its discretion, to permit a grant against which a protest is filed to remain in effect pending the Commission's decision after hearing on the protest.

In addition, the entire protest procedure provided for by section 309 of the Communications Act has been under intensive study by the Commission with the assistance and cooperation of the Federal Communications Bar Association. These studies have resulted in the formulation and presentation to the Congress of legislative proposals by the Federal Communications Bar Association, with the concurrence of the Commission, designed to strike an equitable balance between the rights of interested parties affected by the Commission's grant of broadcast licenses and the public interest considerations inherent in the development and expansion of the communications service to all of the people of the United States.

In 1956, Congress also passed certain amendments proposed by the Commission which provided for greater procedural flexibility in the hearing requirements in cases involving interlocking directorates and consolidation of common carriers.

In its endeavor to further expedite the disposition of adjudicatory cases, the Commission for several years proposed an amendment which would permit its review staff to more fully assist it in those matters which do not involve the final disposition of a case, thus allowing the Commission to concentrate its attention on more important and pressing questions of law and policy. This proposal was passed by the Senate (86th Cong., 1st sess.) and recently was reported out of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also proposed by the Commission, passed by the Senate and now awaiting House action, is an amendment to eliminate the requirement of a prehearing notice to applicants and known parties in interest in those cases where a hearing appears inevitable. In most cases the applicant knows or has the means of knowing the nature of the objections to his application, hence the giving of such notice serves no useful purpose and produces the adverse effect of delaying the final disposition of the case.

The extension of TV service to the more sparsely populated areas of the country, particularly the Rocky Mountain States, has met with difficulty because of conditions peculiar to that region. The lack of large concentrated areas of population sufficient to sustain the maintenance of an adequate television operation and the rugged terrain which acts as an obstacle to the efficient propagation of an acceptable television signal have combined to deter the expansion of television service in this area.

As a result, many communities have devised their own broadcast systems through the installation of antennas, popularly called boosters which rebroadcast the signals from a station in a distant metropolitan location. These boosters are broadcast stations, the operation of which requires a license from the Commission. Moreover, the Communications Act prohibits issuance of a license for a broadcast station the construction of which was commenced without a permit for its construction having been granted by the Commission. Since all of these boosters were constructed without the issuance of the requisite construction permit, the Commission has been powerless to grant a license authorizing their operation.

In order to overcome the construction permit requirements contained in the Communications Act, and to provide an orderly system of television service to the more sparsely populated areas of the country, the Commission proposed an amendment which was passed by the Senate (86th Cong., 1st sess.) and now awaits House action to permit it to grant licenses to booster operations engaged solely in the rebroadcasting of TV signals, thereby assisting the Commission in its efforts to implement a satisfactory plan for authorizing TV service to isolated areas.

The Commission also proposed an amendment which would prohibit any person from directly or indirectly making a presentation respecting the merits of a case under adjudication without giving notice to all parties to such proceeding. This proposal is pending before the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

The Commission has proposed an amendment, passed by the Senate and now awaiting House action, which would repeal a provision of the act which permits commissioners to receive an honorarium for the presentation and delivery of speeches and papers.

In 1956 (84th Cong.), Congress enacted the Commission's proposal amending section 1343, title 18 United States Code to prohibit fraud by wire or radio.

The Commission's legislative proposals, portions of which have been incorporated in an omnibus bill recently reported out of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, make it a criminal offense for any persons to participate in the production or presentation of TV quiz shows involving a contest of intellectual skill where the result of such contests is prearranged or predetermined, and extends the Commission's jurisdiction over persons other than broadcast licensees who engage in the practice of payola.

Major litigation

Because of the tremendous growth in radio and television as well as the other regulated industries, the Commission in the past 7 years has become increasingly involved in litigation in the Federal courts, having been a party to 122 cases in 1959 as against only 36 cases in 1953. Some of the significant radio and television cases that were litigated include the following:

The Commission's decision to accomplish an equitable distribution of television broadcast facilities throughout the country through the establishment of a publicly announced table of allocations with assignments to specific communities was upheld in the courts in *People Broadcasting Company* v. *Federal Communications Commission* (209 F. 2d 286) and *Logansport Broadcasting Corporation* v. *Federal Communications Commission* (210 F. 2d 24). With this approach, which is different from that followed in radio, the Commission has been able to make such changes in assignment of television broadcast facilities to the specific communities as the changing conditions may warrant.

The decision of the Commission to issue radio station licenses on the basis of which community had a greater need for this service was found proper by the court in 1954 in *Allentown Broadcasting Corporation* v. *Federal Communications Commission* (232 F. 2d 57, cert. den. 350 U.S. 1015).

The Commission's determination to prevent an undue concentration of ownership of broadcast licenses was reflected in the issuance of multiple ownership rules, and the validity of this action was upheld by the U.S. Supreme Court in 1956 in *United States* v. *Storer Broadcasting Company*.

The Commission's decision to provide for as many television facilities as possible by assigning transmitting frequencies in both the very high and ultra high frequency bands in the different communities throughout the country was sustained by the courts in 1956 (*Coastal Bend Television Company* v. *Federal Communications Commission* (234 F. 2d 686).)

The position taken by the Commission that the private use of the radio spectrum must be subordinated to national defense requirements and consequently to prohibit private use of frequencies allocated for use in national defense was sustained by the court in 1959 in *Bendix Aviation Corp.* v. *Federal Communications Commission* (272 F. 2d 533).

XVI

PRESIDENT EISENHOWER'S TRAVELS ABROAD

(By U.S. Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, of Massachusetts)

There has been some criticism recently of President Eisenhower's travels abroad. I believe that this primarily stems, simply enough, from the fact that all has not gone exactly as well as it might have in our relationship with friends abroad and our efforts to seek peace. But the reasoning offered is that the administration is substituting so-called personal diplomacy for normal and traditional diplomatic procedures.

I listened to Secretary of State Herter testify on the State Department appropriations bill, and he touched upon the President's trip to the Far East. Mr. Herter emphasized the importance of regular channels for international contact. But he stressed that the purpose of President Eisenhower's travels were to increase friendliness and understanding across the world, and not to negotiate with foreign chiefs of state. The one exception, of course—and the point has been clearly made—was the trip to Paris for the summit meeting.

Criticism based on misunderstanding

It seems to me that the criticism I have mentioned is founded on a misunderstanding, either accidental or contrived, of the true purpose of the President's trips. There is need, therefore, for a clear distinction to be made between international contact among Government officials for actual negotiation and, on the other hand, for the generation of good will.

Perhaps the catchy term "personal diplomacy" has been used too often to describe the President's intent. It has certainly been used imprecisely and even inaccurately. Diplomacy relates directly to conducting negotiations; to arranging treaties, for instance.

The President's travels did not have negotiations as their purpose and, therefore, could not supplant the normal diplomatic processes, which have continued unabated. Perhaps we should carefully make the distinction between "social" and "business" purposes when we characterize the Eisenhower trips.

When the term "personal Presidential diplomacy" is used it must be applied specifically to a situation like the Paris summit

meeting, rather than tossed around casually as a description of everything the President does outside the borders of the United States.

Goodwill missions, efforts to convince far-flung peoples of the basic unity of free men everywhere, travels to demonstrate the dynamic belief of the United States in world peace—these must be separately identified and given full credit for what they are.

I believe these purposes are not only valuable, but necessary, considering the nature of the world today and the character of the Soviet challenge.

Goodwill trips are standard practice

It is actually standard practice for chiefs of state and heads of government to advance their national interests by goodwill trips, and with good reason. We all know of Chairman Khrushchev's efforts in this regard, continuing, in one way or another, since the highly publicized Bulganin-Khrushchev team visit to India in 1955. There is no doubt that this is a crucial weapon in the battle for men's minds, and it would be preposterous for anyone to suggest we should leave it for the Russians alone.

The need for goodwill tours for the President of the leader of free world nations has been advanced by the revolution in transportation and communications technology.

If a head of state can easily and practically visit those he claims to be his foreign friends, it becomes increasingly difficult for him not to do so.

New nations want prestige of U.S. friendship

There is another revolution, so-called, which affects the matter also, and more basically. The new, yearning, emerging nations of the less developed areas have high aspirations for success and prestige in a world previously closed to them.

This is the revolution of rising expectations. In order to encourage these peoples to sustain self-determination, independence, and progress in a free democratic context, we must prove our affection and regard for them.

We must seek to build their self-confidence and self-respect. We go to their homelands to do this, demonstrating directly and personally our recognition of and regard for them. This the President has sought to accomplish in his immensely successful visits to the Near East in 1959, and Latin America and the Far East in 1960. His European trip in 1959 was directed toward vigorously cementing the ties of unity and friendship between ourselves and our Western allies.

Khrushchev feared free world success at Paris

Indeed, a prime reason for Chairman Khrushchev's cancellation of President Eisenhower's visit to the Soviet Union was the fear that such a trip might be too successful from the free world's point of view. The same apprehension undoubtedly directed the organized Communist efforts to block the President's visit to Japan more recently. President Eisenhower's tremendous reputation as a man of peace has had a profound effect on the tactics of international communism.

The dissatisfaction of the Tokyo agitators must be measured against the overwhelming outpourings of affection, admiration, and support from millions of people who have greeted President Eisenhower across the world.

We must not overdraw this recent and temporary damage to our prestige. In many visits—for the first time—of the American head of Government to overlooked nations and peoples, President Eisenhower has demonstrated his willingness to go many thousands of extra miles to improve the chances for peace. Foreign leaders have assured us of the great value to the cause of peace of these journeys, and they have received universal support from within the United States.

XVII

THE REPUBLICAN ADMINISTRATION'S RECORD OF IMPARTIAL FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT, 1953–60

(By U.S. Senator JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, of Kentucky)

One of the most important and satisfying accomplishments of the Republican administration during the past 7½ years has been the reestablishment and continuing growth of public confidence in the impartial administration and enforcement of the Federal laws under the Department of Justice.

Among the factors responsible for this renewed respect for Federal law enforcement have been:

1. The refusal of Government consent to nolo contendere pleas except in unusual circumstances.

2. The abandonment of the health policy in criminal tax prosecutions.

3. The publication of compromise settlements of all kinds.

4. The elimination of private practice for U.S. attorneys and their assistants, thus removing the possibility of conflict of interest.

5. The publication of Executive pardons and the names of those sponsoring such pardons.

6. The employment of the very highest caliber of professional and nonprofessional personnel.

In addition to obtaining attorneys of established reputation and broad experience, an honor law graduate program was established in 1953 to attract to the Department top graduates of the country's leading law schools. To date, 279 talented young attorneys from 73 law schools, representing 40 States and the District of Columbia, have been appointed without regard to considerations of race, religion, or political affiliation.

A sustained drive to eliminate delay in the Government's legal business has been conducted. The primary result of this drive has been the disposition of practically all old cases. An equally important result has been the impressive reduction in the number of cases and matters pending.

During the last 7½ years, despite an overall increase in work brought about by reason of economic expansion and new Federal laws, the total number of items pending, which includes both cases in court and preliminary matters, has been reduced from 74,972 to 48,542, a reduction of 26,430 items, or 35 percent.

The backlog of cases pending, exclusive of preliminary matters, has been reduced from 23,413 to 16,784, a reduction of 6,629 cases, or 28 percent.

In the 7½ years preceding the year 1953, total collections by U.S. attorneys aggregated $202,251,691. In the similar period since 1953, such collections have totaled $234,786,314, an increase of $32,534,624, or 13 percent.

These and the accomplishments described below have taken place without increase in the overall employment in the Department of Justice. On June 30, 1953, the total employment was 30,423; on June 30, 1959, it was 29,987.

Criminal law enforcement

In criminal law enforcement the Republican administration has conducted an intensive and coordinated drive against all forms of organized crime, including narcotics, gambling, illicit liquor operations, tax evasion, and labor racketeering. Highlighting the drive by the Justice Department was the recent conviction of 20 of the conspirators who attended the hilltop meeting at Apalachin, N.Y., in November 1957.

In the labor racketeering field, 143 convictions have been obtained under the Hobbs Act and Labor Management Relations Act as compared to a total of 3 convictions prior to 1953. The list of those convicted includes union officials ranging in importance from the president of the International Longshoremen's Association down to business agents of local unions, in cases where the amounts extorted as the price of labor peace varied from a few thousand to over a million dollars. In addition, the ranking Ohio Teamster official, William J. Presser, was recently convicted of contempt of Congress and obstruction of the Senate Rackets Committee's investigation of the Teamsters Union.

An intensive drive against narcotic violators has resulted in over 10,000 prosecutions with sentences running at an average alltime high. International narcotic smuggling rings smashed include the 1958 conviction of Harry Stromberg and 18 others, and the 1959 conviction of Vito Genovese and 14 others, with the Supreme Court declining to review both cases.

A vast gambling syndicate operating out of Terre Haute, Ind., was broken up by the conviction of its operators on wagering tax evasion charges in July of 1959. In May of 1960, Harry Donovan, multi-million-dollar numbers racket kingpin operating in Richmond, Va., apparently with police protection, pleaded guilty to an 11-count wagering tax indictment.

In addition to thousands of prosecutions against relatively small-scale moonshine producers, the crime drive has centered on eradicating syndicate leaders of large illicit liquor conspiracies in the metropolitan areas. In January 1960, notorious liquor law violators, John and Maurice Levigno, were convicted of conspiracy and operation of large illicit stills in Brooklyn and Long Island City.

Hoodlums and racketeers convicted on tax evasion charges include Pete Licavoli, reputed leader of the old Purple Gang in Detroit, and Paul "The Waiter" De Lucia, alias Paul Ricca, alleged successor to Al Capone in Chicago.

Denaturalization and deportation of racketeers and vice lords is also a part of the program, and denaturalization decrees have been obtained against such figures as Accardi, Corrado, Frank Costello, Vito Genovese, Joe Profaci, and Paul "The Waiter" Ricca, among others.

Frauds upon the investor and consumer public have resulted in a number of significant convictions, the latest being that of Alexander L. Guterma and others for extensive investment frauds.

An average of 1,400 Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act cases have been brought each year to protect the public against adulterated and misbranded products, and a vigorous drive has been made against the illegal sale of sedatives and "pep" pills.

Former Government officials, such as RFC official E. Meri Young, Assistant Attorney General T. Lamar Caudle, and Presidential Secretary Matthew J. Connelly, have been indicted and convicted for irregularities in office. Other important convictions include that of Henry W. Grunewald in a $160,000 tax-fix conspiracy, with whom were five others who were given long prison sentences and heavily fined.

Civil litigation

Civil litigation represents the largest single category of cases in the Justice Department.

During the past 7½ years, the Civil Division has reduced the pending caseload from 76,540 to 13,533 cases by delegating to U.S. attorneys authority to handle smaller routine cases and by conducting an all-out drive to cut the backlog.

The separate Customs Division was eliminated, and its functions were incorporated within the Civil Division and the staff reduced from 22 to 12 attorneys.

A centralized appellate section was organized which last year achieved success in 75 percent of all the appeals handled by it.

The Japanese claims program, involving 24,000 claims and over $130,500,000, was com-

pleted, and the 2 branch offices of the program were closed.

In the first test cases to recover millions of dollars in windfall profits taken by contractors under FHA programs, the results were so successful that administrative compromises were obtained before trial in virtually all other cases and there are only 17 such suits still pending.

A backlog of 2,966 price and rent control cases has been practically liquidated, and only 4 cases remain pending.

In the forfeiture actions brought against such shipowners as Onassis, Niarchos, and Kulukundis, and various Chinese companies, results were so successful that normal Civil Division collections rose from $16 to $18 million a year to over $30 million for 3 years running, and a quarter million tons of new shipping is being built in American yards under the settlements negotiated in several of these cases.

The growth of claims against the United States in foreign courts necessitated the establishment of a special foreign litigation unit and the organization of a network of attorneys in many foreign capitals to represent the Government's interests in the more than 274 cases now pending abroad.

Tax matters

During the 6 years prior to 1953, the pending load of tax cases had almost tripled from 2,500 to 7,000. Despite a continuing proportionate increase in new cases, the Tax Division of the Justice Department not only brought the backlog under control, but reduced the pending workload by over 2,700 cases, concluded a large number of older cases, and cut in half the time required for handling the average tax case from 3 to 1½ years.

During this period, also, this Division of the Justice Department saved the Treasury or collected directly from delinquent taxpayers $350 million, or over 2½ times the amount recovered in the previous 4 years, and 4,344 tax fraud convictions were obtained, as against 2,260 in the prior 12 years.

Among those convicted were former Internal Revenue Commissioner Joseph D. Nunan, Jr.; former Teamster Union President David Beck; Racketeers Frank Costello, Paul "The Waiter" Ricca, Umberto Anastasia, and Peter Licavoli; gamblers Benny Binion, Frank Erickson, Sidney Brodson, and Elmer "Bones" Remmer; labor racketeer Orell B. "Duke" Soucie; Eugene C. James of Chicago, Laundry Workers Union official; Hugh L. Culbreath, former sheriff of Hillsborough County, Fla., an associate of bigtime gamblers; and Frank Keenan, Chicago, former Cook County assessor.

The Tax Division has been successful in 78 percent of the tax cases decided by the Supreme Court and in over 70 percent of those decided by other appellate courts, and today its dockets, for the most part, are in current condition.

Antitrust action increased under Republicans

In the field of antitrust, so important to the preservation of our free enterprise system and the American consumer, a continuation in the pace of stepped up law enforcement saw 63 new cases filed in the fiscal year 1959, more than double the total filed in 1952. Moreover, 70 new cases have already been filed in the current fiscal year. Sixty-six cases were closed in fiscal 1959 and 41 cases have been closed thus far in the present fiscal year. On May 31, 1960, 127 cases were pending.

Since 1953, 215 civil antitrust cases and 171 criminal antitrust cases have been filed. Of these, 31 have been proceedings under the hitherto unused section 7 of the Clayton Act, as amended in 1950, respecting corporate mergers.

Two new contempt cases were filed in 1960, bringing the total since 1953 to 11. This figure represents more than one-third of all such cases filed since the enactment of the Sherman Act in 1890.

The Sherman Act amendment increasing maximum fines has resulted in a rise in fines imposed from $127,000 in 1952 to $914,200 in fiscal 1959. Thus far in fiscal 1960, through May 31, 1960, fines assessed total $993,250. The total dollar amount of fines assessed has shown a substantial increase in every year but one since 1952.

One of the most important milestones in the antitrust field was the establishment in 1953 by the Attorney General of a national committee of some 60 members to study the antitrust laws.

As a result of the committee's work, there was gathered into one place for the first time a statement of prevailing views on major issues of antitrust policy. The Department of Justice gave careful consideration to the report and obtained from Congress amendments to increase from $5,000 to $50,000 the maximum fine which may be imposed for a Sherman Act violation, and authority for the Government to sue for actual damages or injuries resulting to it or its business or property from violations of the antitrust laws. The Division also supported a bill, enacted by Congress in the current session, providing that the Department of Justice be accorded advance notification of proposed mergers of national banks.

Civil rights

The Civil Rights Division of the Justice Department, established in December 1957, is charged with the enforcement of all Federal statutes in the field of civil rights. Since its inception it has processed more than 4,300 complaints of violations of a wide range of statutes and, as of May 1960, has 124 cases pending in court.

Under the Civil Rights Act of 1957, as part of its enforcement program to protect the right of all citizens to vote without racial discrimination, the division instituted three test suits in Georgia, Alabama, and Louisiana which have now been favorably decided by the Supreme Court of the United States. The Louisiana action resulted in restoring to the voting rolls the names of 1,377 Negroes illegally stricken.

Twenty-one other matters under the 1957 act are presently pending in various stages of preparation.

Under the additional authority granted by the Civil Rights Act of 1960, demands for inspection of voting records maintained by local voting registrars have been made in 12 counties. In five of these counties, local authorities have permitted inspection; in other counties there has not been cooperation, and lawsuits have been commenced to compel compliance with the law. The division also conducted successful criminal prosecutions for Federal law violations relating to campaign and election practices.

Convictions involving police brutality have been obtained, and trial of prison guards for mistreatment of inmates will commence soon. Several cases involving the use of "third-degree" methods for obtaining confessions are pending in Ohio against members of a county sheriff's office. An important prosecution under the Fugitive Felon Act, involving flight to avoid State prosecution for kidnapping and murder, resulted in convictions of three offenders and the return of the principal defendant to State authorities in Minnesota for trial and subsequent heavy sentences.

Lands Division of Justice Department

The United States owns about 34 percent of the entire area of the 50 States, and the Lands Division is responsible for all of the land litigation and title work relating to this property.

Some indication of the magnitude of work involved may be seen from the fact that in the field of land acquisition alone, the Lands Division closed in the period 1953 to June 1960, condemnation proceedings or negotiated purchases of over 100,000 tracts of land involving final payments of more than half a billion dollars.

Wherever consistent with the public interest, these takings have been accomplished through settlements, rather than through protracted trials. During the past year, for example, negotiated purchases and condemnation settlements represented about 94 percent of the total dollar volume of all land acquisition closings.

Contributing largely to this record is the effort made during recent years to improve the quality and therefore the reliability of the Government's appraisals of property, in part by the increased use of and reliance upon independent local appraisers.

This has also resulted in the more expeditious handling of cases, as illustrated by the fact that during the past 3 years alone, the number of tracts involved in cases more than 5 years old has been reduced by 63 percent, and in the range between 3 and 5 years the percentage of reduction has been more than 20 percent.

In 1953, at the start of the Republican administration, the Lands Division was instrumental in the formulation of a new policy greatly reducing the amounts of land acquired for dam and reservoir projects. This permitted maximum retention of private rights in land consistent with operation and maintenance requirements. This policy has saved untold millions of dollars in acquisition costs and has allowed equal numbers of millions of dollars worth of land interests to remain on the local tax rolls.

Recognizing the importance of the specialized work in defending the Government against large and complex tribal claims under the Indian Claims Commission Act of 1946, a separate Indian Claims Section was established in 1953, staffed without increase in the total number of division personnel. The aggregate of such claims in the hands of this section is several billions of dollars.

In the field of water and related resources, much progress has been made in representing the interests of the United States in such historic litigation as the Gulf "submerged lands" cases, *Arizona* v. *California* (the lower basin of the Colorado River), and *Wisconsin* v. *Illinois* (the Great Lakes). During this period, rights in offshore oil were largely resolved in the landmark Tidelands cases.

The Lands Division achieved success in fiscal year 1959 in 85.7 percent of the appeals it handled, compared to a 1949–54 average of 73 percent. This is a clear-cut example of Justice Department efficiency under the Republicans.

The division was also principally responsible for the work of the Interdepartmental Committee for the Study of Jurisdiction over Federal Areas within the States, a committee created by direction of the President. This was the first comprehensive factual and legal study in the sensitive area of Federal-State relations, and promises to resolve many important and troublesome problems arising from jurisdictional difficulties.

Immigration and Naturalization

During the past 7½ years, the Immigration and Naturalization Service, through organizational changes and the introduction of new programs and procedures, has achieved significant accomplishments in all of its varied areas of responsibility.

In 1959 a total of 2,865,567 passengers were admitted from foreign countries by sea or air—twice as many as in 1953. With a primary inspection staff increase of just 11 percent, however, the Service, through simplified documentation, improved physical layout, and more efficient inspection procedures, has met this enlarged responsibility effectively and expeditiously.

In 1954, the practice of detaining in Government-operated institutions applicants for admission whose status was doubtful was discontinued, and all large facilities, including Ellis Island, were closed.

In the past 7 years, an average of 132,000 persons became naturalized citizens each year. The Republican administration reduced the waiting period for naturalization applicants from 18 months in 1953 to 40 days in 1960.

As the result of stepped-up enforcement and redeployment of the border patrol, so-called wetback invasion has been stemmed and the daily apprehensions of Mexican illegal entrants reduced from 2,500 to 70.

Since the uprising of the Freedom Fighters in November 1956, almost 32,000 Hungarian refugees have been admitted to the United States under the Attorney General's exercise of the parole provisions of the law. This action was ratified by Republican-sponsored legislation which adjusted the parole status of these homeless people to that of permanent residents.

In the field of law enforcement, primary emphasis has been placed upon the prosecution of criminal, immoral, narcotic, and subversive aliens, rather than on the casual "paper" violator.

Among the 65 persons who attended the Crime Syndicate meeting at Apalachin, N.Y., in 1957, 5 were aliens and 30 naturalized citizens. Of the aliens, Russel Bufalino and Simone Scozzari have been ordered deported; the physical condition of Carlo Gambino precludes completion of his deportation case; and the two others were found not to be deportable. Sam Monachino, a naturalized citizen, fled to Canada and there renounced his American citizenship. Vito Genovese has been denaturalized, and proceedings have been brought against Dominick D'Agostino. Joseph Barbara, at whose home the "delegates" convened, and Salvatore Tornabe have died.

Leaflets dropped from Florida-based planes over Cuba and other incidents resulted in a request from the Secretary of State to the Attorney General for departure control of all persons leaving the United States by private aircraft for Cuba. Since November 2, 1959, the service has covered some 200 private airfields and 100 plane rental agencies, to prevent flights that would increase tensions in the Caribbean area. The Commissioner has served 49 persons with official notices not to depart from the United States for Cuba by private aircraft.

Internal security

One hundred and nine leaders of the Communist Party have been convicted by juries for violating or conspiring to violate the Smith Act, all but 28 of these being subsequent to January 1953.

As a result of the Supreme Court's decision in the Yates case in 1957, laying down more stringent standards of proof, 70 of these cases were dismissed. However, 39 top leaders remain convicted, 4 under the membership clause of the Smith Act, and the remainder under the conspiracy statute. Two cases raising the question of the constitutionality of the membership clause are scheduled to be heard by the Supreme Court next fall, and a 1959 conviction of six Communists in Denver for conspiracy to violate the Smith Act is pending in the court of appeals.

Since the Supreme Court's affirmance of the Barenblatt case in 1959, upholding the authority of the House Un-American Activities Committee, there have been nine convictions for contempt of Congress in the internal security field, and eight additional contempt of Congress cases are pending in the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia.

Nine officials of the Mine, Mill & Smelter Workers Union were convicted, and three others entered pleas of nolo contendere in 1959 to conspiracy to defraud the Government by fraudulently using the facilities of the National Labor Relations Board through the filing of false non-Communist affidavits. The nine defendants have taken an appeal. Previously, seven members of the United Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers Union, most of whom were Communist Party functionaries, were convicted of conspiring to file false non-Communist affidavits with the Labor Board. This case was affirmed by the court of appeals and is now pending on petition for certiorari.

The court of appeals in 1959 upheld the decision of the Subversive Activities Control Board after remand by the Supreme Court that the Communist Party, U.S.A., must register with the Attorney General as a Communist-action organization under the Internal Security Act of 1950. Argument will be heard by the Supreme Court in October 1960. Following the Board's original determination in 1953, the Internal Security Division of Justice moved against 21 Communist-front organizations to have the Board order their registration as such. Registration orders of the Board have been entered against 12 of these organizations, 10 of which have appealed. Eight actions were dismissed on motions of the Government. One action awaits final order of the Board.

Two actions were brought under the Communist Control Act of 1954 to have the Board determine that two labor organizations are Communist infiltrated. One case was dismissed on the Government's motion due to loss of witnesses, and the second is at trial.

Since 1954, active registrations under the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended, have increased from 271 to the present 401. Four individuals and one organization were successfully prosecuted for failure to register under the act.

Recent convictions for conspiracy to commit espionage have included Col. Rudolf Abel, Soviet State Security Service (KGB), Jack and Myra Soble, and Jacob Albam; indictments have been returned against George and Jane Zlatovski, and Alfred and Martha Stern, all of whom are fugitives outside the United States.

The Internal Security Division of the Justice Department also:

1. Obtained convictions against 23 Puerto Rican Nationalist Party members for seditious conspiracy.

2. Convicted 215 persons, mostly Cuban revolutionary sympathizers of Fidel Castro, under the neutrality and munitions control statutes.

3. Brought 18 prosecutions under the Trading With the Enemy Act largely involving trade with Red China, of which nine have been successfully concluded.

4. Obtained 49 convictions of subversives relating to perjury, false statements in Government forms and falsifications of affidavits filed pursuant to the Labor Management Act of 1947.

5. Sustained the constitutionality of the Witness Immunity Act of 1954 in the Ullman case.

6. Secured two convictions for conspiracy and obstruction of justice.

7. Defended 48 civil cases brought against Government officers involving Government employee discharges, passport matters, and military discharges in the internal security area.

This is the factual record of the Republican administration's impartial administration and enforcement of Federal laws.

XVIII

FACTS AND FIGURES ON THE PUBLIC DEBT AND INTEREST CHARGES SINCE 1900—THE FISCAL RECORD OF THE TWO POLITICAL PARTIES

(By U.S. Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS, of Delaware)

This is an analysis of the fiscal record left by the two political parties since 1900.

Since 1900, Republicans have controlled the Presidency during 32 of the 60 fiscal years. Democrats were in office during 28 years. However, President Truman disclaimed responsibility for events during the 80th Congress (fiscal years 1948 and 1949); in the following analysis, therefore, those years are assigned to Republicans, not Democrats.

In this analysis, credit is assigned to the party which was in power at the beginning of the fiscal year, not the end.

During 34 Republican years:

	In millions
Total budget deficits	$30,383
Total budget surpluses	20,279
Net deficit	9,654
During 26 Democratic years:	
Total budget deficits	$273,588
Total budget surpluses	5,112
Net deficit	268,476

Summary:

Net deficit, 1901–60	$278,130,000.
Republicans' share	3.5 percent of total.
Democrats' share	96.5 percent of total.
Interest burden in Federal Budget for fiscal year 1961	$9,585,000
Republicans' share (3.5 percent of total)	335,000
Democrats' share (96.5 percent of total)	9,250,000

Additional data

Interest burden, fiscal year 1961, as percent of total Federal Budget:	*Percent*
Total	12.0
Republicans' share	.4
Democrats' share	11.6

Total cost of interest payments on the Federal debt:	*In billions*
1901 to 1960	$124.6
1901 to 1933	12.7
1934 to 1960	111.9

NOTE.—Total interest payments, 1901–30, $10.8 billion. Estimated interest payments, 1961 alone, $9.6 billion.

Sources: Annual reports of the U.S. Treasury Department and the President's budget, fiscal year 1961.

Federal budget surpluses and deficits, 1901–60 (based on which political party controlled the Presidency)

[In millions of dollars except where otherwise indicated]

Fiscal year	GOP		Democrat	
	Surplus	Deficit	Surplus	Deficit
1901	63			
1902	77			
1903	45			
1904		43		
1905		23		
1906	25			
1907	87			
1908		57		
1909		89		
1910		18		
1911	11			
1912	3			
1913		(1)		
1914				(1)
1915				63
1916			48	
1917				853
1918				9,032
1919				13,365
1920			192	
1921			509	
1922	736			
1923	713			
1924	963			
1925	717			
1926	865			
1927	1,155			
1928	939			
1929	734			
1930	738			
1901–30	7,871	230	848	23,311

1 Less than $500,000.

***Federal budget surpluses and deficits, 1901–60 (based on which political party controlled the Presidency)*—Continued**

[In millions of dollars except where otherwise indicated]

Fiscal year	GOP		Democrat	
	Surplus	Deficit	Surplus	Deficit
1931		462		
1932		2,735		
1933		2,602		
1934				3,630
1935				2,791
1936				4,425
1937				2,777
1938				1,177
1939				3,862
1940				3,918
1941				6,159
1942				21,490
1943				57,420
1944				51,423
1945				53,941
1946				20,676
1947			754	
1948	[1] 8,419			
1949		[1] 1,811		
1950				3,122
1951			3,510	
1952				4,017
1953				9,449
1954		3,117		
1955		4,180		
1956	1,626			
1957	1,596			
1958		2,819		
1959		12,427		
1960	[2] 217			
1931–60	11,858	30,153	4,264	250,277

[1] 80th Cong.: President Truman disclaimed all responsibility.
[2] Preliminary estimate.

Burden of the public debt, by States, according to which political party is responsible

[Figures in millions of dollars except where otherwise indicated]

States	Public debt built up since 1900—	
	Under Republicans	Under Democrats
United States	9,654	268,476
Alabama	94	2,604
Alaska	12	322
Arizona	54	1,503
Arkansas	43	1,208
California	1,003	27,895
Colorado	88	2,443
Connecticut	212	5,906
Delaware	58	1,611
Florida	239	6,658
Georgia	126	3,517
Hawaii	29	805
Idaho	24	671
Illinois	698	19,411
Indiana	227	6,309
Iowa	111	3,087
Kansas	96	2,658
Kentucky	105	2,926
Louisiana	116	3,222
Maine	42	1,154
Maryland	183	5,101
Massachusetts	335	9,316
Michigan	458	12,726
Minnesota	159	4,430
Mississippi	43	1,208
Missouri	223	6,202
Montana	30	832
Nebraska	59	1,638
Nevada	19	537
New Hampshire	31	859
New Jersey	413	11,491
New Mexico	36	993
New York	1,309	36,405
North Carolina	136	3,786
North Dakota	21	591
Ohio	565	15,706
Oklahoma	96	2,658
Oregon	83	2,309
Pennsylvania	697	19,384
Rhode Island	51	1,423
South Carolina	59	1,638
South Dakota	20	564
Tennessee	112	3,114
Texas	419	11,652
Utah	35	967
Vermont	17	483
Virginia	162	4,510
Washington	149	4,135
West Virginia	73	2,040
Wisconsin	201	5,584
Wyoming	16	456
District of Columbia	66	1,826

***Interest cost in 1961 budget, as built up*[1]**

States	Total	Under Republicans	Under Democrats
United States	9,585	335	9,250
Alabama	93	3	90
Alaska	12	[2]	11
Arizona	54	2	52
Arkansas	43	2	42
California	996	35	961
Colorado	87	3	84
Connecticut	211	7	204
Delaware	58	2	56
Florida	238	8	229
Georgia	126	4	121
Hawaii	29	1	28
Idaho	24	1	23
Illinois	693	24	669
Indiana	225	8	217
Iowa	110	4	106
Kansas	95	3	92
Kentucky	104	4	101
Louisiana	115	4	111
Maine	41	1	40
Maryland	182	6	176
Massachusetts	333	12	321
Michigan	454	16	438
Minnesota	158	6	153
Mississippi	43	2	42
Missouri	221	8	214
Montana	30	1	29
Nebraska	58	2	56
Nevada	19	1	19
New Hampshire	31	1	30
New Jersey	410	14	396
New Mexico	35	1	34
New York	1,300	45	1,254
North Carolina	135	5	130
North Dakota	21	1	20
Ohio	561	20	541
Oklahoma	95	3	92
Oregon	82	3	80
Pennsylvania	692	24	668
Rhode Island	51	2	49
South Carolina	58	2	56
South Dakota	20	1	19
Tennessee	111	4	107
Texas	416	15	401
Utah	34	1	33
Vermont	17	1	17
Virginia	161	6	155
Washington	148	5	142
West Virginia	73	3	70
Wisconsin	199	7	192
Wyoming	16	1	16
District of Columbia	65	2	63

[1] Cols. 2 and 3 do not always total col. 1, due to rounding.
[2] Less than $500,000.

XIX

FIGHTING FOR FREEDOM—AT HOME AND ABROAD

(By U.S. Senator STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire)

With the 2d session of the 86th Congress drawing to a close, there are many questions in our minds about the future. Some fateful decisions that will affect the lives of all of us will be made very soon.

There are many things going on in the world that will affect all our lives for all time to come.

Summit collapse not a national tragedy

Foremost in our minds is the international situation. The collapse of the summit conference startled many of us. It was as though we were strolling along a quiet country road, and suddenly a dog, snapping and snarling, runs at us from a farmyard. We don't know whether to kick at him, or throw a stone, or to keep on our way, ignoring him. So it was when Khrushchev began snapping and snarling at Paris.

But, let me assure you of this: the collapse of the summit conference was no national tragedy. A great many Americans have opposed such conferences all along. We remembered earlier summits, when Western heads of state were outmaneuvered and cheated by Khrushchev's predecessor—the cunning Stalin.

Khrushchev's 180° turn from so-called "peaceful coexistence" at Paris was just a reminder of how fully he remains a dedicated Communist. When he saw that he wasn't going to get away with anything, he flip-flopped around and tried to embarrass the President for his own political advantage.

Khrushchev is a pure Communist agitator, from the top of his head to the soles of his feet, but especially in the area of the larynx.

Any time he can talk the world into a crisis, you can be sure he will do so. His failure at Paris was that he did not panic the world. Our President, to his everlasting credit, withstood his inflammatory onslaught with dignity and forbearance. In my opinion, that saved the day for the free world.

Red-inspired riots will not break Japanese-American ties

But crisis follows crisis in these troubled times; the Communist agitators never rest. They stirred up student-Socialist riots in Japan in a vain effort to scuttle the Japanese-American peace treaty. Then, when President Eisenhower's planned visit was postponed, they tried to make something of that, too. They said the United States "lost face," but let's look at it another way. When you want to invite a friend to your home, but your children are so bad that you are ashamed to go through with it, who is embarrassed? Or, if you refuse to break bread with a friend because his household is too rowdy, who should be ashamed, you or your friend?

The fact is, we acted the part of the mature friend and gave Japan the opportunity to postpone the visit, thus saving face. In my opinion, our action was generous, just, and proper. Our friendship with the Japanese people and their Government, carefully nurtured during all the years since the tragedy of World War II, will continue and flourish. The Communists won't drive a wedge between us, because we won't let them.

Our foreign policy has kept the peace

The fundamental purpose of our foreign policy is to keep the peace. That is the test. During the past 7½ years—since the end of the Korean war—our foreign policy has been eminently successful. No American armies are fighting in foreign lands. No American blood is wetting alien soil. No American boys are dying on faraway battlefields.

That is the acid test of our foreign policy. Let us pray that our efforts to wage peace will be equally successful in the years ahead.

Whether we call it "cold war" or what-have-you, resistance to the international Communist conspiracy is a condition of survival for the foreseeable future. We've got to maintain the moral strength and courage to sustain future diplomatic blowups, and we've got to back it up with military power. Certainly we could not have come through the past 7 years in peace, unless we had had the military strength to back up our foreign policies.

Growth of U.S. military power since Korean war

In 1953, no ship afloat was powered by atomic energy. Today we have 9 nuclear submarines in commission and 23 under construction or being converted.

In 1953 the Polaris missile system was just a dream.

This year it is a reality, as 2 of these submarines, each capable of firing 16 warheaded missiles while submerged, join our active defense forces.

At the close of the Korean war, just 7 years ago, an airplane expected to operate at speeds greater than the speed of sound was in its early design stage. Today, Mach 2 aircraft are part of our regular forces, and a Mach 3 plane is on the way.

In 1953, the Atlas Intercontinental Ballistic Missile was a hazy concept. It was surrounded by doubters. They said it would be operational by 1965. But today—1960—we have Atlases on the launching pads, with an incredible record of sucecssful test firing, and a proved accuracy far exceeding

the most optimistic hopes of a few years ago.

In 1953, the Intermediate Range Ballistic Missiles, Jupiter and Thor, were not even contemplated. Today, the Thor is in the hands of our allies in the United Kingdom, and the Jupiter booster launched our first earth satellite in 1958.

Since that first launching, the United States has put 24 satellites into orbit, compared with a total of six space vehicles for the Soviets. Today, we have 13 satellites circling in space, including the remarkable Transit-II-A, launched June 15. This two-package scientific achievement is designed to benefit all of humanity. The American people, who provided the knowledge and skill that went into Transit-II-A, deserve the congratulations and thanks of the entire world.

Two, perhaps three, Soviet space devices are in orbit today, transmitting no information. Beyond any question, we have far surpassed them in overall scientific achievement in the exploration of outer space.

Two years ago, the launching of a satellite made headlines in every newspaper. Today, it does well to make page one at all. Anti-aircraft and tactical missiles, air defense and offense systems come off of the drawing boards and into ships, planes, and land installations—and are taken for granted. Our ground forces have been constantly modernized during the past few years, and just a few weeks ago, more funds were voted for these purposes.

All these changes I have mentioned have taken place in just 7 years—since the close of the Korean war—and during a Republican administration. It's amazing to me that so much could have been accomplished, and there is absolutely no doubt in my mind that this progress in the military field, backing up our foreign policy, has been the main factor in keeping the peace during these trying years.

Peace lets us give attention to domestic problems

Following the great economic crisis of the 1930's, World War II in the 1940's, and the Korean war in the early 1950's, we took full advantage of the years of peace and gave attention to domestic problems.

As I recall a TV commercial—it goes, I think—"Better things for better living, through chemistry."

I'd like to paraphrase that and say, "Better living, for more Americans, through sound Government and the free enterprise system." And I'd like to add a personal opinion—that's a pretty good "commercial" for the progress that we have made since the close of the Korean war.

During this period the American free enterprise system has served our people magnificently.

I would also like to mention that, in 1952, the average weekly earnings of factory workers was $67.97. Last month, it was over $90. Is this not indicative of our tremendous economic growth?

During this same period, homeownership has risen at a steady and healthy rate—and I mention that because I know of no more reliable and significant indicator of economic health. Today, more than 60 percent of us own or are buying our own homes.

The problem of inflation

During the quarter century of crisis to which I referred, when economic catastrophe was followed by war, more economic troubles, and yet another war, the problem of inflation reared its ugly head, and the cost of living soared.

The 100-cent dollars slipped downward to 90 cents, to 80 cents, to 70 cents, and so on, until, during the Korean war, it skidded to 52 cents. We put the brakes on the inflationary roller coaster in 1953, and since then, have held the depreciation of the dollar to just a few cents. It is now worth approximately 48 cents, in comparison with the 1939 dollar.

To express inflation another way—the Consumer Price Index rose 89.4 percent between 1940 and 1952. It rose 9.8 percent between 1952 and 1959.

But, no matter how you express it or illustrate it, it is a terrible thing.

In my opinion, although we have effectively slowed down inflation in the past 7 years, it is still the major domestic problem facing the Nation.

A study in 1957 by the Social Security Administration showed that the average monthly benefit for retired workers had risen only 13.6 percent in terms of real dollars between 1940 and 1957. This means that the typical social security retiree is scarcely better off today than he was nearly 20 years ago. Thus, all the economic progress we're so proud of has not been shared by retired persons.

Now, maybe I'm old-fashioned, but I think a person who works 30 or 40 years and, one way or another, prepares for retirement through savings, participation in a pension plan, and/or the social security program, is entitled to live out his remaining years in comfort. When a person saves on the basis of a 100-cent dollar, but upon retirement finds he must pay for food, shelter, and clothing on the basis of a 50-cent dollar—it's like changing the rules on him in the middle of the game. And I don't think it's right to change the rules on him when he reaches retirement age. When the rules are changed inadvertently, as in inflation, I think we should try to do something to compensate the retiree for the damage.

The Bridges social security proposal

There are various proposals before Congress having to do with helping our senior citizens. One, which I introduced, would permit a man or woman to earn up to $1,800 a year without sacrificing any of his social security benefit. This, it seems to me, is logical and justifiable. This Nation needs the wisdom and skills of our "elder statesman" citizens. And *they* need the freedom to work and earn, to the limit of their own judgment. The present law puts a penalty on those who are able and happy to work and earn.

The administration's medicare plan

Another proposal before Congress of interest to our retirees is the plan for hospitalization insurance for citizens over 65 years old.

Actually, there are two proposals. One is the Forand bill—a compulsory, socialized medicine approach that would be operated by the Federal Government. The other is the administration's medicare plan—a voluntary plan that would be operated jointly by the Federal Government and the States.

The Forand bill benefits many people who do not need the benefits, but leaves out 4 million aged not covered by social security, more than half of whom have incomes of less than $1,000 a year. And the Forand bill is compulsory for those it does cover.

I hate compulsion.

I believe in personal freedom.

I support the medicare plan because I think it is the best plan for the most people. And it is a voluntary plan.

Fighting inflation is fighting for retirees

I hope that the medicare plan and my proposal for the modernization of our social security laws will become law. Both will help. But, there is another fight which, in the long run, is even more important to our senior citizens. That is the battle against inflation.

There are three principle causes of inflation. One is profiteering by business. Another is excessive wage demands by labor. The third, and this is the one I am most directly interested in, is Government spending and monetary matters.

Government deficit spending is simply printing paper money and feeding it into the mainstream of our economy without a compensating supply of goods and services. The result, as someone has expressed it, is: "Too much money chasing too few goods." The result is a soaring cost-of-living index, and the depreciating dollar.

Reckless Government spending won't solve problems

There is no magic formula that will solve the domestic problems confronting our Nation. They cannot be solved by political drumbeating or the reckless spending of the people's money.

While every thoughtful citizen wants a full measure of goods and services for every dollar he spends, our senior citizens are the first to detect signs of inflation, and the first to feel its effects.

Balanced budget key to progress

The mistaken idea has been planted that the drive for a balanced Federal budget stifles progress. On the contrary, by balancing the budget, the Federal Government can contribute to solid progress by stabilizing our dollars. The alternative is creeping or leaping inflation—depending on the amount of deficit spending.

Inflation is not progress—it is only the illusion of progress. During inflation we receive higher wages, but they buy less than before, so how can we say we are making progress?

The greatest service our Government could do for the people right now is to put its fiscal house in order. The greatest service the people could do for their Government is to demand fiscal responsibility of their elected representatives.

Dollars and people

One political accusation that I am sick and tired of hearing is the one that goes something like this: "My opponent is interested in dollars; I am interested in people."

That is the cry of the demagog. What hogwash.

This absurd charge is usually leveled at any conscientious public servant who questions a costly Government spending program designed to benefit a special interest group.

Well, let me ask this: Who's dollars are we talking about? Aren't they the people's dollars? Or have we forgotten our own screams of anguish and our rages against Government spending the last time income taxes were due?

I think two questions should be asked of every Government spending proposal. (1) Can we afford it? and (2) Is it the best use of the public's money in the public's interest?

I view with suspicion any politician who lacks the courage, honesty, or wisdom to face up to the hard decision of how best to spend public money.

We should think twice before entrusting such a man with our welfare and our tax money.

Well-informed citizens—our hope for the future

The hope for the future is a well-informed public. If the problems I have mentioned are solved, and I am confident they will be, it will come about mainly through the interest and efforts of the people.

By now, the cold war has demonstrated that to survive and prosper in a free society, America must rely on its human resources, including its most mature minds.

XX

THE NATION'S PROGRESS IN EDUCATION, SOCIAL SECURITY, HEALTH, AND THE GENERAL WELFARE UNDER THE REPUBLICAN ADMINISTRATION

(By U.S. Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH, of Maine)

Soon after he took office, President Eisenhower recommended establishment of the

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to bring to the highest councils of Government the human problems of the people.

The 83d Congress approved his plan, and the first new Cabinet office in 40 years came into being in April 1953, under the sponsorship of a Republican administration.

In one way or another, the programs developed, recommended, and put into effect by the Republican administration touched the lives of every man, woman, and child in America. The goal of all these programs was to conserve and strengthen the Nation's greatest natural resource—its people.

Since the Department was created, dramatic progress has been made in the national effort to achieve better health, better education, and greater economic security.

The administration has supported and obtained legislation to:

1. Strengthen the Nation's educational system.

2. Broaden the coverage and the benefits of the Social Security Act.

3. Expand a rehabilitation program which offers new hope for the disabled.

4. Strengthen our research efforts in science and medicine.

5. Provide more adequate health services and facilities.

6. Provide improved protection to consumers against harmful foods and drugs.

This progress has been made within a policy of fiscal responsibility in the conduct of Government, and under programs designed to encourage greater initiative and enterprise by individuals, private agencies, and local and State governments.

Progress in health

In 1954, the first full year of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare's operation, expenditures for the Public Health Service totaled $242 million. The President's 1961 budget calls for $825 million—an increase of 241 percent. In the past 7 years:

1. Medical research has been vastly expanded, with particular emphasis on cancer, heart diseases, mental illness, and other major killers and cripplers. Federal assistance to medical research has increased more than fivefold since 1954. Major new research centers have been put to work.

2. Health and medical facilities have been significantly expanded. The Federal-State program to assist in constructing hospital and medical facilities has been broadened to include chronic disease hospitals, nursing homes, rehabilitation facilities and diagnostic and treatment centers. A new grant program has been established to enable medical schools and other institutions to improve and expand their laboratories and research facilities.

3. The supply of manpower skilled in the health sciences has been increased. Training grants and fellowships have been established or expanded for promising research scientists, public health personnel, graduate professional nurses, and practical nurses.

4. Greater emphasis has been placed on the promotion of public health and preventive medicine among the American people. New or greatly strengthened programs have been developed:

(a) Radiological Health: The Public Health Service has greatly expanded its research, training, and consultative activities in the field of radiological health under the Republican administration. It is working toward the development of methods to reduce exposure from radiation sources, and it has intensified its systematic measurements of radiation levels in air, water, and milk.

In March 1958, a new Division of Radiological Health was created by the Service to provide technical assistance to State agencies in dealing with medical, industrial, and other activities involving radiation hazards to health.

In August 1959, the President established the Federal Radiation Council to coordinate all governmental radiological activities and to insure policy consideration of the health factors involved in the highest councils of Government. Responsibility for the collation, analysis, and interpretation of data on environmental radiation levels was assigned for the first time to a single agency—the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The council established basic guidelines for radiation protection standards in its first report to the President in May 1960, and is now making detailed studies to assure continued effective protection of the American people against radiation hazards.

(b) Water pollution: In 1956, the Republican administration sponsored legislation which led to passage of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

This act authorized a broader research program, research fellowships, increased assistance to States, grant programs for State water pollution control activities and for construction of municipal sewage treatment works, and a Federal enforcement role in abating interstate pollution. In April 1959, water pollution control activities were elevated to division status in the Public Health Service to reflect the increasing importance of this program. For the first time in history, the President has called a National Conference on Water Pollution, to be held this December, to focus attention on future needs in this critical area.

(c) Air pollution: Legislation in 1955 established a Federal program of research and technical activities to strengthen control of air pollution. The Public Health Service is collaborating with State and local governments, universities, industrial organizations, and research institutions in a major effort to acquire new knowledge and develop effective measures for prevention and control of the increasing problem of air pollution. In 1958, the Republican administration sponsored the first National Air Pollution Conference, held under PHS auspices, which provided a nationwide impetus to air pollution control activities.

(d) Health data: The Republican administration recommended and Congress authorized a continuing national survey of health and illness in the United States—the first such program in the world. The survey, begun in 1957, is conducted through actual interviews with householders throughout the Nation about illness in the family, accidents and injuries, disability, hospitalization, and medical and dental care. As comparative data are collected over a period of time, this survey will prove invaluable in planning for facilities and staff to meet health needs.

5. Since the transfer of the Indian Health program to the Public Health Service in 1955, dramatic progress has been made in health and medical services to the 385,000 American Indians and Alaskan natives. In 1959, administration-sponsored legislation was enacted providing urgently needed sanitation facilities and services in Indian communities.

6. In addition, legislation has been sought of a Democratic-controlled Congress to make possible further progress in the health field. Major pending proposals sponsored by this administration would:

(a) Establish a broad and balanced program to provide health and medical care for persons over 65 who do not have the resources or the opportunity to obtain adequate protection against the staggering financial burden of long term and other expensive illness.

(b) Improve the Nation's health and medical facilities and increase the supply of medical manpower by:

(i) amending the Hospital and Medical Facilities Construction Grant program to provide greater emphasis on hospital modernization, research and planning for more effective use of medical facilities and services, and construction of special facilities for mental health and for the care of long-term patients.

(ii) authorizing a 5-year program of construction grants for teaching facilities to expand the training capacity of schools of medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, and public health.

(iii) authorizing a 5-year program of project grants to strengthen or expand graduate training in schools of public health and other institutions providing graduate training of public health nurses and sanitary engineers.

(iv) authorizing a 5-year program of Federal credit assistance in the construction of group practice facilities.

(v) providing institutional grants for research in the health sciences to permit colleges and universities to pursue basic research on a more stable foundation, and with full Federal payment of the indirect costs of research.

(c) Strengthen the Water Pollution Control Act to provide increased authority to enforce decisions designed to abate pollution of interstate waters.

(d) Strengthen the Air Pollution Control Act to give the Surgeon General the authority to make investigations and hold public hearings on air pollution problems of broad significance.

Greater food and drug protection

Expenditures for the Food and Drug Administration in 1954 were $6.2 million. The President's 1961 budget calls for expenditures of $17.8 million—an increase of 187 percent. In the past 7 years:

1. Food and Drug Administration inspection force has been tripled since 1954 in order more effectively to guard the Nation's food and drug supply and remove unsafe products from the marketplace.

2. Basic scientific research programs have been intensified, scientific staffs have been increased, laboratory equipment has been modernized, two new field headquarters have been established, and construction of a new headquarters building with modern laboratories have been authorized.

3. Far-reaching legislation has been sought and obtained to improve the protection of the public against harmful, unclean, or misrepresented foods, drugs, or cosmetics. A landmark in this effort was the Food Additives Amendment of 1958, which required that food additives be shown safe for human consumption before use. This legislation established the principle that the burden of proof must rest squarely on the manufacturer to assure the safety of products prior to their sale to consumers.

4. In addition, legislation has been recommended to provide a scientifically sound basis for approving colors that may be safely used in foods, drugs, and cosmetics, and to establish other safeguards including, where necessary, appropriate tolerance limitations on the amount of the color that may be used.

Progress in education

In 1954, Federal expenditures for the Office of Education were $217 million. The President's 1961 budget calls for expenditures of $442 million—an increase of 104 percent. During the past 7 years:

1. The Office of Education's informational, statistical, and technical consultant services to the Nation's schools and colleges have been greatly improved. In 1954, administration-sponsored legislation established a long-needed program of research of problems in education in cooperation with colleges, universities, and State departments of education.

2. In 1955, the first White House Conference on Education was convened by President Eisenhower to bring about "the most thorough, widespread, and concerted study the American people have ever made of their educational problems." The Conference provided a detailed examination of elementary and secondary education, including school

building needs, organization and financing, educational goals, and public understanding and support.

3. The President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School, composed of distinguished lay leaders and educators, made a thorough study of present and future needs of higher education. The Committee's recommendations, submitted in December 1957, focused national attention on the needs of the colleges and universities in the decade ahead.

4. Early in 1958, the administration sponsored legislation to help overcome deficiencies in the educational system and stimulate the fullest development of the mental resources and technical skills of the Nation's young men and women. The National Defense Education Act of 1958, which substantially embodied the administration's proposals, is already recognized as a landmark in the history of American education.

The act established:

A broad student loan program to enable talented students who need financial help to obtain a higher education, and a fellowship program to help overcome the national shortage of adequately trained college and university teachers.

Grants to the States to strengthen instruction in science, mathematics and modern foreign languages in the public schools.

Grants to the States to strengthen testing, guidance and counseling programs in the secondary schools in order that talented students may be more readily identified and encouraged to develop their abilities.

Authorization for modern foreign language centers and institutes to train teachers and increase the number of persons skilled in foreign languages.

Grants to States to assist in training individuals for employment as highly skilled technicians.

5. A total of $1.7 billion has been appropriated during this administration for assistance to schools in federally affected areas.

6. In 1956, the Library Services Act established a program of Federal grants to stimulate the extension of public library services to rural areas.

7. A program of grants to the States and to colleges and universities was established in 1958 to encourage expansion of teaching and education programs for the mentally retarded.

8. Through the surplus property utilization program, many schools and colleges throughout the country have acquired additional facilities and enriched their courses of study. Hospitals and research institutions have also benefited from the program, which in the past 7 years has made available over $1 billion worth of real estate and equipment no longer needed by the Federal Government.

9. In addition, legislation has been sought to make possible further progress in the field of education. In each of the last three Congresses, the administration has sponsored legislation to provide Federal assistance to the States in the construction of needed public elementary and secondary school buildings. To help colleges and universities meet anticipated enrollment increases, the administration is sponsoring legislation to establish a Federal program of assistance to institutions of higher education which would provide payments of up to one-third of the cost of constructing needed academic and housing facilities.

Progress in social security

Since 1953:

1. Coverage under the Social Security Act has been broadened to make 12 million additional people eligible to provide retirement income benefits for themselves and their dependents. Coverage has been extended to include members of the Armed Forces, farmers and farm operators, lawyers, ministers, and other self-employed people.

2. Socal security benefit payments have increased from $2.5 billion in 1952 to an estimated $10.3 billion in 1960. During this period, the number of persons receiving benefits has grown from 5 million to more than 14 million. Benefits provided under the system have been increased in 1954 and again in 1958: the average benefit to a retired worker has risen from $49.25 at the end of 1952 to $73.12 as of February 1960. The amount of money retired men and women have been permitted to earn without loss of benefits has been increased. In 1956, the President signed legislation to provide benefits for disabled persons 50 and over, and in 1958 these benefits were extended to their families.

3. Federally aided programs of old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, aid to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled now provide for some 5.8 million needy people. Federal grants for these programs, totaling over $2 billion a year, have stimulated the States to provide increased payments and more effective social services for needy persons.

4. In 1956, administration-sponsored legislation stimulated significant improvement in medical services to the needy. Payments for medical care have risen from $180 million in 1956 to an estimated $360 million in 1960.

5. In addition, legislation has been sought to make possible further progress in the welfare field. Changes have been recommended to broaden the coverage of the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program, including the removal of the age-50 limitation on the payment of disability insurance benefits. Legislation has also been introduced to establish a broad and balanced program of health and medical care for persons over 65 who do not have the resources or the opportunity to obtain adequate protection against the staggering financial burdens of long-term and other expensive illness.

New hope for the disabled

In 1954, Federal expenditures for vocational rehabilitation totaled $23.6 million. The President's 1961 budget calls for $69.4 million—an increase of 194 percent. In the interim, the administration has sponsored and carried out a broad expansion of the vocational rehabilitation program.

Funds have been provided for the training of doctors, nurses, social workers, and other needed specialists in rehabilitation. Today more than 80,000 handicapped people are now being rehabilitated annually, and a goal of 93,000 rehabilitations has been set for fiscal year 1961.

The new emphasis on restoring the disabled to productive lives combines humanitarian ideals with sound economy. Since the program was expanded in 1954, some 400 thousand disabled men and women have been returned to active employment. These include thousands in the professional fields of medicine, education, and engineering, where the Nation urgently requires additional manpower. Others work on farms or in trades. By restoring the ability of these people to earn their own living, their own sense of self-respect and dignity has also been restored. Moreover, many of them have been transformed from individuals dependent on tax revenues into self-reliant taxpayers.

Persons rehabilitated since 1954 have earned more than $1.9 billion and have paid about $150 million in Federal income taxes. About 80,000 of these people had been on Public Assistance receiving payments at the rate of about $65 million annually. An even larger number would probably have become dependent on public support after exhausting their resources and those of their families if the Federal-State program of vocational rehabilitation had not entered their lives and prevented dependency on public funds.

Progress for the older men and women of America

The Republican administration has given special attention to the needs and opportunities of the Nation's older citizens. The Federal Council on Aging has been reconstituted at Cabinet level to provide overall coordination of executive branch planning and activities on behalf of the aged population. Within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, a special staff on aging has been established and a Center for Aging Research has been created at the National Institutes of Health. For the first time in history, a White House Conference on Aging has been called by President Eisenhower for 1961.

In one way or another, every operating agency of the Department is concerned with the welfare of the 16 million citizens over 65.

Progress for the children and young people of America

The Republican administration has devoted special attention to the needs and opportunities of the Nation's young people.

Grants have been increased for maternal and child health services, care of crippled, and mentally retarded children and child welfare services.

Welfare services have been extended to children in urban as well as rural areas.

A special unit in the Children's Bureau and a special research program at the National Institute of Mental Health have been established to study the problems associated with juvenile delinquency.

In a joint report to Congress in February 1960, the Children's Bureau and NIMH called attention to the need for increased research, field studies, and demonstration projects in the prevention and treatment of juvenile delinquency. The White House Conference on Children and Youth, in March of 1960, spotlighted ways to improve opportunities for all children in the coming decade.

In addition, improvements have been made in the aid to dependent children program as a part of public assistance to needy persons.

XXI

U.S. FOREIGN POLICY UNDER THE REPUBLICAN ADMINISTRATION, 1953–60

(By U.S. Senator STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, senior Republican Senator and chairman of the Republican policy committee)

The accomplishments of the Republican administration in the field of foreign affairs reflect the basic purpose of our foreign policy: to preserve and enhance the security and freedom of the United States.

In our efforts to create a more stable world order, the United States has sought to:

(a) Strengthen collective security.

(b) Deter the use of force.

(c) Create international status in new frontiers of activity.

(d) Progress toward safeguarded arms control.

(e) Promote negotiation of outstanding international disputes.

(f) Help make the United Nations more effective.

(g) Make of the interdependence of a shrunken world a force for peace rather than a breeding ground for war.

U.S. foreign policy—whether it be considered good or considered bad—makes itself felt in every city, town, and hamlet of this great Republic. Our military posture, our domestic prosperity—in fact, our very survival as a Nation—are all affected by success or failure in the conduct of our foreign relations.

Under Republican leadership our foreign policy is based on an alert awareness of

reality. Certainly all Americans—regardless of political party—want the necessary armed strength and preparedness. Certainly all Americans also know that we must not dissipate our economic strength in a wild variety of crash programs.

Many of us have warned for years—and today, and at every opportunity—that at home and abroad we face the challenge of those who would destroy us by Marxian or brute power. Even a process of sugarcoating each socialistic pill would produce a devastating narcotic effect upon once freemen.

We must remember that the big Red spider of communism has strung a barbed wire fence around one-third of the earth's surface.

We must remember that we cannot appease the hunger of communism by throwing it great chunks of free people and free lands.

We must remember to beware of those who would preach the siren doctrine of easy coexistence.

We must remember that peace at any price means the ultimate communization of the world.

With these reminders, the United States, during the past 7½ years under the Republican administration, has performed notably in the following fields of foreign policy:

Collective security

Since 1953, under the leadership of the United States, the free world system of collective security has been substantially strengthened.

Some 50 countries are now associated with the United States in regional or bilateral security pacts.

No member nation of this collective security system has been engulfed by international communism.

These security arrangements no longer assume the aspect of mere military alliances.

They are the framework of consultative processes that day by day are steadily reforming the society of free nations.

Our collective security pacts are not mere expedients. They introduce a fresh concept into the structure of world order.

During the past 7 years NATO has evolved into an effective military and political instrument enabling the Atlantic community to thwart Soviet efforts to dominate Western Europe.

The development of political consultation in NATO in recent years under the Republican administration has demonstrated that interdependence is not merely an empty symbol but a practical necessity for free world survival.

As proposed by the United States, NATO is now engaged in a planning effort addressed to the next 10 years.

In 1954, by the Manila Pact, the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization was created to strengthen the determination and capability of the nations of that area to resist the expansionist thrusts of Communist China. In recent years, certain nations of the area which are not members of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization have come to understand and appreciate its importance for the preservation of freedom.

The Anzus treaty which has strengthened the close ties between Australia, New Zealand and the United States is another illustration of how our security alliances contribute immensely to the development of common purposes in other fields than military.

In 1954 at the Tenth Inter-American Conference at Caracas, there was promulgated the Declaration of Solidarity of the American States. It declared that the domination or control by the international Communist movement of the political institutions of any American state would threaten us all and endanger the peace of the Americas.

During recent years, the Organization of American States has further developed as an instrument of hemispheric cooperation. The August 1959 Conference of the Foreign Ministers of the American Republics in Santiago clearly demonstrated the determination of these republics to maintain peace in the hemisphere through common action on problems creating international tensions.

An outstanding example of this common action came in early 1959 when Panama was threatened by revolution fomented outside her borders. Prompt action by the Inter-American Peace Commission was an important factor in ending this threat.

The United States is working continuously with the other American Republics in the Organization of American States and in the Inter-American Peace Commission to reduce international tensions in this hemisphere, particularly in the Caribbean area, where they are now most acute.

In the Middle East, the United States, although not a member, has strongly supported the Baghdad Pact organization, which was established in 1955. Although the Government of Iraq recently indicated its withdrawal, this organization—now known as the Central Treaty Organization—remains a solid instrument of collective security for the northern tier of states in the Middle East.

The joint congressional resolution on the Middle East helped the administration to provide prompt economic and military aid to Jordan, and to meet through bilateral agreements the need for renewed evidence of U.S. support for Iran, Pakistan, and Turkey.

The situation in the Middle East today is clearly improved as compared with 1958, as a result of actions by the United States, the United Nations, and the states in the area.

With American support, Germany has made a rapid economic recovery, and is now among our strongest allies.

In France, we are witnessing an inspiring example of national renewal.

Free China's extraordinary economic development is a symbol to the entire Far East of how much more freedom can do to improve the lot of people than can slavery.

The building of strength in freedom in these countries, many of them in chaos only a few years ago, is an inspiring success, not only for them, but for U.S. policies which have contributed so much to this result.

Deterrence of force

Under the Republican administration, the United States has by its conduct sought to establish the principle of renunciation of aggressive force and has shown its ability and will to deter such use of force by others.

At the time of the Suez episode in 1956 and the Israeli-Egyptian hostilities, the United Kingdom and France, and then Israel, withdrew their armed forces and accepted a United Nations solution.

When Lebanon considered itself threatened from without and appealed to the United States for emergency aid, we responded with promptness and efficiency. When the emergency was relieved, we promptly withdrew our forces.

In the Far East, the Chinese Communists, with Soviet backing, initiated military action designed, as they put it, to "expel the United States" from the Western Pacific. We stood beside the Republic of China in their successful resistance to that attack. We have refused to recognize Red China, and strongly oppose the admittance of Red China to the U.N.

In 1959, when the freedom and independence of Laos were threatened, the United States supported the establishment of a United Nations Security Council subcommittee to proceed to Laos. This international group succeeded by its presence in contributing to easing a potentially dangerous situation. We hope the U.N. can continue to turn back any possible aggressor against Laos.

The United States and Japan signed a new security treaty providing more equitable and workable relationship with this important Far Eastern ally. This treaty was concluded despite the mounting in Japan of one of the most intensive international Communist campaigns ever organized. This international Communist effort evidences the importance to the free world of the close ties which our policy has built between the United States and Japan.

International law

President Eisenhower has sought acceptance of one facet of international law. This is where national control has not yet entrenched itself, and where the nations might seek some international status in certain areas. However, whether the promises of the leaders of international communism can even be remotely relied upon remains to be seen.

Three U.S. proposals exemplify the international approach.

1. Polar areas: In April 1958, the United States proposed in the United Nations Security Council a system of international inspection of the arctic area to reduce the danger of surprise attack over the north polar region and to reduce the danger of miscalculation. This proposal was vetoed by the Soviet Union.

In May 1958, the United States proposed that the countries which heretofore have shown particular interest in Antarctica, including the Soviet Union, join in negotiating a treaty to guarantee the peaceful use of Antarctica and continue international scientific cooperation there. That treaty was signed by the United States and 11 other nations December 1, 1959, guaranteeing by an effective and unprecedented system of inspection that this vast area will be used solely for peaceful purposes. The treaty is now in process of ratification by the several nations.

2. Atoms for peace: In his famous address at the United Nations on December 8, 1953, President Eisenhower proposed a method to "find the way by which the miraculous inventiveness of man shall not be dedicated to his death, but consecrated to his life."

Under the "atoms for peace" program, the United States has negotiated bilateral agreements with some 40 nations. Research reactor grants have been approved for 17 nations. Negotiations are under way with others. We have developed close and constructive relations with EURATOM, the Atomic Energy Community of France, Germany, Italy, Netherlands, Belgium, and Luxembourg.

The International Atomic Energy Agency, proposed by the Republican administration, was designed to promote peaceful uses of atomic energy around the world. It was finally established in 1957. It gives some promise of the beginnings of an international approach to the problems of atomic energy.

3. Outer space: In January 1958, President Eisenhower proposed to the Soviet Union "that we agree that outer space should be used only for peaceful purposes. We face a decisive moment in history in relation to this matter." This bilateral proposal was subsequently advanced in the broader forum of the United Nations, since it is of concern to all nations, and an ad hoc committee on peaceful uses of outer space was created.

The Soviet Union at first refused to participate, but eventually joined in December 1959 a United Nations 24-member committee on the peaceful uses of outer space. This committee is to study feasible means for giving effect to programs in peaceful uses of outer space and to make preparations for a possible international conference in 1960 or 1961. Here again we must be watchful of moves made by Communist leaders.

Disarmament

In August 1957, the United States, together with the United Kingdom, France, and Canada, submitted a comprehensive arms control proposal to the Soviet Union which, if implemented, would constitute a step toward what might some day be the goal of general disarmament. This proposal had four basic parts:

1. It proposed that the Soviet Union join in inaugurating a system of inspection to provide dependable safeguards against large-scale surprise attack.

2. It proposed a threefold move in relation to nuclear weapons.

(a) Cessation of the production of fissionable material for nuclear weapons.

(b) A system whereby existing nuclear weapons stockpiles could be gradually reduced by transfers to peaceful uses.

(c) A tentative suspension of nuclear testing.

3. It proposed a start on reducing and regulating conventional armaments and armed forces.

4. It proposed the working out of a system to insure that outer space missiles would be used exclusively for peaceful and scientific purposes.

The Soviet Union did not even care to discuss our proposals at that time.

In 1958, President Eisenhower proposed a conference of Soviet and Western experts, which quickly agreed on the nature of measures required to control an international agreement to suspend nuclear testing. Political negotiations have been under way for some time in an effort to translate these technical possibilities into dependable realities. To give the negotiations time to succeed, the President extended the previous U.S. unilateral suspension of nuclear tests.

The President has also proposed that, if the negotiations cannot agree on procedures to inspect a complete test suspension, a preliminary agreement might be concluded suspending nuclear tests in the atmosphere and under water.

These negotiations continue, but their outcome is dependent on the willingness of the Soviet Union to reach a meaningful agreement.

Technical discussions were also undertaken in 1958, at the suggestion of the President, to seek definition of measures required to lessen the danger of surprise attack. These discussions resulted in a clearer understanding of each side's position but, because of Soviet intransigence, no substantial progress was achieved.

In the summer of 1959 the United States, United Kingdom, and France proposed to the Soviet Union that disarmament negotiations be resumed by these four powers and that certain other states be invited to participate.

This proposal was accepted and the Ten Nation Disarmament Commission began meeting at Geneva in March of this year.

The Western Powers presented to the Ten Nation Commission a three-phase safeguarded arms reduction program which could lead to the goal of general disarmament. This Disarmament Commission is continuing its deliberations. Whether it will make substantial progress depends on the willingness of the Soviets to accept a safeguarded and verifiable arms control arrangement.

International negotiation

Arab-Israeli dispute: In August 1955, Secretary of State Dulles, with specific authority from President Eisenhower, proposed a program for progress toward resolution of the Arab-Israeli dispute. It involved three points:

1. Possible substantial participation by the United States in a loan to assist Israel to pay compensation to refugees.

2. Possible U.S. participation in formal treaty engagements to prevent or thwart any effort by either side to alter by force the boundaries between Israel and its Arab neighbors.

3. Possible U.S. help in reconciling the vital interests of all the parties in the matter of boundary definition.

India-Pakistan dispute: The United States has encouraged and assisted the World Bank in its effort to negotiate a just settlement of the serious dispute between India and Pakistan over the Indus waters.

Negotiations with the Communists: Every reasonable and decent effort has been made to find a modus vivendi with the Communists. In an effort to reduce the danger of general war—

1. We made the Korean armistice which ended the hostilities in Korea.

2. We participated in the Geneva Conference of 1954 which ended the hostilities in Indochina.

3. We continue to seek in the Warsaw talks with the Chinese Communists to assure that in the Taiwan area force should not be relied upon by either side to bring about the reunification of China.

4. We have joined with the Soviet Union in concluding the Austrian Peace Treaty which liberated Austria.

5. In 1955, President Eisenhower met with the Soviet leaders at the summit in Geneva. At that time, he presented his famous "open skies" proposal which, had it been accepted by the Soviet Union, would have gone a long way to reducing the danger of a great surprise attack.

6. In 1958, we made a comprehensive agreement with the Soviet Union for exchanges in the fields of culture, technology, and education. This agreement operated successfully for 2 years and recently has been extended for 2 more.

We shall continue our endeavor to bring home to the people of the U.S.S.R. a true picture of the United States. Vice President NIXON's trip to the Soviet Union last year served to emphasize directly to the Soviet people the desire of the United States for peace and friendship.

7. In November 1958, the Soviet Union threatened to take unilateral action against Western rights in Berlin by May 1959 unless the three Western Powers accepted the Soviet proposal for a so-called free city. The United States, United Kingdom, and France refused, with full NATO support, to compromise their rights or to negotiate under duress. When the Soviet Union then indicated that its deadline was of no particular significance, the three Western Powers agreed to negotiate concerning the question of Germany, including Berlin and a peace treaty, at a Foreign Ministers' Conference. Secretary of State Herter spent 10 weeks in Geneva in 1959 seeking a settlement of the German problem and, failing that, of a modus vivendi on Berlin. This Conference clarified and narrowed the differences with the Soviet Union but did not produce agreement.

Negotiating with the Soviet Union is long, hard work—if there can be any worthiness in negotiating with the Russian leaders and, at that, it is difficult to trust them. Months of careful planning went into the preparation by the Western Powers for the summit conference scheduled for May 16, 1960, which the U.S.S.R. would not even allow to take place. Even though it did not take place, the Soviet's abrupt rupture of the meeting increased the solidarity of our alliances. In his report to the American people on this development, President Eisenhower made these three points:

"First. We must keep up our strength, and hold it steady for the long pull—a strength not neglected in complacency nor overbuilt in hysteria. So doing, we can make it clear to everyone that there can be no gain in the use of pressure tactics or aggression against us or our allies.

"Second. We must continue businesslike dealings with the Soviet leaders on outstanding issues, and improve the contacts between our own and the Soviet peoples, making clear that the path of reason and common sense is still open if the Soviets will but use it.

"Third. To improve world conditions in which human freedom can flourish, we must continue to move ahead with positive programs at home and abroad, in collaboration with free nations everywhere. In doing so, we shall continue to give our strong support to the United Nations and the great principles for which it stands."

In discussing this refusal of the Soviets to allow the summit meeting to take place at Paris, Secretary Herter said on May 27:

"We intend to go ahead with existing negotiations, to stand by our commitments and to foster open communication and peaceful exchanges. Above all, we shall not cease from the most determined, patient, resourceful endeavor to find ways to bring the arms race under control and thus to meet the nuclear menace that hangs over mankind.

"I hope that we will not become so fixed in preoccupation with the Soviet challenge as to lose sight of our own constructive purposes—which are larger and more important than merely resisting or reacting to external threats. We have our own vision of the future toward which we want to see the world evolve. We have our own programs for helping to bring that future about—for holding high the light of freedom, for sharing its message and rewards with emerging nations, for trying to create an international community in which the rule of law will replace the rule of force."

We can recall that it took about 3 years of negotiation with the Soviet Union to create the International Atomic Energy Agency, 2½ years for the Cultural Exchange Agreement, 8 years and 400 meetings for the Austrian State Treaty.

The real truth is that the Russian leaders wrecked the scheduled summit meeting because they discovered they would not be able to get all kinds of concessions like they did at Yalta and Potsdam.

United Nations

In the last 7 years, the United States has repeatedly taken the lead in trying to strengthen the United Nations and the processes of international cooperation which the United Nations represents. A few examples follow:

1. In December 1953, President Eisenhower proposed the atoms for peace program to the United Nations.

2. In the economic field, we played a leading role in bringing about two new entities linked with the United Nations: the International Finance Corporation and the Special Fund. The International Finance Corporation, which came into being in July 1956 as an affiliate of the World Bank, invests in private enterprise abroad, thus stimulating the vital private sector of developing economies. The Special Fund, which was set up by the United Nations General Assembly, provides funds for broad regional and basic technical assistance and survey projects more extensive than those financed by the United Nations technical assistance program. We must carefully watch these UN operations lest we lose one bit of our national sovereignty, plus large sums of money.

3. The United States also took the lead at the United Nations General Assembly in creating a committee on outer space. The activities of that committee, we hope, may contribute to the peaceful and cooperative exploration of this new dimension in human experience.

4. At the same time, we have continued to try to strengthen the United Nations procedures. Thus, in January 1958 the United States renewed its proposal to restrict use of the veto in the Security Council. This offer was refused by the Soviet Union.

5. Our leadership has been manifested with particular vigor in recent crises which have brought threats to the peace before the United Nations.

6. When a Middle Eastern crisis arose in 1958, we promptly notified the United Nations of the action that we were taking in Lebanon to meet that crisis and called for an emergency session of the General Assembly to deal with the crisis. At that session, President Eisenhower proposed not only steps to counter the immediate threat in Lebanon and Jordan, but also long-range measures to improve basic conditions in the Middle East: An Arab Development Institution, a standby United Nations force, and possibly a United Nations study of Middle Eastern arms control. The countries concerned are making progress in laying the basis for an Arab Development Institution; the Secretary General has engaged in planning and consultation regarding a United Nations standby force.

7. We have strongly supported the General Assembly in the adoption of resolutions condemning offenses against mankind, such as the wholesale murder of the people of Tibet by the Chinese Communists and the brutal Soviet repression in Hungary.

8. We have welcomed to the community of nations the new countries of Africa. Our support of their admission to the United Nations is but a part of our dynamic policy of friendship and cooperation with these new nations as they attain independence.

As a result of U.S. action such as those indicated above, and of the Security Council action respecting Laos, the United Nations may become a more vital force in support of peace today than it was 7 years ago.

The tireless efforts of former Secretary of State Dulles not only made him a symbol of the fight by freedom against the Communist menace but also led to worldwide recognition of the success of the Republican administration's foreign policies. Secretary Herter has carried forward this great record at Geneva, Santiago, Ottawa, London, Paris, Bonn, and during the President's trip to Europe in September 1959.

The bipartisan nature of President Eisenhower's foreign policy is evidenced by the fact that Secretary Dulles continuously informed appropriate congressional bodies. During his 6 years as Secretary of State he took part in 213 such meetings. This close cooperation with the Congress is continuing under Secretary Herter.

In recent years, there has been a growing clarification of understanding around the world of the real purpose of the Communist leaders—to subject all the world to the dominant influence and control of international communism.

In the Middle East, the deadly designs of communism are now far more clearly realized than a few years ago.

Brutal Chinese Communist repression in Tibet and border incursions and demands against India have brought home aggressive Communist designs more clearly to the peoples of South Asia.

In Southeast Asia, liberty-loving peoples are struggling successfully to remain masters in their newly built national homes.

In Europe, there are a number of inspiring examples of national renewal and recession of Communist influence.

President Eisenhower's historic trip in December 1959, to 11 nations on the 3 continents of Asia, Africa, and Europe, and his trip to the Far East in June of this year, brought home to literally millions of persons the President's message of peace and friendship, in freedom and the sharp contrast between this policy and the pressures and strings attached to relationships with the Soviets. The President also made important visits to South America, to Canada, and Mexico, as well as several visits to European capitals.

The leaders and peoples of nations of the free world now understand better than ever the sincerity of American policy favoring their independence and the willingness of America to support unconditionally their efforts to stay free and to do so in their own way, which may indeed be a non-Western way. As President Eisenhower said at the NATO meeting in December 1957: "There is a noble strategy of victory—not victory over any peoples, but victory for all peoples."

Interdependence

President Eisenhower's policies have been based on a belief that economic growth and interdependence are necessary conditions for stable and free nations.

Here are a number of things that the Republican administration has done in the last 7 years to promote that growth and interdependence:

1. It has given support to the reciprocal trade agreements program. At President Eisenhower's request, the Congress in 1958 extended this program for a period of 4 years, the longest single extension during the 25-year history of the program.

The value of American foreign trade (excluding military exports) in 1953 was $23.2 billion, and in 1959 was $29.3 billion.

2. In 1957 the Congress, at the request of the Republican administration, established the U.S. Development Loan Fund with a capitalization of $300 million. This was a step to meet the needs of less developed countries for loans on terms less rigorous than those offered from existing sources. In 1958 and 1959 the Congress appropriated $1.1 billion more for the Development Loan Fund. It was the first U.S. financial institution set up specifically to help less developed countries. In its short life the Fund has made a significant contribution to economic growth. Qualifying projects awaiting its review are far more numerous than the Fund can handle.

3. The United States has also moved vigorously to encourage the flow of private investment to less developed and other free nations. Under the Republican administration's investment guarantee program which provides insurance against noncommercial risks, such as inconvertibility of currency, expropriation, or war, nearly 40 nations have signed agreements and considerably over $200 million in insurance contracts have been issued.

The United States has negotiated and sought to negotiate treaties designed to create more favorable conditions for private investment abroad.

The Republican administration has commissioned two outstanding studies of means to encourage private investment and is currently considering measures to implement their recommendations.

We have encouraged and assisted the creation in foreign countries of development banks to make loans to private enterprise and of local productivity centers to render that enterprise more productive.

We encouraged the creation in 1956 of the International Finance Corporation, as an affiliate of the World Bank, to make investment in private enterprise abroad.

4. In August 1958 the President instructed the Secretary of the Treasury to propose to other members of the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund that the resources of these institutions be enlarged so that they could continue their effective work in promoting economic growth and monetary stability. As a result, the Governors of both institutions recommended that member governments increase their subscriptions to the Fund and Bank by 50 percent and 100 percent respectively.

In February 1959 the President asked the Congress to authorize $3.175 and $1.375 billion increases in the U.S. subscriptions to the Bank and Fund. This has been done.

5. The President also authorized the Secretary of the Treasury to discuss with other governments the possible establishment of an International Development Association, as an affiliate of the World Bank. These discussions were fruitful, and we may expect to see this agency in operation in the near future, helping to mobilize free world resources to meet the less developed countries' need for financing on flexible terms.

6. At the Republican administration's initiative, 18 European nations have joined Canada and the United States in preliminary steps to reconstitute the Organization for European Economic Cooperation. When the reconstituted OEEC is a reality, we should be able to collaborate more effectively in promoting sound economic growth in the free world and in mobilizing the resources of its industrialized members to help the newly developing lands.

7. The United States took the lead in proposing establishment of an institution to promote economic development in Latin America.

On April 9, 1959, the charter of a $1 billion Inter-American Bank was initiated in Washington. The ratification of this agreement by the United States and by all the other American states—except Cuba—has brought into being a sizable new source of funds for economic development loans to our good neighbors. The Bank's charter also provides for assisting in the development of managerial and technical skills, and the Bank will assist in social development projects where necessary.

8. In August 1958 the Republican administration offered the cooperation of the United States in the establishment of an Arab regional development financing program if the Middle Eastern states concerned were prepared to support such a venture. Exchanges of views among these states have taken place, and the initiative now lies with them.

9. A Common Market for Europe has long been officially supported by President Eisenhower, and in January 1959 the six-nation Common Market of Western Europe became a reality. Measures have also been taken to create an area of freer trade among seven other nations of Western Europe. In addition, Western European currencies have become more freely exchangeable and there is a strong movement for broader economic cooperation in Western Europe. The support of the United States played no small part in these accomplishments.

10. The United States has also moved to encourage and participate in the study of key raw material problems of particular concern to less developed countries. Through our good offices and on our initiative, the International Coffee Study Group was established in June 1958 to consider possible means of dealing with problems arising in international trade of coffee.

Through this study group the Mexico City Emergency Coffee Agreement was continued and expanded to consider the present imbalance in world coffee supply and demand. The United States at the ECOSOC meeting in July 1958 agreed also to become a member of the Commission on International Commodity Trade, which considers general problems relating to international trade in basic commodities.

11. On the initiative of the Republican administration an International Food for Peace Conference was held in May 1959 to discuss ways and means of utilizing wheat to relieve

hunger and to promote economic development among the less developed countries of the free world.

It was participated in by the five major wheat exporting countries. It established a Food for Peace Wheat Utilization Committee to consider specific problems, such as how to make more effective use of wheat in improving living standards, in raising nutritional levels, and in strengthening the economies of free countries. This committee met in June.

At the conclusion of the meeting the other wheat exporting countries expressed their willingness to cooperate to the fullest possible extent in carrying out the objectives of the President's food for peace program.

12. Parallel with these new initiatives, the Republican administration has continued to support the mutual security program, which provides economic and military aid to free countries around the world.

13. The administration has moved energetically and successfully toward eliminating our unfavorable balance of trade with other nations. At our urging, more than a dozen nations have removed trade restrictions on American goods, and several others have indicated an intention to take similar action.

In conclusion

The Republican administration's foreign policy rests on two simple propositions: We want peace, liberty, and well-being for ourselves; and we cannot be sure of peace, liberty, and well-being unless other nations also have them.

XXII

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK DURING THE REPUBLICAN ADMINISTRATION, 1953–1960

(By U.S. Senator WALLACE F. BENNETT, of Utah)

The overall accomplishment of the Export-Import Bank of Washington during the 7½ years of the Republican administration should be viewed in terms of the Bank's purpose. The primary purpose of the Eximbank is to assist in the financing of U.S. exports through dollar loans abroad. With minor exceptions, each dollar lent abroad by the Bank is spent in this country in the form of a purchase from U.S. manufacturers, suppliers, and service companies.

The Bank pays interest on the money it borrows from the Treasury and lends abroad; the Bank also pays dividends to the Treasury on its $1 billion authorized capital. The earned reserves are deposited with the Treasury.

For the 7½ years of the Republican administration—January 1953 to May 31, 1960—the following statement summarizes the activities described above.

	In millions
Total dollar amount of loans authorized	$4,732.1
Total dollar repayments	2,758.8
Total dollar interest on loans (income)	733.4
Interest to Treasury on money borrowed	224.6
Dividends to Treasury on $1 billion authorized capital	157.6
Operating costs	12.3
Losses charged off	2.6
Added to reserves	336.3
Total reserves and surplus as of May 31, 1960	628.9

The Republican administration encompasses a period (1954–59) during which a concerted effort was made to increase not only the dollar amount of loans, but also the number of individual loans authorized. Results were particularly noticeable in the Latin American area, due to the fact that the volume of business in Europe had slackened somewhat because of favorable results of postwar reconstruction.

Latin America

	1950–54	1955–59	Percent increase
Loans	$1,023.4	$1,643.8	60.6
Credits	(102.0)	(614.0)	502.0
Disbursements	773.3	1,166.4	50.8
Repayments	219.4	604.0	175.3

On a worldwide basis, comparable evidence of gain can be shown. At the close of business December 31, 1952, the Eximbank had on its books 305 active credits for a total of $4,134.3 million; and at the close of business May 31, 1960, there were 1,133 active credits totaling $4,732.1 million. In the number of credits, this is an increase of over 300 percent. The small difference in the dollar amount is due to huge reconstruction credits for Europe that were still active. For the same period, the dollar volume of credits authorized but undisbursed on record December 31, 1952, was $600.3 million, and at the close of business May 31, 1960, was $1.5 billion.

Another area of significant gain is that of private capital participation in Eximbank loans. The Bank's statutory authority is specific about its status with regard to commercial financial institutions. The Eximbank is to complement and supplement private capital, not to compete with it. Accordingly, the Bank does not lend where private sources are readily available. The Bank also seeks and encourages private banks to enter into Eximbank transactions without recourse upon the Bank, the exporter, or the borrower.

Prior to 1952, commercial bank participations, without recourse on the borrower or the Export-Import Bank were negligible. From 1952 to the present date, 59 commercial banks have participated with the Export-Import Bank, and without recourse on it or the borrower to the extent of $256,718,000.

It is expected that in the future, and under the impetus of the Republican program for expanding U.S. exports, the Bank's role will be even greater, as will the part played by private financial institutions. It is to be hoped that life insurance companies, with their reservoirs of loanable funds, can be induced to play a larger part in the financing of foreign trade. There are some signs of thoughts in this direction by some of the larger companies in the insurance field.

The year 1960 has seen intense interest in the national balance-of-payments position with regard to world trade. The necessity for increasing U.S. exports prompted the President to advise the Congress on March 17 that the Government should help enlarge export opportunities. In the same message, the Eximbank was charged with the responsibility for issuing short-term political risk guarantees to American exporters.

The Eximbank placed a new short-term political risk guarantee program in operation on May 23. In this program, the Bank guarantees 90 percent of invoice value of exporter shipment against noncommercial losses, e.g., inconvertibility or nontransferability of foreign currencies, imposition of foreign laws or regulations, cancellation of import license, war and civil commotion, and expropriation of goods by foreign entities.

Since the Eximbank has no field establishments, a system was devised by which commercial banks across the country would act as agents for the Eximbank in the actual issue of the guarantees. An exporter, wherever he may be, has access to the guarantee through the banks without complicated negotiation with Washington. More than 100 commercial banks have signed to act as Eximbank agents to date, with more expected to sign. Several guarantees were issued during the first 2 weeks of operation.

In addition to devising the new short-term political risk guarantee, the Eximbank has modified its medium-term transaction formulas for exporter loans, and credits, with the aim of making them more workable and attractive to both the U.S. manufacturer and commercial banks.

The Eximbank has stepped up its activity in loans involving the purchase of U.S. aircraft and aviation facilities. The Bank has participated in U.S. sales, the invoice value of which was $428.9 million. The Bank loans in these transactions totalled $242.2 million for U.S. purchases by foreign flag and private carriers, with 63 percent of the latter amount occurring in the past 5 years. In addition, $30.9 million has been lent for airports and airport equipment abroad, almost all of it during the 7½ years of the Republican administration.

Typical loans of this sort made this current fiscal year show a global distribution in the Eximbank's assistance: $25.5 million to Australia for the flag line Quantas, for three jet liners plus modification of seven other jets already owned by Quantas; $20 million to Belgium for Sabena, five jets; $6.9 million to Brazil for Varig, two jets; $16 million to the Union of South Africa for three jets; and $14 million to Spain for Iberia, three jets.

(NOTE.—The above dollar amounts are not total cost of aircraft and related equipment, but rather the amount of Eximbank participation in total sale.)

The Eximbank has assisted the American farmer in selling his produce abroad. Cotton, wheat, and tobacco have been the principal agrarian commodities for which foreign sales have been financed. Of these, cotton has been the largest single commodity financed. In the Bank's 26-year history, over a billion dollars have been loaned for the purchase of U.S. cotton. In the 7½ years of the Republican administration, $524 million has been loaned for cotton exports. This amounts to roughly 50 percent of all cotton credits during the Bank's history.

In addition to cotton, tobacco, and grains, two noteworthy cattle loans, each for $5 million to the Government of Mexico, have resulted in sales of U.S. beef and dairy cattle for the establishment of Mexican herds.

To focus attention on the work of individual divisions and offices of the Eximbank, it should be noted that: (1) the Eximbank has a staff that is quite small in relation to the magnitude of its operations, numbering about 100 professional people in a total staff of 226; and (2) the contributions of individual divisions and offices are an integral part of each project or transaction, with the total effort of the Bank in each instance transcending and encompassing individual work areas. On the latter point, in a typical project of the first magnitude, findings of the Engineering Division with regard to engineering aspects and feasibility of the project would be incorporated in the staff study of the loan application. The same applies to the Economics Division which would study economic effect and economic feasibility, to the Legal Division, the Loan Division, the Private Capital Division, and the Office of the Treasurer. In this way, accomplishments of the departments of the Eximbank must be considered as units contributing to the Bank's overall progress.

Typical projects in which division and offices participated:

Peru: Toquepala copper mining project in which the Bank made the largest private single loan—$115 million to assist in opening a copper ore body in southern Peru; complete mining and processing installation to produce blister copper; started production February 1960 with the total cost of the enterprise $234 million.

Brazil: $37 million to assist in the financing of dam and hydroelectric installation of the Rio Grande River.

Mexico: $46.5 million to assist in financing integrated steel mill at Monterrey.

Japan: $43.4 million to assist in the expansion and modernization of three steel facilities—Fuji, Yawata, and Toyo Kohan.

Iran: $33.3 million to assist in the modernization of state railways.

Liberia: $15 million for the development and extension of 300 miles of highway.

In August 1954, the Export-Import Bank Act was amended to increase the lending authority of the Bank from $4.5 to $5 billion, to reestablish a bipartisan board of five directors, and to create an advisory committee.

It is felt that the advisory committee has been most successful in its operation. There are nine committee members, chosen from top-level representatives of industry, labor, commerce, finance, agriculture, and education. Each successive committee has been exemplary in its interest in Bank activities, has put forward constructive advice drawn on a wealth of experience, and has been extremely helpful in the shaping of Eximbank policy and practice.

In August 1957, the Export-Import Bank was authorized to make loans in foreign currencies available under section 104(e) of Public Law 480. In March 1960, the Eximbank announced its 100th foreign currency loan under Public Law 480. That loan brought the equivalent dollar value of these loans to $57.2 million, the hundred loans having been made in 16 countries.

In May 1958, the Bank's dollar-lending authority was increased to $7 billion to meet increasing demand for U.S. exporter assistance—another Republican-sponsored move to help American industry and labor.

XXIII

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION UNDER THE REPUBLICAN ADMINISTRATION, 1953–60

(By U.S. Senator GORDON ALLOTT, of Colorado)

The Farmers Home Administration, an agency of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, extends both short-term and long-term credit to American farm families, together with technical farm management assistance and guidance.

Such credit facilities enable farm families to improve and expand their operations wherever the financial resources of banks and other private lending agencies are not readily available to them. These loans are available only to those farmers who are unable to obtain credit from traditional lending institutions such as banks and cooperatives.

The Allott-Cooley bill to revise and simplify the entire authority of the Farmers Home Administration was approved this year by the House, after careful and thorough consideration and improvement by the House Agriculture Committee. Hearings have been held by the Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee.

It is greatly to be hoped that this significant legislation will be enacted into law during the 86th Congress. It has been advocated strongly by, and developed with extensive help from, the Department of Agriculture and the Farmers Home Administration.

H.R. 11761 represents a 5-year evolution from the original bill with the same purpose first introduced by myself in 1956. It would establish a reasonable and organized authority for the Farmers Home Administration as a substitute for the complex hodgepodge of 35 statutes and 1,200 pages of regulations. It would allow the hard-pressed field personnel to provide more prompt, more effective, and more flexible assistance to the farmer in need of credit who is unable to obtain it from private sources.

This needed legislation is approved by the Republican administration, the House of Representatives, and the farmers. It would be a tragedy if, in the political confusion of the closing days of the session, the Democratic-controlled Senate should fail to endorse it.

In these past 7 years, the Republican administration has made the agricultural credit system more responsive to farmers' needs. In line with this objective, the Farm Credit Administration was given a new status of importance when it was made an independent agency of the Government.

In the past 7 years of the Republican administration, Farmers Home loans totaling approximately $2¼ billion have been made to and insured for deserving farm families.

All loans made and insured during fiscal 1960 by the Farmers Home Administration will total approximately $310 million, compared with $229 million in 1953. The following are contributing to this total:

1. Operating loans, provided to help farmers purchase equipment, livestock, feed, seed, and fertilizer, and to finance other farm and home expenses, total approximately $198 million in fiscal 1960. In 1953, the comparable figure was $130 million.

2. Farm ownership loans to develop family-type farms, to purchase such farms, to enlarge undersized farms, and to refinance certain debts amount to an estimated $43 million in fiscal 1960, as compared to $30 million in 1953.

3. Farm housing loans to build or repair farmhouses and other essential farm buildings total approximately $40 million in fiscal 1960, compared to $19 million 7 years ago.

4. The insured loan program has been greatly improved since 1953 and, despite money market conditions which make it difficult to obtain funds for this particular program, the volume of such loans since 1953 has averaged $30.4 million annually, compared to an average of $10.1 million per year in prior years.

In addition, loans amounting to $12 million are being made in those counties participating in the rural development program in 1960, thus helping the low-income farm families most in need of aid to strengthen and secure their farms and make them more efficient and profitable.

Emergency loans are also available in areas designated as having sustained a disaster such as drought or floods.

Soil and water conservation loans for farmstead and irrigation purposes have been broadened since 1954 to extend far beyond the boundaries of the original 17 Western States which previously had been the sole beneficiaries of this program.

In addition, in 1956, the Farmers Home Administration was authorized to make loans to local organizations to help them finance their share of the cost of developing small watersheds.

XXIV

MAJOR ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION UNDER THE REPUBLICAN ADMINISTRATION, 1953–60

(By U.S. Senator WINSTON L. PROUTY, of Vermont)

Reorganization: Complete reorganization of GSA has been accomplished under the Republican administration. This reorganization resulted in closer and more efficient working relations between GSA's central office and its 10 regional offices as well as increased emphasis on the provision of real property, personal property, transportation and public utilities, and records management services to other Government agencies.

Employment: Despite substantial increases in activities and services rendered, total employment has been reduced from 29,141 in January 1953 to 27,722 at the end of May 1960.

Defense Materials Service

Stockpile objectives: Attainment of national stockpile objectives has been practically completed, and present emphasis is placed on proper management, preservation and security of an inventory in excess of $8 billion. GSA's Defense Materials Service has been completely reorganized to reflect this change in program direction, with a careful analysis having been completed for the purpose of (1) establishing long-range qualitative maintenance standards for all stockpile materials required for defense purposes, and (2) determining the ultimate disposal of those items in excess of stockpile objectives.

Strategic materials physical inventory: For the first time, the enormous task of taking a complete physical inventory of the 38 million tons of 100 different strategic materials at more than 200 storage locations was undertaken in late 1956 and will be completed in mid-1960. This included a complete verification of the book accounts and extensive improvements in the physical condition of stockpile materials resulting from the repackaging and repiling of over 5 million tons of materials.

Strategic materials contracts: Intensive review of existing contracts has resulted in important reduction in the Government's liability thereunder amounting, since July 1957, to $367,325,000.

Nicaro nickel plant: The expansion of the Government-owned nickel plant at Nicaro, Cuba, completed in 1957 with a saving of over $7 million from funds authorized, increased the production annual capacity from 30 to 54 million pounds, thus making it the second largest nickel producer in the free world. Production costs have been maintained at a favorable level, despite substantial increases in the cost of materials and labor. In 8 years, the plant has produced almost 275 million pounds and has demonstrated both the technical and economic feasibility of the operation. Nickel sales to industry in the past 10 months have reached an all-time high, notwithstanding the adverse effects of the steel strike. Having received no acceptable offer for the purchase of Nicaro, after formal advertising, further disposal efforts will be deferred pending improvement in the political situation in Cuba. However, the fact that the plant has been kept in operation, under very unfavorable conditions, during and subsequent to the Cuban revolution, is considered a substantial accomplishment.

Disposals of stockpile excesses: Stockpile excesses have been reduced during fiscal year 1960 by approximately $83 million worth of materials, including more than $58 million worth of rubber, approximately $8 million worth of hog bristles, $4½ million worth of coconut oil, $4 million worth of abaca cordage fiber, and various other materials.

Public Buildings Service

Construction program: A badly needed construction program for Federal office buildings throughout the country to provide adequate office space for the Federal establishment was inaugurated, following nationwide community surveys establishing the need therefor. Under this program, 32 buildings have been completed, 46 buildings are under construction, and an additional 28 are being designed for location on Government-owned sites or on sites being acquired. The repair and improvement of badly deteriorated Federal buildings has been put on a planned program basis. In addition, an air conditioning program has been inaugurated for Federal buildings, where climatic conditions warrant and, through fiscal year 1960, 26 percent of the required work has been programed and financed.

Nation's Capital: In Washington, D.C., a program looking toward the ultimate elimination of unsightly "tempo's" and the construction of new permanent Federal office buildings was inaugurated and is now well

under way. Since 1953, 17 separate temporary or obsolete buildings containing nearly three-quarter million square feet of space have been demolished in connection with the construction program.

Construction of the Department of State addition is 96 percent finished, with completion expected by November 1960. The cornerstone of the CIA building at Langley, Va., was laid on November 3, 1959, with completion of this building scheduled by the summer of 1961. Excavation for the new Museum of History and Technology of the Smithsonian Institution on a site formerly occupied by two World War II temporary buildings has been completed, and construction of the building is under way with completion scheduled for the spring of 1962.

Construction of Federal Office Building No. 6 on Independence Avenue is 38 percent finished, and completion is scheduled for June 1961. Sites have been acquired for Federal Office Buildings Nos. 7, 8, 9, and 10, and architectural plans are being prepared. A site has been tentatively selected for Federal Office Building No. 5. Funds for the construction of Federal Office Buildings Nos. 8, 9, and 10 have been requested in the budget for 1961, and these three buildings, when completed, will provide office space for approximately 7,000 employees, with resulting improvement in Government operating efficiency and the release of approximately 1.4 million square feet of leased and substandard Government-owned space.

Surplus disposal policies: In conjunction with the Bureau of the Budget, firm policies have been established under the Republican administration in connection with the utilization of excess and the disposal of surplus Government-owned real property. These policies have resulted in the liquidation of unneeded Government-owned real property, the restoration of a substantial number of valuable properties to local tax rolls, and a significant monetary return to the Government.

Surplus disposal program: Acceleration of a nationwide program of disposal of surplus real property has been emphasized. In addition to properties conveyed to public bodies and eligible institutions for various public purposes, including airport, park and recreational, education, health, and wildlife conservation under priority or price preference provisions of disposal laws, 1,430 properties have been sold to private enterprise at a selling price of more than $183,248,700.

Federal Supply Service

The General Services Administration operates a worldwide procurement and distribution system for common-use items; manages excess and surplus personal property of the Government as well as its motor vehicles; determines supply requirements and regulates procurement of personal property and nonpersonal services by Government agencies; and provides advice and assistance to civil agencies in improving and strengthening their internal supply systems.

Supply procurement and distribution: Procurement for other agencies of personal property and nonpersonal services through the GSA supply system has increased from $504 million in 1952 to approximately $840 million currently under the Republican administration. Some 60,000 line items of various commodities are being made available to all Federal agencies.

The volume of GSA supply depot transactions is reflected in the increase of line items shipped from approximately 1½ million in 1952 to over 4 million currently under the Republican administration. Improved management is demonstrated by the fact that total employment in stores operations actually declined during this period, while costs of operation per $100 of sales were reduced by almost 50 percent.

The quality of supplies, materials, and equipment purchased by GSA for other Government agencies has steadily improved under the Republican administration through introduction of modern and efficient quality control techniques.

Property management: In exercising its responsibility for promoting maximum utilization of excess personal property among Federal agencies, GSA has transferred excess Government-owned property to other Federal agencies for further use in the amount of some $864 million (at acquisition cost) since 1952. During the same period, donations of surplus personal property were approved to State agencies for educational, public health, and civil defense purposes in the amount of almost $2 billion.

Motor equipment management throughout the Government has been strengthened by the establishment of some 56 consolidated interagency motor pools containing over 16,800 vehicles, which provide motor vehicle services to Federal agencies at substantial savings. Over 5,000 fewer Government vehicles are utilized under this system than would have been required under individual agency management. In addition, action has been taken to improve the management, operation and safety practices of the total Federal fleet of over 211,000 vehicles, with combined savings of over $45 million annually resulting from the introduction of these improved management practices.

Supply management: GSA further unified and increased the effectiveness and economy of Government-wide methods and systems during the Republican administration by providing helpful guidance to other agencies in modern supply techniques, and by making some 80 studies of individual agency supply systems which greatly improved their effectiveness.

Uniform and efficient contracting and procurement policies and procedures have been developed and promulgated for all departments and agencies of the Federal Government through the establishment of the Federal Procurement Regulations System, which is being steadily expanded to provide a full body of codified regulations on this subject.

In collaboration with the Department of Defense, a joint effort has been proceeding toward development of a single, standard supply catalog. GSA has concentrated on items used primarily for civilian agencies. To date, over 192,000 civilian agency items have been identified in the Federal Catalog System. The number of specifications and standards developed to improve quality of commodities used by the Federal Government has also steadily increased.

National Archives and Records Service

Records management: A Government-wide paperwork management program was initiated in 1956, as recommended in 1955 by the Second Hoover Commission. Significant progress has been made in correspondence management. The consolidation of existing agency records centers under the GSA system of Federal records centers, as recommended in 1949 by the First Hoover Commission, was virtually completed. The holdings of records in these centers was expanded from 1,630,000 cubic feet in 1953 to 5,500,000 cubic feet in 1960.

Plans have been completed for the transfer to GSA on July 1 of the Department of Defense Military Personnel Records Center at St. Louis, Mo.

National Archives: The centralization in the National Archives of all valuable older records of agencies of all three branches of the Federal Government—executive, legislative, and judicial—was completed.

Public exhibits: Through an accelerated exhibits program begun in 1953, built around the display of the Constitution, Declaration of Independence, and Bill of Rights, the number of visitors to National Archives exhibit areas was more than doubled.

Presidential libraries and papers: A Presidential Libraries System was established under legislation approved in 1955. Under this system, GSA accepted and placed in operation the Harry S. Truman Library at Independence, Mo. The Dwight D. Eisenhower Library, under construction at Abilene, Kans., has been accepted by GSA and will begin operation early in 1961.

Publication was begun in 1958 of a new series of Presidential documents which are compiled, indexed, and published annually in book form under the title, "Public Papers of the Presidents."

Transportation and Public Utilities Service

Traffic surveys: A program of onsite surveys of freight traffic management and transportation methods in civilian executive agencies has been completed. The survey reports contained 253 recommendations. Of this total, 242 recommendations or 95 percent have been accepted by the organizations affected. A summary report entitled, "Freight Traffic Management in Civilian Agencies," and outlining areas for economy and improvements in agency transportation operations, has been released.

Agency assistance: Based on a need revealed by our traffic surveys, an informational handbook entitled "How To Prepare and Process U.S. Government Bills of Lading" was issued in November 1959. This booklet was designed to assist personnel in preparing and processing Government bills of lading more efficiently and economically; 22,500 copies have been purchased by industry and Government organizations through April 1960.

Transportation and public utility management savings: The traffic management program conducted by GSA resulted in a saving of $16.9 million in fiscal year 1959; and it is expected that savings for fiscal year 1960 will equal this amount.

A further saving, totaling $366,000 in fiscal year 1959, was obtained through the public utilities management program.

Action taken by GSA in connection with communication litigation has produced savings to the Government which now amount to $8 million per year, and it is expected this will grow to $15 million per year when the semi-automatic ground environment (SAGE) project is complete.

Business services program

GSA has an active broadscaled program to assist the businessman to achieve his maximum potential in doing business with the Government, with particular attention and emphasis given to the problems and interests of small business. Thirteen business service centers and many subcenters, located in principal cities throughout the country, are daily engaged in informing small firms of the market which GSA offers for their products. The centers also provide necessary bidding documents and specifications, and counsel and advise small firms in their efforts to participate in GSA procurement and disposal programs. In the calendar years 1953 through 1959, of GSA's procurement of $3,665,676,592, there was awarded to small business $1,956,067,984, equivalent to 53.4 percent.

XXV

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION DURING THE REPUBLICAN ADMINISTRATION, 1953–60

(By U.S. Senator NORRIS COTTON, of New Hampshire)

Today, electric power ranks first and natural gas fifth in size among the industries of the United States. The Federal Power Commission's activities are closely interrelated with the development of the Nation's vast hydroelectric power resources, its great electric utility growth, and the mushrooming spread of the relatively young interstate natural gas industry.

The FPC has a basic responsibility of protecting the public interest through its

jurisdiction over interstate transmission and sale at wholesale of natural gas and electric power moving in interstate commerce, the accounts of these companies, the construction of interstate pipeline facilities, and the licensing of non-Federal hydroelectric projects. Through its regulatory activities, the Commission protects the consumer's interest and assures a healthy climate for industry in order to promote the expansion necessary to meet the Nation's rising energy needs.

The Commission's regulatory responsibilities have increased tremendously during the last 7½ years under the Republican administration because there has been phenomenal growth of the electric power and natural gas industries. The FPC, which regulates the interstate aspects of these two great industries, has carried on a continuous searching examination of its internal operations, organizations, and procedures to meet these expanding obligations.

The Commission has continued to make available comprehensive statistics and other operating, financial, and cost data. The value of this service is evidenced by its widespread use by the industry, financial organizations, investors, the general public, and the Congress. In addition, through the Commission's prescribed accounting and reporting requirements, the Commission has exerted powerful influence in matching financial soundness and protection of investors with the unprecedented growth of the industries.

A. Electric power: During the last 7½ years the electric power industry has experienced vigorous growth.

Beginning in 1953, the installed generating capacity of the Nation's electric utility generating plants was 82.2 million kilowatts, compared with 159.7 million kilowatts as of April 30, 1960. For the years 1952 and 1959, respectively, electric power production rose from 399 billion kilowatt-hours to more than 709 billion kilowatt-hours, an increase of about 78 percent.

Increases in revenues and facility investment paralleled the increases in generating capacity and production.

Without any appreciable increase in rates, the annual revenues of the electric power industry from ultimate consumers in 1959 amounted to more than $10.5 billion, compared with about $6.1 billion for 1952.

Plant investment in this same period rose from $30 billion at the end of 1952 to $58 billion at the end of 1959. Selected annual statistics for the electric power industry are shown in appendix A.

The Federal Power Commission since 1953 has issued licenses for non-Federal hydroelectric projects of unprecedented size and importance in various regions of the country.

B. Natural gas industry: Advances in the natural gas pipeline industry have been equally impressive. The interstate transmission of gas for resale has risen from about 4.2 trillion cubic feet in 1952 to approximately 7.7 trillion in 1959, an increase of 83 percent.

Natural gas pipeline revenues from sales to other gas utilities for resale were nearly $2.5 billion in 1959, compared with about $908 million in 1952. Net plant investment growth paralleled the increases in transmission and revenues, rising from approximately $3.4 billion in 1952 to more than $6.8 billion in 1959. Selected annual statistics for the natural gas industry are shown in appendix C.

During the past 7½ years, natural gas has become available in many States and regions which previously were without this service. At the beginning of 1953 natural gas was available in 41 States, while it now moves into all but 3 of the 50 States, the exceptions being Vermont, Maine, and Hawaii. The most notable examples of recent service extensions include pipelines into the Pacific Northwest and down the Florida Peninsula.

This new service required great extensions of the already giant network of interstate lines, through the issuance of certificates by the FPC.

The approval and issuance of these certificates added nearly 46,000 miles of new gas transmission lines and other facilities valued at approximately $4.7 billion.

These actions have facilitated expansion of the entire industry, and between 1952 and 1959 the number of natural gas customers increased from 18.4 million to 29.9 million. Appendix D gives statistics on certificates authorizing construction and operation of pipeline facilities since January 1, 1953.

To help meet the mounting demand for natural gas service in markets far distant from producing areas, the FPC also encouraged the development and expansion of underground storage facilities by interstate pipelines.

By this means, the companies are able to pump large quantities of natural gas into storage areas close to the using markets during the summer months, when much production and transmission capacity otherwise would lie idle.

Withdrawal of the gas during the cold winter months when demands exceed pipeline capacity enables consumers to be served without large additions to pipeline capacities.

Developed underground storage capacity is now estimated at about 2.9 trillion cubic feet compared with 1.7 trillion cubic feet at the beginning of 1953.

C. Improvement in procedures: To expedite the Commission's operations in considering formal matters, its rules of practice and procedure, and its regulations under both the Natural Gas and Power Acts are under constant study and review to improve their effectiveness.

Some major improvements, for example, involve: (1) a revised uniform system of accounts for gas and electric utilities to provide reclassification of utilities by size, to prescribe accounts for nuclear electric powerplant operations, and to reduce the number of expense accounts for nuclear electric powerplant operations, and to reduce the number of expense accounts classifications, etc.; (2) prescribing by rule the greater use of conferences in connection with hearings to provide for discussion of matters to be heard, identifying controversial issues, and exploring the possibilities for agreement; (3) a revised procedure for making natural gas rates on file in the Commission, but under suspension, effective by permitting the applicant simultaneously to file a motion to place rates in effect and a bond or an agreement and undertaking to refund any amounts later found by the Commission to be excessive; (4) combining when possible into one hearing noncontested applications for natural gas certificates, thereby reducing the number of Commission actions, and providing a faster response to industry needs.

An improvement in prospect is represented by the recommended legislation pertaining to delegation of certain substantive authority to one or more Commissioners or to Commission staff. Enactment of this legislation will permit further streamlining of Commission procedures and lighten the workload on an already overburdened Commission.

D. Administrative organization: Major changes have been effected in the Commission's organization beginning with the appointment in 1954 of an Executive Director empowered to exercise the administrative and executive direction vested in the Commission's Chairman. This delegation permitted the Chairman to devote more of his time to the heavy load of policy and substantive matters confronting the Commission.

At the same time, concentrating top management responsibility in an Executive Director facilitated uniform program planning, direction, coordination, and control essential to better gearing the Commission activity in coping with the large and increasing number of natural gas and electric power matters.

XXVI

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION UNDER THE REPUBLICAN ADMINISTRATION

(By U.S. Senator KENNETH B. KEATING, of New York)

The Federal Trade Commission performs a job in the field of business regulation which is of paramount significance, not only to the business community generally, but particularly to small business and the consuming public. This Commission promotes fair play in business by attacking practices which are monopolistic, deceptive, or otherwise unfair. Some of the highlights of its achievements are:

1. During the current fiscal year, which will be the Commission's first complete year under Chairman Earl W. Kintner, the Commission has already instituted more corrective proceedings than at any time in the history of the agency since it was established in 1915. The fiscal year has not, as yet, been completed, but a new record has already been set.

2. Fiscal years 1958, 1959, and 1960 are the first three complete fiscal years during which the Commission has consisted entirely of members appointed by President Eisenhower. It is interesting to compare the record of the past three full fiscal years with that of fiscal years 1950, 1951, and 1952, when the Commission last consisted entirely of appointees under the previous administration:

Fiscal year	Employees	Antimonopoly—		Antideceptive—	
		Complaints	Orders	Complaints	Orders
1950	654	27	16	97	63
1951	684	29	23	80	98
1952	672	29	24	75	108
1958	738	86	46	270	235
1959	732	80	64	272	276
1960 (to date)	751	118	36	318	282

3. Note from the foregoing that the complaints issued during this current incomplete fiscal year alone, in both the antimonopoly field and the antideceptive field, exceed the total issued for the last 3 years put together under the previous administration. Note also that this volume of work has more than trebled with only a very slight increase in the number of employees, even though the agency took on the added duties of administering the Fur Products Labeling Act, which became effective shortly before the change of administration, the Flammable Fabrics Act, and the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act.

4. Notwithstanding the fact that the workload so sharply increased, the handling of matters has, at the same time, been substantially speeded up, as indicated by the following tables giving comparative statistics for the age of cases pending in litigation in 1952 and in 1960:

	Antimonopoly		Antideceptive	
	1952	1960	1952	1960
Pending—number	85	182	127	233
Under 2 years old—percent	45	74	57	91
2 to 6 years old—percent	34	21	23	8
Over 6 years old—percent	21	5	20	1

5. When the first chairman appointed by the new administration took office on April 1, 1953, he discovered that 42 formal briefed and argued cases had been waiting decision of the Commission for over 30 days. Ten had been assigned to a Commissioner for report in 1953, 27 in 1952, and 5 in 1951 (3 of these on January 5, 1951). No similar problem exists today; the Commission is keeping current in its decisional work.

6. One of the most important laws enforced by the Commission is section 7 of the Clayton Act, as amended in 1950, known as the Anti-Merger Act. It proscribes mergers of corporations in interstate commerce where the effect may be substantially to lessen competition or a tendence toward monopoly. Although the law was amended in 1950 to cover acquisitions of assets, the previous administration gave it only token enforcement, instituting only one proceeding. Under the current administration, corporate mergers have been the subject of an intensive economic study and report, and 36 proceedings have been instituted.

7. The Commission normally effects corrective action in formal proceedings through the issuance of an order to cease and desist. Of course, unless such orders are obeyed, they serve little purpose. Not until the present administration has there been any program for the systematic checking of compliance with outstanding past cease and desist orders. While the purpose of the current program is primarily to obtain compliance, it has also resulted in a marked increase in the institution of civil penalty proceedings against violators where necessary. Since 1953, 81 cases have been certified to the Department of Justice for civil penalty proceedings, and judgments of over a quarter of a million dollars obtained.

8. The Commission's basic job is to get people to abide by the laws it administers. The current vigorous enforcement program has been accompanied by a similar intensified effort to obtain voluntary compliance wherever possible. Recently, the Commission has undertaken the issuance of guides dealing with various kinds of practices, in order better to inform the business community of what is required to comply with the law. These have included:

Cigarette advertising guides, September 1955.

Tire advertising guides, May 1958.

Guides against deceptive pricing, October 1958.

Guides against bait advertising, November 1959.

Guides against deceptive advertising of guarantees, April 1960.

Guides under sections 2 (d) and (e) of the Clayton Act, as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act, June 1960.

The last set of guides mentioned represents the first time that an effort has ever been made to spell out in simple language for the guidance of the businessman what the law requires of him in an important segment of the antitrust field.

9. Notwithstanding the fact that the Commission's investigational subpena powers have been spelled out in the law since 1914, it was not until the current vigorous enforcement program was begun that the extent of these powers was litigated through the courts. It has now been established that the Commission may subpena records in the investigation of Clayton Act cases, and also subpena records of those not under investigation themselves. *F.T.C.* v. *Tuttle* (C.A. 2, 1957) 244 F. 2d 605, cert. den. (1957), 354 U.S. 925.

10. Another example of the way in which the Commission is carrying out its responsibilities through vigorous use of its enforcement powers is the procedure it is now developing whereby its authority to require reports from corporations is used in the investigation of cases involving possible law violation. This procedure enables the Commission not only to speed up investigations, but also to investigate practices of competitors in an industry on a broad scale simultaneously, and thereby avoid to a large extent the necessity of singling out a few industry members to their competitive detriment. This is another example of the way in which the current Commission is constantly trying new methods so as better to discharge its statutory responsibilities.

11. Last December, more than 50 representatives of major civic, professional, and welfare organizations met with top Commission personnel for a 2-day Conference on Public Deception. This conference represented a major forward step educating and alerting the buying public about tricky false advertising practicing procedures and other tricky selling methods.

12. Recently, when attention was invited to the practice of giving payola in the broadcast field, the Commission acted promptly and effectively. Already, 85 complaints and 38 orders to cease and desist have been issued against record manufacturers and distributors.

Thus, in this agency, we see an outstanding example of one which, during the past 7½ years, has done more to carry out the powers Congress has given it to protect the competitive system than at any time in its history. Congress set up the Federal Trade Commission as an administrative agency, to handle problems in its field in several ways. It is doing so. It is telling the businessman what is expected of him. It is advising the consumer how to protect himself. It is enforcing the laws entrusted to it by Congress as it has never done before. It has speeded up its work. And, it is doing three times the job it did just 10 years ago, not with three times the people, not with two times the people, but with an almost token personnel increase of barely over 10 percent. Therefore, it is readily understandable why Mr. Henry Bi.on, Jr., General Counsel of the National Association of Retail Grocers of the United States, stated at their 61st annual convention:

"The Commission has certainly shown great vigor and spirit during the past year. It is the outstanding Federal regulatory commission in Washington, and provides a good example of the public service which an administrative agency is uniquely suited to perform. All five members of the Commission deserve the acclaim of the food industry. And we must never forget the many able and dedicated members of its staff."

XXVII

THE STABILITY OF THE DOLLAR; THE TAX REDUCTION RECORD; THE BUDGET AND DEBT MANAGEMENT RECORD; AND THE ADVANCES MADE BY THE TREASURY DEPARTMENT DURING THE REPUBLICAN ADMINISTRATION, 1953–1960

(By U.S. Senator STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, senior Republican member of the Senate Appropriations Committee and chairman of the Senate Republican policy committee)

Stability of the dollar

When the Republican administration took office in January 1953 it found that the dollar had lost almost half of its purchasing power since 1939.

The consumer's dollar in January 1953 was worth only 52 cents in terms of the food, clothing, shelter, and other items it would buy compared to 1939.

During the past seven years the value of the dollar has decreased by about 5 cents as contrasted with the 48-cent loss in the preceding 14 years. Furthermore, there has been no appreciable change in the value of the dollar during the last year.

Inflation acts like a special tax which hits hardest widows and orphans, retired persons, and working people with fixed incomes.

The relative stabilization of the purchasing power of the dollar during the Republican administration has, in effect, saved these groups from such a special tax. Financial stability has been achieved simultaneously with record-high levels of personal income and consumer spending. The highest standard of living in American history has thus been reached.

Tax reduction

The 1954 tax reduction during the Republican administration, amounting to $7.4 billion was the largest tax cut in history.

The largest item in the tax reduction program was a cut of $3 billion in individual income taxes.

Individuals also shared in the savings from the excise tax reductions and in the benefits provided in the tax revision law of 1954. Of the $7.4 billion returned to taxpayers, tax savings of approximate $4.6 billion went to individuals and $2.8 billion to corporations.

Individuals received:	
Individual income tax savings	$3,000,000,000
Savings in excise tax cuts	800,000,000
Tax revision law savings	800,000,000
Corporations received:	
Excise profits tax termination	2,000,000,000
Share in excise tax cuts	200,000,000
Tax revision law savings	600,000,000

The percentage distribution of the $7.4 billion was 62.2 percent to individuals and 37.8 percent to corporations.

The reduction in individual income taxes was about 10 percent for the lowest and middle income brackets. It was only slightly more than 1 percent in the top brackets.

Subsequent to 1954, the administration opposed revenue-losing measures because of the need of revenues to balance the budget.

However, as part of the farm program, provision was made for refund of the excise tax on gasoline used on a farm.

These refunds amounted to $74 million in the fiscal year 1958 and $79 million in the fiscal year 1959.

In addition, between 1955 and 1960, a number of excise tax changes were enacted which in the aggregate reduced excises by about $700 million. Most of this reduction, over $500 million, resulted from repeal in 1958 of the excises on transportation of property and oil by pipeline. Revisions in the admissions tax in 1956 and 1958 reduced revenues by approximately $80 million, and a reduction of the cabaret tax in 1960 decreased revenues by $20 million.

A balanced budget

The Government has continually directed its efforts toward balancing the Federal budget.

This is an accomplishment to which the Republican administration has been pledged from the beginning.

For the individual it is linked directly with stability in the cost of living, in employment, and in earnings.

It puts a sound floor under the Nation's economy.

It inspires the public confidence that is essential to continued economic expansion and sustained prosperity.

It is a convincing demonstration to those nations of the world who have a growing stake in a continuing sound American economy that we are conducting our fiscal affairs in a responsible manner.

Budget surpluses have been achieved in 3 of the last 6 fiscal years and despite the recession engendered deficits of 1958 and 1959, a modest surplus was realized in the fiscal year 1960, and a surplus of $4.2 billion is projected for fiscal 1961 under the President's program.

Tax revision

The tax revision law enacted in 1954 provided benefits for every American by remov-

ing hardships on millions of individual taxpayers, effecting the simplification and clarification of our earlier tax laws, closing some loopholes, and reducing some unnecessary restraints on business.

Tax pressures and injustices were eased by the new code for such groups as working mothers, parents of children who are helping pay their way through schools, retired people, families with heavy medical expenses, farmers in need of new equipment, people with sick and accident policies, persons with nonrelative dependents, farmers engaged in soil and water conservation, and many others.

This code rearranged the tax burden so as to make it easier for the economy to move forward. The goal was to improve the laws so as to help the economy to grow and so create more and better jobs and better living for everyone. Provisions for more liberal depreciation allowances, and in a small measure offering relief from the double taxation of dividends, helped accomplish this.

An important development pushed by Republicans was the Technical Amendments Act of 1958 (Public Law 85–859, approved September 2, 1958).

This measure strengthened the revenue system by closing loopholes and by foreclosing unintended benefits, most of which were the result of carrying over provisions of the 1939 code into the 1954 code.

This act also removed hardships which had previously existed in the tax law.

In addition, the Small Business Tax Revision Act of 1958, which was incorporated in Public Law 85–859, provided substantial tax relief for small business.

Among the provisions aiding small business were: more liberal loss deductions in certain cases involving small business corporations, extension of the net operating loss carryback, more liberal depreciation allowances, more time to pay estate taxes attributable to investment in closely held business enterprises, and an increase in the amount of earnings that a small business may accumulate without being subject to the tax on improper accumulation of surplus.

Besides these broad tax acts there have been a number of specific adjustments in the tax law to correct inequities and provide limited relief. For example, in 1960 the 3-percent limitation was removed with respect to medical expenses incurred by a taxpayer for the care of a dependent parent who is 65 years of age or over, thus allowing the deduction of the first dollar of these expenses.

Further progress was made toward tax simplification. The card return form 1040A was revised in 1958 to permit its use by employees with less than $10,000 of income (rather than $5,000). As a result of this and other changes, as many as 31 million individuals can now qualify to use this simple tax return as compared with 14 million who filed it for 1957. A new income tax return form 1040W, was introduced in 1959 to serve the needs of individual income taxpayers not eligible to use punchcard form 1040A, but whose affairs do not require all the detail specified on regular form 1040. The new form may be used by taxpayers whose incomes consist of salaries and wages regardless of amount, and not more than $200 of dividends and interest, and no other items of income.

A concerted effort was made to expedite the completion of regulations to simplify and increase understanding of the tax law. In this connection, a new regulation on travel expenses was developed which relieves employees who account to their employer for their business travel expenses from reporting such expenses in their individual tax returns. Another regulation permits teachers to deduct educational expenses if their purpose is to update and expand knowledge of the subject taught, to learn improved teaching methods, or otherwise improve teaching effectiveness.

The Excise Tax Technical Changes Act of 1958 revised many excise provisions. Because of lack of time, excises were not given full consideration during the development of the new Internal Revenue Code in 1954. The 1958 act was designed to correct inequities and disparities of a technical nature and was not concerned with the general question of excise tax rates. Major revisions were made in the terminology of the taxes on communications, the method of computing the stamp taxes on stocks, the statutes relating to distilled spirits, and the provisions relating to credits and refunds.

In recognition of the need for a permanent and equitable method of taxation of life insurance companies, the Secretary of the Treasury, in April 1958, sent to the House Ways and Means Committee suggested approaches to the long-range solution of this problem. These suggestions were incorporated in the Life Insurance Company Income Tax Act of 1959, signed into law by the President on June 25, 1959.

To strengthen our Federal system of Government, the Republican administration recommended the enactment of proposals made by the Joint Federal-State Action Committee which called for the transfer of responsibility for certain functions from the Federal Government to the States and the relinquishment of a portion of certain Federal taxes to assist the States in financing these responsibilities.

As the budget permits, additional reforms will be undertaken to increase the fairness of the tax system, to reduce the tax restraints on incentives to work and invest, and wherever feasible to simplify the tax laws. The Treasury Department is making a study of various possible tax adjustments and is cooperating with the House Ways and Means Committee in developing plans for an inquiry into the opportunities for constructive reform of the Federal tax system.

Enrollment to practice before the Revenue Service

New Treasury programs have been instituted to assist taxpayers in their dealings with the Revenue Service. The almost exclusionary type of examination required for applicants for enrollment to practice before the Revenue Service who were not lawyers, certified public accountants or former Service employees was abandoned and a new realistic examination prepared.

Another change will permit the many small taxpayers who have their returns prepared by people who are not lawyers or CPA's to have the preparer represent the taxpayer before examining officers and revenue agents.

These changes will make available to taxpayers a greater number of well-qualified people to represent them at any level of the Service and will also permit the preparers of returns to assist taxpayers in resolving their unusually minor problems with the Service.

Debt management

Debt management policies of the Treasury Department under the Republicans have been keyed to the administration's objective of promoting high employment, rising production, and a stable dollar.

Financings have been designed to tie in with Federal Reserve System actions to keep the supply of money and credit in line with the needs of the country. In addition, the administration has sought by numerous means to distribute the debt more widely among the people.

Since January of 1953 about $50 billion of marketable bonds running 5 years or more to maturity have been sold, in contrast to only $5 billion in the previous 6 years. This has prevented a further erosion in the average length of the debt.

The Treasury has instituted a number of technical improvements designed to facilitate its financing operations. The pricing of new issues at a slight premium or discount has enabled the Treasury to attune its offerings more closely to the market and consequently to get the best deal at the cheapest cost to the Government, consistent with other debt management objectives.

The Treasury has extended the auction method of selling securities to include 6-month bills, and has extended this principle to 1-year bills maturing on a regular basis four times a year. The auction method puts the burden of pricing on those who participate in the bidding and reduces the uncertainty and unsettlement in the market that tends to arise when the Treasury sells issues at a fixed price.

The Treasury has also taken steps to routinize its other short-term debt operations by concentrating these short-term maturities as much as possible in mid-February, May, August, and November, and to even up, as far as possible, the short-term debt coming due during each of these four dates. This is helping to assure a smoother operation in rolling over these maturities. These technical improvements in the short-term area will also be helpful in setting the stage for longer term financing.

In the 85th session of Congress the Treasury requested legislation which would have provided:

1. Removal of the 3.26-percent interest ceiling on savings bonds which, together with other changes, would permit the Treasury to go forward with a reinvigorated savings bond program.

2. Removal of the 4¼-percent interest rate ceiling on new Treasury bond issues—an imperative need to enable the Treasury to avoid an excess of short-term financing.

3. Technical amendments designed to improve the management of the public debt, foremost being a provision for the deferral of tax gains or losses by participants in advance refunding operations in which holders of Treasury securities (in advance of maturity) are offered securities with longer maturities in exchange.

The legislation in its final form enabled the Treasury to increase the yields on series E and H savings bonds to 3¾ percent retroactive to June 1, 1959. As a result the savings bond sales and redemption picture has improved measurably, easing the problem of maintaining a widespread distribution of an important segment of the public debt in the hands of millions of small savers.

The provision for deferral of tax gains and losses in advance refunding operations was granted by Congress and in June 1960 the Treasury offered holders of the 2½ percent bonds of 1961 an opportunity to exchange a portion of their holdings for a 4-year note or an 8-year bond. Over $4 billion of the $11 billion outstanding 2½-percent bonds were exchanged for the new securities, mostly for the 4-year note. This, of course, significantly reduces the future problem of refunding the large 2½-percent bond in November 1961 and is an additional step toward the objective of improving the maturity structure of the marketable public debt.

It is most unfortunate that the Democratic-controlled Congress failed to take action on the requested removal of the 4¼-percent interest rate ceiling on new Treasury bond issues and continuation of this arbitrary restriction is unjustifiable. The Treasury will continue to press for the flexibility necessary to handle the Government's financial affairs in a sound manner.

International financial arrangements

The Secretary of the Treasury is Chairman of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems, which coordinates the policies and operations of the U.S. representatives on international financial institutions and the international financial policies and operations of U.S. Government agencies, including the

Export-Import Bank, the International Cooperation Administration, the Development Loan Fund, and other agencies involved in foreign lending. The Secretary of the Treasury is also U.S. Governor of the International Monetary Fund, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and the International Finance Corporation.

The Treasury Department played the major role in carrying out the President's recommendation that the resources of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the International Monetary Fund be increased by substantial amounts.

The purpose of the increases is to enable the two institutions to continue to carry forward in the years ahead the constructive policies that they have pursued during the first 13 years of their existence.

In June 1959 the President signed the legislation authorizing U.S. participation in the increases, and the Treasury Department promptly took steps to make the required payments. By September 1959, a sufficient number of countries had signed their approval of the increases to meet the minimum amounts required under the terms of the proposal. This forward-looking step in the international field thus has become a reality.

The Treasury has take part in major financial negotiations and consultations with a number of countries, including the United Kingdom at the time of the Suez crisis in 1956 and the establishment of nonresident convertibility in 1958. Other discussions were held with the Federal Republic of Germany, France on various occasions, Turkey, Argentina, Brazil, India, and several others.

The Treasury Department of the Republican administration took a leading part in developing a plan for, and played a major role in, negotiations for the establishment of the Inter-American Development Bank with the 21 American Republics as members. The charter for the proposed Bank was initialed in April 1959, and the Treasury Department bore the main responsibility for obtaining legislation providing for U.S. membership. The President signed the required legislation on September 1, 1959.

All American Republics except Cuba have taken similar steps and accepted membership. The Bank has elected a president, directors, and principal officers and will begin operations on October 1, 1960.

The existence of the Bank will further affirm the deep interest of the United States in its economic relations with the Republics of the Western Hemisphere.

The Treasury has made and renewed exchange agreements with a number of Latin American countries to assist them in keeping their currencies in orderly relations with the dollar and in maintaining their exchange systems free from restrictions, generally in cooperation with the International Monetary Fund.

Most recently the Secretary of the Treasury has vigorously pressed forward the proposal to create a new multilateral lending organization, to be known as the International Development Association.

This organization would be an affiliate of the International Bank and would be authorized to make loans for the economic development of less developed areas on terms more flexible than those which the International Bank can provide.

The institution will provide for the cooperative association of the industrial countries of the free world with the United States in an institution devoted to development lending on flexible terms. In addition, the International Development Association may provide an opportunity for the utilization of some of the foreign currencies derived from oversea programs of the United States. The National Advisory Council, in August 1959, reported favorably to the Congress on the establishment of such an organization. At the annual meeting of the Governors of the International Bank, in September 1959, the Secretary, as U.S. Governor, proposed a resolution calling upon the Executive Directors of the International Bank to formulate Articles of Agreement for an International Development Association. This resolution was unanimously adopted by the Board of Governors, and legislation providing for U.S. membership is being considered in the Congress.

Through the measures noted above the United States has again demonstrated a high degree of effective leadership in the international financial field.

Management improvements

Constant attention to ways in which the Treasury's work can be performed more efficiently and economically has made it possible to reduce the number of civilian personnel in the Department from 87,800 in January 1953 to 74,200 in January 1960, a reduction of 13,600 employees, or 16 percent. At the same time, workload figures in most bureaus have increased significantly. For example, the number of checks issued has increased by 50 percent, the number of checks paid by 30 percent, the number of persons clearing customs by 25 percent, the number of regular Treasury securities issued by over 100 percent, the number of carriers entering the United States by 35 percent, and the number of coins manufactured by 55 percent.

During the first full fiscal year after the Republican administration took office, almost $21 million was saved as a result of immediate economy measures taken. When initial economy efforts lagged, the Secretary gave personal leadership to a search for economies throughout the Department which gave impetus to the Department's regular efforts to improve management. The Department's management improvement efforts under the present administration have resulted in total tangible annual savings of $74.5 million.

Many of the economies resulted in direct improvements in services to the public, such as the following:

1. Goods in world trade move through the American customs with less difficulty and less delay. A huge backlog of unliquidated entries has been substantially reduced. Redtape has been cut on merchandise classification and duty rate determination. Prompt determination of duties on imports has been made possible, with the determinations based on current prices in our foreign trade.

2. Customs declaration forms for the individual passenger have been greatly simplified and continued improvements have been made in income tax forms.

3. Tax administration has been greatly improved by prompt settlement of tax disputes.

Internal operations have been greatly simplified and speeded up by organizational realinements and the decentralization of functions, by the continued modernization and mechanization of procedures, and by increased attention to the recruitment and training of personnel of the highest type. A few examples of these improvements follow:

1. The number of supervisory regional offices of the Internal Revenue Service was reduced from 17 to 9.

2. The use of electronic equipment for paying and reconciling Government checks, and for processing the redemption of savings bonds will save approximately $4 million on a governmentwide basis.

3. Widespread technological improvements have been made in the manufacture of currency and coins, such as the installation of eight new sheet-fed rotary intaglio presses to print currency at the Bureau of Engraving and Printing with savings of $1.8 million.

4. Improved audit and collection procedures in the Internal Revenue Service have resulted in increased revenue collections.

5. The Internal Revenue Service is collecting Federal liquor and tobacco taxes by means of returns instead of by sale of tax stamps with expected annual savings of $1.2 million.

6. The Federal Boating Act of 1958 is designed to promote boating safety in the United States. It requires the numbering for indentification of all motor propelled boats and gives the U.S. Coast Guard civil penalty authority in addition to its present criminal penalty authority for reckless operation of motorboats. Cost of the program is expected to be met by fees to be paid for numbering certificates to be issued to boat owners. The number of pleasure boats in operation is estimated to be increasing by about 500,000 a year since 1947 to a total of over 8 million in 1959.

As the senior Republican Member in the Senate I am proud of the great progress and advancement made on behalf of the American people by the Treasury Department under the Republican administration.

XXVIII

LINCOLN'S PRINCIPLES AND THE REPUBLICAN PARTY CAN BEST LEAD THE NATION IN THE 1960'S

(By U.S. Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, of Massachusetts)

The Republican Party is best equipped to lead the United States through the promise and peril of the decade of the 1960's. The essential values implanted in our party by Abraham Lincoln qualify it to face and meet the major challenges of the new decade.

Lincoln stands out in history because of his courage, humanity, and profound insight into the great moral problems of his times. These are the characteristics he so firmly rooted in the Grand Old Party.

Population explosions, huge industrial and urban expansion, revolutions in space-age technology, an ever-growing government with an ever burgeoning budget, and the constant threat of a giant, arrogant, inhumanly efficient totalitarian state characterize our present world.

The task of protecting human freedom and advancing human welfare is more complex, more sophisticated in the 1960's than it was in the 1860's. Yet the same fundamental principles of leadership needed in America 100 hundred years ago are in demand today. I believe that the Republican Party will again answer the call.

Eight years of profound and durable leadership

The accomplishments of the Eisenhower administration in the field of international relations, human affairs, and economic policy during the past 8 years are profound and durable.

The present Republican leadership established a firm but flexible foreign policy with its stands at Lebanon, Taiwan, and Berlin, its decision at Suez, the "atoms for peace" proposal, cooperative help for the underdeveloped areas, and dynamic efforts in person-to-person diplomacy.

It maintained a powerful military establishment, initiated the Nation's first missile program, and spent over five times as much money on scientific research than did the preceding administration.

It enacted the first civil rights legislation in 80 years, and strove tirelessly to stimulate the initiative of the individual in our overorganized society.

The Eisenhower administration rejected the something-for-nothing and credit-card-economy philosophies in fiscal affairs, and launched a crucial fight against inflation—looking forward to the opportunities and obligations of future generations.

However, such progress is now only significant as a solid foundation for what we build in the future—as Lincoln once said: "The struggle of today is not altogether of today—it is for a vast future also."

To advance freedom and insure peace

These are the three great challenges of the 1960's:

1. The Sino-Soviet threat—the challenge for world peace and security with justice.

2. Human freedom—the challenge for equal rights, individual self-reliance, and betterment for all men.

3. Economic strength—the challenge for growth and stability with fiscal integrity.

The concept of peace and prosperity is taken seriously by the Republican Party.

Peace must be for all men before it can be insured for any men. Thus, we move beyond our borders to advance freedom and reduce the causes of war—giving help and recognition to emerging nationalism in Asia and Africa.

Prosperity must be real, blooming locally throughout the land, not superimposed artificially and arbitrarily by an oversized central bureaucracy.

Qualities of the Republican Party

Four inherent qualities of the Republican Party are essential to the Nation and the world in the coming decade: They are:

1. A belief in unity and solidarity capable of joining men together in a common bond, rather than dividing them through emphasis on separate interest groups.

2. A calm, deep consideration of the whole instead of a distorted dramatization of various parts.

3. A constant dedication to principle, insuring the continuity between philosophy, purpose, and action.

4. A realistic approach to human problems, achieving a dynamic balance of past perspective and future vision. As Abraham Lincoln wrote: "I hope to stand firm enough not to go backward, and yet not go forward fast enough to wreck the country's cause."

XXIX

THE PROUD RECORD OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY IN ENFRANCHISING CITIZENS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

(By U.S. Senator FRANCIS CASE, of South Dakota)

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 39) which was adopted by the Congress during the past session and went into effect, marked a long way down the road toward extending the right of suffrage to the people of the District of Columbia.

In December of 1952, the then President-elect of the United States, Dwight Eisenhower, sent word to me that he would like to have me come to New York in order to discuss some legislative matters affecting the District of Columbia.

The prospect was that I would be chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia of the Senate. Among subjects discussed was the possibility of getting the right to vote for the people of the District of Columbia. The President spoke very feelingly upon the fact that he believed taxation without representation was contrary to the principle of our country. He said he felt there was something basically wrong if we taxed people and did not give them the right to vote. He thought there was something basically wrong if we drafted their sons for military service and did not give them the right to vote.

During the preceding 2 years I had been a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia and had been accorded the honor by the then chairman of the committee, the late Senator Neely of West Virginia, and the majority leader of that day, Senator McFarland of Arizona, of piloting the so-called home rule bill through its consideration by the Senate in January of 1952.

So I was very glad to accede to the suggestion of the President that we devote some energy to the possibility of getting suffrage for the District of Columbia.

During 1953–54 we passed a home rule bill. We also passed a bill giving the people of the District of Columbia the right to vote for delegates to national conventions. The matter of voting for President and Vice President called for a constitutional amendment. We gave some consideration to it but, of course, that was a proposal which would have to go to the Judiciary Committee.

My interest in the subject has continued throughout the years. The interest of the President has continued throughout the years. On various occasions he has continued to express an interest in this goal.

Early in this Congress Senator GLENN BEALL introduced a constitutional amendment proposing that the citizens of the District of Columbia be given the right to vote in presidential elections. The junior Senator from South Dakota introduced a similar constitutional amendment.

In the amendment which I proposed I suggested that the District of Columbia be given three delegates to the House of Representatives with a like number of electoral votes for President and Vice President, in that way preserving the traditional basis upon which a State has votes in the electoral college.

Early this year, when the District of Columbia Committee reported the so-called home rule bill, I offered that constitutional amendment as an amendment to that home rule bill, in fact as a substitute for the home rule bill. Watching the course of these proposals through the years had convinced me that there was little practical possibility of getting home rule, as such, through both Houses of Congress in the same Congress.

Also I knew that every home rule bill which had been presented in the previous 10 years had included a provision to recognize the basic constitutional provision that Congress is given the exclusive legislative jurisdiction for the District of Columbia.

Believing that the people of the District of Columbia should have an effective voice in the Government which governs them; namely, Congress, plus the appointive power of the President, I came to the conclusion that the practical thing to do was to press for a constitutional amendment which would give them a voice in the electoral college for the election of President and Vice President, and, if possible, delegates in the House of Representatives.

So I introduced the constitutional amendment on the floor as a substitute for the home rule bill on the floor of the Senate. The most important result was the interest which developed. Many Members of the Senate said to me, "We would like to support that kind of measure as an independent proposal."

The most helpful interest developed was the interest that was taken by Senator KENNETH KEATING. Not only did he say he believed that that constitutional amendment should be adopted at that time, but, as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, he took an earnest and unrelenting interest in the subject.

The outgrowth of that effort was the reporting of a proposed constitutional amendment to the Senate, built upon the language that had been proposed by the Senator from Maryland, Mr. BEALL; the Senator from New York, Mr. KEATING; and myself. That proposal was reported to the full Committee on the Judiciary.

Then there came before the Senate a proposal to deal with the problem of the election of Members of the House of Representatives in case of an emergency which incapacitated a majority of the Members of the House from acting at any time.

The Senator from Florida, Mr. HOLLAND, proposed an addition to that proposed constitutional amendment. His proposal was an amendment for the abolition of the poll tax in Federal or national elections. That was agreed to.

So, then the distinguished Senator from New York, Mr. KEATING, performed the master stroke of presenting the District of Columbia amendment which had been reported by the Kefauver subcommittee to the full Judiciary Committee. It drew wide support and was agreed to by more than the two-thirds required for a constitutional amendment.

I believe that is an accurate reflection of the record, and the course that this matter has taken. As we adopted the amendment in the Senate, it provided for both representation in the House of Representatives and representation in the electoral college for the voters of the District. The three-pronged resolution then passed by the required two-thirds vote for a constitutional amendment, and it went to the House of Representatives.

The Senator from New York, the Senator from Maryland, and I and others testified before the House Judiciary Committee urging action upon this particular proposition to provide suffrage for the voters of the District of Columbia in the election of President and Vice President. We also urged delegate representation in the House of Representatives.

Of course, under the Constitution, the House of Representatives is the judge of its own membership. In its wisdom the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives reported a constitutional amendment to the House of Representatives in a form which left only the provision for the election of presidential electors for President and Vice President by the District of Columbia.

I regret the dropping of the other two proposals in the triple-pronged constitutional amendment as it passed the Senate. I regret particularly the dropping of the provision for a delegate in the House of Representatives. However, so far as the Senator from South Dakota is concerned, I recognized that in that particular matter, since the House of Representatives itself was concerned with it, we should respect their wishes in that particular.

I might also observe that it is my personal opinion that the Congress could, by an ordinary act of Congress, without requiring a constitutional amendment, provide for a delegate to the House of Representatives, if the Congress so desired, at any particular time.

I conclude by saying that this action will mark the Eisenhower administration as having sponsored and encouraged the greatest extension of suffrage of taxpayers throughout areas where the United States has jurisdiction. First of all, there was the legislation giving to the people of the District of Columbia the right to vote for delegates to the national political conventions. Second, there was the adoption of Alaskan statehood. Third, there was the adoption of Hawaiian statehood.

With this action, every step will have been taken which could be taken by Congress and by the administration to get before the country a constitutional amendment to give to the people of the District of Columbia the right to have some voice in the Government under which they live. This is a proper step to be taken for the seat of the Government of the United States.

I hope that the consequence of this step will not be lost on the peoples throughout the world. It has been a reproach to our profession of democratic principles that people in the Capital City of the United States can be taxed, and yet have no vote. This amendment can lead to the end of that travesty. I hope it will be ratified by three-fourths of the States before the next year of presidential elections rolls around.

XXX

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY UNDER THE REPUBLICAN ADMINISTRATION

(A report prepared personally for the chairman of the Senate Republican policy committee, U.S. Senator STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire)

In the years since the close of World War II, air transportation has become a major industry affecting all aspects of our national life. Recognizing the obligation of the Federal Government to foster the orderly development of civil aviation, both commercial and private, the Republican administration provided the leadership which resulted in the enactment of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 creating the Federal Aviation Agency—the first fully independent Federal body devoted entirely to the regulation and promotion of the aviation industry.

On January 1, 1959, the new agency absorbed the functions and personnel of the Civil Aeronautics Administration and the Airways Modernization Board, as well as certain duties formerly performed by the Civil Aeronautics Board.

The basic intent of the Administration and of Congress was to establish an organization with sufficient power—both of persuasion and by means of appropriate regulations—to restore to air transportation the same degree of public confidence as existed for other forms of travel. A former Air Force general, E. R. Quesada, who had demonstrated an intense interest in measures to advance air safety, was named by President Eisenhower to head the new Federal Aviation Agency.

We recall that the difficulties confronting all segments of the aviation industry were beginning to assume crisis proportions during the early and mid-1950's. Accident rates were on the rise. Burgeoning ownership of aircraft, both commercial and private, thus greatly increasing the use of existing airspace and all types of aviation facilities, created a pressing need for immediate action.

Greatly expanded programs to provide adequate air navigation and air-traffic control facilities were essential. Revised air-traffic rules and procedures were assigned a high priority.

Other regulations, some of which have been adopted as many as 30 years ago, required review in order to meet present and anticipated needs. New aircraft and technical advances brought about the necessity for developing regulations in fields where formal rules hitherto were unneeded.

All such important areas have received attention from FAA and accelerated activity may be expected now that the agency has achieved a state of organization which will permit it to fully discharge its responsibilities. Among the more important regulations adopted since the agency was created are the following:

1. No individual who has reached his 60th birthday shall be utilized or serve as a pilot on any aircraft while engaged in air carrier operations.

2. Improved training and proficiency tests for co-pilots of commercial aircraft.

3. Mandatory weather radar for commercial aircraft.

4. New private and commercial pilots required to demonstrate a knowledge of instruction in instrument flying.

5. Uniform standards of flight instruction established in all flying schools.

6. Medical standards strengthened so as to prohibit from operating aircraft persons with histories of diabetes mellitus requiring insulin, coronary artery disease, psychosis or certain other mental or nervous diseases, chronic alcoholism, drug addition or epilepsy.

7. Private pilots required to receive their medical examinations from FAA-designated medical examiners.

As indicated by the first, sixth and seventh items listed above, the agency has greatly expanded its medical program. Recently, a Bureau of Aviation Medicine was established within the agency in recognition of the new importance of certain medical problems as they relate to the operation of aircraft.

Simultaneous with strengthening the regulatory area of the Agency's functions, Administrator Quesada was determined that enforcement measures should be similarly improved. Quite obviously, good regulations can be ineffective if they are not observed by those to whom they are directed. While insisting upon absolute fairness in enforcement procedures, the Administrator nonetheless seeks to improve upon the rather lax practices which were followed in previous years.

In this connection, the Agency has placed its safety inspectors on a round-the-clock schedule in a concentrated safety inspection of all scheduled air carrier training programs and flight operations. As an example of this increased emphasis on compliance, FAA has ordered its flight inspectors to enforce the requirements that flight crew members remain at their duty stations during flight unless their absence is absolutely necessary.

During 1959, the Agency undertook approximately 3,000 enforcement actions against persons engaged in various aviation pursuits. In many cases, civil penalties, certificate revocations, or suspensions and reprimands were imposed.

The FAA is becoming increasingly active in the field of airport development. In order to improve the effectiveness of the existing Federal-aid airport program, which provides financial assistance on a matching-fund basis to local communities for airport improvement purposes, the Agency has established a revised system of priorities whereby safety items of greatest demonstrated need receive preference in allocating the funds available.

During fiscal year 1959, FAA approved grants for 436 airport projects, involving over $73 million in Federal funds. As of December 31, 1959, a total of 1,050 projects were under firm contract or grant agreement. For fiscal years 1960 and 1961, Federal grants of well over $100 million for about 600 projects have been authorized. Since 1953 over $380 million has been spent, obligated, or programed. Major advances have been realized in improving the Nation's airports.

It is evident that all functions of the Federal Aviation Agency are directly related to the promotion of air safety. In its activities, however, the Agency does not seek to retard the healthy growth of the aviation industry. On the contrary, the Agency is dedicated to fostering the continued development of air transportation—both private and commercial.

As an example of the flexibility which FAA must maintain in order to meet new advances in the aviation industry, we may refer to the advent of the turbojet transport in air commerce. By the end of 1959, the Nation's airlines were operating more than 75 pure jets. During 1960 the carriers will add an additional 150. The introduction of these new high-performance aircraft was accomplished with a minimum of incident and mishap. A total of 28 U.S. airports now handle large jet transports.

The Federal Aviation Agency has sought to align its safety programs to the expansion of jet travel. Last year, for instance, the agency inaugurated a new program of jet flight training for its flight inspectors. This program—conducted by the Air Force at the request of FAA—has provided agency inspectors with the finest jet training available anywhere in the world.

The rapid increase in jet operations has been important in a number of the changes in rules and regulations affecting air carriers which have been adopted in recent months. As aircraft become larger, faster, and more complex, the public interest demands maximum performance standards for all manufacturing, maintenance, and operating personnel.

In still another step to keep pace with the expansion of jet travel, FAA has established 30 new high-altitude jet route segments totaling 25,455 miles. Radar surveillance for these civil jet operations was accomplished when the military permitted FAA to man and utilize 38 Air Defense Command long-range radars.

This arrangement is a typical example of the present close relationship which exists between the agency and the armed services in solving mutual problems. The Federal Aviation Act fully authorizes such close cooperation—particularly in airspace and air traffic control matters.

The coverage provided by the ADC radars supplements FAA's own existing long-range radar to provide nationwide radar advisory service. The combined military-FAA radar system enables agency personnel to track all jet flights from takeoff to touchdown with the exception of a small area in the Rocky Mountain region.

During 1959, the new turbojet aircraft contributed to a 14-percent increase in the revenue passenger-miles flown by the Nation's airlines last year. The total of approximately 35.8 billion was 4½ billion revenue passenger-miles over the comparable figure for 1958.

The expansion of jet service was accompanied by a similar growth in all fields of aviation. For example, the number of student pilot certificates issued by FAA rose from 58,107 for 1958 to 67,714 for 1959—an increase of 17 percent.

The upward trend also is reflected in the increasing volume of air traffic. During 1959, seven FAA towers reported their typical busy hours showed an average of nearly one scheduled airline landing or takeoff per minute. These busy-hour averages do not include nonscheduled operations.

To meet the needs of this expanding volume of air traffic, the Agency expanded its air traffic control system by commissioning a new navigational aid or air traffic management facility at the rate of 1 a day for a total of 365 for the year. These included, in part, 72 approach light systems, 11 new airport traffic control towers, 18 long-range radars, 9 precision approach radars, and 2 airport surveillance radar units. Also during the year, FAA contracted for the construction of six new air route traffic control buildings, and one new traffic control center building was put in service at San Antonio, Tex.

Early in 1959, the Agency set up a new airspace management program which made available over 6,000 miles of new airspace for civil aviation. At the close of the year, more than 100 areas were under FAA review for revocation or reduction in size, height, or hours in use.

Also, during its first year, the Agency installed new electronic computers at six of its busier air traffic control centers. At the same time, FAA scientists and engineers received delivery of the first components of a new fully automated air traffic control system. This giant computer, called Data Processing Central, will handle all the repetitive, nondecisionmaking functions of the air traffic controller. Its most spectacular function, however, is its ability to probe, detect, and predict conflicts or collision courses.

FAA engineers also completed plans for the introduction of automatic landing into the national system of aviation facilities. After final development and thorough testing, all-weather landing is expected to be in operation in 5 years. Planes will be able to land in all types of weather regardless of visibility conditions.

Testing of the automatic landing system is being carried on at FAA's Atlantic City,

N.J., test center—the first such installation to serve civil aviation exclusively. A former naval air station, now known as the National Aviation Facilities Experimental Center, the center is equipped with laboratories, model shops, computer facilities and other types of instrumentation needed to carry out the vital testing and evaluation of new systems and equipment related to air safety. Just recently, as a result of tests at NAFEC, FAA has proposed the adoption on a nationwide basis of a new runway lighting system.

At the present time, the Agency is engaged in building the most modern jet-age airport in the world to serve the Metropolitan Washington area—Dulles International Airport—named in honor of our late Secretary of State. The construction work on the project is proceeding at a rapid pace. Paving of the two north-south runways (each almost 2 miles long) was completed ahead of schedule and other runways are nearing completion.

Bad weather halted operations during the fall of 1959 and has necessitated a postponement of the scheduled opening date from early 1961 until the summer of that year. Dulles International and Washington National Airports—both operated by FAA—are the only major civil airports owned by the Federal Government.

In concluding this summary of FAA accomplishments, it should be mentioned that FAA is making an important contribution in the field of foreign relations. Representatives of the Agency have been invited by the appropriate authorities of numerous free world nations to advise them on various matters relating to civil aviation. In addition, representatives of many foreign countries have come to the United States for the purpose of studying FAA facilities and programs. Further, the Agency is very active in several international aviation organizations.

As a result of these contacts, U.S. civil aviation policies, techniques, and equipment have become almost standard throughout the non-Communist world. In the process much good will has been generated, thereby strengthening our ties with other peoples.

XXXI

THE NATIONAL PURPOSE

(By U.S. Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, of Massachusetts)

The American people are considering their collective determination, direction, and destiny in a self-appraisal which is popularly referred to as the debate on the national purpose.

Our national purpose is bound up dynamically with our social and political heritage, the threat inherent in an affluent society, the vitality of the individual, and above all the international challenge to all freemen.

The debate is being conducted in national periodicals and leading newspapers, in letters to the editors columns, in the speeches of the leading candidates for the presidential nomination, and so on.

Some people talk about leadership, others religious strength, others public awareness of traditional ideals. We read about false optimism, the crisis of understanding, the search for a new frontier. And we hear that America will stumble unless she better defines her objectives; that a major danger is the softness and slackness of our modern society.

At the root of the entire discussion there seems to be a persistent awareness that worldwide demands on this country are greater than ever before and a persistent urgency to shape a national resolve which can meet them. We are concerned that our response be equal to the challenge.

In thinking about our national purpose, there are a half-dozen points which I specially like to keep in mind.

First, I feel that the principal issue before the United States in the latter half of the 20th century is whether a society which is characterized by a huge and unprecedented wealth can sustain the strength and stamina of her great ideals—intellectually, spiritually, and physically. America of the 1960's is, in the words of the song, mighty "comfy-cozy," and her greatest danger in overindulgence.

Today we have the highest standard of living in the world. With our new growth in material strength have come new strains on our moral fabric, a new responsibility to our ideological and spiritual foundation.

As Walter Lippmann wrote in his treatment of the debate: "Our ability to meet that challenge depends upon our success in learning to use our growing wealth for something more than just private satisfaction. * * * We have to be able and willing to pay for what is, to put it briefly, civilization itself."

Second, the individual's energy in accepting his own responsibilities must be stimulated. Purpose is intimately related to vitality. Our survival depends upon a populace concerned about the great challenges of the age and dedicated to their solution, each contributing his own individual abilities.

Recently we have become more conditioned to looking at Government as the source of initiative for getting things done. We forget that under our system of government it rests on us to start things off. Our large, complex society is dominated by a powerful Central Government capable, if we let it, of endangering local and individual incentive.

Each citizen must himself take up the task with vigor and conviction—in the way he works at his job, treats his fellow beings, in the way he conducts his life.

Third, I believe that today's Americans must distinguish between the concept of automatic equality and the principle of equality of opportunity. The latter is the ideal so brightly fought for in the early pages of our history. The former is a more recent tendency toward the feeling that everyone should get exactly the same "deal," that society owes the same rewards to all, regardless of effort or ability.

We believe that all men are created equal and should have an equal chance at life's benefits; that all men must receive equal treatment under the law. But we must be willing to encourage and recognize unusual accomplishment and performance.

Fourth, the United States must have an overriding national interest in order to fulfill its national purpose. Selfish group interests will frustrate any national sense of unity and direction. We must emphasize the whole rather than divisive and often contradictory separate purposes; we must resist the temptation of special appeals. Our citizens must be joined together in a common bond for the common good.

Fifth, any national purpose must be identified with the international purpose. Never before has it been so clear that the destiny of the various peoples of the world was one and the same. Never before has the survival of the values of our own society been so dependent on their survival across the globe.

America's record for assistance to friendly nations is unprecedented. But the issue before us is not so much what we have done but what we must do. The battle for men's minds and the struggle for peace is focused at the source of conflict, where man's plight is worst. The need is compellingly clear.

Sixth, our response to the call of purpose must be aggressive and imaginative, not neutral or standpattish. We must sustain a national purposefulness through the generation of new ideas, intellectual energy, the capacity for ingenuity and innovation.

Our national purpose is perhaps best defined as the collective will of our citizens. Free men have repeatedly proved their ability to survive. A resurgence of our dedication to the proud ideals of democracy can, more than anything else, inspire our Nation to meet the grave challenges of today's troubled world.

There is no time for a leisurely adaptation of our national convention. Our unique physical, spiritual and institutional resources must be marshaled to the task immediately.

XXXII

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE U.S. INFORMATION AGENCY (USIA) DURING THE REPUBLICAN ADMINISTRATION, 1953–60

(By U.S. Senator HUGH SCOTT, of Pennsylvania)

After the Republican administration took office, a special Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee, headed by Senator BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, Republican, of Iowa, reported in 1953, after a year-long review of American overseas information programs, that it had found—

Ineffective coordination of psychological policy.

Duplication and competition in informational activities of U.S. agencies operating abroad.

Ineffective administration, personnel management and evaluation.

Maladjustment of responsibility between Washington and the field.

Failure to secure foreign cooperation in propagating common concepts (anticommunism, need for mutual security pacts, etc.).

Failure to bring about public participation in promoting a better understanding of the United States and in developing mutually beneficial relations with other countries.

Lack of a common understanding of the fundamental objectives of an American overseas information program.

Since its establishment late in 1953 by the Republican administration as an agency independent of the Department of State, the U.S. Information Agency has brought the overseas information program to a position of acknowledged maturity, credibility and effectiveness.

Last year, for example, the American Public Relations Association was so impressed with the Agency's work in furthering "mutual understanding and trust between the people of Thailand and the people of the United States" that it gave to USIS Thailand its 1959 Silver Anvil Award, symbolic of an "outstanding performance in the field of international public relations originating outside the United States."

Clear evidence that English-language broadcasts by the Voice of America have a wide and enthusiastic audience was manifested late in 1959 when more than 65,000 letters poured in from abroad in response to a series of announcements of a VOA survey of the age, location, and program preferences of its listeners. (North Korea, north Vietnam and Albania were the only countries in the world not heard from.)

Conversely, USIA has been the constant object of Soviet vituperation, which is often the criterion for judging the effectiveness of those attacked. In a Radio Moscow broadcast in German on May 27, 1960, USIA was identified as a "dirty factory for the manufacture of lies and slander * * * headed by a theoretician of U.S. imperialism, George Allen."

Here is a partial chronicle of the many steps which have been taken since 1953 to overcome the deficiences in the oversea information program cited by Senator HICKENLOOPER and his colleagues—

Coordination of policy

The Director of USIA has been made a permanent voting member of the Operations

Coordinating Board, and is a regular attendant at meetings of the Secretary of State, National Security Council and Cabinet. According to a Brookings Institution report submitted to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in January 1960:

"At meetings in the (State Department) and in ad hoc interdepartmental groups set up to deal with particular problems, the Information Agency has achieved effective representation. By the presence of its Director in meetings of the National Security Council and in private discussions with the President, the Agency has been able to carry the views and requirements of the information program to the highest levels."

Overseas, USIS officers have become integral members of Ambassadors' country teams throughout the world, in a position to call attention to the public relations aspects of local problems.

The U.S. Advisory Commission on Information, which on many occasions has commended USIA on "its progress and on its ability to develop avenues of cooperation with the Department of State on all levels of policy and administration," recently stated:

"USIA has obtained more coordinated foreign policy guidance as an independent agency than when it was in the Department. Many Ambassadors have also attested to the improvements that have been made."

Information program duplication eliminated

Under the terms of a Presidential directive issued in 1954, ICA ceased operating a separate information program of its own abroad. USIA and ICA have had a basic agreement since then covering the support which U.S. mutual security activities receive within the oversea information program. Close policy and media liaison exist between USIA and ICA in Washington, while at the field level the director of the ICA mission staff and the USIA public affairs officer are key members of the ambassador's country team. This assures continuous joint assessment of ways to achieve maximum political, economic, and psychological support from U.S. aid in each country.

Administration—evaluation

Administration: Close administrative cooperation with the Department of State is evidenced by such steps as scheduling of USIA oversea inspections and audits to coincide with those of the Department and the naming of senior Department officers to USIA employment and promotion panels.

Executive officers have been assigned to several large USIS posts for the purpose of improving budget and accounting procedures, administrative support funds, contracting and procurement, and general post management.

To achieve greater administrative flexibility, the Agency has set aside a contingency fund which can be used by the Director for emergencies and unexpected events on the international scene.

In 1954, the Voice of America was moved from New York to specially designed studios in Washington without an instant's interruption in its worldwide broadcasts. The move has promoted integration with other Agency elements as well as faster and easier coordination with other elements of the Government. (VOAH is currently implementing a comprehensive, long-range program for construction of new radio facilities in five different oversea locations, and is also building new transmitters in North Carolina to provide a more reliable and higher quality signal to its relay bases.)

The Agency has alertly modified its media and geographic structure to meet new program challenges and opportunities. In 1958, for example, in line with an explosive expansion of TV internationally, USIA established a separate Television Service headed by a television executive with heavy international experience. This year the mass emergence of African nations from a colonial or protectorate status has been recognized through the establishment of an African area office under an area assistant director.

Evaluation: An inspection staff of first-rank USIA officers has been set up to carry on a continuous, country-by-country examination of the program, with responsibility for inspection of USIS operations and personnel and evaluation of USIS programing.

The Agency's Office of Research and Analysis, organized in 1954, has also provided measurement of reactions to individual Agency campaigns as a program evaluation device, in addition to making continuing assessments of world opinion and analyzing Communist propaganda trends and techniques.

Personnel management

Today, USIA employs slightly more than 11,000 persons worldwide, as compared with 12,877 in its first year (fiscal year 1954). [In recent years, USIA has placed less emphasis in its foreign service recruitment upon the technical mass-media skills. (Many of these skills are available to the Agency abroad and are in fact performed ably and more economically by about 7,100 foreign national employees under the guidance of American officers.) Recruitment emphasis today is more on broader education and training and the ability to communicate effectively with foreign audiences on a direct personal basis.]

In its 15th annual report, the U.S. Advisory Commission on Information acknowledged that the Agency has had "singular success * * * with its junior officer training program in Washington (which has) both recognized the importance of personnel who are substantially knowledgeable and who can communicate and develop personal contacts.

The Director of USIA has approved the establishment of a career arm of the foreign service reserve corps by appropriate administrative rules and regulations. This is designed to give the Agency a career officer system as nearly like the Foreign Service Officer corps as can reasonably be achieved without legislation. Career legislation has been sought consistently by the Agency since mid-1954, with the President recommending its enactment to the Congress in 1956, 1957, and 1959.

Because the Agency is obviously one which the Communists would like to infiltrate, USIA employment security standards are among the most stringent in the Federal Government. By law, every USIA employee must undergo a full-field investigation by the U.S. Civil Service Commission before he can be hired. Even though employees transferred to its rolls when USIA was created in 1953 had been security cleared, to protect the public interest they were reinvestigated in the light of security rules stricter than those in effect when they were originally employed.

Since satisfactory personal adjustment of the individual officer and his family to foreign duty is so important, the Agency is experimenting with a psychiatric and psychological testing program designed to weed out new recruits who give indication that they would probably experience maladjustments and even failure if stationed abroad. In the opinion of the U.S. Advisory Commission on Information, "This is a new and promising service which, if administered carefully, fairly, and humanely, will go a long way toward developing a healthy foreign service officer corps."

For several years the Agency has given priority to training in languages spoken and read by millions in Asia, Africa, and the Near East. All USIA foreign service officers will be required to have a specified high level of proficiency in a Western European language or a satisfactory level in one of the languages of the Far East, South Asia, Near East, or Africa by June 1962.

Training of new employees assigned to work overseas has been intensified in recent years to include a more thorough study of Communist theory and strategy than was formerly required, a more thorough review of American civilization, and more hours of work on effective use of communications techniques. With the cooperation of American sponsors in the communications media, civic, industrial, educational, and cultural fields, a highly effective orientation program has also been worked out whereby unusually capable foreign nationals employed by the Agency abroad are brought to the United States to get firsthand knowledge of our country and a picture of American life and democratic institutions through personal observation.

Adjustment of Washington-field responsibility

Field officers have been given more discretion and greater responsibility for the development and execution of country plans and programs, the production of materials locally, and the definition and selection of target groups to be reached. USIS staffs abroad therefore have a high degree of flexibility to meet complex problems and critical situations as they arise and to support country team decisions made on the scene. The Agency provides "overall creative plans and guidance" to the field and monitors field operations through country plans, inspections and visits of area assistant directors to assure that posts operate in accordance with such plans and guidance.

Foreign cooperation in propagating free world concepts

The Agency has also aided in training personnel of friendly foreign governments—teachers, information specialists, etc.—who in turn instruct their people in democratic processes and conduct programs which bring about awareness of and effective opposition to Communist activity.

USIA has supported development with NATO, Cento, and SEATO countries of programs which will increase public confidence in such treaty organizations as indispensable elements of an effective free world security system and as the framework within which the member nations can most advantageously exercise their partnership in free world affairs.

The binational center concept—so popular and long established in Latin America—has been extended successfully to other parts of the world, institutionalizing the efforts of foreign nationals and Americans living abroad to improve relations between our countries. Binational organizations (110 in 31 nations) now exist in such farflung countries as Spain, Italy, Greece, Turkey, Iran, Burma, Thailand, and the Philippines.

The Agency has placed emphasis on the teaching of English to foreign nationals (150,000 a year at present), an activity which now lies at the heart of binational center and USIA cultural center programing. Annual seminars are being conducted for about 5,000 teachers of English in local schools (their pupils numbering about a million), who are not only acquainted with modern teaching techniques but also receive a basic orientation in American life and culture. USIA initiative and encouragement have also led to the establishment of many chairs and departments of American studies in foreign universities.

A high proportion of the films produced or acquired by USIA are now shown abroad by agencies of national and local governments and by civic, religious and educational groups. Many USIA films are used in the educational systems of foreign countries. In West Germany more than 2 million persons a month see USIA films exhibited by about 500 all-German community film com-

mittees. This committee network is the Agency's chief means of noncommercial motion picture distribution there. In Greece groups known as Community Information Councils exhibit USIA films on regular schedules.

In administering the Educational Exchange Program abroad for the Department of State, the Agency has taken special pains to follow up with foreign students upon their return from the United States, encouraging them to give lectures and write articles about their impressions of American life and culture, furnishing them with current information about American progress and achievements in their study specialties, etc. Foreign student "alumni associations" have been established with the help of USIS posts, as indigenous vehicles for making American objectives, policies and actions better known and understood.

Many foreign publishers have been encouraged, along with American firms, to produce inexpensive foreign language editions of basic American textbooks, the "Classics of Democracy," and other literature promoting understanding of American life and democratic institutions. Last year alone USIA efforts in this area accounted for the publication of 653 foreign editions in nearly 6.6 million copies in 34 languages, and of 1,815,000 copies of low-priced books, including 40 editions in 10 foreign languages and 46 English editions.

Public participation in foreign relations

USIA laid the groundwork for the launching of the people-to-people program by President Eisenhower in 1956. Hundreds of organizations—business, social, professional, representing millions of Americans—have since rallied to the support of the idea. Offering ways for every American to help build friendship and understanding with peoples of other nations, people-to-people projects include exchanges of people and professional know-how, school and town affiliations, letterwriting campaigns, magazine and book collections, hospitality for foreign visitors, and helpful advice for Americans who want to represent their country effectively when they travel abroad. Several large cities have even established umbrellalike people-to-people councils to enlist and coordinate the services of local civic groups and private industry in building international relationships.

The Agency's Office of Private Cooperation furnishes facilitative assistance, as necessary, to the many communities and groups engaged in this massive grassroots diplomacy effort. A 1958 survey of USIA "seed money" grants to help people-to-people committees to launch highly desirable new projects revealed that every USIA dollar granted generated at least $5 of private spending to achieve people-to-people objectives.

In another important area, the Agency has been able to get objective, expert advice on its overseas programing problems from the 16 top American public relations practitioners who comprise its Panel on Public Relations Policies and Techniques.

Information program objectives

President Eisenhower succinctly stated in his 1953 directive establishing USIA that the Agency's purpose shall be "to submit evidence to people of other nations by means of communication techniques that the objectives and policies of the United States are in harmony with and will advance their legitimate aspirations for freedom, progress, and peace."

Consistent with this mission, the Agency has concentrated on increasing the reliability of USIA as a source of factual information about the United States. Without in any way cutting down programs that depict American progress and advances in many fields, USIA deliberately omits any suggestion of boasting or bragging which frequently alienate and annoy foreign audiences.

There is "an already general acceptance abroad of the USIA as the reliable and truthful voice of the United States in the exposition of our foreign policies," the U.S. Advisory Commission has said, and "the achievement of this reputation is the best insurance against belief in Communist propaganda and their view of world events."

The Commission notes as evidence of this recognition a May 1959 statement by British historian Arnold J. Toynbee that "after a period of trial and error, the present day Americans seem to me to have learned that the best way of instilling confidence in the foreign policy of the United States is to give people in other countries the factual information that will make them form their own judgments about the United States and its citizens. In this field, frankness, sincerity, and objectivity always prove to be the best policy."

In line with its overall effort to make the best possible use of Agency recources, USIA has in recent years developed detailed basic planning and guidance papers devoted to major themes (American life and culture, science, atomic energy, disarmament, anticommunism, American economy, minority affairs, women's activities, etc.) on which media should concentrate in their worldwide output. At the same time field staffs have been required to pinpoint their objectives and themes in their country programs in order to achieve greater concentration of effort and greater impact.

This sharpening of Agency targets and themes has been accompanied by increasingly closer cooperation among Agency policy, area, and media elements. As a result theme possibilities are analyzed in terms of their exploitation potential and, in concert, the media are able to "zero in" on a theme and assure that it reaches the widest possible audience in a variety of ways. This multimedia approach has been successfully employed in many instances. To name a few:

1. "Atoms for Peace"—one of the Agency's major themes since President Eisenhower's memorable speech before the U.N. General Assembly in 1953—has been so successful that the Soviet Union, which originally scorned the concept, has had to reverse itself and adopt it, too.

2. "Peoples Capitalism"—emphasizing the opportunities and accomplishments of millions of ordinary Americans under our free economy—has been so well received abroad as a result of effective USIA media cross play that the Communists have attacked the theme frequently and violently, and continue to pour upon it some of their choicest invective.

3. America's broad-based scientific and technological stature has also been stressed as a major USIA theme, in such activities as comprehensive exhibits on space exploration; timely films like *"Nautilus* Crosses the Top of the World," prints of which were dispatched abroad within hours of the announcement of the American submarine's historic feat; development of a highly popular portable library of paperback books on scientific subjects; work with oversea science clubs, and assistance with techniques of teaching science, American-style, in the schools of other countries.

4. One of the Agency's foremost long-range programs centers around the culture of America—stressing that America's art is worth seeing, its music worth hearing, its books worth reading; and that the American people place a high value on the spiritual and cultural aspects of life. The U.S. Advisory Commission on Information has also applauded the development in recent years of a more coordinated cultural program permeating all media and has noted considerable improvement in the quality of USIA cultural materials especially during the past 2 years.

The Lincoln Sesquicentennial Celebration in 1959 provided the Agency with a unique opportunity to build a comprehensive yearlong, multimedia campaign around the Great Emancipator, whose life and deeds are of interest to peoples in the most remote areas of the world. Thus the Lincoln saga was unfolded in books and other publications (even "comic books"), exhibits, original and acquired films, radio and TV broadcasts, seminars and lectures, well-publicized ceremonies at which Lincoln busts or other memorabilia were presented to foreign dignitaries, etc.

"Atoms for Peace," the American economy, science and technology, culture and many other themes were forcefully packaged last summer in the American National Exhibition in Moscow which attracted nearly 3 million visitors. In effect, the exhibition placed 10 acres of the United States in the heart of the Soviet capital for 6 weeks. In addition to coordinating the event, USIA mounted many of the exhibits, including the astonishingly successful "Family of Man" photo exhibit by Edward Steichen, depicting the hopes, fears, joys, drives and other human denominators common to all the peoples of the earth. It arranged for the spectacular "Circarama" and "Septorama" film presentations; outfitted the "electronic brain" which instantaneously answered in Russian thousands of questions about American life, and trained and supervised the 75 bilingual guides who scored such a personal triumph in their contacts with exhibition visitors.

That an exhibition of this magnitude was mounted within 6 months in the face of seemingly insurmountable logistic (to say nothing of political) obstacles is a testimonial to the ingenuity, resourcefulness and effectiveness of USIA and the other governmental and private organizations which also participated. Despite the demands of this massive "crash" project, the Agency's normal level of worldwide programing was maintained.

XXXIII

THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT DURING THE REPUBLICAN ADMINISTRATION, 1953–60

(By U.S. Senator J. GLENN BEALL, of Maryland)

The U.S. Post Office Department handles more mail than all the rest of the world combined. That makes it one of the world's largest enterprises.

During the 7½ years of the Republican administration, the introduction of modern business management and financial practices has enabled the Department to:

1. Reduce the postal deficit through operating economies and a more equitable postal rate structure. But for these steps the annual postal deficit of $700 million inherited in 1952 would have more than doubled by 1959. Instead, the deficit was substantially reduced despite increases in operating costs and a 20.2 percent increase in mail volume.

2. Bring about next-day delivery of letter mail within metropolitan areas serving 160 million American citizens.

3. Substantially reduce mail handling costs.

4. Bring closer to realization the next-day delivery of cross-country mail.

5. Provide city delivery service for the first time to 9 million families and 700,000 business firms and an additional 1,005 municipalities.

6. Extend rural delivery service to over 1.2 million farm families.

7. Establish a modern and efficient postal transportation system, using all forms of transportation to speed the movement of mail between all communities of the United States.

In addition, the Department has:

1. Continued to seek postal rates sufficient to cover all postal costs to the end that these costs would be borne by those who use the service rather than by the taxpayers.

2. Built more than 4,000 new post offices and embarked upon a 5-year program for completely modernizing the postal plant.

3. Successfully sought ways of mechanizing the postal operations to the end that service has been vastly improved, the productive effort of employees increased, and the efficient handling of future mail volumes assured.

4. Greatly strengthened the career service for postal employees and vigorously promoted salary increases and fringe benefits for postal employees wherever and to the extent justified in relation to living costs and industrial pay scales.

5. Initiated an intensified crusade to clean the mails of obscenity and filth.

6. Revitalized the philatelic program to make greater use of postage stamps to advertise American traditions and ideals at home and abroad.

These activities are described in more detail as follows:

Service improvements

The mail service to our people is being constantly improved. Mailers and postal patrons now benefit from more than 80 improvements in procedures.

1. Eighty-three metropolitan area plans have now been activated, directly benefiting 160 million people and covering 1,850,000 square miles. These plans provide means for next-business-day delivery of mail between post offices within each area.

2. The Department has developed a nationwide integrated postal service plan which links the metropolitan areas and assigned peripheral areas throughout the country with each other through coordination of mail-handling procedures and transportation schedules. This will provide the guidelines for future development of facilities, transportation, and other postal planning.

3. Establishment of regional offices has decentralized and simplified administration and speeded service to the public.

4. Postal transportation terminals, air mail fields, and transfer offices have been consolidated with post offices, resulting in more efficient and economical operations.

5. Post offices in most major cities are open longer, and mail is collected later.

6. Careful surveys of window service at post offices and stations showed that consolidations could be effected during slack periods, without impairing necessary service, and service extended in busy periods. Significant manpower savings were made.

7. A program was initiated and expanded to many cities throughout the country to improve city delivery service through use of light, functional vehicles (Mailsters).

8. Extension of rural delivery services benefited 1,211,000 American farm families.

9. City delivery service was established in over 900 additional cities.

10. The increase in carrier service during the last 7 years has added the equivalent of 31,000 carriers to serve 9,011,000 more American families and upward of 700,000 business concerns. The post office has kept pace with our growing cities and our expanding economy.

11. During the 7 years, 5,659 independent post offices were discontinued or converted to other type postal facilities, and delivery service was provided by rural or city carriers, resulting in an annual saving of over $8,400,000.

12. Combination mail service was established (November 28, 1955) permitting the mailing of a letter inside a parcel.

13. Certified mail was introduced (June 6, 1955) providing important benefits of registered mail, including proof of delivery, at lower cost.

14. More equitable "surcharge" rates for high-value registered mail, and elimination of "nuisance" surcharges, have reduced mailing costs on exceptionally high-value shipments, and more effective internal safeguarding procedures have been established.

15. The filing and settlement of claims for lost or damaged insured and c.o.d. mail have been greatly simplified and expedited.

16. A simplified money order procedure was instituted, reducing patron time and effort in buying money orders.

17. Use of mail meters was simplified and made more convenient to the mailer.

18. Standard directories for the 106 cities where the postal delivery zone system is now in use have been made available to business firms and the general public. This permits speedier delivery with less handling.

19. New and simplified information pamphlets help the public help themselves to better mail service through promoting readable addresses, better packaging, the use of zone numbers, separated and bundled mail for local and out-of-town delivery, and early and frequent mailing during the business day.

20. Seventy-two easy-to-use parcel post zone guides have been prepared for free distribution to mailers. These guides permit mailers at 2,200 post offices, where 70 percent of our parcel volume originates, to quickly compute and affix postage to their own parcels prior to mailing.

21. Establishment of 55 postal services centers at as many large post offices has served to improve management and communication procedures in mail classification and customer relations. Each of these centers is now able to give mail classification and related information to the smaller post offices in their area. This speeds information to the public.

22. Provision was made for installing 4,500 automatic stamp-vending machines in lobbies of post offices to augment window service during regular business hours and to make it possible for mailers to purchase stamps when service windows are closed.

23. A revised work measurement system was established for post offices which combines, with the Department's historic systems, a new concept of individual measurement introduced in early 1960. This permits each man to pace himself and results in faster and less costly service.

Transportation

Transportation policies and practices have been geared to today's commercial transportation system and to the rapid changes taking place. Expenditures for transportation have been reduced substantially in per unit cost of service performed since 1953. Some of the major areas of advancement include:

1. A nationwide postal transportation study, the first of its kind since 1921, resulted in a nationwide integrated postal service plan (also referred to under Service Improvements). This plan is being used by the Department to weld the various transportation media, distribution centers, and post offices into the most up-to-date postal service system.

2. Combination highway-rail-highway service has been developed with large vans serving alternately on rail or highway. "Rail-van," "flexivan," and standard "piggyback" operations are being conducted on four railway systems operating in Illinois, Iowa, Wisconsin, Michigan, Minnesota, and South Dakota. Other types of containers for use on planes, trains, trucks, and steamers are being developed.

3. Since 1953, 300 truck routes have been added to meet compelling needs where rail service is no longer adequate.

4. Airlift of approximately 1.6 billion pieces annually of regular first-class mail over major trunk air routes provides improved service. Postal patrons in all 50 States and the District of Columbia are benefiting.

5. A system of paying only for space used on trains has eliminated the prior practice of paying for a substantial amount of space ordered but not used.

6. Special trains exclusively for mail and express have been established by seven railroads, at the Department's request, on schedules advantageous to the postal service, thus improving mail transportation for several metropolitan centers, including Chicago, Detroit, St. Paul, Boston, Albany, New York, and Washington.

Financial improvements

Postal rates have been raised and procedures have been streamlined and modernized for handling the flow of cash, and for budgeting, accounting and financial reporting.

1. The Congress enacted Public Law 85–426, sponsored by the Department. In Title I: Postal Policy, the Congress stated for the first time an overall postal rate policy. In Title II: Postal Rate Increases, the first general increase in rates in more than two decades was achieved.

2. Accounting functions have been centralized and mechanized in 15 regional controller offices at substantial overall financial savings. This has relieved postmasters of accounting, payrolls, and other fiscal duties and permits them to devote much more time to the operational demands of their post offices.

3. A direct-to-bank deposit plan was designed and installed nationwide, resulting in significant cost reductions. All post offices now deposit their surplus cash directly with Federal Reserve banks.

4. An improved cost accounting system permits better utilization of the 35,000 motor vehicle fleet.

5. Advance partial payments to railroads and air carriers were discontinued, which, with other procedural changes, have made current the submission and settlement of carriers' claims. Previously, the lag in full settlement for some cases was 2 years.

6. Money order forms and issuance procedures have been simplified resulting in stantial reduction in issuing and subsequently handling the 300 million orders annually. Print-punch machines will shortly be supplied to all points of issue, thus eliminating human error in processing, reducing possibilities of fraudulent altering and applying latest processing techniques to accounting.

Improving postal facilities

The introduction of modern, businesslike real estate practices and practical engineering concepts is changing the appearance of the Nation's postal facilities along with patrons' service and the postal workroom areas.

1. During this administration, private industry constructed or will have contracted to construct more than 4,300 new postal facilities, through employment of $185 million in private capital, for lease to the Department. These facilities remain under private ownership and the owner pays local real estate taxes.

2. In addition to new facilities, the Post Office Department's program of modernization and improvement is reflected in interior changes in many facilities throughout the Nation. Workroom space is being redesigned to accommodate new equipment for mechanizing mail processing, a standard feature of all new major mail handling facilities, thus assuring greatly improved mail service to patrons and more pleasant and healthful working conditions for postal employees. New counterlines, mechanical salesmen for postage stamps, postal cards, and airmail sheets, service areas available to the public 24 hours a day for the purchase of stamps, and elimination of old Victorian-type, floor-to-ceiling screenlines, are making

the lobby of today and tomorrow a pleasant place to do business.

3. Mechanical mail handling systems have been installed in 15 major mail handling facilities and bids are being considered for the installation of mechanical mail handling equipment in 14 others to expedite the flow of mail from receipt to dispatch. Through mechanization much of the tedious manual labor of mail handling is eliminated.

4. All vehicles procured since 1953 have been of standard commercial design at a large cost saving. At the present time, 85 percent of the fleet is composed of lightweight, highly maneuverable vehicles. More than 8,300 older, expensive-to-operate vehicles have been retired from the fleet.

5. The fleet of three-wheel, gasoline-powered Mailsters, now a familiar carrier conveyance throughout the Nation, will soon be supplemented by the addition of a limited number of newly developed electric Mailsters and parcel post delivery trucks.

6. The adoption of the red, white, and blue color scheme easily distinguishes collection boxes from carrier relay boxes; on vehicles, the white top decreases heat, the blue lower portion reduces cleaning costs, and the red reflective strip increases visibility to other drivers, thus reducing accidents.

7. From January 1953 through June 1959, hours of vehicle service increased 55 percent, miles of service 80 percent, and the number of post offices served by these vehicles doubled, with a fleet which has increased by only 60 percent.

8. A postal modernization fund was authorized by the Congress for the necessary improvements and extensions to our physical plant. The Department plans to make these extensions capable of handling the mail 20 years from now.

Personnel improvements

1. The Department actively participated in developing a modern postal pay system and has consistently supported wage increases whenever and to the extent justified. Culminating months of work, Public Law 68 was enacted June 10, 1955, providing the more than 500,000 postal field employees with fair wages, incentive to advance in the career service, and compensation directly related to the duties performed, based on sound salary structure. During the ensuing 5 years, the flexibility of this system has been demonstrated frequently, most recently in the transition from manual to machine mail processing at several large post offices, by permitting the establishment and ranking of many new positions without disruption of the basic pay structure.

2. Active support also has been given to worthwhile fringe benefits such as Federal employees' life insurance, more liberal retirement annuities, uniform allowances, and the new health benefits now being installed. Nearly 500,000 postal employees participate in the life insurance program, and almost as many are expected to take advantage of the new health benefits.

3. The nationwide safety program, initiated in 1954, has consistently reduced motor vehicle accidents and has been recognized by the National Safety Council in citation awards for outstanding contribution to traffic safety in each of the past 5 years. Industrial accident and fire prevention programs have also been developed with a substantial reduction in disabling injuries and fire losses.

4. A comprehensive training program has been utilized to develop employee capabilities in mail processing, safe work practices, and specialized technical subjects such as equipment maintenance and operation of new mechanized mail processing equipment. Postmasters and supervisors have been instructed in improved supervisory practices to assure better utilization of manpower resources.

5. The employee suggestion system was decentralized and procedures streamlined to assure effective, prompt consideration of employee ideas. During this administration, more than 200,000 employee ideas have been received and more than 20,000 have been adopted. In addition, over 5,000 employees have been recognized for their outstanding accomplishments through cash and honorary awards.

6. Efforts to attract and retain well qualified employees have succeeded. Ninety-six Civil Service Boards of Examiners, staffed with postal personnel at strategic locations throughout the Nation, have improved the quality of applicants selected and provided a reservoir of eligibles for appointment as the need arises. During fiscal 1960, almost 1 million applications for postal employment have been received. Modern testing techniques are being employed to determine employees' skills and to facilitate selection and promotion. An executive development program was inaugurated in December 1959 to meet long-range executive personnel requirements and to improve opportunities for career development and advancement among postal personnel.

7. Improved employee-management relations have been developed through the establishment of an Office of Special Assistant for Employee Relations in the Bureau of Personnel. Procedures and policies established have contributed materially to improved relations with national and local representatives of employee organizations. Effective employee grievance and appeals procedures assure prompt attention to employee problems.

Legal services

1. New rules have been promulgated for the administrative handling of fraud and obscenity cases, permitting speedier determination of issues while conforming to recent judicial interpretations of the Administrative Procedure Act.

2. A Board of Contract Appeals was established which has final administrative authority to resolve disputes concerning appeals by contractors from decisions by contracting officers.

3. Commercial insurance-type office procedures have been instituted for adjudicating and settling claims filed by private citizens, drastically reducing the time required to settle such claims.

4. Substantial success has been achieved in securing enactment of legislation to revise the maze of archaic and confusing laws which prevented the Postmaster General from operating effectively and economically.

Inspection service

1. The Department has stepped up its campaign to control the alarming increase in mail fraud schemes and in the volume of pornography in the mails. An all-out offensive has been instituted against these nefarious multimillion-dollar businesses under nationally coordinated programs which provide for close coordination with the Department of Justice and the United States Attorneys throughout the country. So far during this administration, arrests dealing with the fraud and obscenity statutes have increased 84 percent. Indications are that the previous record high of 8,859 arrests for all offenses, achieved in 1959, will be exceeded this year. Convictions of offenders brought to trial continue at a rate exceeding 98 percent.

2. During fiscal 1959, the Department completed 111,079 miscellaneous investigations and 52,387 audit inspections. This has meant 10 percent more miscellaneous investigations and 27 percent more audit inspections than were accomplished in fiscal 1953. Investigations during 1959 under the Tort Claims Procedures developed evidence in 178 major suits against the Government, which permitted settlement for $5,749,215 less than the aggregate amounts demanded by plaintiffs.

3. A broadened and more comprehensive internal audit program continued to produce improved benefits, combining continuous interchange of information between postal inspectors and internal auditors and joint consideration and evaluation of particular operating problems.

Mechanization, research, and engineering

A coordinated, broad-gage research and engineering program for mechanizing mail handling was inaugurated for the postal service. Highlights of advances made in this program include:

1. Construction of the world's first completely mechanized post office began at Providence, R.I., with site-dedication ceremonies on April 2, 1959. This multimillion dollar post office will make possible for the first time in the United States the complete mechanization of a "working" post office in a metropolitan area, handling all the functions of a conventional post office, while serving as a laboratory for advanced experimentation in mail handling methods and systems. A second facility of similar general character, contemplating even more advanced techniques in mechanization, is under planning at Oakland, Calif.

2. The transmission of letter mail by electronic means has been successfully tried and will be given a full-scale demonstration early this fall between Washington and Chicago.

3. Letter sorting machines have been developed and installed in several post offices.

4. Work is well advanced in developing address coding through the use of phosphorescent inks and magnetic materials, which will eventually enable letters to be coded and subsequently sorted by machines more speedily than by hand.

5. A machine to read addresses without aid of human eyes and to sort letters electronically without aid of human hands is in an advanced stage of development.

6. Machines have been developed which will automatically face letter mail and cancel stamps.

7. Systems have been developed to move mail by electrically driven conveyors and to eliminate wheeled and castered tables, trucks, and trays on the workroom floor.

8. Four types of semiautomatic parcel sorting machines have been developed and are being tested at post offices.

9. Postage vending equipment has been developed and installed in large post offices. Work is also being completed on an automatic postal substation which will vend not only stamps of several denominations but envelopes, post cards, writing paper, and booked stamps. This will make change not only for coins but also for paper money.

Public relations

1. No efforts have been spared to help the public make more effective use of postal services. Improvements in the mail service and new services have been continuously publicized in the press, in magazines, by radio and television, films and informational pamphlets, and by departmental representatives in speeches and public appearances.

2. A seven-member Citizens' Stamp Advisory Committee, comprising prominent artists, philatelists, and a representative of the U.S. Information Agency, has functioned efficiently in advising the Department on the selection and design of postage stamps. Every effort has been and is being made to issue commemorative postage stamps possessing genuine cultural and educational worth which will promote American ideals at home and abroad.

3. The Department has conducted during the past year an intensive nationwide crusade against obscenity in the mails, particularly that directed toward children. Most

national civic, parental, teacher, and religious groups have endorsed this crusade and are giving it their active support. Congressional support is also widespread, and more effective legislation assuring mandatory prison terms for dealers in obscenity is expected from the present Congress.

4. The need for increased postal rates has been emphasized through press, radio, and TV outlets.

XXXIV

BUSINESS MANAGEMENT IN DEFENSE PROCUREMENT BRINGS PROGRESS DURING THE REPUBLICAN ADMINISTRATION, 1953–60

(By U.S. Senator CARL T. CURTIS, of Nebraska)

Defense supply and logistics management includes a wide range of activities in support of our military national defense effort.

The defense support job requires the maintenance of an inventory range of over 3 million items, representing, at purchase price, $45 billion. This inventory consists of repair parts, components, and assemblies to support major equipments, such as tanks, ships, aircraft and missiles; food and clothing for men and women who compose our first line defense force; and the many thousands of other items necessary to support the military force. The original value of the tanks, ships, aircraft, missiles and other combat vehicles which this inventory must support totals $70 billion, a total combined inventory of $115 billion.

Purchases of material and services average about $25 billion each year. These purchases replenish inventories, provide new weapons and machinery, repair and maintain weapons and facilities, and provide research and development for continued improvement of the Nation's defense.

Supply and logistics functions of our defense efforts represent a volume and variety of activities which dwarf any group of the largest commercial enterprises.

During the past few years Defense has given renewed direction to the application of sound business management practices in this field.

Great support in this effort has been supplied by the Congress, the military departments, and numerous public-minded citizens and groups who have taken the time to understand this huge operation and its complexities, and have provided enlightened constructive criticism.

I would like to review for you a few of the accomplishments which are a part of the effort to have defense procurement and supply functions operate effectively.

Single managers

During the past year, four new commodity areas have been identified for application of the single manager concept.

This concept of supply management has proven itself through analysis and evaluation of its earlier application to subsistence, medical supplies, clothing and textiles, and petroleum commodity areas.

Significant economies have been achieved under these single manager agencies by the elimination of concurrent buying and selling:

Reduction of crosshauls and backhauls.

Integrated distribution operations.

Payroll deductions.

More economical procurement operations.

Stimulation of item reduction and standardization programs.

Analysis indicates current annual savings from these operating agencies amount to $14 million per year and a one-time identifiable savings to date of $339 million.

The four new single manager agencies, extending the use of this business management concept, encompass military general supplies, military industrial supplies, construction supplies, and automotive supplies.

Utilization of stocks in long supply

Utilization of defense long supply stocks within the Government, in lieu of new procurement, has reached new all-time levels through improved business management. For fiscal year 1960, it is expected that final tabulation will show a direct saving of 2 billion procurement dollars. This amount represents the cost of 10 Polaris submarines plus 2 conventional *Forrestal* aircraft carriers, or 200 B–52 aircraft. It is an interesting fact that in fiscal year 1958, $720 million worth of material was utilized from long supply stock. The utilization rate currently is nearly three times greater.

Surplus sales

Currently 350 surplus sales offices are operated by the military departments. These sales outlets are in the process of being consolidated to 35 interservice offices which will handle the surplus sales of all military departments within specified geographic areas.

In this same field a single Bidders' Registration and Sales Registration Office is being established to perform on a consolidated basis many functions which had previously been duplicated in the 350 surplus sales offices. Also a single joint disposal training program was initiated during July to bring further unity among the military departments in their management of surplus sales activities.

Reduction in inventory

During fiscal year 1958 a reduction of $3.7 billion in on-hand inventory was accomplished; in fiscal year 1959 this reduction amounted to an additional $3.6 billion; and when final reports are completed for fiscal year 1960 it is expected that a further reduction of about $3 billion will be achieved. This 3-year reduction in supplies held in warehouses would be equal to more than 15 times the total value of the inventory carried by Sears, Roebuck & Co.

The Defense Department has been able to improve its support capability with these reduced inventories even though at the same time more complicated and expensive major combat equipments have been introduced for operational use. This has been accomplished through refinements in inventory management techniques and buying practices introduced under sound business management concepts.

Procurement practices

The Armed Services Procurement Regulations put into operational effect laws governing the buying practices of the Defense Department and provide specific guidance for the varied conditions under which goods and services are purchased. Significant progress has been made in refinement of the defense procurement practices.

New cost principles have been promulgated which provide detailed and precise policy guidance for the treatment of allowable costs under contracts. These principles apply to all types of contracting and contract settlement situations. Application of these new principles is directed to more effective procurement and savings in contract costs.

Regulations have been revised to require contracting officers, prime contractors, and subcontractors to obtain and utilize the most current, accurate, and complete cost data. As evidence that this has been done, significant contractors must present a certificate to this effect and must secure a similar certificate from their subcontractors.

The military departments are now taking an active part in contractor "make-or-buy" decisions. By reviewing such decisions assurance is made that the military departments get the advantage of the most efficient production methods and that well equipped subcontractors have an opportunity to compete for this segment of defense business.

Stronger regulations have been in force to effect review of subcontracting and pricing systems of major contractors to assure that adequate competition is used, cost and price analysis are employed, and that small business and other procurement policies are followed. Such reviews have also been made applicable to individual contracts of significant size.

A complete revision to the procurement regulations pertaining to the use of formal advertising has been published. The revision reflects experience of the military departments and decisions of the Comptroller General in recent years.

Elimination of the need for the maintenance of hundreds of thousands of property record cards has recently been effected. Previously Government property under a contractor's control valued over $100 required maintenance of individual records. New techniques have been applied to provide proper accounting controls for the periodic review of the total value of such equipment. Record keeping has been confined to items valued at over $500, thus resulting in a one-third reduction in the volume of records maintained.

Communications

Recently a new Defense Communications Agency and system were inaugurated which have been recognized as a major forward step in this important element of defense logistics. The Agency will have operational control and supervision over the vast communications facilities of the three military departments. It will provide for a single centralized long-line system responsive to the total needs of the Department of Defense similar in concept and operation to that employed by the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. Total communications requirements will be reviewed by the Agency to eliminate duplication of facilities and to provide compatibility of equipment and service among the military departments to permit greater joint utilization of the system.

Great service effort

I have only portrayed to you a few segments of the supply and logistics effort to effect sound business management practices. There are many, many more covering the numerous defense support activities. This effort is being exerted on a regular and continuing basis. It is being applied to every phase of the defense supply and logistics activities. The results of these efforts in the improvement and more effective use of procurement funds and inventory assets is readily recognized by those who take the time to realize and understand this great support effort which serves to assure our national defense.

XXXV

CIVIL RIGHTS AND THE REPUBLICAN ADMINISTRATION

(By U.S. Senator CLIFFORD P. CASE, of New Jersey)

This Republican administration has been successful in its progressive sponsorship of the Civil Rights Acts of 1957 and 1960, the first major civil rights legislation in 82 years. These, and the following items, are a matter of record, not just hopeful promises, and they represent accomplishments in all fields of civil rights: Education, employment, housing, and the local administration of justice as well as the most important area of voting rights.

Summary of record in areas other than voting rights:

1. Created first U.S. Commisison on Civil Rights.

2. Created new Assistant Attorney General and Civil Rights Division of Department of Justice.

3. Made hate bombings and bomb scares a Federal crime.

4. Provided free public schooling for Armed Forces children when local schools closed due to segregation.

5. Created President's Committee on Government Contracts headed by Vice President NIXON to obtain compliance of Federal contractors to administration policy of free job opportunities.

6. Successfully advocated abolition of segregation in the District of Columbia.

7. Vigorously completed desegregation of Armed Forces and abolition of segregation in schools on military reservations in 1954.

8. Commenced litigation by Attorney General to eliminate segregation on public beaches in Biloxi, Miss., where Federal contract existed; participated in school desegregation cases; prosecuted local police abuses of the administration of justice.

9. Implemented administration's desegregation policy in federally assisted housing.

10. Desegregated interstate transportation.

11. Implemented desegregation and free job opportunity policies in assisting airport development and improvement.

The civil rights record of the Eisenhower administration represents a more progressive series of accomplishments, as opposed to promises, than in any previous Democratic administration, and certainly is not limited only to the important field of voting rights. In the past 3 years alone, the first two Civil Rights Acts in more than 80 years have become law under the sponsorship of the Republican administration. Aside from securing the important right to vote for all qualified citizens regardless of race or color, the Civil Rights Acts of 1957 and 1960 have:

1. Created in 1958 the first U.S. Commission on Civil Rights for the investigation of complaints of discrimination at elections and the study of the denial of equal protection of the law in areas of discrimination. The Commission's report in 1959 and its recommendations was one of the primary causes for the enactment of the Civil Rights Act of 1960.

2. Created a new Assistant Attorney General to head a new division of the Department of Justice for civil rights. The number of Federal attorneys carrying the administration's progressive civil rights policies into the courts has trebled over those earmarked for this purpose under Democratic administrations.

3. Made it a Federal crime to threaten "hate" bombings or execute them or even possess explosives with knowledge or intent that they may be used for such a purpose.

4. Provided for free public schooling for children of members of the Armed Forces, regardless of race or color, where local schools are closed to them.

In addition to these provisions of the 1957 and 1960 Civil Rights Acts which go beyond securing the right to vote, the following achievements of this Republican administration further demonstrates that the Republican Party is the party of progressive action instead of belated progressive talk in the field of civil rights:

5. On August 13, 1953, President Eisenhower established by Executive Order 10479, the President's Committee on Government Contracts, with Vice President NIXON as chairman. This order established a standard antidiscrimination clause for all Government contracts and authorized the Committee to follow all Federal funds going to private employers under Government contracts in order to obtain compliance with the administration policy of free job opportunity. This Committee has investigated almost 1,000 complaints of job discrimination by Government contractors and, on its own initiative, has surveyed several primary employment areas and through its action many employers have increased job opportunities for minorities. The effectiveness of this President's Committee would be far greater if it were not for a Democratic-sponsored amendment to permanent legislation which forces the Committee to work through Government agencies rather than directly in its own name.[1] The Republican Party platform for 1960 would remedy this, however, by giving the Committee a statutory basis for its program of nondiscrimination in private employment under Federal contracts.

6. On January 18, 1955, President Eisenhower ordered (Executive Order 10590) the creation of the President's Committee on Employment Policy, which is the first Committee created for the enforcement of nondiscrimination in Federal employment which reports directly to the President. The administration's policy of free job opportunity is stated clearly in this Executive order. Surveys conducted in 1956 indicated that approximately one-fourth of our Federal employees were Negroes and preliminary figures in a resurvey being concluded now indicate improvements in the upgrading of Negro Federal employees as well.

7. When the administration took office on January 20, 1953, in the capital of the world's greatest democracy, a Negro could not be served in white restaurants; he could not sleep in white hotels; and he could not sit with whites in many motion picture theaters. Action by the administration helped bring this disgrace to an end.

8. Vigorous executive action brought to completion the elimination of segregation in the Armed Forces and abolished segregation which remained untouched among civilian employees of navy yards and in veterans' hospitals.

9. The Republican administration has provided the Justice Department with a progressive Attorney General in the field of civil rights. Confirmation of the appointment of the Assistant Attorney General for the Civil Rights Division has been held up for approximately 6 months by the Democratically controlled Constitutional Rights Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee to which all civil rights matters go, which is headed by Senator EASTLAND, Democrat of Mississippi, the most outspoken segregationist in the Senate. Nevertheless, the Attorney General has been vigorous in his support of all litigation to safeguard individual equal protection of the laws as well as voting rights. Federal court action, for instance, has been instituted to stop segregation of the public beaches in Biloxi, Miss., on the basis of a Federal contract under which the beach was constructed, and the Attorney General participated in many school desegregation cases as a friend of the court. Since 1957, 23 State police officers have been prosecuted by the Justice Department for violations of the constitutional rights of prisoners, and 14 are presently on trial for such abuses in a Federal court in Florida.

10. The Housing and Home Finance Agency, which is responsible for the principal housing programs and functions of the administration, such as urban renewal, slum clearance, public housing, and home mortgage loan insurance, has refused since 1957 to approve or insure projects of builders who have been found to have violated local housing antidiscrimination laws. On August 14, 1959, HHFA Administrator Norman Mason announced that certification of future insurance of mortgages on low-cost homes for families from urban renewal areas would disregard the racial quota system used in the past. This enables all eligible displaced families to purchase or rent section 221 housing, irrespective of their race, and without allocation or quotas by color. The HHFA has also established a new requirement for an intergroup relations officer for urban renewal in each regional office of HHFA and in February 1960 announced that, before any locality can qualify for urban renewal benefits, it must establish a Citizens Advisory Committee to deal fairly with racial minority problems.

11. The Interstate Commerce Commission, in accordance with the progressive civil rights policy of the Republican administration, outlawed segregated passenger coaches and terminal facilities for Negro interstate passengers on November 7, 1955, in a historic ruling ending the separate but equal principle in interstate transportation subject to the Commission's jurisdiction. They also have received and investigated about 100 complaints of discrimination in interstate commerce in the last 8 years, 60 of which were handled in the last 2½ years.

12. The Federal Aviation Agency has issued a regulation, under its grant-in-aid program for airport development and improvement, that no Federal funds shall be available for participation in the development of terminals if such facilities are designated for use now, or in the future, on a segregated basis. The FAA has most recently begun to require localities contracting for airport development with Federal grant money to insert a nondiscrimination clause covering all jobs created by such contracts.

[1] Russell amendment to section 213 of 58 Stat. 337.

XXXVI

THE NATION'S ECONOMIC WELFARE UNDER THE REPUBLICAN ADMINISTRATION

(By U.S. Senator THRUSTON B. MORTON, of Kentucky)

The Republican administration has brought the Nation to the highest prosperity in history. More people are earning more and saving more and spending more; they are living better, eating better, getting a better education, and receiving better health protection, enjoying more leisure and more culture—enjoying, in short, a higher and happier standard of living than ever before.

Cold statistics tell the tale.

National wealth is up:

Gross national product: 1952, $347 billion; 1960, $505 billion.

Personal income: 1952, $301 billion; 1960, $406 billion.

Average personal income (all families and unattached individuals): 1952, $5,630; 1960, $6,600.

Financial assets of individuals: 1952, $373 billion; 1960, $956 billion.

Total investment in plant and equipment (nonfarm residential structures, mining (underground) structures, producers' durable equipment, private nonfarm inventories): 1952, $345 billion; $1960, $562 billion.

Ten million more families have moved into income brackets of more than $4,000.

Labor is far better off:

Total employment: 1952, 61.0 million; 1960, 68.7 million.

Compensation of employees: 1952, $195 billion; 1960, $295 billion.

Man-days idle through strikes: 1952, 59.1 million; 1960, 2.75 million.

Average weekly wage: 1952, $67.97; 1960, $91.20.

People are better prepared for a rainy day:

Savings deposits in banks, credit unions, postal savings, building and loan associations (yearend): 1952, $85 billion; 1960, $157.6 billion (1959).

Life insurance, average per family (yearend): 1952, $5,300; 1960, $9,500 (1959).

Number of persons with hospital insurance: 1952, 92 million; 1960, 128 million.

Number of persons covered under social security has gone up nearly 12 million.

People are living better:

Per capita consumer spending: 1952, $1,400; 1960, $1,760.

Percent owner-occupied homes: 1952, 56.8 percent; 1960, 64.0 percent.

Percent of homes that are substandard (either dilapidated or lacking inside hot and cold running water, flush toilet and bath for unit's exclusive use): 1952, 32.5 percent; 1960, 14.9 percent.

People have more leisure and travel more:

Average weekly hours of work in manufacturing industries: 1952, 41 hours; 1960, 40 hours.

Average length of vacation in private, nonagricultural sector: 1952, 2 weeks; 1960, 2.5 weeks.

Number of vacations away from home: 1952, 145 million; 1960, 185 million.

Attendance at national parks: 1952, 42,300,000; 1960, 71,045,000.

Motor vehicle registration: 1952, 53 million; 1960, 73 million.

New mileage of highways (in dollars) at all levels of government: 1952, $4,871 million; 1960, $9,977 million.

Dollars spent in travel abroad: 1952, $1,188 million; 1960, $2,550 million.

Education has moved forward:

Number of elementary and secondary schoolrooms constructed: 1952, 48,000; 1960, 69,600.

(Total: 1949–53 178,000; 1955–59 272,300).

Expenditure for equipment, per pupil enrolled: 1952, $6.04; 1960, $9.15.

Expenditures for public elementary and secondary schools in 48 States and the District of Columbia as percent of GNP: 1952, 2.23 percent; 1960, 3.28 percent.

Percent of population 15 years and up who completed high school: 1952, 35 percent; 1960, 41.7 percent.

Percent of population 20 years and up who completed college: 1952, 6 percent; 1960, 7.3 percent.

Enrollment in adult education: 1952, 2,564,870; 1960, 3,428,000 (1959).

Expenditures on church construction in the last 7 years have averaged close to $800 million a year; average in 6 previous years was $330 million. Even in constant dollars, up 60–70 percent.

All this has been achieved at the same time that inflation has been slowed down—from 48 percent in the Truman years to 11 percent in the last 7½. As the President said in Chicago, "There are more Americans employed at higher wages and with more take-home pay than ever before in our history. And today they have more confidence in the stability of their money than they have enjoyed in three decades."

XXXVII

PROGRESS REPORT OF FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD DURING THE REPUBLICAN ADMINISTRATION, 1953–60

(By U.S. Senator HENRY DWORSHAK, of Idaho)

The basic responsibilities of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board are to establish policies, issue regulations, supervise and examine the operations of the Federal Home Loan Bank System, the Federal Savings and Loan System, and the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation. The Board was established by the Congress on July 22, 1932. Since August 11, 1955, the Board has been an independent agency.

Federal Home Loan Bank System

At the close of 1952, the Bank System was serving 4,028 savings and loan associations, or 67 percent of all operating associations. Their $21,258 million of assets represented 94 percent of all savings and loan assets. At yearend 1959, 4,599 members representing 74 percent of the Nation's associations, had assets of nearly $62 billion, or 97 percent of all savings and loan assets.

In 1952, these institutions made loans of $6,303 million. By the close of that year, they held savings of $18,075 million for some 12 million savers. In 1959, member institutions made loans totaling $15,058,988,000, or 40 percent of all loans made. At the end of that year, they held savings of $53 billion for over 25 million savers.

During the 7-year span between December 31, 1952, and the end of 1959, combined assets of the 11 district Federal Home Loan Banks went from $1,225,227,471 to $3,342,525,183; net income climbed from $8,625,076 to $28,099,490; and total paid-in and earned capital advanced from $349,900,757 to $937,066,221.

Since their establishment, the banks have loaned $12,631,306,155 to member institutions without a single loss; some $8,005,047,489 of this total was loaned to members between 1952 and 1959.

An aggregate of $11,300 million of consolidated Federal Home Loan Bank obligations has been marketed since the first issue in 1937. Of this total, $7,312,500,000 were sold during the 7-year span between 1952 and 1959. Consolidated obligations outstanding at the end of 1959 were $1,773,660,000, compared to $48,550,000 on December 31, 1952.

Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation

Since the Insurance Corporation was created in 1934, no saver has ever lost a penny of the insured portion of his account.

The following comparative figures for 1952 and 1959 indicate the growth of the corporation's responsibilities:

December 31, 1952:	
Total assets	$213,691,312
Reserves and unallocated income	$120,484,832
Number of insured institutions	3,172
Assets of insured institutions	$19,656,012,000
Savings held by insured institutions	$16,732,018,000
December 31, 1959:	
Total assets	$348,650,270
Reserves and unallocated income	$328,339,191
Number of insured institutions	3,979
Assets of insured institutions	$59,549,987,000
Savings held by insured institutions	$51,160,057,000

Credit restrictions

The Federal Home Loan Bank System was designed to allow for expansion or contraction to business cycles and overall financial policies of the administration. The system went through a test of its flexibility in the fall of 1955. In September of that year, the Board, because of excessive demands for credit, imposed credit restrictions to curb borrowings from the Federal home loan banks for expansion purposes.

The Board's action was based on the conviction that the capital for mortgage loans must come primarily from new savings and monthly repayments of mortgages outstanding. While the credit facilities of the district banks are available to augment the ordinary flow of savings and mortgage repayments when necessary, advances for expansion purposes continue to be limited substantially in line with the restrictions of 1955.

Board regulations

1. Participation loan program: To encourage capital mobility and a flow of funds through association channels from areas of surplus into areas deficient in home mortgage funds, the Board, on March 29, 1957, adopted a regulation which permits insured savings and loan associations to acquire up to 50 percent participation in home mortgage loans originated and held by any other insured association. From the inception of the program through March 31, 1960, insured associations sold over $427 million of participating interests. By the close of the first quarter of 1960, 587 insured institutions had bought or sold interests in mortgages under this program.

2. Higher percentage loans: On October 23, 1958, the Board granted permission to Federal savings and loan associations to make conventional loans up to 90 percent of the appraised value on single-family homes, subject to certain limitations. This exceeds by 10 percent the previous maximum conventional loans that Federal associations could make. As of December 31, 1959, Federal associations had made 7,772 conventional home loans for a total of almost $107 million under this liberalized regulation.

3. Limitations on brokers: On November 27, 1959, the Board adopted a regulation limiting sales commissions paid to brokers by FSLIC-insured institutions. This regulation became effective January 4, 1960. The Board felt that an undue concentration of savings obtained by insured institutions through the use of brokers or similar intermediaries was potentially dangerous to their safety and soundness.

4. Regulations relating to dividend rates: During the opening months of 1960 the Board took three anti-inflationary steps to curb the rising trend of dividend rates:

(a) The Board proposed, on March 24, 1960, an amendment to increase the liquidity requirement for Federal associations and members of the bank system from 6 to 7 percent, effective March 1, 1961. The Board has the authority, under a law passed in 1950, to set the minimum liquidity requirement from 4 to 8 percent of shareholders' withdrawable funds.

(b) On March 29, 1960, the Board adopted an amendment which takes effect January 1, 1961, requiring that fees, discounts, and similar charges on loans be deferred and credited to income over a period of time and not be taken immediately into current income. Recognizing that the application of this regulation may present problems to some newly organized associations, the Board concurrently modified the "allocation to reserve" requirements of new associations.

(c) On April 18, 1960, the Board proposed an amendment which would prohibit the advance advertising of dividend rates by insured institutions more than 30 days before the beginning of any period for which the announced rate would apply. It would also require, prior to such advertising, a determination by an institution's board of directors of its ability to pay the new rate. If an association increased its rate, 15 days' advance notice would have to be given.

Examinations and supervision

Among the Board's responsibilities are the examination and supervision of all Federal savings and loan associations. It also examines, either independently or jointly with State authorities, all State-chartered institutions insured by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation. The time period between examinations has been steadily reduced and is now approximately 12 months. In 1952, examinations of Federal associations were made about every 18 months, and of insured State associations about every 14 months on the average.

In its efforts to reduce the cost of examinations, the Board in 1953 and 1954 made seven distinct reductions in the examining procedures. The average man-days of examination time for each million dollars of assets have been declining each year. In the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952, the average man-days per million dollars of assets were 3.86, compared with 2.45 in 1959.

XXXVIII

SUMMARY OF MAJOR ACCOMPLISHMENTS IN THE COOPERATIVE FARM CREDIT SYSTEM DURING THE REPUBLICAN ADMINISTRATION, 1953–60

(By U.S. Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART, of Indiana)

I. Legislative accomplishments

Beginning with the Farm Credit Act of 1953, a series of laws have constituted major steps in increasing farmer participation in ownership, improving credit service, reducing Federal Government investment and subsidies in the system, and strengthening the system in other ways. Important features of each law are summarized below.

A. Farm Credit Act of 1953 (Public Law 202, 83d Cong.):

1. Established congressional policy of increasing borrower participation in ownership of the Federal Farm Credit System.

2. Again made the Farm Credit Administration an independent agency in the executive branch of the Government.

3. Improved coordination through changing the basic organization of the Governor's staff.

4. Increased farmer participation in the management and control of the Farm Credit System through establishment of the Federal Farm Credit Board and through an increase in the elected members of the district farm credit boards.

5. Provided for increased decentralization and for delegation by the Farm Credit Administration to the Federal land banks and the production credit corporations (FICB's after January 1, 1957) of certain powers and duties of the administration over the Federal land bank associations (formerly national farm loan associations) and the production credit associations.

The 1953 act was the foundation for the subsequent laws. It restated the objectives of the cooperative system, and directed the Federal Farm Credit Board to make recommendations of means for carrying out these objectives. The following acts were based on recommendations made by the Federal Farm Credit Board.

B. Farm Credit Act of 1955 (Public Law 347, 84th Cong.):

1. Federal land banks:

(a) Loan service of land banks to part-time farmers was expanded; more than 30,000 loans amounting to about $160 million were made to part-time farmers through 1959.

(b) Permitted land bank loans to be closed on the basis of appraisals by land bank designees.

(c) Eliminated the restriction that loans to farming corporations be limited to livestock operations so that land banks may make loans to closely held or family type farming corporations. Loans totaling about $24 million were made to 387 such corporations through 1959.

(d) Increased the land bank loan limit from $100,000 to $200,000. Since the 1955 act, about 777 loans were made for amounts exceeding $100,000.

2. Production credit associations:

(a) Authorized the production credit associations to pay dividends on class A (investment) stock without requiring like dividends to be paid on class B (voting) stock.

(b) Removed restrictions on guaranty funds of production credit associations, thereby giving the associations more freedom in the use of their capital funds to meet the credit needs of their members.

3. Banks for cooperatives:

(a) Provided a plan under which the borrowers from the banks for cooperatives will gradually acquire ownership of the banks and retire all Government-owned stock in the banks.

(b) Provided for retirement of Government-owned stock in the banks through quarterly stock purchases by borrowers and from net savings of the banks.

(c) Reorganized the Central Bank for Cooperatives and provided for election by its borrowers and by district banks for cooperatives of three members of the seven-member board of directors. Directors not so elected are appointed by the Governor.

C. Farm Credit Act of 1956 (Public Law 809, 84th Cong.):

1. Merged the production credit corporation in the Federal intermediate credit bank in each farm credit district, thereby simplifying the district organization and effecting a saving in operating costs.

2. Provided a plan under which production credit associations will gradually acquire ownership of the credit banks and retire all Government-owned stock in the banks.

3. Authorized the distribution of credit bank earnings on a patronage basis to the production credit associations and other financing institutions (OFI's). Patronage dividends must be paid in stock (to production credit associations) or participation certificates (to OFI's) as long as there is Government capital in the banks, but thereafter such dividends may be paid in cash.

4. Authorized each district bank to borrow from and lend to each of the other district banks.

5. Authorized the credit banks to discount or purchase loans with maturities up to 5 years.

6. Broadened the purposes for which production credit association loans may be made.

7. Removed the credit banks from budget control under the Government Corporation Control Act, effective January 1, 1959. This gave the credit banks the same authority as the land banks and the banks for cooperatives to expend corporate funds without regard to certain restrictive statutes.

D. Farm Credit Act of 1959 (Public Law 86–168, 86th Cong.):

1. It transferred from the Farm Credit Administration to the Federal land banks responsibility for making appraisals in connection with Federal land bank loans. The designee program was retained but the requirement of a second appraisal was repealed. It transferred land bank appraisers from the Farm Credit Administration to the land banks, except that certain appraisers were retained by the Farm Credit Administration on the staffs of the Chief Reviewing Appraisers, to be known as farm credit appraisers.

The 5-percent interest rate limitation on farm loan bonds was repealed.

3. The $200,000 maximum loan limit applicable to land bank loans was repealed but loans exceeding $100,000 continue to require Farm Credit Administration approval.

4. The face amount of a land bank loan may exceed 65 percent of the appraised normal value of the farm by the amount of stock which is paid for out of the loan.

5. The names of the national farm loan associations and the secretary-treasurers of such associations were changed to "Federal land bank associations" and "managers" respectively.

6. The Federal land banks were authorized to make unamortized or partially amortized loans under rules and regulations issued by the Farm Credit Administration.

7. The status of employees of the Farm Credit banks was clarified and employees of the district banks are exempt from the provisions of civil service laws and rules and regulations and various other laws relating to Federal employees.

E. Other legislation:

1. Banks for cooperatives: (a) Authorized the Central Bank for Cooperatives and regional banks for cooperatives to issue consolidated debentures.

(b) Enlarged the Board of Directors of the Central Bank for Cooperatives to 13 members.

2. Federal land banks (Public Law 55, 84th Cong.): (a) Authorized Federal land banks to purchase certain remaining assets of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation.

3. Developments and improvements in loan service: Many improvements in credit service resulted from the foregoing legislation. The developments and improvements listed below are partly the result of and partly in addition to the authorities and changes provided in the legislation.

(a) Credit extended reached peak levels. Total amount loaned by all banks and associations, excluding interagency loans and discounts, increased from $2.2 billion in 1953 to $4 billion in 1959. Loans outstanding December 31 increased from $2.2 billion to $4.4 billion during the same period. The enclosed report, "Loans and Discounts of Farm Credit Banks and Associations," gives these data by years from 1932 to 1959.

(b) The total volume of bonds and debentures issued, the principal source of funds used in making loans, reached peak levels, increasing from $1.4 billion in 1953 to $3.3 billion in 1959. This period provided a good test of the ability of the banks to market their securities under varying conditions ranging from recession and credit ease to high levels of business activity and credit restraint. No applicants were denied loans because of a lack of funds during this period.

(c) The making and discounting of intermediate-term loans for capital purposes such as machinery, farm improvement, and foundation livestock were tried out experimentally in 1954 and approved on a permanent basis in 1956. By June 30, 1959, such loans had grown to a total which constituted about 12 percent of all loans held by the Federal intermediate credit banks.

(d) In 1956 production credit associations, on an experimental basis, began entering into agreements with purchasing cooperatives to help finance their members when buying supplies. Such arrangements have now been made with hundreds of supply cooperatives and a number of independent supply dealers in several Farm Credit districts.

4. General operating improvements: As in the case of developments in loan service, improvements in other phases of operations have resulted partly from the legislative changes and partly from administrative action.

(a) In accordance with the 1953 act, numerous delegations of authority have been made by the Farm Credit Administration to the Federal land banks and to the production credit corporations (and Federal intermediate credit banks since they were merged under the 1956 act). These delegations have had the effects of streamlining operations and reducing the personnel required in supervision of the system.

(b) Although the work has increased, indicated by a doubling of the total loan volume outstanding, substantial reductions in personnel employed have been made in both the Farm Credit Administration, the supervisory organization, and the banks and associations supervised. The changes in both the number of employees and in the workload from December 31, 1953, to December 31, 1959, are shown in an enclosed table. The table shows further that the budget for the Farm Credit Administration appropriated by the Congress (but assessed against the Farm Credit banks) likewise decreased during this period of doubled loan volume.

(c) Major adjustments of standards used in appraising farms for land bank loans, in order to adapt loan policy better to changing agricultural conditions, were made in 1954 and 1958.

(d) Although substantial amounts of Government capital in the banks and associations were repaid to the Treasury, their total net worth was increased:

[In millions]

	Dec. 31, 1953	Dec. 31, 1959	Change
Government capital	$277.2	$219.2	−$58.0
Farmer capital	185.4	336.4	+151.0
Surplus and reserves	531.9	650.2	+118.3
Total net worth	994.5	1,205.8	+211.3

XXXIX

CIVIL RIGHTS—AT HOME AND ABROAD

(By U.S. Senator HIRAM FONG, of Hawaii)

Ethnically, Hawaii is composed of many nationalities. The early settlers were the Polynesians. Caucasian sailors, adventurers, whalers, traders, and missionaries were second comers. Then followed Chinese contract laborers recruited to work the sugar plantations as the Hawaiians were not inclined to hard labor.

With the annexation of the islands to the United States in 1898, Chinese labor immigration was completely prohibited as the laws, which were then in force excluding Chinese laborers to the United States, were made applicable to Hawaii.

Japanese contract laborers in great numbers were also imported from 1885 until their exclusion in 1924.

Portuguese, Swedes, Germans, Koreans, South Sea Islanders, Puerto Ricans, and Filipinos also comprised immigrant groups brought in for the cultivation and the processing of sugar.

From these heterogeneous and diverse ethnic groups has evolved a homogeneous community—a community which has been termed by students of sociology as a "Twenty-first Century Society," where racial harmony and cooperation are normal and accepted conditions of life. This spirit of working together pervades civic, business, political, and cultural endeavors. There is sincere respect for, rather than mere toleration of, each other's nationality, traits, characteristics, and cultures.

Living in an island paradise, tropical and balmy, with high standards of health and livelihood; with a good, free educational system; a stable, democratic government; where no group constitutes a racial majority; with peoples on one hand steeped in Christian Puritan outlook and justice, and on the other, imbued with Buddhist and Confucian philosophies stressing human and moral conduct; cemented together and mellowed by the generous openheartedness and carefree aloha spirit of its native Hawaiian people, we in Hawaii would like to believe that we are giving life to a community approaching the ideal of a world at peace and in concord.

Hawaii: A showcase of brotherhood

President Eisenhower said to the people of India during his recent trip, "Hawaii cries insistently to a divided world that all our differences of race and origin are less than the grand and indestructible unity of our common brotherhood. The world should take time to listen with attentive ear to Hawaii."

Hawaii is indeed a showcase for true brotherhood. Elsewhere, even as in ancient days, massive discrimination continues to blight human relationships. Our news media carry daily evidence of man's inhumanity to man, evidenced by oppression, fear, hatred, bias, and discrimination in all quarters of our globe.

Behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains, religious and political persecution persist. In Tibet, the Red Chinese regime continues mass genocide of the civilian population. Large numbers of people still flee East Germany and Red China, at risk of life and limb, to seek sanctuary in more tolerant oases. Anti-Semitism and anti-Christianity erupt as atheistic communism seeks to wipe out religious worship.

Belligerent nationalism is more the rule than not in modern struggles to throw off the yoke of colonialism. Too often such nationalism provokes wholesale bloodletting, with guns replacing ballots as the means of attaining parity and settling disputes.

Unmindful of man's growing yearning for equal status, many cling to senseless caste systems of the discredited past. As in South Africa, the ruling race shocked the world with its brutal methods to enforce apartheid.

There is something barbaric in today's repression of man's natural passion for equity.

We face up to civil rights

Here in the United States we are not yet purged of intolerance and prejudice. Denial of voting rights; desecration of churches, schools, and public buildings; discrimination in employment and in public accommodations point up the urgent need for further progress in learning to live peaceably together. In connection with recent sit-down demonstrations at lunch counters, it is significant to note that many whites who object to Negroes sitting as customers on one side of the counter do not object to Negroes on the other side of the counter cooking and serving the food they eat. Irrational from a standpoint of logic, this attitude is bewildering from a standpoint of emotion as well.

In our glass house that is America, our discrimination and bigotry are in full view of a critical world. We receive considerable adverse comment for our shortcomings—and perhaps not enough recognition for the undeniable progress we are making. Unlike some of our critics, we are not sweeping our problems of civil rights under the rug. We are facing up to them.

Vote on civil rights represents majority

This year, in the Senate of the United States, 100 representatives of 179 million Americans aired our civil rights disagreements in public over a period of 8 weeks. If ever opinions were thoroughly ventilated, these were. And when all the smog had lifted, what was the outcome?

Of the 100 Senators, 82 supported passage of corrective and progressive civil rights legislation. Only 18 voted for the status quo.

In school, we usually consider 70 a passing grade. While 82 may not elevate us to honor roll, it certainly is a very respectable score.

In terms of public sentiment, the 82 percent of the Senate favoring this year's civil rights bill represents a sizable majority of American people. Without such widespread approval, this civil rights milestone would not have been achieved. Although the bill does not go far enough to suit some people and goes too far to suit others, it does denote real progress.

To those who are impatient with our speed in achieving true brotherhood, let me point out that, until 1957, more than 80 years elapsed without passage of a single significant civil rights law. Now, just 3 years later, we have enacted a second major civil rights statute. Unquestionably, this reflects significant transformation in American attitudes.

In many areas of the United States, of course, we still have not matched the tolerance found in Hawaii where acceptance, without regard to race, color, or creed, and based on individual merit and standing, is the general rule—the unwritten rule. Acceptance comes from the heart. It is not superimposed by such means as legislation, judicial process, or promotional campaigns.

XL

OUR DEFENSE POSITION—PRESENT AND FUTURE

(By U.S. Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, of Massachusetts)

Before we return once again to our homes, it may be helpful to submit to you, to the Congress, and to the people, a review of the state of the Nation's defenses.

Since Congress completed action on the fiscal year 1961 appropriations bill there has been continued discussion at home about our defense adequacy and continued tensions abroad as the cold war has entered a new phase of Communist arrogance.

Congress adjourned for a brief 4 weeks, dominated by the national conventions of both parties. Trouble in the Belgian Congo quickly reached serious dimensions, and Premier Castro's government heightened its animosity toward the United States and its identification with the Communist bloc. The Soviet Union blatantly charged our Government with aggressive invasion of its air space, and now fans the world's fears and suspicions with its dramatization of the trial of American pilot Francis Gary Powers.

We returned to Washington with the hope of taking earnest and constructive action on needed legislation. Shortly we shall finally adjourn the 86th Congress and return home for the rigors of a nationwide election campaign.

I believe that it would be particularly appropriate and helpful at this time, to review briefly our defense position, present and future. A concise, balanced analysis of our defense preparedness is called for, not only by the nature of the current international situation, but also by the inevitable commentary of the political campaign ahead of us.

With respect to our present defense position, I think it is generally agreed among informed observers that this country's military strength is clearly superior to that of any potential aggressor. We believe our forces to be capable of deterring thermonuclear general war and of coping successfully with so-called limited conflicts, emphasizing the use of conventional forces, should they break out. In fact, it was with some interest that I noticed that Mr. Robert Sprague and Dr. James Baxter, when they appeared before Senator JACKSON'S Subcommittee on National Policy Machinery, testified that they felt our present military strength was not only awesomely great in an absolute sense, but that it probably represented an alltime high relative to the military strength of the Soviet Union.

This conclusion is inescapable to anyone who considers objectively the size and high state of readiness of our forces, the effectiveness and diversity of the weapons systems with which they are equipped, and the experience and dedication of our soldiers, sailors, and airmen.

Our strategic retaliatory forces now consist of 12 wings of B–52 intercontinental attack bombers and 25 wings of B–47 jet bombers, widely dispersed and well supported by a large fleet of refueling tankers. The planes and men of the Strategic Air Command represent a force unmatched in world history in experience, training, and combat power. SAC's already great effectiveness is being considerably enhanced at this very moment as the first units of the B–52 force are equipped with the Hound Dog air-to-surface missile. Supplementing the almost unimaginable destructive power carried by these bombers of the Strategic Air Command are operationally ready Atlas intercontinental ballistic missiles.

Also, within the next few months the first two Polaris-firing nuclear-powered submarines will be combat ready—at sea with missiles aboard. This schedule was assured by

the recent dramatic and highly successful underwater test firings of the U.S.S. *George Washington*. The Polaris system, of course, has brought a wholly new dimension to our strategic retaliatory power in terms of mobility, concealment, and near invulnerability to enemy missile attack.

Basic to the projection of our military power overseas in situations of limited conflict, as well as important to our general war strength, are the Navy's four great fleets built around modern attack carriers and the tactical fighters and missiles of the Air Force deployed in forward areas. These, together with the 870,000 men in the Army and 175,000 men in the Marine Corps, either deployed overseas or in reserve in this country, constitute a balanced and highly effective force capable of rapidly containing or of defeating local aggression in distant parts of the world.

Our present military strength is not only well known to the members of the free world it is dedicated to defend, but also appreciated by those nations whose aggressive impulsiveness it is intended to deter. But, present strength is not enough; the real question we must address ourselves to is not present but future proficiency—"Will we be strong enough in the years ahead?"

By way of providing some needed perspective, let me cite a brief historical case study. A few years ago, it was charged our defense programs were not adequate to provide the military strength we would need in 1958–60. But the predicted "bomber gap" never materialized. The same dire predictions were made over the superior development of Russian nuclear-powered submarines. But, on the contrary, our own B–52 fleet has increased from less than 1 fully equipped wing then to 12 at the present time. They now represent a force several times larger than the estimated Soviet long-range heavy bomber force and possess capabilities far superior to those of the B–36 bomber force upon which our strategic air strength depended in those days.

Similarly, our present continental air defense system against manned bomber attack is the best in the world. We have many more true all-weather fighters than the Soviet Union—contrary to the popular predictions of 4 years ago—and a highly sophisticated electronic control and warning system. Our present surface-to-air missile defenses are constantly improving. It is doubtful that the Soviet Union has any nuclear-powered submarines. We have 10 nuclear-powered submarines in the active fleet, and well over 30 other nuclear-powered warships are now authorized or under construction.

The fears expressed in 1956 that America would not be prepared in 1960 were unfounded. Now there is general agreement that our Defense Establishment is the best in the world today.

But today persistent viewers-with-alarm tell us that we will not be prepared 3 or 4 years from now. The fact is that we are moving ahead on many programs—land, sea, and air, atomic and conventional power, nuclear weapons, and conventional weapons, missiles, and aircraft, ships, and land vehicles. We are strengthening simultaneously our Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force. The totality of power must impress any fairminded and responsible citizen.

Naturally, in improving these defenses, we have had to recognize a system of priorities of programs. First things have had to come first. And top priority ratings have produced such miracles as the nuclear submarines and their Polaris armament.

The Soviet Union, too, has been forced to allocate limited resources among many competing demands. All nations have to live with the program of allocating limited material and manpower resources.

Some voices have been raised in our land for a feast-or-famine approach to the Nation's defenses. The President has chosen to ignore that siren song in favor of a policy of building strength for the long haul, of maintaining a steady level of effort while continually adjusting its programs to the rapid changes which are taking place constantly in military technology.

We have worked continually to modernize our forces and at the same time have pressed vigorously for the development of the weapons of the future. The President has steered wisely between complacency and weakness on the one hand, and wasteful crash programs on the other.

We can never be complacent about past experience in successfully evolving one's programs to provide a continuing military superiority, when the question before us is still the future. The situation in the summer of 1960 obviously is not the same as it was in 1956. There are great new dangers as well as new opportunities in our position relative to that of the Soviet Union. It is only natural, in view of the collapse of the summit conference in May, more recently the abandonment by the Soviet Union of its participation in the general disarmament conference, and the "increased truculence" of the Communist bloc generally which the President has mentioned, that the question should be raised whether our present programs and funds are adequate to insure our safety in the coming years. In order to serve the national security, it is not only natural, it is necessary to examine these questions.

There has been in recent weeks much discussion as to (1) whether Congress appropriated sufficient funds to maintain our security and to make it clear to the world that we were so strong that no nation would dare to attack us for fear of our ability to retaliate devastatingly, (2) whether the funds appropriated by Congress are being wisely obligated and expended; and (3) whether there is more money needed to be appropriated to make certain that our defenses are adequate and that the research and development of new weapons is sufficiently provided for. These are important questions.

In general, I believe that the defense policies which have served us so well in the immediate past are equally applicable to the coming years. We still need a relatively stable level of effort on a high enough plateau to maintain adequate protection until some less precarious and more permanent understanding is reached with the Soviet Union.

More specifically, we will have continually to adjust our forces and programs to the rapid progress in military technology and to take the steps necessary to maintain a mixed force of retaliatory weapons systems safe from surprise attack, as well as versatile and mobile forces capable of dealing rapidly with situations of limited conflict. The 1961 budget provides funds dedicated to meet these objectives.

What kind of Armed Forces does this fiscal year 1961 defense appropriations legislation provide: For our strategic retaliatory forces, additional B–52H heavy jet bombers will be purchased to permit equipping of the 14th wing. Enough B–58 supersonic medium bombers will be procured to complete the equipping of three wings. More KC–135 jet tankers are also provided to modernize further our airborne refueling capability. Additional Hound Dog air-to-surface missiles are being ordered for our B–52 force, as well as Quail decoy missiles.

In active development is the Sky Bolt air-launched ballistic missile. This will have about double the range and many times the speed of the present Hound Dog missile. Its successful development would strengthen greatly the capabilities of the heavy bomber force and would considerably extend its useful life. In fact, the B–52 carrying Sky Bolt missiles represents a powerful combination of the advantages of the manned bomber—flexibility and weight of attack, with the advantages of the ballistic missile—speed and inflight invulnerability.

The 1961 Defense Appropriation Act also contains about $260 million to continue the development of the B–70 intercontinental heavy bomber, designed to fly at three times the speed of sound.

With respect to our strategic missile strength, this year's budget provides for an increase of more than one-third in the number of Atlas and Titan ICBM squadrons and, in addition, for the substantial augmentation of the last six of the Atlas squadrons.

Development effort on Minuteman will also be increased. This missile, because of its reduced cost, short reaction time, and mobility, is expected to become an important part of our nuclear retaliatory forces by the mid-1960's. Deployed in large numbers in hardened, well-dispersed underground sites and on moving railway cars, Minuteman will be a nuclear strike force of tremendous power and speed.

Funds are also provided this year toward the procurement of 12 more Polaris submarines. These submarines, because of their ability to utilize the ocean depths of the world for mobility and concealment, represent a near-invulnerable weapon system, and one which presents any aggressor with the virtual certainty of a deadly counterblow. I would like to point out, contrary to the impression in some quarters, that the Polaris program has not been held back. In fact, this program is now about 3 years ahead of its original schedule.

But the significant increase in our offensive aircraft and missile strength is only part of the story. As Secretary Gates stated to the Senate Committee on Appropriations when he came before us this past February:

"Our first concern is how best to assure our continued capability to retaliate effectively to surprise attack, at a time when the U.S.S.R. could have in its possession a large number of intercontinental ballistic missiles, in addition to a significant number of manned bombers.

* * * * *

"The solution lies in a whole complex of related measures, each of which in various degrees contributes to the establishment and maintenance of an assured retaliatory capability. These are: improved warning against both missile and aircraft attack, reduction of reaction time, dispersal, protective hardening, concealment, and mobility for our weapon systems; and, as soon as practicable, an effective active defense against ballistic missiles as well as aircraft."

A number of these objectives are met by the 1961 aircraft and missile programs which I have just described. The 1961 defense budget also makes provisions for the other necessary measures.

As General Power, head of the Strategic Air Command, testified, it is not now necessary actually to fly a continuous airborne alert. Funds are provided, however, for the Strategic Air Command to acquire the capability for such an alert, if and when needed. This precaution will serve to reduce significantly the vulnerability of SAC during periods of heightened international tension.

The first Ballistic Missile Early Warning Station is expected to be in operation within just a few months. Funds are provided this year to accelerate the completion of the two other stations in the system. When this system is operational, that portion of the Strategic Air Command on ground alert will have 15 minutes of warning which will give

them time to get into the air and to avoid destruction on the ground from a surprise enemy missile attack.

Development of our military satellite systems is also being accelerated with funds provided this year. The Midas infrared warning satellite will provide even earlier warning of an enemy missile attack than BMEWS, and Samos will do much to supply needed military reconnaissance information and to detect signs of an impending attack.

Research and development on the Nike-Zeus antimissile missile will also go forward at a higher level than ever before in an effort to perfect an active defense against ballistic missile attack.

The Navy will construct another new, large, modern attack aircraft carrier with 1961 funds. This will provide a highly valuable addition to our ability to cope with limited aggression in the distant areas of the world.

A large number of vessels for antisubmarine warfare have been funded in this year's Navy shipbuilding program and funds for research in this field have also been increased.

The Army's ability to meet its responsibilities likewise will be considerably enhanced by the funds made available in the 1961 budget. The procurement of F–105 tactical fighters by the Air Force for close support of Army ground forces in the field, of airlift aircraft to enhance their long-range mobility, and Army procurement of modern rifles, machineguns, tanks, trucks, missiles, and self-propelled artillery, all received sharply increased funding this year.

For military functions of the Department of Defense, Congress, on June 30, approved a total of $39,996,608,000. This was $661,608,000 in excess of the amount submitted in January by President Eisenhower. For military construction in the Department of Defense, Congress, on July 1, approved a total of $994,855,000. This was $193,145,000 less than the President requested in his January budget.

As President Eisenhower pointed out in his press conference on Wednesday, August 10, 1960, funds requested in the budget amounting to approximately $1,100 million for certain purposes were not appropriated and on the other hand approximately $1,750 million were appropriated for purposes that the Defense Department had not originally planned.

As Secretary Gates has assured Congress in recent letters to the Senate majority leader, Senator JOHNSON, and the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense, Senator CHAVEZ, the Department of Defense plans to utilize the great part of the funds provided by Congress immediately.

Adequate time is required for making new plans in order to see that additional funds provided by Congress above the budget request are properly and effectively obligated for spending. Therefore, certain funds are reserved until these programs can be worked out and put to use for urgent future requirements as they develop. As the President has emphasized, this does not mean that the money has been impounded. It does mean that careful plans must be made before the millions involved can be expended thoughtfully.

Among the programs to which additional funding will be applied are: Strengthening of the SAC airborne alert capacity, Army modernization, the B–70 supersonic bomber, the Samos reconnaissance satellite, the Polaris program, and modernization of the airlift fleet. Some of these actions had been indicated in funds appropriated by Congress and others had not.

As Secretary Gates explained in his letter to Senator JOHNSON dated August 9, 1960:

"With respect to the funds not yet apportioned and the items 'apportioned but undergoing review,' I am sure you appreciate that not all service programs are ready to go forward at the time the bill is enacted into law. For many reasons—technical difficulties, changes in concepts, lack of definitive plans—additional time is frequently required in order to assure the development of valid programs. As a matter of good business practice, we must assure that the requirement is still valid in the light of present circumstances, and that all significant aspects of the program have been properly worked out before the funds are released."

In addition, as President Eisenhower announced in his special message to Congress of August 8, numerous "practical" actions had already been ordered toward improving "the readiness and posture of our military commands." These included the deployment of additional aircraft carriers to the 6th and 7th Fleets, the retention of a number of B–47 medium bombers and tankers and an increase in the number and scope of ground forces' strategic and airborne exercises.

In considering the question of whether additional preparedness funds are needed at the present time, it is important to look at the Defense appropriations bill to see what opportunities it provides the Secretary of Defense to enable him—as the chief administrator directly in charge of our ultra-complex Defense Establishment—to continuously assure maximum security according to the changing priorities of our political-military environment.

In order to assure that no weapons program could suffer from lack of funds while Congress was not in session, an emergency fund of $150 million is provided in the legislation for application to any research and development or procurement account of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Defense Department whenever the Secretary of Defense deems it necessary to speed up that particular program. Congress also provided transfer authority of $150 million through the emergency fund which can be used to accelerate any needy program. Furthermore, the Congress made available in section 535 an additional $150 million transfer authority for the acceleration of missile or satellite programs that the Secretary of Defense deems advantageous to the national defense.

In addition, each year the Department carries forward to the next budget some billions of dollars of unobligated balances. These balances are earmarked for specific projects, but, for various reasons, may not be obligated. In the current budget, it is expected there will be approximately $6.3 billion of balances unobligated during fiscal year 1961. Within certain procurement limitations, these funds can, if it is wise and necessary, be reprogramed with the consent of the Appropriations Committees of the Congress. For instance, if more money is needed for a Polaris submarine and there is an unobligated balance in Navy ship construction accounts, these funds could be transferred for this purpose. Or, if it was considered wise to proceed with more procurement of the Minuteman missile, funds could be reprogramed from other Air Force missile programs. The use of these unobligated balances thus provides a certain amount of additional flexibility to our Defense Establishment for procurement purposes.

Through these allowances permitting transfer of funds for research, for procurement and for acceleration of programs, the Congress has given the Defense Secretary broad authority. Furthermore, Congress has approved section 512A, a provision authorizing the President to permit the Defense Department to obligate appropriated funds at a faster rate than now planned whenever he deems such action to be necessary in the interest of national defense. Section 512B permits the President to provide for all the costs of an airborne alert on an actual deficiency basis if necessary. Although section B is little known and has not yet been used, it is highly important for it is another step that Congress has taken to assure that our defenses will not suffer for lack of funds in those areas where high priorities exist and emergencies can develop.

Aside from programs specifically provided for by congressional appropriations and the further authority of the President and the Secretary of Defense to administer their activities with freedom and flexibility, our Defense Establishment cannot meet the revolutionary challenges of the future unless it can and will move quickly for new funds with which to implement new policies at the time they are needed. I believe the record is clear that the present administration will come to Congress for more funds if and when they are necessary.

As President Eisenhower said in his August 8 message:

"Total resources are adequate, although a modest increase may prove to be necessary to carry out the readiness measures. If such an increase should be required, I shall promptly request the necessary funds.

"Once again I assure the Congress that this Nation's military power is second to none and will be kept that way."

Secretary Gates wrote to Majority Leader JOHNSON on August 9:

"All of our programs, force levels and deployments are kept under constant review. Where technological breakthroughs occur, emphasis will be added; where programs are overtaken by events, terminations will be effected. This is in accord with the long-established policy of the executive branch; no change has been made in this policy."

And in his letter of August 12:

"But, this I can assure you—should we conclude that additional programs are required for the Nation's defense, the necessary funds will be requested regardless of the amounts involved."

In conclusion, I believe that Congress has provided sufficient funds in the fiscal year 1961 appropriations bill to provide the "proficiency mix" of defenses which will keep us secure. The foregoing review of military items which these funds make available impressively documents this conviction, in my opinion.

I feel that the Defense Department has demonstrated its competence to utilize these funds in the most effective manner according to changing conditions and priorities. There will always be minor differences of opinion on financial administration, but the strong, continuing cooperation of the executive branch with the legislative branch to the end of highest security seems clear. Moreover, Congress provides the money with such flexibility that the President, the Secretary of Defense, and their deputies are able to make use of it wisely, prudently and efficiently.

For all these reasons, Congress can have confidence in the multi-dimensional character of the U.S. defense posture, its emphasis on the long haul, and the long-range validity of these basic concepts—and can be satisfied that adequate funds have now been appropriated to guard the Nation's security.

Our prime responsibility, however, is to be vigilant for needed additions and revisions and quick to bring them about with necessary action. We must avoid any aspect of complacency or lethargy, but sustain a critical, imaginative and vigorous attitude which alone can produce that unmistakable margin of military supremacy upon which our national security rests.

XLI

WHAT PRICE SOCIAL WELFARE?

(By U.S. Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, of Arizona)

A candidate for the nomination for President recently startled the country by charging that "17 million Americans go to bed

hungry every night." I say "startled" advisedly because while most of us are aware that some Americans, because of unemployment and other factors, do not enjoy a diet on par with those gainfully employed, the figure "17 million hungry Americans" does sound a bit padded. It is also, of course, a well-worked Soviet propaganda stereotype that most Americans suffer from malnutrition and that thousands drop dead in the streets of America every day of hunger.

I am inclined to be charitable and I attribute this particular exaggeration to youthful exuberance and perhaps a bit of overstriving for political effect. What does disturb me is that the claim of so many millions of Americans as being ill fed, ill housed, and ill clothed is not unique or recent. Ever since the early days of the unlamented New Deal, we have been fed a regular and overfull diet of statistics along the same general line. The Soviets merely pick up and rebroadcast our own lamentations as proof of the truth of their charges.

Then the socialized medicine boys got into the act and we were given a liberal dosage of figures and statistics tending to show that despite the highest income level in the world we still had X number million people or X percent of our population suffering from below par medical care—or what was represented to be absolute par in dental and medical care. Then came the Forand bill to take care of the problems of the elderly and retired, and the President's own medical care for the aged plan which was hastily put together as an answer to the Forand bill—all of which prompted me to do a little bit of research to see if it was possible to arrive at some rough figure of what all forms of social welfare have cost the American taxpayer since 1933 or 1934. In other words, "What price social welfare?"

In 1913 all public expenditures for social welfare amounted to a shadow over 3 percent of the gross national product. By 1929, with mounting relief costs, public welfare expenditures had increased only one percent to a trifle over 4 percent of the gross national product. Six years later, in 1935, or 2 years after the beginning of the New Deal, the percentage of welfare expenditure in relation to our gross national product had jumped or tripled to 12 percent. We were well on the way to the welfare state.

In December 1951 the Chamber of Commerce of the United States released a special report showing that some 300 Federal, State, and local welfare plans had cost $23 billion, or 34.2 percent of money expended by Federal, State, and local agencies. The Federal Security Agency itself was quoted as authority for the figures. This meant a tax burden of $575 in 1950 for every American taxpaying family. The FSA included $6.5 billion spent by State and local authorities on education, so even if we deduct this figure it still leaves a total of over $16 billion, or one-fourth of all tax money spent at all levels by the Federal Government and State and local agencies.

It is admittedly difficult, if not impossible, for even conservatives to agree on just what may properly be defined as "welfare." Communist propaganda, New Deal semantics, and word twisting by the liberals into new shapes and forms have raised hob with old-line, accepted definitions. To those who object that expenditures included in the above totals for education, some veterans' benefits, and other forms of disbursement of questionable "social welfare" classification should not have been added, I repeat that extensive statistical analysis and research, which would take months, would no doubt uncover an equal or even larger sum total definitely classifiable as welfare, but sandwiched in other disbursements, including gray or borderline categories.

It would require an economic Argus with a thousand eyes and the wisdom of Solomon to trace out and unravel such items buried in every Federal, State, and local annual budget.

Three hundred and twenty-two billions for "welfare"

We do have some rough breakdowns since 1939 in the Federal budget for "labor and welfare." Since 1939, the Federal Government has spent a total of $52 billion in 22 fiscal years. The Social Security Bulletin for October 1955 had an extended table showing local and State expenditures on "social welfare" from fiscal 1934 to fiscal 1954 as totaling $170.344 billion. As State and local social welfare payments since 1954 have jumped to well over $20 billion per year, we can add another $100 billion for the past 5 years, making a grand total of at least $322 billion.

If, as it is claimed, we still have 17 million hungry people after spending $322 billion in 25 years, then it is obvious we must do one of two things. One, raise taxes still higher a la the New Deal dictum "tax and tax; spend and spend," boost the national debt still higher, and give the spiral of inflation another whirl. Or, two, try something else. That is, spend less, tax less, give away less abroad, balance the budget, and let people keep more of their earned income to prime the economic pump by old and tried economic laws which seemed to have worked pretty well until we started "monkeying" with them.

A little ancient history

Unfortunately, all too often political success still goes to the demagog who, to paraphrase Gen. Nathan Bedford Forrest, promises "the mostest of everything to the mostest of everybody." Unfortunately, the politician who promises the "mostest" is seldom a student of either history or economics. The demagog promising the "mostest" would probably be greatly surprised to learn that the basic fundamentals of his calling were laid down at least 21 centuries ago by the younger Cicero, Quintus Tullius.

In the latter days of the Roman republic, candidates for certain elective offices found they had to promise more and more to the "plebes" or lowest classes of free men in order to get enough votes to be elected. When the famous classicist, Marcus Tullius Cicero, was running for the consulship, his younger brother, Quintus Tullius, gave him some advice which still stands today as smart coaching in practical politics. He wrote:

"One has great need of a flattering manner which, wrong and discreditable though it may be in other walks of life, is indispensable in seeking office. Human nature being what it is, all men prefer a false promise to a flat refusal. At the worst the man to whom you have lied may be angry. That risk, if you make a promise, is uncertain and deferred, and affects only a few. But if you refuse you are sure to offend many and that at once."

The young Cicero undoubtedly had taken his inspiration from the Gracchii brothers, Gaius and Tiberius, who had been early "agrarian reformers" a hundred years before his time. Tiberius was murdered in an election day tumult, but his younger brother, Gaius Sempronius, carried on his "liberal" ideas. He distributed wheat to the poor at fixed low prices and he became the idol of the poor of Rome.

Gaius, however, was outsmarted by an even greater demagog who made even greater and rosier promises, with the result that Gaius lost the election for a third term as tribune. Whereupon, the granddaddy of all New Dealers committed suicide by ordering one of his slaves to kill him.

I bring up the Gracchii brothers and the sage political advice of Quintus Tullius Cicero because this is an election year and in politics there is seldom anything new under the sun. Modern-day descendants of the Gracchii are once more abroad in the land, painting grim pictures of "one-third" or "one-quarter" of the Nation as "ill housed, ill fed" or suffering desperately from inadequate medical and dental care.

Twenty-five centuries ago the Greeks, who first practiced a rudimentary form of democracy in their public squares, learned that with democracy came demagogs. They learned that demagogery was the price of democracy and that, if stable and responsible self-government was to be maintained, demagogs would have to be accepted but treated for what they were with much resort to the salt cellar.

The basis of all swindles

Nevertheless, it is depressing to reflect that, despite all our marvelous technical and scientific progress and our tremendous record of human achievement, politically we have not matured much since the dim and distant days of Solon and the Gracchii. Far too many of our electorate still refuse to accept the simple lesson of life that you cannot get something for nothing—or that somehow the laws of physics do not operate in economics and that it is somehow possible to take more out of a vessel or the treasury than is put into it. The basic "catch" or hook in all swindles and confidence games is invariably "something for nothing," or what amounts to practically the same thing, a great deal for very little at no risk.

The demagog promising the "mostest to everybody" also knows that behind him stand the superdemagogs—the Socialists and Communists. As a Socialist will always promise more than a liberal, so the Communist can afford to promise even more than the Socialist. So it should be plain to even a child that the demagog making promises he does not intend to or cannot fulfill is playing a dangerous game.

The birth of modern welfarism

While welfarism is as old as the first primitive social organizations lost in the mists of pre-Sumerian culture, the concept certainly was well developed and historically established at least in rudimentary forms in the early Greek and Etruscan city-states.

It remained, however, for the Iron Chancellor, Prince Bismarck, to give the stamp of bureaucratic authority to social welfarism as a state monopoly. Authorities tell us that all present forms of social security and other forms of welfarism can be traced directly to the Prussian Chancellor. We are all familiar with Bismarck's difficulties with the Socialists in control of the German unions and the liberals who were powerful in the Reichstag. In converting the newly created German Empire into a militaristic state Bismarck was faced with enormous difficulties and problems.

German socialism was pacifist to the core and bitterly antimilitarist. German industry and commerce, which were in competition with France, joined Great Britain in looking askance at heavy military budgets. In order, as he said, to "steal the thunder away from the Socialists," Bismarck was forced to adopt "nationalistic socialism to end international socialism." German employers as a class, as well as liberals, were of the same mind that social insurance should properly be a private matter taken care of by the workers themselves through their unions or through religious and other organizations already in existence for that purpose.

Bismarck also had revenue troubles. His universal military training program, a revolutionary innovation in European military history, required enormous sums of money which the Reichstag granted with increasing reluctance. The new German Reich, like our own infant Republic, had almost no important source of revenue other than the excise taxes and import duties. Involved parliamentary bickering produced some revenues as

contributions from the various once-independent states absorbed into the Reich. By setting up a comprehensive social security program under Federal control, Bismarck assured himself of a substantial source of revenue beyond the control of the Reichstag. The German example was quickly followed by neighboring European states and modern-day social security collected and administered by a vast and all-pervasive bureaucracy was on its way. Like the proverbial camel's nose under the tent, it was now merely a matter of gradual and imperceptible extension before the whole camel of paternalistic and bureaucratic state welfarism ousted the libertarian concept of individual freedom and social responsibility.

It is very significant and interesting to note that before Hitler maneuvered himself into power, he was violently opposed to the social insurance system of Germany. He ranted that it weakened and demoralized sturdy German concepts of thrift and self-reliance. His real opposition, of course, was due to the fact that he considered social welfare insurance as a powerful weapon of his main political enemy, the Social Democrats of the Weimar Republic.

Nazi propagandists made a great deal of political capital out of charges that there was considerable corruption and waste of money in the compulsory medical care program. This naturally won them considerable support among doctors, businessmen, and conservative middle class elements. The Bruening government was forced, in 1931, to make a number of reforms tending to eliminate the worst abuses. The Nazis naturally reaped the credit.

However, when Hitler took power in 1933, he soon changed his tune. With its heavy emphasis on racial superiority and physical fitness, the Nazi ideology perforce had to concentrate on social welfare as an important state function. A high birth rate and maximum physical fitness were obviously very important to a totalitarian state planning military aggression against its neighbors. Hitler heavily financed all manner of social welfare programs, not for humanitarian reasons but because German human resources had to be mobilized and strengthened for the enormous strains and sacrifices which Hitler knew he would have to impose upon the German people in order to consummate his grandiose plans.

The Bolsheviks take up social welfare

Lenin was a great admirer of Bismarck. The rigid Prussian bureaucratic system of social control struck the father of bolshevism as just the ticket, with some modifications, for huge and chaotic Russia exhausted by World War I blood losses. It is true that there was a basic philosophical difference between Lenin and Bismarck in their concern with bureaucratic control of social welfare for their subjects. Bismarck professed to be actuated by Christian precepts and morality. Lenin, as an atheistic materialist, was concerned only with insuring the health, docility, and productivity of the Russian masses as the solid underpinning of the Bolshevist form of socialist state which he announced "we shall now proceed to create," in November 1917.

It was years before the last vestiges of private ownership and free enterprise were eradicated in Soviet Russia. Social welfarism, or what passed for it under the iron heel of the Bolshevists, was one of the first monopolies set up by the victorious Bolsheviks in 1917, almost simultaneously with the creation of the Cheka or secret police charged with the extirpation of all opposition and even minor and harmless dissent. It has now been long forgotten with the passage of the years, but the abolition by formal decree of all private social insurance, relief, and charity, whether by the church, trade unions, cooperatives, or other established organizations followed the Bolshevik consolidation of power in a matter of months.

I do not mean to infer from this brief historical analysis of social welfarism under various forms of despotism that totalitarianism and social welfarism go hand in hand, or that one leads inevitably to the other. We have had a few exceptions, notably in smaller countries in northeastern Europe with long histories of limited government, where some degree of individual freedom has been maintained. Note that I say "some degree" advisedly, because nowhere else is the old maxim "Something gained; something lost" more true than in the field of welfarism. The supposed tangible gains and material advantages are usually far outweighed by the longrun, intangible values of human freedom and dignity.

Such examples as I have cited and others, which lack of time prohibit further study and examination, do leave an ineluctable conclusion—social welfarism, in its most advanced form, has always been an inseparable part of all totalitarian systems, ancient and modern, Fascist and Communist, openly brutalitarian or heavily disguised benevolent despotisms.

I have already pointed out that socialism, that is to say, the expropriation of private property for exploitation by the state for the theoretical maximum benefit of all, has been a dead issue in this country for lo these many years. The Socialists were smart enough to disguise themselves as "New Dealers" and have openly boasted of the success of their stratagem. We have learned that socialism can be sneaked over against the wishes of the majority through the simple device of expropriation by taxation and the creation of an all-embracing welfare program which effectively robs the individual of all control over his more basic and fundamental human freedoms—that of regulating his own personal affairs as he may see fit.

Nationalization has acquired a sinister connotation, particularly after Great Britain's disastrous experience with disguised socialism. But welfarism has a disarming universal appeal. Who, except an embittered and confirmed misanthrope, could possibly be opposed to human welfare? Those who fish for the souls and minds of men have learned through long experience to be exceedingly cunning in their weaving of gossamer-fine nets and simply irresistible lures and bait. I have tried time and again to show that no one is opposed to human welfare per se—we conservatives are merely opposed to making a government bureaucratic monopoly out of basic human problems traditionally handled and best solved first, through religious and private organizations and, second, through the lowest form of political organization closest to the individual or individuals concerned.

There is election gold in the hills

In their search for votes in this presidential election year, the Democrats seem to feel that they have staked out a real Klondike strike in our aged. And the Forand bill is the sluiceway which is expected to wash out solid gold nuggets of bloc votes in every State. The estimated cost of the Forand bill is $1.1 billion for the first year, and nearly $6 billion over a 5-year period is to me not the main consideration, bad enough as it is. The Forand bill and all other measures promising "more" or the most to 17 million of our citizens over 65 is merely a continuation of a welfare State trend which has become a matter of increasing concern to the economist, the believer in a free enterprise system, and the constitutionalist.

One of the charges leveled against Marxism is that it envisions and strenuously works for the elimination of the family with many of the family's functions transferred to the State. Communist China, in her fanatic drive toward the commune system, has gone further in this direction than older brother Russia. The Marxists correctly, from their viewpoint, regard the family as a serious hindrance in setting up the Communist utopia. As far back as we have any historical evidence, the family, as a unit, cared for its own elderly people. One of the first steps taken by the Bolsheviks in Russia after they seized power, was to abolish all charitable and welfare work of the Orthodox Church. The Soviet state was to be the sole protector and guardian of the aged, ill, and disabled. The Soviet state was a jealous state and would tolerate no other agency standing between it and its enslaved masses, even in the fields of welfare, social insurance, relief, and charity.

Mankind passed from a state of savagery to one of semicivilization when men began to care for their ill and aged instead of dispatching them as a hindrance, or turning them adrift to starve as a costly nuisance. Many savages, even until recent times, practiced geronticide because the rigors of nature and chronic semistarvation made care for the aged and crippled an intolerable burden on the tribe or social unit.

As men became semicivilized and the influence of religion spread over the world, greater and greater concern was devoted to the aged, the helpless, and the disabled. Hospitals and shelters for the indigent aged were first set up by the church. Each family, rich or poor, took care of its own elderly members. Only those elderly and helpless poor who had no living relatives found their way to the poorhouse or a religious-supported home or shelter. Every family from Japan to England, and this country, regardless of religion or race, took care of its own elderly people. It was a matter of fierce pride that even the very poorest took care of their own.

A moral retrogression

All this has now changed, at least in this country, thanks to social security. It is now considered shameful for older people to be taken care of in their declining years by their children whom they nourished and spent small fortunes on "bringing up." Sending one's parents to the poorhouse so that one can buy a new house or a new and flashier auto would, of course, be considered a bit raw; but the same individual sees nothing shameful in turning his parents adrift to shift for themselves on a meager social security pittance. They earned this social security themselves, and whatever deficits have to be made up come out of the public treasury—i.e., somebody else's pocket.

The impersonal arm of a vast bureaucracy centered in Washington can never transmit to the individual recipient the warmth and personal feeling of a family sheltering and protecting its own. Even religious, charitable, or fraternal assistance at local level, because it has been and remains in direct personal contact with the recipient, is bound to be a warmer and more sympathetic bond than that of a mere statistical figure in a bureaucratic budget. And I believe it has been amply demonstrated that Federal collection, administration, and distribution of welfare funds is bound to cost more because of higher administrative overhead than the same process carried on within the community and administered by the community or by private organizations.

We went through all this years ago, and I am sorry to bring it up again, but I still do not understand why it is shameful and humiliating to expect support from one's children but ruggedly independent and dignified to accept a thinly disguised dole from the public exchequer in the form of a monthly security check.

Nor has anyone pointed out the fundamental immorality of taxing those who already take care of their own aged relatives in addition to helping support others whose

children pass their own obligations on to the state. Then there are many spinsters and bachelors who devoted their lives to caring for their parents until they died, and never married as a result of discharging such an obligation. They are now taxed at the higher rates for single persons to help pay the enormous annual cost of caring for those whose own children refuse to do so. One of the most shameful situations presently plaguing welfare agencies in this country is the subsidization by the state of wholesale bastardy practiced by women who have made illegitimacy a "profession," or at least a source of easy and steady income. It should have been plain years ago to even the most obtuse that once we open the Pandora's box of the welfare state, we cannot stop at any particular point or draw the line against any particular segment of the population. Bismarck tried it in Germany 80 years ago, only to learn that the Socialists would invariably raise the ante every time he threw in a new concession.

All of us, left, right, and center, make numerous speeches and declamations against the evils of communism. We affect great horror and deep moral indignation over the brutal methods used by the Chinese Reds in setting up the commune system and their calculated destruction of the ages-old Chinese family system. We lose sight of the fact that it is just as easy to slip unintentionally into a hole on a dark night as it is to jump down into it deliberately in the daytime.

The gradual and imperceptible erosion of the family through ill-advised and misguided welfare schemes over a period of years may bring us in the not too distant future to a commune system of social organization with cradle-to-grave welfarism. Goldsmith's often quoted couplet might well be paraphrased and brought up to date:

"Ill fares the land to hastening ills a prey,
Where welfarism is accelerated and the family is permitted to decay."

XLII

AGRICULTURAL ACCOMPLISHMENTS AT A GLANCE, 1953–60

Total agricultural assets are at an alltime high of $208.2 billion as of January 1, 1960.

Owner equities on January 1, 1960, were $37 billion above January 1, 1953, and hit a new peak of $184.2 billion.

Farm ownership is at a record high, and there is a smaller proportion of tenants than ever before.

Farm foreclosures are near an alltime record low.

Total financial assets of farmers, including farmer cooperatives, have risen from $16.7 billion in January of 1953 to $19.4 billion, January 1, 1960.

Farm debt amounts to only 11½ percent of the value of farm assets.

The standard of living on farms is the highest in history, measured in terms of electrical appliances, automobiles and other conveniences owned by farm families.

Repeal of Federal taxes on gasoline used in tractors and other machinery saves farmers $60 million a year.

Farmers in 1954 were benefited by the largest tax reduction in history.

Per capita farm income rose from $838 in 1950 to $960 in 1959.

Well administered emergency livestock feed programs have helped farmers and ranchers overcome effects of drought, floods, and other natural disasters.

Approximately $600 million a year has been extended in disaster and drought aid since 1953. Such aid enabled families to stay on the land.

The Water Facilities Act was amended to provide for direct and insured loans for certain soil and water conservation activities in all States. Prior to this amendment, the act had applied to the westernmost States only.

Legislation has been achieved which has held down the accumulation of surpluses by the Government by an amount estimated to total $14 billion through adjustment in price supports, Public Law 480 and the soil bank.

A major reorganization of the Department of Agriculture was effected in 1953 to improve the quantity and quality of its services to the farmer.

The bipartisan National Agricultural Advisory Commission was established in 1953 to review agricultural policies and work with the administration in developing and administering farm programs.

Social security coverage was extended to farmers in 1954, ending 19 years of discrimination.

The Rural Electrification Administration continues to meet the growing demand for electric and telephone service in rural areas, including the expanding needs of rural industry. More than one-third of all REA electrification loans have been made since January 1953. During this 7½-year period, about 925,000 new consumers have been added to the lines of REA-financed electric systems. In calendar year 1959, five out of six of these were nonfarm consumers. An estimated 1 million subscribers have received new or improved telephone service since January 1953 as a result of the REA telephone loan program. Electric loans in fiscal 1960 amounted to more than $200 million; telephone loans exceeded $100 million.

The rural development program is raising living standards of those on the lowest rung of the economic ladder through the cooperation of the Federal Government and local authorities, and private leadership. Work is progressing in 30 States and Puerto Rico.

Stabilization

The payment-in-kind export program for grain and cotton came into being in 1956 and 1958. This program resulted in higher prices to producers. This also resulted in less commodities coming to CCC—a saving to the Government.

The new uniform grain storage agreement rates in effect July 1, 1960, will mean a saving of between $85 and $100 million annually. The 19 percent lower storage rates generally represent a net saving to farmers who use commercial facilities.

More than $20 billion worth of food and fiber was moved out of storage and into use at home and abroad in less than 7 years through aggressive disposal efforts.

More than 28 million acres of farmland have been taken out of production by the conservation reserve program of the soil bank. These acres would have otherwise added to surpluses. In addition, participating farmers—while adding to their income—are making unprecedented strides in the conservation of soil, water, forests, and wildlife resources.

Credit

Total credit extended farmers by the Farmers Home Administration during fiscal 1960 is estimated at $310 million, compared with $228.7 million in 1953. Arrangements were made in 1959 for FHA credit to more fully meet the needs of part-time farmers. Loans totaling $12 million will be made in rural development counties in 1960; the 1959 total was $10.2 million.

The agricultural credit system was made more responsive to farmers' needs. The Farm Credit Administration was made an independent agency.

Exports

The Food for Peace program was set in motion by President Eisenhower and is enabling the United States and other food exporting nations to better share their abundance with people in the free world. It is helping to feed hungry people, is supporting economic development of friendly countries, is providing additional outlets for U.S. farm production, and is helping to develop future markets.

Exports grew from $2.8 billion in 1953 to an alltime high of $4.7 billion in fiscal 1957 and for the past 3 years has averaged about $4 billion per year. Exports in fiscal 1960 are estimated at $4.5 billion, the second highest total on record.

The agricultural attaché system was returned to USDA from the State Department to make more effective efforts to expand foreign markets for farmers.

Forest Service

Operation Outdoors was set up to expand family recreational facilities in the national forests. In 1953, 35.4 million people visited the national forests; in 1959 the number was 81,521,000. The Forest Service has built 7,036 new family units for camping and picnicking and rehabilitated 8,973. It has also built 23 new intersports areas, 38 new swimming places, and 10 new organization campsites.

A new milestone was reached by the Forest Service in 1959 when for the first time 2 billion trees were planted, double the 1958 record.

Timber cut in national forests is at the rate of 8.3 billion board-feet, the highest on record. The income from these sales largely offsets the cost of running the national forests.

National forest receipts passed the billion dollar mark in 1958. It took 50 years to collect this amount from use fees and the sale of forest resources. In 1959 receipts hit $142.7 million. At this rate it will take less than 10 years to collect the second billion dollars.

Progress has been made in reducing forest fire losses and in 1957 were reduced to an all-time low.

Marketing

The special milk program was inaugurated in 1954. The program in 1960 operated in 83,000 schools and child care institutions where nearly 2.4 billion half pints of milk helped improve diets of our children.

The school lunch program absorbs large quantities of plentiful foods and improves diets of 13 million participating children. Fiscal 1960 purchases totaled $540 million. Complete meals in 1960 were increased more than one billion over the one billion served in 1951.

About 60 million people in 82 foreign countries have been receiving food and fiber donated by the United States. Over 4 million American people are sharing in our abundance through donations of surplus foods.

In periods of oversupply, 906 million pounds of meat products, poultry, and eggs worth $388 million were bought for the school lunch program, welfare institutions and needy people. Cattle, hog, poultry and egg prices were thus bolstered without the Government getting into the meat business.

Producers of dairy products, one of the mainstays of agriculture, will receive estimated cash receipts of $4.7 billion in 1960, an alltime high.

A major consumer health protection measure, the Poultry Products Inspection Act, went into effect January 1, 1959. During the first year nearly 5 billion pounds of poultry were examined and certified as wholesome.

Research

Appropriations for agricultural research have been increased by 117 percent since 1953. Much of this has gone into successful research to find new uses for our farm abundance, and to develop new crops for current needs.

Research workers in 1959 discovered the mechanism of plant growth. In a major

breakthrough they isolated a pigment that controls germination, flowering, and seed formation.

Important new facilities were established to insure future agricultural progress and livestock health. Among these is the Plum Island Animal Disease Laboratory in Long Island Sound, where diseases foreign to our country are being studied for control purposes. Native diseases will be studied at the new National Animal Disease Laboratory at Ames, Iowa. Victories have been registered in the battle against two serious livestock diseases—screwworm infestation in cattle in the Southeastern United States and vesicular exanthema in hogs.

New concepts in eradication of insect pests have resulted from the successful use of radiation in the sterile-male method against screwworm in Florida.

Success was achieved in the campaign to help wipe out an outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease in Mexico, which, had it spread, would have meant incalculable losses for U.S. stockmen.

The drive to eradicate brucellosis from the United States passed a milestone in June 1960 when New Hampshire became the first State completely free of the disease. Twenty-four other States have almost eliminated the disease. (Brucellosis is a primary threat to the Nation's cattle; in man it is known as undulant fever.)

Soil conservation

The Great Plains conservation program was established in 1956 and is operating in 351 counties. A total of 12 million acres was covered by cost-sharing contracts as of May 1, 1960. The long-range purpose is to minimize drought, flood, and wind-erosion damage in the Western States once embraced in the Dust Bowl.

The number of soil conservation districts assisted in 1959 totaled 2,865, compared to 2,493 in 1952. The land of 21 States, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, is covered by soil conservation districts.

In recognition of the Nation's mounting need for water conservation, this Department has stressed protection of watersheds. As of June 1, 1960, 236 local watershed projects in 45 States were receiving assistance. Authorizations for planning assistance had been extended to 549 projects in 48 States.

The importance of water to farm and city people has been stressed by this administration. The first Soil and Water Conservation Advisory Committee was established and meets regularly to plan for the future.

The internal revenue law was amended to permit farmers and ranchers to deduct from their taxes expenditures made for installing certain soil- and water-conservation practices.

XLIII

THE USE OF INTELLIGENCE AGENTS AND RUSSIAN ESPIONAGE IN THE UNITED STATES

(By U.S. Senator ROMAN L. HRUSKA, of Nebraska)

There is a great uproar around the world at the discovery that the Armed Forces defending the free world against the onslaught of Communist tyranny employ espionage as part of this defense.

The Red dictator, Nikita S. Khrushchev, expresses a great moral distress at this discovery. Some of our allies profess to be dismayed that we use intelligence agents to gather intelligence regarding the plans of an enemy who has brayed out that he intends to "bury us."

It is not for me at this time to dwell on what is presently occurring in this area, but I should like to explore what the headwaters of this problem really are, and to relate some of the disclosures and reports of the Internal Security Subcommittee which have been recorded through the years, and which are well documented.

Where are the headwaters of this problem, Mr. President? The answer to that question has been overflowing into the record all over the world for the past 43 years. Let me give a few summaries from that record.

I quote first from the Second Report of the Subcommittee on Internal Security of March 22, 1954, on "Activities of U.S. Citizens Employed by the United Nations":

"On December 13, 1917, Lenin's handful of Bolsheviks, who had just seized the government of Russia, appropriated 2 million rubles for the needs of the revolutionary internationalist movement. Here is the language of the official ordinance as published in the Gazette of the Temporary Workers and Peasants Government, December 13, 1917, and furnished to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee by Secretary of State Charles Evans Hughes:

" 'The Soviet of Peoples Commissars considers it necessary to come forth with all aid, including financial aid, to the assistance of the left, international wing of the workers movement of all countries, entirely regardless whether those countries are at war with Russia, or in an alliance, or whether they retain their neutrality.'

"This was the original declaration of revolution against the civilized governments of the world. It was an official statement. It was implemented also by Moscow-inspired revolutionary activity on every continent of the globe.

"In 1920, Woodrow Wilson's Secretary of State, Bainbridge Colby, looked at the plain facts of Communist activity, which were visible everywhere then, as they are now, and arrived at this conclusion:

" 'The existing regime in Russia is based upon the negation of every principle of honor and good faith. * * * The responsible leaders of the regime have frequently and openly boasted that they are willing to sign agreements and undertakings with foreign powers while not having the slightest intention of observing such undertakings or carrying out such agreements.

" 'They have made it quite plain that they intend to use every means, including, of course, diplomatic agencies, to promote such revolutionary movements in other countries.

" 'Inevitably, therefore, the diplomatic service of the Bolshevist Government would become a channel for intrigues and the propaganda of revolt against the institutions and laws of countries, with which it was at peace.'

"In 1921, the British Government granted de facto recognition to the Soviet Government by means of a trade agreement. The agreement provided for the prohibition of Bolshevik propaganda in Great Britain. Only 2 short years later, Britain threatened to terminate that agreement because Soviet agents were spreading anti-British propaganda in Afghanistan, Persia, and India.

"In 1924, regardless of what had already happened, Britain granted the U.S.S.R. de jure recognition. Three years later it terminated both the trade agreement and recognition because the Soviet diplomatic service in Great Britain was acting as a "channel for intrigues and the propaganda of revolt," precisely as our American Secretary of State had predicted 7 years before. ("Trends in Russian Foreign Policy," pp. 5, 7, 8, 10.)

"In 1924, China and the U.S.S.R. established 'normal' diplomatic relations. Under the treaty each country was to refrain from spreading propaganda against the institutions of the other. Three years later China broke off relations because the Soviet diplomatic service, once more was acting as a channel for intrigues and the propaganda of revolt (ibid., pp. 8, 10, 11).

"In 1924, Mexico recognized the U.S.S.R. In 1930, Mexico withdrew that recognition (ibid., pp. 9, 11).

"In 1926 Uruguay recognized the U.S.S.R. In 1935, Uruguay withdrew that recognition, charging Communist activity in Uruguay and elsewhere in South America (ibid., pp. 9, 15)."

Despite this record of Soviet perfidy, the United States extended diplomatic recognition to the Soviet Government in 1933 after an exchange of letters between President Roosevelt and Maxim Litvinov, Soviet Foreign Minister, in which Litvinov pledged that the Soviet Union would:

"(1) respect the United States and refrain from interference in the internal affairs of the United States or its territories or possessions.

"(2) refrain from any propaganda, or acts to disturb the tranquility, prosperity, order or security of the United States.

"(3) prevent the formation of any group on Soviet soil, which has the aim of overthrowing the political or social order of the whole or any part of the United States."

This was the first agreement the Soviet Union ever signed with the United States. It was violating the agreement at the very moment that Litivinov was putting his signature to it, it has never ceased to violate this agreement, and it is still violating this agreement today, 27 years after it was signed.

Now I will continue with excerpts from the Internal Security Subcommittee document on "Soviet Political Agreements and Results."

"In 1945 the Soviet Government was still our ally, in the war to establish the principles of the Atlantic Charter. In September of that year, Igor Gousenko, a Soviet diplomat, went to the Canadian Government with documents which caused an immediate investigation by a specially appointed Canadian Royal Commission. When that investigation was concluded, the Royal Commission found:

" 'There exists in Canada a fifth column organized and directed by Russian agents in Canada and in Russia' (the report of the Royal Commission, p. 685).

" 'Members of the staff of the Russian Embassy at Ottawa were actively engaged in inadmissible espionage activities' (ibid., p. 686).

"The Royal Commission also stated:

" 'So far as the evidence discloses, the first head of the Military Intelligence espionage system in Canada after the arrival of the Soviet Minister was Sergei N. Koudriavtzev, whose official title was First Secretary of the Legation [later Embassy]' (ibid., p. 15).

" 'Major Sokolov, on his arrival in Ottawa in 1942, began to reform the previous organization, and was directed by Molier, who has been identified as one Mikhailev, an official of the Soviet consulate in New York who came to Canada for that purpose' (ibid., p. 15)."

On October 28, 1953, Ismail Ege, former chief of the Fourth Section of Soviet Military Intelligence, appeared before the subcommittee. He testified that the General Staff Intelligence Department of the Soviet Union used international bodies to coduct espionage. He proved his point by showing that Sergei Koudriavtzev, who had been head of the Red spy apparatus in Canada, later joined the Soviet delegation to the United Nations.

Let us also remember, Mr. President, that Judith Coplon's espionage partner, Valentin Gubitchev, was attached to the Soviet delegation to the United Nations. He was caught redhanded, in company with Coplon herself, and found guilty, but the U.S. Government returned him to the Soviet Union instead of sending him to prison.

On May 12, 1949, Kirill Mikhailovich Alexsev, who had been attached to the Soviet Embassy in Mexico, told the subcommittee that "all responsible workers of a Soviet Embassy are members of the secret intelligence service of the Soviet Government."

In 1951 the Special Committee on Un-Filipino Activities of the Philippine Government found that "the Communist Party is the vanguard of the Soviet Union here; its border patrol on Filipino shores."

In 1955, an Australian Royal Commission found that there had been operating, out of the Soviet Embassy in Canberra, a Soviet spy apparatus of the same kind that was discovered in Canada. Vladimir Petrov, the defector from the Embassy who uncovered this apparatus, made a memorable statement about his country's espionage activities. Here is what he said—as quoted in the Internal Security Subcommittee Annual Report for 1957:

"Espionage is a distinct and principal Soviet industry. This must be so; because the Soviet Union, alone of all the great powers, regards itself as being in a continuous and chronic state of covert warfare with the whole world outside the borders of the Communist empire. And conspiratorial techniques are natural to a regime that seized power and maintains power by conspiratorial methods. Soviet espionage has reaped a rich harvest by such methods, especially against friendly and unsuspecting countries."

I read now from the Internal Security Subcommittee publication, "Soviet Political Agreements and Results," a staff study published in 1959:

"May 10, 1948: Costa Rica broke relations with the U.S.S.R., because the Costa Rican Communist Party with the help of international communism had taken control of the Government, which provoked a civil war."

The same document tells us, Mr. President, that Brazil, Chile, Cuba, Venezuela, Israel, Australia, Guatemala, and Iraq have all suspended diplomatic relations with the U.S.S.R. since World War II. The same document tells us that:

"The Canadian Government ordered home G. F. Popov, Second Secretary of the Soviet Embassy, because he was engaged in espionage.

"The United Nations ordered home Viktor Ivanovich Petrov, a Russian employee of its Secretariat, because he was engaged in espionage."

Last summer, Alexander Urevitch Kaznachoev fled from his post in the Soviet Embassy in Rangoon and took refuge in the U.S. Embassy. He told the Associated Press that the main occupation of all the Soviet Embassy staff—in Rangoon—is to spy.

Kaznachoev appeared before the subcommittee on December 14, 1959, to tell of his espionage activities under the orders of the Kremlin. He told us that his espionage chief in Rangoon was Ivan Vozsiy, who masqueraded as First Secretary of the Soviet Embassy.

J. Edgar Hoover, who knows more about this subject than any man in the United States, summarized the story in a speech made before the United American Mechanics in Charleston, W. Va., on June 16, 1959, as follows:

"As the No. 1 target of worldwide communism, the United States is the prime objective of Soviet espionage. Soviet defectors are unanimous in stating that between 70 and 80 percent of Russian officials in the United States are members of the Red intelligence Services. The importance that the U.S.S.R. is currently attaching to the value of these intelligence agents is vividly borne out by the sharp increase in the number of Soviet diplomatic personnel assigned to the United States. In May 1954 there were 212 Soviet officials in the United States. Five years later that number has increased to 313, or an increase of almost 50 percent.

"Soviet espionage activities in this country expose the fallacy of so-called peaceful coexistence in recent years; pseudo appeals for peace by Communists have been more than matched by intensified Communist espionage efforts in the United States. Using blackmail, bribery, and similar techniques, Communist agents, many with diplomatic immunity, are stepping up their efforts to obtain our military, scientific, and industrial secrets for use against us."

Mr. Hoover intently analyzed the 17th National Convention of the Communist Party, U.S.A., which was held in December 1959. The Subcommittee on Internal Security published his findings. Here is a part of what he said:

"The party will remain in the future—as it has been in the past—an obedient slave of Moscow. No new personalities were brought into the party's top leadership. Rather, leadership is today exercised by the same corps of hardened, disciplined, veteran Communists who feel that Moscow represents the final goal of all of mankind's hopes. So-called rightwing Communists are not represented. They have either voluntarily resigned in complete disillusionment or been coldbloodedly purged.

"The Communist conspiracy in America today is led by a man who has openly boasted that he was willing to take up arms and fight to overthrow our form of government. Hall was convicted in Minneapolis, Minn., in 1934, in connection with a riot there when he was a member of the Young Communist League. During his trial he testified as follows:

" 'Question. But you would prefer the Russian—you would prefer to be in Russia?

" 'Answer. I prefer America with a Soviet Government.

" 'Question. And you are willing to fight and overthrow this Government?

" 'Answer. Absolutely.

" 'Question. And you are willing to take up arms and overthrow the constituted authorities?

" 'Answer. When the time comes, Yes'."

Only a few weeks ago, the Subcommittee on Internal Security summoned Hall to the witness stand and read him the words I have just quoted to you and gave him opportunity to disavow them. He refused it.

Mr. President, it is my suggestion that we not lose our heads at the revelation that the free world uses espionage to defend itself.

Let us look at the headwaters of the stream.

Let us remember the words of the Communist manifesto:

"The Communists disdain to conceal their views and aims. They openly declare that their ends can be attained only by the forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions."

XLIV

THE WORK OF THE SENATE IN 1960

(By Senator JACOB K. JAVITS, of New York)

(This is a summary of the activities of the U.S. Senate in the 2d sess. of the 86th Cong.)

Peace and free world leadership

In spite of a strong Communist offensive, the United States strengthened its position of peace leadership by its policies respecting the newly emerging nations of Africa in the explosive Congo situation, by our partnership with the South and Central American countries in the Organization of American States with reference to the Dominican Republic and Cuba; and by our calm handling of the Far East crises in Korea and Laos.

Communist pressure on Japan is clear evidence of the strength of the forces with which the United States and the free world have had to contend.

The series of Soviet "cold war" thrusts over the U–2 incident, the collapse of the Paris summit conference, cancellation of the President's trip to Japan after his triumphant visit to Taiwan, the Philippines, and Korea, and the Cuban crisis have been climaxed by the Moscow spy trial of U–2 pilot, Francis Powers and the Kremlin's attempt through it to indict U.S. foreign policy. But these moves appear to have failed to realize their objective.

Ratification of the United States-Japan Mutual Security Pact strengthens Japan in preserving freedom and democracy. The Communists know that Japan is the most industrialized nation in the Far East, and their designs on it form part of their whole effort to divide the free world by weakening it economically. Let any businessman think for a moment what competition would be like if Japan were in the hands of the Communists who could direct its economy to the disadvantage of the free world.

Cuba must respect human rights and liberties

There has been great concern over the deterioration of relations between the United States and Cuba. The President has made it clear that the United States will adhere to a policy of nonintervention in the domestic affairs of other countries and will scrupulously observe our treaty commitments as a member of the Organization of American States. We will insist that Cuba has to respect its obligations under international law, and human rights and liberties under the OAS and U.N. Charters. Our country has shown great forbearance and skill in handling a very trying situation in a new historic partnership policy succeeding the good neighbor policy with the other American Republics; also our sugar legislation sharply reduced Cuban and Dominican sugar imports into the United States.

The decisive struggle with communism in the 1960's will be economic, but survival is primary to winning such a struggle. Therefore we must always be able to lead in the quest for world peace from a position of adequate military posture to carry out our worldwide responsibilities considering modern rocket and missile and conventional weapons and defenses against them.

Fighting the economic cold war

On the economic front of competitive coexistence, the United States and the industrialized countries of the free world are seeking to coordinate their aid efforts to underdeveloped countries and to work out solutions of trade and other economic problems.

The national economic growth of the United States and the free world can be stimulated to a remarkable degree by an upsurge in the export-import trade of all the non-Communist nations. During 1958 and 1959 the United States experienced a $7 billion balance of payments deficit in large part attributable to lack of exports. This trend was reversed during the first quarter of 1960 when U.S. exports exceeded imports at the annual rate of $3 billion; this year our balance of payments position will be substantially improved.

In order to assure continued increase and adequate economic expansion to meet our world peace responsibilities and the Soviet challenge: On March 17 the President proclaimed a program of export promotion including the extension of short-term credit guarantees by the Export-Import Bank along with vastly increased informational and other activities by the Department of Commerce.

Economic cooperation with other nations

The spirit of cooperation is necessary to launch a joint effort among the nations of the free world, particularly those in Western Europe, to aid underdeveloped regions. There are excellent prospects that Western Europe will join a partnership program to raise aid and investment to the less developed nations now estimated at about $4 billion annually to 50 percent above the present effort. A new treaty nation organization, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), is now in formation of which the United States,

Canada, and 18 Western European nations will be members to effectuate this objective. The removal of trade barriers in Western Europe without discrimination against the United States would not only encourage U.S. sales abroad but would also stimulate third countries to produce what they can most economically.

Another problem is that of reconciling the interests of two present European trade blocs: The six nations in the European Economic Community—France, Germany, Italy, Belgium, Holland, and Luxembourg; and the seven nations in the European Free Trade Area—United Kingdom, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Switzerland, Austria, and Portugal.

Legislation was enacted authorizing the appointment of a U.S. Citizens Commission on NATO to participate with similar commissions from other NATO countries in exploring means of cooperation and unity of purpose among the NATO nations to develop democratic freedom by economic and political means.

The Antarctic Treaty

Ratification of the Antarctic Treaty which seeks to keep the Antarctic region open to international cooperation, scientific exploration, and peaceful nonmilitary uses; while inaugurating a system of inspection by observers which may prove most useful in disarmament negotiation with the Soviets.

Mutual security

Strengthening the economies of free world nations and affording a satisfactory rate of development to less developed nations constitute a prime objective of the mutual security program.

Congress appropriated $3,787,350,000 for mutual security as against the mutual security authorization of $4,086,300,000 and $4,175 million requested by the President. Of the amount appropriated, $1.8 billion was voted for military aid funds, $675 million for defense support, $230 million for economic aid, $150 million for technical assistance, $550 million for the Development Loan Fund and $250 million for use in the President's contingency fund in the Congo and other emergencies. Also included in the new Mutual Security Act is a provision establishing an East-West cultural center in Hawaii and a plan for a North-South cultural center in Puerto Rico.

The International Development Association

The Senate approved American participation in the International Development Association.

The IDA makes it possible to expand use of soft nonconvertible local currencies available for loans for development purposes.

It will be an arm of the World Bank with membership of 68 countries and a total initial subscription of $1 billion of which the Senate authorized a $320,290,000 5-year subscription.

National defense and space

Congress has approved a national defense budget for fiscal 1961 of $39,996,608,000, approximately half of the Nation's total budget, and $661,608,000 more than the President's request. Of this amount $4,177,773,000 is for research and development.

The defense appropriations contain sizable increases in funds for construction of Polaris and nuclear attack submarines; continue the Army modernization program and expand our airborne alert capability. Congress also voted $293 million for construction of an aircraft carrier.

At the President's request, Congress voted substantial increases in funds for nonmilitary space projects under the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. These funds will further our plans to keep moving ahead vigorously with an intensive program of scientific exploration and with the development of the large rockets essential to the conquest of outer space. The launching of Echo I and the successful recovery of the Discoverer capsule are exciting portents of what is to come in this exploration of space and shows that we are making material progress closing the gap between ourselves and the U.S.S.R.

Budget and taxes

In his budget message, the President estimated spending at $79,800 million and revenues at $84 billion leaving a surplus of $4,200 million. The total of the appropriations bills enacted by the Congress is $82,816 million.

It is always essential to eliminate wasteful and unnecessary items from the Federal budget, but at a time when the cold war with the Communist world is phasing into a decisive struggle in economic competition, we have to be cautious about any relaxation of our defense and security needs and the requirement of our developing economy. In this connection the President recommended closing certain tax loopholes and the elimination of special tax privileges so that the anticipated surplus may be applied to the reduction of the national debt now about $290 billion.

Depressed areas legislation

The Congress passed a bill to assist chronically depressed areas in our Nation by creating new employment opportunities through grants, loans, and technical assistance, but failed to override the President's veto, which was based upon the high cost of this program.

Labor and minimum wage

The Senate passed the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1960, increasing the Federal minimum wage to $1.10 per hour in 1961, $1.20 in 1962, and $1.25 in 1963, and extending wage and hour protection under the act to approximately 4 million workers not previously covered, principally employees in larger retail and retail-service industries. The House bill called for $1.15 per hour and, as compromise proved impossible, the legislation will have to be acted on again next year. It is important that certain retail, service, and other enterprises, by reason of size, volume, geographical, or seasonal considerations, should not suffer under the new act, and in such cases exemptions must be obtained to prevent competitive disadvantage or injustice to particular groups.

Housing

The Senate passed a housing bill which extended the FHA home improvement program 1 year, increased urban renewal—slum clearance—funds by $350 million, provided $500 million for loans for college housing, and extended and improved the FHA mortgage insurance program. The bill contained a number of provisions, including permission to FHA to lower premium rates from one-half to one-quarter percent, removal of the ceiling on relocation payments for individuals, families, and businesses whose housing is being demolished in the urban renewal program, and increases in the limit which New York colleges could borrow under the college housing program.

The House failed to act on this measure, and there was enacted during the closing hours of the session legislation to extend for 1 year the title I home improvement program, provide $500 million in college housing loan funds, and $50 million in loans for public facilities in small communities.

Education and health

The Federal Government needs to aid the State and local governments in meeting their education needs. This is essential in our national interest under present conditions at home and abroad. The bill to provide Federal matching grants for school construction and to help the State to raise teachers salaries was defeated in the Senate which then passed a bill totaling $1.8 billion over a 2-year period. A similar measure providing $1.3 billion for construction only over a 4-year period was passed by the House of Representatives. There was no opportunity for a House-Senate conference and the bill will have to be acted on again next year.

The objective of Federal aid for adequate health care insurance for our older citizens 65 years of age and over must and will be attained. Enactment of the social security bill, H.R. 12580, assures adequate medical health care for citizens over 65 who are indigent due to medical bills or are receiving old-age assistance. These number over 3 million persons. It is most regrettable that in addition, a plan could not be evolved now for the many people of moderate income estimated at 10 to 11 million who are in need of such health care insurance. There was just no chance to work it out as is normally done here under the conditions of the brief congressional session.

Civil rights and civil liberties

After 8 weeks of debate, the Senate passed the Civil Rights Act of 1960, and it was signed into law by the President. The bill helps further to protect the rights of all Americans to vote by including power for the Attorney General to inspect registration records and for the Federal courts to appoint voting referees where there is a pattern of local voting discrimination, who could register persons who have been denied the right to vote. It also includes provisions to put the FBI on finding and bringing to justice those guilty of hate bombings like those of schools, homes, churches, and synagogues; made unlawful interference with court orders, such as these requiring desegregation of public schools; and provided for the education of armed services personnel's children when local schools are closed to avoid desegregation.

Immigration

Action in the Congress on immigration this year was limited to passage of House Joint Resolution 397 which would admit approximately 5,000 refugees from Europe, and to legislation continuing the alien orphan program for another year.

Post office and social security

A 7½-percent pay raise bill to provide higher salaries for postal workers and other Federal employees was enacted.

The Federal Government has a clear responsibility to be a fair employer itself and to give enlightened leadership to private enterprise throughout the Nation in the treatment of its own personnel.

The Social Security Amendment of 1960 liberalized the provisions which allow beneficiaries to increase their earnings above $1,200 a year.

Agriculture

Our farm problem is not one of shortages, but rather one of surplus and plenty.

The present surplus of wheat has become a major national problem in terms of public investment immobilized and high storage costs as well as in its serious effects upon the future welfare of our farmers.

The President has repeatedly asked for new farm legislation but such has not been forthcoming. Apparently some find it easier to deal with this problem as a political issue than to deal with it in actuality.

Veterans

Public Law 86–211 revising the pension program for the benefit of veterans, widows of veterans, and their children was enacted in the first session of this Congress.

At this session, several bills applying to limited groups of veterans were passed, in keeping with our policy of taking care of those who sacrificed so much to guard our freedoms.

Conclusion

The citizens of the United States of America have responded in ever increasing numbers to express their views on matters of

national interest, as well as on problems in which they have a personal interest.

It is always heartening to know that our constituents feel free to write about their problems or about any issues on which they have decided opinions.

XLV

THE GOLDEN ANNIVERSARY OF WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON CHILDREN AND YOUTH

(By Senator FRANK CARLSON, of Kansas)

On March 27, 1960, 7,000 people assembled in Washington for a conference.

It was an event of great significance for the future of the Nation because those 7,000 people came from all over the country and some from abroad to talk about our children. They were taking part in the 1960 White House Conference on Children and Youth.

The President of the United States addressed the conference at its first meeting. During the following week the delegates discussed the problems and needs of American youngsters and made proposals for meeting their needs.

The White House Conference on Children and Youth is a citizens' conference. It is organized and run by the people of the United States, acting through local, State, and National organizations under the direction of a committee of 92 representative citizens who were appointed by President Eisenhower. Congress provided some funds for basic organization in the budget of the Children's Bureau, but most of the cost of the conference has been met by foundations, organizations, industry, and individuals.

President Theodore Roosevelt authorized first conference

It has become a good American tradition to take stock every 10 years of conditions for our children. The 1960 White House Conference was the sixth such national gathering. The first such conference brought 200 child welfare leaders together in Washington early in 1909, on the invitation of President Theodore Roosevelt. Each one of the conferences stressed a different aspect of child welfare. Each conference has had important influences on legislation and services for children.

The 1909 conference dealt with just one subject—dependent children. Its chief aim was to stimulate nationwide interest in getting homeless and neglected children out of old-fashioned orphan asylums and into good adoptive or foster homes. This first conference produced a historic statement on the value of home life for children, which laid the foundation for the widows' pension movement and aid to dependent children program. Other recommendations led to the establishment of the Children's Bureau and the organization of the Child Welfare League of America, and encouraged the growth of adoption agencies.

The second White House Conference on Children, in 1919, drafted minimum standards for child employment, child protection, and maternal and child health. These standards formed the basis for many State child labor laws, for the Sheppard-Towner Act, and for the maternal and child health program under the Social Security Act. The recommendations of the 1930 Conference were summarized in a Children's Charter which proclaimed the right of every American child, "regardless of race, or color, or situation," to health, education, decent housing, an adequate standard of living, and a home. These recommendations, too, are reflected in provisions of the Social Security Act.

Ten years later, the 1940 Conference outlined a program for State and local action to improve conditions and services for children in all sections of the country, in the cities, and on the farms. World War II interfered with carrying out most of this program. But it was a program for the decades. The 1960 White House Conference could well come up with many of the same recommendations, and we would be working on them for years to come.

Fortunately, one of the achievements of the 1950 Conference was the creation of machinery for citizen action. Lay and professional groups interested in children banded together in a Council of National Organizations on Children and Youth. Committees formed in many States to plan for the welfare of young people coordinated their activities through a National Council of State Committees. These bodies, which functioned through the 1950's, have been preparing for the 1960 Conference. After the Conference is over, they will go to work to carry out its recommendations. In the executive branch of the Federal Government, an Interdepartmental Committee on Children and Youth has been cooperating with these citizen organizations.

Careful preparation for 1960 conference

People all over the country worked for more than a year to get ready for the 1960 conference. In every State and territory, there was a White House Conference committee, appointed by the Governor. County committees were organized in more than half the counties of the United States. Doctors, social workers, clergymen, teachers, lawyers, college professors, businessmen, labor leaders, farmers, and housewives worked on these committees. Public opinion polls, factfinding surveys and studies, town meetings and local, regional, and State conferences are some of the ways the local and State committees used to collect information for the reports they prepared for the White House Conference. Some of these reports were quite voluminous, and they formed the most detailed body of information yet compiled on State and local services for young people.

It is estimated that nearly 5 million people had some part in this tremendous preliminary activity. Many of them were teenagers, high school and college students. These youngsters worked actively with local and State committees; they participated in conferences with their elders. They held youth conferences of their own, and came up with very good and serious recommendations.

Nearly 1,000 of these young people attended this year's Conference as full-fledged delegates. The Conference not only talked about youth, it listened to what youth had to say.

Affect on children of the sweeping changes of the 1960's

Fifty years after the first White House Conference on Children, this Golden Anniversary Conference met at the end of a decade which witnessed breathtaking changes in our country and in the world. The next decade is likely to bring even more sweeping changes.

This conference considered the impact of these changes on the lives of our children today and tomorrow. It was concerned with the strain which our exploding population has placed on all services for children.

It considered such problems as broken homes, working mothers, children with mental or emotional handicaps, children with physical handicaps, delinquent youngsters, and young people without skills needed in order to get jobs in this age of automation.

The delegates had to try to anticipate the problems of the 1960's. They proposed ways of meeting the shortages of schoolteachers and classrooms, of qualified social workers, health workers, and vocational counselors. As President Eisenhower wrote in his letter calling the 1960 White House Conference:

"The rapidly changing times in which we live * * * make it incumbent upon us to do everything we can to plan ahead and to see that we prepare today's children well for life in tomorrow's world."

And plan ahead they did. The 1960 conference represented not the end of a stock-taking process as might have been expected in view of the precise preparation, but a beginning. The delegates learned much from each other and what they learned they took home to their States, their communities, their churches, schools, and civic organizations.

They learned from their factfinding and studies about services that are lacking. They made inventories of unmet needs.

With the impetus of the 1960 White House Conference they will be able to go ahead with the most important part of their work, for the most important part of this Golden Anniversary Conference on Children and Youth will be the action taken after it by American citizens, to carry out the programs which they themselves proposed.

It will be up to them to see that all American children have an equal opportunity to grow in freedom in the world of today and tomorrow.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. First, I want to thank the distinguished majority leader for the courteous and dignified way in which he has presided as majority leader, and the helpful way in which he has extended assistance to many of us. Secondly, I ask this question of the distinguished minority leader: We adopted a resolution which instructed the majority leader and the minority leader to notify the President that we were about to adjourn. I wanted to ask them whether the Senate could be privileged to hear a report as to what the President had said to them at the time when he was notified that we were about to adjourn.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, we will make that statement at the proper time.

Mr. KEATING. Later?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Yes. I understand the other body has already performed its mission, and we plan to carry ours out.

Mr. KEATING. I was very much interested in what the President might have said.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, has consent been obtained to keep the RECORD open for a brief period of time after adjournment?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am informed that the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] has already obtained that permission.

Mr. BENNETT. For how many days?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Until Wednesday, September 21.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Did I correctly understand the Senator from Texas to say he wished to have a vote on the Yarborough resolution tonight?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I would hope we could vote on the pending proposal and other proposals before the Senate. The question of whether we do so is entirely up to the Senate.

I appreciate the Senator's letting me get these matters out of the way, because the minority leader and I have some chores.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am perfectly willing to vote, but I would like to have the yeas and nays ordered, in order that Senators may know that there will be a yea and nay vote on the Yarborough amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is a matter for the Senate to decide, but I hope the Senator from Delaware will withhold that request.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I withhold it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If the Senator wants the yeas and nays ordered at a later time on any of these proposals, the majority leader will be cooperative and will help him try to have them ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I understand.

AREA REDEVELOPMENT

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a letter from the Department of Commerce on the matter of area redevelopment.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., September 1, 1960.

Hon. PAUL DOUGLAS,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR DOUGLAS: Because I believe the public should be informed as to exactly why new legislation to aid those few areas with chronic unemployment failed to pass in this resumed session of the Congress—despite the urgent request of the administration and the desire of Members of the Congress for such action—I am responding to your recent press release by correcting some of its errors and by setting the record straight.

This is not a case of quiddities and quillets over some language in a bill, as some imply. Nor is the crux of the matter whether—as you insist—the administration has or has not assumed a no compromise posture. Plainly, it has not. The issue is far more basic. It is a fundamental difference of principle. This is the difference between those who prefer an economy controlled and regulated by an all powerful centralized government as contrasted with those who place chief reliance on private initiative and local resources to establish free private jobs in a free society. As the record shows, the administration has repeatedly agreed to compromise and has compromised on a multitude of features affecting distressed area legislation while making it plain that these fundamental American principles must remain inviolate.

The basic features of the bill to which you adhere suggest a purpose to achieve centralized government control over the sources of production in the United States. One major objective of current distressed area legislation has been to give a preference to particular localities in their efforts to attract new industry—new enterprises which, as all must agree, do not spring Minerva-like from the forehead of Government but from the confidence in free initiative inspired by our kind of society. It is one thing to espouse this objective but it is quite another thing to insist, as opponents of the administration bill do, that this must be accomplished by and only by—

Financing, including outright grants, so preponderantly Federal as to amount to virtual Federal control of the establishment and location of plants, Federal control of production and supply, Federal control of jobs;

Dilution of this preference so widely as to make it meaningless to particular communities in genuine distress—thus fruitlessly expanding bureaucratic authority over American industry;

Setting the stage for what amounts to Federal piracy of plants from healthy economic regions of the country, unfair competition, displacement of settled jobs, introduction of controls, restrictions and confusion and the inevitable destruction of personal freedoms. In my opinion, no statutory language could protect Peter from Paul under your bill.

Ironically, the bill you sponsor would do less for the areas of chronic unemployment in your own State than would the bill sponsored by the President these past 5 years. Illinois, which has no major depressed areas, has four minor areas under the tests of the administration bill and five such areas within the terms of your proposal. However, the allocation of funds, prorated on the basis of numbers of unemployed, would be as follows:

Name	Number unemployed, March 1960	Administration bill	Douglas bill
Harrisburg	4,600	$682,500	$322,500
Herrin-Murphysboro, West Frankfort	12,050	1,785,000	840,000
Mount Carmel-Olney	1,375	----------	97,500
Mount Vernon	2,850	427,500	195,000

It is not in accord with the facts to allege that the administration is not interested in low income rural areas, in loans to small business in rural areas, in increased loans for public facilities with preference for areas of chronic and persistent unemployment. The truth is that:

1. The administration bill originated the idea of preference money for public facility loans and, through the Housing and Home Finance Agency, would make available to areas of chronic labor surplus twice as much money for such purposes as does your bill. Parenthetically, I do not wish to adopt any numbers game with regard to depressed area legislation. Obviously the important thing is how the funds are used rather than the total amount, since the funds initially appropriated can always be adjusted from year to year in the discretion of Congress if the need is present.

2. The countrywide rural development program to assist low income rural areas is strong and successful despite the dampers placed upon it by restrictive legislation. Nevertheless, aided by a speeded-up rural development program, off-farm income of farm families is increasing more rapidly than ever and has now reached a rate of $6.8 billion per year.

3. The Small Business Administration loan program with regard to rural areas is producing new jobs in these areas at the fastest rate ever, $95 million loaned to small business under this program.

Attempts by anyone to describe the administration as uncompromising are refuted by the fact that the new features of the administration bill, long buried in your committee, include an increased business loan fund, expanded criteria for eligibility, enhanced vocational training funds and vastly increased loan funds for public facilities including—contrary to the assertion of some critics—funds for bringing public facilities to industrial parks and other like developments.

The administration has made statesmanlike compromises and so have others who at first wanted certain details. The pity is the attitude of those few in positions of legislative power who insist upon "all or nothing." For insistence on "nothing" has blocked the passage of a jobmaking bill that would have had the overwhelming support of the Congress and the administration and that attitude has left distressed areas in the lurch—with an issue but without the jobs they could have had.

The public will sense that behind the current issue is a more fundamental question: the basic choice between those who seem to want to place the jobs and production of this country under the thumb of Federal bureaucracy versus the aim of this administration and those who believe in our free society to establish a sound private, local, State, and Federal partnership to provide private jobs in private plants in areas of truly chronic and persistent unemployment.

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP A. RAY,
Under Secretary of Commerce.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, and take up the nominations on the calendar starting with New Reports.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that consideration of executive nominations begin with "New Reports." There are objections to the present consideration of the nomination on the first page.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that those nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, may I ask if action has been taken on the nomination in the Interstate Commerce Commission?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. No; action on that nomination has been withheld. Several Senators have asked that they be notified.

U.S. COAST GUARD

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Coast Guard.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the U.S. Coast Guard be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Coast Guard will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

U.S. CIRCUIT JUDGE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of J. Joseph Smith, of Connecticut, to be a U.S. circuit judge for the second circuit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the Senators from Connecticut have been consulted. We have reviewed the matter very carefully. I believe there are other nominations at the desk, to which there is no objection.

U.S. ATTORNEYS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Cornelius W. Wickersham, Jr., to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of George M. Yeager, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Alaska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of William H. Timbers to be U.S. district judge for the district of Connecticut.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of the nominations today confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be so notified.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR RANDOLPH

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I rise at this time to pay tribute to my colleague, Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH. I consider it an honor to serve in this distinguished body with him.

There are many compliments which could be paid to Senator RANDOLPH. His activities in the Congress have been numerous. His awareness of his responsibilities is unfaltering. At all times Senator RANDOLPH has had the interests of West Virginians at heart, but his thoughts are not limited to his own State. He is a servant of all Americans. At all times he has thought of and voted for legislation which, he believes, will best serve the interests of every citizen of the United States.

As a representative of the people of West Virginia, Senator RANDOLPH has been most effective.

The passage of the coal research bill, so important to West Virginia, was expedited through the combined efforts of many Senators. Senator RANDOLPH was one of the leaders in the fight to secure this much needed legislation.

The Senator was also very helpful in having the depressed areas bill passed by the Senate. When I conducted hearings on unemployment in West Virginia during January 1959, Senator RANDOLPH's aid was very worthy of commendation. As a member of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, he possesses an invaluable knowledge which has been of great help to the committee.

His work on the committee has been lauded by many. Senator RANDOLPH's deep concern regarding the problem of unemployment has been shown many times over in his constant striving for the solution which is needed.

Senator RANDOLPH's work for a Youth Conservation Corps has been outstanding. He succeeded in proving the double benefit to be derived from such legislation—the provision of employment opportunities for our young men and the utilization of their work to preserve the forests of our land.

Many have been the times when Senator RANDOLPH and I have met with officials in the departments in an attempt to improve and to enlarge the surplus agricultural commodities program for needy families. We have had meetings, too, with officials in an effort to curb the ever-increasing tide of residual oil imports, which have been so detrimental to the coal industry.

Senator RANDOLPH's activities in connection with the minimum wage legislation during this session of Congress have been extensive.

These are but a few of the activities in which the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] has engaged.

Senator RANDOLPH's voting attendance record is excellent. His participation and interest in legislation debated on the floor of the Senate have been witnessed by all. His cogent observations and objective questioning have often added to the debate on a wide range of topics.

Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH is a man who has much personal appeal. He has a warm personality, which generates graciousness and good naturedness. He is liked by all who serve with him.

His record of service shows the wide range of subjects which have contributed to his personality. Senator RANDOLPH is a journalist, an educator, and a businessman. In all of these endeavors, history has recorded his successes, but, notwithstanding these accomplishments, his record as a public servant stands at the pinnacle.

Mr. President, I have known JENNINGS RANDOLPH for quite a long time. I have come to know him better, of course, in my service with him in the Senate of the United States. His conscientious approach and sincerity of purpose have been devoid of selfishness, and to me it seems have been motivated by his profound desire to serve his country and his fellow men.

Perhaps my thoughts could be better expressed by those lines written by a poet whose name I do not recall but who I think had in mind someone like JENNINGS RANDOLPH when he penned them:

"How far away is the temple of fame?"
Said a youth at the dawn of the day.
He toiled and strove for a deathless name;
The hours went by and the evening came,
Leaving him old and feeble and lame,
To plod on his cheerless way.

"How far away is the temple of good?"
Said another youth at the dawn of the day.
He toiled in the spirit of brotherhood,
To help and succor as best he could
The poor and unfortunate multitude,
In its hard and cheerless way.

He was careless alike of praise or blame,
But after his work was done,
An angel of glory from heaven came
To write on high his immortal name,
And to proclaim the truth that the temple of fame
And the temple of good are one.

For this is the lesson that history
Has taught since the world began;
That those whose memories never die,
But shine like stars in the human sky,
And brighter glow as the years go by,
Are the men who live for man.

Mr. President, I believe that Senator RANDOLPH is a public servant, a dedicated representative, a great Senator who endeavors to live for his fellow man.

Mr. McNAMARA and Mr. HOLLAND addressed the Chair.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I yield first to the Senator from Michigan, and then I shall yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for yielding.

Very little could be added to the high praise the Senator has heaped upon his colleague today.

I have had the pleasure of working rather closely with Senator RANDOLPH, and I wish to say "Amen" to the fine things said about him. The recitation of the very fine poem I think is quite apropos, because he is a "propeople Senator." I have found him to be exactly that.

Reference has been made to his work on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I have the honor of being the chairman of the Subcommittee on the Problems of the Aged and the Aging. Senator RANDOLPH has been a tireless worker on the subcommittee. Not only did he attend all of the hearings in Washington, but he traveled throughout the country. He was a great help in the building of a very fine record, which will stand, I am sure, as a monument to the subcommittee of which I have the honor of being chairman.

There are many other things in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare we could relate, but time is too valuable at this point.

The Senator did not make reference to the work of Senator RANDOLPH on the Public Works Committee. His long experience on the Public Works Committee of the House has proved to be of tremendous value to the Public Works Committee of the Senate. He not only has knowledge of the field but also contact with Members of the other body who, time and time again, have proved themselves to be of value to us in accomplishing that which is necessary.

There is a necessity for human, personal contact between the two Houses.

His long service in the House is really of very great value not only because of his seniority but also because of the personal contacts his personality has brought about over a period of years.

These are two very important and very hard-working committees. Most Senators serve on only two committees, but Senator RANDOLPH serves on a third committee, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

It has been a very active committee at this session. We all know that your colleague is running for reelection, but because of the work that he has had to do here and to which he has been so dedicated in his service to the people, he has neglected his own personal opportunities to return home and campaign. I think that it has been pointed out that he is most unselfish, and I think that devotion to duty demonstrates his unselfishness very well. I am happy to join in expressing my appreciation of the colleague of the junior Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I am very appreciative of the words which have been spoken by my delightful friend from Michigan. I am especially grateful for his having referred to Senator RANDOLPH'S service in the House of Representatives. Senator RANDOLPH served 14 years in the House of Representatives, and he served there with distinction. His experience in the House of Representatives equipped him admirably for his continuing in service in this great body.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I wish to join in saying a word or two about my good friend of so many years, JENNINGS RANDOLPH, the senior Senator from the State which was my mother's home before she came to Florida. I have had the pleasure not only of a delightful acquaintance with JENNINGS RANDOLPH, but also of being his guest in West Virginia. I believe I know something of the deep affection which the people of West Virginia feel toward him.

He is a graduate of the West Virginia schools. He has served continuously for a long time as trustee of two of the old colleges of West Virginia, Davis and Elkins, and Salem.

He has engaged in so many civic and educational activities in that State that I could not begin to list them. He has peculiar experience which has fitted him particularly to do a great job here in the Senate, growing out of his 14 years in the House, his chairmanship of the House of Representatives Post Office and Civil Service Committee, and his intimate familiarity with the public works field, in which, I may say, he and his distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from West Virginia, have been so assiduous that every time they appear before the Appropriations Committee we know that it is in support of some project that has been authorized which they want to get started immediately.

I commend both of those Senators for having so actively and aggressively pressed for the initiation of important projects in their State, probably to a greater degree than they would have normally, but because of the serious unemployment in their good State and their work on the initiation of those programs. Several important projects have been begun under their insistence, because of their urging. They have successfully urged that work started there would be a practical way of beginning to take up the slack in employment.

The distinguished junior Senator from West Virginia, and the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan have said so many things that are entirely truthful about the fine service of JENNINGS RANDOLPH that I shall not repeat them, but I simply wish to say that I think the span covered by the assignments of the two Senators from West Virginia has enabled them to jump into the breach in a remarkable way to help solve the problems which are bearing so hard upon that good State. I have felt frequently that they were both entitled to great commendation.

As to the senior Senator from West Virginia, I know of no one who is more articulate or able to speak more persuasively and appealingly or in more perfect language than he. I believe he was a professor of speech at college before he came to the House of Representatives. His entire experience has been so well rounded as to enable him to render exceedingly good service indeed, unusual service to his State. He has proceeded to do so through the exercise of unusual industry and aggressiveness.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I am very grateful to the Senator from Florida for his comments concerning the service of my distinguished colleague. I am appreciative, too, for his kind words in my behalf. I think it should be said that the Senator from Florida has always been very conscious of the needs of West Virginia, a State that is very close to him, and he has never ceased to be helpful to my colleague and me in whatever we have tried to do for our people. I should not want to pass up this opportunity without expressing my gratitude, and, of course, that of my colleague, to the senior Senator from Florida.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, it was my great fortune to serve in the House of Representatives with the then Congressman and now Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH. I say great pleasure.

I should add great profit, because I learned from the industry, from the devotion to duty, from the steadfastness of purpose that one can accomplish a great deal as a Congressman, even though he be but 1 of 435.

JENNINGS RANDOLPH was more than merely 1 of 435, a great deal more. He was a force in and of himself. Well do I recall the leadership he took in highway improvement in the House of Representatives. I think it is fortunate for the Senate and for the country that he is now a member of the Highway Subcommittee in the U.S. Senate. In that capacity he has contributed greatly to the prosecution, to the building, to the carrying on of the program of highway improvement, not only in the State of West Virginia, but in Tennessee, Texas, Alaska, and in all of our States.

The concept which Senator RANDOLPH has of highway transportation is a national one, a broad one. He has always demonstrated the capacity, however, to understand the local problems of transportation.

We have witnessed his interest in many fields where recently, as the able Senator knows, he took a most active, forceful, and effective part in the passage of the bill to provide medical care, hospitalization, and other medical benefits for those of our citizens who have advanced in years beyond their income-producing years. For the people who are in want and pain, who are lonely and need the helping hand of our Government, Senator RANDOLPH was ready to fight.

He is an outstanding man. My personal relations with him make it difficult for me to find terminal facilities. We lived only one house apart here in Washington. I know him not only as a fellow Senator but as a neighbor.

He is the kind of man one likes to have for a neighbor, and the kind of a man and gentleman one likes to have for a colleague in the Senate. I daresay he is the kind of man that the overwhelming number of people in West Virginia will want as their U.S. Senator.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. My colleague will cherish the words which have been spoken so sincerely by our friend from Tennessee. I thank him for his contribution.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield to the senior Senator from Alaska.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I subscribe to every sentiment concerning Senator RANDOLPH that has been uttered here. He is a good Senator. He is an able Senator. My acquaintance with the senior Senator from West Virginia dates back over a period of 16 years. A moment ago the Senator from Tennessee commented on the interest that Senator RANDOLPH has had both as a Member of the House of Representatives and as a U.S. Senator in the highway program through the United States. I can attest to that from personal knowledge. I served with him for a good many years in the House when he was a voting Representative from West Virginia and I was a Delegate from the then Territory of Alaska. I first came to know him well when he traveled to Alaska as a member of the Roads Committee. He expressed and maintained a tremendous interest in the roads of Alaska. That interest extended to the borders of every State.

He is, as the Senator from Florida has noted, a first rate speaker, one of the very best in the land. He is a man of driving energy, and he directs that energy into constructive channels. All of us who have been associated with him in the Senate have observed the expression of that energy, even in the cloakroom, where we have noted it, without any intention of eavesdropping. When he is not on the floor or his office he is in the cloakroom constantly making calls in behalf of his beloved people in West Virginia, working for them, and working for the people of the entire land.

He has been an adornment and an ornament of this body, as he was of the House of Representatives. I am happy on a personal basis that our association has been renewed in the Senate. It is well and appropriate and altogether beneficial that the junior Senator from West Virginia should call our attention this afternoon to the constructive work of his colleague from the great State of West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I find it difficult adequately to express my gratitude to the Senator from Alaska. It is best to say to him, "Thank you very much for your kind words in behalf of my colleague." I yield now to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished Senator from West Virginia, who entertains all of us with his poetry and remembers our birthdays, and is one of the most faithful men I have ever seen in this or any other body, for his thoughtfulness in remembering his colleague, the distinguished Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, who had to be away and could not be here this evening.

I serve on two committees with JENNINGS RANDOLPH, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. He is diligent in business. He is constant in attendance. He is fruitful of ideas. He is able in the advocacy of those ideas.

It is a privilege to serve with a man of his drive and ability. That is noted particularly by me in the field of veterans' affairs and in the field of education. He is a member of the Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee, of which I have the privilege to be chairman. Only last year we pushed through the GI bill of rights bill for GI's of the cold war, and in that drive JENNINGS RANDOLPH was in the forefront, in the subcommittee, in the full committee, and on the floor of the Senate.

He has shown his interest in the need for higher education by the fact that he is at the present time on the governing board of two colleges. That shows his interest in higher education and his knowledge of the subject.

In all our projects for higher education, JENNINGS RANDOLPH has been a stalwart fighter. He is one of the most thoughtful men in the Senate. I believe him to be one of the most knowledgeable men in the Senate, particularly in the field of higher education. To me, higher education is one of the greatest governmental lags that we have in our country today.

It is a privilege to serve with a man of JENNINGS RANDOLPH'S knowledge, drive, and his ability.

I again commend the distinguished Senator from West Virginia for his thoughtfulness in bringing this matter before the Senate this evening.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I would like to take this opportunity to extend my warm congratulations to a colleague who has been particularly helpful and who has demonstrated in this session his effectiveness in serving his State and his Nation.

I am referring to the Senator from West Virginia, JENNINGS RANDOLPH.

It is always a joy to be with JENNINGS RANDOLPH. An inner sense of breeding and good manners have made him the "Lord Chesterfield" of the Senate—a man whose courtesy is exceeded only by his good judgment.

I would also like to congratulate him upon his keen perception of the problems that face his people and the instinct that always leads him to the most effective solution to those problems. I look upon him as a friend, as an outstanding public servant, and as a legislator of great distinction, and I want to say publicly what I have said privately so many times, that West Virginia and the Nation are both well served by his presence in this body.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I thank the Senators from Texas. I know that my colleague, Senator RANDOLPH, will be grateful to the Senators who have said these many fine things in his behalf. I personally appreciate everything that has been said concerning my colleague.

DISSEMINATION OF POLITICAL OPINIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 374) amending Senate Resolution 305, authorizing the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to undertake a study of the uses of Government-licensed media for the dissemination of political opinions, news, and so forth.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I ask that the Senate approve Senate Resolution 374.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Has the Senator from Texas concluded his presentation?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I am ready to vote on the resolution. However, I do not believe that all Senators who desire to be heard on it have been heard. If no one else wishes to be heard, I ask that the Senate adopt the resolution.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

Mr. THURMOND. I object.

The legislative clerk resumed the call of the roll.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXTENSION OF MARKETING ORDER QUALITY STANDARDS TO IMPORTED WALNUTS AND DATES

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, 2 days ago the House of Representatives passed and sent to the Senate H.R. 12341. It deals with agriculture. Thus the jurisdiction of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry attached to the bill, and it was with the members of that committee that its fate lay.

I regret that the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, who has evinced no objection to the bill, nevertheless felt constrained, together with the members of his committee, not to have any further meetings. Thus, a bill which has the approval of the House of Representatives and of the Department of Agriculture remains here unable to receive what, had it come here earlier, I think would have been the approval of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and thereafter the approval of the Senate.

The bill deals with dates and walnuts. It is of extreme importance to many of the people whom I have the honor, in part, to represent. I refer to the report by the Committee on Agriculture in the House of Representatives, and I read a part of it:

> Domestic producers of both walnuts and dates have established marketing orders for their commodities under which those walnuts and dates which do not come up to standards of quality, grade, size, or maturity stipulated by the order are kept off of the market in their natural form and may be used only for processing. In the case of each of these commodities, a substantial portion of the harvest does not meet the standards established and is diverted to secondary uses.
>
> At the same time, both the domestic walnut producers and domestic date producers have undertaken programs to acquaint consumers with the high quality of their products and to increase consumer use and acceptance of them. Spokesmen for both groups of producers stated that these programs had had a substantial effect and had increased consumption in the United States of both walnuts and dates.
>
> Unless this legislation is enacted, there is nothing to prevent imported dates and walnuts which do not come up to the high standards set for these products by American producers being brought into this country for sale in unlimited quantities. This would have a serious effect on American producers and their marketing programs in two respects: (1) By selling a product of inferior quality on a generally quality-regulated market, a misleading and unfair price advantage may be obtained, and (2) consumer disappointment at receiving a product of inferior quality can seriously impair the efforts and expenditures of domestic producers to increase consumer acceptance and total sales of these products.

Mr. President, the House committee believed, and the House concurred, that legislation was necessary by which the Government of the United States might require that dates and walnuts which were imported into America have the same standards of quality as are required today by citizens of America who harvest and then attempt to sell dates and walnuts in this country.

Last night two attempts were made to attach this bill to pending measures by way of amendment. In each instance, failure resulted. I recognize that in the next few hours the 86th Congress will have concluded its labors and will have adjourned, pursuant to the resolution, sine die. My only purpose in detaining the Senate for these few minutes is to say that I very much hope that this legislation, now under study in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, may be made the first order of business and may be enacted in the next Congress.

I believe in reciprocal trade. I believe in reciprocal trade which is mutually profitable. I believe no one should apologize for standing in the U.S. Senate and urging that those who raise agricultural products in this country—and I speak now of the date grower and the walnut grower—should not be subjected competitively to an imported product whose quality is inferior to that to which he himself is subjected in this country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter dated November 6, 1959, from Acting Secretary of Agriculture True D. Morse to Hon. HAROLD D. COOLEY, chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., November 6, 1959.

Hon. HAROLD D. COOLEY,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN COOLEY: This is in reply to your request of January 14, 1959, for a report on H.R. 1018, a bill to amend section 8e of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, to include lemons, mandarins, all types of oranges including temples, tangerines, murcotts, tangelos, dried figs, fig paste, sliced dried figs, shelled walnuts, dates with pits, dates with pits removed, and products made entirely of dates in the list of commodities for which imports thereof must be regulated by grade, size, quality, and maturity in the same manner as the handling of part or all of the domestic commodity is regulated.

We do not object to the passage of this bill. The principle of equivalent quality regulations on the domestic and imported items we believe to be basically sound.

The principal citrus fruits added by this bill are oranges and lemons. We now have marketing orders in operation which regulate the quality of fresh oranges; consequently, imports thereof would come under regulation if this bill were to become law. U.S. imports of fresh oranges as well as fresh lemons are very small in relation to domestic production.

The proposal to add dried figs, fig paste, and sliced dried figs as well as dates and date products would result in the first semiperishable and semimanufactured items being added to the commodities for which imports are subject to regulation under section 8e of the said act. The marketing of dates and figs domestically is covered by marketing orders, and the imports thereof would come under equivalent quality regulation if this proposal were enacted into law. U.S. imports of figs and dates are very substantial. Most domestic figs are marketed in the form of fig paste, and most of the imported figs are imported in the form of fig paste.

It is suggested that the term "products made entirely of dates" as used in this bill be further clarified. We know of no date product (except those with moisture content below 5 percent) which consists 100 percent of date material. Date pieces are coated with rice flour or other material to produce a free-flowing product. Other products, such as date butter, contain preservatives or flavor intensifiers. Under our interpretation of the language contained in this bill, none of these products would be included. Moreover, it would be necessary at times to have the date product analyzed to determine whether in fact it was made entirely of dates. This would cause delays and accompanying difficulties in administration.

Imported figs, fig paste, shelled walnuts, dates, and date products are now subject to inspection by the Food and Drug Administration; however, we are advised that such inspections are made on a selective basis and some lots may enter the country uninspected. Although both the Food and Drug Administration and the Department of Agriculture inspections are directed at wholesomeness, the quality requirements of the Department of Agriculture under marketing orders may be different and apply to items of fruit quality not of direct concern to the Food and Drug Administration.

All commodities and products included under section 8e of the aforementioned act are required to be inspected and meet specified requirements at the port of entry. This means that every lot requires inspection by the Department of Agriculture, and the cost of such inspection is borne by the importer.

The cost of administering this amendment is estimated at $25,000 per year.

The Departments of State, Commerce, and Health, Education, and Welfare do not concur with the position taken by this Department on the proposed legislation. Enclosed are copies of letters from the above-mentioned Departments in which their views are set forth.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

TRUE D. MORSE,
Acting Secretary.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from California may yield to me, without losing the floor, so that I may make a brief statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE TO COMMUNICATE WITH THE PRESIDENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the committee appointed to communicate with the President, to see whether he has any communications to make to the Congress, has performed its duty.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider certain nominations which were overlooked, and which are at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

THE REGULAR AIR FORCE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Regular Air Force.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I understand that an objection on the other side has been withdrawn.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the nominations were considered and agreed to en bloc.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCCARTHY in the chair). Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

SURVEY ON FEDERAL AID FOR INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER LEARNING

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, my colleague [Mr. YARBOROUGH] has Senate Resolution 388. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 388.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 388) favoring a survey looking to Federal aid for institutions of higher learning.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I understand that the resolution has been submitted, and is favored by the Commissioner of Education and by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. The resolution does not propose any appropriation. It provides for a study. My colleague, the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], is very anxious to have the resolution acted upon; and I ask that the Senate give it its consideration.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, actually this is a request by the Senate to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to conduct a survey in this field of higher education and junior colleges, and to make a report. It would be made by those now within the framework of the personnel the Department already has; it appropriates no money.

The Secretary did call me, and expressed the hope that the resolution would be adopted.

For that reason, I am quite agreeable to concurring in the request for the consideration of the resolution at this time, and also the request that it be favorably acted upon.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is this the precursor of subsequent action that will require money to carry into effect a program which might be evolved from the proposed study?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. There have been a number of bills; one was introduced by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE]. The majority leader had a very meritorious bill, which was cosponsored by many other Senators, to guarantee loans to students in institutions of higher learning.

None of those bills was reported, due to the fact that the common situs picketing bill got in the way in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Some favored the bill of my colleague, the senior Senator from Texas, which called for the making of loans. Some believe that the need for additional classrooms is more urgent.

There will be one million more students, by 1964, in our institutions of higher learning, due to the fact that the children of World War II veterans will then be old enough to go to college.

This resolution directs the Secretary to report and to state what is found to be needed the most—whether funds to enable the students to go to college, and so forth, and also to report as to how the financing shall be done; and the resolution instructs him to make a survey in the whole field.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I notice that the resolution requests the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare "to review and survey various forms of potential Federal assistance for encouraging and helping institutions of higher learning, including junior and community colleges, to meet their critical needs, giving particular consideration to the desirability and feasibility of Federal assistance."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, let me say to the distinguished Senator from Ohio that one of the real concerns I had when we were considering the aid-to-education bill was the inadequacy of the data with which we had to work. I believe the time has come when we should have better data in regard to this field, as a predicate and a foundation from which to proceed and to operate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I hope the resolution will be agreed to, so the information can be collected. I do not want the resolution in any way to prejudice the bill I have; and I hope the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare will study my bill, because we have already made a fairly good study of it and have gotten the colleges and the student bodies of the country to give us their opinions. I hope we can obtain action on it early in the next session. It will not cost the Federal Government any money; it will establish an FHA for college students.

But I think it essential that we get up-to-date information in the field of education, because I believe it is the Nation's No. 1 problem; and I commend my colleague [Mr. YARBOROUGH] for his very active interest in this field and for the very great contributions he has made to it.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Moss in the chair). Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. THURMOND. I am opposed to this resolution. It is clearly an avenue by which to obtain more Federal funds for education, which is a violation of the Constitution of the United States.

The resolution provides that a study will be made, "giving particular consideration to the desirability and feasibility of Federal assistance." That is the object; and the entire study is to determine how much Federal assistance should be given to the States, with regard to certain plans for education.

Not only is that unconstitutional; but, furthermore, we do not have the money to give to the States for education. Furthermore, there is not a State in the Nation that is not in better shape to meet its educational responsibilities than is the Federal Government.

Mr. President, I am opposed to the resolution; and I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, if objection is made, is the resolution properly before the Senate?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. No; it can be objected to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is not before the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I will say it has not been reported by the committee.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from South Carolina objected.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Did the Senator from South Carolina object?

Mr. THURMOND. Yes, I objected.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I hope the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare will study the resolution, and will set men to the task called for by the resolution. I think the data requested will be valuable, and I hope the study can be made; and I hope it can be done without the resolution. I am sorry the resolution has not been reported by the committee, and I am sorry objection was made.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I wish to say that I have no objection to the collection of statistics. But when the resolution provides for "giving particular consideration to the desirability and feasibility of Federal assistance," it indicates to me that the purpose is to determine whether Federal assistance is needed; and, if so, how much; and so forth.

I think it is clear that that is the meaning; I think the Senator will agree that is the meaning. If the meaning is to give Federal assistance to education, I am opposed to it.

If the Senator wishes to reword the resolution, so as to call for the making of the study, but without giving Federal assistance, that will be different.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Does the resolution anywhere provide or state that a study of statistics shall be made? Does the word "statistics" appear in the resolution?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am not sure.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KUCHEL. Has objection been made to the resolution?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection was heard.

Mr. KUCHEL. Then I would like to reestablish my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has the floor.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so I may ask a question?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I should like to ask the majority leader what further business he is planning to transact before we adjourn tonight.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. We have two or three minor bills. It is possible we shall receive some messages from the House.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I understand the House has adjourned.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If the House had time to message over any differences, we may have amendments, we have the pending business, and I think that is all.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Many of us wish to cooperate with the majority leader and transact business which is essential, but we do not want to go on a merry-go-round and pass a lot of unnecessary bills on the last day. I wonder if we could get a list of the essential ones, act on them, and adjourn.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. So far as I know, other than the pending business, there is nothing of an important nature.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Many of us think the pending business is not very essential.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. We have H.R. 8712, involving leases on Indian lands. There are some objections to that. I do not want to say it is minor legislation. But it would be pretty difficult to get a quorum.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Being a realist, I know one will not be suggested.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Then there are H.R. 12574, H.R. 12622, H.R. 12777, and House Concurrent Resolution 693.

I understand the House has adjourned. Does the Senator from Illinois want to do anything about the immigration bill?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the House rejected all the Senate amendments, but in the form in which it has come back, I suppose it ought to be called up.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Could we not call it up now?

Mr. KUCHEL. No, Mr. President; I would like to make my speech now.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Other than the pending legislation, I would anticipate bringing up nothing before the Senate that would require a rollcall, or, if the Senator insists on a rollcall, as was mentioned earlier in the evening, and I said I would help him get it on any measure on which he wanted it, I would be forced to move to adjourn.

SURVEY ON FEDERAL AID FOR INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER LEARNING

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me briefly?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I desire to express my thanks to the distinguished majority leader and the distinguished

minority leader for their joint support of Senate resolution 388. This measure has been requested by the American Council on Higher Education and by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. It is a bipartisan resolution, jointly sponsored by a majority of the Democratic and Republican membership.

I think it is very regrettable that the Senate did not ask the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make the study, at least to show our interest in higher education, which is lagging far more than is the missile program. I am certain the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, being a former college president himself, will continue his study of this matter.

It seems to me very regrettable that the Senate of the United States should turn its back on the most critical need of the 180 million American people, and that is the need for survival, and education is the No. 1 requirement in the struggle for survival.

It will be recalled that Admiral Rickover said that the lead the Russians had over us in the missile field was nowhere nearly as dangerous as the difference in the comparative educational systems and our failure to build up our educational resources and opportunities.

I thank the leadership on both sides of the aisle for having the wisdom, judgment, and knowledge of what this country needs, and to ask the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to study the matter. The proposal does not appropriate one red cent; it merely asks for a study of this problem, which is a great American problem. I thank the leadership on both sides for their efforts.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me?

Mr. KUCHEL. For what purpose does the Senator ask me to yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. For a brief statement.

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield 1 minute to the able Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I think no resolution is necessary to obtain statistical information as to what the facilities are in institutions of higher learning, or the number of students desiring to enter those institutions. I think a telephone call to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare will achieve that objective, and I join the Senator from Texas in urging that a statistical study be made. But I cannot agree to go along with a resolution that directs him, in effect, to go through with a finding that Congress should begin financing what has traditionally and historically been a local and State function.

TRIBUTES TO THE LEADERSHIP

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, in these closing moments of the 86th Congress, I have the honor to stand on this side of the aisle as a member of the minority and express what has been expressed earlier—the great feeling and respect and esteem which the minority has for its leader and the respect and esteem which I feel sure is shared by those on the other side of the aisle.

EVERETT DIRKSEN has brought to his position of minority leader a vast and a unique experience, an unquestioned ability, one of the most gifted tongues in public life all across the country, and, beyond that, a perfectly wonderful personality and friendliness, which together have welded Republican Senators into an effective team which has devoted itself, as it has seen the light, to the cause of good government in our country.

I think I recall saying one time that the President of the United States indicated his own high regard not alone for the minority leader, but for the esprit de corps which in the 86th Congress has again and again been demonstrated by members of the minority.

Along with our leader, I pay tribute to the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire and the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts. Mr. BRIDGES and Mr. SALTONSTALL have worked unceasingly with the minority leader to achieve those goals which generally have been set forth in the repeated communications and utterances of the President and of the administration.

I wish to have my Republican colleagues know that to have been named whip for them during the 86th Congress will be a happy and memorable recollection which I shall cherish all the days of my life.

These words are said for the leadership. I am most proud to salute a gallant American statesman from Illinois as he has again and again achieved high success and unity not simply on this side of the aisle but also in the entire Chamber, for the good of the country. Only last night it was EVERETT DIRKSEN who rose and who demonstrated so convincingly the need for this country to follow the recommendations of our President, as Americans, with respect to the unhappy and ugly situation existing in part of the Western Hemisphere. It was EVERETT DIRKSEN who succeeded in that leadership in achieving an overwhelming vote in favor of the recommendations which our gallant President had made, as I say, not as a Republican, but as an American.

Mr. President, now I reach across the aisle and pay tribute to the majority leader as well, who acted as an American Senator when he joined with our Republican leader. Together most of us in this Chamber refused to be shackled or manacled by the regrettable action of the other body, and we stood together before this country and before the world demonstrating that we believe this administration is correct in what it urges with respect to the legislation in the field of sugar quotas, with all its important overtones of foreign policy.

Lastly, I wish to say to my friend from Montana, MIKE MANSFIELD, I am most grateful for his friendship to me over the years and, equally important, for his friendly counsel and assistance to all the minority. The majority whip is a distinguished American statesman, and I cherish his friendship.

This, Mr. President, is all I have to say, except that as we strive toward the last moments of the 86th Congress I am sure the Democratic leadership and the Republican leadership merit, deserve, and receive a unanimous vote of thanks for the effective manner in which the business of this session of the Congress has been conducted.

DISSEMINATION OF POLITICAL OPINIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 374) amending Senate Resolution 305, authorizing the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to undertake a study of the uses of Government-licensed media for the dissemination of political opinions, news, and so forth.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to Senate Resolution 374.

Mr. LAUSCHE and Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I move to table the resolution.

Mr. MAGNUSON and Mr. YARBOROUGH addressed the Chair.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I wonder if my friend from Ohio will permit me to make a unanimous-consent request before he moves to table the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio withhold his motion for that purpose?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Washington for that purpose, with the understanding that I shall not lose my right to the floor or my priority as to making the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Ohio? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE TO FILE A REPORT ON INTERCOASTAL WATERWAYS AND INTERCOASTAL SHIPPING

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I understand there is no general resolution for the purpose of filing reports. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce be permitted next week—since the Printing Office is so jammed with printing requests—to file a report on a long investigation which has been held on intercoastal waterways and intercoastal shipping.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Washington? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

DISSEMINATION OF POLITICAL OPINIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 374) amending Senate Resolution 305, authorizing the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to undertake a study of the uses of Government-licensed media for the dissemination of political opinions, news, and so forth.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I move to table the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio to table the resolution (S. Res. 374).

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Ohio withhold his motion for not over 5 minutes, so that I may make a few remarks?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from South Carolina with the same understanding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Ohio? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from South Carolina is recognized.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to Senate Resolution 374. I wish to say that in the first place a large percentage of the telecasting will be on video tape and can be secured from the broadcasting industry, if a question arises.

In the second place, programs will be seen or heard by congressional Members in the original instance, and therefore their minds will be made up prior to the next session, and they will know what they wish to do.

In the third place, the primary question arising from the suspension of section 315 of the Communications Act will be whether equal time is made available, and this obviously can be determined without monitoring.

In the fourth place, this is an FCC responsibility. What we are attempting to do under the resolution is to set up a subcommittee of a subcommittee of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee to supervise and to monitor the broadcasts this fall in the presidential race. There are seven members of the FCC appointed by the President, whose nominations are confirmed by the Senate for 7-year periods. Four of them come from one party and three from the other party. They perform this function. If we pass the resolution we shall be usurping the rights of the executive branch of the Government, which we do not have authority to do.

It is not the function of the Congress of the United States to conduct operations. Under the Constitution it is our function to legislate. It is the function of the executive branch to enforce the law. Exactly as the Congress makes the law, the executive branch enforces the law.

The executive branch of the Government has the FCC. The FCC is specifically delegated the authority and responsibility to do the very work the resolution embraces.

I think we shall be making a great mistake if the Congress attempts to be a watchdog and to supervise these elections, when the responsibility rests with the FCC. I believe we shall be entering into a dangerous field. If we pass this resolution, we shall be setting a precedent to go into that field in other respects.

Mr. President, I am strongly opposed to the resolution on principle. The amount of money involved is only $150,000. It is that much. We, of course, ought to save every dime we can.

Aside from the money, the principle involved is a dangerous one, because we are asked to encroach on the rights of the executive branch of the Government. If there is a desire to conduct any type of supervision, then the subcommittee can conduct such supervision through the FCC. The FCC itself is a proper and appropriate agency of the Government to do the monitoring and to conduct such operations as should be conducted, and to report to the subcommittee members. The subcommittee members can propound questions, and they can confer with the FCC to obtain any information they desire.

Either the subcommittee has in mind watching the election and taking some steps during the election, or it does not. If it does plan to do so, then it will certainly be conducting operations, which responsibility is reposed in the FCC. If it does not plan to do so, then the FCC after the election can report to the subcommittee of Congress and make such recommendations as it feels would be helpful.

I hope that the Senate will not adopt the resolution. Again I say that we are treading on dangerous ground. We frequently complain about the executive encroaching on the rights of Congress, the legislative branch. We complain about the Supreme Court encroaching on our rights as Members of the legislative branch. The resolution provides that we would do the very thing of which we have complained with respect to the other two branches of Government. We have only three branches of Government. We have the legislative branch that makes the law; the executive branch which enforces the law; and the judicial branch which interprets the law. We have the duty of making the laws. It is not our business to enforce the law. The executive branch enforces the law, and the particular agency that would have the particular responsibility involved here is the Federal Communications Commission. It is my sincere feeling that we should leave that responsibility to the FCC, with the subcommittee conferring and coordinating with that committee and making any suggestions or obtaining any information it desires from the FCC.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I do not like to detain Congress when it is time to adjourn. I did not realize that there would be this much opposition to a resolution appropriating a small sum of money to a subcommittee to do a job which I think we have discussed on many occasions in the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

So far as I know, all members of the committee in general agreed to the resolution. Whether the Senator from South Carolina was present at the time we did, I do not know; but surely he has a perfect right to offer his suggestions at this time.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have only 5 minutes. I will yield when I finish.

The Senator from South Carolina makes the point that there are three branches of Government: The executive, the judiciary, and the legislative, but the Senator from South Carolina knows that the FCC is an arm of Congress.

The FCC was created as an arm of Congress. It reports to Congress. It was created to do the things that Congress itself could not do in detail.

The executive department, through the FCC and these other agencies, enters into the picture only because an appointive power was necessary, and we gave that power to the President. Perhaps we made a mistake, because the members of the agencies sometimes are more concerned with their jobs, and who appoints them, than they are in the responsibility of carrying out the intent of the law.

I agree with the Senator from South Carolina that the resolution contains many implications that could go wrong. I have some faith in the members of our committee—the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], the Senator from Wyoming, and the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania—who are in wholehearted agreement on this resolution, and I believe they will do the right thing.

All we propose to do is to see that this great medium of expression, television and radio, is used fairly and equitably.

I know some instances in which it is not. Every Senator knows it.

We do not ask any favors for the Democrats or the Republicans. We simply wish to see that the procedure is correct, and that the best procedure is followed, although some practical problems are involved.

We wish to know that a newscaster, who has only so many minutes of time, will not favor one candidate over another. We want to know that the networks will do the right and fair thing.

Someone said to me, "Well, are they not giving free time to all candidates?"

Surely, they are giving free time. Senators know why. The reason is that we introduced a bill to make them do so, and then they said, "We will do it voluntarily." I think they want to do it. I believe they are going to do a good job.

The resolution simply provides that we shall take a look, and if the stations are doing the right thing, nobody will bother them. There are many places where they are not. The Senator from Arkansas headed a great committee of the Senate which had the same objectives in another field, and took a sort of "look-see" to see what was being done.

I believe that this is the responsibility of the Senate in the issuance of a Government license.

This media of communication is not like a newspaper. A newspaper can editorialize, and we see such editorials in Republican newspapers, Democratic newspapers, and independent newspapers.

A Government license is involved.

The question is not whether we shall appropriate $100,000 or $150,000. The subcommittee now has been allotted $35,000. I think we made it clear in our letter to the Rules Committee exactly what the resolution was intended to call for. We hoped it would work that way.

We stated a modest budget of employment. We would have four employees. We stated exactly what they would do, and if everything is all right in this great medium of communication to the American people, whether it is a political campaign or not, no one will bother the stations.

No person having a license or representing networks appeared in opposition to the resolution, and such people were invited. They agree. They would like to see their industry conducted in as fair and as equitable manner as it can be.

Whether the Senate approves or rejects the resolution makes no difference to me personally, and I am sure it would make no difference to the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH]. All we propose to do is to see that there is fair treatment accorded to everyone in a field in which a Government license is issued, and in a field where there is some responsibility on the part of Congress.

The FCC could take the responsibility. I think perhaps they would like to do it.

However, it is like asking the fox to take care of the henhouse. We have the responsibility; that is all it amounts to.

I shall not be unhappy if the Senate rejects the resolution; I shall not be happy if you do not reject it.

I think it is one of those things that maybe Congress should do at this time in the interest of all American people and the impact of this resolution upon their political lives and the future of the world, so that they can make a fair and decent choice on November 8 or in any other election.

If any Senator wishes to be responsible to say that this committee should not have the wherewithal to try to do a decent and honest "look-see" in carrying out its responsibility, it is all right with me.

Mr. President, I am sure it is all right with the Senator from Texas. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I would like to agree with my esteemed friend, the distinguished Senator from Washington, the chairman of my committee, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. There are a few things that should be brought out. The Senator from Ohio and the Senator from South Carolina both oppose the resolution. We opposed it in committee. We oppose it now on the floor of the Senate. I wish the RECORD to be clear on that point.

With regard to the FCC being an arm of Congress, it is true that Congress created the FCC. Congress created the ICC. Congress created all the governmental agencies. They are all responsive to Congress in a way. But again I say that under the Constitution Congress can only make the laws; the executive branch must enforce the law.

The legislative branch has no jurisdiction to enforce the law. We have no jurisdiction to enforce the law. The laws must be enforced through the executive branch of the Government. The executive branch of the Government, in this case, the FCC, is responsible to the President. It is up to the President to see that the governmental agencies do a good job. If they do not do a good job, there is a way of removing them. They can be impeached. That is our avenue of approach if they do not do a good job. It is our responsibility to take action if they do not do a good job.

I for one am ready to pursue that course. I say let us not take away from them their responsibility. Let us not usurp their responsibility. Let us not usurp the responsibility placed on the President by the Constitution.

The able and distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] said that the networks are doing the right thing because we passed a law. I do not know whether that is the reason they are doing it. Perhaps they are. We passed a law. That is all we can do. We can only pass a law. The executive branch of the Government must enforce that law. The FCC must enforce the law. The Senator said it is like putting the fox in the henhouse, turning this matter over to the FCC. It is their duty to take care of these matters. It is not at all like putting the fox in the henhouse. It is the duty of the governmental agency to do this job. It is their duty to supervise and regulate industry in this country. I, for one, feel it should be left to them. If they fail to do it, we can take action.

The distinguished Senator from Washington, the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and the committee can take action, and the President can take action, if the agency does not do a good job. We have that recourse.

Again I say we are treading on dangerous ground when Congress takes into itself the responsibility of monitoring and supervising and watching over these details on what goes on in the campaign. Again I say it is the responsibility of the Federal Communications Commission. That is where the responsibility should rest. If there is a failure there, we can take action.

I hope the Senate will see fit to table the resolution.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the resolution being voted on, Senate Resolution 374.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved, That Senate Resolution 305, agreed to June 14, 1960, authorizing the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to undertake a study of the uses of Government-licensed media for the dissemination of political opinions, news, and advertising, is amended on page 3, line 18, by striking out "$35,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$185,000".

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I move to table the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion to table.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I want to propound a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The quorum call must be terminated before such a request may be made.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

Mr. KEATING. I object.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I wanted to make a unanimous-consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request is not in order. The rollcall is proceeding. Objection was made to suspending it, so the call must proceed.

Mr. KEATING. I object to the termination of the quorum call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will continue the call of the roll.

The legislative clerk resumed the call of the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move that further proceedings under the quorum call be rescinded.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A motion may not be made to discontinue the quorum call.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The legislative clerk resumed the call of the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may not reserve the right to object. Does the Senator object?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I object until I have had a conference with the minority leader. I object.

Mr. President, after a short conference, I do not object. [Laughter.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the order for the quorum call is rescinded.

The Chair recognizes the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, when the resolution was before the Senate in June of this year, we had considerable discussion of the subject. A request was made for a rather substantial amount of money. Finally the proponents of the resolution agreed to accept $35,000.

I was opposed to the resolution, and I stated very frankly on the floor of the Senate that I thought it was political in character.

How can political discussions and political reflections on radio and TV be

objectively monitored by a committee consisting of Senators who are well identified with both parties? I make no exceptions. I do not speak in defense of the minority members of the committee or of the majority members of the committee. We are all steeped in the arena of politics.

It is very clear from the resolution what its purpose is. The purpose is to monitor political broadcasts, to hear what is said, and to determine whether there has been compliance with the revision of section 315.

Mr. President, that is not a function for a political committee; and a senatorial committee is a political committee, whether we like it or not. If I were on it, it would still be a political committee. I have been a candidate for office, and I think politically. This Chamber is, on occasion, a political arena.

One can try as he will, but in this business he does not completely divest himself of a political attitude.

So when there is a committee of Senators and a staff, all of whom think politically in an election year, one is bound to get the political overtones and the overriding political feeling when determining whether or not something that is said on a broadcast is worthy of complaint, and therefore should be reported and thoroughly investigated, and that a sense of fear and apprehension should be inspired on the part of the owners of a network or of a particular radio station. That element cannot be divorced from it.

I might show up on a television program, wearing a 10-gallon hat; and someone might ask me a question entirely nonpolitical, and perhaps the program would not even be a political program. But someone might suggest a question, and my answer to it might have some political overtones, and the result would be that it should be reported. If I were then a candidate for office, would my opponent be entitled to equal time?

I anticipate that a great many interesting and amazing difficulties, as well as political phenomena, could spring from a political witchhunt of that sort.

Mr. President, this is not a new position on my part; when the resolution was here before, I likewise stated the case.

We have a Federal Communications Commission. As I recall, it was created in 1934. At that time I was a Member of the House of Representatives, and I remember how carefully we spelled out the Commission's responsibilities and functions. Even at that time we had a discussion in regard to what its functions should be with respect to censorship and politics. But that is the administrative bureau of the Government which should be charged with this responsibility.

It is said that the Federal Communications Commission's monitoring extends only to engineering and to technical matters. If that is true, then the proponents of a proposal of this kind should ask for more funds for the Federal Communications Commission, so the Commission can properly evaluate its duties and carry out its responsibilities under the law, as written by Congress.

But that is not the kind of thing that should be done here. Here we are, on the 1st of September, within about 9 weeks of election day. I do not want any committee, either roaming around the country or settled here in Washington, to be monitoring every broadcast, to see the color of one's necktie, whether one is wearing a 10-gallon hat, whether one is reflecting upon someone on the other side of the political fence, whether one is talking about the unlighted candidacy of one who sought the Presidency on another occasion, whether one uses a term of endearment or not.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes, if I may do so without losing the floor.

Mr. KEATING. May I ask whether, following the remarks of the Senator from Illinois, debate will be in order on the motion to table?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Moss in the chair). No. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] withheld his motion, in order that there might be a quorum call, and did not renew the motion after the quorum call was withdrawn.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I did not withdraw my motion to table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A motion to table is not debatable. The question in the mind of the Chair was whether the Senator from Ohio withheld the motion to table, as he did on two or three occasions.

Mr. LAUSCHE. No, Mr. President, I did not; and the RECORD will not show any such withholding.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, if that is the case, the minority leader is definitely out of order, under the Senate rule, because there can be no debate when a motion to table has been made.

Mr. President, is it now incumbent upon me to apologize to the Senate for trespassing on its time? [Laughter.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator from Ohio did not withhold his motion, in order to permit a quorum call, then there is before the Senate a motion to table; and a motion to table is not debatable.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have the floor.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I call for the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A point of order has been raised, and the Chair has ruled on the point of order. The Senator from Ohio has stated that he did not withhold his motion to table. Therefore, the question before the Senate is on agreeing to the motion to table, which motion is not debatable.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry: If the motion to table was pending, as the lawyers say, ab initio, from the beginning, then how did the Senator from Illinois ever get the floor? [Laughter.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois has no right to the floor when a motion to table is pending before the body.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I most respectfully appeal from the ruling of the Chair, on the ground that it is ex post facto, because I have been talking for 10 minutes, and no Senator has been challenging my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion to table was made and was received before the remarks of the Senator from Illinois were made. The Senator from Ohio has stated that he did not withhold his motion to table.

Therefore, the question now before the Senate is on agreeing to the motion to table, which is not debatable.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois does not have the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have the floor unless the Chair rules that the motion to table, previously made by the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], is actually the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair so rules; it is the pending question.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Then, Mr. President, I propound a further parliamentary inquiry: How did I get the floor in the first instance? [Laughter.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As the Chair explained before, it was the understanding of the Chair that the Senator from Ohio had withheld his motion to lay on the table. But the Senator from Ohio now states that he did not withhold his motion to lay on the table.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I must, most respectfully, reject the suggestion——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table. [Putting the question.]

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I object.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard; and the clerk will continue with the call of the roll.

The legislative clerk resumed the call of the roll.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, is a quorum present?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. An inquiry is not in order at this time. The clerk is calling the roll.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Oh. I did not hear him. [Laughter.]

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, it has been a full hour and 15

minutes since the last name was called. At this rate it will take hours to call the roll.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the Senator is not in order. I call for the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is not in order. The clerk will continue to call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings——

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President——

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. What is the situation before the Senate?

Mr. KEATING. A point of order, Mr. President. Is a parliamentary inquiry in order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Not during a quorum call.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a point of order. Are we in the second call or the first call?

Mr. KEATING. A point of order, Mr. President.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The regular order, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will continue the call of the roll.

The legislative clerk resumed and concluded the call of the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 325]

Bartlett	Jackson	Monroney
Byrd, W. Va.	Javits	Morton
Cannon	Johnson, Tex.	Moss
Case, N.J.	Johnston, S.C.	Mundt
Case, S. Dak.	Jordan	Muskie
Church	Keating	Proxmire
Curtis	Kennedy	Randolph
Dirksen	Kuchel	Russell
Dworshak	Lausche	Smathers
Ellender	Long, Hawaii	Smith
Engle	Long, La.	Sparkman
Fong	Lusk	Symington
Gore	McCarthy	Thurmond
Green	McClellan	Williams, Del.
Hartke	McGee	Yarborough
Hayden	McNamara	Young, N. Dak.
Holland	Magnuson	
Hruska	Mansfield	

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] is absent because of a death in his family.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senators from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN and Mr. PROUTY], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senators from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER and Mr. BEALL], the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senators from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES and Mr. COTTON], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senators from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON and Mr. SCHOEPPEL], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Moss in the chair). A quorum is present.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wonder if my friend from Ohio will agree to withdraw his motion to table, with the understanding that I may make a brief statement, and with the further understanding that, when I yield the floor, I will yield it to him, and in the meantime that I will make no motions unless they are agreeable to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I yield on that basis, reserving to myself the right to the floor and to suggest the absence of a quorum and to make a motion to table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator's request to withdraw the motion with that understanding is agreed to.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF DEMOCRATIC CONGRESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, we are approaching the closing hours of the 2d session of the 86th Congress.

The close of a Congress is always a matter of great significance. It is a period of summing up; of judgment; of deciding whether the Congress has fulfilled its obligations to the American people.

But the adjournment of this session is of unusual importance in our history. It marks the close of the longest period of divided government this Nation has ever known.

For 6 years, the Congress of the United States has been controlled by one political party and the executive agencies of our Government by another. This is a situation which was not contemplated by the Founding Fathers and which political scientists have regarded with apprehension.

It would not be accurate to say that divided government brought our country to a paralysis or to a halt. This would have resulted had the Democratic majorities sought to use their strength to hamstring and harass the President. This they did not do.

Instead, the Democratic majorities adopted the philosophy that Americans must make the best out of the circumstances which prevail. The result was a remarkable series of achievements that have few—if any—parallels in American history.

The guidelines for the Democratic majorities could be summed up as an effort to seek the best and to attain the possible. It was decided that the best philosophy was to attempt to resolve, rather than create, issues and that some progress was preferable to no progress at all.

As a result, the Democratic Congresses succeeded in facing up to some of the most difficult issues of our times.

Two major civil rights bills were written into law after 82 years of total inactivity in this field.

The Austrian, German, and Japanese peace treaties were ratified.

The United States was authorized to participate in the International Finance Corp. to help solve the problems of the underdeveloped nations of the world.

Our country was committed to the concept of Atoms for Peace by ratification of the statute of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

An Inter-American Development Bank was established to accelerate the economic development of the nations of the Western Hemisphere.

An East-West Center was established in Hawaii to provide a meeting ground for the intellectual and cultural leaders of the East and the West.

The minimum wage was increased from 75 cents to a $1 an hour.

The largest roadbuilding program in history was launched.

The 1958 recession was met by prompt and vigorous Congressional action in the field of housing, public works, reclamation, and roadbuilding, and the beneficial effects of these programs became apparent the following year.

The Small Business Investment Act was approved to provide loans to State and federally chartered small business investment companies.

A program was launched under congressional initiative to bring the United States into the development and exploration of outer space.

Congressional recommendations were made to strengthen the Nation's defenses.

A landmark social security law established the basic principle of disability compensation at age 50 and extended the coverage of the act and lowered the retirement age for women.

The Upper Colorado River Basin project—the dream of conservationists for more than 50 years—finally became a reality.

Alaska and Hawaii were both admitted to the Union as States.

The Niagara River power development program was authorized.

The cloture rules of the Senate were liberalized.

Legislation to curb racketeering that was preying upon honorable working men and women was placed on the statute books.

Broad programs were enacted to provide housing for our people and keep our economy healthy.

The greatest health research programs in all recorded history were launched to give humanity some hope for relief from the killing and crippling diseases.

The controversial Antarctic Treaty was ratified, which holds forth the promise of securing one area of the world from warlike moves.

These are only a few of the achievements of the past 6 years. A more extended list will be placed in the RECORD at the end of this statement, and I ask unanimous consent that I may do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of all Members of the Senate to a statement I placed in the RECORD yesterday, showing that this year we have appropriated $211 million less than the amount requested by the Executive, and also a table showing that during the term of the present President, Congress has appropriated $12.7 billion less than that requested by the present Executive.

Despite these achievements, however, the strains of divided government were apparent at every turn. These strains became greater as we approached the decisive year of 1960 in which the American people will have the opportunity to bring divided government to an end.

It has not been possible to work out satisfactory legislation to meet the pressing problems of agriculture, primarily because of the difference between the congressional viewpoint and the viewpoint of the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Ezra Taft Benson.

Bills to aid the pockets of economic recession which scar the face of our country have been vetoed.

The only legislation attainable to help our senior citizens with their health problems is considered by many to be inadequate to the needs.

A needed boost in the wage floor could not be achieved—nor could extended coverage, even though the Senate by an overwhelming vote passed such a measure.

Legislation to help in the education of our children has become bogged down, although we passed it in the Senate during the month of February.

These are problems which must be submitted to the American people. The 6 years of divided government have worked in many respects, but it is obvious that there are issues whose resolution will be extremely difficult if divided government continues.

I am confident that in the Senate, where tonight sit 66 Democratic Senators, if we should lose each seat we consider doubtful—and I do not think we shall lose a single one of those—we still, I believe, will have 55 Democratic Senators when we return in January. I think, and I predict, the number will be nearer 70 than 55.

Furthermore, divided government—to work at all—demands the utmost in forebearance from all participants. Heated partisanship at any key position can complicate the problems of divided government beyond endurance.

It is obvious that the American people approve of the responsible approach of the Democratic Congress to the Nation's problems.

The record of the congressional Democrats has been submitted to the American people on three separate occasions since 1952. On each test, the American people have returned increasing Democratic majorities to the House and the Senate.

The full achievement of Democratic programs, however, requires close cooperation between the executive and legislative branches under our system of government. This can be determined only by the action of the people themselves.

EXHIBIT 1

MAJOR LEGISLATIVE ACHIEVEMENTS

YEAR 1955

Housing Amendments of 1955: Authorized 45,000 public housing units through July 31, 1956, and increased the authorization for assistance in slum clearance and urban renewal by $200 million annually in fiscal 1956 and 1957 (Public Law 345).

Railroad retirement: Permitted pensioners to receive both social security and railroad retirement benefit payments; and increased a spouse's maximum annuity from $40 a month to $51.80 (Public Law 383).

Defense of Formosa, Pescadores: Authorized the President to use U.S. Armed Forces in defense of Formosa and the Pescadores against Chinese Communists (Public Law 4).

International finance: Authorized U.S. participation in the International Finance Corporation and authorized $35,168,000 as the U.S. subscription to IFC. IFC grew out of demands of underdeveloped countries for credits not readily obtainable from the International Bank for Reconstruction (Public Law 350).

Reciprocal trade: Extended the President's authority to negotiate reciprocal trade agreements through June 30, 1958; amended existing peril point provisions so that the Tariff Commission could recommend action if a business enterprise producing goods in commercial quantities was suffering seriously from import competition (Public Law 86).

Minimum wage increase: Raised hourly minimum wage from 75 cents to $1 effective March 1, 1956 (Public Law 381).

Armed Forces pay increase: Granted to officers with more than 3 years' service and warrant officers and enlisted men with more than 2 years' service pay increases based on rank and length of service—ranging from 6 to 25 percent; provided an increase in special monthly pay for hazardous air and submarine duty; increased retired pay by 6 percent (Public Law 20).

Military reserves strengthened: Established the first comprehensive program aimed exclusively at bolstering U.S. military reserve forces; authorized up to 250,000 men between 17 and 18½ to sign up annually for 3 to 6 months active duty providing they remain in the Ready Reserve until their service time totals 8 years (Public Law 305).

GI education: Granted full educational benefits under the Korean GI bill to members of the Armed Forces who were on active duty on or before January 31, 1955 (Public Law 7).

Oversea voting: Urged States to enact laws permitting servicemen, Federal employees abroad, dependents of both groups, and merchant seamen to register for voting by use of uniform postcard applications and to vote by absentee ballot (Public Law 296).

Federal pay raise: Raised the pay of all but the top level of Government employees by 7.5 percent (Public Law 94).

Security Commission: Established a 12-member bipartisan commission to study the entire Government security program (Public Law 304).

Airport grants: Authorized for allocation to States and territories for airport development, Federal grants totaling $42.5 million in fiscal 1956 and $63 million in each of the 3 subsequent fiscal years, on a matching basis (Public Law 211).

Small business: Extended the life of the Small Business Agency and increased the total revolving fund from $275 million to $550 million (Public Law 268).

YEAR 1956

Farm bills: H.R. 12 to restore rigid supports at 90 percent of parity on basic commodities. (Vetoed.) After the veto the Congress again considered and passed a farm measure retaining mandatory price supports for small feed grains and gave the Secretary of Agriculture discretionary authority to establish a two-price plan for rice; set up an acreage reserve program to compensate producers for reducing their 1956–59 crops of basic commodities below their allotments or base acreage (Public Law 540).

Social security: Liberalized the Social Security Act by reducing the retirement age for women from 65 to 62 and established a disability program at age 50; extended coverage to lawyers, dentists, chiropractors, osteopaths, veterinarians, optometrists, sharecroppers, etc. (Public Law 880).

Thirteen-year highway program: Authorized the largest roadbuilding program in history—$31.5 billion in Federal-State funds over a 13-year period; also provided for new taxes scheduled to yield $14.8 billion over a 16-year period (Public Law 627).

Upper Colorado project: Authorized a $760 million Upper Colorado River Basin water storage and reclamation project (Public Law 485).

Health programs: Enacted Public Law 911 providing traineeships for professional public health personnel; advanced training for professional nurses; practical nurse training; extension of hospital survey and construction programs; and assistance in mental health programs. Public Law 835 providing for a 3-year $90 million construction program for health research facilities.

Flood insurance: An experimental $5 billion to $7.5 billion Federal flood insurance and loan contract program (Public Law 1016).

Surplus disposal: Enacted Public Law 962 increasing from $1.5 billion to $3 billion the limit on surplus sales for foreign currencies.

Customs simplification: Enacted into law a single valuation system, based on the price at which the goods were offered for sale as exports, instead of the old system under which the higher of two values was used, the export price or the price at which the goods would be sold in the foreign market (Public Law 927).

Seventy thousand public housing units: Provided for 35,000 units a year for 2 years but made Federal aid contingent upon a workable slum clearance program in local communities (Public Law 1020).

Atomic merchant ship: Provided for construction of an atomic-powered merchant ship to promote the peacetime application of atomic energy—estimated cost $37 million (Public Law 849).

Mineral stockpile: Authorized a 2½-year subsidy program for mining tungsten fluorspar, asbestos and columbium-tantalum estimated to cost $91.7 million (Public Law 733).

Servicemen's survivors: Increased benefits for survivers of servicemen and brought 2,850,000 military personnel under social security (Public Law 881).

Water pollution: Increased Federal funds available to States for developing water pollution control programs and authorized a maximum of $500 million to assist communities to build sewage treatment works (Public Law 660).

Farm loans: Public Law 878 increased from $15 million to $65 million the amount of money available for emergency loans to farmers and stockmen under the emergency Farm Loan Act.

Great Plains Program: Provided a long-range program to combat soil erosion in the Great Plains area—authorizing a maximum appropriation of $150 million for the entire program and limited the payments for any one year to $25 million (Public Law 1021).

Railroad Retirement: Increased benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act by 10 percent (Public Law 1013).

International Wheat Pact: Ratified a new International Wheat Agreement guaranteeing the U.S. annual sales of 132 million bushels of wheat at prices ranging from $1.50 to $2 a bushel.

YEAR 1957

Civil Rights Act: Enacted into Public Law 315 the first civil rights measure to pass the Senate since 1875—created an executive Commission on Civil Rights; empowered the Attorney General to seek an injunction when an individual was deprived or about to be deprived of the right to vote; and allows the judge to decide whether the defendant in such cases should be tried with or without a jury.

Middle East—Public Law 7: Authorized the President to cooperate with and assist any Middle East nations desiring help in the development of economic strength, and to undertake military assistance programs with them.

Atomic Agency Treaty: Ratified the statute of the International Atomic Energy Agency designed to implement the 1953 atoms-for-peace proposal.

Atomic Insurance—Public Law 256: Permits the Government to provide indemnities of up to $500 million for damages resulting from nuclear accidents in private industry.

Housing—Public Law 104: Liberalized several existing housing programs; lowered the minimum down payment required to buy a a house with an FHA-insured mortgage and gave FNMA additional funds for buying home mortgages from banks and other private lenders to alleviate the tight money market.

Niagara Power—Public Law 159: Authorized power development at Niagara Falls.

Deferred Grazing: Enacted Public Law 25 designed to aid ranchers and farmers in drought disaster areas by paying them to keep their livestock off parched grazing lands until the drought ended and pastures reestablished.

Farm surplus disposal: Extended the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act to June 30, 1958, and increased from $3 billion to $4 billion the value of surplus commodities that could be sold to friendly foreign countries.

Veterans' compensation: Public Law 168 increased compensation payments for service-connected disabilities by 10 percent with more for 100 percent disability.

Immigration laws: Public Law 316 dealing primarily with hardship cases—authorized admittance of approximately 60,000 aliens; authorized unlimited entry, for a 2-year period, of alien orphans adopted by U.S. citizens.

YEAR 1958

Defense reorganization: Public Law 559 provided for a complete reorganization of the Defense Department.

Federal aid highways: As an antirecession measure authorized $3.2 billion in new Federal funds for highway construction and authorized a one-half percent bonus in Federal interstate highway funds to States that agree to regulate billboard advertising along the Interstate Highway System (Public Law 381).

Area redevelopment: Authorized $280 million in Federal aid for distressed areas suffering from chronic unemployment (vetoed).

Unemployment benefits: Public Law 441 extended the duration of the period in which jobless workers could collect unemployment checks.

Social security: Increased OASI benefits by 7 percent.

Civilian space agency: Created a new civilian agency to direct the Nation's scientific activities relating to all nonmilitary aspects of outer space (Public Law 568).

Reciprocal trade: Four-year extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act (Public Law 686).

Postal rate-pay increases: Provided increases for first-, second-, third-, and fourth-class mail and authorized a permanent 7.5-percent pay increase for all field service employees except those in level 20 (Public Law 426).

Federal pay raise: Public Law 462 provided for an average 10-percent pay increase.

National Defense Education Act: Enacted a 7-year $1 billion program of loans and grants to students and schools to enable needy students to continue their education (Public Law 864).

Emergency housing: Enacted Public Law 364 to encourage and expedite the construction and financing of a substantial number of new housing units, placing primary emphasis on expanding and amending existing programs to provide economic relief.

Aviation agency: Created a Federal Aviation Agency to assume authority over the Nation's airways (Public Law 726).

Military pay raise: Public Law 422 increased the basic pay, by varying percentages, for nearly all military personnel with more than 2 years' service.

Superliner construction: Authorized the Federal Maritime Board to contract for the construction and sale of two superliner passenger vessels (Public Law 521).

Atomic data exchange: Public Law 479 authorized increased exchange of atomic weapons information and materials with U.S. allies.

Small Business Agency: Public Law 536 gave the Small Business Administration permanent status—a decided victory for small business groups.

Capital for small business: Public Law 699—the Small Business Investment Act—provided for loans to State and federally chartered small business investment companies.

Farm surplus disposal: Public Law 931 extended for 18 months, to December 31, 1959, the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act and increased from $4 billion to $6.25 billion the value of surplus commodities that can be sold to friendly foreign countries for local currencies.

Alaska: After a 42-year deadlock Congress enacted Public Law 508 admitting Alaska to the Union as the 49th State.

Minerals exploration: Public Law 701 established an Office of Minerals Exploration as a permanent agency within the Department of Interior to provide Federal assistance for mineral exploration projects.

Construction speed-ups: The Congress adopted two resolutions calling on the administration to accelerate all civil and military construction projects for which funds had been previously appropriated—as one means of checking a recession.

Hospital construction: Public Law 664 extended for 5 years the program of Federal grants for hospital construction.

Presidential pensions: Public Law 745 provided a pension of $25,000 a year for former Presidents, and a pension of $10,000 to widows of former Presidents provided they gave up any other Federal annuity or pension.

YEAR 1959

Agriculture

REA: Restored authority of REA Administrator to approve or disapprove loans without supervision by the Secretary of Agriculture (vetoed). Final passage, 60 to 27.

Wheat supports: Provides price support at 90 percent of parity; reduces acreage allotments by 25 percent below the allotment it would otherwise receive for the 1960 and 1961 crops; and limits wheat price support to $35,000 a year for each producer. Final passage—division vote. Action clearing bill for President adopted by vote of 44 to 40 (vetoed).

Tobacco supports: Stabilizes and protects the level of tobacco price supports by permitting the support price to be either the 1958 level or 90 percent of new parity, whichever is lower, until 90 percent of old parity exceeds either of these levels. Voice vote (vetoed).

Special school milk program: Raised limitation on special school milk program to $80 million for 1960 and 1961. Increased to $78 million for current year. Voice vote.

Civil rights

Cloture: Liberalized the cloture rule by providing that two-thirds of the Senators voting may close debate on any measure, including rule changes; and affirmed the fact that the Senate is a continuing body. Final passage, 72 to 22.

Hawaii: Provided for admission of Hawaii to the Union as the 50th State. Final passage, 76 to 15.

Alaska Omnibus Act: Amends various Federal laws to facilitate orderly transition from territorial to statehood status (voice vote).

Home rule: Provides for an elected mayor, city council, and a nonvoting delegate to the House of Representatives for the District of Columbia (voice vote).

Economy

Economic study: Provided $200,000 for a major study of the Nation's economy by the Joint Congressional Economic Committee (voice vote).

Unemployment problems: Established a Commission on Unemployment Problems of 11 members, 5 to be appointed by the President and 6 by Congress, to make a study of the problems and report in 60 days (voice vote).

Finance

Clayton Act: Amends Clayton Act to expedite procedures for enforcement by Federal Trade Commission (voice vote).

Foreign relations

World Bank and International Monetary Fund: Increased U.S. subscription to the International Monetary Fund by $1.375 billion and the World Bank by $3.175 billion. Final passage 73 to 10.

Health for peace: Authorized a $50 million a year program to improve health conditions through international cooperation in research, training and planning. Final passage 63 to 17.

Mutual security: Authorized a total of $3,543,320,000 for fiscal 1960; authorized an appropriation of $2 billion over the next 2 years for the Development Loan Fund. Established center for cultural and technical interchange between East and West in Hawaii. Final passage 65 to 26.

Inter-American Bank: Provides for U.S. membership in the Inter-American Development Bank to aid in the economic develop-

ment of Latin American countries. Final passage 89 to 3.

International Wheat Agreement: Ratified an extension of the 10-year old International Wheat Agreement for another 3 years, to July 31, 1962 (ratified 92 to 1).

Labor and public welfare

TV education: Authorized grants up to $1 million to each State for purchase of TV facilities and equipment upon their agreement to provide land, building, and operate and maintain an educational channel (voice vote).

Railroad retirement: Provided for a 10-percent increase in benefits under Railroad Retirement and Unemployment Compensation Acts (voice vote).

Labor reform: Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act to curb undemocratic and racketeering practices in labor unions and labor-management relations. Final passage, 90 to 1.

Housing—omnibus bill: Provided for a $1.375 billion housing program emphasizing low-cost housing, college housing, urban renewal, and a more realistic building program for the elderly. Final passage, 60 to 28. Conference report adopted by vote of 56 to 31 (vetoed). Veterans' housing: Provided $100 million for direct Federal housing loans to veterans in rural and small urban areas. Permits the administration to allow lenders to charge 5¼ percent on GI housing loans (voice vote).

Depressed areas: Authorized a new Federal program with an initial authorization of $389,500,000 in loans and grants for industrial redevelopment in economically depressed areas. Final passage, 49 to 46.

Air-pollution: Made permanent the Federal air-pollution control program, authorized funds, and provided for agency cooperation (voice vote).

Health benefits—Federal employees: Provides for a voluntary Federal civilian employees health benefit program comparable to these available to other large employee groups by authorizing payroll deductions and an equal contribution by the Government to meet the costs of the program. Final passage 81 to 4.

National security

AEC: Authorized $165,400,000 for a total of 43 new construction projects; $7 million for the Euratom research and development program; $55,500,000 for the cooperative power reactor demonstration program; and extends for another 5 years the compulsory licensing of atomic energy (voice vote).

Modern Navy: Authorized $110 million construction program of modern naval vessels for 1960 (voice vote).

Airports: Extended for 2 years, until June 30, 1961, the present Airport Act at the same level of annual authorization—$63 million for 1960 and 1961. Substitute adopted 71 to 11.

Natural resources

TVA financing: Authorizes issuance of up to $750 million revenue bonds by TVA to finance additional power facilities subject to congressional and Treasury Department approval.

YEAR 1960

Mutual security: Extended the mutual security program for 1 year and authorized $1.3 billion for economic assistance, technical assistance, and special activities ($2.7 billion for military assistance and development loan funds for 1961 previously authorized).

Conference with Mexico: Authorized U.S. participation in parliamentary conferences with Mexico.

IDA: Provided for U.S. participation in the International Development Association to help provide assistance to underdeveloped countries.

International health program: Authorized the President, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Surgeon General to conduct an international cooperative program in health, research, training, and planning.

NATO citizens convention: Authorized appointment of U.S. Citizens Commission to participate in NATO Citizens Convention to explore ways to develop democratic freedom by economic and political means.

Japan: Ratified Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security between the United States and Japan.

Antarctic Treaty: Ratified Antarctic Treaty assuring that the Antarctic Continent and surrounding areas will be used exclusively for peaceful purposes, that freedom of scientific investigation will be maintained and freezes existing territorial claims and rights in the Antarctic.

Mutual security appropriations: Appropriated $3.722 million for foreign aid.

Latin-American development: Authorized $500 million for assistance in the development of Latin America and $100 million for aid in the reconstruction of Chile.

Mutual security contingency fund: Provided an increased authorization of $100 million for the President's mutual security contingency fund for fiscal 1961 to meet emergency needs in Africa and other areas of the world—contingency fund total of $250 million in authorizations.

Naval expansion: Authorized construction of four modern naval vessels at cost of $157.9 million as part of 1961 naval expansion program involving 57 vessels.

Highways: Authorized $1 billion a year for fiscal 1962 and 1963 in Federal aid for primary and secondary highway systems and their urban extensions.

Sugar Act extension: Extended for 3 months, to March 31, 1961, the Sugar Act of 1948, fixing quotas of domestic and foreign producers; gave President authority to readjust Cuba's quota.

Depressed areas: Provided Federal loans and grants for industrial redevelopment in economically depressed areas (vetoed).

Water pollution: Established Office of Water Pollution Control and increased to $90 million a year grants to local governments to pay 30 percent of cost of construction of sewage treatment works (vetoed).

Price supports: Stabilized price supports for tobacco.

Coal research: Created an Office of Coal Research to find new uses for coal, encourage production and conservation, and otherwise stimulate the industry.

Lead-zinc mining: Provides for stabilizing the mining of lead and zinc by small producers in the United States.

Helium: Authorized a long-range program for the conservation of helium.

Public works: Provided $3,969 million for public works projects, flood control and resources conservation and development.

Social security—medical care for aged: Provided increased social security coverage under existing programs and authorized a new program of Federal grants to the States for medical care for the aged.

Civil rights: Enacted a civil rights measure which authorized Federal courts, through appointed referees, to safeguard voting rights; fixed penalties for obstruction of court orders and for flight to avoid prosecution for vandalism; required preservation of Federal election records for 22 months; authorized availability of funds for education of servicemen's children in areas where schools are closed by integration disputes.

FCC: Amended Federal Communications Act by fixing penalties for acceptance of "payola" and for other abuses and questionable practices.

Housing: Extended life of home repair and improvement program and lifted the ceiling on FHA insurance; increased the revolving loan for college housing loans by $500 million and increased the revolving fund for community facility loans by $50 million.

RELEASE OF A PORTION OF THE $621 MILLION OF FROZEN DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FUNDS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, yesterday, the distinguished minority leader inserted a statement in the RECORD which included the following comment:

> You will recall that the $621 million held for future requirements was the amount shown in the Department's financial plan dated August 9. As a matter of interest, I contacted the Defense Department to learn the present status of these funds, and was informed that the Defense Department has released $107 million of the $621 million.

I congratulate the able minority leader for his ability to pick up the telephone and get information of this sort immediately. Upon reading his statement this morning, I asked a member of my staff to check with the Senate Appropriations Committee and with the Department of Defense to find out exactly when and how these funds were released and for what purposes.

Unfortunately, the Appropriations Committee has received no information from the Department of Defense as yet concerning the release of any of the $621 million that had been frozen as of August 9. However, the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) confirmed that only $3 million—for Army reserve construction—has actually been released as of today.

This official stated that a request for release of all the funds provided by the Congress for the Samos reconnaissance satellite is currently pending before the Bureau of the Budget. The Bureau of the Budget has confirmed that these funds have not yet been released. With respect to the other item mentioned by the distinguished minority leader—release of $70 million for the Polaris program—no request for such release has yet been approved by the Pentagon for submission to the Bureau of the Budget.

I make these remarks simply to clarify the record and do not mean to be critical of the minority leader. I know that he has reported in good faith what he has been told by the Department of Defense. However, we have found from past experience that the Bureau of the Budget does not hesitate to substitute its judgment for that of the Department of Defense on military items. Therefore, I would advise the minority leader not to report that these funds have been released until it is actually an accomplished fact.

Even though my friend may have "jumped the gun" in announcing that these funds have been released. I commend him for his interest and efforts along these lines. I invite him to use his great influence with the executive branch to urge the full and prompt use of the additional funds provided by the Congress to increase our military preparedness.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a memorandum dealing with the impact of expenditure ceilings and other fund restrictions on the defense programs in recent years.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IMPACT OF EXPENDITURE CEILINGS AND OTHER FUND RESTRICTIONS ON THE DEFENSE PROGRAM IN RECENT YEARS

THIRTY-EIGHT BILLION DOLLAR CEILING

In May 1957, Secretary of Defense Wilson issued an order freezing defense expenditures for fiscal year 1958 at $38 billion. At the time this order was issued, defense spending was running at a rate equivalent to $42 billion a year. As part of this expenditure ceiling, the Army, Navy and Air Force were directed to reduce the amounts available for obligation during fiscal year 1957 by $500 million. The directive to make this cutback was issued on May 22 so that all of the cutback had to be made during the month of June.

The sharp and abrupt cutbacks in defense obligations and expenditures resulted in curtailment and elimination of many programs which had been justified to, and approved by, the Congress. Even more disastrous, however, was the fact that these abrupt cutbacks were made at a time when the economy was faltering.

As a result, these defense cutbacks, which were made to "save" $2 billion in defense expenditures, served to trigger the recession of 1958. One byproduct of this recession was the fact that the Government suffered a budget deficit of $12.4 billion in fiscal 1959—the largest peacetime deficit in the history of the Nation.

IMPACT OF SPUTNIK

On October 4, 1957, the Soviet Union placed the first earth satellite into orbit. As a result of Sputnik I, and of hearings held by the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, the administration submitted a supplemental appropriation request for fiscal year 1958 to the Congress on January 8, 1958. The rigid defense expenditure ceiling of $38 billion was also adjusted upward.

Ever since sputnik, the Department of Defense has avoided the issuance of any documents formally establishing a Department of Defense budget ceiling. Instead, the emphasis has been placed on expenditure "targets," "objectives," "estimates," etc. Thus, while formal rigid expenditure ceilings no longer exist, the ceiling psychology still exists and serves as a brake against acceleration or expansion of Defense programs.

QUOTATIONS REGARDING BUDGET CEILINGS

The following are representative quotations regarding the existence and impact of budgetary ceilings and similar administrative limitations on Department of Defense programs:

Impounding of Marine Corps funds (hearings before Senate Appropriations Committee, Department of Defense appropriations for 1958, pp. 266–267)

"Senator SYMINGTON. The decision was made to cut heavily the Marine Corps, and the money was appropriated in the amendment to prevent that being done.

"But I see it was done anyway, so apparently there was a difference of opinion.

"Do you know what the $40 million was going to be used for instead of what the Congress requested?

"General PATE. By the Defense Department?

"Senator SYMINGTON. Yes.

"General PATE. I do not.

"Senator SYMINGTON. Do you, General Moore?

"General MOORE. No, sir. It was impounded and $31 million in the appropriation, 'Military personnel,' Marine Corps was placed in reserve, and together with another $20,963,000 reverted to the Treasury. That is $31,853,000 out of the total $41,148,000.

"There was more than one appropriation involved."

Imposition of expenditure ceiling without knowledge of its impact on Defense program (hearing before Senate Appropriations Committee, Department of Defense appropriations for fiscal year 1958, pp. 412, 415–416, 465, 471, 941–942)

"Senator SALTONSTALL. For the fiscal year 1958, which is the appropriation that we are talking about now, the estimated expenditures of the Department of Defense are a little over $38 billion; is that correct?

"Mr. MCNEIL. That is about correct, Senator SALTONSTALL; yes, $38 billion.

"Senator SALTONSTALL. At the rate that they are running, or are estimated to run, as you foresee it now, they will run nearer $42 billion than $38 billion; is that correct?

"Mr. MCNEIL. They are running, at least during the last 2 or 3 months, at a rate of about $42 billion; that is correct.

"Senator SALTONSTALL. The purpose of this directive here is, as contended by the Senator from Missouri—I would agree quite fully with him on that—that the purpose of the directive is to make sure where you are going, as to whether you are going nearer $38 billion, which is the estimate originally that was submitted to the Congress, or are going to run nearer $42 billion; is that not correct?

"Mr. MCNEIL. That is correct.

"Senator SALTONSTALL. As far as the program of procurement is concerned, and contracts, and what it will do to the Air Force, the Navy, or the Army, that has to be worked out, and you can't tell this committee at the present time just what the effect of this directive will be; is that not correct?

"Mr. MCNEIL. That is correct."

* * * * *

"Senator ROBERTSON. At the present rate of expenditure, what would the actual expenditures be for fiscal 1958?

"Mr. MCNEIL. For fiscal 1958, we will try to work that out and get a more precise figure.

"As I mentioned, in response to Senator SALTONSTALL a few minutes ago, in the last few months the rate of expenditures has been at the rate of about $42 billion.

"Senator ROBERTSON. If that rate continued, it would be $42 billion for fiscal 1958; is that correct?

"Mr. MCNEIL. That is right, if it continued at that rate. I do not think it would necessarily do that.

"Senator ROBERTSON. Not necessarily.

"And your May 21 directive, in the part of overall planning, you started curtailing expenditures in fiscal 1957 with a view to keeping fiscal expenditures in 1958 down to $38 billion?

"Mr. MCNEIL. Or very close to that.

"Senator ROBERTSON. That could involve a cut of $4 billion, a cutoff or a cutback, or whatever you call it.

"Mr. MCNEIL. We do not know yet whether this rate of the last 3 or 4 months would continue at this rate during all of next year. It is possible that it would drop off to some extent during the middle of the year, or even in the latter part of the year.

"This may be a mere temporary hump, but it is almost certain that unless the program is extended, and those things which must be carried on are carried on, while those things that can wait or be delayed are sorted out, these expenditures will run above the $38 billion.

"Something will probably have to be done. and I mention that in my statement. As I say, I was trying to bring this to the attention of the committee in my statement this morning.

"Senator ROBERTSON. The distinguished Senator, my great friend from Missouri, said, or rather he intimated, that the first consideration was a fiscal one and the fiscal one indicated that you needed to keep expenditures for 1958 down to $38 billion.

"You discussed that action without knowing definitely to what extent it may delay and impede the development of bombers, missiles, et cetera."

* * * * *

"Senator SYMINGTON. Right.

"Now, Mr. Secretary, you say:

" 'We have been informed that considering the anticipated revenues of the Government and the statutory debt limit, expenditures for the Department of Defense must not substantially exceed the budget estimate of $38 billion during the coming year.'

"Fundamentally, that is what we are really talking about; is it not?

"Mr. MCNEIL. It is one of our real problems.

"Senator SYMINGTON. Would the answer to my question be 'Yes' or 'No'?

"Mr. MCNEIL. There are quite a few problems, but I would say that was one of the prime problems; yes, sir."

* * * * *

"Senator SYMINGTON. You say in your statement that we have been informed that these expenditures 'must not substantially exceed' and so on.

"Mr. MCNEIL. That is for 1958, sir.

"Senator SYMINGTON. I am not much on definition of how rigid a ceiling is or is not—but are you saying that the Bureau of the Budget is saying you must try to live within this figure? Is there a difference in rigidity you are talking about now?

"Mr. MCNEIL. Yes, sir.

"Senator SYMINGTON. So from here out the programs presented by the President to the Congress really do not mean much, do they?

"Mr. MCNEIL. I think they do.

"Senator SYMINGTON. If you feel that the amount of money is as you have already testified, and that expenditures must be held down, and that is the chief reason for these directives, what you are really saying is you are not going to let the Department of Defense have the money necessary to implement the program.

"Mr. MCNEIL. It does not move quite that way, sir. There is no question that the—well, I might call it a ceiling, is much more rigid for 1958 than it was in 1957."

* * * * *

"Senator SYMINGTON. At this point is it not an entirely fair statement to say that the fiscal situation became completely dominant as against the force situation?

"General BOGART. I think so insofar as the directive is concerned.

"Senator SYMINGTON. There could be no other answer, could there?

"General BOGART. I don't think so.

"Senator SYMINGTON. That would seem especially true in that you were not told what part of the forces to cut. It was strictly a matter of dollars as against security; is that not correct?

"General BOGART. That is true, sir."

After-the-fact acknowledgement that there had been a rigid $38 billion expenditure ceiling on Department of Defense expenditures (hearings before House Appropriations Committee, supplemental Defense appropriations for 1958, pp. 239–40 and hearings before the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, inquiry into satellite and missile programs, pp. 257–258)

"Senator SYMINGTON. Now, you refer to the $38 billion expenditure ceiling, in the memorandum that the President sent me, as—'not as an arbitrary limit on defense spending but as a step taken by the administration to keep military spending in appropriate balance with the requirements of the Federal Government as a whole.'

"Testimony by top civilian officials of the Department of Defense challenge this statement. As I mentioned the Assistant Secretary (Comptroller) said there had always

been some guidelines and restrictions; but now these were rigid ceilings. That was his statement.

"What would you comment on that?

"Was it an arbitrary limit on defense spending or wasn't it?

"Secretary McELROY. Well, there was a limit for a period but, of course, since then, as I think is well known, there has been a change.

"There has been relief in the spending for the fiscal year, so while there was an attempt to set a limitation it was found that that was not right in relationship to the needs of defense and that it was relaxed to the extent of several hundred million dollars."

* * * * *

"Secretary GATES. I imagine what he is talking about, Mr. Flood, is the fact that everyone knows we were operating under an expenditure ceiling in the early days of this fiscal year and there was a holdup of money by the Bureau of the Budget in apportionments in regard to controlling expenditures. This is a costly thing to do in the long run.

"Mr. FLOOD. Then if there is, as a fact, a holdup——

"Secretary GATES. There was.

"Mr. FLOOD. In the allocation of appropriated funds, it was not the fault of the Congress in the development of the nuclear program as of today, it is not the fault of the Navy or the Department of Defense, but the 'Pooh-Bah' at the Budget who substituted his thinking for everybody's and said you could not have this money and you did not get it.

"Is that correct? 'Pooh-Bah' is my word, not yours.

"Secretary GATES. Well, I think——

"Mr. FLOOD. Well, it is Gilbert and Sullivan's, as a matter of fact, but they were good, too. You go on and tell me something.

"Secretary GATES. Yes, sir. I think that the policy of the administration was for a balanced budget and not an increase in the debt limit. The Bureau of the Budget was carrying out the policy of the President in this respect, and this caused an expenditure target to be placed on the departments of Government, including the Department of Defense. This slowed up apportionment procedures, and in some instances delayed obligation of money and procurement of materiel in various departments, including the Navy and the bureaus of the Navy. I think that is what Admiral Rickover is talking about.

"This has been partially corrected. We now have a change in the expenditure targets we were originally working toward."

Impact on Air Force research and development of Department of Defense Directive of August 17, 1957, withholding 10 percent of research and development funds (hearings before House Appropriations Committee, supplemental defense appropriations for 1958, pp. 345–346)

"Normally in the research and development appropriation early in July the Air Research and Development Command, having had the proposed fiscal year program, is able to immediately start initiating new research and development contracts and continuing previous contracts for effort which is still in the overall research and development program. However, new obligations were frozen as of June 30, 1958, so that no new obligations could be incurred without specific approval from the Office, Secretary of Defense. In addition, an expenditure amount for research and development within the overall Air Force expenditure objective was established, which the research and development program should not exceed during fiscal year 1958. Further, about August 17, 1957, the Office, Secretary of Defense, directed a reduction under research and development programs and the Department of Defense in the amount of 10 percent.

"The effect of the above actions was to immediately halt contractual action pending analysis of the fiscal year 1958 program and to establish actions so that the Air Force could live within the directives as issued. In this respect, the Air Force directed the Air Research and Development Command to reduce all work-effort-type contracts by 5 percent so that under the restrictions the most balanced research and development program could be maintained in fiscal year 1958. The funds for the operation and maintenance of research and development centers and test bases were put on a minimum operating base by reduction of local purchase to the minimum need to maintain mission stock levels; by the reduction of overtime for all programs except the ballistic missile test program, and by the reduction of civilian personnel. These actions served to slow down the operation of the research and development effort for a period. Although certain contracts with universities and nonprofit organizations were terminated upon the expiration of existing contracts, complete cooperation was received from most contractors to the point that the Air Force scientific effort was not deferred. The research and development contractors in effect worked 30–60 days past the expiration time of the contract in order to give Air Force time to evaluate effect of these actions on the research and development program and in order that the scientists and engineers working on Air Force programs would not shift to other projects and be lost for the remainder of the fiscal year.

"Upon review of the overall research and development program, the Air Force made the decision to support the research effort to the utmost allowable under the expenditure ceiling and effect release of enough additional expenditures to bring the research program back into phase so that contracts could be written for new work as well as continuing of work which had been all contracted from fiscal year 1957 funds. The Air Force reduced the fiscal year 1958 program by the approximate 10 percent as directed by the Office of Secretary of Defense. This was done by deferring and deleting many projects which had been planned for implementation in the fiscal year 1958 President's budget estimate. On October 24, however, the Air Force began to take actions to place the research and development effort back on the original planned basis for fiscal year 1958. Additional expenditure allowances were provided in order that obligations and expenditures could be achieved in normal manner for the balance of fiscal year 1958. On November 7, 1957, the Air Force relieved the Research and Development Command from the 5-percent reduction of effort-type contracts.

"The research and development program is now proceeding as expeditiously as possible toward fulfillment of the program during fiscal year 1958."

Army strength was cut by impounding fiscal year 1959 funds (hearings before Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, major defense matters, pp. 14–16, 59)

"Senator JOHNSON. Do you have some $200 million for previously approved procurement in 1959 that has been held up?

"General TAYLOR. $210 million, I am informed.

"Senator JOHNSON. All right.

"Now, summarizing—and I want to be as brief as possible because I have only 5 minutes—the Congress said they wanted you to have a 900,000-man Army. That has been reduced to 870,000 by impounding funds. Yes or no?

"General TAYLOR. Yes, that is my understanding, sir.

"Senator JOHNSON. The Congress said it wanted you to have $210 million more for procurement than you have been authorized to spend, correct? Yes or no?

"General TAYLOR. Yes, sir.

"Senator JOHNSON. Has there been any other cutback or reduction in fiscal year 1959 Army funds that you are aware of?

"General TAYLOR. Yes, the Congress appropriated $37 million for modernization and $6,250,000 for construction which have not been made available to the Army. In addition, there are the funds associated with our increased strength which have been held back.

* * * * *

"Mr. WEISL. General Taylor, do you know why the $210 million fund appropriated by the Congress and recommended by the Defense Department was withheld?

"General TAYLOR. My understanding was that it involved the considerations of expenditures; that it was desired to spread out the expenditures more into 1960 and 1961.

"Mr. WEISL. Who made that decision?

"General TAYLOR. I would say that it came down through fiscal channels from the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

"Senator JOHNSON. Where did he get it?

"General TAYLOR. Sir?

"Senator JOHNSON. Where did he get it?

"General TAYLOR. I would not know, sir.

"Senator JOHNSON. By the fiscal channel, do you mean the Director of the Bureau of the Budget?

"General TAYLOR. I would not know, sir."

The Secretary of Defense was not permitted by the Budget Bureau to ask the Senate for any funds for fiscal year 1960 in excess of the Budget request submitted to Congress in January 1959 (hearings before Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, major defense matters, p. 304)

"Mr. STANS. We did not take issue with the Department of Defense determinations as to the position they should take on the House add-ons and on-the-House cuts. We did make suggestions as to what we thought might be the best way to handle them, but the determination was to be made by the Secretary of Defense, and I am not sure that we have all of the details yet as to how the Secretary is going to make the presentation.

"The only limitation that was imposed upon him was that in the aggregate the Secretary would not ask for a greater budget for the Department of Defense than appeared in the budget document last January."

Fixed budget ceilings failed to reflect changing world conditions (hearings before Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, missiles, space, and other major defense matters, pp. 190–191)

"Mr. WEISL. We have been told, General Taylor, that while the Department of Defense and the various services have had guidelines on expenditures, there really never was a budgetary ceiling on expenditures. What is your view on that?

"Has there been a budget ceiling on defense expenditures?

"General TAYLOR. I think that perhaps we are just playing on words, Mr. Weisl. Certainly, for practical purposes there was a finite limit on what we could count upon, and each year that amount was essentially the same.

"I often point out that the split between the services was almost exactly the same for at least 4 years; 23 percent to the Army, 28 percent to the Navy, and 46 percent to the Air Force, giving a suggestion of a frozen pattern, which I don't think corresponded to the changing world conditions.

* * * * *

"Mr. WEISL. In your book you state as follows:

" 'The fact that there is a ceiling of around $40 billion on the defense budget is a reminder to each Chief that all military programs, however disparate in character, are in fact competitors for a fixed number of dollars.

" 'This consideration tends to color the attitude of individual Chiefs toward the program of sister services. It tends to make disinterested judgments more difficult than would be the case if it were possible to form judgments without such regard for fiscal consequences. The fixed defense budget by accentuating the interservice struggle for funds has become the prime cause of the service rivalry which is undermining national confidence in our military programs.'

"Would you like to comment on that?

"General TAYLOR. No; I think, unfortunately, that the statement is accurate. I am sure that each Chief has always tried to sit in judgment honestly and dispassionately, but I know very well that we all think in terms of the effect on the budget of decisions on new weapons, for example. I think that explains to a degree why the Army and the Navy have been very reluctant to support, say Bomarc. I am equally certain that that is one of the reasons why the Navy and the Air Force have been reluctant to support Nike-Zeus; namely, the ultimate effect upon a fixed budget.

"Mr. WEISL. In your judgment, has the fixed ceiling on the military budget kept pace properly with changing world conditions?

"General TAYLOR. Well, I would say, sir, even without any analysis of the defense budget, that it is hard to believe that the world has not changed in the last 4 or 5 years. Yet our military budgets have been virtually the same within a variation of 1 or 2 percent."

Fiscal year 1960 funds provided by Congress for Army modernization were withheld by Bureau of the Budget (hearings before Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, missiles, space, and other major defense matters, pp. 229, 252, 262)

"Mr. WEISL. Last year Congress added funds to the budget for Army modernization. Are these funds being used fully?

"General LEMNITZER. The answer to your question is 'No.' I would like to tell you how the funds have been used, so that it may be clear as to why I give the answer 'No.' The total amount of money that was appropriated by the Congress over and above that which was in the President's 1960 budget amounted to $382.6 million. Now, $164.2 million of these funds are being used to cover a deficiency in the funding of the fiscal year 1960 direct obligational program for procurement of the Department of the Army, which totaled about $1,372 billion. This deficiency resulted from the Office of Secretary of Defense funding program including assets which failed to materialize, but these assets were beyond the control or influence of the Army.

"I might explain what I mean by that.

"Under the mutual security program, the Army provides some of its equipment right out of its inventory to assist our allies. We are normally reimbursed for that equipment so that we can replenish our inventories. The total amount of reimbursements which the Department of Defense estimated we would get did not materialize, and $164 million of the $382 million were used to cover deficits of this sort; $43.4 million of the total of $382 million will be used for modernization. This amount will be used to increase the Army's fiscal 1960 direct obligational program and it will be used in our so-called PEMA budget, that is, the 'Procurement of equipment and missiles, Army.' Of the $382 million, $175 million has been placed in reserve by the Bureau of the Budget for utilization in financing the fiscal year 1961 program. That gives the complete status of the total amount appropriated by the Congress in the fiscal year 1960 budget.

"Senator STENNIS. What was the last figure?

"General LEMNITZER. $175 million.

"Mr. WEISL. Has this amount been put in reserve?

"General LEMNITZER. It has been placed in reserve by the Bureau of the Budget.

"Mr. WEISL. Why hasn't the Bureau released these funds? It was the clear intent of Congress to use that money to modernize your Army?

"General LEMNITZER. I can't answer that. You will have to ask the Budget.

"Mr. WEISL. Did you protest against reserving that money and not using it for modernization of the Army?

"General LEMNITZER. We have requested apportionment of these funds on a number of occasions.

* * * * *

"Senator CANNON. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

"General, we know you are concerned about modernization of the Army, and, of course, as you know, Congress did earmark certain funds for use in modernization.

"I understand you have testified that the Army protested the decision of the Bureau of the Budget in withholding some of these funds that were earmarked for use in modernization; is that correct?

"General LEMNITZER. I wouldn't use the word 'protest.' We asked for the funds. We made a strong case for them. Our request was not approved, but we didn't protest or complain.

"Senator CANNON. You didn't complain. You just asked for them but didn't get them?

"General LEMNITZER. That's right.

"Senator CANNON. But at the time you asked for them, you felt they were very necessary; is that correct?

"General LEMNITZER. We did.

"Senator CANNON. Do you believe these funds are of such importance to our national security that new, or perhaps stronger, efforts should be made to dislodge these funds?

"General LEMNITZER. Well, of the funds that you referred to, Senator CANNON, only $175 million remain available in reserve. I think that is what you referred to.

"We would like to get those funds. We have asked for them, and we probably will make another attempt to get them.

"Senator CANNON. I don't think that quite answers my question, General. The question was: Do you think that these funds and the use for which they are intended are of such importance to the national security that new or perhaps stronger efforts should be made to dislodge these funds from the Bureau of the Budget reserve? I am thinking not only of your own efforts, but efforts on behalf of the Congress.

"General LEMNITZER. We need these funds for modernization of the Army, and as we have testified before various committees of the Congress, we have made a strong case for our modernization program. We need these funds.

"Senator CANNON. And in your opinion they are very important to our national security.

"General LEMNITZER. Yes, insofar as they will improve the capability of the Army to accomplish its mission."

* * * * *

"General LEMNITZER. We would be better equipped with this $175 million. I wouldn't want to give the impression to this committee that the Army can't carry out certain commitments, because it can and will. We can do it better with more modern equipment, as I have attempted to state here this afternoon.

"Senator STENNIS. I know you would do your best, but it is just unthinkable that you would have to go up against better weapons than you have yourself.

"With all the money that we spend, with all the resources we have, the know-how, the technology and everything, it is just unthinkable that we would have to go up against someone else who had better weapons, better equipment, and therefore someone who would place us at a disadvantage to that extent.

"This money is available and appropriated, yet is withheld. Who is holding it up? Is it the Director of the Budget, Mr. Stans? That is where the funds are locked, is it not?

"General LEMNITZER. I don't know who the individuals are; the best information I can give you is that it has been placed in reserve by the Bureau of the Budget."

* * * * *

Budget limitations prevented Navy from submitting its military requirements for fiscal year 1961 (hearings before Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, missiles, space and other major defense matters, pp. 280–282, 329)

"Mr. WEISL. In other words, you were given guidelines as to what plateau you must not cross regardless of how much you needed?

"Admiral BURKE. We were given two planning guidelines, sir.

"One was to build a budget based upon our NOA last year less 10 percent of the procurement, military construction, and research and development. That was to be the basic budget.

"The other one was the basic budget plus that 10 percent plus half a billion dollars. We submitted both budgets to the Department of Defense, based on those guidelines, sir.

"Mr. WEISL. Those guidelines were money limitations, isn't that right?

"Admiral BURKE. Yes, sir.

"Mr. WEISL. Not requirements presentations?

"Admiral BURKE. They were money limitations; yes, sir.

"Mr. WEISL. But the fact is that three fleet ballistic missile submarines as recommended were denied; long leadtime requirement for six additional fleet ballistic missile submarines were denied, and seven conversions were denied. Is that correct?

"Admiral BURKE. Yes, sir, I did that in order to——

"Mr. WEISL. You did that?

"Admiral BURKE. Yes, sir.

"Mr. WEISL. But it wasn't because you thought it should be done, but because of the guideline and the money limitation. Is that correct?

"Admiral BURKE. Yes, sir.

* * * * *

"Senator JOHNSON. What you are saying is that you are following the budget judgment instead of the military judgment. The military judgment is one thing, and the budget estimate is another. You made the recommendations based on military judgment. Then you got restrictive budget guidelines and you compromised by following the guidelines.

"Admiral BURKE. We put our most important items in our budget, in the basic budget, and the next most important items in the add-on, sir.

"Senator JOHNSON. And the budget does not contain items that, in your military judgment, you feel you should have.

"Admiral BURKE. It doesn't contain as many items as we originally asked for, no.

"Senator JOHNSON. It eliminated three Polaris submarines, also long leadtime procurement for six additional Polaris submarines. Does that mean you believe the budget provides all the funds that should be provided for the Polaris submarines?

"Admiral BURKE. I might explain that a little bit, sir. I think that people in the Department of Defense should speak for themselves on this—

"Senator JOHNSON. They will. I want you to speak for yourself. Do you think the budget includes all the money it should have for the Polaris submarines and missiles?

"Admiral BURKE. Not now, sir, because we have completed our tests on the Polaris submarine. It is a wonderful machine, sir.

"Senator JOHNSON. The answer is 'No.'

"Admiral BURKE. Yes, sir.

"Senator JOHNSON. And you think the budget ought to include more money for the Polaris submarines?

"Admiral BURKE. Yes, sir.

* * * * *

"Mr. WEISL. You have given us several examples in which the Navy did not ask for funds it required because of budgetary guidelines. Did you ever submit to the Secretary of Defense your military requirements for 1961?

"Admiral BURKE. As I explained before, we had a directive to submit our budgetary request for 1961 in 2 amounts. One was for a basic budget and one was for the basic and add on; and we followed our directive.

"Mr. WEISL. Then you did not submit your requirements?

"Admiral BURKE. Not as it has been conceived heretofore; no, sir."

"Mr. WEISL. I know, but the Congress provided for the use of those funds in 1959, and they were deferred, were they not?

"Admiral BURKE. Yes, sir.

"Mr. WEISL. Is it not also true that the 1960 budget contained no funds for construction of additional Polaris submarines, except for advance components for submarines numbered 10, 11, and 12?

"Admiral BURKE. That is correct, sir.

"Mr. WEISL. Isn't the withholding of the funds appropriated in 1959, and the failure to request additional funds in 1960, resulting in a sharp decrease, or a gap, in the deployment of Polaris submarines after the first nine?

"Admiral BURKE. Not a sharp decrease, sir. What we can do, of course, will be to deploy about three submarines per year, because that is what we are building per year.

"Mr. WEISL. I understand that, but if you had used the money that you asked Congress to give you and for which you pleaded so eloquently, you wouldn't have had that gap, isn't that true?

"Admiral BURKE. Yes, sir; that is correct.

"Mr. WEISL. Obviously you cannot make up for that leadtime now. Once leadtime is lost, it is lost forever, isn't it?

"Admiral BURKE. Yes, sir.

Expenditure limitations prevented Air Force from requesting additional programs for fiscal year 1961 (hearings before House Appropriations Committee, revisions in 1960 and 1961 Air Force programs, pp. 38, 40)

"Mr. MAHON. Let me get this clear: The add ons which you have presented us today are not all the add ons you requested of the Department of Defense in connection with this presentation?

"General WHITE. That is correct, sir.

"Mr. MAHON. What was the stumbling block with these additions and why did you not get the funds and approval, or do you know?

"General WHITE. Yes, sir; I know. It is an expenditure problem. We must abide, by Service, as to the expenditures that can be made in any given fiscal year.

"Mr. MAHON. Is your expenditure limitation for fiscal year 1961 $18.6 billion?

"General FRIEDMAN. $18.6 billion; yes, sir.

"General WHITE. These addenda bring us up to that figure.

"Mr. MAHON. Were you not already up to that point?

"General FRIEDMAN. We were. But, on a comparable basis—although we dropped out some $500 million and we put in $300 million—the space programs and the missile programs spend out at a higher rate than the types of programs which we deleted. Therefore, on an expenditure basis we net out. The point is that we cannot use the additional $140 million without exceeding the $18.6 billion expenditure.

* * * * *

"General FRIEDMAN. For the Minuteman, we asked for an amount of $20.7 million more in our initial discussions than is shown in the addenda here.

"Mr. MAHON. Why was it reduced?

"General FRIEDMAN. It was reduced on the basis which General White discussed, that this appeared to be the maximum funds we could apply and still remain within the expenditures reflected in the President's budget.

"General WHITE. May I put it this way: The list that you have read adds up to the amount of expenditures which we have deleted by our proposed changes.

"Mr. MAHON. I see the point."

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to yield to my colleague from Texas for a question, or to propound an inquiry, or to receive any suggestion he may have at this time, with the understanding that I shall not lose my right to the floor.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I really desire to direct an inquiry to the distinguished Senator from Ohio.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the junior Senator from Texas may direct an inquiry to the Senator from Ohio without my losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, without challenging the correctness of the Senator's position, does the Senator from Texas or the Senator from Ohio have the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio yielded to the Senator from Texas for the purpose of making a statement.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Chair.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I understood the Senator from Ohio had the floor, and he has stated he would make some kind of a request.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Will my colleague make a suggestion, or ask the Senator a question?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Did the Senator from Ohio say he planned to call for a quorum?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I reserved to myself that right. I did not declare I would do so.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I understood my colleague was probably going to make a suggestion concerning the pending business.

If I yield the floor I shall have no further control of it, and then the Senator may not be able to make any suggestion he desires to make, for the reason that the Senator from Ohio may make a motion to table.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I shall be glad to enable the junior Senator from Texas to make a statement. I shall not preclude him from doing so.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I understood that before the Senator from Ohio granted time to the senior Senator from Texas he stated he might, upon the completion of the statement of the Senator from Texas, again make a motion to table.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. He simply reserved the right to do so.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Considering the lateness of the hour, it is manifest, since we have only 35 minutes remaining, that action on Senate Resolution 374 cannot be completed before midnight, and the adjournment of the Senate would then be forced under the resolution previously agreed to by both Houses. It is obvious that the opponents of the resolution can, under the existing parliamentary situation, prevent adoption of Senate Resolution 374 at this late hour.

I have no desire to delay the Senate or to hold Senators another half hour without purpose, unless there is a reasonable chance for adoption of the resolution. Therefore, I ask leave of the Senate to withdraw the resolution from consideration in order to pave the way for adjournment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none, and the resolution is withdrawn.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, do any other Senators desire to address the Senate?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I wish to state that I have withdrawn the resolution because of the parliamentary situation, but this is in no wise any indication that the resolution is not badly needed and good legislation. The resolution is withdrawn simply because of the lateness of the hour and the impossibility of completing action upon it before 12 o'clock midnight.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I assume that has cleared up the situation.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I yield the floor to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to my delightful friend the minority leader, without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If any other Senators desire to speak before the minority leader speaks, I shall be glad to yield to them.

I yield to the minority leader, with the understanding that I shall not lose my right to the floor.

ADJOURNMENT OBSERVATIONS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, it is not my purpose to indulge in any observations of a partisan or political character. If I were impelled to do so, I probably could make an observation or

two on the general subject of divided government. There are divisions other than those which exist between the executive branch and the legislative branch, but somehow we have come to live with them, and to live with them in a satisfactory fashion.

There is another answer, of course, to the question of division in Government, if I may make so bold as to say so, and that would be a very thumping Republican victory all up and down the line. Then we shall have no divided Government. We have had that situation on other occasions, and I have lived through it.

Mr. President, I came to the Congress as a minority Member in 1933. I saw my party diminish in the Congress steadily over a period of several years—in fact, over a period of several sessions. I believe in 1936 we were reduced to only 89 members in the House of Representatives. One of the favorite canards was that we could hold a convention in a telephone booth.

It was in that period we essayed so many new ventures in the social and economic field, so many of which had to be expunged from the statute books that I sometimes wonder whether the type of division we have now, energized by our President of good will, by a cohesive minority, and by a vigorous majority, I will say, has not been beneficial to the country.

We live in terms of equations today. I forget whether I said it last night or at some other place, but we have come to think that one-third plus one, or 66⅔, should wield the stronger power and be the most potent force in Government.

That is for another day, when we get on the hustings. Tonight I simply wish to pay my respects to the loyal opposition, to the members of my own party, to the staff, to the majority leader, to the Vice President, who unfortunately cannot be with us tonight, and to all those who have made this an effective institution.

The moving finger writes, and the fortuities of politics will probably result in change of some faces when we return in January. Who shall say who will be here then?

There is a sweet sorrow about it because here, above all our divergencies, there arises so majestically the enduring peace of friendship. I say "enduring," because one need only read in the face of one who has served here and returns for a visit with pleasant recollections how enduring that friendship has really been.

So I salute all of those who have been here before and in my time. I salute my own colleagues, and I salute our distinguished friends on the other side of the aisle. I count everyone a friend.

One of the amazing things is that notwithstanding all the changes, how interesting is the adjustment that is made. Old faces go and new faces come, but somehow, like Tennyson's brook, the free Republic continues to go on with vitality, vigor, and an energized faith, as it moves to newer heights and newer achievements for its people in the great moral climate of freedom.

As I think of the word "friend," I recall that all the really great things in life and all the great impelling forces are expressed in the simplest words—"God," "love," "child," "friend." Those are words of one syllable, but they are the great words. Those are the great compelling symbols that somehow move us on, and the word "friend" stands out majestically as we think of ourselves in this Chamber dedicated to great and common purposes, and how easily we adjust because the friendship is deeper and it is greater than any other force that we encounter.

Notwithstanding that friendship, in due course I shall go back to the hustings, and in the nature of things I shall have to recite all of the sins of those on the other side of the aisle. I shall recite the sins of omission and the sins of commission. Tomorrow I shall examine the RECORD fervently and earnestly to see what my distinguished friend LYNDON did not say and what he did say. The result of that study must necessarily then become the basis for some of the utterances that I am expected to make on the platform.

But I wish to say to the majority leader and all Senators that whatever our utterances may be, they shall not be tainted with malice. They will be fair. But I assure the Senate they will be vigorous. They will be equitable, but I can assure the Senate they will be aggressive.

I wish our distinguished compatriots who seek higher political estate everything good—up to a point. [Laughter.] I have always been amazed to see what a difference 16 blocks can make.

I extend the Senators who are candidates the warm hand of fellowship. We want to keep them here. I want to keep them here. It would be lonesome without my distinguished friend the majority leader, and my distinguished friend from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], with whom it has been my honor and pleasure to work on the Senate Labor Committee. My affection is as high as the sky and it is as deep as the sea—and I do not want 16 blocks to intervene. [Laughter.]

We shall be charitable and gracious, there will be no malice; but we will pursue our responsibilities as an opposition party and do our best.

Tonight I wish the 101st Senator were here. I refer to the distinguished Chaplain of the Senate. I doubt whether I was ever so lifted as I was this morning, as fatigued as I was, by what he knew would be his farewell prayer for the 86th Congress. There was at once something lifting and refreshing about it.

What a great inspiration it is that each day, for the most part, a man of God can be with us to reenergize and to renew the faith, and make us realize that, after all, we are here to be helpful, notwithstanding the divergencies of opinion and the disagreements we may have, because that is the great wellspring and it is the great motive power that sends us forward.

To my distinguished friend, the majority leader, I say it has been a great pleasure to serve with him. When it has become my disagreeable duty to take him to task, I have always warned him in advance. I would go to his office and drink Sanka with him. [Laughter.] Certainly I do not intend a TV plug, but even at the risk of being commercial, I must say I have never found too much inspiration in Sanka. On those occasions I would tell him that it had become my duty and responsibility to take him to task, and even though the voice might reach an upper register, and I might brandish my arms and make it appear that I was fairly suffused with ire and anger, he knew better.

Then if, peradventure, the scene appeared on the front page of a newspaper and his beloved wife, Lady Bird, would say, "I thought EVERETT DIRKSEN was your friend," he always had the right answer. He said, "Oh, that was prearranged." [Laughter.]

Yet always the point could be made, and it could be made emphatically, but never to the point where it transgressed that fine line where friendship holds up the torch and says, "Thus far and no farther."

I wish my distinguished friend from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] were here. I said goodby to him a little while ago as he left to rejoin his wife and family and to get a day or two of rest to prepare for the ardor of campaigning that lies before him.

We have had many divergencies of spirit, and I must tell the Senate that in the Labor Committee early last week my heart was broken to have to propose an amendment I was going to offer, then to read it and then to explain it. If I had offered the amendment, my distinguished friend from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA] said he was prepared to table it. So, having had some experience in the art of the motion to table, I merely proposed what I was going to do. Then I read the amendment, and proceeded to explain it. I was terribly distressed when, after an hour of explanation, in the very middle of the explanation, one of my colleagues would rise and say, "The bells have sounded, and the committee has no authority to meet any longer."

I said, "Shame on you. You spoiled everything." So there I am. There is my amendment in the committee room. There also languishes the secondary boycott bill. If the majority leader has included that in his speech tonight, I will find it in the RECORD tomorrow. Then I will make note of it, and somewhere along the line I shall probably have to allude to it.

So it breaks my heart when I have to do these things. These are the disagreeable things, but at the same time they are what I call the negative brakes on progress. The danger is that often we can make progress too hastily.

I believe it is in Deuteronomy it is written: "Follow not the multitude to evil."

I guess I have never been a part of the multitude. I have always been in the minority. [Laughter.] There must be a negative brake somewhere. I presume I will gather no encomiums, and there will be no poems or apostrophes written to me for legislation I introduced. Perhaps my principal function has been the one that once was mentioned by the celebrated historian, Edward Gibbon, when he wrote in his "The

Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire" that progress is made not by what goes on the statute books but by what comes off or what is kept off. So I am a "keeper offer." That has been one of my functions, to stop these brain children from finding their way to the durable parchments of the statute books.

People do not build monuments to one like me, I suppose. At least it is a function, a conservative function. While it breaks my heart, yet I find comfort and durable satisfaction in the fact that that, too, can constitute a great contribution to the advance and progress of our country.

So as I look back, as I look around, as I look forward, as I evaluate the work of this Congress—and, of course, I shall evaluate it a little more leisurely and a little more precisely when in quiet moments I can look at a wall and pour a little oil on my portable typewriter and then proceed to catalog all your sins—it will be so much easier for me, and it will be so much more durable then, when I have it before me, and what a record it will be. But I assure everyone it will not be touched by malice. It will not be touched by anything except compassion and charity.

So we will be looking forward now, God willing—and I always add that. Who shall say which of us shall be here? So I try always to live every day to the full. I once heard William Jennings Bryan say in my hometown that his wife told him to plan as if he were to live forever, and to live as if he were to die tomorrow. It is a good rule.

So I plan to be on hand. I suppose when I expend too much energy, as I did last night, and got a little jittery and had the majority leader scold me—because he will be here in January—it will be like old familiar faces in old familiar places, and I shall get that song from the library and sing it to him.

But I must pay one testimony to our distinguished friend the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN]. I believe I once went up there to campaign against him; I am not sure. But I remember I was in Providence on a Sunday. I believe it was a clambake. I was never much of a hand at clambakes, but I know I made a good speech. The only trouble was, it did not score and it did not get any votes, as I got them last night on the substitute. But I learned the affection and esteem that his people have so long cherished for him. So I salute him as a friend, as a durable friend, who has contributed so much to the country.

I would pay my testimony tonight to the Vice President. He is not here. I trust that we can arrange tomorrow morning to pay a visit to him in the hospital. I notice that it is a rather interesting malady that supposedly afflicts him. It is called hemolytic staphylococcus aureus. That is just a little loss of synovial fluid—if that makes it any better—even though I am not an M.D. So we will go up to see him tomorrow and hold his hand, and I hope his energies will be quickly restored, so that as a great crusader and gladiator he can get back to the hustings.

Our visit will be a testimony and a tribute to how we do things in this country. The majority leader and I will go to see the Vice President. I suppose in other countries the people cannot understand that. They can hardly understand, I suppose, that in this body—and it may never happen again in a century—there can be two candidates on opposite tickets for the Presidency, and a candidate for the Vice Presidency, and that a former Member of this body can be a candidate for the Vice Presidency. Other people would think that we were so beset with selfishness and venality and political aggression that we would be ready to tear each other to shreds. But we live together. We disagree together. But somehow or other the Republic goes forward. When the issue has been resolved and the water smoothed over, then we make a new effort, take another hitch in the belt, and once more this Republic goes on to higher ground.

What a privilege it is to be a citizen of this country, and what a rare privilege it is to have the confidence and the trust of the people, to the point where they make one the spokesman in this body for millions.

I never forget it, and I am never tired of making the confession, that my father and mother came from the old country. Sometimes I wish they could be alive. I wish they could sit in the gallery tonight and look down. I wish that they could say in whispered tones, "That is our son down there." And then say that in no other place in this whole wide world could it happen than in the United States of America, a Republic dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal. It is a blessed place, attended by these enduring friendships. What more can anyone ask?

I salute the staff of the Senate. I do not know what we would do without you. I especially salute my friend, Mark Trice, whose birthday we recently observed. He came here as a page, and has spent 44 years here looking after us. I salute my distinguished friend, his assistant, Bill Brownrigg.

I salute them one and all. Without them, without the staff, without their sense of mission, without their spirit of dedication, this institution could not function with the expedition and the dispatch with which it does function.

So, as we prepare to adjourn sine die, I salute you all. I shall see some of you in your respective States. When I come, I shall be kind. I shall call you up on the telephone when I arrive. I shall say, "I am in town."

You will say, "Yes; I saw it in the newspapers."

I shall say, "I am delighted to see you, and I hope we can have a chance to visit."

You will say, "I wish you well in everything except the mission that brings you here." [Laughter.]

That is another part of the greatness of this country.

So, au revoir. We shall see you on the home diamond somewhere; and when it is all over, on the morning of November 9, all the healing waters will somehow close over our dissidence, and we shall go forward as a solid phalanx once more. (Applause, Senators rising.)

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 8712. An act to amend the act of August 9, 1955, to authorize longer term leases of Indian lands on the Agua Caliente (Palm Springs), Navajo, Torres-Martinez, and Dania Indian Reservations; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 12777. An act to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, as amended, to provide increased benefits in case of disabling injuries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 693) authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Document No. 198 of the 84th Congress, entitled "The Commission on Intergovernmental Relations," was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed four thousand six hundred additional copies of House Document Numbered 198 of the Eighty-fourth Congress, first session, entitled "The Commission on Intergovernmental Relations", of which four thousand shall be for the use of the House Committee on Government Operations, three hundred copies for the House document room, and three hundred copies for the Senate document room.

ADJOURNMENT SINE DIE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 11 o'clock and 52 minutes p.m.), in accordance with the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 745) previously agreed to, the Senate adjourned sine die.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 746, agreed to September 2, 1960, the President pro tempore, on September 6, 1960, signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

S. 882. An act for the relief of the heirs of J. B. White;

S. 1092. An act to provide for the construction of the Cheney division, Wichita Federal reclamation project, Kansas, and for other purposes;

S. 1545. An act to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so as to authorize elimination of a hearing in certain cases under section 408;

S. 1663. An act directing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain property in the State of North Dakota to the city of Bismarck, N. Dak.;

S. 1670. An act to provide for the granting of mineral rights in certain homestead lands in the State of Alaska;

S. 1740. An act to amend section 202(b) of the Communications Act of 1934 in order to expand the Federal Communications Commission's regulatory authority under such section;

S. 1764. An act to amend title 32, United States Code, to authorize the payment of certain claims against the National Guard;

S. 1898. An act to promote the public interest by amending the Communications Act of 1934, to provide a pregrant procedure in case of certain applications; to impose limitations on payoffs between applicants; to require disclosure of payments made for broadcasting of certain matter; to grant authority to impose forfeitures in the broadcast service; and to prohibit deceptive practices in contests of intellectual knowledge, skill, or chance; and for other purposes;

S. 1964. An act to amend the act requiring certain common carriers by railroads to make reports to the Interstate Commerce Commission with respect to certain accidents in order to clarify the requirements of such act;

S. 2195. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the western division of the Dalles Federal reclamation project, Oregon, and for other purposes;

S. 2353. An act for the relief of Col. John A. Ryan, Jr.;

S. 2757. An act to supplement the act of June 14, 1926, as amended, to permit any State to acquire certain public lands for recreation use;

S. 2761. An act to invalidate payments made for certain emergency conservation measures under the program authorized by the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1957;

S. 2770. An act for the relief of Borinquen Home Corp.;

S. 2917. An act to establish a price support level for milk and butterfat;

S. 2959. An act to clarify the right of States to select certain public lands subject to any outstanding mineral lease or permit;

S. 3146. An act to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to donate dairy products and other agricultural commodities for use in home economics courses;

S. 3212. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior and the Administrator of General Services to convey certain public and acquired lands in the State of Nevada to the county of Mineral, Nev.;

S. 3267. An act to amend the act of October 17, 1940, relating to the disposition of certain public lands in Alaska;

S. 3399. An act to authorize the exchange of certain property within Shenandoah National Park, in the State of Virginia, and for other purposes;

S. 3439. An act authorizing the President of the United States of America to present a gold medal to Robert Frost, a New England poet;

S. 3533. An act to protect farm and ranch operators making certain land use changes under the Great Plains conservation program against loss of acreage allotments;

S. 3619. An act to make permanent law the provisions of section 408 of the National Housing Act regulating savings and loan holding companies;

S. 3623. An act to designate and establish that portion of the Hawaii National Park on the island of Maui, in the State of Hawaii, as the Haleakala National Park, and for other purposes;

S. 3665. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to grant an easement over certain lands to the trustees of the Cincinnati Southern Railway, their successors and assigns;

S. 3681. An act authorizing the Rhode Island Turnpike and Bridge Authority to combine for financing purposes the bridge across the West Passage of Narragansett Bay with the Newport Bridge and any other project acquired or constructed by said authority;

S. 3688. An act to amend the act of December 20, 1944, with respect to certain powers of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia;

S. 3759. An act authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands to Auburn University, Auburn, Ala.;

S. 3771. An act to amend certain provisions of the Trust Indenture Act of 1939, as amended;

S. 3773. An act to amend certain provisions of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940, as amended;

H.R. 383. An act to authorize the annexation of certain real property of the United States by the city of Wyandotte, Mich.;

H.R. 816. An act to convey certain lands in Oklahoma to the Cheyenne and Arapaho Indians, and for other purposes;

H.R. 1526. An act for the relief of F. P. Tower, Lillie B. Lewis, the estate of Manuel Branco, John Santos Carinhas, Joaquin Gomez Carinhas, and Manuel Jesus Carinhas;

H.R. 2565. An act to promote effectual planning, development, maintenance, and coordination of wildlife, fish, and game conservation and rehabilitation in military reservations;

H.R. 3536. An act for the relief of Guadalupe Villarreal, Jr.;

H.R. 7810. An act to credit periods of internment during World War II to certain Federal employees of Japanese ancestry for purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act and the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951;

H.R. 7990. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain lands of the United States to the Citizen Band of Potawatomi Indians of Oklahoma;

H.R. 8156. An act for the relief of Jack Kent Cooke;

H.R. 8166. An act for the relief of the Crum-McKinnon Building Co., Billings, Mont.;

H.R. 8424. An act to amend section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949 with respect to positions in the Library of Congress;

H.R. 8665. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a memorial to Theodore Roosevelt in the National Capital" to provide for the construction of such memorial by the Secretary of the Interior;

H.R. 9715. An act for the relief of Otis Drinkard;

H.R. 10087. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit taxpayers to elect an overall limitation on the foreign tax credit;

H.R. 10311. An act providing that certain provisions of Public Law 335 dated October 7, 1949 (63 Stat. 724), shall apply to the Mercedes division of the lower Rio Grande rehabilitation project, Texas;

H.R. 10341. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants-in-aid to universities, hospitals, laboratories, and other public or nonprofit institutions to strengthen their programs of research and research training in sciences related to health;

H.R. 10548. An act to amend the Helium Act of March 3, 1925, as amended, for the defense, security, and the general welfare of the United States;

H.R. 10586. An act to enable the Oregon Short Line Railroad Co. to convey title to certain lands in Idaho to the Pocatello First Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latterday Saints;

H.R. 10841. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to place bamboo pipestems on the free list;

H.R. 10960. An act to amend section 5701 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the excise tax upon cigars, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11322. An act for the relief of Col. Joseph A. Nichols;

H.R. 11380. An act for the relief of Mr. Joe J. Farmer;

H.R. 12043. An act to amend sections 22, 23, and 24, title 13, United States Code, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12383. An act to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to make benefits more realistic in terms of present wage rates, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12458. An act to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for the work of the President's Committee on Employment for the Physically Handicapped;

H.R. 12536. An act relating to the treatment of charges for local advertising for purposes of determining the manufacturers sale price;

H.R. 12574. An act to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, so as to provide that an injured employee shall have the right to select his own physician; and for other purposes;

H.R. 12580. An Act to improve coverage under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system and to remove hardships and inequities, improve the financing of the trust funds, and provide disability benefits to additional individuals under such system; to provide grants to States for medical care for aged individuals of low income; to amend the public assistance and maternal and child welfare provisions of the Social Security Act; to improve the employment compensation provisions of such act; and for other purposes;

H.R. 12659. An act to suspend for a temporary period the import duty on heptanoic acid, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12699. An act to cancel a deed of trust to the United States from the predecessor in the name of Gallaudet College and any evidence of indebtedness related to the same transaction, to quiet the college's title to property belonging to it, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12759. An act to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes;

H.R. 13021. An act to provide for assistance in the development of Latin America and in the reconstruction of Chile, and for other purposes;

H.R. 13053. An act to increase the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the U.S. Park Police, the White House Police, and for other purposes;

H.R. 13066. An act to amend section 4(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended;

H.R. 13161. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes;

S.J. Res. 9. Joint resolution to provide for the removal of a reservation of timber rights from a patent issued to Ivan H. McCormack;

S.J. Res. 176. Joint resolution authorizing the preparation and printing of a revised edition of the Constitution of the United States of America—Analysis and Interpretation, published in 1953 as Senate Document No. 170 of the 82d Congress;

S.J. Res. 209. Joint resolution providing for the establishment of an annual National Forest Products Week;

H.J. Res. 311. Joint resolution authorizing the erection of a statue of Taras Shevchenko on public grounds in the District of Columbia;

H.J. Res. 402. Joint resolution granting the consent and approval of Congress for the States of Virginia and Maryland and the District of Columbia to enter into a compact related to the regulation of mass transit in the Washington, District of Columbia, metropolitan area, and for other purposes;

H.J. Res. 704. Joint resolution to remove copyright restrictions upon the musical composition "Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag," and for other purposes;

H.J. Res. 723. Joint resolution extending an invitation to the Fédération Aéronautique Internationale to hold the 1962 world sport parachuting championships at Orange, Mass.; and

H.J. Res. 784. Joint resolution amending the act of July 14, 1960, to extend the time

within which the United States Constitution 175th Anniversary Commission shall report to Congress and including certain amendments relating to housing.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

The Secretary of the Senate, on September 6, 1960, presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions:

S. 882. An act for the relief of the heirs of J. B. White;

S. 1092. An act to provide for the construction of the Cheney division, Wichita Federal reclamation project, Kansas, and for other purposes;

S. 1545. An act to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so as to authorize elimination of a hearing in certain cases under section 408;

S. 1663. An act directing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain property in the State of North Dakota to the city of Bismarck, N. Dak.;

S. 1670. An act to provide for the granting of mineral rights in certain homestead lands in the State of Alaska;

S. 1740. An act to amend section 202(b) of the Communications Act of 1934 in order to to expand the Federal Communications Commission's regulatory authority under such section;

S. 1764. An act to amend title 32, United States Code, to authorize the payment of certain claims against the National Guard;

S. 1898. An act to promote the public interest by amending the Communications Act of 1934, to provide a pregrant procedure in case of certain applications; to impose limitations on payoffs between applicants; to require disclosure of payments made for broadcasting of certain matter; to grant authority to impose forfeitures in the broadcast service; and to prohibit deceptive practices in contests of intellectual knowledge, skill, or chance; and for other purposes;

S. 1964. An act to amend the act requiring certain common carriers by railroad to make reports to the Interstate Commerce Commission with respect to certain accidents in order to clarify the requirements of such act;

S. 2195. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the western division of the Dalles Federal reclamation project, Oregon, and for other purposes;

S. 2353. An act for the relief of Col. John A. Ryan, Jr.;

S. 2757. An act to supplement the act of June 14, 1926, as amended, to permit any State to acquire certain public lands for recreation use;

S. 2761. An act to invalidate payments made for certain emergency conservation measures under the program authorized by the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1957;

S. 2770. An act for the relief of Borinquen Home Corp.;

S. 2917. An act to establish a price-support level for milk and butterfat;

S. 2959. An act to clarify the right of States to select certain public lands subject to any outstanding mineral lease or permit;

S. 3146. An act to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to donate dairy products and other agricultural commodities for use in home economics courses;

S. 3212. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior and the Administrator of General Services to convey certain public and acquired lands in the State of Nevada to the county of Mineral, Nev.;

S. 3267. An act to amend the act of October 17, 1940, relating to the disposition of certain public lands in Alaska;

S. 3399. An act to authorize the exchange of certain property within Shenandoah National Park, in the State of Virginia, and for other purposes;

S. 3439. An act authorizing the President of the United States of America to present a gold medal to Robert Frost, a New England poet;

S. 3533. An act to protect farm and ranch operators making certain land use changes under the Great Plains conservation program against loss of acreage allotments;

S. 3619. An act to make permanent law the provisions of section 408 of the National Housing Act regulating savings and loan holding companies;

S. 3623. An act to designate and establish that portion of the Hawaii National Park on the island of Maui, in the State of Hawaii, as the Haleakala National Park, and for other purposes;

S. 3665. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to grant an easement over certain lands to the trustees of the Cincinnati Southern Railway, their successors and assigns;

S. 3681. An act authorizing the Rhode Island Turnpike and Bridge Authority to combine for financing purposes the bridge across the West Passage of Narragansett Bay with the Newport Bridge and any other project acquired or constructed by said authority;

S. 3688. An act to amend the act of December 20, 1944, with respect to certain powers of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia;

S. 3759. An act authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands to Auburn University, Auburn, Ala.

S. 3771. An act to amend certain provisions of the Trust Indenture Act of 1939, as amended;

S. 3773. An act to amend certain provisions of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940, as amended;

S.J. Res. 9. Joint resolution to provide for the removal of a reservation of timber rights from a patent issued to Ivan H. McCormack;

S.J. Res. 176. Joint resolution authorizing the preparation and printing of a revised edition of the Constitution of the United States of America—Analysis and Interpretation, published in 1953 as Senate Document No. 170 of the 82d Congress; and

S.J. Res. 209. Joint resolution providing for the establishment of an annual National Forest Products Week.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT ENTITLED "CASE STUDY IN SUBCONTRACTING BY WEAPON-SYSTEM CONTRACTOR" (S. REPT. NO. 1947)

Under authority of the order of the Senate of August 30, 1960, on September 16, 1960, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, from the Select Committee on Small Business, submitted a report entitled "Case Study in Subcontracting by Weapon-System Contractor," which was printed.

APPOINTMENTS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

JOINT COMMITTEE ON INAUGURAL CEREMONIES FOR 1961

On September 14, 1960, the Vice President appointed Senator CARL HAYDEN, of Arizona, to the Joint Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies for 1961, vice the late Senator THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., of Missouri.

APPOINTMENTS TO NATO PARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE

On November 15, 1960, under the authority of Senate Resolution 392, the Vice President, subsequent to the sine die adjournment of the Senate, appointed as members of the U.S. group on the part of the Senate to the NATO Parliamentary Conference, to be held in Paris, France, during November 1960, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], and the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

APPROVAL OF SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

The President of the United States, subsequent to sine die adjournment of the Senate, notified the Secretary of the Senate that on the following dates he had approved and signed the following bills and joint resolutions:

On September 2, 1960:

S. 68. An act to provide for continued delivery of water under the Federal reclamation laws to lands held by husband and wife upon the death of either;

S. 107. An act to amend title XI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, relating to Federal ship-mortgage insurance in order to include floating drydocks under the definition of the term "vessel" in such title;

S. 1781. An act to facilitate cooperation between the Federal Government, colleges and universities, the States, and private organizations for cooperative unit programs of research and education relating to fish and wildlife, and for other purposes;

S. 1857. An act to promote the foreign trade of the United States in grapes and plums, to protect the reputation of American-grown grapes and plums in foreign markets, to prevent deception or misrepresentation as to the quality of such products moving in foreign commerce, to provide for the commercial inspection of such products entering such commerce, and for other purposes;

S. 2369. An act for the relief of Sachiko Kato;

S. 2388. An act relating to the separation and retirement of John R. Barker;

S. 2576. An act to authorize the addition of certain donated lands to the Everglades National Park;

S. 2669. An act to extend the period of exemption from inspection under the provisions of section 4426 of the Revised Statutes granted certain small vessels carrying freight to and from places on the inland waters of southeastern Alaska;

S. 2711. An act to quiet title to certain lands within the Nez Perce Indian Reservation, Idaho, and for other purposes;

S. 2772. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey land in the town of Cascade, El Paso County, Colo.;

S. 2806. An act to revise the boundaries of the Coronado National Memorial and to authorize the repair and maintenance of an access road thereto in the State of Arizona, and for other purposes;

S. 2932. An act to provide for credit for service of sentence for time spent in custody

for want of bail prior to the imposition of sentence by the sentencing court where the statute requires the imposition of a minimum mandatory sentence;

S. 3030. An act for the relief of Michiko (Hirai) Christopher;

S. 3053. An act for the relief of the State of Connecticut;

S. 3070. An act to provide for the removal of the restriction on use with respect to certain lands in Morton County, N. Dak., conveyed to the State of North Dakota on July 20, 1955;

S. 3160. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the founding of the State of Idaho as a Territory;

S. 3264. An act to abolish the Arlington Memorial Amphitheater Commission;

S. 3487. An act to amend the "Anti-Kickback Statute" to extend it to all negotiated contracts;

S. 3532. An act to provide for the striking of medal in commemoration of Century 21 Exposition to be held in Seattle, Wash.; and

S.J. Res. 68. Joint resolution providing for the establishment of the New Jersey Tercentenary Celebration Commission to formulate and implement plans to commemorate the 300th anniversary of the State of New Jersey, and for other purposes.

On September 6, 1960:

S. 285. An act for the relief of the estate of John A. Skenandore;

S. 1321. An act to authorize the Attorney General to consent, on behalf of the Library of Congress Trust Fund Board, to a modification of the terms of a trust instrument executed by James B. Wilbur;

S. 1806. An act to revise title 18, chapter 39, of the United States Code, entitled "Explosives and Combustibles";

S. 1870. An act to provide for examination, licensing, and for regulation of practical nurses, and for practical nursing education in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

S. 2306. An act to exempt from taxation certain property of the National Woman's Party, Inc., in the District of Columbia;

S. 3415. An act to exempt from taxation certain property of the American Association of University Women, Educational Foundation, Inc., in the District of Columbia;

S. 3727. An act to authorize the bonding of persons engaging in the home improvement business, and for other purposes; and

S. 3834. An act to increase the maximum amount which may be borrowed by the District of Columbia for use in the construction and improvement of its sanitary and combined sewer systems, and for other purposes.

On September 7, 1960:

S.J. Res. 170. Joint resolution to authorize the participation in an international convention of representative citizens from the North Atlantic Treaty nations to examine how greater political and economic cooperation among their peoples may be promoted, to provide for the appointment of U.S. delegates to such convention, and for other purposes.

On September 8, 1960:

S. 1066. An act to revise the boundaries and change the name of Fort Donelson National Military Park, and for other purposes;

S. 1214. An act to amend the act of March 11, 1948 (62 Stat. 78), relating to the establishment of the De Soto National Memorial, in the State of Florida;

S. 2131. An act to amend the Motor Vehicle Safety Responsibility Act of the District of Columbia approved May 25, 1954, as amended;

S. 2575. An act to provide a health benefits program for certain retired employees of the Government;

S. 2633. An act to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, and for other purposes;

S. 3416. An act to provide for the restoration to the United States of amounts expended in the District of Columbia in carrying out the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act of 1958;

S. 3648. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia on behalf of the United States to transfer from the United States to the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency title to certain real property in said District;

S. 3835. An act to authorize the District of Columbia Civil War Centennial Commission to plan and carry out in the District of Columbia civic programs in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the Civil War; to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of Defense to make certain property of the District and of the United States available for the use of such Commission; to authorize the said Commissioners to make certain regulations and permit certain uses to be made of public space, and for other purposes; and

S. 3867. An act to exempt from taxation certain property of the National Guard Association of the United States in the District of Columbia.

On September 13, 1960:

S. 1545. An act to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so as to authorize elimination of a hearing in certain cases under section 408;

S. 1663. An act directing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain property in the State of North Dakota to the city of Bismarck, N. Dak.;

S. 1740. An act to amend section 202(b) of the Communications Act of 1934 in order to expand the Federal Communications Commission's regulatory authority under such section;

S. 1764. An act to amend title 32, United States Code, to authorize the payment of certain claims against the National Guard;

S. 1898. An act to promote the public interest by amending the Communications Act of 1934, to provide a pregrant procedure in cases of certain applications; to impose limitations on payoffs between applicants; to require disclosure of payments made for the broadcasting of certain matter; to grant authority to impose forfeitures in the broadcast service; and to prohibit deceptive practices in contests of intellectual knowledge, skill, or chance; and for other purposes;

S. 1964. An act to amend the act requiring certain common carriers by railroads to make reports to the Interstate Commerce Commission with respect to certain accidents in order to clarify the requirements of such act;

S. 2195. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the western division of the Dalles Federal reclamation project, Oregon, and for other purposes;

S. 2757. An act to supplement the act of June 14, 1926, as amended, to permit any State to acquire certain public lands for recreational use;

S. 3146. An act to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to donate dairy products and other agricultural commodities for use in home economics courses;

S. 3212. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior and the Administrator of General Services to convey certain public and acquired lands in the State of Nevada to the county of Mineral, Nev.;

S. 3399. An act to authorize the exchange of certain property within Shenandoah National Park, in the State of Virginia, and for other purposes;

S. 3439. An act authorizing the President of the United States of America to present a gold medal to Robert Frost, a New England poet;

S. 3619. An act to make permanent law the provisions of section 408 of the National Housing Act regulating savings and loan holding companies;

S. 3623. An act to designate and establish that portion of the Hawaii National Park on the island of Maui, in the State of Hawaii, as the Haleakala National Park, and for other purposes;

S. 3665. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to grant an easement over certain lands to the trustees of the Cincinnati Southern Railway, their successors and assigns;

S. 3681. An act authorizing the Rhode Island Turnpike and Bridge Authority to combine for financing purposes the bridge across the West Passage of Narragansett Bay with the Newport Bridge and any other project acquired or constructed by said authority;

S. 3688. An act to amend the act of December 20, 1944, with respect to certain powers of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia;

S. 3759. An act authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands to Auburn University, Auburn, Ala.;

S. 3771. An act to amend certain provisions of the Trust Indenture Act of 1939, as amended;

S. 3773. An act to amend certain provisions of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940, as amended;

S.J. Res. 176. Joint resolution authorizing the preparation and printing of a revised edition of the Constitution of the United States of America—Analysis and Interpretation, published in 1953 as Senate Document No. 170 of the 82d Congress; and

S.J. Res. 209. Joint resolution providing for the establishment of an annual National Forest Products Week.

On September 14, 1960:

S. 1092. An act to provide for the construction of the Cheney division, Wichita Federal reclamation project, Kansas, and for other purposes;

S. 1670. An act to provide for the granting of mineral rights in certain homestead lands in the State of Alaska;

S. 2761. An act to validate payments made for certain emergency conservation measures under the program authorized by the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1957;

S. 2770. An act for the relief of Borinquen Home Corp.;

S. 2959. An act to clarify the right of States to select certain public lands subject to any outstanding mineral lease or permit;

S. 3267. An act to amend the act of October 17, 1940, relating to the disposition of certain public lands in Alaska;

S. 3533. An act to protect farm and ranch operators making certain land use changes under the Great Plains conservation program against loss of acreage allotments;

S.J. Res. 9. Joint resolution to provide for the removal of a reservation of timber rights from a patent issued to Ivan H. McCormack.

On September 15, 1960:

S. 882. An act for the relief of the heirs of J. B. White; and

S. 2353. An act for the relief of Col. John A. Ryan, Jr.

PRICE SUPPORT LEVEL FOR MILK AND BUTTERFAT

The President also notified the Secretary of the Senate that he had, on September 16, 1960, approved and signed the act (S. 2917) to establish a price support level for milk and butterfat, and transmitted his reasons therefor, as follows:

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

I have today signed S. 2917, setting minimum price supports until March 31, 1961, for butterfat and milk for manufacturing purposes. The price of fluid milk, not subject to price support legislation, is not dealt with in the bill.

In 1954 the Congress turned away from rigid price supports and authorized the administrative determination of price support levels, within a stated range, so that agricultural production could be brought into line with demand. S. 2917 elevates minimum support prices for butterfat and manufacturing milk above present support levels and, if continued in effect beyond its termination date, could pose the threat of a return to the disastrous dairy surplus situation of only a few years ago.

The bill would have little practical effect, however, for present prices in the marketplace for butterfat and manufacturing milk are, depending on the item, above, at, or only slightly below the minimum prices that S. 2917 would establish. Moreover, the bill by its own terms will expire on March 31 of the new year.

The bill, therefore, can do little, if anything, to benefit the dairy farmer and, even more important, will do him little harm. Nor should it add materially to the cost of the Federal Government's dairy product price support programs or have a significant effect, if any at all, on the prices of dairy products to consumers.

For these reasons, and because I am mindful that the Congress—which passed the bill overwhelmingly—has by its adjournment no opportunity to attempt to override a veto, I concluded that the bill could and should be signed. These reasons seem to me the more compelling because this is an election year. Had the bill been presented to me under different circumstances, however, I doubtless would have withheld my approval because the bill on its face violates long established and well-known policies of this administration. But because its practical effects are negligible—and hence the violations more theoretical than real—I believe it my duty this year to avoid so far as possible any action on my part that would only serve to engender partisan political charges and countercharges in the dairy regions.

Early next year the new administration will be confronted with this problem, but it will then be very real, for any extension of S. 2917 would pose the serious threat I have described. At that time, however, the matter can be discussed and resolved in an atmosphere free of election year politics. In that regard, I wish it to be perfectly clear that for my part I shall continue to support the policy that agricultural production must eventually be controlled by economic law rather than by political maneuvering. Until this has happened, there can be no settlement of the so-called farm problem and no sound prosperity for the family-size farm.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate September 1 (legislative day of August 31), 1960:

Coast and Geodetic Survey

Subject to qualifications provided by law, the following for permanent appointments to the grades indicated in the Coast and Geodetic Survey:

To be captains

Arthur L. Wardwell
Emmett H. Sheridan
Raymond H. Tryon, Jr.
Chester J. Beyma
Joseph E. Waugh

To be commanders

Robert C. Darling
Miller J. Tonkel
William E. Randall
Allen L. Powell
Norman E. Taylor

To be ensign

Harry W. Floyd.

U.S. Coast Guard

The following-named persons to the grades indicated in the U.S. Coast Guard:

To be chief warrant officer, W–3

John A. Packard.
Don R. Moss.
Leslie A. Mears.

The following-named persons to the grades indicated in the U.S. Coast Guard:

To be chief warrant officer, W–2

Franklin E. Thrall
William H. Dotson
Robert J. Ross
Galen B. Nielsen
Thomas L. Wedgewood
Roland D. Moriarty
John J. Janda, Jr.
George P. Asche
James W. Brawley, Jr.
John V. A. Thompson
Frank E. Braman
John F. Dunn
George L. Gordon
Earl E. Martin
William F. Queen
Robert R. Noble
Warren J. Frederick
Fred P. England
Weymound Davis
Dale H. Huff
Gordon D. Crandall
Jack P. Morgan
Maurice V. Goodroe
John F. Olsen
Bruno A. Forsterer
Milton J. Thompson
Frederick H. Elings
Carlton D. Leonard
Robert G. Keim
Frederick M. Beall
Walter H. Riddle, Jr.
Harry P. Miller, Jr.
Edward V. Dempsey, Jr.
Charles H. Denmark
Charles B. Morrison
James A. Blake
Russell D. Edens
Benjamin S. Beach, Jr.
James J. Gaugan
Daniel F. Kennedy
Albert D. Grantham
George T. Kulick
James J. Truesdale
Edward J. Swenson
Russell E. Sawyer
Richard N. Westcott
Richard J. Briggs
Claud W. Ashcraft
Vern R. Potter
Joseph B. Cowart, Jr.
William E. Ellingsworth
Donn W. Repper
Albert J. Lyne
James G. Lang
Aaron W. Rogers
James J. Leftwich
Robert S. Cutler
Ronald G. Eastman
Robert O. Slade
Herbert D. McQuarrie, Jr.
Noel G. Ballinger
Mark W. Byrd
Norman W. Smith
Robert H. Elkins
Donald P. Nachtwey
Theottis Wood
Duane P. Gatto
Luther "L" Barr
John B. Bosk
Alfred H. F. Marchant
Robert E. Hynds
Edwin L. Brusstar, Jr.
Arnold I. Cousins
Dorwin W. Newman
James D. Lombard
John J. Muldoon, Jr.

U.S. Circuit Judge

J. Joseph Smith, of Connecticut, to be U.S. circuit judge for the second circuit, vice Carroll C. Hincks, retired.

U.S. District Judge

William H. Timbers, of Connecticut, to be U.S. district judge for the district of Connecticut, vice J. Joseph Smith, elevated.

U.S. Attorneys

Cornelius W. Wickersham, Jr., of New York, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of New York for the term of 4 years, vice Leonard P. Moore, resigned.

George M. Yeager, of Alaska, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Alaska for the term of 4 years. (New position.)

In the Army

The nominations beginning John J. Pelosi, to be colonel, and ending Bernice Mary Hill, to be major, said nominations having been received by the Senate on August 25, 1960.

In the Navy and Marine Corps

The nominations beginning Francis J. Vincent, to be an ensign in the Navy, and ending Bruce P. Wood, to be first lieutenant in the Marine Corps, said nominations having been received by the Senate on August 23, 1960.

In the Marine Corps

The nominations beginning Douglas E. Wade, to be major, and ending James W. Wilson, to be major, said nominations having been received by the Senate on August 23, 1960.

In the Air Force

The nominations beginning with George L. Abel, to be colonel, and ending with Alphonse B. Slivinski, to be colonel, said nominations having been received by the Senate on August 11, 1960.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

(Legislative day of Wednesday, August 31, 1960)

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 12 o'clock noon.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 205]

Anderson, Mont.	Grant	Multer
Anfuso	Gray	Murray
Auchincloss	Green, Oreg.	O'Konski
Ayres	Griffiths	Patman
Barden	Hagen	Pilcher
Baring	Hays	Powell
Baumhart	Healey	Preston
Bennett, Mich.	Hébert	Rains
Bolling	Henderson	Rogers, Mass.
Bolton	Hess	Rostenkowski
Bowles	Hosmer	Scherer
Brooks, La.	Kelly	Shelley
Buckley	Keogh	Shipley
Celler	Kilburn	Sikes
Curtis, Mass.	Lafore	Siler
Davis, Tenn.	Landrum	Smith, Kans.
Diggs	Lane	Taylor, N.Y.
Dingell	Lankford	Teague, Tex.
Dowdy	Lesinski	Thompson, La.
Doyle	Loser	Thompson, N.J.
Durham	McDowell	Vanik
Evins	McSween	Van Pelt
Fallon	Macdonald	Vinson
Farbstein	Magnuson	Wainwright
Flynn	Miller, George P.	Withrow
Fogarty	Mitchell	Yates
Forrester	Morrison	Zelenko

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). On this rollcall 344 Members have answered to their names; a quorum is present.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 10311. An act providing that certain provisions of Public Law 335 dated October 7, 1949 (63 Stat. 724), shall apply to the Mercedes division of the lower Rio Grande rehabilitation project, Texas; and

H.R. 13066. An act to amend section 4(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 4384. An act to amend paragraph 1774 of the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to the importation of certain articles for religious purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1092. An act to provide for the construction of the Cheney division, Wichita Federal reclamation project, Kansas, and for other purposes;

S. 1670. An act to provide for the granting of mineral rights in certain homestead lands in the State of Alaska;

S. 2195. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the western division of The Dalles Federal reclamation project, Oregon, and for other purposes;

S. 2757. An act to supplement the act of June 14, 1926, as amended, to permit any State to acquire certain public lands for recreational use;

S. 3212. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior and the Administrator of General Services to convey certain public and acquired lands in the State of Nevada to the county of Mineral, Nev.;

S. 3267. An act to amend the act of October 17, 1940, relating to the disposition of certain public lands in Alaska; and

S. 3688. An act to amend the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945, as amended, and the act approved December 20, 1944, as amended, and for other purposes.

REV. BERNARD BRASKAMP, D.D., CHAPLAIN OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the strength of the American form of government is that it has moral origin, starting with a strong belief, on the part of our people, in God and His law and His word, and emphasized by two great commandments, without excluding the others, love of God, and love of neighbor.

We have in the House of Representatives a great Chaplain, a man who has enriched the life of each and every one of us, particularly along spiritual lines.

I admire and respect our Chaplain very much. He is a gentleman of deep faith. We need that at all times, and particularly in the world today, without regard to what our religious convictions may be, the possession of deep faith and the public manifestation of deep faith, because that is the reservoir which could be the difference between victory and defeat.

We are fortunate in having in the House of Representatives this man of deep faith and of understanding mind. I have benefited from his prayers. He speaks to me when he offers the prayers he does so eloquently and effectively. I am sure when I say that about myself I speak the thoughts and the sentiments of every other of my colleagues.

Today is the 35th wedding anniversary of Chaplain and Mrs. Braskamp. The public manifestation on the part of the Members of the House, with all the Members spontaneously rising and applauding, that has just occurred out of our deep respect for him, constitutes the most powerful remarks that I or any other could make. I know I speak the thoughts and sentiments of all of my colleagues when I extend to our beloved Chaplain and Mrs. Braskamp our hearty congratulations and the wish that God may bestow upon both of them for countless years to come an abundance of His choicest blessings.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the distinguished minority whip.

Mr. ARENDS. Along with my colleague from Massachusetts, the majority leader, I offer my congratulations to Chaplain and Mrs. Braskamp on their 35th anniversary and wish them many, many happy anniversaries to come.

It is not possible for all of us to be present on the floor each day at 12 o'clock to hear the opening prayer, but I try to make it my business to be here, the purpose being to listen to Dr. Braskamp's prayers. He has evolved a pattern that I like, namely, citing some real pointed quotation from the Bible, some paragraph from Holy Script that carries a deep message. It recalls to us some of the words we learned in years past. Such quotation is then followed by an eloquent prayer. What a fitting way to start the day, in this House with words of inspiration and purpose. I wish it might be the privilege of every Member of the House to each day listen to these prayers. They carry with them the eternal hopes of us all, and bring to us a feeling of contentment and peace as we enter the tasks of the day. Such inspiration is not only needed by us all, but deeply appreciated I am sure by each and every Member. We are grateful to Dr. Braskamp for his sincere concern for our spiritual well being.

Again I extend to Dr. Braskamp and his wife my appreciation of their friendship and thank him for his sincere and untiring efforts for this great body.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I join with the distinguished majority leader and the Republican whip in extending heartiest congratulations to Dr. Braskamp and his wife on their 35th wedding anniversary.

I think perhaps I know Dr. Braskamp better than any one in this Chamber. Dr. Braskamp was born in my hometown of Alton, Iowa. I knew his parents who were pioneers in our area. I also claim a bit of relationship, because Dr. Braskamp's eldest brother is marride to one of my father's sisters. So we have had a very happy association together, especially since we first met here in the Halls of Congress some years ago.

Dr. Braskamp is truly a Christian gentleman, a man who is revered and loved by all the Members of this House. His daily prayers are inspiring and his compassion for others has become a part of our daily association in this Chamber.

Heartiest congratulations to Dr. and Mrs. Braskamp. May they live long and happy and may God bless them in the days that lie ahead.

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] to congratulate Dr. and Mrs. Braskamp on the occasion of their 35th wedding anniversary. It is my earnest hope and prayer, that the bountiful blessings attending their 35 years of wedded life be increased even more abundantly in the future and that a gracious God will sustain them and keep them in the bond of wedlock for many years to come. In addition, I, too, want to express my deep appreciation to the devout Chaplain for his spiritual ministry in this Chamber and call the attention of my colleagues to the importance of this daily ritual. When our Founding Fathers were wrestling with serious problems at the time of the drafting of our Constitution, when nothing but chaos seemed to be the lot of earnest men, it was shaggy-haired Ben Franklin who asked for the floor and reminded his colleagues of the need of divine guidance. A prayer was offered and each succeeding session of that Continental Congress up to this very day was opened with prayer, beseeching Almighty God for guidance in the midst of serious problems; forgiveness in the knowledge of guilt, and hope and solace in the dark hours of world affairs. Let us never forget the importance of this intercession. Let us ever remember: "Except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it." Psalms 127:1. This truth is especially important for the trying times in world affairs today. And we reverence our esteemed Chaplain for bringing truths such as these to our attention in his daily devotions.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, certainly I want to join with my colleagues in wishing our good Chaplain and his wife many, many more years of happiness on the occasion of their 35th wedding anniversary.

For me it has been a real pleasure to know the Reverend Bernard Braskamp. His daily messages have been an inspiration to all of us, thoughtful and timely words of faith that help immeasurably to sustain us in the burdens we all face.

Always friendly, always gracious and always helpful, Reverend Braskamp, by his very example among us as a man of God, has contributed mightily to the atmosphere of good will that has characterized our deliberations here in this Chamber.

May the blessings of the Lord he has served so faithfully be upon Reverend and Mrs. Braskamp throughout a long and wonderful life together.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to be associated with the distinguished majority leader and the distinguished minority leader in their felicitations to our beloved Chaplain on this significant milestone in his and Mrs. Braskamp's life. I join with them in expressions of

appreciation of the daily prayer and fellowship and inspiration which Dr. Braskamp has bestowed so generously throughout the years of his service here.

You know, Mr. Speaker, it is a rather impressing thought that from the day the American Congress first met in 1789 down to this time we have never had a session of the Congress that was not opened by prayer.

We have placed upon our coinage from the beginning the national motto "In God We Trust." We have indicated by our daily reverence and supplication for divine guidance through our Chaplain our complete faith and devotion to the Creator of all good and perfect gifts.

I recall in this connection a notable decision made by Speaker Gillette. The question had never been decided up to that time, but one day Mr. Thomas L. Blanton, of Texas, when the House convened rose and made the point of order that a quorum was not present and, therefore, the Chaplain could not offer prayer until a quorum could be secured. Speaker Gillette, passing upon the question for the first time, and for the last time, held that the prayer of the Chaplain was not a part of the business of the House and, therefore, did not require a quorum.

From time immemorial the Speaker has always presented the Chaplain each morning with the announcement "The Chaplain will offer prayer." Speaker Clark alone always said, "The Chaplain will lead in prayer." Let us hope that Dr. Braskamp will continue to lead us in prayer for many years to come.

THE HONORABLE A. S. J. CARNAHAN

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, we always approach the end of a session, the end of a Congress, with more or less poignant regret. The Congress is made up of many men of many minds. It is a cross section of the Nation. Its membership includes men and women of every creed and temperament. They are descended from every nation and people upon the face of the globe. And necessarily—from the method of their selection—they are in the main personages of accomplishments and attainments, charged by great constituencies with vast responsibilities. The plaza of the Capitol is in effect an international highway and we legislate here not only for the United States but in many respects we legislate for the world.

It is a great privilege to have served in the American Congress, the greatest legislative body in history. Here we develop inevitably cherished associations and treasured friendships. And when at the end of the 2 years—with all differences forgotten and only the best remembered, we bid each other goodby with regret. That is especially true when there are those who will not be back.

Among those who will not return are many outstanding men including our colleague, Congressman CARNAHAN of Missouri, who has been a Member of the House for 14 years.

Congressman CARNAHAN has participated in some of the most important proceeding of the Congress in a particularly critical period in American history. He has been a member of one of the important committees of the House—if not the most important—the great Committee on Foreign Affairs.

These later years, the safety and preservation of the Nation threatened by foreign and international enemies has been a primary issue in our national life and Congressman CARNAHAN as one of the national authorities on the subject has risen steadily through the years until he is today the ranking majority member of the committee, second only to the chairman.

We cannot protect the Nation and preserve world peace by arms alone. Too often we have won on the battlefield and lost at the conference table. It was on such issues as these that Congressman CARNAHAN rendered his most invaluable service.

The 14 years he has served in the House and on the committee constitute an investment which his district and his State and the Nation can ill afford to lose. As is apparent on a cursory glance around the House there are States which have long followed a policy of electing able men to Congress and keeping them there. Each year they become with added seniority more valuable and more influential and in better position to render service to their constituencies and their States. As result of this policy these States hold most of the chairmanships and a great perponderance of the influential men of the House and the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, along with Congressman CARNAHAN'S sterling worth and his leadership in his field here in Washington, he bears a name that has always had a strong bearing on our relations. Others may not have thought of it—or perhaps few who know him as A. S. J. CARNAHAN understand the significance of those initials. I doubt whether many of his closest associates know that his name is ALBERT SIDNEY JOHNSON CARNAHAN.

Men of my family—like those of many another southern family—marched with Lee and rode with Stonewall Jackson and died at Shiloh. Gen. Albert Sidney Johnson in the first day of the battle drove Grant's disorganized army back into the river bend under the protection of the gunboats but at the moment of victory was shot from his horse and carried down across the ravine where he died—and victory and the Confederacy died with him.

We appreciate having had the opportunity during these years to be with SID CARNAHAN. He has contributed materially to the probity and the dignity and to the wisdom of House proceedings. We regret to see him leave us although we feel satisfied that in the coming administration the Department of State will find it impossible to continue its work without his services in some other even more important capacity.

So, after our happy associations of these successful and eventful years, we join his district, his State and the Nation in wishing him well, and in bidding him Godspeed.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentlewoman from Missouri.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues in this tribute to Congressman CARNAHAN. He will be missed in the next session; there is no doubt of it. And his charming and gracious wife, who has been such a tremendous help to the Congressman in serving his constituents and who has found the time and energy to run their home so delightfully, will also be missed from the congressional scene. I think we all recognize here that a pleasant and comfortable home environment is a great assist to a Member of Congress because of the erratic hours our jobs require and the continuous uncertainty of the schedule under which we have to perform our work. Mrs. Carnahan has been a great asset to the residents of the Eighth Congressional District of Missouri, in helping in so many ways in making her husband's service so effective over the years, and I certainly want to extend to both Congressman and Mrs. Carnahan my warm best wishes for a long life ahead and much happiness.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I know that many of you hold the same affection for our colleague, Congressman CARNAHAN, that we of the Missouri delegation do. It so happens that in the geographical makeup of our districts, the district that I represent is entirely cut off from the rest of the State by the district represented by Mr. CARNAHAN. It so happens that one of the counties that make up the district that I represent was formerly in the district represented by Mr. CARNAHAN. For that reason I have probably had a better opportunity than any of you to come in contact with the constituents who have seen fit over the years to send Mr. CARNAHAN to Congress as their Representative. On many occasions in all of the counties in my district where he is well known and in the adjoining counties of the Eighth District I have heard expressed the high esteem in which this gentleman is held.

Throughout all my association with Mr. CARNAHAN, and even before I knew him personally, I knew of his reputation because he was serving in Congress before I came to this body. He has impressed not only me but the people of his district as being a man of sterling character, a man of strong conviction, in every sense of the word a dedicated servant of his people not only in the official representation here in the Halls of Congress but as a neighbor and as a friend.

During his many years in the teaching profession he has established a reputation for integrity, honesty, and a sincere desire to be helpful to humanity. I think possibly his dedication to the humanity of this world was responsible at least in a measure for his not being able to survive a very strong primary campaign.

We who live in rural districts appreciate, I think, more than those who come from metropolitan centers, the fact that

foreign aid is not always the most popular issue upon which to make a campaign.

I think we all know also that because of Mr. CARNAHAN's long and dedicated service on the Committee cn Foreign Affairs, where he was next to the chairman in point of service, he was recognized as an authority in this field and was called upon by many organizations to go about the country selling our mutual security program, to which he was dedicated, and on which he is probably one of the best informed persons. That is not too popular an issue in the rural sections, and the district that Mr. CARNAHAN represents is primarily a rural, agricultural section.

Mr. CARNAHAN was not defeated by just an ordinary person in this campaign. His opponent in the recent campaign was a young, intelligent individual whose ability had been recognized by his being selected as Speaker of the House of Representatives in the Missouri Legislature. I think all of us appreciate that in politics the contacts that one is able to make in offices of that character enable one to extend that influence and do things the ordinary opponent could not do. So I do not consider Mr. CARNAHAN's defeat in the primary as any reflection upon his ability, but rather it was because he was dedicated to a cause that perhaps was not quite so popular in his district as it might be in other places. But since his opponent was a young, aggressive, intelligent man of great ability and wide influence, there was certainly no reflection upon our colleague for his inability to survive that campaign.

Mr. Speaker, as Mr. CARNAHAN leaves this body at the close of his term of office, I know he will continue to be of service to his district and to his people throughout the remainder of his term, just as he has returned here now to render service. I also know that in a public expression he has indicated to his probable successor, the Democratic nominee, his willingness to cooperate in his campaign by making available the facilities of his office. That is characteristic of Mr. CARNAHAN.

I know that all of us will regret to see him leave. We wish for him and Mrs. Carnahan, who has been a most helpful helpmate in his life as well as in his office, the greatest measure of happiness and success.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, for many years it has been my privilege to sit across the Foreign Affairs Committee table several days a week from our distinguished friend and colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CARNAHAN]. It is in committee work that you best learn the measure of a man. As Members bat things back and forth, each stating his convictions and the thinking behind them, you discover the real quality of a man, his intelligence, his ability, his sportsmanship, his attitudes.

In the 18 years I have served in the House of Representatives, I have met no finer gentleman and no more conscientious legislator than SID CARNAHAN; no man with a better mind, no man with more diligent dedication to duty. Again and again when we get into a hassle in our committee, he is the one who comes up with a suggestion—makes a motion or offers an amendment, which points the way to a resolution of the difficulty. He has been a most valuable Member of the Congress. I have seen his devotion to his State and his service to the people of his district. He has never been a self-advertiser. He has never sought recognition or credit for himself. He has done his duty quietly and conscientiously as the fine American patriot that he is. He is a man of clear vision, a man who knows that the United States cannot live by itself alone in the kind of world in which we live, a man who has seen that the greatest and most important service he could render to the people of his district, the State of Missouri, and to the whole Nation was to work for a world of justice, order, and peace that would allow the people of his district and ours to use our resources and devote our time and talents to solving our domestic problems, as we cannot do as long as the whole world is torn and threatened with subjugation by a force dedicated to the destruction of all free peoples. His constituents will recognize the superior quality of his service to them more clearly as time goes by.

Mr. Speaker, I salute the gentleman from Missouri, as a good friend, one whom we shall miss sorely. I cannot find words high enough to praise him. I would like to add one comment. Three years ago the gentleman from Missouri and I were appointed by the President to serve as two of our United States delegates at the 12th General Assembly of the United Nations. Mr. CARNAHAN was assigned by the chief of our mission there, Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, to the Fifth Committee which deals with the housekeeping of the United Nations; its budgets, the share that the United States should be assessed or should contribute, along with the amounts that others should contribute to the cost of carrying on the activities of all the various organs of the United Nations including its specialized agencies like World Health Organization, Food and Agriculture Organization, UNESCO, ILO, and so on. Mr. CARNAHAN'S contributions to the internal workings of the United Nations and its budgets, I think I can say without fear of contradiction, have been greater than those of any Member from either body of the Congress who has been sent to the United Nations as a delegate since its formation. All the members of our Embassy in New York will testify to that. With great patience and skill he was able to convince other countries that it is to their advantage not to have the UN too dependent on American contributions, and that they should agree to reducing our share of the overall budgets of these agencies to a smaller percentage—not just to save money for the United States but to build self-reliance and genuine cooperation by all countries in order to make the agencies more effective.

I am sorry indeed to have Mr. CARNAHAN take his leave from the House, and particularly from the Committee on Foreign Affairs. But I feel sure that this administration or the next administration of whichever party, will certainly have the good judgment to use this man in further service to his country in one or another of the many important posts which he is so well qualified to fill.

Mr. BROWN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Missouri. I want to join in these tributes to our distinguished Member, the lovable Professor CARNAHAN, because anyone who knows him and who has watched him work can say without question that his 14 years of service have been good for his district, good for the State of Missouri, and good for the country. He is a very dedicated man. He came here with high ideals and every day he has been here he has worked for those ideals with a dedication that everyone admires.

One of the greatest tributes that can be said about any Member, in my opinion, can truly be paid to SID CARNAHAN. He never voted against the best interests of his people. Whatever comes or goes, no one can ever erase that record. And the world has ben enriched by SID CARNAHAN'S service in the Congress.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield.

Mr. RANDALL. I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Missouri, the dean of our delegation, and simply say that, as a newcomer last March, all orientation courses for first-termers had been adjourned and no one seemed to want to take the time to offer any advice and counsel until one day in the Chamber I sat down by SID CARNAHAN. We quickly became good friends, and in the ensuing days our colleague gave me counsel which was most valuable and most helpful. I never knew until today what the initials "A. S. J." stood for. He was just "SID" to all of us. He is a man of great ability, and a man of high integrity. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] spoke something about the valuable service he has given to this country on the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I observe that his chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Dr. MORGAN, is present and will doubtless make comment on that valuable service.

In order to make this brief, I shall conclude and simply say "To you, SID, good luck and good fortune in all you do."

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to extend my best wishes to my dear friend and colleague, A. S. J. CARNAHAN, who is retiring at the end of this session after having served the 8th District of Missouri ably and with great distinction since the 79th Congress.

SID CARNAHAN and I came to the Congress at the same time, and we both began our service together on the Committee on Foreign Affairs in 1946 where, except for the 80th Congress, SID CARNAHAN has served continuously and with

ever-increasing skill and ability as an expert in the field of foreign affairs.

I am indeed sorry to see SID CARNAHAN leave the Congress. We can ill spare so able a legislator. He has rendered great service to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, to the House of Representatives and to our country. He has distinguished himself in many capacities and has fulfilled difficult assignments with great credit to himself and to our country, including the chairmanship of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on International Organizations, his service as U.S. delegate to the United Nations General Assembly, and during his service as a congressional adviser to the Second International Conference on Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy.

SID CARNAHAN possesses a unique and deep knowledge of foreign affairs problems gained not only by his service on the Foreign Affairs Committee but through the study missions abroad which he has undertaken for the committee. These have taken him to nearly all parts of the world, and the factual information and the keen observations he has been able to make as a result of these missions has been of invaluable help to me and his other colleagues on the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

I know that I speak for his host of friends in the Congress as well as throughout the country when I wish him well and express the hope that he will still be able to find time occasionally to give us the benefit of his sound thinking, his vast wisdom, and his deep knowledge of the problems of foreign affairs. It has been a great pleasure and honor to serve with SID CARNAHAN, and I shall always treasure with fond recollections the memory of the many tasks and the work which we have shared together on the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I am one of those who admire SID CARNAHAN. Through many years of service with him upon the Foreign Affairs Committee certainly both sides have come to know him well, to appreciate his great abilities and to know his worth as a public servant. The committee, and I am sure the whole Congress, suffers a loss in the fact that he will not be with us next year.

I want to make a public statement of the fine service he has rendered and extend best wishes to him in whatever he may undertake.

It has been a pleasure to watch SID CARNAHAN and how he has done his work, and his ability to unite people across all lines and get a common opinion. I repeat, it has been a pleasure to serve with him, and we are sorry to lose him.

Mr. SAUND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SAUND. Mr. Speaker, I am a new Member and I have had the pleasure and distinct privilege of serving with Mr. CARNAHAN on the Foreign Affairs Committee for 4 years. I found in him a beloved friend and a very keen student of foreign affairs. I think I can say without any reservation that Mr. CARNAHAN today is perhaps the best informed man on international relations. I have sat with him and worked under him on the Committee on International Organization, of which he is chairman.

I join in the tributes that have been paid to him and I wholeheartedly endorse everything that has been said in honoring Mr. CARNAHAN. More than that, Mr. Speaker, I may say that in Mr. CARNAHAN I have found one of the kindliest and most gracious gentlemen I have known in life. I think he represents the loftiest kind of American gentleman. It has been a great privilege to serve with him. We shall miss his counsel as well as his sweet and rewarding companionship keenly.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, among all the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs is a very deep regret and a keen sense of the tremendous loss to our country in the retirement of Congressman CARNAHAN. We who worked with him week after week, month after month, year after year knew the qualities of this truly outstanding legislator. When these trying and perilous times have passed, when our security in a happy world of freedom and of peace has been attained, his neighbors in his district in Missouri will be proud indeed that it was their votes that had sent to Washington a man destined for leadership in the long, long struggle for world understanding and the contentment that is possible only in the climate of peace and good will. No man in public office has worked with more dedication, more effectively, and may I say more unselfishly to this end than the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, our beloved colleague, Mr. CARNAHAN. He is truly a great American, and so he will be written in the history of these times.

Whether the next administration be Democratic or Republican, I predict it will reach into Missouri and give a high post as ambassador to our friend and beloved colleague, Mr. CARNAHAN. Our country cannot afford to lose the service of one so preeminently qualified, so richly experienced, so dedicated.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, in closing, may I call attention to one remarkable feature of Mr. CARNAHAN'S service here in the House. That is the general appreciation and support he received from Members on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, there is no partisanship in national defense. Politics stops at the water. Both parties and the leaders of both parties express warm appreciation of the service of Congressman CARNAHAN and deep regret that he is leaving the House.

I include as a part of my remarks an excerpt from a letter by Speaker RAYBURN on one side, and on the other I include a letter from President Eisenhower.

Speaker RAYBURN said: "He is popular with all Members of the House on both sides of the aisle and is, therefore, in a position to be of even greater service to all of us."

President Eisenhower wrote:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, August 15, 1960.

The Honorable A. S. J. CARNAHAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CARNAHAN: I send you this letter with personal regret, for in it I must take cognizance of your failure of reelection. For these past several years I have watched with growing admiration your dedicated support of the Nation's security interests, particularly your unhesitating determination to put America's primary needs before petty considerations where peace, the advancement of freedom, and the Nation's safety have been concerned.

As you retire from public life, therefore, you carry with you the greatest reward achievable to the dedicated public servant—the knowledge that in the matters of greatest moment to our Nation you have kept faith with the American people. Sustained by this knowledge, one can never, in his heart, be defeated.

With personal good wishes,

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include certain letters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend remarks on the service of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CARNAHAN].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, Congress will not be the same without SID CARNAHAN. He is one of God's noblemen. To him and Mrs. Carnahan go all our good wishes. May all their years be happy years.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives has had many distinguished Members who have made an indelible mark on the course of history. To this group we can proudly add the names of our colleagues, Hon. A. S. J. CARNAHAN and Hon. FRANK M. COFFIN.

The closing of this session of the Congress terminates the remarkable careers of these two outstanding Members in the House of Representatives. I deeply regret that our colleagues will not be with us in the 87th Congress. Both are members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and both will be sorely missed in the next session.

Congressman CARNAHAN was elected to the 79th Congress and to each Congress since except the 80th. He was appointed to the Committee on Foreign Affairs in the 79th Congress and has served with distinction in that assignment. In 1957 he served as U.S. delegate to the 12th General Assembly of the United Nations.

He has served the Eighth District of Missouri and his country ably during the 14 years that he has been a Member of Congress. His distinguished record transcends local interests, and he made

his tremendous ability and statesmanship felt on the national level. We value his friendship, wise counsel, and considerate regard for others.

It was my privilege to serve with SID CARNAHAN on the Committee on Foreign Affairs for many years. As a Member of the House of Representatives and a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, he established himself as an outstanding legislator, giving his time and efforts in discharging his duties for the welfare of the Nation.

My wife joins me in wishing SID and his dear wife the best of everything in life, and we hope he will not lose contact with his many friends here on Capitol Hill.

In Representative FRANK M. COFFIN the House of Representatives is losing one of the youngest and ablest Members who has served with distinction during the past 4 years. His keen mind and legislative ability have served our country well. The Committee on Foreign Affairs will miss his understanding of the challenge facing our Nation today and how that challenge must be met. His intense loyalty, his always warm and friendly personality, and his evident sincerity contribute richly to those who are associated with him.

FRANK COFFIN is the type of citizen who is so greatly needed in our country today—a real American and a living example of what can be accomplished by hard work and individual initiative. He is a lawyer with a keen and discerning knowledge and perception, but above all, he is a warm human being who thinks in terms of the welfare of people. Perhaps the greatest measure of the esteem and admiration in which he is held by his constituents was documented when FRANK COFFIN was elected in 1956 despite the Republican victory in the executive branch in that year.

All our very best wishes go with our distinguished colleague, FRANK COFFIN, in his bid for the governorship of the State of Maine. As the next Governor of that great State, we wish him continued success.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, when I first came to Congress in 1954 one of my earliest friendships was established with the able and effective Congressman from Missouri's great Eighth District, SID CARNAHAN.

Mr. SID was by that time already a veteran practitioner of the complex art of being a responsible representative of his people and he was unselfish in his assistance to more recent additions to the Missouri congressional delegation to the Congress.

As the second-ranking Democratic member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, he has participated in policy deliberations of epic importance. His wisdom and foresight in these deliberations are recognized by his many friends on both sides of the aisle.

SID CARNAHAN has ably served his country, his party and his people and he enters his coming retirement from Congress with the affection and respect of his colleagues.

To SID and his lovely wife go my warmest wishes for many future years of good luck, good health, and all happiness.

AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES TO CONDUCT A FULL AND COMPLETE STUDY OF EACH INTELLIGENCE AGENCY OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a resolution calling for a full and complete study of each intelligence agency of the United States.

I have long felt that the Congress of the United States should be more fully informed respecting the several intelligence agencies of the Government which are vital in the life-and-death struggle in which we are engaged with the international Communist conspiracy.

While I believe that the Committee on Un-American Activities presently has jurisdiction and the authority to conduct the study which I propose, because of the nature of the subject matter and also to avoid any questions of possible partial overlapping in jurisdiction with other committees, I feel that it is sound practice for me to submit a resolution to the House in which the Committee on Un-American Activities is specifically directed to make this study.

I want to point out that the resolution requires that extreme caution be taken in order to avoid any possible disclosure of confidential information or of techniques employed by our intelligence agencies.

Is there duplication or conflict in the powers, jurisdictions, and functioning of our intelligence agencies? Are there areas in which there should be either an extended activity or a withdrawal of activity by these agencies? How can their efficiency be improved? Is the information acquired adequately safeguarded from unauthorized disclosures? Is this information made available for maximum practicable utilization by policymaking agencies of the Government?

These and other questions ought to be carefully and judiciously explored by the representatives of the people. In my judgment, the Committee on Un-American Activities is specially equipped to make this study and I accordingly expect to press for early approval by the House of my resolution.

REPORT TO THE PEOPLE OF THE EIGHTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN—XIV

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include a table and extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a report to the people of the Eighth Congressional District of Wisconsin on my voting and attendance record for the 2d session of the 86th Congress.

The report includes all rollcall votes and all quorum calls. Its purpose is to collect in one place and in concise form information which is scattered through some 18,000 pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The descriptions of the bills and the amendments or motions in the report are for purposes of identification only; no attempt is made to describe the legislation completely or to elaborate upon the issues involved. This word of caution is advisable in view of the fact that the descriptions used are, for the most part, taken from the official titles of the bills which, unfortunately, do not always reflect the nature or true purpose of the legislation. Upon request, I will be pleased to furnish more complete information concerning any particular bill, as well as a summary of the issues involved and the reasons for my vote.

The furnishing of this report continues a service I began in the 1st session of the 80th Congress. This is the 14th report of my voting and attendance record. These 14 reports show how I voted on 1,805 questions in the House of Representatives. Based on quorum calls and the record votes, they also show an attendance record of 95 percent.

Roll-call No.	Date 1960	Measure, question, and result	Vote
1	Jan. 6	Quorum call	Present.
2	Feb. 2	H.R. 1217, providing for the free importation of amorphous graphite: On motion to suspend rules and pass bill. (Passed 278 to 116.)	Yea.
3	Feb. 2	H. Con. Res. 459, expressing the sense of Congress that any new interpretation of treaties with Panama receive approval of Senate: On motion to suspend rules and adopt resolution. (Passed 380 to 12.)	Yea.
4	Feb. 2	H. Con. Res. 465, expressing indignation of Congress at recent desecrations of houses of worship and other sacred sites: On motion to suspend rules and adopt resolution. (Passed 393 to 0.)	Yea.
5	Feb. 17	H.R. 3151, permitting cities to withhold income tax on the compensation of Federal employees: On passage. (Passed 222 to 160.)	Yea.
6	Feb. 25	H.R. 3610, establishing Office of Water Pollution Control and increasing from present $50,000,000 to $90,000,000 a year grants for construction of sewage treatment works: On motion to pass bill over veto of President. (Rejected 249 to 157, a two-thirds vote being required.)	Nay.

Roll-call No.	Date 1960	Measure, question, and result	Vote
		H.R. 10743, making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1960:	
7	Feb. 29	On amendment providing $50,000,000 for additional grants for urban renewal and slum clearance. (Rejected 158 to 187.)	Not voting.[1]
8	Mar. 1	Quorum call	Absent.
9	Mar. 7	Quorum call	Present.
10	Mar. 7	Quorum call	Present.
		H. Res. 467, providing for the consideration of H.R. 10777, authorizing certain construction at military installations:	
11	Mar. 7	On adoption of resolution. (Adopted 313 to 1.)	Yea.
12	Mar. 8	Quorum call	Present.
		H. Res. 468, providing for the consideration of H.R. 5, encouraging private investment abroad:	
13	Mar. 8	On adoption of resolution. (Adopted 236 to 127.)	Yea.
14	Mar. 8	Quorum call	Present.
15	Mar. 8	Quorum call	Present.
16	Mar. 8	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 10809, authorizing $970,000,000 for National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal 1961:	
17	Mar. 9	On motion to suspend rules and pass bill. (Passed 398 to 11.)	Yea.
		H.R. 10777, authorizing certain construction at military installations:	
18	Mar. 9	On passage. (Passed 407 to 4.)	Yea.
19	Mar. 10	Quorum call	Present.
		H. Res. 359, providing for the consideration of H.R. 8601, enforcing constitutional rights (civil rights bill):	
20	Mar. 10	On adoption of resolution. (Adopted 314 to 93.)	Yea.
21	Mar. 11	Quorum call	Present.
22	Mar. 11	Quorum call	Present.
23	Mar. 14	Quorum call	Present.
24	Mar. 15	Quorum call	Present.
25	Mar. 16	Quorum call	Present.
26	Mar. 17	Quorum call	Present.
27	Mar. 18	Quorum call	Present.
28	Mar. 21	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 7279, authorizing establishment of Hubbell Trading Post National Historical Site, Arizona:	
29	Mar. 21	On motion to suspend rules and pass bill. (Rejected 171 to 208, a two-thirds majority being required.)	Nay.
30	Mar. 22	Quorum call	Present.
31	Mar. 23	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 8601, enforcing constitutional rights (civil rights bill):	
32	Mar. 23	On amendment providing for appointment of U.S. voting referees. (Adopted 295 to 124.)	Yea.
33	Mar. 24	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 8601, enforcing constitutional rights (civil rights bill):	
34	Mar. 24	On motion to recommit with instructions to omit threatening letters or communications from penalties for obstruction of court orders. (Rejected 118 to 304.)	Nay.
35	Mar. 24	On passage. (Passed 311 to 109.)	Yea.
36	Mar. 28	Quorum call	Present.
37	Mar. 29	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 11300, making appropriations for Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies for fiscal year 1961:	
38	Mar. 29	On passage. (Passed 362 to 10.)	Yea.
39	Mar. 30	Quorum call	Present.
40	Apr. 4	Quorum call	Present.
41	Apr. 6	Quorum call	Present.
42	Apr. 7	Quorum call	Present.
43	Apr. 12	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 11666, making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Judiciary, and related agencies for fiscal year 1961:	
44	Apr. 13	On passage. (Passed 312 to 31.)	Yea.
45	Apr. 19	Quorum call	Present.
46	Apr. 19	Quorum call	Present.
47	Apr. 20	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 11776, making appropriations for sundry independent offices for fiscal year 1961:	
48	Apr. 20	On amendment increasing from $39,100,000 to $75,000,000 the funds provided for construction of veterans' hospital facilities. (Adopted 218 to 155.)	Yea.
49	Apr. 20	Quorum call	Present.
50	Apr. 20	Quorum call	Present.
51	Apr. 20	Quorum call	Present.
52	Apr. 21	Quorum call	Present.
		H. Res. 503, providing for concurrence in Senate amendments to H.R. 8601 enforcing constitutional rights:	
53	Apr. 21	On adoption of resolution. (Adopted 288 to 95.)	Yea.
		H.R. 11510, authorizing the mutual security program:	
54	Apr. 21	On passage. (Passed 243 to 130.)	Yea.
55	Apr. 27	Quorum call	Present.
		H. Res. 498, providing for the consideration of H.R. 10213, amending Housing Act and authorizing purchase by Treasury of $1,000,000,000 FHA and VA mortgages:	
56	Apr. 27	On adoption of resolution. (Adopted 214 to 158.)	Nay.
57	Apr. 27	Quorum call	Present.
58	Apr. 28	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 10213, amending Housing Act and authorizing purchase by Treasury of $1,000,000,000 FHA and VA mortgages:	
59	Apr. 28	On motion to recommit with instructions to include antidiscrimination language. (Rejected 130 to 235.)	Yea.
60	Apr. 28	On passage. (Passed 214 to 163.)	Nay.
61	May 2	Quorum call	Absent.
		H.R. 10596, increasing Federal payments toward support of disabled veterans in State soldiers' homes:	
62	May 2	On motion to suspend rules and pass bill. (Passed 267 to 0.)	Not voting.[2]
		H. Con. Res. 633, expressing sense of Congress that fundamental freedoms and human rights of the people of captive nations should be restored and urging President to pursue this end:	
63	May 2	On motion to suspend rules and adopt resolution. (Passed 277 to 0.)	Yea.
64	May 3	Quorum call	Absent.
65	May 3	Quorum call	Present.
66	May 4	Quorum call	Present.
		S. 722, providing $251,000,000 in Federal loans and grants for industrial redevelopment in certain areas termed economically depressed:	
67	May 4	On motion to lay on the table the motion to dispense with further proceedings under the quorum call (No. 66). (Rejected 167 to 222.)	Yea.
68	May 4	On motion ordering the previous question on the motion to dispense with further proceedings under the quorum call (No. 66). (Agreed to 223 to 164.)	Nay.
69	May 4	On motion to dispense with further proceedings under the quorum call (No. 66). (Agreed to 222 to 159.)	Nay.
70	May 4	Quorum call	Present.
		S. 722, providing $251,000,000 in Federal loans and grants for industrial redevelopment in certain areas termed economically depressed:	
71	May 4	On motion to lay on table the motion to dispense with further proceedings under the quorum call (No. 70). (Rejected 153 to 231)	Yea.
72	May 4	On motion ordering the previous question on the motion to dispense with further proceedings under the quorum call (No. 70). (Agreed to 235 to 153.)	Nay.
73	May 4	On motion to dispense with further proceedings under the quorum call (No. 70). (Agreed to 236 to 151.)	Nay.
74	May 4	Quorum call	Present.
		S. 722, providing $251,000,000 in Federal loans and grants for industrial redevelopment in certain areas termed economicall depressed:	
75	May 4	On motion ordering the previous question on the motion to dispense with further proceedings under the quorum call (No. 74). (Agreed to 237 to 148.)	Nay.
76	May 4	On motion to dispense with further proceedings under the quorum call (No. 74). (Agreed to 237 to 150.)	Nay.
77	May 4	On consideration of the bill. (Agreed to 220 to 171.)	Nay.
78	May 4	On motion to recommit. (Rejected 162 to 223.)	Yea.
79	May 4	On passage. (Passed 201 to 184.)	Nay.
80	May 5	Quorum call	Present.
		H R 11998, making appropriations for Department of Defense for fiscal year 1961:	
81	May 5	On passage. (Passed 377 to 3.)	Yea.
82	May 6	Quorum call	Present.

[1] Absent. If present, would have voted "nay."
[2] Absent. If present, would have voted "yea."

Roll-call No.	Date 1960	Measure, question, and result	Vote
		H.R. 11713, authorizing appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission for fiscal year 1961:	
83	May 6	On motion to recommit with instructions to add $104,000,000 for construction of linear electron accelerator at Stanford University. (Rejected 129 to 194.)	Yea.
84	May 6	On passage. (Passed 321 to 2.)	Yea.
85	May 10	Quorum call	Present.
86	May 11	Quorum call	Present.
87	May 12	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 11510, authorizing the mutual security program:	
88	May 12	On adoption of conference report (Adopted 240 to 138.)	Yea.
89	May 12	Quorum call	Present.
		S. 1358, providing $2,356,000 for a new headquarters for Mount Rainier National Park:	
90	May 12	On passage. (Passed 260 to 83.)	Nay.
91	May 16	Quorum call	Present.
92	May 17	Quorum call	Present.
93	May 17	Quorum call	Present.
94	May 18	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 7155, authorizing construction of San Luis unit of the Central Valley project, California:	
95	May 18	On amendment deleting section exempting from the 160-acre limitation lands irrigated by State water. (Adopted 214 to 181.)	Nay.
		H.R. 5, providing tax relief incentives to encourage investment of private capital in underdeveloped countries:	
96	May 18	On motion to strike enacting clause (killing bill). (Rejected 160 to 232.)	Nay.
97	May 18	On passage. (Passed 196 to 192.)	Yea.
98	May 19	Quorum call	Absent.
		H. Res. 488, providing for the consideration of H.R. 2331, establishing a national historical park along Chesapeake and Ohio Canal:	
99	May 19	On adoption of resolution. (Rejected 124 to 227.)	Not voting.
100	May 24	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 12326, making appropriations for civil functions administered by Department of the Army, Department of the Interior, Atomic Energy Commission, and Tennessee Valley Authority (public works) for fiscal year 1961:	
101	May 25	On motion to recommit with instructions to prevent the use of any funds for construction of the Allegheny River Reservoir in Pennsylvania and New York. (Rejected 110 to 294.)	Yea.
102	May 25	On passage. (Passed 387 to 18.)	Yea.
		H. Res. 536, providing for the consideration of H.R. 10128, authorizing 3-year $975,000,000 program of Federal aid for school construction:	
103	May 25	On adoption of resolution. (Adopted 308 to 97.)	Nay.
104	May 26	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 10128, authorizing 3-year $975,000,000 program of Federal aid for school construction:	
105	May 26	On amendment requiring that schools constructed with Federal aid shall be available to all students in accordance with the 1954 decision of the Supreme Court. (Adopted 218 to 181.)	Yea.
106	May 26	On amendment returning to the States for construction of school facilities 25 percent of taxes collected on cigarettes sold within such State. (Rejected 181 to 219).	Nay.
107	May 26	On committee amendment as amended. (Adopted 223 to 177.)	Yea.
108	May 26	On motion to recommit with instructions to substitute H.R. 12259, a bill providing school construction assistance based upon need and ability of States to support education. (Rejected 80 to 319.)	Yea.
109	May 26	On passage. (Passed 206 to 189.)	Nay.
110	June 1	Quorum call	Present.
111	June 1	Quorum call	Present.
112	June 1	Quorum call	Present.
		S. 1892, authorizing the Norman water project, Oklahoma:	
113	June 1	On amendment reducing the Federal interest charges on certain Colorado River projects by changing the method of computation. (Adopted 228 to 123.)	Nay.
114	June 2	Quorum call	Present.
115	June 2	Quorum call	Present.
116	June 2	Quorum call	Present.
117	June 3	Quorum call	Present.
118	June 3	Quorum call	Present.
119	June 3	Quorum call	Present.
120	June 3	On motion to adjourn. (Rejected 77 to 194.)	Yea.
121	June 3	Quorum call	Present.
122	June 6	Quorum call	Present.
123	June 8	Quorum call	Present.
		H. Res. 550, providing for the consideration of H.R. 12381, raising national debt limit to $293,000,000,000 and extending for 1 year certain excise taxes and the existing corporate income tax rate:	
124	June 8	On adoption of resolution. (Adopted 204 to 181.)	Yea.
		H.R. 12381, raising the national debt limit to $293,000,000,000 and extending for 1 year certain excise taxes and the existing corporate income tax rate:	
125	June 8	On passage. (Passed 223 to 174.)	Yea.
126	June 8	Quorum call	Present.
127	June 9	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 12049, increasing authority of National Aeronautical and Space Agency in civilian space exploration:	
128	June 9	On motion to recommit with instructions to delete section giving NASA discretion of acquiring or waiving title to inventions developed under contract. (Rejected 120 to 269.)	Nay.
129	June 14	Quorum call	Present.
130	June 14	Quorum call	Present.
131	June 14	Quorum call	Present.
132	June 15	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 9883, providing for 7½ to 9 percent pay increase for Federal employees:	
133	June 15	On motion to recommit with instructions to provide for a 5-percent increase. (Rejected 94 to 324.)	Yea.
134	June 15	On passage. (Passed 378 to 40.)	Nay.
135	June 16	Quorum call	Present.
136	June 17	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 12619, making appropriations for mutual security for fiscal year 1961:	
137	June 17	On amendment increasing the funds allotted for military assistance by $200,000,000. (Adopted 212 to 173.)	Yea.
138	June 17	On passage. (Passed 258 to 124.)	Yea.
139	June 21	Quorum call	Present.
140	June 22	Quorum call	Present.
141	June 22	Quorum call	Present.
142	June 23	Quorum call	Absent.
		H.R. 12580, providing grants to States for medical care for the aged; liberalizing and extending coverage under old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program, unemployment compensation, maternal and child welfare, and other programs under the Social Security Act:	
143	June 23	On passage. (Passed 381 to 23.)	Yea.
		H.R. 12261, fixing wheat price supports at 85 percent of parity, reducing acreage allotments by 25 percent, and providing payment in kind for retired cropland equal to 55 percent of wheat that would have been produced, or alternatively, price support at feed grain level and no production control:	
144	June 23	On motion to recommit with instructions to substitute Senate language fixing wheat supports at 75 percent of parity, reducing acreage 20 percent and providing for payment in kind of 50 percent. (Rejected 195 to 211.)	Yea.
145	June 23	On passage. (Rejected 170 to 236.)	Nay.
146	June 23	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 10569, making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and the U.S. Tax Court for fiscal year 1961:	
147	June 23	On motion to agree to Senate amendment eliminating provision allowing delivery of congressional mail addressed to "Occupant" in urban areas. (Adopted 235 to 164.)	Yea.
		H.R. 12740, making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1961:	
148	June 23	On motion to recommit with instructions to delete $5,000,000 for Capitol Grounds expansion. (Rejected 141 to 252.)	Yea.
149	June 24	Quorum call	Present.
150	June 24	Quorum call	Present.
		S. 1508, providing for the regulation by the Interstate Commerce Commission of interstate shipments over the federally owned Alaska Railroad:	
151	June 24	On motion to suspend rules and pass bill. (Passed 267 to 101.)	Nay.
		H.J. Res. 649, establishing international health program:	
152	June 24	On motion to suspend rules and pass resolution. (Passed 259 to 114.)	Nay.

[3] Absent. If present, would have voted "nay."

Roll-call No.	Date 1960	Measure, question, and result	Vote
153	June 24	Quorum call	Present.
154	June 25	Quorum call	Present.
155	June 25	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 8860, subsidizing lead and zinc producers:	
156	June 27	On passage. (Passed 197 to 192.)	Nay.
		H.R. 8697, regulating redevelopment in the District of Columbia:	
157	June 27	On passage. (Passed 348 to 35.)	Yea.
158	June 28	Quorum call	Present.
159	June 28	Quorum call	Present.
160	June 28	Quorum call	Present.
161	June 28	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 11001, providing for the participation of the United States in the International Development Association:	
162	June 29	On passage. (Passed 249 to 158.)	Yea.
		H.R. 7903, extending the veterans' guaranteed-loan and direct-loan programs for 2 years:	
163	June 29	On passage. (Passed 395 to 1.)	Yea.
164	June 30	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 11998, making appropriations for Department of Defense for fiscal year 1961:	
165	June 30	On conference report. (Agreed to 402 to 5.)	Yea.
166	June 30	Quorum call	Present.
167	June 30	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 12677, increasing the Federal minimum wage to $1.25 per hour and extending coverage to additional workers:	
168	June 30	On amendment substituting language increasing the minimum wage to $1.15 an hour and providing limited additional coverage. (Adopted 211 to 203.)	Yea.
169	June 30	On passage of amended bill. (Passed 341 to 72.)	Yea.
		H.R. 12311, extending the Sugar Act for 1 year and authorizing the President to cut Cuban quota:	
170	June 30	On passage. (Passed 395 to 0.)	Yea.
		H.R. 9883, providing for 7½ to 9 percent pay increase for Federal postal and other classified employees:	
171	July 1	On overriding the veto. (Passed 345 to 69.)	Nay.
172	July 1	Quorum call	Present.
173	July 1	Quorum call	Present.
174	July 1	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 8665, establishing a memorial to Theodore Roosevelt in District of Columbia:	
175	July 1	On motion to recommit. (Rejected 59 to 308.)	Nay.
176	July 2	Quorum call	Present.
		H. Res. 596, providing for consideration of Senate amendments to H.R. 12740, making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1961:	
177	July 2	On considering the resolution. (Agreed to 291 to 89.)	Yea.
178	July 2	On adoption of resolution. (Adopted 257 to 109.)	Nay.
		H.R. 2467, authorizing relocation allowance to owners and tenants of land acquired by Federal Aviation Agency:	
179	July 2	On substitute amendment covering only residents of Chantilly, Va. (Adopted 190 to 164.)	Nay.
180	July 2	On passage. (Passed 182 to 167.)	Nay.
181	Aug. 15	Quorum call	Absent.
182	Aug. 17	Quorum call	Absent.
183	Aug. 22	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 12753, strengthening Subversive Activities Control Act in regard to the labeling of foreign propaganda disseminated within the United States:	
184	Aug. 22	On motion to suspend rules and pass bill. (Passed 395 to 3.)	Yea.
		H.R. 5383, giving civil service status to U.S. Merchant Marine Academy staff with all rights of previous status, and giving the Academy the same status as the U.S. Naval Academy:	
185	Aug. 22	On motion to suspend rules and pass bill. (Passed 291 to 90.)	Nay.
		H.R. 9866, establishing Federal agricultural services to Guam:	
186	Aug. 22	On motion to suspend rules and pass bill. (Rejected 202 to 151, a ⅔ majority being required.)	Nay.
187	Aug. 23	Quorum call	Present.
		H. Res. 607, citing S. Sloan Colt, chairman of the Port Authority of New York, for contempt of Congress for refusing to furnish subpenaed documents to the House Judiciary Antitrust Subcommittee:	
188	Aug. 23	On the resolution. (Adopted 270 to 124.)	Nay.
		H. Res. 611, citing Consuelo Burgos De Saez Pagan for contempt of Congress for refusing to answer questions of the House Un-American Activities Committee:	
189	Aug. 23	On the resolution. (Adopted 383 to 0.)	Yea.
190	Aug. 24	Quorum call	Present.
		H. Res. 587, providing for the consideration of S.J. Res. 170, authorizing appointment of a U.S. Citizens Commission on the North Atlantic Treaty Organization:	
191	Aug. 24	On the resolution. (Adopted 349 to 39.)	Nay.
		S.J. Res. 170, authorizing appointment of a U.S. Citizens Commission on the North Atlantic Treaty Organization:	
192	Aug. 24	On the joint resolution. (Passed 288 to 103.)	Nay.
193	Aug. 25	Quorum call	Present.
194	Aug. 25	Quorum call	Present.
195	Aug. 26	Quorum call	Present.
196	Aug. 26	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 12580, providing grants to States for medical care for the aged; liberalizing and extending coverage under old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program, unemployment compensation, maternal and child welfare, and other programs under the Social Security Act:	
197	Aug. 26	On the conference report. (Adopted 368 to 17.)	Yea.
198	Aug. 31	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 13161, making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1961:	
199	Aug. 31	On motion to concur in Senate amendment providing additional $65,000,000 for defense support under the mutual security program. (Passed 203 to 193.)	Yea.
200	Aug. 31	On motion to concur in Senate amendment providing additional $26,000,000 of special assistance funds for mutual security program. (Rejected 176 to 216.)	Yea.
201	Aug. 31	Quorum call	Present.
202	Aug. 31	Quorum call	Present.
203	Aug. 31	Quorum call	Present.
204	Aug. 31	Quorum call	Present.
205	Sept. 1	Quorum call	Present.
206	Sept. 1	Quorum call	Present.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 206]

Alexander	Auchincloss	Bass, Tenn.
Anderson, Mont.	Ayres	Bates
	Barden	Baumhart
Anfuso	Bass, N.H.	Beckworth
Bolling	Forrester	Lesinski
Bolton	Garmatz	Loser
Bowles	Glenn	McDowell
Brooks, La.	Grant	McSween
Buckley	Green, Oreg.	Macdonald
Canfield	Griffiths	Magnuson
Celler	Gubser	Miller, N.Y.
Cohelan	Hays	Mitchell
Conte	Healey	Multer
Curtis, Mass.	Hébert	Murray
Davis, Tenn.	Henderson	Norrell
Dawson	Hess	Patman
Diggs	Hosmer	Pilcher
Dingell	Jones, Ala.	Powell
Dowdy	Kearns	Preston
Doyle	Kelly	Rabaut
Durham	Keogh	Rains
Evins	Kilburn	Reece, Tenn.
Fallon	Kluczynski	Rogers, Mass.
Farbstein	Lafore	Rooney
Flynn	Landrum	Rostenkowski
Fogarty	Lane	Scherer
Shelley	Smith, Miss.	Vinson
Shipley	Taylor, N.Y.	Williams
Sikes	Teague, Calif.	Withrow
Siler	Thompson, La.	Yates
Smith, Calif.	Thompson, N.J.	Zelenko
Smith, Kans.	Van Pelt	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 337 Members have answered to their names; a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The House will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Thereupon, at 1:46 p.m., the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 2 o'clock and 57 minutes p.m.

COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential resolution (H. Res. 643).

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That a committee of two Members be appointed by the House to join a similar committee appointed by the Senate, to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that the two Houses have completed their business of the session and are ready to adjourn, unless the President has some other communication to make to them.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] to wait on the President.

GENERALISSIMO RAFAEL L. TRUJILLO

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the President and the State Department are following a policy in the Dominican Republic that will lead to the destruction of North and South America. By aiding the Communists in their desperate desire to overthrow Generalissimo Rafael L. Trujillo, our State Department is contributing directly to Communist conquest of the Western Hemisphere. If the Trujillo government falls, every schoolboy in America knows that it will be followed by a pro-Communist or neutral government. The blueprint and pattern is a familiar one. The most classic example of it was the overthrow and undermining of a government in Cuba, friendly to the United States, so that a pro-Communist, anti-United States government could follow headed by Fidel Castro.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the order of the day for this administration is to undermine every real friend we have throughout the free world. Our State Department encouraged the overthrow of Syngman Rhee in Korea. They stood by while the friendly government of Turkey was overthrown and now they are working night and day to replace the friendly government of Trujillo.

Mr. Speaker, this policy is a long-standing one and has not followed party lines. The liberals, eggheads, and their State Department flunkies attempted by every means to overthrow Franco of Spain, the only government to defeat communism in war. They opposed De Gaulle's rise in France and ridiculed him. If this policy of the State Department, as exemplified in Cuba and now in the Dominican Republic, is permitted to continue, every government in South and Central America will topple one at a time to be replaced by pro-Communist governments. These dictator governments with Russian military advisory teams and missile bases will be used to threaten and eventually overthrow the United States. Cuba and the Dominican Republic are as important to the defense of the Western Hemisphere as Formosa, Japan, Singapore, and the Philippines are to the defense of the Pacific. Russian bases in Cuba and in the Dominican Republic would control the Panama Canal. They would dominate the Atlantic and even the eastern Pacific, dividing North America from South America and putting both North America and South America under the Communist gun simultaneously. Already the great industrial heart of the United States can be reached by Russian air and missile power over the North Pole. Now the expanding industrial southern part of the United States, Mexico, and progressing South America are under atomic threat.

Mr. Speaker, I might point out at this point that the Dominican Republic under Generalissimo Trujillo, regardless of what he might do in the future, has been friendly to the United States. He made a great contribution to the allied and free world during World War II and the Korean war. He cooperated with us in the important Caribbean when the German and Japanese menace reached to our very shores. Every GI, sailor, and airman is aware of the important role played by Trujillo in the defense of the Western Hemisphere. The Dominican Republic, under Generalissimo Trujillo, is one of the most truly democratic nations in South America, Central America, Asia, or Africa. General Trujillo has responded always to the desires of his people. His country has been vastly improved during his regime. They have made fantastic progress in education, health, roads, standard of living, cleanliness, and love for freedom.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress cannot shirk its responsibility in the field of foreign affairs. In view of State Department failure in the Congo, in Cuba, in Korea, in Turkey, in Laos, in India, in Indonesia, and throughout the world Congress must move to the front and give to the American people a sound foreign policy. The present policy will flatly and unequivocally lead to Communist domination of the world. The fantastic advance of communism in this hemisphere and in Africa will not and cannot be stopped by bipartisan policies of appeasement, Russian goodwill tours, summit conferences, coexistence, and vacillation. Neither platform of the national parties offers much hope for the American people in foreign affairs, but, Mr. Speaker, I do predict that this fall the American people, already alarmed, are going to elect a Congress which will reverse this trend, stand by the Monroe Doctrine, and offer to the world a positive foreign policy.

Mr. Speaker, the real issue during this sugar debate is simply a choice between Trujillo in the Dominican Republic and the Red Communist with atomic missiles aimed at the heart and vitals of the United States. On proven past friendship I will take Trujillo. He has been one of the greatest men of our time.

THE "MUST" MINIMUM WAGE BILL

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I believe it is customary after the ball game is over to compile some sort of box score.

As this session ends, I am certain the leaders of the majority party who called it are thankful that it is grinding to a merciful close.

The President, as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces, as the Executive leader of our Nation, submitted early in the session a 22-point program which the Nation needed and which the President believed was reasonable and within the capabilities of a working Congress to enact.

Obviously very little of this program has been enacted and as for the rest of the "must" bills we came back to pass, the session is a flop. One of the major fiascos was the picayunish rejection of a compromise minimum wage plan. I can only liken the actions of the Senate committee leader, the junior Senator from Massachusetts, on this particular "must" bill, to that of a small boy who breaks up the ball game by taking his ball and going home when he cannot be quarterback. It is ironic that the compromise which was rejected on the minimum wage bill conformed in nearly every major point to the Senator's own bill for the first effective year of its operation. The lower income American worker will suffer for at least a year because of this legislative tantrum.

I want to defend and pay my respects to the sincere, hard-working House conferees who had a good bill, one that would have benefited millions of American workers. I regret they were the subjects of much unfounded abuse and criticism as the smokescreen of misdirected statements poured out from the Democratic presidential camp. I deplore the irresponsible actions of the other body's "Peck's bad boy."

I shall not at this point go into detail about the failures of this rump session. The enormity of its shortcomings will

soon become apparent to the American people.

I am reminded of an audacious slogan being bandied about by the leaders who presided over this ill-starred session. As we go back to our districts I believe all of us realize that we have seen nothing demonstrated here that would lead us to believe the slogan has been carried out. Mr. Speaker, to use the words of the leaderless legion "It is still time for greatness."

HARMFUL EFFECT OF GOVERNMENT TRADE POLICIES

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the present trade policies of our Government are doing great harm to labor, farmers, and to business.

Mr. Speaker, it is becoming increasingly apparent that our present foreign trade policies are wrecking industries in America that are vital to the communities in which they are located and to the employees in these industries, and are eliminating from the American scene industries and skilled workmen so essential to our economy, security, and well-being.

I want to relate some of the circumstances which have led to our unfavorable trade policies and point out certain industries in southern Indiana with which I am especially familiar that are being seriously damaged by our import policies.

BACKGROUND OF PRESENT TRADE POLICIES

Through the centuries, international trade has been a system of exporting those articles which a country or area produces in surplus and importing those which other countries produce in surplus quantities. Countries normally sell what they have in abundance and buy those items which are scarce. In the natural course of international trade one would not expect Brazil to import coffee; Ceylon, tea; Iceland, fish; Japan, silk; Honduras, bananas; or Malaya, rubber. Yet, that in a sense is just what we are doing today in our zeal to help various countries improve their economic status. The American people have been motivated by a spirit of altruism to help their neighbors around the world. The question arises as to just how long and to what extent you can materially help your neighbor and still remain strong yourself. The predicament in which we find ourselves today is not the fault of one political party; both parties have assisted in forging trade policies that benefit friendly countries or countries we erroneously expected to be friendly.

Reciprocal trade agreements which were begun in 1934 were intended to work for the mutual benefit of ourselves and other countries. I would be the last to say that no good has been accomplished by reciprocal trade agreements, and I also would be the last to desire to stifle legitimate trade. However, for reasons which I will not attempt to discuss at this time, trade agreements are geared more and more to encourage the importation of foreign-made goods and, in many cases, to discourage the exportation of American products. I have supported amendments which would have made our trade agreements truly reciprocal and not one-sided against American trade. I spoke against the reciprocal trade bill on June 10, 1958, and at that time pointed out the growing problems of unemployment caused by unfair foreign competition. The developments in the last 2 years have shown that I was accurate in my estimate, as imports have cut deeper and deeper into the markets for domestic production.

I have spoken on the floor of the House and have appeared before appropriate committees many times, pointing out specific instances of industries which were being unfairly damaged or even destroyed by these trade practices. Those of us who saw these approaching dangers attempted in 1958 to limit the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Act to 2 years instead of 4. Today I believe the Congress is alerted and would not extend the act without more adequate protection for American industry.

CHEAP FOREIGN LABOR CREATES TRADE INEQUITIES

The difference between labor standards in the United States and those in other countries creates a trade barrier for which even the superiority of American know-how and machinery cannot compensate in all cases. The wages paid to the men who mine the coal, who produce the raw materials and who operate the machines in the factories abroad are often less than one-tenth of the wages paid the man who performs the same type of labor in America. This labor cost factor, both direct and indirect, allows foreign products to be imported into the United States at prices which domestic producers cannot meet and still maintain our high standard of living.

AMERICAN TAX DOLLARS AND KNOW-HOW USED TO DEFEAT AMERICA

This condition was made doubly unfair after World War II when the American taxpayers began to send billions of their dollars abroad to rebuild damaged industry and install more modern machinery than American industry enjoyed at that time. We also sent abroad the best in know-how—our experts in the fields of farming, engineering, production, and other technical assistance. Industry was even called upon to surrender to foreign countries trade secrets that they had previously kept from their competition here. Although I have mentioned all of this on the floor many times, in the closing of this session I again want to point out a few specific inequities I have found which affect southern Indiana.

STONE, GLASS, TILE, AND WOOD PRODUCTS

Veneers, plywood, and fabricated wood products such as furniture and doors are moving from European and Asiatic markets to the United States at accelerated rates.

As indicative of a trend, a $140 million Lincoln Cultural Center in New York City, partially being paid for by Federal funds, is being built entirely out of Italian stone, carved by stone masons in Italy.

The American glass industry will be destroyed completely within a few years unless remedial action is taken. Last year 8.5 million boxes of window glass were imported into the United States—one-third of the normal U.S. production. That represents a gain of more than 100 percent in less than 2 years.

Structural tile from Spain threatens to replace the domestic product within a few years. Clay sewer pipe faces the same fate from foreign imports. Foreign workmen are held to wage rates of only a fraction of those paid to their American counterparts.

RUBBER GOODS, GARMENTS, SHOES, AND BRUSHES

Those industries in America manufacturing rubber products such as clothing, raincoats, and the like, are facing competition from Japanese manufacturers that is impossible to meet under present Government trade policies. Japanese labor that receives less than one-tenth of what American labor receives will completely eliminate our producers unless our country does something about it.

Imports from Japan and Hong Kong are cutting heavily into the garment industry of the United States.

Shoes from Italy and other countries are replacing those made in the United States. Advertisements even attempt to make foreign-made shoes the style today as opposed to our own domestic-made shoes.

The brush industry is also threatened by imports.

TV-RADIO PARTS, BATTERIES, AND VARIOUS ELECTRONIC ITEMS

The great American electronic industry is facing rapidly increasing competition from Japan. Although the United States has pioneered in this field, once the engineering and tests are completed, then cheaply paid Japanese labor is able to produce it at far less cost than can our own workers who enjoy our high standard of living.

COAL AND OIL

The importation of residual fuel oil, principally from Venezuela, has caused a cutback in domestic oil production and has replaced 43 million tons of coal which would have come from American mines and provided jobs for 20,000 miners. I have heard it stated that we were purchasing this residual fuel oil from Venezuela to help them and to build friendship, yet when Vice President NIXON visited Venezuela mobs attempted to murder him.

AGRICULTURE

The importation of 800 million pounds of meat in 1959 adversely affected the market for livestock raised on American farms. This was an increase of 100 percent over 1957 imports.

A greater damage to U.S. agriculture, however, results from the importation of products that take the place of American-grown products. A good example of

this is the increasing importation of casein, a milk product. Last year more than 100 million pounds of casein were imported. In hearings on this matter, Mr. W. E. Huge, vice president of Central Soya Co., stated:

> Duty-free imports of casein directly displace a potential market for industrial isolated soybean protein approximating the equivalent of 6½ million bushels of U.S. soybeans annually.

Importing products which are also raised on American farms depresses our farm markets.

AMERICAN INDUSTRY MOVING ABROAD

When American industries found that they were failing to compete with the cheap labor abroad, they began to build factories abroad to utilize cheap foreign labor and power and ship their goods back to the American market. Over 3,000 of the leading American manufacturers have spent a total of more than $27 billion in establishing plants abroad.

On August 17, 1959, on the floor of the House, I discussed this trend in detail, emphasizing the effect it ultimately would have on American industry. Not only does this trend injure business today, but it also takes away from American business the research which develops business and industry for the future.

THERE IS A SOLUTION FOR THIS PROBLEM

There are sensible solutions to our trade problems—solutions which would not stifle legitimate trade and which would return us to the principles that were intended in the original reciprocal trade legislation. Several of us in Congress attempted to accomplish this through amendments to the bill in 1958. We attempted to give the Tariff Commission rather than the State Department the authority to furnish the list of articles to be negotiated under reciprocal trade agreements. We also attempted to allow agriculture and labor to be heard by the Commission before harmful negotiations were undertaken. We attempted to include provisions which would allow farmers, farm organizations and related agricultural interests to appeal directly to the Tariff Commission. We lost in those attempts, but I believe that we are all becoming sufficiently aware of the injury to American labor, business and farmers so that when the renewal of this legislation comes up again, such amendments certainly will be adopted.

Another solution to our present trade difficulties has been offered which appears to have real merit. It is suggested that the United States base its tariff in an inverse ratio to the wages paid in the exporting country. This would cause an importer of cheap-labor products to pay a higher tariff, which would prevent the present gross unfairness to American producers and should tend to raise the wages in exporting countries.

REASONS BEHIND CONTINUED INEQUITIES IN TRADE POLICIES

There are several reasons for the resistance to a trade policy that would be fair and equitable to American producers. Many fail to realize that the reciprocal trade agreements are operating in total disregard of the meaning of the phrase "reciprocal trade."

Another reason is that it is human nature to like to sell high and buy low. If we could draw 1960 wages and buy at 1932 prices, it would be wonderful. However, the workman who loses his job to the Japanese workman cannot pay his landlord, his doctor, his grocer, and he cannot pay taxes that pay the teacher. When enough Americans lose their jobs in this manner, the national economy will tumble.

There is also a very powerful lobby which encourages imports into the United States. Billions of dollars are made by those who import products into the States, and their public relations directors are doing a most effective job.

Most foreign countries do not receive imports from America in the same altruistic spirit as we receive theirs. In fields where American know-how and capabilities are so great that we can overcome the obstacles of the low wage rates of other countries, many artificial barriers are placed against American products, such as excessive tariffs, quotas, blocked currencies, and absolute prohibition.

These increased imports from abroad are the principal cause of our diminishing gold reserve.

As I have pointed out for the last 4 years, the American standard of living is the highest in the world, and it is still improving. However, the inequities against American business are increasing. Many industries have as yet been unaffected by our trade policies, but each year more and more American industries are being injured and some are folding up or moving out of the United States.

In the coming session of Congress something must be done to remedy this situation. The responsibility of trade and tariffs belongs to Congress according to the Constitution. We must again assume our direct responsibility and act in the best interest of America.

FEDERAL BUILDING SITE AT DALLAS, TEX.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a GAO report and other material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I feel compelled to take the floor today inasmuch as there have been certain developments concerning my district relative to site acquisition for a Federal building, and even more importantly, before I get into the subject, as to its merits or demerits, the action of one of the committees of this House.

I have here a release listed as coming from the Brooks subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations. This release has gone out across the country. It lists the various subcommittee members at the bottom. I am not sure whether they had anything to do with this or not. I have spoken to several who have not even seen this release.

Let me call your attention to specific statements in the release. By the way, I invited the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS] to be present, as well as the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES] in case we get further into his field, the matter of the Federal building itself.

The release goes on to say:

> For several months we have had under investigation the method utilized by the GSA in acquiring a site in downtown Dallas.

I understand there has been only one meeting in this so-called investigation.

Then the release goes on to speak of "an acquisition procedure with peculiar moral and ethical overtones." Later in the statement he mentions "justifiable complaints of property owners"; and he uses the words "in collusion with their own government" of certain people in Dallas in collusion with their own government. Then later in the release he speaks of it being "very questionable procedure." It seems to me the questionable procedure is found in the language here used.

Further, I want to ask my colleagues what correct procedure is when a Member of Congress, in this case the gentleman from Texas addressing you, goes to a committee of Congress, in this case the Government Operations Subcommittee, asks for certain information, and finds it is refused to him? That occurred to me yesterday. Mr. Ed Brooks, a brother, and employee of the committee, said, "No" when I asked the question. "We haven't authorization to let anyone see it."

I call this to your attention because I believe it is contrary to the rules of the House. I read from Public Law 601—79th Congress, chapter 753, 2d session, page 27, subsection (d) of section 202 of the Reorganization Act:

> All committee's hearings, records, data, charts, and files shall be kept separate and distinct from the congressional office records of the Member serving as chairman of the subcommittee, and such record shall be the property of the Congress, and all members of the committee and of the respective Houses shall have access to such records.

Furthermore, I then spoke to the Comptroller General and I think I can safely say to you that he was somewhat troubled over this, because in the past these GAO reports have been sent simultaneously to the Congressman in whose district the project was located. In this case he sent it to the committee for them to release through its chairman. I think this is irregular; I think it contrary to good procedure.

As to procedure in the release of the subcommittee statement, here in hand, I am not sure whether it was given out by the Brooks subcommittee as a subcommittee or whether by Mr. BROOKS himself, alone. I have spoken to several members of the subcommittee and they are not acquainted with this release.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALGER. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Would it not be easy to find out at this time just what it was? The gentleman from Texas, I believe, is on the floor. The gentleman could ask him as to whether it was issued by the subcommittee or himself.

Mr. ALGER. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS] to enlighten me.

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. It was in reply to numerous requests apparently brought about by very keen interest in the expenditure of $43 million by the Federal Government in Dallas, in the gentleman's district. The statement was issued to clarify the situation.

If the gentleman will read the entire report he will realize that the Committee on Government Operations, as such, is wholly without authority to build any buildings or to disapprove any construction, or to authorize anything.

Mr. ALGER. I do not yield further, Mr. Speaker. The gentleman is encroaching on my time. He is not answering the question, which was: Is this a statement by him or is it a statement by the subcommittee membership?

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. To be more specific, did I write the statement? The answer is "Yes." Does it reflect what the subcommittee has done over several months of intensive study of letters from people in the gentleman's district who are concerned that their property is being taken away from them for the benefit of the nearby and adjacent landowners? The answer is "Yes."

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. The gentleman is still not answering the question, Did the subcommittee authorize the chairman to issue this statement, or was this done on the gentleman's own authority?

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. As chairman of the subcommittee, as the chairmen of most all subcommittees, when they are continually asked about studies and about legislation or a study, it seems only fair to me to give them an answer and tell them, as chairman of the subcommittee, what the report reflects. The report that I gave to the press indicated clearly further study is to be made before any official subcommittee action would be taken. I wrote a letter to that effect to the Administrator of GSA.

Mr. ALGER. The gentleman is not answering the question, which is a very simple question.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I think it is obvious the answer is that the gentleman issued the press release on his own authority. I read the press release, and I notice the names of five members of the subcommittee at the bottom. I think one point has already been established. It was issued by an individual.

Mr. ALGER. Let the gentleman direct his answer to that question.

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. When people ask you for something you try to give them a substantial statement. I did that. At the bottom of the news release, as is customary on every statement made by a subcommittee, you point out for the benefit of people who are interested, the public and members of the press and Members of Congress; yes, the gentleman himself was interested in each instance, in the names of the subcommittee members.

Mr. ALGER. I thank the gentleman for his statement.

We have the answer finally and specifically; namely, that it is Mr. BROOKS' own statement. Of course, he is entitled to his own opinion. He is not speaking for the subcommittee members, although the release with members' names added makes this appear a subcommittee report. This is irregular and unfair procedure.

I learned with some surprise that the GAO made a report last April 4. This is the one I could not get. That report so far as I understand it, and I've studied it, gave a clean bill of health to the site acquisition. Let me quote briefly from it, because, you see, 14 businessmen in Dallas right now are under attack by Mr. BROOKS through the statement released by the gentleman from Texas, wherein he alludes to peculiar moral and ethical overtones in the land acquisition.

Here are the questions that Mr. BROOKS asked the GAO and also the answers.

First, an opinion on whether or not the alleged bid by the syndicate was a proper responsive one, inasmuch as the syndicate was neither owner nor agent for the property it was offering to the Government.

Here is the answer, only part of which someone underlined in this particular copy:

> Presumably, as you suggest, the guarantee offered was not made without some motive on the part of the guarantors, such as enhancement of the value of their own properties. However, there is nothing in the record to indicate that they would personally benefit in any manner different in nature from the benefits which would normally be expected to accrue to any owners of property in the vicinity of the site selected.

Further on is:

> Accordingly, in answer to your first question, it is our opinion that the proposal of the syndicate was not illegal from that standpoint.

And so on.

The second question was: "An opinion on the legality of this condemnation policy in which a private, profitmaking group offered the Government property it did not even own and agreed to share the condemnation costs with the Government."

Here is part of the answer by the GAO:

> As we pointed out in the answer to the first question, in view of the provisions of 40 U.S.C. 298, such a guarantee would not appear to be legally objectionable in the absence of other considerations even though the syndicate might profit from selection by GSA of one of the suggested parcels.

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. Would you read the sentence ahead of that?

Mr. ALGER. I will be glad to have the gentleman do that.

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. Starting with:

> Because of the particular and unusual circumstances leading up to the selection of the site, it is understandable that the former owners of the property taken might question the propriety of the action taken.

Mr. ALGER. It was of interest to me that the gentleman underlined or someone else underlined this copy I have, which is no doubt the part that they wanted to be read. I had tried to read the entire thing in context, and therefore I have asked permission to put in the entire statement so that every Member can take a look at it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I had nothing to do with the site selection; that is not a Congressman's province. I know nothing firsthand about the transaction. I was not a party to it, and I was not on this committee studying the acquisition. What disturbs me is that the release put out today by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS] as the head of this subcommittee apparently relates not at all to the statement made by the GAO. Perhaps it is possible to lift out a sentence of the GAO report and twist it a little bit and then come out with this kind of a statement, but I think that is a very inaccurate way to put it before this body. It is possible that an investigation might show there was something improper, and I am not here to criticize or say that this was right or it was wrong. I am simply calling to the attention of the House the facts as stated in this GAO report, and I hope you will read the GAO report which I will put into the RECORD.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALGER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I think it might be well to ask the gentleman who issued this statement why he waited from April 4 until the end of August to issue any statement and why his committee did not act on this thing instead of his acting as an individual.

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. Would the gentleman yield for a unanimous consent request before answering his question?

Mr. ALGER. I would like to have the gentleman answer the question.

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. May I make a unanimous consent request first so that I am sure I will have adequate time to answer the gentleman? I ask him to yield for that purpose.

Mr. ALGER. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order I received today follow the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER].

Mr. ALGER. Why not add it onto my time and we can share it?

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. I would not want to impose.

Mr. ALGER. It would be no imposition. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does the gentleman agree that we might share the time? I certainly would be willing to split it equally as I have tried to split it up to this point.

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. I will yield when I complete my statement.

Mr. ALGER. Is that agreeable to the gentleman?

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. I will handle the time.

Mr. ALGER. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. Would the gentleman mind repeating the question?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. With the report coming to your subcommittee on April 4, your subcommittee took no action until the end of August, when you issued a personal statement. Why the delay and why the personal statement?

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. Of course, you know that the Committee on Government Operations has rather wide jurisdiction. We have been occupied with a lot of matters which we have been working on pretty steadily both in the subcommittee and in our personal capacity as Members of Congress. The report from the GAO was not received for some time after the study had been inaugurated. As a matter of fact, I did not look over the report until one of my Republican colleagues, whom we hold in high regard, called it to my attention.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, here are the two documents in question. First, the unilateral release by Mr. BROOKS, as chairman of the subcommittee, which purports to be a committee release:

PRIVATE SYNDICATE PAID $310,600 TO INDUCE GOVERNMENT TO CONDEMN LAND, BROOKS REVEALS

WASHINGTON, D.C.—A private syndicate, which stands to profit in the deal, paid $310,600 to induce the Government to condemn property the syndicate didn't own as a site for a proposed new Federal building in Dallas, Tex., Congressman JACK BROOKS, Democrat of Texas, said here today.

"For several months we have had under investigation the method utilized by the GSA in acquiring a site in downtown Dallas for a new Federal building and our study has revealed an acquisition procedure with peculiar moral and ethical overtones," said BROOKS, chairman of the House Government Activities Subcommittee.

"Back in January 1957, the General Services Administration solicited proposals for the sale or donation to the United States, within a specified area, alternate ground areas of 40,000 square feet (minimum required for extending the Government-owned Santa Fe Building), or 75,000 square feet (minimum required for a separate new site).

"The GSA received 21 proposals, including one from the syndicate, guaranteeing that if the Government took any of three tracts it outlined, each adjoining the Santa Fe site, it would reimburse the Government, up to $200,000, any cost over amounts it specified. The reimbursement sum later was adjusted upward. The owners of the three tracts mentioned did not submit proposals in response to GSA's invitation," Brooks continued.

"Three sites offered were ruled outside the specified area and 15 others also were eliminated. This left 3 of the 21, one of which comprised the several tracts stipulated in the guarantee offer. In late December 1957, GSA publicly announced that one of the syndicate-suggested tracts was the final choice."

GSA Administrator Franklin Floete, in a letter to BROOKS, said "This site was selected only after an understanding had been reached with the 14 local businessmen who had submitted the above-mentioned offer whereunder they agreed to pay so much of the purchase price of the selected site as exceeded $1 million."

"The GSA couldn't negotiate satisfactorily with eight of the nine owners to purchase the property the syndicate had offered, without the owners' permission," BROOKS said, "so they proceeded with condemnation. The guarantors, according to latest figures available to the subcommittee, have paid to GSA the sum of $310,600, representing the difference between the estimated cost ($1,130,600) deposited in court, plus $180,000 paid to the owner of one lot, and the Government's maximum obligation of $1 million under the final guarantee agreement."

"We became interested in this matter because of the justifiable complaints this spring of several property owners whose rights to ownership were bargained away by other people in collusion with their own Government," Congressman BROOKS said.

"The GSA and GAO, in reports to the subcommittee, confirm what was done—the individual property rights of eight taxpaying citizens virtually were sold to the high bidder, against their will, for that $310,600. An outside group paid the difference which enabled the Federal Government to take somebody else's property and thereby lucratively enhance the value of their own property.

"These guarantors were the 14 men who signed the guarantee proposal which begins 'in order to induce the United States of America to select and acquire' property they didn't own. These 14 formed the syndicate which Karl Wallace, then GSA Regional Commissioner in Dallas, told us acquired about $14 million worth of property in the 'blighted area' around the Santa Fe Building '2 or 3 years' before the site was chosen. Wallace is now Public Buildings Commissioner for the entire GSA.

"The Government wouldn't have seized this property if the guarantee offer hadn't been made—because it limited its expenditure to $1 million for the site."

The GAO, he said, described the circumstances as "particular and unusual" and Mr. Wallace didn't recall any similar circumstances in his long career. The GAO said it was not illegal but "the syndicate did, in effect, indirectly agree to share the condemnation costs with the Government."

"The whole thing appears to me to be a very questionable procedure," BROOKS said. "The right of eminent domain is a touchy one to exercise, at best, and abuse of it is unpardonable.

"We have expressed our views on the matter to Mr. Floete in the hope that this unusual action does not spawn an official policy which would seem a mighty poor way to maintain the confidence and respect of the people for their Government," BROOKS said.

"This subcommittee does not authorize buildings, so we haven't criticized plans to spend $43 million to join a new structure to the Santa Fe Building that was built in 1924 and converted from a warehouse to an office building during World War II. They'll have enough problems doing that."

Other members of the Brooks subcommittee are: Democrats, ROBERT E. JONES, Alabama; JOHN E. MOSS, California; and HENRY S. REUSS, Wisconsin; and Republicans, GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER, New Jersey; and JESSICA MCC. WEIS, New York. Chairman WILLIAM L. DAWSON, Democrat, of Illinois, heads the parent House Committee on Government Operations.

Second, here is the GAO report which details the site acquisition for the Federal building and which appears to clear the syndicate of any wrongdoing. This is the report so little considered by Mr. BROOKS that he admits he would not have even looked at the report if a Republican colleague had not called his attention to it. This is the report Mr. BROOKS decided could not be seen by Members of Congress, at least this Member:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, April 4, 1960.

Hon. JACK BROOKS,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Government Activities, Committee on Government Operations, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Your letter of March 8, 1960, acknowledged March 9, requests our cooperation in clarifying several points concerning the propriety of the action taken by General Services Administration incident to the selection and acquisition of the site for a new courthouse and Federal office building in Dallas, Tex.

The record shows that this project was originated as a lease-purchase project under title I of Public Law 519, approved July 22, 1954, as amended (40 U.S.C. 356), and that the formal prospectus for the proposed building was approved on July 20, 1956, by the Senate and House Committees on Public Works. The project as then approved contemplated the erection of the building on a site to be acquired. The justification for the project contained the following statement concerning the Government-owned building at 1114 Commerce Street:

"5. This proposal is based on the disposal of the Government-owned building at 1114 Commerce Street. This building, built in 1924, was acquired by the Army in 1942 and transferred to GSA in 1949 without reimbursement. The building was designed basically as a warehouse and merchandise mart type of structure; does not lend itself to economical and efficient office space type of operation; has considerable obsolescence in building service facilities; and is on the fringe of an economically blighted area. It is estimated that an expenditure of $870,000 will be required during the next 5 years for deferred items of repairs, replacements, and improvements."

The site finally approved and acquired adjoins the building above referred to, and the project now contemplated consists of the remodeling of that building and construction of a new extension thereon.

From the letter of February 24, 1960, from the Administrator of General Services to you, it appears that following approval of the project by the Public Works Committees it was deemed in the public interest to give further consideration to the retention of the building at 1114 Commerce Street, in which event a smaller site area would be required. Pursuant to normal policy and site selection procedure an area was delineated bounded by Ross Avenue, Lamar Street, Pacific Avenue, Houston Street, Young Street, Preston Street, and Central Expressway as appropriate for the location of the new building, and during the period January 1 through January 20, 1957, proposals were solicited for the sale or donation to the United States of alternate ground areas of 40,000 square feet (minimum area required for extending 1114 Commerce Street building), or 75,000 square feet (minimum area required for a separate new site). In response to this invitation 21 proposals were received, including one dated January 23, 1957 (submitted by W. W. Overton, Jr.) et al., guaranteeing that the costs to the United States of three tracts offered, each adjoining the 1114 Commerce Street building site and comprising areas of (1) 43,500, (2) 79,500, and (3) 89,500 square feet, would not exceed the amounts of $885,000, $1,655,000, and $2 million, respectively, and undertaking, if the Government selected one of those sites, to reimburse the Government for any acquisition cost in excess of the specified amounts, up to $200,000. The owners of the three sites mentioned did not submit proposals in response to the invitation.

It is stated that, following an inspection of the sites offered in response to the invitation for bids and other sites considered suitable but not offered, 3 sites were found to be outside the specified area and 15 were eliminated because of size, undesirability or unsuitability. This left four sites for further consideration, one of which was comprised of the several tracts stipulated in the guaranty offer; two more were alternate locations in one block, one of 75,000 square feet offered for $1,500,000 and the other of 173,541 square feet offered in exchange for the 1114 Commerce Street Building; and the fourth site, which was not offered, contained 73,250 square feet valued at $1,406,560. It is stated further that an analysis of the available sites and evaluation of all factors involved led to the conclusion that the most practical solution for resolving the matter of site selection was to erect the new building in the vicinity of 1114 Commerce Street, which would enhance the value of existing Government-owned building at 1114 Commerce Street and would provide a convenient location for Government employees and the public. The intention to so locate the building was first announced on October 3, 1957, at which time it was stated that the site would be selected in the near future on the basis of relative cost and desirability. Following further inspection of the competing locations, in the latter part of December 1957, there was selected as the site for the new building the tract of land immediately west of the 1114 Commerce Street Building, between Commerce and Jackson Streets and containing an area of approximately 58,000 square feet, and this selection was publicly announced in Dallas and reported in the local newspapers. It is explained, however, that this site—which was within the boundaries of the tracts designated in the guaranty offer received—was selected only after an understanding had been reached with the 14 local businessmen who had submitted the original guaranty proposal, whereby they agreed to pay all of the purchase price of the selected site in excess of $1 million.

It is reported that appraisals of the selected site totaling $1,334,100 and $1,527,500 were obtained by GSA; that thereafter purchase negotiations with the individual owners of the selected site on the basis of amounts not in excess of the appraised fair market values resulted in acquisition of lot 7, block 63, for the sum of $180,000; that since satisfactory proposals could not be obtained from the owners of the remaining eight lots the Attorney General, on October 31, 1958, was requested to institute condemnation proceedings; that on December 1, 1958, a declaration of taking was filed, at which time there was deposited with the court $1,130,600 as the estimated award. The guarantors have paid to GSA the sum of $310,000, representing the difference between the estimated cost deposited in court, plus the $180,000 paid for lot 7, and the Government's maximum obligation of $1 million under the guarantee agreement.

On the basis of the foregoing you ask us to furnish the following:

First. An opinion on whether or not the alleged bid by the syndicate was a proper responsive one, inasmuch as the syndicate was neither owner nor agent for the property it was offering to the Government.

Second. An opinion on the legality of this condemnation policy in which a private, profitmaking group offered the Government property it did not own and agreed to share the condemnation costs with the Government.

Third. The location and date of acquisition of all lands owned by the subject Dallas syndicate within the bounds cited in the invitation to bid in this matter.

Also, cite whether any of said lands were offered to the Government under this invitation to bid.

The solicitation for proposals as published in the Dallas Morning News on January 3, 1957, was "for the sale or donation to the United States of alternative sites for a Federal office building at Dallas." Owners were informed that they might submit their own proposals and proposals submitted by agents were required to be accompanied by documentary evidence of authority.

The original proposal submitted by the guarantee syndicate specifically stated that it was being submitted pursuant to the next to last paragraph of the solicitation for proposals, wherein the bidders were informed that the Government reserved the right, as its interest might require, to reject any and all offers, and that consideration would be given to sites other than those offered in response to the invitation and that a site deemed more advantageous to the Government than any site offered might be acquired by negotiation or condemnation. The proposal also specifically stated that the property adjoining the 1114 Commerce Street Building, which they urged should be purchased by GSA, would have to be acquired by or on behalf of the Government by negotiation or by condemnation proceedings, and that none of the parties submitting the proposal owned any of the land or any interest therein or had any authority as agent or otherwise to sell, offer for sale, or donate such land to the Government.

The original letter of guarantee attached to the guarantors' proposal was superseded by another letter of guarantee dated December 24, 1957, wherein the guarantors jointly and severally undertook to guarantee that the acquisition cost for the site selected by GSA for construction of the new building would not exceed $1 million, and, in the event the acquisition cost exceeded such amount, to pay to the Government or at its direction all sums in excess of $1 million necessary to acquire the full fee simple title to the property. By letter of February 28, 1958, referring to the letter of December 24, 1957, each of the guarantors was notified that the Government was actively beginning proceedings for acquisition of the proposed new site.

Regarding your first question, it is our view that the proposal submitted by the syndicate was not intended to be a bid in response to the advertisement. Rather, it was an offer that if the Government would select and asquire one of the sites specifically described in their proposal, the syndicate would pay any excess of the acquisition cost over the amount stipulated in the offer, to the extent of $200,000. Thus, it is clear that the syndicate did not offer to sell any site to the Government. Presumably, as you suggest, the guarantee offer was not made without some motive on the part of the guarantors, such as enhancement of the value of their own properties. However, there is nothing in the record to indicate that they would personally benefit in any manner different in nature from the benefits which would normally be expected to accrue to any owners of property in the vicinity of the site selected.

It has been held that a voluntary donation or contribution of cash may not be accepted by a Government official in the absence of specific authority (36 Comp. Gen. 368. However, we do not believe that the acceptance of the guarantee in this instance is legally objectionable, in view of the provisions of 40 U.S.C. 298a, under which the Administrator of GSA is authorized to accept on behalf of the United States unconditional gifts of real or personal property, or other property, in aid of any project or function within his jurisdiction. Although in this instance the offer of the gift was conditioned upon selection of a particular site by the Government, the gift itself was to be outright and absolute, and we do not interpret the word "unconditional" in the statute as preventing the acceptance of such an offer. Accordingly, in answer to your first question, it is our opinion that the proposal of the syndicate was not illegal from that standpoint, even though the syndicate or its individual members may stand to realize some indirect profit by the Government's acquisition of one of the sites forming the basis of the guarantee proposal.

Regarding your second question, as stated above, we do not consider that the syndicate offered the Government property it did not own. On the contrary, the syndicate's proposal specifically stated that none of the parties submitting the proposal owned any of the land suggested for selection as a site and that none of them had any authority as agent or otherwise to sell, offer for sale, or donate such land. The amended proposal as set forth in the letter of December 24, 1957, was submitted "in order to induce the United States * * * to select and acquire the hereinafter described property as a site for a Federal building." The proposal was made in consideration of selection and acquisition by the United States of one of the suggested sites. By guaranteeing that the acquisition cost of the property suggested "shall not exceed the sum of $1 million" the syndicate did, in effect, indirectly agree to share the condemnation costs with the Government, if such costs exceeded that amount. As we pointed out in the answer to the first question in view of the provisions of 40 U.S.C. 298a such a guarantee would not appear to be legally objectionable in the absence of other considerations even though the syndicate might profit from selection by GSA of one of the suggested parcels.

Because of the particular and unusual circumstances leading up to the selection of the site, it is understandable that the former owners of the property taken might question the propriety of the action taken. "Since a declaration of taking has now been filed in the U.S. District Court for the Northern Division of Texas, any question as to the legality of the taking which may arise out of the peculiar circumstances of the guaranty would appear to be one to be put in issue before the court for determination, since it has exclusive jurisdiction over all matters pertaining to the taking of the land." Your second question is answered accordingly.

As to question 3 our auditors have reviewed the Dallas County plat records showing the present ownership of property within the area included in the solicitation for proposals. The property ownerships of the numbers of the syndicate in the downtown Dallas area are set out on the attached sheet marked "Exhibit 1" and shown in green on the attached large map of the Dallas business district, marked "Exhibit 2." The areas outlined in red on exhibit 2 represent the sites offered under the solicitation. It is noted that lots 2 and 3 in block No. 352 are owned by Justin S. McCarty, one of the guarantors, and that this site was offered in response to the solicitation by William M. Alexander, as agent.

In examining the land records it was observed that, beginning near the end of the year 1955 and spring of 1956 and continuing through 1959, a large number of lots and parcels of land in the blocks to the north of the Commerce Street site were acquired in the name of S. P. Cimiotti, trustee. These sites are marked in red on exhibit 3 and it will be noted that several of such sites are immediately across Commerce Street from the site selected for the new Federal building. The deeds conveying title to the trustee did not disclose the names of the trustors or the purpose of the trust and we did not find a trust agreement on record. Attached as exhibit "4" is a list of the lots in question, which indicates the pages of the platbooks on which the transfers, and the dates thereof, are shown. Photostatic copies

from the Dallas County platbooks covering the area within the solicitation for proposals are also enclosed.

If any additional information or assistance should be desired concerning this matter we shall be glad to furnish same upon your request.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE TO INFORM THE PRESIDENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, your committee appointed to join a committee of the Senate to inform the President that the Congress is ready to adjourn, and to ask him if he has any further communications to make to the Congress, has performed that duty. The President has directed us to say that he has no further communication to make to the Congress.

SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 745) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representativse (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress shall adjourn on Thursday, September 1, 1960, and that when they adjourn on said day, they stand adjourned sine die.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BUDGET REQUESTS AND APPROPRIATIONS FOR THIS SESSION OF THE CONGRESS

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, in conformity with the customary procedure at the close of the session I include statistical tabulations and related data summarizing actions by the 2d session of the 86th Congress on the appropriation bills.

The tabulation by bills is necessarily limited to those processed by the Committee on Appropriations through the annual appropriations bills and does not therefore reflect action on those parts of the President's budget recommendations disposed of through revenue bills or the "backdoor" appropriation bills processed outside regular appropriation channels, or other budgetary actions. Disposition of all these propositions and Executive revision of revenue collection and disbursement estimates—all these factors will join with action on the regular appropriation bills to influence the final Treasury position and the January budget prediction of a $4.2 billion surplus for the current fiscal year 1961.

Authoritative data as to final disposition of pertinent features of the record-breaking 1961 budget of the President will not be available for a few weeks, but we can summarize the action on the principal spending measures—the regular appropriation bills.

Mr. Speaker, the House has processed 19 bills during the session. Budget estimates of appropriations submitted to the House by the President in this session, and considered in bills from the Committee on Appropriations, totaled $73,613,979,421. These totals do not include the permanent appropriations recurring automatically under existing law without necessity of annual congressional action; the January budget estimate for these totaled $10,166,000,000, of which $9,500,000,000 was estimated for interest on our monstrous public debt. These latter amounts are likewise subject to some revision in the next several weeks based on information not presently available.

The Committee on Appropriations reduced the President's request for appropriations by $2,475,914,958, recommending a total of $71,138,064,463. With one major and two minor exceptions, every bill reported was below the amount the President asked us to appropriate in his record-breaking budget. The defense bill, reported before Khrushchev wrecked the summit meeting, was only nominally above the budget. But the Congress has developed a special addiction to excessive appropriations in the Labor-HEW bill in consequence of which it was reported out nearly $184 million above the President's suggestions.

Contrary to committee recommendations, the House added back a total of $209,374,500, so the bills went to the Senate at an aggregate of $71,347,438,963—the substantial amount of $2,266,540,458 below the budget estimates considered on this side of the Capitol.

The Senate, characteristically, went above the House totals by $3,796,071,712 and above the corresponding budget estimates of $73,845,974,490 by $1,297,536,185. They asked $75,143,510,675.

With the exception of some of the defense items and possibly a scattered handful of others, every Senate addition could have been dispensed with and we could have saved billions without impairment to essential services and programs.

But at the conference tables, the other body was so insistent that we were compelled to yield substantial amounts beyond the House position. In classic tradition the Senate continues to violate the constitutional intent sponsored by Madison who insisted the Senate should participate in the appropriations process so as to act as a brake on an impulsive and extravagant House.

But the situation operates in the reverse. They not only increase the regular appropriation totals drastically but last year and the year before, they originated some 12 Treasury backdoor measures totaling about $10 billion.

One of the most flagrant and recurring "backdoor" measures is the housing bill. The other body passed a bill this year carrying some $1,690 million in "backdoor" provisions, all above the budget, but it failed of final passage. A similar House bill also died.

On yesterday, the Senate attached to a minor and unrelated House bill two more "backdoor" housing provisions totaling $550 million above the budget. The House concurred without debate. This is a classic example of the evil of the "backdoor" technique—appropriating in the dark, and abdicating the initial appropriating powers of the House to the Senate.

Another "backdoor" bill, $300 million above the budget, involved direct veterans loans.

The periodic highway program, for years a "backdoor" feature operating under the contract authority device, was also enacted.

A summary of the major identified "backdoor" appropriation bills enacted during the session follows:

	Executive request	Enacted	Above Executive request
Housing (public debt borrowing authority):			
College loans		$500,000,000	+$500,000,000
Public facility loans	[1] $20,000,000	50,000,000	+30,000,000
Direct veterans loans (public debt borrowing authority)		[2] 300,000,000	+300,000,000
Total	20,000,000	850,000,000	+830,000,000

[1] The 1961 portion of a total of $100,000,000, which, under the Executive proposal, was to be subject to annual appropriation act control.
[2] For 2-year period.

Consequently, the bills sent to the President total $73,634,335,992, a net decrease of $211,638,498 below corresponding budget requests. We have made necessary upward adjustments in the defense bill following the wrecking of the summit conference, and we have indulged in excesses on some of the other bills, as every Congress does, but nevertheless, we have kept the appropriation bills below the total asked by the President in his record-breaking budget.

The outstanding item on the list of bills sent to the President is the $661 million increase in the defense bill. It is excessive because, like the budget, it appropriates for obsolete and wasteful weapons and defense concepts, although necessarily revised in some particulars.

Another significant bill in which we exceeded the budget—by $333,948,350—is the Labor-HEW bill. We have developed an addiction to increasing that bill far beyond amounts they can intelligently use.

The second supplemental bill—the last one adopted—is also significantly above the budget requests, as the following table shows.

The appetite of bureaucracy is insatiable. If their appropriations were doubled, or tripled, they would still ask more. Before the regular foreign-aid bill had been signed, they were insisting that the conference reductions be restored, notwithstanding the regular bill was nearly $500 million above the previous year. And the Senate complied to the extent of $190 million, notwithstanding they had, only a few days earlier, agreed to the amounts in the regular bill.

The tabulation by bills follows.

Final table of appropriation bills, 86th Cong., 2d sess.

[Does not include any "back door" appropriation bills. Also excludes permanent appropriations]

Bill No.	Title	House										Senate										Final action				House action compared with—	
		Budget estimates to House	Date reported	Amount as reported	Amount reported compared with budget estimates	Date passed	Amount as passed	House action compared with—				Budget estimates to Senate	Date reported	Amount as reported	Date passed	Amount as passed	Senate action compared with—					Amount as passed	Date approved	Public Law No.	Increase or decrease compared to budget estimates to date	Amount reported
								Budget estimates		Amount as passed	Date passed						Budget estimates		House action		Date passed						
	1960 APPROPRIATIONS																									Budget estimates	Amount reported
H.J. Res. 621	NASA Supplemental	$23,000,000	Feb. 19	$23,000,000		Feb. 23	$23,000,000					$23,079,000	Feb. 26	$23,079,000	Mar. 24	$23,079,000			+$79,000	Apr. 14	$23,079,000	Apr. 14	86-425			
H.R. 10743	2d supplemental	1,008,398,264	Feb. 26	229,175,864	-$779,222,400	Feb. 29	237,505,864					979,908,103	Mar. 11	995,491,103	do	995,491,103	-$23,013,755	+757,985,239	+757,985,239	Apr. 13	955,370,003	Apr. 13	86-424			
H.J. Res. 765	Labor supplemental	8,000,000	June 20	6,000,000	-2,000,000	June 21	6,000,000					6,000,000	June 21	6,000,000	June 21	6,000,000	-2,000,000			June 29	6,000,000	June 29	86-535	-$863,134,885	-$770,892,400	
	1961 APPROPRIATIONS																							-2,000,000	-2,000,000	
H.R. 10233	District of Columbia	(242,403,000)	Feb. 5	(237,118,276)	(-5,284,724)	Feb. 8	(237,118,276)					(240,089,152)	do	(240,089,152)	do	(240,089,152)	(-2,313,848)		(+2,970,876)	Apr. 8	(239,470,433)		86-412			
	Loan authorization	(18,700,000)		(18,700,000)			(18,700,000)					(20,100,000)		(20,100,000)		(20,100,000)	(+1,400,000)		(+1,400,000)		(20,100,000)					
	Federal payment	34,533,000		27,533,000	-7,000,000		27,533,000					28,533,000		28,533,000		28,533,000	+1,000,000		+1,000,000		27,533,000			(-2,932,567)		
H.R. 10234	Commerce	799,615,000		700,522,235	-99,092,765		700,522,235					738,388,300	Mar. 29	738,388,300	Mar. 29	738,388,300	-61,226,700		-22,133,935	May 13	729,624,375		86-451	(+1,400,000)		
H.R. 10401	Interior	550,330,300	Feb. 5	543,375,600	-6,954,700		543,375,600					589,212,625	do	589,212,625	do	589,212,625	+38,882,325		+45,837,025	do	557,667,600		86-455	-7,000,000		
H.R. 10569	Treasury-Post Office	4,897,853,000	Feb. 12	4,795,414,000	-102,439,000		4,795,414,000					4,877,014,000	Apr. 25	4,877,014,000	Apr. 25	4,877,014,000	-20,839,000		+81,600,000	do	4,841,914,000		86-561	-90,990,625		
H.R. 11389	General Government	14,302,500	Mar. 25	13,787,500	-515,000		13,787,500					14,572,500	June 22	14,572,500	June 17	14,572,500	-55,000		+785,000	June 30	14,207,500		86-642	+7,337,300		
H.R. 11390	Labor-HEW	4,000,083,981	do	4,184,022,731	+183,938,750		4,184,022,731					4,485,788,931	June 17	4,485,566,950	June 30	4,485,788,931	+465,566,950		+301,766,200	July 12	4,354,170,331			-55,939,000		
H.R. 11666	State-Justice-Judiciary	713,803,755	Apr. 8	676,579,807	-37,223,948		676,564,807					718,010,147	June 22	718,269,147	June 30	718,269,147	-14,761,248		+41,704,340		705,032,567			-420,000		
H.R. 11776	Independent Offices	8,416,167,400	Apr. 14	8,146,167,400	-270,729,600	Apr. 13	8,182,067,400					8,459,412,900	June 22	8,459,412,900	June 16	8,459,412,900	+42,015,900		+277,345,500	July 12	8,311,883,400		86-626	+273,997,828		
H.R. 11908	Defense	39,337,867,000	Apr. 29	39,337,867,000	+2,867,000	Apr. 20	39,337,867,000					40,514,997,000	June 16	40,384,897,000	May 24	40,514,997,000	+1,170,997,000		+1,177,130,000	July 7	39,996,608,000		86-601	-105,503,600		
H.R. 12117	Agriculture	4,135,263,190	May 6	3,964,781,500	-170,481,690	May 5	3,937,943,500					4,005,222,683	May 24	4,005,222,683	May 24	4,005,222,683	+130,040,507		+67,279,183	June 29	3,994,097,600		86-532	+61,660,608		
H.R. 12231	Military construction	(367,000,000)		(557,000,000)	(+190,000,000)	May 11	3,937,943,500					(577,000,000)		(577,000,000)		(577,000,000)	(+210,000,000)		(+20,000,000)		(577,000,000)			-141,165,590		
H.R. 12232	Legislative	1,188,000,000		885,168,000	-302,832,000		(557,000,000)					1,067,227,000	June 27	1,067,227,000	June 27	1,067,227,000	-120,773,000		+191,092,000	July 12	994,855,000		86-630	(+210,000,000)		
H.R. 12236	Public works	104,072,020	do	100,317,660	-3,754,360	June 9	876,145,000					129,870,410	June 20	129,870,410	June 20	129,870,410	-3,543,075		+29,552,750	July 12	129,470,410		86-628	-193,145,000		
H.R. 12619	Mutual security	4,001,016,180	May 20	3,914,798,985	-86,217,195	May 25	3,914,798,985					4,080,010,605	Aug. 10	4,080,010,605	Aug. 10	4,080,010,605	+16,217,425		+115,211,620		3,969,982,455			-3,943,075		
H.R. 12740	Supplemental	4,181,704,000	June 13	3,989,054,000	-791,954,000	June 17	3,914,798,985					3,989,054,000	Aug. 24	3,989,054,000	Aug. 24	3,989,054,000	+899,304,000		+899,304,000		3,969,982,455			-43,810,695		
H.R. 13161	2d supplemental	134,822,200	June 20	49,215,700	-85,606,500	June 23	49,738,200					166,324,740	July 1	166,324,740	July 1	166,324,740	-3,003,100		+116,586,540		162,186,981			-559,354,000		
		67,285,031	Aug. 26	90,587,481	+23,302,450	Aug. 26	91,085,481					305,042,731		305,042,731		305,042,731	+232,762,000		+213,957,250	July 14	138,293,740		86-651	-31,034,100		
	Total, 1961	[1] 72,574,581,157		70,879,888,599	-1,694,692,558		71,080,933,099					74,118,940,572		[1] 73,928,346,547		[1] 74,118,940,572	[1] +1,322,549,970		[1] +3,038,007,473		[1] 72,649,886,989			+89,906,250		
	Total, all bills	[1] 73,613,979,421		71,138,064,463	-2,475,914,958		71,347,438,963					75,143,510,675		[1] 74,007,333,660		[1] 74,007,333,660	[1] +1,297,536,185		[1] +3,796,071,712		[1] 73,634,335,992			-146,503,613		
	Total, loan authorizations	(385,700,000)		(575,700,000)	(+190,000,000)		(575,700,000)					(597,100,000)		(597,100,000)		(597,100,000)	(+211,400,000)		(+21,400,000)		(597,100,000)			-211,628,498		
																									(+211,400,000)	

[1] Excludes permanent appropriations, estimated in 1961 budget at $10,166,000,000, which is subject to some revision.

NOTE.—Indefinite appropriations are included in this table.

So, Mr. Speaker, while we cannot for some weeks determine with precision the status of the session appropriations because of uncertainties involved, there are some salient statistics and data about which there are no uncertainties.

RECORD BREAKING BUDGETS

The law requires the President to make and submit the budget recommendations both as to taxes and appropriations. All fiscal recommendations start with the Executive. He makes the budget, not Congress. It includes only what he urges, what he approves, what in his judgment is necessary. He is by law required to recommend cuts in appropriations of any magnitude he feels is warranted and to recommend revisions of basic legislation to correspond. He is dutybound to recommend any changes in tax rates he believes justified—either up or down.

In the current fiscal year 1961 the budget exceeded all previous estimates. It proposed to take in $84 billion—the largest total ever requested, in war or peace.

They do not have to urge extension of war tax rates in time of peace—as in the 1961 budget and in every past budget from the administration. This alone accounts for much of the January budget surplus estimate—and I emphasize it—is only an estimate—of $4.2 billion. Every authoritative indication is that when the President officially revises revenue and spending estimates for fiscal 1961 in the next few weeks, the $4.2 billion will have vanished and only a nominal surplus, or even another deficit, will take its place.

When the Clerk read the President's budget message to the House last January, it was immediately apparent that the goals announced did not correspond to some features of the attached budget. And it disclosed beyond all challenge that this administration, after 8 years in office, has not and could not at such late date accomplish the laudable fiscal objectives promised in the 1952 and 1956 campaigns.

The January message urged restraint but in the same pages proposed to spend $1.4 billion more in 1961 than in 1960. Furthermore, the President had declared war on excessive spending. He was quoted:

I think every place we are spending too much money. * * * We must start right from the biggest and go right down to the smallest.

He decried what he termed "loose handling of our fiscal affairs." But the last budget submitted shortly thereafter proposed to spend more. And it also proposed increased appropriations, both large and small.

But, Mr. Speaker, so that there will be no doubt that the messages and pronouncements about economy and restraint on the one hand, and the budget estimates on the other hand, go in opposite directions, I submit several sets of official figures. They need little or no explanation. They speak for themselves.

APPROPRIATION INCREASES REQUESTED BY THE PRESIDENT

Although administered by the present administration, the 1954 budget was prepared by the previous administration. The fiscal 1955 budget, submitted in January 1954, was the first budget prepared and submitted by the present administration. From that budget to this budget, they have urged higher and higher appropriations each year as the following published figures on Presidential budget estimates considered in the appropriation bills disclose:

	President's budget estimates
83d, 2d (fiscal 1955 and prior)	$57,422,327,386
84th, 1st (fiscal 1956 and prior)	62,030,092,195
84th, 2d (fiscal 1957 and prior)	68,587,724,820
85th, 1st (fiscal 1958 and prior)	73,113,555,340
85th, 2d (fiscal 1959 and prior)	81,737,060,999
86th, 1st (fiscal 1960 and prior)	83,452,687,259
86th, 2d (fiscal 1961 and prior)	[1] 84,011,974,490

[1] Includes $10,166,000,000 January budget estimate for permanent appropriations, which is subject to some later revision, though not substantial.

Mr. Speaker, these are significant and revealing figures. And they are staggering. Imagine asking appropriations more than $26 billion above those proposed in their first budget. It is incredible. And it is billions away from repeated pledges and promises.

SPENDING INCREASES

The regular appropriation bills no longer fully disclose what goes out of the Treasury. We now have the backdoor bills and every other conceivable gimmick to get money out of the Treasury to avoid passing the acid test of annual appropriations review. The more fully informative and all-inclusive index to the trends are the amounts disbursed—whether from frontdoor, backdoor, sidedoor, or trapdoor appropriations. The ever-increasing amounts expended during the present administration are shocking. And the official Treasury figures are conclusive in the matter. Take the figures from July 1, 1953, the beginning of the fiscal year 1954, when they assumed full control of collecting and spending. Here they are, and interpretation of the trend is inescapable:

Budget expenditures

	Rounded amounts
Fiscal 1954 (from July 1953)	$67,800,000,000
Fiscal 1955	64,600,000,000
Fiscal 1956	66,500,000,000
Fiscal 1957	69,400,000,000
Fiscal 1958	$71,900,000,000
Fiscal 1959	80,700,000,000
Fiscal 1960	77,300,000,000
Fiscal 1961 (this is the January estimate; subject to revision)	[1] 79,800,000,000

[1] The President's estimates; subject to probable substantial upward revision, but these are his proposals. And for simplicity, expenditures from highway trust fund beginning with 1957 are excluded.

Net budget receipts, expenditures, and deficit (−) or surplus (+), 7 fiscal years 1954–60

[In billions]

Fiscal year	Net budget receipts	Net budget expenditures	Deficit (−) or surplus (+)
1. Fiscal 1954 (from July 1953)	$64.7	$67.8	−$3.1
2. Fiscal 1955	60.4	64.6	−4.2
3. Fiscal 1956	68.1	66.5	+1.6
4. Fiscal 1957:			
(a) Including highway trust funds	72.5	70.3	+2.2
(b) Excluding highway fund as per budget	71.0	69.4	+1.6
5. Fiscal 1958:			
(a) Including highway trust fund	71.2	73.5	−2.3
(b) Excluding highway fund as per budget	69.1	71.9	−2.8
6. Fiscal 1959:			
(a) Including highway trust fund	70.4	83.4	−13.0
(b) Excluding highway fund as per budget	68.3	80.7	−12.4
7. Fiscal 1960:			
(a) Including highway trust fund	81.0	80.3	+0.7
(b) Excluding highway fund as per budget	78.4	77.3	+1.1
Total, all 7 years:			
(a) Including highway trust fund	488.3	506.4	−18.1
(b) Excluding highway fund as per budget	480.0	498.2	−18.2

Mr. Speaker, can there be any question that these figures unerringly disclose failure to deliver on the promise of a $60 billion budget? Can they contend that these figures tabulating what they spent bear any resemblance to promised retrenchment?

DEFENSE AND NONDEFENSE SPENDING

There is a general tendency to explain these steadily increasing requests and phenomenal spending budgets as required by the necessities of national security and defense. But contrary to the general impression, the preponderance of increased spending is in the nondefense items, not the defense budgets. The following table serves to prove the excessive spending is in the nondefense items.

Net budget expenditures, defense and nondefense, 7 fiscal years, 1954–60

[In billions]

Fiscal year	Major national security		All other programs		Total net expenditures	
	Defense, military	Total	As per budget	Including highway trust fund	As per budget	Including highway trust fund
Fiscal 1953 (Korean war year)	$43.6	$50.4	$23.9	$23.9	$74.3	$74.3
Fiscal 1954 (beginning July 1953)	40.3	46.9	20.9	20.9	67.8	67.8
Fiscal 1955	35.5	40.6	24.0	24.0	64.6	64.6
Fiscal 1956	35.8	40.6	25.9	25.9	66.5	66.5
Fiscal 1957	38.4	43.3	26.1	27.0	69.4	70.3
Fiscal 1958	39.1	44.1	27.8	29.4	71.9	73.5
Fiscal 1959	41.2	46.4	34.3	37.0	80.7	83.4
Fiscal 1960	41.2	45.6	31.7	34.7	77.3	80.3

Net budget expenditures, defense and nondefense, 7 fiscal years, 1954–60—Continued

[In billions]

Fiscal year	Major national security		All other programs		Total net expenditures	
	Defense, military	Total	As per budget	Including highway trust fund	As per budget	Including highway trust fund
Fiscal 1961 (tentative; subject to revision)	[1] $41.0	[1] $45.6	[1] $34.2	[1] $37.1	[1] $79.8	[1] $82.7
Comparisons:						
(a) 1960 compared with last war year (1953)	−2.4	−4.8	+7.8	+10.8	+3.0	[2] +6.0
(b) 1960 compared with 1st year of present administration (1954)	+0.9	−1.3	[3] +10.8	[4] +13.8	+9.5	+12.5
(c) 1960 compared with 1st year showing surplus under present administration (1956)	+5.4	+5.0	+5.8	[5] +8.8	[6] +10.8	[7] +13.8

[1] Original January budget estimate of the President, subject to revision in next few weeks.
[2] Represents 8.1 percent increase over war year of 1953.
[3] Represents 51.7 percent increase over 1954.
[4] Represents 66.0 percent increase over 1954.
[5] Represents 34.0 percent increase over 1956.
[6] Represents 16.2 percent increase over 1956.
[7] Represents 20.8 percent increase over 1956.

NOTE.—Highway trust fund began with fiscal year 1957.

SEVEN-YEAR COMPARISONS

Mr. Speaker, it is pertinent to compare the condition of Treasury finances as administered in the last 14 years, 7 under the present administration—fiscal 1954 through fiscal 1960—and the immediately preceding 7 years—fiscal 1947 through fiscal 1953. The figures are official and are final. In 3 of the 7 years under the previous administration, we were at war in Korea.

The present administration has taken more taxes from the people than ever before.

The present administration has spent more of the people's funds; they have spent everything they took in and borrowed billions besides and spent that in addition.

The present administration has operated consistently in the red. They have not lived within the national income.

The present administration has raised the public debt to the highest point in the history of the Nation.

In consequence, the cost of living reaches a new record high practically every 30 days.

These official figures are submitted in substantiation:

7-year comparative figures on income, spending, deficits or surpluses, and debt changes

[In billions of dollars]

7-year tax rate, net budget receipts:	
Under present administration (fiscals 1954–60)	480.0
Under previous administration (fiscals 1947–53)	329.3
Present administration over previous	+150.7
7-year outgo, net budget expenditures:	
Under present administration (fiscals 1954–60)	498.2
Under previous administration (fiscals 1947–53)	335.0
Present administration over previous	+163.2
7-year deficits:	
Under present administration (fiscals 1954–60, all peacetime years)	−18.2

7-year comparative figures on income, spending, deficits or surpluses, and debt changes—Continued

7-year deficits—Continued	
Under previous administration (fiscals 1947–53, of which 1951–53 were war years in Korea)	[1] −5.7
Present administration over previous	+12.5
7-year changes in Federal public debt:	
Under present administration (July 1953 to July 1960—from $266.1 to $286.3 billion)	+20.2
Under previous administration (July 1946 to July 1953—from $269.4 to $266.1 billion)	−3.3
Present administration over previous	+23.5

[1] The net deficit during the Korean war years, fiscals 1951–53, was $9.9 billion. Thus, the 4 peacetime years, fiscals 1947–50, showed a net surplus of $4.2 billions.

NOTES: For simplicity here and so as to tie directly to official "budget" figures, amounts applicable to the highway trust fund for fiscals 1957–60 have been omitted.

THE PUBLIC DEBT

Mr. Speaker, the inevitable consequence of living beyond income is our stupendous national debt. It has been necessary to borrow from future generations to pay current expenses. When the present administration assumed full fiscal control, the debt was down to $266,100 million from a world War II high of $279,213 million. But on last December 2 it reached the highest point since the Republic was founded—$292,707,614,012.11.

The Federal debt now represents about $1,600 for every man, woman, and child in America. If State and local debt is included, the per capita figure approximates $2,000.

They have increased the debt by $20,200 million in 7 years, and that in a period of recordbreaking tax takes. Spending more than income, the President has asked Congress, on seven successive occasions, including this year, to raise the old debt ceiling. Failure to live within income has forced step-by-step, piecemeal conversion of the so-called temporary ceilings into permanent status.

Here are the condensed figures:

The public debt—7 fiscal years

[In billions]

1. Actual increase, 7 fiscal years (1954–60):	
July 1953	$266.1
July 1960	286.3
Increase in the 7 years	+20.2

NOTE.—Old statutory limit of $275 billion raised as follows:

For fiscal 1955 by $6 billion (temporary).
For fiscal 1956 by $6 billion (temporary).
For fiscal 1957 by $3 billion (temporary).
For fiscal 1958 by $5 billion (temporary).
For fiscal 1959 by $8 billion (permanently to $283 billion); $5 billion (temporarily to $288 billion).
For fiscal 1960 by $10 billion (permanently to $285 billion); $10 billion (temporarily to $295 billion).
For fiscal 1961 by $8 billion (temporarily to $293 billion).

With the inflationary pressures and decline in popularity of Government bonds attending the profligacy of living beyond income, the cost of borrowing and refinancing the debt has risen phenomenally. It is incredible but true that, without the Congress turning a hand, interest cost on the debt in fiscal 1960 was estimated $1,700 million above the actual fiscal 1959 cost. That was the estimate. It actually cost $1,589 million more than in 1959. I include pertinent data:

Interest on the public debt

1. The debt:	*Billion*
June 30, 1959	$284.7
June 30, 1960	286.3
2. Interest on the debt:	***Million***
Fiscal 1959	$7,592
Fiscal 1960	9,181
(Increase of $1,589 million, fiscal 1960 over fiscal 1959.)	
Fiscal 1961 (estimate in January budget)	[1] 9,500

[1] Tentative; subject to revision.

3. In the fiscal year 1960 just closed June 30 last, interest on the debt averaged $25,153,425 every day, $1,048,09 every hour, $17,468 every minute.

4. In fiscal year 1961, interest on the debt is estimated in the January budget to average $26,027,300 every day, $1,084,400 every hour, $18,000 every minute.

COST-OF-LIVING INCREASES

The inevitable result of inflationary spending is to hike the cost of food, clothing, housing, and all other items entering into the cost of living. The official index has been registering new highs for the cost of living and new lows for the value of the dollar nearly every 30 days as the following chart indicates:

And our gold reserves have been steadily dwindling as foreign claimants demand gold instead of dollars in settlement of accounts. Our reserve is now at $19 billion, down $600 million from a year ago. Potential claims and required reserves now exceed our supply. Confidence in the dollar has steadily deteriorated.

Consumer Price Index and purchasing price of the dollar

	Consumer Price Index (1947–49=100)		Purchasing power of the dollar [1] (calendar year 1939=100)
	All items	Foods	
Years:			
1939	59.4	47.1	100.0
1940	59.9	47.8	99.2
1941	62.9	52.2	94.4
1942	69.7	61.3	85.2
1943	74.0	68.3	80.3
1944	75.2	67.4	79.0
1945	76.9	68.9	77.2
1946	83.4	79.0	71.2
1947	95.5	95.9	62.2
1948	102.8	104.1	57.8
1949	101.8	100.0	58.3
1950	102.8	101.2	57.8
1951	111.0	112.6	53.5
1952	113.5	114.6	52.3
1953	114.4	112.8	51.9
1954	114.8	112.6	51.7
1955	114.5	110.9	51.9
1956	116.2	111.7	51.1
1957	120.2	115.4	49.4
1958	123.5	120.3	48.1
1959	124.6	118.3	47.7
Selected months:			
1946—June	79.8	72.1	74.4
1950—June	101.8	100.5	58.3
1952—December	114.1	113.8	52.1
1953—January	113.9	113.1	52.2
1954—January	115.2	113.1	51.6
1955—January	114.3	110.6	52.0
1956—January	114.6	109.2	51.8
1957—January	118.2	112.8	50.3
1958—January	[2] 122.3	118.2	48.6
1959—January	123.8	119.0	48.0
March	123.7	117.7	48.0
July	[2] 124.9	119.4	47.6
August	124.8	118.3	47.6
September	[2] 125.2	118.7	47.4
October	[2] 125.5	118.4	47.3
November	[2] 125.6	117.9	47.3
December	125.5	117.8	47.3
1960—January	125.4	117.6	47.4
February	125.6	117.4	47.3
March	[2] 125.7	117.7	47.3
April	[2] 126.2	119.5	47.1
May	[2] 126.3	119.7	47.0
June	[2] 126.5	120.3	47.0
July	[2] 126.6	120.6	46.9

[1] As measured by the BLS Consumer Price Index.
[2] New record high.

Source: Office of the Secretary of the Treasury, Debt Analysis Staff.

RECORDBREAKERS

To summarize these documented facts, Mr. Speaker, every breakable record has been broken in the last 7 years.

The President's budget has set several records on tax take—this 1961 budget of $84 billion in revenues is the highest ever known in war or peace. It tops them all.

The administration set a peacetime spending record in fiscal year 1959 when they dished out $80.7 billion.

They set a peacetime record last year when they asked for appropriations of $83.4 billion. They are breaking that record this year.

They set another record when the public debt reached the highest point ever attained—in war or peace—last December 2—$292.7 billion.

The cost-of-living index reached an alltime high only last month, and every indication points to still further high-water marks.

The purchasing power of the dollar hit a new low only last month—down to 46.9 cents.

Any way you measure the situation, any way you compare the record, the facts lead to the same inescapable conclusion: In the last 7 years, the laudable objectives, the promises and pledges have not been met, cannot be met, and will not be met.

AUTHORITY TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a House concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 746) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That notwithstanding the sine die adjournment of the two Houses, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate be, and they are hereby, authorized to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF HOUSE RULES AND MANUAL

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 644) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That a revised edition of the Rules and Manual of the House of Representatives for the 87th Congress be printed as a House document, and that 1,600 additional copies shall be printed and bound for the use of the House of Representatives, of which 700 copies shall be bound in leather with thumb index and delivered as may be directed by the Parliamentarian of the House for distribution to officers and Members of Congress.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORTS OF COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 645) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That, notwithstanding the sine die adjournment of the House, reports of the Comptroller General of the United States made to the Congress pursuant to the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U.S.C. 841 et seq.), shall be printed during such adjournment as House documents of the second session of the 86th Congress.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CLERK AUTHORIZED TO RECEIVE MESSAGES FROM SENATE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the sine die adjournment of the House, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO ACCEPT RESIGNATIONS, AND APPOINT COMMISSIONS, BOARDS, AND COMMITTEES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the 2d session of the 86th Congress, the Speaker be authorized to accept resignations, and to appoint commissions, boards, and committees authorized by law or by the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PRINTING OF REPORTS FILED BY INVESTIGATING COMMITTEES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that reports filed with the Clerk following the sine die adjournment by committees authorized by the House to conduct investigations may be printed by the Clerk as reports of the 86th Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House shall have the privilege, until the last edition authorized by the Joint Committee on Printing is published, to extend and revise their own remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on more than one subject, if they so desire, and may also include therein such short quotations as may be necessary to explain or complete such extensions of remarks; but this order shall not apply to any subject matter which may have occurred, or to any speech delivered, subsequent to the adjournment of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS BY COMMITTEE CHAIRMEN AND RANKING MINORITY MEMBERS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the chairmen of all the standing committees and subcommittees of the House may extend their remarks up to and including the publication of the last RECORD and to include a summary of the work of their committees; also that the ranking minority member of such standing committee or any subcommittee may have the same permission to extend their remarks and to include a summary, if they desire, from their point of view, separately from that of the chairman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

MANAGERS OF TELEPHONES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a House resolution (H. Res. 646) and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That effective September 1, 1960, the positions of Assistant Floor Manager of Telephones (one minority) shall be at the basic rate of $4,500 per annum. The additional sums necessary shall be paid from the contingent fund of the House until otherwise provided by law.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, until recently there has been a basic pay differential of not to exceed $1,000 in the salaries paid the majority and minority managers of telephones and the assistant majority and minority managers of telephones in the House of Representatives.

The present basic salary paid the majority and minority managers is $5,500 while the basic salary currently paid the assistant majority and minority managers is $3,800, a difference of $1,700.

The assistant floor managers of telephones are the lowest paid of the House floor employees and had their last pay raise in July of 1955.

There was an understanding with the minority assistant manager of telephones that upon his completion of active military service and his return to work in January 1959, an adjustment in compensation would be made.

The proposed basic increase to equalize the above-mentioned salaries would be $700, an increase in basic pay from $3,800 to $4,500 for the assistant majority and minority managers of telephones.

EMPLOY THE HANDICAPPED—A TRIBUTE TO PAUL A. STRACHAN

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the Post Office Department issued a stamp designed to attract attention to the effort of the "Presidents' Committee on Employ the Physically Handicapped."

The idea of such a Committee was born in the fertile brain of Paul Strachan, who himself is deaf, and therefore one of those he wanted to keep.

A resolution was passed by the Congress to provide for the Presidents' Committee and for purposes of administration it was placed in the Department of Labor. It functions there now. The resolution provides that the first week in October of each year be designated by the President as "National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week."

This movement conceived by Paul Strachan, has met with such success and today many thousands of handicapped persons are gainfully employed. They have been proven to be efficient workers when assigned to duties they can perform.

Paul Strachan is now retired and living in Florida but he still retains his interest in the handicapped.

As this special stamp goes on sale throughout the Nation I wish to pay tribute to Paul Strachan whose vision and determination has so greatly benefitted those having physical disabilities. Because of his efforts they were helped and the Nation has found a new source of manpower.

Let us never forget Paul Strachan who fought the good fight for those who needed the chance—his efforts will live forever.

Handicapped persons everywhere are deeply indebted to Paul Strachan for his untiring work throughout the years in their behalf. He was the leader for many years in the passage of legislation in their behalf. It was my pleasure, with other Members, to cooperate with him. His whole life has been dedicated to the cause and best interests of the poor, the afflicted, the underprivileged, the exploited, and particularly those with permanent physical disabilities and illnesses.

Paul Strachan is one of the finest and noblest minded persons I have ever met.

In his retirement I wish for Paul Strachan every happiness and success in the years that lie ahead for him.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS BY COMMITTEE CHAIRMEN AND RANKING MINORITY MEMBERS

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a clarifying question of the gentleman from Massachusetts, the majority leader. A unanimous-consent request was made a moment ago that the chairman of all committees and the ranking minority members thereof might have permission to file certain statements as to the activities of the committees, and so forth. Do I correctly understand that if that is done, now, the latest procedure is that the Government Printing Office will not print a pamphlet on the same subject matter? There was a statement to that effect in the RECORD day before yesterday.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am sorry, I am unable to answer the question. Perhaps the chairman of the Committee on House Administration can answer it.

Mr. BURLESON. That is a rule adopted by the Joint Committee on Printing.

Mr. HARRIS. That you can file for RECORD the committee activity report, but if you do you cannot get a printed pamphlet of it, as we have heretofore, for distribution? On the other hand, we can get the printed pamphlet for distribution, but if we do we cannot put it in the RECORD? Is that what I am to understand the gentleman's announcement is?

Mr. BURLESON. That is correct. I am not too sure I follow the gentleman in every implication, but the rule is simply that a duplication is not permitted. One or the other is acceptable.

Mr. HARRIS. Heretofore we have been able to do that, and I think it has been a very fine procedure, because each Member who desires it has a printed pamphlet he can use, instead of having to take the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD around in his hip pocket, which is not very convenient. It seems to me it is a rather unusual procedure that you cannot in this way meet the convenience of the Members of the House, and I do not understand it.

Mr. BURLESON. I think the gentleman will find that was a rule adopted in the 85th Congress.

Mr. HARRIS. In my own experience it was not applicable to my committee, because I put it in the RECORD and had pamphlets printed, too.

Mr. BURLESON. Perhaps no one challenged the gentleman.

Mr. HARRIS. May I say to the distinguished majority leader that I think consideration should be given to changing the rule.

TABLE OF APPROPRIATION BILLS, 86TH CONGRESS, 2D SESSION

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, the following table shows the fiscal estimates for the present Congress and the appropriations and the amounts that each bill is above or below the budget:

Table of appropriation bills, 86th Cong., 2d sess.

Bill No.	Title	Budget estimates	Final action, amount as approved	Increase or decrease compared to budget estimates
	1960 APPROPRIATIONS			
H.J. Res. 621	NASA supplemental	$23,079,000	$23,079,000	
H.R. 10743	2d supplemental	1,018,504,888	955,370,000	−963,134,885
H.J. Res. 765	Labor supplemental	8,000,000	6,000,000	−2,000,000
	1961 APPROPRIATIONS			
H.R. 10233	District of Columbia	(242,403,000)	(239,470,433)	(−2,932,567)
	Loan authorization	(18,700,000)	(20,100,000)	(+1,400,000)
	Federal payment	31,533,000	27,533,000	−7,000,000
H.R. 10234	Commerce	799,615,000	729,624,375	−69,990,625

Table of appropriation bills, 86th Cong., 2d sess.—Continued

Bill No.	Title	Budget estimates	Final action, amount as approved	Increase or decrease compared to budget estimates
	1961 APPROPRIATIONS—Continued			
H.R. 10401	Interior	$550,330,300	$557,667,600	+$7,337,300
H.R. 10569	Treasury-Post Office	4,897,853,000	4,841,914,000	−55,939,000
H.R. 11389	General Government	14,627,500	14,207,500	−420,000
H.R. 11390	Labor-HEW	4,020,221,981	4,354,170,331	+333,948,350
H.R. 11666	State-Justice-Judiciary	733,030,395	705,032,567	−27,997,828
H.R. 11776	Independent offices	8,417,397,000	8,311,893,400	−105,503,600
H.R. 11998	Defense	39,335,000,000	39,996,608,000	±661,608,000
H.R. 12117	Agriculture	4,135,263,190	3,994,097,600	−141,165,590
	Loan authorizations	(367,000,000)	(577,000,000)	(±210,000,000)
H.R. 12231	Military construction	1,188,000,000	994,855,000	−193,145,000
H.R. 12232	Legislative	133,413,485	129,470,410	−3,943,075
H.R. 12326	Public works	4,013,793,180	3,969,982,485	−43,810,695
H.R. 12619	Mutual security	4,281,704,000	3,722,350,000	−559,354,000
H.R. 12740	Supplemental	169,327,840	138,293,740	−31,034,100
H.R. 13161	2d supplemental	72,280,731	162,186,981	+89,906,250
	Total, 1961	72,796,300,602	72,649,886,989	−146,503,613
	Total, all bills	73,845,974,490	73,634,335,992	−211,638,498

This table shows on its face value a reduction of $211,638,498, but that is not the whole story. Backdoor appropriations show in the following table the total $850 million, and make the record bad: An increase of $830 million over the budget:

	Executive request	Enacted	Above Executive request
Housing (public debt borrowing authority):			
College loans		$500,000,000	+$500,000,000
Public facility loans	[1] $20,000,000	50,000,000	+30,000,000
Direct veterans loans (public debt borrowing authority)		[2] 300,000,000	+300,000,000
Total	20,000,000	850,000,000	+830,000,000

[1] The 1961 portion of a total of $100,000,000, which, under the executive proposal, was to be subject to annual appropriation act control.
[2] For 2-year period.

This makes the overall total of appropriations $74,464,335,992, and the amount of $618,369,502 above the budget.

THE FATE OF H.R. 5132, THE RESERVE OFFICERS' INCENTIVE ACT OF 1959

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to call the attention of the House to the action taken by the other body in respect to H.R. 5132.

H.R. 5132, otherwise known as the Reserve Officers' Incentive Act of 1959, was passed unanimously by this body on the 20th of March 1959.

The purpose of this House-passed legislation was to provide Reserve officers on active duty with some degree of career stability. Every Member of this body should realize that approximately 60 percent of all officer personnel on active duty with the Armed Forces are Reserve personnel. Despite this fact, only so-called Regular personnel are provided any reasonable degree of career security. Thus, these Regulars are, for practical purposes, assured the right to remain on active duty for a period of time sufficiently long to enable them to achieve immediate retirement benefits. For those Regulars, who, because of one reason or another, are involuntarily released prior to reaching this important objective, the law provides a substantial severance payment in the amount of 2 months' pay for each year of active duty performed by them.

On the other hand, their Reserve contemporaries, who can be distinguished from the Regulars only by virtue of their categorization as "Reserves," have no similar assurances. However, they are presently provided, under certain limited circumstances, a so-called readjustment payment equivalent to one-half month's pay for each year served on active duty, if released prior to achieving retirement eligibility.

The net result of this inequitable difference in military personnel management is the fact that out of a total of 325,000 officers presently on active duty, each year there occurs a junior officer turnover affecting approximately 90,000 officers. This turnover in junior officer personnel generates fantastic training and personnel costs which could, in large part, be eliminated by persuading these young Reserve officers to continue on extended active duty for another 4 to 10 years.

I need not bore you with the tremendous implications of these facts. However, it should be apparent that despite the obvious and pressing requirement for short-term career junior officers in the armed services, the Defense Department has been unable administratively to provide adequate incentives to retain these Reserve personnel on extended active duty beyond their periods of obligated service.

The Cordiner committee, which made an extensive study of this problem, recommended corrective legislative action. The Defense Department, after much prodding from the House Committee on Armed Services, finally forwarded to the Congress a legislative proposal which was designed to correct this difficulty.

The subcommittee of which I am chairman exhaustively studied this proposal. Upon conclusion of our analysis of the problem and the recommendations of the Department of Defense, both our subcommittee and the full Committee on Armed Services concurred, for practical purposes, in the legislative proposal of the Department of Defense. The House action on the 20th of March 1959 indicated the support of this action by this body.

Briefly, the proposal, as embodied in H.R. 5132, contemplated that in the future every Reserve officer on active duty beyond his 2-year period of obligated service, would be provided a written contract prescribing his period of future service together with a provision which would assure him, upon completion of the contract, of a bonus payment of 2 months' pay for each year of service performed under the contract.

Simply stated, it would guarantee him a bonus equivalent to that provided a Regular released under similar circumstances. However, more importantly, it would recognize in advance the short-term nature of the reservist's career, and both the reservist and the military would be in a position to plan intelligently for the future.

Unfortunately, the Senate, apparently because of the press of business, took no action on this House-passed bill, H.R. 5132, until late yesterday when it passed H.R. 5132 with an amendment.

The action taken by the Senate strikes all after the enacting clause and substitutes a simple increase of one-half month per year in the readjustment pay provided Reserve officers who are involuntarily separated from active duty.

In view of this significant change made by the Senate there exists an obvious and pronounced difference of opinion between the House and the Senate on the proper legislative approach to this problem.

I regret exceedingly the action of the Senate on H.R. 5132.

It must be apparent to all that a reasonable conference on the divergent views expressed in the House and Senate versions of this legislation, because of the lateness of the hour, is impossible.

I am of the firm conviction that acceptance of the Senate amendment by the House would do nothing more than result in a great disservice to all Reserve officers who are now, or may in the future, be on active duty. Such action would almost certainly preclude the possibility of the development of the passage of this absolutely essential legislation during the coming session.

Under these circumstances, I have no alternative but reluctantly to recommend that the House permit this legislation to die.

To accept the Senate amendment would be a capitulation that I am un-

willing to make. I cannot possibly recommend to any colleagues in this House that they become a party to an action that would be a grave disservice to thousands of loyal Reserve officers now serving their country in uniform.

THE DISTURBED FARMERS OF THE CORN BELT

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, it is now crystal clear that the Democrat-controlled Committees on Agriculture of both Houses of this Congress are not one whit concerned about the distressed farmers of the Corn Belt.

They have refused to bring a bill of any nature for the relief of our Midwest farmers to the floor of either House during this extended session of Congress, not even a bill to extend the conservation reserve section of the Soil Bank Act, which expires next December 31, irrespective of our urgent sincere pleadings, which leaves our farmers in a most uncertain situation.

The Democrats think it is good politics for them. I say it is downright dirty politics at the expense of our farmers.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the resolution, House Joint Resolution 721, with amendments of the Senate thereto, and disagree to the amendments of the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, strike out all after line 2 over to and including line 2 on page 2.

Page 2, line 3, strike out "SEC 2. For" and insert "That, for".

Page 2, line 8, strike out "3" and insert "2".

Page 2, line 13, strike out "4" and insert "3".

Page 2, strike out all after line 17 over to and including line 2 on page 3.

Page 3, line 3, strike out "6" and insert "4".

Page 3, line 5, strike out "Lorne" and insert "Loene".

Page 3, line 8, strike out "7" and insert "5".

Page 3, after line 17, insert:

"SEC. 6. For the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Kim Hyoung Geun shall be held and considered to be the minor natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Burlin B. Hamer, citizens of the United States."

Page 3, after line 17, insert:

"SEC. 7. For the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act Maria Luisa Martinez, Angel Ardaiz Martinez, Franciszek Roszkowski, Stamatis Zeris, Andros Szasz, Matias T. Falcasantos, Eduardo Giron Rodriguez, Cesar S. Wycoco and Kyung Ok Ahn shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to each alien as provided for in this section of this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available."

Page 3, after line 17, insert:

"SEC. 8. For the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Man-Yeh Chow shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act. The number of refugees to whom permanent residence in the United States may be granted under the provisions of section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended, is hereby reduced by one."

Page 3, after line 17, insert:

"SEC. 9. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 212(a)(9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Janis Papulis may be issued a visa and be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that Act: *Provided*, That the exemption provided for in this Act shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act."

Page 3, line 18, strike out "8" and insert "10".

Page 3, line 18, after "of" where it appears the second time, insert "sections 1 through 6 of".

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were disagreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OPERATION VERACITY

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Connecticut, CHESTER BOWLES, has disappointed me three times this week. First, I was disappointed at his failure to appear in response to my invitation to discuss Operation Veracity openly with me on the floor of the House on Monday. On Tuesday I was similarly disappointed. Now a statement has been issued in the name of Mr. BOWLES purportedly dealing with Operation Veracity. It is so replete with name calling and smear attacks that I have difficulty in identifying the authorship with my distinguished colleague. I cannot believe that a man with the fine reputation enjoyed by Mr. BOWLES could have authored such a statement.

The release attributed to the gentleman from Connecticut completely ignores the untrue statements in the Democratic platform which were pointed out and proved to be false by Operation Veracity. Instead, it has aimed a low blow at an operation which the Republican Members of the House have tried to conduct, and I believe have succeeded in conducting, on a high ethical and moral plane.

Lawyers have a saying that "if the law is against you, talk about the facts; if the facts are against you, talk about the law; if both are against you, talk about the opposing counsel." Since Mr. BOWLES can find no comfort in a study of the merits of Operation Veracity, he has chosen to center his attack on personalities. I had expected better of him.

DALLAS LAND ACQUISITION

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the matter of the Dallas land acquisition by the Government was brought up by our distinguished colleague from the city of Dallas. I was shocked that he would bring up a matter of this kind, and I will tell you why. We talked about a news release here today but we never did get down to why it had been issued. Concisely, the problem is this: The Government Operations Subcommittee is interested in a bipartisan study of the efficiency and economy in Government land acquisition. We have tried to be fair to Republicans and Democrats. We do our best to consistently follow the spirit and the letter of the rules of the House and the Government Operations Committee. We have investigated land acquisitions in Republican districts and in Democratic districts when buildings were being built and when they were finished and when they were being started. The reason our subcommittee got into this particular acquisition is this: I will tell you concisely. We got letters from people in Dallas complaining that they were victims of unfair treatment. Some of them were not wealthy and some of them pretty wealthy. I will read this one letter to you quickly that we received from one of these people whose land was taken away under this circumstance: That adjacent property owners would pay the Government everything in excess of a given amount which it would cost the Government. The person who wrote this letter was one of those whose property was seized through this odd Government policy, which places the Government in virtual partnership with a private syndicate in exercising the Federal right of eminent domain.

This, to my mind, is selling the right of eminent domain, which the U.S. Government has as a sacred trust, to the high bidder, in this case the adjacent landowner who will benefit and profit from the building of a $43 million Federal Government building on the site that they help to pay for, and to take away property at the same time from other people. This is not fair and I want to point it out.

I received this letter from a person in Dallas, and I want to read it to you here:

DALLAS, *February 20, 1960.*

Hon. JACK BROOKS,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BROOKS: I am enclosing a tear sheet of the Dallas Morning News with story pertaining to the new Federal Center site. I am a widow in my later years and my husband bequeathed to me one-half

interest in three parcels of property on Commerce Street, which parcels of property have been incorporated in the new Federal Center.

My properties were sold out from under me, as I never gave my consent to offer my properties as part of a Federal Center site, nor was I ever approached regarding same.

A syndicate of wealthy men in Dallas offered my properties, and also, without my consent, priced my property to the Government.

Please permit me to protest against the acquisition procedures, which I believe to be unfair and perhaps illegal. I heartily endorse a full investigation of all the facts. Thank you for your kind efforts and interest in seeing that justice is done.

Yours truly,

Mrs. ESTHER ZWEIG.

I think this letter speaks with simple eloquence of how one victim, in this case an elderly widow, feels about the method the Government used in taking her property. How could we fail to heed the cry for help of this abused citizen and not persist in our investigation?

Now, gentlemen, this is what the true problem is: This 14-man syndicate, by its own contract, said that this contract was to induce the Federal Government to select this site nearby to a reported $14 million worth of their own property. As a part of the inducement they said in their guarantee contract with the U.S. Government:

We will pay all the money it costs the Government to acquire this land in excess of $1 million.

The GSA reported the syndicate has paid into the U.S. Government $310,600 as their inducement to the Government to buy this particular site. If there is any doubt about whether that was the basis for the selection of the site, I quote to you from a letter from the Administrator of the General Services Administration, who said in his letter to me of February 24, 1960:

This site was selected only after an understanding had been reached with the 14 local businessmen who had submitted the abovementioned offer, whereunder they agreed to pay so much of the purchase price of the selected site as exceeded $1 million.

Now, this is not a Dallas, Tex., issue. This is an issue which concerns all the people of this country. It is a precedent-setting policy which this Government and this Congress should not have. They do not want it; do not need it. It could set neighbor against neighbor all over this country from coast to coast and from Alaska to Hawaii. It means you can tell your neighbor: "I am going to get your land condemned, and I am going to profit from it; I will help pay for the condemnation. You will get just the same amount of money and the Government will get a little money and the Government will take your land and I will profit from it."

This study is no attack on any people of Dallas. We have been examining a Government contract which happens to concern land in that city. I would make this same statement and the same study if it was in anybody's district, including my own. We are interested in contractual facts, not in personalities or character assassination. If we have any accusations to make we make them openly, to a man's face.

I would add this one thing, that I believe if our friend from Texas, my colleague, would spend a little more time working with Republicans and Democrats in this Congress trying to get a $43 million Federal building built in his district, which is an admirable program—if he would work at that and not spend his time complaining about a legitimate investigation which is not trying to stop his building from being built, and has no effect on it, and use that complaint as a vehicle to get reelected, I think both the people of Dallas and he would be better off.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, a point of order. I think the gentleman's words should be taken down as improper where he says that he was using this as a vehicle to get reelected.

However, Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw that if the gentleman will proceed properly.

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. I will point out that if I had a proposal to build a $43 million building in my district I would be working with the Republicans and the Democrats, and anybody who thinks that it would not help me get reelected is foolish.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I withdraw the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. I think the issues have been stated. The real question is: Is it an ethical, moral, fair way of doing business for the Government to be paid by a third party to condemn the property of another party—especially when it raises the value of the third party's property.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman is not charging the gentleman from Dallas [Mr. ALGER], with anything improper, is he? And had no intention of it; he is just giving him a little bit of good political advice.

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. I am just trying to help him, to be fair to him.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a little clarification?

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I think the gentleman from Texas has misconstrued the matter. There is no complaint about this subcommittee going into this investigation; quite the contrary, I know very well that the subcommittee is doing that. The question revolves around the subcommittee's action itself and whether or not there has been a violation, I may say, of the House rules, including issuing derogatory information about citizens of this country without the committee itself acting upon that information. Let me ask the question I wanted to ask.

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. Another question?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Yes. The question I wanted to ask is this: After you received these letters requesting an investigation and started to proceed, did you call in the people on the other side so as to get their views in a hearing to find out what they had to say?

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. Yes; on February 8——

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. No; I said after.

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. You asked me if we had. I will answer your question. You ask it, I will answer it. We got some letters, got some calls. We then held a hearing. We got some more letters. People felt they were being abused in that Dallas deal and they wanted us to help.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. What was the date of the hearing?

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. The date, I believe, was February 8, when we heard Mr. Karl Wallace, Public Buildings Commissioner from the GSA, and other GSA officials. The meeting was attended by two Republicans and two Democrats.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. The letter you wrote was after the hearing.

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. We got a letter after that. We got one before and we got one afterward.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. The question I asked was: Did you gentlemen after you got these letters complaining about the situation, and got the gravamen of their complaint, did the committee call people on the other side for a hearing?

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. There was no need to call anyone else. The agency making the contract was the focal figure in our study. The facts spoke for themselves. We got a complete report from the GSA, and we subsequently requested and obtained a detailed report from the General Accounting Office.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. I yield for one further question.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I just wish to clear up a point. The gentleman, then, is saying that the committee itself did not call any witnesses on the other side, that you relied simply upon the GAO report. Am I correct in that?

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. The committee has relied on undisputed factual evidence, substantiated by the General Services Administration and the GAO as to the actual terms of the contract under which the General Services Administration selected the site. A certain group had offered $310,600 as an inducement to the Federal Government. The terms of the contract were confirmed to us by the GSA and the GAO. There is no doubt about the facts; they are all contained in the contract. I have a copy of this contract before me right here.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. The gentleman is so wrong when he says that. Of course he should call the other side before issuing any statement.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. ALGER. All of us are interested in trying to protect the property owners. My question now is: Did the gentleman take into account the GAO report?

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. The gentleman took full account of the General Accounting Office report and quoted it extensively in his release because he wanted to be fair as to these facts about private people paying the Federal Gov-

ernment to condemn property other than their own. There is no doubt about that. The proposal was investigated. The people first offered $200,000. Then they proceeded to ante up the kitty a little to induce the Federal Government to take that site.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. I just want to read one more statement here. We never have alleged that this was actually a criminal procedure, and we pointed out in our release that the General Accounting Office said it was not illegal, but we do say it was an unwise procedure and that condemnation was such a touchy issue with people all over the country that it should not be unfairly exercised. To induce the Government to abuse the right of eminent domain is unpardonable.

Mr. ALGER. Will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. I yield for one further question.

Mr. ALGER. Does the gentleman feel that I am complaining about the Dallas building in order to build up some kind of a campaign issue? Is that what I understood the gentleman to say?

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. I do not know what the gentleman is trying to do.

Mr. ALGER. Let me restate it now. A Member of Congress was denied the General Accounting Office report at the gentleman's instructions; correct or incorrect?

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. Obviously, this is kind of foolish, but I will tell you what happened.

We have a very fine member of our committee who is a Republican, and he wrote me for the General Accounting Office report after the newspapers had asked for it. The subcommittee was studying it. It seemed like a reasonable thing to have one of my Republican colleagues request it. I wrote him a letter and sent him a copy of the General Accounting Office report. The staff administrator sent a copy to him, keeping the original in the subcommittee files.

The next day one of my other Republican colleagues I do not know as well, although he is from Texas, apparently went over to the subcommittee and demanded this out of the subcommittee. He wanted to get it, he said. The staff administrator of the subcommittee said something like "Well, I cannot let it out of here unless the chairman agrees, since there is only one copy left." I had given one away. This colleague came over and asked me yesterday afternoon in the Speaker's lobby.

Mr. ALGER. The gentleman is not answering my question.

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. He asked me could he borrow that original. I said "Did you not read the one I gave my friend from Michigan?" He said something such as, "I read it, but I am not satisfied. I want to see the original."

I said, "Do you not have a copy? The copy I sent my Republican colleague from Michigan is an exact duplicate. We got it from the Comptroller General." He sent me an original and a copy.

He said, "I want to read the original." I said, "All right, go over and read it until you turn blue, but you cannot have it because we have only one."

That is how that argument came about.

Mr. ALGER. Then the question is this: The gentleman's staff was instructed not to let anyone see it? That is the question.

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. I do not know.

Mr. ALGER. I asked your assistant.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. You never find me betraying a friend or doing a nasty, dirty trick.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS] may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. This is a very simple matter. I understand the gentleman from Dallas, a distinguished Texan, stated the issue, but the real question was whether or not Members were entitled to information, is that not it?

Mr. ALGER. I would say to the gentleman I tried to get that through in my earlier statement.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman from Texas, Mr. ALGER, came to me because I happened to be the ranking minority member. I had no part in your investigation. I do not know whether it was good or bad.

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. Good.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I assume the investigations were good because the gentleman did it. Mr. ALGER said he wanted to know about this. I think he said that some newspaperman wanted this report. I said that the law as I understand it is you can go ahead and get it. He could not get it. I got in touch with JACK BROOKS and he sent it right over to me. There was a stamp on there "not for publicity," or something of that kind.

Then the gentleman from Texas said or asked: "What have you got?" I said, "Here it is. JACK sent it over. This is it." He said, "I want to see it." I said, "The statute gives you the right to look at it." He said he asked JACK and he asked the Clerk, and he did not get it.

Then he came back to me and I gave him the copy he gave me. There is nothing wrong about that. Is that not a clear statement of the matter? When he asked for it you gave it to him.

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. Yes. He could read the copy I gave you.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. He wanted to look at the original.

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. Yes. He can read it again if he wants to.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes. I will give it back to him. I do not care, I am not interested.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER], in his remarks mentioned the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. I yield to the able and distinguished gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. The gentleman from Alabama came up and asked me to explain the situation in regard to the Public Works Committee. I think it should be pointed out that at the last meeting of the Public Works Committee one of the minority members of the committee, saying that he spoke in behalf of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER], raised the question that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER], was being persecuted because his project in Dallas had not been approved by the Public Works Committee. I think it is pretty obvious that the Subcommittee on Public Buildings has every reason in the world to hold up our determination of this project until these items are clarified. If the situation does not exist, it should be stated. It is pretty obvious it does exist. During the time when the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER], has been a Member of the Congress, which happens to coincide with the existence of the present administration, the Public Works Committee has approved more public buildings in Dallas County than any other county in Texas. In addition, many other buildings have been built by Federal agencies that do not come under the jurisdiction of the Public Works Committee. And, I think it is within the realm of possibility that the gentleman from Dallas, who is the only pure politician in this entire august body of this House of Representatives, is trying to raise the idea that he is being persecuted, and he wants the citizens of Dallas County to send him back again so that he can stand stalwart as the 99.9-percent pure Member to resist all of us politicians who have ulterior motives.

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

HALPERIN LOST HIS U.S. CITIZENSHIP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, it must have been a great shock to every citizen of the United States to find in the daily press a report on Maurice H. Halperin, a Communist and an agent of the international Communist conspiracy and of the Soviet Union, who, pursuant to a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, has been issued a passport and is now working against the United States in Moscow by providing political and economical guidance to the Communist movement in Latin America, including Cuba.

The files of the Committee on Un-American Activities indicate in brief, that Maurice H. Halperin was born on

March 3, 1906, in Boston, Mass. He was a member of the Communist Party in Oklahoma prior to 1942 and a member of the Communist Party in Washington, D.C., from 1942 to at least 1944, whereupon, I might add, some stupid person, or a Communist, put him into the Office of Strategic Services.

Halperin, who refused to tell a congressional committee whether he is a Communist, entered Mexico on November 28, 1953, and has not returned to the United States. He was in contact with, and regarded as a leader of the American Communist colony in Mexico. This colony consists of Frederick Vanderbilt Field, Hugo D. Butler, Joan Abelson, George Pepper, Mr. and Mrs. David Drucker, Albert Multz, Bart and Edna Van der Shelling, Max and Nina Lieber, Mr. and Mrs. Phil Stein, Dr. Jake Levine, and until they fled to the Soviet Union, Mr. and Mrs. Alfred J. Stern—she is the former Martha Dodd.

According to an article which appeared in the September 2, 1957, issue of Ultimas Noticias, Halperin is reported to have facilitated the flight from Mexico of Albert K. Stern and Martha Dodd Stern, who were charged with espionage, by arranging passage for them to Prague, Czechoslovakia, under the name of "Escamilla."

As this House well knows, repeated attempts to have the Congress adopt passport legislation which would permit the Secretary of State to refuse the issuance of passports to identified Communists whose trips abroad would be damaging to the interest of the United States, have failed because of the resistance of a handful of Members of the other body.

Thus, legislation which would at least partially restore order where a 5 to 4 decision of the Supreme Court of the United States has exposed the United States to a clear and present danger, has—most regrettably—not been enacted.

However, it is my opinion that the ruling of the small majority of the Supreme Court of the United States in the *Kent* and *Briehl* case (357 U.S. 116) does not, in fact, deprive the Secretary of State of using his statutory powers in the field of passport issuance so as to prevent people like Halperin & Co. from roaming freely around the world and lending yeoman service to the Soviet Union.

The dissenting opinion written by the truly great jurist, Justice Clark, in which Justices Burton, Holland, and Whittaker concurred, clearly indicates where the Secretary of State could find statutory authority to deny passports to Communists without violating the constitutional principles upon which the majority of the Supreme Court of the United States based the Kent and Briehl decision. Briefly, the authority of the Secretary of State rests upon section 215 of the Walter-McCarran Act—Immigration and Nationality Act, title 8, United States Code, section 1185—upon sections 2 and 6 of the Internal Security Act—title 50, United States Code, sections 781, 785—and upon the discretionary nature of passport issuance itself, clearly stated in the basic passport law which is the act of July 3, 1926.

All the Secretary of State should do in order to have his authority restored after it was fractured by the Supreme Court of the United States, is to request the President of the United States to issue rules pursuant to section 1 of the 1926 act.

The continuing negligence displayed by the Department of State in obtaining such rules from the President, cannot be justified by the Department's reliance upon the enactment of new legislation. True, new legislation is highly desirable, but I wish to state emphatically that it is not necessary for the purpose of preventing the issuance of passports to Soviet agents.

However, there is a much more important task for the State Department to attend to immediately. According to a memorandum on Halperin prepared by the Department of State and printed on page 17792 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 26, 1960, he has informed the U.S. Embassy in Moscow on July 15, 1960, that he is employed by the Soviet Academy of Sciences, directly subordinate to the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R. and therefore clearly a governmental institution of the Soviet Union.

There is no question that section 349 (a)(4) of the Walter-McCarran Act is applicable in Halperin's case. That section of the Immigration and Nationality Act provides that any person who is a national of the United States, whether by birth or naturalization, shall lose his nationality by accepting, serving in, or performing the duties of any office post or employment under the government of a foreign state, and so forth.

This is the same section of the law which, pursuant to my urging the Department of State, has applied to American citizens who have entered into the service of Cuba under Fidel Castro. I was glad to note that pursuant to my recommendations these persons were deprived of their U.S. citizenship, and certificates of loss of citizenship required by section 358 of the Walter-McCarran Act have been issued.

It is now the duty of the Department of State to draw the conclusions from it on findings and proceed immediately with the issuance of a certificate of loss of citizenship in the case of Maurice H. Halperin, thus automatically invalidating his passport.

The law is clear in that respect. The facts have been ascertained by Halperin's own admission that he has accepted employment from the Soviet Government. Action by the Department of State must be taken forthwith.

This, however, should not relieve the Department of State of their duty to look up the applicable law, passport, and nationality, at least from time to time, and make these laws work so as to prevent traitors from using American passports for the benefit of the Soviet Union.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am aware of the importance of the work in behalf of our country and our people that the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania and the other members of his committee are doing, because 26 years ago, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania well remembers, I was chairman of the committee that investigated communism, nazism, and fascism. Out of that investigation there came what is known as the Smith Act, the Foreign Registration Act, introduced by me, and other legislation.

The American people are deeply indebted to the sterling and courageous leadership of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] and the other members of his committee for the great work they are doing and have done in detecting and exposing Communist activities and Communists not only in the United States but elsewhere throughout the world.

May I ask my friend, who in his position has such a profound knowledge of these activities, are the Communist activities in the United States increasing? Have they increased in recent months?

Mr. WALTER. The Communist has become encouraged, I think, by the apathy of the American people. I think this was dramatized by this very disgraceful performance out in San Francisco when a meeting of the Committee on Un-American Activities considering important legislation was almost broken up by a group of Communists who had encouraged some schoolchildren and college students to participate in this very disgraceful performance.

The thing that I think has encouraged those people to go on with their activities is the fact that the newspapers do not tell the entire truth about what occurred. The California newspapers, at least some of them, said that the Committee on Un-American Activities was responsible for the rioting by having these demonstrators removed from the building in which the hearings were being held. That is not the fact, and the people that wrote the stories know that it is not the fact. These rioters were removed from the building because the judges of the courts that were sitting at that particular time directed the police to clear the building so that the legal business could be conducted.

It just seems to me that these very clever foreign agents realized that somewhere they had friends, and that their activities are not exposed in the proper light. Of course, our committee is not interested in exposure for exposure's sake, but it is entirely impossible to conduct hearings without, of course, mentioning some things which expose operations of people who just do not like to have their activities discussed.

I am sure that the gentleman agrees with the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation that the small hard core of Communist agents is tougher and more encouraged at this moment than they were 5 years ago.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I would like to ask my distinguished chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities if in

substance the point he is making with respect to the handling by the State Department of the case he is discussing is not simply one that where there is a will to cope with these problems, there is an abundance of ways, and legal ways, in which to do it.

Mr. WALTER. Of course, there are. And in addition to that, from a practical standpoint, Mr. Halperin has applied for a renewal of his passport while he is in Moscow. Suppose the representative of the Department of State just refused to issue the passport. To what court would Mr. Halperin appeal in an attempt to have the Supreme Court ultimately direct the issuance of the passport? So from a practical standpoint, I just do not see why the Department of State here has announced they are powerless to prevent this Communist employee, and to all intents and purposes, citizen, from obtaining the protection that comes to the holder of a U.S. passport.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I would like to ask my distinguished chairman a further question as to whether in the whole area of combating communism and of standing firm against Communist countries, if in the final analysis the key factor of all is not the will on the part of the leadership of the Nation and on the part of the people?

Mr. WALTER. Of course it is, and I am sure that we must wake up or there will not be very much that can be done about it.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I associate myself with the chairman's statement.

Mr. WALTER. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLS). The time of the gentleman has expired.

ACTIVITY REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. HARRIS. I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to extend in the RECORD an activity report of the 86th Congress of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

PRINTING IN PAMPHLET FORM ACTIVITY REPORT, COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the announcement that was in the RECORD, I believe yesterday or the day before, that the activity report of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the 86th Congress may be printed in pamphlet form for distribution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, does that not also include within that report the report of the special subcommittee on legislative oversight?

Mr. HARRIS. No; it does not. It is the legislative activity of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. We have all been interested in the equal time provision of broadcasting facilities of this country. The Members of the Congress have been very zealous of the equal time provision, that it be adhered to not only to letter of the law but in the spirit of the law.

I have sought information from my colleagues on many points that have been raised. I have had many requests made of me with reference to this particular part of the Communications Act of 1934. I have received many communications. Some of them are difficult to respond to. I have one today that I wish to call to the attention of the House and perhaps ask the advice of anyone who cares to offer it. This communication is from an outstanding radio and TV celebrity by the name of Groucho Marx. Groucho sends me a wire, as chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and he proposes a problem dealing with discrimination and equal time. I would like to read this to the House at this time. It is from Los Angeles, and it states:

> As a stanch defender of equal time, I call to your attention the following wire sent to both Vice President RICHARD NIXON and Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY and request proper action of your committee. Wire follows:
>
> "Your announced scheduled appearance on the nationally televised Jack Paar show has prompted me to call to your attention that portion of Federal Communications Act relating to equal time in the matter of political campaigns. I feel your exclusive appearance on the Parr show is discriminating against me, since I have a show in many ways similar to the Paar show. In the interest of fair play to comedian interviewers, I ask that you consider a similar appearance at your earliest convenience on the Groucho show. There are many advantages. Since we are on the air at an earlier hour, our total listening audience is many times that of the Paar show. May I point out that any voter worth his salt is in bed asleep by 11 p.m. I promise you no commercials will interrupt your portion of our show. We could conduct our conversation either live, on tape, or film, the latter method allowing you complete freedom of editing. In the interest of equal time for myself and our large national audience, I respectfully request a reply at your earliest convenience."
>
> Regards.
>
> GROUCHO MARX.

And he is asking me to give this my attention. It does raise a question of equal time in a different light, and I solicit your advice as to how to answer this question.

SUGAR LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PORTER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, we have put sugar legislation on the backburner. I predict it is going to boil over and as it crystallizes, many people, perhaps Members of this House are going to be burned for not meeting their responsibilities.

There are two propositions that I want to discuss briefly in the closing hours of the Congress. First, the House should have an opportunity to discuss whether to give the President the power to cut the Dominican sugar quota. Second, the President should have been given that power.

What did we do in July? We passed the Sugar Act in the closing hours.

But we never once knew how it would work to give the Dominican Republic a multi-million-dollar bonanza. That point was never raised on the floor or elsewhere to my knowledge before by anyone on the committee or off.

What did we do the other day? I wonder how many here knew what we did day before yesterday when the sugar bill that passed the House was brought up with no advance notice, was brought up without an explanation and no discussion under unanimous consent. We did not consider what we were doing. There was no opportunity properly to consider it. I suppose we should have been diligent and known what the situation was, but we were not and were given no proper opportunity.

Then what happened? It went over to the Senate. The Senate added the President's request for full discretion to cut the Dominican allocation. I do not know why the administration did not take a strong position before the committee in the House with its problem. That is a mystery to me. The committee, I understand, was unanimous. More mystery.

Nevertheless this question has never been before this House for discussion of whether or not we should cut the added sugar quota for the Dominican Republic. We have never discussed it. I think we could disagree on whether or not we should give the President the unqualified power, but I do not believe any Member contends it was really discussed nor that we should not have an opportunity to discuss it on the floor. It was important enough that we should have discussed it. It should have had the full attention of this House.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PORTER. I would like to finish my statement, but I will yield to the gentleman briefly.

Mr. GATHINGS. I agree with the gentleman wholeheartedly that the House should have been given the facts on this most vital issue. I appreciate the gentleman's taking this time to discuss this problem. I do not feel that we as an Agriculture Committee should have passed on such a far-reaching foreign policy as was done in this instance. It is the prerogative of the executive branch of Government.

Mr. PORTER. I thank the gentleman. His point is a good one. I agree with my able colleague, Mr. MORSE, the senior Senator from Oregon, who last night in the Senate said this was not a matter of dollars but a matter of foreign policy and a very important issue which certainly merited our full attention.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PORTER. I yield.

Mr. GATHINGS. I just want to say that at the time the committee acted and reported out the bill that was brought here and passed by unanimous consent yesterday, it was the attitude of all those on both sides of the aisle in the committee that it represented the attitude and feeling of the President of the United States and the State Department. We felt that at the time. Later we learned that was not the case.

It is a serious mistake to adjourn this Congress sine die without taking action on sugar legislation. The President should be given the discretion he seeks. We should firmly support our Government's action taken recently in the Conference of Organization of American States. To fail to do so would be imprudent and unwise.

Mr. PORTER. I understand and I agree with my good friend from Arkansas. I am not sure that the solution adopted by the House—in good faith, I am sure—would have been workable.

The bill as amended did come back from the Senate. It went to the committee. The chairman of the committee—I do not see him on the floor, although I notified him about these remarks so that he could be here—had a meeting of the committee this morning. I understand the vote was 19 to 11 in the committee not to call it up, not to let us have any chance to talk about it here, not to let it go to conference.

Trujillo has been condemned officially by our Government. He was called in a Senate hearing by Under Secretary of State Dillon a torturer, a murderer, a tyrant. He was called a dictator by Secretary of State Herter down in San José. Now if we do not act we permit Trujillo to get $35 million for the extra sugar. We agreed to the Government imposing sanctions in accordance with the meeting at San José where Trujillo was condemned for his many crimes, but now we find that the law we are responsible for here makes it necessary to pay $35 million for sugar that otherwise I am told would not be sold by the Dominican Republic. We are giving him a $13 million or $14 million premium over the present world market price of sugar.

The world price for that sugar as of yesterday was 3¼ cents, but we will pay Trujillo a premium price of $13 to $14 million. So we will help this man Trujillo, whom we rightly and at long last condemn, and in spite of our agreement with the other nations of the hemisphere. We are doing one thing with one hand, and another with the other, but we do not discuss the question on the floor in connection with the legislation.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PORTER. I would like to finish my statement.

Mr. ABERNETHY. The gentleman has asked some questions, and I would like to give him some answers.

Mr. PORTER. I refuse to yield at this time.

Mr. ABERNETHY. That is what I expected.

Mr. PORTER. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman later.

The House bill says if the OAS acts with regard to economic sanctions, then the President would have the power he has requested. I understand that is not practical under the circumstances. I do not think it is necessary.

The agreement we signed in Costa Rica provides:

> Partial interruption of economic relations of all the member states with the Dominican Republic beginning with the immediate suspension of trade in arms, and implements of war of every kind.
>
> The Council of the OAS, in accordance with the circumstances, and with due consideration for the constitutional or legal limitations of each and every one of the member states, shall study the feasibility and the desirability of extending the suspension of trade with the Dominican Republic to other articles.

We can go ahead and act under this agreement that we signed. It is a vital matter of our foreign policy. Our President has decided we should go ahead and break off diplomatic relations as we agreed to do. If this law remains and the President is obliged to carry it out, we will be spending $35 million for this 322 million tons of sugar from the Dominican Republic simply because we here in the House did not act responsibly.

We had an alternative. The Senate bill which we never got a chance to consider here provided the President have the same power we gave him with regard to Cuba. He could cut the whole additional quota, and he would. The Senate voted for that 61 to 17 last night. The leadership on both sides of the aisle joined in passing that amendment to the House bill.

I am aware that the leadership here wanted this matter discussed, that the leadership on both sides wanted it discussed, but even so we were not able to have it discussed because of the lateness of the session.

We now have two alternatives. The President can, under his reserve power, decide not to give the Dominican Republic this boon, this benefit. He can order it omitted. He could, perhaps, do this under his emergency powers. That is a legal question. I do not know the answer at this time. I do not like to see the President do that in violation of laws enacted by the Congress of the United States. But I recognize he does have emergency powers. I recognize that just the other day we authorized an appropriation of a half billion dollars for Latin American countries because we are concerned about the progress communism is making down there.

What are we doing here? Nothing, not even a proper debate. We are going to be, at best, the laughing stock of Latin America and the world. On the one hand, our Government is stating: Trujillo, you are a very bad man, so we are cutting off diplomatic relations with you. We are going to take certain sanctions against you. We do not like you.

On the other hand, we are spending $35 million for Trujillo's sugar. Seventy percent of all the sugar down there is owned by Trujillo himself. There is one company owned almost wholly by North Americans. Seventy percent of the big profits, and they will be big profits, will go to Mr. Trujillo himself because he controls that much of the sugar. What kind of policy is that? Fantastic, distressing, tragic.

I imagine the President is studying this question of the extent of his powers. I have talked to members of the State Department. If the President decides he has to follow the law in this case, if he cannot use his reserve powers and there is a question as to whether he can ignore the law requiring this additional allocation to the Dominican Republic, then if he cannot do it under his reserve powers, the question will have to be put to Congress. From what we decided to do at San José with the other nations, it seems to me that the President would be justified in calling the Congress into special session after the elections to take up this matter. Then we could have on the floor of the House the kind of discussion that was had on the floor of the Senate. The other body's discussion, because of the lateness of the hour this morning, does not appear in the RECORD available to us this afternoon. We need a discussion of that sort in the House to see whether we are going to support the Government in its policy against Trujillo or not. We are in dire need of a policy which will make us more successful in Latin America than we have been.

I say in conclusion that we have been in trouble in Latin America for many years because we have been treating dictators down there as though they were respectable, because we wanted them as allies in the cold war. We have not been giving Latin America the economic assistance that it deserves. Now, when we are getting on the road to better policies, what does this House do when it refuses to discuss a vital matter of spending $35 million extra down in the Dominican Republic, a country with which we have just broken off diplomatic relations, a country against which we have joined all of the other countries of the hemisphere except one in agreeing to levy sanctions. It does not make sense. It does not do credit to this House or to the great Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PORTER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. The gentleman just used the remark that it does not make sense. Does it make sense to cut off 322,000 tons on the one hand and continue to purchase 131,000 tons on the other? Does that make sense?

Mr. PORTER. I prefer that all of it be cut off.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I did not ask the gentleman if he preferred to do it. The proposal was to cut off 322,000 tons of sugar that was allocated to the Dominican Republic which was taken away from Cuba. On the other hand, we purchased under the basic act 131,000 tons. Now, does it make sense to cut off that on the one hand, tonnage which was given recently, and continue to do business on the other?

Mr. PORTER. It makes more sense to cut off 322,000 than not to cut it off. I would prefer that it all be cut off, but I will take what we can get.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PORTER. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Is it not a fact that under the basic act these quotas have already been picked up and the only thing involved is this additional allotment given by the act of last July?

Mr. PORTER. I do not understand that all of the present quota allotment has been picked up.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Once it is in transit, you cannot do anything about it.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PORTER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Now, we have Castro in Cuba.

Mr. PORTER. We do.

Mr. McCORMACK. I did not want him. I knew he was a Communist or Communist controlled before he took over. You are going to have a dictator, anyway, are you not?

Mr. PORTER. I do not think so.

Mr. McCORMACK. You do think so?

Mr. PORTER. No; I do not think so.

Mr. McCORMACK. You did not think so in Cuba?

Mr. PORTER. Let me say to my friend that I shared the hopes of the State Department and many others that Castro meant what he said in regard to free elections and human rights. He did not, and I criticized him more than any other Member of this House, and I tried to improve that situation.

Mr. McCORMACK. That was after the fact, when the damage was done.

Mr. PORTER. I do not believe that a dictatorship is inevitable in Cuba or the Dominican Republic or any place else. I think the cause of freedom will prevail but only when a country like the United States stands up for what it believes instead of sneaking out and treating Trujillo, Franco, Stroessner, Chiang-Kai-shek, and other dictators as though they were respectable.

Mr. McCORMACK. I had a talk with the gentleman and I told the gentleman that Castro would be anti-American and Communist inclined.

Mr. PORTER. I remember that, yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. I analyzed that pretty well. Now, if Trujillo goes out, who is going to go in? Can you tell me?

Mr. PORTER. I would be delighted to see him out.

Mr. McCORMACK. Who is going to go in?

Mr. PORTER. What we have to do here was decided by the OAS.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am sick and tired of those of us who think of the national interests of the United States being put in a position where we are misunderstood.

Mr. PORTER. I understand that the OAS——

Mr. McCORMACK. How many dictators are there in the OAS?

Mr. PORTER. There are still some. There is Mr. Stroessner of Paraguay and Mr. Somoza of Nicaragua.

Mr. McCORMACK. I can name some more. I would have started by naming a few who are not. It would be less trouble.

Mr. PORTER. Nevertheless, we do have an international organization. It has made a decision. We have signed this decision. Are we going to carry out this decision of our Government or are we going to attempt to defeat it by inaction in this Congress and give Mr. Trujillo $35 million, at least 70 percent of which will go into his own pocket?

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PORTER. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. COOLEY. Does the gentleman know what they did at San José? Has the gentleman read the resolution?

Mr. PORTER. I have it right here.

Mr. COOLEY. Did the OAS vote to use economic sanctions against the Trujillo government other than on the shipment of arms?

Mr. PORTER. The language, which I have already read earlier in these remarks, was this. They agreed:

> Partial interruption of economic relations of all the member states with the Dominican Republic beginning with the immediate suspension of trade in arms, and implements of war of every kind.

Mr. COOLEY. Read on.

Mr. PORTER (continuing):

> The Council of the OAS, in accordance with the circumstances, and with due consideration for the constitutional or legal limitations of each and every one of the member states, shall study the feasibility and the desirability of extending the suspension of trade with the Dominican Republic to other articles.

Cutting out the additional tons of sugar quota is not suspension of trade. It is the denial of a benefit.

Mr. COOLEY. We promised to study it along with our friends in the Organization of American States.

Mr. PORTER. This I submit is not a sanction that we are suggesting here.

Mr. COOLEY. What is it?

Mr. PORTER. This is the denial of a benefit. There is no reason why we have to benefit Trujillo by $35 million of additional sugar purchases at $12 million above the world market price.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PORTER. Of course.

Mr. McCORMACK. We have now broken diplomatic relations with the Dominican Republic. Does the gentleman think we should break diplomatic relations with Castro's Cuba now?

Mr. PORTER. No. I personally am opposed to breaking relations with any nations in the world, however bad the government. I think we ought to have relationships with China, because we are going to need China in the matter of disarmament, if we are ever going to have any.

I think the OAS could have gone other ways but they decided on this way. We are a party to this. This is a way in which the whole hemisphere got together to say emphatically that we do not like Trujillo. And I am satisfied that it will be effective in showing to the Dominican people and to others that we do not like this murderer and torturer Trujillo, to use the words of Under Secretary Dillon.

Mr. ALFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PORTER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALFORD. I would like to ask the gentleman two questions. First, do you or do you not agree that both Castro and Trujillo are dictators?

Mr. PORTER. Of course, they are dictators.

Mr. ALFORD. Do you favor Castro over Trujillo—yes or no?

Mr. PORTER. They are both dictators, and, like most Americans, I strongly dislike all tyrants.

Mr. ALFORD. Do you favor Castro over Trujillo—yes or no?

Mr. PORTER. Of the two——

Mr. ALFORD. Yes or no; for the record.

Mr. PORTER. Of the two, Castro is far preferable. In Trujillo-land, they have far more torture and killing, they have had terror for years with little prospect of change in the direction of less terror and more freedom. There is a social and economic revolution with a multitude of serious faults going on in Cuba today. This is why we were not able to get a stronger statement in the OAS. There is a revolution going on in Cuba, a social and economic revolution. There is land reform, which our Department of State has said that we are certainly not opposed to. They are building schools. They have, of course, done many things wrong. The hysterical statements of Castro against the United States have been most unfortunate and incredibly wrong for the most part. He is a dictator. Cuba does not have the usual human rights. There is no freedom of the press or any freedom of dissent. There are no free elections. This is bad. But there is a significant difference between the frozen society, the zombies in the well-kept graveyards in the Dominican Republic and what is going on in Cuba. Cuba has some chance of evolving into freedom. The Dominican Republic's first necessity is to get rid of Trujillo and repudiate him and his kind.

I like the idea of a trusteeship of the Dominican Republic by the OAS. In fact, I proposed this in June in Venezuela. The Secretary of State proposed it in San José. It was rejected by the other nations but the idea is not dead. All we have to do is make it clear that the United States no longer dominates the OAS, but is a coequal member with the other nations. This is the fact but it is not well enough realized just yet.

This is what we should do in carrying out our policy of self-determination of peoples and to prevent the bloodshed and chaos which is sure to come in one form or another when their dictator falls.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PORTER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I want to be sure I understood the gentleman. Did I understand the gentleman to say he would prefer Castro over Trujillo? Did I understand the gentleman to say that?

Mr. PORTER. Will the gentleman be more specific?

Mr. ABERNETHY. Does the gentleman prefer that if we are going to have international relations with either of the countries we have them with that led by Castro or that led by Trujillo?

Mr. PORTER. Let me point out to the gentleman that as far as their Communist connections now are concerned, they are now very similar. Mr. Trujillo's son, Rambis, is in the Soviet Union right now. He has allowed Communists to come into his country. They are now the only organized party there, just as they were the one party allowed by Batista in Cuba. The situation as far as communism goes is practically identical.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Another question: If I understood the gentleman correctly a moment ago with regard to breaking off relations, if the gentleman had the privilege of doing something about it, he would restore relations?

Mr. PORTER. Yes. I think, however, that the decision of the Organization of American States must be respected. It was not what we wanted at San José, but we are part of an international organization. We have to make compromises there just as we make compromises here. We have to keep our word, which we have not in this House done by not acting on the President's request for power to cut the Dominican quota.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Does the gentleman feel there was considerable foot-dragging in the Organization of American States as regards Castro and his regime?

Mr. PORTER. I do feel many of the nations were reluctant to condemn Cuba outright, because they know the social and economic revolution going on in Cuba has a powerful appeal to the peoples of Latin America. They want to condemn communism, yes, but they do not condemn a progress which has long been delayed in allowing these people to get into the 20th century and have a little better lot in life than they have had.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PORTER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BENTLEY. The gentleman said he favored severing relations with the Dominican Republic because of the Organization of American States' resolution. If we saw fit to do so, we could sever relations with the regime in Cuba regardless of what decision the Organization of American States would take?

Mr. PORTER. That is correct. I do not favor severing relations. We have to keep negotiating as best we can, and not give up just because we do not like the government.

Mr. BENTLEY. Since by the gentleman's own definition the nationalist regime on Taiwan is a bad government, he means to say we should keep relations there?

Mr. PORTER. By all means. I think we should keep relations there. If we could get the Taiwanese a little more democratic government, I think it would be all to the good.

THE OAS MAKES HISTORY

The Organization of American States, acting through the meeting of its Foreign Ministers in San José, Costa Rica, last week broke new ground. In condemning the government of Generalissimo Trujillo of the Dominican Republic and imposing sanctions on it, the OAS fulfilled hopes and promises that its creators and well-wishers have fostered for generations. One might say that the hemispheric organization has come of age.

It goes without saying that one must accept the judgment of the sixth meeting of consultation of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the hemisphere as authoritative. Men of the stature and responsibility of Secretary Herter and the Latin American statesmen present do not lightly condemn a fellow member on grave charges and demand sanctions that have never been applied before.

The long and reprehensible career of Rafael Leonidas Trujillo is now branded by his peers for what it has been known to be—a record of flagrant interference in the affairs of other hemispheric nations. Behind this condemnation is an implicit recognition of the fact that for 30 years General Trujillo has had a tyrannical dictatorship typical of the personalist military regimes that have plagued Latin American history since the wars for independence. Everywhere in the hemisphere except in the Dominican Republic and Paraguay this old-fashioned Caudillo-type dictatorship has been overthrown and left behind. General Trujillo and General Stroessner of Paraguay are anachronisms whose survival has long outraged Latin American opinion.

This is aside from the specific offenses of which the Dominican dictator has now been held guilty by the Foreign Ministers. For the first time obviously incontrovertible proof of General Trujillo's misdeeds was offered by the Venezuelans, who deserve the thanks of the hemisphere for their determination and courage in pressing their charges home. It was accepted by the Foreign Ministers that the Trujillo regime connived at a plan to drop leaflets over a Venezuelan city, issued diplomatic passports to Venezuelans who took part in the military uprising of April 1960, and gave material and moral support to the men who tried to kill President Betancourt, of Venezuela on June 24.

If the Foreign Ministers had only passed judgment and sanctions the San José meeting would have been of primary importance in hemispheric history, but they seem ready to go further. They are opening the way to a change in the Dominican regime from a dictatorship to a democracy.

This is hinted at in the paragraph where the OAS is authorized to discontinue its sanctions if "the Dominican Republic should cease to constitute a source of danger to the peace and security of the hemisphere." Secretary Herter offered a suggestion last week to send a commission to the Dominican Republic to supervise democratic elections. This move in itself was historymaking and while not specifically adopted by the meeting it remains on record and may be picked up later.

The Foreign Ministers now move on to the case of the conflict between Cuba and the United States. This is a different and far more difficult problem to handle. One can only predict that more drama will be seen and more history will be made this week in San José.

AN INTER-AMERICAN FIRST: ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES BODY'S VOTE TO PUNISH TRUJILLO PAVES WAY FOR DEALING WITH SUBVERSION

(By Tad Szulc)

SAN JOSE, COSTA RICA, August 22.—The Organization of American States inaugurated last week what is perhaps a new chapter in international relations. This came about when the conference of foreign ministers here voted to apply sanctions against the dictatorship of Generalissimo Rafael Leonidas Trujillo Molina in the Dominican Republic. This is possibly the first time in the history of international organizations that a member state has been punished in peacetime for actions against another country.

The punishment, which was ordered because of General Trujillo's interference in Venezuela, consists of a break in diplomatic relations and economic sanctions. The inter-American system thus may have pioneered a method of dealing with the current aggression in the world: undercover efforts to upset constituted governments.

The action by the foreign ministers may someday be applied to Cuba, if the regime of Premier Fidel Castro goes as far in encouraging and aiding subversion in other American countries as has the Dominican Republic in Venezuela. In the Dominican case, these attempts included a plot to assassinate President Romulo Betancourt last June 24.

FOREIGN MINISTERS WORRIED

Cuba's desire to "export" her revolution is seriously worrying the foreign ministers, who opened a new conference here today to deal with the Cuban situation. Although there is no disposition by anyone, even by the United States, to think in terms of sanctions against the Castro regime at this point, the Dominican precedent will hover in the background.

Created as the Pan American Union in the last decade of the 19th century, the inter-American organization was the first effective international group of this type. Its security system and peacemaking machinery, operating through consultative meetings and the building of a continental jurisprudence, was in some ways the forerunner of the League of Nations and of the United Nations. However, only in 1947 did the inter-American reciprocal assistance treaty give the organization power to act in hemispheric and extracontinental situations.

The inter-American principle that agression against one state constitutes aggression against all of them, inspired the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and subsequent regional security arrangements.

Now the organization's application of the 1947 treaty against the Dominican Republic for aggressive acts of intervention in peacetime has contributed a way of dealing with the spreading practice of attempting to overthrow another nation's government by subversion.

Collective action or sanctions, of course, are not new ideas in international relations. In modern terms, the alliance of "Kings Against the People" called for collective measures if the security system of European empires were threatened by the liberal movement of the mid-19th century.

The League of Nations only once actually invoked formal sanctions. It was against Italy for her military attack on Ethiopia. That was a war situation, in 1935, and the sanctions were not very effective because the League's members could not bring themselves to deprive Italy of the oil that Mussolini needed to continue his African conquest.

The United Nations acted collectively in 1950 in sending forces to Korea, but, again, it was a wartime situation. The United Nations subsequently condemned Communist China for its intervention in Korea—also a wartime situation and one against a nonmember of the United Nations.

In that case the United Nations also recommended an embargo on arms for Communist China. The United Nations presence in the Suez area since 1956, in Lebanon in 1958, and now in the Congo also constituted actions in military situations.

But if the ministers here feel pleased over their action against General Trujillo, they are also beginning to have worried second thoughts about what they have done.

By rejecting a U.S. proposal that would have related the idea of punishing Trujillo to a system of insuring transition to a democracy in the Dominican Republic, they may well have opened the way for a dangerous power vacuum, which could create a new problem.

Fighting for survival, General Trujillo now has turned against the United States and has begun a strange flirtation with communism. If this is designed to show the United States that a mistake was made by disregarding his warnings that his regime was the only alternative to communism, this maneuver could also boomerang, both against the dictator and against the inter-American system.

In allowing the Communists to return to the Dominican Republic and to organize themselves, General Trujillo is creating the possibility that when he falls—which is regarded here now as just a question of time—the Communist party will be the only effectively functioning political group in his country. The Dominican Republic has not seen genuine democratic political activity in the 30 years of General Trujillo's rule.

This is similar to what happened in Cuba when Gen. Fulgencio Batista, the dictator, was ousted. The reported Communist infiltration of the Castro regime can be said to be a result of the absence of other organized political groups.

PROCEDURE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, previously there was a colloquy between the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS] involving committee procedure. My concern with the situation as expressed in that debate was my concern, which I think I have shown over a period of years, in the House procedures, that we follow as best we can the best procedure. I regret to say that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS] and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SMITH], who participated, attempted to get the debate off on a tangent, and far from talking about the issue involved, indulged in regrettable personalities. I hope when the time comes to revise their remarks they will look them over very carefully.

The issue was not, as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS] sought to put it, whether the subcommittee of which he is chairman, of the Committee on Government Operations, should have been investigating the situation. Quite the contrary. There is complete agreement that that was a matter that the congressional committee should investigate. But I emphasize that it should be a committee. There has been a great tendency, as I have observed here in the House, for committees actually to want to usurp what is really the decision of the House and to fail to recognize that a committee is really the handmaiden and creature of the House, designed to gather together information and then report to the House with its advice.

In a similar provision, regrettably, there is sometimes the tendency on the part of whoever happens to be a chairman of a committee or of a subcommittee to usurp what is really the power of the committee and to act as the chairman without consultation or regard for what the committee itself would do. In this area I think we find the gravamen of the complaint that has been registered on the floor of the House. It was clearly established that the gentleman from Texas when he issued a press release in which he had the names of all the subcommittee attached to the bottom did not take this up with the subcommittee at all. It was never discussed there. It was simply a statement issued by himself, yet, in the guise of being committee action. The more serious matter though was that this press statement actually contained accusations which were derogatory of certain citizens of the United States who were involved in this matter that the committee was investigating. We have been through this matter many, many times. In fact, we had new rules established several years ago for our committees to follow so that we would not unintentionally impugn the reputations of some of our citizens without being very careful that we had given them certain rights to come before the committee; they had a right to answer; and even then there would have to be committee action before the material or the information upon which the derogatory statements might be made was issued to the press.

In this instance, of course, the chairman on his own admission, under my interrogation, had never called before the subcommittee the people on the other side, the people who were charged with either misfeasance or nonfeasance and, yet, again the chairman took it upon himself in complete violation of the rules of the House, I might say, to issue this statement. The second or the third major point, of failure to follow correct procedures, I think, lies in the failure of this subcommittee to act promptly upon this information that they gathered. They submitted the question to the General Accounting Office for investigation, apparently, back in February. A report was made on April 4 and, yet, it was not until just today or the day before yesterday that the chairman, without, again I say, referring the matter to the subcommittee, issued a press release. But, no action was taken apparently by the subcommittee during these almost 5 months of elapsed time. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS] stated that the subcommittee was busy. I daresay it was busy. On the other hand, it is going to be quite interesting when this committee files its statement, and I hope it does, of the number of meetings it held during this period of 5 months and its activities, just to put it against this situation of letting a matter that contained, apparently, according to the chairman, derogatory information in regard to certain citizens of this country, without acting upon it, and then waiting until the last day and issuing not a report to the House, if you please, but actually issuing a press release.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ALGER. I want to commend the gentleman and to thank him for getting to the heart of the problem which possibly earlier we did not do as completely as I had hoped, namely, this matter of procedure. We did not get into the details of the project. I had not so intended although I would welcome the opportunity to get into the details of site acquisition. I was concerned about this press release that went out which purported to be the opinion of the subcommittee, but which now has been clearly stated to be just that of the subcommittee chairman.

Secondly, the fact that I was denied a GAO report by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS] and in that denial I represented all other Members of the House who similarly could be denied. I want to thank the gentleman for pointing this out to the House.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I think it was quite clear that that is exactly what he was talking about, and he was discussing this from the standpoint of committee procedure and felt it had been very unfair; it had created damage to the reputations of people in his community. The tragedy of this was that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS] did not answer these charges, but attempted to divert the attention of the House to entirely extraneous matters and then resort to something which I thought was very unfortunate; that was, to attack the integrity of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER] by suggesting that his interest in this matter was something other than what he had stated on the floor to be, a question of procedure. The gentleman from Mississippi echoed those statements. I know the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER] very well, and I think most Members do, and we all respect him for a man who has strong beliefs. I disagree with him on some of those beliefs, but I have yet to see him take an act that was improper other than in a sincere effort to benefit the people of his community generally. Instead of having a debate that could have been sensible, and discussing the issues here, by resorting to that kind of attack, it made this whole matter regrettable.

I trust that those who are interested in House procedure will read the debate on this matter, and consider the issues we have tried to bring out here, because the precedents of the House are not available for one party over another. They are the basis of democratic government in this country, and I know every one of us on both sides are very jealous that those precedents be followed, and when they are shown to be wrong that they be corrected, so that we can conduct the affairs of this Nation in the best procedure possible.

I yield back the remainder of my time, Mr. Speaker.

HON. FRANK M. COFFIN

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, it is with mixed feelings that I call attention to the fact that our colleague and my dear friend, FRANK M. COFFIN, will not be with us in the 87th Congress. I deeply regret the fact that we will not have the benefit of his outstanding skill as a legislator and his profound knowledge of foreign affairs during the next Congress. At the same time, I wish him every success in his aspiration for the governorship of the State of Maine, and I know from my own personal knowledge, based on our close association since his election to the 85th Congress and his appointment at that time to the Foreign Affairs Committee, that he has all those qualifications necessary to make an outstandingly good Governor.

FRANK COFFIN is an indefatigable worker. He is a young man of boundless energy and as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs early distinguished himself for his pioneer work in efforts to strengthen the ties of friendship and understanding between the United States and Canada. His study on European Economic Regionalism has been of great value to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and is looked upon as the outstanding text on this important and complex subject.

I wish FRANK COFFIN the best of success in November, for our loss on the committee will be a great gain for the people of Maine in securing his services as Governor. I shall always consider FRANK COFFIN as my close personal friend and shall seek to keep that friendship close in the years ahead.

HON. CHESTER BOWLES

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to say a few words in praise of the Honorable CHESTER BOWLES, who is retiring voluntarily from the House of Representatives. CHESTER BOWLES is a truly dedicated public servant whose long and distinguished career leads me to hope that the termination of his membership in the House of Representatives will not mark the end of his public service, but that it will open a new phase of even more important work for our country.

CHESTER BOWLES has served but a single term in the House of Representatives. Although the junior majority member on the Foreign Affairs Committee, his experience and background have made him a senior in our committee councils; and it is with a sincere and deep regret that I note his intention to leave the Congress. However, I respect his motives for so doing and know that he only did so because he conscientiously felt such a course would improve his ability to render other valuable service.

It is not often that the Foreign Affairs Committee has the opportunity to welcome to its membership a member who has served with distinction as an Ambassador to a major power. He brought with him a profound knowledge of the existing problems in the field of foreign affairs and many worthwhile new ideas for meeting them. In his comparatively short service as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, he has made an outstanding contribution and won a host of new friends. As he leaves the House he will take with him our very best wishes for his continued success in a career of public service. He is too valuable and able a public servant to be permitted the luxury of retirement to private life.

HON. DONALD LESTER JACKSON

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege and honor to serve with DONALD LESTER JACKSON as members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Although of the opposite party, DON JACKSON early won the admiration and the abiding friendship of his colleagues on our committee for his expert knowledge of foreign policy matters and the nonpartisan spirit in which he used his legislative skill to help secure the enactment of essential foreign policy legislation.

DON JACKSON'S service on the committee has been characterized by an intensive study of United States-Latin American relations, and he has become expert and well versed in the subject. He has also undertaken special study missions to the Far East and to the Mediterranean area, and his services during the early days of his tenure were of particular help in the arrangements which finally led to strategic trusteeship status for the Pacific islands.

DON JACKSON has seen fit to retire from public office, and I wish him well in whatever further activity he may engage. I also hope that we will not lose contact and that the committee may from time to time enjoy the benefit of his keen knowledge and expert advice.

HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I express my deep sense of regret that the Committee on Foreign Affairs will not have the benefit during the 87th Congress of the wise counsel and deep knowledge of foreign affairs of our friend and colleague, ALVIN M. BENTLEY, who has served ably and continuously on our committee since the 83d Congress.

AL BENTLEY brought to the Committee on Foreign Affairs absolutely unique qualifications for his service. Prior to his election to Congress he was a career Foreign Service officer and served with great distinction in many positions at home and abroad. On the Foreign Affairs Committee he has served as the ranking minority member on the Subcommittee on State Department Organization and Foreign Operations and is the second ranking minority member on the Subcommittee on Europe. He also participated in a number of special study missions to Europe for the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and his findings and observations have been of great value to the committee.

Although he is a member of the minority party, I have always considered him an extremely valuable member of the committee and one of the most hard-working members. As chairman, I am indeed sorry that we shall not have in the next Congress the benefit of his vast experience, his parliamentary skill, and his profound knowledge of world problems.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CRIME

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ROBERTS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, recently, before Congress recessed for the national political conventions, a shocking incident occurred on the streets of Washington. Four Capitol pages were stabbed, robbed, and beaten by a gang of young hoodlums.

Luckily, none of the boys was seriously hurt and the stolen articles did not amount to very much.

One of these boys is from Anniston, Ala., and is here because I thought he would benefit from the association with other boys serving as pages in the House. You can imagine the sense of responsibility I feel for this young man, who is an outstanding student back home, active in his school and church.

When this attack occurred, I naturally was distressed. For some time, I have felt that incidents such as this happen—and this is not the first time pages have been attacked—because we as Congressmen do not provide adequate after work or after school supervision to the young men we bring to Washington.

I have urged that we provide a dormitory for the pages with study and recreation facilities which will keep them occupied and under supervision during the evenings. Certainly, housing these boys in private homes over the city and allowing them to come and go as they please is not proper.

And, while I still support those who are working for adequate housing and other facilities for pages, I am not sure that this is enough.

Since that pre-recess attack on the four page boys which I earlier mentioned, at least one of these boys—the fine Alabama boy who I brought here—has been the object of two other attacks by young ruffians. All three of these attacks were unprovoked and, of course, unwarranted. The third of these incidents occurred last Saturday night when the young man was leaving Griffith Stadium with a friend to come to my house where the Alabama boy is residing.

The police and detective forces of the District of Columbia have been most courteous and resourceful in these incidents and have been as diligent as possible in apprehending the attackers. Several of these hoodlums have been arrested and are in the process of being tried for their alleged crimes.

But the very fact that these things can happen in this city, to be frank, makes me more than a little angry and

disturbed. Have the streets of Washington, D.C., been turned into the black paths of an uncivilized jungle? What if these young men had been young women or older ladies—wives and mothers? We occasionally read of terrible things happening here. I had been inclined to discount some of the more rabid talk about Washington delinquency, the stories that women are afraid to walk downtown at night, that they sit afraid behind locked doors and barred windows in their own homes and apartments. But perhaps I have shared the widespread sentiment which is allowing this very situation to exist.

It seems to me to be high time that we quit pooh-poohing Washington crime. I certainly am not sufficiently wise in matters of law enforcement to suggest here and now a guaranteed solution to this problem.

It may be that we need more policemen patrolling the streets of Washington. I am told that this is so. It may be that we need more police dogs to deter criminal elements. I am told that this is effective. It may be we need more judges and court personnel. I understand that the judicial system of the District is woefully overworked.

What I believe is that we must provide whatever is needed—money, personnel, judges—to insure that the city of Washington once again becomes the wholesome and clean city it was intended to be. How can we, sitting in the halls of the world's most powerful legislative body, hope to provide leadership and inspiration to the nations of the free world when we are surrounded in our work and home lives with rampant crime? It seems to me that we need to remove first the beam that is in our own eye by curing the blight which seems to be sweeping the Nation's Capital.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point an editorial from the Mobile Press of Saturday, August 27, 1960, and to read the same.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTS. This editorial is entitled "Crime in the Capital." It reads as follows:

CRIME IN CAPITAL

It is time that someone respectfully suggests to candidates of the two major parties that they work out some plan to rescue Washington, D.C., from its status as a jungle of crime.

For the 18th consecutive month, crimes have increased in the National Capital.

Here is the unhappy record for June: Ninety-seven cases of criminal homicide, 153 of rape, 1,315 of robbery, 3,093 of aggravated assault, 4,446 of housebreaking, 915 grand larceny, 8,173 of petty larceny, and 2,074 of automobile theft.

Reports continue to tell of shocking crimes perpetrated by bands of youths that roam the streets, beating, robbing, and knifing people.

Women dare not walk the streets of Washington after night, for fear of attack by hoodlums.

Were Washington located in a Deep South State, we could expect northern politicians to concern themselves with the city's crime problem.

But these gentlemen are too busy "reforming" the South and meddling into affairs of far off nations to concern themselves with the tragic situation in our Capital City.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTS. I yield.

Mr. KYL. I want to congratulate and thank the gentleman from Alabama for the very fine statement he has made. Because of an interest in juvenile delinquency particularly it has been my privilege to accompany several members of the Juvenile Bureau of the Metropolitan Police Department in their nightly patrols, and to investigate rather thoroughly the personnel, the filing systems and so on of the Metropolitan Police Juvenile Bureau. I want to say those people are doing a wonderful job under very, very difficult circumstances. I would hope that every Member of Congress who has any interest in crime in general and in juvenile delinquency in particular would have the opportunity to see the heavy load these people have and the difficult situations under which they operate.

Again I want to thank the gentleman for the very fine statement he has made.

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTS. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. GRANT. I wish to compliment and thank the gentleman from Alabama for bringing this to the attention of the House. I think it should be done more often. The gentleman hit the nail on the head a moment ago when in enumerating some of the things that should be done he said that we should remember in dealing with the criminal element at any place there is nothing which stops crime as much as swift, positive, and prompt action on the part of the courts.

Mr. ROBERTS. I thank the gentleman.

AIR POLLUTION ACTIVITIES OF HOUSE SUBCOMMITTEE ON HEALTH AND SAFETY

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Health and Safety of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has been very active during the 86th Congress in discharging its responsibilities in the field of air pollution control.

Early in the first session, we held hearings on six bills to extend the Federal air pollution control program. At that time we reviewed in detail progress being made as the result of Federal aid. The hearings have been printed and are available from the committee.

My bill, H.R. 7576, to extend the program and to clarify the language of the original act, was enacted into law—Public Law 86-365.

In July 1959, the subcommittee held hearings on H.R. 1346, by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHENCK], ranking minority member of the subcommittee, to prohibit the use in commerce of motor vehicles which discharge substances into the atmosphere in amounts found by the Surgeon General to be dangerous to human health. The gentleman from Ohio later made some revisions and reintroduced the bill as H.R. 8238, which was favorably reported by the subcommittee.

The bill was revised in committee to direct the Surgeon General to make a study and report to Congress within 2 years of the effect on human health of the discharge of harmful exhaust gases by motor vehicles. This was enacted into law—Public Law 86-493.

This is a real constructive and far-reaching step to solve one of the great air pollution control problems.

In February of this year the subcommittee held hearings on another important aspect of the air pollution control problem, that of the so-called blow-by fumes from automobile engines, which engineers say are an important source of unburned hydrocarbons which pollute the air.

A very cheap method of eliminating this source of air pollution by piping the blow-by gases back into the cylinders have been developed. The automobile manufacturing industry has agreed to install the device on all new vehicles built in the United States for sale in California not later than the 1961 models.

The subcommittee wanted to know why, in view of the fact that the device is being installed in California, it could not be installed on all 1961 models sold in the United States. In this, we were supported by the Honorable Arthur Flemming, Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The answer of representatives of the automobile manufacturing industry was that they would "make any proven air pollution control device available to any area that needs or wants it."

I think the record establishes beyond a doubt that we need this simple, inexpensive device. Apparently, the only way we are going to convince the industry that we want it is by passing legislation either at the Federal or local level, or both.

When Secretary Flemming appeared before the subcommittee, he urged favorable action on a proposed bill to amend the Air Pollution Control Act to:

First, eliminate the time limitation—June 30, 1964—and $5 million ceiling on annual appropriations included in the current act;

Second, authorize the Surgeon General to make investigations and to hold public hearings on air pollution problems which are interstate in nature or are of broad significance; and

Third, delete the requirement for allotment of funds appropriated from grants-in-aid and contracts in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

I introduced the legislation proposed by the Secretary which became H.R. 10696. Arrangements were made to hold public hearings in California to get the

views and suggestions of those most experienced and knowledgeable in the area where the greatest progress has been made in air pollution control. For reasons beyond my control, it was necessary to cancel these hearings.

On June 28, the other body passed S. 3108. As introduced, S. 3108 was identical with my bill, H.R. 10696, introduced at the request of Secretary Flemming. As passed, however, S. 3108 did not eliminate the time limitation and the $5 million ceiling, as suggested by the Secretary but extended the act to 2 additional years, to June 30, 1966, and retained the $5 million limit on appropriations. Also, the Secretary's request made in the third item above was eliminated in the legislation sent the House.

Due to the lateness of the session, the subcommittee was unable to reschedule public hearings to consider the Secretary's proposals and the Senate amendments. I am hopeful that we can hold public hearings to consider the proposals of the Secretary later in the year to have a record for consideration early in the next Congress.

In the meantime, I invite comments and suggestions from all Members regarding the three proposals made by the Secretary as outlined above and included in H.R. 10696.

TWENTY-FIRST ANNIVERSARY OF NAZI ATTACK ON POLAND

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, 21 years ago today on September 1, 1939, at 4 o'clock in the morning, the heroic people of Poland suffered the most devastating armed attack every recorded up to that point in history, when Nazi Stukas and Messerschmidts invaded that country and launched World War II.

I would not want this Congress to adjourn today without paying tribute to these indestructible Poles who so heroically withstood this monstrous attack and continued to fight the Nazis for 21 days before they were forced to capitulate.

The stubborn and monumental defense of Poland against the highly mechanized Nazi army has stirred the imagination and admiration of the entire world, and the determination which these people of Poland demonstrated in defense of freedom for those 21 tragic days served as an inspiration for the duration of the war.

Even though they were held captive by their Nazi oppressors, these heroic people continued the fight in the Polish underground. They had formed armies which had escaped from Poland and fought on the side of the allies throughout the world until V–E Day.

Let us never forget, however, that Hitler would not have launched the invasion of Poland 21 years ago today, if he had not first negotiated the treacherous Ribbentrop-Molotov agreement with the Soviet Union.

Even though the heroic Poles must today suffer the indignity of living under Communist oppression, they shall never forget that in the hour of Poland's greatest struggle against Nazi troops—17 days after the invasion—Communist troops stabbed this gallant nation in the back by invading Poland from the east.

The same spirit of dedication to freedom which prevailed among the Polish people during the Nazi-Soviet invasion of their nation prevails today and I am sure they will never accept communism, no more than they would tolerate Nazi rule.

It is indeed tragic, Mr. Speaker, that despite the heroic efforts of the Polish people in defense of freedom not only in their own country but throughout the world, despite their tragic sacrifices, the Polish people continue today—21 years after the war—to be deprived of full and official recognition to Poland's western boundaries not only by the United States but the rest of the free world.

I would not want this day to pass and have Congress adjourn without paying tribute also to all the other countries which subsequently fought in the cause of freedom. Our own American soldiers ultimately were drawn into this world holocaust, and had demonstrated gallantry and heroism that was beyond the imagination of man up to that time.

I am sure every American today will join with those of us in Congress in paying tribute to those who are not here today, those who made the supreme sacrifice, our American soldiers and our allied soldiers, in the cause of freedom. I am sure our condolences go out to the Gold Star Mothers, to those gray-haired ladies who today live in lonely silence.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that today the world will look back upon this 21st anniversary of the beginning of World War II and the great price that the entire world had to pay that freedom may reign, and look at this 21st anniversary as a reminder of the great and tragic cost of freedom. Freedom is a tremendous costly commodity.

Certainly there were those who during World War II made these great sacrifices and today it becomes rather lamentable when so many people, comfortable in their daily existence, are willing perhaps to make concession after concession and follow a philosophy of peace at any price, completely unmindful of the fact that when a nation looks only to its personal comforts and overlooks the great tragedies and cost of freedom, sooner or later that nation may suffer the loss of its own freedom.

We are today locked in a deadly battle with international communism. There is no question but that in the great anxiety of World War II many mistakes and concessions had to be made, because we had 11 million American boys scattered all over the world, and every second that that war continued meant the life of another American soldier. Today, unfortunately, through the treachery and despotism of the Communist rulers in the Kremlin, we find ourselves again locked, perhaps, in a greater battle. And, I hope that this 21st anniversary of the beginning of World War II will strengthen us in our belief as Americans that we must be prepared, to be firm; be prepared to make the sacrifices that may need to be made. We may very well have to make sacrifices when we find a Communist bastion only 90 miles from the shores of Miami, Fla. And, I believe that on this 21 anniversary we Americans must rededicate ourselves to the unyielding principle that costly as is the price of freedom, this is the only thing worth fighting for. We do not have to have war. Obviously we want to do everything we can to avoid war, and the record is crystal clear that we Americans did everything we could right up until this tragic hour of 4 o'clock in the morning of September 1, 1939, to avoid war. But I hope this Nation will never again permit itself to become so weak, either morally or militarily, that war again will be inevitable.

I hope this 21st anniversary of the beginning of World War II will remind the entire free world that dealing from a position of strength and resolute firmness against any nation that would threaten our freedom is the best and only guarantee for peace.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] for reminding this House of the solemn and tragic anniversary of the start of World War II which this day marks, and for calling attention to the successive violations of rights and denials of freedom to Poland under the Nazi and Communist dictators.

I wonder whether this House is aware of an announcement from Moscow on this first day of September 1960—as reported a short time ago on the Associated Press ticker—that the leader of the Communist tyranny, Nikita Khrushchev, has decided to attend the 15th session of the United Nations Assembly which convenes in New York City September 20.

My colleagues will recall that this House adjourned its first session last September on the eve and under the shadow of the first visit of Mr. Khrushchev to the United States.

Now, on the very last day of the 2d session of the 86th Congress we are regaled with the information that once again this man—of whom the American people and the world know a great deal more than they knew 1 year ago—is to set his feet on our shores.

The fact that he comes this time under the guise of an official representative of Soviet Russia to the United Nations Assembly, the fact that he comes allegedly under the protections and immunities of his diplomatic status, and the fact that the State Department solemnly assures us that there is nothing we can do—under treaty obligations and other legislative provisions which past Congresses have ratified and enacted—to avoid such a desecration of the soil of the United States, does not lessen my repugnance at the news and does not alter my conviction that his sole purpose is to use the United Nations and the dateline "New York City" for his own propaganda objectives of weakening, discrediting and destroying the United States.

My own strong feelings on this matter were expressed in a telegram which I

sent to Secretary of State Christian Herter on August 10, when I first learned of reports of Mr. Khrushchev's possible return visit to the United States under the guise of a United Nations delegation head.

The text of this telegram follows:

Hon. CHRISTIAN HERTER,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D.C.:

For the salvation of the very soul of America, quite as much as for her national security and survival, I respectfully but insistently urge immediate categorical and ironclad assurance that Khrushchev will not be an officially welcomed guest or a tolerated visitor under any guise or pretext anywhere within U.S. boundaries during the remainder of President Eisenhower's administration.

I recall it was at a so-called Soviet press conference that Khrushchev first claimed as his "right" an invitation to the United States which ultimately led to his previous calamitous visit.

History gives signs of repeating itself with his current press conference hints that he wants to attend the United Nations General Assembly session opening in New York September 20.

I believe it will be an intolerable and incomprehensible affront to this Nation, to the American people, and to the President of the United States if such a possibility is not foreclosed forthwith by our Government.

Khrushchev canceled his invitation to President Eisenhower to visit Russia. He torpedoed the summit conference. He brutally and grotesquely insulted the President. He helped engineer Communist riots to prevent President Eisenhower visiting Tokyo. In this hemisphere he pronounces the Monroe Doctrine dead, scorns the Organization of American States, infiltrates and dominates Cuba, and threatens the United States with a rain of missiles if we make any significant move to deny him a free hand in his insolent interference in that unhappy island. He brainwashes Francis Powers and publicly degrades him in a cruel burlesque of judicial processes more obscene than the ancient Romans' public parading of captured enemies in bonds.

To tolerate his presence on American soil under the quibbling technicality of diplomatic immunity as a delegate to the United Nations, when he obviously intends such a maneuver as the means of intruding in our presidential election campaign, as an opportunity for spewing his evil propaganda from within the country he is determined to destroy, and to use the United States as a base for his forays into Cuba, Mexico, or other Latin American countries, would reduce the United Nations as an agency of peace and justice to a total farce.

As a Member of Congress, Mr. Secretary, I plead that your reaction to this incredible impudence may be swift, clear beyond the possibility of misunderstanding or misinterpretation by the American people and Khrushchev himself, and irrevocable to the point that there can be no subsequent modification, evasion or reversal of our firm position.

Congressman AUGUST E. JOHANSEN.

I also include at this point the reply to this telegram in the form of a letter from Assistant Secretary of State William B. Macomber, Jr., in behalf of Secretary Herter, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., August 18, 1960.

The Honorable AUGUST E. JOHANSEN,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. JOHANSEN: Prior to his departure for the Organization of American States meeting in San José, Costa Rica, the Secretary requested me to reply to your telegram of August 10. We in the Department of State fully understand and sympathize with the concern which prompted your message urging that assurances be given that Chairman Khrushchev will not be permitted to enter the United States during the remainder of President Eisenhower's administration.

At the present time, however, we have no firm indications that Chairman Khrushchev is, in fact, planning to head the Soviet delegation either to the United Nations Disarmament Commission or to the General Assembly. If he should chose to do so, I understand his admission to the United States for this purpose could not be precluded under the terms of the United Nations Headquarters Agreement (P.L. 357, 80th Cong.), or those of the International Organizations Immunities Act (P.L. 291, 79th Cong.).

If Chairman Khrushchev should decide to represent the Soviet Government at sessons of one or more United Nations bodies at the United Nations Headquarters in New York, this would not in any sense imply that he was either a guest of the U.S. Government or that he was being officially welcomed to U.S. territory.

If I can be of further assistance to you in this matter, please do not hesitate to let me know.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM B. MACOMBER, JR.,
Assistant Secretary.

I cannot refrain from a number of observations regarding this reply.

I sincerely wish that I could accept with positive conviction the statement that "we in the Department of State fully understand and sympathize with the concern which prompted" my message. I must say, in all candor, that in my opinion if there were a genuine understanding of, and sympathy with, the concern which prompted my message, the State Department would have voiced to Mr. Khrushchev and to the world in clarion tones its profound distrust of the Soviet Premier's motives and intentions in visiting the United Nations as head of the Russian delegation—in view of his performance only a few months ago at Paris. I know of no such official and public expressions by the State Department.

With respect to the statutes cited by Secretary Macomber which preclude any objection to Mr. Khrushchev's attendance at the General Assembly session, I concede that on the basis of the letter of the law as set forth in these acts of the Congress, the State Department has the technicalities on its side. But I am reminded of the admonition of Scripture that "the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life." And I recall that the noble declarations of the United Nations Charter are dedicated to the purposes of "international peace," and to the development of "friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples," and I believe that if Mr. Khrushchev and the government he will represent at New York starting September 20 were judged either by the letter or the spirit of these objectives both he and his nation would be barred from attendance thereat.

The only scrupulous and meticulous observance of the requirements of the charter and of our own implementing legislation, it would appear, is directed to the technicalities of Mr. Khrushchev's alleged right to make New York City the launching pad of his newest anti-American propaganda weapons.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I accept Secretary Macomber's statement that Chairman Khrushchev's attendance at the General Assembly session "would not in any sense imply that he was either a guest of the U.S. Government or that he was being officially welcomed to U.S. territory"—I accept this statement as an implied pledge and a test of the good faith of the State Department.

I wonder just how long this implied pledge will be good for. I hope and pray that it will be the firm and unyielding position of the Government of the United States. But I will add that if the humblest and most subordinate member of the State Department, or any other representative of the Government of the United States, is permitted to participate in the reception of Mr. Khrushchev on the occasion of his newest invasion of this country, I will regard it as a shameful violation of the implied pledge and a further shameful act of appeasement to this chief enemy of the United States.

What is infinitely more important, I believe that all right-thinking citizens of the United States will also so regard it.

THE UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE OF AMERICA

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, this fall marks the 20th anniversary of the establishment of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America. On this occasion I would like to extend my greetings to the committee, and its members, and to congratulate it on the excellent job it has done in the past 20 years.

The Ukrainian Congress Committee is composed of approximately 1,400 civic, religious, social, and political groups. It is a national organization of Americans of Ukrainian background, with a membership of 2½ million persons. The committee has a dual purpose: to educate and inform the American people regarding true conditions behind the Iron Curtain, and to fight for the right of the Ukrainian people to self-determination and a democratic, free and independent country. As the voice of the 40 million Ukrainians enslaved by Russia, the Ukrainian Congress Committee has pledged itself to expose Soviet tyranny in all its forms. It has, for example, exploded the myth of a unified, homogeneous society in the Soviet Union. It has emphasized the fact that the non-Russian peoples of the U.S.S.R. far outnumber the Great Russians. It has brought to light the various atrocities committed by Russia under the leadership of Nikita Khrushchev, from Vinnitsa in the Ukraine to bloody Hungary.

The committee strives to keep all Americans constantly aware of the almost hopeless life led by the people under Communist rule. It aids the free world in our struggle against communism by attempting to dispel any illusions we might have regarding the Soviet totalitarian form of government. The role of the committee and its chairman, Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, in formulating and

organizing Captive Nations Week is indicative of the effective job that the committee is doing in this regard.

On this 20th anniversary I can only wish the Ukrainian Congress Committee a speedy and successful end to their endeavors. The people of America and all the free world join me, I am sure, in the hope that the world will soon see an end to tyranny and slavery in all forms, and that the satellite nations will be able to join the free community of states as equals.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, in connection with the special order with reference to Senator O'MAHONEY earlier on this legislative day, all Members may be permitted to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

THE SUGAR SITUATION

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. THOMSON] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, it is a sad moment to make what I am sure will be my last remarks on the floor of this House. I have profound respect for legislative bodies, having served in the State legislature as well as in this great body. I feel very strongly the prerogatives of the legislative and the responsibility of the legislative, and it is with profound regret that the last remarks that I should make here must be somewhat critical of the current action of this body. The remarks I intend to make are directed to the so-called sugar situation existing at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I come from an area where the amount of sugar produced is small, but it is a very important commodity. It has a profound impact on the domestic economy, and as an American Representative in the Congress I have always advocated a sugar supply for the people of the United States at a right price. The action that was taken last July was not one in which we could take pride. What we finally ended up doing was to pass an act that expires March 31, 1961. Now, mind you, this leaves the domestic industry in uncertainty, and it is not good for the country from the standpoint of having an adequate sugar supply, because they have to plant by that time, and the producers that I have in my area as well as the refiners who are going to refine the sugar have to be able to plan. I think it is regrettable that we did not extend this act so that we could have provided certainty, and I also think it is unfortunate that we did not have the opportunity to discuss it on the floor.

I believe that the deficit should have been granted the domestic producers and an additional quota should be granted to them so as to again provide for greater certainty and to help in this agricultural problem of surpluses and excess acreages which confronts us. But even with my profound interest in that, with the recent action taken in the Congress, the other issue even transcends that of the complications of the domestic industry. That is the question of how our foreign affairs of this country shall be handled in these critical times.

Mind you, I became concerned last October, in October 1959, and wrote to the Secretary of State to do something about the Cuban situation. In March of 1960 the President requested authority with respect to Cuba so that he could take economic action. That request languished in the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives from that time until late June.

No hearings could be had. We merely heard words that we read in the press that no such request would be granted, that the Democratic leadership of that committee would only permit a simple extension of the act for 1 year, giving Cuba all the sugar it would ordinarily get under the provisions of the then act.

I think it is indeed unfortunate for the country that this time elapsed between March of 1960 and July of 1960 before any action was taken to give the President the authority he wanted. Had that action been taken by that Democratic-controlled committee promptly, and the President given this authority, in my humble opinion, the possibility of more precipitate action now in the Cuban situation might have been avoided. At least the situation would have been improved in Cuba by early action. As it was we had no hearings.

You remember what happened on the floor of this House. It went over to the other body and we ended up in conference. The committee report on the present bill which is now about to die without action, H.R. 13062, points out the position of the House conferees. At the same time that this Cuban situation was being considered, as is pointed out in the committee report from the Committee on Agriculture:

> The bill H.R. 12311—

This is the act we passed in July—

> was under consideration in the Committee on Agriculture. The committee report states representatives of the State Department appeared before the committee and requested that the language in subparagraph 408(b)(2)(iii) be modified in such manner that the President would not be required to obtain the sugar covered by that subparagraph on a pro rata basis from countries now having a share of the U.S. quota. It was specifically stated that the State Department had the Dominican Republic in mind and that it might prove embarrassing if the Dominican Republic received its full share of the quota which might be withdrawn from Cuba.

So, Mr. Speaker, the Department made its position clear then. But with the situation developing as it did, in early July, just previous to adjournment, in the late hours of the evening or the early hours of the morning, we took a bill that came back from conference that we were sure was inadequate. Then a new bill was introduced, a new request was made by the Executive. Again we have a situation developing here where the House Committee on Agriculture is taking over the foreign affairs of this country and undertakes to make an amendment to the administration proposal and offer it on the floor of this House. All of us knew we could not take issue with the committee action or we would be minimizing the chances of getting any action at this session. So we had to let it go to the other body, counting on it being put in shape and coming back in a form that would be adequate. It was put in shape in the other body, but we were never permitted even a vote.

Let me point out to you what a simple reading of the House bill will show, and which makes it really a nullity so far as the action of the Congress is concerned.

There is an old adage that a court will not do a useless act. Neither should a legislative body do a useless act.

The committee amendment that was put on this bill that was presented to us yesterday in the House, provided that action can be taken with regard to the Dominican Republic only:

> *Provided*, That if at any time after this Act goes into effect, collective economic sanctions against one or more of the countries from which purchases are to be made under the provisions of this subsection are agreed upon by and between the United States and other countries, pursuant to treaty.

There would have to be another meeting of the Organization of American States.

Then the No. 2 requirement is that:

> Effective specific actions to implement such sanctions are undertaken by a majority provided in the treaty of such other treaty signatories, the President may discontinue, in whole or in part.

There is some confusion about whether there would have to be a new treaty signed, but be that as it may, you would have to have first, another meeting of the OAS, and No. 2, you would have to have the majority of those states take some effective action to impose and implement sanctions before the President could act at all. His hands would be completely tied until a majority had acted. All this had to be done before October 15, 1960, or it could not be done at all. It is obvious nothing could be done to get things in order before that date, so it really meant nothing.

It went over to the other body and they debated it on the floor, and by an overwhelming vote they came up with a bill that simply gives the President the authority he asked for. It provides:

> Except that any amounts which would be purchased from the Dominican Republic under the foregoing provisions of this subparagraph (iii) need not be purchased or may be purchased from other foreign countries, or domestic producers without regard to allocation.

That is a really simple way of handling it. Now as we adjourn, Mr. Speaker, we apparently again will do nothing to implement a request from the Executive.

The thing, however, that is disturbing to me is that apparently the foreign

affairs of this country have been turned over to the Democratic majority of the House Committee on Agriculture. If I understand it correctly, it was more or less a party-line vote, whether to accept the Senate amendment or insist on the House position when that committee met this morning. I do not believe we are ready to turn the foreign affairs of this country over to such a few on that committee with experience not in foreign affairs but in agriculture. But be that as it may, may I point out, No. 1, that the President has had a consistent position of requesting this authority to deal with the Dominican Republic, just as he earlier asked for authority to deal with Cuba. The other body seems to agree with that position. I understand that the majority leader in the other body, who is a candidate for Vice President in the Democrat Party, supported that proposition. The bill comes back over here and apparently the Democratic leadership on the House Committee on Agriculture takes a strictly opposite view and blocks its even coming to a vote in this body, so that none of us can support the proposition in which we may believe, whichever way it is, and mind you, I am not taking any part in whether the Dominican Republic should be handled this way or that or whether Trujillo is a saint or a sinner, although I have my own views.

I find the platform of the other party states:

> We will overhaul our administrative machinery so that America may avoid diplomatic embarrassments and at long last speak with a single confident voice in world affairs.

This is the one test we have had since that platform was written for the American public to judge whether or not the Democrat Party can perform on the promise. And what has happened? The other body, in which both of their candidates for President and Vice President takes one position and this body takes another, and nothing happens. Is that a single confident voice in world affairs? Does that hold promise of the foreign affairs of this country being handled well and with dispatch should their party succeed in November? It goes far beyond party lines. It seems to me that when the foreign affairs of this country are turned over to the Democratic majority on the House Committee on Agriculture, it is "a time for concern."

I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, with all due deference to this committee, that the situation in which they have placed American agriculture recommends that the foreign affairs of this country be turned over to them. They are at least informed and make a particular study of agriculture, but in the field of foreign affairs they have usurped his duties and responsibilities and have chosen to deny the President in this administration to speak out with that single confident voice. It would seem to me the American people would think long about this. It is disturbing to me that we, as a legislative body, must admit defeat in trying to take care of this situation, and place the United States—not the President—but the United States, in an embarrassing position in the effort to cement relationships in Latin America and act in concert with our neighbors to whom we are bound under treaty. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that we should be able to do better than that. I wonder if this is another evidence of the complete collapse of "the new frontier," a sample of what to expect in "the time for greatness and the time for leadership" that is boasted about these days by Democrats in the press?

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SPRINGER. First of all, I would like to commend the gentleman for the statesmanlike way in which he has tried to present the facts and the issues on this matter. In all the years that I have served in this body with the gentleman from Wyoming, I have watched very carefully how diligently he has worked in behalf of the people of the State that he represents. I know how hard he has worked for the sugar growers in Wyoming and how he has spoken out on every occasion when the opportunity has presented itself to speak out in their behalf. To me that is the real sign of a person, being sent here to represent his people, who does represent them ably and conscientiously. I hope the gentleman will carry the interests of the State of Wyoming to the other body after January 1, and this will be the one opportunity I will have to say what high personal regard I have had for him during all the years that I have been associated with him. May I say, too, Mr. Speaker, it has been a real pleasure on my part to know him and to work with him in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has expired.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE 86TH CONGRESS—SPECIAL SESSION

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, many of us who are Members of this House are likely to be asked, in the weeks ahead, just what this special, post-convention session of the 86th Congress accomplished. So much emphasis has been placed on what was not accomplished, that some of us may be apt to forget that there were a number of very substantial legislative accomplishments in this brief session, too. With the thought that in the rush toward final adjournment later today, many of my colleagues may perhaps have overlooked it, I include herewith for their information an article summarizing these accomplishments written by Robert K. Walsh and published today in the Washington Evening Star. I believe that Mr. Walsh has performed a very useful service for all of us as we return home to report to our constituents on our discharge of their public trust. The article follows:

CONGRESS DID MUCH—AND LEFT MUCH UNDONE

(By Robert K. Walsh)

The 86th Congress is leaving in its wake today important bills that sank beyond recovery or survived possibly beyond recognition. But it also delivered a substantial legislative charge at its short August session.

Democratic leaders, particularly the party's presidential and vice presidential candidates, Senators KENNEDY and JOHNSON, saw their hopes dashed for the passage of minimum wage, medical care, housing and school construction measures of the kind they wanted.

The performance of the Senate since it returned August 8, and of the House since it got down to business August 22, nevertheless gave the Democrats cause to deny "do nothing" charges and enabled Republicans to answer complaints of obstructionism. Its record will be warmed over by controversy through the election campaign.

TWENTY THOUSAND BILLS

All bills that fail of enactment at final adjournment will be dead. That includes the vast majority of the 20,000 Senate and House bills hopefully introduced since the 86th Congress began in January, 1959. Many, however, are certain to be tried all over again in the next Congress.

Most Members likewise will try again to be reelected in November for the 87th Congress. Four Senators and more than 30 House Members thus far have announced they will retire.

A half dozen House Members intend to seek Senate seats or gubernatorial chairs. Three House Members already have met defeat in party primary elections. Additional incumbents may lose in November. All 437 House seats and about one-third of the 100 Senate seats are involved in the 1960 elections.

WHAT WAS ACCOMPLISHED

The list of major measures that Congress did not pass at its post-convention session far exceeds in prominence and publicity the amount of legislation it actually agreed on. But in less than 4 weeks in an unprecedented session amid the tense atmosphere of election-year campaigning on the Senate floor, Congress approved:

A modified plan of Federal financial assistance to States for medical care for elderly persons, with funds from general Treasury revenues rather than through the social security taxes. The same bill made important changes in various social security system provisions.

A 12-nation treaty banning nuclear weapons development in the Antarctic and "freezing" present territorial claims there.

A $3.7 billion appropriation for military and economic assistance to foreign countries, with exclusion of the Castro Cuban regime.

A $500 million authorization to help Latin American countries in social and economic development and a $100 million authorization for Chilean earthquake rehabilitation. Funds will not be appropriated until next year.

A $162 million supplemental appropriation bill restoring $65 million of the $215 million previously cut from the foreign aid bill.

Regular 1961 fiscal year appropriation bills for the operation of the Labor; Health, Education, and Welfare; State; and Justice Departments and the Federal judiciary. These total more than $5 billion.

A $3.9 billion appropriation bill for public works projects.

GREAT DEBATES SET UP

Suspension of the Federal Communications Act "equal time" requirement so that the 1960 presidential and vice presidential candidates can stage TV-radio debates without obliging broadcasting networks to give corresponding time to fringe-party nominees for those offices.

A measure setting Federal criminal penalties for persons convicted of payola dealings, rigged quiz shows and other abuses in the TV-radio industry.

A bill strengthening retirement provisions and improving standards for Foreign Service personnel.

A bill to safeguard homeowners by requiring bonding of persons engaged in repair work.

A program of health benefits for retired Government employees.

A stabilization plan for the mining of lead and zinc by small domestic producers.

A move to increase the price-support level for manufacturing milk and butterfats at approximately market levels until March 31, 1961.

A stop-gap housing bill to continue home-repair loan insurance authority and provide $500 million for college dormitories and $50 million for community facilities until October 1961.

A rider added to the District police and firemen pay raise bill authorizing FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover to receive his full $22,000 salary annually when he retires.

A resolution favoring a convention of NATO nations' delegates to achieve greater cooperation and unity of purpose.

Authorization for taxpayers to choose an overall limitation of the foreign tax credit in their income tax returns.

CHIEF CASUALTIES

The chief legislative casualty at the post-convention session was the legislation to increase the present $1 an hour Federal minimum wage and broaden coverage. The Senate and House passed different bills but conferees were unable to agree.

Senate and House versions of legislation for Federal financial aid to States to build schools (and for teachers' salaries in the Senate bill) were blocked by a House Rules Committee coalition of Republicans and Southern Democrats who refused to permit appointment of House conferees.

The Rules Committee divided 6 to 6 and thus blocked an omnibus housing bill from going to the House floor. The Senate earlier this year had passed a similar measure.

A bill allowing labor unions to picket one of several firms at a joint construction site was shelved in the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee.

A bill for appointment of some 30 additional Federal judges was approved by the House Judiciary Committee but was never called up by Democratic leaders.

A resolution opposing the making of Supreme Court recess appointments went through the Senate but not the House. The House but not the Senate passed a bill allowing professionally employed persons, principally doctors, tax deductions of up to $2,500 a year if they set aside a part of their income for voluntary pension plans.

The Senate but not the House favored creation of a Federal Freedom Academy for training against Communist tactics.

RIGHTS LAW RECALLED

This summary does not include numerous other bills that Congress approved or rejected at its 1960 session from January 6 until July 3 when it recessed for the national party conventions at Los Angeles and Chicago.

Enactment of a civil rights bill was a high point during that period. When the Senate reconvened August 8, Republicans attempted unsuccessfully to force consideration of additional civil rights proposals. A measure of that kind was tabled.

Other major enactments earlier this year by the 86th Congress included a constitutional amendment resolution to allow District residents to vote for President and Vice President, a Federal employee pay raise, ratification of the Japanese security treaty, disclosure of expense accounts of Members of Congress and a $293 billion temporary limit on the public debt.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 12574. An act to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, so as to provide that an injured employee shall have the right to select his own physician, and for other purposes;

H.J. Res. 402. Joint resolution granting the consent and approval of Congress for the States of Virginia and Maryland and the District of Columbia to enter into a compact related to the regulation of mass transit in the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 704. Joint resolution to remove copyright restrictions upon the musical composition "Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag," and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 3524. An act to provide for a Commission on Presidential Office Space.

U.S. CONSTITUTION 175TH ANNIVERSARY COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 86-650, the Chair appoints as members of the U.S. Constitution 175th Anniversary Commission the following Members on the part of the House to serve with himself: Mr. BYRNE, of Pennsylvania; Mr. DELANEY, of New York; and Mr. TABER, of New York.

SUGAR BILL

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest to the speech just delivered by the gentleman from Wyoming. I hope we may be able to keep this record straight. I have not up to now trespassed upon the patience of my colleagues in the House of Representatives in connection with the sugar program, but I feel in justice to our committee and to my colleagues in the House of Representatives I should now make some remarks about it.

In the first place, the gentleman who has just addressed the House attempted to indict the Democratic members of the House Committee on Agriculture. Well, he cannot indict the Democratic members without indicting his own colleagues, the Republican members of that great committee, because every Republican on that committee voted for the House bill. The committee amendment, which is the heart of this issue, was adopted by the unanimous vote of the Committee on Agriculture. The members of this committee know and understand the problems involved in the far-reaching ramifications and international implications of the bill we reported. After careful consideration, after conference with representatives of the executive branch of the Government, the State Department and Agriculture, we brought a bill to this House that met with the approval of every Member of the House. If the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. THOMSON] voted against it I am not aware of it. If the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PORTER], who spoke earlier today, voted against the bill, I am not aware of it. It was a unanimous vote.

Now, going back just a little to July, when we were considering a similar extension of the law for 1 year, almost every segment of the sugar industry of America agreed to that 1-year extension. All the refineries, all of the industrial users, the bottlers and the bakers, and all consumers agreed to the 1-year extension. Every country participating in our quota system came to me and said that they were in favor of the 1-year extension. But they all insisted that if we opened the quota provisions they wanted an opportunity to be heard. I assured every one of them that when we opened the quota provisions everyone would be given full and ample opportunity to present their views. So we assumed that the 1-year extension was agreeable.

We passed the 1-year extension in July. That went to conference, and it was not the Members of the House that shortened that 1-year extension. The Senate conferees insisted that we provide a shorter period. So we said, "All right. How about 6 months?" They said, "No. That is too long." The reason we asked for 6 months was that we know what is involved in drafting new sugar legislation and we know the time that is consumed in conducting long hearings.

We thought we could do an intelligent, constructive job, free from pressure, if we could have the entire first session of the next Congress to write a bill. I assured the membership of this House that our committee would conduct a very careful study of the sugar problem.

There is not a man in this House who can go back to his constituents and explain the sugar program in detail; not one. I have lived with it for 25 years, and I know I could not do it, and I think I know as much about it as any other Member. It is a complicated problem. In 1956, after long work by the committee, it passed this House by unanimous vote, with very limited debate. I said at that time, if you will remember, that this bill is so complicated and so involved that it is not possible for me to explain it in detail within the time at my disposal. I said, "You will have to take it on faith." And the House accepted it on faith, and it passed the Senate and went to the White House.

This program has operated so well and so smoothly for so long that the average housewife in America is not aware of the fact that there ever was a sugar problem. It has been an outstanding success.

When we came to consideration of the bill that became law last July, in came

the Department of State officials who had assured us they had no intention of using the power they were asking to cut quotas against Mr. Castro. The President said himself:

> I want no reprisals against the Cuban people. They are a friendly people and we want to keep them friendly.

Very soon, however, he asked for this power. We asked "Why do you want the power if you do not intend to use it?" The answer came back, "Well, we would like to have the power so that if we do need it we can use it. We do not intend to use it in any drastic fashion. We will take away a little quota here and make adjustments." They wanted us to abdicate and turn over this important authority over commerce to the executive branch of the Government—to wit, the President—who in turn would refer it to some bureaucrat downtown, which is what he has done.

So we said, "No, we will not give you that power unless we, the Congress, can direct you in the acquisition of sugar from other sources in the event you reduce the sugar quota of Cuba." So we wrote it out, tried to make it plain. We put in the bill a provision that every little nation participating in the program which had a quota of not more than 10,000 or less than 3,000 tons should be given a quota of 10,000.

Knowing that the Philippines has an abundance of sugar, we said "We will set aside 15 percent for the Philippines." Then we said to the President, "Then you go to the full duty countries, Peru, the Dominican Republic, Mexico, and Nicaragua, exhaust their supplies, and then you can go into the world market and authorize the purchase of sugar so as to provide an adequate supply for our domestic consumption."

Representatives of the Department told us they could live with that bill. So then, Mr. Speaker, we reported out the bill. We were told finally that the reason they wanted this power to exercise over the people of Cuba was to be able to assure the American consumer of an adequate supply. We import more than 3 million tons of sugar from Cuba annually. Over 2 million had already been delivered into our market.

When we granted this power it was not going to be used directly. You know what happened. The President refused to give Cuba 700,000 tons to which she would otherwise have been entitled. I have not heard a man on our committee complain about that action, although the State Department has told us they wanted to apply this quota gradually, take a little bit at a time. I remember the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], vice chairman of my committee, said, and I concurred with him, that if you are going to employ economic sanctions and use it against Castro let us throw the book at him, go all the way.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to object to this additional 5 minutes for the gentleman from North Carolina but I think it is time things were brought to a close and that we adjourn some time soon.

Mr. McCORMACK. I may say to the gentleman from Texas that we are waiting on the Senate to pass the sine die adjournment resolution.

Mr. SPRINGER. If that is the case I will not object.

Mr. COOLEY. I thank the gentleman very sincerely, and I wish to say to the House that I was reluctant to leave and come back here and take the floor to discuss this matter. The reason I am here now is other people opened up the discussion. Some people complain that we had not discussed it, as if we were afraid to discuss it. But there was no need to discuss a bill that passed here in less than a minute's time. Nobody objected, nobody asked any questions.

Let us go back to what has happened. Mr. Castro's government has turned upon us viciously and has committed all sorts of high crimes and misdemeanors—murder, yes, robbery, larceny, and everything you can describe, against the American people. He has taken over hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of property owned by American citizens.

I have no brief for Mr. Castro. I did not have enough respect for him to go to hear him speak when he came to Washington, nor did I go to the reception at the Embassy that was given in his honor. I think I knew what was going to happen.

I happened to be in Havana just 2 short weeks before Mr. Batista left Cuba. You could feel it in the air. Everybody knew that Mr. Castro was on the way to Havana. But before he reached the city of Havana, our State Department went running down the road to put their arms around him and pat him on the back and say "You are our boy," in effect.

Nobody here seems to be jumping on Mr. Castro and all of his communistic activities. I have been trying to get the State Department to draw up a bill of indictment and to file it with the OAS for months.

What is the explanation for all this on the part of our State Department, when dealing with Mr. Castro? He accused us of blowing up a ship in Havana Harbor, burning his canefields, harboring murderers and war criminals. He has accused us of everything, yet we do not complain about Mr. Castro's accusations. We go to the OAS and pick up a dictator by the name of Trujillo and denounce him for crimes and misdemeanors that he has committed in the past. They allege he committed these crimes. Somebody in our committee room said: We assume he is guilty of the crimes of which he was accused. A member of our committee reminded the witness of the fact that under our ancient legal jurisprudence a man is presumed to be innocent and not presumed to be guilty.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. We find ourselves in the position in connection with the national interests of our country, which should be paramount, where we broke diplomatic relations with a regime that is strong and dictatorial, yet was friendly to us; a regime that was strongly anti-Communist. We continue to maintain diplomatic relationships with the Castro regime that hates America. If they are not Communist, they are aggressively pro-Communist. How is that consistent with the national interest of our country, and I would debate that with the gentleman from Wyoming or anyone, on the question of breaking relations with a friendly country that is anti-Communist, and continue relations with a country that hates America and is pro-Communist.

Mr. COOLEY. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks. And, I do not want anybody to understand that I am defending Mr. Trujillo or his government. He is a dictator and he is known to have been a dictator for 30 years. He is running his business there, and everything indicates that he intends, at least in December, which is a very short time away, to hold municipal elections. That is some evidence of his intention to bring about a better government. He has committed himself to hold a general election 2 years from now. Now he is improving rather than deteriorating, and it is difficult for me to understand why we have jumped on him so violently now.

After we passed our law in July and went home, believing that the law of the land would be recognized and some dignity accorded it, we found out that when they started to apply the formula they disregarded the law. They gave sugar to the little countries first, and the Philippines next, and some to the full-duty countries next, but when they got down to the Dominican Republic they said, "We will set that aside and not authorize the purchase of that sugar." There is nothing in the law about suspending authorization or delaying the shipment of sugar. As the result of all these steps, you and I know that sugar has been selling at the highest price that it has sold for in 40 years.

Where will we get our 1961 supply from? We will not be looking around for 700,000 tons; we will be looking around for 3.2 million tons of sugar in the good year of our Lord 1961, because we are not going to bring it in from Cuba. And, if the administration has its way, we will not bring this 300,000 tons in from the Dominican Republic. And, you add those two together, and it is 3.5 million tons short. And, when we pointed that out to the Secretary, he said, "Oh, well, the American consumers will be willing to bear that burden of additional price." The impact has already hit the sugar industry.

Now, the power they wanted was for a specific purpose. I asked him the question. I said, "Mr. Secretary, do you

entertain even the remotest hope that Mr. Trujillo will purge himself; will bring about the necessary reforms in his government and comply with all of the provisions of the charter?" He said, "No, sir." I said, "Then, you want this power to use by unilateral action against his government for the purpose of bringing about the downfall of the government?" He said, "Well, I don't like the word 'downfall.'" I said, "What word would you put in the place of it?" He said, "Change." So then I said, "You are advocating this economic pressure to bring about a change in some foreign government in the Western Hemisphere?" And he said, "Yes."

Now, that is the record. That is exactly why they want the power. Then I asked him if the Dominican Republic could survive if economic sanctions were applied by the other American States, and he said, "No." We asked the question, "Who would be Mr. Trujillo's successor?" Of course, no one knows. But, it is clear to see what will happen. We are preparing a perfect setup, a pushover, if you please, for another little Castro to step into the Dominican Republic. Now, if we want that, that is up to the Congress, but because the President, through somebody in the State Department, wants this economic pressure, are we in the Congress, the Congress of our great country, going on record declaring economic warfare against a country in this hemisphere?

That is the reason that I objected to giving the President this power. But we did provide, very cautiously and very wisely, that if the Organization of American States adopted an appropriate resolution calling upon its members to apply economic sanctions to the Dominican Republic and such sanctions were applied, we would give the President complete power to move in and take every pound of sugar away from them.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Was not the President given practically the same power in the bill that was enacted yesterday authorizing $500 million to be spent for South America? The President could use the power of that money in any way he saw fit, that economic power.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Castro says that is a bribe that we are dangling over their heads, to bribe the members of the O.A.S. And that it was another bribe when we took the sugar away from him and gave it to Costa Rica and Panama and Haiti and some of the other countries.

Mr. GROSS. I am not saying it is right, but I am saying that apparently it is a case of semantics.

Mr. COOLEY. Certainly. I heard the gentleman's argument and observations yesterday and they were very persuasive.

Now, what reason on earth would these 34 men on the House Committee on Agriculture have to do anything that they did not think was in the interest and welfare of the people of America?

Now let me turn to the events of the past few days. As I have previously stated, the Committee on Agriculture met in executive session a week ago last Monday and would have on that day reported a bill providing a simple extension of the existing law through the calendar year 1961, so that we might have adequate time in the new Congress to work out a new basic sugar program.

On that day we were first informed of the demand of the administration that we give the President this new power to take unilateral punitive action against the Dominican Republic. So, instead of reporting the bill on Monday, August 22, we met on Tuesday to hear the Under Secretary of State argue for this power they were asking for. For the rest of that week the committee struggled with this problem. No member of the committee seemed willing to give the State Department all it was asking for.

Then, last Monday, August 29, we met again. And the committee unanimously rejected the proposal made by the State Department and unanimously approved the amendment giving the President the authority to cut our purchases from the Dominican Republic if such action was agreed upon and put into effect by the Organization of American States.

The House approved this bill and its amendment without a dissenting vote.

The Senate Committee on Finance took the bill and made some changes in our amendment. After studying the changes, the vice chairman of our committee, Mr. POAGE, and I discussed them with all the members of the committee we could find on the floor, which was a majority of the committee. All were agreeable to accepting the Senate changes.

Thereupon I informed the distinguished chairman of the Senate Finance Committee that we could agree to their amendments and I felt sure the House would concur.

Then, to my surprise and shock, the administration, which had indicated it could accept our House bill, reversed its position and persuaded the Senate to adopt—without hearings or mature consideration—the very provision which the Committee on Agriculture had unanimously rejected after a full week's consideration.

What position could I take, Mr. Speaker, aside from my own deep convictions on this matter, but to uphold the action of the Committee on Agriculture and of the House in this matter?

In an effort to again seek the direction of the committee, I called an emergency executive session for 11 o'clock this morning. In that session I was directed by a majority vote of the committee to take all possible steps to prevent concurrence in the Senate amendment, both on the floor and in conference, in the event a conference should be asked by the Senate.

But the Senate did not ask for a conference. They merely sent their bill over here on a take-it-or-leave-it basis. Even so, Mr. Speaker, I have gone over to the Senate and discussed this matter with several distinguished Members of that body and they were unanimous in advising me that there would be nothing accomplished by a conference—that there was no real area of compromise.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, our only recourse appears to be the action the House is taking—let the sugar bill go over until January.

We do not need a bill at this time. The present law does not expire until March 31, 1961, and there will be plenty of time before that to extend its expiration date, if that should seem advisable—as I rather anticipate it will.

The only urgency for a bill at this time was the administration's demand for this grant of power to the President over the Dominican quota.

I think the House is wise in permitting the law to remain as it is, at least until January, so that the administration will be compelled under the existing provisions of law to carry out the allocations it has already made to the Dominican Republic and give our sugar market the supplies that it needs from that source.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] has again expired.

OBSERVANCE OF THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF GEN. JOHN J. PERSHING

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, on May 16 of this year the House adopted House Joint Resolution 640, which was finally adopted also by the other body. This was a resolution commending the late Gen. John J. Pershing on the 100th anniversary of his birth, which will occur in a few days. On September 13 we will be observing the 100th anniversary of the birth of this distinguished Missourian and American.

This legislation enjoined the Department of Defense and other departments of the Government to take due notice of this significant occasion in American history. I am sorry to report that on the basis of responses to inquiries that I have been able to make it seems there is not much zeal on the part of these agencies for recognizing the great late General Pershing. I am afraid that we will see no cooperation, for reasons which are difficult to understand.

The Veterans of World War I, Inc., a national organization, has been very zealous in bringing about a proper observance of this significant occasion. But their leaders report to me that they are making little headway. An example of the failure of the administration to take notice of this occasion in a proper way is the recent refusal of the Post Office Department to issue a commemorative stamp as requested by many organizations.

I am afraid that we are seeing here again the truth of the statement of Rudyard Kipling in his poem that—

> It is Tommy this and it is Tommy that
> When the bands begin to play.

Certainly General Pershing, when the guns were firing and the bands were playing, received the plaudits of this Government, but now apparently he is a forgotten man.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITENER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I was very proud to have served in World War I as a lieutenant under General Pershing and I would say to the gentleman from North Carolina that no man in the history of our country has ever placed himself in a more important strategic position than did General Pershing in protecting the honor of the American troops as a fighting unit in World War I under American command. We will not talk about his contributions in connection with the Panama Canal, the Mexican campaign or service in the Philippine Islands, but we will say that in 8 months he alone with his officers drilled and trained the greatest army that ever took the field in defense of a war to end all wars, and that he, under circumstances of pressure, resolved that the integrity of the American forces would be maintained and they would be under one command, an American command. It was demanded of him that the American forces be integrated with the French and English armies. He stated in conformity with his judgment that the unity of control should remain under American command, and thus the victories in the field were American victories.

Mr. WHITENER. I thank the gentleman from Illinois, and express to him my appreciation for his effort in our Judiciary Committee and also on the floor of the House in bringing about the passage of this resolution.

In conclusion, I should like to commend our distinguished colleague from Missouri [Mr. HULL], and the Senator from Missouri [Senator SYMINGTON], for their action in introducing a bill to provide for a monument to this great American here in the city of Washington. I hope it will be acted upon favorably and that this truly great nonpolitical general in our history will receive the plaudits of the American people on the 100th anniversary of his birth, to which he is entitled in such a magnificent manner.

DECISIONS AND DEVELOPMENTS IN THE FIELD OF COLLUSIVE AGREEMENTS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I include in my remarks an address made by Mr. Stephen E. McCloskey, chairman of the labor relations commission of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, entitled "On Decisions and Developments in the Field of Collusive Agreements." The speech was made before the fifth annual conference at the Association of State Labor Relations Agencies at the Hotel Hershey, Hershey, Pa., Tuesday, August 30, 1960.

Mr. McCloskey is an outstanding leader in the field of labor relations. He is very cognizant of the difficulties confronting management and labor, and has done much to solve labor disputes that have arisen in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. He has always been a strong believer in the rights of union members to collective bargaining; he has always insisted and held that it is vital that the unions adhere to their contracts with employers, so that industrial peace can be secured. I commend Mr. McCloskey's speech as being constructive, enlightening, and informative as to advancements made in the field of labor relations:

ON DECISIONS AND DEVELOPMENTS IN THE FIELD OF COLLUSIVE AGREEMENTS

(Remarks of Stephen E. McCloskey, chairman, Labor Relations Commission, Commonwealth of Massachusetts)

Mr. President, officers of the association, distinguished guests, chairman and members of State labor relations agencies and their guests, I am happy to be here again and I deem it an honor and a privilege to be given the opportunity of addressing you on the occasion of your 5th annual conference. Thank you for the invitation.

His Excellency, Gov. Foster Furcolo, has asked me to bring to you the greetings of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and to extend to you an invitation to visit Boston for your annual conference in 1961.

Under the Massachusetts Labor Relations Act, the ban of employer unfair labor practices is intended to produce the type of industrial relations wherein employers and the representatives of their employees deal at arm's length across the bargaining table. These employer unfair practice bans aim at eliminating all those employer activities by means of which employees are prevented from selecting and operating under bargaining representatives of their own choosing. The ban on employer domination or interference in the formation of labor unions slips into this design as one of its essential parts.

We are well aware that one of the principal ways in which employers traditionally interfered with and discouraged organizational activities was by providing assistance in the creation of or by the direct or indirect creation of company unions, unions which were actually no more than puppets. As unscrupulous employers planned, these unions could not engage in arm's-length bargaining with their employers. They were not designed to do so in theory and they did not do so in practice. A few dishonest and traitorous leaders had sold out their fellow employees. The leaders of the company unions did not bargain in good faith and follow the dictates of the majority of their fellows, as they were bound to do under the law. Rather, they followed the dictates of the employer. The State and Federal statutes, therefore, included provisions forbidding the employer practice of dominating or interfering in the formation of labor unions. Most of the statutes on the State and Federal level were almost identical and on the State level were commonly referred to as Baby Wagner Acts.

To dwell at length on the evidence necessary to support a finding that a union was company dominated or that there was undue interference or support of the union by the company would be repetitious of facts that you men encounter frequently in discharging your duties as officials of State labor relations agencies.

Perhaps my observations as a labor official and as chairman of the Massachusetts Labor Relations Commission will provide you with information of interest concerning my State.

Many of you may not be aware that Massachusetts is generally first to show the way to other States not only by a wise and judicious interpretation of the law but also by enacting into law much needed social and labor legislation. In this connection, I am reminded of a leading Massachusetts case that just about ended the criminal conspiracy doctrine established by the famous Philadelphia Cordwainer's case.

In 1836, a few years prior to the famous Massachusetts case of *Commonwealth* v. *Hunt*, the New York Supreme Court deciding *People* v. *Fisher*, read into an exceedingly vague statute a legal bar against labor activity comparable to that of common law conspiracy. The legislature had enacted that "if two or more persons shall conspire * * * to commit any act injurious to the public health, to public morals, or to trade or commerce; or for the perversion or obstruction of justice or the due administration of the laws—they shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor." A group of journeymen shoemakers, organized in a club, were indicted under this statute for striking to procure the discharge of a workman who accepted wages lower than the minimum approved by them. If they were guilty at all under this law, it was for a conspiracy to commit an act injurious to trade or commerce.

A provision of such generality was not much of a guide. But the court readily accepted the responsibility of using it to convict the defendants. It saw the issue as one of a conspiracy to raise wages. Artificially high wages meant correspondingly higher prices for boots, which prevented local manufacturers from selling as cheaply as their competitors elsewhere. Furthermore, the community was deprived of the services of the man whose discharge was effected by the union. Such results were, in the court's opinion, clearly injurious to trade and commerce, and their causes should be punished under the statute.

These and numerous other criminal convictions of workers for taking advantage of what they regarded as their ordinary civil privilege to exercise their right to work or not work, under such terms as they saw fit, bred ill-feeling throughout the East. Mobs of laborers held mock trials of judges and hung them in effigy to show their resentment at being treated as common criminals for having done what they believed they had a perfect right to do. Juries were refusing to convict in some of these prosecutions, in spite of clearly proved cases of criminal conspiracy under the prevailing law. Even the press attacked judicial statements that the unions were of foreign origin or were mainly upheld by foreigners. These were implications that were patently false. News of these events traveled fast. The owners of the newly established textile and shoe factories in Massachusetts were as much concerned over the judicial treatment of organized labor as were the unions themselves.

In the case of *Commonwealth* v. *Hunt* our superior court had convicted seven members

of the Boston Journeymen Bootmakers' Society for organizing a strike, in September 1840, against an employer who had hired and retained one Jeremiah Horne, a journeyman, who was not a member of the society. The indictment had charged them with having unlawfully, perniciously, deceitfully, unjustly, and corruptly conspired not to work for any master who employed any workman not a member of their union, after he was notified to discharge such workman; with having compelled by these means at least one master named Isaac B. Wait to discharge Horne; and with the "wicket and unlawful intent to impoverish" and to keep him from pursuing his trade. The trial judge had instructed the jury that the indictment set forth a course of conduct amounting to criminal conspiracy. This meant that if such acts were proven at the trial, a verdict of guilty should follow.

The convicted shoeworkers appealed to the highest court of the State on the ground that the indictment had not charged a crime. Its decision came down in 1842, Chief Justice Shaw writing the opinion for the court. He was no lover of unions and probably believed them to be thoroughly vicious. In other connections he showed himself unsympathetic to wage earners by preventing them from recovering damages against their employers for personal injuries due to the defective conditions of premises and appliances or because of the carelessness of fellow employees. This had the effect of lessening the overhead risks of infant industry at the expense of workers who could ill afford to bear them.

Nevertheless, he realized from reading the newspapers that Massachusetts workers would react violently if courts persisted in calling them criminals for trying to advance their interests by their refusal to work. He knew that the fortunes of many a future old Boston family were tied up in the newly built mills and that a wave of strikes, on the heels of the recent depression, could easily finish them off. Such a disaster, in turn, might have political repercussions fatal to the proposed tariff believed necessary for the protection of incipient industry. Something simply had to be done to discourage the indiscriminate use of the doctrine of criminal conspiracy against the workers.

Shaw rose to the occasion in an opinion which was a masterpiece of tact and technicality. He disregarded the adverbs in the indictment as mere recital—wishful thinking by the prosecuting attorney. All the indictment really charged, he said, was the intention of the society to induce all those engaged in the same occupation to become members of it. This was not an unlawful objective designed for the purpose of securing power. Such power, he said, might be used for useful and honorable purposes as well as for dangerous and pernicious ones. If the latter were the real ends in view, and were susceptible of proof, they should have been specially charged. For all the court could tell from the indictment, the purposes of the society might be laudable, such as discouragement of the use of ardent spirit. "Such an association might be used to afford each other assistance in times of poverty, sickness and distress; or to raise their intellectual, moral and social conditions; or to make improvement in their art; or for other proper purposes." If this were so, the indictment could not support a conviction. And the court refused to assume that the workers' objectives were bad.

Everyone, including the court, knew what the union's purposes really were, even if they had not been set forth in the indictment. Hence this decision, issued by perhaps the most able State judge of his time, gave the doctrine of criminal conspiracy a considerable setback. Shaw had not abolished the doctrine of criminal conspiracy as some wishful thinkers think he did. But by so obviously sidestepping the real issue in the case as a matter of expedience, he discouraged the use of this doctrine for many years. And, as Dean Landis, of Harvard Law School, a prominent writer in this field, has remarked about Shaw's opinion, "he foreshadows clearly the doctrine of a later day that the legality of a strike is to be made to depend upon the end sought to be attained."

Common law criminal conspiracy has never again played a prominent part in the control of labor unions by American courts, although it was used occasionally after the Civil War to break up strikes. Parliament by statute formally discarded this doctrine for all time in 1875, after English labor unions had achieved substantial political power. But in America it just faded away, perhaps chiefly because the courts developed a much more effective means of control in the injunction.

A few years short of a century later, a racketeer in Worcester, Mass., had created a dummy union and was extorting through fear and threats, protection money from employees through employers in the area. The practice was sure to spread to other cities and towns unless it was stamped out immediately. The union, which was known as the Central Massachusetts Industrial Union, was alleged to have received financial or other support from the employers. In fact, the union, which had all the earmarks of a paper local as we know it today, had as its president a local racketeer and gunman. The gunman had forced a group of cleaners and dyers in Worcester, Mass., by threats and fear of physical violence to recognize said union and deduct 25 cents a week from the pay of its employees. The money was subsequently paid over to Joseph Genduso, president of said union, who was in fact the Central Massachusetts Industrial Union.

Upon charges filed in March 1938, only a few months after the Massachusetts Labor Relations Commission had come into existence, by the American Federation of Labor and the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, two labor organizations acting independently, the commission after investigation issued its complaint against those employers who had entered into contract with the Central Massachusetts Industrial Union. The complaint alleged that each one of the respondents had engaged in unfair labor practices within the meaning of section 8 (1) and (2) of the State Labor Relations Act in that each one of the respondents dominated or interfered with the administration of a labor organization known as the Central Massachusetts Industrial Union, or had contributed financial or other support to said labor organization and had conspired with one Joseph Genduso, president of said labor organization, to so dominate and interfere with the administration of said labor organization or to contribute financial or other support to the same.

Some of the respondents filed an answer denying generally the commission of any unfair labor practice and, in some cases, setting up certain other special defenses.

All of them appeared by counsel at a hearing which was held on April 20, 21, and 25, 1938, before the commission. Joseph Genduso and the Central Massachusetts Industrial Union also appeared at said hearing and were represented by counsel. At the beginning of the hearing, the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, Local 16, appeared and asked permission to withdraw all charges on the grounds that said Local 16 was no longer a party of interest for the reason that, by agreement between Local 16 and the American Federation of Labor, exclusive opportunity and right to organize the employees of the several respondents had been left to the American Federation of Labor.

The commission commenced taking testimony on April 20 and continued through April 21, when counsel for all the respondents and counsel for Joseph Genduso and his union requested an adjournment until April 25, at which time and place said counsel stated to the commission they would present to it an agreement arrived at as the result of a joint conference between themselves, which might be acceptable to the commission and which might permit prompt termination of the proceedings without further hearing.

The adjournment was granted and on April 25 counsel presented a stipulation to the commission by which, without the admission of any of the facts alleged, they consented to the issuance of the order hereinafter stated.

Upon the entire record in the case, upon the basis of the above-mentioned stipulation, pursuant to section 10(c) of the State Labor Relations Act, hereby orders that each of the respondents, its agents, successors and assigns, shall:

(1) Cease and desist from in any manner interfering with, restraining or coercing their employees in the exercise of their rights to self-organization, to bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing, and to engage in concerted activities, for the purpose of collective bargaining or other mutual aid or protection as guaranteed in section 7 of the State Labor Relations Act;

(2) Cease and desist—

(a) From requiring as a condition of employment membership in the Central Massachusetts Industrial Union;

(b) From encouraging membership in said union or any other labor organization of their employees, and from discouraging membership in any other organization;

(c) From deducting dues for said union from the wages of its employees and from soliciting for members during working hours and on the property of the several respondents;

(d) From in any manner dominating or interfering with the administration of the Central Massachusetts Industrial Union or any other labor organization and from contributing any support to said labor organization or any other labor organization;

(3) Take the following affirmative action which the commission finds will effectuate the policies of the act;

(a) Withdraw all recognition of the Central Massachusetts Industrial Union as representative of their employees for the purpose of dealing with the several respondents concerning grievances, labor dispute of wages, rates of pay, hours of employment, or conditions of work and completely disestablish the Central Massachusetts Industrial Union as such representative;

(b) Post immediately notices to their employees in conspicuous places throughout their several shops and stores stating—

1. That said union is so disestablished and that the respondents will refrain from any official recognition thereof;

2. That to secure employment in the respective shops and stores of the respondents, a person need not become a member of said union;

3. That the contract or contracts signed with said unions is or are void and of no effect;

4. That the respondents have ceased and desisted as provided in sections 1, 2, and 3 of this order;

5. Keep such notices posted for a period of 30 days from the date of posting;

6. File with the labor relations commission on or before the 10th day from the date

of service of this order a report in writing setting forth in detail the manner and form in which they have severally complied with the foregoing requirements.

The fact that the commission proceeded in such a forthright and unrelenting fashion to dispose of this case to the satisfaction of the affected employees in the area, undoubtedly discouraged similar activities in our Commonwealth by such unsavory characters as Mr. Genduso. Attorneys and examiners assigned to the case were threatened but this did not deter them in their investigation and prosecution of the case. Representatives of the district attorney's and attorney general's offices were present at the hearings and this probably was responsible for the complete capitulation of Mr. Genduso and the respondents in the case. The stipulation presented to the commission agreeing to the issuance of the above order was designed to prevent the presentation of damaging evidence that would lead to further criminal prosecution. However, our investigation was made available to the district attorney's office and further criminal prosecution followed.

Massachusetts is fortunate in being free from the above-described type of collusive agreement as well as other types of collusive and conspiratorial agreements between employers and paper locals or other employer-dominated and supported unions.

This is due in no small measure to the alert and militant effort of Massachusetts labor leaders, who with the cooperation and assistance of our commission and the National Labor Relations Board have never permitted such agreements and arrangements to exist.

I am proud to be a member of the Massachusetts Labor Relations Commission, which has so admirably and effectively discharged its duties in the past, and as the person charged with the direction and control of this commission, I can assure you that it will continue—at least under my direction—to effectively and impartially carry on the traditions of the past, thereby fulfilling its mandate under our law, to Massachusetts labor and management.

In closing, I want you gentlemen to know that it is my observation that with the type of officials who are members of our various State agencies, whom I have met here and in Detroit, such agreements and arrangements as we have discussed here today will be thoroughly investigated, exposed and eliminated forthwith upon discovery in your respective States.

Thank you for inviting me to participate in your conference. I have looked forward to attending it and I have enjoyed every minute. The hospitality of Mike Crosetto and his board and the hospitality of the hospitality room provided by Mr. Bowers has been wonderful.

PUERTO RICAN-AMERICAN COOPERATION IN ATOMIC ENERGY DEVELOPMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, recently my friend and colleague, CHET HOLIFIELD, chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy's Subcommittee on Legislation, represented the Joint Committee at the groundbreaking ceremonies in Puerto Rico for the AEC-Puerto Rico Water Resources Authority atomic powerplant, utilizing nuclear superheat.

I believe CHET HOLIFIELD had some important things to say as to the lessons to be learned from this Puerto Rican project as an example for United States-Latin American development and arrangements for cooperative projects with other less developed countries.

I would like to introduce Mr. HOLIFIELD'S speech in the RECORD at this point:

PUERTO RICAN-AMERICAN COOPERATION IN ATOMIC ENERGY DEVELOPMENT

(Remarks by Hon. CHET HOLIFIELD, Democrat of California, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, at the dedication of the Puerto Rican atomic powerplant August 23, 1960)

Upon behalf of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, I want to extend congratulations to our fellow citizens of Puerto Rico, to Gov. Muñoz Marín, and to the Puerto Rico Water Resources Authority on the occasion of the dedication of this atomic power project.

It is routine procedure for speakers at a dedication ceremony to declare that it is indeed an historic occasion. However, in this case, I sincerely believe that we are taking note today of a quite remarkable occasion. Let me explain why this dedication of a nuclear power project in Puerto Rico seems an important event to me.

This atomic powerplant, and the Puerto Rican nuclear center, signify several important milestones in U.S. atomic development and United States-Latin American relationships. First, on their merits they will be a significant part of the research and development effort of the United States in the field of atomic power and basic research in atomic energy. Secondly, they show how the democratic process (and I use a little "d" although this is an election year) works to achieve real progress, in contrast to the dictatorial approach used in places not so far from here. Finally, and hopefully, it is possible that what we have learned—and are learning — here may have application throughout Latin America, and elsewhere in areas of the world which are in need of development.

For only a few decades ago, Puerto Rico certainly qualified as an underdeveloped area. We became aware of your problems of poverty, and lack of food, clothing, housing, and gainful work. In those days there seemed to be not much hope for the future.

However, the years of the New Deal for the United States included a New Deal for Puerto Rico, and out of this beginning has grown your Operation Bootstrap. I have been much impressed by what I have heard and read about your successes, under able leadership, in raising the standard of living, developing and attracting new industry, improving education, building decent housing, and carrying forward all of the other activities required for achieving a life of decency and dignity for the people of Puerto Rico.

One of the absolutely essential factors in achieving what you have achieved so far, and in continuing with your remarkable progress, is an abundant supply of electric power at a reasonable cost. I congratulate you and your Puerto Rico Water Resources Authority for the zeal, courage and competence with which you have overcome many obstacles to provide the ever-increasing amounts of power required for Operation Bootstrap. I understand that the authority is one of the fastest, if not the fastest, growing electric utility systems in the United States. I am informed that in less than 20 years you have succeeded in increasing your production of power by more than 10 times; that from a peak load of 18,000 kilowatts in 1941, your authority is now planning for a peak demand of more than 500,000 kilowatts within the next 2 years.

This is amazing growth and an amazing achievement even in the rapidly growing electric power industry.

It is especially noteworthy because, in addition to the usual problems of very rapidly expanding electric power systems, the authority has faced acute shortages of technically trained personnel and a lack of local fuel supplies.

Today, less than 20 years after the creation of the authority, only 12 years after the inauguration of Operation Bootstrap, and 8 years after your attaining Commonwealth status with a new constitution, Puerto Rico is stepping forward into another new frontier—the frontier of atomic power, beyond which if we are successful lies a new and immense source of low-cost energy for the people of the world.

I would think this a less notable occasion if this nuclear plant were simply being built here by the Federal Government as a showpiece, with little or no direct participation by the people of Puerto Rico and the engineers of your water resources authority. The fact is, of course, that quite the contrary is true.

That this project is now to go forward is due in large part to the leadership, the initiative, and the persistent efforts of Gov. Luis Muñoz-Marín (chairman of the board of the authority) and Mr. S. L. Descartes, until recently the executive director of the authority. Equally important, authority engineers have contributed very substantially to the detailed conception and design of what will be a pioneering reactor in the advancing technology of atomic power. We know that for a number of years the authority has sent its bright young engineers to our great atomic laboratories at Argonne and Oak Ridge and elsewhere for training.

This, it seems to me, is a matter of great importance, because in Latin America and in other areas of the world live millions of people who are engaged in a similar struggle to industrialize their countries and raise miserably low living standards. To do this, they must have power, just as Puerto Rico has to have more and more power—for your homes, your new industries, and rural electrification. Puerto Rico's rapid progress must be greatly encouraging to these other peoples. If you now show that it is possible in so short a period of time also to begin to develop and exploit this new source of energy from the atom, the value of Puerto Rico as a demonstration and as a center for training and information for underdeveloped areas everywhere will acquire a new and exciting facet.

Now I do not wish to give anyone the impression that atomic power development, as such, will be the panacea for the ills of underdeveloped countries. For most areas the utilization of increased energy from conventional sources—waterpower, oil, and coal where available—will make the most sense economically as the first step. But we have found that just the competitive threat of atomic power has had a beneficial effect on conventional fuel costs. And there is no doubt that a long-range atomic power development program, tied in with basic scientific research in all fields of atomic energy, will ultimately pay off.

And let me say that I have no doubts about your ability to make an important contribution in this new endeavor.

If I were not convinced that you will succeed, and succeed impressively, there

would be no nuclear power project to dedicate today. We who are on the Congressional Joint Committee on Atomic Energy do not recommend an atomic power project as an act of charity or as a ceremonial gesture of good will. We believe strongly that public funds should be invested in a nuclear power project only if there is a clear promise that the investment will result in substantial and important contributions to technical knowledge.

As you know, atomic power today is expensive. It is not yet competitive from an economic standpoint for civilian use. The basic objective of our Federal atomic power program is not now and never has been simply to build kilowatts of atomic power capacity. The objective is to develop and build facilities and to finance research through which the scientists and the engineers can learn how, as expeditiously as possible, to build commercial atomic power plants that will produce electricity at low cost, safely and reliably.

This project in Puerto Rico offers a good example of the Joint Committee's policies in respect to atomic power. The Atomic Energy Commission first proposed a nuclear powerplant in Puerto Rico in early 1957, following an announcement by Dr. Milton Eisenhower in 1956, to be part of your nuclear energy training center for Latin America. The Joint Committee turned down this recommendation because the Atomic Energy Commission proposed constructing a type of reactor which we already knew how to build. It would have contributed nothing to advancing the technology, although it might have been a nice showpiece. The Joint Committee indicated it would be interested only in a proposal which promised a further step ahead in power reactor technology.

In all honesty, I must say that that probably would have been the end of the project if the Puerto Rico Water Resources Authority at that point had not shown some rather remarkable initiative. Your authority selected one of America's best qualified reactor engineering firms under the direction of Dr. Walter H. Zinn, who is perhaps our most distinguished reactor designer. As a result of his collaboration, the concept for the nuclear superheat reactor was developed which now is to be built and operated here.

The authority took the initiative also in convincing the Atomic Energy Commission and the Joint Committee that the concept was sound, and that the project would indeed contribute greatly to power reactor technology. The fact is that this will be one of only two reactors in our entire program to explore the vitally important field of nuclear superheating. Furthermore, this reactor is to be designed and built as a truly experimental facility—not just a power producer—so that many valuable experiments can be performed with it to increase our understanding of how to design more efficient, more economical atomic power plants as time goes by.

This facility, therefore, is important not just to Puerto Rico and, indeed, not just to Latin America as a new training facility. It is important to the total U.S. program for atomic power development. We expect great technical contributions from this plant and from the engineers of your authority which will operate the plant and conduct many of the experiments.

I cannot resist the opportunity to say that the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy claims considerable credit for this project. We not only insisted that a project be undertaken which would contribute very importantly to our technical development program. We also actively supported the authority's proposal once it was clear that the authority was recommending a technically valuable type of facility and, equally important, possessed the engineering competence to do a good job of operating the plant once it was built.

At the request of Chairman CARL DURHAM and myself in June 1958, the Commission submitted a report to the Joint Committee on the authority proposal. The Joint Committee on its own initiative recommended, and Congress later that year approved, funds for engineering studies of the authority concept. The studies made good progress and the concept looked increasingly promising. We were surprised and disappointed, consequently, when the AEC informed the Joint Committee in April of 1959 that the proposed reactor was too exotic and that there were doubts about building it at a distant point like Puerto Rico.

Senator CLINTON ANDERSON, who became chairman of the Joint Committee again in January 1959, and I both urged the AEC to reconsider, since we felt quite strongly that this was a worthwhile undertaking and should certainly proceed without further delay. I can tell you too, that Commissioner John Graham, who is with us today, has also been an invaluable friend and supporter of this project in the Commission.

In June 1959, Congress accepted the Joint Committee's recommendation and authorized the design and construction of a reactor superheat project. The location and sponsor was left up to the Atomic Energy Commission to decide on technical grounds. For a month or so, it was nip and tuck as to whether we could get the necessary appropriations enacted, and then whether the Budget Bureau would let AEC begin to spend them. It was at this time that AEC Commissioner Graham made a trip down here for firsthand discussions. I am delighted that further studies since then have confirmed our belief that this is a desirable step forward, and that the negotiations between AEC and the authority on the joint financing of this project met with success.

I might also say that the project represents to me a most desirable and wholesome type of partnership between public agencies for the public benefit. All of the information developed from the research program with the reactor will be made available to the public. All of the patents obtained will be available to industry, private and public, on a royalty-free, nonexclusive basis. This is as it should be from the expenditure of public funds.

This is not the first occasion, of course, for this type of collaboration between public agencies in Puerto Rico. Your authority and the Rural Electrification Administration have worked together for years in your highly successful and still expanding program for bringing the blessings of electricity to the rural people of the island. I understand that your authority has called upon the Department of the Interior and Tennessee Valley Authority for advice and assistance in planning and designing your ever-growing generating and transmission system. This is the kind of fruitful collaboration which should go on, and I am glad that now, in the newest frontier of the power industry, we have brought in the Atomic Energy Commission as a new partner in Puerto Rico's outstanding power program.

This nuclear facility which we are dedicating today, like so much that is being done by the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, has a larger significance than its contribution to the progress of the island economy and to the effectiveness of the American atomic power program. Beyond this, and certainly of equal importance, it will be an important element in the nuclear energy center here for all of Latin America. This project and this center will be another demonstration for this region and for the world of how a free people, operating through the institutions of a freely elected and democratic government, can apply effectively our modern technology to improve and advance the general welfare.

I had occasion yesterday to fly over a nearby troubled island which is apparently trying another approach to developing its resources—through the method of authoritarian control, playing the dangerous game of flirting with communistic advisers. I am sure that the differences in the democratic and Communist ways of life will become very strikingly demonstrated in these islands of the Caribbean. The people of many nations are watching this demonstration of two opposing philosophies.

Under the dedicated leadership of Gov. Muñoz Marín, Puerto Rico is demonstrating in a dramatic way the vitality and the vigor with which the people of a progressive democratic society can build for themselves a better way of life.

As a fellow American, I am proud of Puerto Rico and I wish you well in your new endeavors.

PENNSYLVANIA RAILROAD STRIKE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. JOHNSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I rise on this occasion as the House of Representatives rapidly approaches the hour of adjournment to express my deep concern over the rail strike which has shut down the Pennsylvania Railroad system. This strike more than inconveniences thousands of stranded passengers, it strikes an economic blow in 13 States serviced by the Pennsylvania Railroad—and particularly the Eastern Shore of Maryland. While this strike, gentlemen, affects the economic lifeline to the auto, steel, and coal industries, to me, as the Representative of the First Congressional District of Maryland—which comprises that historical area known as the Eastern Shore—I know an economic blow of catastrophic proportions confronts my people.

The Pennsylvania Railroad carries coal to the famous Delmarva Peninsula, and a possible power block looms because coal is used to generate electricity for the area. But more than this, the great poultry industry with 50 million broilers will be without feed ingredients within a few days, the famous seafood and canning industries of the Delmarva Peninsula will be confronted by an economic disaster from which, I fear, they will be long recovering.

This morning I dispatched a telegram to the President of the United States, asking him to exercise the great influence his Office commands by personally calling upon Mr. A. J. Greenhall, president of the Pennsylvania Railroad system, and Mr. Michael J. Quill, president

of the Transport Workers Union, to expeditiously settle their differences.

An unprecedented number of telegrams and telephone calls from my constituents have arrived in my office today requesting an immediate settlement of this tragic strike. Their economic lifeline now severed, leaves them with no other alternative but to call upon reasonable men to reason together.

On the way to the office this morning I heard several individuals deplore the tragedy of this strike by the inconveniencing of thousands who would use the railroad facilities on the eve of Labor Day vacation period. I can appreciate this feeling, but gentlemen, the economic paralysis of our Eastern Shore is of greater concern to me than looked for pleasures of a Labor Day vacation.

I hope the Members will join me in urging the early conclusion of this disastrous strike. I know the people of the Eastern Shore will be most appreciative of your efforts, not only in their behalf, but also for the economic welfare of our Nation as well.

AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION SCARE PROPAGANDA: LET THE PEOPLE DECIDE

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD today following the special orders of the day and to include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, at the height of the Senate debate on the medical care of the aged bill—H.R. 12580—there appeared in the newspapers throughout the country a full-page advertisement under the caption—"Medical Care for the Aged—Let's Help Those Who Need Help."

This was the climax of the American Medical Association's desperate campaign to defeat the Forand bill and other proposals which would use the social security mechanism to provide medical care for our older citizens. So far this campaign has been successful with the Congress but it is my earnest conviction that the views of those in our system of government who have the last word on such subjects—the people of the United States—will ultimately prevail.

AMA DELUGE OF SCARE PROPAGANDA

It is impossible to answer all of the deluge of scare propaganda which cascades upon the American people from the headquarters of the AMA in Chicago. I cannot, however, let the full-page ad of August 17 pass without comment.

The AMA declaration starts off with the not too startling assertion that Americans believe that "helping others is the decent thing to do. But helping those who don't need help doesn't make much sense."

The full-page advertisement goes on to state that the House-passed bill, in providing a Federal-State "means test" program, meets the criteria of helping people who are really in need.

With the proposition that we must take care of our needy I heartily agree. We do need a good program for people on old-age assistance and for those who are medically indigent. The Congress, the Federal executive branch, and the States have been remiss in this area in the past and the recent report of the Advisory Council on Public Assistance has pointed out the "glaring deficiencies" in the public assistance programs.

LET'S DEAL IN FACTS—ALL OF THEM

The weakness of the AMA position is not in their recent espousal of a greatly expanded State-Federal medical plan for the needy but the fact that they present this program as the total solution to medical care for elderly and a complete substitute for the social insurance method. This I believe is the fundamental fallacy of their position which should be pointed out to the American people. The AMA ad grandly proclaims:

> Our older citizens deserve every consideration. Certainly they are entitled to the chance to live their lives as fully as possible, with dignity and independence, with faith and pride in themselves.

But how can the AMA maintain that this is a program that promotes dignity and independence? The House bill, and the almost identical Senate proposal which was approved by the Congress, are both based on the public assistance means test approach. Such a program allows the State through a caseworker to make a humiliating investigation of an individual's income and resources—and even the income and resources of his relatives—in determining eligibility for payments. It is a program which has traditionally been based upon idea that the payment is an act of charity on the part of the Federal and State Government.

It seems only too obvious, in my view, that if you are looking for the preservation of an individual's dignity and independence you inevitably must look to the social insurance approach. This method insures against need, and insures against dependency and indignity that accompanies need. To me the idea of making contributions during one's working lifetime to take care of possible illnesses in retirement years is fully in accord with our best American traditions.

The fact that an individual may never use this protection or, perhaps, has other income or resources to pay for such care does not disturb me in the slightest—for this is the very same type of insurance protection that was made available for workers under social security for retirement and survivor benefits in 1940 and for disability benefits in 1957.

SOCIAL SECURITY APPROACH MEANS INDEPENDENCE

One of the basic reasons for the growth of the old-age and survivors insurance system has been the fact that it does protect the independence and self-respect of the American worker. It has also been demonstrated that the social security administrative mechanism can do the job with unparalleled efficiency.

A Life magazine editorial of April 25, 1960, in discussing the medical care for the aged issue, tried, in its words, to "separate its social realities from its politics, and facts from principles." The editorial stated in part:

> Unquestionably, many older Americans (15.8 million are over 65) are in real need. The average $72 a month they draw from social security scarcely provides food and shelter, much less for the medical expenses which increase with age. Few are in a position to meet the cost of chronic illness from which many suffer. Yet even to get charity care—itself inadequate in quantity and often inferior in quality—they must suffer the indignity of a pauper's oath.
>
> Can their need for medical aid be provided by private, voluntary Blue Cross-type plans? These are expanding, but can never meet the whole need. Premiums for the aged as a separate group are prohibitively high. The least burdensome method of insurance is for the whole society to spread the costs over the whole working life cycle. The cheapest and most logical way of doing this, whether by the Forand bill or a better one, is by extending the existing system of social security.
>
> To provide this aid need not be socialized medicine, as opponents claim, since payments could be made through private channels and patients select their own doctors and hospitals as before.
>
> The first question of principle is whether this form of aid will undermine the private duty of providing for one's own old age through old-fashioned virtues like foresight and thrift. Being a floor, not a ceiling, it need not do so. Individuals will still have plenty of incentive to save for the future, though less fear of it.

There are two other aspects of the AMA full-page ad which I find particularly galling. First, the old familiar lament that under the social security approach the Federal Government will be "telling the doctors how to practice medicine; telling the nurses how to nurse; telling the hospital how to handle its patients." This is the old socialized medicine pitch which just 4 years ago the AMA was using so vociferously in an attempt to kill the disability program. In reality all the social security approach legislative proposals have adequate safeguards against the socialization of medicine since they are designed to preserve freedom of choice and the doctor-patient relationship.

The minority report of five members of the Senate Finance Committee emphasized this point:

> Under any amendment, individuals would continue to exercise whatever choice they now have in regard to the persons or institutions from whom they obtain care. Our amendment (Kennedy-Anderson) would in no way impair the freedom of physicians to practice as they choose. Nor would it affect their responsibility for recommending and certifying the type of care necessary, whether in a hospital, a skilled nursing home, or the patient's own home. On both physicians and hospitals would continue to rest responsibility for developing improved methods of caring for aged persons, utilizing less expansive forms of care when they would prove

constructive, and speeding rehabilitation so as to avoid permanent invalidism.

There is also the question of the consistency of the AMA position on socialized medicine inasmuch as they seem to give unqualified approval to the public assistance medical program. Under these programs the Federal Government does not guarantee an individual that he will receive care in the hospital of his choice. Moreover, States set fee schedules for participating physicians and enter into contracts with certain hospitals to provide care to needy individuals on a specified cost basis. This power in the States, for some mysterious reasons, does not invoke the wrath of the AMA but those social security approach proposals which grant much more circumscribed powers to the Federal Government are described ominously in the full-page ad as "placing your health care under the Federal Government's thumb."

WHAT ABOUT COSTS?

Finally, there is the question of costs and that of fiscal responsibility. The AMA complains in the full-page ad that "the cost of such a program eventually would be staggering, and would make a serious dent in the pay envelopes of millions of Americans covered by social security."

What are the facts? The Kennedy-Anderson amendment—the latest and most refined of the social security approach proposals—is in exact actuarial balance and, thus, soundly financed. It provides hospital, nursing home, home nursing, and outpatient diagnostic services which total exactly one-half of 1 percent of payroll. To finance these benefits the amendment levies a social security tax increase equivalent to this precise amount—an increase on the tax of both the employer and employee of one-fourth of 1 percent. The workers of this country, as demonstrated by the testimony and letters in the Senate hearings, have indicated that they are willing to pay this additional amount.

As to future liberalizations, it should be made clear that the American worker has watched his social security system very closely. The result has been a sound system the solvency of which has been attested to recently by the financial experts of the Advisory Council on Social Security.

It would also be axiomatic that the American worker is capable of deciding at which point social security taxes are becoming a burden, and will so inform his elected representatives without any prodding by the AMA.

WHAT ABOUT FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY?

As to fiscal responsibility, the Kennedy-Anderson amendment is fully self-financing while the funds for the public assistance liberalizations will have to come from general revenue. The latter must come from increased taxation or reduction of other budget items if further increases in the Federal debt are to be avoided. The Finance Committee minority report points to some of the long-range cost aspects of the public assistance approach and the savings in such expenditures which will be effectuated through the use of a social security program:

> Only the social security system can provide medical care insurance for the aged in a satisfactory manner. If medical care costs are not met by social insurance, increasingly they will have to be met through the less satisfactory method of relief. Almost $400 million a year is now being spent by Federal, State, and local governments for medical care under the old-age assistance program; the committee bill would increase this to close to a billion dollars, and this would be just the beginning. In the absence of social insurance protection the present drain on general revenues will more than double in the next several years. A total of $2 billion to $2.5 billion in Federal and State funds would be required to meet the total need.

In the coming months the American people are going to make an important decision as to the method which will be used in supplying protection to our older citizens against the ever-increasing cost of adequate medical care. The people are entitled to all the facts and should not be forced to rely solely on argumentation by organizations with fixed and inflexible positions who can afford full-page advertisements.

ALL IS NOT BLACK

We are indebted to the AMA, however, for reminding us of our basic purpose; that our senior citizens are entitled to the chance to live their lives as fully as possible, with dignity and independence, with faith and pride in themselves.

The social security medical care approach to me is the logical way to make this objective a reality. The AMA program, on the other hand, is a snare and a delusion when it is characterized as the total answer to the need for action in this area. Let the people, with full knowledge of the facts and issues, decide.

CAMPAIGN ETHICS

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. SPEAKER, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, we have heard many speeches and read many articles on campaign ethics, Operation Veracity, clean campaigning, and so forth. But what about excessive expenditures of money in a campaign to defeat a Member of Congress?

Recently I read an Associated Press news release from St. Louis, Mo., dated August 25, with headlines saying: "Missouri GOP Hopes to Win House Seat in the 11th District." This newspaper article quoted Republican National Committeeman Francis C. Corley, as saying that $50,000 would be required "to win in the 11th District of Missouri," to defeat MORGAN M. MOULDER. The paper stated that:

> Corley addressed a luncheon gathering of 50 persons, including members of Missouri Republicans Unlimited, Inc., the party's fund raising arm.

The newspaper quoted Mr. Corley as follows:

> It will take $50,000 to win in the 11th of Missouri. Half of this sum to be raised in the district.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the election laws of Missouri prohibit the spending of such a large amount of money in a congressional district campaign. But regardless of the law to provide for honest elections, here we have an example of contempt for the law and a brazen plan to spend this great sum of money, more than the total salary of a term of office in Congress, to defeat an honest, outstanding, able, and courageous Member of Congress.

Where is the $50,000 or more, to defeat MORGAN M. MOULDER coming from? Is this huge sum of money coming from the people of the 11th Congressional District he so diligently represents in Congress? Or is the $50,000 or more coming from the big selfish interests who seek special privileges from our Government?

Mr. Speaker, I have faith in the people and I don't believe that they can be bought or bribed with any amount of money to turn against their friend, a man like MORGAN M. MOULDER.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The House will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 44 minutes p.m.) the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m., the House was called to order by the Speaker.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment concurrent resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. Con. Res. 745. Concurrent resolution establishing that when the two Houses adjourn on Thursday, September 1, 1960, they stand adjourned sine die.

H. Con. Res. 746. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate to sign enrolled bills.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a resolution as follows:

S. Res. 389. *Resolved,* That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Presiding Officer to join a similar committee of the House of Representatives to notify the President of the United States that the two Houses have completed the business of the session and are ready to adjourn unless he has some further communication to make to them.

OZARK RIVERS NATIONAL MONUMENT

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which would provide for the development as a national recreational area within the National Park Service of the Current and Eleven Point River area of southeastern Missouri. This development has been studied and supported by the Missouri Division of Resources and Development and by the State legislature. In a report recently published, the National Park Service added its support to the proposal for an Ozark Rivers National Monument, as this has come to be called.

The basic aim of this proposal is to maintain the natural beauty of this stream system for the use and enjoyment of everyone. As a crowding and increasingly complex civilization takes one and then another location of natural beauty and outdoor recreation, I think it is important that we set aside areas in our country where these may be preserved. The Current and Eleven Point River area is one of these.

I would like at this point to quote a portion of the summary of the Park Service report on the Ozark Rivers National Monument:

THE STUDY IN BRIEF

"Only a few miles by today's standards from St. Louis or Kansas City or Memphis lies a portion of the Ozarks still relatively wild and natural. The Ozarks are old—mellow with the beauty of great age—remnants of an ancient mountain range. Uplift and water have molded them. Climate has influenced them.

"Today, this particular area houses a unique complex of springs and rivers, caves and sinks, plants and animals. Here are many springs—some giant, some small. Here are spring-fed rivers, the Current, the Jacks Fork, and the Eleven Point—cold, clear, abounding with bass and goggle-eye.

"Here are caves created by waters of the past, many containing an unusual variety of multicolored formations, some still uncharted. Here are interesting sinks—ground surface reminders of cave roof fall-ins below. Here are found the shortleaf pine, oaks of many names, the redbud, the red wolf, the osprey, and the pileated woodpecker—overall, a surprisingly varied ecology.

"Nearly 10,000 years ago, Early Man lived beside these same waters. He too must have marveled at the springs and the rivers flowing from them. More recently, the Indian, the Frenchman, the Spaniard, the logger, each had his day. Descendants of settlers who came mainly from the Appalachians now people the area. Much of the folk culture and character of early American society remains with them.

"For years—largely because of this unusual combination of natural values—there has been interest in preservation of parts of this scene. Four State parks have been established—three along the Current River and one along the Jacks Fork. Two wildlife areas have been set aside by the Missouri Conservation Commission.

"As early as 1950, the State of Missouri recognized a need to preserve the natural qualities of the Current and Eleven Point Rivers. As recently as January 1959 the Missouri Legislature asked the Congress of the United States to establish a national recreation area to preserve the free-flowing qualities of these very rivers.

"Here in the heart of the Ozark Plateau lies a unique opportunity to set aside an outstanding type of area—one not now represented in the national park system. Here, too, is the opportunity to preserve still unspoiled rivers with many miles of shoreline.

"To preserve this area, establishment of an Ozark Rivers National Monument, as part of the national park system, is now proposed. The monument, consisting of approximately 113,000 acres, would be located along some 190 miles of the Current, Jacks Fork, and Eleven Point Rivers. This area would contain the most important portion of these scenic rivers as well as some 13 named caves, 11 geological sites, more than 40 archeological sites, several fine ecological sites, and many springs and sinks.

"Natural concentration of these features in the river valleys makes possible their preservation for public enjoyment in relatively narrow strips of land. It would be difficult to find an area where so much beauty and variety can be preserved by setting aside so little. A sizable block along the Current River has been included to allow preservation of a significant example of typical Ozark topography. Preservation of the area's fragile qualities, while allowing its use, would be the basic objective of all planning, development, and administration.

"Here would be an area preserved for use of people—an opportunity to float the Current or the Jacks Fork or the Eleven Point, to watch the osprey at work, to try camping on a gravel bar, to test the boater's or fisherman's skill, to watch the Ozarks' renowned fall colors pass by, or perhaps even just to loaf. Hiking along the riverbank or to some remote cave, sink, or site where man of yesterday lived; wandering through little known Powder Mill Cave or into spectacular Jam Up Cave; climbing down a shaded trail to magnificent Greer Spring—all of these and many other opportunities would be available to the visitor. A carefully developed interpretive program would add to his enjoyment and understanding of the area."

One of the questions that arises in establishing such a recreational area, especially one which is to include long, narrow strips of property bordering rivers, is that of the best manner of maintaining this property in the state of natural beauty which we seek.

In the bill which I have introduced I have included for consideration a plan of acquisition which would help answer this question. I propose that the Federal Government purchase the land which it will need for campsites, picnic areas, administrative buildings, and the other public services necessary in connection with a national park; and at the same time purchase a scenic easement along each bank of the rivers, leaving ownership of these lands in the hands of the present owners but restricting the use of the banks to a certain distance from the river to pursuits not inconsistent with the overall purpose of the park.

This easement along the river would operate in a manner similar to the setback ordinances of many cities which require so many feet of yard between the street and the front of the building on a particular lot. Also similar to the setback ordinances, this easement would operate as only a partial restriction on the full use and enjoyment of the property owner. In this case most of the riparian owners are farmers; their profitable utilization of the riverbank property, especially in light of bank stabilization, could easily be integrated with the use of the river for outdoor recreation.

In view of the needs of our people for areas of outdoor relaxation and enjoyment, and in view of the widespread support for developing the Current and Eleven Point Rivers area for these purposes, I urge favorable action on this bill by the Congress.

IS THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT OVERCENTRALIZING, OVERCONGESTING, AND OVERBUILDING THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA?

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month I urged the House Committee on Government Operations, of which I am a member, to make a comprehensive study of executive branch policies and practices relating to Federal decentralization, relocation, and dispersal. My request is set forth in the following letter to the gentleman from Illinois, the Honorable WILLIAM L. DAWSON:

AUGUST 3, 1960.

Hon. WILLIAM L. DAWSON,
Chairman, Committee on Government Operations, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I write to urge that the Committee on Government Operations, through an appropriate existing subcommittee or perhaps a special subcommittee, undertake as promptly as possible a study on the important policy question of the decentralization of facilities and operations of the executive branch of the Federal Government.

It seems to me that the question of Federal decentralization, relocation and dispersal falls clearly within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Government Operations, because it is directly related to the efficient and economical functioning of our Government.

The executive branch now employs approxi 2,170,000 civilians inside the United States. Even if the Federal Government assumes no additional responsibilities in the future, it is reasonable to assume that the number of Federal employees will continue to increase roughly in proportion to the increase in our total population. There is surely no reason to assume that the responsibilities of the Federal Government will diminish in the foreseeable future. And even if the number of Federal employees does not increase, it is obvious that the Government must continue, and accelerate, the present program of erecting new buildings to modernize its physical plant, to replace inefficient space with usable facilities, and to house its employees and its operations in permanent, well-designed working quarters rather than in unsightly temporary buildings and in expensive, inadequate rented space.

The question of where Federal employees and Federal buildings will be located in the future is one that, in my judgment, cries out for immediate study and long-range planning. The executive branch and each of its departments and agencies should be requested to set forth current and future plans for expansion, construction, and employee location, and their policy, if any, with respect to decentralization, dispersal, or relocation.

The Congress, it seems to me, has a larger duty than merely approving or disapproving

the construction of individual Federal buildings or facilities in particular locations.

Because of the size and complexity of the executive branch, the Congress needs to be assured that the various departments and agencies are, to the maximum extent possible, coordinating their activities in these areas, and needs to be assured that there is a clearly understood and accepted policy on Government decentralization—for or against—based on sound thinking and proper planning.

I submit that the Committee on Government Operations is the most appropriate agency of the Congress to require the presentation by the executive branch of its plans and programs, to insist on the development of a coordinated and clear policy on decentralization, and to assist in the formulation of such a policy.

The fact is that there now is no policy.

Because of my own concern about this matter, I requested the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress in January of 1960 to prepare a memorandum for me concerning decentralization policy and practice in the executive branch. A copy of the Legislative Reference Service memorandum is enclosed.

In summary, main findings of the Legislative Reference Service study are as follows:

1. "The Eisenhower administration has not declared, adopted or acted upon any form of overall policy for or against administrative decentralization."

2. "No universally understood or accepted program of administrative decentralization is being followed or is in existence."

3. "Most of the departments and agencies do not have established or announced programs or plans of their own for administrative decentralization."

4. While some decentralization has taken place within some departments and agencies since 1953, "this decentralization has been in response to specific situations rather than as a part of a very broad policy."

In essence, the Library of Congress points out that there has been no long-range planning and coordination in the executive branch concerning decentralization, and precious little thought given to the subject within individual departments and agencies.

Yet it is evident that the future location of Federal employees and Federal facilities is of vital importance to the District of Columbia and the surrounding area; to other cities and metropolitan areas in the United States which might be selected as the sites of decentralized Federal operations; and, most importantly, to the efficient and economical functioning of the Federal Government in a manner best calculated to serve the public interest.

The Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, the first Hoover Commission, in its report of May 20, 1949, pointed out that, while economy in administration can often be achieved through centralization, it is also possible to overcentralize, with the result of increasing costs and decreasing efficiency. The Commission (p. 37) stated that its task forces had found "overcentralized operations which are resulting in inefficient and expensive management." The report went on:

"Our task forces also found many instances where headquarters officials in Washington still cling to the power to make decisions even in matters of minor importance. This, too, has resulted in interminable delays in getting things done, has stultified initiative in the field services, and has resulted in decisions being made which have not taken due account of variations in local conditions."

The Commission concluded that further decentralization was needed. But, with a few exceptions such as in the Post Office Department, little has been done.

Obviously, there are certain "headquarters" functions of the Government which must be performed at the seat of government. Obviously, too, there are certain functions which are clearly field services, and can only be effectively performed in the field away from Washington, D.C.

There are, however, many operations of government which do not fall clearly into the "headquarters" category or the "field" category. It is with these operations that we must be increasingly concerned. We must determine whether they can best be performed in the District of Columbia, or elsewhere.

In these days of modern, rapid communication and transportation it seems to me that there are fewer and fewer functions which really need to be performed in Washington, D.C. A number of questions occur:

How many additional Federal employees are to be brought into the District of Columbia and surrounding area? How many new Federal buildings are to be built in or near the District? How can the District, Maryland, and Virginia make logical plans for the orderly development of the National Capital area unless the Federal Government's intentions are known on a reasonably long-range basis?

What has been and will be the effect on the metropolitan area and its people of the location of the Atomic Energy Commission and the Central Intelligence Agency outside but within a few miles of the District? Is this decentralization? Is this relocation or dispersal in the civil defense sense? Does it make sense?

If the Government continues to expand and build in the District and nearby area, what will be the cost, in terms not only of land and buildings, but in terms of congestion, vulnerability, highways, mass transportation, parking, housing, and other requirements of modern living and working?

Would not the Government save money, and maintain or improve efficiency of operations and service to the public, by locating elsewhere in the Nation certain new operations, new buildings, new employees, which need not be at the seat of the Government? Should not the Government consider the relocation to other areas of some operations which need not be in Washington, D.C.?

The decentralization of appropriate Government operations and personnel from Washington to other areas would, in my opinion, result in savings and increased efficiency in the Federal Establishment; it would reduce Government costs and overall congestion in the District of Columbia and vicinity; and it would contribute greatly to the economic health and stability of the communities and areas into which Federal operations and employees were transferred.

I make no bones about the fact that I personally feel that the Federal Government should decentralize. A part of this feeling is based upon my distress at seeing, over the last few years, the removal by the Federal Government from Milwaukee of a number of regional offices and employees, and the reduction in force of others.

While these actions have been taken in the name of efficiency and economy by the present administration, they have been harmful to Milwaukee and Wisconsin both in terms of a loss to the economy and a reduction of service to the public. Furthermore, I strongly suspect that an accurate analysis of the effects of the removal and reduction of Federal operations in Milwaukee would show the alleged efficiency and economy to be false.

However, my concern goes beyond the loss of rank by Milwaukee as a Federal operations center. I believe we are in danger of overcentralizing, overbuilding, and overcongesting in the District of Columbia, and possibly even in some other areas where the Government has regionalized to a great extent. A thorough study by the Committee on Government Operations might reach a different conclusion.

But I do think there is a huge gap in Federal planning when the executive branch has no policy, and few departments or agencies have even thought about decentralization, relocation, or dispersal.

Since we all hope and expect our Government to endure, and to operate efficiently, economically, and in tune with modern times, I respectfully urge that the Committee on Government Operations undertake a comprehensive study of Government practices and policies relating to decentralization.

Sincerely,

HENRY S. REUSS,
Member of Congress.

There follows a report prepared at my request by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress:

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE,
Washington, D.C.

To: Hon. HENRY S. REUSS.
From: History and Government Division.
Subject: Administrative decentralization in the executive branch.

On the basis of information obtained from a variety of departments and agencies in the executive branch of the Federal Government, it can be stated that the Eisenhower administration has not declared, adopted, or acted upon any form of overall policy for or against administrative decentralization.

It would be virtually impossible to approach all executive agencies on this subject, but sufficient data have been obtained from a sufficient number of those most likely to be affected or in the best position to know to make it quite clear that no universally understood and accepted program of administrative decentralization is being followed or is in existence.

A second generalization, not so sweeping in its nature, can also be made. It is that most of the departments and agencies do not have established or announced programs or plans of their own for administrative decentralization. There have been exceptions to this statement, such as the Post Office Department and the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization discussed briefly below, but in general it is valid.

A third generalization might be stated in the following terms. Administrative decentralization has occurred within some departments and agencies since 1953. This decentralization has been in response to specific situations rather than as a part of a very broad policy.

The basic criterion that appears to have been observed is that decentralization has taken place whenever the circumstances indicated that it would lead to better, more efficient, and more economical administration without impairment of services, or that services would be improved. There is considerable unanimity among the departments and agencies on this point.

In view of the functions it performs, the Bureau of the Budget is probably the most likely single agency to be in a position to survey administrative decentralization throughout the entire executive branch. Information on this subject from the Bureau was obtained primarily from Messrs. Carey and Levi, the latter being in the Bureau's Office of Management and Organization.

Both men emphasized that no overall policy in favor of or against decentralization can be said to exist. It was pointed out that such decentralization as has taken place has been done largely on an ad hoc basis whenever an evaluation of all the factors indicated that it would, on balance, be beneficial.

There is some concern with regard to administration about regional or area boundary lines among agencies already decentralized into field offices. Frequently these regional areas differ from agency to agency with the result that there is unnecessary confusion with regard to certain services or functions. Some of the agencies involved are now attempting to work out a plan for more regional boundary lines to be shared in common.

The President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization was also contacted on this issue of decentralization. Its staff director, Arthur A. Kimball, said that this was not a subject in which the committee would have a direct interest as such, but to the best of his knowledge no general policy of decentralization was in effect.

A third body within the Executive Office of the President which might have direct concern in, and knowledge about, administrative decentralization is the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization. Its Assistant Director in charge of Plans and Operations, Lewis E. Berry, stated that he knew of no general, Government-wide policy regarding administrative decentralization. He added that although OCDM has a long-range interest in this subject, its main concern is with what should be done in case of attack or under wartime conditions.

With regard to Government agencies, OCDM is concerned about problems of dispersal or relocation, which may be related to, but surely are not the same as, administrative decentralization, as the latter term is generally used. Mr. Berry mentioned the removal of the Atomic Energy Commission to Germantown, Md., as being brought about, in part at least, by the dispersal policy. The movement of the Central Intelligence Agency to Langley, Va., might be another example, but, as Mr. Berry also went on to say, these changes in location of only a few miles can hardly be considered as essentially dispersal efforts.

Mr. Berry said that most agencies have a plan or policy for the removal and safeguarding of personnel in case of attack. The OCDM also has recommended to the agencies that they have some geographical site in mind to move to in case of an emergency.

From the General Services Administration, Gerald S. Radley of the Office of the Assistant Commissioner for Planning, told the Legislative Reference Service that he knew of no overall Government program about decentralization. Mr. Radley, who works with the allocation of space for Government agencies, went on to say that decentralization policies are not the concern of GSA, but that this agency is very much affected by decentralization after it has been decided upon. Mr. Radley also observed that, on the basis of his experience, there is no particular uniformity among the departments and agencies with regard to their policies or the extent of their decentralization.

Although numerous offices in the Defense Department were contacted, little could be learned about its decentralization policies. Those persons who made any comments believe that there is no broad, standing policy as such, but that decentralization takes place when a move would seem desirable for the general operation of the Department. The Department of the Army's decentralization of its records to St. Louis, Kansas City, and other areas was given as an example. The effort to get more information from the Department of Defense is being continued.

The Department of Agriculture has always been one of the most decentralized of all Federal Government agencies. This is almost inevitable considering the nature of its work. The Department was reorganized in 1953 under Reorganization Plan No. 2 of that year with some decentralization resulting therefrom.

The Office of Administrative Management in the Department told the Legislative Reference Service that most decentralization has been carried out as the apparent need or occasion for it arose. In other words, broadly speaking, decentralization in the Department of Agriculture has been in accord with the general pattern for the executive branch in that it has been accomplished in specific cases to meet specific situations rather than as a part of a general or established policy.

As an example, it was pointed out that on two occasions since 1953 the Office of Personnel has in a sense decentralized its authority by granting field offices greater discretion in the classifying and hiring of employees.

As in the case of the Department of Agriculture, the Post Office Department must be extensively decentralized in order to perform the services for which it was established. The Post Office Department differs from the other agencies covered in this report in that it has had since 1953 an extensive, planned policy of decentralization which has now been carried out. This information was provided by Howard Lewis of the Department's Office of Public Information.

In 1954 the Post Office Department began the decentralization of some of its functions and authority to 15 regional offices in cities throughout the United States. At the time, there were no regional offices of this type. This program was completed in a period of 2 to 3 years and has been working well.

The idea behind it was that there were a great many more or less routine administrative matters that could be handled more quickly, wisely, and efficiently at something closer to the local level. The regional offices have been given considerable administrative discretion, according to Mr. Lewis, and it has worked to the advantage of the entire Department—here in Washington and in the field as well.

This decentralization was in accord with the beliefs of both the first and the second Hoover Commissions, and it was singled out for praise in a special memorandum on Post Office Department operations prepared by the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report.

Information on the subject of administration decentralization is still being sought from the Departments of Health, Education, and Welfare, Treasury, Commerce, and Interior. If it should have any special value, or affect in any way what has been said in this memorandum, it will be passed along to you as soon as it can be obtained.

The Legislative Reference Service sincerely hopes that the information contained in this memorandum will be of value to you.

FREDERICK L. SCOTT.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, the study will be undertaken and that it will have a constructive result.

THE HONORABLE SAM RAYBURN

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] kindly take the chair?

Mr. ARENDS assumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts, the majority leader, Mr. MCCORMACK.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, as you have once said, this has been a fruitful Congress and historic happenings have occurred during this Congress. It has been a hard-working Congress.

It is not my purpose to discuss the considerations, conclusions, and actions of Congress on this occasion, but to express to the membership of the body—and I know I also speak for our beloved Speaker—our sincere thanks for the unselfish cooperation that you have given to the Speaker and myself during the past 2 years.

I have always tried to be fair to every Member of the House, to try to prepare the program in such way as would recognize the exigencies that confronted each Member, and to do it insofar as I could. One of the primary duties of the majority leader—the Speaker has expressed it so well from his angle—I consider to be that of protecting the rights of the individual Member, to see that the rights of the individual Member, particularly of the minority party, are not trespassed upon. I hope I have, to the extent it is humanly possible for me to do so, accomplished that fundamental objective during this Congress.

Each and every one of us is a Member of this great body, and we are here in our own right. I never forget that fact. I recognize the fact that there is a quality possessed by each Member—there must have been—for the people of his district to elect him here, whether for 1 term, 10 terms, or 20 terms; and the more terms one is elected from his district the more profound is the respect and confidence of the people of that district in him. I have always kept in mind that fact, and I realize and appreciate very much the extreme consideration extended to me by all of the Members. In saying that I recognize my own human weaknesses.

If on any occasion I have said anything that has disturbed any Member, I want to assure him it was not intentional; and if anyone has any thought in his mind as a result of any action or expression of mine that disturbs him, I offer him my apology, because I never intend to hurt anybody. I always want to do the things that I would want to have someone else do to me if they were in my place as majority leader.

I particularly want to express my thanks to the minority leader and the minority whip. CHARLIE HALLECK recognizes the responsibilities of responsible leadership; LES ARENDS recognizes the responsibilities of responsible leadership. Responsible leadership recognizes that fact. There has never been any disturbing atmosphere between Speaker RAYBURN and myself and CHARLIE HALLECK and LES ARENDS. Naturally, I particularly refer to CHARLIE HALLECK because he is the leader of the Republican Party in this body.

CHARLIE HALLECK'S word is his bond. CHARLIE HALLECK has always been frank.

When you take anything up with him, he has always frankly expressed himself, and he has always frankly given his opinion and his word, which, as I said, has always been his bond.

So, without going any further, I think I have covered enough so that you all know of my deep feeling of appreciation. I want to express my sincere thanks to all of the Members for your kindnesses and courtesies on behalf of the Speaker and myself, and again I particularly pay my tribute to my very dear friend from Indiana, the distinguished Republican leader, CHARLIE HALLECK.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana, the minority leader, Mr. HALLECK.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 647) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the thanks of the House are presented to the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, Speaker of the House of Representatives, for the able, impartial, and dignified manner in which he has presided over the deliberations and performed the arduous duties of the Chair during the present term of Congress.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, we are approaching the end of another session of the greatest legislative body on earth—the Congress of the United States.

It has been my high privilege to serve in one body of this Congress—the House of Representatives—for 25 years.

For the most of this time the man who has occupied the chair of the Speaker of the House has been SAM RAYBURN of Texas.

I happen to be a Republican, and he is a Democrat.

Speaking politically—and politics does have some consideration around here—maybe I can be forgiven if I say that from that standpoint I might wish history could have been otherwise.

But that is not the only consideration.

As far as I am concerned, since history dictated that for most of my career the Speaker of the House be a member of the opposition party, let me be quick to say that I can conceive of no one more qualified by experience, by wisdom, and by character to carry the burden of his high office than SAM RAYBURN.

The whole world admires a man of granite.

SAM RAYBURN, with the long span of his years of service, with his devotion to the cause for which he has dedicated his life, and with the integrity from which he has never wavered, has himself chiseled a monument of Americanism which will never erode in the hearts and minds of the people who have known him, and who have worked with him here in this Chamber.

I happen to have a conviction that a man born in this wonderful country of ours owes a full measure of his talents to the total welfare of our Nation.

SAM RAYBURN has given this full measure.

Through the years he has been my friend, as I hope he feels I have been his friend.

Together, at such times as it has been my privilege, we have consulted on legislation vital to all citizens.

Never have I found him unfair. Never have I found him arbitrary.

Rather, to me, is SAM RAYBURN a man wise in the complicated mechanics of legislation, a man who understands that the science of politics is a science of compromise.

But most of all, have I found in SAM RAYBURN a statesman who has a deep conviction that ours is the greatest Government ever devised by the mind of man and who is dedicated to making it work so that our free way of life shall endure through all time. [Applause, the Members rising.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is unanimous, and that is the way it should be, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER resumed the chair.

The SPEAKER. Mr. HALLECK and Members of the House of Representatives of the 86th Congress.

We have come to the close of one of the busiest and, in my opinion, one of the most fruitful sessions of Congress it has ever been my privilege to serve in. I am winding up my 24th term. Throughout all the years in which I have served with something like 3,000 men and women in this House, I can look back on each and every one of them as men and women of high character, splendid people, and true representatives of their people. In being true representatives of their people they have served not only their people but the people of our beloved country.

I shall never cease to hold in grateful memory the kindnesses and the compassion with which you have treated me. As Mr. HALLECK said, this is an arduous and onerous position. Just 44 men have held it. Through the kindness of my folks back home and through your favor, I have served as Speaker longer than any other man in the history of the country, and on September 16 I will have wound up 16 years in this position. I want to say again to you, as I have said so often, that the House of Representatives has been my life and it has been my love. I never had any ambition to be a Governor or a Senator. I wanted to come to this body and stay here as long as my people favored me. They have been kind and fine to me as you have been.

We have a great and glorious country. It does not have a long history, but it has a glorious history. No people on the face of the earth who live today or who ever did live have ever lived under a government where the people, the individual man and woman, boy and girl, has as much liberty or enjoys as much freedom. It has been my purpose, and I trust in some way that I have lived up to it, and from the first time that I ever took this gavel, it was my hope, my trust and my ambition that I would uphold the dignity and the prerogatives of the House of Representatives against all winds—it mattered not from where they came. So today my heart is full of gratitude to you. I know you have worked hard—each and every one of you. I know you deserve some rest and change, and I trust that you get it to the fullest degree. I trust that when you come back here on the 3d of next January, you will be in good health, ready to go to work in doing the world's great work, because the Members of this House of Representatives are challenged to do the world's great work and part of that work is to keep our country strong, that it may remain free. We are faced with people throughout the earth, and especially in one part of it, whose people know no freedom and whose rulers acknowledge no God.

That makes it a dangerous world in which we live, I think the most dangerous which the civilization, yes, the Christian civilization that we know and love, has ever faced. It stands in greater danger today that it has at any time in the Christian era.

I know you are determined, have been in these past sessions, and that you will be in the sessions to come, and dedicated to keeping this country strong and keeping it free.

As you go home I wish you everything that is good. I wish that your people will receive you as you should be received, and that they will show appreciation for the great and the fine work you have done.

God bless you and keep you every one.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey (at the request of Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina), for today, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. ALGER, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. WALTER, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. PORTER, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. BROOKS of Texas, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. ROBERTS, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. PUCINSKI, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming, for 15 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. MACHROWICZ.

Mr. COAD and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. TOLL and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DULSKI and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. STRATTON and to include extraneous material.

Mr. WALTER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. STRATTON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOLIFIELD in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

(At the request of Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mrs. DWYER.

Mr. KEITH in two instances.

Mr. WALLHAUSER.

Mr. HOEVEN.

Mr. KEARNS.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona.

(At the request of Mr. MCCORMACK, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. KARTH.

Mr. KITCHIN.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado.

Mr. SANTANGELO in two instances.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan in three instances.

Mr. UDALL in two instances.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey.

Mr. BUCKLEY.

Mr. TELLER.

Mr. MAHON.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2074. An act for the relief of Eric and Ida Mae Hjerpe;

H.R. 4306. An act to provide education and training for the children of veterans dying of a disability incurred after January 31, 1955, and before the end of compulsory military service and directly caused by military, naval, or air service, and for other purposes;

H.R. 4428. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of John David Almeida, a minor;

H.R. 5396. An act to amend title 28 of the United States Code to provide for transfer of cases between the district courts and the Court of Claims and for other purposes;

H.R. 7618. An act for the relief of H. P. Lambert Co., Inc., and Southeastern Drilling Corp.;

H.R. 7877. An act for the relief of Vladislav Fotich;

H.R. 11561. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Army to convey part of lock and dam numbered 10, Kentucky River, Madison County, Ky., to the Pioneer National Monument Association for use as part of a historic site;

H.R. 11573. An act to provide for the free entry of an electron microscope for the use of William Marsh Rice University of Houston, Tex., an electron microscope for the use of the University of Colorado Medical Center, Denver, Colo., and for other purposes;

H.R. 12993. An act to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955, as amended.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. In accordance with the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 745, the Chair declares the 2d session of the 86th Congress adjourned without day.

Accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 52 minutes, p.m., Thursday, September 1, 1960), the House adjourned sine die.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS ENROLLED AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration reported that on September 2, 1960, that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 383. An act to authorize the annexation of certain real property of the United States by the city of Wyandotte, Mich.;

H.R. 816. An act to convey certain lands in Oklahoma to the Cheyenne and Arapaho Indians, and for other purposes;

H.R. 1526. An act for the relief of F. P. Tower, Lillie B. Lewis, the estate of Manuel Branco, John Santos Carinhas, Joaquin Gomez Carinhas, and Manuel Jesus Carinhas;

H.R. 2565. An act to promote effectual planning, development, maintenance, and coordination of wildlife, fish, and game conservation and rehabilitation in military reservations;

H.R. 3536. An act for the relief of Guadalupe Villarreal, Jr.;

H.R. 7810. An act to credit periods of internment during World War II to certain Federal employees of Japanese ancestry for purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act and the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951;

H.R. 7990. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain lands of the United States to the Citizen Band of Potawatomi Indians of Oklahoma;

H.R. 8156. An act for the relief of Jack Kent Cooke;

H.R. 8166. An act for the relief of the Crum-McKinnon Building Co., Billings, Mont.;

H.R. 8424. An act to amend section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949 with respect to positions in the Library of Congress;

H.R. 8665. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a memorial to Theodore Roosevelt in the National Capital" to provide for the construction of such memorial by the Secretary of the Interior;

H.R. 9715. An act for the relief of Otis Drinkard;

H.R. 10087. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit taxpayers to elect an overall limitation on the foreign tax credit;

H.R. 10311. An act providing that certain provisions of Public Law 335 dated October 7, 1949 (63 Stat. 724), shall apply to the Mercedes division of the lower Rio Grande rehabilitation project, Texas;

H.R. 10341. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants-in-aid to universities, hospitals, laboratories, and other public or nonprofit institutions to strengthen their programs of research and research training in sciences related to health;

H.R. 10548. An act to amend the Helium Act of March 3, 1925, as amended, for the defense, security, and the general welfare of the United States;

H.R. 10586. An act to enable the Oregon Short Line Railroad Co. to convey title to certain lands in Idaho to the Pocatello First Corp. of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints;

H.R. 10841. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to place bamboo pipe stems on the free list;

H.R. 10960. An act to amend section 5701 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the excise tax upon cigars, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11322. An act for the relief of Col. Joseph A. Nichols;

H.R. 11380. An act for the relief of Mr. Joe J. Farmer;

H.R. 12043. An act to amend sections 22, 23, and 24, title 13, United States Code, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12383. An act to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to make benefits more realistic in terms of present wage rates, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12458. An act to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for the work of the President's Committee on Employment for the Physically Handicapped;

H.R. 12536. An act relating to the treatment of charges for local advertising for purposes of determining the manufacturers sale price;

H.R. 12574. An act to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, so as to provide that an injured employee shall have the right to select his own physician, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12580. An act to extend and improve coverage under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system and to remove hardships and inequities, improve the financing of the trust funds, and provide disability benefits to additional individuals under such system; to provide grants to States for medical care for aged individuals of low income; to amend the public assistance and maternal and child welfare provisions of the Social Security Act; to improve the employment compensation provisions of such act; and for other purposes;

H.R. 12659. An act to suspend for a temporary period the import duty on heptanoic acid, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12699. An act to cancel a deed of trust to the United States from the predecessor in name of Gallaudet College and any evidence of indebtedness related to the same transaction, to quiet the college's title to property belonging to it, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12759. An act to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes;

H.R. 13021. An act to provide for assistance in the development of Latin America and in the reconstruction of Chile, and for other purposes;

H.R. 13053. An act to increase the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the U.S. Park Police, the White House Police, and for other purposes;

H.R. 13066. An act to amend section 4(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended;

H.R. 13161. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes;

H.J. Res. 311. Joint resolution authorizing the erection of a statue of Taras Shevchenko on public grounds in the District of Columbia;

H.J. Res. 402. Joint resolution granting the consent and approval of Congress for the States of Virginia and Maryland and the District of Columbia to enter into a compact related to the regulation of mass transit in the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area, and for other purposes;

H.J. Res. 704. Joint resolution to remove copyright restrictions upon the musical composition "Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag," and for other purposes;

H.J. Res. 723. Joint resolution extending an invitation to the Federation Aeronautique Internationale to hold the 1962 world sport parachuting championships at Orange, Mass.; and

H.J. Res. 784. Joint resolution amending the act of July 14, 1960, to extend the time within which the U.S. Constitution 175th Anniversary Commission shall report to Congress, and including certain amendments relating to housing.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to the authority granted the Speaker by House Concurrent Resolution 746, 86th Congress, he did on September 3, 1960, sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 383. An act to authorize the annexation of certain real property of the United States by the city of Wyandotte, Mich.;

H.R. 816. An act to convey certain lands in Oklahoma to the Cheyenne and Arapaho Indians, and for other purposes;

H.R. 1526. An act for the relief of F. P. Tower, Lillie B. Lewis, the estate of Manuel Branco, John Santos Carinhas, Joaquin Gomez Carinhas, and Manuel Jesus Carinhas;

H.R. 2565. An act to promote effectual planning, development, maintenance, and coordination of wildlife, fish, and game conservation and rehabilitation in military reservations;

H.R. 3536. An act for the relief of Guadalupe Villarreal, Jr.;

H.R. 7810. An act to credit periods of internment during World War II to certain Federal employees of Japanese ancestry for purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act and the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951;

H.R. 7990. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain lands of the United States to the Citizen Band of Potawatomi Indians of Oklahoma;

H.R. 8156. An act for the relief of Jack Kent Cooke;

H.R. 8166. An act for the relief of the Crum-McKinnon Building Co., Billings, Mont.;

H.R. 8424. An act to amend section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949 with respect to positions in the Library of Congress;

H.R. 8665. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a memorial to Theodore Roosevelt in the National Capital" to provide for the construction of such memorial by the Secretary of the Interior;

H.R. 9715. An act for the relief of Otis Drinkard;

H.R. 10087. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit taxpayers to elect an overall limitation on the foreign tax credit;

H.R. 10311. An act providing that certain provisions of Public Law 335 dated October 7, 1949 (63 Stat. 724), shall apply to the Mercedes division of the lower Rio Grande rehabilitation project, Texas;

H.R. 10341. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants-in-aid to universities, hospitals, laboratories, and other public or nonprofit institutions to strengthen their programs of research and research training in sciences related to health;

H.R. 10548. An act to amend the Helium Act of March 3, 1925, as amended, for the defense, security, and the general welfare of the United States;

H.R. 10586. An act to enable the Oregon Short Line Railroad Co. to convey title to certain lands in Idaho to the Pocatello First Corp. of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints;

H.R. 10841. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to place bamboo pipe stems on the free list;

H.R. 10960. An act to amend section 5701 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the excise tax upon cigars, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11322. An act for the relief of Col. Joseph A. Nichols;

H.R. 11380. An act for the relief of Mr. Joe J. Farmer;

H.R. 12043. An act to amend sections 22, 23, and 24, title 13, United States Code, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12383. An act to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to make benefits more realistic in terms of present wage rates, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12458. An act to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for the work of the President's Committee on Employment for the Physically Handicapped;

H.R. 12536. An act relating to the treatment of charges for local advertising for purposes of determining the manufacturers sale price;

H.R. 12574. An act to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, so as to provide that an injured employee shall have the right to select his own physician, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12580. An act to extend and improve coverage under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system and to remove hardships and inequities, improve the financing of the trust funds, and provide disability benefits to additional individuals under such system; to provide grants to States for medical care for aged individuals of low income; to amend the public assistance and maternal and child welfare provisions of the Social Security Act; to improve the employment compensation provisions of such act; and for other purposes;

H.R. 12659. An act to suspend for a temporary period the import duty on heptanoic acid, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12699. An act to cancel a deed of trust to the United States from the predecessor in name of Gallaudet College and any evidence of indebtedness related to the same transaction, to quiet the college's title to property belonging to it, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12759. An act to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes;

H.R. 13021. An act to provide for assistance in the development of Latin America and in the reconstruction of Chile, and for other purposes;

H.R. 13053. An act to increase the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the U.S. Park Police, the White House Police, and for other purposes;

H.R. 13066. An act to amend section 4(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended;

H.R. 13161. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes;

H.J. Res. 311. Joint resolution authorizing the erection of a statue of Taras Shevchenko on public grounds in the District of Columbia;

H.J. Res. 402. Joint resolution granting the consent and approval of Congress for the States of Virginia and Maryland and the District of Columbia to enter into a compact related to the regulation of mass transit in the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area, and for other purposes;

H.J. Res. 704. Joint resolution to remove copyright restrictions upon the musical composition "Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag," and for other purposes;

H.J. Res. 723. Joint resolution extending an invitation to the Federation Aeronautique Internationale to hold the 1962 world sport parachuting championships at Orange, Mass.; and

H.J. Res. 784. Joint resolution amending the act of July 14, 1960, to extend the time within which the U.S. Constitution 175th Anniversary Commission shall report to Congress, and including certain amendments relating to housing.

And enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 882. An act for the relief of the heirs of J. B. White;

S. 1092. An act to provide for the construction of the Cheney division, Wichita Federal reclamation project, Kansas, and for other purposes;

S. 1545. An act to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so as to authorize elimination of a hearing in certain cases under section 408;

S. 1663. An act directing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain property in the State of North Dakota to the city of Bismarck, N. Dak.;

S. 1670. An act to provide for the granting of mineral rights in certain homestead lands in the State of Alaska;

S. 1740. An act to amend section 202(b) of the Communications Act of 1934 in order to expand the Federal Communications Commission's regulatory authority under such section;

S. 1764. An act to amend title 32, United States Code, to authorize the payment of certain claims against the National Guard;

S. 1898. An act to promote the public interest by amending the Communications Act of 1934, to provide a pre-grant procedure in case of certain applications; to impose limitations on payoffs between applicants; to require disclosure of payments made for broadcasting of certain matter; to grant authority to impose forfeitures in the broadcast service; and to prohibit deceptive practices in contests of intellectual knowledge, skill, or chance; and for other purposes;

S. 1964. An act to amend the act requiring certain common carriers by railroad to make reports to the Interstate Commerce Commission with respect to certain accidents in order to clarify the requirements of such act;

S. 2195. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the western division of the Dalles Federal reclamation project, Oregon, and for other purposes;

S. 2353. An act for the relief of Col. John A. Ryan, Jr.;

S. 2757. An act to supplement the act of June 14, 1926, as amended, to permit any State to acquire certain public lands for recreation use;

S. 2761. An act to invalidate payments made for certain emergency conservation measures under the program authorized by the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1957;

S. 2770. An act for the relief of Borinquen Home Corp.;

S. 2917. An act to establish a price support level for milk and butterfat;

S. 2959. An act to clarify the right of States to select certain public lands subject to any outstanding mineral lease or permit;

S. 3146. An act to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to donate dairy products and other agricultural commodities for use in home economics courses;

S. 3212. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior and the Administrator of General Services to convey certain public and acquired lands in the State of Nevada to the county of Mineral, Nev.;

S. 3267. An act to amend the act of October 17, 1940, relating to the disposition of certain public lands in Alaska;

S. 3399. An act to authorize the exchange of certain property within Shenandoah National Park, in the State of Virginia, and for other purposes;

S. 3439. An act authorizing the President of the United States of America to present a gold medal to Robert Frost, a New England poet;

S. 3533. An act to protect farm and ranch operators making certain land use changes under the Great Plains conservation program against loss of acreage allotments;

S. 3619. An act to make permanent law the provisions of section 408 of the National Housing Act regulating savings and loan holding companies;

S. 3623. An act to designate and establish that portion of the Hawaii National Park on the island of Maui, in the State of Hawaii, as the Haleakala National Park, and for other purposes;

S. 3665. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to grant an easement over certain lands to the trustees of the Cincinnati Southern Railway, their successors and assigns;

S. 3681. An act authorizing the Rhode Island Turnpike and Bridge Authority to combine for financing purposes the bridge across the West Passage of Narragansett Bay with the Newport Bridge and any other project acquired or constructed by said authority;

S. 3688. An act to amend the act of December 20, 1944, with respect to certain powers of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia;

S. 3759. An act authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands to Auburn University, Auburn, Ala.;

S. 3771. An act to amend certain provisions of the Trust Indenture Act of 1939, as amended;

S. 3773. An act to amend certain provisions of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940, as amended;

S.J. Res. 9. Joint resolution to provide for the removal of a reservation of timber rights from a patent issued to Ivan H. McCormack;

S.J. Res. 176. Joint resolution authorizing the preparation and printing of a revised edition of the Constitution of the United States of America—Analysis and Interpretation, published in 1953 as Senate Document No. 170 of the 82d Congress; and

S.J. Res. 209. Joint resolution providing for the establishment of an annual National Forest Products Week.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

On September 2, 1960:

H.R. 2074. An act for the relief of Eric and Ida Mae Hjerpe;

H.R. 4306. An act to provide education and training for the children of veterans dying of a disability incurred after January 31, 1955, and before the end of compulsory military service and directly caused by military, naval, or air service, and for other purposes;

H.R. 4428. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of John David Almeida, a minor;

H.R. 5396. An act to amend title 28 of the United States Code to provide for transfer of cases between the district courts and the Court of Claims and for other purposes;

H.R. 7618. An act for the relief of H. P. Lambert Co., Inc., and Southeastern Drilling Corp.;

H.R. 7877. An act for the relief of Vladislav Fotich;

H.R. 11561. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Army to convey part of lock and dam numbered 10, Kentucky River, Madison County, Ky., to the Pioneer National Monument Association for use as part of a historic site;

H.R. 11573. An act to provide for the free entry of an electron microscope for the use of William Marsh Rice University of Houston, Tex., an electron microscope for the use of the University of Colorado Medical Center, Denver, Colo., and for other purposes; and

H.R. 12993. An act to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955, as amended.

On September 6, 1960:

H.R. 383. An act to authorize the annexation of certain real property of the United States by the city of Wyandotte, Mich.;

H.R. 816. An act to convey certain lands in Oklahoma to the Cheyenne and Arapaho Indians, and for other purposes;

H.R. 1526. An act for the relief of F. P. Tower, Lillie B. Lewis, the estate of Manuel Branco, John Santos Carinhas, Joaquin Gomez Carinhas, and Manuel Jesus Carinhas;

H.R. 2565. An act to promote effectual planning, development, maintenance, and coordination of wildlife, fish, and game conservation and rehabilitation in military reservations;

H.R. 3536. An act for the relief of Guadalupe Villarreal, Jr.;

H.R. 7810. An act to credit periods of internment during World War II to certain Federal employees of Japanese ancestry for purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act and the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951;

H.R. 7990. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain lands of the United States to the Citizen Band of Potawatomi Indians of Oklahoma;

H.R. 8156. An act for the relief of Jack Kent Cooke;

H.R. 8166. An act for the relief of the Crum-McKinnon Building Co., Billings, Mont.;

H.R. 8424. An act to amend section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949 with respect to positions in the Library of Congress;

H.R. 8665. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a memorial to Theodore Roosevelt in the National Capital" to provide for the construction of such memorial by the Secretary of the Interior;

H.R. 9715. An act for the relief of Otis Drinkard;

H.R. 10087. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit taxpayers to elect an overall limitation on the foreign tax credit;

H.R. 10311. An act providing that certain provisions of Public Law 335 dated October 7, 1949 (63 Stat. 724), shall apply to the Mercedes division of the lower Rio Grande rehabilitation project, Texas;

H.R. 10341. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants-in-aid to universities, hospitals, laboratories, and other public or nonprofit institutions to strengthen their programs of research and research training in sciences related to health;

H.R. 10548. An act to amend the Helium Act of March 3, 1925, as amended, for the defense, security, and the general welfare of the United States;

H.R. 10586. An act to enable the Oregon Short Line Railroad Co. to convey title to certain lands in Idaho to the Pocatello First Corp. of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints;

H.R. 10841. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to place bamboo pipestems on the free list;

H.R. 10960. An act to amend section 5701 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the excise tax upon cigars, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11322. An act for the relief of Col. Joseph A. Nichols;

H.R. 11380. An act for the relief of Mr. Joe J. Farmer;

H.R. 12043. An act to amend sections 22, 23, and 24, title 13, United States Code, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12383. An act to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to make benefits more realistic in terms of present wage rates, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12458. An act to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for the work of the President's Committee on Employment for the Physically Handicapped;

H.R. 12536. An act relating to the treatment of charges for local advertising for purposes of determining the manufacturers sale price;

H.R. 12574. An act to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, so as to provide that an injured employee shall have the right to select his own physician, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12580. An act to extend and improve coverage under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system and to remove hardships and inequities, improve the financing of the trust funds, and provide disability benefits to additional individuals under such system; to provide grants to States for medical care for aged individuals of low income; to amend the public assistance and maternal and child welfare provisions of the Social Security Act; to improve the employment compensation provisions of such act; and for other purposes;

H.R. 12659. An act to suspend for a temporary period the import duty on heptanoic acid, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12699. An act to cancel a deed of trust to the United States from the predecessor in name of Gallaudet College and any evidence of indebtedness related to the same transaction, to quiet the college's title to property belonging to it, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12759. An act to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes;

H.R. 13021. An act to provide for assistance in the development of Latin America and in the reconstruction of Chile, and for other purposes;

H.R. 13053. An act to increase the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the U.S. Park Police, the White House Police, and for other purposes;

H.R. 13066. An act to amend section 4(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended;

H.R. 13161. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes;

H.J. Res. 311. Joint resolution authorizing the erection of a statue of Taras Shevchenko on public grounds in the District of Columbia;

H.J. Res. 402. Joint resolution granting the consent and approval of Congress for the States of Virginia and Maryland and the District of Columbia to enter into a compact related to the regulation of mass transit in the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area, and for other purposes;

H.J. Res. 704. Joint resolution to remove copyright restrictions upon the musical composition "Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag," and for other purposes;

H.J. Res. 723. Joint resolution extending an invitation to the Federation Aeronautique Internationale to hold the 1962 world sport parachuting championships at Orange, Mass.; and

H.J. Res. 784. Joint resolution amending the act of July 14, 1960, to extend the time within which the U.S. Constitution 175th Anniversary Commission shall report to Congress, and including certain amendments relating to housing.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS APPROVED AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

The President, subsequent to the sine die adjournment of the Congress, notified the Clerk of the House that on the following dates he had approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On August 31, 1960:

H.R. 5789. An act to incorporate the Agricultural Hall of Fame; and

H.R. 11666. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

On September 2, 1960:

H.R. 900. An act to validate certain overpayments inadvertently made by the United States to several of the States and to relieve certifying and disbursing officers from liability therefrom;

H.R. 2339. An act to revise, codify, and enact into law, title 39 of the United States Code, entitled "The Postal Service";

H.R. 5747. An act to amend section 152, title 18, United States Code, with respect to the concealment of assets in contemplation of bankruptcy;

H.R. 7263. An act for the relief of Edward Ketchum;

H.R. 7792. An act for the relief of Martin A. Mastandrea;

H.R. 8989. An act for the relief of Ralph W. Anderson;

H.R. 9417. An act for the relief of Harry Kaloian;

H.R. 10431. An act for the relief of Isami Nozuka (also known as Isami Notsuka);

H.R. 10455. An act to amend the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920;

H.R. 10598. An act to clarify certain provisions of the Criminal Code relating to the importation or shipment of injurious mammals, birds, amphibians, fish, and reptiles (18 U.S.C. 42(a), 42(b)); and relating to the transportation or receipt of wild mammals or birds taken in violation of State, National, or foreign laws (18 U.S.C. 43), and for other purposes;

H.R. 11188. An act for the relief of Edward S. Anderson;

H.R. 11327. An act for the relief of Chauncey A. Ahalt;

H.R. 11390. An act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11420. An act for the relief of Ferdinand Hofacker;

H.R. 11460. An act for the relief of Edouard E. Perret;

H.R. 11486. An act for the relief of Richard J. Power;

H.R. 12326. An act making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority and certain study commissions, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12475. An act for the relief of Claude L. Wimberly;

H.R. 12476. An act for the relief of John H. Esterline;

H.R. 12619. An act making appropriations for mutual security and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 658. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation in connection with the centennial of the birth of Jane Addams, founder and leader of Chicago's Hull House.

On September 6, 1960:

H.R. 2178. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to make certain changes in the road at Whites Branch, Grapevine Reservoir, Tex.;

H.R. 4826. An act for the relief of Arthur E. Collins;

H.R. 6084. An act for the relief of J. Butler Hyde;

H.R. 7758. An act to improve the administration of oversea activities of the Government of the United States, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8054. An act for the relief of William Edgar Weaver;

H.R. 8289. An act to accelerate the commencing date of civil service retirement annuities, and for other purposes;

H.R. 9377. An act to provide for the protection of forest cover for reservoir areas under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Engineers;

H.R. 9406. An act for the relief of William J. Huntsman;

H.R. 11165. An act for the relief of Robert J. Reeves;

H.R. 12350. An act for the relief of Marion John Nagurski;

H.R. 12471. An act for the relief of Capt. Lucien B. Clark O2051623, MSC, U.S. Army;

H.R. 12530. An act to authorize adjustment, in the public interest, of rentals under leases entered into for the provision of commercial recreational facilities at the John H. Kerr Reservoir, Va.-N.C., and

H.R. 12563. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved August 17, 1937, as amended.

On September 8, 1960:

H.R. 2069. An act for the relief of James H. Presley;

H.R. 3313. An act to amend section 200 of the Soldiers and Sailors Civil Relief Act of 1940 to permit the establishment of certain facts by a declaration under penalty of perjury in lieu of an affidavit, and for other purposes;

H.R. 4059. An act to amend title 28 of the United States Code relating to actions for infringements of copyrights by the United States;

H.R. 6597. An act to revise the boundaries of Dinosaur National Monument and provide an entrance road or roads thereto, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6871. An act to amend title III of the Public Health Service Act, to authorize project grants for graduate training in public health, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7124. An act to require the payment of tuition on account of certain persons who attend the public schools of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H.R. 9432. An act for the relief of Maj. Edmund T. Coppinger;

H.R. 9958. An act for the relief of Brooklyn Steel Warehouse Co.;

H.R. 10921. An act to amend section 35 of chapter III of the Life Insurance Act for the District of Columbia;

H.R. 11813. An act to amend the Menominee Termination Act;

H.R. 12533. An act to amend the Migratory Bird Treaty Act to increase the penalties for violation of that act, and for other purposes;

H.R. 13021. An act to provide for assistance in the development of Latin America and in the reconstruction of Chile, and for other purposes;

H.R. 13053. An act to increase the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the U.S. Park Police, the White House Police, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 13161. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

On September 13, 1960:

H.R. 383. An act to authorize the annexation of certain real property of the United States by the city of Wyandotte, Mich.;

H.R. 4428. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of John David Almeida, a minor;

H.R. 5396. An act to amend title 28 of the United States Code to provide for transfer of cases between the district courts and the Court of Claims and for other purposes;

H.R. 7877. An act for the relief of Vladislav Fotich;

H.R. 7990. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain land of the United States to the Citizen Band of Potawatomi Indians of Oklahoma;

H.R. 8424. An act to amend section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949 with respect to positions in the Library of Congress;

H.R. 8665. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a memorial to Theodore Roosevelt in the National Capital" to provide for the construction of such memorial by the Secretary of the Interior;

H.R. 10311. An act providing that certain provisions of Public Law 335 dated October 7, 1949 (63 Stat. 724), shall apply to the Mercedes division of the lower Rio Grande rehabilitation project, Texas;

H.R. 10548. An act to amend the Helium Act of March 3, 1925, as amended, for the defense, security, and the general welfare of the United States;

H.R. 11561. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Army to convey part of lock and dam No. 10, Kentucky River, Madison County, Ky., to the Pioneer National Monument Association for use as part of a historic site;

H.R. 11573. An act to provide for the free entry of an electron microscope for the use of William Marsh Rice University of Houston, Tex., an electron microscope for the use of the University of Colorado Medical Center, Denver, Colo., and for other purposes;

H.R. 12043. An act to amend sections 22, 23, and 24, title 13, United States Code, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12383. An act to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to make benefits more realistic in terms of present wage rates, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12458. An act to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for the work of the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped;

H.R. 12574. An act to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, so as to provide that an injured employee shall have the right to select his own physician, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12580. An act to extend and improve coverage under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system and to remove hardships and inequities, improve the financing of the trust funds, and provide disability benefits to additional individuals under such system; to provide grants to States for medical care for aged individuals of low income; to amend the public assistance and maternal and child welfare provisions of the Social Security Act; to improve the unemployment compensation provisions of such act; and for other purposes;

H.R. 12699. An act to cancel a deed of trust to the United States from the predecessor in name of Gallaudet College and any evidences of indebtedness related to the same transaction, to quiet the college's title to property belonging to it, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12993. An act to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955, as amended;

H.R. 13066. An act to amend section 4(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended;

H.J. Res. 311. Joint resolution authorizing the erection of a statue of Taras Shevchenko on public grounds in the District of Columbia; and

H.J. Res. 704. Joint resolution to remove copyright restrictions upon the musical composition "Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag," and for other purposes.

On September 14, 1960:

H.R. 816. An act to convey certain lands in Oklahoma to the Cheyenne and Arapaho Indians, and for other purposes;

H.R. 1526. An act for the relief of F. P. Tower, Lillie B. Lewis, the estate of Manuel Branco, John Santos Carinhas, Joaquin Gomez Carinhas, and Manuel Jesus Carinhas;

H.R. 3536. An act for the relief of Guadalupe Villarreal, Jr.;

H.R. 4306. An act to provide education and training for the children of veterans dying of a disability incurred after January 31, 1955, and before the end of compulsory military service and directly caused by military, naval, or air service, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7810. An act to credit periods of internment during World War II to certain Federal employees of Japanese ancestry for purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act and the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951;

H.R. 8156. An act for the relief of Jack Kent Cooke;

H.R. 8166. An act for the relief of the Crum-McKinnon Building Co., Billings, Mont.;

H.R. 9715. An act for the relief of Otis Drinkard;

H.R. 10087. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit taxpayers to elect an overall limitation on the foreign tax credit;

H.R. 10586. An act to enable the Oregon Short Line Railroad Co. to convey title to certain lands in Idaho to the Pocatello First Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints;

H.R. 10960. An act to amend section 5701 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the excise tax upon cigars, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11322. An act for the relief of Col. Joseph A. Nichols;

H.R. 11380. An act for the relief of Mr. Joe J. Farmer;

H.R. 12536. An act relating to the treatment of charges for local advertising for purposes of determining the manufacturers sale price;

H.R. 12759. An act to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 784. Joint resolution amending the act of July 14, 1960, to extend the time within which the United States Constitution One Hundred and Seventy-fifth Anniversary Commission shall report to Congress and including certain amendments relating to housing.

On September 15, 1960:

H.R. 2565. An act to promote effectual planning, development, maintenance, and coordination of wildlife, fish, and game conservation and rehabilitation in military reservations;

H.R. 10341. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants-in-aid to universities, hospitals, laboratories, and other public or nonprofit institutions to strengthen their programs of research and research training in sciences related to health;

H.R. 12659. An act to suspend for a temporary period the import duty on heptanoic acid, and for other purposes;

H.J. Res. 402. Joint resolution granting the consent and approval of Congress for the States of Virginia and Maryland and the District of Columbia to enter into a compact related to the regulation of mass transit in the Washington, District of Columbia metropolitan area, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 723. Joint resolution extending an invitation to the Federation Aeronautique Internationale to hold the 1962 world sport parachuting championships at Orange, Mass.

On September 16, 1960:

H.R. 10941. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to place bamboo pipe stems on the free list.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS DISAPPROVED AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

The message further announced that the President had disapproved of the following bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

STABILIZE MINING OF LEAD AND ZINC

H.R. 8860. I have withheld approval of H.R. 8860, "to stabilize the mining of lead and zinc by small domestic producers on public, Indian, and other lands, and for other purposes."

H.R. 8860 authorizes lead and zinc subsidies based on the difference between market prices and a price of 17 cents per pound for lead and 14½ cents per pound for zinc. The subsidies would be paid on the output of mines producing not more than 2,000 tons annually of each commodity.

The problems of our lead and zinc miners have caused me concern for some time. To help solve these problems, the administration has taken administrative actions and has twice proposed legislation which the Congress did not enact. Thereafter, in October of 1958, I reduced imports by imposing quantitative controls.

Now the Congress has enacted H.R. 8860, but unfortunately it would harm rather than help the lead-zinc industry. It would negate the progress of recent years, increase the problems of lead-zinc producers, subject the market to instability, and burden our taxpayers with unsound subsidies. Apart from the fact that the appropriations authorized by the bill would be completely inadequate to pay the proposed subsidies—with the result that the bill's intended beneficiaries could be misled into production for which they would not receive the promised subsidies—the bill has these fatal defects:

First, H.R. 8860 would intensify the industry's problems by generating substantial additional production at the expense of other miners' jobs. Its subsidies would induce the opening for full-time production of many mines which are not now operating, some of which have operated only intermittently in the past. The substantial additions to supply would depress lead and zinc prices and thus cause cutbacks and layoffs of mineworkers in the unsubsidized mines.

Second, the subsidized production induced by this bill would complicate, even frustrate, programs now in effect that are gradually bringing the production and demand of these commodities into balance. As a result of existing import controls and continuing international cooperation, the volume of imports is at the lowest levels, and constitutes the smallest percentage of total lead-zinc in supply, in nearly a decade. This has made it possible during 1959 for domestic lead and zinc producers to reduce excess stocks and to increase mine output. While consumption of these two metals has been at disappointing levels, the domestic industry should, with increased demand, again move rapidly forward to normal and stable operation at reasonable prices. The depressed prices that would result from the subsidy program would represent a backward step. A lasting solution can best be achieved through a worldwide balance of production and consumption, and that is the object of past and current international consultations.

Third, approval of H.R. 8860 would generate demands for equal treatment and similar subsidies from other producers of lead and zinc as well as producers of many other minerals. Such a system of subsidies would make a substantial portion of domestic mining totally dependent on Federal appropriations and would thereby lessen incentives for the technological improvement vital to the continued health of American mining.

For these reasons, I am compelled to withhold my approval of H.R. 8860.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 2, 1960.*

TARIFF—MARKING OF IMPORTED ARTICLES AND CONTAINERS

H.R. 5054. I am withholding my approval from H.R. 5054, "to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to the marking of imported articles and containers."

The bill would provide that new packaging for articles imported in containers

required by present law to be marked with the name of the country of origin must be similarly marked by the repackager, whether the importer, distributor, retailer, or other handler of the merchandise. Goods in packages not so marked would be subject to seizure and forfeiture. The requirement could be waived only where found to necessitate such substantial changes in customary trade practices as to cause undue hardship.

H.R. 5054 runs counter to one of our major foreign policy objectives—the reduction of unnecessary barriers and hindrances to trade. The burdens the bill would impose are unnecessary because the Federal Trade Commission requires the disclosure of the foreign origin of repackaged imported articles when it is in the public interest to do so.

The United States and other principal trading nations of the world have recognized that burdensome marking requirements can be a hindrance to trade and have agreed to the principle that such hindrances should be reduced to a minimum. H.R. 5054 might well result in successive domestic handlers requiring written assurances of proper marking in order to avoid the severe penalty of seizure and forfeiture. The cost and the complications involved in such cumbersome paperwork would tend to discourage such imports. Moreover, this measure could prove ultimately damaging to our export-expansion efforts, for needlessly restrictive action on our part could readily lead to similarly restrictive action by other countries against American goods.

In addition, the bill would unnecessarily extend the Bureau of Customs into new areas by requiring the Bureau to follow goods after they have entered the stream of domestic commerce and to act against handlers of merchandise who are not importers. The Bureau would be required to determine the nature of customary trade practices and the possibility of undue hardship in a field outside its normal competence. Aside from the unnecessary additional expense, these new responsibilities would be most awkward for the Bureau to administer.

For these reasons I am withholding my approval of H.R. 5054.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 5, 1960.*

H.R. 6767, RAYMOND BAURKOT

I have withheld my approval from H.R. 6767, for the relief of Raymond Baurkot.

This bill would permit the filing of a tax refund claim that was in fact filed after the deadline date set by law.

Public Law 85–859 provided for the refund of internal revenue taxes paid on certain liquors lost as the result of a major disaster occurring prior to the date of enactment, September 2, 1958. It required that claims be filed on or before March 2, 1959. The claimant filed on March 16, 1959, for a refund of $382.10 paid in taxes on beer destroyed in a 1955 flood. He asserted that he had telephoned the branch office of the district director's office in Easton, Pa., on February 26, 1959, and was informed by an unidentified person that he had a "couple of months" in which to file.

The Easton branch office has no record of any such request for information from Mr. Baurkot. That office, moreover, does not itself handle alcohol-tax problems. Its standard procedure is to refer such inquiries to the assistant regional commissioner's office in Philadelphia which has general supervision over such matters.

Information concerning Public Law 85–859 and its filing requirements were widely disseminated to the liquor industry by the Internal Revenue Service. It appears that the claimant received the industry circular published by the Service but thereafter misplaced it. This circular set forth the March 2 deadline and specifically provided that inquiries regarding claims should be addressed to the assistant regional commissioner's office.

Under these circumstances I am unable to approve this bill. The statutory period of limitations, which the Congress has included in the revenue system as a matter of sound policy, is essential to the achievement of finality in tax administration. Efficient administration of the tax laws is dependent upon taxpayers meeting statutory deadlines. To grant special relief in this case would be to discriminate against other similarly situated taxpayers and to create an undesirable precedent.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 8, 1960.*

H.R. 7242, BANKRUPTCY ACT—STATUTORY LIENS

I have withheld my approval of H.R. 7242, to amend sections 1, 57j, 64a(5), 67b, 67c, and 70c of the Bankruptcy Act, and for other further purposes.

I recognize the need for legislation to solve certain problems regarding the priority of liens in bankruptcy, but this bill is not a satisfactory solution. It would unduly and unnecessarily prejudice the sound administration of Federal tax laws. In some cases, for example, mortgages would be given an unwarranted priority over Federal tax liens even though the mortgage is recorded after the filing of the tax lien.

This and other defects of the bill can, I believe, be corrected without compromising its primary and commendable purpose. The Treasury Department and the proponents of H.R. 7242 have been working toward solution of recognized problems in present law. Further cooperative efforts should produce satisfactory legislation that would avoid the undesirable effects of this bill.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 8, 1960.*

H.R. 2074, ERIC AND IDA MAE HJERPE

I am withholding my approval from H.R. 2074, for the relief of Eric and Ida Mae Hjerpe.

In their income tax return for 1952 these taxpayers reported as income certain disability payments received by Mr. Hjerpe from his employer. During 1952, however, the Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit had held such disability payments excludable from gross income, even though the Internal Revenue Service had ruled to the contrary, and in 1957 the U.S. Supreme Court affirmed.

The taxpayers' claim for refund, based upon the excludability of the disability pay received by Mr. Hjerpe, was filed almost 4 years after the 1952 return had been filed and approximately 10½ months after the expiration of the applicable 3-year statutory period of limitations. The claim was accordingly disallowed.

The last Congress enacted legislation to grant general relief, on a nondiscriminatory basis, to taxpayers who had paid income tax on disability pay excludable from gross income under the Supreme Court decision. Relief was not provided, however, for taxpayers who, as in the case at hand, had not attempted to protect their rights by filing timely claims for refund.

H.R. 2074 would direct the payment to Mr. and Mrs. Hjerpe of $1,096.48 as a refund notwithstanding their late filing and failure to qualify under the general relief legislation. The bill is similar to several others from which I have withheld my approval in the past.

The statutory period of limitations, which the Congress has included in the revenue system as a matter of sound policy, is essential in order to achieve finality in tax administration. A substantial number of taxpayers paid income tax on disability payments received by them and failed to file timely claims for refund. To grant special relief in this case, where a refund was not claimed within the time prescribed by law, would constitute a discrimination against other similarly situated taxpayers and would create an undesirable precedent.

Under the circumstances, therefore, I am compelled to withhold my approval of the bill.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 14, 1960.*

H.R. 7618, H. P. LAMBERT CO., INC., AND SOUTHEASTERN DRILLING CORP.

I am withholding my approval from H.R. 7618, a bill for the relief of H. P. Lambert Co., Inc., and Southeastern Drilling Corp.

The bill would waive the applicable statute of limitations and permit a claim for refund of duty paid on certain nondutiable equipment imported into the United States.

The claimants requested that certain oilfield equipment be entered under provisions of the tariff act affording duty-free status to property originally manufactured in the United States. The equipment was admitted duty-free after the Lambert Co., the brokerage firm in the case, had posted a bond to assure production of the documentation required to establish U.S. origin. At the request of the brokerage firm, the time covered by the bond was extended on several occasions. At the end of 2 years,

and when no further request for extension had been received, customs officials personally contacted the firm and advised that the duty would be payable if the requisite documentation were not furnished promptly. Despite this notice and despite a subsequent assessment of the duty, of which the brokerage firm was apprised and which it could have protested within 60 days, the Lambert Co. failed to produce proof of U.S. origin until after its consideration was barred by applicable law and regulations.

Statutes of limitations should be set aside only when justified by compelling equitable considerations. No such considerations appear here. The only extenuating circumstance advanced in this case is that the notice of the assessment of duty was sent to the wrong party. I am advised, however, that the notice was properly sent to the brokerage firm as the party liable for the payment of duty. Furthermore, the firm, presumably well-versed in the customs laws, had not only been given repeated extensions on the bond it posted but had also been specifically advised of the imminence of an assessment of duty.

For these reasons I am unable to approve this bill.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 14, 1960.*

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2431. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of a report entitled "Project Twenty-Twelve," which is a program for the Bureau of Land Management until the year 2012; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2432. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated August 3, 1960, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on an interim report on Raritan River, N.J., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted November 13, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 455); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with one illustration.

2433. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, relative to reporting that an adequate soil survey and land classification of the lands in the Weber Basin project, Utah, has been completed as a part of the investigations required in the formulation of a definite plan for project development, pursuant to Public Law 172, 83d Congress; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2434. A letter from the Deputy Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a report of the tort claims paid by the Veterans' Administration during the fiscal year which ended June 30, 1960, pursuant to Public Law 601, 79th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2435. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated August 25, 1960, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a cooperative beach erosion control study of San Diego County, Calif., appendix IV, phase 2, prepared under the provisions of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented, and in compliance with Public Law 525, 79th Congress and Public Law 85-500 (H. Doc. No. 456); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with 14 illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana: Committee on Science and Astronautics. Report on activities of the Committee on Science and Astronautics; without amendment (Rept. No. 2215). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 12720. A bill to amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954; with amendment (Rept. No. 2216). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 7937. A bill to amend section 1(14)(a) of the Interstate Commerce Act to insure the adequacy of the national railroad freight car supply, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2217). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MORGAN: Committee on Foreign Affairs. Report on relations of United States with Panama (Rept. No. 2218). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. Twenty-sixth report of the Committee on Government Operations (Rept. No. 2219). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. Twenty-seventh report of the Committee on Government Operations (Rept. No. 2220). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government operations. Twenty-eighth report of the Committee on Government Operations (Rept. No. 2221). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BONNER: Committee of conference. H.R. 2565. A bill to promote effectual planning, development, maintenance, and coordination of wildlife, fish, and game conservation and rehabilitation in military reservations (Rept. No. 2222). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.R. 13236. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to make certain technical revisions in the income, excise, and administrative provisions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROWN of Missouri:

H.R. 13237. A bill to provide for adjustments in the lands or interests therein acquired for the Bull Shoals Reservoir project, Arkansas-Missouri, by the reconveyance of certain lands or interests therein to the former owners thereof, their heirs or assigns; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 13238. A bill to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1954 to authorize the donation of not to exceed $1 million of surplus agricultural commodities and other property surplus to the needs of the United States for relief of flood victims in Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HARMON:

H.R. 13239. A bill to amend section 4369 of title 39, United States Code, to provide that each newspaper shall regularly file with the Postmaster General, and publish a report detailing the space devoted in such newspaper to each candidate for public office and to each political party; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 13240. A bill to amend title V of the Social Security Act to strengthen and improve the child-welfare services program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MASON:

H.R. 13241. A bill to supplement the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to complete economic freedom and thus remove the cause of the "class struggle" between employers and employees; to solve the tax-wage-price-profit problem; to pay cash aid to the needy to enable them to buy food, clothing and shelter, and to pay their medical bills; and to solve the farm problem and thus reduce the high cost of eating; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MEADER:

H.R. 13242. A bill providing that the President shall issue a proclamation in every even-numbered year calling upon the American people to display the flag of the United States on election day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13243. A bill to amend the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, to require that full information concerning executive departments and agencies be furnished congressional committees; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 13244. A bill to provide for the establishment, under the National Science Foundation, of a National Science Academy; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. OLIVER:

H.R. 13245. A bill to provide for the conveyance to the State of Maine of certain lands located in such State; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H.R. 13246. A bill to create the Freedom Commission for the development of the science of counteraction to the world Communist conspiracy and for the training and development of leaders in a total political war; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 13247. A bill to amend the Sugar Act of 1948; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 13248. A bill to implement the Agreement on the Importation of Educational, Scientific and Cultural Materials, opened for signature at Lake Success on November 22, 1950; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WIER:

H.R. 13249. A bill to amend section 33 of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act so as to provide a system of safety rules, regulations, and safety inspection and training, and for other purposes. (This act may be cited as the Federal Employees Safety Act); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WILLIAMS (by request):

H.R. 13250. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to provide that disabled persons meeting certain requirements may not

be prohibited from operating motor vehicles in interstate or foreign commerce under certain rules and regulations of the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H.R. 13251. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide coverage under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system for self-employed tree farmers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BENNETT of Michigan:

H.R. 13252. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that, for purposes of disability insurance benefits and the disability freeze, quarters of coverage may be determined on the basis of the period during which wages were earned rather than the period during which paid; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 13253. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to assist in providing rental housing specially tailored to the needs of elderly persons under a program which is separate and distinct from the regular rental housing program contained in section 207 of that act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 13254. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit taxpayers to depreciate tangible property over a 60-month period; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.R. 13255. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the furnishing of institutional convalescent, and nursing home care for certain disabled veterans, to authorize the construction of facilities for the furnishing of such care, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 13256. A bill to provide for grants-in-aid to the States for the treatment of narcotic drug addicts in closed institutions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 13257. A bill to increase the penalties for the sale and distribution of narcotic drugs in violation of the Federal narcotics laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JUDD:

H.R. 13258. A bill to authorize a contribution to the Government of the Ryukyu Islands for the purpose of providing compensation for use of private property and damage to persons and property arising from acts of the U.S. Forces before the entry into force of the Japanese Peace Treaty; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McCORMACK (by request):

H.R. 13259. A bill to amend paragraph 1102 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, with respect to the duties on hair of the Cashmere goat; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MERROW:

H.R. 13260. A bill for the relief of the State of New Hampshire; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 13261. A bill to amend part I of title III of the Communications Act of 1934, to make it unlawful for broadcasters to make unauthorized deletions from certain matters submitted for broadcasting; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 13262. A bill to amend section 1346 of title 28, United States Code, to permit suits against the United States arising out of contracts entered into by nonappropriated fund activities of or under departments and agencies of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PILLION:

H.R. 13263. A bill to increase from $600 to $700 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 13264. A bill to increase from $600 to $800 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 13265. A bill to provide for the establishment of a U.S. Academy of Advanced Sciences and Research Coordination; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.R. 13266. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that employers having pension plans under which payments are correlated with social security benefits shall be subject to an additional tax in cases where increases in such benefits result in a reduction in their own contributions under such plans and are not passed on to their retired employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WOLF:

H.R. 13267. A bill to amend section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H.R. 13268. A bill to provide compensation for disability or death resulting from injury to employees in employment which expose employees to radioactive materiel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts:

H.R. 13269. A bill to amend the act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 682), relating to the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact relating to control and reduction of pollution in the waters of the New England States; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 13270. A bill to provide that three Members of the House of Representatives and three Members of the Senate shall be members of the American Battle Monuments Commission; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H.R. 13271. A bill to authorize the establishment of the Ozark Rivers National Monument in the State of Missouri, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GEORGE:

H.R. 13272. A bill to amend the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H.R. 13273. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that volunteer fire companies which are exempt from tax under section 501 of such code shall be subject to tax on their unrelated business income but shall not lose their exemption because of such income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PILLION:

H.R. 13274. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that volunteer fire companies which are exempt from tax under section 501 of such code shall be subject to tax on their unrelated business income but shall not lose their exemption because of such income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.R. 13275. A bill to provide for adjusting conditions of competition between certain domestic industries and foreign industries with respect to the level of wages and the working conditions in the production of articles imported into the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. WEIS:

H.R. 13276. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that volunteer fire companies which are exempt from tax under section 501 of such code shall be subject to tax on their unrelated business income but shall not lose their exemption because of such income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H.R. 13277. A bill to eliminate the prohibition contained in section 1613 of title 38, United States Code, against affording education or training to an eligible veteran of the Korean conflict beyond 8 years after his discharge; and, to make January 31, 1965, the uniform deadline beyond which such education or training may not be afforded; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H.R. 13278. A bill to establish the requirement that U.S. Government aircraft carriers hereafter shall be constructed alternately in U.S. Government shipyards and private yards; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BARR:

H.J. Res. 805. Joint resolution providing for the celebration of Memorial Day on the last Monday of May of each year; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.J. Res. 806. Joint resolution to provide for the compilation of rubber footwear import statistics by type of footwear; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIEHLMAN:

H.J. Res. 807. Joint resolution to provide for a commission to study and report on the influence of foreign trade upon business and industrial expansion in the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H.J. Res. 808. Joint resolution to provide for a commission to study and report on the influence of foreign trade upon business and industrial expansion in the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. Con. Res. 733. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that all of our U.S. naval shipyards and facilities be maintained on a fully manned operational basis performing essential Navy or other Department of Defense work in the interest of our national defense, and that the President of the United States be urged to instruct the Secretary of Defense to take all necessary steps to insure this end, including the immediate cancellation and withdrawal of any and all instructions or orders issued or contemplated by the Department of the Navy incompatible with this purpose; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LANE:

H. Con. Res. 734. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that all of our U.S. naval shipyards and facilities be maintained on a fully manned operational basis performing essential Navy or other Department of Defense work in the interest of our national defense, and that the President of the United States be urged to instruct the Secretary of Defense to take all necessary steps to insure this end, including the immediate cancellation and withdrawal of any and all instructions or orders issued or contemplated by the Department of the Navy incompatible with this purpose; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MERROW:

H. Con. Res. 735. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that all of our U.S. naval shipyards and facilities be maintained on a fully manned operational basis

performing essential Navy or other Department of Defense work in the interest of our national defense, and that the President of the United States be urged to instruct the Secretary of Defense to take all necessary steps to insure this end, including the immediate cancellation and withdrawal of any and all instructions or orders issued or contemplated by the Department of the Navy incompatible with this purpose; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. OLIVER:

H. Con. Res. 736. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that all of our U.S. naval shipyards and facilities be maintained on a fully manned operational basis performing essential Navy or other Department of Defense work in the interest of our national defense, and that the President of the United States be urged to instruct the Secretary of Defense to take all necessary steps to insure this end, including the immediate cancellation and withdrawal of any and all instructions or orders issued or contemplated by the Department of the Navy incompatible with this purpose; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TOLL:

H. Con. Res. 737. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that all of our U.S. naval shipyards and facilities be maintained on a fully manned operational basis performing essential Navy or other Department of Defense work in the interest of our national defense, and that the President of the United States be urged to instruct the Secretary of Defense to take all necessary steps to insure this end, including the immediate cancellation and withdrawal of any and all instructions or orders issued or contemplated by the Department of the Navy incompatible with this purpose; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H. Con Res. 738. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that all of our U.S. naval shipyards and facilities be maintained on a fully manned operational basis performing essential Navy or other Department of Defense work in the interest of our national defense, and that the President of the United States be urged to instruct the Secretary of Defense to take all necessary steps to insure this end, including the immediate cancellation and withdrawal of any and all instructions or orders issued or contemplated by the Department of the Navy incompatible with this purpose; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. Con. Res. 739. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the President should instruct the American Ambassador to the United Nations to cause the Soviet Union to abide by the standing General Assembly resolutions on Hungary or, by their failure to do so, to be expelled from membership in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. Con. Res. 740. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress in favor of granting relief to the domestic carpet industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H. Con. Res. 741. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that all of our U.S. naval shipyards and facilities be maintained on a fully manned operational basis performing essential Navy or other Department of Defense work in the interest of our national defense, and that the President of the United States be urged to instruct the Secretary of Defense to take all necessary steps to insure this end, including the immediate cancellation and withdrawal of any and all instructions or orders issued or contemplated by the Department of the Navy incompatible with this purpose; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. Con. Res. 742. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that all of our U.S. naval shipyards and facilities be maintained on a fully manned operational basis performing essential Navy or other Department of Defense work in the interest of our national defense, and that the President of the United States be urged to instruct the Secretary of Defense to take all necessary steps to insure this end, including the immediate cancellation and withdrawal of any and all instructions or orders issued or contemplated by the Department of the Navy incompatible with this purpose; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H. Con. Res. 743. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President of the United States express the sympathy of the people of the United States for the victims of Congolese brutality; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER:

H. Con. Res. 744. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that all of our U.S. naval shipyards and facilities be maintained on a fully-manned operational basis performing essential Navy or other Department of Defense work in the interest of our national defense, and that the President of the United States be urged to instruct the Secretary of Defense to take all necessary steps to insure this end, including the immediate cancellation and withdrawal of any and all instructions or orders issued or contemplated by the Department of the Navy incompatible with this purpose; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TABER:

H. Con. Res. 747. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress in favor of granting relief to the domestic carpet industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. Res. 638. Resolution to establish a House Committee on the Captive Nations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. Res. 639. Resolution extending greetings and felicitations of the House of Representatives to the people of Brookfield, West Brookfield, North Brookfield, East Brookfield, Warren, and New Braintree, Mass., on the occasion of the 300th anniversary of the settlement of Quaboag Plantation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. Res. 642. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Un-American Activities to conduct a full and complete study of each intelligence agency of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H.R. 13279. A bill for the relief of Ernest Morris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAHILL:

H.R. 13280. A bill for the relief of Mary Minniti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 13281. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of the Burnham Chemical Co. against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 13282. A bill for the relief of Abigniew F. Buczek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOLEY:

H.R. 13283. A bill for the relief of Kalliopi Kakalis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOODELL:

H.R. 13284. A bill for the relief of Jean Hsu Shao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 13285. A bill for the relief of Michael Brauer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. INOUYE:

H.R. 13286. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Crisanta Cabanting; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHANSEN:

H.R. 13287. A bill for the relief of Mian Abdul Salam; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLUCZYNSKI:

H.R. 13288. A bill for the relief of Kazimierz Niezabitowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PORTER:

H.R. 13289. A bill for the relief of Albert E. Mumma; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13290. A bill for the relief of Kenneth P. Taylor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13291. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Billie Smathers Sherlock; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13292. A bill for the relief of John D. R. Cole; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 13293. A bill for the relief of Jan Binkowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13294. A bill for the relief of Ludwika Kochan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. QUIGLEY:

H.R. 13295. A bill for the relief of certain members of the U.S. Air Force; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13296. A bill for the relief of Bernard F. Figlock, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RABAUT:

H.R. 13297. A bill for the relief of John A. Dutka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H.R. 13298. A bill for the relief of Dr. and Mrs. Demetrios Flessas and two children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SANTANGELO:

H.R. 13299. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Carmela Dovi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 13300. A bill for the relief of Jose Alraham Pizarde Aquilara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VANIK:

H.R. 13301. A bill for the relief of Bohdan Lubaczewski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.R. 13302. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Suad J. Khuri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 13303. A bill for the relief of Josip Civadelic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLF:

H.R. 13304. A bill for the relief of John Feiereisen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XX,

540. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Francis J. Reuter, Charlottesville, Va., relative to a redress of grievance against the Government and asking for restitution and compensation, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

In compliance with Public Law 601, 79th Congress, title III, Regulation of Lobbying Act, section 308(b), which provides as follows:

(b) All information required to be filed under the provisions of this section with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate shall be compiled by said Clerk and Secretary, acting jointly, as soon as practicable after the close of the calendar quarter with respect to which such information is filed and shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate jointly submit their report of the compilation required by said law and have included all registrations and quarterly reports received.

QUARTERLY REPORTS

The following reports for the first calendar quarter of 1960 were received too late to be included in the published reports for that quarter:

A. Active-Retired Lighthouse Service Employees Association, Post Office Box 2169, South Portland, Maine.
D. (6) $492. E. (9) $281.36.

A. Claris Adams, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. AFL–CIO Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,812. E. (9) $5,362.51.

A. William B. Allen, 917 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Rubber, Cork, Linoleum, and Plastic Workers of America, High at Mill Street, Akron, Ohio.
D. (6) $2,210. E. (9) $19.25.

A. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. American Civil Liberties Union, 156 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,030.07. E. (9) $2,030.07.

A. American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.
D. (6) $7,120.80. E. (9) $7,120.80.

A. American Dental Association, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $10,637.34. E. (9) $10,637.34.

A. American Gas Association, Inc., 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. American Legion.
D. (6) $60,032.16. E. (9) $33,468.88.

A. American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $161.75. E. (9) $4,973.07.

A. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $455.85. E. (9) $17.50.

A. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 11 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $1,468.75.

A. American Thrift Assembly, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $532. E. (9) $10,100.44.

A. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $10,290.06. E. (9) $15,675.24.

A. American Veterinary Medical Association, 600 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $604.11.

A. American Yugoslav Claims Committee, 61 West 87th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $384.25. E. (9) $401.23.

A. Robert E. Ansheles, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Thrift Assembly, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Apache Tribe of the Mescalero Reservation, Mescalero, N. Mex.

A. Apparel Industry Committee on Imports, 1130 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $2,688.37.

A. Anne Archbold, 3905 Reservoir Road NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $500.

A. Arnold, Fortas & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $173.27.

A. Lester Asher, 130 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Illinois State Conference of Building and Construction Trades, 130 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $50.

A. Association of Stock Exchange Firms, 120 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Charles E. Babcock, Route 2, Box 406, Vienna, Va.
B. National Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, 3025 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
D. (6) $150. E. (9) $1.

A. Balfour, Guthrie & Co., Ltd., 72 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $1,012.42.

A. William J. Barnhard, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Chamber of Commerce for Trade with Italy, Inc., 105 Hudson Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $35.68.

A. Carl H. Berglund, 1219 Washington Building, Tacoma, Wash.
E. (9) $40.92.

A. Helen Berthelot, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $3,471.79.

A. C. B. Blankenship, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $3,352.48.

A. Mrs. Paul Blanshard, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Unitarian Fellowship for Social Justice.
D. (6) $180. E. (9) $120.

A. J. Wiley Bowers, Sixth and Cherry Streets, Chattanooga, Tenn.
B. Tennessee Valley Public Power Association, Sixth and Cherry Streets, Chattanooga, Tenn.

A. Roland Boyd, 218 East Louisiana Street, McKinney, Tex.
B. Wherry Housing Association, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $8,365.35. E. (9) $679.06.

A. Boykin & De Francis, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mrs. Claire Hugo Stinnes, Grossenbaumerstrasse 253, Mulheim Ruhr, Germany.
E. (9) $160.

A. Boykin & De Francis, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Studiengesellschaft fur Privatrechtliche Auslandsinteressen, e.v. Controscarpe 46, Germany.
E. (9) $270.

A. Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, 1122 Engineers Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Mrs. Fred L. Bull, 4312 Rowalt Drive, College Park, Md.
B. National Congress of Parents & Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. John J. Burke, 1062 West Platinum Street, Butte, Mont.
B. Pacific Northwest Power Co., Post Office Box 1445, Spokane, Wash.
E. (9) $550.

A. George P. Byrne, Jr., 53 Park Place, New York, N.Y.
B. U.S. Wood Screw Service Bureau, 53 Park Place, New York, N.Y.

A. C. G. Caffrey, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.
D. (6) $760.20.

A. Canal Zone Central Labor Union-Metal Trades Council, AFL–CIO, Box 471, Balboa Heights, C.Z.
D. (6) $1,963. E. (9) $1,324.72.

A. Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Cities Service Petroleum, Inc., 70 Pine Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $118.

A. Colorado Railroad Association, 845 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.
E. (9) $704.64.

A. Committee for Broadening Commercial Bank Participation in Public Financing.

A. Committee on Cooperative Advertising, 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Committee for Return of Confiscated German and Japanese Property, 926 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $100.

A. Eugene P. Conser, 36 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 36 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Julien D. Conover, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $2.40.

A. Bernard J. Conway, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Dental Association, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $3,625.

A. Council of Conservationists, Inc., 10 East 40th Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Fred Smith & Co., Inc., 10 East 40th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Council of State Chambers of Commerce, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $845.73. E. (9) $845.73.

A. County Supervisors' Association of California, 1100 Elks Building, Sacramento, Calif.
E. (9) $781.56.

A. Paul L. Courtney, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300.

A. Oscar Cox, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $636.25.

A. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
D. (6) $1,054.60. E. (9) $1,054.60.

A. Leo J. Crowley, 840 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.
B. Colorado Railroad Association, 845 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $704.64. E. (9) $704.64.

A. S. P. Deas, 520 National Bank of Commerce Building, New Orleans, La.
E. (9) $38.45.

A. William C. Doherty, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,125.

A. Douglas, Obear & Campbell, 822 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Anne Archbold, 3905 Reservoir Road, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500.

A. Henry I. Dworshak, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $9.10.

A. John W. Edelman, 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Textile Workers Union of America, 99 University Place, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,410.34. E. (9) $660.41.

A. Harold Edwards, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Health Federation, 703 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $700.

A. John W. Emeigh, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $656.11. E. (9) $21.

A. Mrs. Albert E. Farwell, Box 188, Route 2, Vienna, Va.
B. National Congress of Parents & Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. James Finucane, 926 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Committee for Return of Confiscated German & Japanese Property, 926 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100.

A. Berchmans T. Fitzpatrick, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Wood, King & Dawson, 48 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Florida Ship Canal Navigation District, 720 Florida Title Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
E. (9) $1,350.

A. E. F. Forbes, 604 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., 604 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $7,500.

A. Mrs. J. A. Ford, 808 North Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
B. Townsend Plan, Inc., 808 North Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.

A. James F. Fort, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $128.60.

A. Robert W. Frase, 1820 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Book Publishers Council, Inc., 24 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $1,681.75.

A. M. J. Galvin, 207 Union Depot Building, St. Paul, Minn.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $1,688.87.

A. General Federation of Women's Clubs, 1734 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Miss Chloe Gifford, 1734 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. General Federation of Women's Clubs, 1734 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John A. Gosnell, 801 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Small Business Men's Association.
D. (6) $900.

A. Group Health Association of America, 343 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $217.

A. Alfred N. Guertin, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $28.

A. Rodger S. Gunn, 4618 Highland Drive, Salt Lake City, Utah.
B. Liberty Under Law, Inc., Post Office Box 2013, Salt Lake City, Utah.

A. Hoyt S. Haddock, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. AFL–CIO Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,040. E. (9) $198.74.

A. Hoyt S. Haddock, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $340.06.

A. Hoyt S. Haddock, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Seafarers' Section, MTD, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $204.72.

A. William A. Hanscom, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Oil, Chemical & Atomic Workers International Union, 1840 California Street, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $225.

A. Robert E. Harper, 1913 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Business Publications, Inc., 1913 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John A. Hartman, Jr., 67 Broad Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Cable & Radio Corp., 67 Broad Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $950.65.

A. Hedrick & Lane, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee on Cooperative Advertising, 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Chas. H. Heltzel, 606 Commerce Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Pacific Power & Light Co., Public Service Building, Portland, Oreg.
D. (6) $930. E. (9) $467.27.

A. Joseph D. Henderson, 431 Balter Building, New Orleans, La.
B. American Association of Small Business.
D. (6) $1,875.

A. Jake D. Hill, 1006 Security Federal Building, Columbia, S.C.
B. South Carolina Railroad Association.
E. (9) $75.86.

A. Home Town Free Television Association, 1735 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Vernon F. Hovey, 101 Nott Terrace, Schenectady, N.Y.
B. National Dairy Products Corp., 260 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $269.38.

A. Harold K. Howe, Mills Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Institute of Laundering, Box 1187, Joliet, Ill.
D. (6) $2,649.99. E. (9) $1,139.29.

A. Harold K. Howe, Mills Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Lawn Mower Institute, Inc., Mills Building, Washington, D.C.

A. B. A. Hungerford, 53 Park Place, New York City.
B. George P. Byrne, 63 Park Place, New York, N.Y.

A. John M. Hurley, 302 Hoge Building, Seattle, Wash.
B. Washington Railroad Association.
D. (6) $886.54.

A. Illinois State Conference of Building & Construction Trades, 130 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $3,500. E. (9) $3,143.58.

A. Robert C. Jackson, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $290.

A. Jewelry Industry Tax Committee, Inc., 820 Highland Avenue, Newark, N.J.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $104.75.

A. Peter Dierks Joers, 810 Whittington Avenue, Hot Springs, Ark.
B. Dierks Forests, Inc., 810 Whittington Avenue, Hot Springs, Ark.

A. Glendon E. Johnson, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $302.85.

A. Jerome J. Keating, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington D.C.
B. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,873.

A. Elizabeth A. Kendall, 2310 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $183.

A. Charles E. Kief, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $1,093.75.

A. Joseph T. King, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Associated Equipment Distributors, Sprinkler Irrigation Association, Aluminum Extruders Council, and Northwestern Lumbermen's Association.
E. (9) $409.61.

A. Mr. and Mrs. Harry L. Kingman.
D. (6) $1,420. E. (9) $1,420.

A. Kominers & Fort, 529 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Atlantic, Gulf & Great Lakes Shipbuilding Association, 529 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Charles R. Larson, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $656.11. E. (9) $14.50.

A. Dillard B. Lasseter, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $300.

A. Alan Latman, 200 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. National Committee for Effective Design Legislation, 200 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $792.23.

A. Jonathan Lindley, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
D. (6) $450. E. (9) $26.40.

A. Donald Linville, 205 West Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Hardboard Association, 205 West Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $210.

A. Harold O. Lovre, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $78.65.

A. LeRoy E. Lyon, Jr., 530 West Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. California Railroad Association, 215 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $3,777.54. E. (9) $2,621.55.

A. J. A. McCallam, 1507 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $604.11.

A. William J. McDonald, 3005 Fernside Boulevard, Alameda, Calif.
B. National Council of Naval Air Stations Employee Organizations, 3005 Fernside Boulevard, Alameda, Calif.

A. Joseph B. McGrath, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,019.25. E. (9) $329.42.

A. Charles R. McNeill, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Bankers Association, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $2.55.

A. William P. MacCracken, Jr., 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Mrs. Willi Zietz, Savoy Hilton Hotel, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $150.

A. John W. MacKay, 918 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Postal Clerks Union, 918 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,700.10. E. (9) $350.

A. MacLeish, Spray, Price & Underwood, 134 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,300. E. (9) $950.77.

A. Albert E. Maddocks, 1883 South Seventh East, Salt Lake City, Utah.
B. Liberty Under Law, Inc., Post Office Box 2013, Salt Lake City, Utah.

A. Don Mahon, Box 959, Ben Franklin Station, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $796.34.

A. James D. Mann, 714 Sheraton Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Private Truck Council of America, Inc., 714 Sheraton Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Tommy M. Martin, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $656.11. E. (9) $12.

A. Arnold Mayer, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America, 2800 North Sheridan Road, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,205. E. (9) $377.

A. Ellis E. Meredith, 1130 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Apparel Industry Committee on Imports, 1130 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $312.50.

A. Ross A. Messer, Post Office Box 1611, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Post Office & General Services Maintenance Employees, Post Office Box 1611, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $108.80.

A. M. Barry Meyer, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $42.30.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Safe Harbor Water Power Corp., 90 Broad Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $50,000. E. (9) $14.30.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Helena W. Shire Trust, Helena Shire Oppenheimer, Ann Oppenheimer Kennedy, Nathan Oppenheimer, Jr., the Marine Trust Co. of Western New York, Buffalo, N.Y., trustees.
D. (6) $5,000.

A. John R. Minor, 1025 Connecticut Avenue N.W., Washington, D.C.
B. County Supervisors' Association of California, 1100 Elks Building, Sacramento, Calif.
D. (6) $750.

A. Willis C. Moffatt, First Security Building, Boise, Idaho.
B. Standard Oil Co. of California.

A. Harry L. Moffett, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $13.25.

A. Curtis Morris, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Gas Association, Inc., 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Joseph J. Mulhern, 11 Pemberton Square, Boston, Mass.
D. (6) $7,000. E. (9) $833.94.

A. Andrew P. Murphy, Jr., 1625 L Street N.W., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,615.40. E. (9) $150.63.

A. National Associated Businessmen, Inc., 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,017.90. E. (9) $1,638.57.

A. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $540,330. E. (9) $18,838.84.

A. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

A. National Association of Postmasters of the United States, 348 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $107,038.75. E. (9) $1,500.

A. National Association of Post Office and General Services Maintenance Employees, Post Office Box 1611, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $12,383.61. E. (9) $1,933.39.

A. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 36 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill., and 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $13,054.55.

A. National Association of Social Workers, Inc., 95 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y., and 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,235.

A. National Association of Wheat Growers, Chappell, Nebr.
D. (6) $2,071.20. E. (9) $2,071.20.

A. National Bureau for Lathing and Plastering, Inc., 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Business Publications, Inc., 1913 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Committee for Effective Design Legislation, 200 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,200. E. (9) $2,258.43.

A. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, the Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $21,134.45. E. (9) $21,129.14.

A. National Council of Naval Air Stations Employee Organizations, 3005 Fernside Boulevard, Alameda, Calif.
D. (6) $250.

A. The National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., 2012 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $21,170.75. E. (9) $1,982.67.

A. National Federation of Independent Businesses, Inc., 740 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $10,323.36. E. (9) $10,323.36.

A. National Postal Clerks Union, 918 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $11,150. E. (9) $4,143.

A. National Reclamation Association, 897 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $7,245.80. E. (9) $11,606.91.

A. National Rehabilitation Association, Inc., 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,686.18. E. (9) $735.

A. National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,908. E. (9) $8,330.99.

A. National Small Business Men's Association, 801 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $3,488.37.

A. National Tax Equality Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington D.C.
D. (6) $10,629.68. E. (9) $8,164.73.

A. Henry C. Nelson, Jr., 709 Security Federal Building, Columbia, S.C.
B. South Carolina Railroad Association, 709 Security Federal Building, Columbia, S.C.
E. (9) $22.65.

A. Ross D. Netherton, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Edgar L. Newhouse III, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Smelting & Refining Co., 120 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $125. E. (9) $224.55.

A. Northwest Committee for Transportation Planning, 2928 Macomb Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,501.60.

A. Brice O'Brien, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $600.

A. Herbert R. O'Conor, Jr., 10 Light Street, Baltimore, Md.
B. E. Leitz, Inc., 468 Fourth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. John A. O'Donnell, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $600.

A. John A. O'Donnell, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Philippine Sugar Association, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John A. O'Donnell, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Philippine War Damage Claimants Association, Escolta Building, 46 Escolta, Manila, Philippines.

A. Charles T. O'Neill, Jr., 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Bankers Association, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $375. E. (9) $106.85.

A. Order of Railway Conductors & Brakemen, O.R.C. & B. Building, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
E. (9) $4,748.92.

A. Geo. F. Parrish, Post Office Box 7, Charleston, W. Va.
D. (6) $4,624.98.

A. A. Lee Parsons, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Cotton Manufacturers Institute, 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $42.90.

A. Hugh Peterson.
B. Georgia Power Co., 75 Marietta Street, Atlanta, Ga.
D. (6) $7,500.

A. Hugh Peterson, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United States Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Iris Peterson, 4201 Massachusetts Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Air Line Stewards & Stewardesses Association International, 55th and Cicero Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Andrew A. Pettis, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Industrial Union of Marine & Shipbuilding Workers of America, 534 Cooper Street, Camden, N.J.
D. (6) $3,500. E. (9) $2,703.23.

A. Charles E. Potter, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of American Tanker Owners, Inc., 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,249.99. E. (9) $2,474.19.

A. Homer V. Prater, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Government Employees, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,996.80. E. (9) $30.

A. William C. Prather, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $275. E. (9) $137.52.

A. Mrs. Richard G. Radue, 3406 Quebec Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Congress of Parents & Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Sydney C. Reagan, 3840 Greenbrier Drive, Dallas, Tex.
B. Southwestern Peanut Shellers Association, Box 48, Durant, Okla.
D. (6) $150.

A. William T. Reed, 5800 Connecticut Avenue, Chevy Chase, Md.
B. Standard Oil Co., 910 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $168.50.

A. George L. Reid, Jr., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,999.98. E. (9) $107.30.

A. Geo. L. Reid, Jr., 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Wheat Growers, Chappell, Nebr.
D. (6) $1,800. E. (9) $271.20.

A. John Arthur Reynolds, 653 Cortland Avenue, Fresno, Calif.
B. Western Cotton Growers Association, 310 Fulton-Fresno Building, Fresno, Calif.
D. (6) $1,133.32. E. (9) $257.47.

A. Hubert M. Rhodes, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
D. (6) $575. E. (9) $3.20.

A. E. W. Rising, 328 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Western Sugar Beet Growers Association, Post Office Box 742, Great Falls, Mont.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $538.61.

A. William Neale Roach, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $101.05.

A. John Forney Rudy, 902 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., Akron, Ohio.

A. Kermit B. Rykken, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Francis J. Ryley, 519 Title & Trust Building, Phoenix, Ariz.
B. Mobil Oil Co., Los Angeles; et al.

A. Seafarers' Section, MTD, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $55,000. E. (9) $2,278.79.

A. Selvage & Lee, Inc., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Carpet Institute, Empire State Building, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $146.99.

A. Selvage & Lee, Inc., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. New York Coffee & Sugar Exchange, 79 Pine Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $24.85.

A. Laurence P. Sherfy, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $600.

A. Ralph Showalter, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Automobile, Aircraft & Agricultural Implement Workers of America, 8000 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $2,416.32. E. (9) $1,040.85.

A. David Silvergleid, 918 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Postal Clerks Union, 918 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,700.10. E. (9) $350.

A. Fred Smith & Co., Inc., 10 East 40th Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Edward Mallinckrodt, 16 Westmoreland Place, St. Louis, Mo.
D. (6) $6,000.

A. M. Frederik Smith, 10 East 40th Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Council of Conservationists, Inc., 10 East 40th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Society for Animal Protective Legislation, 745 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $513.50. E. (9) $675.79.

A. Southern Pine Industry Committee, 520 National Bank of Commerce Building, New Orleans, La.
D. (6) $1,560.88. E. (9) $1,186.45.

A. Southwestern Peanut Shellers Association, Box 48, Durant, Okla.
E. (9) $150.

A. Samuel Spencer and Frank J. Whalen, Jr., 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Northwest Committee for Transportation Planning.
D. (6) $1,501.60.

A. Richard A. Squires, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $13.05.

A. Thomas G. Stack, 1104 West 104th Place, Chicago, Ill.
B. National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc., 1104 West 104th Place, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,800. E. (9) $3,735.03.

A. Chester S. Stackpole, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. American Gas Association, Inc., 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Standard Public Relations, Inc., 45 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.
B. Theodore Roosevelt Association, 28 East 20th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $600.

A. Stevenson, Paul, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 1614 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Howard F. Knipp, 3401 South Hanover Street, Baltimore, Md.
E. (9) $1.48.

A. Stevenson, Paul, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 1614 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, the Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,225. E. (9) $697.40.

A. Mrs. Ada Barnett Stough, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. American Parents Committee, Inc., 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Association of Surplus Property Importers, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. Monroe Sullivan, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pacific American Steamship Association, 16 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $893.75. E. (9) $1,108.74.

A. Tyre Taylor, 1511 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Southern States Industrial Council, Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.
E. (9) $561.87.

A. Christy Thomas & Associates, 536 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of River and Harbor Contractors, 15 Park Row, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $178.71.

A. Christy Thomas & Associates, 536 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Puget Sound Bridge & Dry Dock Co., 2929 16th Avenue SW., Seattle, Wash.

A. Joseph A. Todd, Investment Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Cable & Radio Corp., 67 Broad Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Joseph A. Todd, Investment Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Aris Gloves, Inc., 9 East 38th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Joseph A. Todd, Investment Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Freeport Sulphur Co., 161 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Townsend Plan, Inc., 808 North Capitol Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Trustees for Conservation, 251 Kearny Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $8,116.15. E. (9) $3,776.38.

A. Richard E. Vernor, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $125. E. (9) $17.50.

A. Veterans of World War I, U.S.A., Inc., 40 G Street NE., Washington, D.C.

A. Bailey Walsh, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Lion Manufacturing Co., 2640 Belmont Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $900.

A. Bailey Walsh, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Manufacturing Co, 3401 North California Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $600.

A. Marvin B. Weaver, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Cities Service Petroleum, Inc., 70 Pine Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $118. E. (9) $118.

A. William E. Welsh, 897 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Reclamation Association, 897 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $116.45.

A. Western Cotton Growers Association of California, 310 Fulton-Fresno Building, Fresno, Calif.
D. (6) $9,210.35. E. (9) $4,466.23.

A. Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., 604 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $95,245.19. E. (9) $55.67.

A. George Y. Wheeler 2d, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Radio Corp. of America, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Don White, Post Office Box 337, Fairfax, Va.
B. National Audio-Visual Association, Inc., Post Office Box 337, Fairfax, Va.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $3,830.53.

A. John C. White, 838 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $80.99.

A. Scott C. Whitney, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Airlines, Inc., 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $1,550.

A. John J. Wicker, Jr., 706 Mutual Building, Richmond, Va.
B. Mutual Insurance Committee on Federal Taxation, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,184.69. E. (9) $2,184.69.

A. Claude C. Wild, Jr., 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Gulf Oil Corp., Gulf Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $625. E. (9) $200.

A. Albert E. Wilkinson, 417 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Anaconda Co., 616 Hennessy Building, Butte, Mont.
E. (9) $484.20.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Arapahoe Tribe of Indians, Wind River Reservation, Fort Washakie, Wyo.
E. (9) $101.90.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Confederated Salish and Kottenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, Mont.
E. (9) $34.76.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Indians of California, Post Office Box 901, Redding, Calif.
E. (9) $26.55.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Menominee Tribe of Indians, Keshena, Wis.
E. (9) $13.26.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Nicholas B. Perry, 626 Belleview Boulevard, Alexandria, Va.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Quinaielt Indian Tribe, Taholah, Wash.
E. (9) $6.45.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Spokane Indian Tribe, Wellpinit, Wash.
E. (9) $12.75.

A. William A. Williams, Jr., Santa Fe, N. Mex.
B. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Burton C. Wood, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,269.25. E. (9) $116.55.

A. Wood, King, Dawson & Logan, 48 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Committee for Broadening Commercial Bank Participation in Public Financing, 50 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Albert Y. Woodward, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Flying Tiger Line, Inc., Lockheed Air Terminal, Burbank, Calif.

A. Albert Young Woodward, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Signal Oil & Gas Co., 811 West Seventh Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Paul D. Yager, 916 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Cyrus W. and Lucille M. Manfull, 13152 Wentworth Street, Pacoima, Calif.

QUARTERLY REPORTS

The following quarterly reports were submitted for the second calendar quarter 1960:

(NOTE.—The form used for reports is reproduced below. In the interest of economy in the RECORD, questions are not repeated, only the essential answers are printed, and are indicated by their respective letter and number.)

FILE TWO COPIES WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE AND FILE THREE COPIES WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.

PLACE AN "X" BELOW THE APPROPRIATE LETTER OR FIGURE IN THE BOX AT THE RIGHT OF THE "REPORT" HEADING BELOW:

"PRELIMINARY" REPORT ("Registration"): To "register," place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.

"QUARTERLY" REPORT: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this Report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page "3," and the rest of such pages should be "4," "5," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the Act.

Year: 19------

REPORT

PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATIONS OF LOBBYING ACT

P	QUARTER			
	1st	2d	3d	4th
(Mark one square only)				

NOTE ON ITEM "A".—(a) IN GENERAL. This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:

(i) "Employee".—To file as an "employee", state (in Item "B") the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer". (If the "employee" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employee".)

(ii) "Employer".—To file as an "employer", write "None" in answer to Item "B".

(b) SEPARATE REPORTS. An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report:

(i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.

(ii) Employees subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.

A. ORGANIZATION OR INDIVIDUAL FILING:

1. State name, address, and nature of business.

2. If this Report is for an Employer, list names or agents or employees who will file Reports for this Quarter.

NOTE ON ITEM "B".—*Reports by Agents or Employees.* An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employers, except that: (a) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (b) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as "employers"—is to be filed each quarter.

B. EMPLOYER.—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

NOTE ON ITEM "C".—(a) The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this Report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation." "The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House"—§ 302(e).

(b) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "Preliminary" Report (Registration).

(c) After beginning such activities, they must file a "Quarterly" Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

C. LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS, AND PUBLICATIONS in connection therewith:

1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated, ☐ place an "X" in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports.

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the *specific* legislative interests by reciting: (a) Short titles of statutes and bills; (b) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (c) citations of statutes, where known; (d) whether for or against such statutes and bills.

3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (a) Description, (b) quantity distributed; (c) date of distribution, (d) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed)

4. If this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a "Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. If this is a "Quarterly" Report, disregard this item "C4" and fill out item "D" and "E" on the back of this page. Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarterly" Report.

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]

PAGE 1

NOTE ON ITEM "D."—(a) *In General.* The term "contribution" includes *anything of value.* When an organization or individual uses printed or duplicated matter in a campaign attempting to influence legislation, money received by such organization or individual—for such printed or duplicated matter—is a "contribution." "The term 'contribution' includes a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit of money, or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make a contribution"—Section 302 (a) of the Lobbying Act.

(b) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN EMPLOYER.—(i) *In General.* Item "D" is designed for the reporting of all receipts from which expenditures are made, or will be made, in accordance with legislative interests.

(ii) *Receipts of Business Firms and Individuals.*—A business firm (or individual) which is subject to the Lobbying Act by reason of expenditures which it makes in attempting to influence legislation—but which has no funds to expend except those which are available in the ordinary course of operating a business not connected in any way with the influencing of legislation—will have no receipts to report, even though it does have expenditures to report.

(iii) *Receipts of Multipurpose Organizations.*—Some organizations do not receive any funds which are to be expended solely for the purpose of attempting to influence legislation. Such organizations make such expenditures out of a general fund raised by dues, assessments, or other contributions. The percentage of the general fund which is used for such expenditures indicates the percentage of dues, assessments, or other contributions which may be considered to have been paid for that purpose. Therefore, in reporting receipts, such organizations may specify what that percentage is, and report their dues, assessments, and other contributions on that basis. However, each contributor of $500 or more is to be listed, regardless of whether the contribution was made solely for legislative purposes.

(c) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN AGENT OR EMPLOYEE.—(i) *In General.* In the case of many employees, all receipts will come under Items "D5" (received for services) and "D12" (expense money and reimbursements). In the absence of a clear statement to the contrary, it will be presumed that your employer is to reimburse you for all expenditures which you make in connection with legislative interests.

(ii) *Employer as Contributor of $500 or More.*—When your contribution from your employer (in the form of salary, fee, etc.) amounts to $500 or more, it is not necessary to report such contribution under "D13" and "D14," since the amount has already been reported under "D5," and the name of the "employer" has been given under Item "B" on page 1 of this report.

D. RECEIPTS (INCLUDING CONTRIBUTIONS AND LOANS):

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the space following the number.

Receipts (other than loans)

1. $_____Dues and assessments
2. $_____Gifts of money or anything of value
3. $_____Printed or duplicated matter received as a gift
4. $_____Receipts from sale of printed or duplicated matter

5. $_____Received for services (e.g., salary, fee, etc.)
6. $_____TOTAL for this Quarter (Add items "1" through "5")

7. $_____Received during previous Quarters of calendar year
8. $_____TOTAL from Jan. 1 through this Quarter (Add "6" and "7")

Loans Received

"The term 'contribution' includes a . . . *loan* . . ."—Sec. 302(a).

9. $_____TOTAL now owed to others on account of loans
10. $_____Borrowed from others during this Quarter
11. $_____Repaid to others during this Quarter

12. $_____"Expense money" and Reimbursements received this Quarter

Contributors of $500 or more (from Jan. 1 through this Quarter)

13. Have there been such contributors? Please answer "yes" or "no": _____

14. In the case of each contributor whose contributions (including loans) during the "period" from January 1 through the last days of this Quarter total $500 or more:

Attach hereto plain sheets of paper, approximately the size of this page, tabulate data under the headings "Amount" and "Name and Address of Contributor"; and indicate whether the last day of the period is March 31, June 30, September 30, or December 31. Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Amount	*Name and Address of Contributor* ("*Period*" from Jan. 1 through _____, 19____)
$1,500.00	John Doe, 1621 Blank Bldg., New York, N.Y.
$1,785.00	The Roe Corporation, 2511 Doe Bldg., Chicago, Ill.
$3,285.00	TOTAL

NOTE ON ITEM "E."—(a) *In General.* "The term 'expenditure' includes a payment, distribution, loan, advance, deposit, or gift of money or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make an expenditure"—Section 302(b) of the Lobbying Act.

(b) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN AGENT OR EMPLOYEE. In the case of many employees, all expenditures will come under telephone and telegraph (Item "E6") and travel, food, lodging, and entertainment (Item "E7").

E. EXPENDITURES (INCLUDING LOANS) in connection with legislative interests:

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the spaces following the number.

Expenditures (other than loans)

1. $_____Public relations and advertising services
2. $_____Wages, salaries, fees, commissions (other than item "1")
3. $_____Gifts or contributions made during Quarter
4. $_____Printed or duplicated matter, including distribution cost
5. $_____Office overhead (rent, supplies, utilities, etc.)
6. $_____Telephone and telegraph
7. $_____Travel, food, lodging, and entertainment
8. $_____All other expenditures

9. $_____TOTAL for this Quarter (Add "1" through "8")
10. $_____Expended during previous Quarters of calendar year

11. $_____TOTAL from January 1 through this Quarter (Add "9" and "10")

Loans Made to Others

"The term 'expenditure' includes a . . . *loan* . . ."—Sec. 302(b).

12. $_____TOTAL now owed to person filing
13. $_____Lent to others during this Quarter
14. $_____Repayment received during this Quarter

15. Recipients of Expenditures of $10 or More

In the case of expenditures made during this Quarter by, or on behalf of the person filing: Attach plain sheets of paper approximately the size of this page and tabulate data as to expenditures under the following heading: "Amount," "Date or Dates," "Name and Address of Recipient," "Purpose." Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Amount	*Date or Dates—Name and Address of Recipient—Purpose*
$1,750.00	7–11: Roe Printing Co., 3214 Blank Ave., St. Louis, Mo.—Printing and mailing circulars on the "Marshbanks Bill."
$2,400.00	7–15, 8–15, 9–15: Britten & Blatten, 3127 Gremlin Bldg., Washington, D.C.—Public relations service at $800.00 per month.
$4,150.00	TOTAL

A. Claris Adams, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. V. J. Adduci, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Aerospace Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,384. E. (9) $487.87.

A. J. Carson Adkerson, 976 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Arthur F. Aebersold, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the U.S. Government, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,468.19. E. (9) $47.25.

A. Aerospace Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $9,503.34. E. (9) $9,503.34.

A. Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association, 4650 East-West Highway, Bethesda, Md.
E. (9) $1,471.38.

A. Air Freight Forwarders Association, 802 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $20,039.33. E. (9) $20,039.33.

A. Louis J. Allen, 1121 Nashville Trust Building, Nashville, Tenn.
B. Class I railroads in Tennessee.

A. Nicholas E. Allen and Merrill Armour, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Music Operators of America, Inc., 128 East 14th Street, Oakland, Calif.
D. (6) $650. E. (9) $60.07.

A. W. L. Allen, 8605 Cameron Street, Silver Spring, Md.
B. Commercial Telegraphers' Union, International, 8605 Cameron Street, Silver Spring, Md.

A. Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway & Motor Coach Employees of America, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. American Bottlers of Carbonated Beverages, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $248.20.

A. American Cancer Society, 521 West 57th Street, New York City.
E. (9) $7,178.52.

A. American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.
D. (6) $7,870.20. E. (9) $7,870.20.

A. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill., and 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $28,311. E. (9) $28,311.

A. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, AFL–CIO Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $32,616.51.

A. American Federation of Musicians, 425 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $4,941.97.

A. American Hospital Association, 840 North Lakeshore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $15,362.06. E. (9) $13,412.06.

A. American Hotel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. American Israel Public Affairs Committee, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $8,221.46. E. (9) $5,840.84.

A. American Justice Association (Inc.), Post Office Box 1387, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $4.50.

A. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,015.28. E. (9) $90.88.

A. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $10,000. E. (9) $13,315.69.

A. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 11 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $1,843.75.

A. American National Cattlemen's Association, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $11,963.63. E. (9) $4,554.47.

A. American Nurses' Association, Inc., 10 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $4,021.88. E. (9) $4,201.88.

A. American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $672.23. E. (9) $672.23.

A. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. American Parents Committee, Inc., 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N.Y., and 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,023.27. E. (9) $4,277.06.

A. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $4,447. E. (9) $8,695.

A. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,885.19. E. (9) $2,393.64.

A. American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,004.39. E. (9) $2,004.39.

A. American Sugar Beet Industry Policy Committee, 500 Sugar Building, Denver, Colo.
E. (9) $100.

A. American Textile Machinery Association, 60 Batterymarch Street, Boston, Mass.
D. (6) $22.78.

A. American Tramp Shipowners Association, Inc., 11 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $4,992.01.

A. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $10,290.06. E. (9) $22,468.89.

A. American Veterans Committee, 1830 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,342. E. (9) $155.02.

A. American Veterinary Medical Association, 600 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $619.59.

A. American Vocational Association, Inc., 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. American Warehousemen's Association, Merchandise Division, 222 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. America's Wage Earners' Protective Conference, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,275. E. (9) $1,384.61.

A. Jerry L. Anderson, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Walter M. Anderson, Jr., Montgomery, Ala.
B. Alabama Railroad Association, 1002 First National Bank Building, Montgomery, Ala.
D. (6) $84. E. (9) $125.32.

A. Area Employment Expansion Committee, 1144 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,201.93.

A. Arkansas Railroad Committee, 1100 Boyle Building, Little Rock, Ark.
B. Class I railroads operating in the State of Arkansas.
D. (6) $235.60. E. (9) $1,271.81.

A. J. Sinclair Armstrong, 45 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
B. United States Trust Co. of New York, 45 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Arthritis & Rheumatism Foundation, 10 Columbus Circle, New York City.
E. (9) $1,157.14.

A. Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., 20th and E Streets NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Associated Third Class Mail Users, 1406 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,072.99. E. (9) $5,072.99.

A. Association of American Physicians & Surgeons, Inc., 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $375. E. (9) $375.

A. Association of American Railroads, 929 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $19,846.37. E. (9) $19,846.37.

A. Association of Casualty & Surety Cos., 60 John Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,296.72. E. (9) $2,296.72.

A. Association of Oil Pipe Lines, 418 Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Association of Western Railways, 22½ Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $520. E. (9) $520.

A. Edward Atkins, 51 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. National Association of Shoe Chain Stores, Inc., 51 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $25. E. (9) $25.

A. Atlantic Refining Co., 260 South Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
E. (9) $1,500.

A. Richard W. Averill, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $169.71.

A. Charles E. Babcock, Route 2, Box 406, Vienna, Va.
B. National Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, 3025 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
D. (6) $150.

A. Harry S. Baer, Jr., 1115 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Aeronautical Training Society, 1115 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $115.

A. Charles B. Bailey, Sr., 2035 South Avenue, Toledo, Ohio.
B. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees.
D. (6) $1,975. E. (9) $1,852.42.

A. George P. Baker, Soldiers Field Post Office, Boston, Mass.
B. Transportation Association of America.

A. John A. Baker.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,274.88. E. (9) $290.64.

A. Thomas F. Baker, 1128 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Bottlers of Carbonated Beverages, 1128 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $242. E. (9) $6.20.

A. J. H. Ballew, Nashville, Tenn.
B. Southern States Industrial Council.
D. (6) $2,400. E. (9) $205.26.

A. Roy A. Ballinger, 801 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United States Cuban Sugar Council, 801 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Arthur R. Barnett, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Cos., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,340. E. (9) $69.37.

A. Irvin L. Barney, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, 4929 Main Street, Kansas City, Mo.
D. (6) $3,225.

A. William J. Barnhard, 923 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Imported Nut Section, Association of Food Distributors, Inc., 100 Hudson Street, New York, N.Y.

A. William G. Barr, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Parking Association, Inc., 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Edwin C. Barringer, 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Institute of Scrap Iron & Steel, Inc.

A. William B. Barton, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the U.S.A.

A. Laurie C. Battle, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. Roy Battles, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Grange of the Patrons of Husbandry, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $3,650.

A. John V. Beamer, 625 Valley Brook Lane, Wabash, Ind.
B. Fine Hardwoods Association, 666 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $350.

A. James F. Bell, 730 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Supervisors of State Banks, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $450. E. (9) $18.15.

A. Mrs. Rachel S. Bell, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $120. E. (9) $6.50.

A. Ernest H. Benson, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $4,500.

A. Bergson & Borkland, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Freeport Sulphur Co., 161 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Andrew J. Biemiller, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,017. E. (9) $319.65.

A. Walter J. Bierwagen, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Division 689, Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway & Motor Coach Employees of America, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Hudson Biery, 4517 Carew Tower, Cincinnati, Ohio.
B. Ohio Valley Improvement Association, Inc., 4517 Carew Tower, Cincinnati, Ohio.

A. Bigham, Englar, Jones & Houston, 99 John Street, New York, N.Y., and 839 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Mollers Suidah Shipbreakers, Ltd.; the Alpha Shipping Co., Ltd.; and Lancashire Shipping Co., Ltd.
E. (9) $62.08.

A. David Bishop, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Division 689, Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway & Motor Coach Employees of America, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John H. Bivins, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $550.

A. James C. Black, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Republic Steel Corp., Republic Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $500.

A. Richard W. Blake, 1113 10th Avenue, Greeley, Colo.
B. National Beet Growers Federation, 1113 10th Avenue, Greeley, Colo.
D. (6) $435.

A. William Rhea Blake, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.

A. W. G. Blewett, 301 Olive Street, St. Louis, Mo.
B. Peabody Coal Co., 301 Olive Street, St. Louis, Mo.

A. Blue Cross Commission, 840 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. William Blum, Jr., 1741 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee for the Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $584.35. E. (9) $14.05.

A. Blumberg, Singer, Ross & Gordon, 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Cigar Manufacturers Association of America, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Eugene F. Bogan, 1108 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Investment Companies, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $41.41.

A. Hyman Bookbinder, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,250. E. (9) $403.70.

A. Joseph L. Borda, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. Lyle H. Boren, Seminole, Okla.
B. The Association of Western Railways, 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $520.

A. Joseph Borkin, 802 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Alleghany Corp., 230 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Robert T. Borth, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $375. E. (9) $435.91.

A. G. Stewart Boswell, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $360. E. (9) $4.39.

A. J. Wiley Bowers, Sixth and Cherry Streets, Chattanooga, Tenn.
B. Tennessee Valley Public Power Association, Sixth and Cherry Streets, Chattanooga, Tenn.

A. Charles B. Bowling, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Grange, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $600.

A. Charles M. Boyer, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Boykin & De Francis, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mrs. Claire Hugo Stinnes, Grossenbaumerstrasse 253, Mulheim Ruhr, Germany.
E. (9) $170.

A. Boykin & De Francis, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Studiengesellschaft fur Privatrechtliche Auslandsinteresse, e.v. Contrescarpe 46, Germany.
E. (9) $285.

A. Joseph E. Brady, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
B. International Union of United Brewery, Flour, Cereal, Soft Drink and Distillery Workers of America, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
E. (9) $196.

A. Frank P. Brennan, Avoca, Iowa.
B. Iowa Power & Light Co., Des Moines, Iowa.
E. (9) $11.15.

A. Homer L. Brinkley, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives.

A. J. Olney Brott, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Bankers Association, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $54.10.

A. W. Kenneth Brew, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. W. S. Bromley, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $374.04. E. (9) $332.15.

A. George Bronz, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amity Fabrics, Inc., 12 West 32d Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $24.40.

A. Milton E. Brooding, 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. California Packing Corp., 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $1,250.

A. Derek Brooks, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Retail Furniture Association, 666 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $934.61.

A. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express & Station Employees, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $7,440.33. E. (9) $7,440.33.

A. Bryant C. Brown, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Mutual Insurance Alliance.

A. J. D. Brown, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $110.

A. Brown & Lund, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,425. E. (9) $1,449.

A. George S. Buck, Jr., Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $240. E. (9) $21.37.

A. Henry H. Buckman, 54 Buckman Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
B. Florida Inland Navigation District, Citizens Bank Building, Bunnell, Fla.
D. (6) $1,350. E. (9) $98.84

A. Henry H. Buckman, 54 Buckman Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
B. Florida Ship Canal Navigation District, 720 Florida Title Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
D. (6) $1,350. E. (9) $273.80.

A. Bulgarian Claims Committee, 24 Beekman Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $426.75.

A. George J. Burger, 250 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y., and 740 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Burger Tire Consultant Service, 250 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y., and National Federation of Independent Business, 740 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,272.

A. Harold Burke, 140 Front Street, New York, N.Y.
B. United States Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John J. Burke, 1062 West Platinum Street, Butte, Mont.
B. Pacific Northwest Power Co., Post Office Box 1445, Spokane, Wash.
E. (9) $575.

A. F. Hugh Burns, 821 Cafritz Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Association, 821 Cafritz Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,100. E. (9) $182.80.

A. Maurice G. Burnside, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Division of Legislation & Federal Relations of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,937.45. E. (9) $94.59.

A. David Burpee, Fordhook Farms, Doylestown, Pa.

A. Robert M. Burr, 105 Mansfield Avenue, Darien, Conn.
B. National Electrical Manufacturers Association.

A. Orrin A. Burrows, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,750.

A. Hollis W. Burt, 1212 Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Supervisors of State Banks, 1212 Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $44.60.

A. Harry C. Butcher, 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Home Town Free Television Association, 2923 East Lincolnway, Cheyenne, Wyo.
E. (9) $5,927.55.

A. George P. Byrne, Jr., 53 Park Place, New York, N.Y.
B. United States Wood Screw Service Bureau, 53 Park Place, New York, N.Y.

A. C. G. Caffrey, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.
D. (6) $760.20. E. (9) $15.

A. Gordon L. Calvert, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Investment Bankers Association of America, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $320.29.

A. Carl C. Campbell, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $55.39.

A. Judy Carlile, 229 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Counsel Associates, 229 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $63.50.

A. John T. Carlton and M. H. Manchester, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Braxton B. Carr, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,625. E. (9) $375.

A. Robert S. Carr, 1220 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Hiram Walker & Sons, Inc., 8325 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

A. Henderson H. Carson, 600 First National Bank Building, Canton, Ohio, and 744 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. East Ohio Gas Co., 1717 East Ninth Street, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $740.

A. Albert E. Carter, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C.
B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $4,500. E. (9) $1,006.18.

A. Francis R. Cawley, 1101 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Magazine Publishers Association, Inc., 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,680. E. (9) $721.17.

A. Chamber of Commerce of the U.S.A., 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Justice M. Chambers, 2521 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Greg-Gary Corp., 7 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $7,500.

A. Charitable Contributors Association, 100 Old York Road, Jenkintown, Pa.
E. (9) $200.

A. Christian Amendment Movement, 804 Penn Avenue, Pittsburgh Pa.
D. (6) $1,127.91. E. (9) $4,752.76.

A. Citizens Foreign Aid Committee, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Charles Patrick Clark, 500 World Center Building, Washington, D.C.
B. B. Rapaport & Son, Inc., Central Street, Post Office Box 169, Windsor, Conn.

A. Earl W. Clark, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $422.59.

A. Robert M. Clark, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., 80 East Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

A. Clear Channel Broadcasting Service, 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Joseph Coakley, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Building Service Employees International Union, 155 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,800.

A. William H. Coburn, 530 Bowen Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Western Forest Industries Association, 526 Henry Building, Portland, Oreg.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $986.90.

A. Edwin S. Cohen, 26 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. National Association of Investment Cos., 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,150. E. (9) $174.05.

A. Committee for Broadening Commercial Bank Participation in Public Financing, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Committee for Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $13,550. E. (9) $5,447.74.

A. R. T. Compton, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. John C. Cone, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pan American World Airways System, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Julian D. Conover, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $16.65.

A. Orval R. Cook, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Aerospace Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 1100 Bowen Building, Washington, D.C.
B. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 1100 Bowen Building, Washington, D.C.
B. R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co., Winston-Salem, N.C.

A. Mitchell J. Cooper, 1631 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Manufacturers' Association of Puerto Rico, San Juan, P.R.
D. (6) $1,670. E. (9) $21.20.

A. Ben C. Corlett, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Bankers Association, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $659.16.

A. Edward J. Coughlin, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Technical Engineers, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $195. E. (9) $20.

A. Council of Mechanical Specialty Contracting Industries, Inc., 610 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

A. County Supervisors Civic Association of California, 1100 Elks Building, Sacramento, Calif.
E. (9) $784.51.

A. Edsall Lee Couplin, 441 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
B. Michigan Hospital Service, 441 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $2.70.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Can Co., 100 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $44.43.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Committee on Joint Resolution 1955 Legislature, Post Office Box 3170, Honolulu, Hawaii.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Copper & Brass Research Association, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Machine Tool Builders' Association, 2139 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Ohio Deposit Guarantee Fund, 1303 Fifth Third Bank Building, Cincinnati, Ohio.
E. (9) $16.82.

A. A. M. Crawford, 704 Title and Trust Building, Phoenix, Ariz.
B. Southern Pacific Co., 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif., and the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway, 121 East Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $150. E. (9) $28.14.

A. William A. Cromartie, 1 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. The Singer Manufacturing Co., 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $809.38.

A. Laurence A. Crosby, 801 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United States Cuban Sugar Council, 801 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. H. C. Crotty, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

A. Paul Cunningham, 575 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. American Society of Composers, Authors & Publishers, 575 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. John T. Curran, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,250. E. (9) $701.25.

A. Bryce Curry, 907 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 907 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $650.

A. Bernard Cushman, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway & Motor Coach Employes of America, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John R. Dalton, 1508 Merchants Bank Building, Indianapolis, Ind.
B. Associated Railways of Indiana, 1508 Merchants Bank Building, Indianapolis, Ind.

A. D. C. Daniel, 1627 K Street NW, Washington, D.C.
B. National Independent Dairies Association, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $5.

A. John C. Datt, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $687.50. E. (9) $36.51.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $1,130.68.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. The Singer Manufacturing Co., 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $809.38.

A. Dorothy Mondell Davis, 801 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United States Cuban Sugar Council, 801 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Industrial Bankers Association, 813 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. C.I.T. Financial Corp., 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Hilton Hotels Corp., Chicago, Ill.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Industrial Bankers Association, 813 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. C.I.T. Financial Corp., 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Laundry-Dry Cleaning Association of District of Columbia, 2400 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Michael B. Deane, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Twentieth Century Airlines, Lockheed Air Terminal, Burbank, Calif.

A. Michael B. Deane, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United States Poultry and Egg Producers Association, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Tony T. Dechant, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.
B. The Farmers' Educational Cooperative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Richard A. Dell, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $39.45.

A. Mary S. Deuel, 3026 Cambridge Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Washington Home Rule Committee, Inc., 924 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $840.

A. Joe T. Dickerson, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association, 300 Tulsa Building, Tulsa, Okla.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $21.

A. Cecil B. Dickson, 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,125. E. (9) $172.68.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Sacramento Yolo Port District, 705 California Fruit Building, Sacramento, Calif.
D. (6) $2,624.80. E. (9) $199.80.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Westlands Water District, Post Office Box 4006, Fresno, Calif.
D. (6) $3,347.15. E. (9) $347.15.

A. Disabled American Veterans, 5555 Ridge Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio.
E. (9) $1,750.

A. Disabled Officers Association, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $3,757.20.

A. District Lodge No. 44, International Association of Machinists, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $20,744.58. E. (9) $19,612.11.

A. Division 689, Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway & Motor Coach Employes of America, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $329.42.

A. Division of Legislation and Federal Relations of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $46,964.56.

A. Robert C. Dolan, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Cos., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $369. E. (9) $60.89.

A. Paul R. M. Donelan, 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $687.48. E. (9) $6.22.

A. James L. Donnelly, 200 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
B. Illinois Manufacturers Association, 200 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $345.09.

A. Donoghue, Ragan & Mason, 239 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. California Shipping Co., 320 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
E. (9) $153.08.

A. Robert F. Donoghue, 239 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Pacific American Tankship Association, 25 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $1,625.01.

A. Thomas J. Donovan, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. J. Dewey Dorsett, 60 John Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Association of Casualty & Surety Cos., 60 John Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $127.50.

A. C. L. Dorson, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the U.S. Government, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,552.20. E. (9) $116.

A. Fred N. Dressler, Post Office Box 188, Gardnerville, Nev.
B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.

A. Ben DuBois, Sauk Centre, Minn.
B. Independent Bankers Association, Sauk Centre, Minn.

A. Read P. Dunn, Jr., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $540. E. (9) $15.09.

A. William E. Dunn, 20th and E Streets NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., 20th and E Streets NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Henry I. Dworshak, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $2.65.

A. J. S. Eames, 4737 36th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Counsel Associates, 229 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $37.20. E. (9) $37.20.

A. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $94.46. E. (9) $82.51.

A. John W. Edelman, 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Textile Workers Union of America, 99 University Place, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,293.40. E. (9) $543.47.

A. Herman Edelsberg, 1640 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 515 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $140. E. (9) $15.

A. Bernard H. Ehrlich, 1002 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association and Council of Business Schools, 2400 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,050. E. (9) $368.17.

A. James B. Ehrlich, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $516.25. E. (9) $72.20.

A. John M. Elliott, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Association of Street Electric Railway & Motor Coach Employees of America, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Clyde T. Ellis, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $31.25.

A. Otis H. Ellis, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Oil Jobbers Council, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $12,000.

A. Perry R. Ellsworth, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Milk Industry Foundation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $14.

A. John H. Else, 302 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Retail Lumber Dealers Association, 302 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $7,500. E. (9) $227.80.

A. Ely, McCarty & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,375.

A. Ely, McCarty & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Department of Water and Power of the City of Los Angeles, 207 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $3,200.

A. Ely, McCarty & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. East Bay Municipal Utility District, 2130 Adeline Street, Oakland, Calif.
D. (6) $1,800.

A. Ely, McCarty & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Imperial Irrigation District, El Centro, Calif.
D. (6) $2,100.

A. Ely, McCarty & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Palo Verde Irrigation District, Blythe, Calif.

A. Ely, McCarty & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Six Agency Committee and Colorado River Board of California, 909 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $6,037.50. E. (9) $70.82.

A. Myles W. English, 966 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Highway Users Conference, Inc., 966 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Family Tax Association, 2110 Girard Trust Building, Philadelphia, Pa.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $5,283.21.

A. Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $89,363.89. E. (9) $19,328.23.

A. Mrs. Albert E. Farwell, Post Office Box 188, Route 2, Vienna, Va.
B. National Congress of Parents & Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. J. Arnold Feldman, 10011 Dickens Avenue, Bethesda, Md.
B. American Veterans Committee, 1830 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $124. E. (9) $9.41.

A. Bonner Fellers, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Citizens Foreign Aid Committee.

A. John A. Ferguson, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $437.50.

A. Josiah Ferris, 510 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Sugar Cane League, New Orleans, La., United States Sugar Corp., Clewiston, Fla., and Okeelanta Sugar Refinery, Inc., South Bay, Fla.
D. (6) $6,349.98.

A. John B. Fisher, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Bangor & Aroostook Railroad, Bangor, Maine.

A. John B. Fisher, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. C. H. Sprague & Son Co., 125 High Street, Boston, Mass.

A. Berchmans T. Fitzpatrick, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Wood, King, Dawson & Logan, 48 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Norman A. Flaningam, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Consolidated Natural Gas Co., 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. Roger Fleming, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,328.13. E. (9) $20.68.

A. Florida Citrus Mutual, Lakeland, Fla.
E. (9) $2,617.12.

A. Florida Inland Navigation District, Citizens Bank Building, Bunnell, Fla.
E. (9) $1,448.84.

A. Florida Ship Canal Navigation District, 720 Florida Title Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
E. (9) $1,623.80.

A. Fluorspar Consumers Committee, 40 Rector Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $10,000.

A. Foreign Policy Clearing House, 300 Independence Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

A. James W. Foristel, 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $875. E. (9) $49.78.

A. James F. Fort, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $615.74.

A. Ronald J. Foulis, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C., and 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $450.

A. L. S. Franklin, 2309 Pinecraft Road, Greensboro, N.C.

A. Robert W. Frase, 1820 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Book Publishers Council, Inc., 24 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $1,295.10.

A. George H. Frates, 1163 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Retail Druggists.
D. (6) $3,900. E. (9) $1,124.

A. W. E. Fravel, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

A. Freedman & Levy, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Fred H. Lenway & Co., Inc., 112 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Elmer M. Freudenberger, 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Disabled American Veterans, 5555 Ridge Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio.
E. (9) $1,750.

A. Philip P. Friedlander, Jr., 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Tire Dealers & Retreaders Association, Inc., 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $20,175. E. (9) $8,998.45.

A. Garrett Fuller, 836 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. West Coast Steamship Co., 601 Board of Trade Building, Portland, Oreg.
E. (9) $24.30.

A. Wallace H. Fulton, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc.

A. Lawrence H. Gall, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $457.50. E. (9) $8.60.

A. M. J. Galvin, 207 Union Depot Building, St. Paul, Minn.
B. Minnesota railroads.
D. (6) $700. E. (9) $779.57.

A. Gardner, Norrison & Rogers, 1126 Woodward Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Bigham, Englar, Jones & Houston, 99 John Street, New York City, and Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $4.18.

A. Marion R. Garstang, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $1.15.

A. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, Inc., 60 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. General Federation of Women's Clubs, 1734 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. M. George, 165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
B. The Inter-State Manufacturer's Association 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. J. M. George, 165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
B. National Association of Direct Selling Cos., 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Walter A. Giblin, 5713 South Troy Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, 4929 Main Street, Kansas City, Mo.
D. (6) $3,600.

A. Ernest Giddings, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Division of Legislation and Federal Relations of the National Education Association.
D. (6) $1,620. E. (9) $176.97.

A. Joseph S. Gill, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
B. The Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio
D. (6) $1,033.33. E. (9) $759.82.

A. Leif Gilstad, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Transportation Association of America.

A. John A. Gosnell, 801 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $900.

A. Lawrence L. Gourley, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $375.

A. Government Employes' Council, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,966.15. E. (9) $11,846.05.

A. Government Relations Committee of the Office Equipment Manufacturers Institute, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. James L. Grahl, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $50.

A. Grain & Feed Dealers National Association, 400 Folger Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $141.12.

A. Grand Lodge of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen & Enginemen, 318–418 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $16,202.60. E. (9) $16,878.73.

A. Mrs. Edward R. Gray, 3501 Williamsburg Lane NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Congress of Parents & Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Virginia M. Gray, 3501 Williamsburg Lane NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Citizens Committee for UNICEF, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $412.50. E. (9) $65.45.

A. Richard D. Green, 80 Federal Street, Boston, Mass.
B. Last Manufacturers Association, 80 Federal Street, Boston, Mass.

A. Jerry N. Griffin, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Industrial Bankers Association, 813 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Jerry N. Griffin, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. C.I.T. Financial Corp., 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Jerry N. Griffin, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Mutual Benefit Health & Accident Association, Omaha, Nebr.

A. Weston B. Grimes, 1001 Bowen Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Cargill, Inc., 200 Grain Exchange, Minneapolis, Minn.
D. (6) $6,000. E. (9) $12.20.

A. Alfred N. Guertin, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Ben H. Guill, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. ASARCO, New York; A.Z.L. & S. Co., St. Louis; Athletic Mining & Smelting, Fort Smith, Ark.; National Zinc, New York; and Matthiessen & Hegeler, La Salle, Ill.
D. (6) $4,171. E. (9) $817.75.

A. Violet M. Gunther, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Americans for Democratic Action, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,250.04. E. (9) $237.88.

A. Gayle Gupton, 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Clear Channel Broadcasting Service, 532 Shoreham Building Washington, D.C.

A. Frank E. Haas, 280 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
B. The Association of Western Railways, 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

A. Hoyt S. Haddock, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $84.06.

A. Hoyt S. Haddock, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Seafarers' Section, Maritime Trades Department, AFL–CIO, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $204.72.

A. Louis P. Haffer, 802 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Air Freight Forwarders Association, 802 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Hal H. Hale, 423 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Robert Hale, 1039 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Wisconsin Avenue Committee on Transportation Problems, 3900 Wisconsin Avenue, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $39.80.

A. Haley, Wollenberg & Bader, 1735 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Home Town Free Television Association, 2923 East Lincolnway, Cheyenne, Wyo.
D. (6) $1,671. E. (9) $181.41.

A. Harold T. Halfpenny, 111 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Hugh F. Hall, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $758.33. E. (9) $7.74.

A. E. C. Hallbeck, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,375.12. E. (9) $354.91.

A. Charles A. Hamilton, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $145.23.

A. W. C. Hammerle, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $240.38. E. (9) $270.57.

A. Harold F. Hammond, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Transportation Association of America.

A. C. L. Hancock, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Copper & Brass Research Association, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y., and Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Murray Hanson, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Investment Bankers Association of America, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $1,030.83.

A. Eugene J. Hardy, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. James Harmanson, Jr., 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,624.96. E. (9) $81.10.

A. Conrad P. Harness, 1117 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Home Manufacturing Association, 1117 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500.

A. Robert E. Harper, 1913 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Business Publications, Inc., 1913 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Herbert E. Harris II, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,187.50. E. (9) $102.18.

A. Merwin K. Hart, 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N.Y.
B. National Economic Council, Inc., 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $103.31.

A. Stephen H. Hart, 500 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.
B. National Livestock Tax Committee, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $11,403.38. E. (9) $2,842.

A. John A. Hartman, Jr., 67 Broad Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Cable & Radio Corp., 67 Broad Street, New York, N.Y., and subsidiaries.
E. (9) $1,978.86.

A. Paul M. Hawkins, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $326.80. E. (9) $14.50.

A. Kit H. Haynes, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives.

A. Mrs. Glenn G. Hays, 212 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1730 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill.
D. (6) $571.56. E. (9) $832.03.

A. Joseph H. Hays, 280 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
B. Association of Western Railways, 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

A. John C. Hazen, 801 Sheraton Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $60.47.

A. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,385.02.

A. Patrick B. Healy, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $135.10.

A. George J. Hecht, 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N.Y., and 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. American Parents Committee, Inc., 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.

A. Hedrick & Lane, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Comite de Productores de Azucar, Antonio Miro Quesada 376, Lima, Peru, S.A.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $71.25.

A. Hedrick & Lane, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee on Cooperative Advertising, 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $69.73.

A. Hedrick & Lane, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Reciprocal Inter Insurers Federal Tax Committee, 400 United Artists Building, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $1,875. E. (9) $95.67.

A. Robert B. Heiney, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $875. E. (9) $487.42.

A. Kenneth G. Heisler, 907 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 907 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,050.

A. Edmund P. Hennelly, 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Socony Mobil Oil Co., Inc., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,643.42. E. (9) $1,518.42.

A. Maurice G. Herndon, 801 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Insurance Agents, 96 Fulton Street, New York, N.Y., and 801 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $237.50. E. (9) $237.50.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Carpet Institute, Inc., Empire State Building, New York, N.Y.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Boston Wool Trade Association, 263 Summer Street, Boston, Mass.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $48.34.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Hot House Vegetable Growers, Post Office Box 659, Terre Haute, Ind.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Wool Manufacturers, 386 Fourth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Football League, 1 Bala Avenue, Bala Cynwyd, Pa.
D. (6) $12,000. E. (9) $230.68.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Wool Trade Association, 263 Summer Street, Boston, Mass.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Philadelphia Wool & Textile Association, Post Office Box 472, Station S., Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Brewers Foundation, 535 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $111.06.

A. W. J. Hickey, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW, Washington, D.C.
B. American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $262.50.

A. M. F. Hicklin, 507 Bankers Trust Building, Des Moines, Iowa.
B. Iowa Railway Committee, 507 Bankers Trust Building, Des Moines, Iowa.
E. (9) $1,021.99.

A. John W. Hight, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $5.30.

A. Ray C. Hinman, 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Socony Mobil Oil Co., Inc., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,579.76. E. (9) $329.76.

A. Lawrence S. Hobart, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $275.

A. Claude E. Hobbs, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Westinghouse Electric Corp., 3 Gateway Center, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $200.

A. Fuller Holloway, 1000 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Toilet Goods Association, Inc., 1270 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $9,225. E. (9) $389.21.

A. A. D. Holmes, Jr., Gallion, Ala.
B. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.
D. (6) $158.05. E. (9) $158.05.

A. Home Manufacturers Association, 1117 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $1,000.

A. Edwin M. Hood, 441 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 21 West Street, New York, N.Y.

A. J. M. Hood, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $318.75.

A. Samuel H. Horne, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Singer Manufacturing Co., 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $809.38.

A. Lawrence W. Horning, 1010 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. New York Central Railroad Co., 230 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Donald E. Horton, 222 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Warehousemen's Association, Merchandise Division.

A. J. Cline House, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,500.

A. Harold A. Houser, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,499.

A. Vernon F. Hovey, 101 Nott Terrace, Schenectady, N.Y.
B. National Dairy Products Corp., 260 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $500.

A. Erma D. Hubbard, 509 Ridgely Avenue, Annapolis, Md.
B. Military Survivors, Inc., 509 Ridgely Avenue, Annapolis, Md.
E. (9) $10.

A. William T. Huff, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $275. E. (9) $28.

A. William J. Hull, 326 Cafritz Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Ashland Oil & Refining Co., 1409 Winchester Avenue, Ashland, Ky.

A. William J. Hull, 326 Cafritz Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Ohio Valley Improvement Association, Inc.

A. Robert L. Humphrey, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. B. A. Hungerford, 53 Park Place, New York, N.Y.
B. George P. Byrne, 53 Park Place, New York, N.Y.

A. C. E. Huntley, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $410.34.

A. Elmer P. Hutter, Post Office Box 1273, Washington, D.C.
B. Richard F. Bates, Sacramento, Calif., and Edward S. Cohen, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1. E. (9) $305.

A. Elmer P. Hutter, Post Office Box 1273, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $10.

A. Illinois Railroad Association, 135 East 11th Place, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $1,205.09.

A. Bernard J. Imming, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,170. E. (9) $36.60.

A. Industrial Union Department, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $13,697.17. E. (9) $13,697.17.

A. J. Stuart Innerst, 245 Second Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,938.46. E. (9) $31.65.

A. Institute of Scrap Iron & Steel, Inc., 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $99.

A. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen and Helpers of America, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $43,128.95.

A. Interstate Manufacturer's Association, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $3.75.

A. Iron Ore Lessors Association, Inc., W–1481 First National Bank Building, St. Paul, Minn.
D. (6) $5,372.50. E. (9) $945.35.

A. Robert C. Jackson, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.
D. (6) $2,150. E. (9) $237.75.

A. Japanese American Citizens League, 1634 Post Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $175.

A. Daniel Jaspan, Post Office Box 2013, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Postal Supervisors, Post Office Box 2013, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,152.49. E. (9) $47.25.

A. Philip F. Jehle, National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Retail Druggists, 205 West Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $3,500. E. (9) $125.

A. Joe Jenness, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert G. Jeter, Dresden, Tenn.
B. H. C. Spinks Clay Co., Paris, Tenn.; Bell Clay Co., Gleason, Tenn.; United Clay Mines Corp., Trenton, N.J.; Old Hickory Clay Co., Paducah, Ky.; Kentucky-Tennessee Clay Co., Cooley Clay Co., Kentucky Clay Mining Co., Mayfield, Ky.; Tennessee Absorbent Co., Southern Clay Co., Paris, Tenn.
E. (9) $328.69.

A. Gilbert R. Johnson, 1208 Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. Lake Carriers' Association, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Glendon E. Johnson, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $915.28. E. (9) $90.88.

A. Hugo E. Johnson, 600 Bulkley Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. American Iron Ore Association, 600 Bulkley Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Reuben L. Johnson.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,029.44. E. (9) $165.20.

A. W. D. Johnson, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Order of Railway Conductors and Brakemen, O.R.C. & B. Building, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.

A. George Bliss Jones, Montgomery, Ala.
B. Alabama Railroad Association, 1002 First National Bank Building, Montgomery, Ala.

A. L. Dan Jones, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $15.95.

A. Phillip E. Jones, 920 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Beet Sugar Association, 920 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $250.

A. Robert F. Jones, 515 Perpetual Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Cable & Radio Corp., 67 Broad Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Rowland Jones, Jr., 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $202.45.

A. Edwin W. Kaler, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Waterman Steamship Corp., 61 St. Joseph Street, Mobile, Ala.
D. (6) $8,750.

A. John E. Kane, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,780. E. (9) $726.14.

A. Jerome J. Keating, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,873.

A. Francis V. Keesling, Jr., 605 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. West Coast Life Insurance Co., 605 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. James C. Kelley, 1600 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Machine Tool Distributors' Association, 1600 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. George J. Kelly, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Bankers Association, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $270. E. (9) $25.

A. Miss Elizabeth E. Kendall, 2310 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $70.

A. I. L. Kenen, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Israel Public Affairs Committee, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $113.19.

A. Harold L. Kennedy, 420 Cafritz Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Ohio Oil Co., Findlay, Ohio.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $258.85.

A. Miles D. Kennedy, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $3,625. E. (9) $74.37.

A. Frank T. Kenner, 38 Niuiki Circle, Honolulu, Hawaii.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $150. E. (9) $13.30.

A. Franklin E. Kepner, Berwick Bank Building, Berwick, Pa.
B. Associated Railroads of Pennsylvania, Room 1022, Transportation Center, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Ronald M. Ketcham, Post Office Box 351, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. Southern California Edison Co., Post Office Box 351, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $875.70. E. (9) $1,674.65.

A. Omar B. Ketchum, 200 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
D. (6) $3,843.75. E. (9) $235.97.

A. Jeff Kibre, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, 150 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $1,576.31. E. (9) $1,323.89.

A. Charles E. Kief, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $1,093.75.

A. John A. Killick, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $12.50.

A. John A. Killick, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $221.25.

A. H. Cecil Kilpatrick, 912 American Security Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Minot, DeBlois & Maddison, 294 Washington Street, Boston, Mass.
E. (9) $287.21.

A. Kenneth L. Kimble, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $230. E. (9) $4.20.

A. Ludlow King, 2139 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Machine Tool Builders' Association, 2139 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. T. Bert King, 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,350.

A. S. F. Kirby, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
B. National Council on Business Mail, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $133.73.

A. Clifton Kirkpatrick, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $510. E. (9) $53.29.

A. Rowland F. Kirks, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Automobile Dealers Association, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,807.66. E. (9) $119.56.

A. Charles J. Kitchas, 3131 West 162d Street, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, 4929 Main Street, Kansas City, Mo.
D. (6) $2,150.

A. James F. Kmetz, 1435 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Mine Workers of America, 900 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,796.

A. Robert M. Koch, 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $15.

A. William L. Kohler, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. The American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $937.50. E. (9) $77.14.

A. Germaine Krettek, 200 C Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $2,694.22.

A. Labor Bureau of Middle West, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C., and 11 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Local Division 689, Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway and Motor Coach Employes of America, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $8,900.50. E. (9) $5,433.89.

A. Lake Carriers' Association, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Harry J. Lambeth, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

A. James K. Langan, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Government Employes' Council, AFL–CIO, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,126.

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Patent Council, Inc., 1434 West 11th Avenue, Gary, Ind.
D. (6) $999.96.

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Quality Brands Associates, Inc., 1001 Grant Street, Gary, Ind.
D. (6) $900.

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Trinity Improvement Association, Inc., 808 Trans-American Building, Fort Worth, Tex.
D. (6) $1,275.

A. Dillard B. Lasseter, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $375.

A. Last Manufacturers Association, 80 Federal Street, Boston, Mass.

A. J. Austin Latimer, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $450.

A. Alan Latman, 200 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. National Committee for Effective Design Legislation, 200 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $702.63.

A. John V. Lawrence, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $630. E. (9) $5.80.

A. Warren Lawrence, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Standard Oil Co. of California, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $155. E. (9) $75.

A. Gene Leach, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,212.50. E. (9) $62.88.

A. Robert F. Lederer, 835 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Association of Nurserymen, Inc., 835 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $21.87. E. (9) $31.12.

A. Ivy Lee & T. J. Ross, 405 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Committee of American Steamship Lines.
D. (6) $6,249.99. E. (9) $8,616.71.

A. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $572.24.

A. Francis Leon, Keshena, Wis.
B. Menominee Tribe of Indians, Keshena, Wis.

A. John R. Lewis, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association, 300 Tulsa Building, Tulsa, Okla.
D. (6) $315. E. (9) $24.20.

A. Hal Leyshon, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Federation of Musicians, 425 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,333.32. E. (9) $1,764.55.

A. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y., and 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,461.34. E. (9) $6,461.34.

A. L. Blaine Liljenquist, 917 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., 604 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $3,125. E. (9) $22.16.

A. Lester W. Lindow, 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $120.

A. Donald Linville, 205 West Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Hardboard Association, 205 West Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $210.

A. Robert G. Litschert, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Cos., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,012.50. E. (9) $85.52.

A. Walter J. Little, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $920.83. E. (9) $718.48.

A. Fred Livingston, 802 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Air Freight Forwarders Association, 802 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Fred Livingston, 802 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Alleghany Corp., 230 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Gordon C. Locke, 418 Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of Oil Pipe Lines.

A. Leonard Lopez, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. District Lodge No. 44, International Association of Machinists, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,499.90. E. (9) $15.

A. Harold O. Lovre, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $85.05.

A. Otto Lowe, Cape Charles, Va.
B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Finance Conference, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Group Hospitalization, Inc., 825 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $250.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mobile Homes Manufacturers Association, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Outdoor Advertising Association of America, Inc., 24 West Erie Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $250.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Roadside Business Association, 646 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $250.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. St. James Lumber Co., Pinewood Acres, Inc., and Gayland, Inc., Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $375. E. (9) $19.50.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Adolph von Zedlitz, 60 Sutton Place South, New York, N.Y.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Western Medical Corp., 415–423 West Pershing Road, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. John M. Lumley, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Division of Legislation and Federal Relations of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $153.12. E. (9) $7.54.

A. Milton F. Lunch, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $750.

A. John C. Lynn, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,162.50. E. (9) $72.60.

A. A. E. Lyon, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,050.

A. LeRoy E. Lyon, Jr., 530 West Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. California Railroad Association, 215 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $4,250. E. (9) $2,621.55.

A. J. A. McCallam, 1507 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $619.59.

A. William C. McCamant, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $15.

A. John A. McCart, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Government Employees.
D. (6) $2,105.60. E. (9) $73.20.

A. J. L. McCaskill, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $225. E. (9) $7.

A. McClure & McClure, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Coca-Cola Export Corp., 515 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $363.28.

A. McClure & McClure, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Philadelphia & Reading Relief Association, Reading Terminal, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Robert E. McCormick, Sheraton Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Retail Jewelers of America, Inc., 901 Sheraton Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $25.75.

A. Angus H. McDonald.
B. Farmers' Educational & Co-Operative Union of America, 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,208.64. E. (9) $257.70.

A. Joseph T. McDonnell, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Cos., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Rev. A. J. McFarland.
B. Christian Amendment Movement.
D. (6) $999.99. E. (9) $300.

A. William F. McKenna, 908 Colorado Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $112.32. E. (9) $27.50.

A. William H. McLin, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Division of Legislation and Federal Relations of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,477.50. E. (9) $34.62.

A. W. H. McMains, 1132 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Distilled Spirits Institute, 1132 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

A. C. W. McMillan, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $606.13.

A. Ralph J. McNair, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $304.75. E. (9) $5.42.

A. Charles R. McNeill, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Bankers Association, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $73.15.

A. William P. MacCracken, Jr., 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. American Optometric Association, Inc., 8001 Jenkins Arcade, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $3,500. E. (9) $112.23.

A. William P. MacCracken, Jr., 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Frankel Brothers, 521 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $0.75.

A. William P. MacCracken, Jr., 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Mrs. Willi Zietz, Savoy Hilton Hotel, New York City.
E. (9) $1.35.

A. John G. MacFarlan, 1503 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Railway Express Agency, Inc., 1503 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,200. E. (9) $1,367.83.

A. Irene Mack, Neopit, Wis.
B. Menominee Tribe of Indians, Keshena, Wis.

A. Arch L. Madsen, 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2.70.

A. Carter Manasco, 4201 Chesterbrook Road, McLean, Va.
B. National Business Publications, Inc., 1913 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,800.

A. Carter Manasco, 4201 Chesterbrook Road, McLean, Va.
B. National Coal Association, Coal Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $247.

A. Olya Margolin, 1637 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Jewish Women, Inc., 1 West 47th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,797.84. E. (9) $125.89.

A. James Mark, Jr., 1435 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Mine Workers of America, 900 15th Street N.W., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,046.

A. Rodney W. Markley, Jr., Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.
D. (6) $4,200. E. (9) $1,205.82.

A. Raymond E. Marks, 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Southern Pacific Co., 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Edwin E. Marsh, 414 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
B. National Wool Growers Association, 414 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
D. (6) $2,750. E. (9) $758.47.

A. Winston W. Marsh, 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Tire Dealers & Retreaders Association, 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Fred T. Marshall, 1112 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The B. F. Goodrich Co., 500 South Main Street, Akron, Ohio.

A. J. Paull Marshall, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $264.37. E. (9) $151.05.

A. Mike M. Masaoka, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Japanese American Citizens League, 1634 Post Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $175.

A. Walter J. Mason, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,250. E. (9) $746.40.

A. David Mathews, Jr., 345 Fourth Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.
B. The Pittsburgh Coal Exchange, 345 Fourth Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.
E. (9) $255.

A. P. H. Mathews, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,087.35. E. (9) $959.65.

A. Charles D. Matthews, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Cos., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $60. E. (9) $21.42.

A. Joe G. Matthews, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $313.50. E. (9) $202.96.

A. Vera Mayer.
B. National Consumers League, 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,179.96.

A. Howard W. Mays, Jr., 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $7.50.

A. Lester H. Means, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. General Electric Co., Appliance Park, Louisville, Ky.
D. (6) $125. E. (9) $21.

A. John S. Mears, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $2,055.

A. Medical Society of the District of Columbia, 1718 M Street, Washington, D.C.

A. J. T. Metcalf, 1023 L. & N. Building, Louisville, Ky.
E. (9) $175.42.

A. M. Barry Meyer, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $116.15.

A. James G. Michaux, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $69.93.

A. Michigan Hospital Service, 441 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
E. (9) $1,532.12.

A. Clarence R. Miles, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

A. John R. Miles, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

A. Military Survivors, Inc., 509 Ridgely Avenue, Annapolis, Md.
D. (6) $237. E. (9) $887.35.

A. Milk Industry Foundation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Dale Miller, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C.
B. Dallas (Tex.) Chamber of Commerce.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Dale Miller, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C.
B. Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas, 2211 South Coast Building, Houston, Tex.
D. (6) $2,625.

A. Dale Miller, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C.
B. Texas Gulf Sulphur Co., Newgulf, Tex., and New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,250.

A. Edwin Reid Miller, 1004 Farnam Street, Omaha, Nebr.
B. Nebraska Railroads Legislative Committee, 1004 Farnam Street, Omaha, Nebr.
D. (6) $2,553. E. (9) $633.92.

A. Lloyd S. Miller, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C., and 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $625.

A. John Minadeo, 237 Glen Caladh, Pittsburgh, Pa.
B. Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, 4929 Main Street, Kansas City, Mo.
D. (6) $3,480.

A. Claude Minard, 215 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. California Railroad Association, 215 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. John R. Minor, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. County Supervisors Association of California, 1100 Elks Building, Sacramento, Calif.
D. (6) $750.

A. M. L. Minzer, Jr., 2631 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Commodity Exchange, Inc., 81 Broad Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,666.65. E. (9) $581.30.

A. Clarence Mitchell, 100 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,875.

A. M. D. Mobley, 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Vocational Association, Inc., 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Willis C. Moffatt, First Security Building, Boise, Idaho.
B. Standard Oil Co. of California et al.
D. (6) $75. E. (9) $3.91.

A. Harry L. Moffett, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $5.45.

A. Donald Montgomery, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Hotel Association, 211 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $75.

A. Walter H. Moorman, 4650 East-West Highway, Bethesda, Md.
B. Maryland Railroad Association, 300 St. Paul Place, Baltimore, Md.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $122.47.

A. Cecil Morgan, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.
B. Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $153.23.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, the Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Reciprocal Insurance Association, Kansas City, Mo.
E. (9) $31.15.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, the Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Area Employment Expansion Committee, 1144 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, the Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Ford Motor Co., The American Road, Dearborn, Mich.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. St. Thomas Chamber of Commerce, Virgin Islands, United States.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, the Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Sperry & Hutchinson Co., 114 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $64.88.

A. Giles Morrow, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Freight Forwarders Institute, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,625. E. (9) $140.36.

A. Harold G. Mosier, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Aerospace Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,056. E. (9) $125.80.

A. William J. Mougey, General Motors Corp., Washington, D.C.
B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

A. Bernard R. Mullady, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers.
D. (6) $2,644.

A. T. H. Mullen, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. T. H. Mullen, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Walter J. Munro, Hotel Washington, Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

A. Dr. Emmett J. Murphy, 5737 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Chiropractic Insurance Co., National Building, Webster City, Iowa.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $300.

A. Kenneth D. Naden, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,375.02. E. (9) $154.91.

A. Paul A. Nagle, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. National Association and Council of Business Schools, 2400 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Association of Direct Selling Cos., 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $13,750. E. (9) $36.

A. National Association of Electric Cos., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,016.66. E. (9) $14,448.93.

A. National Association of Frozen Food Packers, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Association of Insurance Agents, Inc., 96 Fulton Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,500. E. (9) $8,168.15.

A. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $105,437. E. (9) $25,161.08.

A. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,350.65. E. (9) $3,350.65.

A. National Association of Plumbing Contractors, 1016 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $175.

A. National Association of Postal Supervisors, Post Office Box 2013, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $10,625. E. (9) $7,945.71.

A. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1625 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,375.

A. National Association of Social Workers, Inc., 95 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y., and 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,235.

A. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.
D. (6) $1,206.13. E. (9) $1,527.47.

A. National Association of Travel Organizations, 1422 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $21,734.54. E. (9) $682.50.

A. National Business Publications, Inc., 1913 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $2,007.

A. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $457,711.85. E. (9) $4,695.31.

A. National Coal Association, Coal Building, Washington, D.C.

A. National Committee for Effective Design Legislation, 200 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $950. E. (9) $1,952.63.

A. National Committee on Parcel Post Size and Weight Limitations, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Conference for Repeal of Taxes on Transportation, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $17,041. E. (9) $18,283.

A. National Congress of Parents & Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. National Cotton Compress & Cotton Warehouse Association, 1085 Shrine Building, Box 23, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $425. E. (9) $425.

A. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $8,037.30. E. (9) $8,057.30.

A. National Council on Business Mail, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $193.90. E. (9) $733.73.

A. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,558. E. (9) $3,810.

A. National Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, 3027 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
E. (9) $150.

A. National Counsel Associates, 229 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of First Class Mailers, Walker Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $842. E. (9) $743.

A. National Counsel Associates, 229 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Airlines Association, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,400. E. (9) $1,220.

A. National Economic Council, Inc., 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,606.62. E. (9) $1,430.17.

A. National Electrical Contractors Association, Inc., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Electrical Manufacturers Association, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,730.33. E. (9) $2,730.33.

A. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1729 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $94,931.99. E. (9) $10,835.03.

A. National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $177,620.76. E. (9) $29,543.29.

A. National Food Brokers Association, 1916 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,087.40. E. (9) $1,087.40.

A. National Grange, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $8,000.

A. National Housing Conference, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $13,009.15. E. (9) $17,571.49.

A. National Independent Dairies Association, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $443.47. E. (9) $443.47.

A. National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,109.74. E. (9) $2,227.91.

A. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 18th and M Streets NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,465.87. E. (9) $2,487.01.

A. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,371. E. (9) $1,371.

A. National Livestock Tax Committee, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $11,403.38. E. (9) $2,842.

A. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,647.17. E. (9) $4,593.32.

A. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,960.63. E. (9) $5,960.63.

A. National Multiple Sclerosis Society, 257 Fourth Avenue, New York City, N.Y.
E. (9) $771.25.

A. National Parking Association, Inc., 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Postal Transport Association, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $8,399.78. E. (9) $8,399.78.

A. National Reclamation Association, 897 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $18,742. E. (9) $11,280.22.

A. National Restaurant Association, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $15,504.39. E. (9) $15,504.39.

A. National Retail Furniture Association, 666 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $21,886.54. E. (9) $20,560.

A. National Rivers and Harbors Congress, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $14,196. E. (9) $22,135.72.

A. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $625.88.

A. National Shoe Manufacturers Association, 342 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $500.75.

A. National Small Business Men's Association, 801 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $3,194.73.

A. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $193,978.87. E. (9) $5,897.17.

A. National Tire Dealers & Retreaders Association, 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $51. E. (9) $51.

A. National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1730 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill.
D. (6) $3,017.60. E. (9) $1,685.15.

A. National Wool Growers Association, 414 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
D. (6) $3,485. E. (9) $5,088.98.

A. Nation-Wide Committee of Industry, Agriculture and Labor on Import-Export Policy, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,900. E. (9) $14,495.17.

A. Robert R. Neal, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William S. Neal, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. Samuel E. Neel, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 111 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $4,500. E. (9) $3,290.84.

A. Samuel E. Neel, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. James W. Rouse & Co., Inc., 14 West Saratoga Street, Baltimore, Md.; Walker & Dunlop, Inc., 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.; Frederick W. Berens, Inc., 1722 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.; the Carey Winston Co., 1723 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.; B. F. Saul Co., 925 15th Street, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $40.15.

A. A. Z. Nelson, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $21.50.

A. Paul Nelson, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Edgar L. Newhouse III, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Smelting & Refining Co., 120 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $125. E. (9) $167.35.

A. Herschel D. Newsom, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Grange, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,750.

A. New York & New Jersey Dry Dock Association, 161 William Street, New York City.
D. (6) $4,250. E. (9) $6,204.25.

A. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $3,000.

A. O. L. Norman, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Naticnal Association of Electric Cos., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $956.25. E. (9) $25.72.

A. Harry E. Northam, 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
B. Association of American Physicians & Surgeons, Inc., 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. E. M. Norton, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $121.13.

A. Brice O'Brien, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $18.60.

A. George J. O'Brien, 225 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Standard Oil Co. of California, 225 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Herbert R. O'Conor, Jr., 10 Light Street, Baltimore, Md.
B. National Automobile Dealers Association, 200 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $29.45.

A. E. H. O'Connor, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Insurance Economics Society of America, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $8,130.97.

A. R. E. O'Connor, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. John A. O'Donnell, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $600.

A. John A. O'Donnell, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Philippine Sugar Association, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $1,500.

A. John A. O'Donnell, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Philippine War Damage Claimants Association, Escolta Building, Manila, Philippines.

A. Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
E. (9) $2,543.44.

A. Alvin E. Oliver, 400 Folger Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Grain & Feed Dealers National Association, 400 Folger Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $40.90. E. (9) $4.

A. Clarence H. Olson, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $2,595. E. (9) $46.80.

A. Samuel Omasta, 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $5.

A. Order of Railway Conductors & Brakemen, O.R.C. & B. Building, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
E. (9) $885.69.

A. Order of Railway Conductors & Brakemen, O.R.C. & B. Building, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
E. (9) $6,207.22.

A. Clayton L. Orn, 539 South Main Street, Findlay, Ohio.
B. The Ohio Oil Co., Findlay, Ohio.

A. Morris E. Osburn, Central Trust Building, Jefferson City, Mo.
B. Missouri Railroad Committee.
E. (9) $1,115.81.

A. Kermit Overby, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $182.

A. John A. Overholt, 10315 Kensington Parkway, Kensington, Md., and 1131 Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1625 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,076.93. E. (9) $88.65.

A. Vaux Owen, 1729 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1729 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,365.39. E. (9) $17.25.

A. Pacific American Tankship Association, 25 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $1,625.01.

A. Edwin F. Padberg, 1223 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 6 Penn Center Plaza, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Everett L. Palmer, 901 Hamilton Street, Allentown, Pa.
B. Pennsylvania Power & Light Co., 901 Hamilton Street, Allentown, Pa.
E. (9) $162.35.

A. Lew M. Paramore, Town House Hotel, Kansas City, Kans.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.

A. J. D. Parel, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $40.83. E. (9) $6.82.

A. James D. Parriott, 420 Cafritz Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Ohio Oil Co., Findlay, Ohio.

A. A. Lee Parsons, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.

A. James G. Patton.
B. The Farmers' Educational & Co-Operative Union of American, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $705.50.

A. Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 575 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Science Materials Center, Inc., 59 Fourth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Edmund W. Pavenstedt, 14 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Philip C. Pendleton, Second Street Pike, Bryn Athyn, Pa.
B. Charitable Contributors Association, 100 Old York Road, Jenkintown, Pa.
D. (6) $200.

A. Philip C. Pendleton, Second Street Pike, Bryn Athyn, Pa.
B. Family Tax Association, 2110 Girard Trust Building, Philadelphia, Pa.
D. (6) $2,400. E. (9) $1,104.73.

A. Philip C. Pendleton, Second Street Pike, Bryn Athyn, Pa.
B. Pitcairn Co., 100 West 10th Street, Wilmington, Del.,
D. (6) $1,800. E. (9) $547.10.

A. Sandford Z. Persons, 820 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United World Federalists, Inc., 820 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $867.98. E. (9) $99.30.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Post Office Box 111, Lakeland, Fla.
B. Florida Citrus Mutual, Lakeland, Fla.
D. (6) $1,800. E. (9) $327.35.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Post Office Box 111, Lakeland, Fla.
B. West Coast Inland Navigation District, Courthouse, Bradenton, Fla.
E. (9) $115.54.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Post Office Box 111, Lakeland, Fla.
B. C. C. Woodward, 7630 Biscayne Boulevard, Miami, Fla., et al.
E. (9) $30.10.

A. Albert Pike, Jr., 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $72.50.

A. T. E. Pinkston, 101 East High Street, Lexington, Ky.
E. (9) $498.12.

A. Pitcairn Co., 100 West 10th Street, Wilmington, Del.
E. (9) $2,170.52.

A. Plains Cotton Growers, Inc., 1720 Avenue M, Lubbock, Tex.
D. (6) $11,630.56. E. (9) $1,350.

A. Sanford L. Platt, 723 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association, Honolulu, Hawaii.

A. Raymond E. Plummer, 220 Central Building, Anchorage, Alaska.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $612.13.

A. J. Francis Pohlhaus, 100 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. James K. Polk, 40 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, Inc., 4 Irving Place, New York, N.Y.

A. James K. Polk, 40 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Western Pacific Railroad Co., 526 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Frederick T. Poole, 418 Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of Oil Pipe Lines.

A. Frank M. Porter, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.

A. Stanley I. Posner, 1002 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Linen Supply Association of America, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,499.99. E. (9) $555.95.

A. Nelson J. Post, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $121.95.

A. Charles E. Potter, 1411 K Street, NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of American Tanker Owners, Inc., 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,249.99. E. (9) $3,466.54.

A. Richard M. Powell, 1210 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Refrigerated Warehouses, 1210 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Thomas W. Power, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Restaurant Association, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 1530 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $200.

A. Walter I. Pozen, 1519 26th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Washington Home Rule Committee, Inc., 924 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,333.32.

A. William C. Prather, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $275.

A. William H. Press, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Washington Board of Trade, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,800.

A. Ganson Purcell, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Insular Lumber Co., 1406 Locust Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
E. (9) $3.02.

A. Purcell & Nelson, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Government Development Bank for Puerto Rico.
E. (9) $14.44.

A. Purcell & Nelson, Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Nicaragua Sugar Estates, Ltd., Managua, Nicaragua.
E. (9) $30.88.

A. C. J. Putt, 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans.
B. The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans.

A. Arthur L. Quinn, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Instituto Cubano de Estabilizacion del Azucar, acting as Trustees for Asociacion de Colonos de Cuba & Asociacion Nacional de Hacendados de Cuba, Agramonte 465, Havana, Cuba.
D. (6) $4,652. E. (9) $1,250.

A. Luke C. Quinn, Jr., 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Cancer Society, New York City; Arthritis & Rheumatism Foundation, New York City; United Cerebral Palsy Association, New York City; National Multiple Sclerosis Society, New York City, and National Commission for Research in Neurological Disorders, Minneapolis, Minn.
D. (6) $8,249.97. E. (9) $4,775.11.

A. Alex Radin, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $475.80.

A. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Alan T. Rains, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Donald J. Ramsey, 1612 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Silver Users Association, 1612 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $425. E. (9) $55.41.

A. J. A. Ransford, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Tidewater Oil Co., Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Stanley Rector, 506 Hotel Washington, Washington, D.C.
B. Unemployment Benefit Advisors, Inc.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Otie M. Reed, 1107 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Creameries Association, 1107 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,875. E. (9) $3,056.74.

A. W. O. Reed, 6254 Woodland Drive, Dallas, Tex.
B. Texas railroads.
D. (6) $96.45. E. (9) $629.63.

A. J. B. Reeves, Ninth and Jackson, Topeka, Kans.
B. The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., Ninth and Jackson, Topeka, Kans.

A. George L. Reid, Jr., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,999.98. E. (9) $46.87.

A. Herbert S. Reid, 466 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $169.25.

A. C. Frank Reifsnyder and Charles W. Halleck, 800 Colorado Building, Washington, D.C.
B. China Merchants Navigation Co.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $40.

A. James Francis Reilly, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Potomac Electric Power Co., 929 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $555.

A. Louis H. Renfrow, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amherst Coal Co. et al.
D. (6) $6,250. E. (9) $5,425.45.

A. Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $61,526.95.

A. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the U.S. Government, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $11,369.60. E. (9) $8,649.23.

A. James W. Richards, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Standard Oil Co., 910 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $467.45.

A. William E. Richards, Orleans, Nebr.
B. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.
D. (6) $394.13. E. (9) $394.13.

A. Harry H. Richardson, 335 Austin Street, Bogalusa, La.
B. Louisiana Railroads.
D. (6) $75.95. E. (9) $151.69.

A. Leon D. Richeson, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Division 689, Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway and Motor Coach Employees of America, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. James W. Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Industrial Bankers Association, 831 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

A. James W. Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. C.I.T. Financial Corp., 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. James W. Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Entertainment Law Committee, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

A. James W. Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The First National City Bank of New York, 55 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

A. James W. Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Co., 112 East Washington Street, Bloomington, Ill.
D. (6) $1,100. E. (9) $64.98.

A. Siert F. Riepma, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers.

A. John J. Riggle, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,375.

A. George D. Riley, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,250. E. (9) $549.30.

A. John J. Riley, 20th and E Streets NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., 20th and E Streets NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Hugo J. Ripp, 811 North 22d Street, Milwaukee, Wis.
B. Brotherhood of Railway Clerks, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $1,375. E. (9) $1,141.38.

A. E. W. Rising, 328 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Western Sugar Beet Growers Association, Post Office Box 742, Great Falls, Mont.
D. (6) $233.04. E. (9) $298.21.

A. Eugene Ritzner, 2400 Benedict Canyon Drive, Beverly Hills, Calif.

A. Paul H. Robbins, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $250.

A. Frank L. Roberts, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chrysler Corp., 341 Massachusetts Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $100.

A. Charles A. Robinson, Jr., 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $151.99.

A. Robert Ridgway Rodenberg, 2356 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Government of the Dominican Republic, National Palace, Ciudad Trujillo, Dominican Republic.

A. Donald L. Rogers, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association of Registered Bank Holding Cos., 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $343.75.

A. Frank W. Rogers, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Western Oil & Gas Association, 609 South Grand Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $4,550.

A. Watson Rogers, 1916 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Food Brokers Association, 1916 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. George B. Roscoe, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Electrical Contractors Association, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Maurice Rosenblatt, 229 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Counsel Associates, 229 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,150.

A. Royall, Koegel, Harris & Caskey, Wire Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Tax Equality Association, 208 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $3,385.31. E. (9) $415.18.

A. Royall, Koegel, Harris & Caskey, Wire Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Pinkerton's National Detective Agency, Inc., 154 Nassau Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $232.28.

A. Robert M. Ruddick, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Air Lines, 5959 South Cicero Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Albert R. Russell, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $1,879.10. E. (9) $263.28.

A. M. O. Ryan, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Hotel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $290.60.

A. William H. Ryan, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. District Lodge No. 44, International Association of Machinists, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,999.88. E. (9) $60.

A. Ira Saks, 1008 Standard Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Robert A. Saltzstein, 508 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Associated Business Publications, 205 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $297.39.

A. Kimball Sanborn, 810 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Boston & Maine Railroad, Boston, Mass., and New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad, New Haven, Conn.
D. (6) $785. E. (9) $410.

A. L. R. Sanford, 21 West Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 21 West Street, New York, N.Y.

A. O. H. Saunders, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,950.

A. Henry P. Schmidt, 77 Lincoln Street, Jersey City, N.J.
B. Brotherhood of Railway Clerks, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $1,125. E. (9) $970.88.

A. Schoene & Kramer, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. A. Schwab, 1223 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 6 Penn Center Plaza, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Science Materials Center, Inc., 59 Fourth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Arthur E. Scribner, 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $2.25.

A. Seafarers' Section, Maritime Trades Department, AFL–CIO, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $26,250. E. (9) $9,104.49.

A. Durward Seals, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Hollis Mackay Seavey, 1735 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Home Town Free Television Association, 2923 East Lincolnway, Cheyenne, Wyo.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $83.70.

A. Harry See, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.
E. (9) $27.30.

A. Clayton A. Seeber, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Division of Legislation and Federal Relations of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $213.75. E. (9) $69.75.

A. Fred G. Seig, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $195.04. E. (9) $241.50.

A. John A. Selby, 1000 Hill Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Cigar Manufacturers Association of America, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $500.

A. Leo Seybold, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,125. E. (9) $71.55.

A. Alvin Shapiro, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 11 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,843.75. E. (9) $311.43.

A. Harold Shapiro, 927 Lincoln Road, Miami Beach, Fla.
B. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,200. E. (9) $350.

A. A. Manning Shaw, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brown & Lund, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $893.

A. Leander I. Shelley, 608 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. American Association of Port Authorities, Inc., Washington, D.C., and Airport Operators Council, Inc., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,541.64. E. (9) $79.33.

A. Bruce E. Shepherd, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $150.

A. Laurence P. Sherfy, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $600.

A. Robert H. Shields, 920 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Beet Sugar Association, 920 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $750.

A. Robert L. Shortle, 801 International Building, New Orleans, La.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
E. (9) $487.78.

A. Charles B. Shuman, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $625.

A. Silver Users Association, 1612 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $494. E. (9) $848.82.

A. Six Agency Committee, 909 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $6,000. E. (9) $6,108.32.

A. Harold S. Skinner, Post Office Box 2197, Houston, Tex.
B. Continental Oil Co., Post Office Box 2197, Houston, Tex.

A. Carstens Slack, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Phillips Petroleum Co., Bartlesville, Okla.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $275.

A. Harold Slater, 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $875. E. (9) $9.66.

A. Stephen Slipher, 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,187.50. E. (9) $41.65.

A. T. W. Smiley, 135 East 11th Place, Chicago, Ill.
B. Illinois Railroad Association, 135 East 11th Place, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $1,205.09.

A. Dudley Smith, 732 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico, 732 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Harold Arden Smith, 605 West Olympic Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. Standard Oil Co. of California, 225 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $60.

A. James R. Smith, 1060 Omaha National Bank Building, Omaha, Nebr.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.

A. Lloyd W. Smith, 416 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co., 547 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill., and Great Northern Railway Co., 175 East Fourth Street, St. Paul, Minn.
D. (6) $4,257.

A. R. G. Smith, 23 Riberia Street, St. Augustine, Fla.
B. Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, 4929 Main Street, Kansas City, Mo.
D. (6) $2,150.

A. Wallace M. Smith, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Mutual Insurance Alliance.

A. Wayne H. Smithey, 1200 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.
D. (6) $1,922.50. E. (9) $1,205.82.

A. Lyle O. Snader, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $798.76. E. (9) $279.66.

A. Edward F. Snyder, 234 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,465.38. E. (9) $3.60.

A. Society for Animal Protection Legislation, 745 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $590.50. E. (9) $1,979.98.

A. Charles B. Sonneborn, 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $6.

A. Marvin J. Sonosky, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. Taylor Soop, 400 First Street, Washington, D.C.
B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, 330 South Wales, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,978.74.

A. Southern States Industrial Council, 1103 Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.
D. (6) $20,259.78. E. (9) $8,932.50.

A. William W. Spear, 214 National Bank Building, Fremont, Nebr.
B. Standard Oil Co., 910 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $3,081.03.

A. Lyndon Spencer, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. Lake Carriers' Association, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Thomas G. Stack, 1104 West 104th Place, Chicago, Ill.
B. National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc., 1104 West 104th Place, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,800. E. (9) $3,660.04.

A. Howard M. Starling, 837 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $150. E. (9) $16.50.

A. Mrs. C. A. L. Stephens, Post Office Box 6234, Northwest Station, Washington, D.C.

A. Russell M. Stephens, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Technical Engineers, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $240. E. (9) $20.

A. B. H. Steuerwald, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen, 2247 West Lawrence Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $750.

A. Stevenson, Paul, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 1614 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Howard F. Knipp, 3401 South Hanover Street, Baltimore, Md.
E. (9) $14.

A. Stitt & Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Association To Acquire Compensation for Damages Prior to Peace Treaty, Naha, Okinawa.
E. (9) $120.

A. W. E. Stitt, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $3,789.84.

A. Sterling F. Stoudenmire, Jr., 61 St. Joseph Street, Mobile, Ala.
B. Waterman Steamship Corp., 61 St. Joseph Street, Mobile, Ala.
D. (6) $1,406.25.

A. Francis W. Stover, 200 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
D. (6) $2,125. E. (9) $256.95.

A. O. R. Strackbein, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. America's Wage Earners' Protective Conference, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,384.61.

A. O. R. Strackbein, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Allied Printing Trades Association, Box 728, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $625.

A. O. R. Strackbein, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Nation-Wide Committee of Industry, Agriculture, and Labor on Import-Export Policy, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,250.

A. O. R. Strackbein, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Texas Sugar Beet Growers Association, Hereford, Tex.
D. (6) $2,840. E. (9) $116.17.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Association of Surplus Property Importers, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Blackfeet Tribe of the Blackfeet Reservation, Browning, Mont.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Ben Blumenthal, 608 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Federation of American Scientists, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Hualapai Tribe of the Hualapai Reservation, Peach Springs, Ariz.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Laguna Pueblo of New Mexico, Laguna, N. Mex.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Nez Perce Tribe, Lapwai, Idaho.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Oglala Sioux Tribe of the Pine Ridge Reservation, Pine Ridge, S. Dak.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The San Carlos Apache Tribe, San Carlos, Ariz.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Seneca Nation of Indians, 25 Main Street, Salamanca, N.Y.

A. William A. Stringfellow, 6004 Roosevelt Street, Bethesda, Md.
B. National Association of Mutual Insurance Agents, 829 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $4.40.

A. Norman Strunk, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $232.94.

A. J. E. Sturrock, 607 Littlefield Building, Austin, Tex.
B. Texas Water Conservation Association, 607 Littlefield Building, Austin, Tex.
D. (6) $2,100. E. (9) $1,157.03.

A. J. Monroe Sullivan, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pacific American Steamship Association, 16 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $893.75. E. (9) $1,176.88.

A. Frank L. Sundstrom, 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Schenley Industries, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Noble J. Swearingen, 224 East Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
B. National Tuberculosis Association, 1790 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $560. E. (9) $95.91.

A. Charles P. Taft, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $80.78.

A. Glenn J. Talbott.
B. Farmers' Educational & Co-Operative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Edward D. Taylor, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Office Equipment Manufacturers Institute, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John I. Taylor, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $933.33. E. (9) $28.28.

A. William L. Taylor, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Americans for Democratic Action, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,799.98. E. (9) $205.69.

A. Texas Water Conservation Association, 607 Littlefield Building, Austin, Tex.
D. (6) $4,525. E. (9) $6,022.21.

A. Christy Thomas & Barry Sullivan, 536 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of River and Harbor Contractors, 15 Park Row, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $95.33.

A. Christy Thomas & Barry Sullivan, 536 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Puget Sound Bridge & Dry Dock Co., 2929 16th Avenue SW., Seattle, Wash.

A. Oliver A. Thomas, 125 North Center Street, Reno, Nev.
B. Nevada Railroad Association, 125 North Center Street, Reno, Nev.
D. (6) $350. E. (9) $1,222.22.

A. Julia C. Thompson, Sheraton Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Nurses' Association, Inc., 10 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,785.

A. William B. Thompson, Jr., 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $517.01. E. (9) $125.56.

A. Eugene M. Thore, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $13.37.

A. G. D. Tilghman, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Disabled Officers Association, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $7.20.

A. William H. Tinney, 1223 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 6 Penn Center Plaza, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. M. S. Tisdale, 4200 Cathedral Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Armed Services Committee, Chamber of Commerce, Vallejo, Calif.
D. (6) $295. E. (9) $305.22.

A. Tobacco Associates, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,060.

A. H. Willis Tobler, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,468.75. E. (9) $262.55.

A. John H. Todd, 1085 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Compress & Cotton Warehouse Association, 1085 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn.

A. William H. Tolbert, Post Office Box 191, Santa Paula, Calif.
B. Ventura County Citrus Growers Committee, Inc., Post Office Box 191, Santa Paula, Calif.
E. (9) $4,080.22.

A. Dwight D. Townsend, 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Cooperative League of USA, 343 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. F. Gerald Toye, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $350. E. (9) $76.50

A. Trade Relations Council of the U.S., Inc., 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Transportation Association of America, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Mrs. Hattie B. Trazenfeld, 2012 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Federation of Business & Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., 2012 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $7,251.08. E. (9) $2,065.35.

A. Richard S. Tribbe, 1508 Merchants Bank Building, Indianapolis, Ind.
B. Associated Railways of Indiana, 1508 Merchants Bank Building, Indianapolis, Ind.

A. Matt Triggs, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,662.50. E. (9) $116.55.

A. Glenwood S. Troop, Jr., 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,197.50. E. (9) $59.50.

A. J. T. Trullinger, National Bank of Commerce Building, Olympia, Wash.
B. Mobil Oil Co., 612 South Flower Street, Los Angeles, Calif., et al.

A. Ernest Allen Tupper, 1420 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Can Co., 100 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $52.88.

A. Harold J. Turner, Henry Building, Portland, Oreg.
B. Spokane, Portland & Seattle Railway Co., Henry Building, Portland, Oreg.

A. John W. Turner, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, B. of L.E. Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. William S. Tyson, 821 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Local No. 30, Canal Zone Pilots Association, Postoffice Box 601, Balboa, C.Z.
E. (9) $82.96.

A. William S. Tyson, 821 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Western Range Association, 2438 Tulare Street, Fresno, Calif.
E. (9) $93.26.

A. Lewis H. Ulman, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C., and 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $185.

A. Union Producing Co., and United Gas Pipe Line Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.
E. (9) $1,200.87.

A. United Cerebral Palsy Associations, Inc., 321 West 44th Street, New York City.
E. (9) $1,285.59.

A. United Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers of America, 11 East 51st Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $747.51. E. (9) $260.

A. United States Cuban Sugar Council, 801 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,088.09.

A. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $12,597.11.

A. United States Trust Co., of New York, 45 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

A. United World Federalists, Inc., 820 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,512.82. E. (9) $1,034.54.

A. Thomas M. Venables, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Richard E. Vernor, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $100.

A. L. T. Vice, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Standard Oil Co. of California, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $180. E. (9) $77.

A. R. K. Vinson, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Machinery Dealers National Association, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Carl M. Walker, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $200.

A. Leland M. Walker, 1729 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1729 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,692.34. E. (9) $32.10.

A. Paul H. Walker, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $438.75. E. (9) $8.71.

A. Stephen M. Walter, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Cos., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $716.99. E. (9) $7.94.

A. Washington Board of Trade, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Washington Home Rule Committee, Inc., 924 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,966.91. E. (9) $5,768.32.

A. Jeremiah C. Waterman, 205 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Southern Pacific Co., 205 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500.

A. Waterways Bulk Transportation Council, Inc., 21 West Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,740.

A. J. R. Watson, I.C.R.R. Passenger Station, Jackson, Miss.
B. Mississippi Railroad Association, I.C.R.R. Passenger Station, Jackson, Miss.
E. (9) $968.92.

A. Watters & Donovan, 161 William Street, New York City.
B. New York & New Jersey Dry Dock Association, 161 William Street, New York City.
D. (6) $5,625.

A. Weaver & Glassie, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Atlantic Refining Co., 260 South Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Weaver & Glassie, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5. E. (9) $0.80.

A. Weaver & Glassie, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $187.50. E. (9) $18.73.

A. William H. Webb, La Salle Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Rivers and Harbors Congress, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,119.20. E. (9) $406.08.

A. E. E. Webster, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $3,941.76.

A. William E. Welsh, 897 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Reclamation Association, 897 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $125.70.

A. West Coast Inland Navigation District, Court House, Bradenton, Fla.
E. (9) $703.86.

A. John C. White, 838 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $289.46.

A. Marc A. White, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc.

A. Richard P. White, 835 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Association of Nurserymen, Inc., 835 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $37.50. E. (9) $101.61.

A. H. Leigh Whitelaw, 734 15th Street, Washington, D.C.
B. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, Inc., 60 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Scott C. Whitney, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Airlines, Inc., 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $950.

A. Louis E. Whyte, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Arapahoe Tribe of Indians, Wind River Reservation, Fort Washakie, Wyo.
E. (9) $16.69.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, Mont.
E. (9) $277.80.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Indians of California, Post Office Box 901, Redding, Calif.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Menominee Tribe of Indians, Keshena, Wis.
E. (9) $179.59.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Nicholas B. Perry, 5053 North Mount View, San Bernardino, Calif.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Quinaielt Indian Tribe, Taholah, Wash.
E. (9) $6.40.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Spokane Indian Tribe, Wellpinit, Wash.
E. (9) $12.99.

A. Franz O. Willenbucher, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Harding deC. Williams, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 36 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill., and 1300 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,417. E. (9) $66.75.

A. John C. Williamson, 1300 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 36 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill., and 1300 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,700. E. (9) $853.73.

A. Kenneth Williamson, Mills Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Hospital Association, 840 North Lakeshore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,644.23. E. (9) $1,079.19.

A. Clark L. Wilson, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Emergency Lead-Zinc Committee.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $1,386.99.

A. E. Raymond Wilson, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,597.44.

A. Everett B. Wilson, Jr., 732 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico, 732 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

A. W. E. Wilson, 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.
B. Union Producing Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La., and United Gas Pipe Line Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $600.87.

A. W. F. Wimberly, Post Office Box 4147, Atlanta, Ga.
B. The Pure Oil Co., 35 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. Everett T. Winter, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.

A. Theodore Wiprud, 1718 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Medical Society of the District of Columbia, 1718 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Wood, King, Dawson & Logan, 48 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Committee for Broadening Commercial Bank Participation in Public Financing, 50 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Russell J. Woodman, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Order of Railroad Telegraphers, 3860 Lindell Boulevard, St. Louis, Mo.

A. Edward W. Wootton, 1100 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Wine Institute, 717 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Donald A. Young, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America.

A. J. Banks Young, 502 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $1,680. E. (9) $19.76.

A. Edmund A. Zabel, 200 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
D. (6) $1,825.02. E. (9) $37.65.

A. Sidney Zagri, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,375.

A. Gordon K. Zimmerman, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Zimring, Gromfine & Sternstein, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C., and 11 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Local Division 689, Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway and Motor Coach Employees of America, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $2,517.61.

REGISTRATIONS

The following registrations were submitted for the second calendar quarter 1960:

(NOTE.—The form used for registration is reproduced below. In the interest of economy in the RECORD, questions are not repeated, only the essential answers are printed, and are indicated by their respective letter and number.)

FILE TWO COPIES WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE AND FILE THREE COPIES WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.

PLACE AN "X" BELOW THE APPROPRIATE LETTER OR FIGURE IN THE BOX AT THE RIGHT OF THE "REPORT" HEADING BELOW:

"PRELIMINARY" REPORT ("Registration"): To "register," place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.

"QUARTERLY" REPORT: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this Report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page "3," and the rest of such pages should be "4," "5," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the Act.

Year: 19_____

REPORT

PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

	QUARTER			
P	1st	2d	3d	4th
(Mark one square only)				

NOTE ON ITEM "A".—(a) IN GENERAL. This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:

(i) "Employee".—To file as an "employee", state (in Item "B") the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer". (If the "employee" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employee".)

(ii) "Employer".—To file as an "employer", write "None" in answer to Item "B".

(b) SEPARATE REPORTS. An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report:

(i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.

(ii) Employees subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.

A. ORGANIZATION OR INDIVIDUAL FILING:

1. State name, address, and nature of business.

2. If this Report is for an Employer, list names or agents or employees who will file Reports for this Quarter.

NOTE ON ITEM "B".—*Reports by Agents or Employees.* An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employers, except that: (a) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (b) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as "employers"—is to be filed each quarter.

B. EMPLOYER.—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

NOTE ON ITEM "C".—(a) The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this Report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation." "The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House"—§ 302(e).

(b) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "Preliminary" Report (Registration).

(c) After beginning such activities, they must file a "Quarterly" Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

C. LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS, AND PUBLICATIONS in connection therewith:

1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated, ☐ place an "X" in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports.

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the *specific* legislative interests by reciting: (a) Short titles of statutes and bills; (b) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (c) citations of statutes, where known; (d) whether for or against such statutes and bills.

3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (a) Description, (b) quantity distributed; (c) date of distribution, (d) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed)

4. If this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a "Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. If this is a "Quarterly" Report, disregard this item "C4" and fill out item "D" and "E" on the back of this page. Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarterly" Report.

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]

PAGE 1

A. American Veterans Committee, 1830 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Samuel W. Anderson, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Cerro de Pasco Corp., 300 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y., and American Metal Climax, 1270 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.

A. Arnold, Fortas & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Howard F. Knipp, 3401 South Hanover Street, Baltimore, Md.

A. William J. Barnhard, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Chamber of Commerce for Trade with Italy, Inc., 105 Hudson Street, New York, N.Y.

A. William J. Barnhard, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Olive Oil Association of America, 51 Chamber Street, New York, N.Y.

A. William J. Barnhard, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Strohmeyer & Arpe Co., Inc., 139 Franklin Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Richard E. Barton, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, 404 South Bixel Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. W. N. Brinker, 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Institute of Scrap Iron & Steel, Inc., 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. George Bronz, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amity Fabrics, Inc., 12 West 32d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Harry C. Butcher, 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Home Town Free Television Association, 2923 East Lincolnway, Cheyenne, Wyo.

A. Chapman, Wolfsohn & Friedman, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Camara Minera de Mexico, Gante, Mexico, D. F. Mexico.

A. Chapman, Wolfsohn & Friedman, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Camara Nacional De La Industria Pesquera Manuel Maria Contreras No. 133, Mexico, D. F. Mexico.

A. Chapman, Wolfsohn & Friedman, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Hawaiian Botanical Gardens Foundation, Inc., 1527 Keeaumoku Street, Honolulu, Hawaii.

A. Chapman, Wolfsohn & Friedman, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. West Marin (Calif.) Property Owners Association, 960 Fifth Avenue, San Rafael, Calif.

A. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Ball, Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Sporting Arms and Ammunition Manufacturers Institute, 250 East 43d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Industrial Bankers Association, 813 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Industrial Bankers Association, 813 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Laundry-Dry Cleaning Association of District of Columbia, 2400 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Michael B. Dean, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Twentieth Century Airlines, Lockheed Air Terminal, Burbank, Calif.

A. J. Arnold Feldman, 10011 Dickens Avenue, Bethesda, Md.
B. American Veterans Committee, 1830 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William C. Fitch, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Retired Teachers Association and American Association of Retired Persons, Washington, D.C.

A. Jerry N. Griffin, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Industrial Bankers Association, 813 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Ben H. Guill, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Automobile Dealers Association, Washington, D.C.

A. Gypsum Association, 201 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Robert Hale, 1039 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Wisconsin Avenue Committee on Transportation Problems, 3900 Wisconsin Avenue, Washington, D.C.

A. John W. Hight, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Lawrence S. Hobart, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. W. Ervin James, 1107 South Coast Building, Houston, Tex.
B. Houston Baseball Club of Continental League, Bank of Southwest Building, Houston, Tex.

A. Henry B. Jordan, 916 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Cyrus W. and Lucille M. Manfull, 13152 Wentworth Street, Pacoima, Calif.

A. Sheldon Z. Kaplan, 817 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Guatemala Sugar Producers Association, Guatemala City, Guatemala.

A. Keatings & Older and Roland E. Ginsberg, 3325 Wilshire Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. Great Lakes Airlines, Inc., Lockheed Air Terminal, Burbank, Calif.

A. Richard H. Keatinge, 3325 Wilshire Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. Great Lakes Airlines, Inc., Lockheed Air Terminal, Burbank, Calif.

A. Augustine R. Kelley, 6303 Hollins Drive, Bethesda, Md.
B. Florida and Georgia Cigar Leaf Tobacco Association, Quincy, Fla.

A. Labor Bureau of Middle West, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C., and 11 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric and Motor Coach Employes of America, Washington, D.C.

A. Harry J. Lambeth, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Thomas B. Lawrence, 917 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Licensed Beverage Association, 420 Seventh Street, Racine, Wis.

A. Legislative Research, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Francis Leon, Keshena, Wis.
B. Menominee Tribe of Indians, Keshena, Wis.

A. Roy T. Lester, M.D., 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Lobby for Peace, 345 Franklin Street, San Francisco, Calif., and 327 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.

A. Bernard Locker, 4716 44th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Group Hospitalization, Inc., 825 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. H. B. McCoy, 1333 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Trade Relations Council.

A. William P. MacCracken, Jr., 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Mrs. Willi Zietz, Savoy Hilton Hotel, New York City.

A. Irene Mack, Neopit, Wis.
B. Menominee Tribe of Indians, Keshena, Wisc.

A. Julia L. Maletta.
B. Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, 15 Union Square, New York, N.Y.

A. Bernard Moss, 2500 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Supplemental Air Carrier Conference, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Platform for Peace—1960, 18339 47th Place NE., Seattle, Wash.

A. William C. Peather, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill

---

A. William H. Quealy, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Smith-Corona Marchant, Inc., 701 East Washington Street, Syracuse, N.Y.

A. William H. Quealy, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Standard Oil Co. of California, Standard Oil Building, San Francisco, Calif.

A. James W. Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Industrial Bankers Association, 813 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Robert R. Schutz, 327 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Lobby for Peace (Northern California), 327 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C., or 345 Franklin Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Clifton H. Scott, 155 Jackson Street, Denver, Colo.
B. Continental League, 41 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Seafarers' Section, MTD, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.

A. Hollis Mackay Seavey, 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Home Town Free Television Association, 2923 East Lincolnway, Cheyenne, Wyo.

A. Harold Shapiro, 927 Lincoln Road, Miami Beach, Fla.
B. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William L. Shea, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. D.C. Transit Co., 3600 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Edgar G. Shelton, Jr., 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Broadcasting Co., 7 West 66th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Stitt & Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Association To Acquire Compensation for Damages Prior to Peace Treaty, Naha, Okinawa.

A. Surrey, Karasik, Gould & Efron, 1116 Woodward Building, Washington, D.C.
B. South Puerto Rico Sugar Co., 99 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Richard A. Tilden, 441 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Clothespin Manufacturers of America, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Richard A. Tilden, 441 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. R. E. Schanzer, Inc., 608-612 South Peters Street, New Orleans, La.

A. Hattie B. Trazenfeld, 704 Third Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., 2012 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Water and Power for Self Employed, 405 South Hill Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Thomas D. Webb, Jr., 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. D.C. Transit Co., 3600 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Indians of California, care of Clyde F. Thompson, Post Office Box 901, Redding, Calif.

A. Zimring, Gromfine & Sternstein, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C., and 11 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The 86th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is quite obvious that many persons do not realize how closely their welfare, their opportunities for jobs, for education, health services, old age and disability pensions, and a decent livelihood are affected by decisions of the Congress and the President, or by the failure of the Congress and the President to act on important and essential issues.

WHAT CONGRESS MEANS TO YOU

The power of the Federal Government is divided among the executive branch under the President, the legislative branch under the Congress, and the judicial branch under the courts. It is not possible to properly understand your Congress without understanding its relationship with the executive department. Because decisions or indecision by Congress and the President and his Cabinet officers affect each and every citizen, it is of extreme importance for all of us to know our Government and to know how it functions, and to understand the basic issues which have a far-reaching impact on every citizen.

YOUR HELP NEEDED

Good government depends to a large extent upon the interest and the participation of our citizens in political and governmental affairs. In the complexities of our modern society it is often difficult for the average citizen to understand how government actually affects him. Congress determines our Federal income and corporation tax rates, veterans' programs, social security benefits, farm programs, public works, minimum wages, foreign trade, and hundreds of other matters. The executive department, headed by the President, administers the laws, formulates basic economic and fiscal policies, foreign policy, collects taxes, enforces Federal laws, and directs the expenditures of public funds for programs voted by Congress.

RESPONSIBILITY

When one political party has control of both the legislative and executive branches, as has usually been the case in our history, it is quite evident where the responsibility lies. During the past 5 years, however, control of the Federal Government has been divided between the Republican executive and the Democratic legislative branches.

This is further complicated by another important factor which is very confusing unless one follows closely political and Government matters. Congress has been dominated by a coalition of Republicans and Southern Democrats for more than 10 years. These two groups most often vote together on matters affecting social welfare programs, economic issues, education, and other programs of vast importance to the average citizen. In the 86th Congress, the conservative coalition was successful in blocking or watering down many legislative proposals offered by liberal Democrats which include all Northern and Western Democrats and some progressive Southern members.

POWER OF PRESIDENT

The coalition of Republicans and extreme conservative Southern Democrats is an important force in strengthening the hand of the President, since a two-thirds vote, in both the House and Senate, is necessary to override a Presidential veto. This gives President Eisenhower and his associates the power to block progressive and humanitarian legislation sponsored by regular Democrats.

But aside from the control of Congress by the President and his coalition leaders, the President and his Cabinet officers have great powers in their own right. The power of the executive department is strongly felt in the administration of laws passed by Congress.

COALITION POWER

In the past decade there has been no real change in the control of Congress which has been, and still is, dominated by the Republican-Dixiecrat coalition. The only real change came in control of the executive department when President Eisenhower replaced President Truman. It was this change that brought the conservative hard money and high interest rate policies, the laxity in the enforcement of laws dealing with monopolies and tax collections, and the unsympathetic administration of many liberal and progressive programs which have been historically opposed by reactionary interests.

Administration policies which affect the average citizen most are high interest, hard money and curtailment policies.

These policies give vast power to a relatively few persons and determines to a large extent, the rate of the Nation's economic growth and how fairly the average family will share in the Nation's wealth and productivity. On no other issue is the real difference between the two great political parties so pronounced, as on this money issue.

TRICKLE-DOWN

The hard money and high interest rate policy of the President and his coalition leaders, reflects the thinking and philosophy of big financial interests which support and advocate fiscal and economic policies often referred to as the trickle-down philosophy championed by former President Herbert Hoover and President Eisenhower's close friend and White House adviser, Mr. George Humphrey. Humphrey, who is former Secretary of the Treasury, was instrumental in sponsoring and pushing the high interest rate policy of the Eisenhower administration.

The trickle-down theory is in sharp conflict with the liberal Democratic philosophy of building prosperity from the bottom up. High interest rates have funneled a heavy share of the Nation's wealth to fewer hands, and have produced a top-heavy economy, spurred inflation, curtailed economic growth, and resulted in two recessions, unemployment, and much suffering which Democrats contend is unnecessary and unjust. Democrats seek to strengthen the econ-

omy at the base and would make the average citizen more prosperous with programs for public works, schools, hospitals, better social security, and the like.

SPENDING ISSUE

In opposing liberal and progressive legislation, administration and Republican congressional leaders charge that such programs are inflationary and that Democrats are wasteful spenders. Yet the big spending program of the Federal Government today is for high interest rates, big business subsidies, and defense—not for these liberal programs.

The President gets big headlines in denouncing Government spending, yet Congress has actually cut the President's budget request by billions of dollars. As a matter of fact, the Eisenhower administration has broken all previous spending records. Its big spending has benefited but a very few. Little of it has trickled down to help the average citizen. The national debt has risen by more than $20 billion in the past 6 years, although there was a solemn pledge by the President to reduce it.

The record shows that in 7 years under President Eisenhower, Federal spending totaled $497 billion. This amount, spent by Eisenhower in 7 years, is larger than the total spending for 12 years of $373 billion under Franklin Roosevelt, which included the cost of World War II and the New Deal programs which followed the big depression during the Hoover administration. The official record shows that in 7 Eisenhower years, the Government spent $124 billion more than in those 12 Roosevelt years.

RECORD SPENDING

Another example of big spending is in the Department of Agriculture by Secretary Ezra Benson. Benson has spent $31 billion in 7 years as Secretary of Agriculture in the Eisenhower Cabinet. The official record shows that all other Secretaries of Agriculture, since the Department was formed in 1861, spent a total of $27½ billion. In 7 years, as the record clearly shows, Benson spent over $3 billion more than the total of all his predecessors combined in the last 100 years.

The record also shows that Benson has piled surpluses mountain high. Storage costs of farm surpluses are now more than a million dollars a day, or five times as much as that spent by Benson's predecessor. Mr. Benson is a vocal advocate of Government economy. But the official record shows that in practice he has increased the number of employees in his Department of Agriculture from 67,000 in 1952 to 98,000 in 1959—an increase of 31,000. It also shows that the farm income since 1953 is down one-fifth and food prices are up 5 percent.

Beneficiaries of these policies of the Department of Agriculture are not the farmers and not the public, but the speculators and gamblers in the commodity market, who never before had it so good. Benson has been protected by friendly columnists, commentators, and wire services, who have kept the shocking cost of his policies from the taxpayers. Few people have access to these facts for this is the sort of information which few columnists or commentators report.

FEDERAL AID TO SPECIAL INTERESTS

Subsidies, tax write-offs, and tax loopholes, which are very costly to the public, fit in with the overall fiscal, hard money, and trickle-down policies of the administration. One good example is the million-dollar-a-month postal subsidy to the Luce publications. No mention is made of such subsidies in the administration proposal to raise letter postage rates from 4 cents to 5 cents. While benefiting immensely from Federal aid in the form of postal subsidies, big magazines such as Life and Reader's Digest oppose spending for progressive and humanitarian programs as inflationary while they support costly high-interest rates, hard money, and trickle-down policies.

Immigration Law Revisions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HIRAM L. FONG
OF HAWAII

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter, written by me, addressed to Hon. FRANCIS E. WALTER, chairman, Immigration and Nationality Subcommittee, House of Representatives, relating to discrimination against the peoples of Asia in immigation matters.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEPTEMBER 1, 1960.

The Honorable FRANCIS E. WALTER,
Chairman, Immigration and Nationality Subcommittee, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter of June 14, 1960, which appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 1 and in which you commented on certain statements contained in my article on the discrimination against the peoples of Asia in our present immigration policy, which appeared in the Honolulu Advertiser of May 22, 1960, and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 1.

There is no question that the McCarran-Walter Act, in 1952, meant a significant step forward in the treatment of the peoples of Asia under our immigration laws. The honors you mention as having been bestowed upon you and Senator McCarran were well deserved. Eight years have passed meanwhile. In these 8 years, great changes have taken place. The atomic age and the jet age have arrived. New nations are emerging in Asia and Africa. The ideological conflict between communism and the free world has become a matter of survival.

The United States must demonstrate its leadership of the free world by deeds and not only by words. This is the reason impelling me to seek amendments of the immigration laws to complete the development which you and Senator McCarran initiated in 1952.

I do not wish to repeat all the facts stated in my article of May 22, but should like to stress again the following points:

1. It is offensive to the peoples of Asia and the Pacific that they should be accountable to quotas by race when other immigrants are accountable to quotas by their place of birth. We cannot justify this provision of our law by pointing to the more discriminatory laws which existed prior to 1952.

2. It is difficult to explain to any person, whether Asian or not, why an immigrant of Russian or Swiss parentage born in Brazil may come to the United States without quota restrictions, while an immigrant born in Brazil with 50 percent or more Japanese or Indian blood in his veins must be charged to a heavily oversubscribed quota of the Asia-Pacific triangle.

3. Not even our best friends in the Far East can understand why the creation of a new country in Asia with a quota of its own necessitates the reduction of the minimum quotas of all other countries in the Asia-Pacific triangle so that their total never exceeds 2,000.

4. Under the McCarran-Walter Act an Asian family will be separated in migration if the wife is accountable to an oversubscribed quota although her husband is chargeable to an open quota. On the other hand, a non-Asian wife accountable to an oversubscribed quota may be given the quota of her immigrant husband if he is fortunate enough to have access to an open quota. It is embarrassing for me as a Member of the United States Senate to answer the question why the traditional policy of the Congress to keep families united in migration does not apply to an Asian family.

I agree with you that the quotas of Burma, Cambodia, Malaya, Laos, Nepal, Vietnam, and Thailand are open and unused, as these are countries which generally have not sought migration for their peoples beyond their own borders. However, the quota report of the Department of State dated April 1, 1960, to which you refer lists as heavily oversubscribed the quotas of China, India, Indonesia, Japan, Korea, Pakistan, and the Philippines. The quotas of these countries are so heavily oversubscribed that nonpreference quota immigrants have to anticipate an indefinite waiting period. The same list shows that the so-called Asian-Pacific quota is backlogged for 6 years. The State Department quota list dated August 1, 1960, which has just come to my attention, shows that the quota for Chinese persons, 1 month after the beginning of the new fiscal year, is already completely exhausted for the remaining 11 months.

India, Japan, and the Philippines, and the other countries just referred to, have traditionally sought immigration to the United States. They are the countries which will influence more than some others the future of the world. The friendship of their peoples is crucial to all those who are fighting for the preservation of freedom.

I strongly believe that the problem of immigration is no longer just a domestic issue but seriously affects our stand in the world. I believe we should tackle it on a nonpartisan basis to strengthen our posture among free nations. I appeal to you for your cooperation.

Very truly yours,

HIRAM L. FONG.

My Record of Important Votes in the 86th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. HAYS
OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my voting record on 22 of the

most important bills to come before the House of Representatives during the 86th Congress. I have done this every 2 years since I have been in Congress and mailed out copies so that my constituents could have a convenient method of checking my record. As voters in the 18th Congressional District they have the right to know how their Congressman represented them in Washington and how I voted on the major issues.

The record follows:

My vote	Issue	Result
Yes	Extension of mutual security program for 1 year with emphasis on economic assistance	Became law.
Yes	U.S. participation in international program for resettlement of European refugees	Became law.
Yes	Federal loans and grants for industrial redevelopment in depressed areas	Vetoed.
Yes	Increase Federal minimum wage	Passed House
Yes	Federal aid for primary and secondary highway systems	Became law.
Yes	Permits income tax deduction of medical expenses incurred by taxpayer in care of dependent parent over 65	Became law.
Yes	Extends direct and guaranteed loans to veterans for homes, farms, or business	Became law.
Yes	Public works projects on rivers and harbors for flood control and improvement of navigation	Became law.
Yes	Increases grants to local governments for sewage treatment works for water pollution control	Vetoed.
Yes	Civil Rights Act of 1960	Became law.
Yes	Grants for Federal-State program of medical care for aged; liberalizes and extends coverage under the Social Security Act	Became law.
Yes	Labor-management reform bill	Became law.
Yes	Aid to school districts for school construction	Passed House
Yes	Establishes system of licensing and control over manufacture of narcotic drugs	Became law.
Yes	Extends special milk program for children	Became law.
Yes	Resolution proposing constitutional amendment giving the District of Columbia citizens the right to vote for President and Vice President	Adopted.
Yes	New veterans pension law	Became law.
Yes	Raise Small Business Administration's authority to make business loans by $150,000,000	Passed House
No	Increases Federal gasoline tax	Became law.
Yes	Restores authority of Administrator of Rural Electrification Administration to approve loans without supervision by Secretary of Agriculture	Vetoed.
Yes	Preferential immigration status to relatives of citizens and permanent residents of the United States	Became law.
Yes	Authorizes President to designate Captive Nations Week for prayer for freedom of people behind Iron Curtain	Became law.

Industrial Racketeers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DALE ALFORD

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. ALFORD. Mr. Speaker, I have recently read an article which calls attention to the fact that millions of dollars are being paid out every year by companies to racketeers using tried and true gyp artist methods, and that the swindlers are on the increase.

In this survey, conducted by Purchasing magazine, it is pointed out that a large number of industrial purchasing agents reported their companies had been victimized by slick operators during the past year, and that most of these operators had gone scot free.

The exclusive feature, "Industrial Racketeers," appearing July 18 in Conover-Mast's Purchasing, discloses alarming facts: First, industry is losing millions of dollars each year in swindles; second, 20 percent of the purchasing agents interviewed said they had been approached by shady operators within the past 12 months; third, 17 percent said these frauds were on the rise; fourth, 15 percent admitted their own companies had been victimized in the past.

Detection of these unscrupulous or illegal rackets is made doubly difficult since companies often prefer to pay off rather than go through embarrassing publicity.

Unfortunately—

Says Purchasing—

a surprisingly large number of companies let themselves be bullied into making payment just to get out of an unpleasant situation.

Some of the moneymaking frauds are: The stationery sob story, the phony error racket, the warehouse closing, the bargain pencil racket, and the low bid racket.

Though each of these highly profitable rackets varies in technique, they have one common denominator. In each case the purchaser falls for the scheme because he is interested in saving money for his company. He is, therefore, susceptible to offers of bargains, which more often than not turn out to be well-organized gyp schemes, costing the company a great deal more than legitimate services or products would have cost.

Congressional Investigations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. PAUL KITCHIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. L. H. FOUNTAIN, of North Carolina:

CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATIONS

(Address by Congressman L. H. FOUNTAIN, of North Carolina, before the 62d annual meeting of the North Carolina Bar Association at Myrtle Beach, S.C., June 16, 1960)

I deem it a high privilege and a great honor to be able to speak to you, my distinguished colleagues of the North Carolina Bar Association, on the occasion of our 62d annual meeting.

No experience gives me a greater source of pride and joy than that of being and meeting with members of my own profession, especially those from my home State. I am proud of the North Carolina bar because I believe it has no peer in any State of the Union.

In fact, the longer I am in public life, the prouder I am of the legal profession and the great part it has played and is still playing in building, strengthening, and preserving our American way of life. However, your president invited me to speak, not about our great profession, but on the subject of congressional investigations.

In spite of the prominent coverage being given by the press to the travel expenses of some congressional committees and individual members thereof, I hope we will not lose sight of the essential and very necessary jobs being performed by congressional committees; for it is a known fact that their hard work results in savings of not just millions, but billions of dollars to the taxpayers and in greater efficiency of governmental operation.

As chairman of a House Government Operations Subcommittee which has the responsibility of following our appropriated dollars within certain departments and agencies in the interest of economy and efficiency, I am certainly opposed to extravagance or waste in the use of public funds by any branch of government, whether by means of travel expenses or otherwise.

At the same time, it would be most unfortunate if the kind of criticism contained in the press accounts to which I have referred were to deter appropriate Members of the Congress from making necessary and valuable investigative trips.

I am quite confident that the authors of those travel-expense stories, based upon their own knowledge of congressional investigations, if questioned, would quickly admit both the necessity and the value of congressional committee investigations to the taxpayers of America.

While on this particular subject, let me assure you that on the few occasions when the subcommittee of which I am chairman has found it necessary to travel our hotel accommodations and other expenses related to our travel have been very modest, and at times even austere.

Although the subject of congressional investigations does not today evoke as emotional and heated a reaction as during the 83d Congress, investigations by committees of the Congress, aside from their costs, are still very much in the news and constitute a matter of great and continuing importance. The use of this investigative power, unfortunately, is frequently misunderstood and sometimes misrepresented. To better understand the role of the congressional investigation, perhaps it would be helpful to trace briefly the origin and development of this institution as we know it today.

The legislative investigation originated in 17th-century England at a time when Parliament was engaged in limiting the royal prerogative and establishing the rule of law. In consonance with the English experience, the American settlers quite naturally endowed their colonial assemblies with the power of legislative investigation, and this tradition was passed on to the new Republic.

While not explicitly stated in the Constitution, the power of investigation is generally considered to be, and has been so held by the Supreme Court, inherent in the legislative powers conferred on the Congress by article I, section I.

The investigative powers of Congress were asserted for the first time in 1792 when the House created a select committee to inquire into the disaster of the St. Clair Expedition against the Indians. While the power of Congress to investigate has not been seriously questioned since the early days of the Republic, the scope of that power has been, and continues to be, a matter of some dispute.

It is interesting to observe that the concern of congressional investigations has tended pretty much to follow the growth of our Government and its responsibilities. In the early years, investigations were relatively infrequent and were concerned mostly with the conduct of Government agencies and officials. The War Between the States was accompanied by investigations of the conduct of military operations. Then, with the extensive development of commerce in the 1870's, investigations were directed to business and later to the affairs of the banking and financial community. In the 1920's the investigative spotlight was used to expose instances of national corruption, including the infamous Teapot Dome scandal.

The great depression of the thirties, as we all know, focused legislative attention largely on economic problems. This was followed in the past two decades by numerous investigations concerned with national security and the loyalty of private citizens and, more recently, with labor and management problems. The recent emphasis of investigations on the affairs of private individuals and groups, along with the traditional congressional interest in the conduct of public agencies and officials, has created concern in some quarters about committee procedures and the rights of witnesses.

What, it might be asked at this point, is the purpose of a congressional investigation? First, it should be recognized that Congress could not legislate wisely without first obtaining adequate knowledge of the conditions necessitating correction or regulation. The use of committees to obtain the facts, to enable interested parties to be heard, and to recommend desirable courses of action, is the only practical method of operation for a large legislative body.

Second, and of equal importance, is the use of the investigative machinery to check on the administration of the laws by the executive branch. This is a responsibility of the Congress which is performed principally by each Chamber's Committee on Government Operations, of which I am a member in the House. The power to investigate is an essential tool of the Congress, not alone to determine the needs of the various executive departments, but also for holding the executive accountable for the proper and efficient administration of the laws and for the prevention of misconduct in the executive branch.

Congressional investigations are ordinarily conducted by a committee or one of its subcommittees. It may be one of the standing committees of the House or Senate or a special or select committee created for the purpose of making a specific inquiry. The standing committees and their powers and duties are prescribed by the rules of the House and Senate in accordance with the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. A special committee, by contrast, derives its authority from a resolution which serves as the committee's charter.

While the Congress possesses great latitude for undertaking investigations in connection with its legislative function—the Court has held that any areas in which Congress can properly legislate is an area subject to congressional investigation [1]—this power is not unlimited. And while the Supreme Court has not acted to specifically define these limits, it has repeatedly declared that limits do exist. The nature of such limits is perhaps most clearly expressed in the Quinn case [2] in these words:

"The power to investigate, broad as it may be, is also subject to recognized limitations. It cannot be used to inquire into private affairs unrelated to valid legislative purposes. Nor does it extend to an area in which Congress is forbidden to legislate. Similarly, the power to investigate must not be confused with any of the powers of law enforcement; those powers are assigned under our Constitution to the executive and the judiciary. Still further limitations on the power to investigate are found in the specific individual guarantees of the Bill of Rights, such as the fifth amendment privilege against self-incrimination."

The much publicized Watkins case [3] added the caution that "investigations conducted for the personal aggrandizement of the investigators or to punish those investigated are indefensible. There is no congressional power to expose solely for the sake of exposure."

In the main, the Court has recognized under the separation of powers the authority and responsibility of the Congress itself to regulate its use of the power of investigation. It has been advocated by some observers, however, that the courts should require the proceedings of a congressional investigation to meet the requirements of substantive due process.

There can be no serious questioning of the obligation of investigating committees to conduct themselves with fairness and restraint. Differences of opinion relate, rather, to the nature of the specific procedural guarantees, and the extent to which these should be formalized and by whom.

I am reminded here of the sage words contained in the Federalist Paper No. 51, which is attributed by historians to either Madison or Hamilton. In advocating the doctrine of the separation of powers, the author observes:

"It may be a reflection on human nature that such devices should be necessary to control the abuses of government. But what is government itself but the greatest of all reflections on human nature? If men were angels, no government would be necessary. If angels were to govern men, neither external nor internal controls on government would be necessary. In framing a government which is to be administered by men over men, the great difficulty lies in this: you must first enable the government to control the governed; and in the next place oblige it to control itself."

What, we may ask, are the essential conditions for the fair and responsible conduct of investigations? While committee procedure in general is prescribed by House and Senate rules, discretion necessarily plays a large part in determining how investigations are carried on.

Surely we should expect investigations to be conducted in a nonpartisan manner and reasonably confined to the matters under consideration. Adequate advance notice of hearings and their purpose should and is now required to be given to members of the committee, and active participation even encouraged on the part of the minority as well as the majority members. I am happy to say that in the Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee, of which I have the honor to be chairman, we have never knowingly or consciously used investigations for partisan purposes and, as a consequence, the subcommittee's findings and recommendations are usually adopted unanimously.

I would like to say at this point that the responsibility and cooperative attitude of the minority members of the subcommittee during the 85th and 86th Congresses contributed substantially to the nonpartisan and constructive spirit in which our work was carried on.

We make it a practice, also, to prepare for hearings as thoroughly as possible in order to obtain complete and concise information for the record without wasting the time of witnesses or committee members. The really constructive hearings are seldom spontaneous—they are almost always the result of many hours and even weeks or months of careful preliminary work by the committee chairman and his staff.

Because of the nature and importance of the responsibilities assigned to our Committee on Government Operations, it is one of the few House committees which may sit, hold hearings, and act without special permission while the House is in session. This authority has been extended also to the Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee, with the result that committee members sometimes find themselves engaged in hearings or other committee business when the roll is called on the floor of the House. Unfortunately, the reason for their absence is not always readily apparent to visiting constituents in the gallery or from examination of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The subcommittee has also been granted the authority to issue subpenas requiring the attendance of witnesses and the production of papers, documents, and books in connection with its investigations. We have used this power very sparingly.

Except for a few unusual instances, such as when our subcommittee was concerned about the possibility of damaging the reputation of a witness in a conflict of interest investigation, we have made it a practice to hold open hearings and to make information about our activities freely available. I believe strongly that those of us in the Congress who are chairmen of committees have been entrusted with serious and important responsibilities and the public has a right to know how we are performing them. For this reason, most of our hearings and all our reports are printed and can be obtained by interested persons without charge. However, the great majority of our citizens learn about congressional investigations only through news reports.

By and large, the newsmen who cover Capitol Hill do a very commendable job of handling a tough assignment. However, the pressure of deadlines and the great volume and technical nature of committee work make it extremely difficult for reporters to present complex issues clearly and fully. Sensational sidelights, unfortunately, sometimes seem to crowd out more significant matters.

While a legislative investigation differs greatly from a judicial proceeding and is neither required nor expected to follow court procedures, I believe that procedural safeguards for the witness should be adhered to as far as is practicable. For example, a witness appearing before a committee should be permitted to be accompanied by his own counsel and should always be given an opportunity to fully state his case for the record. An accurate stenographic record should be kept of the hearing, with a copy made available for the witness' inspection. With respect to television, radio, and photographic coverage in the committee hearing room, as in the courtroom, the advantage of wider news coverage must be balanced against the possibility of disrupting orderly and dignified procedures.

While neither the House nor the Senate has adopted a rule governing the televising of hearings, it appears that a witness may effectively object to testifying before cameras. In the case of *U.S.* v. *Kleinman* (1952) (107 F. Supp. 407) where the facts indicated that a defendant was confronted with "television

[1] *McGrain* v. *Daughtery* (273 U.S. 135 (1927)).

[2] *Quinn* v. *United States* (349 U.S. 155 (1955)).

[3] *Watkins* v. *United States* (354 U.S. 178 (1956)).

and newsreel cameras, news photographers with their concomitant flashbulbs, radio microphones, a large and crowded hearing room with spectators standing along the walls," the court held that the refusal of a defendant to testify was justified. It should be pointed out that it is the policy of the Speaker of the House that committee hearings may not be televised.

Many of you will recall the widespread criticism of congressional investigations that was prevalent not long ago and the various measures for reform proposed by the American Bar Association, lawyers, journalists, Members of Congress, and others. As a result of this public concern, the House amended its rules in 1955 in order to clarify and spell out certain provisions relating to committee procedures and the rights of witnesses. Included in these amendments were a prohibition against one-man subcommittees, and a statement of the right of a witness at an investigative hearing to be accompanied by his own counsel.

In the work of the Government Operations Committee, we are concerned principally with appraising the administrative performance of the Federal departments and agencies. This has given rise to a special investigative problem that should be mentioned—that of the occasional refusal of a Federal department to furnish information or records essential for evaluating its work. This highly controversial problem of Executive privilege, however, is much too large and complicated a subject for inclusion in this discussion.

In closing, I think it appropriate and useful to recall some words written nearly 2,000 years ago: "Blame not before thou has examined; understand first and then rebuke. Answer not before thou hast heard; interrupt not in the midst of a speech." This wisdom of the ages might well serve as the foundation of a sound policy for all investigations.

Foreign Propaganda and Federal Censorship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BYRON L. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, in light of the widespread interest in the bill H.R. 12753, approved by the House on August 22, which would amend the Subversive Activities Control Act, I call several items to the attention of any person who may be interested.

There were hearings on similar bills, H.R. 4105 and S. 1273, before Subcommittee No. 3 of the House Committee on the Judiciary in the 84th Congress, 2d session, July 9, 1956, serial 27.

Editorials with respect to that bill appeared in the New York Times on July 9, 1956, and in the Washington Post on July 14, 1956, and a news story in the Washington Star on July 10, 1956.

A complete legal review of the issues can be found in the University of Pennsylvania Law Review for March 1959 and April 1959, volume 107, Nos. 5 and 6.

Unfortunately, none of these materials were used during the discussion here on the floor on August 22. I trust that the Members of the Senate or other Members of the House who may be interested will familiarize themselves with such material in order that Members may have more complete background with respect to this topic before we are again called upon to vote on such legislation.

The Rising Tide of Violence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, the rising tide of violence in the world is a matter that gives us all deep concern. The reversion to savagery in the Congo and the ugly campaign of hate in Cuba are recent examples.

Our able and distinguished colleague, Hon. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS, of Michigan, at the annual banquet of the National Association of Women Lawyers here in Washington on August 27 took notice of this rising trend toward a return to the law of the jungle. I believe her comments are worthy of the consideration of every Member of this House, and under leave to extend my remarks, I submit her speech as follows:

When I accepted the invitation to speak here this evening I had originally intended to confine my remarks to the congressional problem of dealing with trade between nations, more particularly, trade between this Nation and Cuba; but since that time a more fundamental problem has been turned loose upon the world, and I would like first to address myself, however briefly, to the rising tide of violence in the world. One of the most amazing examples was the inability of the established government of an old and long civilized country, Japan, to guarantee the safety of our President from youth gangs.

The Belgian Congo, frightening as it may be to the leadership of nations the world over, presents to lawyers, in my judgment, the most interesting, if not the most primitive legal problem of many centuries, that is the almost total lack of law and order; and the real lack of sufficient foreseeable leadership to establish a government capable of operating in the 20th century on an equal footing with the governments of great industralized states.

It is hardly conceivable that the descriptions of horror emanating from reporters on the scene in the Congo could have been written on any other continent in the world in the past 2 centuries. One reporter from Leopoldville writes: "I will not soon forget the scenes of villages burned to the ground, of women raped and then cut into pieces, or heaps of hands and feet gathered together as trophies of victory. And I did not see the worst; the scenes of cannibalism. Everywhere, this conflict is dragging the youth down to the barbarism of their fathers."

We who are the inheritors of the slow-building, century-by-century, of the common law; we who took as commonplace the passing of monarchies; the replacement of one government by the revolutionary forces of another government must now realize in fascinated horror, first, that law and order is established by reasonable men; and second, that such reasonable men must apply sufficient power or force to maintain order.

All of us, even those of you who may have sympathized with the cry "Africa for the Africans" must now reawaken to the painful knowledge that a nation cannot be maintained, even if established, unless it can guarantee the peace within its own boundaries, and the safety, not only of its own nationals, but of visitors within its domain.

The great powers of the earth may be able to guarantee the borders of small nations against invasions but it remains to be seen whether they can help create and guarantee internal order within a small nation.

The question posed by the Belgian Congo is whether men of the 20th century working in cooperation can bring men of the Stone Age into the 20th century or whether the cooperation will be replaced by a war so calamitous that the 20th century will be pulled back into the Stone Age.

There are those who in their despair or in their superficial reasoning would now like to blame Belgium. Either Belgium should have trained more Congolese to take over the reins of government, or Belgium should not have left the Congo. Let us examine both theses.

Belgium went into the Congo in 1877. Belgium had a population of a little over 5 million at that time. In 1891 there were 425 Belgians in the Congo and over 27 million natives.

During at least the first 50 years of Belgium rule the prevailing ideas of the rulers of the Western World were that colored people could not be educated to white men's standards. It is therefore, in my judgment, not really surprising that Belgium did not proceed at its own cost to set up schools and colleges and force higher education upon the Congolese, or even to offer it to them. I might remind you that in this respect we had an almost impossible time getting our own National Congress to enact a scholarship program for our own people. Indeed, we did not do it until we called it a defense program. Isn't it, therefore, ridiculous to belittle a civilized group of Europeans of 50 years ago for failing to train a group of savages thousands of miles away from them.

In all honesty it must be admitted that colonial experiments were not carried on for the benefit of the colony. They were to enrich the life of the mother country. It is largely incidental that they did, as a matter of fact, enrich the colony.

Suppose we consider the second alternative. Why did Belgium grant the freedom so quickly? Frankly, I don't know; but I would assume that they felt the problem of keeping order, squashing riots, maintaining peace was not worth the price it would cost them. Consider, for instance, the fantastic price to France of maintaining Algiers. Even if Belgium had remained in the Congo, if it had been necessary for them to deal with local riots and rebellions, could they have relied upon the sympathetic understanding of the rest of Africa, of the rest of the world? Of course not. Shakespeare's romantic and dramatic "All of the world's a stage" has become "All of the world is an audience" and all of the audience is prepared to throw rotten tomatoes some of which might be loaded with hydrogen bombs.

At the present time it would be delightful to say of the entire Congo situation "Let them have it. Let's all go home." But we can't say that. We can't do that. The Soviets won't go home. It could be expected that they would immediately extend their rule to this richest mineral area of the Continent of Africa. This we cannot tolerate. The Congo is rich in uranium and we are the chief purchaser. We certainly would not willingly abandon our opportunity for this trade. But, more importantly, we are now apparently irrevocably committed to the policy of government, if not necessarily by the consent of the governed, at least by nationals of the majority group of the country governed.

While we cannot enforce this behind the Iron Curtain, we have certainly gone sled length in the remaining free world. Thus, the war in Korea, the great applause for the

withdrawal of the British Empire from her oversea dominions, the Dutch from Indonesia plus the demands by this administration that Israel, France, and England withdraw from the Suez. This will be but prelude to the demand that the United States leave Panama. I repeat "all of the world is an audience."

Let me suggest, we are viewing now as lawyers or as legislators, if you will, the comparatively simple problem of maintaining order in a nation.

Order, such as it was, had been maintained by the old system of colonialism. As that system has passed, it has opened for the Soviets, the most militant power in the world, an unparalleled opportunity to establish its own system of order. If they have been turned back by war in Korea and by measures short of war, such as the Berlin airlift from actually taking over a country, they have not been idle in other ways.

The modern world which demands new hosts of independent countries—15 new governments having come into being in the past 12 months—demands by the very nature of its industry a greater interdependence among nations economically.

The Soviets have not conspicuously contributed to the problem of maintaining order in the emerging nations. Rather, their purposes have been best served by adding confusion, by stirring up the old hatreds and arousing old prejudices. They have, however, happily moved in to tie nations to them with trade. In that connection, let us now consider Cuba.

For more than 60 years Cuba has supplied sugar to this Nation, ranging in amounts up to one-half of our total annual supply. It is true that since the Jones-Laughlin Sugar Act we have paid them more than the world price. However, this has been done largely to protect our own sugar growers who produce the world's highest priced sugar. Part of the price paid for the foreign sugar has come back to us in tariff which has been sufficient to pay all of the subsidies to our own beet and cane growers.

In the Sugar Act of 1956, we arranged to purchase approximately one-third of our sugar from Cuba. We did this partially because of our longstanding friendship for Cuba. But we should face reality. We also did this because Cuba was a heavy purchaser of American made products, ranking not less than eighth in the world. We were also serving our own interests, therefore, when we purchased from Cuba.

With the coming to power of Castro and his "Hate America" campaign, the situation changed. This time the government, which certainly seemed to be capable of maintaining order, deliberately set about making life unpleasant for visiting Americans. The result was that an annual $40 million of American tourist business dwindled to nothing. Cuban luxury hotels stand empty of guests.

American nationals had large holdings in Cuba. (Please consider that a large part of American foreign policy is geared to the encouragement of private investment, as well as public investment, in underdeveloped countries.) This had occurred voluntarily in Cuba over the past three decades. It did not solve the problem. Those investments became part of the problem. Now, Castro threatened confiscation of American holdings. The American Sugar Act was up for renewal in Congress this year. The American public and the American Government became restive. Democracies are not geared to speedy action. They grope their way toward laws and trade relations that their people will support. But even a democracy must finally act. At this point the President asked Congress for the sole power to cut the Cuban sugar quota. Congress cut the Cuban quota completely and gave the President the power to restore such part as he deemed in the national interest.

Then, in roughly this sequence, the following events transpired: Russia, the largest producer of sugar in the world, who had been purchasing sugar from Cuba for 5 years with fanfare, pomp and ceremony dramatically doubled her largest previous order. Castro began the confiscation of American oil refineries and sugar plantations. He had, of course, played his last card.

There remained little hope that our continued purchase of sugar from that nation could help us. We had to take our business elsewhere—among friends, or at least among nations that understood that the first principle of a good business deal is "Don't spit on the customers." The President then cut drastically the Cuban sugar quota. Russia stepped in to increase their sugar purchases in exchange for crude oil, shipped in Red China's tankers.

In this series of events—who won and who lost? In my judgment—Cuba and the United States lost—Russia won.

The standard of living in both Cuba and the United States was or will be diminished in each country by the amount of trade that was lost, which cannot be replaced elsewhere. Russia gained trade and prestige. She helped another nation win a hate campaign against us. As long as she can continue to put the blame on us for Cuba's lowered standard of living, while herself profiting from their trade, she will continue to win.

What can we do and the free world do to establish and maintain order in nations like the Congo and to survive the hate campaigns in nations like Cuba?

The right of Cuba and the Congo to select their own Government is the right among other rights, to create disorder, to set up a different standard of values, a different view of crime; and is the right finally to aid in pulling the rest of the world into poverty, chaos, and death.

Against the aggressive actions of political immaturity and hatred the free world moves by slow and painful steps to protect itself.

The United Nations by creating a climate of world opinion aids in creating a standard of performance of nations, to the heroic efforts of that organization in the Congo we are undoubtedly indebted for peace today.

The World Bank; the International Development Association and the Inter-American Development Bank are made up of many member nations attempting to answer the great need for capital in the underdeveloped countries, while trying to avoid the result of Cuba's reaction to American investment.

The World Health Organization, composed of 87 sovereign nations cooperates to prevent the spread of communicable diseases. It gives dramatic emphasis to the value of cooperation.

The Organization of American States is an effort of this hemisphere to iron out its own problems.

When enumerated these efforts all sound so hopeful and so easy. They are hopeful, but they are not easy. They have been attained by years of patient, painful, and frustrating effort of innumerable men and women throughout the free world; men and women who have sat in committees composed of delegates from the nations of the world presenting the problems of each nation; seeking a common solution; men and women who have sat in legislative bodies listening patiently to the explanation of the laws needed to effect such cooperation, then explaining in turn to their constituencies the problem and the solution. And when the effort was completed, sometimes the solution has become a problem or has failed in its mission and the whole process has to be started again.

The road to peace, filled with quagmires, will be walked together by men of many nations who have forgiven and forgotten the bond of slave and master, of exploiter and exploited, which bound their forefathers in bitter enmity; but the old road, over which man has traveled for centuries, unrecognized by man for what it is, still calls us back. The hatred of man for man and nation for nation, so easy to instill, so hard to overcome, remains the true hope of the Soviets. Through the arousing and the exploitation of our latent and mutual hatreds, they expect to win the world to communism.

Man has come a long way upon his course, accompanied in the last few years by the shadow of the bomb, which but emphasizes the urgency under which we must seek a better understanding of the problems of our world and their solutions—and in that problem solving, this nation must lead the way.

Immigration and Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the text of a letter I wrote the Honorable CHESTER BOWLES, of Connecticut:

AUGUST 8, 1960.

HON. CHESTER BOWLES,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHESTER: On July 2, 1960, I wrote you regarding the immigration plank of the Democratic platform and I attached a proposal of such plank stressing that it would have great humanitarian appeal and at the same time alleviate the fears of a great many Americans who are plagued with chronic unemployment problems evident in many areas of our country, including the area I come from.

For the record, I wish to repeat the text of my proposal:

"HUMANE IMMIGRATION POLICY

"The large increase of population of the United States revealed by the 1960 census, together with the accelerated shift of our population from rural into urban and suburban centers, as well as the trend of mass movements from the East to the West and the Southwest, has created economic and social problems as yet not resolved. The inadequacy of urban housing, educational and health facilities, and the relocation of manufacturing establishments are the main facts of this complex picture.

"It is imperative that these factors be considered in connection with our immigration policy. Automatic numerical additions to our country's annual intake of immigrants will result in aggravation of the problems faced by our own population and result in regrettable hardship to the newcomer, who seeks economic betterment in America and not a continuation of the harsh life in the depressed economies of the homeland he decided to leave.

"The traditional American policy of hospitality for the immigrant and a safe haven for the oppressed shall, however, not be altered. That policy was implemented in the last 15 years when, under Democratic leadership, a series of laws were enacted, providing for the continuation of immigration policies, enabling the United States to receive refugees from persecution on account of race, religion, or political beliefs. Sound immigration policy was similarly implemented by legislation sponsored and channeled through the Congress by Democrats,

which enabled immigrant families to remain united or to reunite in cases where they became separated in the course of their migrations.

"We likewise believe that it is imperative that our immigration policy provide sound safeguards to prevent the admission to these shores of Communist agents or other subversives who threaten our internal security. We believe that immigration policy preventing the separation of immigrant families and permitting speedy reunion of families is greatly advantageous not only to the immigrants themselves, but to the welfare of the United States and its citizens as well, inasmuch as it facilitates social and political assimilation and enhances economic integration especially when the immigrant enters into a home established by his close relative in this country. We pledge ourselves to the implementation of these policies."

Unfortunately, the immigration plank of the Democratic platform prepared by your committee and approved at the Los Angeles convention bears very little similarity, if any, to my proposal. No pride of authorship is involved, believe me. But as a man who for the last 12 years has been responsible for most that has been done in the field of immigration domestically, and in the field of migration internationally, I cannot refrain from expressing my deep disappointment at what was made a part of our platform as far as immigration is concerned.

Frankly, what appears in the platform are a few excerpts from speeches made quite some time ago by individuals advocating special immigration privileges and selected groups. The old material has not even been reviewed in the light of legislation enacted in the last few years. The result is that what our platform presents to the voters is out of date, not borne out by facts, and insincere. It is simply phony.

Let me explain in detail what I have in mind and let me go over the immigration plank point by point.

Platform: "We shall adjust our immigration, nationality and refugee policies to eliminate discrimination and to enable members of scattered families abroad to be united with relatives already in our midst."

Facts: The Congress has exercised continuous watchfulness over the needs of refugees and scattered families and the result of it is that since the end of World War II this country has never been left without an active refugee immigration program such as embodied in the Displaced Persons Acts of 1948 and 1950, the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, and the act of September 11, 1957.

In addition to that, the permanent immigration law, the Walter-McCarran Act, has equipped this country to deal with emergency problems such as typified by the exodus of Hungarians following the abortive Budapest uprising of 1956. Under the provisions of section 212(d)(5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the doors of this country remain open to those who need a safe haven in a hurry, when Congress is not in session, or where legislative action could not meet the requirements of time. Thus, the Congress has seen to it that the United States is at all times in possession of adequate instrumentality to maintain the position of leadership our country has assumed in granting asylum and permanent homes to displaced persons and refugees.

Similarly, the Congress has seen to it that relief legislation designed to reunite immigrant families and bring into the United States alien members of those who became U.S. citizens or permanent residents of this country be continuously on the statute books as the needs arose. The above-cited act of September 11, 1957 (secs. 5, 6, 9, 11, and 12), as well as the acts of September 9, 1959, and September 22, 1959, eloquently testify that the problem of separated families has been not only constantly in our minds, but that it has been satisfactorily solved.

The fallacious character of the immigration plank is even more evident in the light of the fact that on July 14, 1960, while our convention was still in session, the President signed Public Law 86-648 under which an additional number of refugees will be able to enter the United States. Bear in mind, please, that, on the date of the enactment of this new refugee law, the Department of State still had immigrant visas available for refugees pursuant to the law enacted on September 11, 1957 (a law which I sponsored jointly with our candidate, JACK KENNEDY). Thus, we have seen to it that there is no hiatus in the admission of refugees.

Platform: "In this World Refugee Year it is our hope to achieve admission of our fair share of refugees. We will institute policies to alleviate suffering among the homeless wherever we are able to extend our aid."

Facts: Part of what I said above applies to this empty, pious statement, but let me stress that, during the entire World Refugee Year, the United States has been admitting refugees pursuant to existing law (sec. 15 of the act of Sept. 11, 1957). In addition to that, the United States has contributed $5 million to the funds administered by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees in connection with the World Refugee Year. The enactment of the act of July 14, 1960, implements in a more than adequate way our pledges made in accepting the U.S. participation in the World Refugee Year and determines our "fair share" in the resettlement of the remaining refugees. It is so held by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees and the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration. The World Refugee Year ended before the platform promise was made.

Platform: "We must remove the distinctions between native-born and naturalized citizens to assure full protection of our laws to all. There is no place in the United States for second-class citizenship."

Facts: There are no second-class citizens under the naturalization and nationality laws of the United States. This blatant lie has been invented by Communists who seek the elimination of a statutory provision under which a naturalized citizen who, within 10 years following his naturalization, engages in subversive activities may face the rescission of his naturalization by judicial (not administrative) action. Does the Democratic Party advocate the repeal of that provision of the law?

As far as rights and privileges of citizens are concerned, persons born and persons naturalized in the United States are placed on an exact equality by the Constitution. No law has, or could, change that. The only distinction between citizenship by birth and citizenship by naturalization affects eligibility to being elected to, or to assume the office of the President of the United States. This provision is contained in the Constitution, not in any of our naturalization or nationality statutes.

What the present law does, continuing the provisions of all nationality laws enacted since the erection of this Republic, is to provide for loss of citizenship by those who shortly after naturalization elect to return to the country of their nationality, or live permanently in some other foreign country. Exceptions from this old, general rule were greatly enlarged by the Walter-McCarran Act, and further enlarged by the act of August 4, 1959.

As to the general principle involved, let me quote the following:

"Citizenship is membership in a political society and implies the duties of allegiance on the part of the member and a duty of protection on the part of the society. These are reciprocal obligations, one a compensation for the other. * * * (But) the clearest implication those (naturalization) laws show that it was not intended that naturalization could be secured thereunder by an alien whose purpose was to escape the duties of his native allegiance without taking upon himself those of citizenship here, or by one whose purpose was to reside permanently in a foreign country and to use his naturalization as a shield against the imposition of duties there, while by his absence he was avoiding his duties here. Naturalization secured with such a purpose was wanting in one of its most essential elements—good faith on the part of the applicant. It involved a wrongful use of a beneficent law. * * * That the taking up of a permanent residence in a foreign country shortly following naturalization has a bearing upon the purpose with which the latter was sought and affords some reason for presuming that there was an absence of intention at the time to reside permanently in the United States is not debatable."

These words are not mine. The Supreme Court of the United States said that on October 20, 1913 (*Luria* v. *United States*, 231 U.S. 9). Has the Democratic Party a case to make against this?

Platform: "The national-origins quota system of limiting immigration contradicts the founding principles of this Nation. It is inconsistent with our belief in the rights of man. This system was instituted after World War I as a policy of deliberate discrimination by a Republican administration and Congress."

Facts: The national-origins quota system was embodied in the law in 1924, and has served as the basic formula for the distribution of quota immigrant visas since that time. Except by critics catering politically to minority groups and special interests, the national origins quota system is generally considered to have worked well and served very well the national interests of the United States.

The national-origins quota system is not predicated upon race, culture, morality, intelligence, physical attributes or other characteristics of the people in any foreign country. Our quota system is based on the image of our own people. It is like a mirror held up before the American people, reflecting the proportions of their various national foreign origins. The main purpose of it is to permit the speedy assimilation of the newcomer and his absorption into our social, political, and economic system more readily than if the immigrants would arrive in numbers disproportionate to the national orgins of the people who receive them and make them a part of their own.

Let me quote this: "In formulating a permanent policy two considerations are of prime importance. The first is that the country has the right to say who shall and who shall not come in. It is not for any foreign country to determine our immigration policy. The second is that the basis of restriction must be chosen with a view not to the interest of any group or groups in this country, whether racial or religious, but rather with a view to the country's best interests as a whole. The great test is assimilability. Will the newcomers fit into the American life readily? Is their culture sufficiently akin to our own to make it possible for them easily to take their place among us? There is no question of superior or inferior races, or of Nordics, or of prejudice, or of racial egotism. Certain groups not only do not fuse easily, but consistently endeavor to keep alive their racial distinctions when they settle among us. They perpetuate the 'hyphen' which is but another way of saying that they seek to create foreign blocs in our midst."

Again, these are not my words. They are taken verbatim from an editorial printed in the New York Times on March 1, 1924, a few weeks before the principle of national origin was selected as the distribution formula of the immigration laws of the United States.

However, what is even more important than the consideration of the fairness and the logic of the national-origins quota system is the fact that our basic immigration quotas are nothing but a base upon which our laws operate. The quota has actually no bearing on the number of immigrants entering our country. First, for reasons of hemispheric comity, the quotas do not apply to our neighbors of the Americas. Second, mindful of the humane aspects of immigration and realizing the impact of our immigration policy upon our foreign relations, the Congress has at all times provided for the entry of immigrants outside of the basic immigration quotas, including refugees and relatives of U.S. citizens and permanently residing aliens.

Thus, while in the decade 1930–39, the total of immigrants who entered the United States was 699,375; during the following decade, 1940–49, such total was 856,608; and, in the decade 1950–59, the total rose to 2,499,268.

Here are the figures illustrating the entry of quota and nonquota immigrants since the enactment of the Walter-McCarran Act:

Fiscal year	Quota	Nonquota
1953	84,175	86,259
1954	94,098	114,079
1955	82,232	155,558
1956	89,310	232,315
1957	97,178	229,689
1958	102,153	151,112
1959	97,657	163,029
Total	646,803	1,132,041

Platform: "The protections provided by due process, right of appeal, and statutes of limitation, can be extended to non-citizens without hampering the security of our Nation."

Facts: Under the Immigration and Nationality Act, full protection of all rights is provided to aliens, even to those who have entered this country illegally. Neither due process of law nor judicial review of administrative decisions is curtailed or limited by any provisions of the law. Administrative procedures prescribed in the Immigration and Nationality Act have been extensively tested in the courts, including the Supreme Court of the United States, and they withstood the tests with flying colors—including attacks on their constitutionality.

As to statutes of limitation, the law moves even beyond what is normally so termed. The law contains numerous provisions providing relief for immigrants guilty of reprehensible or outright criminal conduct where such relief was never available to them prior to the enactment of the law presently in effect. Our motif in writing these provisions was the desire not to disrupt family units. One of those relief provisions contains even a statute of limitation on membership in subversive organizations, a provision entirely novel in our immigration laws (secs. 212(a)(28)(I), 244(a)(5), 313 (c) and (d) of the basic code, and sec. 5 of Public Law 85-316).

Hoping that I have adequately dealt with details, let me say, in summing up, that I am genuinely sorry that, having included in the platform a set of wornout slogans and meaningless promises to do things which have already been done, we are now facing our voters without any outline of what our immigration policy is or what it should be.

We may find some consolation in the fact that our Republican opponents have similarly not overexercised themselves. They simply stated that they want to double the number of immigrants entering our country annually. They did not say where they are going to find jobs for them. This, however, does not surprise me as they did not say where they are going to find jobs for those already in this country, either.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS E. WALTER,
Chairman, Subcommittee No. 1, Committee on the Judiciary.

Some Aspects of American Foreign Policy—Address by Senator Fulbright Before American Bar Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, at this moment the distinguished chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], is making an address before the American Bar Association in the city of Washington, D.C. I have had an opportunity to read the address. I think it is broad and comprehensive. It indicates the thought which the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee always gives to his foreign policy pronouncements. It shows the high degree of intelligence he has and the deep knowledge he possesses in the field of foreign affairs.

Because of its timeliness and the scope which it encompasses, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD. I express the hope that Members of the Senate and the House will, during the time available, read the speech, because it is worthy of the consideration of each and every one of us. It is a speech which I commend, because it is in the usual vein in which the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee makes his pronouncements, and I think it indicates deep study and great intelligence.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOME ASPECTS OF AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

(Address of Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, chairman, Senate Foreign Relations Committee, before American Bar Association, Washington, Sept. 1, 1960)

Mr. Chairman and distinguished guests, I am honored to be included on your program and to have the opportunity to share with you some of my thoughts and hopes regarding our position in the world.

According to the press, both of our American political parties seem agreed that foreign policy is the main issue in the coming election. However, foreign policy is not a thing apart. To a degree not fully appreciated by our people, our foreign policy is the summation of all our policies. Our Nation's foreign policy is so dependent upon our strength and competence in other fields that it is merely one aspect of our defense policy, our economic policy, our agricultural policy and, above all, our educational policy. It is, in short, a reflection of our national conception of ourselves and our role in the world.

Failure fully to appreciate this fact accounts, I think, for a curious ambivalence in the American approach to national policy. I emphasize national policy as distinguished from foreign policy or the various segments of domestic policy. If one looks at the United States by itself, one sees an economy which, though it still contains isolated pockets of deplorable poverty, has nevertheless achieved a hitherto unknown level of abundance and productivity.

Yet, if one probes more deeply beneath the chrome-plated surface of American life, he comes inescapably to the conclusion that the American people, by and large, are not happy. The incidence of mental illness and of physical ailments associated with emotional stress is increasing rapidly. American doctors last year wrote almost 50 million prescriptions for the various drugs that come under the general heading of tranquilizers. Every year the waiting lists of psychiatrists, psychoanalysts, and psychotherapists get longer. It has occurred to me that perhaps one of the difficulties is not in ourselves as individuals but in ourselves in our collective capacity as a nation. It would be helpful, I think, if the developing science of psychiatry could make a study of national egos and motives and personalities; for it seems to me that nations have quite as hard a time understanding themselves as do individuals.

I believe that such a study would conclude that America's trouble is basically one of aimlessness at home and frustration abroad. Webster defines "frustration" as a state which results when one has been prevented from attaining a purpose. The American people have attained their private purposes almost too well at home; but beyond their personal material needs they have not yet recognized an objective or purpose which inspires their real interest.

In their relations with the rest of the world, many Americans feel that we have done all the right, decent, and noble things to no avail. In two decades we have fought two wars, one global and one limited to Korea; we have poured out $78 billion in foreign aid of one kind or another; we have sent our sons to places many of us had never even heard of. Yet we find our Vice President stoned in Caracas, our President kept from Tokyo by howling mobs, and our flag trampled in the dust in Panama, in La Paz, and elsewhere.

Above all, we find the lengthening shadow of the hammer and sickle creeping forward through Asia, through Africa, and even into the Caribbean. How and why this has occurred is surely a natural and legitimate question.

Now, as I suggested earlier, I do not think we can find separate solutions to our problems at home and to our problems abroad. They are all really facets of the same problem. And this problem is one which is common to the West, though it is perhaps more acute in the United States than elsewhere.

It is a paradox that we suffer both from aimlessness, or lack of purpose, and from frustration, or failure to achieve a purpose. This unfortunate condition results, in part at least, from confusion regarding our purposes and our objectives specially in our relations with other nations. I think we have tended to set our goals too low at home and too high abroad. We have tended to expect either too little of ourselves, so that the accomplishment of it gives us no great satisfaction, or too much, so that failure results in severe frustration.

May I elaborate upon this latter aspect of our affliction. Historically, our excursions into foreign affairs have been primarily military—painful experiences which were to be gone through as quickly as possible so that we could return to life and business as usual. Even when we are not dealing with strictly

military matters, we still use military terminology. We talk about the cold war and about psychological warfare, in—to use a cliché which I am thoroughly sick of—the battle for the minds and hearts of men. I think we still tend to regard the cold war as an episode rather than an era, although it is already a mighty long episode.

Our frustration results from the discovery that we are not able to fix things up quickly; that in spite of our prodigious efforts, a peaceful, free, secure, and prosperous world has not resulted. The flaw in our approach is the time span in which we have sought to achieve these objectives.

If I may illustrate: It is not uncommon these days to hear brave words about instituting the rule of law among nations and that a great conference should be held to promote it. It seems to me to be a little unrealistic to expect this when we are not able to persuade two-thirds of the Senate to repeal the Connally amendment. It is difficult for me to believe that other nations will take us seriously when we speak of the rule of law among nations so long as we retain the Connally reservation.

I recognize, of course, that there are honest and sincere men among us who view the Connally reservation as the last bulwark of our national sovereignty, as one of our last defenses against the encroachments of a strange and hostile world. To these, I can only say that they misread, in my judgment, the meaning of the times in which we live. As much as some Americans may dislike it, the United States has been thrust into the center of world affairs. Either we move to strengthen the mechanisms of world peace—of which the World Court is a conspicuous example—or we continue to suffer increasingly the frustrations of a world in which there is no real peace.

It has been said so often that it is trite, but it seems not fully to have penetrated our consciousness: We live in an era of unprecedented change and upheaval. The only predictable thing about it is that the velocity and the violence of the change is likely to increase.

Our world is in a period of genuine transition. This transition began with World War I, which in its turn marked the beginning of the end of that earlier, more stable era characterized by domination of the world by the nations of Western Europe. Not only were these powers preeminent in industry and in the arts and sciences, but their economic and political power was worldwide. Their colonial empires were more vast than their homelands.

During the years since World War I and the present, we have seen the liquidation of the old colonial empires and the emergence of a new authoritarian empire under the leadership of the Soviet Union. It is difficult for the West to adjust to this unprecedented rapid growth of the Communist power. Since the outbreak of the First World War they have gained control of 40 percent of the world's population, 27 percent of its territory and 30 percent of its industrial capacity. This should be enough to cause any thinking person to suspect that all is not well within the Western World and yet any significant change in our traditional methods of doing business is grudgingly considered and reluctantly accepted, if it is not rejected outright.

One significant change fraught with yet unknown consequences, is the enormous expansion of the number of independent nations and their admission in the United Nations. In 1945 there were 51 members. Today there are 82, with 15 recommended by the Security Council and awaiting only General Assembly approval and there are more on the way.

I do not wish to imply that all these developments are bad, although some appear to be premature and threaten to end in chaos. However that may be, these changes have resulted in a fluid, unstable situation among the non-Communist peoples. Such a situation, if we have the imagination and the desire, presents us with an opportunity to play a constructive role in the development of these societies. However, if we neglect these opportunities these unstable communities could easily fall prey to chaos and to communism.

In contrast to these unstable conditions in the former colonial areas, the Communists have managed to consolidate and to stabilize their empire. I do not overlook the centrifugal tendencies that may develop between the Chinese Communists and the Russians. Nor do I minimize the fact that the Soviet Union, no less than the West, is subject to the pressures of social and technological change. But it is a fact that since the ruthless suppression of the Hungarian revolt, there have been no violent upheavals in the Soviet Empire. Certainly it would be dangerous if we were to base our policies on the hope, or the expectation, that internal stresses and strains in the Soviet bloc will eventually destroy its monolithic structure.

Furthermore, we will be courting disaster if we underestimate the abilities of the Soviet Union and its satellites in the fields of industrial production, science, education, or even the production of consumer goods. And we had better not underestimate the appeal which communism seems to have for the underdeveloped and newly independent peoples of the earth. We do not like this, but it is a fact that oftentimes newly independent peoples, faced by overwhelming problems and at the same time spurred by demands for immediate improvement in living conditions, succumb rather easily to Communist promises of plenty and, perhaps even more importantly, of self-respect.

I suppose it is characteristic of human beings, especially if they are reasonably comfortable, to be reluctant to recognize change. And even when change is apparent, to adapt to it. Evolution and the survival of the fittest are concepts we understand when applied to plants and animals, but somehow we never seem to recognize that these concepts apply to us. Thus, I daresay that, as we grow older, we are not as likely to realize that we are becoming hard of hearing, as we are likely to believe that people just don't talk loudly enough.

Nevertheless, we can discern some factors which may enable us to begin to comprehend our relationship to the world and avoid some further frustrations. For example, we should recognize that the Soviet Union is here to stay for some time, in my opinion. We should acknowledge that the Soviet Union has demonstrated strength and staying power far greater than we had anticipated. We should acknowledge—much as we dislike it—that communism has an appeal to newly independent poverty-stricken peoples.

But I should say the most important thing for us to recognize is that the period of change which is now under way will be with us for a long time. Whether we describe this period as one of cold war or peaceful coexistence, it will not be brought to an end by the development of any short-range, overnight panacea. It will be decades before stability will be a characteristic of the new nations. It will be decades before we solve, or control, the population problem and the food problems so closely associated with it in these new nations. It may be a long time in these new states before the need for a strong and stable government can be reconciled with the desire and the need for freedom of the individual citizen. We believe we have the correct formula in our constitutional democratic form of government; but it becomes more evident every day that illiterate, destitute peoples do not have the background, the civic consciousness, the resources, to apply successfully such a system to the conditions which confront them.

It will be years before the emerging nations of Asia and Africa and the older nations of Latin America develop the economic institutions and accumulate the capital necessary to give them a self-sustaining rate of economic growth. Yet we in the United States continue to approach this problem as though it were susceptible to a year-to-year solution. There are still many Americans, some of them in the Congress, who hope that somehow—maybe by next year—we will be able drastically to reduce our mutual security program or perhaps to eliminate it altogether.

We are treating our relationship to the world of the 20th century like a quack doctor who prescribes aspirin for tuberculosis—and we are likely to end up not only frustrated but having paid more for quack remedies than we would have paid for a long-range treatment designed to bring about a cure.

Because we as a people have not accepted the idea that we are involved in a long-term struggle, we have failed to plan ahead, and as a result we have lost many precious years with improvised superficial short-term projects. Two years ago the Committee on Foreign Relations proposed that the Development Loan Fund should be given adequate resources and the authority to plan ahead for 5 years. Its proposal was defeated in the Senate with the aid of the administration.

What business in this Nation could succeed if it were denied the right to plan ahead more than 1 year? Such a business would not be able to recruit employees more skilled than migratory help. Yet that is the framework into which we force this Government's competitive struggle with the Soviet Union for the allegiance of the peoples of this world.

A willingness to develop policies for the long pull would enable us to determine the quality and size of our programs instead of pursuing policies of an emergency nature conceived as reactions to Soviet initiatives. A recent example of such an emergency reaction which can be very expensive, is the proposal for Latin America, submitted to the Congress a few days ago.

We ought, for example, to be given more thought, in concert with our friends in Great Britain and in Continental Europe, to ways and means of better harnessing our resources to achieve common objectives. We in the United States have been gratified by the great economic progress Europe has made since the war. We have been encouraged by the steady growth of European economic and political institutions. Whatever strengthens Western Europe strengthens freedom, and we therefore welcome it even though it means keener competition for our own businesses. We do not fear straightforward commercial competition. We do, however, object to discrimination, and we are worried about some signs that the European Common Market may turn into an instrument of discrimination and protection rather than an instrument for further increasing trade, production, and economic growth.

Discussions have already been held on ways and means of concerting Western policies and programs in the worldwide struggle, not only to preserve but also to promote, the human values which are important to the West. These efforts must be pressed forward. The threat we face is not a threat against the United States alone, or against Great Britain alone, or against France alone. It is a threat to all of us; and if we do not meet it together, we shall assuredly suffer separately. Surely unless we pull together economically, we will not be able to compete economically with the Soviet bloc which has managed to eliminate trade barriers extending from the Baltic to the Pacific. We have experienced

instances of severe Soviet competition in recent years in tin, in aluminum, in benzene, and, more recently, in oil.

To resist effectively the ever increasing pressure of the Communist world, it seems to me the free world must develop the machinery for coordinating its military, its economic and its political activities. What an incalculable waste of manpower, brains, and wealth is involved in our policy of requiring the British and the French to duplicate so much of our defense hardware. Even more extravagant are the separate research and development programs in the field of missiles and nuclear physics. The divergent and often conflicting policies of the several nations of the free world are at a disadvantage over the long pull against the united power and purpose of the Communist world. The free world, by a large margin, excels the Communists in material resources and trained manpower. What it lacks is the acceptance by its people of a common purpose and the means to put such a purpose into effect. It is true that we have the common purpose of preventing a third world war, a very worthy purpose indeed. But to achieve such a purpose we must maintain the strength of the free world relative to the Communist world at all times or we will tempt the Kremlin into taking a rash and dangerous adventure.

As we have been in the past, we are still in the present—frustrated. We are confounded and frustrated by a dilemma which demands that either we move positively and boldly in the creation of common policies for the free world, which is repugnant to our traditional, historical isolationism, and also certainly will be costly, or we sit by and watch the Communists extend their power and influence, as they have in Eastern Europe, in Asia, in Cuba, in Latin America, and today in Africa.

Sooner or later, I am sure, the pressure of expanding Communist influence will force us to recognize the necessity for much closer coordination of our policies and our resources. I am only suggesting that if we delay it will be more costly and more painful than if we start now. The North Atlantic Treaty Organization brought hope and confidence to the nations of Europe, and it has prevented a war in that area. The expansion of the same principles into the economic and political fields and among additional nations will, in a like manner, bring hope and confidence to all free peoples. And, perhaps, most important of all, it will prevent another world war. A large number of weak, disunited and unstable democratic nations is an invitation to aggression.

Whenever a public official mentions uniting the free world our super patriots immediately shout that he is a "One Worlder" and therefore a crackpot not to be trusted. Obviously it is not likely to be one world in the foreseeable future if only because a third of it is already in the Communist camp. I do not deny that the concept of a united free world is a difficult one to envision under the circumstances of the present. However, it seems to me that it should not be beyond the capacity of ourselves and our friends who cherish human liberty, first to agree upon a long-term objective of common markets, common defense and research programs and a high degree of coordination of political policies in other fields; and, second, to formulate plans and to take steps toward implementing these objectives without delay.

The problem of reconciling the ideas of unity and diversity within a society is an old one. Each free country has found some kind of solution to this problem in its own particular manner, some more successfully than others. It should not be impossible out of the vast experience of these nations to find precedents and methods which might apply on a broader scale. In any case, the free world needs a unifying purpose, an objective worthy of great sacrifice and self-discipline. We need it not only for our own sake, but we also need it if we are to inspire the newly created nations with confidence in us and in our future.

Perhaps the most persuasive clue to the proper policy for us is to be found in the fears of the Soviet Union. Russia's greatest fear is that the great democracies of the free world will act in a united and constructive manner, or will in fact become united under some new and closer arrangement. This is clear from their persistent efforts to divide us, to drive a wedge between this and that free nation.

Our task, as champions of human liberty, is to draw closer together in all fields of international activity and at the same time to preserve the essentials of human freedom. Recently a distinguished Spaniard, Senor de Madariaga, put it quite well when he wrote:

"The trouble today is that the Communist world understands unity but not liberty, while the free world understands liberty but not unity. Eventual victory may be won by the first of the two sides to achieve the synthesis of both liberty and unity."

Voting and Attendance Record of Congressman Walter Norblad, of Oregon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER NORBLAD
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a report to the people of the First Congressional District of Oregon of my voting and attendance record during the 2d session of the 86th Congress.

The record includes all rollcall votes and all quorum calls. The description of bills is for the purpose of identification only; space limitations make it impossible to describe the bills completely or elaborate on the issues involved.

The purpose of this report is to collect in one place information which is scattered through thousands of pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I want to be able to provide any interested constituent with a simple compilation of my voting and attendance record.

With the exception of two periods when I was in Oregon—once attending the late Senator Neuberger's funeral and subsequently attending my father's funeral—my attendance record on rollcall votes is 100 percent. On the same basis my record on quorum calls is 99-plus percent—missed only 1 during the entire session. My record is as follows:

Rollcall No.	Date 1960	Measure, question, and result	Vote
1	Jan. 6	Quorum	Present.
2	Feb. 2	H.R. 1217, to provide for free importation of amorphous graphite: Suspend rules and pass. (Passed 278 to 116)	Yea.
3	Feb. 2	H. Con. Res. 459, any variation in traditional interpretation of treaties between the United States and Panama may only be made pursuant to treaty: On motion suspend rules and agree to resolution. (Passed 382 to 12)	Yea.
4	Feb. 2	H. Con. Res. 465, expressing indignation of Congress at recent desecrations of houses of worship and other sacred sites: Suspend rules and pass. (Passed 393 to 0)	Yea.
5	Feb. 17	H.R. 3151, withholding, for purpose of income tax imposed by certain cities on the pay of Federal employees: On passage. (Passed 222 to 160)	Yea.
6	Feb. 25	H.R. 3610, so-called Water Pollution Control Act to increase to $900,000,000 Federal grants to cities to build sewage works: On passage over veto of President. (Defeated 249 to 157)	Nay.
7	Feb. 29	H.R. 10743, supplemental appropriations for fiscal year ending June 30, 1960: Amendment to increase appropriations by $50,000,000. (Defeated 158 to 187)	Nay.
8	Mar. 1	Quorum call	Present.
9	Mar. 7	Quorum call	Present.
10	Mar. 7	Quorum call	Present.
11	Mar. 7	H. Res. 467, providing for consideration military construction bill: On agreeing to resolution. (Passed 313 to 1)	Yea.
12	Mar. 8	Quorum call	Present.
13	Mar. 8	H. Res. 468, providing for consideration of Foreign Investment Incentive Act of 1960: On previous question. (Passed 236 to 127)	Nay.
14	Mar. 8	Quorum call	Present.
15	Mar. 8	Quorum call	Present.
16	Mar. 8	Quorum call	Present.
17	Mar. 9	H.R. 10809, authorize appropriations to National Aeronautics and Space Administration: Suspend rules and pass. (Passed 398 to 11)	Yea.
18	Mar. 9	H.R. 10777, authorize certain construction at military installations: On passage. (Passed 407 to 4)	Yea.
19	Mar. 10	Quorum call	(1)
20	Mar. 10	H. Res. 359, providing for the consideration of H.R. 8601, to enforce constitutional rights: On passage. (Passed 314 to 93)	(1)
21	Mar. 11	Quorum call	(1)
22	Mar. 11	Quorum call	(1)
23	Mar. 14	Quorum call	Present.
24	Mar. 15	Quorum call	Present.
25	Mar. 16	Quorum call	Present.

See footnotes at end of table.

Roll-call No.	Date 1960	Measure, question, and result	Vote
26	Mar. 17	Quorum call	Present.
27	Mar. 18	Quorum call	Present.
28	Mar. 21	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 7279, authorize establishment of Hubbell Trading Post National Historic Site, Ariz.:	
29	Mar. 21	Defeated under suspension of rules (171 to 208)	Nay.
30	Mar. 22	Quorum call	Present.
31	Mar. 23	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 8601, enforce constitutional rights:	
32	Mar. 23	On Celler substitute for McCulloch amendment (voting referees). (Passed 295 to 124)	Yea.
33	Mar. 24	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 8601, enforce constitutional rights:	
34	Mar. 24	On motion to recommit. (Defeated 118 to 304)	Nay.
35	Mar. 24	On passage (Passed 311 to 109)	Yea.
36	Mar. 28	Quorum call	Present.
37	Mar. 29	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 11390, Appropriations for Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare:	
38	Mar. 29	On passage. (Passed 362 to 10)	Yea.
39	Mar. 30	Quorum call	Present.
40	Apr. 4	Quorum call	Present.
41	Apr. 6	Quorum call	Present.
42	Apr. 7	Quorum call	Present.
43	Apr. 12	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 11666, appropriations for Departments of State, Justice, the Judiciary:	
44	Apr. 13	On passage. (Passed 312 to 31)	Yea.
45	Apr. 19	Quorum call	(2)
46	Apr. 19	Quorum call	(2)
47	Apr. 20	Quorum call	(2)
		H.R. 11776, independent offices appropriation bill:	
48	Apr. 20	On passage Saylor amendment. (Adopted 218 to 155)	(2)
49	Apr. 20	Quorum call	(2)
50	Apr. 20	Quorum call	(2)
51	Apr. 20	Quorum call	(2)
52	Apr. 21	Quorum call	(2)
		H. Res. 503, providing for concurrence in Senate amendments to H.R. 8601, enforce constitutional rights:	
53	Apr. 21	On passage. (Adopted 228 to 95)	(2)
		H.R. 11510, amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954:	
54	Apr. 21	On passage. (Passed 243 to 130)	(1)
55	Apr. 27	Quorum call	Absent.
		H. Res. 498, providing for consideration of emergency homeownership bill:	
56	Apr. 27	On passage. (Passed 214 to 158)	Yea.
57	Apr. 27	Quorum call	Present.
58	Apr. 28	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 10213, emergency homeownership bill:	
59	Apr. 28	Amendment against any discrimination against purchase, rental, or occupancy on account of race, religion, creed, or color. (Defeated 139 to 235.)	Yea.
60	Apr. 28	On passage. (Passed 214 to 163)	Yea.
61	May 2	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 10596, increasing payments to State soldiers' homes:	
62	May 2	Suspend rules and pass. (Passed 265 to 0)	Yea.
		H. Con. Res. 633, relating to restoration of freedom for captive nations:	
63	May 2	Suspend rules and pass. (Passed 276 to 0)	Yea.
64	May 3	Quorum call	Present.
65	May 3	Quorum call	Present.
66	May 4	Quorum call	Present.
		S. 722, Area Redevelopment Act:	
67	May 4	Table motion that further proceedings under call be dispensed with. (Defeated 167 to 221)	Yea.
68	May 4	S. 722, On motion ordering previous question that further proceedings under call be dispensed with. (Passed 223 to 164)	Nay.
69	May 4	S. 722, To dispense with proceedings under call. (Passed 223 to 160)	Nay.
70	May 4	Quorum call	Present.
71	May 4	S. 722, motion to lay on table motion that further proceedings under call be dispensed with. (Defeated 153 to 231)	Yea.
72	May 4	S. 722, On ordering previous question to dispense with proceedings under call. (Passed 235 to 153)	Nay.
73	May 4	S. 722, To dispense with further proceedings under call. (Passed 237 to 152)	Nay.
74	May 4	Quorum call	Present.
75	May 4	S. 722, previous question on motion to dispense with proceedings under call. (Passed 238 to 148)	Nay.
76	May 4	S. 722, to dispense with proceedings under call. (Passed 238 to 150)	Nay.
77	May 4	S. 722, Will the House consider. (Passed 221 to 171)	Nay.
78	May 4	S. 722, motion to recommit. (Failed 162 to 223)	Yea.
79	May 4	S. 722, on passage. (Passed 201 to 184)	Nay.
80	May 5	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 11998, appropriations for Department of Defense:	
81	May 5	On passage. (Passed 377 to 3)	Yea.
82	May 6	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 11713, authorize appropriations for Atomic Energy Commission:	
83	May 6	On motion to add $104,000,000 for construction of linear electron accelerator at Stanford University. (Defeated 128-195)	Yea.
84	May 6	H.R. 11713:	
		On passage. (Passed 321 to 2)	Yea.
85	May 10	Quorum call	Present.
86	May 11	Quorum call	Present.
87	May 12	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 11510, Mutual Security Act:	
88	May 12	On adopting conference report. (Passed 240 to 138)	Yea.
89	May 12	Quorum call	Present.
		S. 1358, authorize headquarters site for Mount Rainier National Park:	
90	May 12	On passage. (Passed 263 to 83)	Yea.
91	May 16	Quorum call	Present.
92	May 17	Quorum call	Present.
93	May 17	Quorum call	Present.
94	May 18	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 7155, San Luis Unit of Central Valley project, California:	
95	May 18	On agreeing to amendment. (Passed 214 to 181)	Nay.
		H.R. 5, Foreign Investment Incentive Tax Act of 1960:	
96	May 18	To strike enacting clause. (Defeated 160 to 232)	Yea.
97	May 18	H.R. 5, on passage. (Passed 195 to 192)	Nay.
98	May 19	Quorum call	Present.
		H. Res. 448, rule providing for consideration of H.R. 2331, to establish the Chesapeake and Ohio National Historical Park:	
99	May 19	On agreeing to resolution. (Defeated 134 to 227)	Nay.
100	May 24	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 12326, public works appropriation bill, 1961:	
101	May 25	Motion to recommit. (Defeated 110 to 294)	Nay.
102	May 25	H.R. 12326, on passage. (Passed 387 to 18)	Yea.
		H. Res. 536, providing consideration of H.R. 10128, School Construction Assistance Act of 1960:	
103	May 25	On agreeing to resolution. (Passed 308 to 97)	Nay.
104	May 26	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 10128, School Construction Act of 1960:	
105	May 26	Amendment to require that school facilities constructed with Federal assistance be available all students in accordance with 1954 decision of Supreme Court. (Passed 218 to 181.)	Yea.
106	May 26	H.R. 10128, Bow amendment to return to States for construction of school facilities 25 percent of taxes collected on every pack of cigarettes sold within State. (Defeated 181 to 219.)	Nay.

See footnotes at end of table.

Roll-call No.	Date 1960	Measure, question, and result	Vote
107	May 26	H.R. 10128, on committee amendment as amended. (Passed 223 to 177)	Yea.
108	May 26	H.R. 10128, motion to recomit with instruction to report back H.R. 12259, the administration bill as a substitute. (Defeated 80 to 319)	Nay.
109	May 26	H.R. 10128, on passage. (Passed 206 to 189)	Nay.
110	June 1	Quorum call	Present.
111	June 1	Quorum call	Present.
112	June 1	Quorum call	Present.
		S. 1892, authorize construction, operation, and maintenance, Norman project, Oklahoma:	
113	June 1	On amendment relating interest rates applicable proposed projects in Colorado River. (Passed 228 to 123)	Nay.
114	June 2	Quorum call	Present.
115	June 2	Quorum call	Present.
116	June 2	Quorum call	Present.
117	June 3	Quorum call	Present.
118	June 3	Quorum call	Present.
119	June 3	Quorum call	Present.
120	June 3	On motion to adjourn. (Defeated 77 to 194)	Yea.
121	June 3	Quorum call	Present.
122	June 6	Quorum call	Present.
123	June 8	Quorum call	Present.
		H. Res. 550, closed rule on H.R. 12381, Public Debt and Tax Rate Extension Act 1960:	
124	June 8	On agreeing to resolution. (Passed 204 to 181)	Nay.
		H.R. 12381, Public Debt and Tax Extension Act, 1960:	
125	June 8	On passage. (Passed 223 to 174)	Yea.
126	June 8	Quorum call	Present.
127	June 9	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 12049, amend National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958:	
128	June 9	Motion to recommit designed to retain the 1958 provisions regarding property rights in inventions. (Defeated 120 to 269.)	Nay.
129	June 14	Quorum call	Present.
130	June 14	Quorum call	Present.
131	June 14	Quorum call	Present.
132	June 15	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 9883, adjusting rates of compensation for employees of Federal Government:	
133	June 15	Motion to recommit. (Defeated 94 to 324.)	Nay.
134	June 15	H.R. 9883, on passage. (Passed 378 to 40.)	Yea.
135	June 16	Quorum call	Present.
136	June 17	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 12619, appropriations for mutual security, fiscal year 1961:	
137	June 17	On amendment to increase by $200,000,000. (Passed 212 to 173)	Nay.
138	June 17	H.R. 12619, on passage. (Passed 258 yeas to 124 nays)	Yea.
139	June 21	Quorum call	Present.
140	June 22	Quorum call	Present.
141	June 22	Quorum call	Present.
142	June 23	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 12580, Social Security Amendments of 1960:	
143	June 23	On passage. (Passed 381 to 23)	Yea.
		H.R. 12261, Wheat Act of 1960:	
144	June 23	Motion to recommit. (Defeated 195 to 211)	Yea.
145	June 23	H.R. 12261, on passage. (Defeated 171 to 236)	Nay.
146	June 23	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 10569, Treasury and Post Office Appropriations, 1961:	
147	June 23	To recede from disagreement to Senate amendment No. 6. (Passed 235 to 164)	Yea.
		H.R. 12740, Supplemental Appropriations, 1961:	
148	June 23	Eliminate $5,000,000 for Capitol Grounds expansion. (Defeated 141 to 252)	Yea.
149	June 24	Quorum call	Present.
150	June 24	Quorum call	Present.
		S. 1508, regulation of Alaska Railroad:	
151	June 24	Suspend rules and pass. (Passed 268 to 101)	Nay.
		H.J. Res. 649, International Health and Medical Research Act:	
152	June 24	Suspend rules and pass. (Passed 259 to 114)	Yea.
153	June 24	Quorum call	Present.
154	June 25	Quorum call	Present.
155	June 25	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 8860, stabilize the mining of lead and zinc:	
156	June 27	On passage. (Passed 197 to 192)	Nay.
		H.R. 8697, amend District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945:	
157	June 27	On passage. (Passed 348 to 35)	Yea.
158	June 28	Quorum call	Present.
159	June 28	Quorum call	Present.
160	June 28	Quorum call	Present.
161	June 28	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 11001, International Development Association:	
162	June 29	On passage. (Passed 249 to 158)	Nay.
		H.R. 7903, extension veterans' guaranteed and direct loan program:	
163	June 29	On passage. (Passed 395 to 1)	Yea.
164	June 30	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 11998, Department Defense appropriation bill, conference report:	
165	June 30	On passage. (Passed 402 to 5)	Yea.
166	June 30	Quorum call	Present.
167	June 30	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 12677, Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1960:	
168	June 30	On amendment to substitute language of H.R. 12853. (Passed 211 to 203.)	Yea.
		H.R. 12677, as amended:	
169	June 30	On passage. (Passed 341 to 72.)	Yea.
		H.R. 12311, Sugar Act of 1948:	
170	June 30	On passage. (Passed 395 to 0.)	Yea.
		H.R. 9883, adjusting rates of compensation for employees of Federal Government:	
171	July 1	On passage over veto. (Passed 345 to 69.)	Yea.
172	July 1	Quorum call	Present.
173	July 1	Quorum call	Present.
174	July 1	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 8665, Theodore Roosevelt Memorial:	
175	July 1	Motion to recommit. (Defeated 59 to 308)	Yea.
176	July 2	Quorum call	Present.
		H. Res. 596, rule on Senate amendments to H.R. 12740, Supplemental Appropriations 1961:	
177	July 2	On agreeing to consider. (Passed 291 to 89)	Yea.
		H. Res. 596, rule on Senate amendments to H.R. 12740:	
178	July 2	On adopting. (Passed 257 to 109)	Nay.
		H.R. 2467, payment of relocation allowance by Federal Aviation Agency:	
179	July 2	On committee amendment. (Passed 190 to 164)	Yea.
180	July 2	H.R. 2467, on passage. (Passed 182 to 167)	Yea.
181	Aug. 15	Quorum call	Present.
182	Aug. 17	Quorum call	Present.
183	Aug. 22	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 12753, amend Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950:	
184	Aug. 22	Suspend rules and pass. (Passed 395 to 3)	Yea.
		H.R. 5383, amending Merchant Marine Act:	
185	Aug 22	Suspend rules and pass. (Passed 291 to 90)	Nay
		H.R. 9866, establish Federal Agricultural Service to Guam:	
186	Aug. 22	Suspend rules and pass. (Defeated 202 to 151)	Nay.

See footnotes at end of table.

Roll-call No.	Date 1960	Measure, question, and result	Vote
187	Aug. 23	Quorum call	Present.
		H. Res. 607, contempt citation:	
188	Aug. 23	On passage. (Passed 270 to 124)	Yea.
		H. Res. 611, contempt citation:	
189	Aug. 23	On passage. (Passed 383 to 0)	Yea.
190	Aug. 24	Quorum call	Present.
		H. Res. 587, providing for consideration S.J. Res. 170, U.S. Citizens Convention on NATO:	
191	Aug. 24	On agreeing to resolution. (Passed 349 to 39)	Yea.
		S.J. Res. 170, NATO Citizens Convention:	
192	Aug. 24	On passage. (Passed 288 to 103)	Yea.
193	Aug. 25	Quorum call	Present.
194	Aug. 25	Quorum call	Present.
195	Aug. 26	Quo rum call	Present.
196	Aug. 26	Quor um call	Present.
		H.R. 12580, Social Security Act amendments:	
197	Aug. 26	On adopting conference report. (Passed 368 to 17)	Yea.
198	Aug. 31	Quorum call	Present.
199	Aug. 31	Motion for House to recede and concur with Senate amendment No. 5, Mutual Security Act	Nay.
200	Aug. 31	Motion for House to recede and concur with Senate amendment No. 8, Mutual Security Act	Nay.
201	Aug. 31	Quorum call	Present.
202	Aug. 31	Quorum call	Present.
203	Sept. 1	Quorum call	Present.
204	Sept. 1	Quorum call	Present.
205	Sept. 1	Quorum call	Present.
206	Sept. 1	Quorum call	Present.

[1] In Oregon attending the funeral of the late Senator Richard L. Neuberger.
[2] On leave of absence attending father's funeral in Oregon.

A Report on the 86th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, the 86th Congress has come to a close, and I wish to express my sincere thanks to the citizens of the 12th District of New Jersey for granting me the high privilege of being their Representative.

The first session, which ended on September 15, 1959, was the longest peacetime session in 19 years, but its record was unimpressive. Controversial legislation was not concluded because of the knowledge that 1960, being a presidential-election year, would provide a better political showcase.

The duties of a Representative are many and varied, and, in general, fall into three categories. The first is the responsibility to legislate; the second, to serve the needs and wishes of the constituents of the district; and the third, to provide a forum for our citizens to express opinions and views on legislative and administrative matters.

I have diligently attempted to devote myself to all three of these responsibilities. It is worth noting that I was present at more than 95 percent of all quorum calls and votes. Some of my infrequent absences were officially excused by the Speaker because of attention to other official duties.

COMMITTEE WORK

I had the honor to serve on two committees, the Post Office and Civil Service Committee and the Government Operations Committee. The House of Representatives does much of its work in committee, and I found this method, from personal observation, to be very satisfactory. Hearings of witnesses and research by professional staffs enable us to consider bills intelligently before they are voted out for House approval and save time-wasting debate before the entire body in its attempt to write satisfactory legislation.

I served on various subcommittees of each general committee and particularly wish to stress the work of the Subcommittee on Postal Operations, which many have credited with triggering the national interest in the effort to stamp out the evil of obscene literature and pornography, which is a cancerous sore in our national life. This subcommittee, in close cooperation with, and in support of, the Post Office Department, held extensive hearings in various parts of the country and shaped legislation that would assist the Department in its fight against this evil. Further, we encouraged citizen groups in various areas to be active and assisted by helping to provide them with the knowledge and tools to enter the fray.

The Subcommittee on Government Activities devoted time and attention, with considerable success, in an attempt to assure efficient and economical administration of various governmental agencies. I am indebted to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle and the committee staffs for their constructive assistance in my committee work.

FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY

You will recall that one major conflict within the 86th Congress was the effort to balance the budget and preserve fiscal integrity. Believing, as I do, that a vigorous economy depends in large measure on the prevention of runaway inflation, I voted against measures that would unbalance the budget without accomplishing the aims for which the spending was designed. In this category, I list my vote against the enlarged Federal subsidy for airport construction and the effort to reduce it to the amount recommended in the budget. The vote to uphold the President's veto on the second public works bill is another example.

At the same time, I tried to avoid a viewpoint that would be too narrow by carefully considering measures that would be of benefit to the 12th District as well as the public at large. In this category, I voted for the housing bill because it contained an amount that would be realistic for urban renewal, so vital to the decadent districts of some of our larger cities. I voted for the postal workers and other Federal employees pay raise because, as a member of the committee that studied and reported the problem, I became convinced that the loyal workers on the Federal payroll had not been kept abreast of the cost of living increase, forcing many to hold second employment, with a consequent reduction in efficiency to the Government.

LEGISLATIVE ACTION

I was a strong advocate of civil rights legislation that was passed in this Congress, and voted for every strengthening, and against every weakening, amendment. I also was recorded in favor of effective management-labor legislation.

My vote against the depressed area bill was not a negative one but a positive one, because it is my belief that the administration bill would have done more for the really depressed areas than did the bill passed by Congress but not signed into law. This comes about because the extended committee bill held out the probability that areas not really depressed would be so benefited that they would attract industries from districts such as ours. It seems clear to me that the administration bill was a realistic approach to help those severely afflicted.

BOBTAIL SESSION

There does not seem to be much point to attempt to analyze the postconvention, bobtail session just completed. The public press and informed persons have pretty well agreed that no real accomplishments have been achieved and that it was charged from the very beginning with political impulses. Most of the "musts" that were supposed to be so important to the country could have been passed in the previous session if the majority party had the will to do so, because it certainly had the votes. In any event, the 87th Congress will soon convene and measures that may be for the common

good can be thoroughly debated and considered, after full hearings, in the early part of the first session.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND FAILURES

There were some genuine accomplishments by the 86th Congress. The admission of Hawaii as our 50th State is one. The passage of the civil rights legislation to more properly insure the basic voting privilege of all human beings is another; and in many minds, the passage of effective management-labor legislation is another.

Among the failures that I believe are fundamental is the nonsolution of the 20-year farm problem. Neither political party will assume the blame, but it seems clear to me that with a 2 to 1 voting majority, the majority party could have brought out a constructive program if it had one to offer.

NEW LOCAL POST OFFICES

During the session, I participated in ceremonies which included the dedication of the new Essex Fells Post Office, the new Irvington branch of the Newark Post Office, and the new south station of the Newark Post Office. The Livingston Post Office was also dedicated but, unfortunately, I was away on official business and could not participate.

All of these new structures will not only add to the beauty of the communities, but will aid in a more efficient postal service.

NATO COOPERATION

One of the most rewarding experiences of my tenure was that of having been chosen as an official delegate from the House of Representatives to the Atlantic Congress in June 1959. There were 650 leading citizens of the NATO countries who participated in meetings, the purpose of which was to seek ways of further developing cooperation among the NATO members and to assist in the improvement of the economic, cultural, scientific, and political lives of the underprivileged nations of the world. Positive benefit has been derived. The free world has been awakened to the problem of containing communism by strengthening weak nations to resist it. A commission has been authorized by the Congress to study and recommend means for further action. All of our efforts were and are being directed toward the strengthening of the NATO alliance which has proved to be militarily the savior of the free world from the Soviet challenge.

BILLS INTRODUCED

In addition to my voting record, my interest in legislation can be illustrated by some of the bills introduced by me. These include one to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted under social security from $1,200 to $1,800; a bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to assist in the solution of the railroad commuter problem; one to extend social security coverage to self-employed physicians; a bill to strengthen the Post Office Department's authority in the fight against obscene literature in the mails; and one to establish a commission to study and recommend regarding the need for a U.S. Science Academy.

As the 86th Congress comes to a close, there are many questions unanswered and left hanging in the air, but before a positive solution can be found to them, it is important that serious and skilled presentations of various viewpoints be held before the committees of the Senate and the House.

In conclusion, I would like to say that I have honestly and conscientiously tried to use my best judgment in voting on vital issues presented to us, and that I have been diligent in my committee work and attendance at the sessions. It has been a rich experience and I am grateful for the opportunity to serve in the Congress given to me by my constituents.

Ukrainians Still Yearn for Freedom From Communist Yoke

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, this fall the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America is celebrating its 20th anniversary with observances of the occasion by local chapters and member organizations. It is appropriate for this House to pause to recognize the occasion.

Americans with little knowledge of the history of the Soviet Union may not be aware of the persistence of a nationalistic tradition among the 42 million Ukrainians—a tradition so strong that immediately after the Communist revolution, even Lenin's controlling group in Moscow was willing to recognize the existence of the Ukraine as a separate state.

That recognition proved to be a scrap of paper, or even less than that. By 1923 Trotsky's Red Army had moved into the Ukraine and forcibly swallowed it up into the so-called Union of Socialist Republics. The Red Army picked off other independent peoples that originally had been guaranteed separate status and added them to the union. The people of the Ukraine, like the people of Poland, have been forced to endure long generations of captivity within various forms of the imperialistic Russian Empire—but, like the people of Poland, they have continued to yearn for their birthright of national freedom and sovereignty.

Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, chairman of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., is authority for the statement that the nationalistic aspirations of the Ukrainians have so persisted that "each decade since the twenties has seen serious friction, resistance, even open rebellion, scald the hand of their Moscow masters."

There are some 2.5 million Americans of Ukrainian ancestry, and the group of which Dr. Dobriansky is chairman has sought to reflect accurately their sentiments about the captivity in which the land of their ancestors is held by the Soviets.

The committee is purely educational in its objectives. By virtue of their background and interests, Dr. Dobriansky and his colleagues can legitimately claim to be American citizens who are knowledgeable in the affairs of the Soviet Union. They list a fourfold aim for themselves: First, to point out the strategic value of the Ukraine, and other captive areas inside the Soviet Union itself; second, to inform other Americans of the existence of these non-Russian nationalities within the Soviet Union; third, to expose the myths of Soviet unity that are denied by the captive peoples themselves; and, fourth, to propose ways and means to defeat the psychopolitical propaganda drives of the Moscow imperialists in the cold war.

In our own multicultured society, which embraces free men and women of all ancestries, individual groups may often make a contribution for which they are especially equipped. The Americans of Ukrainian ancestry are seeking through their committee to educate, to inform, to stimulate an awareness of certain facts of the modern world that otherwise might be overlooked. They are seeking, and seeking effectively, to keep alive a truth that might become obscured. In the struggle between this free nation and the Soviet Union, truth is an asset that can work most powerfully in the preservation of the ideal of freedom.

St. Anthony of Padua School Opens in Passaic, N.J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, next week a new school will open in Passaic, N.J., after years of dedicated effort and planning. It will be the 2-story, 11-classroom St. Anthony of Padua School.

A recent article in the Passaic, N.J., Herald-News, August 24, 1960, brought the opening to my attention. It reported the year-long search of a dear friend, the Reverend Paschal Caccavelle, OFM, CAP, pastor of St. Anthony's R.C. Church, and others to find properly zoned and reasonably priced property. At times, the problem seemed insoluable, but construction finally began last September at Chestnut and Tulip Streets.

The contemporary building has an exterior of light blue ceramic tile. A cafeteria with all modern equipment and ovens will accommodate 550 children.

Next week a kindergarten through fifth grade will open, and an additional grade will be added each year until the school reaches eight grades. There are 1,352 families in the parish, and the new school was built to accommodate 800 pupils on its 70- by 160-foot plot. The construction cost was $423,000.

Principal and mother superior of the school will be Sister Anthony Mary. Sisters Daniel Mary and Mary Johnette have been assigned to the school. Assistant pastor at St. Anthony's is the Reverend Innocent Amore, OFM, CAP.

I extend best wishes to all those who helped bring the St. Anthony of Padua School into being, and I trust it will serve its parish and the community well in the years ahead.

Report to the People of the 14th District of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I again take this opportunity of reporting to my constituents, the people of Berks County, the 14th Congressional District of Pennsylvania.

PURPOSE OF REPORT

This report summarizes my activities during the 86th Congress, the position I have taken on important issues coming before the Congress, and the record of the Congress itself. It supplements my radio broadcasts, news reports and newsletters.

History will record that this Congress has worked under extremely difficult circumstances to draft laws which would best meet the urgent needs of the American people and survive the threat of a veto. A working coalition between conservative Democrats and the Republican minority combined to develop control over the legislative output. Liberal hopes to legislate on the problems of unemployment, sluggish economic growth, high interest rates, urban blight, social security, and the crucial medical problems of the aged, were put aside.

The President's veto threat hung ominously over the Congress throughout its deliberations and was often employed to cut the substance from worthwhile measures.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Frustrated in efforts to obtain the legislative strength to pass a worthwhile medical care program for the aged as a part of social security coverage, Congress was forced to accept a compromise which merely increased the Federal share of medical care provided by the States to the indigent and to the needy aged.

Social security recipients, who must work to survive while in retirement, will gain a slight advantage from a new provision in which the earnings limitation is raised from $1,200 to $1,500 annually under a complicated formula. For every $2 earned over $1,200 up to $1,500, the recipient will lose $1 of benefits. If he earns over $1,500, he will lose $1 of benefits for every $1 earned. This provision eliminates the former language under which a recipient would forfeit a month's pay if he earned $1 additional. Another section of the new law removes the age limitation on eligibility for total disability.

The 1960 changes in the social security program are only a small part of the tremendous work that must be done to bring the social security program up to date. In improving medical benefits for the indigent, the legislation serves to provide them with better medical services than the thrifty, low income, near indigent can afford. The new Congress must make it possible for all recipients of social security to qualify for health benefits in retirement as a matter of earned right, without charity or proof of poverty by prepayment of premium during their working years. In addition, steps must be taken to substantially increase the limitations on allowable income to permit a decent standard of living in retirement. Steps must also be taken to reduce the retirement age of men and women to 60 years.

BALANCED BUDGET MYTH

Much has and will be said about the balanced budget which was achieved in fiscal 1960. Completely obscured to the public will be the fact that during the past 8 years, $29.4 billion have been added to the Federal debt.

It may be entirely coincidental that budget surpluses occurred in fiscal 1956, 1957 and 1960, conveniently for the national elections involved. The 8-year total gives the true picture of a debt increase of more than $29 billion.

In analyzing the fiscal operations of the Government, the American people should also be aware of the fact that the surplus for fiscal 1960 was in no small part due to the extraordinary contribution to the Federal Treasury by the so-called "independent" Federal Reserve Bank.

In fiscal 1959, when the Nation was facing a $12½ billion deficit, the bank could only make a $491 million contribution. In 1960, however, this contribution was multiplied to $1,093 million. Thus, in order to balance the budget for fiscal 1960 and in order to show a political surplus, the Treasury had to call on the Federal Reserve Board to double its previous contribution. At the same time, heavy defense spending was deferred until July 1, 1960, the beginning of fiscal 1961.

When the true circumstances are brought to light, the 1960 "balanced budget" will prove to have been a fraud on the American people.

TAXES AND LOOPHOLES

The burden of State, Federal, and local taxes has become one of the most critical problems of our times. During recent years, State and local taxes have risen sharply to provide our growing population with better highways, better schools, and better cities.

Criticism has been directed toward Federal expenditures, most of which are spent for the national security. The great Federal debt of $289 billion results principally from the unpaid balance due on the cost of World War II and the Korean conflict. It is regrettable that wartime profits were not adequately taxed at that time. It is also significant that the debt was increased by almost $30 billion during the past 8 years. This resulted more from tax loopholes created by the Revenue Act of 1954 than it did from the high cost of the Korean conflict.

Most Americans fail to recognize that of the total Federal expenditure of over $77 billion in fiscal year 1960, almost $42 billion were spent for national defense, $3½ billion for the foreign aid program which related to the national security, $2½ billion for atomic energy development and research, $5½ billion for the cost of services to veterans, present, past, and future. In addition, $9.2 billion were spent in fiscal 1960 to pay interest on the Federal debt which had almost doubled from $5.8 billion in 1952 because of administration policies which favored more return on the dollar to the lenders.

Therefore, after $5½ billion had been spent on the farm support program, slightly over $10 billion remained for all of the other important functions of the Federal Government including its frequently criticized welfare programs.

In my judgment the American people cannot expect any substantial Federal tax reduction until our Nation's leadership can develop foreign policies which can permit a reduction in the costly program of national defense and the frequently wasteful program of foreign spending. If world conditions could have permitted a $10 billion reduction in defense spending, the Nation would have been on its way to debt reduction and a more secure domestic economy.

As long as our Nation faces an angry and upset world and contributes to this international delinquency, there is little hope for Federal tax reduction. For this reason, I have diligently opposed tax loopholes and resisted tax favors for special groups.

PERSONAL DIPLOMACY

Personal diplomacy which characterized American foreign policy for the past 8 years provides headlines and glamour for its participants, but seldom in history has it proven to be a capable substitute for positive policies of state developed in orderly process.

The personal magnetism of the President operating with firmly established policies of state could not stem the tide of bitterness developing against America.

Throughout the world people pray for a stable peace and the machinery which can insure it. Our policy of supporting friendly dictators has lost us other worthwhile friends. Our belated awareness of the plight of the Latin American Republics now threatens inter-American solidarity.

American foreign policy has too often and in too many places been associated with American investment for high and quick profits. It is no surprise that our official representatives should be jeered and even stoned in Latin American countries, when American funds find their way into investment at fantastic interest rates which range from 20 percent in Peru, 24 percent in Chili, to 36 percent and 40 percent in Brazil and Argentina. Such exorbitant rates of interest in the underdeveloped areas of the world, can do this Nation a grave disservice which no "policies of state" can correct.

If we are to return to our former position of world leadership, we must reaffirm our devotion toward world peace, make manifest our concern for the underdeveloped, the underprivileged, the

suppressed, the neglected, the forgotten people, who constitute most of the population of the world. Dollar diplomacy must give way to human diplomacy. Dollar profit alone has no place in this program. "Good will" can help our Nation much more. The reconstruction of our foreign policy must be the No. 1 goal of a new administration.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

American superiority is unquestioned in many fields. The atomic submarine and the great polar adventures it has made possible are unexcelled. The U–2 incident proved American ingenuity of world observation by "man in flight." The development of rocket warfare, however, raises serious doubt about the usefulness of big Navy carriers and the effectiveness of expansive military bases throughout the free world.

The bitter fact is that the defense lag in America has resulted mainly from administration policies. Defense contracts have frequently been let to provide economic stabilization for industry rather than to fulfill essential defense needs. Large production contracts were repeatedly granted for obsolete military hardware, when production should have been halted with the development of the prototype weapon. Billions of dollars of this obsolete military hardware have been shipped to our bases abroad and to our allies in the free world, frequently to remove the stockpiles of obsolescence from the American scene.

The deterioration of leadership in the Department of Defense is the most tragic circumstance of all. In this special area we had the right to expect the most from our President, particularly in view of his military experience. In this field, where the greatest economies and efficiencies could have been effected, America has been let down. The high office of Secretary of Defense has been passed around as though it were a smalltown postmastership. It is inconceivable that anyone could have occupied this vital position without an unflinching obligation to see the job through the President's term or terms. How can responsible administration result when there have been three different secretaries and eight different deputy secretaries assigned to this task, each with his own policies, each with his own set of advisers, each with his limited experience.

OVERHAUL NEEDED

The complete overhaul of the Department of Defense is of the highest priority. The head of the Department should under all circumstances pledge to remain at his post as long as he is needed by the Executive who appointed him. The continuity of command decisions must not be interrupted. Wasteful practices and procurement must be abolished. Contracts must be granted competitively under procedures established by law without abusing the privilege of suspending proper laws through an emergency declaration which has characterized procurement during the past 8 years.

Such production as is needed must be carried on at the lowest possible cost to the taxpayer, using publicly owned plants and facilities as are available. Emphasis must be upon such defense procurement as is truly needed for the defense of America, rather than for the stabilization or the profit of giant monopolies friendly to the administration.

Furthermore, the $4½ billion spent by the Federal Government in research and development which has considerable civilian value, should be made available to all of the productive forces of America. It is not the private property of the defense contractor who is adequately compensated for this work.

BILLS INTRODUCED

I have introduced bills to raise social security benefits, lower age requirements to 62 for men and 60 for women, and to make disability benefits available regardless of age.

My proposals called for improvements in the Railroad Retirement Act, health benefits for retired postal and Federal employees, and legislation to encourage the hiring of middle-aged and older workers.

Other bills I have introduced were to prevent wholesale abandonment of passenger train service, to limit publishers' second-class mail subsidies, and to expand the public health training program.

Some of my proposals were approved and passed by Congress. Others were enacted in compromise form. Those which were not approved were given consideration which improved chances for favorable action in the near future.

COMMITTEE WORK

I have served on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and the Committee on House Administration. The Commerce Committee has wide jurisdiction over transportation, communication, public health, railroad retirement, and matters affecting Federal regulatory agencies. I am also a member of the Health and Safety Subcommittee.

BOOSTING BERKS

Berks Countians are particularly interested in the many Federal projects and programs in our area, all of which directly benefit our local economy and our people.

Each month an estimated 25,285 Berks County residents receive social security benefit checks totaling $1,653,-111. Thousands more receive railroad retirement benefits and veterans' pensions. Unemployment compensation also helped several thousand unemployed Berks workers and their families.

Federally guaranteed home loans have been obtained by many Berks residents. Small business loans have been made to a number of firms to improve and expand their business. Requests for help for industry in Berks County have had my full cooperation. Planning and construction work on several federally assisted highway projects has moved forward.

In Reading, the Walnut Street urban renewal project has become a reality, while the Cherry and Court Streets projects are moving ahead in their planning stages. The Reading Housing Authority's aged housing project has been started. All are being assisted by Federal funds. The new $650,000 Naval and Marine Corps Training Center in Reading has been opened, while a National Guard Armory in Kutztown has been constructed. Two hundred and seventy-five thousand dollars in Federal funds will go for construction of a new terminal building at the Reading Municipal Airport.

A number of Berks' townships and boroughs have received Federal funds for planning construction of sanitary-sewer systems and water-supply systems. Berks' industry continues to receive a considerable amount of defense contract and subcontract work.

ECONOMIC GROWTH CURBED

Administration fiscal and curtailment policies slowed down our rate of economic growth. Meanwhile, inflation has continued to bring economic distress to millions of Americans on fixed incomes. The cost of living has risen to a record high. Two recessions have wasted irreplaceable productivity, while unemployment has continued at a high level in many areas bringing hardship and suffering to millions of families. The legal requirement to promote "full employment and an expanding economy" has been ignored by the administration.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Congress enacted a civil rights bill aimed at safeguarding the voting rights of all Americans, the second civil rights measure in the past 3 years. Republicans refused to assist liberal Democrats to bring the legislation to the House floor after it was stalled by the Rules Committee coalition. They teamed up with Southern Democrats in an effort to water down or block the bill which was finally passed.

HEALTH AND MEDICAL RESEARCH

Congress again overrode administration objections and increased funds for health and medical research to find the cure for such killing and crippling diseases as cancer, heart disease, arthritis, and mental illness. Congress extended the Hill-Rhodes Act to step up training of needed public health doctors, nurses, and engineers. Congress passed my public health bill, H.R. 6871 shortly before adjournment.

AREA REDEVELOPMENT

For the second time in 3 years President Eisenhower vetoed legislation to help distressed economic areas to help themselves solve the problem of chronic unemployment. Many of these distressed areas are in Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Kentucky, New England, and other parts of the country.

In this instance as in others, the veto power of the President prevented Congress meeting this important problem of economic distress.

I supported and voted for this important area redevelopment legislation, of vital concern to Berks County and other areas of Pennsylvania.

AVAILABLE FOR MEETINGS

This report obviously cannot discuss each of the measures mentioned in much detail. Other issues before Congress have not been dealt with because of space requirements. As in past years, I again welcome the opportunity to appear before any group in Berks County to

speak and answer questions on any issue which may be of interest. Contact my office in the Reading Post Office Building with any such request or on any other matter with which you are concerned.

The Port Authority Disclaims Statements of Federal Jurisdiction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, the Port of New York Authority has written to me stating that my statements on the floor of the House of Representatives during the debate in connection with the citation for contempt of the three port authority's representatives were incorrect. I repeat that my statements were correct. However, in all fairness to the viewpoint of the port authority, I believe that it is my duty to bring to the attention of the House the correspondence between myself and the attorney for the port authority which contains our respective viewpoints and positions. The correspondence follows:

THE PORT OF NEW YORK AUTHORITY,
New York, N.Y., August 30, 1960.

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO,
New House Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SANTANGELO: In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Tuesday, August 23, you are recorded as having informed your colleagues in the House of Representatives that in 1954 when you were a member of the New York State Senate you introduced a resolution asking for an investigation of the Port of New York Authority but your resolution was killed in committee on the basis of representations by the port authority that because it was a bistate agency it should be "investigated by the Federal Government and not by the State."

I am confident that you will wish to correct this undoubtedly inadvertent misstatement of the facts once you have refreshed your recollection by reference to the enclosed memorandum of the Port of New York Authority dated February 8, 1954. This is the memorandum which was filed by the port authority with the finance committee of the New York State Senate, to which had been referred your resolution (Senate Resolution 46, introduced February 2, 1954) calling for the creation of a committee to make a study of the feasibility of reducing tolls on port authority bridges and tunnels. A copy of this memorandum was furnished to you at the time of filing with the committee and on February 18, in accordance with a telephoned request from your office, additional copies of the memorandum were transmitted to you at your New York City office.

Nowhere in this memorandum of the basis for the port authority's opposition to your resolution is there any statement or suggestion that the State legislature lacked power to adopt your resolution. It contains no reference whatsoever to the Federal Government. On the contrary, the memorandum is replete with such acknowledgments of State authority as "the legislatures of both States have full and complete control of projects to be undertaken by the port authority, the port authority has followed in every instance the direct mandate of the Governors and Legislatures of the States of New York and New Jersey" and "the comptroller of the State of New York is authorized by statute to examine the books of the port authority at any time he sees fit."

The port authority memorandum included express assurance that you and your fellow members of the State legislature would be afforded every courtesy and every facility for examination of port authority records and consultation with port authority officials and "to review any and all phases of our operations."

Fully acknowledging the authority of the State legislature to adopt your proposal, the port authority's memorandum in opposition to it was addressed to its substance. The facts set forth therein apparently satisfied the Finance Committee that your proposal was without sufficient merit to warrant its being reported out of committee.

As I said at the outset, I am confident that you will not wish to let the RECORD stand uncorrected now that you have had an opportunity to refresh your recollection as to the facts. Because, during the same floor discussion last Tuesday, Congressman WAINWRIGHT repeated your incorrect statement and Congressman HARRISON, of Virginia, subsequently stated that he had been influenced in his vote by your remarks, I am also transmitting copies of the port authority's 1954 memorandum directly to them. A copy is also being sent to Congressman TABER, of New York, who, I understand, has expressed concern that, because of time limitations imposed on the debate, mistaken and unfounded charges against the port authority could not be corrected at the time.

Sincerely,

SIDNEY GOLDSTEIN,
General Counsel.

MEMORANDUM IN OPPOSITION TO RESOLUTION REGARDING THE PORT OF NEW YORK AUTHORITY

(In assembly, by Mr. Mangan, January 12, 1954, No. 17; in Senate, by Mr. SANTANGELO, February 2, 1954, No. 46)

To the Committee on Ways and Means of the Assembly:

To the Committee on Finance of the Senate:

This memorandum is respectfully submitted by the Port of New York Authority to your honorable committees in opposition to the above resolution.

This resolution, substantially similar to ones introduced at each session of the legislature since 1949, none of which were reported by these committees, to which they were referred, again requests that a legislative committee be appointed "to inquire into the toll charges collected by the Port of New York Authority for the use of the bridges and tunnels operated by said authority," and appropriates $15,000 for the expenses of such committee.

The port authority has made repeated and careful studies of the toll structure of its tunnels and bridges. As a result of these studies, and despite the rising costs of operations, the port authority in the past few years initiated two methods whereby users of the tunnels and bridges may effect substantial savings in tolls. The first of these is the 25-trip ticket, good for 2 years after the year in which purchased, which provides a rate of 40 cents per trip, and therefore an 80-cent round trip, or a reduction of 20 percent. The second is the 40-trip commutation ticket, normally valid for a 30-day period, which provides a 25-cent rate per trip and a round trip of 50 cents, or a 50-percent reduction. At the most recent meeting of the board of commissioners of the port authority on January 14, 1954, these commutation tickets were made more readily available to the general public when the board authorized their sale by designated sales agencies such as banks and service stations as well as at the facility toll booths and port authority main office where previously purchased. This arrangement will also help eliminate long delays at the toll plazas caused by patrons purchasing books and trip tickets at the booths. Furthermore, commutation tickets purchased from these outside agencies will be valid for a 35-day period instead of the usual 30-day period.

It is the considered judgment of the commissioners, who are charged by the two States with responsibility for the credit and financial stability of the port program in the Port of New York District, of which these facilities are a part, that any further reduction in tolls on port authority crossings is unwarranted at this time.

The proposed resolution states that unfair advantage is being taken of the motorist in the expenditure of port authority revenues. A very brief catalog of the many things already done in the recent past and those projected for the immediate future to improve the vehicular facilities operated by the port authority demonstrates the fallacy of this statement.

In passing, it is well to remember that anything that benefits the port district as a whole benefits every resident of the port district, whether he be a motorist or not, but nevertheless the motorist has received by far the greatest benefit from port authority activities. As just one example, the port authority bus terminal, with it direct ramp approaches to the Lincoln Tunnel, has greatly benefited the motorist by removing from the congested streets of the city of New York about 5,000 interstate bus movements per business day. Recent studies indicated that about 90 percent of the intercity buses departing from the congested mid-Manhattan area never touch city streets through use of the bus terminal.

As was recently announced in the public press, the port authority anticipates a minimum expenditure of $250 million within the next 10 years on traffic facilities in the New York-New Jersey port district.

The port authority now has under construction the third tube of the Lincoln Tunnel, estimated to cost almost $100 million. To the end of 1953, engineering contracts totaling more than $32 million had already been awarded. When completed in 1957, the availity of the third tube will increase the Lincoln Tunnel's annual capacity by 50 percent and double its peak-hour capacity in the direction of the heavier movement of traffic.

Beyond that—

(a) During the past November the new ramp connection from the Manhattan exit of the George Washington Bridge to the Henry Hudson Parkway, constructed jointly with the Triborough Bridge and Tunnel Authority at a cost of $1,300,000, was completed and opened to traffic.

(b) On the New Jersey side of the George Washington Bridge a $5,163,000 bridge plaza and approaches improvement is presently in progress. The majority of this project, including widening of the main toll plaza, and new direct connections to the Palisades Interstate Parkway, will be completed in the spring.

(c) A block-long, six-lane $805,000 bridge over the New York Central tracks west of 10th Avenue, between 40th and 41st Streets, New York City, was completed and opened in August to provide an additional approach to the New Jersey-bound tube of the Lincoln Tunnel.

(d) The 179th Street Tunnel on the New York side of the George Washington Bridge was opened to traffic in 1952. This facility cost in the neighborhood of $9 million and has increased the operating expenses of the George Washington Bridge because of the necessity for ventilation, additional policing, general maintenance, and repair.

(e) At the Holland Tunnel extensive expansion and improvement of the New Jersey Plaza at a cost of $340,000 is currently in progress.

(f) The new exit viaduct on the New Jersey side of the Holland Tunnel, completed by the port authority at a cost of approximately $3,200,000, was opened to the public in 1951 and has substantially eased traffic at that point.

(g) Permanent connections between the approaches to the Lincoln Tunnel and the New Jersey Turnpike, costing about $4 million, have been in use since the opening of the turnpike.

Traffic analysts are unanimous in declaring that an improvement in traffic conditions in one portion of an integrated area benefits all portions of that area.

The legislatures of both States clearly recognized this fact when they said (ch. 47, Laws of New York, 1931; ch. 4, Laws of New Jersey, 1931, sec. 1):

"The States of New York and New Jersey hereby declare and agree that the vehicular traffic moving across the interstate waters within the Port of New York District * * * constitutes a general movement of traffic which follows the most accessible and practicable routes, and that the users of each bridge or tunnel over or under the said waters benefit by the existence of every other bridge or tunnel, since all such bridges and tunnels as a group facilitate the movement of such traffic and relieve congestion at each of the several bridges and tunnels."

It is obvious, therefore, that the port authority has not neglected, and does not intend to neglect, the interests of the motorists of the port district—and this includes constant consideration of the possibility of toll reduction. Of course, everybody would like to pay lower tolls, just as everybody would like to pay lower taxes. But, for the public official, the question of responsibility is one of the ultimate best interest of the entire metropolitan community, with all that the necessary and continuing development of the bridges, tunnels, terminals, docks, and airports mean to the welfare and prosperity of business and employment here.

Among other preambles in the resolution, is one which would seem to indicate that the sponsors have a mistaken idea of the purposes for which the port authority was created by the two States, and of the duties imposed upon it by the Legislatures of the States of New York and New Jersey.

The sponsors state that the "revenues collected by the port authority from motorists for the use of interstate bridges and tunnels are being diverted from such original purposes and are being accumulated by the said port authority in order to finance projects entirely unrelated to the operation of such bridges and tunnels."

If the port authority were a mere toll collecting agency authorized only to construct vehicular crossings and thereafter to operate them as individual units, there might be some validity to this argument. But nothing could be further from the fact.

The port authority was created to carry forward a comprehensive plan for the development of the greatest port in the world. In order to accomplish this, and to do so without burden to the general taxpayers of either the city of New York or the States of New York and New Jersey, it was obviously necessary to pledge all of the revenues of the port authority's facilities in one reserve fund.

The States recognized this not only in the compact and in the comprehensive plan, but in 1931 the two States enacted the so-called Unification Act (ch. 47, Laws of New York, 1931; ch. 4, Laws of New Jersey, 1931) in which the States adopted the policy that the revenues accruing from the operation of bridges and tunnel within the port district should be pooled. By statutes enacted in the same year the revenues from all port authority transportation and terminal facilities were similarly pledged (ch. 48, Laws of New York, 1931; ch. 5, Laws of New Jersey, 1931).

As is evidenced by subsequent legislation, it was the intent of the legislatures to utilize all revenue of the port authority for the orderly and economic development of all terminal and transportation facilities in the Port of New York District, without burden to the general taxpayer.

Moreover, the legislatures of both States have full and complete control of projects to be undertaken by the port authority, and, in every instance, the legislatures have specifically authorized the pledge of the general reserve fund for the redemption of bonds issued for the construction of port authority facilities. Even a cursory review of the compiled statutes of the Port of New York Authority clearly indicates that each and every project undertaken by the port authority was authorized either by specific legislation, or by legislation making the bonds issued for the construction of the project legal for investment, and therefore secured by the general reserve fund.

It seems somewhat anomalous to accuse the port authority of diverting funds to purposes unrelated to that for which the port authority was created, when it is self-evident that the port authority has followed in every instance the direct mandate of the Governors and Legislatures of the States of New York and New Jersey.

It is difficult to see what can be gained by a legislative investigation. The comptroller of the State of New York is authorized by statute to examine the books of the port authority at any time he sees fit (ch. 648, Laws of New York, 1929). Any responsible public official is afforded at all times such opportunity as he may wish to examine our books, to consult with our officials, and to review any and all phases of our operations. The port authority assures your honorable committees that every courtesy and every facility for any such examination or consultation will be afforded Assemblyman Mangan and Senator Santangelo, or any of their duly designated representatives at their convenience.

The port authority stands ready at all times to discuss this matter with Assemblyman Mangan and Senator Santangelo, and to give them any information whatsoever which they may desire.

It is respectfully submitted that the resolution should not be reported.

Respectfully submitted.

THE PORT OF NEW YORK AUTHORITY,
AUSTIN J. TOBIN,
Executive Director.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., August 31, 1960.

Mr. SIDNEY GOLDSTEIN,
General Counsel,
The Port of New York Authority,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. GOLDSTEIN: I acknowledge receipt of your letter of August 30, 1960, with an enclosure of a memorandum which the port authority forwarded to me at the time I introduced the resolution to investigate the activities of the port authority in 1954.

You are in error as to the fact that you forwarded to me additional copies of the memorandum to my office pursuant to a telephone call. My telephone conversation requested copies of your reports, and those were forwarded to me, and not additional copies of the memorandum.

I repeat my statement that it was represented to me at the time of the introduction of the bill that the port authority was a bi-state agency and subject to Federal control. During the debate on the floor in connection with the citation of the three representatives of the port authority, I indicated to the body that your representative informed me that I must have been misinformed in 1954. I have no doubt of the accuracy of my statement. I do not withdraw it, and I repeat it.

In all fairness to the port authority, and for a full disclosure of the facts, I am putting into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD your letter to me asserting that I am in error, your memorandum, and a copy of my letter to you of this day.

Very truly yours,

ALFRED E. SANTANGELO,
Member of Congress.

Puerto Rican-American Cooperation in Atomic Energy Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, on August 23, I had the honor of being invited to speak in Puerto Rico, at the ground-breaking for a nuclear-powered reactor which will produce electrical power for the people of that island. I include under unanimous consent my remarks on that occasion in the RECORD:

PUERTO RICAN-AMERICAN COOPERATION IN ATOMIC ENERGY DEVELOPMENT

(Remarks by Hon. CHET HOLIFIELD of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, at the dedication of the Puerto Rican atomic powerplant, August 23, 1960)

Upon behalf of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, I want to extend congratulations to our fellow citizens of Puerto Rico, to Governor Muñoz-Marín, and to the Puerto Rico Water Resources Authority on the occasion of the dedication of this atomic power project.

It is routine procedure for speakers at a dedication ceremony to declare that it is indeed an historic occasion. However, in this case, I sincerely believe that we are taking note today of a quite remarkable occasion. Let me explain why this dedication of a nuclear power project in Puerto Rico seems an important event to me.

This atomic powerplant, and the Puerto Rican nuclear center, signify several important milestones in United States atomic development and U.S.-Latin American relationships. First, on their merits they will be a significant part of the research and development effort of the United States in the field of atomic power and basic research in atomic energy. Secondly, they show how the democratic process (and I use a little "d" although this is an election year) works to achieve real progress, in contrast to the dictatorial approach used in places not so far from here. Finally, and hopefully, it is possible that what we have learned—and are learning—here may have application throughout Latin America, and elsewhere in areas of the world which are in need of development.

For only a few decades ago, Puerto Rico certainly qualified as an underdeveloped area. We became aware of your problems of poverty, and lack of food, clothing, housing, and gainful work. In those days there seemed to be not much hope for the future.

However, the years of the New Deal for the United States included a New Deal for Puerto Rico, and out of this beginning has grown your Operation Bootstrap. I have

been much impressed by what I have heard and read about your success, under able leadership, in raising the standard of living, developing and attracting new industry, improving education, building decent housing, and carrying forward all of the other activities required for achieving a life of decency and dignity for the people of Puerto Rico.

One of the absolutely essential factors in achieving what you have achieved so far and in continuing with your remarkable progress, is an abundant supply of electric power at a reasonable cost. I congratulate you and your Puerto Rico Water Resources Authority for the zeal, courage, and competence with which you have overcome many obstacles to provide the ever-increasing amounts of power required for Operation Bootstrap. I understand that the authority is one of the fastest, if not the fastest, growing electric utility systems in the United States. I am informed that in less than 20 years you have succeeded in increasing your production of power by more than 10 times; that from a peakload of 18,000 kilowatts in 1941, your authority is now planning for a peak demand of more than 500,000 kilowatts within the next 2 years.

This is amazing growth and an amazing achievement even in the rapidly growing electric power industry. It is especially noteworthy because, in addition to the usual problems of very rapidly expanding electric power systems, the authority has faced acute shortages of technically trained personnel and a lack of local fuel supplies.

Today, less than 20 years after the creation of the authority, only 12 years after the inauguration of Operation Bootstrap, and 8 years after your attaining Commonwealth status with a new constitution, Puerto Rico is stepping forward into another new frontier—the frontier of atomic power, beyond which if we are successful lies a new and immense source of low-cost energy for the people of the world.

I would think this a less notable occasion if this nuclear plant were simply being built here by the Federal Government as a showpiece, with little or no direct participation by the people of Puerto Rico and the engineers of your water resources authority. The fact is, of course, that quite the contrary is true.

That this project is now to go forward is due in large part to the leadership, the initiative and the persistent efforts of Gov. Luis Muñoz Marín (chairman of the board of the authority) and Mr. S. L. Descartes, until recently the executive director of the authority. Equally important, authority engineers have contributed very substantially to the detailed conception and design of what will be a pioneering reactor in the advancing technology of atomic power. We know that for a number of years the authority has sent its bright young engineers to our great atomic laboratories at Argonne and Oak Ridge and elsewhere for training.

This, it seems to me, is a matter of great importance, because in Latin America and in other areas of the world live millions of people who are engaged in a similar struggle to industrialize their countries and raise miserably low living standards. To do this, they must have power, just as Puerto Rico has to have more and more power—for your homes, your new industries, and rural electrification. Puerto Rico's rapid progress must be greatly encouraging to these other peoples. If you now show that it is possible in so short a period of time also to begin to develop and exploit this new source of energy from the atom, the value of Puerto Rico as a demonstration and as a center for training and information for underdeveloped areas everywhere will acquire a new and exciting facet.

Now I do not wish to give anyone the impression that atomic power development, as such, will be the panacea for the ills of underdeveloped countries. For most areas the utilization of increased energy from conventional sources—waterpower, oil, and coal where available—will make the most sense economically as the first step. But we have found that just the competitive threat of atomic power has had a beneficial effect on conventional fuel costs. And there is no doubt that a long-range atomic power development program, tied in with basic scientific research in all fields of atomic energy, will ultimately pay off.

And let me say that I have no doubts about your ability to make an important contribution in this new endeavor.

If I were not convinced that you will succeed, and succeed impressively, there would be no nuclear power project to dedicate today. We who are on the congressional Joint Committee on Atomic Energy do not recommend an atomic power project as an act of charity or as a ceremonial gesture of good will. We believe strongly that public funds should be invested in a nuclear power project only if there is a clear promise that the investment will result in substantial and important contributions to technical knowledge.

As you know, atomic power today is expensive. It is not yet competitive from an economic standpoint for civilian use. The basic objective of our Federal atomic power program is not now and never has been simply to build kilowatts of atomic power capacity. The objective is to develop and build facilities and to finance research through which the scientists and the engineers can learn how, as expeditiously as possible, to build commercial atomic powerplants that will produce electricity at low cost, safely and reliably.

This project in Puerto Rico offers a good example of the Joint Committee's policies in respect to atomic power. The Atomic Energy Commission first proposed a nuclear powerplant in Puerto Rico in early 1957, following an announcement by Dr. Milton Eisenhower in 1956, to be part of your nuclear energy training center for Latin America. The Joint Committee turned turned down this recommendation because the Atomic Energy Commission proposed constructing a type of reactor which we already knew how to build. It would have contributed nothing to advancing the technology, although it might have been a nice showpiece. The Joint Committee indicated it would be interested only in a proposal which promised a further step ahead in power reactor technology.

In all honesty, I must say that that probably would have been the end of the project if the Puerto Rico Water Resources Authority at that point had not shown some rather remarkable initiative. Your authority selected one of America's best qualified reactor engineering firms under the direction of Dr. Walter H. Zinn, who is perhaps our most distinguished reactor designer. As a result of this collaboration, the concept for the nuclear superheat reactor was developed which now is to be built and operated here.

The authority took the initiative also in convincing the Atomic Energy Commission and the Joint Committee that the concept was sound, and that the project would indeed contribute greatly to power reactor technology. The fact is that this will be one of only two reactors in our entire program to explore the vitally important field of nuclear superheating. Furthermore, this reactor is to be designed and built as a truly experimental facility—not just a power producer—so that many valuable experiments can be performed with it to increase our understanding of how to design more efficient, more economical atomic powerplants as time goes by.

This facility, therefore, is important not just to Puerto Rico and, indeed, not just to Latin America as a new training facility. It is important to the total U.S. program for atomic power development. We expect great technical contributions from this plant and from the engineers of your authority which will operate the plant and conduct many of the experiments.

I cannot resist the opportunity to say that the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy claims considerable credit for this project. We not only insisted that a project be undertaken which would contribute very importantly to our technical development program. We also actively supported the authority's proposal once it was clear that the authority was recommending a technically valuable type of facility and, equally important, possessed the engineering competence to do a good job of operating the plant once it was built.

At the request of Chairman CARL DURHAM and myself in June 1958, the Commission submitted a report to the Joint Committee on the authority proposal. The Joint Committee, on its own initiative, recommended, and Congress later that year approved, funds for engineering studies of the authority concept. The studies made good progress and the concept looked increasingly promising. We were surprised and disappointed, consequently, when the AEC informed the Joint Committee in April of 1959 that the proposed reactor was too exotic and that there were doubts about building it at a distant point like Puerto Rico.

Senator CLINTON ANDERSON, who became chairman of the Joint Committee again in January 1959, and I both urged the AEC to reconsider, since we felt quite strongly that this was a worthwhile undertaking and should certainly proceed without further delay. I can tell you, too, that Commissioner John Graham, who is with us today, has also been an invaluable friend and supporter of this project in the Commission.

In June 1959 Congress accepted the Joint Committee's recommendation and authorized the design and construction of a reactor superheat project. The location and sponsor was left up to the Atomic Energy Commission to decide on technical grounds. For a month or so it was nip and tuck as to whether we could get the necessary appropriations enacted, and then whether the Budget Bureau would let AEC begin to spend them. It was at this time that AEC Commissioner Graham made a trip down here for firsthand discussions. I am delighted that further studies since then have confirmed our belief that this is a desirable step forward and that the negotiations between AEC and the authority on the joint financing of this project met with success.

I might also say that the project represents to me a most desirable and wholesome type of partnership between public agencies for the public benefit. All of the information developed from the research program with the reactor will be made available to the public. All of the patents obtained will be available to industry, private and public, on a royalty-free nonexclusive basis. This is as it should be from the expenditure of public funds.

This is not the first occasion, of course, for this type of collaboration between public agencies in Puerto Rico. Your authority and the Rural Electrification Administration have worked together for years in your highly successful and still expanding program for bringing the blessings of electricity to the rural people of the island. I understand that your authority has called upon the Department of Interior and Tennessee Valley Authority for advice and assistance in planning and designing your ever-growing generating and transmission system. This is the kind of fruitful collaboration which should go on, and I am glad that now, in the newest frontier of the power industry, we have brought in the Atomic Energy Commission as a new partner in Puerto Rico's outstanding power program.

This nuclear facility which we are dedicating today, like so much that is being done by the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, has a larger significance than its contribution to the progress of the island economy and to the effectiveness of the American atomic power program. Beyond this, and certainly of equal importance, it will be an important element in the nuclear energy center here for all of Latin America. This project and this center will be another demonstration for this region and for the world of how a free people, operating through the institutions of a freely elected and democratic government, can apply effectively our modern technology to improve and advance the general welfare.

I had occasion yesterday to fly over a nearby troubled island which is apparently trying another approach to developing its resources—through the method of authoritarian control, playing the dangerous game of flirting with communistic advisers. I am sure that the differences in the Democratic and Communist ways of life will become very strikingly demonstrated in these islands of the Caribbean. The people of many nations are watching this demonstration of two opposing philosophies.

Under the dedicated leadership of Governor Muñoz-Marín, Puerto Rico is demonstrating in a dramatic way the vitality and the vigor with which the people of a progressive democratic society can build for themselves a better way of life.

As a fellow American, I am proud of Puerto Rico and I wish you well in your new endeavors.

Sell 8,000 Acres of Bull Shoals Land to Former Owners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES H. BROWN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. BROWN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, for 3 years now I have been urging the Corps of Engineers to release some 8,000 acres not needed for public purposes in the Bull Shoals Reservoir, Arkansas-Missouri, and let private owners farm it, or develop it.

We have had numerous headaches over the handling of the agricultural leasing of this land; and I have contended for years that the present Bull Shoals land policy is wrong. First, the Government should have acquired a flowage easement instead of fee title to these acres in the first place; second, there is no equitable or satisfactory way to handle leasing of such land; and, third, unnecessary Government holding of these scenic lakefront acres is stunting the development of our beautiful Bull Shoals area.

It is important to note that the corps follows a different policy in the Table Rock Reservoir area, adjoining Bull Shoals. Landowners in the Table Rock area were permitted to retain title to their lakefront, and granted the U.S. Government only a flowage easement to the land that might be inundated by unusual floods.

All along, I have pleaded for the corps to apply the same land policy to the two reservoir areas. Whatever portions of the Bull Shoals lakefront that are not needed should be sold back to former owners who want it. But the corps has steadfastly maintained the position that such revestment would not be in the best interest of the public.

We have now had experience with the new easement policy applied in the Table Rock area; and it is apparent that it is far superior to the acquisition-leasing policy applied to the Bull Shoals area.

So, on the basis of this new and persuasive evidence, I am renewing our district's request for the corps to sell back excess acres to former owners or their heirs or assigns in the Bull Shoals area, thereby making the two areas consistent.

I have today introduced a bill to accomplish this result in a fair and equitable manner. By introducing the bill now, we are giving the corps ample time to take another look and report back to the Congress early next year on the principle of revestment.

This bill would authorize the Secretary of the Army to sell back to former owners, their heirs or assigns, such portions of land in the Bull Shoals area as are not required for public purposes. Estimates are that some 8,000 acres are involved.

Here is how it would work for John Jones, who owned a 400-acre tract in the reservoir area, when the Corps of Engineers were acquiring land for Bull Shoals Lake. The corps bought 200 acres, the bottom land of the farm, from Jones. Jones still farms the upland. But the Bull Shoals Lake covers only 100 acres of the bottom land bought from Jones. The other 100 acres, owned by the Government as protection against unusual flood conditions, is leased for agricultural purposes to the highest bidder.

Jones himself would like to farm that 100 acres of bottomland. He would never have sold it to the Government, except that they insisted they had to have it for the reservoir.

My bill would authorize the Secretary of the Army to sell back the 100 acres of excess land to Jones, the original owner, his heirs, or assigns.

As it is now, Jones runs cattle on his upland, has to get an easement to take the cattle to the lake for water across bottomland he used to farm, and would like to farm now but was compelled by the Government to relinquish. Yet, the Government does not need it and is leasing it out to someone else to farm.

Or take this example of John Smith. The Government acquired title to Smith's "bluff" land, high above the line where the water level could possibly reach. Smith would like to build a tourist court, if he had a lakefront view. But now he cannot, because Uncle Sam holds the most valuable part of his property, the lakefront. So, Smith cannot develop the property. Yet Uncle Sam does not need the lakefront for project purposes.

Under my bill, the former owner, his heirs, or assigns, could buy back this excess land for the price the Government paid for it in the first place, plus a fair value for any improvements made by the Government, minus any damage done by the Government and any decrease in property values resulting from the terms of the resale—such as flowage easement, rights-of-way, and so forth.

The effect of this bill would be to bring the Bull Shoals land policy up to date with the present policy that the corps has applied to the newer Table Rock Reservoir. And the new policy is far superior to the old.

First. Under this bill, we would get out from under the continual headaches of leasing this excess land for agricultural purposes; second, we would stimulate development of the Bull Shoals lake area through private investment; and, third, we would be giving priority of purchase to those who deserve it, the original owners or their heirs or assigns.

I include herewith a letter from the Corps of Engineers outlining their objections to revestment of this excess land. I think this new legislation overcomes the corps' objection regarding "private properties adjacent to present reservoir boundaries have been developed with private capital, and sale of this property between this development and the power pool to other parties would work a hardship on these private investors."

Under my bill, the Secretary is not authorized to sell to other parties. He could sell only to those former owners, their heirs or assigns, who apply for purchase.

The matter of depriving counties of their share of income derived from agricultural leases is not a valid objection, in my opinion. The tax income to the counties from owners who will develop the land should more than offset any loss in revenue from the discontinuance of agricultural leases.

Again, I urge the corps to reevaluate their land policy on Bull Shoals Reservoir. I sincerely hope that what has happened in the Table Rock area will prompt the corps to support this new legislation to make Bull Shoals land policy the same as Table Rock land policy.

I hope we can get this matter to a hearing early in the next session, and the distinguished chairman of the Public Works Committee, of which I am a member, assures me that we will have his full cooperation.

Under the unanimous consent, I insert herewith a letter from the U.S. Corps of Engineers pertaining to this subject:

U.S. ARMY ENGINEER,
CORPS OF ENGINEERS,
Little Rock, Ark., April 24, 1958.

Hon. CHARLES H. BROWN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BROWN: Reference is made to our conversation in your office on April 10, 1958, concerning the possible revestment of land at the Bull Shoals Reservoir project, Arkansas and Missouri, and my interim reply of April 15. After having investigated this matter in some detail, I am pleased to furnish you the following information. For comparison purposes, a discussion of the acquisition policies at Table Rock Reservoir is included.

The acquisition of land for the Bull Shoals Reservoir project was based on a taking line blocked out along regular land subdivisions or property ownership lines to include all land lying below the 700-foot mean sea level contour, which is the controlling elevation for land acquisition and represents the maximum elevation subject to flooding by the operation of this reservoir. The nominal top of flood control pool is at elevation 695 feet, mean sea level, and the additional 5 feet of elevation is required to permit wave

action, erosion, and surcharge storage during maximum flood conditions.

The acquisition of land in the Table Rock Reservoir area is being accomplished in accordance with the new joint policy for reservoir acquisition as agreed to between the Department of the Army and the Department of the Interior in the fall of 1953. Briefly, this policy provides for the acquisition in fee of all lands subject to inundation on an average of once in 5 years by "blocking out" a taking line along regular land subdivisions or property ownerships below this elevation. In the Table Rock Reservoir area, this controlling contour for fee acquisition is 923 feet mean sea level. The maximum controlling elevation for land acquisition is established as 936 feet, mean sea level, 5 feet above the nominal top of the flood control pool. Where feasible, the area between the blocked-out taking line for fee acquisition and the maximum elevation subject to inundation is acquired by flowage easement rather than in fee.

I would like to point out in this connection that in reservoirs such as Bull Shoals and Table Rock the extreme ruggedness of the topography and the relatively small horizontal distances between the 5-year flood contour and the maximum area subject to inundation, in many cases, preclude the taking of flowage easements since by the normal process of "blocking-out" along regular land subdivisions or property ownerships, the area to be acquired in fee results in the taking of all land necessary for the project. As a result, a comparatively small portion of the Table Rock Reservoir area is being acquired by flowage easement.

No land in the Bull Shoals Reservoir is considered excess to the project needs. However, in the event the new land acquisition policy were to be applied to the land previously acquired for the Bull Shoals project, approximately 8,000 acres would be available for revestment, subject to the retention of flowage easements by the Government on that portion below elevation 700 feet, ms 1. This action would place the two projects in a comparable status insofar as ownership by the Government is concerned. I would like to point out that some of the larger areas in the Bull Shoals Reservoir which were acquired above the 700-foot contour are public domain land which was set aside for use of this project by Executive order, and these areas would not be subject to disposal in the same manner as that acquired from private ownership.

With reference to the question of water rights in the reservoir areas, the policy which is being applied at Table Rock permits the landowner to retain an easement across the Government-owned land for the purpose of furnishing livestock access to the waters of the lake, unless granting such an easement is contrary to public interest. This easement may be reserved at the time the land is acquired by the Government.

Since no such authority existed at the time of acquisition of lands in the Bull Shoals Reservoir, those landowners who lost water rights through acquisition of their land were compensated for this loss as a part of the severance damage paid them. Of course, the agricultural leasing program in the Bull Shoals Reservoir area permits lessees to occupy the Government-owned land and to have access to the waters of the lake as a part of the leasehold agreement. Livestock access to the waters of Bull Shoals lake has not been a problem in the Little Rock district, since the many tributaries of the main lake, which extend beyond the reservoir boundaries, have permitted livestock watering except in periods of extreme drought. In exceptional cases, adjacent landowners could obtain an easement right for access to the lake for livestock-watering purposes under outgrant procedures.

There are some disadvantages to revesting lands at Bull Shoals Reservoir. In many instances, private properties adjacent to present reservoir boundaries have been developed with private capital, and sale of the property between this development and the power pool to other parties would work a hardship on these private investors. Furthermore, those portions of the reservoir which are subject to intermittent flooding above the top of power pool are at present leased to individuals for agricultural and grazing purposes. As you know, 75 percent of the income derived from these leases is returned to the counties in which the land is located. Disposal of the Government-owned land at Bull Shoals would considerably reduce the return to the counties from this operation. Many lessees in the areas have obtained their leases without competition, and are content to pay rent in lieu of taxes.

In view of the circumstances mentioned above, I am of the opinion that revestment of lands in the Bull Shoals Reservoir area so as to make it conform to the more recent land acquisition policy would not be in the best interest of the public. I hope the above information is sufficient for your needs; however, if you desire any further information in connection therewith, I will be pleased to furnish it to you.

Sincerely yours,

A. M. JACOBY,
Colonel, Corps of Engineers,
District Engineer.

The Interstate Commerce Commission Has the Responsibility To Determine the Rules, Regulations, and Facilities Necessary To Prevent Accidents at Railroad Crossings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, it was appalling to learn of a decision by the Interstate Commerce Commission which was brought to my attention only last Tuesday. In my opinion the resulting situation is so serious as to require an immediate report to Congress and a full-dress investigation by Congress of the apparent disregard for human life and safety displayed by the ICC in making this latest pronouncement.

The Commission, by an order in No. 33440, "Prevention of Rail-Highway Grade-Crossing Accidents Involving Railway Trains and Motor Vehicles," has denied a petition filed May 11 on behalf of five railway labor unions for a general investigation to determine what rules, regulations, facilities, or other measures were necessary to prevent accidents at railroad crossings between railway trains and motor vehicles carrying petroleum, petroleum products, and similar dangerous flammable liquids.

On March 1, 1960, at a point near Bakersfield, Calif., the San Francisco Chief, one of the crack trains operated by the Santa Fe Railway, crashed into a tank truck carrying some 7,000 gallons of crude petroleum. This collision caused the immediate death by fire of the engineer and the fireman of the train, of the driver of the truck, and of 11 others who were passengers on the train. In addition to these 14 painful deaths by fire, there were 109 others injured, some of whom were critically injured or permanently disabled. Accompanying this tragic loss of life and personal injury there was property damage in excess of $1,500,000, and the liability for damages resulting from such deaths and injuries was estimated at another $1½ million.

Only a few days thereafter a freight train operated over the Missouri-Kansas-Texas Railway at a point near Chanute, Kans., rammed a tank truck loaded with gasoline at a grade crossing, resulting in the fiery death of the locomotive engineer and the locomotive fireman, who, by coincidence, were father and son.

These incidents followed literally dozens of similar inexcusable collisions by trains with tank trucks or other vehicles carrying cargoes, the very nature of which makes their operation over streets, highways, and railway crossings a menace to the public.

Shortly after these incidents the five brotherhoods of railway employees engaged in operating trains joined together and filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission the petition I mentioned a moment ago, asking that body to inaugurate a general investigation of the frequency, causes, and results of collisions between trains and vehicles transporting petroleum and similar dangerous liquids "to determine what rules, regulations, facilities, or other action is feasible and necessary to prevent such collisions."

These labor organizations, namely the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, the Order of Railway Conductors and Brakemen of America, the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, and the Switchmen's Union of North America were entirely constructive in their request to the ICC for assistance. They suggested that the Commission could readily obtain the sincere cooperation of State officials and Federal agencies and of organizations of shippers and carriers engaged in trucking these dangerous commodities. They asserted that the principal purpose of such investigation should be to prevent such accidents in the future rather than to place blame for those of the past.

If my memory serves me correctly, Congress went so far as to include in the appropriation to the ICC special funds adequate to cover the cost of the investigation sought by these railroad men as well as several other proceedings to be carried on by the Commission.

And what happened to this entirely reasonable prayer for the assistance of the ICC in preventing these horrible accidents?

By this decision dated August 15, 1960, but not released until August 29, only a few days before Congress is to adjourn, the ICC turned down this petition and, like Pontius Pilate, washed its hands of responsibility for the pain and death and destruction which is bound to follow. I am informed that this is the third time the ICC has arbitrarily turned down such a request, the third time it has closed its

eyes and refused to make any effort to find out what it might be able to do to help prevent the constant and tragic repetition of tank trucks failing to stop at railroad crossings, and thus causing the almost certain cremation of the head-end crews on the trains that strike them with sickening and increasing frequency.

In June of this year, after this petition had been filed, there were two more such collisions near Jacksonville, Fla., in which five more men were cremated and again, only last August 8, just outside Birmingham, Ala., in another of such collisions three of the train crew and the truckdriver were killed in a fiery explosion.

The railroad companies supported their employees in their request for this investigation but they were opposed by two groups which now appear to have had strange and unusual influence upon the conscience of the Commissioners, namely the National Tank Truck Carriers, Inc., and the Central Committee on Highway Transportation of the American Petroleum Institute.

It should be remembered that Congress has assigned to the Interstate Commerce Commission primary responsibility for the safety of operation of trains and of trucks including both those operated for-hire and not-for-hire. By doing so it has deprived the several States of much of the power they might otherwise have exercised to prevent these fiery deaths. But from what I can learn the Interstate Commerce Commission has failed miserably in its fundamental obligation to assure safety. Its present action makes it apparent that it is afraid to face the fact that such accidents do occur and that it is not interested in writing or enforcing new and stronger regulations to prevent them or in recommending to Congress that it should act to do so.

About all the Interstate Commerce Commission has done to supervise the safety of tank trucks is to lay down a set of rules and regulations pertaining to their equipment and operation and requiring them to stop before crossing railroad tracks at common grade. I am unable to learn of any special action by the Commission or any of its force to see that these stops are made. Neither can I find that the Commission has any knowledge as to whether or not the States or local authorities are enforcing these requirements to stop or any other of the safety regulations pertaining to operations under its jurisdiction.

In its order refusing to take action the ICC gave as one of its reasons its belief that the encouragement of uniform safety laws and regulations by the several States appears "to be the most effective present means of improvement of the situation." This completely irresponsible buckpassing statement is made without special inquiry as to the power of the States, the contents of State laws, or the degree of effectiveness with which they are enforced.

It would be difficult for anyone to understand why an organization of those companies which own and operate gasoline trucks or why a committee representing oil companies which ship gasoline in tank trucks over the streets and highways would allow themselves to be accused of opposing an honest, good faith effort to find out what can be done by Government or industry or labor to prevent this tragic murder at the grade crossings. Surely they do not want their own men killed and certainly they do not want railroad men or passengers on trains or others to be cremated in horrible tragic collisions with their trucks which are supposed to stop at grade crossings, but have not done so.

Then, too, for the life of me I cannot understand the crass indifference to death and pain and suffering nor the craven disregard to responsibility which would cause members of the Interstate Commerce Commission to refuse to try to find means of improvement when asked to do so by groups of men such as those employed in the railroad industry and who have every legitimate reason to be concerned.

I understand that one Commissioner, Freas, voted for the investigation; that three Commissioners were absent, and not voting, namely, Walrath, Hutchinson, and McPherson; and that those Commissioners who voted to deny the petition for general investigation were Tuggle, Winchell, Herring, Murphy, Goff, and Webb. I wonder how many of those Commissioners have ever seen a man die in flames. I wonder how many of them have experienced the smell of burning flesh. I hope the agonized eyes of these dying men and those who will die in the future will not haunt them in their sleep.

Mr. Speaker, I am so concerned about this situation that when the next Congress convenes one of the first things I will propose is a full-dress investigation of grade-crossing accidents and what the ICC is doing to eliminate them.

The Ukrainian Congress Committee of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, soon to be celebrated will be the 20th anniversary of the founding of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America.

The insidious means which the Russians are employing seek to absorb freedom-loving people into the Communist regime without a grand-scale war. The highly developed tactics used in this cold war attack must be counteracted through the use of a continual truth campaign.

The Ukrainian Congress Committee has set for itself this basic goal. This organization is a uniquely important one dedicated to alerting the world to the plight of the captive nations dominated by Russia. They have highlighted the heinous crimes and the treachery of the Communist movement spearheaded by Russia. While the Ukrainian Congress Committee reflects the sentiments of some 2½ million Americans of Ukrainian extraction in the United States, it represents and works in behalf of all nations struggling under Communist domination.

Peace-loving people throughout the world are grateful for the objectives of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America and its wonderful endeavors.

Twentieth Anniversary of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. BUCKLEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Speaker, this fall marks the 20th anniversary of the founding of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America. This committee is a uniquely united national organization which reflects the thoughts, hopes, and ideas of some two and a half million Americans of Ukrainian ancestry.

I am proud to rise on the floor of the House this day to salute this outstanding organization and its distinguished chairman, Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, of Georgetown University and its Institute of Ethnic Studies. Dr. Dobriansky is an authority on the Soviet Union and the menace of world communism. His views have been widely quoted in many leading newspapers and governmental studies throughout the free world.

The Ukrainian Congress Committee, under the leadership of Dr. Dobriansky, has dedicated itself, first, to the proposition of protecting the interests of the United States of America in its continuing struggle in the cold war with Red communism, and secondly, and I might say even more importantly, to preserving the integrity, security, and freedom of the United States of America. It has done this by constant vigilance in presenting to the American public and to the leaders of the free world the fact that there are behind the Iron Curtain today enslaved millions who have been overrun by the force of communism and who are still striving desperately in their silent struggle for the freedom which is rightly theirs.

The Ukrainian Congress Committee represents a noble heritage—for the people of the Ukraine, some 42 million in number, comprise the largest of the non-Russian nations within the Soviet Union. These people have a long and devoted heritage of dedication to those principles of freedom that are the very foundation stone of our Government. They, along with the other enslaved nations of Europe stretching from the far northern regions of that continent down to the southernmost tip of Europe, are at the present time unable to help themselves. But the Ukrainian Congress Committee is attempting to help not only the people of the Ukraine but all the enslaved nations of Europe by constantly placing before the eyes of the

free world the plight of these people. They are performing a service to this country which I believe is invaluable in the psycho-political and propagandist area of the cold war in which we are now engaged.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that through the force of such organizations as the Ukrainian Congress Committee, some day in the not too distant future all these enslaved countries now under communistic rule and the people within them will have the right to self-determination and to their own form of government.

I trust that the Ukrainian Congress Committee will continue its fine work of informing the free world of the problems faced by these people, and that on its 20th anniversary it will continue to flourish and grow as it has during the past 20 years.

Equal Opportunity for Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, in all the controversy and discussion over civil rights that has taken place in recent years, I believe that John Q. Public has tended to identify civil rights with racial equality alone. He has thought of civil rights in terms of school desegregation, lunch counter "sit-ins," bus boycotts and the like. While all this has certainly been true, it would be a great mistake indeed to exclude from the concept of civil rights the many other areas that fall within the much broader connotation of that term. For in addition to discrimination based upon color, there is also prevalent discrimination based upon race, religion and national origin. Furthermore, discrimination rears its ugly head in many different areas of everyday life: In voting, in education, at lunch counters, in housing, in the administration of justice, in employment. It is this last area, employment, with which I wish to concern myself today. Equal opportunity for employment—an opportunity open to all citizens—is not widely enough recognized as the true civil rights issue that it actually is. If anything, Mr. Speaker, this is an even more pressing aspect of civil rights than what is at stake in the lunch counter "sit-ins," because discrimination in the area of employment directly affects the ability of a man to support himself and feed and clothe his family. Discrimination in employment can deny a man the opportunity—and thus the right—to live among his fellow men in a manner commensurate with simple human dignity. Few issues, therefore, reach to a more fundamental level than the question of discrimination in employment and the opportunity therefor.

In addition to the discriminatory considerations of race, color, religion and national origin, discrimination in employment is often based also on age and sex. As the 1960 Democratic Party platform points out: "Unemployment strikes hardest at workers over 40, minority groups, young people and women. We will not achieve full employment until prejudice against these workers is wiped out." This is indeed a sad commentary on the current temper of our society, but it is nonetheless true. And it must be corrected and eliminated entirely and permanently from our great Nation.

One may ask how this is to be done. The answer is spiritual, moral and intellectual honesty in facing the problem squarely and acting in a bold and positive fashion within the framework of our Constitution and our inherent belief in the equality of all men. This is how it is to be done—not by talk but by action; not with bitterness but with conviction in the right of what must be done; not with contempt or disregard for the traditions and sentiments of some of our fellow citizens but with dedication and adherence to the broader principles for which this whole Nation stands.

The Democratic platform for 1960 is poignantly entitled "The Rights of Man." Time and again it takes full cognizance of the importance of the right to equal opportunity for employment. The civil rights plank of that platform states specifically:

> The new Democratic administration will support Federal legislation establishing a Fair Employment Practices Commission to secure effectively for everyone the right to equal opportunity for employment.

Here is concrete evidence that the Democratic Party plans to take action and not merely to deal with this problem in forensic platitudes. It is this type of clear thinking and positive action that has time and time again over the years made me proud to be a Democrat and I would only hope that I shall be able to transmit this pride and the reasons for it to the many, wonderful John Q. Publics I am privileged to represent.

The Cape Cod National Seashore Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, early next session, the Congress will be called upon to consider legislation of great significance to my district and to the Nation—the Cape Cod national seashore proposal.

I am hopeful that when this measure comes to the floor for action, many Members of the House will be able to contribute to the debate and cast their votes with the foresight which can only come from personal knowledge of the area.

Cape Cod is known as one of America's favorite vacationlands. It is renowned for its natural and historic significances. I take this opportunity to invite all my colleagues who have never visited the Cape to spend "Indian summer" with us.

Freedom Academy Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. WESTLAND. I am gratified that the Senate has passed S. 1689 which I believe potentially is a potent weapon against world communism. This bill, better known as the Freedom Academy bill, is identical to the bill I introduced, H.R. 13227, which would create a Freedom Commission for the development of the science needed to counteract the world Communist conspiracy and for training leaders necessary for total political war.

I intend to introduce this bill again in the 87th Congress and to work for its passage because I believe that in our constant battle against communism this academy will be one of our greatest weapons.

The cold war is political war, and the Soviets accept it as a total war to be won with all resources at their command. Russia had trained tens of thousands in specialized institutions to wage its ideological and political warfare against the free peoples of the earth.

America and the free nations are up against an enemy who has mastered social, political, ideological, psychological, and economic warfare. This enemy has used these tools to infiltrate rear areas of our military defenses and to sway the uncertain and timid to his side.

At our doorstep, less than 100 miles from our shores, the Communists have captured a popular revolution in a Catholic country. The overwhelming majority of Cubans followed Fidel Castro on his victory march into Havana, but instead of a freedom from tyranny it is now under the thumb of a Communist minority. This country, once friendly to America, is the staging area for Communist expansion into Latin America.

This is but one of the problems we face in the cold war today because our enemy has professionals pitted against our irregulars. By passage of S. 1689, we could have taken a step forward toward overcoming our deficiencies.

Mr. Speaker, the Honorable WALTER H. JUDD, of Minnesota, in his keynote speech at the Republican Convention said we have a good strategy for holding, but we cannot hope to win in the end by just holding. We must develop a strategy for victory.

Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON elaborated on this theme in his acceptance speech when he said:

> The Communists proclaim over and over again that their aim is the victory of communism throughout the world. It is not enough for us to reply that our aim is to contain communism, to defend the free

world against communism, to hold the line against communism; the only answer to a strategy of victory for the Communist world is a strategy of victory for the free world.

The gentleman from Minnesota and the Vice President have ably stated the course we must follow to survive. Both have given considerable support in time and energy to the Freedom Academy bill, a concept which provides the framework for building the strategy for victory.

I consider the bill to be one of the most important pieces of legislation that came before the 86th Congress. Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that in the 87th Congress both the House and the Senate will act on this measure and enact it into law so that we will have available what could prove to be the deciding factor in who will win the cold war.

Further Irregularities Revealed in Long Beach Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CECIL R. KING
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, another campaign payoff is being engineered for RICHARD NIXON, only this time a Government agency is directing the insidious job and the little people are footing the bill. A Long Beach, Calif., law firm, headed by NIXON's campaign manager in the area, has been given a lucrative retainer by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board in connection with its unjustified and irregular seizure of the $100 million Long Beach Savings & Loan Association.

For the first 2 months of this arrangement, the firm of Clock, Waestman & Clock drew nearly $8,000 in fees, and the total has by now probably reached 3 or 4 times that amount. The potential importance of this political payola can be seen from the fact that a 10-year fight on another matter involving this same association and this same Federal agency has racked up attorneys' fees that may amount to as much as $400,000.

Details on this deal have just been disclosed in hearings of a special subcommittee of the House of Representatives headed by Representative JOHN E. Moss that is investigating the Home Loan Bank Board's seizure last April 22 of the Long Beach institution. In the same hearings, it was proved that the White House itself has become so deeply involved in the fight over the seizure that a proposed settlement was apparently vetoed by one of the President's top aides. This is an almost identical parallel to the highly improper influence brought to bear upon another agency of the Government in the notorious Dixon-Yates case. Congress vests in the Home Loan Bank Board complete authority to make decisions based on the facts and the law in each case and it has been declared time and again highly improper if not criminal for outside influences of any kind whatsoever to be brought to bear on the members of such boards with respect to their decisions. The undue influence exerted upon this Board has now created an awkward situation indeed for this administration. It has been proven they have improperly entered the case and how to extricate themselves will now present a sticky problem.

Here are the details on the administration's latest deal:

Early this year the Chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board discussed with David W. Kendall, Special Counsel to the President, the Board's plans to seize the Long Beach institution. On Friday, April 22, 10 minutes before closing time, Board agents marched into the association and seized it. When the institution opened its doors the following Monday, long lines of frantic depositors were waiting, and in the next 2 weeks more than $26 million was withdrawn. Full details on this operation, and the potential destruction of the institution, are available in the special subcommittee's report issued last July.

Meanwhile, the Board members realized what a mess they had got themselves into and decided to get some extra legal talent to help fight off the courts and the depositors. Naturally, they turned to NIXON's office and asked for recommendations. A Board member talked it over with Robert H. Finch, administrative assistant to NIXON and now his national campaign manager, and who for years has been associated and involved in the building and loan association industry. And, interestingly, Finch suggested the Long Beach firm whose head by coincidence is handling NIXON's campaign in the area.

All this took only a few days, and in one of the fastest negotiations on record the Long Beach firm got a contract providing a rate of $40 an hour for a partner and $30 an hour for an associate; and $250 a day for court appearances, unless two attorneys were involved, when the rate would go to $400 a day.

So far this has paid off for NIXON's campaign manager at the rate of almost $4,000 a month.

After several weeks, the bank board decided to try to negotiate a settlement, and over the period of a month reached near agreement several times. But then the White House stepped in. The Board Chairman consulted with Mr. Kendall, the President's Special Counsel, and the tentative agreement was reversed. Albert J. Robertson, Chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, admitted in the hearings that he met with Kendall to discuss the situation, but he refused to disclose what was said. However, the president of the seized association testified under oath that he was told by another Board member that Kendall had vetoed the settlement.

These facts are clear from the evidence of the hearings. The bank was seized with notably weak and faulty reasoning, but once the deed was done the White House and NIXON determined not to let the action become a political liability. While the White House sabotaged all possible chances of a settlement that could not help but reveal the stupidity and capriciousness of the seizure action, NIXON's office made sure that his friend and campaign manager would profit as long as the fight continued.

The principal ones to suffer from such political duplicity are the thousands of depositors in the Long Beach institution whose savings and interest earnings are being consumed by lawyers' fees and useless litigation.

This seizure, precipitated by incompetent politically motivated hacks, is now compounded by political opportunists at the highest level. The result is a scandal that must and will be thoroughly investigated, with the guilty persons brought to the bar of public opinion, if not to justice.

A Plea for Tolerance in the 1960 Presidential Election

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK KOWALSKI
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, American citizens who are 21 years of age or over will have the privilege of voting for a candidate for the President of the United States on November 8, 1960. Between now and November it is possible that the basic issues of our time will be eclipsed by the heavy shadows of bigotry, hate, and intolerance. In recent weeks the religious issue has been wound up like a mechanical monster and sent down the political avenue spreading in its path literature, remarks, and innuendoes that are completely un-American.

It is absolutely necessary that between now and November all voters become increasingly aware of the qualifications of our candidates. But it is the responsibility of those same voters to drive out any items of hate which could cause the freedom of religion in our land to crumble in a sorry heap at the feet of democracy. The future peace of the world cannot be advanced if any potential head of our Nation is to be caught in the vise of religious hatred.

May I make one point entirely clear at the very outset. That point, simply stated, is: Religious neutrality of the Government does not imply personal religious indifference of its individual citizens. As the late Justice Rutledge once stated, there is a double price Americans pay for religious liberty—one is the self-restraint of the Government in noninterference with a man's creed; the other is the ban on the use of governmental machinery by or for any church.

Three centuries ago men fled with their families from European shores to find freedom on the fertile earth of the new world. Here on a promising continent they toiled for it, died for it, established it. Here, they forged a nation, which guarantees equal consideration to all men.

Our forefathers believed in the God revealed in the Bible. They wanted and loved freedom more than anything else. They knew exactly what it was they wanted and they defined it.

Foremost among the men who made America possible was John Winthrop, one of the founders of the Massachusetts Bay Colony, and its first Governor. Without his character and integrity, his good judgment and nobility of mind, the colony might never have come to pass, and, once founded, might have failed miserably. An Englishman, he was a believer in liberty. The following quoted document attests his profound understanding of the meaning of liberty. His words are:

> There are two kinds of liberty. One is natural liberty, common to man and beast alike, which is incompatible with authority and cannot endure restraint. This liberty, if unrestrained, makes men grow more evil, and it is the great enemy of truth and peace, needing the laws of God and man to restrain and subdue it.
>
> The other kind of liberty, I call civil, or federal; it may also be termed moral, in reference to the covenant between God and man, in the moral law, and the politic covenants and constitutions amongst men themselves. This liberty is the proper end and object of authority, and cannot subsist without it; and it is a liberty to do that only which is good, just, and honest.

It would seem that the two kinds of liberty John Winthrop defined so clearly are being confused in the political campaign of 1960. Unrestrained—enemy of truth and peace—needing the laws of God. These phrases apply themselves readily to the type of hate literature that has been and continues to be circulated concerning a Catholic who is a candidate for public office.

Religious liberty is perhaps the greatest contribution America has made both in the realm of politics and of religion. Are we to cut this contribution from the arm of America and drift out on the sea of ignorance and hatred?

Ours has been the "Faith of Our Fathers"—Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln. Their religious attitudes contained one essential which we have come to believe has pervaded the American ideology, and that is the insistence on freedom of conscience—not toleration as a concession, but equal liberty as a right.

Washington wrote to the Baptists in Virginia:

> I have often expressed my sentiments, that every man, conducting himself as a good citizen, and being accountable to God alone for his religious opinions, ought to be protected in worshipping the Deity according to the dictates of his own conscience.

Jefferson considered his success in promoting religious liberty one of his greatest achievements. In his first inaugural address he declared:

> Freedom of religion I deem [one of the] essential principles of our Government and, consequently, [one] which ought to shape its administration.

Lincoln declared the "establishing and maintaining civil and religious liberty" to be "the noblest of causes."

Here, briefly, is the ideology, truly American, which the founders and builders of our Nation have espoused. It is fundamental in the religious thinking and experiences of Christians, Jews, and Deists—Protestants and Catholics.

Let us move on into the trend in our time, into a period where we have passed the halfway mark in the 20th century.

At the conclusions of both national conventions of our two great political parties, in July, both RICHARD M. NIXON and JOHN F. KENNEDY announced no remarks of intolerance or bigotry in the area of religion would come from them.

What has happened within the last few weeks? Here are a few of the organized efforts of American citizens to smear the presidential candidate who is of Catholic faith:

A group of 25 local ministers in one of our Southern States adopted a resolution pledging to—and I quote—"oppose with all the powers at our command the election of a Catholic to the Presidency of the United States."

The executive director of the Fair Campaign Practices Committee, a national, nonpartisan, and nonprofit educational organization, was forced to state:

> The circulation of rabidly anti-Catholic material already is many times greater than we have ever seen it. We think at this point there is a substantial danger the campaign in 1960 will be dirtier on the religious issue than it was in 1928.

Recently two southern churchmen said in interviews with the Nashville Tennessean that preachers and ministers in their denomination will use their pulpits to oppose Senator KENNEDY for President.

The president of the 9 million member Southern Baptist Convention has said:

> Since the Roman Catholic Church is not only a church but a political entity, we feel we are justified in making an attack upon Mr. KENNEDY on that basis.

The editor of the Church of Christ publication, said the Church of Christ is against Senator KENNEDY because "he owes his allegiance to the Pope."

On August 20 at Greenville, S.C., the South Carolina Conference of the Southern Methodist Church went on record as opposing election of a Roman Catholic to the Presidency.

The Washington Evening Star on August 25, in an Associated Press article, reported that the Fair Campaign Practices Committee, backed by both major political parties, has been screening questionable material received throughout the country. With the campaign barely under way, experience suggests a deluge of hate literature. The attacks are becoming more virulent and overt.

These are unpleasant facts to report, and they are also facts that many worthy citizens will wish to shove under the nearest rug. Yet they are facts. Consider, for example, the following excerpts from a recent sermon by the pastor of the First Baptist Church of Dallas, Tex.:

> Roman Catholicism is not only a religion, it is a political tyranny. It is a political system that, like an octopus, covers the entire world and threatens those basic freedoms * * * for which our forefathers died. If you have ever seen the symbol of the Pope of Rome, he has two keys; one is the key of religious supremacy and the other is the key of sovereign political power. He claims to possess both * * * [even] if KENNEDY wins with strong emphasis on the separation of church and state, then the door is open for another Roman Catholic later on who gives the Pope * * * recognition of one church above all others in America. Then religious liberty has also died in America * * * as it has died wherever the Roman Catholic hierarchy has the ableness and power to shut down and destroy it in death.

It was reported by Joseph Alsop in his column in the Washington Post on August 29, 1960, that "hundreds of thousands of copies" of the sermon, containing the above comments, have been sent out at the request of "preachers, business groups and other people" for circulation.

RICHARD M. NIXON has issued a general directive forbidding all his campaign workers even to discuss the so-called religious issue. He has had nothing whatever to do with the anti-Catholic agitation that is now growing stronger by the day. If the attacks were on the religion of Mr. NIXON, I am certain Mr. KENNEDY would issue a like directive.

This puts the center of current hatred and bigotry, not in the offices of the two political parties, but with private citizens, who themselves claim to know all there is to know about freedom of religion. Early in this century Israel Zangwill gave to this country a beautiful and poetic ideal in the phrase "the melting pot." This phrase, at least as it was interpreted in the minds of many, brought about a false idea. Many felt that melting pot meant that every group should, under the fire of American life, be liquefied in a mass and then cast into a single type. This is a misconception. Allow me to use the following illustration. There is a process known as smelting and refining. Various lead ores are taken from the various parts of the earth, smelt in a furnace and refined in a pot, and then cast into bars, each identically the same as the other. Before getting this exact sameness, this uniformity, all the gold and silver must be removed, that is, the precious metals.

In the same way, if we were to try to mold everyone in this country to the same pattern we should have to remove the precious elements of individual initiative and individual idealism. This misconception of the melting pot idea is the basis of narrow movements. The finer ideal for the advancement of humanity is to permit liberty for the individual and for his group, and at the same time to do two things: first, to promote cooperative community enterprises, and, second, to educate for mutual understanding.

Man's inhumanity to man is largely traceable to intergroup intolerance and actual hatred. Since the dawn of history wars, internal strife, cruelties in human relationship have been caused, to a large extent, by misunderstanding and envy. The religious hatreds and persecutions in the Old World resulted in the colonization of this country, and when its people formed a government of their

own they did so with the very definite idea of making it a nation where people of different views and traditions could not only live in harmony, but also bring forth a great nation dedicated to equal opportunity for all and service to humanity.

Religion and democracy should go hand in hand. Each protects and complements the other. Each helps to bring about a better, finer life for all decent men and women.

At a time in our national life when we are crying for peace and understanding, the American voter can learn a valuable lesson from the past. He can learn not to fall for vicious and spurious notions that people of one faith are inferior to those of another. He can learn to suspect stories or rumors or implications that are too pat, or unauthenticated, or just plain inflammatory.

The hard fight of a political campaign that is so much a part of the American scene should go forward—not on the religious issue, but on the issues which pertain to national economy, foreign aid, the fight against communism, our entire foreign policy program, the peace of the world, and the challenges of the space age.

I call on the American voter to pay more attention to politics, to learn more about how his Nation and the States and communities that comprise it are governed. He should come to know the candidate for public office for what he is. Then, and only then, citizens sufficiently interested in politics and government will not have time to fan the fires of bigotry and hatred.

In the Christian Century of February 10, 1960, the director of the school of religion at one of our large midwestern universities wrote an article entitled "Religion and the Presidency." Among the comments in the article are the following:

> Perhaps above all we may draw the conclusion that in choosing a man for the greatest responsibility any American—or possibly any human being—can assume, it is far more important to look to his experience in human relations, his record in the rough and tumble of the political arena as well as in public office, to assess his instincts, his sensibilities, his sympathies, than it is to scrutinize his religious affiliation. This is not to suggest that religious affiliation will have no relation to these matters. It may be very significant or it may carry little weight.
>
> Many a self-styled political independent has loudly and proudly proclaimed the old statement which seems to be so full of virtue, "I vote for the man not the party." On the question of religion and the Presidency, perhaps a paraphrase of that statement is in order: "Vote for the man, not the church."

These words were written prior to the two political conventions and prior to the point where hate literature began smearing our national integrity.

"When we understand each other, we find it difficult to cut one another's throats," wrote Van Wyck Brooks. This epitomizes America's need during the 1960 presidential election.

In the 3½ centuries since our shores were settled we have come to believe that Americans have learned a great deal about tolerance. In the final analysis, the voter who is intolerant and the citizen who is misgoverned have only themselves to blame for their plight. The realization of that fact is our hope for the future of the United States of America.

Retirement of a Distinguished Government Official Who Battled for the Consumer

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe I have ever met Dr. Albert R. Miller, who has headed the Meat Inspection Service in the Department of Agriculture since 1944, but I am thoroughly familiar with the outstanding work he has done over the years in protecting the American consumer. The Meat Inspection Division has an enviable reputation among Government agencies which have been set up to protect the public interest, because it has been willing to fight to protect the integrity of its programs despite pressures often exerted upon it from within and outside the Department.

Dr. Miller has now retired from the Department after nearly 35 years of service in meat inspection. I learned this upon reading a Department of Agriculture announcement of the appointment of Dr. Clarence H. Pals to succeed Mr. Miller as head of meat inspection in the Agricultural Research Service. I sincerely hope Dr. Pals maintains the high standards of consumer interest demonstrated by his predecessor.

CONSUMERS' BATTLE NEVER ENDS

For it is certain, Mr. Speaker, that the best of laws can be undermined by reluctant administration. The battle to protect the consumer interest is a never-ending one. After the long legislative fight to enact badly needed laws to protect the consumer, we have too often seen those laws repealed, as it were, by administrative neglect or official antagonism. Too often, I am sorry to say, Government agencies charged with the responsibility of protecting the consumer interest are pushed or pressured into playing the game of the very commercial interests they are supposed to regulate or discipline.

As sponsor of the legislation to establish for the first time compulsory inspection of poultry, I have seen at firsthand how important it is for the regulatory agency to be able to hold fast against pressures to weaken the administration of the law. The poultry inspection work is done as part of the Department of Agriculture's Marketing Service, which is producer oriented; meat inspection is under the Agricultural Research Service, which is, in my opinion, more oriented to the consumer interest. It makes quite a difference.

MEAT AND POULTRY INSPECTION DIFFER

When meat inspection officials decide that certain substances should not be used in or on meat carcasses, or in the processing of food, they make their orders stick despite the pressures. When poultry inspection officials make similar decisions, they are more readily overruled within the Department. All up and down the line, for instance, the poultry inspection people insisted several years ago that the kidneys should be required to be removed from cut up poultry; the producers got to Secretary Benson and the Secretary overruled his own experts, and that was all there was to it.

Again, when certain interests fought to limit the inspection process in both meat and poultry processing to the initial slaughter stage, so that further processors would not have Federal inspection of their products, Agricultural Research Service people fought this raid on their program's integrity and won; the Agricultural Marketing Service people, on the other hand, went along with the weakening proposal and put up no fight at all; we in the Congress had to make the fight for them to prevent a serious weakening—the opening of a big loophole—in the act. I should not blame the people in poultry inspection for going along with their superiors even when they feel their superiors are wrong; they have to go along.

FIGHTING FOR WHAT IS RIGHT

On the other hand, I like and admire the way the meat inspection people under Dr. Miller have stood up for the integrity of their program at every step of the way, and apparently have had the backing of the Agricultural Research Service in doing so—more power to ARS for that.

Mr. Speaker, although, as I said, I have never met Dr. Miller personally, all of these thoughts flashed through my mind when I read of his retirement, and I felt, as a Member of Congress interested primarily in consumer issues, that I could not let this occasion pass without thanking Dr. Miller on behalf of America's consumers for his lifetime of service in their behalf. Consequently, I addressed the following letter to him:

(LEONOR K. (Mrs. JOHN B.) SULLIVAN, Third District, Missouri; Committees: Banking and Currency, Merchant Marine and Fisheries; chairman, Subcommittee on Panama Canal. Home office: Old Federal Building, Eighth and Olive Streets, St. Louis, Mo.)

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., August 31, 1960.

Dr. ALBERT R. MILLER,
Falls Church, Va.

DEAR DR. MILLER: Although I am terribly jammed up with last minute duties, responsibilities, and problems in connection with the imminent adjournment of Congress and the delayed start of my reelection campaign, I cannot leave Washington without extending to you my best wishes upon your retirement from Government, and my sincere thanks for the fine service you have given to the American consumer as head of the Meat Inspection Division.

For reasons with which you may or may not be familiar, I try to keep up with Department of Agriculture releases, trying to glance over the daily summary to see which

releases I want to obtain and read, and in that way learned of the appointment of Dr. Pals as your successor. I then had the Department send over the actual release and read with interest the honors which have been accorded you since joining the Meat Inspection Service in 1926.

During the four terms I have served in Congress, I have been in an almost perpetual battle with the Department of Agriculture over one thing or another but I have never, during that period, had any reason to have anything but the highest regard for the Meat Inspection Division. I had hoped to see poultry inspection handled as well as you have handled meat inspection, and at least wanted it in the Agricultural Research Service. I have admired the way you have maintained the integrity of meat inspection under what I am sure must sometimes have been heavy pressures, and I congratulate you for it.

Good luck and much happiness to you and Mrs. Miller in the years ahead.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

LEONOR K. (Mrs. JOHN B.) SULLIVAN,
Member of Congress,
Third District, Missouri.

PRESS RELEASE ON DR. MILLER'S RETIREMENT

Mr. Speaker, I also submit at this point the official press release from the Department of Agriculture on Dr. Miller's retirement and the appointment of his successor, as follows:

DR. CLARENCE H. PALS NAMED HEAD OF FEDERAL MEAT INSPECTION

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, August 11, 1960.

Appointment of Dr. Clarence H. Pals as Director of the Meat Inspection Division in the Agricultural Research Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture was announced today by ARS Administrator Byron T. Shaw. The appointment is effective September 1, 1960.

Dr. Pals succeeds Dr. Albert R. Miller, who is retiring after a distinguished career embracing almost 35 years of service in the Department. Dr. Miller has headed the Federal Meat Inspection Service since 1944. Under his guidance, and that of his predecessors, this Service has become internationally recognized for its work in assuring American consumers that meats available to them at grocery and meat stores throughout the country are unexcelled in wholesomeness. The standards of this Service which observed its golden anniversary in 1956, have set a pattern for the entire world.

Dr. Pals also has had a distinguished career in the Department. He joined USDA in November 1932 as a veterinary meat inspector at Chicago. Subsequent field assignments took him to Fort Dodge, Iowa (1934–39), to Esterville, Iowa (1939–40), and Sioux City, Iowa (1940), as assistant inspector in charge. In 1941, he went to New York, as assistant inspector in charge. Dr. Pals came to Washington in June 1944 as assistant to the chief of the Meat Inspection Service in the former Bureau of Animal Industry, and in November of the same year was named chief of the trade label and standardization section.

Like his predecessor, Dr. Pals also is a recipient of the USDA Superior Service Award, granted in 1955. He is vice president of the International Association of Veterinary Food Hygienists, past chairman of the food hygiene committee of the American Veterinary Medical Association, and a member of the Commission for Foreign Veterinary Graduates. He was born in Meservey, Iowa, in 1907, and grew up on a general livestock farm. He attended public schools and Iowa State Teachers College and taught rural school in Iowa from 1925 to 1926.

In 1928 Dr. Pals entered Iowa State College, where he was awarded a doctor's degree in veterinary medicine in 1932. Dr. and Mrs. Pals live at 2338 South Ode Street, Arlington, Va.

The retirement of Dr. Miller will be effective at the end of August. Aside from a Superior Service Award granted by USDA in 1948, he also received the Award of Honor given jointly by the Association of Food and Drug Officials of the United States, the Food Laws Institute, and the Association of Official Agricultural Chemists in 1956. Iowa State College presented him with its Alumni Merit Award in 1952. He is author of an authoritative textbook "Meat Hygiene," widely used in colleges of veterinary medicine.

Dr. Miller is a native of Pennsylvania. He received his doctor of veterinary medicine degree from Iowa State College in 1924 and an LL.B. degree from Georgetown University Law School in 1940. He entered USDA as a veterinary meat inspector in 1926, spending 10 years in the field—in Chicago, New Jersey, New York City, and South Kortright, N.Y.—before coming to Washington.

Dr. and Mrs. Miller live at 366 North Washington Street, Falls Church, Va.

VFW Gold Medal of Merit Award Goes to John Daly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, over the past 18 months we have heard a great deal of criticism of the television industry. This has tended to cause us to overlook the many fine services which this industry has given to the American public not only in the entertainment field but also in the field of public affairs.

I am therefore pleased to commend the Veterans of Foreign Wars for the recognition which they have given to one of the Nation's best-known and well-regarded commentators and newsmen, Mr. John Daly, vice president of the American Broadcasting Co.

On August 24, 1960, in Detroit, Mich., during the course of the Veterans of Foreign Wars' 61st annual convention, Mr. Daly was awarded the Veterans of Foreign Wars Commander in Chief's Gold Medal of Merit for his outstanding achievement in the field of newscasting by Lewis G. Feldmann, of Hazleton, Pa. As Mr. Daly entered the convention hall to receive the award, he was given a standing ovation by the 10,000 delegates present.

In announcing the award Commander Feldmann said:

> For many years now we of the VFW have been watching with great interest the efforts of Mr. Daly, and have been happy to note the great emphasis he has placed on our Nation's defense program. There is no question that through his efforts we have today a far better informed public and hence a more secure Nation.

The Commander in Chief's Gold Medal Merit Award is one of the highest the organization can present to any individual. The citation of the award stated that it was given to Mr. Daly "in recognition of his distinguished public service in the field of information, and especially for his consistently objective reporting of events affecting the everyday lives of the American people."

The Back Door to the Treasury—Front Door to Financial Ruin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE CANNON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, when the 87th Congress convenes next January, it could render no greater service to the people and the country than to immediately revise the Rules of the House to conclusively define, once and for all, in harmony with the constitutional meaning, the appropriating jurisdiction in the House of Representatives. It is a compelling national necessity made urgent by indefensible rulings of the Chair and the practices of the legislative committees in the House and the Senate. We are on the highroad to financial ruin and at least we ought to be in position to know when we get there.

The statement is justified by the facts and figures in today's RECORD, pages 19128–19134. They are reinforced by similar data in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 105, part 15, pages 19822–19825, and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 104, part 15, particularly pages 19692–19693.

The RECORD of September 1, 1960, conclusively shows that, in comport with tradition, the regular annual appropriation bills processed under our established system are within the budget requests. They are below the budget—not enough below, but nevertheless below. And they represent the combined judgment of the two Houses, not the judgment of the Committee on Appropriations. But while they are below the corresponding budget requests for appropriations by $211,638,498, not counting loan authorizations set out in the tabular material, the "back door" appropriation bills of the session exceed the Executive requests by $830 million, so that in the aggregate the budget is exceeded by an identified $618 million. Other budgetary actions, or failure of action such as the postal rate proposition and certain tax suggestions not adopted, affect the budget totals.

It is safe to say that only a handful of Members were aware of this outcome until they saw the RECORD today after the House had closed for the year. The Committee on Appropriations had many inquiries from Members, the press, and others, in the closing days of the session as to action on the budget. We told them the budget had been cut in the appropriation bills. What we could not tell them, because we did not and could not know, was what had happened, or was about to happen as a result of the enactment of the back-door bills. The number of back-door bills declined from

the flood of last year and the year before, but that is relatively immaterial.

The practice is reprehensible. Last year, the back-door bills totaled $5,701 million and of course exceeded the budget.

In 1958, they totaled $4,542 million—and exceeded the budget by $1,192 million. That was the year the Senate originated 10 back-door bills and adopted back-door bills totaling $9,226 million, covering the fields of housing, banking, small business, community facilities, depressed areas, minerals stabilization, airport grants, highways, veterans loans, and defense production.

Mr. Speaker, it is high time the House got this vital business of appropriations back on the track. Billions of dollars flow through the back doors and side doors of the Treasury which have been breached by devices ingeniously designed to circumvent the time-tested annual congressional review of demands on the Treasury. Under such diffused practices, how can the House, the Senate, the press, or the people be expected to know what is happening to the taxpayers' pocketbooks? If the Members of Congress and the people are to clearly know what is going on, all the budgetary actions ought to go through one procedure, one system, under the same set of rules. There should be only one door—the front door—through which money is removed from the Treasury.

Under the rules of the House, exclusive jurisdiction over appropriations rests with the Committee on Appropriations. That has been the rule since 1920, when power to report bills carrying appropriations was taken from the legislative committees. The purpose was clear; namely, to have a single committee handling appropriations so as to get better control of spending. No one committee had responsibility for overall review of the appropriation requests. Each committee was concerned only with its limited part of the total. The left hand didn't know what the right hand was doing. There was no single committee to look at the whole appropriations picture and weigh relative urgencies of all requests in light of the conditions, available revenues, and annual needs.

The House wanted to improve its system of checks and balances because, with defined and limited jurisdiction, legislative committees are in the nature of special pleaders with respect to funds to carry out legislation which these same committees have previously sponsored. The demand was for a single committee, institutionally unbiased and objective.

The most ingenious and frequently used back-door technique is the so-called public debt transaction, whereby an agency can borrow money from the Treasury and commit it to a function or purpose of government. This is nothing more or less than an appropriation because it permits withdrawal of money from the Treasury without further legislative action. Indefensible rulings of the Chair, notably in the instance of the Housing Act of 1949, have held this device not to be an appropriation within the meaning of the rules. Therefore, the legislative committees, which are specifically inhibited from including appropriations in bills they report, can include such gimmicks in bills without running afoul of the injunction against appropriations.

Another form is the contract authority device which to all intents and purposes is an appropriation because a contract, once made, must be honored; the subsequent action of appropriation to pay off the contract is essentially foreordained.

The interpretation is wholly unsound and clearly contrary to the rules change in 1920. The Constitution specifically states that the only way money can be drawn from the Treasury is by appropriation made by law. Constitutionally, therefore, any language in a legislative enactment which permits money to be separated from the Treasury is an appropriation—the form, method, or the words used being wholly immaterial. To permit such devices as the public debt transaction in legislative bills, thus bypassing the established appropriations process, is nothing short of cutting the heart out of the 1920 rules change. And such a decision is clearly at odds with the rule of reason.

Of all the legislative prerogatives, the powers to tax and appropriate are the most vital. Not a wheel of Government can turn without the motivation of an appropriation by the Congress. And the act of appropriation is essentially a nullity until money to fulfill it is in the Treasury. So, every function, every action of the Government is dependent on the two cardinal powers of taxation and appropriation. The Constitution wisely committed these powers to the exclusive province of the House of Representatives. It was the plan, the purpose, and the expectation that the immediate representatives of the people, those closest to them, would have the key voice in these matters. The framers delegated these powers to the House in order to assure full, frequent and effective accountability to the direct representatives of the people as to the public business and the public funds. It is the Members of the House, not the Senate, not the spending departments, who bear the first responsibility for unpopular or excessive taxation and extravagrant appropriations. And this fundamental and all-important principle of our form of government has from the beginning been jealously envied, assaulted from all sides, and often disputed beyond the Hall of the House of Representatives. There has never been a time when the departments of Government were not ready and eager to assume the prerogative to say how much and how fast, and for what purpose, tax funds should be removed from the Treasury and committed to myriad purposes of expenditure.

Directly involved also is the fundamental question of the prerogatives of the House as the body closest to the people The precedents are heavy with the record of attempts by the Senate to preempt the exclusive powers of the House to originate tax and appropriation legislation. In the RECORD pages cited earlier, the tabular material on backdoor appropriation bills will disclose that many of them originated in the Senate. And the legislative committees of the House, with the encouragement of the leadership, insist on concurring in this short-circuiting process. They have never willingly conceded in the other body that the makers of the Constitution were somewhat explicit about who should draw the money bills. Some have gone farther and sought to deduce a distinction in the Constitution between taxing legislation and appropriation legislation. No such differentiation is there. What would be the purpose of raising taxes that were not to be spent?

The Government was not established to make or accumulate money. Taxation fulfills the purpose of appropriation, not the other way around. If there is no need for appropriation, then there is no need for taxation. The two are inseparable.

The executive branch and the Congress for some years have lodged more and more budgetary determinations outside the traditional annual appropriations process. The spenders and the special pleaders are the instigators. There is a race to see how much, and in how many different ways, and under how many different guises money can be extracted from the Treasury. The devices assume several forms but they are all for one purpose, and that is to get money from the Treasury without having to pass the acid test of annual congressional scrutiny. The one continuing procedure for congressional control of the activities of Government within the framework of basic statutes is the annual program review and provision of funds which the annual appropriations process was designed to secure. Through annual check, this opportunity to periodically reassess the financial needs and requirements in light of ever-changing conditions and the wishes of the people constitute a foremost responsibility of the House, and of the Committee on Appropriations as a servant of the House.

Many of the programs financed through backdoor appropriation bills, often extending several years into the future, perpetuate expenditures that often might not otherwise stand the test of annual congressional scrutiny. Instances have been documented in recent years where certain back-door bills have been jammed through because the proponents felt they could not make their case through the regular routine.

Mr. Speaker, we are not talking about the merits of the purposes for which the backdoor appropriations are made. That is not the point. The point is that we need to comply with common sense, the rule of reason, and the intent of the rules established 40 years ago. The left hand needs to know what the right hand is doing. The people need to know what we are proposing in money matters. They do not and cannot know under the loose and irresponsible methods followed today. It is high time the House took action. The House must insist—and without exception—on its exclusive constitutional prerogatives by slamming back to the other body the back-door bills which they originate. The alternative is to open the way to virtual destruction of a privilege and a responsibility as old as the House itself. You can

rest assured that if the practice is not stopped, and stopped at the earliest moment, it will grow. I have cited pages of the RECORD containing abundant proof of that fact.

It is imperative that the rules be changed or decisions reversed so as to reinforce effective control of the purse-strings. These end-run devices tend to perpetuate—encourage perpetuation—of programs and expenditures that might not otherwise stand the acid test of annual congressional scrutiny. They are tailormade for that purpose and they often result in staking us out so far into the future as to tie the hands of future Congresses.

The distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], introduced House Resolution 161 in the 86th Congress embodying a proposed rules change to correct this reprehensive practice. It should be adopted.

Scout Award to Bruce Simpson, of Prospect Harbor, Maine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to say that courage is an ingredient that is applauded by everyone, and particularly when it is evidenced in one who is young in years.

I insert into the RECORD an article from the Bangor Daily News that deals with the heroic demonstration of a youth from my congressional district, a deed of which I am justly proud.

Vice President NIXON has also seen fit to commend this valorous act, and in conjunction with the newsclipping concerned, this letter, too, I submit to the RECORD:

[From the Bangor Daily News, June 25–26, 1960]

CUB SCOUT TO RECEIVE AWARD FOR RESCUING CHILD FROM POND

PROSPECT HARBOR, July 11.—Bruce Simpson, 11-year-old son of Mr. and Mrs. Francis Simpson of Prospect Harbor, will be given a special award for quick thinking and spontaneous action in rescuing a 7-year-old girl from Flanders Pond.

While playing on the wharf at the East Sullivan Pond early this summer, little Rhonda Ross fell into the water. Young Simpson, who was swimming close by, observed the accident and noted that she did not come to surface.

He dived into the water, which was about 7 feet deep, brought her to surface and set her back on the wharf.

Rhonda is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Robert Ross, who were residing at West Gouldsboro. The family has gone to Morocco, North Africa, where Mr. Ross is continuing to serve as communications chief in the U.S. Navy.

Simpson is a Cub Scout of Den 2 of the Gouldsboro Pack, and will receive the award for his action in the fall. Cubmaster is James McKinna.

OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT,
Washington, D.C., August 11, 1960.

Master BRUCE SIMPSON,
Prospect Harbor, Maine.

DEAR BRUCE: I just had the pleasure of reading about your recent exploit and I wanted to get this note off to congratulate you on your courageous act in rescuing a young girl from drowning.

Your bravery in saving her life is a splendid example for all of us. The ability which you demonstrated to think quickly and to act promptly in response to a critical situation has earned you the well-deserved appreciation of your fellow Americans. I am indeed proud of you for this noble achievement.

With every good wish for the future.

Sincerely,

RICHARD NIXON.

Commendation of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America on Its 20th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include therein a commendation of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America on its 20th anniversary:

COMMENDATION OF THE UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE OF AMERICA ON ITS 20TH ANNIVERSARY

In these days of growing awareness of Soviet pentration into Latin America and Africa we tend to forget the other areas of the world where Communist penetration is no novelty. A danger lies in the surrendering, through a display of lack of interest, of the East European nations which, at an early stage of Soviet expansionism, were absorbed into the Soviet sphere.

The Soviets have had several allies in their attempts to snuff out the liberties and nationalistic strivings of these nations. Time has served as an enemy to the captive nations, for with time has come a tendency, often unconscious, in the free world to accept their slavery. Distance has likewise served the Communist cause, for the problems of these dozen subjected non-Russian peoples are far from us. In an era where American interests are focused on a virulent Communist threat less than 100 miles from our own beloved country we may tend to forget the further and no less virulent Communist threat several thousands of miles away in Eastern Europe.

Yet, though time, distance, and space have helped keep the Soviet tyranny in power and free from the active challenge of the free world's might, the spiritual values of our common heritage are on our side.

One could feel at times that spiritual values alone cannot fight against the mailed fist. Some feel that the only way to overcome Russian imperialism and achieve the liberation of enslaved peoples is to set loose another bloody holocaust. But war need not be a necessary ingredient in order to have an active East European policy. An organization which has been showing us how to arrive at an effective, realistic and yet bloodless policy has been the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America.

Through the 20 years of its existence the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America has been fulfilling the highly commendable function of presenting to the American people the sordid tragedy of the captive nations. Their importance to the free world in the context of our security has been continually highlighted. Its chairman, Prof. Lev E. Drobriansky and others affiliated with him were among the principal exponents of national observance of Captive Nation Week. When Congress gave its approval to its observance this year, Khrushchev was jolted, a blow for freedom mightily struck, and hope surged again in the hearts of those trapped behind the curtain of tyranny. In addition to these efforts the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America has published several excellent books and pamphlets and regularly presents its enlightening periodicals, the Ukrainian Bulletin and the Ukrainian Quarterly.

The Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, its directors, its various affiliated organizations, and its more than 2 million members are to be strongly commended for their sterling work on behalf of freedom.

A Report to My Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, with the adjournment of the 86th Congress, it is my desire to give an accounting of my stewardship as Congressman to the people of the 20th Congressional District of Pennsylvania, comprising the counties of Blair, Centre, and Clearfield. This report is in accordance with a long-standing policy of mine, to keep the people back home informed of their Congressman's activities.

EIGHTY-SIXTH CONGRESS

The 86th Congress convened on January 7, 1959, and adjourned September 1, 1960. The Senate was in session 280 days and the House 265 days. Both Houses filled nearly 36,000 pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. From the standpoint of legislation introduced, there were 20,164 public and private bills, joint resolutions, and so forth, introduced in the Senate and House of Representatives. Only a fraction of the bills introduced was finally approved and sent to the White House. To date, 1,130 new public laws have resulted from the work of the 86th Congress.

COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS

During the 86th Congress I retained my membership of many years on two important congressional committees—the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy and the House Armed Services Committee. Because of my length of service in Congress, my seniority on both of these important committees has classified me as a senior member of each. Both of my committee assignments, and especially my membership on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, consumed a major portion of my time and to such extent that literally for days I found myself behind closed doors involved in discussing mat-

ters pertaining to atomic energy, military defenses, and domestic and international affairs.

ATTENDANCE RECORD

During the 86th Congress despite the heavy demands on my time and because of committee assignments and visiting various Government agencies on congressional business, I achieved another near-perfect attendance record in answering all but a few quorum and rollcalls. My overall attendance record of 97 percent during my congressional career is one of the best in the history of the Congress of the United States according to Mr. Harry L. Brookshire, clerk of the minority, House of Representatives.

LARGE VOLUME OF MAIL

Throughout the 86th Congress my daily mail continued to increase in volume. Following my usual practice, I personally read every piece of mail received at my Washington and Altoona offices. In the majority of cases, I developed the information to answer inquiries. My files are full of letters of appreciation for services rendered to my constituents. These grateful expressions concerning my effort to truly represent at all times the people of this congressional district are deeply appreciated.

TAXES

With world conditions and an expanding population demanding more Government spending, congressional leaders, both Democrats and Republicans, agreed it was necessary for Congress to continue personal, and corporate income taxes as well as excise taxes because of the need for tax revenue.

In seeking means of reducing taxes, President Eisenhower continued to stress the necessity of reducing nonessential expenditures since the needs of our national defense require over 60 cents of every tax dollar.

The only tax reduction granted by the 86th Congress was a 5-percent reduction in the 10-percent rate on the transportation of persons by common carriers. The prospects of tax relief depend entirely on the cooling off of the cold war and greater economy in Government.

ECONOMY IN GOVERNMENT

Throughout the 86th Congress, in the House of Representatives the spirit of economy was constantly in evidence. The 1st session of the 86th Congress reduced the President's budget request by $1.8 billion while the 2d session added $211 million for a total reduction of $2.1 billion. I voted to reduce nonessential expenditures when I felt such action was justified in view of the fact that only through strict economy can we ever expect to reduce taxes and our national debt.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

As a member of the House Armed Services Committee and also the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, and being constantly briefed on world conditions by officials of the State Department, Central Intelligence Agency, and the Department of Defense, I kept abreast of our needs for national security and as a result supported necessary appropriation measures.

Since we are spending about $40 billion annually on national defense, it is reassuring in view of politically inspired charges of unpreparedness to read a statement by President Eisenhower when he said on August 8, 1960:

> Once again, I assure the Congress that this Nation's military power is second to none, and will be kept that way.

Equally reassuring is the statement on the floor of the Senate August 31 by U.S. Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ, Democrat, of New Mexico, and chairman of the Defense Department Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee, who said:

> Certainly America today is militarily able—and I say this in all sincerity—to defend itself and protect the free world in nuclear combat.

Continuing he said:

> We must keep it so in the future. In so doing we shall not be swayed, I trust, by financial or partisan considerations.

In concurring in the views of President Eisenhower and Senator CHAVEZ, my support of our national defense program is based on my convictions that we must be constantly alert and ready to meet any additions and revisions necessary to produce that unmistakable margin of military supremacy upon which our national security rests.

FOREIGN AID

Viewing world conditions with grave concern and realizing the necessity of continuing our foreign aid program on a reasonable and sound basis, I joined the majority in Congress in voting for reduced appropriations. For the past several years it has been recognized that many friendly nations are experiencing economic recovery and the theory is that they should be encouraged when possible to stand on their own feet, thus taking responsibility for some of the financial burden heretofore assumed by the overburdened taxpayers of America.

I look at foreign aid as part and parcel of our national defense since it is revealed that 42 nations in all parts of the world are part of the free world's program of common defense. This program of collective security in a divided world is the free world's answer to the challenge of communism.

MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED AND SOCIAL SECURITY

With public attention focused on the plight of the Nation's elderly citizens through the White House Conference on Aging, the 86th Congress approved a modified plan of financial assistance to States for medical care for elderly persons with funds from general treasury revenues rather than through social security taxes.

In addition, important changes were made in various social security system provisions, primarily with respect to income limitations and the eligibility age for disability benefits.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT AND RAILROAD UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ACTS

I am greatly disappointed that the 86th Congress did not approve some of my proposals to liberalize the provisions of the Railroad Retirement Act and to increase benefits. There is no type of legislation in which I am more interested than amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act and especially those concerning widows and spouses.

The 1959 amendments to the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act provided railroad workers and their families with higher benefits. These amendments had my full support.

In reporting on my activities in the field of railroad retirement and railroad unemployment insurance, I yield to no one in the effort I put forth during the 86th Congress to liberalize the Railroad Retirement and Railroad Unemployment Insurance Acts and increase their benefits.

VETERANS AND THEIR DEPENDENTS

During the 86th Congress I continued my efforts in behalf of the veterans of all wars and their dependents, an activity that I began after my discharge from World War I in 1919. Not only have I personally assisted hundreds of veterans and their dependents in obtaining benefits to which they were entitled, but I played an active role in securing congressional approval of bills now laws, which provide and increase benefits to the veterans of all wars and their dependents.

One of the legislative disappointments of the 86th Congress was the failure to enact World War I pension legislation.

A SOUND NATIONAL FARM POLICY

During the 86th Congress, I continued my interest in agriculture by advocating a sound national farm policy for the country, the taxpayer, and the farmer. The common objectives were to relieve the Nation from the $7.3 billion stockpile of surplus commodities stored all over the country and costing over $1,000 a minute for storage alone, together with the vexing problem of a declining farm income.

Unfortunately no farm legislation was enacted during the 86th Congress because a political stalemate continued to prevail between the administration and the Democratic-controlled Congress. The latter refused to face up to the farm problem and continued to support obsolete solutions which were conceived back in 1942 as a war measure.

PROTECTING AMERICAN LABOR

In addition to voting for reasonable labor legislation, including the minimum hourly wage, I continued my efforts to restrict the importation of cheaply manufactured foreign products which are destroying the jobs of American wage earners, by sponsoring legislation designed to curb the importation not alone of foreign residual oil from the Caribbean area which has captured our eastern seaboard coal markets but to adjust conditions of competition between certain domestic and foreign industries with respect to wages and working conditions. While not successful in having the legislation approved, the administration is conscious of the plight of the ailing coal industry and has applied quota limitations on foreign residual oil in several instances. In my opinion, reciprocal trade agreements are responsible for much of the unemployment we have in central Pennsylvania in the leather,

lockwasher, gas meter, textile, coal, pottery, light bulb, brass, and railroad industries. The protection of American wage earners against the flood of cheaply manufactured foreign imports will continue to be one of my main objectives.

EFFORTS TO AID SMALL BUSINESS

Ever mindful of the fact that small business is the backbone of our economic life, I devoted much effort to aiding and assisting the businessmen of my Congressional District. Almost daily I aided various industries in the central Pennsylvania area which had problems with the Federal Government concerning contracts, small business loans, and so forth.

This effort on my part to aid business firms resulted in nearly $25 million in Government contracts and $420,000 in Small Business Administration loans. This meant continued employment for the employees of the firms I was able to assist.

It will be recalled that several years ago at my request the Small Business Administration made a survey of my Congressional District to determine the defense production capabilities of our industries so that Government procurement agencies could be guided by such information in channeling contracts aimed at assisting small business firms.

In addition, arrangements were made with officials of the Small Business Administration whereby any manufacturer or businessman in my Congressional District who needed expert advice in the field of Government contracts could secure the services of a business specialist from the Small Business Administration, who made a personal visit to the plant and evaluated its potentialities. This arrangement has paid dividends, for it has resulted in several Government contracts for my Congressional District totaling several million dollars. In a few words, I have left no stone unturned in my efforts to assist small business firms in the central Pennsylvania area.

THE COAL AND RAILROAD INDUSTRIES

Time and time again during the 86th Congress I called the attention of Congress and the Federal Government to the fact that existing Government policies are a menace to the coal and railroad industries in my Congressional District. In my appearances before congressional committees, Government agencies and the White House, I pointed out that the Government policy of subsidizing fuel substitutes such as hydropower projects as well as the importation of residual oil has virtually wrecked the economy of central Pennsylvania. I stressed the fact that since 1948 nearly 50,000 soft-coal miners have lost their jobs in Pennsylvania and that hundreds of coal mines have been abandoned or closed chiefly because of the inroads made by the importation of foreign residual oil which has captured the eastern seaboard coal markets from the soft-coal industry. In addition to my efforts to convince Congress and the Government in general that something has to be done to assist the ailing coal and railroad industries, I joined management and labor in a program designed to focus the attention of the American people on the plight of the coal and railroad industries.

Partial success of our efforts is revealed by the fact that in several instances the President has applied quota limitations on the importation of foreign residual oil. In addition, a bill which I cosponsored was enacted establishing a Coal Research and Development Commission for the purpose of increasing the use of coal.

There was also an effort made on the part of those of us who represent coal-producing areas to establish a joint committee in Congress that would have resulted in the adoption of a national fuels policy.

All of these efforts are directed toward bolstering a sagging economy by rehabilitating the coal and railroad industries and thus producing jobs.

UNEMPLOYMENT

Several years ago when unemployment developed in the central Pennsylvania area due to the closing of coal mines and the effect on related industries, especially the railroads, at my request the U.S. Department of Labor made a survey and immediately declared the great portion of my congressional district as a critical area because of surplus labor. As unemployment continued to develop because of the loss of coal business by the railroads and the fact that the end of the shooting war in Korea brought about a nationwide economic readjustment, I moved promptly at that time in an effort to alleviate the situation.

As the result of numerous conferences with experts in and out of Government service and with top officials of management and labor, it was readily apparent that the coal industry was the victim of severe competition from substitute fuels, the chief offenders being hydropower and foreign residual oil. Recognizing that the salvation of the coal industry depended upon finding new uses for coal and being told by informed sources that it would be years before a practical program of new uses for coal could be perfected, it was apparent that during the interim years new and diversified industries was the only answer to our problem of unemployment.

With the assistance of agencies of Government, community groups were encouraged to develop programs for attracting new industries. Information kits were distributed which contained specific directions on how to proceed in contacting business firms seeking new sites. In addition, from time to time, leads were furnished in the form of lists of manufacturing firms eager to build or acquire new plants. It is pleasing to report that practically every community in my Congressional District has an active industrial committee and thousands of dollars have been and are being raised to finance a realistic approach in solving the need for new industries in order to eradicate unemployment.

Meanwhile, no opportunity was lost to assist business firms in securing Government contracts; to encourage communities in my Congressional District to plan public works projects with Federal aid as provided by the Housing Act; to furnish information on Government-owned patents available to industry; to arrange for a survey by the U.S. Department of Agriculture of the forests in this congressional district to determine the economic value of our timber and the part our forests can play in providing employment opportunities; to join in the program of developing uses for strategic materials found in the central Pennsylvania area.

In addition, I arranged for a Government inventory of the defense production capabilities of our industries; and continually furnished information on employment opportunities with the Federal Government to unemployed persons and assisted hundreds of them to overcome difficulties in collecting unemployment insurance benefits. Then also, several years ago I arranged for the county commissioners in the Blair-Centre-Clearfield area to distribute Government-owned surplus commodities to those eligible for them.

In Congress I was among the first to sponsor area redevelopment legislation designed to alleviate unemployment in labor surplus areas. My efforts in support of area redevelopment legislation have earned the commendation of leaders in Congress, business, labor, and industry.

The unemployment situation in my Congressional District has greatly disturbed me and almost daily I have been asking officials of Government, business, and labor, "What additional steps can I take to alleviate unemployment in my Congressional District?" The answer is that I am doing everything within my power to find a solution to the problem.

HOUSING

During the 86th Congress, housing legislation developed into a political football with the result there was enacted during the closing hours of the second session a modified bill which extended for 1 year the home improvement program, provided $500 million in college housing loan funds, and $50 million in loans for public facilities in small communities.

In addition to the modified housing bill which had my support, several communities in the Blair-Centre-Clearfield area were aided by me in securing Federal funds for housing, urban redevelopment, sewage, water, and school projects.

HIGHWAYS

One of the largest public works measures ever presented to Congress and which had my active support is the 41,000-mile Federal Interstate Highway project costing nearly $45 billion and requiring a construction period of 16 years.

This program which includes the Keystone Shortway is being financed by Federal taxes on gasoline, fuel, rubber, and so forth, and is progressing very slowly because of increased costs and the need of additional revenue. At the present time the program has 26 projects in central Pennsylvania involving 85 miles and nearly $9 million in Federal funds.

PUBLIC HEALTH

Congress approved several bills that I supported which provided for a broader expansion of Federal public-health programs. Other legislation which had my support provided Federal aid in the

construction of public and nonprofit hospitals, diagnostic and treatment centers, rehabilitation facilities, and nursing homes. Research into health problems is also being encouraged through the National Heart Institute and the National Institute of Dental Research.

INTERNAL SECURITY

Since my discharge from the Armed Forces in 1919 following service in World War I, I have consistently opposed the philosophies of communism, socialism, or any other ism which attempts to overthrow or undermine the American system of Government. In this connection, the approval by Congress some years ago of the administration's subversive control program gives to the Department of Justice necessary weapons to be employed in its war against spies, saboteurs, traitors, and their kind. In addition, during the 83d Congress I voted for the bill to outlaw the Communist Party in the United States. This program to control subversives has always had my enthusiastic support because I am convinced there is no compromise possible with communism.

MISCELLANEOUS

In addition to rendering service to my constituents, individually and collectively, my time was devoted to the study of legislation affecting my Congressional District and the American people as a whole. When you consider the time required in attending daily sessions of Congress and committee meetings, as well as interviewing constituents and reading and answering mail, it is realized that the evening hours had to be used in studying legislation in preparation for hearings and debates on various measures. Frankly, I found myself constantly burning the midnight oil as I read volumes of the hearings of major bills pending before Congress. This action is mandatory if a Member of Congress has the best interests of his congressional district at heart and is conscientious in casting his vote in an intelligent manner.

PERSONAL SERVICE TO CONSTITUENTS

As Representative of the 20th Congressional District of Pennsylvania, I have always regarded my constituents as being in the role of my employer and that, together, we enjoy an employer-employee relationship. In an effort to give an account of my stewardship, I have tried zealously to keep in close contact with the residents of Blair, Centre, and Clearfield Counties by frequently informing them of happenings in Washington.

As many of you know, when Congress is in session I report weekly by radio and television in addition to writing a column for the daily and weekly newspapers. From time to time reprints from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of statements made by me in Congress have been mailed to many of you. Although my congressional duties kept me close to Washington on weekdays, I continued my policy of spending as many weekends as possible at my Altoona office and visiting other communities in Blair, Centre, and Clearfield Counties. These weekend visits made it possible for me to be available for interviews with constituents interested in legislation pending in Congress or who had problems affecting some agency of the Federal Government.

THANK YOU, CONGRESSMAN VAN ZANDT

Excerpts from letters of appreciation:

AREA REDEVELOPMENT

Thanks so much for taking time from a busy schedule to be with us this morning as we discussed matters of vital importance to Pennsylvania.

I know that you will do everything in your power to help us accomplish these goals. (David L. Lawrence, Governor, Harrisburg, Pa., July 29, 1959.)

Please accept the congratulations of the Pennsylvania Federation of Labor on your vote in favor of the area redevelopment bill.

By voting in the best interests of 11 million Pennsylvania citizens you have demonstrated a high degree of awareness of what this bill means to Pennsylvania. It may well be the single most important piece of legislation affecting this State to come before this session of Congress. (Joseph A. McDonough, president, Pennsylvania Federation of Labor, May 10, 1960.)

I would like to take this means of thanking you personally for your sustained interest in passing the area redevelopment bill. It was a long fight but a worthy one in a good cause. (Representative DANIEL J. FLOOD, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, May 9, 1960.)

ATOMIC ENERGY

Congressman VAN ZANDT has played a leading role on that committee during the entire 13 years, and I can assure you that his first-hand knowledge and interest in military and atomic matters has been an important asset to our country. (Vice Adm. H. G. Rickover, U.S. Navy, VFW 60th convention, September 3, 1959.)

BUSINESS FIRMS

I have only been in Pennsylvania a little more than a year, but based upon the contacts that I have had with you in that short a time, I feel that the people of this district are indeed fortunate in having a man of your high caliber to represent them in the Congress. (E. A. Oliphant, president, Small Tube Products, Inc., Altoona, Pa., June 30, 1959.)

CLEAN STREAMS

Conservationists all throughout America recognize your vote on the antipollution bill as an indication that you place the welfare of the people and the Nation ahead of political interests, for which we in your State are thankful, and justly proud to claim you as one of us. (Seth L. Myers, chairman, Congressional Legislative Committee, Pennsylvania Federation of Sportsmen's Clubs, Inc., Sharon, Pa., March 17, 1960.)

COAL INDUSTRY

On behalf of the bituminous coal industry, I wish to extend to you our sincere appreciation for your substantial contribution to the passage of H.R. 6596, the coal research and development bill, last Friday. (Harry LaViers, chairman, Committee on Research, National Coal Association, June 17, 1959.)

A COURAGEOUS LEGISLATOR

Representative JAMES E. VAN ZANDT is known for his straightforwardness, no pussyfooting, determined stand on national problems. His congressional record matches his war record—outstanding. (Erie (Pa.) Daily Times, 1951.)

EDITORIAL COMMENT

We doubt if there are many Congressmen in Washington with a fuller knowledge of the various phases of government than Mr. VAN ZANDT, and, with such a background of knowledge, he is able to speak with authority on a wide range of subjects, any one of which is of interest to his audience. (Editorial, the Clearfield (Pa.) Progress, Oct. 14, 1959.)

"Service Above Self." The Rotary Club claims the motto, but it is doubtful that even the international president lives it to the extent of JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, Congressman representing Blair, Centre, and Clearfield Counties in Washington. JIM is never too busy to help a constituent, whether it be through the mazes of Washington bureaucracy or to fill in a broken speaking engagement anywhere within his district. He deserves the support of every voter of his district, regardless of party affiliation. (Editorial, DuBois (Pa.) Courier-Express, Oct. 11, 1958.)

EDUCATION

I just want to send you a note of thanks for voting for the education bill, to see that the children of this country get classrooms to house them. (Paul E. Smith, secretary, National Education Association, Washington, D.C., June 7, 1960.)

FOREIGN IMPORTS

As an employee of the Pennsylvania Shoe Co. in Altoona, Pa., I am very much interested and worried about the shoe imports. We want to protect our jobs and prevent damage to the American shoe industry.

We want to congratulate you on your bill, H.R. 9841, and ask you to continue your good fight. (Miss Colleen Gibboney, 610 North 13th Street Duncansville, Pa., April 19, 1960.)

I have read your speech, "In Defense of American Industry," delivered on the floor of the House and printed in the January 28 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Congratulations. You have presented the plight of domestic industry very clearly. (William F. Cox, assistant to the president, Titan Metal Manufacturing Co. Division, Bellefonte, Pa., February 11, 1960.)

HOUSING

The CIO News, in the July 19, 1948, issue on page 4 included JIMMIE VAN ZANDT on the CIO honor roll of Congressmen, who fought for action on the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill for housing, awarding him an "A" for his efforts in behalf of housing legislation.

KEYSTONE SHORTWAY

Your valued help from time to time in behalf of our common project, has been a factor in our securing State and Federal approval of this highway as a part of the Interstate System on a 90–10 basis. (C. E. Noyes, executive director, Keystone Shortway Association, Williamsport, Pa., March 13, 1958.)

LABOR

Permit me in behalf of the Railway Labor Executives Association and the millions of people affected by the Railroad Retirement Act to thank you for your assistance on our railroad retirement benefit program. Undoubtedly by now you have been informed that your candidacy in the 20th District of Pennsylvania has been endorsed by our political league (comprising 20 standard railway labor organizations). (G. E. Leighty, chairman, Railway Labor Executives Association, July 1956.)

Labor's Nonpartisan League in endorsing JIMMIE VAN ZANDT for the 78th Congress said: "You voted against the crippling Smith amendments to the National Labor Relations Act. You voted against the amendments to the Wage and Hour Act, which would have excluded 2½ million workers from benefits of this act. You voted against the May-Connally antiunion amendments. You cooperated with the United Mine Workers to secure favorable House action on the mine safety bill."

Your outstanding voting record and your leadership in the fights to aid the coal industry and for the welfare and well-being of the ordinary citizen and taxpayer should entitle you to the vote and full support of every workingman and woman in your district. (Robert E. Howe, director, Labor's Nonpartisan League, Oct. 13, 1958.)

MINUTEMAN OF CONGRESS

Representative JAMES E. VAN ZANDT is the "Minuteman" of Congress; whether one agrees with his political philosophy it would be hard to deny that he is one of the hardest working Congressmen in history. (Richard H. Sarge, columnist, Harrisburg (Pa.) Patriot News, 1952.)

NATIONAL DEFENSE

I want to tell you how much I appreciate the assistance you have given our defense effort through your activities as a member of the House Armed Services Committee. (Thomas S. Gates, Jr., Secretary of Defense, August 26, 1960.)

If there is anyone in a Navy uniform who wants to know who is the stanchest Navy defender in Congress, I will say it is the next speaker, one of the most lovable, likeable, and friendly members of our committee, whom we are all privileged to call our friend, JIM VAN ZANDT. (Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, N. Mex., chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, April 15, 1959.)

ONE OF THE TEN

Selected as 1 of the 10 outstanding Members of Congress. Sponsored much veteran, military, old-age pension, and social security legislation. (Congressional Quarterly, Washington, D.C., 1949.)

PUBLIC PROJECTS

The State College League wishes to commend you for your yes vote on the Blatnik bill (H.R. 3610) providing greater Federal incentive payments to the States for allocation to local communities that are building sewage treatment facilities. (Mrs. L. H. Lattman, president, League of Women Voters, State College, Pa., February 4, 1960.)

RAILROAD RETIREMENT

I would like to thank you on behalf of myself and the Sheet Metal Workers I represent for your help in amending the Railroad Retirement and Railroad Unemployment Insurance Acts. (Ralph E. Gipprich, general chairman, Sheet Metal Workers' International Association, Altoona, Pa., May 15, 1959.)

SERVICE TO CONSTITUENTS

This is to inform you that the immigration records which you obtained for me did the job. Mr. Metro Kopilchack received over $1,700 in back social security benefits. (John Temchack, justice of the peace, Beccaria, Pa., March 16, 1960.)

The members of Lodge 287, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, Altoona, Pa., went on record at our last monthly meeting, held on Monday evening, October 26, 1959, desiring to express our gratitude to you for your efforts in behalf of our furloughed members.

The railroad men in this district are indeed grateful to have such a friend. (Paul E. Porta, recording secretary, Altoona Lodge No. 287, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, Altoona, Pa., November 18, 1959.)

VETERANS

The Ladies' Auxiliary, Veterans of World War I, Department of Pennsylvania, adopted a resolution at their State convention being held in Beaver Falls, Pa., July 24, 1959, to commend you for your untiring effort in behalf of World War I veterans. Our deepest appreciation to you. (Telegram, Mrs. Thelma Freed, secretary, Veterans of World War I Ladies' Auxiliary, Monaca, Pa., July 24, 1959.)

CONCLUSION

My seniority on the congressional Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and the House Committee on Armed Services, together with my legislative and administrative duties as a Member of the 86th Congress fully occupied my time during the 2-year period. My congressional duties received my constant attention and wholehearted devotion as I sought to represent my constituents with fidelity, efficiency, and honesty. I have tried in a sincere manner to meet every issue fairly and squarely, and at no time did I permit narrow, partisan views to influence or hinder me in doing what I considered my duty. I gave my undivided attention to the needs of my Congressional District and to rendering prompt and courteous service to all constituents regardless of their creed, political affiliation, or social position in life.

To the many persons who over the years have written me letters of gratitude and encouragement, I gratefully acknowledge your kind expressions and thank you for your thoughtfulness. The residents of Blair, Centre, and Clearfield Counties have my assurance that I feel highly honored to represent the 20th Congressional District of Pennsylvania in Congress. The confidence you have manifested in me is accepted as a constant challenge to continue my efforts to justify your faith in my ability to represent you in Congress.

The Ukrainian Congress Committee of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. RAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following message of greeting to the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America which will be celebrating its 20th anniversary this fall:

THE UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE OF AMERICA: FIGHTER AGAINST SOVIET TYRANNY

During the Korean war we in the West were shocked to learn of the inhumanity perpetrated by the Chinese Communists on captured American soldiers. We call this horrible action brainwashing and were revolted by it. Yet this was not a new technique of warfare; men of evil have always endeavored to change other men's minds by force.

The Soviet Union has, from the time of its conquest of the 12 non-Russian nations, assiduously tried to brainwash these heroic peoples. But long years of persecution, of terror, of murders and tortures and exile have only strengthened the resolve of the people of the Ukraine and the other captive nations not to bow down before their Soviet captors and not to surrender their spirits.

One organization which has done an incalculable amount of good in this respect is the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America. Not only has it reinvigorated the tired souls of the subject peoples but it has also channeled the interest of the free world toward a greater appreciation of the sad plight of these peoples. In a long enduring cold war every possible ally, every possible circumstance which can be turned toward our own good is of inestimable value to us. The Ukrainian Congress Committee of America has demonstrated time and time again the strategic import to our national security of these nations and offered stimulating ideas on the waging of effective psychopolitical warfare against the U.S.S.R.

It is therefore most fitting that I express on this occasion my heartiest congratulations to the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America and to its membership my heartiest commendation for their work and best of wishes for the future.

Summary of 86th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NEAL SMITH

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, at the end of the 1959 session of this 86th Congress, I summarized my version of the year's activities. This was reprinted and mailed to constituents. Hundreds of these constituents responded asking me to do the same thing at the end of this 1960 session; therefore, I am making this summary on this last day of this session which, of course, is the soonest it could be made; and I am going to have reprints made at my expense and distributed immediately.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

The status of our national defense is still a matter of argument even among high military officials. In 1954, we decided to concentrate on small missiles and at about the same time, the Russians decided to concentrate on developing more powerful thrust for bigger and longer range missiles.

Now we have the best small arms and they have the tremendous ability to thrust huge missiles, thermonuclear war instruments, through to targets in other countries including the United States, and this is demonstrated by shoving vastly larger planets into space. Everyone agrees that we must do all we can to catch up. Faced with these facts, Congress set up an Aeronautics and Space Agency with wide authority to speed development.

DEFENSE COSTS

We are spending more than 50 percent of our total Federal taxes on defense and the facts reveal that billions of taxpayers' dollars are lost through procurement policies. Only 16 percent of all contracts are now let on lowest bid basis, and more and more smaller contractors have to become subcontractors to big contractors.

One of the subcommittees I serve on started looking into this last year. It is difficult to determine the exact remedy but by this summer, I had three bills which I believe will help greatly. One, the Anti-Kickback Act of 1960 was passed and became law but lack of time caught the other two, and they must be

pushed hard in the next Congress. I believe there is more opportunity to save taxpayers' money here, without hampering performance, than in any other category of expenditures.

AGRICULTURE

A bill to help stabilize the supply and price of fluid milk was passed last week and some minor farm bills, but the two major farm bills that had been vetoed exhibited the great difference in the views of the Congress compared to those of the Secretary of Agriculture and the administration. It seems to me that many people on both sides make conclusions and then argue from a fixed position rather than trying to be reasonable.

The Poage bill reached the floor in June of this year. It had four parts: First, let wheat farmers choose between the Farm Bureau proposal of low support and no controls or allotments with higher supports, second, give farmers of other commodities a more direct voice and way to recommend a new program or amendments to Congress, third, increased distribution of protein foods to the needy, and fourth, a payment-in-kind program for acres taken out of production. It failed by a vote of 170 to 236 divided as follows: For—9 Republicans and 161 Democrats; against—136 Republicans and 100 Democrats.

I doubt if there is any single area where more work was done and less actually accomplished. Months and months of work was lost by failure to agree. Congress could secure agreement by a majority but could not muster the two-thirds to override the vetoes. The administration could stop legislation by veto but could not muster the majority necessary to pass further amendments they desired.

FOOD DISTRIBUTION

Congress extended the surplus farm products law last year under which millions of tons of food have been distributed to other countries.

A food-stamp plan to give more food to needy families in this country and perhaps help reduce local taxes a little by reducing local welfare costs for food was passed last year, but the administration has refused to use it. This reflects a difference of opinion as to whether more food should be distributed directly to the needy.

CIVIL RIGHTS

The second civil rights law in almost 100 years was passed this year. Almost one-fourth of the total legislative time this year was spent on civil rights bills which mainly involved voting rights. In addition, the Civil Rights Commission was extended for 2 years.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT LEGISLATION

One of the most controversial pieces of legislation to pass during the 86th Congress was the Kennedy-Ervin labor bill, which most people now call the Landrum-Griffin bill. Actually, as finally adopted, it isn't either one. Both labor and management are now citing revisions they believe should be made. Most everyone favored remedial legislation that would eliminate corrupt elements without imposing punitive measures against clean unions and impair the collective bargaining process, but almost no one had the same definition of these terms when applied to a particular provision of law.

The final bill, adopted after blending the two bills together, provides for a secret ballot in union elections, financial reports for unions and employers, and some restrictions on organizing activities.

It also removed many small businesses from the category that can secure the services of the National Labor Relations Board.

HIGHWAY PROGRAM

Some additional funds were provided for the highway program. The administration asked for another one-half cent per gallon increase in the gasoline tax and asked that the 1 cent per gallon increase be continued beyond June 30, 1961, with the money going to the fund, but it did not pass. Highway users are now paying about $1.6 billion more in taxes than is used for roads, but an amendment to transfer some of this to the fund was opposed by those backing the tax increase.

An investigation into the expenditures under the program uncovered waste of funds in some States. The State highway commissions spend the money and Federal authorities were not checking very closely on waste. Some new regulations have been adopted by the administration, but there will be further investigation to seek improvements and reduce waste.

EDUCATION

A bill to provide funds to States to help with school construction and teachers' salaries passed the Senate. A similar bill limited to school construction passed the House. In the House an amendment was passed referring to integration. It did not add anything to present law but the mere reference assured that Southern Democrats on the Rules Committee would join the Republican members and oppose letting the conference adjust the differences; it then died in the Rules Committee.

With most local taxes being school taxes, and going higher each year, there is considerable sentiment to shift a part of the tax burden from real estate and give more Federal aid to States from the growth in Federal tax receipts so that real estate taxes and other local taxes can be reduced or increased school costs met through increased Federal aid to education.

POSTAL AND INTEREST RATES

The administration requested an increase in postage rates, but Congress refused to do so.

The administration also requested authority to increase Government bond interest above 4¼ percent. Although Congress increased the interest rates on the E- and H-bonds individuals can own, authority to increase the interest rates above the present legal maximum on commercial bonds was denied by Congress. Interest rates on these commercial bonds have since been going down.

AIRPORT PROGRAM

More aid for a national system of airports was approved this sesssion. It is cheaper and better to have cities use and improve airports that could be used by the military in time of war than to have a whole separate system. Des Moines and other cities in Iowa to a lesser extent are in the system and slated for more improvements to meet the requirements of modern jet planes.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

The President requested an extension and increase in foreign aid programs that have been in existence and last month requested a program for Latin America. The Latin American program was authorized in this August session. The President secured most of the foreign aid he requested; however, more and more resistance is developing to these programs and mostly because some unfortunate examples of bad judgment in administration have been exposed. Most everyone agrees that vast improvements need to be made, but I believe in supporting the President on international affairs unless I am thoroughly convinced the national interest is to the contrary. The President as Commander in Chief has access to all secret information.

HAWAII STATEHOOD

The 50th State was admitted to the Union. With the recent losses to our prestige and safety from events in Cuba, we can surely feel fortunate Hawaii is a prospering and loyal State rather than in some other category.

NATURAL RESOURCES

Bills to develop natural resources still stir considerable controversy, but some further progress was made in this area. I feel pleased to have been the author of one of the most important bills that passed and was signed by the President. It protects against giveaway transfers of Government minerals in forest lands. Another special committee I serve on found almost unbelievable loss to the Government in transfers, primarily in Arizona and California. We are now working on legislation to protect against trading valuable Government land for worthless land. We found many cases of this. One involved a transfer of land costing a company $50,000 for Government land for which a $5 million offer had been made. It becomes more and more apparent why our forefathers provided ways for each branch of Government to check on the other branch. A recent report reveals that the U.S. Government, which is all of us, now owns $265 billion worth of property, including 722 million acres of land. It is important to protect these assets.

SOCIAL SECURITY

A new law just passed, that I believe the President will sign, broadens slightly the amount a person can earn and still receive benefits. It provides that for earnings between $1,200 and $1,500 per year, $1 will be deducted for $2 earned. Above $1,500 $1 is deducted for each $1 earned. It left unchanged the eligibility to benefits in any month in which less than $100 is earned.

The bill also will: First, remove the arbitrary age requirement for disability benefits; second, increase payments to children of deceased workers; and, third,

make more eligible by reducing the average required after 1950.

RED ROCK AND SAYLORVILLE DAMS

The first appropriation to begin construction of the Red Rock Dam passed last year over the President's veto, but he did not oppose another appropriation approved this year. The earth-breaking ceremony was held June 4 of this year and construction is now under way.

The first appropriation for surveys for the Saylorville Dam was secured last year and some more this year. I am hopeful the surveys will be complete enough in another year so construction can be started.

The minimum size of the lake at Red Rock is 6,300 acres, and I am in the process of getting the necessary protection against it ever being reduced below that size. A 1958 law that authorized a lower level at a later date is being overcome.

I have appreciated very much the cooperation Members of Congress from other areas and States have given me so we can secure these improvements. Such great improvements are hard for us in central Iowa to visualize because we have never had any such improvements before.

AUGUST SESSION

Congress reconvened for a 2-week period just ending today. Some expected more legislation to pass in this 2-week period than usually passes in a year, and, of course, that is not possible—especially because opponents of legislation can use delay tactics such as quorum calls and filibusters to keep committees from meeting and hammering out their differences.

Several appropriations bills were passed during the August session and I believe a considerable savings of taxpayers' dollars resulted from having the additional time to screen these bills for nonessential expenditures.

MEDICAL CARE

The short session passed a bill providing some medical care through welfare agencies. The bill was not a pay-as-you-go measure but was agreed to by the administration and seemed to be the only one sure of passage without being killed by a veto.

HOUSING

The short session also extended FHA loan authority for 1 year so more people could buy a home under that program. It also included college housing. An omnibus bill in 1959 included public housing, college housing, nursing homes, and urban renewal as well as FHA.

BUDGETS

Congress must spend most of its time every year working on appropriations measures, and as shown by tables I am submitting, in 1959 the President submitted spending requests totaling $74,859,008,445 and $72,977,598,352 was appropriated. In 1960, the President submitted spending requests totaling $73,845,974,490 and $73,634,335,992 was appropriated. Thus the total amount the President's spending requests were reduced by this 86th Congress is $2,093,048,591. There was a difference of opinion concerning some items, but by the time both additions and subtractions were made, the amount appropriated was less than the request.

For example, Congress increased appropriations for research and health programs, subsidies to medical schools, and so forth to a record $715 million, but did not grant all the increased bureau personnel that were requested.

I believe the 1946 law concerning budgets should be changed so the budgets submitted separate the various items and include an item for debt retirement. It is too easy to hide unnecessary expenditures under the present law and distort the true picture.

A subcommittee on which I serve started to look into this in the interest of economy and efficiency. I am very pleased that the chairman has expressed agreement with my proposal for a full study and hearings early next year. Some real savings and efficiency can come from making the budget fully reveal what we are paying and not paying for.

TOTAL RECORD OF 86TH CONGRESS

There was much more legislation passed and some very important, but I obviously cannot discuss all of the more than 300 bills that became public law this year. Some bills which I believe were worthy did not pass and a good many that were not worthy did not pass.

Although this Congress has worked for more days than most Congresses, it is not necessarily the most or the least productive. As it is about to end, many Members still have a bill they would like to call up for action, and that would still be the case no matter how long we stayed here.

1959 session final action on appropriations

Title	Amount agreed to by conferees	Increase or decrease compared to President's budget estimates to date
1959 SUPPLEMENTAL		
2d supplemental	$2,764,500,380	−$136,298,990
1960 APPROPRIATIONS		
SUPPLEMENTAL		
Supplemental	977,345,608	−240,744,947
Temporary (July)		
Temporary (August)		
Temporary (September)		
REGULAR		
District of Columbia	(241,289,076)	(−4,700,924)
Federal payment	27,218,000	−7,000,000
Treasury-Post Office	4,643,363,000	−44,964,000
Interior	481,809,100	−9,292,300
Labor-HEW	4,016,485,981	+259,637,400
Independent Offices	6,504,382,200	−82,035,800
Agriculture	3,971,362,673	−110,002,190
General Government	13,463,500	−145,000
State-Justice-Judiciary	648,941,200	−33,446,400
Commerce	712,672,900	−19,518,100
Legislative	128,797,380	−4,850,800
Defense	39,228,239,000	−19,961,000
Public Works	(1,215,477,808)	(+30,071,549)
Atomic Energy	2,683,029,000	−35,686,000
Mutual Security	3,626,718,137	−1,197,766,000
Military Construction	1,363,961,200	−199,238,800
Public Works	1,185,309,093	−97,166
Total regular	69,235,752,364	−1,504,366,156
Total, all bills	72,977,598,352	−1,881,410,093

1960 session final action on appropriations

Title	Amount as approved	Increase or decrease compared to budget estimates to date
1960 APPROPRIATIONS		
NASA supplemental	$23,079,000	
2d supplemental	955,370,003	−$63,134,885
Labor supplemental	6,000,000	−2,000,000
1961 APPROPRIATIONS		
District of Columbia	(239,470,433)	(−2,932,567)
Loan authorization	(20,100,000)	(+1,400,000)
Federal payment	27,533,000	−7,000,000
Commerce	729,624,375	−69,990,625
Interior	557,667,600	+7,337,300
Treasury-Post Office	4,841,914,000	−55,939,000
General Government	14,207,500	−420,000
Labor-HEW	4,354,170,331	+333,948,350
State-Justice-Judiciary	705,032,567	−27,997,828
Independent Offices	8,311,893,400	−105,503,600
Defense	39,996,608,000	+661,608,000
Agriculture	3,994,097,600	−141,165,590
Loan authorizations	(577,000,000)	(+210,000,000)
Military construction	994,855,000	−193,145,000
Legislative	129,470,410	−3,943,075
Public works	3,969,982,485	−43,810,695
Mutual security	3,722,350,000	−559,354,000
Supplemental	138,293,740	−31,034,100
2d supplemental	162,186,981	+89,906,250
Total, all bills	73,634,335,992	−211,638,4981

RECAP

Total the President's spending requests were decreased by the 86th Cong.:	
1959 session	$1,881,410,093
1960 session	211,638,498
Total reduction	2,093,048,591

Hon. Joseph F. Holt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I was privileged to come to Congress in the same year that Congressman JOSEPH F. HOLT became a Member. One of the first firm friendships I formed in Congress was with Congressman HOLT. We served together on the House Education and Labor Committee for a period of 6 years. Also, in 1955 we went together to Russia to test the so-called Geneva spirit. We traveled through Russia at our own expense and came away with the feeling that as far as the officials of the U.S.S.R. were concerned, the "Geneva spirit" was a myth.

JOE HOLT has a capacity for work possessed by few people. Also, he possesses a keen intelligence which gives him a quick insight to almost any problem with which he is confronted. He couples these qualities with a very practical mind which allows him to present a solution to a problem, which is not only a good solution on paper but which will work.

JOE HOLT came to Congress at the age of 26. Therefore, he is still a very young man to have obtained the stature he enjoys, and to have had the experiences he has had. The United States will hear much more from Congressman HOLT in the future, whether his activities be in the world of politics or in the world of

business. I would regard him as one of the more promising young men among our colleagues in the Congress.

I will miss JOE HOLT'S presence, as will many of his other friends. Mrs. Rhodes joins me in wishing to JOE and his fine wife, Lee, the best of everything in the future and to extend to them the assurance of our continuing friendship and good will.

A Congressional Bureau of Efficiency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege to serve in this body over a period of almost 24 years. I have always deemed it an honor and a great privilege to be permitted to represent the people of my district and the people of this Nation in the greatest legislative body in the world.

As one nears the end of his career in this great institution, he is prone to review the past in consideration of the problems being faced today and anticipated tomorrow. One of the many problems facing the American people today is the question of a responsive but efficient and economical Federal Government. It is my belief that this issue will be with us for many years to come. It is a question that has been with us for years in the past.

For example, in February of 1944, during the 78th Congress, I introduced a bill in the House that would have created a congressional Bureau of Efficiency. I include a copy of the bill with this statement. I call attention in particular to the declaration of policy in the proposed legislation. It reads:

> It is hereby declared to be in the national interest from the standpoint of efficiency, economy, and better overall management in the Federal Government to create a Bureau of Efficiency, responsible only to the Congress, to keep the Congress advised at all times with respect to the use of Federal funds, overlapping and duplication of Federal functions and activities, and nonessential Federal expenditures, so that each Member and committee of the Congress shall be completely informed, and so that the Congress may enact remedial legislation.

A further analysis of this bill indicates that some of the duties of this proposed Bureau were to investigate and recommend legislation to the Congress regarding such items as, first, nonessential Federal expenditures; second, overlapping and duplication of activities and functions; third, excessive numbers of Federal personnel; and, fourth, personnel and administrative management practices in the Federal Government.

There is today not a single Member of this body who is not interested and quite familiar with these very same items of Government operations. Needless to say, there has been considerable interest in the 16 intervening years since I first proposed a congressional Bureau of Efficiency.

It was my privilege as chairman of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service in 1953 to establish one of the first subcommittees in the House of Representatives to devote its efforts to a study of the utilization of manpower and the personnel management practices of the Federal Government. The first committee was under the chairmanship of our colleague from Pennsylvania, Hon. Robert J. Corbett. Since 1955 our able chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the Honorable TOM MURRAY, has seen fit to continue this Subcommittee on Manpower Utilization, which has been under the effective direction of Hon. JAMES C. DAVIS, of Georgia.

It is my earnest hope that this body, in the years to come, will continue to concern itself more and more with the factors leading to more effective and economical government, such as I have mentioned here. Many of you may not realize that the civilian payroll of the Federal Government has grown by leaps and bounds. Today it is in excess of $1 billion a month with all likelihood of continuing to increase in cost. The labor costs of our Government are staggering to say the least.

Our Government is today facing many significant management problems. Let us look at a few of them.

The growth of the Federal Government, both in numbers of personnel as well as in functions, has long been of vital interest to me and to many of my colleagues. There is undoubtedly a challenge to you in the Congress next year and the next to review the roles expected of our departments and agencies. We must all, the legislators, the American citizens, concern ourselves with the end results of this expansion.

In the past 20 years with the expansion of existing departments and agencies and the birth of new bureaus there has been the tendency for overlap and duplication of efforts within and among bureaus, agencies, and departments.

For some time there has been an inflationary trend in the grades and salaries of our Classification Act employees. Many different factors are causing this, but the cure will come only from aggressive congressional interest and action.

Last, we have noted a growing tendency of the departments and agencies of the Federal Government to contract out jobs and responsibilities that historically have been done within the Government. This tendency has already shown signs of affecting the morale of career Government employees, as well as the long-range economy of Government operations. There must be definitive areas of Government operations by contractors and by Government itself. Search and penetrating studies by the Congress can help materially to define these areas in Government.

All these factors dictate a new approach but still an approach to ageless problems of management in Government.

I feel today, as I did 16 years ago, that there is a real need for the Congress to interest itself in the management practices of all the Federal departments and agencies of the executive branch. I recognize the fact that each department and agency has a system of self-evaluation. I also recognize areas of responsibility of both the Bureau of the Budget and the Civil Service Commission. However, in my years of experience in this body I have found there is need—yes, a very definite need—for a group closely responsive to the electorate to objectively analyze the operations and management of our departments and agencies.

Much has been done, and is being done, not only by the Subcommittee on Manpower Utilization of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, but by other committees of the House. However, the Members of this body will continue to face a significant and formidable challenge to go to the heart of our Federal Government and there separate the fanciful from the fact, determine the essential, and demand efficiency and economy.

When this has been accomplished, you, my colleagues, will receive the sincere vote of appreciation of millions of American citizens.

The bill, as I introduced it in the 78th Congress, follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

TITLE I

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SECTION 1. It is hereby declared to be in the national interest from the standpoints of efficiency, economy, and better overall management in the Federal Government to create a Bureau of Efficiency, responsible only to the Congress, to keep the Congress advised at all times with respect to the use of Federal funds, overlapping and duplication of Federal functions and activities, and nonessential Federal expenditures; so that each Member and committee of the Congress shall be completely informed, and so that the Congress may enact remedial legislation.

TITLE II

THE BUREAU OF EFFICIENCY

SEC. 21. There is hereby created a Congressional Bureau of Efficiency (hereinafter referred to as the "Bureau"), responsible only to the Congress. The Bureau shall be headed by a qualified Director, who shall be selected by the majority and minority leaders of both Houses of Congress and the Speaker of the House of Representatives as soon as practicable after the beginning of the first session of each new Congress, with the exception of the first Director who shall be selected within ten days after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 22. (a) The Director, as soon as practicable after being selected, shall appoint three qualified Assistant Directors, not more than one of whom shall belong to the same political party as the Director.

(b) Each Assistant Director shall be in charge of, and responsible for, the work in one of the following divisions of the Bureau: (1) Division of Complaints and Investigations; (2) Division of Independent Establishments, Commissions, and War Agencies; and (3) Division of the Executive Departments, the Legislative Branch, and the Judiciary.

SEC. 23. (a) The Director shall receive compensation at the rate of $9,000 per annum and the Assistant Directors at the rate of $7,500 per annum.

(b) The Director shall appoint, without regard to the provisions of the civil-service laws, such employees (not to exceed two hundred in number) as may be necessary to carry out the functions of the Bureau under this Act. The Director shall prescribe the duties of such employees, and shall fix their compensation without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended.

(c) The Bureau is authorized to utilize the services of not more than ten employees at any one time from the executive departments and agencies. The services of each such employee shall be utilized for not more than thirty days during any calendar year unless permission is granted by the head of a particular department or agency for the use of any such employee for a longer period of time; such services to be without cost to the Bureau.

TITLE III

DUTIES AND POWERS OF THE BUREAU

SEC. 31. It shall be the duty of the Bureau to investigate and recommend legislation to the Congress concerning the following matters:

(1) All nonessential Federal expenditures;

(2) Overlapping and duplication of Federal activities and functions;

(3) Excessive numbers of Federal personnel;

(4) Procurement and disposal of all Federal property;

(5) All Federal personnel and administrative management practices;

(6) All requests for appropriations;

(7) Exercise of authority and/or performance of functions in excess of constitutional or statutory authority; and

(8) Any specific problem referred to the Bureau by a joint resolution of Congress.

SEC. 32. (a) The Division of Complaints and Investigations is authorized to receive and obtain evidence for the Bureau with respect to the matters set forth in section 31.

(b) The Division of Complaints and Investigations shall receive all information furnished to the Bureau by citizens of the United States and use such information without revealing its source unless the informant has no objection to its use otherwise, and shall so state in writing.

SEC. 33. The Division of Independent Establishments, Commissions, and War Agencies, and the Division of the Executive Departments, the Legislative Branch, and the Judiciary, shall receive the reports of the Division of Complaints and Investigations in their respective fields, and shall, under supervision of the Director, analyze such reports, prepare recommendations, and suggest legislation for submission to the Congress.

SEC. 34. In carrying out the purposes of this Act, the Director or any Assistant Director of the Bureau is authorized to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the Director or any Assistant Director designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such Director or Assistant Director. The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes shall apply in the case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpena or to testify when summoned under authority of this Act.

SEC. 35. In addition to other reports which it may make from time to time to the Congress, the Bureau shall make an annual report to the Congress on or before the first day of February of each calendar year. Such report shall contain, in addition to a general statement regarding the work of the Bureau, specific information, data and recommendations upon the matters set forth in section 31.

TITLE IV

APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 41. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, the sum of $50,000 and for each fiscal year thereafter such sum as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act. So much of such fund as is necessary may be used for travel and other expenses as is authorized by the Director of the Bureau.

A Survey of the 11th Congressional District In Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following results of a survey which I recently conducted among constituents of my district. We received more than 20,000 replies from my constituents to the questions which follow, and this represents about a 30 percent response.

I am most gratified that my constituents show such a keen interest in the affairs of their Nation.

The results of my survey follow:

	Percent		
	Yes	No	Undecided
1. Should the United States continue its self-imposed ban on the testing of nuclear weapons?	52	40	8
2. Are you satisfied with the administration's progress in outer space research and development?	44	47	9
3. Should we merge our entire space development program with our guided missile program under one command?	76	17	7
4. Do you favor total unification of our Armed Forces to prevent duplication in defense expenditures?	83	14	3
5. Do you favor Federal aid for public elementary and high school construction?	49	48	3
6. Do you favor use of Federal funds to help improve teachers' salaries?	37	60	3
7. Do you favor use of Federal funds for long-term, interest-bearing loans to private schools for construction and renovations?	57	40	3
8. Should parents of students attending institutions of higher education be able to claim the tuition as an income-tax deduction?	72	21	7
9. Should social security benefits include surgical and hospital payments for the recipient?	75	21	4
10. Should the eligibility age for receiving social security benefits (now 65 for men and 62 for women) be lowered to 60 for men and 55 for women?	57	40	3
11. Should the $1,200 annual limitation on earnings for recipients of social security be increased to $2,400?	84	14	2
12. Do you favor my bill to permit employers to claim a full tax credit on the additional cost involved in hiring people 40 years old and older to eliminate present discrimination against the hiring of older workers?	83	13	4
13. Do you approve my bill which requires that 1 percent of each annual Federal budget hereafter must be earmarked for retirement of the national debt?	92	4	4
14. Do you approve U.S. economic and military aid to those of our allies which really need it if Congress first ascertains that unnecessary expenditures have been eliminated?	73	20	7
15. Do you believe the administration's foreign policy has helped stop the spread of international communism?	35	57	8
16. Should the United States yield to Soviet Russia's demand that we abandon our position in West Berlin?	6	90	4
17. Do you believe the United States should base its dealings with the Soviet Union on a firm and decisive demand that the captive nations of Europe be given the right to free elections?	85	9	6
18. Do you believe the Communist rulers of Soviet Russia can be trusted to keep their word on any mutual arms inspection agreements which we might negotiate for total world disarmament?	8	87	5
19. Do you favor denying further loans or other aid to Egypt until Nasser opens the Suez Canal to free access by all nations?	77	15	8
20. Have you noticed any adverse effect that increasing foreign imports into the United States are having on your business or the place where you work?	37	51	12
21. Do you have any reason to believe, on the basis of your own business or employment, that we are heading for another economic slump?	31	57	12
22. Do you favor further revision of our Federal income tax laws in favor of small and medium size business enterprises?	80	12	8
23. Do you favor passage of a uniform Federal unemployment compensation act to provide a more effective economic cushion during recessions?	66	25	9
24. Do you favor extension of the $1 minimum wage law to cover many industries and commercial ventures not now covered?	81	12	7
25. Do you favor raising the Federal minimum wage law above the present $1 an hour minimum?	63	29	8
26. Do you favor a suggestion made by the AFL–CIO for President Eisenhower to summon a White House conference of the Nation's top leaders of labor and industry as a broad national effort to improve the level of labor-management relations in America?	78	15	7
27. Do you believe Congress should remove the 4¼-percent ceiling on long-term Government bonds?	36	53	11
28. Should Congress pass a civil rights bill which will include voting guarantees for all American citizens?	83	10	7
29. Should Congress grant President Eisenhower his request to restore the Federal tax on local telephone calls?	9	75	16
30. Should Congress grant the President his request for an increase in postal rates?	38	57	5
31. Should Congress approve the President's request for a 1-cent increase in the Federal gasoline tax?	22	73	5
32. Do you favor my legislation to give the Postmaster greater powers to keep obscene and pornographic literature from going through the mails?	92	5	3
33. Do you favor my suggestion to substitute the selective service program with a well paid, professional Defense Establishment of volunteers?	62	30	8
34. Should Congress repeal that part of the law making loans available for college students which requires them to state under oath that they do not belong to or support a subversive organization?	25	66	9
35. Do you approve of the idea for me, as your Congressman, to poll my constituents in this manner on their views?	100	0	0

The Fate of the General Housing Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALBERT RAINS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I discuss our inability to obtain an effective and worthwhile housing bill in this last session of the 86th Congress. And let me emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that there should be no mistake about where the blame rests—it lies squarely at the door of the Republican administration and the Republican minority in the Congress. The combination of an ever-present veto threat and the lack of a single Republican vote on the Rules Committee—these two uncompromising obstacles were just too difficult to overcome in this abbreviated session.

It is now abundantly clear that the only hope for adequate programs in the field of housing and urban renewal is the election of a Democratic President in November. With the forward-looking leadership that a Democratic administration would provide, the tremendous economic potential of America would once more be fully utilized and an adequate effort would be made to meet the goals of our national housing policy.

Ever since this administration took office, housing legislation has faced a rough and rocky road. Just 2 years ago, we ended up with no housing bill whatsoever in spite of the fact that an overwhelming majority of the Congress favored such legislation. In fact, when the housing bill was brought up near the end of the session in 1958, it came within six votes of gaining the necessary two-thirds majority to pass under suspension of the rules. Most of us are familiar with the serious problems created by the failure of that bill. FHA ran out of insurance authorization, the Urban Renewal Administration put in an unfair rationing procedure, and the low-rent public housing program was brought to a halt.

In spite of this pressing need for prompt action on a housing bill in 1959, it was not until September, after two Presidential vetoes, that we succeeded in getting any legislation on the books. The very first bill passed by the Congress, S. 57, already included a number of compromises in an effort to meet the administration's objections. In spite of this, the bill was vetoed on July 7. The Congress promptly passed another measure, S. 2539, which made further major concessions to administration opposition, but even this modest measure was vetoed. Finally, a barebones bill, S. 2654, was at long last signed into law on September 23 after the Congress had adjourned. It was clearly understood by all concerned that this last bill was only a 1-year measure designed to enable our housing and urban renewal programs to continue in operation until more comprehensive provisions could be made at the current session of the Congress.

It is incomprehensible to me why the administration persists in its stubborn opposition to sound housing and urban renewal legislation. One of the greatest tasks facing America is the rebuilding of our cities and the elimination of slums. Our national goal of "a decent home and suitable living environment for every American family" adopted under a Democratic administration has received at least token acceptance in Republican platforms. And yet, the lack of genuine warmth in that acceptance has been amply proven not only by the persistent efforts of the administration to block housing legislation, but by its failure to come up with a single constructive idea in recent years.

Today, with the end of the session at hand, we are confronted only with the choice of whether or not to accept this very modest resolution to extend the FHA title I home improvement loan program for 1 year, provide $500 million to meet the backlog of applications under the college housing loan program, and provide $50 million for the community facilities program. But for the administration's determined resistance, the Congress would have a chance to work its will on the comprehensive bill originally recommended by your Committee on Banking and Currency. I would like to describe briefly the major provisions of that bill.

First, there is an obvious and pressing need for measures to stimulate homebuilding activity. The level of housing starts in July was one-fourth below the same month last year. This was an annual rate of less than 1.2 million in contrast to a rate of 1.6 million during the early part of 1959, and in contrast to a need for more than 2 million units a year. Experience has taught us that such a drop in residential construction can well undermine the entire economy. Already severe distress is evident in the Northwest lumber industry, in appliance manufacturing, and in other industries which depend upon residential construction for an important part of their market. If allowed to go unchecked, this decline in homebuilding can add to the already serious level of unemployment.

In order to restore homebuilding activity to a high level of operation, the bill would have liberalized FHA mortgage insurance terms for home buyers. First, in order to lower monthly housing costs and partly offset the record-high interest rates on FHA loans, the bill would have extended the maximum maturity from the present 30 years to 35 years. Second, the bill would have reduced FHA downpayment requirements in all price ranges. Building on the highly successful experience of our great GI home loan program under which 2 million veterans bought homes without downpayment, the bill would have permitted FHA to insure no-downpayment loans on homes priced up to $13,500. Above that a 10-percent downpayment would have been required on any amount between $13,500 and $20,000 in place of the present law which requires 10 percent from $13,500 to only $18,000. The bill would have increased the ceiling on FHA single-family loans from $22,500 to $25,000.

There is every reason to believe that these changes would have brought many home buyers into the market. The potential demand for homeownership has proven itself to be extremely strong in this country. You will recall that the Emergency Housing Act of 1958 which did much to spark the sharp increase in new home production and sales in that year, provided, among other things, for a reduction of FHA downpayments. One needs only to recall the real estate advertisements of a year or two ago, when mortgage money was still available for no-downpayment GI loans, to realize the importance that builders attached to this feature.

Another long overdue amendment to existing law would have permitted the FHA Commissioner to reduce the mortgage insurance premium by as much as one-half under any FHA title II program. Present law requires FHA to charge at least one-half of 1 percent per annum on the outstanding balance of any loan which it insures. However, over its quarter of a century of operations, the FHA has built up reserves of some three-quarters of a billion dollars and many experts feel that the insurance premium can now be safely lowered, at least on some FHA programs. The bill would have given the Commissioner discretionary authority to do just that, thus lowering the monthly payments of home buyers.

Another important provision of the bill would have increased FHA's mortgage insurance authorization by $4 billion although the administration has been hesitant to ask for this. The recent rate of use indicates that FHA may well reach its present ceiling before the next Congress meets. In 1958 the administration failed to alert the Congress that it was rapidly nearing the limit of FHA insurance authority because it knew that this extra factor would have been enough to give us the six votes we needed to pass the general housing bill under suspension. Shortly after the Congress adjourned, FHA was forced to put into effect a stopgap system of agreements-to-insure. This highly dubious procedure was outlawed by last year's housing bill. I sincereiy hope that FHA will be able to get by until the 87th Congress convenes because the adverse effect on builders' plans and homebuilding will be far more serious this time than it was in 1958.

Mr. Speaker, I will not attempt to go into all of the improvements to the FHA programs our bill would have provided. It would have made some very useful improvements in the FHA rental and cooperative housing programs. Also it would have established a new program of FHA insurance to make mortgage loans available in older residential neighborhoods, in order to encourage efforts to halt deterioration in these places before they become actually blighted.

Title II of the bill would have advanced our efforts to provide decent rental housing for our elderly citizens by making another $50 million available for the direct loan program and by eliminating the 2 percent equity requirement now contained in existing law. I take particular pride in this program

which I originally proposed several years ago. Although it was singled out for special criticism and denunciation in each of the two veto messages, it finally became law with the Housing Act of 1959. The administration continued to show its distaste for this outstanding program by refusing to request an appropriation to get it started. In spite of this, the Congress has appropriated $20 million and the first projects should be under way in a short time. This program, which provides 50-year loans at only 3½ percent interest for nonprofit sponsors of rental housing for the elderly, makes it possible to rent these units for $15 to $20 a month less than under regular FHA financing with its higher interest rate and insurance charges. This is a highly important saving to most older families and the program holds great promise of meeting our needs in this area.

Title III of the bill would have converted the FNMA secondary operation program into a central mortgage bank along the lines recommended by the National Association of Home Builders, Mortgage Bankers Association, and the National Association of Real Estate Boards. The need for some device to smooth out the flow of funds to the home mortgage market and thereby reduce the fluctuations in residential construction has long been recognized. The changes which would have been made by this bill, such as giving FNMA greater independence under a three-man board, appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate, and permitting FNMA to make short-term warehousing loans on the security of mortgages, would have gone far to achieve this goal. A comparable secondary market facility for conventional loans to be operated under the Federal Home Loan Bank Board would have been provided by title IV of the bill.

In addition the bill would have made a number of changes in FNMA's special assistance program under which that agency buys mortgages on programs which the President or the Congress has designated as deserving of special aid. FNMA would have been required to pay the full face amount of any loan in these special categories instead of charging discounts as it does at present. Moreover, a limitation of 1 percent would be set on the fees and charges required by FNMA which now total 1½ percent.

Needed increases in FNMA authorizations would have been made by the bill. The general fund, to be used at the President's discretion, would have been increased by $75 million and the existing funds for cooperative housing mortgages would have been increased by $10 million with all of the money to go to true consumer cooperatives. Two new funds would have been established. The first would have provided $15 million for the purchase of FHA section 232 mortgages on nursing homes. This section was added to the National Housing Act in 1959 but potential borrowers have experienced difficulty in finding private lenders willing to make the loans as is so often the case when a new FHA program is established. The second fund, in the amount of $25 million, would have been established to assure the successful launching of the new FHA program provided in title I of the bill to make mortgage insurance available in older neighborhoods.

One of the greatest problems which will face the homebuilding industry in the next few years is the rapid increase in land prices. Already land costs have soared in most towns and cities, making it increasingly difficult for the industry to find places to build lower-cost housing. This inflation has not been due to a lack of raw land—towns and cities now take up less than 1 percent of the total land area of our country—but rather it is due to the lack of developed land available for homebuilding. An important factor in this is the difficulty which builders face in obtaining adequate mortgage credit to meet the expenses of acquiring and developing land. To meet this need, title V of the bill would have authorized FHA insurance on loans to private developers and builders to convert raw land into building sites suitable for housing construction. Because this was a new program it would have been put on a 1-year experimental basis with appropriate safeguards to prevent speculative abuse. The need for some such assistance is obvious and pressing, and action to bring down land costs is long overdue.

Title VI of the bill would have provided the college housing loan program with an additional $500 million to take care of the existing backlog and to carry the program further for 1 year. This program is one of our least controversial and most successful efforts in the field of housing.

Title VII of the bill would have provided an additional $450 million in capital grant authorization for the urban renewal program. The American Municipal Association and the U.S. Conference of Mayors have strongly urged the Congress to provide a 10-year program of $600 million a year. In spite of this, the administration requested not one cent for this vital program which holds the key to the ultimate rebuilding of our cities and the elimination of slums. I am hopeful that the administration which takes office next January will show better understanding of our needs in the field of slum clearance and urban renewal and will recommend an adequate program.

The bill would also have provided for a pilot program for the rehabilitation of existing dwellings. Local authorities would be able to acquire and repair a limited number of dwelling units which could be resold after rehabilitation. Such an approach offers hope for arresting blight before it becomes so serious that only outright clearance can cure it.

In addition, the bill would have accorded to hospitals the same advantages under the urban renewal program which were granted to colleges and universities in the Housing Act of 1959. Under the bill hospital expenditures for urban renewal could be counted as part of the local community's one-third share of the net cost of slum clearance. Other amendments in the bill would have removed impediments in existing law to urban renewal operations involving colleges and hospitals.

Mr. Speaker, one of the most important problems facing urban renewal today is the plight of families and small business firms who are displaced. By the same token, one of the most promising provisions of the bill was Title VIII: Relocation Assistance. This title would have given more equitable treatment to small business firms by permitting full payment of actual certified moving expenses thus removing the inequity that now arises in some cases when a company with heavy equipment is forced to move but cannot be fully compensated under existing law. Moreover, the bill would have provided long-term low interest rate loans—4 percent—through the Small Business Administration to enable displaced businesses to reestablish in new locations. Also, displaced businesses would have been given a reasonable opportunity to relocate in the same urban area to the maximum extent feasible.

In the case of displaced families the bill would have increased the ceiling on relocation payments from $200 to $300. A more far-reaching provision would have greatly increased the effectiveness of FHA's section 221 relocation housing program. Section 221 was designed to benefit displaced families by helping them to acquire other housing on relatively easy terms. It is generally agreed that this program has been a very limited success. In large part, its intended benefits have been nullified by the administration's high interest rate policy which have simply priced many low income families out of the market. To overcome this, the bill would have provided for section 221 loans to nonprofit corporations at 4 percent interest and for a 45-year term—under the present program financing costs total 5¾ percent and the maximum term is 40 years. These more favorable financing terms would lower monthly rentals to displaced families by as much as 15 percent.

In a further attempt to reduce the rentals which displaced families must pay under the program, the bill would have encouraged tax abatement by local communities. Where the local community is willing to exempt a project from local real estate taxes, the amount of the exemption could be counted as part of the local community's one-third share of the cost of the urban renewal project. This would reduce rentals by an additional $10 to $15 per month per unit.

To assure the availability of financing for this new type of housing for displaced families, the bill would set up a special $100 million support fund under the FNMA special assistance program.

Included in the miscellaneous section of the bill was the authorization of an additional $100 million for the highly successful public facility loan program. Under this program, priority is given to communities of 10,000 or less which need water and sewer systems. Fortunately, some funds for this program are included in the measure now before the House.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out one more subject which should have been

included in this year's housing legislation. That is additional authorization of units for the low-rent public housing program. I am confident that if the housing bill had been allowed to proceed along its regular course that at least some new units would have been added either on the floor of the House or in conference. As you know, the general housing bill sent over from the Senate includes 25,000 additional low-rent units. Personally I feel this number is far from adequate. You will recall that last year the House approved a total of approximately 180,000 low-rent units in the first housing bill. In the end we were forced to cut this down to a mere 37,000 units. This figure was arrived at by a careful examination of applications on hand to eliminate all deadwood. Although the administration has dragged its feet and refused to sign contracts for more than a handful of these, the balance is already fully committed in one stage or another. In fact, a backlog of applications is once again building up. This is hardly surprising in view of the great need for these units—a need which will seriously hamper our urban renewal efforts if it is not soon met.

Mr. Speaker, the general housing bill was carefully considered by the Subcommittee on Housing and by the full Banking Committee. It would have met many urgent needs in our housing and urban renewal programs. The people of our country—the home buyers and builders, the mayors, and others interested in sound and equitable measures for rebuilding our cities—have good cause to share my regret that the opposition of the administration and the Republican minority in Congress has prevented the Congress from even having an opportunity to vote on this bill. And this was the only way they could defeat the bill because, as we all know, if the Congress were given a chance to act on this bill, it would have passed by a substantial majority. As it is, we must now wait until next year when I hope and expect to see a Democratic administration which will work together with the Democratic majority in the Congress to enact sound and forward-looking housing legislation.

Relief for Cranberry Growers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HASTINGS KEITH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, I have devoted considerable time and effort this year to obtaining administrative relief for the cranberry growers in my district who innocently suffered financial losses from last November's cranberry scare.

As a member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, I participated in the lengthy hearings conducted on the color additive legislation.

Having been so deeply involved in the pro's and con's of the language of the Delaney amendment, I cannot help but conclude that we have only scratched the surface in evaluating this controversial provision of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

It is my sincere hope that the 87th Congress will have occasion to further study the far-reaching effects of this clause.

Democratic Sponsorship of the Polaris Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the Republican administration is not entitled to take credit for the Polaris project now that it has been tested successfully, and also attempt to claim that it fills the missile gap. The missile gap has not been filled, as yet. Responsibility for the success of the Polaris project lies more with the nonpartisan scientists and engineers in the Navy and the Atomic Energy Commission and their supporters in the Democratic Congress.

The Polaris submarine system combines the nuclear submarine with missiles armed with thermonuclear warheads propelled by solid fuels. In each of these fields it has been the congressional Democrats who have provided the necessary leadership and funds. Perhaps a look at history would be instructive.

The nuclear-powered submarine program was instituted by the Atomic Energy Commission and the Navy under the Democratic administration of President Truman. After the successful operation of the *Mark I* prototype in 1953 and the *Nautilus* in 1955, the nuclear submarine program ran into the rough waters of traditional thinking and budgetary ceiling in the Eisenhower administration.

It has been the Democrats in Congress who have supported Admiral Rickover, the "father" of the nuclear Navy. Democratic members of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy were instrumental in preventing Admiral Rickover from being cashiered from the Navy by the administration. It was the Congress which honored him with a congressional medal after he had been deliberately snubbed by the White House.

The Democrats in Congress recognized the strategic importance of marrying missiles and nuclear submarines and led the way in assuring sufficient funds and sound administration for the program.

From the outset it was a battle with the Republican administration which placed the state of the budget ahead of the state of the art. Right now the number of programed Polaris submarine systems could be increased four times. One would suppose that the Republican platform would have recognized the need for augmentation of the Polaris program. Only the Democratic platform did that.

In 1957 the Democratic Congress pressed for acceleration of the Polaris program. Finally in 1958, after observing that persuasion would not work, the Democratic Congress appropriated $600 million more than the administration requested for the Polaris system. Under the administration plan, at that point in time, only five Polaris submarines would have been programed. The action of the Democrats in Congress almost doubled this number, but the Bureau of the Budget withheld the money except for one submarine.

Actually this 1958 action by the Democratic Congress paid off, for the moneys were released during 1959. However, the administration's release of funds was on a slower schedule.

The Polaris battle of the budget was waged again this year. The administration for fiscal 1961 requested only three submarines and funds for long leadtime procurement of three more. Congress, with its understanding of the missile gap, appropriated money for 12 Polaris submarines.

Let us look at the box score. Left to their own resources, the Republican administration at best would have programed only eight Polaris submarines and scheduled three for long leadtime procurement. As things now stand, and after a successful fight by the Democratic Congress, 14 Polaris submarines are fully funded, and 7 can be scheduled for procurement. The score is this: Democrats, 21 Polaris submarines; Republicans, 11 Polaris submarines.

Each Polaris submarine, by the way, will carry 16 missiles.

The box score with fiscal year breakdowns is presented at the conclusion of my remarks. It is plain to see from this box score that the urgency in the Polaris program has been recognized by the Democratic Congress, which has usually made available more funds than the administration proposed.

The Navy, too, has recommended more Polaris submarines than the administration was willing to approve. The Navy was restrained by the administration in two ways: First, it had to trim its budgetary sails specifically on Polaris planning; and second, it had to work within restrictive overall budget ceilings set by the administration.

The restraint on Navy planning for the Polaris may be gaged by official Navy testimony that the desired objective is 45 Polaris submarines—720 missiles—and that the rate of construction could be stepped up to 12 submarines a year with existing facilities. This is four times the role endorsed by the administration for the past several years.

It will be said by administration spokesmen that the state of the art did not justify a speedup in the Polaris program in prior years. The Democrats in Congress had more faith and confidence in the capabilities of our scientists and engineers than did the budget-conscious administration. That confidence has been fully justified. Democratic leadership kept pace with, and gave impetus to, the Polaris program. The Republican administration lagged behind.

In summary, the Democratic Congress added four Polaris submarines to the administration program in fiscal year 1959. This would have added 64 operational missiles 2 years earlier than requested by the administration. Recognizing the congressional leadership in this program, the administration yielded to a degree. It granted the Navy funds for one more than the two budgeted, to maintain a three-per-year program. It finally released the funds for the other three over a year later, in fiscal year 1960. The result was a delay of 1 year for three submarines.

Just recently, as the election nears, the administration released funds for five submarines for fiscal year 1961, instead of three. Also, by releasing funds for five of the seven partially funded submarines authorized by the Congress, it has indicated a limited program of five per year, in lieu of the former three-per-year program. Even so, the administration is holding back funds for two partially funded submarines, which cannot be begun for another year. The result is a delay of 1 year for two submarines.

The total administration deficit under the program Congress actually provided is thus 1 year's delay for five submarines, or 80 missiles, not on station during the coming years of the Nation's greatest peril.

Funding of Polaris missile submarines

Fiscal year	Number in administration budget		Number provided by Congress		Funds released (actually programed)	
	Fully funded	Partially funded (long lead time items)	Fully funded	Partially funded	Fully funded	Partially funded
1958	3		3		3	
1959	2		6		3	
1960		(3)		(3)	3	
1961	[1] 3	3	[1] 5	7	[2] 5	[2] 5
Total through fiscal year 1961	8	3	14	7	14	5
	Total requested by administration		Total provided by Congress		Total programed	
	11		21		19	

[1] Includes 3 (denoted in parentheses) partially funded in fiscal year 1960 program.
[2] As announced in Secretary Gates' letter of August 1960.

Nuclear Propulsion for Space Exploration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, on August 31 last the announcement was made of the establishment of a joint AEC–NASA Nuclear Propulsion Office, to consolidate the work which has been carried out by organizations in each agency to develop nuclear energy for space propulsion. I think that this action is a milestone in the progress being achieved by our Government in the accomplishment of our national objectives in space. It is a milestone to mark the sound, well-considered and evaluated scientific program through which the United States intends to place man in space and to make the exploration of the solar system a practical reality.

My committee, the Committee on Science and Astronautics, which has legislative jurisdiction over work of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, has since its inception kept thoroughly informed and aware of the forward strides that have been taken in achieving the objectives of our national space program. In carefully watching NASA progress in space research and development, committee contact has been continuous. This committee-NASA relationship has been highlighted by outstanding space achievement.

It is an unarguable fact that the exploration of space is directly related to, and is the result of, progress that is made in propulsion. We are living through the years when the chemical rocket is the only means by which earth satellites, lunar satellites and deep-space probes can be launched. We already foresee and are swiftly reaching the point of development when chemical rockets will no longer provide the necessary boost to achieve our space missions. Today we have the Nova, a 6-million-pound liquid-fueled rocket in the mock-up stage. The gigantic proportions of this booster are considered to be the ultimate in practical utility. Even such a giant as this will not, by itself, place man in space and at the same time permit him to control at will his flight to the planets of our solar system. Hence we have been and are continually looking for new means and devices by which true space missions can be accomplished. Within a few short years, nuclear propulsion promises to give us the means to make manned exploration of Mars and Venus as well as unmanned deep penetrations to Saturn, Uranus, Neptune, and possibly even Pluto, a practical accomplishment.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, progress of research and development, to be valuable, must be built, block upon block, on a sound foundation of valid scientific accomplishment; and each block supporting those above it must be solid and well founded. There is really no such thing as "technical breakthroughs" in the scientific world. Each brilliant accomplishment is not a spontaneous great leap forward but is the culmination of years and years of persistent, unfaltering experimentation, testing, trial, success, and failure. Nuclear propulsion will become a reality in the same way.

In March 1959, my committee conducted extensive investigations, hearing testimony from the Nation's outstanding leaders in research and development, not only from the Government but also from private industry, on the progress that was being achieved in space propulsion. The report on those hearings gives a very clear picture of the immense effort and work that is needed to make nuclear propulsion a practical system. I quote from that report:

"When we leave the chemical propulsion systems for nuclear and electrical systems, we are going largely into unmapped territory." So stated an important industry witness in his appearance before the Science and Astronautics Committee. He went on to point out that some of the principal problems can now be recognized, but that any program for utilization must necessarily be long range and that specific problems remain to be recognized. However, he and other witnesses appearing before the committee on the subject of nuclear propulsion were confident that we would ultimately obtain this new means of space propulsion. The time estimates ranged from 5 to 10 years, with a consensus favoring 10 years.

As envisaged by most of the witnesses, a nuclear propulsion system would consist of a more or less conventional nuclear reactor which would be used to raise the temperature of liquid hydrogen from minus 423° F., convert it to a gaseous state, and expel it at temperatures from 2,500° F. to 4,000° F. This high-temperature hydrogen gas would then be expanded through a nozzle to produce a high velocity jet and thereby thrust. The principal departure from a chemical propulsion system lies in the utilization of a nuclear reactor to provide heat energy instead of obtaining it through chemical reaction. Specific impulses on the order of 1,200 pounds per pound per second would be obtainable at the higher temperatures. This is approximately three times as great as the highest specific impulse obtainable through chemical reaction. Even the lower operating-temperature reactors producing a specific impulse of 600 to 800 pounds per pound per second may represent sufficient improvement to be of interest. Project Rover, a national program to develop a nuclear engine, is based on this heat exchanger concept of propulsion. As a step in the Rover concept, the Kiwi-A test reactor was operated late this spring in Nevada.

The caution expressed by most witnesses as to an early completion of a nuclear rocket engine certainly seems justified by a consideration of some of the principal engineering problems to be solved. For example—

(a) Reactor controls must be made capable of bringing the reactor safely up to operating power within a matter of seconds.

(b) Methods must be provided to reduce heat from neutron and gamma radiation in adjacent engine components and propellant tanks. Radiation shielding is also a problem to limit induced radioactivity in adjacent structural elements.

(c) Consideration must be given to the fact that fission products will be carried by the propellant into the exhaust jet, producing considerable radioactivity in the surrounding area.

(d) Reactor materials will be required to operate at very high temperatures without

erosion, corrosion, or change in physical characteristics.

The major problem in obtaining the high efficiency possible with nuclear propulsion lies in the development of suitable materials to withstand the extreme operating conditions. The peak performance of a heat-exchanger type of rocket is fixed by the ability of core materials, moderators and reflectors, and structural components of the engine to withstand thermal stress, radiation damage, and corrosion and erosion. The attainment of a safe, reliable engine of high power is dependent upon gaining new knowledge of the properties of materials. It may be necessary to develop new alloys or ceramics to meet the stringent requirements. However it is considered possible to develop an engine which operates at lower temperatures, and therefore lower efficiency, using presently available materials.

During the 12-year period from 1945 to 1957, in spite of our best efforts in the great metallurgical laboratories of the country, we were able to increase the working temperatures at high stresses of metal alloys and ceramics only 300°, from approximately 1,500° F. to 1,800° F. This suggests the magnitude of the problem faced.

High temperatures are not the only problem encountered. We want to use hydrogen because of its low molecular weight, but hydrogen embrittles some materials, forms hydrides with others (with resultant corrosion) and forms volatile hydrogen compounds with others (thus eroding the material). Resistance to corrosion and erosion and ability to withstand high temperatures are not enough to qualify a material for nuclear engine use. Materials must also be able to withstand high stress imposed by temperature change and thrust loading. In some cases a material otherwise qualified for use may fail because it is not dimensionally stable under continued neutron bombardment or undergoes other changes in physical properties. A great amount of work is going on to determine and tabulate the properties of a large number of materials under conditions of high temperature and high stress, in the presence of corrosive and erosive substances and exposed to heavy neutron bombardment. For example, elements such as graphite, tungsten, tantalum, molybdenum, niobium, rhenium, and zirconium are under careful investigation. In many cases carbides, nitrides, and borides of these and other elements possess even better properties, and these, too, are being examined. Much work remains to be done and progress will certainly not be easy unless an unforeseeable breakthrough occurs.

Rewards for the solution of nuclear energy problems are great. For example, a theoretical mission of lifting a 50-ton payload from Earth to orbit around Mars and return to an orbit around the Earth, if done with a high-energy chemical propulsion system, would require a six-stage vehicle and a thrust unit capable of lifting 30 million pounds. On the other hand, if this same mission were to be undertaken with a nuclear-powered vehicle, only two nuclear stages would be required and the thrust unit would be required to lift only 3 million pounds.

While the main objective is to provide nuclear space propulsion, important corollary advantages will undoubtedly accrue. Solutions to many of the problems confronting us will result in far better nuclear powerplants for commercial use.

Mr. Speaker, no one is more aware of the need for urgency in our space programs than I. And may I say that I believe that my committee, insofar as our overall national space objectives and the scientific complex needed to achieve those objectives are concerned, is the most widely informed committee in the House and in the Senate. This is not to say that the Senate committee has not had broad orientation and experience in astronautics generally, but I emphasize that our committee has, as its responsibility, the entire area of science as well as astronautics.

Nuclear propulsion is not going to be a solitary achievement. It is going to be the product of the countless contributions that have been and will be made to its success by our entire scientific community. Therefore, our committee knows what measures will be necessary to give to our space effort the benefits of nuclear propulsion.

In our authorization hearings on the 1961 budget the committee diligently and minutely examined NASA's programs, including nuclear propulsion. My committee noted the fact that the Atomic Energy Commission had produced a nuclear propulsion device that showed great promise and indicated that great developmental strides had been made. One of our major witnesses at that time was Brig. Gen. Irving L. Branch, U.S. Air Force, Chief, Aircraft Nuclear Propulsion, Assistant Director for Aircraft Reactors, AEC. In his statement General Branch said:

Project Rover, our nuclear rocket development, is being conducted as a joint AEC-NASA program in which the AEC is responsible for the overall ground feasibility demonstration phases with NASA supporting this effort. Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory conducts the AEC portion of the program. NASA is, of course, responsible for follow-on flight application phases of the nuclear rocket development and its eventual application to the national space program.

You will recall that the Kiwi-A experiment, completed last July at Jackass Flats in the Nevada test site, proved not only the feasibility of the Rover device, but, also, was successful beyond our original expectations. We expect to be able to test next summer a vastly improved fuel element which will be an early step toward important space vehicle applications.

Thus General Branch concisely and clearly outlined nuclear propulsion progress to that date. In fact, General Branch stated to the committee that nuclear rocket propulsion is available—

* * * within the next 5 years, as a matter of fact * * *.

General Branch also pointed out, when questioned about NASA's funding for propulsion developments, that:

It is our opinion that this is a sufficient amount of money at this particular time to match up our capability with their—NASA's—requirement, and also to match up our capability with as rapid a growth in the state of the art at this particular time as we can go. We feel in the future we can go faster than the requirements call for, but at this particular time this is a sufficient amount of money to make a compatible requirement with our development capability.

Permit me to outline for the benefit of the House the scope of NASA programs aimed at the development of not only nuclear propulsion devices but also nuclear power systems. Our committee authorization report stated:

A total of $10 million is being allocated by NASA for this area of research which contains much promise for future application to rocket propulsion in deep space. The objectives of the program are to develop the components and technology required to permit the development of nuclear-powered systems to deliver large payloads to interplanetary objectives. The current emphasis in this program is on solution of the many technological problems that now stand in the way of nuclear system development.

The two principal types of nuclear systems that are considered suitable for the propulsion of high payload rocket systems in space are the nuclear heat transfer rocket system and the electrical propulsion system using a nuclear reactor system to generate electrical power. The nuclear systems technology program supports the work on the nuclear heat transfer rocket system and on the nuclear reactor electric power generating systems.

The nuclear heat transfer rocket is a system in which hydrogen is heated to high temperatures in a nuclear reactor to produce specific impulses in the range of 700 to 1,000 pounds of thrust per pound of hydrogen flowing per second. The high specific impulse potentially available from the nuclear heat transfer rocket permits the delivery of large payloads for various missions requiring high energy. The nuclear rocket can be used in booster rocket systems as well as in the space environment. Although early emphasis in the nuclear heat transfer rocket program was on research aimed at the development of large thrust or high reactor power first-stage rockets, the current goals of the program are aimed at accumulating the necessary research information required to develop a reactor flight test system that would be launched by chemical rockets. Such a system could eventually be incorporated into a space vehicle stage which would take off for its interplanetary objective after having been launched into an earth orbit by large chemical rockets. In this program, the NASA is working with the Atomic Energy Commission.

Nuclear reactor electrical power generating systems are required to supply the electrical power needed to accelerate charged particles or neutral plasmas to high velocities in order to produce thrust in the electrical propulsion systems which appear to have good capabilities for space missions. Analyses of space mission capabilities of these electrical propulsion systems have indicated that such systems will be competitive with the low thrust nuclear heat transfer rocket system described above. One of the disadvantages of the electrical propulsion system is the long trip time involved as the result of the low ratio of thrust-to-stage weight. One of the advantages of the electrical propulsion system is that the electrical generating equipment may be used for communications when the payload has been propelled to its planetary objective.

It is one of the purposes of the present program to do the research necessary to develop high power, lightweight nuclear reactor electric generating systems. It is felt that the development of such high-power systems must wait for the accumulation of various fundamental data and research on critical components of the system. In addition to the funds required for applied research leading to advanced high-power systems, funds are included in this program to continue the development of a system for converting energy from nuclear heat to electrical power using currently available information. This conversion system will be matched with the SNAP-8 reactor being developed at the request of the NASA by the Atomic Energy Commission. This reactor electric system will produce enough power to supply communications needs for planetary missions as well as to test early versions of electrical propulsion systems.

The work under this program is divided into nuclear reactor electric generating systems and nuclear heat transfer rockets. The fiscal year 1959 funds for nuclear reactor

electric generating systems were used to design conversion equipment for a nuclear-electric system (SNAP–8) and to initiate fabrication of the components. In addition, work was started on the acquisition of data that will be required in the design of higher power, higher temperature systems. Funds for the support of the nuclear heat transfer rocket reactor test program were transferred to the Atomic Energy Commission to undertake the development of a pump that will be used in the test program. In addition, funds were used to initiate experiments (such as the effect of radiation on the properties of materials at cryogenic temperatures) that will supply information necessary in the eventual design and operation of nuclear rockets.

In the fiscal year 1960, the components of the nuclear electric system will be fabricated and component testing will be initiated. The work on the fundamental information required to permit the design of higher power, higher temperature systems will be expanded. For instance, work will be undertaken on the corrosion characteristics of high temperature working fluids. The support of the reactor test program will be expanded. This development of a pump for operation under the conditions required for early reactor testing will be completed, and research and development on a pump drive system will be undertaken. Work on the fundamental information that will be required in the design of nuclear rockets will be expanded. For example, work on shielding methods will be undertaken. The test loop for the study of radiation effects at cryogenic temperatures will be designed, fabrication will be started, and preliminary tests will be run.

In the fiscal year 1961 the first conversion system tests will be run as part of the nuclear-electric system (SNAP–8) development program. Much of the fundamental data required for the design of components of a high-power, high-temperature system should be completed so that early applied research design and experimental studies should be initiated on critical components of such systems. In the nuclear heat transfer rocket program, it is planned to develop the turbopump to full rated performance for use in higher power reactor tests than those considered in the fiscal year 1960 pump development. Work will be expanded on the other nonnuclear components that will be required in the nuclear rocket system.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, I have attempted to give a picture of the enormous amount of work, study, research, and development that will be encompassed in creating nuclear propelled rockets. In my 2 years as chairman of the House Science and Astronautics Committee I have become convinced that people in and out of Government who do not have an overall view of our space program cannot properly appreciate the amount and degree of human achievement that is involved. And this achievement will not be realized merely by appropriating money and by Government directive. As an example, years of testing, experimentation, trial, success and error produced the IRBM's and ICBM's upon which our current space missions are completely dependent. These were produced at the price of not only money but "Blood, sweat, and tears". Space exploration by means of the nuclear-propelled rocket will come at no less an effort.

Our success in launching earth satellites and deep-space probes has been unmatched in the world. Our scientific accomplishments made possible by these vehicles have far and away exceeded those of any other nation.

We must build soundly for the future. If we are to achieve nuclear propulsion it must be a real achievement and not just a propaganda device. Achievement does not come quickly. Therefore, I believe that this step in joining NASA and the AEC in a formal organization to promote the development of nuclear propulsion is only one of many significant steps that will be taken to attain that goal.

We are a people who are dedicated to the ideal that science is truth and its accomplishments should be utilized to benefit all mankind. I and my committee colleagues are actively dedicated to this ideal, and we pray that when the true exploration of outer space is made possible by the creation of an efficient system of nuclear propulsion, mankind will approach this great adventure in harmony and good will.

Memorial to the Late Senator Richard L. Neuberger Urged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALL S. LUSK
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. LUSK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, along with my statement, a resolution by the Clatsop County Democratic Central Committee of Astoria, Oreg., urging the erection of a memorial to the late Senator Richard L. Neuberger.

There being no objection, the statement and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORIAL TO THE LATE SENATOR RICHARD L. NEUBERGER URGED

The late Senator Richard L. Neuberger successfully sponsored legislation authorizing the establishment of Fort Clatsop National Memorial, located in Oregon at the mouth of the Columbia River near the city of Astoria. This is Oregon's first national historical shrine. Construction is now under way and commenced in our State's centennial year, 1959. It was in 1958 that President Eisenhower signed into law legislation sponsored by the late Senator establishing Fort Clatsop National Memorial and its formal dedication is expected sometime next year.

Fort Clatsop has played an important role in our Nation's history. It was here that Meriwether Lewis and William Clark spent the winter of 1805–06, the western terminus of their historic expedition authorized by President Jefferson. For the first time men carrying the American flag had spanned the continent.

If it were not for the expedition of Lewis and Clark our Nation would not have been able to support its claim to the great Pacific Northwest. Our country's claim prevailed and as a result this district west of the Rocky Mountains is the only part of our domain which was neither fought for nor bought, but directly the result of the expedition of Lewis and Clark.

Mr. President, recently I received a resolution adopted by the Clatsop County Democratic Central Committee and the Democratic Party of Oregon, urging the placing of a suitable monument or marker at the site of the Fort Clatsop National Memorial in honor of the late Senator Richard Neuberger.

I believe, Mr. President, that it is most appropriate and fitting that the memory of this great U.S. Senator be honored by such a memorial. I have considered it a privilege to serve as his successor.

The resolution follows:

"RESOLUTION OF THE CLATSOP COUNTY DEMOCRATIC CENTRAL COMMITTEE, ASTORIA, OREG.

"Whereas it was due to the untiring work and devotion of the late Senator Richard L. Neuberger that Fort Clatsop was declared a national memorial by the Congress of the United States and the necessary funds were provided to carry out the work of making Fort Clatsop a national shrine; and

"Whereas the Fort Clatsop National Memorial is of great historical interest and will attract thousands of visitors in coming years: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Clatsop County Democratic Central Committee and the Democratic Party of Oregon acting jointly do go on record as urging that in recognition of Senator Richard Neuberger's work and devotion that a suitable monument or marker be placed at the site of Fort Clatsop in honor of the late Senator; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be presented to the Oregon congressional delegates, Department of Interior Secretary Seaton, Gov. Mark Hatfield, Mrs. Maurine Neuberger, the Oregon Historical Society, Clatsop County Historical Society, and other interested parties."

Twentieth Anniversary of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK M. CLARK
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, this fall Americans of Ukrainian descent will celebrate the 20th anniversary of the founding of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America and I should like to pay tribute to this outstanding group of citizens, and especially to those residing in the 25th Congressional District of Pennsylvania which I represent in Congress.

Twenty years ago a group of patriotic, freedom-loving Americans, representing 40 million of their Ukrainian countrymen enslaved by Soviet rule, founded the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America. Since that time 2½ million Americans of Ukrainian ancestry have sought to inform the world of the struggle and desire of the Ukrainians for independence from the Soviet Union. By exposing myths of Soviet unity and proposing means of defeating the Soviet in the cold war, the Ukrainians in America seek to keep alive the spirit of independence and individualism so characteristic of their enslaved countrymen, unable to speak to the world for themselves.

The Ukrainians declared themselves independent in 1918. In 1920 they were taken under Soviet domination. However, those 2 years of freedom still remain in the hearts of the Ukrainians. To be independent once again is their

goal. To reassert their individualistic culture and to reap the benefits of their rich land in their own name is the desire to be always cherished.

The members of the Ukrainian Congress have worked arduously to keep alive the memory of the Ukrainian people. But they are realistic enough to realize that under existing world conditions and the might of the Soviet rule, independence for the Ukrainian people is not likely to come tomorrow. The Congress has done equally as valuable work in informing the world of the struggles not only of the Ukrainians but of all enslaved peoples behind the Iron Curtain. Just to make their fellow Americans and the other free peoples throughout the world aware of Soviet disunity is a vast and rewarding task. If we are to win this war of the minds against tyranny, we must teach and keep alive those values and freedoms we think so valuable. This is what the Ukrainian Congress is doing. I congratulate it on its fine work, and I encourage it to continue to promote its ideals throughout the world.

Parallel of Two Republican Presidents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I had thought before the Republican National Convention that both President Eisenhower and former President Hoover were in agreement about what policies to pursue and what economic social and moral conditions our Nation is in. Well, imagine my surprise when I heard their speeches and later having an opportunity to read them. They do not agree at all. Let me give you some examples:

How is free enterprise working these days under Republican rule? Here are President Eisenhower's words:

> Private enterprise, dependent upon the vigor of healthful competition, leads to individual responsibility, pride of accomplishment, and, above all, national strength. This has always been, is now—and I pray will always be—basic Republican doctrine.

Yet one must wonder whether God is really blessing free enterprise as that term is interpreted by the Republicans. Listen to what President Hoover has to say about that matter as he looks around from his perch in the Waldorf Towers:

> Beyond the terrifying warnings of statistics, we can hardly believe that integrity and moral steadfastness are increasing when we witness the constant exposure of State and municipal corruption. We daily read blazoned headlines in the press exposing corrupt practices in some nationwide services and the fraudulent practices of some distributors of our daily necessities.

And what about our moral posture and our image as the commentators call the ideals and values of America? Listen to President Eisenhower, the fervent crusader, who sees nothing but happiness and joy about him while our Nation suffers from a crisis as serious and as insidious as has ever faced a people.

> The irrefutable truths are that the United States is enjoying an unprecedented prosperity; that it has, in cooperation with its friends and allies, the strongest security system in the world, and that it is working ceaselessly and effectively for a peace with justice and freedom. Our own mounting living standards and the history of the Republican years, provide the proof that these are facts. * * * I have come before you in this assembly to testify to my great pride in the America of today; and my confidence in the brightness of her future. I glory in the moral, economic, and military strength of this Nation in the ideals that she upholds before the world.

But that other purveyor of prosperity who at another time gloried in our economic and moral strength while a nation went hungry and lost its way has this to say about the Eisenhower years.

> I do not need to tell you that today our country is faced with the gravest dangers from overseas in all of our history. Today, America is in the midst of a frightening moral slump. During the 14 years following the Second World War, our statistics show that major crimes in most of the years have increased three times as fast as the population. * * * During this same period since the end of the war, our cities have become increasingly infected with teenage gangs with criminal intent.

Mr. Hoover closes his speech saying that the moral decay of the last 14 years must stop.

> Yours is the task to stop the moral retreat, to lead the attack and to recapture the meaning of the word—America.

And President Eisenhower says in his close exordium for more of the same.

> Over and above strictly material accomplishments, the American people have every reason to be proud of their many domestic achievements during these Republican years.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the American people are ready to turn away from the two-headed Hoover-Eisenhower brand of politics and leadership. Theirs is the politics of drift, of inaction and frustration. Both while in office faced problems of the most serious kind. Neither was able to fulfill the position of the Presidency with the kind of acumen, understanding, and leadership the times demanded. However, President Hoover has certainly shown himself to be the shrewder analyst and commentator on today's world than President Eisenhower judging from a comparative analysis of the speeches which they made at the Grand Old Party's convention.

Twentieth Anniversary of Ukrainian Congress Committee of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK KOWALSKI
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, this fall Americans of Ukrainian descent will celebrate the 20th anniversary of the founding of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., an organization which has compiled a splendid record of achievements.

Speaking for 2½ million Americans, the Ukrainian Congress Committee has served primarily as an educational organization.

It has kept Ukrainian-Americans fully informed on events behind the Iron Curtain, especially the efforts of the dozen captive non-Russian nations within the Soviet Union.

It has served the United States, particularly our national security interests, by bringing to the attention of our Government important facts about the cold war.

I congratulate the Ukrainian Congress Committee on its achievements. I wish it many more years of success.

State Department Acts Belatedly on Banning of Masaryk Stamp by Government of Czechoslovakia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK KOWALSKI
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 31, 1960

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, the decline in American prestige abroad can be attributed in substantial part to the vacillation and delay which are characteristic of the State Department under the present administration.

Just a few days ago, on August 25, the State Department announced that it had sent a note to the Czechoslovak Government requesting information on the barring of U.S. mail bearing stamps honoring the great patriot of the Czech Republic of lamented memory, Thomas Masaryk.

As long ago as last May, Mr. Speaker, I asked the State Department not to seek information but to protest strongly to the Czech Government against its refusal to deliver mail carrying Masaryk commemorative stamps.

I pointed out in May, and in another letter early in June, that the facts were indisputable—that the Czech Government was dumping some mail from America with Masaryk stamps, was returning other mail to the American senders with the notation, "Not Admissible." I also informed the State Department that the Czechoslovak National Council of America had evidence that in some cases letters were being delivered in Czechoslovakia with the Masaryk stamps removed from the envelopes.

These actions by the Czech Government are in clear violation of international postal agreements.

After all these months, the best our State Department can offer is a request to Prague for information about the banning of the Masaryk stamp.

We do not need information, Mr. Speaker, since we have the facts. What we need is strong action by our State Department to compel the Communist

rulers of Czechoslovakia to abide by international regulations and stop interfering with mail sent from this country.

Here we have had an opportunity, now largely lost, to bring before the world that the Communist government of Czechoslovakia is so apprehensive that it will not allow its people to see on postage stamps the picture of a great Czech leader who fought for and helped win freedom for his country.

Last spring, I suggested that our Government bring this story to the whole world, to underscore how reluctant are the rulers in Iron Curtain lands to let their people be reminded of their days of freedom.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this case called for much earlier action and for something stronger than a polite request for information. It is another administration fumble which has cost us a great opportunity.

Method of Detecting Carbon Monoxide and Other Gases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, early in the next session—if my constituency sees fit to return me to Washington—I plan to introduce a bill for which it has been proven that there is a great need; namely, requiring the use of a method of detecting carbon monoxide and other gases, especially in public conveyances, where there has been tragic loss of life due to gas poisoning.

Mr. J. Roy Snyder, an outstanding young constituent of mine from Sharon, Pa., has spent a great deal of time developing a safety device which will sound an alarm when danger is imminent. He has a patent pending on his invention and recently demonstrated it to the Interstate Commerce Commission, where great interest was shown.

Some of the reasons Mr. Snyder has devoted so much time to developing this safety device are as follows:

First. There is no other method known of detecting and sounding an alarm in a motor vehicle. With the alarming increase of carbon monoxide poisoning and deaths, and the changing design of trucks and buses to cab over engine—thus placing the driver's location directly over the engine and exhaust manifold—this danger is being increased. Another increase in this respect is the exhaust outlets on trucks now carried to the top of the window of the cab. Some of these outlets are at such a height, and all are located on the right-hand side of the trucks, that on superhighways when a truck is being overtaken and passed by another truck, the passing truck's exhaust is blown directly in the open window of the truck being passed. In cab-over-engine trucks, when the engine is checked for any purpose, the entire cab is constructed to raise. To do this, a joint is provided to allow the exhaust pipe to raise with the cab. If this joint is bumped or damaged, gas can leak directly into the cab. Extreme care must also be used when lowering the cab to normal position or the proper seal will not be made on the exhaust causing the same hazard.

Second. A great majority of trucks are now being equipped with either gasoline or bottled-gas type of heaters on which there is no provision of proper exhaust. Many drivers have met their deaths with this type of equipment, particularly in sleeper cabs of trucks. These are trucks designed with a bed in the cab of the truck. Many a driver has gone to sleep in these and never awakened. In the South and West trucks are now equipped with air conditioning. This requires all windows to be closed, thus increasing the danger of gas poisoning.

Third. With the alarming increase of truck accidents in which one truck runs into the back of the preceding truck or car, and where no apparent reason or cause can be found, it is quite logical to conclude, after assembling all the known facts from insurance investigation records, ICC reports, and 2 years' questioning of drivers and investigators, that human resistance is lowered by fatigue and, after arduous hours of driving, the known factors of carbon monoxide are lowered. The standard known effects of carbon monoxide on humans, as taken from the Bureau of Standards Tech Paper No. 212, shows that as little as 0.02 percent of carbon monoxide in atmosphere has perceptible effects in 1½ hours and 0.04 percent is dangerous to life in 2 hours. It can be readily seen that this can be a major factor in national safety.

Fourth. All buses which are engaged in carrying the thousands of passengers each year should also be protected from this hazard. This can be attested to by such instances as the two busloads of Mexican workers who were casualties just this past spring and the 37 pupils overcome on the Pennsylvania Turnpike this year.

Fifth. The Department of Education is also aware of this danger in the thousands of school buses engaged in transportation of our children each year, these being engaged in traveling over all kinds of unimproved roads where the danger of damage to the exhaust system is even greater. All kinds of safety equipment and fire protection have been installed on motorized transportation, but nothing has been done to overcome this greatest hazard, chiefly because nothing has been available.

There is now a unit available which is both economical and practical which will not only detect all gases and vapors, but will sound a visible and audio alarm when any such gas enters these vehicles.

The unit is self-contained in a box 5 by 7 by 2 inches and will operate from the electrical system of the bus or truck. It reads the air content of the vehicle on a meter and at all times shows any entrance of gas and the percentage of same, sounding an alarm or turning on a ventilation system to clear the gas and thus afford safety at all times to all occupants and make for greater safety on our highways which have become our Nation's greatest killer and where millions of dollars of material and equipment are lost each year.

Facts of F–27 Funding Action by Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. FOLEY
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, because of its importance and the widespread interest in the action of the 86th Congress on appropriation items for F–27 aircraft produced by the Fairchild Engine & Airplane Corp., at Hagerstown, Md., I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a chronological recital of action by the House of Representatives on these items.

In the early part of February 1959, the Fairchild Washington representative visited my office to discuss the decision of the House Defense Appropriation Subcommittee in denying an Air Force F–27 request in January of 1959.

As a result of this conference, the following letter was sent to the chairman and each member of the subcommittee:

FEBRUARY 17, 1959.

Hon. GEORGE H. MAHON,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Military Appropriations, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: Very frankly this is a request for reconsideration of the subcommittee's recent elimination of the Air Force request to purchase 10 Fairchild F–27's to be used for the Overseas Air Attaché Mission. I am writing to you to explain the extreme importance and the emergency aspect of this procurement program to the continuation of the Fairchild Co.'s operations in the Sixth District of Maryland. Many of the considerations presented before the subcommittee recently are still fresh in your mind. However, I should like to present certain aspects which may not have been submitted to the subcommittee.

Approximately 6,000 employees living in the Hagerstown, Md., area are directly connected with the production of this aircraft. The Fairchild plant is the largest employer in the whole Sixth District of Maryland. This fact points up the strong economic influence that the Fairchild plant has on the district in general and on the Hagerstown area in particular. During the past year, from January 1, 1958, to January 31, 1959, approximately 2,000 were laid off by Fairchild. An additional 500 is scheduled for layoff between now and June 1, 1959. Yesterday, Monday the 16th, 250 persons were given layoff notices. As a result, the unemployment figure in the Hagerstown area, 11.7 percent of the employable population. In the past, the Fairchild plant has employed approximately 39 percent of the work force in the Hagerstown area. An acute depressed condition now exists in the Hagerstown area. Only if the Fairchild plant can intensify production of the F–27 aircraft is there a possibility for the alleviation of this condition.

The subcommittee may have been informed of the Air Force's recent cancella-

tion of the Goose missile which was produced entirely in Hagerstown. In addition, the J–83 engine for the Goose missile was canceled. These cancellations have cost Fairchild not only considerable current income production and profit but amount to approximately $200 million loss in future business. In 1958, Fairchild lost approximately $8 million. The company is anticipating additional operating losses this year, 1959. The company is not independently strong enough financially to survive these blows. A military order for the F–27 airplane is needed at this time, not only for the dollar volume involved, but equally important for the vote of confidence in the company and in the F–27 airplane.

There are sufficient current orders on hand for commercial aircraft to continue the production through all of 1959. However, there is a substantial dollar loss on each commercial plane produced this year.

A small military order and the prospects of additional military production is needed in order to bring the F–27 production volume up enough to produce in the black.

These harsh economic facts for this one particular company would not merit special consideration by the subcommittee if it were not for the fact that the F–27 is peculiarly fitted for existing missions. By this I mean the aircraft is one of the best suited for certain continuing missions carried on by the Air Force. Thus, this is not a request for a make-work project. The Air Force has requested this procurement based on current mission needs, irrespective of the unemployment and the company's economic position. The missions to which the F–27 would be assigned by the Air Force fall into the following categories:

1. The F–27 is a natural replacement for the DC–3 (C–47) which the Air Force uses as a general workhorse all over the world. The DC–3's are anywhere from 12 to 18 years old. They are getting expensive to maintain; the spare parts problem grows more acute with time; and they are wholly unsuited to a number of Air Force missions today.

2. The Air Force could use the F–27 in the photographic and charting service in the low and medium altitudes. The F–27 is the best airplane in the world for this use because of its high-wing configuration. The commanding general of the charting service at Orlando, Fla., has requested the F–27 in the most glowing terms.

3. There is the medical air evacuation mission, particularly in Europe, South and Central America. Because the Air Force is responsible for the medical care of not only its own personnel, but State Department personnel and oversea Government agency employees, some 1,200 people are transported each month by the Medical Air Evacuation Service, ranging from Burma to Iceland. These people are carried from bases or places of employment to military hospitals, etc. The capacity of the F–27 for either ambulatory or litter patients, or both, greatly exceeds that of the C–47 (DC–3). With its jet engines and vibrationless performance, it can do the medical mission better than any airplane presently flying.

4. There is a navigational training mission. The F–27 is particularly suited for the work carried on at the Air Academy, Colorado Springs, Colo. Because of its superior high-altitude and hot-temperature performance, the F–27 is ideally suited for student navigational training work. There are navigational training jobs at a number of air bases in the United States where present aircraft should be replaced by a more modern aircraft.

5. The Caribbean Air Command based in Panama has a daily flight requirement of supplying high-priority equipment, mail, and personnel to some 20 military missions maintained by our Government in Latin, Central, and South America. This work is now being accomplished by old DC–3's. The DC–3's are also being used to furnish high-priority cargo and personnel service to a number of remote radar facilities.

6. The air attaché mission, particularly for countries close to or behind the Iron Curtain, is now carried on by old DC–3's.

In general, because of its greater range, larger payload, and additional speed, an F–27 has 2½ times the productivity or usefulness of the C–47. It costs $0.56 a ton-mile to operate a C–47 today. It costs $0.22 a ton-mile to operate the F–27. Thus the F–27 does 2½ times more work than the C–47 at only 39 percent of the ton-mile cost.

At the recent subcommittee hearing, only the air attaché or embassy use was presented to the committtee by the Air Force. However, the foregoing specific missions indicate that the F–27 has a much wider use and the Air Force has a much greater and broader need for this type of aircraft. For this reason, I have taken the liberty of presenting to you the extreme economic need for the production of this aircraft in my district; the precarious financial condition of the Fairchild Co. unless there is an early military procurement of the F–27. The need for the aircraft exists and can be strongly demonstrated before the subcommittee. I have been reliably informed that Gen. Thomas White, Chief of the Air Force and Lt. Gen. C. S. Irvine, head of the Air Force Procurement Office, are anxious to procure the F–27 for the missions outlined above.

You are respectfully requested to consider the facts set forth in this letter, many of which I believe will come to you for the first time. All of them can be supported by testimony and documentary evidence. It is hoped that the study of these facts will induce you to reconsider the subcommittee action to the end that a further hearing on the Air Force's need of the F–27 will be held.

By way of summary, the unemployment situation in the Hagerstown area is acute owing to the cutback in the production by the Fairchild plant. Alleviation of this unemployment can be accomplished only through expanded production of the F–27 airplane. This expanded production at this crucial time can be accomplished only through the Air Force's procurement of the F–27 to meet the needs outlined above in the numerous missions defined. Since a genuine need for this aircraft exists in the Air Force and since an immediate military order for its production is essential for the continuation of the very life of the Fairchild plant itself, the subcommittee is urged to consider this request favorably.

Very truly yours,

JOHN R. FOLEY,
Member of Congress.

Air Force officials did not later appear before the Mahon subcommittee to make a request for an F–27 appropriation item in the 1960 budget. Debate on the 1960 Defense budget began in early June 1959. On June 2 at about 3 p.m. a telephone conversation was held with the Fairchild Washington representative concerning the omission of an F–27 item in the House proposed Defense budget for aircraft procurement. Approval was given by the Fairchild representative to inform Chairman MAHON that an F–27 item amendment would be offered from the floor of the House at the appropriate time. The Air Force officials had made no request for the F–27 item from the House subcommittee. Every indication existed that the said Air Force officials would not make a request from the Senate subcommittee. Accordingly, on June 2, 1959, time was requested and granted by Chairman MAHON for an amendment to be offered from the floor for the F–27 item. On June 2 permission was also granted by Chairman MAHON to inform the Members of the House that such amendment would be offered. A portion of the presentation on June 2, 1959, as it appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is as follows:

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FOLEY].

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I have asked our distinguished chairman of the Department of Defense Appropriations Subcommittee for an opportunity to rise before you today to inform you that I intend to offer an amendment to the bill pending before the committee at the proper moment. I want to present to you very briefly the factual basis for my amendment. In my short period here in the Congress, I have never met up with a more classic example of bureaucratic bungling, hesitancy and failure to decide and lack of consideration for human elements than the facts of the case I am about to present to you. In my district, at Hagerstown, Md., we have a relatively large aircraft producer, Fairchild Engine & Development Corp. At this very moment that I stand here, over 10,000 people have no source of income, no means to buy food, no source of the wherewithal to pay the weekly rent, and it all goes back to bureaucratic bungling. Let me read to you a few facts which I received this past week from the Maryland Department of Employment Security, affiliated with the Bureau of Employment Security. They present facts that were prepared and collated during May of this year:

"Unemployment at Hagerstown was estimated at 4,425 or 11.7 percent of the civilian labor force of 37,675 in April 1959."

This is the largest depressed area with the largest unemployment in the State of Maryland. This official State agency finding continues:

"The major factors contributing to this employment decline at Fairchild are the cancellations of the defense contract for the C–123 cargo type aircraft as well as the $50 million contract for the Goose 'decoy' guided missile. In the past month, production was also cut on the F–27, a turboprop type of aircraft used primarily for short hauls and commercial business."

I am going to present to the Members of the Committee of the Whole House another side of the spectrum of aircraft vehicles. I am going to present a request that the Air Force be authorized and money be provided to procure only 10 of these turboprop type aircraft for various uses that I will enumerate in due time. This large and increasing group of unemployed persons in Washington County as found by the Maryland State agency are as follows:

"Included in the unemployed are professional personnel, skilled workers such as turret-lathe, milling machine, tool makers, aircraft electricians, welders, maintenance and sheet metal workers, and semiskilled, such as bumper operators, welders, milling machine operators, engine lathe operators, riveters and assemblers."

The report concludes:

"If new military contracts are not obtained by Fairchild Aircraft in the next few months the already crucial unemployment problem will become more acute as the winter advances."

And finally:

"There is no anticipated industrial expansion to absorb the large number of jobless aircraft and construction workers. The outlook for the Hagerstown area is for continuation of the problem of critical unemployment. By the end of May the U.S. Department of Agriculture will begin to distribute free food packages to 975 families

representing 3,200 people, and they estimate another 3,000 are eligible for this assistance."

* * * * *

I am talking about the F–27 aircraft. This F–27 aircraft as contained in the brochure I hold in my hand is listed as a military utility transport. Let me enumerate just briefly some of the uses that this new aircraft can be put to and should be put to and will be put to as I will explain when I offer my amendment tomorrow.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland has expired.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield me 2 additional minutes?

Mr. MAHON. I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes, and after that I shall move that the Committee rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. FOLEY. This aircraft, because of its greater range, larger payload, and additional speed, an F–27 has 2½ times the productivity or usefulness of the C–47. It costs 56 cents a ton-mile to operate a C–47 today. It costs 22 cents a ton-mile to operate the F–27. Thus the F–27 does 2½ times more work than the C–47 at only 39 percent of the ton-mile cost.

On June 3, 1959, at 5:20 p.m. an amendment for the F–27 item was offered from the floor. Part of the presentation as it appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and the action on the amendment is as follows:

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

"Amendment offered by Mr. FOLEY: On page 22, line 23, delete '$4,165,700,000' and substitute '$4,175,700,000.'"

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is at bottom an appeal to you Members of the Committee of the Whole. It is an appeal that I make as an elected Representative of many thousands of unemployed persons in the Sixth District of Maryland and the many more thousands who are dependent upon these unemployed persons. As I pointed out yesterday in my remarks to the Committee, appearing on pages 9608 and 9609 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 105, part 7, these unemployed persons are highly skilled, many of them professional employees and many semiskilled employees. They are employees laid off by the Fairchild Co. in Hagerstown, Md., within the past 17 months.

* * * * *

Last August, in 1958, the Air Force officials requested approval of procurement of the F–27 from the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee. Because of the lateness of the hour of the request, the F–27 was not included in last year's budget. In January of 1959, before the House Subcommittee on Department of Defense Appropriations, of which the distinguished gentleman from Texas is chairman, the request was made for approval of the F–27 for limited air attaché or embassy use. This request was turned down by the subcommittee. In my subsequent conversations with the members of the subcommittee, by letter and by personal visit, I pointed out the many broader and greater needs for the F–27 by the Air Force. I will itemize these needs a little later. Suffice it to say that the Air Force has seen this aircraft and has approved the aircraft and has demanded the aircraft.

I can inform the Members of the Committee without any fear of contradiction that Gen. Curtis LeMay has requested this aircraft, that Gen. Thomas White, Chief of the Air Force, has requested this aircraft, that the Air Force Weapons Board has approved the F–27 and has requested through channels requisitions of the aircraft. Moreover, an Air Force committee, studying the future needs of support aircraft to replace the C–47, the old DC–3, has recommended the purchase of 150 of the F–27's over a period of time. Yet, in the face of this expert appraisal and recommendation of the top Air Force defense official, the civilian spokesman for the Department did not come before the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee and request the F–27 for the 1960 fiscal year.

Let me remind you that last December the Air Force canceled the Goose missile. The Air Force has terminated production of the C–123. Fairchild Co., as a result of these actions, has had to lay off close to 3,000 of its employees within the last 17 months. The company lost considerable money in 1958, and will lose increasing amounts in 1959. In fact, unless there is a military requisition effective within a few months to come, the whole F–27 production program of Fairchild will come to an end.

For this reason, I have presented this amendment to the Committee of the Whole House. Since the top spokesman for the Air Force, for no reason, to my mind, failed to request this necessary aircraft vehicle, I, as the elected Representative of the many thousands of unemployed persons and the last person who can register an appeal with you Members of the Committee of the Whole House, you who are the last refuge for my constituents, make this appeal for support of my amendment. For in our governmental system, it has been necessary for me to wait until this very moment to have the authority and opportunity to make a request of the Committee of the Whole House for appropriations for these needed aircraft vehicles.

* * * * *

An F–27 has two and one-half times the productivity or usefulness of the C–47. It costs 56 cents a ton-mile to operate a C–47 today. It costs 22 cents a ton-mile to operate the F–27. Thus the F–27 does two and one-half times more work than the C–47 at only 39 percent of the ton-mile cost.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FOLEY] has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

* * * * *

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. I should like to say that I agree with what the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. WOLF] said about our colleague from Maryland, JOHN FOLEY, that he is sincerely trying to do a good job for his people.

Certainly, he is here today making an earnest plea for several thousand unemployed people in his district as well as their families.

Mr. Chairman, there are some points that I would like to emphasize following what my colleague has told you about this situation.

First, a proven aircraft producer, namely Fairchild, of Hagerstown, Md., will be saved from imminent economic disaster, and I am not overstating the case.

Secondly, a proven aircraft, namely the F–27, a logical economical replacement, for the old DC–3, will be provided the Air Force.

The gentleman pointed out several other facts in support of his amendment, but I suggest the strongest point that he has to make is the saving of one of our pioneer aircraft producers from possible disaster. The gentleman is making a plea and so am I for several thousand workers, and also for the modernization of our Air Force, and to do away with a lot of the obsolete DC–3's that are now being operated all around the world, with many of them that have been held over since World War II and replacing them with modern jet airplanes that will be capable of doing a much better job and at much less cost, in other words, at about 39 percent of the cost of operating the old DC–3's. The Air Force itself has made a plea for this. I do not know why the Air Force did not come before the committee, but as the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FOLEY] pointed out, General LeMay and General White, I believe were in favor of the F–27. The F–27 has proven its worth and its capabilities. I am certain it would help to modernize our Air Force and replace a lot of planes which are now obsolete.

The F–27 has also proven its worth in air medical evacuation. Some of the officers who are in charge of this have said that they would like very much to have this plane.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland is adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, the Air Force requested funds for certain cargo planes which were eliminated by the committee, and which represent a reduction of $50 million. Certain other administrative type of planes were also eliminated from the budget. The plane in question is one manufactured by Fairchild at Hagerstown. It was not presented to us as a budgetary item at all for 1960. It was discussed somewhat with regard to the program for fiscal year 1959. I have the greatest sympathy and the greatest interest in the people involved here, but, Mr. Chairman, there have been many cancellations of programs throughout the Nation and many people have lost their jobs. Of course, such a thing is always regrettable, but the object of our defense program is to provide the best possible defense for the country with the maximum utilization of the funds available. If we use these funds primarily to aid communities with unemployment problems, we will get ourselves very far afield from our main objectives. I want to say in behalf of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FOLEY] that he has done a diligent and a good job in presenting this very serious problem to the Committee and to the Congress. I do not blame him for offering the amendment. I wish I could support it, but it would be contrary to the principles that this Congress must follow in making defense appropriations. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I must recommend that the amendment be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FOLEY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FOLEY) there were—ayes 25, noes 86.

So the amendment was rejected.

On June 4, 1959, a telephone conversation with Secretary of the Air Force Douglas was held. The substance of the conversation was reprinted in a letter to the ranking minority member of the Senate Defense Appropriation Subcommittee:

JUNE 4, 1959.

Senator STYLES BRIDGES,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BRIDGES: I talked with Secretary of the Air Force Douglas from 4:50 to 5 p.m. today relative to the F–27 program and the action taken yesterday in the House in connection therewith. I assured him that Mr. MAHON, Mr. FORD, Mr. SIKES, and Mr. FLOOD were not in any way adversely affected in their attitude toward the F–27 because of their vote in the House. I mentioned that I had talked with you this morning. I encouraged him to make a request in the Senate for the F–27's and assured him

that I would do everything in my power to make certain that his efforts would be successful from the House side. His concluding remarks were that his plans were still the same to come forward and make a request for F-27's from the Senate. During the course of our conversation, he stated that he was in favor of the acquisition of F-27's.

I am writing the foregoing to you by way of a report and also for the purpose of extending my thanks to you for your interest in this program and for advice this morning.

Very truly yours,

JOHN R. FOLEY,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, thereafter, Air Force officials requested the F-27 item from the Senate subcommittee.

On July 13, 1959, the Senate approved the item at page 13180 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 105, part 10.

On July 30, 1959, the Senate-House conferees on the Defense budget eliminated the F-27 item.

On August 4, 1959, the Maryland Senator from Frostburg took the floor of the Senate to criticize the deletion of the F-27 item by the conferees. At page 15076 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 105, part 12, the Senator specifically pointed out that California and Missouri aircraft procurement items were retained and the Maryland-Oklahoma F-27 item deleted. He stated the Democratic House conferees from California and Missouri showed special interest in their own respective State areas over the Nation's interest. He pointed out that it was the California and Missouri votes that deleted the F-27 item.

On August 25, 1959, the same Maryland Senator took the Senate floor again in connection with the F-27 item deletion by the conferees.

He requested from the Senate permission to correct the RECORD and strike from his remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on August 4, 1959, statements made by him that the House conferee Democrats from California and Missouri showed special interest in retaining their own State items and deleting the F-27 item in the conferee appropriation report. The Senator stated that he was striking the sentences because they lent themselves to a meaning that reflected on the House conferees. In later remarks he praised the California Congressman who was a House conferee as a hard worker with whom he served in the House for 10 years. The Maryland Senator was joined by the two California Senators and a Senator from Missouri in praising the California Congressman.

In early 1960 the following letter was sent to the Secretary of the Air Force urging that the Air Force request inclusion of the F-27 item in the 1961 budget:

FEBRUARY 10, 1960.

Hon. DUDLEY SHARP,
Secretary of the Air Force,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: You will recall that on June 3, 1959, in the 1st session of the 86th Congress I introduced an amendment to the Aircraft Procurement, Air Force section of the defense appropriation bill. This amendment provided for an additional $10 million to be earmarked for the purchase, by the Air Force, of F-27 aircraft from the Fairchild Aircraft Co. Beginning at page 9734 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 105, part 7, and continuing to page 9735, I listed the various uses to which the F-27 can be put by the Air Force. You will recall that the amendment was defeated. Mr. MAHON in opposing my amendment states on page 9735 of the RECORD as follows: "The plane in question is one manufactured by Fairchild at Hagerstown. It was not presented to us as a budgetary item at all for 1960. It was discussed somewhat with regard to the program for fiscal year 1959."

It was because the Air Force did not make a specific demand of the Mahon subcommittee in 1959 that my amendment was defeated, as set forth by Chairman MAHON himself. At about 5:30 p.m. on June 4, 1959, I talked with Secretary Douglas by telephone concerning the action taken by the House of Representatives the previous day on my amendment. I also related to him the attitude of certain members of the Appropriations Subcommittee insofar as they pertain to his making a specific request from the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee. I encouraged him at the time to make the request to the Senate subcommittee. He informed me that it was his intention to request funds from the Senate committee. I informed him in answer to one of his questions that the action of the House in voting down my amendment followed the general practice of supporting an appropriation subcommittee chairman's position. And since the agency involved, the Air Force, has not made a request for the 1960 fiscal year, the committee did not want to accept the amendment on its own and, therefore, was forced to oppose it.

Subsequently, to my great satisfaction and that of my constituents, the Air Force did make a request from the Senate subcommittee. On July 13, 1959, on page 13180 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 105, part 10, the Senate voted $11 million for the specific procurement of 11 F-27 mission support planes. Thereafter, the item in conference was eliminated by a vote of 3 to 2 among members of the House conferees.

I cite the foregoing legislative history, as background for my request that when you appear in the next few weeks the Air Force make a specific demand of the Mahon subcommittee for F-27 aircraft. The needs and uses which I listed on June 3, 1959, without question exist today in February of 1960. The conclusion is clear that the reason that this item was not approved by the House in the 1960 budget was the failure of the Air Force to make the specific request of the Mahon subcommittee when it appeared in 1959.

I am writing to you now to request that this same occurrence will not happen again. I have been informed that the Air Force is scheduled to appear before the Mahon subcommittee sometime toward the end of February. In my discussions with members of the Mahon subcommittee, I have been informed that they are disposed to act favorably upon a request by the Air Force for an amount to be used for the purchase of F-27 aircraft. Thus, the responsibility rests solely on the shoulders of Air Force officials to make this request for F-27 aircraft.

I am sure that you have been informed by other representatives, including those of Fairchild Aircraft Co. itself, of the deteriorating position of this most vital industry in my congressional district. The failure by the Air Force to make a request for funds for the F-27 will prove to be decisive action that will put an end to the Fairchild Aircraft Co. In making this statement I am not exaggerating. I am enclosing by way of official facts, photostats of recent reports by the Department of Employment Security of the State of Maryland. They show dramatically how in recent weeks unemployment rose in Washington County at the Hagerstown office from 2,880 total claims on January 6, 1960 to 5,478 on January 13. The highest rate of unemployment in the country exists in Washington County. The increases in unemployment have been brought about solely by the continued layoffs by the Fairchild Co. necessitated by the spreading out of F-27 production.

It is easy to say that the missile age and space technology is dynamic and, therefore, changes are made and must be made rapidly in our defense program. As a result of these adjustments certain communities are hurt economically. However, Fairchild already has felt the adverse effects by the cancellation of such an item; namely, the Goose missile. But, the F-27 is a workhorse item, and not a missile or space age item.

During the past 20 years the people of Hagerstown and of Washington County in my district served well in the production of other workhorse items; namely, the C-119 and the C-123 aircraft. They are producing a product which can be used now by the Air Force. I am emphasizing by this letter that the Air Force should within the next few weeks request funds from the Mahon subcommittee for the procurement of F-27 aircraft.

Unexpended balances of the 1959 appropriation to the Air Force, I understand, are still available. The Mahon subcommittee is prepared to approve the use by the Air Force of these funds. It is urged that when you and the Air Force officers appear before the Mahon subcommittee you will make a further request to include funds in the 1961 budget for F-27 procurement.

Thanking you for your favorable consideration of this request, I am,

Very truly yours,

JOHN R. FOLEY,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the reply from the Secretary of the Air Force dated February 25, 1960, was as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
Washington, February 25, 1960.

Hon. JOHN R. FOLEY,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. FOLEY: The Secretary has asked me to reply to your letter of February 10, 1960, in which you discussed possible Air Force procurement of F-27 aircraft.

As you mentioned, we have, in the past, made several attempts to secure authority to purchase F-27's from the Congress. We still have a need to replace certain aircraft within our utility fleet. However, this requirement does not hold the priority accorded our first-line combat needs. As a result, there are no funds available or budgeted for a more modern aircraft in the utility transport support area.

It should be noted, at this point, that we have been conducting a number of reviews of all of our programs. This has been necessitated by the rapidly changing composition of our forces and the need to hold Air Force spending to a minimum consistent with national defense requirements. As a result of these reviews, we have already canceled some projects, reduced others, and initiated action to close some installations. As examples, we have canceled work on the F-108, we have decided to phase out part of our aging B-47 force earlier than originally planned, and we have announced our decision to close Ethan Allen Air Force Base, Vt., and to terminate primary pilot training at Malden Air Base, Mo.

In view of the above, we are not presently considering the F-27 aircraft for possible procurement. We recognize the situation at Fairchild and are most sympathetic with the people of Hagerstown. However, in the final analysis, our plans must be based on the needs of the Air Force and the most economical use of the funds made available to us.

I trust that the above will explain our present thinking on the F–27 matter. Should you have any further questions, please call on me.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH T. KINGSLEY, Jr.,
Brigadier General, U.S. Air Force,
Deputy Director, Legislative Liaison.

Mr. Speaker, when it appeared before the Mahon subcommittee, the Air Force did not request an F–27 item in the 1961 budget. However, on March 31, 1960, a specific request for an F–27 item was made by the U.S. Representative from Maryland's Sixth District as printed on pages 439 to 448 of the 1960 hearings before the Mahon Defense Appropriation Subcommittee. A portion of the testimony is as follows:

PROCUREMENT OF F–27 AIRCRAFT

Witness: Hon. JOHN R. FOLEY, a Representative in Congress from the State of Maryland.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. FOLEY.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I am approaching the committee on a subject that I am sure the chairman and the members of the committee know about. The unfailing courtesy of the chairman and the other members of the committee has been the source of real satisfaction to me, and I hope my appearance this morning, however brief, will not be considered presumptuous in any way.

I appear, if I can quote a couple of cliches that I have listened to with some tremendous interest this morning, basically in the interest of free enterprise within the broad context of public interest. In that connection I want to say that I am here because fundamentally the members of this committee have always given me very fine attention and consideration. I am here somewhat like a layman in an area which is beyond my ken, and that is in connection with the F–27.

Mr. MAHON. How many have been produced?

Mr. FOLEY. A little over 50.

Mr. MAHON. Do you think it is here to stay?

Mr. FOLEY. The F–27 is here to stay if we can get some stimulation and inspiration from the Air Force, and that is why I want to appeal to the demonstrated leadership capabilities of this committee to go forward on its own.

I am going to mention something about the importance of utility aircraft as a somewhat neglected orphan in the whole missile program and the whole jet program.

* * * * *

Mr. FOLEY. I have talked to the president of Piedmont Airlines and Bonanza Airlines, I have talked with Air Force personnel, individuals, and they have told me that this is one of the finest aircraft that they have ever flown.

Going back to what I put in the record a year ago, the appraisal committee of the Air Force itself has approved this particular aircraft. General White has requested the aircraft. It was not until we reached the upper echelons of civilian leadership in the Air Force that we ran into trouble. I am not criticizing anybody; I am just making that statement.

Frankly, the company has run into a dead end in a sense, which is why I am here today to appeal to the committee to exercise its own judgment. This committee has been very courteous to me when I have hounded them a little bit. In fact, some of the members have somewhat encouraged me because of their fine consideration of my repeated request.

Mr. MINSHALL. Thank you.

Mr. RILEY. Mr. THOMSON.

Mr. THOMSON. Are there any airlines besides Piedmont and Bonanza that have gone into this particular aircraft?

Mr. FOLEY. Aside from Bonanza Airlines and Piedmont Airlines, there are the following: Pacific Airlines, West Coast Airlines, Ozark Airlines, Quebec Airlines, and West-Alaska Airlines.

Mr. THOMSON. I believe Piedmont and Bonanza had committed themselves to procure some of these planes as of the time of our hearing last January.

Mr. FOLEY. That is right.

Mr. THOMSON. I was interested in knowing whether there had been expansion of use of their airplane into other airlines. The reason I ask that is in our more sparsely settled areas, such as the area I represent, it has been a problem to find an airplane which is a suitable replacement for the DC–3 as it gets older. At one time I thought there was going to be an interest in this aircraft, but they seem to have dropped it. I did not know whether it was a fact or not.

Mr. FOLEY. This is a jetprop aircraft designed for short-range operation. It has a 40-passenger capability. As a layman, I foresee that our economy, our society, and our military services will always need a short-range aircraft regardless of how far we fly a rocket around the sun.

Mr. THOMSON. I think there is no doubt about that.

Mr. FOLEY. There is an element of urgency from my standpoint. We were caught in the switches at Fairchild, and we came up with this aircraft, and it has proven it is airworthy in every test to which it has ever been submitted.

We just feel that if we can get over this dead end, the country will profit and particularly the domestic airlines will profit because the feeder lines will have a constant source of spare parts in future products, but unless we do so—I hate to inject this—we are in a very tough way.

Mr. RILEY. Thank you very much, Mr. FOLEY. I am sure the committee will take into consideration the very fine presentation you have given us.

Mr. FOLEY. I want to thank you again, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, for your unfailing attention and consideration. I really appreciate it.

Mr. Speaker, the Mahon subcommittee did not include an F–27 item in its reported bill that passed the House on May 5, 1960. No amendment from the floor of the House for an F–27 item was offered as was done in 1959. On June 16, 1960, the Senate passed its 1961 Defense appropriation bill including an item for the F–27. This item was again deleted in conference. The Senate passed the conferee's Defense appropriation bill on June 30, 1960. No reference was made to the F–27 item in the Senate during the explanation of the conferee's bill.

The House passed the conferee's bill on the same day, June 30, 1960. The following letter was sent that day to Chairman MAHON:

JUNE 30, 1960.

Hon. GEORGE H. MAHON,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Today I voted for H.R. 11998 providing appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961. However, I voted as I did with considerable misgiving owing to the elimination of the $10 million item for F–27 aircraft. You will recall that on March 31, 1960, I appeared before your subcommittee and requested that $10 million be included in the 1961 Department of Defense appropriation. I pointed out that the F–27 is needed as a replacement item for the Air Force C–47's. My statement appears at page 439 of part 7 of the published hearings.

Since the $10 million item was again this year inserted on the Senate side, it would be greatly appreciated if you would explain to me why the conferees rejected this justified and justifiable item in my view.

Thanking you for your courtesy in the matter, I am,

Very truly yours,

JOHN R. FOLEY,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the reply to the foregoing letter from Chairman MAHON is as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., July 1, 1960.

Hon. JOHN R. FOLEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOHN: This is in response to your letter of June 30 in regard to the F–27 aircraft. All members of the subcommittee which I head have been most aware for many months of your very great belief in and interest in the F–27. As you know, we have discussed this whole problem many times but you have asked me for a formal statement in regard to the problem.

I am attaching a memorandum which, in my judgment, covers the whole situation rather well. The memorandum explains that the President has never included funds for the F–27 in his defense budget. It explains that there is presently no replacement program for the C–47 plane, a plane which the F–27 could replace.

As you know, the House Subcommittee on Appropriations for Defense has not looked with favor upon adding nonbudgeted procurement items to the defense bill, especially unless such additions were of the highest urgency for the defense of the country. The F–27 is a good plane but it could not be considered a high urgency requirement at this time especially in view of the expenditure ceilings which have been imposed by the administration.

I regret that I cannot write more helpfully, but I believe that this letter and the attached memorandum give the picture rather accurately. I commend you for your good work in behalf of the people of your district and extend best wishes.

Sincerely,

GEORGE MAHON.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON F–27 (MANUFACTURED BY THE FAIRCHILD CO. AT HAGERSTOWN, MD.)

The Bureau of the Budget and the Department of the Air Force have never included in the President's budget a request for funds for the procurement of the F–27 aircraft. Had officials in the executive branch desired to do so, funds could have been included for this aircraft in fiscal years 1959, 1960, and/or 1961. Despite efforts of the company to sell the aircraft to the Air Force, no budget request has ever been made of Congress through regular channels for financing procurement of the aircraft.

No reason is known why Congress would not have provided funds for the procurement of the F–27 had a regular budget request been submitted and substantial proof provided that the airplane was required. The implication, to some extent, throughout the controversy in regard to the F–27 has been that the Fairchild Co. has done some good work for the Government, is in financial difficulty, needs a Government order for the purpose of improving the financial status of the

company and for the purpose of adding prestige to the aircraft which the company is seeking to sell and is selling to private industry. The F–27 is considered to be an excellent feeder-line type aircraft for small airlines. It could be used by the Air Force and the Navy as an administrative aircraft and as a replacement for the old C–47, but the services have never submitted a budget estimate for F–27 aircraft. It is true that administrative aircraft in the Air Force are becoming obsolete.

The Air Force has a fleet of approximately 1,200 C–47-type aircraft of an average age of about 15 years. Eventually these aircraft will have to be replaced with more modern types. The Air Force has desired to replace these aircraft, but because of limited funds and higher priority items it has simply not been in a position to make a fight for a replacement plane for the C–47. One of these days a program of replacement will be initiated. Had a program of replacement been initiated 2 or 3 years ago, no doubt the F–27 would have been seriously considered, but, of course, we cannot foresee what the future holds with respect to this matter. There is no doubt but that expenditure ceilings in the Defense Department have made it impossible to make any substantial headway in a replacement-type administrative aircraft. There are no administrative aircraft in the budget for the Air Force or Navy for fiscal year 1961.

The first mention of the F–27 in the official record was during the Senate hearings on the Defense appropriations bill in calendar 1958. The position of the Air Force was summed up in this statement by General White (p. 406, Senate hearings, fiscal year 1959):

"If and when we find that we can start replacing that type of transport (C–47), the F–27 is going to be one of the ones we will look at in conjunction with other aircraft of similar type."

The Air Force had not included a request for the aircraft in its fiscal year 1959 budget. That year the Senate put in the defense bill funds for 10 F–27 aircraft which were later deleted in conference. In January 1959 the Air Force requested permission of the Congress to reprogram funds for the procurement of 10 F–27 aircraft, but there was no budget estimate. The mission of the aircraft was stated to be support of air attachés in Europe and special missions (classified). After holding a hearing on the request, the House Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations voted on the issue, and the request was voted down.

In calendar 1959, the Air Force again failed to include the F–27 in its budget request for fiscal year 1960 and there was only brief mention of the aircraft during the House hearings. The excerpts below (p. 651) indicate the somewhat indefinite status of the aircraft in the Air Force program and its relative insignificance in any plans for replacing the C–47 and similar aircraft:

"General IRVINE (then Deputy Chief of Staff, Materiel). 'We really need some airplanes to replace the obsolete C–47's and C–54's which we now have in inventory.'

" 'This is partly for prestige purposes, for our air attachés, and Ambassadors overseas. The F–27 would have fulfilled that requirement. However, when we got into the problem of programing it forward and matched it against our other requirements, it was one of the things we just felt we could get along without. We could use the airplane. It looks like an economical airplane in that category of operation. It is something like the Goose program and some of the programs of that kind that fell by the wayside because of priorities.'

"Mr. FORD. 'Do I understand there still are or are not funds available in the 1959 program for this procurement?'

"General FRIEDMAN. 'Yes, there are funds but not specifically earmarked for the F–27.' "

In calendar 1959 the Senate, despite the absence of a budget request, did put 10 F–27 aircraft into its version of the fiscal year 1960 defense appropriation bill and these were subsequently deleted in conference.

During calendar 1960 there were no references in Air Force hearings made by Air Force witnesses to the F–27 in the testimony, either of the House or Senate. The House subcommittee did hear testimony from Congressman JOHN R. FOLEY, of Maryland, in whose district the F–27 is manufactured. Mr. FOLEY expressed his conviction that the F–27 could be utilized by the Air Force, making a strong presentation in behalf of the plane. He has upon many occasions stressed the importance of an Air Force F–27 procurement program.

Funds for 10 of these aircraft were again added by the Senate Appropriations Committee, in spite of the fact that the Air Force had not included a request in the budget for them.

The Farmer: His Year of Decision—A Report on Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, 28 years ago America's farm families, racked by poverty, foreclosure and despair—after 12 years of Republican rule—placed their faith and their hopes in the Democratic Party. The Democratic Party was equal to this trust and to this faith. It was equal to the times. Championed, encouraged, and aided by the dynamic administrations of Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman, farmers themselves designed and constructed a farm program dedicated to their needs and to their aspirations. This progressively developing program guided them out of the great depression and, with it, they pressed on to achieve a full parity position in the Nation's economy. Farmers then enjoyed their greatest prosperity in all our history. They then had reason to believe that at last they were equal and accepted partners with all Americans, in the rewards of free enterprise under capitalism.

But, now—after another era of Republican power—their program is wrecked, and the Nation's farm people again have been relegated to unpromising and near hopeless struggle and strain.

Mr. Speaker, agriculture, our basic industry, once more is on the brink of bankruptcy.

THE BENSON REPUBLICAN PROGRAM

The Benson Republican program was established in Washington in 1953. Now, 8 years later, we look upon the consequences.

The family farm, which was the beginning of free enterprise in America, is threatened. Thousands upon thousands of once proud and independent farmers have been forced to leave the land they love.

Farmers' net income in 1959 dropped to the lowest level, in relation to volume of their sales of any year since the Department of Agriculture began keeping records. Average farm prices at the close of 1959 reached their lowest, in terms of parity, for any yearend period since 1933.

In 1960 the farmer is gripped tighter than ever in the cost-price squeeze that is strangling him. In the first half of this year his income was 8 percent below the depressed level of 1959.

The per capita annual income of people living on farms in 1959—including Government payments and also their earnings from off-farm work—again plummeted to less than one-half that of nonfarm people.

Here, briefly, is a summary of the last 8 years, comparing 1960 with 1952:

Farm prices: Down 17 percent.

Farm parity ratio: Down 21 percent.

Realized net farm income: Down 24 percent.

Purchasing power of that farm income: Down 29 percent, lowest since 1940.

Farmers' debts: At a record high, above $24 billion.

Farm population: Declined from 24,283,000 in 1952 to 21,172,000 in 1959.

This is the record. It is a documentation set against the backdrop of Candidate Eisenhower's promise, made in the heat of the 1952 campaign, to reward farmers, not at 90 percent, but at 100 percent of parity.

REPUBLICAN BREACH OF FAITH WITH FARMERS

Mr. Speaker, never before in my memory—probably never before in the history of the United States—has there been a more complete breach of faith with any group of voters than the Republican administration's faithlessness to its promises to the farmers of America.

In his 1952 campaign, the Republican candidate for President promised not merely 90 percent of parity—but full parity. He promised specifically to strengthen the price supports for, as he put it, "the nonperishable crops so important to the diversified farmer—crops such as oats, barley, rye, and soybeans," so that these crops would be given the same protection as available to the major cash crops. He went on to promise a sound way to protect farmers who produce perishable food products.

Mr. Speaker, there was no question as to the meaning of these Republican promises. The Associated Press reported that the Republican candidate had promised "a plan which he said would guarantee present price supports for another 2 years and then would lead to higher prices for the farmers."

The Indianapolis News blazoned the Republican promises of 1952 in black headlines, proclaiming: "Ike Favors More Farm Props and 100 Percent Parity."

The Milwaukee Journal headline declared: "Ike Promises To Work for 100 Percent Farm Parity."

The Des Moines Tribune headline, bannered across the full eight columns of the front page, declared: "Ike Offers Plan for Farm Price Boost."

The Wichita, Kans., Sunday Eagle declared: "Ike Down Line on Parity Laws; Promises Farmers Perishables Support."

These were the Republican promises of 1952. The betrayal of these solemn pledges is now history—history which has been lived in sorrow and despair in every farming community in this land.

These Republican campaign promises have been violated in spirit as well as in the letter of their content. In all the 8 years since these pledges were made to the farmers of America, the Republican national administration has never taken one voluntary step—nor has it initiated one single action to Congress—which would raise the price received by any farmer in America for any farm commodity.

Mr. Speaker, we are now again in the midst of another great political contest. Once again we can expect to hear glowing promises from the Republican national candidates to the farmers of America. Farm people may well reflect upon the promises that were made before, only to be disregarded as soon as the election was over. The outcome of the great national election campaign of 1960 is certain to affect the circumstances of farm families all over America. Perhaps no segment of our people has as much at stake in the impending election as our farmers.

THE WAY OUT

At this place in this report let me recall, for the reflections of the Members, that there were days, in times past, when it was difficult to distinguish a Democrat from a Republican in this body when legislation relating to the well-being of agriculture was debated and voted upon. Our farm people are Democrats and they are Republicans. Their well-being should have no reference to party politics.

I commend, as I have on other occasions, those Members of both parties who have proven themselves to be true and devoted friends of agriculture and who have placed the interests of our farm people above any possible partisan advantage.

But, Mr. Speaker, I must state what now is true—as painful as this may be to me—that Mr. Benson and this Republican administration have injected partisan politics, and have promoted political alinements, in our deliberations in the Congress on vital farm legislation; and they thus have created circumstances whereby a political determination at the polls in November may be the only solution to the problems of our farm people.

Therefore, the farmer and his family must know that their very economic survival, in agriculture, is deeply involved, when they cast their ballots.

I say to the farmers on these broad lands of ours, first and foremost, we must banish from the Department of Agriculture every aspect and vestige of the Benson philosophy and design, and we must install in the Department of Agriculture, a man who understands the farm problem as the Nation's chief agricultural officer, a man who has the confidence of farmers, a man who is devoted and consecrated to the rightful aspirations of farm people, a man who unswervingly will champion the causes of farm families, a man capable of uniting farmers again into a brotherhood of purpose, and a man endowed with the ability of leadership to undo the wrongs of 8 long years and to guide the agricultural economy back to the road of stability and prosperity.

The great need of farmers today is not a specific bill or a specific law but, above all, to install in Washington an administration sympathetic and devoted to the restoration of a parity position—of income and of living standards—for the people who till the soil and feed the Nation.

THE COST-PRICE SQUEEZE

Mr. Speaker, the farmer wonders—and others who are not farmers must question—why has our Government actually encouraged, and promoted, if you please, the cost-price squeeze that is driving our agricultural establishment to insolvency, with all this means in anxiety and privation for farm people? Why, during these years when the prices of things farmers must buy are going up and up and up, why does this administration preach and enforce, by its policies, lower and lower and lower prices for the things that our farmers produce?

Why has Mr. Benson taken control of the farm program out of the hands of farmers and surrounded himself with people "who farm the farmers," as Edward A. O'Neal described those middlemen who profit by the farmers' poor prices?

The stated purpose of this administration is to drive down production by taking away the incentive to produce. It is the bankruptcy route to production adjustment. It is the back road that farmers traveled before we had a farm program. It is the cruel way that in bygone years created in agriculture a second-class status for farm people because they were so poor, so that others in our society amused themselves by calling them yokels, bumpkins, and hayseeds. It is the route to economic collapse in our great countryside.

The people who "farm the farmers" have been rewarded. As applied in the Benson program, this philosophy has succeeded in driving many people from our farms. But it has confounded him by piling surplus upon surplus, with great expense to taxpayers, and consumers have not profited as farm prices have fallen.

Farmers, fighting for survival, have taken over the lands of their neighbors who have been forced out, and they are producing more on these lands than ever was produced before.

Aside from the human suffering involved, Mr. Benson never seems to have examined the simple arithmetic of his program.

As farm prices have gone down, with the margin of profit thinner and thinner, farmers simply have produced more, to make up in volume what they have lost in price.

CORN AND A PAIR OF PANTS

I requested a member of my staff to inquire of the Department of Agriculture as to what a pair of pants cost in 1952, as related to the value of corn, and how much corn it would take today to buy the same pair of pants.

The Department, to my satisfaction, had the figures on a number of items.

I now am advised that it takes 41.7 bushels of corn today to buy the same suit of clothes that 26 bushels would buy in 1952, that it takes 9.2 bushels to get a pair of men's shoes that required only 5.3 bushels 8 years ago, and 6 bushels to buy a woman's dress as compared with 3.6 bushels in 1952. Among other items, a chair for the farmer's house that cost 17.1 bushels of corn 8 years ago now costs 38.6 bushels, and it takes 216.7 bushels to buy an electric stove that could be had for 153 bushels in 1952.

It would seem to me, in all seriousness, that it should have been obvious to Mr. Benson from the start—even in his youth—that if it takes twice as much corn to buy a pair of pants, then the farmer, to keep himself in pants—as certainly he must—will do his utmost to produce twice as much corn.

Farmers are impelled to increase their output as prices fall. Surplus thus builds upon surplus, further depressing prices.

The fallacy, and the tragedy, of the Benson program is as simple as that.

HISTORY REPEATS

Mr. Speaker, our farm people and the Nation should have known what to expect when a Republican President moved into the White House in 1953. Precedent forewarned us. That foreboding harked back to the 1920's and early 1930's when, in the gathering economic storm, the veto power of the President—under Republican power—was used to destroy virtually every piece of general legislation intended to save the farm industry from chaos and from bankruptcy. This legislation in that bygone era was developed and sponsored by the old farm bloc in Congress, counting in its leadership and in its ranks stalwart Democrats and Republicans. But one by one, a Republican President struck down these farm bills, by the exercise of the veto power.

Our farmers had called for help. The Congress responded. But the veto power prevailed.

There are Members of this House today who can remember—and we shall never forget—the catastrophe that then befell the Nation. In the late 1920's and the early 1930's the ruin of agricuture ran its inevitable course, and the whole Nation tumbled into the great depression.

Mr. Speaker, history now repeats. There today is a stark similarity.

When another Republican President moved into Washington in 1953 he installed Mr. Ezra Taft Benson as the chief agricultural magistrate of the land. Mr. Benson forthwith set out upon a course to administer the farm program in a way to discredit it, and thereby to destroy it. There then came into being, under Mr. Benson's guidance, a design and calculation to inflame consumers against farmers, to destroy the parity principle which the Nation had come to accept as sound and just, to repress agriculture's price structure, and thus to woo political strength in the cities because

the numbers of farmers were becoming so few.

The turning point came, Mr. Speaker, when this Republican administration repudiated the principles and the philosophy of the greatest farm statesman the Republican Party ever produced—Clifford R. Hope, of Kansas.

Cliff Hope became chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture in 1953, as Republicans gained control of the Congress. He believed in the program that had served our farmers and the Nation so well. He was one of the architects of this program. He brought to the House for a vote a bill to continue this program. The administration, led by Secretary Benson, turned upon him with a vengeance. It is a sorry story to recall. Mr. Benson was aided in this onslaught by the national officers and staff of the American Farm Bureau Federation, who themselves had turned upon and set out to destroy the program which their own revered leader and president, the late Edward A. O'Neal of Alabama, and other great farm bureau leaders as Earl Smith of Illinois, had developed and sponsored as spokesmen for the farmers of America.

Thereupon, the bill presented by Cliff Hope, the recognized Republican farm leader, received only 23 votes from the 219 Republican Members of the House; and this body—then dominated by Republicans—installed instead the Benson farm program pledged to the lowering of farm prices and the destruction of the production adjustment machinery whereby farmers had patterned their output to their markets.

And, Mr. Speaker, since that day, vetoes of the President—one by one—have been erected like gravestones over the farm program and over the hopes and aspirations of the farm families of America.

The control of the Congress was returned to the Democratic Party in 1955. We promptly enacted legislation—H.R. 12—to restore the 90-percent-of-parity price supports for the major crops. Just as promptly, the President vetoed the legislation.

The Congress next, in 1958, enacted "hold the line" legislation—Senate Joint Resolution 162—to prevent Mr. Benson from lowering the price structure of agriculture any further. This bill was stricken down by the veto.

The shadow of the veto power then spread across every constructive effort in the Congress to restore general stability to farm prices.

Surplus was piled upon surplus and prices continued to fall.

In 1959, we enacted legislation to deal with the great surplus and price problem in wheat. The bill proposed another 25-percent cut in wheat acreage throughout the country, and it would have restored the 90-percent-of-parity support, to prevent a violent drop of farm income in the Wheat Belt.

The veto again was brought to bear. As a consequence, great additional costs have occurred to taxpayers. Our farmers are being buried in an avalanche of wheat.

Also last year, tobacco farmers became concerned that a quirk in the parity formula, not detected when the formula was written, tended to raise tobacco prices to a level which threatened our markets. Our farmers requested a change in the parity computation for tobacco, to prevent unreasonable increases in prices. The necessary legislation was passed by the Congress. The competitive position, pricewise, in world President vetoed the bill. Mr. Benson prompted the veto. He wanted a sharper decrease in tobacco prices. We later were able to develop legislation dealing with price problems of tobacco farmers that the President was willing to accept.

Again in 1959, the Congress passed a bill to restore the authority over the Rural Electrification Administration to the REA Administrator, thus to forestall actions by Secretary Benson which might prevent the proper development of REA. This too, was vetoed.

This is the record. I do not question the veto power of the President, under the Constitution. But I shall never understand the use of it by Republican Presidents, now and in the past, to build a barrier between the farm families of America and their rightful recourse to their Government, as such recourse now is accorded to labor, industry, and other elements of our free economy and democratic society.

ADMINISTRATION UNWILLING TO TRUST FARMERS

Mr. Speaker, when this Democratic 86th Congress convened in its 2d session last January, the President sent to us a special message which led the country to believe he, at last, was ready to approve a sound farm bill. He told us "I will approve any constructive solution that the Congress wishes to develop," within certain limitations. But, when we called Secretary Benson before our Committee on Agriculture, we found nothing had changed. The veto power hung over us as menacingly as ever it had before, daring the Congress to interfere with Mr. Benson's set purpose of holding down the price structure of agriculture.

Thereupon, it being evident that any bill seeking to improve farm prices would be doomed in this session, we wrote legislation which simply would have provided the machinery for farmers themselves to develop, in cooperation with the Department of Agriculture, programs dealing with the pressing and specific problems of the various crops.

The administration quickly condemned the bill. Mr. Benson called it a monstrosity. The people in the American Farm Bureau national headquarters joined with Mr. Benson. We learned then for a fact that there were people identifying themselves as farm leaders who were unwilling, as was Mr. Benson, to trust farmers with a voice in the development of their own programs. The opposition created great confusion among farmers as to the provisions and objectives of the legislation. It failed of passage in the House.

Mr. Speaker, in a last hopeful effort to deal directly and quickly with the deepening crisis in agriculture, I invited the ranking members of our Committee on Agriculture—Republicans and Democrats—to meet with me in Washington, prior to the reconvening of the House following the recess for the conventions. It was my hope to discover some area of unity in which we could move in this August session to bring some relief to the farm economy. Time was running out, and it was obvious that nothing could be accomplished without complete understanding and unity among Republicans and Democrats.

Only one Republican responded to my invitation to the meeting. My effort failed.

Mr. Speaker, this session ends with a Republican Member of the Senate blocking action in that body on farm legislation, except what he has written himself. Doomed by this blockade are important bills reported by our committee and passed by the House, including legislation to expand vastly the research into industrial uses of agricultural products and a bill to revamp and strengthen the laws relating to farm credit through the Farmers Home Administration.

In such circumstances, blockaded by the veto and by legislative maneuvering, our farmers are suffering.

A 20-YEAR STORY AND AN 8-YEAR STORY

The President, who in 1952 advocated 100 percent of parity, has sent messages to the Congress from time to time urging the outright abandonment of the parity principle. In one of these messages he said:

> I have frequently requested legislation to deliver our farmers and taxpayers everywhere from the mounting failures and staggering excesses of the mandatory farm price support and production control program.

Mr. Speaker, as this 86th Congress draws to a close, I feel it to be my duty, as chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, to set the record straight, so that the people may know how our farm families have been treated in these last 8 years and how they fared in the previous 20 years. I hope these facts may appeal to the conscience of the Nation, to the end that the cost-price squeeze that now is strangling agriculture may be broken. This is the primary objective of this report to the House.

The President, in his message, quoted above, referred to the mounting failures and staggering excesses of the farm program. Let us look to the days and years when the old farm program was in friendly hands—before the Benson program was installed in Washington.

Our old pre-Benson program for the major crops operated for 20 years, prior to 1953, at an actual profit to the Government of $13 million. During 11 of these years—1942 to 1952, inclusive—the average price level of all of agriculture was at or above 100 percent of parity each year. At the end of the 20-year period the Government had only moderate investments in farm commodities, including basic and nonbasic crops.

The period prior to 1953 embraced agriculture's golden era, representing the triumph of the parity principle. Rural people came out of the great depression and, with their incomes steadily increasing, became able to buy the conveniences and comforts hitherto available only to our citizens in towns and cities. Electricity was taken to the rural areas. Farmers became financially able

to mechanize their farms and to apply new sciences, to bring food abundance at low cost to the consumers of the Nation. With the means to do it, farmers devoted their energies to the restoration and conservation of the Nation's greatest resource, the soil. Prosperity on the farms created greater markets for industries in the cities.

Then, for reasons yet unexplained to the American people, the new administration in 1953 decided to depart from this program, and the President subsequently called for the scrapping of the parity principle.

Then began the 8-year story, the consequences of which I have set forth earlier in this statement. Farm depression. Record surpluses. Great costs.

A study by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, done at my request, discloses that appropriations or expenditures of the Department of Agriculture since January 1, 1953, have been greater than the combined total of such expenditures or appropriations during all the 90 previous years of the history of the Department. The totals for the period 1862 through 1952—$35,843 million; for the period 1953 to July 1, 1960—$37,017 million.

The present Secretary of Agriculture has had more authority to deal with the problems of farmers than any of his predecessors. He has had more money at his disposal than all his predecessors combined. He has more employees in the Department than any Secretary before him.

Mr. Benson has sought to explain away his failures by contentions that the good years for agriculture, preceding 1953, were the result of food demands of war and postwar years. The facts are that food requirements in our country and the opportunities for export of food have been greater in the last 8 years than in any similar period of history.

Mr. Speaker, the old farm program, as fundamentally constructed, did not fail. When it needed adjustment to accommodate the changing conditions in agriculture, this program was delivered into unfriendly hands and it has been administered, as I have stated, in a manner to discredit and destroy it. And the nearer the program has moved to the low-price, unlimited production philosophy of the present Secretary, the more severe has been the decline in farm income, the larger our surpluses, and the greater the cost to the Government.

THE CONSUMER

In 1959, Mr. Speaker, American consumers bought 16 percent more farm-produced food than in 1952, yet our farmers received $100 million less for that larger volume than for the more limited output in 1952. In contrast, consumers paid food processors and marketing middlemen $10 billion more in 1959 than in 1952 for hauling, processing, and handling the food between the farm gate and the retail counter.

As one illustration of how the farmer and the middleman have fared, I refer to an official Department of Agriculture report which shows that from 1948 to 1958 the cost of wheat and other ingredients in a loaf of bread declined 12 percent at the farm, while processing and marketing margins for the loaf increased 55 percent. Thus, in the 10-year period, the cost of the loaf of white bread increased from 13.9 to 19.3 cents, on a national average, or 39 percent, while the price received by the farmer for a bushel of wheat declined from $1.98 to $1.72.

However, notwithstanding the sharp increase in processing and marketing charges, retail food costs today are lower in the United States in terms of workers' wages than anywhere else in the world.

The average factory worker in the United States spends only 23 percent of his earnings to buy the average amount of domestically produced food consumed by a family of three. Twenty years ago the same food would have cost the same worker 41 percent of his wages, and 30 years earlier—when there was no farm program—48 percent.

The average pay for an hour's work today will buy approximately twice as much food as in 1929.

LOOKING AHEAD

The capitalistic system in America has no greater expression than in the independent family farm. Free enterprise on this continent began with the family farm. There are today more units of enterprise in agriculture—more individual capitalists—than all other industry and business combined. There are now 4,637,000 independent enterprises in agricultural production and 4,589,000 in business and industry.

Agriculture represents virtually one-half of the value of the Nation's productive assets.

This Nation, committed to economic and political freedom under capitalism, will not permit more than one-half of its free enterprise units to struggle constantly on the edge of insolvency.

Our Government provides the minimum wage and collective bargaining powers to protect our labor force, and our industry is favored by the many laws that soften the impacts of harsh and unrestrained competition.

We must rebuild an effective farm program. We must enable farmers, as the managers of other business, to adjust their production to their markets. We must give the producers a voice in the price of the things they deliver into the markets, as is essential to any successful business. These were the free enterprise principles of the program Mr. Benson inherited and which he set as his purpose to destroy.

There has been a studied effort, Mr. Speaker, to spread the impression that the adjustment of production to market demands and the asking of a price that reflects cost of production and a reasonable profit—the free enterprise mechanisms of industry and business—are something different from free enterprise when used by farmers to establish for themselves an equitable position in the economy. Various devices have been used by the opponents of a workable farm program to aline farmer against farmer, crop against crop, farm organization against farm organization, and consumers generally against farmers.

A prosperous agriculture is important to the total economy and to all the people. The farm problem is everybody's problem.

It is unthinkable that urban people can be persuaded to a position of prejudice against farmers. A population predominantly predisposed to agriculture controlled the Congress and the State legislatures during the formative and development years of this country, and it was during this time of great rural influence and power that the laws and the free enterprise climate were created for the growth of the greatest industrial nation on earth. To speculate now that the predominantly urban population will turn upon and deliberately repress the less numerous population in agriculture would be to suggest that a former rural ascendency should have legislated against the development of industry and the growth of cities. Both propositions are absurd.

Agriculture is our basic industry. We are the best fed nation on earth. Our farmers have made it so. The productivity of our farms is today the greatest stabilizing force in the economy of the free world. The Communists have put satellites above the earth, but they cannot begin to match the productivity of the people tilling the soil of America.

Mr. Speaker, I have faith in the fairness and wisdom of the American people. I am supremely confident that, when we have in Washington a President and a Secretary of Agriculture devoted to the well-being of our people on the land, the representatives of the urban populations will join with the representatives from the farming areas in this Congress in support of public policies assuring again to these farm families of the Nation the opportunity to achieve a parity position in the rewards of enterprise, so that they, too, may enjoy full partnership in this capitalistic system that has brought America abundance and unmatched strength and prosperity.

The Ukrainian Congress Committee of America: A Tribute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, 20 years ago one our most forthright and vigorous ethnic organizations was founded, the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America. This committee has performed yeoman service for the interests of Ukrainians at home and abroad but above all it has worked for the United States itself. What the committee has done so effectively is the patriotic task of demonstrating to all Americans the true nature of the Soviet Empire. It has shown, sometimes dramatically—and here I am thinking of its effective campaign for commemorating Captive Nationals Week—that the U.S.S.R. is not a monolithic empire of a homogeneous ethnic group; namely, Russians. But it is rather a massive empire of many oppressed people in which the Russians are

only one group but they are the controlling group over all other peoples in the Russian empire.

To call the attention of Americans to this fact has been a praiseworthy service of the Ukrainian Congress Committee. On this occasion I wish to express my gratitude to its leaders for their courage, wisdom, and forthrightness in their efforts to enlighten the American people and in their general struggle against world communism.

Voting Record, 86th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I firmly believe it is my duty to the people of the Second District of Washington State who elected me to represent them in Congress to compile and publish a record of my stand on important issues. It has been my custom during the four terms I have served in Congress to present a compilation of my votes on these issues in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that it will be available to all my constituents.

More than 14,900 pieces of legislation have been introduced in the House of Representatives during the 2 years of the 86th Congress. Only a small percentage of the legislation introduced got to a vote. Even so, more bills came to a vote than can conveniently be placed in this voting record. Therefore, I am confining my record to issues of national importance and those of particular concern to constituents of my district.

To simplify my voting record, I have placed these measures into categories according to the general fields they encompass, although some are difficult to classify because they are broad in scope and may overlap. If there are questions concerning any of these issues or my stand on a particular issue, I will be happy to answer them when I return to my district following adjournment:

BILLS AFFECTING NATIONAL DEFENSE, NATIONAL SECURITY, AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Voted for H.R. 11713 appropriating $211.4 million for the development of atomic energy. This legislation included funds for many peaceful uses of atomic energy such as medical research, medicine, food preservation, power, and agriculture.

Voted for H.R. 10777 for construction at Army, Navy, and Air Force bases here and abroad.

Voted for H.R. 2260 to extend the draft to July 1, 1963, to extend the Doctor Draft and Dependents' Assistance Act, and to suspend the limit on strength of the Armed Forces.

Voted for H.R. 12049 to increase the authority of the National Aeronautics and Space Agency, the civilian space agency. Voted for H.R. 7007 providing $485.3 million for NASA.

Voted for H.R. 11998 appropriating $39.3 billion for the Defense Department, sufficient funds so we will continue to have a first-class defense system capable of deterring any aggression.

Voted for H.R. 11510 extending the Mutual Security Act to protect the security of the United States. Voted for H.R. 12619 providing appropriations for mutual security.

Voted for House Concurrent Resolution 369 expressing the sense of Congress that the Communist Chinese regime should not be seated in the United Nations.

Voted for House Concurrent Resolution 459 expressing the sense of Congress that any variation in traditional interpretation of treaties with Panama shall only be made pursuant to treaty. In effect, it expresses opposition to any action to permit official flying of the Panama flag in the Canal Zone.

Voted for H.R. 12311 giving the President authority to cut the Cuban sugar quota as requested by the President in order to stop American aid to the Castro-controlled government in Cuba.

BILLS AFFECTING VETERANS, SOCIAL SECURITY, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Voted for H.R. 12580 to provide grants to States for medical care of the aged. Program is voluntary, not compulsory, is under State control and is designed to help older persons who are unable to meet the costs of necessary medical aid. Bill also extends coverage under old-age, survivors, and disability insurance, unemployment compensation, and other programs under Social Security Act.

Voted for H.R. 7903 to extend for 2 years the veterans' guaranteed and direct home loan program to stimulate home construction.

Voted for H.R. 12259 to provide Federal aid to school districts on basis of need and local effort for emergency school construction. Voted against H.R. 10128 which provided no criteria for need or local effort and which would have led to Federal interference in local school matters.

Voted for House Concurrent Resolution 465 expressing the indignation of the Congress at desecration of houses of worship and other sacred sites.

Voted for H.R. 8601, the civil rights bill guaranteeing right to vote for all qualified citizens.

Voted for H.R. 10341 to authorize grants-in-aid to universities, hospitals, laboratories and other public or nonprofit institutions to strengthen their programs of research and research training in science related to health.

Voted for H.R. 6769 and H.R. 11390 providing funds for school construction and operation in so-called federally impacted areas, such as those we have in the Second District.

BILLS AFFECTING ECONOMY, BUSINESS, AND TRADE

Voted for H.R. 10213 authorizing the Treasury to purchase $1 billion of FHA and VA mortgages to stimulate construction of housing.

Voted for H.R. 11207 authorizing an increase of $150 million, to $725 million, the amount of loans the Small Business Administration may have outstanding.

Voted for S. 2611 to facilitate extension of credit to small businesses.

Voted for H.R. 10644 to increase subsidy for domestic ship construction to 55 percent of cost in foreign yards.

Voted for H.R. 10572 authorizing and directing the Secretary of Agriculture through the Forest Service to continue to manage national forests under principles of multiple use.

Voted for H.R. 47 to amend the Internal Revenue Code to permit stock of a small business corporation which is owned by husband and wife to be treated as owned by a single shareholder for purposes of determining number of shareholders in such corporations. The bill is of particular benefit to small businessmen in community property States such as Washington.

Voted for H.R. 5421 to provide differential payments for construction of fishing vessels to stimulate construction of fishing boats in the Pacific Northwest.

BILLS AFFECTING FARMERS AND AGRICULTURE

Voted for H.R. 8609 to extend for 2 years the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act for sale of surplus abroad. This act helps to reduce our surplus commodities.

Voted against S. 1901 to provide unnecessary price supports for tobacco.

Voted for S. 662 to create an Agricultural Research and Development Commission to find and promote new industrial uses for farm products.

Voted for H.R. 9331 to extend the special school milk program for children.

Voted for S. 2917 to provide that the price of whole milk and butterfat shall be supported at not less than $3.22 a hundredweight and 59.6 cents a pound respectively.

BILLS AFFECTING LABOR AND GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Voted for H.R. 5610 to provide increases in benefits under the Railroad Retirement and Unemployment Compensation Acts.

Voted for H.R. 5640 to extend benefits to Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act of 1958 for 3 months to jobless whose State payments expired before April 1, 1959.

Voted for H.R. 8430, the Landrum-Griffin bill, to protect rank-and-file union members, honest labor unions, and the public against labor racketeers and gangsterism.

Voted for H.R. 9883 to increase pay of postal workers and other Federal employees.

Voted for H.R. 12677 to increase the minimum wage to $1.15 an hour and to extend coverage.

Voted for S. 2575, identical to my bill H.R. 8787, to provide health insurance program for retired civil service workers.

BILLS AFFECTING GOVERNMENT OPERATION

Voted for S. 50 providing for Hawaiian statehood.

Voted against H.R. 3151 providing for withholding income taxes imposed by certain cities from pay of Federal employees.

Voted for H.R. 12326 appropriating $3.9 billion for public works construction including funds for Sammamish River flood control project, Snohomish River navigation project, Point Roberts survey

and the Skagit, Nooksack, Snohomish, and Stillaguamish Rivers flood control surveys.

Voted for H.R. 10569 to prevent the loading of city mail boxes with "occupant addresses" junk mail from Members of Congress.

Voted for H.R. 5160 to extend to June 1, 1961, the authority of the President to propose plans to Congress for more efficient reorganization of the Federal Government.

Voted for H.R. 10495 authorizing $925 million a year for fiscal 1962 and 1963 in Federal aid for primary and secondary highway systems and their urban extensions. Provides nearly $50 million for roads in Washington State in fiscal 1962.

Voted for H.R. 7634 authorizing certain public works including a survey at Point Roberts and the Snohomish River navigation project.

Voted for H.R. 3 reaffirming States rights to legislate in the fight against communism.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this is about as complete a voting record that is possible to compile. Not all will agree with each and every vote, but I have always voted for the things I believe are right and for what is in the best interest of the Nation and the people whom I represent.

Report on Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, with the session of Congress at a close, I have issued my final report to my constituents in South Dakota which contains my observations on the record compiled, particularly in this short session ending in September. My report follows:

THE WINDUP

As this session of Congress came to an end, several significant "partial" victories were achieved on bills sponsored by your Senator. Of course the success attained cannot compensate for the lack of action by this Democrat-controlled Congress in other major areas, such as agriculture, or the need for legislation to prevent Communists from obtaining passports and using them against our best interests.

SENATE APPROVAL

Three bills which I introduced passed the Senate. The Freedom Academy bill, in receiving Senate approval, marks a major stride forward. Recognition has now been given that new approaches are needed in the cold war to launch a positive program in the political and economic fields to counteract the Soviet conspiracy. Senate approval also was given to the Mundt-Scott bill dealing with obscene and pornographic literature, and my bill for a special commission to study problems of small towns and rural counties. While it is unfortunate House action was not taken, Senate approval places all of the bills in a much stronger position for the next Congress.

LAST-MINUTE ACTIONS

Before leaving for South Dakota, I conferred with Fish and Wildlife Service officials on the new aquarium at Gavins Point. Agreement was reached on accepting a bid for construction and assurance given that facility will be completed in time for centennial ceremonies in Yankton next year. An additional $100,000 for rehabilitation of forest areas recently burned in South Dakota and Nevada was obtained on recommendations which Senator ALAN BIBLE of Nevada and I made in the Senate Appropriations Committee. Our committee was meeting at the time fires were burning in the Black Hills. The new funds were added to $700,000, providing a sizable sum for rehabilitation work in national forest areas.

IT'S TIME FOR SCORECARDS

While various organizations "rating Congress" have not completed their voting charts, I can report some indication on studies already compiled. One scorecard gives me only a 13-percent record of voting "right." This one I take as a badge of honor and as truly reflecting South Dakota interests, for the 13-percent "right" votes came in the ADA scorecard, the ultraliberal Americans for Democratic Action. I'm surprised the ADA socializers didn't rate me zero. Programs in which ADA says I voted "wrong" are the usual centralized government proposals or wildcat spending gimmicks which would cause a terrific inflationary spurt, further lower the value of the dollar, and take away the system of State and local government so vital to our Republic.

"Free Citizens Voting Record," compiled by Civic Affairs Associates, has your Senator voting "right" 69 percent, the same score, incidentally, as that of Senator JOHN MCCLELLAN, my Labor Rackets Committee colleague. My "right" votes were for economy in government, limited government, and other essential principles enhancing economic and political freedom.

Americans for Constitutional Action, headed by Adm. Ben Moreell, retired, and the former Democrat Governor of New Jersey, Charles Edison, records me with a 73-percent score in voting for "safeguarding the God-given dignity of the individual, and promoting sound economic growth." My percentage—a South Dakota percentage, because it is your scorecard as well as mine—came on my votes against inflation, for economy, conservation, against Government interference, against Government ownership, for individual liberty, against coercion, and for a strong national security.

BACK HOME AGAIN

As this final newsletter of the year reaches you, the Mundts will be in South Dakota again. In closing this report, I want to thank the many, many folks who have written to me during this session of Congress. Your letters have been most helpful, and my hope is that I have been able to be of service to you. My thanks, also, to radio and television stations, wire services, and newspapers which found the newsletter of use to them from time to time.

THE 86TH DEMOCRAT CONGRESS FAILS THE FARMERS

With the "bobtailed" session of Congress finished, the record is written on the 86th Congress, a Congress controlled by a 2-to-1 majority of Democrats. What is the record for the American farmer? It can be summed up thusly:

"One of abysmal failure in dealing with the agriculture problem."

In the fresh bloom of the 1958 victory at the polls, Democrats promised the American farmer that at long last, something would be done to solve the problems which have plagued agriculture for generations.

The House Agriculture Committee opened its session in January 1959, with 23 Democrats sitting in complete control over a handful (12) of Republicans. In the U.S. Senate, the Committee on Agriculture had 11 Democrats in control, with the minority represented by 6 Republicans, of which I am fourth ranking.

The record, after 2 years, is a sorry one. The promises made in 1958 by the Democrat majority led to the election victory which achieved the 2-to-1 Democrat congressional control. The promises were repeated in 1959. And again, as the Congress returned in January 1960, we heard the same promises. Early in July, the Congress adjourned—but not without the promise that "action for the farmer is forthcoming in August."

We heard the national convention proceedings in Los Angeles. We heard the political platitudes reach a crescendo on a platform of glittering promises unmatched in American history. And we heard the candidates selected at Los Angeles again promise action in the August session of Congress—action to solve the farm problem.

But there was no action. The promises, growing bigger, remain unkept. The American farmer has looked to the U.S. Congress for 2 years to take constructive steps to alleviate the difficulties of a cost-price squeeze. The American farmer has looked in vain. He was told of major new plans contained in omnibus legislation. "Look to this legislation or that measure as the answer to your problems," the American farmer was advised. And he looked, carefully, but eagerly. He found only controversy within the House Agriculture Committee, when Democrats, completely in control of that committee, could not agree on a farm bill. The House Agriculture Committee Democrats killed the bill sponsored by their own compatriots.

When the majority in the Congress could not agree on an omnibus bill, they turned their attention to the most critical area, wheat. The Senate Agriculture Committee tangled over various measures, and finally agreed on a compromise which I offered. But the Democrat Senate rejected this proposal, substituting another which could not do the job. And the House added the final death blow to wheat legislation, with rejection of all wheat bills presented for a vote.

In another area, the Senate approved a bill for a crash research program for industrial uses of farm products, legislation identical to that which I have sponsored over the years. The House approved a watered-down, sadly ineffective version, and for more than a year, no agreement has been reached, to work out a compromise on this program which would open a vast area of new markets for American farm products and bring to the farmer a fair price for a full crop.

The President, recognizing deeply the problems confronting agriculture, was willing to accept a compromise with which he was not in full agreement but which he felt should be adopted if it expressed the will of the Congress. On two occasions he sent messages to Congress offering in advance to sign a wheat bill or a general farm bill if Congress would enact one designed to increase farm income, reduce surpluses, and meet the public interest. But the Congress again failed to meet even this test, and again failed the American farmer.

The 86th Democrat-controlled Congress has not been a proud one in the history of American agriculture. It has failed to meet its responsibility in developing constructive legislation, either for the whole farm plant, or for specific areas such as wheat. The American farmer has once again been made the victim of the whims and caprices of politicians who appear dedicated to the proposition that problem for political purposes is better than a solution to end the dilemma and bring American agriculture full force into our vibrant economy. The inaction by a Congress that has placed politics above national interest is a scar that unfortunately is borne by the farmer rather than the legislative body which could not forget the last election results but failed to foresee the next returns.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

The 86th Congress, 2d session's 2d session finally came to a halt, long overdue. In my view, this session was an object lesson in poor congressional leadership. Congressional work could have been programed for final adjournment well before the political conventions. Few, if any, feel that this last session accomplished much. To our credit, it may be claimed that we did not pass aid-to-education or minimum-wage legislation. The danger was ever present (and will be in the future) and should be understood by everyone looking to the next Congress. Some may say our finest compliment will not be over what we did, but what we did not do.

"Operation Veracity" is the title of the effort by Republican Members in 2 days of floor debate to expose 14 misstatements of fact in the Democratic platform. These categorical contradictions thoroughly discredit the Democratic platform without even getting into the controversial issues themselves, such as the party differences on the right-to-work law, oil depletion, tidelands ownership, and others. These misstatements and the two sides of these conflicting views I intend to present in Dallas further to inform the voters.

The second supplemental appropriation bill, 1961, was the final spending catchall, some 70 items totaling $162 million. Two record votes were taken on increasing foreign aid spending. An interesting spectacle developed. When it became apparent that the increase of $65 million for defense support was losing, the leadership on both sides urged Members to change their votes. Eight Members switched from nay to yea (amounting to 16 votes difference) and the appropriation passed 203 to 193. Some felt as I did that $65 million cannot be too important when you realize that the mutual security program already has $8,486 million to its credit for spending this year.

A resolution concerning a Congressional Commission To Commemorate the Constitution's 175th Anniversary later became better known as the vehicle for a housing bill. Unbeknownst to most Members, a $550 million housing expenditure was tacked on by the Senate and slipped quietly through the House under unanimous consent. This is questionable procedure at best. It does fit the pattern of the past when housing bills frequently have been delayed until the closing hours of Congress, precluding careful consideration. The bill extended FHA title I insurance authority for 1 year, added $500 million for college housing, and $50 million for community facilities. This keeps the Federal foot in the door for all three programs until the next session of Congress.

The Dallas Federal building again was rudely thrust into the limelight by a statement issued to the press by the Government Activities Subcommittee chairman, JACK BROOKS, of Texas (subcommittee of Government Operations Committee, chairman, WILLIAM DAWSON, of Illinois), on subcommittee stationery listing all members. I challenged this statement on the floor as improper procedure and unfair. It became apparent that (1) the statement was solely that of Mr. BROOKS, not the subcommittee, although the inference of committee action was plain; (2) hearings were not held; (3) congressional information (the GAO report on Dallas site acquisition) was withheld from Members of Congress; (4) Mr. BROOKS had not looked over the GAO report until a Republican colleague called it to his attention; (5) the GAO report specifically gave a clean bill of health to the Dallas site acquisition; (6) another committee, that on public works, was holding up reauthorization of the Dallas building because of the alleged continued study of the Government Operations Subcommittee (GAO report was received by them last April); (7) the reference to "peculiar moral and ethical overtones" related to Dallas businessmen was unwarranted in view of the April GAO report. This individual's personal attack on the integrity of Dallas business people under the guise of committee action could not go unchallenged, as I saw it. Neither can this charge be allowed to stand if the Dallas Federal building is to be built.

It is now up to Mr. BROOKS and his subcommittee to complete their work and "to put up or shut up." If he is wrong, the record must be corrected—apologies would also be in order. Right or wrong, I agree, indeed, insist, that it is proper for Congress to investigate. Private property—the right to own property—is a precious cornerstone of personal freedom and free enterprise. If there was improper activity in the acquisition of the Dallas Federal Building site, we should know about it. The power of government under eminent domain can be ruthless and destructive. It is incumbent on Congress to protect the citizens from unfair exercise of this power. However, in the zeal of investigation, no Member of Congress has the right to forgo the rules of procedure, nor damage character. Hearings on both sides of the question should be held, Government reports requested and studied, the committee views developed and finally presented to the House for action. Federal buildings should be built based solely on the openly arrived at study of need and merit—not by political deals outside the committees of Congress. On this, as Congressman, just like all Dallas people, I stand. Political decisions and deals should not be allowed to replace dedication to our elementary beliefs in right versus wrong. Fortunately, in most congressional matters, right and wrong generally are readily recognizable. It is so in this case. Congress should get on with this work as needed and right or shelve it for an equally understandable reason—that it is illegal, uneconomic in use of the taxpayers' money or other reason, clearly recognizable as wrong.

South Korean Government Attempts To Drain Our National Treasury Further by Ridiculous Demand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, under the privilege of inserting my own remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, granted all Members of the Congress following adjournment, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to an unusual situation.

Mr. Speaker, it has been my observation throughout a long and active life that friendships based on pecuniary considerations are never lasting friendships.

The press on Friday, August 31, 1960, brought the news that the South Korean Government is demanding a total of $4.1 billion which they claim is due them for ground rentals and building rentals during the period of occupation by American forces from 1950 to the present date.

The Korean officials must have had some encouragement from our military or State Department officials that would lead them to file such an outrageous and unreasonable bill.

I know of no way they could get any part of this settlement, arrived at without consent of the Congress, and I shall make it my business in the 87th Congress to uphold any further drain of our National Treasury by these economic bandits.

The 86th Congress and Marion County, Ind.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH W. BARR
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, when George Washington, Benjamin Franklin, and our Founding Fathers drew up the Constitution, they made an important decision about the Congress. They decided that it would be composed of two bodies—a Senate, whose Members were to represent the different States, and a House of Representatives to represent the people. Since that time the Senate has grown from 26 Members to 100 as new States have been added. The House has grown from 65 to 437 as new congressional districts were carved out of the States. But the responsibilities are about the same.

My responsibility runs clearly to the 700,000 people who live in Marion County, Ind.—the people who are trying to raise families, earn a living, and live a peaceful and purposeful life. I have been the voice of these 700,000 people in the affairs of the United States for the past 2 years as a Member of the 86th Congress.

We have all heard and read a lot about the Congress and world affairs, about the Congress and the Nation, about the Congress and the States. I have been directly involved in all these matters, but I also think it is vital that someone report on the 86th Congress and what it meant to the people in Marion County, Ind.

We are a great metropolitan area with special problems that need special attention. It is my job to see to it that our special problems are recognized and considered. If I do not, no one else will. That is the reason for this report.

WHAT IS MARION COUNTY?

Before anyone can represent this area, he must first know what it is and what its problems are. Just what is Marion County, Ind.? Statistically, it is a great manufacturing and commercial area. It

is one of the largest congressional districts. It is one of the 30 largest counties in the Nation. More people live within our borders than live in 11 different States. We earn about $2½ billion a year in manufacturing, commerce, and services. We pay about $400 million a year in Federal taxes. These are the bare bones of the statistics.

But there is a human side, too. There is a story of about 100,000 men and women making a living in our plants, producing aircraft engines, telephones, drugs, automobile parts, electrical equipment, and a wide variety of other products. There is a story of about 190,000 men and women earning a living in our stores, on construction, and as doctors, lawyers, dentists, and architects. There is a story of 150,000 school children on the one hand, and about 70,000 senior citizens over 65 on the other.

Put the statistics and the people together, mix in our churches, our libraries, our fraternal and social organizations, and some sort of a picture of this great area begins to emerge. This is the picture I keep trying to keep in focus. This is the picture I try to keep before me when I vote.

With this background let us take a look at the 86th Congress from seven different sides—peace and foreign policy, defense, Government finances, business, labor, agriculture, and social security—and see how its record worked out for Marion County, Ind.

PEACE AND FOREIGN POLICY

In Marion County our people share with everyone else in the country, and probably everyone else in the world, a deep yearning for peace. Those of us who were under fire in World War I, World War II, or Korea remember the horror of combat and the anguish of separated families. We all hope to spare our children this fate. But it possibly goes deeper than that. It probably boils down to a concern for the survival of the human race. The question that haunts me was asked by an Air Force general who said: "JOE, this Nation and the Soviet Union are developing almost completely reliable weapons. Just how reliable are you politicians?"

Probably the most significant move that the 86th Congress has made in this field has been through laws doubling the size of the World Bank and the creation of the Inter-American Bank. Maybe you are asking yourself: "What do these banks have to do with peace?" They have a great deal to do with it, and they mark a significant change in our policy. Through these institutions we are saying to 68 free nations of the world and 20 nations in Latin America, "Look, we will join with you, and all of us will put up our cash and our brains to attack the problems of poverty, disease, and ignorance wherever they may exist."

Foreign aid has become increasingly unpopular with the Congress because we realize that our country simply does not have the resources or the brains to solve the problems of the underdeveloped nations of Africa, Asia, and South America alone. Recent events in the world—especially in Cuba and Latin America—have cast serious doubts on the old approach. But recent events have also shown that cooperation will work and can head off Communist drives to exploit these underprivileged nations.

The Community Chest is working fine in Indianapolis and Marion County. Through the World Bank and the Inter-American Bank the 86th Congress just carried this idea on to our international problems of peace and foreign policy. History would indicate that if the world ends up with Russia and China on one side, the United States on the other, and the rest of the world in the middle, then there is little chance for peace or freedom. An explosion is inevitable. But if we bind the free nations to us through this Community Chest approach of sharing brains and cash to attack poverty and ignorance, then the world stands a chance for freedom and peace. We in Marion County stand to get a better return for the $20 million of our tax money that is being spent every year on foreign aid.

DEFENSE

While working for peace, we cannot be foolish enough to neglect our defenses. The Communists obviously respect strength. The question that the 86th Congress had to face was, "What sort of defense?" One wise old Senator told me, "Most generals and admirals are always preparing for the wrong kind of war. They are always getting ready for a war in which we strike the first blow. But this is impossible under our democratic government. We have never struck the first blow and probably never will."

Our task is clear. We must make sure that any enemy knows that we will retaliate with terrible force if attacked. Still, the Congress has to fight the Navy on carriers that we think are vulnerable, and to urge them to concentrate on retaliatory weapons such as antisubmarine warfare. We have to prod the Air Force to consider an airborne alert, and to develop missiles that can be moved on railway cars. Retaliation is our goal, and I think the record of the 86th Congress in that respect is good.

On other defense fronts, I am not too happy. Their accounting methods in the Department of Defense are so old-fashioned that they tell little or nothing to me. About 200 millions of Marion County tax dollars are involved in defense. You can see why I have yelled about accounting.

Probably the biggest gap is civil defense. First of all, I think that the name is wrong. This area is defense pure and simple. If Marion County is hit and our people cannot get back to producing engines, rocket casings, and communication equipment, then how can this Nation launch an effective and sustained retaliatory strike? Frankly our efforts seem poor in this area so vital to us in Marion County.

GOVERNMENT FINANCES

All of us are concerned about the Nation's debt and its spending. I was surprised to find that the House is usually very frugal with our money. In 29 out of 33 appropriation bills, we cut the amount the President requested. The total cuts ran to about $5 billion. I personally voted for about $6 billion less than the administration asked for in 1959 and again in 1960.

Finance is the field in which I am trained and which I know. I have worked harder on Government finances than any other field. I can pass on to the people in Marion County three bits of advice.

First. Do not look for sizable tax cuts until we can get some measure of peace in the world. The cold war has moved to Cuba within 97 miles of our borders.

Second. If we are going to cut the debt, we will have to run a large surplus in good years, because in bad years we will be lucky to end up with small deficits. The returns from the income tax fluctuate violently up and down.

Third. Keep yelling about saving. There is more pressure on the Congress to spend than to save.

BUSINESS

Marion County has one special business interest that should be protected. We sell millions of dollars worth of drugs, truck engines, truck bodies, and many other items in world trade. Some estimates show the total as high as $150 million a year and involving directly 10,000 jobs, and indirectly another 20,000 (for a total of 30,000 jobs).

We are hurt to some extent by imports of bicycle chains, plywood, and a few other products. But on balance a free world trade looks much the best for us.

On the import side we buy enormous amounts of oil, lead, tin, zinc, and copper. Tariff or quota laws keeping these prices high are not best for us.

Marion County is a world trading center. It is hard to realize, but it is true. What is more, we make money out of it. The record of the 86th Congress is not too good in this field. It has been more interested in protection than trade. I voted against protection, but I usually lost.

LABOR

In Marion County we have about 70,000 families where the husband or wife belongs to a labor organization. We have a vital stake in labor laws. The 86th Congress started out to write a law giving union members the right to run their unions through honest election procedures and to control their unions' money. The bill nearly ended up as a union-busting law. It seemed to me that Marion County had a history of decent and responsible labor-management relations. I believe that union members should have the right to run their own unions and that their conduct in our county does not call for any union busting. I voted accordingly.

It is still too early to know what effect this Labor-Management Act will have.

AGRICULTURE

Marion County could not be called a farming county, but our ties with agriculture are very close. We ultimately share the farmer's prosperity or depression. There is no single national program that has failed so miserably in recent years. In the last 8 years we have spent $26 billion on a program that has not kept the small farmer alive. Nearly 4 million people have left the farms.

The program has not supported farm income, which has dropped from $14 billion a year to $11 billion a year. The program has not disposed of farm surpluses. Our surplus holdings have jumped from $2 billion to $9 billion in storage. Our storage costs run at the rate of $1 million a day. And ironically, employees at the Department of Agriculture have increased 20,375 in the past 8 years. What a record.

How do we get out of this mess that soaks up $20 million a year from Marion County tax dollars? It would seem obvious to me that the first step is to get rid of that surplus. No approach will work with that fantastic surplus hanging over the market.

With two-thirds of the world starving, surely this surplus would be a wonderful asset in our attempts to rebuild the underdeveloped parts of the world. But the diplomats always have some objection that we will ruin the markets of our competitors. Frankly, I cannot understand this argument. How can you ruin a market where the people have no money and are starving? We have tried to sell part of this surplus for local currencies that are useless except in that country. This device is backfiring because if we are not careful we will end up owning half of the poor countries in the world. We have enough headaches without that.

Surely we can go back to the cooperative technique I mentioned earlier and join with other surplus nations to use this food for peace. I believe that we can do some good in the world by shipping food instead of firearms, butter instead of bombs. We would also save $350 million a year storage cost.

When we get rid of the surplus, then what do we do to keep a healthy farm economy? For the next decade we may be plagued with the ability to grow more than we can eat or sell. How do we get rid of it? There are all sorts of solutions floating around, but I am going to recommend an approach, not a solution.

Fifty years ago the United States had about the same problem with our monetary system. Surpluses or shortages of money were causing booms or busts that were slowing the orderly growth of the country. We tackled that problem by establishing a commission—the Aldrich Commission—which studied the problem for 3 years and then recommended a Federal Reserve System to give the United States "enough but not too much money." It is dangerous to draw too close an analogy between money and farming, but the procedure can still be recommended. I can say for certain that no orderly solution of the farm problem will emerge from a presidential election campaign.

SOCIAL SECURITY

There are about 70,000 people in Marion County who are 65 or over—10 percent of our population. By 1970 the percentage figure will jump to 15 percent, and the Census Bureau estimates that the total figure will rise to 130,000 senior citizens. Life for these people is not always easy in a great metropolitan area. When we lived on farms, there was always work to do for everyone, and aged relatives were a welcome and respected part of every household. This is not true today in our big city industrial areas. The original social security law was passed to meet this situation. It was passed to give these senior citizens and our society a chance to work out the problem of how to live with some dignity after 65. Today about 49,000 people in Marion County come under the law—about 70 percent of our 65-or-over population.

The 86th Congress made some technical amendments to the law. First, they changed the $1,200-a-year earning limitation to provide that anything earned between $1,200 and $1,500 would reduce benefits 50 cents for every dollar earned and over $1,500 each dollar earned would reduce benefits $1. This gives some incentive to earn more than $1,200 a year.

Second, we eliminated the 50-year age requirement for total disability payments. A person covered under the act can now receive benefits whenever he becomes completely disabled.

Third, we worked on the extremely controversial problem of medical care for the aged. One plan that was considered would have operated directly under the social security law. Anyone receiving benefits would have been entitled to hospitalization. The cost would have been met by raising the social security tax one-fourth of 1 percent.

Another plan called for subsidies to private insurance companies to enable them to shoulder heavier risks.

The third plan called for Federal-State cooperation to provide medical care for those elderly people who were hopelessly impoverished. This was the plan adopted. The United States will match State funds in this program. It is voluntary; any State may or may not join. All programs are administered by the State.

All these plans had their fierce supporters and opponents. The plan adopted was probably chosen because it involves no increase in the tax and will not damage the financial stability of the social security trust.

CONCLUSION

Marion County, Ind., is a highly significant part of the Nation and the world. According to the latest figures of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, we paid more Federal taxes than perhaps any other congressional district. It is certain that we paid more taxes than 14 different States.

We earn more money than many independent countries in the United Nations.

We do not and cannot live in a vacuum. No one can ignore the needs of the country and the world we live in. But this county is important enough to be well and forcefully represented. If we fail, it would be a serious blow to the United States and even to the free world.

Our strength is unquestionably an important part of the total strength of the United States. Surely Marion County, Ind., is entitled to careful and diligent representation.

Over the Speaker's chair in the House is an inscription—a quote from Daniel Webster—which reads:

> Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its powers, build up its institutions, promote all its great interests, and see whether we also in our day and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered.

As we adjourned I breathed a silent prayer that I had lived up to that challenge for Marion County, Ind., and for our beloved country.

The Highway Investigation—Massachusetts and Elsewhere

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the Special Subcommittee Investigating the Federal-Aid Highway Program has denounced on this floor the hit-and-run politics indulged in by certain minority members of this subcommittee. In particular, he rebuked the ranking minority member for having issued a press release in which he charged the subcommittee was ignoring a Massachusetts highway scandal that was the granddaddy of them all and that the subcommittee purposely was avoiding it like the bubonic plague. Everything the chairman said in repudiating this statement has my hearty concurrence. The tactics being employed by the minority members are of the disgusting type that serve only to bring congressional committee investigations into disrepute.

What we have here is a situation in which certain minority members, the Bureau of Public Roads, and the Republican National Committee obviously are all linked in a conspiracy to manufacture political fodder for the fall campaign. Great indeed must be their desperation when we find them showing such complete and ruthless disregard for common decency that the text of a letter addressed to the chairman by the Bureau of Public Roads appears in the public press in Boston prior to its delivery to the chairman's office.

It is significant also that black headlines in the same newspaper proclaim "Millions Involved—Land Appraisals Raised 300 Percent—High State Official Is Under Suspicion," when the letter itself contains absolutely no such statements and there is no indication of where such information originates. I fully expect that some minority members will see to it that all of the furor emblazoned in the Massachusetts newspapers will be reflected in due course in the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Republican Party's candidate for the Presidency of the United States has made the lofty pronouncement that he intends to follow the high road and there is the implication that the Democrats have chosen to travel along the

low road. The record is abundantly clear that certain minority members of this subcommittee propose to travel by subway, with their transportation underwritten by the Republican National Committee.

I do not want anything I say to be construed as indicating that there is nothing wrong in Massachusetts. Frankly, at the moment, I do not know. There may very well be a scandal in Massachusetts and the subcommittee, in due course, will attempt to determine the nature and the extent of any irregularities.

I want to state this for the record, that as long as I am a member of this subcommittee and have any voice in its operation, investigations will be conducted in an orderly and intelligent way and will not become instruments for political purposes. I think it not an unreasonable assumption that the minority members of the subcommittee may have entertained some hope that their fanatical and frenetic fulminations about Massachusetts would stampede majority members into abandoning investigations under way in other States which have occupied most of the time of the subcommittee's staff for the past couple of months. I cannot help but wonder if the attempt to divert the staff from the investigations now being pursued in these other States may be generated by a fear that some of the minority members may be embarrassed.

The political motivation insofar as Massachusetts is concerned is all too apparent. It is the home State of the Democratic candidate for President. The Republicans are also anxious to reelect a Republican U.S. Senator. The Republicans also would like very much to elect a Republican Governor. The Republican candidate for Governor is John A. Volpe who is a former U.S. Public Roads Commissioner and a close friend of many officials who are still in the Bureau of Public Roads.

The participation of the Bureau of Public Roads in the creation of the glaring headlines in the Massachusetts press is so wanton and flagrant as to suggest the advisability of an investigation by the Department of Justice to determine whether or not employees of the Bureau of Public Roads have engaged in political activity violative of the provisions of the Hatch Act.

The blatant irresponsibility so brazenly displayed by the minority members of the subcommittee must be answered. The minority members have had complete access to the facts concerning the progress of this investigation the same as I have. They have twisted and distorted factual information that appears in the official documents of the Bureau of Public Roads and it is for that reason that I set forth the real facts so that anyone so disposed may have the opportunity to judge what has happened with respect to the Massachusetts investigation.

The Bureau of Public Roads last December came into possession of information indicating that there may have been improper activities in relation to right-of-way acquisitions. The subcommittee staff learned about it from the Bureau of Public Roads in January. As I previously mentioned, the staff was busy with other matters at that time and has been ever since, but liaison was maintained with the Bureau of Public Roads right up through the month of May.

During that month the Bureau of Public Roads hired the firm of Beasley & Beasley here in Washington to go to Massachusetts and make appraisals of all the parcels involved in three different projects. There was an agreement between the Bureau of Public Roads and the subcommittee staff that our investigators would not go into Massachusetts until the Beasley firm had completed its work.

It was felt that the Beasley Co.'s work would be materially hampered if it were conducted in an atmosphere which is created by public knowledge of an investigation. Secondly, the results of the Beasley reappraisals work must be completed before there can be an intelligent comparison made with the appraisals that were conducted under the responsibility of the State.

On August 23, 1960, C. W. Enfield, General Counsel of the Bureau of Public Roads, sent a letter to Walter R. May, chief counsel of the subcommittee, in which he gave the following information:

> In response to the request of your office to furnish you with a proposed timetable of completion of review of certain appraisal practices in the State of Massachusetts, we have conferred with Beasley & Beasley relative to the probable dates of submission of their appraisal reports and have arrived at what appears to be the likely completion dates for this matter.
>
> Beasley & Beasley have furnished the Bureau of Public Roads their appraisal reports on all the parcels they are appraising in Wakefield, on one-third of the parcels in Attleboro, and all but a few of the parcels in Reading. They have advised that they will complete their appraisals on the remaining parcels in Attleboro by August 31, the parcels in Gardner by September 15, those remaining in Reading and other appraisals on a few special properties by October 1, 1960. Within a few days after receipt of these appraisals, Public Roads will complete its preliminary review to determine those parcels for which the appraisals submitted to the Department of Public Works of the State of Massachusetts appear to be unreasonably high.
>
> Beasley & Beasley further advised that they will furnish Public Roads with complete narrative reports pertaining to those parcels for which the State's appraisals appear to be unreasonably high, which narrative reports will list all pertinent data upon which the Beasley & Beasley appraisals are based. These narrative reports will be submitted within 30 days after determination of the parcels involved, unless the number of such reports is excessive in which event a longer period of time will be required. The analysis of the appraisals and narrative reports relative to those special parcels should be completed by the Project Examination Division of the Bureau of Public Roads within 2 weeks after receipt of the narrative reports.

According to my calculations, the completion of the analysis of the appraisals and narratives referred to in the foregoing letter cannot come about until sometime in November or possibly later. The subcommittee cannot be expected to proceed with a logical, intelligent investigation until there is a determination of what it is supposed to investigate. If there are wide variances in the comparison of the figures there must then be an investigation to ascertain why.

I am informed that Bureau of Public Roads officials and representatives directly in charge of these particular projects failed to review the appraisals during all of 1959. I am also given to understand that the Bureau of Public Roads regional office did not make any reviews in 1959. You can bet all the tea in China that I am going to have a deep and abiding interest in the question of where the Bureau of Public Roads was all that time if we do uncover evidence of irregularities in Massachusetts.

It seems rather surprising to me that the newspapers can predict the actions and assess the values involved when the Bureau of Public Roads right at this minute supposedly does not have such information and cannot have it until Beasley & Beasley completes the reappraisal work.

What I particularly resent is the making of public statements impugning the motives of the committee and, in general, seeking to destroy what should be a thoroughly nonpartisan investigation on behalf of the American taxpayers. I, for one, will not be a party to covering up anything, anywhere in the United States. I am all for an investigation in Massachusetts just as soon as the fundamental data is available to us, but I do not propose for one minute that any subcommittee of which I am a member will go racing into a State in a witch-hunting manner.

I quite agree with the chairman in his public statements that this subcommittee will not conduct public hearings until a complete and full investigation is made in any case that comes to its attention and until all the available facts have been ascertained.

Reducing the Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE BROCK
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, under the privilege granted me to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am submitting the following statement regarding appropriations.

During the 2 years of this Congress we have considered appropriation bills representing many billions of dollars of the taxpayers' money. Coming from the conservative State of Nebraska, it was necessary for me to evaluate these appropriation bills on the basis of their merit to my State and the needs of the Nation.

At various times it became necessary for me to cast a negative vote in instances where, in my judgment, the requested appropriations were not in the best interests of the taxpayers of Nebraska and the rest of the Nation.

Accordingly, my votes on amendments and final passage of various appropriation bills during the past 2 years have accounted for reductions of over $12 billion less than the amounts that were requested in the President's original budgets.

An analysis of the RECORD for the first session of 1959 indicates my voting to the extent of reducing the President's budget requests by almost $6 billion, for approximately 7.2 percent of the total budget.

In the final 2d session of the 86th Congress, this reduced figure amounted to over $6 billion, a total of approximately 8.6 percent below the requested appropriations by the executive departments.

Following is a compilation of my votes on appropriation bills for fiscal years 1960–61:

	President's budget request	BROCK votes to reduce
Fiscal year 1960 (1st sess., 86th Cong.)	$77,200,000,000	[1] $5,659,000,000
Fiscal year 1961 (2d sess., 86th Cong.):		
Includes following reductions:		
Department of Commerce	799,615,000	−39,092,765
Department of Interior	550,330,300	−6,954,700
Treasury-Post Office-Tax Court	4,897,853,000	−102,439,000
Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare	4,000,083,981	+183,938,750
Executive offices	14,202,500	−515,000
Supplemental appropriation	134,822,200	−85,106,500
State-Judiciary	713,803,755	−37,249,049
Independent offices	8,416,897,000	−270,729,680
Department of Defense	39,335,000,000	+2,867,000
Department of Agriculture	4,135,263,190	−197,319,690
Military construction	1,188,000,000	−311,855,000
Legislative (Library of Congress and GPO)	104,072,020	−3,754,360
Public works	4,001,016,180	−86,217,195
Mutual security	4,181,704,000	−3,589,750,000
Special items:		
Acquisition of Hubbell Trading Post site, Arizona	300,000	−300,000
Pan American health site, District of Columbia	874,000	−874,000
School construction (3-year program)	975,000,000	−975,000,000
Federal postal pay raise	607,500,000	+102,500,000
U.S. Citizens Commission on NATO	300,000	−300,000
2d supplemental appropriation bill, 1961	118,185,031	−27,597,031
Latin America foreign aid	600,000,000	−600,000,000
District of Columbia	5,281,000	−5,281,000
Total	75,698,701,550	[2] −6,821,922,108

[1] Reduction 7.2 percent.

[2] Reduction 8.6 percent.

Statement by Senator Harry F. Byrd, Democrat, of Virginia, Relative to Tax Foundation's Review of Budgetary Actions in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement by me relative to the Tax Foundation review of budgetary actions in Congress.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

When the President submitted his 1961 budget in January he requested new spending authority totaling $79.4 billion. I am advised that new spending authority finally enacted through the end of this session of Congress totaled $80.7 billion, an increase of $1.3 billion as compared with the January requests.

These figures are revealed in a review by Tax Foundation, Inc.

The review strictly follows budget presentations and it covers spending authority—appropriations, authority to spend from debt receipts, etc.—enacted through this session of Congress to become available in fiscal year 1961.

It must be kept in mind that these are not expenditure estimates for fiscal year 1961. Expenditures in the current fiscal year will be made not only from these new spending authorizations but also from the unexpended balances remaining in other spending authority enacted in prior years. By the same token, some expenditures from the new 1961 authority will not be made until later years.

The Tax Foundation figures also reflects the failure of Congress to enact postal rate increases. The President's January requests contemplated $554 million in additional postal revenue from proposed increases in these rates to eliminate the estimated postal deficit. Appropriations to the Post Office Department allow for meeting the postal deficit in an indefinite amount.

The Tax Foundation is an independent research organization which I regard as the best in the field of government at all levels.

As a matter of routine, the Tax Foundation for years has been keeping a running box score on bills authorizing expenditures during their passage through the legislative procedure. This review shows final action by Congress on spending legislation during the session just ended.

The Tax Foundation's review follows:

TAX FOUNDATION TABULATION SHOWING FINAL ACTION ON NEW SPENDING (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1961 BY THE 86TH CONGRESS, 2D SESSION

The budgetary record of the 2d session of the 86th Congress offers hope of a moderate surplus in the fiscal 1961 Federal budget. Depending upon certain economic and other factors, the surplus may be somewhat less than the January estimate of $4.2 billion. Last-minute approval of backdoor financing items in a stopgap housing measure may have little effect upon actual fiscal 1961 expenditures. Despite increases over budget requests, the session was noteworthy for successful resistance to strongly backed big spending proposals.

Spending authority increase: An unofficial tabulation conforming to Budget Bureau accounting practices shows an increase of $1,406 million in new obligational authority for fiscal 1961 over amended budget requests ($1,274 million over the original January estimate). The total does not include upwards of $1 billion for unbudgeted programs (including the pay increase and medical care) for which supplemental funds probably must be provided in the next session.

Appropriation bills: Appropriations providing new obligational authority exceed amended budget requests by $539 million and original estimates by $576 million. Authority in appropriation bills to borrow from the Treasury is greater by $50 million than amended budget requests but less by $120 million than original proposals. The latter decrease is due to the unwillingness of Congress to shift from backdoor financing in two programs.

Backdoor financing: Unbudgeted spending authorizations bypassing the appropriation process in legislative bills were held sharply in check throughout the session. A total of only $818 million applicable to fiscal 1961 was enacted into law, including $550 million in the stopgap housing measure.

Tentative totals: Totals in the unofficial tabulation are subject to revision in official figures in the midyear review of the Budget Bureau. A tentative grand total of $80,689 million in new obligational authority is expected to be reduced by nearly $500 million (with accompanying reductions in budget requests and expenditure estimates) by omission of a temporary advance to the highway trust fund and a shifting of programs financed by the Federal Unemployment Tax Act to the unemployment trust fund under a provision of the Social Security Amendments of 1960. New estimates for indefinite appropriations for interest on the debt and the postal deficit also may show differences.

Fiscal 1961 surplus: An increase in the January estimate of $79.8 billion in fiscal 1961 expenditures is forecast by action on new spending authority, but offsets may be provided by reductions in farm price support and other programs. Revenues may fall short of estimates, but a surplus seems assured.

Nature of tabulation: The tabulation which follows provides a comparison of new spending authority with both amended budget requests and the original January estimates.

The grouping is designed to show the area of spending authority within the jurisdiction of the Appropriations Committee, as distinguished from backdoor financing under control of legislative committees. A grouping under appropriation bills includes appropriations and reappropriations from the general fund of the Treasury, authority in appropriation bills to borrow from the Treasury (or in technical terms "to expend from public debt receipts"), and a separate January budget item of borrowing authority in appropriation bills marking an unsuccessful effort of the administration to shift from backdoor financing in replenishment of mortgage purchase and public facility loan funds.

Inasmuch as the tabulation covers only budget estimates and final spending authority, it fails to show the extent to which backdoor financing figured in uncompleted actions by committees and by the House and Senate.

The totals for permanent authorizations are necessarily based on estimates in the January budget, the latest available until revisions are provided in the Budget Bureau's midyear review.

The fact that appropriation totals in the tabulation are considerably lower than those issued by congressional committees is accounted for by exclusion of (1) an estimated $3,450 million in appropriations from postal receipts, and (2) $417.5 million for liquidation of prior contract authority. The latter includes amounts for grants in the urban renewal program, airports, airmail subsidies,

public domain highways, and minor construction items. The appropriation totals in the tabulation, in accordance with Budget Bureau practice, are limited to those which authorize new obligations from the Treasury. Actual postal costs from the Treasury are included.

Upward trend in spending authorizations: The tentative total of $80.7 billion in new obligational authority for fiscal 1961 is larger than in any other year since the Korean war, except fiscal 1959, which reflected antidepression expenditures. Supplemental appropriations in the new session may boost the fiscal 1961 total up to or above the fiscal 1959 total of $81.4 billion.

Each year since fiscal 1955, when new obligational authority totaled $57.1 billion, final totals have exceeded original estimates. An increase over the previous year occurred each year for 4 successive years.

In the 16 appropriation bills enacted for fiscal 1961, there were net increases over amended budget estimates in 5 bills aggregating $1,689 million and net decreases in 11 bills aggregating $1,111 million, a total net increase of $578 million, which becomes $588 million, when funds for liquidation of prior contract authority are eliminated.

During the progress of the appropriation bills, the House made reductions from budget estimates, including borrowing authority within these bills, amounting to $975.5 million. The Senate increased the total over the House by a little more than $3 billion. The compromises in conference brought the final total down to the $588 million over amended requests.

Fiscal 1961 data comparable to original and amended budget requests

[In millions]

	Original January budget	Amended budget estimates	Total spending authority	Plus or minus January budget	Plus or minus amended budget
Current authorizations:					
Appropriation bills:					
Appropriations [1]	$68,237	$68,274	$68,813	+$576	+$539
Authority in appropriation bills to borrow from Treasury	368	368	418	+50	+50
Budgeted shifts from backdoor approval of borrowing	170	----------	----------	−170	----------
New obligational authority under control of Appropriations Committees	68,775	68,642	69,231	+456	+588
Backdoor financing:					
Contract authority (public domain highways)	----------	----------	118	+118	+118
Borrowing authority (loans for veterans' and college housing and public facilities)	----------	----------	700	+700	+700
New obligational authority under control of legislative committees	----------	----------	818	+818	+818
Total current authorizations	68,775	68,642	70,049	+1,274	+1,406
Permanent authorizations (as estimated in January):					
Appropriations (including interest on the debt)	10,196	10,196	10,196	----------	----------
Contract authority (airport grants, airmail subsidies and urban renewal)	437	437	437	----------	----------
Borrowing authority	8	8	8	----------	----------
Total permanent authorizations	10,641	10,641	10,641	----------	----------
Total new obligational authority	79,415	79,283	80,689	+1,274	+1,406

[1] Appropriation totals follow Budget Bureau practice of exclusion of those from postal receipts ($3,450,000,000) and for liquidation of prior contract authority ($417,500,000), neither of which provides new authority to obligate from the Treasury. Failure of Congress to approve budgeted increases in postal rates to yield $554,000,000 is reflected in an estimated $508,500,000 indefinite appropriation for the deficit (after reduction of $45,500,000 in authorized obligations), which is in addition to a specific appropriation of $49,000,000 for public service costs. Details in table may not always add because of rounding.

Safeguard Colorado River Water Supply

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. D. S. SAUND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. SAUND. Mr. Speaker, in May of this year, the special master appointed by the Supreme Court of the United States in the Arizona against California water suit issued his recommendations. They produced consternation among the people of southern California, dependent on a water supply from the Colorado River.

In view of the fact that the special master, the Honorable Simon H. Rifkind, will allocate more than 4 million acre-feet of Colorado River water to the State of Arizona with a population of about 1 million people as against 3.5 million acre-feet to 7 million people in southern California, it is fitting for us to study the history surrounding the claims, appropriations, and settlements for the Colorado River water supply.

The need for a dam in the Colorado River for flood control and to regulate the supply of water in the lower Colorado River Basin was first emphatically voiced by President Theodore Roosevelt in 1907. Claims had been filed for Colorado River water by Palo Verde and Imperial Valleys in southern California before the close of the 19th century. The first water was diverted for agricultural purposes in Imperial Valley and Mexico in 1901. The Imperial Valley, situated 200 feet below sea level, was always in danger of floods during the river's heavy flow periods and short of water during the summer months when the river was low.

But there was powerful opposition to the building of such a dam from three sources: the State of Arizona, the opponents of public power development, and American owners of land in Mexico. Water was being appropriated in the lower regions of the river, and the upper basin States feared that, if a storage dam was constructed, faster development in California and Arizona would take the river water before development could begin in the upper basin.

Mr. Speaker, to resolve those fears and to find a basis for equitable distribution of the water supply in the river it was found necessary to form a compact between the different States. After several attempts, representatives of the seven Colorado River Basin States—Colorado, Wyoming, New Mexico, Arizona, Utah, Nevada, and California—reached an agreement to hold a conference between the representatives of the seven States and the Federal Government. The conference started early in 1922 and continued until November of that year. It was presided over by former President Herbert Hoover, then Secretary of Commerce.

After nearly 30 meetings in Washington and other parts of the country, as well as personal inspections and thorough study of reports of various commissions, agreement was reached and the Colorado River compact was signed in Santa Fe, N. Mex., on November 24, 1922. The compact divided the available supply of water in the Colorado River equally between the upper and lower basins. Lee Ferry was established as the point of division between the two basins. The compact was ratified by all of the basin States except Arizona. Failure of Arizona to ratify the compact has been the cause of litigation in the Federal courts, including the U.S. Supreme Court, for nearly 30 years.

Legislation was introduced in Congress by Congressman Ralph Swing and Senator Hiram Johnson, both of California. Finally, after long delays and filibusters, the fourth Swing-Johnson bill, authorizing the construction of Hoover Dam at the Black Canyon-Boulder Canyon site, was passed by the Congress on December 21, 1928.

The Boulder Canyon Project Act provided for the authorization of $260 million in Federal funds for the construction of the dam. This sum would be reimbursed, with interest, from sale of electric power to be produced at the dam. It was stated in the law that the act would not become effective until the seven basin States had ratified the compact, or lacking that, at least six States, including California, ratified the act and California passed a limitation act, whereby it agreed to limit its claim to Colorado River water to 4.4 million acre-feet a year. Further, no work was to begin on the dam until the Secretary of Interior had received firm contracts for the sale of power sufficient to pay the entire cost of the dam, with interest, within 50 years. The Colorado River compact was an integral part of the Boulder Canyon Project Act. Water contracts hereafter made by the Secretary of Interior for water stored behind Hoover Dam were to be governed by provisions of the Colorado River compact.

President Hoover declared the Boulder Canyon Project Act effective on June 28, 1929, after all the States except Arizona had ratified the compact and California had passed its limitation act.

Twenty-five million dollars of the cost of Hoover Dam construction was apportioned to flood control, which was to be paid out of the excess revenues from sale

of power. This was a unique provision because in all reclamation projects, the flood control portion is nonreimbursable and borne completely by the Federal Government.

After the contracts for the purchase of power at the dam were completed between the Secretary of the Interior, the city of Los Angeles, the Metropolitan Water District, and the Edison Co., the construction bids were opened.

Mr. Speaker, there is another feature of this project that should receive careful attention. The State of Arizona demanded remuneration from the sale of power at the dam, claiming that because the power was to be developed under Federal control, it would be deprived of tax revenues. In order to satisfy this demand it was provided that the people of southern California not only underwrite the entire cost of the dam but, in addition, agree to pay excess price of power over and above the need to make payments of construction costs. California has been paying $300,000 a year each to the States of Arizona and Nevada and $500,000 a year for development of the upper basin States. The States of Arizona and Nevada did not have to guarantee anything, and in addition, reserved the right to demand 18 percent of the firm power production at rates equal to those charged to southern California.

The irony of the situation, brought out forcefully by the special master's recommendations, is that the State of Arizona fought against the Boulder Canyon Project Act, and it refused to ratify the Colorado River compact. And yet now it will be guaranteed 2.8 million acre-feet of water a year stored in Lake Mead. The State of California, which guaranteed and paid the entire cost of the dam, will receive only 200,000 acre-feet more than it was receiving from the Colorado River before the dam was constructed. People of the State of California have spent nearly a billion dollars to develop their projects. This includes $500 million for the Colorado River aqueduct constructed by the Metropolitan Water District with its own money, raised by the sale of bonds.

Mr. Speaker, if the special master's report is accepted by the U.S. Supreme Court, the Colorado River aqueduct, which supplies water to the Los Angeles metropolitan area and adjoining cities, the city of San Diego and municipalities in my own congressional district, will become completely dry after the State of Arizona and the upper basin States begin using their full share of water of the Colorado River granted in the special master's recommended decree. This can occur within 10 years.

Today fear hangs over the heads of millions of people in southern California who, placing reliance upon Federal statutes and contracts with the Secretary of the Interior, have built their economies and constructed their lives upon the assurance of receiving their share of the Colorado River water.

Within 2 years, the Glen Canyon Dam will be closed and storage of water in the upper basin will begin. Projects are already authorized and under construction which will store 35 million acre-feet of water. The Secretary of the Interior has issued preliminary criteria for the allocation of water during the filling period behind the dams of the upper basin. The criteria mildly assures that the users of water in the lower basin will receive their present supplies during the filling period. People in southern California, particularly my own district, want assurance that their rights for domestic and agricultural needs will be guaranteed during the filling period, and that there shall be no water stored for power at the expense of agricultural and domestic users in the lower basin.

Already the people of my district have been threatened by our neighbors in the metropolitan areas of our own southern California. A proposal has been made by Congressman CRAIG HOSMER, of Long Beach, for a California, Arizona, and Nevada interstate compact to control all existing and future water power development on the Colorado River. Key point of this proposal would be the elimination of existing priorities on use of Colorado River water for irrigation purposes.

Mr. Speaker, after adjournment of Congress, I propose to meet with my constituents and leaders of water companies and water districts to bring to their attention the danger that they face if their rights are not recognized and officially guaranteed by law before the filling period starts 2 years from now.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, we do not accept and in no way agree with recommendations of the special master. We have filed our comments, suggestions, and motions before the special master and we propose to carry our pleas before the Supreme Court of the United States.

Congressman Lester Holtzman Reports to the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, now that the 86th Congress has drawn to a close, I would like once more to bring my neighbors and constituents up to date on my activities as their Representative in the Congress of the United States. Due to limitations of time and space, this report must touch only on the highlights.

Believing that an alert, well-informed, and politically active electorate is the surest safeguard of democracy, I earnestly solicit the detailed views and reactions, as well as questions of the citizens of my district. I hope they will get in touch with me at room 107, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C., so that I may be in the position best to reflect their attitudes and serve their needs as their elected Representative.

INTERNATIONAL SCENE

A series of stunning diplomatic defeats makes total reevaluation of our foreign policy imperative. The launching of sputnik; the rapid growth of industrialization and productivity of the Soviet and the Red Chinese, together with their evergrowing military power; the collapse of the summit; the fiasco in Japan; and the extremely serious situation in Cuba; all point up vividly the transcending need for a positive, well-defined, and imaginative approach in our foreign relations. We must strengthen our ties with our allies and the uncommitted nations, including the new nations of Asia and Africa, and our Latin American neighbors. I am happy to report that just prior to adjournment the Congress passed legislation to provide assistance in the development of Latin America and in the reconstruction of Chile.

A big business administration, with its eyes firmly fixed on budgets and costs, has sometimes accepted less than the best in military power, space research, and economic assistance to the free world. In addition, an indecisive and vacillating leadership has substantially weakened its appeal to the minds of men everywhere by reacting piecemeal to the moves of our opponents, instead of moving forward with an independent program of its own.

I have consistently supported our defense appropriations and have opposed crippling cuts in our mutual security program, which is so vital to our alliances throughout the world. I shall continue to do so, for I believe that the Communist leaders will negotiate honorable solutions with us only when and if they are convinced that we are in fact the strongest nation in the world.

ISRAEL AND THE WEST

The continued belligerence and lawlessness of Dictator Nasser in the Middle East has posed another international crisis which the present administration has badly fumbled. It has granted repeated loans and other assistance to the United Arab Republic in the face of Nasser's persistent denial of passage through the Suez Canal to Israeli shipping in defiance of a United Nations resolution. Israel is a vital bulwark of the democratic way of life. Its political integrity must be defended. In the House I vigorously supported a resolution recently adopted by Congress authorizing the President to deny mutual security aid to any nation that engages in boycotts or blockades barring unrestricted passage through the Suez Canal. I deeply regret that the President has not seen fit to use this power.

CIVIL RIGHTS

At home a vital issue continues to be the protection and extension of the civil rights of every American, without regard to the circumstances of his birth. I served as a member of the subcommittee of the House Committee on the Judiciary which originated the Civil Rights Acts of 1957 and 1960, and I fought for their enactment. These laws are important initial steps, but much remains to be done. The disgraceful lynching of Mack Charles Parker in Mississippi, and the failure or inability of law enforcement officials to prosecute the perpetrators highlight the need for a strong anti-lynching measure such as is contained

in my bill, H.R. 3965. Further, we must safeguard for every American not only his right to vote, but also his right to study, to travel, to be housed, to be employed—in short, to live with dignity in full freedom and equality.

TAXES, SOCIAL SECURITY, MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED

Our present system of taxation unfairly burdens many of our low and middle income families. To correct this inequity and at the same time stimulate our economy, I have sponsored three measures: H.R. 4710 to increase the present $600 personal exemption to $1,000; H.R. 4711 to exempt all retirement annuities and pensions up to $2,500; H.R. 4712 to permit parents to deduct the cost of care for dependent children while the parents are at work.

Similarly, our social security program needs to be brought up to date. My bill, H.R. 3652, would remove the $1,200 limitation on outside earnings, reduce the eligibility age for receipt of benefits from 65 to 60 years for men, and from 62 to 55 years for women, and further provide for payment of benefits to those permanently and totally disabled, without the present limitation to persons 50 years of age. I am happy to report that this last provision was included in the bill just passed by the Congress.

I regard it as equally essential that provision be made under the social security program for adequate medical care for the aged. For that reason, I have joined with many of my colleagues in supporting the principle of the Forand bill, which provides prepayment for medical expenses for persons over 65 years of age under the social security system. This is not only the dignified approach, but the most practical way to cope with this ever-increasing problem of our elder citizens.

SALARIES AND WAGES

Despite glowing slogans by Madison Avenue about our great prosperity there are still large groups of wage earners—white-collar workers, retail-store employees, and retired folks—who cannot make ends meet.

My bill, H.R. 6103, calls for an increase in the minimum wage to $1.25 per hour, and extends coverage to many unprotected wage earners. Unfortunately minimum wage legislation to provide such an increase and the added coverage died in conference.

H.R. 5905, H.R. 3014, and H.R. 7271, which I have also introduced, liberalize the provisions of the Civil Service Retirement Act by granting retirement after 30 years' service; by increasing the multiplication factor from 2 to 2½ percent for hazardous employment; by reducing the possibility of loss of annuities by disability retirees if they have temporary periods of high earned income, and by protecting restoration of annuities if the disability recurs later or if earning capacity diminishes.

Finally, my bill, H.R. 10538, provided for an increase in the salaries of our dedicated postal workers and civil service employees, all of whom have been hurt badly by the spiral of inflation. Happily, legislation in this vein was enacted by the Congress over a veto by the President.

SMALL BUSINESS AND MONOPOLY

As a member of the Antitrust Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, I have worked in Congress to prevent monopolies, strengthen the antitrust laws, and protect small business against predatory and unfair methods of competition. Due in large measure to the efforts of the Antitrust Subcommittee the Congress in recent years has enacted legislation to prevent monopolistic corporate mergers; increase tenfold the maximum penalties for antitrust violations; provide important safeguards against monopolistic bank mergers; protect small business by preventing monopolistic practices by meatpackers and retail chains engaged in meat packing; and protect small business against the unfair pricing policies of large chains, by strengthening the enforcement provisions of the law against price discrimination.

Further, as a result of investigations by this subcommittee, long-distance telephone rates were cut $50 million last September, with additional reductions still to come—all of which will inure to the benefit of the consumers of our country.

SCHOOLS AND TEACHERS

Every parent who reads this report is well aware of the critical shortage of classrooms and other school facilities. We simply cannot afford to be ostrich-like in our approach to this problem but must meet it head on with adequate funds and a long-range program. Likewise, it would be pennywise and pound foolish to forget our teachers, too many of whom cannot cope with their financial problems without additional and secondary employment.

OTHER ISSUES

In addition to the foregoing, a Congressman frequently has the obligation to speak out even where legislation may not be indicated. And so, during the 86th Congress I called on the attorney general of the State of New York to investigate the merger of two banking giants for a possible violation of the New York State antitrust laws; I protested vigorously when a private club barred the distinguished Ralph Bunche and his son from membership; I spoke out in concern over the unfair sentence imposed on Bishop Walsh by the Red Chinese; I expressed my horror at renewed outbreaks of anti-Semitism, so reminiscent of Hitler's Germany; and I voiced strenuous objections to the granting of a permit to the American Nazi Party for a meeting in the city of New York.

BACK HOME

Since I am fortunate enough to live within commuting distance of Washington, I have been able to return home on weekends and take an active part in my community. My membership in civic and other local clubs has made it possible for me to meet and talk with many of my constituents. When local problems have arisen, whether related to traffic regulations, police and fire protection, school construction, or juvenile delinquency, I have welcomed the opportunity to cooperate with leaders in my community toward their satisfactory solution.

Mr. Speaker, my greatest pleasure and privilege during the last 8 years has been the opportunity to meet with so many of my neighbors, to profit from their ideas and recommendations, and to try to serve their personal and civic needs. Their sincere interest in my efforts as their Congressman, and their friendship will always remain my most lasting compensation.

The Minimum Wage Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the failure of House and Senate conferees to agree upon a satisfactory minimum wage bill has caused a temporary setback to present efforts to raise the minimum wage to $1.25 an hour and broaden coverage under the Fair Labor Standards Act to include several million additional low-wage employees. I am confident, however, that this setback will be of short duration. I feel sure that the new Congress that will be elected in November, aided by strong Executive leadership which the election of Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY as President of the United States will provide, will speedily formulate and pass a minimum wage bill that will do an even better job of assuring economic justice for all American wage earners than would either of the minimum wage bills passed by the House or Senate this year.

The fact that Congress has been unable to pass a minimum wage bill this year provides an opportunity for the people to pass judgment in the November election on those responsible for this outcome. Minimum wage legislation will assuredly be a most important issue in the forthcoming presidential and congressional campaigns. For this reason, and since I was a member of the conference committee representing the House, I should like to define the issue, as I see it, and describe what went on in our deliberations so that my colleagues and the American people may fairly judge where the responsibility for our failure lies and the people may cast their votes accordingly.

As I believe my colleagues are aware, statements were made before and during the conference committee sessions that the House conferees would not yield to the Senate and that the Senate conferees would either have to accept the House bill or be reconciled to having no bill at all. I think this was a pretty fair and accurate statement of the problem with which the conferees had to deal. It is important, however, to inquire who made these statements and why the adoption of this position by the party who made them made inevitable the

failure of the conferees to agree upon a satisfactory minimum wage bill.

The statements to which I have reference were not made by any of the conferees representing the majority party on the conference committee. As we all know, the statement was made, and often repeated during our deliberations, by one of the conferees from the minority party representing the House. Nor were these statements merely a prediction of what the conferees might be expected to do. They constituted a deliberate policy assertion without whose adoption by the three conferees representing the minority party from the House the truth of this prediction could not have been realized.

The willingness of the Senate conferees to work out and agree upon any reasonable compromises of the differences between the House and Senate bills has been described in detail in discussions which took place on the Senate floor the day before adjournment. There is no need for me to repeat that discussion here. I only want to add that all that has been said about the desires and the efforts of the conferees representing the majority party in the Senate, led by the conference chairman, Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY, were fully shared and supported by Congressman JOHN H. DENT and myself. With the honorable exception of Senator WINSTON L. PROUTY, who made constant efforts to bring about a conference agreement, however, the Senate conferees representing the minority loyally supported the position of those conferees representing the House. The responsibility for the "House bill or nothing" policy lies squarely at the door of the Republican members of the conference committee.

Why was it, however, that agreement on the House bill was not possible in conference? The answer to this lies in the fact that, as I told my colleagues at the time we debated the Kitchin-Ayres substitute for my bill, the House bill made only token improvements in the coverage of the Fair Labor Standards Act. Whereas the Senate bill provided for a minimum wage of $1.25 an hour for employees presently covered by the Fair Labor Standards Act, the House bill provided for a minimum wage of only $1.15 an hour. Whereas the Senate bill provided coverage for an additional 4,100,000 retail, service, laundry, telephone, and other employees, the House bill provided coverage for only an additional 1,400,000 employees limited to retail chains, doing business in two or more States and having at least—not several—but at least five stores.

Whereas the Senate bill provided for a maximum workweek of 44 hours for newly covered employees during the second year after the date of enactment; 42 hours the third year, and 40 hours thereafter; the House bill provided no overtime protection for newly covered employees.

Some may say that even though the House bill was inadequate, it was better than no bill at all and that the conference committee should have accepted the House bill on the basis that it is more important to do something than nothing at all for our low-paid wage earners. This argument, in my judgment, is completely without foundation. If the Congress had approved the House bill, the coverage of the act would have been frozen at the meager level provided for in the House bill for many years. Rejection of the House bill by the Senate conferees now gives us the opportunity and the duty, at the beginning of the next session of Congress, to begin again. As a result of what has been learned during the course of the discussion of this legislation in the legislative committees, during floor debate in the House and in the Senate, and in the conference committee, I am confident that we will be able to develop next year a new bill that will provide even more substantial new coverage and a minimum wage of at least $1.25 an hour for employees at the low end of the economic ladder who urgently need this protection.

Passage of satisfactory fair labor standards legislation will be a matter of first importance in the next session of the Congress. Aided by strong executive leadership which I am sure the people will guarantee in this fall's national election, we will be able to accomplish much more than the miserable performance to which Congress and the people have been subjected during this recent session of the Congress.

Congressman Griffin Reports on Student Loan Program and Landrum-Griffin Reform Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, when a bill actually becomes a law, the author of the legislation and those most responsible for its enactment are on the spot. With an anxious eye, they watch and hope that the new law will really operate in the manner intended. As helpless observers, they can only stand and wait while the law is being administered by another branch of the Government—the executive.

Promises and claims made as to thousands of bills which never become law are soon forgotten (20,164 bills were introduced in this 86th Congress; only 1,130 became law). But the bills that survive the rigors of the legislative process must stand in a lonely light to be judged.

During my 4 years of service in the House, I have had the rare privilege to cosponsor, and play a leading role in the enactment of two bills of great national importance which have become legislative landmarks. I refer to the student loan program, which is part of the National Defense Education Act of 1958; and to the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 (Landrum-Griffin Act).

Mr. Speaker, as this 86th Congress prepares to adjourn, it will be of interest to the Members of the House, I believe, to have a report on the administration and operation of those two significant legislative programs.

I. STUDENT LOAN PROGRAM

When Congress passed the National Defense Education Act late in the 1958 session, I doubt if there were many who envisaged the tremendous impact that would be felt throughout the Nation's colleges and universities as a result of one portion of the act entitled: "Loans to Students in Institutions of Higher Education."

Although the story of the 1959 labor reform bill is well known, few people are familiar with some of the circumstances and events which led up to adoption in the House of the student loan program.

When administration recommendations were first made to Congress early in 1958 for legislation in the field of education to bolster our national defense capability, no reference was made to student loans, although a limited scholarship program was proposed to encourage talented high school graduates to continue their education.

The more I studied the proposed national defense education bill, as a member of the House Education and Labor Committee, the more I became convinced that a student loan program should be substituted for the limited scholarship (grant) proposal.

Relatively few students could have benefited under the scholarship program as proposed. Moreover, some danger existed that politics could creep into the selection of the chosen few.

On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, I was convinced that a great many more talented students would be willing to invest in an education if they could just borrow part of the needed funds from a revolving fund at low interest rates and have the opportunity to repay it over a long period after graduation. It was ridiculous—but true—that high school graduates could finance the purchase of expensive automobiles on easy credit terms—but few loans were available for ambitious but needy students who wanted a college education.

Fortunately, some of my colleagues on the Education and Labor Committee agreed with my views concerning the need for a loan program. They included Representatives Elliott, of Alabama; Frelinghuysen, of New Jersey; Wainwright, of New York; and Haskell, of Delaware.

In May 1958, at our request, the Office of Education of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare called into conference a number of outstanding administrators in the field of education who had experience with student loan funds. This conference and several that followed proved very fruitful.

Later, in June 1958, several of us huddled with Dr. James R. Killian, the head of Massachusetts Institute of Technology who was then the President's Special Adviser on Science and Technology. Dr. Killian enthusiastically approved the student loan idea and he agreed to set up a meeting with President Eisenhower.

Thereafter, in early July 1958, Dr. Killian, then Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Marion Folsom, and

Representatives Wainwright, Frelinghuysen, Haskell, and I met with the President at the White House. We were joined by Representative Robert J. McIntosh, of Michigan who, while not a member of the committee, was intensely interested and active in promoting the loan proposal.

After a long discussion with President Eisenhower, which included some sharp and critical questions stemming from his experience as president of Columbia University, we left the White House satisfied that President Eisenhower would be with us.

From that point, Mr. Speaker, legislative developments moved rapidly. The appropriate education subcommittee, under the able chairmanship of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT], agreed to incorporate the loan program in the comprehensive national defense education bill. The scholarship title was eliminated. The bill sailed through the House on August 8, 1958, and was passed by the Senate on August 13, 1958.

The student loan program provides for the establishment by each participating college and university of a loan fund from which needy and able students may borrow for the purpose of entering upon, or completing, courses of higher education.

A participating college or university is required to contribute to the loan fund a sum equal to one-ninth of the amount supplied by the Federal Government.

An eligible student may borrow up to $1,000 in any one year, and as much as $5,000 in the aggregate. To be eligible, a student first, must be in need of the loan to pursue a course of study; second, be capable of maintaining a good academic standing; and third, have been accepted as a full-time undergraduate or graduate student.

Interest on the loan, at 3 percent, does not begin to run until 1 year after graduation. The borrower can take up to 11 years after graduation to repay the loan.

Taking special note of the teacher shortage, the Senate added an amendment—which was retained—whereby borrowers who teach in public elementary and secondary schools will be eligible for cancellation of 50 percent of the loan if they teach full time for 5 years or more.

Currently there are 1,410 colleges and universities throughout the Nation participating in this program. Loans averaging $500 have been made to well over 130,000 students in 50 States.

In this session, Congress has appropriated $58,430,000 to meet the Federal Government's share of the funds which participating institutions have substantiated as being required.

Mr. Speaker, in a status report issued in June 1960, the Honorable Lawrence G. Derthick, Commissioner of Education, made these significant comments:

> Contrary to what might have been expected the student loan program has not had the effect of drying up other sources of student loans; rather, it has stimulated non-Federal loan activity.
>
> Besides the very significant change in attitude toward using credit as a means of helping to finance a student's higher education and the increase in loan activity, there is evidence that the program is encouraging a change in the approach of many colleges and universities to student financial assistance. It is a change that can perhaps be characterized as the "umbrella" approach, i.e., bringing all the institutions' financial aid resources—loans, scholarships, grants-in-aid, work opportunities—to bear on the problem of meeting the particular needs of each financially needy student. Such an approach, when combined with a careful assessment of financial need, offers considerable promise of achieving the optimum use of both national defense student loan and institutional student aid funds.

The comments below are illustrative of a great many that are pouring into the U.S. Office of Education:

> From a junior college in Texas: "It appears that the National Defense Education Act has focused attention on the need for a student loan fund and more local participation by the public for scholarship programs in general. We have 13 new scholarships given by clubs and organizations that amount to tuition, books, and fees."
>
> From a large western land-grant university: "Moneys received under the National Defense Education Act have been invaluable in that they have made it possible during the past year for 350 students to obtain additional higher education."
>
> From a State college in Alabama: "The college had no loan or scholarship program whereby a student could finance any significant part of his education. The national defense loan has helped to remedy this situation. Also, the national defense student loan program has had the effect of releasing a number of campus jobs to students who for one reason or another do not qualify for a national defense loan."

In my own State of Michigan, the impact of the student loan program is tremendous. About $2 million will be available during the 1960–61 academic year for loans under the program to students in 39 Michigan institutions of higher learning. If the loans average $500, about 4,000 students will be benefited next year in Michigan alone.

As it is operating, Mr. Speaker, the national student loan program is a dream come true for thousands of deserving students with the will who were searching for a way to a college education.

Perhaps the Members of Congress who worked so hard to advance this legislation—and there were many—can be pardoned if they are a bit proud of this landmark achievement. It may be understandable that I treasure a letter received from Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Honorable Arthur S. Flemming, which reads in part as follows:

> Many of us who have devoted long years to college teaching and administration can well wish that we may have made an educational contribution as far reaching as that made by you as a cosponsor of the national defense student loan program.

II. LANDRUM-GRIFFIN ACT

Mr. Speaker, this report concerning the administration of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 (Landrum-Griffin) will not be as comprehensive as a report soon to be released by the Department of Labor based upon 9 months of operation under the law.

Although the act is still new, it is not too early to notice and begin to evaluate some significant results flowing from its enactment. Quietly but effectively, the Department of Labor has been assembling and putting into operation the necessary enforcement machinery to make the law meaningful.

I should like to take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to commend Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell, Assistant Secretary John J. Gilhooley, Commissioner John L. Holcombe, and those associated with them, for their patient but firm and fair handling to date of the complex and difficult responsibilities of enforcement.

Referring to the new act in a recent statement, the Department of Labor said:

> There has been an awakened interest on the part of many union members in the operation of their organizations. This has been reflected in the many letters and complaints received by the Bureau during its first half year.

In a speech delivered before the labor relations law section of the American Bar Association on August 30, 1960, Assistant Secretary Gilhooley revealed the following up-to-date statistics concerning the volume of enforcement activity handled by the Bureau of Labor-Management Reports:

Reports received, initially processed and made available for public disclosure	106,000
Requests for information have been handled	62,000
Publications distributed	2,300,000
Cases opened for investigation, of which 632 are under active investigation by BLMR personnel in 22 area offices around the country and the balance either investigated by FBI, being processed for prosecution or closed	1,876

Title I of the act, generally known as the bill of rights, is designed to guarantee rank-and-file workers important, fundamental democratic rights within their unions. Many examples could be cited to demonstrate that the bill of rights is having a wholesome impact upon the conduct of union affairs. The following item is illustrative:

The Akron, Ohio, Beacon Journal of January 18, 1960, carried the following story:

> The Landrum-Griffin labor law has restored all 12,000 members of Operating Engineers Local No. 18 to the status of first class citizens in their union.
>
> For the first time, all of them can vote in union elections and all can run for union office.
>
> Before the Landrum-Griffin law was passed, the union was split into A, B, and C class members. Only class A members could vote or run for office. They comprise about half of the total membership.
>
> The new Federal labor law bars such discrimination.

In his recent address before the bar association, Assistant Secretary Gilhooley noted that the bill of rights in the labor law requires still further amendment to provide protection against racial discrimination. He correctly pointed out that in many respects the AFL–CIO constitution and ethical practices code go even beyond the compass of title I, and he said:

> It occurs to me that if the AFL–CIO (and other labor organizations) vigorously pro-

mote these concepts, the need for enforcement proceedings under title I will certainly diminish as the years go by. The trade-union movement would do well to bear this in mind.

Title II, which requires labor organizations to disclose the details of their financial condition and transactions, should ultimately prove to be one of the most effective provisions of the act. Under this title the Secretary of Labor is given authority to conduct audits of account and to determine the accuracy of reports filed. Some concern has been expressed that criminal penalties attached to failure to file, or false filing tend to discourage union members from seeking or retaining union office. Unfortunately, most of the concern stems from the spreading of misinformation and misunderstanding. It should be carefully noted that criminal penalties apply only to one who makes a false statement, knowing it to be false; or to one who knowingly fails to disclose a material fact; or who willfully makes false entries.

It should also be noted that simplified report forms are available for smaller unions and that the Bureau of Labor-Management Reports and its area representatives stand ready to assist union officers, singly or in groups, with any problems concerning required reports.

The language of title II requiring the filing of conflict of interest reports may need clarification before the constructive purpose intended can be fully achieved. The Bureau has indicated that questions of interpretation may account for the fact that a relatively small number of reports have been filed under this provision. Thus far in 11 months, only 96 employers, 137 union officers and 71 labor relations consultants have filed such reports.

Title III of the act provides protection for local unions placed under trusteeship by an international union. The Bureau reports that over 300 trusteeships, or more than half of those known to be in existence when the law was passed, have now been dissolved. Under the new law an unscrupulous union official will think twice before seeking to impose a trusteeship over a subordinate local to obtain control of its finances or to otherwise manipulate it for undemocratic purposes. Title III of the act protects and promotes local autonomy in union affairs.

Title IV of the act which governs union election procedures is one of the most important parts of the new labor law. While many complaints have been filed under this title, the Bureau has moved cautiously and only recently filed its first suit challenging a union election under the new law. The Washington (D.C.) Post of July 29, 1960, carried the following story:

The Labor Department yesterday filed its first suit challenging a union election under terms of the Landrum-Griffin labor reform law.

Labor Secretary James P. Mitchell brought the action in U.S. district court in Newark, N.J., asking that an election of officers last February by the Independent Petroleum Workers Union of Bayway, N.J., be set aside.

In his recent address, Assistant Secretary Gilhooley made this remark which is worthy of notice:

The best way, it seems to me, to keep the Government out of [union] affairs is for the trade union movement to take the initiative more vigorously than ever before to insure that all unions go even beyond the spirit of the Landrum-Griffin bill in administering their affairs. Here is an idealistic mission that can capture the imagination of union people. Here is indeed a moral crusade worthy of the militancy showed by the great [union] leaders of the past in their successful efforts to improve the material welfare of their membership.

For our part, I can assure them that in such a crusade they will have the wholehearted support of the Department of Labor. It is not enough to say, as did one highly placed leader before the passage of the Landrum-Griffin bill, that the trade-union movement lacked the power to do a cleansing job. The power is now available to them if they will use it.

Tangible evidence of the cleansing effects of the new labor law is reflected in a Washington (D.C.) Star news story—March 13, 1960—which reads in part as follows:

James Hoffa, Teamster president, announced publicly following the President's signing of the act that he had sent telegrams to his locals removing the ex-convicts who came under section 504 of the law. A private Department of Labor report indicated that more than 100 Teamster officials were suspended, although the Teamsters themselves will admit to only 5.

A 14,000-member Illinois local has been forced by its rank and file members to publish all that transpires in what were formerly closed leadership meetings. Attendance at the union meetings has so increased that a larger meeting hall had to be selected.

Mr. Speaker, in summing up its first status report on the new law, the Department of Labor said:

Reports received * * * indicate that throughout the country union members have been expressing themselves more freely at their union meetings; union constitutions are being revised along more democratic lines; union members are obviously taking a greater interest in union elections; a number of ex-convicts holding union office in violation of the law have been removed from posts of leadership; trusteeships have been terminated; and, in most cases, both labor officials and employers have expressed their intent to comply with the law.

So far as rank and file union members are concerned, there is mounting evidence of their general support for the objectives of the new law. Illustrative is the following excerpt from an article which appeared in the February 1960 issue of the Great Lakelands magazine—formerly Inside Michigan:

UNIONS LOOK AT LANDRUM-GRIFFIN BILL

Recent statements appearing in union publications indicate that much of the opposition expressed in Washington previous to the enactment of the Landrum-Griffin bill, actually did not represent the opinions of large segments of organized labor. In fact, passage of the Landrum-Griffin reform legislation has aroused frankness and determination among many union officials, unheard of during the past decade.

For example, John L. Cooper, president of the Los Angeles joint executive board of the Hotel, Restaurant, and Bartenders Union, made the following observations in a speech on the west coast recently:

"In my opinion, had the Landrum-Griffin bill, as passed by the House of Representatives, been submitted by secret ballot referendum to only members of organized labor, union members would have voted in favor of this legislation by an even greater majority than when this bill was first adopted in the House of Representatives."

The Star Mop Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I should like to bring to your attention an action by a sports group that demonstrates the overall American spirit and philosophy of cooperative actions in worthy causes. I am referring to the August 14 star mop contest sponsored by the Empire State Underwater Council.

This group, whose members popularly are known as skindivers, worked its diving contest in cooperation with the Long Island oyster farmers, who breed these succulent crustaceans in the waters of Long Island Sound. One of their biggest handicaps in raising oysters, however, are starfish—predators who feed on young oysters. In star mop the contest was geared to 225 participants using and demonstrating their diving skills to gather as many starfish as possible from the underwater oyster farm area so they could be destroyed. Actually, the contest served to bridge an underwater area gap that cannot be covered by now available mechanical equipment, such as dredges and special starfish brooms.

The manager of one of the benefiting oysterbeds, George Vanderborgh, of Long Island Oyster Farms, Inc., described this 1-day contest as a fine alliance between sportsmanship and conservation. I should like to echo that sentiment—and add this important fact, too.

It further pinpointed the need for more diversified usage of the underwater swimming skills of skindivers.

We already know the values of such skills in the military services.

But the numbers of devotees to this sport plus the areas in which they can practice and generate newer skills are limited and should, I feel, be amplified as much as possible. What has been done to benefit Long Island oystermen can similarly be done in other waters of our land where oysters are bred since predator starfish not only are prolific breeders—they are also good travelers.

There are undoubtedly some industrial services—such as cable checkings and repairs, and so forth—which would benefit from skindiving developments as well as the essential advantages of increasing the numbers of our peoples who

can readily handle themselves safely in deep waters.

Were this latter phase the only aspect for encouraging skindiving, I would be most happy to add my enthusiastic voice. But I can envision many more nonsports benefits than already have been made apparent.

I think you will all find that what the Empire State Underwater Council did in my district for my constituents can be done in all districts bordering the oceans and the gulf. There are such underwater groups throughout the country, I am told, who will be most happy to cooperate. They seek only the opportunity, plus the pleasure, of encouraging development in their sport.

Five Farm Vetoes—Facts and Fancy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most ridiculous statements being made by Democrat orators is that President Eisenhower's use of the veto has precluded any effective agricultural legislation. These orators point to five farm vetoes, wring their hands and thus apologize for their own failures, rather than face the unpleasant music that their own Democratic leadership in the Congress, not President Eisenhower, has repeatedly vetoed the American farmer.

I would like to go over with you the five Eisenhower farm vetoes and the numerous Democrat Congress farm vetoes, just to keep them in proper perspective.

There were three farm bills vetoed in the 86th Congress. The first was S. 1901, the tobacco bill of 1959; the second was S. 1968, the Wheat Act of 1959; and the third was S. 144, the Rural Electrification Administration bill.

The tobacco bill was simply a proposition whereby its sponsors wanted to have their cake and eat it too. The issue at stake was the method of computing the tobacco parity formula. Rather than forthrightly admitting that price support at 90 percent of parity for tobacco was losing our export markets and was threatening further cuts in acreage for U.S. tobacco farmers, the proponents insisted upon changing the parity formula. It would of course have been much more simple and straightforward to lower the level of support to whatever figure was necessary to recapture the foreign markets. The bill which was sent to the President put tobacco under the so-called old parity formula, making that commodity the only one of some 170 which would be so calculated.

The President pointed out in his veto message that the American tobacco farmer could very easily be misled into believing he would receive 90 percent of parity as computed for all other commodities.

The defects of this bill, however, were not fatal because 1 year later, Congress passed and the President approved Public Law 86–389, a tobacco price support measure which accomplished the purposes of the vetoed bill without returning tobacco to the "old parity" formula.

S. 1968, the vetoed wheat bill of 1959, was vetoed because it raised price supports without providing for effective production controls. The Department of Agriculture estimated that it would cost an additional $110 million per year if enacted. In addition, it contained a number of obvious loopholes which would have severely aggravated the already serious feed grain problem. It is interesting to note that those who do a great deal of crying about this veto fail to point out that the House of Representatives refused to accept the report of the House-Senate conference committee on this bill. However, knowing full well that the President would not approve the House bill, the Democratic leadership of the Senate sent it to him, rather than work on a realistic compromise. A year later the Senate did pass another wheat bill, but the House refused to consider it with the result that our wheat problem continues to grow. The President again appealed for action with no results on the part of Congress.

The third bill vetoed in the 86th Congress was S. 144, the Rural Electrification Administration reorganization bill. It had nothing to do with interest rates or with the basic operation of this program which has flourished in this administration. It was merely legislative shadowboxing and political muscle-flexing by the newly organized Democratic Congress. It was a sacrifice of sound administrative procedure on the altar of political expediency.

In the 85th Congress the President vetoed Senate Joint Resolution 162, the so-called "freeze" resolution. This legislation was basically a cotton and rice bill designed to prevent then-scheduled acreage cuts from going into effect on these crops. Other commodities were included only at the sufferance of the South. After the veto of this bill, the House Agriculture Committee produced the hodgepodge omnibus bill of 1958 which the Democratic-controlled Congress refused to even consider by defeating the rule on the bill. Finally in 1958 the Congress passed S. 4071, the Agricultural Act of 1958, which was signed into law by the President as Public Law 85–835. This bill provided a new cotton program, revised rice program, the present corn program under which farmers rejected all controls on corn, a 3-year extension of the Wool Act, an extension of the veterans and armed services milk program, and a number of minor amendments to the basic farm laws.

Going back to the 84th Congress, the President vetoed H.R. 12, a bill which contained a number of sound provisions, but contained an unworkable two-price plan for wheat which would have dumped many millions of bushels of wheat into subsidized competition with the feed grain producers of the Corn Belt. The veto, however, did not end farm legislation in the 84th Congress because it was shortly followed by the Agricultural Act of 1956 signed into law by the President as Public Law 84–540. This act included the soil bank program, major amendments to the cotton program, barter amendments, the establishment of an Agricultural Research Commission to study industrial uses, additional donation and disposal authority, provisions dealing with Federal irrigation, drainage, and flood control projects, a number of amendments to the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, the authorization for a study of rice certificate program, increased assistance to States for tree planting and reforestation, and a number of minor amendments to basic farm laws.

The noise about these five farm vetoes is fundamentally an apology on the part of congressional Democrats for their failure to come to grips with the serious problems facing American agriculture. Certainly President Eisenhower has vetoed five farm bills, but he has never vetoed the American farmer as this Democratic-controlled 86th Congress has done.

One of our most valuable and effective farm programs, the conservation reserve, was allowed to expire. No new contracts will be authorized by the Department of Agriculture because the Democrat-controlled Congress has failed to act.

No action has been taken on a number of land retirement, soil conservation, and payment-in-kind proposals that have been introduced by Republican Members of the House.

This Democrat Congress has vetoed more effective research on agricultural commodities by failing to act on the Senate and House farm research bills. An expanded research effort holds a great deal of promise for the profitable use of our surplus production for some years to come. It is tragic that this legislation was killed.

Another Democrat farmer veto in the 86th Congress was the Farmers Home Administration bill which was killed in the Senate. This bill was designed to more efficiently meet the credit needs of farmers using the facilities of the Farmers Home Administration. This bill which had the sad misfortune of being sponsored by a distinguished Republican Senator was never allowed to see the light of Senate debate.

There were three other examples of vetoes of its own farm bills by the Democratic-controlled Congress. H.R. 5432, which would have raised feed grain price supports, and H.R. 8394, which would have set up a Brannan plan for hog producers were both killed by the Committee on Rules which stands 8 to 4 in favor of the Democrats.

H.R. 12261, the residual fallout of what was originally known as the Poage family farm bill was so obnoxious that 100 House Democrats joined in killing it shortly before the recess for the conventions.

The record then speaks for itself. In spite of their almost 2 to 1 majority in the Committee on Agriculture and in the House and the Senate, the Demo-

crats have refused to act. In spite of their own 1960 platform which promises much for the American farmer, congressional Democrats have declined to act. In spite of the fact that President Eisenhower has repeatedly asked for action, and in spite of constructive farm bills that have been introduced by many Members, and in spite of many moans, groans, and crocodile tears about the farm problem, this Democratic-controlled 86th Congress has failed to act.

The outright failure and the downright refusal of this Democratic-controlled Congress to act constructively is an example of the Democrat Party's fundamental attitude toward agriculture during the last 6 years: "There was no action, there is no action, there will be no action."

We Need a Sound National Food and Farm Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MORGAN M. MOULDER
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, the Congress, the President, the political parties, the administrative branches of the Government, and every individual in the Nation cannot afford to disregard and turn aside from what is happening to farmers and the rural communities of the United States.

Congress has tried to correct the present farm situation by enactment of new farm programs to hold up sagging farm income, but the administration now in power either vetoed such legislation passed by Congress or used every possible influence to prevent the adoption of legislation proposed and necessary to help the farmers of America.

United States Department of Agriculture figures show that it takes 41.7 bushels of corn today to buy the same suit of clothes that 26 bushels would buy in 1952, that it takes 9.2 bushels to get a pair of men's shoes that required only 5.3 bushels 8 years ago, and 6 bushels to buy a woman's dress as compared with 3.6 bushels in 1952. Among other items, a chair for the farmer's house that cost 17.1 bushels of corn 8 years ago now costs 38.6 bushels, and it takes 216.7 bushels to buy an electric stove that could be had for 153 bushels in 1952.

It would seem to me, in all seriousness, that it should have been obvious to Mr. Benson from the start—even in his youth—that if it takes twice as much corn to buy a pair of pants, then the farmer, to keep himself in pants—as certainly he must—will do his utmost to produce twice as much corn.

Farmers are impelled to increase their output as prices fall. Surplus thus builds upon surplus, further depressing prices.

The fallacy, and the tragedy, of the Benson program is as simple as that.

Because of the outdated pricing system under which farm products are marketed, the abundance resulting from the farmers' efficiency and hard work has aggravated the farm problem.

Farm income continues to decline. USDA figures for the first 6 months of 1960 show net farm income down 9 percent from the same period a year ago. During the past 8 years, net farm income has fallen more than 26 percent. During the same period, business corporation profits have risen 45 percent after taxes. Farm purchasing power is at a 20-year low with a prospect of further declines. The farm share of the food dollar is lower than at any time since the depression of the early 1930's.

Today the Government inventory of surplus farm commodities is over $9 billion—and will increase this year.

These facts clearly demonstrate the failure of the present farm program as administered by the administration in power. Of course, overproduction has built up huge surpluses, but the surplus production has not been used to any advantage, either at home or abroad.

The administration's farm program has cost more than $30 billion during the past 6 years, but the farmer realized very little benefit from this huge expenditure.

Mr. Speaker, there is definitely a farm crisis in farm income and purchasing power which must be faced by the Nation. Farmers have been substituting credit for purchasing power at an alarming rate. In the past year, total farm debt has increased $400 million to a new all time high of $23.8 billion—more than 50 percent higher than in 1952.

I do not want to be an alarmist, but in all sincerity, I must say that too few people realize the deep economic inroads which have been made into the family farm system because of the 7½ years of lowering of farm prices and 7½ years of deliberate tightening of credit and raising of interest rates.

The processors and speculators who want to obtain a monopoly of the farm and food business know that they have to obstruct and wreck farm programs before they can roll the family farmers off the land. And in this they have made great progress under the administration's Benson farm policy.

Mr. Speaker, a farm program to help the Nation must help the farmer first. You cannot cure the national farm economic problem without solving the economic problem of the individual farmer. Farmers are entitled to such farm prices as will earn a rate of return for their investment, labor, and management which is comparable to that earned by others for their capital, labor, and management.

Mr. Speaker, agriculture needs bold and vigorous action. The first order of business at the next session of Congress should and must be the adoption of legislation that will—

First. Provide full parity prices for all farm products;

Second. Establish marketing quotas in bushels and pounds—under the direction of a farmer elected board—on those products for which it is necessary to protect each farmer's full share of the market;

Third. Provide that the prices and quotas as established be subject to approval or disapproval by farmers in referendums;

Fourth. Establish an accurate formula or method of parity, taking into consideration the farmer's cost of production;

Fifth. Limit farming activity of business corporations, eliminate farm program benefits which might be received by producers who are not bona fide farmers, and strengthen the family farm to prevent the threat of monopolistic forces seeking to control production of food;

Sixth. Establish a food use policy by and through the food stamp plan and a food for peace program—whereby existing surpluses and future production will provide more of our citizens with an adequate and nutritious diet, and help alleviate hunger and poverty in undeveloped nations and by so doing, promote a permanent and honorable world peace;

Seventh. Expand and intensify research by land grant colleges and universities to discover and develop new uses for farm products, especially for industrial purposes;

Eighth. Revitalize the Farmers Home Administration and provide low interest rates to effectively serve family farmers with both long-time and emergency farm credit;

Ninth. Provide a percentage depletion tax allowance for farmers, based upon the net income from the farm;

Tenth. Promote export sale of farm products on world markets with the same or comparable consideration given to industrial exports;

Eleventh. Establish a national safety reserve of food and fiber to be strategically stored and located in relation to the Nation's population; and I am reliably informed that the total balance of unused U.S. foreign aid currencies and counterpart funds in all foreign countries amounts to $2.5 billion. Therefore, we should compel foreign countries having surplus funds to use the funds for the purchase of our surplus farm commodities in the establishment of a safety emergency reserve of food and fiber in each of such countries.

Mr. Speaker, the farmers of America recognize that the farmer's responsibility for improving his economic condition should rest to a greater extent with his development of a better distribution and control of supply. But all of us recognize or should know that it is extremely difficult, if not impossible, for farmers to accomplish these objectives without the benefit of guidance of an organization that deals specifically with their problem or without an opportunity to develop these programs with Government assistance.

All these goals demand the leadership of a Secretary of Agriculture who is not only conversant with the technological and economic aspects of the farm problems, but who is sympathetic with the objectives of effective farm legislation, not only for farmers, but for the interest of the Nation, as a whole.

Agriculture is our basic industry. We are the best fed nation on earth. Our farmers have made it so. The productivity of our farms is today the greatest stabilizing force in the economy of

the free world. The Communists have put satellites above the earth, but they cannot begin to match the productivity of the people tilling the soil of America.

The income crisis is the major and the basic agricultural problem. All other farm problems are secondary in nature. Any proposal which purports to deal with the farm problem without seeking to enhance the net income of farm families does not deserve to be known as farm legislation.

The farm problem is not a political problem. It is a national problem. The same serious farm crisis faces all farmers, Democrats and Republicans alike.

Mr. Speaker, you well know and my record in Congress reveals that I have vigorously promoted, supported, fought for and voted for all farm legislation presented here in Congress to improve, to protect, and to serve the best interests of the farmers, Democrats and Republicans alike.

The farm families have always been and are now the solid social and economic anchor of America. If abandoned, our ship of state will surely flounder toward the ultimate loss of our American way of life.

Former Chairman Murdock Comments on the Master's Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEWART L. UDALL
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, the court-appointed master, Judge Simon Rifkind, of New York City, will shortly file his report with the Supreme Court, and there is every anticipation that within the next 18 months the Court will enter its decision in the protracted litigation between Arizona and California over the waters of the Colorado River.

The history of this dispute, and the ensuing litigation, is of current interest to the Members of Congress as in all likelihood, once title to the water has been finally adjudicated, additional projects will be presented to the Congress to put these waters to beneficial use.

No man within, or without, the Congress knows more of the intimate details of this dispute than my good friend, John R. Murdock, the former chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

In order to enlighten our colleagues as to the implications of the master's report I recently propounded a series of questions to Chairman Murdock, and these questions and his answers are reproduced below:

Question. John, you have been a student of the relations between Arizona and California for years, especially about the Colorado River. Will you answer for me for the record some questions about the case, *Arizona* v. *California* on which you have been reading recently or about which you know personally?

Chairman MURDOCK. Certainly I will be glad to answer any of your questions within my knowledge of existing facts or of historical happenings. When you say the case, *Arizona* v. *California*, to what particular case do you refer? Or to what class of cases which may be not inappropriately labeled? As a lawyer you probably mean, *Arizona* v. *California*, a case now in the Supreme Court of the United States, but I, a nonlawyer, may have in mind—without too great a stretch of language—one of the many historical cases *Arizona* v. *California*, in the Congress of the United States. In fact I can answer questions about legislative cases better than court cases involving us.

Question. Well, lets not quibble over terms. To me a "case" usually means a law suit in a court. Since our contest with California is a quarrel between States, in this instance over dividing the waters of the Colorado River, the case I want to know about is in the Supreme Court. However, if you want to call the hearings and proceedings on a bill in Congress, a case in Congress, I will not quarrel with you. I suppose you have been involved in many such cases.

Chairman MURDOCK. Yes, many cases in Congress—meaning bills—but not as many as has CARL HAYDEN, for he has been in these legislative battles with California in the twenties, the thirties, the forties and the fifties. I have participated in "legislative cases"—meaning bills in Congress—with Arizona opposing California in most of them about water—for the 16 years that I was a Member of the House of Representatives.

Question. John, you have been lecturing on the history of the Colorado River. Have all, or most, of these legislative cases been concerned with the Colorado River? And has Arizona won many of these so called cases in Congress?

CHAIRMAN MURDOCK. Stewart, you are a native of Arizona and a lawyer, but even you may be surprised at how terribly complex the Colorado River problems are. One doesn't have to look at a map to see that the Colorado River separates Arizona and California in more than one sense. You might also be surprised how many legislative battles Arizona has won, but, of course, California in Congress has won most of them.

Question. I did want to question you about both kinds of battles with California, the legislative contests and the judicial contests, but before leaving this point I would like to know how you came to use the term case in Congress.

Chairman MURDOCK. I got that idea first from Mr. Charles Carson, one of Arizona's best lawyers. In discussing the procedure before my committee on a bitterly contested water bill, he said: "Those lawyers—the opposition—seem to want to try this matter like a case in court." I had noticed that the California forces seemed to use more lawyers than engineers and experts and were always harping on the law of the river which they interpreted to prove their way.

Question. Will you name one instance where Arizona won her case in Congress and then will you comment on and explain that phrase: The law of the river?

Chairman MURDOCK. My best example: Arizona won her case in Congress after a bitter fight through 1946 and 1947 to reauthorize the Gila project which gave us the important Wellton-Roll, Mohawk Valley development the ultimate importance of which cannot even yet be adequately measured.

THE LAW OF THE RIVER

As for the law of the river—I have studied it for many years, even before I came to Congress and I do not yet know exactly what it is until the Supreme Court has finally spoken. I am not a lawyer but I have heard good lawyers. I think we might study this law of the Colorado River as used before my committees during the period of controversy from 1945 to 1953 under four heads:

(1) What was the Arizona conception of the law of the river during this controversy? (Let us refer to it as "the law" for brevity.)

(2) What was California's conception, or view, of the law at this same time? (3) What would Arizona's conception, or view, of the law—if finally affirmed by judicial action of the High Court—allott to Arizona in water out of the Colorado River system? (4) What would California's conception, or view of the law—if fixed by judicial determination—probably allot in water to California out of the Colorado River system? California's determination and political power made it inevitable that the U.S. Supreme Court must eventually enter this controversy because California had stressed the law as they viewed it as final. I was well aware of this at all times, but was concerned chiefly about how and when the Supreme Court could best be brought into the controversy in a constitutional way.

At my committee hearing of April 18, 1951, I told the committee that I was not opposed to having an early Supreme Court decision on it; in fact, I was extremely anxious for final Court decree, but was earnestly opposed to the California suit resolution, which one of the three California members had just raised again at that meeting. I was extremely anxious for the Highest Court to tell Arizona and to tell California how much water each should have under the law of the river. However, good lawyers had told me that the Supreme Court does not render advisory opinions in disputes between States and, therefore, the Court probably would not do what I was so anxious to have done. I told the committee that the 4-year-old suit resolution, which was brought up again that day, would only lead us into a blind alley and get us nowhere, but only cause interminable delay. All of this is in the printed record of the hearing of April 18, 1951, and may be read by anyone interested. The three California members, it seemed to me, were trying to force Arizona to sue California, and in that way get the case into court on better terms for them, if at all.

I did not want Arizona to have to sue California, nor ask for an injunction against her for the water California was then taking and, for some time previously, had been taking, through her huge existing facilities. Instead, I wanted Congress to pass a sensible authorization bill, which my central Arizona bill (H.R. 1500, 82d Cong.), could have been made into and was being made into—exactly as Congress had passed a similar authorization bill for California in 1928, and then both States could get into the Supreme Court constitutionally without one having to sue the other. Thus the High Court would interpret the law with a logical new element added.

When Arizona finally had to sue California—as they maneuvered it—it made a harder case for Arizona, bearing the burden of proof. But with 3 Californians on that committee against 1 from Arizona, 30 California Members in the House of Representatives against 2 from Arizona, they had the power to block my proposal, although their counterproposal—the suit resolution, which had been sponsored by all of their Members in both the 80th and also the 81st Congress was never put over. That California's suit resolution had been heard by two Judiciary subcommittees in the 80th and again in 81st Congress through 4 years, and yet no favorable action was taken on it by all those lawyers who, as you know, are always the pick of the lawyer Members of Congress. Thus the case at law went to the Supreme Court in 1952 under terms disadvantageous to Arizona. There it is today—to this day after years of expensive litigation, although they said then it would take only a few weeks.

ARIZONA'S VIEW OF THE LAW BEFORE PRESENT COURT TRIAL

Question. Will you refresh my mind as to Arizona's view of the law of the river during the years you suffered with it?

Chairman MURDOCK. I have suffered with it for 46 years, or ever since I went to Arizona in 1914. But let us think only of the 8 years from 1945 to 1952, both inclusive. Because several changes were made and added thereto after I came to Congress, I'll pinpoint the time let us say, the spring of 1950. You see I am confining my answers right now to the hearings I have had in the House during the 8 years following 1945 when this case was tried in Congress before numerous committees, both of House and Senate, although Arizona tried three times before 1952 to get into court.

Question. What did Arizona think and contend by 1950 made up the law of the river? I'm not asking this for my information, but for the record.

Chairman MURDOCK. Our view included: (1) The seven-State treaty of 1922, known as the Colorado River compact, the basic instrument of law; (2) the Boulder Canyon Project Act of 1928–29; (3) the California Statute (Covenant) of Limitation of 1929; (4) numerous contracts for water out of Lake Mead with the Secretary of Interior, authorized by the Boulder Canyon Act, including Arizona's contract; (5) Arizona's Statute of 1944 ratifying the Colorado River compact of 1922 and authorizing an Arizona contract for water out of Lake Mead; (6) Nevada contracts for water out of Lake Mead; (7) the Mexican Water Treaty of 1944–45; and (8) Gila Project Reauthorization Act of 1947. Of course there were other items, but the above were the main ones; all instruments in print available for reading by anyone who can read. Then, we must remember, there was the general water law of the West, as old as white settlement out there, the law of prior appropriation and beneficial use.

CALIFORNIA'S VIEW

Question. You have named the chief elements of the law of the river in Arizona's view, now how was it in California's view? Would it contain the same elements then as they saw it?

Chairman MURDOCK. Not exactly the same elements—for as early as 1946 we and they differed not only in the reading of these related documents and instruments, but also as to which of the instruments to include as valid. California talked about the Colorado compact—not so much the seven-States compact, signed by all the seven States in 1922, but that compact modified into a six-States compact in 1929. They regarded the California statute of 1929, the irrevocable covenant, to be binding only with the six-States compact, excluding Arizona. They seemed to regard the numerous contracts of the California water agencies, signed in the early thirties, as having higher standing and firmer commitment than any later ones. They took a dim view of Arizona's statute of 1944 ratifying the compact of 1922 and they doubted the legality of Arizona's contract for water out of Lake Mead. Anyway, contracts signed by Secretary Ickes were not regarded by them as on a par with those earlier signed by Secretary Wilbur. And finally, California had fought the terms of the treaty with Mexico and after it passed, thought of ways to let Arizona suffer the consequences of that water burden, or so it seems to me in memory and as the legislative record shows.

Question. Now that you have indicated what Arizona considered to be the law of the river, and also what California indicated to be the law of the river, during the last years you were in Congress, what did each of these views spell out in water for each lower basin State if the Supreme Court should validate either of them?

HOW MUCH WATER FOR ARIZONA?

Chairman MURDOCK. Well, Arizona authorities, while I was chairman of the committee having to do with these disputed waters, considered the law to furnish her—assuming there was enough water in the river to do it—a gross of 2.8 million acre-feet out of Lake Mead annually, and in addition to that, all of the water of the Gila River system in Arizona and without diminution. And in further addition most Arizona authorities counted on 1 million acre-feet more out of the main stream annually in perpetuity, and also half of any surplus which was to be divided after 1963. Besides the above, some Arizona lawyers figured out that the law would give Arizona an extra million acre-feet of lower basin water. But disregarding this very last addition, as doubtful, we can add these sure items to total at least 3.8 million acre-feet annually of mainstream water plus the Gila River water.

WATER YIELDED BY CALIFORNIA'S INTERPRETATION

Question. And what did California authorities figure Arizona to have coming to her about 1950 by their view of the law? What did they think California had under the law?

Chairman MURDOCK. In 1947 one of their keenest lawyers implied that Arizona didn't have another gallon due her under the law as they read it. Furthermore that California had firm contracts for 5,362,000 acre-feet in perpetuity, plus half the surplus. She already had ample engineering facilities built by Uncle Sam, built on their orders to take practically all the flow of the river in the lower basin.

With such drastic conflicting claims of the two States to water to be divided in the lower basin, it certainly became necessary, after the committee action that day in April 1951 (April 18, 1951), for Arizona to sue in the Supreme Court—not as I thought it ought to be done to get into Court, but as they forced it to be done to the great disadvantage of Arizona because she had to sue and prove California wrong in action as well as thought.

Question. All that you have said brings much more to my mind of that long struggle in Congress of Arizona and California over the waters of the Colorado River. But you say Arizona was forced to sue California in 1952. Can you say what has happened since in this court trial?

Chairman MURDOCK. This trial cannot be said to be ended yet, as of this date, although the end of the suit seems to be near. The Supreme Court appointed a special master at once and he held hearings for about 2 years till his death. The present special master continued with the hearing of voluminous testimony for several years, mostly in San Francisco, and has finished his draft report this spring. His 400-page report contains a close analysis of the law of the river pertinent to this lawsuit—*Arizona* v. *California*—and also his rulings on 27,000 pages of testimony as well as the contentions of lawyers. To sum up this report to the Supreme Court the special master drafted a proposed decree which could be approved by the Supreme Court and become final. I will be very happy if it is approved as is and made final. This proposed decree was given to the press early last May and printed. It was hailed as a victory for Arizona, and I think it is. Of course, Stewart, I borrowed your copy while you were home and I have read it carefully, noting the points on which Arizona was held right or wrong according to the master's interpretation of the law and also the points on which California was held right or wrong, in their view of the law. This suit was narrowed down to the question: How shall the waters of the lower basin be divided among the three States under existing law?

Question. Did the master sustain Arizona on all points? Or did he overrule most of them?

Chairman MURDOCK. He overruled some of them but sustained some very important ones. For instance, this decree confirms Arizona's legal rights to 2.8 million acre-feet annually out of Lake Mead, as I read it. The surplus may be divided after 1963 but cannot be the basis of legal rights of appropriations before 1963. I believe this proposed decree allots Arizona her legal rights to a gross of 2.8 million acre-feet out of Lake Mead, plus 1 million acre-feet of mainstream water, and all the Gila River waters within the State. If I have been able to read the master's report aright, I believe it deals justly with Arizona according to the intent of the lawmakers and without injury to California.

The 1960 Anniversary of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, the year 1960 marks the 20th anniversary of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America. This organization represents more than 2½ million Americans of Ukrainian descent. But even more, it is the voice for over 40 million Ukrainians who have been silenced by the boot of totalitarian communism.

The Ukrainian people, although a part of the U.S.S.R., are by no means of either Russian origin or sympathy. They represent the largest nation of subjugated human beings in the Western World. Except for a short period after World War I, there has been no free Ukrainian state for centuries; they have no flag, no army, no national schools to remind them of their heritage. Yet in all this time the desire for freedom has never been quenched.

The year in which this committee was founded, 1940, was a time of great hope for the Ukrainian people. They believed that the victorious German armies were coming to liberate them from their tyrannical Russian masters. They met the Nazi armies with open arms, only to discover that the Germans only wished to murder and enslave them—not treat them like human beings. Only then did they join the Russian national front—not to fight for a Mother Russia, but to defeat the greater of two evils.

An oppressed people fought hard for liberty; but when the war was ended, when their struggle was ended, that people found that its bonds had been tightened even more than ever.

Those Ukrainians who have sought freedom and peace in the United States love their new homeland; yet they can never forget the sufferings of their brethren who still live in slavery. The Ukrainian Congress Committee has thus worked to insure the freedom of all Ukrainians, as well as of all peoples. They have never failed to expose the

dangers of communism throughout the world. Through war and peace they have kept burning a light of hope for oppressed peoples. We congratulate the Ukrainian Congress Committee on a job well done, and hope that the near future may see the freedom of the Ukraine for which they have worked so hard.

Congressman Bow's Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, my customary report to citizens of the 16th Congressional District is both an obligation and a privilege.

I believe it is an obligation of a Member of Congress to report to the people he represents at the end of each Congress, and I have done so regularly since 1952.

It is a privilege to hold public office in a nation where the people rule through elected representatives.

THE DISTRICT

Some 500,000 people in Stark, Tuscarawas, and Wayne Counties are constituents of the Representative of the 16th District of Ohio, an increase in population of about 90,000 since FRANK T. BOW first came to Congress 10 years ago.

They represent as great a diversity of interests as can be found in any congressional district.

Wayne County continues to be one of the foremost agricultural counties of the State and Nation, but small industry is expanding and providing greater balance in the economy.

Tuscarawas County continues to boast the largest concentration of clay industries in America, together with an increasing number of manufacturing plants. It is well known as a center of the swiss cheese industry and its farms form the solid basis of its economy.

Stark County's diversified industry has grown steadily through the 10 years of my tenure in office, and the city of Canton is celebrating a decade of progress that has seen many new industries established beside the giants whose names and products are known internationally.

Thus, farm and business legislation, problems of labor-management relations and of helping to secure Government contracts to keep production humming, problems of water conservation and flood control, city development and interstate highways occupy the time and attention of the 16th's Representative in Congress.

APPROPRIATIONS

During the 86th Congress, FRANK T. BOW continued to serve as a member of the Appropriations Committee, and as the senior Republican member of the Subcommittee on the Departments of State, Justice, and the Judiciary, and the Subcommittee on Commerce and Related Agencies, as well as a member of the Subcommittee on Deficiencies.

Day after day through the session these subcommittees have had hearings on budget requests, seeking to find means of improving Government service while reducing Government expense.

In the first session of the Congress, the subcommittees of which I am a member recommended savings of $675,979,859.

In the second session we have recommended savings of $912,262,023.

KEY TO TAX REDUCTION

Taxes continue to be the biggest complaint of my people. They want tax reduction, but not at the expense of necessary Government programs.

The key to tax reduction of this kind is the careful scrutiny we give appropriations. If every officer of the agencies and bureaus of Government will do his best to cut costs, and if they will cooperate with our committee efforts to find further economies, we can save millions.

The budget surplus of $1.1 billion in the fiscal year just ended, and the promise of another surplus in the current fiscal year, give hope that the increasingly distressing burden of taxes can be eased. If we continue to have an administration interested in economy and tax relief and if we can have a Congress dedicated to that end, the $7½ billion tax cut of 1954, which has saved Americans over $45 billion to date, can be repeated.

NEW FEDERAL BURDENS

Tax reduction history will not repeat itself, however, if the American people or their representatives create new burdens for the Nation's taxpayers.

Forty-five billion dollars' worth of such proposals were introduced during the 86th Congress.

One such proposal to provide from the Federal Treasury $20 for each child of school age to be spent for the public schools of the States without regard to whether such children attended public schools or, indeed, any school at all, came close to passage.

Who would pay the bill?

The same people who now pay school taxes in each district and State.

Why would it be any easier for them to pay additional taxes to Washington than to the local government?

Why should they send money to Washington for the Federal bureaucracy to take out its administrative expenses before returning a pittance to the people?

These are questions basic to every Federal aid something-for-nothing proposal.

There is only one source of tax dollars—the people. Tax dollars buy more when they are collected and spent by government closest to the people.

Federal aid costs more for collection, for administration, for unnecessary Federal requirements and—most of all—because we lose a part of our individual liberty and our individual responsibility every time we turn to Washington to do a job we can do better for ourselves.

These are some of the reasons your Congressman, FRANK T. BOW, has opposed unnecessary new Federal spending programs.

PRINCIPAL BOW BILLS

Carrying out the political philosophy I have explained to the people of Ohio in five congressional campaigns and innumerable other occasions, I have prepared legislation as follows:

A bill to carry out the recommendations of the Hoover Commission to end commercial enterprises of the Government that compete with business and take away job opportunities.

A bill to require a complete inventory of Government property so that property not essential could be disposed of and the proceeds applied to the national debt.

A bill to require the Government to live within its income.

A bill to avoid new tax burdens and Federal control in our schools by turning over to the States for education one-fourth of the cigarette taxes collected in each State.

A bill to restore the constitutional rights of servicemen stationed abroad who may now be tried and imprisoned in foreign courts.

A bill to recognize good citizenship in later years of men who received undesirable discharges from the armed services primarily because of immaturity.

An amendment to the Fair Labor Standards Act to protect the wages of American workingmen by authorizing special duties on products of foreign nations where substandard wages provide an unfair competitive advantage.

A resolution to declare that the Congress believes we should enter into no further tariff reduction negotiations at this time.

A bill to protect and define the right of associations of dairy farmers to deal as a unit with the processors and distributors of milk.

LOCAL PROBLEMS

Working with Government agencies to assure proper Federal service for the 16th District is an important part of the Congressman's job.

During the past 2 years we have come closer to solving many longstanding problems.

Berlin Reservoir: For 10 years we have tried to find a means of maintaining the water level throughout the summer for recreational uses, compatible with the main purpose of the project. In 1960 we obtained a $15,000 appropriation for a study by the Corps of Engineers which should provide a solution. Also, construction of the West Branch Reservoir will be helpful in augmenting water supply.

Chippewa watershed: The project won congressional approval this year and we are working to find some method of preventing unnecessary damage to families in the Orrville area.

Flash flood warning: At my request the Weather Bureau is establishing a flash flood warning system at Akron-Canton Airport that will help to prevent economic and possible human loss when flash floods occur in our three-county area.

Stark County flood control: My resolution authorizing the Corps of Engineers to prepare plans for flood control in the Stark County area, to prevent losses such as occurred in the 1958 floods, was approved by the Congress.

Air travel: Progress continues on improvement of the Akron-Canton Airport

and we are endeavoring to secure new facilities and continued airline service at New Philadelphia-Dover.

Government contracts: Cooperating with local industries, your Congressman has helped to bring important defense contracts to our area to help maintain employment levels.

Postal service: The Post Office has completed several new post office buildings and is working on improvements at others including Massillon and Canton. City and rural delivery routes have been extended to serve several thousand additional families.

MAJOR LEGISLATION

As shown in the accompanying voting record, I have been present and voted on all major issues presented in the 86th Congress.

This Congress has enacted 34 laws extending and improving the program of the Veterans' Administration, all of which I supported.

FARMING

No major farm legislation has been enacted because the Democratic majority in Congress and the Republican administration have disagreed on this subject. The Democratic majority insists upon continuation of the high price support which has encouraged tremendous surplus of certain favored commodities at terrific cost to the taxpayer. While constantly urging modification of this program, Secretary Benson has been forced to administer the Democratic incentive law and to take the blame for the cost of the surplus that law promotes. Farmers and taxpayers alike are suffering from too much Government interference in agriculture. We must break the legislative deadlock that has prevailed so we can give the farmer a chance to produce at a profit, which is the only way we can assure the rest of the population a continued ample supply of food and fiber.

Two programs in this field have proved successful. The conservation reserve, which the Democratic Congress refused to extend, has taken millions of acres out of production at far less cost than paying for surplus that would have been produced.

The use of surplus for relief and barter, at home and abroad, has continued to help millions of individuals while at the same time relieving our storage problem and spreading good will for our country. I am proud to have been a sponsor of this program.

FOREIGN AID

I have continued my unwavering record of opposition to the extravagant and lavish grant of funds to foreign countries. However, I have supported the Development Loan Fund which will help erase the necessity for foreign grants, and the special program for Latin America. We must create harmony and unity of purpose in this hemisphere. If we cannot do that much, we can look forward only to isolation in a hostile world.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT

I voted for the Landrum-Griffin bill—Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959—because it provides an opportunity to give individual members of labor unions the opportunity to run their unions properly and rid them of graft and corrupt leadership.

The labor bosses of America are loud in their demands for civil rights, but nowhere in America are civil rights so trampled upon as in those unions where members are denied the right to secret ballots in union elections, denied the right to know how tremendous union treasuries, taken from their pay, are managed, and denied the right to take part in vital decisions that mean bread and butter to their families.

I voted also for the minimum wage bill that passed the House. This measure provided for a gradual increase to $1.15 per hour and the coverage of about 1 million additional workers. Unfortunately, it was impossible for the House Committee on Education and Labor to compromise this reasonable bill with the more radical approach advocated by Senator KENNEDY with the result that there is no legislation.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Several improvements in the social security program, including the disability program, were enacted in the 86th Congress. Unfortunately, the effort to remove or increase significantly the ceiling on earnings of retired persons was not successful.

After bitter controversy within the Democratic leadership of the Congress over various proposals for medical care to the aged, the Congress adopted a program that constitutes a small beginning toward Federal-State responsibility for elderly persons who, though not on public welfare, cannot afford proper medical treatment.

It is not my intention to make this a political message, but it is impossible to explain the social security medical care issue without reference to politics. Some constituents have written me heated letters blaming Republicans for failure to provide a broad medicare program for the aged. As a matter of fact, President Eisenhower proposed far more comprehensive medicare than anyone else.

The 86th Congress has been controlled by the Democrats in both House and Senate almost 2 to 1. The Democratic Senators and Representatives could pass any bill on which even two-thirds of them agreed. They could not agree on any feature of medical care for the aged; and if any blame is to be cast for legislation enacted, they must bear it.

VOTING RECORD

Proper titles of bills and the methods of voting on them make a congressional voting record sometimes difficult to understand. I have used descriptive rather than proper titles on some of the following important issues of the 86th Congress:

	Bow vote	House action	Final action
1st session:			
Agricultural Trade and Development Act	Yea	Approved	Public law.
Federal-Aid Highway Act	Yea	do	Do.
Landrum-Griffin (labor bill)	Yea	do	Do.
Deny passports to subversives	Yea	do	No Senate action.
Uphold validity State laws	Yea	do	Public law.
Foreign aid	Nay	do	Do.
TVA, self-financing	Nay	do	Do.
2d session:			
Redevelop so-called distress areas	Nay	do	Vetoed.
Civil rights	Yea	do	Public law.
Continued rigid controls on farms	Nay	Defeated	
Federal employees salary increase	Yea	Approved	Do.
Foreign aid	Nay	do	Do.
Social Security Amendments of 1960 including medicare	Yea	do	Do.
School Construction Assistance Act	Nay	do	Failed of enactment.
Increase minimum wage	Yea	do	Do.

The Ukrainian Congress Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, this fall, branch and member organizations of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., will commemorate the 20th anniversary of the founding of the committee.

The work and the objectives of the committee, in informing not only the 2½ million Americans of Ukrainian ancestry but all Americans of the continuing struggle in the Ukraine and in other captive nations against Soviet domination and of the perils of communism, are contributing greatly to the cause of freedom throughout the world. In speaking for the captive Ukrainian people, who have struggled for centuries to break the bonds of tyranny and proclaim their independence, and in affirming their right to freedom and justice, the committee continues to expose the fallacy that communism insures liberty.

It is most urgent today to know and realize fully the true meaning of communism and its danger to the rights and freedom of men and nations. The Ukrainian Congress Committee of America is to be commended for its unceasing efforts to stem the advance of communism, which seeks to extend its tryanny over the world.

Ukrainian Congress Committee of America Celebrates 20th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, this fall marks the celebration of the 20th anniversary of the creation of the Ukrainian

Congress Committee of America, an organization of some 2½ million Americans of Ukrainian descent.

The purpose of this unique organization is to make the American public aware of the situation existing in the U.S.S.R. This "prison of nations" encompasses 15 supposedly independent nations of which the free governments of three—Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania—still are recognized by this country.

Joining together, Americans, bound to these captive nations by ancestral and traditional ties, are devoting their efforts to dispelling the widespread misapprehension of peace and harmony within the Soviet Union. Many of these nations still actively seek their freedom. While we cannot afford to underestimate the power of the U.S.S.R., we need not be absorbed nor overwhelmed by a national purpose and unity which does not exist under Soviet domination.

Mr. Speaker, I join in the salute to these loyal Americans on this 20th anniversary of the formation of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America. Their dedication to the peace and security of our Nation should be an inspiration to us all.

Record of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service During the 86th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. TOM MURRAY

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, the record of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee during the 86th Congress is a tribute to the very able, informed, and diligent performance by the committee, and by each member of the committee, of the duties and responsibilities imposed on the committee by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. It is impossible to single out one or more members for outstanding work; each and every member has made a vital contribution to our committee program and may take just pride in the committee's record of accomplishment.

Improved employee benefits, personnel management, and postal operations during the 86th Congress represent major forward steps in the committee's continuing program to establish and maintain a Government civilian personnel system and a level of efficiency in the postal service which compare favorably with best modern practices in private enterprise. The record of employee legislation is particularly significant when viewed in the light of the very fine benefits so recently approved in the 85th Congress, to which those of the 86th Congress are added.

I welcome this opportunity to express to the committee members my deep personal appreciation for their fine cooperation and conscientious devotion to duty.

The following summary of the committee's legislative and investigative activities is provided with the thought that it might be helpful to the Members during the recess:

FEDERAL EMPLOYEE BENEFITS

Salary increases

Public Law 86–568 (H. Rept. 1636) grants a general 7½-percent salary increase for those categories of Federal employees customarily included in salary legislation, except that the increases are slightly larger (averaging approximately 8.4 percent) for postal field service employees in the first six salary levels and for rural carriers. The coverage of Public Law 86–568 is as follows:

Section	Coverage	Number of employees
102	Postal field service employees	535,000
112	Classification Act employees	980,000
113	Foreign Service Act employees	8,100
114	Employees in the Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration	19,300
115	Agricultural stabilization and conservation county committee employees	15,000
116	Judicial branch employees	5,000
117	Employees of Senate and House of Representatives	7,500
	Total	1,570,000

Public Law 86–568 also extends to the agricultural stabilization and conservation county committee employees coverage of the civil service retirement, Federal employees' group life insurance, and Federal employees' health benefits programs. The effect is to grant these employees pay raises and fringe benefits on the basis already accorded to their fellow workers who are agricultural county extension agents.

This legislation further (1) makes certain adjustments in the salaries of top legal positions in the executive and military departments; (2) establishes the position of Administrative Assistant, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; and (3) earmarks 25 existing supergrade positions for the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Health insurance

Public Law 86–382 (H. Rept. 957) establishes a Federal employees health benefits program—one of the most valuable employee measures approved in any recent Congress. There is no finer example of able and constructive legislative deliberations than demonstrated by the committee in taking this extremely complex and controversial legislation and working out a bill that has the unanimous support of every committee member, the wholehearted agreement of employees' organizations and of private enterprise that will provide services, and the approval of the administration.

The Government will share the cost under this program to protect Federal employees and their dependents against the high, unbudgetable, and financially burdensome costs of medical services. Employees will be able to purchase protection, at very low cost, from the oppressive expenses of normal medical care and often crushing expense of major or catastrophic illness or injury. The program also improves the competitive position of the Government in the recruitment and retention of competent civilian personnel.

Addition of the health program to the existing fringe benefits package for Government employees—which already includes retirement and survivor annuities, group life insurance, annual and sick leave, pay for job-connected injury or death, uniform allowances, and other benefits—places the Government on a substantially equal level with progressive private enterprise in respect to employee fringe benefits.

Basic and extended health protection is made available to 2 million employees and their dependents—some 4,500,000 individuals. There will be free choice among four separate health plans, including a service benefits plan, such as the Blue Cross-Blue Shield organizations offer; an indemnity plan, such as now offered by certain insurance companies; any one of several Federal employees organization plans; and a comprehensive medical plan on either a group-practice or individual-practice prepayment basis. The plans will provide a wide range of hospital, surgical, medical, and related benefits. Both the service and the indemnity plan will include at least two levels of benefits. Thus, each employee will be able to select the plan best suited to his own needs.

The Government's contribution generally is 50 percent of the cost, but not less than $1.25 nor more than $1.75 biweekly for an individual employee and not less than $3 nor more than $4.25 biweekly for an employee and family, subject to certain special exceptions. Employees need not pass any physical examination and, in the event of separation from Government service, may convert their coverage to a private plan without physical examination. No person may be excluded because of race, sex, health status, or—at time of first opportunity to enroll—age.

This legislation enriches the Federal employees' fringe benefits package by a minimum $222 million annual health program, with the Government and the employees sharing the cost. It is widely regarded among employees as the equivalent in value of another liberal pay increase, on top of the 10-percent raise granted a year earlier.

Retirees health benefits program

Public Law 86–724 (H. Rept. 1930) grants former Federal employees (who retired before the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 became effective) a health benefits program comparable to the program established by such act for active employees and new retirees. Approximately 415,000 retired employees and survivors will be eligible for the health benefits program. The Government's contribution to premiums will be not less than $3 nor more than $4 monthly for a retiree who enrolls for self alone and will be twice such rate for a retiree who enrolls for self and family. The Government also will make an appropriate contribution to cover costs of administration.

Retirees will have the option of enrolling under a single health plan, for which the Civil Service Commission will enter into a contract with the carrier making the best offer, or of retaining or obtaining a different plan of his choice. Under either option the Government's contribution will be the same.

Disposition of certain retirement contributions

The first section of Public Law 86–622 (H. Rept. 1916) provides that retirement contributions made by an individual after he has qualified for maximum annuity benefits (80 percent of high average salary) will be applied, first, in payment for any noncontributory service standing to the individual's credit and, second, as voluntary contributions to purchase added annuity benefits under the previously existing voluntary-contribution provisions of section 12 of the Civil Service Retirement Act.

Section 2 rounds out the deferred annuity provisions of the Civil Service Retirement Act applicable to Members of Congress by providing entitlement to deferred annuity benefits for Members separated from the service before reaching age 50 after having completed 20 years of service including 10 years of Member service.

Section 3 provides that any former Government employee who, after retirement, is reemployed for 5 years or more may elect to

have his annuity rights redetermined on the basis of his total service (including the reemployed service) upon final separation and payment of the appropriate contributions for the reemployed service.

Section 4 extends to a very limited class of surviving widows of former Members of Congress survivorship benefits identical in principle to those provided by present law for all other surviving widows of former Members.

Earlier commencing dates for retirement annuities

Public Law 86–713 (H. Rept. 1150) provides that civil service retirement annuities will commence the first day after separation from the service if immediate benefits are payable or, in the case of deferred benefits payable at a certain age, the first day after the prescribed age is reached. Benefits of surviving widows and children will begin the day after the death of the employee or annuitant on whose service they are based. Previously annuities and survivor benefits commenced the first of the month following separation from the service or death, as the case might be. The new law is particularly helpful for widows and children, since their survivor benefits will become payable immediately after death of the employee or annuitant, whereas under prior law the benefits were not payable for periods of as much as 30 days after death.

Reemployment of retirees and miscellaneous retirement improvements

Public Law 86–604 (H. Rept. 832) corrects inequities in the Civil Service Retirement Act relating to reemployed annuitants and the crediting of service and makes certain other revisions of such act. Conditions with respect to (1) reemployed service of retired Members of Congress and (2) crediting of civilian service rendered by Members of Congress before their election to the Congress are placed on substantially the same basis already applicable to other retired Government employees.

The annuity computation formulas for Government employees generally—that is, 1½ percent for years of total service not exceeding 5; 1¾ percent for years of total service between 5 and 10; and 2 percent for years of total service in excess of 10—are made applicable to total service of retiring congressional employees and Members of Congress. For any of such total service not covered by the 2½ percent computation formula applicable to Member service and certain congressional employee service, the 1¾ percent formula will apply to years of total service between 5 and 10 and the 2 percent formula will apply to years of total service in excess of 10.

The age for commencement of deferred annuities of Members of Congress separated on or after October 1, 1956, is made applicable to Members separated prior to that date with deferred annuity entitlement.

A legislative technicality inadvertently contained in Public Law 85–465 is removed so that surviving widows of Canal Zone and Alaska Railroad retirees who died during March 1948 may receive surviving annuities intended for them by Public Law 85–465.

Retirement and leave credit—Internment of employees of Japanese ancestry

Public Law 86–782 (H. Rept. 1920) corrects omissions in Public Law 545, 82d Congress, which granted Federal employees of Japanese ancestry certain seniority and compensation benefits where their grades, time in grades or rates of compensation were adversely affected because of the security policies of the Federal Government during the World War II period of evacuating people of Japanese ancestry to relocation centers. Consideration was not given at that time to crediting such periods as periods of service for annual leave accrual and retirement purposes. Such annual leave accrual and retirement service credit benefits generally are associated with the benefits granted by Public Law 545, 82d Congress, Public Law 86–782 conforms the annual leave and retirement benefits of these employees of Japanese ancestry to the other benefits granted by Public Law 545.

Oversea differentials and allowances

Public Law 86–707 (H. Rept. 902) is another important employee measure, developed by the committee through its Civil Service Subcommittee studies over the past several years. This law will improve and strengthen administration of oversea activities of the Government by establishing a coordinated and reasonably uniform system to compensate American citizens employed abroad by the Government for additional costs, hardships, and inconveniences incident to their working assignments abroad. There will be uniform treatment for all oversea employees, to the extent practicable.

The law embodies the principle that the Government should provide equal treatment for its oversea employees in respect to the additional expenses they incur because of their assignments abroad, over and above expenses of Government employees in the United States, and the hardships, inconveniences, and other differences in environment or conditions of employment which justify additional compensation or allowances.

The law consolidates a wide variety of existing provisions of law granting allowances and differentials for the several categories of Federal employees in oversea areas. Provision is made for a temporary lodging allowance after arrival at a new overseas post and before final departure from the post; reasonable repairs to make substandard living quarters habitable; the inclusion of water as a utility covered by quarters allowances; advance payment of quarters allowances; allowances for maintenance of dependents where a separate establishment is necessary for them away from the post of duty; a post allowance to compensate for living costs higher than in Washington, D.C.; a transfer allowance upon assignment to a foreign post or at a post in the United States between foreign assignments; transportation of children—one round trip to the United States and back—for secondary or college education; a hardship post differential not exceeding 25 percent of basic pay for foreign conditions of environment warranting additional compensation; payment for packing and unpacking, transporting to and from storage, and storing furniture and household and personal effects of employees assigned to foreign posts; payment of unusual expenses incident to the operation of official residences suitable for chief representatives of the United States, and other senior officials designated by the President, at foreign posts; and transportation of the motor vehicle of an employee to his oversea post subject to a general limitation that only one such vehicle may be shipped during each 4 years of overseas service.

Home leave, such as now provided for the Foreign Service, is authorized for other employees who complete 24 months of continuous service abroad, in addition to the usual annual leave. Authority to accumulate up to 45 days of annual leave, now available to classified civilian employees abroad, is extended to employees of agencies operating under the Foreign Service Act or related law. Existing income tax exemptions for foreign areas allowances—but not post differentials—are continued in effect for the foreign areas allowances contained in the bill.

The value of the additional employee benefits provided by this legislation is estimated at $3 million annually.

Oversea teachers

Public Law 86–91 (H. Rept. 357) provides an up-to-date system of personnel administration, for teachers in schools conducted by the Department of Defense for dependents of the Department's personnel in oversea areas, which is comparable to the school systems in most public primary and secondary school jurisdictions in the United States. This legislation was developed through the Civil Service Subcommittee studies in cooperation with the Department of Defense and places in effect an Executive recommendation. It is also a direct implementation of a unanimous committee recommendation contained in House Report 2109, 84th Congress.

This act eliminates serious problems in the compensation and employment conditions of oversea teachers which stem primarily from the fact that they have been employed under civil service laws and rules designed for full-time classified employees—not for the teaching profession. For example, although the school year lasts only 9 or 10 months, oversea teachers' salaries have been on an annual basis, as in the case of the usual classified employees, so that they were being paid only nine-twelfths or ten-twelfths of the annual salary. They have been subject to the Annual and Sick Leave Act, which is entirely unsuitable in view of the school recess periods at Christmas and Easter and in the summer months. They have been receiving no pay or any of the usual oversea differentials and allowances during these recess periods.

Public Law 86–91 removes these teachers from the Classification Act of 1949, the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951, and other unsuitable laws and regulations. They will have a separate salary and allowance system adapted to the requirements of the school program and consistent with that followed in the school system in the District of Columbia. No oversea teacher's salary will be higher than the salary for a comparable position in the District of Columbia school system.

This new law will contribute greatly to maintaining instructional and scholastic levels in schools for dependents of oversea personnel comparable to the levels which would be available were such personnel on duty in the United States.

Rotation of oversea employees

Public Law 86–585 (H. Rept. 1469), based on an official recommendation of the Department of Defense, will contribute to a strengthened defense effort by improving the administration of oversea defense activities. To accomplish such purpose, this legislation establishes a strong policy of facilitating the interchange of civilian employees of the Defense Establishment between posts of duty in the United States and posts of duty outside the United States. Qualified employees will be encouraged (but not forced) to accept oversea assignments by being given every reasonable guarantee of return rights, after completing their oversea assignments, to positions in the United States at least equal in pay and tenure to the positions they held prior to accepting the oversea assignments.

Executive, administrative, and scientific research positions

Public Law 86–370 (H. Rept. 1138) authorizes pay adjustments for Patent Office Examiner in Chief and designated Examiners in Chief from the present $12,770–$13,970 level to maximums of $17,500 and $15,150, respectively; an increase from 146 to 260 in the number of supergrade positions—$15,255 to $18,500—in the Treasury Department; and a net increase of 94 in supergrade positions available to the Civil Service Commission for allocation to other

departments and agencies against a considerable backlog of requests—of which 20 are earmarked for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 4 for the Bureau of Prisons, 3 for the Immigration and Naturalization Service, 1 for the Department of Labor, 15 for the Small Business Administration, and 1 for the U.S. Court of Military Appeals, upon justification by these departments and agencies. Pay of executive positions is adjusted as follows: Commissioner of Social Security from $17,500 to $20,000; and Deputy Commissioner and Chief Counsel of the Internal Revenue Service, Administrative Assistant Attorney General, and Administrative Assistant Secretaries of Agriculture, Labor, and Treasury from $17,500 to $19,000. The Administrator, Agricultural Research Service, previously paid $17,500 under the Federal Executive Pay Act, is transferred to one of the scientific research positions provided by the bill. The Departments of Agriculture, and Health, Education, and Welfare, respectively, are granted 10 and 5 additional scientific research positions in the salary range $12,500 to $19,000.

Administrative authorities for the National Security Agency

Public Law 86–36 (H. Rept. 231) removes National Security Agency personnel from the Classification Act since the Agency security functions make it impossible to give the Civil Service Commission normal position classification and duty data; reestablishes the 50 existing Agency scientific research positions under the new act; and authorizes the Agency Director to fix salaries of other employees, as justified by levels of responsibilities, in relation to Classification Act salary rates, with not more than 50 supergrade positions in the $15,255 to $18,500 range.

Additional civilian positions for the Department of Defense

Public Law 86–377 (H. Rept. 597) increases from 303 to 372 the number of supergrade positions—salary range $15,255 to $18,500—and from 292 to 450 the number of scientific research positions—salary range $12,500–$19,000—in the Defense Establishment to perform necessary duties resulting from the greatly increased complexity and tempo of our defense effort. This legislation also includes a liberalizing amendment to the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act.

Crediting service of U.S. Commissioners

Public Law 86–306 (H. Rept. 687) credits service, for retirement purposes, of U.S. Commissioners who are compensated by fees on the same basis used to credit such service of other Government employees who are compensated by fees.

Training of postmasters

Public Law 86–33 (H. Rept. 230) facilitates the training of postmasters by specifically authorizing such training under the Government Employees Training Act, Public Law 85–507.

Observance of legal holidays

Public Law 86–362 (H. Rept. 362) corrects inequities in existing laws which deprive certain Federal employees of the right to a workday off when a holiday falls on Saturday or an employee's day off in lieu of Saturday. This law requires that every employee receive a workday off for each one of the 8 legal holidays every year, regardless of the day of the week on which any holiday may fall.

Temporary promotions, Bureau of the Census

Public Law 86–769 (H. Rept. 1982) removes certain obsolete provisions of the Census laws and restores a statutory exception from the Classification Act of 1949 relating to temporary promotions of Census employees and enumerator positions. Employees temporarily promoted during peak work periods (such as the decennial census) will have the right to return to their former positions, once their temporary work is completed, without being subject to reduction-in-force procedures.

Qualification for appointment to certain Library of Congress positions

Public Law 86–768 (H. Rept. 1926) excepts the Library of Congress from section 505(1) of the Classification Act of 1949, which (subject to certain exceptions) requires prior Civil Service Commission approval of the qualifications of appointees to positions in grades GS–16, 17, and 18 of the general schedule of such act.

POSTAL FRAUD AND OBSCENITY PROCEDURE

The 86th Congress marked still further progress in preventing use of the mails for fraudulent purposes and the transmission of obscenity and pornography. The measures summarized below were developed by the Postal Operations Subcommittee, in cooperation with the Post Office Department.

Post Office Department judicial officer

Public Law 86–676 (H. Rept. 1493) strengthens administrative procedures in postal fraud and obscenity cases by providing a judicial officer in the Post Office Department to perform such quasi-judicial duties as the Postmaster General assigns to him. This authority overcomes the effect of a judicial decision (169 Fed. Supp. 746) which enjoined enforcement of a postal fraud order on the ground that the Post Office Department's judicial officer has no authority to receive evidence under the Administrative Procedure Act. Public Law 86–676 vests in the judicial officer authority to receive evidence, along with existing authority to render decisions, consistent with the Postmaster General's delegation of authority. This legislation is a valuable aid to the prompt action always necessary to protect the public in fraud and obscenity cases.

Temporary detention of mail in fraud and obscenity cases

Public Law 86–673 (H. Rept. 945) represents one of the finest public interest actions completed by a legislative subcommittee in one Congress. This law provides for timely and effective action to terminate the business of purveyors of filth through the U.S. mails. Properly enforced, it will help sound the death knell to mail-order pornography for profit. The Postmaster General is authorized to apply directly to the appropriate U.S. district court, and the court is authorized, upon a showing of probable cause to believe that the postal fraud and obscenity statutes are being violated, to enter a temporary restraining order against the defendant and a preliminary injunction directing detention of the defendant's incoming mail pending conclusion of the statutory proceedings and any appeal therefrom. This will insure court supervision of the power to detain mail, remove any need for time limit on the period of detention, simplify and expedite proceedings, and helps to terminate dealings in obscene matter by any guilty party.

GENERAL POSTAL MATTERS

Use of certified mail by Government agencies

Public Law 86–507 (H. Rept. 1492) will effect material savings in postage costs for the transmission of official Government mail. A number of statutes heretofore have required that certain official Government mailings be registered, with accompanying charges generally representing the costs involved in providing this special postal service. Public Law 86–507 authorizes each department and agency in its discretion to utilize, in lieu of registry, the far less expensive certified mail procedure established several years ago and widely used by the general public. Since certified mail will serve the purposes of the Government fully as well as registered mail in many instances, the use of certified mail under this new law will result in economies in postal handling costs which will be passed on to the departments and agencies concerned.

Postage rates for books and library books

Public Law 86–644 (H. Rept. 252) revises and clarifies postage rate provisions under which books, library books, and related materials are mailed at special low rates. Either the third- or fourth-class rate or the book rate, whichever is cheaper, will apply to mailings of books and certain other educational matter. The book rates are extended to "sound recordings" in lieu of the existing application to "phonograph recordings," to printed educational charts of a permanent nature, to scientific or mathematical kits, instruments, and devices, and to mailings between cooperative processing centers. Periodicals may be mailed at the book rates in either bound or unbound form. Guides or scripts may be mailed with films and filmstrips at the book rates. Certain meaningless language is removed from the book and the library book postal rate provisions.

Minimum charge on third-class mailings of odd sizes and shapes

Public Law 86–56 (H. Rept. 331) revises the minimum per piece charge for third-class mail of odd size or shape from 6 cents to 3½ cents. This revision eliminates serious hardship imposed by the 6-cent rate on churches, church organizations, nurserymen, and other small businesses and also removes difficult operating problems arising in the postal establishment because of the 6-cent charge.

Statement of number of magazine copies sold

Public Law 86–513 (H. Rept. 573) clarifies the law relating to sworn statements by publishers having second-class mail permits and extends to magazines the requirement—now applied to most newspapers—that the sworn statements show average number of copies of each issue sold or distributed to paid subscribers. The publishers supported this legislation, which will facilitate postal operations.

Credit to postal revenues

Public Law 86–169 (H. Rept. 296) authorizes credit to postal revenues of commissions on toll telephones in post offices; amounts received by employees for witness fees, travel expenses, and subsistence when subpenaed to appear officially in private litigation; and collections for loss of first class registered matter not restored to the original owner.

MISCELLANEOUS

Clarification of salary appropriation provisions

Public Law 86–122 (H. Rept. 386) eliminates from Government salary laws an obsolete provision which is contradictory to existing budget and appropriation procedures. The provision eliminated purported to authorize salary costs, incurred in part in one fiscal year and in part in the following fiscal year, to be charged to the following year appropriations.

BILLS PASSED BY THE HOUSE

Forfeiture of Federal retirement benefits

H.R. 4601 (H. Rept. 258), developed in a special committee study after adjournment of the 85th Congress and passed by the House, April 14, 1959, would correct certain harsh inequities caused by Public Law 769, 83d Congress, which prohibits Federal retirement benefits based on service of an individual who has committed any one of a great many types of minor as well as serious offenses. The bill would continue and strengthen the existing prohibition against any Federal annuity or retired pay in the case of an offense involving the national security of the United States but would restore other annuities—including survivor benefits—previously denied because of comparatively minor offenses having no

relationship whatever to the national security. In many instances the offenses were so trivial there was no penalty and the individual continued in, or returned to, work and rendered long and faithful service until retirement. In these cases, there is no doubt of the individuals' complete loyalty or any semblance of an offense against the national security.

Veterans' preference—Define mothers

H.R. 1907 (H. Rept. 1489) would amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 to redefine the terms "mother" and "mothers" as including a natural mother, a mother through adoption, or a female who stands in loco parentis to a deceased or service-connected permanently or totally disabled ex-service man or ex-service woman for at least 1 year before the ex-service man or ex-service woman attained the age of 21 and not less than 1 year before the entry of the ex-service man or ex-service woman into active military service. This same policy is now contained in the definition of the term "parent" in title 38 of the United States Code, relating to veterans' benefits.

Exemptions from residence requirements, postal employees

H.R. 5571 (H. Rept. 937) would make career postal employees with 3 years of service eligible for postmasterships at their offices, if otherwise qualified, even though they reside outside the town or the office delivery limits.

Saved salaries for postal employees whose salary levels are reduced

H.R. 12663 (H. Rept. 1984) would protect postal field service employees from loss of salary when their salary levels are reduced for any reason except (1) demotion for personal cause, (2) the employee's request, or (3) reduction in force due to lack of funds or curtailment of work. Similar salary protection is provided for classified Federal employees by Public Law 85–737.

Saved salaries of employees whose positions are downgraded—Exception

H.R. 12336 (H. Rept. 1979) would provide a necessary exception from Public Law 85–737, which protects salaries of classified employees whose positions are reduced in grade through no fault of their own. The Comptroller General has ruled that such salary saving provision applies even in the cases of employees given temporary promotions with their agreement to return to their regular salary grades when the temporary work is completed. H.R. 12336 would except such temporary promotions from Public Law 85–737.

Transportation of 4-cent letter mail by air

H.R. 12595 (H. Rept. 1929) would prohibit the transportation by air of mail matter upon which the lawful domestic airmail postage is not paid. The prohibition would not apply to first-class 4-cent letter mail transmitted (1) between the 48 contiguous States (including the District of Columbia) and Alaska, Hawaii, the Canal Zone, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, or any territory, possession, or protectorate of the United States; (2) within or between any of such places which are outside the 48 contiguous States; and (3) military mail moving between ports of embarkation or debarkation in any of such places and any military post office outside of such places or such other places as the Secretary of Defense may prescribe. The bill would not alter existing statutory authority for air star routes where surface transportation is inadequate or for emergency mail service necessitated because of flood, fire, or other calamity.

Waiver of collections on certain raised money orders

H.R. 9507 (H. Rept. 1490) would authorize the Postmaster General to waive collection on raised money orders cashed by banks, business concerns, and individuals where (1) the overpayment resulted from alteration not apparent from visual inspection, and (2) payment was made in good faith and for value with no notice of any defect in the money order. The liability of the person altering any such money order would not be affected, nor would the Postmaster General's responsibility to pursue collection action against such person.

Penalty charges on short-paid mail

H.R. 9889 (H. Rept. 1491) would provide desirable flexibility in the regulation by the Postmaster General of mail on which required postage has not been paid. The Postmaster General would be authorized to establish a penalty charge for delivery of such mail whenever he finds it necessary to protect the postal revenue. This provision would replace the existing requirement for the assessment of a penalty charge, on any such mail, which is equal, as nearly as is practicable, to the approximate cost incurred by the postal service for delivery of the mail and collection of postage and other lawful charges thereon.

Adjustment of postal claims

H.R. 11531 (H. Rept. 1934) would (1) restore authority of the Postmaster General to handle "remission" cases involving funds sent by the postmasters directly to banks rather than through a designated depositary postmaster and (2) authorize the Postmaster General to relieve accountable postal employees from liability for losses resulting from certain illegal, improper, or incorrect payments. The authority for such relief now is vested in the General Accounting Office except in cases of loss by burglary, fire, or other unavoidable casualties which are considered by the Postmaster General. In each of the 717 cases sent to the General Accounting Office in the calendar year 1959, with relief recommended by the Postmaster General, the General Accounting Office granted the relief. The total amount involved was $200,774. This legislation would not affect the audit authority of the General Accounting Office, and any relief granted by the Postmaster General thereunder would be subject to review by the General Accounting Office. There would be no additional cost to the Government under this legislation, which is officially recommended by the Postmaster General.

BILLS REPORTED

Civil service retirement survivor benefits

H.R. 6743 (H. Rept. 1974) would grant certain former Federal employees who were separated before October 1, 1956, after having qualified for deferred annuity benefits, the right to elect reduced annuities and thereby provide survivorship benefits. Former employees similarly separated on or after October 1, 1956, now have such right.

Temporary postal salary increase of 1958 to be made permanent

H.R. 9890 (H. Rept. 1601) was reported, as a precautionary measure, to make certain that postal field service employees would not lose the 2½-percent temporary salary increase granted by Public Law 85–426, regardless of action on new salary increase legislation pending when the bill was reported. The purpose of H.R. 9890 later was effected by enactment of Public Law 86–568, which also granted an additional 7½-percent general salary increase for postal, classified, and many other groups of Federal employees.

Minimum pay raise for classified employees upon promotion

H.R. 543 (H. Rept. 1981) would provide a formula for guaranteeing a minimum salary increase for any classified employee who is promoted from one grade to another. The salary increase would be not less than the aggregate amount of two step increases of the grade from which promoted.

Mail powerboat service in Alaska

S. 1849 (H. Rept. 1921) would amend existing law which authorizes a subsidy to the low bidding carrier of mail, passengers, and freight operating on a prescribed intra-Alaska route so as to require that any steamboat or other powerboat used in performing such a contract for mail service shall be operated exclusively on the prescribed route.

SPECIAL ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMITTEE

Pay study

A special study, directed toward identifying problems with respect to Federal civilian salary policies, and developing solutions thereto, was conducted under the supervision of the committee chairman. The first step in this study was the preparation and publication, in a committee print dated December 8, 1959, of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, and related provisions of law, with pertinent annotations. This publication provides for the first time, in a single document, a convenient and up-to-date means of authoritative reference to statutes governing the compensation of over 1 million Federal civilian employees.

Personnel management in transition to new administration

A committee print of September 12, 1960, entitled "Maintaining the Integrity of the Career Civil Service," sets forth Federal civil service laws, orders, regulations, and related information with respect to advance planning for an orderly transition from the present to the new administration in January 1961. It is essential, in fairness to career employees and to provide an efficient work force for a new administration, that personnel adjustments resulting from changes in policies, objectives, and programs under the new administration, be effected without impeding important programs and in accordance with sound principles of personnel management. The information contained in the committee print is designed to facilitate accomplishment of these objectives by providing guidelines for executives and reassurance to employees that the merit system will be protected.

Placement of separated career employees

In réponse to inquiry made by the chairman on behalf of the committee, assurances were received that all possible efforts would be made to find other suitable Federal positions for career employees who may be separated from the military departments because of current appropriation personnel ceilings. The Secretary of Defense has appointed a coordinator to work with the Civil Service Commission and the Interdepartmental Placement Committee for this purpose. Exchanges of correspondence relating to this program were released September 11, 1960.

Codification of Federal personnel laws

A review is being made of the official administration proposal (H.R. 8748) to enact into positive law the provisions of title 5, United States Code, and appropriate related provisions. This legislation was not enacted during the 86th Congress but is expected to be considered early in the 87th Congress by the House Committee on the Judiciary, which has invited comments and recommendations from the Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS

The Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, pursuant to authority contained in House Resolution 78, 86th Congress, established a new special Subcommittee on Census and Government Statistics, and reconstituted three other special subcommittees which were activated in earlier Congresses, to carry out the committee's responsibilities under this

resolution. A summary of the special subcommitee activities follows:

Postal Operations Subcommittee

This subcommittee devoted primary attention to the serious and growing problem of obscenity and pornography moving through the U.S. mails and other avenues of commerce. The subcommittee conducted an intensive program of study and investigation directed toward corrective measures and held a number of hearings and conferences throughout the country to obtain information and recommendations from recognized authorities at all governmental levels and in private life.

The subcommittee made excellent progress toward its chief objectives—that is, stronger laws and vigorous enforcement thereof and the inducement of full public awareness of the problem—which are essential to combat the growing menace of filthy writings, pictures, and the like in America.

Two major legislative measures developed through the subcommittee studies and enacted into law as Public Laws 86–673 and 86–676 will have a valuable deterrent effect on the filth merchants. The provisions of these laws are explained in the above summary of postal legislation approved by the committee.

Thousands of mothers, fathers, teachers, ministers, priests, and laymen have petitioned for intervention by the subcommittee and the Congress to stop unbridled dealing in obscenity and pornography. The subcommittee has established a strong program of cooperation with organized governmental, community, civic, fraternal, and religious groups all over the country toward this end. The subcommittee reports and recommendations have gained wide and enthusiastic support and are credited with triggering a very effective campaign to protect the public from this vicious commerce.

Civil Service Subcommittee

The 86th Congress marked the virtual completion of the program of this subcommittee, undertaken in the 84th Congress, to strengthen civilian personnel policies in the oversea activities of the Government. House Report 2109, 84th Congress, contains a broad range of major recommendations with respect to such oversea activities, based on the subcommittee investigations during that Congress. These recommendations deal with four primary areas wherein corrective measures were found desirable as a result of a number of hearings and conferences held by the subcommittee in eight foreign nations in which the majority of Americans employed abroad are assigned to duty.

The first such primary area of recommendation—that the competitive civil service be extended to American citizens employed abroad—was placed in effect by Executive action in the 84th Congress in accordance with the subcommittee recommendation.

The second, for the establishment of an effective and suitable compensation and employment system for teachers and other personnel in schools conducted by the Department of Defense for dependents of the Department's oversea personnel, was placed in effect by Public Law 86–91, discussed earlier. This act provides an up-to-date school system for these oversea teachers and other school personnel, along the lines of the District of Columbia primary and secondary school system, and is expected to greatly facilitate and improve oversea school activities while at the same time reducing personnel turnover and recruitment problems to a minimum.

The third—for clarification and coordination of the then widely varied policies with respect to allowances and differentials for the several categories of oversea civilian employees of the Government—is effected by Public Law 86–707, as noted earlier. This bill will improve the operation of critical defense and other oversea activities of the Government through the establishment of a coordinated and reasonably uniform system of compensating American citizens for extra expenses and for hardships and inconveniences incident to their oversea assignments.

The fourth primary area of recommendation, for the establishment of a badly needed medical and health program for American citizens employed by the Government abroad, is embodied in H.R. 5178 and several companion bills on which final hearings were completed during the 1st session of the 86th Congress. Since this bill, like the other committee recommendations, is approved by the administration, early action is expected in the 87th Congress to place the proposed medical and health program for oversea employees in effect so that these employees will have appropriate health services and facilities on a reasonably uniform basis.

The subcommittee report and recommendations were highly commended in a letter from the White House, in these words:

"I would like to say first that this was an excellent report, carefully prepared and reflecting a comprehensive review of the facts, both in the oversea hearings and in the staff research. I believe that the liaison between your office and both my White House office and the Civil Service Commission has been a fine example of cooperative effort between legislative and executive branches of Government in developing sound legislation in this field of personnel administration."

Census and Government Statistics Subcommittee

The Subcommittee on Census and Government Statistics, newly established early in the 86th Congress, has undertaken a broad continuing study of all Government activities pertaining to the collection of information from the public, the processing and use of such information, and the impact on the public. A brief description of specific projects follows:

Census

The subcommittee held hearings on April 8, 1959, and March 18, 1960, on plans for the 1960 census, covering both the statistical content of the census and personnel aspects. A report on the role of the census in the reapportionment of the House of Representatives is contained in House Report No. 2223, 86th Congress. Materials have been assembled and plans made for hearings on the question of holding future censuses of population and housing more frequently than decennially. Preparation for the hearings includes the collection of opinions and recommendations from the Governors of all States, the mayors of a representative list of cities, and various municipal leagues and other groups.

Electronic Data Processing

Hearings were held on June 5, 1959, and March 2 and 4, 1960, on the use of electronic data-processing equipment in the Government. The latter hearings concentrated on problems of employee job security occasioned by the introduction of automation in office procedures. A report on this study is contained in a committee print dated August 31, 1960, now on sale for 35 cents by the Superintendent of Documents at the Government Printing Office.

Reporting Requirements of the Government

A detailed report on "Business Reporting Requirements of the Federal Government" was issued as a committee print on December 6, 1959. The report includes recommendations for controlling and reducing reporting burdens on the public, some of which have already resulted in specific corrective actions by executive agencies. As part of this continuing study, the subcommittee investigations of particular problem areas have led to reductions or elimination of reporting burdens which would have cost the Government and the public millions of dollars. Special attention has been devoted to the reporting burden on small business.

Government Data Compilation Work

The subcommittee surveyed all executive departments and major independent agencies to ascertain personnel and payroll figures for data collection and compilation. The results are summarized in House Report No. 1357, 86th Congress, entitled "Data Compilation Activities of the Federal Government: Personnel and Contract Costs." Government costs for collecting and compiling data from the public are estimated as $79 million a year. The report shows the relative activities of the various departments and bureaus and serves as a benchmark for measuring future increases and decreases. As part of the study, information was obtained on each contract for statistical services let during the past 5 years by a Government agency to any outside organization. Details of many of these contracts, made public for the first time, have led to questions concerning the public need for the information and the desirability of Federal sponsorship.

Transportation Statistics

The subcommittee selected transportation statistics—one of the most poorly organized of the Federal statistical fields—for its first major study in a specific subject field. The study to date has included an intensive examination of the Interstate Commerce Commission, which has led to a number of improvements in the Commission's statistical work, and exploratory surveys of the Civil Aeronautics Board and other agencies. Plans have been drawn up for a series of hearings to be conducted early in the 87th Congress.

Manpower Utilization Subcommittee

The Subcommittee on Manpower Utilization made valuable further progress, during the 86th Congress, in the studies of manpower and related problems which it has conducted during earlier Congresses. The objective of these studies is to achieve maximum efficiency in the utilization of Federal civilian personnel and thereby strengthen the defense effort and other essential services, reduce costs to the taxpayers, and advance the Federal career civil service.

The subcommittee has continued to work in close cooperation with responsible executive and administrative officials in the conduct of this study program. Quarterly manpower utilization progress reports are received by the subcommittee from 24 departments and agencies, setting forth employment changes, reasons for the changes, plans and programs for better manpower utilization, and related civilian personnel matters. During the 86th Congress the subcommittee held 16 days of public hearings, in which representatives of 24 departments and agencies participated.

A summary of major specific projects of the subcommittee follows:

Manpower Utilization in the Missile Program

The subcommittee was one of the first legislative groups to initiate inquiries with respect to the use of scientists and engineers in the design, testing, and production of missiles. The Department of Defense has adopted, or is in the process of implementing, many subcommittee recommendations in this highly important management field. For example, the rotation time of engineers and scientists in the military services who are assigned to missile programs has been extended, duplication of effort in the naval missile program has been reduced, and the Department's policy on bonus payments to contractor personnel is being strengthened in several areas. The subcommittee's "Preliminary Report on the Aspects of the Mis-

sile Program in the Departments of the Navy and the Air Force" (committee print, April 1959) contains subcommittee findings up to that time. A second report is planned for the fall of 1960, with further findings based on a study made by the General Accounting Office at the request of the subcommittee.

Contracting Out Work Normally Performed by the Government

A number of public hearings and field investigations were conducted during the 86th Congress, supplementing and extending the scope of the manpower study program. The subcommittee report based on these hearings and investigations, printed as House Report No. 688, 86th Congress, points up a growing habit of responsible Government officials to contract out functions which have been successfully performed in the past by career Government employees within the Government itself. The subcommittee unanimously agrees that continuance of such a departure from the fundamental policy of holding Government officials responsible for the performance of their assigned duties well may lead to waste and extravagance and have a serious adverse effect on the morale of Federal career employees.

Conference With Departmental Management Officials

The subcommittee during February 1960 conferred with top management officials of the departments and major agencies of the Government as part of the cooperative program to develop and activate still better and more effective utilization of Federal civilian personnel. Valuable contributions were made in the form of suggestions, plans, and projects by representatives of several of the departments and agencies.

Functional Studies

The Secretary of Defense early in 1960 officially reported that a functional study of the financial management programs in the military departments, based on subcommittee recommendations, will result in payroll savings in excess of $25 million a year. Management officials in other departments and major agencies currently are engaged in functional analyses of one or more of their work areas, pursuant to agreement reached in the February conference, and expect to complete the analyses by the end of 1960. Preliminary reports of progress are most encouraging. Three of the departments report that savings aggregating over $14 million a year will be achieved as a result of their functional analyses.

Manpower Questionnaire

Working with representatives of the executive branch and the General Accounting Office, the subcommittee developed a new procedure, in the form of a manpower questionnaire, for determining employment trends and for evaluating manpower programs and policies at local field activities of Federal departments and agencies. The General Accounting Office has been asked to use the questionnaire in the course of its regular audit of activities. To date the questionnaire has been used in some 15 field activities (both military and civilian) to point up basic manpower information that previously has often been lost through editorial processes in the chain of command.

Hiring of Retired Military Personnel

The subcommittee has initiated a study of the hiring by departments and agencies of recently retired military personnel. Numerous instances of this practice have been brought to the attention of the subcommittee. Currently the study is aimed at determining both the magnitude of the practice and the administrative techniques used.

Costs of Recruiting Engineers and Scientists by Defense Contractors

The subcommittee during the 85th Congress became concerned at the heavy turnover of scientific and engineering talent in our defense effort and instituted a study of recruitment practices and the moneys spent by defense contractors to obtain these talents. As a result of the study, Department of Defense officials have indicated that tighter control is being exercised over this item of contractor cost. The subcommittee has made a followup study this year to determine the present situation and later in the fall will issue a report covering defense contractor personnel which will show reduced turnover but also will reveal several problem areas for the contractors in the recruitment and utilization of highly skilled personnel.

Wage Board Pay Procedures

The procedures used in the executive branch to set wage-board employee pay rates were studied by the subcommittee in 1960. Due to a low turnover of Government employees in most of the wage board jobs, review of the current procedures reveals areas requiring further study and possibly action by the subcommittee. There are indications that recommended payroll changes, affecting many thousands of Federal career workers, well may result from this study.

Report of Hon. Gerald R. Ford to Fifth District of Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a report of my voting and attendance record during the 2d session of the 86th Congress.

The record includes all rollcall votes and all quorum calls. The description of bills is for the purpose of identification only; no attempt has been made to describe the bills completely or to elaborate upon the issues involved.

The purpose of this report is to collect in one place information which is scattered through thousands of pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I want to be able to provide any interested constituent with a simple compilation of my voting and attendance record.

It will be noted that there were 206 rollcalls and my attendance record was 93.2 percent.

Voting record, Representative GERALD R. FORD, JR., Fifth District, Michigan

Number	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
1	Jan. 6	Call of the House	Present.
2	Feb. 2	H.R. 1217, amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of amorphous graphite, amended. (Passed 278 to 116)	Yes.
3	Feb. 2	H. Con. Res. 459, expressing sense of Congress that any variation in traditional interpretation of treaties between United States and the Republic of Panama shall be made only pursuant to treaty, amended. (Passed 380 to 121.)	Yes.
4	Feb. 2	H. Con. Res. 465, expressing the indignation of Congress at the recent desecrations of house of worship and other sacred sites, without amendment. (Passed 392 to 0.)	Yes.
5	Feb. 17	H.R. 3151, relating to withholding for purposes of income tax imposed by certain cities on the compensation of Federal employees. (Passed 221 to 160.)	Yes.
6	Feb. 25	H.R. 3610, override the President's veto of bill to increase grants for construction of sewage treatment works. (Defeated 249 to 157.) (⅔ required)	No.
7	Feb. 29	H.R. 10743: On Yates amendment to bill to restore $50,000,000 for slum clearance and urban renewal. (Defeated 158 to 187)	Yes
8	Mar. 1	Quorum call	Present.
9	Mar. 7	Quorum call	Present.
10	Mar. 7	Quorum call	Present.
11	Mar. 7	H. Res. 467: On motion to take up for consideration H.R. 10777 to authorize certain construction at military installations. (Passed 309 to 1)	Yes.
12	Mar. 8	Quorum call	Present.
13	Mar. 8	H. Res. 468: On previous question to adopt closed rule to provide for 3 hours of debate on H.R. 5, foreign investment tax bill. (Passed 236 to 127)	Yes.
14	Mar. 8	Quorum call	Present.
15	Mar. 8	Quorum call	Present.
16	Mar. 9	Quorum call	Present.
17	Mar. 9	H.R. 10809, fiscal 1961 authorization bill for the NASA. (Passed 398 to 10)	Yes.
18	Mar. 9	H.R. 10777, authorize certain construction at military installations. (Passed 407 to 4)	Yes.
19	Mar. 10	Quorum call	Absent.[1]
20	Mar. 10	H. Res. 359, open rule to provide for consideration of and 15 hours of debate on H.R. 8601 to enforce constitutional rights. (Passed 312 to 93)	Paired.[2]
21	Mar. 11	Quorum call	Present.
22	Mar. 11	Quorum call	Present.
23	Mar. 14	Quorum call	Present.
24	Mar. 15	Quorum call	Present.
25	Mar. 16	Quorum call	Present.
26	Mar. 17	Quorum call	Present.
27	Mar. 18	Quorum call	Present.
28	Mar. 21	Quorum call	Present.
29	Mar. 21	H.R. 7279: On motion to suspend rules and pass bill to authorize establishment of Hubbell Training Post National Historic Site in State of Arizona. (Defeated 171 to 208.)	No.
30	Mar. 22	Quorum call	Present.

See footnotes at end of table.

Voting record, Representative GERALD R. FORD, JR., Fifth District, Michigan—Continued

Number	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
31	Mar. 23	Quorum call	Present.
32	Mar. 23	H.R. 8601, amendment to civil rights bill providing for U.S. voting referees. (Passed 295 to 124)	Yes.
33	Mar. 24	Quorum call	Present.
34	Mar. 24	H.R. 8601, motion to recommit civil rights bill to committee in order to omit threatening communications from penalties dealing with obstruction of court orders. (Defeated 118 to 304.)	No.
35	Mar. 24	H.R. 8601: On final passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1959. (Passed 311 to 109)	Yes.
36	Mar. 28	Quorum call	Present.
37	Mar. 29	Quorum call	Present.
38	Mar. 29	H.R. 11390: On final passage of appropriation bill ($4,100,000,000) for Departments of Labor, and of Health, Education, and Welfare. (Passed 362 to 10)	Yes.
39	Mar. 30	Quorum call	Present.
40	Apr. 4	Quorum call	Present.
41	Apr. 6	Quorum call	Present.
42	Apr. 7	Quorum call	Present.
43	Apr. 12	Quorum call	Absent.[1]
44	Apr. 13	H.R. 11666, appropriations bill for Departments of State, Justice, Judiciary and related agencies. (Passed 312 to 31.)	Yes.
45	Apr. 19	Quorum call	Present.
46	Apr. 19	Quorum call	Present.
47	Apr. 20	Quorum call	Absent.[1]
48	Apr. 20	H.R. 11776: On amendment to increase by $35,000,000 the funds provided for independent offices appropriation. (Passed 218 to 155)	Paired.[2]
49	Apr. 20	Quorum call	Absent.[1]
50	Apr. 20	Quorum call	Absent.[1]
51	Apr. 20	Quorum call	Absent.[1]
52	Apr. 21	Quorum call	Present.
53	Apr. 21	H.R. 8601: On final approval of conference report on civil rights bill. (Passed 288 to 95)	Yes.
54	Apr. 21	H.R. 11510, amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954 as amended. (Passed 243 to 130)	Yes.
55	Apr. 29	Quorum call	Present.
56	Apr. 27	H. Res. 498, adopt the open rule providing for 3 hours of debate on H.R. 10213 authorizing purchase by Treasury of $1,000,000,000 of FHA and VA mortgages.	No.
57	Apr. 27	Quorum call	Present.
58	Apr. 28	Quorum call	Present.
59	Apr. 28	H.R. 10213: On recommittal motion designed to include Bentley amendment to prevent discrimination account race, religion, or color. (Defeated 139 to 235.)	Yes.
60	Apr. 28	H.R. 10213: On final passage of bill to amend National Housing Act. (Passed 214 to 163)	No.
61	May 2	Quorum call	Absent.[4]
62	May 2	H.R. 10596, change method of Federal aid to State or territorial homes for the support of disabled soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines of United States. (Passed 265 to 0.)	Absent.[4]
63	May 2	H. Con. Res. 633, relating to restoration of freedom to captive nations. (Passed 276 to 0)	Yes.
64	May 3	Quorum call	Present.
65	May 3	Quorum call	Present.
66	May 4	Quorum call	Present.
67	May 4	Area redevelopment: On motion to table motion that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with. (Defeated 167 to 221)	Yes.
68	May 4	Area redevelopment: On motion ordering the previous question that further proceedings be dispensed with. (Passed 223 to 164)	No.
69	May 4	Area redevelopment: On motion to dispense with further proceedings under the call. (Passed 222 to 159)	No.
70	May 4	Quorum call	Present.
71	May 4	Area redevelopment: On motion to lay on the table the motion to order the previous question. (Defeated 152 to 230)	Yes.
72	May 4	Area redevelopment: On ordering the previous question on motion to dispense with further proceedings under the call. (Passed 235 to 153)	No.
73	May 4	Area redevelopment: On motion to dispense with further proceedings under the call. (Passed 236 to 151)	Yes.
74	May 4	Quorum call	Present.
75	May 4	Area redevelopment: On previous question on motion that further proceedings be dispensed with. (Passed 237 to 148)	No.
76	Mar. 4	Area redevelopment: On motion to dispense with further proceedings under the call. (Passed 237 to 150)	No.
77	May 4	S. 722, area redevelopment: On motion to consider the bill. (Passed 220 to 171)	No.
78	May 4	On motion to recommit to committee. (Defeated 162 to 223)	Yes.
79	May 4	S. 722, area redevelopment: To pass bill. (Passed 201 to 184)	No.
80	May 5	Quorum call	Present.
81	May 5	H.R. 11998, Defense Department appropriations bill. (Passed 377 to 3)	
82	May 6	Quorum call	Present.
83	May 6	H.R. 11713: On recommittal motion designed to add $104,000,000 for construction of linear electron accelerator at Stanford. (Defeated 191 to 129)	Yes.
84	May 6	H.R. 11713, to authorize appropriations for AEC. (Passed 321 to 2)	Yes.
85	May 10	Quorum call	Present.
86	May 11	Quorum call	Present.
87	May 12	Quorum call	Present.
88	May 12	H.R. 11510, adopt conference report on to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1954 as amended. (Passed 240 to 138)	Yes.
89	May 12	Quorum call	Present.
90	May 12	S. 1358, authorize Department of the Interior to provide headquarters site for Mount Rainer National Park. (Passed 260 to 83)	Yes.
91	May 16	Quorum call	Present.
92	May 17	Quorum call	Present.
93	May 17	Quorum call	Present.
94	May 18	Quorum call	Present.
95	May 18	S. 44: On Ullman amendment to bill authorizing construction of San Luis unit of Central Valley project providing exemption from 160-acre limitation. (Passed 214 to 181.)	No.
96	May 18	H.R. 5: On motion to strike enacting clause of Foreign Investment Incentive Tax Act of 1960. (Defeated 160 to 232)	No.
97	May 18	H.R. 5, Foreign Investment Incentive Tax Act of 1960. (Passed 195 to 192)	Yes.
98	May 19	Quorum call	Present.
99	May 19	H. Res. 488, open rule providing for consideration of H.R. 2331 to establish Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park. (Defeated 134 to 227.)	No.
100	May 24	Quorum call	Present.
101	May 25	H.R. 12326: On recommittal motion designed to prevent the use of any funds for construction of Allegheny River Reservoir. (Defeated 110 to 294)	Yes.
102	May 25	H.R. 12326, public works appropriations bill. (Passed 387 to 18)	Yes.
103	May 25	H. Res. 536, rules providing for consideration of and 4 hours of debate on H.R. 10128, school construction bill. (Passed 307 to 97)	Yes.
104	May 26	Quorum call	Present.
105	May 26	H.R. 10128, school construction bill: On Powell amendment to require that school facilities constructed with Federal assistance shall be available to all students in accordance with the 1954 decision of the Supreme Court. (Passed 218 to 181.)	Yes.
106	May 26	H.R. 10128: On Bow amendment to return to States for construction of school facilities 25 percent of the taxes collected on every pack of cigarettes sold in each State. (Defeated 181 to 219.)	No.
107	May 26	H.R. 10128, school construction bill, adopt committee amendment as amended. (Passed 223 to 117)	Yes.

See footnotes at end of table.

Voting record, Representative GERALD R. FORD, JR., Fifth District, Michigan—Continued

Number	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
108	May 26	H.R. 10128, school construction bill, authorize Federal assistance to the States to be used for construction of school facilities. On motion to recommit to committee to substitute provisions of H.R. 12259, the administration bill. (Defeated 80 to 319.)	Yes.
109	May 26	H.R. 10128, authorize Federal assistance to the States to be used for constructing school facilities. (Passed 206 to 189)	No.
110	June 1	Quorum call	Present.
111	June 1	Quorum call	Present.
112	June 1	Quorum call	Present.
113	June 1	S. 1892: On committee amendment relating to interest rates applicable to proposed projects in the Colorado River storage project. (Passed 228 to 123)	No.
114	June 2	Quorum call	Present.
115	June 2	Quorum call	Present.
116	June 2	Quorum call	Present.
117	June 3	Quorum call	Present.
118	June 3	Quorum call	Present.
119	June 3	Quorum call	Present.
120	June 3	On motion to adjourn. (Defeated 77 to 194)	Yes.
121	June 3	Quorum call	Present.
122	June 6	Quorum call	Present.
123	June 8	Quorum call	Present.
124	June 8	H. Res. 590: On closed rule waiving points of order and providing for 2 hours of debate on H.R. 12381 to extend for 1 year existing corporate normal tax rate and certain excise tax rates. (Passed 204 to 181.)	Yes.
125	June 8	H.R. 12381, increase for 1 year period the public debt limit set forth in sec. 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act and to extend for 1 year the existing corporate normal tax rate and certain excise tax rates. (Passed 223 to 174.)	Yes.
126	June 8	Quorum call	Present.
127	June 9	Quorum call	Present.
128	June 9	H.R. 12049: On recommittal motion designed to retain the 1958 provisions regarding property rights in inventions. (Defeated 120 to 269)	No.
129	June 14	Quorum call	Present.
130	June 14	Quorum call	Present.
131	June 14	Quorum call	Present.
132	June 15	Quorum call	Present.
133	June 15	H.R. 9883, recommit the Federal employee's pay raise bill to committee to provide for a 5-percent increase. (Defeated 94 to 324)	Yes.
134	June 15	H.R. 9883, pass Federal employee's pay raise bill providing for 7½-percent increase. (Passed 378 to 40)	No.
135	June 16	Quorum call	Present.
136	June 17	Quorum call	Present.
137	June 17	H.R. 12619, increase the mutual security appropriation by $200,000,000. (Passed 212 to 173)	Yes.
138	June 17	H.R. 12619: On final passage of mutual security appropriations bill. (Passed 258 to 124)	Yes.
139	June 21	Quorum call	Present.
140	June 22	Quorum call	Present.
141	June 22	Quorum call	Present.
142	June 23	Quorum call	Present.
143	June 23	H.R. 12580: On final passage of the Social Security Amendments of 1960. (Passed 381 to 23)	Yes.
144	June 23	H.R. 12261: On motion to recommit in order to substitute the Wheat Act of 1960, approved by Senate. (Defeated 195 to 211)	Yes.
145	June 23	H.R. 12261: On final passage of the Farm Surplus Reduction Act of 1960. (Defeated 170 to 236)	No.
146	June 23	Quorum call	Present.
147	June 23	H.R. 10569, disagree with Senate amendment extending to city delivery the present congressional franking privilege for boxholder mail on rural routes. (Passed 235 to 164.)	Yes.
148	June 23	H.R. 12740, recommit bill to committee for purpose of eliminating $5,000,000 for Capitol grounds expansion. (Defeated 149 to 252)	Yes.
149	June 24	Quorum call	Present.
150	June 24	Quorum call	Present.
151	June 24	S. 1508, make the Government-owned intrastate Alaska Railroad subject to regulation by ICC. (Passed 267 to 101)	No.
152	June 24	H.J. Res. 649 (S.J. Res. 41): On final passage of the International Health and Medical Research Act of 1960. (Passed 259 to 114)	No.
153	June 24	Quorum call	Present.
154	June 25	Quorum call	Present.
155	June 25	Quorum call	Present.
156	June 27	H.R. 8860 (with committee amendment), stabilize the mining of lead and zinc by small domestic producers on public, Indian, and other lands. (Passed 197 to 192.)	No.
157	June 27	H.R. 8697, amend the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945 with respect to the requirements for adoption of a redevelopment plan for a project area. (Passed 348 to 35.)	Yes.
158	June 28	Quorum call	Present.
159	June 28	Quorum call	Present.
160	June 28	Quorum call	Present.
161	June 28	Quorum call	Present.
162	June 29	H.R. 11001, provide for the participation of the United States in International Development Association without amendment. (Passed 249 to 158)	Yes.
163	June 29	H.R. 7903 amend United States Code to extend the veterans' guaranteed and direct loan program for 2 years. (Passed 391 to 1)	Yes.
164	June 30	Quorum call	Present.
165	June 30	H.R. 11998: On conference report making appropriations for Department of Defense for fiscal year 1961. (Passed 402 to 5)	Yes.
166	June 30	Quorum call	Present.
167	June 30	Quorum call	Present.
168	June 30	H.R. 1267: On Kitchin amendment to replace text of bill with language of H.R. 12853 (to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 as amended). (Passed 211 to 203.)	Yes.
169	June 30	H.R. 12677, amend Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 as amended to provide coverage for employees of interstate retail enterprises and to increase minimum wages under act to $1.15. (Passed 341 to 72.)	Yes.
170	June 30	H.R. 12311, extend for 1 year the Sugar Act of 1948 as amended. (Passed 390 to 0)	Yes.
171	July 1	H.R. 9883 (adjust rates of basic compensation of certain Federal employees): On motion to override President's veto. (Passed 345 to 69)	No.
172	July 1	Quorum call	Present.
173	July 1	Quorum call	Present.
174	July 1	Quorum call	Present.
175	July 1	H.R. 8665: On motion to recommit to committee bill to establish a memorial to Theodore Roosevelt in the National Capital. (Defeated 50 to 308)	No.
176	July 2	Quorum call	Present.
177	July 2	H. Res. 596, providing for House consideration of Senate amendments to H.R. 12740, supplemental appropriations bill for 1961. (Passed 291 to 79)	No.
178	July 2	H. Res. 596: On agreeing to the resolution providing for consideration of Senate amendment to H.R. 12740, supplemental appropriation bill. (Passed 257 to 109.)	No.
179	July 2	H.R. 2467, adopt committee amendment that supplied new text of bill to authorize reimbursement of owners and tenants of land acquired by Federal Aviation Agency for Chantilly relocation. (Passed 182 to 166.)	Yes.
180	July 2	H.R. 2467, authorize the reimbursement of owners and tenants of land acquired by Federal Aviation Agency for their moving expense in Chantilly relocation. (Passed 182 to 167.)	Yes.
181	Aug. 15	Quorum call	Absent.[3]
182	Aug. 17	Quorum call	Absent.[4]
183	Aug. 22	Quorum call	Present.
184	Aug. 22	H.R. 12753, amend the Subversive Activities Control Act relative to registration of foreign agents' disseminating political propaganda in United States. (Passed 395 to 3.)	Yes.
185	Aug. 22	H.R. 5383, clarify status of faculty and administrative staff at U.S. Merchant Marine Academy. (Passed 291 to 90)	No.
186	Aug. 22	H.R. 9866: On motion to suspend rules and pass bill to establish Federal agriculture service to Guam. (Deferred 202 to 151.) (⅔ needed)	No.
187	Aug. 23	Quorum call	Present.
188	Aug. 23	H. Res. 607, contemp citation S. Sloan Colt. (Passed 270 to 124)	Yes.
189	Aug. 23	H. Res. 611, citing Consuelo Burgos De Saez Pagan for contempt of Congress. (Passed 382 to 0)	Yes.
190	Aug. 24	Quorum call	Present.

See footnotes at end of table.

Voting record, Representative JOHN R. FOLEY, 6th District, Maryland—Continued

Number	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
191	Aug. 24	H. Res. 587: On rule to consider legislation favoring a convention of delegates from Atlantic democracies looking to greater cooperation and unity of purpose. (Passed 349 to 49.)	Yes.
192	Aug. 24	S.J. Res. 170, favoring a convention of delegates from Atlantic democracies looking to greater cooperation and unity of purpose. (Passed 288 to 103)	Yes.
193	Aug. 25	Quorum call	Present.
194	Aug. 25	Quorum call	Present.
195	Aug. 26	Quorum call	Present.
196	Aug. 26	Quorum call	Present.
197	Aug. 26	H.R. 12580, adopt conference report on Social Security Act amendments, aged, medical care. (Passed 368 to 17)	Yes.
198	Aug. 31	Quorum call	Present.
199	Aug. 31	H.R. 13161, amendment to provide an additional $65,000,000 for defense support under mutual security program. (Passed 203 to 193)	Yes.
200	Aug. 31	H.R. 13161, amendment to provide an additional $26,000,000 of special assistance funds for mutual security program. (Defeated 176 to 216)	Yes.
201	Aug. 31	Quorum call	Absent.[1]
202	Aug. 31	Quorum call	Absent.[1]
203	Aug. 31	Quorum call	Present.
204	Aug. 31	Quorum call	Present.
205	Sept. 1	Quorum call	Present.
206	Sept. 1	Quorum call	Present.

[1] Out of Washington on speaking engagement.
[2] Paired. If present, would have voted "yes."
[3] Against.
[4] Speaking engagement.
[5] If present, would have voted "yes."

Newsletter by Hon. E. Y. Berry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my recent newsletter summarizing congressional action in the closing days of the 2d session of the 86th Congress:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., September 1960.

DEAR FRIEND: This Congress, which came here for the August session with flags flying and bands playing, is sneaking out of town. Its Democrat leadership, who will campaign for the highest office in the land on the slogan that we need leadership, has been unable to lead its own party. Crucial items in the President's program were thrown overboard. The announced program of the Democrat leaders for this session was abandoned. The Nation received a practical lesson on the inability of the majority party in Congress to work together.

On civil rights, Senator KENNEDY himself ran out on the Democrat platform and voted against consideration. On medical care, he lost his principal demand—that medical care for the aged be financed through the social security payroll tax. It was this defeat that led to his proposal to go to the people. In his frustration that followed, he announced, "Congress might as well pack up and go home." On minimum wage, the session came up with much less than young KENNEDY promised. On agriculture, he promised at Los Angeles immediate passage of a farm bill. Nothing was attempted; nothing accomplished.

The people were not led out of the wilderness. The program for the special session ended just about where it left off on July 3. Nothing was done which could not have been done the week prior to the conventions, and the hoped-for leadership of a politically lopsided Congress did not develop.

MEDICAL CARE

In spite of the Kennedy forces, the Senate adopted a medical care bill very similar to the one previously passed by the House, and one which leaves the handling of the program to the States, following its adoption by the States, and will be administered through the State welfare division.

The Central Government proponents wanted the medical care for the aged program linked with social security payroll taxes where it could be handled out of Washington. The objections to this approach are that it would be compulsory and limit benefits to only those already covered by social security.

Actually, the elderly in greatest need of health assistance are those without regular monthly incomes. Linking health to retirement benefits under social security would also add greatly to the cost of the program. The payroll tax for retirement, now 6 percent and costing $10 billion annually, is already scheduled to go to 9 percent by 1969, and employers and employees would be required to pay even more if health were added, giving the worker less and less control over his earnings.

If the Federal Government were to operate the compulsory medical care program, as proposed by Senator KENNEDY, rather than the States, it would mean Federal control of funds, including rates of compensation for hospitals, nursing homes, dentists, and physicians, with reports, audits, etc., to justify an additional army of Federal employees to administer. Again, responsibility would be shifted to Washington, curbing community incentive to build hospitals and handle health problems locally.

In the debate, Senator KENNEDY called the State program most unwise because as he said, "They will operate with all the different standards which are going to be set up in the different States, with some States participating and many not participating." It is difficult to understand just what is wrong with that. The people of South Dakota, acting through their locally elected legislators, may wish to set up standards which differ from those preferred by the people of Massachusetts and their delegation. If so, what is wrong with this? Why should the Federal Government seek to impose its standards, regardless of local wishes, local costs, and local facilities? Is it too old fashioned to believe that there are those other than politicians and Government employees who can operate and handle their own affairs and who can spend their own tax money?

MINIMUM WAGE

Eight votes in the House are all that saved almost every industry in the country from being covered by the minimum-wage law.

As the bill was reported to the House floor, the bill would have increased from $1 to $1.25 the minimum wage of all employees presently covered and would have extended coverage to restaurants, hotels, and nearly all retail and wholesale businesses.

By a vote of 211 to 203, the House adopted the Kitchin-Ayres substitute, which reduced the wage floor to $1.15 and limited coverage to approximately 1.4 million additional workers in retail chains with five or more stores in two or more States. I voted for this substitute.

The central government enthusiasts in the Senate raised the minimum to $1.25 and extended coverage to about 4 million workers now excluded. Covered under the Senate bill were businesses with gross annual sales of $1 million a year or more, even if they operate within one State, disregarding entirely the constitutional limits of Federal legislation of interstate commerce only.

Fortunately for the American public, the House conferees refused to budge from the position established by the eight-vote margin in the House. They refused to knuckle down to the labor bosses and insisted on the House version or none at all. As a result, the conferees were deadlocked and unable to agree on a compromise, with the measure dying in conference as the session ended.

Had it not been for the eight-vote victory of the Kitchin-Ayres amendment in the House, in all probability we would now have on the statute books a $1.25 minimum wage bill affecting almost every business in South Dakota and throughout the Nation, and preventing thousands of unskilled and untrained workers from securing employment.

This, too, will be a major campaign issue this fall. The voters who will decide how they want their vote cast in Congress (keeping in mind the small margin that decided the issue in this session) must consider these questions: Can the Federal Government, by enacting a law, set wage and hour levels without harm to the worker and the economy which supports him? Would the increase be justified if, as is estimated, a half-million people, mainly teenagers, elderly and relatively inefficient workers, would be forced out of work as employers tried to absorb the added cost? Can the Federal Government fairly set wage standards when income levels vary so greatly throughout the Nation? Would such an increase add to inflationary pressures so that pay increases would soon disappear because the worker would have to pay higher prices for goods and services?

MISCELLANEOUS

Because of fire danger in the Black Hills areas, and other public land areas of the West, where mining claims have been filed and annual assessment work is required to be completed prior to September 1, the Bureau of Land Management has granted a temporary deferment of annual assessment work. This is only a temporary deferment, however, and miners seeking such deferment should contact the Billings office without

delay. When deferment is granted, it should be filed in the office of the Register of Deeds of the county in which the mining claim is located to protect the claim. In these cases 2 years of assessment work must be completed prior to September 1, 1961.

The Atomic Energy Commission will probably accept a contract for the establishment of a lignite-uranium plant at Bowman, N. Dak., which would serve northwestern South Dakota and southwestern North Dakota. The contract would be with the International Resources Corp. but the city of Bowman will be constructing the plant. It will be operated by Susquehanna Western, who operate the Edgemont mill. There will be the large mill location in Bowman with two field roasting units preparing the ash for the central mill. AEC will probably approve the contract providing the people of Bowman fully understand the problems involved and are willing to take the necessary risks. Decisions should be firmed up before too long.

Schools in federally impacted areas which were "short changed" some $7.3 million in 1958–59 by congressional appropriation will be relieved of their warrant liability with an appropriation of that amount by this session. Schools with limited tax base, such as the Douglas School District at Ellsworth Air Force Base, were especially affected, but there are some 28 school systems in western South Dakota who will benefit by this delayed appropriation. This is an alarming example of what could well happen if the budget of every school district in the Nation were dependent upon the whims of Congress to appropriate for school construction and for teachers' salaries. Twenty-eight districts in western South Dakota have learned by bitter experience what Federal aid without Federal appropriations can actually mean.

With my kindest regards and best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

E. Y. BERRY.

Report to My Constituents on the 86th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, another Congress—the 86th—is over. The second session adjourned sine die on September 1. It has been a strange Congress in many ways; largely because so much time passed without accomplishment. In the first session there were 23 Fridays when the House did not even meet. This session 3 whole months went by with practically nothing done. The Senate filibustered for weeks over doing anything for civil rights, and now boasts of the bill finally passed. We cannot filibuster that way under House rules, but we dillydallied along most of the winter. Of course the party in power—the Democrats had about a 2-to-1 majority—is always reluctant to put through the program of a President of the other party, especially in election year. This time the Senate held up appointments of judges and postmasters, as everyone in Ohio knows all too well. However, the 86th Congress has adjourned, and we can look at the record.

It was particularly unfortunate that in the first 3 months of this session so little legislation of importance was passed, as it gave an excuse to the majority leadership to recess for the conventions and then come back in August to complete the work. Along with my Republican colleagues I opposed the recess, believing that very little could be accomplished in such a postconvention session and that it was not in the best interests of the United States. Now that the Congress has finally adjourned, the public press and informed persons have pretty well agreed that little if anything real was accomplished, and that it was charged from the very beginning with political impulses. Most of the "musts" that were supposed to be so important to the country could have been passed before the recess if the majority party had had the will to do so. It certainly had the votes.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND FAILURES

This Congress failed to take action on many important matters recommended by President Eisenhower, such as: a moderate upward adjustment of the minimum wage; constructive measures to meet existing farm problems; Federal assistance in the construction of facilities for colleges, universities, and elementary and secondary schools; authorization of 40 new Federal judgeships to expedite the rendering of justice; liberalization of our immigration laws; and proper financing to avoid delays in our interstate highway program.

SOCIAL SECURITY

One of the few important post convention session bills passed was the social security amendments bill which authorizes a new program of Federal grants to the States for medical care for the aged. The plan finally adopted provides that the Federal Government will assume one-half of the cost of providing medical care to persons over 65 who have incomes under minimums to be established by the respective States. The program is voluntary on the part of the State with respect to the establishment of such a program, and it is further voluntary on the part of the individual as to whether or not he or she seeks to be covered. The language of the bill clearly states that the recipients under the program are to be in addition to those persons now receiving old-age assistance, not merely a substitute for it.

Present social security laws restrict to $1,200 the amount of money a person may earn without losing benefits, but do not affect the income he—or she—may receive from stocks or bonds. To me this is wholly unjust. I introduced H.R. 11029, a proposal to eliminate the earning limitation, hoping some action might result. The bill as passed sets up a rather complicated formula which amounts to an increased earning of approximately $150 a year without penalty. In addition, the bill removes the requirement that permanently disabled persons must be 50 years of age before they or their dependents can receive disability payments, and eliminates the 6-month waiting period in the case of recurrence of a disability.

This legislation does not go as far as some would like, and goes further than others think wise. But it will give the country an opportunity to look the program over and make the necessary changes.

HOUSING

Another necessary bill passed in the final days of the session was a modified housing bill which will keep three very important programs going. This legislation authorized an additional $500 million in Federal loans to build college dormitories; provided a 1-year extension of the Federal Housing Administration home improvement program; and authorized $50 million for new loans for the community facilities program, covering such things as city water plants and sewage systems.

NATIONAL ECONOMY

Once again it was necessary to extend for 1 year the present 52-percent corporate tax rate and certain excise taxes on beer, wine, cigarettes, automobiles, telephone, and telegraph. Many of us were hoping that it would be possible to repeal the excise tax on telephones, believing that a telephone should be classified as a necessity, rather than a luxury. However, the bill came to the House under a closed rule which made it impossible to vote on this specific issue.

GOVERNMENT WORKERS

Our Federal postal and classified workers were given a 7½-percent pay increase by this Congress. I voted for this pay raise. After studying the problem carefully, I was convinced that the loyal workers on the postal and Federal payroll had not been kept abreast of the cost-of-living increase, forcing many to hold second employment, with a consequent reduction in efficiency to the Government.

Retired Federal workers were also brought under coverage of the Health Benefits Act by the passage of appropriate legislation.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Another bill on which Congress completed action was a proposed constitutional amendment giving residents of the District of Columbia the right to vote for President and Vice President. I supported this resolution when it came before the House. Thus, after 160 years of being denied this basic right of suffrage, victory is near for residents of the District of Columbia as soon as 38 State legislatures ratify the proposal.

House Joint Resolution 502—now Public Law 86–484—which I sponsored, gives authorization to the National Council of Negro Women to erect a memorial to the late Mary McLeod Bethune in Lincoln Park in the District of Columbia. It is most fitting that in this centennial year honor should be paid this outstanding woman, born the daughter of a slave, who became the counselor of Presidents, and the founder of the Bethune-Cookman College.

VETERANS HOSPITAL

Culminating the efforts of many years, funds were voted this year to construct on property purchased by the Government for this specific purpose at least 12

years ago, a new 800-bed Veterans' Administration general medical and surgical hospital to replace the present disintegrating Crile Hospital. This has long been needed to provide adequate medical care for the more than 715,000 veterans who reside in Ohio's 38 northern counties which come under the jurisdiction of the Cleveland VA regional office. Architectural plans for the hospital are now being drawn and actual construction should get under way next year.

CLEVELAND HARBOR

Once again this year I joined my congressional colleagues and city and business interests from Cleveland in urgently requesting the House Appropriations Committee for funds for the further development of our Cleveland Harbor. The committee approved and the Congress voted an appropriation of $200,000 for design and engineering funds for the replacement of three bridges that are a hindrance to navigation.

NEW FEDERAL BUILDING FOR CLEVELAND

A new $47 million Federal building for Cleveland has reached the stage of having funds for site acquisition and planning approved by the Senate and House Committees on Public Works. Although no site has been agreed to, we are hopeful that the actual construction funds will be appropriated in the next session.

CIVIL RIGHTS

The passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1960 was a real achievement. To get this bill to the floor for action it was necessary to obtain 219 signatures on a discharge petition. Believing this was the only way to get consideration of this very important legislation, I was glad to sign the petition. When the bill reached the floor I supported every strengthening amendment and opposed those amendments which would have weakened the bill. As finally passed, the bill has five major provisions as follows: First, gives power to the courts to name special voting referees when it finds evidence that discrimination against Negroes exists—the referees, under court's jurisdiction, to take appropriate steps to insure that qualified Negroes are able to register and vote; second, provides schooling for children of servicemen whenever desegregation disputes lead to the closing of local schools; third, provides criminal penalties for interference with court desegregation orders; fourth, makes it possible for the Federal Bureau of Investigation to enter cases involving bombings of schools, churches, and synagogues. I had introduced a separate bill on this subject—H.R. 2242; fifth, provides that voting records must be preserved for 22 months for possible Federal inspection.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS—MUTUAL SECURITY BILL

In the area of foreign affairs, our committee sat for many weeks in consideration of the mutual security bill. The legislation which finally emerged from the House-Senate conference provided for an authorization of $4,086,300,000 for fiscal year 1961, a reduction of $88 million from the President's recommendations. In the final days of the session the Congress appropriated a total of $3,716,350,000 for the program—some $458 million less than the administration had requested. This was subsequently increased by a $65 million supplemental appropriation, passed at the urgent request of the President.

SPECIAL PROGRAM FOR TROPICAL AFRICA

One of the new sections added to the Mutual Security Act of 1960 provides a sum of $20 million for a special program for tropical Africa. This sum is planned for use in assisting emerging African countries with basic educational planning and program development. It will supplement teacher training activities carried on under the existing technical cooperation program, and identify us more closely with the aspirations of the African people. With the breakdown of order in the Congo and establishment of a United Nations military force, the Congress approved an additional $100 million of contingency funds for the President to take whatever constructive action that may be necessary.

LATIN AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT

At the request of the administration the Congress authorized a $500 million social development program in Latin America. Growing unrest under conditions of extreme poverty and mounting demands for improvement require immediate attention if violent overthrow of governments and institutions is to be avoided. Specific programs will be worked out in cooperation with each of the governments concerned, and funds channeled through such agencies as the Inter-American Development Bank. An additional $100 million was authorized for relief and rehabilitation expenditures to earthquake-stricken Chile.

NATO COMMISSION

In a move directed toward increased cooperation among the Atlantic nations, the Congress authorized the appointment of a 20-member U.S. NATO Commission. This Commission is expected to participate in a citizens conference of NATO countries, and will explore economic and political measures designed to develop further democratic freedom.

FOREIGN SERVICE AMENDMENTS ACT

As the United States has had to assume increasing responsibility across the world, it became more and more apparent that changes needed to be made in the legislation governing our Foreign Service. Months—over several years—of study by the Department, in conjunction with a subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, on which I serve, gave us S. 2633. Briefly, a reduction was effected in the number of staff personnel classes, and retirement benefits extended to include specialists in the Foreign Service retirement system. These amendments were adopted unanimously, providing some limited recognition of the very fine job that our dedicated Foreign Service officers and staff are doing all over the world.

CONCLUSION

This is little more than an outline of the work of the 86th Congress. Difficult as the situation is, as in the past, it has been a privilege to serve the 22d Ohio District in the many areas of national life that grow increasingly important to each individual American.

Fourth Annual Report to the People of the 18th District of Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, despite the deadlocks, the disappointments and the bitterness which prevailed during the short session of Congress following the political conventions, there were some solid accomplishments made by the House of Representatives and the Senate during the 2 years of the 86th Congress which has now concluded.

In this, my fourth annual report to the people of the 18th District, I would like to outline some of the successes, and the failures.

Certainly, all of us have learned a lesson in the folly of calling Congress back to work following the political conventions during a presidential election year. A great deal of heat was demonstrated by members of both political parties during the short session, but light on the important subjects under discussion failed to shine through the haze of political fog.

NO COMPROMISE

We have found that there is no room for compromise in the heat of a partisan campaign, that issues are drawn and lines of verbal battle so firmly set that logic and cool thinking simply cannot exist under such conditions.

Rather than constructive legislation on issues such as minimum wage, aid to education, housing, agriculture, the American people got nothing.

The upstaging, the playing to the galleries, the passionate pleas which took place in the Senate during this short session are better suited to the theater than to the Senate, which takes pride in calling itself the greatest deliberative body on earth.

Despite the charges and denials, the verbal fencing and the thundering prose which erupted in both Houses of Congress during the short session of Congress, there were some accomplishments. They were difficult to discover, to be sure, but they were there.

These were:

Adoption by both Houses of a modified plan of Federal financial aid to States to provide medical and hospital insurance for our senior citizens. Neither political party was satisfied with the results of this bill, but the act approved by Congress and now Federal law, lays the groundwork for more effective programs in the future.

BASED UPON FREEDOM

The plan adopted by Congress is based upon need rather than compulsion, upon covering as many of our senior citizens who need help as possible, rather than limiting such aid to those covered by social security. Its benefits can accrue to the 4 million who are over 65 but who never were eligible to receive the same benefits as those who held steady jobs prior to retirement.

In addition, administration of this new program of aid to the aged will be partially a State responsibility. I am happy to note that the Michigan Legislature soon will reconvene to consider establishment of a State program of aid under the new Federal law.

Such rapid action by States undoubtedly will mean that a great many of our senior citizens who will be faced with large hospital and medical bills in the near future will be aided by their States and the Federal Government in meeting high medical costs.

Congress also approved a number of changes in our Nation's social security system in the closing days of the short session. These changes were mostly technical in nature, although there are one or two which will prove of definite advantage to many of our senior citizens.

RAISE EARNINGS LIMIT

The first is a change in the retirement test which in effect raises the present $1,200 limit on outside earnings to about $1,500 under a complicated formula. For the past 3 years, I have introduced legislation to raise the limit to $3,000, as I was convinced that the $1,200 limit was totally unrealistic in view of today's living costs. A great many retired persons eligible for social security were suffering financial loss because of this provision. I will continue to seek drastic upward revision of this retirement test as a means of helping those who want to contribute part-time work past the retirement age.

Benefits payable to the children of deceased workers also were increased to include about 400,000 children, while disability insurance provisions were made more comprehensive. Maternal and child welfare funds were increased and unemployment compensation funds were raised.

At President Eisenhower's request, the House and Senate approved a $500 million authorization to provide more funds for Latin American nations to aid them in economic development. Another $100 million was authorized to help the victims of the Chilean earthquake to pick up their lives where they left off after the devastation which destroyed so much of that nation.

In addition, the Congress restored some $65 million of the $215 million it had previously cut from the mutual security program. This raised our total appropriation in economic and military aid to our allies abroad to $3,700 million for the current fiscal year.

PROGRAM COMPLETE

This increase in funds also heralds a change in emphasis in our mutual security program. Following the end of World War II, much of our self-help funds went to those nations which experienced the almost complete devastation of total war. Out of necessity, most of our mutual assistance went to help Europe get back on its feet.

Now, this part of our program has been completed, and our friends in Europe are enjoying economic prosperity as never before. Recovery has been complete, and the standard of living has risen far above that before the Second World War. Resistance to communism in Europe has stiffened to a point where we are stronger militarily, economically and politically than at any point in previous history. The nations of Europe are working together toward a common goal for the first time.

Because of this prosperity in Europe, we now can look forward to a greater participation by the United States in helping other areas of the world, areas such as Latin America and Africa, where in many cases economic progress has lagged far behind that of other areas of the Western World.

There is one sure answer to communism, and that is a high standard of living. We will continue to do what we can to see that this valuable weapon is used to the utmost to stop the spread of communism.

Almost lost in the political debates being waged on the floors of the House and the Senate was another important step forward. That was the ratification of a treaty banning the use of nuclear weapons in Antarctica and demilitarization of this area. This is the first major treaty signed between the free world and the Iron Curtain countries to demilitarize any large area of the earth.

IMPORTANT STEP

This treaty might well prove to be an important step in our goal toward world peace and a model upon which our future hopes for an end to the nuclear arms race can be realized.

One of the most important products considered by Congress during the last year was sugar. Besides its function as a coffee sweetener and its use on breakfast cereal, this product played a large part in our troubles with Cuba and the Dominican Republic.

Like many others in our Nation, I had hoped that Fidel Castro would have turned out to be a force for good in the Western Hemisphere. His overthrow of the dreaded Batista regime, his pronouncements of providing a better life for the people of Cuba certainly seemed to indicate that there was hope that a greater share of Cuba's wealth would get into the hands of its citizens.

Instead, Castro turned Cuba into another dictatorship. He turned his back on the friends of his people in the United States and started a campaign of vilification and hatred against our Government.

He turned more and more toward Russia and Red China and praised the Communists at every opportunity. He took away the basic freedoms of the people of Cuba until his nation has been turned into an armed camp, a military dictatorship twice as evil as the one which preceded it.

CUT SUGAR QUOTA

Early this year I introduced a bill—referred to the House Agriculture Committee—to cut off Cuba's sugar quota. For a number of years our Nation had been paying a top price for sugar, even when the world market sagged. Castro made the statement that Cuba was the economic slave of the United States. Since Castro resented taking our money in the form of sugar subsidies, I thought we ought to oblige him.

A few days after introduction of my bill to cut off Cuban sugar subsidies, President Eisenhower made a request to Congress to give him the same power.

However, it was months before Congress was permitted to take action on this emergency measure, simply because of opposition by the chairman of the House Agriculture Committee and some of his friends. Because of this hesitation on the part of the committee, millions of American dollars poured into Cuba which would not otherwise have been available to Castro.

Again, President Eisenhower asked for the power to cut off the sugar quota of the Dominican Republic after the Organization of American States censured the government of Dictator Trujillo for its highhanded tactics.

NO ACTION

But again Congress balked, and no action was taken on this important matter despite the repeated urging of the President.

It is still possible that President Eisenhower will call Congress back into special session to deal with this important matter of backing up the Organization of American States, one of the great bulwarks of freedom in the Western Hemisphere.

Some of the failures of this session of Congress were total, and the list is unfortunately long.

Federal aid to education was hopelessly stalemated on the question of whether Federal funds should be used to help pay teacher salaries. Both political parties agreed that Federal help was necessary for school construction in those areas in which the tax base was not adequate to provide decent facilities.

But rather than compromise on a bill which would provide relief for those school districts most in need of funds, any hope for Federal school aid was delayed for another year. So schoolchildren will suffer from inadequate facilities in some school districts simply so that a political issue could be made.

The same condition existed in raising the minimum wage. The House-approved bill would have raised the minimum wage to $1.15 an hour in 1 year. The Senate version would have raised the minimum wage to $1.25 an hour over a 3-year period. No compromise was attempted and another political issue was created, much to the despair of those workers who would have received higher wages now, rather than having to wait for another year.

The farm program also stalled in its tracks. After years of wrangling with Congress in an effort to win approval of a sensible program, President Eisenhower finally told Congress that he would approve any farm program passed as long as it came under certain broad guidelines.

ATTEMPTS BLOCKED

Instead of action, Congress simply sat on its hands. All attempts to pass effective farm legislation were blocked. The present program, which all admitted was a failure and a waste of billions of Federal dollars annually, was permitted to continue. Meanwhile, our farmers find their hands tied by the mounting

bureaucracy that Congress has ordered to regulate their every action. Consumers are penalized by paying more than they should for food and clothing and taxpayers are saddled with the stupendous expense of more than $7 billion annually to keep in existence a program which nobody—not even the Secretary of Agriculture—wants.

Because some Members of Congress would settle for nothing less than their own particular fancies, still another problem was permitted to go over another year. That is the problem of providing help for areas which suffer from chronic economic depression. The President often recommended the passage of such legislation, but Congress refused to give him what he asked for.

AREAS SUFFER

As a consequence, those areas of our Nation which suffer from chronic unemployment are only able to find what help is available to the President under previous authorizations by Congress by Executive order. This help has been considerable, but it is not enough to meet this problem.

Even in taking care of this traditional "perennial," Congress experienced a great deal of difficulty. A stopgap housing bill was passed at the last moment to continue certain existing programs and to authorize funds for such purposes as community facilities and college housing, but that was all. The sound approach to our housing problems sought by the President were simply ignored in the rush home to campaign.

In all, President Eisenhower proposed that 21 bills be passed during the short session of Congress. Only four of them were passed into law. The rest were ignored.

Prior to the conventions, Congress found itself at loggerheads over one of the most stirring issues facing our Nation, that of civil rights. Finally, after a prolonged 2-month Senate filibuster, the first effective civil rights bill guaranteeing the right to vote to all of our citizens was enacted by Congress and signed into law by the President.

EFFECTIVE LAW

This new civil rights law will be an effective tool in seeing to it that none of our citizens are treated as second class, that the Bill of Rights in our Constitution means what it says.

Because of judicious use of his veto power and the responsible actions by Congressmen from both political parties, the fight against inflation has been all but won.

During the current fiscal year which ended last June 30, our Federal Government turned up a surplus of better than $1 billion and there is hope of even a greater surplus when the next fiscal year ends.

Our national debt is still at the staggering total of $288 billion, but at least we are moving in the right direction, toward sound fiscal responsibility rather than through further deficit spending.

STILL STRONG

We have accomplished this goal without any reduction in our military power. In fact, our potential to resist attack has been increased considerably in the past year through new weapons, new developments, and closer cooperation with our allies throughout the world.

Last year, Congress took action on a number of important subjects which were effective and far-reaching.

Passage of the Landrum-Griffin bill has turned the crooks, the blackmailers, the extortionists out of office in many of our labor unions. Labor union members now have the Federal Government behind them in winning the right to speak, to vote and to nominate candidates for office in their locals. One year's operation of this new law has demonstrated repeatedly the wisdom of its provisions and has led to better unions, more honest unions and a virtual end to corruption and misuse of union funds by high-handed officials.

DISCLOSE FUNDS

The 86th Congress also approved a bill which I cosponsored to aid in the fight against the distribution of obscene literature through the mails. Postmaster General Summerfield has said that this bill has been one of the most effective weapons in the hands of postal inspectors in bringing these dealers in filth to justice, and I was happy to have played a part in seeing that effective legislation to curb the distribution of this obscene literature to our children, became law.

Also, a bill similar to one I introduced which requires full disclosure by Congressmen of Federal and counterpart funds spent on trips was enacted into law. This bill, along with orders issued by the House Administration Committee, should result in further savings to our taxpayers and the assurance that trips taken by Congressmen are in the public interest and are not simply pleasure jaunts.

In addition, I sponsored a number of other bills including those to place the full faith and credit of the Federal Government behind municipal water and sewer bonds, provide health insurance coverage for retired Federal employees, permit self-employed persons to participate in retirement plans, allow teachers to deduct continuing education expenses for tax purposes, establish a Capitol page residence and provide for selection of pages on a competitive basis.

It was my pleasure to back home rule for the District of Columbia. With the acceptance of Hawaii as our 50th State, the District of Columbia became the last area in our Nation without the right to vote and to select its own governing officials. Important steps toward providing full home rule for the District were made during the past session of Congress, but further steps should be taken as rapidly as possible.

HIGHWAY FUNDS

As a member of the House Committee on Public Works, I had a hand in seeing to it that our Federal Interstate Highway program proceeded on a pay-as-you-go basis and that funds were used for new highway construction rather than reimbursing States for existing toll roads. I also continued the fight against "pork barrel" projects designed to deliver votes rather than benefit the general public of our Nation, battled efforts to expand the scope of tax-free public power projects in competition with private power and urged that Federal projects make payments in lieu of taxes to local communities to make up for loss of local revenue.

During the past years, I have used two methods of finding out the views of those I represent. The first is a questionnaire which I send to a number of my constituents selected on the basis of voting area and in an effort to obtain a fair sampling of their views.

The second is a program of visiting as many communities in my mobile congressional office as possible during the recess period so that I can discuss the operation of the Federal Government face to face with those I represent.

Both of these programs have been enthusiastically received by my constituents, and I feel that they have made me a more effective Representative of the citizens of Oakland County in Washington.

AIDED MANY

The tendency has been for our Federal Government to become increasingly remote from those it is supposed to represent because of the rapid growth of our Nation and our increasing concentration in problems of the world as well as those at home.

These programs have helped to bring Washington a little closer to Oakland County and I feel that they have aided many in fighting their way through the entangling redtape which sometimes gets in the way of effective action at the Federal level.

May I urge my constituents to feel free to call on me when I visit their community in my house trailer turned office.

In addition, I would urge them to write or call me at my regular district office at 2300 North Woodward, Royal Oak, Mich., while Congress is in recess or in room 1422, New House Office Building, Washington, D.C., while Congress is at work.

While Congress is in session, I feel that it is my duty to remain in Washington to vote on the many issues which come before the House.

Quie Questionnaire Report and Highlights of the Work of Congress

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, in every year in which I have had the privilege of representing the people of the First Congressional District of Minnesota in the Congress, I have asked their views on some of the major issues confronting our country.

I have done this by means of the Public Opinion Questionnaire.

Since the inception of the questionnaire, the response has been very encouraging. The many people who have praised the questionnaire seem to re-

gard it as a service with a twofold benefit.

First, the Public Opinion Questionnaire provides them with the opportunity to express easily, in as brief a time as possible, their thinking on a wide range of issues.

Second, the Public Opinion Questionnaire encourages them to take increased notice of the work of the Congress and its task of shaping legislation to affect all Americans.

Early in 1960, I prepared and ordered for printing at my personal expense the third annual edition of the questionnaire. This is an expanded and more comprehensive survey. It presents a variety of questions—mostly major considerations—which reflect, for the most part, the choices to be made in our national life. This year the questions deal with not only proposed legislation, but with broad areas of policy. Included is the question as to the type of diplomacy to be employed to meet the challenge of the cold war. One question pertains to a concept of national defense and military strength. Another outlines possible economic policies for the future.

But for the most part, the questions pertain to legislative programs and proposals.

One significant addition was made this year. Nineteen hundred and sixty is a presidential year and the contest for our highest office must necessarily enter into many considerations. For that reason, I listed the candidates who, by March 1960, had been mentioned for the Presidency. The listing of names, in alphabetical order, included representatives from the two major parties.

In an effort to reach the homes of all First District residents, I mailed 100,000 questionnaires throughout the 12-county area. In some cases new residents may have failed to receive the survey. But I do feel that the canvass was as thorough as is possible.

The response to the questionnaire was very heartening. Experts in the field of direct mail and public opinion surveying list a 10 percent return as a desirable figure. This questionnaire attained an 11-percent return. I am grateful to all those who participated.

The questionnaire follows:

Questionnaire

Do you believe—	Percent		
	Yes	No	No answer
1. Personal meetings between the President or Vice President and Soviet leaders have eased the cold war?	75.5	22.2	2.3
2. That since agricultural production is greater than consumption, production should be reduced by soil banking whole farms?	30.2	62.5	7.3
3. The Federal minimum hourly wage, now at $1 per hour, should be raised and coverage extended?	39.9	56.8	3.3
4. The present $1,200 ceiling on outside earnings for social security recipients should be raised?	60.0	38.4	1.6
5. Congress should pass legislation giving the President the right to veto specific items in appropriation bills? (As it stands now, he has to either veto or accept an entire appropriation measure.)	85.4	13.0	1.6
6. Congress should raise all postal rates in an effort to balance the Post Office Department's income with outgo?	55.3	41.5	3.2
7. Congress should enact legislation allowing parents to deduct from their income tax tuition paid on behalf of their children to institutions of higher learning?	71.0	26.5	2.5
8. Congress should enact a national fair trade law?	45.9	42.6	11.5
9. Congress should pass a GI educational benefits program for peacetime veterans?	29.8	65.3	4.9
10. President Eisenhower is correct in his claim that our present and contemplated military program will adequately provide for our security?	69.6	18.0	12.4

	Percent
11. What economic policy do you favor for the United States during the next year?	
(a) Live within our means and apply surplus funds to national debt	74.2
(b) Balance the budget and use any surplus for expanded Federal programs	16.4
(c) Adopt a "we can afford anything we want" policy and spend accordingly	1.4
No answer	8.0
12. If Congress decides to deal with the problem of industrywide strikes, what course should it take?	
(a) Compulsory arbitration	24.0
(b) Restrict bargaining to individual companies rather than encourage industrywide bargaining	28.2
(c) Set up Federal factfinding boards with power to make recommendations	24.8
No answer	23.0

THE PRESIDENCY

The following men have been prominently mentioned as presidential candidates for both major political parties. Whom would you favor as the next President of the United States? They are listed here in alphabetical order.

Hubert Humphrey	8.1
Lyndon Johnson	1.9
John Kennedy	6.5
Richard Nixon	53.7
Nelson Rockefeller	11.7
Adlai Stevenson	2.8
Stuart Symington	2.1
No answer	13.2

NATIONAL FLORAL EMBLEM

The following have been suggested, in resolutions introduced in Congress, for our national floral emblem. Which of the following plants listed in alphabetical order would you favor?

Corn tassel	14.2
Daffodil	3.0
Daisy	4.9
Marigold	3.4
Mountain laurel	2.8
Rose	45.4
Wreath	8.8
No answer	17.5

HIGHLIGHTS OF THE 86TH CONGRESS, 2D SESSION

Mr. Speaker, along with the First District questionnaire tabulation, I believe it is appropriate to present a summary of the work of the 86th Congress, 2d session.

Such a report must begin with a study of the leadership of the Congress, because of the importance to fix major responsibility for action or inaction.

Under our system of legislative process, the credentials of leadership are given to the majority group. This is a sound concept because with strength derived from the electorate should go authority for action. Such credentials include the major posts of power—including the position of House Speaker here, and the role of majority leader in the other body—as well as the committee chairmanships and the right to numerical superiority on the standing committees of the Congress.

With the authority of the majority comes responsibility—and for that reason it is understood that the majority group has the greatest responsibility for the record written by the Congress. This does not mean that the minority can shrug off its obligations. Far from it. The minority and, in fact, every individual Member of Congress has the duty to strive for accomplishment.

But, the fact remains that, for the most part, credit or blame lies with the majority.

In this Congress, Democratic Members were in the great majority. The session began with a roster of 281 Democrats and 153 Republicans, plus 3 vacancies in the House—and with 65 Democrats and 35 Republicans in the other body.

Such heavy numerical strength intensified the responsibility of the majority for the record compiled by the Congress.

The report that follows specifies action taken in broad areas of legislation, arranged for convenience in alphabetical classifications. As such, this report is a highlight summary—not a minute examination of all legislation considered by Congress.

AGRICULTURE

Congress failed to enact major legislation to bolster farm income and to cope with the threat to the economy posed by the price-depressing surplus. Instead, in the closing hours of the session it enacted a bill which, while providing a measure of short-term benefit, does not even attempt to reach a long-range solution.

The bill raised support levels for manufactured milk and butterfat to a figure just under the average price received in the market this past year The legislation extends only until next March 31, 1961.

Although a hearing was held by a subcommittee of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on legislation which would insure the free flow of milk from Minnesota to other States, no action resulted.

Two other important bills were allowed to die. The House-passed farm credit bill which would have streamlined the credit facilities of the Farmers Home Administration was never acted upon by the Senate Agriculture Committee. Agricultural research bills were passed by both House and Senate, but differences between the 2 versions were not worked out by the conferees.

On June 23, the House rejected—by a vote of 236 to 171—the Poage bill, which contained a wheat section similar to that included in a bill vetoed in 1959, as well as a program for feed grains. As seen by many, the great weakness of the bill was its intent to glean votes on election day rather than to serve as a program to solve the basic problem facing agriculture. In its original form it insisted on higher price supports for wheat coupled with inadequate measures to control production.

During debate on the measure, I pointed out that sound legislation to assist farmers who raise grains and oilseeds should set as its objective the elimination of the price-depressant influence of Government-stored grains. I stated that total production must be reduced by the implementation of an effective program, rather than reliance on old patchwork methods of the past by which one crop would be substituted for another.

Then I proposed a series of amendments designed to improve the Poage bill—measures which, if adopted, would have greatly increased the legislation's possibilities of passage. But when the final vote came, the Poage bill had itself become a legislative patchwork quilt and the measure was defeated.

With the defeat of this bill, the disappointing prospect of no legislation at all spurred many Midwest Members to urge passage of a sound measure representing a serious attempt to benefit farmers.

Earlier in the session, I had introduced legislation outlining a payment-in-kind program which would give farmers the opportunity to idle their wheat, corn, and other feed grain acreage in return for surplus commodities from Government stocks. The twin objectives would be, of course, to bolster farm income and reduce the surplus.

I introduced also another measure which, when linked with payment-in-kind, would spell immediate help for farmers, that is, prohibit the sale of Government stored commodities on the domestic market at less than 105 percent of full parity. I pointed out that if this step were taken, the result would be an immediate jump in the price of corn by 20 cents per bushel.

Adoption of some such program in the "bobtail" session seemed reasonable to expect. The leadership of Congress had explained how necessary it was to come back to Washington in order to pass top-priority legislation. Certainly an effective farm program should be regarded as the No. 1 priority on the agenda of domestic business.

The two-part program was reintroduced and quickly accepted by a group of Midwest Members. The measure began to attract considerable support on both sides of the aisle. In hearings before the House Committee on Agriculture, a representative of the administration—Assistant Secretary of Agriculture Marvin McLain—stated the administration's approval of the bill, along with firm support for a payment-in-kind program advocated by the distinguished chairman of the committee.

Prospects were brightening when the leadership decided that there was not enough time remaining in the session for consideration of the measure.

No time for agriculture? No time for consideration of a sorely needed farm bill this year?

At any rate, progress halted and the legislation died.

One step taken by Congress—affecting agriculture and our policy regarding other nations—was the extension of the Sugar Act through next March 31, 1961. The extension gave the President the authority to reduce the Cuban sugar quota as he sees fit during that period. The President took this step shortly after the extension was granted.

In the waning hours before adjournment, the Congress debated legislation to grant the President conditional authority to not give the Dominican Republic an additional sugar quota. However, the leadership could not resolve disagreements between the two Houses. As a result, Congress abandoned action and adjourned without granting the President the authority he requested to block windfall sugar shipments from a nation whose diplomatic relations with the United States had been severed through action taken in the Organization of American States.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Legislation designed to protect the voting rights of all Americans—and to further the goal of equal protection and full rights under the law—was enacted during the 2d session of the 86th Congress. Passage came 3 years after approval of the historic Civil Rights Act of 1957 which served as a beacon for subsequent action.

The last step in approval of the 1960 measure came on April 21 when the House, by a 288 to 95 rollcall vote, agreed to amendments.

The Civil Rights Act of 1960 serves as a guarantee of voting rights—and as a protection against hate bombings.

On voting rights, the bill provides that records and registration papers in all Federal elections, including primaries, must be preserved for at least 22 months and must be turned over to the Attorney General on written request. The legislation states that on winning a civil suit brought under the 1957 act, the Attorney General can ask for a court proceeding to determine if a pattern of Negro disenfranchisement exists. Were such a pattern found to exist, any Negro in the area under survey could apply for a court order to declare himself qualified to vote consistent with State law, if it were proved that he had not been allowed to register. The court order could be reinforced by possible contempt proceedings.

To assist a court in making such a determination, voting referees can be appointed to receive applications, take evidence and report their findings to the court. If a referee's report is not challenged by State officials within 10 days, the court would issue certificates stating that the citizen in question is a qualified voter. In the event of challenge, the legislation outlines additional procedure.

On bombings, the act specifies that flight across State lines to avoid prosecution or punishment—or to avoid giving evidence—amounts to a Federal crime punishable by a fine of $5,000 or imprisonment up to 5 years, or both.

In addition, the act stipulates that when schools attended by children of Armed Forces personnel would close to avoid integration—and the U.S. Commissioner of Education would decide that no other agency could provide for their schooling—arrangements for their education could be provided.

Additional strengthening measures requested by the President in the post-recess session were rejected with the explanation that the limitation of time prevented the consideration of civil rights.

CORPORATE AND EXCISE TAXES

Congress voted to extend for another year the corporate income tax of 52 percent as well as the excise rates on distilled spirits, beer, wine, cigarettes, passenger cars, and car accessories. Also continued were the 10-percent taxes on passenger transportation and local telephone service. A temporary increase of $8 billion in the national debt limit for fiscal 1961 was provided for bringing it up to $293 billion.

DEPRESSED AREAS

Because he believed that the Area Redevelopment Act did not provide an adequate long-range solution to the problem of unemployment in some economically depressed areas, and that the legislation evidenced fiscal irresponsibility, President Eisenhower vetoed the bill. The veto was upheld. The program had provided for $251 million worth of Federal aid. This authorization was in contrast to the administration's proposal for a $53 million outlay.

EDUCATION

Majority leadership in Congress failed to win necessary support from the House Rules Committee, foreclosing the possibility of passage of a new program of Federal aid to education.

Passed by the House on May 26 was a bill which authorized $1.3 billion in Federal grants over 4 years to assist States in classroom construction. A bill passed by the other legislative wing authorized $928 million a year for 2 years in grants to the States for school construction, teachers salaries, or both. Refusal of the Rules Committee prevented a conference reconciling the two measures.

FEDERAL PAY RAISE

The House, on July 1, voted to override the President's veto of a pay raise bill which authorized an across-the-board 8.8 percent and 7.5 percent increase for 1.6 million Federal classified and postal workers.

In his veto message, Mr. Eisenhower said he favored a salary increase to match the rise in the cost of living. He said the bill was inequitable—favoring those Federal workers who were already receiving adequate pay, and granting proportionately less to the employees who stood in greatest need of an increase.

HOUSING

Despite the fact that a comprehensive omnibus housing bill was included in the must legislation list approved by leaders of the majority in Congress, all that could be provided was a measure described as a stopgap bill to continue the program until January.

Earlier, a bill had been approved by the House Banking and Currency Committee which resembled legislation adopted by the other body. However, the House Rules Committee refused to grant the $1.4 billion House bill a rule, and thus consideration on the floor was forestalled.

Shortly before adjournment, a bill was enacted which amounted to half the outlay originally forecast for housing by the leadership. Under the provisions of the bill, the FHA home improvement loan program was extended and allocations were made of $500 million for college dormitory construction and $50 million for community facilities construction.

INTERNATIONAL POLICY

Ratification by the other body of a formal treaty has been seen as one of the major steps taken during the post-recess session. The treaty, signed by 12 nations, pledges that it "is in the interest of all mankind that Antarctica shall continue forever to be used exclusively for peaceful purposes."

Associated in the agreement are the United States, the Soviet Union, Great Britain, France, Belgium, Norway, Japan, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, Argentina, and Chile. The dozen nations are agreed to observe common ground rules—banning nuclear explosions and military utilization of Antarctica—with all countries having the right of unlimited inspection—waiving territorial claims for the next 34 years and banding together for research pools.

In the last hours of the session, the Congress endorsed another measure which, while not a treaty, had international implications. Approved was a $600 million authorization for Latin American aid—a program requested by the President. No appropriation was made as the measure was designed to serve mainly as a declaration of future intention, to be used to reinforce U.S. participation in talks at the inter-American economic conference at Bogotá, Columbia.

Earlier in the session, Congress had authorized U.S. membership in the International Development Association. The request again had been made by the President. The IDA was established as a lending agency to provide long-term, low interest assistance to underdeveloped areas of the world. Contribution to the fund will be made by the many financially able nations of the world.

MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED

Failure crowned efforts of some to enact a wide-sweeping medical care for the aged bill—although legislation was written which substantially enlarges the scope of Federal aid to States to enable them to assist in payment of medical bills of needy aged.

Rejected in two separate votes by the House Ways and Means Committee was the Forand bill which would have imposed compulsory health insurance coverage by means of the social security system. Instead, the committee introduced and won House approval for an omnibus social security bill with increase provisions and a moderate, State-option medical assistance program.

In the Senate, an unsuccessful attempt was made to pass legislation similar to the provisions of the Forand bill—but the measure failed 51 to 44. The administration's medicare program also failed.

Congress thus ended up adopting instead a program based mainly on the House-passed bill, the salient features of which include:

A program of matching funds to the States to participate in medical care for the aged, which will benefit an estimated 12,400,000 individuals. The Federal share will be 50 to 80 percent of the total cost—running about one-half billion dollars.

A worker covered by social security who becomes permanently disabled will be able to start collecting the benefits for himself and his dependents regardless of his age. In the past, disability benefits have been limited to those 50 years or older.

Increased authorization for child welfare services to $25 million.

No compulsory coverage for self-employed doctors—but clearance for additional ministers to obtain coverage.

Increase in the amount of yearly earnings a beneficiary can have and still receive all the benefits. For each $2 earned over $1,200 (the present limit), $1 will be deducted from the benefit. Above $1,500, the beneficiary will lose $1 of benefit for every dollar earned.

MINIMUM WAGE

In what was regarded by observers as one of the most serious defects of the session, the failure of a joint conference to agree signaled the end of attempts to raise the Federal minimum wage.

The conference sought to reconcile a House bill raising the wage to $1.15 per hour—extending coverage to a limited number of occupations—and a bill providing for $1.25 per hour and including 5 million additional workers.

MUTUAL SECURITY

Appropriation of $3.7 billion for mutual security followed strong attempts in Congress to water down the program designed to strengthen U.S. ties with friendly nations in a continued effort to maintain a bulwark against communism.

Throughout the session, moves were made to seriously curtail the military defense phase of the mutual security program. A drastic cut was restored by the other body in the final week before adjournment. The House followed suit—adding $65 million in defense funds, but still falling short by $125 million the supplemental funds approved by the other legislative wing.

RIVERS AND HARBORS

Legislation approving construction of 63 navigation projects, 9 beach erosion control projects, 43 control projects, 5 miscellaneous projects—and increasing authorization for 10 river basins—was sent to the President on July 1. House action had taken place almost a year earlier and contained a lower authorization—$657,310,500 in navigation and flood control projects, contrasted with the $1,583,768,352 figure in the bill as passed by the other body, and agreed to by both Houses. Rushford and Winona projects were included, both for planning. The President signed the measure into law.

VETERANS LOAN PROGRAM

Home, farm, and business loan programs for World War II veterans and the direct loan program for World War II and Korean veterans were extended by Congress. The programs were due to expire on July 25. Extension until July 25, 1962, was approved.

Authorized by the bill was $150 million for direct loans in each of the 2 years and establishment of a revolving fund for the guarantee program.

Activities of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, with the adjournment sine die of the 86th Congress, the Committee on Science and Astronautics comes to the end of its first Congress.

The committee is unique in that it is the only committee in Congress with legislative jurisdiction over science in general, as well as the space sciences. In these days of great scientific advancement, I need not stress the importance of the work being done by this committee, which has still to mark its second birthday.

However, I would like to cite a few of the committee's achievements during the course of this Congress. As a result of its activities, the committee was honored this year with the Holmes Alexander annual award of the McNaught Syndicate as the outstanding House committee of 1960.

The committee's activities during the less than 2 years of its existence make an impressive record. It conducted 57 investigations, issued 47 reports, held 265 hearings and heard 658 witnesses.

Indicative further of the broad scope of the committee's work, the committee took more than 3 million words of testimony, which have been incorporated in approximately 8,000 pages of printed hearings.

In the legislative field, the committee acted upon the annual budget of the Nation's civilian space agency, now grown

to almost a billion dollars, made extensive revisions in the Space Act of 1958, and approved various other bills and resolutions.

The scope of the committee's investigations was indeed impressive. They covered such varied subjects as the man-in-space program—Project Mercury—space medicine, the effect of noise on man and machine, research on mechanical translation, development of hydrofoils, oceanic research, international aspects of space law, lunar construction, weather modification and control, basic research in agriculture, saline-water research, the status of scientific education in the United States, and many others.

This is a record of which the committee may well be proud. As we round out our first Congress, I feel that we have accomplished much in helping to advance the Nation's scientific and space programs, but I do not feel the committee can sit back on its laurels. Much more work remains to be done. Many worthwhile projects are now in preparation or under investigation, and the committee looks forward to many active months ahead during the remainder of this Congress and the years to come.

The cooperation and hard work of the individual members of the committee and of its staff has made possible this outstanding record during the committee's first Congress.

The committee's activities during the past year have been very fruitful. A summary of the committee's activities during 1960 follows:

ACTIVITIES OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS

INTRODUCTION

The Committee on Science and Astronautics is the successor to the Select Committee on Astronautics and Space Exploration of the 85th Congress which helped enact legislation establishing a civilian space agency, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

As a standing committee of the House, the committee exercises legislative jurisdiction over "outer space, including exploration and control thereof, science scholarships, (and) scientific research and development."

It also exercises legislative jurisdiction over "astronautical research and development, including resources, personnel, equipment and facilities," and over the following executive agencies of the Government:

The Bureau of Standards (including "standardization of weights and measures and the metric system"), the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the National Aeronautics and Space Council, and the National Science Foundation.

ACTIVITIES DURING 1960

During its second year the committee continued to be extremely active, both in the field of legislation and in the investigation of various activities connected with science and astronautics.

As the 2d session of the 86th Congress drew to a close, the committee had compiled this record:

1. Conducted 27 investigations whose scope ranged from exploration at the bottom of the sea to Army plans for construction on the moon.

2. Held hearings on 17 different subjects ranging from a broad review of the Nation's space program to research on mechanical translation.

3. Issued or had under preparation for publication in 1960 a total of 25 reports on a variety of legislative and investigative matters.

Reports (investigative)

During the 2d session of the 86th Congress, the committee issued or had under preparation the following nonlegislative reports:

1. "Preliminary Report on the Refusal of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration To Furnish Information to the Committee on Science and Astronautics" (staff report, Jan. 11, 1960).

2. "Project Mercury, First Interim Report" (H. Rept. 1228. Also listed as Committee Print Serial a).

3. "Outer Space, The Roard to Peace." (Observations on scientific meetings and international cooperation by Representative VICTOR L. ANFUSO, of New York, February 1960.)

4. "Management and Operation of the Atlantic Missile Range" (Committee Print, July 5, 1960).

5. "Report of Representative DAVID S. KING on Inspection Trip of Missile Installations in Utah" (May 5, 1960).

6. "Army Lunar Construction and Mapping Program" (H. Rept. 1931. Also listed as Committee Print Serial f).

7. "Hydrofoil Development" (H. Rept. 2006. Also listed as Committee Print Serial e).

8. "Space, Missiles, and the Nation" (H. Rept. 2092. Also listed as Committee Print Serial c).

9. "Research on Mechanical Translation" (H. Rept. 2021. Also listed as Committee Print Serial d).

10. "Supersonic Air Transports" (H. Rept. 2041. Also listed as Committee Print Serial g).

11. "The Practical Values of Space Exploration" (H. Rept. 2091. Also listed as Committee Print Serial i).

12.[1] "Life Sciences and Space" (H. Rept. ——)

13.[1] "A Chronology of Space Events: 1860–1960" (———).

14. "Ocean Sciences and National Security" (H. Rept. 2078. Also listed as Committee Print Serial h).

15. "Report on Cape Canaveral Inspection" (Committee Print, June 27, 1960).

16.[1] "Noise: Its Effect on Man and Machine" (———).

Reports (legislative)

The committee issued these legislative reports during the second session under the following titles:

1. "Effecting Immediate Transfer of the Development Operations Division of the Army Ballistic Missile Agency to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration" (H.J. Res. 567, H. Rept. 1240, Feb. 4, 1960).

2. "Authorizing Appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration" (H.R. 10809, H. Rept. 1333, Mar. 3, 1960).

3. "Proposed Revisions to the Patent Section, National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958" (report of the Subcommittee on Patents and Scientific Inventions, Mar. 8, 1960).

4. "Amending the National Science Foundation Act" (to make American Samoans eligible for Federal scholarships and fellowships) (H.R. 11985, H. Rept. 1591, May 6, 1960).

5. "Amending the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958" (H.R. 12049, H. Rept. 1633, May 19, 1960).

Reports (miscellaneous)

1. "A Study of Scientific and Technical Manpower." (A program of collection, tabulation, and analysis of data prepared by the National Science Foundation at the committee's request and published by the committee, Jan. 4, 1960.)

2. "Panel on Science and Technology," first meeting (H. Rept. 1587. Also listed as Committee Print Serial b).

3. [1] "Panel on Science and Technology," second meeting (H. Rept ——).

4. "Report on the Activities of the Committee on Science and Astronautics" (2d sess., 86th Cong.). (H. Rept. ——.)

Printed hearings

The committee also issued the following printed hearings on legislative and investigative subjects:

1. "Review of the Space Program." (Jan. 20–29; Feb. 1–24; Mar. 7, 1960. Listed as Committee Publicatior No. 3, pts. 1, 2, and 3.)

2. "The Production of Documents by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for the Committee on Science and Astronautics." (Jan. 27–29, 1960. Listed as Committee Publication No. 1.)

3. "Transfer of the Development Operations Division of the Army Ballistic Missile Agency to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration." (Feb. 3, 1960. Listed as Committee Publication No. 2.)

4. "1961 NASA Authorization." (Feb. 17–26, 1960. Listed as Committee Publication No. 4.)

5. "To amend the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958." (Mar. 8–31; Apr. 4, 1960. Listed as Committee Publication No. 5.)

6. "Frontiers in Oceanic Research." (Apr. 28–29, 1960. Listed as Committee Publication No. 7.)

7. "Panel on Science and Technology," first session (May 4, 1960). (Transcript of remarks is included in H. Rept. 1587.)

8. [1] "Establishment of a National Science Academy." (May 4–25, 1960. Listed as Committee Publication No. ——.)

9. "A bill To Make American Nationals Eligible for Scholarships and Fellowships Authorized by the National Science Foundation Act of 1950." (May 6, 1960. Listed as Committee Publication No. 6.)

10. "Lunar Mapping and Construction in Support of Space Programs." (May 10, 1960. Listed as Committee Publication No. 8.)

11. "Research on Mechanical Translation." (May 11–16, 1960. Listed as Committee Publication No. 9.)

12. [1] "Supersonic Air Transports." (May 17–24, 1960. Listed as Committee Publication No. 11.)

13. "Hydrofoil Development." (May 23 Listed as Committee Publication No. 10.)

14.[1] "Panel on Science and Technology," second session. (June 2–3, 1960. Transcript of remarks is included in H. Rept. ——.)

15.[1] "Space Medicine Research." (June —, 1960. Listed as Committee Publication No. 12.)

16.[1] "Noise: Its Effect on Man and Machine." (Listed as Committee Publication No. ——.)

Investigations

During the 2d session of the 86th Congress the committee conducted 27 investigations or studies, many of them leading to public hearings at which various facets of the Nation's space program and of the Nation's scientific and technological status were explored.

The following subjects held the committee's attention:

1. Refusal of NASA to furnish contract information to the committee and the General Accounting Office.

2. Project Mercury (man-in-space program).

3. Management and operation of the Atlantic Missile Range.

4. Missile installations in Utah.

[1] In preparation for publication in 1960.

[1] In preparation for publication in 1960.

5. Army lunar construction and planning program.
6. Development of hydrofoils.
7. Review of the Nation's space program.
8. Research on mechanical translation.
9. Development of supersonic air transports.
10. The practical and economic applications of space developments.
11. Space medicine.
12. A chronology of space events during the past century.
13. Boron high-energy fuels.
14. Project Wagmight, the development of inflatable aircraft.
15. Oceanic research.
16. Project Slam (supersonic low-altitude missile).
17. NASA-military management of electronic equipment.
18. International cooperation in the peaceful uses of outer space.
19. Scientific and professional education in the United States and abroad.
20. Compilation of the air laws and treaties of the world.
21. International aspects of space law.
22. Cancellation of the Vega space rocket program by NASA.
23. NASA contract award for the second stage of the Saturn space rocket.
24. Development of a 1½-million-pound thrust single-chamber rocket engine (F–1).
25. Project Orion (space propulsion through the use of small nuclear explosions).
26. Development of a nuclear powerplant for space propulsion.
27. The effect of noise on man and machine.

MAJOR SUBJECTS UNDER INVESTIGATION

Review of the Nation's space program

The committee's scrutiny of the progress being made by the United States in space was the most detailed of any investigation conducted by Congress in this field this year. Eighty-eight witnesses appeared before the committee at 26 open and 6 executive hearings during January, February, and March.

The committee's study covered the work of seven Government agencies—Department of State, U.S. Information Agency, Office of the Secretary of Defense, Army, Navy, and Air Force, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration—as well as various technical societies, related groups and industry.

During the hearings, the Space Agency unveiled for the first time its 10-year program of space exploration, calling for approximately 260 launchings over the next decade at a cost of possibly $12 to $15 billion.

Along with its review of the space program, the committee examined the related phases of missile research and development which interact to affect the national interest.

Among the major conclusions reached by the committee during its lengthy review were these:

1. The U.S. space program is "vital to America's future."

2. The efforts of the Department of Defense to concentrate the direction of its research and development programs under a single authority will result in a tighter overall coordination of our national space programs.

3. NASA's 10-year program in space is a good program, but it does not go far enough. Furthermore, the space program is not being pushed with sufficient urgency, especially in the utilization of a nuclear powerplant and the development of a 1½-million-pound thrust single-chamber rocket engine (F–1). However, this view is not shared by every member of the committee.

4. A high priority program should be undertaken to place a manned expedition on the moon this decade. NASA's 10-year program makes provision only for manned flight to the moon "beyond 1970."

5. The Air Force presented a strong case for its having a military mission in space, but not an exclusive one.

6. The Navy opposes a single, national space organization. This opposition apparently stems from a strong concern that the Navy remain free to pursue the naval applications of the space science.

7. The Army should not be removed from the space program because of the transfer of the Development Operations Division of the Army Ballistic Missile Agency, better known as the Von Braun team, to NASA. Failure of other Government agencies to use the inhouse facilities of the Army to their full capability would be "an unwarranted waste of a unique organizational setup."

Project Mercury—the man-in-space program

From time immemorial man has dreamed of extending his range of operation above the surface of the Earth. With the development of the airplane, he took his first big leap and flew with the birds.

Now, he dreams of extending his range into limitless space. First will come a flight around the Earth at a height of 100 to 150 miles; then out to the Moon and beyond in the years to come.

Project Mercury has as its objective the placing of a man in orbit around the Earth. The primary objective of the Mercury mission is to determine man's capabilities and reactions in a space environment.

In view of the importance of the program, which the National Aeronautics and Space Administration ranks first and most urgent on its list of space projects, a study of the progress made by the space agency was conducted by the committee staff.

The study, approved by the committee, came to the conclusion that the Mercury program is progressing satisfactorily, although there have been various delays which have postponed the date for the first attempt to place man in orbit. This epochal event is scheduled now for 1961.

The study emphasized that Mercury is our only program actually under way for putting man into orbit and questioned the desirability of putting all eggs in one basket.

The committee stated in its report on Project Mercury:

"Considering the number of challenging new techniques which must be mastered to make space flight a success, there is a question whether the national interest is best served by a single approach to this problem."

It added:

"There are a number of very promising alternative approaches to putting man in space. By setting a limit on testing these concepts through exclusive adoption of the Mercury approach, the Nation is risking the loss of extremely valuable development time. The country cannot support a large number of approaches in competition with all the other demands on fiscal and personnel resources. But at the same time the failure to develop in parallel at least one other man-in-space program could prove to be a costly mistake."

Overall, the committee commended the "dedication, the ingenuity, and the orderly approach being demonstrated by the many people in NASA, the armed services, the private laboratories, and industry in contributing to Project Mercury."

Refusal of NASA to furnish contract information to the committee

During the committee's continuing study of the Space Agency's contracts and contract procedures, NASA refused to furnish the committee and the General Accounting Office, which is collaborating with the committee, with four documents on the ground of Executive privilege.

As a result, the committee held several public hearings at which it heard NASA Administrator T. Keith Glennan and other NASA officials and Robert Keller, General Counsel of the GAO. The hearings resulted in an airing of the issues involved, but no change in NASA's position.

Subsequently, however, when the committee requested information from the Space Agency on another contract under study, the Space Agency complied with the request by furnishing, voluntarily, documents similar to those previously refused the committee.

Research on mechanical translation

The inquiry into research efforts to provide a means of reliable mechanical translation was an offshoot of committee hearings held in 1959 on "Dissemination of Scientific Information." Various witnesses then expressed the view that mechanical translation could revolutionize the translation problem.

The inquiry disclosed that 11 groups in the United States are now engaged in various aspects of mechanical translation research with support from the Federal Government. These include the Central Intelligence Agency, the first to show interest in machine translation; the U.S. Air Force, Army, and Navy, and the National Bureau of Standards, and the National Science Foundation.

The world is divided by language barriers into about 4,000 linguistic communities, of which well over 50 are large and important enough to carry on extensive trade, communication, and cultural exchange with one another. All interchange between language communities must now funnel through individuals who are to some extent bilingual. The resulting bottlenecks hamper dealings between nations.

The two most important reasons for carrying on research in this field involve national intelligence requirements and the need for the automation of languages to facilitate the dissemination of foreign scientific and other types of information.

The committee found that the most promising long-range program for mechanical translation was the Army-financed research at the National Bureau of Standards. It suggested that a national center for machine translation will be required in the near future.

Army lunar construction and mapping program

One of the most interesting inquiries conducted by the committee involved Project Lamp—the lunar analysis and mapping program.

The Army began studying methods of mapping the moon in 1958, recognizing that lunar maps will be needed prior to unmanned as well as manned exploration of the lunar surface.

The Army program proposes to furnish necessary data for precision maps and information on the structural formation of the moon. The Air Force is doing complementary work in this field. Its work is largely concerned with obtaining aerial photographs, whereas the Army utilizes the photographs to produce the final product, the map. The committee found that close coordination existed between the two agencies.

In addition to the mapping program, there is also under study the development of lunar construction methods designed to withstand the peculiar environment of the moon, and training facilities to provide, in simulated form, the exacting conditions of the hostile lunar environment.

The committee concluded that preliminary lunar mapping is "a prime requisite to the establishment of a base on the moon" and said Project Lamp was worthy of consideration by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to further its program of manned and unmanned exploration of the moon.

Supersonic air transports

The next major advance in civil air transportation appears to be the development of a supersonic aircraft. This development may occur within the next decade and will raise numerous technological and administrative problems which are of particular interest to the committee.

There are other highly significant problems which will require understanding and solution prior to any legislative action which may be deemed appropriate by the Congress.

In addition to the technical problems created by the advanced design of this type of aircraft, and the requirement for more modern navigation, communications, and traffic control systems, the supersonic air transport will be very expensive to develop. The consensus of witnesses was that it will be impossible to finance development and production in the traditional manner. It appeared that some direct or indirect financial support by the Government will be required. In the event that some foreign nation takes the lead in this development, the effects upon American industry and national prestige could be serious.

LEGISLATION

Four bills were approved by the committee during the second session, while action was begun on another, but not completed. The major pieces of legislation reported out by the committee and approved by the House of Representatives were the annual authorization of funds for the Space Agency and revision of the Space Act of 1958.

The legislative histories of the bills follow:

H.R. 10809 (a bill to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for salaries and expenses, research and development, construction and equipment, and for other purposes)

This bill authorized funds for NASA for the 1961 fiscal year beginning July 1, 1960. It was originally introduced January 26, 1960, by Chairman OVERTON BROOKS, of Louisiana as H.R. 9918. The committee held hearings on the measure February 17, 25, 29, March 1, and 2. Four subcommittees also held hearings on the bill February 18, 19, 22, 23, 24, and 26. Committee amendments were adopted February 29 and on March 1 the committee directed the chairman to introduce a clean bill.

The clean bill, H.R. 10809, was introduced by Mr. BROOKS March 1. The bill was reported to the House March 3, accompanied by House Report 1333, and passed by the House March 9.

The Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences reported the bill with amendments April 29, accompanied by Senate Report 1300. It passed the Senate with amendments May 3 and on that date the Senate requested a conference. Conference Report 1629 was filed in the House May 19 and was approved May 23; it was adopted in the Senate May 24. The President signed the act June 1 as Public Law 86-481.

The act authorized funds for aeronautical and space research, scientific investigations in space, satellite applications, manned space flight, vehicle systems technology, space propulsion technology, vehicle development, and tracking and data acquisition.

The legislation also authorized funds to pay for the creation of 30 additional supergrade positions at the George C. Marshall Space Flight Center, Huntsville, Ala.

When the bill was reported to the House, it authorized $915 million for fiscal year 1961, including $170,760,000 for salaries and expenses, $621,453,000, for research and development, and $122,787,000 for construction and equipment. The Senate amendment increased the authorization to $970 million. This included $50 million of emergency authorization for "Research and development" to be available for expenditure to defray the cost of research and development activities which the Administrator determined to be urgently required in the national interest to exploit technological or scientific breakthrough. Also included was a $5 million emergency authorization for "Construction and equipment."

H.R. 12049 (a bill to amend the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, as amended, and for other purposes)

This bill was introduced January 18, by Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana as H.R. 9675 following a message of the President, dated January 14, 1960, transmitting recommendations that the Congress enact certain amendments to the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958.

The amendments were designed to (1) clarify NASA's responsibility for planning and managing a program of nonmilitary space activities and to simplify organizational arrangements relating to such activities; (2) modify the provisions of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 concerning property rights in inventions; (3) provide NASA with certain types of authority which are otherwise available to the Department of Defense or other agencies of the executive branch; and (4) make certain technical amendments to the act.

H.R. 12049 was introduced by Mr. BROOKS, May 3, as a clean bill. It incorporated the provisions of two bills, previously introduced, proposed amendments to the Space Act—embodied in H.R. 4148, authorizing NASA to indemnify its contractors, and H.R. 9484, amending section 305, entitled "Property Rights in Inventions"—thereby tabling these bills.

On March 8 the committee received a report from the special subcommittee which had held hearings the latter part of the first session on proposed changes in the patent section of the act. Hearings were held by the committee on March 9, 10, 14, 15, 16, 17, 21, 22, 24, 28, 29, 30, 31, and April 4 on all aspects of the proposed revision.

On May 3 the committee voted final approval of the bill, and on May 19 it was reported to the House, accompanied by House Report 1633. The House passed the bill without amendment June 9.

As approved by the House, the bill made the following major revisions in the Space Act: (1) abolished the National Aeronautics and Space Council and the Civilian-Military Liaison Committee of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the Department of Defense; (2) established an Aeronautics and Astronautics Coordinating Board; (3) revised the patent provisions under which NASA operated; and (4) added an indemnification section to guard contractors against losses which might arise from unusually hazardous risks.

The Senate took no action.

House Joint Resolution 567 (a joint resolution to effect immediately the transfer of the Development Operations Division of the Army Ballistic Missile Agency to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration)

This joint resolution was introduced by Representative B. F. SISK, of California, January 21 following a message from the President to the Congress on January 14 relative to making certain transfers from the Department of Defense to provide NASA with an organization capable of and equipped for developing and operating large space vehicle boosters and conducting related research.

The committee held a hearing February 3 and agreed to report the resolution. It was reported February 4, accompanied by House Report 1240, and passed the House February 8.

However, the Senate took no action on the resolution and the transfer became effective March 14, or 60 days after the President submitted the proposal, in accordance with the provisions of existing law.

H.R. 11985 (a bill to make American nationals eligible for scholarships and fellowships authorized by the National Science Foundation Act of 1950)

This bill was introduced by Chairman BROOKS April 28. Its purpose was to change the wording in the act to remove discrimination against American Samoans who had been excluded from eligibility for certain scholarships and graduate fellowships authorized to be granted to Americans chosen on merit for study and work in the mathematical, physical, medical, biological, engineering, and other sciences at accredited nonprofit educational institutions in this country and abroad.

The committee held a hearing May 6 and on the same date reported the bill, accompanied by House Report 1591. It passed the House on May 16 and was approved by the Senate without amendment June 18, 1960. The measure was signed by the President as Public Law 86-550 on June 29, 1960.

H.R. 4986 (a bill to provide for the establishment of a National Science Academy)

This bill was introduced by Representative VICTOR ANFUSO, of New York, February 25, 1959. Subcommittee No. 3, headed by Mr. ANFUSO, held hearings on the bill May 4 and 25, 1960. No final action was taken by the subcommittee.

Summary of Congressional Action of Special Interest to the Indian People in the Second District of South Dakota

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my recent newsletter summarizing congressional action of special interest to the Indian people in my district:

DEAR FRIEND: The Democrat-controlled 86th Congress which was elected on promises of doing everything to improve the lot of the Indian people, sneaked out of town last week after having failed in most of its promises and having done little to improve the lot of the Indian people generally.

It should be remembered that it is Congress which passes the laws—it is Congress which appropriates the money—and Congress alone which is responsible for legislative successes or failures.

When Congress is composed of 280 Democrats and 152 Republicans in the House and 66 Democrats and 34 Republicans in the Senate they can hardly blame the Republican Party or the Republican administration for their failure to pass legislation beneficial to the Indian people.

In spite of 2-to-1 Democrat majorities, Republican Members of the South Dakota delegation, Senator MUNDT and Senator CASE and myself, have been able to get through a number of measures helpful to South Dakota and South Dakota Indians. This we have been able to do because of seniority in Congress, and because through the years, we have built up confidence in what we are

trying to accomplish, obtaining the support of even the Democrat majority through the confidence they repose in us. It has taken time to build up this confidence and to reach positions of command on committees. For instance, because of my 9 years of service on the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, which handles all Indian legislation, I am the third-ranking minority member on the committee and the first-ranking minority member on the Indian Affairs Subcommittee.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

I want to apologize to my Indian friends and particularly to those who spent a great deal of time in preparing their testimony given before the Indian Affairs Subcommittee hearings held on all of the reservations in South Dakota in October 1959. As you will recall, the hearings were held by Chairman JAMES HALEY, Democrat of Florida. He had notified all four Members of the South Dakota delegation in Congress of the time and places of the hearings scheduled. Because of their interest in the welfare of the Indians, Senator MUNDT personally attended all of the hearings and Senator CASE attended as many as he could, having his administrative assistant attend those where he was unable to personally be present.

MCGOVERN was unable to attend any of the hearings or to have his assisant present. Because of the fact that Senators MUNDT and CASE took part in the House hearings, he objected to the testimony being printed. The result was that Chairman ASPINALL has refused to permit the testimony taken in South Dakota to be read or referred to, and the work in preparation, the time given over in taking the testimony, was completely wasted so far as Congress having opportunity to benefit from the statements are concerned.

This is the first time in my 9 years on the Interior Committee when an objection has ever been made to Senators testifying or taking part in House committee hearings. As a matter of fact, it is customary for House Members to go over to the Senate to take part in Senate hearings, and for Senate Members to come over to the House side to take part in House hearings, but politics became involved in these hearings in spite of the fact that Chairman HALEY is himself a Democrat.

LEGISLATION

One of the bills I got through Congress this session was a bill relieving members of the Standing Rock, Lower Brule, and Crow Creek Reservations from having delinquent seed loans and other debts deducted from payment of their land settlement where their land was taken under the Oahe Dam.

Three days of hearings were held on my bill to provide industry on Indian reservations, a bill I have dubbed, "Operation Bootstrap—Reservation Style" because it follows closely the Operation Bootstrap program in Puerto Rico. No piece of Indian legislation in modern years has met with such universal approval as Operation Bootstrap. I mailed out 1,000 copies of the printed hearings. You probably have read these hearings and know that people from all over the United States not only came to Washington but presented their testimony in support of this program.

What it does is briefly this. It authorizes the tribe to contract with an individual plant to establish an industry on the reservation, and grants a 10-year exemption from all taxes to the industry, providing it locates on a reservation and employs Indian people.

Hearings on the bill will be resumed in January, and I am very hopeful that early and favorable action will be taken. If we have a Republican majority in Congress, I am certain that with the support of the Commissioner and the Secretary of the Interior, as we already have, that it will be a law within a few months.

This would mean not only jobs but a regular salary. It would mean that the Indian people would then be eligible for housing loans. It would mean that the Indian people would be eligible for water and sewage disposal plants and sanitary facilities of all kinds. It would mean building up reservation areas, and, most of all, providing opportunity for those of working age and much greater opportunity for our young people.

I hope to have an opportunity to visit with you at some of the meetings this fall. Many of you have special land and rental problems with which I have been helping you. I shall continue to keep in close contact with these problems to bring them to a successful close.

Again, thanking you, and with my kind regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

E. Y. BERRY,
(Mahto Cuwiyuksa).

Hon. Melvin Price Reviews Achievements of the 86th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, each year at the end of the session of Congress, it has been my policy to review the work of the session.

The 2d session of the 86th Congress met in a period when the country gradually became conscious that we were nearing the end of the Eisenhower era. It was the period when we began to recover some of the lost ground in the space race but when the Soviet Union showed no lack of scientific achievements. It was the period in which President Eisenhower's journey to the Soviet Union was canceled as Khrushchev withdrew the invitation; when Red instigated and disciplined student rioters forced the cancellation of a visit to Japan. It was the period when the American democracy prepared for a new national election, when the two major parties chose their presidential and vice-presidential nominees and the campaign began.

Historically an election year is not a time when legislation is easily passed—and particularly this is natural when there are legitimate differences of opinion between a Congress controlled by one party and a White House controlled by the other. In the case of the 86th Congress, there have been unavoidable differences.

Moreover, we have come to a time—after 8 years of the Eisenhower administration—when an accumulation of piled-up needs has demanded attention. We have great social needs in shortages in schools, hospitals, college and university facilities; in our social security programs; in housing and farm programs; in the urgency for revisions of our tax systems. The administration, which has sought to hold the line against programs to meet these needs, has a vested interest in continuing its opposition.

The 86th Congress in both its 1st and 2d sessions has been able to cooperate with President Eisenhower in a way to advance the deepest national interests without abandoning its own majority principles.

I can report for the sixth time—each year since the 1954 elections—that President Eisenhower was dead wrong in predicting a political cold war if the Democrats should be trusted by the people with the control of Congress.

Democrats have been in control of the Legislature ever since the President indulged in this bit of campaign oratory, and there has been no political cold war. We have not used our majority to interfere with the President's role as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces or his constitutional position as director of our foreign policy. Politics has ended at the water's edge.

When the Soviet Premier abused Mr. Eisenhower at Paris, when the Soviet Union wrecked the summit conference, we did not exploit the situation.

Khrushchev may have thought he could provoke partisan dissension in the United States, but it never occurred to the responsible Democratic leadership that the unhappy occasions of the U–2 so-called espionage flight or Khrushchev's bad-mannered conduct should modify our own support of America's objectives.

Many of us have had doubts about the wisdom of the personal diplomacy that subordinates the experienced Foreign Service to whirlwind Presidential public appearances before cheering multitudes in foreign lands.

Many would have preferred such energy expended on creative thought on ways and means of meeting the Soviet economic challenge in neutralist and underdeveloped countries. Mr. Eisenhower has still not been subjected to sniping and carping criticisms no matter what the private doubts.

On the contrary, the Democratic majorities in Congress—this year as in the past—have supported the President's major steps.

We passed a bill to authorize American membership in the International Development Association—a lending agency for long-term, low-interest loans to underdeveloped areas under management of the World Bank.

We gave the President support in the mutual security authorizations and appropriations—despite the feeling of many Democratic leaders that Mr. Eisenhower was shortsighted in turning down Senator FULBRIGHT's plan for foreign aid on a 5-year-loan basis, to begin the process of changing assistance from gifts to dependable and repayable loans.

We renewed and extended the Defense Production Act.

The heavily Democratic Senate sustained the President when it ratified the Antarctic Treaty guaranteeing multinational development of the vast Antarctic Continent with guarantees against any nation attempting to plant a military or missile base there.

In the field of appropriations, we again gave careful scrutiny to the President's recommendations on Federal expenditures.

Mr. Eisenhower's record in the area of so-called spending is not one that can

stand the test of history. He has talked a great deal about economy, but there is little evidence that he has ever understood the basic issue of public finance.

I have pointed out previously that in 1952, just before the election, the General promised the late Senator Taft to cut spending to $60 billion a year. He has never been able to cut spending at all. Our population has gone up, the cold war has continued, our needs for national defense and social purposes have increased; we are spending $20 billion more than $60 billion. The record for the 7 Eisenhower years is a deficit record—topped in 1959 by a huge $12 billion deficit.

Mr. Eisenhower has never made himself the master of the figures in the huge and complex Federal budget. For 7 years, former President Truman personally conducted annual briefings on the proposed budget, setting forth the main facts and submitting himself to any question asked by experienced and well-informed reporters dealing with the field. Mr. Eisenhower delegates this task to subordinates. When he is asked at a news conference about some expenditure, he is likely to reply that he cannot keep all the figures in mind.

This year, as in the past, the Democratic Congress has cut many of the President's proposed expenditures. In the first 10 regular appropriation bills and supplementals for fiscal 1960 and 1961, for example, the President asked nearly $61 billion, and we gave him about $300 million less. And we did this while voting to increase defense spending by $650 million.

As many readers know, much of the major work of Congress is done in committees. I have been privileged to continue my work on two major committees—the House Committee on Armed Services and the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy.

In the Armed Services Committee, it is our business to examine the state of the Nation's defenses and the adequacy of the President's proposals. It was from this committee that we were able to initiate some urgent increases in our preparation.

In the Armed Services Committee, also, I was able to initiate a measure that extended urgently justified economic assistance to the citizens of Okinawa, an island critically important to the American defense position in the Pacific. Our Military Establishment has had an impact on the economy of Okinawa that causes natural concern to the people, because of the diversion of arable land, and there have been efforts by the Communists to foment disorder and distrust.

My interest in Okinawa was stirred by a 1955 inspection trip to the island and other Far Eastern positions conducted by a subcommittee of which I was chairman. It seemed to me then, and has continued to seem, that it ill became the United States to disregard the needs of the people where our bases are located. We have at last begun the process of recognizing these needs and seeking to meet them.

I successfully sponsored legislation which resulted in surplus acreage at the Kankakee Ordnance Work in Will County, Ill., being transferred to the State of Illinois for conservation and recreational use.

In the Atomic Energy Committee, we have continued pressure on the administration to expand programs for development of peaceful uses of nuclear power. We have reviewed programs for our defense and reviewed the efforts to reach an enforceable agreement with the Soviet Union for inspection systems that will liberate the world from the fear of nuclear conflict. I was successful in obtaining authorization for a $5 million metallurgical laboratory at the University of Illinois for our atomic energy research program. At my request the Commission will use $750,000 for design study on this building next year.

I have naturally been vitally concerned with advancement of the interests of our own communities. This year again we have been able to obtain approval of appropriations to continue the Army Engineers survey of hillside drainage in St. Clair and Madison Counties, so that projects can be developed to put an end to the flash floods that caused so much death, injury and property damage in 1946 and again in 1957.

I feel certain that the 87th Congress next year will appropriate the relatively small amount of money that will complete the surveys, and that thereafter we can move to actual flood control and conservation projects that will end this waste and devastation.

In discussing local interests, I must emphasize that in many cases the needs of our people are the needs of those in other congressional districts—for schools, housing, slum clearance, purification of our rivers and streams, a fair farm law. Here we have faced an 8-year problem: the philosophy of the Eisenhower administration is hostile to Federal leadership in these fields. This year, as in the past, we have been able to make progress only against the actuality or threat of Presidential vetoes.

The House of Representatives for the first time in history this year passed a general school-aid bill, but only against vehement administration opposition to anything not tied wholly to State-participation provisions that would have made the program meaningless.

The President for the second time vetoed a bill to extend loans and Government guarantees of loans, plus technical assistance, to areas of chronic heavy unemployment.

We were unable to work out a new farm program, although such a program is urgently needed, because the administration has remained wedded to the policies of Secretary of Agriculture Benson and has consistently vetoed congressional attempts to develop solutions.

In 1959 Congress passed a bill, of which I was the House sponsor, to authorize a food-stamp plan by which surplus foods would be taken out of storehouses and distributed to schoolchildren and others who actually lack proper nourishment. Some of the people in our own district would have benefited, and the food-stamp plan was proved workable during World War II. The President and Secretary Benson refused to put the plan into effect after having threatened a veto if Congress should try to make the plan mandatory.

All our river communities, here in our district, would have been greatly benefited by a bill to increase to $90 million a year, in a 10-year program, Federal expenditures on the nationally critical problem of polluted, poisonous river systems. Both the House and Senate passed the bill—but the President vetoed it, and in the House we fell 22 votes short of the required two-thirds vote to override the veto. The great majority of Members recognize the importance of the program, and they refused to allow the President to kill the existing water-pollution program enacted over his opposition.

The stalemate that existed gave Congress power to prevent certain other administration actions that we considered unwise.

Congress declined to lift the ceiling on long-term Government bonds that would have burdened the future with high interest charges. The President repeatedly asked for an increase in the 4.25-percent ceiling, claiming that it was needed to fight inflation, but Congress refused—and a few months later interest rates began to fall in the market.

Congress declined to grant heavy boosts in postal rates because of a doubt that the administration has a proper concept of the Post Office Department as a service institution and has not installed available economies.

Congress declined to impose an increase in gasoline tax levies pending an inquiry into the vast interstate highway program and a chance to examine other tax methods.

There is no doubt that Eisenhower vetoes and veto threats played a major part in checking affirmative legislation or watering it down.

In the social security field, the administration vehemently opposed health care for retired workers financed through the tested social security system, in which citizens would be able to pay for benefits during their working years and obtain these benefits when needed as a matter of right.

On housing, the administration insisted that no general new housing legislation was needed, although the rate of residential construction has fallen far behind the expansion of our population.

On city slum clearance and redevelopment, the administration idea was that the Federal share of expenses should be reduced, although such operations are utterly beyond the fiscal resources of local communities alone.

On the minimum-wage bill, the administration opposed any increase in the minimum above $1.15. It opposed any broad increase of coverage to protect the 10 million in interstate commerce previously unprotected.

In the light of the circumstances, the 2d session of the 86th Congress wrote a creditable record. It added achievement to the record of the first session.

In the first session, it will be remembered, the administration gave some of us our first real lessons in frustration. In 1959, just as in 1960, the President tried to reverse the election results.

I was personally involved in one of his 1959 vetoes. I sponsored, with Senator HUMPHREY in the Senate, a bill to protect the Rural Electrification Administration from what we consider Secretary Benson's hostility. The President slew the bill with a veto, and the House failed by a few votes to override the veto.

We saw the same pattern of obstruction this year on many domestic issues.

Congress, nevertheless, has moved forward on a sound, responsible, progressive course. I think we have built a record that clarifies the clashes of philosophy between the administration and its appointees and the majorities in Congress chosen by the people.

This year we were able to pass the second civil rights bill since the close of the Reconstruction era—and the bill was passed under Democratic leadership that frustrated delays in the House and beat down an actual filibuster in the Senate.

We passed a Sugar Act that gave the President the authority he asked to deal with the problems created by the Castro regime in Cuba.

We granted the President another temporary increase in the ceiling on the national debt—a debt that never has fallen under his administration but has risen despite his charge that only Democrats are "wastrels."

We were able to push through a long-deserved pay raise for Federal civil service and postal employees—and we did this by overriding a veto. The veto was reversed by a vote of 349 to 69 in the House and 74 to 24 in the Senate.

In addition, in the closing weeks of the session after the political conventions, Congress was able to pass these bills:

Amendments to the Social Security Act which eliminates age requirements on totally and permanently disabled persons and a medical care program in cooperation with the States; a public works appropriation bill which provides funds for several flood control projects in this area; a communications—payola—bill; extension of the FHA loans for home repairs and extension of the college housing program.

Twentieth Anniversary of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to salute 2½ million Americans of Ukrainian ancestry on the 20th anniversary of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America.

Members of this organization, under the able and inspired leadership of Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, are performing an invaluable service to the United States of America in keeping us aware of the real nature of Communist imperialism.

We need to be reminded that the Ukraine is not Russian. It is not a willing member of the U.S.S.R. Its people still yearn for and would be willing to fight for the independence that was theirs for a few short years four decades ago.

We need to be reminded that all of the captive nations look to the free world and to the United States of America to keep alive their hopes of liberty from the Kremlin.

This is only a part of the valuable work of the Ukrainian Congress, for which all Americans salute it on its 20th anniversary. As in the past, it will always be my pleasure and privilege to consult and work with the Ukrainian Congress.

TVA Ghosts Come to Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON H. SCHERER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, last year when the Congress passed H.R. 3460, giving to TVA bond issuing authority and broadening existing TVA legislation, I said that the practical effect of the bill would be to remove all presidential and congressional control over the use of bond and power revenues. I further predicted that, as a result, the illusory fence placed around TVA's service area by the bill would shortly fall like a stack of cards.

I argued that the proponents of socialized power had no intention whatsoever of acquiescing in any territorial limitation for TVA, and that the limitations provided in the bill were only a temporary concession or sop to enable the public power boys to get their bond issuing authority through the Congress.

I pointed out that any TVA area limitations would vanish as soon as they were able to meet the power demands in the present TVA service area, which demands had become so great because TVA had pirated industry after industry from other sections of the country by using taxpayer's subsidized power as a lure.

Mr. Speaker, no one in the Congress has a better understanding of the history and operations of the Tennessee Valley Authority and its eventual objectives than does my distinguished colleague, BEN F. JENSEN, from the Seventh District of Iowa. On August 26 I received from him a lengthy and comprehensive letter in which he carefully and with keen insight outlines what has happened and is happening in the Tennessee Valley since the passage of H.R. 3460 in July of last year.

It can be readily seen that the socialized power boys, who vigorously denied what we said during the debates on H.R. 3460, are now proceeding exactly as we had predicted. It is now apparent that the end result in a few short years will be a vast expansion of the TVA service area.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in my remarks I insert in the RECORD this excellent letter of the gentleman from Iowa, BEN JENSEN, and the excerpts from the testimony before the Appropriations Committee referred to in Mr. JENSEN's letter:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., August 26, 1960.

Hon. GORDON H. SCHERER,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SCHERER: In the keynote speech before the Democratic National Convention in Los Angeles on July 11, 1960, reference was made to the Khrushchev prophecy that our grandchildren would be living under socialism. Naturally this Democratic keynoter did not tell his audience that for years this trend toward socialism in the United States had been actively promoted by many of the leaders of the Democratic Party.

One of the prime examples of this socialistic trend is the promotion and expansion over the years of the Tennessee Valley Authority. That it is truly socialistic was proclaimed by none other than Norman Thomas, the perennial socialistic candidate for President of the United States.

During the 1st session of the 86th Congress, controlled by a Democratic majority, two bills—H.R. 3460 and S. 2471—to amend the TVA Act were passed. These bills provided, among other things, for the issuance of revenue bonds by the Tennessee Valley Authority to provide added funds for expanding the electric power facilities of that agency.

Many of the opponents of these bills claimed that their passage would practically relieve TVA of any effective control by the Congress over the plans of that agency for the expansion of its electric power system. An opinion was held by many that after passage of these bills, TVA would proceed to interpret the law as permitting them to construct, at will, new generating plants or units, without prior notice to the Congress, and without specific approval by the Congress.

I was among several Congressmen who protested to the White House, with no avail, about approval of these bills that would practically remove TVA from any effective congressional or presidential control. The replies from the White House took the position that there was no need to be apprehensive about the TVA Act as amended by the bills in question, and that Congress could in the future affirmatively legislate to meet any problem that might arise.

On July 23, 1959, when House Resolution 326 was called up for the purpose of taking up and accepting the TVA revenue bond bill, H.R. 3460 as amended by the Senate, and again on August 11, 1959, when the bill S. 2471 to further amend the TVA was taken up by the House, you spoke out against the added authority being given to TVA and against the elimination of control over TVA by the Congress and the President. You stated that passage of S. 2471 would:

"Instead of giving the President and the Congress direction over the construction of new power-producing projects by TVA as the President desired, unequivocally and completely eliminate any direction and control whatsoever by either the President or the Congress over the use of either revenue bonds proceeds or power revenues by the corporation in the construction of new power-producing projects."

With further regard to S. 2471 you said:

"Today, if we pass this bill, we wipe out all congressional authority and control."

For many years, I, too, have been greatly concerned about the continual expansion of

this autocratic socialistic TVA power empire within these United States. With this expansion there has been a progressive assumption of power by TVA with a concurrent and continuing elimination of effectual and proper control by the Congress.

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 105, part 2, page 2913, I pointed out in some detail why I thought the "Congress should have more, not less, control over TVA—H.R. 3460 and similar bills should not pass." On page 3921 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 105, part 3, I inserted the statement I presented that forenoon to the House Public Works Committee in opposition to H.R. 3460. It should be amply clear from the documentary evidence presented in these two statements that the Congress has been derelict in not asserting proper control over this autocratic socialistic agency. In addition I am enclosing a reprint of an article of mine, "Socialism or Freedom for America," from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 105, part 6. This article deals at some length with development of the autocratic socialistic empire of TVA.

As you know, I am the ranking minority member of the Public Works Subcommittee of the House Appropriation Committee. Hearings before our subcommittee, since the passage of H.R. 3460 and S. 2471 to amend the TVA Act, have clearly demonstrated that your statements and mine about the effect of such bills on the TVA power expansion program were prophetic. Of course, we were not alone in the belief that the passage of H.R. 3460 and S. 2471 would practically relieve TVA of any effective control by the Congress over the power expansion plans of that agency.

Information obtained during the above mentioned hearings disclosed that on August 13, 1959, the day before S. 2471 was signed into law, the TVA board entered into or awarded two contracts for the purchase of two new large steam electric generators. One of these was for a 600,000 kilowatt steam electric generator for a new plant in the western part of the TVA system. The second was for a 500,000 kilowatt steam electric generator for a new plant in the eastern part of the TVA system. It appears that the awarding of the second of these two contracts was in violation of the law in force on the day the two contracts were awarded.

On October 1, 1959, the TVA Board of Directors announced the plans for the construction of a new steam-electric generating plant on the Green River near Paradise in western Kentucky. These contract awards and other actions were taken without prior notification to or prior request for authority from the Congress for such action.

It is quite apparent that TVA now considers that it can start construction of new steam electric power generating plants at will, without prior notification to the Congress, or approval by the Congress as to the size, location, cost, etc., of such plants.

In an effort to obtain an admission by the TVA officials that they do now consider that they can proceed with the expansion of the TVA electric power facilities practically at will and without any requirement for prior notification of Congress, a series of questions and requests for information was presented by Congressman FENTON during the House hearings on the public works appropriation bill for 1961. The TVA officials were requested to submit, for the record, answers to these questions which would be as complete, concise, direct, and germane as possible, leaving out all extraneous comments or verbiage. These questions and answers as reported on pages 882 to and including the first paragraph of page 888 of the House hearings on public works appropriations for 1961 are attached hereto. For easy reference each question has been numbered. An analysis of the TVA answers discloses that in many instances they were neither complete nor fully responsive. This, of course, was not surprising, as it was in keeping with the TVA record down through the years. There was, however, sufficient information furnished in the TVA answers to demonstrate that TVA now believes it has sole authority to decide when, where, and what new power generating facilities are to be constructed by TVA, all without any need to advise the Congress prior to taking action on such expansion or to obtain specific approval thereof.

The following detailed discussion of some of the questions and the TVA answers thereto are presented in order to point out the indicated freedom from congressional control now held by TVA officials. The lack of responsibilities in some instances is also noted.

Questions (1) and (2). These questions requested information on the planned additions to the TVA power system through 1964. Information furnished by TVA appeared substantially responsive for the early years. Information for 1963 and 1964 appears incomplete.

Question (3). Detailed information as to how the power system additions were expected to be financed was requested through 1964. The TVA answer was neither complete nor fully responsive. For instance, information was desired on what portion of the cost of the new Paradise steam electric generating plant was to be financed by power revenues and what part from the sale of revenue bonds. This information was not given.

Question (4). Detailed information was requested as to expected purchase or lease of additional power from others. The TVA answer was to the effect that, other than probable purchase of power from Corps of Engineers projects on the Cumberland River, TVA had no other present plans for obtaining additional power through purchase or lease. In the past TVA has often used the phrase "TVA has no plans" only to end up doing the very thing it told Congress or the courts it had no plans or intentions of doing. Whether this will be true in this case, time can only tell.

Questions (5), (7), (8), (11), and (14). All these questions were related to the primary question of whether TVA had proceeded with the planning and construction of new power projects without prior notification to and specific authorization from the Congress and/or the President.

It was hoped that TVA would, in line with the request, give direct and responsive answers. In most instances, the TVA answers, instead of being straightforward yes or no type answers, were rambling and circuitous. In essence, however, these TVA answers disclose that TVA now takes the position that the TVA Act as amended now contains a general authorization under which TVA can undertake the planning and construction of power projects without prior notification to or specific authorization from the Congress and/or the President.

With regard to question (14) which specifically asked:

"Does TVA now consider it can construct new powerplants when and where it sees fit, without prior notification to or specific authorization from the Congress?"

The TVA reply was:

"This question is fully answered in the opinion of our General Counsel supplied in response to the question which follows."

This was an evasive type answer to a direct question that could have been answered with a direct yes or no. The substance of the General Counsel's response to the seven parts of question (15) discloses that a yes would be the proper answer to question (14).

Question (15). This question was directed to the General Counsel for TVA who was requested to give his opinion on the control or lack of control that Congress now has over the power operation of TVA under existing law. The following seven specific points were listed on which the General Counsel's opinion was requested:

1. What is the geographic area within which TVA can market power from existing or proposed new electric generating plants? Or from plants whose output is to be purchased or otherwise contracted for by TVA? Relate this to area served at time of passage of H.R. 3460.

2. Can TVA initiate the construction of new generating plants without prior notification to or specific authorization from the Congress?

3. Is there any limitation on the area in which TVA can now construct steam electric plants?

4. If the answer to item 3 is yes, what is such limitation?

5. Can TVA enter into contracts to purchase all or part of the power to be available from existing or new non-Federal powerplants outside the TVA area? If so, are there any geographical limitations as to the location of such plants and the area within which the power can be utilized?

6. What are some of the more important legal restrictions or congressional controls TVA believes it is released from by the exception (in sec. 15d(a) of the TVA Act as amended) that expenditures from bond proceeds "shall not be subject to the requirements or limitations of any other law"?

7. Does TVA intend to set up a special account for bond proceeds that will not be reflected in the accounting under the requirements of the Government Corporations Control Act? Will TVA power receipts and their expenditure continue to be reported under the provisions of that act?

Question (15–1). This related to the area within which TVA and its power distributors can serve. The General Counsel's answer simply quoted section 15d(a) of the TVA Act as amended. Apparently TVA does not want to go on record as to how it interprets the area limitation.

Question (15–2). Can TVA initiate the construction of new generating plants without prior notification to or specific authorization from the Congress?

Answer by General Counsel was as follows:

"Congress has authorized TVA to construct needed generating plants within the limits of its bond-issuing authority and the power revenues which are available. No further authorization from Congress is necessary.

"TVA's budget program includes a statement of TVA's plans for the construction of new generating plants during the ensuing year, but TVA's authority to construct plants and to issue revenue bonds for that purpose rests on its basic statute. If TVA should find that additional plants were required beyond those mentioned in the President's budget, it would have authority to begin construction of such plants, and would advise Congress of such action in connection with its next annual budget presentation."

It is evident that the TVA Board of Directors and the General Counsel are in agreement that TVA can under existing law use the power revenue and the proceeds from the sale of revenue bonds to construct new electric generating facilities when and where it pleases, and without prior notification to or specific authorization from the Congress or the President. It is indicated that the TVA budget program would present a statement on the TVA plans for construction of new generating plants during the ensuing year. However, the General Counsel points out that this program could be changed later, with Congress being advised of the change in connection with the presentation of the next annual budget. The General Counsel apparently believes that TVA can, within the limit of its power revenues and bond proceeds, do as it pleases about starting new plants and tell the Congress

and the President afterward. The TVA action on the Paradise plant is ample evidence of such a policy.

Questions (15–3) and (15–4). The question here is whether, in the General Counsel's opinion, there is any limitation as to the area wherein TVA can construct new steam electric generating plants.

The answer given is a circuitous one, which, in essence, seems to say that TVA can construct new plants in any area it chooses, within an implied limitation relative to the cost of power. With TVA itself making the decision as to the relative costs for power, it seems apparent that the General Counsel is saying TVA can construct a new generating plant wherever it pleases.

Question (15–5). The question here is in the same category of questions (15–3) and (15–4), except that it relates to purchase or lease purchase of power from plants constructed by others. The answer here is similar and in keeping with the answers to questions (15–3) and (15–4) to the effect that TVA can lease or purchase power from others pretty much as it pleases.

Question (15–6). The request here was for an opinion as to what were some of the more important legal restrictions or congressional controls TVA believes it is released from "by the exception (in sec. 15d(a) of the TVA Act as amended) that expenditures from bond proceeds 'shall not be subject to the requirements or limitations of any other law.'"

No direct or responsive answer was given. Instead, the General Counsel presented his opinions as to what was the basic purpose of the quoted portion of the TVA Act. He also listed two assurances that he said resulted from the quoted language of the act.

It appears that the General Counsel, in not giving a specific answer, does not want to be put in a position of indicating any possible limitation under this freewheeling amendment of the TVA Act.

Question (15–7). This relates to whether proceeds from TVA bonds are to be recorded and reported in a special account and how TVA power revenues and expenditures are to be reported.

The TVA General Counsel says there is no accounting requirement under the Government Corporation Control Act. He goes on to say the bond proceeds and expenditures, and power proceeds and expenditures, will be reflected in TVA's budget presentation under the Government Corporation Control Act. Just what all this double talk means is not clear. It is evident from the TVA presentation in the fiscal year 1961 budget that no breakdown between bond proceeds and power revenues and their expenditures is to be given. It apparently will be the old, old story of having to pry the information out of TVA piece by piece.

I shall continue to fight for the restoration of proper congressional control over the operations of the socialistic TVA power empire and to prevent its expansion beyond its presently prescribed boundary. In addition, I believe provision should be made for a payment into the Federal Treasury by TVA and its power distributors equivalent to the average unit tax payment made by power customers of the private utilities of the Nation.

As the ranking minority member of the Public Works Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, I shall continue to strive for a full detailed disclosure on the record of TVA's power operations and financial operations.

Sincerely,

BEN F. JENSEN.

PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1961—TVA

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman from Pennsylvania, Dr. Fenton, has left some questions which he would like to be answered in the transcript. I will recognize Mr. JENSEN for that purpose.

The clerk suggests that we reserve the right for the staff to go over them.

Mr. JENSEN. Yes; that is all right.

Mr. CANNON. Without objection.

Dr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, I have a few observations to make and a number of questions to ask and requests to make of the TVA witnesses. A number of the items relate to extending data placed in the hearing record for fiscal year 1960. I would like for the answers to my requests to be as complete, concise, direct, and germane as possible, leaving out all extraneous comments or verbiage.

ADDITIONS TO TVA POWER-GENERATING CAPACITY

Question. Will you furnish a tabulation for the record showing all the major additions to TVA system capacity now under construction, planned and/or scheduled for completion in fiscal year 1960 and for each of the next 4 years, the total estimated cost for each unit or plant, amount expended for each at the end of fiscal year 1959, and the expected expenditures for each in fiscal years 1960, 1961, 1962, 1963, and 1964?

(The tabulation requested follows:)

Additions to generating capacity under construction, planned and/or scheduled for operation prior to June 30, 1964

[In millions]

	June 30, 1959	Estimate, 1960	Estimate, 1961	Estimate, 1962 [1]	Estimate, 1963 [1]	Estimate, 1964 [1]	Total estimated cost
Hydro units:							
Wilson units 19–21	$1.6	$12.5	$8.7	$1.2			$24.0
Wheeler units 9–11		2.3	11.9	5.7	$1.3		21.2
Melton Hill units 1–2			3.1	9.0	6.0	$1.9	20.0
Steam units:							
Widows Creek unit 7	27.6	48.5	5.9				82.0
Colbert unit 5	.6	10.1	35.5	24.6	4.2		75.0
Paradise units 1–2		15.2	65.4	87.0	30.4	7.0	205.0
Eastern unit		1.0	14.1	38.0	33.0	7.9	94.0
Johnsonville units 7–10 [2]	73.1	2.6					75.7
Gallatin units 3–4 [3]	60.6	2.6	.2				63.4
Total	163.5	94.8	144.8	165.5	74.9	16.8	660.3

[1] Preliminary.
[2] Placed in service Nov. 30, 1958, Jan. 14, 1959, June 13, 1959, and Aug. 20, 1959, respectively. Cleanup work being done in remaining part of fiscal year 1960.
[3] Placed in service May 22, 1959, and Aug. 9, 1959. Cleanup work being done in remaining part of fiscal year 1960 and in the early part of fiscal year 1961.

ESTIMATED TRANSMISSION COSTS

Question. Will you also furnish the corresponding estimated costs and expenditure data for the transmission and other related system facilities needed to market the power from the added system capacity for these same years?

(The information requested follows:)

Estimates for transmission system facilities are as follows:

Fiscal year:	*Million*
1960	$30.8
1961	31.8
1962	[1] 31.8
1963	[1] 36.8
1964	[1] 30.0

[1] Preliminary.

SOURCE OF FUNDS

Question. Will you also show what portion of the foregoing costs for generating plants and other system facilities are expected to be expended from appropriated funds, what portion from power revenues, and what portion is to be derived from the sale of bonds? Give details for each of the years noted. Also give expected unexpended balance in each category of funds as of June 30, 1960.

(The information requested follows:)

Appropriated funds available from unobligated balances of previous appropriations are being used to complete Kingston steamplant for which all units have been placed in commercial operation. Estimates for the Kingston plant, not included in the above tabulations, are as follows: Fiscal year 1960, $1.5 million; 1961, $1.2 million.

To the extent possible other generating facilities will be financed from current power revenues. Revenue bonds will be issued as a supplementary source of financing as required. The 1961 budget estimate for revenue bond issues is $115 million during that year. For fiscal years 1962, 1963, and 1964 it is estimated that such issues will average about $100 million per annum. Precise details are not available at this time.

The unexpended balance of power proceeds is estimated at $23,215,289 at June 30, 1960. This estimate includes no funds derived from bond proceeds since first issues are scheduled for fiscal year 1961. Of the $2,411,000 total of appropriated funds estimated to be carried forward into 1961, it is estimated that $1,217,000 will be applied to the Kingston steamplant.

Question. If additional power is expected to be obtained through purchase from Federal projects, or by purchase or lease from non-Federal sources which is not now included in TVA system capacity, give details for each of the following fiscal years: 1960, 1961, 1962, 1963, and 1964.

(The information requested follows:)

Power produced at Corps of Engineers projects now in operation on the Cumberland River is being marketed through the TVA system; presumably power from additional projects on that river may also be so marketed. TVA has no other present plans for obtaining additional power through purchase from Federal projects or by purchase or lease from non-Federal sources.

LACK OF SPECIFIC AUTHORIZATION FOR NEW STEAMPLANT

Question. At last year's hearings you were requested to file for the record a copy of the invitation to bid on over 6 million kilowatts of steam turbogenerators. On October 1, 1959, the TVA Board of Directors announced plans for the construction of a new steam-electric generation plant on the west bank of the Green River near Paradise in western Kentucky. The announcement also stated that the contract for the initial 600,000 kilowatt steam turbogenerator unit was ordered August 3, 1959, from the General Electric Co. at a price of $18,007,280. Was any specific authorization or appropriation ever made by the Congress for the construction of this Paradise steamplant?

(The information requested follows:)

Construction of the Paradise steamplant is covered by general authorization in the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, as amended.

No appropriated funds will be needed in financing the cost of this project.

Question. When was the construction of this $100 million-plus plant authorized by the TVA Board? What was the vote?

(The information requested follows:)

On August 13, 1959, the TVA Board of Directors awarded a contract for a 600,000-kilowatt turbogenerator unit, with the understanding that the unit would be installed in a new steamplant in the western area of the system. On September 25, 1959, the Board selected the Paradise site for the new station. On October 19, 1959, the Board formally authorized construction of the Paradise steamplant. The vote in each instance was unanimous.

Question. Was any committee of Congress ever notified of the intention to construct a plant at Paradise and, if so, what committee and when? (If the answer is "yes," supply a copy of such notification for the record.)

(The information requested follows:)

TVA's budget justification for 1960 which was set out in the record of the appropriation hearings of April 22, 1959, before the House Subcommittee on Public Works Appropriations, beginning on page 792, included statements (p. 803) that "at least another million kilowatts of capacity should be started" to be financed from bond funds, and that "early enactment of financing legislation would support efforts to hold down the Federal budget for 1960 by avoiding the need for appropriations for this additional power capacity." Much of the ensuing discussion was concerned with the financing of power generating facilities from bond proceeds. At that time TVA had already solicited bids for additional generating units in anticipation of enactment of the bond financing legislation and there was considerable discussion concerning the invitation to bid. A copy of the invitation is in the record on pages 918–952. The Paradise site had not been selected at the time of the hearings.

Question. Was the President or the Budget Bureau advised of the pending TVA actions on the Paradise plant prior to such action? If not, does TVA believe it can take such actions without prior notification to or approval by the President?

(The information requested follows:)

The information in the TVA budget justification for 1960 and the record of the hearing referred to in the answer to the preceding question were available to the Office of the President and to the Bureau of the Budget. Similar information was also included in TVA's budget submission for 1960 to the Bureau of the Budget and was the subject of hearings before the Bureau of the Budget. The necessity for the additional capacity had been common knowledge for a long time. By routine, informal discussions the Office of the President and the Budget Bureau were kept informed on TVA's plans to provide required additional capacity.

BIDS ON NEW STEAM-GENERATING UNITS

Question. An examination of the abstract of bids shows that the General Electric bid on the 600,000-kilowatt unit was the only bid for a unit of this size.

Apparently, the invitations to bid were changed almost at the last minute to provide for alternate bids on units of unspecified size. Only two bids were received under this schedule, one from General Electric for a 600,000-kilowatt unit at $18,007,280 and one from Westinghouse for an 800,000-kilowatt unit at $24 million. Each of these bids was around $30 per kilowatt of rated capacity. Can you explain why this change in the invitation to bid was made and why the award was made on a basis of a unit price per kilowatt of almost double the unit price bid on the originally specified 500,000-kilowatt units?

(The information requested follows:)

Invitation No. 31–34762 was issued April 10, 1959, for bids to be opened May 26, 1959. The invitation asked for bids on units of different capacities: 500,000 kilowatts, 400,000 kilowatts, 350,000 kilowatts, and 275,000 kilowatts. On May 6, 1959, by addendum I, bid opening date was changed to June 16, 1959.

Prior to issuing the invitation, our needs had been discussed with various manufacturers. The consensus was that a 500,000-kilowatt unit was probably the largest that could be built and delivered in time for operation in the fall of 1962, the time specified for the first of the units covered by the invitation. The invitation accordingly used this as the top size. After the invitation was issued, the manufacturers said that a review of their plans and manufacturing capacity showed that units larger than 500,000 kilowatts could be delivered within the available time.

On May 22, 1959, about 4 weeks before bid opening date, by addendum III, prospective bidders were notified that alternate bids offering units of different capacities would be considered.

When the bids were opened, General Electric and Westinghouse were the only bidders offering units for operation in the fall of 1962.

After evaluation for efficiency, the bid prices on a kilowatt of capacity basis were:

General Electric	$30.51
Westinghouse	33.62

The foreign manufacturers offered delivery dates too late to supply our needs for a first unit. Their bids, evaluated for efficiency and for "Buy American" differential, on a kilowatt of capacity basis were:

Brown Boveri	$23.03
Parsons	30.54
English Electric	31.00

The bids of Parsons and English Electric were unacceptable both for reasons of price and (for a first unit) of late delivery. Award was made to General Electric as low bidder meeting required delivery. The disposition of the Brown Boveri bid is discussed in the answer to the next question.

Question. It is noted that you have also ordered an additional 500,000-kilowatt unit. When was this unit ordered and where is it to be installed? Who was it ordered from and at what price?

(The information requested follows:)

Invitation No. 31–34762, discussed in the answer to the preceding question, in addition to asking for offers for units to operate in the fall of 1962, asked for offers for units for operation at a later date.

Brown Boveri offered a 500,000-kilowatt unit for operation in August 1963, when it would be required to meet the load growth in that year. Their quoted price was $8,500,000. The corresponding evaluated cost was $11,514,600 after evaluation for efficiency and the "Buy American" differential. This is $23.03 per kilowatt of capacity, as noted in the answer to the preceding question.

Award was made to Brown Boveri for a 500,000-kilowatt turbogenerator unit on August 13, 1959, at the price of $8,500,000.

This unit will be installed at a location not yet selected where it can help to serve loads in the eastern part of the power system.

LOCATION OF NEW STEAMPLANT

Question. The President's budget refers to a steamplant to be built in the eastern part of the TVA area. Where and what size plant is this? Does TVA plan to construct this plant without specific authorization of the Congress?

(The information requested follows:)

As stated in the budget message to Congress, a 500,000-kilowatt turbogenerator has been purchased for supplying loads in the eastern part of the system. Decisions regarding the location of this 500,000-kilowatt unit have not yet been made. As the budget document explains, "The specific location has not been determined and if studies now in progress do not result in a satisfactory new plant location, the unit can be put into an existing station." The installation of this unit is covered by general authorization in the TVA Act, as amended.

COAL CONTRACT FOR NEW PARADISE STEAMPLANT

Question. Was the coal contract for the Paradise plant obtained through competitive bidding?

Yes.

Question. If so, will you furnish for the record an abstract of the various bids received for supplying coal to the Paradise plant?

(The information requested follows:)

Only one bid was received. This was the bid of Peabody Coal Co. which offered 60,000 tons of washed mine-run coal per week for a term of 12 years at $3.80 per ton f.o.b. rail cars at loading point, said price to be subject to escalation to reflect changes in mine wages and other mine labor costs. The bid guaranteed a heat content of 11,700 B.t.u. per pound. The bid was not acceptable to TVA in the form in which it was submitted but a mutually satisfactory contract was worked out through negotiations with Peabody, the only bidder, a course which is entirely consistent with recognized principles of competitive bidding.

Question. What are the quantities, terms, and unit prices in this coal contract?

(The information requested follows:)

As awarded on October 1, 1959, the contract with Peabody calls for delivery over a period of approximately 17 years (beginning in August 1962) of approximately 65 million tons of unwashed, mine-run coal with an average guaranteed heat content of 10,770 B.t.u. per pound. The rate of delivery for approximately the first 9 months is 40,000 tons per week and thereafter 80,000 tons per week. The price is $2.95 per ton delivered (by truck) at the TVA plant. This price is subject to escalation to the extent of nine-tenths of any percentage changes in the average mine price of all mine-run coal bought by TVA from other suppliers under contracts with terms in excess of 1 year. TVA has an option under the contract to obtain delivery of additional tonnage during the contract term.

CONGRESSIONAL CONTROL OVER TVA

Question. Does TVA now consider it can construct new powerplants when and where it sees fit, without prior notification to or specific authorization from the Congress?

(The information requested follows:)

This question is fully answered in the opinion of our General Counsel supplied in response to the question which follows.

Question. Will you have your General Counsel prepare for the record his interpretation of the control or lack of control that Congress now has over the power operation of TVA under existing law? This opinion should, among other things, give a definitive answer to the following:

1. What is the geographic area within which TVA can market power from existing or proposed new electric generating plants? Or from plants whose power output is to be purchased or otherwise contracted for by TVA? Relate this to area served at time of passage of H.R. 3460.

2. Can TVA initiate the construction of new generating plants without prior notification to or specific authorization from the Congress?

3. Is there any limitation on the area in which TVA can now construct steam electric plants?

4. If the answer to item 3 is "Yes," what is such limitation?

5. Can TVA enter into contracts to purchase all or part of the power to be available from existing or new non-Federal powerplants outside the TVA area? If so, are there any geographical limitations as to the location of such plants and the area within which the power can be utilized?

6. What are some of the more important legal restrictions or congressional controls TVA believes it is released from by the exception (in sec. 15d(a) of the TVA Act as amended) that expenditures from bond proceeds "shall not be subject to the requirements or limitations of any other law"?

7. Does TVA intend to set up a special account for bond proceeds that will not be reflected in the accounting under the requirements of the Government Corporations Control Act? Will TVA power receipts and their expenditure continue to be reported under the provisions of that act?

(The requested information follows:)

TVA is a wholly owned agency and instrumentality of the United States. It was created and exists under the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended, and is responsible for carrying out the policies and programs laid down by Congress in the act. Subject to the veto power of the President, Congress may amend the act at any time.

My views on the specific questions are as follows:

1. What is the geographic area within which TVA can market power from existing or proposed new electric generating plants, or from plants whose power output is to be purchased or otherwise contracted for by TVA? Relate this to area served at time of passage of H.R. 3460.

The geographic area within which TVA can market power from existing or proposed new generating plants or from plants whose power output is to be purchased or otherwise contracted for by TVA is specifically defined in section 15d(a) of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, as amended, as follows:

"Unless otherwise specifically authorized by Act of Congress the Corporation shall make no contracts for the sale or delivery of power which would have the effect of making the Corporation or its distributors, directly or indirectly, a source of power supply outside the area for which the Corporation or its distributors were the primary source of power supply on July 1, 1957, and such additional area extending not more than five miles around the periphery of such area as may be necessary to care for the growth of the Corporation and its distributors within said area: *Provided, however,* That such additional area shall not in any event increase by more than 2½ per centum (or two thousand square miles, whichever is the lesser) the area for which the Corporation and its distributors were the primary source of power supply on July 1, 1957: *And provided further,* That no part of such additional area may be in a State not now served by the Corporation or its distributors or in a municipality receiving electric service from another source on or after July 1, 1957, and no more than five hundred square miles of such additional area may be in any one State now served by the Corporation or its distributors.

"Nothing in this subsection shall prevent the Corporation or its distributors from supplying electric power to any customer within any area in which the Corporation or its distributors had generally established electric service on July 1, 1957, and to which electric service was not being supplied from any other source on the effective date of this Act.

"Nothing in this subsection shall prevent the Corporation, when economically feasible, from making exchange power arrangements with other power-generating organizations with which the Corporation had such arrangements on July 1, 1957, nor prevent the Corporation from continuing to supply power to Dyersburg, Tennessee, and Covington, Tennessee, or from entering into contracts to supply or from supplying power to the cities of Paducah, Kentucky; Princeton, Kentucky; Glasgow, Kentucky; Fulton, Kentucky; Monticello, Kentucky; Hickman, Kentucky; Chicamauga, Georgia; Ringgold, Georgia; Oak Ridge, Tennessee; and South Fulton, Tennessee; or agencies thereof; or from entering into contracts to supply or from supplying power for the Naval Auxiliary Air Station in Lauderdale and Kemper Counties, Mississippi, through the facilities of the East Mississippi Electric Power Association: *Provided further,* That nothing herein contained shall prevent the transmission of TVA power to the Atomic Energy Commission or the Department of Defense or any agency thereof, on certification by the President of the United States that an emergency defense need for such power exists."

This provision defines the relationship of the area supplied with TVA power on July 1, 1957, to the area within which TVA can now market power. The only major difference between the area on July 1, 1957, and at the time of passage of H.R. 3460 is that on the latter date TVA was no longer the primary source of power supply for the area served by the city of Memphis.

2. Can TVA initiate the construction of new generating plants without prior notification to or specific authorization from the Congress?

Congress has authorized TVA to construct needed generating plants within the limits of its bond issuing authority and the power revenues which are available. No further authorization from Congress is necessary.

TVA's budget program includes a statement of TVA's plans for the construction of new generating plants during the ensuing year, but TVA's authority to construct plants and to issue revenue bonds for that purpose rests on its basic statute. If TVA should find that additional plants were required beyond those mentioned in the President's budget, it would have authority to begin construction of such plants, and would advise Congress of such action in connection with its next annual budget presentation.

3. Is there any limitation on the area in which TVA can now construct steam electric plants?

See answer to No. 4 below.

4. If the answer to item 3 is "Yes," what is such limitation?

The TVA Board is obligated to supply power at the lowest possible cost to the area which relies on TVA as its primary source of power supply and thus is obligated to construct those generating plants which will accomplish that result. Congress elected to limit the area within which TVA power could be supplied but it recognized that any arbitrary limit on the area within which generating plants could be constructed would be inconsistent with the obligation imposed on the TVA Board to produce power at the lowest possible cost. The location of a generating plant can be selected only after a careful weighing of the various factors which determine its economic feasibility. Among the more important factors are availability of coal, transmission distance to the load centers where the power is needed, the availability of adequate water for cooling purposes, and the availability of rail, water, and highway transportation.

5. Can TVA enter into contracts to purchase all or part of the power to be available from existing or new non-Federal powerplants outside the TVA area? If so, are there any geographical limitations as to the location of such plants and the area within which the power can be utilized?

The TVA Board is under a duty to operate the TVA power system as efficiently, and to keep costs as low, as possible. Accordingly, the controlling consideration in a decision whether to purchase power from a non-Federal source, as in the location of a generating plant to be constructed by TVA itself and in a choice between purchase or construction, is whether the power to be obtained will be the most economical available from the standpoint of the TVA power system as a whole. Subject to this basic limitation, there is no arbitrary geographical restriction on the location either of TVA plants or of non-Federal plants from which power may be purchased. Utilization of power from both sources is subject to the geographical limitations set out in the answer to question 1 above.

6. What are some of the more important legal restrictions or congressional controls TVA believes it is released from by the exception (in sec. 15d(a) of the TVA Act as amended) that expenditures from bond proceeds "shall not be subject to the requirements or limitations of any other law"?

The basic purpose of the quoted provision is to enhance the marketability of the bonds by making clear to prospective purchasers that the limitations on the issuance of bonds are those specified in the act itself. It provides additional assurance that TVA's ability to begin construction of new generating capacity as and when needed is not dependent on the appropriation process. It also provides assurance that the flexibility given to TVA in the act will not be restricted inadvertently by statutes of general application.

7. Does TVA intend to set up a special account for bond proceeds that will not be reflected in the accounting under the requirements of the Government Corporation Control Act? Will TVA power receipts and their expenditure continue to be reported under the provisions of that act?

The Government Corporation Control Act contains no accounting requirements. TVA's bond proceeds and their expenditure will be reflected in TVA's budget presentations under the Government Corporation Control Act. TVA power receipts and their expenditure will also be reflected in TVA's budget presentations.

REDUCTION IN TVA LOAD ESTIMATES

Question. It appears that your peakload for this winter of 1959–60 is nearly three-quarter million kilowatts below the estimate you made last year; is this correct? Will you explain why you were so far off from your estimate?

(The information requested follows:)

The estimate of last year for the winter of 1959–60 was 10,300,000 kilowatts. The actual peak demand for the winter was 9,641,000 on March 1, 1960. The difference between the actual and estimate is 659,000 kilowatts. About 300,000 kilowatts of this difference results from less deliveries to the Federal agencies, principally to AEC, than had been estimated. Also, the aluminum producers in this area did not operate four aluminum potlines and associated fabricating equipment which we anticipated to be in operation. That resulted in another 150,000 kilowatts less load. The temperature at the time of our peak on March 1 was 22°, or about 8° warmer than the normal minimum during the winter season when the peak is expected to be established. At that time, wind velocity was higher than normal offsetting some of the warmer-than-normal temperature. The net effect of the weather, however, reduced the system load by at least another 200,000 kilowatts. The sum of these factors adds to 650,000 kilowatts, which almost exactly equals the difference between the estimated and actual demands.

Question. Why have you reduced all your future load estimates by about 800,000 kilowatts below those of last years? Would it

have anything to do with the lack of a need to show such a gloomy picture on requirements for future capacity additions, now that you have obtained authority to issue bonds?

(The requested information follows:)

From year to year the load forecasts are adjusted to reflect experience of trends and new developments. In the current estimates the expected demands of AEC on the TVA system were reduced about 600,000 kilowatts. About half of that reduction reflected the information that AEC would not be likely to operate at extended load, as it had in recent years; the rest of the reduction was made on the basis of discussions with AEC of their ability to take more power during part of the year and less during TVA's peak season of the year. Most of the other 200,000-kilowatt reduction was made to reflect later knowledge of industrial trends following the recession.

TVA SYSTEM CAPACITY

Question. Will you bring the tabulation on page 906 of the fiscal year 1960 hearings up to date as of December 31, 1959?

(The requested information follows:)

CAPACITY IN SERVICE DECEMBER 31, 1959

The following table divides the installed capacity among the categories named. It also gives a corresponding approximate breakdown of the estimated maximum capability at time of peak demand (before deducting necessary reserves); however, the total has more validity and significance than the components because the capabilities of individual plants or groups or plants are not independent of each other and because they are more highly variable than the total.

[Kilowatts]

	Installed capacity	Approximate maximum capability at peak demand
Hydroplants:		
TVA	2,742,500	2,553,000
Aluminum Co. of America	425,960	405,000
Corps of Engineers	571,000	474,000
Steamplants, TVA	7,647,250	8,264,000
Total	11,386,710	11,696,000

Question. Will you bring the tabulation on page 907 of the fiscal year 1960 hearings forward to show comparable information as of December 31, for each of the years 1960, 1961, 1962, 1963, and 1964?

(The requested information follows:)

Capacity of presently scheduled additions

[Kilowatts]

	Scheduled installed capacity	Corresponding approximate maximum capability at peak demand (before deducting reserves)
Dec. 31, 1960	11,910,710	12,213,000
Dec. 31, 1961	12,072,710	12,375,000
Dec. 31, 1962	13,269,910	13,575,000
Dec. 31, 1963	[1] 14,441,910	[1] 14,750,000
Dec. 31, 1964	[2]	[2]

[1] Tentative (includes new eastern steam unit, Paradise unit 2, and Melton Hill units 1–2).
[2] Program for 1964 has not yet been determined.

PEAK LOADS ON TVA SYSTEM

Question. Will you bring the tabulation on page 909 of the fiscal year 1960 hearings up to date by adding the figures for fiscal year 1960? It is noted that the Federal Power Commission reports the maximum peak for the TVA system for fiscal year 1960 so far was 9,586,000 kilowatts for January 1960. Has this peak been exceeded since that time?

(The information requested follows:)

TVA system loads at time of system peak, in thousands of kilowatts

Fiscal year	Total for TVA area (1)	Federal loads (2)	Non-Federal loads (3)	Memphis loads included in (3) (4)
1950	2,590	285	2,305	141
1951	3,000	359	2,641	162
1952	3,736	717	3,019	178
1953	4,240	963	3,277	205
1954	5,295	1,409	3,886	227
1955	6,952	2,753	4,199	287
1956	8,298	3,597	4,701	327
1957	9,239	3,795	5,444	301
1958	9,418	3,437	5,981	291
1959	9,702	3,254	6,448	327
1960	9,641	3,276	6,365	0

NOTE.—The load of 9,586,000 kilowatts for January 1960 was exceeded by a load of 9,641,000 kilowatts on Mar. 1, 1960.

Question. Will you furnish for the record a tabulation showing your peak load during each month of calendar year 1959 and of 1960 to date, with a breakdown of this to show Federal load, and non-Federal loads? Also show, if any, the peak delivery to Memphis included in the non-Federal loads.

(The tabulation requested follows:)

TVA system loads at time of system peak, in thousands of kilowatts

Month and year	Total for TVA area (1)	Federal loads (2)	Non-Federal loads (3)	Memphis loads included in col. 3 (4)
January 1959	9,702	3,254	6,448	327
February 1959	9,057	3,351	5,706	91
March 1959	8,701	3,346	5,355	91
April 1959	8,212	3,277	4,935	29
May 1959	7,624	3,254	4,370	35
June 1959	7,718	3,320	4,398	0
July 1959	7,810	3,236	4,574	0
August 1959	7,942	3,381	4,561	0
September 1959	7,598	3,323	4,275	0
October 1959	8,313	3,362	4,951	0
November 1959	9,301	3,320	5,981	0
December 1959	9,164	3,357	5,807	0
January 1960	9,586	3,259	6,327	0
February 1960	9,578	3,235	6,343	0
March 1960	9,641	3,276	6,365	0

ELECTRICITY FOR HOUSE HEATING

Question. Will you bring the tabulation on page 911 of the fiscal year 1960 hearings up to date by only including data for calendar years 1959 and 1960 to date?

(The information requested follows:)

Approximate electricity use for house heating in TVA area

Month and year	Energy, millions of kilowatt-hours	Thousands of kilowatts demand [1]
1959—January	590	1,680
February	420	1,360
March	370	1,050
April	130	660
May	20	380
June		
July		
August		
September		
October	120	750
November	430	1,380
December	510	1,240
1960—January	570	1,530
February	600	1,700

[1] The effect of the house heating loads on the monthly system peak is usually less than the numbers shown because of diversity among these loads and other loads.

DEFICIT OPERATION OF TVA DISTRIBUTORS

Question. We have often heard about how successful the operations have been in the TVA power area and how much greater usage the TVA area has in comparison with the balance of the Nation. In examining the TVA report on the operations of the TVA power distributors, I find a number of instances where the distributors are and have been operating at a deficit and have per customer power use below the national average. Many of these particular TVA distributors have been in operation for 15 or 20 years.

In this connection, will you furnish, for the record for each of the past 5 years, the number of distributors that have either operated in the red in any such year or had a deficit in accumulated net income in any of these years?

(The information requested follows:)

The number of TVA distributors who had either a deficit in accumulated net income during the fiscal years 1955–59 or whose operation during these same years produced a negative operating margin is shown below:

Fiscal year:	
1955	16
1956	14
1957	11
1958	12
1959	9

Amortization collections by distributors are available for the payment of interest on long-term debt. The inclusion of these funds in the distributors' annual operating statement would revise the above figures to those shown below:

Fiscal year:	
1955	5
1956	4
1957	2
1958	4
1959	2

Report to the People of the Fifth Congressional District of Indiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, now that the 86th Congress has come to a close and become a part of the history of these United States of America, I want to report to my people of the Fifth District of Indiana the activities of this Congress and my actions during its sessions. This was a hard-working, constructive Congress and I am proud and grateful to the people of the Fifth District for the opportunity to have shared in its deliberations.

Mr. Speaker, I have attended practically every session of the 86th Congress and have answered 372 rollcalls out of 382. Each day as I have approached the Capitol I have voiced a quiet prayer that in the deliberations and votes of the day I should represent to the full extent of my ability the thinking and aspirations of all the people in my district. I have felt that any day would be a lost day unless it marked some progress, small or large, toward the goals for which we are reaching.

During my first term in office I have done my best to keep the people of my district informed of the developments in Government that affect their lives. I

have made special reports to groups on legislation affecting them and requested their reactions. During the sessions I have sent out reports to the newspapers on important issues and once, and sometimes twice, a month, forwarded a newsletter to those people in the district who had requested to be informed on current events of Congress.

In this report I will first deal with those projects and actions that have a purely local impact.

FLOOD CONTROL

Mr. Speaker, although Indiana has not always welcomed Federal flood control programs, it now recognizes that flood control is not something that can be appropriately planned and carried through by State action alone. It must have Federal assistance. When I was a candidate for election I made the pledge that, if elected, I would do everything within my power to secure funds for the construction of an adequate flood control program for the Wabash River Valley.

One month after arriving in Washington I introduced legislation which would have provided funds for the construction of the Huntington, Salamonie, and Mississinewa Dams; and at that time I made a speech on the floor of the House of Representatives, pleading with the Members of Congress for the necessary appropriations. This was later followed by more speeches and committee appearances.

Securing funds from Congress is always a difficult enterprise and this one was further complicated by a resolution—House Concurrent Resolution 2, passed by the Indiana 85th General Assembly in 1947—which in effect disapproved of any new Federal projects for Indiana. This has now been repudiated and the State of Indiana has appropriated the money to pay for the State's share of the costs of a number of specific projects, including those in the Fifth District.

I am happy to report that with the assistance of dedicated, energetic, public-spirited individuals and groups from the Fifth District and the rest of Indiana, Congress was persuaded to appropriate funds for the advance engineering and design of these projects. This, of course, is only the beginning, and I intend to continue this fight for funds until the dams are finished.

These dams will not completely solve the flood control problems of our district. Smaller dams and watersheds will have to be built in several areas. A watershed is in the process of being authorized in the Portland area, which will protect and conserve water in that community. Also, an engineering survey is now being conducted by the Corps of Engineers and the Indiana Flood Control and Water Resources Commission in the Marion area. This is an essential step toward a realistic solution of these problems.

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

Another of my ambitions is to attract new industry to provide increased job opportunities and to stimulate and improve economic conditions throughout the 10 counties of the Fifth District. As the first step, last year I launched a vigorous drive to draw new industry by sending a letter to over 500 major Government defense contractors apprising them of the advantages of locating or subcontracting in Indiana and particularly the Fifth District.

The response to this letter was extremely encouraging and this year I continued this effort by directing another letter to over 5,000 industrial leaders. The replies that indicated an immediate interest were forwarded to the mayors, chambers of commerce, and other interested parties of all Fifth District cities for their information and action.

The economic and social climate of Indiana as well as its potential has been brought to the attention of every major industrial concern and executive in the country. Although we cannot expect results overnight, there is no doubt that this undertaking will eventually bear fruit. I intend to continue in this endeavor next year.

PERSONAL SERVICES

In the field of personal service I have processed hundreds of cases involving servicemen, veterans, social security claims, immigration, tax and postal problems and other difficulties between the citizens of the Fifth Congressional District and the Federal Government. What this means is that, in addition to the normal legislative process, my office handled each year between 300 and 400 detailed and complicated personal problems affecting the lives of many people.

ACADEMY APPOINTMENTS

My service academy appointments achieved heights beyond all expectations. Each district is allowed one admission, or cadet, to each of the 3 Academies—Army, Navy, and Air Force—a year.

My appointments were made on a competitive basis and more than enough boys qualified to fill each vacancy. In addition to filling the vacancies, 2 additional boys—3 in all—were admitted to the Air Force Academy because of their outstanding scores. Five admissions in one year is a record of which our district can be proud.

COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENT

It is a distinct privilege for your Congressman to serve on the Committee on Science and Astronautics. Although the committee is the newest standing committee of the House of Representatives, it was honored this year by being selected as the "Committee of the Year."

The committee's role in this scientific age has been, and will continue to be, an important one. Although it is concerned with all types of scientific endeavors, its major work consists of dealing with legislation affecting the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, a new agency created to expand and coordinate our national effort to advance space technology and space travel.

HAWAIIAN STATEHOOD

March 12, 1959, was a proud day for our Nation for on that date the House of Representatives passed the Hawaiian statehood bill. It was also a proud moment for me when I cast my aye vote on this bill. Mark Twain described Hawaii as, "The most beautiful fleet of islands ever anchored in the sea."

The admitting of Hawaii as a State was, as one colleague put it, a positive and affirmative act to spread the glory of the American dream 2,000 miles west and to say to a great people, we admit you to full partnership in this Union.

LEGISLATION

According to the Clerk over 15,506 measures were introduced in the 86th Congress and over 1,645 bills were considered in the House. It is clearly impossible in the time and space allowed to report on all of these. I shall mention only the most important and highly publicized legislative issues. Upon request, I shall be pleased to furnish more complete information concerning any particular bill, as well as a summary of the issues involved.

NATIONAL BUDGET

Despite the constant talk that this Congress was bent on spending, its record proves it has been an economy Congress. Both the first and second sessions slashed by substantial amounts most of the appropriation bills. It succeeded in reducing the budget requests of the President in the first session by $1,882 million, and it wound up the second session with a surplus of $1.1 billion—five times as big as last January's forecast. The biggest cutbacks in spending from the January forecast were made in four areas: Agriculture, $277 million; Export-Import Bank, $267 million; interest on national debt, $118 million—lower interest rates reduced the Treasury's borrowing costs; Veterans' Administration, $117 million.

In view of the fact that the major portion of our national budget is spent on military matters, it has always seemed to me that substantial savings in Federal spending could be made in that area. Since coming to Washington I have seen considerable evidence of waste, extravagance, and duplication in the military service. In the first session, $19,961,000 less than budgetary requests was approved for defense appropriations. Substantial sums were saved, in that fiscal year and other future years, by compelling the administration to conduct a thorough review of the entire concept of defense against air attack.

No matter how much is spent for defense, it will be adequate only if its services are integrated. A central purchasing agency for all the defense forces, I believe, could save many millions of dollars in eliminating duplications and mismanagement in purchasing. There is much progress to be made in the field of greater efficiency and economy in our sprawling Defense Department. Let me emphasize, however, that I am not advocating any weakening of our defenses for, if anything, they are inadequate to meet the threat of Communist aggression.

In fact, I believe that in order to reduce expenditures and promote efficiency the entire Government structure needs reorganization. I voted to extend the authority of the President under the Reorganization Act of 1959 to propose plans

to Congress for changes in the structure of governmental departments and agencies.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Under the Mutual Security Act of 1959 the Congress appropriated $3.5 billion in the first session, and $3.7 billion in the second session. I voted against the bill in both sessions. I offered one amendment to the 1959 bill and two amendments to the 1960 bill, which, had they been adopted would have resulted in more effective administration of the program and allocation of funds. It would also have resulted in a saving to the taxpayer, since each request for funds for a particular project would have had to be justified to Congress.

While I am in agreement with the objective of the program, I do not feel that the vast appropriations being made year after year can go on indefinitely. It does not seem consistent to preach economy in our domestic appropriations and appropriate indiscriminately for a foreign aid program that is obviously not accomplishing its purpose. The entire program must be overhauled and streamlined so it will help underprivileged people to help themselves. Every effort should be made to draw into the program the more prosperous countries of the free world that they might share the burden of helping the weak nations.

FOREIGN POLICY

On the 17th day of June 1960, I introduced a concurrent resolution calling for a bipartisan foreign policy.

At few moments in our history as a nation have we faced a crisis of such intensity and extent as that which now has begun to surround us. The fiasco of the recent summit meeting is but the most evident of the symptoms. Khrushchev's insults and mockery of the United States through the person of our President marks a low point in our diplomatic fortunes. It provides a sudden and painful illumination of how very far indeed we are from any possible agreement with the Russians on the major issues of the cold war. The last decade marks a shift which could prove the most important in the world's history: The rapid growth of the Soviet Union's economic, military, and political power as a threat to the United States.

Nor have events elsewhere in the world stood still. We are faced with the emergence of the first really pro-Communist government in the Western Hemisphere in the Castro government of Cuba. Syngman Rhee in Korea and Adnan Menderes in Turkey, both closely identified with the United States, have been overthrown. In Japan we met opposition—to the signature of a Mutual Security Pact—so strong as to threaten the Kishi government and to make President Eisenhower's visit there impossible.

We can ill afford to allow this crisis in our foreign policy to continue unchecked. These tragic experiences emphasize the need of bipartisan cooperation in the field of foreign policy.

TAXES

The President asked that the national debt limit be raised by $2 billion to $285 billion and a further temporary increase of $10 billion to $295 billion to June 20, 1960. During this session he asked for an extension of the temporary debt limit. I voted against both proposals. At the end of the Korean war the national debt was $285.5 billion. Today, having risen more than $31 billion since that time, it stands at the highest peacetime figure in history. Do you not think it is about time to call a halt?

The transportation tax was reduced by half—from 10 to 5 percent—and the tax on local telephone calls repealed, both effective July 1, 1960. I supported this legislation; however, during the second session, at the recommendation of the President, this repeal was not allowed to go into effect and the taxes will continue.

The President recommended an increase of 1½ cents in the Federal tax on gasoline and diesel fuels. The Congress enacted a temporary 1-cent-per-gallon increase, which went into effect October 1, 1959. I voted against this increase.

The rates of income tax on the earnings of life insurance companies was established on a permanent basis for the first time in 10 years. I voted for this tax, in justice to other corporations and individuals who pay their taxes on a permanent basis.

Legislation clarifying the States' rights to tax net income derived from interstate commerce was enacted. The passage of this bill is not intended as a comprehensive solution, but as an emergency measure. A study will be carried on to determine if any further legislation is necessary.

Also passed by the House was a bill allowing tax deductions for the professionally self-employed who set aside income for voluntary plans. This is meritorious legislation and should be enacted into law next year.

SMALL BUSINESS

Because of the gaps in the provisions of the Robinson-Patman amendment to the Clayton Act, the efforts of small business to compete against their larger competitors suffered. A company could grant illegal price discriminations three times before effective penalties could be applied. This Congress amended the law to close these gaps.

The lending authority of the Small Business Administration was increased from $500 million to $575 million and then again by another $150 million because of mounting demands.

A bill was passed that permits small business wholesalers of gasoline to pay the tax on the quantities of gasoline sold and thereby remedy the situation prevailing whereby these wholesalers paid an excise tax on gasoline that had been lost due to shrinkage and evaporation.

Legislation was enacted to facilitate extension of credit to small business enterprises by amendments to the Small Business Investment Act. The 85th Congress authorized the agency to set up private corporations to furnish long-term equity capital to small business; however, the administration has done very little to accomplish this.

One of the most powerful elements in building this country to its present greatness is small business. Therefore, to a great extent, our economic growth depends on our keeping this element alive and active. I have supported every piece of legislation which I believe would assist the small businessman to survive and prosper.

AGRICULTURE

One of the most serious domestic problems faced by the 86th Congress was the farm problem. Farmers caught in the squeeze between falling farm prices and rising costs in production have not shared in the general prosperity of other industries. This decline in net income occurred in spite of the fact that the administration has spent millions to bolster the basic commodity prices.

This costly farm policy has not only been ineffectual but has held back national growth. Secretary Benson has been adamant in his conviction that lower prices would increase sales and reduce surpluses. With the help of a series of Presidential vetoes, Benson forced Congress to lower the prices at which surplus crops were supported. This did not work. The increased amounts bought were small and the price cuts were large. In order to offset the decline in prices of farm products, farm operators increased the quantity of production. They broke all known production records on less land and piled up bigger surpluses. In 1960 the Government had $9 billion worth of surpluses stored away with storage charges running $2 million a day.

In an effort to bring farm prices back in line with operating costs and reduce surpluses, Congress considered a farm surplus program—family farm bill of 1960—which would have fixed wheat price supports at 85 percent of parity, reduced acreage allotment by 25 percent, and provided payment in kind for retired cropland or alternatively, price support at grain level and no production control. It would have given the various groups of producers of different farm produce, who cannot agree on what kind of help would be best for all, the opportunity to democratically choose the form they prefer.

The disagreement as to what is best for the farmer does not prevail among the farmers alone, nor between the administration and Congress, but among the Congressmen. It is a regional issue and as a result the foregoing legislation was not enacted.

Agricultural bills were enacted to permit extension of the Crop Insurance Board, authorize leasing of cotton acreage allotments during crop years 1959 through 1961, and extend the provisions of Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act authorizing refinancing of loans on family size farms, stabilize price support for tobacco, and create an Agricultural Research Development Commission to find and promote new industrial uses for farm products.

SOCIAL SECURITY

No group in America is more entitled to special consideration than our elderly citizens who are retired or no longer able to work. After months of hearings and consideration, an omnibus social security bill was passed which liberalizes the

requirements of the disability program; it liberalizes the insured status requirement, making about 600,000 additional persons eligible for benefits; eliminates the 6-month waiting period for disabled workers and removes certain inequities in the law pertaining to widows and children. It also extends coverage to 300,000 additional persons, and, in the vital field of medical care, provides grants to States to encourage them to make improvements in their medical payment programs for old-age asistance recipients. The medicare provisions are inadequate and it is my hope that legislation will be enacted next year to remedy this problem.

VETERANS

I am deeply grateful, as is our entire Nation, for the sacrifice and loyalty of the men and women who have served in the Armed Forces.

Twenty-eight pieces of veterans legislation were signed into law during this Congress. Among the major bills enacted was a law revising the pensions for veterans with non-service-connected disabilities and for widows and dependent survivors. The scale of payments was readjusted to eliminate present inequities in pensions of veterans. It also equalizes the status of World War II and Korean war widows with those of World War I.

The direct-housing-loan program was bolstered by an increase of $100 million in authorization. This program is especially designed to assist veterans in smaller communities and rural areas.

Legislation was enacted which waives payment of premiums on national life insurance policies for certain totally disabled veterans, provides additional compensation for disabled veterans with more than three children, permits conversion or exchange of national life insurance policies to a new modified plan and provides for a program of educational, home purchase and rehabilitation benefits for veterans with more than 120 days of active duty between January 21, 1955, and July 1, 1963.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

It is a well known fact that Government employees have been underpaid. Most Federal employees are paid less than those in private industry for comparable work. Congress has recognized this and been disposed to raise the wages of Federal employees for some time but the President has opposed pay-increase bills. This meant that Government workers were denied increases to which they were entitled by higher living costs and by comparative pay standards in other fields.

This Congress finally passed a bill raising the salaries of classified Government employees by 7½ percent. In voting for this bill, I felt I was voting for a vital need, for this group of people is most deserving.

The health insurance act passed by this Congress will provide extensive low-cost coverage on a voluntary basis for employees of the Federal Government and their dependents. Half of the cost of this program will be borne by the Government.

LABOR

One of the outstanding pieces of legislation enacted by the 86th Congress was a labor bill requiring full disclosure and accounting of funds invested by unions or management groups in pension and welfare funds. This is not an ideal bill but it contains portions of three bills brought before Congress and represents the best that could be achieved to correct the undemocratic and racketeering practices revealed by the McClellan committee while protecting the interests of honest labor leaders and members, management, and the general public.

I voted to raise the minimum wage and extend coverage because it will help establish levels of living adequate for health and help raise purchasing power among the poorest workers. It will increase spending which will raise the level of employment and facilitate more rapid economic growth and reduce unfair competition between covered industries and uncovered industries.

It was my firm conviction that an exemption for these small businesses grossing less than a million dollars a year was essential and I supported this proposal.

CIVIL RIGHTS

I was happy to vote for a civil rights bill which guarantees and protects the rights of every American citizen to vote. The bill authorizes Federal courts to fix penalties for obstruction of court orders and requires preservation of Federal election records for 2 years.

EDUCATION

Mr. Speaker, I have always believed that no nation is stronger than the intelligence and character of its citizenry. The Father of our Country spoke of the necessity for having an enlightened citizenry and we all, regardless of our party, realize the necessity for higher education, especially in view of the Soviet agricultural, scientific, and medical achievements.

Because of our exploding population, States and municipalities do not have the funds nor the borrowing capacity to keep up school buildings or afford more and better qualified teachers. Manipulation of statistics currently being employed by some groups fighting Federal aid to education cannot hide the very obvious fact that we are facing a serious crisis in learning. Education is one of the most essential programs in our society. Notwithstanding this realization, the school construction bill—the President's own bill offered in 1957—bogged down because certain racial and religious considerations were injected into the measure. There are many of us who fear the possibility of Federal interference or thought control of our State and local school systems should any improper type of Federal aid to education be adopted. This issue was given grave consideration and debate and every effort was made to dispel and prevent this possibility.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT

Since I come from a town where the railroad industry is one of major importance, I have personally known many, many railroad employees and am sympathetic to their problems. It was a pleasure therefore to vote for a measure of significant consequence to the several hundred thousands of railroad employees and their families. This bill provides them with increased benefits under the Railroad Retirement and Unemployment Act.

CONCLUSION

In closing, may I say that there will undoubtedly be differences of opinions; however, I considered every issue on its merits and every position I have taken was determined by what I believe to be in the best interest of the people and particularly my district.

I want Indiana, the crossroads of America, to become the hub of industrial and cultural activity. Its economic climate should be such that our people will prosper. I believe in a strong America—an America which can proudly lead the world into the dawning of this new era because of its economic, moral, and spiritual strength.

"Early Bird" Reinhardt N. Ausmus, Pioneer of Aviation History—Built His First Plane During Years 1910-12

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. D. BAUMHART, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. BAUMHART. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to bring to the public's attention a constituent of mine, Mr. Reinhardt N. Ausmus, who at the present time is Erie County veterans' service officer, located in the courthouse, Sandusky, Ohio.

Mr. Ausmus was raised in an orphanage. When he was released from the home at the age of 14, he had no home or job, and it was at this time that he decided to build an airplane. He designed and built his first plane, which took him 2 years, from 1910 to 1912. He flew it in 1912.

At the age of 19, Mr. Ausmus got a job as an instructor and designer at the old Benoist Aeroplane Co. in Sandusky, Ohio. Mr. Ausmus joined the aviation section of the Army Signal Corps, which later was to become the Air Force in the early days of World War I. Being only 20 years of age he was one of the youngest fully trained and experienced aviators in the Army. During the war he suffered injuries which made it necessary for him to give up piloting and which confined him in hospitals for various periods during the next 17 years.

Flying the plane in 1912 qualified Mr. Ausmus to become an Early Bird, an organization of men who piloted heavier-than-air planes before December 17, 1916.

While he has not been able to follow his first occupational choice, he has proceeded to collect records and other exhibits of the early days of aviation, particularly those concerning the early manufacture of planes in Sandusky,

Ohio. These have in some cases been so rare that officials of the Smithsonian Institution have consulted with him on several occasions, and in at least one instance changed the official records because of information in his collection.

While in a Government hospital he resolved that if he were ever able to work he would give his time to helping other veterans as he had been helped. With this aim he accepted a position as Erie County veterans' service officer.

Mr. Ausmus' story has been featured by articles and pictures in many of the prominent daily newspapers of my Congressional District. To name a few: Sandusky Register, Sandusky, Ohio; Chronicle-Telegram, Elyria, Ohio; and the Blade, Toledo, Ohio.

In 1958 the Sandusky Chamber of Commerce presented him with a plaque for his outstanding contributions as a pioneer of aviation history.

Senator Murray's Address to American Chemical Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a symposium of the American Chemical Society opened with an address by our respected colleague, the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. The symposium was a highly technical one, and Senator MURRAY was invited to open this scientific gathering in recognition of his encouragement of methods to reduce evaporation losses from reservoirs by using a chemical film just one molecule thick. For the past 4 years, Senator MURRAY, in association with the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], repeatedly urged the executive branch to take an active part in this imaginative program for conservation of the limited water resources of the Western States. Encouraging results of preliminary tests are now reported, and these give rise to hope of saving many hundreds of thousands of acre-feet of water each year.

In addressing the symposium, in addition to pointing up the urgent need for water resource development and conservation, Senator MURRAY brought to focus several other important aspects of the work of scientists such as those whom he was then addressing. One of these points is that in helping the United States to conserve our scarce water supplies, scientists can also give valuable help to our allies of the free world, many of whom have extremely critical problems of water scarcity. Senator MURRAY pointed out also that international collaboration within the scientific sectors of the world gives hope that international collaboration on even broader fronts may lead to effective transformation of nuclear energy from a terrible engine of destruction into a mighty tool for improving the material prosperity and happiness of mankind.

Awareness of such possibilities, Senator MURRAY told the scientific audience, stimulates the younger scientists in the early stages of their professional careers. This, he suggested, might have significant results in attracting men to research work, and in overcoming unfortunate limitations in some of the applied sciences.

These points have deep significance for all of us. I ask unanimous consent, therefore, that immediately following my remarks, there be printed the text of Senator MURRAY's address to the symposium of the American Chemical Society.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS TO THE AMERICAN CHEMICAL SOCIETY SYMPOSIUM, NEW YORK CITY, BY HON. JAMES E. MURRAY, U.S. SENATOR FROM MONTANA, CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. Chairman, members of the American Chemical Society, and fellow guests, it is a privilege to participate in this symposium sponsored by one of the Nation's most eminent learned societies. I am sensible, too, of the honor of your invitation to make the opening remarks to the meeting.

The program for this symposium deals with matters such as monolayer, energy barrier, surface tension, and like subjects that might seem far removed from the work of the U.S. Senate. Twenty-six years ago, when I first took my seat in the Senate, such subjects actually would have been foreign to legislative considerations, but there have been profound changes in national affairs during the past quarter of a century, and now many of my colleagues share my interest in your researches.

Ever since 1807 when it made its first inquiry into the possibilities for waterways development, the U.S. Senate has been deeply concerned with resource matters. This concern is, of course, most appropriate because development of natural resources for use by the people is the foundation on which this Nation builds its strength and the well-being of its citizens. Minerals, timber, soil fertility, and water are essential ingredients of the great industrial civilization in which we live and prosper.

Recognition of this principle guides the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, of which I am privileged to be chairman, and it has led to authorization of major resource programs. In the field of water resources, I mention only the Missouri River Basin project and the Colorado River storage project as examples of many that are important to the entire Nation.

Resource development and conservation is the clearly expressed purpose of the American people and, now more than ever previously, it is essential to maintenance of the American way of life. Yet in pursuit of that purpose, we are progressively impeded by resource scarcities, especially so in the case of water development programs. Virtually every water project that comes before the Senate for authorization is hedged about with complications arising from scarcity of the resource, and opportunities for beneficial developments are curtailed or frustrated by water supply limitations.

In this context, in 1957 evaporation losses and the possibilities for their reduction were reviewed for my committee in a special staff study undertaken at the suggestion of Senator CARL HAYDEN, of Arizona. This review was enlightening regarding the significance of evaporation. Its importance took on real meaning to those who have lived through destructive droughts, when we learned that evaporation from a stockwater pond often dissipates as much water as is used in a year by 500 head of cattle. It was shown that in the Western States, each year evaporation losses exceed the aggregate capacity of half a dozen of our major conservation reservoirs, while for the United States as a whole, evaporation from lakes and streams exceeds the total use of water by all the cities and towns of the Nation.

The staff report summarized the initial results of the experiments with evaporation suppressants already started in the United States, Australia, and several other countries. On the basis of this information, the Senate responded generously to Senator HAYDEN's and my recommendations that funds be appropriated to the Department of the Interior for evaporation control work. Just within recent weeks, Congress provided a substantial expansion of those studies and tests. The reasons for this interest and support warrant review here because they concern you both as scientists and citizens.

The charter of the American Chemical Society issued pursuant to a special act of Congress includes among its objectives "by its meetings, professional contacts, reports, papers, discussions, and publications, to promote scientific interest and inquiry; thereby * * * fostering public welfare and education, aiding the development of our country's industries, and adding to the material prosperity and happiness of our people."

These are public purposes of great present significance, and this symposium furthers them in important ways. For one thing, there is its direct and very practical relation to our scarce water supplies. This is a matter of increasing urgency to our entire economy, as I shall outline rather broadly in a moment. There is also a second significant aspect of this symposium, that is, its relation to the national and international climate of contemporary life. Although perhaps less commonly recognized, this aspect is also of great concern to you as scientists and as citizens.

Your studies of methods for reducing evaporation losses, along with other resource conservation research, are of prime importance to the Nation. In the field of natural resources, the United States no longer enjoys assurance of abundance—actually, for many resources we now are a have-not Nation. This has been recognized for some time with respect to mineral resources on which the past half-century's industrial development and two World Wars have made such prodigious demands. Now, it is apparent that we also face water shortages. These water shortages threaten to limit our production, curtail our living standards, jeopardize our health, and undermine national security.

As I have just indicated, awareness of this impending water crisis has come to sharp focus in connection with the congressional responsibilities for water resource development. This led my fellow Montana Senator, MICHAEL J. MANSFIELD, in association with me, to sponsor establishment of a special Senate review of the entire water resource situation, and under the chairmanship of Senator ROBERT S. KERR, of Oklahoma, this inquiry has brought together highly significant facts about water supplies and requirements. Because some of these facts bear directly on this discussion, in the following remarks I shall use data from the committee reports.

The United States is entering a period of enormous growh that will require twice as much water as we now use. By 1980, we must expect at least 250 million people in this country instead of the present population of about 180 million. The gross national product by then should be in excess of $1 trillion per year or twice its pres-

ent size, and industrial production should be about three times its present level. As these levels are attained, the United States will grow in strength, prosperity, and well-being.

However, one important requirement for this future growth is adequate quantities of good quality water. Without an abundant supply of good quality water, agriculture and industry would be vastly less efficient, and without abundant good water, contemporary metropolitan life would be vastly uncomfortable. The need for water, experts in this field inform us, will grow from the present level of 250 billion gallons per day to about 600 billion gallons per day by 1980.

But we are already using all the water that is readily available and fit to use. At present, there is virtually no usable water to supply the new requirements that are essential to our growth.

Our basic supply of water is, in the main, fixed by inelastic factors of precipitation and runoff. To avoid the national deterioration that would be the consequence of water deficiencies, the United States must energize a comprehensive program to use more effectively all of the water resources that we have.

You scientists in this symposium have an important role in that task, and this is why Senators and other laymen await with keen interest the results of technical meetings such as this one.

Let me illustrate this with an example that has immediate relevance to this symposium. One feature of the needed water development program is a great increase in storage reservoirs to conserve the river flows that now are only partially used before they discharge into the oceans. Preliminary data suggest that we may need to more than double the present aggregate capacity of all existing reservoirs in this country—that is, to increase from the present 275 million acre-feet of reservoir capacity to almost 600 million acre-feet, possibly even more.

I need hardly point out to this group how such an increase in reservoir capacity will affect losses from evaporation. Greatly increased losses must be anticipated, particularly in view of the fact that as we proceed with construction of more reservoirs, future sites in general will be less favorable in the relation of storage capacity to the surface area exposed to evaporation. Conversely, practical methods for reducing evaporation losses can significantly reduce the requirements for storage capacity. This is true even in humid sections of the country, and it has key importance in the drier western regions.

This relationship to regional development is of deep concern because of the national interest in a balanced economy. Where increased water use is most critical, evaporation takes a costly toll of the limited water supplies and, therefore, it has especially great impact on the growth potential of the Western States. In the next 40 years, these growth potentials are expected to result in the population of the Western States being 2½ times its present size, and this in turn will require full development of western water resources. Let me put it in the specific terms of some of the preliminary studies.

On the Colorado River, for example, it appears that at least 14 million acre-feet of additional reservoir storage will be needed to conserve the flood flows that are now only partially used, and on the upper Missouri River the estimate is that an additional 30 million acre-feet of storage will be needed. Evaporation from existing reservoirs on each of these two rivers already exceeds 1 million acre-feet a year and this will, of course, be increased greatly by the additional storage. Although the reservoirs will be essential, the evaporation loss is a very high price to pay because present calculations show that by 1980 there will hardly be enough water in those river basins for consumptive uses and sewage dilution. These examples demonstrate with great emphasis that practical methods of evaporation control can be of great significance to the potential economic and population growth.

The same considerations also have great significance in many foreign countries. In fact, a preponderance of the underdeveloped areas of the world have hydrological conditions much like those of our Western States, and water scarcity likewise limits their opportunities for improved economic and living conditions.

Evaporation control work is notable for its international character, its progress literally circling the globe. Your work developed from the research of the great British scientist, Sir Eric Rideal, then crossed the Atlantic to advance here in America under your distinguished chairman, Prof. Victor K. LaMer, and again spanning an ocean, it now also numbers among its leaders Mr. Mansfield and his associates in Australia, and includes workers in several other countries as well.

It is encouraging to observe that evaporation control work is broadly based and that it enlists members of university faculties, the personnel of Government agencies, of private research foundations, and of commercial industries. Your group includes chemists, physicists, biologists, and engineers. This broad spectrum of collaboration assures cross-fertilization of ideas and supplies continuing productive stimulus. The merit of wide collaboration is emphasized throughout the Senate consideration of evaporation work beginning with the 1958 report.

Here I will digress somewhat to commend to your consideration the opportunities for contributing to important purposes tangential to the immediate research in which you may be engaged. I speak first of the development of scientific personnel. We hear often of the lack of well-trained men in some research fields, and the dearth of creative and imaginative thinking in the fields of applied science. Perhaps one reason for this may be that the younger scientists in the early stages of their careers are not aware of the broad implications that their work can have.

I like to hope that evaporation control and other resource conservation research will attract these younger men, open new perspectives to them, and be a means for strengthening our resources of trained scientific manpower. In furtherance of this, it is gratifying that there are a number of research contracts between the Bureau of Reclamation and various colleges and universities, and that this collaboration received express approval of the Congress this year in providing increased funds for evaporation studies. It is particularly gratifying that the cooperative program with the State college in my State of Montana is especially well suited for training research men.

Would it not be desirable to make professional training in this broad sense of the term a continuing feature of cooperative research contracts and, in connection with that, to provide collaborating scientists access to the ideas and information revealing the significance of their field of work? Younger scientists, I am certain, are responsive to this, and I am confident also that the enhanced satisfaction in their work will fully repay the effort.

A little earlier I touched on the international character of evaporation control work, and I wish to explore this somewhat more. The internationalism of your scientific work gives you special qualifications to focus the advances that you make in technical problems so that they also will be advances in the problems of world peace. In the formation of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, at which I had the honor to represent the United States, science was recognized to be a major factor in achieving the purposes of the United Nations Charter from which I quote the initial words:

"We, the peoples of the United Nations, determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind, and to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person."

Now, when the hungry two-thirds of the world seethes with violence that threatens the institutions of freedom, I recall to you the words of a great contemporary American who warned that "A hungry man is not a free man."

We have a deep concern with the water supply problems of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. Water is needed there to set men free from want, and time is short. All of us are joined in the race against time to guide the force of men's aspirations from violence into constructive channels that will provide the material basis for freedom.

Perhaps your scientific work can provide methods for immediate improvement of water supplies in underdeveloped countries. In the light of our own experiences when droughts dried up the West, it seems to me that control of evaporation losses from existing impoundments, even quite small ones, should be significant in bettering living conditions in arid regions.

In concluding, I will express one further hope and conviction regarding science in the modern world. In his last inaugural address, Franklin D. Roosevelt stated for us the grave lesson of this century—he said:

"We have learned that we cannot live alone, at peace; that our well-being is dependent on the well-being of other nations, far away."

The middle years of the 20th century are darkened by the terrifying shadow of the atomic cloud—terrifying because we have not yet learned how to work together so that its destructiveness will be transformed to beneficial and productive purposes. It is enormously encouraging to observe the wide collaboration and the spontaneous internationalism of scientists engaged in work such as yours on evaporation control. The international community of technical workers at today's meeting gives renewed confidence in men's ability to work together and in the words of your charter, "add to the material prosperity and happiness of our people." I am grateful for the opportunity to further this effort, and I wish you continuing success in all its aspects.

Hon. Gordon Canfield

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, GORDON CANFIELD is retiring from the House of Representatives after many years of devoted service. He has represented his district faithfully and well. More than that, he has represented the people of this country. As a member of the House Committee on Appropriations, Mr. CANFIELD has worked diligently. He has been fair in his efforts to represent the taxpayers as well as those who appeared before his committee seeking appropriations for the various departments.

As above suggested, he has had the reputation of being more than fair to

all parties concerned. He is respected for his honesty, his industry, and his ability. He has served the country well. We wish for him the best that life can hold.

The Forgotten Men: Veterans of World War I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MORGAN M. MOULDER
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, several months ago I introduced H.R. 7405, to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, to provide a pension of $100 per month to World War I veterans.

The veterans of World War I are, indeed, a special and unique group. They have not been treated on a par, in terms of veterans' benefits, with the veterans of other wars. There is a debt owing to the veterans of World War I based on the fact that this Government has shown greater and wiser concern for the veterans of World War II and of the Korean war. There was no GI bill of rights for the veterans of World War I as there was for the veterans of the other two recent wars.

Mr. Speaker, the veterans who went soldering in World War I lost a definite value out of his life and his career. This he was never permitted to retrieve, as the other and later veterans were permitted to partly retrieve to some extent through the GI bill of rights. World War I veterans got some benefits to be sure, but nothing in proportion to what the country rightfully gave the others. My proposed pension of $100 a month only corrects that inequality. Since it only corrects the inequality it does not create any dangerous precedent.

Mr. Speaker, the very justice of the World War I veterans' case should make it publicly acceptable and I believe the people of the United States generally would approve it. Moreover, the statistics from an actuarial standpoint show that such a pension is sound fiscally and far from a burden to the Federal budget in relation to the results it would produce. There are approximately 2,600,000 World War I veterans. The cost of the program therefore in the first year would come to about $1.8 billion. This would be gradually but consistently reduced since the average age of World War I veterans is now 65.7 years. For example, some 9,000 World War I veterans died last month. For the second year the program would come, according to estimates from the Veterans' Bureau, to something less than $1.78 billion. The third year it would be less even than $1.7 billion, and so on. The sum is formidable to be sure. But it is not by any means an unsurmountable problem in a nation with a gross national product now rapidly climbing to $500 billion annually.

Mr. Speaker, veterans' pensions would be spent for the necessities of life. They will serve as an effective builder of morale by aiding in preserving the self-respect and pardonable pride of veterans who served their country with honor in a national emergency and who, it is understandable, have a natural reluctance against becoming objects of public charity in their declining years.

In theory, Congress has always considered the pension rate as an adjunct to income rather than as supporting income. In this connection, however, many World War I veterans because of advanced age and disability have no other income to support them.

Mr. Speaker, if our Federal Government can afford to spend and give away billions of dollars every year to foreign countries, some of which is used to pension their veterans, then why can we not pension our own soldiers of World War I? I shall continue my fight to secure action on my bill to provide a pension for these veterans.

Mr. Speaker, never must we forget the defenders of our country, of our faiths, and of our institutions. I cannot think of them without sentimentality, or without remembering the words of the poet, Carl Sandburg:

The strong men keep coming on.
They go down, shot, sick, broken.
They live on fighting, singing, lucky as plungers.
The strong mothers pulling them on.
The strong mothers pulling them from a dark sea, a great prairie, a long mountain.
Call hallelujah, call amen, call deep thanks.
The strong men keep coming on.

Congresswoman Martha W. Griffiths Reports to the People of the 17th District of Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I take this opportunity to provide the residents of the 17th District of Michigan a brief résumé of major legislation and of my activities as their Representative in the 86th Congress.

This is the year of the census. Our district has grown from 333,498 in 1950 to 514,959 in 1960, making us the fifth largest congressional district in Michigan, and the second largest in Wayne County, which is now the third largest county in the United States, exceeded only by Cook County in Illinois and Los Angeles County in California.

This Congress will go down in history for expanding our horizons into the Pacific by admitting Hawaii to the Union and by extending our search into outer space by providing the National Space Agency with almost $1 billion for its work.

This Congress has also witnessed the trial of democracy throughout the world. The 1st session of the 86th Congress, the longest peacetime session in 37 years, adjourned at 6:22 a.m., on September 15, 1959, as Khrushchev was about to arrive in Washington for what was to have been an exchange visit with our President, Since that day, the honeymoon between the administration and the Communists has come to an abrupt end. In an historically amazing act, the President admitted that Powers, whose plane was brought down in Russia, was our spy and the breakdown of the Paris summit and the Geneva disarmament conferences followed. Khrushchev withdrew his invitation to our President to visit the U.S.S.R. Anti-American rioting in Japan forced the cancellation of a Presidential visit there. And so it goes, Cuba, the Congo, the Dominican Republic. Our country has lost so much ground in the past 8 years, so much stature and prestige in the world, that Congress and all thoughtful people must give this problem first consideration.

Our foreign policy is determined by the executive branch of our Government. However, Congress helps implement the policy by appropriations, and so forth. This Congress added over $1 billion to the defense appropriations which already averaged $40 billion a year. At the insistence of the President, Congress cut the Cuban sugar quota completely, allowing the President to restore it as he wishes. We also provided for U.S. participation in the International Development Association, along with 67 other countries, to help provide assistance to underdeveloped countries; approved the Antarctica Treaty and the Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security Between the United States and Japan; provided that economic aid may be extended to any nation, except the Soviet Union and the Communist-held areas of the Far East, if the President determines it important to U.S. security. After 7½ years in office, 3 weeks before adjournment, the President asked for and Congress authorized $600 million in mutual security funds for Latin America, an area that has long been neglected. Congress has responded to leadership in the field of foreign affairs but more often than not, lately, it has had to lead.

Congress for the first time in 12 years reconvened for a special session this year to finish their uncompleted business that was interrupted by the business of the political conventions. Actually, compromises on many legislative proposals were impossible to obtain and the gavel brought the end of the 86th Congress, with less accomplished than I wanted but far, far more than the President desired or even was willing to accept. On February 7, 1960, the New York Times wrote:

There is something wrong with a country that has bigger and better tailfins at the same time that it has a second-best defense posture, a worsening slum problem, dirty rivers and streams, inadequate health services, and wretched underfinancing of education.

Obviously the spending of more money is not the answer to our problem. Mr. Eisenhower has produced the biggest peacetime budgets in history yet the problems are still with us. It is how we

spend our money that really matters. I have long maintained that $10 billion alone could be saved in our $40 billion defense budget if proper procurement procedures were instigated and duplication and waste kept to a minimum. For example, this administration wanted to let the Renegotiation Act die. I appeared, along with others, before the Ways and Means Committee urging that it be extended and it was. This act provides for the recovery of excess profits on defense contracts and annually the Government recovers millions of dollars as a result of this Act.

Criticism has been directed toward Federal expenditures. Most Americans are not aware that of the total Federal expenditures of over $77 billion in fiscal year 1960, almost $42 billion was spent for national defense, $3½ billion for the foreign-aid program which related to the national security, $2½ billion for atomic energy development and research, $5½ billion for the cost of services to veterans, present, past, and future. In addition, $9.2 billion was spent in fiscal 1960 to pay interest on the Federal debt, which interest payment had almost doubled from $5.8 billion in 1952 because of administration policies which favored a hard-money policy with higher interest rates to lenders.

With the addition of $5½ billion on the farm support program, slightly over $10 billion remained for all of the other important functions of the Federal Government including its frequently criticized welfare programs.

Obviously, a $10 billion savings in our defense budget from better purchasing techniques would permit us to reduce our debts and to achieve a more secure domestic economy.

In spite of Presidential vetoes of distressed area legislation, housing bills, flood control legislation and legislation for hard pressed postal and other Government workers, this Congress has looked squarely into and has spotlighted the serious dislocations in our economy—into the fact of high unemployment in the midst of what is supposed to be record prosperity and has tried in many ways, through many measures, to put a more solid base under the economy.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Two major amendments were made to the Social Security Act by this Congress. A program of Federal grants to the States for medical care for the low-income aged was approved. Grants will be made available to the States for medical care for two categories of needy aged: First, those unable to support themselves who receive old age assistance, and second, those with sufficiently high incomes to exclude them from receiving public assistance but with incomes too low to cover major medical expenses.

Congress also increased the amount a person can earn and still receive benefits. Under the present law, if a retired person earns $1,200 or less a year, no benefits are withheld. However, under the new law, passed this year, a retired person may earn over $1,200 and still secure benefits, depending on how much he earns. Detailed explanation of this new plan is available in my Detroit office.

The Railroad Retirement Act was revised, increasing benefits to retired employees; and Congress extended the benefits of temporary unemployment compensation for 3 additional months to the jobless whose State payments had expired.

The program of non-service-connected pensions to veterans, their widows and children was revised to correct the many inequities in the operations of our veterans' pension program. For example, under the old law, the widows and orphans of World War II and Korean war veterans could benefit only if the veterans had a service-connected disability. The new Veterans' Pension Act of 1959 places widows and orphans of those who fought in the last two conflicts on the same footing, with the same pension rights, as those of World War I veterans.

HIGHWAY PROGRAM

Some additional funds were provided for the highway program. The administration asked for another one-half-cent-per-gallon increase in the gasoline tax and asked that the 1-cent-per-gallon increase be continued beyond June 30, 1961, with the money going to the fund, but this tax did not pass. Highway users are now paying about $1.6 billion more in taxes than is used for roads, but an amendment to transfer some of this to the highway fund was opposed by those backing the tax increase.

POSTAL AND INTEREST RATES

The administration requested an increase in postage rates, but Congress refused to increase the mail rates.

The administration also requested authority to increase Government bond interest above 4¼ percent. Although Congress increased the interest rates on the E- and H-bonds individuals can own, the authority to increase the interest rates above the present legal maximum on commercial bonds was denied by Congress. The effect of such an increased interest rate would have been inflationary. It would have burdened the taxpayers with additional billions for interest payments for a generation. All of this on the safest investment in the world, U.S. bonds. Since Congress refused this increase, interest rates on these commercial bonds have been going down.

EDUCATION

Once again Congress failed to pass legislation providing for school construction. Although this time both the House and the Senate passed school construction bills, the House Rules Committee refused to let the bills go to final conference, so they died with adjournment. The majority of the educators in our district are very much in support of this legislation.

Congress voted to extend for another 5 years the Library Services Act which provides matching funds to States for the extension and establishment of public library service in our rural communities. The State of Michigan has received $358,346 through 1960.

Under the present programs that provide Federal funds for school construction and operating costs in areas overburdened with Federal activities, such as Army installations and defense plants, the 17th District has received $2,393,363 to date and the State of Michigan $43,742,512.

LABOR

In order to strike a blow at racketeering in unions, after the exposure of many shocking abuses, this Congress passed a labor reform bill which I supported. The 17th District probably sent more mail on this subject than any other congressional district in the United States. My district said, "Solve the problem," and I hope I voted in a way which will help solve it. However, it will remain for the courts, for union members, and for management to correct finally the evils of labor racketeering.

THE CONSUMER

This Congress wrote basic new safeguards against cancer-producing chemical ingredients in our food products and refused to open loopholes in the Poultry Products Inspection Act.

This Congress vastly expanded Government research programs in the health fields—into the causes, control, and prevention of cancer, heart disease, arthritis, blindness, mental illness, and other crippling and killing diseases.

This Congress enacted a long-overdue law to label dangerous or poisonous or hazardous household products so parents will know to keep them out of the reach of children. Every year some 600,000 youngsters swallow dangerous preparations. Of these, more than 500 die.

This Congress discussed, but failed to pass, a "truth in lending" bill which would require money lenders and creditors to spell out the interest they are charging consumers. Anyone receiving a loan or who purchases products on the installment plan should know precisely how much he is paying in interest. Such a bill would go a long way toward wiping out interest-rate gouging, a practice which creates hardships, particularly among the low income groups.

This Congress also considered, but did not pass, a shoe labeling bill that would require the manufacturers of shoes to label the materials and dyes used in their shoes. This is another attempt to assist the consumer in knowing what he buys, as our fabric and fur labeling laws do now. I have long supported it.

The Secretary of Agriculture stopped grading service on lamb and mutton. Protests from small packers and consumers and the House Committee on Agriculture forced him to restore the grading service. Grading service is essential in order to maintain reliability of quality for the consumer.

In 1959, a new district office of the Food and Drug Administration was opened in Detroit. I had long advocated the establishment of a district office here. With our increasing population and the tremendous increase in the number of new foods and drugs it is essential that we provide adequate funds and personnel so that this Agency can insure us safe foods and drugs. This district office, the 17th in the United States, services

parts of Wisconsin, Indiana, and Ohio as well as all of Michigan.

GENERAL

This Congress approved an amendment to the Constitution to give the residents of the District of Columbia the right to vote for President and Vice President. To become effective, the amendment must be ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States. It will no doubt be considered by the Michigan Legislature when they convene in January.

My longtime efforts to expand the distribution of surplus foods to the needy of our country by a stamp plan were temporarily successful. Congress passed a bill permitting the Secretary of Agriculture to establish such programs and Detroit was one of the first cities to apply. However, the Secretary has refused to put the program into effect. In the meantime, the surplus food stocks keep mounting and the welfare costs to the city of Detroit keep mounting.

Among the bills I have introduced is one to create a Department of Urban Affairs. We have a Department of Agriculture with a budget of almost $6 billion. We have a Department of Interior concerned with millions of acres of empty land. But we have no department of Government concerned with the problems of the metropolitan areas. A hundred years ago this was primarily a country of farms and small towns, or rural acres and villages. Today 6 out of 10 Americans—over 100 million persons—live in metropolitan areas.

As a result of the many bombings or attempted bombings of churches, synagogues, and small businesses I introduced a bill which would permit the FBI to investigate these incidents immediately. This bill became a part of the civil rights bill which was enacted into law.

By a large majority, Congress approved a bill authorizing the administration to withhold American assistance from countries which wage economic warfare against other nations which receive economic assistance from us. This was an outgrowth of congressional sentiment that the administration had not done enough to insist the the United Arab Republic end its illegal blockade of the Suez Canal and its periodic seizures of cargoes to and from Israel.

I am the first Member of the House to introduce a bill to provide for the humane treatment of animals used in tests and experiments.

PERSONAL REPORT

In addition to my legislative duties, I would like to make reference to my other work and responsibilities as your spokesman in Washington. I have attempted from the outset of my congressional service to keep the residents of the 17th District as fully informed as possible. To accomplish this, I have written a newsletter each month. If you would like to be on my mailing list, call my Detroit office.

I have taught civics in all the senior high schools in our district and I speak to many social and service groups. Last year I made two speeches in Florida, one, at the request of Mrs. Grace Cogan, sister of the late Mayor Edward Jeffries; the second, at the request of Edith Carew, a former resident of the 17th District. I also spoke at a gathering of women in Tennessee at the request of Senator ESTES KEFAUVER. Last month I was the principal speaker at the annual convention of the National Association of Women Lawyers, meeting in Washington in conjunction with the American Bar Association.

I maintain two full-time offices, one in Washington at 1516 New House Office Building, the other in our district at 14815 Grand River. My district office enables me to give you more prompt and efficient service.

Your letters, phone calls, and visits have been appreciated. I have attempted to assist you as promptly as possible. It has been a pleasure to assist many residents of our district and our local and State officials in their dealings with various Federal agencies such as the Defense Department, Federal Housing Administration, Veterans' Administration, Social Security, and the Internal Revenue Service.

In conclusion, let me say that I have done my best to be responsive to the needs and opinions of the residents of our district and to discharge my responsibility as your Representative in Congress in a way which I hope meets with your approval.

Report to the Voters of the 10th Congressional District of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, for 11 years I have had the honor of representing the people of the 10th Congressional District of New York in the Congress of the United States. As your Representative, I have personally written an annual report, in which I related the most important laws enacted by the Congress for that year. Of necessity, it is always a brief report, but I have tried to make it factual and realistic.

At the closing of this, the 86th Congress, I find the report a most difficult one to write. It is difficult because the events of the year 1960, both at home and abroad, are explosive and world shaking. Of necessity these events have a bearing on the policies of these United States—policies which were initiated by President Eisenhower, and which he, in turn, requested Congress to implement. It is the implementation of these policies into law which I report to the people of the 10th Congressional District.

Undoubtedly, historians will record the year 1960 as the year of crises. These crises involved great risks and affected all people—all nations in all parts of the world. They touched our most vital areas. They battered our resources. They challenged our way of life. They transgressed our political, our civic, our social, and our religious rights. These events highlighted one fact, and that is we are now at a turning point in history, not only for the United States, but for all free men. Our civilization is on trial, and on what we do in the next year or two will depend the future of mankind.

The sole responsibility for this dark period of history can be attributed to the leader of the Communist empire—Khrushchev Incorporated. Many peoples of the free world have failed to realize that there is one, and only one, ultimate goal for communism, and that is world domination. Communist flirtations with democracies is only part of Communist strategy. It is the great illusion and must be recognized as such. Thus, the jovial smiles of Khrushchev hide his ominous objectives. Many people of the free world have been lulled into an apathetic state by these smiles. Since there is no shooting war, Khrushchev's dire threats and implications have been pushed aside as so much grandstand strategy. By playing down the grave danger of communism, President Eisenhower has caused us to forget the Russian's worldwide economic-political offensive with its central planning and clearly defined goal.

Thus, 1960 ushered in the year of the great illusion. The continuing "peace and prosperity" theme of the Eisenhower administration, coinciding with the jovial smiles of Khrushchev, rocked the free world into a state of belief that a just peace was at last within reach.

The Paris summit, the stalemate of the Camp David meeting, the cancellation of the President's visit to Japan, the Cuban situation, Khrushchev's deceptive peace maneuvers—these events added up to accomplishment for Communist aims. Military defense was made to appear as sufficient and arms reduction without controls followed as a natural entity. Seeds of disunity among the Allies were planted. To the new nations waiting on the threshold of democracy, Russia was made to appear as a benefactor of mankind—despite its hypocritical mouthings about peace and justice.

The events of the year 1960 throughout were worldshaking and produced enormous crises. For years to come, historians will trace their effects upon the course of civilization. Despite the many and great obstacles the Communists have placed in the path of democracy, there have been gains for the free world. Western European countries, having recouped their losses from World War II, have reappraised the world situation and laid foundation for unity and progress.

Today, the Europe of the six—Belgium, France, Germany, Italy, Luxembourg, and the Netherlands—has built a formidable economic machinery on its territory. The Schuman plan, aimed at European integration, has laid the groundwork for a common market. Given time and balanced statesmanship, the combination of the six—mentioned above—and the seven—Britain and her partners: Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Switzerland, Austria, and Portugal—to-

gether with the United States, can bring about a free world as an established fact and not mere wishful thinking.

This unprecedented revival of Western Europe is credited to the selfless U.S. assistance since World War II. With this unprecedented revival, European nations must now become full partners with the United States in defense of the free world. The principle of the rights of man for all persons must be defended—for all people, for all nations. This objective has led the free world into direct conflict with the Communist leaders of the Kremlin, who will use any and all methods to achieve their objectives. This has forced the free world to realize that no nation can go it alone—there must be mutual, cooperative assistance among free people and free nations. In 1948 the Democratic Party initiated the Truman doctrine, which is now agreed upon as successful, but the failure of the Republican Party to take this program from its inception into the space age is the reason for the enormous problem facing the United States in 1960. No matter who the next President may be, his challenge is to reestablish a sound moral foreign policy and a sound U.S. economic policy.

I mention the above because the Subcommittee on Europe of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs issued a report on this subject. It is House Report No. 1226, dated January 25, 1960. I am the chairman of this subcommittee and, after a factfinding trip to Europe in the fall of 1959, we made many recommendations. In the report, I recommended a complete review and reevaluation of the U.S. foreign policy, including a review of the foreign aid program which partly implements that policy.

This will require coordinating of tariff policy, agricultural surplus programs, all bank loans and investments, business investments and Government grants. It would also require cooperation by economic groups—labor and management in particular—because without the cooperation of these groups, Government would not be able to withstand invasion of its rights.

In the same report, I recommended a review of the total picture of the U.S. economic status including all facets of U.S. economy. This survey should include all industry, production, trade, and commerce. The report rendered must be a factual report. Unfortunately, for the past year our imports have exceeded our exports. The U.S. budget is about $80.1 billion. The national debt is $288.7 billion and the interest on this debt is near $10 billion.

NATIONAL ECONOMY

With the new Soviet economic offensive, the overriding issue regarding our economy is whether our rate of yearly economic growth is sufficient. While we have been creeping with a low annual growth rate, Russia has raced ahead of us. This in great part was caused by the administration's restrictive policies. If we are to lead the world, we must institute sound new policies which will permit our economy to once again be dynamic. This cannot be accomplished by increased interest rates for which the administration fought so hard. The passage of time proved the fallacy of such reasoning.

During this session of Congress, our national debt limit was extended from $285 billion to $293 billion; the 52 percent corporate tax rate and excise taxes on cigarettes, automobiles, transport of persons, and telephone calls were continued. The cabaret tax was reduced from 20 to 10 percent.

Public Law 470 will now permit the deduction of all medical expenses incurred by a taxpayer for the care of a dependent parent over 65 years of age.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Throughout the past year, distinguished experts have questioned the adequacy of our national defense effort. There were those, including the President, who insisted that the U.S. defense organization was the strongest in the world and completely adequate. There were many who felt that the President was placing budgetary consideration above our true defense needs. Suffice it to say that after the Congress appropriated more money for defense purposes than was requested, the military made use of it. The overall defense appropriation was $39,996,608,000 in comparison to $39,335 million requested by the President. In addition, $211.4 million was authorized to the Atomic Energy Commission and $970 million to the National Security Agency.

MUTUAL SECURITY BILL

Part of the U.S. defense is the Mutual Security Act. This was extended for 1 year and authorized $1.3 billion for economic assistance, technical cooperation and special programs; $2.7 billion was appropriated for military assistance and the Development Loan Fund; $600 million additional funds were appropriated for Latin America, including $100 million for earthquake relief for Chile.

Provisions were made for U.S. participation in the International Development Association to help provide assistance to underdeveloped countries.

GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATION

One of the most important pieces of legislation was that which increased salaries for postal workers and classified Federal employees. These loyal Federal employees, who have been subjected to tremendous economic pressures by the rising cost of living, have long been deserving of increased salaries.

The legislation which increased postal workers' salaries by 8.4 percent and other Federal employees by 7.5 percent was initially vetoed by the President. The President's veto was easily overridden.

Unfortunately, the President saw fit to veto legislation which would have extended aid to depressed areas of the country. This once again showed the Republican administration's disregard for the interests of the poor and indigent.

WAGES

At the 1st session of the 86th Congress, legislation to increase the minimum wage was introduced in both Houses. Senator KENNEDY spearheaded the legislation in the Senate. His bill called for an increase to $1.25 per hour and would have extended protection to millions, while the House bill provided for $1.15 per hour. As a result of the absence of Executive leadership and the threat of a veto, this most important legislation was, after passage, stalled in conference. I was deeply disappointed.

CIVIL RIGHTS

The 86th Congress made history by passing the first civil rights bill, under the leadership of Senator JOHNSON in the Senate and Brooklyn's Congressman CELLER in the House. This legislation provides for the appointment of referees by the Federal courts to safeguard voting rights. The law provides penalties for the obstruction of court orders and requires the preservation of Federal election records for 2 years.

VETERANS

Bills were enacted of particular benefit to veterans.

Public Law 665 extends for 2 years authority for VA loans to veterans for homes, farms, or businesses.

Public Law 499 provides additional compensation for disabled veterans with more than three children.

Public Law 663 provides additional compensation to certain disabled veterans.

Public Law 497 waives payment of premiums on national life insurance policies for certain totally disabled veterans.

NATIONAL RESOURCES

Water pollution is a problem which directly affects every man, woman, and child in the United States. It robs us of our health, recreational facilities, and the natural beauty of our country. Any effort we can make to reduce this hazard is for the benefit of the public. The President's veto of H.R. 3610 which would have provided $90 million to help eliminate the problem was unconscionable.

SOCIAL SECURITY

In the past 5 years, more and more attention is being directed toward the problems of our senior citizens. The increased cost of medical care has created an urgent problem for people who are retired on fixed incomes—especially in the case of older people who require more care.

With these problems in mind, the Democratic Congress embarked on a legislative program which would have provided medical care to the aged through the social security system. This legislation created more public interest than any other bill in recent years.

Again, the lack of Executive leadership, and threat of the exercise of the Presidential veto, caused a less effective bill to be enacted. H.R. 12580 provides for a Federal-State program of medical care for the aged. It is not as effective as the Forand bill and is not operated within the structure of the social security system. This was one of the major disappointments of the session.

CONCLUSION

I realize the enormity of the problems of the United States Presidency, including the terrifying responsibilities of this trust. However, I feel that the Republican administration has emphasized "peace and prosperity"—a "don't worry,

everything is all right" policy—at a time when every citizen should be alert to the gravity of the world situation. The administration recognizes the cold war, a cold war which shifted from the Far East and Middle East to the U.S. back door—Cuba and South America, while a hot war rages in Africa. It is well known that all this is instigated and/or ignited by the Communist leaders of the Kremlin.

It is the responsibility of the Presidency to remain ever alert and constantly to remind the American people and the free world that any concession made by the Communists is a tactical maneuver or expediency. The Communists will repudiate without qualm their actions and agreements when necessary for them or when they so desire.

Thanks to the Soviets, peace, mankind's deepest longing, is still a vision. However, the American dream of attainment of world peace and disarmament, based on world order and law, on the mutual respect among free men and on a world economy, is still a noble aim, and with every American shoulder at the wheel can be brought close to accomplishment in this, our time.

The responsibility of serving the residents of my district for the past 11 years has been a great privilege. My office is open 6 days a week and letters sent to my Washington office receive immediate attention. My address is EDNA F. KELLY, Member of Congress, Washington 25, D.C.

During such times as Congress is not in session and I am not out of the country on matters concerning my chairmanship of the Subcommittee on Europe of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, I am available to see my constituents personally at the Madison Club, 739 Eastern Parkway, Brooklyn, on Monday and Thursday evenings.

United States-Israel Cooperation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement by me on United States-Israel cooperation.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY

As sponsor of the food for peace program and being deeply interested in finding markets abroad for America's agricultural abundance, I derive great satisfaction when I hear of a situation that contributes greatly to the sale of surpluses, utilizes the proceeds of such sales for expansion loans and makes an outstanding contribution to the development of a friendly nation.

We find such a situation in Israel, the biggest per capita market for U.S. grain exports in the world. In 1959 U.S. wheat, feedgrain, and soybean exports to Israel had an f.o.b. value of more than $44 million. Of this, approximately $25 million were local currency sales under Public Law 480. Dollar barter, and section 402 sales totaled about $19 million. The export of this volume of grains to any country is of considerable interest to the farmers of Minnesota and other grain producing States.

Practically all of these U.S. exports move into Israel through the Dagon Silo at Haifa. This facility has benefited from the Cooley amendment to Public Law 480 and contributes to the economy of the country by greatly reducing foreign exchange costs. I believe the Senate should know more about this meaningful and interesting project.

As the visitor to Israel approaches Haifa, by land or by sea, his eye will certainly be caught by the esthetically designed "skyscraper" near the harbor and next door to the railroad station. This is the Dagon Silo, the tallest—almost 200 feet—building in Israel and, based upon its performance record, one of the busiest. But it is not its height nor its artistic design that is of primary interest. Rather, it is the relationship of the functions of this building and the company that operates it to American-Israeli economic cooperation that is dramatic.

With a 51-year concession from the Government of Israel for operation in Haifa Harbor, this facility was incorporated in 1951. The present 20,000-ton silo was completed in the summer of 1955. A model of efficiency, Dagon is also a monument to free enterprise in operation and international financing, including American.

Dagon's American economic ties include the participation by many American investors; the handling of hundreds of thousands of tons of American wheat, feed grains, and soybeans purchased for dollars, bartered for industrial diamonds, and bought under the provisions of Public Law 480; and the expansion of its present facilities through a loan from the Export-Import Bank under the Cooley amendment provision of Public Law 480.

Dagon was founded by Dr. Reuben Hecht of Basel, Switzerland. Dr. Hecht, whose family has handled grain for generations throughout Europe, lives in Haifa and personally directs the operations of Dagon. Dr. Hecht is also the largest individual investor in the enterprise. Investors include Israeli, Swiss, American, Canadian, and Mexican shareholders. One hundred and eighty-four American investors have subscribed to both capital and 10-year loan certificates of Dagon. Of the total investment in Dagon, that from America amounts to 34 percent. For the past 3 years, investors have received dividends of 8 percent per year on share capital.

Because of the importance of the Dagon facility in moving American agricultural products—wheat, feed grains, and soybeans—Dagon applied for, and received, an Export-Import Bank loan of I£1,550,000. This is being used to construct new bins and elevators which will more than double its current capacity. By October 1960, Dagon will have a capacity of 44,000 tons. Further expansion to 70,000 tons is planned in the near future.

The Dagon silo, in 1959, handled a greater turnover relative to its capacity than any other silo or grain elevator in the world. With a total capacity of 20,000 metric tons, the facility discharged and loaded 74 vessels, carrying 659,858 tons of grain, almost 33 times its capacity. This compares with a U.S. record of 20 times capacity, and a European record (in the port of Rotterdam) of 7 times capacity.

This efficiency was recently rewarded when the Israel Institute of Productivity of the Ministry of Labor awarded both Dagon and Dr. Hecht the 1960 Eliezar Kaplan Prize for Efficiency.

On a per capita basis, Israel is the United States most important customer for wheat and soybeans and the second most important for feed grains. Soybean imports, none of which are purchased for local currency, amount to 3 bushels per person. The second highest per capita importer is Denmark at 1.5 bushels.

In 1959, U.S. exports of grains to Israel totaled:

	Metric tons
Wheat	192,700
Feed grains	334,900
Soybeans	176,200

When a grain vessel docks, the long sucker tubes are placed in the vessel's hold, and within minutes, the grain flows over an endless belt through a raised tunnel clearing the docks and railroad tracks into the elevator proper. Discharge is at the rate of up to 265 tons per hour and 5,000 tons per day is not unusual. Once in the bins, grain can be bulk loaded into railroad cars or specially designed truck bodies for inland movement. Facilities are also available for bagging. The entire operation is directed from a master control center in the office section of the building. A huge electronic board indicates at all times the status of grain loading and unloading.

The office building, incidentally, contains interesting archeological exhibits developed by Dr. Hecht, who is recognized as one of Israel's outstanding amateur archeologists.

The ability to handle grain in bulk rather than in bags has resulted in substantial savings to the Israeli economy. It is estimated that for 1959, the Dagon facility saved the Israeli economy $2 million in foreign exchange and I£2.5 million in local currency. The savings resulted from (1) shifting grain handling from bags to bulk; (2) virtually eliminating demurrage costs; (3) earned dispatch; and (4) reduced vessel turnaround time, allowing the lowest possible freight rates for charters.

American visitors to Israel should include on their itineraries a trip to the Dagon Silo. Such a trip will dramatically demonstrate how economic cooperation between Israel and the United States benefits both nations. Most important of all is this living demonstration of how we do use our agricultural surpluses in a positive and valuable manner, how we help ourselves to enlarge our markets and how we cooperate with free people in common endeavors.

Twentieth Anniversary of the Ukrainian Congress Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert in the RECORD the following message sent by me to the chairman of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., on the occasion of this committee's 20th anniversary:

Mr. LEV E. DOBRIANSKY,
Chairman, Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. DOBRIANSKY: I am happy to join with millions of Americans in marking the 20th anniversary of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America.

There can be no doubt that the 20 years of work of your committee has been of inestimable value, not only to the 2½ million Americans of Ukrainian ancestry, but to all Americans who cherish the ideals of freedom and dedication to the good fight.

Your committee has been an unfailing source of accurate information concerning the captive nations who cannot speak for themselves.

In appreciation,
Sincerely,

EMANUEL CELLER.

The Challenge of the 1960's: Education—Our Greatest Nonmilitary Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK KOWALSKI
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have been a cosponsor of the Murray-Metcalf bill, which would have made Federal funds available to the States for school construction and teachers' salaries.

I have said many times, and I say again that, except for our very survival as a nation, there is no more important issue facing America today than the crisis in education. Only with a broad Federal program to supplement the work of the States and local communities can we meet that crisis.

If I am returned to Congress by the voters of Connecticut, I shall again submit my education bill, H.R. 4379, which is identical with the Murray-Metcalf bill and which will provide the means to meet our school crisis.

It is significant that the deciding vote in the Senate against the provisions of the Murray-Metcalf bill—as contained in the Clark amendment—was cast by the man who is now the Republican candidate for President—Vice President NIXON. His vote against Federal funds for school construction and teachers' salaries is typical of the administration's cynical attitude toward education, as demonstrated so often during the past 8 years.

The administration's failure to take decisive action has contributed in large part to the worsening of our crisis in education.

FACTS ON THE SCHOOL CRISIS

We have good reason to be alarmed about our school problem. Consider these facts:

We have a shortage of more than 130,000 classrooms.

One school in every five is an antiquated firetrap and another one in five is on the safety borderline.

Classroom shortages are impairing the education of 10 million children, according to the administration's Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

We have a current shortage of more than 135,000 teachers.

More than half the classrooms in urban districts now have more than 30 children each, although most educators agree that grammar school classes should contain no more than 30 pupils and high school classes no more than 25.

Almost 100,000 teachers—or over 7 percent of all teachers in the country—have only temporary or emergency teaching certificates.

THE YEARS AHEAD

These facts are sobering enough, but the problem will become even more critical in the next decade.

By 1970 we will need 1,500,000 new teachers—at a minimum—which means 150,000 new teachers a year for the next 10 years.

We must provide facilities for more than 20 million additional students in our schools.

Our colleges must erect more new buildings in the next 10 years than they built in the previous 200 years.

SCHOOL NEEDS NEGLECTED

During the past 8 years, our school needs have grown more and more acute.

States and local communities have strained their resources to provide for the ever-increasing school population, but the Federal Government has shirked its responsibility.

State and local spending for education increased from $7.2 billion in 1950 to $15.8 billion in 1958. During this same period, States and local communities increased their bonded indebtedness from $24.1 billion to $58.1 billion, with much of this new debt resulting from school construction. In depressing contrast, all Federal expenditures for education in 1958 totaled $917 million.

Many communities have raised their taxes virtually to the limit but still have been unable to keep up with their school needs.

Half-day sessions mean part-time education, and too many of our children are penalized through the shortage of adequate classroom facilities.

RISING COSTS HURT

Mounting construction costs during the past 8 years have been a key factor in the classroom shortage. Building costs have climbed 42 percent during the present administration.

High interest rates resulting from the tight-money policy have meant higher costs for local communities and school districts. Interest rates on State and local bonds are 91 percent higher than they were in 1952.

In 1952, total interest charges on 30-year bonds for $500,000 grammar school were $164,000. Today they amount to $314,000.

Higher construction costs and higher interest rates have contributed their share to the crisis in education.

OPPOSITION TO SCHOOL AID

Opposition to Federal aid is often based on the claim that it would result in Federal interference with local control of education.

All the major bills, including the Murray-Metcalf bill, contain specific prohibitions against any control from Washington. Full supervision of schools would remain in local hands.

The history of education legislation proves such a fear to be groundless.

Federal assistance for land-grant colleges has been in effect since the days of the Civil War without any claims by the States of interference from Washington.

The Defense Education Act has made Federal funds available for special educational purposes without bringing any allegations that the Federal Government is interfering with State or local rights.

Likewise Public Laws 815 and 874, which provide Federal aid for schools in impacted areas, have been administered without lessening, in the slightest degree, full local control of schools.

MEETING THE CHALLENGE

First. To meet the challenge in education, we must first make Federal funds available to the States for school construction and teachers' salaries.

Second. We must establish a broad Federal program of scholarships and loans to insure that every qualified young American has an opportunity to complete his education regardless of his family's income. It is tragic that in a nation of our vast wealth there should each year be 100,000 talented young people, ranking in the top quarter of their high school graduating classes, who cannot go on to college for lack of funds.

Third. We must improve and expand the Defense Education Act.

Fourth. We must provide for Federal assistance to colleges and universities to help them provide the academic facilities and living quarters that are needed in the decade ahead.

Fifth. We must establish adequate programs for vocational education, adult education, private libraries, use of new techniques including educational television, and exchange of teachers and students with other countries.

Our children are our most precious possession. It is unthinkable that we should continue to shortchange them and dim their future.

We must keep faith with our children, and with America.

De Gaulle Is Right

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, at his recent press conference in Paris, President de Gaulle made some very constructive suggestions which show deep understanding of the many complex international problems with which the world is now confronted, and a keen desire to do something about them.

Pointing out that Khrushchev and his Red cohorts have injected themselves with their ideology and military strength into Africa, the Middle East, southeast Asia, and even the Western Hemisphere, President de Gaulle wants the United States, Great Britain, France, and their allies to meet this menace head on. He sees danger in our lack of unity, and urges that our differences be ironed out so that we may act as a strong, united front.

Although he does not say it in so many words, his meaning is clear. Washington must wake up to the realization that sinister forces are in motion. Russian

planes and so-called technicians in the Congo, and the threat to supply Cuba with rockets are indeed cause for anguish and trepidation. And all we hear from the administration in Washington are pious words of protest. Words, words, and more words. But no action. Words will accomplish nothing. Nor will startled reactions or verbal answers to Khrushchev's propaganda moves avail us anything.

We must take the initiative. We must force Khrushchev to dance to our music. We must take strong diplomatic action that will startle Khrushchev and make him worry about what to do next. His massive propaganda machine must be halted. I have enough faith in our American people to believe that there are plenty of ingenious minds in Washington who can conceive ways and means of silencing Khrushchev.

President de Gaulle very rightly stressed the necessity on the part of the United States, Great Britain, and France to organize politically and strategically, not only on behalf of the democracies of Europe. It is vital, he emphasized, that the Western Powers broaden their horizons and concern themselves also with Africa and the other trouble spots of the world.

Fifteen new nations, all in Africa, have been recently admitted to the United Nations, and several more will gain membership before the end of the current year. We must focus our attention on these nations. We must act to prevent inroads upon them and subjugation by the Soviets.

As it is now constituted, NATO cannot cope with these problems. The first decade of NATO's existence has ended. The world situation has changed immeasurably in these last 10 years, and the organization of NATO must be changed accordingly. It must be revised to meet new conditions. In the words of General de Gaulle, it must be "reactivated." All NATO forces, he says, must revise and coordinate their policies to include not only the continent of Europe, but other parts of the world as well, particularly Africa and the Middle East.

The French President places great emphasis—and rightly so—on the importance of such revision because we cannot afford to allow the aggressive actions of Khrushchev—both overt and covert—in Africa, Cuba, and the underdeveloped areas, to go unchallenged. Our course of action will require the greatest tact, courage, and resourcefulness. To quote President de Gaulle once more, "Divided councils are dangerous. We cannot afford to go our separate ways, nor can we afford the luxury of rivalry among ourselves."

I do not blame De Gaulle for refusing to subordinate French sovereignty to either a united Europe or a NATO. He would like to see France as a coordinate member of a European confederation in which England is also included. I firmly believe that we should encourage this idea. Our greatest strength lies in a European entity—a continent of nations, each maintaining its own identity and sovereignty, but at the same time cooperating in mutual defense, economic welfare, diplomatic and political matters on an international basis, and in cultural affairs. Such a confederation would have a deliberative assembly made up of delegates from the national parliaments of the respective member countries.

General de Gaulle is also correct, in my opinion, in brooking no interference on the matter of Algeria. That country has been an integral part of Metropolitan France for more than 130 years. France has poured her lifeblood and billions of dollars into Algeria. And, if left to her own devices, she will settle her differences with the Algerians without any help or advice from other countries or the United Nations.

We Americans should readily understand De Gaulle's testiness when France is criticized for her policy on Algeria. Suppose we were confronted with cries of independence from Hawaii and Alaska, and France, together with other nations, applauded such efforts. How would we react? What would we say? Would we be complacent or resentful?

There is no doubt that we would firmly resist such a movement for independence on the ground that both Alaska and Hawaii are integral parts of the United States. This is what France claims for Algeria—that it is part and parcel of France. And, just as France maintains, we would tell the world that we will settle our own affairs without the gratuitous counsel of the United Nations.

The carving out of new nations into geographical entities regardless of tribal groupings and affiliations, and the granting of independence without adequate preparation for the responsibilities of democratic government have created new world problems. We must revise our thinking with regard to the precipitous and indiscriminate granting of independence to countries not qualified to cope with it. This is grist for the Communist mill.

I admit that we cannot compare the Algerian Moslems with the Congolese. There is a vast difference in mores, education, background, and ability, to the advantage of the Algerians. But there is a similarity in the complex problems between the French, or Belgians, or European settlers on the one hand, and the civil servants and indigenous populations on the other.

President de Gaulle is trying every possible means of arriving at a just solution by which the Moslems and French can live side by side, safely and harmoniously, in mutual trust and respect.

The United States must refrain from criticizing or interfering with France or Algeria. Let us not become part of an Afro-Asian-Communist anti-French bloc. Let us, rather, stand resolutely behind our oldest, time-honored ally, the Republic of France.

Finally, we must treat France as a trusted ally and not hesitate to share with her our atomic secrets. To continue our policy of informing Great Britain and depriving France of our atomic knowledge causes needless irritation and bitterness and does not redound to our security. We must promptly remedy this situation.

Cheney Division, Wichita, Kans., Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I believe it will be helpful for the Members of Congress and others interested to have a little further information with respect to H.R. 4606 and S. 1092, being identical bills that were recently approved unanimously in the Senate and in the House.

The Cheney division, Wichita project, Kansas, is a proposed joint development between the United States and the city of Wichita in which the principal works comprising a dam and reservoir would be constructed on the North Fork of the Ninnescah River some 6 miles north of Cheney, Kans., and some 25 miles west of Wichita, Kans. The Cheney division, Wichita project, Kansas, is proposed as a multiple-purpose project to provide, first, flood protection on a regional basis; second, irrigation to limited tracts of land downstream from the reservoir site; third, recreation benefits on a regional and interstate basis in an area largely devoid of such facilities at the present time; fourth, fish and wildlife conservation benefits of national and international significance; and fifth, an urgently needed additional source of municipal water supply for the city of Wichita.

The Cheney division, Wichita project, Kansas, is a joint venture between the city of Wichita and the United States in which the city assumes its proportionate share of the risk and agrees to repay with interest the project cost allocated to municipal water supply. Construction cost of the dam, reservoir, basic recreation facilities, and fish and wildlife conservation facilities is estimated at $18,274,000. The city of Wichita has approved a proposed repayment contract and has agreed to pay an amount not to exceed $7,396,000 plus interest, which amount is approximately 40 percent of the construction cost and an allowance for contingencies, thus providing a margin of insurance against the necessity of contract renegotiation in the event of advancing prices.

In addition, the proposed repayment contract provides that the city will at its own cost of $7,650,000 construct the pipeline and related transmission facilities required to transport water from the reservoir site to the city concomitantly with the construction of the Cheney Dam and Reservoir by the Federal Government. Thus, it may be seen that the total construction cost of dam, reservoir, basic recreation facilities, fish and wildlife conservation facilities, pipeline, and related transmission facilities approximates $25,924,000, of which amount the city of Wichita will pay approximately $15 million, or some 58 percent.

Public funds for the appropriate investigations and reports have been made available both by the city of Wichita and by the Bureau of Reclamation. Data with respect to the geologic, engineering,

financial, and economic aspects of the project have been exchanged freely and on a cooperative basis between the respective municipal, State, and Federal agencies concerned.

The reconnaissance reports, the geologic reports, and the feasibility reports issued by the Bureau of Reclamation represent the combined best judgment of the various levels of government and are concurred in by the city of Wichita and its consulting engineers.

The project has been conformed to policies and legislation of the three levels of government concerned with respect to matters of water supply, flood control, irrigation, hydroelectric power, pollution, fish and wildlife, conservation, and recreation.

The project recognizes, first, the desirability of substantial financial participation at the local level in accordance with the so-called partnership policy of the Congress and the President; second, the river basin plan as the most practical approach to the development of land and water resources on a regional basis irrespective of municipal limits or State boundaries; third, the economic factors which make it impractical for a single municipality to develop a river basin water resources program without the cooperation and participation of all levels of government involved; fourth, the importance of maximum use of scarce reservoir sites and limited water resources in accordance with an overall river basin land and water resources development plan; fifth, the interdependence of water supply and pollution abatement problems and the consequent responsibility of local government to make the best possible use of its water supply for the benefit of itself and downstream users.

The city of Wichita has complied with every request for cooperative action that it has received from the Bureau of Reclamation, and the city has taken every possible action to conform the project to existing Federal and State policies and legislation with respect to water supply, flood control, irrigation, pollution abatement, recreation, and the conservation of fish and wildlife. Concluding nearly 5 years of such cooperative effort, the city of Wichita, first, has agreed to obligate itself for repayment with interest of the project costs allocated to municipal water-supply purposes; second, has agreed to construct the connecting pipeline and related transmission facilities from its own funds, unrelated to Federal financing; third, has purchased the distribution properties of the local water utility at a cost approximating $30 million; fourth, has obtained approval of the appropriate applications for water rights for the reservoir site from an agency of the State of Kansas; fifth, has complied with a pollution-abatement program as approved by the Kansas State Board of Health and the U.S. Public Health Service, including the construction of $6.5 million of additional sewage facilities; sixth, has obtained the necessary enabling legislation from the Kansas State Legislature to permit a repayment contract for the Federal Government; seventh, has secured the overwhelming approval of the electorate of Wichita in a special election authorizing construction of the proposed reservoir; eighth, has agreed to operate and to maintain the facilities after construction; and, ninth, has agreed to place the management of the reservoir for fish and wildlife conservation and recreation purposes in an appropriate agency of the State of Kansas.

I am advised that the fish and wildlife nonreimbursable costs of $4,598,000 as proposed in the Bureau of Reclamation report were calculated on the basis of established practices and procedures. The estimated fish and wildlife conservation benefits of approximately $290,000 annually were not established by the city of Wichita but were calculated by an agency within the Department of the Interior—the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife—in accordance with the same practices and procedures which have been applied in several hundred other projects throughout the country. The capitalized value of the annual benefits represents some $10.6 million in fish and wildlife conservation benefits. Also, I am advised that the Bureau of Reclamation found in 1957 that the cost of providing similar area facilities for fish and wildlife purposes by means of constructing small reservoirs—assuming sufficient other sites are available, which assumption is questionable—would result in a greater cost than the amount allocated in the Cheney Reservoir for such purposes.

Further, I am advised that in the case of multiple-purpose reservoirs certain differences of opinion have existed historically between the Federal departments and agencies concerned with respect to the various allocations of project costs and benefits. I understand that these matters were brought into an orderly solution by the Bureau of the Budget on December 31, 1952, through the issuance of Budget Circular No. A47 providing for a uniform method of allocating project costs in multiple-purpose reservoir projects. The method is known as the separable costs-remaining benefits method. The use of this separable costs-remaining benefits method was agreed to subsequently on March 12, 1954, by the Department of the Army, the Department of the Interior, and the Federal Power Commission. It is my understanding that this formula has been applied for a good many years in the allocation of project costs in multiple-purpose reservoir projects throughout the country. The suggestion of the Budget Bureau that the flood control and municipal water supply costs be allocated on the basis of the separable costs-remaining benefits method and that the fish and wildlife conservation benefits be calculated on the basis of separable cost only is inconsistent with established procedures and the fundamental thesis that costs in all multiple-purpose reservoir projects should be allocated on a uniform basis applicable alike to all projects.

In this particular case I am informed that while an incremental amount, approximately $540,000, as suggested by the Bureau of the Budget, is presumed to provide the facilities desired for fish and wildlife conservation purposes, the proposition may be stated in reverse with exactly the opposite result. The proposed reservoir project provides for an inviolate conservation pool of some 10,000 acre-feet of water, to be maintained at all times insofar as other uses are concerned, and for the acquisition of some 2,500 acres of additional lands for fish and wildlife management. Using the same unit cost applied in the proposed Cheney Reservoir project, it has been estimated that the construction of a single-purpose, 10,000-acre-foot reservoir would cost $12 million. Thus, inasmuch as the capitalized fish and wildlife benefits are $10.6 million, it may be seen that the Federal Government is benefiting approximately $2 for each $1 allocated to fish and wildlife conservation purposes under the separable costs-remaining benefits procedure. Similarly, flood control and municipal water supply purposes are benefiting also from a sharing of joint cost and that is precisely what is intended in the allocation of the separable costs-remaining benefits procedure.

The policy with respect to fish and wildlife conservation benefits was established by the Congress and not by the Secretary of the Interior whose report recommends the amount of project costs to be allocated of conservation benefits pursuant to the statutes as follows: First, the Fish and Wildlife Act of March 10, 1934, Public Law 121, 73d Congress, which provides the basic authority for conservation of fish and wildlife; second, the Fish and Wildlife Act of August 14, 1946, Public Law 732, 79th Congress, which amends the authority of the original act and broadens the base of conservation participation; and third, the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act of August 12, 1958, Public Law 624, 85th Congress, which further amends the original act and provides for interagency consultation for conservation purposes and for the allocation of costs to reflect conservation benefits in water reservoir projects.

I quote from paragraph 2d of the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, Public Law 624, 85th Congress, dated August 12, 1958:

> The Secretary of the Interior, in addition to allocations made under section 9 of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, shall make findings on the part of the estimated costs of the project which can properly be allocated to means and measures to prevent loss of and damage to wildlife resources, which costs shall not be reimbursable, and an appropriate share of the project costs may be allocated to development and improvement of wildlife resources, with a finding as to the part of such allocated costs, if any, to be reimbursed by non-Federal fish and wildlife agencies or interests.

I quote further from Public Law 624, 85th Congress, paragraph 2f, as follows:

> In addition to other requirements, there shall be included in any report submitted to Congress supporting a recommendation for authorization of any new project for the control or use of water as described herein (including any new division of such project or new supplemental works on such project) an estimation of the wildlife benefits or losses to be derived therefrom, including benefits to be derived from measures recommended specifically for the development and improvement of wildlife resources, the

cost of providing wildlife benefits (including the cost of additional facilities to be installed or lands to be acquired specifically for that particular phase of wildlife conservation relating to the development and improvement of wildlife), the part of the cost of joint-use facilities allocated to wildlife, and the part of such costs, if any, to be reimbursed by non-Federal interest.

In view of the growing water shortage that is developing throughout our country and in view of the fact there are not now being constructed or even being planned sufficient water projects to prevent severe water shortages from developing in various areas within the next decade, it is inconceivable to me that any delay would be prescribed by the Congress. Particularly is this true in the case of a water project as urgently needed as the Cheney project wherein the local interests have agreed to pay a very substantial portion of the costs and have complied with all present Federal requirements.

Social Security and Old-Age Assistance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MORGAN M. MOULDER
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, everyone seriously studying our situation has concluded that providing for better health care for the aged is a serious problem.

For all too many of our elder citizens, long life has meant shrunken incomes, increased illness, loneliness, being pushed aside, and the shame, which should not be, of being an applicant for a handout from society.

On the 20th day of January of this year I introduced a bill in Congress to amend title I of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of Federal funds payable thereunder to States which have approved plans for old-age assistance and which maintain their expenditures for such assistance at or above the 1959 level. My home State of Missouri is one.

Mr. Speaker, my bill H.R. 9775 would, first, increase the maximum matchable payment from the present $55 per month to $90 per month; second, would revise the matching formula making it possible for the States to receive additional Federal funds for old-age assistance; and, third, would increase the old-age assistance payments, and relieve the heavy privations and burdens endured by our worthy and deserving elder citizens.

Estimates furnished to me by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare show that Missouri would receive, under the provisions of my bill, an additional $12 million in Federal money.

I propose that all welfare payments in our States be studied and increased in line with present-day living costs.

I support all necessary appropriations to make these increases possible.

Mr. Speaker, I pledge my earnest support to expansion and improvement of hospital care for our senior citizens and others in need.

I deeply believe there should be in all States a commission established for the purpose of studying the problems of elder citizens and developing programs to give them a more dignified, satisfying old age.

Mr. Speaker, I believe in more widespread employment opportunities for our senior citizens so that they may make the fullest use of the wisdom they have stored and of the maturity that long lives and experience have brought them. Our present system is guilty of great waste.

Mr. Speaker, I pledge my efforts toward a Federal program of medical care for our elder citizens so that 14 million Americans, including nearly 400,000 of them in my State, who receive social security can face the future confident that if disability comes to them they will receive adequate medical and hospital care.

Mr. Speaker, I support an expanded program of public health services for the protection of our elder people.

I have always supported, and I always will fight for, increased benefits for our elder citizens and for aid to our disabled and needy persons.

I believe that our good American citizens who have fought the battle of life, facing the ups and downs of success and failure, facing the wheel of fortune, ought not in the twilight of their lives to be left without adequate means of support; for out of the labor of their lives they are entitled to it, and it is our duty to provide for them a life they can lead in dignity and respect during their later years.

Mr. Speaker, long years they have spent laboring in the vineyard and in paying the tax collectors. Of them, I do not like to think of old age, but of the golden age they have earned and which it is our duty to guarantee.

I remember the teachings of my parents, who told me from the Bible, "Honor thy father and thy mother, that thy days may be long upon the earth which the Lord thy God hath given thee."

Why Glen Echo?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, not far from the Nation's Capital in Montgomery County, Md., residents of the Bannockburn community are helping write some fine pages in American history. These men, women, and children are marching in a peaceful picket line as part of their protest against segregation at the Glen Echo Amusement Park.

That community's fight has been described in detail by one of the "fighters," Hyman H. Bookbinder, in his article entitled "A Community Joins the Fight," which appeared in the July-August issue of the AVC Bulletin. The article, and one other, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, follow:

[From the AVC Bulletin, July–August 1960]

A COMMUNITY JOINS THE FIGHT

(By Hyman H. Bookbinder)

Montgomery County, Md., is right above the District of Columbia border. It is, to all intents and purposes, part of the Nation's Capital, except that as part of Maryland it has the right to vote. And it has used that vote to elect a liberal county government and a liberal Congressman. Many thousands of Government workers live in the county.

The county has for many years boasted of a superb school system, and after the Supreme Court decision it carried out its integration plans quickly and successfully. So much so that when community leaders were consulted about appointing a Negro principal for the Bannockburn Elementary School, which at the time had only white students because there were no Negro children in the area, the response was unanimously affirmative.

A couple of months ago, nobody would have suggested that there was any civil rights problem in the area. Today, the county is full of it.

Glen Echo Amusement Park in the county is a private enterprise with a large swimming pool and a collection of Coney Island rides. It has been closed to Negroes for years, but even liberal Montgomery County never seemed to care very much. Recently, however, some members of the community were distressed at the fact that the county's official recreation program was using Glen Echo Park for its swimming activities. This meant that its buses and its personnel were being used to take white children to Glen Echo, while other children were being sent to the public pools in the District of Columbia. This was considered both illegal and immoral.

The Bannockburn community is adjacent to the Glen Echo community. It consists of about 200 private homes, and started out about 10 years ago as a co-op. It has a higher than average proportion of residents with labor and ADA-type backgrounds. There are a number of AVC members, too. It was no surprise, therefore, that action against the county's use of Glen Echo Park should initiate here. The PTA and the civic association soon passed appropriate resolutions.

On June 30, however, the pattern of protest was changed sharply. Lawrence Henry, a divinity student at Howard University, showed up with picket signs outside the park. He was joined by some other students, both colored and white, who had formed a nonviolent action group. That group had just succeeded in breaking the color bar in northern Virginia restaurants through the sit-in device. Numerous arrests have taken place as a result of various legal tests which were made.

That appearance by Henry and his followers had led from one exciting thing to another in the nearby communities of Montgomery County and throughout the Washington area. As of this writing, the park refuses to yield, and it may successfully hold out until the Labor Day closing.

In nearby Bethesda, a movie theater was picketed round the clock for 100 hours—"1 hour for each year since the Civil War." A Rockville restaurant abandoned segregation after several weeks of picketing led to a policy declaration by the mayor and town council. Several Bethesda restaurants did likewise.

The biggest victory of all, however, is what all of this has done to the community itself. As it has done elsewhere, the student sit-in movement has sensitized the area of activity, and encouraged others to participate in the

fight for human rights. As a parent of a couple of teenagers, I shall forever be grateful for what this has done to educate all the kids in the area.

They saw many of their parents practice what they had been preaching: walk the picket lines, prepare food for the pickets, write letters to Glen Echo and to public officials, attend meetings of the county council, and all the rest.

They saw at first hand that the fight against Negro discrimination is part of the struggle against anti-Semitism and every other form of intolerance. This they learned when the American self-styled Nazi leader Lincoln Rockwell counterpicketed us with his obscene and hateful signs.

They got into the act themselves. What some of us were beginning to fear was a lost generation, with no sense of purpose or sense of urgency, isn't quite so lost. Dozens of Bannockburn teenagers have walked that picket line for hours on end. And they have spent hours talking with the Negro students, learning directly and personally what civil rights really means.

What started as a small student protest at Glen Echo soon became a community responsibility. Then groups throughout the Capital area joined the fight. AVC brought out impressive groups. A Capital area committee for equality has been formed to work on all remaining problems.

I like to think there is a great lesson to learn from the Glen Echo experience. Most Americans believe in the furtherance of civil rights; they would like to see all segregation and discrimination just disappear tomorrow morning. But they don't know how to—or perhaps would rather not—get involved in the actual fight to secure equal rights for all. But once challenged, or given a specific objective, they will respond. They certainly will not patronize establishments known to be segregated; they will sign petitions or write letters when asked; some will walk picket lines; others will feed the pickets.

Unhappily, in these last few years the American people have not been challenged sufficiently and dramatically. President Eisenhower has not once declared that he thinks the Supreme Court decision is right; never has he made a direct and dramatic appeal to the school boards of the Nation to implement the law of the land. He has been content to declare simply that Americans must obey the laws of the land.

My Bannockburn community may be a cut above the average. Perhaps there aren't too many communities where its people will walk picket lines 7 days a week, or hold meetings till 2 in the morning, or invite 50 or 60 pickets to dinner. But I think there are millions of people who will respond if given the opportunity. The sit-in movement has thrown out a challenge to all of us. We dare not reject the challenge.

On Wednesday evening, August 24, five Members of this House went to the scene of the fight for right. I am proud to have been one of them.

I reported to my constituents a few days later in my weekly report to weekly newspapers. That report "Why Glen Echo?" follows:

WHY GLEN ECHO?

(By Representative CHARLES O. PORTER)

The grass is worn bare on the plot of Federal property near the entrance to the parking lot of the Glen Echo Amusement Park in Maryland, a 20-minute drive from Capitol Hill. The oiled surface in front of the main entrance to the amusement center also has been worn down. Nearly every day for 2 months the parking lot has been less than half full.

Americans of all ages, black and white, have been peacefully marching each day from around 5 p.m. to 1 a.m. in protest of the segregation policy of this public accommodation located in a State that claims to be integrated.

The now self-sustaining picket line at Glen Echo follows the successful peaceful "sit-ins" at many Virginia restaurants. This second step has taken longer, but the walls are tumbling.

On Wednesday evening, August 24, four other Members of the House of Representatives and I drove to Glen Echo. Four of us walked in the picket line at the parking lot entrance. I carried a sign upon which was written "Democrats Support Your Party Platform—Stay Out." My friend SEYMOUR HALPERN, Republican, of New York, carried a sign which stated "Republicans Support Your Party Platform—Stay Out."

Marching with us were Representative CHARLES DIGGS, Democrat, of Michigan, and Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, Democrat, of New York. Representative BYRON JOHNSON, Democrat, of Colorado, simultaneously conferred with members of the peaceful picket line.

Students are leading this crusade. The night I marched I was able to arrange that we Members of Congress met with the manager of Glen Echo. He agreed to arrange a meeting between us and the park owners, Abram and Samuel Baker, as soon as possible. Before then, no negotiations had been held. This was a step forward on a long but important road toward equal rights for all citizens.

Activities of the Committee on Un-American Activities During the 2d Session of the 86th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report on the activities of the Committee on Un-American Activities during the 2d session of the 86th Congress. This report covers the period from January 1, 1960, to and including September 1, 1960.

Under date of September 18, 1959, I inserted in the RECORD a report on the activities of the Committee on Un-American Activities during the 1st session of the 86th Congress.

REPORT BY CHAIRMAN FRANCIS E. WALTER ON THE ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES DURING THE 2D SESSION OF THE 86TH CONGRESS

During the period beginning January 1, 1960, and ending September 1, 1960, the committee interrogated 108 witnesses in public session.

AIR RESERVE TRAINING MANUAL

In February 1960, the Secretary of the Air Force, Dudley C. Sharp, was quoted in the press as categorically repudiating the Air Reserve Center Training Manual as representing Air Force views. Much of the manual dealt with problems of Communist infiltration of church groups in the United States. Some of the material contained in the manual was derived from publications of the Committee on Un-American Activities. Accordingly, Secretary Sharp was invited to appear before the committee to testify on the subject matter.

In response to committee questions, Secretary Sharp testified, among other things, that he did not intend in his prior statements to repudiate the integrity, validity, or accuracy of the testimony before the Committee on Un-American Activities which is quoted in the manual.

COMMUNIST TRAINING OPERATIONS—ACTIVITIES AND PROPAGANDA AMONG YOUTH GROUPS

Continuing a series of hearings on Communist training operations, begun in 1959, the committee held hearings in Washington on "Communist Activities and Propaganda Among Youth Groups." These hearings explored the history and background of Communist penetration of youth groups, surveyed typical Communist propaganda publications which are entering the United States destined to schools and colleges, and developed factual information respecting the Communist-controlled youth festival held during the summer of 1959 in Vienna, Austria.

ESPIONAGE

Pursuing its continuing investigation of Communist espionage operations in the United States, the committee released testimony taken in executive session from Lt. Col. Frantisek Tisler, former military and air attaché of the Czechoslovak Embassy in Washington.

Colonel Tisler had defected and asked for political asylum in the United States on July 25, 1959. He testified that he had been trained in espionage techniques before coming into this country in 1955 and that, from the time of his arrival until his defection, he had served as chief of the Czechoslovak Military Intelligence Directorate Residentura which had its headquarters at the Czechoslovak Embassy in Washington, D.C. In this capacity, he stated, he had five officers serving under him—four attached to the Embassy and one to the Czechoslovak United Nations delegation in New York. Prior to leaving Czechoslovakia, Colonel Tisler said, he was told that his title of military and air attaché was primarily a legal cover for espionage activities and that his principal job would be to recruit U.S. agents and get information from them on classified U.S. materials. He estimated that during the period of his services in the Czechoslovak Embassy in Washington, 45 percent of the Embassy personnel and personnel of the U.N. delegation in New York was engaged in espionage activities against the United States.

He also testified that an American Communist, Antonin Krchmarek, of Cleveland, had been in frequent contact with Embassy personnel during this period; that the Embassy had provided funds for Krchmarek's defense when he was on trial under the Smith Act; that Krchmarek had contacted the Czechoslovak Foreign Institute (a propaganda agency) when he visited that country in 1950, and that Krchmarek had provided information to Czechoslovak Ambassador Petrzelka on the U.S. Communist Party, the 1958 elections and other matters for transmittal to the Communist Government of Czechoslovakia.

Colonel Tisler also identified Charles Musil, editor of a Czechoslovak language newspaper in Chicago, as an intermediary between Krchmarek and the Czechoslovak Ambassador.

When Krchmarek and Musil testified on May 26, 1960, they repeatedly invoked the fifth amendment in response to questions concerning the testimony of Colonel Tisler. Krchmarek, however, did deny that he had ever received funds from the Czechoslovak Embassy or any of its personnel. He also said that he had never given any classified information to the Czechoslovak Ambassador.

Musil denied that the Embassy or Czechoslovak Government had ever paid any expenses for him, or that he had served as an intermediary between Krchmarek and Ambassador Petrzelka.

NORTHERN CALIFORNIA COMMUNIST PARTY

In hearings held in San Francisco in May, during which 42 witnesses testified, the committee explored the organization and operations of the northern California district of the Communist Party. In the course of these hearings, this unit of the Communist Party demonstrated its strength—and danger—as a Soviet fifth column operating on American soil. By means of a carefully organized campaign and with the assistance of a number of Communists fronts, as well as some non-Communist groups and individuals, it not only succeeded in turning out thousands of demonstrators to protest the committee hearings, but also prodded hundreds of them into mob violence on the second day of the hearings. On the very first day of the hearings, a group of hardcore leaders of the northern California district of the Communist Party succeeded in taking virtual control of the hearing room and forcing suspension of proceedings for a period of about 40 minutes. Despite the disruptive activities of these Communists and their dupes, however, the hearings produced extensive information on Communist Party strategy and tactics on the national level, as well as in California.

COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES AMONG THE SEAMEN AND ON WATERFRONT FACILITIES

The grave danger to the Nation's security posed by the lack of any effective waterfront security program was highlighted in hearings held by the committee in Washington, D.C.

Support for a bill introduced by the committee chairman to correct this situation—which has been brought about by court decisions invalidating the former seamen's security program, was voiced in the hearings by Vice Adm. James E. Hirshfield, Assistant Commandant of the Coast Guard; Ray R. Murdock, Washington counsel for the Seafarers International Union of North America; H. Howard Ostrin, general counsel of the National Maritime Union, and Hoyt S. Haddock, director, seafarers section of the maritime trades department, AFL–CIO.

Two former Communists who had served in the waterfront section of the Communist Party in various U.S. ports, pointed out that Communist seamen were a grave security threat because they could be used for espionage and communications networks, for sabotage, and in the smuggling of Communist espionage agent and couriers into and out of the country.

Representatives of the maritime unions pointed out that under present conditions the United States has no jurisdiction over seamen employed on flag of convenience ships, which are owned by U.S. civilians but sail under foreign flags with largely foreign crews.

Nine witnesses, all of whom currently hold papers as seamen or ships' radio operators, invoked the fifth amendment when asked questions concerning Communist Party membership and Communist activities.

COMMUNIST PENETRATION OF RADIO FACILITIES

The threat to the integrity of the Conelrad defense system, stemming from Communist radio operators, was explored in committee hearings conducted in Washington on H.R. 12852, a bill introduced by the chairman. This bill, designed to cope with Communist infiltration in the field of radio communications, prohibits the issuance of a radio operator's license to any individual who willfully fails or refuses to answer certain questions relating to Communist activities when summoned to appear before designated Federal agencies.

Representatives of the FCC, the Air Force, broadcasting and cable companies testified in the hearings, in addition to a number of uncooperative witnesses who either hold licenses or have applications for them pending before the FCC and who invoked the fifth amendment on present Communist Party membership.

REPORTS

COMMUNIST TARGET: YOUTH

The Communist success in the student riots during the May hearings of the committee in San Francisco proves that it can happen here, J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, stated in a report entitled "Communist Target: Youth," published by the committee.

The Communists demonstrated in San Francisco just how powerful a weapon Communist infiltration is, Mr. Hoover stated. He continued:

"They revealed how it is possible for only a few Communist agitators, using mob psychology, to turn peaceful demonstrations into riots. Their success there must serve as a warning that their infiltration efforts aimed not only at the youth and student groups, but also at our labor unions, churches, professional groups, artists, newspapers, government, and the like, can create chaos and shatter our internal security.

"Throughout the world today, governments are toppling with stunning rapidity. Whether large or small, the role Communists are playing in these events must not be discounted. The growing strength of our Nation over the years has not proven a deterrent to relentless efforts on the part of the Communist Party, U.S.A., to destroy our security and prepare our Nation for a similar fate."

Commenting on Communist infiltration and agitation tactics among youth, Mr. Hoover stated:

"The successful Communist exploitation and manipulation of youth and student groups throughout the world today are a major challenge which free world forces must meet and defeat. Recent world events clearly reveal that world communism has launched a massive campaign to capture and maneuver youth and student groups."

In the United States the Communist Party is engaged in a major campaign among youth, with campuses throughout the Nation as prime targets for Communist infiltration and recruitment efforts, Mr. Hoover warned.

Using the Communist success in inciting the student riots against the House Committee on Un-American Activities as an illustration, he stated that it is particularly unfortunate that the many youth and student groups in our Nation today are totally unaware of the extent to which they can be victimized and exploited by the Communists.

WORLD COMMUNIST MOVEMENT

The first volume of a selected chronology of major developments in the history of world communism, covering the years 1818–1945, was prepared for the committee by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress.

The volume documents the expansion of communism throughout the globe and, in the words of the committee chairman, provides "a basis of judging the continuity, tenacity, and all-encompassing character of the world Communist movement."

The chronology reveals that Communist Parties in all nations, including the United States, have, throughout their existence, followed slavishly the orders of the Kremlin.

Subsequent volumes will document major Communist developments through the year 1957, and an index to the overall chronology will be published.

CONSULTATIONS

Lest we forget

This pictorial account of communism in action—a vivid portrait of what communism really is as opposed to what it claims to be—is composed of photographs of events in the Soviet Union and 11 other nations which have become captives of communism. A commentary on the pictures and their significance is given by Klaus S. G. Romppanen, president of The Fight for Freedom—a Pictorial Exhibit from which the photographs were obtained.

The "liberating" Communist troops, torture instruments and chambers, mass graves of the murdered victims of communism, the "living dead" survivors of Communist concentration camps and organized starvation campaigns portrayed in this document throw the cold light of undeniable truth on the terror and violence used by Communists to subject the captive peoples of Europe to Communist domination and to crush the resistance of rebellious nationality groups within the Red empire. The photographs drive home, in a manner which words alone cannot, the true nature of the enemy that this country and all humanity faces.

SOVIET JUSTICE AND SLAVE LABOR CAMPS

A detailed account of the mockery that is Soviet justice, from initial arrest without any legal authority to final imprisonment in Siberian slave labor camps, was given the committee by Adam Joseph Galinski, a former Polish Government official who had fought in both the anti-Nazi and anti-Communist underground in Poland before spending almost 12 years in the Soviet prisons and slave labor camps in the Vorkuta area. Mr. Galinski also described the horrible conditions under which inmates of Soviet labor camps and prisons live. He stated that no one, not even Soviet Communist Party members, was allowed inside Soviet slave labor camps and described certain accounts of conditions in these camps, written by Americans who had allegedly visited them, as a tale out of "A Thousand and One Nights." He could account for the reports of these people which contradict all he learned of Soviet slave labor camps during his 12 years imprisonment, he said, only by information he heard while a prisoner that the Soviet Government operated "showplace" prisons which were populated by secret-police personnel posing as prisoners in order to hoodwink visiting foreigners. He branded as false the reports that the MVD (secret police) had been shorn of power over Soviet slave-labor camps in 1953. He also stated that America was a legend with the prisoners; that they hated the regime and looked forward to the downfall of the Communist regime.

COMMUNIST ECONOMIC WARFARE

Under present conditions trade with non-Communist nations may play the most important role in Moscow's drive for world domination, Dr. Robert Loring Allen, associate professor of economics at the University of Oregon, stated in a consultation with the committee. Military action is increasingly risky for the Soviet Union because of U.S. preparedness and the tremendous destructive power of nuclear weapons. The Kremlin is therefore stressing the use of nonmilitary weapons. Trade, Dr. Allen said, appears to most people to be a completely neutral, nonideological act. For this reason the Soviet Union, which uses trade as a weapon of conquest, might find it possible to utilize it in areas where other weapons such as political pressure, propaganda, and military action were not feasible. Trade is probably the cheapest and most profitable of the nonmilitary weapons in the Soviet arsenal, he said.

For the time being, Dr. Allen stated, the primary aim of the U.S.S.R. is not necessarily Communist Party rule of other nations but rather the transfer of their sovereignty to Moscow. This can be accomplished through trade which, in the vital economic field, can give the Soviet Union effective domination of other nations.

He also said that the Soviet Union has certain built-in advantages in its use of economic weapons against other nations: Soviet trade negotiators have behind them the full power of their Government, an element which their opposite numbers lack;

loan negotiations provide a means for obtaining detailed information on a nation's economic condition, and trade relations provide openings for political propaganda and also for the achievement of Soviet foreign policy objectives through economic pressure.

DUPING FOREIGNERS IN RED CHINA

A carefully calculated and highly organized procedure costing huge sums of money and including thousands of persons has been developed by the Red Chinese government to deceive visitors to that country, according to Robert Loh, who escaped through Hong Kong in the summer of 1957, after serving as a showcase capitalist and receptionist-host for visiting foreigners in Red China. Certain cities, he explained, have been designated by the regime for visits by foreigners. In each one there is a bureau employing thousands of interpreters and other highly trained personnel to take care of the visitors and to see that they are permitted to enter only certain mills, factories, and homes. Special hotels have been designated for the housing of visitors. These, too, are staffed with specially trained personnel and feature restaurants and shops in which are found better food and products at lower prices than are available to the Chinese people.

When important foreign dignitaries visit a city such as Shanghai, he revealed, as many as half a million people will be selected and trained to give the dignitary a proper "spontaneous" reception.

This huge Chinese operation of deceit has been so carefully prepared that the regime is successful in deceiving even trained newspapermen and skeptical anti-Communists who visit the country.

In China, Mr. Loh said: "Whatever the foreign visitors ask, they are bound to hear lies. No truth can be heard." He also said that the Chinese Communists use the same tactics of deception on visiting Communists that they use on the non-Communists.

LEGISLATION

Based upon extensive investigations and hearings, the committee reported favorably to the House the bill (H.R. 12753) introduced by the chairman to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, so as to require the registration of certain additional persons disseminating political propaganda within the United States. On August 22, 1960, the bill passed the House.

The committee also reported favorably the bill (H.R. 11580) introduced by the chairman to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, so as to provide that no individual who willfully fails or refuses to answer, or falsely answers, certain questions relating to Communist activities, when summoned to appear before certain Federal agencies, shall be employed on any merchant vessel of the United States, or within certain waterfront facilities in the United States.

Poland and America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAT McNAMARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, at their 15th biennial national convention, the Polish Legion of American Veterans adopted a series of significant resolutions.

The resolutions reflect a great awareness by this group of patriotic American citizens of the basic conflict that exists in our world today—the conflict between freedom and totalitarianism.

Perhaps it is natural that the members of the Polish Legion of American Veterans would exhibit this awareness. These men are, of course, veterans of the American Armed Forces, and thus they know the horrors of war.

At the same time, however, they have another common bond, that of a cultural relationship with a Polish homeland, and quite frequently, a blood relationship with those who are citizens of that nation.

We all are proud of our Americanism, but we also can be proud of the homeland of our fathers. In the case of Polish-Americans, this pride is tempered by the fact that Poland is still under the heel of communistic totalitarianism.

The fact that Poland, no doubt because of the will and the spirit of her people, has done much to resist total communistic encompassment, still does not ease the pain that exists when there is not complete freedom.

Thus, the resolutions adopted by the PLAV take note of the need for their America to remain strong and also of the necessity that the plight of Poland and her sister nations not be forgotten.

I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from these resolutions be printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE POLISH LEGION OF AMERICAN VETERANS AT THEIR 15TH BIENNIAL NATIONAL CONVENTION, CHICAGO, ILL.

1. As loyal patriotic American citizens, we pledge our loyalty to the United States of America, and we hereby renew our military oath to defend and fight for our country.

2. In memory of those comrades who have given their lives for their country and in honor of those who have suffered combat wounds and disabilities, we pledge ourselves to fight communism at home and throughout the entire world in order that we spread democracy and promote free enterprise everywhere.

3. On this 21st anniversary of the invasion of Poland and the commencement of World War II and in light of Soviet domination of Poland through military occupation, we pledge ourselves to continue our demands for the restoration of freedom to our brothers in Poland. We urge the President of the United States to use his high office for this purpose.

4. We urge that military appropriations of the United States be kept at a high level with the primary goal being an adequate military defense and that fiscal and budgetary considerations be made secondary. We urge a reappraisal of our entire defense policy in order to determine its adequacy with the following objectives in mind: (a) An adequate retaliatory force to deter any aggressor in a nuclear war; (b) an adequate Military Establishment to assure victory in the cold war; (c) economic power sufficient to assure victory in economic warfare with Communist imperialism.

5. In this presidential election year we urge the candidates for that high office to use restraint in their campaign promises, in order that the cruel hoax perpetrated by one of the candidates in 1952 should not be repeated, when he promised to wage war for the liberation of Poland; he gained votes at the price of human misery.

We further urge that our Government carry on its dealings with the people behind the Iron Curtain on a high plane and at a realistic level so that there be no repetition in any part of the world of the 1956 Hungarian uprising with its bloodletting; this uprising was the result of false hope of liberation and aid which had been promised to the Hungarian peoples.

6. The impending visit of Mr. Khrushchev to the United Nations and the United States is met with mixed feelings by the PLAV. In the light of the aborted summit conference of May 1960 and the indignities to which President Eisenhower was exposed in Paris at that time, we, of the PLAV, urge that there should be no enthusiasm shown for Mr. Khrushchev on his arrival in the United States. However, in the event that the head of the Russian Government desires to confer with our President on the subject of disarmament, or to discuss other problems in order to relieve world tensions, we feel that it is the duty of President Eisenhower to receive Mr. Khrushchev for this purpose. It must never be said that the United States is unwilling to discuss world problems with those whose views differ from our own. A failure to accede to the request for a conference with Mr. Khrushchev would be utilized to the fullest by the Russians in their propaganda in the uncommitted parts of the world.

7. We support our comrades in arms—the Veterans of Foreign Wars—in their stand that American schools should teach all children the basic principles of communism. This course should be included in order that our children may compare our way of life with the Communist methods and in order that they may determine for themselves the superiority of democracy and free enterprise over totalitarianism and communism.

8. We urge that the Federal Government assist primary and secondary education throughout the entire United States by substantial appropriations in order that (a) the education standards of the entire country be raised to the highest level possible; (b) that those portions of the country whose standards fall below the national average be elevated in order that all children in the United States be given the same education; (c) that gifted children be given the opportunity for advanced training and study on a college and graduate level, without regard to their own financial situation.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, it is vitally important that we Americans never forget that millions of human beings—literally, our brothers and sisters—are forced against their will to live under dictatorship.

As soon as this is forgotten, as soon as we become complacent with our material benefits and lazy in our minds, we, ourselves, run the risk of becoming easy prey for the dictatorship of the Communist or the Fascist.

But when we keep firmly in mind that totalitarianism has subjugated millions of persons, and will take over still more if left alone by the free world, then we will be constantly alert to the dangers.

We cannot, of course, be content only with combating the Communist ideology in our own Nation. This is not good enough. It is intolerable to the American concept of freedom that people anywhere can be deprived of their liberty by force of arms.

That is why the fate of Poland—the dramatic fight of the Polish people—is also our fight.

In the case of Poland, we have a unique opportunity to combat communism.

In the first place, the peoples of America and Poland are historically friendly. Millions of Poles have emigrated to the United States, many of them to my own State of Michigan.

This has established a strong bond between our two countries, a bond which, we trust, never will be severed.

But there is another common ground between us: the inherent love of freedom.

The Polish Constitution of 1791 is a remarkable document, one that established a parliamentary system and which noted:

All power in civil society is derived from the will of the people.

Unhappily, events in Europe conspired to stifle that birth of freedom—stifle it but not kill it, because freedom's flame still burns.

We will never forget when that flame burst out in 1956 when the heroic people of Poznan turned on their Communist oppressors.

The common bond of the love of freedom and the cultural ties between our two countries make it all the more necessary that our Government maintain a constructive relationship with the Government of Poland, even though it is a Communist government.

In so doing, we can help keep the flame of freedom burning, and we can show the people of Poland that their faith and their hopes have not been shattered.

In recent years, more than $200 million in agricultural commodities have gone to the people of Poland.

We must continue that sort of properly administered aid. We must liberalize our immigration laws to provide a haven for the displaced.

We must keep alive the traditions and the heritage of Polish freedom, as with the issuance in October of a "champion of liberty" commemorative stamp honoring Ignace Jan Paderewski. I am honored to serve, incidentally, on the Paderewski Centennial Committee.

I must make special note, however, of the resolution numbered 5 which I have placed in the RECORD.

This resolution emphasizes the danger in making false promises to the people of Poland and the other Communist-controlled countries; promises too often recklessly made by some politicians. These can lead only to bloodshed and not to freedom.

But with the constructive efforts I have mentioned, I believe that the day will come when, with the help of God, Poland will again be free.

Congressman Moeller Reports to His District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. MOELLER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, for more than three decades the 10th Congressional District of Ohio—the great district I now have the honor and privilege to represent in Washington—was served by my good friend, the late Tom Jenkins, of Ironton.

During his many years of service, Tom Jenkins kept his district informed about what was going on in Washington, particularly those legislative issues affecting the 10th District. I have tried to do the same by sending a periodic newsletter, prepared at my own expense, except for the privilege of the frank, to the people of the 10th District. This newsletter, "News Briefs From Washington," has been so well received that the initial printing of 3,000 copies has been increased to 7,000. These are distributed solely to constituents who have specifically asked me to send the newsletter whenever it is issued.

The overwhelming response in favor of my newsletter now prompts me to prepare and circulate a concise report on the 86th Congress for the information of all residents of the 10th District. Every public official in or out of office, in my opinion, has the just and proper obligation—and I might add, the moral duty—to comply with that Biblical injunction: "Give an account of thy stewardship." Luke 16: 2.

While it is obviously impossible to record in this brief account every word and every action I took in behalf of the people of the 10th District, I am placing into the public record this summary of my efforts and work in their behalf and my personal views and stand upon some of the great issues which came before the Congress.

Some of the most satisfying and rewarding moments of my work during the past 2 years for the 10th District came from the very many favorable results I managed to obtain for those persons who came to me for help. While vitally important to the people concerned, these problems often found quick solution either through a phone call to the Federal officials in charge or a telegram or letter to the field office having jurisdiction. Others were more challenging, requiring concentrated effort and many hours of work. At all times, however, it was my privilege to share the problems and uncertainties of someone in need and deserving of help. The cherished and heartwarming expressions of thanks from the very many people I have managed to help will remain always with me as the greatest reward public service can offer.

Early in the 86th Congress, Mr. Speaker, I was tremendously pleased to be given the highly coveted assignment to the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, the new major standing committee of the House which is the legislative pioneer on the vital problems of space research and development. Dealing with highly technical, scientific research activities and exercising jurisdiction over almost entirely new frontiers of science, the committee has been one of the busiest and hardest working in the House, so much so that it has earned the Holmes Alexander Award as the Outstanding Congressional Committee of the Year.

In the second session alone, this committee conducted some 27 investigations, in many of which I was privileged to participate, whose scope ranged from exploration at the bottom of the sea to Army plans for construction on the moon. My experience and background on this vital committee have already provided direct benefits to Ohio and I shall continue my efforts to see to it that our State receives its equitable share of all Federal awards dealing with space research, missile and allied activities.

The distinguished chairman of this committee, the Honorable OVERTON BROOKS, has indeed been kind to single out my work as a member of subcommittee No. 2 and the special investigating subcommittee. Just recently, Chairman BROOKS wrote me in part, as follows:

I would like to take this opportunity to let you know how much I value your efforts on behalf of the committee during the past 2 years, and how much I have enjoyed the close association we have had in working together to make the committee what it is today.

Your contributions to the success and recognition of the committee are immeasurable. Among these, I feel you have made a major contribution because of your work on subcommittee No. 2 and the special investigating subcommittee, and your record of attendance at committee meetings is outstanding.

As a freshman Member of Congress, I was deeply honored—and in a sense overwhelmed—by my designation early in the 86th Congress to be an official delegate of the U.S. House of Representatives to the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference in London. My attendance at this conference, made up of some 650 delegates from the NATO countries of the world, was a stimulating and instructive experience in international relations. It was my good fortune to be named a member of the Spiritual and Cultural Committee at the London Conference which attracted such world leaders as Prime Minister of England Harold Macmillan; Lt. Gen. James M. Gavin; the late Clement Attlee, former Prime Minister of England; Dr. Richard Jaeger, vice president of the West German Parliament; and Nils Langhelle, president of the Norwegian Parliament.

Mr. Speaker, the 86th Congress dealt with many issues. In fact, the House alone during 1959 and 1960 considered nearly 2,000 individual pieces of legislation. Of necessity, I am prevented from full comment on all this varied and extensive legislation and, therefore, will touch only upon some of the major legislative issues affecting the people of the 10th District.

One of the greatest tragedies I have observed during my professional life and more recently during my service in Congress has been the spectacle of many of our older citizens, in what should be the golden years, actually finding themselves in the evening of their lives in privation and want. After a lifetime of toil in industry or on the farm, after spending their earnings in bringing up, supporting, and educating their children, and after contributing their productive years to the strength and wealth of this Nation, these worthy folks often find themselves discarded and unwanted.

The plight of these good people has been of deep personal concern to me and that is why I actively supported and worked for the liberalization of the social security program. My live interest in the aged, based upon conditions I have observed personally, has been intensified by the very many pleas for assistance which have been reaching me in increasing number.

As they enter the fifties and sixties, many American citizens are faced with new problems and new changes in their lives. Often the serious illness of one partner has meant exhausted savings, depleted resources, and often the bare necessities of life if public charity is to be avoided.

While the Congress has grappled periodically with the problem of adequate social security retirement benefits to meet steadily rising living costs, this year a small step toward effectuating a medical care program for the aged was taken by the 86th Congress with the passage of H.R. 12580, which I supported.

However, this is not the complete answer to the high cost of hospitalization and chronic sickness for the aged and their families. Many instances have come to my attention where substantial, hard-working people, suffering from chronic illness after and sometimes before retirement, have had their entire life savings eaten away by heavy medical expenses for hospital, medical, and nursing care.

For the rich and poor alike, this is no problem. The rich can afford to pay. The poor have our social and welfare agencies to which they can turn. For the rank and file of our people, for the hard-working little businessman, the great middle class, professional people and the like who cannot turn this burden over to others, the high cost of medical and hospital care is truly staggering.

I pledge myself anew to continue my work in the Congress to correct the imperfections and injustices of our present laws dealing with the aged so that all these worthy persons, who are truly one of America's great assets, instead of an unwanted liability, such as is now tragically often the case, may enjoy the peace of mind that comes from security from want and misery. This is the sacred cause to which I shall continue to devote unstinted energy and devotion.

Mr. Speaker, inflationary conditions present another tremendously serious problem to all Americans, whether young or old. Constantly rising prices bring new demands for corresponding rises in wages and thus the vicious spiral continues unabated to the point where purchasing power lags far behind consumer prices. The Federal Government must encourage and stimulate increased industrial production and capacity; not hinder or obstruct small business through bureaucratic interference, confiscatory taxes, and the unwise manipulation of interest rates.

The Presidential veto of the depressed areas bill, which had my strong support and vote because of its tremendous potential to the 10th District, was most unwise. I believe the President was not given all the facts when this bill came to him for signature. In May of this year, I urged the President to sign this needed legislation and during the debate in the House, I cited the three counties in Ohio, including our own Meigs County, where this Federal program would do much to revive industrial growth and help provide jobs for our people.

I shall continue to work vigorously in Congress for a Federal program of action to provide jobs—and that is what my people want, not handouts—to maintain a greater and more prosperous American economy.

It is my belief that we should rehabilitate those areas in need in our own country instead of fostering industries abroad which compete with American plants. I sponsored legislation to protect American industry against foreign competition and will continue my fight in the next Congress to obtain adequate safeguards to protect our industries and the jobs of American workers against the influx of cheaply produced foreign goods which are flooding this country. This cut-throat foreign competition is threatening our industries and prosperity, reducing Federal revenue and creating unemployment in many areas of the country and is hurting our own industries in Ohio. I cite particularly those producing clay products, glass, leather goods including baseball gloves, and canvas footwear. Ohio cannot afford to lose any industries in competition with the 10- and 12-cents-an-hour wages in some countries of the world which have built up their industries under our foreign aid program at the expense of the heavily taxed American worker and American industry.

We must not promote the disintegration of our own essential domestic industries at the expense of our own hard-working people who pay the bill for grandiose foreign aid handouts. I, for one, will continue to seek a more realistic regard and consideration for the interest and needs of American workers and American industries and the general prosperity of the Nation.

Another pressing domestic problem in an area where the Federal Government plays a vital role is the completion of the comprehensive program to end disastrous floods in the Ohio Basin. Much has been done to alleviate flood conditions in many parts of the basin, but there still is work to be done, especially in those areas which were hit by last year's floods.

During the 86th Congress, I vigorously worked for the vital Belleville locks and dam project, which upon completion will do so much to prevent a repetition of the disastrous floods of the past. I held many conferences with the Army Engineers in Washington and in Ohio on this $57 million project and also sought the aid of my colleagues on the House Appropriations Committee, including Ohio's distinguished Congressman MIKE KIRWAN, to make available the necessary funds to get this project under way.

My pleas were successful and the Army Engineers will now be able to complete the necessary detailed planning of the Belleville project with the $250,000 appropriated by Congress this year. The Congress voted $125,000 last year for preliminary Belleville planning.

While additional funds for actual construction would have been desirable, budgetary restrictions and professional engineering estimates have deferred construction until such time as the planning is in the advanced stages. The Belleville work, which will require 5 or 6 years to complete, will be the largest Federal project ever constructed in the 10th District and, naturally, I shall seek construction funds in the next Congress. I have already been assured of the support of the Army Engineers and some members of the House Appropriations Committee in this vital matter.

During the 86th Congress, Mr. Speaker, I sought by voice and by vote to support a truly people's government. I have worked for world peace and freedom for oppressed people everywhere, being the sponsor of the Peace Agency bill which has attracted wide interest and support. I have stood for tolerance and understanding, supporting such bills as civil rights, expanded social security, Federal pay raise, emergency housing, extension of GI home loans, minimum wage, and many other progressive measures.

I believe that it has become generally recognized in the 10th District that I have acted at all times to insure, by voice and deed, higher standards of living for our people, that I have sought equal opportunities for the humblest citizen, that I have worked for health and education benefits, that I have supported legislation providing more generous aid for the aged, the needy, and the infirm, that I have actively promoted legislation seeking to encourage small business and American industry.

These are all on the public record. These are actions that have received the unqualified endorsement of very many individuals and groups within the 10th District who have given me their wholehearted approval of the record of honorable public service I have sought to give my district.

For the second time, I am sponsoring for the 10th District a U.S. Government Day, which has attracted wide attention and support from the various Federal agencies which serve Ohio. This has been termed an unprecedented service to the district in some quarters because in no other part of our great land has there been such an extensive program evolved for the sole benefit of a congressional district so that the people might meet and discuss problems of mutual interest directly with the Federal officials concerned.

In addition, this year with the cooperation of the various school leaders in my district, it was possible for me to bring to Washington at my expense several outstanding boys and girls who saw their Federal Government in action. This program received wide acclaim in educational and other circles and attracted wide interest not only in Ohio but throughout the country. These talented youngsters spent a week as my guests in Washington where they took active part in the operation of my office and also had the opportunity to observe, in between several rounds of

sightseeing, the intricate workings of their Federal Government.

These are simply some of the highlights so to speak, Mr. Speaker, of my first term of office as Congressman from the 10th District of Ohio. As it can be seen, I have always endeavored to work in the best interest of the people of my district and have done my very best to provide them with responsible representation, clothing the office with the dignity and honor it deserves. I know that the people of the 10th District, mindful of the many years of dedicated service rendered by the esteemed Tom Jenkins to this district, and knowing what I have sought to accomplish for this same district, will want to continue this record of devoted and honorable service.

Congressman Harold R. Collier Reports to the People of the 10th District of Illinois

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I take this opportunity to provide the residents of the 10th Congressional District of Illinois with a brief résumé of major legislation and of my activities as their Representative in the 86th Congress.

Looking back over my 4 years as a Member of Congress of the United States, I say unhesitatingly that my two greatest concerns have been maintaining peace in a world of great international tensions, as well as a strong national defense through military and economic stability.

In spite of the delicate and critical situations which have developed in the face of Communist threats, we can still look with optimistic hope that a permanent peace will be achieved. To accomplish this, we have strengthened our national defense to a point where today we are the most powerful nation on earth. This has been accomplished in the face of maintaining a balanced budget in both 1959 and 1960.

Certainly our national security is dependent upon the economic strength of our free-enterprise system, which can only be weakened unless prudence in national fiscal affairs is exercised by those who control the Federal purse strings.

While there are those in the Congress who prefer to avoid any discussion of the national debt through expansion of increased Federal spending programs, we must inevitably face this problem realistically if we are to keep our internal security abreast in strength with our national defense.

We must never lose sight of the fact that the services and the doles provided by the Federal Treasury come alone from tax dollars. We must remember, too, that tax dollars sent to Washington for expenditure by the Federal Government shrink in their spending power because of excessive administrative costs of bureaucracy. The businessman, factory workers, and housewife alike feel the squeeze of inflation and higher taxes, and a retiree and pensioner is in no way immune from the effects of inflation. It is my opinion that a good legislator must keep this in mind when the temptation of yielding to pressure groups confronts him, particularly during an election year.

The 86th Congress has certain achievements to which it can point with pride and failures which certainly the American public have been quick to recognize.

SUMMARY

The 86th Congress convened on January 7, 1959, and adjourned September 1, 1960. The Senate was in session 280 days and the House 265 days. Both Houses filled nearly 36,000 pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. From the standpoint of legislation introduced, there were 20,164 public and private bills, joint resolutions, and so forth, introduced in the Senate and House of Representatives. Only a fraction of these bills were finally enacted into law. To date, 1,130 new public laws have resulted from the work of the 86th Congress; many of these were private bills or legislation of a minor nature, however.

COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS

During the 86th Congress I served as a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs during the first session and the full session on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Both are major legislative committees. I am also on the Subcommittee on Transportation and Aeronautics of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. In extracurricular duties in Washington, I was the past year reelected to the board of governors of the National Rocket Society, vice president of the Illinois State Society of Washington, and a member of the legislative Republican policy committee of the House.

HAWAIIAN STATEHOOD

After many years of deliberation, the 86th Congress voted statehood for Hawaii in one of the most historic actions in recent history. As a member of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee during the 85th Congress and the 1st session of this Congress, I helped formulate the legislation which granted statehood for the Territory of Hawaii, as well as our 49th State, Alaska, which gained its status as a State a year prior.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

With a current defense budget of approximately $40 billion, we have built a well-balanced, flexible and retaliatory force to keep the peace, and I have supported necessary appropriations for these measures. My support of our national defense program is based on my convictions that we must be constantly alert and ready to meet any additions and revisions necessary to produce the unmistakable margin of military supremacy upon which our national security rests. A strong national defense is, in the world in which we live today, a deterrent to war; for those who would attack us would do so perhaps quickly if we were a vulnerable nation.

LABOR

Enactment of the Landrum-Griffin bill went down in history as the major legislative achievement of this past Congress. After many months of hearings by the McClellan Subcommittee on Labor Union Abuses, Congress passed this law in one of the most heated legislative sessions in history. There were those who said the law did not go far enough and others who insisted that it went too far. The fact of the matter is that the Landrum-Griffin bill, while not everything that the proponents and opponents found entirely satisfactory, was basically a sound and effective compromise. It prescribed regulations for the accounting and reporting of union dues and funds and outlawed blackmail picketing and secondary boycotting.

Title I of the act, generally known as the bill of rights, is designed to guarantee rank-and-file workers important, fundamental democratic rights within their unions. Many examples could be cited to demonstrate this legislation has had a wholesome impact upon the conduct of union affairs.

BUDGETARY ANALYSIS

In his state of the Union address in January, President Eisenhower predicted a budget surplus for 1960–61. As the current session came to an end, it appears that this surplus will approximate $1 billion.

There were certain legislative proposals which would have completely eaten away this surplus and created a deficit had it not been for the efforts of the determined minority and executive leaders to hold the line. Certainly, however, the pressures were perhaps greater in this election year than at any other time during my tenure of office. Ardent supporters of the big spending programs will undoubtedly renew their fight when the 87th Congress convenes in January. There are those who have little conception of the costs of the national debt which has accumulated over the past three decades. As a matter of fact, if all the spend-ourselves-rich bills had been passed, it is estimated that our annual budget would be in excess of $125 billion annually. So much for the budget.

THE FARM PROGRAM

The patchwork quilt of farm legislation with its system of controls offers no visible solution in our agricultural economy. Such proposals as might have been identified as a reincarnation of the old Brannan plan were offered during this session. Needless to say, the basic impracticality of the program doomed it to failure. The Senate did pass a wheat bill which would have cut both acreage allotments and support prices. All in all it seemed that there were those in Congress who obviously preferred a political issue to any possible solution. As a result, one program after another went down the drain and into pigeonholes and Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson was made the "whipping boy" as

every sound program was watered down until nothing workable remained.

SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICAL CARE

The proposed Forand bill which would have provided medical care for a portion of the elder citizens failed. Instead, the social security legislation adopted liberalized the $1,200-a-year earning limit for recipients and further provides disability payments at any age instead of after 50 years. This was adopted instead of a proposal lowering the retirement age for the men to 62 years.

The medical care bill for elder citizens finally adopted provided for $202 million a year in Federal contributions to the States to help pay medical bills for elderly people on the welfare rolls.

The fight over this legislation was one of the major political issues of the session, and the medical care bill finally adopted was the result of a complete inability to agree on any of the more sweeping proposals.

TAXATION

A bill to permit American business firms that operate in more than one foreign country the option of lumping all their overseas profits and losses in figuring taxes was adopted this year. A bipartisan majority supported this program which they said encourages overseas assistance in undeveloped countries. This, however, remains to be seen.

There were many proposed tax changes but most were put over until next year when rate cuts, as well as an overhauling of depreciation provisions will be a major issue.

Congress did reduce transportation excise tax from 10 percent to 5 percent but reversed the original House position on a bill to remove the excise tax on telephone service. Your representative was one of those who introduced original legislation in these fields.

A WELL-INFORMED CONSTITUENCY

In my opinion, a well-informed constituency is paramount to an understanding of a Congressman's work and the important functions of government. For this reason, I established a policy of publishing a newsletter on congressional activity as well as my stand on every major legislative issue. More than 500,000 of these were mailed to citizens and taxpayers in my district. Everyone who indicated his or her desire to be placed on my mailing list received these reports. In addition, my staff sent out news releases regularly and special reports on more complex legislation.

I also conducted a public opinion poll throughout my district in the form of a questionnaire sent to approximately 50,000 homes representing a random cross section of the people.

Shortly after my election to Congress, I established a district congressional office which was open this past session every day 8 hours to assist the public in problems which arose while Congress was in session and during the recess.

Following adjournment of Congress in August of last year, I remained in my district until we reconvened and delivered 60 speeches of a nonpolitical nature on congressional activity, appearing before civic and church groups, service organizations, and even high school classes throughout the district.

My staff assisted several hundred residents of the district who visited Washington with their families during the past 4 years. In fact, we dedicated our efforts to being as close to each and every citizen as was humanly possible because we felt the need of bringing the activities of the Federal Government close to those who are affected by the laws which we pass and who must assume the burden of the cost of the vast operation of the Federal Government. My district office is located at 6608 West Cermak Road, Berwyn, Pioneer 9–4115. I welcome the opportunity to hear from you.

The Best Naval Reserve Unit in the Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, last year it was my pleasant duty to attend the ceremonies awarding the coveted Forrestal trophy to a unit of the Naval Reserve Training Center at Whitestone, in my home county of Queens. This trophy is awarded to the best Naval Reserve surface division out of the more than 300 throughout the country. These Reserve units are judged on the basis of achievement in the following areas: on-board strength, attendance at drills, active duty for training, petty officer participation and advancement in rating. The unit with the highest cumulative score wins the trophy.

I have just been advised that the same unit, Surface Division 3–77, has accomplished the singular achievement of winning this award again this year and, as Vice Adm. Charles Wellborn, Jr., said in his telegram of congratulations:

It is hard to reach the top position but in this program, it is harder to repeat the performance.

In further recognition, the Chief of Naval Operations, Adm. Arleigh A. Burke, said in a telegram to the division:

By repeating your 1959 performance you have become the first division ever to win the James V. Forrestal trophy twice. My heartiest congratulations to each member of your Surface Division 3–77 for your sustained outstanding record.

The U.S. Naval Reserve Training Center at Whitestone comprises two surface divisions, 3–77 and 3–76; a CB Division 3–17; a Naval Security Group 3–1; CED Company 3–42; Ship Activation Maintenance and Repair Division 3–3. It is also the home of the Reserve crew for the U.S.S. *Harris*. These units afford training for approximately 800 men and officers. The commanding officer of this important naval training center, Comdr. Robert J. Stankowski, who now has to his credit two winners in 2 consecutive years, also should be commended for bringing in his CB Division 3–17 in third place this year in national competition, and for the fifth-place spot that was awarded to Naval Security Group Division 3–1. Such accomplishment could only be achieved by deep and sincere dedication and devotion to the cause of the Navy, unceasing work, and intelligent leadership—my hat is off to him.

No less honors should go to Comdr. A. D. Oder, commanding officer of Battalion 3–22, who commanded Surface Division 3–77 during the period of its Forrestal winning competition last year, and who has since understandably been promoted to the command of the entire battalion.

The commanding officer of the winning Division 3–77 is Lt. Comdr. Prentice Cushing, Jr., of Douglaston, Queens, who guided his division to victory in grueling competition, and who has demonstrated the ability to keep a top team in topflight shape.

It is indeed gratifying to me to know that the Navy has an active, vigorous, training program. I am glad also that the best Reserve unit in the entire country is in my own county of Queens. I hope that the Whitestone Training Center will continue to be the finest and it is my hope that the Department of the Navy will give appropriate recognition to these splendid officers.

Report to the People of the First Congressional District of Idaho

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GRACIE PFOST

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, as you know, this recently adjourned session of the 86th Congress was one of the longest and most spirited in history. I was kept busy representing the people of Idaho not only in the House, but also on my committee assignments with the House Interior Committee and the Public Works Committee. As part of my duties as chairman of the Public Lands Subcommittee I steered through Congress scores of important measures vital to our State and the Nation. In addition, I testified before both House and Senate committees on various matters affecting the Gem State. I took part in House debates on many bills and answered the many thousands of letters from the people in the First Congressional District of Idaho. The Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission of which I am a member has also required much of my time in studying the recreation, conservation, and development needs of our country.

IDAHO MATTERS

Important to Idaho was an amendment to the $2 billion omnibus highway bill under which our State will get some $2 million in extra funds for forest access and development roads during the next 2 years. Legislation which I cosponsored expanded the Federal school milk program and provided Idaho schoolchildren

with more than 5 million half pints of milk during the past school year.

The State's library program was aided through passage of the Library Services Act under which Idaho will receive almost $73,000 in Federal funds next year, and roughly similar amounts for the succeeding 4 years. Two of my bills clarifying land titles for the Nez Perce Indians were approved. I backed legislation authorizing the Government to strike 10,000 special centennial medals for the celebration of Idaho's 100th anniversary as a Territory in 1963. I sponsored a bill transferring a 2,400-acre area along the Cascade Reservoir in Valley County from the Reclamation Bureau to the Forst Service, thus paving the way for its development as recreation and camping sites.

FARMING

Little was done to help the farmer in the 86th Congress, mainly because of the wide gap between the congressional viewpoint and that of the Eisenhower-Nixon administration. A bill designed to benefit the wheat farmer, which I cosponsored, was vetoed by the President. Another bill I sponsored to lift the income level of the small family farmer also fell by the wayside. Net farm income is still $3.5 billion below 1952, even though the Republican administration has spent more on its farm programs in 7 years than was spent by all previous administrations since the Department of Agriculture was founded in 1861.

I sponsored a bill under which funds were appropriated to underwrite a more effective program for eradication of the dread cattle disease, brucellosis. The administration tried to cut this program back drastically. I was able to cut red-tape and help secure a number of rural electrification loans, including $284,000 for the Idaho County Light & Power Co-op Association.

After viewing frost damage to the fruit of Canyon, Gem, and Payette Counties, I helped get them designated as emergency loan areas for the farmers. Congress rewrote the sugar laws and there is a good chance Idaho's sugar beet quota will be increased in the near future. I vigorously opposed extension by the United States of its sugar-buying agreement with Castro's Communist-controlled Cuba, and I sponsored a price support bill to improve conditions for the dairy farmers which is now law.

MINING

I sponsored—and helped push through the House—a bill to aid the hard hit lead-zinc industry, including many small mine operators in Idaho. As you know, the measure was killed by a Presidential veto. I supported a depressed areas bill, under which the Government would have pumped fresh economic life into depressed areas, including Shoshone County, but this, too, was vetoed. I also went to bat for our torpedoed cobalt industry, urging that domestic mines—mainly in Idaho—be favored over foreign imports.

BUDGET

The 86th Congress pared White House budget requests by $211.6 million. This brought the overall amount by which Democrats have slashed administration budgets during the past 7 years by $12.7 billion. And, despite taxing you more than ever before in American history, this administration has added $20 billion to the national debt during those years. The interest on the national debt alone is now costing us taxpayers more than $8 billion a year—almost $1 million every hour. Roosevelt's highest peacetime budget totaled just $9 billion and Mr. Truman's peacetime budget $39 billion. Truman trimmed the national debt by $3 billion during his 7 years in office.

MEDICAL CARE—SOCIAL SECURITY

Congress approved a very modest medical-care-for-the-aged program. This measure will largely help those presently on public assistance, if the State provides enabling legislation to match Federal funds. Congress also made slight improvements in social security laws—raising the earning limitation from $1,200 to $1,500 for those who must work to supplement their income.

SCHOOLS

I supported a broad school program designed to strengthen the Nation's educational system, with no Federal control. Despite official figures from the U.S. Office of Education showing the Nation to be short 132,000 classrooms this fall, with 800,000 children on double shifts, the House Rules Committee blocked final action on the measure.

In summary, the adjournment of the 86th Congress marked the longest period of divided Government in history. For 6 years, the executive branch of the Government has been controlled by one political party and the Congress by another. This past Congress did not accomplish all I had hoped for, but it faced up to some of the most controversial issues of our times. In view of the circumstances, its achievements were substantial. Important gains were made for both Idaho and the Nation.

Plan Needed To Stabilize Domestic Livestock Prices and Create Methods To Expand Trade in Our World Markets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD G. WOLF

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, in light of the growing seriousness of this problem, I have urged the Secretary of Agriculture to call an emergency nationwide conference of livestock producers in order to formulate an overall plan which will stabilize domestic livestock prices and create methods and procedures by which our world markets in this vital area of our economy can be expanded.

I have asked the Secretary of Agriculture the following questions, the answers to which I believe will shed some light on this fast deteriorating situation:

First. Are there any Agriculture Department policy decisions which might have caused the astonishing rise in the importation of red meats while our export markets for most livestock industry products have remained very sluggish?

Second. Have rapidly falling farm livestock prices been the result of the tremendous increase of red meats from abroad, plus the decision of certain meat processing industries to constrict the domestic market in a quest for greater and greater profits in the short run?

Third. Why is it that our agricultural producers who are acknowledged to be the most efficient in the world are not only losing their own domestic markets but are unable to increase their markets abroad?

Fourth. In light of the fact that the annual fall hog market glut will be upon us in a very few days, do you now have any plans to deal with the problem? I need not tell you that it becomes more urgent than ever that a comprehensive plan go into effect immediately.

Congresswoman Dwyer Reports on the 86th Congress and Union County

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, in keeping with the custom of many Members of Congress—and with a practice I have followed for the past 3 years—I am reporting to the people of the 6th Congressional District of New Jersey on the 2d session of the 86th Congress.

First, I shall review the record of this election-year Congress, and then my own activities as the Representative of the people of Union County.

I have found it an immensely challenging and rewarding experience to represent the more than half million people of our county in the House of Representatives. With this report go my thanks and gratitude for the privilege of acting in your behalf here in our Nation's Capital.

A DOUBLE FAILURE

I cannot recall another session of Congress which denied a President so many of his major legislative requests and which failed to enact so much of the program of the leadership of that Congress.

Here are several of the bills which died at adjournment:

Assistance to the States for construction of schools and classrooms.

An increase in the minimum wage, and broader coverage of the wage-and-hour laws.

Legislation to help keep passenger trains in operation.

Aid to economically depressed areas.

Liberalization of the immigration laws, which have made it difficult to reunite families.

A revised farm program which would ease the burden of surpluses on the consumer and taxpayer.

Establishment of a commission to help assure equal job opportunity under Government contracts.

Home rule for the District of Columbia, where residents are still denied the right to vote.

Creation of new Federal judgeships to help relieve the strain on the Federal courts.

A clean elections bill.

Authority to manage the public debt in a noninflationary manner, and a great many other important measures.

Ultimately, the blame for this failure must be placed on the partisan attitude of an election-year Congress—an attitude which valued political advantage more than legislative achievement, and made reasonable compromise frequently unobtainable.

This means that the 87th Congress will be faced with an unusually demanding schedule of major legislation—legislation, including several bills I have helped get started, which will require of Congressmen their devoted and effective attention if further valuable time is not to be lost.

ANOTHER BALANCED BUDGET

There was relatively little talk this year about balancing the budget or cutting Federal spending—for several reasons. The economy is in good shape. Employment and personal incomes reached record high levels. The budget submitted by the President to Congress last January indicated a surplus of about $4.1 billion, and since no budget-busting legislation was allowed to become law, there is reason to expect some kind of surplus next June 30. Since last year's Federal budget was also balanced, this will mean 2 straight years of black ink in the Nation's account books.

We are still benefiting, too, from the big tax reduction which President Eisenhower put through in 1954. Our national tax bill this year is approximately $10 billion less than it would have been had income taxes not been cut. That is an average tax saving of nearly $60 for every man, woman, and child in our country today.

Legislatively, the two big issues dominating this 2d session of the 86th Congress were civil rights and medical care for the elderly. In both cases, the legislation finally adopted by Congress fell far short of the hopes of sponsors, although all-out opponents of civil rights and medical care legislation were also displeased.

An intensive, well-organized filibuster by southern Democrats in the Senate stripped the President's civil rights recommendations to little more than a voting rights bill, and even this was hedged about by so many cumbersome procedures that the bill may be difficult to enforce.

MEDICAL CARE FOR ELDERLY

In the case of medical care for the elderly, Congress established a brand-new program, but it also gave new strength to the political issue by approving the weakest, least adequate version of the legislation.

The bill finally adopted by Congress did two things, principally: First, it provided more generous Federal grants to States for medical care for people on relief under existing old-age relief programs, and second, it initiated similar medical care programs for elderly persons not on relief but who are determined by States to be unable to pay their medical bills.

While the House was prevented from voting directly on either of the two more comprehensive versions of medical care legislation, it was clear from the Senate voting that the great majority of Senators favored a broader program than the one adopted. This means, I feel sure, that medical care for the elderly will be a major issue in the fall elections and, with the beginning of the 87th Congress next January, renewed efforts will be made to broaden the program or to replace it with a social security-type program. Recommendations of the White House Conference on the Aging, meeting in January, will be important in clarifying this issue.

Although the medical-care legislation was not made a part of the social security system, it was incorporated in a bill making broad changes in the social security laws. Some of these changes will be of special interest to Union County, where 30,000 or more retired people are now receiving social security benefits.

SOCIAL SECURITY CHANGES

The bill made persons eligible for benefits who worked in jobs covered by social security only one calendar quarter of every three quarters, rather than in one of every two. It authorized payment of benefits to survivors of workers who died before 1940 and had at least six quarters of coverage. It increased benefits for surviving children. It brought new categories of employment under social security, including employees of nonprofit organizations.

The bill also changed investment provisions so as to obtain a higher yield from social security trust funds; increased annual authorizations for maternal and child health services, services for crippled children, and child welfare; permitted persons receiving aid to the blind to earn additional income without sacrificing benefits; and extended the coverage of the unemployment compensation system.

The bill also made a rather weak gesture in the direction of liberalizing the present earnings limitation which penalizes persons receiving social security who earn more than $1,200 a year. The change would reduce somewhat the amount of benefits lost by persons earning between $1,200 and $1,500—but not much.

The time is long overdue, I believe, when the earnings limitation should be raised at least to $2,400, as I have proposed in bills I introduced in both the 85th and 86th Congresses. This is not only a matter of justice to people who have earned their social security benefits, but it is also sound national policy to encourage older people who wish to do so to continue to use their experience and talents after they have formally retired. Medical authorities are virtually unanimous in recommending this, and certainly the country cannot afford to lose the skills of its people automatically at age 65.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

In the field of foreign affairs, where it is critically important that Congress and the President work harmoniously toward the one great goal of peace and freedom, Congress took significant steps, all of which I supported in the House.

Latin America: Authorized a new program to aid in the economic growth and social development of Latin America—a great continent on which we depend for friendship and help, but which we have often neglected—and to assist the recovery of Chile from the floods and earthquakes which recently devastated that country.

The Foreign Service: Raised the standards for Foreign Service personnel in the State Department by, among other things, requiring greater proficiency in foreign languages by diplomatic personnel assigned to foreign countries and by encouraging the learning of especially difficult languages by Foreign Service officers.

Refugees: Provided for admission of approximately 5,000 refugees, without regard to U.S. immigration quotas, as part of the International Refugee Year program for resettlement of European refugees still in temporary refugee camps.

Congo crisis: Increased the contingency fund available to the President for use in such emergency situations as the Congo crisis.

Cuba: Empowered the President to determine the amount of sugar to be imported from Cuba as an important diplomatic tool in dealing with Cuban Premier Castro; President Eisenhower then abolished the unfilled portion of Cuba's sugar quota for the present year.

NATO: Authorized the appointment of a U.S. Citizens Commission to participate in the NATO Citizens Convention to explore ways to develop democratic freedom by economic and political means.

Mutual security: Restored part of the funds cut from the mutual security program after the President warned Congress that the cuts would "jeopardize the security of the country."

International health research: Made it possible for the President, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Surgeon General to conduct an international cooperative program in health research, training, and planning.

IDA: The Banking and Currency Committee, of which I am a member, entered the foreign policy field when we approved legislation authorizing U.S. participation in the International Development Association—an agency designed especially to help such newly emerging nations as those former European colonies in Africa to achieve a degree of economic stability and progress and thus avoid the chaos we have seen in the Congo. IDA will also place economic assistance on a much more businesslike basis, with other industrialized nations sharing the cost with the United States.

PROGRESS TOWARDS PEACE

The Senate alone acted on three additional measures which should be recorded here. It adopted the food for peace resolution endorsing the President's plan

to present to the United Nations this month a proposal "whereby we and other fortunate nations can, together, make greater use of our combined agricultural abundance to feed the needy of the world."

The Senate also ratified two treaties: the new Mutual Security and Cooperation Treaty with Japan, and the Antarctica Treaty to restrict the use of that continent for peaceful purposes only. This latter treaty is particularly significant because it marks for the first time since the cold war began that the United States and Soviet Russia, together with other nations, have succeeded in negotiating a binding agreement which prohibits military operations and nuclear testing and provides for complete freedom of inspection and aerial reconnaissance—objectives we have been seeking, on a larger scale, for many years.

The House, too, acted alone in approving two important resolutions—one of which expressed the sense of Congress that the fundamental freedoms and human rights of the people of captive nations should be restored and which urged the President to pursue this goal at international conferences; while the other expressed congressional condemnation of the Nazi-like desecration of houses of worship and other sacred sites earlier this year.

DEFENSE POLICY

The Defense appropriations bill, traditionally the vehicle Congress utilizes to influence U.S. defense policy, provided funds just short of $40 billion—more than 50 percent of the Federal budget—an increase of about $780 million over Defense Department estimates. The bill was passed by rollcall votes in the House of 402 to 5 and in the Senate of 83 to 3, and included these principal items: Increased funds for military airlift—transport of arms and men; approval of the controversial administration-proposed aircraft carrier; a go-ahead for the B–70 supersonic bomber project; doubled funds to prepare for a more complete airborne alert; speeded up the Army's equipment modernization program; greatly increased the immensely successful Polaris missile submarine program; initiated a new Air Force antimissile system; and added funds to increase our antisubmarine warfare capability.

One of the most potentially important changes made by Congress in the defense budget, however, has gone largely unnoticed. This was a 3 percent across-the-board reduction in the appropriation for procurement of military equipment, a cut totaling about $400 million. Congress insisted on this cut, as the conference report noted, "in an effort to compel prompt remedial action" by the Defense Department against waste and duplication in military purchasing.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEGRITY

Among congressional achievements which I supported wholeheartedly and of which I am especially proud, was a series of three amendments designed to prevent congressional abuse of certain of its own privileges. The first, which you may remember I discussed in an earlier report to the people, killed an attempt in the House to allow Congressmen in urban areas to use their congressional frank for junk mail, addressed only to occupant. The second prevented Congressmen and other Government officials from receiving free or reduced-rate transportation on U.S. merchant ships, most of which are heavily subsidized by the Government. And the third amendment required public itemizing and accounting of all kinds of funds, American dollars and foreign money alike, spent by traveling Congressmen and committee staff members.

This was a good, though too long delayed, beginning toward eliminating conflict-of-interest situations in Congress. I hope that additional progress will be made next year, and I shall continue my own efforts in this direction.

SOME ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Other legislative accomplishments this year, all of which I supported, were these:

Pure food: To protect consumers of foods, drugs, and cosmetics from color additives found to cause cancer when used by human or animals.

Pay raise: A modest one for postal workers and other Government employees.

Health training program: To encourage specialized public health training in nursing, engineering, and public health schools.

Housing: A limited bill, in place of general housing legislation, to continue three existing programs: the FHA home improvement loan program, the college housing loan program, and the community facilities loan program—which would otherwise have been halted.

Broadcasting: To prohibit payola and other unethical practices in radio and television broadcasting and adoption of regulations and penalties to be enforced by the Federal Communications Commission.

Tax revision: To permit taxpayers a personal income tax deduction of all medical expenses incurred by them in the care of dependent parents over 65 years old.

Veterans loan program: Extended for homes, farms, or businesses purchased by veterans.

High price supports for wheat: Rejected, as encouraging further overproduction and high prices.

Library Services Act: Extended to bring the riches of the world of books to many who had never known them.

Special milk programs: Continued for children.

Obscene mailings: Strengthened Post Office Department's authority to prevent the use of the mails for distribution of obscene or fraudulent matter.

Narcotics: Established a system of licensing and control over the manufacture of narcotic drugs, and passed a House resolution encouraging the President to call a White House Conference on Narcotics to seek ways of controlling this pernicious evil.

Again this year, both my committees—the Banking and Currency Committee and the Government Operations Committee—where so much of the work of shaping legislation is done, were unusually active, in several cases on matters of direct interest to Union County and the metropolitan New York-New Jersey area.

SAVED $85 MILLION

The Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee of the Government Operations Committee, of which I have been ranking minority member, continued our intensive study of various aspects of the Government's multi-billion-dollar agricultural price support program, in particular its increasingly costly surplus grain storage activities.

In accord with our recommendation, the Agriculture Department decided recently to reduce the storage rates it pays to commercial warehousemen by an average 19 percent. This will save taxpayers, I am pleased to report, between $85 and $100 million in the present storage year.

The chief objective of farm policy, we urged in our reports, should be to assure an adequate supply of food and fiber for consumers at fair prices. We also recommended further economies in the storage of surplus crops and, in an operation involving more than $600 million a year, economy is very much to be desired.

Additional savings in storage costs should also be realized as a result of the Agriculture Department's adoption of my recommendation that greater use be made of the "mothball fleet" of World War II Liberty ships anchored in the Hudson River for storage of surplus grain. As I pointed out to the Department, these ships provide high-quality storage at much lower costs. The Department's recent decision to more than double existing stocks of grain there was good news, not only for taxpayers but also for the economy of our region.

CONTROVERSIAL BILLS

The Banking and Currency Committee had more than its share of controversy this year. An overall housing bill was blocked by the Rules Committee, and the President vetoed the depressed area bill.

A substitute bill, which I supported strongly, called for nearly as much assistance as the committee bill and would have directed it far more effectively into areas of deep and chronic unemployment, such as former textile towns in New England and coal mining areas in West Virginia—which is the whole purpose of such legislation. Unfortunately, the majority on the committee preferred to have an issue rather than provide help, and so they refused even to consider the substitute.

Among its more constructive accomplishments, the committee approved amendments to the Small Business Investment Act facilitating the extension of credit to small business enterprises, a bill I cosponsored.

A major disappointment, however, was the committee's failure to act on another bill I introduced in the House, the mass transportation bill, which would provide both financial and planning assistance to metropolitan areas to preserve and improve commuter facilities. The bill was especially significant, I believe, because for the first time it ap-

proached the commuter problem on a broad basis and integrated the transportation needs of urban areas with all the other aspects of land use and the future growth of our metropolitan regions.

COMMUTER SITUATION

While we persuaded the committee chairman to hold hearings on the bill, at which I testified, he would take no further action without an OK from the House leadership—which, I regret, never came. Nevertheless, this will be a priority matter for the 87th Congress.

The same blindness to the needs of urban areas blocked another of my commuter bills, a measure to require greater consideration of the public interest by the Interstate Commerce Commission before it permits railroads to abandon passenger service. Here, again, the committee—in this case the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee—held hearings on my bill, but then refused—on three separate occasions—to send the bill to the House floor.

Despite these disappointments, I can report some progress in reaching solutions to our grave commuter transportation problem. The Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, which was created last year by legislation I cosponsored, began operation this year. As one of three House members of the Commission, I obtained the cooperation of my colleagues in giving the transportation problem priority attention. Specific action will be recommended to Congress and to the States, counties, and cities in metropolitan areas early next year.

PORT OF NEW YORK AUTHORITY

One of the most dramatic events of the year was the vote by which the House cited for contempt three officials of the Port of New York Authority following their refusal to submit the authority's files to a House committee investigating the extent of the port authority's jurisdiction. The issue arose, you will remember, when it was learned that the port authority planned to build a huge jet airport in nearby Morris County and to initiate jet operations at Newark Airport.

Since the House had unanimously approved the investigation, and because the Constitution specifically assigns to Congress jurisdiction over interstate compacts, such as the compact establishing the New York-New Jersey Port Authority, the House had no alternative but to approve the contempt citations.

As a result, the issue can now be referred to the Federal courts for an authoritative decision as to the extent of congressional responsibility for interstate compacts.

UNION COUNTY IN CONGRESS

Union County was also directly affected by other actions of the 86th Congress:

New Jersey-New York port: The public works appropriations bill included funds for additional navigation work in the port area, for which I testified before the Appropriations Committee. Constant attention to navigation needs in the waters along the shores of Union County and in other parts of the port area is essential for the continued job-producing growth of this greatest port in the world. The rapid development of our own Port Elizabeth is an impressive example.

Air pollution: A particularly hazardous problem in parts of Union County, it came under renewed attack when we approved legislation authorizing an intensive study of the effects of automobile exhaust fumes on public health. This may lead, I hope, to practical developments reducing or eliminating exhaust fumes.

Teenage drinking: Our campaign to persuade New York State to raise its legal drinking age to 21, in conformity with all five of its neighbor States, received added impetus recently when seven Vermont teenagers were killed on their way back from drinking in New York. Unfortunately, it takes a tragedy like this to arouse the public and their elected representatives to the need for corrective action, but we must seize every opportunity to dramatize the dangers. At my request, Governor Rockefeller has agreed to meet with me to see what can be done, and if nothing else will work, I plan to ask the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations to find a way in which our five States can cooperate in bringing pressure to bear on New York.

Highways: The continuing investigation of our national highway troubles by the House Public Works Committee may produce some changes which will help protect our own communities from unnecessary destruction by poorly planned superhighways. Meanwhile, I shall continue to do everything possible to help areas like Springfield and Union in their fight to win approval of more acceptable alternate locations.

Post offices: To meet Union County's postal needs, which have multiplied in recent years under the impact of heavy population growth, new post offices have been authorized this year for Springfield, the Mountainside branch of Westfield, Fanwood, Scotch Plains, the Bayway, and North Section stations of Elizabeth, and the Hillside branch of Elizabeth. New buildings in Kenilworth, Roselle Park, and Garwood are scheduled, and a new Muhlenberg area station is under study in Plainfield. In addition, extensive expansion and modernization work has been OK'd for the Summit Post Office. Many other improvements in equipment, facilities and service have been made throughout the county this year. So the many, many hours I have devoted to on-the-spot study of our postal needs and to discussion with regional Post Office officials and the Postmaster General himself are now paying off.

Other Federal-aid programs which I have supported are now contributing to the well-being of our people. For example, funds have been granted for major hospital construction projects in Plainfield and Elizabeth. Public housing, housing for the elderly, and urban renewal projects are in various stages of work in Rahway, Elizabeth, and Plainfield. And a comprehensive project is under way to plan for a water distribution system to serve 30 northern New Jersey communities, including some in Union County.

HELPING PEOPLE

However, the most rewarding activity of a Congressman, in my judgment, is in the area best described as "helping people." More of my time, I think, is devoted to the multitude of individual problems of individual citizens in Union County than to anything else. This is as it should be, for there is no more important responsibility of a Congressman than to serve as the channel through which individual citizens control their Government.

We cannot always succeed with every request, but we do try. You can be sure, therefore, that your problem is understood, that bureaucratic redtape will be cut, and that within the law and propriety everything that can be done will be done.

This year, to cite a few instances, my staff and I helped to expedite dozens of immigrant visas which meant happy reunions for dozens of families. We helped speed up the issuance of passports, filled requests for thousands of Government documents, answered endless questions about the complexities of Federal regulations, helped servicemen obtain leaves, transfers or, in emergency cases, discharges.

We straightened out numerous snarls which were holding up veterans or social security benefits, including one especially worthwhile case in which a widow of a World War I veteran had been denied for several years her rightful pension benefits.

We have helped to arrange weddings, on the one hand, and obtained the cooperation of diplomatic missions abroad in case of death away from home.

We have obtained military bands for Fourth of July parades, had flags flown over the Capitol for organizations and individuals, and welcomed thousands of you—alone, with your families, or in larger groups—to the Nation's Capital and tried to make your visit here as interesting as possible.

Special mention should be made of Union County's young men at West Point, Annapolis, the Air Force Academy, and the Merchant Marine Academy. Since my election to Congress in 1956, I have made every one of my congressional appointments on a merit basis, as determined by competitive civil service examinations and subsequent Academy exams, rather than on a personal or political basis.

The results speak for themselves. Not a single boy has failed to make good. All of them have ranked well up in their classes, and several have made the dean's list or other honor rolls—an overall performance well above the average. Union County has a right to be very proud of our representatives in the service academies and to be confident that their future careers as officers in our Armed Forces will reflect great merit on themselves, their families, and their communities.

KEEPING IN TOUCH

Finally, as many of you know, I have continued and in some cases expanded my efforts to keep in touch with the people I represent, to seek your views about important issues, and to be ever alert to

the needs and interests of Union Countians.

Through my biweekly report to the people, our annual congressional questionnaire, occasional legislative open houses at my home in Elizabeth, a full-time district office, office hours in other communities, a huge volume of correspondence, and as many weekend visits to Union County as I can manage during sessions of Congress, we have kept each other well informed.

I greatly appreciate the effort, the interest, and the cooperation you have shown in this mutual endeavor. You have made my work here very worthwhile and very satisfying.

Throughout it all, I am pleased to report, I have maintained a nearly perfect record in answering rollcalls—the point of decision, of course, in every legislative issue. Of the 180 rollcall votes in both sessions of the 86th Congress, I missed only 1, and on that I was paired. This is an attendance record of better than 99 percent and an on-the-record percentage—for 4 straight years—of 100.

In reviewing the year's activities, I have been impressed repeatedly by the way in which everything we do fits together as parts of the pattern of our American way of life. Each of us has a role to play in keeping our country strong and our people free, and in making our America ever more worthy of the traditions and heritage we have received from the past.

Over the Speaker's chair in the Chamber of the House, there has been placed a quotation from Daniel Webster, which may serve to remind us all of the opportunities ahead:

> Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its powers, build up its institutions, promote all its great interests, and see whether we also in our day and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered.

Together, we can meet this challenge.

Testimonial Dinner for James P. Mitchell, Secretary of Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, it is my pleasure to speak a few words of praise on behalf of a respected and dedicated public servant whom I am fortunate indeed to count as a fellow resident of the State of New Jersey. He occupies with distinction and high ability one of the most sensitive Cabinet posts in the Eisenhower administration, that of Secretary of Labor.

In the 7 years that he has held that important office, he has been the valued and trusted adviser to both President Eisenhower and Vice President NIXON. He is held in high esteem by working men and women everywhere. He is respected by members of the business community. And he has won the admiration and affection of those who work under him in the Department of Labor.

I am sure, Mr. President, that everyone in this Chamber knows that I am referring to the Honorable James P. Mitchell. Because he is a friend of the workingman, because he is a statesman in labor affairs, because he has administered his office with dignity and fairness Secretary Mitchell was recently honored at a testimonial dinner sponsored by the leaders of the unions which comprise the AFL–CIO and by the United Mine Workers. It is the first time in history that such a high tribute has been accorded a Secretary of Labor by leaders of the labor movement.

His testimonial, which was signed by the James P. Mitchell testimonial dinner committee in recognition and appreciation of the years of service he has rendered to the working men and women of America as Secretary of Labor, was presented him "on behalf of the working men and women of the United States as a symbol of affection and esteem to their friend, the Honorable James P. Mitchell, in grateful appreciation and recognition of his untiring and selfless devotion to their welfare, in tribute to his intelligent statesmanship and competence as a public administrator, and for his human understanding, wise counsel and good sense in providing extraordinary leadership as Secretary of Labor in advancing the welfare of the people of the United States."

I ask now, Mr. President, unanimous consent to have included in the RECORD the text of the address by President Eisenhower at the testimonial dinner.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, AT TESTIMONIAL DINNER HONORING JAMES P. MITCHELL, U.S. SECRETARY OF LABOR, JUNE 29, 1960

Mr. Chairman and distinguished guests, I feel that there is something possibly symbolic about my appearance here this evening. I stand in front of you in plain view, and for some years I have been the target for some of the sharpest barbs that some of you have had to launch in my direction, and I don't know of any time when I've been more exposed than I am at this moment.

But there are two specific areas outside of our common patriotism and love of country in which I find myself always in agreement with the AFL–CIO and indeed the other unions here represented. Those two are: In our recognition that we are but one Nation in the world and that our own prosperity, our own progress, and our own peace depend upon our friendship with those nations and our leadership of them in the paths of peace; and the second: Our common admiration for your guest of honor, Jim Mitchell.

Now, I'd like to talk for just a moment about these two subjects. Time and again I have been encouraged in heart-warming fashion by the members of all our unions in efforts to increase the spirit of friendship and the depth of understanding between this Nation and other nations who, like us, believe in the dignity of man and his possession of inalienable rights given to him by his Creator.

There is in the Cabinet a committee that has as its job trying to promote better markets throughout the world, so that our economy may prosper as we help others to prosper. As their purchasing power rises, our prosperity rises with it.

This is the kind of thing that we understand together and this is the kind of thing in which the AFL–CIO has always been in the forefront in supporting. I cannot tell you how much this has meant to me, because there are those shortsighted people who believe that by building around ourselves walls, walls of guns and walls of tariffs, that we can live in a secure and prosperous isolation.

My friends, you at least, the people of these organizations, have shown that they recognize the falsity of any such belief and indeed have been on the positive side of working to destroy such illusions and delusions in this country.

Fortunately, the number of people that so believe is diminishing, and I am completely sure that part of that result has been because of your enlightened efforts, and for this, on behalf of the entire Nation, I must thank you.

Now, I get to my second subject, Jim Mitchell.

I was once told by a very distinguished soldier that practically every general's reputation as it was recorded in history was a result of his skill in picking a chief of staff. I rather think, if I am going to live in history, one of the reasons is the wisdom I had in selecting Jim Mitchell as your Secretary of Labor. Because he and I both have learned this about the leaders of labor. They do not see eye to eye with us always, but they respect a man of courage, of honesty, of integrity, and who tries to dig under the facades of slogans, of wisecracks, and to get at the facts, get them out so that people looking together at the same problem are not talking about something that is false or distorted, but things as they are, the realities of situations.

I have had the great fortune, the great good fortune of having Secretary Mitchell at my side now these 7½ years. For that good fortune, I thank the Almighty, because he has constantly championed the cause of labor as such and its right to get its proper due because the people who with their hands and their heads and their thinking produce the wealth of this country are entitled to their proper dues and at the same time say that in a free enterprise country, if we're to be preserved as such, that we must recognize the needs for profit, because if there are no profits there will be no investments and free labor as we know it will not continue to exist.

This is the kind of thing he's taught, the kind of thing he's preached, outside and within the confines of the Cabinet room.

Each of us, you of labor, we of Government, have got a very deep responsibility to the United States, the Nation that we believe under God is destined to lead the entire earth to better paths, finer paths, toward peace and justice in this world.

And so I think, regardless of the points of difference you have found and discovered and criticized within this administration, which was not only your right and probably at times your accurate calculation—I don't know—

But I say this, no man has ever been more dedicated to the idea that whatever is good for the United States is good for labor than has Jim Mitchell.

And, therefore, as I salute you, all of you, of the labor movement, I salute him and his family who are so fortunate to be here as part of the group that you're honoring along with him this evening.

Thank you and good night.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, at this point I want to submit for the RECORD a letter written to Secretary

Mitchell on the occasion of the testimonial dinner by the top career civil service officials of the Department of Labor.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 29, 1960.

Hon. JAMES P. MITCHELL,
Secretary of Labor,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MITCHELL: The honor paid you tonight by the American labor movement is well deserved. You have made an outstanding contribution to the welfare of the working people of our Nation.

We career civil-service officials of the U.S. Department of Labor desire to express our own admiration, affection, and respect for you. We consider ourselves most fortunate to have had your wise, fair, and able leadership during the past 7 years. It has been a pleasure, a privilege, and an inspiration to work with you.

Your distinguished service as Secretary of Labor has brought prestige and respect to the Department of Labor. Under your direction, its services to the people of our Nation have grown immeasurably.

Sincerely,

Millard Cass, Deputy Under Secretary; James E. Dodson, Administrative Assistant Secretary; Nelson M. Bortz, V. S. Hudson, Seymour L. Wolfbein, Charles D. Stewart, Deputy Assistant Secretaries; Harold C. Nystrom, Acting Solicitor; John Leslie, Director of Information; Edward E. Goshen, Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training; Robert C. Goodwin, Bureau of Employment Security; A. W. Motley, Bureau of Labor Standards; Hugh W. Bradley, Bureau of Veterans' Reemployment Rights; Aryness Joy Wickens, Economic Adviser to the Secretary; Edward J. McVeigh, Director of Personnel; Leonard R. Linsenmayer, Bureau of International Labor Affairs; John L. Holcombe, Bureau of Labor-Management Reports; Ewan Clague, Bureau of Labor Statistics; Clarence T. Lundquist, Wage and Hour and Public Contracts Division; Frances A. Ambursen, Women's Bureau.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Finally, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for inclusion in the RECORD several newspaper editorials, as well as a column by a respected newspaper commentator, which will show the extent of the public's awareness of, and appreciation for, the fine record of Secretary Mitchell.

There being no objection, the editorials and column were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, July 1, 1960]

A TRIBUTE TO MR. MITCHELL

The testimonial dinner given to Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell, sponsored by 28 top leaders of the American labor movement, was a tribute to a man who has amply deserved it. The occasion was unique both because of the kind of people responsible for it and the character of the recipient himself. It would be almost unbelievable, if it hadn't happened, that so large and influential a group of unionists, whose politics are traditionally Democratic, should honor a Cabinet member in an administration whose policies labor has so bitterly attacked.

Remarkable, too, is the man who for almost 7 years has kept the confidence and respect of a Republican President and members of his Cabinet and of leaders of organized labor—with all of whom he often differed widely. This could only have been done by an unassuming person of stubborn integrity, dedicated to the welfare of the Nation's workers, intimately familiar with the conditions of their life and well aware both of the possibilities, and the limitations, of methods to improve their lot.

Mr. Mitchell, in short, is an idealist of rare sophistication. We, too, applaud his achievement.

[From the Washington Post, June 29, 1960]

SALUTE TO JAMES P. MITCHELL

Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell will be the recipient of a unique tribute tonight. He is to be honored at a testimonial dinner sponsored by President George Meany, of the AFL–CIO, and numerous other leaders of the labor movement in recognition of nearly 7 years of public service in his present post. The event is the more noteworthy because Mr. Mitchell is part of an administration that is often criticized as being probusiness, and he has himself sometimes felt the barbs of sharp labor criticism.

When Mr. Mitchell was chosen in 1953 to succeed Martin P. Durkin as Secretary of Labor, some union leaders found the appointment incredible. For a long time his standing among the labor chieftains seemed very doubtful. As the years passed, however, his sincerity in promoting the welfare of labor has come to be widely recognized. Secretary Durkin had tried to bring about a spectacular agreement upon modification of the Taft-Hartley Act and failed. Secretary Mitchell concentrated on more basic and immediate problems, and he has succeeded in considerable measure both in improving working conditions and in securing amendment of the Taft-Hartley law.

His efforts in behalf of migratory workers have been especially outstanding. In many instances he has contributed to better understanding between employers and employees and to the settlement of stubborn disputes over wages and working conditions. Though he advocated many of the stiff legislative reforms that were written into the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosures Act of 1959, some of which were vehemently opposed by organized labor, his persistent work for advancement of the status of wage earners has earned their respect and appreciation. It is refreshing that political differences have been laid aside for recognition of Mr. Mitchell's good work in behalf of all those who toil.

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, June 28, 1960]

TESTIMONIAL DINNER FOR JIM MITCHELL

Tomorrow night in Washington a large group of the top labor leaders of the country are tendering a testimonial dinner to Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell.

This is a truly remarkable acknowledgment of the public service of one of the most effective men ever to occupy labor's chair in the President's Cabinet. During the 7 years Jim Mitchell has been Secretary, he has worked indefatigably to bridge the historic gap which has unfortunately existed between all Republican administrations and the organized labor management.

On the record and behind closed doors, Secretary Mitchell has won the personal respect of the great majority of labor leaders. Dealing with a group which has traditionally demanded 100 percent compliance as the price of their affection—and then will rarely bestow it on a Republican—Jim Mitchell has been no doormat.

More important, however, he has inculcated a sense of mutual give-and-take which has been helpful and which will bear even more fruit in years to come. The dinner is of such importance that the United Mine Workers are joining with the AFL–CIO in honoring Mr. Mitchell.

Jim Mitchell needs no accolade such as this to give him his "well done," but it must, nevertheless, be reassuring to him to know that his 7 years of dedicated public service are being recognized by the most important men in the labor movement today and, beyond this, by the public as well.

[From the Jackson (Mich.) Citizen-Patriot, July 1, 1960]

A GREAT SECRETARY OF LABOR

The testimonial dinner tendered Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell by the Nation's labor leaders (James R. Hoffa excepted—he was not invited) was a tribute to a man who has done a fine job.

It was unusual in that the guest of honor and President Eisenhower may have been the only Republicans in a crowd of Democrats.

But partisan politics did not keep the men who lead the Nation's unions from their expression of gratitude for the work of a friend. They also recognize the fact that the Cabinet post most directly concerned with their interests finally is being given the stature it deserves.

Mitchell might be classed as the first great Secretary of Labor. Since the Department was created as a separate agency in 1913, it has been filled with a succession of comparatively weak administrators or labor men who were so close to the forest they couldn't see the trees.

Strangely enough, the Labor Department fell to its lowest estate under the direction of Miss Frances Perkins during the Roosevelt administration when labor exerted the greatest influence on government.

In his first appointment to the Department, President Eisenhower repeated the mistake of his predecessors by naming a card-carrying plumber, Martin P. Durkin. On his departure the President turned, not to a labor man, but to a labor expert in the form of Mr. Mitchell.

The result obviously has been pleasing to the unions and to Mr. Eisenhower. With one voice they praised this man who has served so well in a difficult time.

[From the Kansas City Star, June 18, 1960]

LABOR HONORS THE SECRETARY

James P. Mitchell became Secretary of Labor in 1953 with the promise to do "the best possible job for the people of the United States." Now we hear testimony to his success from a source that traditionally has taken a dim view of Republican Secretaries of Labor. The American labor movement will honor Mitchell at a testimonial dinner in Washington June 29.

Perhaps the most remarkable aspect of labor's tribute is that only a few months ago union leaders were still roundly denouncing the Secretary for his part in writing the labor law of 1959. For that purpose, the dusty old phrases once applied to Taft-Hartley were hauled out. Apparently the union leaders are beginning to realize that they can live with—and prosper under—the 1959 law. It is by no stretch of the imagination the slave labor act that it has been called. Perhaps the Mitchell dinner is a small indication that labor is beginning to realize as much.

Mitchell has been no exception to the rule for men in his job. He has been attacked by both labor and management. That's the nature of his post. But he has worked hard at steering a moderate course in the public interest. He has been the President's articulate spokesman on industrial relations. He has worked closely with business and labor and, as all Cabinet officers do, occasionally has "put his foot in his mouth." He has infuriated some labor leaders, but one union man recently commented:

"He understands our problems. He speaks our language."

No doubt Jim Mitchell still has his share of critics, but he certainly has some solid accomplishments for his record.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, June 26, 1960]

LABOR'S FRIENDLY CRITIC

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—The interests of American labor have never been better represented in Government than during the 6-year tenure of James P. Mitchell in the Eisenhower administration.

Partisanship and presidential politics aside, the labor leaders are giving almost unanimous evidence of their high regard for Mr. Mitchell with a testimonial dinner in Washington June 29 sponsored by the combined union movements, including the CIO-A. F. of L. and the United Mine Workers.

U.S. labor leaders are rarely united on anything. They are completely united in paying this tribute to Mr. Mitchell for his role in the conduct of the Labor Department and in labor-management affairs in an administration toward which they have been critical and distant.

There is no political purpose in this gathering of some 500 leaders of the labor union movement to express their appreciation for his public service. Though not one of their own—like Martin Durkin—Mr. Mitchell has proved an able spokesman for but not a prisoner of organized labor. Nearly all of his hosts will be supporting the 1960 Democratic presidential nominee a month hence. On this occasion they will be acknowledging the fairness and the effectiveness of Secretary Mitchell, who is working for the nomination of Vice President NIXON.

Mr. Mitchell would himself not be averse to being Mr. NIXON'S running mate and it is known that this would give President Eisenhower no pain. Other than Attorney General William Rogers, no one has worked more intimately with the Vice President than Secretary Mitchell. They have been close allies in the administration. Together they negotiated the settlement of the steel strike last fall. They have developed great respect for each other.

The labor movement's testimonial dinner does not imply political support for Secretary Mitchell if he becomes the Republican vice-presidential candidate. He would be entirely on his own. It also does not imply that the union leaders like everything in Mr. Mitchell's record.

It is Mr. Mitchell's foremost conviction that U.S. unions must do more than they have thus far in seeing that their own interests are parallel with the public interest.

"Too many labor leaders," Mr. Mitchell told me on one occasion, "tend to make the same mistake which many industrialists made a half century ago when their attitude was interpreted as being—'the public be damned.' There is a disregard of public opinion on the part of quite a few labor leaders. Their sense of public responsibility is not equal to the powerful role they play in public affairs.

"The American labor leader has become too important and powerful a figure not to heed fully his responsibility to the community and to public welfare. Unions operate in a much wider area now, one far removed from the basic bargaining operations. They influence legislation. They administer funds. They invest their members' money. They publish newspapers. They take part in oversea programs and international conferences. They take economic, social, and educational actions which have little bearing upon their traditional bargaining function."

Mr. Mitchell is not suggesting in the least that labor's national role should be narrowed but rather that its national responsibility should be equal to its power. What he is saying is that he would like to see labor more consistently and, symbolically, accept the motto that "what's good for the Nation is good for labor"—rather than vice versa.

One thing is certain: a great merging of national interest is needed to produce the increased productivity and economic growth to win the contest with the Soviets during the decade of the sixties.

[From the Decatur (Ill.) Review, June 27, 1960]

TESTIMONIAL DINNER FOR MITCHELL

Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell will be honored Wednesday night by a wide range of top labor leaders in the Nation. The testimonial dinner is doubly noteworthy because of Mr. Mitchell's political affiliation, one, few labor leaders share.

Secretary Mitchell has served the Eisenhower administration for 6 years. Most of the country's top labor officials feel, on the whole, that he has done a fair and effective job in labor-management relations. His role in helping settle the long and costly steel strike is a recent example. His work in the Eisenhower Cabinet has earned him strong support for the Republican vice presidential nomination, a possibility discussed by columnist Victor Riesel elsewhere on this page.

The testimonial dinner, however, does not mean labor goes wholeheartedly for the Secretary of Labor, nor does it mean he is completely in agreement with the labor union leaders. In an interview with Roscoe Drummond, New York Herald Tribune service columnist, Mr. Mitchell gave some of his basic views on labor leadership:

"Too many labor leaders tend to make the same mistake which many industrialists made a half-century ago when their attitude was interpreted as being 'the public be damned.' There is a disregard of public opinion on the part of quite a few labor leaders. Their sense of public responsibility is not equal to the powerful role they play in public affairs.

"The American labor leader has become too important and powerful a figure not to heed fully his responsibility to the community and to public welfare. Unions operate in a much wider area now, one far removed from the basic bargaining operation. They influence legislation. They administer funds. They invest their members' money. They publish newspapers. They take part in overseas programs and international conferences. They take economic, social, and educational actions which have little bearing upon their traditional bargaining function."

These are telling words. Labor today must broaden its range of public responsibility. The power of such unions as the Steelworkers and the Teamsters over the Nation's functioning is obvious. To go with that power, Secretary Mitchell rightly says, there must be a sense of public responsibility.

[From the Union City (N.J.) Hudson Dispatch, July 2, 1960]

LABOR LEADERS DINE SECRETARY MITCHELL

We thought we had seen just about everything in our long career as a newspaperman but something new was added Thursday night when between 400 and 500 American union labor leaders gave a testimonial dinner at $20 a plate to none other than Republican Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell, of New Jersey.

This was a most extraordinary turn of events, for it is estimated that 90 to 95 percent of organized labor's tycoons vote straight down the line Democratic. Had such a dinner been staged for New Deal or Fair Deal Democratic Secretaries, it would have been taken as a matter of course.

Not so in the case of the Labor Secretary in President Eisenhower's Cabinet, who has survived 7 years at the laborious post, and we hasten to say no pun is intended.

To make dinner even more remarkable, Mr. Eisenhower, enmeshed in the amenities attendant upon the visit of the King and Queen of Siam to Washington, managed to break away long enough to put in an appearance at the Mitchell tribute. He joined in the festivities and lauded the man who has been his labor aid since 1953.

The idea behind the unusual affair was stated to be personal and nonpartisan. Labor leaders said they wanted to express their appreciation of Mr. Mitchell's efforts on behalf of the workers, even though they felt he had not been able to deliver on issues they regarded as top priority.

"There have been times, we know, when Jim Mitchell could have done a much more effective job for labor's justified objectives if he had enjoyed greater authority—times when it appeared he was fighting with both hands tied behind his back," William F. Schnitzler, secretary-treasurer of AFL-CIO, said.

Others who spoke were Jacob Potofsky, president of Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, and George Harrison, president of Railway and Steamship Clerks. George Meany, president of AFL-CIO, was honorary chairman.

On the dinner committee were such union labor bigwigs as Walter Reuther of United Auto Workers, A. E. Lyon, of Railway Labor Executives Association, and Thomas Kennedy, who recently succeeded John L. Lewis as president of United Mine Workers. Particularly noticeable by his absence was James R. Hoffa, beleaguered boss of the Teamsters' Union.

Those who promoted the tribute to Secretary Mitchell declared the dinner was not a political insurance affair. Much was made of this point by Arthur J. Goldberg, counsel for the Steelworkers, who with AFL-CIO Vice President Joseph D. Kiernan, handled many details of the unprecedented testimonial.

[From the Elizabeth (N.J.) Journal, July 1, 1960]

LABOR'S LOVE FOR MITCHELL

Organized labor is the most militant segment of the Democratic Party and when it arranges a tribute for a Republican Cabinet official on the eve of a presidential campaign, the motives speak for themselves.

The dinner that 500 labor leaders held to honor Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell was formal acknowledgment that in his 6 years in Washington, he has done an outstanding job. President Eisenhower's appearance spoke for administration approval.

Just as significant as the list of those who turned out to honor Elizabeth's Jim Mitchell was the absence of James R. Hoffa. The Teamster leader, whom many regard as the symbol of what's wrong with labor, had no reason to honor the hard working Secretary.

Mr. Mitchell has been among the foremost in the fight to clean up unionism. He consistently has defended the good in the labor movement despite the unpopularity of the cause among some members of his own party.

The Secretary's accomplishments in establishing good will with a traditionally hostile group stand out even more sharply when they are compared with the failings of some other members of the Eisenhower team. Mr. Mitchell has been an unsung, but valuable, member of the administration.

The remarkable aspects of the labor tribute were well publicized and undoubtedly one of the most interested readers of all the news copy was RICHARD M. NIXON. Mr. NIXON, presumably mulling over vice presidential possibilities, must be giving considerable thought to Mr. Mitchell.

[From the Asbury Park (N.J.) Press, July 3, 1960]

MR. MITCHELL'S PERFORMANCE

The testimonial dinner given to Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell, by hundreds of union leaders emphasizes the unique role Mr. Mitchell has filled with distinction as a member of President Eisenhower's Cabinet.

It is no secret that many of the union leaders prefer a Democratic administration to a

Republican administration. A number of the speakers at the dinner made this point clear, but they also said that in the difficult assignment Mr. Mitchell has carried out for President Eisenhower there is almost unanimous agreement that only a person of Mr. Mitchell's ability could have met the tests that confronted him.

New Jersey residents will be quick to join in organized labor's admiration for Mr. Mitchell. They have noted that he has been available for all interests whenever management or labor have required his services. Moreover, they have come to respect the understanding and ability he has brought to the function of Government in resolving controversies which affect the Nation's welfare.

Mr. Mitchell has been honored by many of the Nation's leading colleges for the administrative talents he has contributed as a member of the President's Cabinet. This is because he has consistently devoted his efforts toward more efficient use of the Nation's manpower and has repeatedly sounded the call for young people to prepare themselves for the serious tasks ahead when the Nation must rely on today's students as its leaders of the future.

Mr. Mitchell, as a New Jersey resident, has honored his home State by the distinguished service he has rendered to the Eisenhower administration and the Nation. President Eisenhower, as stated by Jacob Potofsky, president of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, "reflected great credit on the administration by the appointment of the Secretary of Labor."

In the closing days of the Eisenhower administration many have expressed the view that Mr. Mitchell would add competence and stature to the Republican presidential ticket as a nominee for vice president. Whether political considerations will dictate this turn in his career must await developments. But in any event the Nation should make certain that Secretary Mitchell is not lost to the public service.

[From the Detroit Free Press, July 6, 1960]

HIGH TESTIMONIAL TO A REPUTATION

Labor Secretary Mitchell has a right to feel that his integrity and fairness have been unusually well certified.

For close to 7 years he has given satisfaction to a Republican administration as one of its Cabinet officers.

A few nights ago he was honored with a testimonial dinner tendered him by 28 of organized labor's principal leaders. These men, traditionally Democratic and often hostile to the administration of which Secretary Mitchell is a member, wanted him to know that he is appreciated and trusted.

Plainly Secretary Mitchell has achieved exceedingly well in his dealings with men and the affairs under his jurisdiction.

He told us once that between his family's desires and the need to attend to his personal fortunes he wouldn't be altogether sorry to be out of public life. If he does leave it when the next inauguration occurs, he will do so with a hearty "well done."

[From the Toledo (Ohio) Blade, July 1, 1960]

LABOR'S SECRETARY

When a Cabinet officer in an administration often accused by labor of being probig business hails a union leader, it's worth mentioning. But when the combined AFL–CIO leadership, plus that of the United Mine Workers, goes out of its way to fete a cabinet officer in the same administration, that's really news.

Such an event was held the other evening in Washington, where 800 labor leaders and guests—including President Eisenhower—gathered to honor Secretary of Labor James Mitchell.

Mr. Mitchell took over his Cabinet post nearly 7 years ago under inauspicious circumstances. He was succeeding a trade union official—Martin Durkin—as Labor Secretary. He was moving into an administration already under fire from unions for supposed business influence. And his own background in the field of business was viewed dimly by many union chieftains.

Yet, through the years, Mr. Mitchell proved to be an eloquent and sincere spokesman for the cause of the laboring man. He fought hard for labor's causes in administration circles, and not always successfully. He managed to reflect the views and objections of union leaders in administration thinking to a far greater degree than labor thought possible. And he gradually won the respect and admiration of some of his stanchest critics within the family of labor.

Jacob Potofsky, Amalgamated Clothing Workers' president, expressed labor's view of Mr. Mitchell probably as well as anyone at the recognition dinner when he said, "It is no secret that we of labor have not viewed with enthusiasm some of the present administration's appointees. But there was one appointment that we believe reflects great credit on the administration and that is the appointment of the present Secretary of Labor."

The timing of labor's honoring Mr. Mitchell, on the eve of a presidential campaign, was not lost on political observers. And labor may yet see more of him, even though the present administration is drawing to a close. For just a few hours before its big dinner for him, one labor official—Lee Minton, president of the Glass Bottle Blowers Association—called upon the Republican Party to nominate Secretary Mitchell as its vice-presidential candidate.

Obviously, from labor's viewpoint, it could do worse.

Statement by Senator Dodd in Regard to Judge J. Joseph Smith and Mr. William Timbers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. DODD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement by me about Judge J. Joseph Smith and Mr. William Timbers.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR DODD

On September 1, 1960, I received unanimous consent to insert at a later date a statement about Judge J. Joseph Smith and Mr. William Timbers who, on that day, were confirmed by the Senate for the posts of U.S. circuit judge for the second district and U.S. district judge for Connecticut, respectively.

Judge Smith has long been recognized as one of the greatest jurists ever to sit on the bench in Connecticut. Prior to his appointment to the Federal bench in 1941, he served with great distinction three terms in the U.S. House of Representatives. A dedicated and thorough scholar of the law, exceptionally well fitted by temperament for the judiciary, a man of brilliant perception and insight, an experienced jurist with two decades of service on the Federal bench behind him, Judge Smith is the universal choice of the Connecticut bar for this post on the second circuit.

I have had the privilege of appearing in court and trying cases before Judge Smith. I feel for him the admiration and respect that are felt by all attorneys who have engaged in litigation before this outstanding jurist.

And so, along with all of those who have known and worked with Judge Smith, I am deeply gratified by his confirmation for the post of U.S. circuit judge for the second circuit.

I am also pleased with the confirmation of Mr. William H. Timbers to succeed Judge Smith as U.S. district judge for Connecticut. During the hearings concerning the confirmation, we heard a series of impressive tributes to Mr. Timbers' qualifications for this post. He was consistently lauded for his legal ability, his judicial temperament, and his experience in complex legal questions. The first of those testifying in favor of Mr. Timbers included outstanding private attorneys, university professors of law, and high-ranking Government officials. I have worked on legal matters with Bill Timbers and can personally vouch for his outstanding legal competence.

I congratulate Mr. Timbers upon his confirmation and I am sure that he will maintain in his new post as district judge for Connecticut the same standard of excellence set by his predecessor, Judge Smith.

Ukrainian Congress Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. MURPHY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure and pride that I insert my message of greetings in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD commemorating the 20th anniversary of the founding of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America which is being celebrated this fall by the branches and member organizations of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc.

This year we mark the 20th anniversary of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America. The year 1960 also marks the beginning of a new decade that all men hope may bring peace, justice, and freedom to all the peoples of the world.

No people has hoped and dreamed more of this freedom, or struggled harder for it, than the Ukrainians. Whether they are the 40 million people still enslaved by Russian communism or their 2½ million free brethren in America, they have never ceased to dream and to fight for a free Ukrainian nation.

No one could fail to admire the indomitable will of a people who have kept alive their dream through centuries of oppression. And no one who loves freedom can fail to hope that the freedom may at last be achieved.

To this purpose, the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America has waged an unceasing battle against communism.

They have continually exposed the dangers of communism to all free peoples when some might forget their peril.

All Americans join with me in hoping that the 1960's will see the culmination of the hopes of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, and of Ukrainians everywhere, for a free Ukrainian nation.

Report to the People of the Ninth Congressional District of Indiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EARL HOGAN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, I have had the honor and privilege of representing the people of the Ninth Congressional District of Indiana in this 86th Congress and I believe it is an obligation of a Member of the Congress to report to the people he represents.

The duties of a Representative are many and varied, but generally fall in three categories. First, it is his responsibility to legislate; second, he must serve the needs and requirements of his constituency; and third, he must act as a clearinghouse for the opinions and views of those he represents on legislative and administrative matters.

My devotion to these three responsibilities has been clearly demonstrated. I have been present at more than 98 percent of all quorum calls and votes. I have had the honor to serve on the Agriculture Committee charged with the responsibility for legislation pertaining to our plaguing farm problems. Because Congress does much of its work in committees, attendance at committee meetings is important. In committee meetings witnesses are heard; Members work with the professional staff on research and background information pertinent to legislation being deliberated upon before it comes to the floor of the House. My agricultural background has been an invaluable asset and, I believe, an aid to the work of the committee during my tenure, reflecting credit to the Ninth District.

Endeavoring to serve my constituency I traveled the entire 14 counties comprising the Ninth District on three different scheduled tours to conveniently afford all an opportunity to personally discuss any matter with me. Correspondence has been carefully and expeditiously answered. Gratifying results have been forthcoming from social security, veterans, and other cases which have had my personal attention.

The first session, which ended on September 15, 1959, was the longest peacetime session in 37 years, adjourning immediately before Khrushchev was about to arrive in Washington for what was to have been an exchange visit with our President.

History will record that this Congress has worked under extremely difficult circumstances to draft laws which would best meet the urgent needs of the American people and survive the threat of a veto. The President's veto threat hung ominously over the Congress throughout its deliberations and was often used to cut the substance from worthwhile measures.

The record of the 86th Congress will show also, that contrary to the President's prediction that the 86th Congress would engage in a cold war of partisan politics, on a number of issues important to our Nation, the President received more support from the Democrats in Congress than he did from the members of his own political party. A number of needed and constructive Democratic-sponsored bills, however, were either vetoed or stopped by threat of veto. Included were proposals to advance a solution to the problem of chronic unemployment and economically depressed areas, to promote home ownership and stimulate lagging home construction, to clean up the polluted water of our Nation, to provide adequately for the needs of our elder citizens—all affecting the human needs of our Nation.

The 2d session of the 86th Congress began on January 6, 1960, and ended September 2, 1960.

Although veto in the 1st session of the 86th Congress delayed flood control by a year, funds for the beginning of flood control activity for the Whitewater River, Franklin and Dearborn Counties, has been secured in second session action. The French Lick Creek watershed project received approval also in the second session. It is encouraging to look forward to giving a helping hand to other areas in their development of watershed projects.

The towns of Napoleon and Sunman were aided by Federal grants-in-aid for sewage projects. The President's veto of the water pollution control legislation adversely affects a half-dozen Ninth District towns needing assistance.

The veto of the wheat bill last spring was topped only by the tobacco price stabilization veto. The second session saw the tobacco bill pushed through to a successful conclusion. Wheat legislation, however, passed in the Senate during the second session, was not acted upon in the House.

The depressed area development legislation would have benefited areas in Indiana. The veto action will retard development of needed assistance on a loan and grant basis to help fellow Americans get on their feet.

Much has been said about the Federal budget. Of over $77 billion expenditures in fiscal year 1960, almost $42 billion was spent for national defense, $3½ billion for foreign aid which related to the national security, $2½ billion for atomic energy development and research, $5½ billion for the cost of services to veterans, present, past, and future. In addition, $9.2 billion was spent in fiscal 1960 to pay interest on the Federal debt which interest payment has almost doubled from $5.8 billion in 1952 because of administration policies favoring a hard-money policy with higher interest rates to lenders.

With the addition of $5½ billion on the farm support program, slightly over $10 billion remained for all of the other important functions of the Federal Government—including its criticized welfare programs.

Amendments were made to the Social Security Act by this Congress. A program of Federal grants to the States for medical care for the low income and aged was approved. The earning restriction was relaxed and the disability age requirement was dropped.

The Railroad Retirement Act was revised, increasing benefits to retired employees; Congress also extended the benefits of temporary unemployment compensation for 3 months in States whose payments had expired.

Veterans legislation was vigorously pursued in the 86th Congress. Twenty-eight public bills were enacted directly affecting the veteran and his family.

Requested increases in gasoline tax, postal rates, and interest rates on commercial bonds were denied by Congress. A slight increase in interest rates on series E and H bonds that individuals can own, was granted.

The Federal aid to education through school construction passed by both the House and the Senate, died with adjournment as the House Rules Committee refused to let the legislation go to a final conference.

A 5-year extension of the Library Services Act, providing matching funds to States for the extension and establishment of public library service in rural communities was passed. Although the State of Indiana has not taken advantage of this program in the past, future administrations can look forward to the opportunity.

Labor abuse legislation was enacted in the first session and civil rights received consideration. The second civil rights law in almost 100 years was passed, involving voting rights. Federal employees were given an increase in pay, overriding a Presidential veto, and the opportunity to participate in a health insurance plan.

Hawaii was admitted to the Union by an act of the 86th Congress.

Suspension of the Federal Communications Act equal time requirement so that the 1960 presidential and vice presidential candidates can stage TV-radio debates without obliging broadcasting networks to give corresponding time to fringe-party nominees for those offices, was legislated.

In international affairs, the Congress again appropriated $3.5 billion in the first session and $3.7 billion in the second session for the mutual security program. I voted against the bill in both sessions. I do not feel that the vast appropriations being made year after year can go on indefinitely while we preach economy in our domestic appropriations. The entire program must be overhauled and the excessive waste and extravagance pruned.

Our foreign affairs are governed by policies of the President which he in turn requests Congress to implement. The events of the year 1960 are world shaking and have produced crises which may well mark the course of civilization. We

have learned that no one nation can stand alone in our world today. The most challenging task for the next administration is the reestablishment of a sound moral foreign policy and a sound U.S. economic policy.

Many other bills have become law in the 86th Congress. Some bills which I believe were worthy did not pass and a good many that were not worthy did not pass. Certainly, this Congress has worked far more days than most Congresses. Each and every piece of legislation considered was given my close study and conscientious vote.

Inquiries are most welcome at all times. I have done my best to be responsive to the needs and opinions of the residents of the Ninth District and to discharge my responsibility as a Representative in the U.S. Congress in a manner that reflects credit and honor to those I am privileged to represent.

Medical Care Program Under Social Security Is the Only Answer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK KOWALSKI
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, only by enactment of an adequate medical care program, under social security, for our senior citizens, can the Government of the United States keep faith with its people and with the future.

I regret that bitter opposition to an adequate, truly meaningful program limited congressional action to a bill which makes only a token approach to this grave problem and which, at administration insistence, includes requirements for a means test which is entirely repugnant to Americans.

INADEQUATE BILL PASSED

The medical care bill which was passed at this postconvention session is inadequate and unfair. Many of us who recognized its grave faults were forced to vote for it because the Republicans made it plain that it was the only bill they would allow to go through, and the only bill that the President would not veto.

It should be remembered, Mr. Speaker, that we were prevented from even having a vote on the Forand bill—a bill which I had the honor to cosponsor.

Let us look at the bill that was passed.

It involves two separate programs.

First. It will provide additional Federal assistance to the States for medical care for those receiving public relief.

Second. It will make Federal assistance available to States which set up their own new medical assistance programs, but the assistance will be available only on a matching funds basis. Thus, each of the 50 States must establish by law its own program and must appropriate the necessary money. Also, and most importantly, even when this is done, if it is, help will be available only to those who meet a means test. In other words, to get any help in meeting medical costs, the applicant must show that he is unable to pay the costs himself.

This pauper's oath provision is a revolting requirement.

Let us have a medical care program which is not based on the idea of public charity.

THE NEED FOR PROTECTION

The need for an adequate Federal program to help our senior citizens meet the cost of illness is plain.

Let us look at some of the facts:

Each year, there are 150 Americans out of each 1,000 who require hospital care, but for those in the 65 to 74 age group the rate is 292 per 1,000—or almost double the rate for the general population.

We all know how hospital and medical costs have zoomed, with hospital costs alone now more than double what they were 13 years ago. The cost of medical care has risen 49 percent.

Older people must spend an average of three times as long in the hospital as younger patients.

Illness for the elderly comes at a time when their incomes are at a minimum level. They simply cannot afford the staggering costs of illness, nor can they meet the cost of adequate private insurance.

It would be a happy state of affairs if all our senior citizens did have incomes sufficient to meet all their reasonable needs, including the cost of illness. Unfortunately, such is not the case.

Almost two-thirds of our senior citizens have incomes, from all sources, of less than $1,000 a year.

Nor do our older Americans have assets which could be readily converted into cash to meet the costs of illness. At least half have less than $500 in such assets.

The elderly just cannot afford to be sick.

PRIVATE INSURANCE?

As a Representative from Connecticut, home of the great insurance industry, I would be delighted if private insurance provided the answer to this great social problem.

The insurance companies have made great strides in the field of medical care insurance. They are to be congratulated for what they have done.

But private companies simply cannot afford to provide the coverage that is needed, at prices that our senior citizens can afford.

It is reported by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare that about 6 million people of our 16 million Americans of 65 or older have some kind of insurance protection against costs of illness. But only 27 percent of those have policies which will pay for as much as half of their medical bills. The insurance carried by the other 73 percent of this minority fortunate enough to have any insurance will pay for less than half of their medical costs.

I believe that the insurance industry would benefit by enactment of a Federal program of medical care under social security.

It would allow the companies to withdraw from an unprofitable field and concentrate on supplemental coverage which can provide good protection at reasonable rates which will allow fair return.

The basic social security law was opposed by some insurance experts yet it has proved to be of great benefit to the insurance industry by providing a base for the establishment of many new life insurance and pension plans.

It would be well to recall what the President's Commission on Health Needs of the Nation said about this problem of medical care for the elderly. I quote from its report to the President in 1955:

> It is clear that the solution to the problem of payment for health services to the aging does not lie in currently available private insurance programs with premiums paid by the aged. Nor does it lie in any reasonably anticipated increase in cash benefits under old-age assistance or old-age and survivors insurance. Rather, the situation requires a new approach.

DR. MAC LEAN'S STATEMENT

The former president of the National Blue Cross Association, Dr. Basil C. MacLean, gave eloquent support to Forand-type legislation.

Such a bill, he said, "provides a way of dealing with the question with dignity and effectiveness."

Said Dr. MacLean:

> As a physician, I have had an intimate look at the special and personal health needs of the aged. As a hospital administrator, I have seen that need reflected as a burden of obligatory and uncompensated service that acted as a constant drag upon the hospital's economic support and growth.
>
> As New York City Commissioner of Hospitals, I have seen these problems further translated into financial and social deficit for the entire community. As president of the National Blue Cross Association, I participated first hand in the attempt to meet some of those problems through existing voluntary prepayment organizations.
>
> A lifetime's experience has led me at last to conclude that the aged simply cannot afford to buy from any of these the scope of care that is required, nor do the stern competitive realities permit any carrier * * * to provide benefits which are adequate at a price which is feasible for any but a small proportion of the aged.

KOWALSKI BILL SUMMARY

It is my intention, Mr. Speaker, if I am reelected to the House of Representatives, to submit again my bill, H.R. 7778, identical with the Forand bill, to establish a Federal program of medical care for senior citizens, under social security.

Here is a summary of my bill:

First. The proposal: To amend old-age and survivors insurance so as to provide insurance against the cost of hospital, nursing home, and surgical services to all those eligible for old-age and survivors benefits or who would be eligible if they applied.

Second. Its purpose: As people grow old, they need more medical care but usually have less money to meet its rising cost. Most of them cannot get adequate protection through private insurance, and a severe disability may mean financial disaster.

Individual health insurance policies are expensive; they usually exclude a preexisting condition; they may be refused or canceled. Group insurance

also is unavailable to most retired persons and aged widows since they have no employment connection such as normally is required.

Young widows and children similarly have low incomes and little opportunity to obtain private insurance.

Many hospitals have constant and serious financial difficulties because they have to provide free service to these people. Private charities and public assistance agencies frequently pay for such hospital care or help make up hospital deficits.

The proposal would transfer to the self-supporting insurance system a financial burden which now falls on individuals and private charities, and on public assistance financed by taxpayers. Thus it would work in the direction preferred by Congress.

Fifteen million persons would be eligible in 1961.

Third. The benefits:

A. Hospital and nursing home services: Each eligible person would be insured against the cost of hospital care, including a semiprivate room and all the hospital services, medical care, drugs, and appliances which the hospital customarily furnishes its bed patients. The insurance system would not pay the attending doctor's bills, except for surgical services.

Skilled nursing home services would be covered if the patient is transferred to the nursing home from the hospital and if the services are for the same condition or one arising from that for which he received hospital care. The care in the nursing home could be extended so that up to 120 days of combined care would be provided in a 12-month period but only 60 days could be hospital care.

B. Surgical services: The insurance system would pay the cost of surgical services provided in a hospital, or in case of an emergency or for minor surgery, in the outpatient department of a hospital or in a doctor's office. Any individual may freely select the surgeon of his choice provided the surgeon has attained specified professional recognition—subsection (c)(2), except in cases of emergency or where the requirement of such certification is not practical. The cost of oral surgery by a dentist in a hospital would be covered.

C. Procedures for insured persons: The insurance procedures would be like those already developed for patients covered by private insurance plans that provide service benefits.

A person eligible for hospital or nursing home insurance would, as at present, be admitted to such an institution on his physician's referral. The patient could receive insured services from any qualified practitioner or institution which has agreed to participate and to be paid for services insured under the plan. In emergency situations, referral or prior agreement could be waived.

Fourth. Administration: The program is to be administered by the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The OASI system would use its existing recordkeeping system to certify eligibility, to issue insurance cards, and the like. For aged beneficiaries, this would mean paid-up hospital and surgical insurance for life.

Any qualified provider of services would have the right to participate. Payments could be made at such rates as are provided in each agreement, covering the actual costs incurred, or on some other mutually agreed basis. Widely used patterns for determining rates have been developed under Government and private programs.

The agreements are to stipulate that the payment at the agreed rates shall constitute full payment for the contracted services; the patient may not be billed for additional sums for the contracted services. Agreements of this type are now in effect under the Federal program for medical care for dependents of members of the Armed Forces.

The Secretary could make agreements directly with providers of services or with their authorized representatives. Group practice prepayment plans would be included.

The Secretary shall prescribe regulations and establish an advisory council. He may utilize the services of private nonprofit organizations to the extent that he determines that their utilization will contribute to effective and economical administration.

Fifth. Special safeguard: Nothing in the bill shall be construed to give the Secretary or administering agencies authority over the internal management of participating institutions or over the practice of medicine or the manner in which medical services are provided.

Sixth. Exclusions: Persons eligible for permanent and disability benefits are not included. The proposal does not apply to costs incurred in Federal hospitals, or in tuberculosis or mental institutions, or in other countries. It does not cover all types of nursing homes or apply to institutions that provide primarily domiciliary care. It does not apply to workmen's compensation cases unless arrangements are made to reimburse the insurance system. It does not include elective surgery, or nonsurgical medical services, except those customarily furnished by hospitals as an essential part of hospital care for bed patients.

Seventh. Financing: The bill would increase contribution rates of employers and employees by one-fourth percent each and of the self-employed by three-eighths percent.

SUPPLEMENTAL BILL

It is also my intention, Mr. Speaker, to submit a bill establishing a special program of medical care for those not eligible for protection under the social security system.

This would provide coverage for the several million of our senior citizens who are not within the social security program.

A CHALLENGE TO AMERICA

The problem of adequate medical care for our senior citizens, under a program that will preserve their dignity and independence, is a challenge to America. It is a challenge we must meet.

The needs of our older citizens have been neglected long enough. It is time that we faced up to those needs and took the action that is necessary.

The basic question is a simple one of social justice. We have a moral obligation to our senior citizens—an obligation which we must fulfill.

A medical care program under social security will be a sound program, a humane program. It will show to the world that America keeps faith with her citizens, that she recognizes the great contributions of those who have done so much to build and strengthen our great land.

I shall keep fighting for such a program, with all my energy, until it becomes law. Despite the bitter opposition, right shall prevail.

Medical Care for the Elderly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I take this means to report to hundreds of constituents who have sent me messages concerning medical care for elderly citizens.

In response to their requests and those of thousands of other Americans, the Congress has taken a great step toward broadening Government responsibility for medical care for the aged.

As many as 10 million elderly Americans—those who most need help—can be helped by the new medical care program.

The Federal Government stands ready to begin this program October 1, 1960. When it will go into effect will depend upon action taken by the 50 States, for this is a Federal-State cooperative program in the same category as aid to dependent children, unemployment compensation, vocational rehabilitation, old-age assistance, and many others.

Each State may determine, within the broad provisions of the Federal law, how it will administer the medical care program.

The Federal law does not require, as has been claimed, that any individual take a pauper's oath, and it specifically forbids any State to require a lien on the home of any individual so long as he or his wife, or husband, is living.

As Senator GORE has said:

> Under different circumstances, this proposal would be regarded as a very great, liberal advancement in social betterment.

The circumstances, as all of us understand, were the political controversies arising out of demands for the much more far-reaching proposal by our colleague from Rhode Island, Mr. FORAND. Again quoting the liberal Democrat Senator, Mr. GORE:

> The circumstances really do not detract and should not be allowed to detract from the very great benefits and the very large forward steps encompassed in the bill.

I supported this measure in the belief and hope that it will bring relief and ease the burdens of millions of older people who are entitled to its benefits. I urge

the State of Ohio to use whatever legal authority it now possesses and to enact such additional legislation as may be required to give the fullest advantages of this generous Federal legislation to our people.

International Space Law and Outer Space

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] delivered a most thoughtful and enlightening address before the 11th International Astronautical Congress at Stockholm, Sweden, on August 16, 1960.

Senator MARTIN'S speech was entitled "International Space Law and Outer Space," which I know is a subject of deep interest to all Americans. I therefore ask unanimous consent to have a copy of this address printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERNATIONAL SPACE LAW AND OUTER SPACE

(Address by U.S. Senator THOMAS E. MARTIN, of Iowa, before the Space Law Colloquium of the 11th International Astronautical Congress, Stockholm, Sweden, Tuesday, August 16, 1960)

I am pleased and honored to have been invited to speak before you today. The International Astronautical Federation has since its foundation in 1950 provided a valuable international forum for the review of outer-space problems and for the stimulation of action in governmental and international public bodies. I hope it will continue to provide this valuable service. In view of the uncharted nature of much of the work in astronautics, the contribution of private thinking and analysis can be of immense importance to the future development of man's efforts in outer space.

The stirring era in which we live is witness to the extension of man's activity into a medium entirely new to him. In the realm of space exploration man is faced with technical and scientific demands of unparalleled difficulty. At the same time, he is given priceless opportunity—a chance to establish new relations with his fellow man in a new environment, relatively free from the limiting influence of precedent.

Starting with a clean slate, man should so plan his activities in outer space as to preclude the possibility of the armed conflicts and controversies which have characterized his history on this planet. He can promote a new atmosphere, based on scientific cooperation and the rule of law, which might serve as an example for his earthbound relations with his fellow man. As Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge stated in an address to the 14th General Assembly:

"International cooperation in the exploration of outer space offers an avenue along which nations may approach mutual understanding and peace. Working together on the great challenges of explorations beyond the confines of earth can create a new perspective, in which national boundaries and national rivalries recede in importance."

Certainly we can agree that the incentives for international cooperation in outer space are many and very substantial. Tremendous expense is involved in space exploration. Geographically widespread and yet tightly coordinated observation stations are required. Coordination of operations is imperative if we are to avoid mutual interference and minimize the danger of accident and damage as traffic in outer space increases in intensity. All these factors urge the importance of international cooperation.

And there is another grim argument for cooperation: Scientific progress has inevitably made possible the use of outer space for new and more dangerous means of waging war. This fact requires that maximum cooperative efforts be made among the nations to guard against the use of outer space for aggressive purposes. Recognizing the great dangers lurking in such use, the United States over 3 years ago proposed a study of means to reserve outer space for peaceful purposes only. Today the United States stands prepared to enter upon such a study separately from the overall problem of disarmament. A concrete proposal in this direction has been made by the 5 Western Powers to the Geneva Conference of the 10-Nation Committee on Disarmament. These nations have urged the banning of weapons of mass destruction in orbit or stationed in outer space.

I hope very much that outer space can be reserved as a great area for peace. It would be a tragic thing indeed if the wars and national rivalries which have too often characterized relations among the nations here on earth were to be projected into outer space.

It is gratifying to note that the strong incentives for international cooperation in outer space which I have mentioned have not been without effect. Even in the initial stages of space exploration, such cooperation has made an important contribution in the tracking of earth satellites and the assembly of scientific data. Wide recognition of the desirability of mutual assistance in this new field is reflected in the intelligent and significant cooperation of states, organizations and individuals during the International Geophysical Year (1957–58). It is also reflected in the continuation of these activities under the aegis of the Committee for Space Research of the International Council of Scientific Unions.

A special and important example of international cooperation, is furnished by the transmission by the United States to the U.S.S.R. of a number of tape recordings of the data received from Sputniks I, II and III.

As the pace of outer space activities increases, there will grow, in addition to the need for cooperation, a need for regulation and control of such activities in order to minimize conflicts of interests and operations. This involves the establishment of broad principles and specific regulatory measures to meet operational requirements.

Because of the very newness of the field of outer space exploration, the context and nature of many potential problems are not yet clear. I therefore believe that it is premature, at this time, to attempt to draw up a comprehensive legal code to cover all contingencies in outer space. It is, after all, a cardinal rule that the development of international law must follow the dictates of concrete need. We do not know enough about the difficulties that may be encountered in outer space to foresee the precise nature of the entire range of regulatory measures which may one day be necessary.

There are, however, certain problems which can be identified at present and studied with regard to possible regulatory and control measures. In this task, as you know, the United Nations ad hoc Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space has made preliminary identification of a number of areas which call for international coordination and control on a priority basis.

Now I would not go so far as to suggest that we install stop-and-go lights in outer space in order to control traffic there. But just as some regulatory measures become necessary for traffic on our international highways and on the high seas, so a certain degree of regulation and control will be essential with respect to outer space activities.

Among these problems, it is interesting to note a useful connection between identification and registration of space vehicles, advance notice of their launchings, and a possible system for guarding against surprise attack or use of outer space for aggressive purposes. It may well be that experience gained in this field may be useful in disarmament and arms control measures.

Regarding freedom of outer space for exploration and use, the ad hoc committee took a liberal and forward-looking view. It pointed out that "during the IGY * * * and subsequently, countries throughout the world proceeded on the premise of the permissibility of the launching and flight of space vehicles * * * regardless of what territory they pass 'over' during the course of their flight."

This premise appears to have been supported by the fact that such space activity has been undertaken and that no nation has raised objection to the launching of space vehicles by another. Thus it would seem to me there has been acceptance of the principle of freedom of exploration and scientific observation in much the same manner as was agreed in Washington last December 1 with respect to the continent of Antarctica.

A similar possibility exists regarding the exploration of and assertion of claims to celestial bodies. Last year agreement was reached by the signatory states to the effect that no territorial claims are to be submitted under the Antarctica Treaty. Why should not serious consideration be given to adherence to such a practice with respect to bodies in outer space? Certainly at the present state of man's knowledge and capabilities it would seem that the resources of natural bodies in space, like the vast regions of space itself, represent sharable assets of the community of nations. Scientific exploration of a planet conducted under the national auspices of one country should in no way involve the prohibition of similar, noninterfering, exploration by other countries.

The question of the establishment of a recognized boundary between air space and outer space is an especially complex one; in my estimation, it represents a surprising number of difficulties—difficulties which may possibly prove insuperable. The main argument for determining a space boundary is that it would help to preclude states from making claims to sovereignty over large parts of space on the assertion that they are air space rather than outer space.

The criteria for such a boundary determination, however, are not easy to establish. Should the division between air space and outer space be defined in terms of the physical characteristics of the air? Or should it be based upon the purpose of flight or on the physical characteristics of flightcraft? There are, for example, vehicles which have the characteristics of both aircraft and spacecraft. These operate on aerodynamic principles in one part of their flight and on pure rocket principles in another.

In order to avoid these difficulties, it has been suggested that an arbitrary limit might be chosen. But where would the line be drawn? Would it be at an altitude of 50,000 feet, or 70,000 feet, or perhaps as high as a manned plane might fly? The result of any arbitrary limit, it seems to me, would likely be either to fetter space activities by inappropriate rules or to interfere unnecessarily

with the existing regime of international aviation.

Even if the difficulties of fixing a stationary boundary were overcome, the achievement would not solve all problems. This would be most obviously the case were the boundary to be fixed at a relatively high altitude. For example, artificial satellites often come much closer to the earth at some points in their orbits than at others. In some cases the perigee, or point nearest the earth, falls within one or more boundaries which have been proposed, while the apogee, or farthest point, falls outside. To me, it would make little sense to impose one legal regime, or status on the satellite at perigee and another on the same satellite at apogee.

Another problem would arise in connection with establishment of a high altitude space boundary. As altitude increases, the relevance and adequacy of normal air space boundaries decrease. There is progressively less relationship between objects located or activities taking place above specific national territory on the surface of the earth. For example, reentry and landing of an object traveling at high speed and high altitude are apt to take place hundreds, or even thousands, of miles farther on in its line of travel.

Rather than seek to limit space activity on the basis of altitude alone, other factors might be equally relevant. Should not one consider the trajectory of the space vehicle or object, its flight mission, the instrumentation and other functional characteristics of the vehicle in question, for example, in the search for appropriate criteria? Even with the resort to such criteria, however, much will remain in dispute. It would, I think, be ill advised to accept a boundary for outer space before its practicality and utility are thoroughly established.

These are some of the imponderables with which we are faced in the formulation of legislation and procedures governing man's activities in outer space. The factors which must be taken into consideration are exceedingly complex, and the technical and scientific information as yet available concerning many aspects of such activities is far from complete. These facts underline the need for considerable caution in drawing up legal provisions relating to outer space activities.

Despite this complexity, however, the accelerating rate of outer space exploration renders indispensable the early consideration of regulatory measures in certain specific areas, as I have indicated earlier. With the growth of customary practice and the accumulation of laws and agreements dealing with particular subjects, a system of laws governing human relations in outer space will gradually be filled out.

In the growth of such a system, the international community will wish to see its basic policy aims, as affirmed in such documents as the United Nations Charter, reflected in the body of outer space law. These aims include the reservation of outer space for peaceful purposes, the encouragement of international cooperation and the encouragement of scientific research, particularly in the interest of achieving practical benefits to increase human welfare.

The hope of cooperation in outer space was put eloquently not long ago by Dr. T. Keith Glennan, Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, when he said:

"Out of the efforts of the dedicated and inspired men of all nations may yet come that common understanding and mutual trust that will break the lockstep of suspicion and distrust that divides the world into separate camps today."

Faced with the tremendous opportunities presented by outer space, we owe it to ourselves and to all posterity to rise to the occasion and meet the challenge with statesmanship and breadth of vision.

The Significance of Flowers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE GRANT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, recently during the recess of Congress, accompanied by my family, I traveled in England and several other countries on the Continent. I was particularly fascinated by and interested in, not only the innumerable flower gardens and small plots, but by the potted and boxed plants in homes, factories, and business establishments. Especially did this seem to be true in France, Italy, Holland, Scotland, and Germany. From a hotel in Rome, I could see countless apartments, and each window had pots or boxes of flowers; also they could be seen blooming in practically every skylight opening. As I gazed upon the serene loveliness of these flowers, there came to my mind a thought which grew stronger each day—if the whole world could see and feel the significance of these flowers, it would be a great forward step toward peace.

Someone has written:

There is a tongue in every leaf—
A voice in every rill;
A voice that speaketh everywhere.

It was Wordsworth who said:

To me the meanest flower that blows can give
Thoughts that do often lie too deep for tears.

Longfellow wrote:

Wondrous truths, and manifold as wondrous,
God hath written in those stars above;
But not less in the bright flowerets under us
Stands the revelation of His love.

In all places, then, and in all seasons,
Flowers expand their light and soul-like wings,
Teaching us, by most persuasive reasons,
How akin they are to human things.

Yes:

Flowers sing a song,
Flowers preach a sermon;
If we will only hear
A song, a prayer of peace.

It is said that music has the power to charm the savage beast. Why cannot this be said of flowers? For, like music, flowers are a universal language. There is no language barrier in flowers. Two people do not have to understand each other's language or way of life in order to appreciate the same beautiful flowers. Flowers tell a story; they have a language all their own; perhaps, this is nature's secret language, one of peace, serenity, and kindness.

Flowers are the lexicon of love—peace and tenderness—as opposed to hate and malice. Can one who loves flowers be a mean person or be one who really hates a foreigner? Flowers are a silent token of worthwhile sentiments and a message of peace and love—"Peace on earth, and good will to men."

Many of the nations of this earth have national flower emblems. The United States has not officially adopted a flower as its national emblem. However, most of the 50 States do have an official flower. While petitions have been circulated, polls taken, and legislation introduced to adopt this and that flower as the national emblem, such has not been done. Perhaps it would be an excellent idea to bunch all of the individual State flowers together and adopt this bouquet as the national flower emblem of the United States.

Regardless of what flower may be the State or national emblem, all flowers silently emblazon love and peace. In the language of flowers, the Madonna lily signifies sweetness; the water lily, purity of heart; lily-of-the-valley, happiness; red rose, love; blue violet, faithfulness; purple lilac, emotions of love; goldenrod, encouragement; and countless others, too numerous to mention, give messages of peace.

If only every person who plants a flower would dedicate it to peace, what a wonderful world we would have. These seeds would grow, not only in the flowerpots, boxes, plots, and gardens; but their message would grow in the hearts of all; a message of hope and faith and one that preaches the futility of war.

We all realize that before this idea can engulf the world that man's attitude toward the ideology of war and distrust must be changed, but herein lies the seed to help bring about this change. If patriotic, civic, flower, and garden clubs in just one country would accept this idea and contact like organizations throughout the world, a possibility of universal peace exists.

Since music is universally loved,
And we can appreciate its tone;
Why not help the white dove,
By a peace flower in each home?

May not a simple flower
Proclaim the end of war?
'Tis true it has the power
To do this and far more.

Then let all nations combine,
In one universal score,
To use the flower as a sign
That war shall be no more.

God in his goodness to every land
Gave each His flowers to love;
So let's join a great brotherhood band
To give thanks to our Father above.

May we through the goodly message of flowers hasten that day when "They shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning hooks"; and war shall be no more.

General of the Armies John J. Pershing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, this month we will celebrate the 100th anniversary of the birth of a great American and a great soldier, General of the Armies John J. Pershing. Many of us here were inspired to serve under his vic-

torious leadership in the first great war of this century.

Before playing his historic role in the First World War, General Pershing fought in the Spanish-American War and the Philippine insurrection, and commanded the troops sent into Mexico in pursuit of Villa in March of 1916. After serving as commander in chief of the American Expeditionary Force in World War I from 1917 to 1919, he was appointed Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army on July 1 of 1921, in which capacity he served until his retirement in 1924.

General Pershing was a product of our democracy. No nobler example of the rise and progress of a humble citizen to greatness and a nation's gratitude is anywhere presented to us. He was a soldier of human liberty. The glory of his achievements is an epic. The historians who come after us to record the events of our times will linger in admiration over the career of this great American. Wherever men enjoy liberty, there will descend upon his memory the benediction of their heartfelt prayers.

May his spirit ever guide us with a truer and nobler courage, to stand as soldiers should stand in the battle to preserve our liberties.

Statement by Congressman Earl Hogan at 12-State Democratic Conference and Rally

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL HOGAN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the statement I was privileged to give in behalf of Indiana farmers during the 12-State Democratic conference and rally at Des Moines, Iowa, August 20–21, 1960:

PRESENTATION BY CONGRESSMAN EARL HOGAN, DEMOCRAT, NINTH INDIANA DISTRICT, AT 12-STATE DEMOCRATIC CONFERENCE AND RALLY, DES MOINES, IOWA, AUGUST 20–21, 1960

Mr. Chairman, it is a real privilege to come before this meeting in behalf of the farmers of the great State of Indiana, for they are in a squeeze and are hurting.

The official research conducted by Purdue University on farmers' accounting records have been completed for 1959. Briefly, they show one of the most drastic drops from 1958 to 1959 of any year since the Hoover depression. But even more disastrous these records for much better than average Indiana farmers show that the farmers in my State are going in the hole and going in the hole rapidly.

These university analyzed farm records show that if farmers in my State were to get just a national legal minimum wage for their labor and that of their families, they would not have earned any return whatsoever on their large investment of capital and operating expenses. Or to put it the other way, if these farmers had been required, as indeed many of them were, to pay going rates of tight-money interest on their capital investment, they would have been working the entire crop year of 1959 for less than nothing, with no return on either their labor or their management know-how. In fact the figures show that the best, most efficient farmers in Indiana had to work for nothing and pay something besides for the privilege of farming in 1959. I know these figures are quite accurate because I had the same kind of results on my own small farm.

One of the first things I did after I was elected to Congress was to work out a proposal with the help of the farm leaders in my district and I introduced it. If my bill, H.R. 7188, had been enacted it would have raised farm income, cut Government costs of the farm program, and set up a conservation program that would make a major contribution to the future strength of our Nation.

Needless to say the Republican administration sent up an adverse report on my bill. However, more than a score of my colleagues and I got together early this year and developed a Family Farm Income Act which contained the provisions of the bills we had introduced separately. And, Mr. Chairman, we added other neded features and found that that bill, too, faced the stubborn opposition of the Republican administration, some of their banker and processor allies, and all of the Republican members of the House Committee on Agriculture of which I am honored to be a member.

There is no secret of what is needed in the way of an improved farm program; we need something that will begin to raise farm income imediately before still more family farms have gone down the drain; a program that will reduce the drain on the Federal Treasury; a program that will not stack up more and more wheat and feed grains in the Commodity Credit Corporation warehouses where large sums are being paid for interest, handling changes, and storage of no benefit to farmers.

All of us know, Mr. Chairman, that we need a program that will conserve and develop our soil and water resources. A program that will give farmers a means to raise their incomes to a fair parity level; that will help them preserve their farms; that will allow them to use marketing orders, marketing quotas, and acreage allotments to balance their production, and market sales to a volume that will clear the market at a fair price.

There's nothing unique about the proposals I have made. They are fully covered in the fine farm plank adopted by the great Democratic Convention in Los Angeles. I think most of you agree with me that the Democratic platform farm plank is the most forward looking most meaningful farm plank that any political party has ever written into its platform.

Our farm plank is dedicated to the family farm. The kind that you and I grew up on. The kind of farm that the Nation should preserve and promote for the national best interest. The kind of farm that Thomas Jefferson and the other Founding Fathers considered to be the foundation and backbone of the democracy in this Republic.

It states several basic principles: Parity of farm income so that efficient family farmers can earn as much on their labor and capital investment as can be earned by similar productive resources in other parts of the economy; the use of abundant food and fiber for unemployed and our needy here at home and to encourage the undecided nations around the world to adopt democracy, to balance farm production with demand; to set up a national safety reserve of food and fiber; and to once and for all set up a farm program that will improve and stabilize farm income—get the issue off the front pages into operation and get on down the road—instead of forever and always having to fight continuing rearguard actions against those who keep on wanting to destroy the farm program and the family farm with it.

The farm problem is not just a sudden emergency; it is not a problem that is temporary. The farm income problem is caused by deeply underlying continuing features of a national economy that are continuous and continuing.

To solve the farm income problem will take continuing programs and continuous effort. But if we set up such a program that can be carried out by the democratically elected farmer committees making adjustments every year to tailor the overall program to local needs, then we'll have an ongoing program that can be adapted to emerging needs by farmers themselves within congressional safeguards and Congress won't be called upon to consider a farm program bill every year. Constant public controversy over farm policy is no good kind of farm program. We need a policy that we can set in motion and quit having public political fights about in Congress every day.

Words Nullified by Deeds—A Look at the Administration's Middle East Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ERNEST GRUENING
OF ALASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement which I have prepared on the administration's Middle East policies.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR GRUENING

Almost 4 years ago, on November 2, 1956, Vice President NIXON stated: "There can be no double standard of conduct in international affairs."

On June 26, 1958, in soothing the fears of party officials concerning the effects on their political fortunes of the Sherman Adams affair, Vice President NIXON stated: "The public memory is short."

Probably in no other aspect of its administration of public affairs does the Eisenhower-Nixon administration hope that the public memory will be shorter than with respect to its double standard of conduct in the Middle East—of its words nullified by its deeds.

President Truman acted to give U.S. recognition to Israel as a sovereign state in May 1948. The United States was the first nation in the world to take this step.

President Truman acted promptly and decisively and adopted a policy of support and friendship for the new Republic of Israel because he was a realist facing up to pertinent and deeply significant facts.

For the fact was that Israel, with a land area of only 7,800 square miles and a population of 650,000, was the only true democracy in the Middle East.

The fact was that its people were free people and its political institutions founded on America's own cherished principle of government by consent of the governed.

The fact was that it was an oasis of civilization in a desert of backwardness, an oasis surrounded by dictatorships controlling areas and populations many times greater than those of Israel and ruling them

without regard to individual rights or freedoms.

The fact was, and has increasingly become, that this long savagely persecuted people, with unprecedented effort, dedication and determination and in the face of incredible obstacles, were converting this tiny arid sliver of earth into a civilized homeland blooming with agriculture, flourishing with small industries and setting up in that long stagnant backwater of the world new high standards of education, health, and welfare.

The fact was that if peace was to come to that troubled area of the world, the example of democracy, working and progressing, that was Israel, must be encouraged and maintained, an example to shine as a beacon to lead the neighboring backward and oppressed peoples to better living standards and greater freedom. Clearly, while the feudal Arab chieftains had no interest in the greater emancipation of their own people, how obviously desirable was such a policy for the United States to proclaim and follow.

But instead, the Eisenhower-Nixon administration, while occasionally professing sympathy with the aims and aspirations of Israel, has acted to the contrary.

There was the administration's buildup of the prestige and power of the Arab nations without an equal effort to maintain the status and strength of Israel as the democratic outpost in the Middle East—the symbolic gift of a pistol to General Naguib, Nasser's predecessor—the invitations to heads of state of the Arab nations, quickly offered and readily accepted—the economic aid granted without regard to whether it would merely intrench the feudal rulers or benefit their people.

There was the policy of impartiality in which the Eisenhower-Nixon administration, professedly dedicated to peace, studiously overlooked the fact that the Arab nations were proclaiming unabashedly that they were at war with Israel and were united in the purpose to achieve Israel's destruction and the extermination of its people. It was a policy almost tantamount to a declaration that the United States would look the other way while Israel's neighbors undertook its annihilation.

There was the pressure on the British by the United States to give up the Suez Canal, without a commitment from Egypt guaranteeing free transit for the trade of all nations.

There was the disavowal of the tripartite agreement under which the boundaries of Israel were guaranteed and the United States, France, and Great Britain were pledged to prevent any change in the relative armed strength of the countries of the Middle East.

There was the persistent refusal of the Eisenhower-Nixon administration to supply arms to Israel to meet the ever-growing imbalance in armed strength between Israel and her hostile neighbors due in great measure to the fact that Soviet Russia, recognizing the vacuum left by the disavowal of the tripartite agreement, was hastening to make Egypt an armed camp.

There was the heightening tension between Israel and its Arab neighbors because of the hit and run raids of Egyptian fedayeen units into Israel's territory resulting in 364 Israeli wounded and 101 killed in the course of 1,843 cases of armed robbery and theft, 1,339 cases of armed clashes, and 172 cases of sabotage, all on Israeli soil—with Israel's continued unheeded protests to the United Nations, none of which resulted in the application of any effective sanctions against the Arab nations.

There was the continued and mounting blockade of the Suez Canal by Egypt against shipping to and from Israel regardless of the flag flown by the vessel carrying the Israeli goods and the reaching into the cities of the United States by the Arab nations to enforce the blockade by requiring American firms doing business in Arab countries to discriminate against employees of the Jewish race, even in their offices in the United States.

Then came the Aswan Dam fiasco. First the Eisenhower-Nixon administration promised financial aid to Nasser for the construction of the dam. Then, suddenly, for reasons never adequately explained the administration withdrew its offer. Nasser promptly retaliated by seizing the Suez Canal. At that time, Nasser assured the world that there would be free and open transit through the canal without discrimination, overt or covert; this covers both political and technical aspects. Further, Nasser promised that the operation of the canal should be insulated from the policies of any country.

These promises were not kept.

The blockade of the Suez Canal continued.

The raids by the Egyptians, urged by the propaganda machinery of the United Arab Republic, were stepped up.

Finally, in October 1956, in desperation Israeli troops marched into neighboring areas to seize the enemy's operating bases.

It was then that the Eisenhower-Nixon administration, after ignoring for years the warning signs of danger in the increasing tempo of Egyptian raids across Israeli borders, the blockage of the Suez Canal, which was slowly cutting off Israel's economic lifeline, and Israel's repeated but unavailing appeals to the United Nations, moved against its traditional friends and allies, Britain and France, and against the only democratic nation in the Middle East, Israel.

Ambassador Lodge, on behalf of the United States, called for a meeting of the United Nations Security Council to consider a resolution of the United States. That proposed resolution, introduced by the United States in anger at Israel's action to prevent further marauding attacks, not only demanded that Israel withdraw, but called upon all members of the United Nations "to refrain from giving any military, economic, or financial assistance to Israel so long as it has not complied with this resolution."

A taut world then witnessed a curious voting pattern in the United Nations. On that resolution the United States and Soviet Russia voted for the imposition of sanctions against Israel—a strange bedfellowship that Henry Cabot Lodge had wrought for the United States—while France and Great Britain voted against such action.

And the next day—on a Soviet resolution calling merely for a cease fire and for Israeli withdrawal—the United States abstained from voting because, as Ambassador Lodge explained it, he could not vote for a resolution which did not contain the sanctions against Israel which he had first proposed. (He is the man whom Presidential Candidate NIXON now proposes to send to the Middle East to straighten out its difficulties.)

It was at that point that Vice President NIXON treated our break with our traditional allies—France and Great Britain—as an accomplishment rather than a setback. He stated:

"For the first time in history [as a result of the Suez crisis], we have shown independence of Anglo-French policies toward Asia and Africa which seemed to us to reflect the colonial tradition. That declaration of independence has had an electrifying effect throughout the world."

The electrifying effect upon the world was closer to dismay than to rejoicing.

In pressing for the withdrawal of Israeli troops, President Eisenhower himself appeared before a nationwide television audience and made the solemn pledge that if the Suez Canal were blockaded in the future such action "would be dealt with firmly by the family of nations."

Israel withdrew its troops. It relinquished the fruits of its brilliant triumph on the field of battle.

But Nasser, emboldened by what, after a crushing military defeat, had become, thanks to the U.S. action before the U.N., a clear-cut victory, tightened the noose around Israel's economic existence by stringently enforcing his ban against all ships dealing with Israel using the Suez Canal.

In December 1959, despite strong congressional protests, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development made a loan of $56 million to Nasser to widen and deepen the Suez Canal.

No quid pro quo, no conditions relating to freedom of transit, were requested or exacted from the United Arab Republic in exchange for this munificent financial and moral support.

This loan was granted at almost the precise moment when a Danish and a Greek ship were being detained at Port Said because they were involved in trade with Israel—at exactly the hour when Egypt was publicly and defiantly repudiating its pledge of "free and open transit through the canal without discrimination, overt or covert," and was acting in violation of President Eisenhower's proclaimed commitment.

It should be noted that all the U.S. representatives on the International Bank voted for this loan. The president, the three vice presidents and the treasurer of the Bank are all American citizens. The United States controls 32 percent of the voting strength of the Bank. With European nations interested in preserving free transit through the Suez Canal, the United States controls over 50 percent of the Bank's vote. A simple word from the White House to the Bank's officialdom indicating that it was the policy of the United States not to grant such a loan without a commitment on the part of the Egyptian Government to allow freedom of passage to ships of all nations, would have been accepted and acted upon by the U.S. officials at least and would, undoubtedly, have prevailed with the other board members.

Either the commitment to allow freedom of transit would have been made, or the loan would not have been made.

The promise of President Eisenhower that any action to blockade the Suez would be "dealt with firmly by the family of nations" was nullified by the action of the International Bank, with the United States having almost one-third of the votes, in granting the $56 million loan without even an attempt to secure a commitment for the free passage of all ships. A negative vote by the United States—and the Bank—until and unless there was an assurance of free transit through the canal would have been understood—an affirmative vote for the loan cannot be understood except in terms that the Eisenhower-Nixon administration does not mean what it says about championing freedom of transit through the Suez Canal.

This action is in marked contrast to the following high-sounding words recently uttered by Vice President NIXON in reply to an inquiry from President Label A. Katz of B'nai B'rith:

"I believe that we must continue to press for the effective implementation of the principle of freedom of the seas and free access to international waterways, and the protection of the interests of American seamen and shipping now being discriminated against by the Arab boycott and blacklisting policy."

It seems obvious that the United States, by not matching its deeds to its words, has continued and aggravated the tension in the Middle East.

The question of freedom of transit through the Suez Canal was considered by Congress this year in connection with the passage of the Mutual Security Act Amendments of 1960.

Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois, proposed an amendment to the bill to the effect that it was the sense of the Congress that assistance under the Mutual Security Act be

administered so as to give effect to the principles that the United States favors freedom of navigation in international waterways and economic cooperation between recipient nations.

This provision was bitterly fought by the administration in the Senate. The amendment was adopted by a vote of 45 to 25 with 77 percent of the Democrats voting for it and 60 percent of the Republicans voting against it. Both Senator KENNEDY and Senator JOHNSON voted for the amendment.

Senator JOHNSON's motion to table a motion to reconsider the vote carried by a vote of 40 to 29 with 73 percent of the Democrats voting for it and 71 percent of the Republicans voting against it. Actually the amendment carried with it no compulsion since it gave the President discretion to follow or not to follow the Senate's recommendation to use economic aid as a lever to enforce freedom of navigation. Since that time it has become clear that the Eisenhower-Nixon administration has disregarded the Senate's suggested policy.

Indeed, the administration's strong reaction against conditioning foreign aid upon adherence to the principle of freedom of transit through international waters is in marked contrast to its insistence in October 1956, in the United Nations that all member nations withdraw economic aid to Israel.

Four years ago—and about 2 weeks before Israeli troops marched to capture neighboring Egyptian bases from which the murderous raids on Israel had been launched, and Ambassador Lodge asked the Security Council to impose economic sanctions against Israel, Vice President NIXON said:

"As an example, President Eisenhower's patient yet firm leadership in the crises that developed over the Suez Canal is making itself felt throughout a tense world today. I can report to you that we are making headway in this difficult matter; we have kept the peace; and it appears that Mr. Eisenhower's tolerance and wisdom and leadership will serve to avert armed conflict in that part of the globe."

But these high-sounding words have been nullified by the actions of the Eisenhower-Nixon administration since taking office.

They have been nullified by:

U.S. pressure upon Great Britain to withdraw from the Suez Canal without receiving assurances from Egypt as to free transit of the canal.

Denial of arms to Israel while arming Saudi Arabia and while Communist Russia was arming Egypt.

Ignoring the increased tempo of Egyptian raids upon Israel.

The consistence of Ambassador Lodge of the imposition of sanctions upon Israel.

The vote by the U.S. members of the International Bank in favor of a loan to Egypt for the Suez Canal without the receipt of assurances that there would be free transit.

The strong fight by the Eisenhower-Nixon administration against the adoption of an amendment by the Congress expressing its opinion that economic aid should not be granted to nations which did not honor their commitments regarding freedom of transit in international waters.

The Eisenhower-Nixon record must be judged not by its words but by its deeds, and by the wide gap that exists between promise and performance.

As Senator KENNEDY has said in referring to the mutual security amendment that gives the President the power to crack down on the violators of freedom of navigation if he chooses to use it:

"If America's word to the world is to have any meaning, if the decisions and resolutions of the United Nations are to be binding on all parties, if the mutual security amendment which I cosponsored with Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS is to have meaning, if the clean, thoughtful language of the Democratic platform is to have meaning—the influence of this Nation and other maritime powers must be brought to bear on a just solution that removes all discrimination from the Suez Canal."

For the past 7½ years that "influence of this Nation" has conspicuously not been brought to bear.

Report by Congressman William H. Avery to the 1st Congressional District of Kansas on the 86th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, as is my usual custom, I am submitting a report to the 1st Congressional District on the 2d session of the 86th Congress. In a report of this nature it is only possible to present the accomplishments of the session and workload of the office in brief outline form.

Almost 6,500 bills and measures were introduced during this 2d session of the 86th Congress. The total bills and measures introduced for the entire Congress was 20,500. This was the first session of Congress to include a special "bobtail" session since the 80th Congress in 1948.

In contrast to the 1st session of the 86th Congress, in which case most legislative action was in the field of domestic matters, the major accomplishments of the second session have been in the field of foreign affairs. Two major exceptions were the enactment of the Civil Rights Act and the medical aid program for the aged.

Turning to the topic of legislative activity during this session, I am submitting for your information and interest a brief résumé of congressional action on legislative proposals and bills introduced by your Congressman. Following this is a listing of my vote on major legislative actions. In the event you should desire additional information on any particular vote, I will be most happy to attempt to furnish such. The listing includes voice votes as well as recorded votes.

First, the action on Avery sponsored bills and proposals:

Introduced and urged passage of amendment to limit Commodity Credit loans to $50,000. Avery proposal adopted by rollcall vote in first session for 1960 crop. Avery bill and other similar bills for 1961 crop rejected by majority. During debate in House your Congressman stated it was never the intention of Congress to subsidize corporation farms. Yet without some limitation the Agriculture Secretary is powerless to refuse to grant loans to a producer who planted within acreage allotment. Under this practice, some loans have exceeded $1 million.

Avery bill to eliminate inequities in the law pertaining to VA dependency and indemnity compensation awards to certain widows of veterans who die as a result of service-connected disability. Avery bill passed Congress and enacted as public law.

Avery proposal to permit duty free entry of experimental flour milling equipment for Kansas State passed Congress and became public law.

Avery legislation to provide payment for certain losses to displaced property owners in Tuttle Creek Reservoir passed House unanimously and is now embodied in a public law.

Avery bill to improve and remove hardships from law covering application for moving costs incurred by displaced landowners in Tuttle Creek Reservoir adopted by the Congress and included in a public law.

Avery proposal to provide health benefits program for retired Civil Service workers passed Congress, is now public law.

Avery bill to amend law to insure adequacy of national railroad freight car supply passed by House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and reported to House.

Avery legislation to amend Social Security Act to eliminate age 50 requirement for disability insurance benefits embodied in bill passed by Congress and is now public law.

Avery proposal to grant consent of Congress to Kansas and Nebraska to enter into a compact for equitable distribution of waters of Big Blue River passed Congress and is now public law.

Avery introduced legislation to grant tax relief to small business through allowable deductions for capital equipment investment.

Listing of the votes cast by your Congressman during second session of Congress:

Voted for bill to create an Agricultural Research and Development Commission to find and promote new industrial uses for farm products. Enacted as a public law. Your Congressman testified before Agriculture Committee in support of this type of legislation stating:

Agriculture must speed up its research efforts in developing more uses for farm commodities. It is not necessary to create any new so-called Government agency. We should utilize our land-grant colleges. Such an approach would permit the facilities at Kansas State to be used.

Voted for civil rights legislation to safeguard voting rights for all citizens and other provisions. Enacted as public law.

Supported extension of Library Services Act to provide mobile facilities for rural areas, is now public law.

Voted against bill to increase the spending of Federal funds from $45 million in present law to $90 million for water pollution control. Passed Congress, vetoed by President.

Opposed unreasonable spending of $250 million as a Federal grant to depressed areas bill. Passed Congress, vetoed, supported President's veto on motion to override.

Voted for authorization for Post Office Department to seek court orders to curb use of mails for distribution of obscene or fraudulent matter. Enacted as public law.

Supported extension of special milk program for children, is now public law.

Voted against motion to override the President's veto of Federal pay raise legislation. The veto was overridden and pay raise enacted as public law.

Helped draft and supported legislation to fix penalties for acceptance of "payola" and for other abuses and questionable practices of the radio and TV industry. Enacted as a public law.

Supported minimum wage legislation granting increase to workers now covered of $1.15, bill would not include "local retail establishments." Did not support the Kennedy-Roosevelt bill to extend coverage to businesses not customarily considered as engaging in interstate commerce. Legislation died in conference committee due to disagreement.

Voted for funds for fiscal 1962 and 1963 for primary and secondary highway systems and their urban extension. Enacted as a public law.

Supported liberalization of amount of loans Small Business Administration may have outstanding and of extension of credit to small business enterprises. Enacted into law.

Voted for tax deductions for professional self-employed who set aside income for voluntary pension plan (H.R. 10). Passed House, no Senate action.

Supported extension of GI loan program for home, farms, or business, is now public law.

Supported President's request for funds for the mutual security program, or foreign aid, is now public law.

Voted for amendment to Criminal Code to permit prosecutions for espionage committed outside the United States. Passed House, no Senate action.

Supported bill to authorize Secretary of State to deny passports to persons furthering international communism and whose presence abroad would endanger American security. Passed House, no Senate action.

Voted for bill to exclude or deport any alien convicted of violation relating to illicit possession of marijuana. Passed House, no Senate action.

Voted for U.S. participation in International Development Association to help provide assistance to underdeveloped countries. Enacted as public law.

Supported proposal to provide tax relief incentives to encourage investment of private capital in underdeveloped countries. Passed House, no Senate action.

Endorsed resolution authorizing President; Health, Education, and Welfare Secretary; and the Surgeon General to conduct an international cooperative program in health research, training, and planning. Now a public law.

Voted for resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the Communist China regime should not be seated in the United Nations as representative of China. Passed House, no Senate action.

Supported bill to permit application of loan provisions of Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act to other soil conservation projects. Enacted as public law.

Favored bill authorizing donation of Federal surplus property to cooperative agricultural extension agencies of States and counties, is now a public law.

Supported a cooperative Federal-State program of medical care for aged and liberalization and extension of coverage of old-age, survivors, and disability benefits program, is now law.

Voted against Federal aid to education legislation for school construction. House and Senate passed different versions, Rules Committee refused to send bill to conference to work out differences, bill died.

Supported extension of corporate, liquor, cigarette, and automobile excise tax and the provision raising temporary national debt limit for 1 year, is now public law.

Voted against Treasury expenditure of $1 billion for Government purchase of FHA and VA mortgages. Passed House, no Senate action.

Voted for legislation providing additional compensation for disabled veterans with more than three children, education and training for children of veterans dying of service-connected disability. Enacted as public law.

Voted for bill to establish wheat price supports at 85 percent of parity, reduce acreage allotment by 20 percent, and provide payment in kind for retired cropland. Bill failed on rollcall vote.

SUMMARY OF CONGRESSIONAL AND COMMITTEE ACTIVITY

One hundred percent voting attendance record.

Answered 108 of 113 quorum calls, for 97-percent record.

Attended 75 sessions of Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, for a 99-percent record.

Seven hundred and thirty-eight bills referred to Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

Attended all meetings of the Small Business Committee.

One hundred percent attendance as Private Calendar Committee ranking minority member, studying 250 private bills as member of committee.

One of two Congressmen selected to appear on special panel at National Watershed Congress.

Held over 150 conferences with officials in Government agencies on cases for constituents.

To give you some idea of our office operation, for the period of January 6, 1960, to September 1, 1960:

Received 6,941 first-class letters from district for an average of 35 per working day.

In total, received and answered 15,000 pieces of mail.

Mailed out 39,302 pieces of mail, of which 26,890 was first-class mail.

Processed cases with VA for veterans from every county in district.

Handled over 600 matters dealing with Agriculture Department.

Four hundred and forty-eight individuals visited the office in Washington.

Received 100 newspapers per week from district, 15 per week from elsewhere.

One of the most significant activities of your office in Washington was the continuation of the "Week in Washington" nonpartisan academic program for Kansas, Kansas State, Washburn, St. Benedict's College, and Mount St. Scholastica College.

The students are selected by their schools impartially on the basis of merit. The purpose of the program is to learn government firsthand. AVERY's office is the only one to carry out this educational program in such broad detail. American Political Science Association rates Avery program tops in objective coverage. The students interview Congressmen, White House aids, Budget Bureau officials, State Department officials, visit both national political party headquarters, observe Congress in session, attend committee hearings, and other features. The program has been in operation for 1 year, with 12 students participating.

The following is a brief summary of the appropriations and Federal activity for our district:

Flood-control projects, $19,718,700.

Military construction, Federal buildings, and VA operations, $14,666,870.

Equipment improvements and repairs to post office facilities, $175,135.

During the recess, I will be in the district. While your office in Washington will be open to take care of your inquiries, we will also have an office in the Hotel Jayhawk, Topeka. Please contact me at any time if you feel "Your Office in Washington" can be of assistance.

Twentieth Anniversary of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America deserves our most heartfelt congratulations on its 20th anniversary to be observed this fall. It is a purposeful and patriotic group of Americans of Ukrainian descent. Its excellent publications, its sterling principles, its dedicated membership, its outstanding leadership—all have made it an outstanding exponent of everything the free world stands for and must fight for.

The Ukrainian Congress Committee of America is indeed fortunate to have for its chairman Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky. Many of us here in Congress are happily acquainted with Dr. Dobriansky through his successful crusade for the Captive Nations Week resolution and through his unswerving efforts on behalf of captive nations. In the face of many obstacles he has led the crusade for recognition of the sorry plight of the non-Russian nations enslaved by the Soviets, for an awareness of the true nature of Russian imperialism, and for greater understanding of the strategic significance of these nations to the free world.

Dr. Dobriansky and the Ukrainian Congress have advocated policies that

are sufficiently flexible to effectively counter the twists and turns of Soviet foreign policy and yet solidly implant on all of us the grim truths and the need for hard work to help the captive nations achieve their rightful place in the free world. We all must pledge our efforts that these policies may be crowned with success.

Our Great American College Fraternity System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE GRANT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, during the last few years, an attempt has been made by certain persons to bring about a change in our great American college fraternity system. These would-be changes seem to overlook the fact that college fraternities, as they have functioned through the years, have rendered a distinct service to college life in many ways. For example, friendships due to close association in undergraduate years, are kept alive by alumni members throughout life. However, it is not my purpose here to defend the college fraternity system, as such; this I would gladly do in another forum. The pros and cons of the college fraternity system is not the issue at this time; I am here to call attention to the membership of this House the real threat that will eventually destroy these organizations through forcing them to lift all restrictions relating to membership.

I believe I can approach this subject with an unbiased opinion. Upon entering college, I did not join a fraternity. Later, when I did, this was the first secret organization of which I became a member. Some of my best friends in college were not members of any fraternity while others were members of fraternities for which I could not meet the membership qualifications. My college fraternity accepted only those students who professed the Christian religion and were members of the Caucasian race. Generally speaking, the membership of the Ancient Free and Accepted Masons is restricted to those of the Jewish and Protestant Christian faiths, Elks, members of the Caucasian race, and so on.

My college fraternity was founded by two Protestants and a Catholic. Later, I joined the Woodmen of the World, Elks, Moose, and the Masonic bodies, including the Shrine. I have sat in Masonic and Shrine meetings with members of the Jewish faith and in the Elks and other secret orders with members of the Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish faiths. Certainly, there has been nothing other than brotherly relations in these groups. Now, do you mean to tell me that this is un-American?

Members of the Negro race have a Masonic and Elks order of their own which are large organizations. To confuse this issue with that of civil rights is pure folly. This has nothing to do with civil rights or any phase of integration. Certainly, I would not propose to all Negro fraternities and sororities that they be required to accept members of the Caucasian race; nor would I say to a Jewish fraternity that it must accept those of other faiths, to a Catholic fraternity that it must accept members other than Catholics, to Acacia that it must accept members other than Masons—none of these things would I do—any more than I would tell a church what members it must accept.

While the present challenge of changing membership restrictions seems to be directed only toward college fraternities, if its advocates are successful on this level, they will eventually move to all fraternal orders, such as the Masons, Knights of Columbus, Knights of Pythias, Woodmen of the World, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, Moose, Shrine, and many others.

By nature, there is a feeling of fraternalism in the heart of man; do nothing to suppress it. Because man wants to limit this close, social fraternalism in no way signifies that he does not believe or give voice to hope and faith in universal brotherhood or that he necessarily believes in discrimination in the sense it is today used, particularly in politics and political life. Keep politics out of fraternities.

We must be careful that in our zeal for democracy we do not destroy democracy itself; keep up this trend, and in time fraternities will be mere instruments of the state—being told whom, when, and how they must initiate. Change the membership restrictions because of the explanation of its advocates that this is all they want, and the next thing will be "Now that you claim to have changed your constitution and bylaws relating to membership, show evidence of good faith; in other words, show that you mean it by initiating a certain number of those whom you did not heretofore solicit."

Everything in America is not wrong. Change for the sake of change should never be. Everything that is old is not necessarily wrong. The principles upon which college fraternities were founded will never change. There are certain truths that are eternal—the same yesterday, today, and tomorrow. Truth, love, and honesty will never change; and, in my opinion, this great American college fraternity system should not either.

You cannot have a fraternity in name alone. The college fraternity is a product of our college life. Either this system, as we know it, is worth fighting for; or, it is not. If there is no will to fight for its survival, then it is not worthy of continuance. It is high time to make up our minds. As for me, mine is made up. This is one place where there can be no compromise. Either the selective system of membership is right, or it is wrong. If it is wrong, then the whole fraternity system is wrong. If fraternities are a bad influence on college life—let us prohibit them—either by legislation in State universities or by action of the board of trustees or other proper authorities in private schools. If one believes that the fraternity system has no place in American colleges, then let him come out in the open and advocate the abolition of all fraternities. In other words, let us admit that the whole idea is wrong and go out of business.

The founders and pioneer members of our college fraternities did not have easy sailing. Stumbling blocks of many kinds were thrown in their pathways. And over the years both State and private institutions have from time to time forbidden fraternities on the college campus.

I recall one particular instance, where even though fraternities were not forbidden, the school authorities forbade those students who were fraternity members to participate in any extracurricular activity, such as athletics, glee club, and so forth. However, this restriction was later withdrawn. In other colleges, subrosa chapters existed; but mark well that in none of these instances was there ever any challenge to the method of membership selection.

For many years, there have been rules and regulations, and properly so, by college authorities setting out scholarship requirements, particularly those with respect to rushing. But the present challenge is something new and of an entirely different order. This, too, will pass if it is met by a united front on the part of a great majority of the fraternities. "United we stand; divided we fall" could never be applied to a more appropriate situation than in the instant case. Every fraternity should join forces and serve notice to these would-be do-gooders to keep their hands off these private organizations.

I am aware that this issue has popped up from time to time over the years, but it never got anywhere until in recent years when there has come a pressure from without seeking to pick up a few converts from within and have them bore within their individual fraternities. This new philosophy is not catching on in the way some of its proponents had hoped it would, but their form of ideology never gives up; rather, it continues and continues.

I believe in progress; I like to call myself a progressive. But do not let us in our desire to accept so-called universal brotherhood feel that it devolves upon us to dictate to all fraternal orders as to just what their principles and requirements of brotherhood are to be.

Do this today, and tomorrow you will be told whom you must take in. This effort is only the beginning; continue to give ground, surrender the principles upon which your fraternities are founded, do away with the cornerstone of the organization, the "arc of covenant," so to speak, and all is lost. The very foundation of every fraternity is its freedom of choice in selecting its members. Destroy that landmark and you destroy all.

Either we are going to have fraternities, or we are not. If we do, they can exist only as real fraternities and be worth anything where each organization has the God-given right to set its own qualifications for membership.

Over the past years we have noted from time to time where in a few isolated instances some local chapter would pledge or sometimes initiate a person who did not meet the qualifications of the national organization; and, in turn, the local chapter would be penalized in some manner or have its charter withdrawn. You cannot, of course, have a national organization which is worth its name that does not maintain discipline and enforce its constitution and bylaws.

Recently, a national fraternity holding a convention changed its membership requirements which led to the resignation of one of the founders of this fraternity.

Webster defines a fraternity as the state or quality of being a brother or brothers; brotherliness; a group of men joined together by common interests, for fellowship, and so forth. "Baird's Manual of American College Fraternities" defines fraternity as a mutually exclusive, self-perpetuating group which organizes the social life of its members in accredited colleges and universities, as a contributing factor to their educational program, and draws its membership primarily from the undergraduate body of the institution. If college fraternities are forced to change their membership qualifications, then the foregoing definitions would be only hollow shells.

If college fraternities do not escape this attempt being forced upon them and is what I conceive to be an un-American trend, then make no mistake about it, the effort will next extend to all fraternal organizations, and on to all private clubs, and then even to the churches. So, I say, hands off—hands off before it is too late to control this spreading infection.

This challenge behooves all liberty-loving persons—whether members of a college fraternity or not—to stop, look, and listen at some of the trends in our Nation today. This is no time for fraternities to act under duress. Many founders of your individual orders were faced with problems and more difficult situations than this, and they certainly did not meet the issue by compromising. Today is not too late to overcome this threat; tomorrow may be.

My Final Report to the District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MERWIN COAD

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. COAD. Mr. Speaker, it is again my privilege to summarize my activities during the 86th Congress in my report to the people of the Sixth Iowa District.

Since the close of the bobtail session of Congress, I have worked full time to get this report finished and into the hands of the RECORD clerk as soon as possible. It is my hope that we can get it out in the mail without further delay.

AGRICULTURE

On the last day of the session we considered a farm bill which would give some assistance in helping the farmers who need assistance so desperately. This bill will raise dairy price supports from $3.06 to $3.22 per hundredweight. This level of price support serves to raise the floor under the market for the market price of milk is presently higher than this figure. However, this will effectively raise the floor level and in this manner serve to stabilize the dairy industry at a higher price level and for this urgent reason this bill should be enacted.

The farm situation is so critical in the Midwest that farm auctioneers are already booked up months ahead. They are going to sell out the family farmers who have struggled so valiantly against the harsh economics of increasing production at lower prices. This philosophy which has been espoused and practiced by the Republican administration has brought economic ruin to many of our farm people. This I say is cruel treatment to some of the finest of American citizens. I am told that in some communities up to 25 percent of the family farmers are going to be liquidated. This is a great tragedy. It is useless and a needless tragedy. It need not have happened and it should not have happened.

President Eisenhower signed this bill, but indicated he would have vetoed it if this were not an election year. It was the last opportunity the President had to redeem, if in such a small way, the glowing campaign promises which he made while a candidate for office in 1952. In 1952, Mr. Eisenhower promised 100 percent of parity in the marketplace by pledging himself to the continuation of the 90 percent supports. We know that during the eight sessions of the Congress Mr. Eisenhower has never lived up to any of the promises he made to the farmers of America. But now, as one of his official acts of signing farm legislation he takes this opportunity of doing a little for the American farmers who are engaged in dairying.

But if Mr. Eisenhower had vetoed this bill, as he has vetoed five other farm bills, he would have a record of 100 percent against our farmers. His remarks about this bill prove that what he said earlier this year about realizing his demands on farm legislation were just so many words spoken in the arena of politics.

In 1956 he vetoed H.R. 12, the Agricultural Act of 1956, passed by the 84th Congress. This was a measure to restore 90 percent farm parity prices for basic crops—corn, wheat, cotton, tobacco, grains, and milk.

In 1958, he vetoed Senate Joint Resolution 162, a Senate joint resolution passed by the 85th Congress. This provided for freezing farm price supports at the 1957 level to forestall a price reduction.

In 1959, he vetoed S. 1909 for tobacco price supports, passed by the 86th Congress. This bill, covering a single commodity, would have set the price supports at 90 percent of parity on tobacco for which marketing quotas were established.

Again in 1959, the President vetoed S. 1968—H.R. 7246—the wheat price support bill passed by the 86th Congress. This bill would have raised price supports from 75 to 90 percent in return for a 25-percent acreage reduction.

Once more, in 1959, the President vetoed a bill to give final REA loan authority to the Rural Electrification Administration instead of leaving it with the unsympathetic Agriculture Department.

Our farmers cannot afford the luxury of having their livelihoods cast about as the whim of politics may choose. Our farmers need assistance. They need assistance in balancing production at a fair price so that their families can live as first-class citizens. It is not fair that the American people should expect the farmers of our land to subsidize the grocery bill forever. The American farmer deserves the best, but he has been receiving only crumbs. The enactment of this legislation, sponsored by Democrats, is a step in the right direction for the economic improvement of American agriculture.

BALANCED BUDGET MYTH

Much has and will be said about the balanced budget which was achieved in fiscal 1960. Completely obscured to the public will be that fact that during the past 6 years, $29.4 billion have been added to the Federal debt.

It may be entirely coincidental that budget surpluses occurred in fiscal 1956, 1957, and 1960, conveniently for the national elections involved. The 8-year total gives the true picture of a debt increase of more than $29 billion.

In analyzing the fiscal operations of the Government, the American people should also be aware of the fact that the surplus for fiscal 1960 was in no small part due to the extraordinary contribution to the Federal Treasury by the so-called independent Federal Reserve bank.

In fiscal 1959, when the Nation was facing a $12½ billion deficit, the bank could make only a $491 million contribution. In 1960, however, this contribution was multiplied to $1,093 million. Thus, in order to balance the budget for fiscal 1960 and in order to show a political surplus, the Treasury had to call on the Federal Reserve Board to double its previous contribution. At the same time, heavy defense spending was deferred until July 1, 1960, the beginning of fiscal 1961.

When the true circumstances are brought to light, the 1960 "balanced budget" will prove to have been a fraud on the American people.

VOTING RECORD

Those who try to condemn by accusation without proof have little faith in our American way of life and even less respect for the intelligence of the American people.

We can be thankful for the truthful historic documentation of the acts of public officials ungarnished with half-truths, insinuations, and partisan commitments.

I do not intend to be indicted and condemned by headlines when the record itself shows quite a different story indeed.

On June 12, 1959, I voted for the wheat price support bill, H.R. 7246, to provide an increase from 75 to 90 percent price support on wheat in return for a 25-percent acreage reduction. This bill also contained provisions for cross-compliance, increased penalties on wheat from acres in excess of the farm acreage allotments, limiting total payment to any one operator and payment in kind.

While this bill was under consideration by the House Committee on Agriculture, I offered the amendment to the bill to provide for payment in kind. This amendment passed the committee, weathered debate in both House and the Senate and emerged in the final draft, as passed by Congress.

In their statement on the final draft of the bill, the House conferees projected that:

> The overall effect of the bill as agreed upon by the conferees and reported herewith will result in a wheat program for the years 1960 and 1961 which will (1) reduce wheat production an estimated 200 million to 300 million bushels per year; (2) result in a cash savings to the Government of an estimated $150 million to $200 million per year.

On June 25, the President vetoed this bill.

Another very controversial issue came up early in the 86th Congress; this was H.R. 3, the so-called States rights bill. This bill provides a rule to guide the Supreme Court in construing statutes of Congress. It was bred in vengeance against the Supreme Court for what it said in the segregation decision of 1954 and nurtured in the contempt for national unity held by Civil War secessionists.

In my judgment, this bill would have created a morass of litigation, ambiguity, and doubt upon the rights, responsibilities, and liabilities of every American citizen. As stated in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, it should have been entitled "A full employment bill for lawyers," because it put in jeopardy of dual interpretation by the Supreme Court nearly every act passed by the Congress since 1779. I voted against this bill and although it passed the House it did not pass the Senate.

One of the most difficult decisions I had to make as a Representative from a primarily rural district was my vote for the Landrum-Griffin labor reform bill. It was tagged as a "get Hoffa bill," and although since its enactment into law it has failed to get Hoffa, its provisions have penalized the unionman who works for a living by taking away his union's rights at the bargaining table. The House Labor Committee bill, which I favored, provided for a more democratic process in union affairs, safeguarding pension and welfare funds, as well as providing protection from "fixed" union elections, but because this bill did not penalize the union workers at the bargaining table, it was considered a weak bill by the antilabor proponents of labor reform who really wanted to break the labor unions, rather than help the man who must work for his living.

One issue was climaxed in an unusual situation during this session of the Congress. That issue was school construction assistance. Separate bills passed both the House and Senate, but neither was sent to the President for final action. I supported H.R. 10128, the School Construction Assistance Act of 1960, because we are short over 130,000 classrooms in this country which today is impairing in varying degrees the education of over 10 million of our young people. This is about one out of every four American children in school. With the unconditional and absolute guarantee that all control in policy and administration remain at the local level, I believe it is not good sense to expect local property taxes to pay for the bulk of the growing costs of education. Already 40 cents of every State and local revenue dollar goes to the support of education. Our current and future needs in this field can be met only by increased assessed property evaluations and/or increased school millage rates unless the more flexible tax sources of the Federal Government are used to close the gap between present actual facilities and the documented current educational needs of this country. H.R. 10128 provided for a temporary 4-year program of grants totaling $325 million a year to be divided among the States for distribution to local school districts according to the needs of each district. The bill specifically prohibited any Federal intervention, direction, or control over any school system.

Another important vote came on June 23, 1960, when the House of Representatives considered and defeated H.R. 12261, the Poage farm bill, which provided for a referendum vote by the wheat producers to choose one of two programs designed to reduce wheat production by reducing wheat acreage allotments by 25 percent with the price support raised to 85 percent of parity for the 1961–65 crop years. Price supports would be available only to producers who cooperate in the program in the event the producers by a majority vote do not disapprove marketing quotas. If such quotas are disapproved, price supports would be lowered to 50 percent of parity; or two, set price supports on wheat in balance with the support level of corn with adjustments made on the basis of the comparative weight and nutritive value of the two commodities. No production controls would be involved but CCC sales of wheat would be subject to certain restrictions and surplus wheat could be used for donation to friendly countries. A 3-year period of soil bank contracts would be authorized so that 60 million acres would be placed in the conservation reserve. Also included in the bill were provisions for the creation of a feed grain program development committee and a program to increase the amount of dairy, poultry, and meat products distributed to the needy.

It was said and is my contention that we are paying more and getting less out of the wheat program than any other commodity programs. This bill would have provided a means to end the wheat glut. It gave the producers a choice of ways to do it and still stay in business. Since pay-in-kind provisions were again included in the bill the costs of the program would have been reduced.

Another vote rated as important to the Nation's farm families during this Congress by farm magazines was the overwhelming override vote of the President's veto on a bill to provide a 7½-percent pay raise for certain Federal employees. The bill increased the average letter carrier's gross salary $28 a month. Testimony at hearings on this bill showed that workers in private industry doing comparable work receive higher salaries than postal workers and in one example, it was brought out that actually they were offering to pay janitors in larger cities more money, as starting salaries, than the postal carriers and clerks who have been working months and years for the Post Office Department. In our depressed agricultural economy here in Iowa it is hard to believe that postal employees' salary scales are so low, but all the facts and figures are in the record.

I have been in a running battle with the top officials of the Post Office Department on many matters since first coming to Congress, but just because I do not always agree with many policies of that Department, there is no reason to penalize the clerks and carriers who work under these policies.

In conjunction with my belief that the working man and woman deserves a living wage, I supported and voted for an amendment to increase the minimum wage from $1 an hour to $1.15 an hour within a 3-year period and to extend the coverage of the act to employees of certain businesses engaged in interstate commerce, which are not now covered by the law. Although separate bills passed both the House and the Senate, the conferees stood in disagreement at the adjournment of Congress, so no finalized bill was enacted.

These six votes during the 86th Congress are my votes on so-called key issues. This is a Coad box score. There were many other votes during this Congress in the transaction of the people's business in Washington, D.C. I have worked and studied the issues as they have come up before the House of Representatives in order to do the best job I can to see that your best interests, as well as the welfare and security of this great land are preserved.

Although it has been said many times that the 86th Congress was controlled by the Democrats, the record shows that neither the House of Representatives nor the Senate has had the two-thirds majority which is necessary to override a Presidential veto. The simple majority of the Democratic Party was not enough to overcome the Presidential veto threat and the organized coalition of the opposition.

GOVERNMENT SPENDING

Apparently the major difference between our two national parties insofar as spending the tax dollars is concerned, is who gets the benefit of the public spending. When I voted for appropriations for such things as aid to airport construction, flood control, and conservation, loans for electric transmission lines in Iowa, veterans' housing loans, a mutual security program, public housing, and agriculture trade development, I am a big spender? I am the worst in the State of Iowa according to one newspaper editor, but nothing is said when

the administration's policies of tight money and high interest rates are put into effect and the public is forced to pay more interest on the private and public debt. We get nothing in return for it and the vested interests on Wall Street pocket the high interest windfall. During the period 1953–59 interest costs on the public and private debt were $23.1 billion more than they would have been at the 1952 level of interest rates. This kind of fiscal irresponsibility does irreparable damage to the national economy for we got nothing in return for this added expense—no schools, no roads or runways, no housing, no wage increase, no military protection—nothing and for this we paid $23.1 billion in the past 7 years.

This 86th Congress actually appropriated $2,093,048,591 less than the President requested in his budgets for 1959 and 1960. Despite the fact that Congress cut appropriations in nearly every area of Government spending, the budget requests were the highest in the history of the country. The table below shows the breakdown of appropriations approved by the 86th Congress.

In fact, the expenditures for the 8 years of the Eisenhower administration will exceed $579 billion, topping the Truman administration by 46 percent and F.D.R.'s—including the entire cost of World War II—by 68 percent. This administration has asked the Congress for five increases in the legal debt ceiling and has added about $15 billion to the national debt. This would have been even greater had not the Congress under Democratic control since 1955, cut the administration budget request by $9.9 billion. As I see it, the spending of which the administration complains, is evidently only that which benefits the ordinary citizen.

1959 session final action on appropriations

Title	Amount agreed to by conferees	Increase or decrease compared to President's budget estimates to date
1959 SUPPLEMENTAL		
2d supplemental	$2,764,500,380	−$136,298,990
1960 APPROPRIATIONS		
SUPPLEMENTAL		
Supplemental	977,345,608	−240,744,947
Temporary (July)		
Temporary (August)		
Temporary (September)		
REGULAR		
District of Columbia	(241,289,076)	(−4,700,924)
Federal payment	27,218,000	−7,000,000
Treasury-Post Office	4,643,363,000	−44,964,000
Interior	481,809,100	−9,292,300
Labor-HEW	4,016,485,981	+259,637,400
Independent offices	6,504,382,200	−82,035,800
Agriculture	3,971,362,673	−110,002,190
General government	13,463,500	−145,000
State-Justice-Judiciary	648,941,200	−33,446,400
Commerce	712,672,900	−19,518,100
Legislative	128,797,380	−4,850,800
Defense	39,228,239,000	−19,961,000
Public Works	(1,215,477,808)	(+30,071,549)
Atomic Energy	2,683,029,000	−35,686,000
Mutual Security	3,626,718,137	−1,197,766,000
Military Construction	1,363,961,200	−199,238,800
Public Works	1,185,309,093	−97,166
Total, regular	69,235,762,384	−1,504,366,156
Total, all bills	72,977,598,352	−1,881,410,093

1960 session final action on appropriations

Title	Amount as approved	Increase or decrease compared to budget estimates to date
1960 APPROPRIATIONS		
NASA supplemental	$23,079,000	
2d supplemental	955,370,003	−$63,134,885
Labor supplemental	6,000,000	−2,000,000
1961 APPROPRIATIONS		
District of Columbia	(239,470,433)	(−2,932,567)
Loan authorization	(20,100,000)	(+1,400,000)
Federal payment	27,533,000	−7,000,000
Commerce	729,624,375	−69,990,625
Interior	557,067,600	+7,337,300
Treasury-Post Office	4,841,914,000	−55,939,000
General Government	14,207,500	−420,000
Labor-HEW	4,354,170,331	+333,948,350
State-Justice-Judiciary	705,032,567	−27,997,828
Independent Offices	8,311,893,400	−105,503,600
Defense	39,996,608,000	+661,608,000
Agriculture	3,994,097,600	−141,165,590
Loan authorizations	(577,000,000)	(+210,000,000)
Military construction	994,855,000	−193,145,000
Legislative	129,470,410	−3,943,075
Public works	3,969,982,485	−43,810,695
Mutual security	3,722,350,000	−559,354,000
Supplemental	138,293,749	−31,034,100
2d supplemental	162,186,981	+89,906,250
Total, all bills	73,634,335,992	−211,638,498

RECAP

Total the President's spending requests were decreased by the 86th Cong.:	
1959 session	$1,881,410,093
1960	211,638,498
Total reduction	2,093,048,591

The Berean Institute, Philadelphia, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, America is unique in its dedication to the proposition that the role of education in a free and democratic society is to encourage and promote the development of the fullest potential of each individual. No other country has so endeavored to provide the wide diversity of educational programs as has this Nation. The Berean Institute of Philadelphia is representative of this spirit of educational challenge and opportunity for all people.

Berean Institute was founded as a vocational school in 1899 by Matthew Anderson, a prominent Negro Presbyterian minister. Its initial purpose was to provide a school for Negro youths and adults in need of guidance, training, and vocational orientation.

The institute was opened in the basement of the Berean Presbyterian Church where it was housed until 1904 when the trades building was erected, and the school was incorporated as a nonprofit institution. Around the time of the erection of the trades building, the institute began receiving partial support from the State of Pennsylvania. It continues to receive such State appropriated funds and derives other income from individuals, organizations, and student fees.

The Berean Institute programs have been developed along the lines of a community college. In this manner, it has provided unique community services. This educational service to the community has long been extended beyond the narrow confines of the Negro race, and programs of training have been opened to all segments of the population in the Philadelphia area regardless of race, creed, or color.

The institute's programs have been concentrated upon meeting the special needs of the underprivileged who cannot afford to pay high tuition costs, but who are deserving people with intellectual potential. Student fees are purposely kept at a minimum level in order to assure maximum educational opportunity to everyone, and, in keeping with this philosophy, an extensive scholarship program has been set up to aid worthy students in need of financial assistance to cover the cost of their studies.

Berean study programs provide the last 2 years of high-school training and 2 years of post-high-school training. These programs have proved to be especially helpful to persons who left school before completion of their studies, and to foreign speaking adults in the area who are not conveniently served by regular and traditional high-school programs. Particular emphasis is placed upon developing skills that will enable students to be beauticians, dressmakers, tailors, and office workers. At the same time, preparation in the fundamentals of English and related mathematics provides a basis for the more capable student who may wish to pursue further technical training. The school fulfills a valuable service to the community by helping to meet the increasing demand for expert craftsmen and reliable artisans. The 2-year post-high-school training provides an opportunity for the acquisition of skills and the general educational exploratory experience often reveals undiscovered abilities.

Berean Institute has also developed a program of parental-vocational education designed to help high school students who have dropped out of school because of childbirth. The program is designed to teach motherhood standards and child care and thereby insure the development of a wholesome and integrated personality for both child and mother. At the same time, the program encourages the development of vocational competency.

The parental-vocational education program is viewed as having long range beneficial effect in reducing the need for public assistance aid to teenage mothers; as well as other continued financial aid forthcoming from the department of welfare for such mothers. Teenage mothers who are reluctant to resume their studies in their former high schools, for personal or age reasons, through the parental-vocational education program of the institute are able to pursue high school training with particular emphasis on developing skills that will enable them to be economically self-supporting.

Berean is located in a densely populated section of Philadelphia surrounded by concentrations of the city's Negro and Puerto Rican populations. The institute's location affords educational chal-

lenge and opportunity for these groups which are frequently handicapped by economic and language barriers. It has been pointed out, for example, that there is a very small percentage of these population segments attending the Philadelphia area post-high-school institutions. In December 1957, a study of higher educational opportunities in the Philadelphia area revealed that of 45,145 students enrolled in 42 institutions there, only 1,144 of such enrolled students were Negro. Yet, it is estimated that about 41 percent of the current enrollment in the city's 22 public high schools is Negro.

Moreover, there is a special need for orientation, guidance, and vocational training of non-English-speaking Puerto Ricans in the city. One of the suggested expansion programs for Berean is the introduction of courses for Spanish-speaking persons. It is reported that one of the greatest handicaps Puerto Ricans face in the United States is the lack of knowledge of the English language. The total question of the educational and related needs of the Puerto Rican community in the Philadelphia area is presently being considered by an advisory committee for a Puerto Rican center at Berean Institute.

Programs of study at Berean presently include: Community college level training—graduation from an accredited high school is the admission requirement for this level of training; high school training—completion of 10th grade or comparable background is required; vocational training—certificate courses are open to all adult persons 21 years of age or over; or young people who have completed at least 10th grade of high school training. Vocational training certificate courses include instruction in business, homemaking, tailoring and dressmaking, and beauty culture. The following is a breakdown of courses of study in each of these areas: Business: shorthand, typing, accounting, business law, office practice, economics, English, salesmanship, management, finance, retailing, mathematics; homemaking: institutional dietetics and nutrition, food preparation, child care, care of the home, personal finishing, selection and care of clothing, color design, children's clothing; tailoring and dressmaking: clothes construction, designing, drafting; beauty culture: operator's course, manager's course, teacher's course, manicurist's course.

The institute also affords student library facilities. The local chapter of the Association for the Study of Negro Life and History is housed in Berean Institute. Thereby, the institute library contains a wealth of general and specialized material on the American Negro.

Student activities at the institute are encouraged as a form of assistance to students in the development of personality, social effectiveness and citizenship. The school sponsors varied activities such as student government, drama, choral music, social groups, and both intramural and interscholastic athletics.

Berean maintains a free job placement service to assist its graduates in finding meaningful and rewarding employment. This service has been successful in placing most of the graduates over a number of years. Most of Berean's graduates are performing service in industry, business, government, and professional and social agency offices. Because of the ever popular demand for a Berean graduate, the institute reports that it has not been able to meet the demand for its trained workers.

Certainly, the fine record of achievement over a 60-year period of the Berean Institute is worthy of praise. Through its programs of study especially designed to meet the needs of underprivileged segments of the population, regardless of race, creed, color or economic background, Berean Institute is making a significant contribution to the American manpower team, as well as to the economic and social advancement of each individual student. I am proud of my association with this institute and my former membership on its board of trustees.

Twentieth Anniversary of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to pay tribute on the occasion of the 20th anniversary of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America.

It is my pleasure to join in the congratulations and celebration for the 20th anniversary of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America. This industrious committee is a veritable superorganization, in the true sense of the term. It is a leader among leaders, coordinating as it does the Ukrainian associations throughout the country.

The Ukrainian people and their descendants have spread widely throughout the United States since their first concentration in Pennsylvania. They and their organizations have made superior contributions to the American way of life. Both in the size of their groups and in the quality of their participation in the national effort have they been outstanding.

Many people in the United States, unacquainted with the details of the many and varied ethnic groups in this country are apt to think of these organizations as simply a nostalgic effort to sustain the traditions, the ideologies, the customs, and the hopes of their former homeland in the land of their adoption. That they are far more than this is amply demonstrated by the Ukrainian Congress Committee, whose 20th anniversary we celebrate at this time.

These organizations are a means of assimilation of their people into the new society to which they have emigrated. They are a source of contribution to that society. They are the instrument through which the newcomer adjusts himself to the new life, and through which in many ways he enriches the land to which he has come.

In no case is this more true than with the communities of Ukrainian-Americans in the United States. Noted as they are for the fervor of their approach to religious, political, and fraternal matters, they have at once retained their admirable ethnic features and become among the best of our American citizenry. Proud and independent in spirit, industrious, conscientious, and devout, dedicated to family life and communal charity, the Ukrainian-Americans have been notable for their contribution to the building of this Nation.

They have, nevertheless, been dedicated—and perhaps even more so than most of our ethnic groups—to a continuing loyalty to the land of their origin, to the Ukrainian people scattered about the globe, and to the never-dying idea of eventual independence for the Ukraine. Mindful of the centuries of domination, of oppression, of suffering of their forefathers, and a current similar ignominy of their contemporaries in the Ukrainian S.S.R., they have never ceased to hope and to work for a future free and autonomous nation of these truly superior people. All too much aware of the tyranny and terror suffered at the hands of a lesser breed of men, the Ukrainians have persisted in their determination to lift from their homeland the yoke of Soviet domination.

The fiction of autonomy with which the Ukrainian S.S.R. was clothed for the purpose of a United Nations vote on the side of the Soviet Union is a travesty on true independence. The Ukrainians are first in protesting this sham. They deplore this semblance of freedom which serves but to emphasize the fact that they are totally unfree to make their own decisions. They seek a real, a lasting, an unfettered state of political independence.

After the revolution of 1917, this rich and cultivated area of western Russia, with its advanced economy and superior culture, became independent for the brief period of 3 years. An enforced Russification had for centuries been the sad lot of these brave, sensitive, cultured, and independent-minded people. The national enslavement and economic exploitation of their superior agricultural and mineral resources of Czarist Russia was soon to be repeated and intensified under the Soviet Union. Unwillingly, they were absorbed into the Communist state.

The resistance and the indignation of the Ukrainians was resented by the inexorable proponents of the new type of dictatorship. The Soviet Union became the most overbearing tyrant of all. Intent on the subjugation of these indomitable individualists, the Communist regime inflicted upon the hapless people of the Ukraine horrors and oppression of incredible proportions. Ukrainian energy and endurance were taxed and tormented by the repression of their advanced culture, by economic exploitage to the point of local deprivation, and by political harassment. Forced labor, mass deportations, massacres followed upon the heels of misery and affliction. Liquidation of the kulaks and an artificial famine, causing the deaths of no less than 5 million persons, were the extreme

measures taken by the Communists in their efforts to quell Ukrainian resistance. Yes; incredible though it seems, the politically inspired terrorists attempted to force the liberty-loving Ukrainians into submission by the means of a purposely arranged famine as a weapon.

Yet these unconquerable souls continued to resist. So the tortures and the horrors were perpetuated as dictator followed dictator among the Communist overlords. Intent on subjugation of the rebellious, none was more cruel than Khrushchev. With the continuous system of purges and daily executions he won for himself the epithet of "hangman of the Ukraine."

Still the hope of liberation of the Ukraine has never been extinguished. It persists among the Ukrainians the world over. They number some 40 million in all. Outside the homeland the greatest numbers of them are in the Western Hemisphere.

Here in the United States, represented by the organizations coordinated in the one we honor today, they carry the torch of freedom not only for their beloved motherland but for all the captive nations languishing beneath the Soviet yoke. The liberation struggle of all the non-Russians subjected to forcible Russification, to communism with all its brutality, is stimulated by this torchbearing group, the Ukrainian-Americans.

The Ukrainians have ever felt a greater kinship with the West than with the Russian peoples. This is true with respect to their efficiency in agriculture, in trade, in their handicraft, in the leaning toward individual enterprise in their economy, as it is in their social and cultural advancement.

It is no wonder that those who have settled in America have established a reputation for good citizenry. Not only have they evidenced it in their progressive undertakings, their ability, and their social consciousness. They have demonstrated that their heritage, their political ardor and their loyalties can be applied constructively to the American way of life.

It is our privilege and pride to take part in this occasion honoring this representative organization of the Ukrainian-Americans, the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America on its 20th anniversary.

Address by Senator Thomas E. Martin at the Dedication of the Ardennes Cemetery and Memorial

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

Hon. EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I am privileged to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a speech delivered by our colleague, the junior Senator from Iowa, at the dedication of the Ardennes Cemetery and Memorial, Neuville-en-Condroz, Belgium, on July 11, 1960. As you know, Senator MARTIN was designated by the Vice President to participate in the dedication of World War II American military cemeteries in Europe and north Africa. His impressive tribute to those who gave their lives in the service of their country should be read by all Americans.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE THOS. E. MARTIN, U.S. SENATOR OF IOWA, AT THE DEDICATION OF THE ARDENNES CEMETERY AND MEMORIAL, NEUVILLE-EN-CONDROZ, BELGIUM, JULY 11, 1960

It was with genuine humility that I accepted the invitation of the Battle Monuments Commission of the United States and the assignment by Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON to assist in the dedication of the Ardennes Cemetery and Memorial.

It is also with genuine pride that I represent the Government of the United States on this memorable day. To the sympathetic people of Belgium, the people of the United States offer their grateful thanks. The peace and beauty of this spot and the memories it recalls are witnesses to the respectful tribute we bring here today. We profoundly honor the memory of those who fought bravely and died valiantly.

It is nearly 15 years since those who rest in these quiet acres gave their lives in the service of their country during the fierce fighting of what history now records as the Battle of the Bulge. Here lie 5,260 American soldiers and airmen. Among them are 750 upon whose white marble crosses is inscribed: "Here lies in honored glory a comrade in arms known but to God." Among these graves also, we count no less than 11 in which 2 brothers lie side by side—the reminder of a double tragedy for their sorrowing families. That all may be reminded of the achievements of our valiant men the Government of the United States has erected the memorial which you see before you.

The full cost of this battle—indeed, the full cost of World War II—will never be known—either in intrinsic value or in intangibles.

Emerging from the most widespread and most disruptive war in history, in 1945 the world faced many major political, economic, and social problems of great importance to the peace and well-being of humanity. The growth of nationalism and the desire of many, less active peoples to improve their political positions and their standards of living have been factors which have presented various problems throughout the world. Tremendous advancements in communication facilities during the past 15 years, greatly accelerated by the demands of military necessity, have brought all peoples closer together in their human relationships. Technological progress leapt forward under the pressure of war. It suddenly became a sobering thought that world political and moral developments had lagged behind technological developments.

During the war the Allies lived in a unity and sustained a partnership in spirit, in mutual effort, and consent. It was the hope of the supreme commander of the Allied Expeditionary Force—and his entire staff—that this kind of fellowship could be extended to all nations.

When Dwight D. Eisenhower became President of the United States, it was with growing concern that he watched the difficulties arising in the path of an enduring peace. In his 1954 state of the Union address, President Eisenhower said, and I quote:

"In the unity of the free world lies our best chance to reduce the Communist threat of war."

Again in 1954, the President of the United States attested to these truths when he said:

"A sound peace—with security, justice, well-being, and freedom for the people of the world—can be achieved, but only by patiently and thoughtfully following a hard and sure tested road."

In these words can also be found the thought that we, the living, must show the same selfless courage in peace that those who lie in this cemetery showed in war; otherwise, the sacrifices remembered today, and the beautiful memorial dedicated at this hour, will have no purpose.

To speak in memory of our war heroes is not a simple matter and our task is not easy. All that we can even hope to do in our time is to follow their example of courage.

Here lie men who loved America because their ancestors long ago helped in her founding. Here lie other Americans who loved her with equal passion because they themselves, or their own fathers, migrated to America's shores in search of freedom. Here lie men of all ranks—officers, noncommissioned officers, and privates—together. Here no man prefers another because of his faith or despises him because of any political disagreement. Within this beautiful cemetery lie no prejudices, no hatreds. Here is a high and pure democracy.

Thus do we, the living, consecrate this ground and give ourselves to carrying on the struggle they began. Too much blood has gone into this soil for us to leave it barren. Out of the records and memories of the Battle of the Bulge should come our promise to assist in a new birth of freedom for the sons of men everywhere.

It was Gen. Omar N. Bradley who said:

"Freedom—no word was ever spoken that has held out greater hope, demanded greater sacrifice, needed more to be nurtured, blessed more the giver * * * or came closer to being God's will on earth."

Freedom is a costly thing. And since it is a costly thing, it entails a responsibility which limits our rights. How costly freedom is, and how valuable, we learned anew from the battles in World War II. Freedom costs the sacrifice and the blood of men. Indeed, all the benefits we enjoy have cost a long and continuing price of the generations that have gone before us. The very receiving of these benefits lays upon us a responsibility for our fellow man and his rights—and the rights of future generations.

We, therefore, do not have the right by our carelessness to let slip these liberties which cost so much. We do not have the right to make mockery of liberties for which our war heroes died. We do not have the right to plunder the resources our predecessors have given us as if we were to be the last generation to inhabit this globe. On the contrary, we have received anew today the responsibility to protect our liberties and our resources for future generations.

Someone has said that God has laid upon man the responsibility for being free, for safeguarding the freedom of spirit, no matter how much sacrifice and suffering it may require.

Out of the battles and bloodshed and horrors of World War II came the United Nations, dedicated to the dignity of mankind, to the freedom of all nations, to the principle of the abolition of war. Within this body is the NATO group of nations subscribing to common civic ideals—banding themselves against encroachment by those who might forget the principles upon which the United Nations is founded. Among these is our longtime friend and ally, the Kingdom of Belgium. It was with more than ordinary pride, therefore, that we in the United States learned that it was American troops who were privileged to help in freeing so much Belgian territory and so many Belgian people from the invader. It is our fervent hope that our two peoples will go forward shoulder

to shoulder down the years in the achievement of the ideals and in the maintenance of the freedoms for which this cemetery is part of the price. These solemn rows of headstones are an eternal reminder of our duty to the cause of peace.

In behalf of the American Battle Monuments Commission and of the people of the United States, I now dedicate this cemetery and this memorial in proud memory of the achievements of our brothers in arms and in humble tribute to their sacrifices.

Congressman Celler's Report to His Voters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, as this year comes to a close, I want to render the accounts of my stewardship to the voters of the 11th Congressional District of New York.

With the close of the 86th Congress, I count the 10 years of my chairmanship of the Committee on the Judiciary as the most productive of my 37 years in Congress. I have taken great comfort in serving some 19 terms and wish to continue in this service as your Congressman and hope you will reelect me in the coming elections.

CIVIL RIGHTS

The Judiciary Committee of the House under my chairmanship succeeded, after almost four decades of inaction, in initiating and having enacted two civil rights bills; one the Civil Rights Act of 1957 and the other the Civil Rights Act of 1960, both bearing my name.

Only a portion of the work to be done in this area is complete. I shall continue the long fight, to assure the rights guaranteed by the Constitution to every citizen regardless of race, creed or color, in all areas, including housing, public facilities, schoolrooms, jobs, and the right to vote.

I have been named by the Democratic nominee for President, the Honorable JOHN F. KENNEDY, to serve together with the Honorable JOSEPH S. CLARK, U.S. Senator from Pennsylvania, to draft the necessary legislation to bring to life the pledges of the Democratic Party platform on civil rights, which I helped draft as a member of the drafting committee of the Democratic platform committee at the Los Angeles Democratic National Convention.

IMMIGRATION

Under my chairmanship, the Judiciary Committee has taken big steps toward the eradication of inequities in the Immigration and Nationality Act: We have enacted legislation enabling thousands of alien orphans to be brought into the United States and suitably adopted; we have enacted legislation that has hastened the reuniting of families and shortened the wait by many years; we have eliminated many of the burdensome procedures such as preexamination, and have permitted an adjustment of status without leaving the country; we have enacted legislation allowing for the participation of the United States in World Refugee Year; we have enacted legislation which changes from 25 to 15 years the residence requirement which precludes the loss of citizenship by a naturalized citizen residing in a foreign country.

Here again is a task that has not been completed. I shall continue my efforts to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act so that the national origins quota system may ultimately be eliminated and to the end that all distinctions between native-born and naturalized citizens be assured of the full protection of our laws and to the end that in our selection of immigrants from Europe there shall be no discrimination as to setting up of quotas against people of southern and eastern Europe, like Italians, French, Spanish, Hungarian, Czechs, Poles, and so forth, and in favor of northern and western European groups. All must be treated alike.

DOMESTIC POLICIES—GENERAL

I have sponsored and supported legislation increasing the minimum wage, granting Federal aid to education, extending and strengthening urban redevelopment and slum clearance, and giving aid to depressed areas.

I have opposed all of the legislation that would interfere with the rights of labor.

I have supported, and shall continue to support, medical care benefits for the aged as part of the social security insurance system. I have supported, and shall continue to support, housing construction of more than 2 million homes a year.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA VOTE

I believe, too, that the Judiciary Committee can take pride in the fact that it succeeded in sending to the States the constitutional amendment, offered by me, which, when ratified by three-quarters of the States, would permit the people of the District of Columbia to vote for President and Vice President for the first time in its history. This is an issue not far removed from the voters of my district since, in a very true sense, it is an extension of civil rights and the wiping away of unwarranted disabilities in the exercise of the ballot. The adoption of the constitutional amendment was one of the most gratifying experiences of my life.

PRESIDENTIAL INABILITY

While the question of what will happen should the President become disabled while in office was never resolved by the Congress, I am proud of the work my committee and I accomplished in clarifying many of the difficulties. The work of the committee in hearings, special reports, and questionnaires have brought us closer to the solution of this problem.

PUBLIC DEFENDERS—APPORTIONMENT

Some battles go on Congress after Congress, but it is wrong for any legislator, convinced of the rightness of his view, to despair. Just as the Celler Anti-Merger Act against monopolies finally became law, after a 20-year battle, just so, it is my hope that the legislation which I have sponsored again and again will become law. I have particular reference to an act which would provide attorneys for indigent defendants who cannot afford to hire counsel and, to that other important piece of legislation, to provide for more just representation of the people in the Congress—doing away with gerrymandered districts for political gain.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

I have supported all legislation to permit the economic growth of the underdeveloped world. It is my belief that this is one of the most potent instruments in the search for peace with honor. International cooperation is an absolute necessity in the world today—we cannot withdraw from the world in isolation. The farthest point in the world today is as close as a rocket ship can make it.

I have strenuously opposed boycotts and blockades imposed by the United Arab Republic upon Israel. I have petitioned the President and the Secretary of State to keep America's promise that the Suez would be free for all shipping, including that of Israel. I have introduced legislation that would prevent the Department of Defense from recognizing the Arab boycott and, hence, preventing American citizens from obtaining shipping contracts to Arab lands if they had traded with Israel. I have urged every reasonable financial aid to little Israel.

I have supported, without reservation, that portion of the Mutual Security Act which permits the President to withhold foreign aid from any country which boycotts and blockades a friendly nation.

I have urged, both in the press and on the floor of the House, increased aid to India since I believe that in the Asian world, India, vis-a-vis Communist China, must prevail.

ANTITRUST

The work of the Antitrust Subcommittee, of which I am chairman, has been particularly fruitful. The committee succeeded in having enacted into law a bill designed to help enforce the prohibitions of the Clayton Act against price discriminations, tie-in arrangements, mergers, and interlocking directorates.

In connection with its investigation of the Federal Communications Commission's relationship to negotiations for the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. consent decree, the subcommittee ascertained that the Commission had failed, despite repeated recommendations by its staff over a number of years, to investigate telephone rates or even to conduct a general telephone rate inquiry. The subcommittee noted, also, that as a result of a $65 million long-distance telephone rate that had been authorized by the FCC in 1953 without a hearing, long-distance telephone users may have been overcharged $159 million in the years 1955, 1956, and 1957.

To remedy this situation, the subcommittee recommended that the FCC institute "promptly a comprehensive formal rate investigation." Shortly after the report was issued, the FCC acted upon the subcommittee's recommendation. As a result, on July 24, 1959, the

FCC ordered A.T. & T. to cut long-distance telephone rates by $50 million a year.

As a result of the subcommittee's investigation, the Department of Justice brought four cases to enforce the provisions of the oil-pipeline consent decree. In three of these cases the defendants agreed to the Department's interpretation and stipulated that they would follow the Attorney General's rulings in the future. On the remaining issue, the Supreme Court on June 8, 1959, ruled against the Department of Justice. This particular issue, the "shipper-owner share" question, was one of the most important that had arisen under the consent decree. The adverse decision of the Supreme Court underscores the need for additional action by the Justice Department if the goal of common-carrier pipeline transportation in the oil industry is to be realized.

Also as a result of the subcommittee's investigation of shipping, the subcommittee was able to refer 127 possible instances of violations of the Shipping Act to the Federal Maritime Board and 26 other possible violations of law to the Department of Justice.

The Attorney General, on the basis of the subcommittee's hearings record to that time, embarked upon grand-jury investigations of steamship industry practices in San Francisco and in Washington. Numerous subpenas duces tecum were issued, directing more than 150 firms to produce documents for use of the grand jury. Preliminary litigation, seeking to quash the subpenas, initiated by approximately 60 of those served, was terminated favorably to the Government in June 1960 and the investigations are under way.

The Federal Maritime Board, in response to the subcommittee's referral of possible violations, opened a number of important investigative and rulemaking dockets.

PORT OF NEW YORK AUTHORITY'S INQUIRY: CONTEMPT CITATIONS

In March 1960, at the request of members of the New Jersey congressional delegation, the staff of the Antitrust Subcommittee was directed to make a study of the activities and operations of the Port of New York Authority, including a review of the scope of the authority's major operations.

The Port of New York Authority is an interstate, regional development authority established under bistate compacts between the States of New York and New Jersey, approved by Congress in 1921 and 1922, for the purpose of dealing with the planning and development of terminal and transportation facilities and improving the commerce of the port district. It was the declared expectation of Congress that the effectuation of these compacts would "better promote and facilitate commerce between the States and between the States and foreign nations and provide better and cheaper transportation of property and aid in providing better postal, military, and other services of value to the Nation." Under the Constitution, all interstate compacts must be approved by Congress. When the Port of New York Authority compact was originally approved, Congress inserted therein a most important reservation; namely, that Congress reserved the right "to alter, amend, or repeal" the compact. The present investigation is in part based upon this reservation. In addition, the operations of the authority exercise a farflung influence on interstate commerce. They yield tax-exempt revenues in excess of $100 million annually from tunnels, bridges, terminals, airports, and shops valued at more than $900 million. The port authority's operations affect the economic lives of millions of Americans living outside as well as inside the port development area and the States of New York and New Jersey. They intimately affect the operation of Federal agencies responsible, among other things, for the national defense, navigable waterways, and air, rail, and highway traffic. In short, they profoundly affect Federal interests of many and various kinds.

Nevertheless, although there were 2 days of hearings before the subcommittee in 1952 on a resolution that would have withdrawn congressional consent from the compacts and the authority, neither the Judiciary Committee, to which is assigned responsibility for interstate compacts of this character, nor any other congressional committee, has ever conducted a general investigation of the Port of New York Authority to determine its conformance or nonconformance to the limits of its authority or the extent or adequacy of its performance of its responsibilities in the public interest.

What is more, in recent months, complaints varying widely in character and gravity concerning the operations of the port authority under the compacts, have come to the attention of the subcommittee. For example, it has been alleged that the port authority, in combining revenues for financing purposes from all its facilities, rather than reducing tools on each facility as it is amortized, places an undue burden on the channels of interstate commerce and is contrary to national transportation policy. It has been alleged that the port authority has extended its operations beyond the geographic limits contemplated by the Congress. It has been alleged that in the letting of certain service and construction contracts, the port authority has not permitted competition and has failed to grant the award to the lowest qualified bidder. It has also been asserted that the overall operations of the port authority have at no time been subjected to a comprehensive independent audit by any governmental agency.

By letter dated March 11, 1960, I initiated the inquiry by requesting the executive director of the port authority to make certain of the authority's files available for examination by committee staff members. Notwithstanding this request, the port authority failed for the most part to make available the documents requested. Rather, it limited itself to supply documents virtually all of which were already matters of public record.

Against this background, the subcommittee voted on June 8, 1960, to begin a full inquiry into the activities and operations of the Port of New York Authority under the 1921 and 1922 compacts. Also on the same date, the subcommittee addressed a letter to the executive director of the authority requesting him to make available for examination by subcommittee staff representatives specified documents dating from January 1, 1946, and indicating that counsel for the subcommittee would call at the offices of the authority on June 15 for the purpose of examining these files at that time.

Two days later, by letter dated June 10, the executive director of the authority raised a number of objections to the request for inspection of documents in the port authority's files. In the same letter he nevertheless expressed the hope that when subcommittee counsel called at the offices of the authority and met with its general counsel, those present would reach agreement as to the materials to be furnished in aid of the subcommittee's inquiry. On June 15, counsel for the subcommittee met with the executive director and the general counsel of the authority at its office. The port authority failed to make the requested documents available.

Accordingly, on June 15, 1960, subpenas duces tecum were served upon Austin J. Tobin, executive director, S. Sloan Colt, chairman, board of commissioners, and Joseph G. Carty, secretary to the board of commissioners, of the Port of New York Authority, directing them to appear before the subcommittee on June 29, 1960, and to bring with them certain records and documents of the port authority.

On June 29, the three port authority officials appeared before the subcommittee and brought with them part of the documents demanded in the subpenas, but failed and refused to produce certain other documents in compliance with the subpenas or as ordered by the subcommittee. The withheld documents are necessary to the subcommittee's inquiry. On the same day, following the appearance of the witnesses, the subcommittee unanimously resolved to report the failure of the officials to honor the subpenas to the Committee on the Judiciary and to recommend that the committee report this conduct to the House with recommendation that the port authority officials be cited for contempt. On June 30, 1960, the Committee on the Judiciary adopted this recommendation. On August 23, 1960, the Committee on the Judiciary filed its reports—Reports Nos. 2117, 2120, and 2121—on the matter and the House of Representatives adopted House Resolution 606, House Resolution 607, and House Resolution 608, whereby the Speaker of the House was directed to and did certify the reports of the Committee on the Judiciary to the U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia.

It is now the duty of the U.S. attorney to bring the matter before the grand jury for its action—title II, United States Code, section 194. By citing the port authority officials for contempt, the House has thus cleared the way for a judicial determination of certain constitutional and legal issues concerning the scope of the investigative powers of Congress which the port authority has seen fit to raise.

RECORD OF PUBLIC LAWS

I believe the voters are entitled to know which legislation I introduced in the past Congress which ultimately became law. This the voters must know in order to judge the scope of my activities, the success of my efforts, and the interests which I have pursued.

I attach herewith a list of the bills and the public law numbers of the 86th Congress which I authored and are now part of the U.S. law.

Public Law	Title	Bill No.
86-24	To amend ch. 13, Wage Earners' Plans, of the Bankruptcy Act	H.R. 4852.
86-49	To repeal clause (9) of subdivision a of sec. 39 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 67a(9), respecting the transmission of papers by the referee to the clerk of the court.	H.R. 4345.
86-64	To amend secs. 1, 18, 22, 331, and 631 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 1, 41, 45, 731, 1031) to provide for automatic adjudication and reference in certain cases.	H.R. 4692.
86-107	To amend sec. 11 of the Clayton Act to provide for the more expeditious enforcement of cease-and-desist orders issued thereunder, and for other purposes	H.R. 2977.
86-110	To amend the Bankruptcy Act so as to consolidate the referees' salary and expense funds	H.R. 4693.
86-135	To eliminate all responsibility of the Government for fixing dates on which the period of limitation for filing suits against Miller Act payment bonds commences to run.	H.R. 4060.
86-138	Relating to the maintenance and travel expenses of judges	H.R. 74.
86-144	To amend secs. 43 and 34 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 71, 62) to simplify the filling of referee vacancies	H.R. 4340.
86-221	To amend sec. 752 of title 28, United States Code (relating to appointment of law clerks and secretaries by district judges)	H.R. 2979.
86-223	To amend sec. 2734 of title 10, United States Code, so as to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to settle claims arising in foreign countries incident to noncombat activities of the Coast Guard.	H.R. 2741.
86-238	To amend title 28 of the United States Code to increase the limit for administrative settlement of claims against the United States under the tort claims procedure to $2,500.	H.R. 6000.
86-243	Relating to the authority of the Customs Court to appoint employees, and for other purposes	H.R. 7126.
86-259	To amend sec. 4161 of title 18, United States Code, relating to computation of good-time allowances for prisoners	H.R. 4347.
86-282	To amend sec. 1870 of title 28, United States Code, to authorize the district courts to allow additional peremptory challenges in civil cases to multiple plaintiffs as well as multiple defendants.	H.R. 2978.
86-287	To amend the act of Sept. 2, 1958, establishing a Commission and Advisory Committee on International Rules of Judicial Procedure	H.R. 8461.
86-293	To amend the Bankruptcy Act in regard to the verification of pleadings	H.R. 6889.
86-312	To fix the official station of retired judges assigned to active duty	H.R. 2982.
86-352	To change the designation of Child Health Day from May 1 to the 1st Monday in October of each year	H.J. Res. 317.
86-411	To amend sec. 2734 of title 10, United States Code, to extend the statute of limitations in the case of certain foreign claims	H.R. 2740.
86-449	To enforce constitutional rights, and for other purposes (civil rights)	H.R. 8601.
86-504	To amend the Bankruptcy Act in regard to the closing fee of the trustee and in regard to the fee for the filing of a petition	H.R. 6557.
86-546	To make the uniform law relating to the record on review of agency orders (Public Law 85-791) applicable to the judicial review of orders issued under the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 and the Food Additives Amendment of 1958.	H.R. 7847.
86-586	To validate certain payments of additional pay for sea duty made to members and former members of the U.S. Coast Guard	H.R. 9921.
86-621	To amend the Bankruptcy Act to limit the use of false financial statements as a bar to discharge	H.R. 4346.
86-631	To amend sec. 678 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 1078) relating to the transmission of petitions, notices, orders, and other papers to the Secretary of the Treasury in ch. XIII proceedings.	H.R. 7726.
86-662	To amend subdivision c of sec. 39 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 67c) so as to clarify time for review of orders of referees	H.R. 6556.
86-682	To revise, codify, and enact into law, title 39 of the United States Code, entitled "The Postal Service"	H.R. 2339.
86-702	To clarify certain provisions of the Criminal Code relating to the importation or shipment of injurious mammals, birds, amphibians, fish, and reptiles (18 U.S.C. 42(a), 42(b)); and relating to the transportation or receipt of wild mammals or birds taken in violation of State, national, or foreign laws (18 U.S.C. 43), and for other purposes.	H.R. 10329.
86-726	To amend title 28 of the United States Code relating to actions for infringements of copyrights by the United States	H.R. 4059.

Also I am proud to indicate that over the years while in Congress I succeeded in procuring the passage of many important laws, among them: The Federal Register Act; the Celler-Kefauver Anti-Merger Act; the Celler-Sparkman Act providing for finality of Clayton Act orders; the Celler-O'Mahoney Automotive Act; the Foreign Trade Zones Act; the Federal Tort Claims Act; numerous refugee acts; and Celler Civil Rights Acts of 1957 and 1960.

A Tax Loophole That Must Be Plugged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives to a most unfortunate development that has recently occurred with regard to imports into the United States from our insular possessions, a development which could not only lead to the loss of millions of dollars in duty revenue to the Government but could also seriously disrupt important industries in this country.

Under section 301 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, articles imported from our insular possessions are permitted to enter the United States free of duty, provided that foreign materials utilized in such articles represent no more than one-half of the total value of the article. This provision was intended, of course, to promote the growth of industries, employment and skills in the island possessions, and to a certain extent this is being accomplished.

Unfortunately, however, in other instances the effect of section 301 is simply to permit avoidance of the duty that Congress intended on foreign imports. Some products are being imported into the island possessions from foreign countries in subassembly form, a very few finishing touches are added in the islands—requiring a negligible amount of labor or investment—and the completed articles are then imported duty-free into the United States.

This duty-avoidance loophole is now available to many industries where the rate of duty is high. This is because the total value of the article imported into the United States is generally considered—under section 402 of the Tariff Act—to be the wholesale price which the article could bring in the U.S. market—and the wholesale price naturally reflects the duty. In other words, imports from the insular possessions get the protection of the duty in establishing their wholesale price or total value, even though they themselves are not subject to the duty.

In any industry where the duty is 100 percent, the total value of the article imported into the United States would be certain to be at least twice the value of the subassemblies shipped into the insular possessions, even though virtually no labor is expended in the islands. Therefore, the duty-avoidance loophole is wide open in all such cases.

It is my understanding that certain industries, including at least one watch company, have already established operations in the Virgin Islands which will allow them to avoid duty payments. Employing only a handful of men, this firm can turn out more than a thousand watch movements each week because so little work is required to screw the subassemblies together into a working timepiece. This one tiny operation can avoid several hundred thousand dollars in duty a year, yet it is of virtually no benefit to the Virgin Islands economy. Certainly, this is a serious revenue loss to our Government, and I understand that the U.S. watch industry—domestic producers as well as bona fide importers—consider the situation a definite threat to this important industry.

There is no question in my mind, Mr. Speaker, that the Congress should look into this situation as quickly as Congress reconvenes and should take prompt action to plug this loophole. No Member of this body believes more strongly than I in the principles of reciprocal trade, nor is any Member more anxious to see the healthy economic growth of our island possessions. I do not believe for one moment that the Congress should allow these possessions to become havens for duty avoidance in operations which clearly do not fulfill their stated objective of stimulating economic growth and self-sufficiency for the islands.

I was pleased to learn that the Treasury Department is aware of this loophole,

and has suggested a legislative remedy which has been introduced by the chairman and ranking Republican member of the House Ways and Means Committee. While I do not believe the Treasury suggestion goes far enough to close the loophole, I am in total agreement with its purposes and am convinced that the Congress will enact effective legislation early next year.

A Report on Agriculture: Democrat Disillusionment, Disappointment, and Defeatism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, it has become abundantly clear that the American farmer was the political football for this Democrat-controlled 86th Congress. Although unfortunate, this situation is not unexpected. In the field of agriculture the record of the Democratic Party has consistently been one of disillusionment, disappointment, and defeatism.

This 86th Congress which began its final "rump" session with a good many empty saddles at the New Frontier has produced very little in the way of constructive farm legislation. It has, however, produced a great deal of misleading and distorted "farm facts" designed for purely partisan consumption. I would like to review some of these political statements and compare them with past Democrat performances.

DISILLUSIONMENT

One popular fantasy that Democrat soothsayers perpetuate is the image of the "good old Democrat days" and the bad, bad Republican days commencing on the very day in 1953 when President Eisenhower took office. By comparing the last 7 years with the previous 7 years, these same soothsayers come up with the conclusion that the Eisenhower administration has precipitated a farm income disaster. Now let me say at this point that I know farmers are in a financial cost-price squeeze that no other segment of the economy must bear. Farmers need a sound farm program, but scant hope is offered them by Democrats as based on the record. Now anyone can compare the last 7 peacetime years with the previous 7 wartime and post-wartime years and come up with a set of figures showing that farm income was greater in the latter period. But I submit, this does not in any way support the idea that the Democratic Party can promote farm prosperity.

One need only look at the realized net farm income figures for pre-World War II to see how the Roosevelt-Wallace regime fared. During the 3-year period, 1939 through 1941, realized net farm income averaged only $5.9 billion per year, or about one-half of the present figure. If the last 7 Republican peacetime years are compared with the last 7 Democrat peacetime years, the record shows farmers' realized net income was $7.7 billion more in the 7-year period since 1952. This is true in spite of the alltime high farm income figures set in the peacetime years just following World War II.

Another ridiculous claim is that the Eisenhower administration has driven great numbers of farmers from the land. As anyone who is familiar with the facts knows, our farm population has been steadily declining throughout our entire history, particularly since 1933. One misleading statement compares farm population in 1952 at 24,283,000 with that of 1959 at 21,172,000 to prove this political claim.

When one studies the official reports, the record is clarified. The comparison using the year 1952 is obviously based on the Republican victory that year. What is not noted, however, is that population estimates are made on April 1 of the year and elections are held in November. It was not until 1953 that the Eisenhower administration took office and in April 1953, the GOP was just beginning to clean up the mess in Washington.

If the Democrats are trying to compare farm population in the Truman administration with that of the Eisenhower administration, they should in all fairness use the April 1953 population estimates. I would note, however, that you will very seldom see a Democrat make such a comparison. The reason is that in the last 6 years of the Truman regime, farm population declined from 27,124,000 on April 1, 1947, to 22,679,000 on April 1, 1953, or at an average of 740,000 per year. In the last 6 years of this administration farm population has declined from 22,679,000 on April 1, 1953, to 21,172,000 on April 1, 1959, or at an average of 251,000 per year.

In other words, an average of approximately 489,000 more farmers left their farms each year during the last 6 years of the Truman administration than did during the first 6 years of the Eisenhower administration.

When one further examines the record it is no wonder so many more farmers left their farms during the Truman administration. The cost-price squeeze, fired in part by inflationary Democrat policies, really hit farmers hard. In 1952 farm production expenses were $22.6 billion or up $9.7 billion from 1945 when these expenses were $12.9 billion. In 1959 these same expenses were $26 billion, or up $3.4 billion, since 1952. In other words, farmers saw their costs of production go up nearly three times as much during the Truman administration than during the Eisenhower administration.

DISAPPOINTMENT

While there are many other examples of Democrat efforts to offset facts with fallacies, I would like to dwell on some more recent Democrat disappointments.

The shortcomings of the Roosevelt and Truman administrations in agriculture cannot begin to compare in despair with futility shown by Democrat farm leaders in recent years.

The Democrat nominee for President has exhibited a fundamental lack of leadership and understanding in this important field. In a Senate controlled by the Democrats 66–34, Senator KENNEDY failed to exercise any initiative in securing passage of an agricultural research bill which held great promise for the development of industrial and other uses for our surpluses. He failed to assist in the enactment of the House-passed Farmers Home Administration bill which would have simplified and streamlined the credit facilities of this important Government agency. He also failed to take any steps toward extending one of our most effective and valuable farm programs, the conservation reserve program, which will now expire in December 1960. He took no interest in any payment-in-kind and soil conservation programs enthusiastically supported by many midwestern Congressmen. The Democratic standard bearer's apathy toward agriculture was especially callous, however, in view of his statements and promises made at the Los Angeles convention.

An Associated Press story dated July 13, 1960, stated as follows:

> Senator KENNEDY announced yesterday he will sponsor an emergency farm aid bill in the Congress session resuming next month, with the aim of getting "full parity prices for farmers."

The story then goes on to tell how the Senator described the farm problem as the "No. 1 domestic problem today," and how the drafting of the bill was then under way. The strange thing is that no such bill was ever introduced by Senator KENNEDY, nor did any such bill receive any attention by either the House or the Senate.

It is now apparent that the Democratic Party rests its application for national leadership in the hands of a candidate for President who as late as August 1960 completely ignored the same farmers to whom he had promised full parity prices just 1 month earlier.

DEFEATISM

While Democrats just naturally seem to be pessimistic on most everything concerning our great country, they plunge to the depths of melancholy when assessing the farm problem. Their negative-minded mentality in turn affects their effectiveness and it often leads them down the road of defeat and discouragement. But they claim an alibi—President Eisenhower's veto power.

During the past several years the President has been forced to veto several major farm bills. Only one of these vetoes resulted in no further legislation. That was the veto of S. 144 of the 86th Congress, the Rural Electrification Administration reorganization bill. This bill, which was merely a political power play, had nothing to do with interest rates to be paid on REA loans nor had it anything to do with increasing the farmers' income.

One veto—S. 1968, the wheat bill of the 1st session of the 86th Congress—was

followed by another wheat bill which passed the Senate, but was killed in the House. The other three vetoes—S. 1901, the tobacco price-support bill of the 86th Congress; Senate Joint Resolution 162, the "freeze resolution" of the 85th Congress; and H.R. 12, the general farm bill of the 84th Congress—were each followed by subsequent congressional action which resulted in the enactment of important legislation.

In spite of the fact that four of these vetoes were later turned into legislative results, the Democrat leadership has consistently used them as an apology for their own ineptness and failure. Not only was the conservation reserve killed, the agricultural research bill strangled, the FHA bill suffocated, and the payment-in-kind bills buried, but their very own unworkable proposals were rejected by their colleagues in the House.

The House Agriculture Committee reported two bills which were killed by the Rules Committee controlled by the Democrats by an 8 to 4 margin. These bills, which would have raised price supports on all feed grains—except corn—and set up a Brannan plan for hog farmers, never saw the light of floor debate.

In 1958 the House Agriculture Committee put together an omnibus farm bill which was so objectionable that the House refused to even consider it and rejected the rule which would have made debate in order.

This year the Democrat farm leadership fared slightly better. The so-called Poage farm surplus reduction bill was debated on the floor, but 100 House Democrats joined in killing it. This bill was the skeletal remains of the ill-fated family farm income bill which 13 midwestern Democrat Governors urged us all to enact. The original version was so bad that it was not able to clear the House Agriculture Committee until 251 of the original 256 commodities originally included were able to escape its unwanted coverage. The final version which was repudiated by the Democrat-controlled House presented farmers and taxpayers with the bleak prospects of $110 million per year more expenditures on an ineffective wheat program which would have an especially adverse effect upon the Corn Belt; a Brannan-plan direct-payment scheme calling for abdication of congressional responsibility carrying a price tag of at least $600 million per year; and a complete duplication of the food distribution facilities by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, costing an additional $500 million per year which was based on a completely unproven theory having no basis in the record.

Rather than face up to their own miserable record, however, these farm-the-farmer politicians spend their time dwelling upon gloomy facts like those concerned with farm credit. The statement is made that farmers' debts are at a record high, above $24 billion. Standing alone this is statistical hogwash which presents only the half-truth. The whole truth is that while total farm debt is now $24.3 billion, the highest on record, it is equally true that farm assets are also at an alltime high of $203.6 billion and owners' equities are likewise at an alltime high of $179.3 billion.

The farm credit record also shows that farm mortgage foreclosures are near the alltime low—less than one out of three farms has a mortgage at all. In addition, farm ownership is at an alltime high.

GOP RECORD IN CONGRESS

I need not remind you that for a good many years Republican Members of the House and Senate have worked long and hard in the interest of rural America. The last Republican Congress, the 83d of 1953 and 1954, was a good example of this worthwhile service. The Pakistan wheat transaction, the strengthening of the Extension Service, the enactment of emergency drought relief legislation, the establishment of the Farm Credit Administration as an independent agency, the Agricultural Act of 1954 including the Wool Act, the establishment of the school, armed services, and veterans milk programs, and the enactment of Public Law 480, all stand as monuments to the effectiveness of a Republican Congress. Under Public Law 480 alone over $10.5 billion worth of surplus farm commodities have been sold to foreign nations for their currencies, bartered for strategic and other materials, or donated to hungry people both at home and overseas.

As the ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture during the 86th Congress, along with other Republican members, I supported many beneficial pieces of legislation such as amendments designed to strengthen the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, the extension and expansion of the school milk program, the extension of Public Law 480, the extension of the Sugar Act granting President Eisenhower the authority to deal with both Castro and Trujillo, the dairy price support bill, the forestry bill establishing the principle of multiple use and sustained yield on our national forests, the land-grant college bill, and strengthening amendments for the farm credit system.

In addition, we urged the administrative action which resulted in U.S. hog markets being protected from a flood of cheap, foreign government subsidized pork.

A good number of constructive Republican proposals for the benefit of farmers never got to first base. For example, the many payment-in-kind land retirement proposals introduced by midwestern Congressmen never received serious attention even though endorsed by the Department of Agriculture.

THE FUTURE

I agree with the junior Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. KENNEDY, when he said—before the special session—that agriculture is the No. 1 domestic problem today. I submit, however, that it is high time for the political shadowboxing to stop if we are to carry out our responsibilities to this most vital portion of our Nation and our economy. We should move forward with confidence in the ability of our vigorous farm people. We should promote programs which embody the great American ideals of freedom, opportunity, liberty, and individual dignity.

Specifically, we should work on the rural development program, expanded agricultural research, extension and expansion of the conservation reserve, land retirement and soil conservation through payments-in-kind, continuation of the Eisenhower food-for-peace program, and realistic price support programs geared to individual commodities. The time for constructive action is here.

The Republican Social Security Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BYRNES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Republican Party has a proud record in the development of legislation improving the Nation's social security program.

Since 1953 under the leadership of a Republican administration, and particularly during the years 1953 and 1954 when that administration was supported by a Republican majority in Congress, genuine progress has been achieved in improving the adequacy, equity, and soundness of each of the programs included in the Social Security Act. These programs include the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program, the public assistance programs of aid to the aged, blind, dependent children, and disabled, and the unemployment insurance program.

The public assistance programs have been improved under Federal-State cooperation to provide more realistically for the citizens to be benefited under the various programs. Cash benefits have risen, medical services have been greatly expanded and improved, and rehabilitation endeavors have been strengthened and encouraged to provide increased opportunity to the individual for self-reliance.

The Federal-State unemployment insurance system has been improved through the extension of coverage to more than 5 million individuals, the strengthening of the program's financing structure, and by the action of every State to increase benefit levels and by 40 States to lengthen the duration of benefit eligibility. With respect to benefit levels and duration, it is significant to note that the States generally have acted to increase benefit levels by 40 percent since January 1953 and potential benefit entitlements by 50 percent since January 1953. These achievements represent real advancement in the improvement of the employment security of our American citizens.

Mr. Speaker, the balance of my remarks will pertain to the accomplishments achieved since 1953 under the

leadership of the Republican Party in improving the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program of the Social Security Act.

President Eisenhower upon taking office in 1953 described the social security system as the "cornerstone of the Government's programs to promote the economic security of the individual." The deep-rooted interest of the Republican Party in human welfare has been evidenced by the Republican achievements in the area of social security.

The most significant and important improvements in the social security program since the inception of the Act were prepared by the Republican 83d Congress in cooperation with the Republican administration. These improvements included:

First. Coverage extension to 10.2 million additional individuals who were working in occupations previously excluded from the protection of the Act such as farmers, certain farmworkers, most professions, ministers, certain State and local employees, and other miscellaneous groups.

Second. Benefit increases were enacted for the more than 6.5 million people then on the benefit rolls including a 20-percent increase in the minimum benefit. For those retiring in the future a new benefit formula was established resulting in a higher benefit for new beneficiaries.

Third. Retirement test liberalization permitted higher earnings without loss of benefit entitlement and the earnings limitation was made inapplicable at age 72 instead of 75 as under prior law;

Fourth. Five-year dropouts of periods of lowest or no earnings in computing benefit amount resulted in a general upward adjustment of future benefit levels and protected persons who had not previously been covered;

Fifth. Disability protection of eligibility for, and levels of, benefits through the so-called wage freeze preserved the benefit rights of persons sustaining a total extended disability;

Sixth. Financing adjustments were made to maintain the actuarial soundness of the program.

These highlights are only a few of the many meritorious improvements in the social security program prepared by the Republican 83d Congress. As I have indicated these changes constituted the most far-reaching improvements ever enacted in the history of the program.

Further changes of a more modest nature were made in the OASDI title of the Social Security Act by the amendments of 1956 and 1958. The principal changes can be summarized, as follows:

The 1956 amendments: First, disability benefits payable to totally and permanently disabled workers aged 50 and over and for certain disabled children; second, coverage was extended to an additional 250,000 individuals; and, third, tax schedule was adjusted to defray the added cost of the liberalizations.

The 1958 amendments: First, benefit levels were increased for present and future beneficiaries; second, maximum monthly family benefit increased from $200 to $254; third, benefits provided for dependents of disabled beneficiaries; fourth, retirement test changed to prevent loss of benefit for any month in which beneficiary earned $100 or less rather than $80 or less as under previous law; and, fifth, financing adjustments were made to defray the added cost of the changes.

Mr. Speaker, these changes received the overwhelming support of the membership in the Congress. However, it is appropriate to say that as these proposals were enacted into law the nucleus of support for the legislation came from the Republican Party, and in large measure the changes were the result of recommendations by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. In making this observation I stress the fact that I am commenting on the legislation as enacted into law. This nucleus of Republican support also existed with respect to the 1960 amendments. I will comment on these amendments at this time.

Mr. Speaker, the 1960 amendments to the OASDI title made a number of changes in the coverage provisions, revised the benefit eligibility qualifications, liberalized the retirement test, and made certain revisions in the financial structure of the program.

The development of these changes to title II of the Social Security Act had its beginning with able work done by a subcommittee of the Committee on Ways and Means in the fall of 1959 through an inquiry into the administration of the Social Security Act. This project was aided by the full cooperation of the officials and staff of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, who recommended many of the legislative changes included in the bill.

The specific changes made in the OASDI title by the 1960 amendments can be highlighted, as follows:

First. Disability insurance benefits are payable to disabled workers under age 50 and their dependents on the same basis as benefits are now provided with respect to disabled workers age 50 to 64. It is estimated approximately 125,000 additional disabled workers, plus their dependents, will qualify for benefits under this change beginning with the month of November.

Second. Disability rehabilitation is strengthened by providing a benefit-paid 12-month trial work period for disabled beneficiaries without the previously existing limitation that such trial work must be done under a formal Federal-State vocational rehabilitation plan. Also a disabled worker who returns to work and again becomes disabled within 5 years would not be required to meet a 6-month waiting period before resumption of benefits.

Third. Coverage extension is made to an additional 180,000 persons. The occupational groups include family employment—e.g., a parent by a son or daughter under certain circumstances—additional employees of nonprofit organizations by eliminating the requirement of two-thirds concurrence by employees concerned, additional ministers by extending the time for a coverage election to April 15, 1962, and other miscellaneous groups.

Fourth. Retirement test is liberalized by providing that earnings above the ceiling of $1,200 annually up to a $1,500 level will result in a reduction of benefits on the basis of $1 in benefits for every $2 earned. Earnings above $1,500 will result in a $1 benefit loss for each $1 earned. Under previous law a month's benefit was lost for each $80 of earnings above $1,200 a year. The result of this change is that a beneficiary earning above $1,200 will always have more in benefits and earnings than if he limited his earnings to $1,200.

Fifth. Eligibility requirements are modified so a person can become eligible for benefits by having 1 quarter of covered work in every 3 quarters elapsing after 1950 or the year he attained 21 whichever is later and before the year he becomes eligible for benefits. The previous requirement was 1 quarter of work in every 2 elapsed quarters. The present minimum requirement of 6 quarters and the maximum requirement of 40 quarters are retained. It is estimated that 400,000 individuals will be eligible for benefits under this change, including 250,000 aged.

Sixth. Child's benefit computation is liberalized so that 400,000 children will receive increased benefits. In addition a child's benefit will be available to a child of a disabled worker where the child is born after the disability or becomes a stepchild of the worker after disability occurs. A child's benefit based on his father's earnings will be payable even though the child is being supported by a stepfather.

Seventh. Benefit entitlement for dependents based on a primary insured individual's wage record is changed in many respects so as to facilitate benefit eligibility for spouses, children, and other dependents.

Eighth. Financing of the OASDI program has been changed with respect to return on trust fund investment so that interest earnings on new investment of funds will approximate the rate of return paid to open market purchasers of Government securities.

Mr. Speaker, for the most part the 1960 OASDI changes will tend to improve the equity of the program and simplify the law. The changes were not sweeping in scope but they were important and meritorious to the people affected by them. It is also significant to note that these changes were accomplished without an increase in the contributions schedule. I will have more to say about the contributions schedule later in my remarks.

Under the leadership of the Republican Party, the social security system has become a program of the people. Virtual universality of coverage has been accomplished so that 9 out of 10 jobs are covered; the system's tax and benefit schedules now have tremendous significance for our economy; the security of our citizens in important part now rests in the maintenance of a financially and actuarially sound system to provide protection at the time of retirement or survivorship.

Let us now look to see how the changes in social security taking effect under the

Republican Party in the last 8 years have improved the program.

The growth in the OASDI program during the last 8 years is indicated by the fact that its coverage has been extended to approximately 12 million additional jobs including farmers and many other occupational groups; disability benefits and liberalized survivors' benefits are provided; a lower retirement age for women to age 62 is established; and two upward adjustments in the benefit level have occurred. I would point out to you that these increases in benefit amounts were accomplished under a Republican administration that maintained a relatively stable cost of living so that from 1953 through 1959 the annual average increase in the cost of living was 1.5 percent compared with an annual average increase in the Roosevelt-Truman years of 1939 through 1952 of 7 percent.

The development of the program is also indicated by the cold statistical facts of the growth in the number of beneficiaries and benefit disbursements. During the fiscal year 1952 OASI disbursements were $2 billion whereas for fiscal year 1960 the OASDI disbursements were $10.8 billion. The number of monthly beneficiaries in June 1952 was 4.6 million whereas in June 1960 it was 14.3 million. The average benefit for a retired worker was $42 a month in June 1952 and in June 1960 it was $74 per month. The corresponding monthly figures for a retired worker and his wife are $68 for 1952 and $124 for 1960.

The widowed mother with two dependent children in 1952 received an average check of $107 per month whereas today the average amount approximates $160 per month. We have gone from 50 million individuals working in occupations protected under the OASDI system to almost 60 million individuals. In 1952 80 percent of our total paid employment was covered by OASDI and today the percentage is over 90 percent.

That is the record of accomplishment by Republican leadership in the area of social security. It is a record of leadership that has found Republican campaign promises matched by Republican performance. It is a record of leadership that has shunned the cruel course of promising appealing but unattainable liberalizations in our social-security law in a selfish quest for votes. In short, Republican leadership has outperformed but has not tried to outpromise anyone in regard to social-security improvements.

Against that backdrop of responsible Republican leadership in improving the adequacy, equity, and soundness of the social security system, let us now look to the future.

In terms of Republican Party principle in the area of human needs the 1960 Republican platform states:

> The ultimate objective of our free society and of an ever-growing economy is to enable the individual to pursue a life of dignity and to develop his own capacities to his maximum potential.

In this context our 1960 Republican platform pledges our party first, to improve the adequacy of the social security program on a basis that maintains the fiscal integrity of the system; second, to improve Federal-State programs providing better health care and greater security to our aged; third, to promote programs enhancing the economic opportunities of the aged so that their wisdom, skill, and experience may be put to productive use; and fourth, to give prompt consideration to the recommendations of the White House Conference on Aging called by the President for January 1961.

In summary, the Republican objective—the Republican position—with respect to social security has been and is a dedication to the principle that our aged and other citizens should have the right of self-determination in an environment of maximum individual opportunity without compulsory subservience to Government bureaucracy and without fear of loss of self-respect.

By contrast the Democratic platform for 1960 asserts that "the Democratic administration will end the neglect of our older citizens." The Democratic platform then devotes more than two full pages to promises of massive Government bounty with little or no recognition of the rights of the individual to self-determination and to self-respect.

As Republicans we pledge ourselves to the support of any meaningful effort to strengthen and improve the OASDI system which is soundly financed and which is not unfair to any group.

Mr. Speaker, I would at this time direct my remarks to a few pertinent observations relative to the actuarial status of the OASDI program and its financial structure.

The actuarial status of the OASDI trust funds is vital to the welfare of our people. It is the solemn responsibility of the Congress and Government officials connected with the administration of the OASDI program to safeguard the system against insolvency. Only in this way can the reliance on the system by the American people—whether they be current beneficiaries or future beneficiaries—be justified. The combined balances in the OASDI trust funds currently approximate in excess of $22 billion. When it is considered that annual payments out of the funds in calendar year 1960 are estimated to exceed $11.5 billion, it is apparent that the funds contain a total principal sufficient only to pay benefits for 2 years in the absence of continued fund income. This is not a great margin of surplus and demonstrates the reliance of the system on current income and the existing tax schedule for current solvency. The actuarial tables on which these observations are based are included as a part of my remarks as table I and table II:

TABLE I.—*Progress of old-age and survivors insurance trust fund under 1960 act, high-employment assumptions, intermediate cost estimate at 3.02 percent interest* [1]

[In millions]

Calendar year	Contributions	Benefit payments	Administrative expenses	Railroad retirement financial interchange [2]	Interest on fund [1]	Balance in fund [3]
	Actual data					
1951	$3,367	$1,885	$81	----------	$417	$15,540
1952	3,819	2,194	88	----------	365	17,442
1953	3,945	3,006	88	----------	414	18,707
1954	5,163	3,670	92	----------	468	20,576
1955	5,713	4,968	119	----------	461	21,663
1956	6,172	5,715	132	----------	531	22,519
1957	6,825	7,347	[4] 162	----------	557	22,393
1958	7,566	8,327	[4] 194	−$121	549	21,864
1959	8,052	9,842	184	−275	525	20,141
	Estimated data (short-range estimate)					
1960	$10,747	$10,726	$205	−$308	$503	$20,152
1961	11,486	11,658	227	−270	520	20,003
1962	11,799	12,326	221	−250	530	19,526
1963	13,882	12,913	223	−270	558	20,560
1964	14,609	13,424	225	−265	620	21,875
1965	14,925	13,880	229	−250	694	23,135
	Estimated data (long-range estimate)					
1970	$20,006	$16,132	$245	−$160	$1,289	$41,270
1975	21,673	19,044	260	−91	1,846	63,305
1980	23,327	22,092	270	1	2,377	81,581
2000	31,477	30,704	356	86	4,101	140,161
2020	38,291	42,127	456	86	7,779	203,208

[1] An interest rate of 3.02 percent is used in determining the level-premium costs, but in developing the progress of the trust fund a varying rate in the early years has been used, which is equivalent to such fixed rate.

[2] A positive figure indicates payment to the trust fund from the railroad retirement account, and a negative figure indicates the reverse. Interest payment adjustments between the 2 systems are included in the "interest" column.

[3] Not including amounts in the railroad retirement account to the credit of the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund. In millions of dollars, these amounted to $377 for 1953, $284 for 1954, $163 for 1955, $60 for 1956, and nothing for 1957 and thereafter.

[4] These figures are artificially high because of the method of reimbursements between this trust fund and the disability insurance trust fund (and, likewise, the figure for 1959 is too low).

NOTE.—Contributions include reimbursement for additional cost of noncontributory credit for military service.

TABLE II.—*Progress of disability insurance trust fund under 1960 act, high-employment assumptions, intermediate-cost estimate at 3.02 percent interest*

[In millions]

Calendar year	Contributions	Benefit payments	Administrative expenses	Interest on fund [1]	Balance in fund
	Actual data				
1957	$702	$57	[2] $3	$7	$649
1958	906	249	[2] 12	25	1,379
1959	891	457	50	41	1,825
	Estimated data (short-range estimate)				
1960	$1,012	$570	$44	$53	$2,276
1961	1,040	802	52	65	2,527
1962	1,066	864	51	76	2,754
1963	1,092	924	53	88	2,957
1964	1,126	978	55	98	3,148
1965	1,154	1,029	57	107	3,323
	Estimated data (long-range estimate)				
1970	$1,177	$1,229	$53	$111	$3,354
1975	1,275	1,401	58	95	3,108
1980	1,372	1,550	62	75	2,438
2000	1,852	2,048	80	(3)	(3)
2020	2,282	2,701	103	(3)	(3)

[1] An interest rate of 3.02 percent is used in determining the level-premium costs, but in developing the progress of the trust fund a varying rate in the early years has been used, which is equivalent to such fixed rate.

[2] These figures are artificially low because of the method of reimbursements between the trust fund and the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund (and, likewise, the figure for 1959 is too high).

[3] Fund exhausted in 1993.

NOTE.—Contributions include reimbursement for additional cost of noncontributory credit for military service and transfers to or from the railroad retirement account under the financial interchange provisions of the Railroad Retirement Act.

The existing tax schedule without any upward adjustment to defray the cost of any future liberalization that may be enacted provides for the combined employer-employee tax to reach 9 percent by January 1, 1969, and the tax on the self-employed will be 6¾ percent. The tax is applicable to the first $4,800 of earned income without allowance for personal exemptions or deductions. I will include the tax schedule provided under existing law as table III.

Application of the following tax schedule to a typical family situation produces the following result: Assume a wage earner with $4,800 of income in the year 1969 who is married with two dependent children. Under existing tax rates his income tax liability will be $389 and the combined employer-employee social security tax will be $432. The self-employed person under similar circumstances will pay the same income tax of $389 and a social security tax of $324. Thus, under existing tax schedules our citizens in 1969 will be paying approximately as much for social security as they pay for all other Federal Government functions, including national security.

It is important, therefore, that future changes in the OASDI program must be evaluated with the greatest of care. It is only in this way that the best interests of the social security system and the American people can be served.

TABLE III.—*OASDI financing*

Item	Present law
C. Maximum taxable amount	$4,800 a year.
D. Tax rate for self-employed	Taxable years beginning after— *Percent* 1959 — 4½ 1962 — 5¼ 1965 — 6 1968 — 6¾
E. Tax rate for employees and employers	Calendar years: 1960–62 — 3 1963–65 — 3½ 1966–68 — 4 1969 and after — 4½

Future liberalizations that add any significant increase in cost will inevitably require an increase in taxes over and above those tax rates presently provided if the system is to be actuarially sound. It is important that the Congress avoid any action that would cause the system to lose public acceptance through the addition of items of cost without careful study of the benefits resulting therefrom. This point was ably pointed up by the remarks of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS], at the time the House was considering the Social Security Amendments of 1960. Chairman MILLS then said in part, as follows:

Whatever we do we must ever keep firm in our minds the requirement that there must be revenue in the fund in time and over a period of years to pay for those benefits that we think our people are entitled to receive * * * we are not discussing small matters when we discuss amendments to the Social Security Act; we are discussing terrifically large matters because of their application to so many people, and because of the great number of important policies that are involved in carrying out this program. * * * I think when this scheduled tax is fully effective in 1969 we are going to find that there is unwillingness on the part of a great number of people to see this tax go higher * * * what I am trying to say is that we must not carry this program beyond the point of willingness on the part of the American people to support it.

I associate myself with these remarks of my esteemed chairman and colleague. I might add that there has been no Member of Congress who has worked more diligently and responsibly to improve the social security system for the benefit of all the people than has Chairman MILLS.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican record on social security demonstrates the fundamental belief of our party in the worth and dignity of the individual. Under Republican leadership the social security program has progressed to provide meaningful protection to our aged and to dependent survivors in terms of a secure basic income. The Republican Party stands for the fiscal and actuarial soundness of our social security system. Within the framework of a sound system we promise continued diligence in our endeavors to improve the program so that it more adequately meets the needs of our people. Such is the responsible record of past performance and future promise of Republican leadership in regard to social security.

Duty-Free Importations Into the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement by me on the tendency of some companies to use the duty-free import statute for our insular possessions as a means of avoiding higher rates of duties.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MCCARTHY

I am sorry that in the closing days of the Congress there was insufficient time to act on a matter which, it seems to me, merits prompt legislation. I refer to the fact that in recent months there has been a growing tendency for companies to establish themselves in U.S. insular possessions on a basis that results in their escaping the proper payment of duty on products they wish to import into the United States.

Section 301 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, was intended to promote the development of employment opportunities in our insular possessions, in the hope that they would be able to raise their standards of living. This section permits the duty-free importation into the United States of articles produced in the islands, provided that the foreign materials utilized in these articles is less than one-half their total value.

While the objectives of this section are most worth while, in practice it has developed into a potentially dangerous loophole. This is because many foreign products which carry a high rate of duty can be shipped into the insular possessions in a subassembled condition; assembled in the islands with a negligible amount of effort; and then automatically qualify for duty-free importation into the United States.

The key to the situation is the method of computing the total value of such articles imported into this country. Under the present statute, the total value is computed in such a way that for articles bearing a high rate of duty, the total value is almost certain to be more than double the cost of the foreign subassemblies imported into the possession, even though there has been little or no value added there, and consequently little benefit to the economy of the U.S. insular possession.

In brief, section 301 has become an avenue for the avoidance of very substantial amounts of duty in certain industries, while failing in these cases to achieve its objective of stimulating employment and investment in the islands.

I understand that the situation has intensified in recent months as concerns producing high-duty articles, such as watches, have started operations in the Virgin Islands. The entire U.S. watch industry, do-

mestic producers as well as legitimate importers, oppose this development as an improper use of the Virgin Islands preference.

While I do not favor the high rates of duty which such industries are now forced to pay, there is no doubt in my mind that it is totally improper and unfair to permit such duty avoidance by their competitors' misuse of the Virgin Islands preference. Continuation of such practices will merely serve to upset more responsible elements in such cases as the watch industry and will, of course, lead to very substantial revenue losses by our Government.

The Treasury Department has recognized the loophole in section 301 and has urged corrective legislation. While time did not permit congressional action in the 86th Congress, I sincerely trust that the Congress will give this matter its prompt attention in January.

Congressman Ludwig Teller Reports to His Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LUDWIG TELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. TELLER. Mr. Speaker, almost 4 years ago, in early January of 1957, I presented myself at the bar of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to take the oath of office of the position to which the voters of my district had paid me the honor of electing me. The following 4 years—because I was reelected in 1959—may not turn out to be the best years of my life; I will have to live longer to answer that question. But, up to date, I have never experienced anything in any way comparable to my service for 6 years as a member of the New York State Legislature and in the past four sessions as a Member of the Congress for the 20th Congressional District on Manhattan's West Side.

The sense of responsibility evoked can be appreciated only by the fortunate few who have been Members of the Senate or of the House. The subjects of legislation with which we have dealt are fascinatingly interesting. The continual contact with my constituents in the full-time district office which I have maintained in New York—not just those who voted for me but citizens of all parties in my district whom I represent regardless of political affiliation—has been a deeply enriching experience. The acquaintanceship with my fellow Members in Congress from all parts of this country has taught me to appreciate the breadth and the wealth of the United States, and the complex character of its problems.

On the opening day of my first session in January 1957 that wise elder statesman, Speaker of the House SAM RAYBURN, expressed my feelings of today. After his many years of service in the Congress he stated his own conclusions, as follows:

This is the highest theater that anyone plays in upon this earth today. I must refer again to the tremendous and at times appalling responsibility that falls upon the shoulders of each and every one of us. We must so act in the days to come that we will merit the confidence and the faith not only of our own people but of the people of the whole world, because your country and mine has been challenged to take the leadership of the free world. If we do not with courage and judgment accept that leadership, then the world will be a place in which good men and women will be unhappy.

The simple, honest, sincerity of this admonition was deeply impressive at the time and I believe that, underlying all the often sharp differences of opinion and judgment which have made the headlines during the past 4 years, my fellow Members and I have agreed with the Speaker's conception of the nature of our responsibility, and that we have tried to base our action on it.

The special postconvention session of the 86th Congress, which recently concluded its work, was extremely disappointing. Efforts were unsuccessful to increase the national minimum wage and extend the Federal minimum wage law to millions of workers not now covered. The Congress also failed to pass the much-needed bill which provides medical insurance for our senior citizens. The critical housing shortage and the need for urban renewal was left unremedied. And Federal assistance for local school construction and raising teachers' salaries failed of enactment. My bill for an enlightened immigration law also failed to pass, but it seems clear to me that we must, if our status as the leader in the free world is to be maintained, completely revise our immigration statute—the McCarran-Walter Act—so as to admit worthwhile persons who are now denied entry into this country because of discriminating quota systems. Our present immigration policy should also be revised to abolish its arbitrary provisions which discriminate between native born and naturalized citizens.

In 1957 and 1958 and 1959, at the end of each session of the Congress, I distributed to all my constituents a brief evaluation of our work—both the accomplishments and the shortcomings. Today, I want to take a longer look. Instead of telling you simply of the highlights of the 1960 session I want to go back over the past 4 years and pick out what might in larger perspective be called the high highlights. A little perspective—even the distance achieved during the brief period of the sessions of two Congresses—modifies and corrects some of the more immediate judgments. I cannot, to be sure, range in order of importance all the legislation which we enacted during this period. Only history can do this, if even history can. But certain of our actions appear to warrant an "outstanding" rating, and these I wish to recall to you.

In the 1957 session I believe that every one would agree that the Civil Rights Act was the most important legislative action. This was the first major legislation on the subject in the 80 years since the Reconstruction period following the Civil War. Far from satisfying those—of whom I count myself one—who wanted much stronger guarantees of civil rights, this compromise measure nevertheless marked a substantial advance. The act created a Federal Civil Rights Commission and a special Civil Rights Division within the Department of Justice, and it gave formidable new powers to the Federal Government to protect a basic civil right, the right to vote.

This kind of legislation was so new and so difficult to formulate to meet the existing conditions that the Congress found it necessary during the past session to amend it very considerably. Under the 1960 law, Federal courts, through appointed referees, are authorized to safeguard voting rights; penalties are established for obstruction of court orders and for flight to avoid prosecution for vandalism; Federal election records must be preserved for 22 months; and the availability of funds is authorized for the education of servicemen's children in areas where schools are closed by integration disputes. It is my hope that later Congresses will amplify and amend the laws of 1957 and 1960 to further protect voting rights, and to add the sanction of the Federal Government to guarantees of other civil rights. In the past 4 years we have made a good start, and we must continue resolutely. The American people will not, I am certain, tolerate any more 80-year delays in protecting for all its citizens those civil rights which constitute an essential part of our democratic form of government.

For many years it appeared that the 48 States constituting the United States of America were to be the total membership. Suddenly, we have added Alaska and Hawaii—both outside the continental boundaries which seemed to be unchangeable. The excitement of welcoming our new members has spread all over the country and, I believe, has given us a new appreciation of the meaning of our Nation. The U.S.S.R. has added many a country to her fold, but the contrast in her methods and in the reactions of the peoples of those countries only emphasizes the significance of our action. The Alaskans and Hawaiians sought American statehood as a high privilege and they are proud that it has been conferred upon them. The older States have welcomed them wholeheartedly, realizing full well the values of membership in our democratic Union.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

The Congress has enacted so much important legislation in the field of international affairs in the past 4 years that it is almost impossible to determine what has been most significant. Probably the total effect, rather than the impact of any one measure, is noteworthy.

In 1957, almost immediately after the session opened, the President asked the Congress to support him in an unusual action—a joint Executive-congressional proclamation pledging the United States to use its military force if necessary to keep peace in the Middle East where a serious crisis had arisen. He also asked for authority to expend foreign aid funds for special projects in this area. The proposal involved an important constitutional question—whether Congress needed to authorize the President to act in the field of foreign affairs. A long

debate preceded the final decision. Congress agreed only to proclaim that the United States was prepared to act militarily if the President should deem it necessary, thus, by implication, placing the responsibility on the President alone. The request for special authority to use foreign aid funds was agreed to by Congress. This year I am proud to have cosponsored an amendment to the foreign-aid program denying further foreign aid to Nasser so long as he remains in defiance of the United Nations Resolution commanding free international access to the Suez Canal. This amendment was enacted into law. It is in line with our traditions of free international trade, and if properly implemented may help to bring peace in the Middle East.

In 1957 the United States ratified the statute of the International Atomic Energy Agency, thus implementing the 1953 atoms-for-peace program. Every year the Congress appropriates millions of dollars to carry out the work of the Atomic Energy Commission, much of which is accomplished in cooperation with friendly foreign nations. The Congress honored me in 1958 when it appointed me a delegate to the Second International Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy, held in Geneva, Switzerland. Here scientists from all over the world assembled, and I had an opportunity to observe at first hand, and to report my findings to the Congress, the incredible possibilities for the good of human beings which exist in the peaceful exploitation of the mysterious world of atomic energy.

In 1958 the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act was extended for 4 years, a victory for liberal trade forces. This action strengthened and extended the President's authority to make agreements with other countries for the mutual reduction of tariffs.

In 1959 the Congress authorized a $50 million a year plan to improve health conditions through international cooperation in research, training, and planning. The Senate ratified an extension of the 10-year old International Wheat Agreement for another 3 years to July 31, 1962. Our subscriptions to the World Bank and International Monetary Fund were increased by considerable amounts. Congress provided for U.S. membership in the Inter-American Development Bank to aid in the economic development of Latin American countries. The 1959 session thus gave proof of American concern with world affairs and our desire to work cooperatively with other nations.

The 1960 record is also encouraging. This year, in the last days of the session, Congress authorized $500 million for assistance in the development of Latin America and $100 million for aid in the reconstruction of earthquake-devastated Chile. We authorized American participation in parliamentary conferences with Mexico.

While, therefore, the Congress has made progress in our long-neglected responsibilities toward our Latin American neighbors, we still lack an integrated single policy. The many small policies and the several agencies moving in different directions overlap and are wasteful and lack overall unity. Accordingly, in a speech which I delivered in the Congress on Wednesday, August 26, this year, I proposed a Marshall-type plan for Latin America. The Marshall plan saved Europe from communism. A similar plan can, in our own interests, do the same thing for our stanch friends and neighbors in Latin America by helping to develop industrial plants and agricultural efficiency to relieve the people of shockingly high unemployment and, for most of the people in Latin America, near starvation.

The last subject in the area of international affairs should, possibly, have been placed at the head of the list. Every year the Congress gives the most serious consideration to the great mutual security program, preliminary to making the annual appropriations for its operation. To describe the long debates, the differences of opinion between the advocates and the opponents of various phases of the program and of its increasing costs, and the interrelationships between the Republican executive branch which must administer the program and the Democratic Congress which must furnish the funds, this fascinating history is far too long to recount in my brief review. But the program advances and the Congress continues its strong support.

Realistically speaking, the congressional actions which I have been discussing under the heading of "International Affairs" might well be classified as "defense measures," since they most certainly are designed to strengthen our position in the world through improved relations with other countries. But the Congress has not neglected defense in the conventional sense of the term. A most important law, providing for a complete reorganization of the Department of Defense, was enacted in 1958.

It is a well-known fact that Congress has increasingly taken the position that the administration's defense policies are inadequate to secure our safety against the Soviet threat. This was strikingly illustrated during the 1960 session. We appropriated for fiscal 1961 about $660 million more for defense purposes than the President had requested. The additional amount was for such items as increased production of missile-firing Polaris submarines, accelerated development of the B–70 high-altitude bomber and the Samos reconnaissance satellite, preparations for a continuous airborne alert of bombers, and improvement of troop-carrying airlift equipment. The President, of course, has complete authority to spend, or not to spend, these funds, but the intent of Congress that they should be used was clearly expressed.

I wish to call particular attention to congressional interest in the field of space science and investigation—a function undreamed of only a few years ago. In 1958 we created a new Federal agency, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration—usually called NASA—to devise and administer nonmilitary programs for the development and exploration of outer space. The work of the new agency has expanded very rapidly, and has attracted wide public interest and approval. Congress scrutinized its record very carefully in 1959 and 1960, preliminary to appropriating the increasingly large amounts of money needed for space research and development.

Two other civilian programs with important relationships to national security should be noted. Congress continues to give strong support to the work of the Atomic Energy Commission. In 1958 Congress created an independent Federal Aviation Agency, with authority over the Nation's airways which had previously been exercised by subordinate agencies within the major executive departments.

I have spent so much time on international relations and defense matters that I may have created the impression that the Congress is little concerned with domestic matters, which, of course, is very far from the truth. Every year we deal with important legislation relating to agriculture, the general economy, labor, public welfare, and natural resources. These are laws which affect the individual citizen more directly than do legislation relating to international relations and defense, and they are less difficult for him to understand. No one would claim, however, particularly in view of the present international situation, that they are more important to him. Perhaps I can briefly recall to you some of our major accomplishments to refresh your memory.

AGRICULTURE

The major problem during the past 4 years has been the imposition of price supports for basic farm commodities—a very complex matter which has not been settled to anyone's satisfaction. The New York Times on September 2, 1960, in reviewing the work of the recently concluded session stated that "the stalemate between the Eisenhower administration and the congressional Democrats over farm policy continued this session, without even the usual gesture of sending a price-support bill to the White House to be vetoed." I wish that I could say that this was incorrect or unduly pessimistic, but I cannot. One of the least satisfactory records of the Congress during my term of membership is in the area of agricultural legislation. Even though I represent an urban district I realize only too well that this is a matter of serious concern to city dwellers, not merely to farmers, and I sincerely hope that the new Congress assembling next January under new administration leadership will be able to arrive at some solution. There is an additional problem I should like to mention—the fact that the cost of food at the grocery and vegetable and butcher shops has been steadily increasing for the American housewife, but the American farmer has been getting less and less each year for his farm products. I have called for a congressional investigation of this strange situation. I believe the Congress has a duty to get at the bottom of it, and to adopt measures which will remedy it.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT

In 1958, I was gratified that my bill to compel disclosure of private welfare benefit and pension plans was enacted into law. Congress recognized that the mil-

lions of beneficiaries of these plans had been kept in the dark as to their financial operations, and the new law provides for publicity which is in the general interest. I was naturally gratified over my appointment, while still a freshman, as chairman of a special committee of the Congress on Welfare and Pension Plans. The Teller Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act, which the AFL–CIO referred to as the greatest victory over big banking and insurance lobbies in 60 years, was the product of this special committee. I hope to have a hand in improving this law in light of the facts disclosed as a result of the Teller law, which is a beginning in what I hope will become a vehicle for protecting working people in their vested rights under welfare and pension plans.

Billions of dollars of pension and welfare trust funds exist in this country as a result of collective bargaining. Some of these trust funds are administered solely by unions, others established after the passage of the Taft-Hartley Act are jointly administered by employers and unions. The investment of these funds in common stocks of American corporations may have vast repercussions in the way in which management is exercised, particularly if the investors decide to exercise a participating hand in the operation of the business. Union efforts to participate in management may be intensified by increased automation and its effects on employment.

Accordingly, at the request of our House Committee on Education of which I am a member, I have been engaged in a study of existing plans and practices by which unions participate in business management. My study, which has continued this year, led me to examine existing plans and practices in this important field in Great Britain, Germany, and France, and an adequate and well-rounded study will have to examine the situation in Italy where union-management cooperative plans have reached a high point; also in Spain, where we have little specific information available in this country but where these plans are alleged to exist. On Tuesday, February 2 of this year, I made a report to the Congress on my findings in this field of worker participation in business management.

One of the antirecession measures of the 1958 session provided for supplementary unemployment compensation to jobless workers, by granting to the States repayable Federal advances if they would agree to continue benefits to jobless workers who had exhausted their rights under the Federal-State unemployment system. Extra payments ranging to $45 a week for a maximum of 13 weeks were authorized. I was naturally disappointed that my more comprehensive bill on the subject was not passed; we have far to go toward adequately protecting our people against the consequences of unemployment, particularly in time of recession.

In 1959 Congress passed a stiff law dealing with corruption in the union-management field. Some provisions of the act also cut down traditional economic pressures by labor unions. Attempts in the 1960 session to amend these provisions were unsuccessful. As a member of the Subcommittee on Union-Management Relations I was preoccupied for months, spending days and nights often without surcease, in the drafting of this law. My bill aimed at racketeering and corruption—H.R. 7811—was defeated, and the Landrum-Griffin bill prevailed, but to my gratification about 100 amendments from my bill were accepted by Landrum-Griffin because they were convinced that, whatever our political differences, the complicated realities of union-management relations ought to be taken heed of.

In 1960, after prolonged effort to pass an act liberalizing the wage-hour law by increasing the minimum wage rate and extending coverage to several million more workers, failure was conceded and the leaders decided that it would be better to try again in 1961 under a new and fresh political climate, rather than to accept such a weak measure as the only one which it would have been possible to enact.

THE NATIONAL ECONOMY

During the past 4 years the state of the national economy has furnished the background of a vast number of congressional actions. In my reports for 1957, 1958, and 1959 I dealt with the subject at more length than will be possible in the present report, which must of necessity note only a few major enactments.

The Federal Aid Highway Act of 1958 authorized a greatly accelerated program of assistance to the federally aided highway program and provided $1.8 billion of new funds for immediate expansion. This furnished needed aid to highway transportation, and acted also as an antirecession measure. During each session Congress has continued its support.

In 1958 Congress gave the Small Business Administration permanent status, a real victory for public and private forces seeking to assist small business. In the same year we passed the Small Business Investment Act, providing for loans to State and federally chartered small business investment companies.

In 1959 a new Federal program was inaugurated, with an initial authorization of $389,500,000 in loans and grants for industrial redevelopment in economically depressed areas. A measure on the same subject, passed by both Houses in 1958, had been vetoed by the President, and in 1960 he vetoed another measure. The three measures differed in many respects but their common worthwhile purpose was to aid the national economy through assistance to those areas of the country in which unemployment is excessive and the economy is suffering from lack of funds to develop its resources.

HOUSING

Legislation dealing with housing can be considered, with equally good reason as being in the interest of the general economy or in the interest of the individual homeowner or renter. The large amounts of Federal aid to housing have certainly benefited the construction industry which constitutes a major sector of the national economy. I shall review briefly the principal legislation of the past 4 years without attempting to explain the complex background of clashing forces which determined the content of these acts. That is altogether too long and difficult a story to recount in a paragraph of two.

In 1957, Public Law 104 liberalized several existing programs; lowered the minimum downpayment required to purchase a house with an FHA-insured mortgage and provided additional funds for buying home mortgages from banks and other private lenders.

In 1958 an emergency housing law sought to encourage a substantial increase in new housing units, chiefly through expanding existing programs. An omnibus bill in 1959 provided for a $1.375 billion housing program emphasizing low-cost housing, college housing, urban renewal, and a more realistic program for housing for the elderly. One hundred million dollars was provided for direct Federal loans to veterans in rural and small urban areas. In the past session we extended the life of the home repair and improvement program and lifted the ceiling on FHA insurance; increased the revolving fund for college housing loans and the revolving fund for community facility loans. This is a good record considered on its face, but to a large group in and out of Congress, of which I count myself one, it falls far short of what should have been done.

The Eisenhower administration has failed to take account of the national housing crisis. Witness Eisenhower's repeated veto of fairly modest housing bills passed by the Congress. It is my hope that the 1961 session of the Congress will be able to come to grips with the problem. Here are some of the dimensions of the problem:

First. The title I scandal, and the use of urban renewal funds for profiteering.

Second. Adequate funds for housing, including guarantees that Federal funds will be used for a balanced program for low- and middle-income housing.

Third. Adequate assurances that decent relocation practices and adequate compensation policies will be followed for tenants who are compelled to move because of title I urban renewal practices.

Fourth. Protection of small businesses when title I urban renewal programs are adopted. I have proposed the establishment of a Federal commission to examine into the adequacy of compensation on condemning properties for needed housing developments. But in addition it will be necessary to afford to small businesses the opportunity to reestablish themselves at the site where the development takes place.

SOCIAL WELFARE; EDUCATION

As a member of the House Committee on Education and Labor, I have had the opportunity to deal at firsthand with an aspect of social welfare in which I have a great interest—education. This is not easy legislation to formulate because of many conflicts. One of them has to do with Federal versus State control of education, a somewhat fictitious issue since not a single effort has been made in the Federal-aid bills to control local education. Another deals with the problem of school segregation; any Federal school

aid bill would violate our traditions and aspirations if it permitted Federal funds to be used for building segregated schools. A third has to do with the grant of funds for private or parochial schools, but the difficulty of working out machinery for guaranteeing long-term bonds led to abatement of the demand for Federal funds in this area.

It is undeniable that the Nation as a whole must have an educational system which is adequate to the increasingly pressing need for a well-educated citizenry. At the same time we are firmly committed to our traditional belief that provision of educational opportunity is, and must continue to be, within the control of our State and local governments. The problem is to insure that both policies are fully supported.

After failure in 1957 to enact a law providing Federal aid, in 1958 we were able to get agreement on the National Defense Education Act, setting up a 7-year $1 billion program of Federal loans and grants to students and schools to enable needy students to obtain an education. The National Defense Education Act is a milestone because it is the first Federal law of general application in the field of education and emphasizes the national character of our responsibility in this important field.

In 1959 Congress authorized grants up to $1 million to each State to purchase television facilities and equipment, upon the State's agreement to provide land and buildings, to operate and maintain an education channel. Our House Committee on Education and Labor this year approved two bills for consideration of the Congress; one was a straight school construction bill, the other provided Federal aid not only for school construction but for raising teachers' salaries. I cosponsored both of these bills and participated in drafting them. After working throughout the 1960 session, the Congress was unable to agree on proposed legislation for Federal aid to public schools. Compromises were made to suit the administration and southern Members but even these concessions were not sufficient and the bill died at the end of the session. The problem will not solve itself, however, and the next administration and Congress will again be faced with it. Providing first-class educational opportunity is the No. 1 implementation of our national security policy, and failure to make available adequate Federal aid in a suitable form is a serious setback.

Social security legislation is under consideration at every session. In 1958 we passed an act liberalizing social security benefits, the principal feature of which was to increase old-age and survivors insurance by 7 percent. In the recently concluded session of 1960 no measure attracted more public attention than the one which provided medical care for the aged, and increased the coverage under existing social security programs. The high cost of medical care for the aged and the need for increased social security benefits convinced most Members of Congress of the urgency of enacting new legislation, but there were widely different and strongly held views on the specifics of the measure. I participated in drafting, and cosponsored, the Forand bill, which provides for a system of hospitalization benefits, nursing home care, and surgical benefits, for those who are recipents of social security benefits. This is a modest beginning, it provides medical care as a matter of right and thus avoids the abhorrent needs test, is limited to our senior citizens, and is easily administered.

It is undeniable that the coming elections had an important effect on the outcome. The bill that finally went to the White House called for $202 million in grants for relief-type State programs during the first year, with the States paying $61 million. About 1,360,000 needy persons over 65 would be potential beneficiaries under this measure. Coverage under existing social security programs was somewhat increased. The Congress will have to reconsider medical care for the aged in view of the very considerable justified dissatisfaction with the new program.

Legislation relating to health in 1958 included extension for 5 years of Federal grants for hospital construction. This Federal-aid program has been most successful.

In 1959 Congress provided for a voluntary Federal civilian employees health benefit program similar to those available to large employee groups in private employment. The plan is financed by payroll deductions and an equal contribution by the Government. The immediate acceptance of this health benefit program by the very large majority of Federal employees gives evidence of Congress' wisdom in establishing it.

The several programs of aid to veterans are so well established that Congress' principal duty is the provision of the very large amounts of money needed to implement them. In 1957 compensation payments for service-connected disabilities were increased by 10 percent, with more for 100-percent disability.

Juvenile delinquency has been a national scandal, but until this year it was not viewed as a national problem. As a member of the House Committee on Education and Labor, I cosponsored a bill to make a massive national attack upon the roots of the problem, and I am happy to report that the Congress passed the program.

QUESTIONNAIRE

Early this year I circulated among my constituents approximately 80,000 copies of a questionnaire on currently important national issues. The results confirmed that the 20th Congressional District which I have the honor to represent takes a liberal point of view. This is evidenced in the overwhelming support for increased housing expenditures, for Federal aid to education, and particularly for improvements in social security benefits. There was sharp and even division as to whether our country should accord diplomatic recognition to Red China. Interest in preventing inflation was strongly expressed, but at the same time the great majority of responses favored continuation of those spending programs which are necessary for the national security, such as the foreign-aid program.

Above all else, perhaps, the answers to the questionnaire expressed an insistent interest in achieving peace, in the Middle East and in the world generally. A great majority of the responses, for example, favored more aggressive policies for suspending further testing of nuclear-weapons.

A questionnaire has greatest value when a substantial number of responses are received. Of 80,000 questionnaires distributed, approximately 7,500 responses were received. This, of course, together with the difficulty of formulating fair yet specific and plainly worded questions, detracts from the value of the questionnaire as a sufficiently reliable test of sentiment. But repeated use of the questionnaire will undoubtedly increase the number of responses and the reliability of the conclusions to be drawn from them.

CONCLUSION

I believe that my recapitulation of some of the high points of the past 4 years gives point to the truth of Speaker RAYBURN'S statement, which I quoted in my opening remarks, to the effect that Congress bears a "tremendous and at times appalling responsibility." The honor of being chosen to accept this responsibility is proportionately great, and I have never been unaware either of the honor or of the responsibility. We have made history, of course, but the test of our work will be, again in the Speaker's words, whether we have helped to make the world a place in which good men and women will be happy. Strengthening and perpetuating the greatest democratic Government the world has ever seen is the most important action which can be taken to insure the happiness of our own citizens and, through us, of all the peoples of the world. I thank my constituents most humbly for having given me the opportunity to make my small contribution to this magnificent purpose.

The Effect of Congressional Action on the 1961 Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

Hon. EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, with adjournment, the tumult and shouting died away, the captains and the kings departed, an objective evaluation could then be made of the effect of congressional action in the 2d session of the 86th Congress on the President's budget for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1960, and ending June 30, 1961.

In January of this year the President submitted his annual budget. It was carefully prepared and reflected the profound hope that a surplus of $4.2 billion could be generated to be used in reduc-

ing the public debt. That hope has in large measure been shattered, as the following statement will indicate. The increase in appropriations over and above the President's request, the so-called backdoor financing which bypasses appropriations procedures, the increase provided by new legislation, and the denial of the President's request for additional revenues has in fact reduced the hope for a substantial surplus by nearly $2 billion.

If the revenue estimates made in January 1960 prove to be too high, the estimated surplus will be further reduced and it is fair to assume that on June 30, 1961, unless unforeseen factors may intervene the estimated surplus may have been whittled to a fraction of the original estimate.

One other item in the summary merits attention and that is the accumulative effect of congressional action over a period of years. It indicates that new legislation during the first year it goes into effect may have only a modest effect on the budget. However, as time goes on the real blow to fiscal soundness can be measured and the data included in the report indicating the effect of some of these items over a 5-year period speaks eloquently of how easily budget figures and appropriations tables can conceal the real fiscal effect of such legislation.

I ask, therefore, that the budget summary be made a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT ON ACTIONS BY THE 86TH CONGRESS, 2D SESSION, WITH RESPECT TO THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 1961

The net fiscal impact of all congressional actions in the second session of this Congress upon the President's budget for fiscal 1961 is as follows:

1. Net expenditures [1] for fiscal year 1961 were increased by $2 billion.

2. Net expenditures [1] for a period of years were increased by $9.1 billion.

SUMMARY

[In millions of dollars]

	Expenditure effect in 1961 over budget	Expenditure effect over period of years [1]
A. Congressional action on President's appropriation requests	+212	+272
B. Increases in the budget through "back-door financing"	+94	+1,117
C. Other increases:		
1. In appropriation acts	0	+1,276
2. In new substantive legislation	+971	+2,818
3. Nonapproval of proposals to increase revenues and decrease expenditures	+711	+3,605
Total effect of congressional actions on budget	+1,988	+9,088

[1] The costs over 5 years are shown unless the legislation contains a definite time limitation or involves costs for a specific period of time.

[1] Spending and losses of revenue required by congressional action over budget requests, plus revenues requested by President but not granted.

CONGRESSIONAL ACTION COMPLETED

TABLE A.—*Congressional action on President's appropriation request*

[In millions of dollars]

	Expenditure effect in 1961 over budget	Total increase
Total, appropriations and authorizations (p. 19129, Congressional Record of Sept. 1, 1960):		
1961 appropriations:		
Mutual security programs	−51	−494
Other programs	+159	+347
	+108	−147
1961 loan authorizations	+91	+211
Total	+199	+64
Plus reductions erroneously credited or requiring restoration:		
1. Commodity Credit Corporation, capital restoration. $1,325,000,000 was requested to cover losses already realized and reflected on the books of the Corporation. Congress approved $1,226,500,000.	0	98
2. Liquidation of contract authority. These reductions are for liquidation of obligations in several agencies incurred under contract authority previously provided.	10	17
3. Advance to highway trust fund. The total shown above includes a $40,000,000 decrease in the authorization for a repayable advance to the highway trust fund. Since the amount advanced is repaid by the end of the year, the budget reflected a net zero for this transaction; therefore, a reduction in the advance cannot be counted as a cut in the budget.	0	40
4. Mutual security program—Contingencies. Congressional table includes President's request as $275,000,000, whereas it was (S. Doc. 117) only $250,000,000.	0	25
5. Department of Agriculture—Reappropriation. Congressional table counts as reductions decreases in appropriation request made possible by reappropriation which is in effect the same as a new appropriation.	3	28
Total	+212	+272

TABLE B.—*Congressional increases through "back-door financing"*

[In millions of dollars]

	Expenditure effect in 1961 over budget	Expenditure effect over period of years
Veterans Housing Loan Act. (Budget did not recommend increase in the authorization. Congress provided $300,000,000 new authorization plus use of repayments and balances.)	+94	+420
College housing loans	0	+500
Public facility loans. (Budget proposed $20,000,000 to be provided through appropriations process; $50,000,000 in back-door authority was enacted.)	0	+30
Park, Indian, and forest roads and trails. (Budget proposed to finance through appropriations process, with no appropriation required for 1961. Congress provided contract authority for 1961 and 1962.)	0	+167
Total	+94	+1,117

TABLE C.—*Congressional action on other measures authorizing expenditures or otherwise affecting the budget for 1961 and future years*

[In millions of dollars]

	Expenditure effect in 1961 over budget	Expenditure effect over period of years
1. Other spending provided in appropriation acts above budget:		
a. Increase in merchant marine subsidized voyages (over 20-year life of contracts)	0	+740
b. Agricultural conservation program (1962 only)	0	+150
c. Cost to complete Federal office buildings added above budget	0	+43
d. Cost to complete after 1961 of unbudgeted 1961 public works starts	0	+343
Total	0	+1,276
2. Effect of new legislation and amendments to existing legislation in excess of administration proposals:		
a. Pay increase for Government employees	+746	+3,730
b. Special school milk program	+11	+11
c. Increased payments to land-grant colleges	+9	+45
d. Reduction in cabaret tax	+20	+20
e. Health benefits for retired Federal employees	+2	+60
f. Medical care for the aged (change from administration proposal)	+85	−1,266
g. Increase in maternal and child welfare grants	+12	+62
h. Rural library service extension	0	+30
i. Income tax deductions for all allowable medical expenses incurred in care of dependent parents over 65 without regard to 3-percent limitation	+50	+50
j. Provide alternative method for computing foreign tax credits against U.S. income tax	0	+20
k. Renew suspension of coconut and palm oil taxes	+16	+16
l. Exclusion of local advertising charges from manufacturers' excise tax base	+20	+40
Total	+971	+2,818
3. Failure to enact budget proposals to raise revenues or reduce expenditures:		
a. To increase postal rates	+554	+554
b. To increase aviation fuel tax	+80	+108
c. To repeal diversion of receipts from automotive excise taxes to highway trust fund	0	+2,568
d. To transfer forest and public lands highway costs against highway trust fund	+41	+183
e. To increase premium rate for Federal Home Loan Bank Board	+27	+172
f. To provide for taxation of cooperatives	0	+20
Total	+711	+3,605

Legislative and Activity Report on the 86th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. PAT JENNINGS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, the adjournment today of this 2d session, 86th

Congress, marks the end of my 6th session as the Representative of the Virginia 9th District—the "Fightin' Ninth." I have endeavored to represent the people of my district to the best of my ability; to always look out for their interests; and to speak up in their behalf when the occasion demanded. Furthermore, I have tried to keep them advised, through statements, speeches, newsletters, news releases, and television-radio reports of the major legislative and other actions in the Congress.

Today, as the 86th Congress concludes its work, I present this general summary of actions taken, and include several items of particular concern to the people of my district.

With both the national and congressional campaigns to begin very soon, the work of this Congress will undoubtedly be debated widely and frequently. In looking back over the two sessions, I think we can honestly say that it has been a highly productive Congress. It would be well to not only consider the legislation approved, in judging this Congress, but some of the various proposals that were not passed. Both are important and reflect the will of the people in really wanting a certain program or opposing it.

In the six sessions I have served in the House, the administration has been under the general guidance of one major party and the Congress of another. We in the Congress have done our best to make this divided government work; we have sought compromises when there was little spirit of cooperation from the administration; and we have tried to fulfill our responsibilities to the people back home despite opposition from the executive branch. In examining the record of the 84th, 85th and 86th Congresses, it is very apparent that the Nation deserves leadership from an executive and legislative branch controlled by the members of the same party. When the 87th Congress convenes next January, I hope to again have the privilege of representing the "Fightin' Ninth," and I believe the people of the Nation will insure that divided government will end by electing both a Democratic Congress and administration.

COMMITTEE WORK

As in the past two Congresses, I have served as a member of the House Committee on Agriculture, and on the Subcommittees of Tobacco; Livestock and Feed Grains; Forests; Research and Extension; Family Farms; Departmental Oversight and Consumer Relations; and Domestic Marketing. Farming is of primary importance to the economy of my district, and membership on this committee has given farmers a direct voice on farm legislation.

It is evident that a major job in the next session of Congress will be legislation to make some changes in the existing farm program. Through 6 years of experience and activity, I believe that my contribution to such work can be helpful, and I will again seek membership on this committee.

Faced with this need to make some adjustments in certain farm laws, the Congress has acted on several bills—trying to make needed changes without completely cutting the ground from under the farmer. But these moderate actions have been met with vetoes and threats of vetoes.

With farm prices and farm income down, with farm debts at a record high, and with farm population still on the decline, we must have a rewriting of certain farm laws by both a sympathetic Congress and administration.

The most successful of the farm programs has been that of tobacco. I have sponsored a variety of legislation on this subject to help our tobacco farmers retain this successful operation which, by the way, has cost the Government very little in appropriated funds. Unfortunately, we have run into an unfriendly attitude on the part of the present administration, whose Secretary of Agriculture has been quoted as believing the law amounts to "rationing of poverty" among tobacco producers.

An example of this attitude is shown in the action on the tobacco price support stabilization bill—known as the Jennings bill—in the 1st session of the 86th. We passed it last year at the unanimous request of tobacco producers and other segments of the tobacco industry—but it was vetoed. With slight modifications, the bill, which I again joined in sponsoring, was passed this year and was signed. We had an unnecessary year's delay because of the administration's attitude on the tobacco program.

This Congress has produced other significant agriculture bills. A wheat bill, vetoed; extension of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act; continuation and expansion of the school milk program, which I joined in supporting; extension of the Sugar Act, including authority for an adjustment to be made in the Cuban quota; a bill authorizing and directing that our national forests, such as the Jefferson National in the Ninth District, be managed on a multiple-use basis to secure the greatest yield of benefits and products; and a measure relating to price support levels for manufacturing milk and butterfat. Unfortunately, conferees of the two Houses could never agree on the provisions of a compromise bill aimed at establishing a broadened research program to promote industrial uses of farm products.

Between election day and the convening of the next session, Mr. Speaker, I would like to see a "summit conference" on agriculture. This would include representatives of the farm organizations, the Congress, the present and the incoming administration, representatives of the consumer, and others concerned with the farm income situation. Agreement on general principles before the new session convenes would insure early passage of a bill to correct problem areas, particularly wheat.

BUDGET APPROPRIATIONS

We have reduced the President's appropriation requests again this year by more than $211 million. In my six House sessions, cuts in appropriations have been effected that total almost $10.1 billion. This should demonstrate accurately and effectively that economy has been of great concern in the Congress, despite the recordbreaking budget requests submitted by the President.

The reduction in appropriation bills this year has not been as much as originally expected, primarily because of an increase in defense funds approved to insure that our defense programs are sound, ever moving forward, and ever ready to meet the threat from the communistic part of the world. Also, we approved an increase in the appropriations requested for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, this being mainly for the all-important medical research activities being carried on by the National Institutes of Health.

A major cut of more than $493.6 million was made in the foreign-aid request of the administration. In the past six sessions of Congress, approximately $19.7 billion has been approved for the foreign-aid operations, and I have voted against these funds. I fully realize that we must continue an aid program during the cold war, but we must not risk a severe weakening of our Nation's fiscal soundness nor ignore needs at home to do it.

In other areas of fiscal legislation, this Congress in each session approved an extension of the corporate tax rate and certain excise taxes; provided more revenue for the Federal highway program, which includes the interstate, primary, and secondary construction that is now taking place throughout the Nation; raised the interest rate that is paid to holders of savings bonds; provided temporary increases in the national debt ceiling as requested by the administration to give "maneuver" room in management of Government finances; and approved a bill to permit a taxpayer to deduct all medical expenses incurred in care of a dependent parent over 65.

NATIONAL ECONOMY

Several bills relating to our national economy and our natural resources were passed. Included were: a major housing bill; extension of the Federal airport program, under which local airport projects are developed on a 50–50 matching basis; a self-financing plan for the Tennessee Valley Authority; new lending authority for the Small Business Administration, and authority to facilitate extension of credit to small business enterprises; and an area development bill to help regions with persistent unemployment problems create a broader economic base through industrial expansion. The President again vetoed this area redevelopment program, as he did in 1958.

Of major interest to the ninth district has been the measure to begin expanded efforts to find new uses for coal through research. In the first session a bill was passed that I cosponsored, to create a coal research and development commission; it was vetoed. In the second session, a modified bill was approved, and currently the authorized Office of Coal Research is being set up. In the final appropriation bill passed this week, $1 million is appropriated for use in this program. As with tobacco, we had a year's delay in this legislation because of the veto. Virginia coal production is

concentrated in my district and this delay could cause future coalfield unemployment. Both large and small coal producers should benefit from this research expansion.

FLOOD CONTROL

Two flood control projects in the ninth district are on their way toward eventual construction as a result of bills being passed in this Congress. In the first session, final planning and initial construction funds were approved for the John W. Flannagan Dam and Reservoir in Dickenson County. These were included in the public works appropriation bill passed over a veto. This year, an additional $3.1 million has been appropriated to continue work on this project that will not only provide flood protection, but give a boost to the local economy through job opportunities during construction, and improve recreation after it is completed. Also, we have authorized a flood-control project on the north fork of Pound River in Wise County, and have provided initial planning funds of $25,000 to begin the preliminary work leading to construction.

OTHER PROJECTS

In addition to the mentioned projects of coal research and flood control, my district is benefiting from other Federal programs that operate for the general well-being of the Nation. These have included new post office buildings, armories, hospitals and health centers, airports, recreation areas in national forest lands, highways, library services, and sewage treatment plant grants. The people of my district are seeking ways to improve the economic development of the area, and I have sought Federal participation in this effort whenever and wherever possible—in many instances it has been a joint local-State-Federal project that brought the improvements.

Mr. Speaker, let me reiterate that the veto has delayed and hindered our development efforts in vital areas: Tobacco price support stabilization, coal research, flood control, area development, and there will probably be others if another administration takes office in January that is not really concerned over economic trouble spots in the Nation.

VETERANS LEGISLATION

The 86th Congress passed a general pension law (Public Law 86–211) that grants increased pensions for non-service-connected veterans, establishes payments on a revised scale based on need, and equalizes the pensions of World War II and Korean war widows with those of World War I. We also approved extension of the direct and guaranteed home-loan program, a bill to allow optometrists to serve veterans with service-connected eye conditions, and the measure to provide medical services to veterans with non-service-connected illnesses requiring treatment preliminary to admission to a veterans hospital.

THE ROUNDUP

Heading the list of major bills not already mentioned in this summary is the Social Security Amendments of 1960, which includes a plan to establish medical care services for the needy aged. The Federal Government will provide grants to the States for this program, which must now be set up and administered in each State. Millions of persons over 65 are expected to benefit, and the States will have wide latitude in putting it into effect. In addition to the medical care provisions, the social security bill makes several other important changes in the existing law. It will remove the requirement that a disabled person must wait until he is age 50 before receiving benefits for himself and family; I joined in cosponsoring this change in the law, as I did in sponsoring and supporting the disability insurance program adopted back in the 84th Congress.

Included in this Congress' work of the first session was the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act to eliminate abuses and racketeering in labor-management fields. I voted for this bill, which finally contained provisions of three or four proposals that were considered at one time or another. Passage of this important legislation resulted directly from the investigations of the McClellan committee.

Minimum wage legislation did not receive final approval in this Congress, despite prolonged efforts to reach a compromise on different bills. My vote for the House version of the bill was based on several considerations, especially the belief that it had the best chance of being passed. I believed a modest bill would be better than none at all; further consideration to coverage of the law and the wage level can always be given in subsequent sessions of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, as one who voted for the $1 per hour minimum wage bill of 1955, I believe new efforts should be undertaken in this field next session. Surely agreement can be reached on a measure that will do an honest job for the workers who benefit from it, but not upset the basis for the law in the first place.

This Congress also approved changes in the Railroad Retirement Act and an increase in benefits.

Two major bills of interest to Federal employees were the health program and pay raise that were warranted, and which will help the Government retain its dedicated workers. An important feature of the pay bill was that bringing employees of the agricultural conservation and stabilization offices under the Federal employee programs.

Statehood was approved in this Congress for Hawaii, following through on the pledge that was made when Alaska was approved as a State in the 85th Congress.

Among the proposals that I opposed was the civil rights bill, which unnecessarily stalled action on other legislation and caused the windup session to be scheduled after the national conventions.

OTHER JENNINGS BILLS

In addition to those measures already listed, I have sponsored several other bills that received varying degrees of consideration in this Congress. I cosponsored the proposal to allow surplus property to be donated to lifesaving crews and volunteer fire departments; the House approved a bill to make such donations for volunteer departments, but it did not clear the Senate. I have introduced legislation to authorize a Joint Committee on National Fuels Policy, which is of great interest to the coal industry. My bill to authorize naming of the Pound River Dam in honor of the late Congressman John W. Flannagan became law. I joined in introducing legislation to extend the library services program which has been of benefit to the ninth district in expanding library service to rural areas.

Mr. Speaker, sponsoring and supporting legislation is the primary concern of a Congressman. But service to constituents in a variety of ways is of great importance and deserves the attention of every Member of Congress. I have provided such service to all requesting it, regardless of their political party affiliation or their location in my district. A Congressman's job after being elected is to serve all, and this I have tried to do.

It is not possible to cover each of the bills taken up during the 86th Congress, or to summarize services my office has rendered. This report, however, covers a few major actions.

I am proud of the record of this Congress, and the 84th and 85th in which I served. We can look forward, I am sure, to another hard-working and productive Congress when the next session begins in January.

A Short History of the Development of the House Committee on Rules

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEWART L. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, in recent months we have witnessed a series of events involving the House Rules Committee which has aroused considerable controversy over the power which this group exercises over the affairs of the House.

In order that my colleagues and other interested citizens may be more fully informed on this subject, I include a study of the history of the Rules Committee as prepared by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. The study follows:

A SHORT HISTORY OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON RULES

From the First Congress, in 1789, there has always been a Committee on Rules in the House of Representatives. For 90 years it was the practice of the House to set up a select committee at the beginning of each Congress authorized to report a system of rules. During this period the committee exercised little, if any, influence over the legislative program or the content of policies. So minor a role did the committee play in early days that no appointments were made to it in the 15th, 16th, 18th, 19th, and 21st Congresses. And for many years in the early history of the House the Rules Committee made no reports. The committee continued to be a select committee until the rules revision of 1880 when it was made a standing committee, with its membership fixed at five,

in accordance with the previous usage. And it has remained a standing committee down to the present time.

In its composition the Committee on Rules has apparently always been bipartisan, with the majority party in the House having a majority of its members. In size, it was increased to 11 members in 1910, to 12 members in 1917, and to 14 members in 1935; since 1945 it has had 12 members: eight representing the majority party and 4 the minority party.

COMMITTEE POWERS

The powers and privileges of the Rules Committee developed gradually over the years. Until 1841 its responsibility ceased for all practical purposes after it reported a code of rules at the beginning of each Congress. In 1841 the Speaker's ruling that the committee might "report from time to time" was sustained on appeal by the House. This was the first in a series of innovations by which the Committee on Rules became an instrument through which the House may exercise special power for a particular piece of legislation (V Hinds' "Precedents of the House of Representatives," sec. 6780).

The next step came in 1853 when the House adopted a resolution providing that this committee's report "shall be acted upon by the House until disposed of, to the exclusion of all other business, anything in the rules hereby temporarily adopted to the contrary notwithstanding" (Globe, 33d Cong., 1st sess., vol. 28, pt. 1, p. 4).

In 1858 the House authorized appointment of a select committee, of whom the Speaker was to be one, to revise the rules and report at the next session. This was the first time in the history of the House that its Presiding Officer had served on one of its committees. From 1858 to 1910 the Speaker continued to be a member of the Rules Committee, serving as its chairman and exercising its authority.

From 1789 to 1911 the Speaker also made the committee assignments, including those to the Committee on Rules. Thus, after 1858, the powers of the committee and the authority of the Speaker were closely connected, a circumstance which served to enhance the role of the committee and to strengthen the influence of the Chair.

A major step in the development of the powers of the Rules Committee took place in 1883 when the House upheld a Speaker's ruling that a special order providing for the consideration of a particular bill was properly reported from the Committee on Rules (IV Hinds' "Precedents," sec. 3160). This ruling, in which the Speaker supported the authority of a committee of which he was himself chairman ex officio, initiated the modern practice whereby the Rules Committee has reported special orders providing times and methods for the consideration of special bills or classes of bills, thereby enabling the House by majority vote to forward particular legislation, instead of being forced to rely on unanimous consent or suspension of the rules, which requires a two-thirds vote. After 1883 points of order made against reports of the Rules Committee were seldom upheld by the Chair. Prior to that time it had been the custom for each committee desiring to bring a bill to the House floor to propose its own special order. By 1890 the function of proposing special orders for the consideration of business had become the exclusive prerogative of the Rules Committee. Hinds tells us that this procedure was not in great favor during the 48th, 49th, and 50th Congresses, but that it was used frequently in the 51st Congress, "and since 1890 has been in favor as an efficient means of bringing up for consideration bills difficult to reach in the regular order and especially as a means for confining within specified limits the consideration of bills involving important policies for which the majority party in the House may be responsible" (IV Hinds' "Precedents," sec. 3152).

In 1891 the right to report at any time was conferred upon the Rules Committee, and in 1893 it was given the right to sit during sessions of the House (IV Hinds' "Precedents," sec. 4321).

During the period 1890–1910 the Rules Committee rose to a preeminent position in the congressional committee system under the masterful leadership of chairmen like Thomas Brackett Reed and "Uncle Joe" Cannon. Thanks to a series of favorable rulings by the Speaker, which were sustained on appeal by the House itself, the Committee on Rules acquired the power (a) to consider and report special orders, (b) to sit during sessions of the House, (c) to report matters not previously introduced, reported, or committed to it, and (d) to have its reports immediately considered. By the exercise of these powers the Rules Committee can sift the business coming from the other 19 committees of the House and decide which bills shall have the right-of-way to consideration on the floor and the order in which they shall be taken up. Through its power to report new business it has original as well as secondary jurisdiction over the legislative agenda. By amending their measures or by forcing amendments to bills as a condition of giving them a "green light" to the floor, Rules can substitute its own judgment for that of the great legislative committees of the House on matters of substantive policy. It can also determine the duration of debate on a controversial measure and restrict the opportunity to amend it, thus expediting or delaying a final decision.

Morever, since the Rules Committee is the only channel through which amendments of the rules can reach the House, it is able to promote or prevent changes in the rules and so to promote or prevent parliamentary reform. In short, the Committee on Rules is to a large degree the governing committee of the House. To it the House has largely delegated the power to regulate procedure vested in itself by the Constitution.

Through special rules this powerful committee is able to advance directly, or to retard indirectly, any measure that it selects for passage or pigeonhole. At least three kinds of special rules are reported by the Rules Committee: (1) Closed rules limiting the amendment of pending measures; (2) open rules permitting their amendment; and (3) rules providing that all points of order against a proposition be considered as waived. By the exercise of its powers the Rules Committee can also function as a steering committee, steering the House in whatever direction the exigencies of the hour appear to demand.

TWENTIETH CENTURY DEVELOPMENTS

A potential restriction on the power of the Rules Committee to control access to the House floor was adopted by the House in 1909 when it provided for Calendar Wednesday. Under the rule for Calendar Wednesday, each Wednesday shall be set aside exclusively for the various standing committees to call up for enactment bills and resolutions not otherwise privileged. For many years, however, the "call of the committees" has been dispensed with by unanimous consent, on motion of the majority leader, although occasionally the leadership has resorted to this procedure to bring up measures blocked in the Rules Committee.

The "revolution of 1910," which reduced the powers of the Speaker of the House, left those of the Rules Committee intact. But the Speaker lost his seat on that committee and it was increased in size from 5 to 11 members.

In 1924 the "pocket veto" power of the chairman of the Rules Committee was curbed after Chairman Campbell had exercised his discretion to the extent of holding in his pocket a number of resolutions which he had been authorized by the committee to report some weeks before. In order to prevent a repetition of such arbitrary action, the House rules were amended in 1924 by adding the following paragraph:

"The Committee on Rules shall present to the House, reports concerning rules, joint rules, and order of business within 3 legislative days of the time when ordered by the committee. If such rule or order is not considered immediately it shall be referred to the calendar and if not called up by the member making the report within 9 days thereafter, any member designated by the committee may call it up for consideration."

Subsequently, this paragraph was amended to provide that if such rule or order is not called up within 7 legislative days, "any member of the Rules Committee may call it up as a question of privilege and the Speaker shall recognize any member of the Rules Committee seeking recognition for that purpose" (House rule XI, par. 23).

Another change in the rules of the House was adopted in 1924 which, while it applies to every standing committee, was designed in part to restrict the prerogatives of the Committee on Rules. The discharge rule, first adopted in 1910, was amended in 1924 so as to set at 150 the number of signatures required on discharge petitions. This number was raised to 218 in 1926, lowered to 145 in 1931, and again increased to 218 (a majority of the total membership) in 1935 where it has remained ever since. Under this rule it is in order to file a motion to discharge the Rules Committee from the further consideration of special orders of business provided that the special order has been before the committee for at least 7 days prior to the filing of the motion to discharge. Twice a month it is in order to call up the motions which have been placed on the discharge calendar. When the House begins the consideration of a bill under this rule, it remains the unfinished business of the House until fully disposed of without intervening motion except one motion to adjourn.

Traditionally the Committee on Rules has functioned down through the decades as the responsible agent of the majority party in the House, using its powers to facilitate the legislative progam of the majority party in the House, the wishes of the majority leaders, and the program of the administration. In 1937, however, the New Deal lost control of the Rules Committee when three of its Democratic members joined with the four Republican members to block or dilute floor consideration of controversial administration bills. Since 1937 bipartisan coalition control of the Rules Committee has continued down to date, except for the period of the 80th Congress (1947–48) when the committee again functioned as the agent of the majority party in the House.

As a result of repeated complaints of the "obstructive tactics" and the "undemocratic and arbitrary dictatorship" of the Rules Committee, as it had operated in recent years, the House amended its rules at the beginning of the 81st Congress (January 3, 1949) by adopting the so-called 21-day rule. This rule stipulated that a resolution providing for the immediate consideration of a public bill already reported and which had been before the Rules Committee 21 days without being given clearance to the House floor could be called up on discharge days (second and forth Mondays each month) by the chairman of the committee which reported the bill and that "the Speaker shall recognize the Member seeking recognition for that purpose." The 21-day rule was in effect only during the 81st Congress (1949–50).

COMMITTEE JURISDICTION

The Committee on Rules has jurisdiction over (a) the rules, joint rules, and order of business of the House and (b) recesses and final adjournments of Congress. Primarily the jurisdiction of this committee is over propositions to make or change the rules, for the creation of committees, and directing them to make investigations. It also reports resolutions relating to the hour of daily meeting and the days on which the House shall sit, and orders relating to the use of the galleries during the electoral count (House Manual and Rules, 1959, secs. 715–717).

A Report to the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. D. S. SAUND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. SAUND. Mr. Speaker, early in 1957, when I first started my career as a Member of Congress, you addressed the freshmen Congressmen and gave us sound advice.

You said:

Gentlemen, you have been elected by your people to be Members of the most powerful legislative body on earth. You will be working with a group of men and women who will do everything in their power to help you stay in Congress if only you will let them.

Then you explained how important it was for a new Member of Congress to cultivate the friendship and win the respect and affection of his colleagues if he was to accomplish any results for his own congressional district or make any sound contributions to the welfare of the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I valued highly your advice and have attempted to abide by it during my 4 years in Congress. I received my reward with deep gratification during the closing days of the 86th Congress when my date bill was called up for debate and discussion.

The date growers of my district, who produce virtually the entire U.S. crop, have invested millions of dollars to introduce and develop a great industry in the unique Coachella Valley of Riverside County. Since Biblical days, the date has been accepted by mankind as a nutritious and delicious food. The date growers of my district desire to create a better image of this wholesome fruit in the minds of American housewives, so that they will increasingly use dates in the daily diet of their families. The producers have discovered through experience that as soon as they advertise their dates and place them on the market in a certain area, the importers place inferior quality imported dates alongside the good Coachella Valley fruit.

Mr. Speaker, three Departments of the administration—State, Commerce, and Health, Education, and Welfare—opposed my bill for erroneous reasons. Also, there was opposition from the large importers of foreign dates and the manufacturers of candy and biscuits. Even though the bill was reported by a unanimous vote by the House Agriculture Committee, the House Rules Committee denied the rule. As you will recall, on August 22 you personally permitted the bill to be considered by the House under suspension of the rules.

After the debate, when the leading opponent asked for a standing vote, I was deeply gratified and touched to note that not a single Democratic Member voted against my bill and all of my California colleagues on the Republican side also voted for the bill. The bill carried by a majority of more than 3 to 1.

Mr. Speaker, when I look back at my scoreboard during two terms in Congress, I can say this with a sense of modesty and pride: I was successful in attaining my objectives for the benefit of my Congressional District. Projects were approved and moneys appropriated—on many occasions against the stiff opposition of the Bureau of the Budget and other departments of the administration. I will cite a few examples.

In the Coachella Valley, thousands of acres of Indian land were lying idle and barren in the midst of highly productive farms. For 7 years, this issue had remained dormant in the Department of the Interior. During my first term, my bill to provide funds to construct irrigation lines to these Indian lands was passed, money was appropriated and the construction work was begun.

In Palm Springs, valuable Indian land in the heart of that great resort city has been the subject of expensive, long-drawn-out litigation between the Agua Caliente Indian Tribe and the Department of the Interior. The Indian owners of the land were not deriving any income. The development of the city was checked. The future of Palm Springs Airport was insecure.

A few benevolent multimillionaires had conceived a novel scheme. At their recommendation, the Secretary of the Interior submitted to Congress in 1957 a proposition without parallel. The Secretary requested Congress to pass a bill whereby he would be authorized to turn over the title—not the management—of the $12 million worth of property to a commission of seven, four to be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior and only three to be elected by the tribal council. When the significance of this proposal was pointed out to the members of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, meeting in Palm Springs at my request, their ire was aroused.

Believe me, Mr. Speaker, it was a hard fight. The Government agencies are powerful opponents where legislation is concerned. But I am proud to state that last year, with the complete cooperation of the city of Palm Springs and the Agua Caliente Tribal Council, my bill was enacted into law. This will make possible the development of valuable Indian property, the expansion of business in Palm Springs and the acquisition of the airport by the city. The members of the tribe also will be able now to enjoy substantial financial benefits from their holdings.

In addition, another hampering restriction was removed by a second bill which I introduced concerning this land. This bill, which was also passed last year, increases the leasing period for lands of the Agua Caliente Tribe from 25 to up to 99 years, permitting the type of financing required for large scale development in the urban Palm Springs area.

I had a difficult time digging out of a deep drawer in the Corps of Engineers office the plans for the Tahchevah Creek Dam in Palm Springs. It took 4 years of continuous correspondence, long distance telephone calls and personal interviews, but finally the project was authorized this year. I have been assured that money will be appropriated for construction of the dam, thereby safeguarding valuable downtown Palm Springs properties from threat of floods.

On two successive occasions, the Bureau of the Budget refused to include funds for advance planning and construction on the San Jacinto River and Bautista Creek flood-control project in the Hemet-San Jacinto area. Thanks to the assistance of the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, the Honorable CLARENCE CANNON, of Missouri, the money was appropriated and the work is progressing.

Everybody in my district knows that the Santa Ana River flood levees at Riverside have been completed. The work was finished with funds appropriated during my first term in Congress.

I asked for Federal assistance to complete the lighting and other devices at Riverside Municipal Airport and for improvements at Imperial County Airport. The money was approved. I also made a strong appeal to the Civil Aeronautics Board for continuance of daily airline service to Blythe, and I was delighted to receive a positive decision.

It will be a genuine pleasure and privilege to participate in the dedication of the new Riverside Armory this fall. With the close cooperation of Riverside city officials, I was able to obtain Federal assistance for this armory which, like so many structures of this kind, will serve the citizens of Riverside long and well.

Only recently authorization for construction of a new post office at Banning was granted by the Post Office Department. This is the 10th new post office approved in Riverside and Imperial Counties since I came to Congress 4 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, March Air Force Base near Riverside is a major military installation of the Strategic Air Command. Air bases in other parts of the country have been closed down. But the Government is still making full use of the excellent climatic conditions and strategic location of this area.

Since the beginning of 1957, with the help of the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, the Honorable CARL VINSON, of Georgia, and the chairman of the House Defense Department Appropriations Subcommittee, the Honorable GEORGE MAHON, of Texas, we were able to obtain more than $15½ million for new construction at March.

Transfer of an Air Reserve training unit from Long Beach will bring 2,000 men to train at March and the area will benefit from their presence. In the near

future, the base will be augmented by a new activity; a fighter squadron of the Air Defense Command is to be transferred to March. These two units will be in addition to the bomber squadrons for which the base is so famous. Another indication of the secure status of March Air Force Base is the fact that $1½ million soon will be expended for rehabilitation of 644 housing units for base personnel.

Some time ago, the personnel at the Mira Loma Quartermaster Depot was cut down to almost nothing. Now a part of the Air Force—it this year received an important new function that will create 256 new jobs and strengthen the Mira Loma Air Force Station's position in the Air Force's vast contracting activities.

When the Department of the Army requested funds for construction of facilities at Yuma, Ariz., which could have been a duplication of facilities already in existence at El Centro Naval Landing Field, I took immediate action. At my urgent request, a study was made by a House Government Operations Subcommittee. The Military Construction Appropriations Subcommittee, headed by the Honorable HARRY R. SHEPPARD, of San Bernardino, specifically prohibited the Army from building such facilities.

After 3 years of effort, we were finally able to obtain an appropriation of $400,000 to move the big dredge from Needles and set up shop at Blythe for channelization of the Cibola Cut. It was the official understanding that the dredging will begin when the California-Arizona dispute over the State boundary is resolved.

Mr. Speaker, I represent one of the most fertile and highly productive farming areas in the United States with a wide variety of crops. The desert valleys of Imperial, Coachella, and Palo Verde at one time commanded the market for early fresh fruits and vegetables throughout the United States. During the past few years, this market has been constantly deteriorating because of importations of vegetables and fruits grown in the Republic of Mexico.

Under the escape clause of the U.S. tariff laws, the growers are entitled to protection through tariffs and import quotas. They are also entitled to benefits of section 32 money controlled by the Secretary of Agriculture. The Secretary is authorized by law to buy surplus commodities for the school-lunch program and thereby relieve the distress of glutted seasonal markets. Unfortunately, the present Secretary has not used the money for the benefit of the growers as he should have.

In order to properly present our case to Government agencies and the Congress, it was necessary to have a complete study made of the impact of the foreign imports on the growers of vegetables and fruits in southern California. I introduced a bill in Congress directing the Tariff Commission to make such a study. My bill was strenuously opposed by the Tariff Commission. But in spite of that, the House Ways and Means Committee, under the chairmanship of the Honorable WILBUR MILLS, of Arkansas, passed a resolution by a unanimous vote this year, directing the Tariff Commission to make a thorough study of this problem.

Since this action, I have personally conferred with Chairman Talbot of the Tariff Commission and the deputies he has assigned to carry on these studies. The studies are now in progress and a team of investigators will be working in the Coachella, Palo Verde, and Imperial Valleys in October. The growers of my district have offered their full cooperation.

As soon as the studies are completed and a report is made to the Ways and Means Committee, I propose to take action, both through the Congress and the Tariff Commission, to stop this deterioration of a highly prosperous agricultural industry by unfair competition from abroad.

There was a move earlier this year to cut down the export subsidy to western cottongrowers by 2 cents a pound, amounting to a potential loss of $10 a bale on every bale of cotton grown in California. The loss of thousands of dollars would have resulted for cottongrowers in my district alone.

I worked hand in hand with growers of the cotton-producing areas of my district and my congressional colleagues from California agricultural areas. By swift action through the House Agriculture Committee, we were successful in thwarting this move.

Mr. Speaker, there is a great deal of discussion and debate in the Halls of Congress concerning the extension of Public Law 78, which authorizes the Mexican national program. I sincerely believe that continuance of this law is essential to the economy of Riverside and Imperial Counties.

I shall at no time condone company stores at places where braceros imported under the law work or are housed. I have discovered in Washington that the Members of Congress are in no mood to permit unscrupulous exploiters of the program to make profits from the paycheck business of the braceros at the expense of local merchants.

I shall urge the extension of Public Law 78, but I have made my position absolutely clear to the users of braceros in my district: any farmer who abuses this program, or allies himself with people who do abuse it, is directly jeopardizing the program itself. American citizens are entitled to jobs on American farms before any imported labor is authorized.

As Congressman of the 29th Congressional District, I receive communications from thousands of veterans, servicemen, senior citizens, farmers, businessmen, housewives and students concerning their personal and community problems. I have attempted to answer each inquiry promptly and I am happy to say that I have been able to help hundreds of my constituents in solving their difficulties. For example:

A senior citizen's records with the Railroad Retirement Board and the Social Security Administration were in a hopeless tangle and his benefits were long delayed. As a result of my appeal in his behalf, he received a retroactive check of $1,400 from the Railroad Retirement Board and a monthly check of $73.30.

As a result of my inquiries in their behalf, another social security annuitant received a check for $1,338, and a widow received a check for $525.50 for retroactive disability benefits which were due her late husband.

Through a mixup about beneficiary rights, a widow of an Air Force man was told she would not receive the $10,000 insurance. I arranged for her to make an appeal, and the appeals board reversed the decision, declaring her to be the beneficiary.

I have helped scores of servicemen to obtain hardship discharges and compassionate transfers when they were needed back home. Veterans going to school on the GI bill have appealed for help when their VA checks were delayed and my office has been able to straighten out their problems.

It gives me a great sense of satisfaction to be of personal assistance to these citizens of my Congressional District. The many letters of thanks and appreciation which I have received are ample reward for my efforts in their behalf.

Mr. Speaker, the forefathers of our country were men of deep religious faith. They were devoted family men and sacrificed greatly for the welfare of their children. They passionately advocated the freedom of the individual and the dignity of man. They fought valiantly for independence and laid the foundations for a society in which freedom of enterprise, based upon the principle of equality of opportunity for all citizens, was recognized as the keystone of a new way of life.

In our early history, when the Nation acquired hundreds of millions of acres of public domain, a choice had to be made between two viewpoints. It was proposed by some that the Government sell the public domain land to the highest bidding land companies and thus pay off the national debt. This idea was firmly rejected. Instead, it was decided to make the land available for free entry by the people, so that they could develop the land and establish homes and communities as private owners.

The Homestead Act of 1862, signed by President Lincoln, gave the final approval to this philosophy. Thus the frontiers were opened for settlement by individuals who took pride in ownership of their homes and businesses.

America is recognized today as the leader of the free world and its citizens have acquired the highest standard of living in the history of man. This can be attributed to the fact that millions of Americans, in their lifetimes, have enjoyed the benefits of personal liberty, equality of opportunity and freedom of enterprise. If we are going to continue in our onward march of progress and leadership as champions of individual dignity, we must keep the avenues of opportunity open to all American citizens.

In the earliest days of settlement in America, firm foundations were laid to make it possible for the citizens of our democratic society to be informed on public issues.

Newspapers and magazines were transmitted through the mails free of charge or at nominal cost. And Members of Congress were granted the free franking privilege, whereby Senators and Congressmen could communicate with their constituents without postage.

The cost to the taxpayers to pay the subsidy to newspapers and periodicals has reached an astronomical figure. But it has been well compensated by the fact that, throughout their history, Americans have been avid readers and their general level of knowledge is the highest on earth.

Mr. Speaker, I know from personal experience how farsighted the forefathers were when they granted Members of Congress the free franking privilege. This privilege has helped me greatly in my efforts to keep in contact with nearly 400,000 constituents of Riverside and Imperial Counties.

As far back as I can recall, my distinguished predecessor's weekly newsletter was regularly printed in the newspapers of my area. But soon after I took office, for some unknown reason, most of the daily newspapers and many of the weekly newspapers in my district stopped printing my newsletter.

Since then, I have attempted to keep my constituents informed of activities and developments in Washington by printing my newsletters and Washington Reports at my own expense and mailing them under the franking privilege. Those dailies and weeklies that still print my news reports deserve thanks for their public spirit.

In reading the history of the United States, we recognize the fact that the forefathers believed passionately in the benefits of public education. Every community in the wilderness had a red brick schoolhouse on the hill for the instruction of young Americans. We have continued in our zeal for education and have become the best educated people on earth.

Lately, due to the increasing costs of education, entailing expensive equipment and larger teaching staffs, it is becoming increasingly difficult for local taxpayers to maintain the standards of education required in modern times. Local taxpayers, heavily burdened with taxes, are refusing to vote in new school bonds. And yet the needs of modern scientific education for an exploding population must be satisfied.

If local communities cannot raise the property taxes any higher to meet these educational needs, there is only one other source for funds and that is the Federal Treasury.

Recent figures show that in the ratio of local, State, and Federal contributions, the Federal Government pays 46 percent of the cost for public welfare and 12 percent of the cost for the construction of highways. But it pays only 4 percent of the cost for education.

I honestly believe that in this modern, atomic age it will be a disaster for the welfare of our great Nation if we ever lag behind in our standard of education for American citizens. Two years ago, it was discovered in a congressional investigation that Soviet Russia was producing twice as many engineers and scientists as the United States of America. This is a sphere of activity, Mr. Speaker, where we cannot afford to stay behind.

Therefore, I am a strong advocate of Federal aid to education, with the definite understanding that the complete control of curriculum and administration be left in the hands of the local school boards. This has been done in the past and it can be stated in any Federal aid to education law in the future. My own bill on this subject includes a specific clause for this purpose.

During the past 4 years, a number of school districts in Riverside and Imperial Counties have received a subsidy of more than $4 million from the Federal Government. This money, authorized by Public Laws 815 and 874, was paid to school districts in which there were children of parents employed by the Federal Government. I submit that there has been no Federal interference with the administration of these local schools.

The administration's tight money policy and high interest rates are already producing their disastrous effect in curtailing production and creating unemployment throughout the United States. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, when I personally explained to you my strong objection to any increase in interest rates, which was demanded by the administration both in 1959 and 1960.

We need an expanding economy, providing full consumption and full employment. Unemployed Americans do not pay taxes and cannot buy the products of industry and agriculture. Above everything else, we must find ways and means of keeping American factories humming and American citizens working with decent wages, commensurate with the rising cost of living. The great achievement of our way of life in the past has been the constantly increasing standard of living of our people.

I am a strong advocate of our social security laws, providing old-age pensions, unemployment insurance, and other benefits. I voted for the health insurance for the aged program during this session of Congress, which will be a beginning in the establishment of health insurance for our senior citizens. This worthy segment of our population must commend the devotion, affection, and esteem of our Nation.

I voted for the civil rights legislation in 1957 and 1960. It does not make sense for the United States to preach democracy and human dignity to the outside world if we cannot grant equal rights in a realistic way to our own citizens. There is no room for racial discrimination and second-class citizenship in Uncle Sam's family.

Mr. Speaker, I have been deeply thankful to you for my appointment as a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee in 1957. Throughout my travels around the world as a representative of that committee, as a delegate to the Interparliamentary Union Conference and as a member of the special congressional delegation that toured NATO bases, I have been a keen observer of the operation of our foreign-aid program.

I believe we have carried much too far the idea of winning friends among foreign nations with money. While it is good sound policy on the part of the United States to assist those nations who want to help themselves with economic loans and small grants, it is absolutely absurd to supply expensive and sometimes obsolete military hardware to foreign dictators and kings who have no sympathy for our way of life and use our equipment to suppress the freedom of their own people.

We did a wonderful job of rehabilitating the economies of the countries of Western Europe through the Marshall plan. It saved the freedom of those countries and they are now back on their feet as independent nations. But although it may have been necessary once to furnish these Western European nations with military equipment for their defense, it does not make sense to me now that American taxpayers should pay with American dollars the cost of constructing military equipment in European factories, especially when our national gold reserve is constantly dwindling.

I understand fully the responsibility and authority granted by the Constitution to the President of the United States to formulate and direct the foreign policy of our Nation. I have continually supported the President in his foreign policy decisions. Although he may disagree with the President at times, a Member of Congress has no other choice. Congress can advise the President but it cannot dictate foreign policy to him.

Yet I have consistently voted to pare down the President's budget requests for foreign aid each year. I know that our foreign policy did not suffer because of my vote for these cuts. Perhaps we would have had more friends abroad today if the cuts had been even larger.

I believe fully in the cultural interchange between the United States and other nations of the world. If we are to succeed in winning the newly emerging nations to our way of life, as against international communism, we must provide means for their leaders and educators to learn our culture and our students to understand their civilizations. The expense of such interchange is infinitesimal in comparison with the billions we have spent on so-called military assistance for people who could not use tanks and guns and certainly could not feed their children with cold steel.

I feel sincerely proud that the bill which I introduced in the House of Representatives, concurrently with Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON'S introduction of a similar bill in the Senate, has become a law. An East–West Cultural Center at Hawaii is being established where scholars from the East and West can meet for study and exchange of knowledge and ideas.

In recent years, an alarming number of small businesses have gone bankrupt in the United States. This is not consistent with our way of life. A basic part of our economic philosophy has been the encouragement of individuals to own and operate their own businesses.

During my two terms in Congress, I have strongly supported the Small Business Administration program, which makes loans to small businesses when financing is not obtainable from banks.

I have endeavored to publicize the opportunities and benefits which accrue to businessmen from the SBA program.

Through the close cooperation of the able regional director of the SBA, Mr. Donald McLarnan, a former vice president of a large banking chain in southern California and long a successful banker, I have been able to obtain approval of $2,309,000 in SBA loans for small business men in Riverside and Imperial Counties in the past 4 years. That is not a large sum of money, but it served to save a few businesses from going broke and enabled others to get on a firm footing or to make needed expansions.

I am glad to observe, Mr. Speaker, that scores of students in my Congressional District have taken advantage of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, which I vigorously supported in Congress. This Act provides Federal funds that make it possible for needy but worthy students to obtain loans from the colleges of their choice that are participating in the program. These funds are interest-free during the student's school years. The Act also includes other programs to improve the quality of education.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, may I say that I am deeply grateful to the people of the two great counties of Riverside and Imperial for affording me the opportunity to represent them in Congress during the past 4 years. It has been a wonderful privilege to serve with my colleagues under your leadership. I have formed close friendships and, as I said at the beginning of this report, these associations have been of invaluable assistance to me in serving my constituents. The experience which I have gained, abetted by the constant and willing advice and counsel of my colleagues, has enabled me to broaden and increase the range of my services to my area and my country.

The House Rules Committee and Its Stranglehold Over Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, it should now be clear to all Members of the House that we as a Nation can no longer tolerate abuses of power such as have taken place during this Congress by a small group who control the House Rules Committee. Year after year, we have seen legislation of vital concern to our citizens die at the hands of the Republican-Southern Democratic coalition which has six votes on the committee—enough to keep any bill from obtaining a rule.

It should be well noted that 100 percent of the four Republicans on the Rules Committee generally voted to bottle up the vital legislation, while 75 percent of the eight Democrats on the committee generally voted to permit the House to work its will in debating and voting on such measures.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the text of a study prepared at my request by the Legislative Reference Service at the conclusion of the last Congress. It traces some of the most flagrant examples of the abuse of power by the House Rules Committee during the past 8 years in the 82d through the 85th Congresses. The study is as follows:

THE RULES COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—SOME EXAMPLES OF ITS INFLUENCE ON LEGISLATION DURING THE 82D, 83D, 84TH, AND 85TH CONGRESSES

This report consists of a limited number of examples of the influence on the fate of legislation exerted by the House Committee on Rules. It does not pretend to exhaust the subject, but only to describe those instances which received some attention in newspapers and periodicals. The committee itself issues no annual or summarizing report of its activities; nor have we discovered such information in any other official or nonofficial sources. It is often difficult, therefore, to establish that a particular bill was not considered by the House of Representatives simply because of the committee's disfavor, or for some other reason. In such instances, this report has accepted the judgment of the sources cited.[1]

EIGHTY-SECOND CONGRESS

Grains for India

Early in 1951, the Indian Government requested food grains from the United States to avert a threatened famine. President Truman referred this request to Congress on February 12 and urged that 2 million tons of grain be sent India as a gift. A bill (S. 872) authorizing the shipment, but on a straight loan basis, passed the Senate May 16.

Meanwhile, the House Foreign Affairs Committee had reported a measure (H.R. 3017) on March 5, keeping the program on a gift basis. The bill was sent to the Rules Committee for clearance to the House floor. While the Rules group failed to act promptly, President Truman twice sent messages to Congress emphasizing the importance of quick action. The Rules Committee refused to give the bill clearance for nearly 3 months until it was amended to provide that the grain be sold to India instead of given as an outright grant. This amendment was incorporated into a clean version of the measure, H.R. 3791, which was finally reported on April 25 and passed by the House on May 24.[2]

Absentee voting

During the 2d session of the 82d Congress the Senate passed a bill (S. 3061), sponsored by the Truman administration, to furnish absentee ballots for servicemen from States which did not adequately provide for such voting. The Senate later passed Senate Resolution 349 which called for Federal-State cooperation in aiding absentee soldiers to vote.

In the House, a Rules Subcommittee under Representative OMAR BURLESON held hearings for 2 days on S. 3061 and on a companion bill, H.R. 7571. Two days after the hearings ended, the subcommittee voted to postpone any action on the legislation and the measure was thereby killed.

EIGHTY-THIRD CONGRESS

Income tax reduction

On February 17, 1953, the House Ways and Means Committee filed a report on H.R. 1, a bill introduced by the chairman of the committee, Representative Daniel Reed, which provided, among other things, for the reduction of personal income taxes. Chairman Reed twice requested a rule for the bill in letters dated February 25 and March 5. He was told by Representative LEO ALLEN, then chairman of the Rules Committee, that the measure would not be considered by Rules until at least May 1.

Mr. Reed protested the delay in a number of public statements, terming it pigeon-hole treatment. On one occasion he rose on the House floor and demanded, "What have I done in the last 34 years that I should be subjected to this treatment here?" On April 13 he filed with the Speaker a discharge motion on behalf of the bill. The prescribed number of signatures was not obtained and the bill died in that session.[3]

Statehood for Alaska and Hawaii

A bill to grant statehood to Hawaii passed the House in 1953 by a majority of 2 to 1. On March 11, 1954, the Senate voted 46 to 43 to join Alaskan and Hawaiian statehood in one piece of legislation. The bill finally passed the Senate on April 1.

In the House, unanimous consent was asked to send the two versions to conference. It was alleged at the time that the Republican majority on the conference committee planned to eliminate all Alaskan provisions from the bill. An objection entered by the Democratic leader, SAM RAYBURN, stalled the move to send the measures to conference. The only other way to get the bills to the conferees was for the House to adopt a resolution to that end. Such a resolution was filed April 12, but the House Rules Committee bottled it up until the middle of the summer. On July 26 the Rules group formally tabled the proposed rule to send the bill to conference, thus eliminating any possibility of passage during that Congress.

The Rules Committee also refused to act during the 83d Congress on a House Alaska statehood bill, H.R. 2982, which had been reported by the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee on June 26, 1953.

EIGHTY-FOURTH CONGRESS

During the first session of this Congress, according to a report in Nation's Business, the Rules Committee "exercised its discretionary function frequently."[4]

Small Business Administration

When the House Banking Committee approved a bill to extend the life of the Small Business Administration, a provision was included to double the agency's lending authority. It was reported that Representative HOWARD W. SMITH, then chairman of the Rules Committee, had announced that the bill would never clear through his group with the lending authority boost in it. When the Banking Committee eliminated the offending section, the Rules Committee granted a rule.

Polio vaccine

Similar treatment befell a bill which was reported out of the Commerce Committee providing funds for polio vaccine. It was said that Mr. SMITH objected to a provision of the bill obligating the Federal Government to match any State funds spent for vaccine, and that the Rules Committee

---

[1] Unless otherwise noted, the material for this report was gathered from Congressional Quarterly Weekly Reports, Congressional Quarterly Almanac, and from numerous articles appearing in the following newspapers: New York Times, New York Herald Tribune, Christian Science Monitor, Washington Star, and Washington Post and Times Herald.

[2] Pringle, Henry F. and Katharine Pringle. The "terrible 12" of Capitol Hill. Saturday Evening Post, June 19, 1954: 28.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Here's how 12 men control Congress. Nation's Business, February 1956: 102.

would refuse to act until this open-end provision was stricken. Representative Percy Priest, chairman of the Commerce Committee, eventually complied with this demand and the bill, thus amended, was permitted to come to the floor for action.

Doctors' draft

The House Armed Services Committee reported during the first session a bill to extend the drafting of doctors. It was reported that Mr. SMITH vigorously opposed any continuation of the doctors' draft unless the age ceiling were lowered. The Senate attempted to bypass Rules by tacking the doctors' draft extension to a House-passed bill continuing the regular draft. But House and Senate conferees on the final version of the bill agreed to lower the doctors' age ceiling somewhat in order to get the legislation through without another Rules Committee blockade.

Housing

On June 25, 1955, the Committee on Banking and Currency reported an amended version of S. 2126, a Federal housing bill. A request to the Rules Committee for a rule on the bill was refused on July 1. Rules members divided 6 to 6 on the measure, thus frustrating the attempt to bring it to the House floor.

Pressure was exerted by the House leadership of both parties. The Republican leader, Representative JOSEPH W. MARTIN, promised that Congress would "get a housing bill before we're through." On July 28 the committee finally granted a rule after three Republican members reportedly switched their votes.

Absentee voting

On February 3, 1955, the House Administration Committee reported a bill, H.R. 3406, to give servicemen permanent voting rights instead of restricting the privilege to wartime. The measure included a provision prohibiting poll tax requirements for servicemen. The Rules Committee granted a hearing on the request for a rule on the bill on February 8, but took no action.

On February 10, the majority leader, Representative JOHN W. MCCORMACK, said that, "as a result" of the hearing by the Rules Committee, the Administration Committee was giving "further consideration" to the poll tax provisions in the bill. On February 18 Administration Committee reported a new bill H.R. 4048, "recommending" to the States means by which members of the armed services and other absentees overseas could vote. The Rules Committee cleared this version and the House passed it on February 24. The anti-poll-tax section was reinserted by the Senate, but the House-Senate conference deleted the provision from the final bill.

Alaska and Hawaii

On March 3, 1955, the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the House favorably reported H.R. 2535, a bill to admit both Alaska and Hawaii to the Union. The Rules Committee held hearings for a rule on the bill intermittently from March 16 to April 19. On April 26 it granted a closed rule prohibiting amendments and providing for 7 hours of debate. The committee's action precluded any attempts to deal separately with either territory or to alter the terms under which each would be admitted. Under these circumstances the House recommitted the bill on May 10.

During the first session of the 84th Congress the Rules Committee also succeeded in preventing the House from considering bills to strengthen Federal controls over bank mergers and to extend Federal powers to combat water pollution.[5] Both measures, however, reached the floor during the second session.

[5] Ibid.

Federal aid to schools

H.R. 7535 was reported by the House Education and Labor Committee on July 28, 1955. The bill authorized $1.6 billion in Federal grants for local school construction over a 4-year period. Although reported in 1955, it was not cleared for floor action by the Rules Committee until June 20, 1956. In the press of business at Congress' end, the measure did not come to a vote in the House until July 5, when it was defeated, 194 to 224, on a rollcall vote. A civil-rights rider insured its defeat, but the late hour at which it was considered precluded any further action in that Congress.

Civil rights

After extensive hearings, the House Judiciary Committee ordered favorably reported on April 25, 1956, H.R. 627, a civil rights bill.

Soon thereafter a request was made of the Rules Committee for clearance to the floor. The chairman of the Rules group delayed calling a hearing on the bill until forced to do so by a majority vote of the committee on June 14.

The rule hearings began June 20. On the following day Chairman SMITH abruptly adjourned the meeting when Representative WILLIAM M. COLMER raised the point of order that a quorum of the committee was not present. Mr. SMITH was reported to have said that further hearings were subject to his call and to have added, "I'm not interested in calling a meeting."

Five committee members, shortly thereafter, formally requested a special meeting to consider the rule further. The committee met on June 27 and, by a vote of 8 to 3, granted the bill an open rule. However, by the time the measure had passed through the House it was July 23 and its opponents in the Senate easily frustrated action for the short remainder of the session.

Housing

Another housing measure was reported by the Banking and Currency Committee during the second session of the 84th Congress. It was a clean omnibus bill, H.R. 11742, and called for construction of 50,000 public housing units a year for 3 years. It also included sections providing for Federal loans to nonprofit organizations to build housing for the elderly and authorizing the use of 10 percent of the funds in the national service life insurance fund for GI mortgages.

The House Rules Committee voted, 6 to 4, to table the bill on June 29, 1956.

On July 20 Representative WILLIAM B. WIDNALL introduced a compromise bill, H.R. 12328, which reduced the proposed number of units to 35,000 and eliminated the other sections mentioned above.

The following day, July 21, the Rules Committee granted a closed rule to H.R. 11742, the Banking Committee bill, allowing 2 hours of debate and specifying that only one amendment was in order—to substitute the text of H.R. 12328, the Widnall bill, "any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding." On July 25 the House passed, by a voice vote, the substitute measure. Mr. SMITH commented: "The rule is probably the most drastic gag rule that I have seen presented in my time here in the House."

Depressed areas

On June 29, 1956, the House Banking and Currency Committee cleared a clean bill, H.R. 11811, which authorized Federal aid to areas suffering large-scale unemployment or low income. Although a request was made for a rule, the Rules Committee failed to clear the bill for House consideration.

EIGHTY-FIFTH CONGRESS

Alaska and Hawaii

Shortly before Congress adjourned in 1957, the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported an Alaska statehood bill. Similar action was taken in the Senate, but by general agreement it was up to the House to act first. For nearly 5 months the House Rules Committee refused to clear the Alaska bill for floor consideration. The measure's supporters then resorted to a special House rule and brought it to the floor as a privileged matter. The motion to consider was approved May 21, 217 to 172, and the bill was passed May 28, 208 to 166.

A bill to admit Hawaii was held up for a considerable time in the House Interior Committee, but was finally ordered reported on August 6. The Rules Committee took no action on the bill before adjournment.

Presidential disability

For the fourth time in recent years, the Committee on Rules pigeonholed during the 85th Congress a Senate-passed resolution to set up a joint congressional committee to study the succession issue and other matters affecting the Presidency.

Federal judgeships

During the second session of the 85th Congress the Committee on the Judiciary reported a bill, H.R. 13672, to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges. The bill was never cleared for action by the Rules Committee.

Premerger notifications

During the first session, the administration requested Congress to amend the Clayton Act to require firms with combined assets of $10 million or more to give the Department of Justice advance notice of their intention to merge. The House Judiciary Committee reported a bill for that purpose in 1957, but the Rules Committee did not clear it.

TVA

On August 1, 1958, the House Public Works Committee reported a bill to permit TVA to issue $750 million in revenue bonds to finance construction or acquisition of new power facilities. The bill had already passed the Senate in 1957. The subject of heated controversy between public and private power groups, the measure died in the Rules Committee.[6]

Housing

The Senate passed on July 11, with little debate, an omnibus housing bill. It authorized the Government to obligate $2.5 billion on various housing programs.

In the House the bill was modified by the Banking and Currency Committee and then reported. The Committee on Rules refused to grant the measure a rule. The bill's supporters then sought to bring it to the floor under a procedure requiring a two-thirds vote of the House in order to suspend the rules. Put to the test on August 18, the House divided 251 to 134, 6 votes short of the required two-thirds. At this point Congress was too close to the end of the session to make another attempt to pass a housing bill.

Area redevelopment

A bill proposing a program of Federal grants and loans to localities for redevelopment was guided through the Senate in 1956 only to die in the House. In 1958 it once more passed the Senate, incorporating a proposed expenditure of $380 million.

In the House, the Banking and Currency Committee knocked out of the bill a $100-million loan fund for public facilities before reporting it on July 1. It was alleged at the time that the House version was "watered down" by the committee mostly because of objections from members of the Rules Committee which actually held up action on the bill until the changes were made.[7]

[6] Hammond, Emily Cuyler. "The Taxpayer's Friend: the Key Role of the House Rules Committee." Human Events, Sept. 1, 1958: 4.

[7] Ibid.

Record of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs During the 86th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, the 86th is the first Congress during which I have had the honor of presiding over the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee as its chairman. My experience has been exhilarating and almost uniformly pleasant. The ranking minority member, the Honorable JOHN P. SAYLOR, of Pennsylvania, has been most cooperative. With his help and the help of my subcommittee chairmen and, indeed, of all the members of the committee, we have turned out a large volume of work that, I am convinced, is and will be profitable for the American people.

It may be that no two of us would agree on precisely what are the dozen or so most important measures that have come out of our committee and been enacted into law. But I do not doubt that there will be general agreement that the Hawaii Statehood Act—Public Law 86–3—is to be counted among these. I think also that the Alaska and Hawaii Omnibus Acts—Public Law 86–70, Public Law 86–624—which cleaned up a great mass of legislation antedating statehood for these two former territories and included wise provisions to assist them during their transitional period, also belong here. Great credit must be given to the Honorable LEO W. O'BRIEN, of New York, for his handling of these bills.

Our jurisdiction over mines and mining matters also resulted in productive legislation. I refer especially to the acts establishing and furnishing implementation for a national helium conservation policy—Public Law 86–777—creating a coal research and development division in the Department of the Interior—Public Law 86–599—and revising and amending several sections of the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, with particular attention to its oil and gas provisions—Public Law 86–705. The Honorable ADAM C. POWELL, of New York, was the chairman of the subcommittee which dealt with these matters.

Our Public Lands Subcommittee, under the chairmanship of the Honorable GRACIE PFOST, of Idaho, also had 2 busy years. Of particular importance in its field of operation were the bills enlarging the area of public lands which the States may utilize for State parks and other public purposes—Public Law 86–292—and settling an important problem arising from demands for the return of former private lands which were turned over to the United States early this century for incorporation into our national forests and parks—Public Law 86–596. I must mention also, among other things, the acts establishing various new units of the national park system: The Arkansas Post National Memorial in Arkansas, Public Law 86–595; Bent's Old Fort National Historic Site in Colorado, Public Law 86–487; Minuteman National Historical Park in Massachusetts, Public Law 86–321; and Wilson's Creek Battlefield National Park in Missouri, Public Law 86–434.

The work of the Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee has also been wide ranging. Its distinguished chairman is the Honorable WALTER ROGERS of Texas. The authorization for the San Luis unit of the Central Valley project in California, Public Law 86–488, stands out in my mind as being especially important, not only because of the large area which will be furnished water by this development but also because of the means the new law affords for cooperation between the State of California and the Federal Bureau of Reclamation in the utilization of a single reservoir site. The authorizations for the Cheney Division of the Wichita project, Kansas, Public Law 86–787, and the Norman project in Oklahoma, Public Law 86–529, are also important because, among other things, of the evidence they afford of our committee's concern for adequate municipal and domestic water supplies. Four other enacted measures authorized construction of the western division of the Dalles Federal reclamation project, Oregon, Public Law 86–745; the Spokane Valley project in Washington and Idaho, Public Law 86–276; the La Feria division of the Rio Grande project in Texas, Public Law 86–357; and the Bully Creek extension of the Vale project in Oregon, Public Law 86–248.

The Honorable JAMES A. HALEY, of Florida, headed the Indian Affairs Subcommittee. To my knowledge, no Member of the House is more diligent than Mr. HALEY in pursuing his assigned tasks. It would be especially hard to isolate and name the most important pieces of legislation that emerged from this subcommittee since nearly all of the bills that come to it deal with urgent problems that affect a single tribe or local group. If I were to name two or three, however, I think I would choose the settlement of the longstanding controversy over equalized allotments of the very valuable Indian lands in Palm Springs, Calif., Public Law 86–326, the provisions for distribution of the assets of the Catawba Tribe, South Carolina, and termination of Federal supervision over the affairs of this small group of Indians, Public Law 86–322, and the act turning over to the Navajo Tribe full control over most of the irrigation works on its reservation, Public Law 86–636.

This rundown does not begin to cover the entire field of our committee's activities. I am proud that, though only about 5½ percent of the total number of House bills, joint resolutions, and concurrent resolutions that were introduced during the 86th Congress were referred to our committee, 11½ percent of all such measures that were reported to the House came from the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and that about 18¼ percent of all the public laws that were enacted were ours.

To put the matter another way, 926 measures were referred to our committee, 177 were reported, 162 passed the House, and 146 were enacted as public laws. A full summary of all of these is being prepared and will be available, in the form of a committee print, to Members and the public.

The consideration of these measures and other committee business necessarily consumes an immense amount of time. The full committee and its subcommittees met here in Washington 308 times for a total of 511 hours. There were, in addition, a number of field hearings and inspection trips. These include, among others, visits to American Samoa, Guam, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, the Ryukyus, and Hawaii, in the interests of territorial legislation; Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands for the same reason; Michigan, Minnesota, South Dakota, and Kansas for the study of Indian problems; Oregon, California, Arizona, Missouri, and Maryland on public land and national park matters; Pennsylvania and the tristate area of Oklahoma, Kansas, and Missouri on mining matters; and Colorado, Utah, Arizona, California, Washington, and Oregon on irrigation and reclamation subjects.

As the figures that I have cited above indicate, and I have already said in connection with the work of the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs, not all of the bills that we have handled are of the glamorous, headline-attracting type. Many of them were workaday bills. That does not make them any the less important. Indeed, a bill that settles what, to outsiders, may look like nothing more than a petty local problem involving, say, not more than 10 acres of land may well turn out to be a precedent-setter with important ramifications and, in any event, of just as much consequence to its locality as a much more ambitious measure is elsewhere. The following paragraphs add to the catalog of measures which I have already mentioned but they by no means exhaust the entire field of our activities.

With this in mind, I point out that the Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee had 183 measures referred to it and that all of the 23 which it reported became law. This subcommittee met 70 times in Washington for a total of 135 hours. In addition to the bills that I have already mentioned, those that emerged from it cover such diverse matters as the delivery of water to lands served by Federal reclamation projects when the death of a husband or wife would make his or her land excess under normal reclamation law, Public Law 86–684; an amendment to the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 making permanent the heretofore temporary authority of the Secretary of the Interior to grant deferment of construction charge payments in cases of extreme hardship, Public Law 86–308; the disposition of net power revenues from the Grand Valley project in Colorado, Public Law 86–640; apportionment of construction costs on the Yakima project in Washington, Public Law 86–204; negotiations by the States of Kansas and Nebraska of an interstate compact governing the Big Blue River and its tributaries, Public Law 86–489;

and the preservation of historical and archeological data endangered by the construction of reservoirs by Federal agencies and their licensees, Public Law 86–523.

With the admission of Alaska and Hawaii as States, the volume of business referred to the Subcommittee on Territorial and Insular Affairs contracted sharply. Nevertheless there were 52 bills referred to it. Of these 10 were reported and 9 became law. The subcommittee met 21 times for a total of 35 hours. I have already mentioned the most important measures in the field that were enacted. The others include a 17-month extension in the life of the Alaska International Rail and Highway Commission, Public Law 86–78; revision of the Virgin Islands Organic Act to modify the term of office and per diem allowance to members of the Virgin Islands Legislature and to clarify the duties of the U.S. attorney and the Virgin Islands attorney general, Public Law 86–289; and provision for suits against the government of Guam, Public Law 86–316, for acquisition from Guamanian property owners of fee titles to or easements for roads constructed by the Navy Department, Public Law 86–314, and for the disposition to the government of Guam of certain filled and submerged lands title to which is in the United States, Public Law 86–664.

The Subcommittee on Mines and Mining met 39 times for a total of 73 hours. There were referred to it 121 bills and resolutions of which 17 were reported and 12 became law. A concurrent resolution handled and reported by this subcommittee was adopted by both Houses. This resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 177, called on the President for a review of Federal stockpiling, barter, technical assistance, and loan-grant programs which have stimulated mineral production abroad and severely depressed the domestic market. It also declared that the national security and public welfare require the maintenance of a strong and healthy domestic mining industry and avoidance of critical dependence on foreign sources and stockpiles planned merely for defense needs. In addition, this subcommittee also handled, among others, bills extending the coal provisions of the Mineral Leasing Act to Alaska, Public Law 86–252, authorizing the issuance of permits to phosphate producers on the public lands, Public Law 86–391, providing for the acquisition of lands by the Geological Survey for observation wells, Public Law 86–406, and relieving innocent purchasers of interests in oil and gas leases from onerous administrative and judicial proceedings arising out of predecessors' failures to comply with the acreage limitation laws, Public Law 86–294. Three of this subcommittee's bills were vetoed by the President. The most significant of these was one, H.R. 8860, which would have provided for payments to small domestic producers of lead and zinc when the market prices of these commodities, depressed as they are by heavy foreign imports, are below certain specified levels.

Of the 347 measures referred to the Subcommittee on Public Lands, 69 were reported and 60 became law. This subcommittee met 58 times for a total of 96 hours. The bills within its jurisdiction which were enacted are of a wide variety. I have already mentioned some of the most important of them. The others include a bill enlarging eligibility for burial in national cemeteries, Public Law 86–260; 22 measures dealing with, for the most part, specific tracts of land in 16 States ranging from Alaska and California in the West through Nebraska and Michigan in the Midwest, to Virginia, Florida, and Mississippi in the Southeast; 21 measures revising the boundaries of or providing for the acquisition of additional lands for 19 units of the national park system in Arizona, Colorado, Florida, Maryland, New Jersey, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Utah, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, and Wyoming; and a number of other miscellaneous subjects.

The Indian Affairs Subcommittee had 188 measures referred to it, reported 55 and 47 of these became law. It met 48 times for a total of 89 hours. I have already mentioned several of the more important bills coming from this subcommittee which became law. Others that deserve special mention are those that supplement the provisions of a 1906 act to permit completion of a program for the disposal of the assets of the Choctaw Tribe of Oklahoma, for a division of the proceeds among the members of the tribe, and for dissolution of the tribal government, Public Law 86–192; enlarge the list of Klamath Indians eligible for loans from the Indian revolving loan fund and permit earlier payment for the Klamath Marsh area than was contemplated by prior legislation, Public Law 86–40, Public Law 86–247; and postpone the date on which the Menominee Termination Act of 1954 is to become fully effective, Public Law 86–733. In addition, there were 16 enactments providing for transfers of surplus Federal land to 15 different groups of Indians, 6 enactments dealing with the sale or lease of lands held by or for such groups, 6 providing for the disposition of judgment moneys obtained by Indians either through per capita distributions or as otherwise allocated by tribal officials, and 11 more which deal with a wide variety of subjects.

I have been speaking thus far of bills on which the legislative process has been fully completed. As usual, we also considered a number of matters on which action could not be finished. Many of these bills will be with us again next year. The time our committee spent on them will not have been wasted, for the foundation has been laid for more expeditious treatment of many of them during the 87th Congress than would otherwise have been the case.

I refer to such bills, in the irrigation and reclamation field, as the one which would furnish a firm and statutory implementation of the policy of developing water resources on a comprehensive multiple-purpose basis by authorizing the establishment of river basin commissions and by prescribing uniform methods for evaluating projects; a whole series of bills embodying various approaches to the problems of Federal-State relations in the water rights field; another group providing for the creation of a Pacific Northwest account in order to give potential Federal irrigation projects in that area a firm statutory basis for assistance from power revenues comparable to those enjoyed in the Missouri Basin, the Upper Colorado Basin, and the Central Valley of California; and still others to authorize construction of the Burns Creek development, Palisades project, Idaho; the Mid-State reclamation project, Nebraska; the Fryingpan-Arkansas project, Colorado; the San Juan-Chama reclamation project, and Navajo Indian irrigation project, New Mexico; and the Garrison diversion unit, Missouri River Basin project, North Dakota.

In the field of territorial and insular affairs we gave long consideration to a number of bills dealing with the status of Puerto Rico in terms of commonwealth, statehood and independence; a series of bills to provide for elective nonvoting representation in the House of Representatives for the Virgin Islands and Guam; and another group concerning the Antarctic programs of the United States.

I have mentioned the President's veto of the lead and zinc bill. Our Mines and Mining Subcommittee spent a great deal of time examining the merits of and perfecting this bill. Perhaps a different approach will have to be taken in the future but I am confident that the basic problem which engendered its introduction and the introduction of other measures in the minerals field—for instance, the bills dealing with beryl, cobalt, and columbium-tantalum on which we also had hearings—are not dead and will be with us for further consideration in the future.

Our Public Lands Subcommittee spent a considerable amount of time and energy on bills to modernize the townsite laws, to provide for the classification and disposition of public lands suitable for urban and business sites, and to curb the activities of so-called land locators. Time also was spent on bills to establish the Oregon Dunes and Cape Cod National Seashore Areas, the Chesapeake and Ohio National Historical Park, the Hubbell Trading Post and Fort Bowie National Historic Sites in Arizona, the Fort Toulouse National Historic Site in Alabama, and other similar units of the national park system. Hearings were also held on a series of major bills to provide for payments in lieu of taxes and special assessments on certain classes of Federal property.

The volume of legislative oversight work which is imposed on or undertaken by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs continues to grow and to consume more and more of its time. I can report, under this category of our workload, that the committee examined 12 applications for loans under the Small Reclamation Project Act, 4 findings of the Secretary of the Interior with respect

to repayment arrangements under the Rehabilitation and Betterment Act, 3 contracts under the Drainage and Minor Construction Act, 4 permits of the Department of the Interior for nonexclusive military use of public lands in Alaska, 14 proposed withdrawals or reservations of public land for nonmilitary purposes, and 5 concessionaire contracts under the national park system.

I mentioned at the beginning of this review the great assistance I have had from the subcommittee chairmen, the ranking minority member and other members of the committee. I cannot close, and I would not wish to close, without mentioning also the invaluable service rendered by the four full-time members of the professional staff, by all six full-time members of the administrative and clerical staff, and by former Judge Paul D. Shriver and Mr. Robert J. Hunter, who served for short periods as special consultants on territorial matters, and Mr. Paul Tyler, who served as a special consultant on minerals matters for several months.

The House Rules Committee—Minority Abuse of Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, it is with genuine regret that I leave the House of Representatives after having the privilege to serve here for four consecutive terms.

In departing I call attention to the need for procedural reform in the House rules, the need for which has been so dramatically demonstrated here during the past several months. This is not a new subject nor one for which there is any simple cure.

While I will not be a Member of this distinguished body in the next Congress, I sincerely hope that those of my colleagues who will be privileged to serve in the 87th Congress will take affirmative action to restore true democratic procedures to the House of Representatives. Only in this way can responsible government for all Americans ultimately prevail over narrow sectional and economic abuses of power in the hands of a few.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the July 2, 1960, and August 26, 1960, news releases of my friend and colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON], an article on the Rules Committee from the June 28, 1960, Wall Street Journal, and another article from the August 30, 1960, issue of the same publication on this subject. The releases and articles follow:

STATEMENT OF HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR., DEMOCRAT OF NEW JERSEY, JULY 2, 1960

With the Democratic Convention only a few days away and with many major bills still awaiting final action, the Congress last Saturday voted to recess until August 15. The more optimistic Members hope that we can return after the two conventions and complete action on important legislation.

My personal feeling is that a session following the nomination of both presidential candidates will result in a political carnival. I voted for the recess resolution, however, because it would be completely impossible to conclude all of the unfinished business before convention time. Adjournment sine die would have meant the death of school construction, housing, medical care, social security, minimum wage, situs picketing, and other important matters.

I have great reservations for several reasons about the session following the conventions, the most important of which is that an effort to make a good political record may result in the passage of legislation consisting of nothing more than a title. A bill entitled "School Construction" which would build no schools would be nothing but a cruel hoax. For instance, if we were to pass the administration's 1959 "do it yourself through loans" school bill, it would be an utterly worthless act. Political pundits are giving all sorts of reasons for the action of the Congress in voting a recess. It seems to me to be true that such actions, leaving essential legislation hanging in the balance, could provide a political tool for some of the presidential hopefuls. "Nominate me and you'll get a bill." Or, "Fail to nominate me, and you'll get no bill." This reasoning, however, is awfully farfetched, especially since the use of a bludgeon would be irresponsible and easily detected.

The real reason for the need of the Congress to return after the conventions is the House Rules Committee. Six willful men, including two Southern Democrats and four conservative Republicans, have arrogated to themselves the power of determining what bills the House shall or shall not consider. They have delayed every major bill of the 86th Congress, and, although they have granted rules in a number of cases, few pieces of important legislation have been given a rule, and this has been done only after interminable delays and in the face of certain defeat. The Rules Committee's delaying actions have created a tremendous backlog of legislation which cannot be acted upon in a few days.

A classic example of the Rules Committee's arrogance and its effect are provided by the school construction legislation, which has passed both Houses, although in different form. Since each body passed a different version, a joint conference is necessary to work out the differences. Under the rules of the House a bill may be sent to conference only by unanimous consent of all Members, or by a rule. If any Member objects, a rule must be obtained. An objection to the school bill was made by Representative JOHANSEN, Republican, of Michigan, and it was, therefore, necessary for it to go to the Rules Committee. It was expected that since it had received a rule earlier (after a 2-month delay) to bring it to the House floor, a rule would be granted by the Rules Committee for a conference. This time, Representative CARROLL REECE, Republican, of Tennessee, who had voted earlier for the rule to debate, switched his position and voted "Nay." REECE was joined by the other members of the Southern-Republican coalition in refusing to let the bill go to conference, so it remains stuck in the Rules Committee.

Twelve years ago, during the 81st Congress, the rules of the House were changed to require the Rules Committee to clear within 21 days bills approved by the legislative committees. In 1951, however, the coalition of Southern Democrats and Northern Republicans repealed the 21-day rule, restoring its tremendous power to the Rules Committee. Last year a fight was brewing to restore the 21-day rule, but those who favored this action withdrew when Speaker RAYBURN suggested to them that they did not have enough votes to win. He also told them that he would make sure that all major bills reported by legislative committees would not be held up in the Rules Committee. It is apparent now that the Speaker cannot obtain the full cooperation of the committee. It is certain that a fight to change the rules will be pushed to a decision next year.

If I am fortunate enough to be elected to the next Congress, I shall join the fight to change the rules. It is an outrage that a committee which was established in 1910 for the specific purpose of making the House procedures more democratic should now become as arbitrary and arrogant as was old Speaker Joe Cannon. My views are shared by a great majority of my colleagues of the Democratic Party. With the help of liberal Republicans, the rules can be changed, and it will be in the national interest to do so. The battle will take place—with or without Republican help—and I feel that it will be won.

STATEMENT OF HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR., DEMOCRAT, OF NEW JERSEY, AUGUST 26, 1960

Although the Congress is still in session, and will be for several more days, it is now apparent that all but the faintest hope for housing and school construction legislation has disappeared. To say that I am tremendously disappointed is an understatement. My disappointment is shared by a great many others here, including Senator KENNEDY.

The fate suffered by these two bills, and many others, deserves examination. It is not enough to say that the Democrats have overwhelming majorities in both Houses. On the other hand, it is not enough to say it is the fault of the Republicans.

Since 1937 the chief instrument of obstruction in the House has been the coalition between the Republicans and most of the Southern Democrats, and this coalition is directly responsible for the failure of housing and school legislation. It is also responsible for the miserably inadequate minimum wage and medical care bills. In each of these fields you will remember the Senate passed worthy bills only to have them slaughtered in the House by the coalition.

The bald facts are that the Rules Committee of the House, under the leadership of Democrat HOWARD SMITH, of Virginia, runs the entire Congress of the United States. SMITH, in daily collaboration with Republican Leader CHARLES HALLECK, keeps the combination together by which the entire House is denied the right to vote on legislation. The Rules Committee is composed of 12 members, 6 conservatives who work in close coalition with SMITH, and 6 liberals or moderates. Since a tie vote is equivalent to "no," SMITH'S boys can effectively block liberal legislation from consideration by the entire House membership. An even-number makeup defies both good logic and rules. Much is written about Senate rule 22, under which filibusters are possible. The power of the House Rules Committee, and it trespasses on the legislative process, is in my opinion, far more evil than the operation of the Senate rule, for at least the Senate can get its legislation before the whole body.

On the first day of the next Congress a determined fight will be made to amend the rules of the House so that the outrageous domination of the Congress by the Rules Committee will be ended. I predict the success of the effort, for more than ever before in recent years the Members resent the two-man domination.

Even a casual student of the legislative process knows that the House is about evenly

divided—with 140 Republicans and 70 Southern Democrats on one side and the remaining Members on the other. The balance of power in most cases is wielded by the six obstructionist votes on the Rules Committee which denies the opportunity to debate and vote on issues of importance to the entire Nation.

The school construction legislation was passed by the Senate some months ago. Subsequently a more moderate bill which I introduced passed the House. This was the first time in history that the House passed a school construction bill. Since there were two versions, the differences could be worked out only by a joint House-Senate conference. To get to a conference, a rule from the Rules Committee is necessary. The committee, its six-man coalition operating smoothly, refused to allow a conference even though a majority of the Members of both the House and Senate had voted in favor of the legislation.

In the case of the Housing bill, the legislative committee approved legislation and sent it to the Rules Committee to be sent to the floor for debate. In their typical cavalier manner, SMITH and his pals refused even to consider the legislation.

As a final note to the school bill's fate, it should be pointed out that two-thirds of the obstructionist votes against it were cast by the four Republicans who voted with Democrats SMITH and COLMER of Mississippi. Therein lies the blame. House Republican Leader HALLECK and Vice President NIXON together could not produce the one Republican vote needed to free the bill.

[From the Wall Street Journal, June 28, 1960]

CONSERVATIVE CITADEL: HOUSE RULES GROUP, KEY CURB ON "LIBERALS," FACES HEAVIER ASSAULT—"LIBERALS" AIM TO ALTER ITS MAKEUP OR CLIP ITS POWER TO BOTTLE UP LEGISLATION—MR. SMITH AND HIS SICK COW

(By Paul Duke)

WASHINGTON.—One of the two great dams which conservatives have long counted on to shield the Nation from a flood of "liberal" legislation is taking a pounding—and could crack open in 1961.

It's the Rules Committee of the House of Representatives, the oldest and most powerful of all congressional committees. It's led by a courtly 77-year-old Virginia Democrat, HOWARD W. SMITH, a farmer, banker, and ex-judge who only a few years ago gave up wearing wing collars. Mr. SMITH is often accused of defying the will of Congress' heavily Democratic majority; he won't even take orders from House Speaker SAM RAYBURN. The Rules Committee, if it pleases, can usually hold back a bill by just refusing to give it the "rule" needed to make it the business of the House. This year incensed "liberals" shoved some key bills over its spillways and dug a few bypass channels around it. Next year they hope to dynamite it.

The other great dam, of course, is the Presidential veto, which Ike has used 160-odd times during his 2 administrations. Since it could be demolished as a conservative dam by election of a "liberal" Democrat this fall, the Rules Committee looks all the more crucial for the future.

EDUCATION, HOUSING, PICKETS

At this moment, the Rules Committee dam may not seem weak. Not only is it endangering a House-Senate compromise on aid to education, but the group is sitting on three other pieces of liberal-backed legislation—bills to boost the minimum wage and broaden its coverage, to pump up Federal housing benefits, and to ease picketing restrictions on building unions. This last bill, supported by the Eisenhower administration, has been stuck in the committee for 4 months. And one or all of these measures may languish right where they are.

The committee stands a good chance to bury such bills because its power is reaching a seasonal peak. With less than 2 weeks left until Congress' early July adjournment for the political conventions, there's little time in which to push bills through or around a reluctant Rules Committee.

The group's usual maneuver is simply inaction. Though it has eight Democrats and four Republicans, the group is philosophically split down the middle:

CONSERVATIVE

HOWARD SMITH, Democrat, of Virginia.
WILLIAM COLMER, Democrat, of Mississippi.
LEO ALLEN, Republican, of Illinois.
CLARENCE BROWN, Republican, of Ohio.
CARROLL REECE, Republican, of Tennessee.
HAMER BUDGE, Republican, of Idaho.

LIBERAL OR MODERATE

RAY MADDEN, Democrat, of Indiana.
JAMES DELANEY, Democrat, of New York.
JAMES TRIMBLE, Democrat, of Arkansas.
HOMER THORNBERRY, Democrat, of Texas.
RICHARD BOLLING, Democrat, of Missouri.
THOMAS O'NEILL, Democrat, of Massachusetts.

Tie votes pigeonhole a bill. Beyond this, Chairman SMITH has special power. He can decline to call committee meetings, decide which bills are to be considered, and drag out deliberations on measures he opposes. If he thinks it necessary now to dodge pressure, some colleagues suspect, Mr. SMITH may fall back on tactics not yet used this year.

He might, for instance, take a vacation amid the preadjournment rush, and so keep his committee from meeting to clear legislation. At crucial moments in the past, he has found it necessary to tend a sick cow on his Virginia farm. Three years ago, he headed home to see about a burned-down barn, at the very time when pressure was mounting on the committee to release a civil rights bill. Now, says a fellow committeeman, "he'd love to sit on some of those pet bills."

The liberals already have two methods for bypassing the Rules Committee, and they've used both of them this year. One involves getting 219 Members of the House—a majority—to sign a petition to discharge a bill from the Rules Committee. The other is a device known as Calendar Wednesday. This lets the chairman of a legislative committee call up on a given Wednesday bills that have been delayed in the Rules Committee.

But the liberals are not content with these parliamentary devices. They're determined to clip the committee's power or alter its conservative position when the 87th Congress convenes in January. Labor's lobbyists, who have waxed more and more impatient with the committee, will throw their weight behind the drive. The uprising could pose the most serious threat in a decade to the power of the Republican-Southern Democrat coalition to sidetrack legislation.

"Changing the makeup of the Rules Committee is certain to be a major liberal objective in 1961," declares Representative LEE METCALF, of Montana, chief of the liberal Democratic bloc in the House.

BANKING ON HOLDOVERS

It's true Mr. METCALF won't be on hand for next year's fight; he's running for the Senate. Some other liberal lights will be gone from the House next year, and the rebels' strength will rise or fall with November's elections. The Democrats are expected to retain a majority, but the size of that majority will influence the course of the revolt. The liberals are counting on likely holdovers to form a 1961 spearhead. It may include, among others, Representative FRANK THOMPSON, of New Jersey, Arizona's STEWART UDALL, and CHET HOLIFIELD and JAMES ROOSEVELT, of California.

It makes no difference that none of today's rebels are Rules Committee members; changes would come through vote of the entire House on revising its rules, as can be done at the opening of each new Congress. And, says Representative THOMPSON, "I think we can do it if we hold our own in the fall elections."

The most extreme step, perhaps, would be to reconstitute the Rules group as a majority-party steering unit, something like the Senate Democratic Policy Committee, to reflect the will of House Democrats generally. Membership would be restricted to the party in control of the House, and members would be elected at the start of each session. At present, Democratic committee members are appointed by Democratic leaders and the traditional seniority system decrees that members retain their places if they wish.

Another talked of possibility is a return to the 21-day rule adopted for 2 years the last time there was a revolt, after Democrats surged to control of the House in the 1948 elections. Under this regulation, the chairman of a legislative committee could call up directly on the House floor any measure bottled up by the Rules Committee for at least 21 days.

Other moves seem more likely now, however. The rebels talk of giving the committee a 13th member, a liberal Democrat, to put the conservatives on the short end of a 7-to-6 count. Or the 8-to-4 Democratic-Republican ratio might be shifted to 9 to 3, with the additional Democrat being picked from the liberals' ranks. Or Speaker RAYBURN could be made an ex officio member of the committee with power to vote in deadlocks. Or the rules could be changed so that a tie vote would send a bill to the floor instead of keeping it in committee.

A more peaceful means of altering the committee might actually be available, if the critics were only patient enough. Both of its two most conservative Democrats, Chairman SMITH and 70-year-old Representative WILLIAM COLMER, of Mississippi, are approaching eventual retirement, and could be succeeded by men of other views. As it happens, the committee's ranking Republican, 61-year-old Representative LEO ALLEN, of Illinois, is quitting after this year, but probably will be replaced by some one equally conservative.

But the liberals are intent on action no later than next year. Their chances for success are iffy—and partly for little-recognized reasons. Many Congressmen actually welcome the Rules Committee as a shield against pressure groups. Often lawmakers, badgered by lobbyists, vote for bills in legislative committees knowing full well they can be quietly buried in the Rules Committee.

BOTTLING UP FAIR TRADE BILL

"I'd bet 90 percent of the House is glad they're bottling up the fair trade bill," declares a Midwest Republican. This measure, to permit manufacturers to set minimum retail prices on national brand products, cleared the House Banking Committee last year, but has been reposing ever since in the Rules Committee. Many members frankly don't like the bill, but might feel forced to vote for it because of pressure from small retailers back home.

For many Republicans, too, the Rules Committee serves as a handy whipping boy. When the committee blocks an administration-backed measure, as it did the civil rights bill for more than 2 months this year, the GOP can accuse the Democratic-controlled Congress of thwarting action—and thus can build up a potential campaign issue. Even liberal Republicans are not red-hot for Rules Committee changes.

On strictly philosophical grounds, the GOP-Southern Democrat coalition is sure to wage a fierce fight in opposition to the drive. "These radicals are bad enough now," complains a top Republican leader, "but without the Rules Committee to throw a few roadblocks they'd be uncontrollable."

So the liberals, for any chance of success, must roughly hold their own in the fall elections; if the Democratic majority is cut sharply or eliminated, the drive would flop. The Democrats now hold 280 seats and the Republicans 152, with 5 seats vacant.

To muster a 219 vote majority for a January showdown on the House floor, the liberals would almost surely have to draw the support of Democratic moderates and at least a few Southern Democrats; only about 170 of the incumbent Democrats can be considered down-the-line liberals.

MR. SAM HAS HAD ENOUGH

The rebels are hoping, too, for the support of Speaker RAYBURN, known to be miffed at the Rules Committee's cold-shoulder treatment of several leadership-backed bills this session. "I think Mr. SAM has about had enough," confides an associate of the Speaker. The liberals already are sounding out Mr. RAYBURN on the possibilities for a change.

The revolt would be helped along by election of a Democratic President clearly bent on passage of New Dealish legislation—notably Adlai Stevenson or Senator JOHN KENNEDY. A President who threw his power behind a drive to change the Rules Committee could use patronage to swing the doubtful votes into line. "With an arm-twister in the White House," says an Eastern Democrat, "we could really go to town."

In this 86th Congress that opened for business in January of last year, the Rules Committee turned more conservative in hue while Congress in general became more "liberal." Two Republican committee members who left this House, Representative Hugh Scott, of Pennsylvania, and Henry Latham, of New York, were replaced by more conservative lawmakers, Representative CARROLL REECE, of Tennessee, and HAMER BUDGE, of Idaho.

Thus, despite growing liberal pressure, the committee has at least been able to delay or tone down important liberal legislation. It sat on the aid-to-depressed-areas bill for a year until bypassed this spring; the final outcome was a Presidential veto, which liberals hope to exploit in campaign oratory. The committee has helped prevent passage of an aid-to-education measure until now. And by bottling up a $1.4 billion housing bill, it may force Congress to adopt a milder housing measure.

The committee has apparently buried some minor measures completely, incurring enemies here and there. Kentucky, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia Congressmen are irked because the committee wouldn't sanction a study aimed at finding new uses for coal. The committee's rejection of a bill to continue a Federal program to assist rural libraries infuriated some liberals.

"Here we are in the third year of the space age and the Rules Committee goes on record against increasing man's knowledge," says liberal Democratic Congresswoman GREEN of Oregon, shaking her head.

Nonetheless, the liberals have handed the committee an almost unparalleled series of rebuffs this year. After over 2 months' delay, the committee finally gave a go-ahead to the bill to protect Negro voting rights. By then, Representative ROOSEVELT and Brooklyn's Representative EMANUEL CELLER had rounded up the signatures of 211 House Members on a petition to discharge the bill from the Rules Committee—nearly the 219-vote majority needed for success.

The committee suffered another setback when it refused to clear the bill to raise pay of Government employees. Congressmen of almost every political hue rebelled, and the necessary 219 signatures on a discharge petition were collected in a single day. "It's ridiculous to hold back a bill like this," declares a Texas conservative. "The committee was just asking to have its ears pinned back."

When the Rules Committee refused to bow to Speaker RAYBURN'S wishes for clearance of the depressed areas bill, Democrats routed it to the floor anyway by the Calendar Wednesday device. Though this tactic can be fought by stalling, liberals made the maneuver work for the first time since 1956.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Aug. 30, 1960]

KENNEDY IS EXPECTED TO SUPPORT LIBERAL DRIVE TO CURB HOUSE RULES COMMITTEE

(By Paul Duke)

WASHINGTON.—Democratic Presidential Nominee KENNEDY is expected to throw his political weight behind a drive to curb the power of the conservative-controlled House Rules Committee.

Democratic sources said the Massachusetts Senator has promised, before Congress adjourns, to announce his support of proposals to revamp the 12-man committee to make it easier to pass liberal-backed legislation. There is also a possibility he will join the liberal chorus advocating changes in Senate rules to make it harder for Southerners to filibuster against civil rights legislation.

Representative METCALF, of Montana, leader of the liberal Democratic bloc in the House, recently conferred with Mr. KENNEDY and told him it was imperative that he back the campaign to shake up the Rules Committee. He said such support is necessary to help liberal Democratic Congressmen in their reelection campaigns and to give stronger impetus to the drive to change the Rules Committee's operating procedure or numerical makeup when the 87th Congress convenes in January. The Democratic platform advocates changes in congressional procedures to make it easier to pass liberal legislation.

The Rules Committee's bottling up of major bills pushed by the Democratic leadership this session has also convinced Speaker RAYBURN, Democrat, of Texas, that changes must be made. The House Democratic leader pounded his fist on the desk during a recent conference on housing legislation and angrily asserted, "I'll never let the Rules Committee get away from my control again."

All major or controversial legislation must be approved by the Rules Committee before it can reach the floor for action. Since 1937, the conservative members of the committee have held the upper hand and in many instances have forced Democratic leaders to accept measures far narrower than they would like. At present, the committee has eight Democrats and four Republicans. But two of the Democrats, Chairman SMITH, of Virginia, and Representative COLMER, of Mississippi, frequently team up with the four GOP members to form a conservative coalition against the six moderate and liberal Democrats. Because tie votes can prevent legislation from reaching the floor, the six conservatives thus exercise veto power over the flow of measures from the committee.

Liberal Democrats have felt especially frustrated because the coalition of Southern Democrats and Republicans has been able to block many of their pet bills this session despite the overwhelming Democratic majority in the House. For this reason, they are determined to make a major fight at the outset of 1961 to wrest control of the Rules Committee from the conservatives. During this session, the committee has impeded or blocked legislation dealing with housing, aid to education, civil rights, depressed areas, and Federal pay raises.

Endorsement by Senator KENNEDY of the assault on the Rules Committee almost certainly would add to the problems the 43-year-old Democratic candidate faces in carrying the South in November. It could well mean new defections by conservative Democrats who would prefer to sit out the campaign rather than endorse the Kennedy-Johnson ticket. For example, it probably would rule out completely any slim hope KENNEDY supporters may still hold for gaining the backing of Virginia's Senator BYRD. And similar reluctance probably would come from Mr. SMITH, who campaigned actively for the Democratic national ticket in 1952 and 1956.

Liberal Democrats believe they have the strength to revise the Rules Committee if they can hold their own in the coming elections. Of the 280 House Democrats, all but about 90 come from Northern, Western, and Border States, and the liberals believe they'll be able to control the Democratic caucus next January. If so, they hope to force a majority vote for the election of Rules Committee members rather than continue the time-honored seniority system of letting Members continue from session to session without a formal vote. The liberal strategy is aimed at voting Mr. COLMER out and replacing him with a liberal Democrat on the ground that he deserted the party by indicating sympathy for the independent elector plan in Mississippi.

Other changes are possible, too. One plan would revise the makeup of the Rules Committee to nine Democrats and three Republicans, with the extra Democrat coming from the liberal ranks. Another proposal would count tie votes as affirmative votes, permitting bills to go to the floor. A third strategy would revise a rule tried briefly in 1950 under which any bill remaining before the committee 21 days could automatically be brought to the floor. All of these proposals, however, would require approval by the full House and might be more difficult to accomplish than the suggestion that Rules Committee Democrats be elected in annual party caucuses.

Legislative Record of John R. Foley, U.S. Representative, 6th District of Maryland—86th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. FOLEY

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is customary for the Congressman from Maryland's Sixth District to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD his voting and attendance record. This is done to give to each interested constituent an opportunity to study his Congressman's record.

Printed first below is my record in the 1st session of the 86th Congress. This shows my vote is recorded in 85 of the 87 total rollcall votes. The two nonvoting instances are explained in the footnotes. The total voting percentage is 97.7 percent. In the 89 quorum calls, I was present for 85. The absences are explained in the footnotes. The total percentage of quorum calls answered is 95.5 percent.

1ST SESS., 86TH CONG.

Voting and attendance record of Representative JOHN R. FOLEY, 6th District, Maryland

Roll-call No.	Date, 1959	Measure, question, and result	Vote
1	Jan. 7	Quorum call	Present.
2	Jan. 7	To elect Speaker of House. (RAYBURN 281 to HALLECK 143)	Rayburn.
3	Feb. 4	Quorum call	Present.
4	Feb. 4	H.R. 2256, to recommit motion designed to delete additional funds for direct housing loans. (Defeated 123 to 277)	No.
5	Feb. 4	H.R. 2256, to provide additional funds for direct loans, to remove certain requirements with respect to the rate of interest on guaranteed loans. (Passed 310 to 89.)	Yes.
6	Feb. 5	H.R. 2260, to extend until July 4, 1963, the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act. (Passed 381 to 20)	Yes.
7	Mar. 4	Quorum call	Present.
8	Mar. 5	Quorum call	Present.
9	Mar. 11	H.R. 4221, to adopt H. Res. 205, the open rule providing 6 hours of debate on measure to provide for the admission of the State of Hawaii. (Passed 337 to 69.)	Yes.
10	Mar. 1	Quorum call	Present.
11	Mar. 12	S. 50 (substituted for H.R. 4221), to provide for admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union. (Passed 323 to 89)	Yes.
12	Mar. 12	Quorum call	Present.
13	Mar. 13	H.R. 1, to require a study to be conducted of the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into Illinois Waterway for navigation. (Passed 238 to 142.)	Yes.
14	Mar. 13	S. 79, to amend Federal Food and Drug and Cosmetic Act to permit the continuance of established coloring practices in orange industry. (Passed 213 to 94.)	No.
15	Mar. 16	Quorum call	Present.
16	Mar. 17	Quorum call	Present.
17	Mar. 18	Quorum call	Present.
18	Mar. 19	Quorum call	Absent.[1]
19	Mar. 19	H.R. 1011, an amendment to reduce from $297,000,000 to $200,000,000 the amount of Federal aid for airports over a 4-year period. (Defeated 194 to 214.)	No.
20	Mar. 19	H.R. 1011, an amendment to require annual appropriations for Federal aid for airports. (Defeated 191 to 216)	No.
21	Mar. 19	H.R. 1011 (S. 1), to authorize Federal aid for airports totaling $297,000,000 for a 4-year period. (Passed 272 to 134)	Yes.
22	Mar. 23	H.R. 2575, to authorize the appropriation of $500,000 for the 3d pan-American games to be held in Chicago. (Passed 257 to 109)	Yes.
23	Mar. 24	Quorum call	Present.
24	Mar. 25	H.R. 4452 (S. 1094), to amend the Bretton Woods Agreements Act to increase the U.S. quota in the International Monetary Fund and its subscription to the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. (Passed 315 to 57.)	Yes.
25	Apr. 14	Quorum call	Present.
26	Apr. 14	Quorum call	Present.
27	Apr. 15	Quorum call	Present.
28	Apr. 15	H.R. 1321, to amend Reorganization Plan No. 11 of 1939 to transfer from Secretary of Agriculture to REA Administration the authority of approving or rejecting rural electrification loans. (Passed 234 to 131.)	Not voting.[1]
29	Apr. 16	Quorum call	Present.
30	Apr. 16	H.R. 5674, to authorize certain construction at military installations. (Passed 377 to 7)	Yes.
31	Apr. 29	Quorum call	Present.
32	Apr. 29	Quorum call	Present.
33	Apr. 30	Quorum call	Present.
34	Apr. 30	To override President Eisenhower's veto of Rural Electrification Administration bill. (Defeated 280 to 146; ⅔ majority required)	Yes.
35	Apr. 30	Quorum call	Present.
36	May 4	Quorum call	Present.
37	May 6	Quorum call	Present.
38	May 7	Quorum call	Present.
39	May 7	H.R. 3460, to recommit to committee, bill to amend TVA Act of 1933 relative to financing its power program with proceeds from revenue bonds. (Defeated 182 to 23.)	No.
40	May 7	H.R. 3460, to amend TVA Act of 1933 relative to financing its power program with proceeds from revenue bonds. (Passed 245 to 170)	Yes.
41	May 11	Quorum call	Present.
42	May 18	Quorum call	Present.
43	May 18	Quorum call	Present.
44	May 19	Quorum call	Present.
45	May 19	Quorum call	Present.
46	May 20	H.R. 7007, to suspend rules and pass bill to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal year 1960. (Passed 294 to 128.)	Yes.
47	May 20	To recommit Department of Agriculture appropriation bill in order to insert provision limiting farm price-support loans to $50,000. (Passed 262 to 105.)	Yes.
48	May 21	Quorum call	Present.
49	May 21	S. 57 (Housing Act of 1959), to adopt Thomas amendment to require direct congressional appropriation of funds in lieu of present Treasury authorization method of financing. (Passed 222 to 201.)	No.
50	May 21	S. 57, on motion to recommit bill and insert provisions of H.R. 7117, for the text of the committee substitute amendment. (Defeated 189 to 233.)	No.
51	May 21	S. 57, final passage	Yes.
52	May 25	Quorum call	Present.
53	May 26	Quorum call	Present.
54	May 26	Quorum call	Present.
55	May 27	Quorum call	Present.
56	May 27	H.R. 7176, on recommittal motion to insert language limiting President's handling of emergency fund. (Defeated 171 to 229)	Yes.
57	May 27	H.R. 7343, to increase appropriations of Department of Justice by $2,000,000. (Passed 266 to 133)	Yes.
58	May 27	H.R. 7086, on motion to recommit bill to limit the extension of Renegotiation Act to 27 months. (Defeated 153 to 264)	No.
59	May 27	H.R. 7086, to amend and extend for 4 years the Renegotiation Act of 1951. (Passed 375 to 7)	Yes.
60	May 27	Quorum call	Present.
61	June 2	Quorum call	Present.
62	June 2	Quorum call	Present.
63	June 3	Quorum call	Present.
64	June 3	H.R. 7454, on final passage of $38,400,000 defense appropriation bill. (Passed 393 to 3)	Yes.
65	June 4	Quorum call	Present.
66	June 5	Quorum call	Present.
67	June 8	Quorum call	Present.
68	June 9	H.R. 3610, to recommit the bill in order to add an amendment requiring States to match the Federal grants for construction of sewage treatment works. (Defeated 156 to 240.)	No.
69	June 9	H.R. 3610, on final passage of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. (Passed 254 to 142)	Yes.
70	June 9	H.R. 7590, to add to public works appropriations bill the sum of $500,000 for water lily eradication program. (Passed 199 to 198.)	Yes.
71	June 9	H.R. 7509, to add to public works appropriations bill the sum of $75,000 for planning of a river project in Wisconsin. (Defeated 192 to 203)	Yes.
72	June 9	H.R. 7509, to recommit the public works appropriations bill in order to reduce by 5 percent each construction item of $5 million or more. (Defeated 149 to 251.)	No.
73	June 9	H.R. 7509, on final passage of the public works appropriations bill. (Passed 380 to 20)	Yes.
74	June 10	Quorum call	Present.
75	June 10	S. 1901, to recommit the tobacco price support bill in order to freeze price supports at 1958 level for next 3 years. (Defeated 138 to 260)	No.
76	June 10	S. 1901, to amend sec. 101(c) of the Agricultural Act of 1949 and of 1945 to stabilize and protect the level of price support for tobacco. (Passed 250 to 149.)	Yes.
77	June 11	Quorum call	Present.
78	June 12	H.R. 7246, on recommittal motion to insert provisions of Belcher amendment (H.R. 7611) for text of H.R. 7246, to amend existing laws with respect to acreage allotments and price supports for wheat for 1960–61. (Defeated 141 to 224.)	No.
79	June 12	H.R. 7246, to amend existing laws with respect to acreage allotments and price supports for wheat for 1960–61. (Passed 188 to 177)	Yes.
80	June 12	Quorum call	Present.
81	June 12	H.R. 6596, to encourage and stimulate the production and conservation of coal in the United States through research and development by creating a Coal Research and Development Commission. (Passed 251 to 54.)	Yes.
82	June 15	Quorum call	Present.
83	June 15	Quorum call	Present.

See footnotes at end of table.

1st Sess., 86th Cong.—Continued

Voting and attendance record of Representative John R. Foley, 6th District, Maryland—Continued

Roll-call No.	Date, 1959	Measure, question, and result	Vote
84	June 15	H. Res. 293, to adopt the rule providing for the consideration of 4 hours of debate on, and the waiving of points of order against, H.R. 7500, to amend Mutual Security Act of 1954. (Passed 277 to 93.)	Yes.
85	June 16	Quorum call	Absent.[3]
86	June 16	Quorum call	Present.
87	June 16	Quorum call	Present.
88	June 16	Quorum call	Present.
89	June 17	Quorum call	Present.
90	June 18	Quorum call	Present.
91	June 18	S. 1968, on accepting conference report on bill to strengthen wheat marketing quota and price support program. (Defeated 202 to 215)	Yes.
92	June 18	H.R. 7500, to amend Mutual Security Act, as amended. (Passed 271 to 142)	Yes.
93	June 19	Quorum call	Present.
94	June 19	H.R. 7749, to increase amount of obligation issued under 2d Liberty Bond Act, which may be outstanding at any one time. (Passed 255 to 177.)	Yes.
95	June 22	Quorum call	Present.
96	June 22	H. Res. 288, to adopt rule providing for consideration and 5 hours' debate on H.R. 3 to establish rules of interpretation governing questions of the effect of acts of Congress on State laws. (Passed 233 to 116.)	No.
97	June 22	Quorum call	Present.
98	June 23	Quorum call	Present.
99	June 23	S. 57, to adopt conference report on Housing Act of 1959. (Passed 241 to 177)	Yes.
100	June 24	Quorum call	Present.
101	June 24	H.R. 3, on motion to recommit bill to establish rules of interpretation governing questions of the effect of acts of Congress on State laws. (Defeated 191 to 227.)	Yes.
102	June 24	H.R. 3, to establish rules of interpretation governing questions of the effect of acts of Congress on State laws. (Passed 225 to 192)	No.
103	June 29	Quorum call	Present.
104	June 30	Quorum call	Present.
105	June 30	H. Res. 294, to adopt rule for consideration of H.R. 5752 relating to observance of legal holidays by Federal employees. (Passed 339 to 42)	Yes.
106	June 30	Quorum call	Present.
107	July 1	On motion to recommit S. 1120, respecting reserves required to be maintained by member banks of the Federal Reserve System. (Defeated 60 to 209.)	Yes.
108	July 7	H. Res. 295, to disapprove Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1959. (Passed 266 to 124)	Yes.
109	July 7	H.R. 4957, to recommit bill to amend United States Code to provide for admission of certain evidence and confessions. (Defeated 138 to 261)	No.
110	July 7	H.R. 4957, to amend United States Code to provide for admission of certain evidence and confessions. (Passed 262 to 138)	Yes.
111	July 20	Quorum call	Present.
112	July 21	Quorum call	Absent.[4]
113	July 22	On motion to adopt conference report on H.R. 7500 to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954 as amended. (Passed 257 to 153)	Yes.
114	July 23	Quorum call	Present.
115	July 23	H.R. 3460, on motion to order previous question on H. Res. 326, a resolution to agree to Senate amendments on H.R. 3460, the TVA financing bill. (Passed 244 to 166.)	No.
116	July 27	Quorum call	Present.
117	July 27	H.R. 7072, to provide for the participation of the United States in Inter-American Development Bank. (Passed 230 to 87)	Yes.
118	July 28	Quorum call	Present.
119	July 29	H.R. 8385, mutual security and related agencies appropriations bill. (Passed 279 to 136)	Yes.
120	July 30	Quorum call	Present.
121	July 31	Quorum call	Present.
122	Aug. 3	Quorum call	Present.
123	Aug. 5	H.R. 7740, to suspend rules and pass bill to amend Agriculture Adjustment Act of 1938 with respect to preservation of acreage and reallocation of unusual cotton acreage allotments. (Passed 308 to 90.)	No.
124	Aug. 10	Quorum call	Present.
125	Aug. 10	Quorum call	Present.
126	Aug. 10	Quorum call	Present.
127	Aug. 11	Quorum call	Present.
128	Aug. 12	Quorum call	Present.
129	Aug. 13	Quorum call	Present.
130	Aug. 13	H.R. 8442, to adopt Landrum-Griffin amendment (H.R. 8400) to replace language of labor-reform committee bill. (Passed 229 to 201)	No.
131	Aug. 14	H.R. 8342, on motion to recommit labor-management and disclosure bill (Griffin-Landrum text). (Defeated 149 to 279)	Yes.
132	Aug. 14	H.R. 8342, on final passage: Labor-management and disclosure bill (Griffin-Landrum text). (Passed 303 to 125)	Present.
133	Aug. 14	H.R. 7040, on motion to disagree with Senate amendment No. 1 which would increase from $10,000,000 to $25,000,000 the Federal contribution to civil defense. (Passed 240 to 166.)	No.
134	Aug. 17	H.R. 6904, to establish an Advisory Committee on Intergovernmental Relations. (Passed 335 to 31)	Yes.
135	Aug. 17	H. Con. Res. 269, expressing sense of Congress against seating of Communist regime in China as representative of China in United Nations. (Passed 368 to 2.)	Yes.
136	Aug. 18	Quorum call	Present.
137	Aug. 18	Quorum call	Present.
138	Aug. 19	Quorum call	Present.
139	Aug. 19	Quorum call	Present.
140	Aug. 19	Quorum call	Present.
141	Aug. 20	H.R. 8609, to adopt the request for separate vote on Sullivan amendment authorizing institution of food stamp plan for distribution for surplus commodities. (Passed 232 to 127.)	Yes.
142	Aug. 20	H.R. 8609, to amend Agriculture Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954. (Passed 305 to 53)	Yes.
143	Aug. 24	Quorum call	Present.
144	Aug. 26	H.R. 1341, on motion to recommit bill to require passenger-carrying motor vehicles purchased by the Federal Government agencies to meet certain safety standards. (Defeated 125 to 265.)	No.
145	Aug. 26	H.R. 5421, to provide program of assistance to correct inequities in the construction of fishing vessels. (Passed 272 to 108)	Yes.
146	Aug. 27	Quorum call	Absent.[3]
147	Aug. 27	S. 2539, on recommittal motion designed to delete provision of $50,000,000 loan fund for construction of classrooms and to spread the $550,000,000 urban renewal funds over 2 years in lieu of 1 year. (Defeated 186 to 231.)	No.
148	Aug. 27	S. 2539, to extend and amend laws relating to provision and improvement of housing and renewal of urban communities. (Passed 283 to 105.)	Yes.
149	Aug. 29	Quorum call	Present.
150	Aug. 29	H.R. 2247, on engrossment and 3d reading of bill to authorize the conveyance of certain real property to Sacramento County, Calif. (Passed 203 to 94.)	Not voting.[5]
151	Sept. 1	S. 2162, on approving Government employees health insurance bill. (Passed 382 to 4)	Yes.
152	Sept. 1	H.R. 7889, to require rice marketing quota for rice when the total supply exceeds the normal supply. (Passed 330 to 52)	Yes.
153	Sept. 1	H.R. 3151, to suspend rules and pass bill relating to withholding for purposes of income tax imposed by certain cities on the compensation of Federal employees. (Defeated 251 to 133; ⅔ required for suspension passage.)	Yes.
154	Sept. 2	Quorum call	Present.
155	Sept. 2	H.R. 7509, to override President's veto of public works appropriation bill. (Defeated 274 to 13; ⅔ required)	Yes.
156	Sept. 2	H.R. 4279, to authorize Secretary of the Interior to construct, rehabilitate, operate, and maintain the lower Rio Grande rehabilitation project, Texas La Feria division. (Passed 281 to 114.)	Yes.
157	Sept. 2	Quorum call	Present.
158	Sept. 2	S. 2524, to prevent under certain conditions States or political subdivisions from imposing on a person a net income tax on income from interstate commerce. (Passed 359 to 31.)	Yes.
159	Sept. 3	Quorum call	Present.
160	Sept. 3	H.R. 8678, Federal Aid to Highway Act of 1959. (Passed 243 to 162)	Yes.
161	Sept. 4	Quorum call	Present.
162	Sept. 4	S. 1555, to adopt conference report on Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959. (Passed 352 to 52)	Yes.
163	Sept. 4	Quorum call	Present.
164	Sept. 4	H.R. 9035, to recommit bill to permit issuance of series E and H U.S. savings bonds at interest rates above existing maximum and to permit Treasury Secretary to designate certain exchanges of Government securities to be made without recognition of gain or loss. (Defeated 133 to 256.)	No.
165	Sept. 4	H.R. 9035, to permit issuance of series E and H U.S. savings bonds at interest rates above existing maximum and to permit Treasury Secretary to designate certain exchanges of Government securities to be made without recognition of gain or loss. (Passed 378 to 7.)	Yes.

See footnotes at end of table.

1ST SESS., 86TH CONG.—Continued

Voting and attendance record of Representative JOHN R. FOLEY, 6th District, Maryland—Continued

Roll-call No.	Date, 1959	Measure, question, and result	Vote
166	Sept. 5	Quorum call	Present.
167	Sept. 5	Quorum call	Present.
168	Sept. 5	Quorum call	Present.
169	Sept. 8	H.J. Res. 352, to suspend rules and pass bill to authorize study and review in connection with proposed additional building for Library of Congress. (Passed 323 to 46.)	Yes.
170	Sept. 8	H.R. 9105, fiscal 1960 appropriations for public works. (Passed 303 to 93)	Yes.
171	Sept. 8	H.R. 9069, to provide standards for issuance of passports. (Passed 371 to 18)	Yes.
172	Sept. 9	S. 2208, to provide for equal treatment for States of Alaska and Hawaii under Federal Airport Act. (Passed 309 to 75)	Yes.
173	Sept. 10	Quorum call	Present.
174	Sept. 10	To override President's veto of public works appropriations bill. (Passed 280 to 121)	Yes.
175	Sept. 15	H.R. 8385, to adopt conference report on mutual security bill. (Passed 194 to 109)	Yes.
176	Sept. 15	On Senate amendment to extend the Civil Rights Commission for 2 years. (Passed 221 to 81)	Yes.

[1] Conference at Annapolis, Md., with State's senators and delegates from the 6th District to discuss Corps of Engineer's development proposals for the North Branch of the Potomac; also conference with Montgomery and Prince Georges senators and delegates on transportation compact, which was introduced as H.J. Res. 402, passed Congress, approved by President Sept. 15, 1960.

[2] Luncheon speaking engagement before Bethesda Civitan Club. Recorded in the RECORD that if in attendance would have voted "aye."

[3] In attendance at Presidential dedication of International 4-H Center in Montgomery County.

[4] Radio report over WGAY on current Federal employee legislative matters.

[5] On official leave to attend Interparliamentary Union; if present would have voted "no."

[6] If present would have voted "no."

Mr. Speaker, in the 2d session of the 86th Congress, there were 93 rollcall votes. Of these, my vote is recorded in 91 of the instances. The voting percentage is 97.84 percent. Of the 113 quorum calls, I answered 109 for an attendance record of 96.4 percent. The four instances not in attendance and two of nonvoting are explained in the footnotes.

Total voting and attendance percentage combined for both sessions of the Congress is 96.85 percent.

2D SESS., 86TH CONG.

Voting record, Representative JOHN R. FOLEY, 6th District, Maryland

Number	Date, 1960	Measure, question, and result	Vote
1	Jan. 6	Call of the House	Present.
2	Feb. 2	H.R. 1217, amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of amorphous graphite, amended. (Passed 278 to 116)	Yes.
3	Feb. 2	H. Con. Res. 459, expressing sense of Congress that any variation in traditional interpretation of treaties between United States and the Republic of Panama shall be made only pursuant to treaty, amended. (Passed 380 to 121.)	Yes.
4	Feb. 2	H. Con. Res. 465, expressing the indignation of Congress at the recent desecrations of house of worship and other sacred sites, without amendment. (Passed 392 to 0.)	Yes.
5	Feb. 17	H.R. 3151, relating to withholding for purposes of income tax imposed by certain cities on the compensation of Federal employees. (Passed 221 to 160.)	Yes.
6	Feb. 25	H.R. 3610, override the President's veto of bill to increase grants for construction of sewage treatment works. (Defeated 249 to 157.) (⅔ required.)	Yes.
		H.R. 10743:	
7	Feb. 29	On Yates amendment to bill to restore $50,000,000 for slum clearance and urban renewal. (Defeated 158 to 187)	Yes.
8	Mar. 1	Quorum call	Present.
9	Mar. 7	Quorum call	Present.
10	Mar. 7	Quorum call	Present.
		H. Res. 467:	
11	Mar. 7	On motion to take up for consideration H.R. 10777 to authorize certain construction at military installations. (Passed 309 to 1)	Yes.
12	Mar. 8	Quorum call	Present.
		H. Res. 468:	
13	Mar. 8	On previous question to adopt closed rule to provide for 3 hours of debate on H.R. 5, foreign investment tax bill. (Passed, 236 to 127)	Yes.
14	Mar. 8	Quorum call	Present.
15	Mar. 8	Quorum call	Present.
16	Mar. 9	Quorum call	Present.
17	Mar. 9	H.R. 10809, fiscal 1961 authorization bill for the NASA. (Passed 398 to 10)	Yes.
18	Mar. 9	H.R. 10777, authorize certain construction at military installations. (Passed 407 to 4)	Yes.
19	Mar. 10	Quorum call	Present.
20	Mar. 10	H. Res. 359, open rule to provide for consideration of and 15 hours of debate on H.R. 8601 to enforce constitutional rights. (Passed 312 to 93)	Yes.
21	Mar. 11	Quorum call	Present.
22	Mar. 11	Quorum call	Present.
23	Mar. 14	Quorum call	Present.
24	Mar. 15	Quorum call	Present.
25	Mar. 16	Quorum call	Present.
26	Mar. 17	Quorum call	Present.
27	Mar. 18	Quorum call	Present.
28	Mar. 21	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 7279:	
29	Mar. 21	On motion to suspend rules and pass bill to authorize establishment of Hubbell Training Post National Historic Site in State of Arizona. (Defeated 171 to 208.)	Yes.
30	Mar. 22	Quorum call	Present.
31	Mar. 23	Quorum call	Present.
32	Mar. 23	H.R. 8601, amendment to civil rights bill providing for U.S. voting referees. (Passed 295 to 124)	Yes.
33	Mar. 24	Quorum call	Present.
34	Mar. 24	H.R. 8601, motion to recommit civil rights bill to committee in order to omit threatening communications from penalties dealing with obstruction of court orders. (Defeated 118 to 304.)	No.
		H.R. 8601:	
35	Mar. 24	On final passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1959. (Passed 311 to 109)	Yes.
36	Mar. 28	Quorum call	Present.
37	Mar. 29	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 11390:	
38	Mar. 29	On final passage of appropriation bill ($4,100,000,000) for Departments of Labor, and of Health, Education, and Welfare. (Passed 362 to 10)	Yes.
39	Mar. 30	Quorum call	Present.
40	Apr. 4	Quorum call	Present.
41	Apr. 6	Quorum call	Present.
42	Apr. 7	Quorum call	Present.
43	Apr. 12	Quorum call	Present.
44	Apr. 13	H.R. 11666, appropriations bill for Departments of State, Justice, Judiciary and related agencies. (Passed 312 to 31)	Yes.
45	Apr. 19	Quorum call	Present.
46	Apr. 19	Quorum call	Present.
47	Apr. 20	Quorum call	Present.
48	Apr. 20	H.R. 11776: On amendment to increase by $35,000,000 the funds provided for independent offices appropriation. (Passed 218 to 155)	Yes.
49	Apr. 20	Quorum call	Present.
50	Apr. 20	Quorum call	Present.
51	Apr. 20	Quorum call	Absent.[1]
52	Apr. 21	Quorum call	Present.
53	Apr. 21	H.R. 8601: On final approval of conference report on civil rights bill. (Passed 288 to 95)	Yes.
54	Apr. 21	H.R. 11510, amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954 as amended. (Passed 243 to 130)	Yes.

[1] En route to Zonta Club charity event, Hagerstown, Md.

2D SESS., 86TH CONG.—Continued

Voting record, Representative JOHN R. FOLEY, 6th District, Maryland—Continued

Number	Date, 1960	Measure, question, and result	Vote
55	Apr. 27	Quorum call	Present.
56	Apr. 27	H. Res. 498, adopt the open rule providing for 3 hours of debate on H.R. 10213 authorizing purchase by Treasury of $1,000,000,000 of FHA and VA mortgages.	Yes.
57	Apr. 27	Quorum call	Present.
58	Apr. 28	Quorum call	Present.
59	Apr. 28	H.R. 10213: On recommittal motion designed to include Bentley amendment to prevent discrimination account race, religion, or color. (Defeated 139 to 235.)	No.
60	Apr. 28	H.R. 10213: On final passage of bill to amend National Housing Act. (Passed 214 to 163)	Yes.
61	May 2	Quorum call	Present.
62	May 2	H.R. 10596, change method of Federal aid to State or territorial homes for the support of disabled soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines of United States. (Passed 265 to 0.)	Not voting.[1]
63	May 2	H. Con. Res. 633, relating to restoration of freedom to captive nations. (Passed 276 to 0)	Not voting.[1]
64	May 3	Quorum call	Present.
65	May 3	Quorum call	Present.
66	May 4	Quorum call	Present.
67	May 4	Area redevelopment: On motion to table motion that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with. (Defeated 167 to 221)	No.
68	May 4	Area redevelopment: On motion ordering the previous question that further proceedings be dispensed with. (Passed 223 to 164)	Yes.
69	May 4	Area redevelopment: On motion to dispense with further proceedings under the call. (Passed 222 to 159)	Yes.
70	May 4	Quorum call	Present.
71	May 4	Area redevelopment: On motion to lay on the table the motion to order the previous question. (Defeated 152 to 230)	No.
72	May 4	Area redevelopment: On ordering the previous question on motion to dispense with further proceedings under the call. (Passed 235 to 153)	Yes.
73	May 4	Area redevelopment: On motion to dispense with further proceedings under the call. (Passed 236 to 151)	Yes.
74	May 4	Quorum call	Present.
75	May 4	Area redevelopment: On previous question on motion that further proceedings be dispensed with. (Passed 237 to 148)	Yes.
76	May 4	Area redevelopment: On motion to dispense with further proceedings under the call. (Passed 237 to 150)	Yes.
77	May 4	S. 722, area redevelopment: On motion to consider the bill. (Passed 220 to 171)	Yes.
78	May 4	On motion to recommit to committee. (Defeated 162 to 223)	No.
79	May 4	S. 722, area redevelopment: To pass bill. (Passed 201 to 184)	Yes.
80	May 5	Quorum call	Present.
81	May 5	H.R. 11998, Defense Department appropriations bill. (Passed 377 to 8)	Yes.
82	May 6	Quorum call	Present.
83	May 6	H.R. 11713: On recommittal motion designed to add $104,000,000 for construction of linear electron accelerator at Stanford. (Defeated 194 to 129)	No.
84	May 6	H.R. 11713, to authorize appropriations for AEC. (Passed 321 to 2)	Yes.
85	May 10	Quorum call	Present.
86	May 11	Quorum call	Present.
87	May 12	Quorum call	Present.
88	May 12	H.R. 11510, adopt conference report on to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1954 as amended. (Passed 240 to 138)	Yes.
89	May 12	Quorum call	Present.
90	May 12	S. 1358, authorize Department of the Interior to provide headquarters site for Mount Rainer National Park. (Passed 260 to 83)	Yes.
91	May 16	Quorum call	Present.
92	May 17	Quorum call	Present.
93	May 17	Quorum call	Present.
94	May 18	Quorum call	Present.
95	May 18	S. 44: On Ullman amendment to bill authorizing construction of San Luis unit of Central Valley project providing exemption from 160-acre limitation. (Passed 214 to 181.)	Yes.
96	May 18	H.R. 5: On motion to strike enacting clause of Foreign Investment Incentive Tax Act of 1960. (Defeated 160 to 232)	No.
97	May 18	H.R. 5, Foreign Investment Incentive Tax Act of 1960. (Passed 195 to 192)	Yes.
98	May 19	Quorum call	Present.
99	May 19	H. Res. 488, open rule providing for consideration of H.R. 2331 to establish Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park. (Defeated 134 to 227.)	Yes.
100	May 24	Quorum call	Present.
101	May 25	H.R. 12326: On recommittal motion designed to prevent the use of any funds for construction of Allegheny River Reservoir. (Defeated 110 to 294)	No.
102	May 25	H.R. 12326, public works appropriation bill. (Passed 387 to 18)	Yes.
103	May 25	H. Res. 536, rules providing for consideration of and 4 hours of debate on H.R. 10128, school construction bill. (Passed 307 to 97)	Yes.
104	May 26	Quorum call	Present.
105	May 26	H.R. 10128, school construction bill: On Powell amendment to require that school facilities constructed with Federal assistance shall be available to all students in accordance with the 1954 decision of the Supreme Court. (Passed 218 to 181.)	Yes.
106	May 26	H.R. 10128: On Bow amendment to return to States for construction of school facilities 25 percent of the taxes collected on every pack of cigarettes sold in each State. (Defeated 181 to 219.)	No.
107	May 26	H.R. 10128, school construction bill, adopt committee amendment as amended. (Passed 223 to 117)	Yes.
108	May 26	H.R. 10128, school construction bill, authorize Federal assistance to the States to be used for construction of school facilities. On motion to recommit to committee to substitute provisions of H.R. 12259, the administration bill. (Defeated 80 to 319.)	No.
109	May 26	H.R. 10128, authorize Federal assistance to the States to be used for constructing school facilities. (Passed 206 to 180)	Yes.
110	June 1	Quorum call	Present.
111	June 1	Quorum call	Present.
112	June 1	Quorum call	Present.
113	June 1	S. 1892: On committee amendment relating to interest rates applicable to proposed projects in the Colorado River storage project. (Passed 228 to 123.)	Yes.
114	June 2	Quorum call	Present.
115	June 2	Quorum call	Present.
116	June 2	Quorum call	Present.
117	June 3	Quorum call	Absent.[2]
118	June 3	Quorum call	Absent.[2]
119	June 3	Quorum call	Present.
120	June 3	On motion to adjourn. (Defeated 77 to 194)	No.
121	June 3	Quorum call	Present.
122	June 6	Quorum call	Present.
123	June 8	Quorum call	Present.
124	June 8	H. Res. 590: On closed rule waiving points of order and providing for 2 hours of debate on H.R. 12381 to extend for 1 year existing corporate normal tax rate and certain excise tax rates. (Passed 204 to 181.)	No.

[1] As a member of the House District of Columbia Committee, inspected by helicopter the Washington and Baltimore metropolitan areas with the President of the District of Columbia Commissioners and the Governor of Tokyo, Japan. If in attendance, would have voted "aye" in both instances.

[2] In attendance at special luncheon for the Far Eastern Foreign Ministers at the National Press Club.

2D SESS., 86TH CONG.—Continued

Voting record, Representative JOHN R. FOLEY, 6th District, Maryland—Continued

Number	Date, 1960	Measure, question, and result	Vote
125	June 8	H.R. 12381, increase for 1 year period the public debt limit set forth in sec. 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act and to extend for 1 year the existing corporate normal tax rate and certain excise tax rates. (Passed 223 to 174.)	Yes.
126	June 8	Quorum call	Present.
127	June 9	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 12949:	
128	June 9	On recommittal motion designed to retain the 1958 provisions regarding property rights in inventions. (Defeated 120 to 269)	No.
129	June 14	Quorum call	Present.
130	June 14	Quorum call	Present.
131	June 14	Quorum call	Present.
132	June 15	Quorum call	Present.
133	June 15	H.R. 9883, recommit the Federal employee's pay raise bill to committee to provide for a 5-percent increase. (Defeated 94 to 324)	No.
134	June 15	H.R. 9883, pass Federal employee's pay raise bill providing for 7½-percent increase. (Passed 378 to 40)	Yes.
135	June 16	Quorum call	Present.
136	June 17	Quorum call	Absent.[4]
137	June 17	H.R. 12619, increase the mutual security appropriation by $200,000,000. (Passed 212 to 173)	Yes.
138	June 17	H.R. 12619: On final passage of mutual security appropriations bill. (Passed 258 to 124)	Yes.
139	June 21	Quorum call	Present.
140	June 22	Quorum call	Present.
141	June 22	Quorum call	Present.
142	June 23	Quorum call	Present.
143	June 23	H.R. 12580: On final passage of the Social Security Amendments of 1960. (Passed 381 to 23)	Yes.
144	June 23	H.R. 12261: On motion to recommit in order to substitute the Wheat Act of 1960, approved by Senate. (Defeated 195 to 211)	No.
145	June 23	H.R. 12261: On final passage of the Farm Surplus Reduction Act of 1960. (Defeated 170 to 236)	Yes.
146	June 23	Quorum call	Present.
147	June 23	H.R. 10569, disagree with Senate amendment extending to city delivery the present congressional franking privilege for boxholder mail on rural routes. (Passed 235 to 164.)	Yes.
148	June 23	H.R. 12740, recommit bill to committee for purpose of eliminating $5,000,000 for Capitol Grounds expansion. (Defeated 149 to 252)	No.
149	June 24	Quorum call	Present.
150	June 24	Quorum call	Present.
151	June 24	S. 1508, make the Government-owned intrastate Alaska Railroad subject to regulation by ICC. (Passed 267 to 101)	Yes.
152	June 24	H.J. Res. 649 (S.J. Res. 41): On final passage of the International Health and Medical Research Act of 1960. (Passed 259 to 114)	Yes.
153	June 24	Quorum call	Present.
154	June 25	Quorum call	Present.
155	June 25	Quorum call	Present.
156	June 27	H.R. 8860 (with committee amendment), stabilize the mining of lead and zinc by small domestic producers on public, Indian, and other lands. (Passed 197 to 192.)	Yes.
157	June 27	H.R. 8697, amend the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945 with respect to the requirements for adoption of a redevelopment plan for a project area. (Passed 348 to 35.)	Yes.
158	June 28	Quorum call	Present.
159	June 28	Quorum call	Present.
160	June 28	Quorum call	Present.
161	June 28	Quorum call	Present.
162	June 29	H.R. 11001, provide for the participation of the United States in International Development Association without amendment. (Passed 249 to 158.)	Yes.
163	June 29	H.R. 7903 amend United States Code to extend the veterans' guaranteed and direct loan program for 2 years. (Passed 391 to 1)	Yes.
164	June 30	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 11998:	
165	June 30	On conference report making appropriations for Department of Defense for fiscal year 1961. (Passed 402 to 5)	Yes.
166	June 30	Quorum call	Present.
167	June 30	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 1267:	
168	June 30	On Kitchin amendment to replace text of bill with language of H.R. 12853 (to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 as amended). (Passed 211 to 203.)	No.
169	June 30	H.R. 12677, amend Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 as amended to provide coverage for employees of interstate retail enterprises and to increase minimum wages under act to $1.15. (Passed 341 to 72.)	Yes.
170	June 30	H.R. 12311, extend for 1 year the Sugar Act of 1948 as amended. (Passed 390 to 0)	Yes.
		H.R. 9883 (adjust rates of basic compensation of certain Federal employees):	
171	July 1	On motion to override President's veto. (Passed 345 to 69)	Yes.
172	July 1	Quorum call	Present.
173	July 1	Quorum call	Present.
174	July 1	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 8665:	
175	July 1	On motion to recommit to committee bill to establish a memorial to Theodore Roosevelt in the National Capital. (Defeated 50 to 308)	No.
176	July 2	Quorum call	Present.
177	July 2	H. Res. 596, providing for House consideration of Senate amendments to H.R. 12740, supplemental appropriation bills for 1961. (Passed 291 to 79.)	Yes.
		H. Res. 596:	
178	July 2	On agreeing to the resolution providing for consideration of Senate amendment to H.R. 12740, supplemental appropriation bill. (Passed 257 to 109.)	Yes.
179	July 2	H.R. 2467, adopt committee amendment that supplied new text of bill to authorize reimbursement of owners and tenants of land acquired by Federal Aviation Agency for Chantilly relocation. (Passed 182 to 166.)	Yes.
180	July 2	H.R. 2467, authorize the reimbursement of owners and tenants of land acquired by Federal Aviation Agency for their moving expense in Chantilly relocation. (Passed 182 to 167.)	Yes.
181	Aug. 15	Quorum call	Present.
182	Aug. 17	Quorum call	Present.
183	Aug. 22	Quorum call	Present.
184	Aug. 22	H.R. 12753, amend the Subversive Activities Control Act relative to registration of foreign agents' disseminating political propaganda in United States. (Passed 395 to 3.)	Yes.
185	Aug. 22	H.R. 5383, clarify status of faculty and administrative staff at U.S. Merchant Marine Academy. (Passed 291 to 90)	Yes.
		H.R. 9866:	
186	Aug. 22	On motion to suspend rules and pass bill to establish Federal agriculture service to Guam. (Deferred 202 to 151.) (⅔ needed)	Yes.
187	Aug. 23	Quorum call	Present.
188	Aug. 23	H. Res. 607, contempt citation S. Sloan Colt. (Passed 270 to 124)	Yes.
189	Aug. 23	H. Res. 611, citing Consuelo Burgos De Saez Pagan for contempt of Congress. (Passed 382 to 0)	Yes.
190	Aug. 24	Quorum call	Present.
		H. Res. 587:	
191	Aug. 24	On rule to consider legislation favoring a convention of delegates from Atlantic democracies looking to greater cooperation and unity of purpose. (Passed 349 to 49.)	Yes.
192	Aug. 24	S.J. Res. 170, favoring a convention of delegates from Atlantic democracies looking to greater cooperation and unity of purpose. (Passed 288 to 103.)	Yes.
193	Aug. 25	Quorum call	Present.
194	Aug. 25	Quorum call	Present.
195	Aug. 26	Quorum call	Present.
196	Aug. 26	Quorum call	Present.
197	Aug. 26	H.R. 12580, adopt conference report on Social Security Act amendments, aged, medical care. (Passed 368 to 17)	Yes.
198	Aug. 31	Quorum call	Present.
199	Aug. 31	H.R. 13161, amendment to provide an additional $65,000,000 for defense support under mutual security program. (Passed 203 to 193)	Yes.
200	Aug. 31	H.R. 13161, amendment to provide an additional $26,000,000 of special assistance funds for mutual security program. (Defeated 176 to 216)	Yes.
201	Aug. 31	Quorum call	Present.
202	Aug. 31	Quorum call	Present.
203	Aug. 31	Quorum call	Present.
204	Aug. 31	Quorum call	Present.
205	Sept. 1	Quorum call	Present.
206	Sept. 1	Quorum call	Present.

[4] Gave principal address at the annual Maryland Convention of the Fraternal Order of Eagles at Hagerstown, Md.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce—Summary of Major Legislative Activity, 2d Session, 86th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OREN HARRIS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to section 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, and House Resolution 56, as amended, 86th Congress, I should like to submit a summary of the major legislative accomplishments of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for the 2d session of the 86th Congress.

During the second session, 237 House bills and resolutions were referred to the committee. Total referrals for the Congress were 783 House bills and resolutions, and 42 Senate bills and resolutions. This year, 21 were enacted into public law; 2 were vetoed; 7 were approved by the House but not acted upon in the Senate, and 8 remained on the House Calendar upon the sine die adjournment of the 86th Congress.

As a result of the extensive investigation of the Special Subcommittee on Legislative Oversight into certain practices in the broadcasting industry, a bill which passed the Senate, S. 1898, limited to a revision of section 309 of the Communications Act, was substantially amended in committee to carry out several recommendations of the Legislative Oversight Subcommittee. The principal House amendments would provide the following:

Section 2 would repeal that portion of section 4(b) of the Communications Act which permits Commissioners to accept reasonable honorariums or compensation for the presentation or delivery of papers.

Section 3 would amend section 307 of the Communications Act to make clear that the Commission can and on appropriate occasion should issue broadcast station licenses for terms shorter than three years.

Section 5 would amend section 311 of the act to require applicants for most instruments of authorization in the broadcasting service to give notice of the filing of their applications, and if any such application is designated for hearing, to give notice of suc hearing. The amendment would also authorize the Commission to hold hearings at a place in, or in the vicinity of, the principal area to be served by the station involved.

This section also deals with the problem of "payoffs" or compromise of applications. The amendment would make it unlawful, without approval of the Commission in any case where two or more applications for a construction permit for a broadcasting station are pending and only one application can be granted, for the applicants to effectuate an agreement whereby one or more such applicants withdraws his or their application or applications. The Commission may approve such agreement only if it determines that it is consistent with the public interest, convenience, or necessity.

Section 6 of the amended bill authorized the Commission to suspend station licenses for a period not in excess of 10 days. This amendment was later rejected by the Senate.

Section 7 authorized the Commission to impose forfeitures on broadcast stations of not to exceed $1,000 per day of certain violations. The Senate further amended this provision by providing that in no event shall the forfeiture exceed $10,000.

Section 8 requires announcements to be made with respect to certain matter which is broadcast. This amendment would also require the disclosure of certain payments made to persons other than station licensees for broadcast matter.

Section 9 of S. 1898, as amended, would prohibit certain practices in cases of contests of intellectual knowledge or skill. It is intended to curb the broadcast of deceptive contests or fixed quiz shows.

The amended bill was approved by the House and returned to the Senate for concurrence. The Senate then approved two additional amendments, the first of which was designed to eliminate completely the power to suspend licenses and to place a ceiling of $10,000 on any forfeiture imposed.

The second Senate amendment provides that the Notice of Apparent Liability, which the Commission is required to send to the licensee, shall set forth the date, facts, and nature of the act or omission with which the licensee is charged and shall specifically identify the particular provisions of law, rule, or regulation, or the particular provision of the license or cease-and-desist order involved so that the licensee is advised with respect to the violation with which he is charged.

The Senate amendment substitutes the words "willfully or repeatedly" for the words "negligently or intentionally" contained in the bill as passed by the House.

The House agreed to the further Senate amendments and the bill was approved by the President—Public Law 86-752. More detailed information on the amendments will be found in the committee report—House Report No. 1800, filed June 13, 1960.

Extensive hearings by the Special Subcommittee on Legislative Oversight of this committee over a period of some 2½ years also resulted in legislative recommendations contained in H.R. 12731, a bill to strengthen the independence and effectiveness of six of the Government's regulatory agencies which administer laws that are within the legislative jurisdiction of this committee—Civil Aeronautics Board, Federal Communications Commission, Federal Power Commission, Federal Trade Commission, Interstate Commerce Commission, and Securities and Exchange Commission.

The major provisions: First, prescribe congressional policies on the basis of which the agencies are directed to issue regulations to prevent the exercise of improper influence upon and improper conduct by members and employees of such agencies; second, require the establishment of proper procedures by such agencies for considering and acting on complaints with regard to such improper influence and improper conduct; third, protect the integrity of on-the-record proceedings through the imposition of criminal penalties for improper ex parte communications made in connection with such proceedings; fourth, strengthen existing requirements with respect to intra-agency separation of functions for the purpose of protecting the integrity of the decision-making processes in on-the-record proceedings; and, fifth, provide that agency members may be removed for neglect of duty or malfeasance in office, but for no other cause.

The bill was reported to the House on July 1 of this year—House Report No. 2070—but time for full discussion of the issues connected with this highly controversial and complex problem was not available in the remaining days of the session. A complete explanation of the bill is contained in the committee report.

A bill designed to accelerate the establishment of additional educational television stations by assisting the States through Federal matching grants in the construction of facilities was reported to the House—House Report No. 1466, filed April 7, 1960.

This committee held extensive hearings on several bills dealing with this subject in Washington, D.C., Birmingham, Ala., San Francisco, Calif., Denver, Colo., Tampa and Miami, Fla., Atlanta, Ga., Topeka, Kans., New Orleans, La., Raleigh, N.C., and Seattle, Wash.

The bill reported from the committee—H.R. 10609—failed to receive the approval of the House Rules Committee and was, therefore, not brought to the House floor for a vote.

Two other measures to amend the Communications Act were reported from the committee. One would grant the Federal Communications Commission discretion in waiving the operation requirement with respect to television booster stations—S. 1886, Public Law 86-609.

The other, S. 1740, was introduced at the request of the Federal Communications Commission and would serve to remove any questions concerning the Commission's regulatory authority over charges and services furnished by common carriers insofar as radio facilities are concerned. The committee and House approved a clarifying amendment—agreed to by the Federal Communications Commission—to more clearly carry out the legislative intent. The Senate concurred in the House amendment—Public Law 86-751.

A legislative proposal to provide for the comprehensive power resources of the United States was incorporated in H.R. 7201. Public hearings were held on this and similar bills by the Subcommittee on Communications and Power. Subsequently, the full committee reported the bill with two amendments—House Report No. 1414, filed March 23, 1960. The House took no final action on the measure prior to the adjournment of the Congress.

Early in the first session of the present Congress the administration proposed

amendments to the War Claims Act of 1948 to provide compensation to American war damage claimants in areas in Europe and Asia not heretofore covered—H.R. 2485. Categories of war claims authorized by this legislation would be paid out of proceeds resulting from the sale of German and Japanese assets located in the United States which were taken over—vested—by the Alien Property Custodian.

The Subcommittee on Commerce and Finance conducted extensive public hearings on this subject. Committee amendments were adopted to change the definition of "national of the United States" with respect to corporations; to authorize two additional categories of property damage claims; and to add to the claims of insurers of ships where the ships were indirectly owned by nationals of the United States. Other committee amendments explained in detail in House Report No. 1279, filed February 18, 1960, deal with stockholder claims, tax credits of corporate claimants, and internal organization of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission. The amended bill also provides that claims arising out of Japanese action will be paid out of the war claims fund rather than out of an appropriation, as provided in the introduced bill.

The House approved the legislation and the bill was further amended by the Senate Judiciary Committee. It was reported to the Senate in the closing days of the session and remained on the Senate Calendar at the adjournment of the Congress.

The committee also approved a bill to amend section 5 of the War Claims Act to provide benefits to certain Guamanians killed or captured by the Japanese at Wake Island—H.R. 6392, House Report No. 1299. It passed the House without amendment but was not acted upon by the Senate.

H.R. 404, a bill to amend section 9(a) of the Trading With the Enemy Act to authorize the sale of certain vested property—General Aniline & Film Corp.—was ordered reported to the House in the closing days of the second session. However, the Congress adjourned before the report could be filed.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare proposed legislation to establish safe tolerances for the use of color additives in foods, drugs, and cosmetics—H.R. 7624. Extensive hearings were held by the committee on this legislation and testimony was also heard from a group of scientific experts selected by the President of the National Academy of Sciences which discussed the scientific problems involved.

Seven principal committee amendments dealt with agricultural chemicals affecting color; color additives exempted under food additives amendments; analytical method for color additives; Ad Hoc Scientific Advisory Committee on Carcinogenicity of Additive; color additive deemed to be safe under the proviso in section 706(b)(4) need not be certified; time schedule governing action on a petition; and review of regulation by Secretary terminating or placing a tolerance limitation on a provisional listing. A detailed explanation of the committee amendments is contained in House Report No. 1761, dated June 7, 1960. The Senate passed a companion bill—S. 2197—which was amended in the House incorporating the committee amendments. The Senate agreed to the House language and the bill was signed by the President—Public Law 86-618.

H.R. 7480, a bill to amend the Food and Drug Act with respect to labeling of pesticide chemicals on raw agricultural commodities, was approved by the House and Senate without amendment and was signed into public law—Public Law 86-537.

The need for legislation requiring better labeling of poisonous and hazardous materials that are brought into the home resulted in the approval of S. 1283, a bill to regulate the interstate distribution and sale of packages of hazardous substances intended or suitable for household use. The bill covers substances which are toxicants, corrosives, irritants, strong sensitizers, flammable, and also substances which generate pressure.

The labeling requirements will advise the user of these hazardous substances in the use of the product and make available immediate information for physicians who are called upon to treat cases of accidental injury. House amendments to S. 1283 were agreed to by the Senate and the bill became Public Law 86-613.

The subject of international health research received extensive consideration by the Subcommittee on Health and Safety. As a result, House Joint Resolution 649 was introduced, the principal purpose of which was to provide international cooperation in health research and research training. Senate Joint Resolution 41, a similar proposal of a much broader scope as approved by the Senate, was amended on the House floor, substituting the language of House Joint Resolution 649 with committee amendments—House Report No. 1915, June 17, 1960. The Senate resolution, as amended, was approved by the President—Public Law 86-610.

Another bill relating to public health, providing for a public health training program, was reported from the committee with an amendment in the form of a substitute—H.R. 6871. The amended bill authorizes a new 5-year program of project grants totaling not to exceed $2 million annually to schools of public health and to those schools of nursing and engineering which provide graduate or specialized training in public health; and extends without time limit the present authority of the Surgeon General to make grants-in-aid totaling not to exceed $1 million annually to schools of public health—House Report No. 1780, filed June 9, 1960. The bill passed both Houses of Congress and is now Public Law 86-720.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare also recommended legislation to amend the Public Health Training Act to give the Surgeon General authority to make grants for the general support of the research programs of institutions, as well as the grants now authorized to support specific projects proposed by individual applicants—H.R. 10341. The proposal was approved by the committee, passed the House and Senate, and has been signed by the President—Public Law 86-798.

H.R. 11545, relating to payments to Bernalillo County, N. Mex., for furnishing hospital care for certain Indians, after having passed both Houses was vetoed by the President.

S. 1508, providing for economic regulation of the Alaska Railroad under the Interstate Commerce Act, was also vetoed.

Another bill dealing with transportation in Alaska was reported from the committee. S. 1509 amends the Interstate Commerce Act to provide grandfather rights for certain motor carriers and freight forwarders operating in Alaska and Hawaii. Committee amendments to the bill are contained in House Report No. 1914, of June 17, 1960. The Senate agreed to the House amendments and the bill became Public Law 86-615.

The Federal Aviation Act of 1958 was amended to authorize free or reduced-rate transportation for certain additional persons. H.R. 4049 was considered and approved by this committee; passed both Houses of the Congress and signed by the President—Public Law 86-627.

The committee also approved legislation giving the Civil Aeronautics Board temporary authority to permit 25 supplemental air carriers to conduct limited operations for 1 year despite a ruling of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit. H.R. 7593, as amended, will give the Congress an opportunity to explore in more detail important policy problems raised by the court decision. The legislation was introduced at the request of the Civil Aeronautics Board. It received approval of the House, Senate, and Chief Executive—Public Law 86-661.

The Civil Aeronautics Board also recommended an amendment to the Federal Aviation Act to authorize elimination of a hearing in certain cases under section 408—S. 1545. The committee adopted a clarifying amendment to the Senate bill which was approved by the House and concurred in by the Senate. It is now Public Law 86-758.

H.R. 2467 authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to reimburse owners and tenants of lands acquired for Chantilly—Dulles International—Airport for their moving expenses. The committee amended the bill in the nature of a substitute which the House approved. The measure was not acted upon by the Senate.

Five legislative recommendations of the Securities and Exchange Commission received extensive consideration by the Subcommittee on Commerce and Finance. Hearings were conducted by the subcommittee during the months March to August, 1959. The bills reported from the committee are:

H.R. 2480, amendments to the Securities Exchange Act of 1934—a detailed explanation of the committee amendments is contained in House Report No. 2177, dated August 26, 1960.

H.R. 2481, amendments to the Investment Company Act of 1940—a detailed

explanation of the committee amendments is contained in House Report No. 2178, dated August 26, 1960. A companion bill (S. 3772) passed the House amended to include the text of amended H.R. 2481. The Senate did not take final action on the House amendments to S. 3772.

H.R. 2482, amendments to the Investment Advisers Act of 1940—a detailed explanation of the committee amendments is contained in House Report No. 2179 of August 26, 1960. A companion bill, S. 3773, passed the House and is now Public Law 86–750.

H.R. 5001, amendments to the Securities Act of 1933—a detailed explanation of the committee amendments is contained in House Report No. 2180 of August 26, 1960.

S. 3771, amendments to the Trust Indenture Act of 1939. The bill would extend the time within which certain applications for exemption from the act might be filed. It was reported from the committee without amendment and approved by the House. The President signed the bill and it is now Public Law 86–760.

H.R. 2480 and H.R. 5001 were not called up for consideration by the House prior to the adjournment of the second session.

The Subcommittee on Transportation and Aeronautics conducted some 3 weeks of public hearings on three identical bills relating to the competitive situation between D.C. Transit System, Inc., and other companies in the sightseeing and charter field. Subsequently, H.R. 4815 was reported to the House—House Report No. 1557, dated April 27, 1960. This bill provides that all assets and personnel of D.C. Transit System, Inc., used in providing mass transportation service shall be so used exclusively and shall not be used in any other service in competition with the service of any other company. This proposal was debated in the House on one occasion but was never brought to a final vote.

As a further indication of the Committee's continuing interest in traffic safety, a bill to establish a national register of revoked motor vehicle operator licenses was approved by the committee, both Houses of Congress, and the President—Public Law 86–660. This law provides for a register in the Department of Commerce which would include the names of those whose permits have been revoked for driving while intoxicated or conviction of a violation of a highway traffic code involving loss of life. State licensing authorities may call on the Department of Commerce for information regarding names on the list, thus enabling them to check the status of applicants before issuing driver licenses.

An amendment to the Accidents Reports Act was enacted—S. 1964, Public Law 86–762. This legislation is designed to improve the quality of accident reporting by railroads so that railroad accident statistics will be more nearly in line with accident statistics of other industries.

S. 1965—to make uniform provisions of law with respect to the terms of office of the members of certain regulatory agencies—was also considered by the committee and subsequently enacted—Public Law 86–619. The public law amends the Federal Power Act, the Communications Act, and the Securities Exchange Act to provide that members of the respective commissions shall continue to serve in office until their successors are appointed and have qualified.

During the course of enactment of S. 1965, two errors were made which required corrective legislation. H.R. 13066 and H.R. 13067 were introduced to clarify the public law. The first received Presidential approval and is Public Law 86–771. H.R. 13067 passed the House but was not reported from the Senate committee.

A more comprehensive activity report of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce was filed in the House, House Report No. 2225, and is available to those desiring more information on the work of the committee during the 86th Congress.

Henry N. Taylor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, like a good newspaper story, the life of Henry N. Taylor packed a lot of action in a small amount of space. As a Scripps-Howard correspondent and a representative of one of my hometown papers, the Cleveland Press, Harry Taylor's star soared. In the brief 6 years he was a member of the working press, this amazing young man's talents sent him with the Marines when they landed in Lebanon; to the Castro revolution in Cuba; across the United States on Khrushchev's tour; with President Eisenhower through Latin America and the Far East. He was returning from Moscow and the Powers' trial when he stopped to cover the African crisis. If there was a trouble spot in the world, you could count on Harry Taylor's being there.

Knowing Harry Taylor well, as I did, it is not difficult to imagine the sheer relish with which he approached the obscure Congolese village of Tchelenge where Prime Minister Lumumba's army was battling Baluba tribesmen. Harry could no more resist a news break than he could help writing colorfully and well or reporting the facts accurately. Nor was he a stranger to personal hazards: he had sent back dispatches from the heart of the riots which precluded President Eisenhower's visit to Japan. Now he shrugged off reports of dangers lurking in the turbulent Kasai province. If there was a story there, Harry Taylor meant to get it.

The last dispatch he filed was typical of the reporting which won him the Ernie Pyle Memorial Award last winter. In it he captured the tragic-comic aspects of a primitive revolt, ending it with the warning:

> Every indication is that as independence gets less and less comfortable for the people of the Congo, Lumumba will resort to ever more rash and preposterous diversions. This means more outcries against American and United Nations imperialism and ever widening opportunities for communism to rescue Congolese nations.

When the shocking news of Harry's death at the hands of an excited tribesman reached the White House, President Eisenhower said:

> As a foreign correspondent Mr. Taylor traveled throughout the world reporting the news developments of our times for the American people. He traveled with me on many of the visits I made to many countries. Killed in the line of duty, his name joins the honor roll of other American reporters who have given their lives to the cause of a free press and increased public knowledge of world affairs.

Harry Taylor would have modestly deprecated these remarks. He was, after all, a man with printer's ink in his blood, a born newsman, son of another distinguished foreign correspondent. Reporting was food and drink to him. It is hard to imagine death coming to this high spirited, very alive young man—he was only 31—at the beginning of a brilliant career. It is not hard to place him in the company of Ernie Pyle, who lost his life on Ie Shima, or Raymond Clapper, who died in the Marshall Islands, or Bill Newton, who was lost over India.

The loss to the newspaper world of a skillful craftsman is a personal loss to me. We spent many hours in one another's homes. Now his body has been brought back to rest in the shadow of the school both he and I attended, the University of Virginia, at Charlottesville. His byline will be seen no more. He has gone on his last great assignment, and I think he would grin to hear me recite a few lines of doggerel written by another newspaperman, Ben Scoville, a long time ago:

"Some day I'll pass by the great gates of gold
And see a man pass through, unquestioned and bold.
'A saint?' I'll ask, and old Peter'll reply:
'No, he carries a pass—he's a newspaper guy.'"

Statement by Senator Wiley on Activities During the 2d Session of the 86th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I request unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a review of legislative highlights, including my own activities, during the 2d session of the 86th Congress.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR WILEY'S RECORD IN THE 2D SESSION OF THE 86TH CONGRESS

During the 2d session of the 86th Congress, a great many programs were considered for dealing with the challenges confronting our people and country.

Following the adjournment of Congress, I, as senior Senator from Wisconsin, am taking this opportunity to review the highlights of legislative action.

The résumé will include:

1. Legislation which I sponsored, cosponsored and/or supported, and

2. My efforts to oppose legislation which I felt were against the best interests of Wisconsin and the country.

Unfortunately, it is not possible to touch upon all the issues considered in this session of Congress. I will, however, attempt to include the highlights, as well as a general survey of my efforts either to support, or oppose, such legislation—as considered to be in the best interests of my country.

MAINTAINING THE PEACE

The maintenance of peace—or, conversely, preventing world war III—is a major challenge confronting us and the world. As a free nation, confronted by a threat to its life from communism, we recognize that complex tasks lie ahead, including:

1. Preventing a further expansion of aggressive, totalitarian ideology—communism.

2. Establishing a sound foundation for peace.

3. Creating a kind of world in which manpower and resources can be dedicated to benefiting—not threatening to destroy—mankind.

NEEDED: A SOUND DEFENSE

The United States—as a world leader—must maintain and further strengthen our arsenal of peace. In our fast-advancing age, this includes a "muscular," hard-hitting, jet-missile-nuclear-space defense capable of striking a deadly retaliatory blow at any aggressor.

During the session, I supported—for the most part—the Eisenhower administration's recommendations for strengthening the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and missile program; procurement of more modern warships and submarines and modernizing weapons and equipment of all forces; cooperation with our allies to provide a global chain of free nations to withstand the spread of communism; and other programs designed to strengthen our security.

FORWARD-MOVING DOMESTIC ECONOMY

A strong, forward-moving domestic economy is essential, not only to support a strong defense, but to serve as the foundation for domestic progress.

To further strengthen our economy, we must combat inflation; establish a pay-as-you-go system for governmental operations (incidentally, the dramatic slowdown of the inflationary spiral and the approximately $1 billion surplus in the 1960 fiscal budget reflects that it can be done); expand the housing program; carry forward public works improvements, such as port and harbor development projects, flood control; and reclamation; increase the flow of international trade and commerce on a mutually beneficial basis; protect domestic industry from unfair competition from imports; although employment is at an all-time high of over 68,300,000 people, the expanding economy must also provide job opportunities for the more than 3.8 million unemployed. We cannot overlook the fact now that of the 3,800,000 unemployed, 1 out of every 2 unemployed in August was out of work less than a month; and one-fifth of the unemployed were teenagers, mostly looking for summer jobs; also, some unemployment is noted in distressed areas. As late as May 1960, however, the administration submitted legislation to Congress calling for a realistic, distressed area bill, but the Democrats, with a 2 to 1 majority in Congress, failed to act.

In addition, effort is needed to improve wage scales for low-pay workers; as well as assure adequate pension and unemployment compensation benefits for the workers of the Nation.

Tax reform is of high priority. Consequently, I again urged the establishment of a Hoover-type commission to carry out a complete review of the tax structure. This would include plugging loopholes, ironing out inequities, if possible, more equitably distributing the tax burden and in other ways improving the tax system. The objective would be to provide more fair tax laws aimed at encouraging—not stunting—economic growth and progress.

During this session of Congress, I supported these and other objectives for improving and strengthening our U.S. economy.

EXPANDING TRADE AND COMMERCE THROUGH ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

The St. Lawrence Seaway—completed in 1959—offers a new trade and commerce lifeline for Wisconsin and the Great Lakes region to other parts of the world.

As a sponsor of the original Seaway law, I naturally feel it essential now to assure maximum flow of cargo-passenger traffic through the waterway. Accordingly, I have:

1. Recommended a comprehensive study by the Department of Commerce to further promote trade and commerce through the Seaway.

2. Urged appropriation of adequate funds to complete the Great Lakes connecting channels at the earliest possible date so as to bring greater benefits and deep-sea shipping to Wisconsin and other States of the lakes region.

3. Supported appropriations for further development of ports and harbors to handle deep sea shipping; and other projects.

FIGHTING AGAINST WATER STEAL BILL

During this session of Congress, a renewed effort was made to authorize the diversion of dangerously large volumes of water from Lake Michigan. Although the bill, H.R. 1, was reported from the Senate Public Works Committee, we were successful in having it recommitted to the Foreign Relations Committee. Why? Because, if enacted, the bill could well jeopardize our relations with our good neighbor, Canada. Moreover, it would not serve the overall public interest domestically. Overall, it is a bad bill. Fortunately, we were successful in preventing enactment of the measure.

IMPROVING THE DAIRY OUTLOOK

Unfortunately, this Congress did not enact any far-reaching legislation to substantially improve the farm outlook.

However, minimum measures for dairying were enacted, including:

Public Law 86-799—which I cosponsored—to lift price supports to improve the economic health of the dairy industry.

Public Law 86-10—along the line of legislation I cosponsored—to carry forward the special school milk program benefiting thousands of students in Wisconsin and throughout the country.

In addition, I opposed the liberalizing of tariffs and quotas on imports of dairy products to compete with products of our domestic industry. Again, also, I urged enactment of the Wiley bill to establish a dairy research laboratory at Madison, Wis. Among other things, the purpose would be to find ways and means to utilize the constituent parts of milk for industrial purposes.

ESTABLISHMENT OF AN ICE-AGE NATIONAL PARK IN WISCONSIN

As proposed in the Wiley bill, S. 894, a study—initiated by the Department of the Interior—has been too long delayed relating to the establishment of an ice-age national park in Wisconsin. The preservation of our moraines—of unique scenic and scientific significance—would be of great State and national interest. Consequently, I began to urge the Department to move ahead on this study for carrying out such a project.

SPACE EXPLORATION

The exploration of space offers new challenges, adventures, problems, and promises for all of us—and for mankind. In these fast-advancing times, man's thinking, ingenuity, imagination—and, yes, his perspective—must extend to the new horizons. The home, fireside, community, and the national and international boundaries can no longer be the limits of our planning, dreaming, and vision.

To cope with the emerging challenges, man must attain a satellite's-eye view, not only of his progress, but of the new interrelationships of men and nations on the globe—and of our planet, earth, to the universe.

In looking ahead in space, the practical rewards will be just as dramatic and exciting as the idea of manned flights into space and to and from other planets.

Although it's difficult to predict all the ultimate rewards of space, there are a number of foreseeable benefits, including:

1. Improved radio, telephone, teletype, and television communications.

2. More effective weather forecasting to minimize loss from tornadoes, hurricanes, and other storms and benefit agriculture and conservation programs for preservation of our natural resources.

3. A stronger defense.

4. Further man's efforts to utilize heat and light from the sun and other natural forces of the universe.

5. Generally gather other data and information about the elements and forces of space for harnessing them to serve mankind.

As a member of the Senate Space and Aeronautics Committee, I have supported realistic efforts to move ahead rapidly in space exploration.

OTHER ACTIVITIES

Supported nomination of James R. Durfee, of Antigo, Wis., to be judge of the U.S. Court of Claims.

Protection of civil rights: As ranking Republican of the Senate Judiciary Committee handling the civil rights legislation, I have supported constructive efforts to protect the constitutional rights of all our citizens, regardless of race, creed, or national origin. Although successful action was taken to further strengthen laws in this field, there is still a good deal of work to be done. The ultimate objective is, of course, to preserve these precious privileges and rights for all our citizens under the Constitution.

Veterans: Extension for a 1-year period during which certain veterans may be eligible for the national service life insurance; extension of veterans home loan program.

Voting: Sponsored legislation for establishment of a National Voters Day to encourage greater voter participation in elections. Passed the Senate, but not the House of Representatives.

Anticommunism: Initiated the updating and republishing of the Internal Security Manual—a compendium of laws, Federal orders, and acts relating to the internal security of the country to strengthen our domestic security program.

Menominee Indians: Sponsored legislation to extend the time for termination of Federal control over the Menominee Indian Tribe—for which State of Wisconsin has created a 72d county.

Manpower: Proposed resolution to set up special Commission To Study Manpower Needs of Space Age.

Protection from imports: Cosponsored resolution to set up study to determine impact of foreign competition on American industry.

Social security: Introduced legislation for liberalizing the "extra earnings" provision of social security law; as well as supported a bill to provide medical care for the aging.

Conservation: Cosponsored legislation to make sea or brackish water utilizable for human or industrial purposes; as well as supported broadscope effort to conserve soil, water, and forest resources.

Recess appointments to Supreme Court: Opposed legislative branch efforts to interfere with powers of executive branch by voting—and speaking—against Senate Resolution 334, opposing recess appointments to Supreme Court.

Tougher laws to combat obscenity: Urged enactment of tougher laws to combat the distributing of obscene literature, with its bad effect on the morality and conduct—particularly of our youth.

And others.

MEMBERSHIP ON COMMITTEES

Although the final "ayes or nays" on legislation are registered in the Senate, the "spadework" of Congress, to a large degree, is performed in its committees. During this session, I served as ranking minority member in the following bodies:

1. Foreign Relations including membership on Subcommittees on Far Eastern Affairs, European Affairs, African Affairs, and Canadian Affairs.

2. Judiciary—including Subcommittees on Patents, Trademarks and Copyrights; Revision and Codification; Antitrust and Monopoly, Constitutional Rights, and Juvenile Delinquency.

3. A member of the Senate Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee.

Medical Care for the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, improved health for our aged population through improved medical care is assured under the Social Security Act Amendments of 1960, H.R. 12580, which has recently passed the Congress.

I would like to discuss the new medical assistance program provided under the 1960 amendments and examine into some of the considerations that bear on this important issue.

At the outset I would observe that the Congress in a new social program, as in any other actions that it takes, must be motivated by the best interest of all Americans and must obtain knowledge and understanding of all the relevant facts. These essential criteria for legislating were particularly applicable in developing an improved medical care program for the aged. If the Congress had not followed these criteria, an unwise action could have occurred that substituted quantity for quality in medical service that would have been unpredictably costly, that would have overcrowded our hospitals, that would have weakened our entire social security system, and that would have made the heavy hand of bureaucratic Federal Government the unwelcomed and bungling arbiter in the physician-patient relationship. Fortunately, Congress did not take an unwise course of action. Instead, the Congress prepared a program that will give the right kind of help at the right place to the people who need help without the imposition of wasteful cost burdens on the American taxpayer.

Mr. Speaker, the 1960 amendments contain two important phases in dealing with medical care for the aged. The first phase is the establishment of a new Federal-State program of medical assistance for aged persons who are able to finance their general living costs but who are not able to bear the additional burden of the cost of illness. These self-reliant citizens might be termed the potentially medical needy. The second phase of the 1960 amendments affecting medical care is a significant increase in the Federal financial participation in State medical care programs for recipients of old-age assistance. Thus the two phases of this new program will give opportunity for Federal assistance to those aged needing help with their medical bills who reside in States participating in a Federal-State program.

A more detailed amplification of these two phases of the medical program of the 1960 amendments seems appropriate and is as follows:

I. MEDICAL ASSISTANCE FOR MEDICALLY NEEDY AGED

The 1960 act amends title I of the Social Security Act to set up a new Federal-State program of medical assistance for aged persons. Such assistance will take the form of payments under State programs of part or all of the costs of medical services incurred by State residents aged 65 or over who are not recipients of old-age assistance but whose income and resources are found by the State to be insufficient to meet the cost of necessary medical services. Eligibility for medical assistance for the aged will be determined by the States on a more liberal basis than eligibility is determined for old-age assistance.

Federal financial participation is provided for medical and remedial services that may be provided under State programs. Such services may include first, inpatient hospital services; second, skilled nursing-home services; third, physicians' services; fourth, outpatient hospital or clinic services; fifth, home health care services; sixth, private duty nursing services; seventh, physical therapy and related services; eighth, dental services; ninth, laboratory and X-ray services; tenth, prescribed drugs, eyeglasses, dentures, and prosthetic devices; eleventh, diagnostic, screening, and preventive services; and twelfth, any other medical care or remedial care recognized under State law.

No aged resident of a State may be found ineligible because he has not resided in the State sufficiently long. The share of the Federal Government in expenditures made under State programs will vary from 50 to 80 percent, according to each State's per capita income. The Federal program becomes effective as of October 1, 1960. Discretion is left to the individual States as to the extent of participation in this new program. It is currently estimated on the basis of the adoption of fairly comprehensive programs by the States that as many as 1 million persons may receive medical assistance during a year and that the annual cost will be $325 million comprised of $165 million Federal funds and $160 million State and local funds.

II. MEDICAL CARE FOR OLD-AGE ASSISTANCE RECIPIENTS

To encourage the States to extend comprehensive medical services to old-age assistance recipients, the 1960 amendments increase Federal participation in the financing of State payments to suppliers of medical care for such persons. A provision has been added to existing law which provides for Federal financial participation in expenditures for payments to vendors of medical service up to $12 per month, in addition to the existing $65 maximum for Federal participation in cash benefits. Under the 1960 amendments where the average old-age assistance payment of a State is over $65 per month, the Federal share in respect to medical-services costs will be a minimum of 50 percent and a maximum of 80 percent, depending upon the State's per capita income. Where the State average payment is $65 a month or less, or it is to a State's advantage, the Federal share in respect to medical-services costs will be 15 percentage points in addition to the existing Federal percentages—50 to 65 percent. Thus, for this latter group of States, the Federal percent applicable to medical-services costs will range from 65 to 80 percent. The increased availability of Federal funds to establish or strengthen State programs of medical care for the needy aged will result in significantly improved medical programs in all States if the States act to take advantage of this opportunity. This change becomes effective October 1, 1960, and it is expected to result in an additional $142 million a year in Federal funds being available to the States for medical care of old-age assistance recipients.

Mr. Speaker, it might be well at this point to examine the way in which the medical care changes in the 1960 amendments will affect the individual States. To facilitate this inquiry I will include as a part of my remarks some statistical tables as follows:

Table I shows the existing Federal matching percentages and the percentages that would be applicable under H.R. 12580.

Table II shows the old-age assistance expenditures by source of funds for calendar year December 31, 1959.

Table III shows the average payment to old-age assistance recipients in June 1960.

Table IV shows the estimated first-year costs of the two phases of medical care under the 1960 amendments.

Table V shows the additional old-age assistance funds that are expected to be available under the second phase of the previously described 1960 amendments affecting medical care.

TABLE I.—*Existing and proposed Federal matching percentages (effective for October 1960 through June 1961)*

State	Federal matching percentages currently applicable under old-age assistance I	Federal medical matching percentages under bill [1] II	Total Federal matching percentage applicable to medical expenses of old-age assistance recipients for States with average total payment of under $65 III
Alabama	65.00	79.15	80.00
Alaska	50.00	50.00	65.00
Arizona	63.23	63.23	78.23
Arkansas	65.00	80.00	80.00
California	50.00	50.00	(2)
Colorado	53.42	53.42	(2)
Connecticut	50.00	50.00	(2)
Delaware	50.00	50.00	65.00
District of Columbia	50.00	50.00	65.00
Florida	59.68	59.68	74.68
Georgia	65.00	74.36	80.00
Guam	50.00	50.00	65.00
Hawaii	53.38	53.38	68.38
Idaho	65.00	67.04	(2)
Illinois	50.00	50.00	(2)
Indiana	50.00	50.00	65.00
Iowa	63.23	63.23	(2)
Kansas	60.78	60.78	(2)
Kentucky	65.00	76.94	80.00
Louisiana	65.00	72.00	(2)
Maine	65.00	65.23	(2)
Maryland	50.00	50.00	65.00
Massachusetts	50.00	50.00	(2)
Michigan	50.00	50.00	(2)
Minnesota	58.57	58.57	(2)
Mississippi	65.00	80.00	80.00
Missouri	53.42	53.42	68.42
Montana	54.07	54.07	69.07
Nebraska	63.41	63.41	(2)
Nevada	50.00	50.00	(2)
New Hampshire	57.91	57.91	(2)
New Jersey	50.00	50.00	(2)
New Mexico	65.00	67.99	(2)
New York	50.00	50.00	(2)
North Carolina	65.00	77.46	80.00
North Dakota	65.00	74.18	(2)
Ohio	50.00	50.00	(2)
Oklahoma	65.00	67.54	(2)
Oregon	52.58	52.58	(2)
Pennsylvania	50.00	50.00	(2)
Puerto Rico	50.00	50.00	65.00
Rhode Island	50.00	50.00	(2)
South Carolina	65.00	80.00	80.00
South Dakota	65.00	75.42	80.00
Tennessee	65.00	76.55	80.00
Texas	61.36	61.36	76.36
Utah	65.00	65.00	(2)
Vermont	65.00	65.82	80.00
Virgin Islands	50.00	50.00	65.00
Virginia	65.00	65.44	80.00
Washington	50.00	50.00	(2)
West Virginia	65.00	72.69	80.00
Wisconsin	54.60	54.60	(2)
Wyoming	50.92	50.92	(2)

[1] These are applicable to the new program of medical assistance for the aged and to vendor medical costs under the old-age assistance program when State average total assistance payment is over $65 per month (when average is $65 or under, percentages shown in next column are applicable).

[2] Average total assistance payment in May 1960 was over $65, so no figure is shown in this table. In all other studies, the average payment was $65 or less, and under these conditions the Federal matching percentage as shown in this column would be applicable.

TABLE II.—*Old-age assistance: Expenditures for assistance to recipients, by source of funds, calendar year ended Dec. 31, 1959*

[Amounts in thousands]

State	Total assistance including vendor payments for medical care	Vendor payments for medical care		Total including vendor payments for medical care					
				Federal funds		State funds		Local funds	
		Amount	Percent of total	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent
Total	$1,875,104	$254,389	13.6	$1,117,987	59.6	$646,762	34.5	$110,355	5.9
Alabama	55,163	14	(1)	41,355	75.0	13,794	25.0	14	(1)
Alaska	1,085			701	64.6	384	35.4		
Arizona	9,925			7,255	73.1	2,670	26.9		
Arkansas	32,369	3,574	11.0	24,037	74.3	8,333	25.7		
California	264,078	21,293	8.1	128,096	48.5	117,902	44.6	18,080	6.8
Colorado	60,160	8,659	14.4	24,535	40.8	35,625	59.2		
Connecticut	19,738	3,235	16.4	7,430	37.6	12,308	62.4		
Delaware	840			574	68.3	267	31.7		
District of Columbia	2,507	322	12.8	1,577	62.9	931	37.1		
Florida	45,034	2,784	6.2	31,992	71.0	13,042	29.0		
Georgia	55,674			41,464	74.5	11,984	21.5	2,227	4.0
Guam [3]	6			3	50.0	3	50.0		
Hawaii	1,062	117	11.1	689	64.9	373	35.1		
Idaho	5,818	129	2.2	4,185	71.9	1,634	28.1		
Illinois	65,361	25,017	38.3	38,534	59.0	26,827	41.0		
Indiana	20,909	6,023	28.8	13,419	64.2	4,494	21.5	2,996	14.3
Iowa	30,918	1,952	6.3	19,660	63.6	11,258	36.4		
Kansas	27,490	3,974	14.5	15,881	57.8	6,202	22.6	5,407	19.7
Kentucky	29,846			22,449	75.2	7,397	24.8		
Louisiana	98,881	2,741	2.8	69,903	70.8	28,918	29.2		
Maine	9,144	1,469	16.1	6,586	72.0	2,557	28.0		
Maryland	6,853	584	8.5	4,467	65.2	1,341	19.6	1,045	15.2
Massachusetts	97,162	38,511	39.6	40,890	42.1	40,099	41.3	16,173	16.6
Michigan	54,351	5,252	9.7	31,988	58.9	20,087	37.0	2,277	4.2
Minnesota	48,848	18,294	37.5	25,711	52.6	12,534	25.9	10,503	21.5
Mississippi	28,633			22,903	80.0	5,731	20.0		
Missouri	81,686	34	(1)	55,047	67.4	26,639	32.6		
Montana	5,560	19	.3	3,687	66.3	1,279	23.0	593	10.7
Nebraska	12,848	3,907	30.4	8,686	67.6	3,528	27.5	633	4.9
Nevada	2,159	189	8.7	1,305	60.4	601	27.8	253	11.7
New Hampshire	4,455	1,058	23.8	2,694	60.5	619	13.9	1,142	25.6
New Jersey	19,569	7,154	36.6	9,332	47.7	6,296	32.2	3,941	20.1
New Mexico	8,125	1,184	14.6	5,911	72.8	2,214	27.2		
New York	105,171	30,999	29.5	42,675	40.6	31,372	29.8	31,125	29.6
North Carolina	24,407	1,155	4.7	18,550	76.0	3,250	13.3	2,606	10.7
North Dakota	7,523	2,549	33.9	4,128	54.9	3,064	40.7	331	4.4
Ohio	72,387	10,294	14.2	43,544	60.2	28,844	39.8		
Oklahoma	82,745	11,048	13.4	51,274	62.0	31,471	38.0		
Oregon	16,448	4,711	28.6	9,037	54.9	5,187	31.5	2,223	13.5
Pennsylvania	40,912	2,060	5.0	24,803	60.6	16,110	39.4		
Puerto Rico	3,946			1,973	50.0	1,973	50.0		
Rhode Island	6,291	1,084	17.2	3,460	55.0	2,831	45.0		
South Carolina	15,456	226	1.5	11,857	76.7	3,599	23.3		
South Dakota	6,468			4,703	72.7	1,766	27.3		
Tennessee	29,216	1,275	4.4	22,045	75.5	5,737	19.6	1,434	4.9
Texas	139,805			100,766	72.1	39,040	27.9		

[1] Less than 0.05 percent.

[3] Program initiated July 1959 under the Social Security Act Amendments of 1958.

TABLE II.—*Old-age assistance: Expenditures for assistance to recipients, by source of funds, calendar year ended Dec. 31, 1959*—Continued

[Amounts in thousands]

State	Total assistance including vendor payments for medical care	Vendor payments for medical care		Total including vendor payments for medical care					
				Federal funds		State funds		Local funds	
		Amount	Percent of total	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent
Utah	$6,532	$419	6.4	$4,606	70.5	$1,926	29.5		
Vermont	3,944			2,877	72.9	1,067	27.1		
Virgin Islands	166	4	2.1	83	49.9	83	50.1		
Virginia	7,519	763	10.2	5,702	75.8	1,131	15.0	$686	9.1
Washington	54,336	12,567	23.1	25,844	47.6	28,492	52.4		
West Virginia	8,690	797	9.2	6,699	77.1	1,939	22.3	52	.6
Wisconsin	33,940	16,569	48.8	18,619	54.9	9,362	27.6	5,959	17.6
Wyoming	2,944	378	12.8	1,740	59.1	550	18.7	654	22.2

TABLE III.—*Average payment per recipient for old-age assistance, for money payments, and for vendor payments for medical care, by State, June 1960*

State	Old-age assistance			State	Old-age assistance		
	All assistance [1]	Money payments to recipients [2]	Vendor payments for medical care [1]		All assistance [1]	Money payments to recipients [2]	Vendor payments for medical care [1]
All States	$67.90	$58.06	$10.52				
Alabama	53.03	53.03	[3].01	Montana	$64.00	$63.67	$0.34
Alaska	64.64	64.64		Nebraska	71.27	47.80	23.88
Arizona	61.66	51.66		Nevada	71.26	65.27	5.99
Arkansas	52.94	46.37	6.60	New Hampshire	77.48	60.74	16.75
California	90.37	81.45	9.47	New Jersey	90.32	62.01	34.76
Colorado	98.65	82.77	15.88	New Mexico	68.18	59.63	8.55
Connecticut	109.11	92.62	18.19	New York	107.92	76.21	35.46
Delaware	50.00	50.00		North Carolina	42.86	41.38	1.48
District of Columbia	65.10	59.23	8.36	North Dakota	85.33	58.36	30.20
Florida	56.87	50.39	6.80	Ohio	74.72	65.15	10.86
Georgia	47.29	47.29		Oklahoma	79.30	67.40	11.90
Guam	24.97	24.97		Oregon	74.97	53.15	23.77
Hawaii	64.16	56.57	7.59	Pennsylvania	68.11	64.28	3.83
Idaho	68.77	60.43	8.38	Puerto Rico	8.24	8.24	
Illinois	73.88	47.01	30.13	Rhode Island	78.37	64.37	14.00
Indiana	62.96	44.96	19.19	South Carolina	43.50	37.93	5.60
Iowa	81.40	75.16	7.48	South Dakota	61.63	61.63	
Kansas	80.01	68.71	12.09	Tennessee	43.44	41.24	2.20
Kentucky	46.04	46.04		Texas	52.91	52.91	
Louisiana	71.56	69.55	2.05	Utah	72.50	67.52	4.99
Maine	67.77	53.77	14.00	Vermont	63.05	51.10	11.95
Maryland	61.79	56.56	5.23	Virgin Islands	23.66	23.20	.50
Massachusetts	99.15	54.85	45.51	Virginia	44.31	38.06	8.41
Michigan	72.50	65.60	6.90	Washington	87.19	60.38	30.32
Minnesota	88.73	53.92	36.39	West Virginia	39.06	34.14	4.92
Mississippi	29.75	29.75		Wisconsin	82.72	41.65	43.86
Missouri	60.01	59.57	.48	Wyoming	72.16	61.91	10.42

[1] Averages based on cases receiving money payments, vendor payments for medical care, or both.

[2] May also include small amounts for assistance in kind and vendor payments for other than medical care. Averages based on number of cases receiving money payments.

[3] Payments made without Federal participation.

TABLE IV.—*Estimated annual 1st-year costs under proposed program of medical assistance for the aged and for additional matching for vendor medical care payments under old-age assistance*

[All figures in thousands]

State	Medical assistance for the aged [1]		Additional OAA vendor medical costs		Additional costs—both programs		State	Medical assistance for the aged [1]		Additional OAA vendor medical costs		Additional costs—both programs	
	Federal cost	State and local cost	Federal cost	State and local cost	Federal cost	State and local cost		Federal cost	State and local cost	Federal cost	State and local cost	Federal cost	State and local cost
United States	$60,000	$55,837	$142,175	$3,873	$202,175	$59,710							
Alabama	34	9	4,155		4,189	9	Montana	$30	$26	$186	$158	$216	$184
Alaska	1	1	52	52	53	53	Nebraska	944	545	712		1,656	545
Arizona	12	6	635	370	647	376	Nevada	47	47	187		234	47
Arkansas	27	7	3,308		3,335	7	New Hampshire	854	620	404		1,258	620
California	780	750	18,365		19,115	750	New Jersey	4,879	4,879	1,362		6,241	4,879
Colorado	361	314	3,627		3,988	314	New Mexico	9	4	877		886	4
Connecticut	3,318	3,318	1,039		4,357	3,318	New York	13,416	13,416	5,919		19,335	13,416
Delaware	33	33	41	13	74	46	North Carolina	62	18	1,897		1,959	18
District of Columbia	75	75	46		121	75	North Dakota	245	85	773		1,018	85
Florida	296	199	3,354		3,650	199	Ohio	1,336	1,336	6,430		7,766	1,336
Georgia	14	5	4,804	984	4,818	989	Oklahoma	1,318	633	8,699		10,017	633
Hawaii	43	43	28		71	43	Oregon	1,719	1,550	1,064		2,783	1,550
Idaho	34	17	673		707	17	Pennsylvania	2,451	2,451	3,601		6,052	2,451
Illinois	5,911	5,911	3,905		9,816	5,911	Rhode Island	896	896	485		1,381	896
Indiana	3,013	3,013	594		3,607	3,013	South Carolina	6	2	1,623		1,629	2
Iowa	96	57	3,120		3,218	57	South Dakota	8	3	419	186	427	189
Kansas	1,092	678	2,485		3,587	678	Tennessee	22	7	1,934		1,956	7
Kentucky	15	4	2,795	572	2,810	576	Texas	79	50	6,891	426	6,970	476
Louisiana	123	48	12,970		13,093	48	Utah	34	18	741		775	18
Maine	156	83	731		887	83	Vermont	43	22	206		249	22
Maryland	822	822	384		1,206	822	Virginia	503	206	331		834	206
Massachusetts	4,751	4,751	5,663		10,414	4,751	Washington	2,481	2,481	3,517		5,998	2,481
Michigan	1,778	1,778	4,405		6,183	1,778	West Virginia	75	28	567		642	28
Minnesota	2,612	1,848	3,943		6,555	1,848	Wisconsin	2,980	2,478	2,770		5,750	2,478
Mississippi	6	2	4,638	1,112	4,644	1,114	Wyoming	53	52	238		291	52
Missouri	175	152	4,582		4,757	152							

[1] Because of the newness of this program, it is extremely difficult to estimate exactly which States will participate and to what extent, especially in the 1st year after enactment.

NOTE.—Estimates were not made for Guam, Puerto Rico, and Virgin Islands, which can participate in these programs; any additional expenditures for these jurisdictions would probably be relatively small.

TABLE V.—*Old-age assistance (OAA) funds for medical care payments: Additional funds anticipated to be available under OAA medical care provisions of the Social Security Amendments of 1960 (Public Law 86-778); additional funds needed to bring medical payments to anticipated levels; and additional funds available to States—expected to be used for program improvement in OAA or medical assistance for the aged*

[In thousands]

State	Additional funds anticipated to be available under OAA medical care provisions of Public Law 86-778		Additional funds needed to bring medical payments to anticipated levels [1]		Additional funds available to States—expected to be used for program improvement in OAA or medical assistance for the aged
	Federal	State-local	Federal	State-local	
Total	$142,175	$3,873	$70,257	$3,873	$71,918
Alabama	4,155		[3] 4,155		
Alaska	52	52	[3] 52	52	
Arizona	635	370	[3] 635	370	
Arkansas	3,308		[3] 3,308		
California	18,365		9,182		9,183
Colorado	3,627				3,627
Connecticut	1,039				1,039
Delaware	41	13	[3] 41	13	
District of Columbia	46		[2] 46		
Florida	3,354		[3] 3,354		
Georgia	4,804	984	[3] 4,804	984	
Hawaii	28		[2] 28		
Idaho	673		[2] 673		
Illinois	3,905				3,905
Indiana	594				594
Iowa	3,120		1,858		1,262
Kansas	2,485				2,485
Kentucky	2,795	572	[3] 2,795	572	
Louisiana	12,970		6,835		6,135
Maine	731		[2] 731		
Maryland	384		[3] 384		
Massachusetts	5,663				5,663
Michigan	4,405		3,744		661
Minnesota	3,943				3,943
Mississippi	4,638	1,112	[3] 4,638	1,112	
Missouri	4,582		[3] 4,582		
Montana	$186	$158	[3] $186	$158	
Nebraska	712				$712
Nevada	187		[2] 187		
New Hampshire	404				404
New Jersey	1,362				1,362
New Mexico	877		[2] 877		
New York	5,919				5,919
North Carolina	1,897		[2] 1,897		
North Dakota	773				773
Ohio	6,430		2,444		3,986
Oklahoma	8,699				8,699
Oregon	1,064				1,064
Pennsylvania	3,601				3,601
Rhode Island	485				485
South Carolina	1,623		[2] 1,623		
South Dakota	419	186	[3] 419	186	
Tennessee	1,934		[3] 1,934		
Texas	6,891	426	[3] 6,891	426	
Utah	741		662		79
Vermont	206		[3] 206		
Virginia	331		331		
Washington	3,517				3,517
West Virginia	567		[2] 567		
Wisconsin	2,770				2,770
Wyoming	238		188		50

[1] An average of $12 per month per recipient except as footnoted otherwise.
[2] More than $6 but less than $12, utilizing all additional Federal funds available under the amendments.
[3] $6 per month per recipient.

Mr. Speaker, using the information and data now at hand I would like to present to my colleagues in the House an explanation of the way in which the 1960 medical care amendments affect the States. For purposes of illustration I have selected my own State of Wisconsin and the State of Tennessee.

First, Wisconsin: By reference to tables I and II we determine that Wisconsin had total old-age assistance payments in calendar year 1959 of $34.9 million, including $16.6 million for medical care with almost 55 percent of the total being Federal funds. From table III it is evident that Wisconsin in June 1960 made an average old-age assistance payment of $82.72, of which $43.86 was a vendor payment for medical care. Reference to table IV and table V discloses that because Wisconsin's present old-age assistance program is above the limits of Federal matching, the State will receive $2.77 million in additional Federal matching for old-age assistance vendor medical costs without the payment of any additional State funds for this purpose. As a consequence, Wisconsin could utilize these additional funds to effect a savings in State expenditures. The State savings could then be used to finance the State share of the new medical program under the first phase of the 1960 amendments, which I previously described. If the State savings were so used, the State would receive in additional Federal matching funds an amount so that the Federal Government would be paying 54.6 percent of the total so spent.

Second, Tennessee: Tables I and II indicate that $29.2 million was spent in Tennessee for old-age assistance in 1959, including $1.275 million for medical care with Federal matching participation amounting to 75.5 percent of the total funds spent. Table III indicates that the average old-age assistance payment in June 1960 was $43.44, of which $2.20 was vendor payment for medical care. Table IV indicates that under the second phase of the 1960 medical amendments Tennessee will receive $1.9 million additional Federal funds for old-age assistance vendor payments without the expenditure of additional State funds. Table V indicates that because Tennessee is low in vendor payments, the State could get even more in Federal funds by the expenditure of some State funds on the basis of 4 Federal dollars for every State dollar until the medical payments averaged $12 per person per month. Alternatively, as in the case of Wisconsin, Tennessee could utilize part of the additional $1.9 million I previously referred to as a means of saving State money to finance the new medical program for nonrecipients of old-age assistance. Whatever Tennessee spends for the new medical care program that I have described as phase 1 would be matched by Federal funds at a rate of 76.55 percent of the total so spent.

Mr. Speaker, a study of the data and information I have presented in regard to the medical care provisions indicates that the 1960 amendments to the Social Security Act contain a sound and efficient solution to the problem of providing for the health needs of those aged citizens who for one reason or another are unable to obtain suitable medical care. The medical care provisions of the 1960 amendments would:

First. Emphasize Government help where such help is needed and necessary by providing medical care to those persons who cannot make their own provision for medical needs; in this way the governmental effort can be more effective and less costly without adding to the personal health costs of other citizens.

Second. Help in the areas of medical treatment for those persons who are least likely to have private health insurance.

Third. Recognize that human rights and needs are best served in governmental activity when the agency is situated as close as possible to the individual which is accomplished by placing administrative responsibility at the State level instead of vesting control in the Federal Government.

Fourth. Continue voluntary action in the health protection field by the great majority of our 16 million citizens aged 65 and over who do not want Federal dictation in medical care.

Fifth. Safeguard against overutilization and overcrowding of hospital facilities by the proper emphasis it places on preventive medicine and the broad range of health services authorized.

Sixth. Avoid the costly impression of "free" hospitalization whether necessary or not which is in fact free only to the extent it is paid for by the taxpayers.

Seventh. Permit our free enterprise system to continue operation in providing our Nation with the highest medical and health standards in the world.

Eighth. Preserve the traditional Federal-State organization structure of our Nation and maintain local autonomy.

Mr. Speaker, these many advantages that are to be found in the approach to medical care for the aged that is provided by the Social Security Amendments of 1960, H.R. 12580, would not exist under a compulsory health insurance approach such as was advocated by some during our deliberations on these amendments. In fact by adopting the Federal-State voluntary approach contained in H.R. 12580 we have avoided many of the disadvantages inherent in a compulsory system. For example in the context of comparing the compulsory approach with the voluntary approach we find that the medical care provisions of the 1960 amendments would not:

First. Discriminate against the 4 million Americans who are over age 65 but are not covered by the OASDI program and who would not, therefore, be entitled to medical care under a compulsory social security approach financed by payroll taxes.

Second. Purport to provide health protection to millions of aged who neither need nor want Government medical care at the expense of 60 million workers who in many cases find it more difficult to meet family medical needs than do the aged.

Third. Violate the traditional cash benefit concept of the OASDI program by instituting a program of service benefits irrespective of need for the particular services offered.

Fourth. Impose unpredictable costs on the OASDI trust funds possibly thereby impairing the ability of those funds to meet the cash benefit obligations.

Fifth. Require higher payroll taxes which would mean a smaller paycheck in terms of take-home pay for everyone under social security.

Sixth. Encourage expensive hospitalization and institutional care when other forms of medical treatment would be more efficacious.

Seventh. Limit medical care to certain arbitrary types of service such as surgical care, hospitalization, and nursing home care but would instead allow a broad scope of benefits so that the type of care could be prescribed according to the individual requirement.

Eighth. Restrict beneficiaries in their choice of physician and hospital through Government controls.

Ninth. Encourage the demands by the nonaged for governmentally provided health care with the eventual consequence being a massive Government national health system.

Tenth. Provide a political solution to a medical problem.

It will be vividly recalled by all concerned that during the preparation of the Social Security Amendments of 1960 the instigated and well-organized political pressure was great for the establishment of a costly but ineffectual program of compulsory health insurance for the aged within the framework of the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program of the social security system. This endeavor was categorically rejected by a vote of 17 to 8 in the House Committee on Ways and Means, by a vote of 12 to 5 in the Senate Finance Committee, and by a vote of 51 to 44 in the U.S. Senate. In short, the compulsory approach to health care for the aged was specifically defeated three times during the consideration of the Social Security Amendments of 1960, H.R. 12580.

The legislation as finally approved in conference did not contain a compulsory health insurance plan and for that reason it was denounced by some leaders in the Democratic Party as being a paupers' bill, a fraud, and a mere sop. These denouncements must not have contained much merit for it will be recalled that the conference report was adopted in the House by a vote of 368 to 17 and in the Senate by a vote of 74 to 11. Indeed even the detractors of the 1960 amendments who favored a compulsory medical care plan could not have been too persuaded by their own criticism because almost to a man they wound up supporting the passage of the bill they had criticized.

Mr. Speaker, to the people who for political or other reasons reprehend the medical care provisions of H.R. 12580 as being not enough, I would point out that unpredictable cost, massive governmental intervention, compulsion, ineffectuality, and discrimination have never been the criteria for good or adequate legislation but they are definite shortcomings of the alternative proposal they supported.

The subject of health care for the aged will be an important consideration for study by the White House Conference on Aging to be held early in 1961. Legislation was passed during the 85th Congress providing for this White House Conference and the Congress will appropriate close to $2 million of Federal funds for the purpose of this conference. State conferences are scheduled for the current year preliminary to the White House Conference. Participating in the White House Conference will be 2,800 delegates including some of the foremost specialists in the field of aging. It is required by law that a report including recommendations be made to the President by April 9, 1961. Many Members of Congress in considering medical care proposals in connection with the 1960 Social Security Amendments were of the view that Congress should not preempt the activities of the White House Conference on Aging by committing the Federal Government to a brand new program of compulsory medical care for the aged under the OASDI title of the Social Security Act.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would commend my colleagues on the Committee on Ways and Means and other Members of the Congress for the important contribution they made to the development of the new medical care provisions provided in the Social Security Amendments of 1960. These provisions under Federal-State partnership will, I am confident, provide meaningful help to those deserving aged American citizens who are unable to provide for their own health care needs. This worthy objective will be accomplished without socializing medicine, without impairment of the right of individual choice of physician, without jeopardizing the OASDI program, and without needless expense to the American taxpayer. Instead, under the 1960 amendments we will spend the tax dollar on the people who need it the most in a way that will do the most medical good. Under this approach the Federal Government will stimulate and supplement rather than replace State, local, and private action. Better health and greater security for our aged will inevitably be the result.

The Way Volunteer Organizations Advance Political Ideas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEM MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. CLEM MILLER. Mr. Speaker, down through our history there have been volunteer organizations to help us set our political facts. In colonial Boston, seeds of the American Revolution were sown by the Sons of Liberty. A century later, a crusade to end slavery was waged by antislavery societies throughout New England.

Today in California, a vigorous organization is engaged in formulating a constructive response to pressing current problems. This organization is the California Democratic Council. Formed in 1953 in the wake of the great electoral debate of 1952, the California Democratic Council today remains dedicated to the free exchange of opinion.

A political party as dynamic as the Democratic Party needs organizations such as the California Democratic Council. With the wide-based support of these organizations, it can continually replenish itself with fresh thinking. The bewildering pace, the rapid growth, the wrenching technological changes which mark contemporary civilization make this process of critical examination and renewal an imperative need.

New ideas sometimes are unpalatable. Needless people often greet free, bold political discussion with cynicism and scorn. It is edifying to watch these scoffers gradually become the stentorian defenders of ideas so conceived which in time enter the sanctum of conventional wisdom.

The volunteer groups such as the CDC help to give shape and meaning to our changing civilization. These organizations, nurtured on care and conscience, can make mistakes, of course, and some of the ideas to come out of their sessions are stillborn. But many come to dominate the thinking of all of us. In its regional and statewide conferences, the CDC brings into focus the aspirations of thousands of California citizens. As with any bringing together of diverse

ideas, these conferences seethe with controversy, with activity, with questing. In the melee, ineffectual ideas sometimes emerge, but this is the price of any act of creativity. It is discouraging sometimes that in our present system of communication-by-scare headlines the sensational rather than the sound ideas first win public attention.

The California Democratic Council is doing a job of reconnaissance, a thankless and dangerous but essential job of scouting the unknown. If this job were not done, and done well, by the CDC and other groups of similar intent throughout the United States, the American political structure would atrophy. Thus, the 40,000 men and women who comprise the California Democratic Council are fulfilling a vital function.

It would be appropriate here to quote an editorial which appeared in the Independent Journal of San Rafael, California on Tuesday, February 16, 1960:

ISSUES, CONFERENCES, CAN BE NEW WAY VOTER SPEAKS

Most hostesses have experienced that sinking sensation when she hears the conversation of her guests turn to politics. Often she will try to change the subject, for fear of bloodshed.

Can you imagine the problems then, of gathering 2,500 together just for the purpose of talking politics? If you can't, you might ask Mrs. Samuel Swadesh of Mill Valley who did the job last weekend in Fresno.

It doesn't help much that all the participants are from one party—Democrats, in this instance. Somehow, there fails to be unanimity of thought there, either.

Last weekend was the second annual issues conference of the CDC.

Conferences such as this have great merit. They provide a forum for many people with many ideas. They let people talk and think about politics, the basis of our republican form of government. They can be helpful in organizing effective political parties.

But we believe the system needs perfecting before it begins to establish policy or to pass resolutions. This can be done, and then the voter will have an improved way of making his voice heard.

This year, because it is a presidential election year, it had an added feature—the appearance of three presidential candidates, Senators SYMINGTON, HUMPHREY, and KENNEDY.

But the main business of the convention was to discuss political issues and reach policy agreement on which the CDC could base its actions and political endorsements.

All day Saturday was taken up in discussion of the six issues. More than 80 small groups of delegates discussed one of the issues. That night small groups of leaders attempted to consolidate all that had been discussed in the 80 groups into six reports for adoption as policy statements. This consolidation job was finished in five of the sections by about 6 a.m., after an all-night effort. The sixth was not completed until morning because the group itself couldn't agree upon a summary of their ideas until about 9 a.m.

Thus it was that when the entire convention convened Sunday morning to pass on their "policies," they had to consider the results of a rush job, by a group of tired men and women. The fact that they had anything before them at all was a tribute to those men and women.

But to saddle a large organization like the CDC, and even the whole Democratic Party, with policies so hurriedly drawn, seems unfair to the public, to the party, and to the CDC.

As Senator SYMINGTON told the group, in general he could go along with the policies, "but some of the details worry me."

It is on the details that the policies stand or fall. Yet, some of the details were contradictory; some did not clearly express the intent; some of the typographical errors were classics; some of the statements, we are sure, would have been challenged by the delegates had they had more than a few minutes to examine them.

The Real Story About REA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement by me on the record of progress and accomplishments of the Rural Electrification Administration.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MUNDT

THE REAL STORY ABOUT REA

In this the first year of a new decade, we hear much talk of "new horizons," "new frontiers," and the "challenge of the sixties." This is as it should be, and I am gratified that the national leaders of both our major political parties are looking ahead and are seeking ways and means of solving those moral and economic problems which still continue to confound our free society.

I think, however, to assure that there is balance in our thinking and to guarantee that our programs and plans for the future are in harmony with our free traditions and institutions, we must of necessity review our accomplishments and achievements of the past. In so doing we come to a greater awareness and a more profound understanding of the many elements and factors within our constitutional republican society which contribute to the successful solution of problems and the real advancement of our society.

I shall not, of course, attempt today to make a total review of the progress and achievements of our great Nation; but I would like to discuss briefly our record of progress and accomplishment in one area; namely, the electrification of our rural United States. It is quite appropriate that we review the record of achievement in the field of rural electrification as of 1960; for, as my colleagues know, this year marks the 25th anniversary of the creation of the Rural Electrification Administration.

I think it can be said, without fear of contradiction, that no single program has contributed more to the improved standard of living of America's farm families than REA—the bringing of good dependable electric and telephone service into the rural homes and communities of this Nation. It has been my great privilege and pleasure to have served in the Congress of the United States during 22 of the 25 years in which REA has been in operation. We in South Dakota are deeply grateful for this program, and we are especially proud of the outstanding job which has been accomplished in our State by this progressive program. As one who has had the opportunity of working in the Congress—first in the House of Representatives, where I assisted in the formulation of the program resulting in the construction of our great hydropower projects on the Missouri River, and now in the Senate, where I serve on the Appropriations Subcommittee handling all the money for REA and RTA developments I, too, feel a gratifying sense of accomplishment in knowing that my efforts have contributed to the advancement of REA in my own State of South Dakota and throughout America.

When I first went to Washington representing South Dakota farmers in 1939, only 585 people in our State were obtaining electric service through REA. At that time only three of our REA co-ops had received approval of their first loan applications—Clay-Union Electric Corp. at Vermillion, Union County Electric Co-op at Elk Point, and Lincoln-Union Electric Co. at Alcester. In the years since, I have taken quiet pride in the fact that 31 additional REA co-ops in South Dakota have become energized and through the 34 hard-working South Dakota co-ops, spread across the length and breadth of our large State, REA electric service was made available to 21,207 consumers by 1949 and as of June 30, 1960, the number of REA consumers has risen dramatically to 72,628.

In 1935 only 2,939 South Dakota farms, or 3.5 percent of our farms, were served by central station electric service of any kind. But by patient and cooperative effort, by working together, we have succeeded in extending central station electric service to over 52,000 more South Dakota farms. We shall, of course, not be satisfied until we have reached the 100 percent mark.

It is the function of the Congress to appropriate the necessary funds to finance an active and expanding rural electrification program, and I am mighty pleased that my seniority in the Senate has afforded me the opportunity to become the fourth-ranking minority member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, from which position I am able to take a personal part in assuring that the Rural Electrification Administration receives proper recognition in the annual budgeting of Federal expenditures. Serving also on the subcommittee of our Appropriations Committee which has direct control of all Federal funds advanced to REA, I take a special pride in reporting no South Dakota REA or RTA loan has been rejected for lack of funds during my term of service.

During my 22 years of service in the House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate it has been my privilege and pleasure to assist South Dakota REA co-ops in obtaining over $120 million in loans for rural electric and telephone service. In addition to working for funds in the Congress, I have participated with South Dakota's able REA leaders in conferences with officials from the Rural Electrification Administration and the Bureau of Reclamation on a variety of problems and matters which are important to the future growth of REA in my home State. It is easy to support a worthwhile program like REA, for one has only to travel the highways of South Dakota at night and note the many lighted farmhouses dotting the countryside to understand how this low-interest loan program has benefited rural America. I have always vigorously and openly opposed any proposal from any source to increase REA interest rates.

A sound power program, of course, requires energetic and sensible leadership at the local level, and South Dakota has been

blessed with an abundance of outstanding REA directors and managers. A sound power program also requires consumers, who are willing to make broad utilization of electric service, and in this respect South Dakota's REA users have responded to the availability of electric and telephone service in a magnificent manner. To make a very poor pun, it has been "electrifying" to observe the wide variety of tasks to which our farmers have put "Willie Wirehand." Feed is mixed by electric devices; eggs are graded by electric graders; power-driven pumps have replaced the windmill; many brooders are heated electrically; and of great importance, REA electric service is now assisting the farm wife in carrying out many of her burdensome household tasks. In the last 10 years electric usage on South Dakota's farms has doubled.

REA REDUCES RATES

During a period when farmers in my State have been experiencing serious income problems due to declining farm prices and increased costs for goods and services, REA can hold its head high as the one service supplier that has cut rather than increased its cost to consumers. When I was first elected to Congress the average cost of electricity to a South Dakota farmer was about 7 cents for each kilowatt-hour. The cost today—some 20 years later—is about 3.32 cents per kilowatt-hour or over a 50-percent reduction in cost of service. The credit for this dramatic reduction in the cost of electric service to South Dakota farmers must in great measure go to the efficient management and operation of our local REA co-ops and to the East River generating and transmission co-op located in my hometown of Madison, S. Dak.

RTA—A SISTER SERVICE TO REA

No less amazing is the progress made by the rural telephone program in South Dakota over the past decade. In discussing the remarkable progress which has been achieved in providing telephone service to South Dakota's rural residents, I would be gravely remiss if I did not pay high tribute to ANCHER NELSEN, the first Eisenhower-appointed Administrator of REA, and David Hamil, the present REA Administrator. It will be recalled that the legislation authorizing loans for rural telephone systems was approved in 1949; however, it was not until the forceful ANCHER NELSEN, of Minnesota, assumed the helm at REA that this program really began to move, and it has continued to move impressively under the steady guidance of Colorado's Dave Hamil.

South Dakota serves as a good example of what these two public servants have done to pep up the RTA program. As of January 1, 1953, there was not a single consumer obtaining rural telephone service through the RTA in South Dakota; but 7½ years later there were 19,470 RTA consumers in South Dakota. I do not cite this tremendous growth of RTA in South Dakota in any attempt to strike a partisan political contrast, but I do it merely for the purpose of paying well-deserved tribute to two able gentlemen from "my neck of the woods," who have rendered distinguished service in the demanding job of Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration. I vigorously supported the Rural Telephone Act, which was adopted during my first year of service in the U.S. Senate; and it is a real source of satisfaction to me to know that this program is providing our farmers with another aid to more comfortable living—the telephone. In this connection I cherish dearly a copy of a resolution adopted by the directors of the Sully-Buttes RTA Cooperative, expressing thanks and appreciation for my assistance in obtaining a $1.7 million RTA loan to provide modern dial telephone service for the more than 2,000 members of that co-op.

It is very encouraging to me to note that REA has been and continues to be a Federal program that has genuine bipartisan support. That this is true is amply demonstrated by the gross-loan figures for the past 14 years. During the first 6 of these years, 1947–52, we had a Democrat President and the gross loans for electric and telephone service totaled $1,873.3 million. During the last 8 of these years, 1953–60, we have had a Republican President and the gross loans for electric and telephone service have totaled $2,253.8 million. Thus both political parties have contributed mightily to REA. Once again we must pay credit to local leadership for having attained this bi-partisan support, for there are literally dozens of States like my own of South Dakota, where the leaders of the individual co-ops have steadfastly refused to allow their REA's to become involved in partisan political activity. The wisdom of these individuals has certainly been vindicated when one views the record of progress under both Republican and Democrat administrations. REA plays no political favorites and both political parties favor REA. Those few self-serving politicians who have tried to use REA as a political device have always met with disappointment.

I stated in my opening remarks that a variety of elements and factors always contribute to real and lasting progress; and I think there is no better example of the truth of this statement than REA. The REA record of accomplishment in a State like South Dakota represents a great deal of hard work and untiring effort on the part of individuals at the Federal, State, and local levels. With the ever-increasing demand for electricity on our farms and in our rural communities the local REA co-ops have been assuming an ever-enlarging responsibility for the success of this program. These co-ops are constantly surveying the power needs and the power potential in their areas, and they are literally working day and night to provide their users with dependable low-cost electric service.

TENTH ANNIVERSARY OF EAST RIVER CO-OP

East River Electric Power Co-op, which headquarters in my hometown of Madison, S. Dak., is typical of the local endeavor which keeps REA moving forward. The first loan for East River was approved on November 16, 1950, and since that date this co-op has borrowed over $12 million in Federal funds to construct the necessary transmission facilities in order that its member co-ops can meet the growing demand for electric power. Throughout these 10 years I have worked with East River Co-op officials whenever asked to help expedite these many loans.

UNCLE SAM GIVES US A BOOST

In recent years our Federal Government has made a magnificent contribution to the growth and improvement of REA service in South Dakota. As of June 30, 1953, our South Dakota co-ops received 22,454,922 kilowatt-hours of power from the Bureau of Reclamation. By June 30, 1959—just 6 years later—South Dakota co-ops were receiving 383,455,000 kilowatt-hours of Bureau power, which means this Federal power contribution has increased 17-fold in that short period. Big Bend reservoir when completed and the finalizing of construction at Oahe will add vastly to our supply of low-cost river power for REA.

EISENHOWER-NIXON RECORD IS OUTSTANDING

Since this year, 1960, marks the eighth and final year of Dwight D. Eisenhower's distinguished tenure as President of the United States, I would like—before closing—to call attention to the fine record of growth which REA has enjoyed under his administration.

Since January 1, 1953, the Rural Electrification Administration has approved loans for rural electric and telephone facilities totaling more than $2.1 billion. This amount represents 44.4 percent of the total REA loans approved since the REA program was initiated in 1935.

Since January 1, 1953, more than $511 million in electric loans have been approved for generation and transmission purposes. This represents 53 percent of the total of $964 million approved for G. & T. purposes since REA began 25 years ago. In other words, more generation and transmission loans have been approved during the 7½ years of Eisenhower-Nixon administration than were approved during the first 17½ years of the electrification loan program. By June 30, 1953, generation loans had been approved to provide an installed capacity of 1,153,171 kilowatts. Seven years later, on June 30, 1960, loans had been approved to provide a capacity of 2,419,530 kilowatts. I take some pardonable pride in the fact I have voted for every dollar advanced to both the REA and RTA in South Dakota during my 22 years in Congress.

In REA's newer telephone program, 88 percent of all loans approved have been made during the Eisenhower-Nixon administration. A total of $511 million in telephone loans has been approved since January 1, 1953, out of a total of $670 million approved since the program began on October 28, 1949. Under this program, the one millionth rural subscriber received new or improved telephone service this summer.

This concludes my review of REA's record of achievement over its first 25 years of service to rural America. The preparation of this statement has provided me with many warm memories of those countless occasions over the past 22 years when it has been my great privilege to work with the REA leaders of South Dakota in bringing "Willie Wirehand" to the service and assistance of an ever-growing number of South Dakota's rural residents. My part in this grand log of accomplishment has been spread over 22 years in the House and Senate and I daresay no activity in my congressional service has given me such a keen sense of worthwhile personal endeavor as my unwavering support of those programs and proposals which will assure REA's continued healthy growth in South Dakota.

Statement Concerning the Activities of the Special Subcommittee on Oceanography, Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, House of Representatives, 86th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to submit a résumé of the activities of the Special Subcommittee on Oceanography of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

GENERAL AND HISTORICAL

On February 17, 1959, the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Hon. HERBERT C. BONNER, appointed a Special Subcommittee on Oceanography as a result of presentations made to the chairman by the Committee on Oceanography of the National Academy of Sciences. For many years the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee has been vested by the House

of Representatives with jurisdiction over matters pertaining to the merchant marine, fisheries, Coast and Geodetic Survey and the Coast Guard. Frequently the many separate aspects of the broad field of oceanography have been of concern to this committee and as a result of the successes of the International Geophysical Year the importance of coordinated study of problems of this nature has been demonstrated.

The subcommittee at the outset of its deliberations decided to conduct comprehensive surveys in the studies of the environment of the oceans, their boundaries, their productivity with respect to life and minerals, the various properties of the sea surface which influence the efficiency of our maritime operation and the influence of tides and currents upon the economics resulting from the environment of the seas of the world.

The subcommittee held hearings on March 3, 1959, March 10, 1959, March 12, 1959, March 17, 1959, April 21, 1959, April 23, 1959, April 24, 1959, June 1, 1959, June 23, 1959, and July 13, 1959, in the 1st session of the 86th Congress, and in the 2d session of the 86th Congress hearings were held on February 9, 1960. The purpose of this set of hearings was to determine our oceanographic assets to ascertain the problem areas which could necessitate legislation and thus to arrive at a sound basis for such legislative action as the subcommittee decided was necessary. These hearings have been published and widely distributed.

In addition, on January 22, 1960, hearings were held on specific legislation, introduced by the Senate as S. 2482 and S. 2483, which had as its purpose the removal of geographical limitations on the activities of the Coast and Geodetic Survey and a provision for flexibility in the performance of certain functions of the Coast and Geodetic Survey and of the Weather Bureau. After amendment by the subcommittee and approval by the full committee and the House, the legislation above described was agreed to by the Senate and are now Public Law 86–409—S. 2482—and Public Law 86–397—S. 2483. In the 2d session of the 86th Congress, I introduced H.R. 10412, and identical companion bills were introduced by Mr. PELLY, of Washington—H.R. 10581—and Mr. OLIVER, of Maine—H.R. 10546. These bills sought to establish a public policy with respect to oceanographic surveys and to provide for coordination of the efforts of Federal agencies with respect to oceanographic surveys.

Mr. PELLY, of Washington, introduced H.R. 9361 with the purpose as stated "to advance the marine sciences, to establish a comprehensive 10-year program of oceanographic research and surveys; to promote commerce and navigation, to secure the national defense, to expand ocean resources; to authorize the construction of research and surveys ships and facilities; to assure systematic studies of effects of radioactive materials in marine environments; to enhance the general welfare; and for other purposes."

I further introduced H.R. 12018 with the purpose "to establish within the U.S. Coast and Geodetic Survey a national oceanographic data center and a national instrumentation test and calibration center." Hearings on the aforementioned bills were held by the subcommittee on May 17, 1960, May 19, 1960, May 20, 1960, and May 24, 1960. These hearings have been published and widely distributed.

In addition to the hearings referred to above, the committee and staff visited the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution at Woods Hole, Mass., the Scripps Institution of Oceanography at La Jolla, Calif., the University of Washington, Texas A. & M. at College Station, Tex., and the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries Radiation Laboratory at Beaufort, N.C. Members of the committee and the staff have attended various oceanographic meetings, such as the International Oceanographic Congress held at New York in September 1959, meetings of the National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council held in California and in Washington, and monthly meetings of an unofficial working level coordinating committee held in Washington. Correspondence requesting suggestions and opinions was initiated with all known Government agencies concerned with the environment of the oceans, various State agencies concerned with their particular problems of the oceans, and outstanding marine scientists of both this country and abroad.

ANALYSIS OF THE HEARINGS

The hearings, although extremely exhaustive in their scope, produced basically two fundamental problems. The first problem is one of funding adequately to insure that the maximum utilization of existing facilities and ships and personnel are used to the fullest extent possible. The second problem can broadly be said to be one of insuring that coordination between the various agencies involved in studies of the environment of the sea are effectually carrying out long-range planning with the minimum of overlapping of function, and properly expressing to the Congress requests for such needed legislation as should be apparent to a coordinated study of the problems of the oceans. To the end that a solution to these two problems may be attained, certain expansion of these problems is important. It should in general be realized that at the current moment the only coordination of effort with respect to studies of the environment of the oceans is being attempted by the Subcommittee of the Federal Council of Science and Technology. This is not a statutorily created body and it is not responsible to the Congress for congressional oversight. In view of the fact that the existence of the Federal Council of Science and Technology depends solely upon Executive direction no permanency of planning can be assured. The problems posed earlier will be considered in more detail.

COORDINATION OF OCEANOGRAPHIC ACTIVITIES OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES

As a result of the hearings before described, it was manifest at the outset that some means of formal coordination of the various Government bureaus and agencies concerned with the study and development of the environment of the sea is necessary. Our subcommittee regards the establishment of a means of statutorily required coordination to be the most important facet resulting from its hearings.

The Subcommittee on Oceanography of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries does not feel that a new agency should be created at the present time to acquire the functions and responsibilities of the aquatic environment which are vested in the various departments and agencies of the Government. This feeling is prompted by the realization that the various departments whose agencies are concerned with the environment of the oceans must of necessity in carrying out their basic function as a department, continue their departmental interest in the oceans. The subcommittee and its staff have under study proposed legislation which will be introduced in the forthcoming Congress to achieve a solution of this pressing problem. The solution of necessity must provide for a continual examination on the part of the Congress as to the performance of the executive department, thereby giving the coordinating means the benefit of congressional oversight.

PROBLEM OF FINANCING

The subcommittee, through its hearings, developed that although the executive department had increased its budget request in many directions it was extremely difficult to ascertain how much of each department or agency budget request was to be devoted to the fullest exploitation of the marine environment.

One thing that did develop was the tendency on the part of the departmental heads to arbitrarily apply a blanket cut when the appropriated funds or the funds to be requested were cut by the executive department to all facets of their department without regard to the immediate problems of the oceans, rivers and lakes. Further it has developed in the case of the Department of the Interior that the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries has been compelled to spend heavily from its Saltonstall-Kennedy funds moneys for purposes other than research. I do not believe this was the contemplation of the Congress. In other words, the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, having received an increase of moneys from the Saltonstall-Kennedy funds, is in a position of having its operating budget cut by the amount of increase with the net result that research in the productivity of the fisheries has been reduced.

Legislation to correct this situation and to insure that the Congress knows at all times the amount of money being spent in the development of the oceanic environment will be introduced in the next session.

S. 2692

On June 25, 1960, a Senate bill was received by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries (S. 2692) after having passed the Senate. This bill originally in scope was similar to the bill introduced by Mr. PELLY (H.R. 9361). Owing to the controversial approach in the thinking of these two bills and to the material developed in the hearings on H.R. 9361, together with the unanimous disfavor of both bills received from all

executive departments and agencies concerned, insufficient time was available to rectify the differences of opinion. It is believed that the legislation contemplated by the subcommittee and referred to above will accomplish the necessary congressional action and will be presented at the next session of the Congress.

Accomplishments of the 86th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the 86th Congress has served during a period of world-shaking developments, uncertainty, and changes in the international climate—and of growth and widening horizons at home.

In the 19 months since we first convened on January 7, 1959, we have heard the howling winds of threatened war and felt the soft, inviting breezes of peaceful coexistence designed by the Soviets to lull us to sleep.

Now, again, the hands of the clock of destiny have come full circle: The dulcet tones of Soviet Minister Khrushchev have risen to a hysterical shriek, the smiling mask has dropped, and the true face of communism's aggressive intent stands exposed in all its cruel malevolence.

History will record that this Democratic Congress neither succumbed to the wiles of the Red peace line, nor quailed before its threats. Rather have we hewed to a steadfast course, proclaiming by deeds that speak more loudly than words, the credo of America: Our love of liberty, our determination to defend it, the sincerity of our aims for peace and of our desire for the attainment by all peoples of the freedom we ourselves enjoy, and for the elevation not only of their living standards but of their status to one of respected individual human dignity.

Even before the debacle at Paris interposed new obstacles to these goals, this Congress was at work on measures to provide the United States with the strongest possible military defense, which—should even that fail to deter an enemy attack—would at the same time supply ample means for instant and irresistible retaliation. We supplied the President with more defense funds than he was willing to use.

This is neither the time nor the place to assess how much or little the inaction of the administration may have contributed to the present sad state of our foreign affairs.

We face the hard facts that the longings, hopes, and aspirations of mankind were shattered at the summit, that our allies and friends are restive and under pressure, and that even a problem child of the Caribbean, heaping indignities upon us at will, has furnished communism with a base on this hemisphere for which the present Republican administration is responsible.

Much more important than how these things were permitted to come about, and who is to blame, is the task of restoring the strength and influence of America's position of leadership in the free world.

To that great cause this Congress has dedicated its efforts. As we know, the Constitution reposed in the President the duty to formulate and execute our foreign policy. It devolved upon this Congress, however, to demonstrate by action that we practice at home what we preach abroad.

Today, we near the completion of that solemn task. In its broad scope and high motivation, in the spirit of the preamble of our Constitution, the program enacted by this 86th Congress is a shining example to all people everywhere of the blessings of liberty:

First. For the first time in our history we have extended a helping hand to the Nation's senior citizens in meeting the problem of mounting costs of medical care in their declining years. We have only made a start, additional legislation is necessary, and with the election of Senator KENNEDY as President and Senator JOHNSON as Vice President, such legislation will be enacted into law.

Second. For the first time in our history this year's national election will be conducted under laws designed to enforce the voting rights of all citizens as guaranteed by the 14th amendment to the Constitution.

Third. For the first time in our history Congress has acknowledged by a constitutional amendment, the rights of the citizens of the District of Columbia to exercise the franchise as American citizens in national elections.

Fourth. For the first time in our history, this Congress has carried on its membership rolls the Representatives and Senators of the sovereign 49th and 50th States of the Union—Alaska and Hawaii, outposts of freedom in the Far North and in the South Pacific. For both of these new States were admitted to the Union by Democratic-controlled Congresses.

These are historic landmarks of a record of solid accomplishment, and a Congress is remembered for its contributions to American history. Not only have we opened new horizons in the fields of social security and civil rights affecting the welfare of millions of citizens of every race, color, and creed, which will be further improved, but we have legislated in the encouragement of small business, in the development of our natural resources, highways and public works, and in many ways met our obligation to the veterans who served our Nation in time of war.

This is not to say that all goals have been fully attained. We have, however, taken the first steps toward the beckoning new frontier. Mankind's upward striving toward the ultimate of his earthly aspirations has always been upon a rocky road that is long and hard.

And so it is, too, under the processes and procedures of a representative parliament of free citizens such as ours. We achieve only what is possible under agreement of the majority, the synthesis and amalgam of conflicting individual, regional, and party viewpoints. And even the will of the majority can be temporarily frustrated in the face and threat of a Presidential veto of one-third plus one.

The very real and impressive record of this Congress has been written over the whole period from its inception, more than a year and a half ago—not in the politically charged atmosphere of the last 3 weeks alone, as some would have the public believe.

That record, in the form of substantial and constructive legislation now embodied in our statute books, is one of which the Members of this body may well be proud.

The legislation is substantial in that it affects every area of our national life.

The legislation is constructive in that it was accomplished under the conditions of a divided Government—a Republican President and a Democratic Congress, a situation prevailing throughout the present administration with the exception of its first 2 years in office.

Democratic majorities, elected and reelected to the 84th, 85th, and 86th Congresses in succession, obviously must have functioned to the overwhelming satisfaction of the voters.

It would seem that the President, even though of opposite political party, would recognize the actions of a Democratic Congress as reflecting and responsive to the will of the people whom they represent, and thus would be less prone to thwart it.

On the contrary, however, the President, usually on specious grounds, has vetoed several vital and progressive measures of this Congress, and adversely affected numerous others by his threats of veto.

To the credit of the Democratic leadership of the Congress, its actions were directed to the attainment of legislation for the good of the country rather than the creation of political issues.

There will always be minorities who may feel that progress is either too slow or too fast. In this election year of 1960 it will be for the voters in November to determine the pace of the next Congress.

The people can confidently expect that with a Democratic President in the White House, exercising his powers of moral leadership, and working hand in hand with a Democratic Congress, the great problems of world relationships, national security, economic progress and domestic welfare will be tackled with renewed vigor.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

A total of nearly $80 billion for national defense was appropriated by this 86th Congress in its 1st and 2d sessions.

The General Accounting Office in a number of reports, and committees of Congress, have shown that considerable waste through unnecessary duplication and purchases has taken place. And the surface has only been scratched. While in the preparation for national defense a certain amount of duplication and excess purchases is necessary which, in all fairness, should be recognized, unneces-

sary duplication and purchases should be eliminated, because such savings could be used for additional real and necessary defense purposes. The present administration has been lax in giving the leadership to avoid such unnecessary expenditures in a field which covers at least one-half of the appropriations for the Department of Defense.

While our overall defense picture is at present strong, we should not and cannot ignore the fact that certain weaknesses exist that Democratic-controlled Congresses have tried to remove.

For example, we feel that our standing Army and Marine Corps should be larger; that our weapon systems, the U.S. Army, in particular, should be modernized, for which funds were appropriated to start such modernization, the most of which by order of the Chief Executive, was not used; that authorization and construction of Polaris atomic-type submarines should be increased, and the construction accelerated of those authorized; that a more adequate defense should be established against attack by intercontinental ballistic missiles and by intercontinental bombers; that funds for military research and development should be increased, having in mind the importance of basic research, and that in the field of which is referred to as outer space in which the military as well as the civilian agency (NASA) are deeply interested, and in which field we are 4 to 5 years behind the Soviet Union in propulsion power, instead of the policy of catching up the Democratic Party's policy is to go ahead of the Soviet Union.

For we have the brains and the facilities to do this in all aspects of research and development, whether military or civilian.

What is needed is the leadership that will coordinate these brains and facilities to obtain the desired and necessary result.

For the Democratic Party recognizes that in the war of survival, which the Republican administration now recognizes after 7½ years, that America cannot be second best in any important field, particularly military, to the Soviet Union.

The disagreement in the field of national defense between the Democratic Congress and the President is not that the administration has gone too far, but that it has not gone far enough. And recent events have clearly supported the position of the Democratic Party in Congress.

The evidence of internal administration conflicts and disagreements, and alleged influence and favoritism among some manufacturers competing for defense contracts, with other factors, such as the established fact of wastefulness of countless of millions of dollars, led the committees of Congress to shift the purposes of some of the funds requested by the budget of the President. Such action was to assure as far as Congress could go the use of appropriated funds for more effective military strength and power.

For example, last year, for fiscal 1960, minimum personnel figures were fixed for each branch of the Armed Forces, increased funds over the budget were allowed for Army modernization and antisubmarine activities. Funds were provided for a second nuclear-propelled aircraft carrier. All of these changes were made within the total figure asked by the President.

For fiscal 1961, Congress again increased, this year by more than $162 million, the President's program for Army modernization; refused to cut the Army National Guard and Army Reserve, and fixed strengths of 400,000 and 300,000 respectively rather than 360,000 and 270,000 he recommended.

One of the more significant actions was provision of $250 million above the budget to provide additional airlift capability for quick transfer of fighting men to any emergency spot. This was done, in the words of the subcommittee chairman, Mr. MAHON, of Texas, after "key officials of the Department of Defense confessed that our airlift is inadequate."

Another vital move was the addition of $145 million above the budget for the Air Force to speed the perfection of unmanned military satellites: the Samos of reconnaissance and intelligence, the Midas for early warning of attack, and the exploratory satellite, the Discoverer.

Other specific fields in which the Congress provided funds in excess of the President's budget were for the accelerated development of the B–70, increased number of planes for airborne alert, a stepped-up fleet ballistic missile program for 12 Polaris submarines.

Much of the increase was balanced by cuts in other sections of the Defense budget, with the net total above the President's requests amounting to $600 million.

Apart from appropriations the Congress took these other actions defensewise:

Extended the draft to July 1, 1963.

Extended the Renegotiation Act for 3 years to December 31, 1962, to provide for recovery of excessive profits on defense contracts and authorizing a study of procurement and renegotiation policies.

Enacted measures authorizing involuntary retirement of officers in the various services to raise the quality of officer personnel and increase efficiency.

Authorizes $1.1 billion of construction projects for fiscal 1961 at Army, Navy, and Air Force installations here and abroad.

Authorizes construction of 4 modern naval vessels at cost of $157.9 million as part of 1961 program involving 57 vessels.

CIVIL RIGHTS

When the historic move was made in the 85th Congress to enforce by appropriate legislation the voting rights guarantee of the 14th amendment, 90 years after its ratification, the life of the new Civil Rights Commission was to expire in November 1959.

Two measures enacted by this 86th Congress will make possible the functioning of the Commission for the first time under the actual conditions of a national election this year.

In the 2d session of the 86th Congress under the Civil Rights Act of 1957, that which, in brief, provides the following:

First. After a finding in a suit brought under the Cnvil Rights Act of 1957, that Negroes have been disqualified from voting on racial grounds, Federal courts have the authority to appoint referees who may, if a Negro fails in a new attempt to register, grant voting certificates binding on State officials under penalty of contempt of court; second, the records of State election officers must be preserved for 22 months after each primary or general election, and inspection by the Department of Justice is authorized; third, one who obstructs a Federal court order will be guilty of a Federal crime; fourth, persons who cross State lines to avoid prosecution for "hate bombings" are also guilty of a Federal crime; and fifth, the Government may provide temporary schooling for servicemen's children in areas where public schools are closed by integration disputes.

Thus the forthcoming presidential election will be the crucible in which this effort to protect a great number of citizens against disfranchisement will be tested. It will be a test likewise of the newly established legal machinery and procedures designed to that end. The administration has the responsibility of enforcing the provisions of this law to see that Americans of the colored race can exercise their constitutional right to register and vote.

For it was the 85th Congress, followed by important amendments in the present Congress, both Democratic controlled, that enacted in close to 90 years civil-rights legislation. This is a record the Democratic Party can be proud of, particularly when it is known that the 83d Congress, Republican controlled and with President Eisenhower in the White House, did not even report, in either branch of the Congress, a civil rights bill out of committee.

With this experience behind us—and not before—it will be time again in the 87th Congress to look at the whole picture and determine what improvements may be needed in the laws, and what other facets of civil rights require action.

Statehood for Hawaii, one of the earliest actions of the 86th Congress, not only added a 50th star to the American flag—following Alaska as the 49th—but it demonstrated to the world the diversity within the unity of our democracy. People of many races of the Far East comprise the citizenship of this new State, and their elected Members of Congress include men of Japanese and Chinese origin, taking their seats in the Capitol along with a native of India and Negroes from our large cities—Americans all.

It was peculiarly appropriate that the last State admitted to the Union should be the first to ratify the proposed constitutional amendment adopted by this Congress, and submitted to the States for approval, to give the citizens of our own District of Columbia the right to vote in national elections.

This action of the Congress not only was a matter of justice to the people of

Washington, but cleared up an anomaly which was beyond the understanding of our friends abroad: that the citizens of our Nation's Capital, among all Americans, should not have the right to participate in the election of their President.

SOCIAL SECURITY, HEALTH, AND WELFARE

The first halting step toward a program of adequate medical care for the aged was made by this Congress.

That it will not suffice the needs of a growing number of elderly citizens to meet increasing costs of medical service, hospitalization, drugs, and so forth, will become evident when the program goes into effect.

Such aid as the measure will provide to a limited number of persons, estimated at 1,300,000 of the 16 million men and women over 65 years of age, is pitifully small. A program of greater benefit to more people could, of course, have been enacted if the President and Vice President had lent support instead of opposition to the principle of self-financing as part of the social security system.

Nevertheless, it is a start, with the prospect that the next Congress, working with a Democratic President who will give leadership instead of lip service on this issue, will fight for expansion of the program. And with a Democrat in the White House, this expansion will take place.

As enacted the law provides for Federal contributions to those States which agree to put up funds to help pay medical costs for eligible individuals. Estimated cost of the program in its first year, starting October 1, is $260 million of which the States would pay about one-third.

Immediately eligible are approximately 2,400,000 needy aged now receiving old-age assistance from their States, under a relief program to which the Federal Government now contributes on a sliding scale up to $65 per person. Under the new act the Federal contribution will be on the basis of an additional $12 per month for the estimated 15 percent of these individuals, or 300,000 needing medical care.

Other potential beneficiaries are 10 million aged not on State welfare rolls but whose incomes are insufficient to pay the full costs of medical care, particularly should a catastrophic illness strike. It is estimated about 10 percent or 1 million of these would need help in any 1 year.

The extent of aid given to persons in this latter group will vary in accordance with standards set up by each State, as to what items of expense the State will help to pay, how much of the obligation it will share, and the income level beyond which persons will not be eligible.

Liens on a beneficiary's property could be required by the States from those on its assistance rolls but not from others.

However, a humiliating feature for our senior citizens will be the necessity of going hat in hand to welfare offices to prove the insufficiency of their income to meet an overwhelming financial crisis in their lives by virtually a "pauper's oath." How much more humane, sensible and self-respecting for the individual is proposal to incorporate health insurance into the social security system under which the individual, by contributing through withdrawal tax, builds up protection against old age ills by paying his own way—and sparing his pride.

The medical care feature is one of a series of other amendments to the Social Security Act which:

Increases from $1,200 to $1,350 the limit retirees may earn without losing OASI pension payments.

Permits disability benefits for the insured and his dependents regardless of age. Previously these payments could not begin before the age of 50.

Reduces the work period required to qualify for old age pensions, thereby making approximately 300,000 additional persons eligible for immediate benefits.

Increases benefits to approximately 400,000 children of deceased workers in families with more than one child up to a maximum per family of $254 monthly.

Extends pension benefits for the first time to widows of qualified workers who died before 1940.

In the whole broad range of social welfare, health and education the 86th Congress enacted more than a score of important measures.

The Federal contribution to the land-grant colleges was increased.

Higher benefits were provided under the Federal Employees Compensation Act.

Increases of the authorized maximum expenditures under the special school milk program for 1959, 1960, and 1961.

Railroad retirement benefits and unemployment compensation were raised.

In further protection of the health and safety of the public and consumers a national register of persons whose driver's licenses were revoked was established in the Department of Commerce.

Control over use of coal-tar coloring in food, drugs, and cosmetics was tightened, regulation provided over distribution of hazardous substances sold for household use, and a system of licensing and control over manufacture of narcotic drugs.

The Federal Air Pollution Control Act was extended and studies authorized of the effects of automobile exhaust fumes.

Health insurance programs for Federal employees as well as civil service workers were established and increases in annuities for retired Foreign Service officers and their survivors were authorized.

Bill providing pay increases of 8.4 percent for postal employees, and 7½ percent for classified and other employees. This bill was vetoed, and the Democratic controlled Congress passed it over the veto of President Eisenhower.

The Comprehensive Housing Act of 1959—which the President finally approved after vetoing two earlier measures as well as one in 1958—fortunately provided 2-year authorizations for FHA loans and urban redevelopment. However the opposition of the administration was sufficient to prevent the passage of a broader and much needed Housing Act.

A new Democratic administration will be able to take a fresh look at these problems. Meanwhile the Congress provided for those programs which will either expire or require additional appropriations authorizations. These were for home repair and improvement, and loans for college housing and community facilities.

Much more serious was the failure to enact a school construction program. Even though the Democratic majority scaled down its legislation to conform with the President's own proposals in an earlier administration bill neither he nor his party leaders would raise a finger to produce one vote in the Rules Committee to get conflicting Senate and House bills to a conference.

Here again we may expect that the election of a Democratic President will make the difference in 1961.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

In spite of the difficulty of the Congress in following the vacillating and uncertain policies of the administration in foreign affairs we have provided the President with the machinery and the funds to do the job.

Approximately $8 billion has been appropriated by this Congress in the past 2 years for expenditure under the Mutual Security Act to aid our allies in strengthening our common defense efforts and to help underdeveloped nations overcome the poverty, disease, and illiteracy which makes them vulnerable prey to communism.

The annual battle over these funds raged again, thanks to the refusal of the President to put this vital program on a long-range basis. Although the Draper Committee which he appointed to study the whole problem of free-world survival urged him to drop the hand-to-mouth shortsighted method of its treatment, he rejected the first step in that direction—a congressional plan to 5-year financing of the Development Loan Fund.

The proposal called for direct financing from the Treasury instead of annual appropriations, which the President resorting to a political shibboleth labeled back-door financing. This is a method to which he has in the past resorted when it suited his own purposes.

This chicken came home to roost this year when $75 million in Development Loan funds were not included in a last-minute supplemental appropriation he sought.

Another ill-timed appropriation asked by the President, for $500 million additional mutual security funds for Latin American countries, was provided by the Congress, along with $100 million to rehabilitate earthquake-stricken Chile. The passage of this bill by itself justified the adjourned session that followed the two national conventions. If Congress had adjourned sine die before the national conventions, in the light of the situation existing in South American countries, the President would have been faced with the question of calling Congress back in a special session.

For the last few years it had been quite apparent that our good neighbors to the south felt we had been neglecting them while concentrating our interest on other parts of the world. Various high administration officials, and even the President's brother, Dr. Milton Eisenhower, had made trips there, come back and made recommendations which were usually pigeonholed.

However, it was not until the Cuban situation became serious and the Dominican issue flared before the meeting of the Organization of American States that the President belatedly came forward, toward the close of the session, with his request.

The Congress earlier, in its first session, enacted legislation providing for the establishment of, and our participation in, the Inter-American Development Bank, to give the Latin American nations an institution long needed to aid their economies through development of their resources.

Another major action by the Congress was provision for American participation in the International Development Association to help provide assistance to underdeveloped countries.

A whole series of treaties were ratified by the U.S. Senate including the vital one to assure mutual cooperation and security with Japan, and the Antarctica Treaty dedicating the use of that continent to peaceful purposes only.

Other major achievements were the bill authorizing $500 million to help South American countries in social and economic development, and a $100 million authorization for Chilean earthquake rehabilitation. If the Congress had adjourned prior to the two national conventions, the importance of early passage of such legislation was such that the President would have been faced with the question of calling Congress back in special session.

A $162 million supplemental appropriation bill restoring $65 million of the reduction previously made to the mutual assistance appropriation bill.

Other matters of importance are:

A $3.9 billion appropriation bill for public works projects. The result of such appropriations will be the marshaling and utilization of additional natural resources located in all parts of our country.

Suspension of the Federal Communications Act equal time requirement so that the 1960 presidential and vice-presidential candidates can stage TV-radio debates without obliging broadcasting networks to give corresponding time to fringe-party nominees for those offices.

A measure setting Federal criminal penalties for persons convicted of payola dealings, rigging quiz shows and other abuses in the TV-radio industry.

Providing for admission of approximately 5,000 nonquota immigrants as part of international program for resettlement of European refugees.

Amending antikickback statute now covering cost-plus contracts to apply to all negotiated Government contracts.

Amending various Federal statutes in view of transition of Hawaii from territorial to statehood status.

Permitting personal income tax deductions of all medical expenses incurred by any taxpayer in care of dependent parent over 65 years of age.

Authorizing $1 billion a year for fiscal 1962 and 1963 in Federal aid for primary and secondary highway systems and their urban extensions.

Bill reducing cabaret tax from 20 percent to 10 percent.

Revising method for treatment of railroad corporation income resulting from discharge of indebtedness in receivership or under bankruptcy proceedings.

Requiring bank mergers to have approval of Federal Reserve Board, Comptroller of Currency, or Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation to assure against monopoly.

Permitting tax credit on foreign income by corporations to be taken on overall instead of country-by-country basis.

Increasing payment for domestic ship construction, for 2 years, to 55 percent of cost in foreign yards.

Providing $2½ million a year for 3 years to aid fishing industry to meet foreign competition in the construction of trawlers.

Amending Investment Advisers Act of 1940 to make enforcement by the SEC more effective.

Amending Investment Company Act of 1940 to strengthen regulation by the Securities and Exchange Commission.

Authorizing $1.5 billion public works projects on rivers and harbors for flood control and improvement of harbors.

Created an Office of Coal Research to find new uses for coal to encourage production and conservation, and to otherwise stimulate this industry.

Of great importance is the bill authorizing $500 million for the construction of the San Luis unit of the Central Valley, Calif., water supply project.

Authorizing Federal cooperation with educational institutions and private organizations in research and training programs on fish and wildlife resources.

Extending special milk program for children to June 30, 1961, and authorizing maximum expenditures of $85 million in fiscal year 1960 and $95 million in fiscal year 1961.

Providing for regulation of interstate distribution of hazardous substances sold for household use.

Clarifying special postal rates for educational, cultural, and library materials.

Also of major importance bill authorizing Post Office Department to seek court orders to curb the use of mails for the distribution of obscene or fraudulent matters.

Establishing a system of licensing and control over the manufacture of narcotic drugs.

Resolution of the House of Representatives expressing the sense of the House that the President should call a White House conference on narcotics.

Authorization and appropriations of over $900 million for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Authorization for adequate appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission, and the making of such appropriations.

NATIONAL ECONOMY

After nearly 8 years of Republican administration of the executive branch of the Government the state of the national economy is ominous:

Unemployment is at 4,500,000; steel production is lower than at any time in the past 10 years; business profits have dropped; the stock market is down in anticipation of lower earnings; consumer buying and consumer credit while both high are rising at diminishing rates, and the rate of increase in personal income likewise has slowed down. Farm income, too, is down.

If elected, Mr. NIXON recently said he would solve the plight of the farmers during the next 4 years. That statement naturally raises the question "Where have Mr. NIXON and the Republican administration been the past 7½ years?"

The administration which not so many months ago was trying to persuade the Congress to raise the interest rate on long-term Treasury securities above the 4½-percent limit is now, though the Federal Reserve Board is cutting rediscount rates, reducing required bank reserves to get credit flowing.

A Congress is to be judged not only by what it does, but what it refuses to do. The Democratic controlled Congress refused to accede to aggressive position, repeatedly stated, of the President to completely lift the 4½-percent ceiling on long-term Federal Government bonds.

The Democratic controlled Congress thereby rendered an inestimable service to the American people.

As a result of the high-interest policy of the Republican administration, put into operation administratively, it is conservatively estimated on public and private indebtedness the taxpayers and the people are paying at least $12 billion more a year now than they did under preceding Democratic administrations. For example, the increase on payments of interest on the Federal debt is over $4 billion a year more now than the payment was as recently as 1952.

There are reliable reports that the administration, which, for a few months put a check on expenditures in order to end the fiscal year June 30 with a surplus, is now accelerating them in order to revive conditions before the November election.

Had the administration not opposed school construction and housing legislation in the last 2 years the economy would today be in better condition.

Had the President not vetoed earlier public works legislation of this Congress those projects would be under way today.

Had the President not vetoed the depressed areas bill the loans and grants provided under that legislation would have been at work helping to redevelop those sections of the Nation burdened with surplus labor of a chronic nature.

Had the President not refused to go along on the $1.25 minimum wage legislation with expanded coverage, which died, the money spent by these wage-earners would be giving the economy a lift.

In spite of Republican obstruction the Congress did manage to enact some legislation helpful to our economic situation:

The lending authority of the Small Business Administration was increased from $150 million to $575 million.

The ceiling on the amount of loans the SEA may have outstanding was lifted by $150 million to $725 million.

The Small Business Investment Act, under which private investment corporations to operate in this field are created,

was amended to make their extension of credit more readily available.

The Clayton Antitrust Act was amended to expedite procedures for enforcement of orders of the Federal Trade Commission.

Highways and airport construction authorizations were enacted and these should make a favorable impact throughout 1961.

Enactment of a measure curbing undemocratic and racketeering practices should have a stabilizing effect on labor-management relations.

The existing 52-percent corporate income-tax rate and the temporary schedule of excise taxes were again twice extended by this Congress, to run now to July 1, 1961.

Likewise, a temporary increase in the limit on the national debt to $293 billion to the end of fiscal 1961 was enacted. The statutory limit was lifted in the first session from $283 billion to $285 billion.

With the administration approaching the end of its 8-year tenure, it might be well to note that the Republicans who ran for office on promises to reduce the debt have now brought it to a peacetime record high.

VETERANS' LEGISLATION

Ever mindful of the contributions made in time of war and in time of peace by the veterans of our country, the 86th Democratic-controlled Congress passed a number of bills important to their best interests and also to the widows and dependents of deceased veterans.

Legislation was enacted into law—

Authorizing $100 million for direct housing loans to veterans.

Increasing non-service-connected pensions to veterans and equalizing pensions of World War II and widows of the Korean conflict with those of World War I.

Extending special enlistment programs under the Reserve Act.

Providing for control of estates of incompetent veterans.

Providing grants to aid totally disabled veterans to acquire specially equipped housing.

Extending for 2 years, to July 25, 1962, authority for direct and guaranteed loans to veterans for homes, farms, or business.

Waiving payment of premiums on national life insurance policies for certain totally disabled veterans.

Permitting conversion or exchange of national life insurance policies to a new modified plan.

Providing education and training for children of veterans dying of service-connected disability after January 1, 1955.

Providing additional compensation for disabled veterans with more than three children.

Increasing payments for support of disabled veterans in State soldiers' homes.

Providing for additional compensation for certain disabled veterans.

Providing for services of optometrists to veterans with service-connected eye conditions.

Clarifying reemployment provisions affecting draftees and reservists.

Providing for free medical service for veterans with nonservice ills requiring treatment preparatory to admission to a veterans hospital.

Providing for $100-a-month pension for holders of the Congressional Medal of Honor.

Extending to March 1, 1964, the period during which families of veterans have preference for admission to public housing projects.

Authorizing the posthumous award of appropriate medals to the four chaplains.

The agricultural community of our country is one of the greatest assets we have, not only as a prominent factor in our gross national economy, but as an important element of our national defense.

For a nation that cannot grow farm products to feed its people could, in time of war, be forced to capitulate to an enemy capable of blockading its shores.

Our farmers and their families are vitally important as sound, substantial citizens.

Agriculture in the United States is in the broad situation of buying necessities for the farm and family in a protected market, and selling surpluses in an unprotected market, and pretty much at world prices.

A broad and dynamic agriculture, with the family-type farm preserved, is a matter of national importance.

The Democratic Party has recognized that in a great industrial Nation like ours, unless our agricultural community—our farmers—receive compensatory consideration for the tariff protection given business and industry, that a broad and dynamic agricultural life, with the family-type farmer properly recognized, will be difficult to exist.

Under past Democratic administrations legislation was enacted into law of great benefit to the farmers of our country, and through a strong agricultural community, of great benefit to the national interest of our country.

During the past 7½ years, under the Republican Party, with the veto power of the President, and his boast and threat of one-third plus one, farm income has materially dropped, at a time when purchases for farm and family, as well as other expenses, have sharply increased. As a result, tens of thousands of family-type farms have disappeared—the farmer owners unable to obtain a living, and the corporate-type farm has sharply increased.

It is not too late for the farmers of our country to reverse this situation. To do so requires understanding the lack of visionary leadership during the past 7½ years, and action on their part at the polls to repose complete control of our Government, the White House, and the Congress, in the hands of the Democratic Party.

With a Democrat in the White House, and a Democratic Congress, which seems to be assured, teamwork and a coordinated leadership will exist that will restore vitality to agriculture and to farm life in our country.

The only promise the Republicans, through their candidate for President, makes is that they will solve the farm problem during the next 4 years.

But where have the Republicans been during the past 7½ years?

During this period several excellent bills passed by Democratic Congresses met with Presidential veto.

The last one was as recently as 1959, providing for a referendum by wheat farmers on 25 percent reduction on planting acreage and 90 percent of parity price support, and failing approval by a two-thirds majority, acreage controls would be removed and price supports reduced.

I might also observe that the Republican Party in 1953–54—83d Congress—was in control of the White House and of both branches of the Congress, and failed to act.

Despite the noncooperation of President Eisenhower who followed the advice of Hon. Ezra Taft Benson, Secretary of Agriculture, Democratic-controlled Congresses have passed legislation of importance to our farming community.

Confining myself to the 86th Congress which has just adjourned sine die, the following bills are some that were enacted into law:

Extending for 2 years to December 31, 1962, Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act for sale of surplus commodities abroad; permits a trial food-stamp plan for distribution to needy at home; authorizes $4.5 billion.

Broadening power of Crop Insurance Board to extend program into additional counties.

Authorizing leasing of cotton acreage allotments during crop-years 1959 through 1961.

Authorizing Commodity Credit Corporation to sell food for livestock in emergency areas.

Transferring responsibility for making appraisals from Farm Credit Administration to Federal land banks.

Extending to June 30, 1961, provisions of Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act authorizing refinancing of loans on family-sized farms.

Permitting continuance of established coloring practices in orange industry.

Extending for 3 months, to March 31, 1961, the Sugar Act of 1948, fixing quotas of domestic and foreign producers; gives President authority to readjust Cuba's quota.

Requiring marketing quotas for rice be established when total supply exceeds normal.

Permitting application of loan provisions of Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act to other soil-conservation projects.

Extending minimum national marketing quota for extra-long-staple cotton to the 1961 crop.

Fixing price supports for butterfat and for milk sold for manufacturing purposes.

Authorizing donation of Federal surplus property to cooperative agricultural extension agencies of States and counties.

A bill of great importance to tobacco producers to stabilize price supports for

tobacco was passed by the second session of this Congress, and is now law.

And yet a bill passed by the first session of this Congress to stabilize and protect the level of tobacco price supports was vetoed by President Eisenhower.

Final Report—2d Session, 86th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of this session of the 86th Congress, it is my privilege to bring to the voters of the 23d Congressional District a final report of the 1960 session's accomplishments. Early "do something Congress" promises of the majority leadership wilted in the heat of their own partisan sound-and-fury. More than one-fourth of the total 264 legislative days in which the House and Senate met were tied up in intra-majority-party wrangling over civil rights. The special postconvention session, which ended at 11:52 p.m., September 1, fizzled out with many major issues unresolved. Of the 6,327 bills introduced at the start of the session, 511 were enacted into law, and 244 of these were private bills. Major legislation shelved by the 86th Congress in the second session included an omnibus housing bill, a minimum wage increase, a costly water pollution measure, an extravagant area redevelopment program, increased veterans' benefits, Federal aid to school construction, general tax revision. The following major legislation was enacted into law:

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Defense appropriations proved a boomerang to partisan detractors of President Eisenhower's defense planning. Even many members of the majority party could not go along with their leaders' exorbitant demands, with the result that despite pressure from all sides the President's original request for $39.335 billion was upped by only $661 million, for a total of $39.996 billion.

Military construction money requests were almost halved by Congress, which chopped the Executive's request $1.188 billion down to $994 million.

Space research and development was given a fiscal shot in the arm with a supplemental appropriation to NASA of $23 million.

Four modern naval vessels were authorized at a cost of $157.9 million as part of the vast naval expansion program which calls for 57 new vessels.

Atomic Energy Commission funds totaling $211 million were voted for new construction projects affecting all aspects of the AEC programs—manufacture of atomic weapons, production of special nuclear materials, reactor development, physical research, and biology and medicines.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mutual security funds were reduced by $559 million, with Congress rejecting a request for $4.281 billion and giving a final nod to $3.722 billion. However, the mutual security contingency fund was padded with an increased authorization of $100 million to meet emergency needs in Africa and other areas of the world.

Latin-American development aid was set at $500 million for good neighbor assistance, with another $100 million earmarked to help earthquake-ravaged Chile in her reconstruction efforts.

Sugar imports from both Cuba and the Dominican Republic were sharply reduced when the Congress voted the President authority to readjust sugar quotas.

NATO citizens convention will have a U.S. Citizens Commission participating as a result of congressional approval. The convention's aim: Exploration of means of developing democratic freedom through economic and political means.

International cooperative health program: Congress authorized the President, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Surgeon General to conduct an international cooperative program in health training and planning.

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Medical care to the aged was provided under a new program calling for Federal-State matching funds. State participation in the plan is discretionary, with aid available to persons over age 65 whose resources are determined by their resident State to be insufficient to meet costs of necessary medical services and those States taking part may determine eligibility for medical assistance on a far more liberal basis than for old-age assistance. Some noninstitutional, as well as institutional, care is permissible under the new law, effective October 1. The Federal Government will grant funds anywhere from $1 for each $1 put up by a State all the way to $4 in Federal money for each $1 of State funds. Estimates are that the program will cost the Federal Government some $202 million the first year, with the total additional cost to the States running about $60 million.

Other social security revisions voted by the 86th Congress in its 2d session extended unemployment compensation coverage to an additional 60,000 to 70,000 employees; payments were increased for children of deceased workers; all age limits on total disability benefits were dropped, bringing 250,000 more persons under such coverage; the income retirement test was revised to permit greater outside earnings for social security retirees: Under the new amendment there will be a $1 reduction in benefits for each $2 earned in outside income between $1,200 and $1,500. A dollar-for-dollar reduction will be made on earnings above $1,500, instead of withholding full benefits for each $80 of earnings over $1,200. This means working beneficiaries no longer will lose in total income as a result of working at jobs paying more than $1,200 annually.

Payola and allied abuses were outlawed when the Federal Communications Act was amended to fix penalties for such offenses.

The Housing Act was extended, continuing the home repair and improvement program and lifting the ceiling on FHA insurance. The revolving fund for college housing loans was increased by $500 million, and the revolving fund for community facility loans was upped $50 million.

Excise taxes on telephone and transportation services were extended another year.

Small business was given a break when Congress changed the Small Business Investment Act to improve effectiveness of the program by making it easier for the small business investment companies to loan money to businessmen. Many restrictions on granting equity capital for small business growth were removed.

An Office of Coal Research was created to investigate new uses for coal, encourage production and conservation of the product, and otherwise stimulate a lagging industry.

Civil rights were further safeguarded by authorizing Federal courts, through appointed referees, to protect voting rights. The 1960 act fixed penalties for obstruction of court orders and for flight to avoid prosecution for vandalism, requires preservation of Federal election records for 22 months, and authorizes funds for education of servicemen's children in areas where public schools are closed by integration disputes.

Health service and research programs were granted a record $715 million for fiscal year 1961.

PUBLIC WORKS

Highway grants of $1 billion for fiscal 1962 and 1963 assured continuance of construction of primary and secondary highway systems and their urban extensions.

Veterans' loans, both direct and guaranteed, were extended another year for homes, farms, and businesses.

Flood control, resources and conservation, and other public-works projects, received $3 billion for the coming fiscal year.

Postal employees and Federal workers were granted a 7½-percent increase in pay.

The preceding summary is necessarily brief. If I can provide you with further information on these—or any other—measures, please do not hesitate to contact me at my Washington office.

Communism: A Threat to Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, to every God-fearing, freedom-loving person in the United States, communism, with all that it stands for, is an odious and abhorrent monster. It is the antithesis of the principles upon which this Nation

was founded. Under communism there can be no religion because communism denies that there is a God. Under communism there can be no individual liberty because the individual is the slave-servant of the state. There can be no Bill of Rights, for only the state has any rights; the individual has none. In short, none of the precepts that we in this country so fundamentally believe in are even possible in the Communist system.

I believe that practically everyone is aware of the truth of what I have just said. But I am fearful, Mr. Speaker, that for far too many people this awareness is wholly academic. By that I mean that there is a vast difference between an awareness or knowledge of what communism is and how it works and an awareness of the grave threat it poses to our continued freedom. For communism is not something that simply exists in far off countries and can be looked at in curiosity or with pure academic interest as just another way of living or as some sort of alien philosophy that we dislike but do not worry about because it really does not concern us anyway. Yet I fear this is exactly what all too many people are doing. It is quite natural for the human mind to close its eyes and turn away from things it finds distasteful or revolting. Communism cannot, must not be treated in this fashion. For the highest goal of communism is communization of the whole world. This is what we must realize. We must constantly remind ourselves of this. We must keep before us constant everyday reminders of the things we believe. And we must recondition our thinking so as to maintain always an acute consciousness of what these reminders stand for—what they actually mean. Indeed, we have many such reminders around us in our daily living. As a reminder of the individual liberty and the democracy we believe in we have but to fix our gaze on the nearest American flag flying above and reflect upon the principles it symbolizes. We immediately realize that everything it stands for is diametrically opposed to the Communist doctrine. We have around us also many reminders that this is a Christian nation which believes in God; a nation founded upon and imbued with a fundamental faith in our Creator; a nation which prays to that God in his infinite wisdom for help and guidance. This faith and such prayer are repugnant in the extreme to communism. Reminders of this are around day after day in various forms.

There are, for example, the words "Under God" in the pledge of allegiance to our flag. This phrase, I am happy to say, was inserted in the pledge as a result of legislation which I was privileged to introduce and which became Public Law 396 of the 83d Congress. There is also the inscription on our currency of our national motto "In God We Trust" placed on the money as a result of legislation authored by the Honorable CHARLES E. BENNETT, of Florida. This inscription also appears on the 3-cent liberty stamp and on the 8-cent stamp. Further, there is the official cancellation mark "Pray for Peace" used on the U.S. mails. This also, I am happy to say, is the result of my efforts.

Perhaps not as widely known but close to the hearts of all Members of Congress is the prayer room in the U.S. Capitol. As a result of House Concurrent Resolution 60, passed by the House, July 17, 1953, and by the Senate May 4, 1954, the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., then Speaker of the House of Representatives, set aside a room near the Rotunda of the Capitol to be known as the prayer room, where individual Senators and Representatives could withdraw a while to seek Divine strength and guidance. There is a single stained glass window in the room. The window has a picture of George Washington kneeling at Valley Forge. If I may quote from Public Document 234, 84th Congress, 1st session:

> The single window speaks of that religious faith which has always been a part of the greatness of our Nation. The central figure is of the kneeling Washington, reminding us of the words from his first inaugural: "It would be peculiarly improper to omit in this first official act, my fervent supplications to that Almighty Being who rules over the universe, who presides in the councils of nations, and whose providential aids can supply every human defect, that His benediction may consecrate to the liberties and happiness of the people of the United States, a Government instituted by themselves for these essential purposes, and may enable every instrument employed in its administration to execute with success the functions allotted to His charge."

Also depicted on the window is the phrase from Lincoln's immortal Gettysburg address, "This Nation Under God."

These and more, Mr. Speaker, are the reminders we have around us every day of what our great Nation is, of what it stands for, of what its people believe and hold dear. What we need to do is to sharpen our awareness of these reminders and to deepen our concentration and reflection on the full meaning of each of them. Doing this, Mr. Speaker, is the surest and most basic way of combating the Communist threat on a day-to-day basis. If this is done, communism cannot prevail.

Report to the People of the 12th Congressional District of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. DORN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker, each year, since my election to Congress in 1952, it has been my custom to submit to the people of the 12th Congressional District of New York, whom I have the honor to serve, a questionnaire setting forth various questions being considered by the Congress of the United States and upon which I, in all probability, would have to vote during the ensuing session.

I have always appreciated the fine response to the questionnaire. It gratifies me to realize the intense interest in their Government shown by the people of the 12th Congressional District, their thoughtful answers and comments, their willingness to give the time necessary to answer the questionnaire. Their opinions and advice have been helpful to me in my work as their Representative.

The following is the 1960 questionnaire and the results and percentages:

Do you favor:

1. Continuation of our general foreign policy? Yes, 49 percent; no, 33 percent; blank, 18 percent.

2. (a) Ending of nuclear bomb tests? Yes, 33 percent; no, 36 percent; blank, 31 percent.

(b) Leaving this decision in the hands of the President? Yes, 42 percent; no, 28 percent; blank, 30 percent.

3. Reduction of the Federal debt before reducing taxes? Yes, 63 percent; no, 26 percent; blank, 11 percent.

4. Reduction in nondefense Government spending even if existing functions are curtailed? Yes, 64 percent; no, 26 percent; blank, 10 percent.

5. Raising the minimum wage to $1.25 per hour? Yes, 73 percent; no, 21 percent; blank, 6 percent.

6. The enactment of a strong civil rights program to enforce the voting rights of all citizens? Yes, 83 percent; no, 11 percent; blank, 6 percent.

7. Making it a Federal crime to bomb or desecrate churches and synagogues? Yes, 85 percent; no, 10 percent; blank, 5 percent.

8. Further reduction in the age at which persons shall be eligible for social security benefits? Yes, 70 percent; no, 23 percent; blank, 7 percent.

9. An increase in social security benefits? Yes, 71 percent; no, 22 percent; blank, 7 percent.

10. (a) Increasing the amount of limitation on earnings for those receiving social security benefits? Yes, 69 percent; no, 18 percent; blank, 13 percent.

(b) Abolishing the $1,200 annual limitation on earnings for those receiving social security benefits? Yes, 69 percent; no, 18 percent; blank 13 percent.

11. Direct Federal grants to States for education? Yes, 60 percent; no, 33 percent; blank, 7 percent.

12. Direct Federal grants to States for teachers' salaries? Yes, 50 percent; no, 44 percent; blank, 6 percent.

13. More liberal credit and lower interest rates for small business? Yes, 77 percent; no, 14 percent; blank, 9 percent.

14. A congressional investigation of the administration of the title I housing program? Yes, 78 percent; no, 8 percent; blank, 14 percent.

Whom would you prefer for President? Nixon, 42 percent; Kennedy, 10.1 percent, Stevenson, 8.5 percent; undecided, 30.6 percent; others, 8.8 percent (Republican: Rockefeller; Democrat: Symington, Humphrey).

In my endeavor to keep in constant close touch with my constituents, I have taken my trailer office around the district, to make myself and my office more easily available to those who have problems or to those who wish to discuss fully the vital questions of the day.

I have been particularly impressed by the sagacity of our senior citizens, by their anxiety to be of continuous service to the community and to themselves.

I have found older people who have devoted their life to hard work and saved to the best of their ability, in need in their old age, archaic social security laws preventing them from helping

themselves. For instance, there is the unrealistic limitation on earnings.

Legislation has been enacted in the past, which only scratches the surface of major problems of the aged. Additional legislation is needed so that the country may take advantage of this valuable source of knowledge and power.

President Eisenhower's White House Conference on the Aging, to be held in January 1961, is but the beginning of what should result in much improved understanding of the steps necessary to be taken.

I have an intense interest along this line of endeavor and will continue my efforts to remove the unrealistic social security limitation on earnings and to obtain legislation which will provide adequate and proper medical care for the aged.

I have been deeply grateful for the privilege of hearing from and discussing these matters with such a large segment of the people of the 12th Congressional District, which has assisted me to more ably represent them in Congress.

If there is any way in which I can be of service to them, I hope they will not hesitate to call upon me. Both my Washington and Brooklyn offices are open every weekday. I have a competent staff and my services and theirs are always available to my constituents. I want them to know that even when Congress is not in session, I am on the job.

Louis Kossuth: A Voice Through the Ages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, those who raise their voices in the cause of freedom belong to all men and to all time. Louis Kossuth, who devoted his life and his extraordinary abilities to the defense of the ideal of freedom is such a man of the ages.

A few years more than a century ago he came to our shores, a patriot from Hungary, pleading the cause of universal freedom and seeking help for his beleagured homeland.

Under his leadership Hungary had gained a brief state of independence from Austria only to be cruelly overrun by an intervening Russia. From the position of head of state he was reduced to prison. After a trial for treason he was sentenced to exile.

Despite the trial he had emerged in his homeland as the honored champion of freedom of the press, freedom of trade, freedom of conscience, and hero of the people. His influence on Hungary persisted. His ideals, inscribed on the hearts of his countrymen, shaped their destiny and spread abroad.

From country to country he spoke in the cause of freedom. In the United States in 1852, traveling from coast to coast, he gave some 200 speeches. His eloquence and his magnetic personality lent strength to a plea that fell on sympathetic ears. Although the aid and official support which he sought were not tendered because of American reluctance to become entangled in European conflict, he was received with wide acclaim wherever he went.

His voice has echoed down the decades with the force of prophecy. It is interesting to recall one of his speeches, in which he said:

> Republican America and all-overwhelming Russian absolutism cannot much longer subsist together on earth. Russia active, America passive—there is danger in that fact. I cannot but believe it were high time to do as old Cato did, and finish every speech with these words, "However, the law of nations should be maintained, and absolutism not permitted to become omnipotent." I could not forbear to make these remarks, and the answer I got was, "That is all true and right, and will be attended to when the election is over; but, after all, the party must come into power, and you know there are so many considerations—men want to be managed, and even prejudices spared." And it is true, but it is sorrowful that it is true.

Louis Kossuth, a man of the ages, has become a symbol and a synonym of freedom, and today he reminds Americans that while we must attend to our domestic business of choosing our leaders, the world abroad continues to demand our attention.

Procedural Reform of House Rules To Assure Majority Rule Is Necessary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that procedural reform of the House rules is necessary to assure majority rule, responsive to the needs of our time. The platform committee on which I had the privilege to serve at the recent Democratic Convention in Los Angeles, wrote the following plank on congressional procedures, subsequently adopted by the Convention:

> In order that the will of the American people may be expressed upon all legislative proposals, we urge that action be taken at the beginning of the 87th Congress to improve congressional procedures so that majority rule prevails and decisions can be made after reasonable debate without being blocked by a minority in either House.
>
> The Rules of the House of Representatives should be so amended as to make sure that bills reported by legislative committees reach the floor for consideration without undue delay.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include two studies on this subject prepared by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress at my request. One discusses the operation of the 21-day rule in effect during the 81st Congress; the other study discusses proposed Rules Committee reforms, classified according to their relation to various concepts of Rules Committee functions. They follow:

OPERATION OF 21-DAY RULE DURING 81ST CONGRESS

The 21-day rule remained in effect throughout the 81st Congress (1949–50), despite a determined effort to repeal it early in the 2d session. A coalition led by Congressman COX, of Georgia, was defeated on January 20, 1950, by a vote of 236 to 183. The rule proved effective in preventing a permanent blockade of important legislation by the Rules Committee. During the 1st session of the 81st Congress it brought an anti-poll-tax bill and a rivers and harbors bill to the House floor for a successful vote and forced action on housing and minimum wage bills. During the 2d session it enabled the House to vote for the National Science Foundation, Alaska and Hawaii statehood legislation, the national minerals act, a veterans' hospital bill, and a joint resolution for U.S. participation in certain international organizations. Altogether, during the 81st Congress eight measures were brought to the floor of the House and passed by resort to the 21-day rule, and its existence forced the Rules Committee to act in other cases. (House Calendar, final edition, 81st Cong., p. 114.)

On January 3, 1951, a bipartisan coalition regained control of the situation and obtained repeal of the 21-day rule by a vote of 247 to 179 after a bitter fight. As a result, the power of the Rules Committee to obstruct bills was restored and exercised during the 82d and later Congresses. For example, a bill authorizing the shipment of wheat to India was held up by the committee for many weeks in 1951 until it had been amended to conform to committee views. "Until the 21-day rule is restored," said Representative HOLLIFIELD, "we can expect further situations in which a few men, strategically situated in the Rules Committee, can impose their will on the Congress and prevent the enactment of legislation deemed by the House majority to be essential to the security and welfare of this Nation." (Hearings before the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, on the Organization and Operation of Congress, June 1951, p. 52.)

CASES OF ACTUAL USE OF NEW PROCEDURES

1. The first use of the new procedure was in connection with the bill (H.R. 3199) prohibiting the payment of poll taxes as a condition of voting in elections for national officers. The anti-poll-tax bill was favorably reported by the Committee on House Administration on June 24, 1949 (Rept. No. 912). On July 1, Chairman Norton filed a resolution (H. Res. 276) providing for the consideration of H.R. 3199. Thereafter the resolution was never discussed in the Rules Committee, and after a lapse of 21 days the poll-tax bill was called up on the floor of the House on July 25 and passed on July 25, 1949.

2. The second instance of the use of the new procedure was in connection with the rivers and harbors bill (H.R. 5472). This bill was favorably reported from the Committee on Public Works on July 6, 1949 (Rept. No. 969). Chairman Whittington immediately applied to the Rules Committee for a rule allowing floor consideration of the bill, but after a delay of 22 days it was apparent that no rule would be granted. On July 28, therefore, Mr. Whittington, by direction of the unanimous vote of his committee, filed a resolution (H. Res. 302) providing for the consideration of H.R. 5472 under the new 21-day rule. On August 29, the House approved the resolution and passed the bill.

During the consideration of the resolution three members of the Rules Committee explained its refusal to grant a rule on this bill. Mr. Sabath stated it was "because of the belief that it was purely a pork-barrel

bill." Mr. Cox stated that "it was their feeling the condition of the Treasury and the financial condition of the country were such as to make it not advisable for the granting of authorizations or the commitments which the bill permits." Mr. Wadsworth explained that the Rules Committee had become deeply concerned over "the general tendency of legislation as it might affect the future financial commitments of the Government. * * * The poor old Rules Committee," he said, "is the only committee that has apparently been interested in understanding and measuring this trend. * * * If we keep on this way the Government will be bankrupt."

3. The third case involved a bill (H.R. 331) for statehood for Alaska. This bill was reported from the Public Lands Committee on March 10, 1949 (Rept. No. 255). After failing to get a rule, Mr. Peterson, chairman of Public Lands, by direction of that committee, called up House Resolution 217 on January 23, 1950, a resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 331. After debate, the resolution was agreed to on the same day by a vote of 373 to 25. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 96, pt. 1, pp. 772–782.) Subsequently, H.R. 331 passed the House on March 3, 1950.

4. The fourth instance also occurred on January 23, 1950, and involved a bill (H.R. 49) to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union. This bill had been reported from the Public Lands Committee on March 10, 1949 (Rept. No. 254). After failing to get a rule, Mr. Peterson, chairman of Public Lands, by direction of that committee, called up House Resolution 218 on January 23, 1950, a resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 49. After debate, the resolution was agreed to on the same day. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 96, pt. 1, pp. 782–785.) Subsequently H.R. 49 passed the House on March 7, 1950.

5. The fifth case concerned a bill (H.R. 4846) to establish the National Science Foundation. This bill was reported from the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on June 14, 1949 (Rept. No. 796). After remaining in the Committee on Rules for more than 21 days without being reported, Mr. Crosser called up House Resolution 321 on February 27, 1950, a resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 4846. After debate, the resolution was agreed to on the same day. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 96, pt. 2, pp. 2406–2410.) Subsequently, H.R. 4846 was laid on the table on March 1, 1950, and S. 247 was passed in lieu thereof.

6. The sixth instance related to a bill (H.R. 5965) to provide for the construction of certain Veterans' Administration hospitals. This bill was reported from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs on August 24, 1949 (Rept. No. 1315). After remaining in the Committee on Rules for more than 21 days without being reported, Chairman Rankin called up House Resolution 348 on April 24, 1950, a resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 5965. After debate, the resolution and bill were agreed to on the same day. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 96, pt. 4, pp. 5604–5620.)

7. The seventh case involved a joint resolution (H.J. Res. 334) to amend certain laws providing for membership and participation by the United States in certain international organizations. This resolution was reported from the Foreign Affairs Committee on August 11, 1949 (Rept. No. 1257). Chairman Kee of Foreign Affairs, called up House Resolution 350, a resolution providing for the consideration of the joint resolution, under the 21-day rule. After debate, the resolution passed the House on June 12, 1950. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 96, pt. 6, pp. 8471–8473.) Subsequently, House Joint Resolution 334 passed the House on June 22, 1950.

8. The eighth and last case concerned a bill (S. 2105) (H.R. 5725) to stimulate exploration for and conservation of strategic and critical ores, metals, and minerals. This bill was reported from the Public Lands Committee on October 11, 1949 (Rept. No. 1416). After remaining in the Committee on Rules for more than 21 days without being reported or acted on, Chairman Peterson called up House Resolution 419 on March 13, 1950, a resolution providing for the consideration of S. 2105. After debate, the resolution passed the House on the same day. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 96, pt. 3, pp. 3227–3229.) The bill had failed under suspensions, October 17, 1949; and failed of passage, March 16, 1950.

CASES IN WHICH THREAT OF NEW PROCEDURE FORCED ACTION

1. One case in which the "antibottlenecking" rule passed by the House apparently had a forceful effect on the Rules Committee was in connection with the housing and slum clearance bill (H.R. 4009). This bill was reported from Banking and Currency on May 16, 1949, by a vote of 14 to 7. A similar bill (S. 1070) had passed the Senate by a vote of 57 to 13. Chairman SPENCE applied to the Rules Committee for a rule, but the committee delayed, held hearings for 3 days, and delayed some more. On June 7 the Rules Committee voted 7 to 5 to table the housing bill, whereupon Mr. SPENCE filed a resolution to bypass Rules. Responding to this move and to pressure from the House leadership and in part, perhaps, to public opinion, the Rules Committee finally reversed itself and cleared the housing measure for floor consideration by a vote of 8 to 4. And on June 29, 1949, the House passed the Housing Act of 1949.

In explaining his final vote to report a rule for the consideration of the national housing bill, Mr. Cox voiced his belief that "considering it under a special rule will afford better opportunity for resistance than would be the case if considered under the new discharge rule." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 95, pt. 6, p. 7833.)

2. Another case in which the new discharge procedure forced action by the Rules Committee was in connection with the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1949. A minimum-wage bill (H.R. 3190) was reported from the Committee on Education and Labor on March 16, 1949. Chairman LESINSKI asked for a rule on this bill, but was informed by Mr. Sabath, chairman of Rules, that "I could not see my way clear whereby I could obtain favorable action on his resolution" because of the opposition of the four Republican and three Democratic members of the Rules Committee." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 95, pt. 8, p. 11208.) Thereafter, on April 7, Mr. LESINSKI filed House Resolution 183 to discharge the Rules Committee under the 21-day rule.

Four months later, on August 5, Chairman LESINSKI appeared before the Rules Committee at its invitation and requested a rule on H.R. 5856, a revised version of the original minimum-wage bill which, he stated, "was developed and passed by a majority of the Committee" on Education and Labor. After considerable confusion, the Rules Committee on August 8 reported House Resolution 183 which provided for the consideration of the revised minimum-wage bill (H.R. 5856). After debate, the Lucas substitute for this bill, as amended, passed the House on August 11.

It was evident from the debate on the House floor on August 8 that the Rules Committee would not have granted a rule on the Lesinski bill had it not been for the new 21-day discharge procedure. Chairman Sabath admitted as much himself when he told the House that—

"Had we not adopted House Resolution 5 on the first day of the session, this bill never would be here before us today, because the Committee on Rules, as constituted, would not have granted a rule on the original Lesinski bill. * * *

"I wish to state that had the chairman's bill not been in order today under House Resolution 5, this rule never would have been granted. But the majority of the Committee on Rules, the Republicans who were working closely with the three Democrats, did not want it to come up; they did not want the bill called up under the change in rules today. They wanted a rule, and in desperation I succeeded in obtaining a majority in favor of the amended rule now before us." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 98, pt. 8, p. 11210.)

Two other statements made in the course of the debate on this rule are of collateral interest. The first was a statement by Mr. Wadsworth, himself a member of Rules, in which he said that "I am convinced we should not establish the precedent under which the Rules Committee may ignore the legislative committees and thrust before the House bills which have had no consideration in those committees.' (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 98, pt. 8, p. 11206.)

The other significant statement was that of Mr. COLMER, also a member of Rules, who raised the question "whether there should be a Rules Committee, * * * if it is going to be bypassed" under the new rules of the House. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 98, pt. 8, p. 11207.)

CRITICISMS OF THE 21-DAY RULE

During the two debates on the repeal of the 21-day rule in 1950 and 1951, its opponents made a number of criticisms of its operation. Thus, Representative HALLECK (Republican of Indiana), said that the "Rules Committee was designed to be the creature of responsible leadership. I am worried," he said, "about a flood of bills that are not desired by the administration or by majority party leadership which may bankrupt the country." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 96, pt. 1, p. 718.)

Mr. KILDAY (Democrat of Texas), took a similar view. The experience of a year, he felt, had proved that the 21-day rule was of minor value in securing consideration of bills pending before the Rules Committee more than 21 days:

"On the other hand, it has resulted in an intolerable condition in the House. The Speaker and the leadership have been deprived of all control of the program and procedure of the House. Pressure groups have assumed control. Any pressure group which can secure favorable consideration by any committee can now secure final favorable action in the House by applying pressure to the chairman of the committee reporting the bill, and such chairman's motion must be entertained by the Speaker." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 96, pt. 1, p. 712.)

Another alleged weakness in the 21-day rule was that, in giving the Speaker the right to recognize a committee chairman, the rule placed responsibility on one man, the elected leader of the majority party, and not on any other embodiment of the majority, of deciding what bills should come before the House, the Rules Committee notwithstanding. The question was raised whether or not some system could be found by which leadership can be sufficiently centralized without completely isolating the responsibility for its exercise.

Although the adoption of the 21-day rule in 1949 was widely interpreted as greatly expanding the powers and prerogatives of the Speaker, it was surmised that Mr. RAYBURN was not disappointed when the rule was repealed in 1951. As one who preferred to exercise his influence on a personal basis behind the scenes, he was perhaps never entirely happy with the way in which the 21-day rule could be used to pin responsibility on him.

The Brown-Allen school of thought attacked the 21-day rule as transferring the power of deciding what bills should be considered from the 12-man Rules Committee

to one man, the Speaker. This, they alleged, was a throwback to the dictatorship of Cannonism.

Representative Herter (Republican, of Massachusetts), calling for the repeal of the 21-day rule, pointed out that it had been adopted because the majority, through the operation of the seniority rule, were "distrustful of their own membership in steering their own party policy. That is a situation, Mr. Speaker, that should not be remedied by a change of rules. That is a situation that ought to be changed by the majority party in selecting its own members of the Rules Committee." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 97, pt. 1, p. 14.)

By curbing the power of the Rules Committee, the 21-day rule enhanced the position of the Speaker and individual committee chairmen, but it weakened the role of the Committee on Rules as an agent of majority party control. Two primary dangers were inherent in the revised system: first, that with the Rules Committee funnel rendered ineffective, undesirable special interest bills, which formerly could have been filtered out of the legislative process, might be unwillingly forced upon politically self-conscious legislators; and, secondly, that by giving the Speaker the power to decide which chairman to recognize, the Presiding Officer might use his prerogative to the detriment of the party, or in any event, might discover that the rule constantly placed him on the political spot, a condition which would weaken his position either as party leader or as representative of his constituency at home.

NOVEMBER 24, 1958.

PROPOSED REFORMS AFFECTING THE HOUSE RULES COMMITTEE CLASSIFIED ACCORDING TO THEIR RELATION TO THE ROLES OF THE RULES COMMITTEE

ROLE OF TRAFFIC DIRECTOR

If the Rules Committee is regarded merely as a traffic director, then its function would be defined in the standing rules of the House as the assignment of priorities to the floor consideration of bills reported from the legislative committees and the determination of the time to be allotted for debate on these bills. Rule XI would be amended to provide (a) that the committee may not consider the substantive merits of legislation and (b) that the committee may not deny special orders for the consideration by the House of favorable committee reports.

Other proposed changes that fit in with this traffic director concept are the following:

1. Require the committee to report a rule favorably or adversely within a specified time.

2. Restore the 21-day rule which allowed the chairmen of legislative committees to bring their bills to the House floor after the Rules Committee had failed to act upon them.

3. Require the Rules Committee to grant a rule if a legislative committee reports a bill favorably a second time.

4. Reduce the number of signatures required on discharge petitions so that the Rules Committee could be discharged from the further consideration of bills it has held up.

5. Provide for a regular weekly meeting day of the committee.

6. Make motions to send House-passed bills to conference highly privileged, so that they cannot be held up by denial of a rule.

AGENT OF BIPARTISAN BLOCS IN HOUSE

If the Rules Committee is regarded as the agent of bipartisan blocs on the floor of the House, with the primary function of reflecting their sentiments, then it is fitting that it should be bipartisan in its composition and control and that it should operate in such a manner as to promote the interests of bipartisan coalitions on the floor. Its existing powers to grant or deny rules providing the times and methods for the consideration of particular bills appear to be adequate to enable it to function in this fashion.

AGENT OF MAJORITY PARTY

If the Rules Committee is regarded as the responsible agent of the majority party in the House—which was its traditional function prior to 1937—then it should be so composed and empowered that it can use its powers to facilitate enactment of the legislative program of the majority party leadership, and of the administration when the Presidency and the House are controlled by the same political party. This concept would involve the following steps:

1. Provide that the Rules Committee shall include only members of the majority party.

2. Elect the members of the committee biennially in the open party caucus at the beginning of each Congress in such a manner as to give the major geographical sections of the country representation on Rules commensurate with their majority party strength.

3. Integrate the Rules Committee with the House leadership by making the Speaker the 13th member of the committee, thus preventing tie votes.

The purpose of these steps would be to convert the Rules Committee into a genuine majority policy committee. If this concept of the committee as the responsible agent of the majority party is accepted, then the aim would be to strengthen the committee and to preserve its traditional powers. In this event the changes outlined above under "Role of Traffic Director" would not be advisable, for they are designed to weaken the committee.

JULY 8, 1960.

Legislation Considered by the Committee on Banking and Currency During the 86th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRENT SPENCE
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report on legislation considered by the Committee on Banking and Currency during the 86th Congress:

SUMMARY OF LEGISLATION CONSIDERED BY THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

LAWS ENACTED, FIRST SESSION

Member bank reserve requirements

Public Law 86-114—House Reports 403 and 651; S. 1120 (H.R. 5237)

This act made three changes in the law relating to the reserves that Federal Reserve member banks must maintain against their demand deposits.

First, the act authorizes the Federal Reserve Board to treat vault cash as reserves. This amendment was effective upon enactment of this act. The Board testified before the committee, however, that it would put this change into effect gradually, so as to avoid the disturbing effect upon our economy that would result from suddenly increasing reserves by the $2 billion in vault cash held by banks. The first steps toward counting vault cash as reserves were taken in December of 1959, when the Board permitted country banks to treat as reserves vault cash they held in excess of 4 percent of their net demand deposits; Reserve city banks and central Reserve city banks were authorized to count their vault cash to the extent it exceeded 2 percent of net demand deposits. Effective August 25, 1960, the figure for country banks was lowered to 2½ percent. Effective September 1, 1960, the figure for reserve city and central Reserve city banks was lowered to 2 percent.

Second, the act provides for gradually eliminating the "central Reserve city" classification, so as to divide all member banks into two classifications (Reserve city banks and country banks). The Board was given 3 years to make the necessary adjustments to eliminate this classification. During the 3 years in which the "central Reserve city" classification continues, the statutory floor and ceiling on reserve requirements for these cities will be 10 percent and 22 percent, the same as for Reserve cities. During these 3 years, the Board will have authority to continue higher requirements for New York and Chicago banks (within the 22-percent limit, of course) than for Reserve city banks. But after the 3 years expire, New York and Chicago will be treated the same as other Reserve cities. On September 1, 1960, the Board reduced reserve requirements from 18 percent to 17½ percent for banks in New York and Chicago, thereby taking the first step toward treating them the same as other Reserve cities, for which the requirement was then 16½ percent.

Third, the Board's authority to allow individual banks in central Reserve cities and Reserve cities to carry lower reserves is broadened. This authority was previously limited to banks geographically situated in outlying districts of cities. The act allows adjustments according to the nature of the bank's business, rather than according to where the bank is located physically.

In addition, the act amends section 5144 of the Revised Statutes, which requires bank holding companies to maintain reserves of readily marketable assets amounting to at least 12 percent of the aggregate par value of the stock of Federal Reserve member banks they control. The amendment applies in cases where there are several bank holding companies superimposed upon each other. In such cases, under the amendment, the Federal Reserve Board may designate one of the tier of holding companies as the only one required to maintain the 12-percent reserve.

S. 1120 passed the Senate on May 13, and passed the House with an amendment on July 1. The conference report on the bill was adopted by the House on July 14 and the Senate on July 15. The bill became law on July 28, 1959.

Lending powers of national banks

Public Law 86-251—House Report 693; H.R. 8160

This act made four basic changes in the laws relating to national banks.

The first section relates to the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, which supervises national banks. It provides for an additional Deputy Comptroller and increases the surety bonds for the Comptroller (from $100,000 to $250,000) and the Deputy Comptroller (from $50,000 to $100,000).

Section 2 increases the limit on borrowing by national banks from 100 percent of capital to 100 percent of capital plus 50 percent of surplus.

Section 3 relates to the limit on credit a bank may extend to one borrower. For national banks, such credit is generally limited to 10 percent of the bank's capital and surplus, but there are several exceptions. The new act makes four changes in this limit for national banks, and in one case makes a conforming change for State member banks. Section 3(a) of the new act permits national banks to extend credit up to 25 percent of capital and surplus where the amount of the credit over the normal

10 percent limit is secured by readily marketable refrigerated or frozen staples, fully covered by insurance. Section 3(b) grants corresponding authority as to discounting paper covering purchases of dairy cattle. Section 3(c) permits both national banks and State member banks (insofar as Federal law is concerned) to lend up to 25 percent of capital and surplus where the loan is secured by U.S. obligations, without regard to a former requirement that the transaction be in the form of a note from the borrower to the bank. Section 3(d) imposes a limit of 2[illegible] percent of capital and surplus on the purchase of consumer installment paper by a national bank from a single dealer, where the bank is relying primarily on the dealer. This eliminates the former distinction between negotiable and nonnegotiable consumer paper; under the old law there was no limit on such purchases if the paper was negotiable, but a 10-percent limit if it was not. If the bank relies primarily on the maker of the obligation (that is, the buyer of the automobile or whatever other item may be involved) rather than the dealer, the transaction is not subject to the 25-percent limit on credit to the dealer.

Section 4 liberalizes some of the restrictions on real estate loans by national banks. Section 4(a) permits loans on leaseholds that run at least 10 years beyond the loan maturity (the former requirement was that the lease run 99 years and be renewable, or run 50 years from the date the loan was made or acquired by the bank). Section 4(b)(1) allows national banks to make real estate loans up to 20 years, covering up to 75 percent of the appraised value of the real estate, if the loans are fully amortized so as to avoid balloon payments. Section 4(b)(2) exempts from the usual real estate loan restrictions any loan fully guaranteed by a State (either directly or through a State authority). Section 4(c) permits national banks to make construction loans on industrial or commercial buildings up to 18 months' maturity where there is a takeout commitment by a responsible lender to provide permanent financing upon completion of construction; in such a case, the loan will be treated as a commercial loan rather than a real estate loan. In view of this change, section 4(c) also raises the limit on construction loans to 100 percent of capital and surplus (formerly 50 percent). Section 4(d) permits national banks to take mortgages as additional security on working-capital loans to manufacturing or industrial enterprises, without subjecting the loans to the real estate loan restrictions.

H.R. 8160 passed the House on July 30 and passed the Senate with an amendment on August 24. The House agreed to the Senate amendment on August 26, and the bill became law on September 9, 1959.

Technical amendments to national bank laws

Public Law 86-230—House Report 694; H.R. 8159

This law repeals various obsolete provisions of the national banking laws and clarifies and eliminates ambiguities that existed. In five instances, however, it makes substantive changes. (1) Section 3 of the act requires approval of the Comptroller of the Currency before a national bank may move its main office inside the city where located. The old law required such approval before the main office could be moved outside the city, and before a branch office could be moved inside or outside the city. (2) Section 10 exempts loans by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation from the limit on borrowings by national banks. This simply restores an exemption which was in the law many years and was inadvertently repealed in 1950. (3) Section 11 allows a longer time (10 days instead of 5 days) for national banks to file reports of condition with the Comptroller after he calls for them. (4) Section 21 requires the Comptroller's approval before a national bank may declare dividends in any year that exceed the total of its net profits for that year combined with retained net profits for the preceding 2 years. A similar limit is placed on dividends by State banks that are members of the Federal Reserve System, except that in such cases approval of the Federal Reserve Board is required. Also the new act repeals a requirement as to dividend reports which had served no practical purpose, and replaces it with authority to require such dividend reports as may be necessary to carry out the national bank laws. (5) Section 23 prohibits any firm from receiving deposits unless it is subject to examination and regulation by State or Federal authority.

The House passed H.R. 8159 on July 30; it was passed by the Senate on August 24, and became Public Law 86-230 on September 8, 1959.

Technical correction in section 5136 of the Revised Statutes

Public Law 86-278—House Report 884; House Joint Resolution 493

This law makes a technical amendment needed because two bills were signed into law at almost the same time, both of them amending the same provision of law. The two acts involved are Public Law 86-137 (relating to financing of TVA power programs) and Public Law 86-147 (relating to U.S. participation in the Inter-American Development Bank). Both acts amended section 5136 of the Revised Statutes and inserted new language covering obligations of TVA (in the first instance) and the new Inter-American Development Bank (in the second instance). Because the TVA bill was signed into law on August 6, 1 day before the Inter-American Bank bill was signed, the amendment made by the second bill was technically deficient. This law corrects the deficiency.

House Joint Resolution 493 passed the House August 17, passed the Senate September 9, and became Public Law 86-278 on September 16, 1959.

International Wheat Agreement Act extension

Public Law 86-336—House Report 883; H.R. 8409

This act extends for an additional 3 years the necessary implementing legislation to carry out U.S. participation in the International Wheat Agreement. This agreement was originally signed in 1949 and since has been extended at 3-year intervals, the latest extension having been ratified by the Senate on July 15, 1959. Under the 1959 agreement, some 30 participating wheat-importing countries have agreed to buy on the average of 70 percent of their commercial wheat imports from the United States and 8 other wheat-exporting countries, at prices within a specified range. This act extends the Commodity Credit Corporation's authority to make wheat and wheat flour available for export to exercise our rights and fulfill our obligations under the agreement.

H.R. 8409 passed the House August 17, passed the Senate September 11, and became Public Law 86-336 on September 21, 1959.

Use of surplus grains to prevent waterfowl depredations

Public Law 86-133—House Report 571; H.R. 7631

This act repeals the expiration date (July 3, 1959) contained in Public Law 654 of the 84th Congress, thereby making permanent the authorization in that law for the Secretary of the Interior to use surplus grains of the Commodity Credit Corporation to feed migratory waterfowl to prevent crop damage. Feeding is done in cooperation with State and local officials as well as private groups, and is accomplished in such a way as to lure waterfowl away from farmers' fields where they are causing crop damage, yet not expose them to shooting.

The bill passed the House July 20, passed the Senate July 24, and was approved August 4, 1959.

Federal Credit Union Act

Public Law 86-354—House Report 696; H.R. 8305

This act rewrites the Federal Credit Union Act of 1934. It incorporates a number of amendments. Some of these are designed only to clarify and modernize existing law. Others are intended to increase the scope and efficiency of Federal credit union operations.

The substantive changes include the following:

1. An increase in the maximum maturity of loans from 3 to 5 years.

2. An increase in the unsecured loan limit from $400 to $750.

3. Authority to pay dividends semiannually and to allow dividend credit for savings received in the first 5 days of a month. Also, the board of directors is authorized to declare dividends (formerly dividends were declared by the members at the annual meeting).

4. An authorization for Federal credit unions to cash and sell checks to members for a reasonable fee.

5. A liberalization of borrowing restrictions on Federal credit union officials. Previously such officials were allowed to borrow from their credit union only up to the amount of their shareholdings. The new act allows loans in additional amounts if secured by shareholdings of other members.

6. Changes in the organizational and administrative provisions to make the operations of the Federal credit unions more efficient. These include—

(a) Appointment of supervisory committees by the board of directors. Under the old law these committees were elected by the members.

(b) Appointment of one or more loan officers by the credit committee. The loan officer may be authorized to approve certain loans formerly requiring approval by the credit committee.

(c) Authority for the board of directors to appoint an executive committee which may buy and sell securities, make loans to other credit unions, or approve applications for membership—functions formerly carried out by the full board of directors.

(d) Authority for the board of directors to appoint a membership officer who may approve applications for membership.

7. Inclusion of Federal credit unions within the criminal laws prohibiting bank robbery and incidental crimes.

In addition, the act provides for a study by the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions of the desirability of establishing Federal central credit unions. A report on this study was filed with Congress on June 10, 1960.

The House passed H.R. 8305 on July 30, 1959. The Senate passed it with amendments on September 9, and the House agreed to the Senate amendments on September 10. The bill became Public Law 86-354 on September 22, 1959.

Housing Act of 1959

Public Law 86-372—No House Report; S. 2654

Three general housing bills were passed by Congress in 1959. The first two (S. 57 and S. 2539) were vetoed by the President. Finally, S. 2654 was introduced and passed the Senate September 9. It passed the House September 10 without amendment and was signed into law on September 23, 1959. Following are the major provisions of that act:

Title I increased FHA's general insurance authorization by $8 billion and extended the home improvement insurance program for 1 year (until October 1, 1960). This title

also gave the FHA Commissioner authority to reduce minimum downpayment requirements on sales housing financed under FHA. The FHA put the new, lower schedule into effect in April 1960. The new schedule keeps the requirement of 3 percent down on the first $13,500 of value as in prior law, but above that it requires only 10 percent down on any amount between $13,500 and $18,000 (in place of 15 percent between $13,500 and $16,000), and 30 percent of any amount over $18,000. The maximum mortgage on low-cost housing in outlying areas financed under section 203(i) is raised from $8,000 to $9,000, and existing construction is made eligible for this insurance. In order to facilitate trade-in home financing, the act permits a nonoccupant owner to close a loan in the full amount available to an owner occupant, provided 15 percent of the mortgage proceeds are placed in escrow pending resale of the house. This provision will avoid duplication of closing costs on trade-in arrangements. Unnecessary foreclosures on FHA mortgages will be avoided by provisions which encourage lenders to show forbearance in case of default, and which give the FHA Commissioner discretionary authority to take over the loan in deserving cases. Also, the FHA is permitted to accept VA construction inspections. The act raises the dollar limitations on per room, per unit, and total mortgage amounts on FHA rental and cooperative housing programs, and increases the permissible interest rates on these programs. Also equity requirements are reduced in the case of cooperative housing. Among other provisions, this title adds a new section 232 to the National Housing Act authorizing FHA to insure loans on proprietary nursing homes.

Title II authorized two programs to provide housing for the elderly. First a new section 231 was added to the National Housing Act authorizing liberal FHA mortgage insurance for new and rehabilitated housing for older people. Nonprofit sponsors can obtain loans up to 100 percent of value, while profitmaking sponsors are limited to loans up to 90 percent of value. Second, a new program of direct loans is authorized. These loans bear interest at not more than the average annual interest rate on all obligations of the United States, plus one-fourth of 1 percent. They may cover up to 98 percent of total development cost, and carry a maturity up to 50 years. The amount of $50 million is authorized to be appropriated for these loans.

Title III made a number of improvements in the FNMA program. The maximum mortgage which FNMA can purchase was increased from $15,000 to $20,000 in the case of secondary market operations; from $15,000 to $17,500 under the special assistance function; and the ceiling was removed in the case of FHA section 220 mortgages (urban renewal housing). The FNMA special assistance fund for cooperative housing was increased by $25 million, divided equally between consumer cooperatives and builder-sponsored cooperatives. The act also authorized FNMA to make advance commitments on existing construction.

Title IV relates to the urban renewal programs. Capital grant authority was increased by $350 million upon enactment, and an additional $300 million became available on July 1, 1960. The act also provides for a more realistic method of determining the extent of use of the borrowing authority provided in the Housing Act of 1949. Under the new law, the Housing and Home Finance Administrator is permitted to authorize land acquisition and slum clearance prior to the signing of the loan-and-grant contract. Also, local improvements started up to 3 years before the signing of the loan-and-grant contract can be counted toward the local share of the cost of the project provided such improvements meet all other requirements for eligibility. Public housing in urban renewal project areas will receive more equitable treatment under the provision which allows the local tax exemption of the housing project to be counted as the community's share of the net cost of the urban renewal land. The law permits the expenditures of colleges and universities to be counted as part of the community's share of urban renewal costs, and removes the "predominantly residential" requirements for projects involving an educational institution. Among other provisions of this title are more liberal relocation payments (raised from $100 to $200 for individuals and families, and from $2,500 to $3,000 for businesses); a requirement that urban renewal developers must publish certain information; and an authorization of $10 million for appropriation for the urban planning grant program.

Title V authorized the Public Housing Administration to enter into contracts for an additional 37,000 federally aided low-rent housing units. It also encourages greater local autonomy in the low-rent program; liberalizes the eligibility requirements for families displaced by Government action; reduces the minimum age for admission of elderly persons; and authorizes local public agencies using public services for which separate charges are normally made to pay such charges.

Title VI provided an additional $250 million for college housing loans, of which $25 million is reserved for student nurse-intern housing and $25 million is reserved for "other educational facilities." Also, nonprofit student housing cooperative corporations are made eligible for loans.

Title VII contains provisions relating to armed services housing. The program of mortgage insurance under section 803 of the National Housing Act was extented for 2 years (until October 1, 1961), and the maximum maturity of mortgages under this program is increased from 25 to 30 years. This title also authorized a new section 810 under which the FHA Commissioner can insure mortgages on single family and multifamily projects for which the need is certified by the Secretary of Defense. This program is limited to not more than 5,000 units.

Title VIII includes a number of miscellaneous provisions. The farm housing research program was extended for 2 additional years (until June 30, 1961) and an appropriation of $100,000 was authorized for the 2 years. The authority for loans and grants for hospital construction under the Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act of 1951 was extended. The Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933 was amended to make more liberal provisions for the purchase of participating interests in mortgages by savings and loan associations. Also insured associations are permitted to invest up to 5 percent of their withdrawable accounts in loans to finance the acquisition and development of land for residential use. The voluntary home mortgage credit program was extended 2 years (to October 1, 1961). The act also provides that mortgage loans insured by FHA under section 203 will not be taken into account in applying the limitation on real estate loans which a national bank may make in relation to its capital and surplus or its time and savings deposits.

Voluntary home mortgage credit program extension

Public Law 86-119—No House Report; Senate Joint Resolution 124

The voluntary home mortgage credit program facilitates the flow of private funds for housing credit into remote areas and small communities. Established originally by the Housing Act of 1954, with an expiration date of June 30, 1957, the program has been extended from time to time. The last previous extension, in the Housing Act of 1957, provided for a termination date of July 31, 1959. Inasmuch as the general housing bill (S. 57) containing a provision to extend the life of the VHMCP was vetoed and action on another general housing bill could not be completed before July 31, the Senate on July 28 and the House on July 29, 1959, passed Senate Joint Resolution 124 extending this program to September 30, 1959. This extension was approved July 31, 1959. As explained above, the Housing Act of 1959 later extended the program to October 1, 1961.

Increase in U.S. subscriptions to International Monetary Fund and World Bank

Public Law 86-48—House Reports 225 and 435; S. 1094 (H.R. 4452)

This act authorized an increase of $1,375 million in the U.S. quota in the International Monetary Fund and an increase of $3,175 million in the U.S. subscription to the capital stock of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. This amounted to a 50-percent increase in our quota in the Fund and a 100-percent increase in our subscription to stock of the Bank. Of the increase in the Fund quota, 25 percent (or about $344 million) was paid in gold; the balance is held by the Fund in non-interest-bearing notes, to be used only at such times as the Fund may need cash to meet drawings by its members. The increase in our subscription to the Bank's stock is not expected to result in any actual cash payments by the United States to the Bank; it amounts to a guarantee of the Bank's obligations which are marketed to private investors and is callable only if needed to pay off these obligations.

The International Monetary Fund is a permanent international financial institution. By accepting the Fund's articles of agreement the members have undertaken to promote international monetary cooperation and sound foreign exchange practices. Since the beginning of its operations in 1946, the Fund has assisted its members to maintain or move toward convertible currencies with unified exchange rates and to eliminate restrictions on international financial transactions. The Fund extends short-term financial assistance to members to help them meet temporary balance-of-payments deficits. At the time the act was enacted, the 68 member countries of the Fund had subscribed to quotas totaling approximately $9 billion. The subscription of each member is equal to its quota and is payable one-fourth in gold and three-fourths in the member's own currency.

The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development has assisted the economic development of its member countries by making sound loans for capital projects. As of December 31, 1958, the Bank had made over $4.3 billion in loans to 49 different countries and territories. In the first few years of its operation, the Bank loaned $500 million for reconstruction efforts. Since that time the Bank has devoted its loans entirely to economic development. Most of these loans have been in Asia, Latin America, and Africa. Disbursements have been primarily for construction of electrical power facilities, improvement of ports and transportation facilities, and various industrial, agricultural reclamation, and other improvement projects. The Bank has had no defaults. This activity by the Bank serves the important U.S. policy objective of assisting the economic development of less developed countries.

The increases authorized by this act were part of a general increase recommended by the Boards of Governors of the Bank and the Fund in February 1959, to take effect only if member countries having about 75 percent of the 1958 Fund quotas and Bank capital agreed to the increases. The President on February 12, 1959, sent a message to Congress

approving the proposed increases and recommending enactment of the necessary legislation on the part of the United States.

The Fund quotas were originally set on the basis of international trade and financial conditions as they existed before World War II. The tremendous increases in international financial transactions in the past 10 years made these original quotas inadequate. Heavy drains on the Fund's resources in 1957 and 1958 left it with only $1.4 billion in gold and dollars available at the end of 1958. The contemplated increases would add about $900 million in gold through contributions from other member countries, in addition to the $344 million paid in by the United States.

The increase in Bank stock subscriptions was needed to facilitate borrowing by the Bank in the private market to obtain funds for loans. Such borrowings were approaching the point where they would equal the uncalled subscription of the United States to the Bank's stock. There were indications of increasing hesitancy on the part of the market to take up new issues of the Bank's obligations as this point was approached. It was estimated that the increase provided in the act would augment the guarantee fund sufficiently to cover borrowing for the next 8 to 10 years.

S. 1094 passed the Senate on March 19, 1959, 1 day after the House Banking and Currency Committee reported a similar bill, H.R. 4452. The House passed S. 1094 on March 25, with an amendment making it conform to the provisions of H.R. 4452 as reported to the House. The differences between the House and Senate bills were resolved with the adoption of the conference report on the bill by both Houses on June 5. It became Public Law 86-48 when the President signed the bill on June 17, 1959.

Inter-American Development Bank

Public Law 86-147—House Report 678; S. 1928 (H.R. 7072)

This act authorized the President to accept membership on behalf of the United States in the Inter-American Development Bank; authorized appropriations of $450 million for the U.S. subscription to the Bank; contained several provisions necessary to make our membership effective, including provisions relating to the marketing of the Bank's securities in the United States; and provided for the coordination of the activities of U.S. representatives to the Bank by the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems.

The Bank's organizational meeting was held in San Salvador in February 1960. Of the 21 American Republics eligible for membership in the Bank, all except Cuba accepted membership. Officials of the Bank were elected at the meeting.

The Bank is designed to expand the economic growth of Latin America. It will make loans for projects in these countries to supplement other sources of credit. It will also assist these countries in formulating development programs and in engineering and organizing projects. Its technical assistance will help these countries obtain capital from other sources, as well as from the Bank.

The Bank will have resources of approximately $1 billion, of which $850 million will be the ordinary capital of the Bank and $150 million will be placed in a Fund for Special Operations. These two kinds of resources will be strictly segregated. Of the $850 million capital of the Bank, $450 million will be uncalled subscriptions, which in effect constitute a guarantee fund against which the Bank expects to sell securities in the financial markets of the member countries.

The U.S. subscription to the ordinary capital of the Bank will amount to $350 million; $150 million of paid-in capital and $200 million in callable capital. Our contribution to the Fund for Special Operations will be $100 million. The balance of the subscriptions to the ordinary capital of the Bank will be apportioned among the other members in approximate proportion to their revised quotas in the International Monetary Fund. In addition, the Latin American countries will subscribe $50 million (half in gold or dollars and half in their national currencies) to the Fund for Special Operations.

SUMMARY OF FINANCING

TABLE 1.—*Resources of the Inter-American Development Bank*

[In millions of U.S. dollars]

	United States	Latin American countries	Total
Bank capital:			
Paid in (in 3 installments):			
Gold or dollars	75	125	200
National currency	75	125	200
	150	250	400
Callable	200	250	450
Total	350	500	850
Proportion (percent)	41.2	58.8	100
Funds for Special Operations (in 2 or more installments):			
Gold or dollars	50	25	75
National currency	50	25	75
Total	100	50	150
Total (Bank capital and Fund for Special Operations)	450	550	1,000

TABLE 2.—*Timing of U.S. payments to the Inter-American Development Bank*

[In millions of U.S. dollars]

	Initial payment (not later than Sept. 30, 1960)	On or after Sept. 30, 1961	On or after Sept. 30, 1962	Total
Bank capital	30	60	60	150
Fund for Special Operations	50	[1] 50		100

[1] Payments on this portion of the quota in the Fund for Special Operations could be required by the Bank at any time subsequent to 1 year after the Bank has begun operations.

In its ordinary operations, the Bank will make normal banking loans repayable in the currency borrowed and at interest rates similar to those charged by other lending institutions. It will sell its securities on terms and conditions similar to the securities sold by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

The Fund for Special Operations will make loans on terms and conditions appropriate for dealing with special circumstances arising in particular countries or with respect to specific projects. Such loans may be repayable, in whole or in part, in the currency of the borrowing country.

The bill passed the Senate July 15; passed the House July 27; and was approved August 7, 1959.

One hundredth anniversary of the first significant discovery of silver in the United States

Public Law 86-29—No House Report; S. 1559

This law authorizes and directs the Secretary of the Treasury to strike medals to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the first significant discovery of silver in the United States, which took place in Nevada in June 1859. The law also authorizes the manufacture and sale by the mint to the public of silver duplicates of the medals upon authorization from the Nevada Silver Centennial Committee.

S. 1559 passed the Senate and House May 11, and became public law May 20, 1959.

One hundredth anniversary of the settlement of Colorado and in commemoration of the establishment of the U.S. Air Force Academy

Public Law 86-65—House Report 402; H.R. 7290

This act directs the Secretary of the Treasury to strike and furnish to the Colorado Rush to the Rockies Centennial Commission not more than 10,000 silver medals to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the settlement of the State of Colorado and to commemorate the establishment of the U.S. Air Force Academy.

The act also authorizes the mint to manufacture and sell to the public silver duplicates of the medals upon authorization from the Colorado Rush to the Rockies Commission.

The bill passed the House June 1, passed the Senate June 12, and was approved June 23, 1959.

One hundredth anniversary of statehood for West Virginia

Public Law 86-184—House Report 881; S. 2099

This act honors the 100th anniversary of the admission of West Virginia into the Union as a State by directing the Secretary of the Treasury to strike a national medal commemorating the event.

The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to furnish to the West Virginia Centennial Commission not more than 200,000 of such medals which are to be made and delivered to the commission in quantities of not less than 2,000; but no medal will be made after December 31, 1963.

The bill passed the Senate July 6, passed the House August 17, and was approved by the President on August 24, 1959.

Gold medal honoring the late Professor Robert H. Goddard

Public Law 86-277—House Report 882; House Joint Resolution 19

This law authorized the chairmen of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics and the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences to present a gold medal on behalf of Congress to the family of the late Dr. Robert H. Goddard, who is generally recognized as the "father of modern rocketry."

House Joint Resolution 19 passed the House August 17, passed the Senate September 9, and became Public Law 86-277 on September 16, 1959.

Regulation of savings and loan holding companies

Public Law 86-374—House Report 679; H.R. 7244

In 1955, the committee reported a bill designed to regulate holding companies in the field of commercial banking. It was subsequently enacted as the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956. Shortly after the committee had reported that bill a new holding company was formed in the savings and loan field. In the succeeding 4-year period, about a dozen holding companies were formed, each of which controlled two or more insured savings and loan associations. They operate in six States, where State law permits formation of permanent-stock savings and loan associations. All Federal savings and loan associations are mutuals, as are most State savings and loan associations, but in some States, particularly California, holding companies have acquired control of a number of stock associations by buying a controlling interest in their permanent stock. In view of the rapid growth of these holding companies, the committee unanimously voted in favor of this legislation, designed to preserve the traditional pattern of independent, locally managed savings and loan associations.

This act prohibits any holding company from acquiring control of two or more sav-

ings and loan associations if the savings accounts in the associations are insured by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation. It also denies FSLIC insurance to any uninsured savings and loan association if it is controlled by a holding company which also controls an insured association. As a protection against self-dealing, the act also prohibits any insured savings and loan association controlled by a holding company from making any loan to the holding company or any of its other subsidiaries.

The act does not have any retroactive effect. That is, it does not require any holding company to divest itself of an insured association it controlled before enactment. But such a company cannot acquire control of any additional insured association.

As enacted, this law contained a termination date of May 31, 1961. As explained below, this was repealed in 1960, making the legislation permanent.

H.R. 7244 passed the House on July 27 and passed the Senate with amendments on September 11. The House agreed to the Senate amendments on September 12, and the bill became Public Law 86-374 on September 23, 1959.

Additional directors for Federal home loan banks

Public Law 86-349—House Report 947; S. 2517 (H.R. 8591)

This law permits the Federal Home Loan Bank Board by regulation to increase up to 13 the number of elective directors of a Federal home loan bank in a district which includes five or more States, and to increase the number of appointive directors. The law made it possible for the Board to provide for three elective directors of the Home Loan Bank of San Francisco for California. California had 3 directors until Alaska and Hawaii were admitted as States, but when the 2 new States each became entitled to elect a director California was reduced to 1 director in order to stay within the former limit of 11 elective directors per bank.

S. 2517 passed the Senate September 9, passed the House September 12, and became Public Law 86-349 on September 22, 1959.

FSLIC insurance coverage in community property States

Public Law 86-112—House Report 572; H.R. 7789

This act corrects the inequity that existed in community property jurisdictions by amending the law relating to insurance of accounts in savings and loan associations so as to provide for husbands and wives in community property States insurance coverage comparable to that which is available to husbands and wives in other States.

Under the FSLIC Act, generally no member or investor of any one insured institution may be insured for more than $10,000. In States that do not have community property laws, one account may be insured up to $10,000 in the name of a husband, one account in the name of his wife may be similarly insured, and a third account may also be insured up to $10,000 if it is held by the husband and wife as joint tenants with right of survivorship or as tenants by the entireties.

Under community property laws, an account in the name of a husband, an account in the name of his wife, and an account in the name of both could all be community property. In these cases there is identical ownership of all three accounts. Consequently until this act was enacted only $10,000 total coverage could be obtained by a husband and wife in community property jurisdictions when all of their savings were community property, as opposed to $30,000 in other States. The act provided for insurance coverage up to $30,000 in community property States, similar to that available in other States.

The bill passed the House July 6, passed the Senate on July 15, and was approved by the President on July 28, 1959.

Small business loans

Public Law 86-367—House Report 946; H.R. 8599

This law provided an additional $75 million for the Small Business Administration's revolving fund for its regular business loan program, by raising the ceiling on such loans outstanding at any one time from $500 to $575 million. It also provides authority for appropriations to continue, beyond 1960, the programs of grants for studies, research, and counseling concerning the managing, financing, and operation of small-business enterprises, as authorized by section 7(d) of the Small Business Act.

H.R. 8599 passed the House August 24 and passed the Senate with amendments on September 10. The House agreed to the Senate amendments on September 11 and the bill became Public Law 86-367 on September 22, 1959.

LAWS ENACTED, SECOND SESSION

Regulation of bank mergers

Public Law 86-463—House Report 1416; S. 1062

This act provides for Federal regulation of mergers of federally insured banks, under uniform standards. Before this act was enacted, controls over bank mergers were incomplete and confusing, particularly with respect to the competitive factors involved. There were gaps in the controls exercised by the Federal banking agencies, and even where agency approval was required before a merger could take place, the standards governing approval or disapproval were not clearly spelled out.

To remedy this situation, Public Law 86-463 prohibits mergers of federally insured banks without the approval of the appropriate Federal bank supervisory agency. If the merger is to result in a national bank or a District of Columbia bank, approval must be obtained from the Comptroller of the Currency; if it is to result in a State bank that is a member of the Federal Reserve System, approval must be obtained from the Federal Reserve Board; if it is to result in an insured nonmember State bank, approval must be obtained from the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. In acting on a merger application, the agency having jurisdiction over the transaction will consider the following factors: The financial history and condition of each of the banks involved, the adequacy of its capital structure, its future earnings prospects, the general character of its management, the convenience and needs of the community to be served, whether the bank's corporate powers are consistent with the purposes of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, and the effect of the transaction on competition (including any tendency toward monopoly). Approval will not be given unless, after considering all such factors, the agency finds the transaction to be in the public interest. Except where immediate action is needed to save a failing bank, the agency having jurisdiction over the transaction will request a report on the competitive factors involved from the other two banking agencies and from the Attorney General.

The act requires that notice of a proposed merger shall be published in a newspaper of general circulation in the community or communities where the main offices of the banks involved are located. It also provides that each of the three bank supervisory agencies shall include in its annual report to Congress a description of the mergers it has approved during the period covered by the report. The report is to include the following information: The name and total resources of each bank involved; whether a report has been submitted by the Attorney General and, if so, a summary of its substance prepared by him; and a statement by the banking agency of the basis for approval.

S. 1062 passed the Senate May 14, 1959; passed the House with amendments April 4, 1960; and the Senate agreed to the House amendments on May 6, 1960. This bill became Public Law 86-463 on May 13, 1960.

Federal deposit insurance assessments

Public Law 86-671—House Report 1827; H.R. 12465

In general, this act takes two steps to simplify the procedures for determining the amount of assessment an insured bank must pay to the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for deposit insurance. First, it bases FDIC assessments on items in the reports of condition insured banks make to their supervisory authorities, rather than on special reports filed with FDIC for that purpose. Second, it simplifies the computation of assessments by authorizing a single, uniform deduction by all banks, on account of "float" and other deductions formerly allowed, of 16⅔ percent of demand deposits and 1 percent of time deposits. The act makes no change in the annual assessment rate (which remains one-twelfth of 1 percent of total deposit liabilities), but it increases the rebate made to insured banks from FDIC's net assessment income from 60 percent to 66⅔ percent.

Before this act was enacted, insured banks were required to furnish their supervisory agencies with certain information concerning their condition and operations, on forms known as "reports of condition," and to file separate, special reports with FDIC for assessment purposes. The information filed with FDIC for assessment purposes was based on fixed dates, specified in the law, whereas the information filed in the reports of condition was based on "surprise call" dates. Also, there were differences between the way deposits were reported in the reports of condition and the way they were reported for assessment purposes. The new act eliminates these differences, and bases FDIC assessments on the information submitted in the reports of condition, thereby eliminating the need for special records for assessment purposes. Under the act, insured banks will submit two certified statements each year showing the amount of assessments due for each semiannual period. Every item to be used in the computation of the assessment will appear in the regular reports of condition except for the percentage deductions. The reports of condition will be made on "surprise call" dates, to be determined by the heads of the three Federal banking agencies.

Formerly, banks were permitted to make certain deductions from their deposit liabilities in order to determine their assessment base. The new act eliminates these deductions from the assessment base provisions of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act. Some of the old deductions are reflected in the new definition of "deposit" and the new provisions on reports of condition, but others are eliminated, and instead a new flat percentage deduction is authorized (16⅔ percent of demand deposits and 1 percent of time deposits). The principal deduction eliminated by the new act was for "float," or cash items in process of collection.

Since 1950, the Federal Deposit Insurance Act has provided that as of the end of each calendar year FDIC shall transfer part of its net assessment income to its capital account (insurance fund), and credit the balance of its net assessment income pro rata to the insured banks, based upon the assessments of each bank becoming due in that year. "Net assessment income" is determined by subtracting from FDIC's total assessment income for the year its operating costs, any losses for the year (or additions to reserve necessary to provide for such

losses), and any such charges for any previous year not fully covered by previous years' income. Under the old law, net assessment income was split 40–60; that is, 40 percent went to the insurance fund and 60 percent was credited to the insured banks. Under the new act, one-third will go to the insurance fund and two-thirds to the banks.

H.R. 12465 passed the House June 28, 1960; passed the Senate July 2, 1960; and became Public Law 86–671 on July 14, 1960.

Treasury sales of securities to Federal Reserve

Public Law 86–567—House Report 1825; H.R. 12346

This act extends until June 30, 1962, the authority of the Federal Reserve banks to purchase securities directly from the Treasury in amounts totaling not more than $5 billion outstanding at any one time.

Prior to 1935 Federal Reserve banks could purchase Government obligations either in the market or directly from the Treasury. The Banking Act of 1935, however, required that all purchases of Government securities by Federal Reserve banks be made in the open market. In 1942 the authority of the Federal Reserve banks to purchase securities directly from the Treasury was restored, but a limit of $5 billion was placed on the amount outstanding at any one time. The $5 billion authority was granted initially only through 1944, but the Congress has extended it from time to time so as to provide continuous limited direct borrowing authority ever since.

This authority permits the Treasury to operate with lower cash balances than would otherwise be prudent; gives the Treasury more leeway in timing new Treasury issues; provides a useful device for minimizing the effects on the economy of short-run fluctuations in the Treasury's cash balance, particularly during periods immediately preceding the peak of tax collections; and provides an immediate source of funds for temporary financing in the event of a national emergency.

H.R. 12346 passed the House June 24, 1960; passed the Senate June 28, 1960; and became Public Law 86–567 July 1, 1960.

Defense Production Act extension

Public Law 86–560—House Report 1739; H.R. 12052

This act extends for 2 additional years, through June 30, 1962, the remaining powers of the President under the Defense Production Act of 1960. These include power to establish priorities for defense contracts, limited power to allocate materials for defense purposes; authority to guarantee loans made in connection with defense contracts; authority to make loans and purchases to build up our defense capacity and assure adequate supplies of defense materials; authority for businessmen to cooperate voluntarily in meeting defense needs without violating antitrust laws; and provision for establishment of a reserve of trained executives to fill Government positions in time of mobilization.

Some of these powers are needed now to maintain production schedules on missiles and other defense contracts; others are needed for longer range preparedness programs; and other powers must be maintained in readiness for possible future emergencies.

H.R. 12052 passed the House June 6, 1960; passed the Senate with an amendment June 18, 1960; and the House concurred in the Senate amendment on June 28, 1960. This bill was signed by the President on June 30, 1960, as Public Law 86–560.

Export Control Act extension

Public Law 86–464—House Report 1415; H.R. 10550

This act extends the Export Control Act of 1949 for a further period of 2 years to June 30, 1960. That act, which is administered by the Secretary of Commerce, authorizes the regulation of exports to the extent necessary (1) to protect the domestic economy from excessive drain of scarce commodities, (2) to safeguard the national security insofar as it might be adversely affected by exports of strategic commodities, and (3) to further our foreign policy.

Controls under the Export Control Act are basically of two types—"security" and "short supply" export controls.

Security export controls are designed to regulate the flow of strategic commodities from moving directly or indirectly to the Sino-Soviet bloc.

Short-supply controls are applied in order to carry out the policy of protecting the domestic economy from an excessive drain of scarce materials.

At present the Secretary is applying export controls only for necessary national security and foreign policy purposes. The controlling of exports for short-supply reasons has been discontinued because there are no important commodities leaving the country in such quantities as to cause any serious shortages to the domestic economy. Authority for short-supply controls was retained in the act, however, because experience shows that our domestic supply of a commodity can change suddenly and it may become desirable to have such controls reinstituted.

H.R. 10550 passed the House April 4, 1960; passed the Senate May 5, 1960, and became Public Law 86–464 on May 13, 1960.

Extension of housing and public facility loan programs

Public Law 86–788; House Joint Resolution 784

As explained below, the committee reported out two housing bills in 1960, the Emergency Home Ownership Act and the Housing Act of 1960, but neither bill became law. Instead, during the last days of the session the Senate adopted a simple extension of three programs, as a rider to House Joint Resolution 784, a resolution relating to the U.S. Constitution 175th Anniversary Commission. The House agreed to the Senate amendment on August 31, and the President approved the resolution on September 14, 1960.

The resolution as enacted extended the title I FHA home improvement insurance program for 1 year (until October 1, 1961). It also provided an additional $500 million for college housing loans, of which $50 million is reserved for student nurse-intern housing and $50 million is reserved for "other educational facilities" (such as cafeterias and student centers). Finally it provided an additional $50 million for the public facility loan program established by the Housing Amendments of 1955, under which the Community Facilities Administration of the Housing and Home Finance Agency makes loans to local communities for needed public facilities, primarily for sewer and water facilities in smaller municipalities.

Housing at NASA installations

Public Law 86–578—House Report 1820; S. 3226

This act restored to essential civilian employees of the National Aeronautics and Space Agency the benefits of home mortgage insurance under section 809 of the National Housing Act. These employees lost their eligibility for this assistance when certain research and development installations were transferred from the Department of Defense to NASA. Section 809 was enacted to help solve the housing problems of essential civilian employees of the armed services at research and development installations. It is needed because in some cases homes built for such employees near such installations exceed the number needed for the normal economic growth of the community. In the opinion of the Federal Housing Administration, homes built in excess of those needed for normal growth do not meet the test of economic soundness fixed by statute as a prerequisite for FHA mortgage insurance. Section 809 permits the economic soundness test to be waived in such cases.

S. 3226 passed the Senate May 25, 1960; passed the House June 24, 1960; and became law on July 5, 1960.

International Development Association

Public Law 86–565—House Report 1766; H.R. 11001

This act authorized the President to accept membership on behalf of the United States in the International Development Association. The Association offers a new approach to a longstanding problem: Through it, other highly developed nations will join with the United States in providing development financing geared to the special needs of the less developed areas of the free world.

The International Development Association will be an international organization whose members must be members of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. It will be an affiliate of the International Bank so far as organization and management are concerned; the Governors and Executive Directors of the Bank are to serve ex officio in corresponding capacities for the Association. The Association will, however, be a separate financial entity whose funds must be kept apart from those of the Bank.

In general, the International Development Association will make loans on terms which bear less heavily on the balance of payments of the borrower than is the case with conventional loans. The Association may make loans which are wholly or partly repayable in the borrower's own currency. Or, loans may be made payable in the currency lent but for longer maturities or at lower interest rates than conventional loans.

The financing provided by the Association must be used to further development in the less-developed areas of the world included within the Association's membership. Financing can thus be provided to less-developed member countries or to less-developed dependent and associated territories of members of the Association, but not to countries or their territories which are not members. Whenever financing is provided by the Association, it must be for purposes which are of high developmental priority in the light of the needs of the area or areas concerned, and, except in special circumstances, financing must be for specific projects. The Association will not provide financing if it concludes that such financing can be obtained from private sources on reasonable terms for the recipient. Private enterprises, as well as governments or public bodies, are eligible to receive financing from the Association. Projects such as pilot housing, sanitation, water supply, etc., are eligible, although the major portion of the Association's resources will probably be devoted to basic economic projects, such as railway programs or a group of integral parts of a country's or region's development program.

The initial resources of the International Development Association will total $1 billion, if all members of the International Bank join. Member countries are divided into two groups for subscription purposes: 17 countries designated in part I of schedule A will contribute about $763 million in gold or convertible currencies, while the other 51 nations in part II will provide the remaining $237 million, 10 percent in gold or convertible currencies and the balance in their own national currencies. The IDA subscriptions are based upon the relative capital subscriptions to the International Bank, and, as in the Bank, voting rights are roughly proportionate to subscriptions. The

90-percent portion contributed by the less-developed countries may not be converted into other currencies by the International Development Association or used to finance exports from the country concerned without its consent. The following schedule lists the contributions to be made by each proposed Association member:

Schedule of subscriptions

[In millions of U.S. dollars [1]]

PART I

Australia	20.18
Austria	5.04
Belgium	22.70
Canada	37.83
Denmark	8.74
Finland	3.83
France	52.96
Germany	52.96
Italy	18.16
Japan	33.59
Luxembourg	1.01
Netherlands	27.74
Norway	6.72
Sweden	10.09
Union of South Africa	10.09
United Kingdom	131.14
United States	320.29
Total	763.07

PART II

Afghanistan	1.01
Argentina	18.83
Bolivia	1.06
Brazil	18.83
Burma	2.02
Ceylon	3.03
Chile	3.53
China	30.26
Colombia	3.53
Costa Rica	.20
Cuba	4.71
Dominican Republic	.40
Ecuador	.65
El Salvador	.30
Ethiopia	.50
Ghana	2.36
Greece	2.52
Guatemala	.40
Haiti	.76
Honduras	.30
Iceland	.10
India	40.35
Indonesia	11.10
Iran	4.54
Iraq	.76
Ireland	3.03
Israel	1.68
Jordan	.30
Korea	1.26
Lebanon	.45
Libya	1.01
Malaya	2.52
Mexico	8.74
Morocco	3.53
Nicaragua	.30
Pakistan	10.09
Panama	.02
Paraguay	.30
Peru	1.77
Philippines	5.04
Saudi Arabia	3.70
Spain	10.09
Sudan	1.01
Thailand	3.03
Tunisia	1.51
Turkey	5.80
United Arab Republic	6.03
Uruguay	1.06
Venezuela	7.06
Vietnam	1.51
Yugoslavia	4.04
Total	236.93
Total	1,000.00

[1] In terms of U.S. dollars of the weight and fineness in effect on Jan. 1, 1960.

The U.S. subscription is payable in five annual installments, with an initial payment of about $74 million. The following table gives in detail the projected payments by the United States:

U.S. subscription payments

[In U.S. dollars]

Installments and fiscal years	10-percent portion (1)	90-percent portion (2)	Total (3)
I—1961	[1] $16,014,500	[3] $57,652,200	[5] $73,666,700
II—1962	[2] 4,003,625	[4] 57,652,200	[6] 61,655,825
III—1963	[2] 4,003,625	[4] 57,652,200	[6] 61,655,825
IV—1964	[2] 4,003,625	[4] 57,652,200	[6] 61,655,825
V—1965	[2] 4,003,625	[4] 57,652,200	[6] 61,655,825
Total	32,029,000	288,261,000	320,290,000

[1] 50 percent of 10-percent portion (5 percent of total subscription) payable within 30 days after date on which Association begins operations, or on date on which original member becomes a member, whichever is later.

[2] 12½ percent of 10-percent portion (1¼ percent of total subscription) payable 1 year after beginning of operations of Association, and at annual intervals thereafter until 10-percent portion fully paid.

[3] 20 percent of 90-percent portion (18 percent of total subscription) payable within 30 days after date on which Association begins operations, or on date on which original member becomes a member whichever is later.

[4] 20 percent of 90-percent portion (18 percent of total subscription) payable 1 year after beginning of operations of Association, and at annual intervals thereafter until 90-percent portion fully paid.

[5] 23 percent of total subscription (5 percent plus 18 percent).

[6] 19¼ percent of total subscription (1¼ percent plus 18 percent).

H.R. 11001 passed the House on June 29, 1960; passed the Senate on June 29, 1960; and became Public Law 86–565 on June 30, 1960.

One hundredth anniversary of Idaho becoming a Territory

Public Law 86–696—House Report 1976; S. 3160

This act directs the Secretary of the Treasury to strike and furnish to the Idaho Territorial Centennial Commission not more than 10,000 medals commemorating the 100th anniversary of the founding of the State of Idaho as a Territory. It also authorizes coining and sale of duplicates of the medals upon authorization from the commission.

S. 3160 passed the Senate June 18, 1960, passed the House August 23, and became law on September 2, 1960.

One hundredth anniversary of statehood for Kansas

Public Law 86–393—House Report 1261; S. 2431

This act authorizes the manufacture and sale to the Kansas Centennial Commission of not more than 20,000 medals to commemorate the 100th anniversary of statehood of Kansas. It also authorizes coining and sale of duplicates of the medals upon authorization from the commission.

S. 2431 passed the Senate September 9, 1959, passed the House March 7, 1960, and was approved by the President March 18, 1960.

One hundredth anniversary of founding of the pony express

Public Law 86–394—House Report 1262; S. 2454

This act directs the Treasury Department to strike not more than 500,000 medals commemorating the 100th anniversary of the founding of the pony express, and to furnish them to the National Pony Express Centennial Association.

S. 2454 passed the Senate September 9, 1959, passed the House March 7, 1960, and became law on March 18, 1960.

Century 21 Exposition

Public Law 86–697—House Report 1977; S. 3532

This act directs the Secretary of the Treasury to strike and furnish to the Century 21 Commission not more than 500,000 medals in commemoration of the Century 21 Exposition to be held in Seattle, Wash., in 1962.

S. 3532 passed the Senate June 18, 1960, passed the House August 23, 1960, and became law on September 2, 1960.

Gold medal in honor of Robert Frost

Public Law 86–747—House Report 2118; S. 3439

This act authorizes the President to present a gold medal in the name of Congress to Robert Frost in recognition of his poetry, which has enriched the culture of the United States and the philosophy of the world. It authorized an appropriation of $2,500 for the purpose.

S. 3439 passed the Senate June 18, 1960, passed the House August 30, 1960, and became law on September 13, 1960.

Savings and loan holding companies

Public Law 86–746—House Report 2119; S. 3619

As explained above, the Savings and Loan Holding Company Act enacted September 23, 1959, contained a termination date of May 31, 1961. Public Law 86–746 repealed this termination date, thereby making the Savings and Loan Holding Company Act permanent law. The principal effect of this legislation is to prevent any holding company from acquiring control of two or more savings and loan associations whose savings accounts are insured by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation.

S. 3619 passed the Senate July 1, 1960, passed the House August 30, 1960, and was signed into law on September 13, 1960.

Small Business Investment Act amendments

Public Law 86–502—H. Report 1608; S. 2611

The Small Business Investment Act of 1958 was enacted primarily to make equity-type capital and long-term credit more readily available for small business concerns, through encouraging the establishment of privately owned small business investment companies (referred to below as SBIC's). Public Law 86–502 amended this 1958 act in order to remove certain obstacles which have impeded the realization of this goal.

The new law did away with a number of restrictions formerly in section 304 of the 1958 act, relating to SBIC's providing equity capital for small business concerns. It amended section 304 to provide that SBIC's may furnish equity capital to incorporated small business concerns "in such manner and under such terms as the small business investment company may fix in accordance with the regulations of the (Small Business) Administration." Thus, the following changes were made in the 1958 act:

(1) Equity capital formerly could be furnished only in the form of convertible debentures, callable by the borrower on 3 months' notice. The new law allows SBIC's to furnish capital in other forms to be authorized by SBA regulation (such as by directly buying stock in the small business, or by buying debentures with severable or "detachable" stock rights).

(2) Section 304 formerly stated it "shall be a primary function" of each SBIC to provide equity capital for small business. The new law strikes out "primary." This conforms SBA's practice of allowing SBIC's to engage solely in the business of making long-term loans, without actually offering equity capital in any form, so long as their charters contain authority for engaging in, and they are thus available for both types of operation.

(3) The 1958 act requires a small business concern to purchase stock in any SBIC from which it gets equity capital. The new law eliminates this requirement, but grants the small business concern an option (exercisable in whole or in part) to buy stock in the SBIC equal to 5 percent of the capital supplied to it.

Section 5 of the new law relates to bank holding companies, and grows out of an interpretation of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 by the Federal Reserve Board. The Board interprets that act, in combination with the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, as permitting a bank holding company to invest up to 1 percent of its capital and surplus in an SBIC. At the same time, it ruled that a bank holding company's subsidiary bank cannot invest in an SBIC, where the SBIC is or will become a subsidiary of the bank holding company. The new law allows a bank that is a holding company subsidiary to invest up to 1 percent of its capital and surplus in any SBIC even though the SBIC is a subsidiary of the same holding company.

The new law also extends the operation of the Small Business Investment Act to possessions of the United States, such as Guam, and exempts SBIC's from the District of Columbia's small-loan law.

S. 2611 passed the Senate September 10, 1959; passed the House with amendments on May 16, 1960; and was approved June 11, 1960.

BILLS REPORTED BUT NOT ENACTED

Area Redevelopment Act

House Report 360; S. 722

(This bill passed the Senate on March 23, 1959; and passed the House with amendments on May 4, 1960. The Senate agreed to the House amendments on May 6, but the President vetoed the bill on May 13, 1960. It failed to become law when the Senate on May 24, 1960, voted 45 to 39 to override the veto, thus falling short of the two-thirds vote needed.)

The bill was designed to help areas of chronic unemployment or underemployment. It would have been administered by a new, independent Area Redevelopment Administration. The Administrator could designate two types of areas—industrial and rural—for assistance under the bill. It provided that any area suffering from substantial and persistent unemployment could be designated as an industrial redevelopment area; designation would have been mandatory for any area with current unemployment of 6 percent or more, plus a history of unemployment of at least 6 percent for 18 out of 24 months, or 9 percent for 15 out of 18 months, or 12 percent for 12 months. The bill also provided that any rural area with heavy concentrations of low-income families and substantial and persistent unemployment or underemployment could be designated as a rural redevelopment area; designation would be mandatory under the bill for any rural county among the 500 counties ranked lowest in level of living of farm-operator families or among the 500 counties with the highest percentage of low-income commercial farms.

The bill contemplated that an overall program for the economic development of the area would be prepared by the leaders of the area, with the help of local authorities and the Area Redevelopment Administration. Appropriations of $4.5 million a year were authorized by the bill for providing technical assistance in these areas. This would include studies evaluating the potentialities of the area for economic growth.

The bill authorized loans for industrial projects, and loans and grants for public facilities, in these redevelopment areas, in accordance with these overall programs. Loans for industrial projects could cover land acquisition and development, construction or improvement of plants, and machinery and equipment. Appropriations of $150 million were authorized by the bill for such loans; $75 million for a revolving fund for loans in industrial redevelopment areas and $75 million for a revolving fund for rural redevelopment areas. It also authorized appropriations of $50 million for loans for public facilities in both industrial and rural redevelopment areas, where needed to bring industries into the area. Finally, another $35 million would have been authorized for grants to help finance needed public facilities in areas that cannot provide them otherwise.

To help clear space for new plants in industrial redevelopment areas, the bill provided for grants and loans to be made to such areas under the urban-renewal program now administered by the Housing and Home Finance Agency, without regard to certain existing requirements. Planning advances authorized by the Housing Act of 1954 would also have been made available for such areas without regard to population limitations that would otherwise apply.

Finally, the Department of Labor and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare would have been authorized to help in providing needed training programs to prepare workers for new jobs provided under the bill in redevelopment areas, with appropriations up to $1.5 million a year authorized for this purpose. Appropriations of $10 million would have been authorized for subsistence payments to unemployed workers undergoing such training, if they were not entitled to unemployment compensation. Such payments would have been equal to the average weekly unemployment-compensation payment in the State and would have been limited to 13 weeks' duration.

Emergency Home Ownership Act

House Report 1394—H.R. 10213

(This bill was passed by the House on April 28, 1960, but was not acted upon by the Senate.)

The purpose of this bill was to halt the decline in homebuilding activity by providing additional mortgage credit and by other provisions designed to lower the cost of housing to the buyer. The principal provision of the bill would have authorized the Federal National Mortgage Association to invest up to $1 billion in FHA and VA mortgages on new homes. These funds could only be used to aid moderately priced new homes—up to $13,500 in normal-cost areas or $14,500 in high-cost areas. The bill would have prohibited FNMA from charging discounts on any loan purchased under its special assistance function, including loans purchased by the $1 billion fund provided in the bill.

The bill also would have authorized a $50 million revolving fund in FNMA for the purchase of FHA section 203(i) loans. These loans, which are available to finance lowest cost housing in outlying areas, carry an extra one-half of 1 percent service charge (making total financing costs to the borrower of 6¾ percent). The bill would have lowered financing costs to the borrower by prohibiting FNMA from collecting this one-half of 1 percent service charge. In addition, the bill would have authorized a $25 million FNMA special assistance fund to support section 810 mortgages (the new FHA insurance program for defense housing in impacted areas).

In order to lower home buyers' monthly charges, the FHA Commissioner would have been given discretionary authority to reduce the FHA insurance premium from the present minimum of one-half of 1 percent per annum to as low as one-fourth of 1 percent.

The bill would have made it clear that the FHA had authority to insure home mortgage loans held by individuals. Also the benefits of FHA's section 809 would have been extended to employees of the new civilian space agency, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. (This was also provided in another bill reported by the committee (S. 3226) which was enacted as Public Law 86–578.)

Other provisions of the bill would have directed FNMA to aid in the stabilization of the mortgage market; limited FNMA sales during the period of tight money; limited FNMA fees and charges and stock purchase requirements; and directed the FHA and VA to require that discounts be reported by lenders.

Housing Act of 1960

House Report 1924; H.R. 12603

(This bill was reported by the committee with amendments on June 20. However, a rule was denied. A general housing bill, S. 3670 had been passed by the Senate on June 16.)

H.R. 12603 was a comprehensive housing bill which provided for extensions and improvements in our basic housing legislation and was designed to expand new home construction in all price classes. The FHA homeownership programs would have been liberalized through lower downpayments, extended maturities, and increased maximum loan amounts. A number of improvements were included to encourage the production of rental and cooperative housing, and a new program of mortgage insurance on older residential neighborhoods would have been established. The bill also would have extended the home improvement loan insurance program for 2 years and provided an additional $4 billion for FHA's general insurance authority.

The new program of long-term low-interest rate loans for housing for the elderly would have been given an additional $50 million (to be appropriated), and the maximum ratio of loan to development cost would have been raised from 98 percent to 100 percent.

A number of changes would have been made in FNMA operations to make it more of a true central mortgage bank facility. A three-man management board appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and a 12-man advisory council would have been established, and the agency would have been permitted to make short-term loans on the security of FHA mortgages. Increased authorizations to FNMA's special assistance operations would have included $75 million for the general fund to be used at the discretion of the President; $10 million for the purchase of cooperative housing mortgages; $15 million for a new fund to aid nursing homes; and a new $25 million fund to assure the successful launching of the program of FHA financing of older neighborhoods.

A new Government-assisted secondary market for conventional loans would have been established. Utilizing capital contributions from the Federal home loan banks, the bill would have set up a new Home Mortgage Corporation under the supervision of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board to buy and sell conventional first mortgage loans and to issue debentures to the public in order to raise additional capital.

In an effort to counter the sharp increase in land prices which has taken place in recent years, the bill would have authorized a new experimental program of FHA mortgage insurance for loans to developers and builders for the acquisition and development of land for housing construction. Appropriate safeguards to prevent abuse were provided.

The fund for college housing loans would have been increased by a total of $500 million, of which $50 million was reserved for "other educational facilities" (such as cafeterias and student centers), and $50 million was reserved for student-nurse and intern housing.

An additional $450 million would have been provided for Federal grants under the urban renewal program. It also would have established a new pilot program under which local redevelopment authorities could acquire and repair a limited number of dwelling units to be resold after rehabilitation. In addition, the bill would have given public and nonprofit hospitals the same advantage under the urban renewal program as was given colleges and universities in the Housing Act of 1959, by counting as part of the local community's one-third share of the net cost of slum clearance eligible expenditures for urban renewal made by the hospitals.

The bill contained a number of provisions designed to meet the critical problem of relocating families and small business firms displaced by urban renewal. Maximum relocation payments permitted to displaced families and businesses would have been increased. In order to provide relocation housing under FHA's section 221 at rentals which low-income families could afford, the bill provided that these loans could be made to nonprofit corporations at 4-percent interest and for a 45-year term. (At present the financing costs for rental housing projects under section 221 total 5¾ percent and the maximum loan term is 40 years.) To assure the availability of financing for this program, the bill would set up a special $100 million support fund under FNMA's special assistance program. In a further attempt to reduce the rentals, the bill would have encouraged tax abatement by local communities by giving credit for the amount of such exemption toward the community's one-third share of the cost of the urban renewal project.

The bill would also have provided an additional $100 million for the public facility loan program which assists small communities in the construction of water and sewer systems.

Small business loans

House Report 1738; H.R. 11207

The main purpose of H.R. 11207 was to increase the authority of the Small Business Administration to make loans under its regular business loan program. Present law limits the amount of SBA business loans outstanding to $575 million. The bill would have increased this limit to $725 million.

In addition, H.R. 11207 would have made three minor amendments to (1) authorize SBA to make prepayments of rentals on safety deposit boxes, (2) permit SBA to file reports on its operations annually, instead of every 6 months, and (3) repeal an unnecessary provision concerning surveys of SBA operations by the Attorney General.

The bill passed the House on June 6, 1960, and passed the Senate with amendments on July 1, 1960. When the House and Senate conferees met in August of 1960 to resolve the differences between the House bill and the Senate amendments, it had become apparent that the Small Business Administration would not reach the $575 million ceiling on its business loan authorization until after the 87th Congress convenes in 1961. Accordingly, further action was postponed until that time.

Surplus grains to feed wildlife

House Report 1978; House Joint Resolution 713

This resolution would have made surplus grain held by the Commodity Credit Corporation available to feed wildlife threatened by starvation as a result of adverse weather conditions. The resolution provided that the Secretary of the Interior, upon finding that an emergency exists warranting such assistance, could requisition grain for use in a feeding program, and make it available to State fish and game agencies. It authorized appropriations to reimburse CCC for its investment in the grain, but provided for the State involved to reimburse CCC for expenses of packaging and transporting the grain.

The resolution passed the House on August 23, 1960, but was not acted upon by the Senate.

Activities of the Committee on the Judiciary, 86th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, it is again my pleasure, as chairman, to give a full report on the activities of the Committee on the Judiciary during the 86th Congress.

Of the 15,506 bills and resolutions introduced in the House, 4,438 House bills were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. Thus, 28.6 percent of all House bills introduced in the 86th Congress were referred to this committee. This is a somewhat smaller percentage than had been the case in the previous Congress. The smaller percentage is explained by the fact that a greater number of bills were introduced in the 86th Congress than were in the 85th Congress. Moreover, due to general legislation in the areas of immigration and claims, there was less need for the introduction of private legislation which fell into the category of general bills enacted into law.

In the 85th Congress, 3,483 private immigration bills were introduced as against 2,283 in the 86th Congress. This holds true of private claim bills as well. In the 85th Congress, 993 private claim bills were introduced; in the 86th Congress, 827 such claim bills were placed before the committee.

Approximately 305 days of hearings were held by the subcommittees in addition to 47 meetings of the full committee.

A total of 730 bills were considered by the subcommittees. Of the public bills thus considered by the subcommittees, 345 were reported to the full committee. Of that total, 82 ultimately became public law.

Of course, these statistics cannot give an accurate picture of the major accomplishments of this committee. For example, the enactment into public law of the Civil Rights Act of 1960 occasioned intensive activity and can certainly be cited as one of the most significant enactments of the 86th Congress.

Also, the enactment of many liberal immigration measures, which are set forth in the detailed analysis, is a major accomplishment for both this committee and the Congress.

I point to the constitutional amendment granting suffrage to the residents of the District of Columbia, and to the many bills enacted into law which will serve to relieve court congestion as among those major achievements of the committee and the 86th Congress.

The streamlining of the operation of the bankruptcy court was accomplished by the enactment of close to a dozen bills in the bankruptcy area.

A careful reading of the detailed reports of the subcommittees will reveal the intensive nature of the work of this committee. Without the unfailing cooperation of the members of the committee, their attention to the detail of the complex legislation before it and their conscientious attendance at both subcommittee and full committee meetings, much of this work could not have been done.

I would also like to call attention to the unflagging devotion of our staff.

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 1, GENERAL JURISDICTION OVER JUDICIARY BILLS AS ASSIGNED—SPECIAL JURISDICTION OVER IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY

In the field of immigration and nationality, Subcommittee No. 1 has acted on the following bills:

H.R. 2807 creates a single, separate, statutory form of judicial review of administrative orders for the deportation and exclusion of aliens from the United States. Aliens may seek judicial review of an order of deportation by filing a petition in the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals, orders of exclusion to be reviewed exclusively by writs of habeas corpus. Such orders shall not be reviewed until all administrative remedies have been exhausted. The bill provides for trial de novo of substantial claims to American nationality by persons who have been ordered deported. The bill passed the House on July 6, 1959.

H.R. 3088 amends certain provisions of sections 353 and 354 of the Immigration and Nationality Act which specify exemptions from the loss of U.S. citizenship by naturalized citizens by including parent or parents of a U.S. citizen who is or are accompanying such citizen for the purpose of remaining with him while he has his residence abroad for reasons specified in the law. Honorably discharged veterans who served during the Korean conflict are included in the exemption from automatic loss of citizenship by reason of residence abroad, which exemption is enjoyed by veterans of the Spanish-American War, World War I, and World War II. The bill changes from 25 to 15 years the residence requirement which precludes the loss of citizenship by naturalized citizens residing in a foreign country. The bill was enacted into law on August 4, 1959—Public Law 86–129.

H.R. 5896 reclassifies close relatives of U.S. citizens and aliens admitted for permanent residence in the United States in the preference portion of the immigration quotas and expedites reuniting of certain families. Alien adult unmarried sons and daughters of U.S. citizens are reclassified to the second preference reclassification; alien adult unmarried sons and daughters of aliens admitted into the United States for permanent residence are placed in the third preference classification. Immigrants registered on the consular waiting lists prior to an established date, who have a preferential quota status, and spouses and minor children of aliens admitted into the United States under the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, who have a preference

status, are considered to be nonquota immigrants; accompanying spouses and minor children are held to be nonquota immigrants. Spouses and minor children accompanying fourth preference beneficiaries are included in that category. The number of alien children adopted by U.S. citizens in whose custody they remained for over 2 years is limited to two unless necessary to prevent the separation of brothers and sisters. The bill passed the House on July 6, 1959, and was enacted into law September 22, 1959—Public Law 86–363.

H.R. 6118 extends for 2 years section 6 of the act of September 11, 1957, the discretionary authority vested in the Attorney General to grant waivers of exclusion in the case of spouses, parents, and minor children, including minor adopted children of U.S. citizens or of aliens lawfully admitted for permanent residence, notwithstanding the fact that such close relatives are afflicted with tuberculosis.

The same bill also extended the law relating to the immigration of orphans. The bill authorizes the Attorney General to investigate the facts in each case to determine the validity of the adoption and the good moral character of the interested parties. The bill was enacted into law September 9, 1959—Public Law 86–253.

H.R. 7209 grants the veterans of the Korean hostilities the same naturalization rights and privileges as are extended under the Immigration and Nationality Act to veterans of World War I and World War II. Under the bill, an alien veteran who served honorably in an active duty status in the military, naval, or air forces of the United States during the period beginning June 25, 1950, and ending July 1, 1955, may be naturalized if first, at the time of enlistment or induction such alien was physically present in the United States or its outlying possessions, regardless of whether or not he was a permanent resident of the United States; or, second, at any time subsequent to enlistment or induction such alien was lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence. The bill passed the House on June 24, 1960.

H.R. 9385 provides for, first, the exclusion and deportation from the United States of aliens convicted of violation of the narcotic laws as they affect illicit possession of marijuana; second, the extension of the privilege of adjustment of nonimmigrant status to that of the status of an alien admitted for permanent residence to aliens who have been inspected at the time of their entry into the United States, excepting crewmen; third, nonquota status for spouses and children of beneficiaries of approved first preference visa petitions, if accompanying or following to join them in the United States; and fourth, temporary admission to the United States of fiances and fiancees of U.S. citizens for the purpose of marriage within 90 days, and for departure or deportation of such fiances or fiancees if the marriage is not contracted. The bill passed the House on January 18, 1960.

H.R. 10419 increases the allocation of nonquota immigrant visas for the Dutch expellees from Indonesia and for victims of the natural calamity in the Azores, and extends the period of time in which they may enter the United States. The same bill also extends for 1 year the period during which certain alien orphans adopted by a U.S. citizen and spouse may be issued nonquota immigrant visas. The bill passed the House on March 7, 1960.

House Joint Resolution 397 enables the United States to participate in the resettlement of refugee-escapees by admitting into the United States a proportionate number of refugees who are under the mandate of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, such number being predicated on the total number of refugees admitted at stated periods of time by countries other than the United States. The admission procedure is based on the parole authority contained in section 212(d)(5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act and the special authority granted the Attorney General under this joint resolution, which will expire on July 1, 1962. The bill passed the House on April 4, 1960. The Senate amended the bill by including in it the provisions of H.R. 9385 and H.R. 10419 relating to the Dutch expellees from Indonesia, the victims of the natural calamity in the Azores, the trafficking in marijuana, the adjustment of status of nonimmigrants in the United States who desire to obtain permanent residence in the United States, and the nonquota admission of adopted orphans. The amended bill was enacted into law on July 14, 1960—Public Law 86–648.

Under the general jurisdiction of Subcommittee No. 1, the following bills were considered:

H.R. 1992 extends the application of chapter 37, title 18, United States Code, relating to espionage and censorship, to acts committed anywhere in the world by repealing section 791 of that title, which provides that the provisions of chapter 37 shall apply only within the admiralty and maritime jurisdiction of the United States, on the high seas, and within the United States. The bill passed the House on March 2, 1959.

H.R. 4154 permits the indictment and trial of an offender or joint offenders who commit offenses abroad against the United States, in the district where any of the offenders is arrested or first brought; and also prevents the statute of limitations from tolling in cases where an offender or any of the joint offenders remain beyond the bounds of the United States by permitting the filing of an information or indictment in the last known residence of any of the offenders, or in the event that the residence of any of the offenders in the United States is not known, by filing indictment or information in the District of Columbia. The bill passed the House on March 16, 1959.

H.R. 8461 amends the act of September 2, 1958, establishing a Commission and Advisory Committee on International Rules on Judicial Procedure by extending the life of the Commission for an additional 2 years, to December 31, 1961. The purpose of the Commission is to investigate and study existing practices of judicial assistance and cooperation between the United States and foreign countries with a view to achieving improvements. The bill passed the House on August 17, 1959, and was enacted into law September 16, 1959—Public Law 86–287.

S. 355 adds a new section to title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit the use by collecting agencies or private detective agencies of any emblem, insignia, or name, or the words "national," "Federal," or "United States," or the initials "U.S.," for the purpose of conveying, or in a manner reasonably calculated to convey, the false impression that such business is a department, agency, bureau, or instrumentality of the U.S. Government. The bill passed the House amended on August 17, 1959, and was enacted into law on September 21, 1959—Public Law 86–290.

S. 1947—House companion bill, H.R. 7126—confers on the Customs Court the authority to appoint various clerks and other employees and to authorize the appointment of a marshal and deputy marshal, which appointments are intended to be in accordance with presently prevailing laws relating to such appointments in other U.S. courts. The bill passed the House on August 31, 1959, and was enacted into law September 9, 1959—Public Law 86–243.

H.R. 10598 amends sections 42 and 43 of title 18, United States Code, by revising provisions relating to the importation or shipment of injurious mammals, birds, amphibians, fish and reptiles, and relating to the transportation or receipt of wild mammals or birds so as to reduce more effectively the hazards arising from the importation and traffic in such species. The bill passed the House on June 24, 1960, and was enacted into law on September 2, 1960—Public Law 86–702.

Action by Subcommittee No. 1 in the field of private legislation is reflected in the following table:

House bills:	
Private laws:	
Individual bills	95
House bills incorporated in 17 House joint resolutions which became private law	236
Pending in Senate:	
Individual bills	7
Bills incorporated in 1 House joint resolution	4
Adverse action by Senate:	
Individual bills	4
Bills deleted from House joint resolutions	18
Passed Senate amended:	
Individual bills	1
Bills in 1 House joint resolution	5
Tabled	590
Tabled, Senate bills passed in lieu	23
Deferred	33
Pending	1,244
Total	2,260
House joint resolutions:	
Private laws (joint resolutions, referred to above, incorporating individual bills)	17
Pending in Senate	1
Passed Senate amended	1
Not acted upon	1
Total	20

House concurrent resolutions: Confirming the findings of the Attorney General in cases submitted to the Congress under the provisions of sec. 6 of the Refugee Relief Act, as amended, and sec. 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended (sec. 6: of the 86 cases considered, 55 were approved; 27 were not approved; 1 was withdrawn by the Attorney General; 1 was considered in a previous Congress; and 2 were held for further information) (sec. 4: of the 23 cases considered, 12 were approved and 11 were not approved)	2
Total	2

House resolutions (H. Res. 384 opposed the granting of permanent residence to 2 applicants for adjustment of their immigrant status under section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended)	1
Total	1

Senate bills:	
Private laws:	
Individual bills	148
Senate bills incorporated in House bills or House joint resolutions by Senate amendments which became private law	7
Tabled	92
Deferred	9
Pending	27
Passed House, amended	2
Total	285

Senate concurrent resolutions: Two of the Senate concurrent resolutions covered cases submitted to Congress under the provisions of section 19(c) of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended. Of the 102 cases considered, 86 were approved, 8 were not approved, 1 was approved earlier, 1 was held for further study, and 6 were withdrawn by the Attorney General. One concurrent resolution covered cases submitted to Congress under the provisions of section 244(a)(5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act. Of the 67 cases considered, 55 were approved, 4 were withdrawn by the Attorney General, 1 was incorrectly referred and 7 were not approved. Three Senate concurrent resolutions rescinded suspension of deportation in three cases previously approved under sec. 19(c) of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended. Final action was taken on the Senate concurrent resolutions referred to above. One concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 108) also covered cases referred to Congress under sec. 244(a)(5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act. Seventy cases were considered. The resolution passed the House, amended, and the Senate did not concur in the House amendments	7
Total	7

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 2, GENERAL JURISDICTION OVER JUDICIARY BILLS AS ASSIGNED—SPECIAL JURISDICTION OVER CLAIMS

During the 86th Congress, the subcommittee conducted hearings on 57 different days. These covered public as well as private claims measures.

Consideration was given to a total of 693 bills and resolutions.

The subcommittee considered a number of bills providing for the amendment of the tort claims provisions of title 28 of the United States Code. H.R. 6000, providing for an increase in the administrative settlement authority of section 2672 of that title, was introduced in accordance with the recommendations of an executive communication of the Post Office Department. The bill passed the House in the form recommended by the subcommittee with amendments increasing the authority of heads of agencies to settle tort claims against the Government by payments up to $2,000. The limit was increased to $2,500 in the Senate and the House agreed to that amendment. The bill became Public Law 86–238.

H.R. 7577 and several companion bills concerned the problem of the personal liability of Government drivers. The subcommittee held an extensive hearing on H.R. 3283, which was introduced in accordance with an executive communication from the General Services Administration, and related bills on the same subject. The subcommittee's recommendations as to amendments to H.R. 3283 were accepted by the full committee and were embodied in H.R. 7577 which was reported by the committee and passed the House. The bill was passed by the Senate in an amended form, but was the subject of a Presidential veto on June 13, 1960. The veto message indicated approval of the bill in the form it originally passed the House and, therefore, a new bill with those provisions, H.R. 12620, was introduced and reported by the committee. This bill passed the House on June 15, 1960, but no action was taken by the Senate prior to adjournment.

H.R. 4821, providing for amendments to the Texas City Disaster Relief Act, was the subject of a hearing before the subcommittee. The subcommittee recommended amendments to the bill to limit the proposed changes to certain categories of claims. The bill was reported with those amendments and passed the House and Senate in that form. The bill became Public Law 86–381.

A bill to implement the settlement of claims arising out of a crash of an Air Force airplane at Little Rock, Ark., on March 31, 1960, H.R. 11644, was reported by the committee. A similar Senate bill, S. 3338, was passed in lieu of the House bill and became Public Law 86–476.

The subcommittee considered two bills amending section 2734 of title 10 of the United States Code concerning claims arising in foreign countries as a result of the noncombat activities of the Armed Forces of the United States. H.R. 2741 provided that the Secretary of the Treasury would have the same authority to act in behalf of the Coast Guard in the settlement of such claims as only the Secretaries of the military departments previously possessed. The bill passed the House and Senate, and became Public Law 86–223. The other bill, H.R. 2740, would increase the period during which such claims might be filed from 1 to 2 years, and was introduced in accordance with the recommendations of an executive communication from the Department of Defense. The bill passed the House and Senate and became Public Law 86–411.

A bill, H.R. 470, which would permit the settlement of claims arising as the result of the use of a motor vehicle anywhere, or the use of property of the United States on a Government installation when the claims would not be cognizable under any other law, was favorably considered by the subcommittee and was reported to the House by the full committee. The bill passed the House, but no action was taken in the Senate prior to adjournment.

The subcommittee also considered a bill, H.R. 7529, which would confer jurisdiction on the Comptroller General to waive indebtedness based on erroneous payments by the Government to its employees, members of the military services, or persons formerly in such categories, when the department concerned recommends relief and collection would be against equity and good conscience. The bill passed the House, but no action was taken in the Senate prior to adjournment of the Congress.

H.R. 471, granting the Secretary of the Navy the same authority as that previously possessed by the Secretaries of the Army and Air Force concerning the remission of indebtedness of enlisted personnel upon discharge, passed the House and Senate and become Public Law 86–511.

The Committee on the Judiciary reported several bills validating certain payments to Armed Forces personnel, their dependents, or Government employees. H.R. 2975 validated certain quarters allowances to civilian employees who served in London, England, between January 1, 1949, and August 16, 1953. That bill passed the House and Senate and became Public Law 86–26. H.R. 4615 validated a group of about 80 transportation requests and payments of mileage or per diem, or both, to members of the naval service for travel performed in accordance with the terms of the bill. The bill became Public Law 86–25. H.R. 8106 provided statutory authority for all temporary storage of household effects of members of the Navy under an interpretation of the joint travel regulations of the uniformed forces which was subsequently challenged by the Comptroller General. The bill passed the House and Senate and became Public Law 86–414. H.R. 9921, which became Public Law 86–586, provided for the validation of sea pay received by certain Coast Guard enlisted men prior to June 30, 1956. The validation of payments of night shift differential pay to a group of employees at the Naval Weapons Plant was provided for in H.R. 10060. That bill passed the House but no action was taken in the Senate prior to adjournment. H.R. 4271 provided for the validation of compensation to Government personnel due to erroneous retroactive wage increases under the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1955. It passed the House but no action was taken in the Senate prior to adjournment.

A number of bills granting relief to State or political subdivisions within States were referred to the subcommittee. Among the bills recommended favorably was H.R. 322, compensating

Monmouth County, N.J., for damage to a bridge, which became Public Law 86–128. H.R. 7605, for the relief of the State of Oklahoma, which was introduced in accordance with the recommendations of the Court of Claims in a congressional reference case, provided for the payment of $652,019.71 in settlement of the claims of that State based on the agreement embodied in a stipulation between the State and the Federal Government. That bill became Public Law 86–369.

The bill, S. 1330, providing for an additional payment of $4,000 to the city of Fort Myers, Fla., by an amendment to an act passed in 1958, was reported by the committee. That bill became Public Law 86–180. The bill, H.R. 2390, for Madeira Beach, Fla., settled the city's claim for the cost of erosion control, and became Public Law 86–353.

A bill compensating the Albertson Water District of Nassau County, N.Y., for reimbursable civil defense expenses, H.R. 8868, became Public Law 86–467. A jurisdictional bill authorizing an action against the Government based on the claim of Ford City, Pa., for alleged flooding of its sewer system, H.R. 5850, became Public Law 86–538.

The subcommittee also considered the bill, S. 3053, concerning the claim of the State of Connecticut for reimbursement of amounts it paid out as the result of damage due to National Guard aircraft operation. The bill was reported, passed the House, and became Public Law 86–692.

Two bills concerning counties passed the House but were pending in the Senate at the close of the Congress. These were H.R. 11136 concerning a claim of the Princess Anne County School Board of Virginia, and H.R. 5726 involving Hood County, Tex.

Two bills involving municipalities were referred to the Court of Claims for findings of fact and recommendations in accordance with the procedures provided for congressional reference cases in title 28 of the United States Code. House Resolution 309 referred the bill H.R. 4583, involving the County of Cuyahoga, Ohio, to the Court of Claims, and House Resolution 470 referred the bill H.R. 10919, concerning Kure Beach, N.C., to that court.

A bill, H.R. 10978, to extend to all agencies of the Government the same authority as that now possessed by the military departments concerning the settlement of claims of personnel of the military departments for loss of personal property incident to their service, passed the House but remained pending in the Senate at the adjournment of Congress.

The subcommittee considered a number of bills which did not relate to its special jurisdiction over claims. The bill, H.R. 2725, barring the use of aircraft or motor vehicles in the hunting or capture of wild horses or burros, and similarly barring the pollution of water holes used by such animals to kill them or effect their capture, was such a bill. It was reported by the committee, passed the House and Senate, and became Public Law 86–234. A bill, H.R. 4012, providing for the observance of the centennial of the establishment of the Department of Agriculture, and the establishment of land-grant colleges, was reported by the committee after being favorably recommended by the subcommittee. The bill passed the House, was reported in the Senate, but no further action was taken in that body prior to adjournment.

The subcommittee considered and recommended favorably the bill, S. 1321, authorizing the Attorney General to consent to a modification of the terms of a trust concerning the University of Vermont. The bill passed the House and became Public Law 86–712.

House Resolution 431, a resolution expressing the sense of the House that the President should call a White House Conference on narcotics problems, was the subject of a hearing before the subcommittee which recommended the resolution favorably. It was reported by the full committee, and subsequently passed the House on April 4, 1960.

H.R. 4390 provided for the relief of persons harmed as the result of the negotiation of forged or fraudulent Government checks issued at Parks Air Force Base, Calif. The bill passed the House but was not acted upon in the Senate.

The subcommittee conducted a 2-day hearing on bills dealing with the problem of claims arising from activities of the National Guard. The subcommittee recommended that the bill, H.R. 5435, be amended to include the language recommended by the Department of the Army providing for administrative settlement in a manner similar to the Military Claims Act provisions of title 10, United States Code, presently applicable to claims arising as the result of the noncombat activity of active duty personnel of the Armed Forces. The bill was reported and a similar Senate bill, S. 1764, was substituted on the floor, which became Public Law 86–74.

The subcommittee held hearings on bills concerning standards to be observed in the establishment of congressional districts, and also on bills to provide representation of indigent defendants in criminal proceedings in the Federal courts.

The subcommittee also considered the bill H.R. 8107, which was the subject of a 2-day hearing. This bill, which would have imposed criminal penalties for the use of U.S. savings stamps for trade promotion, was adversely acted upon by the subcommittee.

The following tabulation reflects the workload of the subcommittee.

Referred to subcommittee:	
Private, House bills	809
Private, House joint resolutions	2
Private, House resolutions	16
Private, Senate bills	64
Total	891
Public, House bills	102
Public, House joint resolutions	13
Public, House resolutions	13
Public, Senate bills	4
Total	132
Grand total	1,023
Approved by subcommittee:	
Private, House bills	293
Private, House resolutions	10
Private, Senate bills	47
Total	350
Public, House bills	30
Public, House resolutions	3
Public, Senate bills	3
Total	36
Grand total	386
Reported to House:	
Private, House bills	292
Private, House resolutions	10
Private, Senate bills	47
Total	349
Public, House bills	30
Public, House resolutions	3
Public, Senate bills	3
Total	36
Grand total	385
Passed House:	
Private, House bills	291
Private, House resolutions	10
Private, Senate bills	46
Total	347
Public, House bills	29
Public, House resolutions	3
Public, Senate bills	3
Total	35
Grand total	382
Private, House bills adversely reported	110
Private, Senate bills adversely reported	5
Public, House bills adversely reported	42
Public, House resolutions adversely reported	10
Total	167
Pending in Senate:	
Private, House bills	91
Public, House bills	7
Total	98
Private laws enacted	208
Public laws enacted	22
Bills vetoed:	
Private	21
Public	1
Private claims settled administratively	14

Sent 10 private claims bills of the House to the Court of Claims by House resolution, and 2 public claims bills to that court by House resolutions.

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 3, GENERAL JURISDICTION OVER JUDICIARY BILLS AS ASSIGNED—SPECIAL JURISDICTION OVER PATENTS, TRADEMARKS, COPYRIGHTS, AND REVISION OF THE LAWS

Subcommittee No. 3 handles such general legislation as is referred to it as well as patents, trademarks, and copyrights, and revision of laws.

In all, 199 bills were referred during the 86th Congress. A total of 23 days of hearings were scheduled on 76 bills. Of the bills referred 26 were reported favorably to the full committee, 24 passed the House and 12 were approved by the President and became law.

The subcommittee, in addition to processing bills, has, during the 86th Congress, given special attention to certain areas of the laws over which it has legislative jurisdiction. A member of the subcommittee attended the Revision of The Hague Arrangement, which deals with international protection of designs. As a result a draft convention has been adopted by a Committee of Experts, which is now under study by the Department of State. See Report on the Revision of The Hague Arrangement on Design, committee print, January 1960; also Public Law 86–614.

The committee also was represented at the Sentencing Institute Conference at Boulder, Colo., which was called by the Chief Justice and the Attorney General of the United States. The purpose of this meeting was to develop guides for our Federal judges with the hope that they will bring about a lessening in the present disparity of sentences. This institute or conference was held pursuant to the Federal Sentencing Act, which the subcommittee reported favorably in 1958—Public Law 85–752.

Another undertaking concerned the implementation of the Paris Convention on the International Protection of Patents and Trademarks. See report on International Patent and Trademark Conference, Lisbon, Portugal, committee print, March 30, 1959. As a result of the meetings the subcommittee has pending H.R. 11070 to carry out the provisions of the convention when it becomes operative.

In addition, a member of the subcommittee visited Federal prisons in Atlanta, Ga.; Terre Haute, Ind.; Chillicothe, Ohio; Ashland, Ky., as well as the Cook County jail in Chicago, Ill. These trips were for both inspection and indoctrination purposes, to acquaint the subcommittee with the functions, activities, and needs of our Federal prison system. See report of Representative LIBONATI: "Inspection of Federal Prisons," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 18892, September 2, 1960.

The staff, aside from working on legislation, serviced the daily requests of Members of Congress, Government agencies, and the public. The law revision duties of the subcommittee, encompassing as they do the entire body of Federal laws, bring calls and inquiries made initially to other committees of Congress to the subcommittee's staff for answering.

The following statement of the subcommittee describes in part its functions and highlights the major legislation processed by it.

GENERAL LEGISLATION

The subcommittee acted on a number of major bills in the first session of the Congress. Without discussing them, since they are covered in the committee's report of September 30, 1959, it may nevertheless be well, for convenience and purposes of reference, to list them:

H.R. 3, Federal preemption; H.R. 15, bombing of churches, schools, and synagogues, and so forth; H.R. 2739, patent and trademark fees; H.R. 4957, Mallory bill relating to unnecessary delay between arrest and arraignment; H.R. 2369, Yates legislation defining the term "organize" in our internal security laws; H.R. 3216, habeas corpus; H.R. 2978, peremptory challenges; H.R. 7559, interlocutory relief; H.R. 6817, foreign agents registration act; S. 1647, penitentiary imprisonment; S. 1645, prisoners' good time allowances; H.R. 5711, Wabash Valley interstate compact; House Joint Resolution 465, Missouri-Illinois interstate compact; H.R. 7474, Virginia-West Virginia interstate compact.

The subcommittee, in this session of the Congress, acted favorably upon the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission compact—House Joint Resolution 402—which is an interstate arrangement among Maryland, Virginia, and the District of Columbia for the regulation of mass public transportation in the greater Washington metropolitan area. Vehicular traffic in the Nation's Capital has become a major problem of ever-growing proportions. The population growth has been accompanied by a physical expansion of the urban and suburban areas. Because of three sovereign entities involved with their individual jurisdictions, it became necessary for the development of a single regulatory body to coordinate traffic conditions on a regional basis. This legislation became Public Law 86–794.

Another bill acted upon favorably by the subcommittee is S. 1806 which revises and brings up to date the provisions of the Transportation Explosives Act. This legislation, among other things, brings the transportation of radioactive materials and etiologic agents—viruses, vaccines, and so forth—under the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission. It also extends the penalties for violations of the Explosives Act, now applicable only to common carriers, to private and contract carriers—Public Law 86–710.

H.R. 9523, which the subcommittee considered, provides a simplified procedure for the payment of judgments of State and foreign courts and also authorizes the payment of compromise settlements effected by the Attorney General on behalf of the United States. Increased overseas activities of this country has resulted in a substantial increase in foreign litigation. This and other considerations emphasize the desirability of establishing a simplified procedure for the payment of routine judgments. This legislation passed the House.

Public Law 86–546 incorporates the judicial review provisions of the Federal Aviation Law, Public Law 85–726, and the Food Additives Law, Public Law 85–929, into the Uniform Judicial Review Act of 1958. The 1958 act set up uniform procedures for court review of Government agency orders. This action is in line with the subcommittee's program for developing, where indicated, standard judicial and quasijudicial procedures.

The subcommittee held hearings on H.R. 11845 and a number of similar bills which would prohibit courts from appointing monitors to manage or administer the internal affairs of labor unions.

S. 2932—H.R. 12208—which became Public Law 86–691 provides that credit is to be given prisoners toward service of sentence for time spent in custody for want of bail, prior to imposition of sentence. Oftentimes the sentencing court lacks authority to differentiate between the offender who must stay in jail for want of bail and the one who is free, pending trial and sentence, simply because the latter has been able to raise bail money. The bill seeks to eliminate this disparity.

The subcommittee also has under consideration H.R. 8138—S. 3560—the purpose of which is to provide for protection against the willful or malicious destruction of any communication facility used or intended for military or civil defense functions. Study will continue on this legislation during the congressional recess, since its provisions vitally concern the internal security of the United States.

PATENTS, TRADEMARKS, AND COPYRIGHTS

There is pending in the subcommittee H.R. 5448 and a number of similar bills relating to the rights of the United States in inventions made in the course of performance of a Government contract. This question has engendered much interest and several congressional committees have had it under consideration. The subcommittee will further study this legislation during the congressional recess to determine, among other things, whether patent provisions of Government contracts should be dealt with on an overall uniform basis or seriatim by individual Government agencies.

In the copyright area the subcommittee processed H.R. 4059, which became Public Law 86–726. This bill waives the sovereign immunity of the United States where the Government infringes on the copyright owned by another. It has long been an established principle that the Federal Government should not appropriate private property without making just compensation to the owner thereof. This principle is firmly established in our patent laws—title 28, United States Code, section 1498—as well as other fields of the law, such as admiralty, contracts, and torts.

Extensive hearings were held on H.R. 5921, a bill to remove the present exemption in the copyright law relating to coin-operated machines, and thus permit songwriters to charge the owners of the jukeboxes royalty fees for the public playing of songs.

In the trademark area, the subcommittee has under consideration H.R. 7234, which would change the present law in several respects, the principal feature being the removal of the right to restrict the importation into the United States of any foreign merchandise where such merchandise bears a mark registered in the U.S. Patent Office.

REVISION OF THE LAWS

CLASSIFICATION OF LAWS TO UNITED STATES CODE AND THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CODE

The primary aspect of the subcommittee's functions regarding the revision of the laws is the classification of the public laws to the United States Code and the District of Columbia Code. During this Congress there have been enacted 800 public laws, comprising about 1,700 pages in the Statutes at Large that have

been reviewed, or will be reviewed, during the recess to determine their appropriate classification to the respective code.

The laws of a general and permanent nature enacted at the 1st session of the 86th Congress were classified and incorporated in the first supplement of the United States Code, 1958 edition, which consisted of more than 800 pages and was the largest first supplement in the history of the United States Code. Similarly, the laws relating to the District of Columbia were classified and incorporated in cumulative supplement VIII of the District of Columbia Code, also consisting of more than 800 pages. Inasmuch as the District of Columbia Code is an annotated code, the reports of the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, the U.S. courts of appeals, and district courts since July 1, 1958, through July 31, 1960, have been reviewed for the purpose of incorporating notes to decisions affecting the sections of the code. The laws enacted during the 2d session of the 86th Congress and the decisions since July 31, 1959, will be incorporated in a new edition of the District of Columbia Code, since the supplement to the 1951 edition is becoming unwieldy and expensive to reprint each year. The work of preparing copy for the new edition has been started and will be continued during the recess. This entails consolidating the laws contained in supplement VIII with the laws contained in the 1951 edition with the voluminous editorial and manuscript work involved. Editorial notes will be enlarged and other improvements made. The new edition will comprise two or three volumes and will contain all the general and permanent laws relating to the District of Columbia in force at the beginning of the 87th Congress.

ENACTMENT OF TITLES INTO LAW

In continuing its program of making the codes more useful the subcommittee has devoted its attention to the preparation of bills to enact particular titles into law. Early in the first session the committee reported favorably a bill (H.R. 2339) to enact into law title 39 of the United States Code, entitled "The Postal Service." The House passed this bill in March 1959, and it was amended by the Senate in July 1960. The House concurred in the Senate amendments and the bill became Public Law 86–682, approved September 2, 1960. This complete title will be set out in Supplement II of the United States Code and will constitute the 16th title of the United States Code, enacted into law in the furtherance of the committee's program. Inasmuch as Public Law 86–682 contains the laws only up to March 1959, it will be necessary to introduce a cleanup bill incorporating the postal laws enacted since that time. The bill is in the process of preparation and will be introduced early in the 87th Congress.

For several years the law revision staff of the subcommittee has been collaborating closely with the General Counsel's office of the Civil Service Commission in the preparation of a bill to enact into law title 5, relating to the executive departments and employees generally. A bill (H.R. 8748) was introduced in the first session and the subcommittee has received many suggestions with respect to the bill in response to its request addressed to all the executive departments and regulatory agencies. As a result a new bill is being prepared and it is hoped that it will be ready for introduction early in the 87th Congress.

Similarly, the staff has been cooperating closely with the office of the General Counsel of the Department of Defense in the preparation of a bill to enact into law title 37 of the United States Code, "Pay and Allowances of the Uniform Services." It is expected that this draft will be completed during the recess and that a bill will be ready for introduction early in the 87th Congress.

The subcommittee has extended its program of improving the codes to the District of Columbia Code and a bill (H.R. 8857) has been introduced to enact into law part II of the District of Columbia Code, "Judiciary and Judicial Procedure," comprising titles 12 to 17. The staff has had numerous conferences with representatives of the courts and the bar association and many suggestions received will be incorporated in a new bill to be introduced in the 87th Congress.

The Governor of the Panama Canal Zone appointed the committee's law revision counsel as an adviser on the preparation of a new Canal Zone Code. The present code was enacted in 1934 and has not been kept up to date by a subsequent amendment. The committee's law revision counsel has attended several meetings of the advisory committee and it is hoped that a bill will be ready for introduction in the next Congress.

STAFF REPORTS

During the Congress the subcommittee published several reports concerning matters within the jurisdiction of the committee.

Because of the growing concern over the effect of interim or recess appointments to Federal judges, the staff prepared a report containing a history of recess appointments and an analysis of the constitutional as well as practical problems involved therein. Recess appointment of Federal judges: Committee print, January 1959.

The staff also brought up to date the listing of State applications asking Congress to call a Federal constitutional convention. In recent years Congress has been in receipt of a number of petitions from various States requesting the calling of a convention to amend the Constitution limiting the power of the Federal Government over the taxation of incomes. Since the Constitution's adoption 170 years ago, there have been over 200 State applications calling for conventions on a wide variety of subjects. While the Constitution has been amended there has never been a constitutional convention, and unfortunately there is no statutory authority to guide the Congress in classifying applications or in setting up a procedure for calling a convention. The staff report discusses in summary form the many problems presented by a constitutional convention method of amendment. "State Applications Asking Congress To Call a Federal Constitutional Convention," committee print, January 1959.

Other reports which were prepared by members of the subcommittee have already been referred to at the beginning of the instant report of this subcommittee's activities:

Bills referred	201
Bills on which hearings were held	76
Bills reported favorably to full committee	26
Bills reported adversely to full committee	95
Bills pending in subcommittee	80
Bills reported to House	26
Bills passed House	24
Bills pending in House	2
Bills pending in Senate	12
Bills which became law	12

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 4, GENERAL JURISDICTION OVER JUDICIARY BILLS AS ASSIGNED—SPECIAL JURISDICTION OVER BANKRUPTCY AND REORGANIZATION

In an effort to streamline the operation of the bankruptcy courts to meet the increasing demand upon their services, the subcommittee considered a large number of bills. Many of these have now become public law, including H.R. 4340, which simplifies the filling of vacancies among referees in bankruptcy; H.R. 4345, which eliminates the requirements that referees transmit certain papers to the clerk of the court prior to bankruptcy; H.R. 4692, providing for automatic adjudication and reference in bankruptcy cases; H.R. 4693, which consolidates the referee's expense and salary funds into a single fund; H.R. 7726, which eliminates the present requirement for the transmission of numerous papers each year to the Secretary of the Treasury and the General Accounting Office.

In addition to these matters of administration, the subcommittee acted on a number of bills directed at improving and simplifying bankruptcy procedures for the parties involved. Of these, the following have been enacted into law: H.R. 6816, which eliminates the requirement that proofs of claim must be submitted under oath; S. 1944, identical to H.R. 8858, which the subcommittee considered in the first session of this Congress, eliminates the need for the verification of pleadings under oath, and thus makes a procedure in bankruptcy consistent with the Federal rules of civil procedure; H.R. 6556, which clarifies the filing time for review of orders of referees.

In addition, the subcommittee acted favorably upon H.R. 7233. This bill passed the House but not the Senate. Its purpose is to require claims in chapter 13 proceedings to be filed within 6 months after the first meeting of creditors.

In order to eliminate a number of abuses which have arisen in bankruptcy proceedings, the subcommittee considered a number of measures and acted favorably on several of these. The following have become public law:

H.R. 5747: This act strengthens the provisions of the criminal code in respect to the concealment of assets by individuals in contemplation of bankruptcy.

S. 2052: By increasing the closing fee of trustees in nominal asset cases, this act is directed at achieving a closer scrutiny of the assets of bankrupts in these cases in order to assure a fair distribution to creditors.

H.R. 4346: This act eliminates false financial statements as a bar to the discharge of an individual, nonbusiness bankrupt, and thus removes the possibility of the use of such statements to intimidate the debtor and to secure favored treatment by creditors who have not been harmed thereby.

Two other bills directed at eliminating certain abuses in bankruptcy proceedings passed the House but did not become law. These are H.R. 8708, which empowers referees to scrutinize the fees paid to attorneys in order to insure that they are fair and reasonable; and H.R. 4150, which authorizes the bankruptcy court to determine the effect of a discharge, upon the application of the creditor and the bankrupt.

Two bills of major substantive consequence to the Bankruptcy Act were also considered by the subcommittee and both have passed the House. They are H.R. 2236 and H.R. 7242. H.R. 2236 places a 3-year limitation on the priority and the nondischargeability of taxes. This bill failed to pass the Senate. H.R. 7242 is a highly complex, multipurpose piece of legislation. In general, it would clarify the status of liens in bankruptcy. It would also clarify the powers which the trustee has in assembling the assets of the estate. Although this bill passed both the House and Senate, it was vetoed by the President after the adjournment of Congress.

In order to encourage wider use of the wage-earner-plan type of proceeding under chapter 13, the subcommittee approved H.R. 2237, which eliminates the monetary limitation on eligibility for filing under chapter 13. This has become public law.

In addition to its activities in the field of bankruptcy, the subcommittee considered a number of other varied bills. In the field of Federal courts and Federal jurisdiction, the subcommittee acted upon the following legislation:

H.R. 2979: This bill authorizes district court judges to appoint law clerks without first obtaining the approval of the chief judge of the circuit. It has become public law.

H.R. 5396: This bill authorizes the transfer between the district court and the Court of Claims of actions arising out of certain maritime transactions. The bill was amended in the Senate to clarify the law in respect to the standards for determining where such cases are to be brought. The House concurred in the Senate amendments and this bill has also become public law.

H.R. 12622: This bill would accomplish a number of significant and necessary changes in the field of Federal jurisdiction. Its purpose is to make it possible to bring actions against Government officials and agencies in U.S. district courts outside the District of Columbia. Because of certain existing limitations on jurisdiction and venue, it is now necessary for many such actions to be brought only in the U.S. district court for the District of Columbia. This bill passed the House in the closing days of the Congress and was not acted upon in the Senate.

Among the miscellaneous bills referred to the subcommittee and acted upon, were the following two bills, both of which have become public law:

H.R. 4060, which relieves the Comptroller General of the responsibility for fixing the date on which the statute of limitations commences to run for certain purposes under the Miller Act.

H.R. 5789, which provides a Federal charter for an Agricultural Hall of Fame.

A statistical summary of the work of the subcommittee during the 86th Congress follows:

Number of bills referred to Subcommittee No. 4	131
Number of bills on which hearings were held	57
Number of bills reported to full committee	74
Number of bills on which reports were filed	34
Number of public bills passed House	34
Number of public bills pending in Senate	6
Number of Senate bills disposed of	8
Number of bills approved by President	24
Number of bills vetoed by President	1

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 5, GENERAL JURISDICTION OVER JUDICIARY BILLS AS ASSIGNED—SPECIAL JURISDICTION OVER ANTITRUST MATTERS

This subcommittee exercises jurisdiction over a variety of subjects, including such topics as civil rights, the Federal judicial system, criminal statutes, and particular jurisdiction over antitrust matters.

During the 86th Congress, this subcommittee had referred to it 252 legislative proposals.

Over 30 days were spent in conducting hearings on various bills referred to this subcommittee. This subcommittee devoted considerable time to the consideration of a number of proposals relating to various civil rights measures. During the course of the hearings over a thousand pages of testimony were taken from various witnesses, including Representatives and Senators in the Congress, members of the Cabinet, State, and local officials, as well as private individuals and association representatives. At the conclusion of the hearings the subcommittee recommended to the full committee a civil rights proposal which was reported to the House and finally enacted into law during the second session of the Congress. This act is now known as the Civil Rights Act of 1960.

Among the bills enacted into law was a proposal which raised the travel and subsistence allowance of Federal judges from $15 to $25 per day maximum. Another public law established a new official station for retired judges, and a third waived existing provisions of the judicial code so as to permit new court facilities to be constructed at Durant, Okla. Another new law provided for a U.S. Park Commissioner for Grand Canyon National Park. A new public law amended the existing provisions of the Federal Judicial Code so as to permit noncitizens to exercise the privilege of filing actions in forma pauperis.

Another public law granted the consent of the Congress to an interstate compact between New York and New Jersey relating to transportation. Another new public law broadened the authority of the Attorney General to acquire land adjacent to Federal penal institutions.

During the 2d session of the 86th Congress this subcommittee considered 30-odd bills which provided, among other things, for the creation of additional circuit and district judges, the creation of new districts and new divisions in our judicial system, authorizing new additional places for holding terms of Federal courts, and permitting the expenditure of Federal funds for new court facilities. After extensive hearings and executive sessions on the part of the subcommittee, a bill, H.R. 12552, was reported to the House. Although a rule was granted for consideration of this proposal, no action was taken by the House prior to the adjournment of this Congress. This bill would have provided 3 new circuit judges and 32 district judges, 4 of whom would be temporary judges.

The subcommittee also recommended a legislative proposal which would have broadened the scope of the Fugitive Felon Act by repealing the specific crimes contained in that statute and inserting the broad language which would include flight involving a crime punishable for a term exceeding 1 year. This bill passed the House and was pending before the Senate Judiciary Committee on the date of adjournment.

This subcommittee processed and recommended favorably the enactment of the constitutional amendment to provide the citizens of the District of Columbia with the right to cast a vote for President and Vice President of the United States. This proposal would provide the District of Columbia with a number of electors in the electoral college equal to that of the least populous State. This legislation passed both the House and the Senate and is now before the State legislatures for ratification. To date two States, Hawaii and Michigan, have already ratified this constitutional amendment.

ACTIVITIES OF THE ANTITRUST SUBCOMMITTEE IN THE 86TH CONGRESS

Legislative

Forty-one bills were assigned to the Antitrust Subcommittee during the 86th Congress. The subcommittee considered 25 of these bills during 19 days of hearings. One bill, S. 726, was reported to the House and, on approval by the President on July 23, 1959, became Public Law 86–107.

On May 27 and 28, 1959, the subcommittee held hearings on H.R. 432, H.R. 2977, H.R. 6049, and S. 726, bills designed to facilitate enforcement of the prohibitions of the Clayton Act against price discrimination, tie-in arrangements, mergers, and interlocking directorates. These bills changed Clayton Act enforcement procedures to make final the cease-and-desist orders issued by the commissions and boards with jurisdiction under section 11 in the same

manner as cease-and-desist orders become final when issued by the Federal Trade Commission Act. Automatic finality of its Clayton Act orders had been requested by the Federal Trade Commission for more than 20 years.

Previous enforcement procedures of the Clayton Act permitted a defendant to engage in the same illegal practices three times before effective legal penalties could be applied as a result of action by the Commission or Board vested with jurisdiction. These procedures were changed to permit the Commission's or Board's cease-and-desist order to become final and conclusive 60 days after its issuance, or upon completion of judicial review.

Once final, the cease-and-desist order is enforced through direct referral to the Attorney General of the facts of the violation. Punishment is by fine recovered in a civil action brought by the United States. S. 726 became Public Law 86-107 on July 23, 1959.

On June 25 and 26, 1959, the Antitrust Subcommittee conducted hearings on a series of identical bills, which would amend section 2(a) of the Clayton Act so as to provide for mandatory functional discounts—H.R. 848, H.R. 927, H.R. 2788, H.R. 2868, and H.R. 4530. These bills would make it necessary for a manufacturing seller to grant in good faith a reasonably adequate price differential to wholesalers. The bills would require such differential to be reasonably calculated to allow the wholesalers' customers to compete with like firms which purchase directly from the seller. During the hearings, the subcommittee received testimony from the sponsors of the bills, representatives of the Federal Trade Commission and the Department of Justice, and from spokesmen from the National Association of Tobacco Distributors, National Frozen Food Distributors Association, National Candy Wholesalers Association, National Oil Jobbers Council, and the American Bar Association.

On August 20 and 21, 1959, the subcommittee conducted hearings on two bills, H.R. 7191 and S. 753, which would authorize cooperative associations of milk producers and marketing agencies owned by such associations to bargain in concert for the sale of milk and milk products with groups of dealers, processors, or other purchasers. These bills would expand the exemption from the antitrust laws that has been granted in the Capper-Volstead Act to agricultural cooperative associations, to additional marketing arrangements by milk producer cooperatives. S. 753 had been passed by the Senate on April 30, 1959.

During the hearings, the subcommittee received testimony from the sponsors of the bills, representatives of the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission, and spokesmen of the National Milk Producers Federation, as well as from representatives from a number of milk cooperative associations and independent dairies.

In September 1959, the Antitrust Subcommittee held 3 days of hearings on a series of bills designed to exempt from the antitrust laws a number of activities in the organized professional team sports of baseball, basketball, football, and hockey—H.R. 2266, H.R. 2370, H.R. 2371, H.R. 2372, H.R. 2373, H.R. 2374, and H.R. 8658.

During the hearings the subcommittee devoted particular attention to the problems involved in extending the antitrust exemptions for these sports to arrangements that affect other industries, particularly the broadcasting and telecasting industry. The subcommittee received testimony from several Members of the Congress, from the Commissioner of Organized Baseball, and from the representatives of television stations in Topeka, Kans.; Buffalo, N.Y.; Terre Haute, Ind.; and New Orleans, La.

On February 17, 18, 19, 24, 25, and 26, March 2 and 3, May 25, and June 1, 1960, the subcommittee held hearings on a series of bills designed to strengthen and implement the criminal laws relating to conflicts of interest and to promote ethics in Federal Government employment—H.R. 1900, H.R. 2156, H.R. 2157, H.R. 7556, H.R. 10575, H.R. 11571, and H.R. 11657. At these hearings the subcommittee received testimony from 6 Members of Congress and from representatives of 13 Federal agencies and 4 bar associations.

Investigative

On May 26, 1959, the Antitrust Subcommittee issued its report on the investigation it had conducted during the 85th Congress on the consent decree program of the Department of Justice. This 379-page report was based on a record of hearings which contained more than 4,500 pages of testimony from 34 witnesses. In its report, the subcommittee concentrated its attention on first, Department of Justice policy and procedures relative to consent settlements in antitrust cases; second, negotiation and enforcement of the 1956 consent decree in the A.T. & T. case; and third, the negotiation and enforcement of the 1941 consent decree in the oil pipeline—Atlantic Refining—case.

In the administration of the antitrust program of the Department of Justice, the subcommittee ascertained that approximately 75 percent of all proceedings that have been instituted by the Attorney General to enforce the antitrust laws have been terminated by negotiation rather than by litigation. Since World War II there has been a general trend toward more consent judgments, and in recent years the practice of negotiating settlements has accelerated markedly.

As a result of its study, the subcommittee concluded that, as it now operates, the consent decree program of the Department of Justice results in the judicial function being superseded by an administrative procedure in which there are no rules to safeguard the public interest and the interests of persons who are not involved as parties in the Government's case.

The Antitrust Subcommittee recommended that the Department of Justice revise its consent decree procedures: First, to provide notice to the public of the terms of proposed consent decrees; second, to establish a waiting period between agreement by the Government and the defendant and entry of the decree; third, to afford private parties affected by the terms of the decree an opportunity to intervene in the Government's case in order to present to the court objections to the terms of the consent decree; and, fourth, to require that when a consent decree is submitted to the court for approval, an accompanying written statement shall be filed setting forth the facts involved in the litigation, the defendants' position, the meaning of the provisions used in the decree and the reasons that are the basis for the Department's compromise.

To supplement its survey of the Antitrust Division's general consent decree policies and procedures, the subcommittee made two case studies. For these studies the subcommittee selected the oil pipeline consent decree, United States against the Atlantic Refining Co., et al., civil case No. 104060, District of Columbia, December 23, 1941, and the A.T. & T. consent decree, United States against Western Electric Co. and American Telephone & Telegraph Co., District Court of New Jersey, January 24, 1956.

A.T. & T. consent decree

The subcommittee selected the A.T. & T. consent decree for particular attention in order to ascertain the reasons for the wide disparity between relief demanded in the Government's complaint and the relief ultimately obtained in the consent decree. In its complaint the Government charged that Western Electric had monopolized the manufacture, distribution, and sale of telephones, telephone apparatus, equipment, material, and supplies. This monopolization allegedly had resulted from the ownership and control of A.T. & T.'s subsidiary, Western Electric Co., which manufactured and sold more than 90 percent of all telephones and telephone equipment sold in the United States, and directly controlled the production of a substantial part of the remaining 10 percent.

In order to restore competition in the manufacture and sale of telephone equipment, the Attorney General sought in his complaint to separate Western from A.T. & T. and to dissolve Western into three competing manufacturing concerns. Additional relief would have required A.T. & T. and its operating companies to buy telephone equipment only under competitive bidding, and Western Electric to dispose of its 50-percent stock ownership in Bell Telephone Laboratories.

In the consent decree, however, Western's manufacturing activities are permitted to remain part of the Bell System on the ground that Western is indirectly subject to supervision by public regulatory bodies. Although the consent decree provides patent relief and requires that licenses be granted to any applicant for all existing and future patents of the Bell System, no provision requires the Bell System to open its markets to any manufacturer that may receive such a license. The consent decree, in brief, assures to Western Electric the unfettered control of the markets that comprise the Bell System.

In its report, the subcommittee ascertained the value of the consent decree and the reasons for its ineffectiveness.

The report concluded that the A.T. & T. decree "stands revealed as devoid of merit ineffective as an instrument to accomplish the purpose of the antitrust laws," and that the consent decree is a blot on the enforcement history of the antitrust laws.

The subcommittee recommended that the Department of Justice reevaluate all the facts and circumstances leading to the A.T. & T. consent decree and promptly to move the court for relief from the decree's inadequacies.

In connection with its investigation of the Federal Communications Commission's relationship to negotiations for the A.T. & T. consent decree, the subcommittee ascertained that the Commission had failed, despite repeated recommendations by its staff over a number of years, to investigate telephone rates or even to conduct a general telephone rate inquiry. The subcommittee noted, also, that as a result of a $65 million long-distance telephone rate that had been authorized by the FCC in 1953 without a hearing, long-distance telephone users may have been overcharged $159 million in the years 1955, 1956, and 1957.

To remedy this situation, the subcommittee recommended that the FCC institute "promptly a comprehensive formal rate investigation." Shortly after the report was issued, the FCC acted upon the subcommittee's recommendation. As a result, on July 24, 1959, the FCC ordered A.T. & T. to cut long-distance telephone rates by $50 million a year.

Oil pipeline consent decree

The oil pipeline consent decree was a settlement of an industrywide antitrust program started in 1940 to eliminate in one proceeding all of the restraints that affected commerce in the oil industry. Inasmuch as the oil pipeline consent decree had been in effect since 1941, it was selected by the subcommittee for individual study primarily because it reflected a prolonged enforcement record and delineated the problems that arise when a consent decree becomes the standard for an entire industry.

Although virtually all of the negotiations for the settlement were devoted to the discussions of the antitrust issues that are involved in oil industry operations unrelated to the operation of oil pipelines, the subcommittee ascertained that pressures from the industry caused a consent decree that contained no antitrust relief to be submitted to the Court. Not only were all antitrust issues thus compromised; the Government in the consent decree also abandoned claims in excess of $1.5 billion for violations of the Elkins Act.

The subcommittee ascertained that the Department of Justice had failed to enforce compliance with the decree's requirements, even though according to the Department, its terms had been violated continuously from its entry in 1941. This failure had made the oil pipeline consent decree ineffective even within that limited area of industry operations to which it applied.

As a consequence, in 1958, the subcommittee concluded, the oil companies that owned oil pipelines enjoyed virtually the same discriminatory advantages over the other elements of the petroleum industry that the shipper-owners had in 1940 when the Attorney General first launched his oil industry antitrust program. The oil pipelines continue, for the most part, to be operated as private carriers for the benefit of their shipper-owners and as plant facilities to the refineries to which they connect.

It is beyond dispute that the record of the Department of Justice, in its efforts to enforce the oil pipeline consent decree, is bad. From the initial reports to the Attorney General in 1943, the Department of Justice believed that some of the defendants continuously had violated the terms of the judgment. Despite repeated recommendations throughout the history of the oil pipeline consent decree from the staff of the Antitrust Division for judicial enforcement of its terms, no action in court was taken by the Department of Justice until after the Antitrust Subcommittee announced its intention to hold public hearings on the enforcement of this particular decree.

As a result of the subcommittee's investigation, the Department of Justice brought four cases to enforce the provisions of the oil pipeline consent decree. In three of these cases the defendants agreed to the Department's interpretation and stipulated that they would follow the Attorney General's rulings in the future. On the remaining issue, the Supreme Court, on June 8, 1959, ruled against the Department of Justice. This particular issue, the shipper-owner share question, was one of the most important that had arisen under the consent decree. The adverse decision of the Supreme Court underscores the need for additional action by the Justice Department if the goal of common carrier pipeline transportation in the oil industry is to be realized.

In connection with its investigation of the oil pipeline consent decree, the subcommittee studied the effects of Interstate Commerce Commission regulation on enforcement of that decree. The subcommittee concluded that while the ICC nominally is responsible for regulation of the oil pipeline industry, in practice the industry itself decides what the ICC will do, and is able to determine the extent and character of its own Federal regulation. As a result, the interests of the general public have been subordinated to the private interests of the oil pipeline companies.

On the basis of the subcommittee recommendations, the ICC terminated two longstanding practices which have contributed materially to the orientation of its activities to the oil industry viewpoint. The ICC no longer permits personnel of the pipeline companies to work in the Commission offices in order to assist in the preparation of ICC records and recommendations. In addition, the ICC has severed its relationship, which had existed since 1933, with the engineers-accountants valuation subcommittee of the American Petroleum Institute. In its report, the subcommittee commended the ICC for these actions.

Shipping investigation

In October and November 1959 and May 1960, the Antitrust Subcommittee conducted 16 days of hearings on antitrust problems in the operation of ocean shipping conferences. This inquiry was started on August 1, 1958. The main focus of the subcommittee in the ocean shipping inquiry has been upon the inter-relationship between the principles of free competition underlying the antitrust laws and the antitrust exemption of the Shipping Act of 1916. For more than 14 months staff counsel examined thousands of documents in files of 53 ocean freight conferences and 9 American and 4 foreign steamship lines in an effort to study as many of the restrictive agreements and practices employed by the industry as time would permit. At the hearings, the subcommittee received testimony from officials of the Federal Maritime Board and from 23 representatives of 13 private corporations and associations.

The subcommittee's hearings disclosed that the shipping lines frequently have conducted their operations without regard for the requirements of Federal law. There have been numerous examples of predatory actions against other shipping lines and numerous instances in which shippers have been victimized.

The efforts of the Federal Maritime Board to secure compliance with the requirements of Federal law were revealed by the hearings to have been largely ineffectual over a period that commenced long before World War II. In addition to what members of the subcommittee characterized as incredible regulatory neglect by the Federal Maritime Commission, the shipping industry was shown to have disregarded the requirements of the Shipping Act to a degree that may well have injured our foreign commerce, caused American consumers to pay more for imported goods and been detrimental to American manufacturers and exporters.

When the 1959 portion of the hearings was recessed, the subcommittee referred 127 possible instances of violations of the Shipping Act to the Federal Maritime Board and 26 possible other violations of law to the Department of Justice. These referrals met with prompt response.

The Attorney General, on the basis of the subcommittee's hearings record to that time, embarked upon grand jury investigations of steamship industry practices in San Francisco, and in Washington. Numerous subpenas duces tecum were issued, directing more than 150 firms to produce documents for use of the grand jury. Preliminary litigation, seeking to quash the subpenas, initiated by approximately 60 of those served, was terminated favorably to the Government in June 1960 and the investigations are under way.

The Federal Maritime Board, in response to the subcommittee's referral of possible violations, opened a number of important investigative and rulemaking dockets. On May 5, 1960, the Vice Chairman of the Federal Maritime Board wrote to Chairman CELLER in part, as follows:

During the hearings held in New York last October and November, the subcommittee brought to light a variety of incidents and practices that may have been in violation of

the shipping statutes. Since then, the Board and its staff have reviewed the transcript and documentary evidence adduced at the hearings, together with the list of possible violations prepared by the subcommittee staff. We have used this material as a basis for further investigations into the practices of the shipping industry, and for the promulgation of rules of general applicability.

The list of possible violations prepared by the subcommittee staff contained 127 separate items. As of this date, we have reviewed all of the items and have initiated action in regard to most of them. The Board has instituted formal investigations, before hearing examiners, in regard to 13 of these items, and 2 more are in preparation. Field investigations remain in progress in regard to 12 of the instances set out on the list; and orders requiring the submission of verified information under section 21 of the Shipping Act of 1916 have been issued to numerous parties in 3 of these cases, and another such order is now ready for issuance. We have referred 17 cases to the Department of Justice for appropriate judicial proceedings. Twelve of the items are the subject of rulemaking proceedings, and such proceedings are under active consideration that will include six additional items. Eighteen cases are in the process of review by our staff. As suggested by the subcommittee we have increased the coordination of our activities with those of the Antitrust Division. * * *

I would particularly like to express the Board's appreciation for the assistance and cooperation provided by the professional staff of the subcommittee. We will look forward to continued coordination of the efforts of the subcommittee and the Board in connection with information that may be brought out in the resumed hearings.

A number of the new investigative dockets opened by the Federal Maritime Board in response to the subcommittee's referrals concern unfiled agreements required by section 15 of the Shipping Act to be filed with and approved by the Board. The importance of these investigations lies in the fact that Federal Maritime Board approval of agreements between carriers is a legal prerequisite to the exemption of the carriers from the prohibitions of the antitrust laws.

Also, the Federal Maritime Board, pursuant to section 21 of the Shipping Act, has issued an order requiring the more than 350 shipping lines forthwith to file with it their rate and other agreements.

In addition, the Federal Maritime Board has instituted investigative dockets and rulemaking proceedings affecting such matters as the filing of rates, the distribution of tariffs, relations with travel agents, and the like.

Port of New York Authority inquiry: Contempt citations

In March 1960, at the request of members of the New Jersey congressional delegation, the staff of the Antitrust Subcommittee was directed to make a study of the activities and operations of the Port of New York Authority, including a review of the scope of the authority's major operations.

The Port of New York Authority is an interstate, regional development authority established under bistate compacts between the States of New York and New Jersey approved by Congress in 1921 and 1922, for the purpose of dealing with the planning and development of terminal and transportation facilities and improving the commerce of the port district. It was the declared expectation of Congress that the effectuation of these compacts would "better promote and facilitate commerce between the States and between the States and foreign nations and provide better and cheaper transportation of property and aid in providing better postal, military, and other services of value to the Nation." The operations of the authority exercise a far-flung influence on interstate commerce. They yield tax exempt revenues in excess of $100 million annually from tunnels, bridges, terminals, airports, and shops, valued at more than $900 million. The port authority's operations affect the economic lives of millions of Americans living outside as well as inside the port development area and the States of New York and New Jersey. They intimately affect the operation of Federal agences responsible, among other things, for the national defense, navigable waterways, and air, rail, and highway traffic. In short, they profoundly affect Federal interests of many and various kinds.

Nevertheless, although there were 2 days of hearings before the subcommittee in 1952 on a resolution that would have withdrawn congressional consent from the compacts and the authority, neither the Judiciary Committee, to which is assigned responsibility for interstate compacts of this character, nor any other congressional committee, has ever conducted a general investigation of the Port of New York Authority to determine its conformance or nonconformance to the limits of its authority or the extent or adequacy of its performance of its responsibilities in the public interest.

What is more, in recent months, complaints varying widely in character and gravity concerning the operations of the port authority under the compacts, have come to the attention of the subcommittee. For example, it has been alleged that the port authority, in combining revenues for financing purposes from all its facilities, rather than reducing tools on each facility as it is amortized, places an undue burden on the channels of interstate commerce and is contrary to national transportation policy. It has been alleged that the port authority has extended its operations beyond the geographic limits contemplated by the Congress. It has been alleged that in the letting of certain service and construction contracts, the port authority has not permitted competition and has failed to grant the award to the lowest qualified bidder. It has also been asserted that the overall operations of the port authority have at no time been subjected to a comprehensive independent audit by any governmental agency.

By letter dated March 11, 1960, Chairman CELLER initiated the inquiry by requesting the executive director of the port authority to make certain of the authority's files available for examination by committee staff members. Notwithstanding this request, the port authority failed for the most part to make available the documents requested. Rather, it limited itself to supply documents virtually all of which were already matters of public record.

Against this background, the subcommittee voted on June 8, 1960, to begin a full inquiry into the activities and operations of the Port of New York Authority under the 1921 and 1922 compacts. Also on the same date, the subcommittee addressed a letter to the executive director of the authority requesting him to make available for examination by subcommittee staff representatives specified documents dating from January 1, 1946, and indicating that counsel for the subcommittee would call at the offices of the authority on June 15 for the purpose of examining these files at that time.

Two days later, by letter dated June 10, the executive director of the authority raised a number of objections to the request for inspection of documents in the port authority's files. In the same letter he nevertheless expressed the hope that when subcommittee counsel called at the offices of the authority and met with its general counsel, those present would reach agreement as to the materials to be furnished in aid of the subcommittee's inquiry. On June 15, counsel for the subcommittee met with the executive director and the general counsel of the authority at its office. The port authority failed to make the requested documents available.

Accordingly, on June 15, 1960, subpenas duces tecum were served upon Austin J. Tobin, executive director, S. Sloan Colt, chairman, board of commissioners, and Joseph G. Carty, secretary to the board of commissioners, of the Port of New York Authority, directing them to appear before the subcommittee on June 29, 1960, and to bring with them certain records and documents of the port authority.

On June 29, the three port authority officials appeared before the subcommittee and brought with them part of the documents demanded in the subpenas, but failed and refused to produce certain other documents in compliance with the subpenas or as ordered by the subcommittee. The withheld documents are necessary to the subcommittees' inquiry. On the same day, following the appearance of the witnesses, the subcommittee unanimously resolved to report the failure of the officials to honor the subpenas to the Committee on the Judiciary and to recommend that the committee report this conduct to the House with recommendation that the port authority officials be cited for contempt. On June 30, 1960, the Committee on the Judiciary adopted this recommendation. On August 23, 1960, the Committee on the Judiciary filed its reports—Reports Nos. 2117, 2120, and 2121—on the matter and the House of Representatives adopted House Resolution 606, House Resolution 607, and House Resolution 608, whereby the Speaker of the House was directed to and did certify the reports of the Committee on the Judiciary to the U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia.

It is now the duty of the U.S. attorney to bring the matter before the grand jury for its action—title II, United States Code, section 194. By citing the port authority officials for contempt the House has thus cleared the way for a

judicial determination of certain constitutional and legal issues concerning the scope of the investigative powers of Congress which the port authority has seen fit to raise.

Liaison with antitrust enforcement agencies

In addition to the foregoing legislative and investigative activities, the Antitrust Subcommittee maintains continuing liaison with the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice and with the Federal Trade Commission in connection with the enforcement by those agencies of the antitrust laws. In its report on corporate and bank mergers, issued in 1955, the subcommittee had occasion to state:

The Celler-Kefauver Antimerger Act adopted on December 29, 1950, was designed precisely to limit future increases in the level of economic concentration resulting from corporate mergers and acquisitions. However, enforcement activity by the Federal Trade Commission and the Department of Justice has been negligible for the most part. These agencies have filed all told but 11 merger cases since the passage of the Celler-Kefauver Antimerger Act almost 5 years ago. Viewed against the backdrop of over 3,000 corporate mergers, this paucity of proceedings indicates to the subcommittee that the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission have made but a token gesture at enforcement. Indeed, it appears to the subcommittee that both enforcement agencies have failed to execute the provisions of law promptly, vigorously, or effectively.

Since the issuance of the subcommittee's 1955 report, the intensity of Federal enforcement activities with respect to mergers has increased materially. Thus in less than 4 years, commencing January 1, 1956, the Department of Justice instituted 17 antitrust prosecutions, and the Federal Trade Commission 23. Enforcement of the Antimerger Act is currently the most important activity of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice and one of the principal activities of the Federal Trade Commission.

In the 86th Congress, as in past Congresses, the Antitrust Subcommittee has referred numerous specific complaints of antitrust violations to the Justice Department and to the FTC, including violations of the Celler-Kefauver Act. In many instances the subcommittee stimulated the initiation of investigative and prosecutory proceedings by these agencies.

Miscellaneous reports

On March 16, 1959, Chairman CELLER released the report on his study of television broadcasting in the United Kingdom, France, and Italy. This report, entitled "Aspects of Television in Western Europe," was based on Mr. CELLER'S firsthand study in the fall of 1958 of European television operations. It supplements the Antitrust Subcommittee's investigations during the 84th and 85th Congresses of the American television broadcasting industry.

Also early in 1959, the subcommittee published a report prepared by the subcommittee staff, constituting a revision of the subcommittee's 1950 publication entitled "The Antitrust Laws: A Basis for Economic Freedom." This revision collates to date all of the amendments to the basic antitrust legislation, and includes all related statutes. Since 1950, the subcommittee has had a constant demand for copies of this publication from educational institutions and business organizations. The up-to-date compilation of these laws in the subcommittee's publication should be of material assistance to the Congress in its consideration of antitrust matters as well as to students, educational institutions, and business organizations.

Publications, 86th Congress

Reports: "The Antitrust Laws: A Basis for Economic Freedom," a staff report to the Antitrust Subcommittee, January 1, 1959; "The Consent Decree Program of the Department of Justice," January 30, 1959: "Aspects of Television in Western Europe," committee print, January 1959; "Finality of Clayton Act Orders," House Report No. 580, June 26, 1959; "Proceedings against Austin J. Tobin," House Report No. 2117, August 23, 1960; "Proceedings against S. Sloan Colt," House Report No. 2120, August 23, 1960; "Proceedings against Joseph G. Carty," House Report No. 2121, August 23, 1960.

Hearings: "Finality of Clayton Act Orders, Serial No. 3, 1959"; "Functional Discounts, Serial No. 7, 1959"; "Group Bargaining by Milk Producers, Serial No. 12, 1959"; "Ocean Freight Industry, Serial No. 14, 1959–60"; "Federal Conflict of Interest Legislation, Serial No. 17, Parts 1 and 2, 1960"; "Return of Subpenas: Port of New York Authority, Serial No. 20, 1960."

Number of public bills referred to subcommittee No. 5	252
Number of public bills on which hearings were held	105
Number of public bills reported to full committee	100
Number of reports filed	12
Number of public bills passed House	11
Number of public bills pending in Senate	1
Number of Senate bills disposed of	3
Number of public bills approved by President	8

Twentieth Anniversary, Ukrainian Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure today to pay tribute to the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, which this fall will celebrate its 20th anniversary. The Congress speaks for over 2 million Americans of Ukrainian descent, many of whom are my friends and neighbors in the 10th District of New Jersey.

This organization has filled an important function in the past two decades by focusing attention upon the cause of the Ukraine, as well as that of all the captive nations. The Congress has been in the forefront in pointing up the fact that there are captive nations within the Soviet Union itself, as well as throughout Eastern Europe. The realization that Soviet unity is a myth, and that there are many separate nations within the Soviet Union yearning for independence, is, of course, of vital significance to our national strategy.

By dramatizing the plight of the oppressed non-Russian nations, the Ukrainian Congress has served the cause of liberty and freedom. May the Congress continue to play its vital role in the never-ending struggle against Communist imperialism in the future.

Address by Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson Before Illinois State Chamber of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
Hon. EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent address by the Secretary of Agriculture, the Honorable Ezra Taft Benson, which he delivered before the Illinois State Chamber of Commerce. In this address, he presented the facts in a direct, effective fashion and received widespread favorable comment.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE EZRA TAFT BENSON BEFORE ILLINOIS STATE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, 1960 STATEWIDE AGRICULTURE-BUSINESS CONFERENCE, CHICAGO, ILL., AUGUST 31, 1960

I deeply appreciate being your guest at this statewide agriculture-business conference. It is good to meet again my friends of the Illinois Chamber of Commerce—and I see here many other friends, both rural and city. May I take this opportunity to commend you of the Illinois Chamber and the farmers of this State for the sound position you have held on farm questions through the years. I thank you in particular for the firm support you have given to me in my humble efforts.

This, no doubt, is my last appearance before you as Secretary of Agriculture. So it is appropriate that we think back over the past 7½ years—and that we ask ourselves what has been learned that can be applied to the future.

What have we learned? It seems to me we have learned some old lessons anew.

We have learned that the supreme test of any Government policy, agricultural or other, is this: "How will it affect the character, morale, and well-being of our people?"

We have learned that the future of agriculture and the preservation of a sound economic system depend upon the vigorous reemphasis of the principles, benefits, and values of private competitive enterprise. No group in America is in a better position to contribute to this need than those who live on the farms and ranches of America.

We have learned that price supports on storable commodities can be useful in providing protection to the farm-producing plant and helping to stabilize national food supplies. But price supports which prevent

production shifts toward a balanced supply in terms of demand—price supports which encourage uneconomic production and result in continuing heavy surpluses and subsidies—these must be avoided.

We have learned that the principles of economic freedom are applicable to farm problems. We need a minimum of restrictions on farm production and marketing to permit the maximum of dependence on competitive free market prices as the best guides to production and consumption. Farmers should not be placed in a position of working for Government bounty rather than producing for a free market.

We have learned that inefficiency should not be subsidized in agriculture or any other segment of our economy. Relief programs should be operated as such—not as an aid to the entire agricultural industry. Emergency programs should be terminated as soon as the emergency is over.

And above all, I hope we have learned anew that freedom is a God-given, eternal principle vouchsafed to us under the Constitution. It must be continually guarded as something more precious than life itself. It is doubtful if any man can be politically free who depends upon the State for sustenance. A completely planned and subsidized economy weakens initiative, discourages industry, destroys character, and demoralizes the people. An uncorrupted citizenry builds a great State. No State ever built an uncorrupted citizen.

I say we have learned these things. By that I mean that the great majority of those who have studied the farm problem recognize these things as true.

But this does not mean that the facts are no longer being misrepresented.

There are those in this land who are still striving with all their energies to make the farm problem a political issue. This is deplorable. Our agriculture is neither Republican nor Democratic. It is American.

There are a few who think the way to win favor with rural people is by promises of unsound, unworkable, pie-in-the-sky policies and programs. But farm people are not on the auction block. Their votes are not for sale to the highest bidder. Those who believe otherwise insult the intelligence and integrity of our farmers.

Farm problems will never be resolved by passionate charges and countercharges—by flagrant misrepresentation—or by seeking out scapegoats.

Farm problems will finally be solved only through honest appraisal, frank and sincere discussion, adherence to sound economic principles, and devotion to the best interests of this country. I have faith in the people of this Nation. They will not be deceived by false promises and false charges.

The pessimists who predicted 1960 would be a bad year for farmers are being disappointed.

The outlook for hogs is favorable.

Cattle producers are experiencing a good year—on top of some of the best years in their history.

Milk prices are running above a year ago and dairy income in 1960 will hit an alltime high.

Exports for the 12 months that ended June 30 set a new record for volume and were close to the record of 1957 in dollar value.

Wheat exports have been sharply increased during the past 12 months.

A million bales were cut from the cotton carryover this year, and cotton stocks on August 1 were the smallest since 1953.

These are some of the specific facts. What about the overall picture?

Farmers' assets are at a record high of $204 billion, up $41 billion since 1953.

Farm debts are less than 12 percent of farm assets.

The standard of living among our rural people was never better.

On the other hand, as a farmer for many years, I do not minimize the seriousness of the very real problems our farmers are still facing: Notably the cost-price squeeze, inflation, and continuing Government-stimulated surpluses of a few commodities. But the cure for these ills is not to give the patient another dose of what made him sick in the first place. Yet that is precisely what some are urging today.

This situation that is called the farm problem is not just a farm problem—it is a national problem.

It is a national problem because of the heavy drain of tax dollars that it entails. And it is a national problem because past efforts to deal with it have carried the country far along the road to Government regimentation and control over agriculture. Many of our farmers have lost far too much of their freedom to plant, to compete, to market, and to make their own decisions.

This is what is back of our repeated appeals for sound new farm laws.

Farmers are not to blame for the troubles the Nation is having—in wheat, for example. The American farmer deserves our unstinting praise for his amazing productivity. Never in history have so many been fed so well by so few.

The difficulties we are having are largely the result of old laws and the refusal of the Congress to make long-needed changes.

Now let me take issue right here with a false statement that has been made and is still being made.

It is said, "The Congress gave Benson just about all that he asked for. This is Benson's program, and it isn't working."

That is a false statement. We do not have, and we never have had, anywhere near the full program we asked for.

When we took office in January 1953, our hands were tied for 2 years by the rigid 90-percent-of-parity price-support law then on the books.

As soon as we could, we asked the Congress as a start to provide a flexible range of supports, running from 75 to 90 percent of parity. We got a range of 82½ to 90 for the first year and 75 to 90 thereafter.

But then Congress passed a bill to restore the old 90-percent law, and the President vetoed it.

Next, Congress set up the soil bank, including the acreage reserve which we recommended as an emergency measure. But Congress made the acreage reserve applicable to 1956, despite the fact that much of the 1956 crop was already planted, and in the face of my warning that it was too late to do any good that year. And they tried to blame us for that.

In 1958 we asked that price supports be widened to a range of 60 to 90 percent of parity. What Congress gave us was a weak compromise—a fairly satisfactory program for corn; a stopgap program moving in the right direction for cotton; some improvement in rice; and nothing for wheat, tobacco, or peanuts.

And there, for all practical purposes, is where matters stand. Time and again in 1959 and this year President Eisenhower and all of us have urged Congress to choose among several alternatives which would improve the situation, but Congress refuses to act.

We do not have the program we asked for. We have a little of what we recommended, but even this came too late to be most effective.

Where we have had, or have been given, the authority to make price supports realistic, the results have been good.

Corn is an example. Corngrowers last year were finally free to plant as their own good judgment dictated. The immediate result was some increase in acreage. However, acreage has stabilized this year, and 1960 production is estimated at 6 percent below 1959. But corn consumption is running 9 percent ahead of a year ago.

Dairying is another example, even though we don't have all the flexibility needed. Supply and demand for milk are practically in balance—for the first time in 8 years. Dairy products are moving into markets rather than Government warehouses and income is at an alltime high.

Where the old price support, acreage control law did not apply—as for hogs, cattle, fruits, and vegetables, for example—farmers have generally done a good job of developing markets and adjusting supply to demand. Soybean producers especially have shown what can be done in the way of developing markets in the absence of controls and price fixing. Nationally, soybeans are the fifth most important crop as a source of income. Here in the Midwest they are second only to corn.

I am attaching to this text a rather full statement, amplifying what I have just said about how much of our recommended program was actually legislated.

Very little is to be gained at this stage, however, by documenting responsibility against our critics—even though strange as it seems, they are actually trying to blame us for the results of the programs they designed and which they refuse to change. Let us rather call attention to what has been accomplished during the past 7½ years and then chart what I consider to be a sound and safe path for the future.

As I have indicated, we have made limited progress toward sounder price support programs through the Agricultural Act of 1954—the act of 1956—and the act of 1958.

Four-fifths of agriculture is free, and doing fairly well. Out of about 250 farm commodities produced commercially only five are under acreage controls.

But we still need legislation—for wheat especially. And Congress refuses to take action.

We have made progress in extending to farm people legitimate benefits hitherto long denied them.

Social security has been extended to farm families and farm workers.

The unfair Federal tax on gasoline used on farms has been repealed. And I am immensely proud to be able to say that the rural development program, started by this administration—the first real concerted effort to deal with the special needs of low-income farmers—is progressing in over 30 States and Puerto Rico.

We have moved ahead in the conservation of natural resources. During the past 7½ years farmers have applied more conservation to their farms than in any similar period in history.

Our national forests are being developed and improved as never before. We developed new water-management programs and expanded existing programs. We established the Great Plains conservation program in 1956.

We have made progress in research.

Appropriations for agricultural research have been increased by 117 percent since 1953. A large part of these funds is being used to expand markets and find new uses for our farm abundance, and to develop new crops for current needs.

We have made progress in credit.

We made the Farm Credit Administration an independent agency, in large measure farmer owned and farmer controlled.

We substantially improved the services of the Rural Electrification Administration and the Farmers Home Administration.

We assisted ranchers with the biggest drought relief programs in U.S. history. Nearly $1 billion has been extended in disaster and drought aid since 1953—most of it during the serious droughts of 1953 through 1956. Such aid enabled many fine farm and ranch families to stay on the land.

Through various programs we have held down the accumulation of surpluses. Except for realistic adjustments in price supports, surplus disposal activities, and the soil bank, surplus accumulations might have risen $14 billion above existing totals.

More than 28 million acres of farmland have been taken out of production by the conservation reserve program of the soil bank. These acres would have otherwise added to surpluses. Instead, participating farmers are making unprecedented strides in conserving soil, water, forests, and wildlife resources.

The special milk program was inaugurated in 1954. In 1960, it operated in 83,000 school and child-care institutions where nearly 2.4 billion half pints of milk helped improve diets of our children.

The food for peace program is moving ahead. We are working closely with Canada, Australia, France, and Argentina to promote wider use of surplus wheat.

We have made an outstanding record in donating surplus food to deserving people at home and abroad. Over 20 million U.S. citizens and some 60 million people in 91 foreign countries received such donations last year.

No nation under Heaven has ever been so generous with its abundance. Every American who knows the story is proud of our record of sharing.

We have made great progress in expanding exports.

During the past 7 years the value of our farm exports was the greatest for any 7-year period in history—$26.5 billion.

In the fiscal year just past, the volume of our agricultural exports reached a new alltime high. Eight products set new alltime export records. The eight were feed grains, poultry meat, soybeans and cottonseed oil, dried beans, tallow, variety meats, and hops.

The size of the export job that American farmers are doing is indicated by the fact that half their wheat production and nearly half of their cotton production last year moved abroad.

As you know, I have just recently returned from an 18-day market development trip to Western Europe and the Middle East.

It was a fruitful trip—part of a long-range world agricultural trade and market development program which has taken me to some 35 foreign countries on 5 trade trips in the past 5 years.

We observed the agriculture of these countries. We noted the operation of our agricultural export program. We investigated the possibilities of increased agricultural trade. We met government officials and representatives of the trade and encouraged good will between the United States and these nations.

And we found that despite all the tensions in the world today and despite all the propaganda offered daily by alien ideologies to distort the image of America, this Nation is still held in high esteem and great trust by millions of citizens in virtually every land.

We not only received every courtesy and consideration by our hosts in each country; we received every assurance of true and lasting friendship.

The late Wendell Willkie once stressed the well of goodwill that abounds in the world for America. I would stress it again today. I sincerely hope that we have added a bit to the well.

We found farmers everywhere—from Flanders, to Amsterdam, to the Nile Delta, to the coastal plain of Israel—much the same in aspirations and outlook as our farmers here in Illinois and throughout the United States. Within the limitations imposed by geography, fertility of soil, and economics, they strive for the same freedom to plan, to plant, and to harvest and market that we all seek. They all pray for peace with all nations. Farm people certainly speak a common language, and in the fields of trade and agriculture I believe we will discover ways to bridge the gaps in mutual understanding so sorely needed in this world of 1960.

The farmers of the United States support multilateral trade based on comparative economic advantage. Trade is a two-way street. Everywhere we went we stressed our interest in expanding markets.

American agricultural representatives must continue to emphasize the need for trade liberalization. American farmers need to see their sales to Western Europe steadily increased in the months and years ahead. This makes economic sense.

In the Middle East there are many opportunities for opening new markets and enlarging present ones.

Our food for peace program is making a great contribution toward improving the level of living in the Middle East.

I repeat—we can all be proud of the way the products of our farms are helping people help themselves. Our agricultural productive ability is now recognized everywhere. So is our generous sharing of our abundance.

These are the facts. Such is the record of our 7½ years of stewardship. When the history of this period of our agriculture is written years hence, this will be revealed as a period of great and lasting progress. The groundwork has been laid for the kind of prosperous, expanding, and free agriculture that is so basic to a strong, virile, secure America. We have reversed the trend of 20 years toward a controlled and socialized agriculture.

We have here in the United States the most advanced agricultural plant in all history—the most skillful, best equipped farmers in the world—the finest, most abundant food supply ever. For the first time in history we dare to think about overcoming, around the world, man's ancient enemy, hunger.

We are in a cold war with communism. In this conflict, our agriculture is one of our greatest assets. The productivity of our farmers outclasses that of Russian farmers, four or five to one. This is a tremendous asset. The underdeveloped nations need our agricultural science and our food. Let us continue to put this advantage to work.

In short, let us focus on our opportunities.

To do this most successfully, we need to complete the progress of the past 7½ years.

The fundamental economics of the farm dilemma is simple—it is the politics of the problem that is baffling. What farmers want and need is less Government in the farming business—less politics in agriculture.

As we move forward, especially during the next 2 politically charged months, we must ever remember that—

Farmers are also good citizens, interested in peace, fiscal integrity, balanced budgets, and a sound economy—as well as in farm prices.

Farmers know that the high prices of 1952—so often referred to by some demagogs—were not due to 90-percent supports but to war, the insatiable demands and inflation of war. Our critics who would take credit for high wartime prices might well take the responsibility for the casualty lists also.

Farmers know that Government tinkering with controls on production, marketing, and prices has been a colossal failure.

Farmers know that political hopefuls who promise pie-in-the-sky 100 percent of so-called parity income will not be able to deliver on their political promises.

Farmers know that the so-called parity index—with an ancient base of 50 years ago—is an outmoded and weak measuring rod.

Farmers know that four-fifths of agriculture is free of controls, pretty well in balance, and doing fairly well, and that most farmers want freedom to make their own decisions without Government regimentation.

Farmers know that the private competitive enterprise system is the best—that it has given us more of the good things of life than any other system—and that it must be preserved, safeguarded, and strengthened.

Farmers know that price must be permitted to play its traditional role in directing production and consumption—that Government price fixing destroys markets, regiments farmers, piles up surpluses in Government warehouses, and puts burdens on farmers and all other taxpayers.

Farmers know they must have expanding markets and that a Government warehouse is not a market.

Yes; the fundamental economics of the farm problem is simple—less Government in farming. Quit trying to fix prices unrealistically from which flow the twin evils of production for Government warehouses and control of farmers. Emphasize markets, increased efficiency, and competitive selling. Eliminate Government's stranglehold on agriculture. This is the solution.

The course is clearly charted. It is right. It is sound.

Here in broad outline is what we need to do.

First, we need to expand the food-for-peace program. Remarkable use has been made of our surplus stocks through special export programs, but there are additional steps that can be taken. Food can serve humanitarian needs in foreign lands, aid in economic development, and serve the cause of peace and freedom.

Second, we should press forward even more vigorously than at present with programs of research to develop new foreign and domestic markets, including new industrial uses, for our farm products.

Third, we need laws to improve the price-support mechanism by providing levels of price support that will allow farm commodities to move into regular marketing channels, and at the same time afford adequate price protection. This will open the way toward further relaxation of existing controls over farm production, and toward an agriculture that is on a free, sound, and profitable basis.

Fourth, we need to adjust further the use of farmland in accordance with needs by such a program as an expanded conservation reserve.

Fifth, the rural development program should be emphasized and expanded as rapidly as is feasible. Through private and public cooperation, we can improve vocational education, offer more effective employment services, and encourage local industrialization and other economic activities as well as better farming. We can help our small farmers make adjustments which they want and need to make to improve their standard of living.

These are the policies American agriculture needs: Policies that build farm markets; policies that permit dynamic adjustments to the rapidly changing science of agriculture; policies that will strengthen our family farms as sound economic units; policies which will always dignify the individual farmer and his family in the free atmosphere of a vigorous and prosperous America.

If we resolutely advance such policies, I am convinced that the most exciting decade of our entire experience lies just ahead of us. The future is filled with absorbing challenges.

Production per man will continue to increase. Living standards for all of us are bound to reach new heights. America will be secure because she remains strong and strong because she remains free.

In January, I shall go back to my full-time work as a churchman. It is natural for anyone in that position to look back

over his shoulder at the road he has traveled. As I do so, I can tell you frankly that—many times in the past 8 years—I have wished that I might have occupied this office in a period of fewer stresses and strains. But it is not ours to pick and choose entirely when and under what conditions we shall serve.

We must all do our jobs as we understand them and under such circumstances as the Lord provides.

Of one thing in particular I am proud. We have never ceased impressing upon our farm people that to exchange principles for Government handouts is a sorry bargain. Giving without earning, rights without responsibilities, and freedom without vigilance are but figments of an imagination gone wild.

It is my hope and my prayer that you, the people of this choice Nation, will never permit this land to fall prey to a mammoth, centralized, paternalistic Government on the pretext that such a Government can by decree create and dispense health, wealth, and happiness to a subservient people.

As we face the critical decisions just ahead, city people and rural alike, let us in the words of Abraham Lincoln 100 years ago "do nothing through passion and ill temper." Let us "stand by our duty, fearlessly and effectively. * * * Let us have faith that right makes might, and in that faith, let us, to the end, do our duty as we understand it."

God grant it may be so.

Pulaski: Polish and American Patriot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, on October 11, 1779, Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski died on the American frigate *Wasp* of a mortal wound received as he led the Pulaski legion in the defense of Savannah, Ga. When only 31 years of age, he had already won international renown as a Polish patriot. He had the reputation of a brilliant military leader under Gen. George Washington.

The memory of this man is inspiring. His place in the annals of history, based as it is on the well-merited honor of two hemispheres, stemmed from one basic fundamental of his character—a devotion to freedom. The leading motive of General Pulaski's life was liberty.

For this in Poland he fought valiantly, and was famous, before he was 25, for his ability, bravery, and leadership. In the struggle against the three invading powers, Russia, Prussia, and Austria, which resulted in the first partition of Poland, he sacrificed his home and fortune, lost his father and brothers, and finally was driven from the country.

He then dedicated his talents and his life to the cause of American liberty. Known for the brilliance of his career to Benjamin Franklin and Lafayette, he was recommended to General Washington, who named him "head of the horse." He became the "father of the American Cavalry."

The American troops under his leadership came to the rescue of Washington's forces at Brandywine, lessened the blow at Germantown, fought in the battles of the winter of 1777–78, and as Pulaski's Legion defended Charleston, S.C., and Savannah, where he was mortally wounded.

Even in death he inspired his men with his valor, his gallantry, and his once self-styled "devoted zeal for the service of the States." After he had fallen in battle they fought on with a determination and bravery extolled by their French allies.

George Washington spoke of him as "a man of real capacity, experience, and knowledge." "Light Horse Harry" Lee wrote:

> Pulaski—a name dear to the writer * * * gallant soldier * * * sober, diligent, and intrepid, gentlemanly in his manners, and amiable in his heart.

In mute witness to the debt, the respect, and the affection which the American people felt for General Pulaski there stands a statue in Savannah. Counties in 10 States have been named for him, besides cities and towns. A 1929 memorial exhibition in Newark, N.J., became a permanent part of the Museum of Newark. In that year, 1929, the U.S. Congress authorized a sesquicentennial celebration in memory of him.

As long as the battles for freedom are commemorated, Pulaski's name will be among the honored.

Legislative Review of the Achievements of Congress During Past 6 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement by me on the legislative record, digest of achievements, and status of presidential recommendations, 86th Congress, 2d session, January 6, 1960, to September 1, 1960.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW OF THE ACHIEVEMENTS OF CONGRESS DURING PAST 6 YEARS

(By Senate Majority Leader LYNDON B. JOHNSON)

The close of a Congress is always a matter of great significance. It is a period of summing up; of judgment; of deciding whether the Congress has fulfilled its obligations to the American people.

But the adjournment of this session is of unusual importance in our history. It marks the close of the longest period of divided government this Nation has ever known.

SIX YEARS

For 6 years, the Congress of the United States has been controlled by one political party and the executive agencies of our Government by another. This is a situation which was not contemplated by the Founding Fathers and which political scientists have regarded with apprehension.

It would not be accurate to say that divided Government brought our country to a paralysis or to a halt. This would have resulted had the Democratic majorities sought to use their strength to hamstring and harass the President. This they did not do.

SEEK THE BEST, ATTAIN THE POSSIBLE

Instead, the Democratic majorities adopted the philosophy that Americans must make the best out of the circumstances which prevail. The result was a remarkable series of achievements that have few—if any—parallels in American history.

The guidelines for the Democratic majorities could be summed up as an effort to seek the best and to attain the possible. It was decided that the best philosophy was to attempt to resolve, rather than create, issues and that some progress was preferable to no progress at all.

FACING THE ISSUES

As a result, the Democratic Congresses succeeded in facing up to some of the most difficult issues of our times.

Two major civil-rights bills were written into law after 82 years of total inactivity in this field.

The Austrian, German, and Japanese Peace Treaties were ratified.

The United States was authorized to participate in the International Finance Corporation to help solve the problems of the underdeveloped nations of the world.

Our country was committed to the concept of atoms for peace by ratification of the statute of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

An Inter-American Development Bank was established to accelerate the economic development of the nations of the Western Hemisphere.

An East-West Center was established in Hawaii to provide a meeting ground for the intellectual and cultural leaders of the East and the West.

The minimum wage was increased from 75 cents to a dollar an hour.

The largest roadbuilding program in history was launched.

The 1958 recession was met by prompt and vigorous congressional action in the field of housing, public works, reclamation, and roadbuilding and the beneficial effects of these programs became apparent the following year.

The Small Business Investment Act was approved to provide loans to State and federally chartered small business investment companies.

A program was launched under congressional initiative to bring the United States into the development and exploration of outer space.

Congressional recommendations were made to strengthen the Nation's defenses.

A landmark social security law established the basic principle of disability compensation at age 50 and extended the coverage of the act and lowered the retirement age for women.

The Upper Colorado River Basin project—the dream of conservationists for more than 50 years—finally became a reality.

Alaska and Hawaii were both admitted to the Union as States.

The Niagara River power development program was authorized.

The cloture rules of the Senate were liberalized.

Legislation to curb racketeering that was preying upon honorable working men and women was placed on the statute books.

Broad programs were enacted to provide housing for our people and keep our economy healthy.

The greatest health research programs in all recorded history were launched to give humanity some hope for relief from the killing and crippling diseases.

The controversial Antarctic Treaty was ratified which holds forth the promise of securing one area of the world from warlike moves.

These are only a few of the achievements of the past 6 years. A more extended list will be placed in the record at the end of this statement and I ask unanimous consent to do so.

STRAINS APPARENT

Despite these achievements, however, the strains of divided government were apparent at every turn. These strains became greater as we approached the decisive year of 1960 in which the American people will have the opportunity to bring divided government to an end.

It has not been possible to work out satisfactory legislation to meet the pressing problems of agriculture.

Bills to aid the pockets of economic recession which scar the face of our country have been vetoed.

The only legislation attainable to help our senior citizens with their health problems is considered by many to be inadequate to the needs.

A needed boost in the wage floor could not be achieved—nor could extended coverage.

Legislation to help in the education of our children has become bogged down.

ISSUES MUST BE RESOLVED

These are problems which must be submitted to the American people. The 6 years of divided government have worked in many respects but it is obvious that there are issues whose resolution will be extremely difficult if divided government continues.

Furthermore, divided government—to work at all—demands the utmost in forbearance from all participants. Heated partisanship at any key position can complicate the problems of divided government beyond endurance.

It is obvious that the American people approve of the responsible approach of the Democratic Congress to the Nation's problems.

The record of the congressional Democrats has been submitted to the American people on three separate occasions since 1952. On each test, the American people have returned increasing Democratic majorities to the House and the Senate.

The full achievement of Democratic programs, however, requires close cooperation between the executive and legislative branches under our system of government. This can be determined only by the action of the people themselves.

Briefly from January 6 to July 3, when we recessed for the conventions, we had in the—

INTERNATIONAL AREA

Extended the mutual security program for 1 year and authorized $1.3 billion for economic assistance, technical assistance, and special activities ($2.7 billion for military assistance and development loan funds for 1961 previously authorized). Public Law 86–472.

Authorized U.S. participation in parliamentary conferences with Mexico. Public Law 86–420.

Extended for 2 years (June 30, 1962) authority of the President to control exports of strategic and critical materials. Public Law 86–464.

Authorized land acquisition in District of Columbia for donation to Pan-American Health Organization as headquarters site. Public Law 86–395.

Reaffirmed sense of Congress that upon achievement of disarmament agreements the United States should join with other countries in a program for peace.

Authorized payment of $6 million to Japanese nationals, formerly on Bonin Islands, in settlement of all claims against the United States. Public Law 86–486.

Provided for U.S. participation in International Development Association to help provide assistance to underdeveloped countries. Public Law 86–565.

Provided for admission of approximately 5,000 nonquota immigrants as part of the international program for resettlement of European refugees. Public Law 86–648.

Authorized agreement with Mexico under treaty of February 3, 1944, for construction of a major international storage dam on the Rio Grande. Public Law 86–605.

Authorized the President, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Surgeon General to conduct an international cooperative program in health research, training, and planning. Public Law 86–610.

Authorized appointment of U.S. Citizens Commission to participate in NATO Citizens Convention to explore ways to develop democratic freedom by economic and political means. Public Law 86–719, approved September 7, 1960.

Authorized funds to effect U.S. participation in International Bureau for Protection of Industrial Property, pursuant to treaty. Public Law 86–614.

Effectuated convention with Cuba for conservation of shrimp.

Ratified the Florence agreement to encourage the exchange of cultural, scientific, and educational materials.

Ratified the Mexican Broadcasting Agreement to provide AM radio frequency priorities between the United States and Mexico broadcasting stations.

Ratified Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security Between the United States and Japan.

Extended through June 30, 1961, suspension of duties on imports of metal scrap. Public Law 86–606.

DEFENSE—SPACE—SECURITY

Authorized $211.4 million for fiscal 1961 programs of Atomic Energy Commission, including $13 million for power reactor plants for the Antarctic. Public Law 86–457.

Authorized $1.1 billion for 1961 project construction at Army, Navy, and Air Force installations here and abroad. Public Law 86–500.

Authorized construction of 4 modern naval vessels at cost of $157.9 million as part of 1961 program involving 57 vessels. Public Law 86–471.

Authorized $970 million for NASA activities for fiscal year 1961. Public Law 86–481.

Approved transfer of Development Operations Division of Army Ballistic Missile Agency to NASA.

Extended to June 30, 1962, President's authority to allocate and fix priorities for strategic materials, grants loans and subsidies under Defense Production Act to expand industrial capacity. Public Law 86–560.

Extended authority of Secret Service to protection of Vice President, next successors in line to the Presidency, and to the Vice-President-elect.

Extended for 2 years, to June 30, 1962, authority for direct and guaranteed loans to veterans for homes, farms, or business. Public Law 86–665.

Waived payment of premiums on national life insurance policies for certain totally disabled veterans. Public Law 86–497.

Permitted conversion or exchange of national life insurance policies to a new modified plan.

Provided additional compensation for disabled veterans with more than three children. Public Law 86–499.

Authorized involuntary retirement after 20 years' service of Air Force and Army officers who fail to meet selection requirements for promotion three or more times. Public Law 86–616.

Provided for additional compensation for certain disabled veterans. Public Law 86–499.

Provided incentive pay for service on nuclear-powered submarines. Public Law 86–635.

Amended Reserve Officer Personnel Act to equalize promotion opportunity in various branches of Armed Forces. Public Law 86–559.

NATIONAL ECONOMY

Provided pay increases of 7½ percent for classified and other employees, 8.4 percent for postal workers. Public Law 86–568.

Provided Federal loans and grants for industrial redevelopment in economically depressed area. Vetoed.

Authorized $1 billion a year for fiscal 1962 and 1963 in Federal aid for primary and secondary highway systems and their urban extensions. Public Law 86–657.

Provided for temporary limit of $293 billion on national debt for 1 year to June 30, 1961. Extended to July 1, 1961, 52 percent corporate income tax rate and the existing schedule of excise taxes on alcoholic beverages, cigarettes, automobiles and parts, transportation of persons, and telephone calls. Public Law 86–564.

Authorized increase of $75 million—to $650 million—on the amount of loans Small Business Administration may have outstanding.

Facilitated extension of credit to small business enterprises by amendments to Small Business Investment Act. Public Law 86–502.

Authorized creation of an Office of International Travel and Tourism in Department of Commerce to promote travel to the United States.

Extended for 2 years, to June 30, 1962, authority of Federal Reserve Board to buy U.S. securities directly from the Treasury. Public Law 86–567.

Permitted personal income tax deduction of all medical expenses incurred by any taxpayer in care of dependent parent over 65. Public Law 86–470.

Revised method for treatment of railroad corporation income resulting from discharge of indebtedness in receivership or under bankruptcy proceedings. Public Law 86–496.

Reduced cabaret tax from 20 percent to 10 percent. Public Law 86–422.

Authorized sale of surplus cotton to domestic textile industry at prices enabling it to compete in export market.

Exempted real estate loans guaranteed by a State or a State authority from limitations of Federal Reserve Act.

Permitted tax credit on foreign income by corporations to be taken on overall instead of country-by-country basis. Public Law 86–780, approved September 14, 1960.

Increased subsidy for domestic ship construction, for 2 years, to 55 percent of cost in foreign yards. Public Law 86–607.

Provided $2½ million a year for 3 years as subsidy to meet foreign competition in construction of trawlers, to aid New England fishing industry. Public Law 86–516.

Fixed wheat price supports at 75 percent of parity, reduced acreage 25 percent, provided for payment in kind for land withdrawn and devoted to soil and water conservation uses.

Established a Commission on Problems of Rural Counties and Smaller Communities.

Extended for 3 months, to March 31, 1961, the Sugar Act of 1948, fixing quotas of domestic and foreign producers; gave President authority to readjust Cuba's quota. Public Law 86–592.

Stabilized price supports for tobacco. Public Law 86–389.

Required marketing quotas for rice be established when total supply exceeds normal. Public Law 86–408.

Authorized donation of Federal surplus property to cooperative agriculture extension agencies of States and counties. Public Law 86–570.

Created an Agricultural Research and Development Commission to find and promote new industrial uses for farm products.

Authorized $1.4 billion public works projects on rivers and harbors for flood control and improvement of navigation. Public Law 86–645.

Established Office of Water Pollution Control and increased to $90 million a year grants to local governments to pay 30 percent of cost of construction of sewage treatment works. Vetoed.

Created an Office of Coal Research to find new uses for coal, encourage production and conservation, and otherwise stimulate the industry. Public Law 86–599.

Authorized $250 million for construction of San Luis unit of Central Valley, Calif., water supply project. Public Law 86–488.

HEALTH AND WELFARE

Extended to June 30, 1964, authorization for funds under Federal Air Pollution Control Act and continuation of public hearings.

Authorized health benefits program for retired civil service workers. Public Law 86–724, approved September 8, 1960.

Extended to June 30, 1965, authorization for $2 million a year in project grants to schools training public health personnel. Public Law 86–720, approved September 8, 1960.

Established a system of licensing and control over manufacture of narcotic drugs. Public Law 86–429.

Extended special milk program for children to June 30, 1961, and authorized maximum expenditures of $85 million in fiscal 1960 and $95 million in 1961. Public Law 86–446.

Tighten control over use of coal-tar coloring in food, drugs, and cosmetics. Public Law 86–618.

Authorized $1.2 billion housing program; renewed authority of various programs; authorized funds for veterans' housing loans, farm housing loans, college dormitories, urban-renewal slum clearance, community facilities, and housing for aged.

Authorized $100 million program for loans and planning grants to aid improvement of mass commuter transportation facilities in metropolitan areas as part of urban redevelopment.

Authorized $1.8 billion 2-year program for school construction and teachers' salaries.

Increased Federal contributions to land-grant colleges for resident teaching grants. Public Law 86–658.

Amended Defense Education Act by eliminating oath disclaiming disloyalty, retaining pledge of allegiance; fixed penalty for seeking or obtaining aid under the act while a member of a subversive group.

Authorized Federal grants of $5 million a year for 5 years to local communities and nonprofit agencies to finance projects to combat juvenile delinquency; established a national advisory council.

Provided for 10-percent increase in annuities for retired Foreign Service officers and survivors. Public Law 86–612, approved July 12, 1960.

Extended the mandatory provisions of the Federal Mine Safety Act to all underground mines regardless of size.

Authorized Post Office Department to seek court orders to curb use of mails for distribution of obscene or fraudulent matter. Public Law 86–673.

GENERAL GOVERNMENT

Enacted a civil-rights measure which authorized Federal courts, through appointed referees, to safeguard voting rights; fixed penalties for obstruction of court orders and for flight to avoid prosecution for vandalism; required preservation of Federal election records for 22 months; authorized availability of funds for education of servicemen's children in areas where schools are closed by integration disputes. Public Law 86–449.

Required that bank mergers have approval of Federal Reserve Board, Comptroller of Currency, or Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation as an insurance against monopoly. Public Law 86–463.

Authorized Attorney General to compel production of documents required as evidence in civil antitrust proceedings.

Legalized community antenna booster stations to bring broadcast programs to remote areas.

Restored to States jurisdiction over voting, taxing, education, and law enforcement rights on federally owned land.

Revised Federal election laws governing campaign contributions and spending.

Established a Commission on Metropolitan Problems and Urban Development.

Authorized 5-year program of payments to State and local governments in lieu of taxes for Federal lands; established a board to administer program and report on need for permanent policy.

Amended Communications Act to limit equal time provisions for duration of 1960 presidential campaign to major party candidates. Public Law 86–677, approved August 24, 1960.

Provided for creation of a commission to plan for a national observance of the 175th anniversary of the Constitution, 1964.

Created a commission to formulate plans for a memorial to Woodrow Wilson in the District of Columbia.

Proposed constitutional amendment giving the District of Columbia three votes in the electoral college and its citizens the right to vote for President and Vice President.

Provided for an elected mayor, city council, school board, and nonvoting delegate to the House from the District of Columbia.

Following is a brief list of major actions taken between August 8 and September 1, 1960.

Antarctic Treaty: Ratified Antarctic Treaty assuring that the Antarctic Continent and surrounding areas will be used exclusively for peaceful purposes, that freedom of scientific investigation will be maintained and freezes existing territorial claims and rights in the Antarctic.

Mutual security appropriations: Appropriated $3,722 million for foreign aid. Public Law 86–704, approved September 2, 1960.

Latin American development: Authorized $500 million for assistance in the development of Latin America and $100 million for aid in the reconstruction of Chile. Public Law 86–735, approved September 8, 1960.

Minimum wage: Increased the minimum wage from $1 to $1.25 over a 3-year period and extended coverage to some 4 million workers.

Mutual security contingency fund: Provided for an increased authorization of $100 million for the President's mutual security contingency fund for fiscal 1961 to meet emergency needs in Africa and other areas of the world—contingency fund total of $250 million in authorizations.

Social security-medical care for aged: Provided increased social security coverage under existing programs and authorized a new program of Federal grants to the States for medical care for the aged. Public Law 86–778, approved September 13, 1960.

Lead-zinc mining: Provided for stabilizing the mining of lead and zinc by small producers in the United States. Vetoed September 2, 1960.

Helium: Authorized a long-range program for the conservation of helium. Public Law 86–777, approved September 13, 1960.

Public works: Provided $3,969 million for public works projects, flood control, and resources conservation and development. Public Law 86–700, approved September 2, 1960.

FCC: Amended Federal Communications Act by fixing penalties for acceptance of payola and for other abuses and questionable practices. Public Law 86–752, approved September 13, 1960.

Housing: Extended life of home repair and improvement program and lifted the ceiling on FHA insurance; increased the revolving loan for college housing loans by $500 million and increased the revolving fund for community facility loans by $50 million. Public Law 86–784, approved September 14, 1960.

Second supplemental: Appropriated $162,186,981 for various agencies and programs, including $65 million for mutual security. Public Law 86–722, approved September 8, 1960.

District of Columbia police and firemen: Unanimously approved 7.5-percent salary increases for Metropolitan Police, District of Columbia firemen, U.S. Park Police, and White House Police. Public Law 86–734, approved September 8, 1960.

Advertising charges: Unanimously approved an exclusion of local advertising charges from the sales price for purposes of manufacturers' excise taxes. Public Law 86–781, approved September 14, 1960.

District of Columbia teachers: Unanimously approved a 7.5-percent increase in salary for teachers and officials of the District school system. Public Law 86–773, approved September 13, 1960

Antikickback statute: Unanimously cleared for the White House extending the "antikickback" statute to all negotiated contracts. Public Law 86–695, approved September 2, 1960.

Transportation: Unanimously provided for licensing independent freight forwarders. This was the record of the 2d session of the 86th Congress.

AGRICULTURE

In the first session, in 1959, we:

REA: Restored authority of REA Administrator to approve or disapprove loans without supervision by the Secretary of Agriculture. Vetoed. Final passage, 60 to 27.

Wheat supports: Provided price support at 90 percent of parity; reduced acreage allotments by 25 percent below the allotment it would otherwise receive for the 1960 and 1961 crops; and limited wheat supports to $35,000 a year for each producer. Final passage, division vote. Action clearing bill for President adopted by vote of 44 to 40. Vetoed.

Tobacco supports: Stabilized and protected the level of tobacco price supports by permitting the support price to be either the 1958 level or 90 percent of new parity, whichever is lower, until 90 percent of old parity exceeds either of these levels. Voice vote. Vetoed

Special school milk program: Raised limitation on special school milk program to $80 million for 1960 and 1961. Increased to $78 million for current year. Public Law 86–163, approved August 18, 1959.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Cloture: Liberalized the cloture rule by providing that two-thirds of the Senators voting may close debate on any measure, including rule changes; and affirming the fact that the Senate is a continuing body. Final passage, 72 to 22.

Hawaii: Provided for admission of Hawaii to the Union as the 50th State. Final passage, 76 to 15. Public Law 86–3, approved March 18, 1959.

Alaska Omnibus Act: Amended various Federal laws to facilitate orderly transition from territorial to statehood status. Public Law 86–70, approved June 25, 1959.

Home rule: Provided for an elected mayor, city council, and a nonvoting delegate to the House of Representatives for the District of Columbia.

ECONOMY

Economic study: Provided $200,000 for a major study of the Nation's economy by the Joint Congressional Economic Committee. Voice vote.

Unemployment problems: Established a Commission on Unemployment Problems of 11 members, 5 to be appointed by the President and 6 by Congress, to make a study of the problems and report in 60 days. Voice vote.

Clayton Act: Amended Clayton Act to expedite procedures for enforcement by Federal Trade Commission. Public Law 86–107, approved July 23, 1959.

FOREIGN RELATIONS

World Bank and International Monetary Fund: Increased U.S. subscription to the International Monetary Fund by $1.375 billion and the World Bank by $3.175 billion. Final passage, 73 to 10. Public Law 86–48, approved June 17, 1959.

Health for peace: Authorized a $50-million-a-year program to improve health conditions through international cooperation in research, training, and planning. Final passage, 63 to 17.

Mutual security: Authorized a total of $3,543,320,000 for fiscal 1960; authorized an appropriation of $2 billion over the next 2 years for the Development Loan Fund. Established center for cultural and technical interchange between East and West in Hawaii. Final passage, 65 to 26. Public Law 86–108, approved July 24, 1959.

Inter-American Bank: Provided for U.S. membership in the Inter-American Development Bank to aid in the economic development of Latin American countries. Final passage, 89 to 3. Public Law 86–147, approved August 7, 1959.

International Wheat Agreement: Ratified an extension of the 10-year-old International Wheat Agreement for another 3 years, to July 31, 1962. Ratified, 92 to 1.

LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

TV education: Authorized grants up to $1 million to each State for purchase of TV facilities and equipment upon their agreement to provide land, building, and operate and maintain an educational channel.

Railroad retirement: Provided for a 10-percent increase in benefits under Railroad Retirement and Unemployment Compensation Acts. Public Law 86–28, approved May 19, 1959.

Labor reform: Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act to curb undemocratic and racketeering practices in labor unions and labor-management relations. Final passage, 90 to 1. Public Law 86–257, approved September 14, 1959.

Housing: Omnibus bill provided for a $1.375 billion housing program emphasizing low-cost housing, college housing, urban renewal, and a more realistic building program for the elderly. Final passage, 60 to 28. Conference report adopted by vote of 56 to 31. Vetoed.

A second housing bill (S. 2539) passed in 1959 was vetoed. The third housing measure, identical to S. 2539 with three exceptions, was signed into Public Law 86–372, approved September 23, 1959. Three exceptions: College classroom program, FHA insurance authorization expiration date removed, and the urban renewal capital grant authorization was modified.

Veterans' housing: Provided $100 million for direct Federal housing loans to veterans in rural and small urban areas. Permits the Administration to allow lenders to charge 5¼ percent on GI housing loans. Public Law 86–73, approved June 30, 1959.

Depressed areas: Authorized a new Federal program with an initial authorization of $389,500,000 in loans and grants for industrial redevelopment in economically depressed areas. Final passage, 49 to 46. Vetoed.

Air pollution: Extended the Federal air-pollution-control program, authorized funds, and provided for agency cooperation. Public Law 86–365, approved September 22, 1959.

Health benefits—Federal employees: Provides for a voluntary Federal civilian employees health benefit program comparable to those available to other large employee groups by authorizing payroll deductions and an equal contribution by the Government to meet the costs of the program. Final passage, 81 to 4. Public Law 86–382, approved September 28, 1959.

NATIONAL SECURITY

AEC: Authorized $165,400,000 for a total of 43 new construction projects; $7 million for the Euratom research and development program; $55,500,000 for the cooperative power reactor demonstration program; and extends for another 5 years the compulsory licensing of atomic energy. Public Law 86–50, approved June 23, 1959.

Modern Navy: Authorized $110 million construction program of modern naval vessels for 1960. Public Law 86–23, approved May 13, 1960.

Airports: Extended for 2 years, until June 30, 1961, the present Airport Act at the same level of annual authorization, $63 million for 1960 and 1961. Substitute adopted 71 to 11. Public Law 86–72, approved June 29, 1959.

NATURAL RESOURCES

TVA financing: Authorized issuance of up to $750 million revenue bonds by TVA to finance additional power facilities subject to congressional and Treasury Department approval. Public Law 86–137, approved August 6, 1959.

In 1958:

Defense reorganization: Public Law 85–559 provided for a complete reorganization of the Defense Department.

Federal-aid highways: As an antirecession measure authorized $3.2 billion in new Federal funds for highway construction and authorized a one-half of 1 percent bonus in Federal interstate highway funds to States that agree to regulate billboard advertising along the Interstate Highway System. Public Law 381.

Area redevelopment: Authorized $280 million in Federal aid for distressed areas suffering from chronic unemployment. Vetoed.

Unemployment benefits: Public Law 441 extended the duration of the period in which jobless workers could collect unemployment checks.

Social security: Increased OASI benefits by 7 percent.

Civilian Space Agency: Created a new civilian agency to direct the Nation's scientific activities relating to all nonmilitary aspects of outer space. Public Law 568.

Reciprocal trade: 4-year extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act. Public Law 686.

Postal rate-pay increases: Provided increases for first-, second-, third-, and fourth-class mail and authorized a permanent 7.5-percent pay increase for all field service employees except those in level 20. Public Law 426.

Federal pay raise: Public Law 462 provided for an average 10-percent pay increase.

National Defense Education Act: Enacted a 7-year $1 billion program of loans and grants to students and schools to enable needy students to continue their education. Public Law 864.

Emergency housing: Enacted Public Law 364 to encourage and expedite the construction and financing of a substantial number of new housing units, placing primary emphasis on expanding and amending existing programs to provide economic relief.

Aviation Agency: Created a Federal Aviation Agency to assume authority over the Nation's airways. Public Law 726.

Military pay raise: Public Law 422 increased the basic pay, by varying percentages, for nearly all military personnel with more than 2 years' service.

Superliner construction: Authorized the Federal Maritime Board to contract for the construction and sale of two superliner passenger vessels. Public Law 521.

Atomic data exchange: Public Law 479 authorized increased exchange of atomic weapons information and materials with U.S. allies.

Small business agency: Public Law 536 gave the Small Business Administration permanent status, a decided victory for small business groups.

Capital for small business: Public Law 699, the Small Business Investment Act, provided for loans to State and federally chartered small business investment companies.

Farm surplus disposal: Public Law 931 extended for 18 months, to December 31, 1959, the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act and increased from $4 billion to $6.25 billion the value of surplus commodities that can be sold to friendly foreign countries for local currencies.

Alaska: After a 42-year deadlock Congress enacted Public Law 508 admitting Alaska to the Union as the 49th State.

Minerals exploration: Public Law 701 established an Office of Minerals Exploration as a permanent agency within the Department of the Interior to provide Federal assistance for mineral exploration projects.

Construction speedups: The Congress adopted two resolutions calling on the administration to accelerate all civil and military construction projects for which funds had been previously appropriated, as one means of checking a recession.

Hospital construction: Public Law 664 extended for 5 years the program of Federal grants for hospital construction.

Presidential pensions: Public Law 745 provided a pension of $25,000 a year for former Presidents and a pension of $10,000 to widows of former Presidents provided they gave up any other Federal annuity or pension.

In 1957:

Civil Rights Act: Enacted into Public Law 315 the first civil rights measure to pass the Senate since 1875: Created an executive Commission on Civil Rights; empowered the Attorney General to seek an injunction when an individual was deprived or about to be deprived of the right to vote; and allows the judge to decide whether the defendant in such cases should be tried with or without a jury.

Middle East, Public Law 7: Authorized the President to cooperate with and assist any Middle East nations desiring help in the development of economic strength, and to undertake military assistance programs with them.

Atomic Agency Treaty: Ratified the statute of International Atomic Energy Agency designed to implement the 1953 atoms-for-peace proposal.

Atomic insurance: Permitted the Government to provide indemnities of up to $500 million for damages resulting from nuclear accidents in private industry. Public Law 256.

Housing: Liberalized several existing housing programs; lowered the minimum downpayment required to buy a house with an FHA-insured mortgage and gave FNMA additional funds for buying home mortgages from banks and other private lenders to alleviate the tight-money market. Public Law 104.

Upper Colorado project: Authorized a $760-million Upper Colorado River Basin water storage and reclamation project. Public Law 485.

Health program: Enacted Public Law 911 providing traineeships for professional public health personnel; advanced training for professional nurses; practical nurse training; extension of hospital survey and construction programs; and assistance in mental health programs.

Public Law 835 provides for a 3-year $90-million construction program for health research facilities.

Flood insurance: An experimental $5 to $7.5 billion Federal flood insurance and loan contract program. Public Law 1016.

Surplus disposal: Enacted Public Law 962 increasing from $1.5 to $3 billion the limit surplus sales for foreign currencies.

Customs simplification: Enacted into law a single valuation system, based on the price at which the goods were offered for sale as exports, instead of the old system under which the higher of two values was used, the

export price or the price at which the goods would be sold in the foreign market. Public Law 927.

Seventy thousand public housing units: Provided for 35,000 units a year for 2 years but made Federal aid contingent upon a workable slum clearance program in local communities. Public Law 1020.

Atomic merchant ship: Provided for construction of an atomic-powered merchant ship to promote the peacetime application of atomic energy; estimated cost, $37 million. Public Law 848.

Mineral stockpile: Authorized a 2½-year subsidy program for mining tungsten, fluorspar, asbestos, and columbium-tantalum estimated to cost $91.7 million. Public Law 733.

Servicemen's survivors: Increased benefits for survivors of servicemen and brought 2,850,000 military personnel under social security. Public Law 881.

Water pollution: Increased Federal funds available to States for developing water pollution control programs and authorized a maximum of $500 million to assist communities to build sewage treatment works. Public Law 660.

Niagara power: Authorized power development at Niagara Falls. Public Law 159.

Deferred grazing: Enacted Public Law 25 designed to aid ranchers and farmers in drought disaster areas by paying them to keep their livestock off parched grazing lands until the drought ended and pastures reestablished.

Farm surplus disposal: Extended the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act to June 30, 1958, and increased from $3 billion to $4 billion the value of surplus commodities that could be sold to friendly foreign countries.

Veterans' compensation: Public Law 168 increased compensation payments for service-connected disabilities by 10 percent with more for 100-percent disability.

Immigration laws: Public Law 316, dealing primarily with hardship cases, authorized admittance of approximately 60,000 aliens; authorized unlimited entry, for a 2-year period, of alien orphans adopted by U.S. citizens.

In 1956:

Farm bills: H.R. 12 to restore rigid supports at 90 percent of parity on basic commodities. Vetoed.

After the veto the Congress again considered and passed a farm measure retaining mandatory price supports for small feed grains and gave the Secretary of Agriculture discretionary authority to establish a two-price plan for rice; set up an acreage reserve program to compensate producers for reducing their 1956–59 crops of basic commodities below their allotments or base acreages. Public Law 540.

Social security: Liberalized the Social Security Act by reducing the retirement age for women from 65 to 62 and established a disability program at age 50; extended coverage to lawyers, dentists, chiropractors, osteopaths, veterinarians, optometrists, sharecroppers, etc. Public Law 880.

Thirteen-year highway program: Authorized the largest roadbuilding program in history: $31.5 billion in Federal-State funds over a 13-year period; also provided for new taxes scheduled to yield $14.8 billion over a 16-year period. Public Law 627.

In 1955:

Housing amendments of 1955: Authorized 45,000 public housing units through July 31, 1956, and increased the authorization for assistance in slum clearance and urban renewal by $200 million annually in fiscal 1956 and 1957. Public Law 345.

Railroad retirement: Permitted pensioners to receive both social security and railroad retirement benefit payments; and increased a spouse's maximum annuity from $40 a month to $51.80. Public Law 383.

Defense of Formosa, Pescadores: Authorized the President to use U.S. Armed Forces in defense of Formosa and the Pescadores against Chinese Communists. Public Law 4.

International finance: Authorized U.S. participation in the International Finance Corporation and authorized $35,168,000 as the U.S. subscription to IFC. IFC grew out of demands of underdeveloped countries for credits not readily obtainable from the International Bank for Reconstruction. Public Law 350.

Reciprocal trade: Extended the President's authority to negotiate reciprocal trade agreements through June 30, 1958; amended existing peril point provisions so that the Tariff Commission could recommend action if a business enterprise producing goods in commercial quantities was suffering seriously from import competition. Public Law 86.

Minimum wage increase: Raised hourly minimum wage from 75 cents to $1 effective March 1, 1956. Public Law 381.

Armed Forces pay increase: Granted to officers with more than 3 years' service and warrant officers and enlisted men with more than 2 years' service pay increases based on rank and length of service, ranging from 6 to 25 percent; provided an increase in special monthly pay for hazardous air and submarine duty; increased retired pay by 6 percent. Public Law 20.

Military reserves strengthened: Established the first comprehensive program aimed exclusively at bolstering U.S. military reserve forces; authorized up to 250,000 men between 17 and 18½ to sign up annually for 3 to 6 months' active duty providing they remain in the Ready Reserve until their service time totals 8 years. Public Law 305.

GI education: Granted full educational benefits under the Korean GI bill to members of the Armed Forces who were on active duty on or before January 31, 1955. Public Law 7.

Upper Colorado project: Authorized a $760 million Upper Colorado River Basin water storage and reclamation project. Public Law 485.

Health program: Enacted Public Law 911, providing traineeships for professional public health personnel; advanced training for professional nurses; practical nurse training; extension of hospital survey and construction programs; and assistance in mental health programs.

Public Law 835 provided for a 3-year $90 million construction program for health research facilities.

Flood insurance: An experimental $5 billion to $7.5 billion Federal flood insurance and loan contract program. Public Law 1016.

Surplus disposal: Enacted Public Law 962 increasing from $1.5 billion to $3 billion the limit surplus sales for foreign currencies.

Customs simplification: Enacted into law a single valuation system, based on the price at which the goods were offered for sale as exports, instead of the old system under which the higher of two values was used, the export price or the price at which the goods would be sold in the foreign market. Public Law 927.

Seventy thousand public housing units: Provided for 35,000 units a year for 2 years but made Federal aid contingent upon a workable slum clearance program in local communities. Public Law 1020.

Atomic merchant ship: Provided for construction of an atomic-powered merchant ship to promote the peacetime application of atomic energy; estimated cost, $37 million. Public Law 848.

Mineral stockpile: Authorized a 2½-year subsidy program for mining tungsten, fluorspar, asbestos, and columbium-tantalum; estimated to cost $91.7 million. Public Law 733.

Servicemen's survivors: Increased benefits for survivors of servicemen and brought 2,850,000 military personnel under social security. Public Law 881.

Water pollution: Increased Federal funds available to States for developing water pollution control programs and authorized a maximum of $500 million to assist communities to build sewage-treatment works. Public Law 660.

Farm loans: Public Law 878 increased from $15 million to $65 million the amount of money available for emergency loans to farmers and stockmen under the emergency Farm Loan Act.

Great Plains program: Provided a long-range program to combat soil erosion in the Great Plains area, authorizing a maximum appropriation of $150 million for the entire program and limited the payments for any one year to $25 million. Public Law 1021.

Railroad retirement: Increased benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act by 10 percent. Public Law 1013.

International Wheat Pact: Ratified a new International Wheat Agreement guaranteeing the U.S. annual sales of 132 million bushels of wheat at prices ranging from $1.50 to $2 a bushel.

Oversea voting: Urged States to enact laws permitting servicemen, Federal employees abroad, dependents of both groups, and merchant seamen to register for voting by use of uniform postcard applications and to vote by absentee ballot. Public Law 296.

Federal pay raise: Raised the pay of all but the top level of Government employees by 7.5 percent. Public Law 94.

Security Commission: Established a 12-member bipartisan commission to study the entire Government security program. Public Law 304.

Airport grants: Authorized for allocation to States and territories for airport development, Federal grants totaling $42.5 million in fiscal 1956 and $63 million in each of the 3 subsequent fiscal years, on a matching basis. Public Law 211.

Small business: Extended the life of the Small Business Agency and increased the total revolving fund from $275 million to $550 million. Public Law 268.

Summary of Legislative Record

Senate activity

	83d	84th	85th	86th
Days in session	294	224	271	280
Hours in session	1,961:52	1,361:23	1,875:29	2,198:37
Total measures passed by Senate	2,553	2,880	2,580	2,048
Senate bills	1,027	1,159	1,062	768
House bills	1,112	1,251	988	812
Senate joint resolutions	43	50	37	41
House joint resolutions	46	60	115	59
Senate concurrent resolutions	54	46	63	57
House concurrent resolutions	45	54	48	39
Senate resolutions	226	230	267	272
Public laws	781	1,028	936	800
Confirmations	68,563	82,694	103,311	89,900
Vetoes	52	34	51	44

DIGEST OF LEGISLATION PASSED BY THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

AGRICULTURE

Acreage remeasurement

S. 3117—Public Law 86-553, Approved June 30, 1960

This law provides a uniform rule for remeasuring acreage planted to allotment crops upon request of the farm operator, and provides uniform conditions under which the operator pays for remeasurement.

The remeasurement of cotton acreage is now provided for by law, which specifies that the farm operator must pay the cost of remeasurement if the planted acreage exceeds the allotted acreage. The remeasurement of acreage planted to other allotment crops is now provided for by regulation, which requires the farm operator to pay the cost only if the planted acreage exceeds the allotted acreage and the original measurement was substantially correct. Thus the farm operator is excused from paying the cost of remeasurement if the original measurement was substantially incorrect in the case of any allotted commodity except cotton. The purpose of the bill is to place cotton on the same basis as the other commodities subject to allotments.

It repeals the existing provision, which relates solely to cotton, and inserts a uniform provision for remeasurement, measurement after adjustment of excess acreage, and payment of remeasurement costs. The bill further provides that if the farmer does not take the proper steps to have the acreage measured after adjustment of excess acreage, the acreage originally measured would be considered as the acreage of the commodity for compliance purposes.

Central Bank for Cooperatives—Increase in directors

S. 2977—Public Law 86-503, Approved June 11, 1960

This law increases the number of directors of the Central Bank for Cooperatives from 7 to 13 to provide for representation of each of the 12 farm credit districts. The Central Bank for Cooperatives is a mixed ownership Government corporation, part of the Farm Credit system, which is supervised by the Farm Credit Administration. It is 1 of the 13 banks for cooperatives organized to make loans to farmers' cooperative associations. The other 12 are regional banks, 1 being located in each of the 12 Farm Credit districts. The Central Bank participates in regional bank loans, making direct loans to cooperatives only in cases where loans by regional banks are not practicable.

The terms of the present directors are to be terminated December 31, 1960, and, beginning next year, seven members will be appointed by the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration with the approval of the Federal Farm Credit Board and the remaining six will be elected by the boards of directors of designated regional banks for cooperatives. The proportion of appointed and elected directors follows generally the pattern set by existing law, varying with the Government's interest in the bank. Each of the elected directors will be elected solely by the directors of the regional bank for the district from which he comes, and cooperatives that borrow from the banks will no longer have a direct voice in the election of Central Bank directors.

Cropland—Acquisition by eminent domain

H.R. 8343—Public Law 86-423, Signed April 9, 1960

This law continues acreage allotments on lands acquired by agencies having the right of eminent domain so long as they remain leased to their former owners. It also permits Federal Government lands to be leased to their former owners for producing price-supported crops without regard to section 125 of the Soil Bank Act.

Section 125 of the Soil Bank Act prohibits leasing of Federal Government lands for producing price-supported crops in surplus supply. Thus, this measure exempts from this prohibition lands leased to their former owners.

It also gives a former owner, who is not in possession of the land at the time the bill becomes effective, 2 years instead of 1 to obtain a lease from the Government and qualify for the continuation of allotments on the land.

Extra long staple cotton

H.R. 12115—Public Law 86-566, Approved June 30, 1960

This law provides that the 1961 marketing quota for long staple cotton will be the same as the 1960 crop. This will prevent a reduction of approximately 50 percent in the acreage of long staple cotton which would otherwise take place in 1961, in spite of the fact that the United States produces less of this commodity than it consumes each year.

Hall of fame

H.R. 5789—Public Law 86-680, Approved August 31, 1960

This law confers a Federal charter on the Agricultural Hall of Fame, incorporated under the laws of Missouri on May 26, 1958, an organization designed to honor all who have made this Nation great with contributions to the advancement of agriculture.

The Hall of Fame is to be located near Kansas City, Kans., and financed entirely from private sources.

Land-grant colleges

S. 3450—Public Law 86-658, Approved July 14, 1960

This law restores the level of support by the Federal Government of teaching in the national system of land-grant colleges and universities to the level authorized by Congress in 1935. These colleges and universities, founded by Federal action, have for nearly a century carried on national functions while under the control and direction of State authorities. The land-grant institutions have received direct Federal appropriations for teaching purposes since the passage of the second Morrill Act in 1890. These funds have not been increased since 1935, although there is general agreement among all college and university officials that funds for faculty salaries are one of the most critical needs of our colleges and universities at the present time. What this bill proposes is an increase in these teaching funds simply to bring them up to the same standard, in terms of the formula on which they were appropriated in 1935, as they were 25 years ago. This would still leave the proportion of Federal funds compared to the amount appropriated by the States, far less than it was 25 years ago.

The additional funds authorized by this bill could be used only for teaching purposes and only in the subjects authorized by the original land-grant college act.

Mexican farm labor

H.R. 12759—Public Law 86-783, Approved September 14, 1960

This bill extends for 6 months (until December 31, 1961), the act under which workers are brought into the United States from Mexico under the supervision of the Department of Labor, and pursuant to an international agreement with the Government of Mexico, to assist in seasonal farm operations in the United States.

This program has been in existence since 1951 with very slight modifications and has provided seasonal help to farmers.

The present act expires on June 30, 1961, in the midst of the most active season of many crops dependent upon labor provided under the program. Its extension before the adjournment of this Congress is essential in order to permit farmers to make their 1961 production plans and obtain financing, where necessary, with assurance that labor to harvest their crops will be available. In many instances adequate financing would be impossible to obtain without this assurance.

Milk and butterfat price supports

S. 2917—Public Law 86-799, Approved September 16, 1960

This bill increases the support level for manufacturing milk and butterfat for the remainder of the current maketing year to not less than $3.22 per hundredweight for manufacturing milk and not less than 59.6 cents per pound for butterfat. The announced support prices for this year of $3.06 per hundredweight and 56.6 cents per pound are the same as have been in effect since April 1, 1958. The average price received by farmers for the marketing year ended March 31, 1960, was $3.23 for manufacturing milk and 59.5 cents for butterfat. This bill would tend to stabilize prices at about this level and prevent the possibility of a price decline which, in view of cost increases since April 1, 1958, would ruin many dairy farmers.

Multiple use

H.R. 10572—Public Law 86-517, Approved June 12, 1960

This law establishes the congressional policy that the national forests are to be administered for outdoor recreation, range, timber, watershed, and wildlife and fish purposes, naming in a single statute all of the five basic renewable surface resources. The Secretary of Agriculture is directed to administer the national forests for multiple use and sustained yield.

In administering the act, the Secretary is authorized to cooperate with State and local agencies. This expression of authority should be construed as encouragement to the Secretary to stimulate State and local agencies and others to cooperate in the development and management of the national forests, particularly where benefits to the local community and local use are great.

Pesticide chemicals

H.R. 7480—Public Law 86-537, Approved June 29, 1960

This law provides for a label on the shipping container of raw agricultural commodities declaring the presence of pesticide chemicals, but does not require a declaration while commodities are displayed for retail sale outside the shipping container.

The amendment proposed by this law to section 403 would not in any way weaken the protection which the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act gives to consumers against the use of unsafe pesticide chemicals on raw agricultural commodities. This protection against unsafe pesticide chemicals is assured by section 408 of the act, which prohibits the use of pesticide chemicals on produce unless the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has prescribed safe tolerances for these chemicals.

Rice-marketing quotas

H.R. 7889—Public Law 86-408, Approved April 4, 1960

This law provides for the proclamation of rice-marketing quotas whenever the supply exceeds normal. Existing law requires that supply exceed normal by more than 10 percent before quotas are proclaimed.

Normal supply consists of domestic consumption and exports plus a 10-percent allowance for carryover. This allowance for carryover, which amounts to about 5 million hundredweight, is adequate. Marketing quotas have been in effect for rice since 1955. Their suspension for any year could result in considerable expansion of acreage for that year followed by a difficult readjustment to quotas in the following year. This law is designed to prevent such a situation.

Special school milk program

H.R. 9331—Public Law 86-446, Approved April 29, 1960

This law increases the amount of Commodity Credit Corporation funds to be used for the special milk program from $81 to $85 million for the current fiscal year, and from $84 to $95 million for 1961 fiscal year.

Under this program, the Department of Agriculture reimburses schools participating in the school lunch program at the rate of 4 cents a half pint in excess of the half pint provided in the lunch and reimburses other schools at the rate of 3 cents a pint. Commencing with fiscal 1961, the Commodity Credit Corporation will be reimbursed by a separate and special appropriation item for any expenditure made under this act. The entire program is to expire June 30, 1961.

Tobacco price supports

H.R. 9664—Public Law 86-389, Approved February 20, 1960

To stabilize the tobacco prices for the Nation's 800,000 tobacco growers, Congress enacted this law to provide that the support level for the 1960 tobacco crop remain at the 1959 level. In 1961 and subsequent years, the support price will be adjusted from the 1959 level in direct proportion to changes in the parity index, using the previous 3-year moving average as a base.

This law ties the support price for tobacco directly to the parity index reflecting the cost of commodities farmers purchase, rather than to a 10-year moving average of farm prices.

Wheat Act of 1960

S. 2759—Passed Senate June 9, 1960. H.R. 12261 (House Companion) (Failed To Pass House June 23, 1960)

The Senate, by a vote of 44 to 36, passed this bill designed to reduce the surplus of wheat without reducing the income of wheat producers by—

Setting price supports at 75 percent of parity for 1961-63 wheat crops;

Providing for a permanent cut of 20 percent in wheat acreage allotments, beginning with the 1961 crop;

Providing payments-in-kind for the 1961, 1962, and 1963 crop years of Government-owned wheat stocks to farmers agreeing to the 20-percent acreage reduction and retiring such acreage from production or grazing; payments-in-kind would be equal to 50 percent of the average production of wheat which would have been produced on the diverted acreage;

Reducing the 15-acre exemption to the smaller of (1) 12 acres, or (11) the highest acreage planted on the farm in any of the years 1956, 1957, 1958, 1959, or 1960;

Prohibiting price-support payments for any other commodity produced in 1961, 1962, or 1963 on a farm subject to wheat marketing quotas if the farm fails to comply with the wheat price-support requirements;

Preserving farm wheat acreage history even though no wheat is planted for the 1961, 1962, and 1963 crops;

Terminating wheat quotas and allotments and providing wheat price support at 50 percent of parity, if the 1961 wheat quota is disapproved by producers.

Wheat farmers—Allotment credit

H.R. 4874—Public Law 86-419, Signed April 9, 1960

This law provides for crediting a wheat farmer who exceeds his allotment, but fails to produce a marketing excess, with the same history he would have received if he had produced an excess and stored it to avoid penalty.

Wheat farmers who either keep within their allotments, or store any marketing excess produced by them, are credited for the purpose of future allotments with acreage history equal to their base acreage. Those who exceed their allotments and do not store their marketing excess are credited only with history equal to their allotted acreage, and lose the difference between their allotted acreage and base acreage. Thus, this law corrects this situation by providing credit for their full base acreage.

APPROPRIATIONS

Table of appropriation bills, 86th Cong., 2d sess.

Bill No.	Title	Budget estimates	Amount as passed		Final action, amount as approved	Increase or decrease compared to budget estimates
			House	Senate		
	1960 APPROPRIATIONS					
H.J. Res. 621	NASA supplemental	$23,079,000	$23,000,000	$23,079,000	$23,079,000	
H.R. 10743	2d supplemental	1,018,504,888	237,505,864	995,491,103	955,370,003	−$63,134,885
H.J. Res. 765	Labor supplemental	8,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	−2,000,000
	1961 APPROPRIATIONS					
H.R. 10233	District of Columbia	(242,403,000)	(237,118,276)	(240,089,152)	(239,470,433)	(−2,932,567)
	Loan authorization	(18,700,000)	(18,700,000)	(20,100,000)	(20,100,000)	(+1,400,000)
	Federal payment	34,533,000	27,533,000	28,533,000	27,533,000	−7,000,000
H.R. 10234	Commerce	799,615,000	760,522,235	738,388,300	729,624,375	−69,990,625
H.R. 10401	Interior	550,330,300	543,375,600	589,212,625	557,667,600	+7,337,300
H.R. 10569	Treasury-Post Office	4,897,853,000	4,795,414,000	4,877,014,000	4,841,914,000	−55,939,000
H.R. 11389	General Government	14,627,500	13,787,500	14,572,500	14,207,500	−420,000
H.R. 11390	Labor-HEW	4,020,221,981	4,184,022,731	4,485,788,931	4,354,170,331	+333,948,350
H.R. 11666	State-Justice-Judiciary	733,030,395	676,564,807	718,269,147	705,032,567	−27,997,828
H.R. 11776	Independent offices	8,417,397,000	8,182,067,400	8,459,412,900	8,311,893,400	−105,503,600
H.R. 11998	Defense	39,335,000,000	39,337,867,000	40,514,997,000	39,996,608,000	+661,608,000
H.R. 12117	Agriculture	4,135,263,190	3,937,943,500	4,005,222,683	3,994,097,600	−141,165,590
	Loan authorizations	(367,000,000)	(557,000,000)	(577,000,000)	(577,000,000)	(+210,000,000)
H.R. 12231	Military construction	1,188,000,000	876,145,000	1,067,227,000	994,855,000	−193,145,000
H.R. 12232	Legislative	133,413,485	100,317,660	129,870,410	129,470,410	−3,943,075
H.R. 12326	Public works	4,013,793,180	3,914,798,985	4,030,010,605	3,969,982,485	−43,810,695
H.R. 12619	Mutual security	4,281,704,000	3,589,750,000	3,989,054,000	3,722,350,000	−559,354,000
H.R. 12740	Supplemental	169,327,840	49,738,200	166,324,740	138,293,740	−31,034,100
H.R. 13161	2d supplemental	72,280,731	91,085,481	305,042,731	162,186,981	+89,906,250
	Total, 1961	72,796,390,602	71,080,933,099	74,118,940,572	72,649,886,989	−146,503,613
	Total, all bills	73,845,974,490	71,347,438,963	75,143,510,675	73,634,335,992	−211,638,498
	Total, loan authorizations	(385,700,000)	(575,700,000)	(597,100,000)	(597,100,000)	(+211,400,000

CIVIL RIGHTS

Civil Rights Act of 1960

H.R. 8601—Public Law 86-449, May 6, 1960

The Senate, by a vote of 71 to 18, passed the Civil Rights Act of 1960, after a debate which started February 15 and ended on April 8, 1960.

The major provisions are:

Obstruction of court orders: Makes it a Federal crime, punishable by a $1,000 fine and/or 1 year in prison, to use threats or force to interfere or attempt to interfere with or obstruct any Federal court order.

Antibombing: Makes it a Federal crime, punishable by a $5,000 fine and/or 5 years in prison, to flee to avoid prosecution for or testifying about the bombing of any building, structure, facility, vehicle, dwelling house, synagogue, church, religious or educational center, public or private. Makes it a Federal crime, punishable by a fine from $1,000 to $10,000 and/or 1 year to life imprisonment, depending upon the degree of injury, to (a) transport explosives in interstate or foreign commerce with intent to damage or destroy any real or personal property to interfere with its use for educational, religious, charitable, residential, business, or civic objectives or of intimidating any person pursuing such objective; and (b) intimidate by bomb threats through use of mail, telephone, telegraph, or other instrument of commerce, subject to penalty of $1,000 fine and/or 1 year in prison.

Federal election records: Requires every officer of Federal elections to preserve for 22 months from date of any general, special, or primary election all voting records, and authorizes Department of Justice to inspect the records at the principal office of the records' custodian. Violators subject to $1,000 fine and/or 1 year in prison.

Civil Rights Commission: Grants authority to each member of Commission to administer oaths and take statements of witnesses.

Education of children of military: Authorizes availability of funds to Commissioner of Education to provide local education facilities for children of military personnel in federally impacted areas.

Right to vote (referee plan): Provides that, after a court finding that a person has been deprived of his right to register or to vote because of his race or color, the court then, at the request of the Attorney General, determines whether it is an isolated instance or a pattern or practice in a given area. If the court finds such pattern or practice, the persons affected apply for and

will be entitled to a hearing within 10 days for an order declaring him qualified to vote (until the violation ceases), provided he can prove he is qualified under State law to vote, that since the court finding he has again been denied the right to register, or found not qualified to vote under color of law. Authorizes the court to appoint voting referees from qualified voters in the judicial district to receive the applications, to take evidence, and to report to the court on the applicant's qualifications. In a voting referee proceeding, the applicant shall be heard ex parte at such times and places as the court shall direct.

In the case of an application filed 20 or more days prior to an election which is undetermined by time of election, the court shall issue an order authorizing the applicant to vote provisionally provided he is qualified to vote under State law. Applications filed within 20 days prior to an election, the court, in its discretion, may make such provisional voting order. In either case the order shall provide for impounding the ballot pending determination of the application.

Provides that the State may be sued jointly or severally for violations under this act.

Constitutional amendment—House vacancies, poll tax, District of Columbia right to vote

Senate Joint Resolution 39—Before States for Ratification

This resolution as passed by the Senate would have amended the Constitution (after ratification by three-fourths of the States) to—

1. Grant to State Governors the power to fill vacancies in the House if more than 50 percent of its membership were killed in an atomic attack or other disaster.

2. Abolish the poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a national election.

3. Provide the residents of the District of Columbia with the right to vote for President and Vice President, and nonvoting representation in the House of Representatives.

However, as returned by the House, it contained only one phase of the original resolution and it was reduced in scope. As amended by the House and adopted by the Senate, the resolution eliminates completely the provisions for District of Columbia representation in the House and provides for representation of three in the electoral college. When ratified by three-fourths of the States, within 7 years, the citizens of the District of Columbia will then have the privilege of voting for President and Vice President.

Hawaiian omnibus bill

H.R. 11602—Public Law 86–624, Approved July 12, 1960

The Hawaiian omnibus bill is a measure necessary to make complete and perfect the admission of Hawaii into the Union on a free and equal footing with the other 49 States. It amends a number of acts of Congress, some merely technically, such as changing the phraseology in a statute from "Territory of Hawaii" to "State of Hawaii." Other Federal laws are amended substantively, primarily to equalize Federal activities in the new State, especially with respect to grants-in-aid programs.

A similar omnibus law, gathering up the lose ends, so to speak, of transition from territorial status to statehood was enacted with regard to Alaska last year in the first session of this Congress (Public Law 86–70).

DEFENSE

AEC authorization

H.R. 11713—Public Law 86–457, Approved May 13, 1960

Authorizes $211,476,000 to be appropriated to the Atomic Energy Commission for fiscal 1961 for new construction projects (the administration requested $293,876,000 to cover high energy physics projects, principally the Stanford linear electron accelerator).

Limits project starts to those where the estimated cost does not exceed by more than 25 percent the estimated cost as authorized.

Authorizes to be appropriated funds for advance planning, construction, design, and architectural services in connection with projects which are not otherwise authorized by law, and AEC is authorized to use funds currently or otherwise available to it.

Authorizes funds to restore or to replace plants or facilities destroyed or otherwise seriously damaged.

Authorizes AEC to continue to use funds for projects which have been authorized by Congress in prior years.

Flight instruction

H.R. 11787—Public Law 86–597, Approved July 7, 1960

This law extends for 4 years the authority for flight instruction for members of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps.

Public Law 879, of the 84th Congress, authorized flight training in the ROTC programs of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force. This authority was intended to attract more qualified young men to apply for flying spaces in the advanced ROTC course, to detect those who would later fail to complete pilot training after having been commissioned for that purpose, and to motivate more young Americans to become career flying officers. The original authority was for a period of 4 years and, unless extended, the authority would expire on August 1, 1960.

The Departments of the Army and the Air Force have participated in the ROTC flight instruction program since fiscal year 1957. The Department of the Navy established the program at two schools, but discontinued the program in fiscal year 1959. The Navy, however, desires to have continued authority to participate in future training.

The flight instruction program provides for approximately 70 hours of instruction—35 flight and 35 ground. The military departments contract with participating colleges and universities to provide for flight instruction. The training is offered during the senior year of the ROTC cadets.

Freedom Commission

S. 1689—Passed Senate August 31, 1960

This measure establishes a Freedom Commission—a commission which, in turn, will establish a Freedom Academy. The Commission and Academy are the organizational means to meet our cold-war development and training needs to—

Carry on research with a view to developing an integrated operational science for our side which will meet the entire Soviet political-economic attack and work toward our national objectives in a systematic manner, utilizing all potential means in the public and private sectors which are in accord with the ethics of free men faced with a Soviet-type challenge.

Train Government personnel, private citizens and foreign students in this science.

The Commission is to be composed of six full-time members and a chairman, to be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. The members are to serve for staggered times of 6 years; and no more than four, including the Chairman, may be members of any one political party. The Chairman is to serve at the pleasure of the President.

Military Construction Authorization Act of 1960

H.R. 10777—Public Law 86–500, Approved June 8, 1960

To strengthen and expand our vital defenses, this law provides construction and related authority for the military departments, within and outside the United States, as well as authority for construction of facilities for the Reserve components, totaling $1,185,320,000 for fiscal 1961. This includes $1,074,554,000 in new authorizations and $110,766,000 for deficiency authorizations on projects started in previous years.

Funds authorized were:

Air Force	$727,305,000
Army	143,561,000
Defense Department	20,000,000
Navy	127,566,000
Deficiencies	109,983,000
Reserve components	56,122,000
Reserve deficiencies	783,000

Naval vessels—Construction

H.R. 10747—Public Law 86–471, Approved May 14, 1960

This law authorizes the construction of 8,000 tons of amphibious warfare vessels and landing craft, 4,000 tons of patrol vessels, and 20,000 tons of auxiliary vessels.

The vessels to be constructed are:

Amphibious transport, dock	1
Escort vessels	2
Fast combat support ship	1

The Navy's shipbuilding and conversion program for fiscal 1961 involves 35 ships and 22 craft, which is a step toward continued development and modernization to enable it to discharge its assigned missions in national defense.

Reserve components

H.R. 5132—Passed Senate, Amended, August 31, 1960

This bill provides an improved status for members of the Reserve components on active duty with the Armed Forces by authorizing an increase in payments to Reserve members who are involuntarily released to inactive duty.

Stockpile rubber—Disposal

House Concurrent Resolution 582—Passed House March 30 and Senate May 4, 1960

This resolution grants congressional consent to disposal of 470,000 long tons of natural rubber from the national stockpile.

The Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpiling Act authorizes the Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization to determine quantities of strategic and critical materials that should be stockpiled and to dispose of any materials no longer needed because of revised determinations of requirements.

The act further provides that material in the stockpile may not be disposed of without the express approval of Congress except when the revised determination is because of obsolescence. The revised determination of stockpiling objectives for rubber is not because of obsolescence; hence congressional approval was required before disposal.

UMT—Amendment

H.R. 5040—Public Law 86–632, Approved July 12, 1960

This law is designed (1) to extend to members of the National Guard who perform 3 to 6 months active duty for training the same reemployment rights available to members of the Ready Reserve performing the same type and length of training; and (2) to adjust the time period within which leave-of-absence rights must be asserted after the performance of inactive duty for training, active duty for training other than an initial period of 6 months of active duty for training, and after being examined for induction.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Alcoholic Beverage Control Act

S. 3258—Passed Senate August 30, 1960

This bill amends the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act to provide for payment of District of Columbia alcoholic beverage taxes (other than wine and beer) by means of a reporting or affidavit method in lieu of the present tax stamp method.

The reporting method has always been used in the District for the collection of

taxes on beer and, since the latter part of 1958, the collection of taxes on wine has been by the reporting method. In other words, this bill provides for the payment of the tax on spirits by a monthly reporting system in precisely the same manner as is now provided for beer and wine.

Alien income tax

S. 2954—Public Law 86-522, Approved June 27, 1960

This measure amends the District of Columbia Income and Franchise Tax Act of 1947 to exempt from the income tax compensation paid to alien employees by certain international organizations.

This amendment applies only to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1960.

Annuity contracts

H.R. 10964—Public Law 86-520, Approved June 12, 1960

This law requires District of Columbia life insurance companies to maintain a separate account for funds received in connection with variable annuity contracts, and gives the Superintendent of Insurance more detailed authority to regulate these accounts. It authorizes him to refuse to allow any life insurance company, whether or not incorporated in the District of Columbia, to issue variable annuity contracts if he believes that the company does not satisfy the required tests. It also permits life insurance companies issuing variable annuity contracts to invest a greater percentage of the assets held in separate accounts in common and preferred stocks and corporate bonds.

The variable annuity contract is a recent insurance innovation providing for payments to the annuitant which vary directly according to the investment experience of the insurance company.

Car sales—Finance charges

H.R. 10683—Public Law 86-431, Approved April 22, 1960

This law provides for regulating finance charges for retail installment sales of motor vehicles in the District of Columbia to halt the present trend of some "overcharging" of consumers. Testimony on the measure disclosed that charges frequently ran to 49 percent or more of the amount being financed.

Under this measure these finance charges cannot exceed the larger of $25 or from $8 to $16 a $100 per year depending on whether the vehicle is new or used.

The measure also provides that the maximum finance charge for a period less or greater than 12 months or for amounts less or greater than $100 must be decreased or increased proportionately.

The District Commissioners are authorized to require dealers and persons licensed to engage in the business of purchasing retail installment sales contracts for motor vehicles, bonds or other security which would be conditioned on observing laws and regulations in force in the District applicable to such a business.

Requires licensed dealers and finance companies to carry public liability or property damage insurance or both.

Violators of any provision of this act may be fined up to $500 and/or imprisoned up to 6 months.

Civil Defense Act strengthened

S. 2446—Passed Senate April 11, 1960. Referred to House District Committee April 12, 1960

To strengthen and increase the effectiveness of the civil defense program in the District of Columbia, this measure makes numerous changes in the Civil Defense Act of 1950, so that it will more adequately meet the needs of the District relative to planning, training, and preparation for civil defense in case of an attack, and for the exercise of emergency powers after an attack or in case a major disaster should occur in the District.

Civil War Centennial Commission

S. 3835—Public Law 86-737, Approved September 8, 1960

The purpose of this bill is to provide the necessary authorization to empower the District of Columbia Civil War Centennial Commission and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to carry out appropriate civic programs commemorating the 100th anniversary of the Civil War, and to authorize appropriations necessary to carry out programs.

Court fees

S. 3194—Passed Senate June 8, 1960. Referred to House District Committee June 9, 1960

This bill exempts the District of Columbia from paying fees as, for example, a fee for a certified copy of a judgment, in any of the courts of the District of Columbia.

D.C. Transit

H.R. 11135—Public Law 86-669, Approved July 14, 1960

This law is to aid in the development of an improved transportation system for the District of Columbia, and is to provide for coordinating transportation with other public facilities. The bill establishes a Federal agency to be called the National Capital Transportation Agency. This Agency is to prepare a transit development program for the National Capital region and, upon the enactment of further authorizing legislation, to acquire land for transit use, to construct transit facilities, and to operate transit service.

The law also gives advance consent to negotiating an interstate compact to establish an organization which will succeed the Federal Agency, and which may perform any other function of a regional character that may be entrusted to it by the compact.

Fire and casualty insurance

H.R. 10183—Public Law 86-526, Approved June 27, 1960

This law permits a company doing business in the District of Columbia to be treated as a stock company for purposes of fire, marine, and casualty insurance provided it was chartered as a company by a special act of the legislature of its domiciliary State prior to the effective date of the Fire and Casualty Act. It must have been doing business exclusively on the stock plan and must have maintained at all times a surplus of not less than $300,000.

Indigents—Representation in courts

H.R. 10761—Public Law 86-531, Approved June 27, 1960

This law creates a Legal Aid Agency, governed by a volunteer Board of Trustees, which would "employ" paid and volunteer attorneys to be available for assignments to represent indigents in certain cases.

Insurance corporation trustees

H.R. 8737—Public Law 86-436, Approved April 22, 1960

This law eliminates a requirement that a majority of the trustees or directors of insurance companies must be citizens of the District of Columbia which, in effect, will place them on a par with other District of Columbia corporations.

Insurance mortality tables

H.R. 10684—Public Law 86-530, Approved June 27, 1960

This law provides for the use, in connection with life insurance issued in the District of Columbia, of the most modern tables of mortality developed and recommended by the National Association of Insurance Commissioners, called the 1958 Commissioners' Standard Ordinary Mortality Table and the 1958 Commissioners' Extended Insurance Table. It also allows policies issued in the District of Columbia on female lives to give effect to the lower mortality on females by rating back to the age of the insured for not more than 3 years and makes minor corrections and clarifications in the so-called standard valuation and standard nonforfeiture provisions of the District of Columbia insurance laws.

Licenses—Learners' permits

S. 3257—Passed Senate June 8, 1960. Referred to House District Committee June 9, 1960

This bill increases the fee charged for learners' permits from $1 to $2. The increased revenue is to be used to offset the expanded cost of the traffic safety education program.

Life Insurance Act

H.R. 1844—Public Law 86-579, Approved July 5, 1960

This law amends the Life Insurance Act of the District of Columbia to broaden the permissible coverage of group life insurance contracts by—

Reducing the number of persons that a group policy must cover from 25 in the cases of employees and union members and 50 in the case of Federal employees to 10 in all cases.

Increasing the maximum amount of insurance which a member of an insured group may obtain from the present maximum of $20,000 to 150 percent of his annual salary or $40,000, whichever is less.

Permitting issuance of group life insurance policies covering members of associations formed for purposes other than obtaining group insurance and allowing all of the premiums for the insurance to be paid by the members.

Providing that spouses and minor children of group insureds may be included in the group for coverage up to one-half of the member's coverage.

Metropolitan Region Development Act

Senate Joint Resolution 42—Public Law 86-527, Approved June 27, 1960

Establishes a policy for coordinating development in the District of Columbia with the development of other areas in the Washington metropolitan region.

Major problems of concern are the water supply, sewage disposal, water pollution, and transportation.

It is anticipated that this act will have the effect of bringing Congress, the Federal Government, the District government, the States of Virginia and Maryland, and the various county and city governments into a more unified plan for future development.

Motor vehicle registration

H.R. 12563—Public Law 86-716, Approved September 6, 1960

This bill amends existing law relative to motor vehicle registration in the District of Columbia, in order to—

(1) Authorize the Board of Commissioners to charge an additional fee not to exceed 50 cents for each set of motor vehicle identification tags in the event that the Commissioners prescribe and issue tags treated with special reflective materials to increase visibility of automobile tags at night.

(2) Authorize registration fees for all motor vehicles registered in the District of Columbia, regardless of type of fuel used.

(3) Change the fees for dealers' tags from the present charge of $50 for the first three sets and $10 for each additional set to $30 for the first set and $10 for each additional set.

(4) Double the registration fees for motor vehicles propelled by fuel not subject to the regular motor vehicles fuels tax.

Public assistance

S. 2363—Passed Senate June 28, 1960. Referred to House District Committee June 29, 1960

This bill consolidates into one act present statutes granting public assistance in the

District of Columbia. At the present time public assistance is administered under the following separate laws:

Old-age assistance: An act to amend the Code of Laws for the District of Columbia in relation to providing assistance against old-age want.

Aid to the blind: An act to provide aid for needy blind persons of the District of Columbia and authorizing appropriations.

Aid to dependent children: An act to provide aid to dependent children in the District of Columbia.

Aid to the permanently and totally disabled: Based on same authority as general assistance, below.

General assistance: Authorized in recent appropriation acts for the District of Columbia; e.g., in the appropriation act for 1960, item for Department of Public Welfare includes "relief and rehabilitation of indigent residents."

Authorizes the Commissioners to establish categories of public assistance;

Makes uniform in all categories a 1-year residence requirement for public assistance eligibility. At present, old-age assistance legislation specifies 5 years of the last 9 immediately preceding filing an application for assistance; aid to blind legislation requires 1 year's residence if the applicant became blind while a resident, otherwise 5 of the last 9 years immediately preceding the application for assistance is mandatory; aid to dependent children, aid to the disabled, and general assistance categories require 1 year's residence prior to filing the application;

Makes uniform the provisions of all categories of assistance regarding the responsibility of relatives to contribute to the support of the applicant.

Permits the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to prescribe by regulation the periods of time which may elapse in each category of assistance prior to a reinvestigation of the recipient's financial and physical circumstances. Present law does not permit the flexibility in this regard desired by the Commissioners.

In addition, the legislation authorizes or accomplishes the following actions or objectives which the Commissioners under existing laws cannot perform or can perform only in part:

(1) Entering into reciprocal agreements with any State for the provision of public assistance to residents and nonresidents.

(2) Penalties for fraud in obtaining public assistance are prescribed.

(3) Authorizes the Commissioners to accept voluntary services in administering the provisions of the act.

Real property purchase

S. 1159—Public Law 86-400, Approved April 4, 1960

This law repeals a provision in the District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Act which requires the National Capital Housing Authority when buying real property to pay not more than 30 percent over and above the current assessed value of all property acquired in the square.

The Authority must purchase this property in order to carry out its statutory responsibility of providing decent, safe, and sanitary housing for families of low income in the District and, in so doing, it has experienced many difficulties because of price limitation.

Redevelopment Act

S. 3688—Public Law 86-743, Approved September 13, 1960

This bill is designed to (1) authorize the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency to eliminate slums and blighted areas whether characterized by residential or nonresidential uses; (2) authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to sell District-owned real property to the Redevelopment Land Agency, 30 days after notice to Congress; and (3) authorize the Commissioners to lease public space over and under District streets where they find such space is not required for public travel.

Registration of births

S. 2327—Public Law 86-524, Approved June 27, 1960

This law authorizes the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish rules and regulations permitting certification of given names for birth records in those cases where names have never been properly certified and where, because of death or incapacity upon the part of parents, proper certification cannot be executed. The Director of Public Health would be authorized to accept such certifications and to make appropriate entries in the official records.

Salary increases—District of Columbia firemen and policemen

H.R. 13053—Public Law 86-734, Approved September 8, 1960

Authorizes a 7.5-percent salary increase for Metropolitan policemen, firemen of the District of Columbia, U.S. Park Police, and White House Police.

The measure also authorizes FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover to retire on full salary after 30 years' service.

Salary increases—Teachers

H.R. 12993—Public Law 86-773, Approved September 13, 1960

This act provides a 7.5-percent salary increase for teachers and officials of the District school system and increases the entrance salary step of District teachers from the present $4,500 a year to $4,800 a year.

Sewer system

S. 3834—Public Law 86-711, Approved September 6, 1960

This measure:

(1) Increases the maximum amount which may be borrowed by the District of Columbia for use in constructing and improving its sanitary and combined sewerage systems from the present limit of $5 million to $32 million;

(2) Permits the District of Columbia to defer the interest and principal payments on not to exceed $10 million of the amounts borrowed, when the Secretary of the Treasury finds that the income received from charges for sewerage service attributable to sewerage flowing into the District of Columbia sanitary sewage works from the Potomac interceptor is inadequate to provide for the payment of interest or principal, or both interest and principal; and

(3) Provides that if interest and principal is deferred under these conditions, then the deferred interest and principal must be added to the sums payable to the Secretary of the Treasury in later years.

Small claims—District of Columbia municipal court

S. 3304—Passed Senate June 8, 1960. Referred to House District Committee

This bill increases to $150 (from $50) the jurisdictional amount of the municipal court of the District of Columbia. This increase will allow more litigants to take advantage of the simplified procedures in such actions.

Taxes—Refunds and overpayments

H.R. 10000—Public Law 86-528, Approved June 27, 1960

This law extends the time for filing claims for refund of overpayments of District of Columbia inheritance and estate taxes from 2 to 3 years, thus making it comparable to the 3-year period allowed for Federal estate taxes.

Teachers—Retirement

S. 2439—Public Law 86-525, Approved June 27, 1960

Permits teachers of the public schools in the District of Columbia (as defined in the act entitled "An act for the retirement of public-school teachers in the District of Columbia," approved August 7, 1946), to count as creditable service for retirement, certain periods of authorized leave without pay taken by them for educational purposes.

Temporary unemployment compensation

S. 3416—Public Law 86-739, Approved September 8, 1960

This bill provides needed authorization for appropriations and procedures to enable the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Board to reimburse the Treasury of the United States for certain expenditures made under the provisions of the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act of 1958, and to avoid the necessity of increasing the Federal unemployment compensation taxes upon employers of four or more employees in the District of Columbia.

The first section of the bill provides that the Secretary of the Treasury transfer from the account of the District of Columbia in the unemployment trust fund to the United States a sum equal the amount of benefits paid in the District of Columbia based upon claims exhausted under the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act.

The second section of the bill appropriates $150,000 or so much of such sum as may be necessary to pay over to the United States an amount equal to the amount of costs incurred by the District Unemployment Compensation Board in connection with its administration of the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act of 1958. This sum is to be appropriated from the moneys credited pursuant to section 903 of the Social Security Act to the account of the District of Columbia in the unemployment trust fund in the Treasury of the United States. The bill provides that the amount appropriated be paid within 2 years from the date of enactment of the bill, and in no event later than December 1, 1963.

Section 3 of the bill establishes a temporary interest and penalty fund to pay the District's share of the administrative expenses.

Traffic violations

S. 3305—Passed Senate June 8, 1960. Referred to House District Committee June 9, 1960

This measure increases from 10 to 90 days the maximum prison term for traffic violations.

Transfer of securities

H.R. 10021—Public Law 86-584, Approved July 5, 1960

This law is to simplify and facilitate the transfer of securities to and by fiduciaries by rendering unnecessary the burdensome excess documentation required by corporations and their transfer agents under existing law.

Section 3 of the Uniform Fiduciaries Act provides that in the case of a transfer of securities by a fiduciary, a corporation or its transfer agent "is not bound to inquire into whether the fiduciary is committing a breach of his obligation as fiduciary in making the transfer, or to see to the performance of the fiduciary obligation, and is liable for registering such transfer only where registration of the transfer is made with actual knowledge that the fiduciary is committting a breach of his obligation as fiduciary in making the transfer, or with knowledge of such facts that the action in registering the transfer amounts to bad faith."

Although the clear intent of the above provision of law is to relieve a corporation

and its transfer agent from any duty to inquire into the performance by a fiduciary of the terms of his obligation, court decisions construing this language have been so broad as to the fixing of liability upon corporations and transfer agents that the latter, in order to avoid liability which might result from having knowledge imputed to them from many sources in situations where a fiduciary might be in breach of trust, have been compelled to continue the extensive documentation which the above section of the Uniform Fiduciaries Act was designed to eliminate.

Vehicle safety responsibility

S. 2131—Public Law 86-730, Approved September 6, 1960

This law amends the Motor Vehicle Safety Responsibility Act of the District of Columbia to—

Authorize the District of Columbia Commissioners to suspend automobile registrations when required reports such as reporting an accident, are not filed.

Require persons injured or damaged in an automobile accident to report their injuries or damages within 50 days to receive benefits under the act.

EDUCATION

Deaf—Teacher training

Senate Joint Resolution 127—Passed Senate May 27, 1960. Referred to House Education and Labor Committee May 31, 1960

This resolution authorizes two 10-year programs of Federal grants for training. One authorizes $1.5 million for each of the first 2 years and additional amounts as may be necessary for the 8 remaining years for grants to public and nonprofit institutions engaged in training teachers of the deaf and affiliated with institutions of higher education for teacher training purposes.

The second authorizes $2 million for each of the first 2 years and additional amounts for the 8 remaining years for grants to institutions of higher education to assist them in providing advanced training of speech pathologists and audiologists.

Under each, the grants could be used to cover training program costs, and to provide scholarships and fellowships.

The national shortage of classroom teachers of the deaf began during World War II and has become more acute each year. It is the task of the teacher of the deaf to bridge the gap between the deaf child's world of silence and the world of sound and hearing, the world of language and speech. The success with which a deaf child is able to bridge this barrier, to develop language and proportionately to minimize his great educational handicap, depends upon the skill, the understanding, and the professional training of his teacher.

Disclaimer affidavit

S. 2929—Passed Senate June 16, 1960. Referred to House Education and Labor Committee June 17, 1960

This bill repeals that portion of the National Defense Education Act which requires every student who applies for a loan under the act to sign an affidavit declaring that he does not believe in and does not support any organization that believes in the overthrow of the U.S. Government by illegal or unconstitutional methods.

Continues the requirement that the student take the usual oath or affirmation to bear true faith and allegiance to the United States, the same as any public servant.

The colleges, through their representative organizations, are virtually unanimous in opposing this provision in the National Defense Education Act. The President recommended its repeal and is supported by HEW and Bureau of the Budget.

No one objects to the principle that all Americans should be loyal citizens and should be willing to swear allegiance to our country. But the disclaimer affidavit singled out students—and only those who had to borrow money to continue their education must sign an affidavit as to their beliefs.

Twenty-one universities—among which are some of the most outstanding ones—felt so strongly about the affidavit that they refused to participate in the program. Thus, in this way we were making it more difficult to "catch up or keep up" with the reputed Russian excellence in education, science, and research. In addition, this requirement worked a great hardship on institutions from an administrative standpoint.

Educational assistance for orphans

H.R. 4306—Public Law 86-785, Approved September 14, 1960

This measure:

(1) Includes within the definition of "induction period" the earlier pre-World War II and between-war periods;

(2) Broadens the eligibility criteria to incorporate a "performance of duty" standards; and

(3) Specifies the conditions under which training by open-circuit television may be recognized.

Persons covered by the eligibility provisions of this bill would receive the type of educational assistance now provided by the War Orphans Educational Assistance Act of 1956. That act provides educational assistance to the children of veterans of World War I, World War II, or the Korean conflict who died of a service-connected disability. In general, the assistance is limited to children between 18 and 23 years of age, and the monthly allowance is $110 for a full-time course not to exceed 36 months.

Library Service Act—Extended

S. 2830—Public Law 86-679 Approved August 31, 1960

This law extends the Library Services Act to June 30, 1966, and retains the present authorization for an annual appropriation of $7.5 million. This bill does, however, repeal the provision permitting funds to carry over for an additional year.

The primary purpose of the Library Services Act is to stimulate the States to provide better public library service in rural areas. It is designed to assist in remedying a serious deficiency in the educational program of the United States. Under the act each State designates a State library extension agency which prepares and submits to the Commissioner of Education a State plan to assure the most effective use of the funds.

Each State receives a basic allotment of $40,000 while Guam and the Virgin Islands each receive $10,000. The balance of the appropriation is divided among the States on the basis of their rural population as compared with the rural population of the United States. The allotment of each State must be matched on the basis of the per capita income of the State as compared with the national per capita income.

Meteorology research

S. 1235—Passed Senate May 26, 1960. Referred to House Interstate May 27, 1960

This measure has a twofold purpose. First, it clarifies the Weather Bureau's basic authority to enter into research contracts in the various meteorological fields, and second, it authorizes the Weather Bureau to install Government telephones in private residences.

At present the only specific authority for entering into research contracts in the meteorological fields is contained in the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, which authorizes the Department of Commerce, Weather Bureau, to enter into research contracts with public and private agencies to increase the safety and efficiency of air navigation. Thus a strict interpretation of this act tends to restrict research contracts to air navigation.

On the other hand, the Weather Bureau has found that in many cases the most efficient method of accomplishing its research in a particular area of meteorological science is to have all or part of the project contracted out to private agencies such as universities, in order that their highly specialized research facilities can be used. In this way the facilities and experienced personnel are made available to the Government at far less cost than if the Weather Bureau were to attempt to perform all research at its own facilities with its own personnel.

In addition to the above, this bill authorizes the expenditure of public money for telephone services installed in private residences, for use as the Chief of Bureau may direct, in carrying into effect the basic enabling laws authorizing collection and distribution of information on weather conditions throughout the United States, its territories and possessions. These installations will be made in cases where frequent need can be shown to exist, or where isolated location prevents use of public utility communication facilities to contact meteorological personnel for reports of severe storms, floods, and to disseminate emergency weather warnings.

National Science Foundation Act—Amendment

H.R. 11985—Public Law 86-550, Approved June 29, 1960

The purpose of this law is to make "nationals" of the United States eligible for certain scholarships and graduate fellowships authorized by the National Science Foundation Act.

Under the provisions of section 10 of the National Science Foundation Act, the Foundation is authorized to award, within the limit of funds made available, scholarships and graduate fellowships for scientific studies and work in the mathematical, physical, medical, biological, engineering, and other sciences at accredited nonprofit American or foreign institutions of higher education. However, section 10 restricts such awards in that the law presently reads "Persons shall be selected for such scholarships and fellowships from among citizens of the United States."

The act amends the original National Science Foundation Act to add the words "or nationals" following the word "citizens," thereby removing the exclusion from eligibility of a small class of persons, principally the inhabitants of our territory of American Samoa, who are legally classified as American nationals. The addition of the word would appear to be in order for the law directs the Foundation to make the awards of such scholarships or fellowships to the applicants in such manner as will tend to result in a wide distribution of scholarships and fellowships "among the States, territories, possessions, and the District of Columbia."

School Assistance Act of 1960

S. 8—Passed Senate February 4, 1960, by a Vote of 51 to 34. H.R. 10128 (House bill) Passed Senate June 8, 1960. Senate requested conference June 8, 1960

The Senate, for the sixth time since 1884, passed a bill authorizing Federal financial assistance for elementary and secondary schools. The Senate approved general support measures in 1884, 1886, 1888, 1948, and 1949; however, none of these measures were acted upon by the other House. Since 1949, the primary interest has been in school construction. The Senate found, despite sustained and vigorous efforts by States and local communities to build schools and to increase teachers' salaries, that there are still serious shortages of classrooms and of teachers which required action on the part of the Federal Government.

The Senate, after more than 2 days and nights of debate, passed S. 8 by a vote of 51 to 34. The major provisions are:

Provides $1.8 billion in Federal funds, over a 2-year period, for school construction and teachers' salaries, or both.

The States have freedom of choice in using allotted funds for either school construction or teachers' salaries.

Amount of funds authorized is based on the number of school-age children multiplied by $20 year.

Grants to the States are made on the basis of number of school-age children in relation to the per capita income in that State.

Equalization formula requires States to match Federal grants on a sliding formula after the first year.

Prohibits all Federal controls.

The first day's debate was highlighted by the defeat of a Democratic-sponsored proposal to double the size of Federal support, and to use the funds to increase teachers' salaries as well as for school construction, or both. This amendment lost on a 44 to 44 tie vote and on the Dirksen motion to table the Johnson motion to reconsider the rejection vote, the Vice President voted "Yea" to support the Dirksen tabling motion. The Senate subsequently won out over Republican opposition by adopting an amendment 54 to 35 to include teachers' salaries in the proposal.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Armed services—Allowances

H.R. 10068—Public Law 86-638, Approved July 12, 1960

This law equalizes travel and transportation allowances and transportation of dependents and household effects for Regular and Reserve officers separated from active duty under similar circumstances.

Under Public Law 368, 84th Congress, a Regular officer who is discharged with severance pay after having completed at least 8 years continuous active duty is entitled to select his home for the purpose of his travel allowances and the transportation of his dependents and household effects. In contrast, a Reserve officer involuntarily released to inactive duty with readjustment pay is entitled to travel allowances and transportation of his dependents and household effects only to his established home of record at the time of recall to active duty or to the place from which recalled.

This bill permits a Reserve officer who is released to inactive duty after having completed 8 years active duty to select a home for the purpose of his travel allowances and the transportation of his dependents and household effects.

Since Reserve personnel who have completed at least 8 years continuous active duty frequently decide to make their home at a place different from their home of record at the time of recall to active duty, and since this right now exists for Regular personnel released under similar circumstances, it appears there is no justification for continuing the existing disparity in the election of the place to which travel allowances are payable and to which dependents and household effects may be transported.

Armed services—Household effects

H.R. 12570—Public Law 86-637, Approved July 17, 1960

This law imposes certain statutory limitations on moving household effects and baggage of members of the uniformed services by commercial air carrier.

Under existing law there is no statutory limitation on the extent to which household effects and baggage of members of the uniformed services may be transported by commercial air carrier.

This bill, in adding new language to existing law, provides that no transportation of household effects for a member may be made by commercial air carrier where this method would result in greater overall costs, unless the transportation officer has certified that this type transportation is necessary in carrying out assigned duties or to prevent undue hardship, and that no other transportation will meet the situation requirements. The bill contains further language in the form of an exception providing that under regulations issued by the Secretary of Defense unaccompanied baggage not to exceed 1,000 pounds may be transported by commercial air carrier. The need for the exception is due to the fact that a large number of military personnel and their dependents, especially in the Air Force, are transported by air to their new duty station. Since they arrive much earlier than unaccompanied baggage traveling by slower means, there is a need that they have baggage with them sufficient to prevent any undue hardship.

Armed Forces—Notaries

H.R. 12265—Public Law 86-589, Approved July 5, 1960

The purpose of this legislation is to authorize certain persons to administer oaths and perform notarial acts for the benefit of persons serving with, employed by, or accompanying the Armed Forces outside the United States.

Under existing law, officers of the armed services are authorized to perform these acts for members of the Armed Forces wherever they may be and for all other persons subject to the Uniform Code of Military Justice who are located outside the United States.

Recent decisions of the Supreme Court have held that civilian employees of the Armed Forces and dependents of members of the Armed Forces are not subject to trial by courts-martial in time of peace for either capital or noncapital offenses, and thus doubt has arisen as to whether these persons can still be considered as persons subject to the Uniform Code of Military Justice.

This measure amends the law in such a way as to permit certain officers of the armed services to perform notarial acts and administer oaths for persons serving with, employed by, or accompanying the armed services outside the United States and outside the Canal Zone, Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands. In other words, the legislation amends the law so as to specifically identify the individuals who may benefit by the authority of these officers who administer oaths and perform notarial acts. This becomes particularly significant with respect to absentee ballots. Because of recent decisions of the Supreme Court it is possible that many dependents and civilian employees of the armed services may not have their ballots notarized or may not have oaths administered to them by officers of the armed services, since it may be held that they are not subject to the Code of Military Justice because of the recent Supreme Court decisions.

The State laws vary on this matter and the proposed legislation, among other things, will insure that no vote is invalidated by improper administration of the required oath.

The only present method by which a dependent or civilian employee who is now located outside the United States, and who is otherwise entitled to vote, may be sure that his ballot is properly validated is to go to the secretary of a U.S. embassy or legation, or to a consular officer of the United States. This frequently is inconvenient and time consuming.

This legislation will permit the system to be resumed which was in effect prior to the decisions of the Supreme Court with regard to the performing of notarial services by officers for civilian employees and dependents.

Armed Forces—Promotion and retirement

S. 1795—Public Law 86-616, Approved July 12, 1960

The purpose of this legislation is to improve the quality of the Regular officer corps of the Army and Air Force. It will accomplish this in two ways:

First, it will permit the Air Force, which seeks the temporary authority, and the Army, which is granted the temporary authority if it wishes to exercise it, during the next 5 years, to involuntarily retire permanent colonels and permanent lieutenant colonels in the Regular Army and Regular Air Force who have three or more times failed of selection to the next higher permanent grade. The Air Force is the only service that seeks this authority and intends to use it at this time. Upon enactment, the Air Force will establish zones to consider for elimination officers who have 20 or more years of service for retirement purposes and who have been considered for permanent promotion and have failed to be selected on three or more occasions.

This portion of the legislation is temporary and expires June 30, 1965.

Except for the first selection board which meets following the enactment of the proposed legislation, not more than 20 percent of those officers who have three or more times failed of selection to the next higher grade in the grade of colonel or lieutenant colonel may be selected for involuntary retirement. In addition, if an officer has once been considered for continuation and has been selected for continuation, he will not thereafter be subject to the provisions of this temporary authority.

The second portion of the legislation amends existing law with regard to the "show cause" procedure now in existing law applying to the Army and the Air Force under which officers who fail to meet prescribed standards, or officers who are charged with professional or moral dereliction or who are security risks, may be eliminated from the active list.

Thus this legislation authorizes temporary new elimination procedures in the Air Force which will permit the Air Force to involuntarily retire about 200 colonels and about 500 lieutenant colonels, during the next 5 years, who have failed of selection three or more times to the next higher permanent grade.

No officer will be eliminated unless he qualifies for retirement pay.

The temporary authority will expire June 30, 1965. It is also applicable to the Army, if the Army decides to utilize the authority. It is not applicable to the Navy and Marine Corps.

In 1959, the Congress enacted the so-called Hump Act, which permitted the Navy and the Marine Corps to involuntarily retire, ahead of schedule, commanders and captains, and their Marine Corps equivalents, in order to create vacancies for lieutenant commanders.

Coast Guard—Additional pay

H.R. 9921—Public Law 86-586, Approved July 5, 1960

The purpose of this legislation is to validate payments of additional pay for sea duty made prior to June 30, 1956, to enlisted members of the Coast Guard who served on vessels of less than 125 feet in length. The law further permits the refund of any repayments made by any of those men relating to payments received in the above manner, and relieve the authorized certifying officers from accountability for these payments.

Coast Guard personnel

H.R. 9449—Public Law 86-474, Approved May 14, 1960

The general purpose of this proposal is to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of the Coast Guard by improving statutes relating to Coast Guard organization, composition, and personnel administration.

It will:

Increase the present limitation of 4 years applicable to extension of enlistments to a new limitation of 6 years.

Increase the present limitation of 3,000 commissioned officer personnel to a new limitation of 3,500.

Improve the organization and composition of both the civilian teaching staff and the permanent commissioned teaching staff at the Coast Guard Academy.

Improve the organization and composition of the top command by eliminating the present statutory position of engineer in chief; eliminating the present statutory term of 4 years for the Assistant Commandant; and providing for the increased grade of admiral for an officer while serving as Commandant, and of vice admiral for an officer while serving as an Assistant Commandant.

Court-martial sentences

H.R. 12200—Public Law 86-633, Approved July 12, 1960

The purpose of this law is to provide statutory authority for the reduction to the lowest enlisted pay grade of an enlisted member convicted by court-martial, whose approved sentence includes a punitive discharge, confinement, or hard labor without confinement.

Before February 20, 1959, an enlisted member of the Armed Forces convicted by court-martial under an approved sentence that included a punitive discharge or hard labor with or without confinement was, as a result of sentence, automatically reduced to the lowest enlisted pay grade. On February 20, 1959, the Court of Military Appeals, in the case of *United States* v. *Simpson* (27 C.M.R. 303), declared the automatic reduction provisions of the "Manual" to be invalid and held that to be effective, a reduction in grade must be specifically provided in the court-martial sentence. As a result of this decision, approved courts-martial sentences that included punitive discharges, confinement, or hard labor without confinement (or combinations of these punishments), no longer resulted in automatic reduction and many enlisted members under sentence retained and continued to serve in a grade higher than the lowest enlisted grade.

On August 19, 1959, the Comptroller General issued an opinion holding that service members coming within the scope of the Simpson decision could be paid only the pay of the lowest enlisted pay grade, thus giving effect to the provisions of the "Manual for Courts-Martial" that were declared invalid by the Court of Military Appeals in the Simpson decision. The conflicting decisions have placed the Air Force and the Army in a dilemma. The Court of Military Appeals in the Simpson case held that the services had no authority automatically to reduce these persons to the lowest enlisted grade as a result of their sentence, while the Comptroller General held that such persons may be paid the pay of only the lowest enlisted grade. This bill amends the Uniform Code of Military Justice to provide, by law, what paragraph 126(e), as amended, of the "Manual for Courts-Martial" now provides by Executive order. Moreover, the bill restores to enlisted ranks the dignity and prestige historically accorded those ranks by preventing sentenced service members in confinement or awaiting punitive discharges from serving in grades above the lowest enlisted grade.

Defense of suits against Federal employees

H.R. 7577—Vetoed June 13, 1960

This bill provides a method of assuming responsibility by the Federal Government for claims and damages against its employees arising from their operation of vehicles within the scope of their Government employment.

The amendments provided that a civil action or proceeding commenced in a State court against an employee of the Government may not be removed to the district court of the United States without the consent of the plaintiff.

Differentials and allowances

H.R. 7758—Public Law 86-707, Approved September 6, 1960

The purpose of this law is to improve and strengthen Government oversea activities by establishing a uniform compensation system for all Government employees in oversea posts regardless of the agency of employment.

Federal Employees' Compensation Act Amendments of 1960

H.R. 12383—Public Law 86-767, Approved September 13, 1960

The primary purpose of this act is to correct inequities that exist in benefits paid to employees of the Federal Government, other than military personnel, who are injured in the performance of their duties and the dependents of those who died as a result of these injuries. The Federal Employees' Compensation Act has not been amended since 1949, and, as a result, the compensation paid to employees who were injured prior to 1946 is much less than the compensation for disability or death computed on the basis of present-day Federal pay scales. At the same time the rise in the cost of living has created a further inequity.

This act increases by 30 percent the wage base used to compute the amount of compensation for disability or death if the injury for which the compensation is payable occurred before January 1, 1946; increases the wage base by 20 percent if the injury occurred after December 31, 1945, but prior to January 1, 1951; and increases the wage base by 10 percent if the injury occurred after December 31, 1950, but before January 1, 1958.

It also increases the minimum amount of compensation for total disability from $112.50 to $180 per month except in cases where the monthly pay of the injured employee is less than $180, in which event—as under the act at the present time—the compensation for total disability would be equal to the full monthly pay of the injured employee.

The act also increases (1) the minimum wage base to be used in determining the amount of compensation to be paid in death cases from $150 to $240, (2) the amount available for burial expenses to the beneficiaries of an employee whose death resulted from an injury sustained in the performance of his duties from $400 to $800, (3) the maximum amount allowable for the services of an attendant in those cases where the employee is so helpless as to require such constant service from $75 to $125, and (4) the maximum allowance payable for the maintenance of an employee who is undergoing rehabilitation as directed by the Bureau of Employees' Compensation from $50 to $100.

In addition, the bill increases the benefits being paid in approximately 1,100 fatal and 200 total disability cases which arose out of various Federal emergency relief programs in operation between 1934 and 1942. The benefits presently being paid in these cases, which are governed by the provisions of the act of February 15, 1934, are pitifully small. The beneficiaries in the fatal cases, who are almost exclusively widows, most of whom are well advanced in years, now receive on an average of $30 per month, and the compensation rate in many of the total disability cases is less than $100 per month. The bill authorizes a minimum compensation rate of $100 per month for the total disability cases and compensation at the rate of $52.50 per month for widows.

Foreign Service Act amendments

S. 2633—Public Law 86-723, Approved September 8, 1960

This measure makes numerous changes in the administration of the Foreign Service of the United States and the Department of State.

Provides a new class structure for Foreign Service Staff officers and employees.

Liberalizes retirement and disability systems.

Improves recruitment and training of Foreign Service officers.

Encourages functional and geographic area specialization by such officers.

Increases by $10 million the authorization for the Foreign Service buildings fund, largely for office space for U.S. missions overseas.

Foreign Service retirement and disability system

S. 1502—Public Law 86-612, Approved July 12, 1960

This measure provides for adjustments in annuities under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system by:

Granting a 10-percent increase in annuities now being received or which will begin on or before June 30, 1962.

Providing that widow survivor annuitants who on or before June 30, 1962, are receiving a survivor annuity, receive a 10-percent increase, or so much in excess as will enable her to receive a minimum of $2,400.

These increases will begin on the first day of the first month which begins more than 30 days after enactment.

Provides for adjustments in annuities that begin after September 1, 1959 on a graduated scale.

Incentive pay

H.R. 10500—Public Law 86-635, Approved July 12, 1960

This law has two purposes: (1) to amend existing provisions regarding entitlement to incentive pay based on duty on board a submarine, to include, with respect to duty on board nuclear-powered submarines only, those periods of training and rehabilitation after assignment to the submarine (this revision is necessary for the two-crew concept now in operation for the Polaris-type vessel); and (2) to add new statutory language which entitles to incentive submarine pay, members who serve as operators or crew members of bathyscaph-type underwater research craft.

The Department of the Navy has determined that two complete crews will be necessary for the operation of each of the Polaris-type nuclear submarines. These vessels are expected to remain at sea at submerged station over long periods of time, possibly as much as 60 days. It has been determined that one crew is insufficient in terms of physical endurance to carry out the mission of these vessels. The Navy is, therefore, assigning two crews to each of these vessels as they become operational. The crew not at sea will be ashore undergoing rehabilitation and further training during the periods when the other crew is aboard the submarine at its undersea location.

The Comptroller General has ruled that an individual is not "on board" a submarine for the purpose of entitlement to incentive pay if he is absent from the submarine to which he is assigned for more than 15 days. The Navy under existing law is, therefore, confronted with the situation of where the crew not actually on board the Polaris vessel would not be entitled to submarine pay for possibly as much as 4 months out of a year. The principal purpose of this legislation is to authorize both crews of a nuclear-powered submarine to concurrently receive entitlement to incentive pay.

In order to receive entitlement to submarine pay under the terms of the bill, an individual must be assigned to the nuclear-powered vessel. Therefore, there would be no entitlement during periods of necessary schooling and training prior to assignment to the submarine.

The Navy has been experiencing difficulty in obtaining volunteers in the desired numbers for the expanding Polaris program. By removing the inequity of losing submarine pay for a substantial part of the year, it is believed that this bill should go far toward meeting its recruitment problems for submarine duty aboard the Polaris-type vessels.

Indebtedness—Enlisted men

H.R. 471—Public Law 86–511, Approved June 11, 1960

This law grants to the Secretary of the Navy similar authority to that now being exercised by the Secretary of the Air Force and the Secretary of the Army as to the remission or cancellation of enlisted member's indebtedness to the United States remaining unpaid before, or at the time of, that member's honorable discharge, if he considers it in the best interest of the United States.

Naval officers

H.R. 12415—Public Law 86–558, Approved June 30, 1960

The purpose of this legislation is to correct a technical defect in the Navy "hump" legislation enacted as Public Law 86–155.

In that public law a new definition of total commissioned service was adopted for the purpose of a temporary promotion provision applicable only to the Marine Corps. The Comptroller General ruled that this definition as a statutory matter also applies to the elimination provisions of the "hump" legislation. Because of the Comptroller's interpretation, 185 officers who have already been selected to be retired June 30, 1960, under the "hump" authority not only cannot be retired at this time, but in some cases remain on until age 62.

This bill in effect repeals section 6 of Public Law 86–155, with the result that the definition of "total commissioned service" is restored as it existed prior to the passage of this public law.

Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps Graduates

S. 3733—Passed Senate June 28, 1960, Referred to House Armed Services June 29, 1960

The purpose of this bill is to place the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps (Regular) graduates in a status comparable to that of U.S. Naval Academy graduates, relative to the form of the Regular commission received by members of this corps.

These Regular graduates are those appointed as midshipmen in the Naval Reserve upon entering the NROTC as a freshman in college, and who obligate themselves to accept upon graduation an appointment in the Regular Navy or Marine Corps.

Under present law, the Regular graduates obligate themselves upon entry as a freshman to serve on duty a minimum of 3 years as a Regular officer following graduation. This period was increased administratively to 4 years several years ago for the new entering classes.

Under existing law, these graduates, before they have completed 30 months of active service, must make application for retention in active service as a Regular officer in the event that they decide to make a career in the Navy or Marine Corps. If they fail to make application, their Regular commission is terminated at the end of their 36 months of service and they serve their remaining obligation as a member of the Reserve. In effect, therefore, under existing law they must request to stay in as a Regular officer in the Navy and Marine Corps.

This measure also repeals existing provisions of law relating to application requirements to remain on active duty as a Regular officer. As a result of this bill, these officers will have to make application in order to get out of the service at the expiration of their obligated tour.

Oversea duty—Reemployment rights

H.R. 10695—Public Law 86–585, Approved July 5, 1960

This legislation takes into account the fact that the Nation's worldwide defense responsibilities are likely to continue without lessening in the foreseeable future. Because of this likelihood—and because of the vital necessity for obtaining personnel of the highest possible ability and character—this measure has been advanced to remedy a serious personnel problem which has arisen out of current provisions for civilian defense employees overseas. Under present law, they have no reemployment rights to positions in the United States upon completion of their foreign duty.

This measure is designed to remedy this by authorizing the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the military departments to grant return rights to career and career-conditional civilian employees assigned to posts outside the United States. The return right would consist of a minimum guarantee to the employee that he will be placed, upon his return from overseas, in the same position he vacated to accept the foreign assignment. If his former post is no longer in existence, the employee will be placed in another position without reduction in seniority, status, or tenure.

The measure expresses the will of Congress that the military departments establish a continuing personnel program designed to rotate Defense Establishment employees between positions overseas and positions in the United States. Return rights would serve as statutory foundation for this program.

Pay raise

H.R. 9883—Public Law 86–568, Approved July 1, 1960

This measure provides a 7½-percent salary increase for employees in the judicial, legislative, and executive branches, including postal employees, scientific, professional, technical, administrative, and clerical personnel required to perform over 15,000 different occupational skills essential to the performance of the varied and farflung functions of the Government.

Gives the chief legal officers of the executive departments the same standing as assistant secretaries, with additional salary from $19,000 to $20,000.

Establishes the position of Administrative Assistant Secretary in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare on the same basis as it exists in the other departments.

Authorizes 5 additional supergrade positions in the Interstate Commerce Commission, making a total of 25 such positions.

Per diem allowance

H.R. 5196—Passed Senate, Amended, June 30, 1960

This bill increases to $15 (from $12) the maximum per diem allowance for employees of the Government while traveling on official business and permits them to be reimbursed for parking fees if they are using a privately owned car.

It includes employees of the U.S. courts, Senators, and employees of the Senate within the provisions of this act, thus equalizing the treatment now accorded the House of Representatives and the executive branch.

Authority for establishing the per diem allowance for foreign travel is transferred from the Bureau of the Budget to the President or his delegate.

Physical examinations

H.R. 8212—Public Law 86–603, Approved July 7, 1960

This law eliminates a requirement that members of the Standby Reserve must have a physical examination every 4 years, and provides a more economical method for the administration of personnel actions affecting the Federal status of the Army National Guard and the Air National Guard of the United States.

Public Health Service Commissioned Corps Act of 1960

S. 2220—Public Law 86–415, Approved April 8, 1960

This measure more closely identifies the Public Health Service Commissioned Corps retirement system with the system applicable to military personnel by authorizing 20-year retirement and by putting career reservists under regular corps retirement system instead of civil service retirement.

Makes inapplicable to reservists, with service of from 1 to 3½ years, the present 10-percent vacancy limitation on original appointments of officers in the regular corps in the full grade or above.

Reserve Act—amendments

H.R. 8186—Public Law 86–559, Approved June 30, 1960

This law provides the necessary technical and substantive amendments to the Reserve Officer Personnel Act for promotion and elimination for members of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces.

Retired Federal Employees—Health Benefits Act

S. 2575—Public Law 86–724, Approved September 8, 1960

This bill provides former Federal employees retired prior to the effective date of the Health Benefits Act of 1959 (the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after July 1, 1960) with a health benefits program patterned after and comparable to the program which becomes available on that date to present employees and future retirees.

The conditions of eligibility for those currently retired are the same as for employees who will retire in the future; i.e., the individual must have retired on an immediate annuity with 12 or more years of service or due to disability. Also, eligible are survivor annuitants of retirees who would have been eligible in their own right as annuitants.

The contribution of the Government will be approximately 50 percent of the cost in each instance under the same conditions as enacted into law last year for current employees and future retirees. The Civil Service Commission estimates that the first-year cost to the Government will run between $15 and $20 million and will decrease each year as the number of former employees now on the retirement rolls diminishes. The effective date of the program is January 1, 1961.

Retirement Act—Members of Congress

H.R. 8241—Public Law 86–604, Approved July 7, 1960

This law removes a number of inconsistencies and corrects certain inequities in the operation of the Civil Service Retirement Act.

Present law requires 5 years of Member service for a Member of Congress to obtain initial coverage under the Retirement Act or to regain coverage previously acquired by virtue of earlier service as an employee in a position subject to the act. This quirk in the law means that a covered employee, upon his selection to Congress, loses his coverage until he completes 5 years of service as a Member. On the other hand, coverage in the case of an employee is based on any combination of 5 years of civilian service. Thus, in the case of an employee, coverage once obtained is not lost by reason of a transfer between agencies or to and from the executive and legislative branches.

The bill corrects this situation by basing coverage in all circumstances on any combination of 5 years' civilian service. Thus, if an employee with 5 years or more of service is elected to Congress, his coverage will continue without break; or for example, an employee with 4 years' service will acquire

coverage after completion of 1 year of Member service.

Present law grants retirement credit for civilian employee service performed before, but with one exception not after, Member service. The exception occurs when a former Member is reemployed in a civilian position subject to the act for a period of time sufficient to acquire title to a separate and additional employee annuity (5 years). However, without such separate employee annuity title, civilian employee service performed after leaving Congress now produces no additional retirement benefits. The bill corrects this obvious inequity by making provisions for computation or recomputation of the former Member's annuity, to include credit for any civilian service, performed subsequent to his service as a Member of Congress.

Under existing law, a retired Member who accepts appointment to a civilian position on an intermittent service or when-actually-employed basis, or on a full time or substantially full-time basis without compensation is required to forfeit his entire annuity for the full period of his appointment even though he receives only an occasional day's pay, or even none at all under a "without compensation" appointment.

The law makes provision for continuing the former Member's annuity on a proper pro rata basis in the circumstances described above but with no resulting increase in retirement benefits. During any such period or periods of reemployment on an intermittent service or when-actually-employed basis, the employing agency would be required to reduce the former Member's salary by the amount of his annuity appropriately allocable to his period or periods of reemployment. The money withheld will be returned to the retirement fund.

Retirement contributions

S. 2857—Public Law 86–622, Approved July 12, 1960

This law amends the Civil Service Retirement Act to authorize a refund of contributions in excess of an amount necessary to purchase maximum benefits payable under the act.

The Civil Service Retirement Act limits annuity payments to 80 percent of the high 5 consecutive year average salary in the case of employees and 80 percent of the final salary in the case of Members. Under present computation formulas employees attain the maximum benefit payable under the act after approximately 42 years' service and Members after approximately 32 years' service. A combination of the different types of service would result in attaining the maximum at any point between 32 and 42 years' service.

Contributions beyond such point purchase no additional annuity benefits. Accordingly, the bill provides for a refund of all retirement contributions made after the month in which an employee or Member obtained sufficient service to entitle him to the maximum benefits payable under the act. Benefits are prospective only and would be payable upon separation either on retirement or death.

Travel expense

S. 3485—Public Law 86–587, Approved July 5, 1960

The purpose of this law is to further increase the ability of the Federal Government as an employer to attract persons to Federal service in shortage occupations such as scientists and engineers. It seeks to accomplish this objective by broadening the coverage of existing law relative to payment of travel and transportation costs of certain new employees, and by making permanent the present 2-year program established by Public Law 85–749.

Public Law 85–749 provided temporary authority to the Federal Government to authorize payment of travel and moving expenses of prospective employees reporting to their first duty station in positions in the natural and mathematical sciences, engineering, architecture, and related technical positions in the continental United States and Alaska for which there is determined by the Civil Service Commission to be a manpower shortage in those skills which are critical to the national security effort.

This law (1) eliminates the restrictive categories contained in existing law by authorizing payment of travel and transportation costs of persons appointed to positions for which there is determined by the Civil Service Commission to be a manpower shortage; (2) authorizes payments to persons appointed to positions in the United States, rather than in the continental United States and Alaska, thereby including all 50 States and the District of Columbia; (3) authorizes payments to student trainees when promoted upon completion of college work, necessitated by the fact that, since they are already on Federal agency rolls as part-time employees, they cannot receive such payments under existing law which restricts payments to new appointees; (4) makes certain technical amendments to existing law necessitated by the addition of the student trainee category; and (5) makes the program permanent by eliminating the 2-year restriction contained in existing law, under the terms of which it would expire on August 24, 1960.

Unemployment compensation

H.R. 3472—Public Law 86–442, Approved April 22, 1960

This law repeals section 1505 of the Social Security Act so that, in determining eligibility of Federal civilian employees for unemployment compensation, their accrued annual leave will be treated in accordance with State laws.

The Federal employees' unemployment insurance program is administered by the States under agreements with the Federal Government. Under section 1505 of the Social Security Act, however, no compensation may be paid to a Federal employee during a period subsequent to separation from Federal service when he is being paid for accrued annual leave. By repealing this section, the award of unemployment compensation to a separated Federal civilian employee while he has accrued annual leave will depend upon State law.

This law also makes a technical correction in order to prevent undue hardship and injustice. Present law provides that a quarter of coverage under OASI is based on the quarter in which wages are paid. Originally Congress provided that coverage should be based on the period when the work was performed, and the retirement test is still based on this concept. Thus this bill qualifies for social security benefits certain workers who have worked in covered employment for the required number of quarters, but who are unable to establish such eligibility due to this method now being used by the Social Security Administration in determining the insured status on the basis of the period in which the wages were paid, instead of the periods during which the wages were earned. Limits this provision in scope to individuals who were not deceased prior to January 1, 1955, and who attained retirement age or died before January 1, 1957.

Uniformed services—Pay accounts

H.R. 9702—Public Law 86–641, Approved July 12, 1960

This law relieves the General Accounting Office of the necessity for settling pay accounts of deceased members of the uniformed services before payments can be made to surviving spouses, children, parents, or legal representatives.

Section 2771 of title 10, United States Code, authorizes a member of the Armed Forces to designate a person to receive the pay and allowances due him if he dies. This section also provides that if the member has made such a designation, the appropriate military department may make immediate and final payment to the person designated by the member. If the member has not designated a beneficiary, the payment will be made in the order listed to: (1) The surviving spouse, (2) the children, (3) the parents, (4) the legal representative of the estate, or (5) the person entitled under the law of the domicile of the deceased member. Payments to persons in these categories may be made only after settlement by the General Accounting Office. Processing settlements when the deceased member has not designated a beneficiary requires an average of approximately 55 days. The average amount due deceased persons is about $125.

Under this law, the military departments would be authorized to make final payments of pay and allowances except to a person entitled under the law of the domicile of the deceased member. This type case would be settled by the General Accounting Office, or the military departments, as authorized by the Comptroller General. In the ordinary case, payments will be made within an average of 5 or 6 days.

Wage rates, Portsmouth, N.H., Naval Shipyard

S. 3800—Passed Senate August 25, 1960; Referred to House Armed Services August 25, 1960

This bill requires the Secretary of the Navy to establish the hourly rates of pay for all per diem employees of the Portsmouth, N.H., Naval Shipyard at the same hourly rates paid to employees of similar classification at the Boston, Mass., Naval Shipyard.

FINANCE, COMMERCE, INDUSTRY

Alumina and bauxite—Duty suspension

H.R. 9307—Public Law 86–441, Approved April 22, 1960

This law continues for 2 years the suspension of duty on certain alumina and bauxite, and extends until July 16, 1960, the suspension of duty on imports of crude chicory and the reduction in duty on ground chicory.

Amorphous graphite—Duty suspension

H.R. 1217—Public Law 86–453, Approved May 13, 1960

This law suspends for 2 years the import duty on amorphous graphite or plumbago, crude or refined, which is valued at $50 a ton or less.

Amorphous graphite is used for foundry facings and in the manufacture of carbon brushes, dry-cell batteries, pencils, and paints, lubricants, and brush stock for electric motors. We have long been dependent on imports for nearly all of our requirements of natural amorphous graphite.

In recent years over 95 percent of the amorphous graphite imported originated in Canada, Ceylon, Mexico, and Norway. The major part of the Mexican deposits is owned and operated by U.S. concerns. The imports of the natural products originating in Ceylon consist of high-grade or high-quality materials which is suitable for certain strategic items required by the Air Force.

Bamboo pipestems

H.R. 10841—Public Law 86–800, Approved September 11, 1960

The purpose of this act to make duty free bamboo pipestems in whatever condition of manufacture and whether bored or unbored, when imported from other than Communist-dominated countries.

Bank mergers

S. 1062—Public Law 86–463, Approved May 13, 1960

This law prohibits mergers of federally insured banks without the approval of the appropriate Federal bank supervisory agency.

If the merger is to result in a national bank or a District of Columbia bank, approval must be obtained from the Comptroller of the Currency; if it is to result in a State bank that is a member of the Federal Reserve System, approval must be obtained from the Federal Reserve Board; if it is to result in an insured nonmember State bank, approval must be obtained from the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

In acting on a merger application, the agency having jurisdiction over the transaction is required to consider the following:

The final history and condition of each of the banks involved, the adequacy of its capital structure, its future earnings prospects, the general character of its management, the convenience and needs of the community to be served, whether the bank's corporate powers are consistent with the purposes of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, and the effect of the transaction on competition including any tendency toward monopoly.

Approval will not be given unless, after considering all factors, the agency finds the transaction to be in the public interest.

Provides that each of the three bank supervisory agencies shall include in its annual report to Congress a description of the mergers it has approved during the period covered by the report.

Bankruptcy Act Amendment

H.R. 6816—Public Law 86-519, Approved June 12, 1960

The law eliminates the requirement that bankruptcy claims be filed under oath. This amendment, recommended by the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, will preserve the present standing of a verified proof of claim as prima facie evidence of the validity and amount of the claim.

Bankruptcy—False financial statements

H.R. 4346—Public Law 86-621, Approved July 12, 1960

The purpose of this law is to limit the use of false financial statements as a bar to discharge in bankruptcy.

Section 14 of the Bankruptcy Act, entitled "Discharges, When Granted," now provides in c(3) that the court shall grant the discharge unless satisfied that the bankrupt has "obtained money or property on credit, or obtained an extension or renewal of credit, by making or publishing, or causing to be made or published in any manner whatsoever, a materially false statement in writing respecting his financial condition."

This law substitutes the following language: "while engaged in business as a sole proprietor, partnership, or as an executive of a corporation, obtained for such business money or property on credit or as an extension or renewal of credit by making or publishing or causing to be made or published in any manner whatsoever a materially false statement in writing respecting his financial condition or the financial condition of the partnership or corporation."

It is believed that complete denial of a discharge is too severe a penalty in the case of the individual noncommercial bankrupt. It is also a penalty which experience has shown to be subject to abuse. An unscrupulous lender armed with a false financial statement has a powerful weapon with which to intimidate a debtor into entering into an agreement in which the creditor agrees not to oppose the discharge in return for the debtor's agreement to pay the debt in full after discharge. The creditor may also accomplish his purpose of preserving his debt by not opposing the discharge and then suing in a State court on the ground that the debt is not dischargeable.

Even where the creditor has had no part in the issuance of a false financial statement, the exercise of his right to bar the discharge completely results in a windfall for other creditors who were not even aware of such a statement. Debts which are dischargeable are not discharged solely because one of many debts was induced by a false financial statement. This result is not required to protect a creditor who has relied on a false financial statement since under section 17a(2) that particular debt is not dischargeable.

Bankruptcy—Liens

H.R. 7242—Vetoed September 8, 1960

The purpose of this act is to establish priority of liens in bankruptcy as recommended by the Judicial Conference of the United States, the National Bankruptcy Conference, and the American Bankers Association.

It is the result of a careful reexamination of several provisions of the Bankruptcy Act. During the past few years the need for legislative action has been demonstrated by the development of decisional doctrine which has created serious questions relating to the position of secured creditors and the rights of the trustee.

This bill deals with two problems in the administration and distribution of a bankrupt estate. The first of these is the problem of preserving the recognized interests of security holders. The second concerns the powers of the trustee.

Bankruptcy—Notice

H.R. 7726—Public Law 86-631, Approved July 12, 1960

This law amends the Bankruptcy Act to require only that a copy of the notice of the first meeting of creditors be sent to the District Director of Internal Revenue for the district in which the court is located, and that whenever the schedules of the debtor, or the list of creditors of the debtor, or any other papers filed in the case disclose a debt to the United States acting through any department, agency, or instrumentality thereof (except for any Internal Revenue obligation payable to the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate), a notice of the first meeting must be mailed as well to the head of such department, agency, or instrumentality.

Bankruptcy referees

H.R. 6556—Public Law 86-662, Approved July 14, 1960

This law clarifies the filing time for review of orders of referees in bankruptcy by making it clear that a petition for review must be filed within the prescribed 10-day period or within such extended time as the court may allow upon petition for extension itself filed within the 10-day period.

Casein—Suspension of import duty

H.R. 7456—Public Law 86-405, April 4, 1960

This stopgap measure extends to July 1, 1960, the suspension of import duties on casein or lactarene pending hearings on legislation providing for a longer extension. A general decline in the domestic production of casein has been shown where the general trend of imports of casein has been up for a number of years.

Casein, a product of skimmed milk, is used by the coated paper industry as an adhesive to hold coating to the paper base stock.

Casein and shoe lathes

H.R. 9862—Public Law 86-562, Approved June 30, 1960

This measure continues for 2 years until August 7, 1962, the existing suspension of duties on copying lathes used for making rough or finished shoe lasts.

It also extends to June 30, 1963, the existing suspension of import duties on casein with the requirement that the suspension not apply to sodium caseinate, sodium phospho-caseinate, of other caseinates if casein or lactarene is the component material of chief value.

Chicory—Duty suspension

H.R. 9308—Public Law 86-479, Approved June 1, 1960

Continues for 3 years, until June 30, 1963, the existing suspension of duty on crude chicory, except endive, and continues for the same period the statutory rate of duty of 2 cents a pound for chicory, ground or otherwise prepared.

Coarse wool—Suspension of import duties

H.R. 9322—Public Law 86-557, Approved June 30, 1960

This law provides for a permanent suspension of import duties on certain coarse wools imported under bond for use in the manufacture of rugs and carpets. It also adds papermakers' felts to the list of products included in the suspension.

Defense Production Act extension

H.R. 12052—Public Law 86-560, Approved June 30, 1960

Extends for 2 additional years, through June 30, 1962, the remaining powers of the President under the Defense Production Act of 1950. These include power to establish priorities for defense contracts, limited power to allocate materials for defense purposes; authority to guarantee loans made in connection with defense contracts; authority to make loans and purchases to build up our defense capacity and assure adequate supplies of defense materials; authority for businessmen to cooperate voluntarily in meeting defense needs without violating antitrust laws; and provision for establishment of a reserve of trained executives to fill Government positions in time of mobilization.

These powers are now scheduled to expire June 30, 1960. They must be extended to maintain production schedules on missiles and other defense contracts; others are needed for longer range preparedness programs; and other powers must be maintained in readiness for possible future emergencies.

The law amends the reporting requirements to permit semiannual reports on activities under the borrowing authority, instead of quarterly reports as now required.

Domestic tin

S. 1957—Passed Senate June 10, 1960. Referred to House Interior June 13, 1960

This bill is designed to encourage discovery, development, and production of domestic tin by providing for a program under the Secretary of Interior to purchase up to 10,000 long tons of domestically produced tin concentrates over a 10-year period.

Since the greatest known potential source of tin in the United States is in Alaska, it is believed that a stable going tin-producing industry in that State will largely wipe out existing unemployment and the accompanying economic distress conditions.

This measure establishes a base price of $1.40 a pound for tin produced from lode mines and $1.25 a pound for tin from placer mines, c.i.f. delivery point.

Federal Deposit Insurance assessments

H.R. 12465—Public Law 86-671, Approved July 14, 1960

To simplify the process of determining assessments paid by banks insured by FDIC, this law bases assessments on deposits shown in the call reports already required by bank supervisory officials. This, in effect, eliminates the need for banks to maintain special assessment records which will be both a time and money saver.

It provides for uniform deductions—16⅔ percent for demand deposits and 1 percent for time deposits.

It increases the amount of net assessment income after payment of all FDIC expenses and losses returned to the insured banks from 60 percent to 66⅔ percent.

Federal Reserve direct purchases

H.R. 12346—Public Law 86-567, Approved July 1, 1960

This act extends until June 30, 1962, the present authority of the Federal Reserve banks to purchase securities directly from the Treasury in amounts not to exceed $5 billion outstanding at any one time.

Up to 1935 Federal Reserve banks could purchase Government obligations either in the market or directly from the Treasury. The Banking Act of 1935, however, required that all purchases of Government securities by Federal Reserve banks be made in the open market. In 1942 the authority of the Federal Reserve banks to purchase securities directly from the Treasury was restored, but a limit of $5 billion was placed on the amount outstanding at any one time. The $5 billion authority was granted initially only through 1944, but Congress has extended it from time to time to provide continuous limited direct borrowing authority. The present authority was granted for 2 years and expired June 30, 1960.

Heptanoic acid—Duty suspension

H.R. 12659—Public Law 86-776, Approved September 13, 1960

This act suspends for 3 years the import duty on heptanoic acid. This type of acid is used in making special lubricants and brake fluids for use in military aircraft.

Holding company regulations

S. 3619—Public Law 86-746, Approved September 13, 1960

This measure provides for permanent regulation of savings and loan holding companies in order to promote and preserve local management by protecting them against encroachment by holding companies.

Public Law 374 of the 1st session of the 86th Congress established a moratorium on further acquisitions pending a survey and report by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board on the feasibility of such a move. The Board recommended permanent legislation.

Household effects—Suspension of import duties

H.R. 9881—Public Law 86-563, Approved June 30, 1960

This law extends for 2 years, until July 1, 1962, the suspension of import duties on personal and household effects brought into the United States under Government orders. During this 2-year period the departments and agencies charged with the responsibility of administering the act will be expected to prevent any possible abuses under the law. All such departments are to submit information to the appropriate congressional committees, not later than January 15, 1962, relative to the operation and administration of the act, including a statement of actions taken to improve its administration.

Local advertising charges

H.R. 12536—Public Law 86-781, Approved September 14, 1960

This bill provides that where a manufacturer, producer, or importer of articles, subject to manufacturers' excise tax, makes a separate charge for local advertising of the article, or reimburses the retailer or other distributor for part or all of his expenses for local advertising, this charge is to be excluded from the manufacturers' sales price or the price is to be readjusted for this charge. Excluding this amount from the sales price, or readjusting this price for this amount, reduces the manufacturers' excise taxes, since this price is the base for these taxes. The price exclusion, or readjustment, is limited to radio, television, and newspaper advertising, and to not more than 5 percent of the sales price, excluding local advertising charges. This amendment applies to articles sold on or after the first day of the first calendar quarter beginning more than 20 days after the date of enactment.

The act also permits taxpayers mining minerals used in making cement to make an election as to base for determining percentage depletion deduction for the years prior to 1961. It further provides that certain specified trusts to be deemed to constitute a qualified trust for tax exemptions only if it is down to the satisfaction of the Treasurer or his delegate that the trust has not in this period been operated in a manner which would jeopardize the interests of its beneficiaries.

Another change in tax law brought about by this legislation and effective for years after 1960, thus putting the States and taxpayers on notice, would provide for only one accrual for State taxes in any one taxable year where the State legislature has changed the accrual date, and would thus eliminate the additional deduction available under existing law.

Metal scrap

H.R. 11748—Public Law 86-606, Approved July 7, 1960

This law continues to June 30, 1961, the existing suspension of duties on metal scrap. It excludes from the suspension lead scrap, lead alloy scrap, antimonial lead scrap, scrap battery lead or plates, zinc scrap, or zinc alloy scrap, or any form of tungsten scrap, tungsten carbide scrap, or other articles of lead or tungsten imported for remanufacture by smelting.

It provides for a separate tariff classification for certain fresh or frozen coconut, and provides that tight barrelheads of softwood be imported duty free.

Old Series Currency Adjustment Act

S. 3714—Passed Senate June 28, 1960—Referred to House Banking June 30, 1960

Authorizes the Treasury to adjust its accounts on large-size currency issued by the Government before 1929 and about $12½ million in gold certificates issued between 1929 and 1934.

The Treasury and the Federal Reserve System are holding approximately $100 million in gold, silver, and other assets as security for this old currency. This includes about $61 million in gold and silver reserves held by the Treasury and about $37 million in reserves held by the Federal Reserve banks to secure Federal Reserve notes.

Thus the Treasury is authorized to transfer the amounts of this old currency from its currency accounts to the outstanding public debt, to be reported as part of the outstanding public debt in the same way Federal Reserve bank notes, national bank notes, and U.S. notes are now reported. The Federal Reserve banks would pay to the Treasury an amount sufficient to discharge their liabilities for outstanding Federal Reserve notes. These actions would make available to the Treasury for current use approximately $100 million. The availability of $100 million will reduce the Government's need to borrow this amount, which will save about $3 or $4 million in interest a year.

Any of the old notes presented for redemption would be redeemed in regular course from the general fund of the Treasury.

It also permits the Secretary of the Treasury to determine the amount of the old currency which has been destroyed or lost and to reduce amounts of this old currency outstanding on the records of the Treasury. This action would not impair the redeemability of any currency subsequently presented to the Treasury.

The Treasury is authorized to withhold from destruction one piece of each denomination of each kind of currency issued, in order to provide an historical collection of the paper currency of the United States.

Payments to Local Governments Act of 1960

S. 910—Passed Senate May 12, 1960; Referred to House Interior May 16, 1960

This measure, sponsored by 35 Senators, authorizes for a 5-year period from January 1, 1960, through December 31, 1964:

A limited program of payments in lieu of taxes on industrial or commercial real property acquired by the Federal Government after June 30, 1950.

Payments in lieu of special assessment and taxes levied after the effective date of the act in urban or suburban areas, if the assessments and taxes were also levied on real property owned by other taxable persons.

Payments in lieu of taxes on the interest of the Federal Government in real property in the custody or control of taxable persons under a lease, contract, or permit to the extent that taxes on that property are not already paid by taxable persons.

The program is to be administered by a five-member, bipartisan Federal Board for Payments to Local Governments, appointed by the President, subject to Senate confirmation.

Requires a taxing authority to file an application, specifying the Federal property involved, the basis of its claim and the period for which the claim is made—not to exceed 12 months in any single application.

Requires the Board, after determining the existence of a probable basis for the claim and holding a hearing if a basis is found to exist, to certify to the controlling Federal agency the amount of payment to be made to the local taxing authority.

Authorizes the Board to conduct a comprehensive study and make a case-by-case analysis of all phases of fiscal and related problems of local taxing authorities arising out of Federal immunity from local real and personal property taxes, including the operation of the existing program. Requires the Board to report, within 2 years following enactment, its findings and recommendations for any future legislative program.

The term "local governments" includes the District of Columbia.

Public debt—Temporary increase

S. 3714—Passed Senate June 28, 1960

Extends to June 30, 1961, a temporary increase of $8 billion in the public debt limit, making the ceiling $293 billion.

Religious items—Duty free

H.R. 4384—Passed Senate, Amended, September 1, 1960

The purpose of this act is to add certain items to the list of articles for religious purposes now permitted free entry, and to clarify and enlarge the list of organizations which may import these articles without payment of duty.

It also authorizes the Federal Government to withhold city wage taxes in cities with a population of 75,000 or more from salaries of Federal employees who live in the same State as the city withholding the tax.

Revolving fund—SBA

H.R. 11207—In Conference

This bill increases by $75 million (to $650 million) the Small Business Administration's revolving fund for its regular loan program. It provides for a wider participation by small business concerns in the subcontracting phase of Government procurement, and authorizes SBA to establish a small business subcontracting program.

It authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to publish in the Department's daily Synopsis of U.S. Government Proposed Procurements, Sales and Contract Awards, all defense procurements of $10,000 or over and all civilian procurements of $5,000 or over except those which are classified, perishable, public utilities, or emergency procurements.

It requires the Attorney General to make surveys and submit yearly reports on a Government activity which might injure small business.

RFC—Payment in lieu of taxes

H.R. 9983—Public Law 86-498, Approved June 8, 1960

This law extends for 2 years, to December 31, 1960, the period in which payments in lieu of taxes may be made to State and local taxing authorities by the Federal Government on certain real property.

The earlier law, which is extended by this one, was designed to furnish temporary relief for local taxing authorities which were under an undue and unexpected burden as the result of a transfer of taxable real property from Reconstruction Finance Corporation or its subsidiaries to another Federal Agency or Department which removed the property from taxation. It authorized payments in lieu of taxes only on property transferred by the RFC or one of its subsidiaries to another Federal Agency or Department on or after January 1, 1946, and only if title to the property had been held continuously by the United States since the transfer.

Registration and protection of trademarks

S. 2429—Passed Senate June 28, 1960; Referred to House Judiciary June 29, 1960

The purpose of this legislation is to make a number of miscellaneous clarifying and correcting amendments to the so-called Trademark Act. These amendments affect details of registration, administrative and court procedure, internal organization of the Patent Office regarding trademark matters, and refinements in language.

Securities Act—Amendments

S. 3769—Passed Senate July 2, 1960; Referred to House Interstate August 15, 1960

This measure amends the Security Act of 1933 in order to bring it up to date and to strengthen the Commission's injunctive powers and the criminal sanctions to prevent or to punish violations of the act.

S. 3770—Passed Senate July 2, 1960; Referred to House Interstate August 15, 1960

Amends the Security Exchange Act of 1934 to extend regulations over registered brokers' and dealers' margin, extension of credit, and proxy practices directly instead of indirectly. It expands the power to make rules over financial responsibility of brokers and dealers and over lending customers' securities by brokers and dealers. It expands the power to suspend trading in any registered security on an exchange and creates the power to suspend trading in the over-the-counter market.

S. 3771—Public Law 86-760, Approved September 13, 1960

Amends the Trust Indenture Act to grant the Commission additional power to exempt companies which have been unable to amend trust indentures issued for their bonds.

S. 3772—Passed Senate July 2, 1960; Passed House, Amended, August 30, 1960

Amends the Investment Company Act of 1940 to require a separate recital of policy for each fund of an open-end investment company which issues more than one series of stock; to limit investment by diversified investment companies; to require that bank custody of security of an investment company include all cash assets of the company; and to limit the equity investments of face-amount companies to prevent their obligations from becoming speculative.

S. 3773—Public Law 86-750, Approved September 13, 1960

Amends the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 to provide new grounds for disqualification of an applicant for registration; to grant new power to postpone effectiveness within certain limits; to authorize the Commission by rule to require books to be kept and reports filed; to permit periodic examinations of a registrant's books and records; to authorize the Commission to define and prescribe means to prevent fraud; and to extend criminal liability to include a willful violation of a rule or order of the Commission.

Small Business Investment Act amendments of 1960

S. 2611—Public Law 86-502, Approved June 11, 1960

The primary purpose of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 is to make equity-type capital and long-term credit more readily available for small business concerns, through encouraging the establishment of privately owned small business investment companies. Under the 1958 act, each Small Business Investment Company must have a minimum initial paid-in capital and surplus of $300,000, of which $150,000 may be supplied by the Small Business Administration through purchase of subordinated debentures of the SBIC. SBA may also make loans to any SBIC, up to 50 percent of its capital and surplus. An SBIC can supply funds to a small business in two ways: by buying the small business concern's unsecured debentures, convertible into stock in the concern, at sound book value as determined at the time the debentures are issued; or by making term loans from 5 to 20 years.

This measure amends the 1958 act in order to remove certain obstacles which have impeded its actual intent. This amendment will open up new methods by which SBIC's may furnish equity capital to small businesses. It will allow SBIC's to furnish capital in other forms to be authorized by regulation of the Small Business Administration, such as by directly buying stock in small business concerns or by buying debentures with severable or detachable stock rights.

This law also repeals the requirement that a small business concern must purchase stock in any SBIC from which it gets equity capital. It grants the small business concern an option to buy stock in the SBIC equal to 5 percent of the capital supplied. It authorizes a bank that is a subsidiary of a holding company to invest up to 1 percent of its capital and surplus in any SBIC, which is now prohibited where the SBIC is a subsidiary of the same holding company. Another major change is that it exempts SBIC's in the District of Columbia from the District of Columbia small loan law, and extends the act to possessions of the United States such as Guam.

Sugar quotas

H.R. 12311—Public Law 86-592, Approved July 6, 1960

Extends the quota provisions of the 1948 Sugar Act through March 31, 1961.

Grants the President discretionary authority to cut the Cuban sugar quota and prohibits him from increasing Cuba's quota.

To make up for any Cuban reduction and other deficits, the President is authorized to obtain sugar from both foreign and domestic sources.

Permits redistribution of sugar assigned to Cuba, which will affect the 156,000 tons of Hawaiian and Puerto Rican sugar Cuba was to receive but, under this act, can now be redistributed to domestic beetgrowers.

Other deficits may be made up by purchase, rather than allocation, from countries having quotas of 3,000 to 10,000 tons, to the extent that their exports to the United States would be raised to 10,000 tons.

Deficits remaining after this initial distribution can, up to 15 percent, be purchased from the Philippines and the remainder from other quota countries.

Should there still be a deficiency, additional amounts can be purchased from any foreign country, regardless of quota provisions, and refined sugar could be imported if raw was not available.

At the time the President signed the bill into law, he signed a proclamation cutting Cuba's share of the 1960 U.S. market by 700,000 short tons. The United States had already certified 2,379,903 tons of Cuban sugar for entry this year, which left only 39,752 tons more to be imported in 1960—out of the original quota of 3,119,655 tons. Cuba's share will be apportioned to free-world nations and American producers.

Sugar—Dominican Republic

H.R. 13062—Passed Senate, Amended, September 1, 1960

The bill which became law on July 6, 1960, extended the Sugar Act until March 31, 1961, and delegated authority to the President to limit purchases of sugar from Cuba. This bill is an extension of the principles of that act with certain new authorizations and limitations until the close of December 31, 1961.

It would have cut the sugar quota of the Dominican Republic by 322,000 tons regardless of whether or not the Organization of American States voted economic sanctions.

Tampico fiber—Duty suspension

H.R. 9861—Public Law 86-456, Approved May 13, 1960

This measure continues until September 5, 1963, the existing suspension of duty on dressed or manufactured istle or Tampico fiber.

Istle or Tampico fiber is derived from several species of the agave plant which is indigenous to Mexico. It is one of the best known and most widely used of all vegetable brush fibers. Its principal use in the United States is in the manufacture of brushes.

At the time of the first suspension of this fiber in 1957, there was no domestic production of the raw fiber and an insignificant production of the dressed fiber from imported raw fiber, and good grades of raw fiber were in short supply. The brush industry and other importers indicated that the prices of dressed fiber had risen, with resulting increases in the cost of production and in the price of the finished product. The purpose of the suspension was to reduce the burden of the higher prices on domestic users of the fibers.

The U.S. Tariff Commission advised there was no substantial change since the original suspension.

Tanning extracts—Suspension of duty

H.R. 9820—Public Law 86-427, Approved April 22, 1960

This law extends for an additional 3 years or until September 30, 1963, the period during which certain tanning extracts may be imported free of duty and the period during which extracts of hemlock or eucalyptus suitable for use for tanning may be imported duty free.

FOREIGN RELATIONS

Alien property

S. 2634—Passed Senate May 26, 1960. Referred to House Foreign Affairs May 27, 1960

This bill permits the return of interests in certain enemy corporations vested under the International Claims Settlement Act or under the Trading With the Enemy Act to persecutees normally barred of a return because of being nationals of Bulgaria, Hungary, or Rumania, enemy countries of the United States during World War II.

Amistad Dam and Reservoir

H.R. 12263—Public Law 86-605, Approved July 7, 1960

Authorizes the conclusion of an agreement with Mexico for joint construction of the

Amistad Dam, a major international storage and conservation dam on the Rio Grande, under the terms of the Mexican Water Treaty of 1944.

The first of the three dams specified in the treaty, Falcon Dam, between Laredo and Roma, Tex., has been in operation since 1953. Experience has shown, however, that it, alone, is unable to control disastrous floods of the Rio Grande.

The Amistad site was selected after years of extensive study and exploration. Thus, this measure authorizes the conclusion of the agreement and, upon conclusion, authority is granted to conclude an agreement to construct, operate, and maintain on a self-liquidating basis a hydroelectric plant by the United States.

Operation of the dam is to be integrated with that of the Falcon Dam to provide the maximum amount of water for beneficial use in the United States. Releases of waters for domestic, municipal, industrial, and irrigation uses in the United States will be granted at the request of the State of Texas and water distribution is to be the sole responsibility of the State of Texas.

Authorizes appropriations necessary to carry out the provisions of the act.

Century 21 Exposition

S. 3532—Public Law 86-697, Approved September 2, 1960

This law authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to strike and furnish, to the Century 21 Commission, national medals to commemorate the exposition to be held in Seattle, Wash., beginning April 21, 1962, and ending October 21, 1962.

The bill provides that not more than 500,000 medals are to be struck, and that the size of the medals authorized are to be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury and members of the Commission.

Export Control Act—Extension

H.R. 10550—Public Law 86-464, Approved May 13, 1960

This measure extends the Export Control Act of 1949 to June 30, 1962. This act, which is administered by the Secretary of Commerce by delegation from the President, authorizes the regulation of exports under standards based on national security, foreign policy, and domestic shortages.

International food for peace resolution

Senate Concurrent Resolution 116—Passed Senate August 27, 1960; Referred to House Foreign Affairs August 29, 1960

Senate Concurrent Resolution 116 expresses the support of the Congress for the continued exploration by the President with other nations for the establishment of an international food program for the purpose of furnishing food to less favorably situated peoples.

The resolution specifies that such an international food for peace program would be for—

(1) combating extreme price fluctuations in the international market in food products;

(2) alleviating famine and starvation;

(3) helping absorb temporary market surpluses of farm products; and

(4) economic and social development programs which are formulated in cooperation with appropriate international agencies.

Participation by the United States in an international food program would be contingent on appropriate statutory or other authorization.

Foreign trade

S. 1857—Public Law 86-687, Approved September 2, 1960

To promote the possibility of reestablishing the markets of Western Europe, particularly, the United Kingdom, which were lost during World War II, this measure provides for the inspection of products entering commerce and makes it unlawful for any person to ship or offer for shipment to any foreign country European-type grapes or European and Japanese-type plums unless certified that it meets minimum quality requirements established by the Secretary of Agriculture.

International Development Association Act

H.R. 11001—Public Law 86-565, Approved June 30, 1960

This law authorizes the President to accept membership for the United States in the International Development Association. The articles of agreement were approved by the Executive Directors of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development on January 26, 1960, to be submitted to member governments of the Bank. The law authorizes appropriations by Congress totaling $320,290,000 without fiscal year limitation for the subscription of the United States to the association.

The purposes of the association are to promote economic development, increase production and thus raise standards of living in the less-developed areas of the world including within the association's membership, in particular by providing finance to meet their important development requirements on terms which are more flexible and bear less heavily on the balance of payments than those of conventional loans.

The resources of the association will be initial subscriptions of $1 billion. Voting power is roughly based upon the size of a country's initial subscription and thus upon the pattern of voting rights in the International Bank. The United States, which contributes about 32 percent of the association's total resources, will have 27.6 percent of the vote.

Requires specific congressional authorization for subscription of additional funds or gifts to the association.

Italy—Centennial anniversary

House Concurrent Resolution 225—Adopted by House and Senate

This resolution expresses as the sense of Congress that the President extend greetings from the United States to the people of Italy on the occasion of the unity of Italy centennial anniversary in March of 1961. It also provides for an official exhibit as our part in the celebration to recognize the progress and achievements of the people of Italy during the past century.

The theme of our exhibit is "Technological Developments in Industry," designed to show how technology in the United States has been made the servant of man and not his master, and that it has brought to Americans the highest standard of living the world has ever known.

Approximately 20 other nations, including Great Britain, India, the Soviet Union, and Czechoslovakia are planning large-scale exhibits. The exhibition, to be held in the city of Turin, will last 6 months and is expected to attract visitors from all over Italy and neighboring European countries.

Latin American aid

H.R. 13021—Public Law 86-735, Approved September 8, 1960

This act authorizes a loan program of $100 million to the President for Chilean reconstruction and $500 million to the Secretary of State to carry out a program for development in Latin America.

The administration indicated the $500 million authorization would be used to assist in such fields as land settlement and land utilization, housing, vocational, technical, and scientific training, and basic public facilities such as potable water systems and sewage systems.

The $100 million for Chilean reconstruction is to assist Chile in rebuilding and maintaining an economic stabilization program.

Mexico-United States interparliamentary groups

House Joint Resolution 283—Public Law 86-420, Approved April 9, 1960

To strengthen the bonds of friendship between the United States and Mexico, this resolution authorizes participation by the United States in annual parliamentary conferences with Mexico. The U.S. group is to be composed of 12 Senators appointed by the President of the Senate (4 from Senate Foreign Relations Committee), and 12 Members from the House appointed by the Speaker (4 from House Foreign Affairs Committee).

The Mexican Congress has passed similar legislation and appointed delegates to the meetings.

Mutual Security Authorization Act of 1960

H.R. 11510—Public Law 86-472, Approved May 14, 1960

This law authorizes appropriations of $1,366,200,000 for the fiscal 1961 mutual security program, which is $88,700,000 less than the President requested in his message to Congress. The bill, however, left intact previous year's authorizations for military assistance and other expenditures.

Major provisions are:

Limits military assistance to $55 million, other than training, for Latin America.

Prohibits assistance to Cuba following date of enactment (May 14, 1960) unless the President determines that the assistance is in the national and hemispheric interest of the United States.

Expresses as the sense of Congress, that assistance under the Mutual Security Act and the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 should be administered to give effect to the principles that the United States favors freedom of navigation in international waterways and economic cooperation between recipient nations.

Authorizes the State Department to submit to Congress plans for a Western Hemisphere cultural center in Puerto Rico, by January 3, 1961.

Establishes a Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange in Hawaii and authorizes necessary appropriations. (Public Law 86-678 appropriated $10 million for this project.)

Directs the President to arrange for a study of the advisability of establishing a Point Four Youth Corps, and authorizes $10,000 from technical cooperation funds to defray expenses.

Abolishes the International Development Advisory Board.

Authorizes the use of funds for the Indust Basin development under the supervision of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and waives the requirement that at least 50 percent of the foreign aid goods be shipped in American vessels.

Defense support information to Congress: Requires, upon request, that information be furnished GAO and committees of Congress and, if the President forbids submission of this material, he must furnish reasons.

Development Loan Fund: Expands the purposes of the Fund to include the development of free economic institutions as well as economic resources and makes it clear that agricultural as well as industrial production is covered. Expresses as the sense of Congress that special consideration should be given to housing loans and guarantees. Continues the availability of the Fund to support sound program of economic development as well as specific development projects. Prohibits the allocation or earmarking of Development Loan Fund funds in excess of $50,000 for use in any country unless an application is received containing sufficient information and assurance to indicate that the funds will be used in an economically and technically sound manner.

Expresses as the sense of Congress that consideration should be given by the United

States to participate in an internationally financed program which would utilize foreign currencies available to the United States to preserve the cultural monuments of the upper Nile, and requests the President to submit his recommendations to Congress on or before March 1, 1961.

Palestine refugees: Authorizes an appropriation of $16.5 million for fiscal 1961 and the use of $6.5 million previously appropriated, making a total of $23 million for resettlement purposes. Directs the President to send to Congress for fiscal 1962 specific recommendations for progressive repatriation and settlement of refugees and for reducing U.S. contributions to UNRWA.

Requires an itemized public accounting by members of congressional committees and their staffs of all funds expended in connection with foreign travel.

Authorizes payment of overland freight charges on relief shipments to landlocked countries.

Permits direct barter of military materials and equipment, thus eliminating the sale of U.S. goods by the United States and purchase of similar goods from another country.

Establishes as the policy of extending loans for associations of small farm operators to strengthen the economies of underdeveloped nations, with a maximum of $25,000 for any association, and an aggregate of $10 million for all loan balances.

Directs the President to have a study made of the functions and coordination of agencies engaged in foreign economic activities with a view to simplifying and rationalizing the formulation and implementation of U.S. foreign economic policies.

	Administration request	House bill	Senate bill	Conference agreement
Defense support	$724,000,000	$675,000,000	$700,000,000	$675,000,000
Bilateral technical cooperation	172,000,000	172,000,000	172,000,000	172,000,000
U.N. technical cooperation	33,000,000	33,000,000	33,000,000	33,000,000
OAS technical cooperation	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
Special assistance	268,500,000	256,000,000	260,000,000	256,000,000
U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,100,000	1,300,000
Escapees	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000
U.N. Children's Fund	12,000,000	12,000,000	12,000,000	12,000,000
Palestine refugees	18,500,000	18,500,000	22,000,000	16,500,000
Ocean Freight	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
ICA administration	40,000,000	40,000,000	40,000,000	40,000,000
Atoms for peace	3,400,000	3,400,000	3,400,000	3,400,000
Contingency fund	175,000,000	100,000,000	155,000,000	150,000,000
Total	1,454,900,000	1,318,400,000	1,405,500,000	1,366,200,000

Mutual security contingency fund

S. 3855—Passed Senate August 19, 1960; Referred to House Foreign Affairs August 22, 1960

This act increases the authorization for the President's mutual security contingency fund by $100 million in order to meet the costs of such emergency operations as airlifting United Nations troops to the Congo.

Under the regular mutual security authorization for fiscal 1961, the administration requested $175 million for the contingency fund and the committee of conference reached the figure of $150 million.

NATO Citizens Convention

Senate Joint Resolution 170—Public Law 86-719, Approved September 7, 1960

This resolution authorizes a 20-member U.S. Citizens Commission on NATO to participate, unofficially, with similar groups from other NATO countries at a convention, and subsequent meetings, to explore the possibilities of promoting greater cooperation among the North Atlantic Treaty nations.

There is a strong feeling among NATO nations that more should be done within the alliance to counter, through political and economic measures, the increasing Soviet bloc emphasis on competition with the West. This could be accomplished under article 2 of the North Atlantic Treaty which provides for cooperation by NATO members in nonmilitary fields. By this means, the North Atlantic alliance could expand to strengthen Western unity without lessening the importance of its military aspect. This 20-member Commission will be appointed by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House after consultation with the Senate and House Foreign Affairs Committees.

Authorizes $300,000 appropriation to carry out the purposes of the resolution.

Pan American Union

Senate Resolution 304—Senate Adopted April 14, 1960

The Senate unanimously adopted this resolution extending greetings to the legislative bodies of each of the republics of the Western Hemisphere on the 70th anniversary of the founding of the Pan American Union on April 14, 1890.

Republic of China—Sale of ships

H.R. 8042—Public Law 86-473, Approved May 14, 1960

This law authorizes the Secretary of Commerce, within 1 year following enactment, to resell to the Government of the Republic of China any two of the four CI-SAY-1 type vessels originally contracted for sale in 1948 under the terms of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946. These vessels were returned to the United States in 1950 because the Chinese Government was unable to meet the installment payments.

Under the terms of the original contract, the purchase price of the four vessels was $1,100,000 each. Before default the Chinese Government made a downpayment of $1,100,000 and an installment payment of $188,000.

This measure provides that the same statutory floor price be applied to the repurchase of any two of the four, and gives credit for the $1,288,000 plus depreciation at 3½ percent a year since default.

It is believed this sale will contribute to the economic development of the Republic of China and will serve the interests of the United States. The two vessels are for use in Chinese trade in Far East and Near East waters exclusively.

Ryukyu Islands

H.R. 1157—Public Law 86-629, Approved July 12, 1960

The purpose of this legislation is to establish a basis in law for U.S. programs to promote economic and social development in the Ryukyu Islands.

U.S. interest in the Ryukyu Islands is indicated by strategic military considerations of the highest importance. Consequently, the task of administering the islands has been assigned by the President to the Department of Defense, an assignment made necessary by the inextricable linking of civil and military functions there. In the tightly constricted area of the Ryukyus, virtually all activities and policies of the local government directly affect military planning and operations. The bill formalizes existing arrangements and provides a means for maintaining and increasing effective performance.

Ship loans—Republic of China and Canada

H.R. 9465—Public Law 86-482, Approved June 1, 1960

Authorizes the loan of one submarine to Canada for a 5-year period, and extends the loan of one destroyer to the Republic of China for an additional 5 years.

Shrimp Conservation Act

S. 2867—Passed Senate May 26, 1960; Referred to House Merchant Marine May 27, 1960

This bill implements a convention ratified by the Senate on June 4, 1959, to conserve shrimp between the United States and Cuba. A Commission for the Conservation of Shrimp in the Eastern Gulf of Mexico is to be established to carry out the objectives of the convention.

This bill authorizes the President to appoint three Commissioners to the U.S. section of the Commission, to serve at his pleasure and without compensation. One of the Commissioners is to be an official of the U.S. Government, and the other two from States which maintain a substantial shrimp fishery in the convention area.

These Commissioners are authorized to appoint an advisory committee of from 5 to 15 members, from groups participating in the fishery and from interested State agencies which operate in the convention area.

Under the terms of the convention, the Commission is to obtain scientific information regarding the abundance, life history, and ecology of stocks of shrimp in the convention area in order to determine the measures necessary for conservation.

TREATIES

Antarctic Treaty

Executive B—Ratified August 10, 1960

The Antarctic Treaty, signed December 31, 1959, by the United States and 11 other nations, including the Soviet Union, to insure a permanent use of Antarctica for peaceful purposes was ratified by a vote of 66 to 21.

The treaty dedicates the use of Antarctica to peaceful purposes only and prohibits all military operations, including the establishment of bases, maneuvers, and weapons testing, but not the use of military personnel and equipment for scientific purposes.

Provides for the complete freedom of scientific investigations in Antarctica and for the exchange of plans, personnel, and results of any scientific expeditions.

Bans nuclear explosions or the disposal of radioactive waste material in Antarctica. Authorizes any signatory nation to designate observers to carry out inspections, including aerial observations, in any part of Antarctica.

Requires periodic meetings of signatory nations to make recommendations for technical implementation of the treaty, solution of disputes, amendment of the treaty, and provides that it will enter into force when ratified by all 12 signatory states.

Educational-scientific-cultural agreement (commonly known as the Florence agreement)

Executive I—Ratified February 23, 1960, by vote of 76 to 14

This agreement and protocol of reservation on importing educational, scientific, and cultural materials, was opened for signature at Lake Success, N.Y., November 22, 1950, entered into force on May 21, 1952, and signed in behalf of the United States June 24, 1959.

It is designed to encourage the exchange of materials of a cultural, scientific, and educational nature by admitting duty free the following materials:

1. Books, publications, and documents.
2. Works of art and collectors' items.
3. Visual and auditory materials.

4. Scientific instruments or apparatus.
5. Books and other materials for the blind.
6. Certain public exhibition materials.

The protocol of reservation permits the United States, and other participants, on a reciprocal basis, to suspend any of its obligations under the agreement if any materials covered by the agreement are being imported in increased quantities and under conditions to cause or threaten serious injury to domestic producers of similar or directly competitive products.

France—Convention of Establishment

Executive G—Ratified August 17, 1960

The Senate ratified Executive G, 86th Congress, 2d session, the Convention of Establishment Between the United States and France, together with a protocol and a joint declaration, signed at Paris on November 25, 1959.

The treaty is designed to insure nondiscriminatory treatment of our businessmen in France and a guarantee that the businessmen of France will be treated equally with the United States.

The term of the convention with France is 10 years after which it can be terminated on 1 year's written notice by either party to the other.

Japan—Mutual Cooperation and Security Treaty

Executive E—Ratified June 22, 1960

This treaty of mutual cooperation and security between the United States and Japan was signed at Washington, January 19, 1960, and replaces the security pact of 1951.

This new treaty represents an affirmation by the two parties of their solemn obligations to settle their international differences in a manner consistent with the Charter of the United Nations; to broaden and strengthen economic ties; and to strengthen their capacities to resist armed attack through self-help and mutual aid. The United States and Japan are to consult together from time to time regarding the implementation of the treaty, and, at the request of either party, whenever the security of Japan or international peace and security in the Far East is threatened.

Each party recognises that an armed attack against either party in the territories under the administration of Japan would be dangerous to its own peace and safety and declares that it would act to meet the common danger in accordance with its constitutional provisions and processes.

The United States is guaranteed the privileges of continued use of military bases and other facilities on Japanese soil. The use of these facilities and areas as well as the status of U.S. Armed Forces in Japan is to be governed by a separate agreement.

This treaty is to remain in force until the two Governments agree that the United Nations can satisfactorily maintain the peace in Japan's area; however, after 10 years, either party can give notice of termination, which would take place 1 year after notice.

The treaty went into effect late June 22, 1960, U.S. time, when the Japanese Foreign Minister and the U.S. Ambassador to Japan exchanged the instruments of ratification in Tokyo.

Mexican broadcasting agreement

Executive G—Ratified February 23, 1960, by Vote of 76 to 8

This agreement, signed at Mexico City on January 29, 1957, governs the relationship between the United States and Mexico in the use of standard broadcasting band. It will remain in force for a period of 5 years unless terminated by either Government or replaced by a new agreement. If, however, consultations over violations are unsuccessful, the agreement can be terminated 90 days after denunciation.

It provides a basic pattern by prescribing engineering standards, procedures, classes of stations, radiofrequency priorities and similar regulations.

North American regional broadcasting agreement

Executive A—Ratified February 23, 1960, by Vote of 76 to 8

This agreement, signed at Washington on November 15, 1950, is a regional agreement concerning use of radiofrequencies in the standard broadcast band between 535 and 1605 kilocycles by the participating countries.

It prescribes engineering standards, procedures, classes of stations, radiofrequency priorities and similar regulations.

Participating countries are Canada, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, the United Kingdom (for Jamaica and the Bahamas), and the United States. Provision is made for the adherence of Haiti.

This agreement remains in effect for 5 years after entry into force unless a new agreement is negotiated.

Pakistan Treaty

Executive F—Ratified August 17, 1960

The Senate ratified a Treaty of Friendship and Commerce between the United States and Pakistan, together with a protocol, signed at Washington on November 12, 1959.

The purpose of the treaty is to protect the interests of those nationals and corporate entities of the treaty parties engaged in conducting business and commercial transactions within the territory of the other party.

The United States has been trying for 11 years to negotiate such an agreement with Pakistan, but not until the present Government assumed direction of that country was it possible to do so.

The term of the treaty is 10 years after which it can be terminated on 1 year's written notice by either party to the other.

Paris Convention

Executive D—Ratified August 17, 1960

The Senate, by a unanimous vote, ratified Executive D, 86th Congress, 2d session, the Convention of Paris for the Protection of Industrial Property, signed at Lisbon on October 31, 1958, to take effect June 1, 1963.

The convention assures protection of industrial property rights of U.S. nationals abroad; namely, patents, trademarks, designs, commercial names, and related rights. Fifty countries are parties to the convention—the United States became a signatory of the original convention in 1887.

Sea law conventions

Executives J–M—Ratified May 26, 1960

These conventions are: Convention on the Territorial Sea and the Contiguous Zone; Convention on the High Seas; Convention on Fishing and Conservation of the Living Resources of the High Seas; and a Convention on the Continental Shelf.

These four conventions codify existing international law and establish additional law. They are concerned primarily with the rights and duties of states and vessels in the territorial sea, contiguous zone, and on the high seas, rights and responsibilities with regard to fishing and conservation on the high seas and formulating international law relative to the exploitation of natural resources on the Continental Shelf.

Visual education

Executive V—Ratified May 26, 1960

This treaty is designed to facilitate the international circulation of visual and auditory materials of an educational, scientific, and cultural character to promote the free flow of ideas and mutual understanding of peoples.

GENERAL GOVERNMENT

Alaska lands

S. 3545—Public Law 86–620, Approved July 12, 1960

This measure provides for the disposal of lands in Alaska by sealed competitive bids as well as by public auction. A 1929 statute granting 100,000 acres of public lands in Alaska for the support of the agricultural college and school of mines restricted sale or lease of these lands by public auction to the highest bidder. The State of Alaska believes that the sealed competitive bidding for sale or leasing of these lands will result in a higher price and thus increase the revenues in the State for educational purposes.

Antarctica Medal

H.R. 3923—Public Law 86–600, Approved July 7, 1960

This law authorizes the Secretary of Defense to issue a commemorative medal to persons who serve or who have served as members of a U.S. expedition to Antarctica between January 1, 1946, and a date to be subsequently established by the Secretary of Defense. It provides a treasured honor for those men, military and civilian, who have actively participated in expeditions in the Antarctic and experienced the hardships and hazards incident thereto.

Under the regulations which the Secretary of Defense would be authorized to prescribe, the awards should assist both the Navy and the National Science Foundation in recruitment of personnel for winter service in the Antarctic. Without the contribution of those persons who have spent time in the Antarctic under its most rigorous conditions, the results of scientific and geographic value and the grounds for U.S. territorial claims alike would be very meager. The law is intended to honor those who have made such contributions and to provide an incentive for others.

Antikickback statute

S. 3487—Public Law 86–695, Approved September 2, 1960

This bill amends the so-called Anti-Kickback Act of 1946 by extending its scope and coverage to all prime contracts with the United States which are negotiated. Under existing law, the act applies only to prime contracts which are on a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee or other cost-reimbursable basis.

The Anti-Kickback Act prohibits the payment or grant of anything of value by or on behalf of a subcontractor to an employee of a prime contractor holding a Government contract, or to an employee of a higher tier subcontractor, either as an inducement for the award of a contract or purchase order, or as an acknowledgment of a subcontract or purchase order previously awarded.

Under the act it is conclusively presumed that kickbacks are ultimately borne by the Government, and prime contractors are required to withhold from subcontractors, upon the direction of the contracting agency or the General Accounting Office, the amount of the kickback.

The act provides for both civil recovery and criminal prosecution and authorizes the General Accounting Office to inspect the plants and audit the books and records of any prime contractor or subcontractor engaged in the performance of a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee or cost-reimbursable contract to determine whether kickback payments have been made.

Changing designation of certain medals

H.R. 3291—Public Law 86–593, Approved July 6, 1960

The purpose of this law is to provide for changes in designation of the "Distinguished Service Cross" and the "Soldier's Medal" to the "Air Force Cross" and the "Airman's Medal," respectively.

The current designations of "Distinguished Service Cross" and "Soldier's Medal" identify these medals as decorations of the U.S. Army, and are essentially carryovers from the period before the Air Force was made a separate Department under the National Security Act of 1947.

Since that time, the Air Force has made several distinctive changes primarily to foster esprit de corps and increase the morale of its members. For example, in April 1952, the enlisted rank designations of private; private, first class; corporal; and sergeant were changed in the Air Force to basic airman; airman, third class; airman, second class; and airman, first class, respectively, and are equivalent to the Department of the Navy designations of apprentice seaman, seaman, and petty officer, third class.

In January 1949, the Air Force adopted the present blue uniform to identify its wearers as members of the U.S. Air Force. In November 1957, the Air Force established a distinctive Longevity Service Ribbon for wear on the Air Force uniform as a visible means of recognizing certain periods of active Federal service performed by its military members.

Clean election bill

S. 2436—Passed Senate January 25, 1960; Referred to House Administration January 26, 1960

This measure completely rewrites the Corrupt Practices Act of 1925 and would—

Increase the spending limit for candidates for Senator and Representative at Large from $25,000 to $50,000, or an amount equal to 20 cents a vote for all votes cast for the office in the preceding general election, plus 10 cents a vote for all votes over 1 million or a similar amount based on the total number of persons registered to vote;

Increase the spending limit for candidates for Representative from $5,000 to $12,500, or an amount based on the above formula;

Increase the spending limit for political committees operating in two or more States from $3 million a year to an amount equal to 20 cents a vote for the highest number of votes cast for President in any one of the preceding three elections, thus raising the annual ceiling to approximately $12 million;

Reduce the number of financial reports required of political committees from four to two in nonelection years, and substitute for one of the two extra reports required immediately prior to elections one to be filed not later than 30 days following elections;

Provide that all spending reports be filed with the Clerk of the House, Secretary of the Senate, and clerk of the U.S. district court, and require that the reports be preserved for 6 years instead of 2; make them available for public inspection within 24 hours of receipt and permit them to be photographed or copied;

Include primaries, conventions, and caucuses within the scope of the reporting requirements (rollcall vote 50 to 39);

Require intrastate as well as interstate committees to report on campaign expenditures and contributions if the committee spends over $2,500 a year to influence the election of a candidate for Federal office or President or Vice President electors (rollcall vote 53 to 37);

Require every person who makes contributions of over $100 (instead of $50) in any year directly to candidates in two or more States to file reports of his contributions (voice vote);

Limit an individual's total political contributions in any year to $10,000 and prescribes criminal penalties for violations (voice vote);

Restrict spending by candidates for President to $12 million and Vice President to $6 million (voice vote);

Eliminate the requirement for a second report following first primary if candidate must participate in a runoff, thus permitting a cumulative report following second primary (voice vote);

Make the bill effective January 1, 1961 (voice vote).

Coast and Geodetic Survey

S. 2482—Public Law 86-409, Approved April 5, 1960

Remove geographical limitations on the activities of the Coast and Geodetic Survey in connection with projects designated as essential to the national interest.

The act of Congress approved August 6, 1947, limited the Survey's activities to the United States, its territories and possessions. Recent experience in many fields of scientific endeavor in connection with military activities, particularly with regard to the exploration of outer space, and the pressing need for expanded knowledge of the ocean's depths for submarine operation and defense makes it necessary for the removal of this restriction.

Commission on noxious and obscene matters

S. 3736—Passed Senate June 30, 1960; Referred to House Education and Labor July 1, 1960

Creates a commission to explore methods of combating traffic in obscene and noxious materials.

The Commission is to be made up of persons who have knowledge of the seriousness of the problem. The Commission will study the need for any new Federal regulations as well as the general need for State laws or local ordinances on the subject.

Desert land laws

H.R. 11706—Public Law 86-552, Approved June 29, 1960

Authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to extend by not more than 3 years the time within which holders of desert land entries on public lands in the lower Palo Verde Mesa, Riverside County, Calif., may complete the reclamation and cultivation of their entries as required by the Desert Land Act. A further extension of up to 3 years is also authorized if the entryman can show before the end of the first extension that he has adequate financing to complete his project during the additional period and if other requirements are met.

In addition, the law permits the acceptance of expenditures for engineering or legal expenses, including sums paid for these purposes to an organization of entrymen, as proof of the past annual expenditures for benefit of the entries required under the Desert Land Act. The minimum amount required for proof work is $1 an acre a year.

Federal Property Act

H.R. 9541—Public Law 86-591, Approved July 5, 1960

This law authorizes the Administrator of General Services to accept funds for testing articles and commodities to aid in the development of specifications and standards. It also extends the authority of the Administrator to include testing of articles or commodities offered for lease to the Federal Government.

GSA—Special police

S. 2851—Passed Senate June 23, 1960; Referred to House Government Operations June 24, 1960

This bill amends the act of June 1, 1948, by adding a new section which would authorize the Administrator of General Services, or certain officials designated by him, to appoint employees of the GSA engaged in investigative functions, to act as nonuniformed special police. The Administrator of General Services contends that nonuniformed special police are required for protecting property under the control of the General Services Administration. These employees would be empowered to enforce Federal laws to protect persons and property, and to enforce rules and regulations issued by the General Services Administrator for protection of such property. The policemen to be designated under this bill would also be authorized to make arrests without warrant for any offense constituting a felony when committed on Government property, if such police had reasonable grounds to believe that the person to be arrested is guilty of the offense.

At present, the Administrator of GSA has authority to appoint uniformed guards as special police for the protection of Federal property. He is also authorized to appoint nonuniformed policemen to make investigations within the District of Columbia, but there is no authority for the appointment of nonuniformed police for duty outside of the District of Columbia.

Greetings to Helen Keller

Senate Resolution 336—Passed Senate June 23, 1960

The Senate unanimously adopted this resolution extending greetings to Miss Helen Keller on the occasion of her 80th birthday:

The 27th day of June 1960 marks the 80th anniversary of the birth of this most remarkable and gentle lady who is loved and respected by people throughout the world.

Miss Keller was born in Tuscumbia, Ala., and was made blind and deaf by disease while still an infant. She was imprisoned, as she later called it, in a "no world." The whole world knows of the challenging inspiring story of how she emerged into womanhood and how, through her own determination and faith, and through the patient understanding and devotion of a dedicated teacher, Miss Anne Sullivan, she won her magnificent victory over darkness and defeat.

Miss Keller's personal victory turned her life and ambitions to the service of others. As she has written:

The more we try to help each other and make life brighter, the happier we shall be.

With this philosophy as her guide, Helen Keller has for more than half a century employed the symbol of her own hope and faith to the benefit of millions of her fellow handicapped in America and throughout the world.

Idaho—100th anniversary

S. 3160—Public Law 86-696, Approved September 2, 1960

This bill authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to strike and furnish to the Idaho Territorial Centennial Commission national medals to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the founding of the State of Idaho as a territory.

It provides that not more than 10,000 medals of either silver or bronze or both be struck. The medals are to be delivered as required by the commission in quantities of not less than 2,000 and no medals shall be made after December 31, 1963. The bill authorizes the manufacture and sale by the mint to the public of silver or bronze duplicates of this medal upon authorization from the Idaho Territorial Centennial Commission.

Indian lands

H.R. 4386—Public Law 86-634, Approved July 12, 1960

This act extends the protection of the Federal law, which now makes it unlawful to destroy or deface Government survey marks, to signs of warnings erected by Indian tribes either to mark the boundaries or their reservations or to indicate no trespassing on the reservations. In addition, the bill makes it unlawful to go upon Indian land for the purpose of hunting, trapping, or fishing without the consent, in the form of a license or permit for which a fee can be charged, by the Indian or tribe concerned.

James Madison Memorial

Senate Joint Resolution 128—Public Law 86-417, April 8, 1960

Establishes a James Madison Memorial Commission to formulate plans for a permanent

memorial to James Madison in Washington, D.C.

Jane Addams Centennial

House Joint Resolution 658—Public Law 86-698, Approved September 2, 1960

This resolution authorizes and requests the President to proclaim September 6, 1960, as a day upon which all Americans should pay honor and respect to Jane Addams, founder and leader of Chicago's Hull House.

John J. Pershing Centennial

House Joint Resolution 640—Public Law 86-483, Approved June 1, 1960

This joint resolution authorizes the President to proclaim September 13, 1960, the 100th anniversary of the birth of General of the Armies John J. Pershing, as a day upon which all Americans should pay honor to the general and the men who served under him.

John J. Pershing Memorial

S. 3901—Passed Senate August 31, 1960. Referred to House Administration August 31, 1960

Authorizes the American Battle Monuments Commission to provide for the erection of a memorial to the late John J. Pershing, General of the Armies of the United States, to be erected in accordance with the plans and design submitted by the Commission on federally owned land in the northwest section of the District of Columbia bounded on the north by Pennsylvania Avenue, on the south by E Street, on the west by 15th Street, and on the east by 14th Street.

The authority in this bill would cease to exist after 5 years unless the erection of the memorial has been begun and the Commission has determined that sufficient funds are available for its completion. Upon completion of the memorial, its maintenance and care would be the responsibility of the Secretary of the Interior.

The Commission would be authorized to accept from any source, public or private, money or other property for use in carrying out its functions, and to cooperate therein with interested public and private organizations.

Junior Achievers

Senate Concurrent Resolution 81—Adopted by the Senate January 26, 1960; Passed House January 28, 1960

To lend encouragement and give proper recognition to a worthwhile group and function, the Congress adopted, unanimously, a resolution authorizing the President to issue a proclamation designating the week of January 31 through February 6, 1960, as National Junior Achievement Week. All citizens were urged to salute the activities of these young people and their volunteer adult advisers.

Junior Achievement, Inc., is a nationwide, nonprofit organization organized in 1942 to provide high school students with an opportunity to learn American business methods by actually organizing and operating their own business under the sponsorship of local business corporations. Junior Achievers are recruited in public and parochial high schools throughout the country with the cooperation of school authorities.

The organization is made up of more than 30,500 teenagers and operates more than 2,000 miniature corporations in some 95 communities throughout the United States.

Juvenile Delinquency Act of 1960

S. 694—Passed Senate January 27, 1960; Referred to House Education and Labor January 28, 1960

The Senate unanimously agreed to this measure which is designed to bring to bear upon the national problem of juvenile delinquency the resources of the national Government in an effective manner.

It provides for a 5-year program of Federal assistance by authorizing an annual appropriation of up to $5 million for fiscal 1960 and each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years to demonstrate and develop improved methods for the prevention, control, and treatment of juvenile delinquency: $2.5 million is allotted for development-demonstration programs and $2.5 million for personnel training.

The Secretary of HEW is authorized to make the grants and render technical assistance to States and municipalities and to other public and private nonprofit agencies, including institutions of higher learning or research.

Establishes a 13-member National Advisory Council on Juvenile Delinquency within HEW to advise the Secretary on the administration of the act and to review and make recommendations on projects proposed for Federal assistance under the act.

Land exchange

H.R. 7681—Public Law 86-509, Approved June 11, 1960

This law transfers authority to the Secretary of Agriculture to exchange national forest lands for State-owned or private lands, to accept title on behalf of the United States to the State-owned or private lands exchanged and authority to dispose, under the Minerals Act, of common mineral materials on acquired lands, thus eliminating the dual responsibility of the Secretary of the Interior for these actions.

It reaffirms the Secretary of Interior's authority to apply the national mineral policies established by the Minerals Leasing Act, the general mining statutes and other statutes governing evaluation, reservation, and disposition of minerals on all public lands, including the national forests.

Law Day

Senate Joint Resolution 203—Passed Senate June 28, 1960; Referred to House Judiciary June 29, 1960

The purpose of this resolution is to designate the first day of May of each year as Law Day in the United States of America.

The designation of a day set aside each year as Law Day was first proposed by the American Bar Association and designated by the President of the United States on May 1, 1958. Since the 1958 designation, by Presidential proclamation, similar recognition has occurred in 1959 and 1960 by Presidential proclamation.

It is estimated that more than 75,000 separate observances were held throughout the Nation this past year. These observances have been celebrated in churches, schools, courtrooms, public auditoriums, and before civic and service clubs.

Legislative jurisdiction exercised by United States

S. 1617—Passed Senate May 25, 1960; Referred to House Government Operations May 31, 1960

This bill permits Federal agencies to restore to the States certain jurisdictional authority now vested in the United States, which may better be administered by State authorities, and to acquire only jurisdiction necessary in connection with future land procurement. Once legislative jurisdiction has been vested in the United States, it cannot be revested in the States other than by operation of a limitation imposed by the State at the time the State granted jurisdiction, or by an act of Congress.

This bill declares it to be the policy of Congress that—

"The Federal Government will receive or retain on that measure of legislative jurisdiction over federally owned or operated land areas within the States as may be necessary for the proper performance of Federal functions.

"To the extent consistent with the purposes for which the land is held by the United States, the Federal Government is to avoid receiving or retaining concurrent jurisdiction or any measure of exclusive legislative jurisdiction."

The overall objective is to provide that, in any case, the Federal Government may not receive or retain any of the States' legislative jurisdiction relative to qualifications for voting, education, public health and safety, taxation, marriage, divorce, descent and distribution of property and a variety of other matters which are ordinarily the subject of State control.

Library of Congress—Additional building

House Joint Resolution 352—Public Law 86-469, Approved May 14, 1960

Authorizes the Architect of the Capitol to prepare preliminary plans and estimates of cost for an additional building for the Library of Congress under the direction and supervision of the Joint Committee on the Library.

The Library of Congress, one of the leading research libraries in the world, must add substantial numbers of publications to its collections each year in order to maintain its effectiveness. This new building will house the Copyright Office and the Processing Department which will acquire and process materials for the Library's collections; the branch Government Printing Office which works closely with the Processing Department in printing catalog cards, binding books, and laminating maps and manuscripts; the Legislative Reference Service; the Division for the Blind; the collections, staffs, and reading rooms of the Manuscript Division; the Map Division; the bound newspaper collection and the microfilm collection with their related reading rooms and staffs; and the motion picture collection.

Medal awards

H.R. 5569—Public Law 86-582, Approved July 5, 1960

This law permits the award of certain medals in cases where the appropriate Secretary determines that the recommendation for the award was made within the prescribed time period, but that no award was made because of loss of the recommendation or inadvertence.

Under existing law applicable to the Army and the Air Force, recommendations for military service awards must be made within 2 years after the act justifying the award, and the award itself must be made within 3 years of the act. For the Navy, the recommendation must be made within 3 years of the act and the award made within 5 years of the act.

There are some cases in which recommendations were made within the prescribed period, but no awards were made on the basis of these recommendations because of loss or inadvertence. In these cases, this bill permits award of the medal if the appropriate Secretary determined that (1) a statement of the act or service and recommending the award was made and supported by sufficient evidence within the statutory period, and (2) no award was made because the recommendation was lost or through inadvertence was not acted upon. The award must be made within 2 years of the Secretary's determination.

Medals—Posthumously

S. 2969—Public Law 86-656, Approved July 14, 1960

This measure authorizes the posthumous award of appropriate medals and certificates to Chaplain George L. Fox, of Cambridge, Vt.; Chaplain Alexander D. Goode, of Washington, D.C.; Chaplain Clark V. Poling, of Schenectady, N.Y.; and Chaplain John P. Washington, of Arlington, N.J., for their

heroism aboard the U.S. troopship *Dorchester* when it was sunk by an enemy torpedo on February 3, 1943.

National Armed Forces Museum Advisory Board

S. 3846—Passed Senate August 31, 1960

Establishes in the Smithsonian Institution a National Armed Forces Museum Advisory Board, which would provide advice and assistance to the Regents of the Smithsonian Institution on portrayal of exhibits depicting the contributions which the Armed Forces of the United States have made to American society and culture.

The Board would be composed of 11 members, including the Secretary of Defense (ex officio), the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution (ex officio), and 9 members appointed by the President of the United States. The members would serve without compensation but would be reimbursed for necessary expenses.

National Public Works Week

Senate Joint Resolution 202—Passed Senate June 28, 1960; Referred to House Judiciary June 29, 1960

The purpose of this resolution is to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation designating the 7-day period commencing October 2, 1960, as National Public Works Week, and calling upon the people of the United States to celebrate the week with appropriate activities and ceremonies.

The establishment of National Public Works Week is an effective means of explaining the role public works engineering and administration play in the lives of every American family, and particularly those living in urban communities. Due to the vital nature of public works and its importance to most Americans, mass media can be expected to help carry its message to its audiences. The designation of a Public Works Week will focus attention on the public works program whose services are dedicated to the health and well-being of the citizens of the Nation. It is felt that this program will help to arouse an interest in the young people of this Nation to pursue careers in the public service inasmuch as that service needs topflight men of imagination, vision, and foresight in the field of public works.

National Voters' Day

Senate Joint Resolution 186—Passed Senate June 28, 1960; Referred to House Judiciary June 29, 1960

This resolution authorizes and directs the President of the United States to issue a proclamation designating the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November of each year as National Voters' Day, calling upon Federal, State, and local governments, civic, industrial, and business groups, and upon the people of the United States to observe the day with appropriate activities and ceremonies.

The aim of this resolution by designating the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November of each year as National Voters' Day would be to encourage not only national efforts, by Governors, mayors, industry, business, labor, fraternal, service, women's, and other civically oriented groups to support voter education campaigns. It is hoped that these programs will educate people on the issues in a campaign, on the candidates and their qualifications, on the mechanism of voting, such as marking ballots and using voting machines, informing eligible voters of, and encouraging them to meet, registration requirements; educating potential voters on the processes of government and the value of citizen support; participation in, and, if advisable, constructive opposition, and launching a counterattack on the trend toward apathy now among the major causes keeping almost 50 percent of the eligible voters away from the polls.

Navajo Indians

S. 2878—Passed Senate March 29, 1960; Referred to House Interior March 30, 1960

The primary purpose of this measure is to convey in fee simple certain federally owned lands excluding mineral rights, located within the State of New Mexico to the Navajo Tribe of Indians. It also adjusts and simplifies the administration of certain other federally owned lands located near Gallup, N. Mex.

Enactment of this measure will permit the tribe and the Bureau of Land Management of the Department of the Interior to initiate a comprehensive management program which will result in better conservation practices.

Payment for lands conveyed to United States

H.R. 9142—Public Law 86-596, Approved July 6, 1960

The principal purposes of this law are (1) to provide compensation for land conveyed or relinquished to the United States during the years 1897–1905 under the act of June 4, 1897, in cases in which the lands or other rights which the owners were entitled to receive under this 1897 act and supplementary legislation have not already been given them; (2) to make inapplicable to the owners, their heirs and assigns a later provision of law directing the Secretary of the Interior, upon request, to return the original lands; and (3) thus to correct defects in the law under which such parties are now laying claim to valuable lands within the national forests and parks and taking them out of Federal ownership.

Presidential office space

S. 3524—Passed Senate September 1, 1960

This bill authorizes the establishment of a Commission on Presidential Office Space. The Commission would be composed of seven members, two Senators to be appointed by the President of the Senate, two Representatives appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and three persons appointed by the President of the United States from the executive branch or from private life. Commission members appointed from the Congress and the executive branch would serve without additional compensation.

It would be the duties of the Commission, after consultation with the President occupying the White House at that time, to approve all design and construction plans, determine the methods for selecting and approve the selection of the architect, and to utilize the services of the Office, Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, to the maximum practicable extent in awarding contracts for the construction work and in supervising the progress of the design and construction work. The work performed by the Chief of Engineers would be on a reimbursable basis. Measures would be taken to assure that all lumber, fixtures, and other materials removed from the Executive Mansion or other buildings are carefully examined to determine their historical value and their proper preservation and distribution. Reports on progress of the work would be submitted to the Congress and the President from time to time, but at least once annually. Upon conclusion of its work, the Commission would promptly submit a final report, and would cease to exist 30 days after such submission.

Public lands for recreational use

S. 2757—Public Law 86-755, Approved September 13, 1960

Under existing law, the Recreation and Public Purposes Act of 1926, conveyances of certain public lands to States for recreational purposes may be made each year in the amount of 6,400 acres, embraced in not more than three sites. This maximum is doubled for the calendar years 1960, 1961, and 1962.

Certain States applied for land under the act in 1959, but for various reasons those applications could not be granted during that period of time, and the States were unable to obtain the acreage allowed for 1959. This bill permits these States to obtain the 6,400 acres for three sites authorized for 1959 and also to take care of similar contingencies which might arise in the future.

The effect of this bill is to provide that if any State fails in any one calendar year to secure the maximum acreage permitted for that year because pending applications could not be processed by the Department of the Interior during the calendar year additional conveyances may be made to that State pursuant to applications on file with the Secretary on the last day of that year, and the additional conveyances will be charged against the limitations for that year rather than for the year in which the conveyances are actually made.

Publication payments

S. 3579—Passed Senate June 18, 1960—Referred to House Government Operations June 20, 1960

This bill amends existing law to provide governmentwide uniform authority for Federal departments and agencies to make advance payment for subscription or other charges for publications which they require, but which do not fall within the category of newspapers, magazines, or periodicals.

Section 3648 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 529) prohibits advance payment for articles purchased by the Federal Government in the absence of specific statutory authority. The act of June 12, 1930, provides general authority for advance payments of subscription charges for "newspapers, magazines, and other periodicals." However, the Comptroller General has ruled that the language of that act does not cover charges for "publications" which do not fall into the category of "periodicals." Under existing law, however, special authority has been provided for the Department of Agriculture, the Department of the Army, and the Veterans' Administration.

This bill amends the act of June 12, 1930, to provide Government-wide authority for the advance payment of subscription "or other charges" for newspapers, magazines, periodicals, and "other publications." It also repeals those statutes providing special authority for the advance payment for subscriptions to publications to provide uniform authority for all departments and agencies.

Reimburse owners and tenants of lands for moving expenses

S. 2583—Passed Senate June 3, 1960; Referred to House Government Operations June 6, 1960

Establishes a uniform and acceptable reimbursement policy to pay expenses and losses incurred by individuals who are forced to vacant their homes or land which was acquired for use by the Federal Government.

Right of States to select certain public lands

S. 2959—Public Law 86-786, Approved September 14, 1960

This bill clarifies the right of States, including the State of Alaska, to select certain public lands as indemnity selections even though the lands are subject to outstanding mineral leases or permits.

Under existing law the States are permitted to select lands which are under a mineral lease or permit but subject to the requirement that selections must include all the lands subject to that lease or permit. None of the lands subject to that lease or permit may be selected, however, if they are in a producing or a producible status.

It is often the case that many oil and gas leaseholds include within their geographical boundaries certain lands to which the United States does not have title. This fact prevents the States from selecting any of the lands under existing law. This bill amends the present laws governing State selections to permit the States to select some of the lands subject to a lease or permit without having to select all of the lands subject to that lease or permit. It further provides that if a State should select such lands it would receive them subject to a reservation to the United States of the minerals for which the lease or permit was issued until the termination of the lease or permit. The revenues from the development of reserved minerals are to continue to be received by the United States and distributed as provided by existing law.

Robert Frost Medal

S. 3439—Public Law 86-747, Approved September 13, 1960

This measure authorizes the President of the United States to present in the name of Congress an appropriate gold medal to Robert Frost in recognition of his poetry which has enriched our culture and the philosophy of the world.

It authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to strike a gold medal and also authorizes an appropriation of $2,500.

Secret Service—Presidential successors

S. 3366—Passed Senate May 26, 1960; Referred to House Judiciary May 27, 1960

This measure is designed to close gaps that exist in connection with threats against the successors to the Presidency and to authorize their protection by the Secret Service.

Present law provides penalties for threats against the President-elect and the Vice President of the United States and authorizes their protection by the U.S. Secret Service, but does not take care of the situation that would occur in the event of the death or disability of either the President or Vice President, or both. Nor does existing law provide protection for the Vice President-elect while he is waiting to assume office after his election. This legislation remedies this lack of coverage by making the threat and protection provisions coextensive with the possibilities of succession to the Presidency.

Existing law authorizes the full-time protection of the President but provides protection of the Vice President only upon his request. It would seem that part-time protection is ineffectual since anyone with a premeditated design to harm the Vice President would be expected to execute his plan at a time when no Secret Service protection was afforded. This legislation removes the discretion of the Vice President.

Small towns and rural counties

S. 3140—Passed Senate May 26, 1960; Referred to House Government Operations May 27, 1960

This measure establishes a 20-member bipartisan Commission on problems of small towns and rural counties.

The Commission is authorized to make a full and complete investigation and study of Federal policies and programs relating to the needs and problems of the Nation's smalltown and rural county areas. It is to study the needs, present and future, related to highways, public services, water resources, schools, recreation, financing, law enforcement, and business and industrial development.

The Commission is to determine the capabilities of State, county, and local governments to meet the needs and seek means of improving coordination of Federal, State, county, and local policies. It is to investigate the possibilities of the Federal Government encouraging wider dispersal of Government procurement operations, the location of Federal facilities as well as other matters which may be of assistance in solving the various problems of, and promoting the social and economic well-being of the Nation's smalltown and rural county areas.

The Commission is to report its findings and recommendations to the President and to Congress on or before February 1, 1962.

Theodore Roosevelt memorial

H.R. 8665—Public Law 86-764, Approved September 13, 1960

The present section 3 of the act entitled "An act to establish a memorial to Theodore Roosevelt in the National Capital," approved May 21, 1932, authorizes the Director of the National Park Service to permit the Roosevelt Memorial Association to erect on Theodore Roosevelt Island a monument or memorial to the memory of Theodore Roosevelt to be approved by the association, by the Commission of Fine Arts, and the National Capital Planning Commission, and to be erected at private expense.

The purpose of this measure is to amend section 3 to provide that the monument or memorial be erected under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior and that the cost of the project be defrayed by public funds. The Department of the Interior estimates that it would cost $886,400 to complete the monument and related structures on Theodore Roosevelt Island.

One hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary, U.S. Constitution

House Joint Resolution 605—Public Law 86-650, Approved July 14, 1960

Creates a 12-member commission to prepare plans for the celebration of the 175th anniversary of the Federal Constitution and to coordinate the plans of various State and civic groups.

Members of the Commission will be the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House. In addition, each of the above will appoint three other members.

Variety Artists Week

Senate Joint Resolution 168—Passed Senate June 7, 1960; Referred to House Judiciary June 8, 1960

In recognition of the untiring efforts of artists who supply us with entertainment, this resolution designates the week of October 2-8, 1960, as National American Guild of Variety Artists Week.

Wilsons Creek battlefield, Missouri

H.R. 725—Public Law 86-434, Approved April 22, 1960

This measure establishes the Wilsons Creek Battlefield National Park to commemorate the Battle of Wilsons Creek, sometimes called Oak Hill by the Confederates. The battle, fought on August 10, 1861, was a struggle between the Confederate and Union forces in Missouri for control of the State in the first year of the Civil War.

The site of this Civil War battlefield is some 10 miles southwest of Springfield, Mo.

Woodrow Wilson Memorial Commission

Senate Joint Resolution 152—Passed Senate June 28, 1960; Referred to House Administration June 29, 1960

Establishes a Woodrow Wilson Memorial Commission for the purpose of considering and formulating plans for the design, construction, and location of a permanent memorial to Woodrow Wilson in the District of Columbia.

The Commission is to be composed of the following members:

1. Former Presidents of the United States, at their pleasure;

2. Two persons to be appointed by the President of the United States;

3. Two Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate;

4. Two Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives;

5. Three members to be appointed by the President of the United States, one from each of the following: (a) The Woodrow Wilson Foundation; (b) the Woodrow Wilson Centennial Commission; and (c) the Director of the National Park Service or his representative.

The Commission selects a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members. Vacancies in membership would be filled in the same manner as the original appointment. The members serve without compensation, but to be reimbursed for necessary expenses.

At the earliest practicable date the Commission is to report its plans and recommendations to the President and to Congress, in the interim submitting annual reports on its progress.

There is authorized to be appropriated not more than $10,000 to carry out the provisions of the joint resolution.

Youth Appreciation Week

Senate Joint Resolution 181—Passed Senate June 2, 1960; Referred to House Judiciary June 3, 1960

This resolution designates the 7-day period beginning on the second Monday of November of each year as Youth Appreciation Week, and requests the President to issue annually a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe this week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

This is intended to strike at the recurring problem of juvenile delinquency by stimulating participation in religious and civic activities.

HEALTH

Air pollution problems

S. 3108—Passed Senate June 28, 1960; Referred to House Interstate June 29, 1960

The purpose of this bill is to authorize the Surgeon General to make investigations and to hold public hearings on air pollution problems which are interstate in nature and of broad significance.

Air pollution study

H.R. 8238—Public Law 86-493, Approved June 8, 1960

This measure authorizes the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service to conduct a study of the effect on human health of substances discharged into the atmosphere by the exhausts of motor vehicles.

Requires the Surgeon General to submit a report to Congress within 2 years with findings and recommendations.

Gorgas Memorial Laboratory

S. 3179—Public Law 86-617, Approved July 12, 1960

This law increases the construction authorization by $250,000 for facilities at Gorgas Memorial Laboratory in the Republic of Panama.

Gorgas is well known for its research work in malaria, yellow fever, and virus diseases. It is considered an important center for field and laboratory studies, not only by its own staff but by visiting scientists, and is one of the very few such centers under American auspices in the American tropics.

Narcotics Manufacturing Act of 1960

H.R. 529—Public Law 86-429, Approved April 22, 1960

This law gives full effect to treaty obligations of the United States to limit exclusively to medical and scientific purposes the manufacture of narcotic drugs and to require that their manufacture be restricted to properly licensed persons and premises.

It also amends the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act to bring the regulation of exports in conformity with current treaty ob-

ligations, and to permit importing and exporting of certain narcotic drugs for scientific research.

Practical-nurse training

S. 3025—Passed Senate May 26, 1960; H.R. 11893—House Calendar

This bill extends to June 30, 1965, the Federal-State program of training practical nurses under the authority of the Vocational Education Act of 1946. Provides authority for the appropriation of up to $5 million of grants a year to be matched by States with State plans for practical-nurse training.

It includes Guam as a participant under the act and provides that Hawaii and Alaska be treated as States.

Public health—graduate training

H.R. 6871—Public Law 86-720, Approved September 8, 1960

This legislation expands and strengthens graduate public health training by—

Authorizing a new 5-year program of project grants, up to $2 million a year, to schools of public health and schools of nursing and engineering which provide graduate or specialized training in public health; and

Extending, without time limit, the present authority of the Surgeon General to make grants-in-aid up to $1 million a year to schools of public health.

U.S. nationals—Care and treatment

S. 2331—Public Law 86-571, Approved July 5, 1960

This law makes systematic provision for hospitalizing nationals of the United States who are returned to this country because of mental illness. It authorizes the Secretary of HEW, upon application of the Secretary of State (1) to receive, and temporarily care for and hospitalize, pending arrangements for suitable continuing care and treatment, mentally ill nationals certified by the State Department; and (2) assume responsibility for continuing care and hospitalization until such time as the State of residence or legal domicile can be ascertained and arrangements made for transfer and release of the person to the appropriate State, or to a relative who has agreed in writing to assume the responsibility.

HOUSING

NASA housing

S. 3226—Public Law 86-578, Approved July 5, 1960

This measure extends the provisions of section 809 of the National Housing Act to essential civilian employees at installations transferred from the Department of Defense to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

This section was added to the National Housing Act in 1956 to help solve the housing problems of essential civilian employees of the armed services at research and development installations. This special program was necessary because in some instances homes built for the employees in towns near or adjacent to installations would be above and beyond those needed for the normal economic growth of the community.

In the opinion of FHA, homes built in excess of those needed for normal growth of a community cannot meet the test of economic soundness required by statute as a prerequisite for FHA mortgage insurance. Section 809 permits the economic soundness test to be waived in these cases.

Omnibus Act of 1960

S. 3670—Passed Senate June 16, 1960; H.R. 12603—House Calendar

This omnibus bill provides for a $1.2 billion housing measure which:

Authorizes the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to undertake a research and study program identifying the solutions to problems involved in construction improvements, methods, and costs.

Permits the FHA Commissioner to insure mortgages secured by housing which is being used for testing advanced technology in housing design, materials, or construction. Limits the insurance to $300,000 a year.

Extends the home repair and improvement program to October 1, 1961, and removes the ceiling on the loan authorization.

Gives the FHA Commissioner discretion to reduce mortgage insurance premiums on programs to one-fourth of 1 percent a year.

Creates the position of Assistant Commissioner for Cooperative Housing.

Permits the Commissioner to exercise discretion as to the extent and period of disqualification of an investor-sponsor identified with an FHA cooperative housing project which failed to meet the requirement that it be sold to a cooperative.

Increases FHA general insurance by $4 billion—existing authorization is $37.8 billion.

Permits FHA to insure multifamily projects secured by buildings in which individual units are owned separately from the whole.

Increases by $25 million the authority to appropriate funds for direct loans to provide housing for the elderly.

Increases by $350 million the capital grant authorization for urban renewal.

Increases the amount that any one State may obtain of the capital grant authorization to 12½ percent of the total authorization, plus a portion of the $150 million reserve fund.

Includes any State-licensed hospital within the provisions of the act.

Increases by $150 million FNMA special assistance fund which is subject to Presidential allocation; and increases by $25 million the special assistance fund for the purchase of cooperative loans insured by FHA.

Increases by $500 million the college housing loan authorization; by $50 million "other educational facilities"; by $50 million the ceiling for student-nurse and intern housing.

Increases by $100 million the public facility loan authorization.

Continues VA direct home loan program for 1 year, and continues the provision in existing law which increases the loan fund by $150 million annually.

Continues the farm housing program for 2 years, and authorizes increases in the loan fund up to $74 million.

Stopgap housing

House Joint Resolution 784—Public Law 86-788, Approved September 14, 1960

This three-point stopgap housing measure, cleared for the President on August 31, 1960, extends the Federal Housing Administration's home improvement loan program for 1 year—through October 1, 1961. It also authorizes an additional $500 million for college housing and $50 million for the public facility loan program of the Community Facilities Administration.

IMMIGRATION

Refugee immigration

House Joint Resolution 397—Public Law 86-648, Approved July 14, 1960

Authorizes resettlement of refugees in the United States under the mandate of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. Under the bill the Attorney General can admit, of the estimated 28,000 or less refugee-escapees in Western Europe, one-fourth of the total number resettled by other countries.

Detailed provisions:

Authorizes parole admission into the United States refugee escapees who, when application is made, are not within a Communist-dominated country, are not a national of the country from which they apply, and who fall under the mandate of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees.

Directs the Secretary of State to inform the Attorney General the number of refugee-escapees resettled between July 1, 1959, and June 30, 1960, by other nations and, on each succeeding January 1 and July 1, the number of refugee-escapees resettled within the preceding 6 months.

Requires the refugees to qualify for admission under the terms of existing immigration law, and requires the Attorney General to submit to Congress by January 15 and June 15 of each year a detailed statement concerning each refugee admitted under the program.

Authorizes the Attorney General to include 500 handicapped, difficult-to-resettle refugees, limited to those of good moral character who are not institutional cases.

Authorizes the exclusion or deportation of an alien convicted of illicit possession of marihuana.

Permits an alien admitted to the United States with nonimmigrant status to qualify for permanent residence without leaving the country to obtain an immigrant visa.

Increases by 500 the number of special nonquota visas available for Portuguese nationals from the Azores and adds a year's annual quota (3,136) to the number of special visas available for Netherlands nationals expelled from Indonesia; extends the expiration date for issuance of the visas to June 30, 1962.

Extended to June 30, 1961, the special program for admission of alien orphans.

Terminates the program on July 1, 1962, or earlier, if either the House or Senate within 90 days of the Attorney General's report adopts a resolution stating the program be discontinued.

JUDICIAL

Sentence reduction

S. 2932—Public Law 86-691, Approved September 2, 1960

This law provides for reducing sentences of imprisonment imposed upon persons held in custody while awaiting trial by the time spent in custody.

The primary purpose is to eliminate disparity in sentences under certain statutes requiring mandatory terms of imprisonment. Under existing law, a person charged with violating a statute requiring a minimum mandatory sentence may not be credited with the time spent in custody for want of bail while awaiting trial. The result is that a sentencing court lacks authority to differentiate between the offender who has been free on bail before trial and one who has been in custody, because it is required to impose the same minimum mandatory sentence as to each.

Application of the proviso contained in the bill, where credit is due, preserves the existing statutory provision that service of sentence commences after sentence is imposed and commitment occurs. Computation of sentence involves determination of the date of eligibility for release by crediting the sentence imposed with good-time allowance at the rate applicable, plus the period of presentence custody for want of bail. (In short, for purposes of the records the sentence imposed stands intact and it becomes effective as under existing law, with duration subject to the credits just referred to.)

Supreme Court—Recess appointments

Senate Resolution 334—Adopted by Senate August 29, 1960

This resolution expresses as the sense of the Senate that recess appointments to the U.S. Supreme Court may not be wholly consistent with the best interests of the Court, the nominee, the litigants before the Court, nor the people of the United States and, therefore, such appointments should not be made except under unusual circumstances and to prevent or end a demonstrable breakdown in the administration of the Court's business.

LABOR

Coal mine safety amendment

S. 743—Passed Senate April 27, 1960; House Calendar

This measure amends the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act to make it applicable to all coal mines regardless of size.

The Federal Coal Mine Safety Act is designed to prevent disasters from mine explosions, mine fires, mine inundation, and man-trip and man-hoist accidents, by making mandatory compliance with the mine safety provisions of the act. To accomplish compliance, the Bureau of Mines' inspectors are authorized to issue orders of withdrawal in the event of imminent danger of a fire, explosion, inundation, man-trip or man-hoist accident, or for failure to correct a violation within a reasonable time. The act prohibits the workmen from reentering violations corrected, and the order annulled.

Under the act (prior to this amendment) these provisions were not applicable to those mines employing 14 or fewer individuals underground. Thus, the Director of the Bureau of Mines had authority only to make annual or necessary inspections and investigations for the purpose of obtaining certain information relating to health and safety conditions. This amendment extends the mandatory provisions to all underground mines.

Depressed areas

S. 722—Vetoed May 13, 1960

This measure, the depressed areas bill, authorizes Federal grants and loans totaling $251 million for the relief of chronically depressed industrial and rural areas. This bill, as passed by the Senate in 1959, authorized $389.5 million.

As sent to the President, the measure—

Created an Area Redevelopment Administration within the executive branch, and an Area Redevelopment Advisory Board to advise the Administrator.

Authorized the Administrator to designate two types of redevelopment areas—industrial and rural—in the United States. Requires the Administrator to designate as a rural redevelopment area any county which is among the 500 counties in the United States ranked lowest in level of living of farm-operator families, or which is among the 500 counties having the highest percentage of commercial farms producing less than $2,500 worth of products for sale annually.

Directed the Administrator to designate as industrial redevelopment areas those which have suffered 12 percent unemployment during the entire year preceding the application, or 9 percent unemployment during 15 out of the preceding 18 months, or 6 percent unemployment during 18 out of the preceding 24 months. In addition to these mandatory requirements, the Administrator may designate any area which in his judgment suffers from serious unemployment of other than a temporary nature.

Authorized an appropriation of $150 million for loans—$75 million as a revolving fund for industrial projects in industrial redevelopment areas and $75 million as a revolving fund for industrial projects in rural redevelopment areas.

Limited the Federal loan to 65 percent of the project cost. Requires that 10 percent of the total cost be supplied by the State or local government or by community or area organization, and not less than 5 percent of the total cost must be supplied by a nongovernmental source. Limited loans to 30 years and required an interest rate of one-half of 1 percent above the Treasury rate.

Authorized an additional $50 million appropriation for loans to State or local governments or Indian tribes for construction and improvement of public facilities in industrial and rural redevelopment areas. Authorizes an appropriation of $35 million for public facility grants.

Authorized an annual appropriation of $4.5 million for technical assistance to redevelopment areas including studies evaluating the needs of and development potentiality for economic growth of these areas.

Amended the Housing Act of 1949 to make available urban renewal benefits under that act to a community when the Area Redevelopment Administrator designates the area as an industrial redevelopment area.

Authorized annual appropriations of $1.5 million for vocational training programs in redevelopment areas, and an additional $10 million for unemployment compensation to these trainees for a period not to exceed 13 weeks.

Minimum wage

H.R. 12677—In Conference

This measure amends the Fair Labor Standards Act and its principal provisions would—

Increase the hourly minimum wage for 23.7 million workers presently covered from $1 to $1.15 in 1961, $1.20 in 1962, and $1.25 in 1963.

Extend minimum wage and overtime protection as follows: 1961, $1 an hour and no overtime; 1962, $1.05 an hour and a 44-hour workweek; 1963, $1.15 an hour and a 42-hour workweek; thereafter, $1.25 an hour and a 40-hour workweek.

Extend coverage to 4 million additional employees of—

(a) Laundry and drycleaning and retail and service enterprises with annual gross sales of $1 million or more and engaged in activities affecting interstate commerce;

(b) Local transit companies for minimum wages only;

(c) Establishments which have annual sales of $250,000 or more (some of these employees are already covered by existing law); or $350,000 or more if engaged in construction work (some of these employees are already covered);

(d) Gasoline service stations which have $250,000 or more in annual gross sales;

(e) Laundries having $250,000 or more in gross annual sales if they were in substantial competition with laundries doing more than half their business across State lines.

Exempt from coverage by this measure:

All employees of hotels, motels, restaurants;

Automobile and farm implement dealers;

Parent, spouse, or child of owner if they are the only employees;

Employees of individual retail stores doing less than $250,000 in annual business;

Motion picture theater employees;

Switchboard operators of independently owned exchanges of 750 telephone stations or less;

Seasonal recreation and amusement establishments.

Exempt from coverage by existing law:

Outside salesmen;

Employees engaged in catching, initial processing, and unloading of seafood;

All agricultural workers;

Employees of local weekly, semiweekly, or daily newspapers with circulation of 4,000 or less;

Employees engaged in canning or processing agricultural commodities or dairy products;

Cab drivers;

Employees of small telegraph exchanges;

Lumbering operations employing 12 or less.

Exempt from overtime coverage by this measure:

Seamen on American-flag vessels;

Local transit employees;

Automobile salesmen;

Gasoline service-station employees;

Small area broadcasters.

Exempt from overtime coverage by existing law:

Certain motor carrier, railroad, pipeline, and air carrier employees;

Employees processing and canning fish;

Outside buyers of poultry, eggs, cream, or milk.

Increase minimum wage rates in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands by 15 percent in 1961 with special provision for appeals in hardship cases, and an additional 5 percent in each of next 2 years.

Amendments effective January 1, 1961.

NATURAL RESOURCES

Arizona-Nevada compact

S. 3433—Passed Senate August 25, 1960; Referred to House Judiciary August 26, 1960

This bill gives congressional consent to a compact recently made between the States of Arizona and Nevada. The purpose of the compact is to establish a boundary between the States along the Colorado River between the point where the Nevada-California boundary intersects the 35th degree of latitude north and Davis Dam. It also provides, in section 2, that "The right to alter, amend, or repeal this Act is expressly reserved."

Bardwell Reservoir, Tex.

S. 601—Public Law 86-399, Approved March 31, 1960

This law provides for the construction and operation of Bardwell Reservoir on Waxahachie Creek in Texas. The reservoir will provide flood control for Waxahachie Creek and for the downstream reaches of the Trinity River that have been affected by floods on the creek. It will also provide water conservation and storage for the cities of Waxahachie, Ennis, and Corsicana.

Total cost of the project is $6,992,000 for construction and $40,000 for annual operating and maintenance costs. Of this total, about 28 percent, or $1,899,000, will be met by local interests.

Flood control benefits from Bardwell Reservoir are estimated at $172,620 along Waxahachie and related creeks and $64,130 along the Trinity River downstream.

Central Valley project—San Luis unit

S. 44—Public Law 86-488, Approved June 3, 1960

This measure authorizes the Department of the Interior to construct and maintain the San Luis Dam and Reservoir under a cost-sharing agreement with the State of California and under Federal reclamation laws. This project will irrigate approximately 500,000 acres of land in Merced, Fresno, and King Counties.

January 1, 1962, was set as the final date for negotiating an agreement with California, following which a Federal project could be built, provided 90 days' notice was given to Congress.

Authorizes $290,430,000 for construction of the unit. Of this amount $192,650,000 will cover distribution systems and drains that local interests do not build, and funds for operation and maintenance.

Prohibits production of surplus price-supported crops on newly irrigated lands serviced by the Federal project.

Cheney division—Wichita project, Kansas

S. 1092—Public Law 86-787, Approved September 14, 1960

This measure authorizes the Federal construction of the Cheney division of the Wichita reclamation project, a multiple-purpose water resource development, in the Ninnescah River Basin, southwest Kansas, at a total estimated cost of $26,024,000, with Federal expenditures estimated at approximately $18 million. Of this amount $7,022,000 is reimbursable.

The principal features of the Cheney division include the Cheney Dam and Reser-

voir, the pumping plant and pipeline to the city of Wichita. Only the dam and reservoir will be financed and constructed by the Federal Government.

Coal research

H.R. 3375—Public Law 86-599, Approved July 7, 1960

This law establishes the basis for a new and expanded program of coal research and development by the Department of the Interior, to be carried out through various means, including particularly contracts with State and local research agencies and private organizations. Technical advisory committees may be established to assist in the program as administered by a Director of Coal Research.

Reports will be submitted to the President and the Congress annually, and all information as to uses, products, processes, and patents which flow from the research will be available to the general public (with such exceptions and limitations, if any, as the Secretary may find to be necessary in the interest of national defense).

It is intended that an Office of Coal Research be established within the Department of the Interior. This Office will be directly responsible to the Secretary and will have the following functions:

(a) Planning a comprehensive coal research program;

(b) Promoting the coordination of all private and governmental research projects;

(c) Developing, in conjunction with the advisory committees, specific projects which would be recommended directly to the Secretary of the Interior; and

(d) Negotiating and being responsible for the successful conclusion of contracts made by the Secretary with the trade associations, educational institutions, and appropriate responsible State agencies.

Provides for the appointment of a Director of Coal Research and prescribes his annual basic compensation.

Columbia Basin project

Senate Joint Resolution 162—Passed Senate April 11, 1960; Referred to House Interior April 12, 1960

Authorizes the Secretary of the Interior during calendar years 1960 and 1961 to deliver irrigation water on the Columbia Basin project, continue necessary drainage construction, and pave the way for the completion of amendatory repayment contracts.

The 2-year moratorium was caused by the repayment problem which has resulted from agricultural and related economic conditions beyond the control of the individual new settlers.

Conejas Water Conservancy District of Colorado

H.R. 6516—Public Law 86-404, Approved April 4, 1960

This law grants congressional approval to a supplemental repayment contract, under the reclamation law, between the United States and the Conejas Water Conservancy District of Colorado.

The principal objectives of the amendatory contract are to extend the development period before repayment begins for an additional 5 years and to provide a variable repayment plan based upon the availability of irrigation water. It does not change the basic repayment obligation of $2,500,000, which covers the irrigation costs of Platoro Dam and Reservoir, the principal features of the project.

Construction of the dam and reservoir was completed in 1951, but the project facilities have not been used to irrigate district lands because of unprecedented drought conditions and Colorado's position under the Rio Grande compact. Under these circumstances, the Conejas Water Conservancy District could not meet the repayment requirements of its existing contract which called for payment of construction charges to start in December of 1958.

Dalles Federal reclamation project, Oregon

S. 2195—Public Law 86-745, Approved September 13, 1960

Authorizes Federal construction of the western division of the Dalles reclamation project in Oregon designed to irrigate some 3,000 acres of nonirrigated land and another 2,300 acres of partially irrigated land in a semiarid area.

The total cost estimate is approximately $5.6 million, which is reimbursable with the possible exception of about $18,000.

Fish and wildlife—Research and education

S. 1781—Public Law 86-686, Approved September 2, 1960

This act is designed to stablize a nationwide program that has been in existence since 1935 and presently is being administered in the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

The cooperative wildlife research unit program grew out of the acute need for facts on which to base sound wildlife management, for trained professional manpower to implement research findings and carry out effective management programs, for education and demonstration activities to bring about improved public understanding and appreciation of wildlife problems and practices, and for technical assistance to conservation agencies.

There are presently 16 cooperative wildlife research units located at land-grant colleges and universities. Nearly 3,000 advanced degrees have been awarded young men and women who have undertaken collegiate study and training in the colleges and universities which have participated in the programs.

This measure continues the authority of the Department of Interior to carry on this worthwhile program.

Fort Belknap Indian irrigation project

S. 1889—Passed Senate May 25, 1960; House Calendar

This measure authorizes the transfer of project works in three units of the Fort Belknap Indian irrigation project to an organization of landowners whose lands are served by the units. Following the conveyance, the landowners will be completely responsible for the operation and maintenance of the works.

The project is comprised of seven units totaling approximately 24,000 irrigable acres; however, actual irrigated land varies from 12,000 to 18,000 acres annually depending upon the availability of water. The three units affected are Big Warm Springs, the upper Peoples Creek, and the lower Peoples Creek. In hese three units there is a total of 7,637 acres of irrigated land. The bill also cancels delinquent operation and maintenance charges amounting to $24,511.41.

Helium Act amendments

H.R. 10548—Public Law 86-777, Approved September 13, 1960

The primary objective of this legislation is to furnish authority to the Department of the Interior to carry out an effective, long-range program for the production, distribution, and storage of helium in order to assure a sustained supply, taking into account supplies from other sources, to meet essential Government needs. Provision is made for cooperation by the Department of Defense and the Atomic Energy Commission. The measure also clarifies and perfects certain of the existing provisions of the Helium Act.

This measure provides essentially for a conservation program and envisions the possible construction of up to 12 new plants located on helium-bearing gas pipelines to extract the helium that would otherwise be wasted from the gas before this combustible gas goes to fuel markets. The helium extracted would then be stored underground in the Government-owned Cliffside gasfield near Amarillo, Tex., until needed in the future. Other underground storage areas could be utilized as needed.

The legislation provides for industry being invited to participate in the program by financing, building, and operating plants to separate helium from natural gas, with the helium then being purchased and conserved by the Government through the Department of the Interior.

Historical and archeological data—Preservation

S. 1185—Public Law 86-523, Approved June 27, 1960

The Historic Sites Act of 1935 provides for a program to preserve historical and archeological data threatened by the construction of dams. This measure is more explicit than the Historic Sites Act relative to historical and archeological salvage, and provides essentially for coordination of archeological investigations and salvage operations with advance planning and construction of dams either by Federal agencies or under permits granted by Federal agencies.

Kansas-Nebraska water compact

S. 1605—Public Law 86-489, Approved June 3, 1960

This law grants the consent of Congress to the States of Kansas and Nebraska to negotiate and enter into a compact relating to their interests in the waters of the Big Blue River and its tributaries, and provides for an equitable apportionment between these States of the waters of the Big Blue River and its tributaries.

The act further provides that one qualified person appointed by the President shall participate in the negotiations as Chairman, representing the United States, to report to the President and to Congress on the proceedings and on the compact.

Lead-zinc subsidy

H.R. 8860—Vetoed September 2, 1960

This measure was designed to stabilize mining of lead and zinc by small producers to aid in conserving domestic reserves and to provide jobs for unemployed miners in depressed lead-zinc communities by—

Authorizing the Secretary of Interior to establish and maintain a program of stabilization payments to small domestic producers of lead and zinc ores and concentrates.

Providing that payments be made when the price of common lead is below 17 cents a pound—the payment to provide an equivalent of 17 cents.

Providing for payments to producers of zinc when the market price for prime western zinc is below 14½ cents a pound—an equivalent return of 14½ cents.

Prohibiting stabilization payments if production is in excess of 2,000 tons.

Prohibiting stabilization payments on materials sold to the U.S. Government under a contract made pursuant to the provisions of Defense Production Act of 1950.

Act effective on first day of first quarter next following enactment and terminates June 30, 1965.

Leasing of oil and gas interests in Texas

H.R. 8740—Public Law 86-576, Approved July 5, 1960

This act provides for the exploration, development, and leasing of the oil and gas deposits reserved to the State of Texas in lands in that State which are owned by the United States, subject to articles 5367 and 5368 of the Revised Civil Statutes of that State, and which are not excluded from the scope of the Mineral Leasing Act for acquired lands. Leases issued by the Secretary of the Interior for these deposits must conform to those issued under the Acquired Lands Act except for section 5. However,

revenues from these leases are to be apportioned between the United States and the State as provided in articles 5367 and 5368 of the Texas statutes.

Marine Sciences and Research Act

S. 2692—Passed Senate June 23, 1960. Referred to House Merchant Marine June 24, 1960

Establishes a 10-year program of oceanographic research and surveys at an approximate cost of $121 million to promote and advance our military, economic, international and domestic welfare.

Military benefits will include a strengthened security from surprise attack by missile-launching enemy submarines. This will be achieved when we know more about underwater acoustics and have perfected our surveillance and detection systems. It requires extensive scientific data on undersea water densities.

Economic benefits will be derived from the resources of the sea. These include food, liquid fuels, metallic minerals. This bill authorizes a scientific research program and economic studies designed to revive a vastly diminished seafood industry and to increase our food supplies from the oceans, their estuaries, and the Great Lakes. Other economic benefits include those to be reaped by commerce generally. Greater knowledge of currents, winds, and weather already enable modern transocean carriers to save a full day or more from previous schedules.

Welfare benefits will accrue from climatological studies, from extensive investigation of the effects on the marine environment of atomic fallout and radioactive wastes, and from research into methods of counteracting pollution of estuarine and inshore coastal waters.

Mineral Leasing Act

H.R. 10455—Public Law 86–705, Approved September 2, 1960

The purpose of this act is twofold: First, to make substantive changes in the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 that experience and changing conditions have shown desirable, and, second, to restate sections 17 and 27 of the act in their entirety to clarify their language and simplify the arrangement of their provisions. Sections 17 and 27 have been added to and amended over the years to such an extent that they have become something of a hodgepodge.

Substantive changes: The principal changes of substance in existing law that would be made by the bill are:

1. An increase in the minimum yearly rentals for oil and gas leases on federally owned lands from the present minimum of 25 cents an acre to 50 cents an acre, and elimination of the waiver of second- and third-year rentals provided in existing law.

2. Consolidation of lease and option maximum acreage provisions. Under existing law, no individual, association, or corporation may hold in any one State except Alaska oil and gas leases totaling more than 46,080 acres nor options for such leases totaling more than 200,000 acres on the publicly owned lands of the United States. This total of 246,080 acres that can be controlled by any one person is not increased by this bill, but the maximum limitations on the two forms of holding are consolidated to a great extent.

3. Substitution of a fixed 10-year lease term for the present 5-year term with automatic right of renewal for a second 5-year term.

4. Division of vast area of the State of Alaska into two leasing districts with the present maximum for Alaska of 300,000 acres applicable in each.

5. Inclusion of a major new source of petroleum within our own country, the so-called tar sands, under the Mineral Leasing Act. At present such tar or petroleum sands are locatable under the Mining Law of 1872, with the locator getting outright ownership of all of the minerals without royalty or rent to the Federal Government, and consequent increase in State revenues.

Mineral rights for Alaska homesteaders

S. 1670—Public Law 86–789, Approved September 14, 1960

This act grants to homesteaders who have completed the task of developing their homesteads on the Kenai Peninsula in Alaska full and complete patents, provided that the work had been finished prior to July 23, 1957.

Homesteading is essential to the development of a balanced economy in Alaska. For this reason many citizens have been encouraged to come to the 49th State.

On the Kenai Peninsula a number of these made homestead applications, entered upon the land and proceeded to construct permanent homes and to clear land for agricultural use. They entered upon the land with the understanding that it was primarily valuable for agricultural development and was not prospectively valuable for any minerals. Available information from the Bureau of Land Management and the Geological Survey was to this effect.

Subsequent to their entry and the investment of large sums of cash, tremendous physical effort, and hardship, the land was reclassified, without notice to the entrymen, as prospectively valuable for oil and gas.

The result was that oil and gas prospectors, holding Government leases, either in their own names or upon assignment, then came upon the entrymen's lands and, as a result of inadequate supervision from the grantor of the lease (the Department of the Interior), caused, in many cases, considerable damage to the homestead investment made by the entryman.

The entrymen were later advised by the Bureau of Land Management that a condition would attach to the issuance of a patent, not contemplated by the entrymen or the BLM at the time the entry was allowed. The oil and gas rights, whether active or inactive, would be reserved to the Government.

Congress feels that the conditions surrounding the handling of the classification of the agricultural land as also possibly valuable for oil and gas warrant the action proposed in this legislation.

National Forest Products Week

Senate Joint Resolution 209—Public Law 86–753, Approved September 13, 1960

The purpose of this resolution is to designate the 7-day period beginning on the third Sunday of October in each year as National Forest Products Week, and to authorize and request the President to issue annually a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe the week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The forest products industry, as one of the oldest industries in the United States, operates in every State of the Union, and plays a highly significant part in the well-being of our Nation's citizens and our Nation.

American forests cover 786 million acres and are the Nation's only renewable natural resource.

Ownership of private commercial timberlands is diversified. Of the 4½ million owners, farmers own 34 percent—166 million acres; wood-processing industries own 13 percent—64 million. Schoolteachers, professional people, housewives, factory workers, and other private persons own 127 million acres, or 26 percent of the commercial forests.

The Federal Government owns 21 percent of America's commercial forest lands. The Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture is responsible for the management of the national forests, including selling the timber rights to private companies. Other lands are handled by the Department of the Interior. Sales of Government timber for fiscal year 1960 are estimated to total nearly $175 million.

Forest land management has as its primary objective the growing of repeated crops of trees. The forest practices and forest protection necessary to accomplish this objective usually result in many additional benefits, among them watershed protection, preservation of the soil, recreation and maintenance of forage for game and livestock.

The forest products industry, including lumber and wood products, furniture and fixtures, pulp and paper products, provides direct employment in 57,000 operating establishments to 1½ million persons, or 9 percent of all manufacturing employees. Payrolls total more than $6 billion annually and value added by manufacture exceeds $11 billion. Expenditures for new plant and equipment by the forest industry totals $850 million annually.

This country produces 30 percent of the world's lumber, 40 percent of its woodpulp, 43 percent of its paper and paperboard, and 51 percent of its plywood.

Through the transportation of forest products during 1959, the Nation's railroads earned more than $1.3 billion in gross freight revenue, representing 15 percent of total railroad freight revenue.

Congress believes that it will be to the best interests of the people of this Nation, including Government, labor, and management to have the forest industry called to their attention annually through the proclamation of a National Forest Products Week.

Navajo irrigation project

H.R. 8295—Public Law 86–636, Approved July 12, 1960

This act authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to transfer to the Navajo Tribe, with tribal approval, title to any or all of the irrigation project works on the Navajo Reservation that were constructed by the United States, together with the equipment usable for the operation and maintenance of the works. The act further provides for Federal personnel to train and assist tribal personnel in operating any irrigation works transferred to the tribe so that the tribal personnel may be qualified to assume full responsibility for project works. The Navajo Tribe will pay the cost of Interior Department personnel employed for this purpose.

There are 67 irrigation units scattered throughout the Navajo Reservation ranging in size from less than 100 acres to 6,000 acres. The total for all units is approximately 33,800 acres. Original reimbursable construction costs for the units was approximately $6,570,000, of which about $670,000 has been canceled, leaving a balance of approximately $5,900,000. The Leavitt Act deferred the assessment of construction costs on Indian irrigation projects until the lands go out of Indian ownership, and this bill does not alter that situation. By its terms, after the project works are transferred, the land and the irrigation works will not be subject to any restrictions because of Indian ownership, but the land, the project works, and any income therefrom will continue to be tax exempt as long as they remain in Indian ownership.

Norman Federal reclamation project, Oklahoma

S. 1892—Public Law 86–529, Approved June 27, 1960

Authorizes the Norman project, on Little River (a tributary of the Canadian River), in Oklahoma, and provides for recognition of certain interest costs on the Upper Colorado River project.

The Norman project consists of a dam and reservoir, pipelines, and pumping facilities

to deliver municipal and industrial water to the project cities of Norman, Midwest City, Del City, and to Tinker Air Force Base. This bill permits Federal expenditures of $19,042,000 if the Interior Department builds the entire project, or $12,920,000, if the Central Oklahoma Master Conservancy District builds the aqueducts.

Other major uses of the project works are flood control, fish and wildlife conservation and development, and recreation.

The act also provides for allocation of costs, and sets out that the reimbursable costs will be repaid in 50 years with interest to the Federal Government. The Federal costs allocated to the Tinker Air Force Base for its proportionate share of the costs allocated to municipal water supply, and to fish and wildlife benefits, to basic recreational facilities, and to flood control, will be nonreimbursable.

It also provides that the water users' organization of the Norman project may sell any surplus water but are required to use these revenues to apply on retirement of project debt payment, payment of interest, and payment of operation and maintenance costs.

It also provides that, upon full repayment, the water users will have permanent right to use of the facilities for municipal water supply purposes.

In addition, the measure changes the method of computing Federal interest charges on money spent for certain parts of the Colorado River storage project. The change will affect those projects started after June 1, 1960, and will limit the interest rate to 2.69 percent.

Omnibus rivers and harbors

H.R. 7634—Public Law 86-645, Approved July 14, 1960

This measure authorizes a $1,441,194,300 for construction of 130 rivers and harbors and flood control projects.

It is a comprehensive act designed to carry forward the important programs for development and improvement of the rivers and harbors of our Nation, for the protection of lives and property of our citizens against the ravages of floodwaters, and for the general development of the Nation's water resources, which will contribute so much to the enhancement of the national economy.

It is a combined omnibus river and harbor and flood-control measure which—

Includes authorizations for river and harbor and beach erosion control projects.

Includes authorizations for flood control projects, increased monetary authorization for previously approved comprehensive basin plans.

Authorizes the evaluation of recreational benefits at water-resource development projects in the United States.

Breakdown of funds:

Navigation projects	$203,169,300
Beach erosion	22,190,800
Barkley Dam, Ky	146,000,000
Decatur Bend, Iowa, project	155,000
Subtotal	371,515,100
Flood control:	
New projects or modifications	251,439,200
Increased basin authorizations	736,240,000
Merced River, Calif., project	12,000,000
Mokelumne River, Calif., project	10,000,000
Missouri River Basin	60,000,000
Subtotal	1,069,679,200
Total	1,441,194,300

Reforestation of publicly owned lands

Senate Joint Resolution 95—Passed Senate June 24, 1960; Referred to House Agriculture June 25, 1960

The resolution expresses the sense of the Congress that it is important that all existing authority for reforestation of publicly owned lands be fully and completely utilized.

The resolution sets forth a series of facts drawn from reports made by the Chief of the Forest Service. There are 488 million acres of commercial timberland in the United States of which 48 million, approximately 10 percent, are in need of planting. This planting should be done in the next 10 years if we are to have an adequate wood supply in the year 2000.

To meet this goal during each of the next 10 years 560,000 acres of Federal land should be planted; 240,000 acres of State and municipal land; and 4 million acres of privately owned land.

Planting of the Federal land is completely a responsibility of the Federal Government and it is of highest priority.

The policy of the Congress is declared to provide a continuing program to accomplish the needed reforestation in the 10-year period commencing July 1, 1960.

Reserved mineral interests

S. 1268—Passed Senate April 11, 1960; Referred to House Interior April 12, 1960

In those cases where a State holds the title to the surface or land in which the Federal Government has reserved the minerals, this measure requires the Secretary of Interior to give written notice to that State of any offer to lease the minerals. The State will then be given 30 days within which to present its views on the proposal. There is no requirement, however, that the State must give its consent before a lease can be issued.

Saline water program expansion

S. 3557—Passed Senate June 24, 1960; Referred to House Interior June 25, 1960

This bill extends the saline water conversion program, enacted in 1952 and increases the appropriation authorization to carry out the objectives of the original act.

It also authorizes the construction of a central test site and laboratory at an estimated cost of $2,500,000.

The categories of activities under the saline water program and more specifically emphasized by this bill are:

Studies and research, theory and laboratory research.

Pilot plant testing.

Demonstration plants: This bill authorizes the Office of Saline Water to negotiate contracts with any States, territories, possessions, political subdivisions or publicly owned utilities organizations for the use of the organization's saline water conversion plant facilities to further the sea and brackish water conversion research and demonstration programs.

Investigation, coordination, and correlation of scientific data.

Economic studies.

To back up the expansion, this bill authorizes a total appropriation of $20 million, which is a modest program in view of its tremendous importance to the future well-being of the Nation.

Wabash Basin study commission

S. 3625—Passed Senate August 25, 1960. Referred to House Public Works August 26, 1960

This bill authorizes the establishment of a Wabash Basin Interagency Water Resources Commission to be responsible for—

(1) Coordinating Federal, State, and local plans for developing water and related resources in the Wabash Basin;

(2) Preparing and keeping up to date a comprehensive, integrated, joint plan for water and related water resources development;

(3) Recommending a long-range schedule of priorities for the collecting and analyzing basic data, for investigation and project planning, and for construction of projects in the basin; and

(4) Fostering and undertaking studies of water resources problems in the basin.

The Commission to be composed of members appointed by the President from the various Federal departments or agencies having a substantial interest in the work to be undertaken and one or more members, as the President determines appropriate, from each of the States of Indiana and Illinois, as well as one member from each interstate compact commission which has jurisdiction over any of the waters of the Wabash Basin. The President would also appoint the Chairman of the Commission. The Governors of the two States would nominate the members from the States of Indiana and Illinois.

Water Pollution Control Act

H.R. 3610—Vetoed February 23, 1960

This measure affects one of the most vital resources of our Nation—water. Congress, despite opposition from the administration, is endeavoring to help by making this vital resource clean. The administration wants to turn this vast problem over to the States, while Congress wants the people of this Nation to have clean water. The problem is that simple.

To accomplish this objective, we authorized the Public Health Service, under the supervision and direction of the Secretary of HEW, to stimulate construction of needed municipal waste-treatment facilities to prevent untreated or inadequately treated sewage or other waste from being discharged into "any" waters.

We have increased the construction grants from $250,000 to $450,000 for individual projects with the proviso that no grant can exceed 30 percent of the estimated cost or $250,000 whichever is smaller. Thus the States pay 20 percent and the communities 50 percent.

We increased from $50 to $90 million the annual authorization for construction, with an aggregate appropriation limited to $900 million.

This increased Federal aid would have enabled the States and the communities to clean up the rivers—with the ultimate result of pure water for all. The act, however, was vetoed.

In his veto message, President Eisenhower stated:

"The bill would authorize an increase in Federal grants to municipalities for assistance in the construction of sewage treatment works from $50 million to $90 million annually, and from $500 million to $900 million in the aggregate. * * * The Federal Government can help, but it should stimulate State and local action rather than provide excuses for inaction—which an expanded program under H.R. 3610 would do * * *."

Watershed Act—Amendment

H.R. 4781—Public Law 86-468, Approved May 13, 1960

This act authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to prosecute non-flood-prevention water management measures in connection with the 11 watershed improvement programs authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1944. The additional measures which could be prosecuted would be similar to those provided for by the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, and the same local organization participation would be required.

It also permits the Secretary to make loans to cover the local share of these 11 programs in the same manner that he is authorized to make loans to cover the local share of

programs under the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act. This is intended to apply both to the flood prevention and non-flood-prevention features of these programs.

Watershed project starts

H.R. 11615—Public Law 86-545, Approved June 29, 1960

The law authorizes Federal assistance for installation of watershed projects under the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act to proceed upon satisfactory assurance that the local organization will acquire the necessary lands, without waiting for final acquisition of title. It is intended to apply only to those cases in which land is being acquired by condemnation and where a formal order of taking or possession has been issued by a court of competent jurisdiction; and it is to be restricted to lands to be acquired by condemnation.

Wildlife, game, and fish conservation

H.R. 2565—Public Law 86-797, Approved September 15, 1960

This measure provides a program for the cooperative use, conservation, and propagation of wildlife, fish, and game on military reservations. The Secretary of Defense is authorized to carry out program plans agreed to by the Secretary of Interior and the appropriate State agency in the State where the reservation is located.

These cooperative plans may stipulate rules and regulations for hunting and fishing, hunting permits, and fee collections. The fees may be used to protect, conserve, and manage the refuges.

This law also offers an opportunity for opening more acres of military lands to hunters and fishermen, both civilian and military.

Wyoming—Riverton Federal reclamation project

Senate Joint Resolution 150—Public Law 86-448, Approved May 5, 1960

This joint resolution gives congressional authorization to the Secretary of the Interior to continue during calendar years 1960 and 1961 to deliver irrigation water to the third division, Riverton project, Wyoming, pending the completion of a repayment contract under reclamation law.

SOCIAL WELFARE

National Little League Baseball Week

House Concurrent Resolution 17 — House Adopted May 17, 1960; Senate Adopted May 28, 1960

This resolution authorizes and requests the President to proclaim the week beginning the second Monday in June of each year as National Little League Baseball Week.

This year marks the 20th anniversary of little league baseball, and during that period the movement has grown to more than 25,000 teams in 23 countries.

Social security amendments—Medical care for aged

H.R. 12580—Public Law 86-778, Approved September 13, 1960

The Congress by almost unanimous vote authorized a new program of Federal grants to the States for medical care for the low-income aged and increased social security coverage under existing programs.

The twofold approach for medical care for the aged provides a new medical-care program for those persons not on old-age assistance but yet financially unable to pay for part or all of any medical care, and strengthens and extends the medical programs now operating or possible under old-age assistance.

The measure increases Federal funds to the States for medical services for the 2.4 million aged persons on old-age assistance; it authorizes Federal grants to the States to help pay part or all of the medical services of a group of persons totaling about 10 million who may, at one time or another, be in need of assistance in paying their medical expenses; and it instructs the Secretary of HEW to develop guides or recommended standards for the use of the States in evaluating and improving their programs of medical services for the aged. The States can take advantage of its provisions in whole or part beginning October 1, 1960.

Extended coverage under OASI: Self-employed: Extended the filing time for ministers to elect coverage.

Employees: Liberalizes coverage for those with more than 1 employer; allows Nebraska to exclude certain justices of the peace and constables compensated on a fee basis; adds Texas to the list of States who can take advantage of the split system provision which allows a State to divide a retirement system into two divisions—those who desire coverage and those who do not; allows the State of Maine until July 1, 1961, to treat the positions of teachers and related positions and the positions of other members of the same retirement system as separate systems for coverage; authorizes coverage of certain hospital employees in California; extended coverage to parents in the employ of their children in the course of the child's trade or business; extended coverage to Guam and American Samoa; extended coverage to employees of international organizations on self-employed basis.

Eligibility: Liberalizes requirement so that an individual will need one quarter of coverage (acquired at any time after 1936) for every three calendar quarters elapsing after 1950, or after the calendar year in which he attained the age of 21 and up to the beginning of the calendar year in which he attained retirement age, or died, whichever occurred first, but he must have at least six quarters of coverage.

Reduces the duration-of-relationship requirements for entitlement to wife's, child's and husband's benefits in cases where the worker is alive from 3 years to 1 year.

Retirement test: No reduction for an individual who earns $1,200 a year or less; if he earns between $1,200 and $1,500, $1 in benefits will be withheld for each $2 of earnings above $1,200; if he earns more than $1,500, $1 in benefits will be withheld for each $2 of earnings between $1,200 and $1,500 and $1 in benefits for each $1 of earnings above $1,500.

Aid to blind: States in determining need may disregard the first $85 per month of earnings plus one-half of earned income over $85 on a month-by-month basis. Provision is optional with the States until July 1, 1962, when it becomes mandatory.

Child welfare service: Authorization increased from $17 million to $25 million.

Unemployment compensation: Raises the Federal unemployment tax rate from 3 percent to 3.1 percent and extends coverage of the unemployment compensation program to several groups of workers.

Disability insurance program: Eliminated the 50-year age requirement which will permit about 250,000 additional workers totally and permanently disabled to qualify for benefits. Strengthened the rehabilitation aspects of the disability program by providing a 12-month period of trial work, during which benefits are continued for all disabled workers who attempt to return to work. Removed the 6-month waiting period requirement for those who become disabled within 5 years after terminating one period of disability before they are again eligible for benefits.

SPACE

Authorization—NASA

H.R. 10809—Public Law 481, Approved June 1, 1960

This measure authorizes appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal 1961, totaling $970 million as follows:

Regular authorizations:	
Salaries and expenses	$170,760,000
Research and development	621,453,000
Construction and equipment	122,787,000
Subtotal	915,000,000
Emergency authorizations:	
Research and development	50,000,000
Construction and equipment	5,000,000
Subtotal	55,000,000

As enacted, the bill provides 30 additional "excepted" positions with 13 of these positions authorized to be paid salaries up to $21,000. The remaining positions will be within the salary ranges of $14,000 to $19,000. The 30 additional jobs increased the total in this category to 290.

NASA—Supplemental

House Joint Resolution 621—Public Law 86-425, Approved April 14, 1960

This measure, a supplemental for 1960, appropriated $23 million additional for the national aeronautics and space agency: $12,200,000 of the $23 million is for additional research and development on Project Mercury and $10,800,000 for Mercury tracking and modifications at Atlantic Missile Range.

NASA—Von Braun team

Congress unanimously endorsed the transfer of the Development Operations Division of the Army Ballistic Missile Agency to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

The transfer plan includes:

Functions of Army Ballistic Missile Agency relating to the development of space vehicle systems, excluding ballistic missiles, and research;

Land area consisting of 1,200 acres, with 98 buildings estimated value of $100 million, located within the Redstone Arsenal, will be leased to NASA;

Personnel at the arsenal presently employed by the Development Operations Division, numbering nearly 3,900 persons (Dr. von Braun team); and

Designated Cape Canaveral facilities, belonging to the Army Ordnance Missile Command, having a value of approximately $14 million.

Plan effective March 14, 1960.

TAXATION

Bicycle tires and tubes—excise tax

H.R. 8318—Public Law 86-418, Approved April 8, 1960

This law relates to excise tax on bicycle tires and tubes. Under present law, a tax of 5 cents a pound applies to bicycle tires and 9 cents a pound to inner tubes. These taxes apply to sales of tires and tubes by the manufacturers, producers, or importers. Bicycle tires and tubes, whether manufactured here or imported, are subject to tax when sold in the United States to bicycle manufacturers or others for mounting on new bicycles. Similarly, they are subject to tax if the tire and tube manufacturer himself mounts a tire and tube on a bicycle, since this use is considered a sale. In the case of bicycle tires and tubes mounted on bicycles outside the United States, where the bicycles are sold in the United States no U.S. excise tax is paid on the bicycle tires and tubes.

This act eliminates this discrimination by providing an exemption for bicycle tires and tubes sold for use in the manufacture, or production of new bicycles, or used by the tire and tube manufacturer for this purpose. The taxes will continue to apply, however, to tires and tubes sold, or used, as replacements.

Cabarets—Tax cut

H.R. 2164—Public Law 86-422, Approved April 8, 1960

This measure reduces from 20 percent to 10 percent the tax imposed on roof gardens, cabarets, and similar establishments.

The necessity for this reduction was due to the fact that the 20-percent rate was discriminatory in that the rates of almost all of the other ad valorem excise taxes do not exceed 10 percent. In addition, it is believed that this high rate has been a deterrent to the employment of musicians and other entertainers.

Charitable contributions

H.R. 6779—Vetoed June 3, 1960

This measure provides that, for the purpose of unlimited deductions for charitable contributions by certain individuals for income tax purposes, the 90-percent test may be met by combining the contribution over 2 consecutive taxable years within the 10 preceding years.

Cigars—Excise taxes

H.R. 10960—Public Law 86-779, Approved September 14, 1960

The Federal excise tax on large cigars is paid by the manufacturer but based on the intended retail price of the cigars. Seven different tax brackets provide tax rates increasing with the intended retail price of the cigar. This intended retail price of the cigar is determined in the principal market of the cigar, or the locality where most of a particular brand is sold. Under present law this price is determined by excluding State and local retail sales taxes from the price. Under this bill the price is determined by excluding "any State or local taxes imposed on cigars as a commodity." This excludes not only retail sales taxes but taxes such as manufacturers and wholesalers sales taxes in determining the intended retail price of large cigars. This amendment is to apply to cigars removed on or after the ninth day of the first month beginning after the date of enactment of this bill.

The measure also taxes real estate trusts as regulated investment companies, modifies filing requirements for estimated taxes, provides a deduction for certain students maintained in a taxpayer's home, and revises the tax on mechanical lighters.

Coconut and palm oil—Tax suspension

H.R. 8649—Public Law 86-432, Approved April 22, 1960

This act continues through June 30, 1963, the suspension of the 3-cents-a-pound processing tax on the first domestic processing of coconut oil, palm oil, palm-kernel oil, fatty acids, salts, combinations or mixtures thereof.

Copyright royalties

H.R. 7588—Public Law 86-435, Approved April 22, 1960

This measure amends the Internal Revenue Code to provide that personal holding company income is not to include income from copyright royalties if—

1. More than 50 percent of their gross income is from copyright royalties;

2. Business expense deductions are equal to at least 50 percent of gross income; and

3. They do not have more than 10 percent of other personal holding company income.

Effective for taxable years beginning on or after January 1, 1960.

Dealers' reserve—Tax treatment

H.R. 8684—Public Law 86-459, Approved May 13, 1960

To prevent a consumer abuse this measure pertains to the tax treatment of certain dealer reserves. A recent Supreme Court decision held that dealer reserve income is to be reported at the time it is properly accruable or, in general, at the time of the sale of the installment paper where this immediately follows the sale of the property. Some dealers, however, following numerous circuit court decisions to the contrary have not reported this income until the reserves were withdrawn by the dealers from the finance companies.

To alleviate any hardship, this bill provides two alternative methods for paying the tax due on income which has not been previously reported. First, it provides that such amounts can be treated as required changes in methods of accounting. This means that the reserves built up prior to 1954, if such years are closed, need not be reported for tax purposes, and that only the excess of the current balance over the 1954 balance in the reserve is to be reported. A second alternative permits the computation of the deficiencies, or overassessments, which would arise if the income had been reported in the proper years, and then the sum of these amounts, plus interest up to the time of selecting this alternative, may be paid in 10 annual installments, generally beginning in 1961.

The usual dealers' reserves arise from the sale of customers' installment paper to finance companies. In transactions of this type the question is whether this reserve is income to the dealer in the year of the sale of the article and the sale of the installment paper to the finance company, or is income to the dealer only when he actually receives the reserved amount in cash from the finance company.

Excise tax—Public debt extension, 1960

H.R. 12381—Public Law 86-564, Approved June 30, 1960

Extends to June 30, 1961, a temporary increase of $8 billion in the public debt limit, making the ceiling $293 billion.

Extends to June 30, 1961, the present corporate income and certain excise tax rates scheduled for reduction on July 1, 1960. Present corporate rate is 52 percent. Excise rates continued are those on distilled spirits, beer, wine, cigarettes, and passenger automobiles, parts, and accessories.

Extends to June 30, 1961, the 10 percent tax on transportation and local telephone service.

Directs the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation to make a full and complete investigation of the operation and effects of present law, regulations, and practices relating to the deduction of expenses as ordinary and necessary business expenses for entertainment, gifts, dues, or initiation fees in social, athletic, or sporting club organizations. Requires the joint committee to report to the House and Senate the results of the investigation as soon as practicable during the 87th Congress, together with recommendations for changes in the law and administrative practices.

Provides for a report by the Secretary of the Treasury on the results of the recently adopted enforcement program of the Internal Revenue Service relating to similar deductions together with recommendations considered necessary to avoid misuse of the business expense deduction. Report to be made to the House and Senate during the 87th Congress.

Prevented excessive depletion allowances in minerals and ores by applying the allowance to raw ores rather than finished products, effective December 31, 1960.

Exploration expenses—Deduction

H.R. 4251—Public Law 86-594, Approved July 6, 1960

Under present law an annual exploration expenditure deduction of up to $100,000 is allowed for no more than 4 years. This bill removes the 4-year limitation and substitutes an overall limitation of $400,000. However, the limitation of $100,000 per year remains.

Exploration expenditure deductions may be taken (currently or deferred and taken when the product is sold) for expenditures made in exploring for ore or mineral deposits (but not for oil or gas) prior to the development stage of the mineral deposit.

This change is to be effective for taxable years beginning after the date of enactment of this act.

Firearms

H.R. 4029—Public Law 86-478, Approved June 1, 1960

This law amends the special excise taxes in the Internal Revenue Code to—

1. Exempt from the special occupational and transfer taxes, rifles with barrels between 16 and 18 inches in length.

2. Subject to occupational and transfer taxes, any weapon made from a rifle or shotgun if the modified weapon has an overall length of less than 26 inches.

3. Lower the manufacturer and dealer occupational taxes and the transfer tax on any other weapon, except a pistol or revolver, from which a shot is discharged by an explosive if the weapon is capable of being concealed on the person. At present the manufacturers' and dealers' occupational taxes applicable to these weapons, generally, are $500 and $200, and, under the bill, will be reduced to $25 and $10. The transfer tax under present law is $200 and, under the bill, will be $5.

4. Raise from $1 to $10 a year dealers' taxes on certain combination shotgun and rifles and certain guns designed to be held in one hand. The applicable transfer taxes are raised from $1 to $5 a transaction.

5. Repeal the proration feature of existing law which provides that occupational taxes are the same whether the individual involved is in the specified business for part, or all, of a year.

6. Make jointly and severally liable the transferor and transferee for the transfer tax.

FNMA—Nonrefundable capital contributions

H.R. 7947—Vetoed May 16, 1960

Financial institutions selling mortgage paper to FNMA must subscribe to its common stock in an amount equal to 2 percent of the mortgages sold. This stock, which is issued at a par value of $100, has been selling on the market at less than the issued price.

This bill provides that where FNMA stock is purchased under these conditions, any excess of the issued price over the fair market value on the date of issuance is to be treated as an ordinary and necessary business expense in the year of purchase rather than as a part of the cost of acquiring the stock. Thus, in the future, the year of purchase is to be the taxable year in which occurs the date of issuance rather than the date of payment.

Effective for tax years beginning on or after December 31, 1959.

Foreign tax credit

H.R. 10087—Public Law 86-780, Approved September 14, 1960

This measure amends the Internal Revenue Code to permit U.S. business firms with holdings in more than one foreign country an opportunity to choose between an overall limitation on foreign tax credits or the present per-country limitation.

This has the effect of permitting taxpayers to treat the taxes of the various foreign countries collectively, rather than separately for each country. For example, if a firm has holdings in one foreign country with a tax rate of 48 percent and another holding in a second country with a 52-percent tax rate, the U.S. firm can now add these together before applying the limitation. The act provides, however, that once the taxpayer has elected the overall limitation in lieu of the per-country limitation, the overall limitation is binding until the Secretary of the Treasury, or his delegate, consents to a change.

Prohibits credits from a per-country year to be carried back and forward to overall years; however, unused credits from a per-country year may be carried back or forward to other per-country years. Permits unused credits from an overall year to be carried back and forward only to other overall years.

Excludes from gross income reimbursements for moving expenses received by employees of corporations formed exclusively to operate laboratories for AEC but applies only to amounts received before October 1, 1955, and only to cases where the individual was expressly told at time of his employment by an authorized official of the corporation that the amount of the reimbursement should not be includible in gross income. Permits these employees whose claims are now barred by the running of the statute of limitations to secure a refund of their reimbursed expenses, without interest, if claim is filed within 6 months after enactment of this act.

Bars credits when certain information requested by the Treasury Department is not furnished concerning the foreign corporation.

Requires the returns to contain information as to its creation, organization, or reorganization of the foreign corporation.

Investment company taxation

H.R. 6132—Public Law 86-416, Approved April 8, 1960

Under present law the documentary stamp tax on original issues of stock is levied at the rate of 10 cents per $100 of actual value. The documentary stamp on stock transfers, however, is levied at the rate of 4 cents per $100 of actual value.

Regulated investment companies operating as open-end mutual investment companies, however, do not usually provide for trading of their securities. Instead they issue new securities to those desiring to buy their stock, and redeem the stock of the sellers. As a result, they pay a 10 cents per $100 issuance tax on transactions which to others would result in a transfer tax of 4 cents per $100 of actual value.

This measure provides that the issuance tax in the case of qualifying regulated investment companies is to be imposed at the rate of 4 cents per $100 of actual value, rather than the 10-cent rate otherwise applicable.

This is to be effective for stock sold following enactment.

Laminated tires—Tax reduction

H.R. 6785—Public Law 86-440, Approved April 22, 1960

This law reduces from 5 cents to 1 cent a pound the tax on laminated tires used for offhighway purpores where the terrain is rough or where there is the hazard of puncture in the case of pneumatic tires. They are used primarily on lifts, cranes, payloaders, weed cutters, and similar types of industrial and farm equipment.

Under existing law the laminated tire is subject to the 5-cent tax. Because of the very heavy weight of the laminated tires, this represents a burdensome tax which, in some instances, represents a burden equal to nearly 20 percent of the retail price of the tire. To be subject to the reduction, the tire must be made wholly of scrap rubber from used tire casings and held together by a metal band on which the pads are threaded in a manner to form a complete circle.

Medical expenses

H.R. 9660—Public Law 470, Approved May 14, 1960

This law amends the Internal Revenue Code to provide a general rule that the additions to tax for the late filing of income, estate, and gift tax returns and the underpayment of estimated income tax are to be assessed and collected without the issuance of a (presently) required 90-day letter to the taxpayer with two exceptions:

1. An addition to tax for late filing which is attributable to a deficiency in tax will be subject to the 90-day letter procedure.

2. Where no return is filed for a taxable year, an addition to tax for underpayment of estimated tax will be subject to the 90-day letter procedure.

The above amendment will be effective following enactment.

The act also removes the 3-percent limit on medical and dental expenses incurred by the taxpayer for the care of his dependent mother or father, or the dependent mother or father of his spouse, if the dependent has attained the age of 65 before the close of the taxable year.

The above provision applies to the 10 years beginning after December 31, 1959.

Nonprofit corporations or associations—Exempt from taxes

H.R. 6155—Public Law 86-428, Approved April 22, 1960

This act moves forward from September 1, 1951, to September 1, 1957, the date before which certain mutual deposit guarantee funds must be organized in order to qualify for income tax exemption. The other requirements for the exemption, which are left unchanged, provide that the organizations must be mutual, nonprofit organizations without capital stock and operated to provide reserves and insurance for building and loan associations, cooperative banks, or mutual savings banks.

Three of the four presently existing mutual deposit guarantee funds were organized before September 1, 1951, and therefore presently qualify for exemption. A fourth such organization organized after that date but before September 1, 1957, will qualify for the exemption under this bill. These organizations perform essentially the same type of services at the FDIC and FSLIC, Federal Corporations which are exempt from income tax.

Effective after December 31, 1959.

Nonresident aliens—Exclusion from gross income

H.R. 135—Public Law 86-437, Approved April 22, 1960

Effective for taxable years beginning on or after January 1, 1960, this measure provides that amounts paid to a nonresident alien individual by the United States for services performed by an employee of the United States are not to be taxable to him to the extent they are attributable to basic U.S. salary derived from sources without the United States. This means that for the typical nonresident alien who has worked for the United States only abroad, no U.S. tax will be payable with reference to his pension.

State taxation study

S. 5349—Passed Senate June 18, 1960; Referred to House Rules June 20, 1960

This bill provides for a study by the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate of all matters pertaining to the imposition of sales and use taxes by the States on sales and other business activities which are exclusively in furtherance of interstate commerce.

The purpose of the prescribed study is to establish a sound factual basis for recommending to Congress proposed legislation providing uniform standards to be observed by the States in imposing sales and use taxes on interstate sales and business activities. Under the bill, the results of the study together with proposals for legislation are required to be reported to the House of Representatives and the Senate on or before July 1, 1962.

In 1959, following extensive hearings by various committees, Congress passed and the President signed into law a bill (Public Law 86-272) limiting the power of States to impose taxes measured by net income upon income derived from interstate commerce if the only business activities within the State consisted of (*a*) the solicitation of orders for sales of tangible personal property, if the orders were accepted and filled by shipment from a point outside the State, or (*b*) the solicitation of orders in the name of or for the benefit of a prospective customer (generally a retail dealer within the State), if the orders were accepted and filled by shipment from a point outside the State.

In addition to making it plain that maintenance of a sales office by an independent contractor did not constitute "doing business" within the State so as to make the manufacturer liable for a net income tax within that State, the 1959 law provided for a congressional study to be completed on or before July 1, 1962, of State net income taxes on incomes derived from business conducted in interstate commerce for the purpose of recommending proposed legislation providing uniform standards to be observed by the States in imposing such taxes on incomes derived from business conducted in interstate commerce. The limitations enacted in 1959 constituted, in effect, stopgap legislation.

Unemployment benefit trusts—Tax exempt

H.R. 8229—Public Law 86-667, Approved July 14, 1960

This act provides a new exempt category for income tax purposes in the case of trusts providing for the payment of supplemental unemployment compensation benefits. These may be the only benefit payments made by the trusts, or may be payments made together with subordinate sick or accident benefits (but not retirement or death benefits). This exempt category differs from the category, already under existing law, under which some of these trusts obtain exemption, in that the new provision does not require the SUB trusts to obtain at least 85 percent of their income from employers or employees (and not from investment income).

The so-called nondiscriminatory provisions of present law applying to qualified pension, profit sharing, and stock-bonus plans are in general made applicable to the trusts qualifying under the new exemption category. In addition the "prohibited transaction" provisions, and "unrelated business income" provisions (including the business lease provisions) of present law are made applicable to the new exemption category.

In general this exemption is to apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1959.

Unemployment tax credits

H.R. 6482—Vetoed June 3, 1960

Permits a successor employer of both incorporated and unincorporated businesses to consider as credit toward Federal income taxes funds paid by predecessors in connection with State unemployment funds.

TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNICATIONS

Aircraft

H.R. 7593—Public Law 86-661, Approved July 14, 1960

The present measure, requested by the Civil Aeronautics Board, amends the Federal Aviation Act to permit the Board to issue limited certificates of public convenience and necessity for supplemental air transportation for a period of 20 months.

In general, this law authorizes the issuance of a certificate upon a determination of fitness and ability based on conditions peculiar to supplemental air transportation; permits the Board to issue "grandfather" certificates to those carriers now holding unrevoked certificates and have furnished service to April 7, 1960, limited to the same period as contained in the original certificate; permits the Board to grant blanket operat-

ing authorization without having to designate specific points and places limitations on these certificates to insure that service is limited to supplemental air transportation; provides for continuance of operations of presently certificated or exempted supplemental carriers on a qualified basis; preserves all existing enforcement and compliance proceedings; and provides for final disposition of certain pending applications of carriers affected by this bill.

Airline pass privileges

H.R. 4049—Public Law 86–627, Approved July 12, 1960

This legislation authorizes air carriers to grant free or reduced-rate transportation to certain classes of persons in addition to those already designated in the Federal Aviation Act of 1958. These are the following:

(1) Retired directors, officers, and employees and their immediate families receiving retirement benefits;

(2) Parents of active or retired officers and employees (whether or not living in the immediate household);

(3) Immediate family of any person injured or killed in an accident in the performance of his duty for the air carrier where the object is to transport these persons in connection with the accident;

(4) Widows, widowers, and minor children of employees who die of injuries received in line of duty.

This law, which implements a legislative recommendation of the Civil Aeronautics Board, was introduced at the request of the Board and was supported by all segments of the aviation industry, including management and labor. It is permissive and not mandatory and the Board will retain control over all conduct of the air carriers.

Alaska Railroad—Economic regulation

S. 1508—Pocket Veto July 6, 1960

To reflect Alaska's status as the 49th State, this measure amends the legislation which created the Alaska Railroad to provide that 180 days following enactment the Alaska Railroad will be subject to the Interstate Commerce Act and related acts, including Safety Appliance Acts, Boiler Inspection Act, and the Employer Liability Act the same as all other States of the Union.

In addition, the bill provides that applicable statutes regulating intrastate transportation enacted by the State of Alaska will apply to the Alaska Railroad as though privately owned.

This measure excepts from jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission the necessity for approval of any extension of the railroad or issuance of securities by the railroad.

Alaska—Vessel inspection

S. 2669—Public Law 86–688, Approved September 2, 1960

Extends to December 31, 1962, the period of exemption from inspection granted certain small vessels operated by cooperatives or associations transporting merchandise of members on a nonprofit basis to or from places within the inland waters of southeastern Alaska and Prince Rupert, British Columbia, or to or from places within the inland waters of the State of Washington.

Aviation hearings

S. 1545—Public Law 86–758, Approved September 13, 1960

To improve and assist the Civil Aeronautics Board in its administration of economic regulation of the aviation transportation industry, this measure authorizes the CAB to eliminate the requirement for a hearing in cases involving relative simple transactions which do not affect the control of a direct air carrier, or create a monopoly, or restrain competition.

In such cases the Board must first determine that the public interest does not require a hearing and that no one with a substantial interest requested a hearing. In addition, the CAB must give notice of its intention to act without a hearing through publication in the Federal Register with a copy of the notice going to the Attorney General.

Bridge commissions—Annual audit

S. 1511—Passed Senate April 11, 1960; Referred to House Public Works April 12, 1960

This measure requires that each bridge commission and authority created by an act of Congress must provide for an annual audit of its financial transactions by an independent, recognized public accountant of recognized standing. The Governors of the States concerned will prescribe the standards. After the completion of the audit, a report of the findings and a copy of the annual report will be sent to the Governors and the Secretary of Commerce.

The measure also provides that members of the commissions shall continue in office until the expiration of his present term, except where a member is serving without limitation as to length of term the Secretary of Commerce shall reappoint such member for a specific term.

Membership vacancies in the commissions will be filled by the Secretary of Commerce. Incumbent members are to serve until successors qualify. The provisions of this bill do not apply to ex officio members.

Canadian vessels—Alaska

H.R. 9599—Public Law 86–410, Approved April 5, 1960

Extends for another year, until June 30, 1961, a waiver of the statutory requirement that vessels of the U.S. registry be used in passenger or freight transportation between the United States and Alaska.

Permits Canadian-flag vessels to carry passengers and freight between Hyder, Alaska, and other ports in southeastern Alaska and foreign ports.

The waiver is necessary because the Alaska Steamship Co., an American concern, has suspended those operations described in the waiver, leaving the southeastern Alaska ports without available American transportation.

Carrier routes and rates

S. 2452—Passed Senate May 4, 1960; Referred to House Interstate May 5, 1960

This measure permits the establishment of through service and joint rates for carriers serving Alaska or Hawaii and the other States and establishes a Joint Rate Review Board.

The measure becomes effective 120 days after enactment and applies to all carriers including railroads, motor carriers, water carriers, and airlines rendering freight transportation service.

This arrangement will permit a number of carriers to render service from origin to destination on one bill of lading quoting a single transportation charge. Each carrier is required to file tariffs with the regulatory agency having jurisdiction over the carrier. These rates must be reasonable and free from unjust discrimination.

The Joint Board, established by this measure, will pass upon the lawfulness of the rates after applying the standards for permissive joint rates and through routes currently provided for motor carriers of property under the Interstate Commerce Act.

Rates applicable to and from the docks in Hawaii are to be excluded from these joint arrangements since most of this service is in the nature of local drayage within a commercial zone which the ICC exempts from economic regulation.

Certified mail—Government agencies

H.R. 10996—Public Law 86–507, Approved June 11, 1960

This law authorizes the various Government agencies to use the certified-mail procedure of the Post Office Department in lieu of registered mail. The certified-mail procedure in many instances will serve the Government's needs equally as well as the more costly registered mail.

Coastwise trade

H.R. 3900—Public Law 86–666, Approved July 14, 1960

To improve transportation facilities to and from Puerto Rico, this law authorizes enrollment and licensing as U.S. vessels two foreign-built hydrofoil vessels to transport passengers and property between and among ports within the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

Communications Act Amendments of 1960

S. 1898—Public Law 86–752, Approved September 13, 1960

Amends the Communications Act of 1934 to eliminate the requirement that, prior to formal designation of an application for hearing, the Commission must advise the applicant and other known parties in interest of the grounds and reasons for the Commission's inability to make the finding that a grant would serve the public interest.

This measure substitutes for the present postgrant protest procedures, a new pregrant objection procedure by means of a petition to deny.

In addition this act—

Imposes limitations on payoffs between applicants.

Grants authority to suspend station licenses.

Requires disclosure of payments made for the broadcasting of certain matter.

Grants authority to impose forfeitures in the broadcast service.

Prohibits deceptive practices in contests of intellectual knowledge, skill or chance.

Authorizes Commission to issue broadcast licenses for less than 3-year periods.

Authorizes local notice and local hearings of broadcast applications.

Requires Commission approval in cases where two or more broadcast applications are compromised or withdrawn as a result of payoffs.

Repeals the provision permitting FCC Commissioners to accept honorariums.

Contracts for transportation of mail

S. 2399—Passed Senate June 24, 1960; Referred to House Post Office and Civil Service June 25, 1960

This bill is designed to make the following needed changes in existing law relating to contracts for the transportation of mail:

First, it revises existing law to require the Post Office Department to act promptly on an application of a star route carrier to be released from his contract on the grounds of hardship.

Second, it gives the Postmaster General authority to withhold payment to a carrier on any given route when service is unsatisfactory instead of on all routes operated by the carrier as now required under existing law; and

Third, it would permit the extension of contracts from 50 miles up to as much as 100 miles when necessary in the interest of the service.

Fishing industry subsidy

H.R. 5421—Public Law 86–516, Approved June 12, 1960

This law provides a 3-year, $7.5 million subsidy program for construction of fishing vessels.

Authorizes a payment of up to one-third of the construction cost for these vessels.

Limits to citizens of the United States the right to apply for a construction subsidy; the citizen, however, must have been recommended for relief by the Tariff Commission under the escape clause of the Trade Agreements Act and relief denied by the President.

Provides that applicants must employ American crews or legally domiciled aliens.

Requires that all plans and specifications must be submitted to the Defense Department for approval that the vessel would be suitable as an auxiliary in time of emergency, and excludes from payments cost of any defense item.

Requires that these vessels be constructed in domestic shipyards by competitive bidding, with disapproved rights reserved to both Maritime Administration and the applicant.

Requires repayment to the United States if a vessel is not operated in the fishery for which it was constructed.

Great Lakes vessels

S. 3019—Public Law 86–555, Approved June 30, 1960

This law establishes pilotage requirements for foreign oceangoing vessels as well as for vessels of U.S. registry while they are navigating the five Great Lakes, their connecting and tributary waters, the St. Lawrence River as far east as St. Regis, and adjacent port areas. It also provides for a regulated pilotage system and for coordinating this system with a similar pilotage system in Canada for ocean vessels navigating the Great Lakes water of that country.

It also sets up qualifications for registered pilots authorized to direct the navigation of the vessels in certain to-be-designated restricted waters, as well as in the open waters of the lakes, and for the other officers who will be authorized to direct navigation solely in the nondesignated, or open, waters.

Provides that the President shall designate certain areas in which registered vessels of the United States and foreign vessels coming into the lakes must have in their service a registered pilot to direct their navigation, and lays down certain bases for the designation.

In waters not designated by the President, the bill permits vessels to have either a registered pilot or the master or another officer among the vessel's licensed complement who is qualified to direct navigation in open waters.

The act becomes effective upon enactment, except that the pilotage provisions would not become effective until the first day of the fourth month following the issuance of regulations by the Secretary.

Hazardous substances for household use

S. 1283—Public Law 86–613, Approved July 12, 1960

The primary purpose of this law is to establish standards for labeling hazardous substances which are used in and about the household which are not now regulated by existing law.

The Federal Caustic Poison Act of 1927 lists 12 chemical substances required to be labeled when in a container suitable for household use. Economic poisons and foods, drugs, and cosmetics are regulated but there are many substances which fit into none of these categories.

It is felt that labeling of these substances must be regulated when shipped in interstate commerce and that the standards and requirements of the labels be uniform in order to warn the use of any hazard in the customary use of the product and, in case of an accident, to identify the hazardous ingredient for the attending physician.

Highway aid

H.R. 10495—Public Law 86–657, Approved July 14, 1960

Authorizes total appropirations of $2,089,500,000 for Federal aid for highways in fiscal 1962 and 1963.

Breakdown of funds:

	Fiscal 1962	Fiscal 1963
From highway trust fund:		
Primary, secondary, urban	$925,000,000	$925,000,000
From general revenues:		
Forest highways	33,000,000	33,000,000
Forest roads and trails	35,000,000	40,000,000
Parks roads and trails	18,000,000	18,000,000
Parkways	16,000,000	16,000,000
Indian reservation roads and bridges	12,000,000	12,000,000
Public land highways	3,500,000	3,000,000
Total	1,042,500,000	1,047,000,000

The ABC road funds (primary, secondary, and urban) to be available to the States according to formulas related to area, population, and postal roads, on the basis of 45 percent for primary roads, 30 percent for secondary, and 25 percent for urban, and with the normal requirement that the States match all funds received on a 50–50 basis, with a downward sliding scale adjustment in the required share for States having certain public lands within their boundaries.

Independent freight forwarders

H.R. 5068—In Conference

This act defines and provides for licensing independent ocean freight forwarders and permits common carriers by water to compensate these ocean freight forwarders when they are licensed and perform any two of six enumerated services.

This bill provides that common carriers by water may compensate independent ocean freight forwarders for performance of certain services, and specifies the terms of the compensation. The purpose of this provision is to end the extended litigation and proceedings on this issue by recognizing the right of the independent ocean freight forwarder to receive brokerage.

International travel agency

S. 3102—Passed Senate June 7, 1960; Referred to House Interstate June 8, 1960

This measure authorizes $5 million for expanding a Commerce Department program to encourage foreign tourists to visit the United States to help offset the current balance-of-trade deficit of the United States.

Establishes in the Department of Commerce an Office of International Travel with a director and staff, to be advised by a Travel Advisory Board of 12 part-time, non-Government personnel.

The office is designed to encourage more host arrangements and tourist facilities in the United States, coordinate Federal travel services, participate in the International Cooperation Administration's technical assistance and economic development programs. It will also collect and publish travel information.

Intrastate motor carriers operating in interstate commerce

S. 3228—Passed Senate September 1, 1960

This bill amends the Interstate Commerce Act to permit State commissions under a specific procedure to grant the right to motor common carriers operating within a single State to engage in interstate or foreign operations within the boundaries of the State in which intrastate authority is simultaneously authorized, and to authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission to issue certificates of registration to existing carriers engaged in interstate operations under the terms of the present second proviso.

The existing second proviso of section 206(a)(1) of the Interstate Commerce Act enables motor common carriers whose operations are confined to a single State and who have been granted a certificate to allow operation within the State from their State regulatory bodies to also engage in operations in interstate and foreign commerce. These operations in interstate and foreign commerce must, of course, be carried on entirely within the State in which the motor carrier is certificated to operate.

Mass Transportation Act of 1960

S. 3278—Passed Senate June 27, 1960; Referred to House Banking June 28, 1960

To assist State and local governments in improving mass transportation services in metropolitan areas, Congress passed this measure and declared as its policy to assist these crowded areas in studies and planning in order to determine their transportation needs, to formulate a program for the most efficient use of existing facilities, and to study and develop plans for various new transportation systems.

This bill—

Authorizes Federal grants for transportation system planning.

Makes the public facility loan program applicable to financing, acquisition, construction, and improvement of facilities and equipment for use in mass transit systems in urban areas.

Provides that mass transportation loans may be made only after a showing that these funds are not otherwise available on equally favorable terms. Interest rates to these borrowers cannot exceed the total of one-fourth of 1 percent a year, added to the rate paid by the Administrator, to obtain funds from the Secretary of the Treasury.

Directs the Administrator, in processing applications for mass transportation loans, to give priority to applicants who have a workable plan to develop a coordinated mass transportation system and to those with the most pressing need for assistance.

Increases the public facility loan revolving fund from $100 to $300 million—$100 million of the total fund is reserved for mass transportation loans. The remaining $100 million of the $200 million increase in the total fund will be available for regular public facility loans.

Provides that funds for such loans be obtained from the Treasury at a rate not more than the average annual interest rate of all interest-bearing obligations of the United States then forming a part of the public debt as computed at the end of the fiscal year next preceding the borrowing.

National Transportation Week

House Joint Resolution 602—Public Law 86–475, Approved May 20, 1960

As a public recognition of the vitality and resourcefulness of those individuals who have capably met and continue to meet the ever-changing and growing transportation needs of our country, the Congress requests the President to proclaim the third week in May of 1960 as National Transportation Week.

Obscene mail

H.R. 7379—Public Law 86–573, Approved July 14, 1960

This law authorizes the Post Office Department to seek court orders to curb use of the mails for distributing obscene or fraudulent matter.

Political broadcasting—Equal time

Senate Joint Resolution 207—Public Law 86–677, August 24, 1960

This legislation is designed to suspend for the period of the 1960 presidential and vice-presidential campaign with respect to the nominees for the office of President and Vice President of the United States a part of section 315(a) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended. That is the part which requires a licensee of a broadcast station who permits any legally qualified candidate for a public office to use a broadcasting station to afford equal opportunities to all other candidates for that office in the use of the broadcasting station.

This joint resolution also provides that the Federal Communications Commission make a report to Congress not later than March 1, 1961, relative to the provisions of this joint resolution and any recommendations the Commissioner may have for amendments to the Communications Act of 1934 as the result of experience under the provisions of the legislation.

Postal service codification

H.R. 2339—Public Law 86-682, Approved September 2, 1960

The intent of this measure is to consolidate and simplify the many laws governing the postal service by—

Substituting simple language for awkward, obsolete terms;

Resolving conflict in laws;

Revising ambiguous provisions to reflect the Comptroller General's interpretations; and

Eliminating superseded, obsolete or executed laws.

Railroad indebtedness

H.R. 11405—Public Law 86-496, Approved June 8, 1960

Revises method for treating railroad corporation income resulting from discharge of indebtedness in receivership or under bankruptcy proceedings.

Present law provides that the discharge of indebtedness of a railroad corporation in a taxable year beginning before January 1, 1958, is not to result in taxable income for the railroad if the discharge occurred as the result of a court order in a receivership proceeding or in a proceeding under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act. This law continues the application of this provision to discharge after December 31, 1959, but only if the court proceeding involved commenced before January 1, 1960.

The Technical Amendments Act of 1958 provided that a deduction for accrued vacation pay is not to be denied for any taxable year ending before January 1, 1961, solely because the liability for it to a specific person has not been fixed or because the liability for it to each individual cannot be computed with reasonable accuracy. However, for the corporation to obtain the deduction the employee must have performed the qualifying service necessary under a plan or policy which provides for vacations with pay to qualified employees. Under this bill the same treatment is extended to deductions for taxable years ending before January 1, 1963.

Ship construction subsidy

H.R. 10644—Public Law 86-607, Approved July 7, 1960

This law raises the construction subsidy ceiling from the present 50 percent to 55 percent on contracts for the construction of merchant ships signed within 2 years from the date of enactment and retroactive to keels laid after June 30, 1959.

Thus, for this limited period, American shipyards and American shipowners will be placed on a parity with their foreign competitors so long as foreign and domestic vessel prices remain at the present projected levels.

Bars free or reduced-rate ship transportation to Government employees or officials on U.S. merchant marine vessels.

Ship mortgage insurance

S. 3018—Passed Senate June 6, 1960; House Calendar

Grants temporary Federal aid to the depressed shipping industry, particularly the tanker industry, by authorizing the Department of Commerce to advance funds to mortgagors, insured under the Merchant Marine Act, in order to prevent them from having to default in their installment and interest payments.

Congress enacted this Government insurance program in 1959 to enable the shipping companies to replace their wornout fleets with modern efficient ships and tankers; also to encourage private financing rather than Government financing. The recession in the shipping and tanker industry, which has developed in the past few months, has created a problem whereby the Government has to either take over and mothball these mortgaged ships or grant temporary relief to the shipowners.

Thus, this permissive legislation will allow the Maritime Commission to borrow from the Treasury and make loans to prevent the defaults and also continue the mortgage payments to the Government but stretched out over a longer term.

Towing vehicles removed from ICC regulation

S. 2375—Passed Senate May 26, 1960; Referred to House Interstate May 27, 1960

This measure removes from ICC regulation motor vehicles used to tow disabled or wrecked vehicles.

Transit regulation compact

House Joint Resolution 402—Public Law 86-794; Approved September 15, 1960

The purposes of the resolution are: (1) to grant congressional consent, pursuant to the Federal Constitution, to an interstate compact between the States of Virginia and Maryland and the District of Columbia, (2) to authorize and direct the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to enter into and execute the compact, (3) to suspend Federal jurisdiction relating to or affecting transportation under the compact and to the persons engaged therein, and (4) to confer jurisdiction upon the Federal judiciary to review orders of the compact commission and to enforce the regulatory provisions of the compact.

U.S. shipyards—Domestic vessels

S. 3189—Public Law 86-583, Approved July 5, 1960

Amends the Merchant Marine Act to require that any vessel of more than 500 gross tons which has acquired the right to engage in coastwise trade must, if rebuilt, be rebuilt entirely within the United States, its territories, or its possessions; otherwise it will lose the right to engage in coastwise trade.

Vessel exchange

S. 2618—Public Law 86-575, Approved July 5, 1960

This act authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to acquire vessels which were constructed as contracted for by the Government between January 1, 1941, and September 2, 1945, or which were constructed between September 3, 1939, and September 2, 1945, and acquired by the Government during the latter period, toward exchange for vessels from the reserve fleet which were built, contracted for, or acquired within the periods noted.

Requires payment in cash at the time of the exchange for the excess in value of the vessels traded out.

Vessels offered for trade-in must have been owned by U.S. citizens, and must have been documented under the American flag and operated without operating-differential subsidy for 3 years immediately preceding the exchange date.

Vessel life—Extension

H.R. 10646—Public Law 86-518, Approved June 12, 1960

This law amends the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 so as to relate the life expectancy of certain vessels to 25 years instead of 20 years.

Under present law the merchant marine is required to establish a depreciation reserve for all ships based upon a 20-year life; however, the actual fact is that these ships have a life of 25 or more years.

Thus, the amendment merely requires that when a ship has a life of 25 years, it may be depreciated or set up on the basis of 25 years, and not on the fictitious basis of 20 years, which requires a higher annual depreciation.

VETERANS

Basic pay

H.R. 7502—Public Law 86-492, Approved June 8, 1960

This act liberalizes the method of computing basic pay for dependency and indemnity compensation by using a higher rank held in service than that held at the time of a veteran's death in service or his discharge, if the use of the higher rank results in a greater benefit to the widow. It applies to cases where the veterans had satisfactorily served on active duty for 6 months or more in the higher rank and was so serving within 120 days of his death or discharge.

The formula for determining the amount of compensation which the widow receives is $112 plus 12 percent of the base pay of the person, who served. Thus, this bill relates the dependency and indemnity compensation payable to a widow to the income level of her husband to which they have been accustomed over an extended period of time near the date of his death or separation from service.

Children benefits

H.R. 10898—Public Law 86-499, Approved June 8, 1960

Under existing law, veterans with service-connected disabilities rated 50 percent or more disabling are entitled to additional compensation for their wives, children (three only), and dependent parents. Thus a veteran with a wartime disability, totally disabled, receives $23 for a wife, $39 for a wife and one child, $50 for a wife and two children, and $62 for a wife and three children. No payment is made for children in excess of three, and the rate for children in excess of one is generally a $12 monthly additional allowance.

This measure permits the $12 monthly payment for all children, regardless of the number a veteran might have.

Dependents—Additional compensation

H.R. 276—Public Law 86-490, Approved June 8, 1960

This measure authorizes additional compensation to veterans for dependents based on the establishment of a disability rating of not less than 50 percent from the effective date of the increased percentage evaluation, provided the basic proof of dependents is received in the Veterans' Administration within 60 days from the date of notification of the rating action.

Under existing law, the effective date of additional compensation for dependents cannot be earlier than the date of the receipt of evidence showing dependent entitlement.

Disabled veterans

H.R. 7211—Public Law 86-663, Approved July 14, 1960

This act provides a new rate of $265 a month for any service-connected disabled veteran who is rated as totally disabled and has additional service-connected disabilities ratable at 60 percent or more, or is permanently housebound.

Duplicate benefit payments—Barred

H.R. 9788—Public Law 86-495, Approved June 8, 1960

This measure prohibits duplicate benefits, such as compensation, dependency, and indemnity compensation, or pension, to a child on account of death of more than one parent in the same parental line. It does not affect insurance benefits which are matters of contract.

Thus, this act will preclude a case such as the following: A World War II widow with three children was receiving compensation for the death of her World War II husband and so were the children of this marriage. The widow remarried and the second husband was a veteran, who later died. Upon his death the three children of the first marriage were receiving benefits from both.

Facilities for veterans

S. 2201—Passed Senate June 28, 1960; Referred to House Veterans' Affairs June 29, 1960

This bill amends the definition of the term "Veterans' Administration facilities" to include private contract facilities for veterans in any war in a State if (1) no Veterans' Administration hospital is located in the State on the effective date of the act, and (2) no Veterans' Administration hospital is located within 500 miles of the border of the State.

The amended definition of "VA facilities" permits the use of private contract hospitals for the care of veterans with non-service-connected disabilities in the States of Alaska and Hawaii. In practical effect, this merely restores privileges to Alaskan and Hawaiian veterans which they enjoyed prior to admission of these States to statehood.

Inasmuch as the VA now has authority to use private contract facilities for the care of service-connected cases, the authority conferred upon the Administrator by this bill is limited to non-service-connected disabled veterans. To qualify for care in a private contract facility, the non-service-connected veteran would have to meet the same standards as would apply to a veteran in any one of the other 48 States.

Guaranteed and direct loan programs

H.R. 7903—Public Law 86-665, Approved July 14, 1950

This law extends the VA guaranteed and direct home loan programs for 2 years, through July 25, 1962.

Insurance waivers

H.R. 10703—Public Law 86-497, Approved June 8, 1960

This act authorizes a waiver of national service life insurance premiums to those veterans who become totally disabled in line of duty between the date of application and the effective date of their insurance. It applies to veterans of World War II and the early Korean conflict only.

The act requires application for its benefits within 2 years after enactment and an extension of time for applying will be provided for insane persons and minors. It revives certain lapsed contracts of insurance but precludes payment in any case where the servicemen's indemnity or gratuitous disability insurance had been paid.

Medal of Honor pensions

H.R. 270—Passed Senate, Amended, August 19, 1960; House Agrees With an Amendment

The purpose of this act is to liberalize the monthly pension payable to holders of the Congressional Medal of Honor. The bill, as passed by the House of Representatives, would eliminate the existing law eligibility requirements that the individual must be 65 years of age and honorably discharged from the armed services, and increase the amount of the monthly pension from $10 to $100. The bill, as passed by the Senate, would reduce the age requirement from 65 to 62 and allow the Medal of Honor holder who has been honorably discharged from the Armed Forces to elect, by filing proper application, either the $10 rate or choose a monthly pension of $100 which would be subject to reduction by the amount of any non-service-connected disability pension which he may receive.

National service life insurance

H.R. 11045—Passed Senate, Amended, June 2, 1960

This measure restores for 1 year (after January 1, 1961) veterans' eligibility for World War II national service life insurance, if the veteran had active service between October 8, 1940, and September 2, 1945, inclusive.

Authorizes for this 1-year period the same type NSLI for those veterans who had active service between September 3, 1945, and April 24, 1951, inclusive.

Restores for this same period the eligibility of persons separated from active service on and after April 25, 1951, and prior to date of enactment of the bill, who have a service-connected disability but are otherwise in good health, for nonparticipating service disabled veterans insurance.

Provides a 1-year period during which veterans separated from active service on and after April 25, 1951, and prior to January 1, 1957, may be granted nonparticipating national service life insurance on a limited convertible term or permanent plan.

This bill requires that the administrative cost of the insurance granted to persons in the above groups, except the service-disabled veterans, be borne by the insured by a reduction in dividends in the participating insurance group, and a loading of premiums in the nonparticipating insurance group.

Provides that a medical examination, when required of an applicant for insurance, other than service-disabled veterans insurance, shall be at the applicant's expense and by a licensed physician.

Exclude from eligibility those persons whose service before July 1, 1946, in the organized military forces of the Government of the Commonwealth of the Philippines while these forces were in the service of the United States, or in the Philippine Scouts.

NSLI—Aviation accident

H.R. 9785—Public Law 86-494, Approved June 8, 1960

This law grants a gratuitous national service life insurance up to $10,000 to any seaman who died as a result of an aviation accident incurred in the line of duty in active service of the Navy after October 7, 1940, and before August 4, 1942, while undergoing flight training leading to appointment as an aviation cadet under the act of April 15, 1935.

The insurance is payable effective from the date of enactment in monthly installments to a limited class of beneficiaries, if living, and no payment will be made to the estate of such person.

Similar laws, which have since been repealed because no longer necessary, authorized a $10,000 insurance policy with premiums paid by the Government to members of the Armed Forces serving as aviation cadets, aviation students, or otherwise undergoing some type of flight training. However, to reduce paperwork the Navy enlisted such students as seamen, second class, V-5, for the elimination and primary stages of flight training. In 1942, Congress passed an act permitting aviation cadets to enlist in the Navy instead of the appointment of such cadets from the enlisted seamen. This act will take care of those few cases in which the seaman was killed prior to qualifying as an aviation cadet, or during his elimination flight.

Outpatient care

H.R. 7966—Public Law 86-598, Approved July 7, 1960

This act expands the use of optometrists' services in the Veterans' Administration outpatient program for veterans having service-connected eye conditions.

Under existing law the Veterans' Administration is authorized to furnish outpatient medical care for veterans with service-connected disabilities. This care is furnished primarily in Veterans' Administration clinics, but it is supplemented by the services of fee-basis, private physicians in cases where it is not feasible to provide the care at the clinics.

The general authority to provide such care states that the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs may furnish "medical services" for a service-connected disability. The term "medical services" is defined as follows:

"The term 'medical services' includes, in addition to medical examination and treatment, dental and surgical services, and dental appliances, wheelchairs, artificial limbs, trusses, and similar appliances, special clothing made necessary by the wearing of prosthetic appliances, and such other supplies as the Administrator determines to be reasonable and necessary."

To insure expanded use of optometrists' services, this act amends the definition "medical services" by adding the words "optometrists' services" immediately after the word "treatment."

Service connected—Death benefits

H.R. 641—Public Law 86-491, Approved June 8, 1960

This act is designed to authorize payment of service-connected death compensation to an otherwise eligible widow of a veteran if she was married to him before the expiration of 15 years after the termination of the period of service in which the injury or disease causing death was incurred or aggravated.

Under existing law, dependency, indemnity, and death compensation may be paid to a widow, otherwise entitled, who was married to the veteran (1) Before the expiration of 15 years after termination of the period of service in which the injury or disease causing death of the veteran was incurred or aggravated; or (2) For 5 or more years; or (3) For any period of time if a child was born of the marriage. However, if neither the second nor third condition is met, death compensation is payable only if the widow was married to the veteran before the expiration of 10 years after termination of the period of service in which the injury or disease causing the death of the veteran was incurred or aggravated.

This bill extends the 10-year period to 15 years to make it consistent with the other service-connected death benefit provision.

Service connected—Severance

H.R. 113—Public Law 86-501, Approved June 10, 1960

This act prohibits the severance of any service connection granted under title 38, United States Code, and which has been in effect for 10 or more years, unless it is shown that there was fraud or that the veteran did not have the necessary service or character of discharge.

It should be noted, however, that this act merely freezes the determination of service connection and does not freeze the percentage rating which represents the degree of the disability and governs the amount of compensation. Thus a veteran with a disability rating of 10 percent may later be medically determined to be 80 percent disabled and have his rating and compensation increased. Likewise, a rating and compensation can be reduced as the degree of disability declines.

State veterans' homes

H.R. 10596—Public Law 86-625, Approved July 12, 1960

This measure changes the method of Federal aid to State homes from a payment of $700 a year to a daily maximum basis of

$2.50. The $2.50 a day maximum increases from $700 to $912.50 a year, the amount payable to States for the care of disabled soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines.

The first Federal contribution to States in aid of State veterans' homes was authorized in 1888. At that time the aid was fixed at $100 a year for each veteran. Since 1920 the Federal contribution has gradually increased and reached its present level of $700 in 1954.

VA Hospitals—Patient turnover

H.R. 7965—Public Law 86–639, Approved July 12, 1960

This law authorizes the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration to furnish medical service for a non-service-connected disability under the following circumstances:

(1) Where such care is reasonably necessary in preparation for admission of a veteran who has been determined to need hospital care and who has been scheduled for admission; and

(2) Where a veteran has been granted hospital care, and out-patient care is reasonably necessary to complete treatment incident to such care.

This new authority conferred upon the Administrator is limited to non-service-connected cases, inasmuch as authority for providing such care to veterans with service-connected disabilities already exists.

The purpose of the bill is to accelerate the rate of patient turnover in Veterans' Administration hospitals.

VA—Reimbursements

H.R. 10108—Public Law 86–590, Approved July 5, 1960

This act authorizes reimbursement for ferry fares, and bridge, road, and tunnel tolls in addition to the mileage allowance.

Section 111 of title 38 authorizes the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to pay the actual necessary expense of travel or an allowance based upon mileage traveled, of any person who travels in connection with vocational rehabilitation, certain educational and vocational counseling, or for the purpose of medical examination, treatment, or care. Travel payments are also allowed for required attendants, other than employees of the Veterans' Administration.

The mileage allowance is currently set at 5 cents per mile. Recent studies by the Veterans' Administration have shown, however, that in some areas the 5-cent rate is inadequate to cover ferry fares, and bridge, road, and tunnel tolls, which, of course, constitute essential elements in general travel costs. Presently, such fares and tolls may be recovered by filing claims for "actual necessary expense" instead of the "mileage allowance"; however, the recovery of fares and tolls by this method involves considerable inconvenience and impracticality.

In view of these facts, it is believed it will be much simpler and more convenient, both for the individual and for the Government, to permit amounts for fares and tolls to be added to the mileage allowance.

ROLLCALL OR VOICE VOTES ON LEGISLATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS SUBMITTED BY PRESIDENT EISENHOWER, 86TH CONGRESS, 2D SESSION

During the 2d session of the 86th Congress, the President submitted 152 recommendations. These proposals were carefully examined by the Congress and changes made wherever and whenever they appeared necessary for the best interests of the people.

Below is a recapitulation of legislative action on these recommendations. Following the recapitulation is a list of all the recommendations with a detailed analysis of all activity on each.

RECAP

Rollcall or voice votes on legislative recommendations submitted by the President, 86th Cong., 2d sess., as of Aug. 3, 1960

Total number of recommendations submitted	152
Action completed	61
Passed Senate	8
Passed House	7
Reported to Calendars (Senate, 3; House 6)	9
Hearings in progress or completed, still in committee	19
No legislation	5
No action	25
Vetoed	2
Rejected	8
Study being conducted	1
Dropped	1
Recommitted	1
In conference	4

Number of presidential recommendations submitted and number upon which Congress completed action from 1953 through 1960

	1953	1954	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960
Administration submitted	83	128	147	151	155	149	162	152
Action completed	58	60	77	101	67	84	79	64

*—Recommended in 1st sess. and again in 2d sess. of 86th Cong.
S—State of the Union.
B—Budget message.
E—Economic message.
Sp—Special message.

Rollcall or voice votes on legislative recommendations submitted by the President, 86th Cong., 2d sess.—Jan. 6 to Aug. 31, 1960

AGRICULTURE

Recommendation by subject	Progress									
	Hearings		Reported		Final passage vote		Rejected		In conference	Final action
	Senate	House	Senate	House	Senate	House	Senate	House		
1. *Revise agricultural price-support programs (S, B, E, Sp., 2/9, 8/8): H.R. 10672		X								
2. Extend for 3 years, with revisions, the conservation reserve program (B, E, Sp., Feb. 9, 1960): H.R. 11930; S. 3881		X		X			59 to 32 6/9/60			
3. Eliminate acreage allotments and marketing quotas for wheat beginning with 1961 crop, and set price support levels at a percentage of the average price during 3 preceding calendar years (Sp., Feb. 9, 1960): S. 2750; H.R. 12261	X	X	X	X	44 to 36 6/9/60			X 6/23/60		
4. Strengthen food-for-peace program (B, E, Sp., Feb. 9, 1960)	X	X	X	X	60 to 25 5/2/60	243 to 160 4/21/60				P.L. 86–472; App. 5/14/60.
5. Approve food-for-peace plan for presentation to U.N. (Sp., 8/8/60): S. Con. Res. 116	X		X		Voice 8/27/60					
6. *Revise interest rates for rural electric and telephone loans (B, E): S. 133; H.R. 10307										
7. *Simplify and consolidate loan authority of Secretary for farm ownership and operation (B): S. 2144; H.R. 11761	X	X		X		Voice 6/2/60				
8. *Require greater sharing by States in costs of farm disaster relief (B): S. 1013; H.R. 6861	X	X		X		Voice 8/3/59	Com.			
9. *Reduce advance authorization for agricultural conservation program (B): H.R. 12117	X	X						Com.		
10. *Extend Sugar Act and cut quota for Cuba, expires 3/31/61 (B, E)	X	X	X	X	32 to 24 7/30/60	Voice 6/30/60				P.L. 86–592; App. 7/6/60.
11. Extend Sugar Act beyond 3/31/61 and cut quota for Dominican Republic: H.R. 13062	X	X	X	X	Voice 9/1/60	Voice 8/30/60			X	
12. *Recover administrative costs of Federal Crop Insurance Corporation (B): S. 1307; H.R. 5743										
13. *Establish revolving fund for REA (B, E): S. 2563										
H.R. 8772		X								
14. Establish revolving fund for Farmers Home Administration (E): S. 870, S. 2144	X									
H.R. 11761		X		X		Voice 6/2/60				

Rollcall or voice votes on legislative recommendations submitted by the President, 86th Cong., 2d sess.—Jan. 6 to Aug. 31, 1960—Continued

CIVIL RIGHTS

Recommendation by subject	Progress									
	Hearings		Reported		Final passage vote		Rejected		In conference	Final action
	Senate	House	Senate	House	Senate	House	Senate	House		
15. Assure equal pay for equal work (B, E): S. 1345; H.R. 3866; S.J. Res. 69	X		X							Recommitted 7/2/60.
16. Revise laws to reflect admission of State of Hawaii (B): H.R. 11602	X	X	X	X	Voice 6/28/60	Voice 5/16/60				P.L. 86-624; app. 7/12/60.
17. *Provide home rule for District of Columbia (B): S. 1681, complete	X		X		Voice					
S.J. Res. 39, partial	X	X	X	X	7/15/59 70 to 18 2/2/60	Voice 6/14/60				Constitutional amdt. before States for ratification.
18. Authorize nonvoting resident commissioners for Guam and the Virgin Islands (B): H.R. 11274		X		X						
19. *Enact civil rights legislation to amend law relative to obstruction of certain court orders (S.B.): H.R. 8601	X	X	X	X	71 to 18 4/8/60	311 to 109 3/24/60				P.L. 86-449; app. 5/6/60.
20. Enact civil rights legislation to punish flight to avoid prosecution for unlawful destruction of educational or religious structures (S.B.): H.R. 8601	X	X	X	X	71 to 18 4/8/60	311 to 109 3/24/60				P.L. 86-449; app. 5/6/60.
21. Enact civil rights legislation to provide for retention and preservation of Federal election records; and authorize Attorney General to compel production of such records (S.B.): H.R. 8601	X	X	X	X	71 to 18 4/8/60	311 to 109 3/24/60				P.L. 86-449; app. 5/6/60.
22. Enact civil rights legislation to assist State and local agencies in meeting costs of special professional services needed in carrying out public school desegregation programs (S.B., Sp. 8-8): H.R. 8601	X	X					61 to 30 4/1/60			
23. Amend Public Law 815-874 of 81st Cong. to provide for education of children of members of Armed Forces in communities in which public schools are closed (S.B.): H.R. 8601	X	X	X	X	71 to 18 4/8/60	311 to 109 3/24/60				P.L. 86-499; app. 5/6/60.
24. Establish a Commission on Equal Job Opportunity under Government contracts (S.B., Sp. 8-8): H.R. 8601; H.R. 11981							48 to 38 4/1/60			
25. Authorize Federal court appointment of voting referees (S.B.): H.R. 8601	X	X	X	X	71 to 18 4/8/60	311 to 109 3/24/60				P.L. 86-449; app. 5/6/60.

DEFENSE AND SPACE EXPLORATION

26. *Discontinue statutory minimum strength for Army National Guard (B): H.R. 3388	X	X						X		
27. *Facilitate sale of surplus real property (B): H.R. 10777	X	X	X	X	Voice 5/13/60	404 to 4 3/9/60				P.L. 86-500; app. 6/8/60.
28. *Authorize sale of Alaska Communications System (B): H.R. 4879										
29. *Eliminate restrictions on foreign bidding on military supply items (B)	X	X	X	X			X	X		
30. Equalize military retirement pay (B): H.R. 11318	X	X		X		Voice 5/12/60				
31. Authorize military construction (in accord): H.R. 10777	X	X	X	X	Voice 5/13/60	404 to 4 3/9/60				P.L. 86-500; app. 6/8/60.
32. Authorize AEC construction (in accord): H.R. 11713	X	X	X	X	Voice 5/10/60	321 to 2 5/6/60				P.L. 86-457; app. 5/13/60.
33. Strengthen organization and management of outer space programs (S, B, Sp.): H.R. 12049	X	X		X		Division vote 235 to 31 6/9/60				ABMA transfer effective 3/14/60.
34. Authorize NASA appropriations for 1961 (B): H.R. 10809	X	X	X	X	78 to 0 5/3/60	399 to 10 3/9/60				P.L. 86-481; app. 6/1/60.
35. Provide permanent authorizations for later years (B): H.R. 10746										
36. Construct a linear accelerator at Stanford Univ. (in accord)	X	X					Joint Atomic Energy Com.	X		

EDUCATION

37. *Authorize financial assistance for local school construction (S, B, Sp. 8-8): S. 8; H.R. 10128	X	X	X	X	51 to 34 2/4/60	206 to 189 5/26/60			X	
38. *Authorize financial assistance for construction of college facilities (S, B): S. 1017; H.R. 4267	X	X								
39. *Revise programs for aid to schools in federally affected areas (B)	X	X	X	X	79 to 2 3/24/60	Voice 2/29/60				P.L. 86-424; app. 4/13/60.
40. Remove affidavit requirement from National Defense Education Act (B): S. 2029	X	X	X		Voice 6/1/60					

Rollcall or voice votes on legislative recommendations submitted by the President, 86th Cong., 2d sess.—Jan. 6 to Aug. 31, 1960—Continued

Recommendation by subject	Progress									
	Hearings		Reported		Final passage vote		Rejected		In conference	Final action
	Senate	House	Senate	House	Senate	House	Senate	House		
FEDERAL EMPLOYEES										
41. Establish policy for financing civil service retirement (B): H.R. 9705										
42. Charge civil service benefits for certain widows and retired employees to trust fund after 1961 (B)	X	X	X	X	Voice 5/5/60	Voice 8/17/59				P.L. 86-604; app. 7/7/60.
Do	X	X	X	X	75 to 8 6/22/60	Voice 4/20/60				P.L. 86-626; app. 7/12/60.
43. Make permanent 1958 salary increases for Post Office field personnel (B)	X	X	X	X	62 to 17 6/17/60	378 to 40 6/15/60				P.L. 86-568; 7/1/60.
FINANCE AND COMMERCE										
44. Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation (B): (a) Increase savings and loan insurance premiums (b) Reduce statutory goal of reserves in FSLIC (c) Authorize FSLIC to borrow from private sources: S. 3175 : H.R. 10676	X									
45. *Provide flexible interest rates on veterans and military housing loans (B, E): H.R. 12213, 12163, 12185										
46. Liberalize authority of small business investment companies (B, E): S. 2611	X	X	X	X	Voice 9/10/59	Voice 5/18/60				P.L. 86-502; 6/11/60.
47. *Broaden exemption of small security issues from registration (B, E)	X									
48. *Extend Federal regulation to bank mergers accomplished through acquisition of assets (B, E)	X	X	X	X	Voice 5/14/59	Voice 4/4/60				P.L. 86-463; app. 5/13/60.
49. *Require notification to the antitrust agencies of proposed mergers by businesses of significant size (B, E): S. 442	X									
50. *Authorize FTC to seek preliminary injunctions in merger cases where a violation is likely (B, E): S. 442	X									
51. *Authorize the Attorney General to issue civil investigative demands in antitrust cases when civil procedures are contemplated (B, E): S. 716	X		X		Voice 7/29/59					
52. *Remove present 4½-percent-interest rate ceiling on new Treasury bonds (S, B, E, Sp. 8-8): S. 2813; H.R. 10590		X		X						
53. Extend temporary debt limit (B, E)	X	X	X	X	84 to 0 6/20/60	223 to 174 6/8/60				P.L. 86-564; app. 6/30/60.
FOREIGN RELATIONS										
54. Extend mutual security program a total of $4.175 billion in following amounts and authorize— (a) Military assistance, $2 billion (b) Defense support, $724 million (c) Special assistance, $268 million (d) Technical assistance, $207.5 million (e) Development Loan Fund, $700 million (f) Contingency fund, $175 million (g) Other programs, $101 million H.R. 11510	X	X	X	X	60 to 25 5/2/60	243 to 130 4/21/60				P.L. 86-472; app. 5/14/60.
55. Revise eligibility requirements for countries to receive economic assistance (B): S. 1697	X		X		49 to 40 9/12/59					
56. Repeal reservations relative to jurisdiction of World Court (S, B): S. Res. 94	X									
57. Authorize payment of certain Philippine war damage claims (B): S. 3238; H.R. 12078		X		X						
58. Authorize compensation to displaced residents of the Bonin Islands (B): S. 2130	X	X	X	X	Voice 8/24/59	Voice 5/23/60				P.L. 86-486; app. 6/1/60.
59. Ratify treaty for importation of educational, scientific, and cultural materials	X		X		76 to 14 2/23/60					Ratified.
60. Ratify North American Regional Broadcasting Agreement	X		X		76 to 8 2/23/60					Ratified.
61. Ratify agreement between United States and Mexico concerning radio broadcasting	X	X	X	X	76 to 8 2/23/60					Ratified.
62. Provide for participation in International Development Association: H.R. 11001	X	X	X	X	Voice 6/2/60	Voice 6/29/60				P.L. 86-565; app. 6/30/60.
63. Ratify agreement for facilitating the international circulation of visual and auditory materials: Ex. V	X		X		77 to 4 5/26/60					Ratified.
64. Extend Export Control Act: H.R. 10550	X	X	X	X	Voice 5/5/60		Voice 4/4/60			P.L. 86-464; app. 5/13/60.
65. Ratify treaty of friendship with Pakistan: Ex. F (86-2)	X		X		94 to 1 8/17/60					Ratified.
66. Ratify convention of establishment with France: Ex. G (86-2)	X		X		94 to 1 8/17/60					Ratified.
67. Ratify convention on territorial seas: Ex. J (86-1)	X		X		77 to 4 5/26/60					Ratified.
68. Ratify convention on fishing and conservation of living resources of the high seas: Ex. L (86-1)	X		X		77 to 4 5/26/60					Ratified.

Rollcall or voice votes on legislative recommendations submitted by the President, 86th Cong., 2d sess.—Jan. 6 to Aug. 31, 1960—Continued

FOREIGN RELATIONS—Continued

Recommendation by subject	Progress									
	Hearings		Reported		Final passage vote		Rejected		In conference	Final action
	Senate	House	Senate	House	Senate	House	Senate	House		
69. Ratify convention on Continental Shelf: Ex. M (86-1)	X		X		77 to 4 5/26/60					Ratified.
70. Ratify protocol of signature concerning compulsory settlement of disputes: Ex. N (86-1)	X		X				49 to 30 5/26/60			
71. Ratify convention of high seas: Ex. K (86-1)	X		X		77 to 4					Ratified.
72. Agreement between United States and India for avoidance of double taxation with respect to taxes on rice: Ex. H (86-2)										
73. Ratify International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution of the Sea by Oil: Exec. C (86-2)	X		X							
74. Ratify treaty of mutual cooperation between United States and Japan: Exec. E (86-2)	X		X		90 to 2 6/22/60					Ratified.
75. Ratify Antarctic Treaty: Exec. B (86-2)	X		X		66 to 21 8/10/60					Ratified.
76. Ratify Convention of Paris for protection of industrial property: Exec. D (86-2)	X		X		95 to 0 8/17/60					Ratified.
77. Authorize $600 million for economic aid to Latin America (Sp. 8-8-60)	X	X	X	X	54 to 10 8/19/60	Voice 8/31/60				P.L. 86-735; app. 9/8/60.
78. Authorize an increase in contingency fund by $100 million (Sp. 8-8)	X	X	X	X	59 to 14 8/19/60	Voice 8/26/60				P.L. 86-722; app. 9/8/60.
GENERAL GOVERNMENT										
79. *Increase patent fees (B): S. 494, H.R. 2739		X		X						
80. *Transfer from Interior to Agriculture certain authority with respect to land and timber exchanges (B): H.R. 7681	X	X	X	X	Voice 6/3/60	Voice 9/2/59				P.L. 86-509; app. 6/11/60.
81. *Charge employers of longshoremen cost of administering disability compensation (B): S. 2134; H.R. 7496										
82. *Increase fees for administrative expenses of Securities and Exchange Commission (B): S. 737; H.R. 6294		X								
83. *Charge for consular services to U.S. shipping and seamen (B): S. 2633	X	X	X	X	Voice 9/9/59	Voice 8/22/60				P.L. 86-723; app. 9/8/60.
84. *Increase fees for agricultural inspection, classification, and licensing services (B): S. 3425; H.R. 12105	X									
85. *Recover costs of certain immigration and naturalization services (B)										New draft in preparation.
86. *Charge for certain Customs and Coast Guard navigation services (B): S. 1390; H.R. 5841		X								
87. *Charge for certain Internal Revenue forms, copies, and certifications (B)										
88. *Raise fees which may be collected by U.S. marshals for serving legal process (B): S. 2349	X		X		Voice 8/24/59					
89. *Include goal of price stability in Employment Act (B): S. 1237; H.R. 6263	X	X		X						
90. *Reimburse citizens for certain World War II property damage (B): H.R. 2485	X	X	X	X		Voice 3/1/60				
91. *Authorize civilian achievement awards (B): S. 3706										
92. *Simplify congressional appropriation procedures for continuing programs (B)										
93. *Authorize item veto for appropriation bills (B): S. 2374; S.J. Res. 44										
94. Extend appropriation control over use of foreign currencies by Government agencies (B)										Appropriation bills responsive.
95. *Revise and extend coverage of Government Control Act (B): H.R. 5784, H.R. 12092		X								
96. Remove time limitation from Reorganization Act (B. Sp. 5/3/, 8-8): S. 1474	X		X							
H.R. 5140		X		X		Voice 6/2/59				
97. Provide adequate office space for President: (Sp. 5/3/60) S. 3524	X		X		Voice 9/1/60					
98. Provide for sale or lease of Indian lands: (Sp. 5/3/60) S. 51										Major study by Senate Interior Committee to be completed in December.
99. Provide for reimbursement of the Treasury by the Panama Canal Company for the annuity paid to the Republic of Panama: (In accord) S. 3388										
100. Provide for erection of Freedom Monument (SPM): H.R. 12327, H.R. 12342										
HEALTH										
101. Extend traineeship programs for graduate or specialized public health training (B): H.R. 6871	X	X	X	X	Voice 7/1/60	Voice 6/24/60				P.L. 86-720; app. 9/8/60.
102. Extend program for advanced training of professional nurses (B): H.R. 6871	X	X	X	X	Voice 7/1/60	Voice 6/24/60				P.L. 86-720; app. 9/8/60.
103. Enact Health Facilities and Training Act of 1960 (in accord); S. 3680; H.R. 12518										

Rollcall or voice votes on legislative recommendations submitted by the President, 86th Cong., 2d sess.—Jan. 6 to Aug. 31, 1960—Continued

HOUSING

Recommendation by subject	Progress									
	Hearings		Reported		Final passage vote		Rejected		In conference	Final action
	Senate	House	Senate	House	Senate	House	Senate	House		
104. Authorize the provisions in annual appropriation acts for borrowing additional amounts for public facilities loan program (B): H.J. Res. 784	X	X	X	X	Voice 8/31/60	Voice 8/31/60				P.L. 86-788; app. 9/14/60.
105. Authorize the provision in annual appropriation acts for borrowing additional amounts for FNMA special assistance program (B): H.R. 12603		X		X						
106. FHA insurance program: Extend authority for insurance of loans on home improvements beyond Oct. 1, 1960 (S, E): H.J. Res. 784	X	X	X	X	Voice 8/31/60	Voice 8/31/60				P.L. 86-788; app. 9/14/60.

IMMIGRATION

107. *Amend immigration and nationality laws to (B): Sp. 3/17, 8-8/60:										
(a) Modernize quota system										
(b) Expand and clarify parole authority and adjust status of parolees already here										
(c) Provide administrative authority to take care of hardship cases										
(d) Provide uniform naturalization benefits for veterans										
(e) Regulate judicial review of deportation and exclusion orders										
(f) Authorize various technical amendments: S. 3225; H.R. 11234, 11235										

JUDICIAL

108. *Create 40 additional Federal judgeships (B, Sp. 8-8): S. 2763; H.R. 12552	X	X	X	X						
109. Increase authorization for Commission on International Rules of Judicial Procedure (B)										Dropped. Received grant from private source.
110. *Strengthen laws against organized crime by prohibiting transportation of gambling devices in interstate commerce: (B) S. 2206; H.R. 7373										
111. Grant immunity from prosecution in testimony: S. 2348; H.R. 7392										
112. Bar income tax deductions relative to criminal activities: S. 2356; H.R. 7394										

LABOR AND WELFARE

113. *Authorize loans and grants to assist areas with chronic unemployment (B, E, Sp. 8/8): S. 722	X	X	X	X	49 to 46 3/23/59	201 to 184 5/4/60				Vetoed 5/13/60.
114. *Finance administrative costs of the employment security system on a trust fund basis (B): H.R. 12580	X	X	X	X	91 to 2 8/23/60	381 to 23 6/23/60				P.L. 86-778; app. 9/13/60.
115. *Widen coverage of unemployment compensation system (B, E): H.R. 12580	X	X	X	X	91 to 2 8/23/60	381 to 23 6/23/60				P.L. 86-778; app. 9/13/60.
116. *Strengthen Welfare and Benefit Plan Disclosure Act (B, E): S. 2550; H.R. 7489										
117. *Extend protection of Fair Labor Standards Act to 3 million additional workers (B, E, Sp. 8/8): H.R. 12677	X	X	X	X	62 to 34 8/18/60	341 to 72 6/30/60			X	
118. *Improve laws governing hours of work and overtime pay on Federal construction projects (B, E): S. 1344; H.R. 5504										
119. *Recover overpayment by Federal Government to railroad retirement account for military service (B)										
120. Increase minimum wage modestly (Sp. 5/3, 8/8/60): H.R. 12677	X	X	X	X	62 to 34 8/18/60	341 to 72 6/30/60			X	
121. Establish health plan for aged: H.R. 12580 (Sp. 8/8)	X	X	X	X	91 to 2 8/23/60	381 to 23 6/27/60				P.L. 86-778; app. 9/13/60.
122. Remove age 50 requirement for disability benefits under social security (in accord): H.R. 12580	X	X	X	X	91 to 2 8/23/60	381 to 23 6/27/60				P.L. 86-778; app. 9/13/60.

NATURAL RESOURCES

123. *Authorize Fryingpan-Arkansas project (B): S. 2700; H.R. 9229, H.R. 9230		X								
124. Authorize negotiation with Mexico for joint construction of Amistad (Diablo) Dam (B)	X	X	X	X	Voice 6/25/60	Voice 6/9/60				P.L. 86-605; app. 7/7/60.
125. *Require non-Federal interests to bear at least 30 percent of the cost of flood protection projects (B, E)	X	X	X	X	70 to 5 6/17/60	Voice 7/16/59				P.L. 86-645; app. 7/14/60.
126. *Amend Helium Production Act to promote greater conservation (B, E): H.R. 10548	X	X	X	X	Voice 8/31/60	Voice 5/2/60				P.L. 86-777; app. 9/13/60.

Rollcall or voice votes on legislative recommendations submitted by the President, 86th Cong., 2d sess.—Jan. 6 to Aug. 31, 1960—Continued

NATURAL RESOURCES—Continued

Recommendation by subject	Progress									
	Hearings		Reported		Final passage vote		Rejected		In conference	Final action
	Senate	House	Senate	House	Senate	House	Senate	House		
127. Authorize coal research on a contract basis (B, E)	X	X	X	X	Voice 6/27/60	Voice 2/15/60				P.L. 86-599; app. 7/7/60.
128. *Increase fees for noncompetitive oil and gas leases on the public domain (B, E): H.R. 10455	X	X	X	X	Voice 6/22/60	Voice 3/21/60				P.L. 86-705; app. 9/2/60.
129. *Preserve 3 undeveloped shore areas for public use (B, E): S. 2010; H.R. 7407	X	X								
130. *Establish revolving fund for Bonneville, Southeastern, and Southwestern Power Administrations, and Bureau of Reclamation (B): S. 2311, S. 2312, S. 3580										
131. Strengthen authority for air and water pollution control (B, E):										
H.R. 3610 (water)	X	X	X	X	61 to 27 9/9/59	240 to 156 6/9/59				Vetoed 2/22/60.
Air pollution study	X		X		Voice 6/26/60					
132. Authorize San Luis project: (Sp. 5/3/60) S. 44	X	X	X	X	Voice 5/12/59	Voice 5/18/60				P.L. 86-488; app. 6/3/60.
133. Establish the Arctic Wildlife Range (SPM): S. 1899; H.R. 7045	X	X		X		Voice 2/15/60				
134. Permit expansion of communities into public land areas (SPM): H.R. 7042		X								

TAXATION

135. Defer taxation of income derived from less developed areas abroad (B, E): H.R. 10087	X	X	X	X	Voice 6/1/60	Voice 4/6/60				P.L. 86-780; app. 9/14/60.
136. *Increase tax on aviation gas to 4½ cents a gallon, and levy same tax on jet fuels (B, E, SP. 8-8): H.R. 12702										
137. Provide additional highway trust fund revenues (B, E SP. 8-8):										
(a) Increase highway fuel tax to 4½ cents until June 30, 1964, and										
(b) Repeal diversion of excise taxes enacted last year: H.R. 10661										
138. Continue current corporate normal tax rates and excise tax rates (B, E): H.R. 12381	X	X	X	X	84 to 0 6/20/60	223 to 174 6/8/60				P.L. 86-564; app. 6/30/60.
139. Postpone scheduled reductions in the excise tax rate on transportation of persons and on local telephone service (B, E)	X	X	X	X	84 to 0 6/20/60	223 to 174 6/8/60				P.L. 86-564; app. 6/30/60.
140. *Provide equitable taxation of cooperatives (B, E): H.R. 7875		X								
141. *Prevent excessive depletion allowances on mineral products (B, E)	X	X	X	X	84 to 0 6/20/60	233 to 174 6/8/60				P.L. 86-564; app. 6/30/60.
142. Revise tax on gains from sales of depreciable personal property (B, E): H.R. 10491, H.R. 10492	X	X								
143. *Adopt clarifying technical amendments to income tax laws (B):										
H.R. 9660	X	X	X	X	Voice 3/29/60	Voice 2/8/60				P.L. 86-470; 5/14/60.
H.R. 9606		X								
H.R. 9662	X	X	X	X		Voice 2/8/60				

TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNICATIONS

144. *Retain receipts from all aviation fuel taxes in general fund (B): H.R. 12702										
145. *Finance forest and public lands highway programs from highway trust fund (B)										
146. Authorize appropriations for (B): Federal-aid highways, Forest highways, Public lands highways. H.R. 10495	X	X	X	X	80-0 6/29/60	Voice 5/12/60				P.L. 86-657; app. 7/14/60.
147. *Increase postal rates (B, E, Sp. 3-11, 8-8-60): S. 3192; H.R. 11140		X								
148. *Remove interest ceiling on Government ship mortgage loans (B): S. 1761; H.R. 6510										
149. Create transportation corporation for National Capital area (B): H.R. 11135	X	X	X	X	Voice 6/27/60	Voice 6/27/60				P.L. 86-669; app. 7/14/60.
150. *Incorporate Alaska Railroad (in accord): S. 2514										

VETERANS

151. Provide vocational rehabilitation for peacetime ex-servicemen with service-connected disabilities (B, E), S. 1138	X	X	X		Voice 7/21/59					
152. *Establish revolving fund for Veterans' Administration loan guaranty programs (B): H.R. 7903	X	X	X	X	Voice 6/30/60	Voice 6/29/60				P.L. 86-665; app. 7/14/60.

Gains for Alaska in the 86th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ERNEST GRUENING
OF ALASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement which I have prepared on the record of legislation, of interest to my State of Alaska, which has been written by the 86th Congress.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR GRUENING

One of the foremost practical advantages foreseen for Alaska throughout the long period in which the people of that former Territory sought statehood was the gaining of a voice and a vote in the Congress.

Now that the end is at hand for the 86th Congress, the first in which Alaska has enjoyed participation on a basis of equality with her sister States, it is appropriate to cast up accounts and see whether and how this first great practical advantage of statehood has been realized.

I believe it must be the verdict of history that the 86th Congress has done well by the infant State. Alaska has made greater progress, governmentally, in the past 20 months than in any like period in her history. The groundwork has been laid for a sound, a prosperous, and—in the long view of history—a populous State. Many enactments which will have great significance in the years to come have been achieved in the two sessions of Congress which have followed Alaska's admission on January 3, 1959.

The record of accomplishment for Alaska in the two sessions now ending is all the more remarkable in that it has been written against a background of divided Government. The Congress has been overwhelmingly Democratic in both House and Senate. Much worthwhile legislation has been lost through the veto or a threat of veto by the Republican President. Some legislation vitally needed by Alaska, such as that providing the first money for Rampart Dam, has been enacted only by the overriding of the veto. With the Senate certain to remain under Democratic control next year and with the House of Representatives virtually certain to do the same, it can be hoped by those interested in responsible and effective Government that the era of discord and division will end with the election in November of a Democratic President sympathetic to Alaska's, and indeed the Nation's, needs and aspirations.

Within the Congress, as far as Alaska programs are concerned, there has been no discord or division. The Alaska delegation has worked unitedly and with singleminded purpose to achieve for our State those things which are essential for our growth and well-being in these first years of statehood. What Alaska has gained in this 86th Congress could not have been accomplished without the devoted efforts of a team, which the Alaska delegation has comprised. No words could possibly express my admiration for the manner in which the senior Senator from Alaska Mr. BARTLETT, and our State's sole Member in the other body, Representative RALPH RIVERS, have worked with me untiringly throughout the session. I would be lacking in gratitude also if I did not at this point express my thanks for the assistance and the understanding of the majority leader, the assistant majority leader, the chairmen of the committees, and many Members on both sides of the aisle who have been helpful in seeing that Alaska is off to a good start as a State.

Here is the story, necessarily abbreviated, of what has been achieved for Alaska in this first session of the Congress in which our State has had full voting representation.

The development of Alaska's unmatched resources for the production of hydroelectric power represents one of the most important areas in which Federal legislation is required to realize the full potentials of this great source of energy.

RAMPART CANYON DAM

At Rampart Canyon, on the Yukon River, Alaska possesses the finest site on the American Continent for the construction of a hydroelectric dam which could produce more electric power than any other installation under the flag. Preliminary studies of the Army Corps of Engineers indicate that a dam at Rampart could produce about 5 million kilowatts of installed power capacity at a cost of approximately 2 mills per kilowatt-hour at the bus bar. It would produce more than twice as much power as Grand Coulee and the size of the power installation and the reservoir created by its construction would dwarf that mighty dam. The capacity of the proposed Rampart Dam would be half again as great as that of the entire Tennessee Valley Authority. The enormous lake that would be its reservoir would cover more than 10,000 square miles and could change the climate of Alaska in its vicinity. The cost of Rampart Dam has been estimated at between $900 million and $1.5 billion, and it may take at least 10 years to construct it.

As a first step toward the realization of this much needed source of power, but in the face of vigorous opposition from the administration, the Alaska delegation, in the first session of the 86th Congress, succeeded in obtaining an initial appropriation of $48,750 to enable the Corps of Engineers to begin its study of this project. For the fiscal year 1961 the administration recommended the appropriation of only $100,000 for the continuation of the study. Through the vigorous support and urging of the Alaska congressional delegation, this sum was raised to $350,000 as passed by the Senate and to $225,000 as finally agreed upon in conference and enacted.

SNETTISHAM POWER PROJECT

In the Juneau area the Bureau of Reclamation has made studies and has reported favorably on the construction of the Crater-Long Lakes division of the Snettisham project. This projected source of electric power would have an installed capacity of 48,000 kilowatts, and could be constructed at an estimated cost of $40 million. Firm energy would be produced at a cost of 6 mills per kilowatt-hour.

For the purpose of obtaining necessary congressional authorization for construction of this project by the Bureau of Reclamation, I introduced a bill, S. 3095. Action by Congress on the measure was not completed by this Congress due to the failure of executive departments concerned to submit required comments on the report of the Bureau of Reclamation in time to allow necessary hearings in Washington. In accordance with authorization for this purpose by the chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, I expect to hold hearings at Juneau on the need for this project and power requirements of the city of Juneau during the period between adjournment of the 86th Congress and the convening of the 87th Congress.

ANCHORAGE POWER REQUIREMENTS

The growing needs of the city of Anchorage for electric power were highlighted in the past year by the request of the city manager that legislation be introduced which would authorize modification of Eklutna Dam in a manner which would raise the present height of the dam and convert approximately 20 million kilowatt-hours of nonfirm energy now produced into firm energy for use of the city of Anchorage. A hearing held on the bill, which I cosponsored, S. 3222, was held in Washington on May 11, 1960, and developed much factual information concerning increasing power needs of the Anchorage area and provided a useful discussion of this proposal as well as other possible means of developing sources of this power.

I expect to hold additional hearings on this bill in the Anchorage area during the period after adjournment of the 86th Congress for the purpose of further exploring needs for Federal legislation to achieve power required for anticipated growth of population and industry in the Anchorage area.

RECLAMATION INVESTIGATIONS

During the first session of this Congress the Senate passed a bill, S. 1514, introduced by Senator BARTLETT and myself, which would remove the present ceiling of $250,000 on annual authorizations for the Bureau of Reclamation for carrying on investigations of water resource development projects, including hydroelectric projects, in the State of Alaska. The artificial ceiling on reclamation requirements for this purpose must be lifted in order that this important agency may make its full contribution to the development of Alaska. Unfortunately, the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee took no action on this bill.

ALASKA OIL RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

During the first session of the Congress I cosponsored a bill, S. 1855, to increase limitations on the amount of public land a single oil and gas lessee may hold in Alaska to a total of 1 million acres, rather than the 300,000 acres under lease and option provided for by then existing law. As reported to the Senate, the bill provided for an increase to 600,000 acres. This bill, which passed both Houses of Congress, was the subject of the most completely unjustified veto of the many vetoes exercised by President Eisenhower during his tenure in office. Relying on advice of the Department of Interior that Alaska should be divided into two regions, separated by the Brooks Range, and that a maximum limitation of 300,000 acres should be applied in each region, the President vetoed this important legislation, thus temporarily delaying passage of a measure designed to expedite development of the oil and gas resources in Alaska.

During the second session of the Congress both Houses enacted comprehensive legislation revising the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920. This is now Public Law 86–705. A provision of the law adopted by both Houses is an increase in oil and gas acreage limitations in Alaska to a maximum holding of 600,000 acres for each lessee. While the law will require a division of the State into two regions, the line of division will follow the line of the Yukon and Tanana Rivers, thus resulting in a more reasonable separation of leasing areas in the State than that originally proposed by the Department of the Interior in its report on the bill vetoed by the President during the first session. In addition to increasing acreage limitations for Alaska oil and gas lessees, the new mineral leasing amendments include many other significant changes in law governing leasing of public lands for oil and gas development.

COAL LEASING

During the first session Congress passed and the President signed the law (Public Law 86–252), cosponsored by Senator BARTLETT and myself, which increased acreage limitations on the amount of land which may be held by a single lessee for coal mining. The previous acreage limitation for Alaska was extremely discriminatory, in that it allowed

Alaska lessees a maximum holding of only 2,560 acres. The new law allows Alaska lessees the same limitation as those of other States—a total of 10,240 acres, with an additional allowance of 5,120 acres at the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior.

COPPER, FLUORSPAR, GOLD, LEAD AND ZINC, TIN

For the benefit of industrial development of deposits of these minerals, I cosponsored the following bills:

Senate Resolution 101, opposing the release of Government stockpiles of copper as a means of maintaining present price levels of copper. Not reported.

S. 1285, to provide for the development and preservation of the domestic fluorspar industry. Not reported.

Senate Resolution 163, a measure adopted by the Senate requiring the Tariff Commission to make a study of the need for imposition of quotas and tariffs on fluorspar imports with a view to taking action needed to insure markets for domestic supplies of this product. Not reported.

S. 590, a bill to provide for the free marketing of gold for the purpose of stimulating the recovery of this industry. Not reported.

Senate Resolution 162, S. 1538, and S. 2169 were all measures designed to improve conditions of domestic producers of lead and zinc. The Senate resolution would have called upon the Tariff Commission to study the need for quotas and tariffs on lead and zinc with a view to increasing markets and stabilizing of domestic production. S. 2169 would have increased duties on imports of lead and zinc, and S. 1538, as another approach to the problems of domestic producers, would enact measures to stabilize production of domestic lead and zinc.

Senator BARTLETT and I cosponsored a bill, S. 1957, passed by the Senate, providing for stabilization payments by the Secretary of the Interior to domestic tin producers, a measure designed to stimulate production of this basic metal. It was not acted on by the House committee.

WATER

I enthusiastically supported legislation designed to reduce pollution of waters of America, and was cosponsor of the bill S. 2992, which would expand Federal programs of research into methods of water pollution control, improve enforcement measures, and otherwise improve provisions of existing legislation for Federal water pollution control programs. This bill was not acted on by the Senate committee.

I objected strongly to the act of the President in vetoing the bill H.R. 3610, which was a measure passed by Congress to increase authorizations for amounts to be expended by the Federal Government on water pollution control.

For the State of Alaska, I joined with Senator BARTLETT in sponsoring S. 2628, a bill passed by the Senate which provided for a study of water resources of the State of Alaska. No action was taken by the House committee on this measure.

FISHING INDUSTRY

Rehabilitation of the Alaska fishing industry is essential for this important segment of the Alaska economy. S. 3658, a bill introduced by me during the second session, cosponsored by Senators MAGNUSON and JACKSON, of Washington, Senators MORSE and LUSK, of Oregon, and Senator ENGLE, of California, would double the amount of funds now authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of the Interior from customs receipts on fish and fish products for research and development of the fishing industry. Additional funds made available would be used for the same purposes for which they are now authorized, including scientific research on fishery development and conservation and development of domestic markets for fish and fish products. This bill was introduced late in the session in the expectation that during the period before the 87th Congress convenes support can be engendered in the Pacific Northwest for its enactment.

Conservation measures, designed to protect fishery resources, which I cosponsored and supported include S. 502 and Senate Joint Resolution 184, in favor of which I testified before the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 502 would prohibit imports of salmon from countries failing to apply conservation measures necessary for protection of salmon stocks. No action was taken beyond the hearings. Senate Joint Resolution 184 would extend a similar prohibition to other kinds of fish and shellfish. Hearings were held but no further action was taken.

The growing importance of the shrimp industry in Alaska caused me to join with Senators from other States to which the sale of shrimp and shrimp products is of particular economic significance in cosponsoring legislation to establish quotas and tariffs on imported shrimp and shrimp products. The purpose of such legislation is to reduce imports of shrimp from other countries, thus enabling domestic producers to find a larger market for their shrimp. The bills which I cosponsored for this purpose are S. 3204, a long range measure designed to enact quotas and tariffs into permanent law, and S. 3639, an emergency measure introduced by Senators from shrimp producing areas to be effective for a limited period of time. No action was taken on either of these bills, but the Finance Committee has directed the Tariff Commission to undertake an investigation of the shrimp industry.

LAND MANAGEMENT

I cosponsored with Senator BARTLETT S. 3469, a bill authorizing the Bureau of Land Management to sell land in Alaska containing coal, oil, or gas with a reservation of minerals to the Government. At the present time, this land cannot be sold. The bill would help simplify the enormously complicated procedures now applicable to land transactions in Alaska. It passed the Senate, but received no action in the House.

I cosponsored a bill with Senator BARTLETT, S. 1411, which has now become law (Public Law 86–512), authorizing owners of land at Big Delta and Tok Junction to acquire property lying between their estates and the highways. This provision enables some of the land that was withdrawn earlier by the Government in the form of excessive rights-of-way to be restored to private entry.

I also cosponsored S. 3267, which passed the Congress, amending the current law relating to disposal of certain lands in Alaska. The new law would enable Matanuska Valley farmers to buy land at less than market value set by the Bureau of Land Management. In addition to correcting previous practices that have caused complaints of unfairness in land sales, the bill will be to the Government's advantage in that the cost of prolonged appeals can be avoided.

S. 3434, which I also cosponsored, would authorize the State of Alaska to make partial selections of public land under mineral lease. This bill is of great importance to Alaskans, as it will facilitate selection of lands allotted to Alaska under the Statehood Act and as such, of course, would greatly assist the State in proceeding with the selection of lands to which it is entitled. Although the Interior Committee did not report S. 3434, its provisions were incorporated in Public Law 86–786 (S. 2959) which was signed by the President on September 14, 1960.

S. 3545, which I cosponsored, and which is now Public Law 86–620, amends a 1929 statute granting 100,000 acres of public land in Alaska for the support of the University of Alaska. Previously this land could be sold or leased only at public auction. The newly passed bill will allow the sealed-bid method to be used. This is, of course, the more general practice in land sales and the leasing of public property by such a procedure usually brings higher prices. Consequently, the University of Alaska stands to benefit from this bill.

Another bill which I cosponsored (now Public Law 86–173) amends the Alaska Statehood Act by permitting the State to acquire lands that may have come under Federal oil and gas lease provisions subsequent to statehood. The enactment of this bill was, of course, greatly desired by the State, as it helps to carry out the primary intent and purpose of Congress in making land grants; namely, that of enabling the State to support statehood in its own right.

S. 2587, cosponsored by me, which passed the Senate, but did not come out of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, is a bill of general application which requires any department or agency of the Government to come to Congress for legislative approval for all land withdrawals in excess of 5,000 acres. This bill is of particular consequence, as the decision to withdraw large areas of land should be accomplished only with legislative approval. This provision amends a law enacted in 1958 requiring the Defense Department to seek similar congressional approval for its proposed withdrawals. If it had passed the House and had been signed by the President, it would have restored some of the legislative authority that has been forfeited to the executive branch during recent years.

HOMESTEADERS

Another major legislative objective was the enactment of a law which would insure fair treatment for Alaska homesteaders who have been faced with demands of the Department of the Interior for waiver of subsurface rights as a result of reclassification of sedimentary lands in Alaska as prospectively valuable for oil and gas.

Early in the session I introduced a bill, S. 1670, to quitclaim to homesteaders the rights of the United States to mineral deposits in homesteads where valid entries had been made prior to the actual discovery of oil on the Kenai Peninsula in July 1957.

The bill, as introduced, ran into strong opposition from the administration. Just prior to the July recess of the second session the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs authorized an investigation of the Anchorage Land Office to determine the extent to which errors of administration of the public land laws by that office had contributed to the problems faced by the homesteaders in connection with the loss of their subsurface rights. The committee requested that the Secretary of the Interior extend the moratorium on submission of waivers of mineral rights demanded of the homesteaders pending completion of the survey and determination of the committee as to action to be taken by it as a result thereof. The Secretary of the Interior refused to agree to the committee's request. Instead, he insisted that the bill I introduced be sharply restricted and limited to those homesteaders on the Kenai Peninsula who had completed all requirements, except the submission of final proof, by July 23, 1957. Realizing that any bill going beyond the demands of the Department of the Interior faced a certain veto, both Houses of the Congress passed, in the closing hours of the session, a bill limited in the manner specified by the Secretary of the Interior.

CONSERVATION LEGISLATION

I was a cosponsor of Senate Concurrent Resolution 73 to create a joint committee on a national fuels policy. A thorough study needs to be made by the Congress in this vital area in order to foster the long-range development of all fuels that continue to be needed to maintain our national secu-

rity and insure continued economic growth. The bill did not come out of committee.

S. 2460, which I cosponsored, would insure that certain portions of the shoreline of the United States would be preserved for public use. The object of the bill is to prevent commercial development of certain areas, so that the public could continue to have use of unspoiled shoreline. No action was taken on this bill.

Another bill, S. 2699, cosponsored by me, would authorize the establishment of the Indiana Dunes National Monument. It is of great importance to all the citizens in the United States that areas having unique recreational scenic and esthetic values be saved from invasion by industrialization. Establishment of the Indiana Dunes National Monument would be particularly expressive of this thinking, as this beautiful and unique area is in very great danger of being ruined by a commercial enterprise. Unfortunately, no action was taken on the bill.

I opposed the Arctic wildlife range bill (S. 1899). This bill would authorize withdrawal of some 9 million acres in northeastern Alaska as a wildlife range. I believe that this particular proposal would be damaging rather than beneficial for the State of Alaska. No action was taken on this bill.

HIGHWAYS FOR ALASKA

One of my primary concerns has been obtaining adequate Federal assistance for Alaska to enable it to catch up with the other States in the needed construction of highways. I have repeatedly brought to the attention of the administration the long neglect of Alaska highway construction by the Federal Government, the unfair exclusion of Alaska from the Interstate Highway program, and the inadequacy of appropriations for highway construction in Alaska as compared with Federal expenditures for similar purposes abroad under the foreign aid programs of the present administration. As a means of obtaining some assistance from the Federal Government commensurate with the needs of Alaska, I introduced or cosponsored the following legislation:

S. 2976, a bill to equalize treatment of Alaska under the Federal-aid highway program with that of other States. The bill provides for the appropriation of $20 million annually for a period of 15 years for the purpose of road construction in Alaska. It is estimated that this is equivalent to the amount of money Alaska would have received from the Federal Government under the Federal-aid highway program had it been included in the program on the same basis as the other States since the legislation went into effect in 1916.

Despite the overwhelming justification for this program, the Department of Commerce refused to acknowledge the need for it, and gave as its view that the bill should not be enacted. The strong opposition of the executive branch, as stated by the Department of Commerce, made enactment of S. 2976 impossible. In the course of discussion of the bill in the Senate Public Works Committee, however, the committee was made aware of the great need of Alaska for highway construction and for Federal assistance for this purpose. Accordingly, the committee recommended and the Senate passed an amendment to the Federal Highway Act of 1960 (H.R. 10495) which would have added 300 miles to the Federal Interstate Highway System, 50 miles of which was intended for the State of Hawaii, and the remaining 250 for Alaska. Unfortunately, the conference committee on the bill was not inclined to support this amendment and it was lost in conference.

FERRY LEGISLATION

As a part of the program of the Alaska delegation to obtain adequate Federal assistance for highway construction in Alaska, two bills were introduced to encourage development of a ferry system in southeastern Alaska in lieu of road construction, which would be prohibitive in cost.

S. 2661, a bill to authorize contribution of Federal funds to the construction by a State of approach roads to ferries was adopted as an amendment to the omnibus Federal highway authorization bill for 1960 (H.R. 10495).

Another measure was S. 1956, which would authorize construction subsidies under the Merchant Marine Act of 1956 for ferries constructed for use in the proposed southeast Alaska ferry system. As a result of determined opposition by the Department of Commerce it was impossible to obtain action upon it by Congress.

MATCHING FUNDS REDUCTION

The provisions of S. 3290, a bill to reduce amounts of funds which States are required to contribute to obtain Federal aid allocations under the Federal-aid highway system, were incorporated as an amendment to the 1960 Omnibus Highway Act. The amendment changes the formula for State matching which previously allowed a reduction of amounts required by States having within their borders public domain lands representing more than 5 percent of the area of the States. The amendment authorized inclusion in the formula of certain public lands which have been withdrawn or reserved by the Federal Government for various purposes other than for national forests, parks, and monuments and which could not, prior to this amendment, be considered for computation of amounts by which matching funds are to be reduced. While there are 13 States with large areas of public land which would have matching requirements reduced by the new law, Alaska benefits by a greater reduction than any other. Matching requirements for Alaska for 1961 apportionments under the Federal Aid Highway Act are reduced from $5,940,877 to $1,963,725—thus saving the State $3,977,152 every year.

WATER AND RAIL TRANSPORTATION

S. 1507, which was introduced by the chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee by request, would provide for regulation, by the Interstate Commerce Commission, of water carriers operating within the State of Alaska and coastal water carriers operating between Alaska and other U.S. ports. No action was taken on it in either session, although hearings were held by the Senate committee to which it was referred.

S. 1508, providing regulation of the Alaska Railroad by the Interstate Commerce Commission, passed the Congress but unfortunately was vetoed by the President.

S. 1509, which is now Public Law 86-615, authorizes certain grandfather rights for motor and inland water carriers in Alaska which came under the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission with passage of the Statehood Act.

Hearings were held on S. 2451 which would require common carriers serving Alaska to establish through routes and joint rates. No action was taken, but S. 2452, which would permit—as contrasted to require—common carriers serving Alaska to establish such routes, passed the Senate, but met with no action in the House.

S. 2669 would exempt from Coast Guard inspection certain small vessels essential for water transportation in southeastern Alaska. These vessels, serving the population along the protected coast, now enjoy such exemption, but to continue to do so, the authority had to be extended. This bill was enacted and is now Public Law 86-688.

Public Law 86-410 reenacts previous legislation authorizing for another year the transportation of passengers and cargo by Canadian vessels to ports in southeastern Alaska.

During this session, I joined with Senator BARTLETT in sponsoring a bill, S. 3005, to extend to 7 months, as against the previous 4, the period of the Federal Maritime Board's authority to suspend proposed tariff increases. The bill would add desirable uniformity in the powers of two regulatory agencies affecting transportation, as the 7-month increase corresponds to the period of suspensions used by the Interstate Commerce Commission. It passed the Senate, but no action was taken by the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee.

AIRPORTS

Air transportation being of primary concern to Alaskans, major efforts were concentrated during the first session of this Congress on obtaining Federal appropriations adequate to finance the needs of Alaska as well as the other States under the Federal Airport Act.

S. 1, a bill to increase appropriations for airport assistance, was introduced by Senator MONRONEY during the first week of the session. I was one of the cosponsors of this bill. Unfortunately, the threat of a Presidential veto made it impossible to enact authorization on a scale commensurate with needs. The legislation finally passed and signed by the President merely called for extension of the program, on the same basis as during previous years, for the 1960-61 fiscal years.

S. 2208, a bill which I cosponsored with Senator BARTLETT, was enacted and signed by the President (Public Law 86-295). This bill, for the special benefit of Alaska, enables the 49th State to receive certain discretionary funds to be allotted by the Federal Aviation Administrator for exceptional airport projects for which financing is not available from regular appropriations. The discretionary fund of the Administrator amounts to 25 percent of all funds authorized.

Other assistance for the aviation industry in Alaska was provided in the Alaska Omnibus Act (Public Law 86-70) which, among other provisions, authorized the transfer without reimbursement of the Anchorage and Fairbanks airports from the Federal Government to the State and authorized appropriations of funds equivalent to amounts that would have been spent by the Federal Government on the airports during the 5 succeeding fiscal years if Alaska had not become a State.

CIVIL RIGHTS

During the 1st session of the 86th Congress, I strongly supported an amendment introduced by Senator HAYDEN of Arizona, designed to continue the existence of the Civil Rights Commission (established by the Civil Rights Act of 1957) and to appropriate funds for its operation. This amendment was adopted and became law.

During the second session of the Congress, I fought vigorously for a meaningful civil rights bill which would insure the right to vote for all citizens regardless of race, creed, or color and for effective enforcement measures for the civil rights of all citizens. While the bill which was enacted (H.R. 8601, Public Law 86-449, the Civil Rights Act of 1960) fell short of what I would have wanted enacted, I nevertheless voted for the measure as a means of progress toward the solution of one of the gravest problems confronting our Nation.

I was an enthusiastic cosponsor of the bill S. 50 (Public Law 86-3) which admitted Hawaii to the Union as the 50th State.

I cosponsored legislation to establish an educational center in Hawaii dedicated to the exchange of cultural and technical information, ideas, and views on a wide range of subjects. The center was authorized in the Mutual Security Act of 1960 (Public Law 86-472).

HEALTH INSURANCE

As a strong supporter of legislation to provide health insurance for elderly persons by incorporation of such an insurance plan in the social security legislation now in force, I cosponsored a bill (S. 3503) introduced by Senator MCNAMARA, which would not only provide for this but authorize certain medical insurance benefits for elderly persons not eligible for old age and survivors insurance. Due to effective administration opposition, this bill, or amendments similar to it, could not be passed. In the end, a limited health plan granting aid to the States was acted on and sent to the President.

INDIAN AFFAIRS

I cosponsored S. 56, a bill designed to improve Indian health standards by authorizing the Surgeon General to improve essential sanitation facilities by various means in Indian homes, communities, and lands, including those in Alaska. This was passed and became Public Law 86–121.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

I cosponsored a number of bills relating to unemployment insurance, including S. 1631, to provide for the establishment of a Commission on Unemployment Problems; Senate Joint Resolution 119, to provide for a conference on measures to reduce unemployment; Senate Resolution 196, to create a Special Committee on Unemployment Problems. All of these bills would help to provide solutions to creating full employment. Hearings were held on these bills, but no action was taken.

I also cosponsored the bill S. 1323, which became Public Law 86–7 during the first session of Congress, providing for a temporary extension during which unemployed persons could file a claim for unemployment insurance. During this second session, I cosponsored a much broader bill (S. 3505) which is designed to revise, extend, and improve the entire unemployment insurance program. In this bill, the Federal Government would assume responsibility for 13 weeks of assistance beyond the State standard, and would thus acknowledge that this grave problem is nationwide in scope. The bill would also raise the base rate for employer contribution, bringing the rate into line with the figure used for the old-age and survivors insurance program. No action was taken on it.

Another bill, S. 722, which I cosponsored, would provide Federal assistance for areas of the United States in which there is a substantial degree of unemployment. This bill was vetoed by the President.

HEALTH INSURANCE BENEFITS FOR RETIRED FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

I cosponsored legislation which extends to retired Federal employees the benefits of health insurance legislation previously enacted for present employed civil service employees. The bill (S. 2575) passed both Houses and is now Public Law 86–724.

ANNUAL LEAVE

Together with Senator BARTLETT I cosponsored legislation (S. 973), which would restore special privileges available to Federal employees in Alaska prior to statehood which authorized these employees to accumulate a maximum of 45 days annual leave, as compared with the 30-day maximum allowed employees elsewhere. No action was taken on this bill.

COST OF LIVING ALLOWANCES

I also cosponsored a bill, S. 176, to authorize payment of cost of living allowances to Federal employees in Alaska in excess of the maximum now specified, which is 25 percent of basic compensation. This bill was not reported by the committee.

DEAF CHILDREN

I cosponsored Senate Joint Resolution 127, a resolution introduced by Senator HILL, which would provide increased educational opportunities for deaf children. The bill would encourage the training of additional teachers equipped to instruct deaf children, and enable professional training for larger numbers of speech pathologists and audiologists needed to assist children handicapped by deafness to overcome this physical disability. This bill passed the Senate, but it was not reported out of the House Education and Labor Committee. I will continue to do everything I can to see that the next Congress enacts this legislation.

YOUTH CONSERVATION

S. 812 would establish a Youth Conservation Corps to provide an opportunity for healthful training and employment for young men in connection with carrying out planned conservation programs. This bill, of which I am a cosponsor, passed the Senate, but no action was taken in the House.

JUDICIARY LEGISLATION

Anticipating the new State's growth and future need for disposing of litigation quickly, I introduced a bill, S. 2705, to provide for a second Federal judge for Alaska. Although no action was taken on the bill itself, it provided an opportunity for the matter to be studied by the various groups and people concerned and consequently should facilitate action to establish a second judicial seat.

LIBRARIES

I cosponsored S. 2830, which extends for 5 more years the current authorization for appropriations for the development of public library services in rural areas by stimulating the States through a grant-in-aid program to develop methods of providing library services to small towns and farming communities which now totally lack or have inadequate facilities. This bill was enacted and is now Public Law 86–679.

POSTAL SERVICE

The Senate passed S. 2869, which I cosponsored, which would restore the size and weight limitations on fourth-class mail to or from Alaska and Hawaii which existed prior to their admission as States. The House Post Office and Civil Service Committee held hearings, but took no further action.

I also cosponsored S. 2963, a bill to provide that first-class mail be transported to Alaska and Hawaii by air. This bill would bring these two noncontiguous States as physically close to the Union as modern transportation advances can achieve and would break the bottleneck of the slow travel of current mail from San Francisco and Seattle. The Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee did not act on the bill.

S. 1849, which I introduced for myself and Senator BARTLETT, would improve mail service for the Aleutian Islands by providing that mail boats serving the area would be required to be based in Alaska. The bill passed the Senate and was reported favorably from the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee but was objected to when called up for consideration on the House floor.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT

I was a cosponsor of a composite bill, S. 226, that passed the Congress during the first session that amended and consequently liberalized the Railroad Unemployment Act of 1937, the Railroad Tax Act and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act. This bill, similar to others which prior Congresses had been unable to pass, strengthened and placed on a sound, self-supporting basis the railroad retirement and unemployment systems and thus brought about long needed reforms that have been greatly desired by the railroad workers.

SCHOOL ASSISTANCE

I was a cosponsor of S. 2, introduced at the beginning of the first session of Congress, designed to assist in the support of public schools by making grants to the States for the construction of facilities and for teachers' salaries. S. 8, which I also cosponsored, was designed to offer an emergency 2-year grant to the States for school construction when it became apparent that S. 2 could not be passed. S. 8 included an amendment, which I cosponsored, to provide aid for teachers' salaries which met with a tie vote and was then defeated by Vice President NIXON's negative vote. Finally, the bill was passed providing only for school aid at the rate of $917 million a year for the next 2 years. However, the House wrecked even this bill, as it would not arrange a conference for it to settle differences between House and Senate versions.

VETERANS

I cosponsored several bills in behalf of veterans. One bill, S. 2675, which sought to provide an additional 1-year period during which certain veterans could apply for national life insurance, was reported favorably as an amendment to H.R. 11045 and passed the Senate but the House failed to complete action.

S. 1138, cosponsored by me, is a comprehensive new GI bill designed to provide benefits for those veterans who served in the Armed Forces between 1955 and 1963. This bill is similar to the older GI bills that have had such a profound and beneficial effect on American life. The Senate passed this major bill during the first session but the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, which held hearings on the bill, took no further action.

Another bill, S. 2201, cosponsored by me, would authorize the Veterans' Administration to furnish care which is needed by veterans in Hawaii and Alaska who suffer from non-service-connected disabilities. This bill passed the Senate but the House Veterans Affairs Committee took no action on it.

S. 3015, cosponsored by Senator BARTLETT and me, would provide relief for certain veterans who entered into an on-the-farm training program and who were advised by their instructors that their eligibility for subsistence would not be adversely affected by reason of off-the-farm employment. Subsequently, the VA ruled that these veterans were not eligible for subsistence allowances and the veterans were assessed. This bill would correct this injustice, since the veterans had acted in good faith. Veterans who have paid would receive refunds and those who had not paid would be relieved of liability. No action was taken on this bill.

HOUSING

Early in the first session, the Senate passed a comprehensive housing bill which would provide, among other major features, assistance for urban renewal, low-rent public housing and housing for the elderly. I supported this bill. Unfortunately, the House would not permit this comprehensive measure to go to conference to work out differences between it and a House-passed bill. At the very end of the second session, an extremely limited housing bill was passed that only extends three crucial programs (Federal Housing Administration home repair and improvement, college loan, and community facility loan programs).

MUTUAL SECURITY

During the second session of the Congress, I repeatedly called the attention of the Congress to the administration's strange double standard under which much needed projects at home were turned down by veto or threat of veto while the administration demanded constantly increasing funds for similar projects abroad.

At the time of the consideration of the Mutual Security Authorization Act for 1960, I proposed an amendment which would have reasserted congressional control over mutual security program expenditures. One of these amendments relating to military assistance was adopted. This amendment would require submission during annual requests for funds of detailed explanations on a country-by-country basis of the force objectives toward which the military assistance is furnished. In other words, the amendment is designed to let Congress know where we are going, militarily speaking, in foreign countries and precisely how much it would cost to get there.

The substance of another one of my amendments was adopted as part of the appropriation bill for the mutual security program for the fiscal year 1961. This amendment would prohibit the expenditure of funds for projects not justified to the Congress.

I cosponsored an amendment to the Mutual Security Authorization Act of 1960 which reaffirms American support for freedom of navigation in international waterways (including the Suez Canal) and opposition to economic warfare, such as boycotts or various other restrictions in international trade. The administration opposed this statement but fortunately this expression of the sense of the Congress remained in the bill as passed.

ANTARCTICA TREATY

I strongly opposed ratification by the Senate of the Antarctica Treaty, which would establish the Antarctic Continent as an area of free access for the 11 signatories for scientific exploration. My principal criticisms of the treaty are that (1) its ratification by the United States would foreclose this country from establishing claims to Antarctica which are well justified on the basis of American exploration and (2) while it binds the Soviet Union, as one of its signatories, it is not binding on the Soviet satellites or Communist China, so that the Soviet Union, acting through them, could establish bases in the Antarctic not devoted to peaceful purposes. However, the treaty did finally pass the Senate by a vote of 66 to 21.

UNITED NATIONS CHARTER REVISION

I was one of the cosponsors of resolutions of the Senate urging review of the United Nations charter for the purpose of determining what revisions should be made to promote a just and lasting peace through the development of enforcible world law. No action was taken on these proposals.

TV LEGISLATION

S. 1886, which has now become Public Law 86–609, was enacted after extended hearings to determine what steps could best be taken to promote the development of a nationwide, competitive television system. This bill grants the FCC discretion to waive, if the public interest and necessity warrants, certain requirements for booster or rebroadcasting stations. The new provisions should provide real assistance in extending television service to small communities. S. 2653, which would authorize the FCC to license community antenna TV systems, was sent back to committee by one vote.

ALASKA OMNIBUS ACT

Basic to Alaska's successful operation as a State was the Alaska Omnibus Act, passed by the first session of the 86th Congress. This legislation, which has become Public Law 86–70, was passed to insure effective transition of Alaska from a Territory to a State. Its provisions include:

1. Transitional grants of Federal funds to the State, authorized to be appropriated over the next 5 years in a total amount of $28,500,000;

2. Provisions for transfers of Federal functions and property no longer needed for those functions to the State government;

3. Amendment of numerous Federal grant-in-aid statutes to authorize Alaska participation as a State, on an equal basis with the other States;

4. Amendment of many other acts to conform with Alaska's status as a State.

PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATIONS FOR ALASKA

Among the most important legislative accomplishments for Alaska of the congressional delegation is the appropriation of sufficient funds for needed public works in the State. Harbors for small boats, flood control projects, improvement of navigable waterways, and planning for the Rampart Canyon Dam are among the items included in the budget for the Corps of Engineers for which the Alaska congressional delegation has fought for adequate funds.

In the 1st session of the 86th Congress it was necessary to overcome two vetoes of the President in order to obtain a public works appropriation for the 1960 fiscal year. In this connection it might be pointed out that the administration asked for no money at all for the Rampart Canyon Dam investigation, despite the exceptional importance of this project. Despite the opposition of the administration a meager sum of $48,750 was finally appropriated as a result of pressure at all steps of the way by the Alaska congressional delegation.

As noted above, for the 1961 fiscal year the administration requested $100,000 for the Rampart Canyon investigation—an amount which we were able to raise to $350,000 in the Senate, but which, in conference, was fixed at $225,000.

Other appropriations for which money was obtained for Alaska public works are set forth in the following tables:

Public works appropriations for Alaska

Public Law 86–254, 1960:	
Rampart Canyon (investigation)	$48,750
Dillingham Harbor	395,850
Naknek River (to be allocated from lump sum appropriation for small authorized projects)	20,475
Seldovia Harbor (to be allocated from lump sum appropriation for small authorized projects)	238,875
Public Law 86–700, 1961:	
Rampart Canyon (investigation)	225,000
Fairbanks flood control	100,000
Homer Small Boat Harbor	542,000
Seldovia Small Boat Harbor	548,000
Ninilchik Harbor (to be allocated from lump sum appropriation for small authorized projects)	229,000
Douglas Harbor (to be authorized from lump sum appropriation for small authorized projects)	364,000

It is my hope, and belief, that even with legislative proposals which for one reason or another were not enacted during the 86th Congress, the groundwork was laid in the 1959 and 1960 sessions for future success.

The Kind of America We Want

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHRYN E. GRANAHAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mrs. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, not far from this historic Capitol of the United States, in the city of Washington, surrounded by great shrines which commemorate the principles and ideals on which our Nation has been founded, a young man with a consuming mission in life has been preaching a gospel of hate.

I am speaking of the self-appointed feuhrer of an infinitesimal group which calls itself the American Nazi Party. Under our guarantees of free speech, this frenzied young man has been calling for an end to freedom in America, and the establishment here of a dictatorship patterned along the lines of Hitler's reich.

Many people are deeply disturbed that such a performance can be given in a public park in our Nation's Capital. People who cannot forget Belsen and Auschwitz and the other extermination camps of Nazi horrors, who cannot forget the suffering of many millions of people in many countries because of the Hitlerian insanity, can hardly be expected to look tolerantly on this kind of agitation only 15 years after the end of the most terrible war in history.

On the other hand, an appeal to establish nazism here is hardly in a position to make much of a dent in American political thought. When we think of Hitler's Nazi policies, most Americans automatically react with a sick feeling in the stomach that such a philosophy could ever have seized control of any country and could have caused such havoc, mass murder, and destruction as accompanied Hitlerism's attempt at world conquest.

PREJUDICE AND HATRED NOT DEAD

We are not in very much danger of going Nazi in this country—of choosing or of having imposed upon us a Nazi dictatorship. We are all painfully aware of the sick bestiality of nazism. Similarly, we have no use for the dictatorship of communism.

Nevertheless, the prejudices and hatreds which should have been stamped out and eradicated in free America generations ago still seem to persist, and we have many willing volunteers who zealously spend their efforts and their money in seeking to spread the virus of divisive hatreds here in the United States. They are doing a great disservice to all of us.

As we approach the end of the 86th Congress, and review our efforts in behalf of the people of our congressional districts and of the country as a whole, and think ahead about some of the unsolved problems which confront us, I am moved to place this problem at or near the top of those I consider deeply threatening to America's well-being—the problem of eradicating unthinking hatreds based on superstition, ignorance, envy, fear or whatever motivates some Americans to hate some other Americans they do not even know, merely because of race, religion or other differences.

Without regard to politics—and I know that religious intolerance is being insinuated into politics this year by all sorts of groups which preach prejudice and divisiveness—I am impelled to make this statement because of the tremendous amount of hate material I have seen flooding the mails of our country in my capacity as chairman of the Postal

Operations Subcommittee of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and I am shocked and dismayed by it.

To me it is a problem as serious to our national health as the flood of pornography which my subcommittee has worked so diligently to curb. Both types of material represent a slimy flow of printed filth emanating from sick minds. It is incumbent on every American who believes in our ideals as a nation to help oppose and help expose those who spread lies and slander and mass indictments of whole groups of other Americans.

ACHIEVING THE KIND OF AMERICA WE WANT

Now, Mr. Speaker, in this opportunity which has been made available to me to report on some of my thoughts as we prepare for the final adjournment of this Congress, I want to turn to some different problems we face which involve not un-American hatreds and prejudices, but the normal clash of political controversy and philosophy in the healthy give-and-take of our democratic system of government.

Representing nearly half a million Philadelphians in the Congress of the United States is a responsibility which I take most seriously, because what we do here is vitally important to all of the people of my district. The people of my district have very strong opinions about the kind of America we want. And they believe, with me, that it is possible to achieve the kind of America we want if we will but make use of the marvelous resources we possess as a people and as a nation to reach our objectives of a better America in a decent world in which freedom cannot only survive but can expand into every corner of the globe.

We are still very far from our goals. In recent years, furthermore, we have lost much valuable ground and much of the initiative. And this is truly alarming.

We must restore America's political vitality both in domestic issues involving our economic well-being and social adjustments, as well as in our leadership role in world affairs.

The people of the Second Congressional District of Pennsylvania in the city of Philadelphia—the good people I have the honor and pleasure of representing here in the Congress—do not consider government in America as a sort of necessary evil to be tolerated unhappily; instead, they consider government in our democracy to be a necessary good, to be used effectively to advance the prosperity and well-being and security of all of the people of a great country. They share my deep concern over the manner in which the machinery of National Government has been allowed to rust and deteriorate in underuse, if not disuse, in these past nearly 8 years of complacent leadership and national slippage.

IS THIS THE BEST AMERICA CAN DO?

In 20 years of the New Deal and the Fair Deal, from 1933 to 1953, we learned to put Government to use in strong, affirmative terms to help meet every serious national problem which came along. In those exciting years, the Government of the United States was a dynamic force for progress here at home and it became a symbol to the whole world of a sincere quest for peace based on international decency—a symbol of freedom throughout the civilized world.

The people of Philadelphia—where our form of government was born nearly 2 centuries ago—are dismayed at the consequences to our position in the world as a result of drift, apathy, timidity, and lack of imagination in national policies in these recent years.

We are experiencing a dangerously static condition in our normally expanding economy at home; we have suffered a dangerous undermining of our moral leadership in the free world.

Is this the best America can do? Of course, it is not. Of course, we can do much better. Of course, we can reestablish the surging strength of our economy and the powerful influence of our democratic ideals in the world—and we must. But leadership is required.

We cannot continue as we have been doing in recent years—that is, without awful consequences to the cause of world peace and the survival of freedom.

RESTORING AMERICA'S "GET UP AND GO"

Under Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry Truman, the activities of Government in the United States, while often—usually—controversial, were always exciting. No one was apathetic about what was being done in Washington. You were either vigorously in favor of or violently against the ideas and proposals and suggestions and reforms and advances which were being put forward by the White House for meeting serious national problems. The whole country was politically conscious—awake to the importance of the decisions being made in Congress and in the executive agencies of Government. The American political system—democracy—was never healthier in the whole long history of our country than it was in those years, for Government was a matter of personal interest and concern to every citizen.

As a result, no problem was too big to solve. No important issue was neglected. Progress in our country—after horrible years of depression, hardship and privation—was spectacular. The good things of life became available to almost every family. Our strength as a people, meanwhile, was so vastly increased that this country was able to achieve the impossible in assuring victory in the greatest war in history—a war fought all over the globe and won with American weapons turned out in sufficient quantity not only to outfit our own fighting men but those of all of our allies.

Look at us now: our economy is tired and not expanding, and unemployment levels are altogether out of proportion to our seeming prosperity; in world affairs, we have frequently been insulted, humiliated, even threatened with bare-faced ultimatums, as the Soviets dazzle the world with scientific and technological achievements in fields where we have to admit we are behind—fields in which we are behind because of pinch-penny research policies dictated by budgetary rather than defense considerations.

America cannot rest complacently on a claim that "everything is fine and dandy" when our situation is so vulnerable. We need an administration in power which will restore the Nation's "get-up-and-go" and put us once again in the forefront of world leadership—for the peace and security of freedom everywhere.

The people of this country must once again have the kind of leadership in the White House which will enlist us all enthusiastically in the hard work of self-government and make democracy once again an exciting part of everyone's daily life.

NEGLECTING THE NEEDS OF OUR ECONOMY

Although we have many outward signs of good living for most of our people, we who live in major cities, as well as those who live in rural areas of farm recession, know that our prosperity is spotty and not as broadly shared as it could be under strong national leadership committed to using the resources of the Full Employment Act sponsored by President Truman in 1946.

The big pockets of unemployment in the distressed areas have continued to exist despite tremendous efforts toward self-help in the communities affected. Our State government in Pennsylvania has worked untiringly to help our own distressed areas. But this is a national problem, and one which can only be solved with effective and intelligent national programs.

As we all know, President Eisenhower vetoed depressed areas legislation Congress several times drafted and presented to him for signature. Philadelphia's economy has certainly suffered as a result of the continued existence of very high unemployment in the hard coal regions of eastern Pennsylvania, and in other parts of Pennsylvania and the Nation. The economy of the United States is so interrelated that we all suffer from depressed conditions, even in distant areas. The Eisenhower-Nixon administration has completely ignored this serious problem.

SMALL BUSINESS DISTRESS—BIG BUSINESS PAYOLA

Small business, the backbone of the American economy for many generations, is being pushed to the wall by monopoly practices among giant corporations dividing up the markets between themselves. Enforcement of the antitrust laws has been far from effective.

It took a series of congressional investigations, meanwhile, to expose the extent of payola practices throughout the business community—not just in the highly publicized entertainment fields. Favoritism in the award of Government contracts, intercession with the regulatory agencies in behalf of big campaign contributors to the Republican Party, and similar practices have shocked the moral standards of the country.

UNSOLVED PROBLEMS, UNMET NEEDS

The fight to clear away blight in our cities and continue the highly successful Democratic urban renewal program launched in 1949, has been a particularly

bitter one because of administration opposition and vetoes. Yet we in the Congress have persevered despite many setbacks, and the program has at least been kept alive and saved from sabotage. But it is now falling behind schedule, and must be restored to full vigor.

There are so many other national needs which have been neglected in these recent years, too—housing for GI's and others who have had such great difficulty in obtaining mortgage financing despite the generous FHA and GI programs enacted and extended by Democratic Congresses; housing at fair rentals specially designed for the elderly—thanks to Congress, such a program is now finally to get under way despite Mr. Eisenhower's previous opposition; expansion of schools and colleges which are now so crowded; expansion of clinics and hospitals; encouragement for construction of private nursing homes—for which Congress made specialized provisions in the FHA law; solution of some of the serious problems created for homeowners, tenants, and small businesses in areas which are to be redeveloped; aid to cities in solving their choking traffic congestion and in broadening mass transit such as we are trying to do in Philadelphia; better educational opportunities for youth and more job opportunities for those over 40; stronger health safeguards in hazardous employment; more attention to highway safety—these are just a few areas in which Congress, under the Democrats, has tried hard to provide solutions, but in which the President and his administration have failed to support or put into full operation the programs Congress has suggested.

HEALTH CARE FOR THE ELDERLY

And what about the health-care problems of the aged? No issue has arisen in recent years which has brought more mail to us in the Congress, showing the extent of national concern this problem enjoys.

This problem has been so cluttered up with scare charges of socialized medicine that we have tended to lose sight of the fact that insurance against high hospital and surgical costs is now pretty much the normal thing for most workers and their families. We must provide a means by which the retired worker and his family can also obtain an effective form of health cost insurance at rates within the average retiree's resources. A pauper's oath program intended only for the medically indigent—whom we already take care of in our existing programs—is hardly the full and complete answer. A solution to this problem must be high on our list of priorities next year.

THE FIGHT AGAINST PORNOGRAPHY IN THE MAILS

Mr. Speaker, I want to speak only very briefly at this point on a matter which has had my very close attention as chairman of the Postal Operations Subcommittee. As the Members know, we have done a great deal of effective work in the investigation of the evil of pornography and in the enactment of legislation to curb traffic in filth. I am proud of the support the subcommittee's membership has given me on this matter and I appreciate the wonderful way in which the House acted so promptly to pass the bills reported out of our subcommittee. Two of these measures should substantially increase the Post Office Department's ability to cope with the flow of filthy materials through the mail: one, a bill to establish a special judicial officer in the Department to handle and expedite cases involving fraud and obscenity; second, a bill to empower the Postmaster General, under certain safeguards, to obtain from the Federal courts temporary orders for the detention of incoming mail addressed to known purveyors of filth, as a means of cutting off their revenues until prosecution can be effective.

There is still much to be done to put the merchants of filth out of business—and I pledge to continue the fight.

DEPLORABLE DETERIORATION OF MAIL SERVICE

While discussing the work of the Postal Operations Subcommittee, I want to make clear that we are not only aware of—but we have been strongly critical of—the policies in the Post Office Department which have led to such a deplorable deterioration in mail service.

So many experiments in mechanization have been undertaken in these last few years that the human element has been shoved aside—and machines, alas, cannot think. That is why Philadelphians are receiving mail from other cities by way of remote, far distant communities—the machinery suffered some sort of aberration. Deliveries are delayed beyond all reason. I do not blame the career people in the Post Office, they are just as upset about this as I am. I blame the top leadership of the Department and the patronage-appointed bureaucrats, who have treated the career employees as if they were unintelligent loafers, and have almost completely destroyed morale and the spirit of conscientious devotion which we have always associated with the career postal employee.

I am sure that under intelligent direction, the postal service will be restored next year to the efficiency we used to experience and applaud, and once again there will be meaningfulness in the slogan of the postal people expressing the determination that the mail go through despite all obstacles.

LEGISLATION BENEFITING FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Philadelphia has a very large number of Federal employees performing—on the career level—tremendously important work in the national interest. I am proud to have played a leading role in this Congress in the enactment of a justified pay raise bill despite a Presidential veto, in the enactment of the health insurance program for active employees, and in the enactment of a new program to begin next July to provide for a contributory health insurance program for retired Federal employees. There is no good reason that I can see why we cannot provide a similar type of program for those retired on social security—the retired Federal employee will pay most of the cost and the Government, as last employer, supplements the premium payment and makes possible the best kind of terms as to coverage. If we had such a program under social security, all workers could contribute to it during their working careers so that the cost would be shared by employee and employer just as are the other costs of social security benefits.

I am proud that the Government employee groups as a mark of confidence have so often come to me to request that I act as main sponsor of some of their major legislative proposals in the Congress. I appreciate the support the rank and file of Government employees have also always given me.

A FORWARD-LOOKING AMERICA

Mr. Speaker, in the coming national elections in November—when every seat in the House of Representatives, one-third of those in the Senate, and the Presidency and Vice Presidency are at stake—the people of this country will have an opportunity to select the kind of Government they want for the kind of America they want. I know that in Philadelphia, where progressive local government has achieved community miracles in less than a decade after generations of municipal corruption and shame, the voters want and insist upon a Federal Government which is forward-looking and progressive and vigorous in pursuit of solutions for the people's needs.

As we prepare for the political campaigns, therefore, let us rededicate ourselves—those of us who subscribe to the Democratic Party's platform for a better America—to carry forward into reality the outline drawn by the leaders of our party at Los Angeles—the most liberal platform ever written by any political party in American history.

Twentieth Anniversary of Ukrainian Congress Committee of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, this fall will mark the 20th anniversary of the founding of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, an organization reflecting the thoughts and sentiments of 2½ million Americans of Ukrainian ancestry. Among the many objectives of this committee are coordinating and intensifying Ukrainian-American participation in the peace efforts of America, strengthening and propagating the American way of life; assisting and supporting the U.S. Government in the event of war, and cooperating in all respects with our Government in its national policies for the common good.

The Ukrainian Congress Committee is a member of the All-American Conference to Combat Communism and has actively assisted and cooperated with the United States, officially and privately, in its struggle to bring world peace and freedom. The committee has also maintained worldwide contacts with friends of the Ukraine, provided aid to the Ukrainian underground, and held as one

of its policies the rejection of the common guilt of the Russian masses, made up of people of captive nations within the Soviet borders outnumbering all the Russians combined.

The committee is a completely American institution, made up of American citizens with a Ukrainian heritage or ancestry and it vigorously opposes the Communist regimes of China, Poland, Yugoslavia, and the other Communist-dominated countries, since these regimes reflect the will of Moscow rather than representing the will of the people.

The ultimate goal of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America is peaceful liberation and the necessary dismemberment of the Soviet Empire, stressing national self-determination and independence.

It is my privilege to congratulate the congress committee on the occasion of its 20th anniversary for its steadfast pursuit of these ideals and policies, its cooperation in all respects with the U.S. Government, and the encouragement it provides to the brave people of the captive nations who have not ceased fighting their oppressors.

Voters Hold Solution to Farm Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GRACIE PFOST
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, since coming to the Congress in 1953, I have become increasingly alarmed over the cost-price squeeze in which our Nation's farmers find themselves. Agriculture plays an important role in the economy of the First Congressional District in Idaho which I have the privilege to represent.

I grew up on a farm in the Boise Valley, and the great depression which swept the land in the early 1930's brought harder times to my parents than they had ever known.

Through sheer grit and hard work, we managed to hang on to our farm while many of our neighbors went under. Twelve years of Republican rule had added up to poverty, despair, and foreclosures, so that the coming of President Roosevelt and the New Deal was like a breath of fresh air on a tired land. And the Democratic Party with such constructive programs as the REA, proved equal to the challenge of those depression years and farmers were again able to hold their heads up in dignity and provide a better life for their families.

But now, after another era of Republican power, the farmer again finds himself slipping into an abyss of despair.

The Benson regime was established in the Nation's Capital in 1953. It came in on a wave of promises that saw headlines in the newspapers which read: "Ike Favors More Farm Props and 100 Percent of Parity," and "Ike Offers Plan for Farm Price Boost." Little did the Nation's farmers who read those headlines so hopefully know what was in store for them. The record, some 8 years later, speaks for itself.

Thousands of once proud, independent farmers have gone bankrupt and have been forced to leave the land which belonged to their forefathers.

The net income of farmers last year dropped to the lowest level—in relation to volume of their sales—than in any year since the Department of Agriculture began keeping records. And worse yet, his income so far in 1960 is 8 percent below the depressed level of 1959.

The per capita annual income of farm families last year—and that includes Government payments along with earnings for off-farm work—plummeted to less than one-half that of nonfarm families.

And what is the overall picture for the last 8 years, comparing 1960 with 1952? It is a sad commentary, indeed. Farm prices are down 17 percent and the farm parity ratio is down 21 percent; net farm income is down 24 percent and the purchasing power of that farm income is down 29 percent, the lowest since 1940; farmers' debts stand at a record $24 billion and the farm population has declined 3.1 million since 1952.

All of this is cold arithmetic. The cost in human terms—in poverty-ridden rural families, in hungry and ragged children, in loss of pride and dignity and a sense of purpose and accomplishment—cannot be measured.

It is the same story everywhere—a cost-price squeeze which has been sapping the very vitality of our farmers. Secretary Benson has taken control of the farm program out of the hands of the farmer and given it to people "who farm the farmers," as someone described them. These middlemen who reap the profits at the expense of the farmers have been richly rewarded by Mr. Benson. But it has confounded him also by piling surplus upon surplus, and the drain on the taxpayers has been heavier with each passing year.

With more than $5 billion being spent annually by Secretary Benson in his patchwork farm program, it is no wonder that he has managed to spend more money than all the Secretaries of Agriculture combined since the Department of Agriculture was founded back in the 1860's.

Today it takes 41.7 bushels of corn to buy the same suit of clothes that 26 bushels would buy in 1952. It takes 216.7 bushels to buy an electric stove compared to 153 bushels in 1952, and 38.6 bushels to buy a chair for the house compared to only 17.1 bushels 8 years ago.

As prices have steadily fallen, farmers have been impelled to produce more to make up for the loss. The result has been mountainous surpluses, which have further depressed prices. This, in a nutshell, is the fallacy of the Benson program. The tragedy it has wrought could not be spelled out in simpler terms.

When Democratic Farm Belt Members of the Senate and House rebelled and tried to pass legislation designed to help the farmer, we were met with veto after veto by the President.

Legislation to restore parity to 90 percent in 1955 fell by an Eisenhower-Nixon veto. In 1958, "hold the line" legislation—Senate Joint Resolution 162—to prevent Secretary Benson from lowering the farm price structure was vetoed. A major wheat bill which sought to cut acreage and raise parity was enacted in 1959, but it was vetoed. A new tobacco bill was voted, but then it also was vetoed. Last year, Congress passed a bill to restore the authority over REA to the REA Administrator, thus to forestall the Agriculture Secretary from crippling that very important agency to farmers, but this, too, was vetoed.

Agriculture is our basic industry. We are the best fed nation on earth. Our farmers have made it so. The productivity of our farms is today the greatest stabilizing force in the economy of the free world. The Communists have put satellites above the earth, but they cannot begin to match the productivity of the people tilling the soil of America.

Mr. Speaker, the fate of 21 million farmers is at stake in the November election. I have deep faith in the wisdom of the American voters. The decision is up to them to place in power in Washington an administration and a Secretary of Agriculture who will be sensitive to the needs of rural America and who will actively work to bring a new measure of prosperity to the farmer.

Congressman Peter W. Rodino, Jr., Reports to the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure once more to report to my neighbors and constituents of the 10th Congressional District on my activities as their representative in the 86th Congress, just concluded.

As a Congressman, it is my aim to represent all of the people, regardless of their needs or political affiliations. I consider this my primary responsibility. During the last Congress, as during each of my prior terms of service, I have faced every bill, every program, and every legislative proposal with one test: Is this in the best interest of the 10th Congressional District and of the Nation?

The past 2 years have been busy, sometimes frantic ones. It is possible to include only some of the highlights in this report. Unhappily, as my report below will show, some of the programs for which I fought, such as the minimum wage bill, did not materialize. Important advances were made in the social security laws, but much still remains to be done.

On the credit side of the ledger, a landmark civil rights bill, based on a report which I prepared, was enacted into law. I was in the forefront of the successful fight to give further protection to the small businessman. And I have been greatly encouraged by the response to my proposal to create a

Senior Citizens' Bureau, as well as to other planks in my legislative program.

No less vital was the time spent in helping my constituents with their personal problems. I shall continue to help in every way possible, for I believe it is the right of every person to petition his Congressman. Whether the problem is big or small, I know that, for the individual concerned, it is very important.

Aware that an alert, well-informed electorate is the surest safeguard of democracy, I submit the following report to you. Your comments in the past have been helpful and most welcome. I solicit your continued reactions, your views, and your suggestions as to my stewardship.

THE UNITED STATES AND WORLD LEADERSHIP

Ten years ago we were fighting the Communists in Korea; today they have ventured into our own backyard. This startling turn of events makes it imperative that we reevaluate our foreign policies and objectives. The crises of the past year—Korea, Japan, Cuba, the collapse of the summit—call for a new American offensive, based on imagination, boldness, and decisive action.

I have long urged that we reexamine our attitude toward our neighbors to the south. Although we waited for the Cuban crisis to do so, we have at last undertaken just such a reexamination. I am pleased to report that one of the major accomplishments of the summer session was the approval of a program for the development of Latin America and the reconstruction of Chile.

As important as economic aid, in my opinion, is getting our true image across to the peoples of Latin America. I have long been concerned with launching sister city programs to strengthen inter-American relationships, in my capacity as chairman of the National Citizens Committee for Columbus Day. I have also been meeting with officials of the U.S. Information Agency to explore what else we can do to reach the Latin American man in the street.

Because the struggle between democracy and communism in the next decade will focus largely upon the uncommitted and underdeveloped nations, I have strongly supported maximum appropriations for foreign aid. I believe we could be far more effective in this field as well, however, if we reexamined our programs, put them on a definite, long-term basis, used our funds to build mutual respect, instead of "buying friends," and supported projects which were truly responsive to the needs of the local citizens.

Communism will fail only if this country remains the strongest nation in the world. Disturbed by the testimony of countless military experts who warned that we will not retain our military superiority unless we intensify our efforts, Congress appropriated almost $40 billion for defense. Congressional prodding also spurred a reexamination of our missile program. We must provide for the defenses we need, not those we think we can afford. A missile lag is something we can afford least of all.

Diplomacy, as well as defense, can decide the cold war. So that we may be prepared on the diplomatic front, I have strongly urged the establishment of a Foreign Service Academy. This academy, I believe, can provide us with a pool of highly skilled, highly trained talent from which we can draw the very best men and women to represent us abroad.

Finally, I have continued to press for the establishment of a permanent U.N. police force, a plan I have been promoting since 1950. The Congo crisis points up once again how valuable such a peace force might be.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Our Nation's strength lies not only in the defense program, but in the guarantee of fundamental rights and liberties.

As in the 85th Congress, I again authored the report which resulted in the Civil Rights Act of 1960—the first breakthroughs in civil rights legislation in 80 years.

The Act of 1960 will secure some of our most sacred rights for all of our citizens.

IMMIGRATION

As a member of the Judiciary Committee, I am pleased to report that the committee engineered legislation to reunite families, help many alien orphans, and admit homeless refugees, a most appropriate step forward in this world refugee year.

SOCIAL SECURITY AND OUR SENIOR CITIZENS

Several good amendments to the social security laws were passed this year, including a moderate increase in the income limitations. As one who has pressed for removal of the income restrictions entirely, I must point out that the job has just begun. We must change the law so that those retired people who are willing and able to work will not be penalized for doing so.

Important changes were made in our disability laws. I am particularly pleased with this because I pointed out many of the serious deficiencies in the social security disability program in testimony before the Ways and Means Committee last fall.

During 1959 Congress launched a new program to provide housing for the elderly. Though a modest beginning, this marks a significant first in a sadly neglected field.

I have been deeply encouraged by the fine response to my suggestion to establish a Bureau for Senior Citizens. I intend to intensify my efforts on this program, for I feel a Bureau is essential if senior citizens are to have the spokesman they need.

LABOR

Congress adjourned without taking action on the minimum wage bill.

As one of those who strongly supported adequate minimum wage legislation, I was deeply disappointed.

We must remember that we cannot regard ourselves as a prosperous nation until each and every one of our citizens has the right and opportunity to earn a living wage.

SMALL BUSINESS

My work on the Antimonopoly Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee is concerned with protecting the small businessman and the consumer.

Most recently, the subcommittee was instrumental in getting legislation to restrict bank mergers, which will help small banks—often the small businessman's chief source of credit—to stay in business.

I authored the report which resulted in the Clayton Act Finality Bill—hailed by the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission as the most significant piece of antitrust legislation to come out of this Congress. This law is important to consumers and small businessmen alike, because it gives us a new weapon against deceptive business practices, price discrimination and unfair competition.

Just last year, the subcommittee was responsible for a decrease in long-distance telephone rates—saving users $50 million a year. We are now working on still another decrease.

PAYOLA

Perhaps one of the most important achievements of this session, and one which had my strong support, was legislation to restore integrity to the radio-TV industry. Those who become involved in payola and other dishonest practices will now be subject to severe criminal penalties.

OBSCENE LITERATURE

My personal fight for stronger laws against smut peddlers has stimulated wonderful support, both from my constituents and from my colleagues in Congress.

As a result of my urging, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee has promised to schedule hearings on my program early next session. At that time, I have been assured, a complete investigation of the entire problem will be undertaken. I am most hopeful that stringent, effective legislation will be a prompt result.

EDUCATION

It has been officially estimated that 10 million of our children receive an impaired education because they go to school in inadequate, overcrowded classrooms. We cannot continue to tolerate this neglect of our greatest national resource. Nor can we continue to ignore the challenge of the Soviet Union, which places far more emphasis on education than we do.

An equitable program to expand our educational facilities has been a firm part of my legislative platform. Unfortunately, those of us who were so committed were unsuccessful in the last Congress. I do not think I need add that I intend to continue my fight in the future.

MEDICAL RESEARCH

Although I am not on the Appropriations Committee, I have taken an active interest in the yearly budget for medical research. This year considerable progress was made, as we increased the appropriation over last year's by about 40 percent.

Who knows what diseases might already be conquered had we invested perhaps 40 percent more in our health and our lives over the last decade.

VETERANS

Of particular interest to the veteran is the extension of the GI home loan program, which had my vigorous support.

I introduced legislation to provide pensions on a more equitable basis for widows and children of veterans of World War II and Korea; such a provision was included in the pension bill enacted in 1959.

Reported out of committee, although not finally approved, was a measure to set up a court of appeals for veterans who are denied claims by the Veterans' Administration. I cosponsored this legislation and testified on its behalf before the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

FOR THE GARDEN STATE

Of special interest to the commuter is the new New Jersey-New York Transportation Agency, set up to handle our commuter problems. At the request of New Jersey State officials, I introduced the bill granting congressional consent to this agency, and steered the bill into law.

I have received the personal thanks of the chairman of the State Tercentenary Commission for my efforts to secure House approval for the New Jersey tercentenary bill. Under this legislation a Federal Tercentenary Commission will help New Jersey celebrate her 300th birthday.

As in prior years, I continued my efforts to focus attention, on the Federal level, on the nonresident tax on New Jersey commuters. It looks now as though at least some relief may be forthcoming early next year.

Immediately after learning of the decision on the Essex East-West Freeway, I contacted the Bureau of Public Roads to press for reconsideration. In the myriad of correspondence, telephone conversations and conferences which have followed, with officials of both the Bureau and the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, I have urged the Bureau to consider the civil defense advantages of a depressed highway, because this factor, when added to all the others, should certainly be enough to justify the expenditure of additional Federal funds.

During our last meeting, the Chief of the Bureau agreed to reconsider the depressed design in the light of all these considerations. As soon as there is any definite word, you may be sure that I shall inform the district.

OTHER ISSUES

I have repeatedly stressed the overwhelming need for an adequate urban renewal program. A great deal more must be done to restore our cities and provide for balanced suburban development. I shall continue to work for programs to eliminate blight, solve urban transit difficulties, meet other problems such as air and water pollution, and rehabilitate our cities.

So that you may know where I stand on issues other than those mentioned above, I might mention that I introduced legislation to establish a U.S. Peace Agency; to combat waste and inefficiency in Government spending; to prevent our servicemen stationed abroad from being tried by foreign courts; to revise and standardize our unemployment compensation system; to provide an additional tax exemption for the physically handicapped; and to improve the immigration laws. I cosponsored the Captive Nations Resolution which was approved last spring, and also introduced a bill to set up a separate Captive Nations Committee of the House. After several years, my efforts to award Medals of Honor to the four chaplains—one of whom was Father Washington of Arlington—were finally successful. The Department of Defense is now preparing an appropriate design.

Your letters are most welcome and deeply appreciated. Whether they discuss legislative issues or personal problems, I feel they help me become truly responsive to the needs and opinions of the people I am proud to represent. I hope you will continue to give me the benefit of your views and suggestions.

Looking Ahead in the Field of Public Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has been one of the most foresighted men in Congress in sensing the need to meet the challenge of providing greater and cheaper electric energy in this country. He has consistently recognized the contribution of public power to our Nation's progress, and earlier this year addressed the seventeenth annual convention of the American Public Power Association in Washington.

I ask unanimous consent that his speech be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOOKING AHEAD IN THE FIELD OF PUBLIC POWER

(By Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN)

Ten years ago I had the privilege of addressing the seventh annual convention of the American Public Power Association here in Washington.

I interpreted the enthusiasm shown at that convention as symbolizing the progress which had been made in public power development.

I said that the problem which led you to pioneer in this field was still with us—"the urgent need for more and cheaper electric energy."

I also called attention to the fact that the utilities were trying to lull us into complacency about the future growth of our Nation by telling us that the facilities they planned would produce enough power to meet the demand.

I noted that in this way they hoped to stall off the public development of our major water resources.

Today, I want you to join me in a glance backward over the 10 years which have passed since your seventh annual convention, followed by a forward look at the challenge to American public power in the decade which lies ahead.

As I look at the situation, I am convinced that the problem has been broadened to include not only the development of water power but also the entire pattern of regional power supply on which all electric systems must depend.

PUBLIC POWER HAS MORE THAN HELD ITS OWN IN LAST DECADE

When I spoke to you in 1949, the country's production of electricity was just passing the 300 billion kilowatt-hour mark.

Last year we passed the 700 billion kilowatt-hour mark.

The 10-year increase of 400 billion kilowatt-hours in the country's power requirements exceeded the total production of electricity by all utility systems, public, private, and cooperative in the earlier year.

For the purpose of review, it is important to note that Federal, State, municipal, and cooperative electric systems (the consumer-owned sector of the power industry) contributed more than a quarter of the 400 billion kilowatt-hour expansion in the country's power production.

The electricity generated in these consumer-owned generating stations increased from 59 billion kilowatt-hours in 1949 to 166 billion kilowatt-hours in 1959.

Thus, consumer-owned production of electric energy rose from 20 to 23 percent of the country's total.

Publicly owned generating stations are today producing more electricity than all electric utility systems in the country produced in 1940, just 20 years ago.

For you gathered here in this great convention there is another significant footnote to this tremendous expansion in the country's supply of electricity.

The increase in the public share of this generation was by no means altogether Federal.

In the 10-year period non-Federal public and cooperative systems increased their total production of electricity from 20 billion to 57 billion kilowatt-hours, or about 185 percent.

This just about paralleled the rate of increase in federally generated power supply and exceeded by a considerable margin that of the investor-owned electric utilities.

Before turning to the prospects of the next decade, I would point out that these figures are of much importance.

We must maintain approximately this same proportion of the capacity required for the next 10 years' expansion, if the strength of the public and cooperative sector of America's power industry is to be preserved.

Assurance that there will be some Federal power supply available as a competitive influence in every region is essential to the survival of the many small municipal and rural cooperative electric systems.

A little later I will tell you why.

Here let me just add, that of the 93.5 million new kilowatts of electric generating capacity added to the 63 million which we had in 1949, about 15.7 million was Federal and 9.5 million non-Federal public and cooperative.

This brought the total consumer-owned capacity to about 37.8 million kilowatts or just over 24 percent of the country's total central station capacity.

So I congratulate you at this 17th annual convention of the American Public Power Association on being fundamentally stronger than you were 10 years ago.

I can congratulate you because, in the face of the all-out drive of the private power companies to reduce the public and cooperative power sector, you have more than held your own.

This has been due in large measure to the growing strength and able leadership of your great organization working shoulder to shoulder with another great organization, the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, and the other important labor-consumer organizations banded together in the Electric Consumers Information Committee.

The inscription across the face of the National Archives Building continually reminds us: "The Past Is Prologue."

Therefore, we must look ahead to the great future we can build for the country in an all-electric age if we can only free ourselves from the influence of sterile slogans and give our fast developing technology the green light—subject only to the moral mandate that the Nation's gigantic powerhouse of the future be founded on the rock of public welfare.

As I warned 10 years ago, we cannot let the private utility people—stanch defenders of the "status quo"—lull us into a state of complacency.

In other words, we can't sit back and leave the Nation's future power supply to Uncle "Power Monopoly," any more than we can leave it altogether to Uncle Sam.

I don't worry about our becoming complacent so long as you people remain organized and alert.

We must develop a new pattern in power supply, adapted to the new technology, in which all forms of electric utility enterprise can cooperate to meet the expanding needs of all at the lowest possible cost.

A part of this pattern will include development of some 20 million kilowatts of additional hydroelectric power as part of the next step forward in our river-basin programs.

An increasingly important part will include an answer to the question of how we are going to organize the great modern regional combinations of large steamplants and hydroelectric plants delivering to high-voltage transmission pools which modern technology makes possible.

CHALLENGE OF THE POWER INDUSTRY'S NEXT DECADE

From this point of view, let us look at what is ahead, at what is going to happen in the power industry, before I address your 27th annual convention in 1970.

To make our perspective crystal clear, we will frankly make use of Electrical World's "Survey of the 1960's" and "Research and Development" issues as field glasses through which to see this future.

Our frame of reference will include an increase of 34 million in population, an increase from $4,900 to $6,250 per family in disposable income, an increase from about 52 million to 60 million in the number of home units, and an increase from $480 billion to $700 billion in gross national product.

The average home use of electricity will be close to double in the next decade.

The number of all-electric homes, including electric space heating, will rise to 4 million using around 100 billion kilowatt-hours of electricity, or as much as all residential consumers used as recently as 1954.

Residential use as a whole will rise to about 400 billion kilowatt-hours, a total exceeding utility sales to all classes of consumers 6 years ago.

Altogether, Electrical World foresees an increase of nearly 1 trillion kilowatt-hours (1 million million) in the Nation's total utility output, with a corresponding increase from 180 million to 337 million kilowatts in the installed generating capacity required to meet the total requirements of 1⅔ trillion kilowatt-hours.

What are the implications of these tremendous figures to the consumer-owned public and cooperative electric systems of the country which, together, serve more than 21 percent of all the country's electric consumers?

Simply this: If the country is to maintain approximately the same proportion of the total production of electricity in public and cooperative hands as prevailed at the end of the last decade, the answer is clear.

During the next 10 years, the Federal, State, municipal, and cooperative electric systems must plan for the construction of about 40 million kilowatts of new generating capacity, with an output of at least 200 billion kilowatt-hours of electricity.

Let me note, in passing, that I am not projecting this necessary public share of the next decade's expansion beyond that assumed by Electrical World.

In its forecast for the 1960's, that able journal assumes that $14 billion of the $67 billion to be expended in the next 10 years on new construction of plant and equipment will be the responsibility of public and cooperative electric systems (Electrical World, Dec. 28, 1959, p. 80).

When I address your annual convention in 1970, I will be citing a total consumer-owned generating capacity of about 80 million kilowatts, with annual output of at least 360 billion kilowatt-hours.

It will take mighty sound long-range planning to make sure that all public and cooperative systems have access to low-cost power.

Just as important as assuring the public and cooperative share of available power will be the reorganization of power supply which will be required if the country is to take full advantage of the low-cost electric energy which modern technology offers.

WHAT MODERN POWER SUPPLY TECHNOLOGY OFFERS

Some years ago representatives of the investor-owned electric utilities came before Congress supporting legislation to free them from certain Federal regulatory requirements if they set up jointly owned power supply companies.

They testified that great savings in power supply costs required the installation of very large generating units in giant steam stations.

The power company spokesmen also testified that considerably less than half of the power systems in the country were big enough to plan such large modern stations or finance them as parts of their expansion programs.

They stressed the importance of joint ownership as the answer and included atomic as well as conventional steam stations in offering this new pattern.

Electrical World's projection for the 1960's presents a picture along this line which we cannot overlook if we are to correctly appraise the future of public and cooperative electric systems.

This journal of the industry projects future steam units averaging more than 230,000 kilowatts, with single units exceeding 1 million kilowatts on order.

These modern steam stations, along with hydro plants, will increasingly be subject to complete, automated, remote control. The Electrical World article states:

"The new decade will bring multimillion-kilowatt systems which will be the integrated and optimized product of a revolution in planning rather than the random assemblies of individually optimized power plants, substations, and transmission networks."

It further foresees demands that the future power supply be ready, reliable, and reasonable in cost, stimulating an unparalleled growth in transmission.

It states that existing system interconnections which tie together 85 percent of the generating capacity of the United States will be immensely extended and strengthened.

It says that the threat of governmental interference will hasten this trend.

It provides us with this picture of the evolution of power supply in the coming decade:

"Power pooling, today well developed, will in the sixties reach fuller flower. There will be the start of pooling of pools, the first and most logical approach to regional and even nationwide power grids."

HOW WILL PUBLIC AND COOPERATIVE SYSTEMS PARTICIPATE

The biggest problem facing public and cooperative systems today, as we move into the new decade, is to determine just how they are to participate in the results of this technological revolution in the electric power industry.

The answer to that problem will determine in large measure whether the country as a whole is going to be protected against a gigantic private power monopoly embodied in a power-company-dominated nationwide power grid.

Thirty-five years ago, in his message to the Pennsylvania Legislature on giant power, Gov. Gifford Pinchot saw the development of the network of interconnected electric lines as so rapid "that a delay of even 5 years in establishing effective public control will bring Pennsylvania and the Nation face to face with an overwhelming and almost uncontrollable electric monopoly." He continued:

"Nothing like this gigantic monopoly has ever appeared in the history of the world. It is immeasurably the greatest industrial fact of our time. If uncontrolled, it will be a plague without previous example. If effectively controlled in the public interest it can be made uncomparably the greatest material blessing in human history."

Fortunately, at that very time, my friend and your friend, Senator George Norris, of Nebraska, was battling to make the Federal Muscle Shoals power project the basis for a TVA which would afford more than 100 municipal and cooperative systems access to modern power supply.

Fortunately, also, at that time E. F. Scattergood, former general manager of the great Los Angeles Bureau of Power and Light and founder of the American Public Power Association, was battling for Boulder Canyon, first of the series of lower Colorado River projects, which are now pouring low-cost power into the local public power systems of southern California, Arizona, and Nevada.

Fortunately, with the coming of the next decade, multiple-purpose river basin programs were initiated, which have become sources of low-cost power for the public and cooperative systems of the Pacific Northwest, the Central Valley of California, the Southwestern States embracing the White, Arkansas, Red, Brazos, and Lower Colorado River Basins, and much of the Southeast outside of the region served by TVA.

Fortunately, to these anti-power-monopoly programs centering around our river basins the REA program was added.

This enabled over 4 million farms and other rural consumers to establish cooperative electric service including, where necessary to prevent monopoly-pricing of wholesale power supply, their own generation and transmission systems.

All these combined have done much to arrest the trend toward the all-embracing private power monopoly that Governor Pinchot feared.

The battle to hold these gains, in terms of the country's tremendous advance into the electric age which lies ahead, will face us in the 1960's.

THE NORTHEAST WITH ITS NIAGARA AND ST. LAWRENCE

When I addressed your convention 10 years ago I talked about the St. Lawrence and Niagara projects and my hopes that these two great public power developments would provide the necessary competitive influence to bring down the high power costs in the Northeastern States.

Now the St. Lawrence project has been on the line for more than a year, with my State of Vermont allotted 100,000 kilowatts of the output, and the great Niagara project will be delivering power within a year or two.

But the grip of the private companies has been so tight that the broad benefits I hoped for have not yet materialized.

The recent report of Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller's Committee on Power Resources for the State of New York may give us an explanation in two brief sentences.

The committee states (1) that "in the area east of the Mississippi and north of the Ohio, Federal power is practically nonexistent," and (2) that "municipal and cooperative ownership of electric utilities is an extremely small factor in the power economics of the Northeastern States."

The latter statement is borne out by the fact that in 1958 the New England and Middle Atlantic States, with about one-quarter of the country's total population, had the advantage of only about one-fiftieth of the 130 billion kilowatt-hours sold to ultimate consumers by public and cooperative systems.

This may explain the fact shown in the Federal Power Commission typical electrical bills report for 1959, that, of the 10 States with the highest monthly bills for homes using 250 kilowatt-hours, 8 are in the Northeast.

These eight States include all of New England, plus New York and Delaware.

The Rockefeller committee, in which three large New York power systems were represented, fully confirmed the fact that we are entering a new power era.

It reported that very large steam generating units would mean a material reduction in power supply costs but that only one system in the State could support such units.

It added, however, that statewide integrated operation may well function in the future with 800,000 to 1 million kilowatt units.

Remarking that installation of even a 500,000 kilowatt unit in New York would cost something like $100 million, a figure approaching or far exceeding the present production investment of each of five of the seven New York companies, the committee added:

"Some form of joint ownership of such large facilities may become necessary."

The report then continues with the following significant statement:

"To the power engineer it is obvious that, in theory the maximum economy and efficiency in developing the power resources of New York State could be attained by planning and operating the generation and transmission facilities as a single statewide system with strong interconnections to adjoining States.

"Such planning, with coordinate construction and operation, would permit taking advantage of the latest and most advanced technology."

THE BROADER PUBLIC INTEREST

We in New England, as well as consumers of electricity in all the Northeastern States, may well ask, should not this coordinated planning, construction, and operation of power systems, taking advantage of advanced technology, be extended on a regionwide basis?

This would enable us to get all the advantages of possible location of giant power producing stations near the coal mines, construction of economical atomic power stations nearer the loads, development of river basin power for peak load and reserve purposes, and the diversity of loads offered where an entire region is included in power supply planning.

This, however, raises the broader problem of whether, in order to simplify regulation, regional bulk power supply should not be separately incorporated as a jointly owned undertaking.

Such regional wholesale power supply organizations could be set up with the cooperation of Federal, State, local public, and cooperative, as well as private power systems.

They should be made responsible for meeting the expanding power requirements of all systems selling electricity to ultimate consumers.

I am convinced that, after careful study of the whole situation, Congress must take the necessary action to facilitate development somewhat along these lines.

But, speaking directly to you, representatives of the country's important publicly owned local electric systems, I say that the biggest problem facing you and your fellow rural electric cooperatives, as we move into the new decade, is to determine how you are going to participate in the advantages of the technological revolution which is taking place in the power industry.

There is no question but that the full weight of private power influence will be thrown into the battle to deny to you the benefits which you should derive from your regional bulk power supply organizations.

The old battle of the holding company era, exposed a quarter of a century ago by the Federal Trade Commission, is still going on.

It will require the most carefully organized, hardheaded, power supply planning, leading to both joint construction and legislative action, to meet the challenge.

You can count on the supoprt of many able Members of both Houses of Congress in going forward with constructive long-range plans which require Federal participation and rulemaking.

You can count on the support of many able well-worked-out comprehensive river-basin programs, including hydroelectric power and needed transmission, as contributions to the realization of such plans.

But, in cooperation with the rural electric cooperatives, you yourselves have got to take the initiative in developing the plans and point the way.

In a very real sense your success will provide the answer to a larger problem, the problem of how the millions of small consumers of electricity throughout this land—farms, rural and urban homes, small businesses—are going to be assured the full advantages of this power revolution, as against the continued threat of giant power monopoly.

This is so because, throughout the entire history of central station electric power, actual or potential public competition, even by little village systems has been the most potent force for better service at lower rates.

So I say, God speed you in building a constructive program during the years ahead.

Congressman John D. Dingell Reports to the People of the 15th District of Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of each Congress, I report on my stewardship to the people of my district.

During this session I served on the Committees on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

I maintain two offices to serve my constituents, one in Washington, D.C., and one in Detroit at 7310 Grand River Avenue, where I will again be available during the fall to meet with people of my district on their problems.

I. LEGISLATION INTRODUCED BY THE HONORABLE JOHN D. DINGELL WHICH HAS BECOME LAW DURING THE 86TH CONGRESS

H.R. 500: Outlawing bombing of churches, synagogues, homes, schools, and businesses.

H.R. 3852: Eliminating the 50-year age requirement for permanent disability under the social security program.

H.R. 11591: Increasing salaries of Federal classified and postal employees by 7½ percent to 8.4 percent, and making permanent certain other Government pay raises.

H.R. 4261: Extending the life of the Civil Rights Commission.

H.R. 12449: Increasing penalties for violation of the Migratory Bird Act.

H.R. 5191: Improving distribution of surplus food to needy families.

II. OTHER LEGISLATION INTRODUCED BY HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

SOCIAL SECURITY

H.R. 3851: To reduce retirement age for men to 60 and for women to 55.

H.R. 3854: To raise the amount which may be earned by social security recipients without penalty to $1,800 per year.

H.R. 3897 and H.R. 5923: To provide for up to 60 days hospitalization per year and other medical care for social security beneficiaries.

H.R. 3853: To liberalize the definition of permanent disability which now excludes many disabled persons from benefits under the permanent disability section.

CIVIL RIGHTS

H.R. 351: An omnibus bill to outlaw discrimination in employment, voting, housing, and transportation, and to create a Federal Fair Employment Practices Commission with strong enforcement powers.

H.R. 352: To authorize the Attorney General of the United States to file civil actions for injunction on behalf of citizens whose civil rights are threatened or interfered with.

H.R. 353: To outlaw lynching or violence because of race, creed, or color of the victim.

H.R. 354: To establish a strong Federal Fair Employment Practices Commission to abolish job discrimination.

PROBLEMS OF THE AGED

H.R. 11167: To make it an unfair labor practice to discriminate against a worker because of age.

MINIMUM WAGE AND UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

H.R. 3558: To provide Federal standards for unemployment compensation and to guarantee unemployed workers two-thirds their weekly wage or half the average wage within their State, whichever is less, for not less than 39 weeks.

H.R. 6239: To increase the minimum wage to $1.25 per hour, and so to protect workers and industries in Michigan from low wage competitors in other areas.

NATIONAL CONTRIBUTORY HEALTH INSURANCE

H.R. 4498: As in previous sessions I sponsored a national program of contributory health insurance to make ade-

quate medical care available to all on a prepaid basis with freedom of choice expressly reserved to both physician and patient.

RECORD OF THE 86TH CONGRESS

Liberals found this Congress most frustrating after the clear mandate of the people in the fall of 1958. The conservative coalition of Dixiecrats and Republicans, which has blocked much worthwhile social legislation since 1938, prevented enactment of minimum wage, school construction and housing legislation, as well as legislation to stimulate the sluggish growth of the economy, to help business and industry, and to provide jobs for our people. In this the Dixiecrat-Republican coalition had the leadership and open assistance of the Republican administration which rattled a constant veto threat over the heads of Congress.

Particularly unfortunate was the betrayal of the aged by the administration and its coalition cohorts on medical care. The legislation passed ostensibly to furnish medical care to the aged, the highest of all groups in all phases of medical need, will do little for them. Matching Federal grants for the care of the needy aged on a strictly welfare basis are provided in the bill passed. The usual means test is required. In all probability, residents of States like Michigan will receive little direct benefit, except that the Federal Government will pay a portion of what is now paid by the State under existing welfare programs to furnish medical care to aged welfare recipients. It is questionable whether this will make improvement in actual quality of the care now afforded our needy aged.

The Congress passed the Civil Rights Act of 1960, principally directed at protecting the right to vote and it should be helpful in this. I am happy to say that not only was I a framer of the discharge petition which brought this legislation to the floor, after it had been bottled up by the Dixiecrat-Republican coalition, but was active in every effort to strengthen the bill. The conservative coalition with the support of the White House and most of the Republican membership beat down most efforts to make this legislation really meaningful. Provisions of my antibombing bill are included in this law.

Although exact figures are not available at this time, the Congress cut the administration's spending requests substantially. The politically balanced budget of the 1960 fiscal year was achieved by juggling of expenditures of the year preceding and the year following. Among others, foreign aid expenditures not needed until 1960 were spent in 1959. Vital defense expenditures, and, indeed, many other necessary expenditures, were put off by the Executive until 1961. Many bookkeeping changes were made to permit this balanced budget, including more than doubling the Federal Reserve's payment to the Federal Government from $491 to $1,093 million.

While this juggling was going on the President and members of his party in Congress were successfully opposing housing and urban renewal programs, aid to depressed areas, and school construction legislation.

The Congress appropriated sufficient money to meet foreign aid requirements, although it appears that the administration is seeking to make up for diplomatic failures by big expenditures. The collapse of American foreign policy in many areas, such as the Congo, Latin America, and the Far East was again a signal for increased foreign aid requests by the administration. The events of the past year have finally proved that the "grand tour personal diplomacy" does not work. I am hopeful that these failures may result in intelligent reappraisal of foreign policy and that emergency appropriations will not substitute for intelligent planning.

SOME IMPORTANT LEGISLATION ACTED UPON BY THE 86TH CONGRESS

Civil Rights Act of 1960: Authorizes Federal courts through appointed referees to safeguard voting rights; fixes penalties for obstruction of court orders and for destruction of homes, churches, schools, and businesses by use of explosives; and requires preservation of Federal election records for 2 years.

S. 722: To provide loans and grants for industrial redevelopment in depressed areas, as well as retaining unemployed workers. This was vetoed by the President and an attempted override failed.

H.R. 12667: To increase the minimum wage from $1 to $1.25 per hour over a 3-year period, and extend coverage to 4 million more workers. This was passed by the House and Senate, but killed in conference by Republican-Dixiecrat coalition.

Public Law 85-564: Extending the limit of $293 billion on the national debt for 1 year.

H.R. 10128: To authorize a 3-year $975 million program of aid to school districts for construction of schools. This was passed by both Houses but the conference request was killed in Rules Committee by Republican-Dixiecrat coalition.

COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES OF HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

Disclosures by me several years ago of irregularities in granting television licenses by the Federal Communications Commission, and my discussion of improprieties of conduct by members of that body, have helped bring about stringent reform legislation. Cancellation of television licenses granted under questionable circumstances, and resignation and indictment of members of that agency, have also followed.

This year I helped bring about a thorough investigation of the Federal Power Commission, by disclosure of ex parte contracts on members of that body. Lobbyists secured an excessive rate of return on gas delivered to the Detroit area by improper visits to commissioners. A thorough congressional investigation resulted, the Federal Power Commission reversed itself, and the people of this area were saved some $16 million over the next 20 years.

I vigorously and successfully opposed other lobby attempts to damage consumer interests. I helped defeat an effort to weaken the food and drug law to permit cancer-producing additives in foods. I joined with a few colleagues in successfully defeating a nationwide so-called fair-trade bill which would have cost consumers over a billion dollars a year in additional costs on food, appliances, drugs, cosmetics, and household items. This bill would have repealed the antitrust laws, and opened businessmen to intimidation, coercion, and improper pressure. It would have vested in special interests license to fix prices and gouge merchants and consumers alike.

I have taken a particular interest in conservation of wildlife and natural resources, and have drafted strong legislation to clean up our rivers and waters and make them again safe for home, industrial, and recreational use. I took part in enactment of every piece of conservation legislation which was passed this session.

It has been an honor to represent my people in the House of Representatives for the past three Congresses, and I hope my efforts will merit their continued approval.

Congressman O'Hara Reports to the Michigan Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, one of the gravest problems facing our Nation arises from the economic squeeze in which the American farmer now finds himself.

It is a problem which has caused me as much concern during my service in Congress as any other single subject.

THE SEVENTH DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN

The congressional district which I have the privilege to represent is composed of Huron, Tuscola, Saniiac, Lapeer, St. Clair, and Macomb Counties in the Thumb of Michigan.

In the majority of these six counties agriculture is the principal industry.

The farmers of my district are both industrious and resourceful, and they farm productive land. Yet today they find themselves in an economic wringer as do farmers throughout the Nation.

When net farm income drops in Michigan by 30 percent between 1952 and 1959, and farm mortgage debt increases by 73 percent in the same period, we are all in trouble. In those same 7 years, 23,000 farms were closed down in our State, and the people that lived and worked on them have gone elsewhere in search of jobs.

This is not a pretty picture, and the national farm scene is much the same. For example, in the Seventh District, where many of our factories produce machines and products used on the farm, we have also felt the impact of the drop in purchasing power of the farmer to its lowest point since 1940.

Now, I should like to review some of the farm programs and policies considered by this 86th Congress, in which I have had the privilege to represent the Seventh District of Michigan.

WHEAT

The wheat generally grown in the Seventh District is a soft white wheat which is not in surplus, as are the hard red wheats, and which has on several occasions in recent years actually been in short supply.

Most of our wheat producers are small growers, many of them operating under the 15-acre exemption.

The wheat bill before the House this year imposed upon all growers of soft white wheat an enforcible acreage allotment equal to the greatest number of acres planted in the last 3 years less 25 percent. The 15-acre exemption would also have been eliminated.

This amounted to penalizing Michigan growers for a surplus situation which they did not create and to which they do not contribute.

I, therefore, proposed an amendment which would have corrected this inequitable treatment. When my amendment failed of adoption, I voted against the bill which was defeated in the House.

While I favor legislation to reduce surplus stocks of wheat and to assist hard-pressed growers, I insist that such legislation deal fairly with all growers of all types of wheat.

MILK

On Wednesday, August 31, the House, with my support, passed and sent to the President S. 2917, a bill to set price support levels for manufacturing milk at $3.22 per hundredweight instead of the present $3.06 and for butterfat at 59.6 cents per pound instead of the present 56.6 cents.

The new price support level of 81 percent represents average market prices of the past marketing year and provides insurance against a price drop during the balance of this marketing year.

This bill was supported by the Michigan Milk Producers Association and other dairy organizations. Michigan Milk's president, Glenn Lake, estimates that the support boost will mean $180 million to the Nation's dairy farmers, $8 million of it to Michigan dairymen.

BEANS

Bean price supports have been lowered from $7.87 per hundredweight in 1952 to $5.35 per hundredweight in 1959, a reduction of 32 percent, with serious impact upon growers.

Additionally, the problem of marketing Michigan beans in an orderly fashion to obtain the highest possible price has been complicated by maintenance of an unnecessarily early takeover date on beans under Commodity Credit Corporation loans.

I have repeatedly urged the Department of Agriculture to change the takeover date from the end of February to the end of April, without success. I shall continue doing so until action is taken.

SUGAR BEETS

The question of allocation of sugar quotas under the Sugar Act has been dominated this year by foreign policy considerations involving relations between our Government and the governments of Cuba and the Dominican Republic.

It is my intention, when the Sugar Act is again up for amendment, to press for a 5-year extension, providing adequate quotas for our Michigan domestic beet producers.

MIGRANT LABOR

In the last hours of this session, the Senate passed, and the House accepted, a bill extending the operation of Public Law 78 under which Mexican nationals are permitted to enter the United States as farm laborers through next year, without change.

Earlier, the House had voted a 2-year extension which the Senate would not accept.

I supported the extension of Public Law 78, but would have preferred a longer extension along with amendments to correct abuses of the program which have arisen, mostly in the five States of the South and Southwest in which about 90 percent of the bracero labor is used.

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

I was pleased to be able to assist the successful efforts of the Snover and Deckerville industrial development groups to bring small industries to their communities.

I would like to see much more of this and stand ready to assist other communities in such efforts in any way I can.

Earlier this year, I voted for the area redevelopment legislation setting up a program to assist in bringing new industries and new jobs to areas of substantial and chronic unemployment and to rural areas in which a proven need for supplemental income and employment opportunities exists. This would have helped especially in the Port Huron and Detroit employment areas.

Unfortunately, that bill was vetoed by the President, in part because he felt that "loans for construction in rural areas are incongruous and unnecessary." Michigan State has done some very successful work with their rural development program, and this bill would substantially assist their pioneering work in our rural Michigan counties.

Nevertheless, Congress should, I believe, persist in its efforts in this direction next year.

FOOD FOR NEEDY

Last year I joined with Michigan's Senator PHIL HART, who serves on the Senate Agriculture Committee, in sponsoring a bill to establish a food stamp demonstration program. The Secretary of Agriculture, under this proposal, would operate six pilot demonstration food stamp programs in areas of high unemployment, both in rural and urban counties, to utilize the surplus production of our farms to help the needy.

We believed that this demonstration food stamp program, once under way, would once and for all time show the feasibility and usefulness of food stamps for the needy in all parts of our Nation. This proposal was passed in the Senate, but was changed before it finally passed the House to the extent that it did not direct the Secretary of Agriculture to get on with this food-stamp program, but simply gave him authority to undertake such a program if he wanted to. Secretary Benson said he did not believe there was any need for a food stamp program, and to date has refused to use this authority which Congress gave him.

I intend to keep pressing for a sound program to get our surplus food into the stomachs of needy people in our country, as well as the hungry overseas.

FOOD FOR PEACE

The United States has no greater weapon in the cold war than the productive ability of our land and our farms. I have supported the programs under Public Law 480 to use our food surpluses and our abundant production as an instrument of peace and friendship. But I believe that there can be great improvements in this program. Unfortunately the administration has fought every effort of those of us in Congress who want to improve this program. We could, for example, be using the foreign currencies received for the sale of our surplus commodities to build storage facilities for national food reserves in nations that have had serious deficits.

We would be helping to prevent starvation from famine or other disaster by having the food close at hand to the country needing it.

I have believed this type of program to be sound, and in the best interests not only of our farmers, but of our Nation and the peoples of the world. Efforts to enact such new programs for use of food surpluses overseas have been blocked by this administration. I will continue to work for expanded food-for-peace programs, and my support for them will be a continuing one.

FARMS AND THE ECONOMY

Mr. Speaker, all of us have a stake in achieving economic justice for the farmer. We cannot prosper as a Nation unless the farmer shares in our prosperity.

Yet net farm income in 1959 was 16 percent below that in the recession year of 1958. If farm income continues to decline, the demand for products of the mines, mills and factories of America will also decline. The inevitable result will be widespread unemployment and depression.

TOP PRIORITY

Mr. Speaker, the depression on the farm should be assigned top legislative priority in the next Congress. Simple justice demands prompt action to win for the farmer a fair price for the fruits of his labor.

Congressman John Brademas Reports on the 86th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I submit for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my annual report on the work of Congress.

In a few weeks the American people will choose the party and the President to lead them in the 1960's. This fall Members of Congress will discuss their records with the people they represent. Here is a report from your Representative on his work and activities in the 86th Congress.

TOP PRIORITY: THE FIGHT ON UNEMPLOYMENT

Since coming to Congress I have given top priority to working for measures to combat the evil of unemployment, still a serious problem in Indiana and the Nation. Unemployment represents human tragedy for the jobless workers and their families and lost production to the Nation at a time when Khrushchev threatens to "bury" our capitalist system by outproducing us.

My first bill, the area redevelopment bill, was twice passed by Congress but twice vetoed by President Eisenhower. Its purpose: to encourage more industry and new jobs in areas of chronic unemployment. I am confident the bill will become law next year.

I also introduced bills to repeal the excise tax on autos and musical instruments to stimulate purchases; and a bill to help the U.S. rubber industry defend itself against a wave of imports of Japanese rubber footwear.

MINIMUM WAGE INCREASE SUPPORTED

Senator VANCE HARTKE and I worked hard to stop the shutdown of Kingsbury Ordnance Plant in La Porte County and so were glad to arrange for the Senate Special Committee on Unemployment Problems to hold hearings in La Porte.

I also sponsored legislation to modernize unemployment compensation by raising benefits and extending weeks of payment, and I worked to raise the minimum wage to $1.25 and extend its coverage to more workers.

HIGHLIGHTS OF AUGUST SESSION OF CONGRESS

In the August session Congress passed five major appropriations bills, the Antarctic Treaty, suspended the equal-time broadcasting requirements to permit the Kennedy-Nixon debates, a stop-gap housing bill, an antipayola bill, $600 million in Latin American aid; the minimum wage bill died in Senate-House conference after the House conferees insisted on their version or none, but Senator JOHN KENNEDY said Congress would come back and pass a good bill in January, 1961.

REPUBLICANS OPPOSE HEALTH INSURANCE FOR ELDERLY

Congress passed a social security bill setting up a program of Federal grants to States for medical care for elderly persons on relief or in need. Only 1 Republican joined 43 Democratic Senators in support of Senator KENNEDY'S bill to provide health insurance through the contributory, pay-as-you-go, social security system, also endorsed by GOP Gov. Nelson Rockefeller. A solid block of Republicans and Dixiecrats killed the bill; the administration-endorsed "pauper'" bill was then passed.

DEMOCRATIC 86TH CONGRESS CUTS $2 BILLION OFF EISENHOWER BUDGETS

The 86th Congress cut $2,093,048,591 off President Eisenhower's budget requests for fiscal year 1960–61. The President asked for $148,704,982,935; the Democratic Congress cut the big-spending GOP administration's appropriations to $146,611,934,344.

Administration opposition killed a plan to let self-employed persons, such as doctors and lawyers, deduct from taxable income a limited amount placed yearly in retirement funds.

EDUCATION: A SOUND INVESTMENT IN AMERICA'S FUTURE

America's children need more schools and more teachers. The world's richest nation can afford to invest more in education. Latest figures show we need 134,000 more classrooms and 132,400 more teachers. As a member of the House Education Committee, I worked hard in the 86th Congress for Federal support of State and local efforts to build more schools and improve teachers' salaries—whichever the States chose to do. I am strongly opposed to Federal control of education. I am just as strongly aware that we cannot raise local property taxes much higher.

GOP-DIXIECRAT COALITION BLOCKS SCHOOL BILL

Both House and Senate passed school bills but the Republican-Dixiecrat coalition on the House Rules Committee refused to permit a conference to resolve the differences. I am confident that with a Democrat in the White House, a good school bill will become law next year. We can no longer cheat hundreds of thousands of American children, including many young Hoosiers, of a good education because of overcrowded classrooms and a lack of qualified teachers.

BRADEMAS SCHOOL LUNCH BILL CALLED EXCELLENT

Here are some other items on education.

The Council of Chief State School Officers said my bill to improve administration of the national school lunch program, which feeds 13 million children daily, was "excellent" and offered "substantial improvements" in the law.

In June I was named to the advisory committee for the first Washington, D.C., seminar for college and university presidents.

I am also serving on the area committee for the Midwest Program on Airborne Television Instruction which seeks to encourage the use of instructional television in classrooms.

CONGRESSMAN'S LIFE BUSY BUT REWARDING

Service in Congress is to me one of the greatest honors that can come to any American. Here are some of the fine experiences I have had:

Assisting CHESTER BOWLES, chairman of the platform committee at the Democratic National Convention, in Los Angeles in July.

Representing Methodist laymen in a nationwide TV program on the history of Methodism.

Receiving the Citizenship Award of the Democratic National Committee, the Ahepan of the Year Award, and the Outstanding National Achievement Award of Detroit's Hellenic Board of Trade.

GOLD MEDAL FOR DR. DOOLEY PROPOSED

Participating in a film, "Mr. BRADEMAS Goes to Washington," showing the first weeks in the life of a new Congressman, used for schoolchildren in civics classes across the nation.

Meeting Dr. Thomas A. Dooley, the remarkable young doctor who brings medical help to the people of Laos, and introducing a bill authorizing the President to confer on him a special gold medal because of his inspiring service.

HAROLD HANDLEY'S GIVEAWAY

With letters I requested from State Senator Matt Welsh and Hoosier Democrats in Congress, I persuaded the House Appropriations Committee to restore nearly $200,000 in funds for rural library service. Because GOP Gov. Harold Handley refuses to accept this money, Indiana is the only one of the 50 States not in the program. Handley's action is an outrageous giveaway of Hoosier tax dollars. I am glad Matt Welsh has promised to use the funds if elected Governor, and so return Indiana to the Union.

HELPING DISTRICT CITIZENS A GREAT THRILL

Helping citizens of the Third District gave me a great deal of satisfaction in my first term.

The Housing Act of 1959 contained my amendment to enable 320 South Bend families in the Southmore housing project to keep their homes.

My bill giving rent-free classroom space at Kingsbury Ordnance Plant to a La Porte County school destroyed by fire also became law.

I helped secure $7,800 in Federal funds for an Army Engineers study of Michigan City's harbor, the first step in major improvements.

MICKEY JOSEPH'S DAUGHTERS COME FROM LEBANON

Congress passed the Brademas-Hartke bill to let Mr. and Mrs. Mickey Joseph, of Michigan City, bring their two adopted girls from Lebanon.

His father in Michigan City has just advised me that Soviet authorities are going to let 18-year-old Gediminas Kavaliunas leave Russian-controlled Lithuania to join his family here. I arranged for Vice President NIXON to carry an appeal for the boy's release to Russia on his recent visit and I also sent a personal telegram to Nikita Khrushchev when he was here urging him to permit the young man to be reunited with his parents after 15 years of separation.

SOUND FARM POLICY STILL A BIG PROBLEM

The stalemate on farm policy between the Eisenhower-Nixon-Benson administration and Congress continued with no major change in farm law. There are no easy answers to the complex farm problem but I believe we must work toward policies that enable farmers to receive fair prices for what they sell without being forced into bankruptcy.

Cash farm income in Indiana was down about 8 percent in 1959 from 1958. For the Nation net farm income for 1959 was $3.5 billion below 1952, a drop from $15.3 billion to $11.8. Yet the price of food to the housewife hasn't gone down—the cost of living has hit the highest peak in U.S. history.

HOOSIER GOP CHAIRMAN SAYS BENSON PROGRAM "NOT CLICKING"

So the Hoosier GOP State chairman may be right when he said recently that

Benson's farm program "is not clicking." I believe we need an approach that will curb unlimited production and the falling prices that follow. We need to do more to use our surplus foods to wage war against hunger at home and abroad.

HOFFA: "DEFEAT BRADEMAS"

My vote for the Labor-Management Reform Act got me listed as one of the Congressmen Jimmy Hoffa wants purged at the polls.

A secret Hoffa memo, revealed by the press, called me a bad actor on the House Labor Committee and demanded my defeat. Although my Republican predecessor voted against a labor reform bill in 1958, I felt some legislation was needed to protect the millions of honest union members in America against the corruption of a few.

POLL ANSWERED BY 23,485

A substantial majority of the 23,485 persons who returned my questionnaire on issues favored Federal programs for education, depressed areas, health insurance for the aged, raising the minimum wage and extending coverage. The questionnaire was sent in April to most registered voters in the Third District.

KENNEDY and NIXON were top choices for President, with Democratic candidates getting 55 percent of the votes; Republicans, 45 percent. In the May 3 Indiana primary, Democratic candidates received 56 percent of the votes and Republican 44 percent.

CONGRESS PASSES ANTIBIGOTRY RESOLUTION

This year the House unanimously passed my resolution expressing the profound sense of shock and indignation at the wave of anti-Semitic and anti-Catholic demonstrations in Western Germany and other nations.

We all know, as I told the House, that when one man or one house of worship or one religious faith is today made the object of attack, tomorrow another may feel the sharp lash of bigotry.

LETTER FROM LINCOLN

As a Protestant and a Democrat, I am in full agreement with the noble words of a great Republican, Abraham Lincoln, who, a century ago, in a letter to a Kentucky friend in 1855, wrote:

> Our progress in degeneracy appears to me to be pretty rapid. As a Nation we began by declaring that all men are created equal, except Negroes. When the Know-Nothings get control, it will read "All men are created equal except Negroes and foreigners and Catholics." When it comes to this, I shall prefer to emigrating to some country where they make no pretense of loving liberty.

Abraham Lincoln understood the simple truth that all of us belong to some minority group.

"WE HOLD THESE TRUTHS TO BE SELF-EVIDENT"

The Declaration of Independence boldly declares that "all men are created equal" and are "endowed with certain unalienable rights." The task of securing these rights to all Americans, regardless of race or color, is one of the most crucial issues facing our country today.

Here is a summary of my work for civil rights during my first term in Congress:

First Member of Congress to introduce the constitutional amendment guaranteeing the right to vote to all Americans, as suggested by the Reverend Theodore M. Hesburgh, president of Notre Dame and a member of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission.

Introduced both the Democratic and Republican proposals for registrars and referees to insure Negroes the right to vote in the South.

Served on a civil rights task force of Democratic Congressmen who sought to pass an effective civil rights bill against GOP-Dixiecrat efforts.

Helped preside over the Notre Dame Civil Rights Conference attended by Federal officials and other persons concerned with civil rights legislation.

Worked at Democratic National Convention on the platform committee which drafted the strongest civil rights plank in either party's history.

SECURING PEACE AND FREEDOM

The greatest challenge to the American people is the securing of peace and freedom in the face of expanding Communist power. The common danger of mankind is war and the threat of war. But to work effectively for peace, we must restore American political, military and economic leadership in foreign affairs.

I believe that in the life or death area of foreign policy, a conscientious Congressman must vote in the national interest and put his political party second. My Republican predecessor in Congress supported President Eisenhower on foreign policy votes only 46 percent of the time. Although I am a Democrat, I have not once voted against President Eisenhower on a foreign policy issue, a 100 percent record.

EISENHOWER THANKS BRADEMAS FOR FOREIGN POLICY SUPPORT

In fact, President Eisenhower wrote to me in May to voice his appreciation for a letter I had written him on behalf of a group of 28 Democratic Congressmen expressing our support of adequate funds for his mutual security program.

Republicans on the House Appropriations Committee, urging support of the mutual security appropriation bill this year, warned:

> This is no time to kowtow to Khrushchev or be soft on communism.

I agree, and on June 17, 1960, I voted for this bill.

REPUBLICAN OPPONENT VOTES AGAINST EISENHOWER FOREIGN POLICY

But when my Republican opponent was our Representative in Congress, he cast his vote, on July 2, 1958 against President Eisenhower's mutual security appropriation bill and thus drove a knife into the heart of a program the President has described as "indispensable to our own and free world defense against Communist imperialism."

Some other activities of your Congressman:

I was glad to receive so many letters in support of my bill to create a Great White Fleet to carry surplus foods and medical help to disaster areas all over the world.

I strongly supported the point 4 Youth Corps idea, adopted by Congress, to provide for a study of the possibility of sending able young Americans abroad, at soldiers' pay, to serve our country in technical aid missions in the underdeveloped areas. It is in these areas that much of the battle for a free and peaceful world is now being fought.

BRADEMAS DELEGATE TO CONFERENCE IN LATIN AMERICA

The troubles in Cuba remind me of my recent visit to Latin America as a delegate from the U.S. Congress to the First Inter-American Parliamentary Conference in Lima, Peru, where I had the chance to talk with legislators from South and Central America. I served as translator for the chairman of our three-man delegation during a committee meeting on agricultural policy. My conversations with Latin American political leaders at this 16-nation meeting made clear to me that: First, economic development is the No. 1 problem facing these Republics; and, second, we must give much more attention than we have been doing to our relations with Latin America.

The 86th Congress Sets a Forward Course

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY O. STAGGERS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to present my analysis of the 86th Congress and invite every American, especially the good people of the Second District of West Virginia, to read it word for word.

America is awakening to the fact that all is not well with our Nation either at home or abroad. Our enemy, communism, is getting bolder and more threatening day by day. Congress has been impressed by events on the international scene and by the testimony of military and economic experts who challenge the administration view that we are in good shape. Much of the time and attention of the 1960 session has been spent in devising means of combating the dangers which threaten us. Matters of particular interest to the people of the Second West Virginia District may be summarized as follows:

Defense, space, security: Concern over the No. 1 worry—defense—has raised the total authorized expenditure in that category to $46.6 billion, more than $600 million above the President's request. Some $15 billion of this will be spent on submarines, missiles, aircraft, and other military equipment; $4.6 billion will go to research and development in atomic energy fields. In addition to these military appropriations, Congress enacted no less than six important measures to strengthen our relative position in the vital matter of defense. If appropriations are used immediately for the purpose intended, they should help to restore our prestige abroad and blunt the edge of insults to which we have been subjected in recent months.

International affairs: It is no less important to assist our friends in the free

world than to look after our own defense interests. To that end, Congress provided $1.3 billion for economic and technical assistance and other special activities for a long list of allies and potential allies, as well as $2.7 billion for strictly military assistance. The mutual security program was extended for 1 year. In the last days of the session, a special fund of $600 million was set up for assistance to our Latin American neighbors to the south. These programs are all designed to help raise economic conditions in the recipient nations to the point where freedom and self-respect can maintain strong governments devoted to resistance to any foreign domination. Other action of significance on the international front included: Extension for 2 years of the President's authority to control exports of strategic materials; funds to effect U.S. participation in International Bureau for Protection of Industrial Property; a bill authorizing the President, the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Surgeon General of the United States to conduct an international cooperative program in health research, planning, and training; a resolution reaffirming the sense of Congress that upon achievement of disarmament agreements the United States should join with other countries in a program for peace. The last two of these matters embody programs on which I have worked ever since I came to Congress. I have introduced a number of bills providing for international study of methods of cancer control, in particular, and for the establishment of a Department of Peace in the President's Cabinet. Both of these matters deserve positive consideration and action. Congressional agreement on my proposals is now a fact.

Domestic economy: As defense is the No. 1 problem in our foreign relations, lag in economic growth at home creates serious domestic difficulties. The 1960 session of Congress acted on a wide range of subjects in this field. Your Representative spent many hours in promotion of three measures. The first of these was the depressed areas redevelopment bill, which would have provided technical assistance and loans for setting up or relocating small business enterprises in areas of substantial unemployment, a service similar in nature but much less expensive than economic aid for foreign countries. This bill was specifically tailored for conditions in West Virginia and in other depressed areas scattered over the country. The bill was passed twice by the Congress and vetoed each time. Another bill, under my cosponsorship, authorizes comprehensive development of national forests for timber uses, grazing, land and mineral resources, and recreation. Some 50 Congressmen joined in introducing similar bills, showing the widespread popularity of the idea. Forests constitute one of the most valuable assets of West Virginia, and their scientific development and use will add significantly to the local economy. This measure was finally approved by the President. A third bill for which I was cosponsor created an Office of Coal Research to find new uses for our fuel resources. Other matters affecting the domestic economy to which I gave special attention include: The creation of an Agricultural Research and Development Commission to find new industrial uses for farm products; the establishment of an Office of Water Pollution Control and an appropriation to assist local governments in sewer construction—vetoed; amendments to the Small Business Investment Act extending credit to small business enterprises and increasing its working capital; authorization of $1 billion for each of the next 2 years in Federal aid for highway construction, of which West Virginia will get a share. The public works authorization of $1.4 billion for flood control projects and improvements to navigation contains more than $21 million for programs in our State.

Labor: The millions of unemployed in the United States furnish eloquent evidence that our boasted prosperity does not extend to important segments of our population. Jobs ought to grow as fast as available workers, and I have no apology for my intense interest in projects and programs, both public and private, which will furnish job opportunities and increase the earnings of workers. The $21 million for flood control and locks and dams in the rivers of the State of West Virginia provide work opportunities in an otherwise depressed area. Congressional authorization has been given for the expenditure of some $79 million for the Naval Radio Research Station at Sugar Grove, W. Va., in Pendleton County. This includes an appropriation for this year of $17,800,000, with other millions yet to come. Scientists say the Sugar Grove project will be the "Eighth Wonder of the World." The National Radio Astronomy Observatory of the National Science Foundation, located at Green Bank, Pocahontas County, W. Va., is now being constructed at a cost of some $10 to $12 million. This installation is employing highly skilled and well-paid workers. The Internal Revenue Service Computer Center at Martinsburg in Berkeley County will soon be under construction at a cost of approximately $3,500,000. Approximately 289 acres of ground in Jefferson County have been secured to develop an Army Communications Center. The Bureau of Mines Station at Morgantown now employs 224 persons, with a payroll of $58,640 every 2 weeks and with a total authorization of over $2 million annually.

I have worked diligently with all Government agencies to reactivate the Morgantown Ordnance Works and I have been assured by high Government officials that the chances are good for putting the plant back into operation. In the early 1950's, when operations had ceased at this chemical facility in Morgantown, I worked diligently and was successful in having the Army lease the plant to private enterprise and operations were resumed. Airport improvements at Morgantown have been approved and $671,000 in Federal funds allocated to complete the job. A new Federal building is being constructed at Martinsburg at a cost of $1,400,000. At least nine new post offices in the Second District have either been constructed or are currently scheduled for construction. These are located at Petersburg, Kingwood, Shepherdstown, Romney, Moorefield, Westover, Star City, and Paw Paw. New offices for Elkins and Morgantown are on the planning list.

Incidentally, these post offices under a new plan are being constructed by private enterprise under a long-term lease to the Government. They will therefore be subject to local taxation and add to the tax base instead of subtracting from it. With the assistance of Federal appropriations, for which I voted and actively worked, hospitals have been built or planned for Romney, Petersburg, Webster Springs, Philippi, Kingwood, Morgantown, and Martinsburg. The fish hatchery in Randolph County was established by a bill for which I was cosponsor. The Elkins Airport bill saved the city of Elkins approximately $100,000. The armory at Keyser is nearing completion, and the Elkins Armory will soon be constructed. Both of these armories were made possible by Federal matching funds for which I worked ceaselessly until they were made available.

In 1958, the most recent year for which complete figures are available, total Federal payments in West Virginia for old-age and survivors benefits, for veterans' programs, railroad retirement and unemployment plans, and unemployment insurance amounted to the impressive sum of $450 million. All these projects and benefits turn loose money in the Second District which is used for the procurement of an endless variety of goods and supplies, for the employment of workers, and for new and important services. And every one of them involves constant alertness and attention on the part of your Congressman.

Veterans: No fewer than 10 important items of veterans' legislation emerged from the 1960 session. The list will indicate the nature of the benefits and services provided, and will demonstrate the fact that our ex-servicemen have been neither forgotten nor neglected. They are: Extension for 2 years of authority for direct and guaranteed loans to veterans for homes, farms, or business; waiver of premiums on national life insurance policies for certain totally disabled veterans; permission to convert or exchange national life insurance policies to a new, modified plan; additional compensation for disabled veterans with more than three children; additional compensation for certain disabled veterans; provisions for the services of optometrists to veterans with service-connected eye conditions; authorization for involuntary retirement after 20 years' service of Air Force and Army officers who fail to meet selection requirements for promotion three or four times; incentive pay for service on nuclear-powered submarines; amendments to the Reserve Officers Personnel Act to equalize promotion opportunity in various branches of the Armed Forces; and posthumous awards to the four chaplains.

Numerous other bills engaged the attention of Congress, but failed to reach final action during the 1960 session.

Health, education, welfare: In these fields, obstructionists in the administration and among some ultraconservatives in Congress cut off forward-looking action on several important matters. A realistic proposal for health care for the aged was watered down, but pushed through in the best form that could be had at this time. Threats of a Presidential veto precluded any satisfactory school-aid bill. A new minimum wage bill suffered the same fate. Constructive action on a number of matters was taken, the list including such items of District interest as the extension of the special milk program for school children, with an increased appropriation of $10 million; tightening of control over use of coal-tar coloring in food, drugs, and cosmetics; redefinition of certain narcotic drugs, with tightened control over their manufacture and sale; new regulations to curb the use of the mails to distribute obscene and fraudulent matter.

Miscellaneous: A bill which I cosponsored authorizing the purchase of Storer College and other land at a cost of $300,000 for addition to the Harpers Ferry National Monument will add materially to the attractiveness of this historic site, which already entertains more visitors than any other monument in the United States except one. Serving the needs of these tourists adds significantly to the prosperity of the locality.

As a disabled veteran of World War II and the father of six children who are attending the public schools of West Virginia, I assure the people of the Second District, whom I have the honor and the privilege of representing in the Congress—as well as every American—that I will always continue to work and fight for those things which will strengthen our Nation and make it a better place in which to live and to bring up their children and mine.

Every Member of the Congress is responsible for his actions to his own conscience, to his constituents, to this incomparable Republic, to world opinion, and, in the last analysis, to that Supreme Power which guards our destiny and shapes our ends. In this spirit, we submit our record, both individually and collectively, to those who must be our judge.

The 20th Anniversary of the Ukrainian Congress Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America on the occasion of its 20th anniversary.

As the spokesman for the 40 million Ukrainians under the domination of Soviet tyranny the committee has been in the forefront of the struggle against communism. Its purpose has been to educate its fellow Americans and the citizens of the free world and to inform them of the realities of life under Russian communism. In the past 20 years the Ukrainian Congress Committee has always spoken out, clearly and forthrightly, on behalf of all the captive non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union. It has attempted to dispel any illusions we of the free world might have about the Soviet totalitarian system of government. By its own words and actions the committee has advanced the cause of democracy and aided the United States and its allies in the crucial struggle against dictatorship in all forms.

I congratulate the members of the Ukrainian Congress Committee for its wonderful work. All Americans can be justly proud of this organization and take heart from its endeavors. Let us hope that we shall soon see a fulfillment of the committee's aims and a world of both peace and freedom.

Congressman Stratton's Annual Report to the People of the 32d Congressional District of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, once again, in accordance with my usual practice, I am taking this opportunity to report directly to the people of the 32d District of New York, whom I have the honor to represent in Congress, on some of the accomplishments of this 2d session of the 86th Congress, now drawing to a close.

JOBS AND UNEMPLOYMENT

This year, just as last, the major problem facing our people continues to be unemployment—severe and extended unemployment, created by the loss of jobs to the South, to the west coast, and, through mounting foreign competition, even overseas.

Early last January, at my request, the Special Senate Subcommittee on Unemployment came to Schenectady and held a day-long hearing into unemployment problems throughout our district. As a direct outgrowth of this hearing, the House in May, after some rather extensive parliamentary maneuvering, brought to the floor and successfully passed a bill to help distressed areas suffering from unemployment. I was a cosponsor of that bill and a leader in the fight for its adoption. The bill passed the House, largely on the basis of the impressive facts about unemployment in our district originally developed at that Schenectady hearing. This was a major legislative victory for our district.

Yet the victory was short-lived. The President vetoed the bill, in spite of a last-minute visit of mine to the White House to plead again for his signature. He killed as being too costly a bill that would have given the Nation's unemployment areas, so as to get back onto their feet, only 5 percent of the figure that is spent every single year to aid foreign countries. Personally, I would have been willing to support any bill the President would have signed so as to get some assistance law on the books. But time was just too short to enable us to get around all those complex parliamentary obstacles all over again. This bill certainly must become the number one item of unfinished business on the agenda of the next Congress.

NEW INDUSTRY FOR SCHENECTADY

One bright cloud on the horizon is the expectation that a new industry will move into Schenectady. This was made possible when the General Services Administration agreed in August to my request to sell the Niskayuna Tank Testing Plant to the Schenectady Industrial Corp. for use by this new industry, even though the offered price was well below the fair market value of the building. If Government surplus can be used to create new jobs for distressed areas, then we would be money ahead even if we gave it away.

OTHER JOB DEVELOPMENTS

Other Washington developments that have been designed to ease some of the heavy pressures of unemployment in our area are these:

First. A new Government contract on rocket research was completed for the Malta Test Station of the General Electric Co. This will keep the station in operation for several additional months. But we still need further Government work to make the fullest utilization of these facilities and the people trained to operate them. The House passed this session, with my strong support, the Brooks bill to encourage companies with large private research organizations like General Electric to participate in contracts for the National Space Agency on a par with smaller, Government-created companies. Unfortunately the Senate never took up the measure. It would have helped our area.

Second. The Defense Department, after a succession of requests on my part, finally consented to increase available housing facilities at the Schenectady General Army Depot by allowing the Army to acquire the Mohawk Manor development on Duanesburg Road. This action will fill in the one major gap in the depot's present facilities, and will thus insure its continued status as a permanent defense installation. I feel certain that as a result more military missions and with them more jobs will be transferred to Schenectady in future months when other military installations in other parts of the country are closed down.

Third. When the House passed legislation earlier this year to ban retired service officers from exercising improper influence in the awarding of defense contracts, the bill that was finally adopted had wisely been stripped of those original provisions that would have banned all defense contracts to companies like GE and Alco with retired officers on their payroll. I succeeded in eliminating this harmful feature during

our Armed Services Committee's consideration of the bill, and insisted that we make it clear that the valuable services of men such as Admiral Rickover, for example, would not be lost forever to the Nation's defense program in private industries like the GE Knolls Laboratory simply because they had retired from active service. A poorly worded bill, passed in the heat of debate, could easily have done irreparable harm to Schenectady.

Fourth. Although the Navy persisted in their decision to close down the Scotia Depot, the General Services Administration has taken over the site as a Government facility, and still provides a sizable number of jobs to the area. As a result of my request, a number of former Navy personnel have been retained at Scotia to meet some of the heavy requirements of machinery transferral which had not been fully anticipated in the Navy's original decision. Where there is life there is hope. I am still hopeful we can keep these men on the job, and can convince the Navy and the GSA next year of the advantages of increasing job opportunities at Scotia by switching here other Government operations now being performed less efficiently elsewhere. I still believe that the decision of the Civil Defense Administration not to transfer more defense storage functions to Scotia simply because Schenectady is a "target" area is unwise and shortsighted, both from the point of view of defense as well as unemployment. This is a decision I believe can and must be reversed by the incoming administration.

Fifth. Throughout the year my office has been channeling to area businessmen and manufacturers periodic information about Government contracts coming up for bid. In this way I believe we have helped to increase the opportunity for local businessmen to get a larger share of Government work.

Sixth. I have introduced and fought hard for legislation to require that foreign governments making purchases in this country with American aid funds be required to spend those funds in unemployment areas like our own. Such a policy is vitally necessary to insure that Alco in Schenectady, for instance, gets a fair share of locomotive business being financed by American taxpayers' dollars.

THE GROWING PROBLEM OF FOREIGN COMPETITION

Because much of the serious unemployment problem in our area, especially in Amsterdam and Fulton County, is the result of increasing low-cost foreign imports, the battle against this unfair competition has continued to occupy a very major part of my time and efforts.

Early last spring I testified personally before the U.S. Tariff Commission in support of the glove industry's request for tariff and quota relief. I told the Commission that if existing law could not grant such protection to the glove industry, then it would be hard to see how any industry could ever get relief. In spite of strong appearances by manufacturers and labor representatives and the marshaling of a most impressive group of statistics, the Tariff Commission ruled against the glove industry. To me this is clear proof that the Commission is simply not performing the function it was designed by Congress to perform, and that the whole legal procedure which Congress originally drafted to protect domestic industries must be completely revised next year when the Reciprocal Trade Act comes up for renewal.

In the same way I have fought for a better break for the hard-hit carpet industry, and took the lead in the House in supporting the industry's very proper request that our State Department withdraw some of the present tariff concessions to carpet-manufacturing countries like Japan which have already taken away so many jobs from Amsterdam and elsewhere. Although the legislation on this matter did not get an opportunity to be voted on in the brief period of our special session, I feel confident that as an expression of wide congressional interest it should still have a healthy effect on our negotiators at the tariff discussions now going on in Switzerland.

I have also offered several other pieces of legislation intended to bring to the attention of Congress and the public the serious shape of the problem of foreign competition and to suggest some constructive answers. One such bill was H.R. 11418 which would limit imports from countries with a lower standard of living than ours but allow those countries to collect the tariff levies themselves, provided they used them to help raise their own living standards.

All in all I feel we have made real progress in this matter. Congress is certainly more alert to the problem now than ever before. I feel confident that those of us who have worked together these past 2 years to protect American industries will be in a position to nail down a real victory when the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act comes up for renewal in the next Congress.

BUILDING AN INVULNERABLE DEFENSE AGAINST COMMUNIST AGGRESSION

As a veteran of two wars, a member of the Naval Reserve, and a member of the House Armed Services Committee, I have long had a deep interest in building the strongest possible defense against Soviet aggression. Even the attacks made on me during my first few months in Washington by the Soviet propaganda radio because of my outspoken position on defense have not deterred me one little bit. This past year, for example, I led a successful fight in the House to put more money into our defense budget for Polaris submarines, a decision which was fully justified by the successful firing of the weapon from a submerged submarine in July.

I also took the lead in insisting that in view of the deterioration of some of our oversea land bases as a result of the U–2 incident, we needed funds in the budget for a new aircraft carrier. In spite of opposition from several key House leaders we won this fight too. But I have been profoundly disturbed to see the contract for this new ship taken away from New York State, where it belongs, and transferred to Virginia.

INFLATION AND A BALANCED BUDGET

The problem of inflation, the rising cost of living, with its impact on everyone but especially those living on fixed incomes, continues to be of great concern to me. One of the best ways that the Federal Government can meet this problem, of course, is to keep its own financial house in order, balance its budget, and pay off something every year on the national debt. I am happy to report to you that for the second straight year, during my tenure as your Congressman, the Federal Government has not only balanced its budget but has produced a surplus to be used to retire a portion of our huge Federal debt. As your Congressman I have repeatedly resisted spending proposals which I believed to be unnecessary or which would have had the effect of unbalancing the budget. I am proud that I have had a part in bringing about this sense of fiscal responsibility, and in insuring once again that the funds appropriated by Congress were less than those requested by the President.

FARM LEGISLATION

Because our 32d District is one of the most important farm areas in New York State and the Nation, I have worked especially hard to promote legislation to help our farmers.

One major accomplishment in this regard was the defeat of the 1960 wheat bill, which would have seriously aggravated our present surpluses and would have put an even greater squeeze on the New York dairy farmer by increasing his grain costs. Not only did I cast my own vote against the wheat bill, but I also succeeded in enlisting the support of many Congressmen from the New York City area who have in the past usually supported the Midwestern farmer. As a result, the wheat bill was defeated in the House of Representatives by a sizable majority.

Another important accomplishment was the establishment by Congress this year of a special agricultural soil and water research facility within New York State at Cornell University. Some time ago Congress authorized creation of a series of these facilities in various parts of the country to help the farmer improve his production by eliminating harmful deposits in the soil and by increasing the ability of his soil to retain necessary water and minerals. One of these laboratories was scheduled for construction this year in the northeastern part of the United States. But we were not sure whether it would go into New York or into one of the adjoining States. All of the major New York State farm organizations, the Farm Bureau, the Grange, and the Dairymen's League, were united in their desire to have this facility located in New York. I was one of three New York State Congressmen selected to represent our full 43-member delegation in presenting the arguments in behalf of our State to the Appropriations Committee. We were successful in our request. The President has signed the bill into law, and the facility, which will be of great help to our New York farmers, is scheduled to be built next year.

MILK

Of course, the overriding problem confronting the farmers of our district during this past year has been the steadily

declining price of milk. The consumer in the city still pays the same high price for milk, of course, but the farmer has been getting less and less. During the year I have taken these actions to help meet this serious farm problem:

First. Supported expansion of the school milk program to promote greater consumption of fluid milk.

Second. Introduced legislation to have the Government test out the effects of a milk advertising and promotion campaign.

Third. Proposed an investigation into the feasibility of tying the New York-New Jersey milkshed in with the New England milkshed, so that more New York State farmers could profit from the higher milk prices paid to farmers in the New England area.

Fourth. Actively supported the bill increasing the price for manufactured milk. This is one of the first real breaks, by the way, for our New York farmers.

Fifth. Testified against a bill designed to permit flooding the New York milkshed with unlimited quantities of midwestern milk and succeeded in forcing this unwise bill to be killed in committee.

Sixth. Took the floor to oppose action by Congress to destroy existing milk market orders in New York State, as is now being attempted in a pending Pennsylvania court case. Congress took no action.

Seventh. Joined in efforts by upstate New York dairy farm organizations to request Secretary Benson to postpone an October 3 hearing on tying New York milk prices into midwestern condensery prices. The hearing was deferred.

With rapidly sagging milk prices, the New York State dairy farmer is today facing a grim future. In my judgment it is time that our farm legislation be geared less to midwestern problems and more to the immediate and urgent needs of our own dairymen.

BLOCKING BIG DAMS IN OTSEGO COUNTY

Since coming to Washington I have, of course, been a consistent opponent of the Army Engineers' plan to combat floods in the Susquehanna Valley by building large reservoir dams on much of the beautiful and valuable farmland of historic Otsego County. This year we made real progress by finally persuading the Army Engineers to put their big dam plan on ice and look for a new approach. At my request the Army agreed to resurvey the whole flood situation in the light of modern conditions, and Congress passed the necessary authorizing legislation. The survey itself will require some 3 or 4 years to complete and all indications are that it will find suitable alternatives to the old big dam idea.

DISASTER AREAS

Incidentally, I was happy to be successful in getting the Army to move quickly into Oneonta this spring when the floodwaters hit, an action that later led to their agreement to undertake the overall survey. In similar fashion we were successful in getting the Army to reexamine the possibility of flood control work along the Mohawk River at Schenectady. I am also glad to have been successful in having Schenectady declared a disaster area after the tornado hit last June, with the result that Federal help was quickly made available to many tornado victims by the U.S. Small Business Administration.

HEALTH INSURANCE LEGISLATION

One piece of legislation passed by Congress which was plainly inadequate to meet the existing need was our health insurance bill for retired citizens. Both political parties have acknowledged its shortcomings, yet neither was able to get an expanded bill adopted in the limited time available during the special session. I am certain, however, that the next Congress will adopt an improved and expanded health insurance program. At any rate, the bill which was written into law recognizes at least the responsibility of the Government to help our older citizens meet these heavy medical costs.

GENERAL ACCOMPLISHMENTS

In addition to the items already touched on, the session of Congress now drawing to a close has several other accomplishments listed to its credit which deserve brief mention: a new civil rights bill, insuring the right to vote without regard to race or color; a constitutional amendment to give the citizens of the District of Columbia the right to vote for President and Vice President; a pay raise for postal and other classified Government employees; a needed addition to the Schenectady National Guard Armory; flood control works construction for the South Chuctanunda Creek in Amsterdam; and a bill awarding a special congressional medal to the four chaplains, including the late Reverend Clark Poling of Schenectady's First Reformed Church.

OVERALL VOTING RECORD

Throughout my legislative service, both in Congress and for the 9 years before that in municipal government, I have been proud of the designation once given to me by a newsman—"independent as a hog on ice." Throughout this session of Congress, as in the previous session, I have endeavored to serve the interests of my district and my Nation without regard to consideration of narrow partisanship. Believing that I was elected to serve all of the people, I have opposed some measures supported by my party, just as I have supported others I believe to be sound. I was one of the few members of my party, for example, who refused to join in the partisan attack on President Eisenhower at the time of the U–2 incident. Having once served in time of war in the military intelligence field, I believed and still believe that in such matters the national interest should have priority over party advantage. Similarly, when the proposal was offered in the House to cite three outstanding officials of the Port of New York Authority for criminal contempt I voted against these citations, believing that any such contest of naked power between the Federal Government and the individual States ought never to be encouraged except as an absolutely last resort.

REPORTING TO THE PEOPLE

Throughout this year, as in the past, I have endeavored to keep all of you posted regularly on developments in Washington—not only by means of our weekly newsletter, which many of you have commented on so very generously, but also through the medium of the press, radio, and television. All of these services have cooperated most generously in passing these reports along to you, and I appreciate their courtesies deeply. In addition I sent out this past spring a detailed questionnaire on legislative matters pending before Congress, and asked you for your advice and recommendations on them. The response to this questionnaire was tremendous, and your views and suggestions did prove most helpful to me in discharging my responsibilities as your elected spokesman in Washington. I am hopeful that this questionnaire can become an annual procedure.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, may I express my appreciation to all the people of my district for the support they have given me, and for the many encouraging words they have sent to me during these past two years as I have tried to work for their interests. It has been an exacting, a time-consuming, but also a tremendously challenging and satisfying job to be your Congressman. I am hopeful that the progress our district has made in these past 2 years will serve only as the groundwork for even greater achievement in the years ahead.

Report by Congressman Laurence Curtis to the People of the 10th Congressional District of Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAURENCE CURTIS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, with the adjournment of the 86th Congress, I give an accounting of my stewardship as Congressman to the people of the 10th Congressional District of Massachusetts, comprising nearly one-third of Boston, wards 4, 5, 10, 12, 19, 20, 21, Newton, and Brookline. This is my first report of this nature, although I have made newsletter reports published in the local papers.

THE COLD WAR

The House Committee on Foreign Affairs, on which I have served for 3 years, is the committee most closely concerned with the nonmilitary aspects of the cold war. The cold war underlies and affects most of the other problems, domestic and foreign, confronting our country. The defense effort and other cold war activities cost the American people more than half of its hard-earned tax dollars. I, therefore, report first on my work as a member of this committee.

My votes have been cast with these facts in mind: the realization that the present nonmilitary aggression against the United States is war; that threats of

rocket retaliation against us have been voiced by Chairman Khrushchev; that Americans must have strong hearts and steady nerves, and that it may be necessary to risk war in order to avoid certain war; that once a country gives in to threats it remains subject to blackmail, and is on the road to appeasement which can lead only to eventual war, or surrender and enslavement.

I have supported the President's foreign policies and foreign aid, known as mutual security. I have seen this program in action while on a study mission with other members of the committee to the Far East and around the world last year. I believe that technical cooperation and economic assistance must receive greater emphasis, with less emphasis on military pacts and military assistance. I believe that more of our aid should be handled on a multilateral basis in cooperation with other free world countries.

The great objective is to show the people of less developed areas who are striving to raise their standards of living that they can do so in freedom rather than by succumbing to false but to them alluring doctrines of communism. Should they choose the path of slavery, centers of hostile power may develop even in our own hemisphere. The balance of world power could swing against the free world and endanger our own national security.

A STRONG DEFENSE

I have been discussing the nonmilitary aspects of the cold war, with which the Foreign Affairs Committee is particularly concerned.

As to the military threat against the free world, I have supported a strong defense, and have consistently voted for appropriations for that purpose. I have voted for increased appropriations where the amounts requested by the President had been cut by the Committee on Appropriations.

THE MIDDLE EAST AND CUBA

As a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I was glad to support the action of that committee aimed at promoting peace in the Middle East. Amendments to the mutual security law sponsored by that committee upheld freedom of the seas and condemned economic warfare—blockades and boycotts. This was, of course, aimed at the illegal blockade of Israeli shipping through the Suez Canal and the economic warfare waged against Israel by her neighbors.

The amendment provides that our principles in opposition to these practices shall be applied in the administration of foreign aid.

The mutual security legislation also condemned discrimination against American citizens based on race or religion. This was aimed particularly at the Middle East, where such discrimination has existed.

The situation in Cuba was also taken up in this legislation. It prohibited the use of foreign aid funds to countries directly or indirectly selling arms to the Castro regime or giving or loaning military or economic aid.

DOMESTIC ISSUES

Civil rights legislation, to protect the constitutional rights of minority groups, has had my strong and active support. Two great acts on civil rights have recently been passed by the Congress. When the 1957 act was before the Congress, I was a member of the Committee on the Judiciary which was handling the legislation and so was in a good position to give the measure strong support. I was glad to take part in the debates on this year's bill, voicing strong support.

Both bills were focused on protecting the right to vote. This is a key right because, if widely exercised, it can unlock the door to the protection of other rights. Other rights were also acted upon, such as protection from bombings. There have also been strong advances in the protection of civil rights through administrative action. All of these advances have had my undivided support.

The immigration laws are still marred by the taint of some discriminatory provisions. I have supported efforts to amend them and have filed bills seeking this objective.

On the other domestic issues I have on the whole followed the President's leadership, avoiding the extremes on either side. I supported the more moderate approach to the minimum wage legislation and medical care for the elderly.

The bill passed by the Congress on the latter subject goes further than many people realize, and will be a big step forward in the long battle against poverty and underprivilege.

The other approach to the problem, favored by many, which keyed the medical care to the old age and survivors insurance program, did not in fact come before the House for vote. The House Ways and Means Committee, which had jurisdiction, and which is of course dominated by the majority party, decided not to bring forward a bill keyed to social security insurance, and floor amendments were not in order.

I was glad to support other changes in the social security law which were enacted this year. One made it possible for beneficiaries to receive disability insurance benefits before attaining 50 years of age. Another increased the $1,200 earnings limitation for persons who have retired on Social Security by about $150. I had filed a bill to raise the limit to $2,400, and regret that the provision adopted did not go further. This subject will probably be taken up again next year.

I have voted for and supported bills giving Federal aid for school construction, housing, and slum clearance. I have opposed overcentralization of power in Washington, and shall refer to this in connection with a bill I filed to protect agencies formed under interstate compacts from unwarranted Federal interference.

I have cast my votes in a direction which I believed would promote a free economy, sound money and wise governmental economy.

MASSACHUSETTS PROBLEMS

Problems affecting Massachusetts have of course received my special attention.

Some of the Federal aid programs have a tendency to drain money unfairly from Massachusetts taxpayers for the benefit of other sections of the country whose industries are in competition with ours.

Massachusetts people are of course ready to do their fair share on problems of truly national interest and national importance, but it is necessary to be constantly on the alert to see that Federal aid is not taken advantage of by other areas whose combined legislative power is great, to the disadvantage of Massachusetts.

I have opposed Federal aid programs which I believed were going too much into local problems to the disadvantage of Massachusetts. I have taken the floor in debate to oppose the "formula for distribution" of Federal aid when I felt it was unfairly weighted with factors which resulted in discriminatory treatment of Massachusetts. This must be a constant battle.

Some of the problems affecting Massachusetts must also be handled on the administrative level rather than through legislation. Many times the entire Massachusetts delegation, Democrats and Republicans, have taken action in support of procedures which will be helpful to Massachusetts. I have joined wholeheartedly in these efforts, and have also personally taken up these problems with the departments concerned.

The problems to which I refer relate to such matters as: Tariff protection of Massachusetts industries; protection of small business, which is of particular importance in Massachusetts; freight rates which are discriminatory against the port of Boston; the allocation of Federal sugar purchases which can be unfavorable to the local candy industry and other Massachusetts consumers by forcing them to purchase less advantageously from the Chicago market largely fed by beet sugar than they could purchase from local refineries handling cane sugar imported by sea; limitations on imports of residual oil, which hurt our area.

VOTING RECORD

Believing that most people would be interested in key votes on important legislation, I am including here my record on certain votes picked by the New York Times as the key rollcall votes of the 86th Congress. The New York Times picked 11 such votes before the House in 1959, at the 1st session of the present 86th Congress, and 9 before the House in 1960 during the 2d session. Here they are:

NEW YORK TIMES KEY ROLLCALL VOTES, 1959

(The first paragraph after each number was copied from the New York Times. The further description of the issues was compiled by Congressman CURTIS.)

1. Hawaii statehood:

March 12, 1959: Passage of bill. Passed: Yea, 323; nay, 89. Democrats: Yea, 203; nay, 65. Republicans: Yea, 120; nay, 24.

CURTIS voted for Hawaiian statehood.

2. Airport construction:

March 19, 1959: Passage of first House bill. Passed: Yea, 272; nay, 134. Democrats: Yea, 242; nay, 25. Republicans: Yea, 30; nay, 109.

This bill provided Federal aid for airport construction in amounts opposed by the President as excessive. CURTIS voted against it.

The amounts were subsequently greatly reduced by a committee on conference between the two branches, and the bill was enacted

and signed by the President. CURTIS at that time voted for it.

3. Rural Electrification Administration:

April 30, 1959: Passage of bill over President's veto (two-thirds vote required). Failed to pass: Yea, 280; nay, 146. Democrats: Yea, 274; nay, 4. Republicans: Yea, 6; nay, 142.

This bill sought to strip the Secretary of Agriculture of important controls over the Rural Electrification Administration. It was vetoed by the President. CURTIS voted to sustain the veto.

4. Tennessee Valley Authority bonds:

May 7, 1959: Passage of bill. Passed: Yea, 245; nay, 170. Democrats: Yea, 238; nay, 31. Republicans: Yea, 7; nay, 139.

This bill provided for further expansion of the public power facilities of the Tennessee Valley Authority by permitting self-financing by TVA. It was opposed on the ground that the bill provided insufficient Federal financial and budgetary control. CURTIS vote against the bill.

Subsequently the bill was improved by Senate amendments, was enacted and signed by the President.

5. Wheat program:

June 18, 1959: Adoption of conference report. Rejected: Yea, 202; nay, 214. Democrats: Yea, 195; nay, 71. Republicans: Yea, 7, nay, 143.

This bill was opposed on the ground that it would intensify rather than improve the problem of surplus wheat. It was later vetoed by the President. He said: "The proposed return to the discredited high rigid price supports would hasten the complete collapse of the entire wheat program." CURTIS voted against adoption of the conference report, which was in effect a vote against the bill.

6. Foreign aid authorization:

June 18, 1959: Passage of bill. Passed: Yea, 271; nay, 142. Democrats: Yea, 182; nay, 83. Republicans: Yea, 89; nay, 59.

This was the mutual security (foreign aid) authorization bill. It made moderate cuts in the amounts requested by the President. It was opposed mainly by those desiring deeper cuts. CURTIS voted for it.

7. Housing:

June 23, 1959: Adoption of conference report. Adopted: Yea, 241; nay, 177. Democrats: Yea, 222; nay, 51. Republicans: Yea, 19; nay, 126.

This was the first of three housing bills. It was opposed by the President as excessive in many respects, and was later vetoed. CURTIS voted against the adoption of the conference report, which was in effect a vote against the bill.

Subsequently, a second bill, also regarded by the President as excessive, was passed and vetoed. Finally, a bill more in line with Presidential policy was passed and became law, and CURTIS then voted for it.

8. Federal-State law conflict:

June 24, 1959: Passage of bill. Passed: Yea, 225; nay, 192. Democrats: Yea, 111; nay, 162. Republicans: Yea, 114; nay, 30.

This was the so-called States rights bill, H.R. 3, relating to preemption. It sought to limit the Supreme Court in its interpretation of Federal statutes in relation to possible conflicts with State statutes. It was opposed mainly on account of its retroactive effect, being applicable to past as well as future statutes, which opponents claimed would unsettle past decisions and require relitigation. CURTIS voted against the bill. It was not acted upon by the Senate.

9. Labor bill:

August 13, 1959: LANDRUM, Democrat, of Georgia, and GRIFFIN, Republican, of Michigan, amendment to substitute for the committee bill the language of their bill, containing curbs on secondary boycotts and organization and recognition picketing, and giving the States power to handle "no man's land" labor disputes. Agreed to: Yea, 229; nay, 201. Democrats: Yea, 95; nay, 184. Republicans: Yea, 134; nay, 17.

This was the crucial House vote on the labor reform bill which subsequently became law. It was to substitute the stiffer Landrum-Griffin bill for the bill which had been reported by the House committee. Substitution prevailed. The bill as so amended was passed by the House. After slight modifications by a committee on conference between the branches, it was enacted and signed by the President. CURTIS voted for substitution.

10. Public works appropriation:

September 2, 1959. Passage of the bill over the President's veto (two-thirds majority required). Failed to pass: Yea, 274; nay, 138. Democrats: Yea, 263, nay, 6. Republicans: Yea, 11; nay, 132.

This was the first "pork barrel" bill, providing money for hundreds of rivers and harbors improvements, flood control, reclamation and power projects all over the country. It was vetoed by the President as excessive, principally on account of 67 unbudgeted new starts, which would have involved large future commitments. CURTIS voted to sustain the veto.

11. Public works appropriation:

(Second bill.) September 10, 1959: Passage of the bill over the President's veto (two-thirds majority required). Passed: Yea, 280; nay, 121. Democrats: Yea, 260; nay, 5. Republicans: Yea, 20; nay, 116.

This was the second "pork barrel" bill, passed with little change after the first one was vetoed. It still contained the 67 unbudgeted new starts. The President again vetoed it, but it was passed over the President's veto. CURTIS voted to sustain the veto.

NEW YORK TIMES' KEY ROLLCALL VOTES, 1960

1. Water pollution veto:

February 25, 1960: Motion to pass, over the President's veto, amendments to the Water Pollution Control Act raising Federal grants to the States for sewage plant construction to $90 million a year. Two-thirds majority, or 271 votes, required for passage. Rejected: Yea, 249; nay, 157. Democrats: Yea, 234; nay, 27. Republicans: Yea, 15; nay, 130. CURTIS voted nay. I favored the President's more moderate approach.

2. Civil rights:

March 24, 1960: Motion to pass the Civil Rights Act of 1960, making obstruction of integration in the schools a crime and providing Federal referees in voter-registration disputes. Passed: Yea, 311; nay, 109. Democrats: Yea, 179, nay, 94. Republicans: Yea, 132; nay, 15. CURTIS voted yea.

3. Aid to schools, Powell amendment:

May 26, 1960: POWELL, Democrat, of New York, amendment to the School Construction Act of 1960 barring Federal funds to segregated school systems. Passed: Yea, 218; nay, 181. Democrats: Yea, 100; nay, 160. Republicans: Yea, 118; nay, 21. CURTIS voted yea. I did not want money of Massachusetts taxpayers to be spent on segregated schools.

4. Aid to schools, passage:

May 26, 1960: Passage of school bill as amended, authorizing $325 million a year for 4 years for school construction. Passed: Yea, 206; nay, 189. Democrats: Yea, 162; nay, 97. Republicans: Yea, 44; nay, 92. CURTIS voted yea.

5. Foreign aid:

June 17, 1960: TABER, Republican, of New York, amendment to mutual security appropriation, 1961, restoring $200 million of a $400 million cut in the President's foreign aid requests. Passed: Yea, 212; nay, 173. Democrats: Yea, 15; nay, 138. Republicans: Yea, 107; nay, 34. CURTIS voted yea.

6. Health care for aged:

June 23, 1960: Omnibus social security bill providing increased benefits under existing programs and authorizing Federal grants for medical care programs that may or may not be established by the States for needy persons 65 years of age and over. Passed: Yea, 381; nay, 23. Democrats: Yea, 244; nay, 16. Republicans: Yea, 137; nay, 7. CURTIS voted yea.

7. Wheat:

June 23, 1960: Farm Surplus Reduction Act of 1960, raising price supports and reducing acreage. Rejected: Yea, 171; nay, 236. Democrats: Yea, 162; nay, 100. Republicans: Yea, 9; nay, 136. CURTIS voted nay.

8. Minimum wage:

June 30, 1960: KITCHIN, Democrat, of North Carolina, substitute for committee amendments to Fair Labor Standards Act, reducing increase in minimum wage from $1.25 to $1.15 an hour and limiting extension of coverage. Passed: Yea, 211; nay, 203. Democrats: Yea, 90; nay, 176. Republicans: Yea, 121; nay, 27. CURTIS voted yea.

9. Pay raise veto:

July 1, 1960. Motion to pass Postal and Federal Employees' Salary Increase Act of 1960 over the President's veto. Two-thirds majority required for passage. Passed: Yea, 345; nay, 69. Democrats: Yea, 256; nay, 13. Republicans: Yea, 89; nay, 56. CURTIS voted nay.

CURTIS' FIGHT TO PROTECT MASSACHUSETTS AGENCIES FROM UNWARRANTED FEDERAL INTERFERENCE

The fight for home rule and against unwarranted Federal interference must be a continuous one. Government should be kept close to the people, and local control of local matters is a cornerstone of American democracy. Federal power has a tendency to feed on itself. The danger of overcentralization of governmental powers in Washington needs continual watching.

In support of these principles, I filed a bill to protect an agency formed under an interstate compact, to which Massachusetts was a party, from unwarranted Federal interference.

This interference was threatened because Congress had insisted on its right to investigate the Port of New York Authority, an agency formed under an interstate compact, and the principle relied upon was broad enough to pose a threat to other agencies.

In the New York case the right of investigation was challenged by Governor Rockefeller, of New York, and by Governor Meyner, of New Jersey, and by the Port of New York Authority itself. Three officials of that authority who refused to produce certain documents were cited for contempt of Congress.

The New England Interstate Water Pollution Control Commission informed me that it felt that the assertion of Federal power in the New York case presented a threat to that commission. I filed a bill to protect that commission from unwarranted Federal interference.

In the New York case, the claim that Congress had the right to investigate was based on the requirement of the Constitution that States shall not enter into interstate compacts without congressional consent. My bill seeks to make it clear that the consent heretofore given to the New England Interstate Water Pollution Control Compact shall not carry with it any right of the Congress to investigate or regulate the acts of the commission formed under that compact.

This bill raises an important question of Federal-State relations. The main purpose of interstate compacts is to find a way of avoiding the constant growth

and concentration of Federal power, and to make provision for the States to assume responsibilities and act effectively in matters of local concern as to which State cooperation was desirable. This purpose is prejudiced, if not defeated, by the claim that the Congress has the right to investigate and regulate the activities of agencies formed under interstate compacts.

While my bill was filed too late for action in the last session, it brought this problem to public attention and has received much favorable comment.

OTHER CURTIS BILLS

It is the practice of some Congressmen to file many bills. These are often repetitions of other bills already before the Congress on subjects of popular interest. I have not followed that practice, but have limited my bills to matters of special interest to the district, or to matters which I felt were otherwise insufficiently covered.

Among Curtis bills of general interest, the objectives of which were favorably acted upon, were the following:

To reduce from 65 to 62 the age at which a single woman can qualify for admission to a low-rent housing project and the age at which a woman can qualify her family for admission to a project designed specifically for elderly families. This provision was included in the Housing Act of 1959.

To control bombings, usually manifestations of racial discrimination. This objective was included in the 1960 Civil Rights Act.

A House resolution honoring and congratulating Arthur Fiedler on his 30th anniversary as conductor of the Boston Pops Orchestra. It was passed by the House, no Senate action necessary.

To increase social security earnings limitations to $2,400 per annum. This was included in greatly reduced form in the Social Security Amendments of 1960.

A resolution to express indignation of Congress with the desecration of places of worship. This objective was partly included in the bombing provisions of the Civil Rights Act of 1960.

PRIVATE BILLS

During the 86th Congress in 1959 and 1960, I filed 15 private bills. These relate to individual problems and seek special legislation regarding immigration matters or private claims against the Government or by the Government against the individual. They usually seek an exception to some law or regulation which would create hardship if literally applied.

These are difficult bills on which to secure favorable action, but the action on the Curtis bills was gratifying:

Five of the Curtis bills were enacted;

One was passed by the House but not by the Senate;

The objective of one was accomplished by administrative action;

Several were filed too late for action by the 86th Congress and will be brought up again next year.

This was an unusually favorable batting average for this type of legislation.

OTHER ACTIVITIES

I believe that one of my major duties is to see to it that constituents are fairly treated in all their dealings with the Federal Government. I have maintained offices open the year around in both Boston and Washington for every possible service to constituents. I have conducted periodic meetings with constituents in every section of the district.

My newsletter published in the local press seeks to keep people in touch with matters of interest in Washington and report on my activities. I write these letters myself, and do the necessary research myself.

CONCLUSION

In closing this report, I express my appreciation to the people of the 10th District for the honor and privilege of representing them in the Congress of the United States.

Congressman Joseph E. Karth Reports to the Citizens of Ramsey County

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, at this the close of the 86th Congress, I feel it my duty to review the events, the achievements and, yes, the failures which have marked the last 2 years.

Our district, Mr. Speaker, with 422,000 people is one of the largest in Minnesota. I am proud to serve my friends and neighbors as their Congressman and to report to them.

ST. PAUL—SOUTH ST. PAUL FLOODWALL

I was particularly gratified to have had an important part in winning for our district the first appropriation amounting to $500,000 for construction of the long dreamed of and planned floodwall project along the west bank of the Mississippi. Approval of these funds by Congress has already set into motion multi-million-dollar plans for an industrial park and redevelopment which will mean new jobs and business for an important area of our district which has too long been held back from realizing its potential and too long had to put up with human misery and great financial loss.

I will continue to press for additional funds for this important project until it is finished.

ACTIVITIES IN SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS COMMITTEE

When committee assignments were made I received an appointment to the new Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House which has in its legislative jurisdiction outer space, including exploration and control thereof, science scholarship, scientific research and development, and astronautical research and development—including resources, personnel, equipment, and facilities.

The committee also has legislative jurisdiction over these Government agencies: Bureau of Standards, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the National Aeronautics and Space Council, and the National Science Foundation.

During this Congress the committee conducted 27 investigations covering topics ranging from the exploration of the bottom of the sea to Army plans for construction on the moon. Extensive hearings involving untold hours of testimony were held on 17 different subjects ranging from a broad review of the Nation's space program to that of research on mechanical translation. This committee's importance is well recognized since Congressman McCORMACK, Democratic leader, and Congressman MARTIN, a high-ranking Republican, serve on it as their only committee assignment.

INTERNATIONAL SITUATION

A strong America—strong in defense, strong in industry, strong in moral purpose, and strong in friends through the world—is the only guarantee to peace.

In 1952 we had all of these, but since then a failure in administration leadership has caused our country to suffer diplomatic defeats in Japan, Indochina, Egypt, and the Near East, Hungary, South America, Cuba, and now in the Congo.

The bookkeepers in the Budget Bureau now dictate our global defense strategy and the weapons which are to be built.

While the Constitution severely limits the actions of Congress in international relations, we have given the Chief Executive everything he has asked, and more, in maintaining our defense. But while the Congress appropriates funds to defend America the Executive can and does "freeze" them, and our overall strength is lessened.

The Congress, too, has supported substantially the requests for foreign economic and military assistance, although with many misgivings that too much of the money will be badly spent in poorly planned projects and in supporting discredited and even corrupt foreign governments.

Most Ramsey County citizens would, I am sure, consent to spend such funds as Americans can reasonably afford in preserving the peace with honor.

I hope, too, that the next administration will give serious consideration to such legislative proposals as mine to establish within the Government a permanent National Peace Agency of top experts devoted to researching the conditions of permanent and honorable peace and to the means of achieving them.

RESPONSIBILITY IN GOVERNMENT FINANCES

It has become a regular practice now for the administration to accuse Congress of fiscal irresponsibility in many instances where Congress has disagreed on programs involving expenditures.

The RECORD should show that during this last session of Congress the administration asked for about $73,846 million to run the executive department but the Congress finally reduced this staggering sum by $212 million. For the two sessions of Congress (1959 and 1960) the Congress cut the administration budget requests by well over $2 billion.

Let the RECORD also show who the spenders are: This administration's first budget totaled $57 billion; its last, $84 billion—or $27 billion more. When the administration took over, the public debt amounted to $266.1 billion; when it leaves the debt will be about $286.3 billion, or $20.2 billion higher than when it took office.

Let the RECORD also show that on this debt the present administration will be paying this year $13 billion more in interest than the last year of the previous administration.

I think the RECORD should show that because of this high interest rate policy, the purchasing power of the dollar has fallen by 10 percent during the past 7½ years.

AMERICA'S FAILURE TO GROW

The administration's tight money-high interest policies have stunted the economic growth so that in midyear 1960 the employment and business growth outlook of our country is not good. Steel mills are producing at half their capacity and about a fifth of the Nation's production machinery is idle. Over 5 percent of the labor force continues to be unemployed while millions of other workers have only part-time jobs.

LABOR

Under the pretext of driving crooks and racketeers from the country's labor movement, conservatives in both parties managed to pass the Landrum-Griffin law which more than ever handicaps legitimate and decent trade unions and puts them over all sorts of legal hurdles.

The rank and file of labor continued to suffer from the hostility of the administration in their efforts to soften the effects of the Taft-Hartley law in regard to picketing and the open invitation to unscrupulous employers to move to low-wage, right-to-work States. Every worker and employer in my district should be vitally concerned with this problem of lost jobs and lost industry.

Fair Labor Standards Act amendments which were introduced to raise the Federal minimum wage and to extend coverage to millions of workers not now included, were defeated in the conference committee.

RAILROAD WORKERS

Benefits for railroad workers and their families were improved under the Railroad Retirement Act and the Railroad Unemployment Compensation Act.

GOVERNMENT WORKERS

Congress responded to the desperate need of postal workers and classified Government employees for improvements in wages by passing a law increasing their income by 8.4 percent for postal workers and 7½ percent for others.

OLD-AGE HEALTH CARE

The big issue of the 86th Congress was the controversy over the establishment of a Government program to finance the cost of health care for aged persons—16 million of whom are now 65 years and over.

Several approaches were proposed. One, as part of the social security system which would provide hospital benefits to the aged and involve a slight increase in social security tax; the second would give subsidies to private insurance companies and be paid out of regular Federal taxes; and the third method called for a joint State and Federal program covering only the aged who demonstrate that they cannot afford medical care—this would be financed out of regular State and Federal taxes.

The last of these was finally adopted with many misgivings on the part of those who sincerely want not a political issue but actual, adequate care for sick, old people.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Included in the omnibus bill to amend the social security law was:

An important amendment which eliminates altogether the 50-year age requirement for disability benefits—now a person is covered whenever he becomes totally disabled. Another provision which in effect lifts the income limitation on outside earnings of social security recipients from $1,200 a year to about $1,350.

EDUCATION

Assistance for America's schoolchildren became a political casualty when school construction legislation was bottled up in the rock-ribbed conservative House Rules Committee which ordinarily tells the House what legislation can be considered. A bill giving assistance to our short-changed schools passed the Senate earlier.

SMALL BUSINESS

The 86th Congress closed gaps in legislation to protect small business from illegal price discrimination and make it possible to compete against large companies.

A bill was passed allowing small business wholesalers of gasoline to pay the excise tax on gasoline actually sold by them. Previously these wholesalers had to pay a tax on all the gasoline he bought and as a result was penalized when he lost gasoline through spillage and evaporation.

Congress again showed its willingness to help small business by increasing the lending authority of the Small Business Administration first, from $500 million to $575 million and then again by another $150 million. We also voted changes to make it easier for small businesses to obtain long-term equity capital.

CIVIL RIGHTS

An important milestone was made in the last session in the progress of our Nation to achieving the full rights of citizenship for all our people. The 1960 legislation was drafted to help Negroes win voting rights in areas of the South which have long in the past completely disfranchised otherwise qualified citizens. I hope this act will be enforced with full vigor and dispatch.

THE VETO AND THREATS OF VETO

The Nation—and the people of Ramsey County—suffered from a negative government. The administration and the Republican leaders in Congress thwarted many legislative measures for building our Nation by the threat of the veto or sustaining a veto—making it necessary for the advocates of worthy programs to have over two-thirds of the votes of the Congress to prevail.

Some of the legislative programs which were lost to the country by veto or a threat of veto were:

First. An adequate Federal housing program: U.S. taxpayers receive, with interest, repayment of loans—public housing has never lost a dime.

Second. School construction program: There are few things more important to America than the education of its youth—Ramsey County would have profited from Democratic sponsored education bills.

Third. Realistic farm legislation: Present program costs have risen almost 500 percent at the same time farm units have decreased by 900,000 and farm income has decreased 24 percent.

Fourth. Distressed area program: Loans would be granted on a matching basis to areas which are permanently economically distressed and have high unemployment.

Fifth. An expanded water pollution program: Within a few years, unless we work at the problem, we will be without an adequate supply of safe, fresh water for our growing population.

Sixth. Effective old-age health care without the stigma of a pauper's oath: There are 16 million persons now over the age of 65—many of them in need of medical care which they cannot afford or get—unless they become charity cases.

It is my fervent hope that the next Congress working with a do-something administration will get our country off the dead center of inaction and stagnation so that we again can assume the leadership that the world has so long expected of us as a people.

Congressman Porter's Report to His Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, as I approach the end of four sessions as the U.S. Representative from the Fourth District of Oregon, I am impressed with how swiftly time passes. These have been busy years. I have done my best to keep my constituents informed about my activities and views but I know that many of them appreciate a summary report at the end of a congressional session.

This is my summary report for the 86th Congress. It cannot be complete because there were too many votes, too many activities and too many opinions to include. If any constituent of mine desires further information about any aspect of my work as his Representative, I ask him or her please to write or to call me at Eugene.

Following these remarks is a record of my votes on the major issues that were

presented to the 86th Congress during the last 2 years.

This summary is divided into three parts: First, I shall discuss some of my achievements directly for the people of the Fourth Congressional District. Then I shall list my position with respect to major national legislation. Finally, I shall deal with my efforts to improve our chances of maintaining peace with freedom in this troubled, perilous world.

FOURTH DISTRICT ACHIEVEMENTS

I have continued my practice of being readily available to my constituents by mail, telephone, or in person. During the sessions of the 86th Congress I returned home nine times. I maintain year-round offices in both Eugene and Medford. I often hold office hours, publicized in advance, in towns and cities throughout my district.

I make a special point of being available because I believe this is the first duty of a Member of Congress. My top three staff members have been with me in Washington ever since my election in 1956. We pride ourselves on the service we give to constituents. We have learned a lot in 4 years. We know we still have lots to learn.

We are ready, willing and able to help constituents who have problems involving any Federal agency or policy. We have helped thousands. Our mail from Oregon amounts, on the average, to about 75 letters daily. We often receive more than 100.

The Fourth District is growing. The 1950 census total for our seven counties was 368,007. The recently announced 1960 census total was 461,865. This most recent population countdown incorporated the most advanced of scientific know-how with hard work by enumerators. I serve as ranking Democratic member of the Census Subcommittee of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

I value the opinions of my constituents. In 1959 I sent a questionnaire to 10,500 constituents and this year I sent one to 131,000. I also mailed special inquiries to interested parties with respect to the proposed Oregon Dunes park and the proposed Agate Dam.

In deciding how to use his time and how to vote, a Member of Congress has to make up his own mind. He does this best when he has considered the relevant facts and the various opinions. I deeply appreciate the help I have received from many of my constituents.

FOURTH DISTRICT: PUBLIC PROJECTS

My biggest accomplishment during the 2 years of the 86th Congress was the new construction start on the Green Peter Dam project in Linn County. The appropriation for fiscal 1961 was $1.4 million. The total cost will be $64 million, making it the largest of all the Corps of Engineers new construction starts this year.

Green Peter has been ready for construction for 3 years but this was the first year the administration included any money in its budget. I enlisted the aid of both Congressman NORBLAD and Governor Hatfield. We needed all the bipartisan firepower we could mobilize.

At the other end of the district we made continued progress on the planning of the Rogue Basin flood control project. Community support is strong and enthusiastic. Now we have reason to hope that the temperature and flow studies of the Fish and Wildlife Service soon will demonstrate the feasibility of a high dam at Lost Creek on the Rogue River.

You know that our primary industry is the processing of logs. When lumber sales plummet, Fourth District families suffer—as many are suffering now because new housing starts were down 17 percent for the first 8 months of this year as compared to the same period last year.

People need homes now more than ever. We are a growing Nation. The problem is money. That is why I worked very hard for additional funds for Federal Housing Administration loan guarantees and for more liberal terms. My bill to add a billion dollars for small FHA loans passed the House but died in the Senate under the certain threat of a White House veto.

We did extend the college housing loan program by increasing it by $500 million. We extended the home repair improvement loan program and we increased the community facilities loans by $50 million.

In the interests of space and saving your time, let me list briefly several other accomplishments that I am proud to claim:

Established Federal timber policies conferences at University of Oregon as annual event. Third conference will be held there November 10, 1960.

Promoted Selma-Gold Beach Road by organizing horseback expedition over route both in 1959 and in 1960 to speed utilization of tremendous timber, recreational, and mineral resources in that area.

Investigated thoroughly and drafted bill for Oregon Dunes National Seashore Park in the Florence-Reedsport area. This park will mean millions of dollars additional income for Oregonians as well as the development and preservation of a uniquely beautiful portion of this ever more crowded planet.

Intervened to preserve historical Bandon Lighthouse.

Arranged for water level to remain high for recreational purposes in Fern Ridge Lake an additional month—September 1960.

Promoted legislation through House to extend penalties on transporters of explosives to help prevent another Roseburg disaster.

Speeded approval of Willakenzie watershed plan; worked with Agriculture Committee to secure House hearing and approval.

Secured additional $300,000 for work on Forest Service, South Bank Road to Agness.

Helped secure additional access road funds.

Introduced and advanced shoe labeling bill to protect consumers. This legislation is advocated by constituent Wilbur Gardner of Medford. Was promised full hearings next year. We already have fabric and fur labeling laws. Sparked current Federal Trade Commission study of shoemaking practices.

Testified more than 50 times before congressional committees on Fourth District problems and projects such as: Timber management, Camp White, water pollution control, library services act, Federal aid to education, housing, funds for public works projects, mining, abolishing age discrimination in hiring, freight car distribution.

PORTER ON NATIONAL ISSUES

I have already mentioned housing. No legislation is more vital to the Fourth District economy. None is more necessary to counter the high interest, tight-money policies of this Republican administration.

I spent a lot of my time trying to find ways to head off vetoes and the opposition of the Dixicrat-Republican coalition. The needs of our people over the Nation will, I predict, force legislation which will mean that we will hear no more about the alleged overcapacity of our plywood and lumber mills. All their capacity is needed for the production of the lumber that the Nation needs for the building and repair of suitable homes.

MEDICAL CARE AND SOCIAL SECURITY

Medical care for the aged was a big issue in the 86th Congress. The bill amending the social security laws came to the floor of the House under a closed rule; that is, no amendments could be offered. We had expected that the Forand bill, or something like it, would be substituted by the Senate and that we would have a chance to vote on it later in the House.

It turned out that the Senate failed by a narrow margin to pass this needed legislation. The issue is not dead. The legislation enacted is plainly too cumbersome. Each of the 50 States must set up a particular plan and the Federal funds are available to States only on a matching basis. Very few of the States are expected to be in a position financially to take advantage of this program.

The money coming from the Federal Government must come directly from the Treasury, not from the social security trust fund. The Federal law clearly implies that under the new plan some type of income and resource test will be applied by the State.

It would be far better to enact a medical care plan within the well proved social security system. This plan would be self-financed. The recipients would not have to declare themselves paupers in order to be eligible for help.

I predict that such a plan will be enacted during the 87th Congress and, if I am returned, I shall continue to press for its adoption.

I supported and Congress did eliminate the minimum age requirement for persons receiving disability insurance. And the restrictions on the amount of outside earnings for a person receiving social security were improved and clarified so a person does not lose money by working. Under the old law, anyone earning more than $1,200 lost an entire month's benefits for each $80 or fraction thereof above $1,200. Now on earnings

between $1,200 and $1,500, he loses only $1 for each $2 earned. Over $1,500 the ratio is 1 to 1.

AID TO EDUCATION

One out of four of our children has to attend an overcrowded or poorly staffed school. States and localities do not have the funds necessary for adequate facilities. Both parties approved Federal aid to education, in varying degrees, but the Dixiecrat-Republican coalition blocked enactment.

All of the Republican members and three-quarters of the Democratic members of the Rules Committee voted to keep the House from considering Federal aid to education legislation. We shall have to make changes in the Rules Committee early in the next session. This is not the only legislation that this committee has blocked from consideration by the whole House. Its power is too arbitrary, too uncontrolled, too irresponsible. Many House Members are determined to clip this committee's wings.

Other items of legislation on which I acted:

Helped secure health benefits for retired Federal employees.

Helped secure reemployment rights for Federal employees accepting positions overseas.

Supported revisions in Labor-Management Act of 1959.

Supported common situs picketing.

Supported criminal penalties for political preference with respect to applicants for Government jobs.

Helped secure pay increase for Federal employees.

Supported aid to depressed areas.

Supported revisions of draft law.

Helped secure statehood for Alaska and Hawaii.

PURSUIT OF PEACE

Man is a pretty smart animal. He learned the secret of the atom, of electronic directional systems and of rocket power. He put them all together and made intercontinental missiles, weapons of incredible range, accuracy and power. Every day he improves these weapons. The decision time gets shorter and shorter. And many other nations get closer and closer to the possession of such weapons.

Man is also a pretty dumb animal at times. He gets drunk, he misunderstands communications, he blows his top, he panics, and he does many other strange and unexpected things that prove he is a human being, error-prone and quite imperfect in many respects.

Put these lethal weapons in the hands of man—nobody else is available—and what have you got? A serious situation, to say the least. Even if you discount the dangers of an intentional war, because the parties—at least right now—must realize that no one could win this kind of a struggle, you still have the very present danger of war by accident or miscalculation.

The arms race continues. It is not only more dangerous every day but tremendously more expensive. We are spending $45 billion on arms this year alone, more than half our budget. I voted for these expenditures, sometimes very reluctantly. I figured that I would err, if at all, on the side of strength until we worked out some way to disarm with proper safeguards.

Our Department of State has spent less than $800,000 on disarmament in the last 8 years. The whole executive branch of our Government, which has issued many solemn statements about the crucial importance of disarmament has fewer than 40 full-time staff members working on disarmament.

The new U.S. Disarmament Agency, which I helped to force into being by my inquiries about the extent of the administration's efforts, will only employ at most another 80 persons.

WE MUST MOBILIZE OUR INTELLECTUAL AND SPIRITUAL FORCES

We are doing far too little to mobilize our intellectual and spiritual forces in the search for a feasible method of turning back from the arms race. This is why I have participated in the work of the World Parliament Association and of the East-West Roundtable Disarmament Conference. This is why I have journeyed to London, Paris, and Stockholm to discuss these vital problems with legislative leaders of other nations.

This is why, with Senator JOE CLARK, of Pennsylvania, I started an organization of more than 50 Members of Congress, called Members of Congress for World Peace Through Rule of Law. This is why I have been organizing a convention of 500 legislative leaders from all over the world in Washington, D.C., at the end of next May.

It is my belief that too many people, including many leaders of many nations, including our own, underestimate the danger of the arms race. I believe that we are smart enough to figure out a way to survive our terrible and expensive weapons, but I believe we must act quickly and with great determination.

Disarmament is a must. That is one major belief that I have sought to promote as your Congressman. Of course I mean disarmament with appropriate safeguards. Honest disarmament is not easily attained but it is a goal we must seek with all our might. Plainly we do not have much time.

Disarmament, dictators and China are the major categories for my foreign policy actions during the last 2 years. The disappearance of Gerry Murphy, my Eugene constituent, in the Dominican Republic when I first entered Congress early in 1957 led me to deplore publicly and repeatedly this administration's coddling of dictators.

Now, very recently, this administration has publicly condemned Trujillo and we have broken off relations with his government. We have embarked on a Marshall-plan size aid plan for Latin America. We are in trouble there and elsewhere.

Too long we have treated as our friends any government, no matter how cruel and corrupt, just so long as it pretended to be on our side against international communism. We did this with Batista of Cuba. Our Ambassadors fawned on him. We sent him guns, bombs, and warplanes which he used against his own people.

WE REAP WHAT WE SOW

Now we are reaping what we have sown. I tried to help persuade Castro to keep his early pledges of free elections and individual rights. When he broke these pledges, I broke with him. His revolution continues, Red-tinged and violently anti-Uncle Sam primarily because of misguided policies that were not in keeping with our deepest traditions.

If I am returned to Congress I shall continue to do what I can to promote a moral foreign policy. We should indeed give the formal handshake to dictators and the warm embrace to democratic leaders.

This brings me to my last point: That we must increase communication with China, and of course I mean no more than a formal handshake for this cruel and despotic government. We should exchange newsmen and other nonofficial citizens as a beginning. We should enter a period of exploration and negotiation prior to any possible normalization of relationships.

Unless we increase communications with China we face great danger from possible rash acts which we might be able to avert. Equally important, we must have the participation of China in any disarmament treaty because there is no other way to put international inspection stations inside the borders of China.

Certainly we will not stop nuclear tests or otherwise reduce our military strength if China is free to do anything she likes within her borders.

Negotiation is difficult, frustrating, and often infuriating—but what is the alternative today? Instead of talking about breaking off relationships entirely, as Senator BARRY GOLDWATER does, or about getting rough, as others do, we would do better to mobilize our intellectual and spiritual resources squarely and massively to meet the challenge of maintaining peace with freedom in this precarious world.

During the 86th Congress I traveled to Europe, South America, and the Far East in search of knowledge and insights as to how I, a Member of Congress from the Fourth District of Oregon, could help.

When I was first elected to Congress in 1956 I promised my constituents that I would spend at least one-third of my time doing whatever I could, however little, for peace. I have tried to keep that promise. I have tried, not only because I know that my constituents want me to try, but because of the memory of my friends who died in World War II. I want my children and the children of others to have a world of peace and freedom and opportunity beyond that of which we have dreamed.

CONCLUSION

It is a great honor and privilege to represent my friends and neighbors in Congress. I deeply appreciate this chance to serve. The office has great powers and great responsibilities. I do not claim a perfect, or even a near-perfect record of performance. I do claim that I have done my best.

Key votes, 1st sess., 86th Cong.

Date 1959	Measure	Vote
Feb. 4	H.R. 2256, provide more funds for direct loans, remove certain requirements with respect to rate of interest on guaranteed loans. (Passed 310 to 89.)	Yes.
Feb. 5	H.R. 2260, extend as is until July 1, 1963, Universal Military Training and Service Act. (Passed 381 to 20.)	No.
Mar. 12	S. 50, Hawaiian statehood. (Passed 323 to 89)	Yes.
Apr. 15	H.R. 1321, to amend Reorganization Plan 2 to transfer from Secretary of Agriculture to REA authority of approving or rejecting rural electrification loans. (Passed 254 to 151.)	Yes.
Apr. 30	S. 144, to override President Eisenhower's veto of REA bill. (Defeated 280 to 146; ⅔ majority needed.)	Yes.
May 21	S. 57, on final passage of Housing Act of 1959. (Passed 261 to 160)	Yes.
June 9	H.R. 3610, on passage of Water Pollution Control Act authorizing increase in grants for construction of sewage treatment works; to establish the Office of Water Pollution Control; and for other purposes. (Passed 255 to 143.)	Yes.
	H.R. 7590 on final passage of public works appropriations bill. (Passed 381 to 20.)	Yes.
June 23	S. 57, Housing Act of 1959 conference report. (Passed 241 to 177)	Yes.
July 7	H.R. 4957 to amend United States Code to provide for admission of certain evidence and confessions. (Passed 262 to 138.)	No.
July 27	H.R. 7072 to provide for U.S. participation in the Inter-American Development Bank. (Passed 233 to 87.)	Yes.
Aug. 13	H.R. 8342, to adopt Landrum-Griffin amendment (H.R. 8400) to replace language of House committee bill. (Passed 229 to 201.)	No.
Aug. 14	H.R. 8342, to recommit Landrum-Griffin bill to committee. (Failed 149 to 279.)	Yes.
Aug. 14	H.R. 8342 on passage of Landrum-Griffin bill. (Passed 303 to 125)	No.
Aug. 20	H.R. 8609 on Sullivan food stamps amendment to the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954. (Passed 232 to 127.)	Yes.
	On passage of H.R. 8609. (Passed 305 to 53)	Yes.
Aug. 27	S. 2539, to extend and amend laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing and the renewal of urban communities, and for other purposes. (Passed 283 to 106.)	Yes.
Sept. 2	H.R. 7509, to override President's veto of public works appropriation bill. (Failed 274 to 138.)	Yes.
Sept. 3	H.R. 8678, Federal Aid to Highway Act of 1959. (Passed 243 to 162)	Yes.
Sept. 4	S. 1555, to adopt conference report on Labor-Management and Disclosure Act of 1959. (Passed 352 to 52.)	Yes.
Sept. 8	H.R. 9105, fiscal appropriations for public works. (Passed 303 to 93)	Yes.
Sept. 10	H.R. 9105, to override President's veto of public works appropriations bill. (Passed 280 to 121.)	Yes.

Key votes, 2d sess., 86th Cong.

Date 1960	Measure	Vote
Feb. 25	H.R. 3610, to override the President's veto of bill to increase grants for construction of sewage treatment works. (Failed 249 to 157; ⅔ required.)	Yes.
Mar. 24	H.R. 8601, passage of Civil Rights Act. (Passed 311 to 109)	Yes.
Apr. 21	H. Res. 503, on final approval of conference report on civil rights bill. (Passed 288 to 95.)	Yes.
Apr. 27	H. Res. 498, adopt the open rule providing for 3 hours of debate on H.R. 10213 authorizing purchase by Treasury of $1,000,000,000 of FHA and VA mortgages, etc. (Passed 214 to 158.)	Yes.
Apr. 28	H.R. 10213, to recommit H.R. 10213. (Failed 139 to 235)	No.
Apr. 28	H.R. 10213 to amend National Housing Act, final passage. (Passed 214 to 163.)	Yes.
May 4	S. 722, area redevelopment (depressed areas). (Passed 202 to 184)	Yes.
May 18	H.R. 5, Foreign Investment Incentive Tax Act of 1960. (Passed 196 to 192.)	Yes.
May 25	H.R. 12326, public works appropriation bill. (Passed 388 to 18)	Yes.
May 26	H.R. 10128, to authorize Federal financial assistance to States for school construction. (Passed 206 to 189.)	Yes.
June 15	H.R. 9883, Federal employee's pay raise bill providing for 7½ percent increase. (Passed 378 to 40.)	Yes.
June 17	H.R. 12619, on passage of mutual security appropriations bill. (Passed 259 to 124.)	Yes.
June 23	H.R. 12580, on passage of Social Security Amendments of 1960. (Passed 381 to 23.)	Yes.
June 29	H.R. 7903, to amend United States Code to extend the veterans' guaranteed and direct loan program for 2 years. (Passed 398 to 1.)	Yes.
June 30	H.R. 12677, amend Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to provide coverage for employees of interstate retail enterprises and to increase minimum wages under act to $1.15. (Passed 341 to 72.)	Yes.
July 1	H.R. 9883, override of President's veto of Federal employee's pay raise bill. (Passed 345 to 69.)	Yes.
Aug. 24	S.J. Res. 170, a joint resolution favoring a convention of delegates from Atlantic democracies looking to great cooperation and unity of purpose. (Passed 289 to 103.)	Yes.
Aug. 26	H.R. 12580, to adopt conference report on social security amendments, aged, medical care. (Passed 369 to 17.)	Yes.

Naval Shipyards and Facilities Must Be Maintained on a Fully Operational Basis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. OLIVER
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, in July of 1959, the Department of the Navy through its Bureau of Ships issued a series of instructions.

One of the instructions, namely, 4860.22, was designed to bring about the closing of shops in naval yards and facilities, such as foundries, forge shops, pattern shops, galvanizing and plating facilities, sail lofts, and gas manufacturing plants. The work performed by these facilities will be let out to private industry. Another instruction, No. 1223.40, was designed to eliminate apprenticeship programs in the shipyards and facilities. The effect of such directives, Mr. Speaker, may well dry up a very valuable source of highly skilled craftsmen whose skills the Navy must rely upon for its continued effectiveness.

Since the issuance of these orders, I have met with several of our colleagues who also have located within their congressional districts naval shipyards and facilities. It is our general feeling that these instructions would decrease the full functioning of existing facilities of our naval shipyards with a strong probability of serious detriment to our national security.

In the event, then, these recent instructions from the Navy Department may not be in the best interest of our national defense, I have cosponsored with several of my colleagues the following resolution which I again call to your attention:

Whereas all of our U.S. naval shipyards and facilities were developed, manned and operated so as to enable our Nation to more adequately meet the vital and continuing needs of our national defense; and

Whereas these U. S. naval shipyards and facilities with their tens of thousands of competent and highly skilled workers have ceaselessly demonstrated the vital role they play in the maintenance of our navy readiness both in peace and wartime by keeping our naval combat vessels in top fighting condition and by serving as a major source of our naval vessel construction, thus making it possible for our Navy to attain and maintain its proud record of effective service in our national interest; and

Whereas the Department of the Navy, through its Bureau of Ships has issued a series of instructions; namely, instructions 4860.22, 5450.94, 12156.16, 10290.25, 1223.40, 4850.10c, to the commanders of its naval shipyards and other Bureau of Ships facilities the effect of which is to decrease the full functioning of existing facilities of U.S. naval shipyards with probable detriment to the national security: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress hereby expresses to the President of the United States its extreme concern and disapproval of these actions, and particularly its alarm at the pattern of these actions with consequential weakening and erosive effect on a major arm of our national defense, and urges the President to instruct the Secretary of Defense to take all necessary steps to insure that these U.S. naval shipyards and facilities be maintained on a fully manned operational basis and that they be assured of sufficient Navy and other Department of Defense work so as to fully utilize these installations and their manpower skills so essential to the preservation of active Navy readiness which is a prime component of our national defense posture.

Summary of the Record and Accomplishments of the Committee on Ways and Means During the 86th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILBUR D. MILLS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the 86th Congress has witnessed a period of intensive activity and sound legislative accomplishment on the part of the Committee on Ways and Means. Legislation which is beneficial, meritorious, and fiscally sound has been reported by the

committee and enacted in all the major fields of the committee's jurisdiction. As Members of the House will recall, this jurisdiction is quite broad, since it covers legislation relating to, first, our Federal internal revenue laws; second, our Federal social security laws; third, customs and tariff laws and programs, including reciprocal trade agreements; fourth, measures relating to the management of the public debt; and, fifth, other important categories of legislation such as the Renegotiation Act, laws for the control of narcotics, legislation on the financing of the Federal-aid highway program, measures relating to the interest rate on Government obligations, and so forth.

It is clear that the nature of the measures falling within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means is such that this committee must always proceed with the utmost caution, responsibility, and prudence. Laws on the subject of taxes, tariffs, social security, and fiscal matters generally personally affect the lives of every American citizen, and in all of these areas our committee must act with the highest degree of responsibility and statesmanship. On each of these subjects the committee must always bear in mind not only the immediate effect of proposals upon which it may take favorable action, but it must also consider most carefully the long-range effect and impact of the proposals in addition to the relationship which the precedent which it will set will bear to other proposals which may be made sometime in the future.

Before proceeding to summarize and discuss the accomplishments of the committee, I wish to take this opportunity and means of expressing publicly to the members of the Committee on Ways and Means my appreciation for the conscientious and diligent manner with which they have approached their heavy responsibilities on the committee. As will be demonstrated from the statistics which I shall subsequently set forth, the committee has applied itself diligently to the tasks before it in discharging its responsibilities to the Congress and to the American people. My colleagues on the committee have served ably and conscientiously, and during the course of the 86th Congress we have initiated and acted upon legislation which is meritorious and in the public interest. Members of the committee have not always agreed on all of the measures which have been reported by the committee, just as I have not always agreed with each and every such proposal, but this is the way the committee system operates and the results of our work during this session I am confident will stand the test of time.

As I have heretofore indicated, due to the importance and complexities of the legislative measures which come before the Committee on Ways and Means it is necessary for the committee to devote a great deal of time to a careful and full exploration of the issues involved and an evaluation of the ramifications which any given proposal may have on the economy of the Nation prior to taking action. In the very nature of things, therefore, legislation in the fields of taxes, tariffs, and social security must be approached with great caution and requires thoroughgoing and time-consuming preparation before results become apparent.

In addition to pursuing to enactment major and minor legislation in the areas of its jurisdiction, the Committee on Ways and Means has conducted public hearings touching upon most facets of its legislative responsibilities. The committee also established three subcommittees which have had particular responsibility to maintain continuous watchfulness over the administration of the laws within the jurisdiction of the committee by the administrative agencies concerned. Another major undertaking during this Congress was the initiation of a broad scale study of our entire Federal income tax system by the committee with a view toward consideration of the practical possibilities for constructive tax reform.

Before reviewing in detail legislation which was favorably reported by the committee during this Congress and which was enacted into law, it may be of interest to consider pertinent statistics which disclose the intensive activity on the part of the committee during the two sessions completed.

OVERALL STATISTICS OF COMMITTEE ACTIVITY

During the 86th Congress there were referred to the Committee on Ways and Means a total of 2,156 public bills and resolutions out of a total of 12,215 such bills and resolutions introduced in the House. The figures for this Congress are in accord with the pattern for the past several Congresses, since customarily the Committee on Ways and Means has referred to it one-fifth to one-sixth of all the public bills and resolutions introduced in the House. Of the total of 2,156 such bills and resolutions, there were 1,184 tax bills, 347 tariff bills, 525 social security bills, and some 100 bills relating to other facets of the committee's jurisdiction.

During the 86th Congress the committee favorably reported to the House of Representatives a total of 97 bills, which total breaks down as follows: 55 tax bills, 5 social security bills, 31 tariff bills, and 6 miscellaneous bills. It should be noted that one major bill which the committee orders reported will cover the subject encompassed in dozens of bills referred to it. Most of these measures which were reported by the committee to the House were passed by the House, the Senate, and were signed into law by the President.

It should be observed here that these statistics become more meaningful when it is realized that the customary method of operation of the Committee on Ways and Means is not to enact piecemeal legislation in the area of its principal responsibilities, but rather to report to the House omnibus bills following careful consideration in executive session of all of the individual pending measures on a given subject. For example, while the statistics reveal that the Ways and Means Committee reported five social security bills to the House of Representatives during this Congress, it should be understood that one of the five consisted of the social security amendments of 1960 which consisted of a bill of 261 pages covering an extremely broad variety of aspects of the subject of social security and it resulted from a careful consideration of the some 500 social security bills pending before the committee.

For the further information of the Members, I shall insert at this point a table—table I—which shows a breakdown of the measures referred to the committee, followed by another table—table II—setting forth statistics on the status of bills referred to the committee during this Congress:

TABLE I.—*Committee on Ways and Means, 86th Cong., 1st and 2d sess., Jan. 7, 1959, through Sept. 1, 1960*

Total number of bills introduced in House (public and private) through Sept. 1, 1960	13,304
Total number of House joint resolutions introduced in House (public and private)	808
Total number of House concurrent resolutions introduced in House (public and private)	747
Total number of House resolutions introduced in House (public and private)	647
Total	15,506
Total number of public bills and resolutions	12,215
Total number of private bills and resolutions	3,291
Total	15,506
Total number of bills referred to Committee on Ways and Means through Sept. 1, 1960	2,053
Total number of House joint resolutions referred	15
Total number of House concurrent resolutions referred	82
Total number of House resolutions referred	5
Total number of Senate bills referred	1
Total	2,156

Legislation referred to Committee on Ways and Means, 86th Cong., 1st and 2d sess., Jan. 7, 1959, through Sept. 1, 1960

	Total tax bills	Total tariff bills	Total miscellaneous bills	Total social security bills	Total
House bills	1,179	278	74	522	2,053
House joint resolutions	3	8	2	2	15
House concurrent resolutions	1	59	21	1	82
House resolutions	1	2	2	0	5
Senate bills	0	0	1	0	1
Total	1,184	347	100	525	2,156

TABLE II.—*Statistics on status of bills referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, 86th Cong.*

	Social Security	Tariff	Tax	Miscellaneous	Total
Bills reported to House	5	31	55	6	97
Bills passed House	5	30	50	6	91
Bills reported to Senate	4	25	36	5	70
Bills passed Senate	4	25	32	5	66
Bills enacted into law	4	23	29	5	61
Bills vetoed		1	3		4

NOTE.—Amendments to one bill passed by the Senate (H.R. 4384) were not accepted by the House.

Mr. Speaker, before proceeding to a substantive discussion of the legislation given favorable consideration by the Committee on Ways and Means, I think it will also be of interest to indicate the time spent by the committee in terms of public and executive meetings of the committee. During the two sessions just completed the committee and its subcommittees conducted 80 days of public hearings and which resulted in the receipt of 8,210 pages of printed testimony. In addition to the public hearings, the committee spent 180 days in executive session considering legislation and subject matters within its jurisdiction. I am confident that this is a record of work which indicates that ours is one of the busiest committees of the House of Representatives. In this regard, I shall insert at this point a table showing the public hearings conducted by the committee during the 86th Congress—table III:

TABLE III.—*Public hearings, Committee on Ways and Means, 86th Cong.*

	Dates held	Number of—	
		Days	Witnesses
Advisory group recommendations on chs. C, J, and K of the Internal Revenue Code	Feb. 24, 25, 26, 27, and Mar. 2, 3 and 4, 1959	7	41
Mineral treatment processes for percentage depletion purposes	Mar. 5, 6, 9, 10, and 11, 1959	5	46
Unemployment compensation	Apr. 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 15, and 16, 1959	8	95
Extension of the Renegotiation Act	Apr. 27, 28, and 29, 1959	3	19
Public debt and interest rate ceiling on bonds	June 10, 11, and 12, 1959	3	16
Foreign Investment Incentive Act (H.R. 5)	July 7, 8, and 9, 1959	3	52
Children's estate tax deduction (H.R. 7924)	July 10, 1959	1	8
Hospital, nursing home, and surgical benefits for beneficiaries (H.R. 4700)	July 13, 14, 15, 16, and 17, 1959	5	86
Taxation of exchanges and distributions pursuant to antitrust decrees (H.R. 8126, H.R. 8231)	July 20 and 21, 1959	2	11
Highway trust fund and Federal-aid highway financing program	July 22, 23, and 24, 1959	3	68
Administration of the social security disability program	Nov. 4, 5, 6, 9, 10, 12, 13 and Dec. 7, 1959	8	51
Panel discussions on income tax revision, 1959	Nov. 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 23, 24, 30, Dec. 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 14, 15, 16, 17, and 18, 1959.	22	178
Tax treatment of earnings of cooperatives	Feb. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, 1960	5	54
Permanent suspension of duties on coarse wools	Feb. 29, 1960	1	9
Revising tax on gains from sales of depreciable property (H.R. 10491, H.R. 10492)	Mar. 2, and 3, 1960	2	11
"Gross-up" in connection with foreign tax credit allowed domestic corporations on dividends from a foreign subsidiary (H.R. 10859, H.R. 10860).	Apr. 11, 1960	1	9
Total		79	754

I am also inserting at the end of these remarks a complete table showing the status of all bills acted upon by the Committee on Ways and Means in the 86th Congress—Appendix I.

SUBCOMMITTEE ACTIVITY

The Committee on Ways and Means, under the rules of the House of Representatives, is charged with maintenance of continuing watchfulness over the administration of the laws within the jurisdiction of the committee by the departments and agencies concerned. In order to more effectively carry out its responsibilities in this respect, the committee in the early part of the first session of this Congress established three subcommittees, as follows: Subcommittee on Administration of the Internal Revenue Laws; Subcommittee on the Administration of Foreign Trade Laws and Policy; Subcommittee on Administration of the Social Security Laws. These subcommittees were authorized and directed to maintain watchfulness over the administration of the existing laws within their respective jurisdictions, and to keep the full committee advised.

The time within which these subcommittees had to operate was somewhat limited, due to the very heavy schedule and agenda of the full Committee on Ways and Means. However, solid accomplishments were obtained through these subcommittees, and constructive legislation by the full committee in several instances resulted therefrom. For example, the Subcommittee on Administration of the Social Security Laws conducted an intensive study and review of the administration of the disability provisions of title II—OASDI—of the Social Security Act during the fall of 1959, including a series of public hearings, and ultimately reported a number of findings and recommendations to the full committee, in addition to the publication of a "Disability Insurance Factbook." The Social Security Amendments of 1960 contain several provisions resulting from the findings of the Social Security Subcommittee, for example, the elimination of the age 50 requirement as a qualification for disability insurance benefits. The membership of the three subcommittees follows:

Subcommittee on Administration of the Internal Revenue Laws: WILBUR D. MILLS, Democrat, of Arkansas, chairman; THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, Democrat, of Illinois; EUGENE J. KEOGH, Democrat, of New York; FRANK IKARD, Democrat, of Texas; NOAH M. MASON, Republican, of Illinois; HOWARD H. BAKER, Republican, of Tennessee; JAMES B. UTT, Republican, of California.

Subcommittee on Administration of Foreign Trade Laws and Policy: HALE BOGGS, Democrat, of Louisiana, chairman; CECIL R. KING, Democrat, of California; FRANK M. KARSTEN, Democrat, of Missouri; THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ, Democrat, of Michigan; JAMES B. FRAZIER, JR., Democrat, of Tennessee, JOHN W. BYRNES, Republican, of Wisconsin; VICTOR A. KNOX, Republican, of Michigan; BRUCE ALGER, Republican, of Texas; JOHN A. LAFORE, JR., Republican, of Pennsylvania.

Subcommittee on Administration of the Social Security Laws: BURR P. HARRISON, Democrat, of Virginia, chairman; A. S. HERLONG, JR., Democrat, of Florida; WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR., Democrat, of Pennsylvania; JOHN C. WATTS, Democrat, of Kentucky; LEE METCALF, Democrat, of Montana; THOMAS B. CURTISS, Republican, of Missouri; JACKSON E. BETTS, Republican, of Ohio; ALBERT H. BOSCH, Republican, of New York.

INCOME-TAX REVISION STUDY

During this Congress, the Committee on Ways and Means initiated the first phase of a broad-scale study of our entire Federal income-tax structure and system with a view toward exploring the practical possibilities of broadening the tax base and lowering tax rates.

The beginning of this study consisted, first, of the preparation of a document, consisting of three volumes of prepared papers, entitled "Tax Revision Compendium," which was printed and made available to the general public. A broad range of experience, training, knowledge, and ability was represented in the contributions made by the many experts in the field of Federal taxation who submitted the papers at the request of the committee for inclusion in the three-volume compendium. These individuals were tax lawyers, accountants, university professors, economists, as well as individuals from the fields of business, labor, and agriculture. This compendium was made widely available to the general public prior to the subsequent phases of the study.

Following the issuance of the compendium, the committee conducted a series of panel discussions participated in by the contributors covering the various principal areas which were the leading subjects in the tax revision compendium. These public panel discussions ran for a period of 5 weeks, during which time the committee received the views, suggestions, and recommendations of approximately 175 individuals in 31 different panels. There was opportunity during this operation for the panelists to state their views and question one another and for the members of the committee to question the various panelists on suggestions made. Following completion of the public panel discussions there subsequently was printed and issued to the public the full record of these discussions. This document entitled "Income Tax Revision Panel Discussions" was given broad circulation, and intense interest was manifested in it by individuals

and organizations throughout the Nation.

After completion of the public panel discussions I indicated in my closing statement the nature of the work which would be required as the next step in the broad-scale study, as follows:

The purpose of these discussions has been to explore the practical possibility of broadening the tax base and lowering tax rates. Some of the suggestions appear to offer some practical possibilities; others do not.

There must be an assessment of the various issues from the standpoint of their effect on fairness among taxpayers, on revenues, on economic growth, on economic stability, and on ability to pay. Before there can be any resolution of the issues raised by these panel discussions, there must be a considerable amount of study of all the problems involved.

Thus, before any plan can be developed, it will be necessary for the staffs of the committee, the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, and the Treasury Department to review and analyze the various suggestions which have been made to us and give the committee the benefit of their views as to their feasibility and practicability.

Therefore, I am requesting the staffs to analyze the compendium and the record which was developed and provide the committee such suggestions as they believe meet these standards. After the staffs have completed this study and analysis, and before any overall general revision proposal can be reported by the committee, there will, as I have said in earlier statements, be hearings and an opportunity for the interested public to express its views.

It will not be possible for the staffs to complete this analysis in the remainder of this Congress. Thus, it will not be possible for the Committee on Ways and Means, itself, to give specific consideration in 1960 to any broad proposals of tax revision based on these discussions.

It is certainly my thought that our tax rates are much too high from the standpoint of incentive and economic growth. I hope that as a result of these hearings and their analysis by the staffs, we will be able to find some means for making an adjustment in the tax rates through revision in the tax base while at the same time keeping the level of revenue collections sufficient to meet essential expenditure requirements.

LEGISLATION TO STRENGTHEN AND AID SMALL BUSINESS

Before proceeding to a discussion of the major legislation reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, I will briefly mention at this point several measures which received favorable consideration by the committee which in the aggregate will result in material assistance to small business enterprises throughout the Nation.

As may be recalled, the committee has properly been concerned for the past several years with the continued maintenance of opportunities for successful operation for the Nation's small business activities. Without undertaking to enumerate these measures in any order of relative importance, the following are worthy of mention: Legislation providing that for purposes of the law relating to the payment of the excise tax on gasoline, wholesale distributors of gasoline are to be treated as producers. Under this legislation, a hardship previously existing with regard to the payment of the excise tax by independent distributors and jobbers on evaporated or lost gasoline will be effectively removed. Second, the committee favorably reported and there has been enacted into law a measure to remove a hardship with regard to the taxation of so-called dealer reserves. This legislation, which is summarized at a later point, should be of material benefit in assisting not only dealers in automobiles, but also dealers in other forms of personal and real property. For the most part, these are all small business enterprises. Third, the committee acted to amend the laws relative to the tax treatment of expenditures made to determine the presence, location, quantity, or quality of any deposit of ore or other mineral—except oil and gas. Prior law provided for a maximum deduction which might be taken for any one year of $100,000 but for no more than 4 years. The legislation approved by the committee would remove the 4-year limitation while maintaining an overall limit of $400,000. This legislation would, therefore, assist the small enterprises engaged in this form of activity. Still another provision of law which was agreed to by the committee, in the form of acceptance of Senate amendments to another House bill, was a change in the statute relating to the election of certain small business corporations as to their taxable status.

Specifically, this provision removed a hardship which had developed under prior law in determining the number of shareholders of a small business corporation where a husband and wife owned stock jointly or as community property. Additionally, the law was clarified with regard to the definition of a small business corporation. Finally, these amendments also included a provision to exempt small-business investment companies from the personal holding company tax, a measure which was requested by the Small Business Administration. A further example of legislation which would prove to be of particular assistance to small business enterprises provided for the reduction of the cabaret tax from 20 percent to 10 percent. The 20-percent tax was considered to be discriminatory since the rates of practically all of the other ad valorem excise taxes did not exceed 10 percent, and, moreover, the high rate of tax was believed to have been a substantial deterrent to the employment of musicians and other entertainers, and thus a restrictive influence on the continued operation of many small business establishments in the restaurant and entertainment fields. Still another example of legislation which would be of specific benefit to small business enterprises provided for a reduction in the 5-cent-a-pound tax to 1 cent a pound in the case of the sale of laminated tires not of the type used on highway vehicles, where the tires consist wholly of scrap rubber from used tire casings and have an internal metal fastening agent. The laminated tire industry is both a new and a small industry and this removal of the discriminatory impact of the tire tax should assist this small industry to further develop by removing the competitive disadvantage.

The foregoing is not intended to be a complete or exhaustive discussion of all of the measures which the committee favorably acted upon which will benefit small business, but merely to list a few examples of such measures as indicative of the committee's solicitous regard for the importance of maintaining and strengthening small business enterprises in our great Nation.

BRIEF OVERALL SUMMARY OF MAJOR BILLS ENACTED

The following measures might well be classed in the category of major legislation which was favorably reported by the Committee on Ways and Means and which was enacted into law during the 86th Congress: The Life Insurance Company Tax Act of 1959; the Public Debt Act of 1959; the financing provisions of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1959; a bill permitting the issuance under specified circumstances of series E and H United States savings bonds at interest rates above the existing maximum, and so forth; a bill making technical changes in certain excise tax laws; the extension of the Renegotiation Act of 1951; the Tax Rate Extension Act of 1959; the Narcotics Manufacturing Act of 1960; the Public Debt and Tax Rate Extension Act of 1960; and the Social Security Amendments of 1960.

In addition to the foregoing, the Committee on Ways and Means favorably reported several major measures most of which passed the House of Representatives but which, due to various circumstances, failed to complete the legislative journey through the Senate and thus failed of enactment. Among these should be mentioned the Self-Employed Individuals' Retirement Act of 1959; the Foreign Investment Incentive Act of 1960; a bill to make technical revisions in the income tax provisions of the Internal Revenue Code relating to estates, trusts, partners, and partnerships; and a bill relating to interest rate restrictions on bonds of the United States.

A brief summary of each of the major measures enumerated above which were enacted into law follows:

H.R. 4245, BY MR. MILLS; PUBLIC LAW NO. 86-69, SIGNED JUNE 25, 1959

The Life Insurance Company Tax Act of 1959 provided the most comprehensive revision of the taxation of life insurance companies since 1921. In 1921, life insurance companies were taxed only on a portion of their investment income. The portion taxable broadly represented the amount of investment income over and above the company's requirements for adding interest to life insurance reserves. This excess portion has in the past been computed on the basis of formulas derived from the aggregate industry experience. Since 1921, the life insurance companies paid no tax on their so-called underwriting income, that is, the excess of their premium income over their expenses and their provisions for death benefits and additions to reserves.

The new life insurance company tax law makes two fundamental changes. The law provides that the tax will be based only in part on the company's investment income, and in part on the

company's underwriting income. In computing the taxable portion of the investment income, the law avoids the use of industry-wide formulas and provides a method whereby each company's investment income tax liability is based upon its own investment experience.

To explain the new law more specifically, the investment income tax is contained in the so-called phase one tax. For purposes of this tax, the company first determines its net investment income, that is, the total of interest, dividends, and the like, minus investment expenses. From this, it is permitted a reserve interest deduction computed by multiplying its adjusted reserves by its earnings rate. The earnings rate is the lower of its current earnings rate or the average of its earnings rate over the previous 5 years. The adjusted reserves are the book reserves adjusted to eliminate the effect of the company's arbitrary reserve interest assumption.

The so-called phase 2 of the tax is based upon the company's actual net gain from operations which is, generally speaking, its total income. This total income figure is derived from the company's own books with certain adjustments. If the total income exceeds the phase 1 tax base, the company must add to its taxable income from phase 1 one-half of the difference. If the total income is less than the phase 1 tax base, the company may subtract the difference, after limiting its deduction for policyholder dividends to a maximum of $250,000.

To comment on the second alternative first, it should be pointed out that the new law for the first time since 1921 provides that the life insurance company's tax may go down when the company's actual operations show losses. It has been a feature of the investment income tax approach that many new and small life insurance companies have had to pay substantial taxes on their investment income in years when their own books showed an aggregate loss. For this reason, the new tax law will be of great benefit to many new and small life insurance companies.

In the case of life insurance companies whose aggregate income is in excess of the tax base from phase 1, it was explained that they will be taxable currently on only one-half of this difference. The other half will, so to speak, be available as a reserve to meet future contingencies and will be added to the tax base at any time that it is actually paid out to shareholders.

The bill also contained a number of provisions dealing with special situations that might arise in the life insurance industry.

H.R. 7749, BY MR. MILLS; PUBLIC LAW 86–74, SIGNED JUNE 30, 1959

This bill, which became law without amendment, provided for an increase in the permanent debt ceiling of $2 billion, to $285 billion, and for an additional temporary increase of $10 billion for 1 year, making the debt ceiling $295 billion to June 30, 1960.

The administration had requested that the permanent ceiling be raised to $288 billion, with an additional temporary increase for fiscal year 1960 of $7 billion. The committee, however, did not consider it necessary or advisable to raise the permanent ceiling to the full extent requested by the administration, and in subsequent testimony the Secretary of the Treasury indicated to the Senate Finance Committee that the provisions of the bill reported by the Committee on Ways and Means were workable in terms of Treasury requirements, and acceptable to the administration.

TITLE II OF H.R. 8678; PUBLIC LAW 86–342, SIGNED SEPTEMBER 21, 1959.

One quite significant and important action of the Committee on Ways and Means was the development of title II of H.R. 8678, provided financing provisions to secure additional revenue for the Federal-aid highway program, which is financed through the highway trust fund. While the bill H.R. 8678 was formally reported by the Committee on Public Works, title II thereof was developed and drafted by the Committee on Ways and Means in accordance with a prior agreement which had been worked out by the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Public Works. Likewise, the material contained in title II of the House report which accompanied the bill was developed and drafted by the Committee on Ways and Means.

It was drawn to the attention of the committee during the course of the first session that an immediate problem with regard to financing the Federal-aid highway program was in evidence in that without legislation providing further funds for the program, it was estimated that there would be a deficit in the highway trust fund by the end of fiscal year 1960 of some $490 million, and at the end of the fiscal year 1961, an accumulated deficit of $980 million would be in prospect even if no further apportionments were made.

Legislation, therefore, was urgently necessary to provide additional financing for the highway trust fund to meet this immediate problem.

Title II of H.R. 8678, therefore, contained a solution for the financing problems and enabled the continuance of the Federal-aid highway program at a level commensurate with completion of the program and the needs of the economy. Specifically, title II of H.R. 8678 provided for the imposition of an additional 1-cent-per-gallon tax on gasoline, diesel fuel, and special motor fuels, for the 21-month period beginning October 1, 1959, and ending June 30, 1961, and allocation to the highway trust fund of 5 percentage points of the manufacturer's excise tax on passenger cars, and so forth, and of 5 percentage points of the tax on auto parts and accessories for the 3-year period beginning July 1, 1961, and ending June 30, 1964. The additional revenue provided by title II, combined with the existing revenues of the trust fund, should make possible apportionments for the Interstate System of $1.8 billion for the fiscal year 1961 and $2 billion for the fiscal year 1962, in addition to the $2.5 billion of apportionments which had already been made for the fiscal year 1960. These apportionments can be made without suspension of the limitation on the trust fund, which is the so-called Byrd amendment.

H.R. 9035, BY MR. MILLS; PUBLIC LAW 86–346, SIGNED SEPTEMBER 22, 1959

This bill made a number of changes in the laws relating to savings bond interest rates and other aspects of debt management:

First, it permits the maximum interest rate—or investment yield—limitation of 3.26 percent on series E and H savings bonds to be exceeded where there is a finding by the President that the national interest so requires. The bill also authorizes increasing the interest rates on outstanding series E and H savings bonds. In this case also, the existing maximum limitation of 3.26 percent on these bonds may be exceeded but only in the case of a finding by the President that the national interest so requires. A Senate amendment to this section of the bill, which was accepted by the House, added a proviso that in no event may the interest rate or the investment yield on these bonds exceed 4¼ percent per annum.

Second, the bill adds a new section to the Internal Revenue Code providing for nonrecognition of gain or loss on the exchange of U.S. obligations when so provided by regulations. This is intended to aid the Government in its attempts to achieve a better balance in the debt structure by facilitating the refinancing of outstanding securities in advance of their final maturities.

Third, the bill authorizes the issuance of obligations of the United States to Government trust funds at the issue price, whether or not at par. Under existing law in the case of certain trust funds these obligations may be issued to the funds only at par.

Fourth, the bill makes it clear that both the principal and interest on U.S. obligations are exempt from all State taxes except nondiscriminatory franchise, et cetera, taxes.

Fifth, the bill relieves from liability to the U.S. Government agents who erroneously paid U.S. bonds if they did not receive written notice from the United States within 10 years from the date of the erroneous payment.

This legislation was quite important to the millions of American citizens who purchase and hold series E- and H-savings bonds, since it will permit an increase in the interest rate payable to these individuals on this important type of savings, if the President finds that the national interest will thereby be served. The legislation will further encourage investment in these bonds by our individual citizens, and will permit them to continue to participate in this vitally important savings program. It will assist the Treasury in the management of the public debt.

H.R. 8725, BY MR. HARRISON; PUBLIC LAW 86–344; SIGNED SEPTEMBER 21, 1959

In 1958 the Congress passed the Excise Tax Technical Changes Act of 1958, which constituted a comprehensive revision of the technical and administrative provisions of the Federal excise taxes. In a technical revision of this magnitude, almost of necessity there are

changes made which after experience in actual operations will require further modifications. The purpose of H.R. 8725, as amended by the Committee on Ways and Means, was to effect six such modifications which experience under the 1958 act has shown to be required. These technical changes amend the provisions relating to the retailers' excise tax on jewelry, the exemptions from excise taxes for nonprofit educational organizations, the club dues tax, the tax on communications as it relates to common carriers and communication companies, the basis of the documentary stamp tax in the case of transfers of stock rights or warrants, and the occupational tax applicable to so-called claw, crane, or digger machines in certain cases.

This legislation, which was favored by the Treasury Department, became law in the form reported by the committee.

H.R. 7086, BY MR. MILLS; PUBLIC LAW 86-89, SIGNED JULY 13, 1959

As reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, this bill provided for an extension of renegotiation authority for 4 years to June 30, 1963. Certain other amendments were contained in the bill which the committee was of the opinion would be of benefit to industry as well as contributing to the administration of the act. These related to the factors to be considered in determining excessive profits, the provision for carryforward of losses on renegotiable business, the statements required to be furnished by the Renegotiation Board, proceedings before the Tax Court in renegotiation cases, and review of Tax Court decisions in such cases.

The Senate amended the House bill substantially, and it was sent to conference. Under the conference agreement, which was accepted by both bodies, a 3-year extension of renegotiation authority was provided, to June 30, 1962. In addition, a 5-year carryforward to fiscal years ending after December 31, 1958, of renegotiation losses was provided, in the case of losses arising in fiscal years ending on or after December 31, 1956. An increase in the compensation of the General Counsel of the Renegotiation Board was provided, to $19,000 per annum. Further, certain studies of procurement policies and practices, the Renegotiation Act, and the policies and practices of the Renegotiation Board were directed to be made. The overall report developed from these studies is to be made not later than March 31, 1961.

H.R. 7523, BY MR. MILLS; PUBLIC LAW 86-75, SIGNED JUNE 30, 1959

As reported to the House by the Committees on Ways and Means, and as the bill passed the House, it would have provided a 1-year extension, to July 1, 1960, of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain excise-tax rates—the so-called Korean increases, including the increased rates on distilled spirits, beer, wine, cigarettes, passenger automobiles, and automobile parts and accessories. The legislation was designed to implement the request of the administration that these rates be continued for another year.

The Senate, while approving the provisions of the House bill, added several amendments. These included the repeal, as of July 1, 1960, of the excise taxes on communication services, the repeal of the tax on transportation of persons, the repeal of the 4 percent credit against tax presently provided for dividend income, and other amendments relating to the Federal share in certain public assistance programs under the social security law.

Under the conference agreement, and as the bill became law, the bill in addition to providing a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and the excise-tax rates referred to above, provided that the tax on transportation of persons be reduced to 5 percent as of July 1, 1960, and that the tax on general—local—telephone service be repealed as of July 1, 1960.

H.R. 529, BY MR. KARSTEN; PUBLIC LAW 86-429, SIGNED APRIL 22, 1960

This bill, as reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, was designed to give full effect to treaty obligations of the United States to limit exclusively to medical and scientific purposes the manufacture of narcotic drugs and to require that such manufacture be restricted to persons and premises that have been licensed for the purpose. It was also designed to amend the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act to bring the regulations of exports in conformity with current treaty obligations, and to permit the importation and exportation of certain narcotic drugs for scientific research purposes. It established a comprehensive system of licensing and control over the manufacture, distribution, and use of both natural and synthetic narcotic drugs.

The committee received favorable reports on this legislation from the Departments of State and the Treasury, and it had the approval of the pharmaceutical industry. The committee was of the opinion that enactment of this legislation would be of assistance to the agencies charged with administering our narcotic control laws and treaties, and would be beneficial to the citizens of our Nation.

The Senate amended the bill only with respect to certain effective dates, and the House concurred in these amendments.

H.R. 12381, BY MR. MILLS; PUBLIC LAW 86-564, SIGNED JUNE 30, 1960

As reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, this bill contained two titles. Title I provided for a temporary increase, for a period of 1 year, of $8 billion in the statutory debt limit. The permanent debt limitation remained, under the bill, at $285 billion, and the temporary limit was decreased from the existing $295 billion to $293 billion, through June 30, 1961.

The second title of the bill provided for a 1-year continuation, to July 1, 1961, of certain existing tax rates, including the 52 percent corporate income tax rate and the existing rates of excise tax on distilled spirits, beer, wine, cigarettes, passenger cars, automobile parts and accessories, general telephone service, and transportation of persons.

The Senate, in addition to adopting the provisions of the House bill, added a new title III to the bill, containing several sections. Under the conference agreement and as the legislation became law, the bill provided, in addition to the provisions of the House bill, for, first, an investigation and report—as soon as practicable during the 87th Congress—by the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation with respect to the treatment of entertainment and certain other expenses, with recommendations for any changes in the law and administrative practices which in the judgment of the joint committee are necessary or appropriate. This section also provided for a report by the Secretary of the Treasury on the results of the enforcement program of the Internal Revenue Service relating to the deduction as ordinary and necessary business expenses of expenses for entertainment, travel, club dues, et cetera, together with such recommendations as the Secretary considers necessary or appropriate to avoid misuse of the business expense deduction; and, second, amendment to section 613 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, relating to the depletion rate for certain clays and to the treatment processes considered as mining for computing percentage depletion in the case of minerals and ores. A public hearing had previously been held by the Committee on Ways and Means on the legislation proposed by the Secretary of the Treasury relating to this subject.

H.R. 12580, BY MR. MILLS, PUBLIC LAW 86-778, SIGNED SEPTEMBER 13, 1960 (SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1960)

I. OLD-AGE, SURVIVORS, AND DISABILITY INSURANCE PROVISIONS (TITLE II OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT)

A. Disability insurance, removal of age 50 requirement: Disability insurance benefits will be provided for workers under the age of 50, and for their dependents, on the same basis as such benefits are provided for disabled workers aged 50 to 65 and their dependents. Approximately 125,000 disabled persons and 125,000 dependents will qualify for benefits beginning for the month of November 1960.

B. Disability insurance, broadening of the applicability of the trial work period as an incentive to rehabilitation: Provision is made for extending the 12-month period of trial work, during which benefits are continued for all disabled workers who attempt to return to work, rather than limiting this trial work provision only to those who seek to rehabilitate themselves under the former Federal-State vocational rehabilitation plan, as in prior law. If, after 9 months of trial work—not necessarily consecutive—the beneficiary has demonstrated that he is no longer disabled within the meaning of the law, he will receive benefits for an additional 3 months. Any beneficiary—whether or not he has attempted to work—who has been determined to be no longer disabled within the meaning of the law, will be given an additional 3 months of benefits as above. Effective October 1960.

C. Disability insurance, elimination of a second 6-month waiting period before

paying benefits: A disabled worker who regains his ability to work but again becomes disabled within 5 years, will not be required to wait through a second 6-month waiting period before his benefits will be resumed. Under prior law a 6-month waiting period is required before any disability insurance benefits can begin. Effective September 1960.

D. Disability insurance, children who become dependent after worker's disability: Dependents benefits are provided to a child who is born, or who becomes the worker's stepchild, after the worker becomes disabled or who is adopted within 2 years after the worker becomes entitled to disability benefits if the child was living with the worker at the time of disability or if adoption proceedings had been started at that time. The amendment would be effective as if it had been enacted by the 1958 amendments—that is, for months after August 1958, based on applications filed on or after that date. This corrects a technical flaw of the previous law.

E. Disability insurance, alternative insured status requirement: Under existing law an individual must have 20 quarters of coverage out of the last 40 quarters—5 out of 10 years—elapsing before his disability. The amendment would provide an alternative insured status requirement for a few individuals who would have, first, 20 quarters of coverage—at least 6 quarters earned after 1950—at any time; and second, quarters of coverage in all quarters elapsing after 1950 up to the quarter in which be comes disabled. Effective for benefits payable October 1960.

F. Liberalization of requirements for insured status for older people: Some 400,000 individuals not now eligible for benefits can qualify immediately under the amendment which requires only one quarter of coverage—acquired at any time—for every three quarters elapsing after 1950 and up to retirement age, provided they meet the minimum requirement of six quarters of coverage. Present law requires one quarter out of every two quarters. By January 1, 1960, it is estimated that 1 million persons will be added to the rolls as a result of this provision.

The following table shows the number of quarters of coverage required under prior law, and under the law as amended, effective for benefits starting with October 1960:

Year of death, disability, or attainment of retirement age	Required quarters	
	Prior law	1960 amendments
1953 and earlier	6	6
1954	6- 7	6
1955	8- 9	6
1956	10-11	6
1957	12-13	8
1958	14-15	9
1959	16-17	10
1960	18-19	12
1961	20-21	13
1966	30-31	20
1971	40	26
1976	40	33
1981 and after	40	40

G. Earnings limitation—retirement test: The earnings limitation—retirement test—for people receiving social security benefits was revised so that earnings up to $1,200 a year are exempt—as in prior law—but $1 of benefits is deducted for each $2 earned between $1,200 and $1,500 and deductions are on a $1 for $1 basis above $1,500. This change overcomes a feature of former law which, in deducting 1 month's benefit for each $80, or fraction thereof, above $1,200, could result in an actual loss of more money in benefits than he earned over the limit. For example, in the case of a retired worker whose benefit is $100 a month and whose wife is receiving $50 a month: Under former law, if his annual earnings reached $1,210, the $10 in excess of $1,200 cancels the total family benefit of $150 a month. Under the new law, the family would lose just $5 (half of the $10 in excess of $1,200) instead of $150. Effective in calendar 1961 and thereafter.

H. Benefits for survivors of workers who died before 1940: Some 25,000 persons, most of them widows aged 75 and over, will be eligible for benefits as survivors of workers who died prior to 1940 and who had at least 6 quarters of covered work. Effective for October 1960.

I. Increase in children's benefits: About 400,000 children will get some increase in benefits as a result of the increase in the amount of children's benefits to 75 percent of the worker's benefit subject to the family maximum. Former law paid 50 percent of the worker's benefit to each child and divided another 25 percent of the worker's benefit between eligible children, subject to the same family maximum. Effective for December 1960.

J. Removal of family employment exclusion: Service performed after 1960 by parents in the employ of a son or daughter would be covered, other than service not in the course of the employer's trade or business or domestic service in the private home of the employer. Prior law excluded such coverage.

K. Coverage extended to Guam and American Samoa: Coverage is extended to Guam and American Samoa, in addition to present coverage which includes the 50 States, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, and the District of Columbia. Effective for employees on January 1, 1961 and for the self-employed for taxable years after 1960.

L. Extension of time within which present ministers may elect coverage: An estimated 60,000 present ministers can elect coverage under the program as a result of an extension of the period of time for filing a certificate. Generally ministers will have until April 15, 1962, in which to elect coverage.

M. Coverage of U.S. citizens in the employ of foreign governments and international organizations within the United States: Such employees would be covered on a compulsory basis and under the provisions applicable to the self-employed, effective for taxable years ending after 1960. This employment has heretofore not been covered because the United States cannot levy the employer tax of the program upon foreign governments or international organizations. Coverage of these employees, as self-employed, was deemed "a practical solution to the unique problem of covering American citizens employed by such governments and organizations"—House Report No. 1799, 86th Congress, 2d session, page 22.

N. Coverage of employees of State and local governments:

First. Retroactive coverage: Allows State and local agreements entered into after 1959 to take effect as early as the first day of the fifth year before the coverage is agreed to, but not before January 1, 1956.

Second. Adds Texas to the list of States which can take advantage of the so-called split-system provision, which allows a State to divide a retirement system into two divisions, one to be composed of those persons who desire coverage, and the other of persons who do not wish coverage.

Third. Adds Virginia to the list of States which can cover policemen and firemen in positions under State and local retirement systems.

Fourth. Makes certain technical amendments relating to a State's liability for social security employer taxes, statute of limitations, and appeals procedure; also takes care of various coverage and validation of coverage problems in Maine, California, Mississippi, and Nebraska.

O. Employees of nonprofit organizations: Eliminates the requirement of prior law that two-thirds of the employees of a nonprofit organization must consent to coverage before the organization can cover any employees who desire coverage. Under this change a nonprofit organization can, if it so desires, file a certificate electing to provide coverage for all employees hired in the future and those current employees, if any, who wish to be covered. About 100,000 employees of nonprofit organizations not now covered could qualify under this amendment. Effective for certificates filed after September enactment date.

P. Miscellaneous changes affecting benefits of wives, widows, children, husbands, and widowers: Certain dependents and survivors of insured workers would also benefit by provisions included in the amendments which, first, authorize benefits for the spouse of an insured individual even though there was a legal impediment as defined preventing a valid marriage, if he had gone through a marriage ceremony in the belief that it would create a valid marriage and if the couple had been living together at the time; second, reduce from 3 years to 1 year the period required for marriage for a wife, husband, or stepchild of a retired or disabled worker to qualify for benefits; and, third, assure continuation of a child's right to a benefit based on the wage record of his father, which is now voided if a stepfather was supporting him—and living with him—at the time his father died or retired. Effective for September 1960.

Q. Investment of the trust funds: To improve the status of the Federal old-age and survivors insurance and disability insurance trust funds in relation to their long-term commitments, the amendments provide that the interest received on future obligations issued exclusively to the trust funds be related to the average market yield of all marketable obligations of the United States that are not

due or callable for 4 or more years from the time at which the special obligations are issued. Under present law, the interest on special obligations issued for purchase by the trust funds is related to the average coupon rates on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States that are neither due nor callable until after the expiration of 5 years from the date of original issue—thus relating the interest rate to the coupon rate that prevailed at some time in the past. As a result of the formula in prior law, the average interest rate on special obligation issued to the trust funds is now about 2⅝ percent, while the average yield on outstanding marketable obligations is above 4 percent.

R. Advisory Council: The times at which an Advisory Council on Social Security Financing is to study the status of the trust funds would be changed so that an Advisory Council will be appointed in 1963, 1966, and in every fifth year thereafter. The Council appointed during 1963 will study and report on all aspects of the program not just financing. Previous law provided that these councils would be appointed prior to each scheduled increase in the contribution rates.

II. PUBLIC ASSISTANCE AMENDMENTS (NOT RELATED TO MEDICAL CARE) (TITLE I OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT)

A. The amendments provide, at the option of the States until June 30, 1962, and on a mandatory basis thereafter, for the disregarding of additional earned income in determining need for aid-to-the-blind programs. At present, the first $50 per month of earned income is not taken into consideration. Under the amendment, the amount of earned income to be disregarded is increased to the first $85 per month plus one-half of that in excess of $85 per month.

B. The amendments also postpone until June 30, 1964, the termination date of special legislation that provides for the approval of certain State plans for aid to the blind—Missouri and Pennsylvania—that do not meet all the requirements for State plans until title X. This legislation is now scheduled to expire on June 30, 1961.

III. MATERNAL AND CHILD WELFARE PROGRAMS (TITLE V OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT)

A. Increased authorizations: The ceilings on the amounts authorized for annual appropriations were increased to $25 million for each of the three programs under title V of the Social Security Act. They represent an increase from the former amounts of $21,500,000 for maternal and child health services, $20 million for crippled children's services, and $17 million for child welfare services.

B. Grants for special projects of regional or national significance in the field of maternal and child health and crippled children's services: Grants for such special projects to be made directly to institutions of higher learning—as well as State agencies which now receive such grants—are authorized by the amendments.

C. Grants for research or demonstration projects in the field of child welfare: Grants are authorized to public or other nonprofit institutions of higher learning or to public and nonprofit agencies and organizations, for special research or demonstration projects on new methods or facilities which show promise of substantial contribution to the advancement of child welfare services, particularly those on behalf of mentally retarded children.

IV. THE UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION PROGRAM CHANGES

A. Financing: The amendments, first, raise the net Federal unemployment tax—the tax that may not be offset by a credit for taxes paid under a State program—from three-tenths to four-tenths of 1 percent on the first $3,000 of covered wages effective in 1961; second, provide that the proceeds of this higher Federal tax after covering the administrative expenses of the employment security program will be available to build up a larger fund for advances to States whose reserves have been depleted; third, make additional improvements in the arrangements for administrative financing; and, fourth, improve the operation of the Federal unemployment account by tightening the conditions pertaining to eligibility for and repayment of advances.

B. Coverage: The amendments also extend the coverage of the unemployment compensation program to several groups not presently covered, i.e., first, employees of certain instrumentalities of the United States which are neither wholly nor partially owned by the United States, including Federal Reserve banks, Federal credit unions, Federal land banks, and others; second, employees serving on or in connection with American aircraft outside the United States; third, employees of feeder organizations all of whose profits are payable to nonprofit organizations and employees of nonprofit organizations which are not exempt from income tax; and, fourth, certain employees of certain tax-exempt organizations, including agricultural and horticultural organizations, voluntary employee beneficiary associations, and fraternal beneficiary societies.

In addition, the amendments provide that Puerto Rico will be treated as a State for the purposes of the unemployment compensation program.

V. MEDICAL CARE PROVISIONS

The social security amendments of 1960 contain a number of provisions designed to help meet the problems which face persons 65 years of age or older who cannot meet their medical expenses. This would be accomplished by one or the other—or both—of the two approaches described below.

The new legislation, which amends title I of the Social Security Act would first, authorize a new program—medical assistance for the aged—under which the Federal Government would provide funds on a matching basis to the States to assist them, in part, in providing medical assistance for individuals who are not on old-age assistance but whose income and resources are insufficient to meet the costs of necessary medical services, and, second, increase the rate of Federal financial participation in the old-age assistance medical care programs for needy people so as to help improve those programs now operating and to encourage States without such medical programs to undertake them. Federal funds under both approaches would be available to the States for the quarter beginning October 1, 1960.

It should be understood that the new program is for needy individuals who are not on old-age assistance; the other provisions relate to persons who are on old-age assistance.

Participation is optional with a State, and it would be free to participate in either or both programs. Administration of such programs must be under a single State agency.

The historical State-Federal grant-in-aid method of the Social Security Act's public assistance program will be used. Participating States thus have broad latitude in determining eligibility for benefits as well as the scope and nature of medical services to be provided as long as their plans are approved by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare as complying with the requirements of Federal law.

For both programs Federal participation would be restricted to vendor medical payments; that is, payments made by the States directly to the doctor, hospital, et cetera, providing medical services.

A. NEW PROGRAM OF MEDICAL ASSISTANCE FOR THE AGED

First. Eligibility for benefits: States entering the new program must comply with certain provisions of the law relating to eligibility in order to qualify for Federal matching. The State plan must apply to persons aged 65 years of age and over. It must include "reasonable standards, consistent with the objectives of this title, for determining eligibility." The Senate report states:

> Under this program, it will be possible for States to provide medical services to individuals on the basis of an eligibility requirement that is more liberal than that in effect for the States' old-age assistance programs * * *. A State may, if it wishes, disregard in whole or part, the existence of any income or resources, of an individual for medical assistance. An individual who applies for medical assistance may be deemed eligible by the State notwithstanding the fact that he has a child who may be financially able to pay all or part of his care, or that he owns or has an equity in a homestead, or that he has some life insurance with a cash value, or that he is receiving an old-age insurance benefit, annuity, or retirement benefit. The State has wide latitude to establish the standard of need for medical assistance as long as it is a reasonable standard consistent with the objectives of the title * * *. The committee intends that States should set reasonable outer limits on the resources an individual may hold and still be found eligible for medical services (S. Rept. 1856, 86th Cong., 2d sess., pp. 6–7).

A State plan cannot require a premium or enrollment fee as a condition of eligibility. It cannot impose property liens during the lifetime of the individual receiving benefits (except pursuant to court judgment on account of benefits

incorrectly paid), and any recovery provisions under the plan must be limited to the estate of the individual after his death and the death of his surviving spouse.

The State plan must not impose a citizenship requirement which would exclude a citizen of the United States or a requirement which excludes a resident of the State. It must also provide, to the extent required by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, for inclusion of residents of the State who are absent therefrom.

Second. Scope of benefits: The State plan for medical assistance for the aged may specify medical services of any scope and duration, provided that both institutional—hospitals, and so forth—and noninstitutional—outpatient clinics, and so forth—services are included.

The law specifies that the Federal Government will share in the expense of providing any or all of the following kinds of medical services: First, inpatient hospital services; second, skilled nursing home services; third, physicians' services; fourth, outpatient hospital or clinic services; fifth, home health care services; sixth, private duty nursing services; seventh, physical therapy and related services; eighth, dental services; ninth, laboratory and X-ray services; tenth, prescribed drugs, eyeglasses, dentures, and prosthetic devices; eleventh, diagnostic, screening, and preventive services; and, twelfth, any other medical care or remedial care recognized under State law.

The Senate report states that "a State may, if it wishes, include medical services provided by osteopaths, chiropractors, and optometrists, and remedial services provided by Christian Science practitioners"—Senate report, page 7.

The Federal Government, as in the case of presently established public assistance programs, would not participate in respect to medical services furnished to an inmate in a nonmedical public institution, or to patients in mental or tuberculosis hospitals. However, included for purposes of Federal matching, will be the services, for his first 42 days of care, to a patient in a medical institution—other than a tuberculosis or mental institution—as a result of a diagnosis of tuberculosis or psychosis.

Third. Federal sharing: The Federal Government will share in the total expenditures made by the State. The Federal share as to vendor medical payments will be determined periodically by the relationship between the per capita income in the State as compared to the national per capita income and will range from 50 to 80 percent depending on such income. States at or above the national per capita income will receive a 50-percent Federal share, as will Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands. Under the most recent computation the Federal share, State by State, will be as follows:

[In percent]

Alabama	79.15
Alaska	50.00
Arizona	63.23
Arkansas	80.00
California	50.00
Colorado	53.42
Connecticut	50.00
Delaware	50.00
District of Columbia	50.00
Florida	59.68
Georgia	74.36
Guam	50.00
Hawaii	53.38
Idaho	67.04
Illinois	50.00
Indiana	50.00
Iowa	63.23
Kansas	60.78
Kentucky	76.94
Louisiana	72.00
Maine	65.23
Maryland	50.00
Massachusetts	50.00
Michigan	50.00
Minnesota	58.57
Mississippi	80.00
Missouri	53.42
Montana	54.07
Nebraska	63.41
Nevada	50.00
New Hampshire	57.91
New Jersey	50.00
New Mexico	67.99
New York	50.00
North Carolina	77.46
North Dakota	74.18
Ohio	50.00
Oklahoma	67.54
Oregon	52.58
Pennsylvania	50.00
Puerto Rico	50.00
Rhode Island	50.00
South Carolina	80.00
South Dakota	75.42
Tennessee	76.55
Texas	61.36
Utah	65.00
Vermont	65.82
Virgin Islands	50.00
Virginia	65.44
Washington	50.00
West Virginia	72.69
Wisconsin	54.60
Wyoming	50.92

As in the present public assistance programs the Federal Government will share in administrative expenses on a dollar-for-dollar basis.

Fourth. Costs: The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has estimated that the first-year costs of the program will amount to $60 million in Federal funds and $56 million in State and local funds. It is also estimated that the Federal cost may be $165 million in a full year of operation after the States have had opportunity to develop these programs—and this figure could be somewhat higher if all States had relatively well-developed and comprehensive plans—see pages 7 and 8 for State-by-State breakdown.

B. OLD-AGE ASSISTANCE MEDICAL PROGRAMS

At the present time, under the provisions of the Social Security Act relating to old-age assistance—title I—the States are authorized to make vendor payments to providers of medical services on behalf of persons receiving old-age assistance payments. These State programs vary greatly. It is understood that some States make relatively adequate provisions for the medical care of needy aged persons; others make little or no provision. The new legislation provides for increased Federal participation as to a specified amount of vendor payments for medical services so as to help improve those programs now operating and to encourage States without such programs to undertake them.

First. Increased Federal matching: Under previous law, the maximum amount within which the Federal Government would match for a combined program of money and medical vendor payments was $65 a month times the number of people on the old-age assistance rolls.

The amendments provide for Federal financial participation exclusively in expenditures to vendors of medical services up to $12 per month in addition to the $65 maximum provision.

For States with average monthly payments over $65, the ceiling can thus be increased to $77 if the $12 earmarked for medical vendor payments is added on top of the existing $65 maximum. The Federal share in the excess expenditures for medical care will range from 50 percent to 80 percent under the formula based on per capita income. Based on May 1960 benefit payments, the following States would be affected and will receive the percentages noted:

[In percent]

California	50.00
Colorado	53.42
Connecticut	50.00
Idaho	67.04
Illinois	50.00
Iowa	63.23
Kansas	60.78
Louisiana	72.00
Maine	65.23
Massachusetts	50.00
Michigan	50.00
Minnesota	58.57
Nebraska	63.41
Nevada	50.00
New Hampshire	57.91
New Jersey	50.00
New Mexico	67.99
New York	50.00
North Dakota	74.18
Ohio	50.00
Oklahoma	67.54
Oregon	52.58
Pennsylvania	50.00
Rhode Island	50.00
Utah	65.00
Washington	50.00
Wisconsin	54.60
Wyoming	50.92

For States with average monthly old-age-assistance payments of $65 or less the Federal share in average vendor medical payments up to $12 will be an additional 15 percentage points over the Federal percentage applicable to the amount of payments falling between $30 and $65, which now ranges from 50 to 65 percent on the basis of a State's per capita income. This percentage, when added to the Federal percentage for the second part of the formula for payments, will give a total Federal share of from 65 to 80 percent. Based on May 1960 benefit payments, the following States will be affected and will receive the percentages noted:

[In percent]

Alabama	80.00
Alaska	65.00
Arizona	78.23
Arkansas	80.00
Delaware	65.00
District of Columbia	65.00
Florida	74.68
Georgia	80.00
Guam	65.00
Hawaii	68.38
Indiana	65.00
Kentucky	80.00

[In percent]

Maryland	65.00
Mississippi	80.00
Missouri	68.42
Montana	69.07
North Carolina	80.00
Puerto Rico	65.00
South Carolina	80.00
South Dakota	80.00
Tennessee	80.00
Texas	76.36
Vermont	80.00
Virgin Islands	65.00
Virginia	80.00
West Virginia	80.00

Provision is also made so that a State with an average payment of over $65 a month would never receive less in additional Federal funds in respect to such medical service costs than if it had an average payment of $65.

As to Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands, their additional matching for vendor medical expenditures will be on an amount up to an additional $6 per month per recipient rather than the additional $12 a month for the States and the District of Columbia. This was done because their matching maximum for old-age assistance is an average of $35 a month per recipient in contrast to $65 for the States. Under existing law there are also overall dollar maximums applicable to Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands for the public assistance programs. These are increased proportionately on condition that the additional increases are used for vendor medical expenditures under old-age assistance.

Second. Costs: The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has estimated that the increase in old-age assistance medical programs will result in an additional cost of $142 million to the Federal Government and $4 million to the States and localities in the first year. In the long run the additional Federal cost has been estimated at about $175 million a year—see pages 7 and 8 for State-by-State breakdown.

C. MEDICAL GUIDES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

As recommended by the Advisory Council on Public Assistance, appointed pursuant to the Social Security Amendments of 1958, the law instructs the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to develop guides or recommended standards for the information of the States as to the level, content, and quality of medical care for the public assistance medical programs. He will also prepare such guides and standards for use in the new State programs of medical assistance for the medically needy aged.

In addition to the major bills discussed above, there were a number of less comprehensive but nonetheless important bills reported by the Committee on Ways and Means which became public law during the 86th Congress, which are summarized below, grouped as to the subject with which each deals—that is, taxes, social security, customs and tariff, and so forth.

TAX LEGISLATION ENACTED INTO LAW

H.R. 47, BY MR. BOGGS; PUBLIC LAW 86-376, SIGNED SEPTEMBER 23, 1959

As reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, this bill provided that, with respect to the $600 dependency exemption for income tax purposes, a child placed with the taxpayer by an authorized placement agency for legal adoption by him shall be treated in the same manner as a natural born child and a legally adopted child, if the child is a member of the individual's household.

The Senate, in addition to approving the provision of the House bill, added two basic amendments, both relating to the tax treatment of small business. The first, making changes in the statute relating to the election of certain small business corporations as to their taxable status, first, amends section 1371 of the Internal Revenue Code to provide that in determining the number of shareholders of a small business corporation, a husband and wife owning stock jointly or as community property shall be counted as only one shareholder; second, amends section 1374 of the code to make clear that a deceased shareholder will not be denied his pro rata share of a small business corporation's net operating loss; and, third, strikes out paragraph (8) of section 1504(b)—relating to the definition of "includible corporation"—of the code, thereby clarifying the definition of a small business corporation. The Senate Finance Committee report indicates that this paragraph of the code actually operates to have an effect just reverse of its original intent, which was to prevent an electing small business corporation from having an 80-percent-owned subsidiary.

The second Senate amendment amended section 542(c) of the code to exempt small business investment companies from the personal holding company tax. This amendment had been requested by the Small Business Administration in an Executive communication which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

The House agreed to the Senate amendments to this legislation, and the bill became law in that form.

H.R. 135, BY MR. KEOGH; PUBLIC LAW 86-437, SIGNED APRIL 22, 1960

This legislation provided for the exclusion from U.S. tax of the portion of amounts paid to nonresident alien individuals by the United States as civil service annuities and other retirement benefits for services performed abroad as employees of the United States. Nonresident aliens working for an American Embassy or other Government agency abroad are not subject to U.S. tax on salaries paid by the United States; similarly, amounts set aside by the Government for the future retirement of nonresident aliens working abroad are free of tax. However, prior to the enactment of H.R. 135, to the extent such annuities represented earnings on the amounts set aside by the Government, such payments were taxable. The Committee on Ways and Means was advised by the Department of State that nonresident alien employees consider their pensions to be deferred compensation, and that since their earned income is tax free, they expect their pensions also to be tax free. The committee was further informed that the imposition of this tax has caused severe hardships and has engendered resentment against the United States, and that this tax treatment has been objected to by many foreign governments, some of which have repeatedly protested its imposition.

Due to the passage of time between House and Senate action on the bill, the Senate amended the effective date provisions to make the exclusion applicable for taxable years beginning after December 30, 1959. The House accepted this amendment, and in this form the bill became public law.

H.R. 137 BY MR. KEOGH; PUBLIC LAW 86-175, SIGNED AUGUST 21, 1959

This bill prevents a pyramiding of Federal estate taxes where foreign death taxes are imposed on charitable bequests. This is accomplished by allowing a deduction for estate tax purposes for foreign death taxes—as provided under present law for State death taxes—imposed—and paid—on charitable bequests if, first, the property on which the tax is imposed is situated in the foreign country and included in the gross estate of a citizen or resident of the United States; and, second, if the decrease in tax resulting from the deduction is to go to charities—or the entire Federal estate tax is to be equitably apportioned among all of the transferees of the estate. Where this deduction is allowed, no credit against the estate tax is to be available for the foreign taxes which are deducted.

As reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, and as the bill passed the House, this provision would have been effective with respect to the estates of decedents dying after the date of enactment of the bill. The Senate, however, amended the bill to provide an effective date of July 1, 1955; that is, to apply to the estates of decedents dying on or after that date.

The Senate amendment was accepted by the House.

H.R. 147, BY MR. KEOGH; PUBLIC LAW 86-37, SIGNED MAY 29, 1959

This bill, which was enacted into law without amendment, suspended through June 30, 1960, the 3-cent-per-pound tax imposed on the first domestic processing of palm oil, palm-kernel oil, and fatty acids or salts derived therefrom. This action was taken in order to place these oils on a competitive parity with coconut and babassu oils, which are used for the same general purposes. The tax on the first domestic processing of coconut oil was suspended to June 30, 1960, by the provisions of a Senate amendment to H.R. 2842 of the 85th Congress, which the House accepted and which became part of Public Law 85-235; no processing tax is imposed on babassu oil. The resulting situation, therefore, placed palm and palm-kernel oils at a competitive disadvantage, and this legislation was designed to restore the competitive balance.

H.R. 1219, BY MR. BENTLEY; PUBLIC LAW 86-141, SIGNED AUGUST 7, 1959

This bill added a provision to the 1954 code relating to persons who have been mentally incompetent for a period beginning at least 3 months prior to December 31, 1947, and who remain so until

the date of their death. The bill provided that any powers such persons have at the date of their death to change beneficiaries of a trust they created—of the type referred to in section 1000(e) of the 1939 code—are not to result in such property being included in their gross estate for estate tax purposes. This provision is the same as a 1939 code provision — section 811(d)(4) — which was applicable with respect to decedents dying after December 31, 1947, and on or before August 16, 1954.

The provision added to the 1954 code by this bill is to apply with respect to estates of decedents dying after August 16, 1954. Thus, as a result of this bill, and previous actions, the exception for mentally incompetent will apply to all years from 1947 forward, so long as the decedent involved is mentally incompetent from October 1, 1947, to the date of his death.

The bill, which became law without amendment, contained a provision that no interest is to be allowed or paid on any overpayment resulting from its enactment with respect to payments made before the date of enactment.

H.R. 2164, BY MR. FORAND; PUBLIC LAW 86–422, SIGNED APRIL 8, 1960

This bill, which became law in the form reported by the Committee on Ways and Means to the House, provided for the reduction from 20 to 10 percent of the tax imposed with respect to roof gardens, cabarets, and similar establishments. The committee stated in its report on the bill that this action was taken for two principal reasons: First, the existing 20-percent rate was discriminatory in that the rates of almost all other ad valorem excise taxes do not exceed 10 percent; and second, it was believed that the high rate of this tax constituted a substantial deterrent to the employment of musicians and other entertainers.

H.R. 2906, BY MR. M'CORMACK; PUBLIC LAW 86–280, SIGNED SEPTEMBER 16, 1959

As reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, this bill provided that the period of limitations for filing a claim for credit or refund for an overpayment of taxes, to the extent attributable to a creation of or an increase in a net operating loss carryback resulting from the elimination of excessive profits by renegotiation, is not to expire before September 1, 1959, or the end of 1 year after the month in which the agreement or order for the elimination of the excessive profits becomes final, whichever is later. The bill amends both the 1939 and 1954 codes, and applies to all 1954 code years and, with respect to the 1939 code, to claims for taxable years ending after December 31, 1952. While the special period provided under the law where net operating loss carrybacks are involved generally provided adequate time for the filing of a claim for credit or refund, the committee's attention was called to a type of case where this was not true and where the taxpayer may not be in a position to know that he is eligible for a credit or refund before the expiration of the period of limitations. This placed the Government in the position in such cases of taking money away from a taxpayer, on one hand, and yet on the other hand denying him the opportunity to obtain a credit or refund where this decreases his tax liability. This legislation was intended to rectify this situation.

The Senate approved the provision of the House bill, and added an amendment directing the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate to allow credit or refund to Dexter Phillips and Jeannette H. Phillips of an income tax overpayment for the calendar year 1951, to the extent such overpayment was attributable to the erroneous inclusion in their gross income for such year of the amount received by Dexter Phillips in final distribution of his grandfather's estate.

After conference agreement to the Senate-passed bill, the bill became law in that form.

H.R. 4251, BY MR. BAKER; PUBLIC LAW 86–594, SIGNED JULY 6, 1960

The effect of this legislation, which became public law as amended and reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, was to remove from law the 4-year limitation relating to the allowable deduction for income tax purposes for exploration expenditures made to determine the presence, location, quantity, or quality of any deposit of ore or other mineral. This provision does not apply in the case of oil and gas wells. Under the previously existing law, the maximum deduction which might be taken for any year was $100,000, for no more than 4 years—whether or not consecutive—with respect to all property held by a taxpayer. H.R. 4251 removed the 4-year limitation, and substituted an overall limitation of $400,000; the maximum limitation of $100,000 in any one year is retained.

The committee was advised that the 4-year limitation tended to discriminate against small producers, in that a large producer could obtain the full benefit of these deductions by claiming $100,000 in each of 4 years, but a small producer whose annual exploration expenditures are not as high as $100,000 would have the deductions available to him reduced below $400,000 because of the 4-year limitation. Under the new law, a taxpayer will still not be able to claim exploration expenditure deductions with respect to any year in excess of $100,000, but if his expenditures on a yearly basis are less than $100,000, he will be able to claim such deductions over more than a 4-year period so long as the total deductions claimed are not in excess of $400,000.

H.R. 4586, BY MR. FORAND; PUBLIC LAW 86–413, SIGNED APRIL 8, 1960

The purpose of this bill, which became law without amendment, was to exempt aromatic cachous from the excise tax on toilet preparations. The committee was of the opinion that aromatic cachous—which are aromatic pellets, such as Sen Sen, which are chewed for the purpose of sweetening the breath—should not be subject to tax as toilet preparations since they are more nearly like mouthwashes and candied mints than like the externally applied toilet preparations which comprise the other articles subject to that tax.

H.R. 4857, BY MR. HAGEN; PUBLIC LAW 86–319, SIGNED SEPTEMBER 21, 1960

As reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, this bill amended two of the exemptions from the admissions tax to provide that in determining whether an athletic game is played between students from elementary or secondary schools, or colleges, where the proceeds inure to a hospital for crippled children, or an exempt organization operated exclusively for the benefit of retarded children, the term "student" is to include anyone who was a student at the school or college within the 8 months immediately before the athletic game. This makes the exemption available for all-star and other similar benefit games even though the game is played shortly after the end of the school or college year. The bill was favored by the Treasury Department, and became public law in the form reported by the committee.

H.R. 5547, BY MR. MILLS; REPORTED TO HOUSE AUGUST 19, 1959

See Public Law 86–779, H.R. 10960.

H.R. 5751, BY MR. MACHROWICZ; REPORTED TO HOUSE AUGUST 18, 1959

See Public Law 86–342, H.R. 8678, title II.

H.R. 6132, BY MR. MILLS; PUBLIC LAW 86–416, SIGNED APRIL 8, 1960

This bill, which became public law without amendment, amended the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the rate of tax on the issuance of shares of certificates of stock by regulated investment companies.

Under the law the documentary stamp tax on original issues of stock is levied at the rate of 10 cents per $100 of actual value. The documentary stamp tax on stock transfers, on the other hand, is levied at the rate of 4 cents per $100 of actual value.

Regulated investment companies which operate as open-end mutual investment companies, however, do not usually provide for the trading of their securities. Instead they issue new securities to those desiring to buy their stock, and redeem the stock of those desiring to sell. As a result, in the absence of this legislation, they must pay a 10-cents-per-$100 issuance tax on transactions which to others would result in a transfer tax of 4 cents per $100 of actual value.

The new law provides that the issuance tax in the case of qualifying regulated investment companies is to be imposed at the rate of 4 cents per $100 of actual value, rather than the 10-cent rate otherwise applicable.

H.R. 6155, BY MR. BETTS; PUBLIC LAW 86–428, SIGNED APRIL 22, 1960

As amended and reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, this bill amended the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from taxation certain nonprofit corporations or associations organized after August 31, 1951, by moving forward from September 1, 1951, to September 1, 1957, the date before which certain mutual deposit guarantee funds must be organized in order to qualify for income tax exemption. The other requirements for the exemption, which are left unchanged by this bill, provide

that the organizations must be mutual, nonprofit organizations without capital stock and operated to provide reserves and insurance for building and loan associations, cooperative banks, or mutual savings banks.

Three of the four presently existing mutual deposit guarantee funds were organized before September 1, 1951, and therefore presently qualify for exemption. A fourth such organization organized after that date but before September 1, 1957, will qualify for exemption under this bill. These organizations perform essentially the same type of services as the FDIC and FSLIC, Federal corporations which are exempt from income taxation.

A Senate amendment, which was accepted by the House, changed the effective date of the legislation and the bill became law effective with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1959.

H.R. 6785, BY MR. FRAZIER; PUBLIC LAW 86–440, SIGNED APRIL 22, 1960

The purpose of the bill, as reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, was to amend section 4071 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, so as to provide a tax of 1 cent a pound in the case of the sale of laminated tires not of the type used on highway vehicles if the tires consist wholly of scrap rubber from used tire casings and have an internal metal fastening agent. This is in lieu of the 5-cents-a-pound tax which otherwise would apply. Such tires are used for off-highway purposes, primarily on lifts, cranes, payloaders, weed cutters, and similar types of industrial and farm equipment. The committee was advised that there are relatively few known manufacturers of laminated tires, and it is believed that any revenue loss from enactment of this legislation will be negligible. The bill became law in the form reported by the committee, except for a Senate amendment to correct a typographical error in the bill.

H.R. 7588, BY MR. KEOGH; PUBLIC LAW 86–435, SIGNED APRIL 22, 1960

As reported to and passed by the House, this bill amended the Internal Revenue Code to provide that personal holding company income is not to include income from copyright royalties. Certain conditions were specified to preclude the abuse of this amendment.

The personal holding company tax was developed to provent the establishment of a corporation to be used as a corporate pocketbook in handling investment income. It has been brought to the committee's attention that existing law does in fact characterize as a personal holding company an organization that is actually an operating company. This problem existed in the case of music publishing companies, which presently get most of their income from royalties on record sales where previously the principal income came from sheet music sales, and this bill was designed to prevent the personal holding company tax from applying to the operating income of such companies. The Senate amended the House bill so as to prevent a possible unintended effect of the House bill as treating certain motion picture and TV film and tape rentals as personal holding company income, and by moving the effective date forward from 1959 to 1960. These amendments were accepted by the House, and the Senate-passed version of the bill became public law.

H.R. 7885, BY MR. FRAZIER; REPORTED TO HOUSE MAY 26, 1960

See Public Law 86–779, H.R. 10960.

H.R. 8229, BY MR. KNOX; PUBLIC LAW 86–667, SIGNED JULY 14, 1960

The purpose of this legislation was to provide a new exempt category for income tax purposes in the case of trusts providing for the payment of supplemental unemployment compensation benefits. Under the new law, the trusts may make supplemental unemployment benefit payments and they may also make such payments together with sick or accident payments, but they may not make any retirement or death benefit payments.

The new exempt category differs from the category, already existing in law, under which some of the trusts could obtain exemption, in that the new provision does not require the SUB trusts to obtain at least 85 percent of their income from employers or employees and not from investment income.

The so-called nondiscriminatory provisions of the Internal Revenue Code applying to qualified pension, profit-sharing, and stock bonus plans are applicable to trusts qualifying under the new exemption category. In addition, the "prohibited transaction" provisions, and the "unrelated business income" provisions—including the business lease provisions—of the Internal Revenue Code are also applicable to the new exemption category.

In general, the new law applies to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1959.

H.R. 8273, BY MR. WALTER; REPORTED TO HOUSE MARCH 28, 1960

See Public Law 86–779, H.R. 10960.

H.R. 8318, BY MR. KEOGH; PUBLIC LAW 86–418, SIGNED APRIL 8, 1960

The purpose of this bill, which became public law as amended and reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, was to exempt from the manufacturers' excise tax on tires and tubes bicycle tires and tubes sold for use, or used, in the manufacture of new bicycles. The taxes will continue to apply to tires and tubes sold, or used, as replacements.

Bicycle tires are subject to the 5-cents-a-pound manufacturers' tax on tires, and bicycle inner tubes are subject to the 9-cents-a-pound manufacturers' tax on inner tubes. This is true both of tires and tubes manufactured in the United States and those imported. These excise taxes do not apply, however, to tires and tubes already mounted on bicycles when the latter are imported into the United States. This legislation was designed to equalize the situation between imported bicycles and domestically manufactured bicycles.

H.R. 8649, BY MR. KING OF CALIFORNIA; PUBLIC LAW 86–432, SIGNED APRIL 22, 1960

This legislation, which became law as amended and reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, continued through June 30, 1963, the suspension of the 3-cents-per-pound processing tax imposed on the first domestic processing of coconut oil, palm oil, palm-kernel oil, and fatty acids, salts, combinations, or mixtures thereof.

The committee was of the opinion that experience under the existing suspensions of tax on the first domestic processing of these oils had been such as to warrant their extension.

H.R. 8684, BY MR. IKARD; PUBLIC LAW 86–459, SIGNED MAY 13, 1960

This legislation pertains to the timing of reporting for tax purposes with respect to dealer reserves and provides transitional rules to bring the reporting of dealer reserve income into conformity with proper accounting methods. As amended by the Committee on Ways and Means and reported to the House, two alternative methods were provided for payment of tax due on such income not previously reported. First, it provided that such amounts can be treated as required changes in methods of accounting. In general this means that the reserves built up prior to 1954 need not be reported for tax purposes, and that only the excess of the current balance over the 1954 balance in the reserve is to be reported. A second alternative provided permits the computation of the deficiencies—or overassessments—which would arise if the income had been reported in the proper years, and then the sum of these amounts—plus interest up to the time of selecting this alternative—to be paid in 10 annual installments, generally beginning in 1961.

The committee agreed that dealer reserve income should be reported on a proper accrual accounting basis; however, it was believed that a hardship would be created by requiring all dealers to make the transition to this method of reporting this income in 1 year, following recent Supreme Court decisions in this matter, especially in view of the numerous circuit court decisions going to the contrary of these Supreme Court decisions, which many dealers had previously been following.

The Senate accepted the substance of the House bill with a number of amendments, which, although some were substantive in character, were for the most part qualifying or relatively technical amendments. Under the conference agreement, the House bill was amended to make it applicable to taxpayers with respect to taxable years that were open on June 21, 1959—the day immediately following the pertinent Supreme Court decision—and to extend to September 1, 1960, the date for making the election to take advantage of the bill. The bill was made applicable to taxpayers who are required to use the accrual method of accounting even though the original return may have been on some other method, and it was further amended to make it somewhat easier for taxpayers to qualify for the installment payment

privilege. The definition of dealers reserves was expanded to accommodate certain cases where the finance company participates from the beginning of the sales transaction by advancing money to the customer. With these amendments agreed upon by the conference committee, the substance of the House bill became public law.

H.R. 9660, BY MR. MILLS; PUBLIC LAW 86-470, SIGNED MAY 14, 1960

As reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, this bill related to the procedure for assessing certain additions to tax. Additions to the tax shown on the return by reason of late filing of income tax returns have since 1926 been assessed without the issuance of a statutory notice of deficiency—commonly known as a 90-day letter. Similarly, the Internal Revenue Service has assessed additions to tax for underpayment of estimated tax without issuing a 90-day letter. Recent court decisions, however, have held that a 90-day letter must be issued before assessment of such additions to tax. The Committee on Ways and Means was of the opinion that immediate enactment of clarifying legislation was necessary to the orderly administration of the internal revenue laws. The bill provided that additions to tax because of: first, late filing of income, estate, and gift tax returns; and, second, underpayment of estimated income tax are to be assessed and collected without the issuance of a 90-day letter. The bill further provided that additions so assessed and collected before enactment of this legislation may not be recovered where the sole basis of the claim is that the assessment was made before the issuance of a 90-day letter.

The provisions of the House bill were approved by the Senate, but that body added two new provisions to the bill—one of which was deleted in conference. Under the conference agreement, which was accepted by both Houses and reflects the bill as it became public law, the House bill was amended by the addition of a section providing that the 3-percent floor in existing law relating to the deduction of medical, dental, and so forth, expenses be removed in the case of medical and dental expenses incurred by the taxpayer for the care of his dependent mother or father, or the dependent mother or father of his spouse, if such mother or father has attained the age of 65 before the close of the taxable year.

H.R. 10087, BY MR. MACHROWICZ; PUBLIC LAW 86-780, SIGNED SEPTEMBER 14, 1960

As reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, this bill would have amended section 604 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit a taxpayer earning foreign source income to elect the overall limitation on the foreign tax credit instead of the present per-country limitation, provided that once an election is made it must continue for 5 years. The carryback and carryforward provisions would have been made applicable from per-country limitation to overall limitation years, but not vice versa. The Senate Finance Committee amended the bill to permit an initial election to the overall limitation at any time, but any subsequent change would require consent of the Treasury Department. The second amendment limited carryback or carryforward from a year in which the per-country limitation applies to another year in which the per-country limitation applies, or from a year in which the overall limitation applies to another year in which the same limitation applies. A third amendment provided that to the extent foreign taxes are above those imposed by the United States because of the special 14 point tax differential provided by the United States for Western Hemisphere trade corporations, they cannot be used to offset U.S. taxes at a 52 percent rate on income earned in countries where the foreign taxes involved are less than those imposed by the United States.

In the Senate, amendments were added relating to exclusion from gross income of reimbursed moving expenses for certain employees of corporations operating on Atomic Energy Commission contracts. Amendments were also adopted requiring the filing of information returns with respect to foreign corporations controlled by domestic corporations and also with respect to the filing of returns by certain U.S. citizens with respect to foreign corporate organizations and reorganizations. The conference committee adopted the Senate amendments with changes in two cases. In the case of an affiliated group including a Western Hemisphere trade corporation, the excess credit is allowed with respect to income earned by non-Western Hemisphere trade corporations in countries in which the Western Hemisphere trade corporations operate, but only if the income is from regulated public utilities. The Senate amendment requiring the filing of information returns by domestic corporations controlling any foreign corporations was changed with respect to the type of information required and with respect to the penalty for failure to comply.

H.R. 10960, BY MR. HERLONG; PUBLIC LAW 86-779, SIGNED SEPTEMBER 14, 1960

As reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, this bill related to the excise tax on cigars, and provided for the exclusion of any State or local taxes imposed on cigars from price in determining the retail price for the purpose of establishing the rate of Federal excise tax. The Senate approved the provisions of the House bill, but amended the bill substantially by the addition of numerous provisions not related to the provisions of the House-passed bill. Under the conference agreement and as the legislation became law, the bill included, in addition to the provisions of the original House-passed bill, the following:

First. An amendment, similar in substance to H.R. 12036—which passed the House on August 24, 1960—to section 243 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 providing that the 85-percent intercorporate dividends received deduction is to apply with respect to dividends paid by a foreign corporation out of its earnings and profits if such earnings and profits were accumulated by a predecessor domestic corporation which was subject to the income tax under chapter 1 of the 1954 code—or corresponding provisions of prior law.

Second. Provisions generally similar to H.R. 5547—which passed the House on September 9, 1959—relating to limitation on reduction in income tax liability incurred to the Virgin Islands and to the estate and gift tax treatment of certain citizen residents of possessions. Under this amendment, it is provided—with 2 exceptions—that tax liability incurred to the Virgin Islands pursuant to the income tax provisions equivalent to those of the United States, as made applicable in the Virgin Islands by the Naval Appropriations Act, approved July 12, 1921, or pursuant to section 28(a) of the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands, is not to be reduced or remitted in any way, directly or indirectly, whether by grant, subsidy, or other similar payment, by any law enacted in the Virgin Islands.

The first exception relates to United States and Virgin Islands corporations and, in general, provides that subsidies can be paid to these corporations under much the same conditions as those under which income tax exemptions are presently available in the case of U.S. corporations carrying on a trade or business in most other U.S. possessions. The second exception relates to citizens of the United States who are bona fide residents of the Virgin Islands and permits the granting of subsidies in much the same manner as bona fide residents of Puerto Rico may claim an exemption from U.S. income tax with respect to their income derived from sources within Puerto Rico. With respect to this second exception, gain or loss from the sale or exchange of any security—as defined in section 165(g)(2) of the code—shall not be treated as derived from sources within the Virgin Islands. The amendment provides, in effect, that U.S. citizens who are residents of a possession, and whose citizenship is derived from citizenship of that possession, are to be subject to the estate and gift tax imposed by the United States, in general, to the same extent as in the case of nonresidents not citizens of the United States.

Third. An amendment to section 6015 (a) of the 1954 Code, relating to the declaration of estimated income tax by individuals, which (a) provides that no declaration is to be required if the estimated tax can reasonably be expected to be less than $40, (b) eliminates the gross income test of $400 plus $600 times the number of exemptions, and (c) increases from $100 to $200 the minimum gross income which can reasonably be expected to be received from sources other than wages without becoming liable to file a declaration.

Fourth. The addition of a new section 180 to the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 providing that a taxpayer engaged in the business of farming may elect to treat as expenses which are not chargeable to capital account expenditures—otherwise chargeable to capital account—which are paid or incurred by him during the taxable year for the purchase or acquisition of fertilizer, lime, ground limestone, marl,

or other materials to enrich, neutralize, or condition land used in farming, or for the application of such materials to such land. The expenditures so treated are to be allowed as a deduction. For this purpose, "land used in farming" means land used—before or simultaneously with the expenditures described in the preceding sentence—by the taxpayer or his tenant for the production of crops, fruits, or other agricultural products or for the sustenance of livestock.

Fifth. An amendment to section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 having the effect of permitting the deduction, as a charitable contribution, of amounts paid by a taxpayer to maintain an individual—other than a dependent or a relative—as a member of his household during the period that the individual is a full-time student in the 12th or any lower grade at an educational institution located in the United States and is a member of the taxpayer's household under a written agreement between the taxpayer and an organization described in paragraph (2), (3), or (4) of section 170(c) of the 1954 code—that is, religious, charitable, scientific, literary, educational, veterans, fraternal, and so forth, organizations—to implement a program of the organization to provide educational opportunities for students in private homes. The deduction is limited, for each taxable year, to an amount equal to $50 times the number of calendar months during the taxable year which fall within the period in which the student is a member of the taxpayer's household under the agreement described above, and will not apply to any amount paid by the taxpayer within the taxable year if the taxpayer receives any money or other property as compensation or reimbursement for maintaining the student in his household during such period.

Sixth. Provisions, the same in substance as H.R. 7885—which passed the House on June 27, 1960—relating to capital contributions to the Federal National Mortgage Association. Section 162 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended to provide that, for purposes of subtitle A of the 1954 code, whenever the amount of capital contributions evidenced by a share of stock issued pursuant to section 303(c) of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act exceeds the fair market value of the stock as of the issue date of such stock, the initial holder of the stock is to treat the excess as ordinary and necessary expenses paid or incurred during the taxable year in carrying on a trade or business. A new section is added to the 1954 code relating to special rules as to the basis of property. The new section 1054 provides that, in the case of any share of stock described above, the basis of such share in the hands of the initial holder is to be an amount equal to the capital contributions evidenced by such share, reduced by the amount—if any—required by the new section 162(d) to be treated—with respect to such share—as ordinary and necessary expenses paid or incurred in carrying on a trade or business. This amendment applies with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1959.

Seventh. An amendment relating to the excise tax on mechanical lighters for cigarettes, cigars, and pipes which is somewhat similar to H.R. 8273, which was reported to the House on March 28, 1960. The amendment provides that the tax on the sale by the manufacturer, producer, or importer of such mechanical lighters is to be 10 cents for each lighter sold, but not more than 10 percent of the price for which so sold.

Eighth. An amendment to the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 similar in substance to H.R. 12559, which passed the House on June 29, 1960, providing substantially the same tax treatment for real-estate investment trusts as provided under existing law for regulated investment companies; that is, in general, where 90 percent or more of the ordinary income is distributed, the real-estate investment trusts will be taxed only on retained earnings—thus, the distributed earnings will be taxed only to the shareholders.

Ninth. An amendment providing that the pension fund, Plumbers Local Union No. 775, shall be deemed to constitute a qualified trust and to be exempt from tax for the period beginning May 1, 1957, and ending May 11, 1959, but only if it is shown to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate that the trust has not in this period been operated in a manner which would jeopardize the interests of its beneficiaries.

H.R. 11405, BY MR. HERLONG; PUBLIC LAW 86496, SIGNED JUNE 8, 1960

This bill, which became public law as amended and reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, made two changes in the existing law, both of which related to the continuation of provisions which had previously been in effect.

First. Existing law provided that the discharge of indebtedness of a railroad corporation in a taxable year beginning before January 1, 1958, is not to result in taxable income for the railroad if the discharge occurred as the result of a court order in a receivership proceeding, or in a proceeding under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act. H.R. 11405 continued the application of this provision to discharges after December 31, 1959, but only if the court proceeding involved commenced before January 1, 1960.

Second. Congress in the Technical Amendments Act of 1958 provided that a deduction for accrued vacation pay is not to be denied for any taxable year ending before January 1, 1961, solely because the liability for it to a specific person has not been fixed or because the liability for it to each individual cannot be computed with reasonable accuracy. However, for the corporation to obtain the deduction the employee must have performed the qualifying service necessary under a plan or policy which provides for vacations with pay to qualified employees. This legislation extended the same treatment to deductions for taxable years ending before January 1, 1963.

H.R. 12036, BY MR. BOSCH; REPORTED TO HOUSE AUGUST 15, 1960

See Public Law 86-779, H.R. 10960.

H.R. 12536, BY MR. MILLS; PUBLIC LAW 86-781, SIGNED SEPTEMBER 14, 1960

As reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, this bill related to the manner of determining the manufacturers'—or producers' or importers'—sales price, which is the base on which various manufacturers' tax rates are applied. The problem involved the treatment of certain local advertising expenses incurred by the retailer—or other distributor—of the taxed article where reimbursement is to be provided by the manufacturer—or producer or importer—for part or all of these expenses. The Committee on Ways and Means concluded that, due to the existing confusion as to the status of advertising charges in determining manufacturers' sales prices, there was need for statutory clarification, as well as some limitations as to the extent to which such exclusions or adjustments should be allowed. The committee concluded it to be appropriate to exclude from the manufacturers' sales price a reasonable amount of local advertising where the advertising is under the control of the distributor, and as reported to the House this legislation provided that where a manufacturer—or producer or importer—of articles subject to manufacturers' excise tax makes a separate charge for local advertising of the article, or reimburses the retailer—or other distributor—for part or all of his expenses for local advertising of the articles—subject to certain limitations—this charge is to be excluded from the manufacturers' sales price, or this price is to be readjusted for the charge. This would have the effect of reducing the manufacturers' excise taxes which are payable, since the manufacturers' sales price is the base for these taxes. The price exclusion, or readjustment, would be limited to radio, television, and newspaper advertising and to not more than 5 percent of the sales price—excluding local advertising charges.

The provisions of the House bill were approved without amendment by the Senate Finance Committee, but the Senate, while accepting the provisions of the House bill, added several provisions not relating to the original bill. Under the conference agreement and as the bill became law, this legislation included, in addition to the provisions of the original House-passed bill: First, a provision permitting taxpayers mining minerals used in making cement to elect to apply, within 60 days after publication of final regulations on this subject, to open years beginning before 1961, the cutoff provisions adopted in the Public Debt and Tax Rate Extension Act of 1960—H.R. 12381—in determining the percentage depletion deduction; second, an amendment providing that the following pension trusts be deemed to constitute qualified trusts and thus tax-exempt, for certain periods of time specified in each case—where it is shown to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate that the trust has not in this period been operated in a manner which would jeopardize the interests of its beneficiaries: the Iron Workers' mid-America pension fund; the Pattern

Makers' pension trust fund of Chicago; the Pipe and Refrigeration Fitters Local 537 pension fund of Boston, Mass.; the annuity plan of the Electrical Switchboard and Panelboard Manufacturing Industry of New York City; the District Council No. 19 welfare fund, now known as Painters District Council No. 19 welfare and pension fund; and the local union No. 377 pension fund; and, third, an amendment designed to preclude an accrual basis taxpayer from obtaining a double deduction of State or local taxes in one tax year by reason of any action taken by the taxing jurisdiction after December 31, 1960, which accelerates the accrual date for such taxes.

H.R. 12559, BY MR. KEOGH; REPORTED TO HOUSE JUNE 28, 1960

See Public Law 86–779, H.R. 10960.

SOCIAL SECURITY LEGISLATION ENACTED INTO LAW (IN ADDITION TO H.R.12580, THE SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1960)

H.R. 213, BY MR. PATMAN; PUBLIC LAW 86–284, SIGNED SEPTEMBER 16, 1959

As this bill was reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, it amended section 218 of the Social Security Act to provide an additional period of time within which certain State agreements may be modified to secure coverage for nonprofessional school district employees. This provision, under which nine States—including Hawaii—can provide OASI and disability insurance coverage for certain nonprofessional school district employees without a referendum and as a group separate from the professional employees who are in positions under the same retirement system, had expired on July 1, 1957, and the committee was advised that at least some of the named States had not secured the desired coverage before its expiration. In order to accommodate the States whose legislatures meet only in odd-numbered years, the committee-amended bill reinstates this provision to January 1, 1962.

In addition to approving the provisions of the House bill, the Senate added several amendments. These amendments extend to the States of California, Kansas, North Dakota, and Vermont the application of the present provision of the social security law which permits specified States to extend old-age, survivors and disability insurance coverage to policemen and firemen covered by a State or local retirement system. A provision was also adopted which has the effect of validating certain social security contributions which had erroneously been made by certain municipal employees in Oklahoma.

In conference, the House agreed to the Senate amendments, and the Senate-passed version of the bill became public law.

H.R. 3472, BY MR. FORAND; PUBLIC LAW 86–442, SIGNED APRIL 22, 1960

As reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, this bill provided that in determining the eligibility of Federal civilian employees for unemployment compensation, their accrued annual leave shall be treated in accordance with State laws. Under previous law, no compensation could be paid to a Federal employee during a period subsequent to separation from Federal service when he is being paid for accrued annual leave. The committee was of the opinion that there is no inconsistency in the payment of both unemployment compensation and a sum for accrued annual leave to the same person for the same period of time, as the concept of insurance, unemployment, and maintenance of purchasing power—with which unemployment compensation is concerned—are not involved with respect to the matter of annual leave. This legislation placed the Federal civilian worker in the position of being treated in exactly the same manner as workers in private industry who receive similar annual leave payments upon separation, by making the award of unemployment compensation dependent upon the provisions of the appropriate State law.

A Senate amendment, which was accepted by the House, provided, under certain limited circumstances, that a quarter of coverage under old-age and survivors' insurance shall be based on the quarter in which wages are earned, and the bill became law with this section added to the original provisions of the House bill.

H.R. 5640, BY MR. MILLS; PUBLIC LAW 86–7, SIGNED MARCH 31, 1959

The purposes of this bill, which was reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means and passed the House without amendment, was to extend from April 1, 1959, to July 1, 1959, the time during which unemployed persons who had established a claim to temporary unemployment compensation under the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act of 1958 before April 1, 1959, might receive such payments. The legislation was designed to provide a gradual closing out of the program rather than a sudden discontinuance. The unexpended balance of the appropriation which had been made at the time the 1958 program was enacted was more than sufficient to take care of the additional payments and costs which the Department of Labor estimated were involved in this legislation.

The Senate amended the bill to some extent, and under the conference report which was agreed to by the House and Senate, the bill became law as passed by the House, with an amendment which had been suggested to the Senate Finance Committee by the Department of Labor which was designed to assure that individuals who had exhausted their regular benefits prior to April 1, 1959, but whose regular report days, under procedures followed by their State agencies, would be after April 1, 1959, would not be precluded from receiving the benefits of this act—in all cases such claims must have been filed before April 7, 1959.

H.R. 5920, BY MR. BOSCH; REPORTED TO HOUSE AUGUST 31, 1959

See Public Law 86–778, H.R. 12580.

CUSTOMS AND TARIFF LEGISLATION

H.R. 1217, BY MR. BENTLEY; PUBLIC LAW 86–453, MAY 13, 1960

This bill, which became law as reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, provided for a 2-year suspension of import duties on amorphous graphite or plumbago—crude or refined—which is valued at $50 per ton or less. The United States is dependent on imports for nearly all its requirements of natural amorphous graphite, which is a mineral with a wide variety of uses.

H.R. 2411, BY MR. MAGNUSON; PUBLIC LAW 86–262, SIGNED SEPTEMBER 14, 1959

As reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, this bill provided for the addition to the free list of tourist literature issued by certain groups, relating chiefly to places or travel facilities outside the United States, the purpose and effect of the legislation being to simplify the tariff treatment of tourist literature and to extend the present duty-free treatment to a broader class of such literature. Safeguarding provisions against abuse are provided for by law.

The Senate, in addition to approving the provisions of the House bill, amended the bill to include the provisions of two other bills which the Committee on Ways and Means had previously reported, both of which had passed the House: First, H.R. 4576—providing for a 2-year suspension of duty on the importation of book bindings or covers imported by certain institutions; and, second, H.R. 6249—liberalizing the tariff laws for works of art and other exhibition material. The amendments of the Senate were accepted by the House.

H.R. 2886, BY MR. KEOGH; PUBLIC LAW 86–235, SIGNED SEPTEMBER 8, 1959

Enactment of this legislation suspended for 3 years the import duties on certain classifications of spun silk yarn provided for in paragraph 1202 of title I of the Tariff Act of 1930. Spun silk yarns of the fineness provided for in this bill are not produced domestically in any quantity. Imported yarns, which are usually finer in size than those of domestic manufacture, are used for various decorative purposes and in the production of certain types of silk broadcloth and other fabrics. The committee was advised that suspension of the duties on the raw materials for such silk fabrics would improve the competitive position of the domestic silk-weaving industry and would tend to increase domestic production of silk cloth. Favorable reports on the legislation were received from the Departments of State, Treasury, Agriculture, and Commerce, as well as an informative report from the U.S. Tariff Commission.

The bill became law in the form reported by the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3681, BY MR. OSTERTAG; PUBLIC LAW 86–34, SIGNED MAY 29, 1959

This legislation provided for the duty-free entry of certain chapel bells imported for the use of the Abelard Reynolds School No. 42 in Rochester, N.Y. The committee was advised that these bells are not manufactured in the United States, would be used for the musical training and appreciation of students at the school, and would remain the property of the school. The bill became law without amendment.

H.R. 4576, BY MR. COHELAN; REPORTED TO HOUSE AUGUST 10, 1959

See Public Law 86-262, H.R. 2411.

H.R. 5508, BY MR. MILLS; PUBLIC LAW 86-14, SIGNED APRIL 22, 1959

This bill, which became law without amendment, provided permanent legislation permitting the free entry under bond of imported articles for exhibition or use at fairs designated by the Secretary of Commerce. The bill follows the basic provisions of the numerous trade fair laws which have been enacted for individual fairs in the past, and eliminates the necessity for the enactment of separate laws in behalf of individual fairs and the repeated issuance of regulations, as in the past. The committee was advised that enactment of this legislation, which was recommended by the interested executive departments, would facilitate cultural and commercial interchanges between the United States and other countries.

H.R. 5887, BY MR. KEITH; PUBLIC LAW 86-402, SIGNED APRIL 4, 1960

The purpose of this bill, as amended by the Committee on Ways and Means, was to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, by placing ground, powdered, or granulated seaweeds on the free list. The seaweed involved is used primarily by domestic processors who produce an end product in the form of a powdered extractive used in foods and other products as jelling, thickening, and so forth, agents. The committee received favorable departmental reports on this legislation. The bill passed the Senate without amendment and became public law in the form reported by the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6054, BY MR. KARTH; PUBLIC LAW 86-115, SIGNED JULY 28, 1959

This bill, which became law in the form in which it was reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, provided for a 1-year continuation, to June 30, 1960, of the suspension of duties on imports of metal scrap. Favorable departmental reports were received on this legislation, and the committee received no information indicating any opposition to its enactment.

H.R. 6249, BY MR. METCALF; REPORTED TO HOUSE AUGUST 24, 1959

See Public Law 86-262, H.R. 2411.

H.R. 6368, BY MR. HERLONG; PUBLIC LAW 86-325, SIGNED SEPTEMBER 21, 1959

The purpose of this legislation, which became law without amendment, was to transfer from the dutiable to the free list of the Tariff Act of 1930 pumice stone imported to be used in the manufacture of concrete masonry products, such as building blocks, bricks, tiles, and similar forms. The Committee on Ways and Means was advised that enactment of this legislation would benefit the makers of building blocks and other masonry products, and that there were no facts to indicate it would have an adverse effect on any U.S. industry. Favorable reports were received on the bill from the Departments of State, Treasury, and Commerce, as well as informative reports from the Department of the Interior and the U.S. Tariff Commission.

H.R. 6579, BY MR. KEOGH; PUBLIC LAW 86-288, SIGNED SEPTEMBER 16, 1959

This legislation, which was enacted into law in the form reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, provided for the temporary free importation—to the close of September 28, 1960—of extracts, decoctions, and preparations of hemlock suitable for use for tanning, regardless of their chief use. Favorable reports were received on the bill from the Departments of State, Treasury, Commerce, and Labor, and an informative report from the U.S. Tariff Commission.

H.R. 7456, BY MR. BALDWIN; PUBLIC LAW 86-405, SIGNED APRIL 4, 1960

As reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, this bill would have extended for 3 years, to the close of March 31, 1963, the suspension of import duties on casein. The Senate, however, amended the bill to provide a 3-month extension only, in order to afford time for the Senate Finance Committee to conduct a thorough study without allowing the existing duty-free status to lapse. The Senate amendment was accepted by the House, and as the bill became public law, the duty-free treatment of casein was continued to July 1, 1960. The 3-year extension was later enacted through Senate amendment to another bill.

See H.R. 9862.

H.R. 7567, BY MR. MILLS; PUBLIC LAW 86-99, SIGNED JULY 17, 1959

This legislation, which was introduced in behalf of the administration at the request of the Department of Defense, extended for 2 years, to July 1, 1961, the privilege of free importation of gifts from members of the Armed Forces of the United States on duty abroad. This privilege has been provided continuously since 1942, and is limited to shipments of bona fide gifts not exceeding $50 in value.

Adequate safeguarding provisions exist in the act and through appropriate administrative regulations. The bill became law without amendment.

H.R. 9307, BY MR. BOGGS; PUBLIC LAW 86-441, SIGNED APRIL 22, 1960

As amended by the Committee on Ways and Means, this legislation provided for the continuation for 2 years, until July 16, 1962, of the suspension of duty on, first, alumina when imported for use in producing aluminum; second, bauxite, crude, not refined or otherwise advanced in condition in any manner; and, third, calcined bauxite Favorable departmental reports were received on this legislation.

The Senate approved the provisions of the House bill and added an amendment providing for a 90-day extension, to July 16, 1960, of the existing suspension of import duty on crude chicory and the reduction in duty on ground chicory, in order to provide time for consideration of the House bill providing a 3-year extension of the duty treatment accorded chicory—H.R. 9308—without allowing the existing status to lapse. This amendment of the Senate was accepted by the House and was included in the bill as it became public law, along with the provisions of the original House bill.

H.R. 9308, BY MR. BOGGS; PUBLIC LAW 86-479, SIGNED JUNE 1, 1960

As amended by the Committee on Ways and Means, this bill provided for a continuation of 3 years, to the close of April 16, 1963, of the existing suspension of duty on crude chicory—except endive—and for the continuation for the same period of the statutory rate of duty of 2 cents per pound for chicory, ground or otherwise prepared. Favorable reports had been received on this legislation from the Departments of State, Treasury, and Commerce, as well as an informative report from the Tariff Commission.

The Senate amended the bill to provide a termination date of June 30, 1963, having earlier provided a 90-day continuation to July 16, 1960, by amendment to H.R. 9307, so as to coincide with the end of the fiscal year. The House agreed to the Senate amendment, and in this form the bill became public law.

H.R. 9322, BY MR. HARRISON; PUBIC LAW 86-557, SIGNED JUNE 30, 1960

This legislation, which became law as amended and reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, provided that the existing suspension of import duties on certain coarse wools imported under bond for use in the manufacture of rugs and carpets and certain other products be made permanent, added papermakers' felts to such list of products, and provided that the standards for determining grades of wools are to be those established from time to time by the Secretary of Agriculture pursuant to law.

Convincing evidence was presented to the committee that, in the absence of this legislation, foreign carpet manufacturers would be in a position of competitive advantage over domestic carpet producers. In the public hearings held by the Committee on Ways and Means on this legislation, all segments of the wool industry indicated their support of the committee bill, and favorable departmental reports were received on it.

H.R. 9820, BY MR. KEOGH; PUBLIC LAW 86-427, SIGNED APRIL 22, 1960

The purpose of this legislation, which became public law as amended and reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, was to continue for 3 years, through September 30, 1963, the period during which certain tanning extracts, and extracts of hemlock or eucalyptus suitable for use for tanning, may be imported free of duty.

The committee was advised that the conditions which gave rise to the enactment of the earlier legislation providing for this duty-free treatment continue in effect today.

H.R. 9861, BY MR. BETTS; PUBLIC LAW 86-456, SIGNED MAY 13, 1960

This bill, which was enacted into law without amendment, provided for the continuation for a 3-year period, until

September 5, 1963, of the existing suspension of duty on dressed or manufactured istle or Tampico fiber. The committee was advised by the Tariff Commission that the purpose of this legislation—to reduce the burden of higher prices on domestic users of the fibers—would not be accomplished without a continuation of the duty-free treatment.

H.R. 9862, BY MR. BOSCH; PUBLIC LAW 86-562, SIGNED JUNE 30, 1960

As reported by the Committee on Ways and Means to the House, H.R. 9862 provided for a 2-year continuation, to August 7, 1962, of the existing suspension of duty on certain shoe lathes. This action was taken in order to continue to make available to domestic shoe last manufacturers highly specialized and expensive copying lathes which can only be obtained from foreign sources.

The Senate approved the provisions of the House bill, and amended the bill to add a section providing for a 3-year extension, to the close of June 30, 1963, of the suspension of import duty on casein. Under the Senate proviso, this suspension would not have applied to casein imported for use for human food or for conversion to such use. This language was deleted in conference, however, and substitute language was adopted providing that the suspension of duty on casein shall not apply with respect to sodium caseinate, sodium phosphocaseinate, or other caseinates, any of the foregoing of which casein or lactarene is the component material of chief value. The conference agreement was adopted by both the House and the Senate, and as the bill became public law it provided for the 2-year extension of the suspension of duties on shoe lathes as in the original House bill, and the 3-year extension of the suspension of duty on casein with the limitation adopted in conference.

H.R. 9881, BY MR. MILLS; PUBLIC LAW 86-563, SIGNED JUNE 30, 1960

The purpose of this legislation was to extend for 2 years, until July 1, 1962, the provisions of law relating to the free importation of personal and household effects brought into the United States under Government orders. It is stated in the conference report on this legislation—under the terms of which the Senate agreed to the provisions of the House bill—that it is the understanding and intention of the conferees that the departments and agencies charged with the responsibility of administering the law will submit information to the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Finance, not later than January 15, 1962, with respect to the operation and administration of the law, including a statement of actions taken to improve its administration and recommendations for any statutory changes or limitations which may be necessary in order to effect adequate safeguards against abuses.

H.R. 10841, BY MR. CANNON; PUBLIC LAW 86-800, SIGNED SEPTEMBER 16, 1960

The purpose of this legislation, which became law in the form reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, was to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 so as to place bamboo pipestems on the free list, when imported from other than Communist-dominated countries.

Bamboo pipestems are used principally on corncob pipes. The committee received favorable departmental reports on this legislation.

H.R. 11573, BY MR. IKARD; PUBLIC LAW 86-774, SIGNED SEPTEMBER 13, 1960

As it became public law, this legislation incorporated not only the provisions of the House bill as reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, which provided for the duty-free entry of an electron microscope for the use of William Marsh Rice University of Houston, Tex., and an electron microscope for the use of the University of Colorado Medical Center, Denver, Colo., but also two Senate amendments which were accepted by the House providing for, first, the duty-free importation of certain equipment by Kansas State University for a pilot-plant grain and flour milling installation; and, second, an amendment to section 809(g) of the National Housing Act, designed to afford housing at the research and development installation of the Atomic Energy Commission in Los Alamos County, N. Mex.

H.R. 11748, BY MR. MACHROWICZ; PUBLIC LAW 86-606, SIGNED JULY 7, 1960

This legislation, as reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, provided for the continuation of the existing suspension of duties on metal scrap for a period of 1 year, to the close of June 30, 1961. The Senate, in addition to approving the provisions of the House bill, added three new sections to the bill, which were accepted by the House in conference. As the bill became law, in addition to the provisions relating to metal scrap, the legislation provided, first, for a separate tariff classification for certain fresh or frozen coconut; second, for the free importation of tight barrelheads of softwood; and, third, for the withdrawal of certain supplies for vessels and aircraft operating between Alaska and Hawaii and the mainland United States free of customs duty and excise tax.

H.R. 12659, BY MR. IKARD; PUBLIC LAW 86-795, SIGNED SEPTEMBER 15, 1960

As reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, this bill provided for the temporary suspension, for a 3-year period, of the import duty on heptanoic acid. This type of acid is used in the making of special lubricants and brake fluids for use in such important products as military aircraft. The committee was advised by the Department of Commerce that there is no domestic production of this acid, and the U.S. consumption is dependent entirely on imports.

The Senate approved the provisions of the House bill, and added a new section relating to the definition of "waterproof cloth" under paragraph 907 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended. The amendment of the Senate was accepted by the House in conference, and became public law as a part of this legislation.

MISCELLANEOUS

H.R. 4029, BY MR. KING OF CALIF.; PUBLIC LAW 86-478, SIGNED JUNE 1, 1960

This legislation amended the sections of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 which were developed from the National Firearms Act. The primary purpose of that act was to facilitate the control of weapon utilization by gangster and other underworld characters. The purpose of this bill was to eliminate the interference of this police regulation of these weapons with sport and recreational utilization without jeopardizing the deterrence to improper and unlawful uses. The legislation, the provisions of which were worked out in conferences with representatives of the Internal Revenue Service and law enforcement agencies, will be of benefit to gun collectors, rifle associations, and persons having an avocation involving firearms, without interfering with the effective administration of the National Firearms Act taxes. As a result of the conferences on this legislation, a number of features were incorporated in the bill which were designed to aid in enforcement and simplify the administration of these provisions.

H.R. 8685, BY MR. MILLS; PUBLIC LAW 86-368, SIGNED SEPTEMBER 22, 1959

The purpose of this bill, which became law as amended by the Committee on Ways and Means, was to provide that the Assistant General Counsel for the Treasury Department who is to be the Chief Counsel for the Internal Revenue Service is to be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The office of Assistant General Counsel serving as Chief Counsel of the Internal Revenue Service, which the new office replaces, was filled by an appointee of the Secretary of the Treasury. The basic compensation rate of the new officer will be $19,000.

Enactment of this legislation was favored by the Treasury Department.

S. 2282, BY SENATOR SALTONSTALL AND SENATOR KENNEDY; PUBLIC LAW 86-371, SIGNED SEPTEMBER 23, 1959

The purpose of this legislation was to provide that no department or agency of the United States shall accept compensation from any State or territory for withholding State or territorial income taxes. Enactment of this bill had become necessary because of a newly enacted State law providing for compensation to employers who withhold State taxes from their employees, and in the absence of legislation to the contrary, there was doubt as to the power of the executive departments or their officers to decline to accept compensation due to the United States. There are compelling reasons against the wisdom of such acceptance. After consideration, the Committee on Ways and Means agreed to the Senate amendment, and so indicated on the floor of the House, without filing a committee report, whereupon the bill was passed and sent directly to the President.

APPENDIX I

Status of bills referred to the Committee on Ways and Means on which legislative action was taken, 86th Cong.

No. and author of bill	Title	Reported	Passed House	Reported in Senate	Passed Senate	Sent to conference	Conference report agreed to in—		Date approved	Law No.
							House	Senate		
H.R. 5 Mr. Boggs	To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage private investment abroad and thereby promote American industry and reduce Government expenditures for foreign economic assistance.	Feb. 19, 1960 H. Rept. 1282*	May 18, 1960*							
H.R. 10 Mr. Keogh	To encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by self-employed individuals.	Feb. 24, 1959 H. Rept. 64*	Mar. 16, 1959 under suspension of rules	June 17, 1960 S. Rept. 1615*						
H.R. 47 Mr. Boggs	To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a personal exemption for children placed for adoption.	Aug. 10, 1959 H. Rept. 816*	Aug. 18, 1959	Sept. 8, 1959 S. Rept. 913*	Sept. 10, 1959*	Sept. 14, 1959.—House agreed to Senate amendments			Sept. 23, 1959	86-376
H.R. 135 Mr. Keogh	To provide an income credit in the case of civil service annuities received by nonresident alien individuals not engaged in trade or business within the United States.	Aug. 24, 1959 H. Rept. 980*	Aug. 25, 1959	Jan. 19, 1960 S. Rept. 1028*	Mar. 28, 1960	Apr. 11, 1960.—House agreed to Senate amendment			Apr. 22, 1960	86-437
H.R. 137 Mr. Keogh	To allow a deduction, for Federal estate tax purposes, in the case of certain transfers to charities which are subjected to foreign death taxes.	Feb. 26, 1959 H. Rept. 82*	Mar. 23, 1959	July 8, 1959 S. Rept. 483*	July 24, 1959	Aug. 10, 1959.—House agreed to Senate amendment			Aug. 21, 1959	86-175
H.R. 147 Mr. Keogh	To suspend temporarily the tax on the processing of palm oil, palm-kernel oil, and fatty acids, salts, and combinations or mixtures thereof.	Feb. 24, 1959 H. Rept. 65	Mar. 23, 1959	May 7, 1959 S. Rept. 241	May 20, 1959				May 29, 1959	86-37
H.R. 213 Mr. Patman	To provide that certain State agreements under sec. 218 of the Social Security Act may be modified to secure coverage for nonprofessional school district employees without regard to the existing limitations upon the time within which such a modification may be made.	Feb. 24, 1959 H. Rept. 66*	Mar. 23, 1959*	Apr. 10, 1959 S. Rept. 159*	July 24, 1959*	Aug. 20, 1959	Sept. 3, 1959 Conference Rept. 1107	Sept. 1, 1959	Sept. 16, 1959	86-284
H.R. 529 Mr. Karsten	To discharge more effectively obligations of the United States under certain conventions and protocols relating to the institution of controls over the manufacture of narcotic drugs, and for other purposes.	Aug. 26, 1959 H. Rept. 1053*	Sept. 9, 1959	Feb. 4, 1960, S. Rept. 1077*	Mar. 28, 1960	Apr. 11, 1960.—House agreed to Senate amendments			Apr. 22, 1960	86-29
H.R. 1217 Mr. Bentley	To amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of amorphous graphite.	Sept. 3, 1959 H. Rept. 1143*	Feb. 2, 1960, under suspension of rules	May 3, 1960 S. Rept. 1332	May 5, 1960				May 13, 1960	86-453
H.R. 1219 Mr. Bentley	To amend sec. 2038 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to revocable transfers).	Feb. 26, 1959 H. Rept. 83	Mar. 23, 1959	July 8, 1959 S. Rept. 478	July 24, 1959				Aug. 7, 1959	86-141
H.R. 1925 Mr. King of California	To extend to fishermen the same treatment accorded farmers in relation to estimated income tax.	June 28, 1960 H.Rept. 2016*	June 29, 1960							
H.R. 2164 Mr. Forand	To repeal the cabaret tax	Aug. 10, 1959 H. Rept. 817*	Sept. 1, 1959 Under suspension of rules	Feb. 17, 1960 S. Rept. 1084	Mar. 29, 1960				Apr. 8, 1960	86-422
H.R. 2397 Mr. Forand	To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 to provide a credit against the estate tax for Federal estate taxes paid on certain prior transfers in the case of decedents dying after Dec. 31, 1947.	June 28, 1960 H. Rept. 2019	June 29, 1960							
H.R. 2411 Mr. Magnuson	To amend par. 1629 of the Tariff Act of 1930 so as to provide for the free importation of tourist literature.	Feb. 24, 1959 H. Rept. 68	Mar. 23, 1959	Aug. 11, 1959 S. Rept. 665*	Aug. 25, 1959*	Sept. 3, 1959.—House agreed to Senate amendments			Sept. 14, 1959	86-262
H.R. 2573 Mr. Yates	To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the application of the estate tax marital deduction to widow's allowance or award.	Aug. 10, 1959 H. Rept. 818*	Aug. 18, 1959							
H.R. 2886 Mr. Keogh	To suspend for 3 years the import duties on certain classifications of spun silk yarn.	Aug. 14, 1959 H. Rept. 897*	Aug. 18, 1959	Aug. 25, 1959 S. Rept. 811	Aug. 27, 1959				Sept. 8, 1959	86-235
H.R. 2906 Mr. McCormack	To extend the period for filing claims for credit or refund of overpayments of income taxes arising as a result of renegotiation of Government contracts.	Feb. 25, 1959 H. Rept. 74*	Mar. 23, 1959	Aug. 11, 1959 S. Rept. 663*	Aug. 18, 1959	Aug. 25, 1959	Sept. 3, 1959 Conference Rept. 1105	Sept. 1, 1959	Sept. 16, 1959	86-280
H.R. 3151 Mr. Curtis of Missouri	Relating to withholding, for purposes of the income tax imposed by certain cities, on the compensation of Federal employees.	Aug. 11, 1959 H. Rept. 872	Sept. 1, 1959 Failed of passage under suspension of the rules Feb. 17, 1960 Passed House							
H.R. 3176 Mr. Harrison	To amend sec. 4071 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (re imposition of tax on tires and inner tubes).	Aug. 15, 1960 H. Rept. 2093*								
H.R. 3392 Mr. Watts	Relating to the duty free imports of Philippine tobacco	Aug. 15, 1960 H. Rept. 2094*	Aug. 24, 1960							
H.R. 3472 Mr. Forand	To repeal sec. 1505 of the Social Security Act so that in determining eligibility of Federal employees for unemployment compensation their accrued annual leave shall be treated in accordance with State laws, and for other purposes.	Feb. 25, 1959 H. Rept. 80*	Mar. 23, 1959	Mar. 2, 1960 S. Rept. 1154*	Mar. 28, 1960	Apr. 11, 1960.—House agreed to Senate amendment			Apr. 22, 1960	86-442
H.R. 3681 Mr. Ostertag	To provide for the free entry of certain chapel bells imported for the use of the Abelard Reynolds School No. 42, Rochester, N.Y.	Feb. 24, 1959 H. Rept. 70	Mar. 23, 1959	May 20, 1959 S. Rept. 242	May 20, 1959				May 29, 1959	86-34

H.R. 4029 Mr. King of California	To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to eliminate the proration of the occupational tax on persons dealing in machineguns, and certain other firearms, to reduce occupational and transfer taxes on certain weapons, to make the transferor and transferee jointly liable for the transfer tax on firearms, and to make certain changes in the definition of a firearm.	Aug. 17, 1959 H. Rept. 914*	Aug. 18, 1959	May 2, 1960 S. Rept. 1303*	May 5, 1960	May 19, 1960.—House agreed to Senate amendment			June 1, 1960	86-478
H.R. 4245 Mr. Mills	Relating to the taxation of the income of life insurance companies	Feb. 13, 1959* H. Rept. 34	Feb. 18, 1959*	May 14, 1959 S. Rept. 291*	May 19, 1959*	May 20, 1959	June 10, 1959 Conference Rept. 520	June 10, 1959	June 25, 1959	86-60
H.R. 4251 Mr. Baker	To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to remove the 4-year limitation on deduction of exploration expenditures.	Aug. 26, 1959 H. Rept. 1054*	Sept. 9, 1959	Feb. 24, 1960 S. Rept. 1137	June 23, 1960				July 6, 1960	86-594
H.R. 4384 Mr. Machrowicz	To amend par. 1774 of the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to the importation of certain articles for religious purposes.	Aug. 10, 1959 H. Rept. 819*	Aug. 18, 1959	Aug. 25, 1960 S. Rept. 1911	Sept. 1, 1960* (legislative day, Aug. 31)					
H.R. 4576 Mr. Cohelan	To transfer to the free list of the Tariff Act of 1930 book bindings or covers imported by certain institutions.	Aug. 10, 1959 H. Rept. 820*	Aug. 18, 1959	(See action on H.R. 2411 (Public Law 86-262).)						
H.R. 4586 Mr. Forand	To amend sec. 4021 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to the excise tax on aromatic cachous).	Aug. 10, 1959 H. Rept. 821	Aug. 18, 1959	Jan. 21, 1960 S. Rept. 1033	Mar. 28, 1960				Apr. 8, 1960	86-413
H.R. 4857 Mr. Hagen	To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the exemption from the admissions tax for athletic games benefiting crippled or retarded children shall apply where the participants are recent graduates of designated schools or colleges as well as where they are currently students therein.	Aug. 11, 1959 H. Rept. 873*	Aug. 18, 1959	Sept. 2, 1959 S. Rept. 877	Sept. 9, 1959				Sept. 21, 1959	86-319
H.R. 5054 Mr. Herlong	To amend the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to the marking of imported articles and containers.	Aug. 31, 1959 H. Rept. 1078*	Feb. 2, 1960 under suspension of rules	June 27, 1960 S. Rept. 1747*	July 2, 1960	Aug. 24, 1960.—House agreed to Senate amendment.			Sept. 6, 1960.	Vetoed.
H.R. 5508 Mr. Mills	To provide for the free importation of articles for exhibition at fairs, exhibitions, or expositions, and for other purposes.	Mar. 16, 1959 H. Rept. 213	Mar. 23, 1959	Apr. 13, 1959 S. Rept. 162	Apr. 16, 1959				Apr. 22, 1959	86-14
H.R. 5547 Mr. Mills	To amend certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to possessions of the United States.	Sept. 2, 1959 H. Rept. 1131*	Sept. 9, 1960	June 29, 1960 S. Rept. 1767*		(See action on H.R. 10960 (Public Law 86-779).)				
H.R. 5640 Mr. Mills	To extend the time during which certain individuals may continue to receive temporary unemployment compensation.	Mar. 13, 1959 H. Rept. 212	Mar. 16, 1959 Under suspension of rules	Mar. 23, 1959 S. Rept. 135*	Mar. 25, 1959*	Mar. 25, 1959	Mar. 25, 1959 Conference Rept. 257	Mar. 25, 1959	Mar. 31, 1959	86-7
H.R. 5751 Mr. Machrowicz	To amend secs. 4081 and 4082 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to include wholesale distributors within the definition of "producers" of gasoline, and for other purposes.	Aug. 18, 1959 H. Rept. 938*				(See action on H.R. 8678 (Public Law 86-342).)				
H.R. 5887 Mr. Keith	To amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to place ground, powdered, or granulated seaweeds on the free list.	Sept. 3, 1959 H. Rept. 1144*	Sept. 9, 1959	Jan. 13, 1960 S. Rept. 1020	Mar. 28, 1960				Apr. 4, 1960	86-402
H.R. 5920 Mr. Bosch	To amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that an individual who had maximum earnings for a year before 1951 shall be credited with 4 quarters of coverage for such year (with certain exceptions) in the same manner as is provided for years after 1950.	Aug. 31, 1959 H. Rept. 1079*	Sept. 9, 1959			(See action on H.R. 12580.)				
H.R. 6054 Mr. Karth	To continue until the close of June 30, 1960, the suspension of duties on metal scrap, and for other purposes.	June 23, 1959 H. Rept. 577*	June 24, 1959	July 8, 1959 S. Rept. 482	July 15, 1959				July 28, 1959	86-115
H.R. 6066 Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania	Relating to the deduction for income tax purposes of contributions to charitable organizations whose sole purpose is making distributions to other charitable organizations, contributions to which by individuals are deductible within the 30-percent limitation of adjusted gross income.	Aug. 15, 1960 H. Rept. 2095*	Aug. 24, 1960							
H.R. 6132 Mr. Mills	Relating to the rate of tax on the issuance of shares or certificates of stock by regulated investment companies.	Aug. 31, 1959 H. Rept. 1080	Sept. 9, 1959	Jan. 13, 1960 S. Rept. 1021	Mar. 29, 1960				Apr. 8, 1960	86-416
H.R. 6155 Mr. Betts	To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from taxation certain nonprofit corporations or associations organized after Aug. 31, 1951.	Aug. 24, 1959 H. Rept. 982*	Aug. 25, 1959	Jan. 21, 1960 S. Rept. 1034*	Mar. 28, 1960	Apr. 11, 1960.—House agreed to Senate amendment.			Apr. 22, 1960	86-426
H.R. 6249 Mr. Metcalf	To liberalize the tariff laws for works of art and other exhibition material, and for other purposes.	Aug. 24, 1959 H. Rept. 984*	Aug. 25, 1959			(See action on H.R. 2411 (Public Law 86-262).)				
H.R. 6292 Mr. Bennett of Florida	To authorize the acceptance by the Government of gifts to be used to reduce the public debt.	Aug. 15, 1960 H. Rept. 2096	Aug. 24, 1960							
H.R. 6368 Mr. Herlong	To amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to place certain pumice stone on the free list	Aug. 14, 1959 H. Rept. 898	Aug. 18, 1959	Aug. 25, 1959 S. Rept. 812	Sept. 9, 1959				Sept. 21, 1959	86-325
H.R. 6482 Mr. Utt	Relating to the credits against the unemployment tax in the case of merged corporations.	Aug. 27, 1959 H. Rept. 1058*	Sept. 9, 1959	Apr. 19, 1960 S. Rept. 1276*	May 4, 1960	May 19, 1960.—House agreed to Senate amendments.			June 3, 1960.	Vetoed.
H.R. 6579 Mr. Keogh	To amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the temporary free importation of extracts, decoctions, and preparations of hemlock suitable for use for tanning.	Aug. 14, 1959 H. Rept. 899*	Aug. 18, 1959	Aug. 25, 1959 S. Rept. 813	Sept. 9, 1959				Sept. 16, 1959	86-288
H.R. 6777 Mr. O'Brien of Illinois	To amend sec. 421 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the income tax treatment of certain stock held at death.	Aug. 24, 1959 H. Rept. 985*	Aug. 25, 1959							
H.R. 6779 Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania	To amend sec. 170 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to the unlimited deduction for charitable contributions for certain individuals).	Aug. 24, 1959 H. Rept. 991*	Aug. 25, 1959	May 4, 1960 S. Rept. 1334*	May 5, 1960	May 19, 1960.—House agreed to Senate amendments.			June 3, 1960.	Vetoed.
H.R. 6785 Mr. Frazier	To amend sec. 4071 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to fix a tax of 1 cent per pound of certain laminated tires produced from used tires.	Aug. 31, 1959 H. Rept. 1081*	Sept. 9, 1959	Feb. 4, 1960 S. Rept. 1076*	Mar. 28, 1960	Apr. 11, 1960.—House agreed to Senate amendment.			Apr. 22, 1960	86-440
H.R. 7086 Mr. Mills	To extend the Renegotiation Act of 1951, and for other purposes	May 14, 1959 H. Rept. 364	May 27, 1959	June 18, 1959 S. Rept. 407*	June 23, 1959	June 24, 1959	July 1, 1959 Conference Rept. 619	July 1, 1959	July 13, 1959	86-89
H.R. 7123 Mr. Boggs	To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to provide that lawful expenditures for legislative purposes shall be allowed as deductions from gross income.	July 1, 1960 H. Rept. 2077*								

*With amendments.

Status of bills referred to the Committee on Ways and Means on which legislative action was taken, 86th Cong.—Continued

No. and author of bill	Title	Reported	Passed House	Reported in Senate	Passed Senate	Sent to conference	Conference report agreed to in—		Date approved	Law No.
							House	Senate		
H.R. 7456 Mr. Baldwin	To extend for 3 years the suspension of duty on imports of casein	Aug. 10, 1959 H. Rept. 823*	Aug. 18, 1959	Jan. 13, 1960 S. Rept. 1022	Mar. 28, 1960* Reconsidered Mar. 29, 1960 and passed with amendments	Mar. 31, 1960.—House agreed to Senate amendment			Apr. 4, 1960	86-405
H.R. 7523 Mr. Mills	To provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain excise tax rates.	June 4, 1959 H. Rept. 436	June 8, 1959	June 24, 1959 S. Rept. 427*	June 25, 1959*	June 26, 1959	June 29, 1959 Conference Rept. 587	June 29, 1959	June 30, 1959	86-75
H.R. 7567 Mr. Mills	To extend for a period of 2 years the privilege of free importation of gifts from members of the Armed Forces of the United States on duty abroad.	June 16, 1959 H. Rept. 555	June 24, 1959	June 25, 1959 S. Rept. 431	July 14, 1959				July 17, 1959	86-99
H.R. 7588 Mr. Keogh	To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the treatment of copyright royalties for purposes of the personal holding company tax.	Aug. 17, 1959 H. Rept. 915*	Aug. 18, 1959	Jan. 25, 1960 S. Rept. 1041*	Mar. 28, 1960	Apr. 11, 1960.—House agreed to Senate amendments			Apr. 22, 1960	86-435
H.R. 7749 Mr. Mills	To increase the amount of obligations issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act which may be outstanding at any one time.	June 16, 1959 H. Rept. 556	June 19, 1959	June 25, 1959 S. Rept. 432	June 25, 1959				June 30, 1959	86-74
H.R. 7885 Mr. Frazier	Relating to the income tax treatment of nonrefundable capital contributions to Federal National Mortgage Association.	May 26, 1960 H. Rept. 1662*	June 27, 1960	Aug. 24, 1960 S. Rept. 1910*		(See action on H.R. 10960 (Public Law 86-779).)				
H.R. 7947 Mr. Ikard	Relating to the income tax treatment of nonrefundable capital contributions to Federal National Mortgage Association.	Aug. 31, 1959 H. Rept. 1082*	Sept. 9, 1959	Feb. 15, 1960 S. Rept. 1083*	Mar. 28, 1960	Apr. 14, 1960	May 5, 1960 Conference Rept. 1547	May 4, 1960	May 14, 1960.	Vetoed
H.R. 8126 Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania	To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the taxation of exchanges of property; and distributions of stock made pursuant to orders enforcing the antitrust laws.	Sept. 2, 1959 H. Rept. 1128*								
H.R. 8229 Mr. Knox	To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an exemption from income tax for supplemental unemployment benefit trusts.	Sept. 3, 1959 H. Rept. 1145*	Sept. 9, 1959	June 6, 1960 S. Rept. 1518*	June 23, 1960*	July 1, 1960	July 2, 1960 Conference Rept. 2073	July 1, 1960	July 14, 1960	86-667
H.R. 8273 Mr. Walter	To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to suspend the manufacturers excise tax on mechanical lighters for cigarettes, cigars, and pipes.	Mar. 28, 1960 H. Rept. 1430*				(See action on H.R. 10960 (Public Law 86-779).)				
H.R. 8318 Mr. Keogh	To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt bicycle tires and tubes from the manufacturers excise tax on tires and tubes.	Sept. 8, 1959 H. Rept. 1171*	Feb. 2, 1960, Under suspension of rules.	Feb. 24, 1960 S. Rept. 1136	Mar. 28, 1960				Apr. 8, 1960	86-418
H.R. 8576 Mr. Boggs	To amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to extend to residents of the United States who are crew members on vessels, aircraft, and other conveyances arriving in the United States, within specified limits, the same exemptions from duty on personal and household articles as are granted passengers arriving on such conveyances.	June 27, 1960 H. Rept. 2011*	June 29, 1960							
H.R. 8649 Mr. King of California	To make permanent the existing suspensions of the tax on the 1st domestic processing of coconut oil, palm oil, palm kernel oil, and fatty acids, salts, combinations or mixtures thereof.	Feb. 22, 1960 H. Rept. 1285*	Mar. 2, 1960	Apr. 5, 1960 S. Rept. 1233	Apr. 11, 1960				Apr. 22, 1960	86-432
H.R. 8678 Mr. Fallon	To amend the Federal-Aid Highway Acts of 1956 and 1958 to make certain adjustments in the Federal-aid highway program, and for other purposes.	Sept. 1, 1959 H. Rept. 1120*	Sept. 3, 1959	Sept. 4, 1959 (Title II) S. Rept. 903*	Sept. 5, 1959*	Sept. 9, 1959.—House agreed to Senate amendments.			Sept. 21, 1959	86-342
H.R. 8684 Mr. Ikard	To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for deferral of taxation of amounts withheld by a bank or finance company from a dealer in personal property to secure obligations of the dealer, until such time as such amounts are paid to or made available to the dealer.	Sept. 7, 1959 H. Rept. 1170*	Sept. 9, 1959	Jan. 28, 1960 S. Rept. 1045*	Mar. 28, 1960*	Apr. 14, 1960	May 5, 1960 Conference Rept. 1548	May 4, 1960	May 13, 1960	86-459
H.R. 8685 Mr. Mills	To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the Presidential appointment of a General Counsel for Internal Revenue, to provide for the appointment of other officers for the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes.	Sept. 7, 1959 H. Rept. 1169*	Sept. 9, 1959	Sept. 11, 1959 S. Rept. 1007	Sept. 14, 1959				Sept. 22, 1959	86-368
H.R. 8725 Mr. Harrison	To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to make technical changes in certain excise tax laws, and for other purposes.	Aug. 24, 1959 H. Rept. 992*	Aug. 25, 1959	Sept. 2, 1959 S. Rept. 878	Sept. 9, 1959				Sept. 21, 1959	86-344
H.R. 8732 Mr. Forand	To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and incorporate therein provisions for the payment of annuities to widows and certain dependents of the judges of the Tax Court of the United States.	June 23, 1960 H. Rept. 1958*	June 29, 1960							
H.R. 9000 Mr. Green of Pennsylvania	To provide that States and political subdivisions which operate liquor stores shall not be required to pay more than one tax as a retail dealer in liquor.	Aug. 15, 1960 H. Rept. 2097*	Aug. 24, 1960							
H.R. 9035 Mr. Mills	To permit the issuance of Series E and H U.S. savings bonds at interest rates above the existing maximum, to permit the Secretary of the Treasury to designate certain exchanges of Government securities to be made without recognition of gain or loss, and for other purposes.	Sept. 3, 1959 H. Rept. 1148	Sept. 4, 1959	Sept. 5, 1959 S. Rept. 909*	Sept. 8, 1959*	Sept. 9, 1959	Sept. 12, 1959 Conference Report 1183	Sept. 12, 1959	Sept. 22, 1959	86-346
H.R. 9240 Mr. Mack of Illinois	To amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to authorize informal entries of merchandise where the aggregate value of the shipment does not exceed $400.	June 22, 1960 H. Rept. 1938	June 29, 1960							
H.R. 9307 Mr. Boggs	To continue for 2 years the suspension of duty on certain alumina and bauxite	Feb. 22, 1960 H. Rept. 1286*	Mar. 2, 1960	Apr. 5, 1960 S. Rept. 1235*	Apr. 11, 1960	Apr. 14, 1960.—House agreed to Senate amendments			Apr. 22, 1960	86-441

H.R. 9308 Mr. Boggs	To extend for 3 years the suspension of duty on imports of crude chicory and the reduction on duty on ground chicory.	Feb. 22, 1960 H. Rept. 1287	Mar. 2, 1960	May 3, 1960 S. Rept. 1333*	May 5, 1960	May 19, 1960.—House agreed to Senate amendments		June 1, 1960	86-479
H.R. 9322 Mr. Harrison	To make permanent the existing suspension of duties on certain coarse wool	Mar. 14, 1960 H. Rept. 1390*	Apr. 11, 1960	May 19, 1960 S. Rept. 1402*	May 26, 1960	June 1, 1960	June 25, 1960 Conference Rept. 1883 | June 17, 1960	June 30, 1960	86-557
H.R. 9660 Mr. Mills	To amend sec. 6659(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the procedure for assessing certain additions to tax.	Jan. 21, 1960 H. Rept. 1217	Feb. 8, 1960	Feb. 23, 1960 S. Rept. 1098*	Mar. 29, 1960	Apr. 14, 1960	May 5, 1960 Conference Rept. 1549 | May 4, 1960	May 14, 1960	86-470
H.R. 9662 Mr. Mills	To make technical revisions in the income-tax provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to estates, trusts, partners, and partnerships, and for other purposes.	Jan. 28, 1960 H. Rept. 1231	Feb. 4, 1960	June 18, 1960 S. Rept. 1616*					
H.R. 9820 Mr. Keogh	To extend for an additional 3 years the period during which certain tanning extracts, including certain extracts, decoctions, and preparations which (irrespective of their chief use) are suitable for use for tanning, may be imported free of duty.	Feb. 16, 1960 H. Rept. 1266*	Mar. 2, 1960	Apr. 5, 1960 S. Rept. 1234	Apr. 11, 1960			Apr. 22, 1960	86-427
H.R. 9861 Mr. Betts	To continue for a temporary period the existing suspension of duty on certain istle or Tampico fiber.	Feb. 16, 1960 H. Rept. 1268	Mar. 2, 1960	Apr. 14, 1960 S. Rept. 1269	May 4, 1960			May 13, 1960	86-456
H.R. 9862 Mr. Bosch	To continue for 2 years the existing suspension of duties on certain lathes used for shoe last roughing or for shoe last finishing.	Feb. 22, 1960 H. Rept. 1288*	Mar. 2, 1960	Apr. 14, 1960 S. Rept. 1270*	May 5, 1960*	May 24, 1960	June 25, 1960 Conference Rept. 1884 | June 17, 1960	June 30, 1960	86 562
H.R. 9881 Mr. Mills	To extend for 2 years the existing provisions of law relating to the free importation of personal and household effects brought into the United States under Government orders.	Feb. 16, 1960 H. Rept. 1267	Mar. 2, 1960	May 19, 1960 S. Rept. 1403*	May 26, 1960	June 1, 1960	June 25, 1960 Conference Rept. 1885 | June 17, 1960	June 30, 1960	86-563
H.R. 10087 Mr. Machrowicz	To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit taxpayers to elect an overall limitation on the foreign tax credit.	Mar. 8, 1960 H. Rept. 1358*	Apr. 6, 1960	May 19, 1960 S. Rept. 1393*	June 1, 1960	June 13, 1960	Aug. 30, 1960 Conference Rept. 2199 | Aug. 30, 1960	Sept. 14, 1960	86-780
H.R. 10590 Mr. Mills	Relating to interest rate restrictions on bonds of the United States	Feb. 29, 1960 H. Rept. 1297							
H.R. 10841 Mr. Cannon	To amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to place bamboo pipestems on the free list	July 1, 1960 H. Rept. 2079*	July 2, 1960	Aug. 25, 1960 S. Rept. 1912	Aug. 31, 1960			Sept. 16, 1960	86-800
H.R. 10960 Mr. Herlong	To amend sec. 5701 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the excise tax upon cigars.	Aug. 15, 1960 H. Rept. 2098*	Aug. 24, 1960	Aug. 25, 1960 S. Rept. 1915	Aug. 27, 1960*	Aug. 29, 1960	Aug. 31, 1960 Conference Rept. 2214 | Aug. 31, 1960	Sept. 14, 1960	86-779
H.R. 11266 Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin	To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit the prepaid dues income of certain membership organizations to be included in gross income for the taxable years to which the dues relate.	Aug. 15, 1960 H. Rept. 2099*	Aug. 24, 1960						
H.R. 11405 Mr. Herlong	To provide for the treatment of income from discharge of indebtedness of a railroad corporation in a receivership proceeding or in a proceeding under sec. 77 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 205) commenced before Jan. 1, 1960.	May 2, 1960 H. Rept. 1563*	May 19, 1960	May 24, 1960 S. Rept. 1416	May 26, 1960			June 8, 1960	86-946
H.R. 11573 Mr. Ikard	To provide for the duty-free importation of scientific equipment for educational or research purposes.	June 27, 1960 H. Rept. 2012*	June 29, 1960	Aug. 25, 1960 S. Rept 1914*	Aug. 27, 1960*	Aug. 30, 1960.—House agreed to Senate amendments.		Sept. 13, 1960	86-774
H.R. 11584 Mr. Baker	To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to impose import taxes on lead and zinc.	Aug. 17, 1960 H. Rept. 2105*							
H.R. 11681 Mr. Knox	To amend sec. 902(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit for foreign taxes paid by a foreign corporation 20 percent or more of the voting stock of which is owned by another foreign corporation in which a domestic corporation has a substantial stock interest.	Aug. 15, 1960 H. Rept. 2100	Aug. 24, 1960						
H.R. 11748 Mr. Machrowicz	To continue until the close of June 30, 1961, the suspension of duties on metal scrap and for other purposes.	May 2, 1960 H. Rept. 1565	May 19, 1960	May 27, 1960 S. Rept. 1491*	June 2, 1960	June 29, 1960	July 2, 1960 Conference Rept. 2074 | July 1, 1960	July 7, 1960	86-606
H.R. 12036 Mr. Bosch	To amend sec. 902 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to foreign taxes paid by certain predecessor corporations.	Aug. 15, 1960 H. Rept. 2101*	Aug. 24, 1960			(See action on H.R. 10960 (Public Law 86-779).)			
H.R. 12329 Mr. Betts	Relating to the gift and estate tax treatment of the relinquishment of certain powers in the case of reciprocal and other trusts.	Aug. 15, 1960 H. Rept. 2102*	Aug. 24, 1960						
H.R. 12381 Mr. Mills	To increase for a 1 year period the public debt limit set forth in sec. 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act and to extend for 1 year the existing corporate normal tax rate and certain excise tax rates.	May 31, 1960 H. Rept. 1699	June 8, 1960	June 16, 1960 S. Rept. 1602*	June 20, 1960*	June 21, 1960	June 27, 1960 Conference Rept. 2005 | June 28, 1960	June 30, 1960	86-564
H.R. 12536 Mr. Mills	Relating to the treatment of charges for local advertising for purposes of determining the manufacturer's sale price.	Aug. 15, 1960 H. Rept. 2103	Aug. 24, 1960	Aug. 25, 1960 S. Rept. 1916	Aug. 26, 1960*	Aug. 29, 1960	Aug. 31, 1960 Conference Rept. 2213 | Aug. 31, 1960	Sept. 14, 1960	86-781
H.R. 12559 Mr. Keogh	To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a special method of taxation for real estate investment trusts.	June 28, 1960 H. Rept. 2020*	June 29, 1960			(See action on H.R. 10960 (Public Law 86-779).)			
H.R. 12580 Mr. Mills	To extend and improve coverage under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system and to remove hardships and inequities, improve the financing of the trust funds, and provide disability benefits to additional individuals under such systems; to provide grants to States for medical care; for aged individuals of low income; to amend the public assistance and maternal and child welfare provisions of the Social Security Act; to improve the unemployment compensation provisions of such act; and for other purposes.	June 13, 1960 H. Rept. 1799	June 23, 1960	Aug. 19, 1960 S. Rept. 1856*	Aug. 23, 1960*	Aug. 24, 1960	Aug. 26, 1960 Conference Rept. 2165 | Aug. 29, 1960	Sept. 13, 1960	86-778
H.R. 12659 Mr. Ikard	To suspend for a temporary period the import duty on heptanoic acid	June 29, 1960 H. Rept. 2033	July 2, 1960	Aug. 25, 1960 S. Rept. 1913	Aug. 26, 1960*	Aug. 29, 1960	Aug. 31, 1960 Conference Rept. 2212 | Aug. 31, 1960	Sept. 15, 1960	86-795
S. 2282 Messrs. Saltonstall and Kennedy	An act to amend the act of July 17, 1952		Sept. 14, 1959	Aug. 11, 1959 S. Rept. 662*	Sept. 11, 1959*			Sept. 23, 1959	86-371

*With amendments.

Summary of Veterans' Legislation, 86th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting for the information of the Members of Congress material showing the status of veterans' legislation at the end of the 2d session of the 86th Congress, along with certain general information relative to various veterans' programs which I believe will be helpful to Members:

SUMMARY OF VETERANS' LEGISLATION REPORTED, 86TH CONGRESS

LAWS ENACTED

Public Law 86-73 (H.R. 2256): Makes $100 million available to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, upon his request, for immediate use in the direct-loan program for the purpose of reducing existing waiting lists. Provides that the interest rate on guaranteed and direct loans may be set at a rate not to exceed 5¼ percent per annum and repeals provision of law requiring that VA interest rate be not less than one-half percent below FHA rate. Makes certified agents of Federal Housing Administrator eligible to make VA automatic loans if approved by the Veterans' Administration. Authorizes the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to refuse to appraise homes for builders and lenders suspended by FHA. (Approved June 30, 1959.)

Public Law 86-103 (H.R. 5447): Extends for a period of 10 years, to June 30, 1970, the existing authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to maintain offices in the Republic of the Philippines. (Approved July 25, 1959.)

Public Law 86-109 (H.R. 5446): Requires that Veterans canteen service pay reasonable charges for the use of space, buildings, and structures furnished by the Veterans' Administration, the amount of charges to be determined by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. (Approved July 28, 1959.)

Public Law 86-113 (H.R. 3269): Liberalizes statutory bar to benefits available to a veteran discharged during a period of hostilities on his own application or solicitation as an alien by presuming that he was not so discharged in the absence of affirmative evidence establishing the fact. (Approved July 28, 1959.)

Public Law 86-116 (H.R. 269): Grants to employees of the Manila, Republic of the Philippines, office of the Veterans' Administration, who are U.S. citizens, certain allowances and benefits similar to those enjoyed by Foreign Service personnel—transportation, home leave, etc. (Approved July 28, 1959.)

Public Law 86-146 (H.R. 6319): Restricts payment, upon death of an incompetent veteran, of gratuitous veterans' benefits deposited in the "personal funds of patients' trust fund" to wife, child, and dependent parent rather than paying to personal representative. Provides that an incompetent veteran receiving hospital care at public expense and having neither wife nor child shall have any gratuitous VA payments stopped when his estate reaches $1,500 and such payments shall not be resumed until the estate is reduced to $500. Payments may be made for the needs of a dependent parent or parents. Where State institutions charge for the care of a veteran patient, payment out of the benefit is permitted. (Approved August 7, 1959.)

Public Law 86-150 (S. 906): Provides that, for veterans of the Korean conflict, receiving education or training under the "Korean GI bill," a change from the pursuit of one program to the pursuit of another will not be considered a change of program if the first program is prerequisite to, or generally required for, entrance into pursuit of the second. As an example, where a veteran may have declared his educational objective to be the attainment of a master's degree and he later decides that he wishes to attain a doctor's degree, this change of objective would not be considered a change of program. (Approved August 11, 1959.)

Public Law 86-152 (S. 1694): Extends authority of the Veterans' Administration to provide hospital and medical care abroad to include U.S. citizens temporarily residing abroad who require hospital care and medical treatment for peacetime service-incurred disabilities. (Approved August 11, 1959.)

Public Law 86-187 (H.R. 267): Increases the presumptive period for service connection for the disease of multiple sclerosis from the present 2-year period to 3 years. (Approved August 25, 1959.)

Public Law 86-188 (H.R. 271): Provides that Hansen's disease (leprosy) developing to a degree of 10 percent within 3 years from the date of a veteran's separation from the service shall be considered to be service connected. (Approved August 25, 1959.)

Public Law 86-195 (H.R. 2405): Includes as a "child" for purposes of laws administered by the Veterans' Administration (except those relating to insurance and the disposition of personal property of a decedent left upon the premises of a VA facility), one who was a member of the veteran's household at the time of his death and who was adopted by the veteran's spouse within 2 years after death, unless at the time of the veteran's death the child was receiving regular contributions toward his support from some individual other than the veteran or his spouse, or from any public or private welfare organization furnishing services or assistance to children. (Approved August 25, 1959.)

Public Law 86-211 (H.R. 7650): Modifies the pension programs for veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict, and their widows and children.

1. Provides a sliding scale of pensions based on the income and dependency status of the recipient. Such scale of pension rates applies to veterans, and to widows and children, as indicated below:

Veteran, no dependents

Annual income		Monthly pension
More than—	But equal to or less than—	
	$600	$85
$600	$1,200	70
$1,200	$1,800	40

Veteran with dependents

Annual income		Monthly pension		
More than—	But equal to or less than—	Veteran and 1 dependent	Veteran and 2 dependents	Veteran and 3 or more dependents
	$1,000	$90	$95	$100
$1,000	$2,000	75	75	75
$2,000	$3,000	45	45	45

Above rates increased by $70 when veteran needs regular aid and attendance. In addition, for this group the Administrator may furnish an invalid lift. (Invalid lift benefit applies to all wars.)

Widow, no child

Annual income		Monthly pension
More than—	But equal to or less than—	
	$600	$60
$600	$1,200	45
$1,200	$1,800	25

Widow, 1 child [1]

Annual income		Monthly pension
More than—	But equal to or less than—	
	$1,000	$75
$1,000	$2,000	60
$2,000	$3,000	40

[1] Plus $15 for each additional child.

No widow, 1 or more children

Annual income equal to or less than (earned income excluded)—	Monthly pension
$1,800	$35 for 1 child and $15 for each additional child.

2. All income, regardless of source, counts except:

(a) payments of the 6 months' death gratuity;

(b) donations from public or private relief or welfare organizations;

(c) payments by VA of pension, compensation, and dependency and indemnity compensation;

(d) payments under policies of U.S. Government life insurance or national service life insurance, and payments of servicemen's indemnity;

(e) lump sum social security death payments;

(f) payments to an individual under public or private retirement, annuity, endowment, or similar plans or programs equal to his contributions thereto;

(g) amounts equal to amounts paid by a widow or child of a deceased veteran for—

(1) his just debts,

(2) the expenses of his last illness, and

(3) the expenses of his burial to the extent such expenses are not reimbursed by VA;

(h) proceeds of fire insurance policies.

3. The income of the spouse (if not estranged) may count as the veteran's income. In determining annual income, where a veteran is living with his spouse, all income of the spouse which is reasonably available to or for the veteran, except $1,200 of such income, shall be considered as the income of the veteran, unless in the judgment of the Administrator to do so would work a hardship upon the veteran.

4. All waived income counts.

5. Discretionary authority granted VA for a finding on the net worth of the veteran or the widow or child which could lead to a determination that the applicant is not eligible for pension because of net worth.

6. Places World War II and Korean conflict widows and children on same basis as widows and children of World War I for purposes of pension eligibility.

7. The pension of a veteran being furnished hospital or domiciliary care by the Veterans' Administration will be reduced to $30 a month after the expiration of 2 full months but the Administrator may apportion to the wife or children the balance of the pension.

8. Under the savings provision, the amendments to title 38, United States Code, will

not apply to pensioners on the rolls on the day before the effective date unless they seek and are granted pension under the amended title 38. Thus, no person on the pension rolls on the day before the effective date shall have his pension reduced or shall be removed from the pension rolls because of the enactment. All persons on the pension rolls on the day before the effective date will be permitted election to the higher rates if they qualify under the new program or may elect to remain on the rolls under the old law.

The rate under the old law, which may be continued if the veteran chooses, is $66.15 per month, except that where the veteran shall have been rated permanently and totally disabled and has been in receipt of pension for a continuous period of 10 years or reaches the age of 65 years and is permanently and totally disabled, the rate is $78.75 per month. A rate of $135.45 per month is authorized in the case of an otherwise eligible veteran who is helpless or blind or so nearly helpless or blind as to need or require the regular aid and attendance of another person. Such pension is not payable to any unmarried person whose annual income exceeds $1,400 or to any married person or any person with minor children whose annual income exceeds $2,700.

In the case of widows and children, the rates under the old law are as follows (subject to income limitations of $1,400 per year if widow has no child and $2,700 if she does; $1,400 for each child if there is no widow):

Widow	$50.40
Widow, 1 child	63.00
Each additional child	7.56
No widow, 1 child	27.30
No widow, 2 children	40.95
No widow, 3 children	54.60
Each additional child	7.56

9. Effective July 1, 1960.

Of all single veterans now receiving pension, 278,000 or 78 percent will receive more money. Sixty percent or 262,000 of the veterans with dependents receive more while 70 percent or a total of 298,000 widows and orphans benefit by passage of this law. Eighty-seven percent of veterans receiving aid and attendance will be increased.

Of all pensioners, married and single veterans, widows and orphans, almost 70 percent, or 838,000 cases, will get a raise; 72,000 cases would be added to the rolls because of the higher income limits; 206,000 cases would be added to the rolls because of equalization of death pension eligibility. The total cases helped would be 1,116,000.

Estimate of cost of Public Law 86–211

[In thousands of dollars]

Year	Total with equalization	Equalization	Total living and deceased veterans	Living veterans	Deceased veterans
1st	$309,076	$154,268	$154,808	$104,730	$50,078
2d	294,323	162,085	132,238	85,333	46,905
3d	265,599	177,719	87,880	47,320	40,560
4th	222,512	201,169	21,343	[1] 9,699	31,042
5th	165,104	232,476	[1] 67,372	[1] 85,722	18,350
5-year total	1,256,614	927,717	328,897	141,962	186,935
Period ending—					
1970	1,698,760	1,955,594	[1] 256,834	[1] 353,358	96,524
1975	1,784,981	2,171,533	[1] 386,552	[1] 326,367	[1] 60,185
1980	2,245,862	2,816,755	[1] 570,893	[1] 474,456	[1] 96,437
1985	1,985,965	3,357,038	[1] 1,371,073	[1] 1,283,022	[1] 88,051
1990	901,937	3,764,620	[1] 2,862,683	[1] 2,796,991	[1] 65,692
1995	4,065	3,956,505	[1] 3,952,440	[1] 3,876,711	[1] 75,729
2000	[1] 558,984	3,792,893	[1] 4,351,877	[1] 4,220,747	[1] 131,130
Total	9,319,200	22,742,655	[1] 13,423,455	[1] 13,189,690	[1] 233,765

[1] Savings.

This law makes no change in requirements under the old pension program as to disability, length of service, age, and unemployability of a veteran. These requirements are as follows:

A veteran of World War I, World War II, or the Korean conflict is eligible for pension if he is permanently and totally disabled from non-service-connected disability not the result of willful misconduct or vicious habits. He must either have served in the active military, naval, or air service for a period of 90 days or more during the applicable period and have been discharged under conditions other than dishonorable, or have been discharged for a service-connected disability.

The determination of permanent total disability is made on a liberal basis. Such rating is granted (where the requirement of permanence is met) when there is a single disability of 60 percent, or two or more disabilities one of which is 40 percent in degree, combined with other disability or disabilities to a total of 70 percent, and unemployability attributed thereto.

Although age alone is not a basis for entitlement to pension, it is considered in association with disability and unemployability in determining permanent and total disability. The aforementioned percentage requirements are reduced on the attainment of age 55 to a 60-percent rating for one or more disabilities, with no percentage requirements for any one disability; at age 60 to a 50-percent rating for one or more disabilities; and at age 65 to one disability ratable at 10 precent or more. When these reduced percentage requirements are met and the disability or disabilities involved are of a permanent nature, a permanent and total disability rating will be assigned, if the veteran is determined to be unable to secure and follow substantially gainful employment by reason of such disability.

A widow's age, disability, or unemployability is not considered in determining her eligibility for a pension, either under the old law or under the provisions of Public Law 86–211. Under the old law, a widow of World War I, World War II, or the Korean conflict is required to meet an annual income limitation of $1,400 if she has no dependents or $2,700 if she has dependents. In addition, the deceased husband of a widow of World War II or the Korean conflict must have had a service-connected disability, although his death was not caused by this disability. Public Law 86–211 removes this latter requirement and places the widows of World War II and the Korean conflict in the same status as widows of World War I veterans. (Approved August 29, 1959.)

Public Law 86–212 (H.R. 255): Makes applicable to a competent veteran who disappears the provisions of existing law which provide that where an incompetent veteran who is receiving compensation for a service-connected disability disappears, the Veterans' Administration may pay to his wife, children, and parents the compensation otherwise payable to such veteran, amounts payable to each not to exceed the amount payable if the veteran had died from a service-connected disability. (Approved September 1, 1959.)

Public Law 86–222 (H.R. 7106): Prior to passage of Public Law 86–222, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs had authority to forfeit the rights of veterans, widows, children, and dependent parents to all gratuitous benefits under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration. Forfeiture was authorized in two categories:

1. Where the Administrator finds the one claiming benefits has been guilty of mutiny, treason, sabotage, or rendering assistance to an enemy;

2. Where a false or fraudulent statement has been made concerning any claim for benefits.

The forfeiture decision of the Administrator was final and not subject to review in the courts. Forfeiture, if adjudged, forfeits all benefits and continues for the lifetime of the forfeited individual, unless pardoned by the President.

This law continues the authority of the Administrator to forfeit in all cases where the guilty person resides, or is domiciled, outside the jurisdiction of the U.S. courts.

Where the accused resides, or is domiciled, within the United States at the time of the offense, the new law eliminates the authority of the Administrator to impose a forfeiture based upon false or fraudulent statements. Forfeitures previously imposed are not affected. This law also provides for automatic forfeiture of rights to gratuitous veterans' benefits in all cases of conviction of certain specified offenses involving loyalty or security. A Presidential pardon restores the right to benefits.

Authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to make an apportionment award disability compensation to dependents of veterans in cases of administrative forfeiture for fraud or forfeiture for offenses involving loyalty or security is terminated. (Approved September 1, 1959.)

Public Law 86–236 (H.R. 2773): Provides war orphans' educational assistance to children of veterans of the Spanish-American War who die as the result of a disability incurred or aggravated during that period of war service. (Approved September 8, 1959.)

Public Law 86–239 (H.R. 7373): Expands the program of assistance for severely disabled veterans in acquiring homes equipped with special facilities made necessary by the character of their service-connected disabilities. The bill brings into this program those with compensable permanent and total disabilities incurred when such disability includes (1) blindness in both eyes, having only light perception, plus (2) loss, or loss of use, of one lower extremity such as to preclude locomotion without the aid of a wheelchair. Also, it removes the limitation that where eligibility is based on loss, or loss of use, of both lower extremities that such loss must have been due to certain specified conditions. (Approved September 8, 1959.)

Public Law 86–255 (H.R. 7040): Veterans' Administration appropriations, fiscal year beginning July 1, 1959, and ending June 30, 1960. (For details, see: "Veterans' Administration Appropriations," p. 14. This legislation reported from House Appropriations Committee.) (Approved September 14, 1959.)

Public Law 86-490 (H.R. 276): Authorizes payment to veterans of additional compensation for dependents (based on establishment of a disability rating of not less than 50 percent) from the effective date of the increased percentage evaluation, provided basic proof of dependents is received by Veterans' Administration within 60 days from date of notification of rating action. (Approved June 8, 1960.)

Public Law 86-491 (H.R. 641): Authorizes payment of service-connected death compensation to an otherwise eligible widow of a veteran if she was married to him before the expiration of 15 years after the termination of the period of service in which the injury or disease causing his death was incurred or aggravated. (Approved June 8, 1960.)

Public Law 86-492 (H.R. 7502): The service-connected death benefit of dependency and indemnity compensation is payable to a widow at a monthly rate equal to $112 plus 12 percent of the "basic pay" of her deceased husband. Generally, such basic pay is computed by using the rank of the veteran at the time of his death in active service or last discharge therefrom. The law changes the method of computing basic pay for dependency and indemnity compensation purposes by using a higher rank held in service than that held at the time of a veteran's death in service or his discharge therefrom, if the use of such higher rank would result in a greater benefit to the widow. It applies to cases where the veteran had satisfactorily served on active duty for 6 months or more in such higher rank and was so serving within 120 days of death or discharge. (Approved June 8, 1960.)

Public Law 86-494 (H.R. 9785): Grants gratuitous national service life insurance in a maximum amount of $10,000 to any enlisted person who died as the result of an aviation accident incurred in line of duty while undergoing flight training in the active service of the Army or Navy after October 7, 1940, and before August 4, 1942, if such person would have been eligible for life insurance with premiums paid by the United States had he been serving under an appointment as an aviation cadet. Upon application filed generally within 2 years, the insurance is payable effective from the date of enactment of the bill in monthly installments to a limited class of beneficiaries, if living, and no payment is made to the estate of any person. Liability for such payments to be borne by the national service life insurance appropriation. (Approved June 8, 1960.)

Public Law 86-495 (H.R. 9788): Prohibits the payment or furnishing of benefits under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration to or on account of any child by reason of the death of more than one parent in the same parental line. The law permits a child to elect one or more times to receive benefits by reason of the death of any one parent in the same parental line, thus allowing the child to receive the greater of two or more benefits. Applies only to cases where the death of a parent occurs after the date of enactment thereof. (Approved June 8, 1960.)

Public Law 86-497 (H.R. 10703): Grants waiver of payment of national service life insurance premiums, upon application, in any case in which an insured, during World War II or the early Korean conflict, became totally disabled in line of duty after making application for insurance and prior to the effective date thereof and remained continuously totally disabled to date of death or the date of enactment, whichever is earlier. A waiver of premiums under this law would render the insurance nonparticipating while the waiver is in effect. (Approved June 8, 1960.)

Public Law 86-499 (H.R. 10898): Authorizes payment of additional $12 per month for each child of service-connected disabled war veterans who qualify to receive dependents' allowance (50 percent disabled or more) and 80 percent of that rate for peacetime veterans. (Approved June 8, 1960.)

Public Law 86-501 (H.R. 113): Prohibits the severance of a service-connected disability which has been in effect for 10 or more years, except when based on fraud or when military records clearly show that the individual did not have the requisite character of discharge or service. To be effective January 1, 1962. (Approved June 10, 1960.)

Public Law 86-590 (H.R. 10108): Authorizes reimbursement for ferry fares, and bridge, road, and tunnel tolls, in addition to the mileage allowance payable for the travel of certain Veterans' Administration beneficiaries and their attendants. (Approved July 5, 1960.)

Public Law 86-598 (H.R. 7966): Provides for the furnishing of needed services of optometrists by the Veterans' Administration to veterans having service-connected eye conditions. The Veterans' Administration was authorized to furnish outpatient medical care for veterans with service-connected disabilities prior to enactment of this law. This care is furnished primarily in Veterans' Administration clinics but is supplemented by using the services of fee-basis private physicians where it is not feasible to care for veterans at the clinics. (Approved July 7, 1960.)

Public Law 86-625 (H.R. 10596): Reimburses State homes at the rate of $2.50 per veteran per day (or a maximum of $912.50 a year per veteran) rather than at the rate of $700 per annum, for care of veteran members who are eligible for care in Veterans' Administration hospital or domiciliary facilities. (Approved July 12, 1960.)

Public Law 86-626 (H.R. 11776): Veterans' Administration appropriations, fiscal year beginning July 1, 1960, and ending June 30, 1961. (For details, see: "Veterans' Administration Appropriations," page 14. This legislation reported from House Appropriations Committee.) (Approved July 12, 1960.)

Public Law 86-639 (H.R. 7965): Authorizes the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to furnish medical services for a non-service-connected disability when reasonably necessary in preparation for admission of a veteran in need of hospital care. Outpatient treatment reasonably necessary to complete treatment incident to a veteran's hospital care is also permitted. (Approved July 12, 1960.)

Public Law 86-663 (H.R. 7211): Establishes a new statutory rate of disability compensation for certain service-connected seriously disabled veterans. A monthly rate of $265 is authorized for a veteran who has a service-connected disability rated as total and (1) has additional service-connected disability or disabilities independently ratable at 60 percent or more, or (2) by reason of his service-connected disability or disabilities is "permanently housebound." (Approved July 14, 1960.)

Public Law 86-665 (H.R. 7903): Extends the World War II loan guarantee program and the World War II and Korean conflict direct loan program for 2 years, from July 25, 1960, to July 25, 1962. Permits processing of loan guarantee applications and closing of direct loans subsequent to July 25, 1962, when applications received (for loan guarantee) or commitments issued (for direct loans) before that date. Authority for Treasury advances to the direct loan revolving fund in the aggregate amount of $150 million per fiscal year (but not more than $50 million in any one quarter) are continued through fiscal years 1961 and 1962. Committee amendment adopted on House floor provides (1) for issuance of guarantee when veteran has in fact occupied house as his home but occupancy certifications were not completed; (2) that a veteran's deposit or downpayment be held by seller in a trust account until the loan is closed; and (3) that a revolving fund be established in the Veterans' Administration. (Approved July 14, 1960.)

Public Law 86-670 (H.R. 9786): Permits Indian war and Spanish-American War veterans to elect to receive aid-and-attendance pension at the rates and under the conditions (except service requirements) applicable to World War I veterans. (See Public Law 86-211, p. 2 of this summary.) (Approved July 14, 1960.)

Public Law 86-721 (H.R. 3313): Amends the Soldiers and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940 to provide that facts may be established by written unsworn statements, declarations, verifications, or certificates which are certified to be true under penalty of perjury. These statements would be in lieu of affidavits which are today required in any court action or proceeding where there is default of any appearance by the defendant. In such a case the claimant shall, prior to entering a judgment, file in the court an affidavit setting forth either (1) that the defendant is not in military service, or (2) that the defendant is in military service, or (3) that the plaintiff is unable to determine the status of the defendant insofar as military service is concerned.

Senate amendment extends vocational rehabilitation program until July 25, 1965, for service-connected disabled veterans of World War II who have been prevented from entering or completing training because: (a) they had not attained, retained, or regained medical feasibility for training because of disability; (b) they had not met the requirement of an honorable discharge but character of discharge was later changed by appropriate authority; or (c) they had not timely established the existence of a compensable service-connected disability. Program is also extended for those veterans in training on June 1, 1960, until such time as training is completed. (Approved September 8, 1960.)

Public Law 86-785 (H.R. 4306): Provides educational assistance for the children of persons who die as the direct result of armed conflict or while engaged in extrahazardous service (including such service under conditions simulating war) during the period after January 31, 1955, and before the end of compulsory military service.

Senate committee amendment extends eligibility to children of persons who die as the result of disabilities incurred in the performance of duty and specifies conditions under which training by open-circuit television may be allowed. (Approved September 14, 1960.)

PASSED HOUSE AND PASSED SENATE WITH AMENDMENT, RETURNED TO HOUSE FOR CONSIDERATION OF AMENDMENT

H.R. 1104: Provides a new plan of insurance for national service life insurance (NSLI) policyholders. The plan is modified life insurance which provides a level premium throughout the life of the insured but the face value of the policy will be automatically reduced by 50 percent at the end of the day preceding the insured's 65th birthday. The face value of any extended term insurance in force under the modified life policy would also be reduced by 50 percent at that time. The plan is permissive. Policyholders may elect to retain the insurance otherwise lost at age 65 by paying premiums for age 65 without medical examination. The modified life plan will provide permanent plan insurance at a lower premium rate than the existing permanent plans of insurance. This is true because the protection is cut in half at age 65 and a

more realistic table is used for calculation of premiums on participating insurance. A comparison of premiums per $1,000 of participating insurance is as follows:

Age	Annual premium for the modified life plan	Annual premium, present rates		Level premium after age 65	
		8 LPT	O.L.	If 50 percent face continued	If 100 percent face continued
30	$9.83	$8.41	$18.47	$9.83	$43.22
35	11.72	9.00	21.31	11.72	45.11
40	14.09	10.06	25.10	14.09	47.48
45	17.17	11.72	30.07	17.17	50.56
50	20.84	15.04	36.94	20.84	54.23
55	25.22	20.95	46.53	25.22	58.61
65		47.00	78.97		

Senate amendment permits issuance of national service life insurance to persons eligible to apply between October 8, 1940, and December 31, 1956, both dates inclusive. Application to be submitted in writing within 1 year after January 1, 1961, with proof of good health at time of application. Veterans who served between April 26, 1951, and December 31, 1956, with service-connected disabilities may obtain a special type of policy. Administrative cost and cost of physical examination to be borne by veteran.

House Report No. 1543; April 21, 1960.

Passed House May 2, 1960.

Referred to Senate Finance Committee May 3, 1960.

Senate Report No. 1485; May 26, 1960.

Passed Senate June 2, 1960, with amendment.

PASSED HOUSE, AMENDED BY SENATE, RETURNED TO SENATE BY HOUSE FOR RECONSIDERATION OF AMENDMENTS

H.R. 270: As originally passed by House, increased from $10 to $100 the monthly pension payable to holders of the Congressional Medal of Honor, permits payment at any age instead of the present requirement of attaining the age of 65 years, and pays holders of the medal whether or not they are on active duty.

Senate amendment permitted election of $10 or $100 rate, subject to reduction by the amount of any non-service-connected pension payment received by the veteran. Those veterans receiving compensation or retirement permitted election of $10 or $100 rate, not subject to reduction, but paid in addition to compensation or retirement payments. Age requirement reduced from 65 to 62.

House amendment to Senate amendment reduced qualifying age from 65 to 50 and provided that a veteran receiving non-service-connected aid and attendance pension may receive, in addition, the special $100 a month Medal of Honor pension. Not payable to active duty or retired personnel.

House Report No. 413; June 2, 1959.

Passed House July 20, 1959.

Referred to Senate Finance Committee July 21, 1959.

Senate Report No. 1837, with amendment, August 17, 1960.

Passed Senate August 19, 1960, with amendment.

Passed House August 29, 1960, with amendment to Senate amendment.

BILLS PASSED BY HOUSE, REFERRED TO SENATE COMMITTEES

H.R. 268: Adds "deafness of both ears, having absence of air and bone conduction" to the other types of service-connected disabilities specified in the law pertaining to veterans' disability compensation for which an additional award in the amount of $47 monthly is provided.

House Report No. 411, June 2, 1959.

Passed House August 31, 1959.

Referred to Senate Finance Committee September 1, 1959.

Senate committee action: Tabled April 4, 1960.

H.R. 283: Provides that if a veteran, as a result of service-connected disability, has suffered the anatomical loss or loss of use of one foot, or one hand, or both buttocks, or blindness of one eye, having only light perception, the rate of compensation therefor shall be $47 per month for each such loss or loss of use independent of any other compensation provided in subsections (a) to (j). At present this provision limits payment thereunder to one statutory award of $47 per month for all such losses, except where the losses are in addition to other combinations of disabilities specified in subsections (l) to (n). Under the bill as reported, the total payment in any case may not exceed $309 and the loss of more than one creative organ would, for this purpose, be considered a single "loss." In peacetime cases the rates are 80 percent of the above-mentioned rates.

House Report No. 415, with amendments, June 2, 1959.

Passed House August 31, 1959.

Referred to Senate Finance Committee September 1, 1959.

Senate committee action: Tabled April 4, 1960.

H.R. 5996: Authorizes payment in a lump sum of the total amount of compensation, representing the statutory awards of $47 monthly for the anatomical loss or loss of use of a creative organ and $67 monthly for arrested tuberculosis disease, which would have been payable for the period August 1, 1952, to date of bill's enactment had claim therefor been filed on August 1, 1952 (the effective date of Public Law 427, 82d Cong., which first provided such statutory awards for World War II and Korean conflict veterans). Applies to all cases in which the condition was determined, before August 1, 1952, as service connected, and would require reduction of the amount payable by any such statutory awards paid during that period.

House Report No. 419; June 2, 1959.

Passed House July 20, 1959.

Referred to Senate Finance Committee July 21, 1959.

Senate committee action: Tabled April 4, 1960.

H.R. 8098: Permits the combination, or tacking, of two or more separate periods of service during more than one period of war in satisfying the 90-day service requirement for payment of non-service-connected disability or death pension to veterans and their widows and their children.

House Report No. 1536; April 21, 1960.

Passed House May 2, 1960.

Referred to Senate Finance Committee May 3, 1960.

H.R. 9792: Provides that the salaries of managers of Veterans' Administration hospitals, domiciliaries, and centers shall be not less than $16,500 per annum and the salaries of directors of professional services shall be $16,250 per annum.

House Report No. 1539; April 21, 1960.

Passed House May 16, 1960.

Referred to Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service May 17, 1960.

H.R. 12566: Requires that decisions of the Board of Veterans' Appeals shall be in writing and shall contain findings of fact and conclusions of law separately stated.

House Report No. 2030; June 29, 1960.

Passed House August 23, 1960.

Referred to Senate Finance Committee August 24, 1960.

BILLS REFERRED TO HOUSE COMMITTEE FOLLOWING PASSAGE BY SENATE

S. 1138: Provides readjustment benefits to persons with more than 180 days of service, entering the service after January 31, 1955, and before the termination of compulsory military service (July 1, 1963), as follows:

1. Education and vocational training;

2. Vocational rehabilitation (for veterans with service-connected disabilities); and

3. Guaranteed and direct-loan assistance for the purchase of a home or farmlands, livestock, machinery, etc., to be used in farming operations conducted by the veteran.

S. 1138, 86TH CONG. (AS PASSED BY THE SENATE ON JULY 21, 1959)

TABLE 1.—*Sec. 2. Education and training—Estimate of expenditures for direct benefits and monthly average trainees* [1]

Fiscal year	Expenditures for direct benefits			Monthly average trainees				
	Total	Educational loans [2]	Grants	Total	College	Below college	Job	Farm
1961	$178,000,000		$178,000,000	134,000	76,000	47,000	8,000	3,000
1962	360,000,000	$25,000,000	325,000,000	271,000	128,000	108,000	22,000	13,000
1963	379,000,000	37,000,000	342,000,000	285,000	134,000	114,000	24,000	13,000
1964	375,000,000	34,000,000	341,000,000	281,000	128,000	116,000	24,000	13,000
1965	362,000,000	39,000,000	323,000,000	272,000	124,000	112,000	23,000	13,000
1966	359,000,000	38,000,000	321,000,000	269,000	121,000	112,000	23,000	13,000
1967	322,000,000	38,000,000	284,000,000	242,000	109,000	104,000	18,000	11,000
1968	247,000,000	31,000,000	216,000,000	186,000	84,000	81,000	12,000	9,000
1969	182,000,000	24,000,000	158,000,000	137,000	62,000	61,000	8,000	6,000
1970	130,000,000	18,000,000	112,000,000	98,000	45,000	44,000	4,500	4,500
1971	90,000,000	13,000,000	77,000,000	67,000	32,000	30,000	2,000	3,000
1972	58,000,000	9,000,000	49,000,000	44,000	21,000	20,000	1,000	2,000
1973	37,000,000	6,000,000	31,000,000	27,500	13,500	12,500	500	1,000
Total [3]	3,079,000,000	312,000,000	2,767,000,000					

[1] This estimate assumes enactment early in fiscal year 1961, prior to the beginning of the school year. Amounts which might be expended because of retroactive payments for training subsequent to Sept. 1, 1939, as currently provided in the proposal, are not included in the estimate. With retroactive payments for fiscal year 1960, approximately $46,000,000 additional would be expended for grants, and approximately $10,000,000 of the total expenditures shown for fiscal year 1961 would be for loans.

[2] Assumes persons taking loans would take as much as they would have received on a grant basis.

[3] Total is through fiscal year 1973 only. Additional expenditures for direct benefits beyond fiscal year 1973 have not been estimated. The program will continue for several years beyond fiscal year 1973.

TABLE 2.—*Sec. 3. Vocational rehabilitation—Estimate of expenditures for direct benefits and monthly average trainees* [1]

Fiscal year	Expenditures for direct benefits	Monthly average trainees
1961	$6,000,000	3,200
1962	13,000,000	6,800
1963	18,000,000	9,000
1964	19,000,000	9,800
1965	19,000,000	9,900

[1] These estimates assume that there will be no concurrent readjustment education and training program. Participation and cost would be reduced to approximately ½ the amounts shown if there is a concurrent readjustment education and training program.

Administrative costs, including counseling and beneficiary travel, would approximate one-sixth of the direct benefit cost.

S. 1138, 86th Cong. (as passed by the Senate on July 21, 1959)

TABLE 3.—*Sec. 4. Home and farm loan benefits*

Participating veterans [1]	1,000,000–1,250,000
Administrative cost	$40,000,000–$50,000,000

[1] Assumes that the number of entries into the Armed Forces continues at approximately the present rate and that from 3 to 4 million veterans will become eligible for the loan benefits.

The cost to the Government of the proposed extension of the loan guaranty benefits is not subject to precise estimate. It is quite problematical whether a one-half of 1 percent fee (the maximum permitted by the bill) would be adequate for offsetting the expenses resulting from claims under the guarantee and the subsequent expenses which might result from acquisition of properties, their management and sale. To the extent that the mortgage guarantee fund, which would be derived primarily from such fees, proved inadequate to meet these expenses, they would be paid out of appropriated funds.

No additional direct loan funds would be provided by the bill beyond those which will be available under present law for the World War II and Korean veterans. Hence, no additional direct loans would be authorized, but there would be an increased demand for the limited amount of direct loan money available.

Senate Report No. 514, July 14, 1959.

Passed Senate July 21, 1959, with amendment.

House committee action: Hearings, February 23–26, March 3, 4, 9, and 14, 1960.

S. 2201: Proposes to amend the definition of the term "Veterans' Administration facilities" contained in 38 U.S.C. 601(4)(C) to include private contract facilities for veterans of any war in a State if (1) no Veterans' Administration hospital is located in the State on the effective date of the act, and (2) no Veterans' Administration hospital is located within 500 miles of the border of the State.

This would permit the use of private contract hospitals for the care of war veterans with non-service-connected disabilities in the State of Alaska. Hawaii having become a State, private hospitals there could also be used for hospitalization of veterans with non-service-connected disabilities.

Senate Report No. 1730, June 24, 1960.

Passed Senate June 28, 1960.

Referred to House Committee on Veterans' Affairs June 29, 1960.

BILLS REPORTED BY HOUSE COMMITTEE, FAILED TO PASS HOUSE

H.R. 12653: Establishes a Court of Veterans' Appeals consisting of five judges to be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. Judges are to be appointed for 10-year terms.

The bill also authorizes the court to appoint not more than 50 commissioners. The commissioners shall perform such duties as the court may prescribe, including the conducting of hearings, the receiving of evidence, and the making of such reports as the court may prescribe.

The court is given exclusive jurisdiction to review by appeal decisions of the Board of Veterans' Appeals except in cases involving life insurance contracts, housing or business loans where jurisdiction is now vested in the U.S. courts.

The decisions of the court shall be final. This, for the first time, subjects decisions of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to review by a separate and independent agency.

House Report No. 2031, June 29, 1960.

Passed over, August 23, 1960, House Consent Calendar.

Summary of Veterans' Affairs Committee action

	Congress						
	80th	81st	82d	83d	84th	85th	86th
Bills and resolutions referred	498	619	436	402	537	491	628
Hearings sessions	60	64	50	46	71	69	55
Hearings, printed pages	3,596	2,355	2,562	5,337	4,271	4,834	3,472
Executive sessions	49	34	27	55	37	28	21
Bills reported	60	44	36	36	48	44	42
Bills in House	16	1		14	1	5	2
Pending in Senate committees	6	16	14	2	17	11	6
Bills on Senate Calendar		1	1	2			1
Recommitted		1	1			1	
Bills vetoed	1	2	4			1	
Bills passed over veto		1	2				
Laws enacted	36	24	22	25	30	26	33

VA appropriations (fiscal years ending June 30, 1960 and 1961)

	Public Law 86–255 approved Sept. 14, 1959 (fiscal year 1960)	Public Law 86–626 approved July 12, 1960 (fiscal year 1961)
General operating expenses	$163,373,000	$153,500,000
Medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses	29,349,000	34,500,000
Inpatient care	792,079,000	817,021,000
Outpatient care	83,866,000	86,481,000
Maintenance and operation of supply depots	2,218,000	2,500,000
Compensation and pensions	3,300,000,000	3,800,000,000
Readjustment benefits	585,000,000	344,000,000
Veterans' insurance and indemnities	$53,000,000	$48,800,000
Construction of hospitals and domiciliary facilities	31,659,000	75,000,000
Grants to the Republic of the Philippines	2,000,000	1,500,000
Service disabled veterans insurance fund		
Soldiers and sailors' civil relief		
Total	5,042,544,000	5,363,302,000

STATUS OF BILLS REPORTED, BY BILL NUMBER

(For additional information, see appropriate section of this summary)

H.R. 113: Public Law 86–501.
H.R. 255: Public Law 86–212.
H.R. 267: Public Law 86–187.
H.R. 268: Tabled, Senate Finance Committee.
H.R. 269: Public Law 86–116.
H.R. 270: Tabled, Senate floor.
H.R. 271: Public Law 86–188.
H.R. 276: Public Law 86–490.
H.R. 283: Tabled, Senate Finance Committee.
H.R. 641: Public Law 86–491.
H.R. 2256: Public Law 86–73.
H.R. 2405: Public Law 86–195.
H.R. 2773: Public Law 86–236.
H.R. 3269: Public Law 86–113.
H.R. 3313: Public Law 86–721.
H.R. 4306: Public Law 86–785.
H.R. 5446: Public Law 86–109.
H.R. 5447: Public Law 86–103.
H.R. 5996: Tabled, Senate Finance Committee.
H.R. 6319: Public Law 86–146.
H.R. 7040 [1]: Public Law 86–255.
H.R. 7106: Public Law 86–222.
H.R. 7211: Public Law 86–663.
H.R. 7373: Public Law 86–239.
H.R. 7502: Public Law 86–492.
H.R. 7650: Public Law 86–211.
H.R. 7903: Public Law 86–665.
H.R. 7965: Public Law 86–639.
H.R. 7966: Public Law 86–598.
H.R. 8098: Pending, Senate Finance Committee.
H.R. 9785: Public Law 86–494.
H.R. 9786: Public Law 86–670.
H.R. 9788: Public Law 86–495.
H.R. 9792: Pending, Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee.
H.R. 10108: Public Law 86–590.
H.R. 10596: Public Law 86–625.
H.R. 10703: Public Law 86–497.
H.R. 10898: Public Law 86–499.
H.R. 11045: Passed House; passed Senate amended; returned to Speaker's table.
H.R. 11776 [1]: Public Law 86–626.
H.R. 12566: Referred, Senate Finance Committee.
H.R. 12653: House Calendar.
S. 906 [2]: Public Law 86–150.
S. 1138 [2]: Pending, House Veterans' Affairs Committee.
S. 1694 [2]: Public Law 86–152.
S. 2201 [2]: Pending, House Veterans' Affairs Committee.

[1] Reported from House Appropriations Committee.

[2] Reported from Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee.

Estimated distribution of compensation and pensions, fiscal years 1960 and 1961

	Fiscal year 1960			Fiscal year 1961		
	Total	Living	Deceased	Total	Living	Deceased
Compensation (service-connected), total	$2,043,731,000	$1,563,904,000	$479,827,000	$2,066,288,000	$1,581,394,000	$484,894,000
Spanish-American War	1,794,000	542,000	1,252,000	1,774,000	509,000	1,256,000
World War I	264,463,000	204,019,000	60,444,000	252,334,000	190,172,000	62,162,000
World War II	1,422,747,000	1,102,476,000	320,271,000	1,437,509,000	1,119,059,000	318,450,000
Korean conflict	227,396,000	178,070,000	49,326,000	236,698,000	186,310,000	50,388,000
Peacetime service	127,331,000	78,797,000	48,534,000	137,973,000	85,344,000	52,629,000
Pensions (non-service-connected), total	1,202,539,000	848,676,000	353,863,000	1,715,807,000	1,144,796,000	571,011,000
Yellow fever experiments	5,000	5,000		5,000	5,000	
Mexican War	2,000		2,000	2,000		2,000
Indian wars	615,000	83,000	532,000	574,000	63,000	511,000
Civil War	2,775,000	3,000	2,772,000	3,012,000	2,000	3,010,000
Spanish-American War	103,131,000	41,826,000	61,305,000	99,042,000	41,761,000	57,281,000
World War I	978,312,000	727,188,000	251,124,000	1,316,093,000	991,824,000	324,269,000
World War II	110,049,000	73,781,000	36,268,000	279,897,000	102,008,000	177,889,000
Korean conflict	7,579,000	5,744,000	1,835,000	17,112,000	9,090,000	8,022,000
Peacetime service (private acts)	71,000	46,000	25,000	90,000	63,000	27,000
Other—Total	60,730,000	17,659,000	43,071,000	57,905,000	13,407,000	44,498,000
Emergency officer's disability retirement (World War I)	3,408,000	3,408,000		3,406,000	3,406,000	
Adjusted service and dependent's pay	1,000		1,000	1,000		1,000
Subsistence allowance for disabled veteran trainees	14,151,000	14,151,000		9,916,000	9,916,000	
Initial burial allowances	43,070,000		43,070,000	44,497,000		44,497,000
Special allowance, dependents (70 Stat. 857)	100,000	100,000		85,000	85,000	
Program total	3,307,000,000	2,430,239,000	876,761,000	3,840,000,000	2,739,597,000	1,100,403,000

VETERANS IN AMERICA

Population of veterans

America's population of living veterans is over 22,500,000.

About two-thirds, or more than 15 million served in World War II. They average nearly 42 years of age.

Almost 5,500,000—average age 31—served during the Korean conflict period. Approximately 960,000 of them are "double duty" veterans, serving both in World War II and the Korean conflict.

Less than 2,700,000—average age 66—served in World War I.

Spanish-American War veterans—average age 83—number 36,000. Less than 50 oldtimers served in the Indian wars. Their average age is 91 years.

The Nation's veterans, together with their families and survivors of deceased veterans, make up about 45 percent of the total population of the United States.

MEDICINE

VA operates 170 hospitals for the care of ill and disabled veterans. On any average day, VA's patient load exceeds 114,000. During an average year, VA admits nearly half a million veterans in its hospital program.

Admissions are under a priority system.

First call goes to veterans with service-connected conditions. Generally, the service-connected are admitted immediately.

And next—if beds are available—come veterans with non-service-connected ailments who are unable to pay for private hospitalization. In addition to signing a statement of inability to pay, they also must submit a statement of their assets and liabilities.

INSURANCE

Approximately 6 million veterans today hold GI insurance policies valued at over $42 billion. The breakdown:

Nearly 5 million World War II veterans hold $34.7 billion of participating national service life insurance; 620,000 Korea veterans hold $5.9 billion of special nonparticipating national service life insurance; 43,000 disabled Korea and post-Korea veterans hold $380 million of special nonparticipating insurance—the only type that may now be newly issued; 275,000 World War I veterans hold $1.4 billion of participating U.S. Government life insurance.

GI LOANS

Eligibility: Any person who served in the armed services at any time on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to July 26, 1947, or on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to February 1, 1955, discharged under conditions other than dishonorable after active service of 90 days or more or because of disability incurred in line of duty is eligible. Generally loans, or applications for guarantee, must be made prior to July 26, 1962, for World War II veterans; veterans of Korea have until January 31, 1965. Widows of deceased veterans whose death was due to service may also qualify.

Amounts: Non-real-estate loans up to $2,000 and real-estate loans in certain cases up to $7,500, or a prorated portion thereof, or loans of both types or combinations thereof, may be guaranteed with interest at not more than 5¼ percent per annum, repayable in not more than 30 years, except in the case of farm realty, which may run for 40 years. (Maturity on non-real-estate loan may not exceed 10 years.) If the proceeds of the loan are to be used for the acquisition of residential property, the amount guaranteed may be 60 percent of the loan but not over $7,500. Banks or other lending institutions make the loans, with the Government guaranteeing 50 or 60 percent of the loan, but in no case to exceed the above amounts. Under certain conditions, Veterans' Administration is authorized to lend, until July 25, 1962, up to $13,500 directly to the veteran when private sources are not available.

Under this program, veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict have borrowed more than $48 billion for homes of their own. VA has guaranteed more than half of this amount, or $26 billion.

The record established by veterans in meeting their GI loan obligations is unparalleled.

So far, veterans have repaid in full nearly 1,600,000 GI loans having a total value of $10 billion.

Defaults on GI loans—for which VA has had to make good the guaranteed portions to lenders—number a mere 61,000, or slightly more than 1 percent of the total number of loans granted.

EDUCATION

More than 10½ million veterans so far have trained under the four programs. That's more than three times the total enrollments in every college and university in the United States of America.

Of the 10½ million total—

More than 7,800,000—one-half of all World War II veterans—trained under the World War II GI bill. Of them, 44 percent went to schools below the college level (such as trade and technical schools); 29 percent studied in college, and the rest trained on the job and on the farm.

Another 2,330,000—more than 2 out of every 5 Korea veterans—trained under the Korean GI bill. Their numbers will grow (the program doesn't end until 1965).

A new trend has developed under the Korean GI bill. Fewer veterans have attended schools below the college level (36 percent), and more have gone to college (more than 50 percent). Enrollments in on-the-job and on-the-farm courses account for the balance.

Another 615,000 disabled World War II veterans and 64,000 disabled Korea veterans have received vocational rehabilitation training. Some 40 percent have trained for top-level jobs in professional and managerial fields.

It has helped raise the educational level of veterans to better than 4 years of high school, whereas the level of nonveteran males, same age group, is but 2 years of high school. "Your every voter, as surely as your chief magistrate, exercises a public trust," said Grover Cleveland. Through more education, veterans have become better prepared to exercise this public trust.

It has helped build up America's reservoirs of trained manpower, so urgently needed for our Nation's strength and well-being. This country has gained immeasurably from the 478,000 engineers, 391,000 schoolteachers, 275,000 in the medical and related fields (130,000 doctors, dentists, nurses), and 140,000 scientists who learned their skills under the GI bill and the vocational rehabilitation programs.

Approximately 20,000 war orphans have trained since the war orphans educational assistance program began in the fall of 1956. Of these, 79 percent trained in college and

the rest in schools below the college level. Approximately 1 in 6 had selected objectives in the scientific field. Of the 1,400 training in the medical and related fields, more than 900 were female students most of whom selected the field of nursing. Almost all of the 1,100 training to be engineers were males. More than 500 trained to be scientists. Approximately 2,300 trained to be schoolteachers.

NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS AND DEATHS IN SERVICE DURING ALL WARS; NUMBER OF LIVING VETERANS, AND VETERANS AND DEPENDENTS ON COMPENSATION AND PENSION ROLLS, JUNE 30, 1960

Revolution (1775–83): Participants, 395,000; deaths in service, 4,000; last veteran died April 5, 1869, at age 109; last dependent died 1906, at age 92.

War of 1812 (1812–14): Participants, 536,000; deaths in service, 2,000; last veteran died May 13, 1905, at age 105; last dependent died 1946.

Mexican War (1846–48): Participants, 130,000; deaths in service, 13,000; last veteran died September 3, 1929, at age 98. Dependents on compensation and pension rolls: Widows, two; children, one.

Civil War (1861–65) (Union forces only): Participants, 2,213,000; deaths in service, 364,000; last veteran died August 2, 1956, at age 109. Veterans and dependents on compensation and pension rolls (Union and Confederate forces): Widows, 3,164; children, 749.

Indian Wars (approximately 1860–98): Participants, 106,000; deaths in service, 1,000; living veterans, 44. Veterans and dependents on compensation and pension rolls: Widows, 665; children, 21; veterans, 44.

Spanish-American War (1898–1902): Participants, 392,000; deaths in service, 11,000; living veterans, 36,000. Veterans and dependents on compensation and pension rolls: Parents, 2; widows, 77,395; children, 2,336; veterans, 33,373.

World War I (1917–18): Participants, 4,744,000; deaths in service, 131,000; living veterans, 2,673,000. Veterans and dependents on compensation and pension rolls: Parents, 10,889; widows, 435,240; children, 78,511; veterans, 1,025,730.

World War II (Sept. 16, 1940–July 25, 1947): Participants, 16,535,000 [1]; deaths in service, 409,000; living veterans, 15,202,000.[2] Veterans and dependents on compensation and pension rolls: Parents, 252,030; widows, 93,664; children, 189,615; veterans, 1,633,451.

Korean conflict (June 27, 1950–January 31, 1955): Participants, 6,807,000 [1]; deaths in service, 54,000; living veterans, 5,482,000.[2] Veterans and dependents on compensation and pension rolls: Parents, 36,771; widows, 10,843; children, 22,579; veterans, 212,857.

Total, all wars: Participants,[3] 31,858,000; deaths in service, 989,000; living veterans, 22,534,000.[4] Veterans and dependents on compensation and pension rolls: Parents, 317,805,[5] widows, 638,065 [6]; children, 306,115 [7]; veterans, 3,008,935.[4]

[1] Includes 1,476,000 who served in both World War II and the Korean conflict.

[2] Includes 962,000 with service in both World War II and the Korean conflict.

[3] Persons who served in more than one war are counted as participants in each.

[4] Includes 103,480 former members of the (peacetime) Regular Establishment who are receiving VA disability compensation.

[5] Includes 18,113 parents of deceased former members of the (peacetime) Regular Establishment.

[6] Includes 17,092 widows of deceased former members of the (peacetime) Regular Establishment.

[7] Includes 12,303 children of deceased former members of the (peacetime) Regular Establishment.

Report to Ohioans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. HENDERSON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, at the close of this, my last year in Congress, I desire to continue a previous practice of summarizing the legislative activities of the year, particularly as they affect the people of the 15th District of Ohio whom I represent here. These Ohioans are joining with the millions of other Americans in paying the gigantic cost of supporting the Government and are naturally interested in knowing how their money has been appropriated and what laws have been enacted to increase further this burden upon them. Then, too, they would like to know in what respects the Congress has acted to restrict their freedoms or regiment their activities. The people of southeastern Ohio are not dreamers, but they are not entirely despairing in the thought that Congress might enact legislation which would remove some of the bonds which restrict their freedom of action or lessen the burden of taxation. Legislation in the latter category, unfortunately, seems to be reaching the same point of virtual extinction as the whooping crane.

HOW MUCH WAS APPROPRIATED?

One of the most important functions of the Congress is to appropriate funds for the operation of the Federal Government. During the past session, the Congress focused its attention on the projected fiscal needs for the 12 months beginning July 1, 1960, as well as for funds to supplement the requirements of Federal agencies during the first 6 months of this year. In 19 separate bills, the Congress appropriated $73,634,335,922. These are bills which provide for operating funds. They do not reflect additional millions in backdoor financing, a method devised by the Congress to avoid the yearly review of expenditures by the Appropriations Committees of Congress, and the payment of the interest on the national debt which has now reached $9,316 million annually.

The cost of this $73.6 billion Federal appropriation to the people of the 15th District of Ohio is approximately $414 for each of the residents of our 7 counties. The average taxpaying family of four therefore, can expect its share of the cost will be $1,656.

By far, the greatest amount of these funds were set aside for national defense expenditures in one form or another. While the total cost of our national defense is not reflected only in appropriations for our military forces alone, the funds consigned for the Department of Defense for the next 12 months were $39,337,867,000. This is, of course, a sum far in excess of the total amount required to operate our entire Federal Government only a few short years ago. Thus it is apparent that the price of preparedness and national survival in the world today is tremendously high.

What else did we do besides spend money?

A partial answer to this question can be found in the groundwork laid for spending additional sums in the future. Many of the 417 bills passed during the 124 days of the session carry with them the expectation or requirement that funds will be appropriated to carry out the purposes of the legislation.

It would require much space to explain and analyze in detail all of the bills which were passed. However, it is sufficient for this purpose to outline briefly some of the more important measures enacted into law. They are as follows:

CIVIL RIGHTS

The 1960 legislation authorizes Federal courts, through appointed referees, to safeguard voting rights to all citizens; fixes penalties for the obstruction of court orders and for flight to avoid prosecution for vandalism. It also requires the preservation of Federal election records for 2 years and authorizes arrangements for education of servicemen's children in areas where public schools are closed by disputes over school integration.

INCREASED PAY FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

This measure brought an across-the-board pay increase to all Federal employees.

REDUCED CABARET TAX

The reduction in the cabaret tax from 20 percent to 10 percent was virtually the only tax reduction to emerge from the past session. Without belittling this congressional action and regardless of our attitude toward places of entertainment, there has been no question that this tax has done great harm to the music profession and to the performance of live music in the Nation.

TAX EXTENSIONS

A number of taxes due to expire were extended for 1 more year. Among these were the 52 percent corporate income tax rate and the existing schedule of excise taxes on alcoholic beverages, cigarettes, automobiles and parts, passenger transportation, and telephone calls.

NATIONAL DEBT LIMIT

Legislation authorized raising the temporary limit of $293 billion for the national debt for 1 year to June 30, 1961.

INCOME TAX DEDUCTION

An amendment to the Internal Revenue Code permits an income tax deduction of all medical expenses incurred by any taxpayer as part of the care of a dependent parent over 65 years of age.

VETERANS' LOANS

The authority for direct and guaranteed loans to veterans for homes, farms, or businesses was extended for 2 years to July 25, 1962.

LIBRARY SERVICES

The present Library Services Act was extended for 5 years (to June 30, 1965) to provide mobile library facilities for rural areas.

COAL RESEARCH

Special legislation created an Office of Coal Research to find new uses for coal, encourage production and conservation, and otherwise stimulate the industry.

What can we be thankful for?

Once again, by chance, miracle, or by deft legislative maneuver of the minority, many costly and irresponsible schemes were defeated or failed to receive final favorable consideration. In many such instances, the Nation should be grateful. It is one of the excellent commentaries upon the American lawmaking process that legislative pitfalls—sometimes called safeguards—are available to protect the people's interests from the efforts of their representatives to curry favor in return for political support.

What was done to benefit the 15th District of Ohio?

Insofar as the 15th Congressional District is concerned, appropriations were approved permitting the completion of the Dillon Reservoir on the Licking River. This large project, to provide long-awaited flood control for Zanesville and the Muskingum Valley, will now add the measure of safety the people of the valley have sought for many decades. In addition, new funds allow for the continued work on the Belleville Dam on the Ohio River below Marietta.

What about committee work?

Each Member of Congress is occupied with work of a legislative committee to which he has been assigned. I have served as a member of the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives and as ranking minority member on the Subcommittee on Claims. My subcommittee had referred to it and held hearings on a total of 813 bills originating in the House of Representatives and 64 Senate bills in 1960. This assignment has been a busy and extremely time-consuming one. However, the sense of gratification in considering bills largely intended to assist individual Americans has been very great. Other general problems have been considered by the subcommittee in addition to its regular work with special private legislation. Chief among these proposals was the study of the problems encountered by persons over 40 years of age in their search for employment.

In the Judiciary Committee itself, the most important legislation considered this year was the civil rights bill. Another measure which aroused interest throughout the Nation was the proposed amendment to the Constitution to accord residents of the District of Columbia the right to vote for President and Vice President.

What was the theme of the session?

If there was one prevailing theme of the past session, it was, beyond doubt, politics. Politics, more obviously than usual, entered the legislative picture very early in the year. In an election year, the floor of the House of Representatives was utilized as a sounding board for schemes to woo voters, create public images of potential candidates for national office, and to raise issues which might be useful in the campaign later in the year. Thus it often seemed that the creation of issues was a greater motivation than any genuine effort to reach conclusions on legislative programs. There were days and weeks when little or no legislative business was brought before the Congress. Through this time, however, the paper mills and printing presses droned on at full capacity reproducing long tracts for the public eye and ear. Some observers felt that a session following the midsummer political conventions might produce a new theme and that the paralysis of the earlier months might be ended. However, the August session was played out on the same theme with, if anything, less inspired results as the short session ground to an unproductive and unlamented halt before Labor Day. When the finale had been reached on September 1, most of the audience had left Washington and many of the Senators and Congressmen as well had departed.

What can we expect?

One is inclined to conclude that little harm was done by a session of Congress which talked volubly, did little, and in which most of the bad proposals were defeated. This is, I believe, a short-sighted conclusion. It may well be that the past session, so undistinguished in its work, was more in the nature of a rehearsal than a full-fledged congressional performance. Legislation which died aborning is certain to be revived in the new Congress next year. Better preparation, more propagandizing of the public, additional salesmanship at the grassroots level may be needed before many of the schemes which will wrench our way of life into a more unrecognizable form can be put through the Congress at some future time. This kind of effort will be made. The answer lies with the people. Their government is the image they create. They elect their representatives to do their bidding. The electors who keep silent or who stay at home on election day cannot expect to find their reflection in the troubled waters of Washington.

The De Gasperi-Gruber Agreement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD J. IRWIN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, there has arisen a dispute between two nations—Italy and Austria—over the interpretation of a treaty between those nations, the De Gasperi-Gruber agreement, signed in Paris September 5, 1946, which concerns Alto Adige, the Bolzano Province of Italy, which is known to Austrians as South Tyrol.

The Government of Austria has claimed that Italy has acted in violation of the terms of the 1946 treaty, and on July 6, 1960, Austria submitted its argument to the General Assembly of the United Nations for consideration at its session now under way in New York.

The Italian Government, on the other hand, offered to submit its case to the International Court of Justice at The Hague, as the principal judicial organ of the United Nations.

At issue is the question of where the dispute should be resolved.

It seems to me that since the dispute involves a treaty between the two nations, it would be best suited for presentation to the International Court of Justice.

Current Status of the Passamaquoddy Tidal Power Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. OLIVER
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, our national security is indispensably tied to maximum economic growth. Equally, indispensable, therefore, to our national security is the development of electrical power. As we well know, this kind of energy is the lifeblood of industry. Not only is electrical power the lifeblood of industry, but we further know that the growth rate of any industrial economy is determined and measured by the growth rate of electrical power development. A less than maximum rate of power development results in a less than maximum rate of economic growth. This is a situation we just cannot afford, especially when we are reminded that the Soviets are estimated to be well ahead of their schedule of hydropower development and that by 1975 if they merely remain on schedule, their hydropower output may equal our own.

I am calling these items to your attention, prefatory to my remarks on the current status of the Passamaquoddy project because it would seem that I would be remiss in my duty to the people of my district and State and the Nation if I did not indicate the vital importance of Quoddy not only to the economy of the State of Maine, but to the national economy as well, especially when we reflect upon the rapid advancement of the Soviets.

What then is the present status of the Quoddy project? I am pleased to note that solid commitments are now being made to the development of this project. As an example, Mr. Speaker, I would insert the following:

THE DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM: THE RIGHTS OF MAN

(Report of the committee on resolutions and platform as adopted by the Democratic National Convention, Los Angeles, July 12, 1960)

The Republican administration would turn the clock back to the days before the New Deal, in an effort to divert the benefits of the great natural energy resources from all the people to a favored few. It has followed for many years a "no new starts" policy.

It has stalled atomic energy development; it has sought to cripple rural electrification.

It has closed the pilot plant on getting oil from shale.

It has harassed and hampered the TVA.

We reject this philosophy and these policies. The people are entitled to use profitably what they already own.

The Democratic administration instead will foster the development of efficient regional giant power systems from all sources, including water, tidal, and nuclear power, to supply low-cost electricity to all retail electric systems, public, private, and cooperative.

The Democratic administration will continue to develop "yardsticks" for measuring the rates of private utility systems. This means meeting the needs of rural electric cooperatives for low-interest loans for distribution, transmission and generation facilities; Federal transmission facilities, where appropriate, to provide efficient low-cost power supply; and strict enforcement of the public-preference clause in power marketing.

The Democratic administration will support continued study and research on energy fuel resources, including new sources in wind and sun. It will push forward with the Passamaquoddy tidal power project with its great promise of cheaper power and expanded prosperity for the people of New England.

It was also a pleasing and happy experience for me to hear the remarks of Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY:

THE DREAM OF PASSAMAQUODDY

(Excerpts of address by Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY, Democrat, of Massachusetts, at Maine Democratic Party issues conference banquet, Augusta, Maine, Sunday, November 15, 1959.)

Let us examine the impact of this coming revolutionary decade on the State of Maine, selecting only one vital area: The demand for electrical energy. By 1970, this State alone, according to official estimates, will need 405,000 more kilowatts of capacity than all existing and planned private power sources can possibly supply. Without this added power, your industrial development, your competitive status, your business costs and home conveniences, will all lag behind other parts of the country. But there is an answer—an answer now based on a solid, factual study—and that answer is a dream 40 years old that must now become a reality: Passamaquoddy.

The recent report of the International Passamaquoddy Engineering Board fully justifies all the years of urging, planning and hoping. Soon after I took my oath of office as Senator, nearly 7 years ago, I urged an immediate study of the economic feasibility of harnessing these huge tides which surge and recede every day through Passamaquoddy and Cobscook Bays. I said then that such a study was urgently needed if we were to plan and prepare for the pressing power needs of Maine and all New England. And it is clear from this recent report that to tap this fantastic flow of 70 billion cubic feet of water each day would be a tremendous spur to the economic growth of Maine, and New England, and the entire United States.

I do not say that it is a simple undertaking. It will require vision and effort and leadership—more than we have been accustomed to in recent years. It will take money—more than many would like to spend. But if we have leaders who are willing to look ahead—who are willing to spend money now in order to reap vast returns in the future—then we can look forward to a new supply of 550,000 kilowatts—to some 1 million tourists a year coming to view one of the most spectacular products of modern technology—to the attraction of innumerable new industries with growing power needs—and to the regeneration of the whole economy of Maine and Washington County in particular.

I know something of Maine's economic problems—for we see them in Massachusetts as well: the problems of the hard-hit textile and fish industries, the problems of chronically depressed areas, the problems of transportation, unfair competition and so-called "economic old age." But I also know the advantages which Maine possesses: a highly skilled and well-educated labor force, easy access to oversea raw materials, and abundant supplies of fresh water. Combine these assets with a tremendous new supply of power at Passamaquoddy and Rankin Rapids—and new industries will flock to Maine.

This is not a relief measure, born of the Great Depression, that we are talking about. It is not a visionary dream—or an expensive pork-barrel project. We are talking about a great national asset, like TVA, the Grand Coulee Dam or the St. Lawrence Seaway. It is, moreover, a great undertaking in peaceful international cooperation. For New Brunswick and all of Canada also need power to expand their economies. As in the case of the Seaway, their needs and their problems will also be considered along with our own in determining the precise form this project will take.

But even if the United States must go it alone, the combined Passamaquoddy and Rankin Rapids projects will not meet all of Maine's power needs by the year 1980. And if the power is to be shared with Canada, it will not even fulfill your additional needs in 1970. In short, there is no time to be wasted. The money, the labor, the plans and the contracts and the equipment—on all of these a start must be made in the near future.

It will be a breathless undertaking—one of the most impressive wonders of the modern world. It need not—it should not—be a partisan undertaking. Both parties have played a role. There is work enough for all—the benefits from this project will be withheld from none. But this bold undertaking will require progressive leadership, unlimited vision and tireless determination—and these are the qualities which this Maine Democratic conference is talking about tonight.

My own efforts of recent date to expedite the realization of Quoddy was to arrange for a meeting in my office on Monday of this week. The story of that meeting is best described by the following news release:

Congressman JAMES C. OLIVER, Democrat, First District, Maine, announced today after a meeting in his office, "That there is no question in my mind that there is a sincere conviction on the part of all present today that the Passamaquoddy tidal power project will be realized at a time not as remote in the future as some would have us believe."

OLIVER further added, "The results of the meeting were encouraging in that there was an opportunity to become better acquainted with the mutual problems involved."

OLIVER said that "an informal discussion of this kind often leads to frank talks and this was the situation in my office today."

Present at the meeting were Congressman Frank M. Coffin, member of the Subcommittee on American and Canadian Affairs; Congressman Robert Jones of Alabama, chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Works; Congressman Frank Smith of Mississippi; Congressman Joe Evins of Tennessee, member of the Appropriations Committee; E. A. Bacon, Chairman of the U.S. Section of the International Joint Commission; Francis Adams, member of the U.S. Section, International Joint Commission; Gen. Samuel Sturgis, who works in a consulting capacity with the board which made the Passamaquoddy tidal power project survey; and, finally, John Roach, of the Army Engineers, who has been identified with Quoddy from the early thirties.

OLIVER said that "the purpose of the meeting was to indicate to the U.S. members of the IJC that there is decidedly favorable interest on the part of Members of the House of Representatives, as well as to develop with the members of the IJC some understanding of the problems involved in negotiating with their counterparts of the Canadian section of the IJC.

OLIVER finally added as to purpose that it was his idea and Congressman FRANK COFFIN's "to gather some indication of any specific action which they might be taking in the next few months, which would be helpful in getting the IJC report expedited."

On Wednesday, I sent the following letter to Hon. E. A. Bacon, Chairman of the U.S. Section of the International Joint Commission:

AUGUST 31, 1960.

Hon. E. A. BACON,
Chairman, U.S. Section, International Joint Commission, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thanks for your courtesy and cooperation in participating in the meeting on Monday in my office when the present status and current problems incident to the negotiating of an agreement with your Canadian counterpart on the IJC of the Rankin Rapids-Quoddy report were discussed.

I hope that you were similarly impressed as I was with the sincere interest of Congressman JONES of Alabama, Congressman SMITH of Mississippi and Congressman EVINS of Tennessee in the project and their desire to cooperate in expediting a favorable report and recommendations by the Commission.

I agree with Congressman SMITH and the implied support of Congressman JONES that we should proceed on the basis of U.S. underwriting of this entire project. I realize that this entails consent of the Provincial or Dominion Governments of Canada or both that we may build on their soil and in their sovereign waters.

However, this should not prove too difficult to achieve because of the direct quid pro quo which obviously falls into Canadian laps as a "windfall" resulting from the downstream benefits on the St. John River, which is created by upstream storage, necessary to the Rankin Rapids installation.

You will recall that General McNaughton, your counterpart on the Canadian section, in his testimony before the External Affairs Committee of the House of Commons on Wednesday, March 14, 1960, stated, on page 152, "Rankin Rapids is one of the possibilities of firming up the tidal power, but we have to persuade our friends who live on the St. John River above Fort Kent to build a dam at Rankin Rapids or perhaps a smaller dam at Big Rapids in construction with another at Lincoln School and between them to make available something like 1¾ to 2½ million acre-feet of storage.

That storage water would be released through an installation at Rankin Rapids or Lincoln School in the United States and would be used to regulate the flows of the St. John River, and enable an increased installation to be made at Beechwood for which, on our recommendation the government of New Brunswick has already made provision, would, also, enable a couple of other plants to be installed * * *" and (2) on page 159, "I have nothing new to report on the St. John River except to say that we cannot go ahead with our Beechwood Mor at site run of river plants until we get storage. But we hope that someday our U.S.

friends will see fit to undertake in cooperative arrangement the development of the Rankin Rapids and the Lincoln School."

These statements of General McNaughton, in my opinion, underscore the value to Canada of the Rankin Rapids storage capacity which is a must if Beechwood expansion and additional downstream projects are to be undertaken on the St. John in New Brunswick.

Why, then, should we not proceed on the assumption that Canadian cooperation in the matter of authority for us to build on their tidelands and soil is clearly and justifiably indicated?

It is my opinion that the Rankin Rapids-Quoddy project as a unilateral undertaking of the United States can be far more favorably presented to the Congress than could any alternative proposals involving long, complicated and, I feel, impossible negotiations with the Canadians. Single U.S. sponsorship of the project might include reciprocal interchange of power when and if mutually advisable. Perhaps it should be borne in mind that the Canadians do not need to participate in the power output of the project once their own plans for expansion of Beechwood and additional installations on the downstream of the St. John have been made possible by the Rankin Rapids-Quoddy proposal.

The recreational, navigational, and highway connection benefits which would automatically accrue to the people of New Brunswick would add to the downstream windfall, once we have completed this project.

These are some of the conclusions which I have reached as a result of our several discussions, and I present them to you for what they may be worth. It is my hope that they make some sense for you as well.

In closing, let me apologize for burdening you with additional correspondence and to express my deep and sincere appreciation for your willingness to consider our problems in Maine in respect to Quoddy with such an open and tolerant understanding. I feel certain that, if the deserving people of Maine are to benefit from the untold benefits of this great natural resource project during this generation, then we must act forthwith. I feel certain that the good people of New Brunswick are of similar mind, General McNaughton to the contrary, notwithstanding.

Let me repeat, I am available for any and all possible cooperation which in your opinion may be constructive and in the best interests of the Rankin Rapids-Quoddy project.

Sincerely,

JAMES C. OLIVER,
Member of Congress.

P.S.—I have taken the liberty to send copies of this letter to our friends John Roche, Congressman Frank Smith, Congressman Joe Evins, Congressman Robert Jones, Congressman Frank Coffin, Francis Adams, General Sturgis, and Roscoe Emery.

In discussing the current status of Quoddy, I would also call to your attention the relation of low-cost power to industrial development:

SOME NOTES ON THE RELATIONSHIP OF LOW-COST POWER TO INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

A recent survey by the publication Mill & Factory indicated that in the decade 1950 to 1960 New England was the only region in the country suffering a decline as an industrial market. In contrast, the Tennessee Valley region enjoyed a 21-percent increase; the Pacific coast, also a region of low-cost electricity, gained 53 percent.

As a contrast, let us look at the recently published 10-year (1950–60) report of the Tennessee Valley Authority. During the decade $2½ billion was invested by private industry in expanding existing industries in the TVA area and in building new ones. One hundred thousand new jobs were created. Industrial use of electricity increased from 7.5 billion kilowatt-hours to 16.38 billion kilowatt-hours.

A more recent and more direct example of the lure of low-cost electricity was provided last month (August 1960) by the Bonneville Power Administration. Bonneville had announced earlier this year that an additional 300,000 kilowatts of firm and secondary electricity would be sold to industry. Last month, Bonneville reported that the power had been allocated to provide for the establishment of two new electroprocess industries and plant additions for two existing industries. Investment in new plant facilities alone is expected to approximate $140 million, as a result of this power allocation.

The impact of new jobs on a community has been measured by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce in nine counties enjoying rapid industrial growth, two of them in the TVA area. According to the chamber's publication, "What New Industrial Jobs Mean to a Community," each 100 new factory workers bring a total of 296 new people to the community; create 112 more households, and $590,000 more personal income per year. Of this income, $360,000 goes into retail sales. A further breakdown shows that $70,000 of this would go to grocery stores; $30,000 to eating and drinking places; $45,000 to department stores; $25,000 to clothing stores; $50,000 to automobile dealers; $20,000 to gasoline service stations; $15,000 to lumber yards and building materials dealers; and $105,000 to other stores. The 100 new factory workers also would bring four more retail establishments into the community and would create jobs for 74 other workers in retail trade, construction, professional and related services, transportation, government, and other trades and services.

It is not surprising that TVA's 100,000 new jobs were accompanied by a rise in per capita income (average) from $890 in 1950 to about $1,296 at the close of 1958.

The Governor of Washington State, Albert D. Rosellini, recently summarized the benefits which Federal multipurpose development of the Columbia River has brought to his State. In summary, these benefits were: A high degree of electrical living among the people; industrial diversification and expansion which have been a direct benefit of low-cost power. He reported that the aluminum companies which played such a vital role in our war effort were the first major industrial users of Bonneville power. Subsequently, other industries have been added, ranging from carborundum reduction to chlorine manufacture. "These industries have stabilized our economy, increased taxable income, and have provided badly needed diversification of employment," he said.

A good example of industry following low-cost power can be seen at the St. Lawrence project. In a report by the New York Power Authority (28th Annual Report, Feb. 9, 1959) it is pointed out: "Industrial and commercial development and expansion in the north country are directly attributable to the St. Lawrence power project. Alcoa, pioneer in the use of electric power embarked on a $25 million program of modernization and expansion. Reynolds Metals is constructing a new plant scheduled to employ 1,000 workers while Chevrolet Motors is building a casting plant expected to provide employment for 700. At Rouses Point the Quebec Lithium Corp. has scheduled a new plant where 800 will be employed. These construction projects, costing well over $100 million have not only provided employment for local labor but commerce for area merchants and businesses, while related activities in new motels, hotels, shopping centers, gas stations, and other service businesses have contributed heavily to the further growth of the St. Lawrence Valley's economy."

Finally, in order to develop a proper perspective as to the meaning of Quoddy when related to the Maine economy, I would refer you for your study and thoughtful consideration to a statement presented in testimony before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, March 3, 1959:

AN UNTIDY GRAVEYARD

(Statement filed by Benjamin J. Dorsky, president, Maine State Federated Labor Council, AFL–CIO, Bangor, Maine)

REPORT ON WASHINGTON COUNTY IN THE STATE OF MAINE

The Senate Committee on Banking and Currency now conducting hearings on area redevelopment legislation should, in the judgment of the organized labor movement in the State of Maine, have before it the attached rather startling report on a little-known depressed section of our State. This report on a depressed area, described as an "Untidy Graveyard" has been prefaced by a competent student and observer who knows the county from firsthand experience and who has studied sufficient documentary material to verify the conclusions which the naked eye plainly reveals.

We, the officers of the Maine AFL–CIO, believe that Washington County, Maine, should be studied in depth by trained observers representing the Senate Banking and Currency Committee. We are confident that further investigation would prove that the situation we describe is in fact worse than we depict it to be.

The existence of even one such spot as Washington County in these United States makes it imperative and urgent that the Congress adopt legislation which will attempt to mitigate and finally correct such conditions as are set forth in the statement we offer herewith.

Situated in the extreme northeastern part of the United States exists a strange phenomenon. It is no exaggeration to say that in Washington County, Maine, exists an untidy graveyard, its inhabitants belonging neither to the living nor the dead.

Here are just a few of the essential facts about Washington County and its people. What we set forth here are not stories from some melancholy bygone day and age; these are cruel, hard facts about life in one American county today.

The families in 6 of the 217 counties in the Northeastern States had median income of less than $2,000. Three of these six counties are located in Maine. Washington County ranked next to the lowest.[1] Sixty and three-tenths percent of Washington County families have incomes of less than $2,000 a year.[1]

Subsistence living is also seen in the way people in Washington County spend what little money they have. It goes for the necessities of life—food and general merchandise. The only two luxuries that are extensively enjoyed are television and the automobile.

Again in the Northeastern States, the average value of farmland and buildings was $11,684. Only two counties have houses the value of which averaged less than $4,500. These are Piscataquis and Washington Counties, both of which are located in Maine.[1]

Restricting ourselves to comparisons within Maine, Washington County has the lowest percentage of persons employed in manufacturing, the fewest per capita number of hospital and nursing home beds, the highest rates of illegitimacy and unemployment and maternal deaths. Again, among the Northeastern States, 21 counties had nonfarm single-family houses that averaged less than $4,000 in value. Three of these were in Vermont, nine in Pennsylvania and eleven in Maine. In only Washington County the median value of houses was less than $3,000.[1]

---

[1] 1950 Census Bulletin PB 19.

Again, among the Northeastern States, 10 of the 217 counties were such that less than 40 percent of their dwelling units had hot running water, a private toilet and bath, and were not dilapidated. Four were in Pennsylvania. The remaining six were in Maine. Washington County consistent again was the most primitive.

The low average of the gross wage for manufacturing in Washington County is $3,047. The gross wage for manufacturing statewide is $3,551.

The textile, paper, and hard goods plants within Washington County which are the only industries which provide steady employment account for only 40 percent of the labor force engaged in manufacturing.

For a 3-month period during the winter months in 1956–57 almost half of the entire Washington County labor force was unemployed.

During the winter months of 1957 and 1958 more than half of the Washington County Labor force was unemployed.

All of the industries in Washington County, all but lumber, paper, and poultry, are highly seasonal and insecure.

For instance, their sardine plants operate for the period from the latter part of June through September; the blueberry season—a few weeks in August and early September.

Returning to income analysis again for Washington County, it is startling to note that the model income for families is between $1,000 and $1,499.[1] Eight and six-tenths percent of Washington County families earn less than $500 per year.[2]

Only 57.9 percent of Washington County children who entered the ninth grade from the years 1953 through 1957 completed their high school years.

In 1954 more than half of the commercial farms in Washington County received gross income of less than $2,500.

As of January 1959, according to figures released by the Maine Employment Security Commission, estimated unemployment was 3,590. Of this group 2,339 are covered for unemployment compensation. Three hundred and thirteen of that group have exhausted their unemployment compensation. Average weekly payments in unemployment compensation made for the year 1958 were $21.53.

Only 19 percent of Washington County schoolchildren participate in the school-lunch program.[3]

Injury frequency rates in manufacturing in Washington County for the year 1956 were 24.3 percent as compared to 19.2 percent for the State of Maine, and 12 percent for the Nation.[3]

Workers in manufacturing organized under union contract were 18.5 percent in 1956 as compared to 43.5 percent for the State of Maine.

Aid to dependent children payments per 1,000 population for the year 1957 in Washington County was 70 percent as compared to 41 percent in the State of Maine. An examination of the level of income in the Washington County communities suggests a real correlation between the level of income and the aid to dependent children payment rate. In all of the three categories of the public assistance program, old-age assistance, aid to the blind, and aid to the disabled—the rate here is again high when compared to the overall State percentage.

The preceding is merely a random sampling which points to the overall hardships endured by the over 35,000 inhabitants of Washington County. It is still difficult, however, to depict the social climate and accompanying problems which subsistence living and consequent social isolation has produced.

One observer who visited the county summed it up this way. "These people keep going by virtue of hope alone. They hope for better times—that an economic miracle of some sort will occur. They hope that maybe somehow or other job opportunities will improve."

For the most part, the population lives in scattered coastal communities. Another observer visiting Washington County and going from one community to another, talking with shopkeepers, professional people, and, in one community, a minister, factory workers, clerks, school children, and others, found that the people of the county are incessantly hopeful of a change for the better. One gas station owner, when queried with the question as to what high school graduates do, said they have two choices—"They either leave the State or go into the service."

A shopkeeper had this to say. "There is absolutely nothing for young men and women to do here—absolutely nothing." A sardine factory worker put it this way when asked, "What do you do for a living?" "Nothing." He further indicated that he had one more unemployment compensation check to draw. When it was pointed out that his new benefit period would begin on April 1, he said, "I didn't work enough last year to draw anything after April this time."

A restaurant operator said, "Things are slow and I don't mean this year; they have always been. It doesn't seem that we can even hope for a change any more. Some people haven't learned yet that we have always had it bad, and I'm convinced now that we always will. It's sort of funny. You'd think we would have enough sense to just pack up and leave, but we have our roots here." The minister had this to say: "It's hard for people to live a good moral life when they can't even feed their bodies. You wouldn't believe it, but the only way some people get through the winter here is on a straight clam diet. If we didn't have the sea at our front yard, we just wouldn't be able to even subsist."

The shopkeeper made this comment on the high migration of young people out of Washington County: "I know these youngsters. My own boy would give his right arm, and I mean it, his right arm, if he could come back and find a job and live in the county. But there's nothing for him here and nothing for any of the others either. The only thing they can do is to work a few months in the sardine factory and draw State checks during the winter."

A variety store manager in the town of Eastport said: "People here make their income working a few months in the fish factory and drawing State aid checks of various sorts." This comment was repeated time and time again. Welfare payments and unemployment checks are an integral part of the moneys which people use to live on in Washington County. It is a strange thing to find that the "public dole" should be regarded as an integral part of income.

It is strange, too, when one compares the average income of fishermen in some of the many fishing towns in the Province of Nova Scotia, Canada. For example, the 45 active members of the fishermen's cooperative of Port Bickerton, a fishing village of 90 families on the eastern shore of Nova Scotia, last year had an average gross income of $10,500. It should be noted before they woke up to the possibilities of group effort, their highest income was not over $1,000 and most of the fishermen received only $200 to $300 a year.[4] Here is a possible way out for the fishermen, not only along the coast of Washington County, but for the entire coastal area wherever its inhabitants are oriented toward the sea and its resources.

The visitor is struck by the dreadful shabbiness of the people's dress in the towns where unemployment is acute; it was reminiscent of Tobacco Road. One interview was particularly humiliating for the observer. The man's jacket had been taken from the inner lining of a coat and wrapped around his body and secured by a rope. Aware that cigarettes might be considered luxury in the community, the observer offered the man his pack. The man, 26 years of age, refused the gesture, saying, "I'm afraid not. I had to give them up some time ago. They are just too expensive and now I just can't afford to smoke anymore."

Just how do the people in Washington County feel about rural and industrial development? A word should be said about the industrial barons of the county and their effect on the growth of industry. This is a very difficult problem to get at but it would seem to be a safe conjecture that there has been for decades deliberate sabotage by this group to circumvent any attempts to develop the county. We know, of course, that in this area of Maine there has been for some time a surplus labor pool.

We know too that some types of industries hire as cheaply as possible and are able to do so because of the low level of industrial development and the constant surplus labor pool. During one trip through Washington County a particular textile mill was pointed out by one of the town residents. This plant, we were told, had once been situated elsewhere in Maine, and paid prevailing wages. To escape from the necessity of paying just ordinary standard rates of pay, this plant folded up and came to this area of Maine where the workers would, without question take whatever pay the employer wished to give.

Interviews seem to indicate that there are two groups in Washington County. The larger group which favors industrial development and the smaller group of industrial barons who strive to conserve the status quo and its consequent economic and social problems.

The information would be worth while if the wage rates, particularly for the fish processing plants, were available for analysis. But such is not the case. The Labor and Industry Department of the State of Maine, although permitted by law to request such information, has failed to exercise its statutory authority and make such a survey. The high injury frequency rates in manufacturing in Washington County suggest at least sympathy between the Department of Labor and Industry of the State of Maine and the industrial barons of the county.

Any report, even such as this, as brief and sampling as it is, would not be complete if it didn't make mention of the proposed Passamaquoddy Hydro Development which would be a key dynamic forward thrust for Washington County as well as the whole State.

Attention should be called to the answers to questions which were made by the Maine State Department of Education; the purpose of which was to determine the vocational needs of the county. Given the low standard of living, acute unemployment, distressing social problems, the results of this survey would at first glance seem to be disturbing and puzzling, since the survey indicated that the people of Washington County were not interested in the development of personal job skills in relation to the needs of a variety of industries. The results were puzzling because they seemed to indicate that these people are some type of a zero quantity.[5]

---

[1] 1950 Census Bulletin PB 19.

[2] September 1957 Report to Nutrition Committee on School Lunch and Special Milk.

[3] Census of Maine Manufacturers 1956 Department of Labor and Industry Bulletin 255.

[4] M. M. Cote, director of St. Francis Xavier University, Antigonish, Nova Scotia, delivered in Madison, Wis., May 10, 1958, a speech entitled "A Plea for Democracy."

[5] Vocational Needs Survey, 1958, Maine State Department of Education.

Why? There is data, even at this time, that has been developed, which, if interpreted, might suggest the answer as to why the Vocational Needs Survey showed a negative attitude on the part of Washington County people toward the development of personal job skills. Might it be suggested here something that has been known to educational people for some time—that the learner is the center of the learning process, that the curriculum in programs must be built around the learner's basic needs. Therefore, it would seem reasonable to suggest that any rural development programs must be geared to the real needs of the people rather than develop a program of frills, which, although they may be nice things in themselves, have no conscious value to these people and their unanswered needs. Another reason which might be suggested to explain the negative attitude of the people of Washington County to the Vocational Needs Survey is that they are living in a type of economy far removed from challenging and stimulating personal development.

The low percentage of persons employed in manufacturing, the few per capita, number of hospital and nursing home beds, the high rates of illegitimacy, unemployment, maternal deaths, the bare subsistence standard of living, the low value and ill-equipped homes, and other almost incredible economic and social features of Washington County were mentioned earlier in this report. It is easy to suggest a real correlation between the level of income created by the lack of industry and these problems. Washington County strikes one as an untidy graveyard whose inhabitants belong neither to the living nor the dead—where hope is dying or dead. This is another way of saying that the pattern of living of its people is a reflection of a static and binding economy. It is assumed that people are people wherever they may be found—that at the moment of conception they inherit the promise of creative greatness. We must probe deeply into the problems of the people of Washington County and ask ourselves why this promise of creative greatness has been thwarted.

The Problems of Small Business 1960–61: Iowa Small Business in Trouble—130 Bankruptcies in 1950—809 Bankruptcies in 1959—Hope for the Future in Legislation Proposed by Len Wolf

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD G. WOLF

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, the past few years have not been good years for small business. According to a Dun and Bradstreet report there were 14,964 business failures in 1959 in the United States. This was the greatest number of business failures in any year since 1933. For example, in 1950 there were 130 bankruptcy petitions in Iowa while in 1959 there were 809 bankruptcy petitions.

Because of this very serious business downturn, we might even call this period the "quiet depression." The first bill that I introduced when I came to the House of Representatives was one which, had it been passed, would have done much to remedy the present business depression. This bill, H.R. 2812, allowed small business a tax reduction on earnings which are plowed back into the business. The amount that would be allowed is 20 percent or $30,000, whichever is the lesser amount. This bill has become a necessity because of the unfair competition which now exists between small and big business. Small business cannot compete against businesses that have unlimited credit and reserves unless given a helping hand.

My major efforts in the Congress have been directed to preventing the big from getting bigger, and the small from getting smaller or eliminated.

I know firsthand the heartbreak and disappointment that can come to a family when the hard work of many years is wiped out. I know the pressures and the sleepless nights caused by unsatisfied creditors forcing accounts you owe, and when doing the best you can is still not enough for the creditors. I know the anxiety which comes to a family when business reverses come through no fault of its own. If we are serious about free enterprise, then we will help protect it through effective legislation to eliminate many of the problems from which small business is suffering today.

One of the great problems that we in the Middle West face concerns the serious decline of our small towns. With this decline, of course, has gone the decline of small business. I have endeavored to provide solutions to these problems through certain legislation that I offered in the 86th Congress. I proposed the establishment of a county industrial agent program. The county industrial agent program would be set up in the same manner as the county agricultural extension program. The financial support for it would come from State, Federal, and county governments on the same basis that the present farm extension program is supported.

The basic purpose of this program is to reinvigorate our small towns with new employment opportunities so that they may again thrive—industrially and culturally. I believe in the life of the small town and in the importance of the small businessman in these towns. But they need help and new direction—direction which could come from the enactment of the county industrial agent program. The Small Business Administration, many colleges, and industrial groups have shown great interest in this program.

My proposed concurrent resolution—which Senator KEFAUVER also came to sponsor—directs the U.S. delegation to the United Nations to work out ways to stop world monopoly. Pricing and protective arrangements today exist between some of the largest companies in the world in order to control the price on about 140 different raw material items. Furthermore, these activities ultimately come back to haunt American foreign policy so that it looks as if we are invariably taking the sides of the world monopolists. This program which I sponsored was the American foreign economic policy before 1953, and because of pressure from the mining and oil interests this policy was changed by the present administration.

I have worked hard for the fair trade bill so that it could get a fair hearing on the House floor. I believe that there is great merit in this proposal, and I signed the discharge petition so that this bill could be jarred loose from the Rules Committee. Unfair competition from so-called wholesale mail order houses could be stopped if we win this one.

Vertical integration in the meatpacking and animal-raising industries could be prevented with passage of a bill which I introduced this past year. The competitive relationship with chainstores is also improved from independent business.

I believe that the excise tax on telephones is a detriment to small business, and since I have been in the Congress I have worked for its repeal.

In view of the difficulties experienced by small businesses in securing operating money at prices they can afford, I have consistently worked for low interest rates and have opposed legislation which would breach the traditional ceiling on long-term Federal borrowing, since any such change in connection with Federal borrowing would be extended to the field of private borrowing.

In efforts to arrest the continuing upward spiral in costs of natural gas charged by pipeline companies, I worked very hard to secure action on my bill to prohibit pipeline companies from imposing consecutive gas rate increases while it still has a previously filed application pending before the Federal Power Commission. I have also worked for legislation to require the FPC to act more promptly on rate increase applications and carry out its statutory duty to regulate natural gas rates. One hundred and seventy-nine communities and more than 200,000 families in Iowa have been affected by 8 gas rate increases imposed on the consumers since 1951. The Denver Post stated that "the Federal Power Commission would become a beehive of activity, grinding out decisions in rapid order," if my bill were to become law.

I have worked in support of legislation creating a Central Mortgage Reserve Facility which would have provided a sound national monetary approach to homebuilding finance. Unfortunately, this proposal died in the Rules Committee. Tight money has in many periods pinched the lifeblood of building—which has an unfavorable cumulative affect on our entire economy—not only to builders, but to workers, and to the public. When mortgage funds for homes dry up, builders lay off workers, stop buying lumber, cement, and appliances. In terms of jobs, this means millions of man-hours lost in factories, forests, and local communities.

I am proud of my record in the fight for small business. It is my hope that in the next year the kinds of proposals that I have worked for will become law, for unless they do I fear that the small businessman will be forced out of business—and the American people as a whole will be the losers.

Mr. Speaker, on many other occasions I have taken the floor to bring to the

attention of the Congress the problems of the independent merchants of America, and I pledge to continue my fight to improve the economic climate for our small businessmen.

Congressman O'Hara Reports on the 86th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, as the 86th Congress draws to a close, it is appropriate that we take inventory of our legislative efforts. It is appropriate, too, that as representatives of the people we should report to those whom we represent. I am therefore taking this opportunity to speak to the people of the 7th District of Michigan on the activities of the 86th Congress.

This Congress has been subject to a great deal of criticism because it did not accomplish more than it has, and indeed it has not accomplished as much as many of us had hoped. On the other hand, this Congress has had to deal with more controversial issues and has carried out its deliberations in a greater atmosphere of crisis than perhaps any other peacetime Congress in history.

Our efforts have been hampered by a Rules Committee whose only purpose at times seemed to be to prevent consideration of any but the most innocuous measures. In spite of this handicap, the 86th Congress accomplished a great deal of which we can be proud.

LABOR REFORM

The most outstanding achievement of the first session of this Congress was the labor reform bill. In spite of extreme pressures brought to bear by some elements of labor and management, the measure which finally emerged was substantially sound and well worth the effort.

Much remains to be done in this area, however. The need for corrective and improving amendments to the labor reform bill are already evident. The provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act dealing with national emergency strikes are inadequate and unworkable. The National Labor Relations Board has been conducting an investigation of the Kohler strike for over 6 years, and only within the last month has a decision been rendered. Investigation shows that the average time elapsed between the filing of an unfair labor practice complaint and the rendering of a decision by the NLRB is 2½ years. Justice so long delayed is hardly justice at all. Congress must next year address itself to the problem of expediting the procedures of the Board and of the courts in dealing with labor disputes.

SOCIAL SECURITY

The social security bill had some very necessary and admirable provisions. Social security beneficiaries can now earn more without a loss of benefits, and for those who do earn more than the new limit the loss in benefits is substantially reduced. The requirement that a worker must be at least 50 years of age to be eligible for disability benefits has been eliminated. As a result of this year's amendments a great number of older people will now qualify for benefits who would otherwise be excluded. Starting next year a parent who works for a son or daughter, outside the household, will be covered. All of these changes are steps in the right direction.

I had hoped to be able to report a general health insurance bill for the aged as one of the accomplishments of this Congress. Unfortunately, the bill which we passed, while it pays lipservice to the health needs of the aged, continues to withhold adequate protection. I voted for it with reluctance and only because it establishes a precedent which we can elaborate on and strengthen next year.

The system we have set up is bound to fall of its own weight. In the long run the only practical way to provide adequate health protection to our elder citizens is to let them pay the premiums in the form of social security taxes while they are earning wages and able to do so. To say that such a proposal is socialism is utter nonsense. One could say with equal accuracy that our public schools, fire departments and parks are socialistic because they represent a community effort financed through public taxation.

EDUCATION

The House Rules Committee stymied our efforts to provide more Federal assistance to hard-pressed school districts. Both the House and the Senate passed school construction bills, but the committee refused to let the bills go to conference, and they died with the adjournment.

I am reminded of what George Washington once said:

> In a country like this if there cannot be money found to answer the common purposes of education, there is something amiss in the ruling political power, which requires a steady, regulating and energetic hand to correct and control it.

Some Federal funds are flowing to local school districts, however. In recent years the State of Michigan has received about $44 million for construction and operation of schools in areas where there is substantial Federal activity, around such installations as Selfridge Field and the Detroit Arsenal. Similarly, some Federal funds are flowing to our schools under the National Defense Education Act. It is worthwhile noting that under both of these programs Federal assistance has been provided without Federal interference or control.

With passage of the Library Services Act, we insured continuation of joint Federal-State efforts to extend public library services to our rural communities.

MINIMUM WAGE LEGISLATION

Many of us had hoped to raise the minimum wage and to extend coverage to many workers not protected by the Fair Labor Standards Act. A bill was passed by the House and another by the Senate. The conferees could not agree, and the committee broke up without even reporting to their respective Houses. As a result we had no minimum wage bill.

This was the work of a coalition of northern and southern conservatives. It was, however, a success only for the southern Congressmen, who sought to help the South attract northern industry on the basis of a regional substandard wage scale.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Throughout the past year distinguished experts have questioned the adequacy of our national defense effort. While there were some who insisted our defense organization was the strongest in the world, there were many others, I among them, who felt that budget considerations had been placed before our defense needs.

American superiority in many fields is unquestioned. The atomic submarine and the development of the Polaris missile will vastly increase our striking power. The development of rocket warfare, however, raises serious doubt about the usefulness of big Navy carriers and the effectiveness of our expensive oversea bases.

Defense Department officials have admitted the existence of a missile gap. Testimony before congressional committees made it clear that we also lack adequate means to carry out a conventional military operation. Inadequate manpower, outmoded equipment, and insufficient transport would hamper any limited-war effort should we need to act.

In this regard I should like to make it clear that I derive no personal or partisan satisfaction from calling your attention to this tragic situation. Acknowledgment of the strength of our enemies is not treason, however, and a recognition of our own weakness is a necessary first step in the elimination of that weakness.

I do derive satisfaction, however, in informing you that this year the Congress appropriated $600 million more for defense programs than had been requested. The bulk of these funds will be used to step up missile development and to modernize our Armed Forces.

Obviously, our defense problems will not be solved simply by the expenditure of more public funds.

Administration of the Department of Defense has been hampered by a lack of continuity over the last 8 years. We have had three different Secretaries and eight different Deputy Secretaries, each with his own policies, each with his own advisers, and each with limited experience. The much-needed overhaul of the Department of Defense will not be achieved unless administrators at the top policy level serve a reasonable period of time so that continuity of command is maintained.

Even more critical, however, is the need for elimination and revision of wasteful procurement practices. More and more the Defense Department has moved away from the competitive bid procedure to a greater utilization of the so-called negotiated bid. There is ample

evidence that we are not getting our military hardware at the lowest possible cost to the taxpayer.

For 2 years now I have fought against policies that virtually prohibited utilization of publicly-owned arsenals and depots for the production of military hardware. Partly as a result of my efforts, Chrysler Corp. was finally granted a contract for the production of tanks at the Detroit Tank Arsenal in Centerline. Until that contract was let, the taxpayer was paying three-quarters of a million dollars a year to maintain that plant in idleness.

THE BUDGET

The most recurrent argument of this Congress has been the level of Federal expenditures and who is responsible for all of the spending in Washington.

It must be admitted that Federal expenditures are at an astronomical level, and the need for these expenditures is clear only if we understand for what the money has been spent.

For fiscal 1960 we had a budget of over $70 billion. Of this, almost $42 billion was spent for national defense; $3½ billion for the foreign aid program which is related to our national security; $2½ billion was appropriated for atomic energy development and research; $5½ billion for the cost of veterans benefits, past, present, and future; an additional $9.2 billion was spent in fiscal 1960 to pay the interest on the national debt, the greatest portion of which was incurred in fighting World War II. As you can see, over 70 percent of our entire national budget went to pay the cost of past wars and to protect ourselves in the event of possible future wars.

An additional $5½ billion was spent on the farm support program. The rest, about $10 billion, paid for all other important functions of the Government, including the frequently criticized welfare programs.

During this Congress the President's spending requests were reduced by $2,093 million. For my part, I supported the reduction in Federal expenditures. As I told you before, however, I did vote for additional funds for national defense. I also voted for additional funds for expanded Government research into the causes, control, and prevention of cancer, heart disease, arthritis, blindness, mental illness, and other crippling and killing diseases.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Under our Constitution the sole responsibility for initiating policies and executing programs of an international character resides in the President. While it can to some degree influence Executive decisions in this area, the power of the Congress is strictly limited. In spite of these limitations and in spite of the natural reluctance of the Congress to interfere with the actions of the President in the conduct of our foreign affairs, a number of important congressional actions have taken place.

The Congress established the office and approved the appointment of a comptroller to oversee the mutual security program. It placed numerous specific restrictions on the disbursement of funds under our foreign aid programs. It conducted careful and thorough investigation of administrative practices and policy decisions in the field of foreign relations.

The approval of U.S. participation in the International Development Association and the establishment of the Inter-American Development Bank are evidences of congressional desire to change the emphasis in our international assistance programs from grants and gifts to loans.

The Antarctic Treaty limiting the use of that continent by all nations to peaceful purposes is perhaps a forerunner of more extensive international agreements to demilitarize areas of the world toward the goal of eventual disarmament and world peace.

HOUSING

An omnibus housing bill designed to halt the decline in home construction and to make more money available to low- and middle-income home buyers failed to clear the Rules Committee. In a last-ditch effort, however, Congress did pass a stopgap measure to extend the home-improvement loan program of FHA and two other housing programs which would otherwise have lapsed.

AREA REDEVELOPMENT

For the second time in 3 years the President vetoed a program authorizing loans and grants for the relief of chronically depressed industrial and rural labor surplus areas. I find it difficult to understand the President's position on this measure. It was not a handout or a giveaway bill, but an effort to help economically distressed areas in this country to help themselves in the same way we are helping underdeveloped countries around the world.

GENERAL AND MISCELLANY

The Congress enacted a civil rights bill aimed at safeguarding the voting rights of all Americans.

Basic new safeguards against the introduction of cancer-producing ingredients in our food products were enacted. A measure was passed requiring the labeling of hazardous and poisonous products used in the home so that parents will know to keep them out of the reach of children. Home accidents in which children had swallowed such products had reached a total of 600,000 a year.

Additional funds for the highway program were provided, but Congress refused to accede to the President's request for another increase in the gasoline tax.

An amendment to the Constitution was approved giving the residents of the District of Columbia the right to vote for the President and Vice President. The Michigan Legislature will no doubt ratify this amendment when it meets in January.

Congress authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to establish a program for the distribution of surplus commodities to the needy by means of a food stamp plan. So far, however, he has not taken steps to use this authority.

These are a few of the achievements of the 86th Congress. More than 740 public laws have been enacted in this Congress. Obviously I have not mentioned all of them. Nor have I dealt as extensively as I would have liked with many of the subjects I have mentioned. If you have questions concerning my position on any legislative matter, please feel free to write me in care of my Fraser office, 32909 Utica Road.

PERSONAL REPORT

In addition to my legislative duties I have undertaken a great deal of other work in connection with my responsibilities as your spokesman in Washington.

I have acted on a number of occasions as a liaison man for municipalities seeking to procure Federal assistance for water pollution programs and for school districts applying for funds under Public Laws 815 and 874. I have attended numerous conferences with Department of Defense officials in an attempt to bring a greater portion of Government defense contracts into our area. Over 500 people have sought and received my assistance in substantiating their claims for social security and veterans' benefits, and in helping them solve the many problems which individuals have with agencies of the Federal Government.

To keep you better informed of my activities in Washington, I have published a newsletter, issued press releases and recorded statements for the use of radio stations in our district. I have taught civic lessons in many of the high schools in our district, and I have at every opportunity met with and spoken to social and service groups, both to explain my own position on legislative matters and to keep them better informed of the workings of the Federal Government.

In representing you in Washington I can honestly say that I have done my very best. I have diligently striven to maintain an independence of mind and to avoid undue influence by any group or special interest. I earnestly hope that my efforts have met with your approval.

REA in Kansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, in Kansas we are proud of the accomplishments of the Rural Electrification Administration. For that reason I ask permission to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my statement "REA in Kansas."

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REA IN KANSAS

(Statement by Senator SCHOEPPEL)

Throughout the Nation the standard of living on our farms has been continuously improving. I am happy that this progress being made is also true in Kansas, the State I have had the privilege of representing in the Senate since 1948. One of the most important contributing factors to the steady improvement of our rural standard of living in Kansas has been good, dependable electric and telephone service made possible largely through REA.

We in Kansas who have worked for the furtherance of REA are especially proud of the outstanding job the rural electric co-ops, the rural telephone companies, and telephone co-ops have done—all made possible by funds from REA. As Senator of our State I, too, have had the opportunity to work for the continued progress of the REA program and I, too, feel a sense of accomplishment in knowing that my efforts have borne fruit in easing the load on our Kansas farmers, their wives and children by providing needed central station electric service and good telephone service to them.

The record of accomplishment we have been able to make in Kansas for REA is an outstanding one. Yet we find there are those who for purely partisan political gain will attempt to obscure and confuse that record and especially will they do so in regard to my own service as a strong supporter of REA in Kansas. In order that our farm people and others living in our Kansas rural areas can judge for themselves it is my intention today to set out in simple and concise terms what we have been able to do in Kansas to further good electric and telephone service. This record will also reveal the strong and helpful support which I have always willingly and gladly contributed as a Member of the U.S. Senate.

1. AMOUNT OF LOANS MADE IN KANSAS

I am proud of the fact that there has never been a loan application submitted to REA from the people of Kansas that has been disapproved. This speaks well for our Kansas citizens who have worked in the REA program. It has been my job to lend a helping hand in getting these loan applications through in Washington and I have been especially proud that I could give them my wholehearted support.

When I went to Washington in 1948 there had been about $45 million granted in loans for electric service in Kansas. At that time the program had been in effect since 1935—about 13 years. Since that time the amount of electric loans has more than doubled so that now the amount stands at more than $118 million—an increase of over $73 million in my two terms in the Senate. Of course there were no telephone loans when I first went to Washington and I was very happy to work for the Rural Telephone Act making such loans possible after my first year in the Senate. Since then, over $40 million has been made available in Kansas to provide our rural people with good telephone service. I might also add that the record will show that in addition to providing these added amounts in Kansas, I have voted for adequate funds to provide REA loan money for all of America's rural areas.

2. NUMBER OF KANSAS PEOPLE BEING SERVED

The amount of money loaned in Kansas does not tell the whole story, for, of course, we all want these REA loan funds used wisely and economically to serve the most number of people in Kansas. When I first came to the Senate in 1948 only about 36,000 people were getting REA electricity. As of June 30 this year, this number is over 93,000—nearly a threefold increase. The number of people getting REA telephone service has come from nothing in 1948 to nearly 60,000 in March 1960. In 1948 only about 50 percent of our Kansas farms had electricity. Today, over 92 percent of all Kansas farms are completely electrified with central station service.

3. COST OF ELECTRICITY HAS DROPPED

In a period when our Kansas farmers have had to pay more and more for the supplies they use on their farms, it is especially heartening to me to know that the cost of REA electric service has gone down. In 1948, the average cost for every kilowatt-hour of REA electricity on Kansas farms was 4.7 cents. In 1952, the average cost was 4.1 cents. In 1959 this cost had been cut again to 3 cents per kilowatt-hour and is now estimated below 3 cents for every kilowatt-hour. As the cost to Kansas farmers has come down they have turned more and more to electricity, to help them produce for America so that today we find electricity not only being used to lighten the household chores but also working in the barns, tool shops, silos, poultry houses, and milking parlors. That is as it should be for I want to see that our Kansas farmers get the greatest use out of their REA electricity at the least possible cost.

4. SCHOEPPEL VOTING RECORD

Throughout the 12 years I have served in the U.S. Senate I have consistently voted and worked to make the record of accomplishment that I have outlined possible. In fact, not one vote has been cast that would hurt or detract from the outstanding record of performance accomplished in Kansas. A recently completed study of my voting record over all the 12 years pertaining to REA reveals that it is 100 percent in favor of those measures necessary to make this record of accomplishment in Kansas what it is today.

The managers and directors of the REA borrowers in Kansas can be justly proud of the record they are helping to make in Kansas. I am proud that I can work for and with them in furthering this great REA program. "The proof of the pudding is in the eating" is a saying that well applies here also. The proof of the job they are doing and that I am doing is written in the accomplishments I have just spelled out. I want to continue that kind of a job for our Kansas farmers so long as I can serve them in the U.S. Senate.

Equal Pay for Equal Work Is Elementary Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. OLIVER
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, consistent with our oath of office, we are committed to the continuing task of securing fair and equitable treatment for all our citizens. When in the performance of this sworn duty one frustration is deliberately added to another, it becomes necessary under such circumstances to identify the origin of these frustrations which have worked a breach between our concept of elementary justice and its application. I am referring, Mr. Speaker, to our long standing and accepted principle of equal pay for equal work and would include the following letter:

JULY 19, 1960.

The Honorable DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
President of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Your refusal, once again, to approve the recently reenacted Kittery-Portsmouth wage equalization bill, in my opinion, was ill advised and based upon unfair conclusions.

I realize that your decision was sincerely motivated, but, representing, as I do, some 4,000 Maine citizens employed in the yard, it is my duty to express our resentment of the character assassination of these loyal Americans which was implied in your pocket-veto memorandum, in these quotes: "This kind of legislation—this expectation of something-for-nothing from the Government just because it is the Government—weakens our national fabric and with each occurrence leaves it more seriously impaired," and, further, that the measure would give yard workers "a much higher hourly wage" than that paid by "fairminded private employers in the Portsmouth area."

In this instance, the something-for-nothing from the Government, as you have termed it, is equal wages for equal work, which is only elementary justice. Certainly, as President of all the people, you will agree that legislative and executive justice is far from being something for nothing. Rather is it the basic obligation of all office holders, particularly elected officials, which your office symbolizes, as the top man.

The threat of weakness in our national fabric to which you have referred is certain to develop, directly, from practiced injustice. This is what your disapproval of this wage equalization legislation represents to the thousands of naval yard employees and their families in the Kittery-Portsmouth Yard.

It would be well for your advisers, who have on two occasions recommended your act of disapproval, to pay heed to these facts:

1. Fuel costs in Maine equal or exceed those in Boston.

2. Food costs in general in Maine are not lower than those in Boston.

3. Clothing and costs of shelter for comfortable housing are as high or higher than Boston.

4. Local and State taxes in Maine exceed those in Massachusetts, as well as 47 other States of the Nation.

Your protection of the "fair-minded private employers in the Portsmouth area," to which your memorandum alludes, falls rather flat when it is recognized that these same employers are waxing fat, economically speaking, from the very wages of these Navy yard employees which they have persistently urged you to downgrade. This is some sort of civic masochism in which the leaders of the Associated Industries indulge without really appreciating what they are doing to themselves and the economy of the area.

It is a rather significant fact, I think, about which you may be presently uninformed, that several of the high ranking naval officers, now in the Pentagon and advising you on this issue, recommended, while in command of the Kittery Yard, that their wage scales be equalized, as they were prior to 1947. It is rather ironical that your veto action on two occasions should be recommended by these very same officers. There is no basis for a compromise approach to basic justice. You are either for it or against it. Your disapproval of wage equalization for Kittery Naval Yard employees with Boston employees for performing the same kind of work is not an act of justice.

Respectfully yours,

JAMES C. OLIVER,
Member of Congress.

Years of Frustration and Failure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, we are about to conclude the 2d session of the 86th Congress. It is a good time to look back at what we have done, to review the bills we have enacted and to place upon the record the reasons for the fail-

ure to enact other bills. It is also appropriate to direct attention to the conduct of the executive departments of our Government during this Congress.

As a proper prelude to these remarks I have placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the statements I have made upon the conclusion of the work of each prior Congress in which it has been my honor and privilege to serve. I believe they demonstrate that I have approached my service not as a Democrat, which I am proud to be, but as an American.

I make this statement now, as an American, to alert all of those who agree with me to the opportunity of returning me to this high office, knowing full well that I hereby give notice to those who disagree with me that theirs will be the privilege of voting to return me to private life.

Immediately after the 1952 election, and again after the 1956 election, most of my Democratic colleagues joined me in pledging the Eisenhower-Nixon administration our wholehearted support in acting in the best interests of our country.

Throughout all of these 7½ years we have done just that. We have not been the loyal opposition. We have been a responsible, coordinate body of our Government. We have never opposed for the sake of being contrary. We were ready to follow the path that led to what was best for our Nation. We had no leader in the White House and none in the second in command. When we sought to lead we were abused with vitriolic, unreasoned and illogical vetoes.

Ties that could have been broken by a Vice President's vote in favor of progress found the vote favoring reaction and opposing progress.

Just as the 80th Congress has found its niche in history under the title of "the do-nothing Congress" this Eisenhower-Nixon administration will go down as "the could-not-have-done-worse administration." Its voice of experience is the voice of frustration and failure.

The record of this Republican Eisenhower-Nixon administration is so bad that more and more candidates running for office under the Republican Party's label will disown their party and try to disassociate themselves from it in order to get elected.

The Republican cry throughout this Congress has been that the Democratic program, the Democratic Party philosophy, is fine but they, the Republicans, know better how to implement it. Unfortunately, too frequently they have voted contrary to the way they talked. All too often they were joined by those Democrats from the southern part of our country who are just as reactionary as most Republicans.

When Democratic Congresses had Democratic Presidents and Vice Presidents we moved forward. We were not scourged with vetoes. All we needed was a majority of each House of Congress and a President in sympathy with our goals, in fact, setting our goals, and we had good, sound, responsible Government.

If we had had a President, or even a Vice President, who took the trouble to find out what the people wanted or what was good for the people, either of them, the President or the Vice President, could have delivered enough Republican votes to help us do the job. It is useless to consider where they were or why they were missing when this aid was needed. The sad fact is that they were nowhere to be found when they could have been so helpful.

I have heard the taunts that the Democrats in Congress could have passed any legislation they wanted because two-thirds of each House were Democrats. That just is not so. At no time did the Democrats in the Senate, even counting all the southerners, constitute a two-thirds majority. The nearest they came to that was a count of 66 to 34, which was one short of two-thirds of the 100 Members of the Senate. In the House we were never that close. 283 to 154 was as close as we got in this Congress. We failed to override vetoes by from one to six votes. The result was, instead of rule by the majority we had rule by just more than one-third plus a veto.

Those are the reasons why we have had no aid to depressed areas, no aid to education, no aid to housing, no real liberalization of our social security laws, no increase in minimum wages, no good farm bill, no sufficient liberalization of our immigration laws, no proper conservation and water pollution control bills, and an insufficient, unworkable and improperly financed bill for medical care for the aged.

We authorized and appropriated more money than requested for national security and defense. We believe that the lives and liberty of Americans cannot be measured by dollars and no sum is too great to preserve them. But a see-nothing, hear-nothing, learn-nothing Eisenhower-Nixon administration has refused to spend that money. They have talked big and acted little. That is why our entire defense and missile program is outdated.

Our loss of prestige throughout the world, among our friends and neighbors, is bad enough. It is, however, as nothing when compared to the real danger that now besets us. What answer can they give us? They know that the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans are no barrier to trouble in the Middle East and the Far East. But we do not even have those oceans separating us from the troubled areas at our backdoor and at our front-door—in Cuba, in Panama, in Central America, and in South America.

While talking about containing communism, they have permitted it to move in upon us. Imagine the cries of treason, and worse, if a Democrat were President.

During all this time, while prating about keeping us safe from our enemies, this Eisenhower-Nixon team has been demanding that we fight inflation at home by spending less. How have they done it? Let me tell you.

During 7 years of the Truman administration the cost of living rose just over 1 percent. Under Eisenhower and NIXON it has been pushed up 11 percent.

Everyone concedes that 4 percent unemployment is dangerously near a depression. Eisenhower and NIXON have pushed unemployment up to almost 6 percent.

They have pushed up the interest rate on GI mortgages more than 25 percent and on Government-guaranteed FHA mortgages almost as much. They have pushed up the interest our Government pays on the public debt almost 50 percent, to $9 billion a year.

Bankruptcy rates are the highest they have ever been in the history of this country. But the Eisenhower-Nixon administration ordered a curtailment of loans to small business while continuing to grant more and bigger favors to big business.

In 7 years the Eisenhower-Nixon farm program has cost the taxpayers $26 billion, 5 times more than in the entire 20 years prior thereto. In those same 7 years the Eisenhower-Nixon administration received and spent more billions of dollars than in all the prior administrations put together, starting with President Washington and ending with President Truman.

Had enough? I have.

Any doubts or questions about any of the foregoing will be quickly resolved by dropping a note to me at Room 1305, New House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Aged Medical Care in Review

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, the controversy that waged during the 86th Congress concerning the question of medical care for our elderly citizens was assuaged to some extent in the Social Security Amendments of 1960. Neither of the two major points of view prevailed. Both the contributory social security approach, as embodied in the famed Forand bill and in the Anderson-Kennedy amendment, and the Javits amendment, so strongly supported by the administration, which provided for Federal grants to the States for subsidizing voluntary health plans, all met with defeat. The action finally taken came, as you recall, in the form of amendments to title I of the Social Security Act.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, this section provided for Federal financial participation only in State plans for old-age assistance. These plans, of course, must be approved by the Federal Government. Basically what has been done this year amounts to three basic changes in this section of the law. These amendments allow the States to develop plans that fall into one of three categories: First, those that cover both old-age assistance and medical assistance for the aged; second, those that cover only old-age assistance; and, third, those that apply only to medical assistance for the aged. A separate set of requirements has been

set down for each of these three types of plans. These requirements constitute necessary prerequisites for Federal approval of State plans. It is important to realize that until now the Federal Government could participate in State plans providing monthly payments to those people eligible for old-age assistance benefits. This was done under the Federal percentage formula by which a State received from the Federal Government four-fifths of the first $30 of its average monthly payments for each recipient plus the Federal percentage of the remainder of the average monthly payment excluding that part of the payment in excess of $65. This Federal percentage, of course, varies for each State in an inverse relationship with the square of the per capita income of the States, but it has a minimum of 50 percent and a maximum of 65 percent. Under the new amendments this payment to the States would continue but would be increased by adding a further payment based on the newly created Federal medical percentage. What this would do, in effect, is pay the States an additional amount based upon that portion of the average monthly assistance payment or of an amount up to $12 in excess of the average payment which the State spends for medical care of recipients of old-age assistance. This feature is specifically designed to encourage the several States to broaden and strengthen their medical programs for these people or to initiate new programs. In addition a whole new area of Federal participation has been created. That is to enable the States as far as possible to furnish medical assistance for the aged who are not recipients of old-age assistance but whose incomes and resources are not sufficient to meet necessary medical expenses, and to allow the Federal Government to participate in such efforts.

As one who has from the very start actively supported the Forand bill and consequently that approach which would pay for medical care through an increase in the social security tax, I was understandably disappointed at the defeat of that bill. I still favor that approach. But these new amendments are at least a start and I welcome them as a beginning toward the final solution of what to me is a "crying human need," not merely a pressing social problem. I feel sure, Mr. Speaker, that the years to come will see a continuing improvement and augmentation of this vitally necessary program.

Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MORGAN M. MOULDER
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, at the end of World War II, the United States stood at the highest point of worldwide respect and power. For a short time, the United States stood ready to fulfill the world's hopes and aspirations. It had no part in kindling the flames of war. Our country had made a decisive contribution to victory. During the postwar years, the United States seemed dedicated to an infinite purpose—the purpose of binding up the wounds of war for building the machinery for the preservation of peace, of aid and guidance to the underprivileged, and of directing the great newly discovered forces of atomic energy exclusively toward peaceful human betterment. This was the short era of magnificent good intentions, many of which were realized.

Unfortunately, there was also the era of dangerous delusion. Now, there are at least 27 Federal agencies engaged in either loaning or giving away our dollars and resources to foreign countries. I cannot reconcile the totally different attitudes and policies of our Federal Government toward the economic problems of our own people and those of people in foreign lands. There is no agency and no money for doing for our own people what many of these foreign lending and giving away agencies are doing for people abroad. It seems to me that if such assistance as all these foreign lending agencies are providing for people abroad are based upon sound economics, then surely such assistance for our own people is equally sound economics. If our Nation cannot afford the money for Federal aid to education, for pensions to veterans of World War I, farm price support programs, and help to distressed areas at home, then most certainly we cannot afford to spend our taxpayers' money for the same purpose in foreign countries.

And now, what about Federal Government receipts from the public?

Total tax receipts from Apr. 30, 1789, to Jan. 1, 1946 (157 years) (Washington to Truman)	$233,124,696,392
Total tax receipts from Jan. 1, 1946, to Jan. 20, 1953 (7 years) (Mr. Truman)	337,661,865,422
Total taxes collected and received since Washington's time and including the Truman administration (164 years)	570,786,561,814
Total tax receipts under the Eisenhower administration from Jan. 20, 1953, to June 1, 1960 (7 years, 4 months, 11 days)	572,258,819,664

In other words, the Eisenhower-Nixon administration collected $1,472,257,850 more in taxes and revenue than was received in the 164 years preceding them. Our national debt—Federal, State, local corporation and private, total a staggering $1,300 billion. Our Government owes more money than all other nations in the world combined and since the present administration has been in power the National or Federal Government debt has increased from $266 billion to $289.9 billion. This increase has occurred even though Congress has reduced the President's budget request each year to a total reduction during the past 8 years amounting to $24.3 billion. To increase taxes would be almost certain to bring diminishing returns. We cannot continue spending at the present rate without undermining our economy, which is what the Communists want us to do.

During World War II and for several years after, American exports of machinery and food went to wartorn countries, sometimes as foreign aid and sometimes as commercial sales. But when foreign countries reached the point where they could produce their own requirements, many of our exports were shut out completely by various economic restrictions. During that period when our products were barred, their manufacturers suffered no competition from us; and many of them copied our designs which saved them all of the cost of research, experimenting, and designing. With such advantages they have been continuously and are now taking over more and more of our export trade. Their invasion of our domestic markets is more evident each day, resulting in the loss of foreign trade and employment in our own country.

The so-called foreign aid program has financed and contributed every possible assistance toward diminishing our export trade and discouraged the development of industry at home. In spite of the fact that one of the Federal agencies engaged in giving our money and resources away to foreign countries had a total unexpended balance at the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1960, of $8,154,355,000, almost $4.2 billion was requested of the Congress by the President for this fiscal year.

We are virtually working to set up a planned economy in nearly every country in the world but the adverse impact of foreign aid upon our own economy is disastrous. Forty-five percent of our entire national debt has gone for foreign aid and our cumulative interest paid on indebtedness incurred for foreign aid alone is over $31 billion. Approximately $3 billion will be the 1960 interest obligation on all U.S. taxpayers.

Foreign aid programs are the greatest cause of inflation in America today and if we really want to benefit the American people, let us discontinue the foreign-aid spending program and pass these savings on to the American people. Certainly our own fiscal economy should not take second place to any nation.

Unemployment—Solutions to the Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. O'HARA
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, there is reason to believe that when the 87th Congress convenes in January, the Nation may be facing a full-scale recession.

For several months now economists have been predicting a worsening of business conditions. Business Week, the Wall Street Journal, the financial pages of the New York Times, and other publications have reported a growing volume of opinion that an economic downturn is imminent.

The Secretary of Labor has just reported that unemployment in August rose to 5.9 percent of the labor force—a new high for the year. Unemployment in Detroit and southeastern Michigan now exceeds 10 percent.

UNEMPLOYMENT—POSTWAR

The postwar years have brought a new kind of problem to the national economy—a new and growing type of joblessness that persists in good times as well as bad. It is time something was done about it.

Since World War II there have been three economic downturns which have resulted in periods of substantial labor surplus. There are two facts worth noting about these recessions, both equally alarming. First, the amount of unemployment for each was greater than the recession which preceded it. Second, recovery from each of these recessions left us with substantially higher levels of unemployment.

After the 1947–48 recession, unemployment was reduced to 3 percent of the labor force, but it never got below 4 percent after the 1954 recession. Since 1958 it has never been less than 5 percent.

What I have described is a trend of increasing joblessness running through the cyclical changes of recession and recovery. If this trend continues, and if we are in another economic downturn, unemployment in 1961 may hit 8 to 10 percent of the Nation's workers, and the period of recovery will still find 5.5 to 6 percent of them unemployed.

The principal characteristics of the postwar economy that have caused this trend are three: A growing labor force, a slow rate of growth, and automation.

Since the Korean war there has been a substantial slowdown in the rate of growth of the economy as a whole. As a result, the economy is generating new jobs at a slower rate than that at which the labor force is growing. Automation and technological advances in the form of laborsaving devices have reduced manpower requirements in many industries and permit a substantial increase in production without a corresponding increase in the number of jobs.

The flat statement that unemployment has reached about 6 percent of the labor force does not reveal the real magnitude of the problem. It does not take into account the 2.4 million workers who are working only part time. The total idle time of part-time workers is the equivalent of having another 985,000 workers unemployed.

Moreover, the average duration of a worker's unemployment status has increased markedly in recent years, and, increasingly, joblessness is concentrated in particular areas, communities, and industries.

Even if predictions of an economic downturn are erroneous, there is an obvious need for Federal action on a wide front to remedy some of the causes of unemployment and to relieve the human suffering it entails.

AUTOMATION

Automation of our productive processes is a source of potential abundance for our Nation. In the years ahead we hope to raise our own standard of living. We must maintain a costly military machine, provide for the needs of a rapidly growing population, create jobs for a working force that will reach 86 million by 1970, and we must continue to help less favored nations through the foreign aid programs. We can achieve these goals and satisfy these needs only by achieving monumental increases in productivity, and increased use of our scientific, technological know-how is absolutely essential.

Automation, however, must be used to serve the needs of all the people. Experience has shown that it can contribute to serious dislocation in the lives of individuals and virtually destroy the economy of whole communities. Automation contributed to a 6 percent decline in the number of factory production workers between 1948 and 1958 during a period when the index of industrial production increased by 35 percent. In the case of the auto industry, the number of employees is one-half of what it was some 8 or 10 years ago, yet auto production has increased.

Automation threatens to destroy thousands of jobs; it has created fear among workers and among their families. In some areas it has created poverty and hunger, as in the coal fields of West Virginia, Pennsylvania, and Kentucky. It has become a national problem, transcending the boundaries of communities and States. It is creating problems to which the Federal Government must immediately address itself.

It is, unfortunately, a problem we know far too little about. We have no firm basis for anticipating what its ultimate impact will be. At the present time we do not know how heavily our labor markets will be burdened with the task of redistributing displaced workers. We do not know its effect upon skills. Many skills will be rendered completely obsolete; new skills will be needed, but at present we have no way of knowing what these skills will be. We need to know more about the overall social and economic consequences of automation.

The search for the answers to these questions is beyond the means of single individuals, business management or State and local governments. There is immediate need for a national conference of industrial and union leaders, under the sponsorship of the Federal Government, to make a comprehensive and continuing study of automation and its effect on this Nation's manpower needs.

A PROPER SUBJECT OF COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

The Republican minority leader of the Senate, Mr. DIRKSEN, has introduced a measure to remove from the area of legitimate union-management discussion the question of discontinuation of jobs and job descriptions. This measure is aimed directly at the worker whose job is or may be destroyed by the introduction of automated processes. In many if not most collective bargaining contracts today management and labor have recognized their mutual responsibility to solve the problem of transition. It is unthinkable that the Federal Government should interfere in the efforts of the two most interested parties to solve the problem of concern to them both.

The Federal Government must make every attempt to encourage and assist joint union-management efforts through collective bargaining to minimize the hardships that result from the introduction of automated equipment. The working man must retain the right to bargain about the discontinuation of his job, not because he will use this power to prevent economic growth, but because he must have some protection during the period of transition so as to keep to a minimum the dislocations that result to him, to his family, and to his community.

The Federal Government through the Department of Labor should be in a position to render technical assistance to business management which is in general seeking an honest solution to the problems resulting from the introduction of technical change without causing undue hardship to their employees.

EMPLOYMENT SERVICE

The functioning of the U.S. Employment Service must be strengthened and expanded. Right now when a worker becomes unemployed, say at an auto plant in Macomb County, the local employment service knows little or nothing about the job opportunities that may be available to this worker in another part of Michigan or outside the State. Far too little guidance and counseling is available to him. There are substantial areas in the Nation in need of skills which exist in large surpluses in other areas of the Nation. The operation of the Employment Service should be expanded. A clearinghouse for information concerning job surpluses and manpower requirements should be set up in Washington with branches operating on a regional and statewide basis so that workers whose skills are surplus in one area can be informed of the need for their skills in other areas.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

Existing unemployment compensation programs in most States are inadequate in almost every respect. They are inadequate in terms of the number of people who are covered. Some 13 million workers—20 percent of the labor force—are not covered at all. Benefits are too low and their duration too short.

The individual State in competition with its neighbors to attract industry is unwilling and unable to improve the situation. We need national standards raising the level of benefits to at least 50 percent of the weekly wage, extending the benefit period to 26 weeks and giving protection to those not presently covered. Only Federal legislation can accomplish this.

RETRAINING

The Federal Government in cooperation with State and local governments, labor organizations and business management must work to devise new and effective programs to retrain workers whose skills have become obsolete.

Incidentally, I propose that we should revise our outmoded unemployment compensation laws so as to permit a worker who has been laid off to engage in a retraining program without losing his unemployment benefits. Workers should be encouraged to retain their skills, not hindered in their efforts to develop new and needed capabilities.

With results of information gathered from a study which I have proposed, the needs of American industry for particular skills can be projected. Our high schools and vocational training institutions can be alerted to our future needs and begin to train students in accordance with the findings.

DEPRESSED AREAS

Immediate attention must be addressed to the particular type of joblessness that characterizes the so-called depressed areas of the Nation where chronic and substantial unemployment has existed for months and years and where there is little hope for improvement unless the Federal Government undertakes a program to help these communities to help themselves.

I am impatient with those who state that the unemployed in these depressed regions should migrate to more prosperous areas and thereby solve their problems. It is unreasonable to expect people to pull up their roots, to leave the communities where they have lived all their lives, where their families and their friends are, to settle elsewhere where job opportunities are probably also limited. Rather than dismantle communities, it makes much more sense to me to assist these communities in their attempts to encourage expanding industries, both new and old, to locate in their areas.

The techniques for solving area unemployment are well known. They have been an integral part of our foreign aid programs since the days of the Marshall plan and the point 4 program. They are embodied in the area redevelopment bill which was unfortunately vetoed by the President on two different occasions. They are simply a combination of technical assistance for economic planning, loans to industry for planned expansion, loans and grants to communities for the utilities necessary to attract new industry and for the retraining of jobless workers to equip them with needed new skills.

I am happy to note that both political parties have endorsed such a program in their platforms, and perhaps it is not too much to expect that the Federal Government will finally act to help distressed communities meet the problems which are too far-reaching to be resolved by local initiative.

FOOD-STAMP PLAN

At the present time about 5½ million Americans are receiving surplus commodities consisting of flour, butter, rice, cornmeal, and powdered milk. During the last session of Congress we gave the Secretary of Agriculture authority to revive the food-stamp plan so that our huge agricultural surpluses could be more effectively used than they are today in feeding our hungry people. The Secretary, for some reason known only to him, has refused to use this authority. I propose that early next year we enact legislation that will require him to use this authority.

RATE OF ECONOMIC GROWTH

My proposals thus far have been directed mainly toward relieving the distress that results from unemployment and toward meeting the special problems that have resulted from automation. In the last analysis if we are to find a final solution to the problem of unemployment as well as to the problems resulting from automation, then the American economy must increase its rate of growth.

We must reverse the unrealistic and stifling monetary policies of this administration. High interest rates and tight money have stifled the American economy. We must consciously and vigorously set about the task of stimulating economic expansion.

The needs of our Nation are great. In the great cities and in many small towns and rural areas people are inadequately housed. There are shortages of hospital facilities; we have too few schools, too few teachers; we need additional vocational and recreational facilities. Our transportation facilities are antiquated and are in themselves a hindrance to economic development. If we set about meeting these needs through responsible public investment, not only will we get the things done which we should be doing, we will put men to work, and in doing so we will stimulate economic growth which of itself will provide increased Federal revenues with which to pay for the work we are doing.

Let us plan to act. We cannot continue to ignore the future. It does not promise to take care of itself.

Congress and National Defense: A Summary of the Action of Congress in the Vital Field of National Defense by the Honorable George H. Mahon, of Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE MAHON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, the contributions of Congress toward a strong national defense have been outstanding. Congress and the country generally can take pride in the work that Congress has done. In a nonpartisan manner, Members of Congress—Democrats and Republicans alike—have worked, worked hard and effectively, to safeguard the security of our great country.

It seems at times that under both Democratic and Republican administrations, the Congress, not the executive branch, has carried the ball, provided the zeal and sense of urgency, provided the drive and determination, provided the initiative that has sparked our most spectacular gains in defense.

In this statement I shall review in a limited way the defense actions of the 86th Congress embracing the calendar years 1959 and 1960, and the fiscal years 1960 and 1961. For this period Congress has been under the control of the Democratic Party, but in the references which I shall make to Congress I shall include, of course, both Democrats and Republicans. The party in power in Congress must take the major responsibility for what Congress does or does not do, but the minority party can and does share in the credit or blame. In defense matters the 86th Congress has been markedly nonpartisan. It could be said that I, as a Member of Congress, speak from a biased standpoint, but I welcome an objective weighing of my statement by the people of our country.

Congress is not meddling when it seeks to influence defense programs and defense policies—it is not meddling, it is performing its proper and mandatory function. Article I, section 8, of the U.S. Constitution provides:

> The Congress shall have Power * * * to raise and support Armies * * * to provide and maintain a Navy; to make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces.

This language has been interpreted to cover the raising and support of all military forces of the Department of Defense.

In the course of my remarks I shall briefly outline some of the key areas where leadership has been taken by Congress in pushing toward the attainment of a stronger defense. Congress, in fulfilling its constitutional responsibilities, seeks the honest advice of the best available military thinkers before engaging in actions affecting defense planning, new concepts, and weapons systems.

At times it will be found that in a given year Congress appropriates almost identically the amount of money for the Department of Defense, and I include all the services, as is requested by the executive branch. The quick conclusion in such instances would be that Congress has merely rubber stamped the budget requests for funds. A brief examination will reveal that such a conclusion would be far from the truth.

Congress, often within the framework of defense funds requested, has substantially and importantly changed the course of defense programs, giving them new direction and emphasis. In some cases the change may represent a reduction such as a cutback in funds for outmoded nonballistic missiles or other weapons considered by Congress to be of low priority value. A high priority weapon may be substituted for a low priority weapon. A high priority program such as the intercontinental ballistic missile program may be accelerated beyond the point recommended by the Executive. Good examples of the latter are the Polaris missile-firing submarine and the Atlas ICBM.

The changes made by Congress in the programs submitted by the Executive have been both up and down. Through this system Congress has placed its imprint in a most helpful way upon the course of our defense effort. The influence of Congress would have been greater except for the frequent tardiness of the executive branch in carrying out the in-

tent of Congress, as will be discussed hereafter.

Congress has been especially sensitive to the demand inherent in the present world situation that we positively must be as well prepared as possible to deter an attack upon this country. We need to do everything in our power to acquire a state of instant readiness. We must be able to cope with the danger of surprise attack. We have sought constantly to improve our state of readiness and our capability to discourage surprise attack or cope with it if required to do so.

Good examples of our actions this year in this respect are our increases above the budget programs for the development of reconnaissance satellites designed to give us information about the U.S.S.R. and our acceleration of the airborne alert program.

The executive branch does not always move to accelerate programs in consonance with congressional intent. At times the funds are impounded and not used for the year in which appropriated. This is the exception to the rule. However, while prompt action is not always taken by the executive branch to carry out the will of Congress, some action along the lines recommended by Congress is usually taken after a short or long delay and within the fiscal year for which the funds are appropriated.

AIRBORNE ALERT

For example, Congress on June 30 of this year provided $85 million above the budget for the purpose of improving our ability to maintain an airborne alert; that is, the ability in an emergency to keep aloft and ready for instant action a proportion of our B–52 bomber strike force. The executive branch recommended against additional funds above the budget for the airborne alert effort which Congress nevertheless provided. It seemed for a time that the efforts of Congress had come to naught in this special area of great importance to the defense effort. Then on August 9, 1960, 5 weeks after Congress took final action on the bill, the Secretary of Defense advised Congress that the airborne alert funds were to be used as directed by Congress for the purpose of improving our defense capability against surprise attack.

POLARIS MISSILE-FIRING SUBMARINE

The Polaris ballistic missile, designed to be fired to a range of 1,200 miles or more, from a submarine while submerged, is a weapon system which has captured the imagination of the world. Everyone is pointing with pride to Polaris. To the Congress must go a large share of the credit for the rapid development of this weapon.

In the 1959 budget estimates only two Polaris submarines were requested. This was for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1958. Congress boldly added $609 million for an additional four submarines and for acceleration of the entire Polaris program. Unfortunately, these additional funds were frozen by the executive branch and 6 months elapsed before the Navy was permitted to place contracts for the first of the four Polaris submarines added by the Congress. The funds for three of these additional four submarines remained frozen throughout the entire fiscal year 1959. In the early part of the next fiscal year, these funds were finally released to the Navy and the objective of Congress was substantially attained—although there was a delay in the program which could not be made up.

In the 1961 budget, the budget for the current fiscal year, funds were requested to complete three Polaris submarines and for a start on three additional submarines. Here is what Congress did. We added $394 million above the President's January budget for the completion of an additional two submarines and for the initial procurement for an additional four Polaris submarines. This brought the funding program for fiscal year 1961 to five fully financed Polaris submarines plus advance components for seven additional submarines.

In recent weeks, the executive branch has announced its approval of a revised Polaris program for fiscal year 1961 for the construction of five submarines plus advance components for five additional submarines. However, even today the executive branch is withholding about $70 million of the $394 million additional provided by the Congress. The Navy is very grateful for the foresight and aggressive support of Congress for the Polaris program, and I believe the people of the country share the sentiments of the Navy.

ICBM PROGRAM

In the intercontinental ballistic missile program, the leadership and initiative of Congress is highly significant. Last year, the executive branch submitted a budget based on a 9-squadron Atlas ICBM program. Congress took the position that the program as submitted was inadequate and proceeded to increase it from 9 to 17 squadrons. The sum of $85 million was appropriated over and above the budget request for the purpose of getting under way promptly the accelerated Atlas ICBM program. It should be pointed out that presently the Atlas missile is our only operational ICBM and accordingly is the most important.

Last year Congress also added funds above the budget to accelerate the follow-on Minuteman ICBM program. Again this year, Congress has added funds to speed the development of a mobile capability for the Minuteman missile. Congress also added $136 million to the fiscal year 1961 budget to expand and accelerate the Atlas ICBM program.

It cannot be disputed that the actions of Congress on the Polaris, on the Atlas and Minuteman, and many other key weapons, have added immeasurably to the deterrent strength of the military forces of this country. This country would be much weaker today except for the forceful actions of Congress in these important areas. We would be stronger today had not the executive branch been tardy in a number of instances in implementing the will of Congress with the funds provided. And the funds were provided, as I have said before, by both Democrats and Republicans in Congress, on a nonpartisan basis. In that connection, I cite the committee reports and the congressional debates and the defense hearings.

THE B–70 BOMBER PROGRAM

During the calendar year 1959 Congress provided $345,600,000 for the fiscal year 1960 program for the B–70—the follow-on bomber to the B–52. These funds had been included in the President's budget. After Congress provided the funds, $195,600,000, or all but $150 million, was withheld by the executive branch from the B–70 program.

The budget program for the present fiscal year cut back the B–70 to a mere two prototype aircraft program, without providing for concurrent development of the elements needed for an operational weapons system. Congress refused to accept a cutback in this critical program which promises to open up a new era in manned flight and in weaponry. Funds for the development of a complete weapons system for the purpose of making this aircraft a fighting instrument, and not merely a prototype flying machine, were added by the Congress. Testimony given to the Congress indicated that a major consideration in the slowdown on the B–70 last year and again this year was the fear that expenditure ceilings would be exceeded.

The fiscal year 1961 budget request for the B–70 amounted to $75 million. The Congress appropriated an additional $190 million specifically for the B–70 program and provided an additional $100 million which was earmarked for use only for air defense aircraft or the B–70. The judgment shown by Congress in making an additional $290 million available for the B–70 was, to some degree, accepted by the Secretary of Defense when he announced on August 9, 1960, that $100 million of the additional funds would be released to the Air Force for the B–70 program.

ARMY MODERNIZATION

In each of the sessions of the 86th Congress, funds have been made available above the requests of the executive branch for the increased modernization of the Army. The amounts appropriated provide for various equipment running the gamut from armored personnel carriers, through modern rifles, to the Zeus antimissile missile. Over one-half billion dollars have been appropriated above the budget estimates for Army modernization during the 2-year period. Our purpose was to make our country better prepared to meet the threat of limited war. Unfortunately, the executive branch has not seen fit to use a large part of the additional funds provided by the Congress for this purpose.

AIRLIFT FOR DEFENSE FORCES

For years Congress has been dissatisfied with our capability for airlifting military forces and their equipment. Certain military exercises earlier this year reemphasized this inadequacy. Congress as a result of this inadequacy appropriated for the current fiscal year the sum of $200 million above the request of the executive branch for the procurement of modern, high-speed, long-range aircraft necessary for troop movements. Even though such funds

were not a part of the budget proposals, it is understood that the executive branch has now concurred in the action of Congress and is proceeding with procurement.

ANTISUBMARINE WARFARE

Other good examples of efforts to meet the demands of the present world situation are the congressional increases above the budget programs for antisubmarine warfare in recent years. The increase for the current fiscal year approximates $107 million. However, despite the critical importance of antisubmarine warfare, thus far the executive branch has cut back the antisubmarine warfare program and has withheld a total of $174 million provided by the Congress for this purpose. The net effect is the nullification of much of the congressional add-on and a withholding of certain antisubmarine warfare funds provided in the original budget request. Involved in the cutback are three nuclear attack submarines, plus some funds for research and development.

EFFECT OF CONGRESSIONAL ACTIONS

These examples give an understanding of the sense of urgency with which Congress has approached the problems of national defense. The atmosphere created by Congress has been wholesome. The actions referred to have encouraged defense-minded officials in the executive branch to move, and move faster, in many important areas.

REDUCTIONS IN FUNDS IN LOW-PRIORITY PROGRAMS

I have pointed out examples, and many more are available, of instances where Congress has increased budget estimates in order to initiate new programs or accelerate going programs. The objective has been achieved more or less within the framework of budgets which have been submitted to Congress. Reductions made in low-priority programs have made possible the achievement of these objectives in most instances without the necessity for large increases in the overall dollar amounts of the defense budget.

A few examples are in order. At the insistence of Congress, a review of the entire air defense program was made last year by the Defense Department. Many Members of Congress had concluded that the air defense program was unrealistic and geared to the past. The Defense Department itself, following a congressional study and a further Pentagon review, recommended in April of this year a reduction in the trouble-plagued Bomarc program in the sum of $381 million. Congress accepted reductions recommended in this program, and in this and related air defense programs, made further adjustments downward. In total, for the 2 years of the 86th Congress, the reductions effected amount to approximately $880 million, in all phases of air defense.

These congressional actions in air defense do not indicate a lack of interest in Congress in proper air defense. They relate chiefly to the newer concepts of how to meet the threat of attack and the deemphasis of the manned bomber threat in the light of the greater long-range threat of the ICBM. As heretofore stated, Congress has accelerated above the budget requests the Nike-Zeus program, designed to counter the ICBM.

REDUCTIONS MADE TO STIMULATE BETTER MANAGEMENT AND GET MORE VALUE FOR DEFENSE DOLLARS

The Congress has consistently emphasized the need for elimination of overlapping and duplicating functions, facilities, and organizations. Each year, funds ranging from a few millions to in excess of a hundred million dollars have been recovered through economy reductions in these areas.

In reference to economy reductions, it is pertinent to describe efforts made by Congress this year with respect to overstaffing.

Studies have revealed that in Defense Department headquarters alone, principally in the Washington, D.C., area, the annual cost approaches about $450 million. The total manpower involved, civilian and military, approximates 54,000. To get better control of this expenditure of money and manpower and facilitate economy in this area, Congress this year imposed limitations on Defense Department administration and reduced the funds by approximately 4 percent, and also took steps to reduce civilian payrolls in this field by about 10 percent.

In the area of travel Congress made a reduction in the budget this year of $55 million.

In another area, the Congress, upon the recommendation of the House Appropriations Committee has, for the past several years, made general reductions in the amounts of money available for the procurement of military materiel, not to cut the numbers of items to be procured, but in an effort to enforce better contracting methods. Wasteful practices in this area have caused widespread criticism in and out of Congress. Startling evidences of mismanagement and poor judgment have been brought to light, and Congress has sought to force economy and more effective procedures. The amount cut from the budget this year for this purpose exceeds $400 million.

IMPACT AND OBJECT OF CONGRESSIONAL ACTIONS

I repeat, the United States is immeasurably stronger today, and is more adequately prepared to meet its grave responsibilities by reason of the aggressive action of Congress taken upon its own initiative above and beyond the recommendations of the executive branch. Members of Congress know this. It is proper that the people of our Nation should know this, especially since the issue involved is the survival of the United States.

My position is, generally, that if Congress is due any credit, and I think it is, the credit comes principally not from increasing or decreasing defense budgets but from redirecting, reemphasizing, and accelerating key defense programs. The important role of Congress has been in the downgrading of marginal projects or low priority projects and the acceleration of high priority projects having a direct relation to our ability to survive.

It is not to be inferred that Members of Congress feel that they are great experts in defense strategy and weaponry. It is true, of course, that within Congress is a vast reservoir of information and experience in defense matters. Rarely does Congress provide funds for a defense project or policy that lacks a strong segment of support from military experts in the Pentagon. Nor does Congress in taking actions to reduce or accelerate defense programs act hastily. On the contrary, months of study are usually devoted to the question at issue. A good example of this would be the cutback of the Bomarc air defense missile program to which reference has been made.

As to whether or not the actions of Congress in modifying defense programs have been reasonably sound, I cite the fact that in a large number of cases the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Secretary of Defense, and the administration itself, have quickly or tardily approved and adopted the congressional actions taken. This fact testifies to the soundness of congressional actions in defense matters.

At times there is a strong sentiment in Congress for major changes and increases in defense budgets and programs. The majority of the Members of Congress have been realistic with respect to this situation. Vast sums of money above budget estimates, which obviously would not be utilized for any effective purpose by the executive branch, have not been provided. Had the atmosphere and sense of urgency in the executive branch been different, then Congress might have undertaken certain programs of a much more far-reaching nature. The point is, Congress has not seen fit to play politics with the defense issue or provide funds for programs which would obviously not stimulate effective defense action. In other words, Congress has refrained from engaging in exercises in futility.

GENERAL SUMMARY OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS FOR 86TH CONGRESS

In brief summary, for the two sessions, Congress has appropriated almost $80 billion in the regular annual defense appropriation acts. This total and the figures which follow below do not include funds appropriated during the 86th Congress for military construction. Appropriations for military construction for fiscal year 1960 were about $1.4 billion and for fiscal year 1961 were just under $1 billion.

In the first session, the estimates submitted were $39,248,200,000. Congress appropriated $39,228,239,000, representing program changes which resulted in a net reduction of $19,961,000. In the second session, the regular annual estimates presented officially were $39,335 million. Congress made program changes as heretofore summarized, which resulted in appropriations of $39,996,608,000, a net increase of $661,608,000 above the request of the executive branch.

ACTIONS IN DETAIL ON FISCAL YEAR 1961 DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. Speaker, on June 30, 1960, when I presented to the House the conference

report on the defense appropriations bill for the current fiscal year, I stated that at a later time I would insert in the RECORD a more comprehensive statement as to the actions of Congress on the measure then before us. In keeping with the statement heretofore made, I shall insert in the RECORD a table reflecting the various changes in the Department of Defense appropriation requests effected by the Congress as the 1961 defense appropriation bill progressed toward final approval. This table reflects the additions and the reductions made by the House, by the Senate, and in the final version of the bill approved in conference, as compared with the January budget submission from the President. I will not further discuss each of these changes. Within the detailed tabulation for 1961 there is an explanatory note of the House action, the Senate action, and the final conference action on each item. In addition, each of these items was explained in some detail in the House and Senate committee reports and my comments accompanying the conference report on June 30 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Referring to the tabulation of the current year, it should be of considerable interest to Members to note that in acting on the 1961 defense appropriation bill, the House made program increases totaling $1,996,100,000, while at the same time the House made reductions in that bill totaling $1,993,300,000. This resulted in a net of approximately $2,800,000 more than the overall budget request.

The changes up and down were effected in a number of appropriations and in many programs. They have been summarized here into about 25 major items for purposes of brevity. Following these items through the legislative process, it will be noted that in taking action on the bill, the other body approved most of the program increases made by the House except for air defense, airborne alert, and antisubmarine warfare programs. At the same time, the other body included additional amounts above the House figures, for the B–70 aircraft program, Army equipment modernization, and the Samos space project. In addition, the other body restored a substantial portion of the reductions made by the House so that the bill as passed by the other body provided for program increases totaling $1,866,500,000 and program decreases of $686,500,000, or a net increase over the budget request of about $1,180 million compared with the $2,800,000 increase over the budget approved by the House.

In the compromise that was agreed upon in conference, many of the reductions made by the House were reinstated, and some of the Senate increases were retained, so that the final version of the bill reflected program increases totaling $1,921,500,000 and program decreases totaling $1,259,900,000, or a net increase over the original budget estimates of about $661,600,000.

The actions taken all along the line in connection with the defense appropriation bill were very carefully considered. Each change upward and downward was thoughtfully weighed for its effect on the overall defense posture.

ACTION ON FISCAL 1960 DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS

I shall also insert a summary tabulation reflecting the adjustments accomplished by the Congress in connection with the defense program for fiscal year 1960, during its consideration of the defense appropriation bill for that year. This table covers the past fiscal year 1960 and, of course, is not in the same detail as the table which reflects changes and explanatory notes for fiscal year 1961. Nevertheless, it does give an idea of the extent of congressional action on defense programs during the 1st session of the 86th Congress. While the bill as it finally passed Congress appropriated about $20 million less than the budget request, the program changes effected by the Congress substantially increased the defense potential of the United States and the majority of these changes were eventually concurred in by the executive branch. For a more detailed explanation of the congressional actions taken in connection with defense appropriations for 1960, Members are referred to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 4, 1959.

Changes in Department of Defense appropriation bill, 1961, from the January budget submission

[Dollar amounts in millions]

	Changes from budget estimates approved by—		
	House	Senate	Conference
ADDITIONS			
1. Army National Guard and Reserves House: Added funds to maintain the respective strengths of the Army National Guard and Army Reserves at 400,000 and 300,000 rather than 360,000 and 270,000 as proposed in the budget. Senate: Approved House increases for strengths and added $7,500,000 for National Guard technicians. Conference: Approved increases for strengths and approved addition of $5,000,000 for National Guard technicians.	+$105.4	+$112.9	+$110.4
2. Air National Guard Senate: Added $11,300,000 for the Air National Guard at the request of the Department, to provide for increased expense due to shift of F–102 aircraft. Conference: Agreed to increase.	----------	+11.3	+11.3
3. Marine Corps Senate: Added funds for pay and support of Marine Corps strength of 200,000 rather than 175,000 as proposed in the budget. Conference: Deleted funds for increased strength of Marine Corps.	----------	+40.0	----------
4. Modernization of Army equipment House: Added $207,600,000 to provide additional high priority equipment for so-called Army modernization. This increase was partially offset in the Army procurement appropriation by other program reductions totaling $170,500,000, thereby reflecting a net increase in the Army procurement appropriation of only $37,100,000 over the total dollar budget request. The offsetting reductions made were $120,000,000 for anticipated reimbursements for off-the-shelf sales of surplus equipment not reflected in the budget estimates, $42,500,000 as a part of the overall economy reduction applying to all procurement accounts; and $8,000,000 for procurement of jeeps. Senate: Added $215,100,000 above the House for additional Army modernization but offset this increase by indicating that the figure included restoration of all but $8,000,000 of the House reductions. Thus the Senate only approved $45,100,000 of the House increase for Army modernization and in effect added $215,100,000 more for a total modernization addition of $260,200,000. Conference: Agreed to an appropriation for Army procurement which is $158,400,000 above the budget estimate. This increase for Army equipment modernization, however, is supplemented by the reductions made in this appropriation in the same manner that other program adjustments are reflected in this tabulation. Therefore, the final action in conference on the item of Army equipment modernization provided $212,600,000, including the $158,400,000 over the budget estimate, the $46,200,000 economy reduction applied in this appropriation as in all procurement appropriations, and the $8,000,000 reduction for jeep procurement. In addition, the conferees agreed that if and when any part of the $120,000,000 anticipated to be realized as reimbursements for off-the-shelf sales of surplus stocks is realized, these funds should also be applied to Army modernization.	+207.6	+260.2	+212.6
5. Airlift House: Added $250,000,000 over the budget for procurement of urgently needed modern aircraft to provide a greater airlift capability. Senate: Approved $200,000,000 of the House amount for modern airlift and added $10,000,000 for procurement of F–27 aircraft. Conference: Deleted $10,000,000 for procurement of F–27 aircraft and agreed to the Senate figure for airlift.	+250.0	+210.0	+200.0
6. Air defense House: Added $215,000,000 for F–106 fighter aircraft as replacement for Bomare missiles. This committee increase was augmented by an increase of $167,900,000 for air defense items proposed by the Department as a semiofficial budget adjustment. Senate: Eliminated $215,000,000 for the fighter aircraft added by the House. Conference: Added $100,000,000 to the Senate figure to provide for fighter aircraft, with the understanding that if these additional funds are not needed for fighter aircraft the money may be applied to a step-up in the B–70 bomber program.	+382.9	+167.9	+267.9
7. Airborne alert House: Added funds to provide for a greater capability to undertake an airborne alert, if and when necessary. Senate: Eliminated the House increase, relying upon the authority provided in sec. 512(b) of the bill. Conference: Agreed to an increase of $85,000,000 which doubles the amount in the budget for preparation toward attaining an airborne alert capability. Of this amount, $70,000,000 is for procurement of spare parts and $15,000,000 for operation and maintenance.	+115.0	----------	+85.0

Changes in Department of Defense appropriation bill, 1961, from the January budget submission—Continued

[Dollar amounts in millions]

	Changes from budget estimates approved by—		
	House	Senate	Conference
8. Antisubmarine warfare	+$207.0	+$41.9	+$107.0
House: Added $207,000,000 over the budget request for ASW, including $100,000,000 for research, $57,000,000 for an additional nuclear powered submarine and $50,000,000 for 2 destroyer escort vessels, and in addition refused to accept a reduction of 2 nuclear submarines estimated to cost $114,000,000 as proposed by the Department in the semiofficial budget amendment.			
Senate: Eliminated $58,100,000 of the House funds for research, $57,000,000 for 1 nuclear submarine and $50,000,000 for the 2 destroyer escort vessels.			
Conference: Provided $50,000,000 for ASW research and restored $57,000,000 for the attack submarine deleted by the Senate.			
9. Polaris	+394.0	+394.0	+394.0
House: Added $241,000,000 to the Polaris program and accepted the semiofficial budget adjustment request for $153,000,000. This approved a program for fully funding 5 submarines, with supporting missiles and equipment, and partially funding 7 submarines, instead of fully funding 3 and partially funding 9 as proposed in the semiofficial budget adjustment request of the Department. The original budget requested full funding for 3 and partial funding for 3.			
Senate: No change from House.			
Conference: Not in conference.			
10. Minuteman missiles	+47.7	+27.0	+27.0
House: Added $20,700,000 above the budget to speed development on a mobile capability for the Minuteman missile and accepted an increase of $27,000,000 as proposed in the semiofficial budget adjustment request.			
Senate: Deleted the $20,700,000 added by the House.			
Conference: Agreed that extra funds added by the Senate for Samos could be made available to extent of $20,700,000 for Minuteman missile if deemed advisable.			
11. Atlas	+136.0	+136.0	+136.0
House: Accepted the addition of $136,000,000 for Atlas as proposed in the semiofficial budget adjustment request.			
Senate: Approved the House action.			
Conference: Not in conference.			
12. BMEWS	+35.0	+35.0	+35.0
House: Accepted the addition for the ballistic missile early warning system as proposed in the semiofficial budget adjustment request.			
Senate: Approved the House action.			
Conference: Not in conference.			
13. B–70 aircraft program		+285.0	+190.0
Senate: Added funds to carry on the B–70 program at a level designed to produce a complete weapons system rather than the 2 prototype aircraft program proposed in the budget.			
Conference: Provided funds for development of a complete weapons system as proposed by the Senate but with reduced funding during fiscal year 1961. In addition, agreed that $100,000,000 added for fighter aircraft may be used for the B–70 if such fighter aircraft are not procured.			
14. Space projects:			
Midas	+36.6	+26.4	+26.4
House: Added $10,200,000 to the $26,400,000 increase proposed in the semiofficial budget adjustment request for the Midas project.			
Senate: Deleted the $10,200,000 House increase for this project.			
Conference: Agreed that extra funds added by the Senate for the Samos project could also be used for this project to the extent of $10,200,000.			
Discoverer	+45.0	+35.0	+35.0
House: Added $10,000,000 to the $35,000,000 increase proposed in the semiofficial budget adjustment request for the Discoverer project.			
Senate: Deleted the $10,000,000 House increase for this project.			
Conference: Agreed that extra funds added by the Senate for the Samos project could also be used for this project to the extent of $10,000,000.			
Samos	+33.8	+83.8	+83.8
House: Added $33,800,000 for this satellite project.			
Senate: Accepted the House increase for this project and added $50,000,000 more.			
Conference: Agreed to the Senate increase but also agreed that the increased funds could be used for the Minuteman, Midas, and Discoverer projects to the extents indicated.			
Total additions to budget	+1,996.1	+1,866.5	+1,921.5
Army	+313.1	+373.2	+323.1
Navy	+601.0	+475.9	+501.0
Air Force	+1,082.0	+1,017.4	+1,097.4
Office Secretary of Defense	0	0	0
REDUCTIONS			
1. Travel	−73.1	−57.4	−55.8
House: Made a 10-percent reduction in all travel funds for the Department of Defense.			
Senate: Made partial restoration.			
Conference: Agreed to Senate restoration plus an additional $1,600,000 for the Marine Corps.			
2. Transfers of surplus stock fund cash	−15.5	−15.5	−15.5
House: Transferred surplus stock fund cash to certain military personnel appropriations.			
Senate: Approved House action.			
Conference: Not in conference.			
3. Communications	−84.3		−24.3
House: Held funds for communications to the 1960 level to compel consolidation and better management.			
Senate: Restored the increases requested for 1961.			
Conference: Agreed to restoration of the increase in funds associated with various warning systems.			
4. Departmental administration	−33.6	−13.6	−18.6
House: Made a reduction in salary and expense items for all departmental headquarters offices and placed a numerical limitation on military personnel and a fiscal limitation on amounts available for the expenses of such headquarters.			
Senate: Restored a part of the House reduction and deleted the limiting language from the bill.			
Conference: Agreed to a reduction of $18,600,000 applicable to departmental headquarters offices but making personnel reductions effective by Dec. 31, 1960, and restored the language limitations.			
5. Operation and maintenance generally	−85.8	−63.7	−66.3
House: Made a number of economy adjustments in operation and maintenance funds in addition to travel, communications and departmental administration. These reductions were for aviation fuel, mission support, flying, costs related to proficiency flying, motor vehicle hire, maintenance of Wherry and Capehart housing, and education of dependents.			
Senate: Restored parts of each of these reductions, except for family housing maintenance which was reduced further.			
Conference: Agreed to Senate restorations except administrative use of aircraft and dependents education for which only a part of the Senate restoration was agreed to.			
6. Army procurement	−128.0	−8.0	−8.0
House: Made $8,000,000 reduction for jeep vehicles because of slippage in the program and $120,000,000 reduction for unbudgeted funds anticipated to be realized from reimbursements from off-shelf sales of surplus equipment not to be replaced.			
Senate: Restored House reduction of $120,000,000 for anticipated reimbursements for off-shelf sales.			
Conference: Agreed to Senate action in restoring $120,000,000 reduction reflecting anticipated reimbursements but agreed that if and when any part of such reimbursements are realized they should be applied to Army equipment modernization.			
7. Procurement generally	−400.5		−418.1
House: Made a percentage reduction in all procurement items to force more economical procurement management and practices.			
Senate: Restored the House reduction.			
Conference: Agreed to a percentage reduction in all procurement items as proposed by the House. The increased amount reflects restoration of other House reductions in procurement appropriations and Senate program increases.			
8. Aircraft procurement		−17.8	−17.8
Senate: Approved a reduction of $17,800,000 in aircraft procurement for F–102 support equipment at the request of the Department.			
Conference: Agreed to the Senate action.			

Changes in Department of Defense appropriation bill, 1961, from the January budget submission—Continued

[Dollar amounts in millions]

	Changes from budget estimates approved by—		
	House	Senate	Conference
9. Aircraft carrier House: Eliminated funds for an aircraft carrier. Senate: Restored funds for the aircraft carrier. Conference: Agreed to provide funds for an aircraft carrier.	−$293.0		
10. Air defense House: Accepted the reduction proposed in the semiofficial budget adjustment package for SAGE and other air defense items. Senate: Approved the House action. Conference: Not in conference.	−204.4	−$204.4	−$204.4
11. Bomarc House: Accepted the reduction in the Bomarc program proposed as a part of the semiofficial budget adjustment package and took further action to eliminate the Bomarc-B program entirely and recover as much of the funds as possible. A part of these funds were then applied to buy fighter aircraft to replace the Bomarc missiles as indicated above. Senate: Restored the House reduction in the Bomarc program and reinstated $75,000,000 for 2 bases proposed for elimination by the Department as a part of the semiofficial budget adjustment request. Conference: Agreed to a modified Bomarc-B program which is $244,000,000 above the House action, $125,000,000 below the Senate action, $431,100,000 below the January budget, and $50,000,000 below the revised program proposed by the Department as a part of the semiofficial budget adjustment proposal in April.	−675.1	−306.1	−431.1
Total reductions from budget	−1,993.3	−686.5	−1,259.9
Army	−224.7	−41.6	−100.2
Navy	−516.3	−48.4	−207.1
Air Force	−1,235.3	−580.8	−936.6
Office of Secretary of Defense	−17.0	−15.7	−16.0
Net changes from budget	+2.8	+1,180.0	+661.6
Army	+88.4	+331.6	+223.0
Navy	+84.7	+427.5	+293.9
Air Force	−153.3	+436.6	+160.7
Office of Secretary of Defense	−17.0	−15.7	−16.0

Changes in Department of Defense appropriation bill, 1960, from the January budget submission

[In millions of dollars]

	Changes from budget estimates approved by—		
	House	Senate	Conference
Additions:			
1. Maintain National Guard and Army Reserve strengths	+$152.5	+$147.2	+$147.2
2. Nike-Zeus and Army modernization	+200.0	+405.3	+362.6
3. Antisubmarine warfare programs	+255.3	+18.0	+137.3
4. Additional Atlas missiles	+85.0	+85.0	+85.0
5. Acceleration of Minuteman missile mobility	+87.0	+87.0	+87.0
6. Increase Marine Corps strength to 200,000	----------	+43.1	+43.1
7. Provide nuclear-powered aircraft carrier	----------	+380.0	+35.0
8. Procurement of F–27 aircraft	----------	+11.0	----------
Total additions	+779.8	+1,176.6	+897.2
Army	+352.5	+552.5	+509.8
Navy	+255.3	+441.1	+215.4
Air Force	+172.0	+183.0	+172.0
Office, Secretary of Defense	----------	----------	----------
Reductions:			
1. Military personnel, net economy reductions	−2.0	−2.0	−2.0
2. Operation and maintenance, general economy reductions	−163.9	−82.5	−130.5
3. Eliminate conventionally powered aircraft carrier	−260.0	−260.0	−260.0

	Changes from budget estimates approved by—		
	House	Senate	Conference
Reductions—Continued			
4. Mace missile funding	−$127.5	−$127.5	−$127.5
5. Bomarc missile funding	−162.7	−82.8	−82.8
6. Procurement of passenger and trainer type jet aircraft	−101.4	−53.5	−53.5
7. Aircraft modification contingency estimate	−100.0	−50.0	−50.0
8. Procurement of radar equipment	−50.0	−50.0	−50.0
9. General, 1 percent, procurement	−131.2	−1.4	−60.0
10. Air defense research and development	----------	−10.8	−10.8
11. Transfers from revolving funds	−81.0	−110.0	−90.0
Total reductions	−1,179.7	−830.5	−917.2
Army	−130.6	−109.0	−119.0
Navy	−338.0	−286.4	−316.7
Air Force	−710.7	−420.1	−466.5
Office, Secretary of Defense	−.4	−15.0	−15.0
Net change	−399.9	+346.1	−20.0
Army	+221.9	+443.5	+390.8
Navy	−82.7	+154.7	−101.3
Air Force	−538.7	−237.1	−294.5
Office, Secretary of Defense	−.4	−15.0	−15.0

Another One for the Books

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, the public library services of our Nation are a vital part of the educational opportunities which we provide our citizens in an effort to give equal opportunity to all. Although the library services program, which came into being with enactment of the Library Services Act during the 84th Congress, has been in operation for 5 years, the condition of library services in rural areas is far from adequate.

We are spending vast sums to insure our Nation's strength abroad. Of great and equal importance is our strength at home and I believe there is no question that an informed and educated citizenry is the backbone of that strength. Today's libraries serve their communities in many important ways. Every public library is, in fact, a center for the dissemination of a wide variety of educational, vocational, and recreational materials; a source of guidance in the exploration and development of personal interests; a clearinghouse for the gathering and discussion of ideas, practical as well as cultural, important to the community and an invaluable extension of the school on all levels.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to point to the fact that the first bill which I introduced upon coming to the Congress of the United States was a bill to establish the library services program. Last month the House of Representatives approved and cleared for the President's signature a bill to extend the Library Services Act "to promote the further development of public library service in rural areas" for an additional 5 years. It is, of course, impossible to adequately assess the value and the rich rewards realized by our citizens, particularly those in rural areas, as a result of this wise investment of Federal funds through the library services programs. The modest sums made available to the States through the program has not only done a good deal to provide our rural areas with library services, but has stimulated local governments and communities to doing their part in giving library facilities and services to our children and adults. In this connection, Mr. Speaker, and in an effort to clear up any

misunderstanding which may have resulted from the limited debate in the House of Representatives last month—with particular reference to the State of Ohio—I would like to record a few facts and figures.

In earlier discussion on this legislation it was observed that $21,261,612 of Ohio's intangibles tax money is spent each year on libraries in Ohio. And it is certainly true that $21 million is a lot of money. But take a look at where the $21 million went and what it means to the 88 counties in Ohio: $16 million or 75 percent of that total went into the 9 metropolitan counties in which are situated the cities of Cleveland, Cincinnati, Columbus, Toledo, Dayton, Akron, Canton, Youngstown, and Lorain; $19 million or 90 percent of the total went into the above counties and adjacent industrial counties containing such cities as Warren, Hamilton, Lima, Ashtabula, Springfield, Salem, Mansfield, Steubenville, Newark, and others.

Thus 31 counties received $19 million or 90 percent of the total library income in 1959. Fifty-seven counties had to exist on 10 percent of the total or approximately $2,200,000.

And what does this mean to the libraries in some of these 57 counties? Adams County, had a total of $6,526 on which to operate two libraries in the county, located in the communities of Peebles and Manchester. This is not enough to hire one librarian and rent a building, to say nothing of buying books, which is the library's reason for existence; yet this amount had to be divided among two libraries. How could such a library or libraries even begin to think of buying a bookmobile to serve the small towns and rural areas in the county? A bookmobile itself costs $15,000 to purchase and another $15,000 annually to operate.

How could a county like Carroll, situated right next to wealthy Stark County in northeastern Ohio but with a library income of $17,713 get an additional $30,000 to establish bookmobile service? If it received 100 percent of the collection in that county, which it did not, there would not be enough to do this.

How could Union County, with a library budget of $27,000 which might be considered adequate, pick up an additional $30,000 to start bookmobile service?

Monroe County in 1959 had a total intangibles collection of $10,509. How much library service will that provide? Noble County had a collection of $6,170 of which only $4,000 could be spared for the library. Pike County had a total of $6,333, not much better. Vinton County had $4,417. The library there received 100 percent of the collection, which sounds wonderful but still only represents about one-eighth of the cost of a bookmobile.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert in the RECORD an editorial which appeared last month in the Toledo Blade together with a feature article from the same newspaper which gives a pretty clear idea of the extent to which the State of Ohio has participated in the program, the services which our State library has provided under the competent leadership of State Librarian Walter Brahm, and the effectiveness of Federal legislation in this area. Mr. Speaker, I commend this body for its prudent action in extending the Library Services Act for an additional 5 years.

[From the Toledo Blade, Aug. 27, 1960]

PAGE OF OPINION

A little bill that had been snagged in the House Rules Committee, and which might easily have been lost in the shuffle, was passed this week by the House under a suspension of the rules and sped on its way to the White House. It is at least a small plus mark for the shirttail session of Congress.

The bill involved—and its prospects had seemed very dim for a while—was a 5-year extension of the Library Services Act of 1956. Under it, the Federal Government is authorized to provide a total of $7.5 million a year in matching aid to the States to encourage the development of rural library services.

This moderate Federal help has been most useful in Ohio. The chief and almost only public support for libraries in this State comes from the intangibles tax. Of approximately $22 million distributed to them from this source last year, 90 percent went to libraries in 31 industrial and urban counties.

These counties, of course, contain most of the population and supply the bulk of intangibles revenues. But that's no excuse for depriving people in rural areas, and particularly children who are the best customers of libraries, of books that educate and entertain.

The people of rural Ohio, and rural America, will benefit from the extension of this inexpensive form of pump-priming Federal aid. There's no surplus of books on the farms and in the small towns.

[From the Toledo Blade, Sept. 11, 1960]

EXPANSION OF STATE LIBRARY FACILITIES CHARTED UNDER THE LEADERSHIP OF FORMER TOLEDOAN—NEW PROJECTS IN THE WORKS FOR 143-YEAR-OLD AGENCY

(By Frank Kane)

COLUMBUS.—One of the oldest and yet perhaps least known of the State agencies is the State library.

It dates back to 1817 when Gov. Thomas Worthington used some State contingency funds to buy books for his legislators.

For many decades the State library remained largely an information center for State officials and members of the general assembly.

But in recent years, under the leadership of Walter T. Brahm, former assistant librarian of the Toledo Public Library, and with the aid of Federal grants, it has been rapidly expanding its activities.

Today Mr. Brahm, the State librarian, has big plans for its future, including a proposal to issue statewide library cards to Ohio residents which could be used to draw books from any public library in the State and establishing nine regional book storage and service centers to aid small libraries throughout the State.

As Mr. Brahm points out, most of the 270 tax supported libraries in Ohio are small, with budgets of less than $25,000 a year and staffs of fewer than a half dozen employees.

With the high cost of books today, they need every bit of help that they can get from the State in order to provide adequate service.

The first regional book storage and service center has already been established in Napoleon, to service about 30 small northwestern Ohio libraries. And Mr. Brahm is asking the general assembly to appropriate funds next year for eight other such centers.

The State library itself is housed on 2½ floors of the State office building in Columbus and has about 900,000 volumes, ranging from the latest fiction to all types of nonfiction.

Any resident of Ohio is eligible for a card enabling him to draw books from the State library. But as might be expected, most of the persons who visit the library are residents of Franklin County and State employees.

Governor DiSalle makes frequent use of the library in researching executive questions. For example, the library recently furnished him with a sheaf of material on the clemency powers of the Governor that he utilized in writing a formal statement commuting a death sentence.

Since State agencies are required to furnish copies of their official publications to the library, it also is used extensively by legislative research committees. Other States also mail copies of their documents and publications to the library.

In addition, the library houses a large genealogical collection, including census records which show the names of persons residing in Ohio up to 1880. It also has some valuable Ohio historical records, including letters of Arthur St. Clair, first Governor of the Northwest Territory, and replies to him from President Washington.

The library also does a considerable mail order and traveling book collection business throughout the State.

Persons can write for volumes unavailable locally and the library will either furnish them, with the customer paying the mailing costs, or make arrangements with another library in the State to ship the volume to the resident's local library for his use.

The State pays the loaning library 50 cents for handling and packaging of the volume. In addition it loans collections of books to small libraries for a year at a time.

It also provides advice to local libraries on financing and operations and distributes about $270,000 a year in State subsidies to them.

A total of $40,000 goes to the Cleveland and Cincinnati libraries for providing braille service to the blind and the rest is distributed on a needs formula.

The biggest boost to the library came in recent years when the Federal Government started allocating money to the States to improve rural library service.

Ohio now gets about $270,000 a year from the United States, and this money has been spent on bookmobile service to Adams and Brown Counties in southern Ohio and Fulton and Henry Counties and parts of Defiance County in the northwestern sector, the establishment of the regional center in Napoleon, purchase of additional books for the State library, and the start of a statewide cataloging service.

(The bookmobiles, incidentally, are almost self-supporting once they start operating because of local contributions, according to Mr. Brahm.)

The cataloging center, located in a former supermarket in Columbus, was inaugurated because today "it costs almost as much to catalog a book as it does to buy it," Mr. Brahm said.

Many small libraries simply cannot afford to hire skilled catalogers, and the State is trying to set up a system whereby it will furnish any of the indexing and cataloging operations at cost. It is already servicing about 15 small libraries, mostly in southern Ohio.

Mr. Brahm's most controversial project has been his proposal for a statewide library card. Officials of many smaller libraries have welcomed the idea, he said, but officials of some large libraries oppose it because they fear it will result in a lot of nonreturned books.

Mr. Brahm would have the State guarantee any losses and assume the responsibility for recovery from forgetful borrowers.

The State librarian, who receives $11,280 a year (less than head librarians receive in many major cities), has spent most of his life working with books. When he was in high school in his native Massillon, Ohio, he worked in the Massillon Library and then received a scholarship to Western Reserve University where he received a bachelor's degree and a master's degree in library science.

Later he worked in the Western Reserve Library before moving to Toledo in 1937 as head of the business and technology section of the Toledo Public Library.

In 1938 he was made assistant Toledo librarian and served in that post until 1942 when he became State librarian.

Today, he supervises a staff of about 60 persons working on a budget of about $769,000 per year, including the $270,000 a year in State subsidies to local libraries and $270,000 in Federal subsidies.

Let Us Be Worthy of Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the text of an address which I was honored to deliver before the biennial convention of the National Federation of Republican Women in Atlantic City, N.J.

The address follows:

Women have a reputation for facing facts, whether in their personal and family lives or in their political and public activities.

At this point in the 1960 campaign, it seems to me there are two overriding facts about American political and national life which we, as Republicans and as Republican women, have a special interest in facing.

The first fact is this: the Republican Party is a minority party in America today.

In recent years, it has been the exception rather than the rule when we have attracted to our party a majority of American voters.

The second fact is related to it: America is a minority country in the world today.

Our free institutions, our working democracy, our high standard of living have placed us in a uniquely fortunate position among the nations of the world—but a position from which it is increasingly difficult to win friends and influence people.

Together, these facts comprise the greatest challenge we have ever faced.

If the values and the principles on which our party and our country have been built are to live and thrive, then we cannot rest content with our minority status.

The party of Abraham Lincoln, Theodore Roosevelt, and Dwight Eisenhower possessed the vigor, the sense of purpose and the active public conscience which won for them and their administrations the personal respect and enthusiastic support of the American people.

It is our task to translate their vital and progressive approach to government—which is the finest tradition of Republicanism—into terms the American people will understand and to which they will respond. This is the way to generate the approval and the popular force which will win elections and help save our country.

In the same way, the American people have built a nation out of diverse peoples and different interests and varied regions, and have given it unprecedented unity and strength, freedom, and justice.

We must take this heritage and give it new meaning, not only for ourselves, in the new perspectives of the atomic age, but for the hundreds of millions of people in the new and developing nations of the world who—even now—are beginning to shape the future of our planet.

We must give new life and fresh significance to the ideas of freedom and justice and opportunity as they exist in America, demonstrating in practice our conviction that these fundamental values belong to all people without difference or distinction. Only in this way can we win the friendship and respect of peoples who want desperately to believe that America still holds out hope for a better world—of progress toward personal liberty, enough to eat, and a chance in life for their children.

In what way can we set about to attain these goals—to demonstrate our party's capacity to govern and to exercise the kind of leadership our country and the free world must have?

We shall be judged, I suggest, on our attitude toward the great issues and problems of our time, and on our ability to fashion solutions to these problems and to exert effective leadership in making those solutions work.

Three great issues stand out in my mind as being decisive for us: Science, education and civil rights. Actually, they are more than issues. They represent three vast areas of human activity in which our performance and our accomplishments will count far more heavily than our words or good intentions—whether as a political party or a Nation.

Consider science for example. To be first in the race for scientific achievement means more than national prestige, important as that is. Every new scientific breakthrough, every new discovery about the functioning of our universe, opens up vast and uncharted worlds—and, with it, creates great new resources of national power.

I do not believe we can afford to be less than best, for I do not believe we can permit such immense potential for good or evil to be controlled by those who do not share the fundamental values of Western civilization.

Education is another case in point. We cannot master the new science and the new technology, not to speak of the complex social, political, and economic problems which these developments have brought, without an intelligent and informed citizenry. In a democracy, where responsibility for everyone rests to some degree upon all of us, we can assure excellence in our national life only by providing the opportunity for excellence for all our people.

Until every young man and woman in America has a chance to develop his God-given talents to the fullest, we shall have work to do. Let us begin this work by harnessing the resources of our Federal, State, and local governments—as well as our private institutions—in a more effective partnership, in which every part makes its fullest contribution.

Underlying, or perhaps dominating, all other issues is the question of civil rights. This is the one great human test of our society—whether we who were conceived in liberty and born in human dignity are prepared to extend equal recognition and equal opportunity to all our brothers, of whatever color or religion or origin.

More than on any other issue, we in America are judged by the peoples of Africa, Asia, Latin America, and Europe on our record in civil rights.

The people of the world, including our own, may not appreciate the fine points of astronautics, but they see with an intense clarity what it means to put a man into space or to reach the moon.

They may not understand the sociological and psychological roots of prejudice, but they know the bitter face of discrimination as well as the warm hand of brotherhood.

We shall be judged, therefore—as a party and as a people—by the fruits of our ideals, by the success or failure of our effort to broaden the dimensions of the American dream to fit the framework of a new age.

As a party, we are well equipped for the task. Not only have we inherited a progressive spirit from our party's past, but we have fashioned a platform for 1960 which is as fine a statement of our national goals as we have ever written.

And in our party's leaders—in Vice President Nixon, Ambassador Lodge, and Senator Case—we have men of compassion and conviction, men who know with their minds and hearts the extent of the problems before us and who have committed themselves, as men of integrity, to the never-ending struggle for progress.

By now, it is a well-known fact that women in American politics provide the bulk of our workers and, perhaps by November, will account for the bulk of our voters.

Is it not time, therefore, for us to reassess our place in our party? Is it not time for us to assume a greater measure of responsibility, not only for practical precinct politics, but for the infinitely more important matter of assuring that our party lives up to its high ideals?

The opportunities are unlimited, and the means are at hand.

Let us be worthy of victory in November.

The Tight-Money Policy Has Shortchanged America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. OLIVER
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, we presently live in hope that the tight-money policy, which in effect has shortchanged America by restricting its economic growth, will soon be relegated to its proper limbo. The National Democratic platform wisely identified the restrictive effects of tight money upon our economic growth in the following statement:

ECONOMIC GROWTH

The new Democratic administration will confidently proceed to unshackle American enterprise and to free American labor, industrial leadership, and capital, to create an abundance that will outstrip any other system.

Free competitive enterprise is the most creative and productive form of economic order that the world has seen. The recent slow pace of American growth is due not to the failure of our free economy but to the failure of our national leadership.

We Democrats believe that our economy can and must grow at an average rate of 5 percent annually, almost twice as fast as our average annual rate since 1953. We pledge ourselves to policies that will achieve this goal without inflation.

Economic growth is the means whereby we improve the American standard of living and produce added tax resources for national security and essential public services.

Our economy must grow more swiftly in order to absorb two groups of workers: The much larger number of young people who will be reaching working age in the 1960's, and the workers displaced by the rapid pace of technological advances, including automation. Republican policies which have stifled growth could only mean increasingly severe unemployment, particularly of youth and older workers.

AN END TO TIGHT MONEY

As the first step in speeding economic growth, a Democratic President will put an end to the present high-interest, tight-money policy.

This policy has failed in its stated purpose—to keep prices down. It has given us two recessions within 5 years, bankrupted many of our farmers, produced a record number of business failures, and added billions of dollars in unnecessary higher interest charges to Government budgets and the cost of living.

A new Democratic administration will reject this philosophy of economic slowdown. We are committed to maximum employment, at decent wages and with fair profits, in a far more productive, expanding economy.

The Republican high-interest policy has extracted a costly toll from every American who has financed a home, an automobile, a refrigerator, or a television set.

It has foisted added burdens on taxpayers of State and local governments which must borrow for schools and other public services.

It has added to the cost of many goods and services, and hence has been itself a factor in inflation.

It has created windfalls for many financial institutions.

The $9 billion of added interest charges on the national debt would have been even higher but for the prudent insistence of the Democratic Congress that the ceiling on interest rates for long-term Government bonds be maintained.

The effect of the tight money policy has caused anxious concern on the part of many from all areas of the country. Indicative of this concern, several weeks ago I received the following letter from E. G. Johnston, editor and publisher of the Georgia Tribune. Some of my thoughts on the problem are contained in my reply to him.

THE GEORGIA TRIBUNE,
Columbus, Ga., July 14, 1960.

HON. JAMES C. OLIVER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SIR: I have just finished reading a reprint of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, proceedings of the 86th Congress, 2d session, of March 21, 1960.

This document was sent to me by a gentleman of St. Louis, who is an ardent reader of my newspaper, the Georgia Tribune, which has national circulation, and it deals, as you know with a subject of which the Bible tells us, the "Love of which is the root of all (kinds of) evil."

Now, the thing I wish to do, inasmuch as I have recently run an article taken from Mr. Wickliffe B. Vennard Sr.'s book, "The Federal Reserve Hoax." I have been castigated, defumigated, and otherwise hounded by certain interests who were not begging bread by any means, and I am now seeking to proceed with handling through the columns of my paper some of your remarks made in the above-mentioned document, "not printed at Government expense," and I should like very much to have a word from you, whom I believe to be honest and honestly interested in this "age of deception," relative to "our money."

I shall be happy to place you on the mailing list of our Georgia Tribune, a newspaper seeking to tell as much of the truth as possible and especially that portion of truth which our dear daily press, bought and paid for by certain interests, doubtless, will not touch with a 50-foot pole.

With every good wish for your happiness and success, I am,

Sincerely,
E. G. (PARSON JACK) JOHNSTON,
Editor and Publisher.

AUGUST 30, 1960.

MR. E. G. JOHNSTON,
Editor and Publisher, the Georgia Tribune,
Columbus, Ga.

DEAR MR. JOHNSTON: Thank you for your letter of July 14. I am delighted that you have expressed some interest in my comments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in which I inserted several articles dealing with Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN'S views and proposals concerning our money system.

I can imagine the criticisms and the difficulties which a crusading editor such as yourself encounters in trying to educate his readers on our monetary system. I will, of course, be glad to have you print any remarks of mine which you consider to be worthy of your readers' attention.

First of all, let me say that I do not belong to that small school of thought which holds that the Federal Reserve System is a hoax. It misreads history to suggest that such men as President Woodrow Wilson, Senator Robert L. Owen, and Congressman Carter Glass did not know what they were doing in framing the Federal Reserve Act. Those who suggest that the Federal Reserve System was created, in 1914, merely to serve some conspiracy of the "international bankers" also overlook the history of the periodic money panics and the chronic inadequacies of the pre-1914 money system which the Federal Reserve was intended to correct, and largely has corrected.

All of this does not mean that improvements in the money system are not needed, nor that reforms in the management of the system are out of order. On the contrary, there are inadequacies and abuses which cry for correction.

Let me give just a thumbnail sketch of the improvements which seem to me to be clearly and urgently needed.

1. The method of naming officials to the Federal Reserve System should be modified so that the policymaking bodies represent more of the broad public interest and are less heavily weighted in favor of the bankers' interests. Specifically, the Federal Open Market Committee should be changed. This is the committee within the System which decides how much money and credit the country will have and what interest rates we shall all pay the banks and other financial institutions for the use of money. This committee has on it five representatives elected by the banks. It is hard to escape the belief that the tight-money, high-interest policy which the System has forced upon the country during the Eisenhower administration has not been completely free of bias in favor of the bankers' profits. Certainly the System has imposed tight money and high interest in the name of "fighting inflation" even in periods of high unemployment, idle plant capacity, and surpluses of goods of all kinds.

Since 1952, personal income alone from interest has been more than doubled and is now at the rate of $25 billion per annum, which is more than twice the total farm income of the country. It would be hard to exaggerate the importance of this redistribution of the income, in favor of a relatively few families, which has been brought about by the high-interest policy.

2. The highly advertised fiction that the Federal Reserve is independent of the rest of the Government in all of its activities must be brought to an end.

When the Federal Reserve System was set up, it was with the intention that the System would, by its very existence, provide an elastic money supply. That is, the System was to provide a money supply which would automatically expand with expansions in economic activity. And similarly, the money supply was to contract automatically with contractions in the production of real wealth, should such contractions occur. But in recent years, the Federal Reserve officials have been operating on the reverse theory. Specifically, they have deliberately and consciously restrained the production of real wealth by reducing the money supply, and they have taken the position that it is one of their main duties to do this, whenever they consider it in the public interest to do so. I believe you will find, however, that these officials have no legal authority for trying to regulate the country's level of economic activity, except for such authority as is contained in the Employment Act of 1946.

The Employment Act of 1946 declares the national policy that the Federal Government shall coordinate and utilize all of its policies, resources, and agencies to maintain maximum employment production, and purchasing power—within a system of free enterprise. Since the act says that the Federal Government's agencies, resources, and policies are to be coordinated, I think we can assume that the law means just that. Obviously, we cannot have either rational Government or Government responsible to the people if the Federal Reserve is to operate as an independent, fourth branch of the Government, making the Nation's economic policies independently of the President's duties and responsibilities for economic policies. This would mean that the Federal Reserve people would exercise practical veto powers over decisions and policies reached in the constitutional way, by Congress' enacting bills and the President's signing them. Indeed, the Federal Reserve has, in practical fact, vetoed such policies and decisions during the Eisenhower administration, though I suspect with at least the tacit consent of the administration.

You know, of course, that the Democratic platform adopted at Los Angeles recognizes this unconstitutional state of affairs and pledges the Democratic Party to correct it. There is no suggestion, of course, that the President will or should impinge upon the independence of the Federal Reserve in the performance of its quasi-judicial duties and its quasi-legislative duties, which are the kinds of duties assigned to the System by the Federal Reserve Act. But determining monetary policy is an executive duty, and it would be folly to think that a Democratic President could carry out his economic pledges to the country without having a voice in deciding monetary policies. The pledge to restore our economy to a wholesome rate of growth and to provide the world with a practical demonstration that our economy can grow under a free-enterprise system as rapidly as the Russian economy grows under the Communist system most certainly cannot be kept under a continuation of the present tight-money policy.

3. The so-called stock which the private banks own in the Federal Reserve banks should be retired. While the private banks do not, in truth, own the Federal Reserve banks—indeed, they would own the Government's power to create money if they did—the existence of this stock causes many people and many of the bankers themselves to believe that the banks do own the System. This misunderstanding leads to banker pressures for Federal Reserve policies which maximize bank profits rather than for policies which are best for the general public. Canceling this stock and repaying the banks their money would clear up the confusion which leads to bad policies.

4. The Federal Reserve's method of buying and selling Government securities in the so-called open market needs drastic reform. The System buys and sells annually many billions of dollars of Government securities in this so-called open market, a "market" which in fact consists of a select group of 17 Wall Street dealers. This market should be opened up to all who care to trade in it—or to all who can trade in amounts above some reasonable minimum. The importance of obtaining a truly open and competitive market is that prices at which the Federal Reserve trades Government securities have a decided influence on interest rates throughout the economy.

Further, this so-called open market in Government securities should be put under public regulation. The people of this country have long since recognized the necessity for public regulation of the stock exchanges and the commodity markets for such things as cotton, wheat, onions, and so on—regulation not, of course, to fix prices, but to assure open and fair competition to safeguard against prices being rigged or the market's being manipulated.

5. A variety of steps should be taken to strengthen the smaller banks which serve the cities, towns, villages, and crossroads outside of New York and Chicago. One of these steps would be for the Federal Reserve to make available through the 12 regional Federal Reserve banks more of the total credit it does make available, rather than channeling, as now, substantially all of this credit through the New York City banks.

Furthermore, in turning out more of its credit through the regional Federal Reserve banks, the Federal Reserve should also return to the practice of discounting eligible loan paper for the local banks. This would mean more credit available to small and independent businesses, because the local banks needing more credit for this purpose could themselves obtain it. Independent, local businesses are rapidly losing out to the nationwide chains no less in Maine than in Georgia, and one of the main reasons for this is that the great corporations can, and do, obtain whatever credit they wish to have, while the smaller firms get only whatever is left over, if any.

Strong local banks having a fair share of the Federal Reserve's credit are the best hope that the Main Streets of America will not all become absentee owned—that the door of opportunity for initiative and independence will be kept open. Under its recent policies and methods of operation, the Federal Reserve System has not, I think, proved to be a complete solution to all of the problems it was set up to meet. Woodrow Wilson described these problems in 1911, in part, as follows:

"The plain fact is that control of credit—at any rate of credit upon any large scale—is dangerously concentrated in this country. The large money resources of the country are not at the command of those who do not submit to the direction and domination of small groups of capitalists, who wish to keep the economic development of the country under their own eye and guidance. The great monopoly in this country is the money monopoly. So long as that exists our old variety and freedom and individual energy of development are out of the question. A great industrial nation is controlled by its system of credit. Our system of credit is concentrated. The growth of the Nation, therefore, and all our activities are in the hands of a few men who, even if their action be honest and intended for the public interest, are necessarily concentrated upon the great undertakings in which their own money is involved and who necessarily, by the very reason of their own limitations, chill and check and destroy genuine economic freedom. This is the greatest question of all, and to this statesmen must address themselves with an earnest determination to serve the long future and the true liberties of men."

I am sorry for the delay in answering your letter. However, I am sure you will understand the pressing nature of my legislative duties.

Sincerely,

JAMES C. OLIVER,
Member of Congress.

The restrictive effect of the tight-money policy upon our economy is no illusion.

As a further demonstration, may I refer to an article, "New Business Rhythm," published in the October 1959 issue of Challenge.

Without the three postwar recessions, our GNP would now be running at an annual rate of about $600 billion, instead of the current $500 billion. The cumulative loss to our economy cannot be estimated with the precision required for the balance sheet of a business concern. But estimates I have undertaken, starting from various assumptions, range from $400 billion to $500 billion at 1958 prices—approximately the same order of magnitude as the cost of our participation in World War II.

In order to make any kind of estimate as to what an increase of $100 billion a year in the gross national product would mean to the economy, certain assumptions must be made. The following estimates assume that the additional output would have been possible without increasing prices on the average. It also assumes that the division of output between the private and public sectors of the economy would not be significantly changed.

Since in recent years personal income has averaged about 80 percent of gross national product, it is reasonable to assume that an increase of $100 billion in GNP would mean an increase in personal income of about $80 billion. This would mean an increase of $444 in per capita income, based on present population of about 180 million in the United States. Using the figure of the loss to the economy in the postwar period of $400 billion to $500 billion in GNP, this would correspond to a loss in average personal income, per capita, of some $1,600 to $2,000, or the equivalent of a full year's personal income for most of the years in the 1950's.

If we assume that government expenditures—Federal, State, and local—account for about 20 percent of total GNP, then an annual increase in GNP of $100 billion would mean an increase in Government purchases of goods and services of about $20 billion, and an increase of purchases in the private economy, by consumers and by business, of $80 billion a year. An increase of $20 billion annually can be visualized as being equivalent to the construction of an additional $1 million school and a $3 million hospital in every one of the 3,050 counties in the United States, plus in addition the construction of over 7,000 miles of modern highways, based on recent construction cost averages of about $110,000 per mile. Twenty billion dollars is almost twice the total expenditure for public schools in the United States in 1956, which was just under $11 billion.

The increase of $80 billion in GNP which can be attributed to the private sector of the economy would in dollar terms be the equivalent of the construction of 3 million $20,000 homes plus 40,000 industrial establishments of $500,000 each.

Of course, it must be recognized that any such increase in the GNP would be used for a wide diversity of purposes, the exact distribution of which, both within the private and public sectors of the economy, cannot be predicted. Hypothetically one might anticipate that if there were an increase of 20 percent in the GNP—from $500 billion to $600 billion—there could be a corresponding—20 percent—increase in number of houses started, about 280,000; and an increase in number of factory sales of automobiles of nearly 2 million.

If gross national product were now increasing at a rate of 5 percent a year, instead of 2½ percent, it would mean, in terms of a $500 billion GNP, an increase of $25 billion a year instead of $12.5 billion a year.

Using the same proportions as used above, this added increase of $12.5 billion would mean additional Government expenditures of $2.5 billion and private expenditures of $10 billion. The $2.5 billion would make possible in a year the construction of a $1 million school in each of 2,500 counties; that is, all except 550 counties, or the construction of 1,000 $2.5 million hospitals. The $10 billion private expenditure would be equivalent to the construction of 500,000 $20,000 houses, or 20,000 half-million-dollar industrial establishments.

Mr. Speaker, America has been shortchanged.

We Need Cool Heads and Stronger Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY O. STAGGERS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, the world in which we live and work and play is getting more dangerous day by day. It is impossible any longer to ignore the steady pressure of foreign ideologies on American life. The threat to freedom of thought and of action grows more vivid and more direct as turmoil rises in Africa and in nearby Cuba. Every day's issue of newspapers and every day's reports on radio and TV offer new evidence of Soviet intransigence in parts of the world hitherto counted on the side of democratic freedom. Open threats to attack immediately any ally of the United States which dares to assist the deterrent program of this Nation have apparently paralyzed resolution in the smaller nations. Pakistan, Japan, Norway, Finland, and others have been subjected in rapid succession to the demand that they withdraw support to Western civilization or suffer the consequences. Cuba is promised military assistance in the event of any American action to defend our

rights in that next-door republic, and the Organization of American States is disinclined to raise any protest. In the Congo, direct Soviet intervention seems to be a present fact. From our viewpoint, the news is all bad. As the international situation worsens, Communist confidence grows more blatant. Either they have succeeded in perpetrating a gigantic bluff, or they have the power to do what they say they intend to do.

Public opinion in this country has already assumed that the latter is the fact. As a consequence, anxiety over world security, even over our own national security, is the No. 1 worry of a vast section of our people. How far behind the Russians are our military capabilities that they dare to taunt us on our very doorstep? What possibilities do we have of catching up with them? No domestic problem of inflation, of unemployment, of rising crime, of race relations, serious as these problems really are, engages a fraction of our concern. Are we, too, being hypnotized by fear of the imminence of something dreadful which we are powerless to prevent? Has that greatest of all fear, the fear of fear, reduced us to administrative inaction and impotence?

For a number of years prominent individuals in and out of Government have been warning us of the danger and protesting a do-nothing policy. Some of them have felt compelled to resign key positions in administrative office or in military research and production in order to express disagreement with things as they are. They include high officers in the Armed Forces and some of the most eminent scientists engaged in atomic research and development. They are on both sides of the political fence. Governor Rockefeller has not hesitated to add his voice to the theme, and it was so strong and impressive that the Republican candidate for President was forced to yield as far as he dared.

The President's budget for the fiscal year 1961 revealed that some $18 billion of funds previously appropriated for national defense had not been expended. The major part of these unexpended sums were specifically designated for research and procurement. If they had been expended for the purposes intended, would our military position be now inferior to that of Russia? Would we be compelled to endure fearfully and helplessly the hostile movements of the Communists? In the face of our rapidly declining power and influence in the world, we still persist in neglecting the all-out efforts necessary to reestablish ourselves. We hold fast to our foolish promise to abandon testing. While we claim overall superior deterrent power, we are admitting one by one our inferiority in specific arms. We know that in long-range missiles and in the ability to put into space heavy projectiles we are far behind the Russians. Now we are beginning to admit that we are also inferior in submarines, in aircraft, and in paratroops. In what particular, then, are we superior? Our advanced bases in countries which are supposed to be our allies may soon have to be abandoned. On the other hand, the Russians may soon have similar bases within easy distance of our borders.

Perhaps worst of all, we have advertised that we never intend to use what power we have until and unless we are directly attacked. We propose to wait until the initial fury of the enemy has been unleashed on our cities and our factories and our bases, and then attempt to reply with what resources we have left. If we are inadequate while our forces are unimpaired, what will be our situation when a half or three-quarters of our striking power lies broken and in ashes? A recent appraisal of Russian plans assumes that their attack will be directed first of all at our military installations. They would hope to immobilize them with the first outburst. Submarines and air force would then land troops and equipment which could seize our factories and our cities almost without opposition, and turn these to their own uses. The sickening details, and they are too realistic to deny that they are practical, are too horrible to contemplate. Undoubtedly our enemy possesses accurate maps of every flying field, of every missile base, of every military installation whatsoever. With time on his hands to plan the details of every move, and with assurance that we will not interfere until after the event, he can choose the hour best suited to his purposes. What point is it that we are supposed to have warning systems in operation, and that those systems will give us 15 or 30 minutes before the attack falls? Missiles once sent on their way cannot be turned back or turned aside from their target. They will speed to their appointed destiny and the holocaust will be upon us.

Philosophers thousands of years ago looked forward to an age of reason, when men would use their intelligence and their divine humanity to avert the destructiveness of war. They knew that a few days of conflict could destroy more than a century of civilization could build up. Why cannot men spend their energies and their ingenuity on building up instead of on tearing down? Unfortunately, to large and vigorous groups of human beings, war is a natural state of affairs. Whether we like it or not, naked force is the only thing respected. Prestige is earned and kept only by the ability to make good our word. The Communists believe that the kind of social organization they espouse is best for the world. They consider it realistic to impose that organization on the whole world because they know that as long as a different ideology is in existence their own is in peril. They know also that the only way to secure acceptance of their system is by force. They do not entertain for an instant any conscientious scruples in regard to methods that may be successful. Shall we abandon the field of realism to them?

In the first great crisis of our national history, when we were just entering on our contest with England for our independence, there were many prominent citizens of this country who favored compromise and negotiation with the mother country. Patriots such as Thomas Paine and Patrick Henry and Samuel Adams argued ceaselessly that the time for compromise was past and that negotiation only resulted in further yielding and submission. Our position today is by no means dissimilar. We must stop fooling ourselves with the vain delusion of some kind of accommodation with communistic philosophy. We must begin at once a heroic effort to match the striking power of the Red world. Things have already gone far enough—too far. The sooner we initiate a show of force, the sooner will our prestige and influence begin to rise among the nations.

A Report to My Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, in the Holy Book we are told: "Let justice roll down as waters; and righteousness as a mighty stream." This old Biblical injunction has for many years served as a guidepost for me in my public functions and in my efforts to obtain justice and righteousness for the people of my district.

I have just completed 4 years of service in the U.S. Congress representing the people of the 18th District of New York. This is a good occasion to inform my constituents about my record, and especially about my efforts to serve their needs and their interests. They are entitled to know it. I believe that a well-informed public is an intelligent public.

My district, which includes Yorkville and East Harlem, is one of the most cosmopolitan areas in New York. It is a community that is made up of people from every nationality, every religious faith, every race; there are 32 ethnic groups. Yet we live in harmony and peace, as good neighbors, and with little friction. For the most part they are working people and low-income families, but decent and loyal American citizens. I regard it as a great honor to serve as their Representative in Congress.

U.S. SECURITY AND DEFENSE

The security and defense of the United States against the onslaught of international communism still is the paramount issue in world affairs. Soviet Russia and Communist China have stepped up their activities in the past year to foment trouble, chaos, and disorder in many parts of the world. Through infiltration and subversion they have made inroads into peaceful areas of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. Cuba and the Congo are two such examples of Communist infiltration which is endangering the peace of the world and directly threatening the security of the United States.

Recently I forwarded to my constituents a copy of my speech entitled "Fidel Castro—From Liberator to Infidel." Consequently, I shall not repeat my opinion of Castro, and my endeavors to warn

against the Communist influence in the Castro government in Cuba.

Early in 1959 I was appointed as member of one of the most important committees in Congress, the House Appropriations Committee, which deals with appropriating funds for all Government departments and functions, including national defense. This has given me an excellent opportunity to learn at first-hand about our defense setup, the huge cost to maintain it, and the efforts to keep the United States prepared for any eventuality and to assure the security of our Nation. During the current fiscal year, for example, we appropriated close to $40 billion for defense purposes alone, and this constitutes about half of the Nation's total budget.

At hearings of our committee it was disclosed that the United States still possesses the greatest overall military strength in the world, despite the fact that in missiles and certain scientific achievements in space we may have fallen somewhat behind Russia. Our position remains strong, but we must not remain complacently smug, and we must continue all efforts to maintain our superiority with its deterrent capacity. For this reason, Congress approved some $660 million more for defense than the President requested. We felt that the present Republican administration was not doing enough in this respect, that it was more interested in balancing the budget than in safeguarding the Nation's security. We must continue to hope for peace, but we must also be prepared with our defenses. We cannot negotiate peace and security from a position of weakness; we can obtain peace through strength.

To further strengthen our position abroad, I supported the mutual security appropriation for military and economic aid to our allies. Wherever possible we sought to eliminate waste in our program to help underdeveloped nations. Our primary aim remains to strengthen our allies in order to eliminate poverty and hunger and to remove the causes which could bring communism to them. In this way we make it possible for them to join with us in the worldwide struggle against communism. In order to avoid waste and bribery in our foreign aid program, I introduced an amendment to eliminate certain practices by our officials abroad. The amendment was adopted and is now a part of American policy.

On several occasions, when we discussed the security of the United States and our lagging behind Russia in scientific progress, I appealed to my colleagues in Congress for national unity and casting aside partisan politics. On one such occasion I said: "We do not gain anything by talking about who is at fault. We know we have a struggle against communism. Let us face it as Americans and let us forget partisan politics."

I also supported legislation against seating Communist China in the United Nations; encouraging private investment abroad to promote American industry and reduce Government expenditures; and the so-called captive nations resolution calling for the restoration of freedom and human rights to the peoples of Eastern Europe suffering under communism. The latter resolution, of which I was coauthor, was passed unanimously. I was coauthor of a resolution to set aside a fleet, to be known as the Great White Fleet, to render emergency aid to nations suffering from famine, epidemics, and natural disasters.

WASTE IN DEFENSE CONTRACTS

During hearings of our committee, it was established that there were many wasteful practices in Government defense procurement, as well as useless programs. It was our estimate that about $4 billion is being wasted in this way, which could be used more efficiently and with better results or for reduction of the tax burden of the American people. In the past 2 years, I harped continuously on this subject, calling attention to the waste, and particularly the harmful influence of retired military officers in procuring defense contracts through methods described as "influence peddling."

As a result of my efforts, the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee investigated the situation. I testified before the committee, refraining from bringing direct accusations against such officers, but merely stressing the dangers involved when such officers take on employment with defense contractors. Their influence has proven costly to our defense budget, but certain elements of the press attacked me for my attempts to eliminate this influence.

I introduced bills last year and this year to correct this situation. In one bill it is proposed that the armed services use competitive bidding methods in awarding contracts, instead of negotiating such contracts. Another bill provides that there should be a ban on employment of retired officers by defense contractors for at least 2 years to eliminate influence peddling. When the appropriation for the Defense Department came up for consideration, I introduced an amendment which provided that none of the funds could be used to enter into a contract which provided compensation to retired military officers. Unfortunately, Congress did not approve my amendment by a close vote, which shows that many of my colleagues felt it was a worthwhile proposal. I shall continue my fight to eliminate waste and influence peddling in this important phase of our defense effort.

CIVIL RIGHTS AND CIVIL LIBERTIES

Civil rights continues to be a major issue in American life. We must strive to eliminate discrimination against minority groups because of their racial or national origin or their religious belief. The civil rights bill passed by Congress is a protection of the voting rights of all U.S. citizens, a right which is guaranteed in the U.S. Constitution. During the consideration of the civil rights I expressed my views when I declared that the "four cornerstones of the temple of equality are the right to vote, the right to decent housing, the right to education, and the right to employment. Of these, right to vote is the key to all civil rights." The significance of civil rights, I stressed in these words: "The bread of full freedom, human dignity, universal suffrage, and equality of opportunity has also been the American dream." I shall continue to fight for a meaningful civil rights legislation and equal opportunity for all.

MEDICAL AID FOR THE AGED

The 15 million citizens of our country who are 65 and over are today a most disappointed group because the medical care plan, as provided in the Forand bill, was not enacted. It was my belief that this bill was a humane and practical measure which advocated hospitalization, surgical and medical aid, and nursing home care for these elderly people under the social security system. It was the best approach to the solution of this problem, and for this reason I was a cosponsor of the Forand bill.

Several times in the past 2 years I spoke in support of the measure. I showed how it would help our elders in their twilight years, and I also pointed out that the Republican administration's proposal would merely be a cruel hoax on the people. I appeared before the House Ways and Means Committee to plead for adoption of a Forand-type bill. Unfortunately, the measure that was finally adopted is nothing more than a "pauper's oath" type of medical aid which will benefit very few, only the poorest of the poor, and it is not under social security. It will be handled instead by the States and there is no guarantee that all States will adopt, so that the overwhelming majority of the needy elderly people will not benefit by it.

I am disappointed by this measure. We could have done better. I think the elderly folks have been misled, and I would blame the Republican administration for this because of its opposition to the Forand bill. I am convinced that not until there is a change in administration will an adequate plan to meet the medical needs of the aged be adopted. I shall continue to work in that direction.

In addition, I have also sponsored and supported other legislation to increase social security benefits. One of my bills calls for reduction from 62 to 50 the age at which widows can become eligible to receive such benefits. Women over 50 who become widowed find it most difficult to obtain employment and are faced with many years of hardship. Another of my bills provides that tips and other cash gratuities received by wage earners should be regarded as wages under the social security system. Tips are considered as wages for income tax purposes but not for social security. This will enable service workers at hotels, restaurants and other places where tips are customary to receive higher social security payments when they retire.

LABOR LEGISLATION

Labor has not fared too well in the 86th Congress, due mainly to a coalition of Republicans and southern Democrats who defeated every effort to pass legislation to aid those in labor's ranks and to institute labor reforms where necessary.

My view was that economic advantages motivated the passage of the labor bill and not true labor reform. I supported

the Kennedy-Ives bill in the 85th Congress which was designed to eliminate racketeering and corruption. I opposed the Landrum-Griffin bill which went far beyond the measures to stamp out corruption and abuses in union activities. This bill, by its restraints on legitimate unions, perpetuates the economic advantages which southern and antilabor States enjoy because of their low wages and total lack of social legislation laws, such as minimum wage, disability compensation, and unemployment. This bill aids the flight of industry from New York and the industrial East to the South.

The situation was no better in the case of increasing the minimum wage from $1 to $1.25 an hour and to extend coverage of this benefit to several million more workers. I was one of those who had introduced a bill to increase the minimum wage, as did a number of my colleagues in both Houses of Congress. Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY, the Democratic Presidential candidate, worked hard to obtain passage of the measure. But the story is the same. The Republican-southern Democratic coalition stalled on it and finally defeated it. Our fight will continue in the next Congress.

I supported the area redevelopment bill which was intended to help depressed localities through various rehabilitation and works projects and would have provided much employment, but the President vetoed this bill. Another measure for the protection of American labor dealt with the importation of cheap labor from Mexico to work on U.S. farms. Nearly a half million such workers are imported yearly for this purpose, and this is hurting our own farm laborers. It was my opinion that the Government should not permit the entry of this labor, except for cultivation and harvesting of food supplies.

HOUSING

Adequate housing for millions of people still remains an acute problem in the large cities. In my district many families are still compelled to live in substandard dwellings. Not enough housing units are being built for the low- and middle-income families. There is also a great need to provide housing for elderly persons and for single people.

All efforts to pass effective legislation to provide adequate housing proved futile because of Republican opposition. Several times I called on Congress to take definite action to rejuvenate the Nation's housing program and to provide housing for all income levels. I urged that slum areas be eliminated, that deteriorating industrial centers be restored, and that displaced families be relocated in better housing. I cited the difficulties encountered in finding proper housing by elderly persons, veterans, college students, and most of all by minority groups who run into discrimination. I also introduced a bill to amend the Housing Act so as to provide aid to families and business concerns displaced by housing projects.

All these efforts were of no avail. Only a measure to extend for 1 year the home improvement program and to provide for college housing was enacted. The country still needs a decent housing program, which should include slum clearance, urban renewal, lower premium rates on housing loans, and so forth. Only under a Democratic administration will this be achieved.

SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM

Ever since coming to Congress I have taken an active interest in the school lunch program, which I consider an important medium for improving the health of the Nation's children by providing them with well-balanced and nutritious lunches at school. It also serves as an outlet for some of our agricultural commodities. I recently stated in the House: "The school lunch program is one of the most worthy programs we have in this country and it should be expanded. It is inexcusable that needy children do not have a school lunch program."

But instead of expanding it, the Republican administration and the Department of Agriculture are trying to curtail this program.

Several years ago I succeeded in increasing the cash appropriation for school lunches from $100 million to $145 million. This year, for reasons of economy, it was cut back to $95 million.

EDUCATION AND CARE OF OUR YOUTH

We all agree that we must give our youth the best possible education, but we have fallen behind in several respects. Higher education has become most expensive, so that families of limited means cannot afford to send their children to college. Our teachers are woefully underpaid. We are not building enough schools and youngsters must study in overcrowded classrooms or attend school in shifts. This is incredible in our country with its vast resources, and explains in part why we are falling behind the Russians in education.

When the bill to authorize financial assistance to the States for the construction of schools was brought in Congress, I supported it ardently. According to this bill, a sum of $325 million was to be allocated each year for the next 3 years to build schools. It is estimated that we have a shortage of about 132,000 classrooms, and if this bill had been enacted it would have reduced the shortage to about 85,000 classrooms. But as in the case of housing, minimum wage, medical care for the aged, and other programs to help the people, the measure was killed through inaction by the Republican-southern Democratic coalition.

Now the matter will have to come up again next year and, let us hope, under a favorable Democratic administration. It means another year's delay, and that means again overcrowded schools, double shifts, and low-salaried teachers. We are not fooling anybody but our own children and ourselves.

To cope with the problem of higher education, I introduced a bill to allow taxpayers a deduction from their income tax for tuition expenses paid for the education of their dependents. This deduction, if enacted, would be available for those whose dependents are attending college or high school where tuition is required, and would apply to tuition up to $600 annually. This would be of great assistance to parents.

Closely linked with education is the care of our youth, juvenile delinquency, proper employment for teenagers no longer attending school, and similar problems. These should not be ignored. Juvenile delinquency is a national problem and only an enlightened public can deal with it. Courts alone are not enough, but rehabilitation and preventive measures should be adopted with the aid of communities everywhere. I introduced a bill this year to provide Federal assistance for projects which will demonstrate or develop techniques toward a solution of this problem. I have also advocated that industry and government could make a valuable contribution toward the control or prevention of juvenile delinquency by providing jobs for young people, because too much leisure time and no outlook for the future leads them to crime.

AMERICANS OF PUERTO RICAN ORIGIN

Among the various nationality groups in my district, Americans of Puerto Rican origin have assumed a prominent place. They are becoming more integrated into the community with the passing of time and are making fine progress in overcoming the language barrier, social and economic adjustment, educational problems, and so forth. The community treats them as equals, and they in turn are assuming the responsibilities of good citizenship. Many Puerto Ricans have become active in politics, and some are working in Democratic ranks.

In addition to helping these people overcome economic, social, and language barriers, we are also doing everything possible to raise their standard of living, and especially their standard of health. For example, I have traveled through the district with a tuberculosis mobile unit urging the public to take chest X-rays and to protect themselves against the ravages of this disease. We have also sponsored programs designed to promote better understanding and intergroup relations between Puerto Ricans and other ethnic groups in the district, into which we have brought church leaders, community and labor representatives, and young people. We arranged for an exchange visit of seven boys of Italian origin from the district who spent a week in Puerto Rico last Christmas, and a similar group of Puerto Rican youths visited us.

Last year I visited Puerto Rico as a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture to study the rural electrification program there. I was pleased to see it was working efficiently, that 50,000 rural homes now have electrification and it is hoped to increase this to 100,000 homes in the next 3 or 4 years. Puerto Rico is undergoing a peaceful economic and social revolution, agriculture and industry are expanding, and the people look better fed and better dressed. I was pleased to learn that 240,000 children in Puerto Rico are benefiting from the school lunch program, for which I have been working these past few years. The United States can be proud of its

achievements in Puerto Rico and its relationship with the people there.

CONSUMERS AND FARM PROBLEMS

As a member of the Appropriations Committee one of my assignments was on the Subcommittee on Agriculture. Coming from a big city, I felt that I could best serve as a spokesman for the city people and consumers. I have come to the conclusion that there is no class war between farmer and city dweller; we are all interested in education, decent housing, human rights, and a better standard of living. When it comes to the high cost of living, farmers and consumers actually face a common struggle. Farmers are receiving less and less of the consumer dollar, yet the prices of food keep soaring—thus showing that the middlemen are really the ones who are profiting.

As spokesman for the consumers I shall continue to do all I can for the consumer benefit and protection, such as the school lunch program, poultry and meat inspection for consumer health, donations of food supplies to needy people, improvement of marketing systems and inspection, reduction of storage rates for agricultural products, donations of our food surpluses to famine-stricken areas abroad, and in other ways. I have also called attention to the so-called "quick-buck" operators in the food industry who are making excessive profits and have urged that these operations be investigated.

I led the fight to reduce the high cost of storing grains in commercial warehouses and bins, and as a result of my activities, the cost of storage has been reduced by $100 million. Nevertheless storage costs are exceedingly high and while bins are overflowing, poverty stalks in America and in underdeveloped nations. That is why I have supported many measures for an intelligent distribution of foods in our own country and in poverty-stricken areas of the world. Our economic superiority is our greatest weapon in the struggle for friends and peace, and we must use our surplus intelligently and must not store it without utility like Midas stored his gold.

I sponsored legislation to establish a Department of Urban Affairs which is to deal with urban problems, such as housing, urban renewal, slum clearance, water supply, air and water pollution, sewage facilities, public utilities, commuter transportation, and others, in order to make life more pleasant for those of us living in the big cities.

In connection with my service on the Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture, I was pleased when the chairman of the subcommittee, Representative J. L. WHITTEN, paid public tribute to me on the floor of the House on May 10, 1960, saying:

> The gentleman from New York is a splendid lawyer and a tireless worker, who is interested in the subject. He has contributed greatly to the considerations of this subcommittee and he has performed great services not only on the subcommittee, but also by his understanding of the problems of the industrial and city areas. Mr. SANTANGELO has done a great service on this committee, and I am glad to say so.

POSTAL AND GOVERNMENT WORKERS

I was happy to see Congress enact this year a pay increase for postal and Government workers. I strongly supported this increase, although I had hoped that it would be higher than the 7½ percent actually voted. Early in 1960 I introduced a bill to increase the salaries of postal and Federal employees by about 12½ percent. I felt that this was an adequate pay raise which these employees deserve and which would provide them with an income to work in dignity and to maintain the family as a unit.

When the pay raise bill came up for consideration, I spoke in favor of it and voted for it. When President Eisenhower vetoed the bill, I voted to override his veto because I felt that these workers deserved the raise. It was always my belief that the Government must treat its employees fairly, and for that reason I supported the raise and other measures which would improve the lot of postal and Federal workers.

Last year I voted in favor of the health benefits program for Government workers, and this year I supported the bill to extend these health benefits to retired employees. I also sponsored legislation to increase the annuity of retired Government workers.

VETERANS' LEGISLATION

Several important bills were enacted by Congress which are of interest to veterans, their dependents and survivors. I supported the bill to provide funds for direct loans to veterans for the purchase of homes and to extend the guaranteed loan program for another 2 years. I also supported bills to permit conversion of policies of national service life insurance for World War II and Korean veterans, additional compensation for children of disabled veterans, improvement of the pension program for all veterans and their dependents.

On several occasions I spoke in favor of providing decent housing for veterans, and also for protection of veterans' deposits on homes and giving them lower interest rates so that their monthly payments would not be so high. I sponsored legislation to remove certain provisions from the law which are unfair to veterans who have less than 90 days of service in the matter of non-service-connected disability. The veterans of this country deserve our fullest support at all times.

IMMIGRATION

With the exception of one small measure, there was practically no action by Congress in the field of immigration legislation. The one measure enacted would admit about 5,000 European refugees and would continue the alien orphan program.

I was cosponsor of a bill to revise the present discriminatory immigration and to abolish the national origins quota system, but the committee did not even hold hearings on any of these bills. Another of my bills proposed that 30 percent of the quotas each year be made available for issuance of visas to qualified immigrants who are parents of U.S. citizens or unmarried children of such parents. There was no action on this bill either. Despite these delays and setbacks I shall continue to work for liberalization of our immigration laws.

MISCELLANEOUS MATTERS

Among other bills which I supported were: admission of Hawaii as the 50th State; Water Pollution Control Act to eliminate pollution in rivers and along shores in the interests of public health; the Small Business Investment Act to help small business people obtain long-term loans; public works projects which include major improvements in New York harbor; food stamp plan for distribution of surplus commodities to needy persons in the United States, and other measures.

I sponsored legislation authorizing the Federal Government to participate in the New York World's Fair to be held in 1964; to establish a Joint Committee on Intelligence Matters to study the activities relating to the gathering of intelligence affecting the security of the United States; to reimburse States for certain free and toll roads on the national highway system; to designate March 9 of each year as Amerigo Vespucci Day in honor of the Ital' n navigator after whom America is named.

I was also cosponsor of a resolution, passed by both Houses of Congress, for U.S. participation in the centennial celebration in 1961 in honor of the 100th anniversary of the unity of Italy and recognition of the achievements of the Italian people during the last century.

I was cosponsor of a bill, enacted into law, which provides a deduction from income tax for all medical and dental expenses incurred by dependents over 65 years of age. If your parents or your wife's parents reside with you or are dependent on you for support, you may now deduct their medical expenses from your income tax. I also voted to reduce the cabaret tax from 20 to 10 percent.

I strongly supported the resolution in Congress expressing indignation at the desecrations of churches, synagogues, and other houses of worship of all religious faiths. We must not tolerate such indignities to religious edifices in this country. I have often participated in brotherhood rallies and on such occasions I have protested against those who seek to spread religious hatred and bigotry.

Similarly, I have protested against certain elements of the press and other media of expression who are defaming and maligning, directly and by innuendo, Americans of Italian descent. Such defamation of a proud ethnic group must be stopped, and henceforth we must cease the practice of guilt by association, which is un-American and undemocratic. In this connection, it is worth reporting that last year it was my great pleasure to sponsor 55 members of the Columbia Lawyers Association, an organization of lawyers of Italian origin in New York, for admission to practice before the U.S. Supreme Court. This year I again sponsored for admission 38 members of the same group.

I also supported the efforts in Congress to obtain the records of the Port of New York Authority in order to examine thoroughly its operations and the

charges of favoritism. The Port of New York Authority still permits extortionate tolls over bridges and tunnels in the New York area, although some of these, such as the Holland Tunnel, have been paid for several times over. It is high time that Congress looked into its financial dealings and operations.

On the anniversaries of the independence of various countries, I have made it a custom each year to extend greetings to the people of those nations and their kinsmen in America. I do this annually on the anniversary of the establishment of Israel, and express my continued support for that country. In the case of countries in Europe which have fallen under Communist domination, such as Poland, Lithuania, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, I protest the inhumanities perpetrated against the people of those countries and express the hope that they will soon be liberated.

My offices in Washington and New York perform many personal services for several thousand people each year who contact me or my staff on various problems. My staff and I are ready at all times to be helpful in any way we can to the people of my district. I am very proud of this record of service and want to express my sincerest thanks for a job well done to my Washington staff, Mrs. Melba Coutsonikas and Miss Maria Gobbi, for their invaluable help. Likewise, I want to thank my New York assistants, Max Feigin, Modesto Munoz, and Michael Lazzazaro, who are doing a splendid job in the district. Over 21,000 residents have been served in my area in the past 4 years.

I hope and trust that the people of my district will permit me to continue to serve them in the U.S. Congress. They know that I am devoted to the community, I understand its problems, and I have the interests of the people close at heart. They know that in my public service I have always tried to live up to the Biblical precepts of justice and righteousness for the people.

I ask you to read my record of service to the people and to judge it on its merits. Feel free to write to me about your problems or about your views on various issues and legislation. Your letters will be welcome and will receive full consideration. Please address your letter to: Congressman ALFRED E. SANTANGELO, New House Office Building, Washington 25, D.C.

Charles Flammand Renders Patriotic Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, there recently came to my attention an outstanding and most unusual record of patriotic service which has been achieved by my friend and constitutent, Charles Flammand, of Northbridge, Mass.

For the past 41 consecutive years, Mr. Flammand has served as an official member of the firing squad designated by his American Legion post to participate in the community observance of Memorial Day. During these many years, Mr. Flammand, who is now 70, has been active in three American Legion posts and it now has become a tradition with Oliver Ashton Post No. 343, American Legion, of Northbridge, to name this wonderful gentleman to the Memorial Day firing squad.

With each passing year, new comrades have joined him in this annual tribute to Northbridge veterans of all wars and some of his fellow firing squad members who saw service in Korea can now recall Mr. Flammand's faithful service during the Memorial Days of their youth.

Often, this memorable and devoted service to his community and to his comrades has meant an early rising hour of about 5:30, but Charles Flammand has never been heard to complain. In fact, his fellow members of Oliver Ashton Post state that he has always been among the first to volunteer his services for the Memorial Day observance.

A well-known barber for many years in the Blackstone Valley, Mr. Flammand is now retired, but he maintains an active interest in community affairs and participates in many veterans activities. He served as a corporal during World War I.

I am very thankful to my friend, Mr. Rosaire Rajotte, of Northbridge, for writing me about the patriotic contributions of his fellow townsman. I am pleased, indeed, to have this opportunity to bring this most distinctive record of Charles Flammand to the attention of my colleagues in the House.

Schoeppel Answers COPE

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, in the days since the Congress adjourned I have been preparing the attached statement to be made a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This statement which I have titled "SCHOEPPEL Answers COPE," I would like to have made a part of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SCHOEPPEL ANSWERS COPE

The most highly organized and most adequately financed political action machine in the United States today—financed in part by the dues money of individual union members—is the AFL–CIO committee on political education, better known as COPE.

The activities of COPE are supposed to be supported from voluntary sources. These funds enable COPE to operate like a well-greased political machine in all elections, besides subsidizing a nationwide propaganda offensive.

Before the 1956 election, COPE published a booklet entitled "How Your Senators and Representatives Voted 1947–56." Again, before the 1958 election, COPE distributed a second booklet entitled "How Your Senators and Representatives Voted 1957–58." COPE stated that "if the voters have full information about the record of candidates running for office they will vote for the best ones. On that belief is built the political education program of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organization."

COPE has assumed the responsibility of telling the American people how their Senators and Representatives voted, based on a very small percentage of the total record votes held. Because of the wide distribution of these booklets—some 16 million copies—I have made the following analysis of the votes selected by COPE. I am confident that the people of Kansas will be a fairer judge of my record than the AFL–CIO committee on political education.

In 1956, I had the honor of being chairman of the Republican senatorial campaign committee. I charged that COPE had selected only 20 Senate rollcalls for the 10-year period, 1947–56, representing only 1.3 percent of a total of 1,528 Senate rollcalls. One must tell the whole truth and even if those 20 rollcalls were correctly described, they could not possibly constitute the whole truth concerning the record of any U.S. Senator.

Of the 20 votes selected, on 2 votes I was not yet a Member of the Senate; I was absent on official business on another 2 votes; and of the 16 votes in which I participated, I voted, according to COPE, right 2 times, and wrong 14 times.

The issues COPE selected as representative of the categories of labor, general welfare, domestic policy, and foreign aid were most unrepresentative. I would like the people of Kansas to know how COPE has distorted the description of the issues, and has judged me as voting wrong in 14 instances.

A. LABOR

Under the heading "Labor" I was listed by COPE as voting wrong on six occasions.

I. COPE charges: Taft-Hartley (H.R. 3020); June 23, 1947, veto overridden, 68 to 25; nay=right. Vote to override President Truman's veto of act destroying protection of Norris-La Guardia and Wagner Acts; subjecting unions to injunctions and suits for damages; outlawing closed shop, secondary boycott, and union hiring halls.

My position: I was not a Member of the Senate on June 23, 1947. I was elected to office in November 1948 and took my oath of office in January 1949.

In spite of the fact that during the past Congress, there was a 2-to-1 Democratic majority, the Taft-Hartley Act was retained and strengthened by the adoption of the Landrum-Griffin bill to better protect the rights of the rank-and-file members of unions rather than their leaders.

II. COPE charges: Lucas anti-injunction amendment (S. 249); June 28, 1949; defeated, 44–46; yea=right. Amendment to Taft-Hartley by Senator Lucas, Democrat, of Illinois, would have abolished injunctions in so-called national emergency strikes.

My position: This amendment would have eliminated the use of injunctions in national emergencies after a plant had been seized by the Government.

The issue before the Senate when this vote was taken was simply this: Should the Government—and only the Government—during a national crisis be permitted to use the injunction to maintain production during the period of Government seizure.

COPE again gave the impression that the vote was a vote to permit private employees to invoke the injunction. Nothing could be further from the truth.

I voted against the amendment. I would do it again. The welfare and the very life

of this Nation must always be placed above the interest of any person or group. I say that COPE was wrong.

III. COPE charges: Byrd injunction amendment (S. 2594); June 10, 1952; passed 49–30; nay=right. Asked President Truman to use Taft-Hartley injunction against striking steelworkers (he refused).

My position: When this amendment was before the Senate the Korean war was in progress. American boys were giving their lives in defense of their country. On April 4, 1952, the steelworkers went on strike and on April 8, President Truman seized the steel plants. One month later the Supreme Court declared President Truman's act unconstitutional and again the steelworkers went on strike. This amendment requested the President to use the Taft-Hartley injunction against the steelworkers.

I voted for the amendment because I believed that we owed it to our boys in Korea, who had no injunctive rights to see to it that they received the supplies they needed to protect their lives and your country. It is now apparent that the efforts to avoid the use of the Taft-Hartley Act only interfered with the progress of our troops who were fighting a gallant war in defense of freedom under very difficult conditions. I say that COPE was wrong.

IV. COPE charges: Bacon-Davis amendment (H.R. 10660); May 29, 1956; passed 42–37; yea=right. Amendment to give the Secretary of Labor, rather than local agencies, the right to fix minimum wage rates on interstate highway construction.

My position: H.R. 10660 was actually the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956. The Senate first voted for an amendment to permit the States to determine prevailing wages for interstate projects within the State. Later the Senate reversed itself and supported the Chavez amendment which COPE lists here as a "key vote." Again, COPE misleads its readers. H.R. 10660 was the Federal aid to highway bill; the Bacon-Davis amendment was just one of many amendments offered. I say that COPE was wrong.

V. COPE charges: Minimum wage (S. 653); August 31, 1949 defeated 26 to 51; nay=right. Amendment by Senator ELLENDER, Democrat, of Louisiana, to hold hourly minimum wage at $0.65 instead of raising it to $0.75 and to permit it to drop even lower in times of business recession.

My position: COPE did itself proud in distorting this issue. In the first place COPE's description of the vote is misleading. The Senate did not defeat the minimum wage bill as COPE infers. In 1949, we raised the minimum wage from $0.40 to $0.75 per hour. In 1955, we passed a bill raising the minimum from $0.75 to $1 per hour.

The amendment in question would have established an hourly minimum wage fluctuating from a base of $0.65 instead of raising it to $0.75. It would have moved up and down with the Consumer Price Index from $0.55 to $0.75. Hence as the living cost moved up the minimum wage would also move up.

It is strange that COPE criticizes tying wages to the BLS Index yet union after union protect themselves by putting this type of escalator clause in their contracts.

What COPE also fails to mention is that I supported the legislation providing for a minimum wage of 75 cents per hour.

VI. COPE charges: Civil service (H.R. 4974); June 3, 1953; defeated 35 to 36; nay=right. Motion to permit vote on amendment by Senator CARLSON, Republican, of Kansas, creating patronage plums and letting Government agencies fire career employees arbitrarily, without regard to veterans' preference.

My position: Here again COPE distorted the purpose of the amendment. The bill was not a civil service bill and the Senate was not voting against civil service which the description infers. To begin with H.R. 4974 was an appropriation bill. This amendment would have given the State and Justice Departments the authority to dismiss noncivil-service employees who were poor security risks or suspected Communist subversives in Government. It applied only to positions excepted from competitive civil service. It applied to political patronage appointments and appointees who had never taken a civil service examination but later were blanketed in under civil service. I voted for this amendment aimed at getting Communists and subversives out of Government who slipped into the State and Justice Departments without taking civil service examinations.

In view of the perilous conditions which confront us throughout the world today, it is difficult for me to conceive of any loyal American who would challenge my desire in 1953 to take adequate steps to reinforce the integrity of our State and Justice Departments which are charged with so great a responsibility in dealing with the Communist menace. I say that COPE was wrong.

VII. COPE charges: Postal pay (S. 1); May 24, 1955; defeated 54–39; yea=right. Vote to override President Eisenhower's veto of bill increasing postal worker pay 8.5 percent.

My position: This was only one of five votes on postal pay recorded during the 1st session of the 84th Congress. I voted to sustain the President's veto.

Later a new bill was passed by Congress and signed by the President which provided for an 8-percent increase. I supported this bill. COPE again demonstrated its technique of telling half truths by completely ignoring and not mentioning this latter legislation.

B. GENERAL WELFARE

Under the heading of "General Welfare" I am recorded as voting wrong four times.

VIII. COPE charges: Unemployment compensation (H.R. 5173); July 13, 1954; defeated 30–56; yea=right. Amendment by Senator KENNEDY, Democrat, of Massachusetts, would have raised weekly benefits and provided 26 weeks of coverage in all States. The Eisenhower administration argued these improvements should be left to the States and opposed the bill.

My position: Here again, COPE infers that the Senate defeated a bill concerning unemployment compensation. The fact is the bill H.R. 5173 passed by a vote of 78 to 3 and I voted for passage. The vote used by COPE was on an amendment offered by Senator KENNEDY. It was one of three rollcalls but again COPE fails to mention the vote on the entire bill. It prefers to speak in half truths. Historically unemployment insurance is a State program. If this amendment had been adopted, the responsibilities for financing this program would be automatically shifted to the Federal Government. This would have been a step toward greater Federal control and a loss of State rights.

I voted for the bill, but because I was against this amendment which tried to impose more Federal control, COPE says I voted wrong. I say COPE was wrong.

IX. COPE charges: Offshore oil (H.R. 5134); July 30, 1953; passed 45–43; nay=right. Vote to overrule Supreme Court and give offshore oil, gas and mineral resources valued at $50 billion to $300 billion to coastal States. An amendment by Senator HILL, Democrat, of Alabama, stricken from this bill, would have applied revenues from offshore leases to aid education in all States.

My position: The description of this bill by COPE is completely false. This bill called the Outer Shelf Act, was a sister act to the tidelands bill (H.R. 4198) which gave the States title to offshore submerged lands and their resources within their historic boundaries.

H.R. 5134 did not give any lands to the States; on the contrary it clarified the situation so that the Federal Government could develop the lands beyond the 3-mile limit. To date, revenues from leasing these lands have brought millions of dollars to the Federal Treasury which it would not otherwise receive. I supported this bill. I say COPE was wrong.

Senator HILL's amendment was an attempt to earmark these funds for education. No funds would be paid to Kansas or any other State without additional legislation by Congress. There were some who would have earmarked these funds for aid to the aged. Personally, I do not believe that it is a sound practice for the Government to collect money and earmark it for any specific purpose. Any Federal program to assist education may be authorized by the Congress from the General Treasury funds without taking the action contemplated in this measure. Many States are now facing serious financial problems because their revenue have been allocated for specific purposes. Such earmarking limits the effectiveness of the legislature in determining how best to meet the needs of the people with the available resources. COPE says I am wrong.

X. COPE charges: Public housing (S. 866); April 21, 1948; defeated 35–49; nay=right. An amendment to strike provisions for public housing from the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill.

My position: I was not a Member of the Senate when this amendment was voted upon. The amendment was defeated on April 21, 1948. I did not assume my duties as a Senator until January 1949.

XI. COPE charges: Public housing (S. 3855); May 24, 1956; defeated 38–41; nay=right. CAPEHART, Republican, of Indiana, amendment to Housing Act to cut the number of new low rent public housing unit starts authorized from 135,000 each year to 35,000 each year.

My position: No one denies that good housing is necessary to promote the health, welfare and happiness of our people. The Federal Government should aid our citizens to become homeowners and I have always supported this objective.

However, the issue with respect to this amendment was, "How far the Government should go in spending the taxpayers' dollars to construct units and rent them to people." I believe that our Government should help its people become homeowners but it should avoid making them dependent upon Uncle Sam to supply rental properties and then become a landlord.

The record shows that as of July 31, 1960, we had built 474,000 rental units. We have approximately 150,000 under construction, preconstruction, or under reservation. Yet in Kansas there is not one single unit that has been built. United States, 474,000; Kansas, 0. That is the score to date. The monthly rent charged by the Government has not been sufficient to take care of the operating costs, maintenance, and interest, to say nothing of the cost of construction. Last year the taxpayers in addition to paying for the units had to furnish another $130 million because the rents would not pay the bills.

On the basis of our previous experience, President Eisenhower had recommended 35,000 units, but COPE's position supported 135,000 units. Senator CAPEHART'S amendment attempted to keep this program in line with what it had been in the past.

What COPE failed to say was that 2 months after the Capehart amendment was defeated by a vote of 38 to 41, the Senate by a standing vote accepted it.

I support programs for better housing. I think we should carefully consider how fast we should travel down the road to make Uncle Sam the biggest landlord on earth. I say COPE is wrong.

XII. COPE charges: Social security (H.R. 7225); July 17, 1956; passed 47 to 45; yea=right. Vote on a provision to expand the social security program to include pensions at

age 50 for persons totally disabled. The Eisenhower administration opposed the measure.

My position: I am not a vindictive person by nature but I don't mind telling you that some of the half-truths being broadcast by COPE makes my blood boil. A good case in point is H.R. 7225, the social security measure which passed the Senate on July 17, 1956, by a vote of 47 to 45.

COPE tells you that I voted against the amendment which expands the social security program to include benefits beginning at age 50 for persons totally disabled.

What COPE does not tell you is that I voted for the bill with the amendment attached.

C. DOMESTIC POLICY

On the issues listed under this heading COPE says I voted wrong four times.

XIII. COPE charges: War profits tax (H.R. 4473); September 26, 1951; defeated 33 to 54; yea=right. An amendment by Senator Lehman, Democrat, New York, to set January 1, 1951, as starting date on new taxes on corporation profits, instead of April 1, 1951. This amendment's defeat permitted corporations, with record profits, to escape payment of $500 million in taxes.

My position: Here, COPE resorts to fancy titles for an amendment which is completely misleading. S. 4473 was actually the revenue bill of 1951. In an attempt to place the defense program on a more nearly pay-as-you-go basis Congress in 1951 increased taxes by $5.7 billion. Of the total amount $2.2 billion was to come from increased corporation taxes. The Congress increased the taxes on corporations from 25 to 30 percent.

This amendment raised one issue. Should January 1, 1951, be the starting date on new taxes on corporations or should it be April 1, 1951. This bill was before us in September 1951. A business, like an individual, sets aside money to pay its taxes. The majority of Senators including myself, felt that it wasn't fair to increase the taxes and at the same time make them retroactive when the businesses had not made provision to accumulate reserves to pay the taxes. COPE says I am wrong. Suppose Congress decided in August 1961, to increase your income tax and make it effective as of January 1, 1961. Would I be right in voting for this kind of legislation? I say COPE is wrong.

XIV. COPE charges: Seven hundred dollar income-tax exemption (H.R. 8300); June 30, 1954; defeated 46 to 59; yea=right. An amendment by Senator George, Democrat, Georgia, to increase the $600 tax exemption by $100 for all taxpayers and dependents and to eliminate loopholes.

My position: Here again COPE attempts to lead its readers to believe that the Senate had before it one simple amendment. The fact is that the Senate was considering a complete revision of the entire Internal Revenue Code.

Personally, nothing would have given me more satisfaction than to have been able in good conscience to support this amendment. I was running for reelection to the Senate in 1954. It would have been much easier and far more advantageous from a vote-getting standpoint to have supported the amendment. But its passage could have brought about only one result—namely, such losses of revenue that the Federal Government would have been forced into deficit spending, which in turn would have generated a new wave of inflation. Governments, like people, must live within their budgets. I, too, would like to give tax relief to our citizens, but you can't "spend your way out of debt." Let COPE join with me in getting rid of some of the unnecessary spending, and we can give our people the tax relief they are entitled to.

XV. COPE charges: Natural gas (H.R. 6645), February 6, 1956; passed, 53 to 38; nay=right. Passage of bill to permit producers of natural gas to increase prices without Government approval.

My position: Production of natural gas is vital to the economy of Kansas. COPE rated me as voting wrong because I supported this legislation.

Here again COPE's description of the bill is misleading. The bill provided that the Federal Power Commission have the power to regulate the price paid by pipelines to the producers to a level which the Commission finds to be a reasonable market price. Prior to the Supreme Court decision on the Phillips case in 1954, independent producers generally were exempt from regulation. It was to remove the inequities of this decision that this bill was passed.

Kansas is an important oil- and gas-producing State and receives little or no gas from across State boundaries for consumption in Kansas. My vote on this legislation was in the direct interest of Kansas and the employees engaged in this industry. COPE says I am wrong. In terms of the interest of the Kansas economy, COPE is wrong.

XVI. COPE charges: Dixon-Yates giveaway (S. 3690), July 21, 1954; defeated, 36 to 55; yea=right. An amendment to forbid President Eisenhower to carry through a plan to weaken TVA and give the Dixon-Yates power combine a contract to make $40 million profit on a $5.5 million investment.

My position: On the issue of TVA facilities, COPE was a master at distortion.

President Eisenhower did not believe that all the taxpayers (and that includes the people of Kansas) should be asked to pay for the building of additional power facilities in the Tennessee Valley Authority area to take care of the growing needs of the city of Memphis.

The Dixon-Yates contract made it possible for a private power company to furnish electricity into the TVA system for use in Memphis. This power replaced energy which the Atomic Energy Commission was taking from the TVA system for use at Paducah and Oak Ridge. After the contract was signed, the city of Memphis decided to build its own steam plant at no cost to the taxpayers. When the plan became definite, President Eisenhower canceled the Dixon-Yates contract. In this particular instance the Eisenhower administration brought a suit against the individual who was responsible for negotiating this contract as it was charged that there was a conflict of interest involved. However, the case was dismissed by a judge appointed by a Democratic administration when he found that there was no evidence on which to base such an action. The fact of the matter is that this contract did not cost the taxpayers of Kansas a single cent.

I might add further that we in Kansas are seeking new industries. Therefore, I for one will not vote for legislation which will build Government powerplants to produce cheap energy in other States at the expense of Kansas taxpayers.

XVII. COPE charges: Honesty in government (S. 2391); August 1, 1955, passed 36 to 34; nay=right. A motion by Senator CAPEHART, Republican, Indiana, to excuse businessmen holding nonpaying jobs in Government from filing personal financial statements. Such statements were recommended to prevent the use of a Government position for private gain by an individual or a firm.

My position: COPE again distorts the intent of Senator CAPEHART's amendment. Senator CAPEHART in the conference between the House and the Senate proposed that all persons serving the Federal Government without compensation should be required to file for publication in the Federal Register, the name of his employer, the salary he is receiving, the companies in which he had stock or the partnership in which he had an interest. This is the extent of personal information which could have any possible bearing on one's ability to serve the Government without a conflict of interest. The conference reported an amendment which required continuous periodic reports and additional information. The vote reported by COPE was a vote to recommit the measure to conference so that Senator CAPEHART's proposal could be reviewed.

XVIII. COPE charges: Farm price supports (H.R. 12); April 11, 1956; passed 50-35; yea=right. Passage of bill, later vetoed by President Eisenhower, to support basic crops at 90 percent of parity and to assist farmers with soil bank provisions.

My position: This is the one vote on which COPE is apparently in agreement with my position.

D. FOREIGN AID

XIX. COPE charges: Point 4 (S. 3304); May 5, 1950; passed 37-36; yea=right. Motion by Senator Connally, Democrat, of Texas, to add the point 4 program to the Foreign Economic Cooperation Act. This was a necessary step to prevent Communist expansion by relieving distress and raising the standard of living in backward areas of the world.

My position: I was not present when the vote was taken on this amendment. In view of the mismanagement of our foreign-aid program during this period as well as the closeness of the vote, I am sure that if I had been present, I would have voted against the adoption of this amendment.

IN 1957–58

Prior to the 1958 election, COPE again issued a booklet entitled, "How Your Senators and Representatives Voted 1957–58," and continued to distort the issues.

Sixteen votes were selected for a 2-year period which represents only 5.2 percent of a total of 307 such rollcall votes.

If we accept the narrow definition of issues COPE proposes, it would be equally logical to presume that on the remaining 94.8 percent of the issues I voted right.

Of the 16 votes selected, I was absent because of illness on 1 vote, COPE says I voted right on 1 and wrong on 14. Again, let's analyze the 16 votes which COPE says is the record.

I. COPE charges: Hells Canyon Dam (S. 555); June 21, 1957; passed 45 to 38; yea=right. Passage of bill to use valuable natural resources for low-cost public power, flood control, irrigation and recreation instead of for benefit of Idaho Power Co.

My position: Only one major issue was involved in this instance. "Who should construct the Hells Canyon Dam? Should it be constructed by private concerns or should it be constructed at Government expense?" In either instance, whether the dam was built by private industry or the Government, organized labor would be employed in its construction. I believe that private industry should be given an opportunity to develop any project that conforms to the specifications and requirements of Federal regulatory agencies. This was the case in connection with the Hells Canyon Dam. This procedure places the development on the tax rolls and at the same time eliminates Government spending.

The passage of this bill would have authorized the Federal Government to spend a half-billion dollars and in addition would have jeopardized a further half-billion dollars of potential tax revenues, making the venture a billion-dollar mistake. Although this measure was offered as a reclamation project, its passage would not have provided an additional drop of water for irrigation or for municipal or industrial use in Idaho or in any other State.

I was judged wrong by COPE because I insisted that Kansas taxpayers should not be saddled with the development costs of a dam that private business was ready and willing to build. I was wrong, says COPE because I opposed subsidizing industry in another State at a cost to Kansas taxpayers.

Had the legislation been adopted, Congress would have been committed to spend an additional $100 million a year for 6 years for this single project designed primarily to supply cheap power to two States and thus enable them to compete with Kansas in attracting new industries.

II. COPE charges: Rule XXII; January 4, 1957; passed 55–38; nay=right. A motion by Senator JOHNSON, Democrat, Texas, killing a proposal to change the Senate rules to provide a workable means of ending filibusters.

My position: If a Senator voted for the Johnson motion COPE rated him wrong. I have favored civil rights legislation. The Congress in 1957 enacted the first broad program of civil rights in almost 80 years without a change of rules. At the opening of the 86th Congress, I voted for a change in rule XXII which had the support of the leadership of both parties and thus had a reasonable chance of being adopted. I support the Republican platform which provides that the Senate will endeavor to make any further revisions that are warranted in rule XXII, so that a willful majority cannot prevent the Senate from acting. On the other hand, it is important that those who are concerned with any particular issue affecting a minority group realize the importance of maintaining the Senate as a forum for free expression.

I have exerted every effort to prevent abuse of free debate and will continue to do so, but I am unwilling to participate in the destruction of the world's greatest deliberative body merely to gain passage of a particular bill. If the right of free debate is completely eliminated, it would be possible to push through a bill that would be comp'etely obnoxious. Incidentally, this motion was sponsored by the Democratic Party's Vice Presidential nominee whom COPE supports.

III. COPE charges: Civil rights bill, section III (H.R. 6127); July 24, 1957; passed 52–38; nay=right. An amendment by Senators ANDERSON, Democrat, of New Mexico, and AIKEN, Republican, Vermont, eliminating from the civil-rights bill section 121 of part III which would have empowered the Attorney General to use Federal court injunctions to enforce court decisions and civil rights laws generally.

My position: I was absent from the Senate because of illness when this vote was taken.

IV. COPE charges: Foreign aid (S. 2130); June 14, 1957; defeated 32–54; nay=right. An amendment to the Mutual Security Act of 1957 by Senator MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon, to eliminate the Development Loan Fund which was intended to help other nations by providing long-term, low-cost loans for economic development.

My position: COPE says I voted right on this issue. I am pleased to know that for once COPE saw the light.

V. COPE charges: Housing, veterans' interest rates (S. 3418); March 12, 1958; passed 47–47; nay=right. A motion by Senator Knowland, Republican, California, which had the effect of permitting the Veterans' Administration to raise the interest rates on GI housing loans from 4.5 to 4.75 percent (Vice President NIXON cast the tie-breaking vote in favor of higher interest rates on GI mortgages.)

My position: Again, COPE distorts the issue. In the first place the bill did not increase interest rates. It merely raised an artificially low ceiling which has dried up the funds available to thousands of veterans and prevented them from taking advantage of the GI loan program.

Thousands of veterans were able to get approvals from the Veterans' Administration but found it impossible to find a bank or building and loan association which would lend them any money to build a house. As long as the prevailing rates available to banks and other financial institutions were more advantageous, there was no prospect that they would buy any sizable number of GI mortgages. My vote was cast to assist veterans in securing homes.

Yet COPE says I voted wrong when I voted for a bill which would make it possible for GI's to get money to build homes and thus provide jobs to laboring men in the construction field.

VI. COPE charges: Welfare and pension funds (S. 2888); April 24, 1958; defeated 28–59; nay=right. An amendment to the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act by Senator ALLOTT, Republican, Colorado, which would have excluded employer-operated plans from the requirements and penalties of the law. Passage of this amendment would have denied this protection to about 90 percent of the workers now covered by pension and welfare plans.

My position: S. 2888 was a bill to provide for the registration, reporting and disclosure of employees' welfare and pension plans. It was drafted to prevent abuses in certain pension plans that were disclosed before a Senate commitee. In every instance where abuses were found the employee was not guaranteed a definite sum of money upon his retirement.

Such plans merely provided that the employee pay a certain amount into a fund that was collectively managed by the union and the employer. On the other hand 90 percent of the pension plans were already adequately protected by the Internal Revenue Service. An employer, in order to qualify for tax exemption on those funds contributed must work about 3 years in order to satisfy the Internal Revenue Service that the fund is properly organized and that it will be conducted according to law. Once a plan is authorized, the company is required to file annual reports. This bill would have required many companies to file additional forms with another branch of the Government. The principal difference between the plans covered by the Allott amendment and those in which abuses had been disclosed is that under a level-of-benefit plan the worker is guaranteed a fixed benefit in accordance with the agreement between his union and the company.

What was back of COPE's reasoning except to make it appear that the employers were getting by with something—no one will ever know.

VII. COPE charges: Public works interest rates (S. 3497); April 15, 1958; defeated 40 to 41; yea=right. An amendment to the Community Facilities Act of 1958 by Senator FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, to lower from 3.5 to 3 percent the interest rate on funds loaned by the Federal Government to State and local governments for the construction of needed public works in the broad program to relieve unemployment.

My position: When the communities facilities bill was reported by the Senate Banking Committee, the committee agreed that the proper rate of interest to charge the communities should be exactly the same rate which the Government had to pay, namely 3½ percent—no more and no less.

I opposed this amendment because I believed that if a community borrowed money from the Government it ought to pay the Government at least the exact interest charge which the Government had to pay to borrow money. I say COPE was wrong. Does it make sense that Uncle Sam borrow money and pay 3½ percent and loan it to a community at 3 percent? Why should the taxpayers of Kansas make up the other one-half percent?

VIII. COPE charges: Davis-Bacon (S. 3497); April 15, 1958; passed 54 to 25; yea=right. An amendment to the Community Facilities Act of 1958 by Senator CASE, Republican, of New Jersey, to incorporate provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act requiring prevailing wages and a 40-hour week in public works construction.

My position: This amendment again proposes Federal interference in local projects. The local community would have spent its own money and should have been able to specify the conditions of employment rather than have a bureaucrat in Washington dictate the terms. I have confidence that State and local officials, who must seek the approval of the voters in every respective State, will completely administer the laws. I say COPE is wrong.

IX. COPE charges: Depressed areas (S. 3683); May 13, 1958; passed 46 to 36; yea=right. Passage of Area Redevelopment Act providing $379.5 million in Federal loans and grants for the redevelopment of localities suffering from long-time chronic unemployment.

My position: For 5 consecutive years the President has urged the Congress to enact sound area-assistance legislation.

No one will deny that (a) need exists for a program to alleviate the suffering of the unemployed; (b) depressed areas are dangerous and costly since unemployment breeds sickness, discontent, and crime; (c) unemployment is costly as these people cannot pay taxes. Further, common decency requires that we must take care of the less fortunate; (d) a government that can spend billions to aid the underdeveloped nations of other lands has an obligation to assist those in our own land who are ready, willing, and able to work but through no fault of their own are unable to find suitable employment.

I am in complete agreement with the objectives of this legislation. If I thought for a moment that S. 3683 would have brought about increased productivity, provided jobs for the unemployed, and improved the economy of this country, I would have been one of the first to stand on the floor of the Senate and support the measure. High sounding phrases and laudatory declarations of policy do not create jobs.

President Eisenhower proposed a $50-million program which was realistically designed to meet conditions which confronted the country. The bill which was finally passed was vetoed because President Eisenhower believed it called for too little local responsibility.

X. COPE charges: Unemployment compensation (H.R. 12065); May 27, 1958; defeated 21 to 63; yea=right. An amendment by Senator KENNEDY, Democrat, of Massachusetts, to the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act of 1958 to extend coverage, increase benefits, and lengthen duration of emergency benefits.

Unemployment compensation (H.R. 12065): May 28, 1958; defeated 36 to 47; yea=right. An amendment by Senator KENNEDY, Democrat, of Massachusetts, to the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act of 1958 to extend the duration of benefit payments by 16—instead of 13—weeks and to provide Federal administration of the program if the States failed to act.

My position: In May 1958, the Senate was considering a bill to provide additional unemployment compensation. That bill as enacted into law provided for payments from the Federal Treasury to those States which agreed to extend by a maximum of 50 percent the unemployment benefits provided by State laws. It applied to persons who had exhausted their unemployment benefits under State law. That bill passed the Senate by a vote of 80 to 0. Senator KENNEDY's amendment proposed substantial alterations to the State laws. By extending these benefits in the form of Federal grants, Congress would have completely undermined the principles of a sound State unemployment program and would have replaced an insurance program with a dole. The Kennedy proposal would have cost the taxpayers $1½ billion.

In voting against the Kennedy amendment I was voting with 65 percent of the Senate. The second Kennedy amendment would have extended unemployment compensation in all States regardless of their wishes. From my experience as a Governor, I am convinced that the initiative in these programs should come from the States, where there is a better opportunity to develop a program which meets local needs and requirements. I am a strong believer in local control wherever possible. I say COPE was wrong.

XI. COPE charges: Public assistance (H.R. 12065); May 28, 1958; defeated 40–40; yea=right. An amendment by Senator LONG, Democrat, of Louisiana, to increase public assistance payments to the aged, blind, and disabled by about $5 per month. It would have benefited over 2 million people. (Vice President NIXON declined to break the tie in favor of the aged, blind, and disabled.)

My position: Here again, COPE proves itself to be a master of deceit. On the front page of its booklet, COPE says, "That is why we have distributed a record of key congressional rollcalls prior to election." First, you will note that this amendment is to H.R. 12065, a bill to extend the benefits to the unemployed. This amendment had nothing to do with the temporary extension of unemployment benefits legislation. The attachment of this amendment upon which no hearings had been held could have jeopardized the enactment of H.R. 12065 or delayed the availability of benefits to unemployed workers. Two months later, on August 16, the Senate passed H.R. 13549, the fifth successive bill to liberalize the Social Security Act, which increased old-age and survivors insurance benefits by 7 percent. This measure also increased from $60 to $65 the maximum benefit which the Federal Government shares with the States on old-age assistance.

It also increased the Federal contribution for aid to the blind and totally disabled for those States whose income was less than the national average. The key vote on H.R. 13549, which increased social security benefits, was adopted by the Senate without any opposition. This is the measure which really affected social security benefits, yet COPE ignored it and instead mentioned the above amendment to H.R. 12065. This is a typical example of COPE's deceit in misleading its members.

The last four issues listed by COPE are all amendments to the labor reform bill considered by the Senate in 1958:

Labor relations (S. 3974): June 13, 1958; defeated 37 to 53; nay=right. An amendment to the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1958 by Senator Watkins, Republican, of Utah, to permit States and territories to assert jurisdiction over labor disputes which the NLRB declines to handle.

Knowland 20 percent petition (S. 3974): June 14, 1958; defeated 31 to 52; nay=right. An amendment by Senator Knowland, Republican, of California, to the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1958 to require unions, on petition of 20 percent of the members, to hold secret-ballot referenda on the recall of officers or changes in the constitution.

No-strike clauses (S. 3974): June 17, 1958; defeated 32 to 57; nay=right. An amendment by Senator Knowland. Republican of California, to the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1958 to outlaw no-strike clauses in union contracts unless approved by a majority of the membership in secret ballot.

Building trades (S. 3974): June 17, 1958; defeated 29 to 60; nay=right. An amendment by Senator MCCLELLAN, Democrat, of Arkansas, to strike from the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1958 a provision permitting building trades and construction employers to conclude contracts in accordance with traditional industry practices.

On all four votes I was rated wrong. COPE gave the impression they were all antilabor, but insofar as dues-paying, rank-and-file union members are concerned, these amendments sought to protect the rights of the laboring man in Kansas and throughout the Nation.

In 1958, I sent a letter to the Committee On Political Education, Wichita, Kans. In this letter I set out my beliefs. In that letter I said:

"Frankly, I'm at a loss to understand why you suggest such action. Not a single amendment offered by Senator Knowland could in the slightest degree be labeled a 'damaging' amendment insofar as dues-paying union members are concerned. Every amendment seeks to protect the rights of the laboring man against abuses in labor relations exposed by the McClellan committee.

"I cannot believe that you are opposed to legislation which provides that no person shall be eligible to serve as an officer unless elected by a popular vote of the membership at an election in which all members of such organization shall have been entitled to vote and at which the voting shall have been by secret ballot. Are you opposed to giving every member of a labor organization the right to vote? Are you opposed to the use of secret ballots properly supervised where every member may vote without fear of reprisal?

"Why should any workingman be opposed to legislation which provides that the filing of a petition by 15 percent of the membership would be sufficient to require an election at which the workers again would be entitled to vote by secret ballot on the question of recalling any elected officer? Many union constitutions provide for the removal of officers found untrustworthy or derelict in the performance of their duties. There are others that do not. Why do you label an amendment 'damaging' which would grant the workers the right to recall any officer without fear of reprisal is beyond me. What is antiunion about such a proposal?

"If my memory serves me correctly, approximately 30 years ago the coal miners in southeast Kansas lost their right to elect their district officials. To this day, the miners in this area are required to pay dues but are given no voice in the selection of such officers. Recent hearings held by the McClellan committee pointed out time and again how certain union leaders through the establishment of trusteeships and supervisorships controlled activities and funds of local unions. What is damaging with legislation which provides that no national or international organization shall have the power to remove officers of local unions for the purpose of establishing a trusteeship unless such provision is authorized by and is in accordance with the provision of its constitution or its bylaws—and then only for 1 year? What is so damaging with legislation which provides that the funds of the local union are to be used exclusively in connection with the affairs of the local union when a trusteeship has been established? Am I to understand that you feel that such protection for the membership of any local union against unjustifiable action of some national organization is not in the best interest of the union members?

"The McClellan committee found instances where the leadership of labor unions had established a system of class membership whereby only those in a certain class could vote and participate in union affairs, yet all members were required to pay dues.

"All Senator Knowland's amendment attempted to do was to provide that no labor organization shall be a representative of any employee for the purpose of collective bargaining, unless such organization agrees to admit all of the employees it seeks to represent to membership in the union on the terms and conditions and with the same rights and privileges accorded to all other members of the union. Frankly I do not believe that such legislation is antiunion and I feel in my heart you must feel the same way. I honestly believe that any reputable and competent union man who wants to join a union should be permitted to do so and such membership should carry with it the right to participate in union activities. For the life of me I cannot see why you consider any proverb, that grants every workingman equal rights within the labor organization, a damaging amendment, or against the best interest of the laborer whom I'm sure you want to represent.

"With respect to the calling of a strike, the Knowland amendment provides that no strike shall be called or sanctioned by a labor organization unless, at least 30 days prior to the commencement of such strike, such labor organization shall give notice to the Board and the employer of its intention. If the Board then receives a petition signed by 15 percent of the employees requesting an election, the Board must hold an election to determine whether a strike should or should not be called. If the majority of the members oppose the strike, no strike shall be called for 90 days. All this proviso provides for is, that if a strike is called it must be sanctioned by the majority of the members and not by a minority group or some national organization. What is so damaging in granting to the workers the right to determine whether a strike should or should not be called? After all it is the workingman, his wife, and his children who must make the sacrifices that are required when a strike is called and not the salaried officials of the organization, State or National.

"Why do you label as a 'damaging amendment' a proposal that gives to every union member the right to petition the NLRB when such member feels that his right to vote has been denied in violation of the union constitution, charter, or bylaws? All the Knowland amendment attempts to do is provide safeguards to protect every member's right to vote. When does protecting a union member's voting rights become antilabor in nature?

"Under the NLRB it is illegal for an employer to pay or promise to pay a representative of the workers or for a representative of the worker to receive gifts from the employer. The McClellan committee exposed a number of these so-called sweetheart arrangements where representatives of management and union representatives engaged in collusive arrangements which resulted in benefits to management and to the union officials—but detrimental to the best interests of the union members. All that Senator Knowland's amendment proposed to do was to close this loophole and yet you label such legislation as a 'damaging' amendment. 'Damaging' to whom, the honest union members or to the corrupt officials and companies who enter into these agreements?

"I supported all of the Knowland amendments. So long as I am in the Senate, I shall continue to support legislation in the field of labor-management relations which I think is in the best interest of the rank-and-file worker and my country. During my last campaign for the Senate the Committee On Political Education attempted to brand me as antilabor. I have no doubt but that they will again brand my support of the Knowland amendments as antilabor.

"In utter candor, I say to you that I have faith in the sound judgment of the rank-and-file laborer. I do not believe that the great mass of honest union laborers will ever condemn any effort on my part or any other public official's part to enact legislation that is aimed at protecting their rights and

their liberties against corrupt practices whether it comes from within the leadership of labor organization or management. I fully realize that the vast majority of union officials and union organizations are honest. But corruption and rank discrimination must be eliminated wherever and whenever found.

"If supporting legislation which protects the rights and liberties of the rank-and-file laboring man against corrupt practices is 'damaging' and antilabor in the eyes of the committee on political education, then I shall have to depend upon the laboring men to judge my actions."

IN 1959–1960

During the 86th Congress COPE has again selected 10 issues out of 400 rollcalls to judge the effectiveness of a U.S. Senator as a friend of labor. These issues are unrepresentative.

I. COPE charges: Labor's enemies win (S. 1555); April 22, 1959; NIXON broke tie 45–46; nay=right. Trick political maneuver to cement antilabor provisions in reform bill brings the vote, broken by NIXON'S vote to subject labor to endless legal battles in court and cripple legitimate union procedures.

My position: This vote was to insure that an amendment, sponsored by Senator MCCLELLAN, Democrat of Arkansas, to provide a bill of rights which would protect union members against unauthorized or unscrupulous actions by their leaders would be included in the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959.

I voted for the protection of the rights of the thousands of dues-paying union members of Kansas rather than accept the demands of a small group of union officials in Detroit and Washington.

II. COPE charges: Unions score victory (S. 1555); April 24, 1959; 41–50; nay=right. Senate defeats McClellan amendment to ban secondary boycotts, a legitimate, fair and necessary trade union tool used for years to protect decent working conditions.

My position: COPE attempts to give the impression that the unions secured a victory in the defeat of an amendment by Senator MCCLELLAN which banned secondary boycotts.

I voted for this amendment. What COPE fails to state is the fact that, again, the substance of this amendment is included in the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 as section 704, entitled "Boycotts and Recognition Picketing." The final Senate vote was 95 to 2.

COPE says I am wrong, but, after all of the facts had been developed through hearings by both Houses of the Congress, there was an overwhelming support for my original position. I took this stand to insure that no union member would find he could not earn his livelihood because of a dispute in which he had no direct interest.

III. COPE charges: Helping depressed areas (S. 722); March 23, 1959; 49 to 46; yea=right. Area Redevelopment Act would have approved $389.5 million to help people help themselves in depressed industrial and rural areas with high unemployment over an extended period. Unfortunately, the final version of this bill was vetoed by President Eisenhower.

My position: COPE says I was wrong in voting against the so-called Area Redevelopment Act. It admits that this measure was vetoed by President Eisenhower, although the President had requested area redevelopment legislation in his budget message. This bill was vetoed because COPE supporters so increased its scope and cost that it ceased to have any semblance of practicality. Had it not been for the addition of many unworkable provisions, it would have been possible to have started the program recommended by the President.

I voted for the establishment of a workable program. COPE says I am wrong, but I know that there are areas in Kansas that would have benefited from a reasonable program and these areas know that I was right in supporting a measure which would have helped them.

IV. COPE charges: Filibuster triumphs (Rules); January 9, 1959; 36 to 60; nay=right. This vote hurt civil rights by killing the drive to provide a meaningful way to stop Senate filibustering tactics and force voting on an issue. Rule XXII was slightly modified later.

My position: COPE says I was wrong in maintaining rule XXII, although it admits that it was subsequently modified. It fails to state that I supported the final passage of Senate Resolution 5, which so liberalized Senate procedures that it was possible to enact civil rights legislation in 1960.

Again, by telling only a portion of the story and omitting the rest, COPE is not providing its members with all of the facts. I have always supported civil rights legislation, but my 12 years of experience in the Senate convinces me that taking an extreme position will only insure the defeat of a step-by-step approach. COPE's position is a disservice to those who are seeking greater protection in enjoying the freedoms to which every American is entitled.

COPE says I am wrong, but based on an intimate knowledge of Senate procedures, I know that I was right in casting my vote in support of the Senate leadership of both parties, including Senator JOHNSON.

V. COPE charges: Civil rights knifed (H.R. 8601); April 4, 1960; 56 to 34; nay=right. Passage of Dirksen motion ends Javits and McNamara attempts to give U.S. Attorney General more "legal teeth" in school desegregation and other civil rights areas.

My position: Civil rights legislation is a complex and difficult subject. It is impossible for the Congress to legislate brotherhood and good feeling among all Americans.

In supporting this motion I was again striving to avoid the inclusion in a civil rights bill of provisions which would have made it impossible for the Senate to enact any legislation. An understanding of Senate procedures often insures progress which a dogmatic position jeopardizes.

COPE says I was wrong, but the fact of the matter is that civil rights legislation was enacted during this Congress because those whom it says voted wrong exercised reasonableness and secured the support of a majority of the Senate.

Now that the Congress has enacted the first civil rights legislation in more than 80 years, I know that it will be far easier than it was in the past to make even further progress.

VI. COPE charges: Housing enemies licked (S. 57); February 4, 1959, 37 to 50; nay=right. Move by CAPEHART to cut 35,000 urgently needed public housing apartment units from Housing Act was defeated.

My position: COPE says I voted wrong in supporting an amendment to reduce the number of public housing units authorized in the first housing bill of the 86th Congress that President Eisenhower was forced to veto.

There are very few communities in Kansas which receive Federal grants for public housing. By including numerous provisions, such as the authorization of these public housing units, all housing legislation was delayed as the President was forced to veto the bill. He stated that "even though we have over 100,000 previously authorized public housing units as yet unbuilt, the bill would authorize 190,000 more." All Senator CAPEHART was trying to do was to delay a program and save the taxpayers $21 million.

Again, COPE fails to provide its members with all the facts. After President Eisenhower's veto was sustained, a second bill, again including extravagant provisions, was passed by the Congress and vetoed.

Finally, on September 23, 1959, after months of needless delay a bill was signed by President Eisenhower, which provided substantially fewer public housing units.

Again, COPE says I was wrong, but history proves that I was right since valuable time, from July 7, when the first housing bill was vetoed, until September 23, was lost. On the latter date a reasonable bill was passed which I supported and it was enacted into law.

A workable, moderate program will provide more homes for those who need them, and I believe that this was in the best interest of Kansas.

VII. COPE charges: School kids win (S. 8); February 4, 1960; 51–34; yea=right. Grants about $40 over 2-year period for each school-age child to build classrooms and increase teachers' salaries, with more money going to the less wealthy States. Yet, final action on even this modest bill was deferred due to July recess of Congress.

My position: COPE misleads its members in stating that school kids win, and that I was wrong in voting against the passage of this measure.

COPE's inference is that I am opposed to education for our children. Nothing could be further from the truth. COPE states, no action was taken due to the July recess of Congress. The fact of the matter is that even though the Congress reconvened following the national conventions and had a 2-to-1 Democratic majority pledged to a bill incorporating these provisions, no such legislation was enacted.

I believe that a reasonable measure to assist needy school districts in Kansas in accordance with President Eisenhower's program, which was completely neglected in COPE's ranking of the U.S. Senate, would have accomplished a great deal more. My support of the administration's program was ignored. It would have allocated $600 million per year for 5 years to assist school construction. Again, COPE says I was wrong. I know that I was right. The extreme measure COPE supported prevented the enactment of any school aid. It would have used the money for school construction and teachers' salaries. The moneys which a reasonable measure would have made available to many districts in Kansas have been denied to them because of the actions of COPE supporters.

VIII. COPE charges: Taxing dividends fairly (H.R. 1281); June 20, 1960; 42–41; nay=right. Passage of McCarthy amendment to repeal 4 percent tax credit on dividend income over $50 could have increased Federal revenues by $350 million a year. But this proposal was removed from final bill in conference with the House. Earned income now is taxed at higher rate than dividend income.

COPE implies that I voted against labor by encouraging investors through a modest dividend credit to create more jobs for our expanding population. Although some labor leaders have opposed a dividend tax credit, there are many millions of union members who are today acquiring stock in the companies for which they work and are benefiting from the dividend credit.

COPE is incorrect in stating that earned income now is taxed at higher rates than dividend income since corporations must first pay a corporate income tax to the Government before any dividends are declared and these dividends are then subject to tax as well.

COPE says I was wrong, but I was right in voting to provide the necessary capital to make more jobs for Kansas workers and to assist any employees who will ultimately become the owners of American industry.

IX. COPE charges: Foreign loans saved (S. 1451); July 2, 1959; 30–50; nay=right. Senate defeated Ellender attempt to cut drastically Development Loan Fund which helps underdeveloped countries help themselves. Under Mutual Security Act, long-term loans are

made to help finance needed economic programs. Good way to fight communism peacefully.

My position: COPE says I took a position against labor by limiting the funds available for foreign aid.

The fact of the matter is that I was absent when this vote was taken, but if I had been present, I would have supported this limitation on foreign aid. I have always been more concerned with creating jobs for Kansas than in burdening our taxpayers for dubious projects throughout the world.

What COPE fails to state is that the Ellender amendment did not eliminate funds for the Development Loan Fund, but it merely authorized a smaller amount. My experience in the Senate convinces me that when a program is effectively curbing communism. there are no difficulties in securing increased authorizations to make it more effective.

COPE says I was wrong, but I know that I was right in curbing expenditures at a time when our own internal demands were at a very high level until this program had been proven useful for the defense of the free world.

X. COPE charges: Unemployed lose out (H.R. 5640); March 25, 1959; 38–49; yea=right. Senate rejected McNamara move to help jobless workers by extending Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act of 1958 to July 1, 1960. This would have provided assistance for still jobless workers whose unemployment insurance benefits had been exhausted and other workers not already receiving benefits. Final bill extended benefits only from April to June 1959.

My position: COPE states that I voted against the unemployed. This is not true. Information, which was made available to the Congress by the President, clearly showed that an extension of this program through June 1, 1959 would enable the States to then pick up the burden and operate their unemployment compensation systems in a satisfactory manner.

If a real need had been indicated for continued assistance after the expiration date of the program, it would have been a very simple matter to have extended it again. Employment increased, the numbers of those unemployed decreased, and the States had the necessary resources to cope with their problems.

In the coming 1960 election, COPE is again distributing millions of copies of a distorted analysis of the voting records of Senators and Representatives in the U.S. Congress. As I have already indicated, out of more than 400 rollcall votes in the Senate during the 86th Congress only a minute number have been considered.

It is amazing that labor leaders who have the opportunity to know the fact have such contempt for the intelligence of their members. I cannot believe that these an yses by COPE will influence the votes of these 16 million citizens who are members of the AFL–CIO. Rank and file union members have shown over the years that they, like all other citizens, vote their convictions based on their own analysis of the facts and issues. In the spirit of fair play, does it not seem reasonable to examine a Senator's complete record—the bills he introduced, his work in committees as well as his actions on the Senate floor, most of which are never recorded by rollcalls but vitally affect the lives of a Senator's constituents.

The citizens of Kansas have twice elected me as their Governor. They have twice elected me to represent them in the U.S. Senate.

I have expended my efforts to protect the interests of my country and the people of Kansas. COPE's highly distorted documents provide little information concerning the entire record of candidates seeking public office. They do not meet the test of furnishing the whole truth.

Two-Year Report to His Constituents of Progress on His 10-Point Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD G. WOLF
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago in my campaign for Congress, I campaigned on a 10-point program. I believe that the voters in my district are entitled to a report on my stewardship and on the progress made on my 10-point program.

I would like to outline each of these 10 points and to discuss some of the work I have done on each of them. I am proud to state that we have made some progress on every one of the 10 points.

1. PEACE AND MILITARY COSTS

The promise: Encourage and foster international understanding with the hope that thereby a gradual reduction of our vast military and defense machine can be brought about.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to delve deeply into this particular point because I believe this is my most important job as a Congressman—to help insure world peace; therefore, I worked harder on this program than on any other.

The performance: Peace. In efforts to promote an international climate for peace I have worked unceasingly to gain acceptance for my plan to use our agricultural abundance as a tool for peace.

March 26, 1959, I introduced the food for peace through the United Nations bill. The purpose of this bill was to utilize our food and fiber resources through the United Nations in order to promote economic development in underdeveloped areas as well as to stave off starvation. At that time I pointed out that if the plan were enacted and implemented over a 10-year period over $1,540 million in storage costs would be saved. Twenty-seven members of Congress cosponsored this bill with me.

Since we did not receive a hearing from the Agriculture Committee on this bill, I proposed the plan as an amendment to the Mutual Security Act both in the 1st and in the 2d sessions of the 86th Congress. It was not adopted either time. However, I am very happy to report now that Vice President NIXON and Senator KENNEDY have both endorsed the United Nations food for peace plan which I introduced at the beginning of the 86th Congress. It is my guess that during the 87th Congress the United Nations food for peace plan will pass since both candidates of the national parties now support my proposal.

Because I led the fight for the United Nations food for peace bill in the Congress, I was appointed by the Congress as an official observer at the World Food and Agriculture Conference in Rome, Italy, in November 1959. Here I had a great opportunity to work for the cause of world peace through feeding the hungry.

I was an official emissary for the Governor of Iowa in the delivery of 35 hogs to the typhoon-ravaged area of Japan in January 1960. International peace was greatly strengthened by this gesture of the people of Iowa in behalf of the people of Japan.

The director of agriculture for the Karachi area of Pakistan worked in my office last spring in the capacity of a staff assistant, under the sponsorship of the American Political Science Association. In addition to observing the democratic process at work in the Congress, I am convinced that Mr. Zafar took back with him to Pakistan happy memories of his sojourn in the United States and warm feelings for our people which will strengthen the bonds of friendship between our countries.

In connection with my work as ranking member on the Research and Development Subcommittee of the House Science and Astronautics Committee, I have attended two conferences on the question of world aeronautical problems and one conference on the law of outer space in the United Nations.

One of the great dangers which the world faces today is nuclear destruction by recklessness, blackmail, or accident. The chances for this occurring increase greatly as more and more nations gain access to information and equipment necessary to the building of nuclear weapons. I have led the fight in Congress against the sharing of nuclear weapons and nuclear information with other countries because of this great danger. It is interesting to note that within the administration now there are serious difference of opinion on this matter, with the State Department not wanting other nations to have nuclear weapons because of the realization that there is no deterrent against nuclear accident whereas the Defense Department and the Atomic Energy Commission have tried to lobby Congress—but not successfully—into changing the law.

I am very happy to report that as a result of the fight which I and others made on this issue during the 86th Congress, 1st session, the changes which the Atomic Energy Commission and the Defense Department asked for in the 2d session, 86th Congress, were denied by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

As a member of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 613, a resolution which expresses the sense of the Congress that outer space be given over completely to peaceful exploration rather than be used for military purposes. It would be a bad thing, indeed, to continue the cold war in space as well as on the ground. The danger of allowing military exploration of outer space is that nuclear weapons could circle the earth in manmade satellites. I am working on a program which will outline more completely the role of the United Nations in outer space so that there will be a shared sovereignty of all the nations in outer space rather than risk the chances of nuclear destruction.

MILITARY COSTS

In the 1st session of the 86th Congress, I led the fight against blanket extension of the 4-year draft. I favored a 2-year extension with the establish-

ment of a joint congressional committee to conduct an extensive study of the procurement and utilization of military manpower for the purpose of seeking alternative methods to military conscription. I felt that the draft law was becoming a crutch to lean on which was not necessary. It is interesting to note that the draft call across the United States now averages less than 7,500 men a month. This, I felt, was small enough so that alternative methods could have been found to enlist this number of men. As a result of my efforts a Committee on the Utilization of Military Manpower was appointed by the chairman of the Armed Services Committee. Congressman FRANK KOWALSKI, a member of that subcommittee said:

DEAR LEN: You are to be congratulated on your part in the formation of the Military Manpower Utilization Subcommittee last year.

I hope you are aware of the full extent to which your leadership in the fight on the draft led to the formation of this subcommittee.

As a member of this subcommittee, I sincerely believe that it has already been responsible for great savings to the taxpayers.

Each year for the past few years we have spent over $40 billion on defense. Over 60 cents of each tax dollar goes for the military budget. There have been many reports in Congress which have shown existing waste and duplication as a result of poor planning and management within the Pentagon structure.

I introduced in the 2d session of the 86th Congress a bill which would act to reunify the Department of Defense under a single civilian command to eliminate duplication and waste. Studies which have been done on this subject suggest that as much as $7 billion a year could be saved if a good reorganization plan were followed. Besides this, the gross inefficiency which exists results in a defense force not as strong as it could be. Priorities are given to wrong things. Unnecessary competition exists between the services and petty opportunism exists among too many of the officers of our services.

2. COMMUNIST INFILTRATION

The promise: Guard against Communist infiltration on all fronts in Government and industry.

The performance: Recent revelations of American defectors to the Soviet Union point up, I feel, our need for greater security measures to counter the international Communist conspiracy. I voted for H.R. 12753, to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, to require the registration of persons disseminating political propaganda within the United States as agents of a foreign government.

I supported also H.R. 9069 to tighten up our passport laws to make it more difficult for Communist agents to move about the world. I have made several speeches both in Congress and throughout the United States on Communist penetration, in an effort to awaken the people. I have appeared before many youth conferences in Washington in an effort to stimulate their interest in American Government and to stiffen their moral fiber, to prepare them for the psychological war being conducted by the Communists for the minds of the young people.

3. TAX RELIEF

The promise: Work for a tax program which will be based on your ability to pay—a tax which will call on lower income groups to pay less. Fight for renewal of the excess profits tax on big business, the removal of which has done much to increase costs of consumer goods. I will support tax reductions and adjustments to strengthen small business in order to provide for expansion and growth.

The performance: I voted for Public Law 86-470 which permits personal income tax deduction of all medical expenses incurred by any taxpayer in care of a dependent parent over 65.

The first bill which I introduced in the Congress (H.R. 2812) was for the purpose of allowing small business a tax reduction on earnings which are "plowed back into business." This bill, I think, is a necessity because of the great competition small business presently faces from monopoly and oligopolistic industries which are able to destroy small business. It is about time that Congress defended in a positive way small business and free enterprise. The best way to do this is through the tax laws.

I introduced H.R. 7991, the purpose of which is to prevent double taxation in the case of gifts to bona fide charitable institutions by a person by means of a will.

I have made several speeches urging the renewal of excess-profits taxes.

I introduced legislation and supported measures to eliminate the telephone excise tax.

Although I voted against the 1-cent-per-gallon increase in the gasoline tax, I favored a continuation of the interstate highway program. My vote for not increasing the gas tax was based on the fact that Congress was not given a chance to consider an amendment to the gas tax bill which would have reduced the oil depletion allowance from 27½ percent to 15 percent. If this amendment had passed the gasoline tax would not have had to be raised and the small taxpayer would not have been hurt. At that time I said "I am very sorry that one of the true beneficiary groups of the new highway system—the billion dollar oil companies—are able to escape the tax burden which other people not in oil have to pay." I also noted at that time that the administration had diverted other moneys collected from the Federal highway fund for other purposes. At least $1.2 billion a year which should have specifically been earmarked for the Federal highway fund is not getting into that fund. This was the reason the taxes had to be raised.

I fought for the repeal of section 34 of the Internal Revenue Code. This section allowed credit against tax and exclusion from gross income for dividends received by individuals. Over $335 million are lost annually in additional revenue by the American people because of preferential treatment given to those who receive their incomes from dividends rather than from salaries and wages. There seems to me to be no logical reason why a person who earned his money through wages and salary should be treated differently from those who draw their income from dividends. This amendment passed the Senate but was not considered by the House because of a procedural maneuver.

4. AGRICULTURE AND CONSERVATION

The promise: Work for a farm program which will bring the income of the farmer up to the level of other workers in our economy.

The performance: I was one of the original sponsors of the Family Farm Income Act. I am still convinced that this type of legislation will become law when we have a Democratic President and a Democratic Congress.

I sponsored a food stamp plan which would utilize our surplus food in the United States to feed the millions of people who live on inadequate diets and who have little or no money for the purchase of food. Charitable organizations and educational institutions would be able to utilize to better advantage surplus food and fiber, also. Part of my food stamp plan was incorporated in Public Law 86-341.

I have consistently supported soil conservation programs.

I introduced a Chemical Pesticides Coordination Act which would require greater coordination between Federal agencies and State conservation agencies before any Federal agency embarks on a major pest eradication program. This measure was unanimously reported by the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee but was objected to when it was brought upon the House floor.

I introduced a Milk Sanitation Act to set up a national sanitary code for milk to eliminate artificial barriers in the sale of milk.

I supported a bill to create an Agricultural Research and Development Commission to find and promote new industrial uses for farm products. This bill passed both Houses of Congress but died in a conference committee.

The provisions of my bill, H.R. 12394, were passed by both Houses of Congress and sent to the President for signature, providing a realistic floor in the support price for manufacturing milk of $3.22 instead of the present $3.06, and for butterfat of 59.6 cents per pound instead of the present 56.6 cents.

Also, I introduced the Green Acres Act of 1960 providing for land retirement under a payment in kind program.

Introduced a bill to establish permanent authorization of a fully adequate nationwide milk-for-children program, in order to make sure that all of our youngsters get enough milk in their daily diets.

I introduced a bill to make it possible for the growers and feeders of livestock to be heard before the U.S. Tariff Commission at any time they feel that the importation of meat is having a seriously adverse effect on the domestic industry.

I have strongly supported the Rural Electrification Administration to provide

electric and telephone service to areas not serviced by private utility companies.

5. SOCIAL SECURITY

The promise: Fight for a program which will, first and above all, increase social security benefits.

The performance: In the closing days of the 86th Congress, a bill was passed, which I supported, which included the following features: (a) Removal of the provision formerly required that a person be 50 years old before he could qualify for social security disability benefits even though he might be totally disabled; (b) a voluntary health insurance program for our senior citizens, through the States, based on Federal contributions to the States which are willing to participate in the program; and (c) raised the limitation on income which can be earned in any calendar year by a social security recipient.

6. WORKING PEOPLE

The promise: Oppose any legislation or any other action which would destroy the right of working people to bargain collectively. Support laws to protect people over 40 against job discrimination.

The performance: The following actions were taken to benefit working people:

A bill to prevent job discrimination against people over 40 years of age.

A county industrial agent bill under which new employment opportunities can be created in rural communities and depressed areas.

I supported Public Law 86–470 which permits personal income tax deduction of all medical expenses incurred by any taxpayer in care of dependent parent over 65.

Worked to halt the continuing upward spiral in costs of natural gas; 179 communities and more than 200,000 families in Iowa have experienced 8 gas rate increases since 1951, most of which have not been approved by the Federal Power Commission. My bill would prohibit pipeline companies from imposing consecutive gas rate increases while they have a previously filed application pending before the Federal Power Commission, and to require the FPC to act more promptly on rate increase applications.

Introduced a food stamp plan so that our surplus foods can be made available to our needy citizens. Part of my proposal was incorporated in Public Law 86–341.

7. EDUCATION

The promise: Work for a program which will provide funds and other aids to outstanding students, thereby enabling them to continue further education. Put Military Academy appointments on merit basis without regard to party politics, family influence, or financial position.

The performance: Sponsored a bill to extend the benefits of the GI education bill in peacetime to those members of the armed services who have served 2 years or more. A similar bill passed the Senate but was bottled up in the House Rules Committee.

Supported the school construction bill which would have helped the States meet the rising cost and the increasing need for classrooms. This bill which passed both Houses of Congress died in the House Rules Committee which refused to send them to conference.

Sponsored a House concurrent resolution to encourage an international educational program by allowing freer and greater exchanges of students between our country and other countries.

Introduced a bill, the provisions of which were incorporated in Public Law 86–679 to extend the Library Services Act for 5 years. This act is of vast importance to Iowa since it serves as an important means of communication and education to people of all ages in our rural communities.

Have given every young man from my district who applied an opportunity to compete for an academy appointment. All appointments have been made after careful study of civil service examination grades and scholastic achievements—after the applicants have met established physical and medical requirements.

8. MONOPOLY AND SMALL BUSINESS

The promise: Fight against mergers of giant corporations causing unfair competition to small business, and against vertical integration in agriculture.

The performance: Introduced House Concurrent Resolution 430, joined by Senator KEFAUVER in the Senate, which would instruct our delegation to the United Nations to work to eliminate harmful restraints on international trade. This resolution was aimed specifically at world monopolies which keep prices at artificially high levels.

Introduced H.R. 11959 to prevent vertical integration in the retailing, feeding, slaughtering, and packing of meat food products, livestock products, and other food items.

Introduced H.R. 2812 to allow small business a tax reduction on earnings which are plowed back into the business.

Supported the fair trade bill, H.R. 1253, and signed the petition to get it reported out of the House Rules Committee. This bill would protect small business against unfair competition in nationally marketed items.

9. RISING GOVERNMENTAL COSTS

The promise: Fight hard to reduce cost of Government.

The performance: Introduced H.R. 11775 to reunify the armed services under a single civilian head. This would save billions of dollars.

My food for peace program would result in an average annual saving of over $100 million.

I vigorously dissented to an unnecessary expenditure of $12 million on the part of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics for the Century 21 Exposition at Portland, Oreg., in 1961. I lost on this one.

The reorganization of the Department of Agriculture proposed in my Family Farm Income Act would have reduced substantially the costs of that Department. It is interesting to note that within the last 7 years the Agriculture Department under Secretary Benson has spent $37 billion—$2 billion more than was spent by all the previous Secretaries of Agriculture in a period of more than 90 years.

10. SECOND DISTRICT REPRESENTATION

The promise: Do my best to fight for the best interests of the many people in this district not now being represented.

The performance: I have made the words "district representation" truly meaningful with my mobile office and a full-time field secretary. Our mobile office has traveled literally thousands of miles and has been in every county once a month during the past 2 years, and by September this office had visited at least once every town in this 12-county district. Through personal contact with this office many people experiencing problems involving the Social Security Administration, Veterans' Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency, the armed services, the Internal Revenue Service, Post Office Department, and other Federal agencies have secured a more thorough consideration of their problems and in many instances their problems have been solved.

Other accomplishments: I have supported other measures, which have been enacted into law, for the benefit of all our people, although they are of a less dramatic nature than the foregoing. A few examples are:

Public Law 86–613, which requires that hazardous substances normally sold for household use such as disinfectants, and cleansers shall be boldly labeled "Poisonous—Keep Out of Reach of Children."

Public Law 86–618, which tightens control over use of cancer-causing coal-tar coloring in food, drugs, and cosmetics.

Public Law 86–673, which authorized the Post Office Department to seek court orders to curb use of mails for distribution of obscene or fraudulent matter.

Dubuque Harbor: I am happy to report that in my first term in the Congress I was able to get Congress to authorize and to appropriate money to carry out the much-needed dredging of the Dubuque Harbor. This project is now included in a list which the Corps of Engineers will submit to the Secretary of the Army within the next few days for his approval to go ahead with the work.

Improved telephone service: Within the past 2 years many miles of new telephone lines have been built in the Second District and many rural families now have telephone service which they did not previously have—all made possible through Rural Electrification Administration telephone loans.

Federal Housing and Home Finance loan for Clinton Bridge: During my term as your Congressman an HHFA loan was approved to meet engineering fees for the proposed new Lyons-Fulton Bridge. The new bridge will replace the present Lyons-Fulton Bridge which spans the Mississippi River between North Clinton, Iowa, and Fulton, Ill. Traffic dangers will be lessened by more adequate approaches, lengthened span and widened roadway of the new bridge. Construction will begin by about April 1, 1963.

Northeast Iowa has shared in Government contracts: During my 2 years in Congress several million dollars worth of Government contracts have been awarded to industries in our district. I hope that my service on the Science and Astronautics Committee will continue to be of benefit not only to our country, but to Iowa so that it can figure prominently in the space age through new job opportunities.

Reimbursement to city of Clinton has been made since I have been your Congressman for sewer damages caused by creation of navigation pool No. 14 on the Mississippi River which was opened to navigation in 1939. This reimbursement was in the amount of $146,800.

I am proud of the work that I have done in the Congress for my constituents, for the cause of world peace and for economic and social justice for our citizens. But I shall not rest on the accomplishments of my first term in Congress. This has been just a start for what I humbly hope will be even greater accomplishments in the future.

My Pledges and How I Fulfilled Them, 1947–59

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 1, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, in order to accommodate the many requests I have been receiving for copies of my reports to my constituents, I am setting them forth as they previously appeared.

Incidentally, they provide a good comparative review of the conduct of our Government since 1948:

MY PLEDGES AND HOW I FULFILLED THEM

(Remarks of Hon. ABRAHAM J. MULTER, of New York, in the House of Representatives, Saturday, August 7, 1948)

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, during my campaign for election last year, I told my constituents my political philosophy and what they could expect of me if I were elected to represent them in the House of Representatives. They elected me with an overwhelming majority of the votes cast.

I believe that I kept my every promise and more. I think I have the right to assume that my constituents approve my conduct and my voting record here because this year the Republican Party and the Liberal Party, as well as the Democratic Party—the only party in which I have ever been enrolled—have unanimously designated me as their candidate to succeed myself.

Nevertheless, I think I should here record my pledges and how I fulfilled them.

LABOR

During my campaign, I said:

"I favor a broad social security program including old-age pensions, unemployment insurance, security for crippled and dependent children, and the blind.

"I will support a legislative program which will endeavor to establish fair-employment practices and prohibit discrimination in employment.

"Risk capital, new enterprise, and the development of our natural resources must be encouraged. Small business must be promoted. Competitive private enterprise free from control by monopolies, cartels, or any arbitrary private or public authority must be continued.

"The Taft-Hartley law is bad for the reasons stated by President Truman in his veto message to Congress. As pointed out by the President, it invites 'conflict between the National Labor Relations Board and its general counsel.' Furthermore, it puts the employer in a position where he can refuse to bargain with his employees. In fact, it puts him in the anomalous position of being able to choose the workers' bargaining agent.

"By the simple expedient of refusing to bargain with his employees the employer can force a strike.

"While the men are on strike the employer can replace them with other workers of his own choosing and then call for an election of the bargaining agent to represent the workers. At the election the strikers who were replaced will be deprived of the right to vote, with the result that the bargaining agent selected will be representative of the employer rather than the employee, whom it is supposed to represent.

"I favor increasing the minimum wages now fixed by law to a sum that will more closely approach the realities of present-day cost of living."

During my incumbency, I urged broadening the social security laws. I opposed legislation attempting to limit and to emasculate the social security laws. I urged extended benefits under the unemployment insurance laws. I urged and voted for increased compensation for the lower income Federal employees, including postal workers. I repeatedly pointed out the advantages of the New York State Fair Employment Practices Act as reasons for enactment of a similar national law. I urged enactment of a law increasing minimum wages. Nothing was done about the Taft-Hartley law because the Labor Committee could not be induced to take any action with reference thereto. I voted against weakening the anti-trust laws.

TAXATION

During my campaign, I said:

"Our tax laws must be adapted to an expanding peacetime economy, having in mind, however, that tax cuts must go first to the low-income groups. This should be accomplished by increasing the tax exemption granted to all taxpayers. By doing that the low-income earner may get complete tax exemption. At the same time, the man in the higher brackets will get an equal advantage. It will be fair to all, while, at the same time, helping those who need it most. I also favor the enactment of a law which will grant the same income-tax privileges to all married people throughout the country, regardless of whether they live in a so-called community-property State or not. It is rank absurdity to permit a man and wife in one State by the simple expediency of changing their residence to another State to obtain tax advantages under our Federal income-tax laws. The situation can be remedied only by Federal legislation."

During my incumbency, I urged enactment of tax legislation to effectuate my promises. That part putting all our citizens on an equal basis as to so-called community property has been enacted into law. I opposed the tax bill submitted and voted to sustain the Presidential veto of that bill because it unfairly gave the largest tax cuts to those best able to pay and gave the smallest cuts to those least able to pay. About 70 percent of the tax cut was given to about 6 percent of our taxpayers. Ninety-four percent of our taxpayers received only 30 percent of the tax cut. Bills which I introduced to broaden the tax exemption base, to eliminate inequalities, to exempt pensions, and to eliminate wartime nuisance taxes failed of enactment.

HOUSING

During my campaign, I said:

"The Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill should have long since been enacted into law. It should be passed at the earliest possible moment. The Government must do everything possible to encourage and aid private industry in relieving the housing shortage by the building of permanent homes for all those who need them."

During my incumbency, I fought continuously for adequate housing legislation. My first official act, after taking my oath of office, was to sign the petition to bring the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill before the House for debate and for a vote. My effectiveness was increased by my election to the Committee on Banking and Currency which had this legislation before it. My efforts are reflected by the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and were publicized by the press.

PRICE AND RENT CONTROL

During my camgaign, I said:

"Control of the price to be paid for any commodity, whether it be the use of property or the purchase of food, clothing, or anything else, can be justified only as the use of police power in an emergency. That the emergency has existed and still exists cannot be denied as to both food and rents. Some relief may be obtained by the enactment of rent-control statutes by the various States. Such local control can be made effective by proper legislation and by proper administration. Houses cannot be moved across State lines to avoid such local legislation.

"Foodstuffs, however, must be controlled on a national scale. They cannot be controlled locally. If we were to have local legislation fixing prices in one community, the producers could beat the law by the simple expedient of sending their merchandise to communities that do not have such restrictions.

"I am in complete agreement with President Truman's policy of attempting to solve the situation by voluntary discipline. If that does not solve the problem, then price control will be the only way out. It will be the last resort if the emergency continues."

During my incumbency I introduced a comprehensive price-control bill and repeatedly urged enactment of price-control legislation, but my pleadings fell upon deaf ears. The efforts of my colleagues who joined with me in urging effective rent-control legislation was only slightly more effective. A weak, but bettter than none at all, rent-control bill was enacted after long and arduous debate. By the dint of almost superhuman effort, a provision which would have made the entire bill unconstitutional was eliminated. I also introduced a bill to control fuel during emergencies.

FOREIGN POLICY

During my campaign I said:

"I have been preaching the establishment of a Jewish homeland in Palestine since 1921. The President and the Democratic Party favor the opening of Palestine to unrestricted Jewish immigration and colonization and the establishment there of a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth.

"We favor the majority report of the United Nations Special Committee on Palestine as the best means presently available to solve the problem. We urge the immediate implementation of the program there advanced.

"The Communist Daily Worker and its American Labor Party candidate opposing me in this campaign have attacked me as a warmonger, not because I have talked out

against their beloved Russia, but because I have dared to talk out in support of the American democratic way of life. These are my principles, and these are the principles which they find fault with:

"In order that the world may not again be drenched in blood by international outlaws and criminals we must 'join with the other united nations in the establishment of an international organization based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states, open to membership by all such states, large and small, for the prevention of aggression and the maintenance of international peace and security.' To 'make all necessary and effective agreements and arrangements through which the nations would maintain adequate forces to meet the needs of preventing war and of making impossible the preparation for war and which would have such forces available for joint action when necessary.

" 'Such organization must be endowed with power to employ armed forces when necessary to prevent aggression and preserve peace.

" 'We favor the maintenance of an international court of justice, of which the United States shall be a member, and the employment of diplomacy, conciliation, arbitration, and other like methods, where appropriate, in the settlement of international disputes.

" 'World peace is of transcendent importance.'

"The quotation is from the Democratic national platform of 1944. Those were my sentiments then—they are my sentiments now. President Truman and my party have reasserted them time and time again. We will deal with Russia and everyone else around the peace table. We will do all in our power to prevent war. If Russia and the Russians want communism they can have it and we will do nothing to change their minds about it, provided they keep it to and for themselves.

"By the same token we want none of their Communist ideology here and we will do all in our power to keep it out of this country.

"When Hitler and Stalin had a peace treaty the Communists and their fellow travelers in this country were most vociferous in their demands that we be isolationists and send neither food nor munitions to Britain or France. At that time the Munich appeasement was applauded and Hitler's attack upon the rest of Europe was an imperialistic war by the countries attacked.

"When Hitler ignored his peace treaty and attacked Russia this same group found that the imperialistic war was a people's war and they could not get our boys and supplies over fast enough.

"Thank God they were in time and Hitler and his murderous hordes were eliminated.

"During those days there were no insults by the Vishinskys and the Molotovs. Parenthetically I might ask: Has Litvinov, who did so much to bring about friendly relations between the United States and Russia been liquidated because he was foolish enough to think that the Russians intended to do all the amicable and peace-loving things that he preached while we were fighting together?

"There is only one way to preserve our American heritage and our American birthright, and that is to at all times be so militarily strong that no one will dare attack us. The world must know that never again will we be in a position where any aggressor nation can pull a Pearl Harbor on us.

"If that is warmongering, I am willing that my name be placed alongside of those of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Harry S. Truman, James Byrnes, George Marshall, Averell Harriman, and David Lilienthal.

"The Marshall plan to relieve the dire need and distress of a stricken world must be put into effect at the earliest possible moment.

"That, even faster than military might, will stop the Communist hordes in their tracks."

During my incumbency, I worked assiduously to enact into reality the things I preached during all my adult life.

The establishment of the free state of Israel became a reality. It has been and will continue to be aided in every respect by every freedom-loving American. Our Government will soon give Israel full and complete recognition; it will give Israel all the aid that a friendly ally is entitled to; it will soon receive a $100 million loan from our country. My efforts in connection with all thereof, which are still continuing, I prefer not to record at this time. In due time, others may see fit to tell about them.

I am proud of my vote in support of the Marshall plan, now known as the European recovery plan, and I am proud of my vote to eliminate from the House version of that bill aid to Franco Spain.

My vote in favor of selective service—the draft—was not only dictated by my conscience and my belief that it was in the best interests of peace, but it was in accordance with my pledge to my constituents during my campaign. I lived through two World Wars. My older son served overseas in World War II. My younger son is subject to the new law I supported. I feel as deeply as any the waste of money and manpower for military purposes. But just as we would not vote to disband a municipal police force, we must insist on a national and an international police force.

I fought for a fair displaced persons bill and opposed the discriminatory and unfair provisions of the bill as it was passed.

I introduced a bill to permit adopted children to enter our country free of quota restrictions.

I introduced a bill to sever all relations with Lebanon.

I introduced a bill to withhold from Britain and all other countries the equivalent of the moneys they were lending and/or giving to the Arab aggressor nations.

I introduced a bill to investigate conditions in Palestine.

I introduced a bill to exempt from penal prosecution all Americans who enlisted in the army of Israel.

I introduced a bill calling for limitation of the veto power in the United Nations.

I introduced a bill to improve the Veterans' Administration.

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES

During my campaign, I said:

"I condemn the tactics of the Un-American Activities Committee in pilloring men and destroying reputations without giving the accused an opportunity to be heard."

During my incumbency, I did not hesitate to make my stand known. I actively opposed with all my energy the enactment of the Mundt-Nixon bill. At the same time, I gave no comfort to the Communists and their fellow travelers and to totalitarianists, no matter what name they used. Nevertheless, I opposed and voted against giving any funds to the Un-American Activities Committee.

MISCELLANEOUS

I could write volumes on my activities on behalf of my constituents who needed help. I will leave that story to be told by those who called upon me from time to time.

Anyone and everyone who called upon me received a respectful hearing. One thing I did not and never will permit is to allow anyone, individual or delegation of individuals, to call upon me under false colors, using high-sounding but misleading names. Whenever they do, I will expose them for what they are.

Those who desire a more detailed record of my activities will find my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under the following subjects on the pages indicated:

Adopted children: 9550, A4702.

Americanism: A3101, A3451, A3800, A3903.

Brotherhood: 1284, A648, A1105, A3145, A3634.

Brooklyn has a remedy: A3905.

Brooklyn adopts Breukelen: A944.

Civil rights: 2550, 5856, 5859, 5860, 5861, 5862, 6043, 6108, 6109, 6117, 6492, 9532, 10110, A1321, A1527, A1547, A1586, A3910, A4056.

Communism, first session: A4770. Second session: 6108, A1524, A1664, A1968, A1985, A2320, A3090, A3091, A3458, A3695, A3813, A3868 A4090, A4168, A4670, A4673, A4768, A4779, A4833, A4842, A4915, A4947, A5067.

Control of prices and rents, first session: 11732, A4922, A4929. Second session: 1433, 1621, 1988, 2868, 2871, 2888, 2957, 2962–2964, 2980, 8890, 9761, 9875, 9888, 10206–10207, 10241, A903, A3950, A4835, A4950.

Congressional investigations and the Un-American Activities Committee: 2413, A1547, A3391.

Displaced persons: 7874, 8860, 10110, A1105, A1529, A2724, A2938, A3391, A4903, A4960.

European Recovery Plan—the Marshall plan: 7164, 7207, A3699.

Fuel emergency: 1433.

Gag rule, first session: 11724. Second session: 9875, 9888, 10241.

Housing: 2014, 9875, 10206–10207, 10241, A3142, A3714, A3950, A4960, A5078.

Italy: 4438, A2394.

Palestine: 431, 1421, 3396, 3510, 5515, 5990, 6549, 6989, 7071, 7725, 7982, 9351, A497, A637, A795, A899, A905, A1320, A1826, A2320, A2322, A2380, A2396, A2398, A2574, A2724, A3014, A3050, A3143, A3450, A3456, A3488, A3522, A3654, A3656, A3694, A3695, A3699, A3712, A3817, A3833, A3844, A3854, A3959, A4278, A4668.

Postal workers: A2851.

Rayfiel, Hon. Leo F.: 2998.

Religious education: A3688, A4275.

Reconstruction Finance Corporation: 5444.

Selective Service: 38, 8507, 8677, A1326.

Surplus property: 716.

Taxes, first session: 11429. Second session: 200, 716, 4079, 5749.

United Nations: 4438, 5462, A4960.

Veterans: 38, 2512, A2724, A5253.

The gentleman from Mississippi: 431, 1988, 2550, 2980, 7874, 9532, 10110, A1586, A3450, A4056.

Youth united: A4056.

YOUR CONGRESSMAN REPORTS TO HIS CONSTITUENTS

(Remarks of Hon. ABRAHAM J. MULTER, of New York, in the House of Representatives, Tuesday, September 19, 1950)

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the 81st Congress is approaching the end of its sessions after two long and difficult years of legislative work. This is a proper time to report to my constituents on some of the major problems which confronted us during the past 2 years. The people of my district are entitled to know how their Representative in Congress served their interests and that of the Nation as a whole. They will have an opportunity to pronounce judgment on my record of service on election day.

During each of my campaigns for election, I fully and fairly made known my views on all major political and economic problems. I made it crystal clear to them what they could expect of me as their Representative, how I would represent them, what I would fight for, and what I would fight against. They elected me by overwhelming majorities, in 1948 by more than 3 to 1. I am very grateful to the people of my district for this outpouring of confidence

in me. I believe I have fulfilled every promise made to them.

For the third time in succession my party—the Democratic Party—has designated me unanimously for another term in Congress. The Liberal Party also is unanimously supporting my candidacy, as it has done twice before.

Labor's League for Political Education, in its congressional scorecard issued for the guidance of American Federation of Labor members and the public generally, has given me a perfect score on 10 selected key issues in Congress, including such matters as the Taft-Hartley Act, rent control, public housing, minimum wages, antitrust laws, social security, and others.

Similarly, the Congress for Industrial Organizations—CIO—published a supplement to the CIO News where the voting record of all Members of Congress was appraised on the basis of 13 selected issues, and I was rated as having voted "right" on every issue.

The magazine, New Republic, in a special supplement containing a progress report on the 81st Congress, gave me a score of 100 percent on 15 major issues, among them the Marshall plan, reciprocal trade, broadening social security, veterans' pension plan, antipoll tax, Brannan farm plan, and others mentioned previously.

More recently, the well-known liberal organization, Americans for Democratic Action, labeled my voting record perfect on what they considered the 15 most important issues. These included some of those already mentioned by the other organizations, as well as Korean aid, FEPC, middle-income housing, point 4 aid to underdeveloped areas, the natural gas bill, health reorganization plan, Defense Production Act, and the Wood-Mundt-Nixon bill.

During the 1st and 2d sessions of the 81st Congress over 12,000 pieces of legislation were introduced, including public and private bills and various resolutions. Several hundreds of these reached the floor of the House for action. Those and many others were carefully studied and analyzed by me. I voted at all times in the best interests of the people of the United States and of my district, but never provincially and never contrary to my platform pledges.

My record in Congress is an open book. I modestly, yet proudly, present this record to my constituents and invite them to acquaint themselves with my efforts and accomplishments. I do not pretend to be infallible. Suggestions and constructive criticism will always be welcomed by me.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

During my campaign in 1948, I expressed the following views:

"Peace and democracy at home gain when democracy abroad is healthy. The Marshall plan to rehabilitate Europe strengthens our economy and helps destroy subversive influences. Antidemocratic doctrines must be vigorously combated. We want peace without appeasement.

"Strengthen the United Nations. A strong United Nations demands a strong United States of America. Discard the veto power. Establish an international police force to prevent aggression."

In the 2 years that have passed since I stated these views communism has made serious inroads abroad, particularly in Asia, but it was stopped in Europe where countries like Italy, France, Greece, and others were threatened. Thanks to the aid given them through the Marshall plan, the march of communism in Europe was successfully contained. The United States has demonstrated to the world that she desires peace, but that she is not desirous of attaining it through appeasement of communistic efforts at enslavement of the world.

Unfortunately, the situation is different in Asia where open warfare and bloodshed are the order of the day as a result of the invasion of South Korea by the Communists of North Korea, using Russian arms and serving as a spearhead of Russian imperialism in the Far East. If we had had a stronger United Nations, if the U.N. had discarded the veto which Soviet Russia is utilizing for its own interests and to the detriment of the U.N. and world peace, if the U.N. would have had a strong international police force to deal with acts of aggression—it is very likely that the Soviet aggression in Korea would never have been risked and communism would have been stopped in its tracks in Asia as in Europe.

I have supported the Marshall plan during the past 2 years and I shall continue to support it in the future. I shall also continue my efforts to build a strong U.N., as I have done in the past. I voted for the Korean-aid bills originally, and more recently supported the bill providing additional funds for military assistance.

On the matter of war, I stated on the floor of the House of Representatives on March 7, 1950, as follows:

"The American people do not want war. I believe the Russian people do not want war either—if only they had the opportunity to speak their mind freely. But if war nevertheless engulfs this world, it will be due to the insatiable lust for power on the part of the present rulers of Soviet Russia."

On June 26, 1950, the day after the brutal and unwarranted attack by the Communists on South Korea, I supported the declaration of the U.N. Security Council condemning this aggressive act and I lauded President Truman's decision to aid the U.N. I said:

"No one can consider it a warlike act for us to carry out our obligations as a member of the United Nations to protect our weaker sisters from brutal, unprovoked aggression. No one in our time has done more than President Harry S. Truman to bring about permanent peace in every part of the world. * * * His action with reference to Korea and the Far East is further proof of his determination to maintain peace. Our country and all the peace-loving peoples of the world will be ever grateful to him for his patience until action could no longer be withheld, and for the speed and forthrightness with which he ordered our Armed Forces to the defense of democracy when no other alternative was possible."

On June 30, 1950, President Truman graciously wrote to me with reference to this subject. He said in part:

"Your assurances will be helpful indeed as we go forward with the steps necessary for the promotion of peace and stability in the world."

PRICE CONTROL

Next to the problem of war, the most immediate threat to our democratic way of life is the spiraling inflationary situation which took on sudden momentum after the outbreak of the conflict in Korea. Prices of food, clothing, and other necessities of life began to soar sky high, and hoarding once again reared its ugly head. During my campaign in 1948 I said:

"Runaway prices of food, clothing, and other necessaries make it harder and harder for you to make ends meet. American family life cannot survive without food, shelter, and clothing which the people can afford."

It would extend my report to undue proportions to cite the many instances in the past 2 years when I spoke up in Congress against high prices and in favor of effective price control and the interests of the consumer. I have appealed for an end to profiteering and for the necessary measures to stop hoarding.

More recently, when Congress was considering the Defense Production Act of 1950 to establish the necessary controls for the present emergency, I supported the establishment of such controls and urged granting the President the necessary powers to control prices, wages, rationing, credits, and commodity speculation. On August 2, 1950, I said in the House:

"If we must invoke controls, price controls, wage con'rols, and other controls we ought to go all out and make them enforceable."

The next day I said:

"Price and wage stabilization is intended to eliminate and prevent profiteering, manipulation and speculation, and to protect the consumer, the wage earner, and the investor from undue impairment of their living conditions."

And on August 10, shortly before the House voted on the Defense Production Act, I made a final appeal and issued a warning, as follows:

"In a few moments you are going to be called upon to stand up and be counted and have your names recorded permanently in the records of this Congress so that your children and the children who come after them may know who stood up here and said: 'Send them over to fight, but keep from them that which they need in order to be able to fight. Regiment the boys into the armed services. Regiment little lobbyless John Q. Consumer back home. But stay away from the untouchables who can pressure us with their powerful lobbies. Exempt the agricultural exploiters, the commodity-exchange manipulators, and the real estate interests. Control the little man and woman in the home and in their daily activities, but let the moneylenders and the moneychangers and the gamblers run riot.'

"The time will soon come for you to be recorded; let your conscience be your guide."

RENT CONTROL

Coupled with the problem of rising prices, profiteering and protection of the consumer is the question of rent control. During the campaign in 1948, I said:

"We must continue the fight against exorbitant rents. Low-cost housing and slum clearance laws must be enacted."

I have fought consistently for an effective rent control act. I am aware of the great hardships to the people in the large metropolitan areas who are threatened by any relaxation of rent control and I raised my voice in Congress on numerous occasions to bring this matter to the attention of all legislators. Typical of my remarks on this matter are the following:

January 18, 1950:

"I think every man, no matter what his politics may be, who comes from any metropolitan community, any large municipality, must stand for an extension of rent control at this time."

March 30, 1950:

"There are still millions of families who urgently need the protection which this law (i.e. rent control) affords them, and there are still hundreds of thousands of families who have to live doubled-up because of lack of sufficient housing. * * * In view of the fact that rent has always been a basic factor in the cost of living for many millions of families, and in view of the slow but gradual increase in unemployment in many sections of the country, we should not be too hasty in suspending this means of protection which will unquestionably hurt the lower income groups very severely. I fear that if we allow the rent control law to lapse, that if we do not renew it for another year, our inaction or refusal to extend its protection to those millions of our citizenry who still need it, may lead to a chain of events which would

seriously undermine the economic stability of many areas of the country. * * * Let us not encourage economic chaos; let us not contribute to economic instability. Rent control is still a matter of emergency legislation. It is absolutely necessary."

June 13, 1950:

"Who wants this continuance of rent control? Is it, as you have been told by some of the opponents of the bill, only the left-wing or the Communists or those who think along the same lines? Six of the largest and most influential national veterans' organizations of this country came before our committee and asked that these controls be continued. The CIO and the AFL asked that these controls be continued."

After a bitter struggle, Congress voted to continue the rent control law until the end of 1950 with a provision for an additional 6-month extension for local municipalities which enact laws therefor.

The Korean war and the resulting emergency, of course, make it imperative that rent control be continued, and strengthened. It will be one of my major tasks to fight for a more stringent rent control law in the next session.

HOUSING

The enactment of housing legislation, including adequate provisions for slum clearance and low-rent housing projects, is of utmost importance. In this matter I supported President Truman and the plank in the 1948 Democratic platform which said:

"This Nation is shamed by the failure of the Republican 80th Congress to pass the vitally needed general housing legislation as recommended by the President."

Throughout the session of Congress I urged housing legislation for the benefit of low-income groups, including cooperative housing projects. When the executive board of the CIO passed a resolution on February 16, 1950, urging Congress to approve the middle-income housing bill, I had that resolution reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the same day so that all Members of Congress might read it. When the bill came up before the House on March 20, I described to my colleagues the cooperative housing movement in certain Western European countries as I had observed it on a mission for the House Committee on Banking and Currency. I said:

"The surest way to make a convert to capitalism and to individualism is to give a family a piece of property or an equity in it, no matter how little. Give him the opportunity to call something his own and he will fight to the death the efforts of socialism or communism to take it away."

When some Members wanted to retain certain obnoxious provisions in the housing bill, I frankly stated on March 22:

"They say those provisions are not special legislation; they do not take care of special groups. They just take care of big business, the financial fraternity of the country, the big builders. Of course, when we do anything like that we are never catering to special interests. But when you try to take care of the forgotten man who is never forgotten when it comes to taxes, the fellow in the middle-income group who is carrying the tax burden of our Government, you are told we are socialistic, communistic, collectivistic, discriminatory, everything except what it is."

LABOR, SOCIAL SECURITY, AND UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

During my campaign in 1948, I said:

"The aged, the ill, and the unemployed must be cared for. A broad program affords your best protection against depression and the awful hazards of illness and disability. The gains of labor must not be impaired."

My opposition to the Taft-Hartley labor law is a matter of record. My votes against this bill and some of its rigid antilabor amendments have been duly noted by the American Federation of Labor, the Railroad Brotherhoods, the CIO, and all patriotic labor unions. I shall continue to work for the removal of its restrictions on labor unions and the laboring masses. At the same time I shall continue to work for sound labor relations during the present emergency and to keep strikes at a minimum in order to maintain production at a high rate.

I have been an ardent supporter of the Social Security Act and worked for its expansion to include 10 million additional people. The expanded act finally went into effect recently thereby substantially increasing benefit payments to many millions of our citizens. Due to the more liberal provisions of the act many who were ineligible before will now be entitled to receive social-security payments. In time, it is hoped, the act will entitle our entire adult population to the benefits of old-age and survivors' insurance when they reach the statutory age. I shall continue to work toward that goal.

In the matter of unemployment, I constantly advocated that the necessary measures be taken to prevent a rise in unemployment. Among such measures, I urged the repeal of wartime excise taxes on a large number of commodities and articles in order to stimulate production and purchasing of such articles on a larger scale. In a statement to the House Ways and Means Committee urging repeal of such taxes, I said:

"I am also fearful of the effect this will have in the near future on the employment situation, not only in the industries affected by the excise taxes where already considerable unemployment is being reported, but even in other fields."

Fortunately, at the present time our unemployment figures are among the lowest in our peacetime history. For those who unfortunately must remain on the unemployed lists I wholeheartedly favor maximum payments under unemployment insurance.

TAXES

During my campaign in 1948, I said:

"Low income earners should not pay taxes. The first $3,500 of income should be exempt."

Throughout my incumbency of office I have supported the idea of tax exemption for the low-income groups. Notwithstanding the need for higher taxation resulting from the war in Korea and our defense needs, I still believe that the burden of taxation should be taken off the shoulders of the small wage earners and placed upon the high income groups, big business, and the big corporations.

When I advocated the repeal of excise taxes, I did it primarily because it hurts the small-income people most. The Korean conflict, unfortunately, postponed the possibility of repealing the excise nuisance taxes.

I also earnestly support an excess-profits tax to stave off excessive profiteering on the part of a small group at the expense of the rest of the population. An excess-profits tax at this time would help take the burden off the small taxpayer.

I urged repeatedly that we pay for armaments and defense as we incur the expenses therefor. That means more taxes now.

I voted against adjourning the Congress until we enact an excess-profits tax. I earnestly hope we will do so before the end of the year.

In the matter of excess profits, I said:

"One need not be an economist to know that you control profits when you control prices. A primary result of price control is the limitation of profits."

CIVIL RIGHTS

During my campaign in 1948, I said:

"Safeguard freedom of opinion and speech. Sustain our traditions of justice and fair trial. Eliminate poll taxes. Abolish discrimination."

I have worked most diligently to safeguard civil rights in this country, notwithstanding the hysteria of the times and the befuddled thinking of conservative forces who are dividing our people at a time when unity is most urgent. As the leading nation of the free world we should be a model of democracy and should set an example in practicing the principles of tolerance, understanding, and the treatment of minorities in our midst. Abolition of discriminatory practices in employment, in education, in the Armed Forces, in housing, and other phases of our activity will not only safeguard our freedom here, but will help us gain many friends throughout the world for the cause of democracy.

During the term of the 81st Congress, I spoke up on numerous occasions for the maintenance of civil rights. Here are a few such examples:

January 12, 1950:

"Never before in world history was there greater need for human understanding, good will, and lasting peace than in the present postwar critical period. * * * False prophets and hatemongers in our own country spread doctrines of bigotry and hatred which serve only to undermine the unity of our people at a time when such unity is urgently needed for our very survival."

January 18, 1950:

"I hope that on Monday of next week this House will call up for final action the FEPC bill that has been receiving so much attention throughout the country. At this time I want to direct your attention to the fact that one more step in the right direction to eliminate discrimination in this Nation has been taken by the Army, pursuant to an order issued by Gen. Gordon Gray. He has issued an order which requires that Negro troops be integrated into every branch of the service. * * * Last year I introduced a bill in the House which would attempt to accomplish the same purpose in the National Guard. * * * The enactment of the FEPC law on a national scale will go a long way toward eliminating those very situations which bring about such riots and lynchings, it will be one further step in the accomplishment of true freedom, freedom in the democratic way."

The FEPC bill was finally called up in the House on February 22, 1950, and I voted for it. Although it was stymied in the Senate, I continued to urge final passage of this bill and other civil rights bills.

I urged home rule for the 900,000 disenfranchised Americans living in our Capital City of Washington.

In continuing the struggle against intolerance, on March 22, 1950, I said:

"My view is that wherever bigotry and intolerance of our fellow men is practiced, in any part of our country, it should be exposed. Every effort should be made to eliminate the cancerous growth of hatred and prejudice wherever it shows its ugly head."

When the courts of New York upheld the restrictions limiting the huge housing project of Stuyvesant Town to whites only, I advocated that the U.S. Supreme Court reverse that decision. I stated as follows:

"The effort to reverse that decision has significance which goes beyond the field of housing or even the problem of racial discrimination. Unless the decision is reversed it may set a precedent which in time may prove ominous to our whole American pattern of democratic government."

When reports reached me that segregation and discrimination are gradually and successfully being eliminated at our military bases and camps, I said on August 15, 1950:

"At a time when our democratic system is on the defensive the elimination of racial segregation in our Armed Forces is a very encouraging factor. It is the best reply to Communist hypocrisy and doubletalk. Na-

tions throughout the world cannot fail to realize that as a Nation we stand united, in peace or war. They, likewise, will realize that the rights of minority people and human rights for all are best respected and defended in countries which practice true democracy."

COMMUNISM

During my campaign in 1948, I said:

"Fight communism, but not at the expense of Americanism."

I have favored elimination of subversive and disloyal elements from Government service, but I am vigorously opposed to any punishment being meted out to any of our citizens who may have different political views. Thought control is not in the American spirit or tradition. It is the practice of dictatorships, not of democracies.

Discussing the question of democracy versus communism, I said on May 2, 1950:

"The late Franklin D. Roosevelt, at a time of national emergency, told the people of this country that the only thing we had to fear was fear itself. Should another emergency arise, the American people will not be afraid to rise to the situation. Our problem is how to avoid that emergency, how to stave off disintegration from within and destruction of our freedom from without."

On another occasion, on May 24, I brought to the attention of Congress the excellent article by David Dubinsky, president of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, published in the magazine Foreign Affairs, in which he discussed the new international labor organization created earlier this year in London and the role of free labor throughout the world as a dynamic force in the struggle against communism. On another occasion, I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full text of a plan by Walter Reuther, president of the United Automobile Workers Union, in which he suggested a positive peace offensive to stop Communist aggression by initiating a program of economic and social action to eliminate poverty, human insecurity, and injustice which are the sources of Communist power.

Although I have spoken out against communism on numerous occasions, I was and still am opposed to so-called control bills. I opposed the Mundt-Nixon bill when it first came up 2 years ago, I opposed it when it was revived recently as the so-called Wood bill. I said then and I still say that such bills are bad, they will do us untold harm and will not help us solve the situation.

During my 1948 campaign I frankly told the voters that I had voted against the Mundt-Nixon bill and why. I made perfectly clear that if reelected I would vote against any similar bill.

I would have been duty bound to vote against the Wood-Mundt-Nixon bill this year if it were only as bad as the Mundt-Nixon bill of 1948. As a matter of fact, it was much worse.

The company in which I find myself in opposing this bill is small, but indeed select. It includes our President, Harry S. Truman; our Attorney General, J. Howard McGrath; FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover; our Secretary of Defense, Gen. George C. Marshall; our Secretary of State, Dean Acheson; our Director of Intelligence, Gen. Walter Bedell Smith; Gen. Dwight Eisenhower; Catholic Bishop Bernard Shiel, of the Archdiocese of Chicago; Philip Murray, of the CIO; William Green, of the A.F. of L.; Walter Reuther, of the UAW; David Dubinsky, of the ILGWU; and Jacob Potofsky, of the ACWU. I have no doubt that time will prove us right.

In opposing the bill in the House of Representatives on September 20, I said:

"I bow to no man in or out of this Congress in a desire to preserve this country and its good, true—yes, divine principles of democracy. Time is too brief to call again to your attention the arguments that were raised against the Mundt-Nixon bill 2 years ago and then against the present bill a short time ago when we considered it. They are still valid against this bill."

I enumerated some of the dangerous parts of the bill. They were referred to at length by President Truman when he vetoed the bill. The bill is designed to catch votes and headlines but not spies.

As I told the Congress, the alien and sedition laws of 1798 were directed against subversives too. The reported cases, however, show that the only ones convicted and jailed under them were Republicans who opposed legislation espoused by the Federalists—the then majority party. I do not want my party prosecuting Republicans or even Dixiecrats, nor do I ever want to find Democrats in a position to be prosecuted by them—because of political or religious beliefs. Under this very bad law I can be prosecuted for urging its amendment or repeal.

I have and always will be in the forefront of every fight against totalitarianism under every guise and every name. Just as vigorously will I fight for our American principles of democracy.

ADMISSION OF DISPLACED PERSONS

During my campaign of 1948, I said: "Stop discrimination against Catholics, Protestants, and Jewish displaced persons. We want no Nazis here."

I am happy to report to my constituents that Congress finally passed a more liberal DP bill, minus most of the discriminatory clauses of the old DP Act. The number of DP's eligible to enter the United States has been substantially increased, certain preferences were established for orphans and children, while the eligibility date has been moved forward several years making many thousands of DP's eligible for admission. After 2 long years of struggle, our efforts in this matter finally were successful.

Let me add, that on March 15, 1950, I introduced a bill to provide nonquota immigration status for children coming to this country for adoption by American citizens. At a later date, I called the attention of Congress to the work being done by the International Refugee Organization which is caring for and feeding the DP's in the camps. I urged that sufficient funds be made available to this organization to help it find homes for the remaining DP's and thus finally resolve the DP question.

ISRAEL

During my campaign in 1948, I said:

"A free democratic homeland is the hope of the Jewish people. It must not be bartered away by imperialistic powers, intent only upon private gain. Extend de jure recognition. Lift the arms embargo. Grant the loan. Stop aggression."

The picture has vastly changed during these 2 years. Israel is today recognized by nearly all the nations of the world, it is a member of the United Nations, the war on its frontiers has been stopped, the United States has granted it a $100 million loan and has removed the arms embargo. Relations between Israel and the United States are most cordial and friendly, and Israel is supporting our efforts in Korea.

Earlier this year, when the Arab countries were arming at a furious pace and threatening Israel with a second round, many of us in Congress demanded that this country take steps to prevent a renewal of bloodshed and to protest against British arms shipments to the Arabs. I was among the first to warn of dire consequences unless the armament race in the Near East is ended. Beginning in February of this year and succeeding months, I spoke on the matter in the House, I contacted personally high officials in our Government, I went with congressional delegations to Secretary of State Acheson. I exerted every effort in my power to gain active American support to secure the existence of the Jewish state. Finally, on May 25 the three-power declaration was issued whereby the armament race was ended and the nations of the Near East were warned against aggressive acts.

I also spoke out against the internationalization of Jerusaleum, for peace between Israel and the Arab States, for economic assistance to Israel to help it stabilize its economy and integrate the hundreds of thousands of new immigrants entering the country. In April, when Israel celebrated the second anniversary of its independence, I organized a salute to Israel on the floor of the House and more than 40 Congressmen participated with addresses and statements of greeting to the Jewish state and its leaders. At the request of the American Zionist Council, which includes all Zionist groups in the United States, I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a review prepared by the council of the accomplishments of Israel in the first 2 years as an independent state.

I was privileged to accompany to the White House, Mr. Benjamin G. Browdy, president of the Zionist Organization of America, on two different occasions and will participate in conferences with President Truman concerning Israel, its political and economic problems, and its close ties with the United States.

OTHER ISSUES AND EFFORTS

The issues previously referred to were among the most important ones that came before the 81st Congress. There were others, some of lesser importance from the international standpoint, but all of great significance to large segments of our population. In each such instance I took a stand fearlessly and worked assiduously to enact those ideas which I considered constructive and to oppose those which I considered detrimental. Let me enumerate just a few of these:

I introduced a bill to assist cooperative and other nonprofit organizations in the construction of housing for families of moderate income.

I urged loans to needy students to enable them to continue their education over a period of 4 years at the rate of $1,000 per year.

Time and again I brought to the attention of Congress the plight of oppressed minorities all over the world, including that of the Jews in Russia, the true situation concerning Jewish life in that unhappy country, the rise of anti-Semitism there, the refusal to allow Jews to emigrate to Israel, and the extermination of Jewish religious and cultural life there.

On several occasions I protested the revival of anti-Semitism in Germany and the deterioration of democracy there, and our failure to denazify the Germans. On May 23, 1950, I introduced a resolution asking for the appointment of a bipartisan commission to investigate American policy in Germany.

I urged immediate ratification of the Genocide Convention of the United Nations to outlaw mass murder of whole peoples as practiced by the Nazis, and as threatened to be practiced by the Communists.

I protested against the rigged and phony trials of Cardinal Mindszenty in Hungary and of Cardinal Stepinac in Yugoslavia. I repeatedly urged our State Department to remonstrate with these Governments against their incarceration.

I introduced a bill to issue a special postage stamp to honor the memory of Col. David (Mickey) Marcus, the Brooklyn hero who died in the fight for Israel's independence.

I introduced a bill to amend the Tariff Act by stabilizing import duties in order to encourage trade relations with foreign countries.

I supported and voted for the various reorganization plans submitted by President

Truman to make the executive departments of our Government more efficient.

I protested vigorously to the House Committee on Post Office against the curtailment of the postal service as false economy and urged the reestablishment of the service and introduced a bill to accomplish that purpose.

I supported the President's point 4 program to aid underdeveloped areas of the world. I spoke up for Americanism, for religious freedom and brotherhood, a helping hand to Italy, unity of Ireland, dissolution of the monopolies in order to aid small business, and many other phases of activity in American life.

In arriving at my conclusion as to how to vote on legislation I always had in mind that veterans who had answered the call of their country and their families were entitled to certain rights and privileges which must always be respected and preserved and my vote has always been cast so as to preserve their best interests.

I am not touching at this time on the numerous efforts in behalf of the many constituents who called upon me for help of one sort or another. In every instance, I did everything I could to help them. The voters of my district have been good to me in permitting me to serve them. I have tried to reciprocate in kind.

CONCLUSION

The United States and all the free people of the world are now in the midst of a world crisis. Unity of purpose is the demand of the hour. The whole world looks to this country for guidance and leadership in the days ahead to make life more secure for ourselves and our children and to bring lasting peace to a tortured mankind that has not known the meaning of real peace for many years. I have great confidence in the American people, in their loyalty to the highest ideals of mankind, in their will to uphold and maintain our democratic way of life. With God's help, we will go forward to a better day.

YOUR CONGRESSMAN REPORTS TO HIS CONSTITUENTS

(Remarks of Hon. ABRAHAM J. MULTER, of New York, in the House of Representatives, Friday, July 4, 1952)

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the 82d Congress is approaching the end of its sessions and this seems an appropriate time to report to my constituents on my service.

During the 2 years when this Congress was in session our Nation was confronted with many important problems at home and abroad. As each of these problems came up before Congress, I sought to the best of my ability to serve the interests of the Nation as a whole, as well as those of the people of my district. Ever since I first took the oath of office as a Member of Congress my guide has always been that all-embracing phrase in the preamble of the Constitution of the United States which reads:

"We, the people of the United States, in order to * * * promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity do ordain and establish this Constitution."

The welfare and liberty of the people, to my mind, are the two greatest principles and needs of our time.

In presenting this, my third report to my constituents, I wish to take this opportunity to express my gratefulness to the people of my district who thrice have elected and reelected me to this high office, each time by overwhelming majorities. I appreciate more than words can express this great outpouring of confidence and encouragement.

Now, for the fourth time in succession, the Democratic Party has unanimously designated me for another term of 2 years in Congress. Similarly, the Liberal Party, after reviewing my record in Congress, is supporting my candidacy for reelection, as it has done on previous occasions.

Many endorsements and commendations have come my way from leading national organizations, labor unions, civic groups, and others. Only a few of these can be mentioned in this brief space. The A.F. of L., the CIO, and the United Automobile Workers rated me as having a perfect score on selected vital issues in Congress, such as civil rights, labor laws, housing, price control, rent control, public power, control of commodity speculation, tidelands oil, foreign aid, reciprocal trade, social security and so forth. Railway Labor's Political League, the Railway Conductors, and the Seafarers International Union have endorsed my candidacy for reelection.

Letters of commendation have come voluntarily from the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the National Grange, National Woman's Party, Marine Corps Reserve Officers Association, American Veterans Committee, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Reserve Officers Association of the United States, American Chamber of Commerce for Trade With Italy, National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, National Federation of Federal Employees, American Federation of Government Employees, New York Federation of Post Office Clerks, and the National Association of Postal Supervisors.

The American Zionist Council voiced its gratitude for my efforts on behalf of Israel; the Welfare Council of New York City appreciated my help in defeating the amendment to limit the construction of public housing; and the Brooklyn chapter of the American Red Cross wrote:

"Your latest actions in our behalf merely serve to confirm our belief that you are making a valuable contribution to the well-being of all the people of Brooklyn and elsewhere by your efforts on our behalf."

Business and consumer groups likewise expressed their appreciation for my efforts and achievements in Congress. The National Association of Consumers thanked me "for your participation in the long and hard struggle during debate on the need for continuing the controls as provided in the Defense Production Act, especially those relating to price, credit, and rent controls. You are to be commended for your contribution." The Office of Price Stabilization appreciated help to that agency in its efforts on behalf of consumers, and the Small Defense Plants Administration for aid in furthering its program in behalf of small business. Other commendations were received from New York State Pharmaceutical Association, National Council of Salesmen's Organizations, Diamond Manufacturers and Importers Association, New York State Bowling Proprietors Association, and many other organizations.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

For more than 2 years now our country, in conjunction with other members of the United Nations has been resisting Communist aggression in Korea and has resorted to all possible efforts to prevent this long, drawn-out conflict from developing into another and more destructive world conflagration. Our primary gain in Korea has been not only to stop communism in its tracks, but also to stop the march of communism elsewhere. Since the ill-fated aggression on Korea the masters of the Kremlin have made no attempts at open invasion of peaceful nations.

In Congress I have supported our foreign policy and our efforts to check Communist imperialism. We have attained a certain degree of success through such efforts as the Marshall plan and more recently through military and economic aid under our mutual security program. President Truman's point 4 program to aid underdeveloped areas is becoming more significant and is beginning to show concrete results. Many nations have been aided economically to get back on their feet. We have strengthened our ties with others, particularly in Latin America and Europe. Today, the free nations of the world are probably more united against the common enemy than ever before.

In addition to the steps mentioned, I have supported our own defense efforts so that we and our allies abroad should have the necessary weapons and be prepared to defend our people in the event of further Communist aggression. The security of this Nation is uppermost in our thinking and planning, and for this reason I wholeheartedly supported the appropriations required to meet our military and economic programs.

Specifically, I have urged that financial aid be withheld from those nations who participate in acts of aggressions; that a Joint Committee on International Economic Development be established to study the possibilities of development of backward areas; that we undertake steps to strengthen the United Nations and to seek to convert it into a world federation which would be able to preserve peace. It has always been my view that if the U.N. had been a stronger and more influential organization, the conflict in Korea could have been averted and the world would today be far advanced on the road toward genuine peace.

Other problems and issues within the sphere of foreign affairs which I supported are: Prohibiting the transfer of strategic materials to aggressor nations, extension of reciprocal-trade agreements, shipment of wheat to India to alleviate the famine in that country, contribution to the International Children's Emergency Fund, advocating the unification of Ireland, aid to the people of Italy in their efforts to preserve democracy in their country, approving the constitution of Puerto Rico granting the people of that country self-government, investigating the Katyn Forest massacre of Polish officers during the last war.

The Prime Minister of Italy presented to me an autographed picture of himself as a tribute to my efforts to help rid his land of communism.

On a number of occasions I protested the persecution of religious minorities, the violation of freedom of speech and of the press in Russia and its Communist satellites. I have directed attention to the Soviet technique of attracting minorities to its cause by pretending to aid them, only to suppress and crush them later. On April 10 of this year, I placed in the RECORD a lengthy document prepared by our Department of State showing how the Communist Government of Rumania is conducting an all-out campaign to destroy freedom.

My interventions and efforts to aid the State of Israel are a matter of record. I have not only voted for economic aid to Israel in 1951 and 1952, but I have exerted every effort within my power to establish cordial relations between Israel and the United States and to obtain this country's intercession to reach peace between Israel and the Arab States. Ever since the establishment of Israel, I have utilized the occasion of independence day to organize a "salute to Israel" on the floor of Congress in which many Members participate with appropriate addresses and greetings.

CIVIL RIGHTS

The question of safeguarding our civil liberties and reaffirming our civil rights has become one of the foremost problems of our time. Notwithstanding the hysteria of present day, I have always worked diligently in Congress for the principles of civil rights as they affect the entire population, and the minority groups in particular, such as Ne-

groes, Jews, Catholics, and so forth. I have opposed discrimination in employment and in housing; I fought against segregation in the armed services and for freedom in education.

While I am wholeheartedly in favor of eliminating subversive and disloyal individuals from public service, I am vigorously opposed to tactics which smack of thought-control, character assassination, guilt by association and other such totalitarian methods which we have come to recognize as "McCarthyism." These are not in the tradition of American democracy and, if continued, will do irreparable harm to this country, to its democratic institutions, and to the civil rights and liberties of the American people.

When Congress was considering a resolution to investigate philanthropic and educational foundations, I fought and voted against this resolution because I saw in it an attempt to censor and control the policies and objectives of these institutions. Among those to be investigated are listed the Rockefeller Foundation, Guggenheim Foundation, Carnegie Endowment, and the Rosenwald Fund, all of which have contributed greatly toward the education and improvement of the standard of living of minorities.

I have urged home rule for the disenfranchised people of Washington, statehood for Alaska and Hawaii, withholding of aid to National Guard organizations practicing discrimination, and elimination of restrictions in housing on the grounds of race, color, or creed. I have never hesitated to speak up for religious freedom, tolerance, brotherhood, and true understanding among the people of this great Nation.

PRICE CONTROL

To give my constituents a complete picture of the struggle I waged in the past 2 years to continue economic controls and check inflation would require a report several times the size of this item. As a member of the House Banking and Currency Committee—which is the committee that deals with legislation on economic controls—I was in the forefront of the struggle for price control, rent control, housing, wage stabilization, and credit control.

At all times during these lengthy conflicts both in committee and on the floor of problems and difficulties facing the average Congress, I was continually guided by the problems and difficulties facing the average American family in meeting its budget for food, shelter, clothing, and other necessities of life. That was uppermost in my mind, for it was clear that unless we adopt legislation to effectively halt soaring prices and the spiral of inflation, our entire economy would be ruined. Hardest hit of all are those of middle and low income, the workers, the professionals, and those of fixed incomes including those living on pensions.

Throughout 1951 and 1952, when the Defense Production Act was up for renewal and powerful forces sought to cripple controls or to eliminate them entirely, I spoke up in the interests of the consumer. Whenever possible, I sought to show the conspiracy against the consuming public on the part of profiteering and greedy elements. On June 12, 1951, I said:

"There is little doubt in my mind that there is a conspiracy afoot between the big packers, some of the feeders, and some of the cattlemen, to scare the consuming public into demanding a cessation of price control. As part of that conspiracy they will try to create beef shortages where actually there are none and there is no reason for any. We have more livestock today than the country has ever before produced."

In the ensuing weeks, when it became evident that the Republicans in Congress were not concerned with price control or inflation but were actually impeding every effort to establish effective controls in order to aid certain selfish interests, I stated on the House floor June 30, 1951:

"The Republican program this year as to how to control inflation starts with the promise of pay-as-you-go taxation; the action, Republican votes to defeat every item in the tax bill so you do not get enough taxes with which to pay for the expenses of Government. Next is the Republican promise to stop inflation by control of credits * * *; the action, Republican votes beat down the amendments to the Defense Production Act which seek to do that. Then they say control inflation by increased production because that will bring prices down. But prices continue to run away. So the Republican action on every vote * * * is to kill price control."

When the Republicans continued to emasculate controls through various crippling amendments, I again warned them that the consumer will not forget their action. On July 5, 1951, I said:

"If we are to have an effective control bill that is going to do any good and help save the economy of our country and beat down the forces of inflation, which all agree are just as vicious and just as bad as communism at its worst, we will have to have a control bill that will do equal justice to all with exemptions to none. We will have to put the national interest above the selfish interest. But the consumer is a small guy; he has no lobby here to come in and plead for him. We can kick him around. He speaks only on election day and you hope by election day of 1952 he will have forgotten how you mistreated him in 1951."

On occasion, when certain elements could not meet the arguments in defense of the consumers in the big cities, they resorted to name calling and threats. In defense of the good name of the people of New York, I refuted such tactics as follows—July 17, 1951:

"To those who continually make invidious reference to New York black marketeers, let me say that if their constituents were as law abiding, as cooperative, and as good citizens as the average New Yorker, we would have very little difficulty."

Finally, when it became evident that the 1951 control bill would be weak and practically ineffective, I frankly told the Members of Congress on July 19:

"I am taking this time to call the attention, not only of the Members of Congress but of the American public to this situation, so that they can wake up and know that unless this Congress wakes up we will have a Defense Production Act without any defense and without any production. We will have a control bill with no controls."

Some last minute changes were written into the bill which made it workable to some extent last year. When renewal of the act came up for consideration early this summer, a strenuous effort was made on the part of opponents of economic controls to kill the entire act or at least to eliminate price control, rent control, credit control, and other vital phases. Again and again I pleaded with the opposition not to terminate controls but to extend them for another full year. On June 19, 1952, I stated:

"The Banking and Currency Committee showed good judgment when they voted to extend the controls until June 30, 1953. We must play it safe as far as our economic stability is concerned. If the controls are extended for 12 months, and if the emergency should end in a shorter time, they can always be terminated by administrative or congressional action. On the other hand, if the emergency should still be with us a year from now, Congress would have adequate opportunity to consider further extension legislation."

I was highly dissatisfied with the final bill as adopted by Congress, I considered it an unenforcible bill with ineffective provisions. I stated then:

"I voted for the extension of the Defense Production Act most reluctantly. I do not think that it was a good bill, but I think it is better than having no controls at all. The rent-control provisions, for example, are, in my judgment, very weak. I also think that some of the price-control features, particularly the one relating to processed fruits and vegetables, are bad. The amendments affecting the wage-stabilization program are likewise far from perfect."

At every step of the way I sought to improve the act by introducing amendments and bills to aid the consumers in the struggle against soaring prices. Among the more important proposals were bills to create a select committee to study consumer interests; to protect the Nation's economy against inflationary pressures; to provide for fuel allocations and priorities during emergencies; to appoint business advisory committees; to repeal the Capehart amendments, and so forth.

RENT CONTROL AND HOUSING

As already indicated, I fought consistently for effective rent control, which is so vital to the maintenance of our standard of living for millions of Americans. The danger of any relaxation of rent control is especially great in the large metropolitan areas where a difficult situation would follow. It has always been my view, ever since I became a Member of Congress, that the fight against exorbitant rents must be continued with ample protection, however, to the landlords to assure them a fair return. I fought against every attempt to lift rent control in various areas, particularly in critical defense-housing areas. In the latter case I argued as follows on June 26 of this year.

"In these critical areas the Federal Government—not the local government—is responsible for the acute housing situation and the pressure on rents. The Federal Government has established the military installations and has directed the men to be stationed at these installations. The construction and expansion of defense production plants are the direct effect of defense orders which the Federal Government has placed. For these reasons, the Federal Government has a responsibility which it cannot evade—to provide protection to servicemen and defense workers against exorbitant rents."

Similarly, I have urged the adoption of legislation calling for slum clearance and the construction of federally assisted low-cost and middle-income housing, as well as cooperative housing projects to alleviate the urgent need for adequate housing. In support of such legislation I stated on August 14, 1951:

"Under this bill, we will have no more slums * * *. In every community that needs housing that does not have the finances to build community facilities, this bill will give private free enterprise the opportunity to create private housing. The bill will also provide the community facilities without which the housing is uninhabitable. * * * You thereby help these communities to build up in the American way, under the American standard of living, and we will have no more slums, and we will have no insanitary conditions."

The most difficult struggle encountered by the forces fighting for adequate housing was the move instigated by the real-estate lobby which attempted to cut the number of public-housing units to be constructed per year from 50,000 to a mere 5,000 units. During the debate on this question, I spoke up frequently in support of 50,000 units and also read to the Members of Congress a telegram addressed to me by the mayor of New York

describing how the proposed cut would seriously hurt the housing situation in New York. On March 19, 1952, I said:

"May I remind you that originally the law provided for the starting of not more than 135,000 units of public housing each year. Then we cut that to 75,000 units per year * * *. Last year we cut it to 50,000 units per year. Now this distinguished committee recommends that you cut it to 25,000 units per year."

Actually, however, it proved to be even worse, since an amendment was introduced on the floor of the Congress to reduce the number of units to 5,000. When that amendment came up for discussion and the vote the next day I said:

"What you are going to do if you adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER] to cut this to 5,000 units * * * is to make worthless millions of dollars of investments of cities and States throughout the country. I tell you that you are making a very serious mistake if you do not go along with this project, at least to the limited extent of 50,000 units per year. * * * If you want to do the right thing by your constituents, if you want to do the right thing by those people who cannot help themselves, if you want to eliminate delinquency and crime among the low-income groups, give them a decent place in which to live, give them a place where they can bring up their children in some sort of decent fashion, so that they may realize the ambition of every American to attain the standard of living that we recognize as the very minimum."

LABOR AND SOCIAL SECURITY

My opposition to antilabor laws and my efforts for improved labor legislation have been duly acknowledged by the A.F. of L., the CIO, and other sections of organized labor. I look forward to determined action in the Eighty-third Congress for better labor laws and I shall give my utmost support to achieve this goal.

In the field of labor relations, I opposed the Lucas amendment which sought to abolish the Wage Stabilization Board or reduce its effectiveness by taking away from the Board its emergency labor-disputes powers assigned to it by the President. The amendment which aimed to strip the Board of its power in 1951 was rejected by Congress, but a new and more successful attempt to destroy the WSB was made this year.

What brought it on was the prolonged steel-industry dispute which sharply divided opinions on such matters as the legality of the wage-dispute functions of the WSB, the invoking of an injunction against the union, proposals to submit labor unions to the provisions of the antitrust laws, and other matters. In arguing against changing the equal tripartite structure of the WSB, I stated on the House floor on June 20:

"If you adopt the Lucas amendment as it is given to you now, when you put more public members on the Board than labor and management together, you will still have the public members controlling and giving a decision just as they did in the steel dispute case * * * The Wage Stabilization Board made the recommendation that the union-shop clause should be part of the contract. Who started this cry of 'kill the umpire'? The steel mill owners and managers who lost the decision."

Several days later, on June 25, when Congress was considering a request to the President to invoke the Taft-Hartley law in the steel dispute, I said:

"The Congress is not enacting fair and effective legislation. It is not any legislation if it adopts this amendment to the Defense Production Act by which you will send the President a letter telling him to use a law which you and I know is not going to produce steel and is not going to get the men back to work.

"For reasons of fairness, practicality, and effectiveness, the Taft-Hartley Act does not provide the answer to the present steel dispute. What is needed is authority for the Government to operate the steel mills until a settlement is reached."

In the end, Congress retained the tripartite structure of the WSB, but it took away the Board's jurisdiction over the union-shop issue and instituted other unjustifiable changes. This may result in much difficulty in settling labor disputes in the future.

Just as I worked for and voted in 1950 to broaden the Social Security Act to include 10 million additional people, so this year I wholeheartedly supported the bill to increase social security benefits. The increase goes into effect as of October 1, 1952, and every beneficiary will receive at least $5 or more additional in his monthly check. I shall continue to work toward the goal whereby the entire adult population will be entitled to such benefits upon reaching the statutory age.

Among other measures in this field I sponsored a bill to provide equal pay for equal work for women, a bill to amend the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings to $80 per month (this Congress increased the sum to $75); I supported an increase in the pension to retired railway employees and an increase in unemployment insurance benefits.

NATIONAL ECONOMY AND TAXES

During the fiscal year 1951–52 Congress appropriated about $50 billion for defense, while in the current year some $60 billion have been designated for that purpose. They are unquestionably tremendous sums. They constitute about three-fourths of our national budget. Unfortunately, we have no other recourse, since the security of our Nation comes before everything else. In order not to invite national disaster, our defenses must be strengthened and made ready for any eventuality.

This huge budget is met through taxation which serves a double purpose: Taxes help to pay the expenditures of our defense program and operations of the Government, and they also serve to keep inflation in check. There is not a Member of Congress who would not like to see the day come soon when taxes can be appreciably reduced and all controls abolished—and I am among them—but I would not like to see it done at the price of ruin to our national economy resulting from runaway inflation.

At the present time, we can only hope for equalization of the tax burden whereby that burden should be taken off the shoulders of the low-income groups and placed upon the middle and higher income groups and big business. In the past, I advocated repeal of excise taxes because they affect primarily the small wage earner; I supported an excess-profits tax directed chiefly against profiteering on the part of the greedy.

More recently, I have urged tax exemptions for members of the Armed Forces who are serving outside the United States, deductions for expenses in connection with education of children, increasing the exemption to $3,500 for heads of families and $2,500 for single persons, granting exemptions to persons living on retirement pensions and annuities, and other proposals.

In connection with strengthening the national economy, I took an active interest in aiding small business in order to keep it alive and operating during this period of our dislocated economy. In February 1951, I was appointed as a member of a Select Committee To Conduct a Study and Investigation of the Problems of Small Business. This congressional committee conducted hearings throughout the country and made a number of important recommendations to aid small business by extending to it a share of the defense work and through the establishment of the Small Defense Plants Administration to cope with this problem.

IMMIGRATION

It has always been my view that one of the major reasons for this country's growth and development was its liberal policy on immigration which enabled the homeless and the persecuted to come to these blessed shores and help to build our country. In Congress, I have always favored the continuation of such a policy. Consequently, I worked ardently for passage of the Displaced Persons Act in 1948 under which more than 300,000 DP's entered the United States. When that act was about to expire in 1951, I urged that all DP's who had filed for admission to this country before the expiration date of June 30, 1951, should be granted the opportunity to come here notwithstanding the fact that the law will have expired. This was subsequently accomplished by enactment of a 6 month extension.

It was not so simple, however, in the case of the McCarran Immigration Act which was passed by Congress this year. I did my utmost to fight this discriminatory measure, but the anti-immigration forces were too strong. When the bill was under discussion in the House, I stated on April 23:

"I do not know whether my father and mother came here because somebody gave them the exalted right or the exalted privilege to come here, but I do know that most of us would not be here today if their forebears had not had the absolute right to come here before the time that some Congress wrote into this Nation's law that provision making it only an exalted privilege. * * * If you look at the bill and try to determine where the merit or lack of merit lies, you will find there is discrimination written all through the bill."

That bill was, as is well known, approved by overwhelming majorities in both Houses of Congress, and then the President's veto of the measure was overridden to make it the law of the land. I hope that a strong effort will be made in the 83d Congress to eliminate the discriminatory and racist sections of this law.

VETERANS' AFFAIRS

In casting my votes on veterans' legislation I have always tried to preserve the best interests of the men who answered the call of their country. They and their families are entitled to certain rights and privileges which must be respected and preserved.

The most important legislative measure containing benefits to veterans to come out of Congress this year was the GI bill for veterans of the Korean conflict, who were granted medical, educational, housing, training, and other benefits similar to those extended to World War II veterans. I supported this measure, as well as other bills calling for pension and compensation benefits for disabled veterans and their dependents and pay increases to servicemen to meet the cost of living.

At the same time, I sponsored various bills of interest to veterans, such as to provide free postage for members of the Armed Forces; to amend the Housing Act of 1950 to permit veterans to use guaranteed housing loans to $7,500; to provide that pension, compensation, and retirement pay be paid during active service, such amount being deducted from active-service pay.

I joined with the entire Brooklyn congressional delegation to prevent the Veterans' Administration from removing its regional office from Brooklyn. When the same threat came up a second time during the summer of 1951, I introduced a bill to prohibit the Veterans' Administration Administrator from transferring any offices or making extensive

reductions in the Veterans' Administration staff until 60 days after giving notice to Congress.

In recognition of my services on behalf of veterans, I was given two awards by veterans' organizations, which I shall always cherish. The Raymond Lupin Memorial Post of the American Legion in Brooklyn elected me an honorary patron in 1951. The Brooklyn chapter of Disabled American Veterans presented me with a certificate of merit for outstanding accomplishments in promoting legislation for disabled veterans.

MISCELLANEOUS MATTERS

The defense of the rights of minorities in various countries where they are persecuted as such has always been of deep concern to me. On numerous occasions I brought to the attention of Congress the plight of the Jews in the Soviet Union and in the Communist satellite countries where Jewish religious and cultural life is being exterminated and Jews are not permitted to emigrate to Israel. Similarly, I have vigorously protested the resurgence of nazism in Germany and our failure to denazify the Germans. I have been as alert in protesting the plight of persecuted Catholics in various countries.

On January 30, 1951, I described to the Members of Congress the anti-Jewish policy of persecution adopted by Communist Hungary. I said:

"Anti-Semitism is rampant in Hungary, the Jews and other religious minorities are regarded with suspicion because they look to America and the West as their last hope for eventual freedom."

I have similarly urged the House Foreign Affairs Committee to appoint a bipartisan commission to investigate our failure to stamp out nazism in Germany and to eliminate anti-Semitism there. I told the committee:

"Large sections of our population today are distrustful of Germany. They fear we may be building up a new Frankenstein that may someday come back to plague us."

Not only has the violation of human rights abroad concerned me, but I am equally interested in the efforts to combat prejudice and anti-Semitism in this country. I have urged interfaith understanding and true brotherhood as a means of combating such misconduct. Rabblerousers in this country have for some time been spreading the lie that one of our Founding Fathers of this Republic, Benjamin Franklin, disliked the Jews and criticized them. The story was a forgery and an insult to the memory of this venerated American. To establish its falsity, I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a document showing how Franklin headed a drive to clear the debt of a Jewish synagogue in Philadelphia in 1788.

As a result of my efforts, for the first time since the establishment of the Military Academy at West Point and the Naval Academy at Annapolis, Jewish chaplains have been assigned to each Academy on a full-time basis to minister to the boys of their faith, who are in attendance there as cadets and midshipmen.

One of the projects, of which I am most proud, was my part in obtaining the consent of our great President, Harry S. Truman, to lend his name to the establishment of a village in Israel, known as Kfar Truman.

The village was dedicated to him at a dinner tendered by the Jewish National Fund to the President in Washington, D.C., on May 26, 1952, attended by outstanding personalities from every walk of life and every part of the country. The speakers on that historic occasion included the Vice President of the United States, the Ambassador of Israel, Dr. Harris J. Levine, president of the Jewish National Fund, and your humble servant. President Truman's response was beautiful and inspiring.

Other issues which were of interest to significant segments of our population were considered by the 82d Congress. Where the idea was of a constructive and beneficial nature, I worked assiduously for its enactment; where it was, in my opinion, detrimental to the interests of the Nation, I opposed it vigorously.

Time and again I urged upon Congress to increase the pay of Federal and postal employees. They are loyal and efficient workers. I opposed cutting their annual leave and sick-leave benefits. I also protested on several occasions as false economy the curtailment of the postal service and I introduced a bill to reestablish the service to its previous status.

In the realm of Government reorganization, I supported the various reorganization plans to make the executive departments more efficient, including such plans as reorganization of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, revision of our military reserves, reorganization of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and others.

I opposed the tidelands oil bill which aimed to give away to a few States the offshore oil deposits estimated to be valued at about $40 billion. This is the property of the country as a whole and all the people should benefit from it.

In the field of health and welfare, I favored aid for local and State development of public-health units, the extension of grants to States for public assistance, and flood relief for people in the stricken areas.

Other bills which I introduced were to provide a uniform national system of automobile registration; to amend the Tariff Act by stabilizing import duties to encourage international trade relations; for negotiation of a treaty for the defense of the Mediterranean area; to establish a memorial honoring the contribution to American military and naval history by all religious faiths, and many others.

I introduced a number of private bills to aid individuals where the circumstances merited such aid. In other instances I did all possible to help those of my constituents who called upon me for assistance of one sort or another. I never failed to try to help them, even though my efforts have not always been successful.

CONCLUSION

My record in Congress is an open book, which I modestly, yet proudly, present to the people of my district. They have been kind to me in permitting me to serve them in the highest legislative Chamber of the Nation. I have tried to show here how I have fulfilled their trust in me, realizing at all times that "public office is a public trust."

The exigencies of our time are so great that we must not lessen our efforts to defend human liberty and preserve our free institutions. The free nations of the world must stand united in their common effort to uphold the highest ideals of mankind and to maintain our way of life. Our people are on the threshold of great decisions. With the help of Almighty God, we shall decide wisely and go forward to a better day of peace and tranquillity for all mankind.

SO THE TIME FOR A CHANGE ARRIVED, AND CREEPING SOCIALISM BECAME THE BIG GIVEAWAY WHILE THE LITTLE FELLOW LOST HIS SHIRT

(Remarks of Hon. ABRAHAM J. MULTER, of New York, in the House of Representatives, Monday, Aug. 3, 1953)

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, this is the true story—I wish it were a fairy tale—of an America grown up—but not wiser.

If what follows sounds political, believe me it is intentionally so. After all, politics, according to all lexicographers, is the science of government and this saga deals only with government—your Government.

If it sounds partisan it is so only because the members of the opposite political faith have slanted the record that way by their actions.

If what I say hurts, it is only because the sponsors of inimical policies have failed to provide any armor against the cruelties inherent therein.

With such brief apologia, let me proceed to tell this tale of woe.

For 20 years almost every attempt by Democratic leaders and legislators to improve the conditions of our country and to establish world peace and to expand man's divine right of equal opportunity to earn a livelihood with a decent standard of living, has been ridiculed, derided and opposed by members of the Republican Party. In all those years there was little or no constructive criticism. There was much carping and bitterness as phony labels were sought to be attached to every progressive step that was taken to benefit the citizenry of our country.

Home loans, farm loans, small business assistance, housing and power, rural electrification and telephones, soil conservation and flood control, farm subsidies and fuel regution, savings programs and bank deposit insurance, development of natural resources for the benefit of all, social security and unemployment insurance, protection of the right to work, improvement of the lot of the civil servant, protection of the veteran, particularly the maimed and disabled, assistance to the orphan, the widow and the helpless, aids to health, education, and the public welfare were all labeled creeping socialism and worse.

Only in the field of foreign policy was there any semblance of bipartisan cooperation for the best interests of the country. Even there it was only agreement on principle. Despite the fact that a Democratic administration sought and obtained only the best available men, regardless of political affiliation (thus putting as many Republicans as Democrats in charge of administration) the sniping never abated.

We were told:

Time for a change—stop the monster from creeping further into the Nation's vitals—drive it out—return the country to free enterprise—stop inflation—bring prices down—produce more—pay less—get more—balance the budget—cut expenditures—reduce taxes.

Repetition had its effect. Even those who knew better, began to succumb to the never-ending stream of propaganda.

At the psychologically correct moment the knight in shining armor appeared on the scene, a truly great soldier, deservedly honored as a world hero. When he, unacquainted with the ways of politics, but in the best of faith and intentions, began to sing the same song, the melody was indeed sweet and the words most beguiling.

Logic and reason took flight. Fantasy and wishful thinking wafted many into the land of make-believe. What could we lose? Is a Republican mink coat—or is it sable—different from the Democratic one? Is it not time for a change? Few asked: A change to what or why or for whom? After all—we can always change back. Nor did they stop long enough to inquire: If the change should be for the worse, can we regain our losses?

Election day, 1952, came and with it the first change as the people willed it. A Republican President and a Republican Congress.

Eureka but not yet utopia.

Democrats, who for 20 years winced under the tongue lashing of the Republicans remembered the Biblical injunction to do unto others as you would have them do unto you.

Like good American citizens, they bowed to the will of the majority.

They promised cooperation. They announced there would be only constructive criticism, no sniping, no backbiting, no invectives.

Came January 3, 1953, and the new Congress was sworn in and organized. They listened politely but impatiently and indifferently to the outgoing President. They waited for Inauguration Day.

Came Inauguration Day, January 20, 1953, and they listened fearfully but enthusiastically to the incoming President. And again they waited.

Be not impatient. Give them time. Give them a chance.

Time passed. And they acted—both the new President and the new Congress. Things happened. Not too much and certainly, not too good.

Now as the 1st session of the 83d Congress comes to a close this fine summer day, August 3, 1953, would it be unfair if I stated the account, totaled the "do's" and the "don'ts," the "gives" and the "takes" and tried to get a balance—knowing full well that there will be little balance left for our fellow citizens.

Here goes:

Promise: A balanced budget.

Performance: More unbalanced than when the Republicans took over.

Promise: Spend less.

Performance: Spent more with an increase in future fixed charges of government.

Promise: Reduce taxes.

Performance: Increased by extending taxes due to expire.

Promise: A stabilized economy by reduction of prices and cost of living.

Performance: Higher prices to the consumer, higher costs to the home buyer, higher rents to the tenant and lower prices to the farmer.

Promise: Reduce the national debt.

Performance: An attempt to increase it, prevented by an almost solid Democratic opposition in the Senate. It passed the House with 84 percent of the Republicans voting for it and 61 percent of the Democrats opposed.

Promise: A new foreign policy. Precisely what changes we were to expect we were never told.

Performance: Absolutely no change in policy. The change in administration, however, is driving our friends and allies further and further away from us.

Promise: A new farm policy.

Performance: No change in policy. A change in administration that has antagonized the farmer who has voted 10 to 1 to continue the old policy.

Promise: A new tax program.

Performance: None presented. The only change is the reduction in individual income taxes effective January 1954, pursuant to a law enacted by the last Democratic Congress and signed by the last Democratic President. However, Mr. Taxpayer, do not spend that saving. The next session of this Republican Congress may take it away from you. They are even now threatening us with a Federal sales tax.

Promise: The Republican Party promised to keep the Taft-Hartley labor law intact. The Republican candidate for President said he recognized its inequities and promised amendment.

Performance: No change in that law.

Promise: Statehood for Hawaii and Alaska.

Performance: Nothing.

Promise: A change in our permanent immigration laws to liberalize them and remove the inequities and unfairness thereof.

Performance: No change. The temporary Refugee Immigration Act to admit 217,000 immigrants over a 3-year period was part of the Democratic program and was enacted only because of Democratic support.

Promise: To conserve the natural resources of the Nation.

Performance: Submerged oil lands given away. This was promised by the Republican candidate and he was supported by southern Democrats who campaigned for reelection on that pledge. Public power, TVA, AEC, and soil conservation programs gutted. Rubber plants ordered sold, RFC assets, including defense plants, ordered disposed of.

Promise: Encouragment and improvement of health and education programs.

Performance: Cutting the budgets for these programs.

Promise: A comprehensive civil-rights program.

Performance: Nothing.

Changes that we got even though not promised:

First. Hard money, that is, money that is harder to get.

Second. Higher interest rates on Government bonds, thus increasing the cost of Government and the burden of the taxpayer; higher rates on mortgages; higher rates on consumer's financing; higher rates on veteran's loans; higher rates on business loans; higher rates on State and municipal loans; higher rates on farmer's loans; higher rates on auto loans.

Third. Depreciation of Government bonds, some are selling as low as 92 cents on the dollar.

Fourth. Destruction of the public-housing program.

Fifth. Impairment of the morale of civil service employees by Executive orders emasculating the merit system.

Sixth. Decrease in veterans' benefits.

In sharp contrast to all of the foregoing is the conduct of the responsible Democratic Members of the Congress.

They offered bills to implement their party platform. They could get no hearings from committees controlled by the majority party.

They offered bills and amendments to bills to effectuate the President's program to the extent that it coincided with the Democratic program.

The press, time after time, referred to the passage of such bills as "Eisenhower victories." Actually they were part and parcel of the Democratic platform. They could never have been enacted without Democratic votes. In most instances there were more Democrats than Republicans voting for those measures.

Notable among these measures were, first, extension of the President's power to reorganize the executive departments—if he does not economize in that field, the responsibility is solely his; second, establishment of the Cabinet post of Health, Education, and Welfare; third, rejection of the cut in funds for REA; fourth, prevention of the weakening of civil service; fifth, rejection of cut in funds for soil conservation; sixth, restoration of funds for aid to schools; seventh, continuance of a nonpolitical Tariff Commission; eighth, extension of Reciprocal Trade Agreements Authority; ninth, prohibiting arbitrary denial of medical care to veterans; tenth, authorization and appropriation of moneys for foreign aid; eleventh, extension of the mutual-security program; twelfth, gift of wheat to starving Pakistanians; thirteenth, admission of 217,000 immigrants over 3-year period.

That is the record to date.

Even if President Eisenhower should not acknowledge that his program could never have been enacted without Democratic votes, we in the Democratic Party will continue to vote for what we believe is in the best interests of our country.

In the not too distant future, the electorate will have an opportunity to voice its approval or disapproval of the changes it got and of the changes it did not get.

Until then, we will do our duty as we see it—let the chips fall where they may.

To Secure These Rights the Fight Must Go On

(Extension of remarks of Hon. Abraham J. Multer, of New York, in the House of Representatives, Thursday, August 19, 1954)

Mr. Multer. Mr. Speaker, at the close of the first session of this Congress, on August 3, 1953, I reviewed for my constituents the accomplishments, and lack thereof, of our distinguished body. I pointed out the great divergence between the pledges and promises by the Republican Party and its presidential candidate in 1952 and their performance or lack thereof as the majority party in power in 1953.

Another legislative year has now gone by. It is time again to take a look. Perhaps not a new look, but certainly a good look, even though we know it will not look good. I intend today to reverse the usual form of stating first the facts and then the conclusion.

CONCLUSION

When the 80th Congress was dubbed the worst Congress of history, our contemporaries overlooked that worse than a "do-nothing Congress" is a Congress that does nothing but gives away the birthright of a nation.

The 83d Congress and this Republican administration have earned the right to be charged with doing nothing but g'ving away the people's rights and property.

The balance of this report will be devoted to documentation of the foregoing conclusion.

HUMAN RIGHTS

This is an excellent time to refresh our memories with a quotation from our Declaration of Independence of these immortal words:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, that whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their health and happiness."

Those principles have been written into our Constitution as rights accorded to our citizens, and with restrictions against any impairment by executive, judicial, or legislative action.

If they are to be changed, that change can be accomplished only by constitutional amendment.

Nevertheless, we have seen during these last 2 years, a complete disregard of those basic concepts.

Fear runs wild, and hysteria has taken over.

Laws have been enacted in violation of article I of the Constitution, prohibiting ex post facto laws and bills of attainder.

Laws and executive orders violative of the Bill of Rights, as contained in our Constitution, have been enacted and promulgated.

I have done my best to resist such utterly un-American conduct, first, because it is fundamentally wrong and second, because it strengthens our enemies and weakens our will to withstand their totalitarian philosophy.

I favor the right, under safeguard of court order or search warrant, to obtain evidence, even by wiretapping, to convict criminals. I opposed the bill to give the right to use

such evidence previously obtained without court order or search warrant.

I favor empowering the courts to require witnesses to testify in criminal proceedings by granting them immunity where otherwise some other criminal might escape trial. I oppose giving that right to Congress, because Congress is a legislative body and not a court. Congress is supposed to investigate solely for the purpose of legislating; it is not the FBI; it is not a grand jury; it is not a petty jury; it is not a judge; it is not a prosecutor; it is not a President with power to pardon. No legislative body in our entire American history has ever been blocked from legislating because a witness or group of witnesses refused to testify.

The best evidence that I am correct in that statement is that despite witnesses who have refused to testify about communism, the Congress has, nevertheless, enacted a law finding that the Communist Party is not a political party but a criminal conspiracy.

I agree with the finding, but urged that the law was a very bad one because it usurps the function of the judiciary.

The bill to outlaw the Community Party violates every principle of good government. Aside from being a bill of attainder and an ex post facto law, it denies not only free speech but free thought; it denies the right of assembly and the right of petition for redress of wrongs. It is a completely totalitarian technique.

The manner in which these bills were foisted upon the Congress was even worse. Not only was gag rule imposed by limitation of debate, but they were brought before the House without having had adequate hearings, without reports for guidance of the Members, without copies of the bills, and under rules permitting no amendments.

That is the horribly terrifying manner in which a heretofore deliberative body struck down our liberties and impaired our freedom by pushing through in the closing days of this session bills which do violence to the things for which men and women have fought and died since before Magna Carta.

I attribute these bad bills to what has come to be known as McCarthyism. Those who contend that McCarthyism has alerted the country to the danger of communism must now concede that the direct result has been the creation of an unhealthy atmosphere of fear and suspicion which may easily destroy the very vitals of good government.

LIBERALISM VERSUS CONSERVATISM

Our President has repeatedly told us that as to human values and human rights, he is liberal, but as to property and property rights, he is conservative. It sounds good. I wish it were true. I will not repeat here the many failures of President Eisenhower to perform the pledges of candidate Eisenhower. They have been previously documented. Let us today analyze what has happened under our President's leadership and thereby make apparent his and the Republican Party's fulfillment of the converse of his declared policy.

OPERATION GIVEAWAY, OR BUNDLES FOR BILLIONAIRES

The gift of the submerged-oil lands was camouflaged as a return to certain States of their property. You cannot return to a State what it never had. The U.S. Supreme Court three times ruled that these lands and rights never belonged to any State. As a matter of fact, most of them were bought with funds from the U.S. Treasury.

If Congress and the President had not given them away for the benefit of the big oil companies and not the few States involved as is claimed, the revenues from those lands would have been used to educate the children of every State of the Union.

OUR NATIONAL RESOURCES: CREEPING FAVORITISM

The Nation's resources have been the subject of a whole series of gigantic giveaways, beginning with the offshore oil bill endorsed by President Eisenhower.

Perhaps the most incredible giveaway of all, deals with atomic energy. The people of the country have spent $12 billion of their tax money in developing an atomic-energy program. The Eisenhower administration and the Republican-controlled Congress, however, chose to set the wheels in motion for giving away the rights to atomic energy to the few private power monopolies. The most fantastic Republican proposition was the Dixon-Yates contract whereby a certain private group was granted contract rights to provide power without competitive bidding; it was arbitrarily selected for the benefit, although other firms offered to do the job more cheaply. The Eisenhower administration even offered to pay all their taxes for them and guarantee them against any loss. I am proud of my vote against the atomic energy giveaway.

The efforts to dispose of our synthetic-rubber and tin-smelting plants and the attempt to wreck TVA and our entire public power program, are more of the giveaway philosophy in action.

MONEY: HARDER TO GET

I spent considerable time and effort in opposing the Republican giveaway to bankers through higher interest rates. The so-called hard-money policy actually made money harder to get. Republican bankers took over the Treasury Department and promptly proceeded to raise the interest rate to the highest level since 1933. They sold Government bonds below par value to bankers who profited immensely from unnecessarily higher interest rates. I joined with other Members of Congress in protesting this giveaway to bankers, and my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD are quite numerous on this subject.

Not only did this hard-money policy constitute excessive profit for bankers, but it was perhaps the principal cause of the recession we have had. With interest rates excessively high, consumers and small businessmen could not borrow money. As a result, mass unemployment occurred, causing a serious recession because of a lack of consumer purchasing power to buy the products of American industry.

The Eisenhower administration was disastrously slow in taking action against this recession; indeed, we still have close to 4 million Americans unemployed, with many more in jobs at only part time. Because of our constant pounding, the administration finally reversed itself and repudiated the hard-money policy, although its evil effects are regrettably still with us.

Call me a prophet of gloom, Mr. President. But it is your Secretary of Commerce who says that the gross national production is down $9 billion from 1953 to 1954, and it is your Federal Reserve Board that says that industrial production is down $12 billion from 1953 to 1954.

VETERANS' RIGHTS

Part of the liberal Republican policies was the increase of interest rates on veterans' mortgages. This was among the very first accomplishments of this administration.

As soon as we achieved a reversal of the hard-money policy, I started a campaign to decrease the veterans' loan interest rates to what they had been.

The chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, on the floor of the House, promised me such legislation would be enacted.

It has not even been reported to the Congress.

We did succeed in enacting a bill to increase veteran's pensions by 5 percent. Liberal, indeed. A monthly pension of $50 is now $52.50.

But all veterans' services—medical care, hospitalization, and the like—have been cut and cut more than 5 percent.

That was not being illiberal as to humans; it was being conservative as to money.

I have consistently supported measures to adequately compensate our Armed Forces and veterans for the sacrifices they make in the Nation's behalf. I have introduced bills providing free postage on letters to and from members of our Armed Forces, extra compensation for prisoners of the Korean war, income tax exemption for members of the Armed Forces, and various adjustments to secure equitable pensions, compensation, and retirement pay.

THE CONSUMER'S POCKETBOOK AND THE FARMERS' PLIGHT

During these 2 years of Republicanism, the cost of living has reached an alltime high, as any shopper can testify and as Government statistics prove in black and white. Coupled with this record high cost of living have been the hardships caused by the recession, so that many millions of Americans have suffered reductions in their standard of living.

Particularly pernicious has been the price of food. Consumers are forced to pay twice for their food, first in their tax bill to the Government and then in the marketplace. There is something radically wrong with the present agricultural program, as I have often said in Congress. Official reports show that food prices to the consumer have actually risen, while prices to farmers have declined.

Yet the Republican leadership has done nothing to remedy this situation. The only solution the Secretary of Agriculture offers is to reduce farmers' incomes below their present level, despite his claim that no appreciable reduction in consumer food prices will result. The proposal I have made is to try the Brannan plan for all agriculture, which candidate Eisenhower termed "moral bankruptcy," but which President Eisenhower has instituted for the wool industry.

The President and his agriculture experts pretend that a flexible price support program will reduce prices to the consumer and increase income to the farmer.

They continue in that fallacious claim even after they have proved themselves wrong.

We have never had rigid but only flexible price supports for the dairy industry.

One of the first things done by our Secretary of Agriculture, with the hearty approval of our President, was to drop price supports for this industry from 90 percent of parity to 75 percent.

Result: The farmer is getting less and the consumer is paying more.

That is not caused by any failure of the cut in prices to seep through.

I am talking about milk produced one day and sold the next day for which the farmer receives less and the consumer pays more.

How can they urge that any different result can come from products that will be stored for long periods of time?

Do not be fooled by any pretense that we will store less of the staples or basic commodities.

On the basis of the representations of the President and his Secretary of Agriculture that we will store more, this very session of Congress increased the buying, lending, and storing authority of the President and his Department of Agriculture from $6½ billion to $10 billion. That is in addition

to all the billions to be taken out of storage and not charged to the authorization.

LABOR AND UNEMPLOYMENT

One of the most important Republican pledges was amendment of the Taft-Hartley law. I favored the elimination of the Taft-Hartley Act's repressive measures against organized labor. I have always sought to promote legislation fair to labor and management.

But, as you may remember, President Eisenhower reversed himself when he refused to go along with the Secretary of Labor Durkin's program for labor legislation, which followed Candidate Eisenhower's promises. Mr. Durkin resigned. The Republican leadership did not allow Congress to pass on the bills seeking to right the wrongs of the Taft-Hartley Act.

I sponsored a number of bills in the labor field, but as usual the Republican leadership did nothing. One called for equal pay for equal work and an end to discriminatory wage practices against women. Still another case where the Republicans did nothing was the minimum wage. My bill called for an increase in the minimum wage from 75 cents to $1 an hour. Secretary of Labor Mitchell agreed there should be an increase, but President Eisenhower's Economic Report flatly opposed one.

The most serious problems in this field is that apparently the Republican Party is not concerned over the tremendous loss of earnings of the wage earners of our country. I have called attention to the millions of Americans without jobs, largely due to the administration's hard-money policy, and to the millions more earning smaller wages and working only part time.

In the present Congress, I have been a cosponsor of H.R. 9430, the Forand bill, dealing with unemployment-compensation standards. I introduced H.R. 1270 to permit an increase in earnings without loss of social security benefits. My bill, H.R. 1277, called for income-tax exemption on annuities and pensions, a principle adopted in part in the new tax law.

This administration takes credit for enactment of a broader social-security law, but soft-pedals the fact that this was a New Deal-Fair Deal measure that was supported and fought for by Democrats during all the years Republicans were resisting it as creeping socialism.

PUBLIC HEALTH AND HOUSING

I have always insisted that effective Government action must be taken to improve the national health. Proper medical care must be put within the reach of every American. It is a duty of the Government to assure that and to do it without socializing medicine.

Yet the Eisenhower budget cut cancer research 28 percent, heart disease research 33 percent, and the National Institutes of Health allotment 34 percent.

The so-called health reinsurance bill, the administration proposed, merely came to the aid of certain insurance companies, and did nothing for the health of the individual American man, woman, and child. The only public health in the bill was in its title. It made neither health nor insurance available to any citizen.

A similar situation was the Republican housing bill, which I called "a sham and a fraud upon the American people." I have long maintained a particular interest in public housing, and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is replete with my attempts to try to provide decent housing for all Americans. I proposed amendments to legislation to deal with FHA abuses, but Republicans joined as a unit to vote them down, as they did my efforts to prevent discrimination against minority groups and to provide low interest rates on housing loans and veterans' home loans.

However, the Republican leadership insisted on guaranteeing excessive profits for builders and lenders and blocked my efforts and those of my colleagues to write into law even the minimum number of public-housing units requested by the President.

Here too, the only public housing in the bill was in the title. I think it is outrageous that the people of this country should be denied an opportunity to live in decent shelter.

The so-called housing bill passed this year prevents any new public housing and effectually kills the program. The same bill, however, makes it easier for the bankers, mortgage lenders, and builders to get richer. It contains no real safeguards against a repetition of the FHA scandals now filling the newspapers. It does contain a provision subsidizing the mortgage lenders, guaranteeing them not only against loss, but also a profit, all at Government risk.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS: BEWITCHED, BOTHERED, AND BEWILDERED

The present world situation is one of crisis, and I have wholeheartedly supported the administration's continuation of the bipartisan policies initiated by prior Democratic administrations, including the point 4 program and foreign aid. I have urged the strengthening of our greatest potential instrument for peace, the United Nations.

Our position in world affairs, however, has worsened markedly under Republican leadership. World communism has increased, and we have lost much of the good will painstakingly built up by Democratic administrations with the non-Communist nations of the world. The present administration has cut our military strength and has foolishly tried to compensate for it by a series of transparently hypocritical slogans.

No one knows where we stand on anything. If you add up all the pronouncements made by the President, the Vice President, the Secretary of State, and assorted Republican leaders, the sum total is bluff and backtalk, threat and retreat.

If the matter were not so very serious, we could sing "Bewitched, Bothered, and Bewildered." We have learned a bitter lesson that Indochina could not be saved by the threats of Mr. Dulles and his colleagues. The situation in the Far East is bad.

The same muddled thinking is causing the situation in the Near East to worsen from day to day. This administration refuses to recognize that an enemy of a friend cannot be a friend and that you do not arm one who may use the arms against your friend.

I opposed the Bricker amendment, which would paralyze the President's right to conduct our foreign affairs.

I have supported the extension of reciprocal trade agreements and lower tariffs to aid our allies, even though the President backed down from the request he had termed "essential."

I have tried to build up friendly relations with the Latin American Republics, and with Italy, whose late Premier Alcide de Gasperi I had the pleasure of greeting on his visit here in 1951.

I have striven for peace in the Near East and the proper development of that new addition to the family of free nations, Israel.

OPERATION TAKEAWAY: GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

I have long felt that the Government should act as a model employer, and I have been deeply distressed by the methods of the present Republican administration as regards civil service. Aside from the reprehensible "numbers game" reflecting on many loyal civil servants, the Eisenhower administration has conducted the crudest sort of spoils system in taking away the jobs of Government employees for political reasons.

I have opposed the transfer of Government agencies from the New York and Brooklyn areas for political reasons, such as the Quartermaster Purchasing Agency and the diversion of contracts from the Brooklyn Naval Yard. I have sponsored bills to extend Federal compensation coverage to civil defense workers, for longevity step increases in the civil-service scale, to exempt compensation and pensions from income tax, to excuse Government employees from work to permit them time to vote in elections, and similar measures aimed at making the Government an employer of which every citizen can be proud.

I realize full well the inadequate salaries paid civil servants, and I have supported proposed increases. Having worked as a railway mail clerk, I know the hardships of postal employees, and on their behalf have testified before the House Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service.

It is nothing less than reprehensible to deny postal and Federal employees a 5-percent increase in their pay. From the President down, every Republican concedes that these loyal men and women are underpaid.

To deny them a pay increase unless we simultaneously provide additional revenue is a fraud and a sham. The subsidy given to business, by the Post office Department alone, exceeds the entire amount of such increase. The dividend tax exemption alone exceeds the cost of such a pitifully inadequate increase. The additional depreciation tax cut to big business is about double that cost.

Conservative policy indeed, as to wages for the underpaid and liberal, as to tax cuts for the greedy.

IMMIGRATION

The inequities of our present immigration laws make a mockery of the splendid inscription on the base of the Statue of Liberty in New York Harbor. I was happy to serve as a cosponsor with Senator Lehman and many other Members of Congress of a bill designed to rewrite completely our immigration laws and to remove every trace of bigotry therefrom.

In addition, I introduced a bill calling for 240,000 special visas during the fiscal year 1953–54, and have sponsored many private bills for the relief of my constituents and their families.

In this field, as in so many others, the fight must go on, and I am confident that someday the faults of our present immigration system will be corrected. They still remain under President Eisenhower's administration, although candidate Eisenhower pledged prompt reform.

TAXES: THE TRICKLE-DOWN BILL

Surely no part of the activities of government is more important than taxation—and it is in this field that we find the most glaring and inequitable giveaway.

Ninety-two percent of American families have good reason to be unhappy about the Republican tax bill that is now the law of the land, for they do not own any corporation stock. This Republican Congress and administration, however, have given tax benefits to the 8 percent of American families who do. In fact, the Republican program of "bundles for billionaires" especially benefits only six-tenths of 1 percent of American families, who own 80 percent of all publicly held stock.

The new Republican tax law provides benefits for stockholders, to the detriment of those Americans who earn their income through the sweat of their brow. Let us take as an example two families, each with husband, wife, and one child, and an income of $5,000. One of these two families has an income consisting entirely of wages or salary; its income tax will be $420. The other family, with income entirely from stock dividends, will pay an income tax of only $328. Thus unearned income is to be taxed less than earned income of the same size.

Of course, the tax difference increases greatly as income increases. Seventy-three and seven-tenths percent of taxpayers with incomes over $25,000 reported dividend receipts, while only 4.5 percent of taxpayers with incomes under $5,000 did so. It is primarily those with incomes of $10,000 or more per year who report dividend receipts. I might point out further that the Eisenhower administration asked for much greater benefits for stockholders, but Democrats in Congress managed to cut them down.

This Republican tax bill gives corporations, and the 20 percent of American taxpayers with incomes over $5,000, 77 percent of the total tax benefits. The 80 percent of American taxpayers with incomes less than $5,000 get only 23 percent of tax relief, thanks to Republicanism. It seems that the basis for Republican taxation is the old "trickle-down" idea, which we thought had disappeared forever; it gives the wealthy the benefit of tax relief although they need it least, in the hope that some of the benefit will trickle down to the great mass of the people. I am proud of my vote against the "trickle-down" tax bill.

I believe in giving tax relief to those who need it most. Ever since 1948 I have introduced resolutions calling for an increase in personal exemptions to $3,500 for heads of families as the first step in reducing taxes. But of course this was in conflict with the policy of the Republicans in control who insists on giving tax preference to those wealthy enough not to need it. One of my proposals, however, was partially carried into effect: An exemption will be provided for the first $1,200 of retirement income. Another of my proposals gained some ground, too; child-care allowances were provided, but much less than adequate and much less than I called for in my bill.

One further fact should be mentioned here about taxes, because Republicans are very unlikely to mention it themselves; the general 10-percent decrease in individual taxes that became effective the first of this year was passed by a Democratic Congress and signed by a Democratic President. The Republican tax bill is the one benefiting the well-to-do, and that is the giveaway I opposed.

Please understand, I am not opposed to eliminating double taxation. But I insist that inequities be remedied equally. The taxpayer earning interest on a savings account is entitled to the same relief as a taxpayer receiving dividends on stock. Furthermore, if we cannot remove all inequities because we will lose too much revenue, do not select one class as against another.

Do not increase and continue depreciation and depletion allowances at the expense of the wage earner. If we cannot save taxes for all, save taxes for him first. He spends all his earnings almost as fast he gets them. That is what makes for prosperity.

CIVIL RIGHTS AND BROTHERHOOD

Unfortunately, the Republican leadership defeated my efforts to prohibit discrimination in regard to public housing projects, and did nothing about my measures to prevent Federal aid to National Guard units practicing discrimination and to secure similar acts to guarantee civil rights for all.

I have always recognized the role of religion in life, and I have been privileged to participate in many religious and interfaith activities.

Although I recognize the separation of church and state guaranteed by our Constitution, I appreciate that the fundamental principles of civil rights are based on the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God.

We can legislate on these principles intelligently only if we understand them. We understand them only if we know religion.

That is why I constantly direct my colleagues' attention to the activities of all religious groups and do my utmost to stir them into action against all antireligious groups and activities.

In opposing McCarthyism and in deploring the current wave of hysteria in this country largely inspired thereby, I do not lessen my hatred of communism and all its works. My constituents may well remember the campaign of 1948 when my opponent was Lee Pressman, once described as the No. 1 Communist of the country. In that year the Communists spent a quarter of a million dollars trying to defeat me, and I was viciously attacked because of my vigorous anticommunism. I am happy to associate myself with the remarks of the Most Reverend Bernard J. Sheil, auxiliary bishop of Chicago and a leading Roman Catholic churchman and genuine anti-Communist. He said, among other things:

"I take it that a genuine anti-Communist is one who despises the court methods of the Communists. I take it he hates the Communist idea that one is guilty until proved innocent. I take it that the genuine anti-Communist is one who above all believes in the democratic procedures and is willing to stand by them, even in the face of great temptations to lose one's temper and to lose one's faith in the methods of freemen."

I am proud to stand alongside him in this vital fight for our civil liberties.

I am the only Member of any Congress who had an opponent who dared to avail himself of the privilege of running for office under the name and emblem of the Communist Party.

I am also proud of the autographed photograph given me by one of the great statesmen of the free anti-Communist world, the late Premier Alcide de Gasperi of Italy, for my efforts in behalf of Italy's fight against communism. Indeed, when I think that a certain Senator first discovered communism in 1950, 2 years after I had opposed and defeated communism in a congressional election; when I think of my votes for foreign aid to bolster the anti-Communist allies of this country and the contrast with his votes against all foreign aid; when I think of his apparent objective, the catching of headlines rather than Communists, and the demoralizing effect of his wave of fear, then I am certain that even my humble efforts have done more against communism than his ever will.

I have called attention to the McCarthyite actions of the staff of the Reece investigating committee, branding as communistic the encyclicals of two Popes of the Catholic Church. I have opposed—even when almost alone—the serious threats to our civil liberties posed by actions taken during a wave of hysteria, when some legislators abdicated their responsibilities because of fear. In my position, I have been happy to coincide with the views of J. Edgar Hoover, Chief of the FBI, and Judge Harold Medina, who presided over the trial which resulted in the conviction of the top Communists of the country.

THE FOLKS BACK HOME

It is with mixed humility and pride that I present this report. It is with humility, because I recognize my responsibility as a servant of my constituents and of the public interest. It is with pride, because I have never failed to carry out a campaign pledge, and because I have consistently striven to serve the public interest as I saw it to be.

My services have always been at the disposal of my constituents. I have never failed to try to help with their individual problems so far as I was able to do so. I joined with my colleagues in trying to keep local Federal services operating efficiently and at a maximum.

While I do not expect the electorate to agree with me at all times on all matters, at least we will make every effort to understand one another so that our respect for each other will survive our disagreement.

That is the American way.

HOBGOBLINS AND REALITIES

(Extension of remarks of Hon. ABRAHAM J. MULTER, of New York, in the House of Representatives, Tuesday, Aug. 2, 1955)

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, before the start of our legislative session, the President had great misgivings about the coming months. He reprimanded the voters of the Nation because they chose to send Democrats to Congress, while the administration was of the opposing political faith. He forecast that a Republican administration would not have the support of a Democratic Congress. During the 1954 congressional campaign, he even foresaw the possibility of a cold war within Government which could destroy the Nation's unity at this crucial time.

The same kind of talk from a Democratic President would have been labeled in the one-party press either as intended to scare our people or as an insult to our intelligence. Coming from the leader of the Republican Party, that same part of our American press repeated the reckless charge as though it were unimpeachable gospel.

How disappointing it must be to them to find that the hobgoblins and the gremlins disappeared into thin air even before the 84th Congress opened.

Now that the first session of this Congress has closed, the American people are entitled to the full story.

Even though an ardent Democrat, I will not pretend that none of my Democratic colleagues made any mistakes, nor that there was no occasion when some of my Republican colleagues did vote right. I do proclaim, however, as loudly as I can, that my Democratic colleagues voted right more frequently than my Republican colleagues and conversely, that the Republicans voted wrong more frequently than the Democrats—too frequently for the good of our country.

Let us now proceed to analyze the record.

The President greatly underestimated the caliber and character of the Democratic majority. He now admits that the political responsibility of the Democratic-controlled Congress made the successes of this session possible. The proof of Democratic leadership and support—the willingness to lay aside political antagonism and jealousies—is a part of the record.

It is with great pleasure that I review these accomplishments. In doing so, we must have in mind that what is right or wrong is not determined by who sponsors a proposal, nor by which party supports it. The determination must be based on the sole test of what is best for the greatest number of our people.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS: UNITY AND STRENGTH

Nowhere is the story of cooperation and responsibility better illustrated than in the areas of foreign policy and national defense. The world situation threatens to remain a precarious one for many years to come. Although the great ideological conflicts between East and West show some indication of being eased, few are shortsighted enough to believe that the aims of international communism have changed so completely in so short a time. If these differences between East and West cannot be settled or at least compromised, the alternative is a global atomic war from which no side could emerge victorious. While urging thorough exploration of every path that might lead to world peace, the Democratic Party stood as one man in favor of keeping our guard up and our defenses strong enough to withstand a sneak attack. In our system of government

the President and his State Department must assume the leadership in the realm of international affairs. Congress responded by supporting them completely on every major issue. The President was authorized to use U.S. military forces in defending Formosa and the nearby Pescadores Islands. Executive agreements were ratified establishing a mutual-defense treaty with Nationalist China and a NATO-type defense alliance for southeast Asia.

Despite overwhelming sentiment in the Congress for it, the executive branch of our Government took no firm or realistic step toward establishing permanent peace in the Near East.

The occupation of Germany was ended so that she could be armed and brought into the European defense system. Austria was reestablished as an independent and democratic state.

To carry out our foreign policy aims, Congress authorized $3.2 billion for economic and military aid to foreign countries.

To encourage the benefits of international trade, the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act was extended for 3 years so that the President has the full authority to continue his efforts to promote our foreign affairs. A bill simplifying our complicated and outmoded system of customs definition, classification, and rate structure was passed by the House of Representatives and awaits Senate approval in the next session of Congress.

A manpower reserve program was put into effect which provides for a trained military reserve of 3,900,000 men by 1959. Such a program, the President told us, will avoid the cost and inconvenience of a large standing Army, while at the same time providing for the national defense. It was necessary, nevertheless, to extend the selective service law for 4 more years, including the draft of doctors and dentists for 2 more years. I am far from satisfied with either of these laws, but believe they are the best compromise we could get at this time.

Atomic energy projects were authorized to the extent of $237 million for research facilities and actual production of atomic peacetime projects, as well as atomic weapons. Funds were also authorized for the expansion of existing aeronautical research, for construction of foreign military bases and housing, and for a billion-dollar Navy shipbuilding program.

The only issue on which Congress and the administration clashed was the relatively minor one involving Marine Corps manpower. Congress refused to bow to the Republican demand for a 22,000-man cut in this important military unit.

All in all, the Democratic Congress was happy to follow a foreign-policy program whose principles were enunciated by President Truman and Secretary of State Acheson several years ago. The result has been a satisfying one. American prestige has grown abroad, the cold war tensions have lessened, if only temporarily, and a period of diplomatic negotiation has been vigorously begun. Democratic support, far from being absent, has been consistently greater than the support of the President's own party. Because of this support, the United States has been able to demonstrate its strength and unity.

SOCIAL LEGISLATION FOR THE MANY AND NOT THE FEW

In domestic matters, of course, there was no comparable need for unanimity of thinking. The Democratic majority acted according to its political and economic principles and clashed with the administration where there was substantial difference. Once again, however, Mr. Eisenhower's forecast of a cold war was completely unfounded. The Democratic opposition to administration policies was as intelligent and high-minded as it was determined. There was no opposition merely for opposition's sake.

In the area of social legislation, several of the administration's proposals were extensions of earlier New Deal and Fair Deal ideas. These found enthusiastic Democratic support as far as they went—but often they did not go nearly far enough. Increased railroad retirement benefits, better FHA mortgage insurance coverage, and improved surplus property disposal to schools and hospitals were implementations of the Democratic program. Other parts of the administration program, however, proved quite inadequate.

A minimum wage proposal of 90 cents per hour, unreal at a time of high prices and general prosperity, was changed to a $1 minimum. This increase over the old 75-cents minimum will help keep industries from running away to the South and West where labor is so much cheaper, as well as preserve a decent wage for all American workers. More important, it raises the standard of living of all our citizens, nationally and not sectionally.

The administration's housing bill asked for only 35,000 public housing units and made them well-nigh impossible of construction by improper restrictions. Congress increased the low-rent provisions by 10,000 additional units and eased the requirements to enable more extensive and better balanced housing projects. Such liberalization of the law is necessitated by the acute housing shortage and the slum clearance needs of our urban centers.

To cure the unfortunate polio vaccine mixup, Congress authorized $2 million more than was asked by the President. In addition, all necessary funds are to be made available to the States to purchase enough vaccine for one-third of all the unvaccinated children, plus all expectant mothers. A more extensive and a better program was opposed by the administration as unnecessary and a step toward socialized medicine. The threat of a veto of the entire program effectually prevented the enactment of control legislation. Obviously, this administration is willing to risk black markets which may destroy the health of our people.

In appropriations for general matters of health, education, and social welfare, the Congress added more than $17 million to the Eisenhower program. The Congress felt that these were matters in which false economy was extremely dangerous. We were not willing to bear the responsibility of holding back research programs on cancer, heart disease, arthritis, and mental health so that the Federal budget might be a fraction of 1 percent lower. This, too, points up a basic difference of philosophy. The Democrats believe in being liberal with money to conserve the health of our people.

So too, an attempt to liberalize the social security laws and make the program more adequate to meet today's problems was stoutly opposed by the Republican administration. The Democratic majority in the House of Representatives overwhelmingly passed a bill to lower retirement age for women from 65 to 62, to allow disability benefits to 250,000 workers aged 50 or more, to continue disability benefits for children after age 18, and to extend coverage to the professions. Administration opposition in the Senate defeated this program there, although the need for such legislation has become more and more apparent in recent years.

Throughout the consideration of these matters, the Republicans consistently showed themselves for what they are—a party dedicated to the few rather than the many; a party which is more interested in budgetary figures than human needs; a party seeking to carry out a minimal social program at a minimal expense. Plenty of lipservice, but no votes.

BUSINESS AND TAXATION: THE LITTLE FISH IN A BIG POND

The Eisenhower administration has time and again denied that it is an administration of, by, and for big business. And yet the record clearly shows that almost all the major economic policies which seek to help the small businessman have originated among the Democratic Members of Congress and have been opposed by the Republican administration.

The Small Business Administration, an agency dedicated to the plight of small business, was extended for 2 years. The administration opposed any increase in its authorized funds. The amount of any individual loan was increased to $250,000. These loans are intended for those deserving small businessmen who cannot get help from regular bank sources. The disaster loan program and the small business participation in Government procurement were strengthened. The lending function together with the help given to small business in getting a fair share of Government procurement contracts makes SBA one of the most important agencies to have been started in recent years.

This is one of the few domestic policies, which in principle, has been consistently supported by both parties.

Bills were passed to halt the growing monopolistic practices in business. The antitrust penalty for violation of the Sherman Act was raised from $5,000 to $50,000. It was evident that $5,000 to a large corporation is merely a petty-cash transaction which was no deterrent to such a potential violator. In addition, the House passed a bill to curb the influence of bank holding companies by requiring Federal approval of new bank acquisitions by holding companies and requiring those companies to divest themselves of their nonbanking interests. This bill is designed to preserve the small independent bank as the banking unit best able to serve the interests of the small businessmen. In the area of taxes, most of the existing income, corporate and excess-profits taxes were extended for another year. The only important proposal for tax relief came from the Democratic side of the Senate and the House of Representatives. Although this concerned a mere $20 cut in personal income taxes for each taxpayer and each dependent—relief aimed at the lowest-income bracket, yet equally fair to all income brackets—the Republican administration forcefully rejected the idea and caused its defeat in the Senate after the House had given its approval.

ARMED SERVICES AND VETERANS: SOMETHING FOR SOMETHING

Thanks to Democratic support, the serviceman and veteran were not forgotten during the past few months. Those who were in the service as of January 31, 1955, were allowed to go on building up GI schooling benefits until discharged from the service. The Veterans' Administration direct-loan program was extended for another 2 years and was broadened to include home improvements as well as home purchases. Disabled veterans, including those who fought in Korea, were given the privilege of starting purchase of a special automobile before October 1956.

To help the buildup of a strong backbone of career servicemen—an essential supplement to the new military Reserve program—Congress raised the pay and created greater benefits for servicemen as an incentive to a military career. Finally, Congress decided to continue regular pay to the dependents and relatives of missing or captured men who had fought in Korea.

The feeling was strong in the Congress that our Government should do as much as it could for the men who defend our country and are called upon to make great sacrifices.

This program was both an expression of gratitude of the American citizen and a means of compensation for their sacrifices.

TRANSPORTATION: BUT NOT AT ANY COST

The pressing need to bring the Nation's transportation system up to date was apparent to the leaders of both parties. Airport construction was encouraged to the extent of $252 million in grants-in-aid to the States for 4 years.

In advocating a nationwide highway-construction program, the Eisenhower administration asked that the 10-year program be financed with special high-rate bonds. This would have involved at least $2.7 billion in unnecessary interest payments to bankers and other bondholders. The administration proposal was another unfortunate example of special-interest legislation which the Democratic majority has refused to stomach. The Democratic majority almost unanimously rejected this. They proposed in its place a system of user taxes on gasoline and tires, a plan by which those who benefited by the construction of the highways would pay their cost. Opposition to this proposal arose from many sources and the House defeated the bill even though the Senate had given its approval. The Republican opposition was almost unanimous.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES: MORE OF THE SAME

With regard to the pay of Federal employees, the administration insisted it would approve only a straight 5 percent increase, while conceding the employees were entitled to more. The Democrats once again felt this to be bad business and false economy, having in mind how much Government workers' pay had lagged behind the cost-of-living increases and comparable wage increases among other workers throughout the country. We prevailed, though not to the full extent. Increased pay bills for more than the administration recommended were passed and approved.

THE GIVEAWAYS: HIGHER AND MORE

The minks are now sables. The 5-percenters are 10-percenters. Teapot Dome was a drop in a bucket compared to Dixon-Yates. First they gave away our oil lands. Now they are trying to give away all the rest of our natural resources.

The projects in which big business would not risk its stockholders' money are now beginning to pay back the taxpayer his investment. So the administration will now get the Government out of business by giving to big business the taxpayers' property.

To help do this our Government now uses W.O.C.'s. That is the old dollar-a-year man. He now works for us "without compensation." Big business pays him and lends him to the Government for nothing. For nothing to the taxpayer, but not for nothing to his private employer. He merely steers the Government business to his employer. He sits in on all the high-level policymaking conferences, either as the head of the department or as his consultant. Maybe he does not give his private employer any advance information. Maybe he does not write the specifications that only his private employer can bid on. Maybe I am speculating. Then why did Secretary of Commerce Weeks refuse to tell a congressional committee what his big business advisers do? Why was it necessary to employ as a top executive in the Container Division of that Department, the Washington "special representative," on the payroll as such, of the country's largest container corporation? The testimony showed this man knew nothing about the business.

The full story is being developed now and promises to be the biggest scandal of our history.

THE FARMER AND THE CONSUMER: THEY NEED EACH OTHER

I have supported the Democratic farm program because I am convinced that neither farmer nor consumer can prosper alone. They live and prosper together, or not at all.

The Eisenhower farm program will destroy our country.

Our warehouses are bursting at the seams. Some because they are overloaded. Others because this administration bought and paid for defective storage facilities.

In various parts of the country there is unemployment so serious that our people are starving while surplus commodities in Government warehouses are rotting away.

Under 20 years of Democratic administration, the farm program sustained losses of $1 billion. In less than 2½ years of Republican administration the farm program lost $2½ billion.

In 20 years under the Democrats, the maximum authorization for the program was $6¾ billion. In 2½ years under the Republicans, the Eisenhower administration increased it to $12 billion.

If you do not think cheese smells, ask Secretary Benson to explain about the millions of dollars he just handed to—no, not the farmers—to the big cheese processors.

FISCAL POLICY: I HOPE YOU CAN ADD

Candidate Eisenhower promised to balance the budget. Of course, you know he was fooling. President Eisenhower, thinking you took Candidate Eisenhower seriously, has hastened to explain that he did not say when.

But he did promise as President, that if we increased the national debt limit in 1954 to $281 billion, he would cut back the increase in 1955. In the last days of this session, he sent word to your Congress that he could not keep his promise and that we must give him another year in which to do what he said needed only 1 year to do.

Let us not be too hard on him. I think that you, too, would have trouble with that much money. I know that I would.

MY OWN PROJECTS: SOMETHING FOR THE FUTURE

Every Congressman has his own particular interests that he hopes to see enacted. Throughout the years I have been able to gain the approval of many proposals while others still await congressional approval. Without attempting to set them forth in the order of their importance, some of the proposals I hope to see enacted in the near future are: low-income housing for the aged; a complete civil-rights program; revision of the refugee relief and immigration laws; no discrimination or segregation in National Guard units; measures to keep racist and defamatory literature out of the mail; power to the President to act in health matters in case of a national emergency; strengthening of our antitrust laws to help keep the small businessman as the backbone of our free-enterprise system; income-tax deductions for all educational expenses of dependents and exemptions for servicemen serving overseas; prevention of the giveaway programs of Government rights and property; free postage to and from members of the Armed Forces; a review of all disapproved veterans' claims by the U.S. Court of Claims; a sound and just security program that will weed out the disloyal, without destroying the loyal; a system of standby economic controls for the prevention of inflation; a system of allocations and priorities of fuel for emergencies; a Department of Civil Defense within the Department of Defense, with strengthened authority; greater consideration of consumer problems by establishing a congressional committee therefor, as well as an executive department to protect the consumer; better pay for Federal employees; equal pay for equal work by women; and a code of ethics in Government for Government officials which, among other things, will prevent big business from acquiring our birthright.

CONCLUSION: RESPONSIBILITY AND INTELLIGENCE

The record of the Congress this year has been a mixed one. And this is far from a complete record. It is merely a brief summary. Some of the more important legislation that might have been enacted this year have been left until next year.

The accomplishments, nevertheless, have been solid ones—the very opposite of what the Republican leaders told the American people to expect.

The moral of this story may be simply stated: the opposition to the administration by the Democratic majority has been intelligent and responsible. Where differences have existed between administration and Congress there has been a give-and-take and compromise worthy of democratic institutions. The people of this country were not neglected by their Government in favor of partisan politics and petty jealousies. The Democrats of this country have a right to be proud of that record.

REFLECTION IS GOOD FOR THE POLITICAL SOUL

(Extension of remarks of Hon. ABRAHAM J. MULTER, of New York, in the House of Representatives, Friday, July 27, 1956)

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, 4 years ago a giant hoax was perpetrated on the American people. They were promised a new approach to Government, one that truly was to represent them. In 1952, they were promised a world of peace and prosperity, lower taxes, higher wages, lower prices, and a balanced budget. The best business heads in America were to run our Government.

Two years went by, and the disillusioned American people went back to their own party, the Democratic party, by electing a Democratic Congress. The administration moaned and warned of a partisan cold war, of a stalemate within the Government. President Eisenhower cried loudest. Let us now review what happened.

Whatever good there was in the President's program had more support in every instance from the Democratic Party than from his own Republican Party. The President, himself, presently admits that the Democratic Congress produced a substantial amount of worthwhile legislation.

In 1952 the American people were fooled into believing in a program that its authors themselves did not believe in. We hope in this election year they will not fall prey to the hoax that the Elephant will again try to foist upon them.

Evaluation of the past will help us to spot the election year myths when they are presented by Republican campaigners.

THE ADMINISTRATION—ABSENTEE MANAGEMENT: WHO'S MINDING THE STORE?

We were promised a President who would be a guiding knight, an active and strong manager, a leader of our country, an expert in military affairs, and a friend of our foreign allies.

Instead we have an ailing gentleman, who had no experience in government, and who has shown no interest or desire to learn about his tasks. On several occasions he has told his press conferences about seeking the enactment of bills he had already signed into law. This disinterest or lack of knowledge cannot be attributed to ill health. Eisenhower's pleasing personality and past military achievements are no substitute for political leadership. There can be no justification for his delegating the authority and

responsibility vested by our Constitution solely in the President.

The business managers of our Nation, such as Secretary Wilson and Secretary Humphrey, may be fine in business, but they have proved they do not belong in government. The promotion of the national well-being for the benefit of the many rather than the few is foreign to their philosophy.

It is not true that what is good for General Motors is good for the country. Profits of an automobile industry are not equivalent to the welfare of a people.

Our health program should not be measured with an eye to a balanced budget. Nor has Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey earned the right to act as an adviser to our Armed Forces. Defense and national security must not be impaired by a desire for a balanced budget.

THE CONSUMER, LABOR, AND THE FARMER—THE TIGHT SQUEEZE

The one problem common to the farmer, to labor, and to all of us, is that of the consumer.

Candidate Eisenhower promised us a lower cost of living. President Eisenhower will surely disclaim responsibility for a higher cost of living.

Consumers prices are at a record high. The National Consumer Price Index rose for the fourth successive time in a year. It has reached the highest peak in 5 years. Next month another rise is expected.

The Democratic farm program is based on the knowledge that general prosperity cannot be maintained while we continue to depress the farmer. President Eisenhower vetoed our Democratic farm price support bill and then quickly raised price supports himself. Apparently his sliding scale had slid too far, for farm income is down 30 percent in the past year.

Milk prices to the consumer have continued to rise. Secretary Benson decided to raise dairy prices just when manufacturers had warehouses filled with cheese and butter bought at the lower price level. The farmer who sold his milk at the lower price then had to buy it back as high-priced butter. This apparently is the Republican idea of how to aid the dairy farmer. No wonder so many of these farm families spread oleo on their bread.

Milk prices do not worry Secretary Benson who finds that the little farmer is of no importance. Benson is more concerned with the three members of his advisory Board whose firms have been indicted for monopolistic practices. Mr. Benson is apparently fully occupied in directing the administration's ever-changing farm policy. He first opposed and then supported a soil bank; he first opposed and then approved the plowing under of crops; first opposed and then approved the idea of farm policy as a political issue.

The present administration makes many boasts as to the increase in the size of the labor force. This increase is largely a result of our ever-increasing population. Of far greater significance is the fact that at least 2,900,000 people who want jobs, cannot find them. In the past year 1 million persons have been added to our unemployed rolls. That represents a total of nearly 10 million American men, women, and children who have lost their means of support. The billion-dollar year that General Motors has just concluded does not help these people.

The Democratic Party sponsored a bill to help our unemployed learn new skills when their previous trades no longer offer employment. Retraining these people will help to relieve all of us of the burden of support. This is the type of constructive, positive legislation which brought our country to the prosperous state which it enjoyed in 1952 when Republican businessmen began to tear it down.

Candidate Eisenhower pledged himself to the amendment of the Taft-Hartley Act. President Eisenhower has consistently refused to live up to his campaign promises. Former Secretary of Labor Durkin offered the President 19 amendments, which were in accord with Candidate Eisenhower's promises. Eisenhower refused to go along with any of them. Instead he submitted to Congress a program which would toughen the Taft-Hartley Act. His Labor Secretary resigned and was replaced with another big businessman. Congress refused to go along with President Eisenhower's labor program as presented.

In an attempt to meet the increased cost of living, Congress has raised the minimum wage to $1 per hour over President Eisenhower's protest that 90 cents was adequate.

The Republican Party as represented by President Eisenhower may be a party of the people—but of and for a very few people.

BAD GOVERNMENT

During his 1952 campaign Candidate Eisenhower had much to say about corruption in government and useless personnel in government.

We said then and repeat now: no political party has a monopoly on virtue or efficiency. Every party when trusted with the privilege to govern must be ever alert to weed out the loafers, the incompetent, and the criminal.

President Eisenhower has sadly failed the people in that regard.

The executive departments, in almost every instance, are employing more people and more top executives at higher salaries than in any previous administration. The exceptions are in the so-called service departments.

The Post Office Department serving all of the American people is using fewer employees and giving the worst service we have ever experienced.

The Veterans' Administration, serving our veterans, and particularly our disabled veterans, has been reduced in force, moved around, kicked around, and made a less useful agency to those who need it most.

The Agriculture Department has been reorganized to take out of the hands of the farmers most of the things they can do best for themselves.

Misappropriating funds is the order of the day for this administration. This administration has appointed more corrupt officials than any other in our history.

Starting with Secretary Benson using Department funds to refurbish a Government lodge for his personal use, we find corruption rampant in every department.

Warehouses bursting at the seams because improperly constructed; selling millions of dollars worth of cheese to the processors and buying them back at higher prices, without the cheese ever leaving storage or changing hands; indictment of three members of Secretary Benson's Advisory Board; self-dealing for his private profit of one of his paid subordinates; loading the school lunch program with more than $400,000 worth of phony transportation charges in Illinois for the sole benefit of one of his Republican friends. There are no doubt many more such incidents which have not yet been exposed. We are just beginning to investigate the monopoly enjoyed by three companies in disposing of surplus commodities.

Under 20 years of Democratic administration the Commodity Credit Corporation never exceeded an authorization of $6¾ billion. The total lost in those 20 years from operation of the program was about $1 billion. During 3½ years, the Republicans have increased that authorization to $14 billion. The losses have increased by at least $4 billion. No small part is attributable to the increased interest rates paid to bankers, and much of it paid in violation of law.

Dixon-Yates was bad; so bad that even the Republican administration has backed down on its spurious claim of legality.

The cancellation of a Defense Department contract awarded to the Chrysler Corp., and awarding the same business to General Motors is only a small part of the wrongdoing in that Department.

The foot-in-mouth statements of Secretary Wilson is the least important of the many things that are bad in this administration.

The Small Business Committees of the Congress have devoted some part of almost every day to urging the Defense Department to follow the law and its own regulations in awarding contracts and making payments earned thereunder.

The Office of the Comptroller of the Currency and that of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation have also been managed in a manner adverse to the public interest.

The big banks and big holding companies have grown bigger with the aid and abetment of the Republican appointees to those agencies.

The responsibility for the Illinois bank scandal, the theft of State funds through bank manipulations, must be borne at least in part by those same Republican Federal appointees.

Internal mismanagement by those officials of their offices I hope will soon be the subject of thorough investigation.

Under the leadership of the Secretary of the Treasury and the Comptroller of the Currency attempts are being made to weaken our banking laws for the benefit of the big banks and to the detriment of the small banks and small investors. A part of that scheme was the abortive attempt to destroy the right of minority stockholders to minority representation on the directorates of national banks.

The full story about the giveaways by the Interior Department, the attempt to destroy TVA, REA, and our other public facilities and natural resources requires much more time than I can give here.

SMALL BUSINESS

Since 1953 our Government has been taken over by big business and the big banking interests of the country. The little fellow has had no representative in the Cabinet or at the top of any executive department. On the contrary, he has had as antagonist big business and the big banks, not only in the marketplace but also in every department of Government.

What is even worse, the so-called w.o.c.—the big businessman on loan to the Government, drawing no compensation from the Government, but being paid by his big business employer—has an inside track keeping big business constantly informed as to Government plans and channeling Government business away from the small businessman and to big business.

Credit restrictions are manipulated so as to dry up all sources of credit for the small businessman.

Except in times of war or emergency, w.o.c.'s should not be employed by the Government.

I have contended and will continue to urge that the Small Business Administration Act must be strengthened by eliminating the Policy Board now dominated by Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey and Secretary of Commerce Weeks. The agency must be made not only permanent, but permanently independent of the Treasury Department and the Department of Commerce.

The small businessman, displaced by slum clearance and highway construction, should be entitled to low-interest-rate loans based upon character and ability to perform, rather than bankable collateral.

The Defense Department must be directed by the Small Business Administration to dis-

card, as required by law, the old arbitrary numerical definition of a small business firm and follow a more realistic one. This will give small business a larger and more equitable share of Government contracts.

The Small Business Administration may boast that during 3 years it has approved 3,560 business loans, in an aggregate amount of $137,915,000, on account of which it disbursed $52,578,000. Compare that, however, to what this administration has done for big business in the same period through the Export-Import Bank alone, to wit, 805 loans, for a total authorized aggregate amount of almost $7,500 million, against which it disbursed over $5,171 million. The Export-Import Bank made 22 percent as many loans, with an average disbursement of over 426 times more per loan. To put it more simply, SBA's loan disbursements averaged less than $15,000 each and the Bank's more than $6,400,000 each.

While big business has made more and bigger profits than at any time in the history of our country, small business has been going into bankruptcy in greater numbers than at any time since the depression days of the early 1930's.

For years, I have led the fight to establish offices of the Small Business Administration in Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico so as to enable American citizens residing so far from the mainland to avail themselves of the privileges accorded by law to all. I personally urged the Appropriations Committee to give the agency the money for that purpose. The money was voted. I am still waiting to be informed that even one of those offices has been opened.

GIVEAWAYS: THE GOVERNMENT'S PRIVATE CHARITY

The administration in its "partnership" plan gives, and gives, and gives, and the people get nothing in return. First, it was offshore oil lands, then TVA, then natural gas. Now, any river or forest that big business wants, it can have for the asking.

The President wanted and got a Federal water storage project on the upper Colorado River. Since no big business wanted it, the President's partnership plan was forgotten. And Idaho Power Co. wanted to build a private power project at Hells Canyon, so the administration opposed the public sponsored Hells Canyon project. The administration opposed the idea of municipalities in New York State having priority purchase rights to the electric power which would issue from the Niagara River power development program.

The development of atomic energy for peace is an idea that the Democratic Party sponsors wholeheartedly. But we voted against the administration's atoms-for-peace program since it would have given a few big businesses a monopoly in the development of atomic energy for peacetime use.

Incidentally, Attorney General Brownell now has completely disavowed the Dixon-Yates contract and has accepted the view of the Democratic Party that the whole agreement was illegal.

It took New Deal reclamation programs to give us back our forests. It has taken less than 4 years of an Eisenhower administration to lose them. The administration's policy is to lease them to private industry—which flagrantly abuses them.

We have no right to expect anything else of the Department of the Interior under this administration. Its consistent policy is to put political appointees in the place of ardent careermen. It has been no accident that many of these political appointees have been anticonservationists. There is no necessity for commenting on the scandals that have evolved over the private uses that many of these appointees have made of the assets of the Department.

FEDERAL AND POSTAL EMPLOYEES

Anyone aware of the importance of all Federal and particularly the postal employees, can see no reason why they should not have many of the rights that are accorded to workers in private industry.

We have, over the objection of the administration, raised their wages, to enable them to meet the rising costs of living. This, while the President kept clamoring for increased pay for those already in the highest brackets. We have also liberalized the civil service retirement benefits.

We have not yet devised any method to stop administrative destruction of the merit system.

Nor have we been able to abolish the brazen gag order that Republican Postmaster General Summerfield has imposed on postal workers. He has forbidden them to complain about the Post Office to anyone but their superiors in the Post Office. Members of Congress and the press have become off limits to these employees. We must now write into the law, permission for these employees to complain to their Congressmen without impairing their merit standing.

The Supreme Court's decision, limiting the scope of the security program to those areas of government which can be defined as sensitive would seem to have eliminated the problem created by the unwarranted administrative security clearance procedures. The administration is now sponsoring a bill which would classify all Government positions as "sensitive." The recommendations of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, which fundamentally agree with the decision of the Supreme Court, should be followed in this regard. No American wants subversives in our Government. We can and must provide adequate means for protecting the Government's best interests. But we must do it without needless duplication of effort and without destroying our fundamental principles of fair play and of good government.

VETERANS AND ARMED FORCES

Neither the veterans nor the Armed Forces have been forgotten by the 84th Congress. Aware of our debt, we, the Democratic Party, sponsored and supported measures to better their lot.

The veteran home-loan program has been extended, as have been the disability benefits for the veterans of World Wars I and II. Neither forgetting the youth of our Nation nor those who were their fathers, we are providing educational assistance to children of servicemen who died in World War II and in Korea. We have extended the Missing Persons Act authorizing continued pay for service personnel missing or captured in Korea.

To maintain a strong armed force, we have extended the draft law to 1957. To provide greater incentive for career personnel—a necessary essential in our defense program—we have placed all military personnel under our social security program, and have increased the benefit payments to survivors of servicemen and veterans. We have also provided for medical care for the dependents of members of our Armed Forces. We have raised the pay of our 6-month trainees under the Reserve program as well as the pay of the Armed Forces in order to attract and keep better men in the service.

SOCIAL LEGISLATION—THE UNBALANCED SCALE

Social legislation is not a partisan matter to the Democratic Party. The welfare of the Nation is more important than party politics. We, of the Democratic Party, were happy to note that much of the welfare legislation of the administration was an extension of New and Fair Deal plans. These acts and others of a similar nature were supported wholeheartedly by the Democrats.

Over the administration's protests we succeeded in amending the Social Security Act by lowering the retirement age for women to 62 and permitting the disabled to become eligible for full benefits at the age of 50. Democratically supported and New Deal initiated, and administration sponsored, the benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act, and the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act were increased.

National disaster insurance for the victims of flood and hurricane disasters was established.

We have extended the Federal school milk program to include child care centers, nursery schools, settlement houses, summer camps and other similar nonprofit associations.

I sponsored a Federal Scholarship Act. Worthy students who desire a college education or postgraduate work, would be enabled to apply for these loans to aid them through school. This is no giveaway, since the students will repay these loans when their education has been completed. Such a program has been found feasible in prior years. It should never have been abandoned.

We have also authorized $378 million in Federal aid for school construction, in areas which have become overcrowded by increased governmental activity.

Little need be said of the failure of the school-aid bill. Due to a shameful coalition of a minority of the members of my own party and of a majority of the Republicans, this much-needed bill was defeated.

In matters of national health and medical research we went beyond what the administration requested. The Oveta Hobby attitude, of health being a strictly private affair, did not reoccur during this session. Ninety million dollars have been set aside for medical research of crippling and killing diseases, for extended hospital construction and for training nurses and health specialists. Four million dollars have been set aside for a Dental Research Institute.

The housing bill authorizes a public housing program of only 35,000 units a year for 2 years. The Democratic majority in the House felt that this was an unrealistic attempt to remedy the housing shortage. Administrative opposition proved too strong and we were compelled to settle for less than is needed. We did succeed in liberalizing the terms of Federal mortgages; for financing home improvements, for financing single-family home purchases, and for financing rental dwellings. We also liberalized, not enough, but somewhat, the Federal mortgage terms for elderly people and for urban renewal projects.

The administration sponsored a civil rights bill which was quite innocuous. It provided for things which the President now has the right to accomplish without any new laws. Once again a self-interested coalition of a few Democrats and a great many Republicans thwarted this measure. That action will no doubt be President Eisenhower's excuse to do nothing about the matter.

We did not enact the health insurance program of the President since it would have done nothing except help some insurance companies. It would have done nothing for the individuals who need medical and hospital assistance or insurance to pay therefor.

Throughout this program, the unbalanced scale continued to dominate the administration's thinking. No matter who sponsored the legislation, the Democratic Party approach was: If it was for the benefit of the people as a whole, we supported the bill. This cannot be said of the Republican Party. Their narrow interests and petty insights have not yet revealed to them the importance of the broadest approach for the benefit of the greatest number.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS—PERILOUS PATHS

Under our system of government, the President must assume the leadership in the realm of international affairs. He must

make the policy in the first instance. His State Department should be his spokesman. Congress may respond by approving appropriations or by senatorial action on proposed treaties.

The path of peace is always difficult. The Democratic Party believes it can only be maintained by an unequivocal but honorable approach to foreign affairs. To find a permanent peace, we must be vigilant and alert, honest with ourselves and with our allies, and firm with our potential enemies.

The ideological conflict between the East and West continues. The Communist countries have changed their outward demands, but they have not changed their aims of world domination. This administration has made no attempt to move forward in this field. It has mumbled and fumbled, it has bluffed and rebuffed, it has bleated and retreated.

The Democratic Party has supported President Eisenhower in his attempts to find a road to peace. We have supported his foreign-aid program authorizing $3.9 billion to be used for military, economic, and technical assistance to our friends and allies during the next year. Although the President asked for more, his aids have admitted that they cannot spend in the next year the funds now appropriated for those purposes.

The removal of U.S. troops from Japan is imminent and will permit her, as our ally, to regain her true place in the world of nations. The House passed a resolution asking that Japan be admitted to the United Nations.

I have been continually opposed to the Near East policies of President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles. Their blindness, if not stupidity, has helped raise Egypt's Nasser to a position in which he threatens the peace of the world.

Our demand for arms for Israel has been ignored. Instead of firmly insisting upon a cessation of hostility, Dulles has encouraged Arab fighting. We demanded that Dulles and Eisenhower protest against blocking the Suez Canal to Israeli and Greek ships. My question is still unanswered: "What will the United States do when American ships are barred?"

The antisemitic boycott by the Arab States has been approved by a delinquent administration. It has excluded American soldiers and American civilian employees of the Jewish faith from American bases in Saudi Arabia.

PROTECTING THE INTEGRITY OF UNITED STATES CITIZENSHIP

From the very earliest days of the establishment of our Nation, we have insisted that American citizens, wherever they may be and wherever they may go, must be treated as such regardless of race, color, or religion. We have a long history of having come to the aid of American citizens wherever their rights have been threatened, impaired, or impeded.

This administration has sadly failed the American people and has repeatedly and constantly backed away from that fundamental principle of American freedom.

The protection of the integrity of U.S. citizenship and of the proper rights of U.S. citizens to lawful trade and travel and other activities abroad, is a basic principle of U.S. sovereignty. It is a primary principle of our Nation that there shall be no distinction among U.S. citizens based upon individual religious affiliations.

Any attempts by foreign nations to create such distinction among our citizens in the granting of personal or commercial access, or any other rights otherwise available to U.S. citizens, is inconsistent with and contrary to our principles. Any such distinction directed against U.S. citizens is incompatible with the relations that should exist among friendly nations.

We should insist that in all negotiations between the United States and any foreign state that every reasonable effort should be made to maintain these principles. We should carry on no negotiations and engage in no conventions, agreements, or treaties with any foreign nation that does not recognize these principles or violates them.

These principles have been so firmly embedded in our tradition that up to 1952 no political party found it necessary to restate them in a political platform.

In 1952, however, the Republicans inserted these words in their platform, to wit:

"We shall see to it that no treaty or agreement with other countries deprives our citizens of the rights guaranteed them by the Federal Constitution."

That should have been a warning signal. We had no such treaties or agreements then and have none now. No prior administration, Republican or Democratic, ever permitted the rights of American citizens to be impaired by any foreign country.

This administration, however, has permitted the Arab States to disregard, ignore, and even trample upon the rights of American citizens in travel and trade. They prohibit Americans from traveling into, through, or over these nations because of religion. On the same basis they refuse to allow Americans to trade with their own citizens.

This administration has ignominiously permitted a foreign nation to violate a treaty obligation and acquiesced in that country, Saudi Arabia, banning American citizens from an American base on the sole ground of religion.

CIVIL DEFENSE

To aid our civilian defense program Congress has increased the appropriation for construction of aircraft control and warning systems.

Testimony adduced before congressional committees established that our so-called civilian defense is utterly worthless and completely valueless in the event of an atomic bomb attack. Every penny presently being spent by the so-called Department of Civilian Defense is wasted.

Nevertheless, this administration would do nothing to improve this horrible and horrifying situation.

CONCLUSION

The record of the 84th Congress speaks well for our country. It could have been better. I am sure it would have been better, if we had had a Democratic president.

The levelheaded approach of a Democratic Congress under a Republican President produced meritorious legislation. We did not enact all that legislation that should have been passed. What was accomplished, in the main, is a record that the Democratic Party can be proud of. Even though we worked under an unsympathetic administration, the national interest was our first thought at all times. I am proud to have had the privilege to serve in the responsible 84th Congress.

DOUBLETALK

(Speech of Hon. ABRAHAM J. MULTER, of New York, in the House of Representatives, Friday, August 30, 1957)

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, this has been a most unusual legislative year. It started with much promise. The 1956 election had returned the people's hero to the Presidency with an unheard of popular vote.

At the same time, they showed their confidence in the Democratic Party by continuing it in control of both Houses of Congress.

Obviously, the American people agreed that control of the 84th Congress by the Democrats under a Republican President was indeed good for our country.

With the 1st session of the 85th Congress behind us, I believe we can demonstrate that the country would have been better off under a Democratic President. I, for one, am certain we would have had more real leadership and much less doubletalk.

Under our system of government we have a right to look to our President for leadership. Our Constitution requires him to send an annual message to Congress on the state of the Union. Traditionally, our Presidents have interpreted that to mean that they are required to submit a legislative program to the Congress.

Never before in our history have we experienced such a lack of leadership by the President, coupled with so much doubletalk.

Absenteeism is bad enough, of and in itself, in high places. Vacillation and indecision are much, much worse. I will concede that few persons reading the President's messages to the Congress can disagree with the fine, high-principled generalities contained therein. But, by the same token, his campaign speeches in 1952 and again in 1956 were in the same vein.

But what are the specifics? What about the implementation of these fine principles?

Some of the President's supporters, even some of the members of his Cabinet, have been brash enough to label his campaign addresses as merely campaign promises. But his messages to the Congress were not campaign speeches.

It is all well and good for our Republican friends to say, "Oh, this is a Democratic Congress, the Democrats are in control. They can pass any legislation they want to."

Such statements, too, are mere doubletalk. The hard, practical facts of political life are that, in a Congress where the majority party does not have an overwhelming majority in both Houses, neither party can pass legislation without the cooperation of at least some members of the other party.

Wise congressional leadership avoids bringing to the floor of the Congress legislation that the leadership knows will be opposed by enough members of the opposition party to defeat the bills.

In all those spheres of activity where our party platforms are in agreement, the President should have been in a position to deliver enough Republican votes to offset the defections in Democratic ranks, so as to give the people of the country a working majority in the Congress.

Permit me now to document my case with some specifics.

PARTY PLATFORMS AGREE, BUT THE PRESIDENT IGNORES THEM

Both parties agree that the minimum wage laws should have wider application; that distressed labor areas require Government aid; that the Taft-Hartley law requires amendment; that all Federal employees and, more particularly, the postal employees, are entitled to increased compensation. In most of these instances the President talked gently and fairly but in generalities. As to the Federal employees and postal employees he spoke specifically. He said they were underpaid. He said they were entitled to increased wages.

In none of these instances, except as to the increase of salaries for Government employees, were we able to enact any legislation, because the President and his appointed officers in the executive departments not only refused to help but actually opposed congressional action.

As to the increases of salaries for Government employees, the President signed the bill which gave those in the highest brackets big increases and more pay.

As to the little fellows, the civil-service employees, the career employees, the post office workers, he sent word to us that if we dared so legislate he would veto the bills. Unfortunately, we couldn't get the bills to him in time to override a veto. As of today—

the last day of this session—it seems certain that the President will veto these bills which do only what he said was fair and just; that is, to give to the little fellow, the civil-service worker and the post-office employee, a cost-of-living increase.

BIG BUSINESS GETS BIGGER AND SMALL BUSINESS GOES TO THE WALL

Other spheres of activity where we got the same kind of doubletalk involved monopolies, trusts, and big business. The mergers continue. Big business gets bigger. Their profits grow. The small businessman goes into bankruptcy. The big businessman gets more and bigger tax cuts by way of fast write-offs and obsolescence and depletion allowances and Government giveaways, and the little fellow gets the tax bills.

The President is still advocating a natural gas bill. One day he advocated an amendment to that bill, to protect the consumer, and the next day he said he would take the bill without the amendment.

He opposes the development of public power and tries to give the natural resources of the country to the big utilities. By his appointment to various Government agencies and commissions, he does all within his power to destroy TVA, rural electrification, and the other important Government agencies.

HUMAN RIGHTS ARE FORGOTTEN

He says he is for statehood for Alaska and Hawaii but will not lift a finger to bring that about. He says he is for liberalization of our immigration laws and, instead of trying to liberalize them, he condones the action of his State Department and his Attorney General in keeping out immigrants clearly entitled to entry into this country under existing law.

The civil rights muddle in the Congress was as much his doing as that of anyone else. He did not know from press conference to press conference what was in the bill labeled "the Eisenhower bill." It is surprising that we got a bill at all under the circumstances. Time will demonstrate, in my opinion, that the bill will accomplish very little except to give him and some of his supporters an excuse for new campaign doubletalk. And all the time, the demagogs will continue to rabble-rouse.

He talked big about Federal aid to education. When it came to a showdown in the House, the bill was lost on a very close vote. It could have been won if the President had made three telephone calls. He could have telephoned one of his erstwhile campaign supporters who left the Democratic Party to urge the people to reelect Mr. Eisenhower and who was absent on the day this important bill was defeated. The other two calls could surely have changed two opposition votes into two votes for the bill. These were not just two votes of Republican Members of the House. These two men are the President's leaders of his party in the House. The three Members of the House referred to, Mr. Speaker, go unnamed as a matter of traditional congressional courtesy. The record vote discloses who they are.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS CONTINUE TO BE BUNGLED AFFAIRS

The muddle in foreign affairs is the direct responsibility of the President and his Secretary of State. Those matters of maladministration have no direct bearing upon the legislative function of the Congress. I therefore make no further mention of them here, particularly since that subject alone would require much more time than I can devote today, and my remarks pertain merely to the legislative program.

Those who are interested may read my statements before the House Foreign Affairs Committee and on the floor of the House on this vital subject.

Suffice it to say, I foretold precisely what to expect with reference to the Middle East, including the recent events in Egypt and Syria. Although I did not pretend to set forth any timetable, the sequence of events was exactly as I predicted.

The so-called Eisenhower doctrine is preventing the spread of communism and sovietism exactly nowhere.

THE HIGH COST OF EVERYTHING

The increase of interest rates on Government and private debt is the direct responsibility of the President and his Secretary of the Treasury. They have increased the cost of living of every man, woman, and child in the country by increasing the expense of operation of every business enterprise in the country.

The increase in cost of Government is staggering. At the same time, while telling us that the people should save more money and spend less, the President and his Secretary of the Treasury keep the interest rates on Government savings bonds under other interest rates, destroying the incentive of our citizens to save.

He insists that mortgage interest rates be raised and because Congress refuses to increase the interest rates on veterans' mortgages, he threatens to veto the extension of the GI mortgage bill.

I, and many of our colleagues, have been urging that the veterans are entitled to direct loans from the Government. This would not be using Government money but would be using their own life-insurance funds.

Banks, trust companies, life-insurance companies, pension funds, all invest their money in real-estate mortgages. But some shortsighted people urge that the veterans' life-insurance funds should be invested only in low-interest Government bonds instead of in 4-percent veterans' mortgages.

We could not prevail upon our colleagues to go that far. The bill we sent to the President, which he now threatens to veto, merely extends existing law, permitting veterans to get mortgages in those areas of the country where FHA is not operating and for reasons mainly of convenience cannot or will not operate.

The President glibly talks about controlling inflation and urges voluntary restraint by labor and business to keep costs down.

Then he ridicules labor's promise to forgo wage increases if big business will lower prices.

At the same time, he permits price increases in all Government restaurants serving the very employees whose wages he will not increase. He allows their rents and those of all others in FHA houses to be increased, thus setting the example for increased rents by all landlords.

That is not doubletalk; it is doubledealing.

SOME HOPE FOR SMALL BUSINESS

The House passed a Small Business Administration Act to make that agency permanent and to make it more effective in serving the small-business community of our Nation. Despite the fact that the President has not talked out in favor of this bill, we hope that in the next session of Congress, the Senate will pass the House version of that bill.

By that time, too, I hope we will have a good bill ready to give the small businessmen some sorely needed tax relief.

FUNNY FIGURES MAKE PHONY BUDGETS

The worst example of doubletalk on the part of the administration, however, came with reference to the budget and the request for appropriations for defense, for foreign aid, and for operation of the Government.

In this field, too, no one knew where the President or his appointees stood from one day to the next. All sorts of ridiculous claims were submitted to the Congress for exaggerated sums. Probing by alert members of the Appropriations Committees showed how farcical some of these claims were.

Despite the disclosure of tremendous waste of money and property during the last 5 years, heads of the departments, aided and abetted by the President, came forth again urging more money than they needed and more money than they could spend.

After the money was appropriated and the bills approved into law by the President, he then directed the heads of various departments not to spend the sums appropriated.

I will refer to only two of the many instances of this heinous maladministration.

The U.S. Public Health Service has indicated its need for funds to prevent a yellow fever epidemic threatening the United States. The money was appropriated. The bill was signed. The Budget Bureau, under the direction of the President, has directed the department not to expend those moneys, the sole purpose of which was to control the disease.

This is the Government that is conservative where property is concerned and liberal where human values are concerned. That is not my language. That is the modern Republicanism of President Eisenhower.

One more instance of the same kind. After the appropriation for the Defense Department had been approved into law by signature of the President, he then directed that the money not be spent. Mind you, this is the very appropriation request, which when cut by the Congress, was declared by the President to be insufficient for our national security. Now he says to his Department heads that they may not spend as much money as was appropriated.

Practically all of the Members of Congress from Metropolitan New York attended a conference with Navy Department officials, urging them not to release skilled career employees. It was admitted that if these men were discharged their skills and services would probably be forever lost to the Government. It was further conceded that the full sum necessary to keep these men employed for the next year had been appropriated and that the men were being dismissed solely in order to come within the President's directive to spend less money than had been appropriated. The question of national defense and security was subordinated to the demand to save a few paltry dollars.

WASTE AND CORRUPTION

Congressional committees continue to uncover waste and corruption in every department of Government. At another time, I will discourse at length upon this subject, which continues to be ignored by our President, except on those occasions when he awards a medal or a certificate of merit to the head of the department whose misconduct is exposed.

All of these facts are borne out by the record.

HAD ENOUGH?

(Speech of Hon. ABRAHAM J. MULTER, of New York, in the House of Representatives, Saturday, August 23, 1958)

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, please pardon my partisan pride in saying that as surely as the 80th Congress has gone down into history as the do-nothing Congress, so will the 85th Congress be remembered as one with the greatest accomplishment under the most adverse conditions.

With no constructive leadership in the White House or from any of our President's appointees, the Congress could have sat on its hands. Instead, it worked harder to establish a good record of accomplishment.

Ignoring the campaign threats of the Republican Party and its titular leader, by dint of resolute, intelligent, and responsible legislating we put to shame the prophecies of a

cold war between the White House and the Congress.

We proved once again that the Democratic Party, by and large, is the spokesman, yes, the protector of the people of our country, serving them so as to accomplish the greatest good for the greatest number.

I have placed in the RECORD the speeches I made at the end of the 84th Congress on July 27, 1956, and at the end of the 1st session of this, the 85th Congress, on August 30, 1957. I suggest that they make good reading as an introduction to these remarks. I will borrow some of the titles I used then and bring the facts up to date.

THE CONSUMER, LABOR, AND THE FARMER: THE TIGHT SQUEEZE

The last year saw the laws of economics repealed by the facts of life.

In the midst of a most depressing recession with between 7 and 8 million persons unemployed, the cost of living continued to soar.

As much as 7 percent of our total civilian labor force could find no employment. That is, 7 percent of those who were ready, willing, and able to work, were unemployed. In 5½ years of Republican maladministration, the cost of living rose by 9 percent, almost 3 percent in the last year alone. In 1958, the average American family is paying $406 more per year for the necessities of life than in 1953.

Why? Because the big businessmen in control of the executive departments of Government, appointed by our President, tightened the money supply, made money harder to get, raised interest rates, increased rents on properties built with Government subsidies, gave away our surplus commodities or permitted them to be stolen by friends of big business appointees, squandered our money in boondoggles and refused to spend it for defense, national security, health, and education.

The unthinking may readily say: The Democrats were in control of the Congress and could have stopped all of that.

My answer is twofold: First, let the people in the next election give the Democratic Party a substantial majority in both Houses, enough to override Presidential vetoes, and we will do a real job. Secondly, all the reactionaries and all the conservatives are not in the Republican Party. I am sorry to say that some of them are in the Democratic Party too. If the President were really the leader he should be, he could have been able to get enough liberal Republicans to make up for the defections in the Democratic ranks.

Suffice it to say, in almost every instance a majority of the Democrats were found voting for what was best for our country and a majority of the Republicans voted the other way.

For instance, we could not get enough Republicans to join us in voting for a good housing bill, or for a community-facilities bill or a mining bill, or for scholarships for college students, or for higher minimum wages, or for aid for school construction, or for giving our surplus-food commodities to our needy, who are on relief, or for reform of our labor laws. Most of these measures were lost by a few votes on the floor or in committee. The President never raised a finger to help get these bills enacted. We did get enacted a bill to aid depressed areas. The rumor mill indicates the President intends to veto it.

HUMAN RIGHTS ARE FORGOTTEN

Of course all of this fits the pattern of modern Republicanism enunciated by the President and mouthed by his supporters. Remember it? "Liberal where human rights are concerned and conservative as to money matters."

None will deny that most of these bills would cost money. At the same time, no sensible person will dare challenge the statement that all of these bills vitally affect every human being in our country and all of their rights and privileges.

When talking of human beings and relieving their distress, we must not overlook the fact that we passed laws permitting some 30,000 Hungarian refugees to remain here and also permitting persons illegally here since 1940 to apply for permission to remain.

CIVIL RIGHTS

We can give our Republican friends credit for helping to get enacted a bill to guarantee our citizens the right to vote.

Up to this minute, I have not yet heard of a single case instituted under that law by our President's Republican Attorney General.

The same law calls for a commission to be appointed by our President to impartially study and advise the President on conditions that may deprive citizens of the equal protection of the law because of race, color, or religion. Draw your own conclusions from the fact that one of the President's appointees to that Commission contributed $500 to the campaign chest to elect to the U.S. Senate an avowed segregationist.

I refrain from any comment about the Little Rock fiasco.

SMALL BUSINESS

Big business and big bank mergers continue unabated.

There have been no big business failures.

Bankruptcies nevertheless are at a record high—yes, higher even than in the depression of the 1930's. They are 129 percent higher than in 1952, the last year of the Truman administration.

To the credit of our Republican colleagues, most of them joined us in supporting several measures to help small business.

These bills enacted into law were:

First. Making the Small Business Administration a permanent agency of Government and increasing the amount it may lend to any one small business concern.

Second. Establishing in the Small Business Administration a new division for aiding small business concerns to get long-term risk and equity capital, and

Third. Giving to small business some long overdue tax relief.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS—PERILOUS PATHS—FOREIGN AFFAIRS CONTINUE TO BE BUNGLED AFFAIRS

The titles borrowed from my prior speeches tell the story.

American citizens abroad continue to be abused, affronted, jailed, and even murdered in cold blood.

Our State Department looks the other way.

In fact, the standing joke abroad is—the more degrading an act a foreign country can commit against our country, the more money it can get from us on the double quick.

Unfortunately, we still have no foreign policy other than to stumble from brink to brink and from crisis to crisis. Further comment is withheld lest I give comfort to our enemies.

Fortunately, there is a good Lord above who protects us. I pray He will never turn His back on us, no matter how sorely we try Him.

BAD GOVERNMENT—WASTE AND CORRUPTION

Add to my previous itemizations just a few more: vicuna coats, hotel bills, traveling expenses, "borrowed" rugs, non-interest-bearing loans, valuable franchises to the favored few, Government contracts to friends, tax arrears settled, abated, or remitted for those who know the right people, and so on ad nauseam.

"Businesslike methods": Remember Candidate Ike's promise? Listen to just one of the many "businesslike" deals. The Department of Agriculture sold surplus rice to private traders at $40 a ton. They sold the rice back to ICA, another U.S. Government agency, for $59.50 a ton, without even moving it. A neat little profit of $150,000. I will not ask who got what lest I be told it was only a rice cooky.

PROMISE AND PERFORMANCE

It will take much too long to list all of the breaches of promise that are attributable to our Republican friends in high places. I give you just a few that are typical.

Promise: Leadership.

Performance: The general will be found far to the rear.

Promise: A cold war with Congress.

Performance: A Congress that produced a maximum of good legislation with a minimum of friction.

Promise: Increased prosperity.

Performance: A bad recession.

Promise: A lower cost of living.

Performance: A higher cost of living.

Promise: Full employment.

Performance: Distressful unemployment.

Promise: A balanced budget.

Performance: A $12 billion deficit.

Promise: Reduce the Nation's debt limit.

Performance: Increased it by $10 billion.

Promise: Get our boys home from Korea.

Performance: Put them in Lebanon, and I dare not predict where next.

Promise: Honesty in government.

Performance: My deep respect for our American institutions prevents me from labeling that one.

CONCLUSION

Remember the Republican slogan, "Had enough?" I will be watching for the democratic answer on election day. I intentionally spell "democratic" with a small "d."

FIGURES—OF PRINCIPAL AND OF INTEREST—OF SPEECH AND OF PRINCIPLE—AND OF INTEREST

(Extension of remarks of Hon. ABRAHAM J. MULTER, of New York, in the House of Representatives, Monday, September 14, 1959)

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the dropping of your gavel coincident with your pronouncement that this 1st session of the 86th Congress has ended will surely come in a matter of moments. I therefore ask your indulgence, while I recount briefly our congressional activities.

We have done much in which we can take pride as Americans and as Democrats.

There is still much to be done. Most of that we will do in the second session of this Congress, which will start on January 6, 1960. But in a never-ending fast-moving world, new problems will always beset us. Instead of delving into the future, a most uncertain task at best, I will dwell on the immediate past.

We have enacted into law some 400 laws of general national and international interest. Of that number, about 100 can be labeled of major importance. Merely to list all of these would take much more time than is now available. I, therefore, will refer only to the most important.

SPENDING

We appropriated more than $39 billion for national security and defense; that is almost 60 percent of the total sum appropriated for the fiscal year for all purposes. This is $20 million less than the President asked for.

The total sum appropriated for all purposes, including what Republicans invidiously refer to as back-door financing, was $79,428,598,352, more than $2½ billion less than the President requested.

It can never be sufficiently emphasized that the Congress can merely authorize expenditures and appropriate the money therefor. Only the President and his appointees, under his direction and control, can spend the money. Surely we, the Congress, can refuse to authorize or appropriate. But even after

we do both only the Executive—the President—can spend. Under our form of government there is but one spender—the President. Repeatedly, the incumbent now in the White House has ignored congressional intent and directive. He has refused to spend money as directed, spent it contrary to congressional directives and even spread out and canceled out contracts authorized and let.

Let us never forget that when our Republican friends and campaigners start calling names, the only spender, reckless or otherwise, in our National Government, is the titular head of the Republican Party, President Eisenhower. By doubling the cost of operation of his own office, he has set the spendthrift example which all his appointees seek to imitate.

While on the subject of spending, let me remind you that a major part of the cost of Government is the interest we pay on U.S. obligations. This administration without the help of Congress and over our vigorous protests has run up that cost from 1953 to date by more than 100 percent. Starting with short-term interest rates of under 2 percent and long-term rates of not more than 2½ percent, President Eisenhower has approved our paying 4¾ percent and assents to the threat of his Secretary of the Treasury that we may yet pay 6 percent. The President and his big-moneyed friends are demanding that the Congress eliminate the limit on the interest rate on long-term bonds so that he can, and I quote the President, "demonstrate responsibility in the management of our Federal debt."

Responsibility, indeed. He may have forgotten but we cannot forget that this is the same fiscal genius who in two political campaigns—1952 and 1956—promised to reduce the national debt. Three times since his first promise, at his request we increased the debt limit. This year by $2 billion to $285 billion permanently and to $295 billion temporarily until 1960.

I am proud that this Congress increased the interest rate payable on savings bonds and refused to increase it on long-term bonds. I have been introducing a bill to accomplish that in each of the last four Congresses. The administration has at long last seen the light and gone along with me.

Note the difference between savings bonds, the E- and H-bonds, and other Government securities. The savings bonds are anti-inflationary because they tend to immobilize savings. Other securities produce money that flows into the money stream to pay bills for construction, experimentation, material, services, and the like.

Savings bonds traditionally, until 1953, paid an interest rate higher than savings and thrift accounts. Our people are not so stupid as to keep their savings in bonds at minimum rates, when they can keep them in institutions paying maximum rates, all guaranteed by U.S. Government agencies.

I suppose it is human nature to take care of one's friends. So let us not be too hard on Ike and his big-business, big-moneyed friends, who say let the devil take care of the masses, the wage-earners and little businessmen and his E- and H-savings bonds. Be sure these big business operators in Government will take care of their friends with more and more profits and higher and higher interest rates. They will continue to complain about being in the 90-percent tax bracket, to try to make us forget that the little fellows pay 90 percent of the gross tax collection.

Before I leave the fiscal affairs of our Nation I wish to comment on the scare campaign the Republicans are engaging in about inflation.

The one thing they learned from President Roosevelt was "there is nothing to fear except fear itself." The difference is that he tried to teach us to be unafraid. They are using that concept in reverse, to scare us into ignoring the facts of life.

If they can cry inflation loud enough and long enough, we may look away from administered prices that ignore the law of supply and demand. We may not learn that the worst kind of inflation comes from administered prices coupled with unconscionable interest rates. The very people who are demanding that we cut Government expenses are the same ones who are pushing prices up, demanding higher interest rates and tax cuts, allowances, and exemptions, and all to balance the budget.

In 1958, the banks and moneylenders of the country had their best year in our history in gross receipts and in net profits—both before and after taxes. Nineteen hundred and fifty-nine will be even better.

The same is true of corporation profits. Eight hundred and eight leading corporations showed a 56-percent increase in profits this year over the same period for 1958—$6,915,729,000 as against $4,438,065,000, or $2,477,644,000 more net profits after taxes. More than half of these did better than that average. Four hundred and twenty-eight of these corporations improved their corporate profits by more than 75 percent in the second quarter of 1959 as against the same quarter in 1958.

These 808 companies are the very ones paying for full-page ads to frighten us out of our skins because of inflation they created and as a result of which they made these profits.

BANKING LAWS

In the financial field, we also enacted bills that increased our subscriptions to the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development—the World Bank—to set up a new Inter-American Bank for Central and South America similar to the World Bank, some modernization of the National Banking and Federal Reserve Acts, restrictions on holding companies in the savings and loan association field, and the first complete revision in 25 years of the Federal Credit Union Act. I was most pleased that the credit union bill was enacted in almost the exact form in which I had introduced it.

FOREIGN AID

The mutual security authorization and appropriation bills were a fine example of the operation of our Government in true bipartisan spirit, with both parties in Congress and the President moving forward in the best interests of our country and of world peace.

What irked me, however, was that in his messages to us asking for legislation in the international field the President indicated we had enough money for loans and grants abroad, for housing abroad, for highways abroad, for reclamation and community facility projects abroad, for schools and education and health programs abroad, in short for almost everything anyone could ask for abroad. But the domestic scene was different. From his veto messages it became apparent he thought we did not have enough money for any of these things needed so badly at home; not even enough for loans to our cities and States.

My position on these matters was and is quite simple—I am for all of these things for foreign friends. I have always voted for them. But I have and always will vote for them for our people at home as long as we need them.

If the time is here or ever comes that we do not have enough for both, we must first take care of our own and use the surplus, if any, to take care of those abroad.

This is not a matter of charity begins at home. This is fiscal responsibility as to taxpayers' money. I can apportion my personal funds, charitywise as I please. I have no right to do so with taxpayers' funds.

RULE BY VETO

Incidentally, it is well to note that although we overrode a Presidential veto only once, each of the other votes by which we failed to override demonstrated that the overwhelming majority of the people and their representatives were against the President. The Constitution requires a two-thirds vote to make a bill law against a Presidential veto. In neither House does the Democratic Party control a two-thirds vote. In the Senate there are 35 Republicans and 65 Democrats. In the House there are 153 Republicans, 283 Democrats, and 1 vacancy. We failed to override vetoes by from one to six votes on important measures, thus permitting one-third of either House plus one to six votes to thwart the will of a vast majority of the people's representatives.

VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Veterans' affairs were given considerable attention. We extended their direct loan program, although in my opinion not sufficiently nor in the right direction. Among other things we should not have increased their interest rates. At the urging of this administration, these rates have now been pushed up by 32 percent since 1953. We wrote a new Veterans' Pension Act and extended veterans' preferences and entitlements. Still pending is much needed legislation for a civilian pardons board to review sentences imposed upon members of the armed services.

MISCELLANEOUS

Business has been helped by amendments to the antitrust laws, the Small Business Administration Act and the Small Business Investment Company Act. Much more needs to be done in these fields.

Increased benefits to retired employees, extended temporary unemployment compensation, changes in our immigration laws, the extension of the Draft Act, establishment of a National Space Agency, aid to Federal airports and a TVA self-financing act are among our creditable accomplishments.

HOUSING

Two vetoes of the housing bills were further demonstration of smoke screens blown up to camouflage real issues. The third housing bill, which the President approved, is just as inflationary as the two he vetoed. The only real difference in substance is that the final approved version omits $50 million in loans for college classrooms. The President admits we need the classrooms but contends that in the $8 billion housing loan guarantee program, which he approved, a $50 million loan program is inflationary. He had his way—a Pyrrhic victory, if ever there was one. No one will ever be able to assess the loss to the Nation and the world if only one potential genius is denied a college education because these loans are postponed to an election year.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Hawaii became a State, thus establishing another beacon light along the path of true democracy and affirming the divinely inspired sentiments of our Founding Fathers that "all men are created equal" and "are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights" and that "governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the governed."

Our citizens in the District of Columbia have not fared as well. Five times in the last 10 years, the Senate has passed a bill granting home rule to the District. Not once during that time has the House District Committee reported a bill. Not once in that period, until I filed a discharge petition, to bring a home rule bill before the House, did the House District Committee even conduct any hearings. Congressional courtesy dictates that I do not characterize

those hearings. Suffice it to say, that if some members of that committee and of the Rules Committee have their way, no bill will reach the floor in this Congress.

A home rule bill will be acted upon by this Congress only if 219 Members sign my discharge petition. Up to this time 104 Democrats and 16 Republicans or a total of 120 Members have signed it.

Home rule for the District of Columbia is pledged by both party platforms. The public is fast learning that we are getting a lot of double talk from our Republican friends. No one expects southern Republicans or southern Democrats to support home rule for the Nation's Capital. That eliminates about 120 Members, 111 Democrats, and 9 Republicans. Four hundred and thirty-six less 120 leaves 316. One hundred and fifty-three Republicans less 9 southern Republicans leaves a net balance of 144. Two hundred eighty-three Democrats less 111 southern Democrats leaves a net balance of 172. One hundred four of the 172 Democrats have already signed the discharge petition. Only 16 of the 144 Republicans have signed it. That is a terrible indictment of the Republican Party. I am certain that if the Republicans will sign that petition in the same ratio as the Democrats have, in the first 2 weeks of January 1960, enough additional Democrats will sign the petition to bring the bill to the floor.

THE LABOR BILL

One other important piece of legislation that was enacted has been hailed as the labor reform bill. Time will prove, in my opinion, that this was the worst piece of anti-industrial-city and anti-labor legislation ever enacted by any Congress.

I impugn no Member's motives, good faith, or integrity. I trust that those who voted for that bill will credit as much to me and the 200 colleagues whom I joined in voting against that bill. It ill behooves any citizen, capitalist, union leader, businessman, or wage earner to pretend to be so omniscient as to have the right to accuse anyone on either side of a vote of 229 to 201 of having voted except in accordance with what his conscience dictated was best for our country. If as few as 13 Members voted the other way, the bill would have been defeated by a tie vote of 215 to 215, with the Speaker casting the deciding negative vote. If the four absentees had been present and voted nay—since they were not paired, I do not say they would have so voted—it would have required only a switch of 11 votes to defeat the bill.

No one will dare say that there is any Member of this House, regardless of how he or she voted on this bill, who would not vote to eliminate racketeering and crime not merely from union activities but from every sphere of activity on the American and even on the world scene.

The same must be said about legislation that would make unions more responsible and more responsive to the needs and desires of their members. Again that must also be said of legislation that would protect business as well as the public against illegal or improper activities of unions.

This bill was represented as accomplishing those ends. I will concede, for the sake of argument only, that that was the purpose of the bill.

I am convinced, however, it does not and will not accomplish those ends. To the extent that it tends to, I am afraid it does so by means that the courts will condemn. There are now more than enough laws on our statute books to arrest, indict, and convict every criminal, in and out of unions, whether the crime is perjury, embezzlement, forgery, fraud, bribery, theft, assault, murder, or conspiracy to commit any of these crimes or merely the attempt to do so. On that score we do not need more laws but better enforcement of those we do have.

To the extent that this bill may make criminal that which heretofore was legal, though perhaps immoral, under our Constitution, the law must be prospective and not retroactive in its effect.

It follows, therefore, that it will oust from unions, on account of past conduct, no one, no matter how bad and no matter what his name.

Despite all of the foregoing, I could have brought myself to vote for the bill if it had not been for its other many bad features. I believe they far outweighed all the good sought to be accomplished.

In voting on all bills I try to keep in mind our fundamental law, the Constitution, and particularly that portion of it known the world over as the Bill of Rights. I will never vote for any piece of legislation, no matter how well intentioned, which does not square with it. If it violates the Bill of Rights, I cannot support it. That Bill of Rights must forever remain inviolate. If we chip away even the slightest part thereof we begin to destroy it.

This bill, in my opinion, oversteps the bounds of propriety; it makes second-class citizens of unionists and workingmen who might desire to join unions; it denies them rights guaranteed to them by our Constitution.

Furthermore, this bill can be used to entice business out of our industrial centers and into labor surplus parts of the country. It is not sectionalism that prompts me to take this position. It is part of the free enterprise competitive system for business to move to the place where it can operate most profitably.

However, the best interests of our country, of the whole country, demand that no part of the country be permitted to entice businessmen to come there because of the promise or intimation that by moving there they will have cheap labor, sweatshop conditions, or nonunion shops. This misnamed labor reform bill practically guarantees to every unionized business firm that it can freely move to nonunion States and be forever free from unionization. To me that means destroying unions and enslaving the working men and women of our country. I am all for raising the standards of our citizens to the highest prevailing. I am opposed to lowering those standards to the lowest prevailing.

A PERSONAL NOTE

Permit me at this time to inject a rather personal note. During this session, I was incapacitated by illness, from which, thank God, I have recovered. For a long time I was out of Washington and for an even longer period prevented from giving full time to my congressional duties. But everything in this world has its compensating balances. My misfortune brought me the good that comes from learning how much our colleagues are genuinely concerned about each other. They extended to me a spirit of fellowship and camaraderie close to kinship. It crossed district and State lines as well as party lines and religious and color lines The assistance and offers of aid to me, and more particularly to my staff, were immeasurable. I am forever in their debt. I am, indeed, grateful. Some say only in America can it happen. I say only in America it does happen.